UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

Appendix

VOLUME 96—PART 13

JANUARY 3, 1950, TO FEBRUARY 28, 1950

(PAGES A1 TO A1448)

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE, WASHINGTON, 1950

AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

MAR 12 1950

United States of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 81st CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Appendix

Address of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by President Truman at a luncheon of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Washington yesterday, as recorded and transcribed by the New York Times from a radio broadcast:

I congratulate the National Conference of Christians and Jews on another year of widespread and effective work in the cause of human brotherhood at home and abroad. I assure you of my support and enthusiasm for your program for the coming year, and, in particular, for your brotherhood week, which is to be held next February.

I know of no organization that renders greater service to the basic principles on which this country is founded than the National Conference of Christians and Jews. This country is founded upon an ideal—the ideal of the equality of men before God and under the law.

On the basis of this ideal, we have created a nation composed of people from many lands with many faiths and many beliefs. Here in this country men of different traditions and different faiths have worked together for the common good.

I have just come from the National Cemetery at Arlington, where I laid a wreath on the grave of an American hero. No American knows, no real American cares, whether that man was a Catholic, a Jew, or a Protestant, or what his origin or color were. That grave—the Grave of the Unknown Soldier—symbolizes our faith in unity.

We have achieved our unity in this country, not by eliminating our differences in religion and tradition, not by hiding or suppressing our political and economic conflicts, but by holding to a concept, which rises above them all, the concept of the brotherhood of man.

FIRST STEP OF ENEMIES

The first step of every enemy of this country has always been to attempt to separate the different strands of faith and belief out of which this Nation has been woven. Our enemies have tried to set up group against group, faith against faith—to create prejudice and to spread hate and distrust among our people.

The great service of the National Conference of Christians and Jews is to fight against the forces of intolerance, to bring light to the dark byways of prejudice, and to spread the spirit of tolerance and brotherhood which unites our country. This is a great patriotic service, and the country is indebted to the men and women in this organization who have given so much of their effort and substance in performing it.

In looking over your record of performance for the last year, I have been impressed by your comprehensive day-to-day program of education. Your efforts to promote understanding and eliminate prejudice have extended to almost every kind of organization in our society. You have reached not only the schools and colleges, not only the churches and synagogs, but factories and shops, the press, the radio, and the movies, and organizations of veterans, women, and young people.

You will, I am sure, go on to reach more of these groups and bring your message to every agency that helps shape those attitudes of mind which are important to good citizenship.

This fine work by your organization will reach its peak again next February in Brotherhood Week. I am happy to have the opportunity to serve again as honorary chairman of that event. I am sure that it will be a notable success under the leadership of my friend John Sullivan, former Secretary of the Navy, and with the help of those associated with him, who are gathered here today and who are listening in.

STRENGTH IN PRINCIPLES

The greatest strength of this organization lies in its fundamental principles. The National Conference of Christians and Jews has rightly recognized that the true foundation of the brotherhood of man is belief in God. The only sure bedrock of human brotherhood is the knowledge that God is the father of mankind.

In the history of the world, there have been some movements inspired by a desire for brotherhood and greater justice among men which have denied or forgotten the religious foundation of those ideals. Sooner or later these movements have wavered and lost their way.

They have become self-centered; they have set up their own interests as the only standard of right and wrong, and they have degenerated from movements of liberation into movements of tyranny and oppression. We can succeed in achieving brotherhood only if we acknowledge that the ideal of brotherhood is something outside or above us, something by which we in our turn will also be judged.

All the great religions represented in this organization, whatever their differences, acknowledge this belief in God as the father and creator of mankind. For us, therefore, brotherhood is not only a generous impulse but also a divine command. Others may be moved into brotherhood only by sentiment. We acknowledge brotherhood as a religious duty.

All the faiths represented here claim as a common heritage the great thoughts of the Hebrew prophets. The prophets were among the first of men who saw that the concept of the fatherhood of God required men to do justice to one another. They called on the people of their day, just as they call on us today, not only to recognize the humanity of others but also to work unceasingly for the achievement of a greater justice in human relations.

Those of us who believe in God, therefore, can never be content to live for ourselves alone. We must always be working to eliminate injustice, and to create a society which carries out our ideals.

If we look at ourselves in the true spirit of brotherhood, we must acknowledge that in the United States there are instances of discrimination and injustice because of difference in color, religion, or national origin.

But we are working diligently to overcome these violations of the fundamental faith which holds us together. It is encouraging to see that Americans all over the country are growing more and more aware of the importance of this problem.

ASKS LAWS FOR GREATER JUSTICE

I have asked that our Federal Government take an active part in this effort to achieve greater justice. I have called for legislation to protect the rights of all its citizens and to assure their equal participation in national life, and to reduce discrimination based upon prejudice. In view of the fundamental faith of this country and the clear language of our Constitution, I do not see how we can do otherwise than adopt such legislation.

We must strive abroad, as well as at home, to defend human rights and to expand the enjoyment of freedom. We have taken a firm stand in the councils of the United Nations against the violation of human rights. With the help of your organization and others like it, we have been able to play an important part in the United Nations in developing such historical international documents as the Declaration of Human Rights and the Convention on Genocide.

Furthermore, we realize that economic progress is essential to the peace and brotherhood that we desire for all mankind. That is why we are striving with other nations to create world economic conditions in which people may achieve freedom and dignity.

That is why we are undertaking our program of economic assistance and putting forward our proposals for helping underdeveloped regions of the world to achieve a better standard of living through their own efforts.

The task of achieving greater justice and freedom will be long and it will be difficult. The beliefs on which we have founded our form of government and our hope of a better world are under attack. In various parts of the world today human rights and freedom are being deliberately violated and

suppressed. Men and women are being systematically persecuted for their religious beliefs. Campaigns are being waged to turn religion into the tool of the state.

These things are not only morally wrong, they threaten to undo the slow and hard-won achievements of civilization. They represent a new barbarism, more terrible than that of ancient times. These are the acts of men who conceive of other men as slaves and not as brothers.

My friends, I am doing everything of which I am capable to organize the moral forces in the world to meet this situation. I am trying to get all those people who look up and who know that there is a greater power than man in the universe to organize themselves to meet those who look down and who are strictly materialistic. That's what we are up against.

The defense of mankind against these attacks lies in the faith we profess—the brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God. Men and women who have this faith will refuse to bow to force. They will refuse to worship the power of the state.

They will refuse to set their own nation or their own group above criticism. For they understand that above all these works of man there is the eternal standard of God by which we shall all be judged.

It is only the people of religious faith throughout the world who have the power to overcome the force of tyranny. It is in their beliefs that the path can be found to justice and freedom. Their religious concepts are the only sure foundation of the democratic ideal.

To them, therefore, we must extend the hand of brotherhood. This is a task for all men of good will, working together everywhere. There can be no higher challenge than to build a world of freedom and justice, a world in which all men are brothers. That is the goal toward which we must strive with all our strength.

Sustained and strengthened by one another, we can go forward under God to meet and overcome the difficulties which confront us. With His help mankind will come at last to a world where peace, freedom, and justice will be enjoyed by all people everywhere.

A Fitting Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES W. WADSWORTH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and article from the Buffalo Courier-Express of Sunday, January 1, 1950:

A FITTING MEMORIAL

Two weeks from today—January 15—the $20,000,000 veterans hospital will be dedicated. This new facility will mean a great deal to Buffalo as well as to the veterans it will serve. But to have it known only as the Veterans' Administration Hospital in Buffalo or the Buffalo VA Hospital seems a mighty cold proposition. For this reason we strongly urge that it be given a more significant name.

The search for an individual to be honored, and at the same time one whose name would honor the hospital itself, brings us to one conclusion. Buffalo had just such a man. He served with distinction in World War I, rose from private to major, was wounded in action and won the Distinguished Service Cross for heroism. In World War II he also served with distinction; but this time he did not wear a uniform, though he had much to do with building the great military machines which forced aggressors to their knees at opposite ends of the world. Last year, weakened by overwork in behalf of his country, he died.

We therefore urge the Congress of the United States, which will convene day after tomorrow, to name the new hospital for a former Member of that body—to have it known as Walter Gresham Andrews VA Memorial Hospital.

We have already mentioned that Walter Gresham Andrews won the Distinguished Service Cross for bravery in action as he led an attack of the machine-gun company of the One Hundred and Seventh Infantry on the Hindenburg line on September 29, 1918, but we have not enlarged on the service he gave the armed forces during his 18 years in the House of Representatives. During World War II he was the ranking minority member of the House Military Affairs Committee. In the Eightieth Congress he was the chairman of that committee. Later he became chairman of the Armed Services Committee when that was formed to include Army, Navy, and Air Force affairs under unification. It was the tremendous work involved in this high position that weakened his heart, forced his resignation from Congress, and brought about his death last year. This record, to our way of thinking, makes Walter Gresham Andrews a veteran of veterans.

To stress another point, let us quote from a statement made by the late Defense Secretary James Forrestal:

"Regardless of political affiliation, all those in Government who have known Representative Andrews will learn with regret of his decision to withdraw from public life. Throughout his career, first as a member of the Military Affairs Committee of the House and then as chairman of the Armed Services Committee of the same body, he has rendered great public service."

We agree with Secretary Forrestal. Regardless of Representative Andrews' political affiliations, there should be no quibbling in Congress over naming the hospital as his memorial. We do not believe the men he led in battle against the Hindenburg Line asked if he was a Democrat or a Republican. They knew he was a brave soldier—and he was a brave veteran in later years, too.

These are the best of reasons for Congress to pass an act naming the VA hospital in memory of Representative Andrews. It would be fine if it could be done before the dedication 2 weeks hence. But whether it be done before or after dedication, Congress will be honoring itself as well as Mr. Andrews, Buffalo, and the veterans when it is done.

PFEIFFER PLANS BILL TO HONOR REPRESENTATIVE ANDREWS—MEASURE SLATED FOR INTRODUCTION TUESDAY WOULD PUT LEGISLATOR'S NAME ON VA HOSPITAL

(By Lucian C. Warren)

WASHINGTON, January 1.—Representative WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, of Buffalo, tonight announced he would follow up immediately the Courier-Express proposal to name Buffalo's veterans hospital in memory of the late Representative Walter G. Andrews by offering a bill in Congress. He said a bill to provide the necessary authorization will be introduced Tuesday, the opening day of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

"The naming of the Veterans' Administration hospital in Grover Cleveland Park, Buffalo, in honor of Congressman Andrews," said PFEIFFER, "would be not only a fine but really fitting tribute to a man whose outstanding devotion to his country is hard to match."

The Pfeiffer bill follows the suggestion of a page 1 editorial in Sunday's Courier-Express advocating that the late Mr. Andrews' distinguished service in combat in World War I and as chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in World War II be recognized in the name to be given Buffalo's magnificent new $20,000,000 veterans' hospital.

It is the hope of PFEIFFER, who succeeded to Andrews' post as Representative of the Forty-second Congressional District, that the bill may go through Congress quickly enough to be in time for the dedication of the hospital January 15. He said he would do his utmost to have the bill passed in record time, but that if it is not enacted in time for the dedication he would continue to push for its passage until it becomes law.

The Veterans' Administration today made it clear that an act of Congress is required before the hospital can be named after Andrews.

The VA pointed out that two hospitals have been named for individuals, both through an act of Congress. One is the Royal C. Johnson Memorial Veterans Hospital at Sioux Falls, S. Dak., recently opened. In this case there was a background very similar to the proposed Andrews Memorial Hospital. Johnson was a former Congressman and a hero of World War I. The late Representative Andrews received the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I and also worked for veterans' interests as a long-time member of the House Military Affairs Committee and the first chairman of the House Armed Services Committee in the Eightieth Congress.

PEEKSKILL HOSPITAL CITED

The other hospital named for an individual is the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Veterans Hospital, now under construction at Peekskill. Several hospitals constructed during the war by the Army are known informally by the names given by the Army, though VA officials designate these hospitals by the names of the cities in which they are located rather than the Army name.

In announcing that he would sponsor legislation for the proposed Andrews Hospital, Representative PFEIFFER issued this statement:

"Ham Andrews loved the United States of America. He was my friend for over 20 years and I believe that many people still do not realize the important part he played in establishing and maintaining our national defense.

"He was almost a professional soldier. After he won the Distinguished Service Cross in World War I, Ham Andrews became determined that his services to the country were not ended but instead had only begun.

"As a Member of Congress—a Member whom I have the privilege of succeeding—Ham Andrews was able to understand exactly what was needed to maintain a well balanced national-defense organization. He was a major contributor in the writing of the Unification Act and a firm believer that unification was vitally needed in order to provide the country with the best possible system of national defense. This work sapped his strength and was a contributing factor to his untimely death.

"He was well liked by both officers and enlisted men. His knowledge of military matters was highly respected by the President, Cabinet members, and Members of Congress.

"By naming the new Veterans' Administration hospital in memory of Ham Andrews we will be performing a duty—a duty of giving credit to a person who devoted his life to the preservation of his country and fellowmen."

Resolution of Hospital Industries' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution of the Hospital Industries' Association, which I have been requested to insert in the RECORD:

Whereas the manufacturers and distributors of hospital equipment and supplies, operating under a system of free enterprise, have established the world's highest standard of scientific performance, treatment, and research, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major Nation in the world; and

Whereas the benefits of American medicine have been made available to the people of this country through budget-basis voluntary health insurance, the best health insurance which exists in the world; and

Whereas the experience of all countries where government has assumed control of medical services has shown that there has been a gradual erosion of free enterprise and a progressive deterioration of medical standards and medical care to the detriment of the health of the people: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Hospital Industries' Association does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress of the United States, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Presiding Officer of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association at 1 North La Salle Street, Chicago, Ill.

THOMAS G. MURDOUGH,
President.
GEORGE J. HOOPER,
Secretary-Treasurer.

State Medicine or the American Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal of May 29, 1949:

STATE MEDICINE OR THE AMERICAN WAY?

While it is unlikely that anything in the nature of a national health plan will be adopted by the Congress between now and early summer adjournment, the number of pending bills, plus the administration's continuing, intensive pressure, indicates very clearly that an ultimate decision will probably be made in the next session.

In the meantime, the American people owe it to their well-being to familiarize themselves with the various proposals and to weigh them, so far as is possible, in light of Britain's experiment in state medicine.

The people are going to have to decide whether they want similar, complete medical regimentation for which they will foot the tremendously heavy bill through new taxation, or whether they intend to continue to care for themselves and others in the traditional American manner—voluntarily.

The counterpart of the far-from-successful British plan is the Truman "cradle-to-grave," compulsory scheme to be financed by every American worker and employer, and which would provide state medicine for rich and poor alike.

This is the plan which has inspired greatest opposition, not only from the medical fraternity and thinking Members of the Congress, but from millions of Americans alarmed by the socialistic trend of Washington maneuvering.

There is little, if any, disagreement anywhere on the point of the Nation's need for better medical coverage—for improved public health programs, more medical schools, more doctors, more technicians, and more nurses.

The controversy is on how the needs can be met in the best American manner.

Under the administration's scheme, which, in the final analysis, would be politically controlled, everybody would get everything in the book—from false teeth to bifocals—from "a" to "izzard" in anatomical and mental care. That is what is promised. There is no guarantee of delivery.

The financing of this grandiose scheme would be threefold. The worker would contribute 1½ percent of his wages up to the first $4,800 annually. Another 1½ percent would come from employers. General tax funds in the United States Treasury would provide still another 1 percent. Those who paid nothing into the fund would get the same care as those who did.

Treatment could be general or specialized—in the home or at a hospital, and at the latter would include every type of service the well-equipped hospital could give. Doctors and hospitals could decide whether they wanted to take the patient.

Payment to doctors would be either on a fee or per capita basis. The Government would decide the amount. The number of patients to be served by one doctor would be determined by local committees.

The present grants-in-aid to States would be increased from the present $75,000,000 to $150,000,000 a year as a means of increasing hospital facilities.

To meet the need for more doctors the administration scheme would provide medical school aid of $300 a year for each enrollee up to past average enrollment. Beyond that the aid would be $1,700 for each new student. Other aid formulas are established for public health and sanitary engineering schools, dental and dental hygiene schools.

Construction and equipment needs along the school line would be met by a 50-50 matching fund plan. Funds would be provided for scholarships, too.

Monetary nurse training aid would be supplied at a rate of $200 a year for each student up to the average enrollment point and $1,200 annually above that point.

Research institutes would be established for special fields; grants and loans would be made to provide rural area services; for experimental undertakings financial aid is authorized for farmers' health cooperatives. The administration bill authorizes an expenditure of $70,000,000 for this purpose alone over a 5-year period.

Local health programs in both treatment and training categories would be financially aided.

The boss of all this would be the politically appointed National Security Administrator. The cost, says the Administration, would be $6,000,000,000. The amount would probably be astronomically greater.

Divided Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Boston Daily Globe of November 29, 1949:

DIVIDED IRELAND

One of the embarrassments of being a statesman, and making frequent professions of fealty to principles of government, based upon the expressed will of a majority of the people in any country, is that some of those people may take you at your word. The inspiring thesis you propounded to rally support for your policy in far places comes, as it were, home to roost.

"Your policy," spokesmen for a small state at your doorstep rise to remark, "your policy is admirable. We concur heartily. We agree that every country has a right to its own unity when history, geography, and the will of the majority of its inhabitants fortify claim to that unity. We agree that the more unity in the world today, the better for all concerned.

"We acclaim your insistence that the selection of free government is, and ought to be, the concern of the people who are to be governed; and that it should not be a prerogative exercised by some powerful neighbor, which maneuvers a minority regime into the saddle and then rigs arrangements to insure their continuance in power.

"With all these admirable utterances of yours, we find ourselves in complete agreement. Will you now be good enough to inform us when you propose to apply them to the small nation for which we speak? Surely, principles so well tested, and so devoutly supported by you, are not championed solely on a geographical basis. If sound and desirable in one-quarter of the world, they cannot become a dubious matter in another. It is difficult, we realize, to get them functioning in distant lands, dominated by a monolithic despotism. But we are your neighbors."

This, in substance, is the plea being raised today in Boston by three distinguished visitors from Ireland, one from the south, the other two members of the Parliament in the six counties of the north. The issue created in the partition of their country by act of the British Parliament in 1920 has been sharpened since last May, when the present British Labor Government enacted in Commons its new statute, redefining the relationship between Eire and England consequent to Ireland's affirmation of independence.

The bone of contention tossed into Anglo-Irish relations by that act was defined in clause 1. "The Parliament," runs the statute, "hereby * * * declares that northern Ireland remains part of His Majesty's Dominion and of the United Kingdom, and

affirms that in no event will northern Ireland cease to be a part of His Majesty's Dominion and of the United Kingdom, without the consent of the Parliament of Northern Ireland."

To the harassed labor government at London doubtless this seems a logical and sensible arrangement. It may even appear to be endowed with a savor of democratic principle. The trouble with the proposal, however, is that it rests upon a basis of externally applied force in defiance of the wishes of the majority, not of southern Ireland alone, but in the north as well. Partition in 1920 did not occur by agreement. It was an external act of coercive power. Reaffirmation of partition in 1949, again by the British Parliament without consultation of the people of Ireland, clothes it with no more validity in morals or principle than it had in the first place.

London's action, as the Prime Minister of Ireland has pointed out, purports "to prevent the British Legislature itself from passing legislation dealing with a subordinate Parliament of a small area created artificially by a previous act of Parliament, an artificial area created for the express purpose of enabling a particular majority always to be in power in that Parliament." The gerrymandering of constituencies in northern Ireland's six counties in the interest of perpetuating the present set-up is notorious. Fermanagh's population is 55.3 percent in favor of reunion; but Fermanagh gets but 33.3 percent representation in the northern Parliament. Tyrone has a majority—55.2 percent—for union, but only 44.8 percent representation. Of the entire 4,248,000 population of Ireland, 80 percent want a united Ireland. Of the entire 32 counties, north and south, 30 seek union. Of 199 representatives elected to both Parliaments in the two areas, 159 want union.

The issue here involved will not wisely be ignored, either in London or Washington, if consistency be part of their political doctrine.

UNCLE DUDLEY.

Increasing Cost of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from the speech which I made some time ago before the Worcester County Selectmen's Association at Auburn, Mass.:

The war has undoubtedly contributed greatly to the expansion of the Federal Government. The demand for new social services has been another factor. Despite economy efforts there are many items in the Federal budget which cannot be reduced at this time without imperiling the national security or in some serious way affecting the welfare of the Nation.

It is also true that the cost of local and State government has followed suit. At the local level, partly because of the impact of programs initiated by the State or Federal Governments, expenditures and, consequently, tax rates have risen to an all-time high.

Thoughtful persons cannot view these conditions without gravest concern for the future. Most regrettably, the heaviest part of these tax burdens fall upon the ordinary rank and file of our people. Withholding taxes, and other taxes too numerous to mention, taking money out of the pockets of working men and women that otherwise could be used for their own improvement and security, are beginning to undermine our high standards of living which we believed were resting on a solid foundation.

The painful part of this situation is that the end is apparently not yet in sight. Current governmental deficits are steadily rising, expenditures are getting well ahead of income. During the past 15 weeks the Federal Government is reported to have spent about $2,500,000,000 more than its income. If this trend continues, by the end of the fiscal year the Nation will face a deficit of perhaps more than $5,000,000,000. This deficit will have to be made up by taxes, including onerous and shocking taxes upon our poor working people who can ill afford to pay out a larger share of their present meager incomes into the coffers of the Government.

But that is not all. Operating business throughout the State and Nation upon which our working people depend for jobs, high wages and steady work will be immeasurably penalized, hampered and discouraged by increased tax burdens. If this situation continues long enough, it is entirely possible that our institutions of private enterprise and free economic activity will be brought to a state of stagnation.

Every effort must be made in ensuing months by appropriate officials of the Government to implement existing plans for economy and the elimination of waste and extravagance. But this cannot be done without cooperation of our local and State officials who in their respective communities by intelligent courageous planning can furnish a striking example of the good results that can flow from economy and efficiency in checking and diminishing the heavy burdens of our people.

PHILBIN also dealt with aspects of the current international impasse and urged a united, coordinated front against global communism and its manifestations in the United States.

Military conquest is not the only way by which this Nation can be reduced. Systematic infiltration of Communist ideals, unsound and unwise fiscal and governmental policies, extreme and unbearable taxation can in time accomplish the same end. Your organization which has the confidence of the people where your members reside and serve can wield a direct and powerful influence in molding and mobilizing public opinion in behalf of sound progressive government. That you have achieved so well and so constructively is not only an evidence of your loyalty, energy, and ability but also a very great encouragement to all those of our rank and file who are interested in preserving the essential patterns of American life and the freedoms we have cherished since America was founded.

Christmas Eve Message of President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Boston Sunday Globe of December 25, 1949:

TEXT OF PRESIDENT TRUMAN'S CHRISTMAS EVE MESSAGE

INDEPENDENCE, MO., December 24.—The text of a talk by President Truman broadcast from here in connection with the lighting of the national community Christmas tree on the White House grounds at Washington:

"My Fellow Countrymen: To each, to all, a Merry Christmas.

"Once more I have come out to Independence to celebrate Christmas with my family. We are back among old friends and neighbors around our own fireside. Christmas is the great epic of home. Our homecoming here on this Christmas eve in familiar surroundings sanctified by family associations through the years—memories of joys and sorrows, of life and death—is typical of similar family gatherings all over the country.

"The memories of most of us go back to childhood when we think of Christmas. After all, the first Christmas had its beginning in the coming of a little child. It remains a child's day, a day of childhood love and of childhood memories. That feeling of love has clung to this day down all the centuries from the first Christmas. There has clustered around Christmas Day the feeling of warmth, of kindness, of innocence, of love—the love of little children—the love for them—the love that was in the heart of the little child whose birthday it is.

"Through that child love, there came to all mankind the love of a Divine Father and a Blessed Mother so that the love of the Holy Family could be shared by the whole human family. These are some of the thoughts that came to mind as I gave the signal to light our national Christmas tree in the south grounds of the White House.

"MUST NOT FORGET HOMELESS

"Sitting here in my own home, so like other homes all over America, I have been thinking about some families in other once happy lands. We must not forget that there are thousands and thousands of families homeless, hopeless, destitute, and torn with despair on this Christmas Eve. For them as for the Holy Family on the first Christmas, there is no room in the inn. Among these families—broken with the tragedy of homelessness—are myriads of little children who have never known what it was to have a home or a country that they or their parents or their brothers and sisters could call their own.

"Let us not on this Christmas, in our enjoyment of the abundance with which providence has endowed us, forget those who, because of the cruelty of war, have no shelter—those multitudes for whom, in the phrase of historic irony, there is no room in the inn.

"In this blessed season, let not blind passion darken our counsels. We shall not solve a moral question by dodging it. We can scarcely hope to have a full Christmas if we turn a deaf ear to the suffering of even the least of Christ's little ones.

"Since returning home, I have been reading again in our family Bible some of the passages which foretold this night. It was that grand old seer Isaiah who prophesied in the Old Testament the sublime event which found fulfillment almost 2,000 years ago. Just as Isaiah foresaw the coming of Christ, so another battler for the Lord, St. Paul, summed up the law and the prophets in a glorification of love which he exalts even above both faith and hope.

"We miss the spirit of Christmas if we consider the incarnation as an indistinct and doubtful, far-off event unrelated to our present problems. We miss the purport of Christ's birth if we do not accept it as a living link which joins us together in spirit

as children of the ever-living and true God. In love alone—the love of God and the love of man—will be found the solution of all the ills which afflict the world today. Slowly, sometimes painfully, but always with increasing purpose, emerges the great message of Christianity: Only with wisdom comes joy, and with greatness comes love.

"In the spirit of the Christ child—as little children with joy in our hearts and peace in our souls—let us, as a Nation, dedicate ourselves anew to the love of our fellow men. In such a dedication we shall find the message of the Child of Bethlehem, the real meaning of Christmas."

Construction of Jefferson National Expansion Memorial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, as the Representative in Congress from the Eleventh District of Missouri, it has been my privilege today to introduce in the United States House of Representatives, a bill providing for the construction of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial at the site of Old St. Louis, Mo., in accordance with plans approved by the United States Territorial Expansion Memorial Commission, and for other purposes.

It is fitting that, as we enter the second half of this century, we turn our attention to the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

The one is a landmark of time, the other a landmark of history.

Just 145 years ago, our pioneer Nation sent forth the Lewis and Clark expedition to explore the vast territories of its breathtaking Louisiana Purchase.

Three years and four months later—long after they had been given up for lost—the small, brave group clambered up the river front shore of St. Louis.

They had accomplished their mission. It is there, on that same shore, that the city of St. Louis proposes the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial be built.

When Lewis and Clark returned from their long, silent journey, they brought with them a report of national wealth more staggering than the wildest imaginings of their time.

They had explored and charted thousands of miles of the Nation's newly acquired territory. They had mapped the great Missouri and Columbia Rivers, crossed the rugged western mountains, noted the rich, fertile soil and the fabulous reaches of timberland.

Out of their explorations, out of the daring foresight of one of our Nation's greatest Presidents, Thomas Jefferson, has grown much of our beloved and respected history, many of our great States.

To that, the river-front memorial will be a shrine.

But it also will be a symbol, a symbol of democracy and of faith in our United States.

For a tradition of our history, is our ever-present belief in the future, the belief that our freedom and the good things we enjoy and strive for must be preserved for our posterity.

This memorial, a monument to the pioneering spirit that sought out and conquered great and challenging frontiers, will remind us constantly both of our traditions and of our opportunities.

Our Nation deserves this shrine.

Address of President Truman at Dedication of the Carillon at Arlington National Cemetery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of President Truman's address today at the dedication of the carillon at Arlington National Cemetery as carried in the New York Times of December 22, 1949:

Here in Arlington National Cemetery, in the presence of our war dead, we have come to consecrate a carillon.

In their nightly hymn, the bells of the carillon will sing of our faith in the kinship of man and God. Each time they sing that faith, they will proclaim our compact with the veterans of our Nation's wars who gave their lives that our faith might endure.

Our American heritage of human freedom is born of the belief that man is created in the image of God and therefore is capable of governing himself. We have created here a government dedicated to the dignity and the freedom of man. It is a government whose creed is derived from the word of God, and its roots are deep in our spiritual foundations. Our democracy is an expression of faith in the spirit of man, and it is a declaration of faith in man as created by God.

On these spiritual foundations, we have established a creed of self-government more precious to us than life itself. These soldier graves are a testament to this creed, for these men died for it. While freedom prevails, we—the living—shall keep our compact with these dead. And as long as this Government remains rooted in the dignity of man and in his kinship with God, freedom will prevail.

SAYS MANKIND IS WAR WEARY

If man could achieve self-government and kinship with his God throughout the world, peace would not tremble in the constant dread of war. Mankind is exhausted from the ordeal of conflict. All men are sick of blood letting and hunger, and weary of the trouble suffered for so many years. If we could mobilize world opinion among all men who walk the earth, there would never be another war.

This we cannot do alone. For the earth is deeply divided between free and captive peoples. There is no appeal to the brotherhood of men who live in daily fear of the concentration camp. Until the captive peoples of the world emerge from darkness, they cannot see the hand we hold in friendship. While they are made to respond to our handclasp with a mailed fist, we have no choice but to stand ready in self-defense.

Much as we prize peace and friendship, we prize freedom more. And much as we trust in God, while He is rejected by so many in the world, we must trust also in ourselves.

STRESSES NEED FOR COURAGE

In an age where peace must be protected we must resort to our own strength to hold aggression at bay. When good will prevails and peace comes to the earth, it will come because we have had the resolution to hold fast through perilous times, and we have had the courage to share our resources with other nations who believe in freedom.

By generous sharing of our material goods in the past few years, we have restored to many peoples faith in themselves, faith in their freedom, faith in the certain triumph of confidence over fear. Just as long as we continue to face our world responsibilities with the courage and realism we have already shown, we shall deserve the right to hope—and work—for lasting peace.

Meanwhile, our efforts in search of peace and security have not spared us problems at home. Not only do the security needs of our Nation seem at times to be in competition with social progress, but the attention we must give to weapons of defense may obscure the fact that the real basis of our strength is a strong and active faith in freedom.

HOLDS FAITH MUST BE MAINTAINED

As long as freedom remains a force for human welfare, men will cherish it in their hearts and defend it with their lives. In this present-day world where man's personal independence is cramped by the complexities of his economic existence, it is the duty of government to see that each citizen does not lose faith in his ability to provide freely by his efforts for his own welfare.

We have revived the belief of free peoples in themselves in many foreign countries; and we must continue to safeguard at home the belief in ourselves and belief in freedom as the greatest force for human welfare.

This is an age where faith in one's self, faith in freedom, faith in the kinship of man and God, are more important to our survival than all the mighty armaments of war.

As these bells ring out their hymns, they will proclaim that message of faith. As long as they ring, these honored dead may rest.

While faith lives, so does freedom.

While freedom lives, so does hope of a just and lasting peace.

Asleep at the Switch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the following editorial, written by J. H. Van Winkle in the Oregon City Banner-Courier, on the subject of the failure of the President to appoint a Chairman of the National Security Resources Board:

ASLEEP AT THE SWITCH

At the request of the President, Congress enacted laws setting up several agencies for national defense. These agencies were made responsible to the President. They were

created at his bidding and turned over to him. They were thought necessary by Congress as a major part of implementing our defense planning.

Three of these independent agencies are the National Security Resources Board, an almost all-powerful manager of just about everything that affects preparation for or against war; the Defense Research and Planning Board, which is charged with stock piling or finding substitutes for critical war materials we do not produce within the Nation; and Munitions Board, which has wide powers for the procurement and storage of armament and supervision over development and manufacture of modern improvement of munitions.

All three of these vitally necessary agencies have been fumbling around in the dark without a full complement of members and without President-appointed chairmen simply because the President has felt it more expedient to play politics than to implement the national defense.

The President deliberately has refused to fill the chairmanships because his democratically controlled Senate couldn't stomach his nominations. Those characters offered for membership were found repugnant even to the Senate controlled by the President's own party.

Investigation found them wanting in every respect except one—that they were of the right political faith and were cronies of the President. The Senate, wisely enough, protected us from having ne'er-do-wells on these important commissions. It refused to rubber stamp the President's political pay-off.

As a result, the President has turned huffy and pouts, in effect, by saying well, if you won't have the men I want, you'll have no one.

In other words, because the President's poker pals are not believed competent to fill the jobs, the Nation's defense can go to pot before the Chief will bother to consider seeking out responsible and able hands for the vacancies.

World War II Memorial Dedication, Chelsea, Mass.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include herein a statement I made during the World War II Memorial Dedication held in Chelsea, Mass., November 6, 1949. Dr. J. B. Toltz was the chairman of the memorial committee.

The statement follows:

We who assemble in reverent service at this dedication are separated by time and distance from the men who died for us.

As we grow old and new generations succeed us the meaning of this sacrifice will also be buried in the dry pages of history unless we raise a memorial to them which shall ever remind us of their gallant, generous, and immortal spirit.

From the dawn of history, man has built shrines and has worshipped before altars to those powers greater than himself. Through different stages of his development and by means of various creeds he has lifted his heart to the creative essence of life and has prayed to it for strength and consolation and guidance.

Once he worshipped the elemental forces of nature in fear. The sun and the rain—these were the life-giving elements which he was completely dependent upon for survival. To him a long dry spell during the growing season or the thunder and lightning of a storm were signs that he had incurred the disfavor of the gods. And so he sought to appease them with his primitive rituals.

But as he matured in faith and understanding, the one true God in whose image he is created was revealed to him. Through prayer and good works he seeks to make himself worthy of that eternal love.

And to that Creator he offers the supreme gift of sacrifice.

Not in abject fear or under compulsion, but as the joyful offering of his heart.

In many quiet ways, on this journey through life, average men and women have moments in which they rise above the selfish claims of existence and "do unto others as they would have others to unto them."

It was so with these men whose memory we honor today.

They did not want war.

These fine young men, in the glory of their youth and health, wanted the same chance to live as others who had gone before them.

But when we were attacked there was no other choice. Only the best among us were capable of defending the rest.

And so they went forth, torn by the first wound of separation from happy homes often blessed with wives and children. Others left sweethearts behind them. All put aside their dreams, ambitions, plans to face with the sternest test of their manhood our responsibility.

Shouldering this double burden they went out to meet the fearful unknown, never to return.

When the war that they won at great cost came to an end we rejoiced.

The war was over, but they did not come back.

Today we gather together in a more sober mood, seeking comfort in the company of the living as we reckon our great loss.

Why, why must the cream of a nation's youth be called upon to die for our mistakes? Why didn't we exert every effort beforehand to prevent the tragedy of war? Where were we and what were we doing during those years when the danger was slowly mounting?

For the dead of World War No. 2 it is too late to ask such questions.

They sleep, their lives cut short by our neglect. Even now we reach out through memory to recall their smiles and laughter and the eagerness of their youth which brightened our homes, but memory cannot take the place of life. They are gone, and the world is darker without them.

The door of death has closed on a wealth of character and ability that was denied the opportunity to offer its great gifts to life. We who mourn are the losers in more ways than one.

Time and distance and forgetfulness.

They are merciful to those who have lost a loved one.

But we cannot, we do not want to forget completely.

To do so would betray those who sacrificed that we might learn, and would repeat the careless complacency from which they saved us. Next time, if we should permit the tragedy of war to come again through our blunders, they will not be here to help us, and that may be the margin by which we could lose everything that we cherish.

We cannot fail a second time.

The children of the heroic dead and all children who are so happy on this Sunday afternoon trust in our protective strength and wisdom. They will never forgive us if they at some future date should have to surrender life itself because we would not work for peace.

Standing as we are between the dead and those who are young in life, I believe that we are aware of this responsibility.

We have come to dedicate this memorial so that we shall not forget.

It is made of stone and steel, as imperishable as mortal hands can make it.

But this memorial will not serve its purpose unless we repeat its meaning to ourselves each time that we pass it on our way to work or recreation.

They faced the unknown with fear and with a courage which conquered that fear.

Can we do less and still call ourselves their brothers?

No.

Because ours is an easy job by comparison. We are being asked to solve those problems which will prevent war. Difficult as it may be, this, the greatest of all possible victories, can and will be won.

That is, if we emulate the unselfish devotion of the men from Chelsea who gave their lives in World War No. 2.

This memorial is a shrine to valor.

To young men who once walked the streets of this city even as those we see today, ordinary men who became great under the pressure of crisis. We look up to the high example of courage which they have set before us, proud of them even as we grieve for them. They were members of our human family. They lived in our city and perhaps one or two of them lived on our street. We watched them growing up as children and were shocked when we heard that these youngsters had become men overnight and had died defending us.

And we ask ourselves the question: "How can we be as worthy of life as they have been?"

Perhaps wrapped up in our own problems we have not seen the many small ways in which we could be of help to our city, our Nation, and the world. With the extra years granted to us, we have a greater opportunity to live fully, knowing that we go this way only once and determined to be a good neighbor and a good citizen, for only by this effort can we contribute to understanding and the cause of peace.

A few men with too much power at the head of any nation are responsible for most wars. The hope of the world is in the common people. They get along well together because they have learned the sturdy values of cooperation. This experience must be extended.

It is up to national leaders to learn from them, as we have learned from our young men who made the supreme sacrifice.

By their dying they have opened our eyes to the need for greater courage from the rest of us, the courage to face the larger problems of this life, to think of them, to make ourselves well informed concerning them, and to express them as part of the great voice of public opinion which no leader can ignore.

I know some people who don't want to hear the word "atom" mentioned. It terrifies them. Now, I say that this is fear of the unknown. The power of atomic energy is a fact and a responsibility. We cannot run away from it. Rather, we must work to find some way by which we can be sure that it will be applied to the constructive tasks of peace. That will require effort, patience, and courage. The courage which the heroic dead whom we honor today expect from us.

With this plaque to ever remind us, is it not better for us to become their living memorial, advancing with increasing tolerance and intelligence toward that better world for which they died?

I believe that these young men did not die in vain.

A life lived for others and given for others is the noblest life that any man can live.

It illuminates the way for those who follow by its shining example.

It nourishes us with the immortal spirit which it so clearly revealed.

Four times and more the seasons have come and gone since these gallant men went through the valley of death to that country from which no traveler returns.

Most of their remains have been brought home so that their last resting place may be carefully tended for by their loved ones.

The city of Chelsea goes further. As evidence of a community's reverent regard it is dedicating this memorial on which their names are inscribed in their honor.

So that generations yet to come may pause, and remember, and thank God that the United States had men such as these to save for all her people the blessings of peace, security, and freedom.

Time To Weigh Our Gains—Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Detroit Free Press of December 28, 1949:

TIME TO WEIGH OUR GAINS—FOREIGN AID

High and hot on the agenda of the Eighty-first Congress' second session, will be European aid expenditures—economic and military.

There will be strong congressional sentiment for sharply cutting this huge outflow of taxpayer dollars. And this opposition will bring dire predictions. Pressure will be turned on to keep Americans in a mood both generous and fearful.

The taxpayers will hear that any appreciable reduction in Marshall plan or related spending will pave the way for Communist imperialism.

Before national opinion formulates, let American taxpayers weigh objectively the things their money being spent abroad has bought, and what a future outlay can buy.

Economically, distressingly little has been purchased. Europe doggedly maintains its old barriers to self-sufficiency. Despite the fine talk about constructive spending and the fallacy of mere stopgap giving, all we have managed is the latter.

Europe's own attitude has frustrated our best intentions.

We have kept things going and by artificial expedient have fended off communism's westward spread. But we can't keep it up forever and survive ourselves. America will be as broke as Europe, with nothing gained and all lost.

Military free spending on behalf of Europe is more a proposition for the future than an existing fact, but the move to make it a fact is far along.

That our money can ever buy a military line of defense east of the English Channel is the remotest of possibilities.

France, which would have to be the continental kingpin of an alliance, can't maintain a government. Under its conception of military teamwork it must be the quarterback, line, backfield, and coach, with only the role of water boy reserved for its friends.

Exemplifying its individualism, jealousy, or whatever you care to term it is "Chairman" Montgomery. Britain's Marshal Montgomery is nominal chief of the feeble military team into which western Europeans have banded themselves.

So faction-ridden, so plagued with national egoisms is this alliance that its principal military man cannot be accorded a military title.

In truth, it isn't an alliance at all, but a committee. And a defense run by a committee couldn't hinder the march of the Honduras constabulary.

Britain, within the limits of her size and poverty, doubtless would stand as firmly as she could. So might some of the very small countries, but their potence in a major conflict would be so trivial as to be almost invisible.

So tax money sent overseas to arm Europe can hardly be counted a judicious direct spending for a military hedge against communism on the march—with tanks and cannon.

The best you can say is that perhaps it would contribute to an atmosphere of kinship and comradeship with what America stands for as a democracy. Maybe it would implant a habit of thought, make the western European, no matter what might befall, feel himself a partisan of democracy.

But this is all highly problematical, the more so since investigation indicates that the ordinary European has almost no real knowledge of America's part in his welfare, and that often his appreciation is even less than his information.

To say the least it is a dubious type of insurance for us. If the day ever came to collect on our policy we might find we had been paying our billion-dollar premiums for nothing.

That day for collection would be one on which either by military aggression or political coup the Communists took over lands we have been assisting. If these, even in the hands of communism, remained obdurately loyal to the remaining strongholds of democracy it would help vastly in their rewinning—given time.

But this is decidedly a long-shot chance. There is nothing in the form sheet to support it. And staking billions, year upon year, on a long shot in power politics is no wiser than doing the same thing at a horse track.

The Majority Leader

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following excellent editorial on our majority leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., on Sunday, January 1, 1950:

A TRIBUTE TO A TRUE MAN

This is New Year's day of 1950. It is the commencement of a new year freighted with opportunity but frightening with possibilities. This is the first day of the month that was named in the Roman calendar after Janus, the god with two heads, one looking forward and the other looking backward.

So on New Year's Day, it is our custom to look ahead to the future as well as look back at the past, in order to make a proper appraisal of events as they pass in review. The importance of government as well as governmental affairs as it pertains to our daily life, cannot be overemphasized in these days.

Accordingly, we must look to our national leaders and their leadership in order to get a proper picture of our direction. Any endeavor to obtain such a perspective will bring into focus the personality and achievements of our own Massachusetts leader, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority leader of our National House of Representatives.

The proud record of the Eighty-first Congress established under the direction of Congressman MCCORMACK is one of which all Americans should be proud. Majority Leader MCCORMACK again and again asserted his brilliant leadership for his party, his State, and his country. Years ago, JOHN MCCORMACK was a pioneer in raising his voice in protest against the growing Red terror, south of the border, in our neighboring country of Mexico.

Again and again, he battled against the antireligious drives that would result in chaos and disorder in old Mexico.

His voice was then a voice crying out in the wilderness. Today, all well-informed persons acknowledge the debt of gratitude that is owed to Mr. MCCORMACK for his courage and intelligence in uncovering the dangers that lurked in such a campaign.

When later, world-wide communism commenced to rear its ugly head and to make threats against the American way of life and its peace and serenity, again it was the same leader, MCCORMACK, who sounded the tocsin that Americans must be on guard against the Red peril.

Leader MCCORMACK's work in the Eighty-first Congress was outstanding. It was truly said to be a "triumph for peace and democracy." Mr. MCCORMACK helped in the shaping of our policies for international recovery and peace, for our national defense and security, for housing, for the programs underlying social security, health, and welfare, as well as those affecting the reorganization of our governmental set-up, our national economy and our agricultural problems. He contributed his political genius to legislation in behalf of labor, the veterans, and did his best to guarantee to all Americans equality of opportunity and civil rights to all, regardless of race, color, or creed.

In his own words, delivered on the floor of Congress on October 19, 1949, Majority Leader MCCORMACK summed up the results of his statesmanship in these words:

"This Congress backed up the impressive foreign policy of President Truman not only with the necessary legislation, but with funds to aid friendly countries to rehabilitate their economic and military strength.

"This foreign-policy program, the prime purpose of which is to bring peace and prosperity to the world, is the greatest undertaking by any government on earth. Our esteemed President, Mr. Harry S. Truman, instituted it and history will record his effort as the greatest ever made to wipe the ravages of war from the face of the earth. Personally, I am proud, and I know my colleagues are proud, to be a Member of the Congress which gave the tools to our leader for the most gigantic enterprise ever undertaken in the history of mankind."

And so, again, the Lynn Telegram-News is glad to publicly acknowledge the debt of gratitude that is owed to Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, and on this joyful New Year's Day, may we express our best wishes to the Congressman and his gracious and charming helpmate, Mrs. John W. McCormack. May they both enjoy all the blessings and the good things of life that they have so well earned and so richly deserve.

Preservation of the American Way of Living

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Research Engineer is a monthly publication of the Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Ga.

In its issue for the month of November 1949 there was published on its editorial page a statement by Col. Blake R. Van Leer, the president of the Georgia Institute of Technology, regarding the meaning of the phrase "Preservation of the American way of living," a phrase which has been widely used recently.

Colonel Van Leer's statement regarding the American way of living is one of the finest which I have seen relating to this important subject. In it he presented some great truths in plain and understandable fashion. I was so impressed with Colonel Van Leer's statement, which is short and to the point, that I asked his permission to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. He was kind enough to grant my request, and I insert the article herewith:

"Preservation of the American way of living" is a catch phrase much used today by men with vastly different viewpoints. To the hide-bound isolationist it means the same as the prewar "America First"—nothing for any other country if it would deprive us of an iota of our well being. To the average citizen it means defending our constitutional rights and privileges against the onslaughts of isms, maintaining that atmosphere in which men are individuals instead of units of a state system. To the extreme radical it means free license to advertise his beliefs without fear of the reprisal which the system he advocates would inflict.

To the scientist and engineer—assuming that this group also agrees with Mr. Average Citizen—the phrase "Preservation of the American way of living" is a challenge to increased efforts to find new and better methods and products. To this group, particularly, the "American way" is not a static one; it is progressive. Our method of living has developed, not stood still. It is the outgrowth of the efforts of many men. "Preservation" of this mode of living, therefore, means preservation of a dynamic balance between the best elements of the present and what the future can bring if we strive our hardest.

BLAKE R. VAN LEER,
President, Georgia Institute of Technology.

Government Detectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Clement Norton which appeared in the Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass.:

DETECTIVES

Our Government has done a great job at protecting us. They "planted" reliable intelligence agents right in Communist meetings for years. As a matter of fact, the agents became members of the party and officials of the same. Why not? If the "Commies" are out to destroy our form of government, then we must know these facts. Likewise, if they are not out so to do, then our agents will so report.

Man has more freedom here than any land of the world. I marvel at it. When I go abroad and see how others live. See how little freedom the common man has—why I admire the homeland more and more. This is heaven on earth if you think and read and study and appreciate.

CRIMINAL

It would be criminal negligence for our leaders to stand by and allow Communists or any other group to meet and conspire to destroy this Government, and do nothing about the same. So, of course, we had not only the right, but the duty to "plant" intelligence agents in the meetings of any suspected group. If you woke up some morning and found the gestapo agent at your door, with a gun, then it would be too late.

I'm no hysterical hate-monger. I'm no fanatic against the Commies. I believe that every group has the right to free and open expression of opinion in America, but freedom is not a license to conspire to destroy our Government. If those very same Communists who meet on American soil, and plan to destroy our democracy, were to meet on Russian soil, and plan to destroy Stalin's form of government, they would be taken right out and shot. There would be no trials. No bail. No witnesses. They would just "disappear," the most awful thing that can happen to you in Russia. Disappear as did the 10,000 officers of Poland's army, the "cream of the crop," who were later found buried at Katyn, in Russia, by the Germans, and each officer was shot in the back of the head.

WHY?

So, why should there be any question about the right of our Government to "plant" intelligence agents, in communistic meetings? And yet, when some of our agents testified at the recent Commie trial in New York, I heard a few unthinking citizens remark: "That was a dirty thing to do." No, it was the right thing to do. It was the proper thing to do. It was the patriotic thing to do, for no one must be allowed to plot to destroy our country on American soil without our leaders, and our people knowing about it.

Clyde M. Reed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, because of his long and distinguished public service, the people of Kansas came to know CLYDE M. REED well in his official capacity. Through the years he had a wide personal acquaintance. However, because he was such a busy man and so diligently devoted to his public duties, there were many who knew him well in his public capacity who had no opportunity to know CLYDE REED as he was known by his family and close personal associates.

Following Senator REED's death his public service was widely acclaimed in the editorial columns of the Kansas press by men who had been long associated with him in the newspaper profession and in public life. These editorials told of the life of CLYDE REED as a great and distinguished public servant. Another and less well-known side of CLYDE REED's life and career is presented in an editorial appearing in the Parsons (Kans.) Sun on November 10, 1949, by Clyde M. Reed, Jr., the present able editor of that paper. I feel sure that his former associates in Congress and in official life in Washington will be interested in reading this beautifully written and poignant picture of CLYDE M. REED as his family knew him:

CLYDE M. REED

My father left this world as he would have chosen, at the peak of his career. Retirement to him was unthinkable because that meant inactivity and he never had known much of that in the busy 78 years which made up his life.

Others knew him as a Senator, a Governor, a newspaper publisher, and an active public man. Our family saw him in that light, but possibly were too close to judge him objectively. We knew him best as a loving father, the head of a large family. He took a deep interest in all of us, despite demands made on his time by other interests. His pride increased with the arrival of each additional grandchild. He was pleased as punch when Clyde M. Reed III, came into the world. He hated to lose at anything, but when the young man, now 7, beat him in checkers twice one evening not so long ago at the hospital, father had a twinkle in his eye that said more than a thousand words ever could tell.

My earliest recollections of my father were as a busy man, constantly on the go. His body rested at times, but his mind never did. In my early years, he was in work that laid the foundation for his wide knowledge of transportation. We had freight rates for breakfast, boxcars for supper. Occasionally I was able to get in a word about football and there would be brief attention given to my sisters' current boy friends, but then we got back to more serious things.

Whether boxcars, freight rates, or later, the State highway system which was inaugurated when he was Governor, or still later, the many national and international questions which came before him as Senator, underneath them all was a deep sympathy for and understanding of people as human beings.

He understood because he had been faced with many problems himself on his way up the ladder. His sympathies were not those of a professional do-gooder or one who got his knowledge of human problems from a textbook. He learned from first-hand experience. His friendships knew no bounds.

One of the daily pleasures he anticipated here at home was a visit to the barbershop of the Grimes brothers. He and Tom and Otis Grimes would discuss a little bit of everything and he got many chuckles and not a few pointers from them. That Tom and Otis are of another race never entered his mind. They were friends, first of all.

He was vitally interested in the work of the Sisters of St. Joseph who operate Mercy Hospital in Parsons. That interest often took precedent over matters of national importance which confronted him, but the sisters were serving humanity, working with people and more than that, were providing

an indispensable service in the community he loved and called home, and those things were important in his mind.

In his political life he was known as a fighter, a scrapper. The family knew him in those roles because he brought them home with him and we talked about them. He couldn't leave his work at the office because he was a bundle of energy that functioned 12 hours a day on the minimum and 16 hours on average and the thought that he should slow down some time was mentioned often but never caught on.

Because he was a fighter, he lost battles as well as won them. The defeats hurt. He was pictured by friend and foe alike as a hard-shelled man. On the surface, perhaps. But underneath was a soft heart that reacted to the ups and downs which come with a career like his.

He suffered some low blows. They hurt most of all. He placed unlimited confidence in his friends. It took him a long time to get over the fact that on rare occasion such confidence was misplaced. He was a sentimentalist who tried to hide it and got away with it to all except those of us who saw him at closest range.

That he accumulated his share of worldly goods in a life which began in that regard from scratch never was as important to him as the fact he had stood fast for a set of principles throughout his career and had come to be recognized for them.

Basic in his philosophy that it was better to be right than popular. He was more concerned with the correctness of the thing than whether he would be riding the high tides of public opinion. He believed that when you were right, the rest would come eventually. He lived to see many one-time foes become steadfast friends and supporters. That the lag between rightness and popularity often was a matter of years never concerned him.

Carrying him through in the meantime was courage of a high order. In later years, when declining health and advancing age plagued him, raw nerve pushed him on. Always he was able to arise to the occasion. Advice that he should spare himself was brushed aside. He had come up the hard way, by sheer work and determination. He was determined to finish that way. He did.

Merciful Providence has taken him into another world. Behind he leaves a precious heritage that will live with members of his family always. We are sad, but find unlimited comfort in the fact he was with us so long and that we could do our bit from the side lines to help him make his life what it was.

That was, and is, our father, CLYDE M. REED. We leave him now with his God.

C. M. R., Jr.

Hoover Report on Veterans' Administration Hospitalization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following very enlightening statement made by John M. Barry, M. D., of Lawrence, Mass., at a special conference between the Department of Massachusetts, American Legion, and the Massachusetts congressional delegation, held in the Parker House, Boston, on December 19, 1949:

In this report the Commission recommends (No. 1) the establishment of a United Medical Administration, into which would be consolidated most of the large-scale activities of the Government in the fields of medical care, medical research, and public health (including preventive medicine). The responsibility for furnishing medical and hospital care for veterans would be included in the consolidation by transfer of the functions, facilities, and personnel for medical care from the Veterans' Administration (No. 4). Likewise, out-patient service in field offices and special services incidental to hospitalization would be transferred, though the Veterans' Administration would continue to certify patients for treatment and would determine disability ratings, etc.

I would like to call your attention to the fact that we in the Legion are considering only that portion of the Hoover Commission report which deals with Veterans' Administration hospitalization. At this time we are not discussing that portion of the report considering a United Medical Administration for the Military Establishment and the Public Health Service. In brief, at this time we are concerned only with the problem of former service men and women who are now civilians requiring Government medical care through the Veterans' Administration.

I would also like to point out at this time that although the American Legion and I personally have been among the severest critics of the Veterans' Administration, we wish to point out that the Veterans' Administration has made truly tremendous strides toward increased efficiency in the past few years. Legion experience, of course, dates back to the period immediately following World War I, whereas my own experience is limited to the period of time since my separation from the Army in 1945. It has been our common experience that the Veterans' Administration has steadily and progressively raised its standards of medical care and increased the scope and speed of its service.

This proposal of the Hoover Commission is in basic conflict with the traditional policy of the Government to accord to veterans, as a class, special consideration through one single agency responsible for administering the various benefit programs. In addition, it would put individuals who are now civilians under the same regime of care and discipline as the armed forces personnel, their dependents and merchant seamen, and it would produce an intermingling for care of strictly service personnel with strictly civilian patients. It would also impede the efficient handling of claims for compensation, pension, insurance and other benefits where a physical examination is necessary. We should also bear in mind that this policy of caring for veterans through a central agency is not a radical departure which sprang up over night like an unwanted weed, but rather it has had a natural, healthy growth based on the bitter and frequently tragic experiences of divided responsibility over a period of years. This has resulted in the evolution of a system which is really working and constantly showing progress. This progress has been the result of the direct interest and concern of the Veterans' Administration, especially its Bureau of Medicine, aided by the cooperation of organized medicine in the formation of the various deans committees to raise professional and teaching standards and further aided by the influence and cooperation of veterans organizations, particularly the American Legion. As a result of this cooperative effort, a truly enviable position has been achieved in medical care by the Veterans' Administration.

You have already heard from Father Reardon the historical background of the development of the Veterans' Administration program. We should keep in mind that disability compensation and pensions and insurance benefits predicated upon disability require medical examinations, including hospitalization for observation. The monthly payments in cases of veterans without dependents are subject to reduction while receiving hospitalization or domiciliary care. The amounts of monthly payments in many cases are dependent on the veterans' social adaptability requiring field investigations. The feasibility of trial home visits looking to complete discharge from the status of a hospital patient requires investigations of home conditions. Entitlement to new and reinstated insurance is often dependent upon proof of insurability proven by medical examination. Entitlement to vocational rehabilitation under the provisions of Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, is dependent upon medical-examination findings. Entitlement to assistance in acquiring specially adapted housing under the provisions of Public Law 702, Eightieth Congress, is dependent upon medical examination and other medical findings. In brief, major benefit programs are so dependent upon and integrated with the medical, hospital, and domiciliary-care programs as to preclude their separation from the Veterans' Administration, of which they are a part, without disastrous effects on the efficient administration of veterans' benefits.

In view of the historical facts which have been outlined and the experiences gained therefrom, it seems clear that the proposed plan would not work without detriment to the efficient operation of the program of medical and hospital care and other benefits provided for veterans. The high standards of care which have been attained by the Veterans' Administration would necessarily be lowered by a merger of our program with other programs.

Under the circumstances, the Committee on Hospitalization for the American Legion of Massachusetts must strongly recommend against the adoption of this plan to incorporate the Veterans' Administration into a United Medical Administration. We believe it more advisable to recommend that the Veterans' Administration be retained for the medical and associated care of veterans, and, secondly, that with the cooperation of Government, organized medicine, veterans' organizations, and the Veterans' Administration itself, a concerted effort be made to aid the Veterans' Administration in accomplishing its mission with the highest degree of efficiency at the least cost.

I would like to add as an addendum that we must also remember that many so-called non-service-connected cases on admission to a Veterans' Administration hospital later become actual service-connected. One other frequently overlooked factor is the problem of the medical indigent. At present cost and in the light of present medical knowledge, practically all patients with a diagnosis of tuberculosis, neuropsychiatric conditions and those requiring hospitalization beyond a period of 90 days, sometimes 60 days, are medically indigent. In addition, due to particular circumstances, a given individual may be medically indigent on a given date, whereas he would not be indigent at another time. Individuals falling in this category who are veterans require assistance from the Veterans' Administration, and the quickest and safest determination of this need is best made at local level under conditions as they now exist in the Veterans' Administration.

Who Won the War?—Visit of Banker Abs to United States Seen as Plan To Restore Nazi Order in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Washington Star of December 16, 1949:

WHO WON THE WAR?—VISIT OF BANKER ABS TO UNITED STATES SEEN AS PLAN TO RESTORE NAZI ORDER IN GERMANY

(By Thomas L. Stokes)

Every so often the curtain is lifted and we get another glimpse of how the old Nazi order is being restored in Germany with our kind cooperation—as our war aims go glimmering.

We discover now, for example, thanks to Senator GILLETTE, Democrat, of Iowa, that Herman J. Abs, formerly a director of the Deutsche Bank when it was one of Adolf Hitler's chief agents in exploiting occupied Europe, has been in this country for several weeks—since November 17—conferring with New York bankers but also incidentally visiting the State Department.

Herr Abs long ago wormed his way back into the high councils of German finance and those of the victorious allies. He was permitted to go through the British lines 2 days after the fall of Berlin with 7,000,000,000 of marks in cash to reestablish his business in Hamburg in the British zone, and afterward acted as economic and financial adviser to Sir Sholto Douglas, commander of the British zone.

VISIT EXPLAINED

In explanation of this latest episode here, the State Department, on inquiry from Senator GILLETTE, said that the Department was not trying to keep his visit a secret, but did not want to enhance his prestige in Germany by drawing attention to his activities here. He came to this country, it was said, to confer with American bankers who hold about $30,000,000 of German credits and spent a day in Washington during which he called on officials in the German Division of the State Department to discuss technical matters.

He came, it was explained, with Wilhelm Vocke and Hans Treue, officials of the Deutsche Leander Bank, a trizonal bank of all the German states set up in April 1946 by the United States, Great Britain, and France, and as a private citizen, though he is not exactly that, being a director of the German Reconstruction Loan Co., an agency of the West German Government. His visa expires December 25.

Who is Herman J. Abs and what was his role in Hitler's conquest?

This was clearly spelled out in a special report in June 1947 by Gen. Lucius D. Clay, then American Military Governor in Germany, based on an exhaustive investigation by AMG experts. It said he was influential in operations of the Deutsche Bank when it, along with the Dresdner Bank, "acted virtually as an economic branch of the Wehrmacht in exploiting the resources of the occupied countries.

The desire to acquire certain institutions or corporations sometimes originated within the banks, sometimes within the Nazi Government, but all acquisitions had one aim in common, namely, the economic and political domination of Europe by Germany. * * * Both banks obtained a share in the spoils."

BANKS PLUNDERED JEWS

Herr Abs was identified as the key figure in the Deutsche Bank's seizure of French-Belgian properties in Czechoslovakia, Luxemburg, Yugoslavia, and Romania. Before the two banks spread out their operations to other countries, they plundered the Jews in Germany, which is told in a section of General Clay's report on Role of the Banks in Aryanization of the German Economy. It says:

"In this way the Dresdner and Deutsche Banks acquired properties for their own account, financed acquisitions of Aryanized property for customers, selected and appraised property for future Aryanization and even searched for prospective customers interested in this type of transaction. This experience gained in Aryanization activity in Germany served the banks in good stead in their subsequent economic spoliation of occupied Europe."

Herr Abs turned up prominently after the war. When the new trizonal bank of the German states was organized its German board of directors elected him president and August Schniewind, a director of the Dresdner Bank in the Nazi regime, as chairman of the board, but on condition that these two jointly would have a veto on the board. This scheme was spiked by General Clay.

Herman Abs turned up also on the list of German trustees on the control board for the Ruhr iron and steel industry, along with other ex-Nazis, who were picked by a German, Dr. Hermann Punder, president of the executive council of the Bizonal Economic Administration, but this was too much for trade union leaders to take and they protested so vigorously that Herr Abs and some of the others were dropped.

Now he turns up in the councils of the mighty in Washington and New York.

Who won the war?

Address of Hon. Joseph K. Carson, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Commissioner Joseph K. Carson of the United States Maritime Commission delivered at a luncheon given by the Minneapolis-Honeywell Regulator Co., Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York City, on Thursday, December 8, 1949:

I am honored by being afforded the opportunity of taking part in this occasion, sponsored by Minneapolis-Honeywell. Our chairman, Maj. Gen. Philip B. Fleming, has asked that I express to you his interest in your enterprise and that you will not only cause to be expressed your best effort in the work you are now doing in which the Commission is interested but that you will continue the improvement of your process and product.

It is always worth while for those charged with the performance of public duty to meet with those in industry whose genius and practical ability make it possible for government, and through government, the people, to enjoy the fruits of the inventive minds and productive skill of forward-looking private enterprise.

This meeting, held as it is, under the auspices of Minneapolis-Honeywell, let us say for the purpose of brevity, is an affair which is in its essence a commercial. To use the vernacular, let us call it a little horn tooting. Well, I just love horn tooting.

I remember the time during the war when I was present at a meeting held in Brighton, England. I was seated next to a lady who said, "Colonel, I suppose you Americans think we are terribly antiquated and behind the times." I said, "No, I shouldn't think we feel that way at all, because after all, the British are a literate people and if you want or need all the modern things we enjoy in America, you would contrive some way of having them." I then went on to say, "We shall adopt many of the practices which we are learning from you people while we are here in your country." She replied, "Really, but I should wonder if your pride would let you do that?" I said, "Our pride would not let us do less. We pride ourselves upon having imported and put into use in America all of the good things we have found in every land and clime."

Prosperity in the United States is dependent upon the invention, production, use, and consumption of the things we do not have to have for existence and propagation. Therefore, it is advertising, putting our best foot forward and tooting our own horn that has brought to the people, in this our promised land, the greatest abundance the world has ever known—and with enterprises such as yours being permitted a free hand within the law to progress further, we are in reality only at the beginning of a better way of life for all mankind. For my part, a light under a bushel is no light at all. Good works should be emblazoned across the firmament of the heavens.

Let me state emphatically at the outset that Minneapolis-Honeywell has earned the esteem of the marine industry by its proven ability to make a real contribution to the American Merchant Marine by handling large contracts involving the installation of improvements in ships to make them truly modern and thereby enabling the industry to improve the service offered to travelers and shippers under the American flag.

Our interest today is focused on air conditioning. The Maritime Commission has been interested in air conditioning for a long time. Even before the war the Commission devoted a great deal of attention to air conditioning and better ventilation of ships. As the result of tests made under Commission sponsorship, we have been able to establish certain standards by which more economical designs have been produced than could have been achieved with conventional practices.

During these investigations into the proper use of air conditioning aboard vessels, the Minneapolis-Honeywell organization has been one that stood by and cooperated with the Commission, not alone in the interest of securing contracts, an entirely legitimate aim, but to throw the weight of their experience and technical ability into the effort to produce the best possible results. That is the sort of thing on which a sound business reputation is built.

Now a few words about what air conditioning means to the success of the American merchant marine. It is by no means a far-fetched connection. It costs much more to own and operate ships under the American flag than under any foreign flag. That is why we make subsidy allowances, under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, to place our operators on an equal footing with their foreign competitors. In other words, these subsidies make up the disparity between foreign and American building and operating costs.

The reason that American costs are higher, and the reason that such a disparity exists, is a very important and fundamental one. We have in this country a tradition of free enterprise. We strive to have every business organization stand on its own feet and make

its own way in a freely competitive climate. We do not approve of collusion among companies or business organizations. That would restrain trade or attempt monopolistic control of costs of production. In fact, we have laws that prohibit such activities. Compare this with the situation abroad, where for centuries the economies of countries and entire regions have been controlled by cartels, trade associations, or whatever they may be called, for the purpose of regulating production, prices, and wages wholly for private and selfish interests.

In America, on the one hand, we have had free enterprise in the public interest. Abroad, on the other hand, there has been and still is regulation and restriction by private interests for their individual benefit. The result is that today we have in America a land bountiful in blessings, with opportunities for all, while abroad we see some nations struggling bitterly not only to recover from the ravages of war but to rebuild their economies along the lines of the old concepts.

Here in the United States one business can compete with another because all operate in the same atmosphere of free enterprise. When an American business attempts to compete with a foreign business, however, it is quite a different matter. An American steamship operator in competing with a foreign-flag company is forced to do so under many disadvantages. Among those disadvantages are higher wages, costs of fuel and ship's stores, original construction and repair costs, and higher standards of safety and sanitation.

Therefore, we are always alert to find means of meeting and offsetting these disadvantages. One means of accomplishing this is provided by law which authorizes construction and operating subsidies to operators which perform specified regular sailings over trade routes found by the Commission to be essential in the foreign commerce of the United States. Although we offset certain cost differentials by allowing construction and operating differential subsidies, American-flag shipping must go further than receiving financial aid from the Government if it is to compete successfully with foreign flags. In other words, what I am pointing out is that the subsidy merely makes up the cost disparity. From there on out the American subsidized operator is on his own, and whether he makes a profit depends on the kind of a businessman he is.

In competitive fields of passenger and cargo lift a steamship company must offer the public service. By that I mean careful handling, stowage, and preservation of cargoes. By that I also mean well-designed, adequate, comfortable, and attractive accommodations for passengers.

To compete successfully against the international field, therefore, we must offer superior service that will attract both shippers and travelers to American-flag lines. One of the most effective ways in which we are doing that is through the development of air conditioning, both for the protection of cargo and the comfort of passengers.

As I have said, the Maritime Commission has been interested in the development of air conditioning since before the war. Although the war itself side-tracked some progress that was being made along the lines of full air conditioning, it actually accelerated the application of mechanical ventilation because blackout regulations made it impossible to use the conventional methods of natural ventilation. During the past 11 years all passenger ships built in the United States have been provided at least with air-conditioned dining saloons, and most ships built in the last few years have had all passengers' quarters air conditioned and at least half of those have had the crew's quarters so treated. All passenger ships designed in this country within the last 3 years are completely air conditioned, including all passenger and crew accommodations.

Air conditioning is the most important advancement in passenger comfort in passenger liners in the last generation. Yet, few people who take air conditioning in land establishments for granted understand or appreciate the difficulties under which engineers work when designing and installing such systems aboard vessels. We in the Maritime Commission know, for instance, that difficulties experienced in planning of ship construction are far greater than those experienced in planning for structure on land, and that this applies particularly to the inclusion of air-conditioning systems in a large vessel. Fortunately, ship owners are keenly aware that efficient ventilation and air conditioning are not merely a desirable feature, but that sharp competition in the passenger trades makes them an asset to the business which will pay dividends. Consequently, air-conditioning systems are now considered as "musts" in the original designs of all our passenger vessels.

Most of the ships in which air conditioning is a must will be built with Government financial aid and in return for Government aid the purchaser of the new vessel is obliged to accept plans and specifications which meet with the approval of the Commission. Because the presence of air conditioning is an indispensable part of a truly modern passenger vessel, the Commission will not, I am sure, furnish any financial assistance in the construction of any vessel without it. I am certain we would not build an out-of-date ship or one that did not contain the maximum appointments for passenger and troop health and comfort.

First of all, we require air-conditioning systems that are reliable. That means that they must be large enough and rugged enough to do the maximum job required without more than ordinary attention and servicing at sea. We require systems that are reasonable in original cost and in cost of operation. With the exception of refrigeration machinery, cooling coils, controls, and chilled-water piping, a system should certainly not cost more than a first-class marine heating and ventilating job, particularly when provision has been made for it in the original designing of the ship. And we must bear in mind that in passenger ships air-conditioning systems must be such that will not only produce maximum comfort for the people aboard, but will also comply with safety requirements of vessel design and construction, and the specific needs placed upon a vessel as a troop carrier in time of war.

Inertia to change is always with us in every field of endeavor. It is one of the fateful things of life, but progress in America has been made in spite of it. Through the course of our history, practically every invention which has added to the fullness of life has been figuratively thrust upon a skeptical and unreceptive public through the artifices, if you will, of promotional advertising. In earlier times many an inventor went to his grave never knowing that the fruits of his genius, which he could not sell for the price of a little food and shelter, would within a few decades become commonplace in the life of the community. In reverie, I sometimes wonder whether our great men of invention, production, and distribution today are not often amused as they prepare some new blessing of modern science and industry for the sharp battle it must undergo before it is accepted and put to universal use by a still skeptical and unreceptive public. These men must withstand the insults and accusations of windbags, marplots, and ne'er-do-wells who blaspheme and abuse their benefactors with charges that they are interested only in private gain. True, business is run for profit in this capitalistic world of ours, but let me tell you that if it were not for the great forward vision of our large industrial organizations, where extensive research programs are constantly being carried on at private expense to wrest from nature and the universe all that it has to offer for a higher and finer civilization, there would be little hope for the future of the human race. Yes, our industrialists must possess a humor tinctured whimsy as they thrust aside the fulminations of their traducers and turn to produce more of the good things for all of us to enjoy.

The resistance to progress is ever present in shipbuilding. There are several schools of thought, among both technicians and laymen, concerning the value and use of air conditioning. Among engineers and designers themselves, there are those who think that only dining salons and staterooms should be air-conditioned, while lounges and other public rooms should be ventilated only by the outside air. We are coming to the general belief, I think, that it is best to provide air conditioning for the entire vessel with individual room controls so that the ship may be kept comfortable no matter where or under what weather conditions she may be operating. This is particularly important from the troopship standpoint, since a liner which operates regularly in the North Atlantic, let us say, in peacetime, may find herself in the Tropics a good part of the time during war.

Air conditioning on passenger vessels when employed commercially is primarily for the comfort and convenience of the traveler and it is, therefore, the aim of the Commission that this desirable feature be so engineered and installed as will permit the occupant to use, regulate, or dispense with it in his own quarters.

The importance of air conditioning when a vessel is used as a troop transport, cannot be over-emphasized. War lowers the standard of living for everyone, but particularly for those in combat. When we send men overseas we are not able to limit room occupancy as we do with our first-class passenger accommodations. We put 8 or 10 or even more in a room, stacked up in berths from deck to ceiling. Therefore our air-conditioning systems must be able to provide enough air for several times the number of persons who ordinarily occupy the space, in order that our troops may be made as comfortable as possible. This is important both to the health and morale of men traveling in troop ships under wartime conditions when anxiety and general strain are at a high peak.

I am aware that air conditioning is going to cost a tidy sum, approximately half of which the Government must pay if the vessel is built with a construction subsidy. While I am not an engineer, I know that the increase in cost will not only be attributable to the distributing systems required to carry the clean and healthful air to all parts of a great ship, but will entail greater electric generating capacity and added fuel costs. But it will be worth it. Consider for a moment what we mean when we say that American shipping must compete with foreign-flag shipping. We are not thinking in terms of this Nation competing with another. We are thinking in terms of the United States competing with all the rest of the world.

It is with a stark realization of the world condition which confronts us which calls upon us to marshal the efforts of all who can make a useful contribution to the construction of the best-equipped, safest, and most suitable vessels for the transportation of passengers and cargo that science and the will to achieve can produce. As a part of such an effort Minneapolis-Honeywell is making a substantial contribution. I am told, and I address this to that organization, that you have the contracts for the installation of air conditioning in all of the six new ships the Maritime Commission has under construction. Had you not been able to demonstrate your capacity to discharge with competence

the undertaking you have embraced you would not have been chosen for the job.

You may not get the next job in which the Maritime Commission is interested. Competitors may challenge your work. Instead of Minneapolis-Honeywell smugly preening itself with satisfaction in its own works, it too will strive for greater perfection. If you attain success it will not be through change—it must come through painstaking work and dogged diligence. If you fail to achieve success, all society loses. If, on the other hand, you are successful in your present undertaking and in all of your works, you'll earn dividends for your stockholders and the people will get their dividend in better service, comfort, and health.

In truth you are playing in a great game—one in which financial winnings for you mean bonuses in better living for everyone.

Letter From Hon. Edwin Arthur Hall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

DEAR FRIEND: Congress goes back in session this month. As usual, I am at your service in our Nation's Capital.

Every man and woman in our congressional district, regardless of race, religion, or color, has a right to call on me at any time for help with problems.

Don't let the stooges of Stalin scare you from writing to me because I am always glad to hear from you. I value your opinions and often I am in the spot to do you or your loved ones a favor. All you have to do is ask me.

Before I vote on the following questions I want to know how you feel about them.

1. Do you want compulsory health insurance? ------

2. Do you want Federal aid to education? ------

Mark your answers "Yes" or "No" after these questions.

Your interest in your Government will keep America free.

Your Congressman,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

St. Vincent's Hospital—100 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, all of us know that getting sick is an expensive matter. Few of us are in a financial position to regard with equanimity the cost of medical care for a major illness. Even so, it is difficult for us to comprehend the impact of a serious sickness on the families of the very poor—the empty, helpless feeling that must come with the realization that the breadwinner, or the hard-working mother, will be lost to the family group through hospitalization.

In thinking of such situations, it is heart-warming to recall the friendly, understanding services of the voluntary charitable hospitals.

An outstanding example of such institutions marked its centenary recently. This is St. Vincent's Hospital in New York City.

St. Vincent's was the first Catholic hospital in the city when it was established 100 years ago. It also was the first voluntary hospital established to care particularly for the sick poor. Through a century, its area of usefulness has widened steadily. But St. Vincent's has remained faithful to its primary charge—to provide adequate medical care for those whose means permit them to pay little, or nothing, for it.

It is a Catholic hospital, operated by the Sisters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul, the oldest order in the Archdiocese of New York. But no consideration of creed ever has controlled its readiness to care for an indigent sick person. It is a voluntary hospital in the purest sense.

New York's growth has changed St. Vincent's drastically in a physical way, but its spirit—that of comfort for the afflicted—has remained unchanged. The devoted nuns who minister there today are one with the sisters of 100 years ago.

It is a privilege to note the centenary of St. Vincent's at this time and to express the hope that God's blessings will continue to favor its works of mercy as it enters on another century of service as an element of the Catholic Medical Center.

Some Miracles To Ponder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, one of my distinguished constituents, Mr. LeRoy G. Davis, of Sleepy Eye, Minn., this past year celebrated his ninetieth birthday and has been engaged in the practice of law for over 67 years. He is the author of a poem, Some Miracles To Ponder, which is a beautiful expression and was contained in his 1949 Christmas greetings. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his poem:

SOME MIRACLES TO PONDER

Who planned the mechanics
That prints without fail
The white on the tips of
The cock robin's tail?
And who do you think fixed
That beautiful thing,
The red on the bend of
The blackbird's wing?
And how?
Who planned for the black on
The meadowlark's throat,
Which comes by a rule that
No man ever wrote?
Who planned the contrivance
From dust of the earth:
That brain for your thinking
You had at your birth?
And why?

—*LeRoy G. Davis.*

1949.

Bishop William T. Manning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, during the recess of the Congress, New York and the Nation have lost a distinguished churchman and most valuable citizen—Bishop William T. Manning.

For 26 years, until his retirement less than 2 years prior to his passing, Bishop Manning was the head and symbol of the Protestant Episcopal Diocese of New York. He died at 83—a revered statesman of his church who retained an active interest in its affairs.

To one not of his faith, the striking characteristic of Bishop Manning was his intellectual integrity. He was forthright, courageous and uncompromising in his advocacy of social principles he considered to have the highest validity. In this, he provoked bitter criticism, as well as firm support.

On occasion, he was impatient with those who were disposed to place a tortured construction on the words of the Holy Bible in an effort to shape it to their conception of modern life. He said:

The Bible teaches religion, not science.

Bishop Manning was born in Northampton, England, and came to the United States with his parents at the age of 16. He was educated at the University of the South, Sewanee, Tenn., and later returned there as a teacher of theology. He held rectorships in Redlands, Calif., Lansdowne, Pa.; Nashville, Tenn.; and New York City, where he officiated in Trinity Parish.

In 1920 he became Protestant Episcopal Bishop of New York. While he was a stern defender of his Anglican beliefs, he made the pulpit of the huge Cathedral of St. John the Divine available to clergymen of other faiths. As early as 1933 he was attacking Hitler for his persecution of the Jews. And last February he was condemning the trumped-up conviction of the Catholic Cardinal Mindszenty in Hungary.

Although essentially a conservative, he supported such social reforms of President Franklin D. Roosevelt as anti-child-labor legislation and unemployment insurance.

If he needs a tangible memorial, his cathedral will serve admirably. Its present magnificence is attributable

principally to his unflagging determination to make it a complete temple of God.

All faiths can admire his crusade against spiritual lethargy. Throughout his long career in the clergy, Bishop Manning fought to arouse renewed awareness of the presence of God. He could not countenance passive faith.

We can all admire and salute his noble character—his militant devotion to God.

Toward World Stability

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Toward World Stability—An Attack on One Is an Attack on All," which I delivered at the Institute of World Affairs, held under the auspices of the University of Southern California, in the Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif., December 13, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TOWARD WORLD STABILITY—AN ATTACK ON ONE IS AN ATTACK ON ALL

Throughout the history of governments the test of the worth of a constitution has always come in wartime. If we overlook the Kellogg-Briand Pact, which in theory outlawed war, we did not have in the history of governments until the promulgation of the present Japanese constitution a constitution based upon anything but force. The Japanese constitution is one within a superior rule. The projected union of Asiatic States is to be based wholly upon morals. The implementation of arms for the North Atlantic Pact finds America once again acting with words used to inspire unity in repelling an aggressive attack. Seldom has it been mentioned, that when Jefferson heard of the use of British troops against the people of Massachusetts before our Declaration of Independence he justified Virginia's interest in what was taking place in Massachusetts by use of words that are now part of one of the greatest positive law treaties that America is a party to, the North Atlantic Pact.

America, in all that she has done in advancing the concepts of liberty and freedom in the world, has always acted bigger than she thought. And never in her action has she failed to back up her words, if need be, with deeds. America has always been stronger than she thought, and her strength has helped in her leadership in the world.

When the people of Philadelphia celebrated the signing of the Constitution they offered two toasts; one, "the United States of America;" the other, "liberty and freedom to all mankind." Thus in America's beginning our people who were near to the spirit of those who wrote the Constitution interpreted that document with a dual meaning; one, an accomplished fact; the other, a hoped-for ideal. America's foreign policy today stands just where it did that night at Philadelphia; first, to keep America strong; second, to maintain our hoped-for ideal.

When our forefathers founded the United States of America they framed a Constitution which assured us our individual rights, liberties, and safety of person and property. They made it an indestructible instrument for the preservation of democratic principles, by which men would be assured that their innate dignity would be respected by government and society. They made it a flexible instrument which guaranteed representative government. In providing for decision by majority vote with full safeguards for minorities they bequeathed us a way of life which has brought us to our present position as the leading power of the free world. By substituting ballots for bullets, peaceful collaboration for decision by violence, they devised a principle of political action which was then, and is now, the highest attainment of man for the ordering of his affairs. Peaceful change deliberately arrived at—an American governmental invention which we have followed for many generations and which the world is now free to adopt—that is America's gift to the world. Direct actionists do not like it. Change by violence is still their way. An election instead of revolution is the democratic way within a nation. Collective action instead of the marching feet of the aggressor is the substitute the world is offered for war. The struggle is not yet won, but the people have seen the point. They believe that aggressors can be curbed, that a substitute for war has been found, and that ultimately mankind can live in a world of peaceful change instead of one of violence.

Throughout the history of this Nation, we have in theory steadfastly applied these democratic principles in the management of our domestic affairs and in the conduct of our foreign affairs. We have expressed in our international relations the same respect for human rights and liberties as we have zealously sought for ourselves. Traditionally, we have gone to the aid of the oppressed and spent our blood in the defense of the territorial integrity and the political independence of other nations as well as our own. Throughout our history in many parts of the world our actions, our force and our flag have stood for what the world learned to recognize as an American doctrine. We did this in 1898 and in the first World War. We did it again in 1941.

We are sometimes criticized for lack of foreign policy and paradoxically at other times for inconsistencies in our policies. Always admitting that we are human and therefore possessed of human frailties and contradictions, I submit that such accusations arise from an imperfect knowledge of our past. Many of our policies are not as new as some would have us believe. Most of them are deeply rooted in history.

The North Atlantic Treaty as an instrument may be new, but its underlying philosophy is the logical outgrowth of our age-long search for security for this hemisphere as expressed in the League of Nations Covenant, the Charter of the United Nations, in the Rio Pact, and in the Act of Chapultepec. These look back to the Monroe Doctrine, and that in its turn is deeply couched in the past. Indeed 12 years before that memorable message was delivered to the Congress President Madison in an earlier confidential message to that same body, dated January 3, 1811, said: "I recommend to the consideration of Congress, the seasonableness of a declaration that the United States could not see, without serious inquietude, any part of a neighboring territory, in which they have in different respects so deep and so just a concern, pass from the hands of Spain into those of any other foreign power." In response to this message Congress acted with a resolution that laid down the policy of what became a half a generation later the Monroe Doctrine. And troops were used to show we meant it. It was a congress that gave us our Declaration of Independence. It was a congress called convention that gave us our constitution. It was Congress that gave us the resolution that led to the Monroe Doctrine. It was a Senate resolution that paved the way for the United Nations. It was another Senate resolution that directed what became the Atlantic Pact. In each of our great steps towards carrying out the second part of the Philadelphia toast it was the representation of the people that bespoke the policy. American democracy has functioned in the making of our foreign policy.

These things we must never forget. America means popular sovereignty. It accepts the theory that men can act as a result of deliberation and reasoning. America's contest today is as it always has been, a contest against absolutes, the single will, legitimacy, divine right of kings, and dictatorship.

We need not think that article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations, which speaks of the natural right of individual and collective self-defense, nor article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which covenants that an attack on one signatory shall be considered as an attack on all the other signatories, are new concepts. It was Thomas Jefferson who said, "An attack on one is an attack on the whole."

Indeed, we might go on the same way with most of our foreign policies, for Thomas Jefferson said, "Make our hemisphere one of freedom," and he struggled for a good-neighbor policy over a hundred years before President Wilson uttered his Mobile address and Franklin Roosevelt embarked upon that same policy under the specific name, "good-neighbor policy." Jefferson also advocated a moral society and a united world which long preceded our participation in the United Nations.

Among the oldest policies we have is that of seeking to establish a stable world in which we and other countries may safely live.

In our present relations with the rest of the world, in problems affecting the United Nations, in the European recovery program, in efforts to end the Greek civil war, in aid to Korea, and in many other current relations, it is therefore consistent with our traditions that we should seek stability.

Thus, too, in our relations with the U. S. S. R., which often dwarf all other problems, it is only normal for us to seek that same stability. And it is in the striving for that stability that we most frequently find ourselves opposed to the deliberate Soviet campaign of threat of force, infiltration, propaganda, and sabotage, to subvert nation after nation, and to reduce the entire world to a collection of puppet states subserviently following without question a single will.

The world knows now that the dictator technique is to exploit instability wherever it exists and to create it where it does not; to incite turmoil, distrust, and violence; to trade on human misery by empty promises of abundance to come through communism; to capitalize on fomenting mass movements toward nationalism in the hope of diverting them into a pattern of puppet governments; and to sabotage any and all efforts by the free nations to establish political, military, and economic stability throughout the world by collective agreement. All this amounts to the creation of social and political chaos for power purposes.

In contrast, to avoid the terrible consequences of falling before the promises of single-will magic and to assist the free peoples of the world to escape totalitarianism,

the United States is pursuing its time-honored and tested course. Wherever possible, we are joining with other nations and peoples in a great endeavor to achieve world stability, for the protection of the freedoms, rights, security, and economic well-being of freedom-loving peoples everywhere. Two world wars in succession have convinced us that the destinies of all peoples are now joined inseparably, and we must either work together to stabilize this closely interdependent world community or allow it to be wrecked. Half the world has apparently not yet learned this lesson, hence enormous energies and resources which might be applied to constructive purposes must instead be marshaled to counter the Soviet threat of destruction. From an American standpoint the fight today is the same as it was against German imperialism, Hitler nazism, Italian fascism, and Japanese Tojoism. The struggle is the same whether it be against the pirates of the Mediterranean, the Holy Alliance, a Napoleon, a czar, a Boxer, or a Spanish king who would enslave our neighbors in the Caribbean.

Today and yesterday, by refusing to respect and comply with their solemn pledge to support and abide by the Charter of the United Nations, the Soviet Union has prevented this great collective means of safeguarding peace from reaching fully effective stature. There is little question that the Soviet has done and is doing this designedly. The United States, enjoying a monopoly of the atomic bomb, offered to share in an international system of atomic inspection and control and to forfeit thereby its great military advantage over other nations. The Soviet Union, counting perhaps on the unwillingness of the United States to exploit its dreadful weapon, has by its veto thwarted the overwhelming will of the UN majority to set up that necessary control. Soviet vetoes have similarly blocked efforts to reduce conventional armaments and to make the Security Council an effective guardian of peace. Let's give our former ally the benefit of the doubt; but lately the inference is inescapable that the Soviet Union does not want international security and an effective outlawing of war, but instead harbors designs and ambitions whose ultimate fulfillment could only be accomplished by crushing democracy.

We see the same pattern for instability in other directions in the disputes and conflicts which have arisen within and between nations to endanger the security of all others. Two spirits are in the world—the persistent veto in the UN or refusal to cooperate in efforts to settle political struggles and armed conflicts in the Balkans, the Middle East, Europe, the Far East, and Southeast Asia. We have only to catalog such names as Greece, Korea, China, Berlin, and Indonesia to expose the mark of noncooperation and note incitement to conflict. Equally, in all these cases, we see the clear record of the democratic spirit wholeheartedly seeking to apply the peaceable, constructive methods set forth in the UN Charter for the establishment of concord within and among all nations and our efforts toward stability through relief, collective action, and military aid.

The great obstacle which stands in the way of world peace is noncooperation. Let us briefly assess its magnitude and far-reaching character. For the moment the issues involved are most clearly set forth in the Far East.

The conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan would unquestionably have a beneficial, stabilizing effect both throughout the Far East and in the rest of the world. It would enable the new, democratic Japan to play a more constructive role in supplying important goods to other nations and would serve as an example of restored political balance which could have a good effect on other countries still beset by political dissension. General MacArthur has declared Japan to be now fully qualified and ready for the treaty and the greater freedom of action which would follow. However, there are forces in the Far East and elsewhere who oppose a treaty now. To me the saddest phase of the peace, following the unconditional surrender, was the dividing up of both the Japanese Empire, a defeated nation, and China, a victor, by the surrender papers. Adjustment is a necessary key to peace in the Far East.

Korea is another example of efforts toward integration and political stability which are being blocked by single-will adherents. The United Nations has put its seal of approval on the democratic government formed in south Korea and has sought to promote the entry of north Korea into that democracy. However, the northern sector is firmly in the grip of a militant Communist minority and is condoning, and perhaps instigating, threats of invading and subjugation of the legal recognized republic of the south.

Turning to China, we see still another situation calculated to disturb the rest of the world. The Chinese Communists have control of China's millions by force of arms. The ominous influence of that part of the world that opposes stability has been publicly displayed by the Chinese themselves in their announcement of their allegiance to the Soviet and in the declaration of Mao Tse-tung. What this means, in the way of world-wide Communist growth, is shown in the special commercial and other privileges which the Chinese Communists have already granted to the Soviet Union. They will most certainly not offer equivalent privileges to other nations, nor would any of the free nations wish to accept them and thereby exploit the Chinese peoples. In this new compact between totalitarian Chinese and power-hungry Russians, there is danger not only to the East but to the entire world.

Almost everywhere else in the Far East, militant Communist groups—some composed of Chinese immigrants outnumbering native populations—are openly striving for political control, creating instability and endangering the uneasy peace of the world. The far eastern peoples themselves are under no illusions as to the Soviet Union's interest in these subversive movements. The heads of some of these states have publicly called for joint action to end the threat to them all of dictator-inspired and directed movements aimed at seizing political control.

But the danger, as we know, is not confined to the Far East. Almost anywhere we look in the world, we see that the policies and actions of advantage-takers within nations as well as those from without are delaying and threatening the efforts being made to find reliable security and political stability throughout the entire community of nations.

The key to our policy lies in the efforts to offset this world-wide organized campaign for chaos. Accordingly, while continuing our efforts with the UN majority to organize world security, we have had no recourse but to supplement that effort. We have done this by joining with other free nations in regional, collective defense arrangements, in harmony with the UN Charter, to assure sufficient strength to deter aggression. Failure to accept the spirit of peaceful change had made the Rio Pact, the Atlantic Pact, and the military assistance program essential. Without them, there could not be sufficient confidence to enable us to proceed with the great task of repairing the damage of war and moving on to new levels of human productivity.

And there again, in the field of economics, we encounter the same grim contest between the seekers after chaos and the architects of stability.

When it became apparent that the economic health of the entire world was endangered by Europe's inability to recover unaided from the devastation inflicted by the war, the United States came forward with the Marshall plan, saving the peoples of Europe from despair and giving them the physical means to rebuild their productive capacity in agriculture and industry, and to reenter world trade on a scale beneficial to themselves and all other peoples. The Soviet response to this great undertaking was to forbid the participation of satellite states of eastern Europe and to endeavor to wreck the recovery program. Happily, the eastern bloc failed in its effort and Europe is now advancing toward recovery.

While the Soviet continues to boycott the constructive programs and activities of the UN specialized agencies, the United States continues to support the manifold efforts to increase food supply, eradicate disease, raise standards, build labor forces, improve education, modernize agriculture, and apply modern technology to the development of human and natural resources throughout the world. The President's point-4 program of technical and capital-investment aid to the underdeveloped areas of the world has been successfully developed in the UN Economic and Social Council, and there are indications that this great enterprise—which has created new hope among many millions of handicapped peoples—will be put into operation in the near future. During the discussions in the Economic and Social Council, Communist-inclined delegates at first attacked point 4 as a scheme of capitalist exploitation. Subsequently, the Soviet Union and its satellites joined with the majority in supporting plans for a greatly expanded UN program of technical assistance to underdeveloped areas. Even the obstructors dared not oppose this effort. This is the most hopeful sign we have yet had that a united world may realize at last that the true interests of all peoples will best be served by cooperating instead of opposing every constructive measure undertaken for the benefit of mankind.

When 34 nations met recently at Annecy, France, to draw up new tariff agreements offering multilateral benefits and assuring a greater volume of world trade, the United States was notable by its presence and cooperation, the Communist-controlled nations were notable by their absence. Similarly, when the 1949 World Wheat Agreement was concluded last spring in Washington, the United States was present as a participant and a leading force; the Soviet Union came, observed, and withdrew. The effect of that pact in stabilizing half the world trade in wheat, at prices fair to consumer and producer, will be to put more bread within reach of millions of people and to keep it within their reach.

The list could be continued indefinitely, but there is no need to do so in order to establish the fact of the two spirits in the world—one working for stability, the other working to promote chaos to accomplish political ends.

We know that any solution of the grave issues which confronts us transcends the powers and abilities of any single state. It is a collective job. The instrument we need lies at hand and calls for perfecting and support. We must strengthen and back the United Nations to the fullest. If we do, I am convinced that the single-will dictators of the world will be forced to admit the futility of their ambitions and will have to bow before the enlightened, determined will of aroused free peoples.

There is a powerful new current running through the affairs of all mankind—the current of collective desire to find a universally acceptable and practical method of solving problems now too great to be solved by nations and peoples acting alone.

Almost half of the Senators during the past session of the Congress have joined in

the introduction of bills designed to strengthen the United Nations and to create world government. These measures seek stability through some form of international organization which will escape the veto and control the hitherto unbridled acts of a minority. It is my honor to serve as the chairman of the subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, which will consider all of these bills during the next session. We plan to hold hearings on them in January and hope that they may serve as the basis for another resolution of the Senate in foreign relations comparable to the Vandenberg and Connally resolutions. By such steps as these we press forward to eventual peace.

The stability which we seek in company with other free nations grows stronger day by day. The tasks ahead are difficult and enormous, but we have found the method that works, and we will use it. We look forward to the day when all peoples will stand beside us as full partners in the interest of all humankind.

Organization of the Executive Branch

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a speech on the organization of the executive branch, which I made before the Greater New York Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report at the Hotel Astor, New York, on Thursday, December 1, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have very kindly asked me to tell you in a few words why Representative BROWN and I, early in 1947, brought forward the Lodge-Brown bill which gave birth to the Hoover report which your organization is dedicated to advance.

Certainly one thought came from the fact that I had just been in the Army and had seen some of the waste of war. I was also deeply impressed with the way in which the Government had mushroomed, first, during the prewar years of depression, and, secondly, during the war itself. Certainly, so it seemed to me, there had never been a time when reorganization was more needed and when the need for it would be more apparent to everyone.

It was clear that this reorganization would have to be accomplished on a bipartisan basis or it would not be accomplished at all.

It was plain that the concept of economy and efficiency must be linked together. Service in our State legislature and in the Senate before the war had convinced me that economy by itself arouses little enthusiasm.

I also remember reading, shortly before I returned to the Senate, in 1946, a newspaper account of an exchange at a hearing between a Senator and a representative of the Interior Department. The Senator asked the witness: "How many employees could you fire and still run the Department?" The witness replied: "That is a very difficult question to answer. I can only say there are places where reductions can be made." The Senator then had the understandable reaction. He said: "I think that a good way would be to fire about half of these Government people and then see if the public complains of poor service."

This exchange struck me as peculiarly significant. In the first place, the Senator was simply stating an approach to Government economy and efficiency prevalent not only in Congress, but in the country as a whole. There existed then, as there exists today, a widespread, if often inarticulate, protest that our Government is needlessly costly and cumbersome and that the best way to solve the problem is to get out the meat axe and proceed forthwith to chop off large slices of Government, letting the blows fall where they might.

This was a familiar reaction to a familiar situation, but it seemed to me wholly the wrong approach. Organization of the top-heavy governmental structure can never successfully be accomplished by the meat-axe technique. This has been tried again and again by a Congress faced always with the dilemma of either cutting too much or cutting too little—in the wrong places, at that. The situation seemed to me one which required not the brutality of the butcher's axe, but rather the sensitivity of the surgeon's scalpel.

The trouble was that we needed the expert diagnosis of the best surgeon, and here we have always found ourselves up against a stone wall. The representative of the Interior Department, whose testimony I have just quoted, emphasized this universal perplexity when he plaintively remarked that he simply did not know how many employees his department could do without, although he felt certain there were places where economies could safely be effected.

This was indeed the Government that nobody knew. Fiscal responsibility extended off in one direction, while management responsibility went off in the opposite direction. Everyone seemed to be aware of incredible waste, inefficient duplication, and ponderous clumsiness. But there was no one to turn to for the indispensable diagnosis; we had no X-rays of the gigantic patient; there was no surgeon with the training, experience, intelligence, and vision to whom we could look with either confidence or enthusiasm.

These were some of the considerations which led me to the conclusion that talk of Government economy and efficiency was utterly meaningless unless and until we found the surgeon so desperately needed. In this instance, however, we had literally to create our surgeon. It was essential, first, that he be preeminently qualified, the best the country could find. Second, he should be free from any political taint. Further, he should have plenty of time in which to complete his job. He should be given ample funds and all the assistance he needed. It should be clear that he do his work not as a witch hunter or as a headline seeker, but with the purity of the true crusader.

Thus it was that on January 13, 1947, the so-called Lodge-Brown bill was introduced. Its aim was to establish a group of men, to be known officially as the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This Commission would be our expert surgeon who would at last introduce us to the Government nobody knew, who would go through the baffling governmental maze with a fine-toothed comb, casting light and focus into all the dark and fuzzy places.

Thus the effort began. The legislative history of the Lodge-Brown bill in the Senate, at least, was not without some obstacles. The Budget Bureau, while agreeing to cooperate, pessimistically complained that commissions on Government reorganization were an old story and that such commissions had studied and submitted reports during the Taft administration without any constructive result, so why, it said in effect, go through the futile motions again and simply provide more voluminous reports as material on which the dust would gather? The Comptroller General in a lengthy letter said that an attempt to reorganize the Government, undertaken in 1798, had not worked. Once it was explained that the present situation differed from that which existed in 1798—or during the Taft administration—the doubting Thomases subsided. But we still faced the obstacle of congressional inertia. Here was a manifestly workable solution to a problem of the vastest complexity to which no one seemed to object, but still it was difficult to get anything done. At last, however, both Houses of Congress, by a unanimous, nonpartisan vote, approved the bill in the spring of 1947, the President signed it, and the path was clear for the Commission to commence operations.

Since those days I have had nothing but a series of pleasant surprises. I was first surprised at the extraordinary high caliber of men appointed to the Commission by President Truman, Senate President pro tempore Vandenberg, and Speaker of the House Martin. I was surprised and inspired at the way in which President Hoover subdivided the subject, organized the Commission, and laid out the work. I was delighted at the way in which the activities of the Commission were completely kept out of the Presidential campaign of 1948. To be sure, the bill was drawn so as to keep it out of politics, but the language of a law is never enough, by itself. Another surprise came to me in the quality of the Commission's recommendations which, of course, have aroused the praise of Americans in every part of the country. In fact, the entire Hoover report is now a subject for widespread public confidence and praise and, of course, this praise is music to my ears.

So now we have the report. The expert surgeon has given his diagnosis. It is a report in 19 separate parts which makes more than 300 recommendations. It stresses three things: to fix responsibility clearly, to give ample authority, and to set up a framework of control.

The report found, for example, what one commissioner described as "a complete lack of cost consciousness within the armed services"—something to remember today while Secretary Johnson struggles to carry out the unification law. Mr. Arthur S. Flemming, of the Hoover Commission, reports that Secretary Johnson has already effected economies of $300,000,000 during this fiscal year and will save about $500,000,000 during the next fiscal year. As much as $1,500,000,000 can eventually be saved in the armed services as a whole and without sacrifice of military strength. It is wonderful what can be accomplished by men who are not constantly thinking of new ways of spending money.

But there is still much to do.

The Commission found an absolutely indefensible competition for the taxpayer's dollar between the Reclamation Bureau and the Army engineers in an area where spending amounting to more than $50,000,000,000 is contemplated.

In the field of land management it found a three-way race going on between the Reclamation Bureau, the Forest Service, and the Soil Conservation Service.

Overlapping in Government medicine had created a situation in which there were only 155,000 patients in Government hospitals having a capacity of 255,000.

Recommendations were made to cure all these evils and these recommendations would save from $3,500,000,000 to $4,000,000,000—not millions, but billions.

So we have, thanks to the Hoover report, already accomplished something which no one would have thought possible; indeed,

even if we stopped there, the result would have been worth while in terms of public education. But we have not stopped there. Fully 20 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been enacted, which means a potential saving of $1,500,000,000. Congress has already passed one law which gives the President the right to submit plans which become law unless vetoed by Congress and six out of seven such plans have been already accepted. It has also enacted legislation to simplify and consolidate the housekeeping functions of government, to unify the armed services and to reorganize the State Department.

If the next session of Congress enacts as much as 60 percent of the remaining recommendations it can bring further economies of at least $2,000,000,000. But if Congress is to do this, it will need the guidance and help of Mr. Hoover and the Commission, who must prepare detailed reorganization plans and precise legislative proposals. The progress of the Hoover report cannot be aggressively advanced unless it is formulated into definite bills on which public opinion can focus. I hereby request Mr. Hoover and those associated with him to get these bills ready so that Congress will be given every facility for action.

This is a good place to pause and to pay a tribute to a man who surely must have had his fill of tributes, for he has received from people of every race, creed, and color, coming from every part of the world and from every walk of life. Yet each one of us who has had some contact with Herbert Hoover can add his own special and personal word of praise. For a period of time I saw him under circumstances which were in their way unique and which I shall always remember. In the full tide of his wisdom he would kindly consult with me as the work of the Hoover Commission progressed. I will not burden you, his friends and admirers, with my comments on his vast knowledge of government, his genius for organizing huge and complex work, his skill at keeping men of differing philosophies of government together, and his realistic sensing of the need for a truly effective follow-through in Congress. The memory that will always stay with me and which I particularly want to stress is of the way in which he never spared himself trouble, work, and fatigue. I think of him in the sweltering summer heat of a hotel room. I remember him—a former President of the United States—making the rounds of offices in the Senate Office Building, calling on Senators to discuss this great work, wearing out shoe leather and expending his energies at a time of life when most men enjoy the well earned ease of retirement. This was love of country indeed and it will always inspire me.

Much has been done but there is still much which remains. The job is still big. A government which has gone from 5 departments with 1,000 employes in President Washington's time to 180 agencies and 208,000 persons under President McKinley and then has increased to a point where today we find President Truman grappling with 1,812 agencies employing 2,100,000 persons cannot be untangled overnight. The deficit of the Post Office Department this year alone will be almost as much as the whole cost of government in McKinley's time.

And all this translates itself into such items as the $10 purchase order for the 50-cent typewriter ribbon, the penny post card that costs 2½ cents to deliver, and the $6,000,000 dam that cost $93,000,000.

All is inexcusable waste. None of it can be condoned on grounds of generosity or liberalism. In fact, the convinced socialist should be leading the cheering for the Hoover report since he wants the Government to do so much. The billions of dollars which enactment of the Hoover report would save are indeed of vital importance. But it was Calvin Coolidge who said: "I favor economy not because I want to save money but because I want to save people." And—to maintain the essential nonpartisan tone of our proceedings—it was Franklin Roosevelt who said: "Liberal governments are often wrecked on the rocks of loose fiscal policies."

What is at stake, therefore, is nothing less than our liberal Government and the viewpoint about man which this Government represents. For our system of government cannot be expected to endure if, in military parlance, it is no longer operational. It must be an effective instrument for translating into action the aims and aspirations of the people.

The reason for the destruction of democracy in so many countries of the Old World is that it did not or could not give effect to these aims. Let it never be said of us that we lost our democracy because we could not keep our Government lean and vigorous and effective.

Problems Confronting Municipal Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix to the RECORD a very timely address delivered by the Honorable R. Ray Shute, mayor of Monroe, N. C., before the Fortieth Annual Conference of the North Carolina League of Municipalities.

This meeting was held in Winston-Salem in October, and this address contains much food for thought with reference to the municipal governments and to other problems which confront governments at all levels.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On the occasion of this year's annual meeting of the North Carolina League of Municipalities, it would be timely to conduct a sort of orientation course for our new municipal officers, due to the fact that the mortality rate has become exceedingly high of late with our official family. It is the sixty-four-dollar question, whether Johnny Q. Public gets more provoked with his city officials than they do with him. At any rate, we are suffering a tremendous turnover in local government, whether we like it or not. I have the greatest admiration for those who are willing to make the personal sacrifice necessary to holding public office on the local level, because it is usually there that the going is toughest. And may I add, parenthetically, those of you who are considering sponsoring the city control of alcoholic beverages in counties that have already voted against control, would do well to converse privately with the speaker. I have just come through such a campaign and I assure you that I was exceedingly lucky to preserve my trousers in the ordeal. The Allied Church League even demanded my impeachment, and had they not won the election probably would have attempted it.

The city is the earliest form of self-government and is the mother of all levels of political enterprise. It is, therefore, not unnatural that citizens expect, and as a rule receive, more services from their city than from any other level of government. In the present complicated system of interrelated government it is perplexing, to say the least, to see the local unit so completely obscured when consideration is given to remedial legislation by either the Federal or State legislative bodies. With this specifically in mind, the American Municipal Association has sponsored legislation to create a Federal commission on intergovernmental relations, which aims at a vertical reintegration of government and we should lend our wholehearted support to this commendable undertaking.

Where once every house had a Chic Sale's nestling peacefully behind a floral design of morning-glories and sunflowers, had a well in the side yard, and an ever-burning trash pile in the back yard, today we have municipal sewer and water systems and garbage disposal. The kerosene lamp has been replaced by the incandescent bulb and the volunteer fire brigade has been replaced by professional firemen and the old vigilante patrols have been replaced by policemen. Dusty and muddy sidewalks and streets are now paved and kept clean by our sanitary and street departments, while the ditches and ponds and puddles are now safely replaced by adequate storm-sewer and drainage systems. Yes; we have come a long way in municipal government and still we are progressing.

Libraries, hospitals, parks, playgrounds, stadiums and other recreational facilities, armories, schools, health centers, airports, courts, prisons, traffic and parking facilities, zoning, planning, retirement, merit systems, public relations, research; yes; even cemeteries are now all a part of municipal government. It is a far-reaching and intricate system of conveniences and services and has so expanded, and so continues to expand, that efficiency experts, business managers, accountants, and a host of specialists and technicians are needed to operate even a modest city.

Today, as never before, we need men in office who are willing to familiarize themselves with the many intricacies of city government and we also need good educational programs to educate our urbanites on the varied problems of municipalities. It is no easy or simple matter to operate city government today, as every single one of you present here today can honestly testify. Ours is a responsibility and a challenge-worthy of our mettle. Faced, as we are, with increasing budgets every year, demands for more and better services and, at the same time limited sources of revenue, municipalities face a future whose glowing symbol seems to be a gigantic question mark. In North Carolina the progress which has been made by our cities is all the more phenomenal when consideration of our restricted finances is fully understood. It is, I think, a tribute to our municipal officials.

In the past we have painstakingly discovered new sources of revenue, effected economies all along the line, planned and financed carefully and safeguarded every fiscal and psychological gain. We have hoarded and budgeted our funds and diligently scrutinized and controlled our bond issues and capital expenditures and we have kept our current expenses at a very low level. It is, therefore, to different avenues of relief and assistance that we must now turn to meet the ever-increasing demands being constantly made. We must seek a redefinition of authority and a reinterpretation of certain State fiscal policies as they relate to municipal operations.

While we can expect little increased tax powers, we should at least seek legislation on a positive level which would, for example, permit us to tax wherever we are not specifically denied the right. As it now stands, we are authorized to levy and where specific authority is not granted, we are prohibited—it

is a negative method. There are many other ways and means of finding tangible assistance for our cities if we had the support and understanding of both the Legislature and the administration. It is, I think, in these areas that we should seek for answers to many of our problems.

We must not lose hope or feel that ours is a losing fight, regardless of the many disappointments we experience. We are making gains and we are nearer to the people than any other governmental unit. We will eventually win our battle and secure many of the goals that we have heretofore set. We have a cumulative gain and some day a legislative spirit of understanding and cooperation will be manifested. It will not always be as absurdly one-sided as it now stands. More than one-half of our population is now urban and this will increase with the passage of years.

We must continue to exert every effort to operate efficiently and to plan carefully. We must keep our people informed on our problems and solicit their continued cooperation and understanding. The future is not too bright, I'll willingly admit, but it is not entirely without hope. To date, we have exhibited the most efficient operation of any unit of government and we will find newer and better ways of doing things.

There is one thing we must do and that is to guard against the evils into which we can fall—we must never become intolerant, class-conscious, or parties to discriminations and factionalizing. Let others say what they choose, but for us let that old spirit of true democracy continue in the future as it has in the past and we shall be happier and freer. Let us not lose our devotion to our fellowman nor our sense of proportion in these hectic times. Changes will come and men will arise who will have a new vision for the future, wherein democracy will become reactivated and a continuing force for the betterment of all. As in the past, so in the future, democracy must be our optative mood in life. It is our heritage and our only hope in years to come.

I sometimes find myself wondering just where this beautiful and meaningful experiment that we call democracy is destined to lead us in the eventful years that lie ahead. We have observed with no little interest and concern, certain very puzzling trends during the past two decades, which may or may not be indicative of fundamental changes in our way of life. Certainly we all applaud the many economic and social gains which have been made and many of us look with cooperative anticipation to still further gains in the immediate future. However, there are other signs of the times that hardly merit our approbation and if they are straws in the wind, then we should be most apprehensive of the current trend of our times.

In its inception, democracy—certainly the American brand—predicated its right of survival on the thesis of equal rights for all and special privileges to none. The individual, for the first time in recorded history, was given official status in government and the theory of democracy was declared to be a mutual sharing together by individuals in decisions affecting the lives of all. This was a new philosophy of life, refreshingly different, stimulatingly new and typically American. It was a new day in the conception of a way of life, later to be distinguished by the title "The Age of the Common Man"—a term not so well cherished by imperialists in the areas of political, economic, and social, not to mention religious experience. The idea of rugged individualism, private enterprise, and the inherent rights of the freeman became paramount. Under this system America has grown from a seacoast colony of minute proportions to the mightiest Nation on the face of the globe. The challenge of this thrilling new continent furnished the dynamic for Americans to develop a cockiness and confidence that has led us to successes undreamed of in the annals of man. The American way of life became a term associated with strength, courage, vision, and determination. We became a Nation to whom failure was an obsolete term and the impossible merely a challenge to our dogged adventuresomeness, imagination, and skill. Ours has indeed been a record of achievement unparalleled in all of man's history and the world has learned to live and move according to American methods and democratic thought patterns.

Yankee ingenuity has won out on many occasions and our cooperative potential has twice thus far in this century saved the democratic way of life for the entire world. However, today we observed the greatest paradox in mankind's existence. America has, let us hope momentarily, lost its zest for experiment, its spirit of aggression, its daredevil attitude of leadership, its positive urge and its determined will to progress and surge forward. Something quite serious has apparently happened. We no longer seem able to lead or even willing to strike out on our own. We have adopted an attitude as un-American as the Sphinx. Our every thought, every act, every concern, seems to be on Russia, and we have assumed a negative philosophy of life. We wait to see what the Soviet does—then we do the opposite. This new and unique attitude is most alarming to many of us and we deplore seeing the wealthiest, most powerful, and most prolific Nation on earth surrendering, by default, its position of leadership to an upstart conglomeration of slave states whose basic ideology is as inhuman as it is economically and politically unsafe and degrading. I think most Americans are becoming disturbed about this anomaly and as dislike becomes more intensified, perhaps we may hope for a rebirth of the American affirmation of life and see a resurgency of democracy that will sweep every opposing tenet before it, whether from the right or left, and lead our Nation and world into the challenging future of the atomic age. This, I take it, is the national imperative of this very hour.

While it may not necessarily be associated with this same attitude previously mentioned, at the same time we have developed a new, and to many of us a dangerous, system of government by and for vocal minorities and pressure groups. This departure from the truly democratic process is both un-American in its inception and exceedingly damaging in its operation. More and more we note the passage of important legislation predicated on the voices of pressure groups rather than the apparent needs of all of the people.

And may I pause here, for the moment, and say that I concur with our Governor in many, if not most, of his reforms and I am increasingly thankful that we have a Chief Executive who has the guts to strike out on his own for reforms which are so badly needed and it is my studied opinion that the vast majority of our people will go along on most of these programs. I am sure that every fair-minded citizen of North Carolina wants every segment of our people to go forward together; farmer, merchant, laborer, manager, borrower, lender—with locked arms and hearts and minds and spirits in a mutuality of sharing together in the blessings, the responsibilities, the gains, and the losses of our great Commonwealth. This is the only way that true progress can be effectually made and we of the North Carolina League of Municipalities offer the friendly hand and heart to our brothers of the soil and others in this great State and ask for peace and brotherhood and cooperation from every quarter. It can only be on this basis that we can hope for a future of promise. Let us pioneer and explore and dare to advance; let us do it together and in the true spirit of understanding and democracy.

As Tom Paine wrote on the head of his drum during the trying days of our national revolution: "These are the times that try men's souls." To be sure we live in trying times but only the coward would turn back and seek retreat from the realities of the now—whether they be good or bad. Hence, our course for the day and for the morrow lies ahead: Upward and onward. This is not the first time that we have encountered stormy weather and many times ere this our seamanship and courage have brought us safely through. Our ship is sturdy, our course is clear and behind the clouds the sun is ever shining. We have but to sail on and fear not, for the morning cometh and the lark will yet again sing and skies will be blue and the storm will spend its fury. I say, "Hold the Faith, have courage and be of strong heart." It is always darkest just before the dawn.

The United States Marine Corps

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the keynote address delivered by Col. Melvin J. Maas, president, Marine Corps Reserve Officers' Association, at the national conference held on October 21 and 22, 1949, in Philadelphia.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Since our last conference in Chicago in January of this year, many things have happened, but the Marine Corps still finds itself faced with the same determined efforts to drastically curtail it as a combat force. The fact that these objectives have not been accomplished is due in no small measure to the efforts of MCROA chapters and individual members who have devoted so much time and intense interest and effort in preserving the Marine Corps.

While our sentimental love of the corps might in itself be a compelling motive to spur us on in the battle to preserve the Marine Corps, that is not our basic motive. We are principally concerned with the necessity of having always available for instant readiness, an effective combat force of shock troops and amphibious teams. While the Marine Corps may not be the only method of accomplishing this, it is certainly the most effective and economical way to do it. The continued existence of the Marine Corps, maintained in a high degree of readiness, is the only assurance that we will have such a force. By the very nature of modern warfare under which hostilities start with stunning suddeness and develop with lightninglike rapidity, a combat-ready force in existence and capable of moving at an instant's notice is absolutely essential. In no other way can we buy the time necessary to even mobilize our defensive military forces, let alone have the opportunity for effective retaliation.

Those who would reduce the Marine Corps to guard-duty status and transfer its amphibious mission to the Army and transfer its air-support mission to the Air Force, are perfectly sincere in their belief that the Marine Corps constitutes a duplication and is therefore unnecessary. They are mistaken. They are mistaken because for while one understands long-range bombing and the other

understands mass troop movement, they do not understand the influence nor the effect upon an enemy of the pressure of sea power. They are under the mistaken delusion that a Navy is designed only to fight enemy ships. What they fail to appreciate, is that sea power is one of the most effective forces in putting pressure on any enemy, to help destroy his capacity and his will to further fight, even in the case of vast land-locked areas. Sea power can deny to the peoples of such areas their essential imports. Any nation's mass imports must ultimately come by sea, therefore the quickest way to strangle a nation's war potentiality is to deny it those parts of its economy which must come over the broad highways of the ocean.

Because we have never had unification of our military services in past wars, the soldier understands only fighting other soldiers; the aviator largely thinks in terms of aerial combat with other aviators. Neither knows nor understands the function and the mission of sea power. The seething conflict within our military services that has finally erupted into a congressional investigation, is not merely a conflict of either the self-interest nor the divergent professional points of view of our Navy or our Air Force. While what appears on the surface is an effort on the one hand of the admirals to retain their traditional roles, and on the other hand an effort by the aviators, because they are a new element, to assume unto themselves roles which heretofore were performed by the Navy and Army, this is only a side issue of the real story. It would be made to appear that we are witnessing merely a clash of personalities, a struggle for personal military power. Some people see this as the dying grasp of the straw by the drowning Navy, others see the newborn infant "air power" attempting to arrogate to itself all of the functions and missions of the older and more traditional services.

Actually all this is only evidence of a much deeper and far graver situation. What has been happening in the Pentagon and before the committees of Congress is evidence that the United States has not yet realized its dominant position of leadership in the world. We are relatively a young nation, but suddenly we find ourselves thrust into the role of world leader and champion of the democratic forces throughout the world. We and all that we stand for are challenged by a rising and formidable enemy whose ideology and methods are the direct opposite of ours. No; this is not a question as to whether the Navy is right and the Air Force wrong, or vice versa. It is not a question as to whether we can save money by duplicating the Marine Corps in the Army or whether all airplanes should be in one air force. The protests resulting in public outbursts emanating from the Pentagon by the Army, Navy, and Air Force are evidences that the United States has failed to adopt a world policy and a program which is essential if we are to assume our position as world leader. The reason that the Navy protests the Air Force's domination, the reason that the Marine Corps protests the Army's efforts to starve out the combat forces of the Marine Corps, the reason that there is a struggle between the Army, Navy, and Air Force for the control of guided missiles is that we have no formula within which to fit the proper assignment of the missions of our military services. We can have no firm, intelligent military program which will be understood and accepted by all within and without the military services until we do have such a formula. Such a formula is dependent first upon our having a national policy of our position in the world. Neither the people nor the Government have as yet stated nor even formulated what our world objectives are. Neither we nor our friends, nor even our potential enemies, know just what the United States stands for nor what its long-range policies will be. We find ourselves pushed around dangerously in various parts of the world because the opposition forces in the world are uncertain as to what our limitations are. They will advance their interests everywhere in the world short of war by pushing us around wherever we will permit ourselves to be pushed. While their objectives may be to accomplish their aims short of war, neither we nor they can be sure that it will stop short of war, since neither of us know just how far we can be pushed before we push back and war becomes the inevitable result. Our friends and potential friends throughout the world are hesitant because they do not know how far we will support them nor how long such support as we do give them will continue. Our military leaders are confused because they do not know just what it is they are to be called upon to do in the support of our national policies. How can they? Those policies have never been stated; in fact, no two people in nor out of Government can clearly define what our objectives are.

The military establishment has as justification for its existence, the implementation of our foreign policy. How can our military or our congressional leaders provide the proper size and type of military organization when they themselves do not know precisely what the mission is to be. The objectives of a nation's military force is not to win a war as such. The objectives of a government including its military forces, is to preserve its integrity, independence, and peace. When war becomes unavoidable in attaining these objectives, the purpose in fighting that war is to destroy forces that are opposing those objectives with the further purpose of resuming those objectives when the hostilities are over, in other words, when the opposition to our policies has been removed.

Therefore, our international concepts and our military strategy and tactics must be such as to further those ultimate aims in war if it be forced upon us, but the war must be so conducted that we do not defeat our own purposes. We must as a Nation, for instance, decide whether we intend to adopt a Genghis Khan concept of totally wiping out our enemy in a war, or adhere to the traditional American idea that we will merely fight an enemy government with the purpose of liberating its peoples from their own tyrannical leaders. Under the latter concept our philosophy has always been that people so liberated would then be receptive to our democratic ideals and would ultimately achieve freedom, liberty, and economic independence. This is the basic issue behind the current flare-up within the Military Establishment. It strikes to the heart of the problem—that of the future of the world.

Our answer to this problem will determine what kind of a world there will be for the next thousand years. A wrong solution will mean another war and a war which will result in the destruction of everything that man has been fighting to achieve during the last thousand years. A right solution will mean not only the preservation of the achievements of mankind but will permit them to progress and advance as much during the next thousand years as they have during the last thousand.

Therefore, you and I are fighting not to preserve the Marine Corps in order to preserve an organization of which we are proud and to which we owe service allegiance. Whether we are conscious of it or not, we are fighting to assure this country a type of military force which will make it possible for us to continue to achieve our worthy objectives in the world. Without a striking force instantly available, retaliation may not become sufficiently evident to a potential enemy to deter him from over-stepping the bounds of our national self-interest. Without such an instantly available striking force as the Marine Corps alone provides, the nature of such a war, if forced upon us, may compel us to wind up with either Genghis Khan warfare, or at least the use of such mass destruction methods as will make it impossible for us to ever again lead the rest of the world in adopting our ideals and philosophy. No, this movement to preserve the Marine Corps is not merely service rivalry, nor evidence of fierce pride in a great and glorious corps. It is the inner conviction of people who have the knowledge that we must have what the Marine Corps can give the Nation in order to survive as a democratic nation, and to continue to be the hope of peoples throughout the world who aspire to ultimate democracy.

MCROA at its last conference, held in Chicago, called upon the leaders of our military services to end the interservice bickering and to accept the decisions of the constituted leaders once the decisions had been made. We called upon all officers, Regular and Reserve, to either accept the final decisions or get out of the service. MCROA, at that time, pledged its leadership in this demand by promising to set an example. We renew that demand and renew our pledge.

However, I wish to call your attention to the fact that our demand and our pledge was predicated upon the assumption that before the constituted leaders made their final decisions, all services would be adequately, fairly, and freely heard, and that they would all be dealt with on a basis of equality in their treatment. This does not necessarily mean equal appropriations, but it does mean that each shall have his problems and his requirements treated on a basis of equality with all the others. When I called upon MCROA in January to demand the end of interservice bickering, I proposed that the bickering be ended by an intelligent and fair elimination of the causes that were leading to this unfortunate controversy. I fear that what has happened in the meantime is that efforts have been made to eliminate the controversy by arbitrary suppression of the bickering and endeavoring to conceal the controversy from the public rather than by getting to the basic causes and removing the sources of conflict. The positive proof that this is what has happened is the fact that the bickering has not ended, the conflict has not been settled and, in fact, has continued to grow until it has finally exploded on Capitol Hill and has resulted in a congressional investigation.

Actually this situation cannot be entirely corrected within the military itself. The Congress and the people themselves must assume the major share of the burden for this situation. A final and lasting solution can come only from the people through the Congress. It is a healthy sign and still a most happy one that this service conflict could get out in the open and could reach the point where all sides could be heard by the legislative representatives of the people, the United States Congress.

Merely to suppress the evidence of the conflict is dangerous. Compare the situation that existed in prewar Germany. There, the military leaders were supreme. All opposition was suppressed so that the public was misled into believing that there was complete unity. This led to the feeling that the leaders had found the correct solution to their military problems. One branch of service dominated the military and, through them, the government of prewar Germany. Unfortunately, those particular leaders, while they understood well the problems of land mass armies, did not understand the potentialities of sea power nor the full implications of the new element—air power. Those who did understand these two elements were only half heard and then suppressed. The dominant military leaders in Germany saw sea power largely as limited

to undersea raiders and air power as merely long-range strategic bombing. Germany lost the war, because she did not bring adequate sea power to bear upon her initial victories, and then failed to follow through on total air power. Germany was doubtless capable of doing both but was prevented from doing so because the informed advocates of adequate sea power, and total air power were suppressed by those who had impatience with these concepts, an impatience due to ignorance of their full implications. Had adequate sea power been made available in Germany, American lend-lease would have been cut off. England would not have survived the furious onslaught of the Germans. The final blow to Germany came when the Luftwaffe lost the Battle of Britain through its failure to provide its strategic bombers with adequate fighter aircraft coverage.

Had the battle of Britain been won by Germany, there is very little doubt but that the United States would have been denied the opportunity to have even challenged Germany in Europe, for England was our only possible base of operations in Europe proper. Adequate sea and total air power on the part of the Germans would likewise have denied to us the opportunity of our African campaign. Even so, our African, Italian, and French landings were made possible only by the use of amphibious tactics and weapons developed by the Marine Corps long before World War II started. Every amphibious landing, whether in the Atlantic or Pacific, succeeded because it followed the pattern developed by the Marine Corps. The Marine Corps being a relatively small, closely integrated organization, employing every weapon, was able to study and develop the tactics, techniques, and the weapons necessary for successful amphibious operations. Neither the Army nor the Navy nor the Air Force each by itself can conduct such studies. It takes an integrated organization with all weapons available at all times, to successfully develop and continue the progress of amphibious operations. Furthermore, amphibious tactics are a complete lifetime military job. It cannot be developed on a part-time basis either by the officers or men engaged in it. The only military organization in the United States that was ready—that is, trained and equipped for the nature of World War II when that war came—was the Marine Corps. Traditionally, armies and navies prepare for the next war by getting ready to fight the last war better. The marines, on the other hand, traditionally forget the methods of one war, the day it is over, and begin to train and prepare for the nature of a future war. Thus, in 1921 the marines realizing that if another war came it would not again be trench warfare but would involve our attacking and landing on hostile shores everywhere in the world, reorganized itself and dedicated the whole Corps, including its air branch, to the development of modern amphibious tactics. So, too, at the end of World War II, the Marine Corps realizing that we would not again be recapturing the same islands in the Pacific we took in World War II, reoriented its entire concept for the nature of a probable future war. No time was lost in reorganizing the field forces of the Marine Corps, its supporting echelons and its tactics, techniques, and its weapons.

To destroy the Marine Corps as a laboratory in time of peace, for the study of future tactics, and as an assault force immediately available if a future war comes may very well spell defeat for the United States in the event of another war. Our national history indicates that if the Marine Corps is destroyed as a combat organization, we are very likely to enter world war III largely with the weapons, tactics, and techniques developed in fighting World War II. However, they simply will not be good enough. The Marine Corps is an essential and integral part of sea power.

So again I call upon MCROA to lead the way. I urge that MCROA insist that the interservice bickering be ended by a full, frank, and intelligent elimination of the causes that have led to this interservice conflict and further, that MCROA urge the people and the Congress to no longer delay in the determination and proclamation to the world of our national and international objectives. When this is done, a formula can be devised whereby military programs will result in providing the United States with security forces that will actually provide security and at a cost that will not wreck the economy of the Nation.

To the chapter presidents and all the members of MCROA, I hand this challenge. It is your greatest assignment. On the outcome, far more depends than any assignment you ever have had in uniform. To assure our objective of the continued existence of a Marine Corps capable of fulfilling its mission, it is essential that Congress provide that the minimum strength of the Marine Corps shall never be less than 6 percent of the total strength of the combined armed forces. Six percent spells security. Hand in hand with this necessity, is its twin—that the law must provide that the Commandant of the Marine Corps sit with the Joint Chiefs of Staff during consideration of amphibious matters, and on all matters affecting the Marine Corps. Not until and unless these two things are done, is this Nation assured of proper military security.

So, the order to MCROA is forward march.

United States Cultural Exchange Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New York Times of Sunday, December 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION IN REVIEW—UNITED STATES CULTURAL EXCHANGE PROGRAM NOW COVERS 50,000 PERSONS AND IS GROWING

(By Benjamin Fine)

The United States, as never before in its history, is engaged in a tremendous program of cultural and educational exchange. The State Department, responsible for this project, is convinced that the democratic way of life can be made more secure and the false propaganda of the totalitarian nations more easily negated if the peoples of the world have closer contact with one another.

We exchange with other countries leaders in various fields of industry and professors, teachers, and graduate students. We maintain libraries in all parts of the world. Our experts cooperate with other countries in developing scientific and technical projects in such areas as agriculture, engineering, or medicine. A number of cultural centers in the Latin-American countries, sponsored by the State Department, have helped thousands of adults learn the English language.

At present 26,000 students from foreign countries are enrolled in American colleges and universities. More than 16,000 American students are studying in foreign universities. In addition, another 10,000 nonacademic persons who are specialists in such areas as social welfare, government, technical work or industry will come here or go abroad. As a result, the total flow of academic and nonacademic exchanges will go beyond 50,000. This figure is double the prewar total—and it is still rising.

The exchange program is stimulated to a large degree by the Fulbright Act, which President Truman signed on August 1, 1946. This is the first year that it has been put into effective operation.

The program is financed by the sale of American surplus property abroad. Under the Fulbright Act a country purchasing our surplus war material can pay for it in part by underwriting the education of American students in that country, and by financing the travel expenses of its own exchange scholars who come to the United States.

TOTAL ESTIMATED AT $140,000,000

The act limits the educational exchange in any one country to the equivalent, in their currencies, of $20,000,000. It specifies that the sums allocated for this project can be spent at a rate of not more than $1,000,000 annually. Before the act runs its course, it is expected that a total of $140,000,000 will be made available for the educational exchange program, making this the greatest project of its kind.

Three types of programs are included under the Fulbright Act: (1) Graduate study, (2) teaching, and (3) research. Scholars in each of these three categories will receive maintenance, tuition, incidental expenses, and travel. However, the United States has no funds for foreign scholars coming here under the Fulbright Act, since all available funds are in foreign currencies. The act provides for transportation to and from the United States in those cases where travel can be paid in foreign currencies. Various private agencies cooperate with the State Department in obtaining funds to permit foreign students to come here.

To supervise the operation of the act, Congress has authorized the establishment of a Board of Foreign Scholarships, consisting of 10 members who represent cultural, educational, student, and war veteran groups. The board is responsible for (1) approving policies for the educational programs under the act; (2) approving the types of programs and projects to be undertaken; (3) selecting institutions to be approved for participation; and (4) selecting all candidates, both American and foreign.

FOUNDATION TO BE OPENED

The countries which are participating in the program include Belgium, Luxemburg, Burma, China, Egypt, France, Greece, Iran, Italy, the Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, the Philippines, and the United Kingdom. In each of these countries a United States educational foundation is to be established. These foundations will carry on the exchange programs and handle the funds, under supervision of the State Department. The foundations recommend programs to be followed in their particular countries, and suggest the candidates they feel should be sent here.

In the United States the Board of Foreign Scholarships has designated three agencies to assist it in selecting candidates.

These agencies are:

(1) The Institute of International Education, which makes the preliminary selection of applicants for student grants, both foreign and American. Under the chairmanship of the institute, a national committee representing various other private agencies reviews the applications and submits nominations to the board.

(2) The United States Office of Education makes the preliminary selection of teachers who want to be placed in elementary schools, secondary schools, and junior colleges abroad. The education office also reviews applications of candidates recommended by the United States educational foundations abroad for travel grants to take up similar positions in this country.

(3) The Conference Board of Associated Research Councils (composed of representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council) selects persons who wish to go abroad as professors, specialists in certain fields or advanced research scholars.

EXCHANGE TOTALS

According to present plans, the Fulbright Act will exchange a total of 3,000 persons each year. Of this total 1,500 will be American scholars who would be sent abroad, and an equal number who would come here. It is expected that the United States will divide its three categories this way: 750 graduate students, 500 research specialists or professors, and 250 teachers.

American groups and organizations subsidize the exchange program far more than the Government does—of the 26,000 foreign students here now, probably fewer than 1,000 get any direct funds from the United States Government.

Private groups are in the lead. For example, the Institute of International Education, a Carnegie-supported organization, serves as a clearing house for much of the exchange program. Last year it sponsored more than 1,000 Americans and citizens of other countries, who received scholarship and travel aid worth more than $2,000,000.

Scores of national, State, or local groups, both large and small, are supporting the exchange idea. For example, the American Scandinavian Foundation brought 515 students to this country last year at a cost of $500,000. The Girl Scouts financed 87 students or youth leaders from 31 countries. The English Speaking Union provided 41 scholarships. The Rotary International last year took care of 38 foreign students. In addition, many local Rotary Clubs had their own scholarships. Several college fraternities have raised scholarships to bring foreign students here.

BASIS OF UNDERSTANDING

Explaining the Government's position in this program, Dr. William C. Johnstone, Jr., director of the State Department's Office of Educational Exchange, declared that understanding based on an appreciation of differences in culture, customs, and history was essential to a world of international cooperation. In a recent interview with this writer, Dr. Johnstone expressed the hope that the exchange program would help build the foundation for a more peaceful world.

"As a Government we are doing everything possible to assist the people of the United States to have more direct contact with the peoples of other nations," he observed. "It is a program of peoples speaking to peoples. It is part of a total American effort to build a secure world. We believe that such security must come in a world in which men's minds are free to accept or reject ideas."

Unfortunately, the money available for this exchange is inadequate. Aside from the funds provided for under the Fulbright Act, the State Department has less than $5,000,000 available for this tremendous job. This is provided under the Smith-Mundt Act, which permits the Department to carry on various kinds of educational, scientific, and cultural exchanges throughout the world. Perhaps as the value of the exchange program becomes more apparent, the necessary funds will become available.

Socialism by Default

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Socialism by Default" delivered by Cecil Palmer, English publisher, author and journalist and one of the signatories of the manifesto on British Liberty at the fifty-fourth annual Congress of American Industry, sponsored by the National Association of Manufacturers, New York City, on December 9, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Nationalization undertaken by our present socialistic government is, without the possibility of contradiction, Britain's one-way passage to destruction—destruction of all which the people of my great nation have held dear for generations, yes, centuries—destruction of their right to work where they choose, where their talents best suit them—to a large extent, destruction of their right of ownership and enjoyment of property—destruction of their privacy with their physician or surgeon.

All this because the road on which we of Britain are now speeding—on which there is but a one-way passage (unless a miracle, not now foreseen, halts it)—leads from one state control to another state control until finally the state controls all.

I make no differentiation between socialism—which is the proper appellation for nationalization, though seldom mentioned by our socialistic government—and communism. Socialism and communism are identical twins, make no mistake about that. There may be this difference—whereas socialism merely paralyzes the soul of man, communism utterly destroys it. But where socialism takes hold, in even its mildest form, communism soon follows with all its destructive forces.

Under the past 4 years of socialistic nationalization, Britain has become a nation of frustrated, regimented, undernourished, dispirited people—perhaps nearly the most miserable people on earth. Their respect for law and order has dwindled ominously. In greater or less degree, we in Britain are all criminals now for it is utterly impossible for any man to abide by all the rules and regulations laid down by a socialistic, paternalistic bureaucracy such as is now inflicted upon our people.

How is nationalism accomplished? It is a dastardly story, but here it is.

The first move is to set the governmental propaganda machine in motion and to lay on the poisonous juice progressively until the selected industry itself begins to wonder how it ever came into existence at all. It is coaxed, threatened, cajoled, and insulted with equal hypocricy at every stage. It is told it is inefficient, costly, greedy, and quite incapable of working harmoniously with its employees. When as much as possible of this mud is firmly plastered over the industry, the next move is introduced.

The industry is set a minimum production target or goal. Even if the industry, left to itself, could attain it, the Government has no intention of allowing it to do so. With their rules, regulations, licenses, and permits, the Government already has the power of life and death over almost every private enterprise undertaking in the country.

The third move merely adds insult to injury. What is called a working party is imposed on the now tottering industry. Superficially, it looks fair enough, but, in substance, it amounts to nothing more than a committee of persons—persons who do not know the business—trying to pass on their ignorance to people who do know it. Usually without waiting for the working party's report, another move is inaugurated. The industry is asked to rob its stockholders by the limitation of dividends on the grounds that normal dividends, if distributed, would have an inflationary influence and give impetus to too much money chasing too few goods. The fact that these assumptions are 95 percent fallacious does not worry the Government one little bit.

By this time the industry, from a private-enterprise point of view, has had it. The stock-exchange prices reflect the situation grimly and graphically. The market quotations go down and down and down, and then, when the Government is advised that the break-up price has been reached, it steps in, freezes the current stock-exchange quotation as the purchase price for nationalization, and compulsorily acquires the industry. It is as simple and wicked as that.

The London Economist, which, more often than not, is a good friend to the present Government, made this comment: "The compensation clauses are as objectionable as ever. Indeed, in the case of steel, they are more so. To rig the market first and then to make compulsory purchases at the market price is more than sharp practice. It is plain dishonesty."

Nationalization has a blighting influence on the British economy as a whole. It relentlessly, ruthlessly, and fatuously reduces an economy of profit, which is the only economy that makes good sense, into an economy of loss, which makes utter nonsense.

At present, the losses of nationalization are being met by the profits of private enterprise—plus the very magnificent generosity of the United States and Canada, without which we would surely meet unthinkable disaster. And I might add, parenthetically, this is borrowed money, running into the billions of dollars, from hated capitalistic systems which the borrowers are so energetically trying to destroy.

Nationalization would seem to operate on the theory that a socialistic government can legislate unsuccessful people into prosperity merely by legislating successful people out of it. The thinking people of Britain are walking about with grim faces, chiefly because the rewards of endeavor, the glittering prizes of achievement are no longer attainable.

Under 4½ years of socialistic nationalization, Britain has become a nation governed by third-raters—not a big man in the whole socialistic governmental set-up—nothing but third-raters dragging down a first-class nation to their own puny level. Theoretically, they know all the answers—but, practically, they know none of the questions.

And this is not all that nationalization, or socialization, is doing to Great Britain. Today our prisons are full, juvenile crime is a national scandal, our state schools' curriculum is strictly secular and, on the material side, we are dissipating more wealth than we are creating. Having substituted state help—which is dear—for self help—which is cheap—we have lost both the desire and the capacity to save. For the first time for over 20 years the British people as a whole are not only not able to save, but are spending past savings. For the first 9 months of the financial year, 1948–49, withdrawals from savings exceeded deposits by $72,000,000. The one institution which continues to spend money as though it were as abundant as

water in the Atlantic Ocean, is the state. It has taught the unsophisticated among our people that "the state will pay," and now they do not realize that the status quo state is a pauper with a pauper's mentality when suddenly confronted with an opportunity of spending other people's money.

For instance, the nationalization of the railways, cost the nation as purchase price over $4,000,000,000. It will surely be granted that this is not a bad bit of extravagance for a nation whose government has had to admit that but for American and Canadian aid Britain would be confronted with an alarming unemployment problem and that her present low standard of living would have to be still further reduced. The chairman of the British Transport Commission has hinted, in an interim statement last November, that for the full financial year the deficiency between income and expenditure probably will be $112,000,000. And it will become worse as more and more would-be travelers learn that the trips they would have made in prenationalization days, they cannot make today because of increased cost of such trips.

Under nationalization of the coal-mining industry, the miners seem to be no more disposed to dig it out of the bowels of the earth than they were under private enterprise. In 1938, under private ownership, coal production was 227,000,000 tons. In 1948, the Socialist government urged its coal-mining comrades to achieve a modest goal of only 211,000,000 tons. They could not, or would not, make the grade. The actual production of 208,500,000 tons was 2,500,000 tons short of government expectations, and 19,000,000 tons less than was produced in 1938 under private ownership.

Now, in striking contrast, I would mention steel, still under private enterprise, though threatened with a large dose of socialization. In 1938, steel production was roughly ten and one-third million tons. Unlike the nationalized coal goal, which was lowered, the steel goal was raised by the Socialist government to an almost impossible and certainly improbable figure of fourteen and one-half million tons. The steel industry produced 15,000,000 tons, or 500,000 tons more than the goal—all accomplished by the hated private enterprise system.

And now, as to the individual himself and a free and unfettered democracy, the present Socialist government has almost succeeded in casting these into bondage. By a stroke of the pen, it has imposed industrial conscription, in peacetime, on every citizen of Great Britain between the ages of 18 and 50. All men and women, unless in an exempted category, can be directed to work under the control of engagements order, 1947. Britain today, under socialism, is only a little less than a vast concentration camp.

There has been an immense amount of ballyhoo put over by the governmental propaganda machine about its wonderful handling of the unemployment problem. It typifies the palpable dishonesty of its statistics. It claims to have maintained what it is pleased to call full employment. It has done nothing of the kind. A Truth commentator has pungently pointed this out in the following quotation:

"An ominous feature of the manpower figures to the end of 1948 was that national and local government services were employing 2,230,000 persons, which is 80,000 above the ridiculously high figure to which the government said the bureaucracy was to be reduced by the end of 1948. It is worth pondering what this means. Of the total in employment—20,328,000—2,230,000 are on unproductive, if not obstructive, tasks, leaving only 18,098,000 to do the nation's work. That is, for every eight workers there is one official. The figure in the United States is, I believe, about 1 in 16."

There can be no doubt the Socialists are maintaining this large bureaucracy of 2,230,000 employees to a great extent because it is a powerful factor in bolstering up the fiction of full employment. The correct description, of course, is "concealed unemployment."

And here is another disgraceful example of socialistic planning in Britain—the housing problem. There is an acute shortage of both houses and flats and the cost of them when built is preposterous and the quality deplorable. Home ownership is severely frowned upon. Houses for weekly rental are the order of the day. When the National Savings Committee issued a poster depicting a happy house owner, with the obvious implication that thrift had paid for it, the present Socialist government demanded its immediate withdrawal. Why? Because a Socialist government must not and will not permit its servile subjects to enjoy the feeling of security in home ownership.

Our Socialist government cannot even hold its own in its relationship with its fellow comrades, the Russians, much less make any tangible advance toward mutual understanding. I do not blame them in this instance for their failure. I blame them for their cocky boasting that they could do so much better than the men whose political positions they were destined to occupy.

But here is socialism's greatest racket—social security's cradle-to-the-grave fallacious fantasy. It seduces the people into allowing the state to do for them the very things they should be willing to do for themselves. Something for nothing just does not add up, and when the state exploits this kind of crooked arithmetic it is and can be only for an ulterior motive.

The National Health Service now operating in Britain exposes all the sinister implications of this foreign-conceived conspiracy to capture the bodies and souls of men and women and their children in sickness and in health. The nationalization of medicine is an integral part of the Socialist frame-up. Indeed, it is almost the last link in the chain that is being forged for the eventual communization of Britain. All dictatorships that have outlived their growing pains have found it necessary, sooner or later, to coerce medicine into doing their dirty work.

I am not suggesting for one moment that Britain's health service was conceived in this spirit. Nevertheless, all the necessary machinery is blueprinted for the use and abuse by some future tyrant if one such should emerge. Even today Britain's Socialist cabinet ministers have taken unto themselves powers and prerogatives which grossly and malignantly overstep the centuries-old established boundaries of our constitution.

The formula, issued as a statutory instrument, and in itself neither debated nor challenged in Parliament, reads as follows:

"Confirmation by the minister shall be conclusive evidence that the powers of the act have been applied and that the order lies within the powers of the act."

Our state medical service in its first 9 months' working has exceeded the estimate by nearly $234,000,000, and as the original estimate allowed for an expenditure of approximately $700,000,000 it is not unfair to assume that the aggregate cost per annum will be not less than $1,000,000,000. Such colossal state expenditure on a single item in the social-services program would be fantastic at any time. In Britain's present financial situation, it is stark, raving madness.

The government cannot and has not delivered the goods. There are not enough doctors, or nurses, or hospitals, or clinics. The hospital situation is especially acute and it hits hardest of all the poor patient who, under the voluntary hospital system, could always count upon and always did receive priority treatment. Many of us foresaw the deplorable state of affairs that would follow the introduction of the National Health Service. It was clear to all who observed, that the sudden opening of hospital doors to every citizen, irrespective of his income, would overcrowd these already full institutions. Prior to the effective date of the National Health Service, the man of small means had complete priority of admission to a hospital bed—and rightly so. After that date the hospital beds remained the same in number, but the candidates for admission increased enormously. The Socialist government had come to the rescue of the rich man and abolished the priority of the poor man. This has all been a revelation of thoughtless and careless hospital planning.

The scheme is a political fraud because it has been foisted on the public as a free medical service. It is nothing of the kind. The patients', real and potential, contributions to the Health Service alone is $2,800,000 a week. If that is free medical service, it would be nice to have an estimate for one that isn't. It might be cheaper. It couldn't surely be dearer.

The state medical service has done two things. Firstly, it has revolutionized the status of the doctor. His livelihood, his professional advancement, his loyalties are now at the mercy of the state—the state which pays him with the citizens' compulsory contributions. And, secondly, it has destroyed the relationship between doctor and patient. Privacy and secrecy have gone despite the parliamentary assurances of the Minister of Health. In an official leaflet explaining the new services and issued to all householders in Great Britain and Northern Ireland, a categorical assurance is given in the following terms: "Your dealings with your doctor will remain as they are now, personal and confidential." Only a few weeks later the Minister of Health issued a statutory instrument, No. 506, which flatly contradicted this assurance and created an entirely new position in the Ministry's own relationship with the doctor. Under the heading, "Term of service," every practitioner enrolled in the service is required, and I quote from that instrument, "to keep record of the illnesses of his public patients and of his treatment of them in such form as the Minister may from time to time determine; and to forward such record to the local executive council," which council, I must explain, consist largely of lay persons. Women especially are furious about this barefaced breach of confidence. They point out that Mrs. Smith, the patient, living in block A discovers to her horror that Mrs. Brown, a member of the council, lives in block B with all the possibilities of neighborly gossip about Mrs. Smith's ailments.

From time immemorial, doctors in Britain have voluntarily accepted the Hippocratic oath as binding upon them professionally. Indeed, it was strictly enforced by the British Medical Association and any doctor breaking it made himself liable to be struck off the medical register, a punishment that in effect precluded him from practicing. Thus, a doctor's real dilemma has been created. If he abides by his oath, he must disobey his new master to whom he is now dependent for his salary. If he disregards his oath and places his patients' confidences at the disposal of the Minister, he is clearly guilty of "unprofessional conduct."

Under the scheme, doctors practising in large areas are called upon to accept 4,000 patients. In smaller areas the number is reduced to 2,500. Each doctor receives a per capita fee of approximately $3.25 per patient per annum. It has not taken the doctors long to discover that their net incomes, after deduction of heavy expenses and income tax, are totally inadequate and

they are now, through the British Medical Association, pressing the Minister for a reconsideration of this and other difficulties in the working of socialized medicine.

Furthermore, there is considerable significance in the fact that within a few months of the act coming into operation a new organization, under the leadership of Lord Horder, the eminent physician, and calling itself the Fellowship for Freedom in Medicine, has come into existence and is being strongly supported up and down the country by medical men who have quickly realized that the high standards of British medicine are in jeopardy.

It has been estimated that doctors today can give their public patients only an average of 5 minutes per patient for both diagnosis and treatment. The state, on the other hand, claims under the scheme that "it is the duty of the citizen to keep well," and demands from the doctor a willingness to exercise "harsh certification," which, in plain English means disposing of illness or disability in the shortest possible space of time.

One Cabinet Minister recently told the world that the British were a fine people but that "an occasional crack of the whip" paid handsome dividends. It is my very confident guess that the day is not far distant when the doctors will make the discovery that they are expected to "crack the whip."

Perhaps, after all, the late Stephen Leacock was not so greatly wrong when he facetiously observed that socialism will work only in heaven, where they don't want it, or in hell, where they have got it already.

Reason for Dulles Defeat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE E. KILBURN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. KILBURN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial which appeared in the November 15, 1949, issue of the Commercial Advertiser, Canton, N. Y. I thought it was one of the best things I have read on the New York election and the state we presently find ourselves in. It was written by Mr. John A. Finnigan, whom I consider one of the best country editors in our State. It follows:

EDITORIAL COMMENT

The editorial writer and the columnist become editorial writer, the man on the farm and on the street, in the little shop and the big factory have been given to post mortems on last week's election. But few if any hit the point. As a matter of fact, so long as millions are receiving generous hand-outs from the administration in power, so long will these millions desire that the system be not changed. The average person of maturity doesn't look beyond the point of their nose.

It is easy to say that Lehman, Truman, and others more fully represent the needs of the Nation than John Foster Dulles and Dewey and those who represent the party now outside the Federal feed pen. It must be recognized, put party aside, that the people who profit by a system of government handout, call it dole or call it something else, don't wish the system changed. The farmer as a rule takes those subsidies and other things that come along. The laborer is getting his, there are millions who believe the Government owes them a living and they are riding the Government pensions or something else that means about the same thing.

There is along here a question that millions have not answered, if they have even thought about it. Where is the money coming from? Is there anywhere along the line that last straw that breaks the camel's back? Is there any such thing as national bankruptcy? Look at England today that started out in this merry ride of spending and is admittedly bankrupt. Where is the money to come from?

Those who are old enough to remember, recall days when old people and young people were thrifty and laid away for the rainy day. There were exceptions to the rule, however, always were and always will be. The writer as a boy knew many elderly people in their little homes not looking for doles; their needs were not large. They had lived lives of thrift, they abhorred waste. Perhaps they had one or two cows and a pig or two and a few acres of land. They were not the objects of charity. In fact they were too proud to accept charity.

Standing in the welfare office in the town hall a few years ago among those present was Prof. Herbert Philbrook Morrell, a member of the faculty of the Theological School of St. Lawrence University. Both the Reverend and Mrs. Morrell were givers to charity and to other things to the extent of their ability. They gave so much of their substance that they were in want, yet they gave.

On the occasion mentioned, Professor Morrell remarked, "The trouble with what we are doing is that if we continue we will become a nation of beggars." He was right and we are largely to blame as people for the system that is creating a nation of beggars. We are telling men and women they are not fit to work after 65. An attempt is being made to lower that age if it is not already lowered. We have a system of employment that invites the worker to quit his job and take a vacation at $25 per or better. Many a good man or woman is out of a job through no blame to them, but there are others, as many more who work just long enough to get that 6 months' vacation with pay.

The system is wrong. The whole thing is a sort of vote-buying excursion of those who run it and those who accept the free handouts of Government. The writer recalls the instance when assistance was being given certain people and they were spending it for booze and local authority objected and cut off the assistance, the persons appealed to higher authority and a representative was sent to Canton to investigate. This representative called on J. Fred Hammond both supervisor and welfare officer at the time. When questioned, Mr. Hammond explained that the money was being thrown away in things not needed and that were not good for those who used it so. The conversation became heated and finally the outside agent put it this way, "It is none of your damned business what they do with the money, drink it up, throw it in the fire, you must give, or we'll take care of you."

There is the explanation of election results in New York City and in your little country town—they are voting to get all they can, regardless of national or local bankruptcy. The only remedy is to change it. In the old days it used to be charged that the Democrats or Republicans had millions of dollars in campaign funds and would spend to the limit to remain in power or, if out of power, get in power. There you have what has been, but the picture today is reversed. The party in power has the stupendous volume of political patronage, pork-barrel legislation, and every other kind of legislation to subsidize the vote of the country. Instead of voting for the public welfare, millions are voting for their own pocketbooks.

The writer recalls that a little over 10 years ago the village of Canton had a piece of public work performed. The building of Main Street from the corporation line on the Potsdam Road to the corporation line on West Main Street, and Gouverneur Street to the underpass. A man or a boy couldn't get a job on that contract unless he was either a Democrat or would become so when of age. The same thing might have happened had the contract been under Republican administration. That it was and might be so shows the weakness of the whole system.

The country is on a spending spree, a give-away campaign. It wasn't always so and it won't be so long now at the present rate, this country will be in financial ruin. We have the example of England. We have the example of all western Europe on which we have been spending billions.

There is the explanation of why John Foster Dulles didn't win the other day; there is the reason the weak Harry Truman defeated Dewey in 1948—the system—the handouts must go on, rich man, poor man, beggar man, thief, doctor, lawyer, merchant, chief.

Keep Your Eggs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is most interesting to listen to the blatant voices of some proponents of the so-called Fair Deal as they speak of the vaunted prosperity in which the farmers of this country are allegedly wallowing.

They can only be excused on the grounds that they are ignorant of the fact that in the past few weeks egg prices to farmers have dropped to as low as 18 cents a dozen.

In order that Members of Congress, who may be unaware of some of the economic facts of life, become enlightened on the current situation with respect to the farmers, I submit the following lead editorial from the Iowa Falls (Iowa) Citizen:

KEEP YOUR EGGS

It's been a long time since we've seen a sign like this. But it showed up last week—tacked to the back door of an Iowa Falls' grocery store:

"We are paying only 18 cents a dozen for eggs."

We gather that the intent of the sign was to save the farmer's time and breath in bringing his eggs in—if he expected more than 18 cents.

Recent sharp declines have been the result of a 25-percent increase in production over that of a year ago—plus the uncertainty that grew out of the shift from a Government price support of 90 percent of parity to 75 percent of parity.

A good many people think that egg support prices have been too high. And the fact that the Government has spent $90,000,000 in order to carry out the 90 percent of parity support price would seem to bear out that viewpoint.

Nevertheless, the sign tacked on the back of that Iowa Falls' grocery highlights the need there is to stabilize farm prices and give farmers some protection from the vast fluc-

tuations which too frequently occur in their markets when things are left entirely to God and free enterprise.

Of course, we wouldn't be confronted with situations like that if, some morning, we woke up and found signs like this on every farmer's gate:

"Eggs are only 18 cents: Therefore we are paying only $1 a pair for overalls, $850 for a tractor, and $50 a ton for protein supplement."

Privately Supported Hospitals and the Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the December 16, 1949, issue of the Reconstructionist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRIVATELY SUPPORTED HOSPITALS AND THE PUBLIC HEALTH

Columbia University, at the request of the New York State Joint Hospital Survey Planning Commission, recently completed a study on hospitals in New York State. The study, directed by Dr. Eli Ginzberg, of the Graduate School of Business, has important implications for the problem of health throughout the country.

The hospital study concluded, for example, that the data collected by the research staff did not justify introducing a compulsory system of health insurance for any of the richer States like New York. It was pointed out that coverage could be achieved, with some effort, for about 85 percent of the State population through Blue Cross and commercial health insurance. At the present time some 57 percent of the New York population receives some kind of coverage through the voluntary plans. Dr. Ginzberg suggests that the combination of privately sponsored hospitals, voluntary protective plans, and an expansion of the present State facilities can achieve the ideal of guaranteeing medical care for all the citizens of New York. But he warns, "If one does not look with favor on the expansion of Government into the voluntary hospital field, then one must see to it that it doesn't become necessary. This means that the hospitals must get enough charitable support for their free and partly free work, for medical education and research, and to replace obsolete facilities and get new equipment."

There are many problems raised by the facts revealed in the study and by the suggestions made by its director. Here we should like to discuss just a few of them. In the first place, there appears to be need for widespread publicizing of the facts about medical facilities. At the very luncheon at which the completion of the study was hailed, Governor Dewey declared his concern over "the steady march toward government ownership of hospitals" and "the half bankruptcy of our voluntary hospitals." Yet the study reveals that the voluntary hospitals are approaching "a tolerably decent economic position." Apparently Governor Dewey and other public officials like to set forth their prejudices as objective fact. Citizens must be prepared with the data necessary to evaluate such political utterances.

Secondly, we are somewhat disturbed about the apparent conclusion that government assumption of more and more responsibility for the care of health is something to be avoided. The study asserts that 85 percent of all residents of New York could afford the coverage given in the voluntary plans. Yet the amounts required by such plans do not fall equally among the 85 percent who can afford to pay. A $60 annual payment can conceivably be afforded by a person earning $3,000 per year, as well as by one earning $7,500. But why should not the ability-to-pay fomula apply to contributions for public health as it does to taxation generally? Must we not reckon, moreover, with the reluctance of people in good health but with modest incomes to spend money on insuring their health unless required to do so by law? Also to be considered—and this is revealed in the study—is the fact of the limited extent of coverage in the voluntary plans. Diagnosis and the care of long, serious illnesses are rarely supplied. The poor man must still, under these circumstances, turn to the free wards of charity or State-supported hospitals. It seems, therefore, that much initiative for public health needs must still be taken by government.

The study, as reported in the New York Times, asserts that voluntary hospitals ought to "offer a maximum opportunity for qualified doctors to join the staff." The fact is, however, that in privately sponsored hospitals there is much discrimination against doctors because of their race or creed. Much of the demand for Jewishly sponsored hospitals, for example, stems from difficulty facing Jewish doctors in gaining entry to those that are not under Jewish sponsorship. Here is another instance where the emphasis on private rather than State support for hospitals appears to ignore the evils that inhere in the sectarian responsibility for medical health.

Let it also be emphasized that, as we cited above, Dr. Ginzberg declared a compulsory system to be unnecessary in the richer States. What are the implications of this remark for the backward areas of the United States? Do we need some form of socialization of health services in such places? Or can we rely there, too, on voluntarism and the good heart of the local citizenry?

These are only a few of the issues suggested by the Hospital Survey, which is now available in a volume entitled "A Pattern for Hospital Care." The American people owe a debt of gratitude to Dr. Ginzberg and his associates for their careful collection of the data and their forthright recommendations. The report deserves the close attention of those who would like to see medical care extended to all who need it.

One Hundred and Sixty-second Anniversary of Ratification of Federal Constitution by Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and scholarly address delivered by State Senator E. Paul Burkholder, before the Georgetown-Millsboro Rotary Club at the official Delaware Day Observance in Georgetown, Del., on December 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are gathered together to commemorate the one hundred and sixty-second anniversary of the ratification of the Federal Constitution by the State of Delaware.

It was only another link in the great chain of human events that has taken place to enable all mankind to achieve and maintain their freedom. In every generation, men and women have struggled and died that the human spirit may be free. From the creativenes of mankind's liberated mind and spirit has come a host of ideas, discoveries, and inventions with their benefits of comfort and opportunity, and with all of them has come a burden of responsibilities and problems.

Sometimes these responsibilities would be assumed and the problems would be solved by a capable and energetic government in favor of the welfare of the people. In other periods of human history, the freedom of the individual was ignored and tyranny would rule. Then it was, when those men and women who were able would leave their homeland with its oppression and misery and flee to other parts of the world where they hoped to be free.

So it was in the year 1631 when a small ship named *De Walvis*, commanded by Peter Hayes, with about 30 liberty-loving persons aboard set sail from Hoorn, Holland, braved the perils of the Atlantic and finally dropped anchor on the banks of the Delaware. A settlement was made near the site of the present town of Lewes and they named it Zwaanendael. It was known as the De Vries expedition, but De Vries, who organized the party, did not accompany the ship, but appointed Peter Hayes to be the leader. This settlement lasted a short time. In some way, not fully explained, the whole colony was put to death, the presumption being that they were all killed by the Indians. De Vries, afterward in command of two expeditions, came to the Delaware River and explored the same as far north as the present site of Philadelphia.

In 1632, the King of England gave Lord Baltimore a grant of land that was not then cultivated, bounded on the west by the Chesapeake Bay, on the east by the Atlantic Ocean, on the north by the fortieth parallel, now the southern boundary of Pennsylvania, and on the south by the Potomac River.

Even though the colony in Lewes did not last very long, it did prevent Lord Baltimore from acquiring immediate possession of what is now called Delaware. That is why you will find the statement inscribed on the monument erected in Lewes the words: "That Delaware exists as a separate Commonwealth is due to this colony."

In 1638 a group of Swedes, led by Peter Minuet, settled on the Delaware, their location being at Fort Christina, now a part of Wilmington. A park and monument now mark this spot. This colony grew and expanded without interruption. At least 10 shiploads of people arrived during the next decade. Governor Ridder followed Minuet and Governor Printz followed him.

Almost 30 years later, in 1655, the Dutch who were in control of New Amsterdam, now New York, came south and captured all of the settlements on the Delaware, including Christina.

In 1681, the King of England gave a grant of land to William Penn, now the State of Pennsylvania, and in 1682, the Duke of York gave Penn the tract of land now known as the State of Delaware. There is some doubt as to whether the Duke of York had the authority to make this grant.

However, all of the settlements along the Atlantic coast now came under the control of the English. Sir Thomas West, who held the title of Lord De La Warr, became Governor General of the English Colonies and named the territory Delaware. The three

lower counties were named New Castle, Kent, and Sussex. Wherever there were a hundred families, the territory thus inhabited became known as a hundred. Zwaanendael was named Lewes and Christina was renamed Wilmington in honor of Lord Wilmington, a personal friend of William Penn.

From then on until the Declaration of Independence this territory was under the control of the State of Pennsylvania although most of the time it had a separate general assembly.

During all of these years, a growing unrest developed throughout the Colonies which finally culminated in the drafting of the Declaration of Independence for presentation to the Continental Congress.

The Delaware delegates were Thomas McKean, George Read, and Caesar Rodney. McKean and Rodney were for independence, while Read was opposed to it. Rodney was absent from the session, thus leaving the vote of Delaware divided. On the day before the vote was to be taken, McKean sent an urgent note to Rodney asking for his immediate return to the Continental Congress. It was then that Caesar Rodney made his now famous ride from Dover to Philadelphia, arriving in time to cast the deciding vote of the Delaware delegation in favor of the resolution for independence.

Of course, this action brought on the War of the Revolution. Four thousand Delawareans served under George Washington. The battle of Cooch's Bridge was fought on Delaware soil. Two outstanding military figures from this State emerged from the conflict. One of them was Colonel Haslet, who lost his life at the Battle of Princeton. The other was Captain Caldwell, who was born on a farm near Felton. In those days the soldiers amused themselves between engagements by staging cock fights, and it soon developed that some of the roosters brought up from Delaware seemed to be as game as any of the rest, whereupon the Delaware boys would claim that it was a chick from a blue hen. Before long the soldiers from this area were called the Blue Hen's Chicks and Delaware became known as the Blue Hen State.

After 7 years of fighting the war came to a close and the American Colonies at last were free. The Continental Congress now set up a government under the Articles of Confederation.

It was soon discovered that these regulations were entirely inadequate when applied to the actual working of the Government. The Federal Government was bankrupt financially and spiritually. It commanded neither obedience or respect. It owed immense sums of money at home and abroad and had no way of even paying the interest. It had no revenues of its own and no powers of taxation. It could make requisitions on the States, but could not enforce its demands. We had no minted money of our own, and with the exception of some copper coins, all the coined money in circulation was that of foreign nations which fluctuated widely in value. The continental paper money was worthless. Some of the States had issued paper money, and this too was of uncertain value.

We were not a nation, but a collection of 13 States, suspicious of and antagonistic to each other. The strong States oppressed the weak. Export and import duties were freely imposed. Navigation of our rivers was either prevented or hindered. Some of the States were anxious to make a separate alliance with England. Other foreign powers were watching for an opportunity to take control of this weakling among the nations.

Many of the States hoped to absorb the others. There was a proposal made that New Jersey become part of New York, that Rhode Island be a part of Connecticut, and that Delaware be ceded to Pennsylvania. Maryland claimed the southern shore of the Potomac River as her boundary, thus giving her control of the river. In an attempt to bring order out of chaos and to save this infant Nation, Virginia called a convention in 1786, to be held in Annapolis, for the purpose of setting up uniform regulations of trade. Five States, including Delaware, sent delegates. On account of the small number of States represented, no business was transacted, and the Continental Congress issued a second call for a convention to be held in Philadelphia in May 1787 to consider such alterations to the Articles of Confederation as were necessary to make the existing system of government adequate. No mention was made of an entire change in the system.

On February 3, 1787, the Delaware General Assembly passed an act appointing John Dickinson, George Read, Gunning Bedford, Richard Bassett, and Jacob Broom deputies to the Convention. Little did these men suspect what important part in world history they were destined to play.

John Dickinson, a native of Maryland, moved to Kent County and lived on a large farm along the St. Jones River. He studied law in Philadelphia and London and practiced successfully. He was known through the Colonies for his political writings. Politically he had been President of Pennsylvania and also of Delaware, as well as a Representative in the Continental Congress.

Gunning Bedford was a native of Philadelphia, graduate of Princeton, where he was valedictorian of his class. He practiced law in Dover and Wilmington. Politically he had served as a member of the general assembly, attorney general, a Member of the Continental Congress, and judge of the Federal court.

Richard Bassett was a lawyer and wealthy man, having three homes, one in Dover, one in Wilmington, and one in Maryland. Politically he was a member of the general assembly, but later became Governor and United States Senator.

Jacob Broom was a native of Wilmington, surveyor by profession, having made maps for George Washington. Politically he had served as burgess of Wilmington, as well as postmaster, and was a member of the general assembly.

George Read was a native of Maryland who moved to Newcastle, where he practiced law and served as attorney general under the English rule. He was a member of the Continental Congress and later became United States Senator and Chief Justice.

The average age of this group of men was 45.

The Convention finally met and was organized on May 25, 1787. George Washington was selected as chairman, and James Madison became the floor leader. Seventy-four delegates were present. The New Hampshire delegation was elected but never arrived in Philadelphia. Rhode Island did not send a delegation. This left Delaware as the only small State represented in the Convention.

Even though the Convention was called for the purpose of amending the Articles of Confederation, it soon became evident that a new basic law of the land would be formulated. In the old Continental Congress, each State had equal representation, regardless of population. The great question in this Convention was whether or not each State should have equal voice in the new government. Before many days passed, it was agreed upon that the States should be represented according to their population in one branch of Congress, and the small States fought for an equal voice in the second branch. This proposition was bitterly fought by the larger States. All during the month of June the debate was carried on with the large States winning every argument. On June 11, Sherman from Connecticut moved that each State should have one vote in the upper branch. This was defeated 6 to 5. The tension was great, and after a few more weeks of debate, Gunning Bedford, from Delaware, arose in the Convention on June 30 and attacked the larger States. He accused them of being actuated by their numbers, wealth, and ambition for power. Furthermore, he warned them that if they persisted in their attitude, the small States would find a foreign power that would give them just recognition. This speech threw the Convention into a turmoil. After a few more speeches from delegates of the larger States, the Convention adjourned until the following Monday, July 2.

Immediately after the Convention reconvened, Pinckney, of South Carolina, proposed that a committee be appointed with one member from each State to devise a compromise and report back to the Convention. Benjamin Franklin represented Pennsylvania and Gunning Bedford represented Delaware on this committee.

On July 5, the committee reported that they had agreed on a plan whereby each State was to have an equal voice in the Upper House of Congress and placed it before the Convention for their consideration. Gunning Bedford again arose and defended the smaller States and warned the larger States of the dire consequences if they were ignored. On July 10, Madison the floor leader went home in disgust. He was followed the same day by the New York delegation. Dayton, of New Jersey, and Martin, of Maryland, stated that they would never agree to anything less than equal voice in the Upper House for each State.

The stage was finally set for a vote on Monday, July 16. The fate of the Constitution and perhaps the entire Nation depended on this decision. You can imagine the tenseness of the situation, when you realize that 10 States were left to decide this momentous question, New Hampshire and Rhode Island not represented and New York having gone home. Finally all debate ceased and the roll was called. Massachusetts, not voting; Connecticut, yes; New Jersey, yes; Pennsylvania, no; Delaware, yes; Maryland, yes; Virginia, no; North Carolina, yes; South Carolina, no; Georgia, no—five yeas, four nays.

The great battle was won. Not only a victory for the small States, but also a victory for Gunning Bedford, the delegate from Delaware. Thus because of this victory each State has two Senators in the United States Senate.

During the next 6 weeks, the various provisions and details of the Constitution were agreed upon and on September 17, 1787, it was finally adopted and presented to the States for the ratification.

In November of that same year, the Delaware General Assembly passed an act calling for an election of delegates to a convention for the purpose of considering the Constitution. The act specified that 10 delegates were to be elected from each county to convene in Dover on December 3. The election was held and the Convention convened in Dover on December 3. What they did for 4 days is not known, but it is a matter of record that they ratified the Constitution on December 7, 1787, thus making Delaware the first of the Thirteen Original States to take this action. That is why Delaware is called the first State and why December 7 is an important date in our history.

The struggle for human freedom marches on.

In the War of 1812 we had Commodore MacDonough, who defeated the British in the Battle of Lake Champlain and thus prevented our country from being invaded from the north.

In the Mexican War two Delaware marine lieutenants named Rogers and Chambers were among the first men to storm the fortress of Chapultepec, in Mexico City.

Seven regiments were furnished for the War Between the States, and Commodore Samuel Du Pont was a naval hero.

In World War II we had Major Welch, Admiral Halsey, General Reybold, and General Holcomb, as well as the two Congressional Medal of Honor winners, Sergeants Nelson and Conner.

In every war Delaware has furnished more than her quota in men and money.

Besides military and naval heroes she has given the Nation three Secretaries of State, one Secretary of the Treasury, one Attorney General, five Ambassadors to foreign countries, as well as more than a hundred writers, painters, and inventors.

In the field of education Delaware had her church schools in colonials days and boasted of 22 private academies in the year 1800. She has taken great pride in her educational system ever since.

Delawareans have always been a God-fearing, religious people. Among the early Swedish settlers were two Lutheran clergymen. Old Swedes Lutheran Church was built in 1698. The cradle of Methodism, in the form of Barrett's Chapel, built in the year 1780, still stands in Kent County, north of Frederica. The early shrine of the Presbyterians, built in 1773, is Old Drawyers Church, near Odessa, in New Castle County.

Yes, Delaware has played her part in the march for freedom, and will continue to do so as long as she is true to her heritage.

Statesmen live and pass from the stages of government. Governments arise, thrive, and decay. Principles of freedom and justice live through eternity.

Statement of John Tope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following text of statement by John Tope, chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, on the state of the Union for young men and women, Washington, D. C., January 3, 1950:

There are some 46,000,000 young men and women in this country in their twenties and thirties seeking to make their own way through life. For them the state of the Union today is one of danger, diminishing opportunity, and frustration. More and more we young people are becoming the ones who are going to have to pay and are paying for the disastrous policies of the Truman administration. Therefore, we, like President Truman, are also obligated to present our views on the state of the Union to the American people.

I. THE ADMINISTRATION'S FLIRTATION WITH SOCIALISM

Ever since the advent of the New Deal, in 1933, the Democratic Party's administration, lacking faith in the American people, has followed a policy of flirtation with socialism. This policy has kept us in an atmosphere of perpetual crisis; it has brought us one trouble after another; and now this policy places us on the very brink of disaster.

The socialistic theme of the administration is that our prosperity as a people depends upon governmental fixing of the prices of goods and commodities and upon fixing of the wages of labor and Government competition with business. This argument began with the NRA in 1933, which proved to be a dismal economic failure and repugnant to the American way of life, even before it was declared unconstitutional. It was continued with the peacetime OPA, which in 1945 left the country in chaos, with empty shop windows, housewives standing in line, and the bootleggers of the black market controlling the necessities of life. Although these disastrous conditions forced President Truman to terminate the OPA in 1946, in 1948 he came back again with a proposal for peacetime OPA. Then in February 1949 this flirtation with socialism reached its peak with the introduction of the Democrat-sponsored Spence bill, H. R. 2756, now pending in Congress. This bill provides for governmental price fixing of all goods, commodities, and wages, and proposes to put the Government into business in direct competition with private enterprise. This bill would nationalize industry into a carbon copy of the Russian system. And as a build-up for these proposals, business all over America has already been hamstrung by hostile Government regulation.

II. THE DEPLORABLE STATE OF THE UNION

These are the burdens placed upon the youth of America by the administration's flirtation with socialism:

A. Living on borrowed money: Each and every day the United States Government now spends $15,000,000 more than it takes in, even at the high tax rates now in force. This reckless spending has resulted in a $5,500,000,000 deficit in this year of high business activity, a year when some of the $250,000,000,000 national debt should have been reduced. Yet the Federal Government ever proposes to keep on spending and going into debt, even in these times of high income, just as if debt were no problem and there need never be a day of reckoning. But a nation that spends more than it takes in in taxes, like a man who spends more than he earns, borrowing year after year, is headed for bankruptcy and its people for the poorhouse. President Truman's administration insists on borrowing more and more money to finance its present policies, and indeed now proposes new and more fantastic hand-outs, leaving to the youth of America the bitter inheritance of inflation, a crushing load of unbearable taxes, and poverty and chaos. The true state of the Union today is that it is rushing toward absolute ruin.

B. The fantastic cost of "Truman prosperity": The cost of direct relief in the United States in the so-called full employment year of 1948 was more than double the payments to individuals for direct relief in 1934, a year of national depression. In 1934 Federal, State, and local governments made payments to individuals for direct relief of $745,000,000. In the so-called prosperous year of 1948 these same payments were more than doubled at $1,727,000,000—and the above figures do not include social security, pensions, unemployment insurance, and the like, which average $9,400,000,000 for each of the last 3 years. Moreover, these expenditures have been increasing at the rate of about 20 percent a year since the end of the war. Hence the relief hand-outs under "Truman prosperity" make the payments under Roosevelt's depression dwindle to insignificance. If all this is the cost of "Truman prosperity," may God help us in the next depression.

C. Punitive taxation: Coupled with extravagant spending and piling up of Government debt, the Truman administration has maintained wartime taxation to the point where it injures the people because it heavily penalizes individual incentive, compels every worker to give a larger and larger part of his earnings to the Government, deprives the country of risk capital, and prevents the establishment of new enterprises and the creation of new industries. This has made it extremely difficult for new business undertakings to grow and expand and to compete with those already established.

D. Paralyzing the country with class warfare: The people of the United States have just suffered many hundreds of millions of dollars of damage due to the coal and steel strikes. Innocent parties have suffered—workers and employers alike—in the railroad, steel fabrication, and automobile industries, as well as the merchants in the strike areas, and others. Yet not a word of disapproval has come from the President or any member of his Cabinet. We demand that President Truman explain on what theory of justice a special group can inflict such terrible damage on the people? It is the policy of the Truman administration to encourage class warfare, to set labor against management and employee against employer, and then to load the scales in favor of the labor bosses against the worker and his employer. Today the labor union chiefs with their enormous economic power and their millions of dollars paid for political gain and campaign expenses, enjoy a Government-sponsored monopoly of the use of manpower in whole industries. These labor bosses, aided and encouraged by the Government, now misuse their power to regulate production, create scarcities, and increase the cost of living. While labor unions have a legitimate right to organize and bargain collectively, their bosses have no right to misuse their power to tie up a whole industry at the whim of a single person or group, and cause millions of dollars of loss to innocent citizens of the community. The public interest must come first.

E. Political demagoguery: Recently the President has assailed certain "interests" as selfishly seeking to undermine America for their own evil purposes. We call upon the President in his forthcoming state of the Union message to identify the "interests" by name and address so that everyone may know who they are, and so that these sinister activities may be stopped. In the public interest, the President should abandon the coward's role of failing to identify those whom he accuses.

F. The colossal blunder in China: At the same time that it is spending some $22,000,000,000 a year for armaments and aid to fight communism in Europe, the administration has affirmatively aided the Communists in Asia, opening the whole Orient to the Red tide of communism. The administration aided the Communists by dealing the recognized Chinese Government a death blow. After the recognized Chinese Government had the upper hand over the Communists in 1945, the Truman administration forced the Nationalists to cease hostilities, placed an embargo on shipment of arms to China, attempted to force a coalition with the Communists, and enabled the Communists to arm themselves with Japanese arms captured by the Russians. These were horrible mistakes. The Truman administration's diplomatic blunder in the Orient is without parallel in our history. And the administration still lacks a global policy on communism.

III. RANK DISCRIMINATION AGAINST YOUNG MEN AND WOMEN

In conclusion, the state of the Union is not good. This is due to the socialistic program of the Truman administration which has thrown obstacles and stumbling blocks in the way of the American people. And if we young people allow this policy to continue we are bound to endure the poverty and suffer the frustration which has overcome youth in other parts of the world. In short, we want a state of opportunity instead of a state of charity for all. Moreover, we will not tolerate President Truman's rank discrimination against the Nation's young men and

women. We are entitled to the same chance in life that our forefathers enjoyed, and we call upon the American people to rise up and compel the President to put a stop to the trend which he has inaugurated now—before it is too late.

Conservation of Soil Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, the Library of Congress and the files of the Department of Agriculture are no doubt abundant with many fine articles on the subject of soil conservation, but for eloquence and brevity I have never read a finer exposé of the subject than the second prize essay in the Nation-wide essay contest on Conservation of Our Soil Resources, sponsored by the National Grange and the American Plant Food Council, Inc.

The winner of this contest was a young lady from my own State, Miss Natalie Snyder, of Pittstown, N. J.

Since New Jersey is justly proud of this splendid effort, I ask unanimous consent that the essay be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, where I hope it will be read by all Members of the Congress who are interested in soil conservation.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SECOND PRIZE ESSAY IN THE NATION-WIDE CONTEST ON CONSERVATION OF OUR SOIL RESOURCES SPONSORED BY THE NATIONAL GRANGE AND AMERICAN PLANT FOOD COUNCIL, INC.

(Winner: Miss Natalie Snyder, age 18, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. William T. Snyder, Pittstown, Hunterdon County, N. J.)

Three centuries ago, when the first settlers journeyed to these shores in search of a new life, they were rewarded by a vast expanse of rich land which stretched out on every side. Because the land yielded bountiful harvests, the people prospered, and because it was free and plenteous, man enjoyed independence and freedom. It was thus that American soil served as a foundation for the great liberty-loving Nation which grew and became strengthened with the passing of time. Even today, soil is the basis of man's life; everything which man does, every gain he makes, begins with and depends upon its sustained productivity.

However, we were prone to take this great blessing of fertile land for granted, and did not trouble ourselves to become acquainted with the methods to best safeguard and preserve it. We grew extravagant and careless, gradually slipping into the shiftless habit of wasting this gift of nature by tragic misuse. Consequently, down through the years, erosion has destroyed 100,000,000 acres, and has severely damaged an equal amount. Each year adds more eroded acreage to the count, and the ultimate cost is growing daily.

Erosion not only results in wasted lands, but in ruined lives as well. The farmer's future is blackened, for the yield of his land is greatly lessened, and under such conditions he cannot prosper. Half of all the land in the United States has been affected by erosion. This, of course, reflects upon the welfare of the tiller of the soil, and many are forced into the depths of poverty.

According to statistics, we now have around 459,000,000 acres of good cropland in the United States. In addition, there are about 100,000,000 acres that need various improvements. All in all, we are allowing 500,000 acres to deteriorate each year. This waste is one of our country's chief enemies, for without farm prosperity, our Nation is drastically weakened. Not only our own land, but much of war-torn Europe is greatly affected, for the lives of millions across the sea depend to a large extent upon this country's economic stability. Thus, the importance of the conservation of our soil resources cannot be overemphasized.

What can be done to protect our land and to conserve what we have? The answer lies in the very definition of the term "soil conservation"; we must learn the proper use and management of our land. Most of our soil difficulties stem from ignorance on the part of man concerning measures to keep the land productive. Steps are now being taken to correct this situation by the Soil Conservation Service and other similar units, which are making great strides in education and technically aiding farmers in conservation work. Through extensive and continual research, the Soil Conservation Service has been able to learn much about the science of conservation, and many practices have been found to be highly effective in saving our soil.

Contour cultivation, a prime factor in this attempt, not only makes the work of the farmer less strenuous, but conserves the rainfall and reduces the amount of soil washed away as well, because of the rounded furrows resulting from farming the land horizontally rather than vertically. Strip cropping is another soil saver, and wind stripping, similarly executed, does much to prevent wind erosion.

Terraces and diversion channels are valuable in diverting damaging run-off of water, and hedges serve as a check to water and to forceful winds. Windbreaks, in the form of other trees and shrubs, are useful on the open prairie and plains.

Stubble mulching and the use of cover crops are beneficial in several ways. The former protects the soil from wind erosion, aids in controlling grasshoppers, cuts down soil erosion, evaporation, and baking, helps the soil to retain rainfall, and aids advantageous bacteria growth in the soil. Cover crops prevent erosion of cultivated areas, and may provide a humus for the soil.

Crop rotation, irrigation of arid areas, and drainage of wet and soggy soil are other imperative measures in keeping the land productive.

Of all the essentials of conservation, however, perhaps the paramount factor to be considered is that no bit of land is without value; every piece should be used to its best advantage. Therefore, it is our duty, as the youth of today and the citizens of tomorrow, to become acquainted with these values and to learn to use them wisely, for when ignorance of proper soil-conservation methods is completely overcome, both the farm and the Nation will be better places in which to dwell, and will be the foundation for a finer world for ourselves and our posterity.

Point 4's Human Goals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of December 5, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POINT 4'S HUMAN GOALS

Two conferences meeting in New York on Friday and Saturday heard discussions of some of the objectives of the point-4 program for aid to the peoples of underdeveloped areas. It was agreed by several speakers that concentration on economic objectives must not lead to an exclusion of consideration of cultural, humanitarian, and social projects. One speaker, Dr. Alva Myrdal of the United Nations, also warned that economic changes must not be too rapidly pushed lest they be detrimental to social values.

This emphasis is sound and we need its balance. But we need to remember likewise that Dr. Myrdal wisely remarked that "social welfare * * * cannot reach very far without economic development." As President Truman set forth the point-4 program and as it was embraced by the United Nations, it rests on the basis of extensive private investment. Unless that investment is forthcoming there will not be much of a program and the investment cannot be expected unless there is the prospect of making a reasonable profit and assurance against unreasonable loss, such as confiscation.

Fortunately investment for profit can be made to have its reflection in raised standards of living, and these can be translated directly into the humanitarian project that are major goals of the program. It goes almost without saying that one of the first items on any program for an underdeveloped people is a sound public health project. Part of the reason for underdevelopment at different points is the presence of endemic or epidemic disease. In Africa it is sleeping sickness, in East Asia cholera, elsewhere it is tuberculosis or malaria or both. Those scourges can be wiped out, but to do so will require money, and a lot of it. Similarly it is agreed that a wise educational program can contribute largely to human well-being and happiness, but this also will demand a very large outlay. That is where the investment for profit must come in, to develop the productive, taxable wealth for channeling into fields such as these.

The two phases of the program are not at all incompatible. In fact, they must be indissolubly wedded if the large goals of the project are to be achieved. What is required here is the combination of a big, warm heart with a good, hard head, and neither can be sacrificed to the other.

Republican Resurgence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Republican Resurgence," written by Mr. Samuel Shaffer, and published in the magazine Newsweek for January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPUBLICAN RESURGENCE

To Republicans, the Fair Deal's insistence that a welfare state wasn't incompatible with free enterprise seemed a dangerous, if not

a deadly, delusion. Some Republicans suspected that many Fair Dealers didn't really believe it themselves, but were merely attempting to lull the Nation into somnolence while they saddled it with a kind of "creeping socialism." Others, more charitable, thought with less respect for Harry S. Truman's wisdom, said the whole trouble was the President's failure to understand the consequences of his acts.

They agreed that the President was far from a revolutionary and that he was pressing for such measures as compulsory health insurance and the Brannan plan without any thought of destroying the free-enterprise system, but they argued that he was driving the Nation to socialism nevertheless. For a welfare state would make socialism inevitable, they asserted. It was a simple case of cause and effect.

As the Republicans saw it, the only way to prevent socialism, therefore, was to scotch Mr. Truman's plans for a welfare state. Last week, as the Republicans returned to Washington for the wind-up session of the Eighty-first Congress, they came primed for a no-quarter fight on the welfare state in all its aspects.

NEW VIGOR

They were quite a different breed from the Republicans who had put up such an ineffective battle against the Fair Deal during the first session of the Eighty-first, a battle characterized by lack of strategy, divided counsels, shattered morale, and bedeviling doubt. At best, they had then fought a delaying action; at worst, they had broken lines to join the Democratic enemy.

Now they were acting like men who had discovered the way to political salvation, for themselves as well as for the country. With the fervor of repentant sinners, they were gathering together under a banner pledging death to spendthrift socialism. Political realists for the most part, they were not promising themselves or their followers a quick, easy victory over the Fair Deal. All they guaranteed was "a helluva fight." As one GOP leader put it, "the shadow boxing is over. Maybe we're in for another licking, but for once we'll have the satisfaction of going down fighting."

At long last the Republicans appeared to have recovered from the state of shock which gripped them on November 3, 1948. Throughout 1949 they had been numbed by a feeling of complete hopelessness and helplessness. Dozens of them had become almost convinced that it would be a waste of effort to run for reelection next fall. Publicly, they blamed Thomas E. Dewey and Earl Warren for their plight, saying that it was their overconfidence which had cost the Republican Party victory in 1948. Deep down, however, they knew they had been just as guilty themselves.

What nagged them most was the fear that perhaps the country really wanted the welfare state, after all. Did they face no alternative except to let the wave of the future engulf them, or else swim quickly to its crest?

THE PAST

At times, during the opening session of the Eighty-first Congress, party discipline had evaporated entirely while the soul searching went on. Minority Leader JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., dropped the reins for weeks at a stretch. At least twoscore of the Republican legislators voted almost automatically for every welfare-state measure proposed. Another 50, gripped by despair, voted frequently with the Democrats. On some issues, nearly half the House Republicans broke party lines.

There was, moreover, no liaison between House and Senate GOP leaders. Months went by without a phone call or a visit to coordinate strategy. The Senate leaders went off in one direction; the House leaders, in another. In the Senate, ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, fought for public housing. In the House, the Democrats were able to wave TAFT's name in the face of Republicans who opposed it. JOE MARTIN's all-out effort to kill the public-housing measure, therefore, was doomed to failure from the first.

The uncertainty about their future and the divisions in their leadership weren't the only factors that had depressed the Republicans. There was also the bitter fight over the chairmanship of the Republican National Committee between the pro-Dewey and anti-Dewey forces, which ended in the victory of the latter and the election of Guy G. Gabrielson. And finally, there were the insistent letters that kept flooding in from their home districts, demanding: "What does the Republican Party stand for, anyway?" The GOP legislators weren't sure themselves.

What brought about the sudden switch in morale and point of view? The Republican legislators themselves last week offered several explanations:

During the recess between congressional sessions they learned that, from the GOP standpoint, the picture wasn't nearly as black as they had thought. Throughout the country they found resentment over high taxes, the high cost of government, and deficit financing. They found a genuine fear of a Fair Deal drift toward socialism. Where they had previously wondered if they didn't represent a futile minority in their opposition to Mr. Truman's program, they now were convinced they spoke for the majority.

In Washington they had been scared to political paralysis by what they believed was the sure-fire appeal of the Brannan plan. At home they had discovered that it was leaving the farmers cold. Representative AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, of Minnesota, a ranking Republican member of the House Agriculture Committee, last week told his big-city colleagues over lunch in the House restaurant: "Why, the farm organizations back home are beating the brains out of the Brannan plan."

They discovered that even the Democrats, including HUBERT HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, and PAUL H. DOUGLAS, of Illinois, were equivocating or beating a downright retreat on compulsory health insurance.

They analyzed the New York State election in 1949 and drew considerable comfort from it. The GOP candidate for the Senate, John Foster Dulles, had been a political unknown, with only 5 weeks to campaign against the best Democratic vote-getter in the State. He had waged an all-out fight against the Fair Deal in what for years had been a Fair Deal stronghold. He had lost by only 2 percent. Although less partisan observers might insist that Dulles' showing was made possible not by his attacks on the welfare state but by Catholic defections—the result of Lehman's siding with Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in her dispute with Francis Cardinal Spellman—the Republican legislators preferred to consider it a great moral victory for the principles of Republicanism. In New Jersey, they said, Republican Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll won despite his me-too campaign; his victory was merely a repudiation of the Hague machine.

Significant of the new attitude of the Republicans was the strategy that Representative RICHARD NIXON, of California, had worked out in his campaign for Democratic Senator SHERIDAN DOWNEY'S seat. NIXON, a youthful, handsome, curly-haired, and strong-jawed former Navy officer, who is widely considered one of the most capable Republicans in the House, had come out in flat opposition to everything the Fair Deal stands for.

He had announced his candidacy in these words:

"The issue * * * is the choice between freedom and socialist baloney. They can call it planned economy, the Fair Deal, or social welfare. It's still the same old socialist baloney any way you slice it. Believe me, I am well aware of the Communist threat, and I do not discount it. But I am convinced that an even greater threat to our free institutions is presented by that group of hypocritical and cynical men who, under the guise of providing political panaceas for certain social and economic problems in our society, are selling the American birthright for a mess of political pottage. Slowly but surely they are chipping away the freedoms which are essential to the survival of a healthy, strong, and productive Nation."

It had been a difficult decision for NIXON to make—to declare war on the Fair Deal in a State which had always been so overwhelmingly Fair Deal that Republicans like Governor Warren were almost indistinguishable from Democrats. But last week, NIXON assured his colleagues that it was paying dividends. "Things look so good," he confided, "I'm worried."

THE FUTURE

This week, as the Eighty-first opened its wind-up session, the GOP was almost solidly united in the fight on the Truman program. Its ranks included only a handful of mavericks, like JACOB JAVITS, of New York, and JAMES G. FULTON, of Pennsylvania, in the House, and WAYNE MORSE, of Oregon, and CHARLES W. TOBEY, of New Hampshire, in the Senate. Even men like Senators HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, and GEORGE D. AIKEN, of Vermont, weren't expected to wander far off the GOP reservation.

In a now-or-never mood, the Republicans were planning to seize the initiative in pushing excise-tax cuts, antilynching, and anti-poll-tax legislation, and slashes in foreign-aid and domestic welfare-state expenditures.

Although they still had differences on foreign policy, the chances were decidedly against a split even over that issue. Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan, had made unity possible by calling for reductions in foreign spending. Even Senator KENNETH WHERRY, of Nebraska, who had consistently fought against the ECA, was prepared to make only a token fight against its extension if the appropriation was slashed by a billion or a billion and a half. And for once, the Republicans had something really to shout about—China and Asia in general, where communism had been making frightening strides, while GOP legislators like Senator STYLES BRIDGES, of New Hampshire, charged, the Administration dawdled.

The Republicans expected to raise a real furor over deficit spending, with a challenge to Mr. Truman to balance the budget by reducing expenditures. And they were prepared to make a covert alliance with the Dixicrats on all issues where it would stymie the Fair Deal.

Only on one Fair Deal issue would they go along: the expansion of social security. Industry generally favored it because it would serve to stifle labor's growing demands for noncontributory pensions. Moreover, the increasing number of aged people in the population made any other position political insanity.

The renewal of confidence and cohesion among the Republicans spelled genuine danger for the administration's program, including renewal of rent control, Federal aid to education, and expansion of public housing. The Brannan plan, compulsory health insurance, Taft-Hartley repeal, and any kind of tax increase calculated to offset probable excise-tax cuts and narrow the inevitable deficit were almost certainly dead.

SIGNIFICANCE

Thus, Democrats and Republicans alike view the 1950 congressional campaign as one of the most vital in the Nation's history. If the Democrats win, the Fair Dealers among them at least will accept the election returns as a mandate for the welfare state, and the chances are that enough conservative Democrats and even Republicans will agree with this appraisal to open the way in Congress for a major part of the welfare-state program.

In the present exuberant state of the Republicans, moreover, a Fair Deal victory will be a stunning psychological blow which

may well have permanent effects. It would be extremely difficult to rally the party again in the 1952 Presidential campaign for an all-out fight on the Fair Deal; 1952 might find the Republicans embracing "me-too" as a permanent policy. The issue of a welfare state would have been resolved. From then on the only question would be: How much welfare in the welfare state?

A Republican victory would not be quite so decisive. The Democrats aren't entering the campaign with the same feeling of desperation as the Republicans; they have been winning too many elections for too many years. They would view a defeat in 1950 as merely a temporary set-back, like the one in 1946. And just as they recovered from the 1946 debacle to press their campaign for the Fair Deal with renewed vigor in 1948, so would they be likely to revive the battle for the welfare state in 1952.

On the other hand, a Republican victory would completely block the Truman program on the Eighty-second Congress, it would re-invigorate the party, and it would increase GOP chances in 1952.

Communist Fronts Attempt To Mislead the Supreme Court of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the Supreme Court of the United States is being invaded by Communist fronts in the most vicious attack on the white people of this country, especially of the Southern States, in the case of Henderson against the United States.

Never in all the history of this country have the relationships between the two races been better than they are between the whites and blacks in the Southern States today. The Negroes are enjoying more prosperity, more peace, more protection, and more security than they have ever known before anywhere in the world.

Yet, we find these Communist fronts going into the Supreme Court of the United States and filing briefs to try to destroy that relationship by wiping out segregation and destroying the present program of equal facilities for both races, knowing full well, if they know anything, that they are merely stirring race trouble and doing both the white people and the Negroes of this country infinite harm.

I am going to put the names of these organizations in the RECORD, and I am going to give you some of the low-down on some of the low-downs involved in this communistic drive.

This is a case where a Negro by the name of Henderson filed suit against the United States of America, the Interstate Commerce Commission, and the Southern Railway Co., because, while he was afforded equal facilities and was permitted to eat with the other Negroes on the train, he wanted to get away from them and eat with the white people.

The circuit court of appeals dismissed the case and this appeal was taken to the Supreme Court of the United States.

Certain Communist-front organizations, which I shall name here, went into the Court and filed briefs under the pretense of amicus curiae, or friend of the court.

One of the outfits that filed these briefs under the false pretense of amicus curiae was the so-called National Lawyers' Guild, a Communist-front organization that had been so branded and exposed by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the Congress of the United States and also by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the State of California.

In its beginning some very prominent lawyers, including Attorney General Robert H. Jackson, now on the Supreme Court, and Lieutenant Governor Poletti, of New York, joined this organization; but when they found out what it was, they both resigned, as did a number of other leading attorneys throughout the country.

In this case it is represented by Robert J. Silverstein, as its chief counsel, who signed a statement in 1941 defending the Communist Party. That statement was printed in the Communist Daily Worker on March 5, 1941, and is to be found on page 645 of the appendix No. 9 of the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities in 1944.

Another outfit that has filed a brief under the pretense of "amicus curiae" is the Anti-Defamation League, which is the gestapo for the B'nai B'rith, often referred to as a Yiddish Ku Klux Klan.

Members of this Anti-Defamation League are carrying on the most vicious persecution of white gentiles ever known in this country. They are a disgrace to the Jewish people whom they pretend to represent.

This attack on the white people of America, and especially on the white people of the South, is not made through any love of the Negro. They do not give a "tinker's dam" about the Negro. They are simply carrying on a program of persecution of white Americans and using this method of stirring up racial trouble throughout the country.

I call upon the Committee of Un-American Activities to investigate this outfit and put a stop to their communistic defamation and persecution of white Christian Americans.

They have a file on every white gentile in America of any standing, and whenever a man in public life or in business, or a Christian minister, if you please, says or does anything to displease the members of this alien organization, they immediately turn loose a barrage of smear propaganda, for the purpose of destroying such individual.

Another organization that has filed its brief in this case under the pretense of "amicus curiae" is the American Jewish Congress. They are not interested in the Negro. I should like to see the Committee on Un-American Activities investigate this outfit also.

These organizations are attempting to carry out the program of the Communist Party as announced through its vicious pamphlet called The Negro in Soviet America. They are going out of their way to try to wipe out our segregation laws, destroy our separate schools, bring about race riots, bloodshed, and revolution, if possible.

I cannot believe that the Supreme Court of the United States will fall for this kind of propaganda. Every intelligent individual on that august tribunal must know that if the position of these Red fronts is sustained, it will do infinitely more harm than good to both the white people and the Negroes in every section of the country.

Examples for the Western World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Thomas L. Stokes which appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times of December 27, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXAMPLES FOR THE WESTERN WORLD
(By Thomas L. Stokes)

WASHINGTON.—It is worthy of note that despite the lack of concrete results of a basic nature from the recent meeting of the United Nations General Assembly there did emerge from it in a new role an international figure who demonstrated a positive impulse for peace. Moreover, he symbolizes leadership of the kind that holds hope for the future.

It is significant that Brig. Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, of the Philippines, is the first veteran of World War II to be President of the Assembly. In that capacity he represents the men who fought the war and who had, and still hold in spite of everything, the dream of a new sort of world.

He was personally responsible for the one achievement that relates to the dark problem that overhangs the world—the atom bomb. He was the moving influence behind the resolution which revived and put back to work again the UN Atomic Energy Commission, which is trying to find some formula for international control of atomic weapons.

Beyond this, he offered and now has reiterated his own proposal for a temporary halt in production and use of atomic weapons to stop the race between the United States and Russia and thus provide a more favorable atmosphere for devising some permanent plan of international control and inspection.

There is another also in his part of the world, Pandit Nehru, of India, who finally led his people to an independent status.

Reflecting on the activity of these two, both men of spiritual quality as well as courage and intelligence, suggests that leadership in the campaign for world peace may come from that area of the world—the oldest—and from it we may get a new sort of spiritual revival that may, in the end, save us.

All we in this sphere, on either side, have been able to offer is to arm ourselves like rival bandits to protect ourselves from each other. That is the old way, which never has worked. It can only lead to conflict eventually. Meanwhile, it is draining away our resources that might better be used in other ways. And it is eating away at our funda-

mental liberties of which western civilization has been justly proud.

These are truths demonstrated by history and experience.

They are recognized by the Romulos and Nehrus. They deserve at least our thanks and our support.

American Policy With Respect to Communist Aggression and Expansion in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, on November 28, 1949, a mass meeting was held at Carnegie Hall, New York City, on the question of American policy with respect to Communist aggression and expansion in Asia. The meeting was held under the sponsorship of the Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, whose national chairman is Mr. Frederick C. McKee, a distinguished citizen of Pittsburgh who has long been a prophetic and courageous leader in the development of a sound American foreign policy, especially during the last critical decade and a half. Speakers at the rally included three distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, the Honorable JAMES FULTON, of Pennsylvania; the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut; and the Honorable EARL T. WAGNER, of Ohio; and the Honorable HERBERT R. O'CONOR, United States Senator from Maryland.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include the following resolution passed by the meeting, outlining a constructive foreign policy for our Government with respect to China, and a letter to the President expressing opposition to any recognition by the United States of the Communist regime in China:

We, citizens of the city of New York, at Carnegie Hall in mass meeting assembled on this 28th day of November 1949, firm in the conviction that the envelopment of the Chinese Republic by the armed forces of Communist aggression gravely threatens the security of the United States of America and world peace, call upon our Government—

First. To declare now a policy of nonrecognition of any government of China imposed by force of arms and intimidation upon the Chinese people.

Second. To declare this Government's moral support of all elements in China opposed to and resisting Communist aggression.

Third. To give significant economic aid and military advice and supplies to those elements in areas of China not under Communist control.

NOVEMBER 30, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America, the White House,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: We respectfully call to your attention two resolutions adopted unanimously as to China policy and with two dissenting votes as to Communist arrests of American citizens and officials, at a meeting of more than 2,000 citizens at Carnegie Hall, New York, on November 28.

The speakers on that occasion, Democratic and Republican Members of the Congress, expressed views warmly received by the audience that the present policy of withholding by the United States of America effective support to anti-Communist forces in China is—

1. Inconsistent with the United States policy in Europe and the Middle East, and severely discounts the effectiveness of and warrant for that policy.

2. Inconsistent with our obligations to a faithful ally.

3. Discouraging to anti-Communist leaders in other Asiatic countries and the Malay Archipelago now in the shadow of Communist aggression.

4. A gesture of defeat and submission destructive of American prestige throughout the world, and a great encouragement to intensified Communist expansion.

These results are viewed as a grave danger to American security and world peace.

Respectfully yours,

FREDERICK C. MCKEE,
National Chairman.

Keep Our Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a remarkable sermon preached on November 27, 1949, by Rev. Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrews Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo., entitled "Keep Our Freedom."

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

KEEP OUR FREEDOM

(By Earle B. Jewell, rector of St. Andrew's Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo.)

God send us men whose aim 'twill be,
Not to defend some ancient creed,
But to live out the laws of right
In every thought and word and deed.

God send us men alert and quick,
His lofty precepts to translate,
Until the laws of right become
The laws and habits of the state.

God send us men of steadfast will,
Patient, courageous, strong, and true:
With vision clear and mind equipped,
His will to learn, His Work to do.

God send us men with hearts ablaze,
All truth to love, all wrong to hate:
These are the patriots nations need,
These are the bulwarks of the state.

—*Frederick John Gillman.*

This is Advent Sunday, the New Year's Day of the Christian calendar. Today is the day we begin to get ready for the coming of Christ on Christmas Day. As we think about the coming of Christ and His life on earth, we ask, "What was one of the specific things Christ came to earth to do?"

We have been talking the last few Sundays about how to make God real in our everyday life. We have learned that Christ came to the earth to help us make God real in our lives. This morning I want to go a little further and see if we can get a specific activity where we can make God real.

I believe one of the specific things Christ came to earth to do was to give man a sense of dignity and to help man realize his worthwhileness in the world. He came to earth to help God become so real to us that we as individuals can understand why in God's sight we are important. God came to earth in the form of man, to dignify man, to lift man above the animal, and to make man conscious of his oneness with the Divine.

Man has existed on the earth, if we can believe science, for millions of years. However, only 7,000 years is the recorded period of man's progress. For 5,000 years man was struggling for a meaning to life. Man was struggling against his environment, his awakening consciousness, and his superstitions. He was making a pathetic effort to find a purpose in the world for his life and a reason for his existence. Then something happened in the world of men's aspirations that changed human life with the force of an atomic bomb. Christ was born into the world. Two thousand years ago a man came to the earth and told mankind that the individual was important in God's sight. Man learned that he was a little lower than the angels. Man was taught that God would give His spirit to human beings. Through this gift of God of Himself, man began to walk the earth with confidence and courage and to face life with an inner sense of diginity.

One hundred and seventy-two years ago, or seven generations (one generation equals 25 years) there was founded in the world of nations a new country—a country that was made possible and was brought about because man had received the truth that God intended man to be free. This ideal of freedom opened the door of man's concepts so that he knew that he could have and should have an opportunity to express self-initiativeness, and that he possessed the potentiality of private effort and private enterprise. One hundred and seventy-two years ago man knew that God existed in the world. Our proof is, that men and women seeking to fulfill their inner desire for freedom, came to this America of ours and established the only nation in all history that started on the preface that God intended man to be something in His own sight. America became a reality built and based on a faith in God. God was so real that men and women lifted their heads and their shoulders above the cry of their own defeat and established the only nation in the world built upon the Christian faith, that through God and God's reality, man was important. Man was a free agent in God's world.

Think of it. Man has been going toward civilization for only 7,000 years. Five thousand of those 7,000 years man was searching and seeking. Then just 2,000 years ago God came to this earth as a man and revealed that the individual man was real in the sight of God and God was real to man.

It was only 172 years ago that this great Nation was established on that ideal. Think what has been accomplished in 172 years. Men and women landed on the eastern coast of this continent. They found no buildings. They found no roads. Yet these people marched from the east coast across one of the largest areas in the world. They were propelled by the faith and the courage in the Christian idea that they were free. They conquered a continent and built up the strongest, finest Nation in the world. We call it the United States of America, built upon the Christian faith that God is so real to men that men are free, that men have a sense of dignity, that men know they are worth while in the scheme of God's plan, and that men have the right to express self-initiativeness and private enterprise. And, above all, this Nation was built upon the Christian ideal that God is so real that the individual man has the divine right and the divine gift to keep his self-respect by making his own living in the world without expecting the world to make a living for him.

This morning, after Thanksgiving Day, I am pleading with Christian Americans to awaken. I urge us as Christian Americans to get on our knees and ask God for more courage and more Christian faith to accept back again God's gift of self-reliance, dignity, and the right to express God-given personality. Yes, I am asking Americans to get on their knees and ask Almighty God to give back our lost self-respect. In this regained Christian faith, God again will become real. We will be aware that God intends us to give expression to our liberty. Then and only then will we be able to throw away the dole that is making Americans beggars before the throne of the universe. God will help us to stand again on our feet as men of courage and say, "We are Americans. Freemen. Our self-respect cannot be sold for a mess of pottage. Our freedom as Christian Americans, our freedom as individual personalities, is not for sale on the altar of political expediency. Our independence as freemen cannot be auctioned on the greedy altar of those organizations which deny God and yet demand a toll from every honest American who wants to express his own personality."

It is later than we think. When we destroy the self-respect of an individual we destroy his moral character. In the absence of moral character man becomes dependent, and he is no longer an upright free American. He is a slave to the dole, and the result is that God cannot be real to such a person.

If we can get enough men to lose their self-respect we will get enough people to lose their moral sensibility, and thus we will create a group of dependents who are no longer free Americans. These people become slaves to the dole. People who willingly deny God's gift of self-respect deny God. If we can get enough people to surrender their freedom for a mess of pottage called the dole, for the expediency of the now, we can destroy America, because we have destroyed the character of American people.

The morning paper informs us that the vote-bribing politicians plan to gave $100 a month pension to everybody over 65. Ah, yes, man doesn't have to be independent any more. Man doesn't have to keep his self-respect any more. Man doesn't have to have a moral character any more. All he has to have is a voice that says, "Give me," and a hand that can reach out, and an attitude that says, "Everything in the world is free." We don't know God when we think that way. We don't know the history of America when we accept that kind of foreign propaganda. We do not become aware of the sacrifices of people who have made this Nation possible for us when we expect a dole. We are throwing our freedom overboard in one generation.

Don't ask me if God can be real to this country. He can be as real to us as He was to the people of old. But He can only be real insofar as we accept His gift of dignity that causes us to fight to keep our freedom. Our freedom is based upon the conviction that God made us to be an individual personality. As an individual personality we are aware of the gift of freedom, the gift of self-respect, and the gift of our importance in God's divine economy of His universe. We refuse to have these gifts destroyed by anything in our environment or any easy promises made to us for our physical well-being.

Men of old did not go back on their faith in God when they started out from the east coast and went across this Nation fighting sickness, loneliness, storm, blizzard, flood, Indians, wild animals, and diverse forms of affliction. They kept going forward because they believed in their individual dignity. They knew that man without freedom is without dignity.

We can sell out if we want to. We can sell our divine gift as individuals to pressure groups, organized minorities or to some form of economic government. But let us remember that the moment we sell our personality for the temporary comfort of a mess of pottage, we cease to be recipients of God's divine gift to us of a free and dignified personality. We cease to become an individual man. We become a mere physical being.

I repeat, if we want to destroy a man's self-respect, make him dependent. The moment we make him dependent we destroy his moral character. After his moral character has been destroyed he becomes a cowardly slave. He is concerned only with his immediate comfort and protection.

It's later than we think. If this country of ours, through Christian people like us, keeps on condoning the dole, we have lost more in one generation than we have created in seven generations. America cannot exist as America without man's faith in God. Such a faith makes God so real that man is aware of his dignity and knows his importance as an individual. This man keeps his self-respect which is so strong that he is able to say, with conviction, "For everything I get I know there is a price tag on it and I am not going to sell out for the immediacy of my own comfort."

I know this is not an accepted doctrine in this country right now. I know that some of you people will say, "I do not go to church to hear economics. I do not go to church to hear politics." This morning I am not talking economics. I am not talking politics. I am talking applied Christianity. I am talking the kind of a message I believe the Christian church should give repeatedly throughout this Nation. Men need to be made aware that there is a danger that they will lose their freedom because their self-respect, their sense of dignity, their moral character is being undermined. When these are surrendered we will lose America and thus separate ourselves from our God because we have chosen enslavement rather than the divine gift of freedom. We become a people enslaved; enslaved to our own appetites and enslaved to the animal instincts of our own protection. We have thrown overboard Christ's crucifixion on the cross. We reject the offering of Himself. He offered Himself for us because He believed that we were so important as individuals that He hung on the cross to redeem us back to our manhood and make us men so that we could stand in His world and struggle with Him to make the individual free.

The moment we tie up our freedom with an economic badge, that moment we have sold out our freedom. We cannot build a moral character on lies or promises that cannot be fulfilled. We cannot build a Christian nation, a nation of strong courageous men and women, without asking people to believe that the God who created them gave them a spirit and a dignity that is beyond purchase price. Yes, we may take our dole now because it sounds so good. But we know the price we are paying for it. We are paying with our lost self-respect as individual free people, and we are taking something from future generations who have no obligations to us.

You ask me what I am going to do with the aged and the poor and the sick and those who can't take care of themselves. I am saying we ought to take care of them. But let's take care of them as a Christian people through the giving and the charity of individuals and of churches and of the charitable organizations that are organized to take care of them. But let's take our needy people off the pay rolls of a political party that stays in power because they promise something for nothing but do not reveal that they are knowingly taking away our freedom and self-respect.

Americans, let us hang on to our personality. Cling to our individual self-respect. Hold to the fact that God wants us to be men and women of strong character. We do this because God is real to us. Let us cling to these truths regardless of the price that may be demanded.

God did not come to this earth to give men a form of government or a form of economics. God, through Christ, came to this earth to give us life, and the blood of Him feeds our blood through the divine sacrament of His own gift of Himself. We can stand up as men filled with His spirit, fed upon His life, because we have accepted His blood through the sacraments of His love, and we become men again. We need not be afraid of those who destroy the body, but we fight those who destroy the soul.

Americans, awake. Get on your knees. Ask God to baptize us anew with His spirit that restores our manhood and makes us free because through Him we keep our self-respect. We keep our self-respect because we can say, "God gave us the world. He told us to work it, and by His grace and by His help we are men enough to work it."

God has paid the price with His love for us. He has paid the divine price of His own Son to show us how worthy we are in His sight.

Our allegiance is to a God who is so real that He says to us as individuals we are worth while. Our personalities are valuable to Him and to man, and so we keep our self-respect.

Awake, people of America. Let us get on our knees and ask God to help us keep our liberty through refusing to surrender our self-respect. Yea, and then by the grace of God we will be men again.

FOR VICTORY WITH GOD

O Christ, my Captain and my Saviour, help me to bear Thee always in my heart and to follow Thy commandments in my life that, as I meet the onslaughts of evil men and their denials of Thy truth, I may not fight against them in my puny strength alone but may draw on Thine eternal might and power and win all victories with Thee. Amen.

Stronger United States Role Urged To Bar Europe's Collapse at End of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forthright article by Blair Moody from the Washington Star of December 25, 1949. He advocates precisely the action by our ECA officials in Europe that some of us tried in vain to get into the original European Recovery Administration legislation in 1948 and again in the act extending it in 1949. Better late than never.

STRONGER UNITED STATES ROLE URGED TO BAR EUROPE'S COLLAPSE AT END OF ECA

(By Blair Moody)

The United States must take a stronger hand in Europe.

In the next 2 years, we must discreetly increase our pressures and require basic, constructive reforms, in return for our Marshall plan dollars, beyond anything we have attempted in the past.

Failure to do this with sufficient perception and vigor may mean the failure of our whole, vast, costly undertaking for world peace and stability. Any other course almost certainly will confront us in 1952 with the choice of continuing to subsidize a dry-rotted system,

or—with Communists engulfing the continent—letting it collapse as it would have had the Marshall plan never been started.

The whole pattern of a future world in which Europe must be an integral part—whether communism or freedom finally wins the cold war—may depend on whether we find the way to insist without seeming to be offensive.

Europe has made a remarkable recovery from the shock and shambles of war, but it is not yet doing the things that must be done to stand on its own feet. Unless we insist, it will not do them.

NOT NOW CAPABLE OF SELF-SUPPORT

In 2 years, of course, Europe cannot possibly turn a feudal structure—shot throughout by antique customs, national boundaries, and special interests—into a model, modern social economy. But it can do much. At least, it can set a new trend of policy and thinking from which, once understood and undertaken, there would not likely be a turning back.

The cold fact is that western Europe, as it is now organized, is not capable of supporting itself without American aid. If it is ever to become capable of self-support, now is the time it had better begin making changes.

The United States must take the lead or wake up one day to find it has spent billions, and the free world is still in a mess, which is precisely what the Communists are counting on.

European statesmen worried by the trend will welcome—privately at least—a stronger use of American influence. Two high French officials told the writer in Paris that the United States must force Britain to form, with France, a duet strong enough to provide constructive leadership within Europe itself. If they don't, say the French, the Germans will.

GERMAN REVIVAL BLOCKED

Another Frenchman said he thought France had saved the United States bacon by blocking the impulse for hell-bent revival of German power, spurred by Wall Street interests, but added: "When it comes to a wise, moderate German program you must at least seem to force us. That will make it possible for us to explain to the French people."

An Italian official in Rome said: "Our country's future depends on other countries adopting the American program. They won't do it unless they are forced. So long as you are feeding them, you can force them. For heaven sakes, in their own interest, do it."

One of the most prominent civilians in Spain, who does not like Franco but supports him because he fears the alternative would be worse, pleaded that the United States make the Caudillo undertake reforms necessary to bring American credit and stave off economic collapse.

Paul G. Hoffman, the Marshall plan manager, is moving as rapidly as he feels he can. But the fight for fundamental change is just starting. The favorable production record of Europe since the war is deceptive because it is grounded in the artificial stimulant of donated American goods and materials. When the stimulants are removed, then what?

STILL CARTEL-MINDED

Europe is still cartel-minded. John J. McCloy, when he took over as American High Commissioner in Germany, found little had been done to break down the centralization of industrial power that paved Hitler's path to war. John Kenney, new Marshall plan chief in London, is trying to crack the British system in which 1,100 trade associations fix prices, control material supply, set production quotas, and discipline competitors. Jean Monnet, No. 1 economist of France, warns that the first results of the customs union between France and Italy have been talks looking toward new cartels.

American influence has to be strong in demanding that European nations balance their budgets and stabilize their currencies. But we have done little to urge continental politicians to improve the relative position of workers so they will have a greater personal stake in modified capitalism and be less suspectible to Communist agitators. This is the most important job of all, and it is proceeding with dangerous lethargy.

In a continent cursed by high prices and lack of mass buying power, wide profit-margins soak narrow, wealthy markets, and nothing much is done about it because the Communists have captured so many workers that the anti-Communist left is politically ineffective.

TAX SYSTEMS FAULTY

In Italy, centuries-overdue land reform seems quite imposing until matched against what there is to be done. Tax systems in most European countries range from reactionary to ridiculous.

France is pleading for closer teamwork with England. The British have such commitments in their sterling area that they cannot link too intimately with the Continent, although they are responding to our suggestion for a northern liaison with Scandinavia. They cannot pool their reserves, for example, in the new Federal Reserve of Europe.

But there is no reason the British should not agree with France on common policies on Germany before that nation builds to dominance of western Europe. And there is no reason the United States should not give British Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin a private bumping around if he refuses to do so.

Since we are giving the Continent billions, there is no reason why we should not exercise the same influence as any banker who loans thousands. It must be done carefully, since the Communists, now unable to deny the great good we are doing Europe, charge we are attempting to make it our colony. This gives them the double strategy of tearing down confidence in us and, by making us hesitant to insist on our views, keeping Europe in a state where it some day may tumble into their hands because it failed to reform.

Not a country in Europe can get along without our aid until it makes major reforms. The situation is that bad. The Continent has no leadership worth a continental. But they all know that our only selfish interest is in a stable world and peace, which is also theirs. And if we are reasonable and unofficious but lead strongly enough, they will follow.

Steel Prices and Steel Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Minnesota Labor of December 30, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STEEL PRICES AND STEEL PENSIONS

Just when talk about lowering costs and cutting unnecessary expenditures has reached a new high among businessmen, the hatchet swings down hard. Just as government, business, and labor seemingly had halted the trend into a depression valley in spite of many ill omens to the contrary, the dynamiters blew up these efforts.

Even while plunging farm prices and shrinking real wages of factory workers remain a daily millstone around the neck of those who struggle to keep depression out of America, along comes United States Steel and whams out a bell-clanging price boost.

As a result the rest of the steel companies, as has been past practice, fall into line with almost identical price inflations on their products. So costs to all producers and fabricators of products using steel zoom upward again. And prices to retailers will be notched to even dizzier heights as a result.

What does this recurring trend of inflation mean to the average person?

It's too soon to know, but the State CIO research department says that the raw steel price raise will increase prices of various products about as follows:

Automobile: $8 (sheet steel is up $6 a ton).

Refrigerator: 40 cents.

Kitchen cabinet: 27 cents.

Farm tractor: $3.

Garbage can: 4 cents.

The research department points out that retailers may not increase these and hundreds of other prices, however. It's getting tougher to move such merchandise. Retailers don't raise prices when sales are harder to make. Maybe they'll try to absorb these cost increases. This will cut their profits again. And in some cases the results will be to force many small-business men out of business.

A hardware store, the appliance retailer, automobile accessory salesmen handle large volumes at small profits. A hike in their unit costs, such as the research department points out, is a distinct possibility—if they can't pass it on in the form of higher retail prices—will push many of them out of business with conditions what they are today.

Why, then, did United States Steel raise prices?

It thinks it can get by with it. Demand for certain types of steel is still strong. Steel can raise prices, get what it asks for and continue to reap huge profits just as long as industry is able to pay the price. It is significant that not all prices were raised. Tin mill products, which are sold on contract on an annual basis, were lowered in price.

Benjamin Fairless, head of United States Steel—the corporation that turns out one-third of the Nation's supply—said the union welfare and pension plan costs made it necessary to increase prices.

The President's steel fact-finding board last September said the steel industry had used much of its recent big profits for wholesale plant modernization. This action "will substantially lower costs and thereby increase profits considerably, given no decrease in the demand for steel."

These lower costs would permit somewhat lowered prices, the fact-finding board of experts pointed out. Ah, but what about the increased costs caused by the pension plan the board recommended?

Said the board on this point: "The steel companies, under present conditions and under presently foreseeable conditions (which include cost reductions because of plant improvements) appear able to afford this and still put into effect the price reductions mentioned above."

And if the steel companies failed to so reduce prices, the board said, and if business continued to be generally favorable, then "There would appear to be justification for the union to renew its demand for larger participation in this industry's income." In other words, a fourth-round wage increase, which the union called off on the fact finders' advice last fall.

It is highly significant that Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), whose work on the prewar TNEC steel investigating

committee makes him one of today's top experts in Congress on monopoly prices in the steel industry, says the price increases are completely unjustified. He says that United States Steel in the first 9 months of 1949 earned $133,000,000 in profits—after taxes. That's about half again as much as it earned during the same period in 1948—$88,000,000.

What Is the Constitution of the United States Worth to American Women?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 4, 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "What Is the Constitution of the United States Worth to American Women?" delivered by Helen Elizabeth Brown of the Baltimore bar before the Lawyers' Civic Association of Maryland, on Wednesday, November 2, 1949.

I have an estimate from the Government Printing Office which indicates that the manuscript will take one-fourth of a page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $184.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WORTH TO AMERICAN WOMEN?

Although the Constitution of the United States forbids any State to deny to any person the equal protection of the laws, believe it or not—

Men, aliens, and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country; American women are not.

It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

To exclude men from jury service would be to deny them a trial by a jury of their peers and the equal protection of the laws; excluding women from jury service is no such violation of the Constitution.

It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not.

Sex, marriage, and motherhood are the bases of rank injustice and discrimination against American women.

In utter amazement, people ask how such a thing can be in this American Republic. Bishop Hoadly had the answer when he said that, "Whoever hath an absolute authority to interpret any written or spoken laws, it is he who is truly the lawgiver, to all intents and purposes, and not the person who first wrote or spoke them." Justice Holmes condensed it when he remarked that the Constitution is what the courts say it is.

The Supreme Court of the United States has said that a woman is not a person who is entitled to equal protection of the laws under the Constitution and that the Constitution cannot protect her against inequalities and discriminations as long as they are based solely on sex.

INTERPRETATIONS

The famous fourteenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1868, shortly after the Civil War. It states that all persons born or naturalized in the United States and subject to its jurisdiction are citizens and no State shall make or enforce any law abridging the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States. It further commanded that no State shall deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law, nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws.

The Constitution is the supreme law of the land and is said to be a great charter of human liberty, unique in the history of the world. But, oh, what the Supreme Court has done to that great charter of human liberty where women are concerned. The interpreter is indeed the lawgiver. The Constitution has been prevented from protecting women from the rankest kind of discrimination, injustice and inequality by the interpretation—or misinterpretation—placed upon it, that is, by bench-made law.

After the adoption of the fourteenth amendment, many laws were challenged as violating it. The courts say whether or not a law violates the Constitution. If a law does conflict with the Constitution, it is void and cannot be enforced. Cases began to go before the Supreme Court, as the final authority, for decision.

EXCLUSION FROM JURIES

One of the early decisions involved jury service. A Negro man in West Virginia was indicted for murder by a grand jury from which Negro men were excluded and convicted by a petit jury from which Negro men were excluded. The West Virginia law limited jury service to white male persons. The law was unconstitutional, said the United States Supreme Court, insofar as it singled out colored people and expressly denied them all right to participate in the administration of the law as jurors because of their color though they are citizens and may be in other respects fully qualified. "This," said the court, "is practically a brand upon them affixed by the law."

The right of a trial by jury, said the Supreme Court, is guaranteed to every citizen and the constitution of juries is a very essential part of the protection such a mode of trial is intended to secure. "The very idea of a jury is a body of men composed of the peers or equals of the person whose rights it is selected or summoned to determine; that is, of his neighbors, fellows, associates, persons having the same legal status in society as that which he holds." The Court then topped this off by saying that the State could constitutionally place restrictions on jury service which were not based on color, such as confining the selection of jurors to males. (*Strauder* v. *West Virginia* (100 U. S. 303 (1880)).)

Many years later a woman in Massachusetts charged with crime challenged the array of jurors because women were excluded from it. She was not getting her constitutionally guaranteed right to a trial by a jury of her peers and her rights under the fourteenth amendment were being infringed, she contended.

The Massachusetts jury law did not confine jury service to males. It provided that a person qualified to vote shall serve as a juror. The woman's suffrage amendment had been adopted and women were voting in Massachusetts. Women were persons, the accused woman insisted, and they had some rights under the Constitution.

Whether women are persons or not, ruled the highest court in Massachusetts, depends on when and where that word is used. It was admittedly true that the jury law said "person," but when that law was passed women were not persons who could vote and it was not contemplated that they ever would be. The right to a jury trial was limited to a common law jury which was made up of "12 free and lawful men." Women could not serve as jurors at common law. On the theory that the word "person" without further limiting phrase could hardly be construed to include only a part of the male citizens, colored men were declared eligible for jury service, but women of any race were not. As for the nineteenth amendment, that related exclusively to the franchise for women. The fourteenth amendment was intended to take away oppression because of race or color, the Supreme Court had said so in the West Virginia case. The accused had not been denied the equal protection of the laws either, said the Massachusetts court, and pointed out that the Supreme Court of the United States had already decided that it was not a violation of the fourteenth amendment to deny to women the right to practice law in *Bradwell* v. *Illinois* (16 Wall. 130), and *Lockwood, Petitioner* (154 U. S. 116); to deny them the right to vote before the adoption of the nineteenth amendment in *Minor* v. *Happersett* (21 Wall. 162); or to deny them the right to contract for their labor in *Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U. S. 412) and *Riley* v. *Massachusetts* (232 U. S. 671).

"These rights," quipped the Massachusetts court, "appear to us quite as essential to the privileges and immunities of citizens and equal protection of the laws as the duty to serve as jurors." (*Commonwealth of Massachusetts* v. *Welosky* (276 Mass. 398 (1931)).)

The Supreme Court of the United States placed its stamp of approval on this denial to women of a trial by a jury of her peers and the equal protection of the laws by denying a writ of certiorari in *Welosky* v. *Commonwealth of Massachusetts* (284 U. S. 684 (1932)).

Despite the Constitution, some States today exclude women from jury service denying to a woman accused a jury of her peers, those holding the "same legal status," and denying to all women the right to participate in the administration of the law as jurors thus placing "a brand upon them affixed by law." This cannot happen to Negro or white men under the Constitution.

LABOR RESTRICTIONS

Labor restrictions applied to working women while leaving men competitors and their employers free from the restrictions themselves and the attendant bureaucratic bother, report filing, Government inspections, and criminal penalties form one of the most curious chapters in American legal history. In this category, women were out of the Constitution, in again, out again, and this on again, off again, wobbling of the court from one side to the other usually hinged, not on law, but on the notions of one man, and at the most crucial point on the vote of one man who could not make up his mind. Cast on first one side and then the other his lone vote is now responsible for taking away from American women the protection of the Constitution against unequal and discriminatory labor laws.

At the outset the Supreme Court determined that labor restrictions could not be

imposed on men because such legislation violated their constitutional right of liberty of contract. As to men, the Court did not deviate from this ruling. New York State at the turn of the century passed a law limiting the working hours of men. The State courts upheld the law on the grounds of health, morals, and public safety. The State had a right to have healthy, able-bodied men at its command, said the New York court. Oh, no, said the United States Supreme Court, there is scarcely any law but might find shelter under such claims, but they can have no force against the fourteenth amendment to the Constitution of the United States which guarantees to the individual the liberty of contract, and the right to sell one's labor is protected by the amendment. Your law is void and you cannot enforce it because it violates the Constitution. (*Lochner* v. *New York* (198 U. S. 45 (1905)).)

When a few years later Oregon passed the very same law and made it applicable to women, but not to men, it was discovered that the "individuals" whose liberty of contract was protected by the fourteenth amendment were men only. Women had no rights and no claims to the equal protection of the laws that the fourteenth amendment guaranteed. Any kind of discriminatory labor restrictions could be imposed upon them, and as long as they were based solely on sex the Constitution did not protect them. (*Muller* v. *Oregon* (208 U. S. 412 (1908)).)

Before this decision, State courts, believing the "individuals" referred to in the Lochner case included women, had condemned such laws as unconstitutional. But when the Supreme Court declared that such legislation violated men's constitutional rights, but did not violate any constitutional rights women had, there was suddenly a great abundance of such laws which handicapped women in obtaining and keeping gainful employment, and they had the additional burden of struggling against them. Cases arising from this struggle kept coming before the Supreme Court.

In California a woman took a job in a hotel and agreed to work 9 hours a day because that was the time required to do her particular job. But California had a law prohibiting any female from working in a hotel for more than 8 hours. Women doing the same work in boarding or lodging houses were not included in the law. The woman's employer was charged with a crime and sent to jail. He obtained a writ of habeas corpus on the ground that his imprisonment was illegal because this law violated the California Constitution and the fourteenth amendment of the Federal Constitution. But the California court said the statute was a police regulation to promote the general health and welfare and sent the woman's employer back to jail. The case went to the United States Supreme Court, which said that this sort of thing could go too far; in fact, it could be pushed to a "wholly indefensible extreme"; but no constitutional rights had been violated here even though like legislation for men could not be sustained. (*Miller* v. *Wilson* (236 U. S. 373 (1915)).)

These statutes were indeed pushed to indefensible extremes. The "health and welfare" sham was used to eliminate women from competition in the labor market. Nobody cared about her health and welfare or how long she worked at any kind of drudgery as long as she did not get paid for it. But the minute she obtained paid employment and came into competition with men her health and welfare became of grave concern, and male labor organizations went to male legislatures to have a law passed against it. The laws themselves belied the health-and-welfare pretense in their coverage and exemptions. For instance, the California law in the Miller case applied to women working in hotels and exempted women doing the same work in boarding houses. There were no restrictions on jobs men did not want or could not get.

One of these laws, a minimum wage law for women and minors in the District of Columbia, which had thrown many women out of work, went to the Supreme Court on the question of its constitutionality. This time the Supreme Court said that it could not accept the doctrine that mature women require or may be subjected to restrictions upon their liberty of contract which could not lawfully be imposed in the case of men under similar circumstances and declared the law unconstitutional. (*Adkins* v. *Children's Hospital* (261 U. S. 525 (1923)).) There was great rejoicing. Women had at last broken into the Constitution. But this application of "equal justice under law" was of short duration.

Soon thereafter the waiters' union in New York was casting about for some means of eliminating the competition of women as waitresses in the late evening when trays were lighter and tips larger. So they went to the New York Legislature and got a law prohibiting women from working as waitresses between the hours of 10 o'clock at night and 6 o'clock in the morning. It was so very bad for women's health and morals to work as waitresses those particular hours. There was no concern as to what might happen to their health and morals if they lost their jobs. Neither were the sponsors of this bill interested in the health or morals of women working during those hours as singers, performers, attendants in ladies' cloak rooms, cleaning up in hotel kitchens, or even waitresses in lunchrooms run by employers for employees where there was not much pay and no tips. These women were not competing with them so they were not interested in their health or morals and they were exempted from the law, as it was easier to pass it that way.

After its enactment the law was challenged on the ground that it violated the fourteenth amendment by depriving the employer and employee of their liberty to contract and denied the equal protection of the laws by an unreasonable and arbitrary classification. The Supreme Court said it was not arbitrary and did not violate any constitutional rights. It pointed out that laws had been sustained by which women working in hotels could be restricted while those doing the same work in boarding houses were not and limiting the hours of women pharmacists and student nurses in hospitals but exempting graduate nurses. The Adkins case was brushed aside with the comment that it involved a wage-fixing law pure and simple and had nothing to do with hours or conditions of labor. (*Radice* v. *New York* (264 U. S. 292 (1924)).) Many waitresses lost their jobs and American women were out of the Constitution again.

A dozen years later they got back in—for just a little while. New York State made an extensive survey of labor conditions which very clearly showed what common sense makes abundantly clear, that if there was to be labor legislation of any kind it ought to apply to all workers and be based on the nature of the work—not the sex of the worker. It was demonstrated that men workers needed protection as much or even more than women. After all, the race does have fathers, and their health and welfare are important, too, not only to themselves but to their families and the community. It does not add to the general welfare if the workman's wife is left with little children to support and laws to hamper her in doing it. The survey further showed that to place restrictions on some workers and not on others was to handicap those restricted and give an unfair advantage to those left free of the restrictions. But the labor lobby wanted the restrictions placed on women only. They did not want any statutory limitations on men. The New York Legislature shifted its responsibility by passing two laws which were identical with the exception that one applied to all workers, men and women alike, and the other subjected women to its burdensome restrictions. Both bills were sent to the then Governor Lehman. The unions pressured him into signing the bill that restricted women but not men. The New York courts held this act unconstitutional, citing the Adkins case.

The United States Supreme Court said the New York court was right and invalidated the law on the authority of the Lochner and Adkins cases. Mr. Justice Butler, writing the opinion of the court, said, "That under circumstances such as those portrayed in the factual background, prescribing minimum wages for women alone would unreasonably restrain them in competition with men and tend arbitrarily to deprive them of employment and a fair chance to find work." *Morehead* v. *New York* (298 U. S. 587 (1936).) Women were back in the Constitution, but insecurely.

This was a 5-to-4 decision. Mr. Justice Owen J. Roberts was one of the five justices making up the majority of the Court. One vote alone gave women the protection guaranteed to all "persons" by the Constitution. Less than a year later Mr. Justice Roberts changed his mind and his vote and took that protection away from them. *West Coast Hotel Co.* v. *Parrish* (300 U. S. 379 (1937).) This was another 5-to-4 decision. By the vote of one man the Adkins and Morehead cases were destroyed, and women were out of the Constitution again. Justice Sutherland wrote a scathing dissent denouncing the law as an invasion of women's constitutional rights and made some sharp remarks about the exercise of the judicial function, adding some penetrating observations on government. But this did not change the result, and women are still out of the Constitution. The law of this land today is that labor restrictions against women only do not violate any rights women have under the Constitution.

BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL DISCRIMINATIONS

Women engaged in manual occupations are not the only ones subject to this oppressive injustice. The Constitution does not protect any American woman against the enactment by any State legislature of laws prohibiting the employment of women in any kind of business, in any profession or barring her from any lawful means of earning a living. Many States have done just that and the Supreme Court has ruled that in so doing they do not violate the Constitution. The Supreme Court has made the Constitution powerless to protect women.

Shortly after its adoption, the Supreme Court actually announced that the fourteenth amendment could not be set up to protect women against unequal laws which were a barrier against the right of females to pursue any lawful employment for a livelihood. Mr. Justice Bradley said that in *Bradwell* v. *Illinois* (16 Wall. 130 (1872)) and the court has not changed its mind. Myra Bradwell was denied admission to the practice of law although she met all the requirements and the Illinois statute said that any qualified "person" could practice. But Myra Bradwell was not the kind of "person" who was entitled to the equal protection of the laws. She was a woman, and worse than that, she was a married woman. If the legislature had not excluded women, it must have intended to, said Justice Bradley, besides it belonged to men to make, apply, and execute the laws. At the moment he was demonstrating what a mess some men can make of it.

Contrast this with the case in which the court with great anxiety and solicitude extended the protection of the Constitution to male aliens. It voided a law which contained no discrimination in itself but was being administered so as to be hurtful and an unfair discrimination against subjects of the Emperor of China. It was a law regulating laundries. It applied alike to all laundries and all persons operating laundries. But the law required the consent of a county board of supervisors regarding certain phases of the business. It seems the board was enforcing the law against Chinese laundrymen only. Such discrimination against these Chinese subjects would not do at all, ruled the Supreme Court, the Constitution forbids it. Said the court: "Though the law itself be fair on its face and impartial in appearance, yet, if it is applied and administered by public authority with an evil eye and an unequal hand, so as practically to make unjust and illegal discriminations between persons in similar circumstances, material to their rights, the denial of equal justice is still within the prohibition of the Constitution." (*Yick Wo* v. *Hopkins* (118 U. S. 356 (1886)).)

Aliens are entitled to the equal protection of the laws and equal justice, but American women are not. When it came to corporations, the Supreme Court did not even want to hear any argument about it, but simply announced that the Court was of the opinion that corporations were persons under the amen .ment (*Santa Clara County* v. *Southern Pacific Railway Co.* (118 U. S. 394 (1886))).

On top of that the Supreme Court said that the State of Virginia was not violating the Constitution by denying to Belva Lockwood the right to practice law in that State on the sole ground that she was a woman. Belva Lockwood had been a member of the bar of the Supreme Court and had practiced law in the District of Columbia for years. The Supreme Court said so and even pointed out that the Virginia statute provided that any person eligible to practice law in any other State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, could practice in that State, but the Virginia Court of Appeals denied her application. Nevertheless, it was not violating any constitutional rights a woman had because it was for the Virginia court to determine whether the word "person" as used in the Virginia law is confined to males and whether women were entitled to practice in that State. The Bradwell and Minor cases were cited in support of this (*Re Lockwood* (154 U. S. 116 (1894))). The Constitution does not require States to give to women the equal protection of their laws.

Once established in a profession, a woman is not safe from persecution and discrimination. California had a law limiting the work of all pharmacists to 10 hours a day. Then it passed a law that all women in hospitals, except graduate nurses, should work only 8 hours a day. One hospital affected had a pharmacist who was a woman. She and the board of trustees of the hospital took the case all the way to the Supreme Court. The Court said she had not been denied the equal protection of the laws. Of course, she was deprived of her means of livelihood when she lost her job to a man who could remain on duty a little longer but her constitutional rights were not violated, according to the Supreme Court (*Bosley* v. *McLaughlin* (236 U. S. 385 (1915))). What was the Constitution worth to her?

The very latest word on the subject by the Supreme Court is that women may be barred from any employment and deprived of the use of their property in spite of the Constitution (*Goesaert* v. *Cleary* (335 U. S. 464 (1948))). One of the last acts of Justice Rutledge was to protest against this in a dissenting opinion. Justice Douglas and Justice Murphy joined him, but their protests did not change the decision. It is now law.

American women have been read out of the Constitution of the United States by the Supreme Court of the United States. They have been compelled to work their way into this great charter of human liberty by amendments. The Constitution itself speaks of the rights of persons and citizens. Masculine courts have said women are not persons and citizens because of sex. With but a single exception, the United States Constitution is now worthless to American women. The one right guaranteed to them is the right to vote. This was accomplished by the nineteenth amendment which specifically forbids the denial or abridgment of the right to vote on account of sex.

THE EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

To make other provisions and guaranties of the Constitution a protection for women of this country, another amendment must be added. The new amendment is necessary to eliminate discriminatory bench-made law and make the fourteenth amendment mean what it says. The new amendment must specifically forbid the denial of due process of law and the denial of the equal protection of the laws on account of sex. Such an amendment, known as the equal rights amendment, has been pending in the Congress for many years. Its passage has been pledged by all political parties and is long overdue.

It is difficult to understand why the Congress has not submitted this amendment to the States for ratification. Lawyers see the need of it in their daily practice. Obviously we cannot do much of a job of selling democracy abroad with this sort of situation at home. Russia, China, Turkey, and many other countries have equal-rights provisions in their constitutions. The United Nations Charter provides for equal rights for men and women. Our own Constitution is prevented from making equal rights for all Americans effective by the crippling and mangling it has suffered at the hands of the Supreme Court.

Some serious thought should be given to these numerous oaths so glibly taken to preserve, protect, and defend the Constitution of the United States. Today's most urgent need is to save the Constitution—remove its shackles, heal it, restore it, put it back on its feet, and see that it does what it was intended to do for every American.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, Announcing His Candidacy for Reelection to the Senate

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered at Havana, Ill., on December 27, 1949, by the distinguished majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], announcing his candidacy for reelection in 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

My old friends and neighbors, as I stand here before you tonight, I remember the crowded years of my life, the years which have been so exciting and so challenging, the years which have led me into so many battles and so many victories, the years which throw a blazing light upon the path ahead of me.

My life has been a very fortunate one. I was fortunate enough to be born in the Lincoln-Douglas country, in a region filled with the tradition of great men and great deeds. I was fortunate to grow up among the friendly people of the great progressive State of Illinois.

Let me tell you that I have expressed my gratitude to God many times because I had the glorious privilege of being born in the heart of America. Nowhere else upon the whole earth would the way be open for the son of a tenant farmer to become the leader of the United States Senate, the greatest legislative body in the world.

The story of my life is a familiar story here in America. It is the story of freedom and opportunity for the poor as well as the rich, the folks on the farms as well as the citizens in the cities. It is the story which rises from the well-springs of liberty.

All of you here tonight have helped me to make the record upon which I am going to run as a candidate for another term as a servant of Illinois in the Senate of the United States.

You selected me as your State's attorney, when I sought my first public office as a young war veteran. Soon after that, you recall that my comrades of the American Legion honored me by electing me as State department commander and a little later named me national judge advocate for 4 years. You sent me to Congress in 1934 to fill the place of a great man, the late Henry T. Rainey, who had become Speaker of the House of Representatives.

In my two terms in the House, I battled for the rights of Illinois farmers. Those were the stirring days when we passed the Soil Conservation Act and the second Agricultural Adjustment Act—two vital measures which have enabled the farmers of Illinois and the Nation to reach new heights of prosperity. I wrote into the second Agricultural Adjustment Act the first provision for mandatory corn loans which still stands as the basic method of our farm price-support program.

During those terms in the House, I did everything in my power to advance the interests of Illinois labor and Illinois business. To stimulate business, I advocated revision of the tax laws, and I urged special consideration for small-business men. To place labor upon an equal footing with other groups in our economy, I supported the National Labor Relations Act, the Employment Insurance Act, the minimum-wage law, and other measures to improve the living standards of all working people.

In 1938, with the support of the late Gov. Henry Horner and other outstanding leaders of Illinois, I asked for the privilege of serving you in the United States Senate. You gave me another magnificent vote of confidence, and I moved from the House to the Senate with a deep determination to render the devoted and faithful service which would bring honor to my home State.

My 11 years in the Senate have been the years of America's rise to world leadership. In this period from 1939 through 1949, our country has become the most powerful and the most prosperous Nation on earth. I am humbly grateful that I was permitted to take part in shaping the national policy which has brought us victory in war and bounteous plenty in peace.

Yes, my friends, we have shown the world a marvelous achievement here in the land of liberty. By using our Government as an instrument of progress in the hands of the people, we have spread the good things of this life among the vast majority of Americans without the loss of a single freedom.

For 16 years, the moaning men who have captured one of our major political parties have beat their breasts and cried out: "All this must stop. We've got to turn around. We must go back or we'll lose our liberties." These prophets of despair are blood-brothers of the fearful man who didn't believe America could win independence, who didn't believe America could even survive the War of 1812. These gloomy fellows have been predicting disasters and catastrophes for America since 1776.

Yet we have advanced, step by step, year after year, in national strength and national security. We have confounded the critics and astounded the aristocrats of entrenched privilege.

We have approached a new freedom, while we have maintained and cherished our old ones. We can speak freely, write freely, worship in any house of God, go where we please, work where we like, and criticize our Government without any threat of punishment, just as we have always done.

And we have added a new liberty—freedom from the grim specter of want. We have set a goal of full employment, to offer every American a job, and today we have 60,000,000 people gainfully employed at good wages. The profits of American business are reaching new peaks, and our national income is more than $220,000,000,000 a year. Our savings have reached a total of more than $150,000,000,000. Farmers are prosperous and happy.

All these things are reasonable in a country blessed by God with enormous resources. All these things are sound and sensible, and we know it. We are not frightened any more when certain leaders of the Republican Party tell us that we are on our way to the poorhouse.

We remember that the Old Guard men who control that party do not speak for the millions of progressive Republicans who have joined hands with progressive Democrats to overcome unemployment, to wipe out slums, to give pensions to the needy aged, to launch new projects which have raised the United States to the pinnacle of prosperity.

We know that the man who looks around America today, who sees our roads filled with new cars, the smoke of industry rising in our skies, and farm bins filled with bumper crops, cannot agree with the fearful gentlemen who talk about the perils of the poorhouse.

It is a sad thing, my friends, that some of the spokesmen for the Grand Old Party do not realize that the forward-looking Democrats and Republicans of this Nation are not ready to put their heads against a wailing wall and ask for crying towels.

Most of us are aware of the truth about America—and the truth is that our country is doing fine.

We have moved through the dangerous years of the postwar period without a disaster, without the depression and collapse which the moaners glimpsed around every corner.

We have met the challenge of aggressive communism by creating a bold program for European recovery known as the Marshall plan. That plan along with other kindred programs has sent a tide of hope and confidence through Europe, and that tide is weakening the walls of the Soviet slave states.

We have launched a giant housing program here in the United States of America. We have taken long strides toward reorganization of the executive branch of our Government to obtain greater economy and efficiency. We have strengthened our national defense to safeguard the ramparts of freedom.

You know my record. You know that I fought for every one of the major measures in our foreign and domestic policy.

In foreign affairs I have always lifted my voice against the deadly doctrine of isolationism. If you give me your support in the coming election, I will continue my determined efforts to keep America working in harmony with the free nations of the earth.

In domestic legislation, I have supported every measure to maintain and extend the economic prosperity which the American people have earned by their energy, their intelligence, and their skill.

As I look ahead, I see the future filled with challenges which will call for the highest statesmanship and the widest knowledge available. Because America holds the key to the destiny of all mankind, I believe that any man who seeks a post in the Senate today must dedicate himself to days and nights of strenuous effort to obtain a secure peace for the world.

We are going to have peace, because another war would hurl the nations of the earth into a blazing furnace of destruction.

To reach our goal of peace means the expenditure of billions upon billions for national defense and our international obligations. But I am willing to pay the price of peace, for in this atomic age, another war would be infinitely more costly in blood and treasure than the cost we must now bear for defense and aid to the free nations. If we do not win the peace and the holacaust of atomic war should fall upon us, all the talk of achieving governmental economy would seem a vain and foolish thing.

We must find the way to peace, because our sons must not be sent forth to die in a collossal conflict which would carry the victor down in the ruins with the vanquished.

With the guidance of Almighty God, we will use the fruits of the earth for the joy of mankind. With the wisdom which led us to the secrets of the atom, we will take the road which leads upward to the hills of happiness.

In the Eighty-first Congress, in which I have the honor of serving as majority leader of the Senate, we have gone far along the road of peace, progress, and prosperity.

Recognizing the inescapable fact that the forces of democracy and the forces of communism are contending today for the future of mankind, this Congress has extended our successful bipartisan foreign policy to maintain our world leadership.

We have placed our reliance upon a comprehensive series of measures to expand trade, to increase the productive power of the free nations, and to continue the scientific advances which have enabled America to lift the standard of living year after year.

While we have suffered a severe set-back in Asia through the collapse of the Nationalist Government in China, we have gained victory after victory in Europe and the Middle East.

The attempt of Soviet guerrillas to seize control of Greece has been defeated.

The aggressive desires of Russia to dominate Turkey have been frustrated with our aid.

The free governments of France and Italy stand with us, and the Communists in those countries have lost their power to disrupt the economic systems of those vital nations.

We have helped the 270,000,000 people of western Europe—very productive and highly skilled people—to take giant strides toward economic and social strength.

Thus far, we have invested more than $7,000,000,000 in the European recovery program. That is a tremendous sum—until you compare it with the cost of the possibility of fighting an atomic war against a vast nation led by tough and utterly ruthless commissars. If we heeded the cries of the short-sighted men who have been telling us that we cannot afford to continue the Marshall plan, if we retreated from the world struggle and let western Europe sink beneath the red tide of communism, what would it cost us to arm for a war which we would ultimately have to fight alone?

Here is the view of Paul G. Hoffman, the great Republican businessman, chosen by the President to administer the Marshall plan. Just 2 weeks ago, Mr. Hoffman declared in Cleveland: "If nations now free should become satellite police states, only one course of action would be open to us. We would have to increase sharply our defense expenditures." Paul Hoffman asserted that we would have to spend on arms, "25 billion or 30 billion" dollars a year. I assert that he made a very modest prediction.

We would have to convert our beloved America into a garrison state. We would have to keep huge fleets of planes patrolling the skies above our borders. We would have to keep our Navy and our Army in a perpetual state of readiness to prevent the possibility of a sudden attack which might snuff out the lives of 40,000,000 Americans and destroy dozens of our crowded cities.

I believe our present policy is the only sane and sensible course. Despite what the critics tell you, we are getting excellent results. These carping critics offer you no constructive alternative which gives hope for world peace and the betterment of mankind. Those who oppose our bipartisan foreign policy are deluded isolationists or following a course of political expediency.

Those who urge America to retreat into an iron shell are the faint-hearted men of little faith who call our successful policy a give-away program and a gravy train. Let us analyze these glib phrases for a moment.

The facts prove that the money we are spending for the Marshall plan does not go into gravy or lavish gifts. The money goes into orders for American factories—many of them right here in Illinois—and to buy the products of American farmers.

Here are the figures, my friends, which I have obtained from official sources. The United States is the major source for most types of goods going to the Marshall plan countries. We supply 96 percent of the machinery and vehicles shipped to the countries participating in the program. We sell 93 percent of the miscellaneous products, 68 percent of the raw materials and manufactures, and 62 percent of the food, feed, and fertilizer.

Yes, my friends, we are making a good investment in the Marshall plan. The dollars we appropriate in Congress come home to roost in Illinois and other great States, because our friends abroad must use these dollars to buy the supplies we produce.

Let me give you some examples. The Caterpillar Tractor Co. and other firms in Peoria have received orders under this program which total millions of dollars. During the first 9 months of the ECA, Peoria obtained $6,236,000. Moline received $1,597,000. Chicago got $42,000,000. And many other cities in our State shared in large orders.

Millions were expended under the Marshall plan to buy the products of Illinois farms which were urgently needed by the free nations. Remember these facts. The next time a smooth gentleman tells you we are pouring money down a rat hole, ask him whether he means the money which has gone to Illinois factories and the Illinois farms.

Because we are assisting our allies to create a better life, because we are trying to build a better world rather than retreat into selfish isolationism, because we have demonstrated our leadership in a good cause, we

have won the confidence of many millions of people around the globe.

In the coming fiscal year, we will be able to reduce our expenditures for the military forces by $2,000,000,000. We may be able to cut the size of the Marshall plan appropriation by almost a billion dollars below the amount appropriated for the current fiscal year.

We can do these things because our allies in Europe are growing stronger. The production rate in Western Europe is now 20 percent above the rate attained by European industry before World War II. The free nations will be able to do more and more for themselves and we can reduce our economic aid as their internal strength becomes greater.

But we are not going to slash the Marshall plan to the point where our recovery program may be endangered. I am sure you will agree with me that this Congress should not jeopardize our national defense in the name of meat-ax economy, or cause the Marshall plan to collapse in the name of a balanced budget.

You know that I regard an unbalanced budget as a terrible evil, especially at a time when our national income is very high and the Government is receiving revenues of nearly $40,000,000,000 a year.

You know that I have always met my personal obligations. I have never been a free spender. I do not enjoy the process of appropriating the hard-earned money of American taxpayers, because I am a taxpayer myself. I assure you that I am not one of those individuals who spend for the sake of spending.

But when our Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, and other leaders of our defense establishment, tell me we must spend billions to protect our homes, our families, our freedoms, from a possible aggressor, I find myself constrained to heed such warnings.

You know as well as I do that Secretary Johnson, who bears the responsibility for keeping our military forces ready to defend the Nation, is an excellent administrator who has demonstrated his determination to save hundreds of millions of dollars wherever he can do so.

I have talked with the President of the United States about this budget problem. I wish all of you could see the President going over the Federal budget. He demands a justification for every dollar to be spent. He orders the fiscal experts to examine every estimate, to check every sum, to search for places where economy may be enforced.

In spite of all our efforts, we are now confronted by the disturbing reappearance of deficit financing. We are confronted by the likelihood of another rise in our Federal debt.

I hate deficit financing. I hate to have the Government borrowing more money from the American people.

But if we must make a choice between a period of deficit financing to strengthen our chance for peace or running the chance of engaging in an atomic war, I will declare right now that I prefer the risk of deficit financing.

If we win a secure peace, if we save our sons from the agony of fighting in Siberian snows or dying in the wreckage of devastated cities, I believe our economic sacrifice will be worth while. I do not see how any patriotic American who loves his country and his fellowmen can come to any other conclusion.

We are not going to resign ourselves to an atomic arms race which might lead to a fiery finish for our whole civilization. But that does not mean, that we will not add to our stock pile of bombs. We will continue to send arms to our friends all over the world, and we will try harder than ever to find paths toward peace.

Why did the American people take the announcement of Russia's atomic weapon with such serene confidence?

We were calm and cool, because we knew we had embarked upon the right course, at home and abroad. We were prosperous, progressive, and prepared to win through any crisis which might come. We had proved our own good faith in the ideals of freedom and abundance, and we knew we could count upon liberty-loving men everywhere to meet any challenge which might arise.

Without hysteria and without panic, the Senate of the United States had ratified the Atlantic Pact, linking 12 free nations in a firm alliance to prevent aggression.

The Senate of the United States restored our reciprocal trade program to the liberal policy laid down by Franklin Roosevelt and Cordell Hull.

The Senate of the United States ratified the International Wheat Agreement, to guarantee the export of 168,000,000 bushels of American wheat at fair prices for the hungry nations of the world.

The Senate of the United States voted to send arms to our friends overseas, to enable them to resist any sudden attack and to lift their heads without fear.

We made history this year in the Senate, my friends, and I will thank God as long as I live that my collleagues entrusted the leadership of the Senate to me at such a vital hour.

We proved to the people of the earth that America measured up to the demands of our age.

All the clouds of confusion stirred by the communists cannot conceal the fact that America has made the greatest progress under a liberal government in recent years in spite of a catastrophic depression and the necessity of fighting a global war against the Axis Powers.

Compare 1949 and 1929 for Mr. and Mrs. America. In this year of grace, according to a noted economist, the average American receives 86 percent more dollars in his pay envelope than he did in 1929. Prices have risen by 39 percent. Taxes have increased too. Mr. and Mrs. America are much better off than they were 20 years ago, and these figures prove it.

The American workman can buy a pound of bread with the money he earns in 6 minutes of labor. In Soviet Russia, the workingman must labor more than four times as long.

Our shoe workers can earn the money for a pair of $9 shoes in one-third the time required by European shoe workers. Our dairy workers can earn the price of a pound of butter in one-sixth of the time necessary for Europeans.

Because their incomes have risen, the working people of America can consume greater quantities of meat and eggs, bread and butter, the products of farms, and still have money for manufactured goods and personal savings.

Because our farmers are getting good prices for their crops, farm income has multiplied many times. Farm debts have been reduced, mortgages have been paid off, and the savings of farmers have grown rapidly.

Yes, my friends, the progressive policy of your Government has brought benefits to every group in America. We have all advanced together, during the last 16 years. And we are going to continue our advance under a Democratic administration.

The President and the Congress are committed to a program designed to widen the liberties, to raise the living standards, and to assure more security for all Americans. Under the banner of freedom and progress, we are striving to attain a fair deal for American business, American farmers, American labor.

We are not resting on our achievements of the past—even though our accomplishments in the last 16 years have no parallel in the history of popular government.

We know that we must make it possible for more people with moderate incomes to own and enjoy homes of their own. Good homes in decent neighborhoods produce citizens who believe in democracy.

We know that we must extend and improve our social security system. We must enable millions of Americans to save for their age with the cooperation of far-sighted employers.

The House of Representatives passed a bill in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress to add 11,000,000 Americans to the lists of those who share in social security. As majority leader of the Senate, I promise you that this Congress will complete its action on this bill before we adjourn next year.

We are going to make a mighty effort to obtain a fair-employment law in the coming session of Congress.

We will try to enact a bill for Federal aid to education which will be satisfactory to Americans of all faiths.

Many other important measures will be given final form and enacted into law before the Eighty-first Congress goes down into history.

In the coming session we will devote much thought to our consideration of proposals for greater economy and efficiency in our Government. The President has informed me that he intends to submit additional plans for reorganization along the lines recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Let me remind you that this Congress has already approved more vital measures for streamlining Federal agencies than any other Congress in this century.

On June 20, 1949, we authorized the President to reorganize the executive departments to reach the essential objectives of efficiency and economy.

In addition to this comprehensive reorganization law, we gave our approval to six out of the seven special reorganization plans sent to the Congress by the President.

Through acceptance of these plans, we gave the President a go-ahead signal to streamline the Department of Labor, to reorganize the Post Office Department, to transfer the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President, to reorganize the Civil Service Commission, to reorganize the Maritime Commission, and to transfer the Public Roads Administration from the Federal Works Agency to the Department of Commerce.

I am strongly in favor of most of the recommendations made by the nonpartisan Commision headed by our former President. But I want you to be well aware of the fact that President Truman and this Democratic Congress have not been asleep at the switch on reorganization of the Government. Many people are apparently not informed on this subject. Many newspapers do not seem to realize that we have already acted in several fields to reorganize our Federal departments and save hundreds of millions for American taxpayers.

Remember that it will take time to obtain the savings we all desire. Remember that efficiency and economy cannot be achieved by swinging an ax wildly over the heads of Federal employees. Remember that savings which may amount to billions of dollars a year can be attained in the future by calm and scientific reforms carried through by able executives.

My friends and neighbors, Republicans and Democrats alike, who have gathered here to do me honor, I lift my voice to pay you a humble and sincere tribute. Your presence here is a recognition that you believe in me. I assure you that when I am reelected to the Senate, I shall devote my days and nights to the service of the people of Illinois and the

Nation in the years ahead as I have done in the years gone by.

I enter this campaign with only one obligation—my obligation to the people of my home State and America.

Here in Havana in 1944, when I opened my last campaign, I declared to you: "No individual or group of individuals, no organization, no newspaper, controls my vote in the United States Senate." That is true now, as it was in 1944, and it will always be true.

America has been good to a son of a tenant farmer, who has been given the opportunity to speak for the people of a great State from the highest post in the Senate.

I ask for your continued confidence and faith. I will strive to be worthy of your approval and your support.

This is an hour of great challenge in the affairs of the Nation and the world. We must rise to our responsibilities. There can be no question that we can go forward together to new victories for our beloved America.

Every indication in the Nation, from the Democratic victory in the New York senatorial election to our victories in the county elections recently held here in Illinois, points to another great triumph for our cause in 1950.

We are going to win because the voters in Illinois and the whole country know that the leaders of the Democratic Party are men of unimpeachable integrity and rugged honesty.

We are going to win because we have many splendid leaders in the State, such as our great Governor, Adlai Stevenson, our great mayor of Chicago, Martin Kennelly, and my great colleague in the Senate, PAUL DOUGLAS.

We are going to win because we have drawn to our banner millions of progressive Republicans and independent voters who want to advance with us along the road of peace, progress, and prosperity.

In the coming campaign, we shall elect men who will be faithful to their trust, who will keep Illinois in its rightful place—at the head of the American parade.

Here's to victory in 1950—victory for the principles of democracy—victory for the people.

Federal Power Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a pamphlet entitled "Federal Power Policy," distributed by the American Public Power Association. I found the recommendations of the APPA to be very cogent and certainly worthy of much consideration. The recommendations were adopted by the board of directors of the American Power Association on September 26, 1949.

There being no objection, the pamphlet was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL POWER POLICY

(Recommendations on the generation, transmission, and sale of Federal electric power by American Public Power Association)

INTRODUCTION

For almost 40 years, the power program of our Federal Government has grown like Topsy. It has been influenced, especially during the last 20 years, by major amendments to existing laws as well as new legislation, such as the TVA Act, designed to apply only to particular regions or to solve special problems, such as electrifying our farm areas. Until 1930 power was an incidental byproduct from dams designed primarily for flood control, navigation, irrigation, and providing water for domestic and municipal purposes. Up to that time the total installed kilowatts in Federal plants was only 226,000. Beginning with Hoover Dam, on the Colorado River, there developed the concept of huge dams, vast reservoirs for water storage, large blocks of low-cost hydro power, and the need for over-all control of a river basin, to attain maximum benefits from the investment. The impact of these large blocks of power on the economy of an area quickly became apparent.

Today, according to the Federal Power Commission, there are in operation, under construction, or authorized almost 17,000,000 kilowatts of federally owned generating capacity, and the Secretary of the Interior has stated that by 1960 some 30,000,000 additional kilowatts can reasonably be anticipated.

Since municipalities, cooperatives, and other public agencies now have preference under the law in the disposition of this power, their stake in the policy followed becomes readily evident.

Accordingly, to protect their present interests and to assure the economic feasibility and soundness of the program, the American Public Power Association has drafted these recommendations for a Federal power policy. Adoption of the statement reproduced below marks one of the most significant actions to be taken by APPA in its 9-year history. It is hoped that this statement will help guide the drafting of legislation in this sphere of governmental activity which is witnessing such a phenomenal growth.

STATEMENT OF RECOMMENDATIONS

In the construction of electric power facilities and in the generation, transmission and sale of electric power, the United States should adhere to the following principles, that is:

I. Development of hydroelectric power sites

1. In order to conserve irreplaceable fuel supplies, every site for the generation of hydroelectric power should be developed if and when such development is economically feasible. In the case of projects to be constructed primarily for some other purpose, such as navigation or flood control, maximum power production consistent with such primary purposes should be provided.

2. Hydroelectric power sites are natural resources of the people of the United States and in their development preference should be given to public agencies. Plans for developments should provide for maximum economic utilization of stream systems. Local public agencies should have preference in making developments that fit into such plans.

3. Recapture provisions should not apply in the case of grants and licenses given to any public agency. The only useful purpose of a recapture clause is to reserve a natural resource for the public benefit, and where the people themselves undertake the development the need for the provision disappears.

4. In every case in which the United States has, in effect, preempted a stream and/or precluded local development of hydroelectric power, or assumed the obligation to provide a power supply to an area, then it is the duty of the United States to develop power under an orderly program which will anticipate the potential power demands and meet those demands as they arise.

5. The construction of any Federal dam or power generation plant should be preceded by authorization by act of Congress.

II. Economic feasibility and financing of Federal power projects

1. Determination of feasibility:

(a) The Congress should prescribe standards of economic feasibility for Federal power projects and these standards should be applied to all projects.

(b) With respect to any administrative determination of feasibility pursuant to standards prescribed by Congress, review should be provided by an independent agency.

(c) In determining economic feasibility, each project should stand upon its own merits, but the interrelation of the proposed project with other projects (existing and potential) within the areas should be fully evaluated.

(d) Minimum standards of feasibility should be such that power revenues, after payment of power operation, including depreciation, and maintenance expenses, should be adequate to provide for the payment of interest upon the capital investment of the United States chargeable to power and reasonably to insure the United States against loss of any part of such capital investment.

2. Financing: In those cases in which the United States has precluded local development of a stream, or assumed the obligation to provide a power supply to an area, capital funds must be made available in such an orderly manner as to permit installation of economically justified generating facilities in anticipation of the potential power demands and in time to meet those demands as they arise.

III. Transmission lines and steam plants

1. Regional integration:

(a) The United States should construct and own fuel-burning plants, integrated with its hydroelectric plants whenever necessary for the efficient economical operation of its hydroelectric plants.

(b) The United States should construct and own any transmission lines economically necessary for the proper integration of Federal hydroelectric or fuel-burning plants.

(c) Integration policies should be directed toward benefiting the ultimate consumer and where integration of a Federal hydroelectric plant with the production facilities of a local publicly owned distributing system will better serve the ultimate consumer, such integration should be preferred to integration exclusively with other federally owned generating plants.

2. Transmission to load centers:

(a) The United States should construct and own transmission facilities (within the limits of economic feasibility) in every case where such construction and ownership is necessary to provide service, upon reasonable terms, to public agencies and cooperatives accorded preference by acts of Congress.

(b) Local public agencies and cooperatives should have a preferred right to construct transmission facilities to load centers in all cases where the local agencies are willing to provide transmission upon reasonable terms to customers within the area entitled to preference by acts of Congress.

IV. Power sales

1. Sales to ultimate consumers: The United States should not engage in the distribution of electric energy to ultimate consumers (other than agencies and instrumentalities of the United States) if such consumers can reasonably and adequately be served by any local public agency or cooperative.

2. Preferential rights:

(a) In the sale of power, public agencies and cooperatives should have preference.

(b) In the sale of power, public agencies and cooperatives taking power for direct distribution to ultimate consumers should be preferred to all others.

3. Contracts: Contracts of Federal agencies with privately owned utilities should be

limited in time and should contain provisions for modification upon reasonable terms to the extent necessary to protect the preference of public agencies and cooperatives within the area.

4. Rates: Power from Federal projects should be sold at the lowest possible rates consistent with sound business principles. Rates for power produced at multiple-purpose projects should be sufficient to meet all costs properly chargeable to power, but should not be burdened with any costs properly chargeable to any other purpose; provided, however, that when irrigation is one of the joint purposes, then power revenues may properly be used to pay that portion, if any, of the capital costs properly chargeable to irrigation which is beyond the ability of the irrigators to pay; provided the total capital costs paid from power revenues (those chargeable to power plus those chargeable to irrigation but paid from power revenues) shall never exceed the amount for which a comparable supply of power could have been developed had irrigation not been one of the purposes of the project.

V. Multiple-purpose projects

1. Allocation of capital:

(a) Congress should fix policies and practice with respect to the allocation of capital at Federal multiple-purpose projects and these policies and practices should be uniformly applied upon all projects.

(b) All administrative action with respect to capital allocations should be made subject to review.

VI. Recognition of local interest in Federal projects for the utilization or control of water

1. Investigation and reports respecting proposed water projects: The United States should at all times recognize the rights of the States in determining the development of the watersheds within their borders and their interests and rights in water utilization. To this end, investigations concerning any proposed project for the utilization and control of water should be conducted in such a manner as to make available currently to every affected State information developed by the investigation and opportunity for maximum consultation and cooperation. Similarly, reports concerning any such project should be submitted to every affected State for comment, criticism, or recommendation prior to the authorization of any construction work upon the proposed project, or, if the report be for submission to the Congress, before such submission.

2. Local participation in operation of Federal projects: The local interest in every Federal project for the utilization and control of water should receive recognition, and local participation should be invited to the greatest extent consistent with the responsibilities of the United States. Such local participation may be achieved through local public hearings, local representation on consulting and administrative boards and councils, and by other means.

VII. Rural electrification

1. It is in the public interest to electrify our rural areas as rapidly as possible. Sufficient funds—both for administrative and loan purposes—should be provided by the Congress as needed.

2. Present powers of REA to finance generating plants and transmission lines, and acquire properties, should be continued.

3. More extensive financing of research in rural utilization of electric power should be undertaken by appropriate agencies.

Adopted by the board of directors, American Public Power Association, September 26, 1949, at Washington, D. C.

One Job for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW F. SCHOEPPEL
OF KANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the President of the United States submitted to Congress yesterday his message on the state of the Union. Many things were covered in that speech. Many of us feel that we cannot be so optimistic about the outlook for the future of our country if we take an honest, practical look.

An interesting editorial appeared on January 1, 1950, in the Cleveland Plain Dealer entitled "One Job for 1950."

I ask unanimous consent to have this editorial printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is something worth thinking about.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE JOB FOR 1950

Hello, 1950. This is a pretty bewildering world for such a young fellow to enter. It isn't like it used to be when your brothers dropped around to spend a year. Then life was simple. Two and two made four. If you worked you ate and if you loafed you didn't. Hardly anybody got paid for doing nothing, and nobody made a career of going on relief. And all the gold was not buried in the ground in Kentucky.

To say, 1950, that we are nuttier than a fruit cake is to understate the case. We haven't made up our minds what we are going to do about China; what we are going to do about a lot of other things. We drift from one expediency to another, yet manage to keep in mind the priceless precept that he who gives away the most to the greatest number remains longest in power.

To saddle all these problems on your poor little back seems brutal, but you might as well learn early that life is a pretty kettle of fish. No one expects you to be able to solve them all. But if you could concentrate on just one thing and get it straightened out, you would be remembered as a jewel among years.

We refer, 1950, to the Government's farm price-support program which prevents prices from going to their natural level.

Uncle Sam, it seems, has a $2,000,000,000 inventory right now, including some 5,000,000 bales of cotton, 400,000,000 bushels of wheat, 600,000,000 bushels of corn, 400,000,000 pounds of linseed oil, 16,000,000 bushels of flaxseed, over 70,000,000 pounds of dried eggs, more than 100,000,000 pounds of butter, $30,000,000 worth of dried milk, to say nothing of large stores of tobacco, tung oil, dried fruit, turpentine, rosin, sheep's and goat's wool, soybeans, turkeys, peanuts, and walnuts.

The Government is running out of storage space. Expense for storage currently runs to $250,000 a day, and at least $80,000,000 is being invested in additional space this fiscal year.

If you could straighten out this one matter, 1950, before it becomes compulsory for every homeowner to offer up his basement, garage, and spare bedroom for storage purposes, you would not have lived in vain.

But don't let us infect you with our somewhat pessimistic outlook. The fact that nothing has been done in recent years that made much sense, does not prove that we shall continue to live an Alice in Wonderland existence all the rest of our days. It is as certain as the noses on our faces that we must return to a solvent condition or go broke.

Perhaps, 1950, you may be able to give us a slight push in the direction of plain, old-fashioned horse sense.

Well, good luck, kid, and happy landings.

Capt. John D. Crommelin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 5 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute to Capt. John D. Crommelin, by Walter Winchell.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CASE FOR A GALLANT SAILOR

(By Walter Winchell)

The Japs burned the uniform off Capt. John D. Crommelin, but it didn't stop him from rescuing his wounded men lying below in sick bay. The politicians are trying to keep the admiral's star off Captain Crommelin's shoulder this week, but unlike the Japs, they won't face him in open combat. In the best tradition of Hitler, they have denied him a court martial because he has a complete defense.

There is now an official public reprimand in his record, placed there by Admiral Forrest Sherman. The best constitutional lawyers tell me Admiral Sherman had no more right to do that than the cop on the corner has a right to electrocute you without trial.

This is how it was done: Admiral Sherman, without trial, placed this death sentence of promotion in Captain Crommelin's record: "To the degree that you deliberately ignored your responsibilities to your naval superiors and disregarded the well understood privacy of confidential and privileged communications, you brought into question your fitness to exercise a position of trust and confidence under those superiors or elsewhere in the naval service."

Admiral Sherman must have known when he wrote—as everyone in Washington does—that a large number of Senators, Congressmen, and senior officers of the United States Navy are almost fighting each other for the privilege of testifying for Crommelin. To the extent that he ignored the evidence, Admiral Sherman was stacking the cards. But to the extent that he ignored the law, he was breaking it himself.

Admiral Sherman wrote me a letter explaining his position. Examination of it reveals he used the exact words of naval legal authority but added to them words which suited his purpose, omitted those which restricted his authority and ignored those which questioned the legality of his act. The admiral relies for his authority on the inherent right of a commander-in-chief to express approval or disapproval of the official conduct of subordinate officers under his command.

He omitted to say that the very same book he quotes, the Naval Digest, 1916, specifically states on the very same pages, numbers 500 and 501, that "public reprimand, even as a part of a court martial, is not favored by the Navy."

To railroad Crommelin they had to go far back. That Naval Digest, published in 1916, was quoting naval law as far back as 1893 and 1864. I know Admiral Sherman will have the greatest difficulty trying to produce before the congressional investigation committee which will be formed a single instance where the chief of naval operations has acted in this manner in the last 50 years. The best research lawyers have been unable to produce a single case in the last 30 years, as this goes to press.

Admiral Sherman quoted to me the directive of the Secretary of the Navy, dated January 7, 1949. He neglected to state the directive of Secretary of Defense Johnson, dated June 8, 1949, 6 months after, in which the Navy Department, along with the other armed services, was directed to lift the gag on all officers except for material which was classified "for security reasons." Captain Crommelin was also prepared to prove that the confidential dispatch in answer to which Admiral Bogan's letter was written had been opened to the public by direction of the Secretary of the Navy some 10 days previous to Captain Crommelin's release of Admiral Bogan's letter. In short, Capt. Crommelin has been sentenced, without trial, for making public an answer to a letter which the Secretary of the Navy himself had made public 10 days before.

These are only a few of the legal points in the greatest outrage in the history of military justice since the framing of Captain Dreyfus. As a few more, the Naval Digest, upon which Admiral Sherman relies, isn't even naval law. It is a mere reference book and states so on its very first page. It is the opinion of able counsel that the authorities cited by Admiral Sherman are nullified by United States Code of 1935. Further, in order to bar Captain Crommelin without trial, it was necessary, according to legal experts, to hold that his superiors had sweeping rights over his conscience. Apparently Admiral Sherman has forgotten that we hanged the Nazi generals for blindly obeying Hitler's orders.

Saturday's headlines were misleading. They stated "the Navy was through with the Crommelin case." The Navy may be, but the Crommelin case is not through with Admiral Sherman; nor is the Congress of the United States. Unlike Captain Crommelin, who got no open trial, Admiral Sherman will have full opportunity to explain to the Senate just how the Navy's first airman got the illegal reprimand in his record, which under ordinary circumstances would forever stop his promotion, and he will be asked if, as the AP stated on November 8, he called Crommelin before him, without counsel, and told him if he would avoid "controversial subjects" he would be free to speak in Montgomery, Ala. (Free to speak.)

Crommelin refused. He was hit shortly thereafter with a reprimand. What happened to the Bill of Rights? Doesn't Admiral Sherman know the Constitution of the United States is specifically made a part of naval laws? The trees over Thomas Jefferson's grave at Monticello must be weeping.

As the historic case of Capt. John Crommelin moves to the floor of the United States Senate and the United States Supreme Court issues even greater than freedom of speech are presented. The Congress of the United States has been defied, according to leading Senators and Congressmen, in its efforts to obtain information so that it can perform its constitutional duties. Members of Congress have charged naval officers are being railroaded to naval Siberias for daring to answer the lawful questions of Congress.

To his defense have already come United States Senators of both parties. They are prepared, I am informed, to act not only as his counsel but to take the stand to testify to his public service for the very act for which he has been condemned. High-ranking officers of the Navy will testify that he is, contrary to Admiral Sherman's censure, entitled to hold positions of highest trust and honor. (The enemy Japs—and his two brothers killed in action—are the best testimony on that.) Literally thousands of Americans of very high standing in their community are clamoring to rebut Admiral Sherman's public reprimand.

There will be no admiral's star on Captain Crommelin's shoulder, according to Washington insiders. But that will mean one star has gone from the American flag.

Address by Hon. Scott W. Lucas, of Illinois, at Convention of National Association of Postmasters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], the majority leader, at the convention of the National Association of Postmasters.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, fellow Democrats [applause], I want to take this opportunity of expressing to my old friend, Burris Jackson, my deep gratitude for the kind and tolerant remarks that he made about me in that very generous introduction. I found out in my political career that I always go best, as far as applause is concerned, when I speak to postmasters. [Applause.]

That is especially true with Illinois postmasters [applause], and I know there are a large number of them in attendance at this wonderful convention.

Your distinguished chairman has spoken somewhat briefly about the Senator from Illinois being the majority leader in the United States Senate, and I thank him for those kind things that he said about that position. Yet I come before this intelligent group of people to advise you that I doubt if there is another position in public life today that is so difficult as being the majority leader of the United States Senate. We have a majority in the United States Senate of Democrats. Sometimes I think in theory only. [Laughter.] That is, when I see some of my colleagues voting some other way.

You who have followed the history of the Eighty-first Congress well realize that upon a great number of the votes upon highly important and controversial matters, it was a question of touch and go as to whether or not we could win the day.

You who are not familiar with parliamentary procedure must remember that we of the United States Senate in this greatest legislative hall in all of the world have no rule of relevancy. We have no rule of germaneness. An indvidual Senator who is recognized by the Vice President can stand on his feet and talk as long as there is breath in his body. In fact, not long ago they provided a new device to carry on a filibuster in the United States Senate.

A SEATED FILIBUSTER

My good friend, Senator LANGER, from North Dakota, who is a friend of the postmasters, was carrying on a filibuster just at the close of the session. While the Senator from Illinois and other Senators were away from the Chamber for lunch, and only two or three Senators were on the floor, the Senator from North Dakota asked unanimous consent that he might be seated and read his speech instead of standing. [Laughter.] Nobody objected, and it was granted. Under the rules of the Senate, you can drive a donkey or an elephant down the aisle under unanimous consent and agreement if nobody objects. We do have privileges a lot of other folks do not.

I came in the Senate and learned what had happened, and I saw my friend, LANGER, sitting at the desk pounding it as usual in the great speeches he sometimes makes, and I took exception to what had happened, because, ladies and gentlemen, we must carry on and maintain the integrity and the dignity of the United States Senate. In the Senate of the United States is the last bulwark of free legislative and independent government, and under no circumstances can we as Members of that great body permit the Senate to deteriorate either in integrity or dignity because if that should happen, then government in the United States could well be on its way out.

In these perilous and difficult times through which this great Nation is passing, never was it so important for men and women who serve in that body or in the body on the other side of the Capitol to give the best that is in them to carry on in the great traditions of the founding fathers of the Constitution of the United States in order that America may continue to lead the rest of the world under a form of government which has never been equaled or surpassed in all of the annals of time. It is only because of that type of representative government that we have been able to do the things that are so necessary and so vital in this turbulent and topsy-turvy world today.

Your presence here indicates that you people here have a right to come and hold your convention in a free and open spot. This is one of the few places in the world where you could really do this. Those who oppose our way of life would not permit you to do what you are doing today unless you had permission from some top man in the Kremlin.

We believe, ladies and gentlemen, that what we have accomplished under a democracy has never been equaled, will never be equaled, irrespective of any other type or form of government. When we look about today and see what we have in this Nation, in the way of happiness and prosperity, what we are doing in the Congress of the United States in our efforts to bring about a universal peace for all mankind, every American should cherish from his boot tops up for the fact that he lives as an American under the Stars and Stripes. [Applause.]

INTERESTED IN POSTAL SERVICE

As you know, I have always been deeply interested in the progress of the postal service and the advancement of postmasters and the highly skilled men and women who serve in our post offices.

I presume other speakers have told you about the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress, but I shall repeat them. A

number of laws have been put into effect which will be of great benefit to postal employees; will improve our entire postal service system.

I take great satisfaction in the fact that the Eighty-first Congress has done more for the American postal service than any other Congress in our recent history, and facts will prove what I say. [Applause.]

We have authorized a research and development program in the Post Office Department which will be devoted to the modernization of equipment, the creation of new methods of handling mail, and the introduction of new devices to give the American people better postal service than they have ever received before. Experts of the Commission on Reorganization of the Government, headed by our former President Hoover, have estimated that the research and scientific development program could result in a savings of $80,000,000 a year.

While the various branches of the Post Office Department have been very progressive in the development of equipment and efficient methods, it became evident that much more could be accomplished by establishing a special office of research which would have the particular duty of making further improvements. The Hoover Commission, in its report on the post office, declared: "If the postal establishment is to be operated as a business enterprise, organized research will become increasingly important in order to remove guesswork from the formulation of service policies."

I know that plans are progressing for the development of mechanical mail sorting, and the use of other devices to expedite the movement of the enormous volume of mail passing through our magnificent postal system.

I might leave my manuscript for a moment to tell you good people that I presume every office in the United States Senate is like mine, and if that is true, there is more mail going through that office today than at any time in the history of the Nation. In other words, more people are writing about their problems and about legislation than at any time in the past. Believe it or not, the office of Senator LUCAS sends out on an average of 25,000 communications to his people in Illinois each month, a regular mail-order house, so to speak. [Laughter.]

We try to answer all of our mail. Sometimes you may get a form letter. If you do, it is only because of the lack of help and we cannot give you a personalized letter.

While the various branches of the Post Office Department have been very progressive in the development of equipment and efficient methods, much work can be accomplished by establishing a special office of research which I talked about a moment ago.

Another action which will improve the postal service available to the American people was the enactment by this Congress of a bill to give postal employees a salary increase of $120 a year. The post office has many thousands of workers who have been in the postal system for many years, and the Congress recognized the fact by placing a special provision in the pay-raise bill to give additional compensation to employees who have long records of service.

Longevity increases are given under the new law in three stages: $100 for those who have served 13 years; another $100 for those with 18 years of duty, and a third increase of $100 for those who have been on the job for a quarter of a century. Those who have served for 25 years or more will receive all three of the $100 longevity increases in addition to the flat pay increase of $120. That means that many postmasters who have made the postal service their life work will obtain a total increase of $420 a year.

SALARY ADJUSTMENTS FAVORED

While this increase is fairly substantial, I do not believe it is enough to bring the scale of compensation for postmasters, assistant postmasters' and postal supervisors to the level appropriate for their responsibilities. [Applause.] At this session of the Congress, I introduced a bill to adjust the pay of assistant postmasters and other executives in the postal field service. Hearings were held last May by the Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and my bill was discussed along with the general postal pay raise bill and other measures affecting the postal system. The committee then prepared its own bill, S. 1978, which includes all the provisions of my bill with a few minor changes and a special section designed to reclassify the pay of postmasters.

I was informed by the Postmaster General, the Bureau of the Budget, and the chairman of the Post Office Committee that there should be further study before a bill for a complete reclassification of the salaries of postmasters could be recommended for final passage by the Congress. I understand that S. 1978 was based upon suggestions made by the National Association of Postmasters, the organization now meeting here today. Let me assure you that the bill to give postmasters the salary scale they should have certainly will receive early consideration at the next session of the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.]

The laws passed by this Congress to modernize the postal system and to lift the level of postal pay rates are examples of the kind of progressive legislation which we have been able to achieve under the leadership of this administration.

Reorganization of the Post Office Department was one of the seven reorganization plans submitted to Congress by President Truman. It was one of the six plans which went into effect with the tacit approval of the Senate and the House of Representatives. The only plan which was not accepted by the Congress was the President's proposal to establish a Department of Welfare to replace the Federal Security Agency. The six plans now in operation will streamline several important agencies of the Government and will make possible the eventual saving of hundreds of millions of dollars annually for the benefit of American taxpayers.

If I may diverge for a moment, the President of the United States, with whom I have the great honor of meeting every Monday morning when the Senate of the United States is in session, has advised me that when we return in January that a great number of other reorganization plans will be sent to the Congress for their approval, and when these reorganization plans finally get to work, with the elimination of useless employees and the overlapping and duplication of effort, we believe that we can save billions of dollars, presuming, of course, that the Hoover Commission is correct in their conclusion.

Leaving the postal bills for a moment, briefly discussing some of the other things that happened in the Congress of the United States, and since I received a rather generous applause when I said fellow Democrats a moment ago, I do not hesitate to make just a few political implications as I go along. [Laughter and applause.]

OTHER LEGISLATION DISCUSSED

One of the most important pieces of legislation that we passed during this session, and which is now a public law, signed by the President of the United States, was the housing bill. The result of the housing bill that was passed is that some 810,000 new units will be on their way in a short while, giving to those in the low-income groups a right to have a decent home where they can rear a family. In that same bill we appropriated money to eliminate the slums in some of the great cities of this Nation.

You know, a great number of people fought the housing bill, and have been fighting it for years, on the theory that it will invade the field of free enterprise. Others have the temerity to call it a socialistic movement. Well, a good many Republicans are on that socialistic line, if it is so.

What will happen in the slum areas is this, and what is happening today, you and I know: There is where poverty, diseases, and crime breed, and out of that sort of an environment comes the virus of communism, and that is the very reason, ladies and gentlemen, that I, for one, stood four square behind the housing bill that was passed in the United States Senate some time ago. [Applause.]

We passed a bill known as Federal aid to education, which costs money, but unless the youth of this Nation is properly educated, to meet the test of tomorrow, no one knows what will happen to this great Nation of ours.

We believe that we have passed in the Senate of the United States a bill which takes care of all religious faiths. That was stymied in the House of Representatives, but we have every reason to believe that that bill which has been a part of the Democratic platform for years will be enacted into law before we conclude the second half of the Eighty-first Congress. [Applause.]

Another important bill that you people who live in the rural areas will surely understand came about this time when we introduced a measure to amend the Commodity Credit Corporation charter. You will recall the Eightieth Congress, the Republicans, took from the Secretary of Agriculture the power to acquire and lease additional storage facilities about a year ago this time.

You will recall down through the Corn Belt section of Illinois, where I happen to live, and all through the Corn Belt section of the Midwest, farmers were selling their corn, at least the surplus that they could not sell, at a tremendous sacrifice that did as much, in my opinion, to elect Harry Truman President as any single thing, so far as the farmers are concerned. [Applause.]

So we recognized that evil. Under this Congress, we corrected it. All you have to do is to go into any section of Illinois now and hear the hum of the hammer and saw, building additional storage facilities to take care of the farmer who was denied that right under the previous Eightieth Republican controlled Congress.

We are going to take care of the farmer. We always have and if he is a smart fellow, and I believe he is, he is going to stay with us again when these campaigns come along. [Applause.]

Another thing we did was to increase the minimum wage from 40 to 75 cents an hour, long past due, ladies and gentlemen, to a group of individual white collar people in this country who have no one to represent them in the Congress of the United States, the white-collar crowd who have no leaders as do the other great labor organizations. They are here and they are there and they depend upon me and the others to see that they get their just due. We believe that we have done something worth while to give to that underpaid fellow at least the minimum of 75 cents an hour, so that he, too, can put shoes on the feet of his kids and buy the kind of food that they need in order to make them healthy children in this great land of ours. [Applause.]

FOREIGN AFFAIRS RECORD

In the field of foreign affairs, you know what we have done over the protests of a certain small group of isolationists in this country. They are in the Senate and they are in the House of Representatives. They are out here in the Midwest. We tried isolationism once in 1917. We tried it again just before we got into World War II. It has not worked. It never will work in this atomic age, irrespective of what any one man may say, and under the bipartisan foreign policy of the United States Congress, we have brought forth to this Nation and to

the world a sound, progressive, far-reaching foreign policy which we believe will bring to the peoples of this earth an everlasting and a durable peace. [Applause.]

My friends, I do not tell you that what we are doing is not a calculated risk. I do not know whether we will succeed or not. But what is the alternative if we do not go through with the continuation of aid to Turkey and aid to Greece, continuation of the Marshall plan, continuation of the Atlantic Pact and the implementation thereof with the assistance arms program? The alternative is to come back here in this isolated shell of the United States of America, build an iron wall around this great country of ours, and instead of appropriating $15,000,000,000 for national defense, you will appropriate three times that much, yes, five times that much, in short order, that we may prepare for the oncoming day when the Soviet crowd will challenge us in an aggressive way.

So long, ladies and gentlemen, as we can keep France and England and these other countries, keep their economic position strong, keep them from going to the communistic regime, we are doing just that much to keep communism away from the shores of this great country of ours.

You know, France and Italy had a pretty close call. A year ago this time I was in those countries. I visited Turkey, I visited Greece, Germany, Italy, France, and Spain. I heard the people on the streets talking. I heard them in high places discussing the question and they literally went for the things that America had done for them, regardless of what anyone says to the contrary. They are appreciative people. They are a grateful people and what we have done through the extension of the Marshall plan to those democracies of Europe has stopped the spread of communism from riding herd over all of those great countries. When President Truman not long ago announced to the world that Russia had acquired the atomic bomb, it became even more clear than ever as to the necessity for our carrying on a firm, rigid foreign policy against any aggressor who seeks to challenge the American way of life.

I want to say to you that in the opinion of the experts in Washington, the moment that we entered the Atlantic Pact, that was the beginning of the end of the cold war around Berlin. The blockade was lifted thereafter. They have been getting along pretty well with those fellows since that time.

NOT SEEKING TROUBLE

We are not looking for trouble. We are only looking for peace. We fought two wars. We have asked for nothing. We give and give and give. It is what we do in order to just be left alone, that we might continue on and develop our way of life in this country of ours.

There is no territory that we asked for, no reparations, no aggrandizement of property, nothing except the good will of other nations of the earth.

I have always believed that there was room enough in this world for Russia and the United States to live, notwithstanding the difference in the ideologies that are expressed in the two nations, and Russia may realiz that some day. At least we hope that she does.

This great bipartisan foreign policy being carried on at the present time under the leadership of the great Senator from Texas, the distinguished TOM CONNALLY, a Democrat, who is a close friend of Burris Jackson's [applause], and on the Republican side we go to Michigan and find the ranking minority member on the Committee on Foreign Affairs, that statesman, one of the greatest statesmen of all times, ARTHUR VANDENBERG, a Republican, ladies and gentlemen. [Applause.]

When you realize that VANDENBERG and CONNALLY and every other member of the Committee on Foreign Relations, whether they are Democrats or Republicans, have reported out on all of these bills this year unanimously, you understand the power that exists in that one committee as far as this country and the world is concerned, and it must continue to be that way. I will take VANDENBERG's ideas on foreign policy rather than some isolationist out here in the Midwest or any other place, ladies and gentlemen. [Applause.]

I think perhaps I have the score.

I do not believe I have. I thought I had the figures on the number of votes, but as I recall, on the Atlantic Pact, there were only 12 United States Senators who voted against the Atlantic Pact. There were only 6 in final analysis who voted against the continuation of the Marshall plan, although they were in there with crippling amendments attempting to defeat indirectly what they could not do directly, ladies and gentlemen.

This has been a Congress that stayed on the job, while the Eightieth Congress ran away, and we have accomplished a tremendous program of good. We have carried out many a point of the Democratic platform and we are only half through. We have another second half of the Eighty-first Congress session to go.

You know, when we go back, we do not have to go through the organization of committees, assignment of bills, hearings, and so forth. Everything that is on the calendar at the present time will be ready for consideration the moment we return. So consequently we will lose no time. We will move right in, a couple of days after the 3d of January, discussing and debating important legislation that affects the general welfare of all of the American people.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have been in the Senate of the United States for the last 13 years, that is, the last 11 years, I served as a Member of the House of Representatives for 4 years before that. All in all I have been in Congress some 15 years. I have seen a good many things happen during that time. But I repeat what I said a moment ago, that I do not believe that in the 15 years that I have been there, that I have seen more controversial, more important legislation that affects the welfare of the people of the world than exists at the present time. It is a difficult job for any Senator, a difficult job for any leader. All that the Senator from Illinois is attempting to do is to do what he believes is right.

I do not say that I am always right, but I pray God that I am right, and then vote accordingly.

TRIBUTE TO HADERLEIN

You have all been very kind to listen to me. Before I retire, I want to pay just a tribute to my friend, the postmaster of the city of Chicago, who has been your host. He has not been in the post office too long, but he is a wonderful fellow, and I predict for him one of the best careers of any postmaster in any big city in the United States. He has made friends by the thousands already. He is running an efficient office over there. I am glad to pay this tribute to my friend, John Haderlein. [Applause.]

If any of you folks are coming to Washington next year while we are in session, and if the Senator from Illinois can do anything for you, just call me. If you cannot come, write me. That is your privilege under the Constitution, to write your Senator. Present your grievances to him or to your Congressman.

You may not get the answer you want, but you will get an answer of some kind.

Thank you so much.

Essay on Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to direct the attention of the House to certain passages in a book which I think may certainly be considered one of the English classics, but which, like other classics, is not as much read as it should be. I refer to the essay On Liberty written by the great British philosopher John Stuart Mill and published by him in the year 1859. In the closing chapter of the book in which he discusses practical applications of the limits to the authority of society over the individual, the writer gives a statement of objections to Government interference which I think we might all do well to keep in mind. So much am I impressed with the force of what the writer says that I should be glad to see it in the RECORD at the beginning of every session. Even the reference to Russia, although it is a reference to the Russia of the czars, is probably fairly apt when applied to the Russia of the Soviet Union.

The language to which I refer is as follows:

The objections to government interference, when it is not such as to involve infringement of liberty, may be of three kinds.

The first is, when the thing to be done is likely to be better done by individuals than by the government. Speaking generally, there is no one so fit to conduct any business, or to determine how or by whom it shall be conducted, as those who are personally interested in it. This principle condemns the interferences, once so common, of the legislature, or the officers of government, with the ordinary processes of industry. But this part of the subject has been sufficiently enlarged upon by political economists, and is not particularly related to the principles of this essay.

The second objection is more nearly allied to our subject. In many cases, though individuals may not do the particular thing so well, on the average, as the officers of government, it is nevertheless desirable that it should be done by them, rather than by the government, as a means to their own mental education—a mode of strengthening their active faculties, exercising their judgment, and giving them a familiar knowledge of the subjects with which they are thus left to deal. This is a principal, though not the sole, recommendation of jury trial (in cases not political); of free and popular local and municipal institutions; of the conduct of industrial and philanthropic enterprises by voluntary associations. These are not questions of liberty, and are connected with that subject only by remote tendencies; but they are questions of development. It belongs to a different occasion from the present to dwell on these things as parts of national education; as being, in truth, the peculiar training of a citizen, the practical part of the political education of a free people, taking them out of the narrow circle of personal and family selfishness, and accustoming them to the comprehension of joint interests, the management of joint concerns—habituating them to act from public or semi-public motives, and guide their conduct by aims

which unite instead of isolating them from one another. Without these habits and powers, a free constitution can neither be worked nor preserved; as is exemplified by the too-often transitory nature of political freedom in countries where it does not rest upon a sufficient basis of local liberties. The management of purely local business by the localities, and of the great enterprises of industry by the union of those who voluntarily supply the pecuniary means, is further recommended by all the advantages which have been set forth in this essay as belonging to individuality of development, and diversity of modes of action. Government operations tend to be everywhere alike. With individuals and voluntary associations, on the contrary, there are varied experiments, and endless diversity of experience. What the State can usefully do is to make itself a central depository and active circulator and diffuser, of the experience resulting from many trials. Its business is to enable each experimentalist to benefit by the experiments of others; instead of tolerating no experiments but its own.

The third and most cogent reason for restricting the interference of government is the great evil of adding unnecessarily to its power. Every function superadded to those already exercised by the government causes its influence over hopes and fears to be more widely diffused, and converts, more and more, the active and ambitious part of the public into hangers-on of the government, or of some party which aims at becoming the government. If the roads, the railways, the banks, the insurance offices, the great joint-stock companies, the universities, and the public charities, were all of them branches of the government; if, in addition, the municipal corporations and local boards, with all that now devolves on them, became departments of the central administration; if the employees of all these different enterprises were appointed and paid by the government, and looked to the government for every rise in life; not all the freedom of the press and popular constitution of the legislature would make this or any other country free otherwise than in name. And the evil would be greater, the more efficiently and scientifically the administrative machinery was constructed—the more skillful the arrangements for obtaining the best qualified hands and heads with which to work it. In England it has of late been proposed that all the members of the civil service of government should be selected by competitive examination, to obtain for these employments the most intelligent and instructed persons procurable; and much has been said and written for and against this proposal. One of the arguments most insisted on by its opponents is that the occupation of a permanent official servant of the state does not hold out sufficient prospects of emolument and importance to attract the highest talents, which will always be able to find a more inviting career in the professions, or in the service of companies and other public bodies. One would not have been surprised if this argument had been used by the friends of the proposition, as an answer to its principal difficulty. Coming from the opponents it is strange enough. What is urged as an objection is the safety valve of the proposed system. If indeed all the high talent of the country could be drawn into the service of the government, a proposal tending to bring about that result might well inspire uneasiness. If every part of the business of society which required organized concert, or large and comprehensive views, were in the hands of the government, and if government offices were universally filled by the ablest men, all the enlarged culture and practiced intelligence in the country, except the purely speculative, would be concentrated in a numerous bureaucracy, to whom alone the rest of the community would look for all things: The multitude for direction and dictation in all they had to do; the able and aspiring for personal advancement. To be admitted into the ranks of this bureaucracy, and when admitted, to rise therein, would be the sole objects of ambition. Under this regime, not only is the outside pubic ill-qualified, for want of practical experience, to criticize or check the mode of operation of the bureaucracy, but even if the accidents of despotic or the natural working of popular institutions occasionally raise to the summit a ruler or rulers of reforming inclinations, no reform can be effected which is contrary to the interest of the bureaucracy. Such is the melancholy condition of the Russian Empire, as shown in the accounts of those who have had sufficient opportunity of observation. The Czar himself is powerless against the bureaucratic body; he can send any one of them to Siberia, but he cannot govern without them, or against their will. On every decree of his they have a tacit veto, by merely refraining from carrying it into effect. In countries of more advanced civilization and of a more insurrectionary spirit, the public, accustomed to expect everything to be done for them by the state, or at least to do nothing for themselves without asking from the state not only leave to do it, but even how it is to be done, naturally hold the state responsible for all evil which befalls them, and when the evil exceeds their amount of patience, they rise against the government, and make what is called a revolution; whereupon somebody else, with or without legitimate authority from the nation, vaults into the seat, issues his orders to the bureaucracy, and everything goes on much as it did before; the bureaucracy being unchanged, and nobody else being capable of taking their place.

The Dogged Retreat of the Doctors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, at this time the country is being flooded with misleading literature put out by an advertising firm with more regard for sensationalism than accuracy, in opposition to Government health insurance. Millions of dollars, levied by a compulsory tax on doctors, are being spent to mislead people on the issue of paying their doctor and hospital bills through a national health-insurance fund raised by pay-roll taxes.

"The Dogged Retreat of the Doctors," an excellent article by Milton Mayer in Harper's Magazine for December, gives the history of the American Medical Association's position on health insurance over several decades and discusses the real facts on the need for improved medical economics in the United States. Everyone who seeks a real understanding of the struggle for a better system of distributing medical care will want to read this article. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include it in the RECORD, as follows:

THE DOGGED RETREAT OF THE DOCTORS

(By Milton Mayer)

I

The American Medical Association spent the best years of its life defending things as they were, and things as they were weren't good; too many people were getting too little medical care too late. The defender in chief of things as they were was Morris Fishbein. Fishbein, though his title was only editor of the Journal of the AMA, was the voice of medicine from 1924 to 1949, and there were those who suspected that he was medicine's master as well as its voice. The suspicion was unfounded; no man, not even Morris Fishbein, makes that much history all by himself.

He did the doctors' thinking for them, but that didn't mean they didn't like it. The problem of medical care was no business of the public, still less of the Government. The medical profession was competent to deal with it, and why did it need dealing with anyway? Wasn't American medicine the best in the world, just as Fishbein said? Why socialize it, in Fishbein's words, just because of what Fishbein called local inequalities? And even if it were true that a majority of the American people could not afford the cost of chronic or catastrophic illness, why didn't they, as Fishbein suggested, save their money for a rainy day?

The thinking was fine. What the doctors didn't like was the declining market for it, and they blamed the decline on Fishbein. England had fallen, the thirty-ninth nation to succumb to socialized medicine—that is, government medical insurance. The public demand that something be done was reflected by successive bills in Congress and by President Truman's call for legislation last spring. More and more medical-school professors were on the wrong side. More and more bona fide doctors were on the wrong side. Gosh—even Barney Baruch was on the wrong side. So last June the AMA performed an autolaryngectomy. The voice of medicine was removed.

The inference, perhaps even the implication, is that Fishbein had misrepresented the doctors' position. The fact is that he had represented it—right into the ground—and the fact is confirmed by the further fact that the association's last-ditch struggle against reform has continued, deeper in the ditch than ever. "You have got to understand," said one of the high holies of medicine, who would rather be found installing goat glands than have his name mentioned, "that Fishbein really represented what the doctors think are their interests. Mind you, I said 'think.' "

The trouble with the AMA is that there are too many doctors in it. A doctor is, by definition, a man who doesn't have time. One of the things the average doctor doesn't have time to do is catch up with the things he didn't learn in school, and one of the things he didn't learn in school is the nature of human society, its purposes, its history, and its needs. There are hundreds—many hundreds—of exceptions among them. But there are thousands—140,000—of doctors in the AMA.

If medicine is necessarily a mystery to the average layman, nearly everything else is necessarily a mystery to the average doctor. Medical education is uniquely narrow, intense, and protracted. The doctor is the specialist par excellence. And his specialization doesn't end with his entrance into practice. The developments in medicine come so fast that the conscientious practitioner has no time to interest himself in the common concerns of citizens.

All these circumstances are common knowledge, but commonly known circumstances have consequences, too. The doctor—the average doctor—is a nice fellow to have around the house or the hospital. His self-sacrifice for his patients is proverbial and proverbially true. But he sometimes breaks down in the larger areas of social intercourse because his training and his calling break down there. And the medical calling, like others that deal with bodies qua bodies,

has a peculiar attraction to the socially circumscribed personality. "Of course I dislike the AMA," said one of Chicago's most distinguished surgeons a few years ago, "but I'm not going to get mixed up in any row. I dislike politics, too. If I had liked politics, I wouldn't have gone into surgery."

Because he dislikes politics, this particular surgeon's office is a precinct headquarters today in the AMA's $2,000,000 campaign to terrify him into terrifying his patients into terrifying their Congressmen to vote against socialized medicine. His office wall is ornamented with a jumbo reproduction of the heartbreaking painting, The Doctor, emblazoned with the heartbreaking appeal, keep politics out of 'his picture. His reception room is stacked with with red-white-and-blue pamphlets titled, "The Voluntary Way Is the American Way," containing some truth, some distortions, and some outright misinformation. His bills are covered with stickers reading, "As your personal physician * * * please write your United States Senators and Representatives. For more information, ask me." It is all furnished free, in unlimited quantities, by the National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association, Whitaker & Baker, directors. "I wish we had Fishbein back," he says, "I don't like politics. That's why I went into surgery."

II

Back in 1901 the AMA, after a half-century of high-minded obscurity, was told by its committee on reorganization that "if the association would give sanction to its recommendations the profession throughout the country in 5 years would be welded into a compact organization whose power to influence medicine would be almost unlimited and whose requests for desirable legislation would everywhere be met with that respect which the politician has for organized votes." In those days organized medicine, more medical than organizational, was interested in raising the standards of medical education and hospital service and extending medical care. The streamlining was effective; in the next few years the AMA brought about licensure of medical schools and hospitals and obtained the adoption of the first Pure Food and Drug Act. The streamlining also relieved the membership of politics; in 1937 the association was able to report that "attempts were being made"—obviously in vain—"to cause the association to send a questionnaire to every physician in the United States in order to determine his point of view regarding the socialization of medicine."

The streamlining made AMA membership automatic through membership in the county or county-group medical societies, the constituent bodies which send delegates to the State societies, which in turn send delegates to the "legislative policy-making" body of 190, the AMA house of delegates. The delegates meet twice a year to ratify, in practice, the proposals of the board of trustees, which, in principle, is responsible to the house. When the board, which had in the past unanimously supported Fishbein, announced its unanimous recommendation of his dismissal last June, the house unanimously approved.

There are no dues in the AMA, but a subscription to the Journal makes a member a fellow—the Fishbein touch—entitled to hold office in the association. The various councils test pharmaceuticals, foods, cosmetics, and appliances; they also approve medical schools and hospitals. AMA approval is accepted by State licensing boards for medical-school graduates, and hospitals without AMA certification for intern training are almost impossible to staff. These life-and-death powers bind medical schools and the hospitals to the AMA chariot.

The drug manufacturers also have a natural community of interest with the AMA, but the AMA does not rely on naturopathy. Its seal of approval is the pearl beyond price of drug advertising, and the manufacturers and the retailers are ever ready to set their hand to the preservation of the fundamental American liberties of the men in white.

No government would lightly launch an attack upon such a Wehrmacht or fight the doctors frontally on the issue of insurance. If the doctors maintained a united front, the Government might get medical insurance but no medicine. "You can't mine coal"—or gallstones—"with flags." The adoption of Government insurance has encountered bitter resistance from the profession in most countries; in Germany in 1883 and in England in 1911 organized medicine actually called a strike, which failed in both cases for the same reason, namely, that a majority of the practitioners preferred the future contingency of slavery to the present certainty of starvation. But the AMA has spurned the strike proposal, currently advanced by a group called the Association of American Physicians and Surgeons, as "a strike against the sick public." Doctors are professional men.

Or so they think until they run up against the AMA lock-out. Expulsion from the association, invariably preceded or followed by expulsion from the county and State societies, is a doctor's death warrant. Once expulsion meant charlatanism; today it more often means political deviationism. In 1930 Dr. Louis Schmidt, the urologist, courted and won expulsion for advertising his VD clinic to the poor. The Journal addressed itself, not to the great Schmidt, but to the little Smiths: "The individual who violates the rules in a zealous search for an answer to the problem"—of extending medical care—"may overstep the bounds and thereby suffer loss of his relationships to the organized medical profession. When he does so, he is answerable to his own folly, since the organized medical profession has established means whereby an individual may assure himself that the system which he wishes to practice is for the public good and at the same time not a detriment to the practice of medicine." There, beneath the gauze of gobbledygook, was the party line; all who ran might read.

Last spring some 140 doctors who disapproved of Government insurance publicly protested the AMA's $25 assessment for its "national education campaign" against the Truman health program. They suggested that the fund be used to work out a better medical program than Truman's. One of the group, a prominent pediatrician, received a letter from the State health officer of Arkansas a few days after the protest was published: " * * * The Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaiski County Medical Society have been advised through authoritative sources that you were one of the 136 signers of certain papers and documents severely criticizing the American Medical Association. Through this action on your part, the Arkansas State Medical Society and the Pulaski County Medical Society request that you not appear on the postgraduate pediatric course to be conducted [at the University of Arkansas]. * * * This department sincerely regrets that this most embarrassing situation has arisen and further regrets that it is necessary to cancel your appointment as special consultant for the Arkansas State Board of Health."

The officers and the trustees of the AMA are almost invariably prosperous specialists. And the members of the house of delegates are almost invariably selected by committees appointed by the presidents of the State societies, who are almost invariably prosperous specialists. The association's leadership represents the members, but it may not be impossible that it represents them not as they are, but as they would like to be. It certainly does not represent the ill-fed one-third of the medical profession. In the monthly Medical Economics, we learn that "the delegates [to the December 1946 meeting] met in an atmosphere of high optimism over the national [Eightieth congressional] election results. Dr. Harrison Shoulders, AMA president, put into words: 'For the first time in many years, we're meeting in an atmosphere that approaches freedom.' "

The high optimism of the AMA was not always based on the national election results. Once upon a time its leaders were the leaders of advance in medical education and medical practice. Once upon a time its presidents—Billings, Gorgas, Blue, Bevan, Lambert, Harris—advocated Government medical insurance and its committee on social insurance prepared a model bill providing it. Once upon a time its house of delegates adopted its board of trustees' report that "the time has come when we can no longer resist the social movement, and it is better that we should initiate the social changes than have them forced on us," and its Journal demanded Government insurance and excorciated the British Medical Association for opposing it.

But that was once upon a time. The British Medical Association had opposed the National Health Insurance Act of 1911, which provided government medical insurance of low-income workers. Within a year after its adoption, more than half the doctors in England were voluntarily enrolled, and the BMA was forced to release its members from the association's refusal to work the act. "The important feature of the British Act," said the Journal of the American Medical Association in 1912, "is the recognition that it is the duty of society, as represented by the government, to furnish medical treatment for those who are unable to secure it for themselves. It also means the recognition of the modern physician as a health officer of the State, working for the general good, rather than a private or professional businessman."

In 1915, community sickness surveys by the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., the New York State Board of Charities, and other agencies revealed an appalling inadequacy of medical care, and the AMA established its social-insurance committee. In its first report the committee asserted that after 25 years of experience with various forms of voluntary insurance several European countries realized that the "logical conclusion" was compulsory state insurance. This, in the committee's opinion, was the only solution to the problem of the poor and the problem, as well, of "the unfortunate physician facing starvation."

In its second report, a year later, the committee said that wherever compulsory insurance had been introduced, the result had been improvement in the general health and prolonged life to the workers. "The advantages of these systems are so great that the disadvantages, while it is necessary to combat them, cannot be mentioned in comparison * * *. Blind opposition, indignant repudiation, bitter denunciation of these laws is worse than useless; it leads nowhere and it leaves the profession in a position of helplessness if the rising tide of social development sweeps over them." After listening to an attack on the report by a representative of the Prudential Life Insurance Co., the association's section on public health rejected it by a 24–20 vote. It was a narrow squeak.

"It is interesting to think," says the History of the American Medical Association, "what might have happened to social insurance if the war had not intervened." Though innumerable county and State societies had endorsed Government insurance and the model bill had been introduced in 14 legislatures, war prosperity reduced the

pressure for legislation, and postwar normalcy turned the tide. In spite of the plea by its president-elect that the AMA resist the insurance companies, which were lobbying against the bill, the 1919 convention recognized the stupendous character of the problem and buried the committee's report, along with the committee. "It is not a question for the decision of the medical profession," said the committee, "whether or not these laws shall be put in force. * * * It is for the profession to decide whether or not it wishes to carry on its existence under some form of sickness insurance or under some method of state medicine. That choice must inevitably be made."

The 1920 convention declared its opposition to the institution of any plan embodying a system of compulsory contributory insurance against illness. The 1921 convention spent its time defining state medicine and listening to emphatic denunciations of health centers, group medicine, and diagnostic clinics, and the 1922 convention declared its opposition to all forms of state medicine. The discussion was closed. The pages of the Journal were closed, too. In 1924, Assistant Editor Fishbein became Editor Fishbein, and Government insurance became socialized medicine, political medicine, assembly-line medicine, and peasant medicine. Medical service reform of any kind was thereafter damned from hell to breakfast and from week to week.

In darkest 1932, the Committee on the Costs of Medical Care, headed by Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, president of Stanford University and a former president of the AMA, recommended voluntary medical insurance. The Journal called the recommendation socialism and communism. But there were doctors whose shrunken stomachs would no longer tolerate epithets, and group practices with insurance plans sprang up everywhere. The Journal called them medical soviets. The hard-hit hospitals accepted the Blue Cross insurance plan. The AMA wouldn't touch it. Medical ethics required the doctor to serve the sick—and forbade him to solicit patients. Thousands of doctors sat in their offices—and waited; millions of sick persons lay in their homes—and waited. Maybe the Wilbur report was socialism and communism, but it revealed that in the peak year of 1929 one-third of the doctors in America had had net incomes under $3,000, and one-half under $3,800.

Though the AMA succeeded in eliminating a medical insurance provision from the Social Security Act of 1935, the California Medical Society had already established an insurance plan. Other States followed. The AMA could not purge whole State societies. It had to backwater. It began forgetting all about the evil of contract medicine and ended by pointing with pride to the State society plans as the alternative to Government insurance. It was the same with hospital insurance. By the end of the 1930's the Blue Cross plans were so well entrenched (over AMA opposition) that the association had to recognize them (on the condition, of course, that the doctor's bill remain uncovered). Three years ago, the Blue Shield plans for limited medical care were started. Last June the AMA declared a "complete separation" from Blue Shield, but an amiable one. The association could no longer afford to condemn the plans; it was using them as its stick to beat Government insurance.

The medical soviets—group practices with insurance plans of their own—which were outside the control of the State societies were given the old cold pogrom treatment. The Civic Medical Center of Chicago could not even find out why its staff was excluded by the Chicago Medical Society. Testifying before a Senate committee in 1946, a representative of the Center told of the effects of the blacklist. Because the AMA required local medical society membership for staff members of hospitals accredited for intern training, the center's physicians had access only to two inconveniently located hospitals, and, denied staff membership even in these, found it almost impossible to get beds for patients. The center's staff members were refused membership on the staff of any teaching or research institution. They were excluded from carrying their share of care of the indigent in hospital wards and dispensaries. They were refused accreditation by specialty boards. No insurance company would issue them malpractice policies. The Navy automatically disqualified them as medical officers, and riciprocal licensure in neighboring States was automatically closed to them.

The procedure was the same all over the country, in Dallas, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, Milwaukee, New York, and in little Elk City, Okla., where Dr. Michael Shadid's famous cooperative community hospital was supported by the local chamber of commerce. The quality of medical treatment was not questioned; the principle of insurance was decisive, and even this principle had to be abandoned when the State societies started their programs.

What did the AMA want? The conservative Medical Economics quoted a State society executive as saying: "I don't believe the AMA liked voluntary health insurance in the first place. I think the higher-ups would be glad to see them all fail. The AMA has tremendous power. It has some good men. It has lots of brains and lots of money. But it isn't interested. And that's too bad."

It was too bad, and it was getting worse. In 1937 a group of Government employees in Washington organized the Group Health Association for full medical care on an insurance basis, and when the Journal announced that "physicians who sell their services to an organization like the Group Health Association for resale to patients are certain to lose their professional status," Assistant Attorney General Arnold lifted his ears. The Medical Association of the District of Columbia initiated the pogrom—even threatening that members who consulted with group health doctors would be expelled—and when a group doctor was expelled in 1938 the Government brought suit against the AMA and the District of Columbia Medical Society for conspiracy in restraint of trade. The Supreme Court unanimously upheld the decision against the defendants in 1943. The AMA was told to cease and desist from its interference with medical practice and was fined $2,500.

Frustrated by the Federals, the AMA, like so many associations before and since, turned to the States for aid and abetment. In 1939 the New Jersey Legislature enacted a health-insurance-plan law providing that all members of the governing body of any such plan be approved by the State medical society and permitting such a plan to operate only in counties in which not less than 51 percent of the doctors approved it. Some 25 legislatures have since passed remarkably similar laws—most of them in the war-distracted sessions of 1943 and 1945. The State societies not only sponsored the laws, but proudly claimed paternity. The voluntary way, which was once socialism and communism, is now the American way, providing that the AMA has a monopoly on volunteering.

Enlightened conservatives within the profession pressed the AMA to stave off Government insurance with a genuine program of medical service reform. The committee of physicians—including such formidable names as Peters of New Haven, Holt of Baltimore, Cabot of Rochester, Morgan of Nashville, Veeder of St. Louis, Frothingham and Osgood of Boston, and Cooley of Detroit—came before the board to plead for a program. The upshot was still another promise of still another survey. But the surveys all came to nothing, and the committee of physicians abandoned hope in the AMA and accepted the principle of Government insurance. When President Truman proposed legislation in 1945, the association came up with a program which began with improved living conditions and ended with postponement of consideration of revolutionary changes while 60,000 medical men are in the service voluntarily and 12,000,000 men and women are in uniform.

It was not only the unions that demanded Government insurance now, or the radicals, the reformers, and Mrs. Roosevelt; it was also conservatives like A. D. Lasker, David Sarnoff, Gerard Swope, and Lessing Rosenwald. "Too many doctors," Bernard Baruch told some of them, "have been fighting a rear-guard action for too long. Voluntary health insurance is not good enough. A sizable segment of society does not earn enough to pay for it. Nothing has been suggested so far which promises success other than some form of insurance covering those people in by law and financed by the Government, at least in part. * * * A form of compulsory insurance can be devised without the Government's taking over medicine, something I would fiercely oppose."

Those who opposed the status quo in medical care were driven, nolo volo, into the Government insurance camp, while those who favored the status quo in everything else found in organized medicine a new sounding board. In 1938 the Physicians Committee for Free Enterprise in Medicine appeared, under the auspices of Frank Gannett's Committee to Uphold the Constitution. This committee evaporated a year later, and its place was taken by the National Physicians Committee for the Extension of Medical Care. Both physicians' committees, oddly enough, were directed by the same man, who, oddly enough, wasn't a physician but a professional advertising man. But the board members of the national physicians committee were all officers or past officers of the AMA or its State societies, and Morris Fishbein sat in on the committee's organization. The representatives of the big drug houses sat in, too.

The NPC had AMA approval and plenty of money. Twelve thousand newspapers received its canned editorials weekly, and a Nation-wide network of speakers was made available to civic, social, and fraternal organizations. At least 23,000,000 copies of its basic pamphlet were distributed under 2 different covers—1 for the medical profession under the title "$4,000,000,000 of Political Medicine Yearly in the United States," the other for businessmen under the title "Abolishing Private Medical Practice—Prelude to Centralized Control of the Professions and of Industry." The pamphlet depicted doctors under the Murray-Wagner-Dingell bill as "political stooges and henchmen" and called upon them to "demand a continuance of medicine under the Christian concept of the sanctity of the human personality—the American way."

The arsenal was down to the dumdum bullet that the AMA had never fired. Morris Fishbein had never been accused of anti-Semitism. A year ago the NPC sent every doctor in the country "one of the few really vital pronouncements of the age," a statement by Dan Gilbert, an old "sidekick" of the notorious Gerald Winrod. The statement began, "Dear Christian American." In the ensuing uproar, the Journal condemned the statement and repudiated "allies of doubtful repute in its campaign for the maintenance of a high quality of medical care and for freedom in medicine in our country."

III

Out of the welter of words there emerge—rather, there can be mined—one grand fancy and a half dozen grand facts on the issue of medical insurance.

The fancy, or hallucination, seems to be almost universal in the medical profession. The doctor thanks God that he is as other

men are. He is not. He sees himself as a free agent, with duties, to be sure, but with duties that are private and are due to private persons, in particular those private persons who pay him for his services. He calls himself a private practitioner. He is wrong.

His practice has been public, and a public duty, since the time of Moses, when the law was promulgated "of him in whom is the plague of leprosy, whose hand is not able to get that which pertaineth to his cleansing." "Medicine," said Wendell Berge, with less authority but more recency, "may or may not be state medicine; it cannot escape being social medicine." The doctor has always been "clothed with a public interest"; he has been licensed for centuries. He is not a tradesman, and he does not enjoy a tradesman's prerogatives or immunities; he has never been allowed to refuse his services or plead caveat emptor. The sliding scale of fees, asserted in Leviticus, attests his servitude to public need.

Medicine's ace in the hole, or Sunday punch, is the sacred relationship between doctor and patient. We are told that this sacred relationship would be destroyed by Government intervention. Besides being an ace in the hole and a Sunday punch, the sacred relationship is a bag of bones. Common kindness is sacred, but it isn't medical; as medicine, it is sacred only to the psychosomatist, not to the prostatist or the proctologist. The doctor's only sacred relationship—like the priest's, the teacher's, and, incidentally, the lawyer's—is to his profession. What makes a profession a profession is that it professes something, namely, the obligation of its practice. The doctor's profession obligates him to heal the sick, at any cost, at all costs, or at none, though the heavens fall, the landlord evicts, the shoe store replevins, and the public service corporation shuts off the gas.

"Socialized medicine," says the AMA, "would abolish private practice." How would it abolish private practice? It would abolish private practice by putting an end to the doctor's—and the patient's—"freedom of choice." There is just enough truth in this charge to tangle the falsehood. Under Government insurance, the patient can go to any doctor he wants to and the doctor can take any patient he wants to, but insurance covers care only by those doctors (upward of 90 percent in most insurance countries, including England) who choose to enter the plan. Millions of Americans, geographically or economically isolated, now have access to one doctor or none. The AMA would preserve their present freedom of choice.

Though they have sacred relationships and freedom of choice, doctors are men, not gods, and men must eat. Morris Fishbein let them know that the AMA protected their earnings from the ravages of socialized medicine. This, too, was true—that is, 10 percent true. It was true of the top 10 percent of the profession, who, as in England, could remain outside the medical insurance program and continue anointing the top 10 percent of the populace. For the other 90 percent of the profession, the $12,000 maximum income allowed under the English system probably looks pretty good, and the English practitioner's $8,000 average doesn't look bad, especially since American earnings, like everything else American, would be higher. Raymond T. Rich, hired in 1946 to survey the AMA's public relations, came up with the conclusion that they were bad, and resigned with the statement that its policy had, unfortunately, identified the organization with the economic interest of the doctor.

IV

The half dozen hard facts about medical insurance argue persuasively—but not overwhelmingly—for compulsion.

The most persuasive fact is that, unlike the cost of food, clothing, shelter, recreation, and education, the cost of medical care to this man this year is wholly unpredictable and ought, therefore, like the cost of fire and death, to be spread over a lifetime. Insurance is the American, that is, the sensible way to do this. The second most persuasive fact bears on the question, voluntary or compulsory insurance? Those citizens who need medical insurance the most are, like those motorists who need personal liability insurance the most, precisely those who cannot afford it. And the poor man, like the poor jalopy, is out of order oftener and longer than the rich and, in his jalopic condition, more of a menace to the common weal than his dynaflown brother.

The third most central fact is that most voluntary medical insurance covers only surgery or catastrophic illness, and then only in part. General Manager Lull of the AMA says that, "given enough time, our plan will take care of anybody's catastrophic illness in the United States." There are three jokers in that promise. The incidental joker is our plan, the AMA having fought our plan—voluntary insurance—for 20 years. The minor joker is given enough time, the catastrophically ill being just cantankerous enough to want treatment now. The major joker is catastrophic illness.

There is a costlier kind of illness than the catastrophic: the chronic. No voluntary plan dares to cover the full cost of chronic illness, and few of them cover any part of it. In addition, the greatest need in health is not cure at all, but prevention. While regular medical examination is only one form of prevention and, like all medical attention, only a secondary form, it is established that the two great killers, heart disease and cancer, can, in a substantial proportion of instances, be checked upon early discovery. The Committee on the Costs of Medical Care—the Wilbur report—found that fewer than 7 percent of the American people had even partial medical examination in 1930. The voluntary plans are almost all limited to curative care.

The voluntary plans now cover an inadequate number of people inadequately, and always will. The reason is cost. The National Education Campaign of the American Medical Association, Whitaker & Baxter, directors, asserts, in red, white, and blue, that "an average, fully-approved plan, for full coverage—surgical, medical, and hospital protection—charges $2.50 a month for an individual and $5.50 for a family, irrespective of size." The truth is that the fullest-coverage Blue Shield—nonprofit—plan costs $5.50 a month for a couple and $8.10 for a three-child family, and it does not provide full coverage. It excludes optical care, mental care, industrial accidents, dental fillings, inlays and dentures, prophylaxis for noncommunicable diseases, medicines for nonhospital cases, chronic cases beyond one year, and, among other things, preexisting conditions. Full coverage isn't offered because the rate would price it out of the market.

The high cost of voluntary plans results in cream-skimming, and their history in Europe reveals a tapering-off after a high proportion of the middle classes have been reached. The Blue Shield plans—for limited medical and surgical care—are only 3 years old and are growing fast, with 12,500,000 current subscribers. But some large proportion of these must be included in the 34,500,000 subscribers to the Blue Cross plans for limited hospital care, and the Blue Cross rate of growth is now declining. The total of partial hospitalization coverage—not medical or surgical—is about one-third of the population, if the AMA is to be believed.

Not everybody believes that the AMA is to be believed. President Truman, in his medical insurance message to Congress last spring, said that "only 3,500,000 of our people have insurance which provides anything approaching adequate health protection." The chairman of the board of the AMA replied that 10 or 15 years ago this was true. Today 55,000,000 Americans are protected under the voluntary health insurance systems of this country against the cost of hospital care, and 37,000,000 policyholders are insured against surgical or medical bills."

In view of Morris Fishbein's statement 2 months earlier that more than 1,000,000 were covered by complete medical care programs by the end of 1947, Truman's figure is probably generous. But the new figure of 37,000,000 insured against surgical or medical bills stands in more than remarkable contrast to Truman's 3,500,000. How many of the 37,000,000 are covered for all (not just catastrophic) surgical and (not or) medical care? What does 37,000,000 policyholders mean? Does it mean persons, or does it mean policies? And what kinds of policies are included? Workmen's compensation? Veterans' care? Commercial insurance, at rates prohibitive even to the middle classes? Newspaper accident policies? How many of the 37,000,000 policyholders also have hospital coverage? Were there 61,000,000 persons with prepaid health care in September 1949, as the AMA said there were, when there were only 55,000,000 hospital policyholders in April 1949, and only 15,000,000, according to the AMA, in 1944?

No consideration is more essential to the resolution of the medical insurance issue than the figures on voluntary coverage; if the American people can insure themselves against the cost of sickness, they should resist Government intervention to the death. And the figures on voluntary coverage can be got. The Government could get them with the greatest difficulty. The American Medical Association could get them with the greatest ease. Why haven't they been got?

Either the disparity between 37,000,000 and 3,500,000 is attributable to honest differences in calculation—in which case a count is indicated—or the Government or the American Medical Association is an egregious enemy of public intelligence.

In the pre-inflation year of 1939, the AMA's bureau of medical economics published a chart showing that only families with incomes over $3,000 were medically self-sustaining. No lower-income group was self-sustaining even for minor illnesses, much less for catastrophic or chronic. Eight years later the Journal was still perspiring over the "misuse of American Medical Association data," but the chart simply cannot be read two ways.

Adjusting the 1939 figure for the 1947 price level, the Journal admitted that the $3,000 would be the equivalent of 1947's $4,800, an income then enjoyed by only 21 percent of the families of the country. (In 1939 only 8 percent had incomes of $3,000 or more.) Thus in 1939 nine-tenths (and in 1947 four-fifths) of all American families were unable, according to the AMA, to afford the cost of chronic or catastrophic illness or even of all minor illnesses.

In the face of this figure, organized medicine's remedy was "a little common sense economy" by "the average man," who is "quite efficient" in planning the cost of radio sets and baseball tickets. The United States Chamber of Commerce liked common sense economy, too, as the solution to a desperate national problem, and suggested, in a pamphlet called You and Socialized Medicine, that a nation which spent $10,000,000,000 a year for liquor could pay its doctor bills. The Chicago Tribune, an even more rapturous advocate of freedom, said that Government medical insurance meant that the "provident" would have to take care of the "improvident," and declared, with unbridled intuition, that "the really poor are already provided medical care by public and private charity." Another AMA ally, the National Economic Council, Inc., found that Government insurance was "explicitly Marxist," since "the basic principle of Marxism is

'from each according to his ability, to each according to his need.'" (This basic principle of Marxism was first asserted, as every national economic councilor knows, in verses 34 and 35 of chapter 4 of the Acts of the Apostles in that popular Marxist handbook, the Holy Bible.)

As the clamor for medical insurance rose ever higher, the AMA yielded ever faster, but always too little and too late. It was willing to have "State aid"—this on the assumption that the State had it to give—dispensed to the "indigent" by the medical profession. It came ultimately to its latest Maginot Line of defense, the provision of Federal funds for State aid, "where needed," to the "medically indigent." By the AMA's own reckoning, four-fifths of the families of America would be taking means tests to receive medical care.

This formula is embodied in a bill introduced by Senator TAFT in the current Congress. Senator SMITH of New Jersey, another AMA ally, reported a few months ago that every governor, with the exception of one, either is definitely opposed to the compulsory plan or says definitely they want the plan worked out by their States with Federal aid. The State-aid program has been uniformly branded by its opponents—and the history of child-labor and minimum-wage legislation by the States may be instructive on this point—as a device for killing action.

V

There are good arguments against Government medical insurance, but they do not touch the fact of the national need. There is the argument that free, that is, tax-paid, medical care would be abused by hypochrondriacs and malingerers. The British Minister of Health, Aneurin Bevan, said soberly, when the plan was established in England a year ago, that this is a very great test of the maturity of the British people, insofar as they have all the resources of the medical profession at their disposal without charge. Government insurance would test the maturity of the American people, too; but so, in some measure, do the voluntary plans. A check in Birmingham, England, after 4 months of the plan, showed that 97 percent of the persons tested for glasses actually needed them. Senator TAFT's unsupported assertion that the English experience has been that millions rush to doctors for every little ache or pain, just because it is free, is contradicted by the testimony of the esteemed London Lancet: "Practitioners, whether in town or country, agree that they are making hardly any more, and sometimes fewer, visits than they usually do at this time of year. Every account agrees that frivolous complaints are no more common than before.

The AMA maintains, though America has more doctors for its population than England, that there are not enough doctors to meet the national need. In the past 40 years, while the population of the United States has increased by more than two-thirds, the annual output of medical-school graduate has remained almost unchanged at 5,000, and the AMA's interest in extending medical training is, like all its new interests, little and late. But this condition, coupled with the national need, would seem to argue for the systematic extension of medical training correlated with the systematic extension of insurance. There is the contention that a physician with 2,000 patients, even though only a small minority of them would be sick at any one time, would have to treat them superficially. On these two deadly serious points, the medical profession, and the medical profession alone, is expert, and one of the major tragedies of the AMA is that its fanaticism has deprived it of expert status.

The question of cost—another consideration which does not nullify the need—is simply unanswerable on the basis of available information. Any estimate would be reckless, and the Government's is more reckless than any other—four to six billion dollars a year. (The Nation's medical bill is at least that high now.) The British underestimated the first year's cost by 100 percent, owing, says Minister of Health Bevan, "to the overwhelming volume of need which the service has revealed. There was a vast amount of silent suffering before." Serious guesses—not the AMA's, which is $18,000,000,000—range up to $8,000,000,000, with a rise for several years at least.

The power to tax is the power to destroy, and the present Senate bill, embodying the Truman program, establishes an open-end account, permitting the use of general funds in the Treasury in addition to the proposed tax of 4 percent (divided evenly between employer and employee) on wages up to $4,800. (The Brookings Institution says the average family spends 4 percent of its income on medical care.) It is clear that a tax subsidy of the "improvident" by the "provident" would be involved; how big it would be no one knows. With the social-security tax rising to 3 percent in 1950, medical insurance, at its cheapest, would mean a fixed 7-percent charge on the economy for social insurance. The choice between guns and butter—or medicine—is a hard one.

Employers are generally unenthusiastic—at least the organizations which speak for them are—about their 2-percent contribution to the medical fund, though individual employers have taken the Government's position that the improved health of their employees would increase productive efficiency that much. The cost of administering the present nonprofit voluntary plans is 12 percent, and bureaucratic profligacy, if it exists, would probably be offset by consolidation. The British sickness-insurance system, operated, like our military conscription system, with volunteer boards, held administrative costs to between 2½ and 3 percent of the first year's expenditures.

The argument against "political medicine" brings the discussion to a lower level more characteristic of the AMA's national education campaign. True, the British doctor complains today of being smothered by forms; true, too, there are nonfilterable, highly reproductive organisms that seem to have red tape in place of red corpuscles, and they turn up in Government service in disproportionate numbers. Doctors, like poets and plumbers, would rather ask silly questions than answer them. But the public business was ever thus, and the more democratic the more thus. "Bureaucracy," however, is not "politics." The AMA never accused the United States Surgeon General of "politics" until he endorsed Government insurance, nor has the Veterans' Administration been accused of dispensing "political medicine." There has not been a breath of "politics" in the English experiment not even according to Morris Fishbein. And in this country Republicans get their mail occasionally, even when Jim Farley was Postmaster General.

The weightiest argument of all against Government insurance is also the most nebulous of all, and it is wholly nonmedical. It involves the interpretation of the already rubberized "general welfare" clause of the Constitution. Medical insurance would certainly extend the economic scope of the Federal power. The Government has for decades been engaged not only in financing but also in performing medical services of particular kinds, and 24,000,000 persons are now so served. But the general power to maintain medical care seems to be, like unemployment compensation or old-age pensions, a categorical enlargement of the welfare function.

The issue is no clearer today than it was when Lincoln set Locke and Mill spinning in their graves by asserting that the function of government was anything its citizens could not do, or could not do as well, for themselves. Historically, there is no demonstrable connection between government medical insurance and despotism; the AMA's howl of "totalitarianism" is of a piece with all its howls. A nation's liberties seem to depend upon heavier and heartier attributes than the liberty to die without medical care. In the end, what the founding fathers called "the peculiar genius" of the people will probably preserve those liberties and its want will lose them, and there is no evidence that it is affronted by compulsory self-insurance for private medical care. It would be better—less risky, let us say—if the voluntary program would work. It would be better yet not to be compelled to do anything, and if (as Hamilton said) men were angels, this might be arranged.

There is a clear and present danger to the democratic process, and that is the unenlightened condition of the public after more than a decade of discussion of a great national issue. But it was the American Medical Association that reduced the issue to the false simplicity of a slugging match.

The character of the discussion has been shockingly low on both sides. What the advocates of Government medical insurance call "national health insurance" is neither health insurance nor insurance, but a tax to insure one, and only one, element of health, namely, medical care. What the AMA calls "socialized medicine," on the other hand, is not socialized medicine at all. But the AMA started it, throwing the whole weight of an honorable profession into a barnyard brawl. The association's first recorded charge of "socialized medicine" against the Government was made in connection with veterans' care. The year was 1928, and the President was Calvin Coolidge. The advocates of Government medical insurance have described it disingenuously as "no different from maintaining the fire department." They have talked about "325,000 preventable deaths every year" and have included 40,000 accidental deaths as, presumably, medically preventable. They cite the rejection—even Bernard Baruch fell for this one—of 5,000,000 draftees for medical causes when some 3,000,000 of these rejects suffered from such medically incurable and unpreventable afflictions as musculoskeletal defects and mental deficiency. They have pinned down cost figures, and pinned them down low, in the absence of adequate information, and even if we had the information the figures could not be pinned down precisely. (Discoveries in cancer or heart disease might cut the Nation's medical bill by 25 percent, and epidemic polio might double it.) They have said that Government insurance would raise the quality of medical care when, for many years at least, it would lower the quality to the total of those served by employing even the incompetent practitioners.

But the advocates are white as snow compared with the men in white. The AMA says that American medicine has made Americans the healthiest, strongest, best-cared-for people on earth, a claim which, even if it could be demonstrated (the Scandinavians, among others, might object), ignores the dominant role of other factors than medicine and the fact that, even medically, American health is traceable in large part to the discoveries of Europeans. It says that in every great nation which has tried government insurance, "the result has been second-rate medical care," when the British Medical Associa-

tion says that the contrary is true in England—and the AMA itself said 35 years ago that the contrary was true everywhere. It says that a vast bureaucracy of political administrators, clerks, bookkeepers, and lay committees would consume 8 to 10 percent of every pay check, and it says that government insurance would invade your privacy and put both of us under political control. Alfred Emanuel Smith had a word for it.

In a two-way effort to stem the tide, the AMA house of delegates met last December and voted a $3,500,000 war chest for a national education campaign, the money to be raised by a $25 assessment on every member. The session was secret, and the action was not admitted until after the news had leaked out. It was understood that Fishbein, under heavy fire within as well as outside the organization, would not be put in charge, but even so, the reaction was hostile. The assessment—billed by the local societies along with their dues notices—was widely attacked. It was even more widely ignored; it wasn't, apparently, the principle of the thing so much as it was the $25. Six months later the AMA books showed that $2,000,000 had been raised; more than 40 percent of the members had failed to kick in.

The next tack was the adoption of a brand-new 12-point program immediately following the Truman demand for legislation last spring. The program—another AMA declaration of no policy—called for voluntary plans and State aid. While the proponents of government insurance sat back and let the AMA do their work for them, such eminent opponents of government insurance as Minot, Graham, Keefer, Barr, Whipple, O'Leary, Cobb, Sabin, and Goodpasture called the new program a disservice to medicine.

VI

But the sick physicians of the AMA just didn't want to get well. They hired the team of California promoters that had beaten Governor Warren's medical program by the interesting device of buying a minimum of 100 inches of advertising in each of 700 newspapers. Self-advertising, the hoariest of medical heresies, was the order of the day, and the AMA had the word of Whitaker & Baxter that the response from editors in publicity has been far beyond anything we expected." It was good enough for the railroads and the brewers and the utilities, and it was good enough for the holy art of healing. Whitaker & Baxter, loaded with the assessment money, set out to do for America what they had done for California.

Instead of trying to deodorize the AMA, the new promoters took it out and buried it. One hundred forty thousand old family physicians arose in its place, all wearing beards, wing collars, high button shoes, and threadbare frock coats, all keping an all-night vigil at the beside of your curly-headed little child and mine. Keep politics out of this picture. "The Doctor" never was a good painting, even in the Tate Gallery tradition. You may have seen it on your doctor's wall when you were young; it used to be distributed as an advertisement for Petrolagar. It made the doctor feel good. If Whitaker & Baxter are right, it still does.

With Fishbein out of the way, the new campaign is a grass-roots affair reminiscent of the wonderful Willkie boom at the 1940 Republican Convention. The doctor is cautioned against entering too many debates on medical insurance. He is to apply the heat to his patients personally, and the principal physician of every Congressman and every United States Senator is to send his honorable patient a letter telling him of the danger of socialized medicine. The Whitaker & Baxter literature outfishbeins Fishbein; pick it up at your doctor's office and ask him how he likes it.

Whitaker & Baxter are "working with the great newspapers and national magazines to get them to do special jobs," and in one grand spread published in September 1949, Fishbein's dismissal in June 1949 is not even mentioned. But there is some evidence that the great newspapers and the national magazines are not rising to the opportunity of being worked with. M. S. Rukeyser, economic commentator of the great newspapers owned by W. R. Hearst, who hates socialized medicine and the devil, in that order, reported in September that a visiting caravan threw a luncheon party on behalf of the campaign at the Perroquet Room at the Waldorf-Astoria in New York. "They drew modestly," Mr. Rukeyser reported, "on the $2,000,000 which the doctors have made available to the American Medical Association to combat the Truman-sponsored health insurance bill. The representatives of newspapers, magazines, and radio," Mr. Rukeyser went on, "declined to trade their independence in exchange for a little hospitality."

The representatives, while they fished the olives out of their martinis, may have been pondering the reports, lately confirmed by the FBI, of current Department of Justice investigations of the practices of State and local medical societies in Portland, Oreg., New York City, Chicago, Houston, and other cities. The Department's Antitrust Division refuses to discuss the investigations, but its case against the Oregon State Medical Society, the Oregon Physicians' Service, and seven county societies and eight individuals in Oregon was scheduled to go to trial in late October, the Government charging that "the defendants have obstructed medical care organizations other than those sponsored by them * * * hindering competing organizations in their attempts to procure doctors and in obtaining hospital facilities for their members." It was just 10 years ago that the AMA and the District of Columbia Medical Society were convicted of conspiracy to do just that.

Doctors are not as venal as the AMA says they are vestal, but there is no reason for their being perpetual chumps. They should realize by this time—but, then, Louis XVI should have realized before the Champ de Mars—that not even an honorable campaign to hold on to all they have, or all they wish they had, will save them from the clamor of millions of people for a new equity in society, for (quite literally) a new lease on life. The medical-insurance bills made further progress in Congress each time they were buried under AMA pressure, furthest of all in the last session, when no fewer than 17 alternatives to the Truman program went into the hopper.

The members of the medical profession will either accept the fact that the twentieth century—the first half, if not the second—is here or lose their freedom fighting for their freebooting. If socialized medicine—not Government insurance, but socialized medicine—is ever fastened upon this country, the American Medical Association will call Government insurance the American way. But it will be, for the last time, too late.

Labor Must Put Wishes of Members Into Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER B. HUBER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HUBER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Akron Beacon Journal:

LABOR MUST PUT WISHES OF MEMBERS INTO ACTION

(By L. S. Buckmaster, general president URWA-CIO)

In complex and changing times it is especially difficult to look into a crystal ball and foresee the future.

Rather than being crystal gazers, we have to take an approach more nearly like that of a pilot of a sailboat in a race.

Knowing that his ultimate objective is to win the race, he must chart his immediate course to round the next buoy, taking into account the trim of his ship, the strength and direction of the wind, the roughness of the water and the positions of other boats.

Similarly, while we in the labor movement recognize that our long-range goal is a free and prosperous society in a peaceful world, we must make our current plans in terms of current problems and the changing social, political and economic environment in which we find ourselves.

The activities we undertake in the coming years and the ways we select to carry them out will be to a great extent determined by the activities of other institutions like business and government and the way and extent to which they play a constructive part in developing a healthy, secure and satisfying life for all people.

American labor has its roots deep in the history of our Nation and we today are justly proud of such accomplishments of our fraternal predecessors as our system of free public schools.

The CIO is one of the newer branches in the long development of American labor and it is a fresh and spirited organization.

For many years our chief purpose was to organize the unorganized and to bring the basic benefits of collective bargaining to our members. We now have become a national institution and in order to serve our members well we have to take careful account of the social, political, and economic winds.

We reflect the needs and wishes of the people we represent through the democratic procedures and principles upon which we are organized.

In a sense, what we have to do is to translate the needs and wishes of our people into coordinated actions on the national scene and in the industries and communities in which we operate.

All factors of modern life are important to us. We in labor are charting our course with the idea that the people in this Nation are our real concern, and that our political and economic institutions must serve the people and not be their masters.

While we cannot tell exactly where we are going and how we shall get there, we do have some clear objectives and we can see the general circumstances which will govern our activities in the coming years.

In economic affairs, the measure to which we as a Nation are able to maintain a high and continuous level of prosperity is certainly one of the major conditions to which we will orient our actions. We are aiming for a reduction in the fluctuations of our economy which engender fear in the hearts of our people.

If American business continues to insist that the best way to adjust our economic affairs is by a return to practices which did not work or which caused suffering and hardship on the part of the American worker, then we in American labor will chart our course for strong regulation of those practices which seem to be responsible for the evils which we are trying to prevent.

On the other hand, should American business take an enlightened approach and endeavor to work out adequate protection for our people with fair and unselfish methods

to sustain high employment and production with just compensation, our approach also will be one of cooperation with fewer controls.

On the economic scene there are other equally important factors which must be integrated into our policies. The decisions of the Government in taxes and foreign trade are among other signs by which we in labor will chart our course. Always our interest will be in how those policies and decisions affect the well-being of the American people and our economy.

There are other national circumstances which will help to influence the future policies and programs of our labor unions. Laws and programs which are developed in the political arena will be of compelling concern to us.

But again we are somewhat less concerned with actual laws than with the development of democracy in this Nation so that the laws which are passed will be a true reflection of the attitudes of the American people.

We in the CIO, for instance, are interested in seeing that more and more people every year participate in local, State, and national elections.

We are interested in seeing that every voter has a full opportunity to hear every viewpoint about the questions on which he votes. Anything resembling monopoly control of the press or radio services in a community or nation is certainly not in the best interests of democracy.

Even though those who operate monopolies of press or radio might try to be impartial, they cannot escape from their personal environments and backgrounds, and their comments are something like the book, An Impartial History of the Civil War From the Northern Point of View.

Even with our deeper concern in the democratic processes of our Nation, specific laws which are passed will also guide our actions as labor unions.

Measures such as the Taft-Hartley law, designed to restrict operations of labor unions, will certainly tend to make the policies of labor unions more militant and directly concerned with political affairs.

Our political programs will, however, not be based on any one law. The whole political climate and the extent to which we are able to feel secure as an institution to express freely and work for the welfare of our members will be our guides.

Problems of a social nature are of increasing concern to American workers and to their unions. All the refrigerators, automobiles, and telephones which we can produce will not make for a strong and stable Nation if the people are plagued with fears of old age, dissatisfaction with their jobs, or inadequate educational opportunities for their children.

The recent drive by many CIO unions for adequate pensions, for example, is but part of developing a meaningful and secure role for older people. As we get deeper and deeper into this question, we see crucial problems arising in such areas as community recreation and adult education.

Health clinics and family counseling agencies will undoubtedly have to be expanded to meet increasing stresses of industrial city life. Labor will be more and more active in these social needs of our members and their communities, for we aim to have a population which is happy as well as prosperous and healthy.

We in labor must have the support and active cooperation of other groups to obtain these economic, political, and social objectives, not only for industrial workers but also for farmers, office workers, and others who are a part of our Nation.

The problem of how we can integrate our activities with those of other groups will be important in the coming years. Our success will be small unless we can achieve some unity of thinking about our basic national needs and objectives.

I believe that it is healthy to have as much of an exchange of information and direct contact among members of various groups as possible. In so doing we will be able better to orient our activities to the problems of all the people of our Nation.

The collective bargaining process is one of the best ways of achieving necessary social and economic improvements for the welfare of the working people. It is through collective bargaining that the needs and wishes of the working people are brought to the direct attention of management.

The bargaining table can be one of the bulwarks of freedom in our Nation, but if management regards collective bargaining as something distasteful and the needs of the workers as something which they would rather not bother with, then the unions will be forced to achieve social and economic objectives through legislation.

But it is not only in labor and management that joint efforts can be constructive. Labor and education, for example, can make important contributions to each other.

Labor unions and the medical profession also have a vast area in which cooperative action will be necessary. How we will integrate these and other aspects of our national activities is problematical, but that we shall do so I believe is certain.

We are living in a divided world with the awesome prospect of raising our children to be consumed by atomic explosions. One part of the world is being drawn closer together because the tentacles of the Kremlin are pulling it together.

Our part of the world is being pushed together by the existence of such external forces as the malignant growth of communism and fascism.

I have a faith, however, that our unity will emerge the stronger because we are free men joining together and integrating our institutions and our individual lives out of a common desire for freedom.

Our unity is becoming one of cooperation rather than compulsion. Compulsion is confinement. Cooperation is creation.

Panama Canal Tolls

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress a special subcommittee, of which I am chairman, and Representatives TOM B. FUGATE and E. T. MILLER are members, conducted an investigation into the financial operation of the Panama Canal and Panama Canal tolls, pursuant to House Resolution 44. An interim report of that investigation, submitted on August 23, 1949, is contained in House Report 1304, Eighty-first Congress. A final report will be submitted at an early date.

The studies of this subcommittee have clearly indicated that the Panama Canal presents issues of the gravest national and international importance, in which the toll question and the physical form of the future canal are definitely linked. These subjects are now being extensively discussed in the maritime industry of the United States as matters of vital concern to ship operation.

In this connection, I invite special attention to a selected bibliography in the Isthmian Canal Policy of the United States which I placed in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949.

As illustrative of the current Canal discussions in marine periodicals there appeared an instructive editorial in the September 1949 issue of Marine Progress, a magazine that is devoted to the interests of the American merchant marine and the improvement of our waterways.

The text of this editorial follows:

PANAMA CANAL TOLLS

The postponement until April 1, 1950, of the decision to increase the tolls for transiting the Panama Canal from 90 cents to a dollar a ton will give the industry more time to prepare for congressional study a complete presentation of its views concerning the manner of computing charges, of levying tolls, of the proportion which commercial shipping should pay, the portion that should be charged to national defense, and other facets of this question that need futher polishing to bring out their principal characteristics.

The decisions reached in respect to the Canal tolls may have a strong influence on the future physical changes to be made in the Canal—whether it will remain a lock canal, a sea-level canal, or a terminal lake canal. Since commercial shipping is to bear a large part of the cost, and possibly all of it, the final decision is bound to be most important to that group that habitually use the waterway on their normal voyages.

PRINCIPAL USERS

Operators under the American flag who are the greatest users of the Canal are those in the intercoastal trades. In addition to these, there is also a large group engaged in international trade between the east coast of the United States and the west coast of South America and other groups, although smaller, in the west coast of the United States to the east coast of South America trade. To a still lesser degree is the group using the waterway for trans-Pacific voyages and also the tanker companies operating on a number of routes, some of which do not touch at United States continental ports. All these operators have a stake in the toll controversy. While the principal interest in the Congress is for the American operators, any change made will also affect a large number of foreign-flag operators who pay the going toll.

The present toll increase reached the proclamation stage by the easiest of routes. While any such major change would normally call for hearings, the proposed toll increase came about first by a recommendation of the Washington office of the Panama Canal, which, seeing the need for additional revenue under its system of bookkeeping, recommended that the toll be raised by Presidential proclamation, as provided by law and without any action by the Congress, since the enabling legislation was already law. The recommendation that the toll be increased passed through the normal military channels, reaching first the Governor of the Panama Canal, who approved, then the Secretary of the Army, who also approved and thence to the President's desk. He, too, approved and set the date when the increase would become effective. The date was October 1, 1948, subsequently postponed until April 1, 1949 because of the storm of protests that came up over the shipping hori-

zon. Only within the last fortnight has the date again been postponed and it now stands at April 1, 1950.

Meanwhile the shipping industry got working on the problem and strong representations were made to the President and the Congress by the National Federation of American Shipping, the Association of American Ship Owners, the Pacific American Steamship Association and other groups. The result of this protest was the postponement of the effective date but not the cancellation of the move to increase the tolls.

FINANCIAL ASPECTS

The stirring up of the Panama Canal tolls kettle brought to the surface many things that had been buried for as long as the Canal has existed. Some of these things were relatively unimportant but others were vital insofar as American ship operation was concerned. It was learned, for instance, that in the basic law, passed in 1912, the Congress had reserved to the United States the right to discriminate in favor of the United States ships as far as the fixing of tolls were concerned. This power still lies with the Congress, ready to use if need be.

Another uncovering showed that the figuring of the Panama Canal financial officials resulted in commercial shipping bearing the brunt of the cost of Canal operation if not the cost of its construction. The line separating the commercial aspects of the Canal from the national-defense aspects has never been drawn and it is upon the sharp delineation of these two functions that the answer to the tolls question is said to depend.

Since the Canal government has been traditionally in the hands of the United States Army's Corps of Engineers, the emphasis has been on national defense. When the question arises as to the allocation of funds for the operation and maintenance of the Canal there has been a decided tendency to put the accent on the commercial value of the waterway and to minimize the national-defense aspects of it.

PACIFIC COAST REACTION

Naturally any attempt to switch the burden of support on commercial shipping, particularly in face of an increase in tolls, brought about some realistic talk concerning the Canal and for what and for whom it was built. The Pacific American Steamship Association published a question-and-answer brochure to show the direction its thinking goes in this controversy.

The PASA showed in its brochure that commercial shipping had paid for all the expenses of putting its vessels through the Canal, all the civil government expenses, and supplied a surplus of $274,000,000.

On the other hand, the Canal government has, each year, added a 3-percent interest charge on all capital improvements plus the actual construction cost of the waterway, money which is not paid by the Canal to the Treasury nor billed to the Canal by the Treasury. It is, PASA reports, merely a bookkeeping figure in use in the Canal Zone for the purpose of calculating the transit rate.

The American ship operators have not asked for free transits nor have they set a figure which they consider adequate as a toll for transiting the Canal. Since the cost of putting a C–3 vessel through the waterway is $14,000 for the round voyage, the interest in toll increase or decrease is vital to the operators.

What the operators want from the Government is a change in calculation methods for computing the toll. Since military or Government-owned vessels transit the Canal free, the commercial operators see no reason why they should have to have the expense of these transits prorated to the commercial users. Neither do they see any justification for adding to the costs of operation such expenses as maintaining hospitals, schools, recreational areas, policing, sanitary work and many other functions not connected to the work of putting a ship through. They feel that these are the duties of the Government and should be paid by the Government.

The operators also feel very strongly about the 3 percent interest charge which is arbitrarily tacked onto the Canal operating costs. Since it is not payable the continued use of the device to extract added revenue is seen as being unfair and unjust.

Since the Pacific coast ports of the United States bear the brunt of the Canal transit costs, since most of the transited cargo is discharged there and transportation costs are normally added to the cost of the merchandise, the interest of the Pacific American Steamship Association is a legitimate one requiring the support of the entire industry.

RECOMMENDATIONS

There has been enough discussion of the problem before the subcommittee of the House Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries for it to make some recommendations before the hearings are completed.

The first recommendation is that the President be requested to cause a study to be made of the organizational aspects of all phases of the Panama Canal, including the Panama Railroad, and that his recommendations of suitable changes be furnished to the Congress. Inasmuch as the problem has recently been considered by the General Accounting Office and the Bureau of the Budget, it is believed that this study may be concluded within the present calendar year, and in any event not later than January 31, 1950.

The second recommendation was that in the meantime the pending proclamation No. 2775, be withheld until a decision is reached as to the final organization of the Panama Canal.

This latter recommendation has already been carried out and the proposed increase has been postponed until next April.

While no formal recommendation was made the subcommittee said that it would like to call attention to a possible improvement in the Canal itself at comparatively low cost. This is the completion of the third locks project, where much of the excavation work has been completed and which has been modified to include the terminal lake plan. This plan will include the elimination of the Pedro Miguel Locks, the concentration of the three western flights in a single structure at Miraflores and the creation of an artificial lake between Miraflores Locks and the entrance to Gaillard Cut. This lake would eliminate lock surges, now present at Pedro Miguel, provide anchorage for locked-through ships in case of fog in the cut, with a subsequent faster transit when the fog lifted, plus other benefits.

Nehru, Asia, and America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Mr. J. J. Singh.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

NEHRU, ASIA, AND AMERICA

(By J. J. Singh)

Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Prime Minister of India, arrived in the Nation's Capital on October 11 and left from New York on November 7. Nehru spent 27 days in the United States (3 were spent in Ottawa and Vancouver). During this period, he visited Washington, D. C., New York, Boston, Chicago, Knoxville, White Sulphur Springs, San Francisco, and Madison, Wis. In every city he visited, he spoke at innumerable public and semipublic gatherings. He also met and talked to scores of Americans who called upon him in every city.

Almost every minute of his time was taken up. Nehru willingly subjected himself to this gruelling schedule, which left him little time to sleep or rest, because he wanted to know and understand America and Americans. His thirst for discovery of America, as President Truman had called it, was overpowering and unquenchable. Title of one of Nehru's books is Discovery of India.

Let it be stated right here that America had a terrific impact upon Nehru. It is true that as a keen student of history, as an author, as a well read, well traveled and well-informed man, he knew America through its history, its literature, its modern skyscraper civilization, and through his personal contacts with scores of Americans in Europe, England and India. But nothing in the past had created such an impact upon him as did his 27-day stay in this country. Nehru felt drawn toward the people of America as the people of America felt drawn toward him. A new bond of "emotional awareness" of each other was created—a bond that did not exist before. Frankly, Nehru had a cynical approach toward America—an approach of a cultured intellectual who, perhaps, said to himself, "So America is the richest country in the world, it is the most powerful country in the world, and it has this and it has that. So what? Is this all that counts in life? Aren't there other values?"

This visit proved to Nehru that there were other values in America. He looked into the eyes of the average common Americans and found kindliness and friendliness. He found that Americans are not all hard-boiled, hard-headed, hard-hearted, and drunk with power. He found that Americans were, just like any other people, basically decent and good. He found that Americans were not robots, that they were human beings who loved their children, affectionately patted their dogs, and tended to flowers.

Nehru was also very much pleased to find that, by and large, Americans had great friendship for the people of India. In one of my talks with him, Nehru told me, "I cannot add anything to your knowledge of this country. (I have lived here for 23 years), but I do want to tell you that there is a great fund of good will here for India."

Anyone who watched Nehru on the day of his departure for England could not have helped but notice that he was almost sad that the time for bidding farewell had come. I was standing close to him when newspapermen asked him for a final word. Nehru said: "My final word is of deep gratitude to the people of America for their kindness and friendship. * * * I hope we shall meet again." When he said that his voice displayed emotion and his ever-expressive eyes seemed to be saying, "Will it be so?"

Such was America's impact upon Nehru. Did Nehru create any impact upon Americans? From what information I have been able to collect from varied sources the general consensus is that Nehru created a most profound effect upon Americans who saw

him, met him, and listened to him. One thing stands out in all the comments I have heard—Nehru's utter sincerity, straightforwardness, and fearlessness. Many were amazed that the head of a government, a leader of 350,000,000 people, could be so outspoken and truthful. There was nothing "off the record" with Nehru. What he told President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, or other high officials in private conferences, he repeated in public. It is quite possible that other world leaders may emulate Nehru and take the people into their confidence instead of presenting them with fait accompli.

However, it would be indulging in wishful thinking if we were to assume that all sections of American people and the American press were sold on Nehru. Many have remained critical. But I venture to suggest that his critcs are rather unjust and impatient. These critics, who mostly represent a small section of the American press and a much smaller section of the American people, and who are advocates of the theory, "Let's go and drop the atom bomb on the Russians before they drop it on us," had mistakenly expected that Nehru, upon his first contact with America, would hasten to declare that he had joined their ranks.

Anyone who had at all taken the trouble to study Nehru's background, his philosophy and thinking, should have known that he would not join the advocates of another war. Nehru abhors wars and is convinced, like so many other thinking men, that wars do not solve any problems. He, like most human beings, wants peace, even though he is not a "peace at all costs" man. Nehru repeatedly said that peace couldn't be preserved by surrendering to aggression or "by compromising with evil or injustice."

Almost 90 percent of the newspaper and radio stories and the comments before Nehru's arrival, and during his stay, and since Nehru's departure, have mentioned Nehru's "neutrality" in the cold war between Russia and the western democracies. I am sorry to see that, notwithstanding Nehru's forthright statement on the "neutrality" issue, which he made on the third day after his arrival in this country, his position remains misunderstood. Speaking before the United States Congress, Nehru said: "Where freedom is menaced or justice threatened, or where aggression takes place, we cannot be and shall not be neutral."

What could be more lucid and to the point? India has not been and is not "neutral" today. India, as Nehru said, is in a "pivotal" position and could not remain "neutral" even if she so desired. India and Nehru could not remain neutral between good and evil, or between democracy and totalitarianism. (Nehru, in his speech in Chicago on October 26, said that under the Soviet system "individual freedom ceases to exist.")

At this stage I am sure the question is likely to be asked that if that is so why doesn't India join America, a democracy, against Russia, a totalitarian state? That would be oversimplification of the problem.

In a most delightful and illuminating talk with Nehru on this subject, I thoroughly understood his position. Nehru said to me, "I am not a dictator * * * India is a democracy—I must carry my people with me." The last sentence, "I must carry my people with me," tells the whole story. It spells out the problem. And that problem is that the vast majority of the people of India are suspicious of America—not that America has done anything, but because of the 200 years of British rule in India. Let us not forget or overlook a simple, a very simple fact: The Americans speak the same language as the British do, the Americans look like the British, eat like the British, and dress like the British—and people of India have had such a bad taste of the British. Memories are still fresh. The same Nehru who is now the Prime Minister of India was rotting in a British jail until May 1945—4½ years ago. I know Nehru has no traces of bitterness left in him for his former jailers, but Nehru is a great man—and India, like all other countries, is full of plain and ordinary people. Thus the memories and suspicions of the foreign ruler still linger on. And thus, new alliances, even with good foreigners, cause raising of the eyebrows and create doubts and suspicions.

I would like to suggest to those Americans who believe in the adage, "If you are not with me, you are against me," to be a little patient. After all, India has been free only 27 months, not 27 years. And at the time of the coming of freedom, our country was torn into two, and for several months, in the very infancy of our independence, we had to go through veritable hell. Therefore, if we are a little preoccupied in putting our house in order, we should not be blamed too much. And if we are desirous to remain clear of alliances with a western nation or nations—then, in fairness, it must be recognized that it is due wholly and solely to a western nation's exploitation and ruthless rule of our country which has left a mark upon us, and which in its turn makes us hesitate and ponder. It will take more than 27 months to remove that mark and that hesitation.

Thinking people in India know that America has no intentions of taking over where European colonial powers have ended. They also know that no western power could ever rule the Asian peoples again, because the Asians are determined to die rather than be the slaves of a foreign power. But even with this new strength and vitality, the memories of foreign rule cannot be obliterated so quickly and so easily. Thus it is that Nehru, a democrat, not a dictator, must wait till he is sure of carrying his people with him in new alliances and alinements.

There is another important angle. I know that India is a large country with 350,000,000 people and thus is exceedingly important in its own right. But I also know that most Americans think of India's importance vis-à-vis the strategic position India holds in Asia. Suppose Nehru, while in America, and as demanded by some ultranationalist Americans had said, "All right, I am in the American corner." What effect such an announcement would have had in Asia. Would such a declaration from Nehru help the cause of freedom and democracy in Asia? No; most certainly not. To start with, Nehru would have received the lambasting of his life from the people of India. They would have accused him of having sold India down the river. They would have accused him of becoming a pawn of Wall Street monopolies. Instead of receiving a hero's welcome, which he did, upon his return from America, the people of India would have thrown shoes at him—a sign of great disfavor and insult. Nehru's influence in India would have begun to dwindle rapidly. His prime ministership might also have been jeopardized. Would that have served the cause of the democracies of the world? I am afraid not.

Another point. What do you think Communist China would have done if Nehru had joined the "American corner?" They would have unleashed a propaganda barrage of unprecedented magnitude to all the Asian peoples, telling them to be wary of Nehru—a man who had sold his soul for American dollars. The prestige of India in Asia would have gone down and the prestige of Communist China would have gone up. Would that have served the cause of democracies? No, such a step would not have served the cause of democracies. On the contrary, it would have played into the hands of Communist China and the Communist parties and the fellow travelers in every country in Asia.

India today is respected by all Asian countries. They look up to India as one looks up to a big brother. India today is the only country, because of its geographical position, population, and resources, that can halt the onward march of Communist China—not by guns or armed conflict, but by ideologies, by preaching and practicing dynamic, active, and alive democracy.

Americans should stop talking about India's "neutrality." India is a democracy and will always line up with democracies.

Does Luce's $12,700,000 Intake From Liquor Render Him Immune to Decency and Conscience?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, as evidence of the need for the enactment of H. R. 2428, I submit herewith an article from the Union Signal of December 10, 1949, and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The article follows:

DOES LUCE'S $12,700,000 INTAKE FROM LIQUOR RENDER HIM IMMUNE TO DECENCY AND CONSCIENCE?

(By Ernest Gordon)

Mr. Henry R. Luce, through Time, Inc., last year was paid $12,712,000 by the whisky, beer, wine, and associated manufacturers in the liquor field. It is an accepted assertion in financial circles that Mr. Luce controls financially and directly the policy of the three publications of Time, Inc., namely, Time, Life, Fortune.

During two pre-Christmas issues of Life and Time, 1948, Mr. Luce's intake for Time, Inc., was $1,270,000 for liquor advertising.

As is pointed out by R. H. Martin, chairman of the Committee Against Liquor Advertising of the National TPC, these liquor receipts for pre-Christmas issues were 2⅔ times the average sum received for these items during other months of the year.

"This possibly suggests," Mr. Martin adds, "Life, Time, Fortune, and their editor in chief's conception of the proper way to celebrate the birth of the Saviour of the World."

The circulation of Life, Time, and Fortune, according to Standard Rate and Data Service, in 1948 was 7,145,158, with an estimated readership of 36,000,000 for 1949.

"Here are three magazines, the unparalleled facilities of which Mr. Luce and his associates turn over to the big distillers and brewers of America, to carry their liquor propaganda to every corner of our land, to one quarter of the entire population of the country, into fifteen to eighteen million American homes."

That "simply means," says Mr. Martin, "this Luce trio" has become "the most powerful ally the liquor industry has in its gigantic advertising program to increase the sale and consumption of intoxicating liquors," by the most sinister and amazing invasion of free speech and a free press ever perpetrated by the vicious cabal of liquor makers and mongers in American annals.

It is for that reason that the following searching analysis and appraisal by Ernest Gordon of the Luce relationship to and policy toward the liquor interests in the United States calls for the most serious consideration of thoughtful men and women everywhere.

It is an appraisal which like everything else that Dr. Gordon has offered the public is

marked by the most thoroughly authenticated factual evidence that could be marshaled on this subject.

"Alcohol is recognized as the third great medical problem in America," declares Dr. Gordon. "It is indeed recognized as a carrier of disease. In its wake follow all kinds of bodily and mental sicknesses, toxic psychoses, cirrhoses, epilepsies, blastophthorias.

"As a carrier of this disease, through their advertising columns, Time and Life, netting their owner $9,400,000 from drink ads in 1947, appeal to the great public to which they minister week after week, to buy alcohol in numberless enticing forms."

ENTICEMENTS TO YOUTH

Budweiser: "Golden, bubbling, sparkling, foaming. It tells you with every sip why it is something more than beer, a tradition in hospitality."

Arrow Creme de Menthe: "The crowning touch to a perfect dinner."

California wines: "The custom is ages old to set a glass of bright, fragrant wine beside each plate on Thanksgiving. Try it and you find why a custom lives on."

Hiram Walker's Cordials: "Blackberry liqueur. You'd never believe the hard-to-catch flavor of luscious fresh blackberries could be captured in a bottle."

Sunnybrook: "Come over to Sunnybrook side. Enjoy the whisky that's cheerful as its name."

Corby's Whisky: "Thanks and the same to you." Father and son giving each other the same whisky Christmas present.

Roma Wine: "The first call to dinner."

Pabst Blue Ribbon: "Mrs. Winston Guest and friend drinking beer in her flame-vined Palm Beach patio, enjoying the tropical sunshine."

Four Roses: "Once again it's time to make a bowl of Merry Christmas."

Hunter's Scotch: "First over the bar," Courvoisier's Napoleon brandy, Johnny Walker, Heublein, Club Cocktails, Kinsey Whisky "that noble, noble flavor," Ballentine, Glenmore, Old Crow—every possible brand of every possible type of alcoholic type drink, spread out like flypaper, and not a suggestion that each and all contain what the greatest physiologist of all time, Claude Bernard, declared "the perfect type of a poison of the nervous system."

EDITORIAL HOCUS POCUS

But that is not all. The promotion of alcoholic drink and the defense of those who make, sell, and use it, goes on incessantly and more or less obviously in the text, as well as in the advertising columns of Life and Time. The reader lives in a rarefied alcohol atmosphere. He stumbles into little alcohol pools every now and then. Its use is made to appear normal, desirable, harmless, the proper accompaniment of social life, a note of good form. What a priceless thing this secondary advertising, which is not formal advertising, must be to brewer and distiller and distributor of alcoholic wares.

Typical was the great 13-page spread entitled "Liquor. Current studies in Medicine and Psychiatry," in the May 27, 1946, number of Life. Its contents were simply impossible. Thus we were told that "modern research gives alcohol a clean physiological bill of health. The drys (1) have taught that drinking may blast liver, kidneys, and gastrointestinal tract and make the drinker prone to cancer, heart disease, and tuberculosis. These claims have no foundation in fact.

"Taken for purposes of relaxation alcohol has never damaged anyone. Even when taken in fairly large amounts over a long period of time, the purely physical effects of alcohol by itself are almost negligible.

"Alcohol does not attack, or corrode, the brain cells. It does not lead to insanity."

A declaration of war, indeed, on all knowledge of the subject.

The greatness textbook on psychiatry, that of Professor Bleuler, of Zurich, devotes an entire chapter of 56 pages to alcohol poisoning, tells us that it is responsible for a quarter of male admissions to insane hospitals and to 10 percent of cases outside, that it complicates, codetermines, and aggravates other psychoses, especially epilepsy, traumatic neuroses, and paresis. Of the physical effects, described by Life, as "negligible," Bleuler says (p. 318), "We cannot determine why in one, drink ruins the liver, in another the heart, in the third the regulation of metabolism, in the fourth the brain, in the fifth all the organs."

It is impossible to quote any even small part of the scientific evidence which annihilates Life's science. One can but name the masters—Struempell and Weichselbaum in pathology, Kraepelin, and Bleuler in psychiatry Kassovitz, Wlassak, Nicloux, Delbrueck, Widmark, Le Breton, Graf, and how many more. An outstanding pathologist of today, Dr. Roch of the Geneva Clinic, sums up his studies (L'Alcoolisme et son role en pathologie interne), with this concluding sentence: "In our country and apparently also in most lands of the temperate zone, alcoholism is the most important factor in morbidity and mortality."

For this masterpiece of misrepresentation, Mr. Luce should have the Pulitzer prize, in that he has given the world a perfect example of what a journalist should not do. He has every resource for getting at the truth about alcohol. The literature on the subject is prodigious in amount and brilliant in interest. In every other field he enters he seems to get the truth and to give the truth as far as truth is attainable. Only regarding alcohol does he deviate from truth and that as far as possible.

By thus concealing the results of alcohol study which are so terrifyingly unanimous in their condemnation of drink, as well as by popularizing its use on all occasions and stimulating its sale by every device known to advertising, Life and Time have become not only the typical, but the preeminent, carriers of the disease called alcoholism, and thus premier factors in the spread of morbidity and mortality. Beside alcoholism and its associated diseases of mind and body, typhus is but an occasional plague which we are now easily able to stamp out. But the conflagration for which the Welt narcoticum, the international narcotic, is responsible, endangers our entire European-American civilization.

Perhaps Mr. Luce also believes this, for, speaking at White Sulphur Springs, W. Va., some years ago, he said, "The fate of western civilization depends on the individual and collective behavior of the advertisers of the next 10 years." Does he refer to the whisky advertisers and does he imply that these great spreaders of the alcohol plague oblige editors to say things that are not true and suppress things that are true? If so, we can assent to his later Williamstown aphorism. "The true poison of our time is that press that gives the public what they want." So he calls for "facts, the significant facts, the difficult and complicated facts, the unpalatable facts."

What a reorientation, if adopted, that would mean for the alcohol policies of Life and Time.

TEXT AND HEADLINES SCOFF AT ABSTINENCE

The text of Life fairly crawls with these little carriers of alcoholism. I tested, for example, 24 weeks of Life's 1948 issue and found a nearly unvarying three allusions to drink in each number. Were they planted there to give drink prestige, and to gratify their advertisers? I do not know, of course, but it would not be surprising.

At the premiere of the White Sulphur Springs season, those partaking in this social event consumed, we are told, $3,000 worth of champagne but drank little purgative water. Derby Day at Yale makes straw hats and beer cans obligatory equipment. In a later number Cornell's beer picnics are described. "Doug raises his fraternity stein to toast a friend." However, "this year's event was a partial flop since some of the beer was left over in spite of the fact that the price was set low, namely, all the beer a couple could drink for a dollar." On a preceding page, the guests at an Atlanta home "moved inside to listen to a fine collection of records and drank long glasses of bourbon and water." The less aristocratic Packers' Union of the A. F. of L. "indulged in grape juice au rhum and ice cream soaked in cognac."

In the May 31 number, a pleasant gibe is inserted in a life sketch of Shirley Temple. "When the news leaked out that Shirley was to take her first drink, the WCTU was up in arms" at the enormity. Cocktail parties are the common mise en scène for important events. "After meeting her at cocktails on board his yacht, Howard Hughes decided that Miss Doumergue was a movie natural. * * * At a cocktail party given by Mrs. R. Clapper, Cord Meyer answered arguments. * * * Mrs. Henderson threw a night-club crawl to help John Alden Talbot, Jr., celebrate his divorce and offers to drink champagne from her guest's moccasin."

July 19, page 71, there is a full-page picture of young people drinking spiked watermelon. In the August 9 number, the recipe was given: "The Californians pictured added half bottles of champagne, brandy, gin, and rum and whisky to the melon's inside."

We go abroad and discover that in the Crown Colony, Hong Kong, "British, on hot afternoons, sip gimlets." At a Zegreb fair "the fun is largely beer drinking." When an Indian prince is married, whisky, gin, beer are served "not at a butler's whim but as required. Third-class guests had only wine."

In the August 2 number we return to the United States of America where in a quarter page we are treated to the picture of a beer-drinking contest. Men hold nipple bottles for each other. The winner of the prize struggled through his battle in 4½ minutes." The next number, August 9, has a full-page picture of a man up to his shoulders in a pool drinking a bottle of beer, an event of major importance. We were told in the old days that Connie Mack reprobated drink for athletes. Life would correct this scandalous mistake. "Connie gave up his own modest drinking when he was 76. Brother Mike, on the other hand, lived to be 90 by sticking to a glass of whisky."

PHOTOGRAPHS AND ART WORK RIDICULE TEMPERANCE

In its January 24, 1949, number, Life carried a feature article on Williams College and its problems. Williams always brings to mind the able and venerable president, Mark Hopkins, who led it from 1836 to 1872, 35 long years. Life does indeed here print a picture of him, a thumbnail photograph. But the full-page illustration is reserved for Mr. Grimm, a French professor, drinking cocktails in a student dormitory room that is fully equipped with a bar behind which students are mixing drinks.

Mark Hopkins and William E. Dodge were the great figures in the National Temperance Society and made it a power in the land. This picture is a measure of the alcohol barbarism into which the United States has fallen—in no little degree because of the advertisements in Luce publications.

So it goes. I may be mistaken in thinking that these little alcohol luces are purposely allowed to crawl into their pages. If others doubt, let them scrutinize Life's columns from week to week or, better, study Life's files in recent years, here and there, in text soundings.

All this goes along very well with the extensive photographing of near nudity, high

kicking, and strip-teasing with which Life, by stirring up the little underworld in men's hearts, seeks to raise its circulation figure. It recalls the pink pages of the old Police Gazette, which in railway camps in the old days we used to call the great American educator, and adds piquancy to Mr. Luce's religious addresses as, for example, that before the National Conference of Church Women in Milwaukee, 1948. The face of Janus—Henry Loose * * * Henry Luce.

Time is less risque than Life, yet here, too, one hears little alcoholic obligatos played to the main themes. Its heraldic emblazonment might well be two vipers tangled into one, namely, high finance and the liquor powre. Its editor is a trustee of the American Heritage Foundation which sponsors the Freedom Train. There is no copy of the eighteenth amendment on the Freedom Train, yet it might have been exhibited there as representative of what promised to be one of the greatest emancipations of all times. It was Wall Street in the persons of Mellon, the Du Ponts, bootlegging Percy A. and backsliding John D. Rockefeller, who destroyed that great document. Garrison and Phillips and Abraham Lincoln would have defended it in the teeth of all comers had they been living.

Time insidiously supports the repealers in their continuing efforts to prevent any relief, legal or educational, from the ever-mounting, devastating alcohol flood. It has ever the appropriate gibe, the distorted report. In its October 4, 1948, number it described the WCTU convention in so many words as a collection of septuagenarian hens clucking lamentations over the spread of alcoholism. This is just the impression the drink interests would wish made on the general public.

When Kansas prohibition was repealed last November, their comment was the following moronic simplification, "Kansas boys, raised on lemonade, went away to war, learned there was something more exhilarating, came home demanding more of the same" (Nov. 15, 1948.) It follows the stereotyped Tap and Tavern line, "To Kansas, their bone-dry law has long been a laugh. Good whisky is easier to get in Topeka than in wet Kansas City. * * * Millions of quarts of bootleg stuff from across the border," etc. (September 9, 1946). When a prohibition hearing is held in Washington, bony, pious Joseph R. Bryson and perky Mrs. Ida Wise-Smith are picked for ridicule, the latter representing organized mother-love, and much is made of a tract being circulated, Use Your Bible To Battle the Bottle (January 24, 1944). In another passage, to enforce its antiprohibition clack, it quotes, believe it or not, old St. John Chrysostom, "I hear many cry when deplorable excesses happen 'Would there were no wine.' Oh folly. Oh madness. * * * If you would say, 'Would there were no wine because of drunkards,' then you must say, 'Would there were no steel because of murderers, no women because of adulterers' (January 25, 1945).

When an alcohol-trapped Wisconsin editor made known editorially his despair, Time with exquisite courtesy announced that an elderly reader had put him on her prayer list, that a minister had read the editorial in his Sunday-school class and that two ladies from the WCTU welcomed him to their side (January 21, 1946).

TIME REVELS IN PSEUDO SCIENCE

Time revels in current alcohol pseudoscience, contrasting the Yale modern school of alcohol studies with the old blue-nose, dry crusade. Alcohol seldom damages the body permanently. * * * Drinking is the result, not the cause of, the drunkard's neurosis. * * * Alcoholics get that way in childhood, etc. (July 8, 1946).

I can hardly imagine that Mr. Luce believes these paradoxes, any more than any other person of sense. If he does, let me make this suggestion. On November 14, 1937, at the French Embassy at Washington, Mr. Luce, because of his publishing successes, was presented with the Order of Chevalier of the Legion of Honor. In the year 1948, among those who received the same distinction were, grand officer, Dr. Georges Duhamel; commandeurs, Dr. Armand-Delille, Professor Carnot; officers, Dr. Barthelemey, Professor Boulet, Dr. le Couteur, Professor Mouquin, Professor Portes; chevaliers (Mr. Luce's grade), Dr. Bernou, Dr. Trivas.

Why do I quote these names in this connection? Because every one of these savants is also a member of the Groupement Medical d'Etudes Antialcoholiques, the new radical mobilization of French medicine against alcoholism. My suggestion is this. Let Mr. Luce get in touch with Prof. Dr. Paul Perrin, the secretary of this distinguished group—it has deans of 10 medical schools and 30 professors of medicine on its roster—and let him give an objective report on their program and literature in one of his publications. Then we will believe that he is not what he appears to be.

Time mentioned in its December 6, 1948, number a new drug for the cure of alcohol habit. A letter from the publisher of January 31, 1949, told us that its discoverer was overwhelmed with orders by cable, air mail, telephone, as well as by letters in seven languages. The contents were always the same, cries from the depths, "My husband, my father, my son, my brother, my nephew, my friend * * * is a good man but an habitual alcoholic. Send the drug whatever it costs."

And what did the editorial hard-hearts of Time say of it? They expressed gratification at this impressive evidence of the readership of their medical section, right round the world.

They talk as a vivisector would over a successful experiment, undisturbed, and least of all conscience smitten, at this evidence of the international effectiveness of Time's advertising.

I suppose that Time will be satisfied with whatever happens to our land so long as it is well paid for running its whisky advertisements. In a book review regarding the 3,750,000 excessive drinkers who now burden themselves and American society, it opens with the nonchalant words, "The United States may as well get used to the idea of more and more alcoholics," adding later, "It may as well be admitted that it is a drinking society and make provision for those among us too ill to cope with it."

When Mr. Luce was divorce-sued by his first wife for cruelty, it took the court only 15 minutes to grant her relief. That cruelty was a slight thing, indeed, compared with the vast, mean cruelty of his alcohol promotion.

The Luce fortune from drink advertisement comes indirectly from millions of heads, alcoholic addicts, actual and potential.

AVIDLY APPEALS FOR MORE LIQUOR ADVERTISING

Still he is unsatisfied. Mr. Luce is doing something which no other publisher before or after him ever did, so far as is known. He actually appeals to the distillers' organ, Spirits, for additional advertising. In a great 2-page advertising spread, exhibited by Life in this trade paper, July 1949, one reads: "Five million, two hundred thousand selling messages. That's what liquor advertisers put behind their brands when they're shown in any issue of Life. Life sells 5,200,000 copies every week, read by 26,000,000 people week after week."

In the April 1949 number of Spirits, the Life advertisement has a large picture of the crowded Rose Bowl in Pasadena. We are informed that its subscribers are 260 times as numerous. In no other than liquor publications does Mr. Luce advertise for advertising, as far as observed.

ARDENTLY SEEKS MINISTERS AND EDUCATORS

And while Mr. Luce is making this frenzied appeal for whisky advertising, he is at the same time offering clergymen and educators reduced subscriptions to Life, knocking off $1.75 on a 2-year subscription and $1 on a 3-year one. So does he play both ends against middle.

And it is to this man, to such a man that Protestant officialdom is kowtowing.

Proposed Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I have repeatedly called attention to the necessity for the immediate repeal of the wartime excise taxes which we promised to repeal when peace came. I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD dozens of letters from Wisconsin, newspaper editorials, and magazine articles, pleading for the Congress to act.

Already there are in the hopper excise tax repeal amendments which my colleagues and I intend to offer, if necessary, to the oleo measure. We firmly believe that repeal of these taxes, rather than contributing to a loss of revenue, would bolster national income and thereby increase tax revenue. At this time I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of a straight-shooting editorial on this subject which appeared in the January 7, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLIER'S DEMANDS CONGRESS REPEAL WARTIME EXCISE TAXES AT ONCE

The wartime excise taxes were put on in wartime.

They were put on to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business in lines that were competing with the war effort.

The rates were set very, very high. They were wartime rates. They were made very, very high to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business in lines that were competing with the war effort.

Have you been to the movies lately? Have you bought a lipstick? Or sent a telegram? Or gone on train or plane to visit Aunt Mary? Or to shop, or to sell what you make? Did you have to buy some luggage? Did you buy or not buy a scarfpin? Or a watch? Or baby oil and powder? Did you buy or not buy a fur coat? Or did you buy a cheaper one? These are only some of the ways the consumer and the producer are whipsawed by consumption-reduction taxes. No wonder unemployment is up and national income is down.

Congress promised that when the war was over, the wartime excise tax rates would be repealed.

Nobody wanted peacetime taxes that would reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business after the war was over.

The war is over. The wartime excise taxes have not been repealed. They are operating

today in the specific industries affected to reduce employment, penalize consumption, discourage business just as they did in wartime.

We don't want discriminatory taxes in peacetime. We don't want to reduce employment in specific industries; we don't want to penalize consumption of specific products; we don't want to discourage business just because it used scarce materials and labor in wartime.

Let's repeal the wartime excise tax rates on American business, on American employment, on American consumer demand. The war is over. Let's stop wartime discrimination.

Somebody may say we need the wartime excises because of the revenue. No tax that is bad for business and employment was ever any good for revenue.

By reducing consumption we reduce tax receipts on manufacturing profits, on retail profits, on the income of workers; and in addition we increase outpayments for unemployment benefits. And the citizen whose circumstances force him to buy has to pay more than the goods are worth by as much as 20 percent. The Administration policy of keeping the wartime excise taxes on this long is incredible. It's crazy. It's worse than crazy, it's nuts.

Congress knew that the wartime excise tax rates were no good for peacetime. Congress said that when the war was over, the wartime excise taxes would be repealed. Congress would have repealed these wartime taxes last summer if the executive branch had given the slightest signal.

But the executive branch was confused. It couldn't see the difference between gross revenue and net revenue. It couldn't see the difference between a tax to reduce employment and a tax for revenue. It couldn't see that wartime excise tax rates discriminated between one kind of peacetime employment and another. It couldn't see.

Let's get rid of this wartime hang-over. Let's let people go back to work making things people want. Let's stop these penalty prices. Let's use the common sense that Congress is prepared to use.

Mr. President, give Congress a free hand. Congress will meet its wartime pledge, and restore peacetime employment to American citizens and American communities. It will remove the blight of wartime controls from American enterprise. It will permit reasonable prices on peacetime products that are wanted by Mr. and Mrs. American Consumer.

Repeal of the wartime excise taxes is the first order of legislative business for 1950.

THE EDITORS.

To Unite Federalists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Freedom and Union for December 1949:

TO UNITE FEDERALISTS

(By Clarence K. Streit)

As the author of a book whose readers have become divided, I find myself in a peculiar position. Many of the readers of Union Now favor the Atlantic Union resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 57, House Concurrent Resolutions 107, 111). Others of its readers favor the world federation resolution (Senate Concurrent Resolution 5, House Concurrent Resolution 64). Still others favor both.

I myself support the Atlantic Union resolution, but I have always worked for Atlantic Union as a step toward an eventual free world government. And so—speaking only for myself, though I hope results will show that I am speaking for many of my friends who are now divided—I would suggest that a second paragraph be added to the enacting clause of the Atlantic Union resolution, so that it would read as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring):

"1. That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principles of free federal union.

"2. That this Atlantic Federal Convention be called as the next step in strengthening the United Nations and in attaining a more distant goal which, in the sense of Congress, should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States—namely, the development of a free world federation open to all nations willing and able to maintain its principles of free, representative government, and capable of effectively safeguarding individual liberty, preventing aggression and preserving peace by its defined and limited powers to enact, interpret, amend and enforce world law."

This amendment would incorporate in the Atlantic Union resolution much of the language and all the major provisions of the world federation resolution,[1] while adding certain necessary safeguards, particularly as regards freedom and the United Nations.

As that resolution now stands, it makes no provision that the world government it seeks shall preserve individual liberty. This omission is no doubt due to oversight on the part of its sponsors, resulting from the present widespread American habit of taking freedom for granted. I trust that on second thought they will agree that it is wiser to return to the habits of our forefathers. They based our government on the principle that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty and devised a remarkable set of checks and balances to secure that vigilance.

The fact that the world federation resolution now contains no reference to individual freedom should make it much more acceptable to Stalin than to us. "A world federation open to all nations, with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law," is quite compatible with dictatorship, slavery, and terror. It fits the kind of world government we would suffer if the present Soviet Communist Federation achieved its dream of bringing all the world under its law. That law has proved more than adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression with its present jurisdiction.

I know that this kind of world government and law is far from the one the backers of the world federation resolution have in mind, and so I trust they will welcome its being made clear that they aim at a free government. We Americans, and a number of other Atlantic peoples, have long insisted on something more than peace and law—a something called freedom. To secure this freedom we, and these other peoples, have sacrificed peace more than once.

True, our forefathers sought to insert no safeguards for individual freedom in the alliance they made with the French Bourbon autocracy during the war for independence. But when they turned to the task of constituting a federation—a government, instead of a mere association of governments—they did not attempt the impossible feat of making it with their autocratic French ally, or with their allies among the Indian nations who had little notion of free, respresentative government. They were careful to limit the enterprise of constituting government to those peoples who were willing and able to build it on a free basis. And they climaxed the Preamble of their, and our, Constitution with a declaration that its aim was to "secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity."

Experience proves that it can be practicable and wise for free governments to cooperate to some degree with dictatorial governments not only in alliance, but in leagues such as the United Nations. Such associations by their nature must be formed without individual liberty being effectively safeguarded in the treaty establishing them.

To constitute a federation, a government, is—it cannot be emphasized too much—quite a different thing from forming an alliance, league or other association of governments.

Since Americans began constituting government—as early as 1639 in federating the three towns that formed the colony of Connecticut—they have always been careful to make sure that the government was not only of the people, operating directly on them as citizens, but was by and for the people—for their individual freedom. Surely every American would want this precedent maintained now when freedom is so threatened, and would not, on second thought seek the formation of a world government that gave no safeguard for human liberty as the fundamental objective of United States policy. Perhaps I should add that union now, though it popularized the ideal of world government as far back as 1939, insisted that freedom must be the basis and the aim of any such government.

The only other important changes that my amendment makes in the world federation resolution—apart from safeguarding individual freedom—may be thus clarified:

The world federation resolution, as it now stands, permits its objective to be achieved only through the development of the UN and risks having the objective interpreted as an immediate one. My amendment, while calling for the strengthening of the UN and permitting us to make the most of every opportunity to develop it into a world government, does not restrict us to achieving a free world federation only by amendment of the Charter or other action by the UN. It leaves all possibilities open, and there should be no objection to that.

While keeping the strengthening of the UN as an immediate goal, my amendment, moreover, makes clear that world federation is a more distant goal. It thus guards against the resolution, once adopted, being interpreted as authorizing immediate or premature attempts by the United States to change the UN into a world federation. Such attempts could only result, in my judgment, in wrecking the sole world political organization mankind now possesses, and leaving the nations not only sharply divided into two

[1] *Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the UN and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law.

camps but lacking even the common meeting place that Lake Success now provides.

The Kremlin would veto any attempt to develop the UN into a free world federation, and the United States would veto any move to convert it into an autocratic world government. Consequently, there would seem to be no possibility of changing it into either so long as dictatorship rules the U. S. S. R., and freedom rules the U. S. A.

Some argue that the United States should, nonetheless, make immediately an attempt to amend the Charter, either to make it a world government or at least to abolish the veto—which is also certain to be vetoed by the Kremlin. They contend this would improve our moral position and fix the responsibility for failure on Soviet Russia. They assume the United Nations would continue thereafter as before, and believe it would then be safe for the United States to form within the United Nations a federation of all the nations that had proved willing to make one when the offer was made to Moscow.

My 10 years of experience covering the League of Nations for the New Times helps convince me that all this, though it seems quite plausible, is very unsound speculation.

Unless one is aiming to go to war, and ready for war, it is wiser not to try to pin down certain responsibilities, or to attempt to maneuver a great power into too openly humiliating a hole. A careful jockeying for moral position is too often the immediate prelude to war. It is very likely to be, if one of the disputants is more concerned with fixing blame on the other than with facing him with power too effective and overwhelming to be challenged.

NUMBERS DO NOT MEAN POWER

A federation formed by the above process (that is, of combining those nations, excluding Russia, which do accept the offer), would not only tauten present tension to the breaking point but it would invite attack. Those who assume it would be stronger than the proposed Atlantic Union repeat a time-honored error, the one that brought the Persians to grief at Marathon and Salamis. They confuse mere numbers with power. They reckon the loosely organized horde to be stronger than the smaller but closely knit phalanx.

Above all, they overlook the basic fact that the great bulk of non-Communist armed, industrial, and developed raw-material power in the world today is in the hands of the few North Atlantic democracies with which the Atlantic Union resolution would begin the formation of a world federal union. These democracies because of their greater community of interest and stronger natural bonds can be much more closely knit together than they can be federated now with a large number of divergent, inexperienced democracies or dictatorships.

To try to federate all the non-Communist world does not change the facts of power; it can result only in shifting away from the experienced Atlantic democracies more or less of the control they now possess over their power. If they should consent to enough shift of control to make the federation a real federation—which is highly unlikely—they would merely be placing their power in less experienced hands. What could encourage the Kremlin more? If they refused thus to shift control of their power, the result would be another loose league instead of a federation. Would another, smaller United Nations overawe the Kremlin?

By taking either course we would not only sacrifice the overwhelmingly powerful federal union we could make with the other Atlantic democracies, but we would sacrifice precious time. The Kremlin could string out the discussion of any Charter amendment as it did the vain proposal for a world atomic authority. While the negotiations for the latter went on, the Kremlin succeeded in learning how to make an atomic explosion. Shall we waste more time now on attempts to strengthen the UN and achieve world federation that require us to begin by asking the Kremlin's consent?

Before we consider further so dangerous a course, let us rid ourselves of the notion that such a proposal to change the Charter would, when it failed, leave the UN still functioning as before. True, if an amendment to the United States Constitution fails of adoption, the Government goes on unchanged, and so it is not surprising that many assume the same would be the case in the UN.

But suppose a powerful group of our 48 States proposed to change our Constitution fundamentally—to make it, for example, a dictatorship, or to change it from a federal union into a league of States from which any State could secede. If they failed to get their way, would the United States still continue as before, or would it be wrecked, and probably plunged into civil war by the bitter controversy this attempt inflamed?

Certainly, if the United States could not survive peacefully such an attempt to change its basic character despite a powerful minority, the much weaker and younger UN would be destroyed, for all practical purposes, by any American move to abolish the veto or change the Charter into a world government—while dictatorship rules the Kremlin and the Atlantic democracies remain unfederated.

Why embark on a policy that so gravely endangers our best remaining bridge to Soviet Russia, while giving the Kremlin time to stock pile atomic bombs before we even attempt to federate with our closest and strongest friends?

The Atlantic Union resolution avoids these perils. There is nothing in the UN Charter preventing any members from going the limit toward achieving its ideals by mutually, peacefully uniting in an organic federal union. Such union requires no action by the UN. The Atlantic Union resolution takes advantage of this fact. We can call the federal convention it proposes without having first to ask the Kremlin's consent. We thus avoid waste of precious time. We also avoid the kind of debate that would ruin the UN.

We preserve it, too, by not attempting to federate all its non-Communist members, but only a few Atlantic democracies at the start. We do not split it into two clear-cut camps; we leave the greatest number of its members where they are today, in between us and the Kremlin, but with us in an emergency, since the Atlantic Union would be no threat to them but a protection—and the only place where they could sell their products and get the manufactured goods they need.

By the Atlantic Union resolution we preserve, too, the charter's bridge to the Russian people, and all the possibilities the charter gives of lining up a coalition of all the non-Communist world behind the Union, in the improbable event the Kremlin should threaten it. Even though the UN is not strong enough to insure peace, and even though it cannot be seriously strengthened by charter amendment, it still can perform so many valuable services to peace that we should seek to preserve it.

The Atlantic Union resolution, in short, would avoid the dangers other policies involve, would preserve the UN and strengthen it in substance, and, by my amendment, would commit us to the goal of ultimate free world federation. And yet it would let us begin at once to explore whether we can now form the nucleus of such a free federal union with the other sponsors of the North Atlantic pact. If we cannot federate with them, how can we hope to federate effectively with the rest of the world now? And if we can join with them in a federal union of the free—as I am confident we can, difficult though even such federation is—we can confront the Kremlin in good time with far more power than we can otherwise put behind freedom and peace, and at far less cost. We can thus block its scheme to win the world through economic disaster and further monetary depreciation in the Atlantic area. We can confront the Kremlin with such immense armed, industrial, financial, raw material and moral power that Soviet Russia dare not challenge it.

Thus we can stabilize the world situation long enough for the slow evolution needed to attain without world war our ultimate objective—a free federation of all the world. By this policy we wed the practical to the ideal. And we do more.

We promptly begin to carry out the pledges in the Atlantic Pact that commit us and our allies "to safeguard the freedom * * * of their peoples, founded on the principles of * * * individual liberty," and "to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which these institutions are founded."

Our American freedom is based on our Federal Constitution, and nothing could contribute more to a better understanding of its principles than to explore in a Federal Constitutional Convention the possibility of our unity through these principles with the other sponsors of the Atlantic Pact. By this policy we keep freedom first. We recognize and act on it for what freedom truly is—the key to peace.

Civic Problems, Civic Bodies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Civic Problems, Civic Bodies," written by Jesse C. Suter, and published in the Washington (D. C.) Star of December 18, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIC PROBLEMS, CIVIC BODIES—SUPERINTENDENT AND BOARD PRESIDENT; WOMEN'S GENERAL FEDERATION CAMPAIGN

(By Jesse C. Suter)

GENERAL FEDERATION OF WOMEN'S CLUBS AND NEELY'S CHALLENGE

The national legislative chairman of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, Mrs. Leslie B. Wright, reports that their Nationwide campaign in support of national representation for the District of Columbia is getting under way. Legislative chairmen of the various State federations are expected to begin intensive work immediately on Senators and Representatives from the respective States to obtain their pledge of support to the Neely joint resolution—Senate Joint Resolution 132.

The immediate need in this campaign is to provide these State legislative committees and the constituent groups of the State federations with succinct printed statements of

the District's case. It is essential that the question should be well understood by these public-spirited and patriotic women throughout the Nation in order that they may arouse the required interest and enthusiastic activity.

The Neely joint resolution proposes an amendment to the Constitution of the United States which would empower the Congress to provide "that there shall be in the Congress and among the electors of President and Vice President members elected by the people of the District constituting the seat of the Government of the United States, in such numbers and with such power as the Congress shall determine, but such representation and powers shall be no greater than those of a State. All legislation hereunder shall be subject to amendment and repeal."

Such an amendment to the Constitution is necessary for the reason that the Constitution makes no provision whatever for representation in the Congress other than by States. It is believed that such provision was omitted unintentionally from the Constitution at the time of its being drafted, as matters of far greater importance were at stake.

At a "civic clinic" held by Senator MATTHEW M. NEELY, Democrat, of West Virginia, chairman of the Senate Committee on the District of Columbia, in September, Mrs. Wright stated that the first thing to get for Washington is representation in Congress and the electoral college. She stated that she was speaking as chairman of the legislative committee of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, for 5,000,000 women, whereupon Senator NEELY said: "If you have 5,000,000 women all agreed on that, you can get it before the end of the next session." He urged her to get active on the subject and get these women busy with their Senators and Representatives.

State chairman visits headquarters

The State legislative chairman for the Federation of Women's Clubs of Michigan, Mrs. Wade Van Valkenburg, called at the headquarters of the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation for the District during the past week for the purpose of obtaining required information for use in their campaign. Some literature was supplied, and the lack of fundamental American rights for District residents, the necessity for constitutional amendment, and the required procedure were explained.

Mrs. Van Valkenburg was surprised and shocked to learn, from one of the victims, that these American citizens resident in the District of Columbia and owing allegiance to no particular State are deprived of all participation in the National Government which taxes them and sends them to war, and in the local government which performs the administrative functions usually performed by States, counties, and municipalities. She was much impressed with the opportunity offered in this campaign to render practical service to these voteless and unrepresented fellow Americans of the Nation's Capital.

The late Theodore W. Noyes, long editor of the Star and for many years chairman of the Citizen's Joint Committee on National Representation for the District, always held that there was special appeal in this campaign for national representation to the women of the country. Through the long years of the campaign for woman suffrage, District women occupied a conspicuous place with the women of the States for an amendment to the Constitution which would put women on an equal footing with men at the national ballot box. All the while these District women were engaged in this self-sacrificing service they knew full well that without another amendment to the Constitution they would not acquire through the woman suffrage amendment the privileges of voting in the national elections. Now, it surely is up to the women throughout the United States, particularly in the ranks of the well-informed clubwomen of America, to put their shoulders to the wheel and work earnestly to give these women of the District of Columbia, and likewise the men, the right which they helped acquire for the women of the States.

American Oil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LISTER HILL
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, this morning the Washington Post carries an interesting editorial captioned "American oil." The editorial is inspired by a statement by the attorney general of the State of Alabama, the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, the statement by Mr. Carmichael being on the question of tidelands oil. The editorial deals at some length with Mr. Carmichael's statement, and I ask unanimous consent that the editorial, together with the full text of the statement by Mr. Carmichael, may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial and statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of January 6, 1950]

AMERICAN OIL

It is heartening to find a State attorney general who talks about the marginal sea like an American. A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of the State of Alabama, has made a public answer to the National Association of Attorneys General, which has constituted itself a lobby for the purpose of persuading Congress to quitclaim the valuable mineral resources submerged off the costs of the United States. "If the Congress makes such a gift to the States," says Mr. Carmichael, "it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States."

In 1947, the Supreme Court held, in *United States* v. *California*, that California had no title to the submerged lands lying outside its inland waters and beyond the low-tide mark and that the United States Government had paramount rights in and power over these lands. Since that decision, the National Association of Attorneys General has emitted a great deal of expensive propaganda intended (1) to show that the Court was wrong, and (2) to induce Congress to donate to the States what Congress would have power to donate only if the Court was right. Mr. Carmichael said about all there is to say on this subject:

"Title to land, under our system of law, is determined by the courts. A determination of ownership, or nonownership, is binding. It is, therefore, ridiculous for the advocates of State ownership of the marginal lands to declare that the States are being deprived of land, rightfully theirs, by the Federal Government. The highest court in the United States has held that the States do not own, and never have owned, the subsoil beneath the marginal sea. The concept of States' rights is totally irrelevant. A State cannot be stripped of lands in deprivation of its rights, when that State has never had any legal right to the lands. The States' rights concept is again being used, as it has been used so often in the past, to obscure the real issues in the controversy."

Mr. Carmichael has also pointed out what most State attorneys general have apparently ignored, that by quitclaiming the marginal sea Congress would be making an outright gift not to all the States but to a very few—California, Texas, and Louisiana principally, with Alabama itself a possible beneficiary—of incalculably rich mineral resources, the income and use of which should rightfully benefit all citizens of this country. These resources should be conserved and managed in the national interest and as a bulwark of the national security. To give them away would be to give away, fraudulently, an inheritance of the American people.

STATEMENT BY A. A. CARMICHAEL, ATTORNEY GENERAL OF ALABAMA

The statement of Walter Johnson, special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General, that Congress will donate the marginal submerged lands (commonly called tidelands) and the oil reserves therein to the States deserves an answer from one who is himself an attorney general. If the Congress makes such a gift to the States, it will be tragically derelict in its duty as the highest legislative body in the United States.

In 1947 the Supreme Court of the United States, in the case of United States against California, held that California, and undoubtedly other States in similar circumstances, had no ownership whatsoever in the submerged marginal lands called tidelands, and that the United States Government had paramount rights in and power over those lands.

After this opinion was rendered by the United States Supreme Court, a weird assortment of State attorneys general and oil magnates have called the opinion wrong. According to these critics, the Supreme Court of the United States (all eight of its members since Mr. Justice Jackson was not sitting at the time) is ignorant as to the meaning of prior decisions of that court.

Title to land, under our system of law, is determined by the courts. A determination of ownership, or nonownership, is binding. It is, therefore, ridiculous for the advocates of State ownership of the marginal lands to declare that the States are being deprived of land, rightfully theirs, by the Federal Government. The highest court in the United States has held that the States do not own, and never have owned, the subsoil beneath the marginal sea. The concept of States' rights is totally irrelevant. A State cannot be stripped of lands in deprivation of its rights, when that State has never had any legal right to the lands. The States' rights concept is again being used, as it has been used so often in the past, to obscure the real issues in the controversy. Since the States severally never possessed or owned the subsoil beneath the marginal sea, such subsoil could not possibly have been taken from the States.

The Congress would be well advised to consider precisely what it would be doing if it should decide to quitclaim the lands beneath the marginal sea to the States. The Congress, in such a case, would be making an outright donation to a few States (Texas, California, and Louisiana, in the main) tremendously wealthy lands whose income and resources should redound to the benefit of all citizens of this country. The Congress would most definitely not be returning to certain States that which is rightfully theirs. For the highest court in this country has decided that the lands in question do not rightfully belong to the States. One need not resort to speculation to determine the magnitude of the oil wealth which Mr. Johnson would have the Congress donate to Texas, California, and Louisiana. The total

area of the continental shelf contiguous to the United States is estimated at 262,500 square miles or about five times the area of the State of Wisconsin.

Geologists have estimated that the continental shelves of the earth contain 1,000,000,000,000 barrels of oil. The shelf contiguous to the United States and Alaska, about one-tenth of the total area of all continental shelves, is estimated to contain approximately 100,000,000,000 barrels of oil. Thus, the potential oil resources in the submerged lands which Mr. Johnson proposes that the Congress donate to three or four States, containes five times as much potential oil as there now is in the whole of the United States.

In terms of dollars—taxpayers' dollars—the figures concerning Mr. Johnson's gift to the States are even more astounding. At the present prices, the estimated 100,000,000,000 barrels contained in the continental shelves contiguous to the United States and Alaska would sell for $268,000,000,000.

There are considerations of conservation, national defense, and public welfare involved in Mr. Johnson's proposal. If the Congress gives the oil-rich submerged lands to the States, Congress will lose irrevocably any chance to control these lands and the oil produced from these lands. The resources will be exploited without consideration of questions involving defense and conservation and welfare.

There must be some reason why oil magnates unanimously desire State ownership. The proponents of State ownership have never explained why they would not be willing to have Congress quitclaim the lands to the States, with the reservation that the United States Government could control the exploitation of oil. Mr. Johnson and his cohorts have argued ardently that their only wish is to protect the States against Federal usurpation. They have stated that oil is not of controlling importance to them. But they do not want the Federal Government to have the power to direct oil leasing, even though the Federal Government might be willing to quitclaim the submerged lands with such a reservation. It is difficult to believe that Mr. Johnson and the oil magnates are not thinking primarily about oil.

The cost of public education, public health, aid to Europe, national defense, social security, and other of the more extensive Government programs does not, in the aggregate, even approach the potential money which Mr. Johnson would so generously give to Texas, Louisiana, and California.

It is apparent that Mr. Johnson's proposal represents an outright donation of immensely wealthy Federal resources to a few coastal States. Mr. Johnson's proposal completely ignores defense, welfare, and conservation considerations. If the Congress of the United States gives these tidelands to the few coastal States involved, the Congress of the United States will be perpetrating a fraud on the people of this country.

Upswing in Rents Is Found Where Controls Are Ended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Lee E. Cooper which appeared in the New York Times of January 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

UPSWING IN RENTS IS FOUND WHERE CONTROLS ARE ENDED

(By Lee E. Cooper)

A general upswing in the level of residential rents in decontrolled areas throughout the country was indicated yesterday in a survey made by The New York Times. With Federal controls lifted from more than 2,600,000 family rental units during the past 9 months, it was apparent from reports received from all regions that the prices being paid for shelter had broken out of the narrow range in which they had been held by law for about 6 years.

Although about 12,000,000 families, including those in New York City, and nearly all other major population centers, still are under rent-ceiling protection, many of these families have been affected recently by the growing number of approvals by rent authorities of landlord petitions for increases.

From April 1, 1949, the date the present Federal legislation became effective, to December 9 the Office of the Housing Expediter in Washington reported that 631 decontrol actions had been completed, taking 2,587,000 family rental units from its control. In the past 3 weeks several communities have been added to the list.

STATES WITHOUT CONTROLS

Four States, Nebraska, Texas, Arizona, and Utah, are now without controls and Alabama has voted to end controls in May. Wisconsin is under a State law which replaced the Federal statute and has permitted substantial rises in rents.

Details on the present situation in the housing market as reported by New York Times correspondents in key cities and obtained from other sources were in most instances at variance with the assertions of realty interests that the lifting of the ceilings had caused no appreciable changes in rental conditions. Unprecedented building activity in some centers, however, has helped to ease the problem of transition.

The general level of rents in Houston was found to have risen 11 percent in 3 months and nearly as much in Milwaukee. "Substantial" increases were reported in Omaha and Lincoln in Nebraska. Rises put into effect in Spokane, Wash., were said to average 14.3 percent.

There was evidence of isolated increases of 100 percent or more in some cities now operating under a "free" market. In communities such as Tampa and Miami families occupying the cheaper apartments were found to have been hit hardest, while tenants of some of the more expensive apartments had slightly lower monthly charges.

THE NORTHEAST

In New York State and the New England region all major population centers still are under the Federal ceilings extending to June 30, 1950, and fairly stable conditions are noted despite occasional protests against approval of rent rises based on the "hardship" clause or other sections of the law. No large city has been decontrolled. Actions seeking decontrol have thus far affected only a few sparsely populated communities.

Thus far the Metropolitan Fair Rent Committee, representing property owners here, has failed in its efforts to get a blanket increase of 15 percent. Last week it suggested an increase of 25 percent under the revived rule requiring repainting of apartments every 2 years.

In Boston, although exact figures were not available, a large percentage of rent-increase petitions was being granted under the fair-net-operating-income provision of the law, according to Edgar Driscoll, area rent-control director for New England. This was in line with a general policy reflecting increased costs of operation, Mr. Driscoll said.

In the five-county Philadelphia area containing 420,000 registered units under the jurisdiction of the Housing Expediter, the borough of Swarthmore voted for local option in October, but otherwise there has been no movement for the removal of rent controls.

A spokesman for the Philadelphia Real Estate Board reported that his organization always would be moving in the direction of decontrol and also would like to see some provision allowing for the increasing cost of operation and maintenance.

The Philadelphia area rent office processed 749 petitions from landlords in November and approved 490. The approvals grant rent increases on 1,725 units with an average rise of $10.45 monthly. In the first 11 months of 1949 increases approved on 7,389 rental units increased aggregate monthly payments by the tenants from $348,445 to $421,593.

THE SOUTH

In the South attention has been centered on Florida, where Miami, Tampa, and Jacksonville were freed of ceilings recently after Gov. Fuller Warren had vetoed a bill which would have removed controls on a Statewide basis except for areas around military installations.

In Miami a typical small apartment or house which brought $50 monthly now is renting for about $65, but those which had been leased at $200 can be had for about $150.

With more than 100,000 new family units built in Miami in the past 3 years and many seasonal units offered on an all-year basis following decontrol, the supply now exceeds the demand in some types of housing and there are quite a few vacancies. The net effect is to force down the rent for higher-priced living space.

Higher-priced all-year apartments in Tampa which had been bringing $90 to $120 a month have been reduced by about 10 percent. In the medium-price bracket, from $50 to $90, there have been rent increases of about the same percentage. In the cheaper housing, notably housing for Negroes, there have been instances of rent increases of more than 100 percent, with rents formerly at $4 a week going to as much as $10. Owners of this type of housing assert that they went for years without any return on their investment while rents were frozen.

A high level of house building in Tampa has helped to keep rentals down. Motor court building on the outskirts also has been very active recently, with the result that a price war has developed in some areas. This has forced down the daily cost of a kitchenette unit in some courts to about $1.25 per person from $3.50 to $7.

Not much change in Tampa

Officials of the Tampa Board of Realtors, on the basis of a recent survey, reported "not much change" in the general level of rents.

By action of the Alabama Legislature, rent ceilings will end in the State May 25. Rent-control officials in Montgomery predicted that the result probably would be a number of upward rent adjustments ranging to 50 percent.

An increase in the number of rental units was reported in Knoxville, Chattanooga, and some smaller communities in Tennessee, but spot surveys indicated an over-all rise of 6 to 8 percent in monthly rentals. One leading realtor in Chattanooga estimated the rent rise in that city at 12 to 15 percent. There has been a marked increase in the amount of repair work on rental properties recently. High-priced units have been offered at lower prices.

Landlords and tenants in Atlanta are bracing for a fight over decontrol this month when a new city council takes office. The prospects seem to favor the tenants. Mayor William B. Hartsfield has been opposing all attempts to lift ceilings in the city.

Atlanta has had a continued shortage of low-rent units. There has been no let-up in the demand for housing at $60 a month or less, but the situation has eased for houses and apartments at $80 or more, with slight declines noted last month in the rents on new higher-priced suites. The level of rents in the city rose about 4 percent in the year ended November 15.

Columbus, Ga., moved into the rent-decontrol bracket last week when Gov. Herman Talmadge approved action of that city's rent commission. Savannah has taken similar action to go into effect early this year. Decontrol also has been voted in Charlotte and Asheville, N. C., and Columbia, S. C.

Local action to lift ceilings in Savannah and Charlotte, however, received at least a temporary set-back by an adverse ruling just made by Ed Dupree, Acting House Expediter, because deferred dates were fixed for decontrol in those cities. The resolution adopted by the governing body of Savannah had set February 1 as the decontrol date, and Charlotte had specified May 1.

Mr. Dupree said the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 failed to make any provision for decontrol by local option at a specified future date, but contemplated only immediate actions.

It is expected that amended resolutions omitting the dates will be approved in the two cities.

THE MIDDLE WEST

A considerable number of decontrol actions taken on the initiative of the Office of Housing Expediter and increasing numbers of rent rises granted on petitions of landlords characterized the past year in the nine-State area administered as region VI.

Region VI comprises Colorado, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Minnesota, Missouri, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Wyoming, and covers about 2,500,000 rental dwelling units. Nebraska and Wisconsin were in region VI, but Nebraska dropped controls by legislative action over the veto of Gov. Val Peterson, and Wisconsin substituted a State law last September.

The decontrol actions in region VI indicated an improvement in the rental situation in smaller communities, but conditions still are tight in the metropolitan districts, particularly with respect to medium rentals available to families with incomes of $50 a week or slightly higher, where the bulk of the demand is concentrated.

Rents were officially increased in the region for various reasons on 25,000 apartments during October, the rises ranging from $6.94 to $8.83 a month. The final figures are expected to show 35,000 or more December increases. The Chicago Fair Rent Committee has an action pending in the Emergency Court of Appeals for a blanket increase.

Farm areas not affected

Conditions were found to be fairly quiet in the agricultural areas of the Midwest, which never felt the full force of the housing shortage. Few instances of use of the local option clause in the Federal statute have come up. In Ohio, ceilings still are in effect in Cleveland, Cincinnati and Dayton.

In Des Moines, the city council recently rejected a decontrol resolution. In St. Louis a movement has been started to put a decontrol resolution before the city council. In Laramie, Wyo., such a petition recently was withdrawn.

Wichita, Kans., and Blytheville, Ark., were freed of ceilings last week, but the full effect has not yet been apparent in either place.

Continued unprecedented apartment building has eased the housing situation in most Indiana communities and there have been no general complaints of rent increases. Some Federal officials, however, insist that the situation demands more Government-sponsored projects.

Bloomington, Ind., took local decontrol action but formal ratification in Washington was held up because the Bloomington petition had set a deferred date, April 1.

Wisconsin law debated

Controversy has arisen over the merits of the Wisconsin law which replaced Federal ceilings. The State statute authorized rent increases of 15 percent for all tenants who had agreed to a 15 percent voluntary rise previously under the Federal regulations and permitted increases of 30 percent for families which had not signed such agreements.

Most landlords requested and received the authorized increases. Some held the line voluntarily, however, and others decided to charge less than the maximum permitted under the law. The State CIO challenged the constitutionality of the State law, but lost the case in the Federal district court.

Conflicting reports were heard in Topeka, Kans., following decontrol. Officials of a property owners' group which sponsored the decontrol movement insisted that increases had been slight, but a labor union representative declared that in some instances rents had doubled. One instance was cited of a monthly rate increased to $75 from $40.

A disturbed situation was noted in Nebraska, where decontrol was completed on November 2 with the lifting of ceilings in Omaha and Lincoln. Mayor Glenn Cunningham, of Omaha, said tenants' complaints recently had declined to a "trickle" and court records there showed a slight drop in evictions.

The fair-rent committee set up by the Omaha Real Estate Board asserted that these factors indicated "a surprisingly easy adjustment" to decontrol, but Mayor Cunningham and spokesmen for labor countered that they merely indicated that "there is nothing the people can do about it."

"I think that maybe in the spring the situation will begin to adjust itself, but certainly November was too early for decontrol," Mayor Cunningham commented.

He guessed that rent increases had averaged 45 percent.

Al Witzling, president of the Omaha Central Labor Union, said that the increases would average 50 percent. He declared that one reason for the dearth of complaints is the fear of eviction.

Dr. Wesley Jones, who represents the Urban League on the Omaha fair-rent committee, stated that the rent situation as a whole was fair, with increases averaging 30 percent. Peter Marchetti, lawyer representing the Small Property Owners Association, reported many large houses made available for rent after having been held off the market while controls existed. Jack Evahn, representing the Omaha Building Owners and Managers Association, estimated the average rent increase at 20 percent.

In Lincoln, Joseph T. Wishart, lawyer and chairman of the Nebraska Small Property Owners Committee, estimated the average rise at 18 percent.

THE WEST COAST

On the west coast conditions generally were reported stabilized, with controls continuing virtually intact.

A considerable number of higher rents was noted in Spokane, Wash., after 5 months of decontrol. James P. Dillard, chairman of the Spokane Rent Advisory Board, which recommended the decontrol, noted in a report last month to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods that the average increase was 14.3 percent, or about $5.25 monthly. He added that a few rental housing operators had taken advantage of the situation to put unreasonable increases into effect.

He stated that there had been a large increase in the number of properties offered for rent recently, and estimated the number of Spokane vacant units at 1,200 to 1,500. One reason is the heavy postwar construction of fairly low-priced houses.

On the other side of the picture, Fred Simmons, who managed the Spokane area rent office before decontrol closed it, announced that he had received complaints from 100 tenants that their rent had been increased 38 to 53 percent.

In the Los Angeles district rents were reported still "extremely tight." Decontrol was authorized on December 7 in Beverly Hills and Ben C. Koepke, area rent director, said that complaints by Beverly Hills tenants of rent increases of as much as 275 percent and averaging nearly 80 percent had reached his office. Bitter controversy preceded decontrol in Beverly Hills, west end neighborhood of Los Angeles.

Complaints also were received from Pasadena, Alhambra, Elmonte, and Pomona. The average increase cited in the complaints, according to Mr. Koekpe, was slightly more than $52, indicating that some owners were attempting "rent gouges" and that others were taking this method of trying to get rid of unwanted tenants.

General Los Angeles picture

Many modern apartments are available in the Los Angeles district at $75 or more a month, unfurnished, but hundreds of families are looking in vain for places at $35 to $70 and new arrivals are complicating the situation.

A growing sentiment for decontrol was noted in Long Beach and some other populous communities near Los Angeles, where the housing situation has improved lately.

Controlled rental units in the San Francisco area show an average rate of $44.42 a month, compared with an average of $82.50 for suites in new houses not under control, according to the Federal rent office there. Rent adjustments were granted in the year to landlords of more than 7,000 units, with an average increase of $8.25 a month. The total annual income of landlords was increased by about $695,000. All of the populous centers near San Francisco still are under the rent regulations.

THE SOUTHWEST

In the Southwest interest has been centered on the results of decontrol in the large cities of Texas. The Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics reported that the index of rents in Houston rose 11 percent in the 3 months which ended November 15. There was said to be a comparable situation in Dallas, Fort Worth and San Antonio, all of which have been free of ceiling since September 1.

Rents for some houses in the four cities have been increased 10 to 15 percent, with isolated increases of perhaps as much as 100 percent, according to the Houston Property Owners Association. The association asserted, however, that these increases had been largely offset by lower rents for many apartments.

There have been recurrent warnings lately that Houston may be "overbuilding" so far as multi-family housing is concerned. A renter's market appears to be returning. There also has been a broad expansion in construction of houses. A further competitive factor has been the return of many houses to the rental market following decontrol.

Woodrow Wilson: Man of Half Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting to read the list of names chosen as the most outstanding men of the last half century. Rightly appearing among the great is the name of Woodrow Wilson.

David Lawrence, in the current issue of United States News, presents the name of President Woodrow Wilson as the most outstanding man of the past 50 years.

As a part of my remarks, I beg leave to insert said article in the Appendix of the RECORD:

WOODROW WILSON: MAN OF HALF CENTURY
(By David Lawrence)

If decisive influence upon the course of world affairs is the criterion in determining what man during the first half of this century did most for mankind, then the fateful heroism of Woodrow Wilson transcends the claims that may be offered in behalf of anyone else.

For it was Woodrow Wilson who turned America away from more than a century of aloofness and traditional isolation and placed her mighty industrial and military power at the disposal of the free democracies of Europe and thus tipped the scales on the side of victory in World War I. This affected the whole destiny of our modern civilization and kept aloft the torch of democracy which had burned so brightly since our own War for Independence and the French Revolution.

It was Woodrow Wilson who in his war message of April 1917 unhesitatingly recommended to Congress the conscription of our manpower, the extension of unlimited financial aid to our allies, and the prompt dispatch of an American expeditionary force to battlefields more than 3,000 miles away.

It was Woodrow Wilson who in 1918, at the critical moment of the war, insisted on a unified command among the Allied armies and not only recommended Marshal Foch as supreme commander but stood staunchly behind him in the great decisions of World War I.

It was Woodrow Wilson who promulgated the doctrine of the "self-determination of peoples from which has since come a recognition of independence movements in Ireland, the Philippines, India, Burma, Israel, Indonesia, to say nothing of the struggles for democracy in central Europe unhappily thwarted now by another autocracy.

BIRTH OF AN INTERNATIONAL CONSCIENCE

It was Woodrow Wilson who gave the world an international conscience. He sought to secure for the world through the League of Nations not only a system of collective security but the maintenance of the territorial integrity and independence of all nations, large and small.

It is no disparagement of his record that America switched back to isolationism in 1920 and forsook the League by refusing to accept its obligations. It is no disparagement, either, that the Charter of the United Nations corrected some of the mistakes experienced with the Covenant of the League. It is no disparagement of Woodrow Wilson's record that a Hitler arose to threaten democracy again and based his aggressive action on the mistaken assumption that the turn to isolationism in America in the twenties was an assurance against our participation in a second world war.

It is natural that the great eloquence and extraordinary pen of Winston Churchill should command attention for him in choosing the Man of the Half Century. But while Churchill saved his own country by his courage in 1940, the die had already been cast for American cooperation in World War II by the decisive steps "short of war" taken by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when Holland and Belgium were invaded in May 1940.

If decisive influence on the course of world history is the yardstick of measurement, then Franklin Roosevelt would appear to stand higher than Winston Churchill, not by reason of any invidious comparisons of ability or personality but solely because of the immense power which Mr. Roosevelt wielded and the decisions he made to use that power in the best interests of mankind.

GOALS OF HUMAN HAPPINESS

Franklin Roosevelt ultimately carried forward what was left undone when Woodrow Wilson's principles were abandoned in 1920 by an isolationism which was to hold fast in both our political parties for nearly two decades afterwards. Even Mr. Roosevelt in the spring of 1932, as he camaigned for the Democratic nomination for the Presidency, wrote that he considered the League of Nations as dead. He displayed no fervor about reviving it until 1945 when he exacted from Stalin at Yalta a pledge to help build the United Nations.

If the course of history is to be influenced in the future by some form of world government or world discipline or by some formula of collective security, the ideals for which Woodrow Wilson gave his life must be viewed as the ideals of the century. They represent still the stirring manifestation of a conscience among the peoples of the world. They are still the aspirations of men and women, whether oppressed behind the iron curtain or elsewhere.

We have not yet come close to those goals of human happiness for which Woodrow Wilson strove so valiantly. But Woodrow Wilson's passion for human freedom in an international sense and his recognition of the ever-increasing need for liberalism in a national sense are today the very essence of such progress as we have made in recent years not only in America but throughout the world.

Resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
OFFICE OF THE CITY CLERK,
January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to the directions of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo, I enclose to you herewith copy of Resolution 160, passed by that body at a meeting held December 27, 1949, in relation to funds for the development of water-front facilities.

Very truly yours,
Dr. J. J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

Resolution 160
(By Mr. Rybka)
Funds—Water-front development

Whereas the capital expenditures committee, created by the council, is presently considering the development of the water-front facilities of the city of Buffalo and has appropriated a sum of money for the purpose of initiating such development; and

Whereas such appropriation is but a small fraction of the amount of money needed to defray the expense of the development of our water front; and

Whereas the citizens of Buffalo are entitled to and should have a modern water front complete with park and recreational facilities, bathing beach, boat harbors, etc., without the necessity of traveling great distances to enjoy such facilities outside the city of Buffalo; and

Whereas there is presently, before the common council and the capital expenditures committee, a proposed skyway in addition to water-front development which would facilitate traffic conditions along the water-front area and that such plans represent a large expenditure of money; and

Whereas such development would enhance the value of our city by attracting tourists and new industry: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the common council go on record memorializing the New York State Legislature, Congress, and Senate of the United States for State and Federal financial aid to the city of Buffalo to be considered at the next session of both bodies beginning January 1950; be it further

Resolved, That the area members of the New York State Senate, Assembly, and United States Senators HERBERT H. LEHMAN and IRVING IVES and area Congressman CHESTER GORSKI, ANTHONY TAURIELLO, and WILLIAM PFEIFFER be advised of the common council's action and to take the necessary appropriate measures to secure the requested financial assistance for the city of Buffalo.

Passed: Ayes, 15; noes, none.

Taxes Big Issue Faced by Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Courier-Times of New Castle, Ind., for December 28, 1949:

TAXES BIG ISSUE FACED BY CONGRESS

The question of taxes promises to be the most important that will face Congress which starts its session next week. No one knows for sure what the President will recommend, but he is certainly facing a public which is more and more becoming tax conscious. Mr. Truman has stated that he prefers higher taxes in order to avoid deficit financing and has been met by demands that deficits be eliminated through the spending of less money.

One of the larger of the tax issues concerns the so-called excise taxes. These are the

left-overs from the war and include many items, automobiles, railroad fares, telephone and telegraph tolls, furs, cosmetics and a lot of other things originally classified as luxuries. Many Republicans, headed by JOE MARTIN, GOP leader in the House, believe the time is here to repeal these excise levies and they are being joined by many Democrats.

Of course, if the excise levies are repealed, revenue to make up the deficit must come from other sources. The argument of those favoring repeal is that it would prove a healthy stimulus to business generally and this would make possible a greater normal tax return to the Treasury. If, for instance, the $500 or $600 Federal tax involved in the sale of an automobile be repealed, thus bringing the price down to where sales would boom, the income tax of the manufacturers might be increased to the extent that the return to the Treasury would balance the loss in excises. The same reasoning could be applied to dozens of now taxed articles and the whole thing might be the making of an unprecedented business expansion.

One thing is sure, the whole field is worthy of exploring and Congress is likely to do that very thing.

Mr. Truman on Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for January 6, 1950:

MR. TRUMAN ON FORMOSA

President Truman's statement on Formosa is a direct reply to the recommendation of former President Hoover and Senator TAFT that United States armed forces be used to aid in the defense of the island. They will not so be used, the President states. We feel that a majority of Americans will agree that this decision is well taken and that the risks of a possibly unsuccessful military commitment outweigh the advantages that might be gained.

Beyond that point, however, the President's declaration compounds the confusion in which the problem of Far East policy is already wrapped. The United States, the President says, has no desire "to establish military bases on Formosa at this time." If not "at this time," then at what time? Why the gratuitous introduction of this qualification?

The United States, says Mr. Truman, will not pursue a course that would lead to "involvement" in a civil conflict in China. But the President has repeatedly pledged the "involvement" of the United States in the cause of the survival of free states against the depredations of aggressive communism. The President's statement means that the United States does not propose to be involved in the support of a Government which, whatever its faults of leadership, we still recognize and presumably expect to continue to recognize against precisely those forces that the President has identified as aggressive.

In addition, the President says that we will not provide "military aid or advice" to Chinese forces on Formosa. That needs explaining. Does it mean an embargo on arms shipments? Apparently not, since the President says that the forces on Formosa have resources adequate to obtain items for defense. Obtain them from where? From the United States? The President says we will not provide "advice" to the Chinese. Is this merely a disavowal of the plan to send some sort of military mission or does it mean that the Americans who are now on Formosa, actually not only advising but training Chinese, will be returned to the United States?

The President says that the present authorized ECA program will be continued. For what purposes and in what amounts? If it is used to strengthen the island's industries, and thus indirectly advance its military potential, will this not constitute military aid? Do the resources of Formosa include any part of the $75,000,000 that the President was authorized by Congress to spend in the China area? If not, why not?

The President has said, in effect, that we wash our hands of Formosa. On the same day, the President's Ambassador Extraordinary, Dr. Jessup, declares in Tokyo that we have no intention of abandoning China. What China? Does Dr. Jessup mean that we have no intention of abandoning Communist China? That seems unlikely. Then he must mean the lawful government of China which President Truman indicates that we are, in effect, abandoning.

It is small wonder that the British, on the eve of their own recognition of the Chinese Communists, regard our policy as vacillating and unpredictable. If it had been otherwise the British might have been considerably less precipitate in recognizing the Mao Tzetung regime, and we would have had one less element of confusion in the picture.

The President's statement has many of the earmarks of a political impromptu designed to meet opposition criticism and to give a line to those Members of Congress who are always ready to support the administration. But it is more than time, now, that the entire matter have a complete airing, with all of the hitherto withheld reports about China brought out into the open. The only place in which that airing can take place is the elected Congress.

New Declaration of Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of the outstanding farm journals of the country, the American Agriculturist, whose editor is E. R. Eastman, has inaugurated a movement to arouse its readers and the country to the dangers of current trends in Government. It has published a new Declaration of Independence and is soliciting the support of all citizens who are ready to subscribe to the declaration and actively participate in steps to forestall the continuance of these socialistic trends.

Feeling that this declaration should be of general public interest, I am taking the liberty of including it as an extension of my remarks:

WILL YOU PLEDGE YOURSELF TO THIS NEW DECLARATION OF INDEPENDENCE?

The following new Declaration of Independence was written by and represents the joint thinking of a group of responsible citizens concerned with the gradual loss of our liberties. They and we are determined to do something about it.

We believe that no American citizen would vote at any one time for the amount of socialism we now have. And we are sure that most people do not realize how fully this country has gone socialistic, or that socialism is the half-brother of communism. Socialism has crept up on us a step at a time. And, because of our indifference, our selfishness in getting our own little handouts from government, or because of our concern for our private affairs, creeping socialism has now reached the walking stage, and unless we can stop it, it will soon be galloping.

The consequence is that the Nation has gone a long way down the road toward centralization of government and the philosophy that the state is more important than the individual. We have more and more government employees, government control, deficit spending, and ever-higher taxes, all of which is resulting and will continue to result in the loss of our most precious possession, individual liberty.

Because of this alarming situation, more and more citizens believe that America is on the downward road and that we must immediately retrace our steps back to the crossroads and start again on the right road to our true destiny of free opportunity for everyone. This can only be done if the people themselves realize what is going on and do something about it. The welfare of every citizen of the United States, and the welfare of the world, depends on what course America follows in the immediate future. It is a grave responsibility.

So, read the statement that follows. If you agree with its principles, pledge yourself to stand by and fight for these principles, and get your friends to do the same.

E. R. EASTMAN.

We, loyal citizens of the United States, determined to maintain and preserve the blessings of liberty and of personal opportunity for ourselves and for our posterity, hold it to be the truth that our American Government and our American system of free enterprise have for generation after generation given our people more opportunity to develop their own natural talents and ability to achieve success and a higher standard of living than has any other government or social system of the past or present. Competition and incentive provided by the free market—in other words, individual enterprise—are absolutely necessary to progress resulting in an ever higher standard of living for everybody.

We emphasize the tremendous sacrifices that have been made since the days of King John and the Magna Carta to the present to achieve our present degree of political, religious, and economic liberty. We submit that one cannot exist without the other.

We are agreed that these liberties are rapidly being lost, and that in many respects there is less liberty in the world today, even in America, than there was before the Declaration of Independence. These losses of our liberties nullify the untold sacrifices of our fathers and sons and are largely due to a false belief on the part of a large number of people that some other social or government ideology, some other "ism" of the Old World, is better than our own Americanism.

We hold it to be self-evident that true liberty of all kind is based upon the welfare and the importance of the individual, that government exists for the individual and never the individual for government. It follows, therefore, that if his importance is to be maintained, more emphasis must be placed on the individual and his organizations, more emphasis on volunteer work for the public good, and less upon force or compulsion by law and government regulations. The powers of government should never be used except to provide the rules that make maximum freedom possible, to protect the citizen from abuses within, to

provide safety from outside aggression. When the powers of government are used they should be based on law, not on bureaucratic regulations.

In view, therefore, of maintaining these basic and vital principles we solemnly pledge ourselves to work with our representatives in the State and Federal Governments, with our associates, with our organizations, with the general public, and with our friends:

I. For less Government in business, agriculture, and labor.

To this end we support the Hoover Report, which calls for fewer Government services and consolidation of departments and bureaus resulting in a lesser number of public employee's, lower taxes, and more efficiency.

II. We will regularly and constantly call attention to the growing army of government employees, Federal, State, and local.

As of July 1949, there was a total of approximately 6,500,000 employees on the State and Federal pay rolls, about two-thirds of whom were State and local employees and one-third Federal. These figures compare with the figures for 1940, when the total number was approximately 4,500,000, with almost 1,500,000 of them on the Federal pay rolls. It is plain that America cannot continue to exist on this spendthrift basis.

We are certain that this army of employees, with their total voting power and their natural and normal inclination to keep themselves in office, are a dangerous factor in our Republic. We are convinced that there is confusion and duplication of services, and that many of the jobs done by Government employees can be better done by the individual and his organizations on a volunteer basis.

III. We are determined to emphasize at every opportunity the growing public debt, the constantly increasing current expenses of Government, the ruinous effects of these, and the resulting taxes upon every business and individual in America.

We are convinced that the huge strain of ruinous taxes is increasingly retarding the investment by individuals and industry of capital in constructive enterprises. Such investments are essential to continued expansion of employment and continued growth of the country. Before the war, in 1940, the total State and local tax bill was $8,500,000,000, and that of the Federal Government was $5,500,000,000. Now, in 1949, the State and local tax bill is $14,500,000,000, and the Federal is $42,000,000,000. Even excluding Federal expenses due to war, costs of the Federal Government have doubled. In the last 4 years the Government has spent more money than in all the preceding 169 years since the founding of the country. The power to tax is the power to destroy.

IV. We believe that unrestricted Government subsidies and price-support schemes will destroy liberty and lead to national bankruptcy. Therefore, we will urge the greatest possible use of the free market, competitive system in every segment of our economy.

We submit that an ever increasing standard of living can come only from an ever increasing production of industrial and agricultural products. We believe that free market prices with a stable price level are the best possible guides to production of agricultural and industrial products. Government subsidies and price supports must always lead to controls and restriction of production. Whenever production is restricted, unemployment increases and the national standard of living falls.

The most important factor in maintaining a stable price level is the fiscal policy of government. We believe that government attempts to inflate and deflate the currency bring about instability rather than stability of the price level. We believe that thrift in government, a pay-as-you-go fiscal policy, is conducive to a stable price level and we will work to that end.

V. We believe that every American should have the unrestricted right to work and earn.

VI. We pledge ourselves to work for a better understanding of the principles on which this Government was founded, between and among agricultural, industrial and labor groups and individuals in general, with a liberal and tolerant attitude toward all constructive groups and organizations in our political and social economy, realizing that peace among the nations must first start with understanding and friendship among ourselves.

Now, Mr. President, Just Who Pays Our Tax Bill?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, on this opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we, the elected Representatives of the American people, must, as never before, take into consideration the financial condition of our United States Treasury. We must take a good, square look down the road we are traveling before it is too late to save our people from utter destruction.

All of you, my colleagues in this House of Congress, have just returned from your respective districts, as have I, and I am sure you will admit, if you want to be honest with yourself and the people, that your people, like mine of the Seventh Iowa District, are more deeply worried and nearer to losing heart when looking into the future, seeing what is in store for them and their children, than ever before in peacetime. Surely you must all agree that they have good and sufficient reason to be worried. From the lips and hearts of thinking people, in all walks of life, whether it be the laborer, the farmer, or businessman, all without exception, asked me why, oh why, does Congress spend our money as if it grew on trees? Then, when the news hit that the President contemplated a $5,500,000,000 deficit for the fiscal year 1950, which ends next June 30, without promising a greatly reduced spending program for the fiscal year 1951, their hope for the future looked still darker. And, to add insult to injury, President Truman demanded an increase in taxes. That was the last straw.

Of course, the President said only the tax on corporations will be increased, but what he forgets is that most of the American people have fully awakened to the fact that to impose more taxes on any business, large or small, is just another concealed tax on the consumer, who is the wage earner, the farmer, the retired elderly folks, and all the rest of the consumers. They must pay in tax dollars in the final analysis every penny Congress spends, either with cash, withholding tax, or by the hidden tax on everything they buy. The hidden tax now amounts to about 30 cents on every dollar's worth of goods they buy to eat or use. Surely the President knows that the ultimate consumer has no place; nor any way to shift his taxes; he must pay the bill which the President is trying to hoodwink him into believing is paid by the corporations, or the "big bugs" as the administration likes to call American industry and business. Business must add taxes onto the price of all the goods they manufacture or sell every day to the consumers of America. If they did not do that, they would very soon go bankrupt, and the President knows that too.

Let us see just who the folks really are who are being soaked by the vote-buying and reckless-spending proposals which are demanded by the President, and have been demanded ever since he took over a few months before our fighting Americans, with their brains and brawn and blood, defeated the gang across the seas, whose dictators had promised their subjects security and Utopia at the end of the same road down which the President seems determined to lead us.

Who are the folks who must pay this bill? Well, that is an easy one to answer when we get right down to brass tacks. It is the consumer who pays the fiddler, being the laboring people of America, both blue-denim and white-collar workers, plus the retired elderly people, who altogether constitute about 60 percent of the consumers dollarwise; and our farmers who now number about 20 percent of our total population, but who buy and consume one and one-half times more per capita than do the average of the rest of us, making 30 percent total consumption by our farmers dollarwise. Therefore, that leaves only 10 percent for the owners of business and industry of every kind to pay. But mind you, it is this small 10 percent of our consumers dollarwise who our President and his socialistic palace politicians are trying to trick and doubletalk us into thinking they want to soak. Then the truth is, as I have just shown, it is Mr. Farmer, Mr. Wage Earner, and the retired elderly folks, who are getting the real soaking and will get a worse soaking if this vote-buying outfit in power is not stopped.

An editorial in a recent issue of one of our leading farm magazines, stated:

> A rising complaint about taxes is evident over the country. People are beginning to realize that the direct taxes, such as property, income, and school levies, are by no means all they are paying. Back of these is a jungle of hidden taxes. They are a part of the cost of every business and are passed along in the price of everything a person buys. An ordinary good suit of clothes is calculated to carry more than 100 different taxes, an automobile more than 200.
>
> Because the tax collectors' fingers reach into one's pockets at almost every turn, they now take a large part of all income. The Northeast Farm Foundation estimates that they absorb, in visible or invisible ways, over 30 cents of every dollar the farmer earns.
>
> The rate at which the tax bill is growing raises a question of critical importance to everybody. It is simply: How much of the national income can be taken by taxes without leaving too little for the Nation's economy to operate at full capacity? * * *
>
> What should be done is plain. It is to call a halt to unproductive tax spending and to examine every new proposal along that

line solely from the standpoint of whether it adds to or takes away from the funds in the common purse. Upon their conservation depends the ability of industry to make and sell goods, of labor to have steady employment, and of agriculture to enjoy a stable market.

The tax question is now a matter of saving a good standard of living in America.

Maybe you personally have not felt the soaking yet, but you will sooner or later regardless of who you are or what you do, unless this Congress makes up its mind to ignore the sweet mouthings of our President and his power-mad, wasteful spenders, and take the bull by the horns and bring all requests and demands for Federal expenditures in line with what the American people can afford to pay for the running of their Government in Washington.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress spent over $1,200 for each family in America to pay. Does that mean anything to you, Mr. President, or don't you care? Don't forget, Germany's Hitler, Russia's Stalin, and England's Attlee also promised their people security and utopia in exchange for their votes. Their people got neither, but to the contrary they lost their God-given liberties. You know the sad, sad story. Look at England today.

As a member of the Appropriations Committee of this House of Representatives, I plead with you my colleagues for your help in saving our country from committing national suicide through the bankruptcy route as has been the fate of every nation on earth which traveled the full road we are now traveling at breakneck speed.

Regardless of party, I pray that every Member of this Congress will recognize the duty to be performed and rise to that duty. The signposts on the road ahead are now crystal clear.

Martin Gorski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, it was indeed a great shock for me to learn of the sudden passing of our colleague MARTIN GORSKI. Martin and I were sworn in as new Members of the Congress on the same day.

As my district adjoins the city of Chicago, I soon found that the problems, legislative and otherwise, existing in his district were identical on a great many important matters of legislation to those of mine. On many occasions we consulted and exchanged ideas, and I always found his good judgment and common sense very helpful.

MARTIN GORSKI came to this country from his native Poland with his parents when a mere child. He was in every sense of the word a self-made man. I do not know of any Member of Congress who regarded his congressional duties and responsibilities more seriously than MARTIN GORSKI. Everyone who knew him respected his opinion, and he enjoyed the confidence of many Members of this House. He will be sorrowfully missed by his friends in this body, as well as throughout the Chicago area.

I wish to extend to his family my sincere sympathy in their bereavement.

The Late Sir Willmott Lewis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from today's issue of the Washington Post and call the attention of the Members to the death of a great friend of America and one of the world's finest and most noted newspaper men.

Bill Lewis' understanding of America, our traditions, our personality, and our history did much during his many years of service in Washington to cement relationships with the British Empire by giving both the United States and his native country a better understanding of one another.

His anecdotes and salty humor will be greatly missed on the Washington scene, but will long live in the memories of his many friends here and throughout the world. The fourth estate has lost one of its most honored and respected members.

SIR WILLMOTT LEWIS

Few deaths, we suspect, have occasioned such an intimate sadness among so many persons as that of Sir Willmott Lewis, who was for 28 years the Washington correspondent of the Times of London. There is probably no other man in Washington who has enjoyed so much admiration and affection among the members of his own trade. Among them his wit, intelligence, kindliness, and companionability had won him a special status, secure from all jealousy or malice.

It was one of Sir Willmott's peculiarities that with all his long residence here he never shed any of his British mannerisms. But it was also true that he understood the American psychology and the workings of American politics far better than most Americans. Among the many things for which he was famous were his informal lectures in American history to his American colleagues at the bar of the National Press Club. He was an incomparable raconteur, and his fund of anecdotes, accumulated partly from personal experiences in many corners of the world, partly from his omnivorous and incessant reading, was well-nigh exhaustless. He had encountered at one time or another in his career nearly all the great historical figures of the twentieth century, and he had an intimate imaginative acquaintance with most of those who had died before his time.

His dispatches were models of essay prose. It is safe to say that those who followed them in the Times were far better informed about what was happening in Washington than most American newspaper readers. For that matter many eminent American Washington correspondents acquired the habit of reading them for enlightenment.

It was a commonplace observation in Washington that Sir Willmott Lewis had won more good will for his country than a whole succession of British diplomats, and indeed both by his colleagues and by the British Embassy he was recognized as a sort of unofficial ambassador. He was Welsh by origin, and part of the secret of his charm for Americans of all types and trades was a kind of wild Celtic exuberance that broke continually through his affectation of languor.

The legends that have accumulated around Sir Willmott Lewis are innumerable, and will probably be repeated and elaborated as long as all those who knew him survive. Now that he has gone, Washington will seem a sadder and drearier place.

Cotton-Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I insert a resolution adopted by the Richmond County, N. C., Board of County Commissioners, and a letter from Mr. N. L. Hendrix, county agent for Richmond County, involving the cotton-acreage allotment.

These representations and many, many others that have come to me clearly indicate that the Congress must with haste make changes in the legislation so as to prevent widespread unemployment and so spell out the law that the acreage allotments will be fair and equitable.

The cotton growers in my district strongly favor control but the severe cuts if carried out in this first year will develop economic tragedy. Even now many honest and faithful tenants are making their way to county welfare offices for actual necessities of life.

The resolution and letter follow:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE RICHMOND COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS, ROCKINGHAM, N. C., JANUARY 5, 1950

Whereas pursuant to Public Law 272 the North Carolina cotton growers in the cotton referendum of December 15, 1949, voted for marketing quotas and cotton allotments; and

Whereas there was much dissatisfaction with the formula for establishing acreage allotments under the provisions of the Public Law 272 and, despite the dissatisfaction, the cotton producers voted for the referendum, clearly indicating that a control program was desired in some form; and

Whereas the formula and acreage allotment which have been adopted and will be used under the marketing and allotment program will impose an undue hardship on many people who have depended on cotton production for many years, and in many cases individuals will be left destitute, dependent entirely on welfare agencies: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Honorable C. B. DEANE, United States Representative, Eighth Congressional District, State of North Carolina,

be and he is hereby, requested to use his influence in an effort to support some legislation, by way of amendment, or otherwise, which will more nearly equalize the quotas or allotments for the cotton producers in Richmond County, N. C.

COOPERATIVE EXTENSION WORK IN AGRICULTURE AND HOME ECONOMICS,
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
Rockingham, N. C., January 4, 1950.

Hon. CHARLES B. DEANE,
Old House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: The 1950 cotton-acreage allotment in Richmond County is not adequately distributed to the farmers who have been growing cotton in this county. Figures show that 391 farmers have an allotment of less than 5 acres, and 341 farmers have allotments of exactly 5 acres. These 732 farmers have a total allotment of approximately 3,600 acres. Many of this number of farmers grew cotton only 1 year out of the 3-year period of 1946, 1947, 1948.

To illustrate, Farmer No. 1 grew 5 acres of cotton in 1946; Farmer No. 2 grew 5 acres in 1947; and Farmer No. 3 grew 5 acres in 1948. Thus, the average cotton planted by these three farmers would be 5 acres. Under the existing allotment laws, these three farmers have a total allotment of 15 acres. This may be overstressed, but I feel that this type farmer in Richmond County certainly has not averaged more than 50 percent of this allotment in the years discussed. Thus, the farmers who have been growing cotton as the principal crop are being severely penalized for 1950.

There is a total of 1,132 cotton allotments in this county. Therefore, the 400 farmers who have been growing the greater percent of the cotton are only getting a little more than 5,000 acres.

As it is now worked out, the 732 farmers who have an allotment of 5 acres or less are getting more allotment (and a large percent of these farmers do not depend on farming for a living) than the average planted acres of the base period; whereas, the 400 farmers who depend on farming for their main income have an allotment of approximately 51 percent of their normal planted acreage. A few farmers have slightly above this figure, because of their war crops planted and open land factor.

I am not writing this in behalf of the big landowners, but for the tenants on these farms. For instance, one farmer in this county who has been planting approximately 500 acres of cotton each year had his allotment cut almost 50 percent. There are approximately 75 people on the farms operated by this farmer that depend principally upon cotton for a living. Some of these tenants have lived with this farmer for 20 years or more, but this farmer cannot keep these tenants on this small acreage allotment. Now, just what is going to happen to these tenants?

If farmers of this size were allowed 70 percent of their normal acreage, they could probably take care of their tenants.

Eighty-nine farmers in Richmond County who did not plant cotton in 1946, 1947, or 1948 received cotton allotments. This was received by the past farm cotton history and the production of war crops. Most of these farmers were surprised at getting a cotton allotment, and normally would not plant cotton in 1950. However, most of these farmers will be reluctant to give up this allotment and I don't blame them, for it would be an asset in case the farm should be for sale.

The total cotton allotment in Richmond County is approximately 9,500 acres, and this allotment is close to the acreage that has been planted in the past, but it is just not on the farms that have been growing cotton.

The additional acreage which would be required to give each farmer an allotment equal to 70 percent of the average 1946, 1947, 1948 actual planted acreage is 1,909 acres.

Anything that you can do to help adjust this situation would be greatly appreciated by the farmers of Richmond County.

Very truly yours,
N. L. HENDRIX, *County Agent.*

The Big Job for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert this editorial from the January 1 edition of the Milwaukee Journal:

THE BIG JOB FOR 1950

The Nation's big job for 1950 is the reorganization of Federal agencies—to bring costs within the ability of taxpayers to pay, and to bring about the efficiency by which we can meet our problems, at home and abroad.

The groundwork has been done. The Hoover Commission took 2 years to find out what happened to our sprawling, improvised Government under the impact of two world wars and a depression. Today we are wasting—actually wasting—not millions but billions. We are setting forth democracy as the most desirable form of government, but the best we can show is only a low percentage of efficiency.

The Hoover Commission laid down the outlines for improvement. It made in all 318 recommendations. The President then took leadership and the first session of the Eighty-first Congress responded by enacting 20 percent of the program. The hard pull will come on the 80 percent remaining, and that points up the job for the second session.

There are two possible road blocks. One is political partisanship and the other is the vested interest of bureaucracy.

The Hoover Commission itself kept partisanship outside the door. Congressman CLARENCE J. BROWN, who wrote the legislation that created the bipartisan set-up, could say before the recent reorganization conference in Washington that never once did the Commission in formulating its recommendations divide on partisan lines. There were differences but they were personal differences. Partisanship can be kept out.

The greater obstacle is bureaucratic obstinacy. People are becoming aroused, however. The Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report is becoming a mighty force. But it is still possible that bureaucracy may stymie reorganization by using vast numbers of people—the citizens themselves—to do it. Here is an example:

One of the most amazing disclosures of inefficiency was that made by the task force which surveyed the Veterans' Administration. This sprawling, overstaffed set-up is of vital importance to 18,000,000 veterans, and of scarcely less importance to all taxpayers because of the billions involved in its budget to meet the Nation's obligations to the men who served America well. Yet the VA uses 10 times the amount of labor to handle an insurance policy that a private company uses. It takes many more days, even weeks, to settle a death claim than private companies take. By actual survey it was shown that the average employee in the VA insurance department does only one-fourth as much work as the equivalent employee in a private company.

One might think that the Veterans' Administration, under such a showing, would leap to reorganization. It has not. The Hoover task force has reported an almost total lack of responsiveness. The chances are that the VA will fight reorganization.

Enough has been said to indicate what line the opponents will take. They will try to make veterans believe that their interests are being assailed. This is not true. The Hoover Commission has not challenged a single benefit to former service men and women. It is asking only that the VA be efficient enough to serve the veterans without wasting the money that the people give. But if the veterans can be aroused to a fancied danger, that will be a formidable attack, indeed.

Another obstacle will come on reorganization that deals with western resources. There the interests of the Army engineers, the Bureau of Land Management of the Interior Department, and the Forest Service of the Department of Agriculture will clash. There will be an opportunity to promote a mighty upheaval in the West in which the real interests of the Nation could be sunk.

Nothing is more important than that our natural resources—our forests, our grazing lands, our topsoils, our minerals, and our water supply—be conserved. But they are being wasted, and dollars along with them, in the present chaos of agencies. If reorganization can best be done by shifting and combining bureaus, as the Hoover Commission recommended, fine. Or if it would be better to create a new Department of Natural Resources, as the Commission's own task force recommended, then it can be done that way. This is for Congress to decide. The unforgivable thing would be for Congress to let pressure groups push it off the track.

This whole reorganization job is tremendously important. Every adult American ought to insist that it be done in 1950.

Truman Promises All Things to All Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the first few days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress indicate conclusively that President Truman and his henchmen are going to attempt to be all things to all men. Since this cynical political strategy has succeeded in the past, President Truman and his followers believe it will continue to succeed politically. They may be right.

In his message to Congress, Truman alined himself with the "I'm-for-economy, but—" group. In other words, he is for economy in speeches to gullible groups of our citizens, but he is not going to do anything about bringing economy to pass in government. He wants to spend you out of all your income.

The President came out in favor of free enterprise. But the kind of "free enterprise" he talked about is the kind the slaves used to enjoy on southern plantations before the Civil War. The slaves were free to come and go as long as they

did not leave the plantations. They were free to mix and mingle in the slave quarters as long as they did not come up around the big white house and try to obtain a better deal on the amount of time they worked each day for the "old marster." They were free to accept hand-outs from their benevolent "old marster," but not to kick against the welfare measures he suggested—such as long rows of cabins, ill lighted, broken down, and filled with vermin.

Oh, yes, there was freedom on the old plantations—just as there is freedom in the "poorhouse state" for which Truman is plugging away. The people in the big White House can throw parties, get away with tax-free expense allowances of $50,000 a year, have a private yacht out on the river, and lord it over the foremen, subforemen, and vassals.

Remember, when Truman talks about free enterprise, he is talking about the freedom which he, Harry Vaughan, and all the rest of the freebooters exercise in the big White House while the rest of us are supposed to be out in the backhouses singing hymns. Occasionally, we might be allowed to come around for the lighting of a Christmas tree, to sing folk songs, or to hear the "old marster" expound the virtues of freedom, but by and large, our task is merely to work and sweat and pay.

The "old marster" in the big White House, like those on the southern plantations of long ago, can afford, as long as world conditions allow it, to overlook what is happening outside his "plantation." Thus, Truman overlooked talking about the steady, ever-onward aggressive march of communism. He dodged the issue of whether we shall recognize Spain, whether we shall withdraw recognition from Soviet Russia, whether we shall defend Formosa against the Communist hordes, or whether he is going to clean out the dilettantes, the Hisslovers, the knaves, and the fools around him. He can afford to be the "old marster" a little longer.

One of these days, the slaves in the backhouses are going to awaken to what is happening to them and to their beloved "plantation"—this great land of ours. When they do, and when they understand fully what the "old marster" and his crowd are doing to them and to their land and to their chances for survival, there is going to be a whoop and a holler that will make those emitted by slaves freed by Lincoln seem like the tinkling of a cowbell compared to the explosion of an atom bomb.

If the people—and by the people, I mean every Tom, Dick, and Harry, every laboring man and farmer and the rich and the poor—ever wake up to what "Marse" Harry has in store for them, and already is practicing upon them in subtle ways, they will vote so heavily for the Republicans it will be nothing short of a revolution.

The Republicans have a job to do. That job is to expose, expose, and expose, domestically and internationally. If the people see clearly the miasma in which they are wading, they will begin to look for firmer ground. And "old marster" will be gone—where the good darkies go.

A Congressman Views the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN J. ALLEN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I desire to insert in the RECORD, under leave to extend my remarks, a speech which the Honorable HUGH D. SCOTT, JR., a Member of Congress, made before the San Francisco Lions' Club on December 6, 1949. Representative SCOTT is a member of the Lions' Club of Germantown, Pa. Before delivering the address he had recently returned from a visit to Great Britain and Europe as a member of the House Subcommittee on Medicine. He is a member of the House minority policy committee. A great many members of the San Francisco Lions' Club requested copies of the address, and I believe it merits being brought to the attention of all Members of Congress. Mr. SCOTT's speech was as follows:

I think it quite possible that I have received during the past 12 months more letters and oral suggestions regarding the development of a truly American program than any other person in this country, since, as chairman for much of that time of the opposition party I was the focal point for such suggestions. Now at last I am free to talk simply as a citizen and as one member of the minority policy committee of the House of Representatives. I welcome such an opportunity and I am going to talk to you about the development of an American program leading away from the deep-freeze state.

What is the deep freeze state (usually called the Socialist state in Britain and the social welfare state here)? They're moving away from it in Britain because they've tried it in its more extreme form; we're moving toward it, because too many people are still deluded by the ballyhoo of the give-away program and the concealed cost hasn't yet pinched the pocketbook nerve of enough of its gullible beneficiaries.

What's it like to live in the deep-freeze state? (Everything's for free—buttered on both sides—with room service at no extra charge.) Well, let's pass by the German experience from Bismarck's social security (through three wars to make good on more abundant life promises) to the ultimate degradation of the national socialistic experiment.

Let's see what happened in Britain when the deep freeze set in. Was it good for the workers? Did they get the welfare? They did not. Their average wage in Great Britain is $29.80 a week. Here it's $55. In Great Britain income tax begins at 40 percent after the first $672, and the cost of living goes higher every month. Bread has just taken another leap away from the worker's mouths and rents are going higher.

The Government in Britain has taken over much of industry. Government is now an employer and anxious to show a profit. So when British workers struck last summer on the docks, the welfare state used troops to break the strike.

Who gets the welfare in the deep-freeze state? Why, the officeholders, of course. There is a story in point. An American auto worker visited a plant in Russia and asked, "Who owns the plant?" "The people own it" said the Russian. "Who owns all of these automobiles?" asked the American worker. "Oh," said the Russian, "they belong to the officials." Later, so the story goes, the Russian visited the American worker at a Detroit plant. "Who owns all of these buildings?" asked the Russian. "Oh, they belong to the company," was the reply. "Well, then who owns all of those automobiles out on the lot?" "Oh," said the American worker, "they belong to us."

In Britain there are far more bureaucrats than were necessary before or even during the war and the workers' wages are frozen and he is frozen in his job, while his real wages go down because the Government steadily takes back more and more in taxes of what it pays out in wages.

What happens to the hope to do better for yourself and the kids next year? That's laid away in the deep freeze, too. Since there is no incentive to the employer or employee from hope of profit, people produce less and costs and prices go higher.

That government which freezes initiative and destroys incentive cannot excuse itself by argument that its motives are good because it would like all of its people to be guaranteed free food, clothing, and medical care by the state. But, of course, at the same time, remember that food and clothing and medical care are produced by work and work only. Therefore in the nature of things they cannot be free, but can only be had by paying for them, either directly by the worker or indirectly through taxes to the government. And it always costs more when government is the middleman because government puts on a lot more nonproducers (government employees) to distribute the product.

The deep-freeze state is a state of ultimate misery because its plan is to strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. It tries to legislate unproductive people into prosperity by legislating productive people out of it. As Mr. Churchill put it: "Capitalism is the unequal distribution of plenty, while socialism is the equal distribution of misery." Socialism will work only in heaven, where they don't want it, or in hell where they've got it already.

The America we know didn't come out of a deep freeze, but out of a burning desire for new frontiers of the land, of the mind, of the spirit. We didn't come out of a deep freeze and we aren't going into one, be it Wallace's or Truman's—or even General Vaughan's.

In England you can't change jobs without permission of the Government. You can't take your money out of the country, you can't get many of the things we regard as necessities in this country. You can't work your farm except as the Government tells you, you can't build your business in certain areas where you run afoul of the decentralization program, you can't even buy a drink of the country's Scotch, and you'll go broke trying to keep up a moderate little vice like the smoking habit. I'm sure you wouldn't like the deep-freeze state, even though part of your taxes help to make up the billion dollars a year we send over to shore up the weakening timbers of this shaky structure.

So you wouldn't like it. But back in Washington the men in power, from Mr. Truman up, say they have a mandate to bring the welfare state to the United States.

If you agree that here is a European import that we don't want, how do we go about keeping ourselves out of the deep freeze? Well, let's talk plain. Let's fight back. Let's get mad. I firmly believe that freedom is best nourished by a lively sense of outrage. The Boston "Indians" felt it when they showed King George III where he could put his tea. Your ancestors and mine got plenty mad at Ticonderoga, at bitter cold Valley Forge, at Antietam, and up San Juan Hill. And the last two times somebody went after our liberties we were pretty sore, too.

Well, the price of liberty is eternal vigilance. In Washington at Valley Forge, the author has General Washington saying,

"This liberty will not seem so dear when men no longer die to keep it." And Benjamin Franklin's comment bears remembering. "They that would give up a little liberty in turn for temporary safety, will soon have neither liberty nor safety."

I said: "Let's talk plain." I'll begin with this statement: "What this country needs is an American program, a program of enlightened conservatism. To conserve means to save, and what's wrong with that? Millions of Americans are trying in spite of the best efforts of High Tax Harry and the wastrels of Washington to save something, to put a little something by for a rainy day."

The Missouri minstrel strums away: "It ain't gonna rain no more." Not all of us believe it. That's what the boys in the back room told Noah. Noah built his ark anyway. And a good thing, too.

HOW TO STOP RUSH OF MODERN FORTY-NINERS TO THE GOLD FIELDS OF FORT KNOX?

Your modern conservative knows that the Greeks had a word for it. Their wise man, Solon, said: "The state can do no more good than the state can bear."

He will ask himself, then, several questions in testing any proposal to further obligate the Government. (1) Is it good? (2) Is it in the public interest? (3) Will it work? (4) Can it be done best by the Federal, State, or local government? (5) Can we afford it? (6) How shall it be paid for?

The modern conservative would do well to avoid the maudlin hypocrisy of the radical left or the selfish greed of the reactionary right. Let him remember that there are dangerous ruts into which one may sink on either side of progress road. Let him profit too from the signposts along the road we have traveled. If some say that he is not mindful of the public good, let him remember that the Eightieth Congress of 1947–48 was led by modern conservatives; that Congress did not heed reactionary clamor to limit existing social services, nor did it heed the radical demands that the Federal Treasury be ravished.

What did those modern conservatives do? They conserved, in the public interest, the existing social services, they heard and heeded the just claims for greater irrigation and reclamation programs, they cared generously for the veterans of the country's wars. But taking note of their obligation to guard the average man's right to better himself and his natural desire to retain more and more of the fruits of his labor, these modern conservatives said to the citizen: "We will help you to keep more of what you earn." This they did, by reducing his income taxes and by holding steady the cost of the things he had to buy, by making Uncle Sam live within his income and even pay off some of the mortgage on the United States homestead.

The discouraged guy says: "Them days are gone forever." Uncle Sam is on a spree again. He's borrowing more this year, over and above the forty-odd billions he's taking out of our pockets, than it used to cost to run the Government for a whole year. He will go in the red five or six billion this year. That single red-ink item used to be enough to run the country in the black for 12 months. Uncle Sam's binge makes the selfish interests on the Potomac very happy. More jobs for the selfish interests. "Don't worry," they say, "everything will be all right. We're going to inflate your money until production figures hit $300,000,000,000 a year. Then we will be able to stop borrowing to spend. After that we'll just spend what we take in, because we'll be taking in more."

I don't agree that the days of living within our income are gone forever. I believe there will come a time when the once-bedazzled voter will look at the Truman crazy quilt and demand something better. It will be up to those of us who think that slap-happy government is all wrong to be able to say to such a person not merely "We told you so" but "We've been telling you what to do about it. Now, let's all get together and put our house in order."

What to do about it? What's an American program? Here are some suggestions: Retain social security, unemployment insurance, old-age benefits, care of the needy and disabled veterans and their dependents, and those social-security services which courts and Congress have declared to be within the sphere of the Federal Government, reserving the right to provide for administration through home rule by the States and local communities of such responsibilities as can best be assumed by them for reasons of economy, administrative efficiency, or constitutional function. Provide, preserve, and improve legislative square treatment for employee, public, and employer. Protect the public domain from private exploitation (by presidential favorites, for example), and continue its steady development in the public interest.

Balance the budget by cutting extraordinarily wasteful Government expenditures. Although Congress has passed all but one of the Hoover Commission legislative proposals, the President has not yet put into effect most of the Executive proposals which could save this country as much money as this year's multi-billion-dollar deficit. Reduce unfair wartime excise taxes on transportation and certain other items.

Give us, not doles, not insurance that is only a caricature of real insurance, or other types of economic fakery that pass for business statesmanship. End the adventures of Government into the attempted suspension of natural economic law. Inflation is not prosperity. Take the shackles off business. Make it possible for business to function at its productive and job creative best. Give us a bill that will reduce taxes so that business and industry may distribute profits and have enough left for replacement and venture into new enterprises. Give us, as soon as possible, lower individual taxes so that people can save for old age instead of being dependent upon Government which impoverishes them during their productive years and then gives them a small and inadequate part back as a "benefit." Give us a sound currency, upon which we can rely. Give us a full production plan. Pass it and see what happens.

By offering constructive American alternatives which are not socialistic; for example, to provide for grants-in-aid for the training of doctors, dentists, nurses, and technicians; to set up local health departments, for medical research, for expanded aid in hospital construction, for school health service, for special aids to bring doctors to sparsely settled areas, and for expanded maternal and child welfare services and research; extension of the Blue Cross and Blue Shield services; and the improvement of medical service in local areas such as has been done in Alameda County, Calif., and notably as developed in Kansas by Dean Murphy of Kansas University.

Where States and local communities cannot provide some services unaided, let the Federal assistance be in the form of grants-in-aid, without domination by overseers from Washington and regulations drafted in remote Washington bureaus.

Expose the sham promises of hypocritical demagogues, by battling unceasingly for absolutely fair and equal economic treatment of every American regardless of the color of his skin or the way he worships his God. Unequal treatment is indecent and unworthy. Apply to all legislation the tests of workability in the public interest.

The times cry out for men and women with a sense of what it is right to do, a program for action—with good will toward their neighbors and the courage and the determination to establish certain principles as veritics and to fight for them, everlastingly—with tolerance, intelligence and a high spirit.

There is the voice of Lincoln to guide us: "With courage to do the right as God gives us to see the right."

Yes, you can change the world, you can do these things, for there are millions ready, waiting. But remember: "You gotta stay mad."

The Ultimate End of the Truman Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of recorded history that—

The passing of innumerable legislative measures, all of them in a general way of a restrictive order, conduces necessarily to augment the number, the power, and the influence of the functionaries charged with their application. These functionaries tend in this way to become the veritable master of civilized countries. * * *

This incessant creation of restriction laws and regulations, surrounding the pettiest action of existence with the worst complicated formalities, inevitably has for its result the confining within narrower and narrower limits of the sphere in which the citizen may move freely. Victims of the delusion that equality and liberty are the better assured by the multiplication of laws, nations daily consent to put up with trammels increasingly burdensome. * * *

Accustomed to put up with every yoke, they soon end by desiring servitude, and lose all spontaneousness and energy. They are then no more than vain shadows, passive, unresisting and powerless automata.

Thus is bureaucracy with its infiltration of communism sapping the vitality of our people.

What does the experience of other bureaucratic Marxist governments demonstrate? Here is the recorded answer:

Arrived at this point, the individual is bound to seek outside himself the force he no longer finds within him. The functions of governments necessarily increase in proportion as the indifference and helplessness of the citizens grow. They it is—

The Fabian socialistic bureaucratic New Deal planners—

who must necessarily exhibit the initiative, enterprising, and guiding spirit in which private persons are lacking. It falls on them to undertake everything, direct everything, and take everything under their protection. The state becomes an all-powerful god.

Under leave to extend I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, an article of Frank R. Kent which article appeared in the Wall Street Journal, Tuesday, January 3, 1950:

TRUMAN STRATEGY THIS YEAR IS TO PLAY BOTH ENDS AGAINST THE MIDDLE

(By Frank R. Kent)

WASHINGTON.—Sometimes the ardent praise of a President's friends constitutes a more deadly indictment than any his enemies can frame. An interesting instance of this is afforded in the explanation of the legislative strategy, fashioned by his intimate advisers, which Mr. Truman brought back with him from Key West and which is expected to be-

come the party line in the session of Congress about to open.

According to those who reliably reflect the views of the White House insiders, this strategy proves that, though he may not always seem so, Mr. Truman really is an extremely clever man and is just about to tie the "rigidly stupid" Republicans in a knot they will be unable to untie in time to put up even a respectable fight in 1950. In this advisory group there is considerable self-adulation and congratulation over the smartness of the presidential program.

Here is the strategy as they somewhat shamelessly present it.

The purpose of the President at this session is to present himself as the fighting champion of the three great voting groups—organized labor, the farmers, and the Negroes. At the same time the "stupid" Republicans are to be made to seem the enemies of these groups, which then are expected to show their gratitude to the Democrats at the polls. But all this is to be accomplished without the passage of any helpful legislation whatever for these groups before the election. True, in his soon-to-be-delivered State of the Union message the President will strongly insist again upon repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, the enactment of his so-called civil-rights program, and the passage of the Brannan farm bill, the cost of which even its author has not been able to estimate.

These are the three pieces of legislation which Mr. Truman will demand in his message. But, say those who framed this strategy and are, curiously enough, proud of it, not one of these measures will be passed. "Nothing," wrote one of the more outspoken of the Fair Deal commentators, "could more upset the White House than for the lawmakers to bow to the President's expressed will in this session."

In brief, the demand will be wholly insincere. The message will be a phony. The presidential recommendations will be frauds. The whole idea is to beat the drums for these three pieces of legislation, to put up a grand show in their favor but in all three cases refrain from putting enough administration weight behind any one of them to permit its passage. Success of this scheme, it is pointed out, will not only preserve all three as live issues for the 1950 campaign but will enable the Truman administration to blame failure of its phony program upon the Republicans and Dixiecrats, whom they will indict as enemies of organized labor, the farmers, and the Negroes.

There are several things to be said about this strategy. One, of course, is that, accepting the printed explanations of those who favor and framed it, it is a brazen piece of political skulduggery. Another is that it is entirely typical of the political advisers by whom Mr. Truman is surrounded. Most of these are decent men in their personal lives but in politics appear to have no sense of right or wrong and are willing to form any combination, make any alliance, to win an election.

The thought of how their political plans will affect the country is so completely secondary as not to be considered at all. Every legislative proposal, every White House recommendation, is rooted in politics. Every move is made with the view of holding organized labor, the farmer, and the Negroes—the three bought groups upon whose support Mr. Roosevelt was three times elected and which the Truman effort is to see stay bought.

The question is, Can they get away with it this time?

The strategy, of course, is based on the belief that the great mass of the people are credulous dupes. It's an insult to the intelligence of every decent citizen and certainly ought to be resented by the three groups with whom they are playing. But the Fair Deal has immensely superior propaganda agencies. It also has a tremendous bureaucratic political machine. Also it has a great deal of money. And, it is true, the split Republicans help.

Nevertheless, it is a revolting piece of hocus-pocus and not the least offensive phase of it will be the extreme smugness of its advocates.

CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Joe Miller, Seattle newspaperman, published in the CIO News December 26, 1949, points out why the people of the Northwest demand a Columbia Valley Administration. Titled "CVA Foes May Have Overplayed Their Hand," the story indicates northwesterners' recognition of the propaganda being circulated by Columbia Valley Unauthorities:

(By Joe Miller)

Is it the people versus the special interests?

In the Pacific Northwest, where mighty rivers run with the speed of the fabled Mercury, the people have reason to say with fervor:

"And how it is."

For Harry Truman's favorite phrase aptly describes the bitter struggle that is currently being fought out in America's farthest corner over the President's proposal to create a Columbia Valley Administration.

Fighting the CVA with every weapon it has is the power trust and its big business allies, the great timber barons and companies. With CVA legislation getting closer to final congressional action, these groups have redoubled their relentless campaign of misrepresentation in a desperate attempt to influence public opinion against CVA.

The power trust has set up front organizations to lead the fight against CVA. These outfits are flooding the sprawling Northwest with tons of expensive propaganda.

Carpetbaggers brought in to preach the anti-CVA line are attempting to burrow into every community. The region's newspapers, most of them notoriously reactionary, give the widest currency to all anti-CVA broadsides and play down favorable stories.

Recently, two conservative national magazines—Saturday Evening Post and Reader's Digest—have contributed their bit by printing editorials that damn the CVA.

The Post editorial was written by a former private power propagandist who wrote in the same magazine a few years ago that Grand Coulee Dam would overshadow for the first time in 5,000 years the stupendous folly of the Pharaohs."

(Grand Coulee, world's mightest power producer, has been responsible for the creation of many thousands of new jobs in the Pacific Northwest; its power produced aluminum for one-third of America's airplanes and helped develop the A-bomb.)

So utterly untruthful has this concerted barrage been that a great conservative newspaper, the Portland Oregonian, has coined a new term to describe these spokesmen: "CVU's—Columbia Valley Unauthorities."

Where do the CVU's get the money to circulate their propaganda?

Part of the answer is provided by the first financial statement of 1949 from the Power Trust's chief lobbying outfit, the National Association of Electrical Companies.

In the first 6 months of the year the NAEC spent $224,222 against CVA and other power and resource developments. Only other lobby to spend more than this sum was the American Medical Association.

The rest of the answer will be given when the Northwest's private utilities file statements of their 1949 expenditures, as they are required to do by Oregon and Washington law. In past years, before the CVA fight became hot, these concerns had contributed more than $50,000 to anti-CVA outfits.

When President Truman first announced he was going to seek a CVA, private power's top dog lobbyist, $65,000-a-year Purcell Smith, declared: "We're going to do everything in our power to stop CVA."

By inundating the Northwest and the rest of the Nation with their propaganda, Purcell and his well-paid "wrecking crew" have kept their word. Yet it is beginning to look as if they overplayed their hand.

They persist in the amazing claim that "CVA is being foisted upon the people of the Northwest by the Washington, D. C., bureaucrats."

Yet for 4 years every farm-labor organization in the region but one has been on record for CVA and has been contributing to the grass-roots campaign for its enactment. These 11 organizations include the CIO, AFL, Grange, farmers' unions, and railway brotherhoods—and they represent approximately 1,500,000 of the region's 4,500,000 residents.

In contrast, the few major groups that oppose CVA represent less than 50,000 of the region's inhabitants.

It was this solid base of CVA support in the grass roots and the obvious need for more efficient management of the area's resources that induced President Truman to make CVA the leading plank of his resource development program last year.

And he received large majorities in five of the six CVA States and came awfully close in traditionally Republican Oregon, where Dewey had campaigned steadily for more than a month.

Another reason for the groundswell of support for CVA has been the conspicuous refusal of the opposition to accept the many challenges of the League for CVA to debate the issues, in the tradition of Lincoln and Douglas.

The most conspicuous rebuffs have come from the Governors of Washington, Oregon, and Idaho, who have been spearheading the opposition to CVA. These men, who announced opposition to CVA 2 months before the bill was actually drafted, seldom miss an opportunity to attack CVA, but want no part of a debate.

Twice challenged to debate by Representative HUGH B. MITCHELL, Democrat, of Washington, president of the League for CVA and a sponsor of the bill, Gov. Arthur Langlie said he was too busy.

Yet the Governor has found time to make more than 50 anti-CVA speeches and twice travel to Washington, D. C., at State expense to testify against CVA. Langlie's favorite charge is that CVA is fascism.

Mussolini and Hitler had efficient resource programs, therefore an agency which will efficiently develop the Northwest's unmatched natural resources, must b fascistic.

Obviously the arguments of Governor Langlie and his cohorts could easily be disproved in open debate. When he testified at House committee hearings in Washington, D. C., he was asked to name the "dangerous" powers he had said CVA would create. His answer:

"I am not prepared at this moment to give you the details of it."

Under further questioning, Langlie said he could not even remember whether the

Bureau of Reclamation or the Army engineers ran Grand Coulee Dam—the biggest thing in his State, in fact the biggest structure in the world.

Gov. C. A. Robins, of Idaho, was frank. Asked if he understood the CVA legislation, he answered:

"As a matter of fact, I do not."

The position of these men in opposing CVA is made all the more ridiculous by two major facts:

1. The Hoover Commission report which establishes beyond shadow of reasonable doubt that the present system—which the power trust and its allies want to perpetuate—is fouled up beyond recognition.

This impartial report tells of bureaucratic jealousies, hopeless tugs of war, and inefficiencies, which have slowed the West's development to a virtual standstill, and wasted the taxpayers' money.

2. The obvious need for CVA, which is highlighted by four items:

(a) Power shortage: With 42 percent of the Nation's hydrcelectric potential, the Northwest is the only region in America with a power shortage.

(b) This lack of power, when it is potentially here to burn, has helped to create an unemployment three times the national average in the region.

(c) Flood control: Every year raging floods destroy lives and property throughout the Northwest. Yet no adequate system of flood control exists, nor has one been proposed by the existing Federal agencies.

(d) Erosion: With 100,000,000 tons of topsoil going down the Columbia every year, the Pacific Northwest is the second most critical area in the Nation for erosion, according to the United States Soil Conservation Service. Yet scarcely anything is being done about it.

These facts point the way to CVA, and the people of the Pacific Northwest—through the educational program of their farm and labor groups—are realizing it.

So, too, may the opponents of CVA, when the people of the Northwest go to the polls next November.

Mr. Hauser's Parallel Makes the Distinction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Battle Creek (Mich.) Enquirer-News which I believe should be read by the greedy, vote-hunting Raw Dealers. It might do some good:

MR. HAUSER'S PARALLEL MAKES THE DISTINCTION

The bald admission that 150,000 census-taking jobs are being used for political patronage is no less shocking because the census chief has been so candid about the whole affair.

In fact, the cynicism which attaches itself to such an admission is a moral measure of an administration which has apparently lost all political perspective.

Even the most hard-shelled political boss usually attempts to cover his operations with a public dressing of gentility. Not so Acting Census Director Phillip M. Hauser. He bluntly admitted that census jobs are used as political hand-outs with the flimsy excuse that it's always been done that way by both parties, "in keeping with the American democratic process."

There have been plenty of shenanigans in American political history. But the democratic process has survived in spite of chicanery and petty politics. It will continue to survive because the American people as a whole draw a distinction between the democratic process and ward-heel politics.

Mr. Hauser may not have realized it, but he is helping the American voter to draw the distinction as regards the national political scene.

The Christmas Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following forthright article by Michael Joseph, editor, Labor Beacon, Michigan City, Ind. He proclaims that the Yuletide spirit should be practiced throughout the New Year and "peace on earth, good will to men" should be uppermost in our minds. Nothing could be more appropriate to practice in this session of Congress.

CHRISTMAS SPIRIT

(By Michael Joseph)

This Christmas, men of all races, creeds, and nations look to each other for hope and a way toward better living, mutual faith, and peace. They look into the hearts of each other, too, for they have learned that words are treacherous—invisible, malicious things with sound an no meaning. This year, 1949, is drawing to an end—even as this paper reaches you—is the turning point of life of the world.

We either adopt the standards set for us by the man whose birthday we celebrate this week, or we bring destruction upon curselves. We either learn to rely more upon the spiritual values of living in our homes, our offices, and in our plants or we plunge ourselves into economic and physical slavery and sudden death.

No man has a right to exploit his neighbor—whether he be the man next to him on the job, the man who hires him, or a man of another color or race, or another nation. The man who does, the man who looks upon his fellow beings as only means of satisfying his own ego, who uses them as stepping stones in his ever-striving for material gain, is going against the laws of all that is decent and human. He is treading on the divinity of mankind; for all men, no matter who they are, are sons of God.

There are no such things as differences between one group of people and another. They all spring from the same source. They all have the same functions, the same fears, the same hopes, and the same yearnings for happiness. Those are things of the heart, the things that make men men and not stones. They are not ruled by color or speech. They are the things that connect mankind to that mysterious, ever-present thing from which they sprang.

Today we are in the midst of labor upheavals in this country. At times they make little sense. And there are moments when the upheavals show little of labor and much of the sinister influences at work in this country today—influences that are absolutely opposed to the idea that all men are great and fundamentally good. The men of labor who are keeping their heads, keeping their love of country and self-respect must unite to fight these enemies of the people.

These enemies of the people and of the event and the Man which Christmas memorializes have no respect for the decency of men. They use men as tools for their own greed and selfishness. They play race against race, they break up homes, they foment false concepts of capitalism and labor. They ridicule the idea of Christianity. They scoff at the idea that men can, if they will, live and work in peace with each other. Their warped ideology of communism has become a real and terrible evil which is stalking through our land today.

Surely, people who celebrate Christmas must have some sincerity in their observance of this day? Surely, they must realize that the men who have been dying the last few bloody years for decency, brotherhood, and peace, have some right to their respect? Blood and suffering cannot be wiped out by mugs of beer, flag waving, and radical ranting. You cannot forget the debt of life you owe those youngsters. You cannot sell them out, by passiveness and don't-give-a-whoopness. You will pay for it if you try it. What then can we do this Christmastime to realize the things they were forced to die for?

In the first place we can start making ourselves over. Right there is the answer to the whole business. Everybody thinks the other fellow ought to change, but never considers that he himself is probably in need of extensive overhauling. That's the place to begin—to learn tolerance, understanding, and humbleness.

At this Christmas, the home will be the center of activities—in many for the only time during the year. That, too, is a darned good place to do some fighting for a better world, instead of with the members of the family. To be forced to observe the products of some of America's homes these days is enough to bring on the shudders. The home has broken down. Parents, either by necessity or greed, took advantage of the war boom to make money and turned their kids loose all too often to shift for themselves. In consequence we have a lost generation right here in this country and the effects of the unfortunate thoughtlessness and neglect and indifference of the parents will be felt for years to come.

America must have strong homes, homes based on teamwork, trust, and love. Not a single person in this country has a right to shed a tear for the waifs and war wreckage in other countries until he has done something to clean up the wreckage and damage of war in this country. The place to begin on that job is in his own home, if it needs it, and then try to let others see the course to take. Parents are directly responsible for their children and if the parents fall down, then they are indeed criminals and should be treated as enemies of the people. A parent who buys his youngster a lot of toys and gifts at Christmastime and lets him run wild during the rest of the year makes a mockery of Christmas and parenthood. Parenthood is an all-year job, as the heads of all good homes realize. Homes, no more than life itself, can be successful if they are based on selfishness, cowardice, and desire only for worldly gain.

Most American homes need more of a fear of God and less of a fear of what the Joneses are doing.

At Christmastime we see and hear the age-old quotation of "Peace on earth, good will to men." It doesn't mean a thing, unless we have it in our hearts. It doesn't mean a thing, even if we dressed ourselves in white robes and proclaimed it from the roof tops, if we do not remember it the rest of the year. Alas! How quickly we do forget it. As soon as Christmas is gone and the wrappings

burned up we go right out and wallow in intolerance and bigotry, and worry and scrap and grouch and gripe.

Well, someone says, that's human nature. It may be human nature, but it's only human nature on the wrong track. Human beings are naturally happy, lovely people. They have gotten off the right track and hit too many tunnels and switches and dead ends.

What we all need, and want, is the nerve to practice the Christmas spirit in our daily lives and occupations. If we all did that, then we would find a world full of smiles, and people who were startlingly likeable. We would find a world where even the Communists cut out their hell raising and snarling and slithering. We would have a world full of happy homes. We would find labor and management working together instead of being at loggerheads. And we ourselves would find a greatness and a power in us that would make us soar to new heights.

It can be done. We can have a world of peace if we want it. We can have happy homes if we work for them. We can raise decent children if we remember our duty. We can have industrial peace if we demand it and work for it. We can have all those things if we make up our minds to.

Tito and Spain: A Study in Contrasts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the controversy as to whether the United States should recognize Spain, few people realize that the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt not only went out of his way, not merely to recognize the Spanish Government, but also to court and win favor of the head of the Spanish state.

This revelation is contained in an address delivered by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs, at the Belvedere-Sheraton Hotel, Baltimore, Md., October 12, 1949.

Dr. Thorning's address is, in my opinion, an historical document which should be available to everyone interested in this important subject. Therefore, under leave to extend my remarks, I include this address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

TITO AND SPAIN: A STUDY IN CONTRASTS

(By Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs)

Mr. Dean Acheson calls his flirtation with Tito a Marxist totalitarian, a calculated risk. It is a risk, as everybody can see, to loan $20,000,000 to a military dicator who owes his power to the Soviet hierarchy as well as to the criminal folly of those Western leaders who betrayed their one-time ally, Drazha Mihailovitch. For the details of this treachery one has only to study a book entitled "The War We Lost," by Dr. Constantin Fotich, former Ambassador of Yugoslavia to the United States. Totalitarian Tito is a creature of Soviet intrigue and Anglo-Saxon dishonor. Consequently, anything that is attempted in the current crisis to support Josip Broz, who fought on the leftist side in the Spanish civil war, can be characterized as a deliberate gamble. Mr. Acheson's maneuver in power politics is undertaken with open eyes because Tito's record of Red fascism has been writ large on the pages of history. Mr. James F. Byrnes, himself a dupe of Soviet diplomacy, in his amazing bit of self-revelation, Speaking Frankly (pp. 144–145) relates his distress at Tito's murderous actions with respect to American airmen. The whole passage, which may be recommended reading for Mr. Acheson at this time, reads as follows:

"During this * * * period a crisis in our relations with Yugoslavia * * * occurred. There, Marshal Tito, who had fought in the Russian Revolution and was a thoroughly trained Communist leader, had worked his way into control. * * * The Army's Air Transport Service operating between Rome and Vienna passed through Udine in northern Italy to Klagenfurt in Austria. It was impossible for our planes to travel the 65 miles between these two points in a straight line because the northwest tip of Yugoslavia jutted out between them and, because of Yugloslav protests, our planes had been ordered to stay away from that territory. The order was often difficult to obey as the territory is rugged and many navigational hazards exist. Pilots must fly through a pass where mountains are 9,000 feet high and surrounding peaks reach as high as 18,000 feet. * * *

"On August 9, an army transport, carrying 7 Americans, a Turk, and a Swiss, lost its way, strayed over Yugoslav territory, was attacked by two Yugoslav fighter planes, and forced to make a hazardous landing in a wheat field. * * * On August 19, another transport en route to Rome radioed Udine that it was over Klagenfurt. It was never heard from again, but Klagenfurt reported it had been attacked and sent down in flames by Yugoslav fighters. The bodies of the five Americans were found 5 days later. * * *

"The State Department asked for information and Marshal Tito made a belligerent speech. * * *

" 'Yugoslav claims to be a friendly government and your planes can fly over our territory at any time,' I told him. 'But even if you were not friendly and one of your planes, flying over Canada, got lost and happened to fly over the United States and was grounded, the officials of the United States would feel it their duty to do everything in their power for the safety and comfort of the Yugoslav crew and its passengers. Any official who failed to do so would be reprimanded by our Government. The idea of a United States Army plane, under such circumstances, firing upon a plane of Yugoslavia, killing its crew and passengers, is something the American Government would never be guilty of and is something for which the American people will not forgive Yugoslavia.' "

In contrast to this Marxist savagery, Spain, motivated by Christian charity, saved 1,200 American aviators from the rigors of internment during World War II. Although these flyers made forced landings in the Iberian Peninsula, they were received hospitably and returned to their homes and families, not in rude, wooden coffins as happened to the innocent boys who, because of bad weather, took a short cut over the territory of a despot they helped to preserve. Tito had far greater reason to show us gratitude than the present head of the Spanish State. And yet the latter, despite pin-pricks and provocations, has never retaliated in kind. Indeed, he has returned good for evil, authorizing the members of his cabinet in Madrid to sign the first international air agreement between the United States and any European country.

With sincerity and truth, the head of the Spanish Government can declare to the people of the United States:

"Spain claims to be a friendly government and your planes can fly over our territory at any time. But even if you were not friendly and one of your planes, flying over the Iberian Peninsula, got lost and happened to fly over Spain and was grounded, the officials of Spain would feel it their duty to do everything in their power for the safety and comfort of the American crew and its passengers."

Furthermore, in the air agreement, which Spain concluded with us, we were enabled to obtain landing rights for military as well as civilian planes. This is a valuable concession when you recall, as Senator MILLARD E. TYDINGS. chairman of the Senate Armed Forces has pointed out, "that some 14 or 15 of the most important air fields in the world, from the standpoint of United States defense, are located in or around Madrid, the capital of Spain."

The United States Navy knows the strategic importance of the Iberian Peninsula. Consequently, Admiral Richard E. Connolly led his warships into the harbor of El Ferrol del Caudillo. Moreover, this gallant naval officer had a most cordial visit with the head of the Spanish state. Like the Hon. James A. Farley, formerly chairman of the Democratic National Committee, the admiral found that the head of the Spanish state could give pertinent, intelligent and interesting answers to all questions under discussion. This is the same report we receive from all Senators and Reperesentatives who visit Madrid. The Navy remembers the loyal attitude of Spain at the time of the North African invasion. And even before that critical hour, the Spanish Government displayed its deepest sympathies, not in words which were utilized to distract Hitler, but in deeds of humanity, as Rear Admiral P. P. Powell has testified. The latter, in the New York Times, September 16, 1949, wrote as follows:

"In 1940, just after the Battle of Dunkerque, I was associated in the evacuation of neutral refugees from Europe through the port of Lisbon. The Spaniards, in many instances, facilitated the escape of British, French, and Polish troops, as well as citizens, and allowed the establishment of three underground routes through Spain to France, over which many of our secret agents were passed without any betrayal so far as known." The admiral, concluding his eloquent, truthful testimony, suggests that "it well behooves the Washington Government to take some intelligent steps to try to improve our relations with that country rather than, through neglect, to allow such a diplomatic catastrophe as has occurred in China to be duplicated in Europe."

It is interesting to compare this advice of Admiral Powell with the text of a question and answer given by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt in the October 1949 number of McCall's.

The question reads as follows:

"How in the name of intellectual honesty and fair play can you explain your stand on the Spanish question? To be consistent you should apply the same yardstick to Russia, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, etc."

The reply of Mrs. Roosevelt has this phraseology:

"I cannot see that not wanting to bring, at the present time, more recognition and power to Franco is inconsistent at all with my stand on any other country. Franco is the only living dictator who was an ally of Hitler and Mussolini, against whom we fought the war. It is true that for a short time Russia was an ally of Germany under Hitler, but she afterward fought Hitler. It is true also that today Russia and her satellites are dictatorships, and one has to speak out against dictatorships. Certainly no one has been more outspoken than I have.

"But Russia is a member of the United Nations already and is also one of the powerful nations of the world. While we can be quite honest about what we disapprove of in communism, we must recognize the fact that by becoming our ally the U. S. S. R. helped us to win the war, and we can only

hope, because of her power and strength, that the U. S. S. R. will eventually learn to live side by side with the democracies without trying to change them. To go out of our way at the present time to recognize a dictator who upheld Mussolini and Hitler would seem to me to make little sense."

Analyzing these words, what points may be considered worthy of attention?

In the first place, it is good to see that our relationships with Spain are to be set in a framework of intellectual honesty and fair play. These are precisely the virtues that are at stake in this discussion. And they are qualities highly prized in American life throughout the Western Hemisphere.

"It is true," Mrs. Roosevelt admits, that the Soviet Union, under the domination of Generalissimo Josef Stalin, as well as the Soviet satellites, are "dictatorships." Why does not the wife of the former President add that Josef Stalin and his Soviet gauleiters are at the head of slave states which, in word and deed, are waging war upon the United States of America and upon every free man, woman, and child in the world. To be sure, it is a limited war. But it is a war which is bringing torture, imprisonment, civil and religious persecution, and sudden death to thousands of Christians and Jews in Sovietized Czechoslovakia, Soviet Hungary, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty is unjustly kept in durance vile, Soviet Bulgaria, Soviet Rumania, Soviet Albania, and the Far East now in process of Sovietization, while Mrs. Roosevelt contents herself with describing both Spain and the Soviet Union as "dictatorships."

Can Mrs. Roosevelt allege that Spain is destroying one country after another? Does Mrs. Roosevelt claim that a combination of Soviet dictatorships, backed by bombing planes, atomic weapons, tommy guns and torture chambers, is on the same level as authoritarian Spain, where tourists are free to come and go, where minority groups, such as monarchists and republicans live side by side with Government supporters, and where there is not a single Protestant or Jewish clergyman under trial, much less in prison or in cemeteries? Why does not the writer for McCall's magazine point out that there is some difference between a dictatorship which is waging war upon every continent and a Spanish Government which has given and continues to give unmistakable signs of friendship and good will?

During the current year, Mr. Dean Acheson recommended the appointment of Ambassadors to the Soviet Union and to Soviet satellite states. Furthermore, Mr. Acheson freely gave "recognition and power" to the butcher, Josip Broz-Tito, without any guaranties from the latter as to the establishment of civil and religious liberties. Why did not Mrs. Roosevelt protest this grant of "recognition and power" and, we may add, money from American taxpayers to a totalitarian Marxist tyrant who is every whit as evil as Hitler or Mussolini? Tito is a Red Fascist dictator. He is very much alive. He was elevated to his position of dictatorship in Marxist Yugoslavia by Generalissimo Josef Stalin and some deluded allied leaders, who failed to take into account the realities of international life.

In order to justify full diplomatic relations with the butcher, Stalin, Mrs. Roosevelt points to the fact that "Russia (she means the Soviet Union, White Russia, and the Soviet Ukraine) is a member of the United Nations already and is also one of the powerful nations of the world."

Why does not Mrs. Roosevelt explain that the Soviet Union, White Russia, and the Soviet Ukraine were admitted to the UN as peace-loving nations. Does she believe that this status, the Soviets' sole title-deed to membership, is clean? Does Eleanor Roosevelt think she can gloss over the essential, criminal role of the Soviet generalissimo, Josef Stalin, in unleashing World War II, by his share in the partition of Poland, 1939, with the easy, disarming description of "Russia (she does not say 'Stalin') as an ally of Germany under Hitler * * * for a short time." Was not this short time crucial? Was not this alliance the partnership, however temporary, that led to the slaughter of millions?

The second part of Mrs. Roosevelt's apology for Stalin's career of murder merits similar analysis. The Soviet Union, she asserts, "is also one of the powerful nations of the world." Does the lady wish to imply that might makes right. This sounds like Napoleon's dictum that "God is on the side of the big battalions." Or like Bismarck's appeal to iron and blood. Indeed, this type of apology on the part of Mrs. Roosevelt seems to be an echo of the war cry of the late Paul Joseph Goebbels: "What matters is not who is right, but who wins." Or are we to decide questions of right and wrong, issues of international law and practice, by putting the infamous question Generalissimo Stalin proposed with reference to His Holiness, Pius XII: "How many divisions has the Pope?"

The real question is one of right and wrong, of good and evil, of fairness or hypocrisy. The issue is not whether the Soviet Army, because it boasts 5,000,000 men under arms, is more important than the 28,000,000 people of Spain. In 1946, the year of Potsdam, the Soviets began to spread the propaganda story that the Spanish Government should be boycotted, economically, and, if possible, eliminated altogether, because experiments with nuclear energy were being carried on behind the Pyrenees. In fact, this was the specious argument of a renegade American citizen, Mr. Oscar Lange, when he, under the whip of his Soviet dictators, attempted to exploit the machinery of the United Nations in order to starve and subdue the Spanish Government and the Spanish people. Mr. Lange, double-dyed turncoat, failed in 1947. And in 1949 a majority vote in the General Assembly favored an end to the diplomatic boycott of Spain, while a vote of 40 to 6 repudiated the principal accusation brought against that administration.

Try as she will, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt cannot establish a parity between the iron-curtain countries and the countries of the Iberian Peninsula, Portugal and Spain. Within a few hours, any respectable United States citizen can secure a visa to visit Spain. He can talk with the people, hear their criticism of the administration, as he would hear complaints voiced in the United States, in cafes, hotels, private homes, or public buildings. Without a police permit, this same United States citizen could travel from Barcelona to Madrid, from Madrid to Sevilla, and from Sevilla to Valencia. Nowhere would he find the apparatus of a police state, as he would find it in the Soviet states and in Tito's Yugoslavia: (1) A work card; (2) a ration card; (3) a travel document; (4) a lodgings permit.

These are the badges of slavery; they do not exist in the Iberian Peninsula, although there are limitations on freedom of the press, public assembly, and political organization. It is one thing to restrict political liberties, as is the case in Spain; it is something quite different to suppress both political and personal freedoms, as is the iron rule in all Marxist totalitarian states, whether they work in collaboration as do Sovietized Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Rumania, Albania, and Bulgaria, or one of them is reduced to isolation, as is Tito's Yugoslavia.

In Spain there is progress toward representative government and greater political as well as personal liberty; with regard to the iron-curtain countries, the supreme tragedy prevails in that not even hope of change remains without outside help. Nevertheless, Mrs. Roosevelt, who does not want to accredit an ambassador of the United States in a Madrid that, in the light of this comparison of facts, is relatively free, acquiesces gladly in the appointment of United States ambassadors to European capitals where Soviet gauleiters, á la Hitler, lord it over the people we promised to liberate.

Mrs. Roosevelt can agree to accord prestige, recognition, and power to Red Nazis who make a mockery of the Atlantic Pact and God-given rights. All that the former First Lady asks is that "the U. S. S. R. will eventually learn to live side by side with the democracies without trying to change them." How agonizing such words must be to the noble Polish people, to the Czechs, the Slovaks, Ruthenians, Hungarians, Chinese, Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians. What a message of grief and sadness this must bring to the Russian people themselves, to say nothing of Germans and Austrians in the Soviet zones of Europe. Mrs. Roosevelt's final comment in McCall's may now be subjected to analysis. This conclusion reads:

"To go out of our way at the present time to recognize a dictator who upheld Mussolini and Hitler would seem to me to make little sense."

Is this a correct statement of the issue? In the first place, it should be recorded that, of the some 2,000,000 men who took part in the Spanish civil war, 95 percent were Spaniards. Then, when Mrs. Roosevelt speaks of a dictator "who upheld Mussolini and Hitler," she distorts the picture. It was rather Italy and Germany that accorded help to Nationalist Spain at a time when Soviet international brigades were organized by Stalin to do the job in the whole Iberian Peninsula that they subsequently did in eastern and central Europe, including Czechoslovakia. Paradoxical as it may seem, it was a good thing for free peoples everywhere that Stalin failed in Spain when he took sides against Mussolini and Hitler. If anybody in the course of history upheld Hitler and Mussolini, it was Stalin when he joined his fellow dictators to start the war.

Perhaps Mrs. Roosevelt should be reminded about the identity of the United States President who, subsequent to the abovementioned help from Germany and Italy to Spain, recognized the government, headed by the same Spaniard who has guided the destinies of his country since 1939. It was the Honorable Franklin Delano Roosevelt who, on March 31, 1939, "went out of his way" to recognize the present Government of Spain as the "de facto" and "de jure" government of that country. It made good sense then to President Roosevelt, because the establishment of full diplomatic relations simply means that we regard a given administration as firmly installed in authority and ready to respect its international obligations.

On another occasion our late President F. D. Roosevelt "went out of his way" not merely to "recognize" the Spanish Government, but also to court and win the favor of the head of the Spanish state. At a time when we needed every friend we could muster, and that hour will strike again, President Roosevelt chose as his wartime Ambassador to Spain a gentleman who had special titles to command the respect and sympathy of the Spanish people. He knew well what it was when he sent his signed promises to the Spanish chief of state in November 1942, "I hope you will accept my full assurance," he wrote, "that these moves in our north African operation are in no shape, manner, or form directed against the Government or people of Spain. * * * Spain has nothing to fear from the United Nations. I am, my dear general, your sincere friend, Franklin D. Roosevelt."

"In the intercourse of honorable men," comments an intellectually honest, fair-minded scholar, Father Edgar R. Smothers, S. J., of West Baden College, West Baden,

Ind., "such words are not to be tendered as a booby trap. They are tendered to be kept, unless the other party rejects them or breaks faith with their author, who was in this case the President of the United States."

"So long as an immediate advantage accrued," Father Smothers continues, "we kept our promises to Spain. Once the main hazards of war were over, and President Roosevelt had come back from Yalta, he wrote his letter (March 10, 1943), unpublished at the time, to the Honorable Norman Armour, his Ambassador to Spain, cutting the ground from under his assurances to the head of the Spanish state. He specified no breach of faith committed by the Government of Spain against the Government of the United States. Our authorities have never done that."

That was after Yalta. At Potsdam, the new President, the Honorable Harry S. Truman, made the public announcement that none of us likes Franco. The following September, Mr. Dean Acheson, then Acting Secretary of State, published President Roosevelt's letter to Ambassador Armour. Our policy of unfriendliness toward the Government of Spain was now an official fact of public record. To that policy we have been faithful; but every step of the way is stained with the moral stain of an international breach of faith.

The recognition accorded by the Honorable F. D. Roosevelt to Spain has never been withdrawn. The act of recognition and the flattering gesture of friendship at the time of the north African invasion were both the decisions of the departed husband of Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt. By her inadequate, misleading answer in McCall's, Mrs. Roosevelt must share the responsibility with Mr. Dean Acheson for what Father Smothers rightly describes as "an international breach of faith."

Our State Department has admitted that the iniquitous, Soviet-inspired move of the so-called Polish delegation in the General Assembly of the UN has strengthened, rather than weakened, the present Government of Spain. Consequently, Mr. Acheson must be the first to acknowledge that his policy, from the standpoint of international law, or attempted domestic interference in Spain, or in the sphere of the good-neighbor policy, where the other American Republics are taking the lead in sending ambassadors and other chiefs of diplomatic mission to Madrid, has been a failure. And by Mr. Acheson's policy of economic discrimination against the country that sent Christoper Columbus to discover America, we are successful only in this: We compel the Spanish people to suffer for Mr. Acheson's default of statesmanship and of honor.

Cotton-Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. LYLE, JR.

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LYLE. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks many statements have been made regarding cotton acreage allotments for 1950. Members of Congress from all cotton-growing States have been in meetings with their farmers, discussing the problems that arise out of the restrictive acreage provisions of Public Law 272 of this Congress and Public Law 12 of the Seventy-ninth Congress. Not only have Congressmen made statements, but the press has been abundantly supplied with statements by elements of the Department of Agriculture, statements attempting to dodge responsibility of bad administration by placing the blame on the law. That may be the easy way out, but it certainly is not the honorable answer in the present crisis.

It is my judgment, after much investigation, that the difficulty that most of the farmers are experiencing with the present acreage allotments resulted from the deliberate and arbitrary misinterpretation by the Department of Agriculture of both the intent of Congress and the express language of Public Law 272. The Department may not like the law, but assuredly it has no right to deliberately disregard the wishes of Congress and the obvious meaning of the law in order to suit its own purposes.

All of the people of the United States have a stake in the economic security of the farmer. As the farm income goes, so goes the national income, and the prosperity of the American people is in direct proportion to the income of the American farmer. The farm problem is not a sentimental one, nor a political one, but it is one of cold economic facts. This Nation cannot prosper without a prosperous farm income. For every $3,000,000,000 the farm income drops; a million nonfarm workers go on relief rolls.

The Congress of the United States is conscious of this, and has made a sincere effort to devise laws that will benefit the Nation while benefiting the farmers. The arbitrary action of the Department of Agriculture in misinterpreting Public Law 272 imperils the stability of a large segment of our agricultural population and, consequently, the Nation.

It is difficult enough for the farmer and his prosperity to be subject to the will of a legislative body without having the peril of administrative decree and interpretation hanging over his head.

In addressing this body in February of last year, I called your attention to the difficulties we were to encounter in writing legislation of this character. I did not then question, nor do I now question, the necessity of a national plan for the influencing of, if not the control of, a product such as cotton. At that time I was concerned with the legislation, but I did not anticipate the difficulty of having to write legislation, and then having to fight the Department for a fair interpretation.

The 19 counties in south Texas, which I have the honor to represent, are historically large producers of cotton. They have the know-how, the soil and the equipment suitable for cotton farming. During the past few years, at the suggestion of the United States Government, and in their own interest, cotton farmers have attempted to diversify their activities and, particularly during the war, they gave heed to the requirements of their country and went strong for war crops. Whatever may have been their purpose, they had the right to depend upon the integrity of an agency which said, and I quote the regulations promulgated in 1945 pursuant to enactment of Public Law 12:

War crop determination for the protection of cotton allotments: That in establishing cotton-acreage allotments under title III of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, or under the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act, as amended, for any farm for which a cotton-acreage allotment was established for the 1942 crop, if the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm during 1945 or any subsequent year during the present emergency is in excess of the total acreage of war crops grown on the farm in 1941, the cotton-production history for the farm for any such year will not be considered as representative of the normal history of the farm and the farm will be considered as one on which cotton was planted in such year. For the purpose of this determination, the following are designated as war crops: Soybeans for beans, peanuts picked and threshed, flax for seed, Irish potatoes, sweetpotatoes, dry edible beans, grain sorghums, sugar beets, sugar cane, rice, tomatoes for processing, oats, barley, sweet sorghums, Sudan grass, biennial and perennial legumes, and mixtures containing biennial and perennial legumes.

And Public Law 272, which said:

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary, in administering the provisions of Public Law 12, Seventy-ninth Congress, as it relates to war crops, shall carry out the provisions of such act in the following manner:

"The total of the war-crop credits due the individual farms in each county shall be credited to the county and the total of the war-crop credits due all of the counties in a State shall be credited to the State.

"The acreage credited to States, counties, and farms for the years 1945, 1946, or 1947, because of war crops, shall be taken into full account in the determination and distribution of cotton-acreage allotments on a National, State, county, and farm basis."

However, the Department of Agriculture, in interpreting Public Law 272, disregarded the intent of Congress and what I believe to be the plain and express language of the act.

Let me give you, as an example, the effect of the law as interpreted upon Texas:

The national acreage allotment base, as you know, is 22,500,000 acres, and the national acreage allotment is 21,000,000 acres. Texas' share under provisions of section 344 (C) (1), which includes war crops plus the estimated additional acreage for each State required for small-farm allotments under subsection (F) (1) is 8,302,194 acres. The Department found that under provisions of section 344 (C) (2), the actual acreage planted to cotton in Texas, including small farms and adjustments under (B), amounted to 8,182,540. It will be noted that the war crops figure is the larger by 119,654 acres, and to all intents and purposes it would appear that Texas should be considered a State which would come under the war crops formula in the law.

This, however, was not the case. The Department held as follows:

Since, they said, the national acreage total is 22,775,480, which includes an acreage base of 22,308,486 plus 289,994 for small farm adjustments, plus adjustments under section 344 (B) amounting to 177,000 acres, it was necessary, under the law, to reduce that figure to the 22,500,000 acreage allotment base.

It was never contemplated, apparently, that the national acreage total should exceed the allotment base, and the law was written on the premise that the acreage

total would fall below the allotment base. Conseqently, under section 344 (c) (1) (C), which reads:

The additional acreage required to determine a national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres, which additional acreage shall be distributed among States receiving no adjustment under paragraph (2) of this subsection.

Texas, which fell under section (C) (1) would not have received adjustment under paragraph (C) (2), and therefore would have received the additional acreage had it been necessary to add acreage to "determine a total national allotment base of 22,500,000 acres." Their reasoning was that since it was necessary, instead, to reduce acreage to accomplish this purpose, the reduction was applied to only those States which would have received the additional acreage had the situation been as was contemplated at the time the law was written.

By this converse reasoning by the Department of Agriculture, Texas lost approximately half of the total national reduction of 275,480, the difference between the actual national acreage and the national acreage allotment base. There is no provision in the law for making this reduction apply to those States which receive no adjustment under paragraph 2. There is provision only to give additional acreage to those States if the national acreage should be less than the national acreage allotment, and it is a matter of interpretation only to apply the converse when the acreage proved greater than the allotment. It appears to me that what the Department has done is to fill in a gap in the law by an administrative ruling, since there was no provision for making the reduction, in the event the national acreage be greater than the national allotment.

We were told by the Department representatives that having applied this reduction, it was found that the Texas acreage, figured on the basis of the war-crop formula, was less than the total figured on the basis of 95 percent of the 1947–48 acreage actually planted to cotton, by a difference of 93 acres. Since the law states that the State allotment base shall not be less than 95 percent of the 1947–48 acreage actually planted to cotton, the Department contended that it was compelled to place Texas in the category of those States whose allotment was figured on the basis of 95 percent of the actual 1947–48 cotton acreage.

I note, however, that in the Federal Register of Tuesday, December 13, 1949, the Department has this to say in that connection:

On first trial, it was determined that a straight pro rata deduction based on the initial State acreage allotment bases would cause the State acreage allotment base for Texas to be less than 95 percent of the 1947–48 average acreage actually planted to cotton. Consequently, the deduction was limited to 119,654 acres for that State, thereby causing the State acreage allotment base to equal 95 percent of such 1947–48 average acreage.

Apparently it was the trial run that did us in.

The Department's decision which cost Texas 119,654 acres, was, in my judgment, an unwarranted and arbitrary one.

Of course, the Department did issue orders to the State committee to give the individual farmer credit for his war crops, but they should have known, and did know, that giving the farm credit for war crops, without giving war-crop credit to the counties, would do far more harm than it would do good.

Perhaps some of you who do not think in terms of farming, and cotton farming in particular, would like to know the practical effect of Public Law 272 as interpreted by the Department. Atascosa County, one of the fine farming counties in my district, in 1942 had a cotton-acreage allotment of 31,583 acres. The 1950 allotment is 5,677. Bee County in 1942 had 33,951 acres but for 1950 the allotment is 8,887. Nueces County, my home county, the county whose rich soil a few years ago enabled it to lead the State, if not the Nation, in cotton production received an allotment of only 92,081 acres in 1950. Comal County in 1942 had 6,054 acres, but in 1950 its allotment is only 670 acres.

Since the emergency ended, war crops, without strong support of the Government, are no longer practical farming crops in large degree. Great economic suffering will inevitably result unless this Congress, during the next few weeks, enacts legislation so plain and so strong that it is not subject to misinterpretation by the Department of Agriculture, and legislation which will equalize and fairly distribute the acreage to be planted under allotments.

Here is an individual case, so that you may understand the problem right down to the soil. A young man of my district, a veteran of World War II, a young man of 29 years of age, purchased 300 acres of fine farm land. He has been farming the land to cotton for the past 3 years. It was excellently adapted to cotton and the equipment which he purchased is that designed for cotton farming. Under the 1950 allotment he may plant 67 acres of cotton. He still owes $100 an acre on the land and is very much concerned as to how he shall meet the payments with so small an allotment.

A war widow called me last week. She was left 600 acres of brush land which at an expense of $600 an acre, she put into cultivation in cotton in 1949. She got no allotment at all under Public Law 272.

These are but typical examples of thousands of farmers. We have not been treated fairly by the Department of Agriculture in its interpretation. It seems to us that with the acreage allotment for the Nation reduced by so small a percentage, any fair interpretation of the law would not leave us with such a critical economic problem and such a disastrous situation as confronts our farmers.

We have been to the Department of Agriculture and have received no relief. We have but one place to go, and that is the Congress of the United States. We believe in legislative government and not administrative decree, and we have every confidence that you will come to our aid and assist us in a fair share of what we believe we are entitled to receive, historically and legally.

Several bills have been introduced. I introduced one this week, which calls for full credit to the counties for war crops. I also favor the proposal agreed upon during the first part of December by several of us, meeting with members of the House Committee on Agriculture, and which is being introduced by Mr. COOLEY.

For those of us living in the southern part of Texas, early action is imperative, for planting will begin within the next few weeks.

Chairman Gaston, of the Export-Import Bank, in Illuminating Broadcast Discusses Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, because of the large public interest in point 4 of President Truman's plan, and the work being accomplished in the development of that plan by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank, I am sure my distinguished colleagues will be interested in the memorable and illuminating presentment of that subject by Mr. Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Board of the Export-Import Bank, in a recent radio broadcast over Station WCFL in Chicago. Therefore, under the unanimous consent granted I am extending my remarks to include the full text of this broadcast, which follows:

Sound of quorum call: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. Quorum call—the three bells that send the Members of the House of Representatives hurrying from their offices to the floor of the House.

Sound of quorum call: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. Quorum call—these three bells are again calling the Illinois Members of the House to report to the people of Illinois. This station presents, as a public service, another in a series of programs transcribed on Capitol Hill in the radio studios of Congress. These programs bring to you a personal report from your delegation in the House of Representatives. Your moderator is Congressman BARRATT O'HARA, of the second district. Now here is Speaker RAYBURN calling the House to order.

Speaker RAYBURN. The Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK. Buckley of Illinois, present; Chesney, present; Dawson, present; Gordon, present; Gorski of Illinois, present; Linehan, present; Mack of Illinois, present; O'Brien of Illinois, present; O'Hara of Illinois, present; Price, present; Sabath, present; Yates, present.

Representative O'HARA. My friends, the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois today salute the Chicago Press Veterans' Association which this week is holding its eleventh annual dinner.

It's the most famous and exclusive dinner event in the Chicago calendar. You can't

get in even as a guest unless a couple of decades ago you were a real honest-to-goodness reporter, copyreader, or editor on a big Chicago daily newspaper or are presently so employed. The newspaper greats and the celebrities of the Fourth Estate past and present, will be flying from all parts of the world to attend. They always do. These annual dinners have become the great national event—the one big must date—among veteran newspapermen and are looked forward to by newspapermen in Illinois and all other Middle West States regardless of where they live.

Richard J. Finnegan will be there, and Charley Wheeler, and John Delaney, and Jim Doherty, and Oscar Hewitt, and Bill Stuart, and Warren Brown, and Jim Cleary—that's just the beginning—not forgetting the peer of the best, our own James Spike Bonnessey, statesman and journalist, to whom the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois doff their hats in a special salute in recognition of his outstanding service in the campaign of 1948 and in the cause of government of, for, and by the common people of our country.

Some of those grayheads at the dinner of the Chicago Press Veterans' Association will be getting up to introduce themselves ex-"I.-O."—meaning they did their stuff on the old Inter-Ocean on Monroe Street.

Won't you tell them, Mr. Gaston—I am speaking, my friends, to the distinguished guest of the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois, the Honorable Herbert E. Gaston, Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank—tell them, Mr. Gaston, how come you qualify as an ex-"I.-O."

Mr. GASTON. I should say first, Mr. O'HARA, that I feel honored and am happy to be a guest, even though at a long distance, of the press veterans' association. I have been for some years a member of what is possibly a more ancient—although I won't say more honored—organization called the Silurians, which consists of old-timers in the newspaper fraternity in New York.

But answering your question, Mr. O'HARA. Truly, I am afraid I cannot qualify as an ex-"I.-O." It wasn't the Inter-Ocean but the Record-Herald for which I worked in 1904–6, and I achieved no dignity there as a journalist. I worked as a night ad compositor 2 or 3 nights a week in a back corner of the composing room overlooking Daily News Alley. I understand that Frank B. Noyes, who achieved some newspaper fame, was the publisher of the paper then, but I didn't meet any such eminent persons. I worked, however, under a fine old gentleman named Eddie English, the ad foreman, whose kindness I shall always remember.

At the same time I attended an institution out on the Midway and Jackson Park, since made famous by Mr. Hutchins. But when I arrived on the scene it was marked by the presence of such men as William Rainey Harper, Amos Alonzo Stagg, Walter Eckersall, and some others whose names you may remember. This, Mr. O'HARA, is how I qualify—if not as an ex-"I.-O.," at least as something or other in connection with the newspaper business in Chicago.

May I add—if I can without tears—that when I came to Chicago the English-language morning papers included the Tribune, Record-Herald, the Chronicle, the Examiner, and the morning Inter-Ocean. Among the evening papers were the Daily News, the Post, the Journal, the American, and the Evening Inter-Ocean.

As an echo of my printing days, let me say that I'm glad to see the Chicago papers again printing today's news today.

Representative O'HARA. I am sure, Mr. Gaston, that the veteran newspapermen of Chicago and the Middle West are well acquainted with your brilliant record on the editorial side after those early years in Chicago, but it probably will be news, and most heartening news, to the members of the Chicago Typographical Union, that the head of what is probably the most powerful bank in the world once worked in the composing room of a Chicago newspaper and carried a card in the Chicago Typographical Union.

Mr. Gaston, would you mind telling us briefly just how the Export-Import Bank fits into the picture of what we are trying to do in rehabilitating a world pretty well wrecked by war?

Mr. GASTON. Briefly and simply, Mr. O'HARA, the Export-Import Bank lends dollars to promote the prosperity of the United States through helping to develop the productive resources of foreign countries. This is exactly what President Truman's famous point 4 is designed to do. It is to add force and new direction to something the Export-Import Bank has been doing for some years—fifteen, to be precise. We do this, not with tax money, but with money borrowed by the United States Treasury and lent to the bank. We have a total lending power of three and a half billions, and it is revolving—that is, the money paid back we can lend again. Our directions are to lend in such a way as to promote the export and import trade of the United States. It is plain that to do this in any effective and lasting way we must consider both the ability of the borrower to pay and the adequacy of the dollar income of the country where the loan is made. That means we must make loans which will earn money and which will earn or save dollars, for we are directed to lend with reasonable assurance of repayment. Of course, this means loans that in the long run really do most for the building up of any country. Loans for useless and unproductive things would mean a future burden or a future default. But we had a special postwar role to play. Before the creation of ECA (the Marshall plan) we made emergency loans to most of the western European countries so that they could go on buying from the United States. The amount of these reconstruction and pipe-line loans (as some of them were called) was close to $,000,000,000.

Representative O'HARA. I think our friends in the radio audience may have read recently of the loan by your bank of $16,000,000 to Bolivia for a highway that will open up some 300 miles of rich territory, heretofore neglected, unsurveyed and unreachable. Where does this money come from and what security do you demand? In other words, is this like Marshall plan money or will it come back to us?

Mr. GASTON. We make loans, as I remarked a moment ago, Mr. O'HARA, with reasonable assurance of repayment—and we are confident we have that reassurance in this case. We think the dollars will come back to us and that we will be further rewarded by increased trade and increased stability—political and economic—in the heart of South America. The security we have demanded is nothing but the public credit of the people of Bolivia, our faith that they have accepted this loan with the intention of paying it back and that they will pay it back. Contrary to some popular impressions about Latin-American credits our experience is that good loans—productive loans well made—will be repaid. The road is from many standpoints a fascinating project. It takes off at Cochabamba in the heart of the Andes and makes its way across mountain ranges and through fertile valleys for 300 miles to Santa Cruz, on the low-lying eastern plain of Bolivia. It is part of a plan proposed by a United States mission in 1942 to promote food and forest production. But it is to do more than that. It is to tie disunited parts of a country together for political and social as well as economic benefits, just as the railroads and the highways and now the airplane have knit together the United States into the economic and political unit that it is today. The engineering problems faced by the United States Public Roads Administration in designing the road have been great and it will not be a simple construction project—but the object to be attained is great, too—in effect, building a new country by a sound economic engineering method.

Representative O'HARA. Then, Mr. Gaston, as I understand it, taking the case of the Bolivian loan, in the first place the loan was made as a sound investment, after passing the test of conservative banking judgment, and there is every reasonable assurance that the money with interest will return. Then, in the second place, the road to be built will open up 300 miles of new territory with tremendous possibility for developments which will furnish a new world of profitable employment for thousands of Bolivians, and while improving their economic condition and raising their standard of living will put them in financial position to buy the products of our factories. And meanwhile when the highway is being constructed much of the money loaned by your bank to Bolivia will be spent in the United States for machinery to do the work and in payment of salaries and wages to American engineers and skilled workmen employed on the project. Thus all we are doing is increasing the wealth of the world and thus benefiting everyone, including ourselves. It seems to me just as simple as that. How many such loans have we made already, Mr. Gaston? Won't you give us a bird's-eye picture of the accomplishments to date of the Export-Import Bank?

Mr. GASTON. Well, that's a pretty fast-flying bird you are ordering, Mr. O'HARA. What the Bank has done is to put out or obligate something over two and a half billion dollars of the funds of the United States. These are borrowed funds and not tax funds. The Bank earns money. After paying its expenses and interest to the Treasury, it earned almost an even $50,000,000 last year. Its losses have been extremely light, but it is reserving on the books all its profits—around $150,000,000—as a safeguard against any future losses. It has loans or commitments in some 40 countries in practically all parts of the world. We announced this week a commitment of $21,000,000 to build irrigation projects and associated works to develop the agricultural potentialities of Afghanistan, which are great. We have made irrigation and water conservation loans also in Colombia and Haiti. We have helped with mine, harbor, railroad, and industrial projects in Turkey. Our commitments to develop and rehabilitate specific industries in Italy amount to $100,000,000. We have financed great integrated iron and steel plants in Brazil and Chile. We are helping to build a chemical fertilizer plant in Mexico and another in Egypt. Our engineers are working with Mexican engineers and railroad officials in modernizing the trackage, rolling stock, motive power, and management of the Mexican railways and we are helping a privately owned American-owned railroad, the Southern Pacific of Mexico, to modernize its system. We are undertaking to assist American public utilities in Latin America to expand their systems to meet the rapidly growing industrial and domestic demands for electric current. We have lent money for roads and water supply in Ecuador and are now considering what we can do to help them in repairing their recent earthquake damage. We have furnished capital for textile mills and packing plants and we are in course of acting on a cement plant financing deal in Saudi Arabia. We lent money to promote the chemical industry of China, which we expect will ride through the present storm and convulsion. And we are right now studying the situation in Indonesia, where a new nation is to arise on January 1, with the expectation that we can be safely helpful there in what has been done and, we are sure, will be again, one of

the great productive regions of the world. Maybe these high spots will give you an idea, Mr. O'HARA.

Representative O'HARA. I recall you said to our committee, Mr. Gaston, that there was a duplication of the work being done by the Export-Import Bank and the International Bank in this so-big and so-promising field. Would you mind explaining that to our radio audience?

Mr. GASTON. It is quite true, Mr. O'HARA, that many of the loans made by one of the two banks could be made by the other. But we try not to compete or to duplicate. We met today, for instance, with officers of the International Bank and we meet regularly with them to lay our cards on the table and to discuss what is proper for one bank to do and what the other. The main differences between the two are that our Bank is an agency of the United States, while the other, as its name reveals, is an international institution; that the International Bank can make loans only to its members, while we are not so limited; and that the International Bank must have the guaranty of the government in whose country it makes the loan on any loan it makes. We often do obtain Government guaranties, but not if there are other adequate endorsements available. Thus, besides making loans to forward definitely the interests of the United States, we have greater freedom to help private industry and American business in preference to competitors.

Representative O'HARA. Mr. Gaston, am I correct in summarizing it this way? American money is being loaned in foreign countries to develop neglected areas, thus increasing the wealth of the world and making potential purchasers for our products. This American money comes from: (1) Our contribution with other participating nations to the World Bank; (2) proceeds of the sale to American investors of bonds issued by the world bank; and (3) the loans of your Export-Import Bank to an amount authorized by the Congress. All of this is investment capital, loaned on good security, and expected to be paid back with interest. The Marshall plan, of course, was never intended to be anything more than a stopgap. Do you think, Mr. Gaston, that by the time the Marshall plan gift-money has run out the countries we are helping will be on their own feet, economically through the investment capital, technical knowledge and American know-how we are pouring into them on sound, conservative business reckoning through your Export-Import Bank and the World Bank? What is the prospect as you see it from the driver's seat?

Mr. GASTON. I'll have to renege, Mr. O'HARA, on the driver's seat. There's too much good competition. But you are correct in general summary, and here are my ideas for what evaluation you and our audience choose to put on them. This country has for many years looked happily on what is called a favorable balance of trade; which means simply that we are used to selling more than we buy. We have made this possible by individual gifts—by foreign travel, by foreign investments that didn't always pay out, and in a variety of other ways. But in the last few years because of war devastation and—more importantly—because of political and economic disorganization which have made the United States the only market in which to buy so much of what the world wants and needs, the trade discrepancy has become tremendous. Believe me, it's our problem as well as a foreign-dollar problem, because we've got a business set-up gaited, first by the war and then by postwar lending and giving, to shipping out a huge production surplus. If we were to stop doing it suddenly, unpleasant things would happen here. I can't claim to know the answer, but these things I fully believe: We need to continue and to accelerate investments and to do that we need to make the way safe for them. This would otherwise be menacing. It is advisable to do this because we have, I am sure, a great deal to contribute in meeting challenging opportunities for development and new productiveness. It is advisable also because commerce in the broad sense of trade, building and exchange of ideas will be the greatest civilizer and offers the best hope of leading the world away from the idiocy of periodical wars, which can only lead back to barbarism. As a part of encouraging commerce we shall have to invite more imports, even though this means keener competition for some. Finally, I think we shall have to find new ways to make surplus labor and surplus production available for increasing the well-being of our own people. But I don't think anybody in the world can give a definite answer to your question of what will happen when the Marshall plan money runs out. There will certainly be readjustments that may be painful and even menacing. It is well to plan, but the world's problems cannot all be met by planning.

Representative O'HARA. As a banker then, Mr. Gaston, you think point 4 of President Truman's inaugural plan is thoroughly sound? There is so much interest in point 4 among our people that I know our listeners would appreciate knowing just what you think of it.

Mr. GASTON. I may already have indicated what I think. Of course, I believe it is thoroughly and unquestionably sound and the most important item on the agenda of the world. It is the first order of business if we want to survive. Either we do our best to spread civilization or somebody else spreads chaos. Point 4 or perish is a slogan for you that is packed with truth. We have an interest in substituting knowledge for ignorance, abundance for starvation, comforts for misery. Even to those to whom doing good has a namby-pamby connotation, self-preservation may not have. That is my opinion in a nutshell of point 4, the essence of which is the application of modern science and knowledge to developing the resources of lands that are not being fully or properly utilized. Somebody in your committee, Mr. O'HARA—or maybe it was the Senate committee—asked how about a point 4 for the United States. Well, I believe in that, too.

Representative O'HARA. Mr. Gaston, would you care to say anything about H. R. 5594, known as the Export-Import Bank loan guaranty bill, which our Banking and Currency Committee reported out and which will be one of the very important measures to be considered by the Congress when we reconvene in January?

Mr. GASTON. I'm glad of the opportunity. The bill as it stands would enable the Export-Import Bank to guarantee investments in foreign countries against loss through inability to convert promptly a foreign currency received as profits or return of capital into dollars; and to guarantee against governmental seizure of property representing a dollar investment without prompt compensation. Note that I say it would enable the Export-Import Bank to do these things. This is a discretionary bill and not, as some people have thought, an automatic guaranty bill to give all investors this limited degree of protection as a matter of right. It would be merely one more of a formidable catalog of powers given to the Export-Import Bank to enable it to discharge its function of promoting the foreign trade of the United States. It would be exercised just as we exercise our other powers, on a case by case basis, and we wouldn't think of giving any sort of investment guaranty to any investment unless we were convinced it was sound from the business point of view and would help to develop the economy of the foreign country concerned. There is absolutely nothing to the fears of those who think we might swamp the foreign-exchange authorities and central banks with obligations far beyond their ability to pay or prevent the conversion into dollars of earnings on money now invested in foreign countries. What would prevent us from doing these things is simply the exercise of ordinary business judgment. We could today guarantee a bond issue of any foreign country or foreign business—with an unqualified guaranty against any risk whatever—within the limits of our lending authority. What prevents us from doing it is simply a grain or two of horse sense. The proposed new guaranties differ from our present powers only in that they could be issued to cover equity investments or proprietorships in addition to the power to guarantee fixed obligations which we now have; but they would not cover any ordinary business risks at all, but only the two contingencies specified in the bill. We think it would be a useful power, because it might enable us to induce private capital to take the place of public loans.

Representative O'HARA. As a member of the Banking and Currency Committee, Mr. Gaston, I was greatly impressed by your testimony and that of Mr. Snyder, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Mr. Webb, the Undersecretary of State, but, as you will remember, I was afraid unless we made the contrary clear our proposed guaranty would be construed in some quarter as a guaranty of the stability of existing governments and thus provocative of meddling on our part in the domestic affairs of foreign nations. I think the statement which Under Secretary Webb, on my suggestion, and I believe after conference with you and Secretary Snyder, put in the record thoroughly cleared up that phase so that there would be no possible misunderstanding.

Mr. GASTON. I hope sincerely that it did, Mr. O'HARA. We believe in promoting both political and economic stability and in doing everything we can to encourage democratic government, but we don't believe in meddling nor in attempting to establish a protectorate over any country or political regime. I think the limited guaranties we propose will not invoke that danger, any more than do our present loans. I think, in that connection, you will be greatly interested in the fact that obligations to the Export-Import Bank have continued to be respected in spite of political coups d'états and other governmental changes. I hope I have said enough to indicate that our aim has been and will be to promote orderly development, both economic and political; to be as helpful as we can but not to give the slightest ground for the charge that America or Americans have any aggressive or imperialistic aims.

Representative O'HARA. Thank you, Chairman Herbert Gaston, of the Board of Directors of the Export-Import Bank. We have been honored having you with us, and I know the folks back home in the invisible circle of homes in the Middle West to which we are speaking deeply appreciate your fine contribution to making clear and simple just how we in the United States are proceeding in our plan to make this a better world for ourselves by making it a better and a richer world for all men and women everywhere than any we or they have known.

And now, my friends, we have reached the end of another Quorum Call. For the 12 Democratic Congressmen from Illinois, and to all of you everywhere, until next week good-by and happy hours.

Sound of quorum bell: R-r-r-r. R-r-r-r-r. R-r-r-r-r-r.

ANNOUNCER. You have been listening to Quorum Call, another in a series of weekly reports to the people of Illinois by the Members of the Illinois delegation in the House of Representatives. Won't you join our listening audience next week for another factual report from your Representatives in Congress in the National's Capital. This program is presented as a public service. This is Washington; I return you to your announcer.

Iowa Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following essay written by Stanley Wenck, of Glidden, Iowa, in the sixth district. This essay won first place in a State-wide contest sponsored by the Iowa Development Commission. I heartily concur in its sentiments:

IOWA SPEAKS

IOWA, U. S. A., *April 1846–1949.*

DEAR UNCLE SAM: This is Iowa speaking, 103 years after my admission to the Union. Would you be interested in hearing from your leading agricultural State? I am a land of rolling hills, golden grains, and majestic industrial sights; efficient self-sustaining, and justly proud of my varied activities. Where else are greater advantages to be found than within my borders? Why should anyone seek his fortune elsewhere when my boundaries overflow with opportunities? Rainbow's end is here at home.

The finest of cattle graze contentedly on my pastures, where great quantities of fine quality hogs are found, second to none in your United States. Livestock, whose total value ranks first in the Nation, consumes generous amounts of my famous corn crop. My corn is king over one-third of my land area, ranking first among your States in production. Its sister crop, popcorn, and oats, add more firsts to my honors.

I wouldn't trade places with any other State as our geographic position provides a healthful climate for my inhabitants and an adequate growing season for my abundant crops.

A hawk's-eye view of my graceful countryside would reveal the splendor of my endless rows of stately corn swaying in the gentle breeze and glistening in the morning sun. Seas of gold, in reality acres of ripening oats, thrive upon lush prairies and limitless valleys. How could we maintain such a healthy population without the fruits and vegetables, the poultry and eggs we produce?

No wonder I am called the garden spot of the Mississippi Valley; America's breadbasket. My soil is called black gold since it is estimated to be worth more than all the silver and gold mines in the world. It yields to my native sons and daughters their wealth and health. Just listen to their joyful song: "We're from Iowa, that's where the tall corn grows."

The happy laughter of vacationists at my lake resorts and park areas is music to my ears. I provide recreation for every season of the year.

Nothing exceeds the joyous expectancy of springtime. Now you may see the robins return and hear the goldfinch, our State bird, trill his merry song. Among other events, let me picture for you the Easter egg hunt for tiny tots, the elementary schools' spelling bee, and high school music festivals. How entrancing is the gorgeous tulip festival at Pella.

During the brilliant sunshine of midsummer, my busy people find relaxation in golf and tennis tournaments, the rodeo at Sidney, the State fair at Des Moines. Swimming, fishing, and boating on the rippling blue waters of Lake Okoboji and many other lakes provide delightful pastimes. You should see the crowds at our numerous baseball games.

Autumn arrives with its mild haze and soft fleecy clouds, then, when my forests are aglow with brightly colored foliage; my people may attend such events as intercollegiate football games or the Dairy Cattle Congress at Waterloo.

Winter comes. Snow covers the landscape with a sparkling white blanket. Now which do you choose: Hockey games at Dubuque, the Corn Festival in Des Moines, or hiking and skiing in our "Little Switzerland"? This is the season when thousands of basketball fans crowd into gymnasiums to watch this spectacular sport. Have you heard of our annual winter carnival, where colored lights play upon a palatial ice palace at Black Hawk Lake and ice skaters give wonderful entertainments?

High overhead transcontinental airplanes roar on their way, above the network of sweeping, smoothly-curved highways; broad ribbons which lace every county in Iowa and comprise the crossroads of your Nation. Did you know that no part of my State is over 12 miles from a railroad? Motorists travel over 6,000 miles of superior pavements, on the side of which my State flower, the wild rose, grows abundantly.

The Mississippi and Missouri Rivers, to my right and left, respectively, keep on rolling along, carrying heavy freight barges. These assist in the distribution of surplus raw materials.

Most of my farm crops are processed in huge factories. Here busy workmen turn out plastics, corn products, canned goods, etc. The world's largest cereal plant is at Cedar Rapids.

How would you like a fountain pen from one of the largest pen factories in the world, Fort Madison? Could I interest you in some of our millwork; or in the wool products from Amana? My tractor and farm equipment factories buzz with activity. The famous Maytag Co., largest washing machine factory in existence, is said to wash the clothes of the world.

There are creameries in abundance. Fresh butter and other dairy products delight our growing children. Surely, you have noticed, Uncle Sam, how hungrily the Nation views our meat-packing industry? Look. How many miners are busy supplying the humming industrial factories with fuel. Coal underlies about one-third of our area. Iowa ranks second among the States in the production of gypsum, limestone, and clay. Do you wonder at all our brick and plaster concerns?

Not everyone realizes that my State's industrial income is approximately equal to its agricultural income. Immense fortunes are invested in manufacturing establishments in Iowa, land of industrial opportunity. We paid you a half-billion dollars in taxes last year, Uncle Sam.

Do you hear school bells ringing? One-fourth of my 2,600,000 inhabitants eagerly attend elementary, secondary, or college courses. Observe the State university, where culture and art are developed under excellent facilities. Notice the aspiring faces of the students at Drake University. What a mighty cheer goes up from the crowds at the annual Drake relays. Capable, thoroughly trained graduates of Iowa State College at Ames develop modern ideas for the advancement of agriculture, industry, and soil conservation.

What other State boasts a higher educational standard? Iowans are keenly interested in learning. Could you show me a more excellent school system, or better equipped buildings? I point with pride to our 97.7 percent of literacy. The Hawkeye State ranks first in intelligence.

The cultural achievements of my talented sons and daughters are indeed noteworthy. My gallery of greats include: Grant Wood, inspired painter of Iowa's beauty; Phil Stong, whose book and movie, State Fair, make one decide, "That's for me"; MacKinlay Kantor, author, who depicts the joys of our Happy Land. How one thrills to the musical strains of Largo, composed at Spillville. Perhaps the most famous of my sons is Herbert Hoover, thirty-first President of the United States.

Songs, which endure wherever voices are raised, found their origin in Iowa. How quaintly is Pale Moon, by F. K. Logan, how equally entrancing his Missouri Waltz.

Newspapers, magazines, and radio stations also add cultural advantages. Libraries, State hospitals, and welfare institutions attest to the abiding interest in our mutual happiness and well-being.

Finally, Uncle Sam, I conclude this proud panorama. The vast resources of this State have scarcely been tapped. We have almost limitless possibilities for the future. How can we evaluate my potentialities?

The green and gold of my fertile fields nestling among sparkling streams, give promise of continuing productiveness for many generations to come. The future is bright as our agricultural prospects continue to unfold.

Our outstanding educational system attracts students the world over who wish to study the Iowa way.

We cannot sing loud enough praises for our expanding industries. We glory in our superb manufacturing sites, which are surpassed by few other States. This is proved by our progressive factories and million-dollar institutions. Success begins with an interest, and where there's interest there's Iowa.

Occupation never grows monotonous here with the four seasons providing opportunity for many varieties of recreation.

Now it is twilight—the sun sinks in the west and its sparkling rays set the golden dome of the capitol aglow. See? It is reflecting the enormous pride and gratitude we Iowans feel because of the many privileges and freedoms guaranteed to us by our systematic and efficient form of government.

Night falls. Stars twinkle above a peaceful and tranquil landscape. May they ever portray the Christian atmosphere of Iowa which continues to be known as the Bible State. Church spires beckon all to worship the Good Shepherd, Who has guided our destiny in the past, guards our welfare in the present, and who, we pray, will continue to grant success to our efforts in the future.

The stars and stripes above me, and the flag of Iowa beside me, I affix herewith the great seal of my State, and sign myself,

Your favorite nephew,

IOWA.

What Health Insurance Would Mean to You

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, a great many people in this country are seriously concerned about the need for some better method of meeting medical costs. They know, from all-too-bitter experience, that one serious illness, or a number of minor ones in a short period, can bankrupt the average family. They know that it is quite beyond the possibility of the average family to provide adequately for the cost of the medical care they need.

The American Medical Association is trying to make people believe, first, that there is no serious need of any change

at all in the present hit-or-miss system of medical economics, and second, that voluntary plans are completely adequate to meet the need which they deny exists.

A speech by Hon. Oscar Ewing, Federal Security Administrator, What Health Insurance Would Mean to You, discusses these points very thoroughly. It shows the need for health insurance, and the impossibility of meeting that need by any voluntary plans. I include this speech in the RECORD:

WHAT HEALTH INSURANCE WOULD MEAN TO YOU

(By Oscar R. Ewing, Federal Security Administrator)

Good evening. I want to talk to you tonight, not about the Nation's health, but about your own health. Suppose that tomorrow morning, you should become suddenly ill—seriously ill. Suppose you found that you needed an operation, with special medical care, and all kinds of X-rays and drugs. Suppose you had to stop working for some months while you went through your operation and your convalescence. Suppose the doctor's bill, the hospital bill, the bills for special laboratory services and medicines, added up to hundreds of dollars—maybe even thousands. Would you be able to afford it?

If you are like most other people in this country, I can tell you the answer just as quickly as you would tell it to me if I were sitting there in the room beside you. The answer, for most of us, is one word: "No."

Most of us are neither very rich nor very poor. People who are very rich don't need to worry about their medical bills, any more than they need to worry about whatever other bills they run up. On the other hand, people who are very poor do generally get medical treatment in the United States, because we have charity care which does make doctors and hospitals available to the real needy. But, if you are like the majority of Americans, you are somewhere between those two extremes. You've got a job. You've got your self-respect. And you like to stand on your own two feet. But you're not made of money; and when sickness strikes, when you wake up one morning with acute appendicitis, or when your old folks get sick, or when your child comes home from school restless and feverish, you have two worries—your first worry is that they should get the best treatment in town; and your second worry is how you're going to pay for it.

If you have ever been lying in a hospital bed after an operation, worrying about where the money to pay the bills would come from, you know what I mean. If you have had to go to a loan company and borrow money to pay a hospital bill, you know what I mean. If you have ever received a note from your child's school, telling you that your little boy or your little girl needs adenoids or tonsils out, and wondered how you'd pay for it, you know what I mean. If your wife has noticed a lump in her breast, but puts off going to the doctor because of the cost, you'll know—and she'll know—what I mean.

We have a problem in this country, and we're grown-up enough to face it squarely. Here we have some of the finest doctors and hospitals in the world, and we have the benefit of the magnificent research laboratories of America. True, we should be spending more money on medical research, but just with what we've done, we have already made such huge progress in medical research that we could call our times the age of giant advances in medicine. Yet, right now, thousands of sick people are not receiving the benefit of these giant advances because they cannot afford it. Every physician knows the torment he must go through when a patient comes in with a disease that could be cured if only that patient had the money to pay for X-ray treatments, or expensive specialists, or costly new drugs or equipment, that would make him healthy again.

In America today there is a barrier between the doctor and the patient. That barrier is the dollar bill.

This is our problem—to remove the barrier of dollars, to bring the patient and the doctor together, and in this way to make medical care available to all our people, not just the very rich and the very poor, but all our people.

Now, we could simply say, "Oh, we've gotten along O. K. so far, why change things? If people worry, why, they've always worried, haven't they? If people have died for lack of medical care, why, they've always died, haven't they? So what?" Or we might take another line and say: "Anyway, there are systems of voluntary health insurance to take care of those who want to provide for themselves." Yes, we could say these things—if we had the heart to do so. But we aren't the kind of people who can say, "So what?" when we hear that one out of every two mothers who died in childbirth in this country this very day, November 14, died unnecessarily, and that her life could have been saved if known medical measures had been fully applied. It might have been your wife. We can't say "So what?" when we know that one out of every three babies who died in this country today, November 14, could have been saved if known medical measures had been fully applied. It might have been your baby.

The voluntary plans for health insurance are fine as far as they go. But how far do they go? In the first place, most of them stop short of giving the amount of medical care you need. For example, most of them won't pay the bill if you have to call the doctor to your home or even if you go to his office. And if you have a serious chronic ailment at the time you enroll, then they will make a particular point of not giving you protection for that ailment. There are varous other limitations in voluntary insurance policies which I won't take time to recite because these two examples illustrate what I mean.

Another reason why the voluntary health insurance may be impracticable for you is that the premiums for this type of insurance are not adjusted to your income. Whether you earn $50 a week or $200 a week, you pay the same amount.

But most important, in voluntary health insurance you generally get a poor return for your money because overhead and profits of the insurance company eat up huge chunks of the premiums you pay. Many commercial companies are in the hospital, surgical, and medical insurance business sell only group policies. Generally speaking, this means that there must be a group of 25 or more employees of a concern who want the insurance. By dealing with a group, the cost of selling the insurance is reduced and bookkeeping costs are largely eliminated, since the employer keeps all the wage records. However, companies selling group insurance pay out on the average 30 percent of their group insurance premium receipts for overhead and profits, leaving only 70 percent for payment of benefits. But you can't get group insurance if you are a clerk in a small store or if you are a farmer or if you are a small-business man. Unless you work for some large business, you must probably buy insurance from a company which sells individual policies. Now, here's the catch. On individual policies these companies spend for overhead and profits an average of about 60 percent of what you pay them and only about 40 cents of your premium dollar goes for benefits to policyholders. Obviously, such insurance is a mighty poor buy.

Under voluntary non-profit insurance plans, Blue Cross hospitalization plan paid back 85 cents of the premium dollar in hospital benefits last year, and Blue Shield surgical-medical plans paid back in benefits 77 cents on the premium dollar paid.

We ought to be able to do better than that. We can do better than that. That is why we are proposing a plan for national health insurance. There has been a lot of loose talk about this proposal. I think you will want to have the straight facts on how this plan would work for you personally.

Under national health insurance, if you get sick, or anyone in your family gets sick, you would call your family doctor, just as you do now. He would examine you in order to decide the treatment he should prescribe. Your doctor would know that he can freely use X-ray and any kind of laboratory tests he thinks desirable. He may decide you should see a specialist or go to the hospital. Possibly you need eye glasses or a hearing aid or maybe you need an expensive medicine like streptomycin. Under national health insurance, your doctor is free to give you the best that medical science has to offer without giving a thought to what it will cost because this cost is met, not by you personally, but by the insurance fund.

But, you naturally wonder, Where does this insurance fund come from? Well, if you are employed, your employer will pay into the fund an amount equal to 1½ percent of your salary, and another 1½ percent will be deducted from your pay check. This deduction is only taken from what you earn up to $4,800 a year. If you earn $50 a week, you would pay a premium of 75 cents. The maximum premium for any employee, no matter how high his salary, would be $1.40 a week. If you are self-employed, your premium would similarly be worked out on the basis of how much your income was. These payments cover home and office calls by the doctor, treatment by specialists, hospital and nursing care for at least 60 days, eyeglasses, hearing aids, cost of expensive medicines, X-ray, laboratory tests, and dental services to the extent available—for yourself and your family.

You can see from this that national health insurance would affect you and your family in three ways: First, all the bills for medical services will be paid by the insurance fund and not by you; second, you will get more and better medical care; and, third, your contributions to the insurance fund would be in the form of small regular deductions from income when you are well and working, and best able to pay. No longer would you have to pay large doctor and hospital bills when you are sick or convalescing and least able to pay. And you would be getting the most for your money. Remember the figures I gave you before—group policies that pay out in benefits about 70 cents on the dollar, individual policies that pay out only about 40 cents on the dollar, nonprofit hospital plans that pay out about 85 cents on the dollar, nonprofit surgical- and medical-care plans that pay out about 77 cents on the dollar. Overhead under national health insurance would cost no more than 5 to 7½ percent—which means that from 92½ to 95 cents of every dollar in premiums would go to pay for the medical care you need.

The reason estimated overhead costs for national health insurance are so much lower than those of the voluntary companies is that under national health insurance (a) there would be no selling costs; (b) the Federal Security Agency is already keeping the wage records of some 90,000,000 workers and health insurance records would add comparatively little to this cost; and (c) the Treasury Department already is collecting social security pay-roll deductions, and deductions for health insurance could be collected with comparatively little added cost.

Now, what about the doctor under national health insurance? You hear a lot of talk about regimenting doctors, about doctors

spending long hours making out reports, socialization of medicine, etc., etc. You can put all that talk down as just plain "baloney." The proof of this is very simple. Today, the doctors are almost all plugging for voluntary health insurance. But under voluntary health insurance, doctors have the same problems regarding the making of reports, arrangements for payment of their services, handling of hypochondriacs, etc., as they would have under national health insurance. The only difference between national health insurance and voluntary health insurance, so far as the doctor is concerned, is that his bill would be paid by a check from a national insurance fund instead of from a private insurance fund.

Maybe you're worrying about red tape. Maybe you are asking yourself, "Who's going to run this thing?" Well, here's the answer: It would be run right in your own home town, right in your own State, by your local doctors, and by local people representing you as partners in national health insurance. There would be no more red tape than you find today in the voluntary plans for health insurance, and probably less. The day-to-day administration of the program would be in the hands of local doctors and laymen—not here in Washington.

You may have heard some criticism of health insurance. Most of it comes from people who may mean well but who just haven't taken the trouble to find out what the plan involves. Many doctors, I'm sorry to say, have been misled by people who tell them all kinds of horrible stories about what it would do to their profession. When someone tells you one of these wild stories, ask him just to find out what we are really proposing. The plain fact is that this program, when it comes into force, will be the greatest boon to the medical profession since the discovery of anesthesia; for it will help the doctors to practice better medicine for more people. It is just an honest-to-goodness attempt to remove the dollar barrier that separates you from your doctor and prevents you and your family from having the best medical care that money can buy. It is pretty much like social security and not much different, in theory, from life insurance, or fire insurance, or accident insurance.

What would national health insurance mean to you? It would mean that, when someone asks you, as I ask you, "Can you get all the medical care you and your family really need?" you could answer with confidence and relief, "Yes, under national health insurance I can."

WHERE THE HEALTH INSURANCE DOLLAR GOES

Commercial health insurance plans:[1] Under group insurance policies, on the average about 30 percent of premium receipts goes for overhead and profits, leaving only about 70 percent for payment of cash indemnity benefits.

Under individual insurance policies, on the average about 60 percent of premium receipts goes for overhead and profits, leaving only about 40 percent for payment of cash indemnity benefits.

Non-profit health insurance plans:[2] The Blue Cross hospitalization plans showed about 85 percent of premium receipts paid as benefits in 1948, and in the same year the Blue Shield surgical-medical plans paid about 77 percent of the premium dollar as benefits.

National health insurance (proposed):[3] Administrative costs under national health insurance would amount to no more than 5 to 7½ percent, leaving 92½ to 95 cents of every dollar paid by employers, employees, and Government to pay physicians, dentists, hospitals, and others for medical services.

British national health service:[4] Mr. Aneurin Bevan on October 6, 1949, at a press conference in London, placed their actual cost of administration at 2½ to 3 percent of the total expenditures, leaving approximately 97 cents of each dollar to pay for medical, hospital, dental, and other services. He pointed out that it had been possible to achieve the low administrative cost because of the nonpaid volunteers who were entrusted with important parts of its administration.

[1] Spectator Pocket Register of Accident Insurance, 1949, p. 49, "Adjustment expenses" for claims administration (estimated at 2.8 to 5.5 percent), included in "losses paid" in this reference, were reassigned to overhead and profits.

[2] Hearings on a National Health Program, 1949, subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, on S. 1106, 1456, 1581, and 1679, pp. 387, 404.

[3] Medical Care Insurance: A Social Insurance Program for Personal Health Services. Report from the Bureau of Research and Statistics, Social Security Board, to the Committee on Education and Labor, U. S. Senate, Senate Committee Print No. 5, July 8, 1946, p. 146.

[4] New York Times, October 7, 1949; London Daily Telegraph, October 7, 1949.

Patriotism an Eternal Virtue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS CASE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, during the interim between the first and second session of the Eighty-first Congress, it was my privilege on behalf of Rapid City Lodge, No. 1187, of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, to invite a colleague, the Honorable JAMES I. DOLLIVER, of Iowa, to deliver the address at the annual Elks memorial services on the first Sunday in December. Our colleague's address was so universal in its appeal and so well pointed in its tribute to the virtues of patriotism, courage, and fidelity that, with the permission of the House, I am placing it in the RECORD at this point:

More than usual, I am grateful to you of Rapid City for this invitation. This city is the gateway to an area very close to my heart. Not only because this is the richest 100 square miles on earth; not only because it has become the playground of the west for all the people of America; not only because here are the customs, the atmosphere, and the traditions of the old West with all its adventure and excitement. But the Black Hills is dear to me because of my own father was one of its pioneers. He came to these hills when Deadwood was the heart of the roaring gold rush of the last century. He was a pioneer preacher in the days when life was cheap and sin was unabashed and flourishing.

He must have loved this land in western Dakota, because he came back here to spend the last years of his life among the pine trees and the people of this truly golden west. He lies buried on a hillside in the Black Hills not too far from here, beside my mother, who followed him here in life and death, too.

So you see, there is a poignancy and meaning to this occasion far beyond the ordinary. I deeply appreciate your courtesy and kind hospitality in making me your guest today.

As in the days gone by, and in years to come, on the first Sunday in December, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks observe Memorial Day.

The occasion here has been so significant and so long observed that it has become an important day in the calendar of this organization and the entire community. On this Memorial Day, first of all, we invoke the memory of those who have passed on during the last year. We remember them fondly. We recall the smile of their faces, the touch of their hands and the warmth of their friendship. In our mind's eye, today we can see them again, in the fellowship of the lodge, radiating that cheer which is one of the characteristics of an Elk. As we think of them, we give them a sort of immortality, the immortality of memory. They live on with us in our mind's eye.

It is as if they had gone on a journey, a long journey, to be sure, which we, too, some day must take in order to rejoin them.

"Strange is it not, that the myriads who
Before us passed the door of darkness through,
Not one returns to tell us of the road
Which to discover, we must travel, too."

On an occasion like this, the age-old question always presents itself, the question asked by the prophet. "If a man die shall he live again?" On the first Sunday in December every year, the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks gives a resounding affirmative to that question. If a man die he shall live again, we assure ourselves, again and again.

Whence comes this assurance and what is the rational basis for our belief? Is it merely a superstitution handed down to us from age-old ignorance or does this faith have some semblance of rationality? Is this confidence, as said by the Communists, an opiate of the people, or is it the inspiration to better living and finer ideals?

I suggest to you that our belief in immortality stems from our inescapable belief in God. Most rational human beings have a belief in the Supreme Being. Indeed, that concept of the Deity has been taught by philosophers and thinkers of all generations as the highest expression of human intellect. And indeed how could anybody doubt the existence of God, looking out upon the Black Hills of South Dakota? Clothed in the verdure of summer or covered with the white mantel of winter, whose soul has not been stirred by the infinite beauty of these mountains? And what man is there who has not responded to such grandeur, with the humble affirmation that this is the handiwork of an architect whose power is without limit and whose concepts of beauty far transcend those of any human artist?

The very fact that the human brain can appreciate such a stupendous work as these Black Hills or, indeed, any of the manifestations of nature, gives that human being a kinship with the Almighty. It suffices to make him a part of the plan of the Deity and thus gives him a spark of immortality, one of the attributes of God.

Several years ago, I had the opportunity to look through the eyepiece of the great telescope at Mount Wilson in southern California. Up to the time of the erection of the 200-inch glass at Mount Palomar, the Mount Wilson telescope was the largest in the world. A huge instrument of optical glass and metal, it brought within range of the human eye the satellites, the planets, the stars and the galaxies far beyond the reach of naked vision. In that eyepiece we saw the craters of the moon, the rings of Saturn, the nearest fixed star, and the vistas of the Milky Way.

For centuries, of course, the astronomers have been studying the heavens. For centuries they have sought to find an outer limit to the infinity of space. And yet, with the 100-inch telescope on Mount Wilson and now with the 200-inch reflector on Mount Palomar, no outer limits have yet been found or even approached. The astronomers tell us that space is limitless, endless, without dimension.

Some doubter may ask why a power which created such infinity would give any time or thought to so finite a creature as man. Or as the Psalmist says, "What is man that thou art mindful of him?" And the answer is as clear as the question itself. A human being whose brain can project itself to the planets, the Pleiades and beyond the galaxies, has some of the attributes of infinity. The human brain that can encompass the precession of the equinoxes, whose study of the sciences has led him from the infinity of space to the infinitesimal concept of the atom, whose power over nature has been gained by constant research and study—such a being has the attribute of infinity and has at least a scintilla of immortality.

The great and merciful God who endowed his creatures on earth with ability to peer into the vast open spaces of the heavens and to refine the smallest particles of matter to serve the ends of man, such a God does not deny the boon of eternal life to his human creation.

But perhaps these men whom we memorialize today were not astronomers or bacteriologists or atomic scientists. Perhaps it can be fairly said that most of them were ordinary men such as you and I. They had no specially outstanding attributes of intellect. Perchance, however, there was another field in which they excelled.

Some of them were men of courage. I can think, for example, that they showed a fortitude and bravery, perhaps in war, perhaps in peace, perhaps in their daily lives, which transcended that ordinary courage with which most of us face our daily tasks.

Or perhaps among them was a man who under great stress and difficulties displayed the virtue of kindness; when he might have been harsh and vindictive he was loving and forgiving. Where he might have shown his anger he showed mercy.

Or doubtless there were among these who sometime during their earthly life displayed that monumental virtue of loyalty: faithfulness to a cause, faithfulness to some other person, faithfulness in the face of superabundant difficulties, loyalty transcending the usual or ordinary call.

Another human virtue which all Elks exemplify is love of freedom and loyalty to our country. No organization has more fully carried out the precepts of patriotism than has our organization through the manifold activities of its members, both in peace and in war. This is a free organization of free men, devoted to constitutional liberty, foe of every form of tyranny. No doubt in this gathering today there are those who served in the armed forces of this country during the recent war with totalitarianism.

During those years from 1941–45 we all entertained the hope that when the fighting was over the war for liberty would be won. Not so. We discover that serious attempts are still being made both at home and abroad to destroy our republic. Insidious plotters bore from within, and abroad our motives are misrepresented and maligned.

Some well-meaning people in this country by espousing doubtful causes or crackpot theories would make Americans the victims of an all-powerful state. They forget that maxim of a free government—that the state is not the master of the people, but its servant. By unsound and destructive financial policies, by promising "everything to everybody," they will drag this beloved land of ours to something closely resembling pseudo-security—freedom gone.

It behooves all Americans to scrutinize closely this trend, and by use of our representative self-government direct our political leaders to follow the trail of freedom and opportunity.

Of course, abroad, even more than at home, we have to face the scourge of communism. A godless, atheistic doctrine and philosophy, it has become a dominant enemy of freedom everywhere. Without the slightest regard for honesty and integrity, this modern devilish concept has damaged and nearly destroyed any semblance of honor in its international relationships. To millions of people communism has meant loss of human freedom and national independence. The number of freedom-loving people behind the iron curtain who are actual slaves is estimated by some authorities as high as 15,000,000.

Without any hesitation, we are told that this foul thing is to sweep the world, and engulf us in free America. I tell you, western civilization has not been confronted with so great a threat since the Moslems knocked at the gates of Vienna half a millennium ago.

Thus on this Memorial Day our bounden duty becomes the more clear. To honor those whom we remember today, we ought to take unswerving and undying allegiance to the land they loved.

These virtues, all virtues, partake of the nature of immortality. They are everlasting. They are as permanent as the granite of these hills. In them we recognize the eternal value of the moral law; the everlastingness of a human spirit embodying courage or kindness or patriotism or loyalty. These virtues have the attribute of eternity in the moral world, just as outer space has the attribute of infinity in the phyiscal world.

Need I remind you that these men whom we remember today, possessing as they did, these virtues of constancy, courage and kindness, portrayed in their own earthly existence virtues as eternal as God himself? Thus the beings who portrayed these virtues and exemplified them in life, can no more pass on and into oblivion, than the everlasting stars of heaven. It is hard to define a moral virtue in abstract terms. But it is not hard to recognize a man whose life embodied in his daily living morality.

May I give you an illustration of patriotism, courage, and fidelity? During the recent war, a young man from my home town, Capt. Darrel Lindsay, was piloting a bomber with its crew over Paris. Their objective was a bridge across the Seine. The Germans were in occupation of the French capital. His was the lead plane in the formation. They ran into serious antiaircraft fire, so serious that one of the engines was ablaze. The captain ordered the crew to parachute to safety, which they did. He stayed at his post. He accomplished his mission. He saved his crew. He died in the flames of the doomed ship. He was awarded the Congressional Medal of Honor for his constancy, courage, and self-sacrifice.

Can such a human spirit die? I tell you—

"There is no death. The stars go down
To rise upon some other shore,
And bright in heaven's jeweled crown
They shine forevermore.

"There is no death. The dust we tread
Shall change beneath the summer showers
To golden grain or mellow fruit
Or rainbow-tinted flowers."

What is the lesson of this Memorial Day to us, the living? Of course, the answer is obvious. It is that we continue striving to live according to our own best conscience; that we be aware of our own dignity as human beings with an eternal destiny.

The FEPC Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by my friend, Walter Johnson, of Heathsville, Va., who writes a weekly column, Country Lawyer, regularly appearing in the Orange Review and some 20 other live Virginia weeklies.

As Commonwealth's attorney of Northumberland County Mr. Johnson has the unique distinction of being the only elected Republican officeholder in eastern Virginia. Last year he was nominated for Governor in the first Republican primary ever held in Virginia and polled a most encouraging vote in the general election.

In his column Mr. Johnson presents a question that deserves the most careful consideration of all thoughtful citizens who believe in the freedom and dignity of human beings.

The article follows:

COUNTRY LAWYER

(By Walter Johnson)

The chosen representatives of the people are again assembled in Congress in Washington. They will be urged to take further substantial steps along the reactionary road backward in accord with the Fabian plan to lessen the freedom and dignity of the people of this fair land we so proudly call the United States of America.

This Fabian plan derives its name from a Roman general named Quintus Fabius, who argued that the only way to defeat Hannibal was to avoid a general engagement and instead to lure him into a series of small battles and destroy him little by little. It is the plan that worked in England to eat into freedom and to establish socialism and it is the plan that is working here to the same end.

Several large bites into our freedom are on the agenda of Congress. These include the Brannan plan to enslave the farmers and the Taft-Hartley repeal and the FEPC measure to further lessen the freedom of the workers.

Under the Taft-Hartley Act the workers as well as all the people have a measure of protection against arrogant and dictatoral labor bosses. Its repeal would work sharp injury to all.

The FEPC proposal is one of the most far-reaching so far advanced under the Fabian movement. It would destroy a larger chunk of freedom than any previous bite. This monstrosity is advanced under the usual high-sounding name.

It would create the Fair Employment Practices Commission with power to stand between job applicants and the employer and determine who may, in fairness, be given the job in question. Everybody believes in fairness though there is seldom agreement on what constitutes fairness. A Federal agent would decide.

This is proposed as something that would help colored people and force them in jobs not now normally open to them. Most colored people accept that argument and support the FEPC. Actually the FEPC would be a blow of magnitude to all workers and employers both white and colored.

It would mean loosening of another great host of Federal agents to roam the highways and byways to interpose themselves and their ideas between workers and employers. These agents would have power to decide who shall be employed.

Having the power to decide which job applicant shall be hired Government would also have to the power to determine where a man or woman must work. Instead of helping the colored people it would set them back toward a new condition of servitude, and whites as well.

There can be no substitute for the proposition of every man standing on his own individual worth and merit. It is true that many jobs are now closed to colored but it is also true that for some time these jobs have been steadily opening to them as they, in turn, develop and command greater and greater respect from their white friends by merit and individual worth.

On the national scene the Democrat Party has become captive of this Fabian plan. A bewildered Republican Party goes along though it does drag its feet a little. In the national picture the Republican Party seems lacking in the courage necessary for it to stand as an effective minority party.

The Republican Party needs a complete and thorough renovation. It should reconsider and embrace the only formula ever devised by which men can be free and enjoy self-government. That formula was written for us right here in Virginia in 1776 by such truly great men as Patrick Henry, George Mason, Thomas Jefferson, and others.

If the Republican Party is unable or unwilling to embrace and take the affirmative for the freedom and dignity of mankind then we need a new party for that purpose. There must be some way by which the people can rally around the cause of freedom.

Excise Tax on Admission Tickets to Amusements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution of the Common Council of the City of Buffalo:

CITY OF BUFFALO,
January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to directions of the common council, I enclose to you herewith copy of a resolution adopted by that body relative to excise tax on admission tickets to amusements.

Very truly yours,
JOSEPH J. TRONOLONE,
City Clerk.

Excise tax on admission tickets to amusements

Whereas the Federal excise tax on amusements is commonly referred to as a luxury tax; and

Whereas movies rank with newspapers and radio as a means of news, entertainment, and education; and

Whereas the movies are the greatest form of entertainment serving approximately 90,000,000 persons weekly, the greatest number of whom are in the low- and middle-income brackets; and

Whereas the 20-percent tax on admissions was patriotically paid during the war and the boom period later, but now is severely felt by the moviegoers and is one of the causes of the serious drop in attendance; and

Whereas the slowing down of the movie business in all its branches jeopardizes the jobs and wage scales of tens of thousands of workers in studios, distribution exchanges, and theaters; and

Whereas other forms of entertainment and sports are similarly affected by this tax; and

Whereas elimination or reduction of this discriminatory tax would undoubtedly cause an upturn in attendance thereby resulting in a lesser actual loss of revenue to the United States Government by reason of increased attendance and thereby increased profit taxes, income taxes, etc.; and

Whereas the welfare and well being of the residents of the city as well as all the industries located therein is a matter of vital concern to the members of the common council: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo memorialize the Congress of the United States to immediately repeal or substantially reduce the 20-percent excise tax on admission tickets to amusements; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the city clerk to the President of the United States, the Clerks of the Senate and House of Representatives, Senators IRVING M. IVES and HERBERT H. LEHMAN and Congressmen CHESTER C. GORSKI, ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO, WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER, and DANIEL A. REED.

The Privileged Few

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Gazette and Bulletin, Williamsport, Pa., for November 3, 1949:

THE PRIVILEGED FEW

The DeMille Foundation, of Los Angeles, has issued a bulletin that puts in a clear style one of the major problems facing the United States today. Rather than try to rewrite or summarize the bulletin, we give it to you complete.

"Denouncing the selfish interests is one of the oldest tricks in every politician's bag.

"Everyone will agree that selfishness is wicked.

"Everyone will agree that, as President Truman has said, the strength of our Nation must continue to be used in the interest of all our people rather than a privileged few.

"But let's bring it down to cases.

"Who are these few?

"And what are their privileges?

"The very rich—with their privilege of paying upward of 90 percent of their income to the Government?

"The capitalists? They can't qualify because they are not few. There are more stockholders in the country than there are union members. If Joe Smith owns a corner grocery, that makes him a capitalist. And there are lots of Joe Smiths in the United States.

"Who are the real twentieth-century barons of privilege?

"Well, it's quite a privilege to be able to shut down the coal mines of the country. One man can do that.

"Then there is the privilege of being able to reach across the Pacific and throw a blockade around the Hawaiian Islands. One man did that.

"Not many feudal lords in the Middle Ages had as many serfs as there are, say, teamsters or musicians in the United States today—and we do not hear of any successful efforts to separate Mr. Tobin or Mr. Petrillo from their privileged positions.

"In the Middle Ages a runaway serf could stay in a city for a year and a day and become a freeman.

"In the United States, in this enlightened age, a union can say to a man: 'You may get a job if you go to another State and change your name, but there's no work for you in this State.'

"How does that line up with another of President Truman's admirable generalities: 'No * * * artificial distinction should bar any American * * * from a job that he is capable of performing?'

"The most potent privilege any man can hold is power over another man's right to work.

"If we mean business about not running the country for the benefit of a privileged few, let's strike privilege where it is strongest."

Coal Crisis Demands Action

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, I received a telegram this morning from the Mount Vernon (Ill.) Chamber of Commerce which reads as follows:

Only 50 tons of stoker coal and 800 tons of other types available at Mount Vernon. Not more than 1 day's supply is left. The weather is near zero. We urge immediate and drastic action be taken by the Government to make coal available to homes and industry.

I received another telegram from the coal distributors of Mount Vernon, Ill., which reads as follows:

Coal situation in Mount Vernon is extremely critical. Only low-grade stoker coal is available, and by rationing will only last one more day. It is urgent that mines resume full production.

Signed by all Mount Vernon retail coal dealers as follows: Anchor Coal Co.; Browning Coal Co.; Bigham Coal Co.; Jax Coal Co.

Mr. Speaker, certainly the public health and safety of these citizens are seriously threatened. This city of 20,000 people with its hospitals, schools, churches, manufacturing industries and homes, is almost solely dependent upon coal for heat. The weather is around zero there at the present time.

It is to be hoped that the highest power of this Government will be immediately invoked to settle the coal dispute to bring about full production in the mines of the Nation. The situation is extremely critical, and it is time for quick and bold action.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this editorial sums up briefly President Truman's message to the Congress on January 4. After all, it was pretty much of a dream, and Mr. Truman failed to provide the ways and means of reaching this utopia—50 years hence.

The editorial follows:

PROSE POEM

The more things are the same, as the French aphorist did not say, the more they change. The President's message on the state of the Union is in its fundamentals what it was last year and the year before. The major recommendations, from completion of the Marshall plan to the repeal of Taft-Hartley, follow a familiar pattern, and the well-meaning, if somewhat elusive, philosophy behind them appears to be what it always was. But this year there is a difference.

No longer is there an effort to grapple with the mechanics of inflation or deflation. No longer is there an attempt to deal precisely (as in last year's proposal of Government investment in steel capacity) with the controversial problems of productivity. No longer are any exact figures provided on budget and taxation policy; the President's proposals on taxation, coming late in a long message—"some changes in our tax system which will reduce present inequities, stimulate business activity, and yield a moderate amount of additional revenue"—are indeed a masterpiece of understatement, if not of self-contradiction.

All such hard and practical problems the President has preferred to leave to his budget message and succeeding recommendations. Here he has chosen to present, instead, what might almost be called a prose poem—a vision of America, advancing down the sunlit dairy field of the future, in peace and automatically multiplying prosperity, to quadruple the national product and treble the average family income by the end of the present century. Only one serpent—communism—lingers in the grass, and that is already being scotched by the Marshall plan and the bipartisan policy in Europe (the one surprise of the message is its omission of any references to foreign policy in the Far East); and but a single spook—monopoly—can be observed on the domestic scene.

All that is necessary is to recognize the principle that "the Government has a special responsibility to help create and maintain the conditions which will permit the growth we know is possible." This dictum would certainly have astonished Grover Cleveland and would have surprised most of those who actually did create the extraordinary growth over the past 50 years on which Mr. Truman bases his optimistic prognosis. But it simplifies the policy. It requires only that one offer, as the President here does, something to everybody—a competitive system for large business, a protected system for small business, a guaranteed income for farmers, a repeal of Taft-Hartley for the labor magnates, bigger Federal old-age pensions for those whose unions cannot extract the pensions from industry, wider social security, more Government housing, Government medical care beyond the large amounts already provided, Government education, together of course with undiminished provision for those responsibilities of national defense and foreign policy which are historically the major reason for existence of the Federal Government. The cost-accounting for all this is a minor question which will be taken up later.

California Veteran Hospital Situation Critical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, California veterans are unable to obtain the medical and hospital care to which they are entitled because of inadequate facilities for veteran care in our State.

New veteran hospitals and increased bed capacity has not solved the problem especially in the case of tubercular and mentally ill veterans and overcrowding has continued.

It is therefore necessary that every available hospital facility be utilized at this time in California to provide efficient effective medical care for our veterans. The Naval Hospital at Corona, Calif., which was built by the Navy at a cost of $19,000,000 has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle. This hospital could be converted for use as a veterans' hospital.

The California State Legislature has adopted the following resolution requesting that the Corona Naval Hospital be transferred to the Veterans' Administration for the benefit of California veterans who are in critical need of hospitalization, and I am in full accord with this resolution:

Senate Joint Resolution 5

Joint resolution relative to hospital facilities for veterans in California

Whereas there are insufficient beds in Government hospitals for veterans in California as evidenced by waiting lists and by the large number of tubercular and mentally ill veterans now adding to the overcrowded conditions of California State and county hospitals; and

Whereas the Veterans' Administration has announced plans for a future building program for hospitals to meet this need; and

Whereas the United States naval hospital at Corona, built by the Navy since 1941 at an expenditure of $19,000,000, has been abandoned by the Navy and is now idle but in every way suitable and desirable for the care of veterans by the Veterans' Administration; and

Whereas the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and other ex-service organizations have recommended the Corona Naval Hospital for transfer to the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and the Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the Veterans' Administration be, and hereby is, requested to take over at once the Corona Naval Hospital as a major veterans' facility for the care of sick and disabled veterans in California; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is memorialized to bring about the transfer of the Corona Naval Hospital to the Veterans' Administration and to enact any legislation which may be needed for this purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution shall immediately be dispatched by the secretary of the senate to the President of the United States, to the Vice President of the United States, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of California, and to the Veterans' Administrator.

Frankness Preferred

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post edition of January 4, 1950, on the subject Frankness Preferred which I feel should be of particular interest to Members of the Congress:

FRANKNESS PREFERRED

As the new Assistant Secretary of State for Public Affairs, Edward W. Barrett will have a job as broad in scope and as significant as any in the State Department. He will be an adviser on public opinion to the Secretary of State; he will be responsible for the foreign information and education programs; he will be in charge of keeping the American public informed on foreign policy; and he will direct American participation in the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. These are all fields in which frankness and a minimum of pretense will pay dividends.

In all respects but one the Barrett appointment is admirable. It is fallacious to think that the only good men come from outside the Government, and the President could have helped boost the morale of the career service by making his choice within the State Department. This, however, is no reflection on Mr. Barrett. As editorial director of Newsweek, as a participant in UNESCO and with previous service in War Information and psychological warfare, he has an amazingly good background for his job. He is known as an extremely competent administrator. More important, he is devoid of any razzle-dazzle or big-shot complex.

Among Mr. Barrett's many responsibilities, foreign broadcasts are perhaps the most spectacular, though by no means the most important. Here he has an opportunity to place more emphasis on quality and less on physical facilities and technique. What is needed most in the Voice of America is a consistent philosophy, and this entails recognizing the Voice for what it is: an instrument of warfare dealing with men's minds. If the purpose of psychological warfare is to cause other peoples to reject communism, then the Voice ought to be aggressively exploiting every chance to place the Communists on the defensive. This would not mean any departure from truthfulness, but it would mean using the truth as a weapon of propaganda. As Ladislas

Farago pointed out in a recent issue of The Reporter, the Voice ought to be the most authoritative source of information on the Tito-Stalin rift. For it to exploit the full potential of this split, the cooperation of American intelligence agencies will be necessary.

But it is easy to overstress the importance of the Voice of America as compared with other media and contacts. What the people of India think of the United States, for example, is of infinitely greater immediate significance than the at-best-hopeful efforts to win friends behind the iron curtain. Ties with Latin America have never received the serious attention they deserve. There is room for a good deal of fence-mending in the State Department's relations with the American people. Mr. Barrett could seek no better goal than to end the atmosphere of double-talk that too often surrounds State Department proclamations and insist on the rugged honesty that ought to characterize our foreign policy.

Dodging Facts Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune for January 5, 1950:

DODGING FACTS AGAIN

Perhaps some day we shall have a President who will not regard the American people as a bunch of temperamental children or nincompoops.

Mr. Truman's message Wednesday on the State of the Union was in every sense, a political speech. It dealt not so much with realities, and with common-sense problems before us, as a Nation, as it did with fantasies.

It was on the order of a fairy story, told to hold the attention of children.

There was nothing new in his message. It was the same Fair Deal, all over again. Washington observers say Mr. Truman is impatient these days with anyone who mentions New Deal to him. He is convinced that his Fair Deal is far superior to anything Mr. Roosevelt and Harry Hopkins ever cooked up.

His thinking, of course, is along political lines. He obviously judges a Presidential program solely by its vote-getting power.

His far-fetched thinking is demonstrated by his statement that by the year 2000 the Nation's production will total a trillion dollars a year—nearly four times what it is now.

If we are to deal in facts, however, it is inescapable that we ask Mr. Truman whether his trillion-dollar-production figures are based upon his own vastly inflated dollar, or upon the steadier dollar value of the prewar days.

That makes a lot of difference.

The average salary these days is put at $3,600 a year. Ten years ago, it was half that. Ten years ago, you could buy a car or a home for half what you must pay now. The same is true of almost every other commodity.

Thus, it is plain enough that the standard of living has not risen perceptibly in the last decade, even though the amount of dollars earned has risen steadily.

If Mr. Truman's tax program goes into effect, if local and State taxes keep their present pace, if Government regulation and discouragement of investment capital continues, a trillion-dollar production in the year 2000 may not be sufficient to give this country the poverty-stricken standard of today's Soviet Russia.

The President asks for another increase in taxes. It requires a certain quality of effrontery to ask the American people for more taxes, and then to go on spending billions to help support much of the world in which socialistic doctrines of lassitude and general decay are growing.

Almost every time the President speaks to the American people, it is to demand more of them * * * until even their way of life will be demanded.

Senator MARTIN said, "It is difficult to reconcile his program for vastly increased spending and greater centralization of power in Washington with his references to the need for a balanced budget and economy in government, which his administration consistently has opposed."

Said Representative SIMPSON, of Huntingdon, "He finds satisfaction in results to date of our spending $38,000,000,000 in the cold war. He overlooks the fact that more human beings are dominated today by the Communists in Europe and Asia than ever before."

Mr. Truman's record will not bear close inspection by the American people.

Mr. Truman's spending of the public tax money from the 1946 fiscal year to the end of September 1949, adds up to over $191,000,000,000 * * * nearly $12,000,000,000 more than all his 32 predecessors spent * * * except for the 1941–45 war period * * * and Mr. Roosevelt was no slouch at tapping the Treasury.

This kind of spending is without precedent in the world. The American people are financing it. We shall be held accountable for it.

It is our Nation * * * not alone Mr. Truman's. There are more custodians of America than those found in the White House, and environs.

But, these other custodians have fallen down on the job when we let a President spend us along the road to ruin as Mr. Truman is doing, and as he proposes blithely to keep on doing * * * unless the American people by their protests, tell him plainly that he has been given no mandate to destroy our Nation. Protests to Congressmen, to Senators, and to the White House are the only methods the people have * * * until election time, of registering their opinions.

More Needless Bloodshed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, I invite the attention of the House membership to the article included herewith and which appeared in the December 31 issue of Labor, official weekly newspaper of 15 recognized standard railroad labor organizations. I do so because I am hopeful that early in this present session of the Eighty-first Congress we will have the opportunity to vote on adoption of railway safety legislation that will help to bring an end to such tragic accidents.

This accident could have been avoided. Through the years hundreds of lives have been lost in other accidents which could have been avoided.

Will it take another major accident on our American railroads to awaken Congress to the urgency of improving our national rail safety laws? I hope not.

The article follows:

MORE NEEDLESS BLOODSHED—THREE TRACK WORKERS KILLED IN MOTORCAR CRASH; ICC MAKES USUAL RECOMMENDATION

Three more track workers have been slaughtered in a smashup of a rail motorcar and a train.

The tragedy occurred on the St. Johnsbury & Lamoille County Railroad near Cambridge, Vt., October 10.

The Interstate Commerce Commission made the usual investigation and found the carrier could have prevented the crash by providing an adequate block system or train order protection for the motorcar.

The ICC recommended the carrier provide "adequate protection" for motorcars. Nothing was done to compel the railroad to do this.

The Commission has contended that it lacks the authority to order such safety measures and for several years has suggested legislation to remedy this unfortunate situation.

However, not many months ago when congressional committees held hearings on safety bills, which had the backing of the standard railroad labor organizations, the Commission's legislative committee did a startling about-face and lined up against the proposal and on the side of the railroad lobby.

Meanwhile, the blood of rail employees continues to be spilled unnecessarily. At least 51 workers have been killed and 86 injured in track car smash-ups alone during the last 6 years.

Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL WILSON
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the House has been favored since this new session was called to order with reports from all parts of the country brought to us by the men who represent those parts in this Congress. The people of my district, the ninth of Indiana, have something to say to you, too. My people would like to know when Harry Truman and the Democrats who go along with the Truman Fair Deal are going to learn the economic facts of life that you cannot spend more than you earn and put off bankruptcy forever. I heard the Vice President when he called us "tree-sitters" and "hitching post" thinkers because we were wondering how long this state of unreality could last. The Veep, beaming bridegroom of the year and story-teller to the court of Sir Harry, may have been bred in Old Kentucky but that kind of talk indicates "crumby" thinking in my part of Indiana.

The political flight of fancy in which Harry Truman indulged in this Chamber last Wednesday proves again that he cannot keep his feet on the ground or his

hand out of our pockets when he thinks he hears any loose change jingling. If you will recall, there was almost no mention made of how much it would cost us to bring to life all those political dreams of which Mr. Truman's ambitions are made.

He plays a perpetual game of "let's pretend" with himself, and his advisers help his delusions by keeping from him the rumbling resentment of the common people who are beginning to ask "how much did this Government hand-out cost me?" and "when will things be back to normal in Washington?" Some day the realization will overcome them that normalcy in Washington is that one shade short of insanity that keeps the whole blooming town out of a mental institution. I am ready to join my friend, Mr. RICH, of Pennsylvania, whose new slogan, "Be thrifty in '50" may guarantee him a place in history when the history of this period is honestly written.

End of Tragicomedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial that appeared in the Washington Post of January 6, 1950:

END OF TRAGICOMEDY

Those who have been pleading with the administration for a decisive statement on Formosa will be gratified by the President's declaration yesterday. The statement is pithy, full of point, and compact with common sense; and it should clear the air all over the world about American intentions. Mr. Truman is to be complimented upon meeting head-on the challenge from a lunatic coterie of the Republican Party. The members of it are less significant in numbers than in noise and intimidation. Their policy is simple: they would commit the puissant United States to the role of playing second fiddle to the bankrupt Chiang Kai-shek.

Think of what such a policy, if that is the word, would entail. It has been obvious from the comment of recent days that the interventionist policy would undermine American influence everywhere in non-Communist Asia. Our only allies would be busted politicians. The whole Atlantic community, now joined together in an alliance, would be riven asunder. For none of the other allies intends to scramble aboard the sinking ship of Nationalist China before it collapses out of sight. In the United Nations, with the United States the lone friend of Chiang, there would be so much chaos that the institution would become a laughingstock All this would be the evil fruit of the policy of military action that the interventionists want to impose upon the United States. Like Lot's wife, the United States would become a pillar of salt, though the categorical imperative of our situation as leader of the free world compels us to move forward with what William James would have called the blunt and stubborn facts.

Canutelike intervention in behalf of Chiang had already been declared to be beyond the stomaching of many Republicans. Senator LODGE boggled at it, and would doubtless echo Secretary Acheson's "once is enough." On the House side, Representative JOHN KEE, chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, saw the situation as clearly as his opposite number in the Senate, Senator CONNALLY, saw it through a glass darkly. Mr. KEE said the choice was simple: either cut the painter or take Formosa away from Chiang, and hold it. The President has decided on the former course—at least he has taken the first step in a thoroughgoing disembarrassment in our relations with Chiang.

The main thing is that involvement in civil conflict in China is disavowed unequivocally. To be sure, there is one hedge in the declaration. That is that "at this time" there is no desire on the part of the United States "to obtain special rights or privileges or to establish military bases on Formosa." This, in the light of Mr. Acheson's statement, should, more properly, have read, "In present circumstances." For the qualification, he says, was inserted as self-protection in case the Russians take leave of their senses and attack American forces in the Far East. A casus belli of any such description would thrust upon this country the obligation of developing and even extending its defenses.

Assuredly Formosa in Communist hands would break the chain in America's offshore military posture in the Far East. So, for that matter, does Formosa in Chinese Nationalist hands. But neither Communist China nor Nationalist China is an air power or a sea power with any potential likely to affect the defense equation. Eighteen months ago, while civil war was going on, there was some reason to take temporary possession of Formosa. Now that the civil war is over, with Chiang Kai-shek holed up in Formosa, there is no sense in it. De facto, Formosa is Chinese, and the need of the moment is to reaffirm the territorial integrity of China.

This Secretary Acheson has done with an unmistakable accent which will be heard all over Asia. He is to be congratulated on the boldness with which he has seconded the President's initiative. Plain speaking was called for equally with a reassertion of Presidential leadership because of the activity of GOP diehards in holding up the United States to universal derision. The air for the last week has been cluttered with the dead cats of amateur Secretaries of State on the Hill whose purpose seemed to be only to second Chiang's aim of getting America into conflict with Russia.

Now the Executive has disengaged itself decisively from this interventionist maneuver. It is on the way to an orderly and correct American in place of a Chinese policy in the Far East. It would make its position absolutely clear in this respect if it now wound up the muddle about the blockade and started to protect the American flag in China seas.

Stating Republican Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I want to insert the following editorial comment from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis., one of the largest and most influential newspapers in our State:

DISCARDING "ME-TOOISM"

Republicans, within the next few weeks, will put a committee to work drafting a definite statement of party policy. That is all to the good, and we recall supporting, many months ago, a proposal for a national grassroots GOP convention where party members could air their views and furnish such a committee with a sample of rank-and-file sentiment.

A good deal of publicity has been given to the statement by National Republican Chairman Gabrielson that the party would discard "me-tooism."

Various interpretations have been placed upon this, and in some quarters—both Republican and Democratic—there has been a tendency to suggest that the Republican party is ready to go on record as flatly opposed to all welfare legislation enacted since 1932.

An eastern newspaper of high repute made this comment recently on this rather dubious strategy:

"Obviously the Republicans cannot be against whatever the Democrats have done or plan to do. It would be a complete abandonment of reason and principle if the party were to let the fear of 'me-tooism' lead it to a denunciation of everything the last decade has brought about. Gov. Driscoll of New Jersey has spoken wisely in this regard, saying that the Republicans are not going to advocate repeal of the Ten Commandments and the Constitution merely because the Democrats have affirmed their support of these things.

"The problem, in a word, is to decide what is good and what is bad, what is desirable and what is dangerous. And the standard of judgment is to be derived less from what the Democrats happen to have done or said than from large considerations of the public need."

With that view we agree completely.

It has been a mistake for the GOP to accept many New and Fair Deal plans with the promise that "we can do it better." It would be an even greater mistake for the GOP to discard all Democratic programs as utterly worthless. Neither political party, made up of good and sincere Americans, has a monopoly on wisdom.

DECLINE OF PARTY PLATFORMS

We believe there are several issues on which the Republican and Democratic parties have similar objectives in mind; the great difference lies only in method.

Both parties are in favor of civil-rights legislation, although there is disagreement on the extent that Federal police authority should be allowed to overshadow State and local government powers.

Both parties are on record in favor of using a certain amount of Federal money to support education. Republicans insist there is a limit to the money available; they also insist that the right of local communities to run their own schools remain undisputed.

Both parties are in favor of expansion of the national social security program. Again, the Republicans insist on a certain amount of home rule, and insist on realistic financing.

Both parties are on record in favor of protection for the Nation's farmers. The Democrats further are committed to the Brannan plan, with costs that appear astronomical and controls that are unquestionable. The record shows that the GOP favors flexible price supports.

There is nothing the matter with the two major political parties having similar objectives or even, when necessary, favoring the same methods. But these differences in method must be spelled out.

If both parties wrote honest and definite political platforms, they would be taken more seriously than they have the past few elections.

In the last couple of decades, there has been a tendency by both Republicans and Democrats to attempt to outpromise the other.

That has led to a ridiculous situation where voters are thoroughly confused and where platforms have come to mean but little.

THERE ARE REAL DIFFERENCES

There are many instances where the Republican Party must and will disagree with its Fair Deal opponents.

There is the question of Government reorganization. It is becoming more apparent each day that the Democratic Party is willing to sidetrack and forget the Hoover Commission's reforms. We believe that the Republican Party should accept the Hoover Commission recommendations 100 percent, and give them a fair trial.

There is a difference of opinion between the two parties on what constitutes a fair labor law. Democrats want to repeal Taft-Hartley and replace it with something resembling the Wagner Act. Republicans favor retention of Taft-Hartley, with addition of the amendments rejected by the Fair Deal during the last session of Congress.

The greatest difference between the two political parties lies in the field of taxation and Government spending. The coming Republican policy declaration should be explicit on this point, and reveal bluntly and honestly where economies can be made. The GOP statement also should call for tax reduction but with enough leeway to provide for some national debt retirement. If the Democrats wish to campaign in 1950 on a program of high taxes and high Government spending, that should be their privilege.

Republicans and Democrats are miles apart on the matter of improving the Nation's health. Democrats, led by Oscar Ewing, seem willing to go whole-hog for socialized medicine. Republicans should make it plain that they are not. There are some in the GOP, led by Senator TAFT, who believe the party should support extended Federal aid for health programs and individual health insurance. The GOP policy statement must state clearly how far the party is willing to go in this direction.

We believe that the parties do, and should, differ on public housing. Democrats have indicated they favor Government housing not only for low-income families, but for middle income groups as well. We believe Republicans must and will define the extent to which they believe Uncle Sam should become a landlord.

There is a difference between the two parties on the matter of socialized electric power. The Democratic Party under Mr. Truman is committed to the extension of the authority plan. Republicans have and probably should continue to support publicly owned power and irrigation projects in some sections of the country. But Republicans should make it clear that they do not favor the pouring of public money into Government-owned and operated projects in areas where private business firms already own and operate satisfactory utility plants.

WHY NOT THE TRUTH?

The basic difference between the Republican and Democratic Parties today involves money—how much should be spent by the taxpayer and how much should be taken from him to be spent by government.

It is here that the Republican Party must draw a line, because it is painfully obvious that the opposition will not do so.

There are a good many things it would be pleasant to have government do for us.

It would be nice to have government pay us all a pension of $500 a month, and let us retire at age 45. We could play a lot of golf, and do some fishing.

It would be pleasant to have Uncle Sam provide us with maids and motor cars. Wonder what it would be like to saunter down to the grocery store and order what we want, without bothering to pay for it? Send the bill to Washington!

But there are limits—financial limits—to which we can go under our present form of government. Those limits should be defined, precisely.

We believe that the Republican Party could be perfectly honest, and could strike a blow for freedom by taking the position that, except in times of crisis, the Federal Government cannot and should not take more than a given share of a wage earner's salary. Its policy statement should make it clear that government cannot afford to do those things for Americans that they can best do for themselves.

Americans are not quite so stupid as many politicians seem to believe.

All of us—regardless of our political affiliation or economic status—know that there is a limit to government spending and thus a limit to the things that we can expect from government.

Let the Democrats do the promising—with a billion here for this little group and a billion there for that little faction.

If the Republican policy statement is honest, it must be realistic.

Americans have a high regard for the truth.

Intervention in Formosa Would Mean Grave Risks for United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Russell Barnes that appeared in the Detroit News of January 4, 1950:

INTERVENTION IN FORMOSA WOULD MEAN GRAVE RISKS FOR UNITED STATES

(By Russell Barnes)

The question whether the United States should in effect take over Formosa and fight Chiang Kai-shek's battle to recover China from the Communists has been appealed over the heads of the administration to the American people.

The attempt to overrule the White House and the State Department, by employing American forces to save Formosa and aid Chiang, as part of our world stop-communism campaign, has been launched by a group of Senators, mostly Republican, led by HOMER FERGUSON, of Michigan, and WILLIAM M. KNOWLAND, of California.

The proposal to use American armed forces to protect the island of Formosa, and to prevent complete destruction of Chinese Nationalists, has now received the powerful support of former President Hoover.

The demand, of course, is not new—it has been hammered long by Americans who hate communism and love China, and who have been dismayed by the spectacle of powerful Communist armies crumpling Nationalist forces and driving them to a last refuge on Formosa.

A DEMOCRATIC PROCESS

The effort to reverse the administration's Asiatic policy of staying clear of the Chinese civil war is obviously a democratic process. All power basically rests with the people.

But it is just as obvious that if the American people decide to force the administration to switch its Chinese and Asiatic policies, they should act with a clear knowledge of the fundamental facts, and with a realization of what American intervention to save Formosa might mean.

To clear his mind before arriving at a decision, it might be well for the American to seek answers to these questions:

Should the United States risk war in Asia?

Should the United States put itself in the position of occupying Chinese territory?

WHO WOULD COMMAND?

Would American intervention at Formosa strengthen or weaken far-eastern communism?

Should American generals assume command of Chinese Nationalist forces?

If we should decide to intervene to save Chiang, are we prepared as a Nation to spend the lives and money that would be required to reconquer China for the Nationalists?

Do the Chinese people favor return of Chiang and his Nationalist regime?

What would 7,000,000 Formosans and 450,000,000 Chinese think about American intervention?

What would be the attitude of our Asiatic and European allies in the world conflict with Russian communism?

Would Moscow welcome our involvement in the Chinese civil war, because it might further sap American economic strength, and thus speed the day when world revolution might be possible?

WHAT IS RISK OF WAR?

Those are all questions which must be answered cold-bloodedly before the American people decide to try to help Chiang hold Formosa.

As for whether we should risk war to stop expansion of communism in Asia, that is easily answered—we have all along been risking war by trying to stop communism in Europe.

The real question is whether we would stand to win or lose a Chinese war, without enormous expenditure of life and capital.

Factors to bear in mind are that in Europe we have had the support of the governments and peoples involved. It is at least questionable whether the mass of Chinese people favor a return of Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalist regime.

The record shows that they deserted wholesale to the Communists, because of the failure of Chiang and his government to do a job for the people, and to stamp out governmental corruption and inefficiencies.

Formosa is essentially a Chinese island, whose inhabitants dislike both the mainland Chinese and former Japanese occupiers.

American intervention could certainly be achieved without formal seizure of Chinese territory—the obvious example would be Greece—but our action would certainly be plugged by the Reds as another example of American imperialism.

Most far-eastern authorities seem to think that Asiatic peoples at present are in an anti-imperialistic, antiforeign, nationalistic temper. They argue, rightly or wrongly, that if the United States starts throwing its weight around in Asia, the reaction might be to strengthen the Reds.

American military experts sent to aid the Nationalists have reported that Chinese generalship is so inept and irresponsible that the only hope for success would be to put Americans in command.

If we went that far, obviously we would have to fight the Chinese war through to a

successful conclusion, possibly against an enormous hostile population, or take an awful blow to the national prestige.

We would also be running counter to the convictions of our European and Asiatic allies that Chinese Communists have established a government which probably should be recognized, because it conforms to the yardsticks of international law.

If it is true that the Russians hope we will break ourselves economically, by spreading ourselves too thin internationally, Moscow might welcome American intervention in China, where American prospects of winning would be, to say the least, less than in Europe.

China poses big problems for the American people. The problems are too big to be solved by snap judgments.

The Kind of Democrat I Am

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOWARD W. SMITH

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include herewith an address which I delivered at the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 24, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York City, as a participant in a panel discussion of the subject The Kind of Democrat I Am:

I am what may be termed a conservative Democrat. It is one whose normal habitat is south of the Mason and Dixon's line. I represent that congressional district of Virginia that was the home of George Washington, who conceived the idea of a Constitution; of George Mason, the great exponent of Democratic government who wrote the Bill of Rights; Thomas Jefferson, who wrote the Declaration of Independence and founded the Democratic Party; James Madison, the Father of the Constitution; James Monroe, author of the Monroe Doctrine; and John Marshall, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court who, by his decisions, breathed life and vitality into the Constitution.

We conservative Democrats adhere to the underlying and fundamental principles of government that guided the thinking of these and other statesmen who wrote our Constitution.

We conservative Democrats believe in certain fundamental principles embedded in the Bill of Rights.

We are unwilling to surrender our convictions to meet every real or fancied emergency that may arise in a modern world, distressed and torn by the swarms of strange ideologies sweeping over the earth.

These conservative Democrats refuse to either marry, betroth, court, or flirt with any of these foreign innovations in government.

Our convictions can be tersely stated by quoting the language of the Tenth Amendment to the Constitution. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people."

We therefore hold with the long-accepted theory that Congress has no power to enact legislation or expend the people's money on any subject that it is not given authority to deal with under the Constitution. These limitations of the constitutional powers are not mere academic theories. In practice, they are vital to the welfare, the personal liberties, the rights of private property, and even to the social freedom to select one's associates and business affiliates.

I shall cite with necessary brevity some instances and some consequences of the failure of Congress to confine its functions to the power granted it under the Constitution.

In the field of social welfare, we have enacted the minimum wage law, forbidding the private citizen from working for a lesser wage or for longer hours than the Congress, in its wisdom, deems appropriate to his welfare; ignoring the obvious sequel that if Congress can fix a minimum wage, it can with equal power fix the maximum compensation that our supposedly free citizens may be permitted to earn.

The House of Representatives has repeatedly passed the antilynching bill, under which the Federal Government proposes to inject itself into the enforcement of the criminal laws and the police powers of the sovereign States.

The House of Representatives has, in each recent Congress, passed an anti-poll-tax bill, which undertakes to fix the qualifications of voters in the States in the face of the Constitutional provision reserving to the respective States exclusive authority to fix the qualifications of their voters.

For several terms past, we have had pending in both houses of Congress, and enthusiastically endorsed by the platforms of both major parties, the so-called Fair Employment Practices Act, under which the Federal Government proposes, through the establishment of a horde of national investigators and enforcement officers, to dictate to the free American citizen whom he shall employ and to compel him to engage as his business associates persons with whom he prefers not to associate.

Time does not permit a detailed discussion of all the altruistic activities of the Federal Government that account in a large measure for the nearly bankrupt condition of the Federal Treasury.

Constantly rising over the past two decades, the Government debt has reached the appalling figure of $250,000,000,000—more money than any country has ever owed in all history.

The bulk of this debt comes from the necessary large expenditures of the recent war. While sound policy requires large expenditures and mounting debt during wartime, equally sound policy requires in peacetime rigid economy and reduction of the debt.

Today, in time of peace and unprecedented prosperity, our national budget is unbalanced, our debt is increasing.

In the first years following the war, our revenues were increasing and our expenditures decreasing so that in the fiscal year 1947 there was a surplus of approximately $2,000,000,000, and in the year of 1948, a surplus of $8,000,000,000.

But the year 1949 showed an alarming trend. There was a reduction in receipts and an increase in expenditures over the previous year, resulting in a deficit of around $2,000,000,000, and in the present fiscal year, the most optimistic predictions forecast a deficit of $5,000,000,000.

This presents a picture that should alarm even the most unwary.

Our revenues are on the decrease, while our expenditures increase. No private business could long survive the fiscal policies of the Federal Government.

I do not believe we can continue these policies of irresponsible and reckless expenditures without ultimate disastrous results.

A few examples must suffice to indicate the trend of Congressional thinking. The Congress recently passed a Federal housing bill, which authorized appropriations to the extent of $18,000,000,000, the bulk of which is to help pay house rent for one element of the people so that they may live in the kind of houses to which they would like to become accustomed. Thus, Congress takes the money of one tax-paying citizen to pay the house rent of another.

The Senate has passed, and the House almost passed, a bill to pay subsidies to those miners of certain minerals whose cost of production does not permit the profits to which they would like to be accustomed.

Last year we paid $225,000,000 to subsidize the potato growers who, with a tempting subsidy in sight, raised more potatoes than the market could consume.

Housing subsidies, agricultural subsidies, shipping subsidies, mining subsidies, mail subsidies, and a score of other subsidies that drain the substance of our taxpayers to meet the demands of minority groups of all types.

We rob taxpayer Peter to pay supplicant Paul, if he can marshal a sufficiently potent amount of political pressure.

These briefly present some of the tendencies in Federal Government that go far beyond the functions delegated to Congress.

This Nation has been hewed out of the initiative, the ambition, sweat, and toil of our citizens, seeking by their own efforts to better their social and economic status. When we whittle away, bit by bit, the initiative and the fundamental freedoms of the people; when we teach them more and more, day by day, to depend upon hand-outs from the Federal Treasury to meet every actual or artificial emergency, we take away that initiative, that ambition, and the self-reliance that has made our country great.

This is the insidious way of the welfare state.

The hand that passes out the grants from the taxpayers' money becomes, in the natural course of events, the mailed fist of dictatorship. As more and more largess is distributed, so more and more restrictions and limitations are being imposed upon the liberties of the people.

Such has been the history of the growth of dictatorship.

I deeply resent these tendencies and policies, by whatever political party they are advocated. They are undermining too rapidly the freedom, the initiative, and the independence of our citizens.

Unless there is a swing back to the normal American way of life, I have grave fears for the future of our country.

I have been in Congress nearly 20 years, and watched with increasing alarm the growth of demands from pressure groups of all kinds that Congress enact legislation so foreign to the constitutional concepts of our legitimate functions that there seems no limit to the encroachment on personal liberties or the rights of the sovereign States.

What is the remedy?

There is only one.

Congress reflects the will of the people. The will of the people is transmitted to Congress by those who make the loudest noise and the most convincing threats of political reprisal.

Until and unless the great mass and majority of our thinking people awaken to their responsibility and assert their demands for sound business in Government and a return to the constitutional limits upon the functions of Congress, we shall continue the present policy until some time, some sad day, we find that we have gone too far to retrace our steps.

In a democracy a people get the kind of government that they deserve.

If they think little, they deserve little. If they do little about it, they get little results.

If the present trend of Government is wrong, as I believe it is, it will continue wrong as long as a slothful and indifferent people remain impervious to, and neglectful of, the danger signals flying all about them.

Fair, With Scattered Clouds—Down the Middle of the Road

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 3, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Erwin D. Canham, that appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 4, 1950:

FAIR, WITH SCATTERED CLOUDS—DOWN THE MIDDLE OF THE ROAD

(By Erwin D. Canham)

The tone of the economic experts as they look into 1950 is essentially cheerful. Most of them think 1950 will be more normal than any year since 1940. While they recognize the dangers of communism in Asia, and the still uncertain economy of western Europe, they see a better year ahead.

In France, the cost of living has gone down a little, for the first time since the end of the war. In England, the drain on gold and dollar reserves has been reversed. The reserve fund is slowly increasing. In Italy, Premier de Gasperi says his nation has made a complete return in every field of world activity. And when Speaker RAYBURN left the White House after going over the President's message on the state of the Union, he said: "It looks like the country is in pretty good shape—I never saw it in better shape."

The big problem of the new year is immediately Formosa, and on a longer view, all Asia. There is a sharp division of opinion on Formosa.

Former President Hoover, Senator TAFT, and many other critics of administration policies say we should take military and naval action if necessary to enable Chiang Kai-shek to cling to Formosa and Hainan, another island off Indo-China. They want us to withhold recognition of the Communist regime indefinitely, and to keep on supporting the Nationalists even in exile. They say this will build a wall against communism in Asia, that to lose Formosa would drive a breach into our line of defense, that to hold it would mean a foothold and a symbol for eventual return of a free government to China. They point to the dangers of having Chinese Communist missions in the United States and the United Nations. Behind these and other influential Republicans, stands General MacArthur.

On the other hand are those who think that United States military intervention to save Formosa might provoke a third world war. That is the view of Chairman KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Senator LODGE, although a Republican, said he had grave doubts of taking any military action toward Formosa. Others said that the Communist regime's conquest of China was already an established fact, and recognition of the government was inevitable sooner or later. They said that to continue hostility toward the Communist regime would be to drive it further into the arms of Moscow.

The main thing, they said, was not the regime but the people of China. New American contacts with the people must be opened, and they thought that indefinite failure to recognize an established government would widen the breach between us and the Chinese people.

If we fought the regime with arms and navies, they said, we might indeed induce Russian intervention. Moreover, our friends and allies in Asia have decided to recognize the Communist government, and we cannot indefinitely widen the gulf between ourselves and them. Already it is with American arms that the Nationalists are bombing open Chinese cities. Indeed, it was with American arms that the Communists made themselves the best equipped army in Chinese history—with arms they took from the largely unresisting Nationalists. So American prestige in China is at its lowest ebb. Unless we begin to work ourselves back, by achieving some contacts with the Chinese people, we are in a hopeless position.

Those who hold this view say that private individuals—missionaries, teachers, doctors, engineers, and other technicians—will offer the best way of proving ourselves to the Chinese. President Truman's point-4 program ultimately offers the best hope of reestablishing a right concept of America in China. But none of this can ensue unless sooner rather than too much later we have regular relationships. And if there is any hope at all of inducing Titoism in China, say these people, we certainly cannot do it by aloofness.

There are the two arguments. It is unlikely that either of them will win President Truman and the Congress outright. The President is likely to be timorous of the political consequences of either extreme. We are likely to try sitting on two stools again, and that is a very difficult feat indeed.

Meantime, it is dubious that the Communists will be able to assault Formosa directly against the effective Nationalist air forces. If the Nationalists are brought down by civil defection within Formosa, their extreme weakness and ineptitude will be evidenced again. We can hardly be expected to intervene to suppress civil strife.

We are therefore likely to do something, at least, for the Nationalists—military and civilian advice, perhaps, which would be a gesture of support and perhaps of some practical value. Such a step, however, would prolong the problem of opening up new channels to the mainland. It would be a concession to a powerful faction of opinion in the United States. It might be the price of continuation of the bipartisan foreign policy. And it might delay a real solution in Asia.

The Late Honorable George J. Bates

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, the tragic death of GEORGE J. BATES was a great shock to all his colleagues but especially to those of us who were privileged to be associated with him more intimately.

I first came to know him well 30 years ago when he was chairman of the Committee on Municipal Finance of the Massachusetts House of Representatives and I was mayor of my home city of Melrose. I then had occasion to confer with him frequently at the statehouse on Beacon Hill in Boston for he was well known as an authority on fiscal matters relative to municipalities. All Massachusetts cities were then operating under the provisions of a new Municipal Finance Act and Representative BATES was most constant in urging sound financial policies and most helpful in demonstrating their value to city officials who, while eager to keep in step with changing rules of administration, were inclined to consider the new law revolutionary and restrictive.

Five years later he became mayor of Salem, and during the 14 years he held that office I was in the legislature and continued to see him frequently in connection with pending legislation affecting municipal government.

When I came to Congress in 1943, he had been here for 6 years, and so it was only natural that I should follow the habit of seeking his counsel, and I constantly profited thereby.

So long as I shall live I shall never cease to be grateful for the inspiration and genuine helpfulness which has come to me in public life over these 30 years by reason of constant consultations and conferences with GEORGE J. BATES. Many besides myself have learned how fully was he always willing to share with others the knowledge he had acquired by experience and industrious attention to the problems of government.

The Nation has lost one of its ablest and most devoted officials.

I join my colleagues in extending warmest sympathy to his splendid wife and family in their great loss.

Making Democracy Work

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OREN HARRIS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the greatest encouragement we have as to the future of our democracy is the reaction and attitude of our young high-school students. Though in their teen-ages now, it will only be a short time when we will look to them to assume the responsibility of our democracy.

Recently when I was back in the district and visited the Lions Club at Stephens, Ark., I, together with the others present, was inspired by two of the most interesting discussions on the subject of Making Democracy Work. These talks were given by two fine high-school students from the local Stephens public school—Miss Sally Jo Wade and Miss Nona Dalton.

They had been studying how our democracy works in their social science classes. Out of this study these two fine young ladies participated in a radio broadcast originating in Camden, Ark., which received a tremendous response. The Stephens High School, the teachers and all interested in the studies and programs, are to be highly congratulated in teaching the young people of that community the basic understanding of our democratic form of government.

I was so much impressed with these interesting discussions that I wanted to share them with others, that they too might be inspired with this living example from our young people. I therefore ask unanimous consent that under

this subject I might include the statement of Sally Jo Wade on Democracy In Social Science, followed by the statement of Nona Dalton on the subject of democracy in the student council. I am sure not only the Members of Congress but people throughout the country who have an opportunity to read these fine statements will be tremendously impressed:

DEMOCRACY IN SOCIAL SCIENCE

In keeping with our theme, Making Democracy Work, I am to tell you how democracy is taught in the social science department at Stephens High School. This department consists of two courses in American history, one in world history, and a civics course. All are prerequisites for graduation.

Democracy must be lived rather than learned. Yet without learning the truths which inspired the founders of our Nation, the facts about our Government, and our relationship to it, living becomes a thing of chance. We may act rightly by accident, but we are far more likely to do so if we are equipped with the information that will help us to make the right choices. Each of us has a place in the life of his community. Our community will reach its possibilities only as each member of it reaches up to his own opportunities for service and achievement.

Social science teaches that no citizen has the right to shift the responsibility for his own thinking and conduct from himself to any organization. We must form our own opinions. It is our duty to get all the information that we can, then stand on our own feet in dealing with those questions that come before us. The fundamental information that the citizen gets comes from the schoolroom.

Upon us, as citizens of our community, State, and Nation, rest certain obligations; social science stresses these: We must have a clear understanding of our rights, and a real appreciation of the duties that go along with those rights. We should learn as much as we possibly can about the world we live in. We should make right use of all the talents and powers we have. We should be loyal to those who have rightful authority over us. We should actively support those causes which we believe to be right. We must believe in the American's creed, which I quote:

"I believe in the United States of America as a Government of the people, by the people, for the people; whose just powers are derived from the consent of the governed; a democracy in a Republic, a sovereign Nation of many sovereign States; a perfect union, one and inseparable; established upon those principles of freedom, equality, justice, and humanity for which American patriots sacrificed their lives and fortunes.

'I therefore believe it is my duty to my country to love it, to support its Constitution, to obey its laws, to respect its flag, and to defend it against all enemies."

DEMOCRACY IN THE STUDENT COUNCIL

I realize that in a democracy I have a much greater chance of happiness than under any other form of government. Sometimes when I read about conditions in other parts of the world I become afraid. What would happen if we lost our democracy? I become more frightened when I read how some foreigners are working against our form of government. Still more alarming is the indifference of our citizens. Too many stand back and criticize rather than work to improve conditions. We need leaders. There are 4,000,000 boys and girls of school age who are not attending school. These are enough to swing any election. Whose responsibility are they?

I want to do my part and I think working on the student council is one way now and also excellent training for future years. Our student council has 14 members. We have charge of a number of school activities. We spent one day in Sheridan learning how their live student council works. We have undertaken to raise $108 to repair our gym floor. Already we have earned $156 of this money by sponsoring school programs. The other students cooperated with us. We have become better acquainted and more cooperative as we worked together. We are realizing that friendliness is a greater asset sometimes than higher grades. We are using our influence for better school work, a courteous, friendly student body, good deportment, and a good record in attendance and punctuality. We have a well behaved student body. The pupils are busy and happy in the classroom, the study hall, and on the playground. We want each student to realize that this is his school and it will be what he and other students make it. If we practice these things in school life, and help in student government, I think that when we have finished school we will want to take part in the affairs of our community and Nation.

We should all—both young and old—devote ourselves to keeping alive the freedom we have won at so great a price. Let us all strive to make democracy work.

The War Claims Commission and Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter I have received from Mr. Peter Campbill Brown, Acting Assistant to the Attorney General, and other letters pertaining to war claims.

The letters follow:

DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
Washington, November 29, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your note of November 7, 1949, to Mr. David L. Bazelon, requesting an estimate of the future status of the fund which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States under section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

The net value of the Attorney General's interest in all vested property as of October 1, 1949, is approximately $336,000,000. It is estimated that debt and title claims in the amount of $50,000,000 may be allowed out of this amount. In addition, approximately $125,000,000 of this property is subject to suits for return under section 9 (a) of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended. After deducting debt and title claims and property subject to section 9 (a) suits, a balance of $161,000,000 remains which may ultimately be available for transfer for the payment of claims in accordance with the War Claims Act of 1948.

However, while it is presently estimated that this amount will eventually be made available, the amounts actually available for transfer at present or in the near future cannot be determined until it is possible to process the individual vesting accounts in which the former German and Japanese property is held in order to ascertain which items of property are no longer subject to claim or suit. This processing cannot be undertaken until the time has expired for filing new claims or suits with respect to the property. The time fixed by statute (50 U. S. C. App., sec. 33) for filing claims and suits has expired with respect only to a portion of the property held, and two bills are pending in the Congress (S. 603 and S. 729), either of which would extend the filing period even in those cases. Since both bills passed the Senate in the last session and were pending before the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, this office withheld processing the accounts involved because of the difficult problem raised if the filing period should be extended after a portion of these accounts had already been cleared.

The recent payment of $25,000,000 was made in advance of this processing on the basis of estimates that this amount was the maximum safe amount which could presently be advanced against those accounts which, on the basis of present information, probably will not be claimed. While this office will proceed to clear out unclaimable accounts as rapidly as possible when it is feasible to do so, in view of the uncertainty as to the limitation date on claims and suits, it is not possible at the present time to estimate what funds will be available in the near future.

The above information was transmitted on November, 3, 1949, to Mr. Daniel F. Cleary, chairman, War Claims Commission, in response to his request of October 19, 1949.

I regret that it is impossible to give you more definite information at this time. As requested in your note, we are returning a copy of Mr. Cleary's letter of November 2, 1949, to you which was forwarded to the Office of Alien Property.

Sincerely,

PETER CAMPBILL BROWN,
Acting Assistant to the Attorney General.

WAR CLAIMS COMMISSION,
Washington, November 10, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In response to your inquiry of October 24 with reference to the study that is being made by the War Claims Commission, we are not able to say at this point exactly the amount of time necessary to complete our work. You recall perhaps that we requested an extension of time through Senator CHAVEZ. I feel that it will take all of that to adequately make the survey necessary.

I am indeed concerned over the handling of alien property. I trust that sufficient investigation is being made before any property is restored to its original owner, but I am not at all sure that enough care has been taken in such investigations. I have talked the matter over with the Senators of the Appropriation Committee and trust they will ask for reports at least, if not further investigation, when Congress convenes.

We are told by the custodian that approximately $35,000,000 more is under contemplation now for the return to original owners. It has been stated by this authority that this will be the extent of action to be taken along this line. There will be left approximately $350,000,000 after this last deduction. I hope that we will be able to maintain the $350,000,000 balance for our use. If so, we will be able to do a fairly creditable job in settling war claims but the other members of the Commission and certain of the legal staff feel as I do that the matter should be carefully watched.

As soon as Congress convenes, it is my plan to ask your committee to look into the matter further. I believe you have the authority to ask for reports, or to investigate

further if you care to take the time. Knowing your interest in the matter, I feel that you will concede to our wishes.

May I add this statement. We are making noticeable headway in our work, organization, and preparation for the handling of claims. Considering that we have been in office only 6 weeks, I believe we can claim some approval of our effort.

I am looking forward to seeing you again in Washington for further discussion of these problems.

Very sincerely,

GEORGIA L. LUSK,
Commissioner.

DECEMBER 27, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Gladewater, Tex.

MY DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: This is in reply to your notes of November 26 and December 6, 1949, addressed to the Attorney General requesting information regarding certain specific aspects of the fund which will be covered into the Treasury of the United States under section 39 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended.

Your note of November 26, 1949, transmitted a copy of Commissioner Georgia L. Lusk's letter to you of November 10 in which it is stated that the Office of Alien Property has under contemplation the return of $35,000,000 of vested properties to their former owners. Commissioner Lusk states further that after these returns have been made, there will remain approximately $350,000,000 of vested properties which may be used by the War Claims Commissioners pursuant to Public Law 896, Eightieth Congress, second session (62 Stat. 1240). You ask verification of these data. In reply reference is made to the Department's letter to you of November 29, 1949, in which it was stated that as of October 1, 1949, the net value of the Attorney General's interest in vested properties was $336,000,000. Further, it was pointed out that this sum was subject to deductions which might reach $175,000,000. Hence, it was estimated that approximately $161,000,000 remain which may ultimately be used by the War Claims Commissioners.

In your note of December 6, 1949, written on a copy of the Department's letter of November 29 referred to above, you request information as to the value of the Attorney General's interest in vested properties if no returns had been made. From March 1943 to October 1949 approximately $19,500,000 of vested properties have been returned. Since the Attorney General's interest in vested properties as of October 1, 1949, was $336,000,000 and since approximately $19,500,000 of vested properties had been returned as of the same date, it would appear that if no returns had been made the total would have been $355,500,000.

As requested, there are returned herewith your notes of November 26 and December 6, 1949.

Yours sincerely,

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Is This the Time To Spend Billions More?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Williamsport (Pa.) Sun:

IS THIS THE TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS MORE?

Here are two columns of figures. One gives the amount spent by each of our 32 Presidents from George Washington to the end of Franklin D. Roosevelt's second administration. The other gives the amount spent by President Truman since his inauguration up to September 30, 1949.

The figures have been compiled by John T. Flynn, from Historical Statistics of the United States (Census Bureau) and United States Treasury Reports, as published in the Reader's Digest.

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term)

Washington	$34,083,486
Adams	34,262,668
Jefferson	72,424,289
Madison	176,473,864
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,968
Van Buren	122,325,242
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,093,918,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	46,938,260,143
Harding	6,667,235,429
Coolidge	18,585,549,119
Hoover	15,490,476,636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,746,001
Total	179,620,113,645

Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to Sept. 30, 1949

Truman	$191,081,394,191

Think this over:

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,620,113,645.

One President in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Hon. Martin Gorski, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday in St. Matthew's Cathedral here in the Nation's Capital, memorial mass will be sung for Hon. MARTIN GORSKI, our beloved colleague from Illinois who passed to the Great Beyond only a few weeks after our adjournment in October.

It seemed fitting to the members of his own party and from his city of Chicago that on the first Sunday following our convening for the second session that we should meet, with his many friends from the delegations from the other States of the Union, in the sanctified atmosphere of religion to pay honor to the memory of a stout friend and a great public servant.

In every meaning of the phrase, MARTIN GORSKI was a great American. He never forgot when large opportunity came to him in the broadening of his influence that the greatest use which can be made of influence is to employ it in behalf of those who are most in need of the services of friendship. He was the champion of the oppressed and his hand was always extended to help to their feet those whom unfortunate circumstances had buffeted about.

As a lawyer of the highest standing in Chicago, as a learned and universally respected master-in-chancery, and as an influential Member of the Congress of the United States, he made a reputation for industry, integrity, and brilliant achievement which for generations will be an inspiration to the youth of Chicago. He was brought to this land, a lad of 3, an immigrant boy. Behind him was no influence. To help him were not available the means of wealthy parents. Yet when he passed to his eternal reward the flags at half mast over the Capitol and over the House Office Buildings reflected the grief of the Nation to the service of which, and its ideals, he had given the fruitful years of his life.

Mr. Speaker, we have lost a great American. To me, with all the other Members from Illinois, has come the loss of a close and beloved friend.

The Problem of Unification of the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. W. STERLING COLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered to the American Veterans' Committee, at Newport, R. I., on November 17, 1949, by Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, on the problem of unification of the armed forces:

Three years ago, there were in existence two armed forces: the Army and the Navy. The Air Force was a part of the Army, and the Navy was composed of a powerful, highly integrated organization of ships, marines, and aviation.

Today, there are three organizations as a result of the National Security Act of 1947. There is also a degree of bitterness and unrest on the part of the Navy, justified or otherwise, which will take much time to eradicate.

It is my opinion that the passage of the National Security Act was a serious blunder. It has imposed on the Government a great monolithic structure in an attempt to solve problems which required evolution, not revolution, to arrive at a proper solution. Like the prohibition amendment, it was a

"noble experiment," and of the same dubious value.

No reasonable person denies the necessity of coordination in the organization and operation of the armed forces. Their development and training in time of peace must be to the end of united effort under a common plan in time of war.

This was realized to a very considerable extent in the past war. There were the Joint Chiefs of Staff who decided the general plan of campaign. There was unified command in the European area and, with the exception of the southwestern Pacific, in the campaign against Japan.

For many years before the war joint maneuvers were an annual event, and the service colleges were composed of officers of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. There was every reason to believe that as a result of the lessons of the war and the realization among the officers of all services for the necessity of united action coordination would have proceeded at a more rapid pace than before the war. The procedure could have been covered by Executive orders instead of by an elaborate act of Congress, and the uproar and bitterness that exists today could have been avoided.

Let us discuss briefly some of the factors that enter into the coordination of the armed forces:

First is that of education. Officers, especially those destined for high command, must have an understanding of the capabilities and limitations of the other services besides their own if they are to be placed in charge of combined operations in time of war. This process of education is being carried out in the staff and war colleges today. This is a matter of time. Since war is a continuation of policy by other than peaceful means, officers of the Foreign Service of the State Department should be included in the student body of the higher colleges.

It is interesting to note that in the Security Act there is no mention of education—one of the most important factors in intelligent and effective coordination of the services.

Another important factor is that of appropriations for the several services and involves the question whether the authority to allot funds and to decide how much each service should receive should rest in the hands of the Secretary of Defense. This is great power to place in the hands of one man, and experience to date shows that it has not been overly successful. There have been accusations that limitation of funds to one service have been with the idea of reducing the effectiveness of that service and increasing that of others.

Since the establishment of the armed forces, the allotment of funds for the Army and Navy has been the prerogative of Congress and its committees. There is where it belongs under the Constitution and there is where it should remain.

There is now one Armed Forces Appropriations Committee, many of whose members have a thorough knowledge of the services through years of committee hearings. They constitute a jury who hear the requests for funds and the arguments for their necessity. Their decision is final; there can be no appeal. There is where the question of the amount and allotment of funds should remain. No service can question the decision of Congress as to their needs or requests.

The Security Act provides for a number of councils, agencies, and boards, some new, and one which was in existence under another name for many years—the Munitions Board. These boards have a certain value but there is an apparent overlapping of functions which may be confusing. There are in addition to the military departments a National Security Council, an Armed Forces Policy Council, a Central Agency, a National Security Resources Board, a War Council, Joint Chiefs of Staff, Joint Staff, Munitions Board, a Research and Development Board, and advisory committees when deemed necessary.

Surely there will not be any lack of information or advice. The problem will be to coordinate it, and I think that is a feature for which the act makes no provision.

The results of all their labors should be centralized in the strategic plans for war, yet the responsibility for such plans rests with the Joint Chiefs of Staff, a purely military body.

The whole object of the Security Act was to increase the efficiency and economy of the armed forces in peace and war, and the heart of the whole complex organization was the "preparation of strategic plans and provision for the strategic direction of the military forces."

This strategic plan must consider many factors:

1. Is it to be a total war, or a limited war, or a preventive war?

2. How does the war plan comply with our present and future national policies?

3. Has the Nation adequate raw materials to conduct the type of warfare decided upon?

4. Can the Nation stand the expense of total war if the military decide such is necessary?

5. What will be the consequence on the national economy of a total war, or a limited war?

6. Are we going to use atomic bombs, and gas, and bacteriological weapons? All are equally effective, and equally barbarous.

These and others that might be asked, are momentous questions, and the answers to them may decide our national security or destruction.

When war takes place, the task assumed by the military forces is the defeat or destruction of the enemy. Cost or subsequent consequences are not considered. Those are matters for civilians. Yet there is not a civilian on the Joint Staff which prepare the plans on which the fate of the Nation depends.

This seems to me to be the fatal defect in the present law. It is fairly certain that, if left to the military with no regard to the object of war, its cost, or its postwar results, we will be embarked on a campaign that will require the drafting of many millions of men, the practical exhaustion of our natural resources, and a debt of trillions, not billions, of dollars.

Nowhere is the presence of our ablest civilians more necessary than on the Joint Staff. The chairman of the Staff should be a civilian, and the chairman of the Central Intelligence Agency, the National Security Resources Board, and the Munitions Board should be members as well as personnel from the State Department. The chairmen of the Senate and House Foreign Relations and Armed Forces Appropriation Committees should be members ex-officio, and to be kept in closest touch with the work of the Staff.

The object of war is to secure a more perfect peace. It is not to destroy the enemy nation. It should be directed against the enemy military forces and not against the enemy people. It should be conducted as humanely as possible, with full observance of the rules of war that were in effect before 1914. It should stop when the enemy is willing to treat for a negotiated peace. The peace terms should be generous. Our enemies of today may be our allies of tomorrow.

After the war between Prussia and Austria in 1866, Bismarck, the German chancelor, insisted on liberal terms of peace with the result that some years later Austria was a member of the Triple Alliance. Had Bismarck shown equal forbearance to France after the Franco-Prussian War of 1870, it might have changed the subsequent history of Europe.

In 1917, Lord Lansdowne in England proposed a negotiated peace with Germany, the latter country then being willing to consider the offer. Landsdowne was denounced as a pacifist, a defeatist, and even as a traitor. The Premier, Lloyd George, declared that the war must go on until the power of the German royal regime was destroyed. Hitler and World War II was the eventual result.

In this war we had "unconditional surrender" decided upon at Casablanca. The taxpayers of America are now footing the bill.

There is no doubt but that the Security Act provided enough boards, staffs, and agencies to collect the information necessary on which to base an adequate war plan. It is another matter to see that this data is evaluated and utilized. In 1941, the War and Navy Departments had information from intercepted Japanese dispatches of the imminence of war and also that an attack on Pearl Harbor was likely. The failure to evaluate this information and to pass it on to the commanders in Pearl Harbor resulted in tragedy.

The act provides for a Munitions Board which has very important duties. Yet much of the information and the plans for which this Board is charged was carried out by the War and Navy Departments between 1919 and 1939 and embodied in an Industrial Mobilization Plan which, had it been placed in effect in December 1941, would have saved months of confusion and wasted effort befote a fairly satisfactory scheme of operation was devised. Why that plan was never utilized remains a secret.

All in all, I believe the National Security Act as amended provides for a set-up which is ponderous, over-organized, with too much power in the hands of one individual, yet which misses what should be the heart of the whole problem: civilian control and adequate civilian as well as military staffs on the War Plans Division—a staff that will ensure that if we are so unfortunate as to be involved in another war, it will be one that insures a more perfect peace.

Now a few words on the effect of the act on the Navy. Before and during the war, the Navy developed the most efficient, and united, force of naval vessels, marines, and aviation, that ever carried out military operations.

The plan of campaign was to move direct across the Pacific to the heart of Japan. Bases were seized at Kwajalein and Eniwetok in the Marshall Islands, then the long hop to Saipan and Guam and finally Okinawa. Working together like a Notre Dame football team, the submarines, surface vessels, and aircraft sank the enemy merchant marine, destroyed its surface navy, and practically all of its air force. Japan was helpless with no fuel oil for the few warships still left, no gasoline for planes, and no imports of food for her population. Her official surrender was only a matter of weeks. No invasion of her home-land was necessary, nor were the atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It was the most brilliant naval campaign in history. Also it was a magnificent example of a coordinated force—surface ships, submarines, the military represented by the marines, and the air force working together under a single command to a common end—the destruction of the naval and air power of Japan.

All of the many thousands of lives lost through disease and battle in the swamps of New Guinea and in the Philippines were sacrificed to no purpose since the enemy forces in those islands would have been forced to surrender when the homeland collapsed, as did those in China, Malaya, and Indonesia.

The success of the Navy in the Pacific was due to years of training and maneuvers following the First World War. The submarine force was a corps d'elite whose remarkable work was responsible for the de-

struction of the bulk of the enemy merchant marine.

Naval aviators were trained as naval officers first and aviators second. Their work was with the fleet in combined operations. They knew ships and how to operate with them in scouting and combat duties. During the years of peace they developed dive bombing, scouting tactics, and carrier operations to a high degree of perfection. It takes a skilled flyer to find his way back to his ship in thick weather at sea and land safely on a field 150 feet long, which in rough weather may be rising and falling 15 or 20 feet. Here are a few aviation statistics of the Pacific naval campaign:

1. Naval and Marine Corps planes destroyed 15,400 enemy planes.

2. Of the Navy's total score, 80 percent were destroyed by carrier-based planes.

3. Fourteen Japanese planes were shot down for one carrier-based plane lost.

4. United States carrier planes destroyed 5,649 Japanese aircraft on the ground.

The United States Marine Corps probably represents more fighting value per dollar expended than any other military force in the world. Their battles in the Pacific—the Solomons, Tarawa, Kwajalein, Saipan, Guam, Iwo, and Okinawa—prove that statement. The Corps has been in existence for 174 years. Prior to 1941 the Corps developed the landing craft and tactics for amphibious operations which were a major feature in the Pacific campaign.

The corps has an Air Force of highly trained aviators whose specialty is tactical operation during landings and afterward. They are also trained in carrier landings and fly from these vessels to the support of the marines when landing.

The Navy during the war and today have the most efficient body of officers and men manning its surface vessels of any time in its long and honorable history. Officers at an early age are placed in charge of intricate machinery and in command of submarines and destroyers costing millions of dollars. The greater part of the present officer corps has had war service to their credit, and this fact plus their acceptance of the responsibilities of command at an early age insures the Navy of an exceptionally able officer personnel for years to come.

A few months ago strange rumors came out of Washington. The Navy and its air arm were to be given as their function the protection of convoys and warfare against submarines. It had no need of large carriers. The Marine Corps was to be deprived of its aviation and restricted to guard duty at naval stations. Coming as they did, after the brilliant campaign in the Pacific, they caused consternation in the Navy, especially since there was considerable basis for the rumor.

It is common knowledge that the Army would like to see the Marine Corps reduced to corporals' guards at naval stations, or disbanded entirely. This feeling has existed since the First World War.

In September 1918 I returned to Washington from duty in London on Admiral Sims' staff. One of the tasks assigned me before leaving London was to see the Army Chief of Staff and request the shipment of the Sixth Brigade of Marines in France of a number of 7-inch tractor mounted guns that were available at Quantico. I explained the object of my visit and the need of the guns by the marines.

"These guns are for the marines?" he asked.

"Yes, sir."

"I will never have another marine in France."

The marines did not get their guns.

It is also common knowledge that the Air Force would like to absorb naval aviation, or, failing that, to see it reduced to the lowest possible limit.

In 1941, there were eight bills in Congress providing for a separate Air Force. Six of these bills provided for the inclusion in the Air Force of all naval aviation.

The cancellation of the contract for the construction of the large carrier last spring was mainly due, without doubt, to the objections of the Air Force who feared that such a vessel might encroach on their function of strategic bombing.

At any rate this crescendo of rumors, baseless or otherwise, resulted in the congressional investigation and the disclosure of reports of naval officers which would have gathered dust in the secret archives had they not been brought to light by means not included in the regulation book.

There is no doubt but that the disclosure of these reports and the testimony before the committee have brought into the open a situation that should be in the open. Wars are fought by the youth of the Nation and paid for by every taxpayer. Surely they should be entitled to information regarding the state of efficiency of the armed forces. And it is the youth of the Nation that will give their lives; if another war comes.

Furthermore, the charge of disloyalty directed against the naval officers who testified before the recent congressional committee has no basis. It is the duty of any conscientious officer to report situations which in his opinion are contrary to the national interest. His oath of allegiance is to the Constitution; not to personalities. When the Pentagon is manned with "yes-men," it will be a sad day for the Nation.

What will be the final result of the Security Act remains a question. There is no doubt but that it requires many changes to make it an effective instrument. There is also no doubt but that an organization which provides a square deal for each service without fear of discrimination will receive the wholehearted support of the Navy.

Furthermore, the organization of the armed forces must provide for the control of the war plan itself by the civilian authorities, if we are to avoid another total war which will result in the destruction of our civilization.

High Panama Canal Tolls Hurt Pacific Coast Shipping

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the present toll rates charged vessels passing through the Panama Canal are greatly in excess of the actual cost of operating and maintaining the Panama Canal and should be reduced.

Excessive toll rates are oppressive to our California intercoastal shipping and have brought a reduction in the volume of cargo handled at Los Angeles Harbor, as well as at all other Pacific coast ports, with the attendant loss of business and pay rolls.

The intercoastal shipping industry of California and the other Pacific Coast States is a vital factor in our national economy, as well as in our national defense. But high toll charges have caused a steady decline in our intercoastal merchant shipping.

I have received resolutions from many substantial organizations protesting the present rates and requesting that serious consideration be given to a reduction in Panama Canal toll rates based on the belief that the present tolls are a deterrent to intercoastal shipping, which is a valuable asset to the Pacific coast economy. The following are copies of the resolutions I have received from the California State Legislature, the San Francisco Chamber of Commerce, the board of directors of Marine Exchange, Inc., the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, the Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland, the Export Managers Association of San Francisco, and the Motor Truck Association of South California:

Senate Joint Resolution 1

Joint resolution relative to memorializing the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States, to reduce the tolls of the Panama Canal

Whereas vessels passing through the Panama Canal are now required to pay tolls which are greatly in excess of the cost of operating and maintaining the Panama Canal and are oppressive and destructive to the intercoastal shipping industry; and

Whereas such tolls have been a most important factor in reducing the number of privately owned vessels in the intercoastal shipping service from 170 before World War II to 18 at the present time; and

Whereas this decline in intercoastal merchant shipping has resulted in a corresponding reduction in the volume of cargo handled by all ports on the west coast of the United States with a consequent loss of business and pay rolls by the ports of California, Oregon, and Washington; and

Whereas a number of chambers of commerce and civic organizations have emphatically urged a reduction of Canal toll rates; and

Whereas an active and prosperous intercoastal shipping service is vital to national defense and the welfare of the Pacific coast: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and Assembly of the State of California (jointly), That the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of the Navy, and the Maritime Commission of the United States, are hereby respectfully memorialized and requested to take such steps as may be necessary to reduce Panama Canal tolls to fair and equitable rates which will encourage and stimulate intercoastal shipping; and be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of the senate be hereby directed to prepare and transmit copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the Secretary of the Navy, the Secretary of Defense, the Maritime Commission of the United States, the Chief of Naval Operations, the Congress of the United States, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each Senator and Representative from California in the Congress of the United States.

RESOLUTION OF THE SAN FRANCISCO CHAMBER OF COMMERCE RELATIVE TO PANAMA CANAL TOLLS ON COMMERCIAL SHIPPING

Whereas water-borne commerce is essential to the economic welfare of the San Francisco Bay area; and

Whereas 64 percent of all intercoastal and foreign-trade cargoes in all Pacific coast ports are subjected to tolls at the Panama Canal; and

Whereas only 20 percent of Gulf cargoes and 14 percent of Atlantic coast cargoes are subjected to such tolls; and

Whereas by means of the accounting practices at the Panama Canal, tolls on commercial shipping are based not only on the cost of providing Canal transit to commercial vessels, but also the cost of providing toll-free transit to Government ships; the cost of certain expense items at the Canal not related to the transit of commercial shipping; and a 3-percent annual interest charge on building funds; and

Whereas no such interest charges are made at the 12 other major, federally built canals in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That Congress is urged to develop a definite formula for computing tolls at the Panama Canal, based on these principles:

1. That tolls should reflect only the cost of providing transit to commercial ships—

(a) the cost of providing toll-free transits to Government ships should be eliminated as toll factors on commercial ships.

(b) the cost of certain dual-purpose items should be eliminated as toll factors, on an equitable division of such costs should be made in the case of those adjudged to be of service to both the national defense and commercial aspects of the Canal.

2. That as a minimum recognition of the national defense value of the Canal, no interest should be charged on building funds used.

That the president of the chamber of commerce is requested to furnish copies of this resolution to the President, the California delegation in the United States Congress, and to members of the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the Senate Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee.

Approved by the board of directors, San Francisco Chamber of Commerce.

M. A. HOGAN, *Secretary*.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY BOARD OF DIRECTORS, MARINE EXCHANGE, INC., SAN FRANCISCO, AT THEIR REGULAR MONTHLY MEETING ON NOVEMBER 8, 1949

Whereas bay area employment is largely dependent upon shipping operations in the various ports in the San Francisco Harbor; and

Whereas like other Pacific coast ports, nearly two-thirds of all cargoes moving across bay area docks pass through the Panama Canal and thus are in effect subjected to its tolls; and

Whereas the tolls are not based solely on the true cost of providing transit for commercial vessels through the Canal; and

Whereas free transits to Government ships, numerous quasi-Government activities, and a permanent, non-amortizing interest charge are all cost factors in establishing Canal tolls; and

Whereas no such interest charges and in fact no tolls are charged at 12 other Government-built canals in the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That tolls on commercial vessels at the Panama Canal should be based solely on the true cost of providing transit to commercial ships and that all building and operating expenses at the Canal properly allocable to the national defense should be so charged and should not be included in Canal tolls computation.

RESOLUTION OF SACRAMENTO (CALIF.) CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Resolution on Panama Canal tolls

Whereas the second economic development of ocean transportation is vital to the welfare of Sacramento and the northern California area; and

Whereas the Panama Canal is recognized to be vital as a national defense utility and to commercial shipping; and

Whereas it appears that the cost of certain governmental functions cannot rightly be considered to be part of those directly related to the transits of commercial vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce, Sacramento, Calif., recommends the establishment of a definite policy for assessing tolls on commercial shipping through the Panama Canal; such formula should be based solely on the cost of providing transit to commercial vessels; all expenses properly chargeable to the national defense should be so allocated and not be considered as factors in the tolls formula; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, to each member of the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and our Senators and Congressmen.

A. S. DUDLEY,
Secretary-Manager.

LOS ANGELES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
December 12, 1949.

Hon. GORDON L. MCDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN MCDONOUGH: The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce has adopted the following resolution:

"*Be it resolved*, That the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, fully cognizant of the value of the Panama Canal to the national defense and the importance of the Panama Canal to the economic welfare of the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach and the maritime industry, hereby goes on record:

"1. In favor of a reexamination of the costs and expenses arising out of the maintenance of the numerous civic, Government, and military activities in the Canal Zone which costs and expenses are presently viewed as reimbursable through toll charges; and

"2. In favor of a formula for the assessing of toll charges on all ships of every character on such basis as to equalize all proper operating expenses of the facility, including depreciation and interest on investment."

In the discussion resulting in the adoption of this resolution, the board considered many important facts; some of these are as follows:

1. Approximately 64 percent of all west coast cargoes in foreign and intercoastal trade are subject to Panama Canal tolls.

2. Such tolls are reflected in the general costs of shipping and therefore should be regarded as important to the economic welfare and growth of the maritime shipping industry.

3. The volume of cargo moving through the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach is vital to the prosperity and economy of the general public and business of this area.

4. The burden of inequitable costs and charges will have an adverse effect on the welfare of the community as well as that of the maritime industry.

5. It appears that the present financial operation of the Panama Canal places the cost burden for certain Government operations on commercial shipping.

There are several very important factors which should be considered in the operation of the Panama Canal. These factors are as follows:

1. Commercial shipping be charged only those costs directly assessable to the transits of commercial vessels.

2. The national-defense value of the Canal be recognized by the Congress.

3. A fair and equitable fomula be established for setting toll rates based on those considerations as well as—

(a) Elimination of the costs of toll-free Government transits as a factor in determining tolls on commercial ships.

(b) Unrelated Government functions should be eliminated as factors in arriving at tolls on commercial shipping.

The Board of Directors, by its resolution, does not propose the cancellation of these tolls and has no intention of creating an unfair competitive situation. Because of the importance of the Panama Canal to the Nation as a whole, and to the Pacific coast specifically, the Board has merely indicated that a policy should be followed which is fair and equitable to all concerned.

In the interest of the ports of Los Angeles-Long Beach, the maritime industry and the community generally, your serious consideration and careful attention to the matter will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely yours,

EARLE V. GROVER,
President, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce.

BOARD OF PORT COMMISSIONERS, CITY OF OAKLAND

Resolution B678

Resolution with respect to Panama Canal tolls

Whereas the Board of Port Commissioners of the City of Oakland is engaged in the operation of the municipal marine terminal facilities of that city, and the success of its operations is directly dependent upon the extent of ocean freight it can serve; and

Whereas the cost to commercial vessels in transiting the Panama Canal is a large factor in the movement of that freight; and

Whereas the tolls for the use of the Canal assessed against commercial vessels are inequitable and unduly burdensome: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That this board hereby urges Congress to enact legislation providing the basis for fixing tolls against commercial vessels using the Panama Canal do not include (1) the share of the cost of operation attributable to the transit of Government vessels, calculated on the basis of proportionate use; (2) interest charges on the cost of the construction of the Canal; and (3) not more than half the costs of carrying on governmental functions in the Canal Zone.

RESOLUTION OF THE EXPORT MANAGERS ASSOCIATION OF SAN FRANCISCO, DECEMBER 13, 1949

Whereas this association is vitally interested in the promotion and welfare of intercoastal and foreign water-borne commerce through the ports of San Francisco Bay; and

Whereas it appears that free transit to Government ships, numerous quasi-Government activities and a permanent, nonamortizing interest charge are considered as cost factors in establishing Panama Canal tolls against commercial vessels: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we believe that in the establishment of Panama Canal tolls for commercial shipping, consideration should be given to the exclusion from computation of such tolls, the expenses and costs of operations rightly chargeable to governmental functions and military defense, to the end that tolls may be established which are just and equitable charges on commercial water carriers.

A. E. OJEDA,
President.

RESOLUTION OF THE MOTOR TRUCK ASSOCIATION OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF.

Whereas the construction of the Panama Canal opened the transit of water-borne freight and passengers between the Atlantic and Pacific Oceans, and facilitated the

prompt and efficient movement of military vessels in the national defense; and

Whereas investigations have been made by the Congress from time to time to determine proper methods for administering the operation of the Canal and the apportionment cost thereof; and

Whereas it has been developed that since 1931 the national defense share of the capital cost has been so readjusted as to place the entire financial burden of the canal on commercial users; and

Whereas 64.2 percent of all tonnage paying canal tolls has been charged to Pacific tonnage, thus adding to the already heavy burden of costs imposed upon such water-borne traffic, necessitating increases in rates to meet the mounting costs, which the public is required to pay in the purchase of such tonnage; and

Whereas it is believed that a more equitable formula for the distribution of Canal costs should be arrived at under the following suggested policy:

1. Commercial shipping should pay only its own way, with tolls reflecting the true cost of providing transit for commercial vessels.

2. Interest should not be charged on funds used to build the canal. No interest or tolls are charged on the 12 other Federal-built canals. Panama Canal interest charges should be eliminated as a minimum acknowledgement of its national defense value.

3. All vessels of all types should pay tolls at the Canal. Government vessels now transit the Canal toll free.

4. Commercial shipping should pay through tolls no more than half the cost of dual-purpose expenses at the Canal. Military and civil-government activities should bear at least half: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the board of directors of the Motor Truck Association of Southern California, representing the major portion of the trucking industry handling water-borne commerce through the ports of southern California, That the Congress of the United States in considering the report of the Bureau of the Budget covering the within subject, take into consideration the matters submitted herein and act favorably upon the suggested policy hereinabove stated; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to each Member of the Congress from the State of California.

Coal Situation in New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, I have sent the following telegram to President Truman:

The coal situation in New England has reached a stage of emergency in the opinion of all in position to know the facts. Three days of operation each week is inadequate to care for normal winter demands and a serious cold spell due any time at this season of the year would bring on much unnecessary suffering. Dealers report to me that their supplies are shrinking rapidly. Many are now having difficulties supplying day to day needs, and unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering could develop almost overnight. I urgently request that you recognize the existence of this emergency and take immediate action under present law with proper authorities to avert what might develop into a serious situation.

I took this action following the receipt of various communications from constituents and others of which the following are typical:

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 30, 1949.

Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
United States Congressman,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: It is apparent to everyone in the coal business that 3 days per week operation at the mines does not furnish enough coal to take care of normal winter demands.

In the last few weeks, inventories in the hands of dealers have been shrinking very rapidly. With the advent of cold weather, many dealers will be entirely without coal. Unless action is taken immediately to assure adequate supplies from the mines, widespread suffering is apt to result.

I enclose copy of a letter sent to the President of the United States, which bears on this subject.

I hope that you will use your influence to secure action.

Very truly yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

NEW ENGLAND FUEL DEALERS ASSOCIATION,
Boston, Mass., December 29, 1949.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States of America,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: In the newspapers and on the radio last week, you were quoted as saying, in effect, that you would take the necessary action if the coal situation reached the emergency stage. I heartily approve of your determination to act, but I am afraid that we may differ as to what constitutes the emergency stage.

I am reminded of the story which we used to read when we were children about the little Dutch boy who discovered a hole in the dike through which the water was seeping from the ocean on the outside of the dike. He put his thumb in the hole and kept it there, effectively stopping the flow of water until others could come and repair the damaged dike. The little Dutch boy, while probably knowing that the amount of water flowing through the little hole of itself would do no great damage, realized that without immediate action on his part the hole would gradually grow until the water came through in torrents and the countryside would be flooded. The emergency existed although the immediate consequences were not great. If immediate action had not been taken, it is probable that the dike would have been demolished and irremedial damage caused.

The present emergency stage of the coal situation, of course, is much more advanced than that discovered by the little Dutch boy. Irremedial damage will soon be with us unless effective steps are taken immediately to prevent it.

An emergency exists, in my opinion, when current economic forces will bring widespread hardship and suffering unless curbed. It is not dependent upon the actual present existence of hardship and suffering.

Unless the present forces at play in the coal business are checked, it is inevitable that people will suffer from lack of heat, that factories will close from lack of fuel, and their employees thrown out of employment.

On behalf of the fuel dealers of New England and the people who are dependent, directly or indirectly, upon coal for their livelihood and comfort, I urge you to recognize immediately the existence of an emergency and to take such steps as will assure the people of an adequate supply of their vitally necessary fuel.

Respectfully yours,

J. L. JOHNSON,
President.

THE CARBON COAL & COKE CO.,
Boston, January 4, 1950.

Hon. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ANGIER: As a good lawyer, I thought you would be interested to see the list of "unfair practices" of John Lewis and the United Mine Workers, as listed in the petition which the Northern and Southern Coal Producers Associations have presented to General Counsel Denham of the NLRB. They are listed on page 2 of the enclosed bulletin.

Also is a column clipped from the Commercial Bulletin, of Boston, current issue, listing some of the results of Mr. Lewis' bad union leadership during the past year.

If there is anything that can be done to bring such monopoly unions under the Sherman antitrust law, it seems to many of us coal men that it should be taken up by Congress as promptly as possible. The present restrictions of the union seem very much like a conspiracy in restraint of trade.

With my best personal regards, I remain,

Sincerely yours,

L. F. LEIGHTON, *President.*

[From Bulletin No. 242 of the American Coal Sales Association, Washington, D. C., December 30, 1949]

NORTHERN AND MIDDLE WESTERN OPERATORS FILE CHARGES WITH NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD AGAINST UMWA

Late this afternoon eight operator associations filed charges of unfair labor practices against the United Mine Workers of America; namely, Indiana Coal Producers Association, Indiana Coal Operators Association, Ohio Coal Association, Northern West Virginia Coal Association, Western Pennsylvania Coal Operators Association, Virginia Coal Operators Association, Winding Gulf Operators Association, and Somerset County (Pa.) Coal Operators Association. The operator members of these eight associations mined, in 1948, in excess of 111,000,000 tons of bituminous coal.

The petition charges that the union is attempting, coercing, and forcing members of the association to enter into the "illegal" contract by strikes and partial strikes. The petition concludes by averring that the union has committed the following unfair practices:

1. It has insisted upon a collective-bargaining agreement containing the illegal clause requiring all miners to be or become members of the UMWA. The union has not petitioned the National Labor Relations Board nor has the Board conducted any election or have the majority of the employees voted in such an election to authorize the union to make an agreement embodying such a requirement. The union has forced this provision upon members of the association in the past despite its illegality.

2. The union has insisted on a contract provision with respect to the welfare and retirement fund which would limit the benefits of the fund to members of the union and require administration of the fund solely through local offices of the union in violation of the National Labor Relations Act.

3. The union insisted upon provisions which would extend benefits of a welfare fund to persons who have never been employees, and who are not members of the family or dependent upon persons who had been employees, of any of the employers who contributed to the fund. Such terms are illegal under the National Labor Relations Act.

4. The union's insistence upon the "able and willing" clause is a refusal to make a contract for a definite term and withholds the mutuality which is essential to the existence of a contract and denies to employers the benefits of collective bargaining in good faith.

5. The insistence by the union of the unrestricted memorial periods also withholds the mutuality which is essential in a contract and denies to the operators the benefit of good-faith collective bargaining.

6. The union has refused to make a new contract giving employers representation in the administration of the welfare and pension fund, but has insisted upon the right to designate all three trustees of such fund, and has thereby refused to bargain except on terms made criminal by the laws of the United States.

7. It has refused to bargain in good faith with authorized representatives of employers and has made offers of contracts to individual employers which it has not offered to the operators' committee.

8. The various meetings held by the union with the operators' committee were not serious efforts in good faith to bargain and reach an agreement.

9. Finally, the union has, through coercion, caused and attempted to cause the operators in the hiring of employees to discriminate against those not members of the union, despite the fact that no lawful agreement requiring membership in the union has ever been in effect.

[From the Commercial Bulletin, Boston, December 31, 1949]

A RECORD NOT TO BE PROUD OF

In 1949 the leadership for which coal miners pay high salaries was responsible for a $1,420,000 fine for lawbreaking. The miners paid.

The same leadership in March cost the miners 2 weeks' pay for a strike ordered to protest the appointment of James Boyd as Director of the United States Bureau of Mines.

It has failed to negotiate a new contract to replace the old one, expired June 30.

It put the miners on a 3-day week in midsummer with heavy loss in pay.

It called a second strike for 52 days which ended November 10.

It has dissipated the welfare fund—no coal mined, no 20-cents-a-ton royalty.

It insulted the head of the United States mediation service.

The current report of one of the leading coal companies for the 9 months ended September 30, 1949, shows that on a 5-day week basis from January 1 to November 9, the mines lost 82 days due to strikes. The loss in wages to the miners in this particular company for the period in question was $1,250 per union employee.

Labor leadership in the coal mines has kept them closed for long intervals for many years, and the miners' loss in wages has been enormous. Wages in other lines of business and industry have increased without disastrous strikes each year.

The United Mine Workers' long continued policy of insolence shows the lengths to which an uncontrolled monopoly will go to gain its ends.

It has forced hours, working conditions and wages on the coal industry, regardless of the laws of economics, that make it impossible for that industry under normal conditions to pay those wages and operate at a profit. That is part of the reason the coal industry is only employing 400,000 men and that is why it is losing a large percentage of the American fuel business that it used to have.

Labor rates, like other commodities, are supposed to be competitive. But coal mine labor rates under the United Mine Workers' monopoly are not. The product of the mines, however, must be sold in a highly competitive field. Thus UMW leadership is rapidly turning the coal business over to competitive fuels and destroying jobs of miners.

Dean Roscoe Pound Explains What the Bill of Rights Means to Us Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, during the recent recess of Congress, I had the privilege of attending a meeting of the Bill of Rights Commemorative Committee which was originated by Mr. Joe Crail, a nephew of the former Member of the House of Representatives from California, the late Honorable Joe Crail.

This meeting was known as the Freedom of Press and Speech luncheon, and was attended by prominent members of the press, radio, television, public officials, and civic leaders. The principal address was delivered by the illustrious Roscoe Pound, dean emeritus of Harvard Law School and visiting professor and dean of the law school at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Dean Pound's address is the most illuminating, intelligent, and logical I have ever heard on the origin and the present-day application of the Bill of Rights. I was unable to obtain a full transcript of his speech, but submit herewith a few of the pertinent highlights of the excellent speech made on this occasion by Dean Roscoe Pound. I am confident that all Members of the Congress will be better informed after reading the following excerpts from Dean Pound's address:

A bill of rights is a characteristic Anglo-American institution. Indeed, although it had its origin in Magna Carta and royal charters in medieval England, it has had its highest development as an effective guaranty of fundamental individual rights in the United States where it has behind it a Constitution as the supreme law of the land enforced by independent courts bound to deny effect to all infringements by it and to treat all infringements as actionable wrongs at suit of person injured thereby.

As far back as the thirteenth century it was pronounced that the King ruled under God and the law. In the fourteenth century when Edward III wrote a letter to a sheriff directing him not to execute a writ for seizing a person outlawed by the judgment by a court, the Court of King's Bench fined the sheriff for not executing the writ, issued a new writ, and said in effect that Edward, King of England, could pardon an offender by pardon under the great seal, but Edward Plantagenet could not interfere with the course of justice in the courts by a private letter to the sheriff.

In the seventeenth century contests between the courts and the Crown the common-law rights of Englishmen were firmly established as beyond royal power and in 1774 the American colonists, in the Declaration of Rights of the Continental Congress, claimed them as the birthright of Americans. They were guaranteed in the Virginia Bill of Rights in 1776 and have been guaranteed in bills of rights in the Federal and all State constitutions since.

It is instructive to compare these bills of rights with the continental European declarations of rights following the French Declaration of the Rights of Man of 1791. These latter have no independent judiciary behind them and give no power to injured individuals to invoke them against unconstitutional official action. They are only preachments; only exhortations to the executive or the legislative organs of government as to what they should do or not do. The constitution of the second French Republic committed enforcement of its provisions to the senate. At his coup d'etat Napoleon III, then President of the Republic, sent a body of soldiers to put out the Assembly which would not ratify the coup. The president of the senate read the constitution to them. But they were responsible to the executive which was the judge of its own powers, and the reading had no effect. The incident speaks for itself.

So long as the Constitution is upheld by independent courts as the supreme law of the land and the guaranties of the Bill of Rights are not frittered away or lose their hold on the people by spurious interpretation, freedom of the press and freedom of speech are secure. The danger to them today is twofold: (1) Growing disrespect for courts and a cult of force throughout the world; (2) weakening of the Bill of Rights by extending State guaranties to impossible undertakings to secure claims not enforceable by a legal order under a constitution. The staple argument by which dictators overthrow constitutions and come to power is that a constitution cannot and they can guarantee complete satisfaction of all human wants.

Thirteenth Annual Wildlife Restoration Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been invited to an event of great interest to conservationists—particularly sportsmen.

It is the thirteenth annual Wildlife Restoration Week, and it is described in the following announcement from the National Wildlife Federation to which I invite the attention of Members of Congress and others interested in wildlife conservation:

NATIONAL WILDLIFE FEDERATION ANNOUNCES THIRTEENTH ANNUAL WILDLIFE WEEK PLANS

America's thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, originally established by Presidential proclamation in 1938, will be observed this year during the week of March 19–25, under the sponsorship of the National Wildlife Federation.

Wildlife Week aims to focus the attention of 150,000,000 Americans upon the importance of wildlife conservation to their everyday life and the debt which they owe coming generations to help perpetuate our natural resources for future welfare and prosperity.

State, county, and local group meetings throughout the Nation will direct public

discussions of wildlife conservation through prudent management of America's natural resources, including water, soil, trees, and all other plant as well as animal life. Conservation-minded and public-spirited organizations participating will include sportsmen's associations, garden and nature clubs, and other adult and school groups.

Calling all lovers of the outdoors to take part in a Nation-wide conservation program, the National Wildlife Federation urges cooperation with State conservation officials, as emergencies may arise, in winter feeding of snowbound birds and animals to prevent suffering and losses through starvation.

Ever since Wildlife Week was inaugurated by the federation and recognized by proclamation of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1938, the federation has carried on a year-round conservation education program. The federation business office issues annually a series of wildlife conservation stamps, with descriptive albums for preserving them.

The distribution of these stamps during Wildlife Week and other times is a part of the education program of the federation. Proceeds from their sale are the organization's main source of income to carry on its wildlife programs. The 1950 series in natural colors includes 36 animal, bird, and plant subjects from the brush of Walter Weber of Vienna, Va., famed wildlife artist and former art consultant to the federation.

A nonprofit and nonpartisan organization, the National Wildlife Federation is composed of an estimated 5,000,000 members of affiliated community and county clubs and State wildlife federations.

Conservation studies initiated in 1938 resulted in concentration in the grade schools on teaching conservation. A series of four books, entitled "My Land and Your Land" is in wide use in grades 3 to 8. It is the federation's aim that these books will become an integral part of the Nation's school curricula. Series for junior high and high-school grades are in preparation.

During 1949 Man on the Landscape, by Vernon Gill Carter, was published by the federation's committee of conservation education. The author is head of the conservation department of the Zanesville, Ohio, schools. The book tells the story of a human being in relation to his land environment, and is designed primarily as a teacher's guide and textbook.

"Much responsibility for the control of erosion, floods, forest butchery, pollution, and declining living standards," says Mr. Carter, "rests on the parents and teachers of American youth." This statement has special emphasis during Wildlife Week.

As a clearinghouse for public as well as members' information on congressional legislation and administrative actions relating to conservation of wildlife and other natural resources, the federation issues Conservation News and Conservation Report. During the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, 53 reports were issued, totaling 480 pages and digesting 1,164 Senate and House bills, as well as reporting any actions taken on them. These bills also have been tabulated in a 34-page index.

During its existence, the federation has sponsored and supported legislation which is today basic in the administration of wildlife, such as the Pittman-Robertson Act, providing Federal aid to State wildlife restoration. The federation believes the time has come for legislation that will do for State fisheries restoration what the Pittman-Robertson Act has done in saving our game.

The average citizen can take part in Wildlife Week by attending community conservation meetings, reading wildlife literature, and purchasing wildlife stamps. These activities will inspire him to practice conservation every day of the year in such simple ways as, for example, extinguishing matches to prevent forest fires.

A musical feature of 1950 Wildlife Week will be the singing of favorite songs of the outdoors at conservation gatherings, aided by the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc., and its 30,000 members.

The Navy of the Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a copy of an address entitled "The Navy of the Future" made by Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, before members of the first class of the brigade of midshipmen, United States Naval Academy, Annapolis, Md., on Friday, December 2, 1949. In my opinion, Admiral Sherman's remarks display a penetrating and high-minded understanding of the functions of the modern Navy in this troubled world. Such remarks as his should do much for Navy morale and should dispel the doubts which some appear to have regarding the Navy's future.

The address follows:

THE NAVY OF THE FUTURE

The uppermost thought in the mind of every man here, at one time or another, has been: "What are my chances for a successful career in the Navy?"

I make no exceptions, when I say "every man here." Some of us wrestled with that question 30 years ago. So must it have been with the officers and midshipmen of 1899, of 1866, and even of 1815.

I must say to you at the outset, that the young men in the Navy today face a greater challenge, and are confronted by greater opportunities than any of their predecessors in the indispensable service whose uniform we wear.

Times have changed since the days of the frigate, but the necessity for a Navy is as vital to the Nation as it was in the time of Stephen Decatur. That necessity will endure as long as humanity survives on continents separated by oceans. And as long as the necessity exists, just so long will the Navy offer its officers an honorable career, a career of opportunity limited only by the ability and determination of the young man who enters it. I need not tell you that it is not an easy life; that the material rewards are often not adequate to the sacrifices, toil, and devotion to duty required. You took that all into consideration when you accepted your midshipman's warrant.

It seems to me that midshipmen at the Naval Academy are in many ways better fitted to view the future of the United States Navy with complete objectivity than are older officers in mid-career, or nearing the end of their service. There are reasons why, at this time, I should be seeking your guidance, instead of offering advice to you. Midshipmen are, in many ways, closer to the glorious history of our service, to its traditions, and to its ideals, than we who have grown gray wearing the Navy's blue and gold. You are certainly less marked by events of recent years which tend to obscure the broad view of the future—and also of the past from which the future must be appraised.

The physical Navy is ever changing and always evolutionary. Its officers have maintained throughout its existence, ideals and standards which have changed but little. Our high traditions of loyalty, service, and devotion to duty will always be upheld. However, the ships in which we serve and the weapons with which we fight have changed continuously. We can be certain that they will continue to change. Technological developments during any long peace will change the art of war at sea and the character of the fleets we need.

The conclusion of nearly every war in our history has produced not only the same contraction in naval strength necessary to peacetime economy which some of us tend to overemphasize and misinterpret today, but also recurring gloomy prophecies that the Navy itself will become obsolete. Thus it was when we scrapped the 1816 program of sailing ships of the line. Thus it was when ironclads and torpedoes made our great Civil War fleet obsolete. When after the First World War we scrapped not only our older battleships, but also seven new battleships and four battle cruisers, it was claimed that the airplane had sounded the death knell of surface warships. Earlier the same had been claimed for the submarine. Yet, during the Second World War, we had to build, man, and take into battle greater fleets of surface ships and greater numbers of naval aircraft than the world had ever envisioned. Today—and tomorrow—and as far ahead as we can see, the airplane and the submarine, and for that matter guided missiles and atomic energy, which have been claimed to mark the end of great navies, will in fact increase naval requirements and result not only in survival but also further development of fighting ships.

Our Navy finished the war with a great fleet in which the aircraft carrier had become the ship of the line, and the battleship a supporting ship for the carrier task group or for shore bombardment. We had more of every useful type of ship and aircraft than could possibly be kept active. We have carefully moth-balled most of this victorious Navy. This has given us a reserve fleet so large that there is some question as to our ability to maintain it without expenditures which will prevent maintaining an adequate active fleet. We have a shore establishment so large that it absorbs funds needed to maintain combat forces in being.

Furthermore, although our ships are new and powerful, they steam through an age of change. We can be very proud of our active ships spreading America's influence around the world. Ship for ship, they far excel the ships of other nations and are the envy of other navies.

But without progress they will not long remain superior. We live in an age of tremendous change. The atom has been split, airplanes roar through the sonic barrier, metals have been transmuted. Like all else in life, our Navy must move forward, must keep up to date or slowly die.

We must shape our future Navy in the light of the lessons of the past and the indications as to future needs. We must take into account the lessons of Hiroshima, Nagasaki, Bikini, and Eniwetok. We must consider the implications of the revelation of Soviet developments in the field of atomic explosions. We must consider the significance of guided missiles and of the feasibility of conducting very long-range bombing in connection with the results of bombing in the last war.

We must remember that in two wars we and our allies have suffered heavy losses from enemy submarines and that much development has taken place in submarines and

more is to be expected. We must make certain that every practicable means is exploited to make the Navy fully ready to defeat a third attempt to deny us the use of the sea by undersea warfare. At the same time, we must be prepared to prevent aircraft from denying us the use of the sea. Our naval counter measures against both the submarine and the aircraft must include striking them at their bases as well as local defense against them.

While we should not adhere blindly to the weapons of the past, it is well to remember that although men thought that Jutland would be the last great sea battle we had nearly 30 years later to fight the great battles of Midway, the Philippine Sea, and Leyte Gulf. Men thought that the advent of aircraft, of coast defenses, machine guns, and automatic weapons had made great amphibious operations impracticable, yet this same generation lived to see the greatest amphibious operations in history. Despite every opposition, we moved great armies over long distances, landed them on hostile shores, and supported them as long as support was needed. We must always move forward, but we must move sanely, grasping the strength of the future, holding the useful from the past.

Within a sound national economy there must be provided airborne and amphibious troops, soldiers and marines; there must be an Air Force capable of defending our vital centers against attack, capable of striking our enemies at great distances, and capable of effectively supporting the Army and the Navy. There must be a Navy strong enough to control the seas which separate us from our potential enemies.

Our country is fortunate in being in effect an island power. As long as we control the sea we cannot be attacked except by airborne weapons, and we can attack any target within reach of the aircraft and other weapons which we carry in our ships. We can establish and maintain our troops and land-based air power in positions from which they can operate effectively.

The seas are cushions of distance which protect us against our enemies. They are also avenues through which we can project and support our joint military power. The seas enable us to apply relatively small forces and yet achieve superiority in critical areas of our own choosing, and to give visible and substantial support to our national interests and national policies.

Ability to control the seas and the airways which cross the seas is essential to our security, and to our struggle to prevent any hostile power from so dominating all of Europe, Asia, and Africa as to menace our survival. Our national security, I repeat, requires that we maintain a balanced team of fighting services and you may be sure that the Navy is and will be a vital element in the fighting team—a vital necessity in our national life.

My belief in the future of the Navy is shared by everyone who objectively ponders the security of the United States. In his very recent but already important book, Modern Arms and Free Men, Dr. Vannevar Bush has this to say:

"The mission of the Navy will be as important, and as difficult, as it ever has been in history. It will need to employ modern techniques to the utmost, and in ample quantity." And, again, "The days of the Navy are not over, nor are its missions less essential. We are a power in the world and we intend to exert that power, if need be, far from our shores to support our friends and strike an enemy where he is the most vulnerable. * * * We shall still need to sweep enemy forces from the seas, whether they are under its surface or above it."

In those quotations you have the opinion of probably the best-informed civilian on military matters today. I can assure you that similar beliefs are deeply rooted in the American people and are held also by the responsible heads of our Government. Do not be misled by the moaning of the perennial pessimists nor the partisan propaganda of proponents of other programs.

That leads me to a topic which is made more important by the realization that a number of you are destined to serve in the United States Air Force.

It would be less than realistic not to take cognizance of the conflicting views of the services with respect to their responsibilities for national security which have been aired since the end of the war, and particularly in recent months. Differences in professional opinion are to be expected, and with the strong characters required in military leaders, sharp conflicts are apt to occur. Adequate presentation of such opinions is healthy if kept within proper bounds, but never forget that we are all striving for a common goal—the preservation of our country, our freedom, and our national way of life. When our beliefs and professional advice have been adequately presented—on any level of command or responsibility—it is then our duty to carry out the decisions of our superiors without equivocation or evasion. This is particularly necessary in the case of decisions by the civil authorities in whom the ultimate responsibility rests.

We in the Navy must aid and support our sister services, and we have a right to expect them to aid and support us in maintaining the essential naval elements of the national defense.

We often hear the question, "Why do we need a powerful Navy in peacetime?" The answer, of course, is that if we need a Navy in wartime, we have to have one in peacetime. A navy can't be conjured into being by a Jason sowing dragon's teeth. The question is sometimes elaborated in these terms: The Japanese and German fleets are destroyed; the British will always be our allies; the Russian fleet is relatively small; why then spend three or four billion dollars a year on the maintenance of a powerful United States Navy?

You young gentlemen know as well as I how specious that question is. All we have to do is go back to General Marshall's statement in his final report, as follows:

"Oceans are formidable barriers, but to the nation enjoying naval superiority, they become highways of invasion."

It is essentially the Navy's job in wartime to keep the conflict remote from our own shores, and to deliver the Nation's fighting strength overseas. These are still our principal functions, although not an enemy surface vessel be on the high seas.

But that question ignores a very patent fact, which is that our principal potential enemy does in truth possess a very powerful Navy designed for its own unique geographical situation. A self-contained military power, already in possession of the bulk of two continents and with the potential possibility to envelop and occupy the territory adjacent, has no need for extended lines of sea communications. Its naval problem differs radically from our own. Our business, in a war with such a power, would be to get at the enemy with speed and in strength, while at the same time keeping open the sea-lanes upon which we depend. Our possible opponent, on the other hand, would seek to prevent us from transporting our military strength across the ocean, and to cripple that strength by denying to the United States essential overseas trade.

For the foreseeable future, the fast carrier task force will be the principal offensive striking element in our fleets—the core of their offensive power, available to strike far from our own bases and to cover and support the operations of other services. This force gives us the power to move wherever we choose against enemy shores, while denying the enemy that same freedom of operation against us. This force is essential to all naval operations. The composition of our fast carrier force must, however, be so adjusted as to bring into balance the expenditures for procurement, maintenance, and operations in the fields of personnel, ships, and aircraft. This is a complex problem on which we are working.

Amphibious operations will continue to play an important part in the Navy of the future. Tactics and techniques will change and equipment will be improved. The availability of weapons of mass destruction, such as an atomic bomb, will exert a profound influence, but they will not change the fundamental necessity in war for moving men and material into overseas positions. They will not reduce the benefits that control of the sea brings in permitting selection of time and place of attack while forcing on the enemy overwhelming defensive commitments. We may expect a highly coordinated and highly flexible use of both airborne and amphibious elements. We must develop speed in preparation, speed in the movement to the objective, and speed in getting troops and supplies ashore and dispersed. Heavy concentrations on the shore line will have to be avoided by speed and dispersal, by the use of separated attack points and by greater use of preliminary infiltrations.

The development of atomic bombs will actually increase the requirement for overseas operations and overseas bases, and will therefore increase the need to maintain in the fleet an amphibious task force and to develop greater skill in its employment.

Besides the fast carrier and amphibious task forces, you may expect to find in the fleets a third type of task force—the antisubmarine task force in recognition of the seriousness of the submarine threat and our major responsibility for insuring the safe movement of men and supplies by sea.

There actually exist in the world today two very powerful navies with opposite and therefore intensely conflicting missions. That we have aircraft carriers and the other naval power has none, that we have a large amphibious force and the other naval power has only a collection of small landing craft, are unacceptable arguments for diminution of American fleet strength. That the other power has a submarine force larger than ours is a potent argument for the United States to possess, not an equal number of submarines, but antisubmarine naval elements of great effectiveness.

These must be so constituted as to permit attacking the submarine by every possible means, not only in our coastal waters and the high seas, but in the enemy coastal waters and bases themselves. Our antisubmarine task force may thus include fast carriers in conjunction with surface and submarine guided missile ships for attacking bases. It might include special raider amphibious units for demolition of bases. It will require hunter-killer teams of submarines, surface ships, and many types of airplanes and blimps. It will require powerful convoy escorts and coastal defense forces especially against submarines firing guided missiles into our cities.

We do not today need to match an enemy naval force type for type, because our probable function is not to resist invasion, but to support military operations overseas. Tomorrow it may be different, and always we must clearly understand the great necessity for a powerful peacetime Navy is the need to have it ready for war. It also has a continuing and a salutary function in the retardation—if not the prevention—of war. A strong navy, by virtue of its mobility, is a potent factor in upholding United States foreign policy. Naval forces have been truly defined as the precision tools of diplomacy. Unlike armies or airplanes, the Navy can traverse the globe without trespassing upon the sovereignty of any nation. As a decisive deterrent to piecemeal aggression, the United States Navy has amply justified its existence in the last 2 years alone.

At that, however, the Navy has been but the visible projection of a tremendous strength in military power and manpower—the latter both militarily and industrially. It could not do the job alone. I sometimes regret that the entire American public is not as aware of the power for peace that our Navy exerts as are the people of Europe. The aircraft carriers, cruisers, destroyers, and marines which have operated in the Mediterranean during the past 3 years have been essential factors in the maintenance of peace and stability in the area. The Mediterranean people know and appreciate our naval strength. Many of our own people do not. If the American Navy is allowed to languish and deteriorate, it will largely be the fault of us, the articulate Navy, for not presenting these facts and our needs more convincingly. Incidentally, one of the best ways to insure the continuance of our vital part in the national defense structure is to demonstrate not only our individual importance but also our ability to work with the sister services as an integrated team.

The three fighting services must become a single versatile team with the single purpose of the security of our country. It is our business, in that team, to shape the country's naval forces so they contribute their maximum to the total fighting strength of the Nation. It is our sacred duty to translate into a maximum of useful fighting power the appropriations given us for that purpose, to take full advantage of every available scientific and technological development to do our specific job as perfectly as human ability permits, and to help our sister services to conclude their tasks as we expect them to help us. It is our duty, too, to prune from the Naval Establishment every component that does not contribute in dollar value to our actual or potential combat strength in those definitive terms.

The Navy is a big business. As such it must be prudently operated, and must have competent administrators in its officer corps. There is no one commercial concern whose business affairs approach the Navy in scope, diversity, or complexity. During the fiscal year, 1949, the Navy had over 524,000 contracts with industry, of a total value of $2,000,000,000. Over 2,000 persons in the Navy were wholly employed in that time with purchasing alone.

The money spent by the taxpayers for their Navy is not just an insurance premium, paying off manyfold in war, but returns to swell the national wealth and augment the national income. Navy personnel work intimately with leaders of all fields of activity and endeavor, from agriculture to the pure sciences, from medicine to machine shops.

The identical developments which superficial thinkers argue spell the Navy's obsolescence are the essential ingredients of the greater Navy of the future. Whether they be guided missiles, supersonic aviation of hitherto incredible ranges vertically and horizontally, noiseless high-speed submarines which never need to surface except for replenishment, or atomic missiles—they are all implements which the Navy now and in the future must be prepared to employ, and also combat.

What does this mean to you, individually and collectively? It may appear that you are being pushed, willy-nilly, into specialization; that no individual can hope to gain proficiency in a profession which has so many facets. Not so. You are required first to be naval officers. There is never an excess of the all-round, highly competent combat officer. But for the individual with special interests or special talents, each technological advance offers a new route for advancement in the naval profession. I could give you innumerable examples of officers whose promotion has been accelerated by specialization; I could also give innumerable examples of officers whose promotion has been accelerated by maintaining a thorough grasp of the broader aspects of the naval profession.

All of you are aware of, and some of you may have been unduly impressed by, the headlines which announce drastic reductions in the Navy in the fleet and in personnel. Remember this, however: We are still in the process of contracting a wartime Navy to one consistent with the national economy, and the Nation's peacetime requirements. But when completed, the contraction will give us a Navy very much larger and more diversified in its functions than this country has ever before possessed in peacetime. It will still be small enough, of course, for the duties and responsibilities placed on its ships. In our generation we have witnessed profound changes in world powers. Swiftly the United States has moved to world leadership with all the great obligations inherent therein. Not the least of these is control of the seas; nor is the least part of this problem the incorporation into the Navy both for offense and defense the incredible technical advances that have made modern navies tridimensional.

Consider this also. So insistent are the requirements of the transitional Navy of today and the Navy of the immediate future, that the United States Naval Academy is not able of itself to meet all the officer needs of the Naval Establishment.

The challenge, then, is to you. It is not so much a question of "What does the Navy offer me today?" as "What have I to offer the Navy?"

What have you to offer the Navy in, say, the primary field of endeavor of the seagoing line officer, or in such specialties as logistics, law, aviation, submarines? Numbers of you will elect the Marine Corps for your career, where specialization and integration, paradoxically, are both of the essence. You will find that the outstanding characteristic of the Marine Corps will always be, as it is today and always has been—readiness. Readiness to go anywhere, at any time, to do any job. In the Marines, the Nation truly has a force in constant readiness.

Recently there has been added to the Navy's responsibilities, the function of sea transport for all the armed services. The Military Sea Transport Service may seem like humdrum duty in peacetime, but it will give many officers valuable sea experience, acquaintance with foreign ports, and a more thorough knowledge of shipping problems than we have had heretofore. Should war come, it will be responsible for the delivery overseas of troops and supplies for all our fighting forces and will become a combat element of great importance.

Whether it be in fighting on the sea, under the sea, or over the sea with the fleet, fighting on land with the marines, transporting the fighting men, or laboring behind desks to keep the combat forces equipped with all they need—our Nation in the crisis of war will need every one of you, and 10 more as near like each of you as can be obtained. None of us looks forward to the catastrophe of war with eager anticipation, but there is no more noble a profession than that of the man who dedicates his life to be ready—amply ready—when his Nation's existence depends upon his skill to meet that catastrophe, to confine it and to resolve it in victory.

If you are to be ready you must perfect yourself in every duty assigned. You must learn the art of command by seeking opportunities to lead, and by observing carefully the methods of successful leaders. You must cultivate a philosophy of loyalty and objectivity, must develop tolerance and understanding of human attributes, and never forget that you are learning to command men—not material. You must cultivate the ability to work with others within your ship, within the fleet, within the service, and as between the services. You must be guided by faith in our country and its free institutions.

The Navy has a glorious future. Those who serve in it have glorious opportunities to contribute to the national welfare both in peace and in war. The Navy may be a stern taskmaster, make many demands on us, and be less than tolerant of serious shortcomings, but in it may be found a life of satisfaction—a life so attractive that those who leave it carry with them, more often than not, a never-ending nostalgia for the service and its ways.

In peace and in war, the officers of the Navy must serve their country unselfishly and faithfully. By our industry, our loyalty, our self-discipline, we must set an example to those who serve under us. We must also set an example to every American in the responsibilities of citizenship.

I envy those of you who will carry on and shape the Navy of the future. You will have a life of fascinating interest, of self-respect, and of achievement. To you, I present the Navy of the future in terms of opportunity unlimited.

Why a Worthless Income Under Inflation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, there are many countries under inflation that have paid wages far in excess of $12,000 incomes to its individual workers. The money, however, had no purchasing power so that the people who received it were on a starvation basis. It is not what the people receive in money—it is what the money will buy. Under the wasteful, extravagant, boondoggling program of the Truman administration our dollar will depreciate so that even the President's $50,000 exemption would not buy a ticket to the beaches in Florida.

Under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which appeared in one of the outstanding newspapers in my district, the Olean (N. Y.) Times-Herald of January 7, 1950:

THAT $12,000 INCOME

Vern Croop, the head of the Gannett News Service Bureau in Washington, has a most illuminating dispatch from the National Capital on this page today.

His theme is just what President Truman did not say in his state of the Union message; and it is a most intriguing theme, too.

But one thing the President did say probably has been engaging the attention of a great many of our citizens to an unusual degree.

Most of us—human nature being what it is—like money. The more we can put our paws on, the more we are pleased. Money is the root of all evil; but it also comes in very handily in buying groceries, clothing the children, buying furniture and gasoline and a thousand and one other things. Even the churches would close without money.

So that when the President solemnly holds out the lure—and we think we have used the right word there—that in another 50 years' time the "real income" of the average American family (that takes in the vast majority of us) would be $12,000 a year or better, it is

only to be expected that a lot of people would ejaculate: "Suffering ducks! Is it possible?" or something to that effect.

And they have a perfect right to be startled.

For most of us have never experienced a "real income" of $12,000 a year; and never expect to.

It's a lot of money; and it is an interesting procedure to speculate on what the average family would do if it had $12,000 a year coming in.

Sounds wonderful, doesn't it?

But we're always a little suspicious of such things; and we have that pesky habit of trying to figure just how they would work out if put into actual practice. For if they don't work out in actual practice—well, that's the end of them.

Well, let's try and think this thing through.

Suppose the working force of any business you can name were in receipt of a wage around $12,000 a year, what would the cost of its product have to be in order to keep going and make a profit—for if there isn't a profit there won't be any keeping going.

Suppose, for instance, that the packing houses of the country paid their vast working forces $12,000 a year—or better—what would a pound of sausage or a can of corned beef hash cost?

If the automobile industry were to pay such wages, what do you think the price of new cars would be?

What do you think a newspaper would have to charge for its advertising and for its subscription rates?

Oh, well, some enthusiast might respond, if we all had that amount of money coming in we would not care what things cost?

No?

Do you think we would sell anything to any other country with manufacturing costs at such a level?

Would we not have to put up abnormal tariff walls around our country in order to keep cheaper foreign-made goods out and prevent them from putting our own industry out of business?

And if we kept all foreign goods out, and did not sell any of our own abroad, where would we land within a very short space of time?

You're right, brother; we would land back on solid earth with such a thud that it would take us a long, long time to get the jar out of our systems and be able to function normally again.

And that process might be very, very painful.

But apparently, we still have people in this country who are convinced that there will be always more where that came from, that the sky's the limit, that there's no need to save and be thrifty, that a beneficent government will provide this and that, and that everything in the national garden will be perfectly lovely—even to the extent of the average family receiving a real income of $12,000 a year or better."

Isn't it about time we snapped out of it?

The Problem of Federal Grants-in-Aid and Federal Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, time and again I have referred on the floor of the Senate to the crucial problem of increasing Federal intervention in State and local affairs. Tied up with that problem of Federal centralization is the interrelated problem of Federal grants-in-aid and Federal taxes. I have suggested that the only way to end the duplication of power and taxes and the increasing centralization of functions in Washington, is to pass legislation, of which I am a cosponsor, to set up a little Hoover Commission to analyze the status of Federal-State-local relations.

Throughout my own State of Wisconsin, as I have previously reported, there is an increasing discussion on this issue of Federal grants, taxes, and powers. Some of the ablest newspaper columnists in Wisconsin have devoted many columns to this subject and have enabled our State to be among the leaders in seeking a solution to this problem.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of two of the ablest write-ups, in my opinion, on this subject. One is a copy of a write-up by Mr. John Wyngaard, of Madison, as published in the Janesville Daily Gazette of Friday, January 6; and the other is a column published some time earlier in the Wisconsin State Journal by Mr. Sanford Goltz.

There being no objection, the articles referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Janesville (Wis.) Daily Gazette of January 6, 1950]

UNDER THE CAPITOL DOME—INDEPENDENCE OF STATE AGENCIES IS SHRINKING UNDER FEDERAL AUTHORITY

(By John Wyngaard)

MADISON.—There is an adage in folklore, about the rule that he who hires the fiddler calls the tune. The State government has become aware of that ancient saying. Federal financial intervention in State services has grown steadily, and with the Federal cash windfalls has come increasing Federal control. In some State agencies independence of action and State sovereignty are almost theoretical today.

After years of silence on the subject, there is today an increasing study of Federal subsidies and their effect in local government. The Wisconsin Taxpayers' Alliance recently analyzed the Federal aids that accounted for 16 percent of all State expenditures during the last fiscal year. The flow of Federal dollars also was given prominent display in the annual report of State Budget Chief E. C. Giessell.

THE EFFECT

The Alliance report always is judicious and careful. In the current issue the Alliance observes that "Federal aid funds must be spent according to the pattern and rules laid down by the Federal Government," and that when State funds are used to match the Federal hand-outs, the Federal rules also determine how the State tax dollar is spent.

Thus is the budgeting authority of the State legislature, and its responsibility, gradually being chipped away. The Federal funds are not budgeted by the State's own elected lawmakers. They are sent into particular departments for designated purposes. The effect, moreover, is to reduce legislative authority over the disposition of funds matched out of the State treasury.

The Washington rules also apply to the actual administrative details of the subsized programs. There are many irritants in these "directives" from the remote Potomac for State officers, but they rarely complain because they want the flow of Federal dollars to continue. They suspect, and some of them have learned, that it is infinitely easier to apply for money to Washington than to persuade locally elected lawmakers to provide it. In the designing of roads, the hiring of personnel, the promulgations of standards, hours of work and many other details, the decisions and the rules are made by Washington, in an ostensibly sovereign State government.

The proportion of State and Federal money that is contained in some State department budgets suggests how limited State authority must be. About four-fifths of all the money spent by the industrial commission comes from Washington. About half of all the dollars spent by the board of health are Federal aids. About two-thirds of the budget of the State board of vocational education comes from the National Government, although the agency is peculiarly a Wisconsin development.

ALTERNATIVE

Wisconsin citizens are paying out millions in Federal taxes that are being returned to Wisconsin to pay for local governmental services.

Governor Dewey, of New York, who has made frequent representations about the threat to the integrity of the States, proposes that the National Government abandon the numerous excise taxes it now levies and allow the States to use such sources of revenue to pay for public expenditures that now receive Federal aids.

It is likely that if Wisconsin were to get its per capita share of Federal excise taxes now being sent to the Federal tax collectors, it could comfortably finance all of the Federal aid programs now operative according to its own rules and wishes, and according to local needs. Then would the Wisconsin State government be independent and sovereign according to the original meaning of the Constitution. At the present rate, the Federal tax dollar will become a gradually increasing factor and State responsibility finally will be stultified.

[From the Wisconsin State Journal]

UNDER THE DOME

FEDERAL HAND-OUTS TANGLE TAX PICTURE

(By Sanford Goltz)

A rising tide of Federal grants-in-aids to State governments—practically doubled in 2 years and still on the increase—is being pointed to by the council of State governments with something resembling alarm.

Resisting money from Washington is a rather uncommon occurrence, and probably will continue to be. But the State governments group has a reason for its concern.

"If the upward trend of Federal aid continues," a special council committee that has been studying the subject commented this week, "there is little likelihood that any considerable tax reduction will occur in fields suitable for State and local taxation.

"If the States and localities are to regain some of the tax sources preempted by the Federal Government, it is essential that Federal tax reduction be accomplished, and this is dependent upon a substantial reduction in Federal expenditures."

In 1948 the Federal Treasury put out just about a billion and a half dollars to the States, either for use by them or for distribution to their political subdivisions. Two years earlier the amount was $770,700,000, roughly half as much.

For Wisconsin, Federal aids for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1947, added up to $23,600,000. For the year ended last June 30, the figure was $38,811,000.

Next year, the total is expected to be $44,600,000, and for the 1950–51 fiscal year, $46,300,000.

The council's study showed that for fiscal year 1947, Federal grants-in-aid averaged just over $8 per person. They ranged from a low of $4.22 in New Jersey to $34.85 in Nevada.

In Wisconsin the Federal money was the equivalent of $6.72 per person, putting it thirty-eighth in rank in amount of aid received although the State ranks twentieth in per capita income and twentieth in amount of Federal taxes paid.

The variation in Federal aid from State to State is largely explained by differences in their welfare programs, which account for more than half the aid payments.

Public-assistance aids, including payments and administration of old-age assistance, aid to dependent children, and aid to the blind, are paid federally in proportion to what the State and local units of government will contribute. Higher contributions there mean more Federal money.

Federal aids for highways, the second most important aid in size, goes to the States on the basis of total area. Figured that way, Nevada got $24.40 per capita, while Wisconsin got less than a dollar, and little Rhode Island wound up with 12 cents.

The council may be overhopeful in looking to Washington for lower spending so that the State and local taxing units can be given a little more leeway in its tax choices.

If it could be done, for instance, there's no doubt that most States would be glad to have the Federal gasoline tax of a cent and a half wiped out, leaving that field entirely to the State.

Those States that wanted to raise the equivalent of Federal highway aids could boost their State gas taxes to do it, and have complete say-so on where the money was used.

There are not many fields, however, where the idea of cutting Federal taxes at the price of lost Federal grants would be popular. Many Wisconsin legislators undoubtedly would balk at boosting the State budget by the $15,000,000 or more a year that Federal old-age assistance grants alone run to—although there, too, Wisconsin would be the gainer if the Federal tax bite here were reduced thereby.

It still remains to be seen if the States mean it when they say now and then, that they don't want all that Federal money.

Address by the President at the Samuel Gompers Centennial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief extemporaneous address delivered by the President of the United States, at Hotel Statler, Washington, D. C., on January 5, 1950, before the assembled guests who were celebrating the birthday of Samuel Gompers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The PRESIDENT. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Vice President, members of this big organization, I have been at my House all evening working on two more messages on the state of the Union. [Applause.] One of them, the economic message is ready, it is going down tomorrow. [Laughter.] Then I have one that is creating a great deal of conversation, known as the Budget Message. [Laughter.] Everybody thinks they know all about it but me, and I am the only one who knows all the figures in it. [Laughter.] But I was sitting there thinking about this celebration in honor of one of labor's greatest statesmen, and I could not stay away. [Applause.] I knew that anything I would say would be a surface remark after the Vice President and Matthew Woll and William Green had paid a tribute to the great Samuel Gompers, but I wanted you to understand that I remember him distinctly as an originator of the great movement that set labor free. [Applause.] And I wanted to come here and pay tribute to him. I remember when he passed away. It was back in 1924, the year in which I was defeated for reelection. They have never succeeded in doing that to me since. [Applause.]

I was one of Samuel Gompers' great admirers when I was a very young man on the farm. Everybody in that day and age considered him a labor statesman. He was not only a labor statesman in a bipartisan sense, but he was just as good a Democrat as I ever was. [Applause.] I remember very distinctly he supported Woodrow Wilson when Woodrow Wilson needed support worse than anything he ever needed in his life. That was when California decided the election for Woodrow Wilson in 1916. [Applause.]

Samuel Gompers made a great contribution to the welfare of this great Nation of ours, and I consider it a very high honor that Mr. Green and the men who are conducting this meeting tonight should ask me to come here and pay this very slight tribute to one of the greatest labor leaders who ever lived. I thank you for the privilege. [Applause.]

Recognition of Communists in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "We Needn't Follow Britain," from the Greenville (S. C.) News of January 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE NEEDN'T FOLLOW BRITAIN

As had been widely forecast the British Government is moving to accord full diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime in China and to cease to recognize Chiang's Nationalists.

The action follows similar moves by other British Commonwealth countries; and it must be acknowledged that it marks a rift, or at least a pronounced divergence, between America and Britain over this phase of policy in the Orient.

Britain, of course, is no less opposed than before to communism, but the British statesmen take what they regard as the practical attitude that nothing would be gained by "boycotting indefinitely a Government ruling over a vast territory and population."

But we dare say Britain's desire to safeguard the huge British investments in China and to maintain and expand trade with China is really at the bottom of the apparent British haste to get on good diplomatic terms with the Red regime.

But if Britain is moved by these economic considerations to be so prompt to extend the diplomatic hand to the Chinese Reds there is no corresponding reason why this country should be in any haste to follow suit.

On the other hand there is very good reason why this country should hold itself aloof from this Red Chinese regime for an indefinite time. We have nothing to gain by rushing to extend the "hand of diplomatic fellowship" to it. The Chinese—any Chinese governmental regime—wants a lot more from the United States than we could possibly want from them, or it. We can very well wait to let them make the approaches and we have no reason to be eager to shake hands.

Maybe we shall eventually feel that this regime is sufficiently well established to merit our diplomatic recognition, on the same basis that we recognize well-established governments in Russia and other Communist countries.

But we might as well make it clear in our current policy that we are not currying any favors from this Red regime in China and that on the other hand we still stand ready to give assistance to any soundly based movement in China to achieve a really democratic government that will seek sincerely to serve the people's welfare.

Let Britain, if she will, act with eagerness for "trade advantages." We have no such motive, and we can very well let the Chinese Red regime stew for an indefinite time, and leave to it the burden of demonstrating its worthiness for our recognition.

How Falsehoods Spread

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "How Falsehoods Spread," which was published in the Bismarck (N. Dak.) Leader, January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW FALSEHOODS SPREAD

A recent Saturday Evening Post article dealing with the city of Minot has brought a blizzard of letters to the editor of the Post's letters column.

Some of the letters agree with the Post's story on the Magic City; some don't.

But that isn't the important thing. Disagreement is good and healthy in any free country. When the day comes that all persons think alike, it will mean the end of progress.

What we'd like to point out is a certain letter about farm co-ops which was written to the Post by a member of the Nebraska State Grange. The Grange and the Farmers Union don't always think alike; they are rival farm groups. But when H. C. Filley, of the Nebraska Grange, saw a false statement about co-ops in the Post's Minot article, Mr. Filley sat down and wrote an answer to it. Here it is, as published in the Post's letters column:

"The author made a misstatement concerning cooperative companies '* * * The

Farmers Union * * * operates oil companies, general stores, feed stores, and farmers' supply and implement shops, all on a cooperative, nontaxpaying basis.' * * *

"Business enterprises (such as those mentioned) organized under cooperative statutes pay real-estate taxes, personal-property taxes, sales taxes, social-security taxes, communication taxes, excise taxes, and franchise taxes, where applicable, the same as any other corporation."

This newspaper wants to compliment the Post for retracting the error of its reporter.

The reporter probably met some Minot businessman who has been misinformed by the false propaganda of the North Dakota tax-equality lobby—and as a result a huge falsehood was spread among the SEP's many millions of readers.

Great publications can reach millions—and it is not easy to retract an error in a small letter to the editor—when the original article may have been seen by many more persons than will see the letter. And the impression they may have got from the article will, by retraction time, have been scattered widespread by word of mouth.

The Leader wants to compliment again the Saturday Evening Post for its retraction, but it wants to compliment even more the member of a farm organization who had the goodness to defend another farm organization against an unjust attack.

Lobbying Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Lobbying Money," written by Joseph Harsch, and published in the Christian Science Monitor. It was republished in the Leader, of Bismarck, N. Dak.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOBBYING MONEY

The news that the American Medical Association is going to collect and spend $2,000,000 next year to oppose socialized medicine shows that the AMA is going to be doing a lot of opposing of socialized medicine next year. (It has spent most of $1,500,000 doing the same thing this past year.)

It also shows something else about our political system which, for the most part, has passed us by without our attention.

Two million dollars is a lot more money than the Republican Party has in its treasury today. And it is money that the Republican National Committee would give its eye teeth to get its hand on.

Two million dollars would also look big to the Democratic National Committee, although the Democrats are currently a bit better off than the Republicans, thanks to all the Democrats who experienced a reawakening of party loyalty in the early hours of the morning after last November's election day.

The Republicans, after spending approximately $2,000,000 in the last Presidential election, started 1949 with $800,000 in the till. When the balance was drawn down below $100,000 their national treasurer resigned. It is supposed to be a bit above that figure today, but not by much. The Democrats, who spent $1,680,000 in the 1948 campaign, probably have about $250,000 on tap. But neither Republicans nor Democrats have anything like the wealth of the AMA at their immediate disposal, although, of course, this is an off year.

Behind these figures is the fact that much big money which used to go to the big party organizations for direct political action is now moving instead into the treasuries of organizations with special political causes to plead.

Partly this is because their causes are not identical with those of one or the other of the two big parties; partly because they think they can get more for their money if they spend it themselves than if they donate it to a political party, and partly because of new laws which make party contributions reportable. The reason undoubtedly varies with different organizations.

The AMA is operating the single biggest lobbying operation in the United States today. But it is not the only organization spending large sums of money for political action by itself, rather than contributing it to the coffers of one of the regular parties. The CIO and AFL, in particular, are in the big league.

Here is a list of organizations which reported to Congress that they spent over $100,000 during the first 9 months of this year on lobbying or political action and the amount spent by each:

American Medical Association, $1,225,028.
Committee for Constitutional Government, $443,756.
National Association of Electric Companies, $305,751.
Townsend Plan, Inc., $285,371.
United World Federalists, $220,509.
Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, $186,371.
National Small Businessmen's Association, $161,283.
Association of American Railroads, $135,671.
National Cooperative Milk Producers Association, $131,781.
General Electric Corporation, $128,563.
National Association of Real Estate Boards, $111,172.

This is only a small part of the picture of the money being spent on political action outside the channels of political practices. No one could estimate the cost to the taxpayer of political action involved in Government operations, such as the campaign to win support for a nationalized health service. No one could discover what moneys labor unions spend indirectly on political action. The amounts which they report to Congress as direct lobbying expense are far smaller than their total budgets for political action.

No one has ever compiled the total of the cost of institutional advertising which has a political purpose although it goes on the advertising budget of corporations and thereby cuts their taxes. No one could estimate the cost of political pleading on some of our radio programs because it is mixed in with news and product promotion.

When Republicans or Democrats take an ad, or buy radio time, or put up bill posters we know who is advocating what. And the time was when most political pleading was in such forthright and overt form. But those days are long gone by. Today politics shuns the overt form and the direct appeal. Today you are like as not to find it disguised with your breakfast cereal, your comics, your music.

And the treasuries of the two big parties languish.—Joseph Harsch in the Christian Science Monitor.

Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article published in the December 1949 issue of the Reader's Digest entitled "Is This the Time To Spend Billions More?"

The amount of money spent by President Truman up to September 30, 1949, is shown in this article to be in excess of $191,000,000,000 as compared to less than $180,000,000,000 for all Presidents from George Washington through the second term of Franklin D. Roosevelt. To this amount spent by Mr. Truman should be added the expenditures of the Government from September 30, 1949, to June 30, 1950, the end of the present fiscal year. The Congress has already appropriated funds to cover the cost of Government to that time.

Today the President submitted his budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, and ending June 30, 1951. He proposes expenditures in excess of $42,000,000,000 for that period. This brings the total amount spent or requested by President Truman to over $250,000,000,000.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS THIS THE TIME TO SPEND BILLIONS MORE?

(Compiled by John T. Flynn, from historical statistics of the U. S. Census Bureau and U. S. Treasury reports)

Here are two columns of figures. One gives the amount spent by each of our 32 Presidents from George Washington to the end of Franklin Roosevelt's second administration. The other gives the amount spent by President Truman since his inauguration up to September 30, 1949.

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term)

Washington	$34,088,486
Adams	34,262,668
Jefferson	72,424,269
Madison	176,473,964
Monroe	147,237,899
Adams	65,427,017
Jackson	152,969,968
Van Buren	122,325,242
Harrison and Tyler	108,904,678
Polk	173,477,220
Taylor and Fillmore	179,631,529
Pierce	255,154,244
Buchanan	272,933,490
Lincoln	3,252,380,410
Johnson	1,578,557,645
Grant	2,253,386,743
Hayes	1,032,268,037
Garfield and Arthur	1,027,742,757
Cleveland	1,077,629,089
Harrison	1,412,315,899
Cleveland	1,441,674,174
McKinley	2,093,918,514
T. Roosevelt	4,655,450,505
Taft	2,799,211,854
Wilson	46,938,260,143
Harding	6,667,235,429

Spent by 32 Presidents from Washington to Roosevelt (through second term)—Con.

Coolidge	$18,585,549,115
Hoover	15,490,476,636
Roosevelt (8 years)	67,518,746,001
Total	179,620,113,645

Spent by President Truman from fiscal year 1946 to Sept. 30, 1949

Truman	$191,081,394,191
	191,081,394,191

Experts predict a large Federal deficit during the current fiscal year, ending next June. Yet the administration is demanding expenditure of many additional billions of dollars on vast new and untried projects.

All those who are critical of the program, whether Democrat or Republican, are castigated by the President as being just about 160 years behind the times.

Think this over:

Thirty-two Presidents in 156 years spent $179,620,113,645.

One President in less than 5 years has spent $191,081,394,191.

(The extraordinary expenditures of the war years from 1941 to 1945 have been excluded.)

Basing-Point System Not Needed in Our Economy—Propaganda Predictions of the Calamitous Effects of Cement Decision Fail To Materialize—Building of New Steel and Cement Plants and Increasing Capacity of Old Plants a Good Omen—S. 1008 Must Be Defeated To Allow Present Trend of Normal Plant Dispersal To Continue—Small-Business Stake in S. 1008 Is Destruction of Robinson-Patman Act

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the calamity howlers who have insistently, through their billion-dollar lobby, pounded on the doors of the Congress for legislation upsetting the cement decision should, if they have the least bit of modesty, run for cover. The predictions which flew thick and fast after the cement decision, to the effect that the steel, cement, and other industries would pine away and die because they could not use the basing-point system of pricing, has turned out to be, like most propaganda, pure bunk.

The plain truth is that the dispersal of factories, which the prophets of doom predicted would be pulled up by their roots and moved, has occurred to some extent but not in the way these predictors expected. There have been completed many new plants throughout the country, and many plants heretofore restricted to small production now have increased capacity. Because of the high level of business, the population increase, and many other factors in our economy, the building up of sections of the country which need production has been taking place. The continued abandonment of artificial price controls will make available to all sections of the country production and distribution of basic materials at fair prices and lower transportation costs.

NEW ENGLAND PLANS NEW STEEL PLANT

New England, where the steel and iron industry had its birth in this country, but which for over 100 years has been paying high transportation costs, whether incurred or not, now contemplates building a steel plant. This plant will not take care of all of New England's needs, but it is a start in the right direction. Many small plants in many sections of the country, relieved of the restraint and threat inherent in artificial pricing such as the basing-point system, are encouraged to increase production without the threat of their big competitors "dumping" in their own back yard. It is a fallacious argument to speak of local monopoly in the steel, cement, brick, and lumber, and many other industries in our industrial structure. The day has passed when it is possible for local monopolies to exist unless artificial restrictions in the form of pricing and transportation are invoked. Free use of all forms of transportation in a competitive manner lowers the cost to the consumer. The railroads are making a tremendous mistake in constantly and insistently pressing for higher and yet higher freight rates. The railroads can live as a necessary part of our economy only to the extent that they render service in competition with other forms of transportation. We need the railroads. They did a tremendous job during World War II, but they did not do it for nothing. The railroads did this job for profit, and it shows even today in their balance sheets and in the retirement of obligations which appeared to be insurmountable before the war came on. If any industry in this country profited because of the war, it is the railroad industry. However, the railroads cannot expect to live in the lap of luxury at the expense of other forms of transportation and at the expense of the consumer. But with determined greed, the railroads not only press for increased freight rates but lend their influence to industries which desire to use artificial pricing systems. It is a short-range view and one if successful, will eventually be detrimental both to the railroads and to our entire economy.

LOBBYISTS BUSY DURING RECESS—TRY TO INFILTRATE RANKS OF SMALL BUSINESS

The Supreme Court decisions in cement, in certain steel products, in oil, and in other industries added day by day to the array of industrial giants determined to secure legislation upsetting the court decisions. The greed and determination to secure legislation adverse to the public interest is astonishing. All during the recess of the Congress the lobbyists have been busy. These lobbyists have tried to infiltrate into the defense of small-business organizations, honest organizations which are rendering a real service to their members, not the phony ones, for these they already have under their wing. These lobbyists have lost no opportunity to address bodies of small-business men and to feed such groups words upsetting to their business digestive system. Fortunately, it is a rare occasion when these prophets of doom make much impression. Nevertheless, with bottomless pocketbooks and genius minds, they continue to hammer on the antitrust laws and particularly laws which were designed to protect, and are protecting, small business. The focal point of the attack is the act amending the Clayton Act, which since 1936 has afforded small business its greatest protection.

DESTRUCTION OF ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT AND CHARTING FOR PRICE FIXING DUAL AIM OF LOBBYISTS

With hands folded in upright supplication and a look innocent of all guile, these billion-dollar lobbyists say they do not want to harm small business; they want small business to live and prosper. Yes, they want small business to live and prosper like a cat wanting a mouse to live and prosper or like a wolfhound wanting a rabbit to be free to attend to its own enterprise. There is only one appellation which could properly describe these lobbyists—a word which I leave to your own imagination. The truth leaks out occasionally, as it did before the American Bar Association meeting in St. Louis, at the convention of the National Association of Retail Druggists in New York, and at a more recent meeting of the American Petroleum Institute. The truth that leaks out is the desire of the lobbyists for the artificial-pricing-system crowd to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act. Nothing less—nothing more.

THE CHAINS AND OTHER PRICE FIXERS

The passage of S. 1008 will destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and allow the giant chains to move in on the hometown merchant. The predatory interests in any industry can move in on the hometown manufacturer. In other words, we revert to the situation that existed in the depths of the depression before there was any Robinson-Patman Act. The same interests which now seek to destroy the antitrust laws are the same interests that originally fought the Robinson-Patman Act. They are the same interests which believe in the divine rights of the seller to fix prices. They are the same interests which want little or no Government control of any kind and, if permitted, would sweep all antitrust laws off the books, set up cartels and trusts which would draw the life-blood of our economic stream into their own coffers and eventually—and this has been said before—become more powerful than government itself. It is the truth, however, and it is up to the Congress to see to it that such a situation does not exist.

PROPOSED STEEL BASING-POINT ORDER

More lately, having failed temporarily in securing passage of S. 1008—the basing-point bill, the Robinson-Patman-Act-destroying bill, the antitrust-law-destroying bill—the steel crowd made another approach, with wonderful unanimity of thought. They have attempted, through the administrative

procedures of the Federal Trade Commission, to secure what they have not thus far secured by way of legislation from the Congress. This neat little package which is proposed to the Federal Trade Commission permits some fancy variations of the basing-point system. Surely the representatives of FTC were guiltless of any knowledge that such a thing would happen, but nevertheless it is there to be read by all with an inquiring mind. Astute commentators for big-business mouthpieces so admit, and impartial commentators in a somewhat freer press so analyze the situation with respect to the proposed steel order.

STEEL INDUSTRY BOOSTS PRICES IN FOND ANTICIPATION OF PHONY FREIGHT ABSORPTION

In preparation for all of this—that is, in preparation for the basing-point system—Big Steel and its satellites have boosted the price of its products. In addition to boosting the base price of steel, the extras and differentials have been so juggled that men long familiar with steel-industry prices are unable to estimate exactly what the cost to the American consumer will be. Interestingly enough, in a leading article in the impartial New York Times of Sunday, December 18, Thomas E. Mullaney, commenting on the recent steel price rise, attributes this increase to the prospective reestablishment of artificial selling controls. Mr. Mullaney stated his analysis of the situation in part as follows:

ACCORD ON FREIGHT IN VIEW

Another reason for the suddenness of the steel price rise may be the expectation of the industry that its long quest for permission to absorb freight charges in shipments of steel to customers will be granted early next year. It has been reported that the Federal Trade Commission is on the verge of agreeing to a settlement of the 1947 price-fixing case against the steel companies to give them the privilege of limited freight absorption.

Even if the FTC does not extend that privilege it has been taken as assured that Congress will pass an enabling measure early next year. The steel industry has refrained from absorbing freight charges since it abandoned the basing-point system last year, following FTC and United States Supreme Court decisions interpreted as placing a question of legality on the steel industry's freight-absorption practices.

With steel prices higher now in advance of either FTC or congressional rulings allowing freight absorption, the industry will be better prepared to bear the cut in revenues that such a system of forgiving part of the shipment cost to customers entails.

PLENARY BASING-POINT SYSTEM ALLOWED BY PROPOSED STEEL ORDER

The fact that the steel companies agree to quote f. o. b. mill means nothing, for most quotations mean little without an obligation to ship if an order is placed. The meat in the proposed FTC steel order is permitting a basing point at every mill. This looks, on the face of it, as if all prices would be based on the mill from which the purchase is made. This is not the case at all, for it is the controlling mill that sets the destination price. A consumer might have a steel mill across the street which was a basing-point mill, but steel from this neighboring mill into his yard might cost as much as steel from a mill many miles away. Thus, the local mill under a plenary basing-point system is enabled to charge some other mill's base price plus the freight from that mill to the customer's destination, which, as pointed out above, may be only across the street.

Under a free competitive system in the steel industry, the tendency would be for the local mill to protect its customers and protect itself from the inroads of its competitors.

EXAMPLES OF NEW PIPE AND TUBE FACILITIES IN STEEL INDUSTRY

It is all quite elemental and should not cause Members of Congress a moment's doubt in arriving at a decision. The fact is that any scheme, such as the proposed FTC steel order, or any law which the Congress may pass, permitting any deviation from the present rules of the game is injurious to the public interest and destructive of free competition. I am confident that if the Congress upholds the Supreme Court decisions the trend which has already started in a quiet and orderly way will eventually lead to a dispersal of our basic industries, which will not only be beneficial to our economy but will be vital to our total national defense. For the information of the Members, I include a list of completed and contemplated pipe and tube mills in the United States, most of them in sections of the country where they are most needed.

Company and location	Type and size	Capacity (in net tons annually)	Date of completion
Formed Tubes, Inc., Sturgis, Mich	2 Yoder mills	10,000	August 1949.
Basalt Rock Co.-Kaiser, Napa, Calif	14- to 36-inch welded	Unknown	In operation.
Kaiser Steel Corp., Fontana, Calif	5⅝- to 14-inch welded	Unknown	Early 1950.
Sharon Steel Co., Farrell, Pa	2 electric weld mills	Unknown	Mills installed March 1949.
National Tube Co.:			
Lorain, Ohio	2- to 4½-inch seamless	216,000	Began November 1949.
McKeesport, Pa	Welded pipe 26 inches and larger	100,000	March 1950.
Youngstown Sheet & Tube, Indiana Harbor, Ind	1- to 4-inch butt weld	Unknown	Expected May 1950.
Lone Star Steel Corp., Daingerfield, Tex	Up to 16 inches welded	350,000	Expected 1950 or 1951.
A. O. Smith Corp., Houston, Tex. (jointly with Sheffield Steel).	8⅝- to 30-inch welded	360,000–420,000	Expected mid-1950.
Consolidated Western Steel Corp., Orange, Tex	24 inches and larger welded	100,000	Company purchased Government plant November 1949. Will install equipment.
Portsmouth Steel Co., Portsmouth, Ohio	4- to 16-inch welded	Unknown	Planned for 1950 under company's expansion program.

1 eastern company is planning the construction of a new mill to make 6- to 20-inch seamless pipe.

To show the Members what has happened in the cement industry since the Cement decision by the Supreme Court on April 26, 1948, I include a list of new plants and improvements to existing installations in the cement industry, as follows:

Item No.	State	Company	Data on new plants and improvements on existing installations, 1949
1	Alabama	The Ideal Cement Co	To increase capacity of Mobile plant.
2	Alaska	Alaska Portland Cement Co	New $2,500,000 plant proposed—1,500 barrels daily.
3	Arizona	Arizona Portland Cement Co	New $3,976,000 plant at Rillito—2,000 barrels daily.
4	Arkansas	Ideal Cement Co	Plans to double capacity at Okay plant.
5	California	Calaveras Portland Cement Co	Plans to increase capacity 80 percent.
6	do	Riverside Portland Cement Co	Plans to increase capacity at Oro Grande plant to 3,500,000 barrels.
7	do	Whitewater Portland Cement Co. (Samuel Guiberson)	Plans new $15,000,000 plant near Palm Springs.
8	do	California Portland Cement Co	Improvements and general rehabilitation of the Colton plant.
9	Colorado	The Ideal Cement Co	Improvements, increased production of Portland plant by 1,000 barrels per day.
10	Florida	Florida Portland Cement Co	Plans to increase capacity at Tampa plant.
11	do	Lehigh Portland Cement Co	9,500 acres cement-bearing materials near Flagler Beach.
12	Idaho	Lewiston Area Development Association, Inc	Announced that a $4,000,000 cement plant will be constructed in that area—capacity 3,000 barrels daily.
13	Illinois	General Portland Cement Co	$4,000,000 expansion program at Chicago.
14	do	Medusa Portland Cement Co	Improvement program for Dixon plant.
15	Iowa	Dewey Portland Cement Co	Improvements at Davenport plant to increase production 40 percent.
16	do	Northwestern States Portland Cement Co	Carrying on $1,000,000 improvements at Mason City plant.
17	Kansas	Monarch Cement Co	Plans to increase capacity to 700,000 barrels annually at Humboldt plant.
18	do	Universal-Atlas Cement Co	Plans modernization of Independence plant.
19	Louisiana	Lone Star Cement Corp	Completed $1,000,000 improvements which boosted capacity 50 percent to 6,400 barrels per day.
20	Missouri	Missouri Portland Cement Co	New 6,000-barrel plant at Prospect Hill—to be completed in 1950.

Item No.	State	Company	Data on new plants and improvements on existing installations, 1949
21	Montana	Ideal Cement Co.	Improvements completed doubling plant capacity at Trident.
22	do	Permanente Cement Co.	490 acres cement-bearing materials—Helena.
23	North Carolina		1949 assembly proposes a new State-owned plant. Plan an $8,000,000 cement plant in Raleigh area.
24	North Dakota		State legislature grants $25,000 for survey to establish cement plant.
25	Ohio	Diamond Portland Cement Co.	Completed improvements increasing capacity Middle Branch plant 50 percent.
26	do	Universal-Atlas Cement Co.	Plans modernization of Osborn plant.
27	Oklahoma	Dewey Cement Co.	Began $1,445,000 expansion program at Bartlesville plant.
28	do	Ideal Cement Co.	To increase capacity at Ada plant.
29	Pennsylvania	Penn-Dixie Cement Corp.	Plans improvements at West Winfield plant.
30	do	Medusa Portland Cement Co.	Improvements at York and Wampum plants—part of multimillion-dollar program.
31	Puerto Rico	Ponce Cement Corp.	Plans to increase capacity to 10,000,000 sacks annually (2,500,000 barrels).
32	do	Puerto Rico Cement Corp.	Plans to increase capacity.
33	South Dakota	South Dakota State cement plant.	Plans to double capacity to 4,000 barrels daily.
34	Tennessee	Signal Mountain Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Chattanooga plant.
35	Texas	Tex-Mex.s Cement Co.	New $6,000,000 plant at Corpus Christi.
36	do	Lone Star Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity 20 to 25 percent at New Orleans.
37	do	Trinity Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity at Eagle Ford, Fort Worth, and Waco plants.
38	do	Ideal Cement Co.	Plans to double capacity at Houston plant.
39	do	Lone Stae Cement Corp.	New plant near Sweetwater.
40	Virginia	(a) Lone Star Cement Co. (b) Universal-Atlas Cement Corp.	1,700 barrels daily—plans to build new plant near Roanoke. Capacity unknown.
41	Washington	Lehigh Portland Cement Co.	Plans to increase capacity.

DEFEAT OF S. 1008 WILL RELIEVE PRESSURE ON DESTRUCTION OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The defeat of S. 1008 will continue the beneficial trends now under way in our basic industries and will protect and invigorate our small-business institutions throughout the country because the threat to the Robinson-Patman Act, now so imminent, will have been dissipated. I cannot believe that the Federal Trade Commission will so depart from the fundamental concept of its original sponsors as to approve a document such as the proposed steel order.

RESTRICTED PRODUCTIVE CAPACITY PREVAILED PRIOR TO THE SUPREME COURT DECISION IN THE CEMENT CASE

The foregoing list of cement production facilities, which covers a period of less than 2 years, in sum total is greatly in excess of new facilities built in the previous 25 years. Restricted production of cement and other commodities in our basic industries is the legitimate offspring of the basing-point system. Many instances of powerful forces at play in the cement industry during the basing-point era were brought to light by the proceedings in the cement case before the Federal Trade Commission.

California had a thorough investigation, by a committee of its State Senate during the twenties, which revealed the devastating effects of the basing-point system on dealers in cement in the State of California. Also revealed was the lack of cement production to supply that rapidly growing area. Many stories of intimidation and threats have come to light, which makes it common knowledge that under the basing-point system it was virtually impossible for an outsider to get into the cement business. Henry Kaiser, by the dint of sheer pluck and keen business acumen, bucked the cement trust and built a new plant in the West to supply the Mount Shasta Dam. However, many times in the 25 years prior to the war, even existing plants were forced out of business. Many of these plants were owned by local people who had invested their savings in the cement business.

It is astounding, indeed, how rapidly cement plants and additional facilities in old plants have been built and planned since the Supreme Court decision outlawing the basing-point system. The record shows that fewer plants were built between the years 1920 and 1945 than are presently contemplated. The real reason for cement plants being built over the distant reaches of the United States is recognition of a fact so often stressed; namely, that without artificial pricing controls our heavy basic industries will build their plants at locations where the demand can be supplied at its source. The continued outlawry of the basing-point system, to reiterate, will see cement, steel, and many other plants manufacturing basic commodities erected in every corner of the United States. This is as it should be. The buyer must have more of a choice than the choice of paying the same price, regardless of who furnishes the material. The basing-point system, that handy instrument for the elimination of all price competition, must itself be eliminated permanently if small business and free competition are to have their innings in a postwar world.

DEFEAT OF S. 1008 WILL RELIEVE PRESSURE ON DESTRUCTION OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

The defeat of S. 1008 will continue the beneficial trends now under way in our basic industries and will protect and invigorate our small-business institutions throughout the country because the threat to the Robinson-Patman Act, now so imminent, will have been dissipated. I cannot believe that the Federal Trade Commission will so depart from the fundamental concept of its original sponsors as to approve a document such as the proposed steel order.

THIS IS NO TIME FOR RETREAT—FRIENDS OF SMALL BUSINESS MUST STAND FIRM

This is no time to open the doors to cutthroat competition, to fixed prices, to the destruction of small business; and this is no time to open the doors to a situation which further restricts the choice of consumer by the elimination of competition. This is a time for the resurgence of the spirit of free enterprise and a time to consolidate our gains on the antitrust front. Any weakening of our position now is an invitation for the destruction of small business in the United States.

Address by the Vice President at the Samuel Gompers Centennial Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the distinguished Vice President, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, at the Samuel Gompers centennial dinner on January 5, 1950, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, I greatly appreciate the honor involved in the invitation extended by President Green and his associates to me to participate in this memorial program on the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers.

I did not realize when I accepted the invitation that I would run into so much competition. [Laughter.] I have seen more vice presidents assembled under this roof than I have since the twentieth of January, when I was inaugurated. [Laughter.] But I welcome them into the fraternity of vice presidents with the same spirit with which they welcome me into their fraternity. [Applause.]

It is a great pleasure always to memorialize the lives of great men. It is a great thing to receive inspiration from the lives of men who have consecrated themselves to some great cause, whether religious, educational, economical, or political—and it is a greater thing to have been permitted to enjoy an intimate acquaintance with any of these great men whose lives we celebrate, or whose hundredth anniversary we celebrate and memorialize.

It was my happy privilege to know Samuel Gompers in person. I came here as a young, inexperienced Member of the House of Representatives on the 4th of March 1913—longer ago than I sometimes like to admit. [Laughter.] I have not been here, however, as long as Samuel Gompers was president of the American Federation of Labor. [Laughter.] I came into the House of Representatives with the Woodrow Wilson administration, and I learned, very shortly

thereafter to respect and honor two great Americans. One of them had dedicated his life to education and to politics—not politics in the sense of politics as a game in which men maneuver for position, for high office or preferment—in which men maneuver for the success of a political party merely for its own sake—but one to whom politics was the science of government, as it really is in its truest sense. The other one had dedicated his life to the welfare of the American working man and woman, those who draw the water and hew the wood, those whose names rarely ever find a place on the front pages of our newspapers or periodicals, but who live the lowly walks, in the shadows that infest the valleys between the mountain peaks of achievement, of honor, and of notoriety. This leader dedicated himself to such an extent that I doubt if there has ever been a leader of the American working man or woman—or whether there can ever be one—who so indelibly impressed his personality and his character upon the American people as did he. [Applause.]

These two men whom I learned early in my own congressional career to respect, to revere, and honor were Woodrow Wilson and Samuel Gompers. [Applause.] Strange as it may seem, they were men of the same stripe of humanity—men of keen intellect, discriminating taste, eloquent tongue. And strange at it may seem also to those who do not recall it, in the great crisis that faced our country in World War I there was no man in America upon whom Woodrow Wilson leaned more heavily or confidently than upon Samuel Gompers. [Applause.]

Gompers was not only a labor leader, he was a labor statesman. He was broad-minded in his sympathies and understanding, and he recognized that American labor had its fight to make—had its way to make—and had to establish its right to organize and to act in solidarity for the welfare of the American workingman. I recall his appearance before committees of the House of Representatives. I recall his deep emotion as he pleaded the cause of the American workingman. I recall his cryptic sentences, his eloquence, his deep convictions. I recall the profound impression made not only upon me as a young member of the House, but upon the whole committee and the whole Congress and the whole American people.

I recall that when the Clayton antitrust law was before the House of Representatives and its Committee on the Judiciary, it was largely due to the eloquence and the conviction and the persuasion of Samuel Gompers that we wrote into that law a provision that the labor of a human being is not a commodity to be peddled in the market place [shouts—applause], giving legality and sanction to the membership of men and women in labor unions, for their own mutual advantage and protection, and for the guaranty of their rights. Samuel Gompers was this sort of a statesman.

I recall on one occasion when the Kentucky delegation went out to see President Wilson to recommend a great Kentucky lawyer and jurist for appointment to the Supreme Court of the United States. One by one we made our little speeches in our candidate's behalf, including two Senators from the State and all the Members of the House. When we had concluded, President Wilson, with that keen insight for which he was noted, said to us: "Gentlemen, does your candidate believe that the law grows, or does he take the legalistic view that it is finished?" By that interrogatory he drew a picture of the sort of man he wanted to put on the Supreme Court. But far beyond the appointment of a single man to the highest Court in our land, he drew his picture of the sort of Government in which he believed and the sort of Government that Samuel Gompers believed in and fought for—not only for labor, but for all American people. [Applause.]

We know that the law is not finished; we know that it does grow. It can never be finished nor cease to grow so long as humanity grows. We know that just as science and education and medicine and religion and agriculture and industry are constantly in search of new avenues for expansion and for development and the betterment of their own positions Government likewise must grow and remain modern [applause] in order that it may meet the requirements of a dynamic age where men and women are no longer satisfied that their Government shall sit merely in Washington and in any other capital complacently and with self-satisfaction and draw its pay and do nothing. I recall—and I beg your pardon for these personal references—but I'm sure you'll understand the reverence with which I recite them—I recall one day as I sat in my office in the House Office Building rather unexpectedly a delegation came to see me. It was headed by Samuel Gompers. There were many members of organized labor on that committee, including the railway brotherhoods, and I recall that Davey Robertson and Bert Jewell—George Harrison, of course, will know the significance of those names—came into my office. And Mr. Gompers was the spokesman of that committee, and he, on their behalf and on his own and on behalf of the great American Federation of Labor, asked me if I would introduce and fight for the passage of a law repealing what was then the Railway Labor Act and enacting a new railway labor act which would give fairness to railway employees and not make it one-sided, as the Taft-Hartley law is now [drowning applause]. You may understand that I felt greatly complimented by this honor being done to me. We worked for days and weeks and months in preparation of that legislation. I introduced it in the House of Representatives and Senator Howell, of Nebraska, in the Senate, and it became known as the Howell-Barkley bill. That was in 1924. We were unable to secure passage at the session, but in the next session we did enact it into law and, with such modifications as have been found necessary by experience and administration, it is still the law of this land, and the fairest and the best and the most workable labor law that has ever been enacted in the history of the United States. [Applause.]

These personal experiences of mine with this great labor leader endeared him to me as a young man devoted to the ideals of fairness, just principles in the administration of our growing economic system in which labor and industry must work together in peace and harmony insofar as it can be done in fairness and justice to those who are engaged in it. The century which has been marked by the hundred years since the birth of Samuel Gompers has been sometimes referred to as the "wonderful century." In many respects it has been one of the most wonderful centuries in all the history of man. In many respects mankind has advanced further in all fields of his activity and his endeavors than all the previous history of the world. I need not now recite these advances for lack of time.

Samuel Gompers came to this country when he was about 10 years of age, and through the force of his character, through the clarity of his intellect, through the foresight of his vision, he became the great leader, not only of American labor but, as a symbol, he became the leader of labor throughout the world. [Applause.] During his 48 years as president of the American Federation of Labor, he saw that great organization of human effort, human blood and bone and sinew—sometimes symbolized by tears and heartaches—grow into a body of 3,000,000 men. And when he died, the American Federation of Labor numbered its members at the 3,000,000 mark. Twenty-five years have passed since then, and as his successor William Green [applause] and as his associates and inheritors Dan Tobin and Matthew Woll have epitomized and characterized and emphasized the good principles of Samuel Gompers, until today the American Federation of Labor numbers 8,000,000 men and women. [Applause.] They are, as has been said, a great bulwark against un-American influences seeking now to penetrate our country. And so long as American labor, organized and unorganized, hold the fortresses and the buttresses and the ramparts of democracy and liberty and freedom—fight for freedom of religion and of speech and of the press and assembly—there will not be enough crackpots in America to break down the stability of our great country. [Applause.]

Samuel Gompers came here to find a land of promise. He helped to make it a land of fulfillment. The American way of life which we cherish and enjoy has been humanized and infinitely enriched by his life and by his labors. With all of his heart he believed in the words of Abraham Lincoln, who said, "Whatever helps labor helps the Nation." He fought against industrial serfdom and oppression. Out of the vision of his life, out of his great heart and of his great brain, he helped to create American labor democracy—equality and justice. He added to the Lincoln philosophy one of his own when he said, "Any good union member must first be a good citizen." [Applause.] He believed that in a free country like ours free men and women working freely together could advance their standard of living, elevate their lives, and appreciate more and more their Government and their political and social institutions because under a real democracy they were permitted to help fashion them. History now records how right he was. [Applause.]

A Word About Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the internationalists have betrayed the taxpayers of this country by pouring billions of their money into England to keep the Socialists in power. Now this Socialist regime at the first opportunity has shown its true colors by joining its Communist brethren in Moscow and surrendering China, our traditional friend, to the tender mercies of Stalin and his raiders. This whole move has been aided and abetted and planned by the Communists who have infiltrated into the inner circles of our Government.

It will not be long now before the nations that the internationalists have been supplying with our taxpayers' money will line up against their United States benefactor; then this Nation's young men will have to face the Communist armies of the organized nations to the east of us and to the west of us. UNRRA and ECA and the internationalists have done their deadly work and sooner or later the people will pay for this with their material treasures and the blood of their boys.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial which ap-

peared in the Washington Times-Herald of Monday, January 9, 1950:

FORMOSA

Mr. Truman's announcement that the United States would do nothing to keep the Chinese Communists out of Formosa preceded by a few hours Britain's recognition of Communist China's Peiping government. Britain no longer recognizes the Chiang Kai-shek government.

Mr. Truman's Anglophile administration and State Department had unquestionably been notified of Britain's intentions, and the President faithfully brought American policy into conformity with them. The fact that he and Secretary Acheson have not yet extended formal recognition and the possibility that they may not do so later do not alter this judgment.

Britain's principal interest is to preserve her billion-dollar investment in China, her long-established China trade, and her title to the crown colony of Hong Kong. It is incumbent upon her to cozy up to the Chinese Communists, even at a considerable sacrifice in self-respect, in order to hold what she has. An Associated Press report is that she has exceeded the minimum requirements to curry favor by selling 20 British tank landing ships and a number of motor-boats to the Communists at Hong Kong for use in their coming invasion of Formosa.

Mr. Truman and Secretary Acheson can serve British interests quite effectively by denying further support to Nationalist resistance without going the whole way and recognizing the Communist regime. In this way they separate themselves from the British only in the sense that we are left to carry on a technical opposition to the Chinese Communists, while the British carry on the trade with them.

By thus placing us at a disadvantage their policy works out for the benefit of England—which is the usual goal of American foreign policy.

ADMINISTRATION GOES ISOLATIONIST

The Truman administration, in abandoning all of China to the Communists, with Formosa to follow, has gone isolationist with a vengeance. This decision means that Soviet Russia's Chinese satellite will now be installed in the same threatening position on the flank of America's outposts and communications as Japan was in 1941, when Formosa was under Japanese rule.

The parallel is heightened by the fact that the Communists are preparing an invasion of Hainan Island, in the south China Sea, which Japan seized from China in 1939. From Formosa the bombing run to the American base at Okinawa is 300 miles, and to the American bases in the Philippines 250 miles. It will be recalled that Jap planes from Formosa wiped out the American Air Force in the Philippines at the very outset of the Pacific war in December 1941.

In 1941 Mr. Roosevelt brought the United States to war with Japan on the theory that a China under partial domination by Japan was a threat to American survival, and that Japanese occupation of such other positions as Hainan and Formosa was contrary to the interests of America and her imperialist friends. Now Mr. Truman would have us believe that, although he regards communism as a threat to the survival of free government everywhere, and although the Communists of Mao Tse-tung are allied with Stalin, a China wholly controlled by the Communists is to be regarded as a matter of indifference to the United States, and Communist control of the strategic bases of Formosa and Hainan need not disturb us.

If Mr. Truman's view is correct, Mr. Roosevelt's certainly could not have been correct. Mr. Truman is, in effect, conceding that his predecessor plunged the United States into a wholly unnecessary and terribly costly war, to no purpose at all. For all of the objects that Mr. Roosevelt regarded as essential to be attained through his war policy have now been sacrificed by Mr. Truman's policy of neutrality. Russia and its Chinese agents are conceded everything which, when held by Japan, was supposed to make war by America imperative.

FOREIGN POLICY IS LUDICROUS

This confusion of foreign policy is rendered still more ludicrous by the fact that, while Mr. Truman, in pursuit of his policy of containing Russia's aggressive expansion, corks up the European end of the bottle, he leaves the Asiatic end open. While he deems Chiang to be a person unworthy of American support, he and his Ambassador in Belgrade, George V. Allen, vow that they will oppose any Russian aggression against Yugoslavia. Thus they make a distinction in favor of the shabby Communist Nationalist dictator, Tito, who not so long ago was killing American aviators.

The whole development of present official administration attitudes toward China and Formosa demonstrates the folly of Mr. Roosevelt's war and the fatuity of Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Truman's personal war diplomacy. It demonstrates, also, the subservience of American foreign policy to British interests and the irrationality of spending twenty-three billion annually on a cold war to stop communism in the west while it is permitted to run wild in the east. Mr. Truman's decision that China is none of our business is a decision which Mr. Roosevelt should have reached 8 years ago.

Freedom and Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. KINGSLAND MACY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MACY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the remarks made by me on Thursday, January 5, 1950, at the ceremonies attending the visit of the New York State Freedom Train to Bay Shore, Long Island, in my home township of Islip, N. Y.:

Save for such parts of the past as have enriched us by experience and may be resummoned by recollection, history for us is a scroll of object lessons seldom learned. However, when we individuals wrest so little profit from mistakes that have resulted in personal disappointment or anguish, it is small wonder that the collective experience of the ages has proven so poor a palliative against tragedy.

Our recorded approach to history sometimes seems to me ranting and vainglorious and, unconsciously or otherwise, designed to magnify our globe-dwelling ego as though we traveled into the future's space with a comet's blazing beauty in our wake, instead of crawling as we do through the centuries, dragging history behind us like a long chain of mortal and venial sins. Saga and song have aggrandized our slow progression, highlighting all epic events, recounting the splendors and importance of men and principalities. Even as the kings of old had their sweet singers—David to praise Saul in Israel, the bards to harp Ireland's greatness at Tara—modern nations and public men have press agents to herald and interpret their events and actions. Distortion is inevitable, confusion is to be expected.

Much that historians should have recorded has been left to the novelists. Stephen Crane in his Red Badge of Courage, Remarque in All Quiet on the Western Front, and more latterly, Mailler in The Naked and the Dead, show the fumbling admixture of sordid and splendid that compose outcomes known as history, and how pathetically the individual man is bewildered by his puppet-like compulsions. For him the present itself is unrelated.

Historians have yet to give us an integrated picture of the past wherein so much ancient and new now appears foolish beyond belief until we realize that reflective review requires only evaluation and not the exercise of judgment, and that history is as much a matter of judgment as it is continual struggle against nature and the nature of man.

Unquestionably of all studies, history is the most fascinating, unrolling for us as it does—in picture after picture of passion and sublimity, sweat, and vanity—the leavening, making and crumbling of gens and tribes and nations. Even though we may view it with the irony the Welsh put in their proverb—"Human history is similar to the heroic tales pigs relate of swine"—we cannot but be deeply moved by the rare moments in time when man has manifested his spiritual nature through action for freedom and human dignity.

In such high moments America's patrimony is great and rich and of this happy benefice, the Freedom Train carries much precious documented proof, evidence that arouses and inspires. In incentive to freedom we are a Nation singularly endowed, and this incentive, this latent desire which mounts up like fire when the winds reach it, is our true wealth, our treasure.

Without it America would coarsen and turn its will in crassness to building a silk-lined corncrib for security. There is nothing wrong with security. Unlike sin, no one "is agin it," and come the millennium, I might hasten to add, we shall have it.

In the meantime, though every child knows actuality's fingers prick bubbles, the delectable delusion that security can be rolled off the White House lawn like a wonderful and imperishable egg, seems to be making the rounds in so-called adult circles.

Many serious thinkers are disturbed by the problem this puff-and-promise game is propounding. Included among them is my honored and long-time friend, Bernard M. Baruch, who discussed the subject at length with me when I visited with him recently in his New York home. He does not know the answer, he says, nor do I.

How can we best serve the common welfare, now and ultimately? Can we buy future security with today's dollars in the light of possible dollar-value fluctuations? Should we lay away funds for security payments at a stated retirement age in terms of units cashable at a movable rate to be computed annually during those years payment is made? Should the basic subsistence need of the individual be determined and fixed like a parity price, with the government or the social security funds coming through with the differentials?

These are merely questions concerning the social security system that I throw out to you. Actually my concern is comprehensive, as I pointed out some 3 years ago when I addressed the Sons of the American Revolution in Manhattan and said:

"America, meshed in economic complexity, can only retain its place untrammeled in the forefront of free men if it improves its social structure with emphasis on economic independence and not on social security.

"When I talk of social security I do not refer to the old-age pension system, a thing for which I fought in the New York State Legislature when it was exceedingly unpopular with the leaders of my own party. Then, as now, I considered it a sad

commentary on the involved financial structure controlling our great wealth that men need cry out to the State for aid in sickness or old age. I believed then, as I do now, that through education, scholastic and civic, and without sacrifice of the primary concept of freedom, the time could eventually come when there would be no 'underprivileged.'

"Our freedom today is threatened by the mounting economic pyramid of developing industrial civilization. Built on the broad base of American free enterprise, this pyramid is ever narrowing. As it grows it is limited, tier by tier, by monopoly and specialization. When its apex is reached free enterprise will be done for and freedom will be gone. * * * The mechanized civilization we have built will circumscribe us with constraints unless we are watchful. Freedom shall be a small thing dwarfed by security.

"Unless we concern ourselves passionately with freedom, how shall we place it comparatively? Unless we are enamored of it, how shall we say it is not to be superseded? What was a conviction with Washington and the creators of America, will be a mere historical footnote of an era's aspiration if our desire for easy living distorts our sense of proportion and we erroneously diminish the great."

What I said 3 years ago still seems true to me and so I repeat it, though perhaps today when honored to address you who have come to view the Freedom Train, my time should have been devoted to listing documents aboard these richly freighted cars and expounding upon their significance as it reaches through to me. I must confess, however, to not getting much beyond the name of the train itself, for there is something about the very words "Freedom Train" that sets one to thinking in wide measure.

Everything to be seen will interest you I know, for it was my pleasure, as one of the Regents of the University of the State of New York, to have a part in preparing the train and sending it on its way.

It carries the original draft by Abraham Lincoln of the emancipation proclamation with corrections in the handwriting of Seward; the "Duke's Laws," enacted in Hempstead in 1665 to protect labor; and the Flushing Remonstrance, sometimes called "the First Declaration of Independence," that firm protest of the Quakers to Peter Stuyvesant against restriction of worship. These and many other of the exhibits will have great meaning for you, including the petition of the coopers of Southampton and East Hampton against unfair competition in one of our early Long Island industries. All these documents, manuscripts, and imprints collected and collated by the New York State Freedom Train Commission, represent tangible evidence that when jeopardy of inherent rights and allowable privileges arouses men, men make such history as that which shapes an America—a country, that will, with God's help, continue to keep clear the rails upon which a freedom train may forever run.

Our Retreat From Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York World-Telegram and the Sun dated Friday, January 6, 1950:

OUR RETREAT FROM ASIA

President Truman's refusal to give either military supplies or advice to the Chinese Nationalists in their fight to save Formosa from the Communists may prove the most fateful decision of his administration.

China held the key to the situation on the Asiatic mainland. When it was lost western civilization was left with no dependable ally there.

That pushed us back out to sea, behind a defense line based on the islands of Japan, Okinawa, and the Philippines. Formosa, in Red hands, will endanger that whole line.

In September 1947 Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer recommended that Manchuria be placed under a United Nations trusteeship, and submitted a program to the President which he believed would save China from communism. His memorandum contained this warning:

"Continued deterioration of the situation may result in the early establishment of a Soviet satellite government in Manchuria, and ultimately in the evolution of a Communist-dominated China."

General Wedemeyer's plan for positive action was suppressed in favor of then Secretary of State Marshall's do-nothing policy, which in turn was succeeded by Secretary Acheson's wait-and-see policy.

So, while our Government sat on its hands, both of General Wedemeyer's dire predictions have come to pass.

In March 1948 General MacArthur joined General Wedemeyer in urging a positive policy in the Pacific. He said, in part:

"The Chinese problem is a part of a global situation which should be considered in its entirety * * * for if we embark upon a general policy to bulwark the frontiers of freedom against the assaults of political despotism, one major front is no less important than another, and a decisive breach of any will inevitably threaten to engulf all."

Loss of China broke the Asiatic frontier, and loss of Formosa will breach our defenses in the Pacific.

However, though the President's attitude toward the Formosan issue has been clarified, the issue has not been settled, as Senator VANDENBERG has warned. Debate on that issue has just begun.

Britain and France did not secure "peace in our time" at Munich, and Britain and the United States cannot buy peace in Asia by compromising with totalitarianism there. Meanwhile, if the Chinese Nationalists, left to their own meager resources, can withstand an armed attack on Formosa, President Truman and the British Foreign Office may find to their chagrin that they have been backing the wrong horse.

Deliberately Placing a Communistic Enemy Across From Our Western Frontier

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to note that the press is taking notice, through some of the articles of the outstanding columnists, that this administration has been betrayed by the British Fabian Socialist government. The propaganda of the communists in this country has been so effective that the citizens have ignored the warnings that some of us have given them and they have swallowed the propaganda of the administration hook, line, and sinker.

I am inserting the article entitled "These Days" by George Sokolsky to give it wider circulation among the people who will suffer most as a result of the bertrayal of their interests by the department of the government which is supposed to protect the people of this country in their foreign relations.

The article which I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD, under consent heretofore given, appeared in the Times-Herald of January 9, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Having given China to Soviet Russia, the Yalta traditionalists in the State Department are faced by the sharp fact that their British mentors are fast at work preparing for arrangements with Soviet Russia that would, if successful, isolate the United States more effectively than any "America Firster" ever dreamed possible.

The British have to be understood, if we are to see this picture clearly. They realize that there are to be no additional gifts to Great Britain beyond our current commitments under the Marshall plan.

They would like an additional $2,000,000,000, but they can read the signs of the times and it is obvious that the next Congress will reduce rather than increase the burden of foreign assistance. Therefore, they would, on the continent of Europe, like to increase east-west trade; that is, the trade between England and such countries as Czechoslovakia, Poland, and Soviet Russia.

It should be recalled that this idea was included in the Marshall plan, but did not develop because the iron-curtain countries refused to join the Marshall plan.

The British had to be cautioned not to sell goods sent to them from the United States to such countries and there was at one time a bit of a scandal concerning that.

At any rate, the British have been very busy fixing up the east-west trade and their economic relations may force them to become a neutral as between the United States and Soviet Russia. Such neutrality, in the political field, could tie us in a knot in the United Nations.

As regards China, the British concern themselves only with trade relations and whatever arrangements they can make with the Chinese Communists concerning Hong Kong, which cannot be adequately defended by the British.

Before the China war (1931), the British had a commercial and industrial capital investment in China of about $1,500,000,000. Such firms as the British-American Tobacco Co., Jardine's, Butterfield & Swire, the Hong Kong and Shanghai bank, and many others are tremendously important in Britain's world economic picture.

If the Chinese Communists follow the universal Marxian pattern, they will, in time, seize and nationalize all property.

The British would like to salvage what they can and to hold it for as long as possible. All that they can offer the Chinese Communists as a quid pro quo is recognition and such trade as would aid Mao Tze-tung's regime, which is at this time particularly short of foodstuffs and construction materials.

It could be a profitable barter trade, the Chinese providing hides, skins, silk, tea, or

other exports. It is a trade to which the British are accustomed.

Hong Kong is an island, rising to a deep peak. At the base of the hill is a mass of Chinese. Opposite is an area called Kowloon which is also inhabited by Chinese.

Hong Kong itself produces practically nothing but is dependent upon a hinterland, the center of which is Canton, now in Communist hands. It would be easy to starve Hong Kong. A general strike would leave the city without essential services.

Therefore, if the Communists decide to take Hong Kong, they can do it by starvation and attrition. No military force which the British could muster in China would be sufficient to save the city.

The problem for the British then is whether they are prepared to abandon Hong Kong or make a deal with the Chinese Communists, whose bargaining power is enormous.

On the other hand, Chiang Kai-shek is not altogether without strength. The next few months will show whether his guerrilla forces can be effective. His base on Formosa could be made good for some time for guerrilla operations in southern and western China.

Furthermore, Formosa lies on the Philippines-Japan defenses of the United States. With Formosa in Russian hands, General MacArthur's situation in Japan would finally become untenable.

He admits that the effort of the State Department to minimize the strategic position of Formosa is deceitful propaganda in support of the British and may, with safety, be discounted.

The soundest proposition would be to relieve the State Department of its responsibility for our China policy, which it has messed up beyond belief, and to turn the Formosan problem over to the Department of Defense so that it may come under the aegis of General MacArthur.

New England Hopes To Have Its Own Steel Plant—Freedom From Steel Monopoly Sought by the Six New England States—Small Business Will Be Greatly Helped by New England Steel Plant—Many Regions West of Mississippi Still on Steel Starvation Basis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, plans of New Englanders for a steel mill to turn out 1,250,000 tons of steel ingots annually seem close to maturity. This will be an integrated mill which will have a finished steel capacity of over a million tons of hot- and cold-rolled sheets, bars, and light plates. More than 2,000 acres of land will be required for this plant, which will employ approximately 5,000 persons. This mill, when completed, will be a magnificent contribution to New England's economy. Since the beginning of the steel industry in this country, New England has paid a heavy toll, through the price-fixing mechanics of the basing-point system, for raw and semifinished steel to keep its thousands of metalworking and fabricating plants in operation.

New Englanders have long operated small, medium, and large plants manufacturing fine tools and hundreds of mechanical appliances which have been distributed throughout the country. New England is noted for its quality products in this field.

NEW ENGLAND AT A DISADVANTAGE WITHOUT STEEL-PRODUCING CAPACITY

Over the years, New England has hauled its steel in from distant points, manufactured it into various products which were shipped back over the same lines from whence came the raw materials for the manufacture of these products. Thus, competitively, New England was at a disadvantage against products produced by factories in the Ohio Valley and Midwest which were close to steel plants. The outlawing of the basing-point system has undoubtedly spurred New Englanders on with the hope of finally having, partially at least, its own steel supply. It is understood that the ore is expected to be hauled in by water from the newly explored deposits in Labrador and that coal for coking and other purposes, produced in the southern Appalachian fields, will flow in, also by water, from Hampton Roads, Va. Limestone is plentiful in nearby locations.

NEW ENGLANDERS PRAISED FOR COURAGE AND FORESIGHT

New Englanders have a big raw-materiel supply problem in undertaking to build this mill. Their foresight and courage to overcome all of these obstacles is to be highly commended. In comparison, the flow of raw materials into the Lone Star plant at Daingerfield is relatively simple. Lone Star mines in Oklahoma have as fine a coking coal as is produced in the Appalachian fields. Its large body of ore nearby and limestone and other materials are accessible and convenient. New England is to be congratulated for conceiving and carrying out plans to take care of a portion of its steel needs in the face of such tremendous obstacles.

MANY AREAS ON STEEL-STARVATION BASIS

Many great areas of our country, particularly west of the Mississippi, have been on a starvation basis, as far as the supply of steel is concerned, for the last 50 years or more. The time has come for these regions to throw off the shackles which have bound them to the steel trust and to build their own steel plants. There are many bodies of low-grade ore in this country where a plentiful supply of fuel is available, as well as limestone and other ingredients suitable for the manufacture of steel.

We have come to accept, no matter how thoroughly we dislike, a huddle of steel plants in a few spots east of the Mississippi River. This is all right as far as it goes, but this country needs, from the standpoint of both utility and national defense, more steel-producing capacity closer to the point of consumption. Again I commend the enterprise of the New Englanders and hope that other great sections of our country will profit by their example.

New York Times and Labor Note Progress of Tennessee Valley Authority

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, the annual TVA report elicited commendatory comments from newspapers with widely differing editorial attitudes. Labor scoffed at those who in speaking of TVA "make a lot of noise about socialism, and the Welfare State" and added that the actual TVA accomplishments "makes the woeful prophets look silly and should make every American proud."

The New York Times, in a different tone, praises TVA accomplishments and says it "continues to be a success." I ask that the two editorials be published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From Labor for January 7, 1950]

NORRIS AND ROOSEVELT ALSO WERE CALLED SOCIALISTS—BUT SEE WHAT THEIR GREAT TVA HAS DONE—SAME CRY NOW RAISED AGAINST TRUMAN

Politicians and propagandists who are on the pay roll of the predatory interests continue to make a lot of noise about socialism, the welfare state, and how they are ruining our country. This is not the first nor loudest noise made by these gentlemen.

Back in the 1930's, power-trust propagandists led a furious shouting against socialism. They were positive the country was headed for the rocks of ruin, because the late Senator George W. Norris and President Roosevelt were teaming up to create the TVA.

For 16 years the Tennessee Valley Authority has been carrying on the Norris-Roosevelt program. Have the dire predictions about it come true? Far from it. On the contrary the TVA this week published an annual report which makes the woeful prophets look silly and should make every American proud.

"The seven-State valley served by the TVA," the report points out, "is becoming more and more productive, both agriculturally and industrially. Its resources, being more efficiently conserved and used, have strengthened both the region and the country as a whole.

"Average income per person in the Valley increased from $148 in 1933 to $797 in 1947," the last year for which figures are available. That is a rise of 440 percent, compared with only 260 percent for the entire United States."

By its system of 27 dams and reservoirs, TVA has reduced floods in the Tennessee and lower Ohio and Mississippi River Basins, saving the people of those vast regions tens of millions of dollars annually.

By soil conservation, improvement of navigation, wiping out malarial mosquitoes, improving farming methods and fertilizers, and providing new facilities for the people's recreation, Uncle Sam's great public enterprise has brought untold benefits to the citizens of the region and Nation.

All that, and more, on top of achieving the purpose of which most people think when they read or hear the famous intials TVA—production of plentiful and cheap electric power. Here, too, great success is reported.

In 1949, TVA power cost the average residential consumer only 1.4 cents a kilowatt-hour, compared with the national average of 2.98 cents. That's a saving of more than 50 percent.

Incidentally, consumers all over the United States would be paying much more for electricity if Uncle Sam's TVA yardstick had not educated the people and forced private utility companies to bring their rates down.

Yet, while providing power at less than half the average price, TVA in 1949 made a profit of $21,000,000, or 5 percent on the money Uncle Sam invested in his power yardstick.

No private corporation could or would dream of undertaking such a huge all-around development of an immense region and its resources, for the benefit of its people and the entire country.

Yet politicians and propagandists—of the same kind now shouting "welfare state" at President Truman—screamed "socialism" at Norris and Roosevelt when they asked Congress to create the TVA.

[From the New York Times]

PROGRESS ON THE TENNESSEE

By every measurable test the Tennessee Valley Authority continues to be a success. Its sixteenth annual report shows an annual production of nearly 16,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours, or about 10 times as much electricity as was available in its area in 1933. In 1933, 3 percent of the farms in the area were electrified; now the proportion is 66 percent and growing. The improved Tennessee last year carried 427,000,000 tons of freight, or 13 times the load it did in 1933. TVA has taken the lead in conservation measures to protect soil, forests and wild life; it has had a large share in the nearly complete elimination of malaria. Private business has flourished. The per capita income in TVA territory has gone up from $148 in 1933 to $797 this year—still below the national average but increasing much more rapidly than the national average.

TVA's great building period is nearly over. It has constructed 17 dams and operates a system of 27 major dams and reservoirs. To the installations on the Tennessee and its tributaries will be added dams being built by the Army on the Cumberland, power from which will be distributed by TVA. By 1952 TVA expects to be turning out 22,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours annually, for which a ready market will be found. All this has been done with much less mandatory legal power than most people outside of the Tennessee Valley suppose.

The argument as to whether TVA is in unfair competition with the privately owned electrical industry may long continue. On the face of this report and other official documents it seems likely that TVA is paying sums in lieu of taxes and sums to the Federal Government out of its net profits that come close to being equivalent to the taxes it would have to pay if it were a private enterprise. In addition to these payments, municipalities which operate their own distribution plants are earning net incomes which, in effect, are a species of tax on the ultimate consumer. The real argument for the TVA principle remains substantially what it has always been: that the multiple-purpose development of a great river is too huge an enterprise to be entrusted to a private monopoly. What we can hope to get out of such enterprises, publicly owned and managed, is decentralized and democratic management and the least possible amount of interference with local communities and private businesses. We think that in these objectives TVA has set an admirable example.

The ECA Racket

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the observations of a noted columnist, George Rockwell Brown, who has been an ardent and able supporter of sound government throughout the years, and who has been so recognized by all thoughtful people, are pertinent with reference to our foreign situation, and I am placing them in part in the Appendix of the RECORD, under consent heretofore granted. These remarks appeared in the Times-Herald of January 9, 1950:

Congress has repeatedly voted Marshall-plan money to keep the Socialist-Labor Government at London in power.

It has permitted the financing with ECA funds of organized British effort to steal the American domestic market with the ultimate object of flooding this country with British goods, and sending American working men and women to the unemployment-relief agency.

It has poured billions into Europe, ostensibly to stop the march of communism, whilst the Truman government was steadily and stealthily permitting the march of communism in Asia. Another ECA appropriation bill is in the making.

Congress can deny further aid to Britain on two grounds, one that it is financing the extension of state socialism with American tax money; secondly, that British recognition of the Communist government of China defeats the whole purpose of the Marshall plan.

Against such a program of courageous Americanism the administration will bring to bear all its power and strength.

If socialism falls in Britain, this spring or summer, as it has in New Zealand and Australia, the Truman welfare state will be on its way out in November.

And well does it know it.

Socialism Suffers New Set-Back

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Star and Herald of Panama City, Panama, of December 11, 1949:

SOCIALISM SUFFERS NEW SET-BACK

After 8 years of experimenting with socialism, the Australians yesterday voted the Laborites out of office and placed a Liberal-Country Party coalition in office.

Socialism received the same set-back almost a fortnight ago in New Zealand, where a Socialist regime had been in office for 14 years.

As Lord Woolton, chairman of the Conservative Organization of Great Britain, said last night, both Australia and New Zealand have tried out socialism and found it lacking and they now know from experience that it just does not bring contentment and a higher standard of living.

It would be interesting to see what the captive peoples who live on the fringe of Red Russia would do to their Communist regimes if they were afforded such an opportunity as the free people of Australia and New Zealand to express their will without fear of repressive reprisals by the armed minority which holds the rights of people in absolute contempt.

Unfortunately, those people live in a so-called new democracy, wholly bereft of the freedoms which we of the old democracy enjoy. To these freedoms we owe the progress of civilization to its present stage; to their regimentation they owe the iron curtain that blacks out the rest of the world from their eyes and keeps them under the yoke of the tyrants who usurped their human rights.

It is possible that the next people to cut themselves free of the Socialist experiment in government will be those of the United Kingdom. Their lot has been a tragic one. They are still just as badly off, if not worse than during those trying days when the Nazi blitz and submarine blockade forced short rations as an unavoidable necessity.

Many billions of dollars have rolled into Britain's treasury from the United States and apparently rolled out just as easily, without doing any apparent good under the present Socialist regime. Many industries have been nationalized but the benefits, if any, of this drastic action do not seem to have advanced the welfare of the people to any appreciable extent. Of what good then, has been the Socialist experiment? If it failed in Britain, it surely must fail anywhere else.

Only when shielded behind an iron curtain can socialism be made to appear as a success by the distortions and half-truths of the propagandists.

The New Zealanders and the Australians no doubt have sounded the death knell of socialism as a governing system in the Western World.

What the A & P Ads Don't Reveal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have before me the November 5, 1949, issue of America, also known as the Catholic Review of the Week. The feature article, prominently listed on the cover page, is entitled "What the A. & P. Ads Don't Reveal—the Law Catches Up With the Nation's Big Grocer."

AMERICA—CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

This review of the A. & P. matter by one of the country's most respected weeklies is worthy of attention by all of us, particularly doubting Thomases who may still think that A. & P. is being abused by the Government's present suit to compel it to end its monopolistic practices.

A. & P. ALREADY CONVICTED IN CRIMINAL TRIAL

The article brings out clearly what the A. & P. advertisements studiously omit—that A. & P. has already been criminally

convicted on the charges in the present suit, the purpose of which is merely to enjoin and prevent A. & P. from continuing activities already found to be unlawful.

PRESENT ACTION IS CIVIL

The present suit is a civil action, and is being tried for the Government by J. Francis Hayden, former chief of the New York office of the Antitrust Division.

With the leave of the Speaker and the Members of this House, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the article in America, as follows:

WHAT THE A. & P. ADS DON'T REVEAL

(By Robert F. Drinan)

The announcement by the Department of Justice on September 15, 1949, of a civil suit to break up the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. for repeated violations of the Federal antimonopoly laws came as a surprise to most consumers who, taken in by A. & P.'s adroit public relations, felt that this mammoth chain was one of the unmixed blessings of the American housewife. The A. & P. also pretended to be surprised. In a series of four Nation-wide, full-page newspaper advertisements, it claimed that the Justice Department was operating on a false interpretation of the antitrust laws and that the company was guilty of nothing except selflessly building up its giant grocery business with the sole purpose of providing the American consumer with better food more cheaply. The advertisements could deceive only the more naive. They were promptly and publicly repudiated by the United States Attorney General.

The truth of the matter is that the A. & P. has behind it a 25-year record of violations of the antitrust laws, a record built up in its attempt to dominate and control the retail grocery business in the United States. The pyramiding of manufacturing, distributing and holding companies which make up the gargantuan A. & P. is one of the most incredible stories in American industrial history.

It all started innocently enough with the opening of the first A. & P. some 90 years ago by the Hartford family. By 1925, however, the company owned 14,220 of the 46,800 chain grocery stores in America. In that year a complete reorganization of the A. & P. into 14 distinct corporations took place. No managerial revolution overtook them, because George and John Hartford, heirs of the company's founder, remained as A. & P.'s top executives. Keeping a very close control over the entire organization, they perpetuated their ancestor's drive for domination of the grocery field.

After the 1925 buying policy of A. & P. became more and more one of using its strong and ever-growing power to get a lower price on merchandise purchased than that obtained by its competitors. The company sent its own agents into the field disguised as independent brokers. The suppliers would pay the ordinary brokerage fees, which would, of course, immediately be transferred into the coffers of A. & P. In 1935 gross revenues from this source alone approached $3,000,000. This system of sham brokerages continued to operate until it was made illegal by the passage of the Robinson-Patman Act in 1936. The small-business men of America engineered this legislation through Congress. It provided, also, among other things, that any price-discrimination in favor of purchasers of large quantities of goods would be illegal, unless the discount was based on actual savings to the supplier.

In an effort to evade this new legislation, A. & P. then instructed its buyers to induce A. & P.'s suppliers to reduce their price by the amount of the brokerage fee now outlawed. If the suppliers protested or refused, the company threatened to refuse to buy from them or to set up its own manufacturing plant for the item in question. Most suppliers succumbed. Once again A. & P. had the edge over its competitors, at least until the Federal Trade Commission issued a cease-and-desist order against evasion of the Robinson-Patman Act. The Third Circuit Court of Appeals sustained FTC, and in 1940 the Supreme Court refused to review the case.

Indomitable A. & P. now resorted to "direct buying"—again a disguise, because the great grocery chain insisted that its suppliers pay A. & P. for advertising of their products, for sales promotion, and other such services, found to be largely fictional by the courts. Since the funds from these "advertising allowances" took the place of the forbidden brokerage fees, A. & P. continued to undersell the market and overcome its competitors.

At this juncture A. & P. became ever more subtle in its attempts to obtain discriminatory allowances. It required certain suppliers to file with the corporation letters, framed by A. & P., certifying that no concessions were tendered A. & P. in violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. At the same time, however, the grocery chain insisted on its rebates camouflaged as "advertising allowances." During this period, too, the company consolidated its far-flung chain into supermarkets and accepted deliveries to the retail outlets at a discounted price, while it protested against direct deliveries from its suppliers to the stores of its rivals. Another less lucrative but valuable way of securing secret rebates was A. & P.'s custom of furnishing bags and labels to its own manufacturers at a substantial mark-up from the cost of these items.

THE GOVERNMENT BRINGS ACTION

These practices were continued until February 1944 when the Antitrust Bureau of the Department of Justice brought action against A. & P., alleging a conspiracy to restrain interstate commerce and to monopolize a substantial part of the retail food market. The suit was criminal, an action reserved for willful or repeated offenders against the antitrust laws. After a trial lasting several months, A. & P. was found guilty of violating the Sherman Act, and in February 1949 the trial court's verdict was affirmed by the circuit court of appeals in a decision written by Judge Sherman Minton, recently appointed to the United States Supreme Court.

The trial court's decision made it clear that there is no law to prevent the normal expansion of a business, that there is no objection to the mere size of a corporation even if the resources and strength of the corporation give it a dominating place in the industry. Neither horizontal integration nor vertical integration is in itself illegal under the Sherman Act. The use of this concentrated power becomes illegal, however, when, by reason of intent or the inherent nature of contemplated acts, the public interest is prejudiced by the restriction of competition.

The A. & P. trial has brought out into the open the hidden role of the corporation's alter ego, the Atlantic Commission Co., commonly called ACCO. This vast wholesale purchasing company, incorporated by A. & P. in 1926, purchased in huge quantities, sold to A. & P. at preferential rates and to its competitors at tidy profits. In 1940, ACCO handled about 12 percent of the total national movement of fresh fruits and produce. ACCO's size and power have frequently permitted it to reserve to itself the right to set prices unilaterally.

A. & P.'s greatest profits have been derived from the hidden mark-up on all merchandise transferred from ACCO to A. & P.'s 6,000 retail outlets. In fact, the annual earnings from ACCO alone have very nearly approached the total retail earnings of all the stores. Because of this hidden income, A. & P. has been able to undersell, even at a loss, where necessary, all competitors in a certain substantial territory and thus, by this lethal weapon, force all other grocers out of business. When State minimum mark-up laws made such practices illegal, A. & P. would neatly evade the laws by underbilling the products from their own manufacturing plants and from ACCO to the retail outlets. When competition was dead, the A. & P. would then raise its prices above normal, recoup its losses and settle down to enjoy the fruits of relative monopoly in the territory in question.

ACCO—A. & P.'S PAC

With the help of ACCO, the A. & P. has organized the Better Business Association, Inc., to protect A. & P.'s interests, but never has A. & P. let it appear to the public that this association was financed and dominated by the grocery chain itself. Likewise, A. & P. has operated behind the front of the Emergency Tax Council of New Jersey, which, supposedly in the name of and for the sake of the public, conducted a State-wide campaign against special taxes on supermarkets. A. & P. also organized the National Consumers' Tax Commission of Illinois, for the ostensible purpose of studying taxes but actually to express A. & P.'s views on the chain-store-tax question.

Closely connected with this phase of A. & P.'s activities were ACCO's attempts to organize various producers' cooperatives, some of which ACCO sought to dominate, others of which it sought to direct, all with the intent, of course, of securing reduced wholesale prices for A. & P. ACCO's most ambitious effort along these lines was the organization of the Super-Co-op, an association dominated by the grocery chain and designated to give ACCO greater control over its suppliers, but camouflaged to make it appear that the shippers themselves were the moving force in the organization. Super-Co-op was to be used as a propaganda agency to fight A. & P.'s enemies and to induce the movement of all fruits and vegetables through ACCO. Super-Co-op was abandoned, however, because of the admitted fear that it was too apparent an attempt to monopolize the entire produce industry.

Restraint of competition must inevitably follow, the trial court held, from the multiple, irreconcilable, inconsistent functions of ACCO, including its obligation as an agent for sellers to sell high and its obligation as a buying agent for A. & P. to purchase as cheaply as possible. ACCO, said the Court, is the "rotten thread" that runs through the entire corporate structure of A. & P.

THE GOVERNMENT'S SOLUTION

To effectuate last February's verdict of guilty against A. & P., the Justice Department has recently filed a civil action to enforce the Government's recommended reorganization of the company. The suit demands the complete separation of A. & P. from its vast wholesale affiliate, ACCO. The manufacturing and processing of food conducted by A. & P. must be made entirely distinct from its business of buying and selling food. The national network of A. & P. must be divided into seven separate parts, each part to be under independent ownership, control, and management. Its national headquarters purchasing departments must be abolished, and all shadow of collusion and conspiracy between the autonomous sections of the new organization is forbidden.

The Government's remedy seems drastic. Yet it only enforces the strong language of the Sherman Act passed by a Republican

Congress in 1890. The mere attempt to monopolize any part of the commerce between the various States is there made illegal. Likewise, the strong language of the Robinson-Patman Act of 1936, outlawing any discrimination in prices not based on real saving, allows but one interpretation.

The A. & P. fought back at the Government enforcement agency in a second series of full-page advertisements on September 30. The grocery chain asserted that its patrons have deluged the company with messages to the effect that the dissolution of the A. & P. will be a great loss to American consumers. This is, of course, beside the point, since the preservation of free competition is the real good for the consumer. The stifling of competition, even if it brings present reduction in prices, will inevitably lead to partial or total monopoly, and monopoly always makes the many the victim of the few. At least, that is the underlying premise of the Sherman Antitrust Act. In the ads, A. & P. also assured the public that it is not a monopoly because some years ago it controlled 11 percent of the retail grocery business and today it controls only 6 percent. This is merely in line, however, with the Government's position that bigness is not necessarily badness unless the power inherent in bigness is abused.

Other arguments put forth by A. & P. in this second series of advertisements are not worth answering. We can be grateful at least that the newspaper editorial writers have not echoed A. & P.'s misrepresentations of the issue, although it is probably a foregone conclusion that the public will hear nothing of the truth of the matter, even during the long negotiations between the company and the Antitrust Bureau which will soon begin.

A. & P.'s suppressed major premise is its belief in limitless free competition, a system which results, as Pius XI put it so well in Quadragesimo Anno, in the "survival of those who are the strongest, which means those who fight most relentlessly, who pay least heed to the dictates of conscience." Even the inadequate existing antimonopoly legislation in the United States will prevent such a result if this legislation is properly enforced. The A. & P. has done its bit to obscure the value of such legislation in the public eye.

The corporation skilled legal staff will spend the next several months in defending the practices of its employer. Victory for the Government, however, is all but certain, even though it will cost the taxpayer several hundred thousand dollars to prove that A. & P. is wrong. I hope that the money will not be entirely wasted, insofar as it will further the preservation of the system of free, but not entirely unrestricted, competition which is an essential and valuable part of the American way.

Betrayal Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include an editorial that appeared in one of the Nation's leading newspapers, the Omaha World-Herald, on January 6, 1950. The editorial is as follows:

BETRAYAL COMPLETED

Now the betrayal of Nationalist China by its allies in World War II is complete. President Truman has announced that the United States will not aid in the defense of Chiang's last fortress, Formosa.

In the opinion of many responsible Americans—among them, ex-President Hoover, Senator Taft and, reputedly, Douglas MacArthur—the interests of the United States also have been betrayed.

Whether the President was chiefly influenced by the State Department, or by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, or by the Government of Great Britain, was not stated.

But this much is known:

The Joint Chiefs had proposed sending a mission to Tokyo and Formosa in February, to consult with General MacArthur and to study western defense plans. The President's decision short-circuits that proposal, and gives a direct slap to America's greatest authority on Pacific warfare.

Some days before the Presidential decision was announced, word leaked out that Secretary Acheson had sent a secret memorandum to his men in striped pants, advising them that the capture of Formosa by the Communists was widely anticipated, and that the American public should be prepared in advance for the loss of the militarily unimportant island.

In other words, the abandonment of Formosa was an Acheson policy before it was announced as a Truman policy.

Whatever its origin, abandonment of Formosa is a logical extension of the appeasement policies begun at Yalta. There the late President Roosevelt pledged to Stalin that Russia could have Manchuria, the Kuriles, Sakhalin Island, Port Arthur, almost anything else she wanted, if only she would join, sometime, in the war against Japan.

Chiang, one of the allied Big Five, didn't hear about the Yalta deal until 4 months afterward. When he learned of it, he was helpless.

Russia did enter the war against Japan—for 1 week. Then she seized the promised territory, including huge stores of war matériel which were used by the Reds against the beleaguered Chiang.

Now, with the official abandonment of Formosa by the Government in Washington, the Communist world has harvested the full fruits of Yalta.

The State Department's advocacy of the Formosa decision is especially interesting because it is primarily the work of two men.

One is Secretary Acheson, who was Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary during the war, and who is the continuity man between the Roosevelt and Truman Administrations. The China white paper issued last year under his sponsorship was an amazing exposition of the view that Chiang, not communism, was the enemy of America in the Orient.

The other architect of Asiatic policy is Philip C. Jessup, the Department's far eastern investigator. Some years ago Mr. Jessup was associated with the Institute of Pacific Relations, a propaganda organization which campaigned against Chiang and in favor of the Communist rebels. He was a supporter of Red Spain. More recently, he appeared as a character witness for Alger Hiss, the man accused of giving State Department documents to Soviet Russia.

On those two men, apparently, President Truman relied.

To General MacArthur he did not even listen.

Admittedly, a decision to defend Formosa or to strengthen Chiang's forces there would have involved the grave risk of war.

But as against that risk, the chosen policy creates prospects which are no less grave.

One is that Formosa will fall. Military men say there is little if any doubt of it. In that case it will be a Red dagger point at the Philippines, Japan, and all American outposts in the West.

Another is that the Red Government will then become the undisputed ruler of China, and as such entitled to general recognition—and to China's permanent seat on the Security Council of the United Nations. That body will then be divided 3–2 between Communists and non-Communists—with either Britain, the friend of Red China, or France, which sometimes wavers toward communism holding the balance of power.

Not a pleasant prospect for Americans to contemplate. Conceivably the consequences may be more dreadful than those which followed Munich. But it is the course which President Truman and his trusted advisers irrevocably have chosen.

We Have Forsaken Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the January 7, 1950, issue of the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post:

WE HAVE FORSAKEN FORMOSA

Why we have abandoned Formosa to the Communists, for that is what we have done, is not yet clear. President Truman has barred any United States military intervention, aid, or advice, asserting that the program conforms to the traditions of our foreign policy in China, the Cairo and Potsdam agreements, and to a United Nations resolution against any nation's seeking influence or imperial aggrandizement in China.

Did he prevent a war, a real shooting war, by leaving the island open to Communist invasion? Or has he brought us closer to a shooting war by allowing the Communists to take over an island which endangers our Pacific defense line from Japan to Okinawa and the Philippines?

The military leaders of the country were stunned by the abandonment of this Pacific bastion. They disagree fully with Secretary Acheson, who, like his predecessors in the Cabinet post have been sitting on their hands while Moscow has spread its armies and its political control all over Asia.

Intervention to save the island, and the remnants of Chiang Kai-shek's government and troops, might have gotten us into an early war with Russia, is Secretary Acheson's view. We would like some more light on that view. The administration is committed, after all, to stopping communism, yet by its decision on Formosa, it provides Russian communism with an opportunity to advance and menace our Pacific outposts.

The loss of China was bad enough, as it broke the Asiatic frontier, and as soon as the Communists step into Formosa, as they will eventually, our defenses will suffer another break. It all looks very much like a compromise with totalitarianism.

Now that Britain has given full diplomatic recognition to China's Red government, the first major break in Anglo-American accord on foreign policy in 25 years, perhaps an explanation of our policy in Asia will be forthcoming from Mr. Truman. Such an explanation is more important now than anything he said in his state of the Union address. We hope he gives it.

Abject Surrender to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the credulity of many of our citizens under the persuasive power of propaganda seems to know no limits. Millions of our citizens know that Poland was betrayed at Yalta and they know that the existing administration has coddled the Communists and given them a key to the front door of many of the departments of our Government. The internationalists representing credulous constituencies without regard to party have voted billions of the taxpayers' money to promote and to perpetuate a Fabian socialistic government in England. Now, when the ECA notorious racket bids fair to collapse and the stream of our taxpayers' money is now to be curtailed, the Fabian socialistic government, which I repeat has been supported by internationalists, has double-crossed our people and have recognized the Communist Government set-up in China. I am wondering just how long the people are going to be bamboozled and fooled by the men who have squandered these billions and who now shout for economy and refuse to support tax reduction. I admit that they are playing a clever game of deception, but it ought to be obvious now to thoughtful people that they have been sold and are about to be again sold down the river. The administration plan now is to pass a few crumbs in the way of the elimination of excise taxes to quiet down the public urge for real tax reduction and thus preserve the larger portions of the revenues collected for further domestic and international boondoggling.

It is the people who should demand forthrightness on the part of their representatives and not be lulled into false security by the shouts for economy on the part of the most notorious spenders of the taxpayers' billions.

The economic principles which have given this country a sound economy and a safe foreign policy have been scrapped.

Under leave heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in a recent edition of the Washington Evening Star:

PRINCIPLES OF UNITED STATES SEEN THROWN TO WIND AT YALTA CONFERENCE—RESULTS IN CHINA DECLARED INEVITABLE; MEANING OF PARLEY STILL UNDIGESTED

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The case against the Chinese National Government and Chiang Kai-shek was presented to the State Department as early as 1934 and again in 1941 by the Japanese, who argued that Chiang was corrupt and reactionary and that this justified Japanese intervention. Then the State Department, under Mr. Hull, stood on the basis of legitimacy and international law, arguing that the incapacities of the government of a country furnished no excuse for fishing in its troubled waters. It was the maintenance of that standpoint against appeasing Japan that precipitated the war with Japan.

The viewpoint had the merit of embodying a traditional and understandable principle. It was entirely abandoned at Yalta, in February 1945.

Although the Chinese Government was an ally, our Government, in a secret agreement with Stalin, of which the Chinese Government was informed only 4 months later, effectively assured that Manchuria should fall to Russia and—if our previous attitude made any sense at all—that this would assure Russian hegemony over all China. We thereby threw previous principles of legitimacy and law to the winds, and also abandoned the only consistent China policy the United States had ever had—that of the open door and no special interests in China.

BARRAGE OF PROPAGANDA

This was preceded and followed by a barrage of American propaganda against Chiang Kai-shek and for the Chinese Communists. Leading in this propaganda were the publications of the Institute for Pacific Relations—on whose board Prof. Philip C. Jessup, now of the State Department, sat in various high capacities—which, as early as 1943, had opened a blast against the national government, presenting the issue as between feudal and democratic China.

The campaign was taken up by most American writers on China; by Gen. Joseph W. Stilwell and finally—in a veiled way—by the official white paper, whose thesis is we could have done nothing anyhow. This thesis is flatly denied by our Ambassador to China. The paper is an appalling record of the disintegration of an originally clear policy, even to the extent of justifying the Yalta deal by historical precedent—the precedent being Russian intervention in China under the Tsars.

The meaning of Yalta has still not been digested. Administration apologists (including the late Edward R. Stettinius, in his book Roosevelt and Yalta) take the line that Yalta was all right but the Russians did not respect their agreeements. This is tantamount to saying Munich was all right but Hitler did not respect his agreements. Like Munich, Yalta established spheres of influence among three great powers, and contemplated a Big Three peace in a Big Three United Nations. Russia was granted special interests in east Europe and China, in no case were the Allied Governments consulted.

RESULTS WERE INEVITABLE

The fundamental thesis of Yalta was incompatible with every principle of freedom, equality, and international law. It was, therefore, incompatible with democracy. It denied every paragraph of the Atlantic Charter, and it had inevitable results.

Because the Atlantic Charter was abandoned, we have the Atlantic Pact.

Because we agreed to the division of Europe and the partition of Germany we have our frantic efforts to integrate and unite a rump Europe which is a political and economic monstrosity.

Because we recognized special Russian interests in China, overthrowing the whole concept of the open door, we have a Russian puppet government over the whole China mainland.

You cannot destroy the authority of a government in one place and restore it in another. The case against the Chinese Nationalists has been written by American officials, journalists, and policy. The Communists don't need to write a word of their own propaganda. They can quote Americans.

There is no principle of any kind we can invoke, not even the principle of nonintervention, because at Yalta we did intervene, and made a deal, which we enforced on the China Government.

We are now in the preposterous situation of standing out alone against recognizing the Communist Government which we, more than any country except Russia, helped create. It cannot be done, and certainly not by this administration. We shall have to lie in the bed made for us, though we shall not sleep. The last laugh may well be Chiang's.

Technique of Point 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Ira E. Bennett entitled "Technique of Point 4" which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of December 31, 1949:

TECHNIQUE OF POINT 4—PROPOSED PROGRAM LINKED CLOSELY TO NATIONAL SECURITY AND WORLD DEVELOPMENT

(By Ira E. Bennett)

The preliminary study thus far given by Congress to the so-called point-4 program reveals that the proposal is closely linked with problems of national defense and security and also that certain basic features of the program are already in successful operation in Latin America. There, through cooperation, American technique in the fields of education, sanitation, and agriculture has accomplished gratifying results at insignificant cost, and with increased assurance that enormous supplies of materials needful for hemispheric defense will be available.

It is assumed by critics of point 4 that it is a fantastic semisocialistic scheme for feeding hungry people all over the world at the expense of American taxpayers. It is described as a program for delivering a bottle of pasteurized milk daily to every Hottentot, with the compliments of the United States, in the hope that the Hottentotters will join hands in fomenting world affection, fraternity, and eternal peace.

Some of the critics insist that the scheme will not work successfully because bureaucrats will botch it in the administration thereof. Others hold fast to the central idea that it is not the business of the United States to uplift lazy, swarming hordes of foreigners, and that the spending of billions of tax money for this purpose would be a crime. Hence, without examining point 4, they condemn it in toto.

A few minutes' study of point 4 reveals that the really fantastic part of the picture is the criticism of the program and not the program itself. The United States stands to gain vastly greater benefits through the program than it could gain by the expenditure of billions otherwise. While the cost to the United States—the cost in public money—will be very small, however rich the resulting benefits to the peoples of undeveloped countries by the application of American "know-how" and industrial methods to potentially great natural resources.

In the American Republics there have been exchanges of skilled advisers with good results at small cost. One expert from the American Geological Survey assisted Brazilian colleagues to map a reserve of 17,000,000 tons of manganese ore, and two other American geologists from the Survey mapped a manganese reserve of 7,500,000 tons in the Amazon area. The Bureau of Mines, according to Julius A. Krug, formerly Secretary of the Interior, has done fruitful cooperative work with Brazil, Bolivia, Mexico, and Peru.

A small technical mission to Mexico contributed substantially to an enormous expansion in fish production.

About 600 projects, large and small, are comprised within the cooperative work now going on in 10 American Republics, under the general jurisdiction of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs. American experts are aiding in the task of bettering education, sanitation, and agriculture in the countries concerned.

The cost to the United States is insignificant, but the ultimate benefits are expected to be very important as the level of living standards rises and the productive capacity of the workers increases with improved health and better education.

Congress was so favorably impressed by the operations of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs that it unanimously, in the recent session, extended the life of the institute for 5 years and gave it a modest appropriation with which to finance the American share of the program.

Far-reaching political considerations are involved in the work now going on. All the American Republics are bound by the Treaty of Rio de Janeiro to act as one in case of aggression, and at the conference at Bogotá they agreed to cooperate against Communist propaganda and intrigue. In case of war it could be assumed that the resources of Central and South America, as well as those of the United States and Canada, would be made available for the defense of this hemisphere. Thus the manganese of Brazil and the uranium of Canada would help the United States to replenish its stock of strategic materials.

It is not solely in a quixotic mood, therefore, that the United States desires the increase of production in undeveloped democratic countries. The Soviet embargo upon manganese exports to the United States means little in any event, as manganese is obtainable elsewhere; but it is a comfort to know that South America contains immense stores of this necessary component of steel.

Treaty negotiations are under way, it is said, with 16 countries for the purpose of safeguarding American capital and assuring its fair treatment while engaged in developing foreign resources.

The proposed treaties are to be the basis of policy under point 4 so far as American investments abroad are concerned. The objective is to encourage American capital to take hold of enterprises which American technical experts have found to be capable of development on a large scale with profit to the investors, and with great benefit to the producing country in the way of good wages to workers. This procedure has already brought rich returns in the development of the copper and nitrate industries of Chile by American capital. Venezuela's oil production is largely financed by Americans. Central American countries are benefited by American enterprise in developing banana production.

Altogether, it is estimated that American capital invested in foreign countries aggregates $17,000,000,000. Only $2,000,000,000 of this, however, has been invested since World War II, as capital has been wary of taking risks in politically restive countries.

The solidarity of the American republics in the matter of common defense has helped to reassure American capital that it can feel fairly safe hereafter when the republics make treaties intended to insure fair treatment and immunity from expropriation. The profit motive in such conditions could be expected to induce American capital to consummate mass production development which would be too heavy for native capital to tackle.

Point 4 involves no expenditure of public money in any foreign enterprise; but it does contemplate the use of public funds in sharing with other countries the modest cost of pilot work by technical experts in finding the places and means whereby great natural resources can be developed. The lion's share of benefit would go to the producing country. The byproduct of such development would benefit the United States in several ways—by the lessening of tensions and war dangers; by the increase of trade with countries making headway toward a higher standard of living; and by better assurance that vitally necessary strategic materials would be available when needed.

Among these strategic materials are copper, tin, nickel, manganese, uranium, high-grade iron ore, oil, certain chemical products, etc., all of which are obtainable within the Western Hemisphere.

Venezuelan and Mexican oil production is to be joined now by Canadian production from several new fields. In Ecuador vigorous exploration is going on by several strong companies. An outstanding geologist not long ago stated that all signs pointed to large oil pools under Florida.

Just as the American Republics are combined in a defensive past against aggression, so all self-governing nations are in process of combining to resist the Communist world revolution. The Atlantic Treaty embraces some of these free governments. Other alliances probably will be made if Soviet pressure increases. The point-4 program contemplates cooperation with our governments only when those governments are opposed to communism. It would be economically impossible to cooperate with the Soviet Union or its satellite governments, because all of them prohibit private enterprise and monopolize all commerce and shipping.

To the extent that development of natural resources under point 4 would raise living standards and increase the strength of free peoples, the program commends itself to Americans as useful in combating the Communist world revolution. But, of course, they would be opposed to giving public money to develop the resources of other countries, rich or poor.

Since private capital cannot be compelled to go abroad, there need be no apprehension that American investors would suffer losses in foreign enterprises voluntarily undertaken by big American corporations. Those corporations have suffered sometimes, and they are now only too cautious in entering foreign fields. They know, however, that the foreign field can yield enormously rich returns to capital when conditions are favorable. It is for the purpose of bringing about favorable conditions that point 4 has been devised.

It would be possible to abuse the discretion to be lodged in the State Department with respect to lending technical experts to assist foreign governments in developing their economy. However, if enthusiasm for the program should lead to rainbow-chasing by overgenerous bureaucrats, Congress could quickly bring the dreamers to earth by cutting off the appropriation.

In any event, it seems probable that the point-4 program will be approved by Congress after perfecting the legislation that is now pending, and that administration of the program will be directed by the State Department. International political considerations require that execution of the program shall be in harmony with the Nation's foreign policy. Naturally, all agencies of the Government would furnish technicians for foreign exploratory work as directed by the President under the proposed legislation.

A point sometimes overlooked is this: The United States is itself one of the "undeveloped countries of the world." It can profit by exchanging technicians with other countries whose experts could be sent to this country to assist in developing American resources to better advantage.

Still another point of cooperative advantage is the fact that foreign students trained here in American technical and scientific institutions, including Federal agencies, become the forerunners of important constructive enterprises in their home countries. One of these men who studied the methods of the Reclamation Service was placed in charge of two projects in his own country requiring an outlay of $40,000,000.

Whether American or foreign technicians familiar with American equipment are the pilots of new undertakings, their natural inclination is to recommend the use of American machinery and equipment. Thus foreign enterprises, even if not financed by American capital, will enlarge the demand for American materials, machinery, equipment, and skilled personnel.

Old Man of the Mountain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the National Tribune of January 5, 1950:

OLD MAN OF THE MOUNTAIN

With years a richer life begins,
The spirit mellows;
Ripe age gives tone to violins,
Wine, and good fellows.

—*Trowbridge.*

The announcement on Christmas Day by Commander George Craig, of the American Legion, that Miles Kennedy, of New York, is to replace Gen. Thomas Taylor as legislative director will doubtless cause a pang in the hearts of many a legionnaire. And, for that matter, the news will be received with regret by numerous of Taylor's friends who are not of the Legion and by some who are not unfriendly but who have often locked horns with him in his official capacity. Certainly we of the Tribune, even though it has been an open secret for months that the general must retire, felt a bit uncomfortable when it seemed necessary to name a successor, and we could not permit the news to travel far without attempting to voice briefly our reactions.

In Washington Jack Taylor is something of an institution and one with which people have had to reckon for many years. Beloved by most with whom he has dealt, feared by some because he was once ruthless when opposed in the performance of his Legion duties, but respected by all for his fearlessness in carrying out the dictates of convention resolutions, he is perhaps best known around the Nation's Capital as a lobbyist without a peer. A familiar figure in the Halls of Congress, his mind has clicked for years as precisely as have his heels on the marble of the corridors on Capitol Hill. He was, and is, a familiar figure, carrying always his ash walking stick and wearing spats of gray that are as much a part of him as his tousled mane of gray hair, his flying coat tails, his warm smile, and his static speech.

This commentator has known him at his best—and at his worst—for 25 of the more than 30 years Taylor has devoted to the Legion. It gives us license to treat a little familiarly with the history of a man whom nature endowed with a force of character possessed by few and with whom time has dealt gently. We say he is beloved by most men for the reason that there is gentleness and a warmth of understanding in him; he

likes well those who are attracted to him and those he can call his friends. We say he is feared because we have heard him blasphemed by Congressmen, legislators who had to be whipped into line by an artful and fluid tongue, sometimes by the banging on a solon's desk with that ash cane; aye, we have seen recalcitrants persuaded by a man and his machine until they have voted right, even though that day and that sort of inducement is no longer in vogue. And that he and those he represents are respected is a living thing that can be found in accomplishment When Taylor finally passes into history, his works will ever shine as a splendid example of love to fellow man. If the American Legion has given to him, he has given to the Legion.

Because, perchance, some may look upon this as an obituary, we hasten to make two assurances. Taylor has his faults like any other human, and he has erred, but it is proper to be kind when a person of his mein approaches retirement, so we avoid listing his shortcomings. Also, he is not yet through. The governing group of the Legion has recognized that the "old rock" has not yet disintegrated, and, by special dispensation, it has wisely decided to continue Taylor in a consultant capacity and as a tutor and guide to his successor. At a proper time we shall warn Kennedy against the good general's failings, while we meantime commend to him his virtues. We treat here mostly with good deeds and with a struggle with Father Time. Under Legion rules it is as inevitable that retirement must come with the months ahead as it is impossible that time will not take its toll. Yet time travels in divers paces with divers persons.

Nobody who looks upon the Taylor countenance would judge him to have seen 65 summers. Nevertheles, he was 34 when he came out of World War I as a high-ranking shavetail with 17 months of overseas service. It would have been doubted that he was 57 years young when he again went abroad for action in World War II in which he participated for 2½ years, and that he was edging on to retirement when he earned that star on his shoulder. A few people rush to get a pencil and paper when they begin to count the many ribbons on Taylor's broad chest, and, if it will suit any sourpuss to know it, one marks him as a first-class private in the French Foreign Legion, but there are some there that denote distinguished service, and we consider him to have a medal of gold for a great performance of duty to the Legion, with a diamond added for his long years of helpfulness to the sick and the disabled of our wars and to the dependents of our departed dead. Thirty-one years of application to work in the veterans' cause and to the Nation, from the birth of the American Legion to its present peak of usefulness, is a mark of distinction given to a very small number of the people's servants.

Back in the 1500's, a poet wrote these lines which we feel fit a landmark in Legion history and one of its foremost participants:

His golden locks time hath to silver turned;
O time too swift! O swiftness never ceasing.
His youth 'gainst time and age hath ever spurned,
But spurned in vain; youth waneth by encreasing.

Jack Taylor has not squandered time nor effort. In the past he has mastered both, because they demand no waste. Time can be counted by heartthrobs or by creeping hours, and too many have elaborately thrown it away, but Taylor has had the strong mind to combat it. Withal, it gallops by relentlessly and they are to be envied who have left strong and eraseless footprints in its sands. It has not been ungenerous to Jack, even though it has tamed a little his hand and tempered his judgment, but there must be a follower, a next of kin, if the good of his work to go on. We know that the new legislative director has the required energy and the native ability to fill a pair of shoes, difficult though the transition may be, and that he will have the companionable assistance that only one with Taylor's qualifications can give him in carrying on the assignment and in performing the service that the position demands. We look forward confidently even as we are forced to witness the early passing of the Old Man of the Mountain. We cannot have all we desire for all time, or, as Browning put it:

Never the time and the place
And the loved one all together.

Cotton Acreage Allotments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES B. DEANE

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, much is being said concerning the cotton acreage allotments. I have been interested in reading a telegram forwarded by Mr. Allan B. Kline, president, American Farm Bureau Federation, to the Secretary of Agriculture and the reply of Secretary Brannan to Mr. Kline.

In view of the apparent confusion concerning this important legislation, the Congress and the public, I feel, are entitled to have the benefit of views expressed in the following telegram from Mr. Kline and the response from Secretary Brannan, and under permission to extend my remarks, I include these statements and likewise express the hope that the Committee on Agriculture will rapidly develop corrective legislation to avoid exceedingly serious economic disorders throughout the cotton-producing area of this country.

The statements follow:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
December 16, 1949.

Mr. ALLAN B. KLINE, *President,*
American Farm Bureau Federation,
Chicago, Ill.

DEAR ALLAN: I have briefly delayed answering your wire of December 10 concerning the 1949 cotton marketing quota legislation because I did not want to appear to be influencing the referendum under this new law held yesterday. Now that the referendum has been concluded, I want to set the record straight on this vital subject.

The American Farm Bureau Federation authored and aggressively supported the legislation by many hours of testimony, by the activities of many of its national and State officers in the Halls of the Congress, and by other means. The bill was adopted in almost the precise form which the American Farm Bureau Federation prescribed, notwithstanding the fact that representatives of the Department of Agriculture and others pointed out that the already discredited method for allotting acres among farms within the county by a cropland formula would create many difficulties and inequities and invite litigation.

I agree with you that the law does create inequities. But I do not agree with you that its defects can be corrected by administrative determinations.

With respect to the three provisions of the law which are the primary contributing factors to the inequities complained of; namely, the cropland formula, the large war crop credits, and minimum small farm provisions, the American Farm Bureau Federation vigorously opposed the vesting of any latitude or discretionary authority in the Department of Agriculture.

Your statement that I have authority to make farm allotments more equitable by reallocating to hardship cases the acreage which will not be planted by the farmers to whom it has been allotted is not borne out by the language of the legislation or the legislative history. Such authority was contained in the act of 1938, but was consciously deleted from the present law. In short, you ask me to take administrative steps which the Congress specifically refused to authorize.

The Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture and all of our staff working on cotton legislation have devoted many hours to the task of making this legislation as workable as possible. But we have been frustrated at every turn by the strict, mandatory provisions of the law. Nevertheless, we are still trying to find means for alleviating the inequities and we heartily welcome your suggestions to that end. If any step now being taken is not consistent with the law, or if another step which you wish to suggest is reasonably authorized by law, please supply us with your recommendations.

I am presenting a chronology of how this legislation came into existence because the cotton producers of this country should be allowed to judge for themselves.

It is clear from this record that the troublesome provisions as to county and farm acreage allotments had their origin in Farm Bureau action even before the Memphis conference or the subsequent activities of its steering committee which itself was dominated by Farm Bureau officials.

Walter Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau and official cotton spokesman for the American Farm Bureau Federation, during hearings on the cotton allotment law, assured Congress that your members would be "delighted" if Congress adopted his proposal.

This legislation came about as a result of the following events and activities:

1. A special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture, headed by Congressmen STEPHEN PACE, began hearings on January 7, 1949, on cotton-marketing quota and acreage-allotment legislation. On January 26, the Secretary appeared before the full House Agriculture Committee and urged that the marketing-quota provisions of the 1938 act be modernized. In the course of his remarks he declared that:

"In establishing a basis for apportioning State, county, and farm allotments, a recent period of years should be used."

It was also explained to the committee:

"The recommendations which will be given to you in detail by other department witnesses are in the main the cumulative results of many months of work by the field staff of the Production and Marketing Administration through democratically elected farmer committeemen. State committeemen have obtained, analyzed, and passed on to me the farmers' thinking as to what their program should include, and how it may best be administered."

2. On January 26 and 28, the Production and Marketing Administration made specific recommendations to the special subcommittee regarding cotton legislation, emphasizing that they originated with the farmers out of nearly 2 years of discussions in the Cotton Belt. They recommended (a) that the national acreage allotment for 1950 and 1951 be

apportioned to the States on the basis of cotton plantings for the years 1945–48, inclusive, and for each year thereafter on the basis of the 5 years preceding the year in which the national allotment is established, excluding 1949 in all cases, (b) that the State acreage allotment be apportioned to the counties on the basis of the cotton plantings during the same period of years used in apportioning the national allotment to the States, with 10 percent State reserve for adjustments, and (c) that the county allotment for 1950 be apportioned to farms on the basis of cotton plantings on the farm in 1947 and 1948 and for each year thereafter on the basis of such plantings in the preceding 3 years, excluding 1949 in all cases, with a county reserve for adjustments of 25 percent for 1950 and 15 percent for each year thereafter.

3. On January 31, Walter L. Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau Federation and a member of the board of directors and executive committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation, appeared before the committee, announcing he was testifying in behalf of the national organization. His testimony on the point at issue opposed the Department. For example:

"We recommend that the county allotment be apportioned to farms primarily on the basis of the cropland on the farms in the county that are adapted to the growing of cotton. Experience has demonstrated that this is the most satisfactory method of apportioning county allotments to individual farms."

4. The hearings of the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture ended February 11, but the only cotton bill which resulted directly from these hearings was the one later enacted as Public Law 28, which excluded 1949 plantings in the calculation of cotton allotments for future years.

5. A nongovernmental belt-wide cotton conference was held in Memphis, Tenn., on April 24 and 25, in which farm bureau leaders from the Southern States took a very active role. Recommendations were made for establishing national and State acreage allotments, along with other recommendations for cotton marketing quota legislation. There were no recommendations regarding acreage allotment distribution from States to counties, or from counties to farms—the present trouble area. But the conference provided at its conclusion that each cotton-producing State should appoint one man to serve on a general committee "to implement measures adopted at this meeting."

As a result, an eight-man steering committee was created, headed by H. L. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau Federation, as chairman; and J. A. Sweet, chairman of the New Mexico Farm Bureau's cotton committee, as vice chairman; and including Hugh Agnew, president of the South Carolina Farm Bureau, and J. H. West, of the Texas Farm Bureau. Thus half the committee was comprised of farm bureau leaders. The recommendations worked out by this committee were incorporated into Senate bill 1962 introduced by Senator CLINTON P. ANDERSON on May 27.

6. On May 27, the Department submitted a bill to the Congress which was introduced as S. 1971 by Senator ELMER THOMAS, chairman of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, on May 31. This bill contained, among other things, a complete revision of the cotton marketing quota provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938. The cotton provisions conformed substantially to the recommendations made to the House by the PMA in January.

7. A special subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, headed by Senator ANDERSON, began hearings on S. 1962 on June 14. On that day the Deputy Administrator of the Production and Marketing Administration appeared before this committee with the adverse recommendations of the Department and to explain the Department's views on S. 1962. Those views had been set forth in a letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture to Chairman THOMAS dated June 13. This report on S. 1962 included the following:

"The Department recognizes the desirability of legislation which will accomplish the general objectives of section 344 (c), which establishes a formula for apportioning the national acreage allotments to States for 1950 and 1951. However, the formula proposed appears to be unduly complicated and to involve factors difficult to justify. In lieu of the establishment of fixed and temporary minimum State allotment bases, we suggest that as a means of providing equitable allotments for 1950 and 1951 factors or guides should be established for the use of the Secretary in making adjustments for trends or abnormal conditions."

The letter then goes on to say that the Department opposed the use of cropland as a basis for apportioning the county allotments to farms, citing five specific reasons, including:

"Under a uniform cropland factor approach, farms do not share in the county allotment according to their contribution to the county allotment, and some producers would bear a greater share of the acreage reduction than others. State and county allotments are based on the total cotton acreage of individual farms located within their boundaries, since the apportionment of the national allotment to the State and of the State to the county is based primarily on cotton-acreage history. Under the cropland-factor approach, however, two farms with the same cropland acreage may obtain the same size farm allotment, even though one of the farms historically may have contributed considerably more acreage to the county and State totals."

The Department emphasized its stand that the historical basis was the traditional way of establishing allotments—it had been tested in the courts, it worked effectively with other crops, and it was accepted and understood by the farmers. By contrast, the Department report said the cropland factor method had not worked satisfactorily when tried in the past until the historical factor was added, commenting:

"The Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as originally enacted, contained a similar provision (to that in S. 1962) and it was found necessary to supplement this provision for determining farm-acreage allotments * * * with other provisions so as to correct inequities. These supplementary provisions * * * were based mostly on historical plantings."

The report added:

"In connection with the use of a uniform cropland factor for determining cotton farm allotments, it also should be noted that farm allotments for other commodities, such as wheat, corn, tobacco, rice, and peanuts, have been established largely upon acreage history and that this method apparently has been satisfactory to producers of these commodities. Since it is probable that allotments for these other commodities may be established on a cotton farm, it will be confusing to producers as to why different methods are used for farm allotments for cotton as compared with other crops."

The Department's report concluded that S. 1962 should not be passed.

8. In explaining to the Senate subcommittee why the Department opposed S. 1962 and made other recommendations, a Department spokesman told of efforts ever since 1945 to obtain, compile, and analyze views of cotton growers generally and county and State PMA committeemen in cotton-producing areas in regard to preferences on all phases of farm, county, State, and national cotton-acreage allotments, adding:

"Then, in January of 1949, another meeting was held in Washington of the PMA State committmen, who went into this question very, very thoroughly, considered every conceivable angle, and took a vote by States on the most pertinent points that were in issue. On the basis of all that background and study, we drafted language for a bill that would modify the Agricultural Act of 1938 (S. 1971).

"I relate all of this background to emphasize the fact that we have, to the best of our ability, tapped the sources of information out in the country and have tried to find out the thinking of the farmers themselves and of those people who are very close to farmers."

The Department's testimony then pointed out the necessity of having some reserve set up in the national allotments to provide for adjustments in new areas, new farms, and small farms:

"The reason we make that suggestion is we think there will always be cases coming up which none of us can foresee, where new areas will be entering into the picture for which some sort of adjustment will have to be made. * * *

"We would suggest that it be deducted on a national basis * * * it makes it much more flexible and more workable."

9. The chairman of the Senate subcommittee stated that it seemed unlikely that all of S. 1971 would be enacted at the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and requested that the Department submit its recommendations in a separate bill dealing only with cotton. Such a bill was presented to the subcommittee later that same day, June 14. Its provisions were the same as those pertaining to cotton in S. 1971

10. H. L. Wingate, president of the Georgia Farm Bureau and chairman of the Memphis conference steering committee, testified before the Senate subcommittee to urge passage of S. 1962, saying it carried out the general objectives of the Memphis meeting and the manner in which such points had been implemented by the steering committee. Dr. C. R. Sayre also appeared as a spokesman for the steering committee, explaining the "added work done by the steering committee to make more feasible in a legislative sense the actual basic principles worked out at Memphis."

J. A. Sweet, chairman of the New Mexico Farm Bureau cotton committee and vice chairman of the steering committee, said it was their specific aim to permit as little latitude as possible for the Secretary of Agriculture in assigning or adjusting allotments:

"May I comment, too, upon the recommendations made by the Secretary of Agriculture. * * * The chief difference lies in the fact that in Senate bill 1962 adjustments for trends and shifts in acreages as between the States are spelled out. The members of this committee have studied carefully the Secretary's recommendations and we can assure you that there is unanimous support behind our proposal that the allotments to the States during the next three years be fully and explicitly spelled out in legislation. You will find other differences between the two sets of recommendations and nearly in every case it is a matter of defining in detail the administration of allotments in Senate bill 1962 and broad authority in the Secretary's suggested legislation."

11. Other Farm Bureau officers testifying in support of S. 1962 as official spokesmen for their natural organization included R. E. Short, of Arkansas, vice president of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Walter L. Randolph, president of the Alabama Farm Bureau, executive committee member of the American Farm Bureau Federation; Delmar Roberts, president of the New Mexico Farm Bureau; John Taylor, president of the Okla-

homa Farm Bureau; and R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau.

Both Mr. Randolph and Mr. Short specifically supported the cropland ratio factor of distributing allotments to farms. Mr. Short testified:

"I take the opportunity here to emphasize that we are very strong for allocating cotton acreage to farms primarily on the basis of tilled acres * * *

"We strongly approve the suggestion in this bill, and do not agree with the suggestion of the Department of Agriculture."

Both Mr. Short and Mr. Randolph opposed the Department's recommendations for a national reserve for adjustment purposes.

Mr. Short testified:

"The bill has sufficient provisions to take care of the reserves for small farmers. We believe those requirements can be met much more equitably on a local and State basis than on a national basis. Administration of the program in the past has indicated that ample provision is made for it, and therefore no need for national reserves on that basis. We therefore strongly oppose it."

Mr. Randolph testified:

"I think this bill better than any bill ever before Congress, takes care of the purposes for which this national reserve is recommended, and this bill leaves the major portion of the decision to the local committees and the State committees.

"So we would say we are very much opposed to a national acreage reserve. We are very strongly in favor of the provisions of this bill * * *."

Mr. Randolph told the committee the farm bureau had approved the principles of the bill long before the Memphis meeting, saying:

"At our national meeting in Atlantic City in December we had a committee of which Mr. Short was chairman, and nearly every State was represented * * * we reached agreement there which was substantially in line with this bill, and at our board meetings that has been refined from time to time, and we feel and believe that we represent our membership, which is 1,325,826. In the State of Alabama, I can say with all confidence that the producers, by their repeated votes, the members of the farm bureau, by repeated unanimous votes, have authorized me to represent them, and many of them do know about provisions of this bill and I am certain they will be delighted with the bill if it is enacted."

Mr. Short further testified:

"I think it is rather significant that the Memphis recommendations are in substantial agreement with our original recommendations."

12. A warning contrary to the farm-bureau viewpoint was voiced at that same hearing by Congressman CECIL WHITE, a member of the House Committee on Agriculture:

"It is my observation, gentlemen, that very few of the cotton producers in the United States, particularly in California, know anything about the provisions of the Memphis agreement."

13. On June 29, the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry reported favorably on S. 1962 with minor amendments. The report makes clear the origin of the provisions now being protested by the farm bureau. Of the Memphis conference, it stated:

"At that conference, the proposed system of cotton-marketing quotas and acreage allotments contained in S. 1962 was agreed upon."

The Senate passed S. 1962 on July 6 in substantially the same form in which it was reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

14. On June 29, the special subcommittee of the House Committee on Agriculture began hearings on H. R. 5392, differing in some respects from S. 1962 but incorporating substantially all of the provisions of the so-called Memphis plan. Although no formal report from the Department was requested on H. R. 5392, representatives of the Department were asked questions regarding provisions of the bill during the hearing.

15. H. L. Wingate, as chairman of the Memphis steering committee, and other members of that committee appeared before the subcommittee to urge passage of the Memphis plan, the major provisions of which were set forth in H. R. 5392.

16. The only national farm organization which appeared before the special committee of the House at hearings on this bill was the American Farm Bureau Federation, represented by Walter Randolph. After proposing a number of minor revisions in the bill, Mr. Randolph stated:

"We strongly support the essential features of H. R. 5392 relating to the computation and apportionment of National, State, county, and farm cotton allotments. * * *

"We want to emphasize our support for the provisions of H. R. 5392, which provide that county allotments shall be distributed to individual farms primarily on the basis of the cropland on the farms in the county that are adapted to the growing of cotton. Experience has demonstrated that this is the most satisfactory method of apportioning allotments to individual farms."

17. Following the conclusion of the hearings by the special subcommittee of the House, Congressman Pace introduced a new cotton bill (H. R. 5738) which differed in some respects from both his earlier bill and S. 1962. However, the revised bill contained substantially all of the provisions of the Memphis plan, except one important provision relating to the problem which has since developed.

18. On August 1 the House committee reported favorably on H. R. 5738 with certain amendments which did not alter materially the general plan of cotton allotments set forth in the original House bill. The House sent the bill to conference after a parliamentary move (substituting the provisions of H. R. 5738 for the provisions of S. 1962, as passed by the Senate).

19. The Senate and House conferees agreed for the most part on the provisions of the House bill, except for the provisions relating to the manner in which the State acreage allotments should be apportioned to the counties. In this respect the present legislation contains the provisions of the Senate bill which had been insisted on by Mr. Randolph for the Farm Bureau.

20. The legislation which was finally enacted as Public Law 272 contained the Memphis plan, as expanded by the steering committee, almost in its entirety. Thus, the two provisions of the legislation which are giving trouble at the moment—namely, the provisions relating to the establishment of county and individual farm allotments, were worked out entirely by the Memphis steering committee along the lines of Farm Bureau recommendations. The Department of Agriculture recommended against both proposals and suggested instead that the county and farm allotments be established primarily on the basis of county and farm cotton history, with provisions for considering other appropriate factors.

That is the record.

It is unfortunate for the cotton growers of this country that such a situation has developed, but I hope it may be turned to a constructive end by serving as an example.

Meanwhile, we will administer the law as best we can. Interpretations of the law to date have been made, of course, under the direction of our Solicitor. We have tried to alleviate the ill effects of which your organization complains by the most liberal interpretation of the terms of the act.

We will welcome an opportunity to work with the Congress and the farmer representatives during the next session of Congress to obtain workable amendments. Until we have this opportunity, however, I invite you to give the Department the benefit of any recommendations which might show us how we could steer a different course than that which we have announced and followed.

Farm leadership is no better than the direction in which it leads. If the direction proves to be wrong, then the leadership was wrong. The only way to correct it is to have a candid examination of the reasons for the error. It will do neither the organization leaders nor the farmers any good to blame the leaders' error on a Government official or agency. My duty as Secretary of Agriculture requires me to make it clear to the farmers where the responsibility rests for mistakes in representing the farmers' interest. For this reason, and because your telegram was made public, I am releasing this letter.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary.

CHICAGO, ILL., *December 18, 1949.*

CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.:

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation today issued the following statement:

"Cotton producers will vote December 15 on the question of marketing quotas for the 1950 cotton crop under a new law passed by the last session of Congress. Many farmers are reported to be dissatisfied with the acreage allotments which have been issued under this law. Marketing quotas have not been in force since they were suspended in 1942. It is only natural that some difficulties should arise the first year that a new program is put into effect, or an old program reinstated after several years of disuse. Actually, the 1949 Cotton Allotments Act is not a new law, but a modernization of the cotton provisions of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938.

"While everyone recognizes that it is impossible to write an acreage-allotment law that will cover all cases equitably, the major difficulties thus far encountered with cotton allotments are in the main a result of administrative failure to make full use of the authority provided in the law for the establishment of administrative areas within countries and the setting up of State and county acreage reserves to meet the very type of situations which are now arising. This is not solely the responsibility of the State and county committees. The ultimate responsibility rests squarely with the United States Department of Agriculture.

"The Secretary of Agriculture has full authority to make the allotments much more equitable than they are by reallocating to hardship cases the acreage which will not be planted by the farmers to whom it has been allotted. We call upon the Secretary to issue an administrative ruling providing for such reallocations wherever county committees find that the acreage allotted to a farmer exceeds his intention to plant.

"We believe that a vast majority of the inequitable allotments can still be corrected by administrative action without amending the law, but if amendments are found necessary, we shall seek prompt action when Congress reconvenes in January.

"The question of correcting inequities in acreage allotments, however, should not be confused with the main issue farmers must decide in the December 15 referendum on marketing quotas. That issue is whether the 1950 cotton crop is to receive price support at 50 percent or 90 percent of parity. If quotas are approved, the support price for 1950 will be about 28 cents per pound. If quotas are defeated, the support price will drop to 15 cents per pound. The economy of the Cotton Belt cannot stand such a drastic cut in income as would probably result. We therefore urge that cotton farmers

overwhelmingly approve marketing quotas. We can then concentrate our efforts on ironing out inequities in the acreage allotments."

ALLAN B. KLINE,
President, American Farm Bureau Federation.

The Spanish Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would wish to include an editorial from the Washington Star of January 2, 1950. This important declaration should be considered in connection with the fact that, in the last General Assembly of the United Nations, the membership voted 40 to 6 against the Soviet-ized Polish delegation's motion to censure Spain as Fascist and as having been "imposed by the Axis." As Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs, pointed out last May, this destroyed the whole basis of the case against Spain as it was originally formulated by the agents of the Soviet Union. After the unbelievable blindness of leftist propagandists about China, it would be a tragic blunder to continue to try to appease the Kremlin with reference to Spain. It is time for the resumption of full diplomatic relations with Madrid as well as for other measures of friendship and help for the Spanish people.

The editorial follows:

THE SPANISH FRAUD

Senator CONNALLY'S statement that he believes this country could properly exchange ambassadors with Spain if it wanted to do so is interesting as a subject for speculation.

In 1946 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting member nations to withdraw their ambassadors from Madrid. This was a phony show of morality that was rooted in deceit and tainted with fraud. The pretense was that the Spanish Government had aided the Axis, that it was a dictatorship, and that it suppressed civil rights and religious freedom. And, of all things, the leader of this crusade for decency was that inverted model of democracy—the Communist-dominated government of Poland.

Evidently Senator CONNALLY is not in sympathy with this shabby performance by the General Assembly. And since he says that he does not regard the 1946 resolution as legally binding on this country, the inference is that he may use his influence as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in an effort to persuade this Government to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain.

If so, he will be working in a good cause. And this is true, not because of any especially compelling reason of self-interest, but because this country, if it aspires to a position of moral leadership in the world, ought to purge itself of the intellectual dishonesty inherent in its position on the Spanish issue.

There is reason to believe that the State Department, or many of the top men in the State Department, would like to see an American Ambassador at Madrid. But they wring their hands and say that this cannot be done while the UN resolution remains in force. Perhaps there is some merit to that contention. Even if one believes that we were mouse trapped by the iron curtain delegations when the resolution was passed, there is still some force to the argument that the United States ought not to act in defiance of the Assembly.

But when these arguments are appraised in the light of the position taken last spring, they are found wanting in simple honesty. There was an effort last May to rescind the 1946 resolution. The vote was 26 to 15 in favor of repeal, but since a two-thirds majority was needed, the effort failed by a margin of 4 votes.

And what was our delegate doing in this attempt to cure the injustice of snubbing Spain while maintaining relations with the iron-curtain dictators? He was doing nothing. Under instructions from the State Department, he sat on his hands and abstained from voting.

It is this aspect of the matter which is most offensive to any concept of integrity. The United States should support the UN. But there is no valid reason why it should refuse to go on record as between right and wrong. If our Government believes the original action was a fraud, it should have voted to rescind it. If it does not believe this, its vote should have been cast against the repealer. In one breath we proclaim our greatness and our moral principles. And then we stultify ourselves by refusing to stand up and be counted on a clear-cut issue which bears not only on our own integrity, but on the integrity of the UN as well.

The Investigation of Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, I am impressed and pleased by the widespread interest being shown throughout the country in the assignment given by the House to the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities to investigate all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation. As chairman of that committee, I am also encouraged greatly by this interest and by the many suggestions we have received so far for avenues of investigation.

In the next few weeks it is my hope that the committee will determine a program of investigation and of hearings which will lead to a full report to the Congress and to the American people on the extent and nature of lobbying activity both by private and public groups on the problems of keeping this lobbying activity out in the open where it can be observed and properly assessed, and on the need for any changes in our present statute requiring the registration and filing of financial data by individuals and organizations engaging in the practice of seeking to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation.

The other members of this select committee, Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia; CARL ALBERT, of Oklahome; CLYDE DOYLE, of California; CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA of Minnesota are, I know, sincerely committed with me to an intention to make of this committee's investigation a constructive task in the national interest and not a smear campaign or a political witch hunt.

A few weeks ago I issued a statement in the nature of a progress report on the work of the committee and its staff up to that time. At the end of that statement appears a sample of a questionnaire which was distributed among all Members of Congress, seeking their advice and suggestions on policies we should follow or investigations we should make. I hope that those Members who have not yet had an opportunity to respond to that questionnaire will do so shortly. We are finding the suggestions which have come to us so far as a result of this questionnaire to be most helpful, and I am sure every Member of the Congress has similar worth-while information of value to us.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the RECORD the statement issued by me on December 19 as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE FRANK BUCHANAN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, CHAIRMAN, HOUSE SELECT COMMITTEE ON LOBBYING ACTIVITIES, DECEMBER 19, 1949

The Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, created by House Resolution 298, was authorized and directed by the House of Representatives earlier this year to investigate all lobbying activities, including activities of agencies of the Federal Government, "intended to influence, encourage, promote or retard legislation."

We were provided with full subpena powers, and an initial appropriation of $40,000, and were ordered to report our findings and recommendations to the House before the end of the Eighty-first Congress.

The seven-member committee appointed by the Speaker, and which includes Representatives HENDERSON LANHAM, of Georgia; CARL ALBERT, of Oklahoma; CLYDE DOYLE, of California, CHARLES A. HALLECK, of Indiana; CLARENCE J. BROWN, of Ohio; and JOSEPH P. O'HARA, of Minnesota, organized October 11. On October 19 it authorized the chairman to proceed during the congressional recess with the employment of a staff and the conduct of preliminary investigations and research designed to provide a general over-all picture of lobbying activities and the operation of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

No decisions were made by the full committee as to what specific lobbying groups, organizations or individuals, or Federal agencies or officials engaging in lobbying activities might be made the subjects of intensive inquiry and public hearings.

The scope of the inquiry the House has directed us to make into the subject of lobbying is not limited in the resolution in any particular except as to time. Obviously, however, we cannot possibly investigate every individual lobbyist and every individual lobbying practice.

At the same time, it is my hope that before this committee completes its work and makes its report and recommendations to the House, we will be able to answer definitely whether the lobbying law now in operation is being violated and, if so, to what extent and in what manner; also, whether the present act is adequate or requires amendment in order to make it conform to the purposes Congress had in mind in 1946 when it included this unprecedented Federal law on lobby regulation as title III of Public Law 601 of the Seventy-ninth Congress, the historic

La Follette-Monroney Legislative Reorganization Act.

I believe that, as a corollary aim, this committee will try to show the Congress and the American people a clear picture of the extent to which lobbies of all sorts seek to influence legislative action by Congress even when such action may be contrary to the public good and to economy and efficiency in Government.

These are our long-range goals. For the immediate present, however, and until the full membership of the committee has decided upon an agenda of full-scale investigations and hearings, the staff of the committee is engaged primarily and exclusively in the accumulation of essential information of a generally noncontroversial nature, in the compilation of what might be termed a catalog of basic fact on the theory and practice of lobbying.

In recent weeks, in addition to engaging staff members, I have, under the committee's authorization, directed the following staff activities:

1. Assignment of investigators to review the books and records of a number of prominent, acknowledged lobbying organizations for the purpose of obtaining factual information on how some typical lobbies actually operate in their efforts to influence legislative action by Congress. Since there is no particular significance attachable to the selection of these preliminary sources of such information, the committee is not presently making public the names of the groups or individuals being contacted. I might say that, with certain exceptions, cooperation on the part of the lobbyist involved so far in this preliminary study has, on the whole, been satisfactory.

2. Two sets of questionnaires, each containing the same 10 questions, have been directed to all Members of the House and Senate, in one instance, and, in the other, to several hundred scholars and journalists who have made special studies in the past of pressure tactics or of lobbying regulation. These questions (a sample copy of which is attached at the end of this statement as exhibit A) are intended to elicit leads on possible violations of the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act or, in the case of lobbying by Federal officials or agencies, of the Criminal Code. They also invite information on lobbying practices generally and on abuses, and ask for suggestions of specific lobbies or Federal agencies or officials whose lobbying activities warrant detailed study and investigation.

3. An additional questionnaire is being prepared for eventual circulation among all of the approximately 2,000 lobbyists and lobbying organizations registered with the Clerk of the House under the lobbying law. These groups and individuals, all directly involved in this entire investigation, will be asked to make recommendations for clarification and improvement of the Lobbying Act as a result of their own experiences under it, and will also be invited to suggest specific avenues of intensive investigation.

The advice and suggestions contained in the answers we receive from these questionnaires, plus the information daily coming to the committee from a variety of other sources, including our staff investigations and research, will be compiled and analyzed for the information of the full committee as possible guides to future policies and hearings.

If I have not already made it sufficiently clear, I want to say as emphatically as I can that in any and all cases where investigators of this committee may be disclosed to have examined the files of any lobbyist or lobbying organization, there is no inference warranted that the lobbyist or organization involved is suspected of violating the lobbying law or that the actions of such lobbyists are thought to have been improper in any way. And there would be no basis for a conclusion that the particular lobbyist or organization is to be a subject for all-out investigation or any committee hearings. Our investigators are examining the records of only a limited number out of the many registered lobbyists, and in preliminary fashion only. They are studying these records as examples of typical lobbying practices. The committee itself will decide which groups will be scheduled for thorough study.

EXHIBIT A

Pursuant to House Resolution 298 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Select Committee on Lobbying Activities is undertaking "a study and investigation of (1) all lobbying activities intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation; and (2) all activities of agencies of the Federal Government intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."

In light of your past work and interest in this field, the select committee would appreciate receiving from you suggestions and information, based on your experience and study, on the following matters:

1. Lobbying activities by unregistered persons or organizations;

2. Undisclosed receipts or expenditures by lobbyists and lobby organizations;

3. Undisclosed interests behind lobbyists and lobby organizations;

4. Methods of soliciting or obtaining funds for lobby activities;

5. Methods of expending funds for lobby activities;

6. Practices and abuses of lobbyists and lobby organizations;

7. Specific lobbyists and lobby organizations whose activities in your opinion, warrant detailed study and investigation;

8. Violations of 18 U. S. C. 1913 restricting lobbying activities by Government officers and employees;

9. Practices and abuses of Government officers or employees in regard to lobbying;

10. Specific Government departments, agencies, officers, or employees whose lobbying activities, in your opinion, warrant detailed study and investigation.

The more specific your suggestions and information are, the more useful they will be to the committee. If it is convenient to supplement your response by personal interview, please let me know, so that an informal meeting can be arranged with the members of the committee or its staff.

Yours very truly,

———— ————,

Chairman, Select Committee on Lobbying Activities.

Welfare State Ruining British Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article written by one of my constituents, Louis Bromfield, of Lucas, Ohio. I am certain that friend Louie, as he is known to all of us, needs no introduction to the membership of this body. In his article he clearly sets forth what has taken place in Britain under their present regime.

THIS IS YOUR COUNTRY—WELFARE STATE RUINING BRITISH FARMERS

(By Louis Bromfield)

I have a large and lively correspondence with a considerable number of Britishers engaged in farming, livestock breeding and truck gardening. Out of that correspondence there has emerged, over a considerable period, a fairly horrible picture of the fashion in which the Socialist welfare state operates in relation to all those citizens who have to do with providing food and fibre for the British Isles. Indeed, I doubt that any American farmer, even after the experience of the OPA and other regimenting agencies during the war, could imagine the hardships of agriculture under the British welfare state. I quote below paragraphs from two or three letters. They are not from individual "soreheads" because the tone of them is universal.

Apparently the same tone colors the comments of almost any farmer one encounters on his own land in the British Isles.

Writes one, "I am just about to give up, not because I'm doing less well than before. The government subsidies take care of that and the taxpayers pay the difference between what I get for my produce and what the consumer pays for it. The money is taken out of the taxpayer in the form of taxes paid by the city chap. These fellows are perhaps less well off because they're not only paying the difference in prices but at least a couple of million pounds to support the bureaucracy, which has been set up to carry out and administer the regulations and subsidies.

"It's my own opinion that it's more fun to spend your own money for something that costs you just as much than to have the government take it and then pay a lot of incompetent fellows who probably couldn't hold a decent job elsewhere to spend it for you. No, it isn't the price factor. It's the misery of spending hour upon hour filling out forms, telling what you have raised and how much it cost you and whether you followed the recommendations of the nearest bureaucrat who probably knows less than nothing about farming.

"There comes a point when no amount of profit is worth the misery that goes with it, and believe me, Mr. B., it is misery. My sister and I sit up for hours at night after we have done a hard day's work doing bookkeeping and filling out forms.

"If you don't do it, you don't get the subsidy and without the subsidy we couldn't make ends meet on our production."

BUREAUCRATIC DELAY

Another writes: "It is the perpetual hamstringing that gets you. I may need a new machine or even a part of a machine but I can't get it unless I fill out a series of forms in triplicate. They aren't just simple forms. They practically want to know who your ancestor was under Queen Anne and how many hours and minutes you will use that particular machine during the year.

"Then the form goes off and from 6 to 9 months later you are told whether you can have that machine or part of a machine, and meanwhile the crop and your profits have gone down the drain. I'm persuaded that these forms lie about in bureaucrats' offices for weeks at a time without ever being looked at. Some of our reports I'm sure are never looked at but simply stowed away to gather dust.

"The Government is now engaged in using valuable building materials to build structures simply to house the mountains of forms and paper work. Canute trying to keep back the sea was nothing compared to trying to keep your head above the paper work. If you don't fill out everything, you're out of the picture. You don't get subsidies and you can't make a profit, and they practically have a gestapo in operation looking out for black

marketeers, and the taxpayers pay for the gestapo as well."

Still another writes: "What in heaven's name does a Government clerk know about what a farmer ought to raise? We're supposed to have farmers' boards to set up programs of the crops which are needed most, but the whole thing is decided in the end by some Socialist bureaucrat with his feet on the desk for whom both farmer and taxpayer are paying.

"The whole thing is a case of everybody kidding everybody else and himself included. The satisfaction of growing good crops, of doing a job of good farming is practically gone, and as any farmer knows, so is the satisfaction in living.

"There isn't any flavor in life any more. We're no longer individuals. We're just cogs in a machine, told what to do from the time we get up in the morning till we go to bed at night. You can have the whole 'womb to tomb' program. I'd rather run my own life and go without a meal or a new jacket now and then."

IT COULD HAPPEN HERE

And so on they run, the letters. We had a taste of it during OPA days. Yet a lot of farmers are asking for it when they say, carelessly and without thought, that "there may be something in the Brannon plan."

And don't forget that if you don't farm in England as the bureaucrats decide is the right way to farm, the government will put you off your own place and give it to some other fellow who will do what the bureaucrats tell him to do.

They'll even sell your farm from under you and dispossess you altogether. None of this is very far from the Soviet state. Only the worst white trash among American farmers would want such a program. The next step, which may come at any time under the welfare state in England is to censor mail. My correspondence with my farmer friends in England may end at any time the Labor Government sees fit to pull down the iron curtain.

You can't be a little bit Socialist-Communist any more than you can be a little bit pregnant. The welfare state is simply the nausea symptoms.

Governmental Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, before the Congress reconvened for the second session of the Eighty-first Congress I spent considerable time in my district and observed the very obvious fact that the people of the Fourth District of Iowa are fully conscious that Federal expenditures have gone beyond bounds and will burden the generations to come with taxes. Folks are emphatic in their insistence that we start practicing economy now, and one very timely letter on this subject was written by Mrs. G. W. Norris, of Grinnell, Iowa. It was published in the Grinnell Herald-Register and the Seymour (Iowa) Herald. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include this article, as follows:

WHAT CAN WE DO?

Persons interested in governmental economy will rejoice in the stand taken by a former Seymour woman, Mrs. G. W. Norris, of Grinnell, the former Ferne Hart, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Pearl Hart, of Seymour.

Mrs. Norris is legislative chairman for this district of the Federated Women's Clubs in Iowa, and wrote the following remarks in a letter to the Grinnell Herald-Register recently.

Her letter follows:

"'What good does it do to say this?'—from your editorial tonight. That certainly is the $64 question, for all of us feel helpless when we actually realize the immensity of our Federal expenditures. Here are more interesting—and amazing—facts.

"Our Federal Government, this year, is spending about $276 for every man, woman, and child in this country. How many of us can afford it?

"It costs the Government 2½ cents to deliver a 1-cent post card and 85 percent of the post cards are sent by business firms. Would you pay 1½ cents for that advertisement you received today?

"Although the Veterans' Administration stated that they are unable to hire personnel for 5,600 of the beds they now have, Congress, in August, appropriated $237,000,000 to add another 16,000 beds, which will also, no doubt, remain unstaffed.

"What can we do? We can keep informed and inform others, and perhaps an aroused citizenry will insist on economy. The Hoover Commission, a nonpartisan group of able and public-spirited people, have presented its recommendations, but does Congress hire a good doctor and then follow his advice? Not without a big fight.

"Already legislation completed makes possible a saving of at least 1.25 billions, but such savings are resisted, almost without exception, by the bureaus and people involved. It means loss of some jobs, prestige, and power. Congress itself is allowing two bills to die which would authorize further study—one to study the overseas administration, and another to study Federal-State relations, a field in which nothing has been done in over 150 years. Congress is not eager to take any more chances on commissions which tell them more than they want to know.

"I have my information from the Citizens' Committee on the Hoover report, whose slogans are 'Waste not and want not' and 'Better government at a better price.'

"Yours sincerely,

"FERNE NORRIS
"(Mrs. G. W. Norris)."

Only Lip Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting a letter which I have received from a very good friend of mine. I think the points taken in this letter merits the consideration of all of us as we start the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. I respectfully ask that the membership read the following letter:

DECEMBER 29, 1949.

DEAR FRIEND: When one becomes confused or lost in a big city, it is wise to ask a policeman what to do next in order to get where one wants to go. Asking a college professor might not bring desirable results. Policemen are experienced in giving directions. They seldom lose sight of the human factor.

Being somewhat confused over domestic and foreign and philosophical problems, I recently sought the advice of three wise men—folks whose experience and wisdom might get me on the track of where I wanted to go.

The first wise man—a domestic expert—told me that mankind would be more prosperous if it were more thrifty; that the weak could not be strengthened by weakening the strong; that character and courage could not be built by destroying initiative and independence; that sound security could not be established on borrowed money; that we could not keep out of trouble by spending more than we earned; that mankind could not permanently be helped by doing for it what it should do for itself; etc.

The second wise man—a foreign expert—told me that we should not take on the quarrels and hatreds of Eurasia; that we should not expect what had failed in other countries to succeed in America; that we would eventually be better off if we tended to our own business and refrained from foreign comments; etc.

The third wise man—a philosopher—told me that kindness and love would solve all of our problems; that manners, unaccompanied by kindness, could not exist; that wars, accompanied by love, were impossible; that greed and hate had to disappear when kindness and love appeared; etc.

I passed all of this wisdom along to many of my acquaintances. Most of them privately agreed it was sound. Many of these most did not pass it along to others because it was not popular. Several of them called me an isolationist or a fundamentalist or a stand patter or a reactionary. One of them suggested I was a Communist. When I told them who the wise men were, many of them became angry—said I was platitudinous. They all gave lip service to Abraham Lincoln and George Washington and Jesus Christ, but many of them were too cowardly or too selfish to preach their gospel.

If, during this coming year, you do what you should to get mankind back on the track, I wish you a perfect 1950.

As ever,

POP.

The Political Platform of Harry S. Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

THE POLITICAL PLATFORM OF HARRY S. TRUMAN

The plain truth that President Truman is using the domestic problems of the Nation to further his political aims is now definitely established.

He damned the Republican Eightieth Congress for blocking his legislation. Now he is trying to blame that Congress for the lack of satisfactory (to him) action from the Democratic Eighty-first Congress. Truman is a smart politician and he can see the trend even in his own party is away from his welfare-state program. To combat the will of the people from sending him another Republican or nonsocialistic Congress in 1950 he is carrying out the following program:

1. He is deliberately turning his back on duly enacted laws which do not fit his po-

litical conniving. Witness his refusal to use the Taft-Hartley Act to settle the Hawaiian stevedore strike.

At the same time his avowed intention to repeal this law has been allowed to lag. The bill remains to bait for labor votes in next year's congressional elections.

2. His sudden decision to put aside his civil-rights program until later is recognizable as part of the pattern to cull favor with southern Democrats while holding out hopes for future enactment of this legislation to his party supporters in the East and North.

3. He deliberately went on a spending spree he knows we can't afford, counting on raising taxes to pay for his give-away program in an off-election year.

4. Out to get the farmer and the housewife vote, he sent his Secretary of Agriculture into the breach with a farm-support program touted to guarantee farmers high prices and housewives low food prices. The fact that the money difference in such a cockeyed arrangement would have to be paid out of taxes collected from the farmers and housewives were soft-pedaled. The question of how much this deal would cost was never answered.

5. His determination to pay off his handpicked party hacks regardless of their fitness is exemplified in the cases of Mon Wallgren and Leland Olds. Apparently that is the only way he can keep supporters.

Mr. Big first attempted to force Wallgren in as chairman of the national resources board. Failing this, he then put his pal on the Federal Power Commission.

In the Olds case he put the heat on the Senate for confirmation through the Democratic national committee. He wanted Olds kept in his post on the Federal Power Commission, regardless of the nominee's record of sniping at our form of government. But such tactics were too bald for even his own party to accept.

6. In a move to win support from small business overburdened by government regulation he let fly against special interests. Thereupon the Department of Justice filed an antitrust suit against the A. & P. groceries, adopting the time-worn "soak the rich" policy.

7. In his move to expand social security as a sure vote getter he also demonstrated still further indifference to the American housewives. The new social-security amendments propose to cover domestic servants into old age retirement benefits. As a result the majority of housewives in the country will have to become tax collectors.

To Truman it's a matter of simple arithmetic. He believes more votes will come in from the domestics covered by the bill than will be withheld by the housewives.

8. Mr. Big's record on socialized medicine, the heart of his welfare program, falls into the same old rut. After sending forth his Federal Security Administrator, Oscar Ewing, to beat the bushes, he failed to hold Congress in session long enough to take action on the proposal. Such a golden lure for ballots was too good to be rushed. It makes much better campaign stuff in 1950 and 1952.

After the American Medical Association began a fight for life against this proposal the Department of Justice jumped on the American Medical Association. More arithmetic—there are more patients than doctors.

9. His sneering references to "red herrings" mark his attempts to hold onto the left-wing and one-world elements in the political machine bequeathed him by Roosevelt. His efforts to belittle the menace of communism have persisted despite the reports of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the trial of the 11 Communists in New York, and the Alger Hiss case.

10. The neatest dodge practiced by Truman during the past congressional session was his announcement of an atomic explosion in Russia. Although the explosion is reported to have occurred 2 weeks before, nothing was said about it until the late afternoon of September 23.

In the meantime the administration's $1,314,000,000 European armament plan was being pushed in the Senate against strong opposition based on the obvious fact that normal military weapons in the hands of European mercenaries would be useless if Russia should unleash an atomic attack on this country.

The administration answer to that was that Russia did not yet have the atom bomb and we should set up strong armies in western Europe to fend off a Soviet invasion.

So the bill was passed. A few short hours afterward it was revealed from the White House that Russia had cracked the atom. Angry Senators exclaimed that the vote on the bill would have been different had they known beforehand that the immediate threat from Russia was an air-borne atomic attack, not a ground operation on foreign soil.

Truman will tamper with national security and endanger our whole economy if it will further his own political career.

Political Dilemma

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star:

POLITICAL DILEMMA

The urgent appeal from Senate Majority Leader LUCAS for action by the administration to ease the coal crisis puts the Democrats in a serious political dilemma and exposes the unworthiness of the President's campaign for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Senator LUCAS' statement came 3 days after the President, in his state of the Union message, renewed his demand for repeal of the labor statute, which he described as being punitive in purpose, one-sided in operation and inconsistent with the practice of true and effective collective bargaining.

As majority leader, Mr. LUCAS will be expected to lead the hopeless fight in the Senate for repeal of the law at this session. But as Senator from Illinois, faced with a stiff battle for reelection next November, he finds it necessary to seek for his constituents the protection which can be found only in the Taft-Hartley Act. And the need for this protection is so urgent, in his opinion, that the majority leader has announced that unless the mine operators and John L. Lewis reach some agreement under which the miners return to work on a 5-day basis he will "be constrained to take the floor of the United States Senate and protest as vigorously as I know how against the continuation of these conditions."

It is possible to sympathize with Senator LUCAS. For he is a trapped man. On the one side he is beset by the fiction, cultivated by the the Democrats for partisan political reasons, that the Taft-Hartley Act is an oppressive, union-busting law which must be wiped from the statute books. And on the other side he is hemmed in by the facts of life. His constituents, he believes, are suffering, and in an election year at that. This being so, he is forced to turn to the berated Taft-Hartley Act, which provides the sole statutory authority for cracking down in the public interest on Mr. Lewis and the operators. It is not an enviable position for such an estimable gentleman as Mr. LUCAS to be in. One hopes that he will not be driven by events to the unhappy length of appealing as vigorously as he knows how, in one breath, for action under the Taft-Hartley law in behalf of the people of Illinois, and then, in the next breath, demanding repeal of the Taft-Hartley law in behalf of the President and the party's political fortunes.

Mr. Truman has taken the position that he will invoke the national emergency provisions of the law if and when a national emergency arises. In his opinion, that stage has not been reached, and here, obviously, he differs from Senator LUCAS. It should be remembered, however, that Mr. Truman has a large responsibility. If he invokes the law, he must be prepared to satisfy the courts that a real national emergency exists, and, this being so, he is entitled to wait until satisfied as to the fact.

But if the President's reluctance to act hastily is understandable, his continued attack on the law itself is not. The Taft-Hartley Act is designed, not to punish unions, but to protect the people from excessive punishment at the hands of irresponsible labor leaders and employers. If Mr. Truman really disbelieves this, he ought to have a little talk with Senator LUCAS. And all of the Democrats who have joined in this disingenuous attack on a law, the essentials of which are needed for the protection of the public, should remember that some day they, too, may be in the unhappy position of Senator LUCAS. What will they say to their constituents then if they should succeed in scrapping the Taft-Hartley Act?

Restoring Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the elections held in Italy in April 1948 were among the most important in all world history. The issue was whether Italy would remain free or succumb to Communist enslavement. It was of vital concern to free peoples everywhere that the democratic forces should prevail and the Communists be overthrown.

For weeks, prior to these elections, the air waves were filled with messages from this country urging all Italians to get out to vote. American citizens with friends and relatives in Italy were urged to communicate with them and impress upon them the imperative necessity for casting their ballots. Thousands upon thousands of letters and cables resulted.

A number of American citizens, estimated at about 4,000, who were then in Italy on business or travel, or visiting relatives, fired with enthusiasm to join in the Italian fight for freedom, went to the polls and cast their votes. Little did they realize in so doing they would lose their American citizenship. But when they sought to return to their native land, they found they had been expatriated.

I have introduced a bill, identical to one authorized by our colleague from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER], chairman of the Subcommittee on Immigration and Naturalization, to remove this disability and permit these unfortunate expatriates

to rejoin their loved ones in this country, provided they have had clean records during all of the time they were out of the country. It will heal a lot of broken hearts and restore to one roof, American families disrupted by this innocent, but mistaken effort to uphold the cause of freeedom in the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I quote an editorial from the Washington Post commending this legislation:

RESTORING CITIZENSHIP

Several thousand native-born and naturalized Americans lost their citizenship by voting in the Italian elections of 1946 and 1948. Most of them want to come back to this country but can do so now only as immigrants and under a quota oversubscribed for the next 8 years. It seems that, in general, these people were not aware that loss of citizenship would be entailed in voting abroad. Moreover, they were subjected to a considerable amount of pressure to participate in the Italian elections. Church officials and even the British and American military authorities in Italy urged them to vote in order to overcome the Communist Party threat of the period.

These facts give persuasive support to a bill introduced by Representative FRANCIS E. WALTER and unanimously endorsed by a House Judiciary Subcommittee to amend the Nationality Act so as to enable such persons to regain their status as Americans by taking an oath of allegiance to the United States within the next 3 years. Many if not most of them are undoubtedly victims of a misapprehension about the law. They should not be penalized for so innocent an error. Careful screening of the expatriates would appear to be in order to avoid the return of the few who may not be genuinely American. But the bulk undoubtedly deserve a warm welcome home.

Mrs. Norton's Record Boost for Women in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I herewith include in my extension of remarks a splendid but deserving editorial relating to our distinguished colleague Mrs. NORTON, of New Jersey, appearing in the Jersey Journal of December 14, 1949, entitled "Mrs. NORTON'S Record Boost for Women in Politics":

MRS. NORTON'S RECORD BOOST FOR WOMEN IN POLITICS

There will be regrets, not only among her many admirers, but also among voters who have differed sharply with some of her views, if Congresswoman MARY T. NORTON'S long-standing decision to retire from Congress a year hence is carried out. The Thirteenth Congressional District, made up of the southern half of Jersey City and Bayonne, will lose one of the Nation's notable legislators when this lady completes a congressional record covering 26 years, marked by outstanding events of national and international importance.

Mrs. NORTON'S record and activities are a devastating answer to those old-fashioned souls who insist that "woman's place is in the home," and who would limit a woman's sphere on account of sex.

Here is a woman who has not only legislated superbly in the interest of the home, but as freeholder, as political leader, and as Member of Congress has shown marked ability in grappling with hospitalization, labor problems, war and peace topics, veterans' problems, and economic subjects of the greatest importance.

Mrs. NORTON has been one of those rare human beings in politics who was not afraid to call a spade a spade, who declined to be a trimmer, who refused to smother convictions to win fleeting praise, who refused to sell what she considered the truth to serve the passing hour.

Frank Hague, who as political leader, has sometimes picked lemons, proved himself a shrewd picker when in 1920, upon the adoption of woman suffrage by national amendment, he chose MARY T. NORTON against her will to begin a public career.

Among Mrs. NORTON'S remarkable political performances was her work in pushing through the House of Representatives the Wagner Labor Relations Act, which endeared her to union labor and brought upon her head the criticism of some who feared Mrs. NORTON was going too far for the benefit of the toiler. In any event, Mrs. NORTON'S record in general provides support for the well-founded claim that in New Jersey one of the outstanding sins of both parties has been the failure to accord to women the rightful place that it has been shown they can fill.

Austere Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of November 17, 1950:

AUSTERE SECURITY

American businessmen were told Tuesday by the European Economic Cooperation Administration—Marshall program—that they must be ready to accept greater competition from European-made merchandise in the American market.

The report, sent by Mr. Truman to Congress, states that so far as can be seen, such European competition with our own business would have a minor impact on American producers.

The catch in this latter statement lies in the fact that the Government has been consistently underestimating the European economic situation.

Once a regularly established flow of foreign-made goods is directed into American trade channels, it is inevitable, and proved by the records, that our industries suffer. American watch factories, clay-products plants, glassware producers, leather and sporting goods manufacturers have felt the impact of European imports.

In our own State, the hand-blown glass industry has been cut 50 percent in the last year. Our glassworkers earn about $1.42 an hour. But glassware imported from Belgium, France, and Czechoslovakia is made by workers who earn from 20 cents an hour to 33 cents an hour. And such imports have reduced production in our own plants.

From New England come reports that watch factories are being hard hit by European imports of watches. British leather goods is displacing American-made products in many of our markets.

The economic administration and Mr. Truman contend that this is world trade, that we must build up European markets and foster foreign trade in order to keep the wheels going around.

But, there's a catch in this, too. It throws all true economic calculations out of line. That catch is that European production is based upon American tax dollars.

How far must American taxpayers go to make Europeans self-supporting?

That becomes a question our administration dodges.

For 5 years, we have been sending money, materials, and credit to Europe in tremendous amounts.

The results have not been good. Mr. Truman, Secretary Acheson, and Administrator Hoffman tell us that the Marshall plan is working. But, they belie their words the next day by hinting that we shall have to provide some kind of continuing aid for western Europe beyond the 1952 Marshall program deadline, and that unless we admit more foreign-made goods to compete with us, unless we withhold our own goods from the world market and let Britain and France sell their goods instead, the Marshall program may fail.

This all adds up to a doubtful proposition. If American taxpayers take a real appraisal of it, more will be required to soothe them than the hearty assurances of Mr. Truman and his spokesmen.

The President and Mr. Acheson are concerned about the future of Europe.

What about the future of America?

That is the question the American people should ask.

It is worth noting that the President and his spokesmen do not mention costs.

Is Mr. Truman leading this country directly toward an austerity program such as Britain has suffered for years?

Senator TAFT says he is. All political interests aside, it is worth looking at the figures, which no one denies.

America faces a deficit of five and a half billion dollars. When a man or a nation is in debt, it is necessary to ease up on spending, and to try to get more money.

Mr. Truman evades the issue on easing up on spending, but he says we'll have to have more taxes.

Senator TAFT says it will take 50 percent more taxes to finance the Truman welfare-state program, and such an increase is more than American business and American working people can stand without destroying our present high standard of living.

To increase our own taxes, increase our spending for security programs and for foreign aid will mean inevitably the destruction of many industrial plants, increasing unemployment, increasing Government work projects, and fewer of the things which Americans have grown accustomed to have—autos and homes, radios and good clothes, electric kitchens and the good food prepared in them.

Are we in America headed for austerity instead of security?

Samuel Gompers Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, last Thursday evening President Truman, Vice President Barkley, President William Green, of the American Federation

of Labor, and others addressed a mammoth banquet at the Hotel Statler opening the centennial celebration of the birth of Samuel Gompers, the founder of the American Federation of Labor.

The following is the address delivered by Mr. Green, commemorating the work and accomplishments of the man who pioneered the labor movement in America:

The number of labor executives who new Samuel Gompers grows smaller each year. We are glad that this celebration of the hundredth anniversay of his birth in London, honoring the name and work of the founder of the American Federation of Labor, also permits those of us who knew and worked with him to share our experiences with newer members of our organization.

Though not a large man, Samuel Gompers had a magnetic personality and a commanding presence that forged him to the front as a leader. With a rich and powerful voice and a rare ability to plumb the mind and feelings of his listeners, his was a high crusading spirit that voiced the struggle of his fellow workers, urging them to join unions and to agitate, educate and organize and enlist others in the battle for human freedom. There was a radiance in his gift for living and enjoying homely details and this gift drew men to him in sincere comradeship.

The first 10 years of his life spanned the bridge between East Side London and East Side New York. Even at that early age he was thrilled with the opportunity of the West, the struggle to free slaves, and the hope of a better life. He explored New York, its theaters, operas, and Cooper Union, while he worked at the cigarmakers' trade. Even before maturity he found what he called the great fact of his life—the trade-union. It fascinated him and consumed his time. He tried to escape to have more time for his family but the union needed and sought him and he needed the union. East Side New York in the 1860's and 1870's was a cosmopolitan jungle where the revolutionaries of Europe sought refuge in the midst of the thousands of new immigrants coming each year. Many cigarmakers came from Germany, Scandinavian countries, from Austria as well as from England and France. Of such were the cigarmakers with whom Samuel Gompers worked. Many had known unions in Europe and they sought to adapt experiences gained in their countries to conditions in the New World. Wages were low, hours long, work uncertain and threatened by tenement production. Collective bargaining as we know it was unknown. Gompers learned much from the older workers who seemed to recognize his unusual qualities. With his inquisitive eagerness to know, he accumulated wisdom from their experiences which helped him to avoid mistakes. He learned from his first union teacher, Karl Laurrell: "Always keep your union card before you. If anything doesn't square with that card, it isn't good for you." Together these workers struggled to build up and develop their union, to better conditions for the cigarmakers of New York. To secure permanence of union membership, they developed union benefits and an employment service. They secured a State law abolishing tenement-house manufacture of cigars to rid themselves of sweatshop competition. They instituted collective bargaining and made their union a business agency, serving members as well as a fraternal agency through which they could help each other in time of need. When they succeeded in developing the New York local, they carried this union plan to their national union convention and elected one of their group president. He extended the practices to all unions.

For many years Samuel Gompers was president of this union of which he was so proud. While he worked and talked, he dreamed dreams of how unions might grow and what they might accomplish. When cigarmakers' unions were under way, Gompers and other union leaders began talking of a national federation of all trade unions. Out of such talks and letters to more distant unions came a national conference in Pittsburgh in 1881 and the Federation of Trades and Labor Unions of the United States and Canada. Without full-time officers, this organization languished. When the Knights of Labor began invading the functions of trade unions, so that the very existence of trade unions was endangered, a great national conference was called which formed a new federation to promote and conserve the trade unions—the American Federation of Labor. The old federation was merged with the new one and Samuel Gompers became its full-time president. In 1887, with an office which was contributed, with makeshift furniture, but with sturdy volunteers, he began to mold the strongest and most aggressive labor movement in the world. He had to do business with pioneers of American business. These captains of industry were strong and often ruthless. Unions also had to fight to survive and make gains. From 50,000 in 1881, the federation had increased threefold by 1886. The nucleus expanded slowly until at the turn of the century more rapid growth came. It reached 4,000,000 in the First World War but declined following the postwar drive against unions. The membership was approximately 3,000,000 at the end of Mr. Gompers' career.

The organizational job alone was stupendous. It began with awakening workers to a realization of what organization could do for them—locally, regionally, and nationally. It rested upon educating individual workers to a consciousness of the personal responsibility of each for promoting his own welfare in cooperation with other workers. He had to develop the tools of operation along with working out plans to achieve its goals. Every institution has its procedures, its rules and records. If these enable it to perform its functions, the organization develops as intended. So in accord with the constitution of the American Federation of Labor, Samuel Gompers developed working rules and forms whereby representatives were authorized to work and report on problems and results. This included devising and issuing credentials to organizers and charters to unions—local, national, city and State federated bodies. Each step of progress was voluntary because the workers concerned saw it promoted their welfare. They said to each and all, "Join with us and it will do you good." Unions were educated to realize that failure to affiliate with central bodies, State federations and national organizations, weakens the whole movement and limits progress. The American Federation of Labor followed the practice—agitate, organize, educate. Force and compulsion were to be resorted to as a disciplinary measure only after all other methods had failed.

Nor was trade-unionism limited to craft workers, he said, in reflecting on unions of workers on streetcars—the horse-drawn variety: "It is not necessarily skill in work on which the union rests, but skill in organization." Sharing of each other's problems in promoting their welfare facilitated organization which was rooted in brotherhood. There is a deep significance in the American union practice of addressing fellow members as brother and sister. Unionism has a spiritual reach that makes it an indomitable force. Gompers felt that any worker taking the obligations of union membership became a person obligated to put human freedom and personal responsibility foremost in his philosophy and to live so as to give reality to that way of life. Since freedom was the goal, voluntarism was the principle he advocated. Democracy to him meant responsible individuals living in a responsible society. Individual rights were the practical results of that way of life. As president of the American Federation of Labor, Gompers could not compel any person or union to act contrary to his or their judgment. He depended, therefore, on persuasion and education to build up a federation held together by conviction and moral standards.

Voluntarism partly explains his emphasis on economic action in preference to legislative action. As workers gained in organization, they achieved economic power which in turn gave them political influence. Bettering conditions and raising standards came directly and rapidly through union demand and collective bargaining. In good times wage rates through union demand and collective bargaining. In good times wage rates could be raised by action of those concerned. To do these things by legislation took more time, for more people had to be convinced. Legislation enforces minimum standards and well-tried practices. Legislation deals with matters affecting all citizens and with rules of action conforming to the ideals of the majority of citizens. It does not provide the flexibility needed for pioneering for new standards. So in economic relations—where men and women determine their work lives—he conceived of the development of economic order by mutual contracts guided by basic principles of human welfare and scientific law. He sought to establish economic government in which all concerned in production should have representation and voice. He was preoccupied with the problems of daily progress. He declared, "We want more, we demand more, and when we get that more we shall insist upon again more and more and even more until we get the full fruition of our labor."

As opposed to the straightforward union plans to reduce hours and increase pay, there were European socialists who wanted to abolish private employers; Henry George, who argued for single tax on land; the Populists, who wanted cheap money, political reform movements, exiles from the Paris Commune, and many others led by intellectuals who wanted to use workers for their own ends rather than to improve work conditions. Watching such leaders beguile workers from the main problem of eliminating poverty, Samuel Gompers urged one organization devoted purely and simply to the welfare of workers—trade unions.

Shorter hours and more pay, he said, are the most revolutionary forces in lives of workers.

Pure and simple trade unionism meant to him unions of workers directed by workers, to promote the welfare of workers. Only workers employed in the union's jurisdiction were eligible to membership and only members were eligible to election to union office. All other organizations, however worthy, were secondary to the union. Some like the Socialists, the Knights of Labor, the American Railroad Union, and the IWW, tried to build up dual unions but without real success. These experiences led the American Federation of Labor to another cardinal principle in union government—one union for one jurisdiction. Other union principles and practices were evolved out of experience in dealing with problems. Our unions took on aggressiveness, born of the New World, where all struggled to benefit by opportunities freely available to all. Samuel Gompers realized that if the union harnessed all the energy and resourcefulness of wage earners in furtherance of economic purposes, the union would lift real standards of living for

all workers and would make workers a power in their community.

This Rope of Sand as he once called the American Federation of Labor, was to him the strongest force on earth because held together by mutual interests and moral compulsion. The principle of voluntarism he extended to political action when in 1906 and 1908 he rallied all the unions to nonpartisan trade-union action to secure relief from injunction abuses that threatened freedom and from application of antitrust legislation to trade-unions. "Laborers have no product for sale," he cried. "They possess only their labor power—their power to produce." To save trade-unions from being crushed by legislation and court decrees, he submitted a bill of grievances to Congress and petitioned the political parties to include labor's declarations in their platforms, and then called upon workers to reward their friends and punish their foes. Their guide was loyalty to the principles of unionism. His faith was later to be justified by the labor provisions of the Clayton Antitrust Act regulating and limiting the use of the injunction and declaring that the labor power of a human being is not a commodity nor article of commerce; and by the enactment of the law establishing the United States Department of Labor, and the Seamen's Act.

In his later years, still crusading for human freedom, he gave distinguished service in the First World War and helped to create the Pan-American Federation of Labor to bring economic freedom to the wage earners of the Western Hemisphere.

As Samuel Gompers journeyed across the country to what he knew was his last labor convention in El Paso, he wrote a personal and final message to labor. In it he embodied his creed. I felt it a great honor that he sent for me and asked me to read it for him as he explained that his eyes no longer served him. That message ended:

"As I review the events of my 60 years of contact with the labor movement and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunities of the future, I want to say to you men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labor's structure has been builded—but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes—human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense."

Such was the kind of labor movement Samuel Gompers helped to mold—an organization typically American and devoted to the ideals that gave our Nation purpose. It is the kind of labor movement in which any free nation may take pride. It is part of the life stream of American democracy.

The organization which Gompers built has withstood the grueling tests of business prosperity and depression. Because of its services it has gained and held members. Bound by spiritual and fraternal bonds, it has inspired its members to work on for ever higher standards. The organization he built stands today unchanged in basic principles. As new problems have developed we have applied the old guiding precept and have added a bit here and there to procedures. There has been growth without change of purpose or goals. Our foundation rooted in understanding of human dignity with inalienable right to freedom, will remain unchanged.

We pledge our founder loyalty to the principles he upheld. We know that the freedom we enjoy was gained by the sacrifices of men who understood and accepted responsibility. If we are to continue to enjoy this freedom we must also share responsibility for exercising rights and maintaining freedom.

Bible Versus Commie War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article entitled "Bible Versus Commie War," which appeared in the Uniontown Morning Herald on Saturday, December 24, 1949. I hope all the Members will read this very fine sermon by Rev. William S. Hill, of St. Peter's Episcopal Church, of Uniontown, Pa.

BIBLE VERSUS COMMIE WAR VIEWED BY LOCAL RECTOR

Parishioners of St. Peter's Episcopal Church were greatly impressed by a sermon delivered recently by the rector, William S. Hill, on the subject, Communism Confronts Christianity.

"It was one of the finest sermons I ever heard delivered anywhere," said one member of the congregation.

Enthusiastic over the masterpiece, Attorney Lynn V. Phillips, secretary of the vestry, added:

"Everyone should know what Communism is and how it works in contradiction to Christianity. The sermon by Rev. Hill is one of the best explanations I have heard or read. It is stated so simply and is so complete in thought that a youngster is able to understand the distinction and difference."

TWO ANTAGONISTS

The Morning Herald presents the sermon in its entirety:

"Over and above as well as under and behind any war of weapons, is an even more fundamental war of ideas. Whether or not there is a 'shooting war' of major proportions during the second half of the twentieth century, there is going to be a fierce continuation of the 'cold war' of ideas and the two antagonists in this war of ideas, as everyone knows, are Christianity and Communism.

"Today supplies us with a good opportunity to consider this ideological conflict for this is Bible Sunday—the day on which Christians recall with gratitude the gift of the Holy Scriptures and of course in the present controversy the arsenal of Christianity is the Bible, whereas the arsenal of Communism is the Communist Manifesto along with the writings of Karl Marx.

"The basic similarities as well as the fundamental differences between Christianity and communism can be said to arise from the conception each has of man himself. Christianity prays, 'give us this day our daily bread.' Christianity realizes that as a physical being man must eat. But Christianity also maintains that 'man does not live by bread alone.' Christianity asserts that as a spiritual being man has a hunger which mere bread will not satisfy."

MARX BOAST

"On the other hand, communism does not merely affirm that man needs bread; it goes on to assert that this is all he does need. Karl Marx himself boasted of having got rid of 'the lumber of soul and spirit' and at his death standing beside the grave, Marx's friend, Friedrich Engels said, 'Marx's discovered the simple fact that human beings must have food and drink, clothing and shelter, before they can interest themselves in politics, science, art, religion and such like' and the implication was that these things should be forgotten until all economic problems were settled.

"But now look into your own heart and ask yourself which of the two points of view describes you. Of course, you have to eat. But would you be willing to live by bread alone? Does eating alone satisfy you? Are there not great areas of the spirit which you overlook only at the cost of your own happiness? You are familiar with the lines by James Terry White:

" 'If thou of fortune be bereft
And in thy store there be but left
Two loaves, sell one and with the dole
Buy hyacinths to feed thy soul.'

"You recognize this as an adaptation of a Persian theme but doesn't it describe our own attitudes? Sure, we need the one loaf but we need the hyacinths, too. The hunger for beauty, for companionship, for affection, for inspiration, for inner security is not satisfied by bread alone.

"Now, let us consider for a moment the implications in the phrase, Give us this day our daily bread. Here there is the recognition, first of all, that men and women are physical, material beings. They have to eat. And then there is the recognition that any social order or economic system which deprives people of the opportunity to eat, that is, to make a decent living, is unjust and should be changed. Moreover, there is the further recognition that all things on earth—its fruits, its raw materials, its resources—have been put here not for the benefit of the privileged few but for the general good of all. All these points are implicit in the Lord's Prayer and all of them are made very explicit in numerous passages in the Bible."

GOAL OF COMMUNISM

"On all these points communism walks hand in hand with Christianity. In fact, Arnold Toynebee, the eminent historian, says that communism is a leaf taken from the book of Christianity. And indeed it is. The Marxist ideal of social justice comes straight from the Hebrew prophets; the belief that the strong should have power to exploit the weak comes almost word for word from Saint Paul; and the notion that the interests of humanity should be served regardless of racial or national boundary lines represents the thought of innumerable passages in scripture.

"To state it succinctly, the goal of communism is to create an international, interracial society to which each contributes according to his ability and from which each receives according to his need. The plumber, the professor, the parent, the policeman, the politician, each contributes to society according to his ability, and to each of these is given according to what he requires. Could anything be more just than that? Could anything be more Christian than that? Truly, as Toynebee says, communism is a leaf taken out of the book of Christianity.

"Now some may ask, Why did that leaf have to be taken out? Why did communism arise in the first place? Let us be honest about this. It was because Christianity did such a poor job of living up to its principles. Day after day Christians prayed for their daily bread with but little concern for whether or not their neighbors were receiving any bread at all. For too long after the social upheaval of the industrial revolution the Christians were insensitive to the needs of the downtrodden masses, unaware of the claims of simple social justice. You have heard the phrase, 'Religion is the opium of the people.' It did not originate with Karl Marx, as many think. It originated with Charles Kingsby, an English clergyman, who early in the nineteenth century despaired at

the lack of social vision on the part of religious people in his own country."

SOURCE OF POWER

"'The best reason for becoming a Communist,' it has been said, 'is an empty stomach.' And in so-called Christian countries from the beginning of the industrial revolution to the present, there have been plenty of empty stomaches. Consider the sketches made of the English laborers 100 years ago by the artist Gavarni—'the men devitalized and clad in rags, the women pining and wasted, the children pallid, rachitic and tearful'—do you wonder that Communist notions of justice got a foothold? Consider the conditions (up until very recently) of our own American workers in mills, mines, and trades. Do you wonder that there are Communists seeking to get power in some of our labor unions? Consider the economic discrimination against the Negro race. Do you wonder that many Negroes are sympathetic to communism?

"If Christianity fails to create a just social order, satisfying the elementary need for bread, we can be sure that people will incline to the false panaceas and false religions which promise them relief. If Christianity fails, communisim will succeed for within every one there is the cry, 'Give us this day our daily bread.'

"But for all that Christianity and communism have elements in common they nevertheless part company. As Arnold Toynbee has said: Communism is 'a leaf taken from the book of Christianity' but he goes on to add, 'This leaf has been torn out and misread.' And it has been torn out and misread precisely because communism deliberately ignores the fact that man does not live by bread alone. He needs the loaf but he needs the hyacinths and all they stand for, as well."

CITES COMPARISON

"One thing man wants almost as much as he wants bread is freedom and to live in a Communist regime is to live in a prison. St. Peter, St. Paul and other biblical characters have shown us how to live constructively and creatively even in a prison; but it is significant that they did their greatest work not when they were in prison, where they were fed regularly but when they were out and had to take their chance on subsistence. Interestingly enough, back in 1878, Otto von Bismarck prophesied that should a Communist state be established it would become a vast prison with all but the tyrants at the top at the mercy of the jailers. And on top of the Christian belief that life can flourish best in an atmosphere of freedom, add also the Christian belief that no one is so high and mighty that he has the right to tyrannize over another, just as no one is so lacking in personal worth that he can be expected to become another's slave.

"This brings us to another point, namely Christianity's concern with the preciousness of the individual Jesus, as you know, spoke of how terrible it is to offend one of the 'little ones' and He held up the duty to 'the least of these, my brethren.' From the Marxist point of view, however, the individual counts for little. When some of Lenin's associates were complaining about the terrible sacrifice of blood resulting from the civil war in Russia, he rejoined, 'It doesn't matter a jot if three-fourths of mankind perish. The only thing that matters is that in the end the remaining fourth should remain Communist.' Where he set out still more intransigeantly 'to reconstruct humanity to fit the machine.'"

LENIN STATEMENT

"Related to the disregard for the preciousness of individual is the doctrine wholeheartedly taken over the Marxists but always seriously questioned by the Christians that the end justifies the means. By fomenting class war, by stirring up hatred, by using all kinds of violence, by sowing confusion, by employing every form of intimidation, and by resorting to trickery, deceit, and chicanery, the Marxists hope to build a society of abundance, harmony, and general welfare. Listen to what Lenin said to Gorky in 1920 during a symphony concert, 'I do not like often to listen to music for it might make me chatter amiable stupidities and stroke these people's heads. Today is not the time for stroking heads—today we must use our hands to split skulls, to split them remorselessly.' So the perfect society is going to be built by cracking heads, by compulsory work battalions, by Siberian prisons, by the secret police. That is the kind of absurdities of reasoning you commit when you let yourself believe the end justifies the means. For more likely that all these enormities will produce further enormities. As Bertrand Russell once remarked, 'There is so much of hate in Marx and communism that Communists can hardly be expected when victorious, to establish a regime offering no outlet for malevolence. The Christian principle is that what you build out of hatred and violence will only generate more hate and violence. As the apostle put it, 'Be not overcome of evil but overcome evil with good.'

"But the great quarrel which Christianity has with communism is, of course, on the question of materialism. The Marxists believe that materialistic and economic considerations are the only ones which have any reality and any power. Karl Marx himself wrote in the Communist Manifesto: 'The charge made against communism from a religious, a philosophical, and generally, from an ideological standpoint, are not deserving of serious attention.' Why? Because from his point of view such things as religion, philosophy, and the like are simply the product of economic systems and are used by the ruling classes to keep the common people in subjection. What you think you want and what you believe, in other words, has been forced on you by the economic system under which you live. In contrast to this, Christianity affirms that life is not determined by material forces exclusively. Man does not hunger only for bread. He hungers also for beauty, for art, for understanding, for fellowship, for love, and by no means least, for God."

PERTINENT CONFLICT

"Man does not live by bread alone," says Christianity, and on this affirmation Christianity decisively and permanently parts company with communism.

"But what faces the world today is more than a 'parting of company' between communism and Christianity. It is a war—a war of ideas, a conflict between the Bible and the Communist manifesto. The lines are clearly drawn. In the Marxist view, religion impedes the evolution of this world toward a classless society, and thus religion must be eradicated. In the Christian view, on the other hand, communism for all its insistence on justice bids fair to debase human relations, to distort human personality, to defeat all striving after the beautiful and true, to destroy mankind's hard-won liberties and to desecrate the human soul; therefore communism must be eradicated. So the cold war is on.

"What part is the individual Christian to play in this conflict of ideas? I would say that our fundamental duties in this conflict are two. First, to demonstrate in our lives that our religion breeds a passion for justice more intense and more universal than any which the Marxist shows, in this passion for justice attacking the evils out of which communism frequently arises—misery, poverty, economic insecurity, and war. And then our second duty is to confront Marxist atheism with a vital theism, a living belief in and dedication to God that gives to every area of life a new quality and character making it clear to all that man does not live by bread alone but by every word that proceeds out of the mouth of God."

Conferences in the Pacific Coast States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL R. KING

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks. I include therein the report made by the Secretary of Commerce to the White House, of conditions as he found them in the Pacific Coast States during his recent tour of inspection:

CONFERENCES IN THE PACIFIC COAST STATES

The conferences which I held in cities along the Pacific coast during September reminded me once again of the differences which characterize the various broad regions of the country and of the variety of their problems and opportunities. The economy of this general area is typified by extremely dramatic and continuing growth. My meetings were held at San Diego, Los Angeles, San Francisco, Portland, and Seattle—a coverage which presented a representative picture of the current situation and a wide range of problems.

The fact which stands out above all others in California, Oregon, and Washington is that of tremendous population growth. Nearly a third of the entire national growth in population since 1940 has occurred here. California's gain of more than 3,500,000 accounts for most of it, but Washington's increase was exceeded by only five other States, and in Oregon the rate of growth was faster than that of any other State. Two aspects of this exceptional phenomenon are of particular significance, especially for California. One is that by far the larger proportion of the population increase has come not from new births but from migration into the area of people from other parts of the country, most of whom come not to retire, as in former years, but to settle and make a living. The other is that, though wartime expansion created much of the growth, it has continued steadily through the present year. Some of the current difficulties of the area are rooted in these population changes. By the same token, much of its rich economic opportunity is based on that factor—for here are hundreds of thousands of new workers to process the products of the forests, and farms, and mines, together with the resources of water and power with which to do it. And here, too, is a vast new market for their output. Indeed, the dramatic growth in employment, and business, and industry throughout this area from 1940 to 1948 demonstrates the actual workings of that process.

California, with over 10,000,000 of the area's 15,000,000 people, has felt the full force of all of this. Here, since prewar days, employment has grown rapidly—factory jobs alone have nearly doubled. Nonetheless, and though conditions have improved since the time of my visit, California unemployment has been running above national levels. In important part, this stems from the

continued influx of workers. In Los Angeles, for example, it was pointed out to me that actual employment was higher this summer than in the summer of 1948. But so was unemployment. It was estimated that as many as 15,000 people were still coming into the State monthly; estimates for the Los Angeles area alone ranged above 10,000. Unemployment conditions in Washington and Oregon more closely resembled the national picture, and there was much less difficulty reported there from influx of new workers. However, though unemployment nationally did not reach substantial proportions until the spring and summer of this year, it is important to note that both in Washington and California the number of jobless was already considerable in the summer of 1948—a situation reflecting in large part the conversion from wartime to peacetime production and employment.

Reports made to me on business conditions along the coast from San Diego to Seattle presented many contrasts. Businessmen repeatedly pointed out that levels of activity are far higher than anything known before the war, and said that most of the declines experienced this year represent normal price and inventory readjustments which were desirable and necessary. It did not appear that the general volume of sales in wholesale and retail trade had fallen much below that for last year in physical terms, though the dollar volume was indicated as being at lower than national levels. Representatives of many firms reported a noticeable improvement in sales volume during the summer. However, in those localities adversely affected by dock strikes and curtailment of shipbuilding and other military activity the picture was distinctly less favorable. It was the consensus among those in retail and wholesale trade that because of price reductions and increased operating costs their 1949 profits would be substantially under those for last year. None of the bankers attending my conferences indicated any substantial falling off of business for the year. Real-estate activity was reported to be extremely good, and in some instances, ahead of 1948. On the other hand, a number of construction firms and contractors' organizations mentioned a substantial falling off in commercial and industrial construction and some decline in residential construction as compared with last year; however, home building appeared to have turned upward during the summer, and construction of schools and public and institutional buildings had been vigorous. After experiencing an unprecedented wartime and postwar market, the lumber industry, a major economic factor in Washington, Oregon, and northern California, was said to have experienced some decline earlier in the year, with a resurgence of demand during the summer. However, there appeared to be little question that the decline was felt more severely among the small mills and logging firms which multiplied greatly during the war and find difficulty in a more competitive market. Very large numbers of these were reported to have ceased operations, a major factor contributing to unemployment. The pulp-paper industry was also reported operating at lower production levels than for last year, though activity became stronger in the summer. Production and employment in commercial fishing appeared to have been sustained very well through the year in the Northwest, though at lower prices. The tuna packing industry of southern California, however, was reported to be facing extreme difficulty in competition with tuna imports. Producers of woolens and other garments reported generally satisfactory business. Operations in the fields of basic steel products, machinery, and other heavy goods were reported below 1948 peaks but in line with national trends.

Some of the less favorable business and employment situations along the Pacific Coast, particularly in California, are clearly the aftermath of the amazing record of war production through that area. Notable among these are shipbuilding and ship repair work. San Diego, Long Beach, Richmond, and other communities grew suddenly to enormous size around the great shipyards, or within commuting distance of them. With the necessarily drastic cutback in ship construction, many of the war workers have still to find steady employment. Moreover, ship repair work had greatly fallen off due to the transfer of naval vessels to the mothball fleet, assignment of others to operations elsewhere, the postwar decline in foreign commerce, and such work stoppages as those in docks at San Francisco and Hawaii. Public officials and business and labor spokesmen from the affected communities appeared at my meetings and strongly urged that the Federal Government make a special effort to direct a larger measure of maintenance and repair work on naval and private ships to these centers. All of them, of course, were anxious to see shipbuilding activity resumed. Further, they were particularly distressed at the necessary reductions in civilian employment at military establishments. Some of them urged that the reductions be held in abeyance until displaced war workers were more fully absorbed into other employment. Others urged that the reductions be effected through normal attrition rather than through layoffs.

Still another postwar adjustment problem was posed by numerous small manufacturers doing subcontract work for the aircraft industry. They reported that, because of the postwar decline in prime contracts for military aircraft and because producers of commercial aircraft were pulling production work back into their own plants, a drastic curtailment of orders had resulted. Among this group of businessmen there was a keen interest in the Government procurement program as a source of new business. It was repeatedly urged that procurement procedures be simplified, that contracts be broken down into smaller units, and that small firms be given greater opportunity to bid on prime contracts. With reference to the aircraft industry, there were grave fears in the Seattle area and in southern California arising from discussion of the shifting of production to inland centers. These fears were related not only to the loss of employment and trade, but to the effect such a shift would have on general industrial growth.

Still other problems affecting many businesses in the Pacific Coast States related to our foreign-trade situation. Historically, foreign trade has played a major role in the economy of this whole area. Its harbors have been outlets for a great deal of its own production and that of States to the east, and they have served as ports of entry for a major portion of the Nation's imports. An important part of that trade was with the Orient; dollar shortages and unsettled postwar conditions have been such that it has failed to flourish again. Further, a number of reports made to me from the citrus industry in California and from the lumber and fruit industries of the Northwest stated that our foreign-aid programs had failed to restore to them the European markets they once enjoyed. Other exporters cited the dollar shortage for the failure of their Latin American trade to thrive. Again, both business and labor spokesmen from the movie industry described a truly serious falling off of production and employment stemming from the loss of export business, not only because of dollar shortages but because of market restrictions established by importing nations. Exporters were hopeful that the foreign-aid program would eventually ameliorate these conditions; citrus growers in particular urged that the ECA undertake to support their European markets. Flour millers operating far below capacity complained that a disproportionate amount of wheat, as against flour, was going to Japan in light of the inadequate know-how there for its conversion into superior flour and bread as a dietary supplement. It was complained, too, that because of arrangements under the international wheat agreement which permit Canada to sell in Philippine and other free markets at a price below that set for countries inside the agreement, the United States' share in wheat exports to free markets has been reduced unfairly. Finally, there were complaints that the aluminum industry was not getting an adequate share of ECA purchases, and that ECA funds were being used to purchase aluminum produced in Canada in plants which the United States helped finance during the war; it was stated that domestic producers could not match Canadian prices because of lower production costs there.

The foreign-trade problems called to my attention involved imports as well as exports. This was especially the case in Washington and Oregon. Thus, for example, representatives of the lumber, building materials, pulp-paper, fruit growing, wool, and meat-packing industries were extremely fearful that, following devaluation, imports would seriously affect their sales volume and prices. Because of high labor and other operating costs, they reported great difficulty in meeting the price competition involved. Labor officials as well as businessmen in the Northwest expressed considerable concern over the effects of devaluation because of the great similarity between agricultural and industrial production there and in nearby Canada. In southern California, as previously indicated, tuna fishermen and packers and labor representatives reported that that industry was experiencing vigorous price competition in national markets because of sizable tuna imports. As a result, inventories were said to be moving slowly and accumulating rapidly. There were indications, however, that resolution of problems within the industry domestically might soon improve that situation, and that more effective distribution methods would improve the industry's competitive position.

Along the Pacific coast, as elsewhere in the West, there were many complaints regarding freight rates. Businessmen repeatedly claimed that postwar rate increases on eastward shipments had been disproportionately higher than increases elsewhere in the country, and that the application of the wartime excise tax on top of present rates has the effect of further magnifying the distortion. Both in the Northwest and in California fruit growers and packers stated that for these reasons they were having great difficulty competing in eastern markets. They attributed a generally lower farm income partly to this situation. Among manufacturers selling in the national market there were many expressions of concern as to confusion over the legality of freight absorption in connection with basing-point pricing.

Some of the most effective activity in the field of small business credit to come to my attention I found along the west coast. Some of the banks there, along with service on commercial loans, are extending service of a technical nature on marketing and management problems, thus helping to assure profitable operations both for the bank and the borrower. However, most of the suggestions made regarding capital needs, whether in large or small firms, had to do with revision of the Federal tax structure to permit

retention of a larger share of business earnings for capital purposes and to make equity investments more attractive.

The strike among dock workers in Hawaii and San Francisco appeared to have been felt all along the west coast. A large amount of shipping was said to have been diverted from that area to the Gulf coast. Firms processing Hawaiian fruit imports were deprived of their normal receipts. Retailers importantly dependent upon dock and shipping workers as customers experienced severe losses in sales. Other firms which normally use waterborne shipping for the movement of freight were put to extra expense in using more costly forms of transportation.

The work stoppages above provoked a great deal of interest and discussion among businessmen concerning labor relations. I have already referred to the suggestion made to me in my business conference in San Francisco that both management and labor would do well to spend the money they now put into conflict on learning how to get along with each other. I was impressed, too, with the continued use and achievements of the labor-management committee which has been carried over from the war period in Portland. One of the most thoughtful and sympathetic analyses I heard of current business problems in the movie industry was given me by a labor spokesman at Los Angeles.

Labor representatives outlined a number of situations which can make for difficulties in the field of labor relations. One was the shortage of low-cost housing. It was evident, particularly in California, that population growth had considerably out-paced new residential construction and that a large market demand remains, particularly in the lower-priced field. Labor groups in the lumber industry were most anxious for more vigorous activity in the housing field as a remedy for unemployment there. Labor representatives in California were particularly distressed over what they reported to be the illegal residence of workers imported from Mexico for seasonal agricultural work; remaining in California following their seasonal work, it was claimed that these workers enter into competition with native labor and tend to depress wage patterns. Workers in California were also distressed by the continued influx of workers from other States, especially since many permanent residents have still to find regular peacetime employment.

The rapid population and economic changes through the Pacific coast area have created a host of problems for State and local government. One of the most serious of these is that of water supply in California. Another is the shortage of electric power in the Pacific Northwest, where marked increases in industrial, commercial, and residential power consumption have outdistanced the growth in basic generating capacity; as a result, that area was reported to have been unable to supply power for a number of new industries which would have provided much needed employment for displaced war workers and others moving in from other States. In California, municipalities and private utilities had greatly expanded production capacity to keep up with constantly rising demand. Yet it was reported that an important part of the power supply, coming from the Boulder Canyon project on the Colorado River, will revert to States to the east as they exercise their rights to it; it was strongly urged by local officials that the Federal Government accelerate its power-development program and provide municipal systems with larger amounts of available power. Public officials in California also urged that the Federal Government assist in resolving the conflict between the States over water rights in the lower Colorado Basin in order to assure more adequate water and power supplies. It appeared that San Diego, at the extreme southern tip of the State, had completely exhausted its reserve supplies of water and can sustain further growth only by development of additional facilities to carry water from mountain sources. Several alternative proposals were said to be under study by State and local officials and agencies of the Federal Government.

Population growth in the west-coast area has been largely a matter of urban expansion. Particularly in California this has created extremely serious deficiencies in community facilities and services—schools, sewer and water systems, streets, etc., as well as in those provided by State government. I heard numerous reports there on the very large outlays made since the war both by the State and the communities for all kinds of public works. It was stated that in some localities the financing of such outlays is made difficult by virtue of the large property holdings of Federal agencies and the loss of local tax revenues on such holdings. State and local public works needs were acute also in Washington and Oregon communities on which reports were made, though the situation appears less critical than among California communities. In none of my meetings, despite the urgency of these needs, was there any significant sentiment for lavish Federal spending on State and local public works as an unemployment remedy. Indeed, labor spokesmen in California expressed the fear that such a program might greatly aggravate the unemployment situation by attracting an even larger influx of workers from outside the State. They urged, instead, that public-works expenditures be carefully programmed to fit actual needs and used to provide employment for permanent residents and older workers out of jobs and for the training of unskilled workers. Considerable interest was expressed in Federal aid for the advance planning of public works, and all communities were interested in financial aid for actual construction should it become actually necessary to initiate such programs.

In all of my west-coast meetings there was a very keen consciousness of the need for constant enlargement of the economic base of the area to provide employment and business opportunities for a rapidly growing population. Accordingly, on every hand I heard pleas for development of the power and water resources of the Central Valley of California and the Columbia and Colorado River basins, though there was no unanimity as to the type of administrative arrangement which would best achieve that objective. I heard earnest pleas that the services of this and other departments be made fully available to public and private groups in connection with their efforts to attract new industries and to develop others indigenously.

It was a rich experience to talk with those who have participated so intimately in the recent economic development of our Pacific Coast States. That development has been phenomenal. Business and labor and government there have many vexing problems. But they are largely problems of growth, not of decline. And that growth has added and is adding greatly to our national wealth and strength. The potentials for further growth are very large. Throughout the whole area I found high confidence in the future and a driving enthusiasm to get on with the task of achieving it.

These lengthy accounts of business, employment, and general economic conditions in the regions which I visited necessarily compress a vast amount of factual information and numerous detailed observations and suggestions made to me. They may serve, however, to underscore the obvious fact that this is an extremely diverse country. Trends in employment and production and sales do not take place on some abstract national basis, but within the distinctive and varying settings found in the economies of the several great regions of the Nation. Programs of the Government can gain much in effectiveness when formulated and executed with due regard to these differing needs and aspirations.

The President's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN TABER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the President says his budget estimate calls for expenditures in the fiscal year 1951 of $42,400,000,000. That is what he says.

But on page A–6 of the budget appears the real story of what is being requested.

The President is asking for appropriations for 1951 of $40,244,000,000. Of this, $4,513,000,000 is said to be for liquidating previous contract authorizations. In addition to that, he is asking in his budget estimates for $1,444,000,000 of deficiency items for 1950, the current fiscal year. He is asking for new contract authorizations of $148,000,000 and for new funds for 1950, which requires legislation, of $4,275,000,000 and new funds for 1951, which requires legislation, of $1,360,000,000 and new contract authorizations for 1951 of $3,362,000,000.

If you add the new appropriations that he is asking for, including the contract authorizations, the deficiency which this Congress is asked to provide, the new authorizations which this Congress is asked to provide, the items provided for in new legislation carrying an over-all picture of what the President is asking the Congress to give him in this session, you get a total of $50,833,000,000.

Of this amount $3,511,000,000 is new contract authorizations, so that the cash requests total $47,322,000,000. This is an increase of almost $9,000,000,000 over the $38,500,000,000, of cash provided by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

It is easy enough to see that if the President's budget goes through there are only two choices for the Government: To default on its obligations or to impose additional taxes on a tax paying public that is already groaning from the load.

There can be no question but that this request for cash totalling over $47,000,000,000 means vast spending programs not included in the $42,400,000,000 which the President states he plans to spend in 1951.

The whole situation is critical for the American people. It means so many new taxes and such a drain upon the economy of the country that if we are to have a solvent Government the Congress must wake up to its responsibilities, even though the President himself has no sense of responsibility.

We cannot maintain our liberties if we turn this money over to the President

and the socialistic schemers who surround him.

I intend to fight for a balanced budget. The revenues in sight are $38,000,000,000 and we must keep our expenditures down below that.

More Papa Knows Best

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Thursday, January 5, 1950:

MORE PAPA KNOWS BEST

There will be little fault to find with President Truman's state of the Union message insofar as his external objective of peace is concerned, but on the domestic side it is a hodgepodge of glaring contradictions which are all too familiar. We suspect that this phonograph record has by now been played so often that not many will be fooled by it.

The President paid tribute in his state of the Union message to fundamental American principles. These principles—of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—to these he dedicates himself and his administration. Yet, he steps on the accelerator of domestic social reform, going whole hog for European socialistic measures when he hasn't even tried the most obvious American solutions to such problems as public health. He is for "the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise," but he makes no more than a gesture toward reducing the taxes which are strangling enterprise. He deplores monopoly as the great hindrance to small business on the very day that a great New York newspaper, the Sun, is forced to give up its existence because of the high costs of production brought about by Truman policies.

The President is for freedom and a chance for the entrepreneur, but he wants to keep on rent controls. He talks about our freedom-loving farmers and yet espouses the Brannan farm plan which is so unfreedom looking to the farmers that some of their largest organizations have opposed it. Implicit throughout the message is the President's faith, not in the people, but in a government under his direction to give the people benefits. Despite persuasive showings that there are little promising hydroelectric development prospects in New England, he would have the Government look into that, too. In short, if anything can be done by Government that might please a lot of voters, regardless of cost, Mr. Truman's for that.

This doesn't sound like statesmanship to us. It doesn't sound like even well-visioned leadership. There is little evidence in this message of national stewardship, of any serious attempt having been made to evaluate the relative importance of national and domestic programs, of putting first things first, or of any awareness of a calendar which leaves room for doing some things when they can be better afforded by those who have to pay the bills.

Once again, papa knows best, but it isn't papa who pays.

The Young Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY O. TALLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and editorial which are self-explanatory:

THE MARION SENTINEL,
Cedar Rapids, Iowa, January 2, 1950.

Hon. HENRY O. TALLE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Last summer I worked out the Young plan for TVA. We published it October 13, and you probably read it.

On November 20, the Knoxville Journal published the Holt plan. Holt, a former TVA employee and evidently a competent man, has presented his plan, originally proposed by me, to seven southern governors.

I wish him all the power in the world, but in justice to the Sentinel, I would appreciate having the original proposition and date printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. With kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely,

ROSS N. YOUNG.

[From the Marion (Iowa) Sentinel of October 13, 1949]

FACING THE FACTS

(By Ross Young)

It is time to call the bluff of the public power lobby and its captive columnist. The weird bookkeeping and other sly actions of TVA may seem smart to a Lilienthal, but they are offensive to many informed and honorable citizens.

It will not be too difficult to discover if TVA bureaucrats, the public-power lobby, and the liberal columnists are really sincere. Simply offer to sell TVA to the people of the Tennessee Valley. The selling price could be the actual cost plus interest. The people in the Tennessee Valley should jump at such a bargain, for most of the construction was carried on at half the present costs. The State of Tennessee and other affected areas could form a corporation. All or part of the stock could be sold to individuals, companies, cooperatives, and municipalities.

In giving the locally owned TVA such a bargain, the Government would insist, of course, on certain safeguards. The new corporation would pay the regular local and Federal taxes. It would be required by law to set aside depreciation and other reserves in accordance with the best business practices.

A first lien on income would be obligations owed the Government. While the sale of stock and local appropriations could take care of much of the necessary financing, the new corporation might wish to take from 10 to 20 years to complete payments. These payments and all future borrowings from the Government would be amortized by standard procedures.

The new corporation could charge any rates it saw fit. Rates could be high enough for solvency, replacement, and expansion. They could be low enough to improve living standards and to stimulate business in the valley.

The experience would be valuable in guiding the American people in making decisions on other projects. There would be a genuine yardstick. TVA would no longer have its hands in the people's pockets, and Federal taxes could be reduced. Does the public-power lobby dare to accept such a challenge to honesty and sanity?

Rice Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit copy of a letter addressed to Hon. Charles F. Brannan, the Secretary of Agriculture, of date November 22, 1949, from Mr. Homer Brinkley, general manager of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association on the subject of rice acreage allotments and quotas.

Mr. Speaker, my constituent, Mr. Brinkley, is recognized as one of the outstanding leaders in the rice industry, and his opinion is generally accepted as reflecting the ideas and wishes of the producers of rice in the Southern States.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Department of Agriculture is contemplating the imposition of acreage allotments and marketing quotas for rice in the United States, I am submitting this statement for the information of interested parties, and I hope that those concerned with the administration of the program under contemplation will give favorable consideration to the recommendations and facts which are included in the following letter:

AMERICAN RICE GROWERS
COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION,
Lake Charles, La., November 22, 1949.

Re rice acreage allotments and marketing quotas.

Hon. CHARLES F. BRANNAN,
Secretary of Agriculture,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In response to your invitation to interested parties to submit their views with respect to the establishment of rice-marketing quotas for 1950, the following statement represents the attitude of the American Rice Growers Cooperative Association.

This association is an organization of rice growers in Louisiana and Texas which this year will handle for its members approximately 40 percent of the rice marketed for commercial purposes in these two States. In addition to 20 division organizations operating sales offices in both States for the sale of rough rice, members of this organization own three rice mills which this year will mill over 1,500,000 barrels of rice; 20 rice driers with a drying capacity of 2,500,000 barrels of rice; 17 rough-rice warehouses, an irrigation system, a wholesale producer supply organization, and miscellaneous other enterprises.

At a meeting of the directors of the association in Beaumont, Tex., on November 19, 1949, the following resolution was unanimously passed, and a committee was appointed to implement the resolution with a more detailed statement with respect to our position:

"*Be it resolved,* That this association is not opposed to the principle of acreage allotments but is gravely concerned over the prospect of the establishment of marketing quotas affecting the 1950 rice crop. In addition to many other factors influencing our opposition to the establishment of marketing

quotas for the 1950 crop, we stress the fact that the active demand and extremely rapid movement of the rice crop for the past several years, occasioned by the need for supplying the deficit areas no longer supplied by the traditional surplus areas, gives us reason to believe that as long as the world-wide rice deficit continues no reduction under the present rice production in this country is either necessary or desirable, and therefore that the imposition of marketing quotas should not be resorted to for the 1950 rice crop."

In order to elaborate our views on the subject, a committee of the board of directors, appointed for the purpose, submits the following points in support thereof:

1. The average production of rice in Louisiana, Texas, and Arkansas for the past 5 years amounted to 17,688,000 barrels. An allowance of 10 percent as carry-over, and an additional 10 percent as a point at which marketing quotas might be imposed, results in an amount of 19,465,000 barrels, which is 1,285,000 more than this year's estimated production in the South.

2. When the total supply of rice does not exceed the total available market, and when the carry-over at the end of each season is only sufficient to last until the new crop comes on the market, then that total supply is, by any measure of practical market philosophy, a normal supply.

Based on that hypothesis, the present statistical position of rice is such as not to justify the establishment of marketing quotas, or of establishing an acreage allotment at less-than-current acreage. The possible exception to this is in the California situation, but we insist that special means to meet special situations such as this are indicated rather than drastic blanket measures affecting tens of thousands of rice growers in other areas who are in no degree whatever responsible for the problems arising therefrom.

3. California has increased its production 2,000,000 barrels over last year, which is at least 2,000,000 barrels in excess of any commercial market they have ever had. It is this sudden increase in production in California which is responsible for the estimated record supply of rice this year, and we regard as unjust to the South to permit this situation to tip the scale as to whether quotas should be imposed on the entire United States industry, including the South.

In contrast with the California position, the South this year is estimated to produce more than a million barrels less than the actual production last season. It is our view that we in the South have about reached the maximum capacity of land and water requirements.

4. The southern crop has moved into channels of direct consumption and has not been a burden on Commodity Credit Corporation. At the present time harvesting in Louisiana and Texas is practically complete, and at this time the stock of unsold rough rice in first hands is below that of last season.

5. It is our view that since the world-wide shortage of rice still exists and is critical in many areas of the world, we have both an opportunity and an obligation to help supply the deficit. For example, FAO this week issued a statement indicating its alarm at the general world-wide increase in price levels for rice. This increase reflects the deficit situation referred to. Trade opportunities over the world exist, and we cite the case of the Philippine purchase last year, which absorbed the last of our remaining stocks of low-grade rice in the South, and of Indonesia this year which has recently come into the southern market for a quantity of rice estimated at 1,600,000 pockets.

6. While the world market for rice of the type produced in California is far more restricted than for the southern types, we point to the fact that there is ample need for this rice in Japan; and in view of the fact that the United States is responsible for the economic welfare of Japan, such surplus rice as is produced in California can readily be disposed of in that country.

7. The armed forces of the United States have recently purchased $1,600,000 of rice in Egypt. Purchases were also made last year in that country. Such rice might well be purchased in this country, thereby still further obviating the possibility of unsalable surpluses here.

8. Recent events have convinced us we can be and are competitive in world markets, quality considered. For example, on November 18 the following bids were submitted in Jamaica: Italy, $8; Ecuador, $8.50; Indochina, $11.40; Siam, $9; Egypt, $9.35; and ourselves, $7; all c. and f. Kingston. Such foreign markets will absorb large quanities of our lower-grade rice at competitive prices, and there is the additional opportunity of moving even larger quantities of our broken rice into industrial channels in this country. Furthermore our domestic markets are being expanded under the stimulus of the most comprehensive advertising program in the history of the industry.

9. The growers of Louisiana and Texas particularly have regarded the Commodity Credit Corporation program as a device for supporting prices and not a dumping ground for surplus supplies. We have moved out the current crop at prices below, at, and above support levels, and the average for the season will be above. We do not think it likely that in Louisiana and Texas at any rate, any material quantity of rice will be acquired by CCC this year. We definitely do not view CCC as a market, but rather as a means by which prices may be stabilized at reasonable levels and bankruptcy conditions prevented.

10. We submit that growers should know what their acreage allotments are before being called upon to vote on marketing quotas. We point to the grave inequities and instances of uncorrected injustices that existed when we previously had acreage allotments. From that sad memory comes the conviction that at least a year's experience with acreage allotments should be sought before marketing quotas are imposed.

Individual grower production programs are generally geared to a certain narrow range of acreage—the most economic individual operation as determined by ability, need, and experience. Allotments and quotas become a vested property right and tend to make very difficult those normal adjustments between, for example, landlords and tenants; provision for new producers; the needs of more efficient producers; desirable changes of production areas, etc. All this clearly indicates the need for far more experience with acreage allotments before the vastly more drastic quotas may become effective.

11. It is our view that acreage allotments are desirable and will be a deterring factor in further increases in acreage, particularly in such areas as California where growers are apparently producing for a CCC market. Under such circumstances they cannot afford to lose the support which may be gained only by compliance with acreage allotments. If growers in any area are obviously planning their production and marketing program very largely on the basis of CCC operations instead of for the commercial market, it appears to us quite logical that if such a program is not available to them, they will seriously re-examine the inherent danger of their position. The same is true of the high-cost individual producers.

12. The world trend of rice prices is up because of continued abnormally low production and of population increases in the heavy rice-consuming areas of the world. If this situation continues rice producers may become priced out of markets by competitive foods or by lack of sufficient purchasing power. United States rice growers may find themselves in identically the same position if our supply is artifically reduced below the total demand. High support prices coupled with sharp reduction of production constitute strong incentives for continued production by inefficient producers and in marginal areas.

The proposed cut of 20 percent in acreage allotments is far too severe a reduction. It should be clearly understood that while we are not opposed to acreage allotments, we are unalterably opposed to a reduction which establishes acreage at so far below current levels.

13. A sharply curtailed production coupled with the increase of parity of 15 to 18 percent which will become effective next year will run grave risk of resulting in a price structure materially higher than substitute or competitive foods in both foreign and domestic markets; therefore even a smaller production may actually result in a greater surplus at the end of the season than would otherwise be the case. This identical situation existed when the rice industry operated under a marketing agreement program in the early thirties. This surplus would in that case then become the problem of the Commodity Credit Corporation and of the industry as well, since it would seriously affect the marketing situation of succeeding crops so long as it remained unsold. A surplus is always a surplus regardless of ownership.

14. A penalty of 50 percent of the parity price on the marketing excess does not constitute a serious hazard to those highly efficient producers raising rice on good land with the most modern and efficient machinery known to agriculture. If marketing quotas are established on the basis of what we understand to be a proposed reduction of 20 percent under the 5-year average, such growers as referred to above, with their acreage so sharply curtailed, will unquestionably have an incentive and an opportunity under the stimulus of the increased support levels resulting from the new parity, constituting as it will an important stimulus to generally higher price levels, to ignore the quotas and produce outside the program. Ironically enough, the smaller producers, those least able to afford reduced acreage, will be much more seriously affected in their operations than the large producers and the corporate farms.

15. An acreage reduction of 20 percent under the average acreage of the past 5 years will result in acreage allotments of 1,126,000 in the South and 199,000 for California, or a total United States allotment of 1,325,000 acres. This compares with a 1949 acreage of 1,794,000 for the United States, therefore a reduction of 20 percent under the 5-year average will be an actual reduction of 26 percent under the 1949 acreage.

Such a reduction can be justified only by an aggravated situation of surplus supplies and depressed prices, neither of which exists in the industry today. At the present time, for example, there is expected to be an actual scarcity of rice in Louisiana and Texas. We have seen the fastest moving market we have ever had, even during wartime, with a steady increase in price levels. Bad weather conditions during the harvesting period over the entire South will, we believe, be reflected in a considerable reduction in estimated production before the end of the season. Such situations are the very opposite to those which might justify drastic measures to reduce production next year.

Yours very truly,

HOMER L. BRINKLEY,
General Manager.

Something for Nothing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Wheeler McMillen, editor-in-chief, Pathfinder News Magazine:

SOMETHING FOR NOTHING
(By Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief, Pathfinder News magazine)

Looking toward next year's elections, politicians in both parties are hunting for surefire vote bait. Each party wants to gain as much as possible in order to build greater strength for the 1952 Presidential struggle. Many governorships, many local offices, and control of Congress are at stake.

Also at stake is the future of America.

Politicians are almost overwhelmingly tempted by the lure that so frequently in history has rolled up majorities, kept parties in power, and ruined nations. That is to "promise 'em something for nothing."

How long has it been since a political campaign was waged on the principles of patriotism? Two wars in this century have shown that most Americans are willing to make some sacrifices in favor of patriotism and freedom. Has it become impossible for a political leader to rise who can appeal to that spirit, instead of to the spirit of larceny?

If so, and if no administration can govern other than by following the give-away system, the bright future of America is fading fast. Leave the people be free and the American standard of living can be doubled in another generation. But the give-aways mean controls, controls reduce production incentives, work will go down and prices go up, then more controls will come and the United States of America will drift on down to the end of the era of freedom.

What would happen if the whole United States Government, all the laws and all the governmental bodies were by some improbable miracle suddenly blanked out? What would America do if they now had to start from scratch, as their forefathers did in 1787, to create an entirely new Government?

My guess is that the people would very quickly set up a new government to maintain order and to provide national defense. Those are the only absolutely essential jobs for which a country needs government.

Then, if wisdom prevailed, people would wait awhile to see what they missed most. They might find no reasons for recreating more than about half the functions which they now support.

How much of the present Government do you think you would miss if it no longer existed?

The space that we of the press devote to Government seems to me to be out of proportion to its real importance. Of course, we do have to discharge the duty of a free press to place information before the people. We have to criticize and oppose what appears to be wrong. At its best, the press should never wholly support any administration because always some weaknesses need to be brought to public attention.

The advances of the country rise out of the efforts of men in industry, agriculture, commerce, education, and science. One Thomas A. Edison or one Henry Ford has done far more to raise the national standard of living than almost any half-dozen Presidents. One business genius, by developing some better method for distributing goods, will accomplish more than two or three Congresses.

I have remarked before that as long as Government every week takes one-fourth or more of every worker's income, perhaps every citizen should devote one-fourth or more of his time toward trying to reduce and improve Government. Certainly few do anything like that. Our preoccupations are with our jobs and our duties. And that's natural, since our own personal standards of living and satisfactions come mainly from the discharge of our personal responsibilities. But we do need to be alert to prevent Government from interfering with our doing our work successfully.

We Are Losing Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. WHITAKER
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. WHITAKER. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "We Are Losing Patience," written by W. C. Lassetter, vice president and editor of the Progressive Farmer, which appeared in the January issue of this magazine:

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the penalty. Such persons should be exposed and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working diligently, earnestly and ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious snipers? The ablest among us sometimes are the most sensitive.

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work goads them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks. We feel for these men who have the courage to remain in public service. We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Bert Andrews appearing in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, there surely is something decidedly wrong with the foreign policy of the administration, or rather the lack of foreign policy. I had the privilege of visiting the Far East this fall and the crossfire bickering among those representing us in this part of the world is disgraceful. Now we have the English recognizing the Soviet Republic of China for what they consider their own benefit and which will also be for the benefit of the Soviet Union of Russia. For one not on the inside of our diplomatic affairs, it does seem rather idiotic to continue helping a country that is helping communism, while we are spending billions to fight communism.

The article follows:

FORMOSA: WHAT HAPPENED—FULL STORY OF WASHINGTON INTRIGUE ON POLICY SETS A RECORD IN SCHEMING AND BACKBITING

(By Bert Andrews)

WASHINGTON.—A strange and fascinating story of backbiting, infighting, news suppression and news leaking lies behind President Truman's final decision to have the United States maintain a hands-off policy toward Formosa.

It is a tale that has flabbergasted even veteran observers of the Washington scene, who thought they'd seen just about everything in the way of official intrigue, only to learn in this case that new and fancy touches can be added at will by inventive minds.

It is a chapter in the book of history which involves President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, General of the Army Douglas MacArthur, and Senator H. Alexander Smith, Republican, of New Jersey, to say nothing of a host of minor characters.

The basic issue of what to do about Formosa and what is left of the Nationalist government of China is a problem of long standing, of course, and this account will deal only with the weird happenings of the 36 days from December 1, 1949, to January 5, 1950, when the matter came to a head with the President's decision.

Senator SMITH, 69 years old, one of the mildest-mannered and best-intentioned men in the Congress, was, to his own astonishment, the man who set off the chain of events leading up to the show-down.

Senator SMITH did it by holding a press conference in his office on December 1.

He had just returned from a trip to the Orient. In Tokyo he talked with General MacArthur. To be precise, he probably listened to General MacArthur, for it has been the experience of most individuals who have visited General MacArthur since the

tide turned in World War II in the Pacific that the general does most of the talking.

Senator SMITH, being a gentleman who abides by promises not to quote people when he has been asked not to, didn't quote General MacArthur. But it was clear that the Senator wasn't merely giving his own views when he contended:

That it was unthinkable that Formosa should be lost to the Chinese Communists.

That Communist possession of Formosa, 100 miles off the coast of China, would endanger the Philippines, American-held Okinawa, and perhaps even Japan.

That Communist drives made possible by a Formosa base might eventually push America's defense back to the Marianas, the Hawaiian Islands—and the Pacific coast.

The Senator got some headlines in the afternoon papers. But by the time the morning papers came out, his views were pretty well down in the stories, for the leaking had begun and the stories were topped by contrary word from authoritative sources.

The authoritative sources in this instance were men in the State Department.

(Secretary Acheson was to say subsequently: "We have had leak and counterleak, gossip and countergossip." He ought to know.)

The sources solemnly told reporters that the as yet unannounced view of the Department was that Formosa was of no strategic value to the United States and that the Department consequently was prepared to see the island fall to the Chinese Communists.

Over in the Pentagon, where Secretary Johnson holds sway and sometimes gets himself into difficulties by talking too much to the wrong people at the wrong time, there had been some advance notice that that was the way Secretary Acheson felt.

It was also known that the Joint Chiefs of Staff weren't, as of that day, inclined to dispute Secretary Acheson on Formosa.

But—on that same December 1—two men were sent on a flying trip to Tokyo and it seems reasonable to think they went with the blessing of Secretary Johnson and with instructions to "get me something to fight with."

Mr. Johnson, it should be explained, had been saying privately that he thought China policy had been mismanaged and that he was going to keep on asking what our present policy was until he found out.

The messengers to MacArthur were Tracy S. Voorhees, Under Secretary of the Army, and Lt. Gen. Alfred M. Gruenther, Army Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations.

They talked with General MacArthur. Or listened to him. Evidently they got an earful, for they came back to Washington in mid-December and reported to Secretary Johnson and things began to happen. Like this:

December 22: An all-day meeting of the Joint Chiefs of Staff was held. The members drafted a recommendation that the National Security Council attempt to deny Formosa to the Communists to the extent of sending a United States military mission there. The argument, straight from General MacArthur, was that it wasn't necessary to send troops. The argument was further that Gen. Sun Li-jen's forces on Formosa were strong enough to stop any Communist invasion if properly trained and equipped, and if their Chinese commanders had the advice of experienced American officers.

December 23: Presumably the new decision on the joint chiefs was communicated to Secretary Acheson. It didn't seem to make much difference, for a couple of other things happened on this day:

1. The State Department notified its attachés in a memo dated December 23 that Formosa wasn't considered important strategically and that the attachés ought to begin to publicize that view so the United States wouldn't lose prestige if the island fell. (What price a decision by the joint chiefs?)

2. Chinese Ambassador V. K. Wellington Koo called at the State Department and talked to W. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs. The Ambassador made a formal request for military, political, and economic advisers for Formosa.

This was at 4:30 p. m. on the day before Christmas, and all through the State Department house things were pretty quiet. Thus no reporters saw the Ambassador enter the Department. No announcement was made, and Mr. Butterworth left for a Christmas holiday without telling Michael J. McDermott, the Department's top public-relations man, anything about the visit.

There matters stood until December 28, when this reporter learned from a good friend and trustworthy source (reporter's note: sorry G. F. and T. S. that you won't take credit though credit is due and that your G. F.'s and T. S.'s won't either) that the criticism by Senator SMITH and others was about to bear strange fruit.

President Truman and his top advisers began to get worried lest Senator SMITH and other critics accuse them in the Congress that was then about to reconvene of having no policy for Asia. So the orders were to have the National Security Council get together on Thursday, December 29, so that a positive policy could be prepared for presentation to Congress.

The statutory members of the N. S. C. are the President, Vice President, Defense Secretary, Secretary of State, and chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The law gives the President the right to invite any other Government officials to the council meetings in an advisory capacity.

It seemed that the showdown was at hand: that the long-held differences of opinion between Secretary Acheson and Secretary Johnson would be aired in a face-to-face meeting.

Secretary Acheson was there.

Where was Secretary Johnson? In Florida getting some sun.

Why wasn't he there? Well, the best information this reporter has been able to get is that Secretary Johnson had heard that Secretary Acheson had already sold President Truman on his arguments, and that there wasn't any use of him being there.

Unkind critics suggested, of course, as unkind critics are prone to do in such cases in Washington, that Secretary Johnson had run out on the fight. The other view is that if a decision had already been made, there wouldn't be any fight, and hence there was no need for him to listen in while the President gave the nod to the other side.

The best information is that Secretary Johnson asked the President if it was O. K. for him to go away for a while and that the President kindly assured him it wasn't necessary for him to attend the NSC meeting.

At any rate, Gen. Omar Bradley, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, stated the MacArthur-backed arguments for keeping Formosa out of the hands of the Chinese Communists.

About all General Bradley did was to read the document prepared by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Reporters couldn't learn whether he backed it up with emphatic arguments of his own, thus taking personal as well as offical issue with Secretary Acheson.

Secretary Acheson was prepared with official and personal arguments. He insisted that the United States should not go a little way toward aiding Formosa unless it was prepared to go all the way, including war to protect it from aggression. One report was that he got General Bradley to concede that Formosa did not warrant the commitment of American troops now or even if the Chinese Communists attacked it.

So—with Secretary Acheson in the driver's seat and Secretary Johnson in the Florida sun—President Truman decided for Secretary Acheson's views.

Friends say that Secretary Johnson hasn't given up the fight.

They point to the fact that the Joint Chiefs of Staff are scheduled to visit General MacArthur in February to talk with him. Or listen to him. They might come back so strongly reinforced with arguments as to compel reopening of the case. But that's doubtful.

There is some more chronology:

December 30: Mr. McDermott denied that Nationalist China had formally requested aid for Formosa.

January 2: Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, Republican, of California, just returned from a visit to General MacArthur, said Mr. McDermott had erred; that the Senator knew a formal request had been made.

January 2: Herbert Hoover, America's only living ex-President, and Senators Knowland and Robert A. Taft, Republican, of Ohio, agreed that the United States should use its Navy if necessary to protect Formosa and raise "a wall against communism in the Pacific."

January 3: Mr. McDermott, who never deceives reporters when he knows or can get the answers to queries, sadly admitted he had erred in his December 30 statement. Seems Mr. Butterworth hadn't told him anything about the Ambassador's call.

(Mr. Butterworth, incidentally, had been upset on December 28 when this reporter got wind of the fact that a meeting of the NSC had been called to frame a China policy. Seems he had just got back from his holiday and that he decided on December 28, "If that's coming up, I'm going right away from the office again." He did.)

Then came January 5, with President Truman's announcement of the hands-off policy and Mr. Acheson's statement giving details.

It has made the Republicans so angry—both what was done and the manner in which it was done—that attempts to keep foreign policy going on a bipartisan basis are in danger.

"It has been kicked out the window by the President and the Secretary of State," said Senator HOMER FERGUSON, Republican, of Michigan. "I mean in all fields. The President and the Secretary can't divide the world into two parts and say we'll have bipartisanship in one part and to hell with Congress in the other part."

Secretary Acheson summed it all up when he told why the President and he issued their statements:

"We have had leak and counterleak gossip and countergossip. We have gotten a great deal of confusion in the minds of foreign people. We have stirred up a good deal of speculation, all of which, if allowed to continue, would be highly prejudicial to the interests of the United States of America. And, therefore, it was the President's desire to clarify the situation."

Is everybody clarified?

History of the Labor Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following address made by me to the Massachusetts CIO Convention in Boston on November 27, 1949:

President Belanger, distinguished and invited guests, officers of the Massachusetts State CIO, and delegates to the convention,

since the development of trade-union organization is one of the principal themes of this convention, it is altogether fitting and proper that we pause and reflect upon the tremendous strides which the past 60 years have witnessed in the labor movement.

Significantly, labor relations concepts in this country were developed largely by means of judicial decisions. Near the end of the last century, prevailing opinion recognized the legal right of workingmen to combine and to strike in order to secure for themselves higher wages, shorter hours, and improved working conditions.

A great diversity of opinion developed, however, relative to the means by which, the persons through whom, and the persons upon whom, pressure might permissibly be exerted in order to enforce the demands of the workers.

In the absence of legislation, the courts were thus called upon to determine what the public welfare demanded in answer to these problems.

The first judicial opinion on boycotting was rendered in 1886; that on peaceful picketing in 1888. Our courts, then, became the arbiters of social policy in the field of labor relations, and being thus called upon to exercise a quasi legislative function, they naturally differed in their conclusions.

The injunction first came into prominence as a weapon in labor conflicts in 1888. A few years later, when its use became widespread and conspicuous, the controversy surrounding it outweighed the question of the substantive rights of the parties themselves.

This equitable remedy, even though it was applied in conformity with established judicial practice, had unintended effects which impinged upon the personal rights and liberty of the wage earners.

Allegations of violating the terms of injunctions were often heard upon affidavits alone, without any opportunity for confron' tion of witnesses or the right of cross-examination. Findings of guilt for contempt and commitment in the judge's discretion had the effect of successful prosecution for crime; but in the course of such proceedings, the wage earner was denied all of the rights commonly assured by the constitution to one charged with crime.

Judges, therefore, were accused of usurping the functions of a jury in finding facts on affidavit; of usurping legislative functions in prescribing conditions under which strikes were permissible; and incidentally, of seriously limiting the constitutional rights of a free press, free speech, and to peaceable assembly.

In urging restrictions of the use of the injunctive device, the most powerful argument was that its uninhibited use endowed property with a force which would make it dominant over human beings and the rights of man. In other words, under the guise of safeguarding property rights, the employer was allegedly seeking sovereign power.

At this juncture, right-thinking citizens, zealous only for the public welfare, advanced the commendable theory that the law of property was not an appropriate channel for dealing with problems of social progress or of social unrest, and that the power of State should not be exercised through the courts in favor of one side in the social struggle.

It was believed that the problem of control and conduct of labor relations demanded a solution of its own apart from traditional judicial techniques—and until such time as the proper principles for the governance of industrial relations were formulated, it was wiser not to determine industrial issues by means of injunction.

Opposition to the practice of "government by injunction" led to the seeking of aid from Congress and the State legislatures.

From 1894 to 1914, legislative proposals relating to labor disputes, boycotting, picketing, restraints on injunctions, and the right of workers to combine occupied every session of the Congress; and only within our own memory did these efforts result in enactment of such broad and progressive legislation as the Norris-LaGuardia Act, the Wagner Act, the Walsh-Healey Act, and the Wages and Hours Act.

Out of this history of American experiences grew the plan of federation and combination which gave labor its place in the sun. It started with the organization, in 1869, of the Knights of Labor. Then came the American Federation of Labor, and more recently, your own progressive and forward-looking organization—the CIO.

The legal right of employees, through their unions, to negotiate as a partner in industry—the right of collective bargaining—was fought for fiercely for many years—and with the passage of the last 17 years, under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt until his untimely death, and now President Harry S. Truman, it has been my happy privilege, as a participant in enlightened national administrations, to see it recognized and vindicated.

During the Eightieth Congress a marked step backward was taken in the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act. This will be only temporary. Progress of man's associations with man may be delayed by powerful forces, or a step backward taken at times, but the onward journey of progress cannot be stopped.

In the Congress a combination of forces having different intents and interests have blocked temporarily the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act and have prevented the substitution for it of sound labor law conducive to the best interests of capital and labor and of the country as a whole. This combination can only delay, not stop, the ultimate repeal of this unsound, unhealthy, unfair piece of legislation.

It is my opinion, which I express in all frankness to you, that we will not be able to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act in this Congress. But while this may be so, we can get satisfaction out of the fact that further antilabor legislation, which was intended before the last election by certain forces, cannot and will not pass this Congress.

The repeal of this law is not alone for the best interests of labor. It is for the best interests of capital and management. It is for the best interests of the country.

If my opinion that the Taft-Hartley Act is not repealed in the next session of Congress is later proven to be correct, I make the prediction that if a minimum of 20 more progressive-minded Members are elected to the National House of Representative, and a minimum of 5 in the Senate, that this punitive and discriminatory bill will be repealed in the Eighty-second Congress.

In that masterful encyclical on the conditions of the working classes, Pope Leo XIII stated, in part:

"That workingmen's associations should be organized and governed as to furnish the best and most suitable means for attaining what is aimed at; that is to say, for helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, soul, and property."

You have for decades been a leader in achieving this aim, not only for the organized worker but for the unorganized worker.

Labor has not confined itself in its leadership of progress to its own immediate field. It has consistently led the fight for all workers against exploitation; against low wages and inhumanly long hours. It has been a leader in the field of social-security legislation; of legislation to develop the national resources of our country; of legislation to strengthen the position of agriculture and the farmer; of legislation to remove and prevent discriminations against our fellow Americans; all along the line of legislation that will strengthen our country by making the family life of our Nation strong and virile.

The strength or weakness of a nation is dependent upon the strength or weakness of its basic unit—the family.

Labor has been the leader in the constant fight for economic security or, to put it conversely, a leader in the fight against economic insecurity.

In times of peace American labor has been a great force in sound progressive action. In times of war it has always responded to the maximum extent possible. It has repeatedly shown its patriotism and the love of its members for our country.

And in the many contributions to our progress, in peace, and our safety in war, your organization, the CIO, has played a most important part.

I predict that with the completion of the elimination of the dissident elements that your organization will play a far greater and more important part in the future life of our great Nation.

The aim of workingmen's associations in the words of Pope Leo XIII: "Helping each individual member to better his condition to the utmost in body, soul, and property" can further be achieved by balancing right with duty, privilege with obligation, and immunity with license.

As a great American organization, imbued with and actuated as you are by high American ideals and objectives, in the years ahead of us the CIO will continue to grow and expand in influence as a free, American, and democratic movement.

Your President and Mine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. W. F. NORRELL

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. NORRELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Millard D. Gibbs, D. D. S., of Hot Springs National Park, Ark.:

YOUR PRESIDENT AND MINE

(By Millard D. Gibbs, D. D. S., Hot Springs National Park, Ark.)

In discussing "Your President and Mine" I am doing so in a plural sense and what I wish to present is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The man in the White House is our recognized first citizen and Chief Executive. The freedoms we have in America are the envy of most people in foreign lands. We must preserve them at all costs, and one way to accomplish this is not to abuse them.

Some individuals speak most disrespectfully of the President of our country and, in my opinion, they are sowing seeds of discontent when such abusive tactics are indulged in. In the interest of unity in our Nation, there should be instilled in the hearts of all Americans a more profound respect for whoever may occupy the White House as President of the United States. The application of the golden rule would accomplish this.

Any movement that may serve to strengthen our Nation should be definitely encouraged. Communism, socialism, and other "isms" are continually in our midst, and each has leaders who have strong desires to destroy the democracy our forebears fought for and died to preserve. The Star-Spangled Banner and America, My Country 'Tis of Thee, we proudly sing, but to build a stronger and a lasting America should be our goal for not only this generation but for those of the future.

To be respected as a nation we need to exemplify the same high regard in our daily lives that we exact of other nations for America. If, as an American citizen, one feels justified in criticizing our Chief Executive, why not let such nonapproval be registered in an honorable and respectful manner? Let us stop pretending Americanism and be real supporters of America and the true democracy she stands for and un-American activities will fade out of the picture.

One may have the right as an American to speak disrespectfully of the President, but such practice is an indication of a shrinking patriotism. As Americans we proudly proclaim our freedoms, but seldom alert ourselves regarding the abuse of these cherished possessions and the resulting damage to America and all it represents.

The enemies of America and the wonderful democracy she represents are the ones who profit most when we, as American citizens, violate our moral or loyalty obligations to our Nation. Yesterday the atomic age was merely scientific speculation. Today it is a stern and dangerous reality. Will atomic energy prove an agent for the betterment of mankind or the agent for the annihilation of the human race? With this discovery now in the hands of potential enemies, it behooves all freedom-loving people to strive in every way to outlaw this horrible weapon of death and destruction.

Our President and those who may succeed him, regardless of party, will be faced with these and other grave problems that must be solved.

In a former article, Mr. President U. S. A., not only was the idea of greater respect for the office of President suggested but it was suggested that a national holiday honoring all Presidents be set aside. All civic clubs, the American Legion, Amvets, and other groups of Hot Springs approved the proposal, as did some governors, Congressmen, Senators, and Vice President BARKLEY. Some opposition to a national holiday developed because so many holidays are already in existence and this phase of the proposal has been removed.

Since the suggestion to create in America a greater respect for the high office of President and the one who occupies the office met with such unanimous endorsement, I feel it incumbent upon me to further attempt to bring to a successful termination this patriotic proposal—that America may become a stronger Nation.

The flag of our country we love, honor, and respect and this is as it should be—yet our flag is only symbolic. The President of the United States is the elected Chief Executive of our Nation and represents our country at home and abroad. He is no ordinary person, yet because of our great democracy he may have risen from a most humble environment. This man whom we call Mr. President is the chief defender of our flag as he is the Commander in Chief of both the Army and Navy. He holds the highest position in the gift of our people.

There is a radio program each Sunday afternoon at 1:30 known as Mr. President. It is well dramatized and features that well-known and popular actor, Edward Arnold. This program brings out very vividly the many problems with which our Presidents are confronted. The stories on the broadcast are based upon actual happenings during the administration of the President portrayed in each episode.

Some of our Presidents have died martyrs of assassins' bullets. Others have died in office, victims of mental and physical strain occasioned by the great responsibilities placed upon them. This exalted position most certainly cannot be termed "a bed of roses." No matter which political party succeeds in putting its candidate in the White House, the Chief Executive is not in all respects going to please even his own constituency. He will be praised and condemned, no matter which direction the pendulum may swing.

The business of such nations as ours is definitely not a one-man job, so it becomes necessary to surround the President with a law-making body and a Cabinet, representative of the different departments of government, education, banking, labor, agriculture, industry, and all phases of economics must be included. Many debatable and controversial questions come up before these bodies, and while we have a Secretary of State, Secretary of the Army, Secretary of the Navy, and other secretaries of less importance, the President is Chief over all.

Many outstanding men and some lesser lights have been candidates for the high office of President. Candidates, in most instances, are approved because they have filled either State or National positions and often because they hail from some section of the Nation where they might be a factor in influencing votes. Upon a political platform a candidate is nominated and he immediately becomes the recognized leader of his party. If elected, he becomes the leader and representative of approximately 150,000,000 people. To please all voters and millions of potential youthful voters is a target hard to shoot at with precision. If Congress is not friendly the aim cannot be relied upon.

To hold the office of President, one must believe in God but has the privilege of worshipping according to the dictates of his own conscience. This liberty is embodied in the Constitution of our Government.

The nominee of each party may have liberal tendencies or he may be of the conservative group, while some are extreme in either of these. The President can be sincere in his views that may have influenced his election, yet later realize his mistake. Should he stand by his campaign pledges or support the measures he is now convinced are best for his country?

Our two major-party systems are unquestionably democratic, yet political antagonism is so prevalent that no matter how well the party in favor succeeds it is rather generally and severely criticized by political opponents. The President, as it were, becomes a veritable target. Some Presidents can thrive on it while with others it acts as a most troublesome stumbling block. The criticisms are often abusive and destructive, yet the President of our Nation is our No. 1 citizen. Freedom of speech and freedom of the press in our democracy are granted to us but in speaking disparagingly of the President, our first citizen, I am wondering if we are not abusing our much-enjoyed freedoms.

Under normal conditions the President is endowed with the power to act, and in case of war or other vital emergencies, he is accorded increased power. He makes many proclamations regarding the observance of days set aside to do honor to some worthy cause or individual. Why not honor him? The Congress, Senate, churches, schools, colleges, universities, the radio and press, and other organizations could arrange appropriate programs. Such a plan would no doubt develop in the hearts and minds of our people a far greater respect for our chief executive. George Washington is known as the Father of his Country and we honor him still. History records the main events occuring during the administration of a President. We should not wait to pay tribute until he has gone fom us, but rather let him know during his life that Americans hold him in high esteem.

Differences of opinion exist among men, even when they are members of the same religious or political organizations. This is true in every walk of life. These facts make it impossible for any one individual to decide momentous questions that will be satisfactory to all in a single or collective group. The President, to be such, must have attained a certain degree of success in former undertakings. Otherwise he would never have been selected as the leader of a great political party. He holds an honorable position and at heart is interested in the welfare of the Nation he has been selected to serve. Let the Nation, in turn, honor him by instilling in the hearts of all our people and the nations of the world that the President of the United States is worthy of the honor we have bestowed and that he is entitled to the most profound respect at home and abroad, regardless of political affiliations.

To pay homage or proper respect to the President of our Nation should be a pleasure to all good Americans. Constructive criticism is right and proper but to desecrate the highest office in our land is failing definitely in our patriotic duty as citizens of what we consider the greatest Nation of all. In attempting to keep "our Government house in order" the President needs the help of God and a sympathetic, understanding public. As true American citizens we designate ourselves 100 percent. If we slander and speak disrespectfully of the President of the United States, I am wondering if we are not lowering the patriotic standards we claim to uphold. The high office he holds deserves the respect of every American. In our evaluation of any President of the United States, let us think first before becoming harsh and abusive because someone unfriendly to America may be among those present.

Remember, he is "your President and mine." God bless America!

Record of the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following radio address made by me over the National Broadcasting Co. network, out of Station WBL of Boston, the evening of November 18, 1949:

Ladies and gentlemen, tonight I would like to review quickly my impressions of what people—the voters—think of the record of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress and what it means for 1950.

When the first session of the Eighty-first Congress concluded after a near-record session that lasted nearly 10 months, I addressed the House of Representatives as majority leader and summed up the record of accomplishments.

It was an excellent record. But I would like to give you an idea of what the people in my own district in Massachusetts think of that record and what that means as regards the future. And my district is a representative American district.

Immediately following the close of Congress I came home.

I sought out my friends at home and asked them to tell me candidly what they thought. There were many others who sought me out and told me, candidly, what they thought.

During the same time I have had occasion to talk to many of my colleagues in the House of Representatives and Members of the Senate and I have compared notes with them.

The results of our joint findings are very similar.

The people—and I mean the vast voting public which elects Congressmen to office—feel that the Eighty-first Congress is the best Congress since the emergencies of war took the accent off domestic legislation.

They feel that their Democratic Eighty-first Congress has gone far toward redeeming its 1948 campaign promises. Furthermore, in the instances where the promises have not been fulfilled, a good fight was put up, or a good start made toward fulfillment.

In the field of international relations there was a solid record of achievement. The foreign policy of the Democratic administration was enacted into law. The economic recovery program—the Marshall plan—was extended for another year.

Most voters think this is the single greatest step ever taken by this country in the field of international relations. Almost all the people I talked to—and my colleagues report the same—feel that the democracies of western Europe depend on ECA and unless we continue to help them, Russia will be able to extend her regime of godless communism further toward our shores.

Now I think it is important to realize that people do understand that the ECA alone is not the solution. For that reason they know that the extension of the Reciprocal Trade Act was essential, if the full benefit of our ECA program is to be realized.

I was not surprised to learn, although some of my friends seemed to doubt it, that the voter understood the implications of this important law. The people understand that trade does not work on a one-way street, but has to go both ways. They understand that the only way in which such a balance can be reached is to lower tariff barriers everywhere in the world.

With our production capacity and technical know-how we are bound to be the eventual gainer on the upturn in trade that will result.

To implement our policy, the Eighty-first Congress also approved the North Atlantic Pact and Arms Aid to Europe, which strengthens the defensive position of the western democracies. Thus we have moved to rebuild the European democracies economically and to safeguard them politically and militarily.

My constituents understood these things and approved.

They asked shrewd questions—questions that went to the heart of each subject. They knew what I was talking about and they knew how it affected New England and the Nation.

My people are not a provincial-minded group who fail to see the forest for the trees. On the contrary they understand very well the implications and the necessities and they, if anything, are ahead of the thinking in the Congress.

This is particularly true in the field of domestic legislation.

In Boston we knew by personal experience the terrible problems of the housing shortage. We knew the problems of high rents and insufficient homes.

It was a major issue and the people of my district regard the passage of the long range housing bill and of the extension of the rent-control law as major steps forward in meeting their needs.

They know in my district that slums breed more crime, more disease, and require more State and municipal services paid for out of the tax bill of every citizen than do any other areas.

My constituents and the voters in other Congressmen's districts with whom I have talked knew all about the efforts of the real-estate lobby to stop action in this vital field. If the real-estate lobby had succeeded—well, there's a song title that answers what would happen—There'll Be Some Changes Made.

One of the most important pieces of legislation passed by the Eighty-first Congress was the new Fair Labor Standards Act, which raised the minimum wage of labor from 40 cents an hour to 75 cents an hour. Now it is true that in New England where I come from this affected relatively few workingmen because labor is well organized.

But it is important from a national sense, in that it betters working conditions for labor in general and tends to equalize labor costs in the various sections of the country. Low-wage areas cannot compete with low sweatshop labor costs with the high living standard areas and get away with it.

Now, as I said, the voting public knows why this law is important. They also know that while the minimum wage was raised, its coverage was not expanded as broadly as the President asked. They know why. That'll be important politically in some areas next year.

In New England, too, where the problem of cheap power has become a paramount issue because industry needs great quantities of cheap power to survive, the people were interested in the action taken by the Congress on public power questions.

Unfortunately the matters considered by the Congress did not include power projects for New England. But the principle of public power transmitted over publicly owned transmission lines to the user at the lowest possible price was enunciated by the Eighty-first Congress. In New England this move was applauded by the people—while the power interests gritted their teeth.

But the people wanted to know:

"If cheap public power is good for the Northwest and for the Tennessee Valley why isn't it good for New England?"

They are going to continue to ask that question until something is done. It may be that the voting public will do something itself—in 1950.

Here in New England there are few large farms. But the workingman and the businessman in New England realize full well that the economic fate of the farmer is bound inextricably with his own.

They wanted to know about the new Farm Support legislation and they asked penetrating questions concerning the Brannan Plan. The people wanted to know why it wasn't good to allow farm surpluses to be eaten rather than allowed to rot in storage. They will continue to ask such questions.

As for the actions of the Congress in rectifying the ripper legislation passed by the Republican Eightieth Congress, the people overwhelmingly approve. They know that if a farmer, for instance, is to get his government loan under the law, he must have storage space for his grain. And they approve the legislation which the Democrats passed to give that storage back to the farmer after it had been taken away by the Republicans.

The people heartily favor the bill passed by the Congress which allows the Rural Electrification Administration to loan money for cooperative telephone service in areas where there is no service now. This was a great step forward and the people so regard it.

So far I have discussed the manner in which the people regard the accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress. They approve of those bills and approve highly. But they are also conscious of the failures.

They want the Taft-Hartley Act repealed. They don't want labor shackled with an unfair law. They want labor allowed to sit at the collective bargaining table as the equal of industry. They don't want government interference to give management an unfair advantage in the collective bargaining act.

They want civil rights legislation passed.

The people know that the Republicans in the Senate, through their cynical repudiation of their own civil-rights plank in the Republican national platform, allowed a southern minority to establish a new rule governing debate in the Senate which places the problem of limiting debate back beyond the 1917 reform.

The Republicans egged the southern Democrats into the filibuster and when the vote finally came to uphold Vice President BARKLEY's key ruling, 23 Republicans—a majority of the Republican membership of the Senate—repudiated their own national stand on the issue to join with the southern Democrats to kill the civil-rights program.

Since fewer than half of the Republicans in the Senate had stood by the platform pledge of their party something had to be done to fix up the record. Under its terms, a minority of only 33 Senators representing perhaps 8 to 10 percent of the Nation's voters can kill any bill it wants to kill. The resolution was passed and the southerners won their victory.

But the Republicans, while they have tried to make a lawyer's record, have not fooled the people. There will be questions asked, and changes made.

Now there are some other phases of the Eighty-first Congress' work in the first session which have been watched with great interest at home. The displaced persons bill for one.

This has passed the House of Representatives. It will be brought up in the Senate early in the next session. I am sure action will be taken promptly to liberalize an unjust law.

And believe me, the people who know who wrote the present unfair law. And they know why it was delayed.

The passage of legislation extending the coverage of the Social Security Act and increasing the benefits paid under the act was also passed by the House and is now up before the Senate. I am sure this will pass with speed as soon as the Congress convenes in January.

This bill is one of the very important parts of the Fair Deal program advanced by President Truman and will bring some 11,000,000 additional persons under the coverage of the social-security law. It will increase benefits in line with advancing costs of living.

Now I have summed up many of the major items passed, defeated, and pending. That is the basic record which the voting people at home in the States are talking about when they see their Congressman or their Senator.

Now let me project this record into the future.

Actually this was a good session of the Congress. But its record was marred by the actions of some of its Members.

Those Members, mostly Republicans, will feel the wrath of their constituents come next year unless they watch their steps.

The recent elections were a good demonstration of the truth of what I say.

The people at home are for the Fair Deal. They know the Fair Deal means the people's deal.

They do not care if the Republicans try to scare them away by screaming "welfare state," "statism," "collectivism."

The people at home only know that for 17 years under Democratic administration, with the exception of 2 years of a Republican-controlled Congress, they received constructive and courageous leadership. They know they have improved their lot immeasureably. They know that labor and the farmer have been able to advance, to take their rightful place as full partners in the economy. They know they got these things as the result of Democratic leadership.

They will not be scared off.

They showed it on November 8, 1948.

And in 1950 they will underscore it once again.

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress has made an outstanding record.

The Eighty-first Congress will make a fine record of accomplishment.

But in 1950 there will be an even stronger Democratic majority for the Eighty-second Congress, and even more will be done.

My people, and the people strongly throughout the Nation, realize that the Democratic Party under the leadership of the immortal Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now under the leadership of our sincere and courageous President, Hon. Harry S. Truman, is dedicated to fighting economic insecurity, and to strengthening the family life of America.

Santa Claus and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, this year I received a lot of form Christmas cards which said:

A very merry Christmas to you, my Congressman, and you can make it a happy new year for me if you'll help put these packages under my 1950 Christmas tree: Government economy, tax the untaxed, excise tax relief.

I answered all of them with this letter:

I acknowledge receipt of the generous sentiments expressed in your Christmas card. I'm sure you will excuse the delay in responding in view of the impropriety of mixing politics with the spirit of Christmas.

Responding to the political page of your greeting, I will vote to equalize taxes on every commercial enterprise. But I doubt the wisdom of taxing churches, lodges, charitable institutions, labor unions, and chambers of commerce. If you feel differently about the latter be assured I'll give your views my prompt and careful consideration when communicated to me. It will not be necessary to wait until next Christmas and couple your views with the affectionate sentiments with which your heart seems to be filled for me. I will consider a letter written for that purpose without any sentimental overtone.

Further answering your political expressions (which I am sure were merely incidental to your burning desire to wish me a merry Christmas), I am in favor of every economy consistent with our safety, and I also favor repeal of most excise taxes—liquor and tobacco being notable among my exceptions.

However, this repeal may necessitate an increase in income-tax rates during unsettled international affairs. For example, the five economy-minded Republican members of the Foreign Affairs Committee condemned the Secretary of State for first appealing to the conscience of the world, rather than immediately appealing to arms, in his successful efforts to procure the release of Angus Ward from the Chinese Reds. These same folks are demanding a drastically reduced budget. But you don't fight wars with popguns. An appeal to arms could well await failure of peaceful efforts. These folks remind me of a fellow who once stood with his hands in his pockets and told another fellow he'd knock his nose in, then turned his head to spit. When he got up he advised his friends to be ready when offering to fight.

Some of these folks also derisively accuse this administration of playing false Santa Claus. Yet they have induced you to ask me to do just that. I know of no way we can provide free protection for you, your loved ones, and your possessions. I suggest you examine the exhortations of those who demand we first resort to arms in each international incident and, at the same time, demand less taxes.

Many of these folks foster the belief that most of your taxes go for welfare legislation. Hence it might not be amiss to remind you of the figures: Health and welfare services, 6 percent; interest on debt, 13 percent; veterans' affairs, 13 percent; military, 34 percent; and international affairs (bipartisan), 16 percent; and general government, 18 percent; the last being swelled by many incidental relationships to present and past defense.

Those are the facts. But they are never related by those who sneer Santa Claus at this administration, while inducing you to demand that I play Santa Claus by providing for your protection for less than it costs.

I lay no claim to occult powers. Nor do I propose to play the role of a charlatan by pretending I have a magic formula. I conceive it to be my duty to tell you the truth, and the truth is that this is a dangerous world—we are on it and we can't move off of it. The atomic bomb is real, not a fairy tale, and Russia has the bomb. The Indianapolis News said (January 13, 1949): "Whether we like it or not a foreign dictator, Joseph Stalin, is writing the ticket for our national expenditures and taxation for the fiscal year 1950."

I shall effect every economy possible while a Representative; but I refuse to turn my back on the facts and when the people want to be kidded by their Representative, they can get another to do the job.

For example, the Indiana Congressman who talks most about economy voted for the military pay raise bill; arms to Europe and to pay the same pension to a 90-day veteran as to a 4-year veteran. I voted against these measures, but I voted for expenditures I deem necessary and honest. Furthermore, I tell the people how I voted and why. Which type of Representative do you prefer?

Would you write me as your Representative in Congress your own views on:

1. Where would you cut expenditures and how much in each instance? (NOTE.—This question is not facetious. I will carefully consider your views.)

2. The Republican State committee recently asserted that expenditures should be cut 20 percent each year. Do you believe this can be done, and if so where, in detail?

3. Would you approve of this administration advocating strengthening of the United Nations to empower it to decide international disputes (even to the point of bindingly deciding against the United States) and to furnish the United Nations the military power to enforce such decisions (even against the United States)?

4. Would you condemn or approve this administration if it took a softer approach toward Russia in its efforts to find a solution to the cold war?

5. Before settlement of the cold war would you approve withdrawal of our armed forces from any, and if so, what parts of the world?

6. Do you disapprove of the bipartisan aid to western Europe program and are you acquainted with the end objectives of that program?

7. Would you agree with me that the Federal Government should adopt Indiana's plan of pay as you go even when expenditures are enormous due to war or threats thereof?

8. Finally, you must realize that the industrial age has thrust a tremendous problem upon us; i. e., business must be big (how big is a question) to produce what we need. Hence corporations (combined financing by many) are necessary. Any one of 50 corporations own assets in double the amount of the assessed valuation of all property found in any one of 13 States. Seven corporations each own assets exceeding the assessed valuation of all property found in Indiana. This wealth creates power, and many of these corporations employ more workers than the population of some States. Therefore, we permit labor to organize to create counter power to protect workers. These combinations present a new problem to society; that is, how to control these enormous concentrations of power without breaking down the very entities necessary to produce. I will read and study any proposal made to solve this problem. Name-calling will not do it, neither will blind criticism. It requires thinking and some give and take. Your help in thinking out this problem will be deeply appreciated.

Senator CAPEHART lambasted the New Deal for years. Then when the issue was put squarely to him in debate he admitted he wouldn't repeal any of it. So he isn't a Santa Claus either—he has no magic free solution to the enormous problems of the day. Neither do I, but neither do I pretend that I do. If you have, I would be pleased to have your suggestions.

In the meantime, I have played Santa Claus by putting one package under your Christmas tree. In that package is this pledge: "I will tell you the truth and not practice demagoguery by pretending there is a Santa Claus who can give you what you want for nothing."

I wish you and yours a happy and prosperous year and many more to come and I thank you for the kind sentiments you expressed.

Resolution of North Dakota American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, in my extension I shall include a resolution passed by the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, at Fargo, N. Dak. In reading this resolution we realize that it is the same old story told over and over again in a different way and on a different occasion.

When the war drums begin to beat then nothing is too good for the boys. They are lauded and assured that their patriotism will be appreciated. We assure them that if disabled they will be taken care of. We assure them that their dependents will be taken care of. We assure them that when they return they will be put as near as possible in the same position they would have been in if they had not been called to serve their country.

But when the war drums cease to beat we gradually lose interest in the veterans. We become more niggardly. We appropriate billions to foreign sponging governments. Governments that started the wars that our boys finished. We give these governments blank checks to do as they please. Yet we should never forget that we owe our

first obligation to the veterans who won the wars that these nations started.

Here is the resolution:

Whereas certain uninformed individuals and organizations have recently seen fit to again flood this country, as they did following World War I, with erroneous propaganda concerning the cost of the veterans' rehabilitation program established by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas such activity is designed to bluff the American people into believing that this Nation's veterans, particularly the wounded and disabled who are still fighting their war from hospital and sick beds, are receiving benefits to which they are not justly entitled; and

Whereas the cost of rehabilitating this Nation's veterans, who served their country in time of need, must be considered as part of the actual expense of war as was the cost of bombs, planes, and ships during armed hostilities; and

Whereas the Hoover Commission Report, which suggests the elimination of the Veterans' Administration as the agency responsible for the administration of veterans laws, was written without seeking the advice and counsel of those who have made the care of disabled veterans their lifework; and

Whereas the adoption of the Hoover Commission Report would place the care of disabled veterans under several Government agencies wholly incapable of and absolutely unwilling to appreciate the many problems of the veterans of all our wars and their dependents; and

Whereas the Hoover suggested procedure was tested after World War I and was found wanting because of the red tape and confusion it caused and the unnecessary expense it placed upon the taxpayers of our country due to the many Government agencies which attempted the handling of veterans' affairs; and

Whereas Congress eliminated such confusion by establishing the Veterans Bureau, now known as the Veterans' Administration: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the annual midwinter conference of the American Legion, Department of North Dakota, meeting at Fargo, N. Dak., December 12 and 13, 1949, That the American Legion vigorously oppose that portion of the Hoover Commission Report pertaining to veterans which advocates the elimination of the Veterans' Administration hospital program and the turning over of that program to social welfare agencies, and that the American Legion take immediate steps necessary to present the true picture of veterans' activities in correction of the insidious misinformation now being circulated by antiveteran individuals and organizations.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following splendid address recently made over the radio by Hon. Paul A. Dever, Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I consider it a genuine privilege to be invited to address you under the sponsorship of the Polish-American Congress on the subject Justice for Poland.

It is especially appropriate that the Governor of Massachusetts should appear on this program. For here in the commonwealth we have a great many citizens of whom we are justly proud and who trace their ancestry to that long-suffering nation against which crimes of unspeakable enormity have been perpetrated in our own time.

This valiant country which lies eastward of Germany and westward of Russia has undoubtedly been the victim of the most savage and sanguinary warfare; the most hypocritical and deceitful diplomacy; the most harsh and despotic tyrannies; in short—the most outrageous injustice known to the people of our generation.

Suffering is not novel in the experience of Poland. Long prior to our time it has suffered aggression, oppression and cruelty at the hands of the tyrannical regimes which governed its neighbors. More than once in history its fair and fertile lands and its architecturally imposing cities have been ravished by conquering hordes who came in overwhelming numbers and irresistible combinations. Not for the first time has Poland had her birthright stolen by the fraudulent transactions of enemies who, behind her back and without her consent, cynically disposed of her possessions at the tables of diplomacy.

Yes, many are the injustices which have been worked upon this ancient nation to whom European civilization owes its very existence; whose history reaches back as far, if not further, than any other country in the world; who has made to the culture of mankind contributions as great as those made by any people on the face of the earth. Yet it remained for our time and a few months over 10 years ago for the most barbarous series of injustices of all to have been visited upon Poland.

It has been said, "Happy is the nation that has no history." Poland can boast of a magnificent history. Yet, just as there is no mountain without valley, so from time to time Poland has suffered occasional reverses as it marched triumphantly forward to its destiny of greatness and glory. Conquests, partitions and enemy occupations have from time to time marred her long and illustrious record.

Today, as a result of the infamy which commenced in August 1939, this great nation appears for the moment to have gone into eclipse. She has been violated and outraged in a manner that transcends the darkest days of all her past. Today she stands before the nations of the earth, a mute but eloquent accuser. She has been wronged, ravished and betrayed as she has never been wronged, ravished or betrayed before. In this her moment of sorrow and travail, her condition cries out for the compassion of the world. It should be a burden on the conscience of civilization.

Following World War I, Poland enjoyed a new and joyous rebirth after a protracted period during which she had lain dormant under the control of the despotic regimes which had partitioned her at the infamous Congress of Vienna.

During the War of 1914–18, Russia had undergone humiliating defeat at the hands of Germany and was embroiled in the throes of internal revolution when Poland reemerged in history. The Austrian-Hungarian empire had been dismembered and its former regime was deposed and banished as Poland rose once again. The German Empire which had imposed upon czarist Russia an overwhelming defeat and a brutal peace had in turn succumbed to the victorious allies, and was crushed as Poland was reborn. Once again, Poland had taken up her birthright. Once again she had recovered her liberty and independence. At that happy moment, Poland was proving to the world that what had seemed to have died had only been sleeping. With remarkable energy she reorganized her government and her economy.

Under the wise and prudent direction of the brilliant Paderewski and the formidable Pilsudski she rapidly became a power in the councils of Europe. In this period of her reviving strength she might easily have crushed the then puny tyranny which had seized the reins of power in Russia, but Poland chose to remain in peace, in dignity, and on terms of tolerance with her erstwhile enemies who then lay helpless in defeat, in revolution, in anarchy, and in chaos. Poland continued to pursue the paths of peace while her gigantic enemies gradually restored themselves so that within a generation they once again became threats to the peace of the world. In 1932, Poland in all good faith executed a nonaggression pact with Russia. Later she executed one with Germany. But in 1939, Nazi Germany without a shadow of provocation or a scintilla of justification, violated its solemn treaty obligations and with all the resources at its command invaded Poland.

Within a month, as the Poles fought gallantly, desperately, and brilliantly against the Nazi onslaught facing them from the west, the archscoundrels of Soviet Russia struck them from the rear and inflicted the death blow on the Polish nation. The Polish armies scattered. Some were enslaved in the concentration camps of Nazi Germany, some were enthralled in the equally atrocious internment hells of Communist Russia, but many escaped to fight valiantly by the sides of their allies who had brought help too little and too late. A peace-loving nation and an honorable people had stood up against overwhelming odds and against invasions hurled against them unexpectedly and in violation of solemn covenants to make no aggressions against Poland's territory or sovereignty. As she faced our faithless enemy she was stabbed in the back by an equally unfaithful neighbor.

Yet perhaps the worst was to come. At the very moment when exiled Poles were fighting with their allies on every battlefront of the world, their country was betrayed by those who had professed to be her friends.

As is ever the fashion of thieves, the Nazis and Communists fell out and Hitler's armies invaded Russia. After many dark days of war, after much treasure had been drained and millions of lives had been sacrificed, the tide of battle changed and the Nazi monster was being brought to heel in the west. Even the Red army, which had been repeatedly pushed back by the German forces, was beginning to enjoy some measure of success, and the Germans, under increased pressure from the allies, gradually fell back until ultimately they were defending the city of Warsaw. At that moment a Russian army under command of the notorious Marshal Rokosovsky was standing at the gates. Word was given to the courageous Polish people within to take up arms and they would shortly receive assistance from the Russians who were besieging from without. Bravely they arose to the occasion, but the Red army cynically betrayed them and stood unmoving beyond the gates while the Nazi overlords of the city slaughtered the people who, without adequate arms, had attempted to shake off the alien yoke.

Today a Red regime rules in Warsaw. How false, how foreign, and how anti-Polish is this regime. We need no further proof than the fact that the command of the Polish Army has been entrusted to the brutal Rokosovsky who connived at the slaughter of the people of the city of Warsaw.

For ten long years Poland has suffered the greatest infamy, the greatest outrages, and the greatest betrayals of all her history. The Polish people today are under the domination of alien tyranny. The entire history of the world records few despotisms as bad and none worse. But Poland has shaken off tyr-

anny before and Poland will do it again. The gallant nation which has fought so many successive wars in times past under the ringing battle cry, "For your freedom and ours," will, I trust, soon again achieve the independence, the liberty, and the peace to which she is entitled. May the nations of the earth soon recognize their guilt, their complicity, or at least their unjustifiable indifference, and may they see to it that Poland receives the justice to which she is entitled.

General Pick, Chief of Corps of Engineers, Says "United States Takes Water for Granted While It Runs"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army has a long and honorable and successful record in protecting this country against floods, have made our rivers and streams navigable, have made possible the establishment of great ports, have builded great dams and reservoirs to control and store water to prevent devastating floods and for irrigation and to supply our cities with pure water for drinking and other commercial purposes; they keep the lanes of commerce open by maintaining the channels of our rivers and ports, protect our great recreation centers against beach erosion, build harbors and places where boats take refuge, and in disasters are the first on the ground to give relief and protection with their equipment and skill. All of this in peacetime.

In war, the Corps of Engineers are the first to be called upon to build camps, airfields, roads, bridges, ports of embarkation for men and for the transport of matériels. They prepare the landing beaches for landings, and are always necessary in the operations of our Army.

Mr. Speaker, over a long period of years the Corps of Engineers has had distinguished men at the head of its organization as the Chief of Engineers, and all of them have left their imprint upon the country by their great works.

At this time we are indeed fortunate to have as the Chief of Engineers one of the most distinguished and learned and experienced engineers that the Corps of Engineers has ever had, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick.

I do not have to tell you of his record and his accomplishments as his activities are too well known to the people of the United States.

During World War II General Pick was assigned the most difficult tasks that any engineer had ever undertaken, and all of his missions were accomplished.

Last year when the Midwest was in the throes of a blizzard, one of the worst in the history of this country, the President sent General Pick to take personal charge of the operations to save the lives of the people and save thousands of head of livestock from destruction. This he did without much acclaim.

Looking back on the disasters in our country, our people in Louisiana and the entire Mississippi River Valley were reassured and glad to have General Pick in charge of the fight in the greatest of all floods in the Mississippi River Valley, the flood of 1927, when General Pick was a colonel in charge of the New Orleans, La., district engineer's office where he made a brilliant fight with the odds against him.

It has been my pleasure within the last few months to listen to several magnificent speeches given by General Pick before a number of waterway organizations, and if we will follow his advice and recommendations, there is no question in my mind that the country will be more securely protected from floods; that our resources will be conserved, and that most of our water and waterway problems will be solved.

In this connection, Mr. Speaker, I feel that, in view of the problem which we recently had in many sections of the United States in regard to water shortages caused by drought that it would be of interest to publish a statement including the opinion of General Pick on this subject given in an interview with Mr. Francis P. Douglas, in the Washington Star of December 8, 1949, as follows:

UNITED STATES TAKES WATER FOR GRANTED WHILE IT RUNS—NATION CAN'T AFFORD TO LET SURPLUSES DRAIN AWAY—ENGINEER CHIEF SAYS NEW YORK CRISIS WILL BE REPEATED

(By Francis P. Douglas)

Our future as a Nation depends on our water supply.

This is the opinion of Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Chief of Army Engineers and one of the Nation's foremost experts on water conservation on a grand scale.

He regards water as "the biggest story in the United States." To him the current shortage of water in New York City is an example of crises that will be repeated elsewhere in the future.

According to General Pick, if the United States is going to retain its world leadership it must learn to solve its water problems—husbanding the supply, using it intelligently and effectively. It cannot let surpluses drain off into the oceans in spring floods when it is needed later in the year for parched lands and to fill the streams.

He tells this "biggest story" briefly this way:

"Because we are a great industrial Nation and a great agricultural Nation we find ourselves the leading Nation of the world. If we are to continue to be the leading Nation we must continue to build as an industrial Nation and as an agricultural Nation."

WATER PROBLEM NOT NEW

"We now have 150,000,000 people. It is expected that in another century, we will have twice this number, 300,000,000.

"We have to conserve the land and water to feed this population. We have to have water for industry, which uses tremendous amounts, and for our rivers over which we carry supplies to industry. We have the best harbors in the world and 28,000 miles of inland waterways.

"From the industrial standpoint we are using up some of our basic materials. One is iron ore. A search is being made around the world for sources of iron. With cheap transportation we can afford to go abroad for our industrial raw materials and bring them here to be processed.

"We can afford to do that if we can provide meat and bread to feed our people. But we cannot afford it if we have to bring both raw materials and food from abroad.

"The only thing that will stop our development is that we fail to make proper use of our water."

General Pick declined to make comparisons with other nations. But in the light of what he said, the experience of the British Isles obviously comes to mind. Britain imports both raw materials and food, she has been outstripped in competition and there is discussion whether part of her population should move to other British lands. On the other hand, there is Russia, with great supplies of raw materials, with the possibility of producing abundant food, but so far with a deficiency in industrial experience and skills.

LOS ANGELES SITUATION

The water problem has attracted attention by the experience of New York, where the city's shortage has been dramatized by the whiskers on the faces of those observing no-shaving Fridays to conserve water. General Pick lays the New York shortage to last summer's dry weather plus the steadily increasing use of the supply.

Elsewhere, the water problems is older and more acute. The growth of Los Angeles, for example, is held to be definitely limited unless the city can obtain more water. It now brings water 350 miles from the Colorado River. So acute is the problem that the California Legislature was asked to appropriate $1,000,000 for ideas how to obtain drinkable water from the sea at reasonable cost.

There is also a supply of water underground. But in places along the California coast so much was pumped out that sea water took the place of the fresh water under ground and the wells were salted. This has occurred in Florida, too, and even in Brooklyn and adjacent areas of Long Island.

FARMS SOP IT UP

Higher farm prices led to more acres in cultivation and to the need for more water. In Arizona so much water was pumped from underground that the water tables subsided and in some places the supply of water has failed to meet the demand. Texas has similar problems, both for agriculture and for its growing cities. Parts of Illinois and Ohio have encountered shortages in their underground supply.

"Washington has an ample water supply," said General Pick, giving reassurance to this area. "But," he warned, "it would be used up quickly if we would place large industries along our streams."

General Pick asserted that we have had enough experience now to know that we cannot take from underground amounts of water comparable to the surface water that is used. Tapping the underground supply is only a temporary expedient, he said.

INDUSTRY'S USES

He gave the daily average use of water per capita in this country as 200 gallons. Since it is estimated that the domestic use runs at 100 gallons a day or less, it is apparent that industry and irrigation takes a half or even more of the supply.

To indicate the tremendous quantities of water industry uses General Pick gave these figures: It takes 10 gallons of water to produce 1 gallon of gasoline; 33 gallons of water for 1 pound of steel (steel is usually figured in tons, which means 66,000 gallons of water per ton of steel); 100 gallons of water for 1 pound of synthetic rubber.

"If we are to continue to expand our industry," he said, "we will have to decentralize our industrial areas. Defense is not necessarily a consideration in this. The main reason is water.

"Heavy industry should be along the larger streams not only where it can get water

transportation b:t—and more important—where it can get fresh water. That is a must."

A new drain on the water resources, the general pointed out, is the comparatively new air-conditioning industry. He said we must look forward to the time when most stores, restaurants, public buildings, and theaters will be cooled during hot weather. And it takes a tremendous amount of water.

Much of the water used by industry for cooling can be used again. But some water so used is contaminated and must be treated before re-use. General Pick said that steel plants of the Youngstown area along the Mahoning River all use the river water and that the temperature of the stream below the city gets as high as 140°.

He cited an excellent example of industrial location the Standard Oil refinery on the Mississippi at Baton Rouge, La. The plant uses an enormous amount of fresh water, but there is plenty in the river for use when the mud is taken out. Deep-draft vessels can come directly to the refinery docks. Both rail and highway transportation are excellent.

NECESSARY STEPS

Some of the Gulf refineries are using brackish water for cooling, General Pick said. The resulting corrosion is a major problem.

How is the water problem to be met?

General Pick said we have to conserve the soil, not only to produce food and lumber but to save water as well. And we have to control the run-off.

Terracing and contour plowing prevent the erosion of the top soil. This saves fertility for food production, helps prevent the silting of reservoirs and allows more water to sink into the ground.

Reforestation not only will provide a future supply of lumber but it also will save the soil of the cut-over areas and slows the run-off of water.

There remains the major engineering problem of saving the water in the river basins and not permitting it to tear its way through the rich bottom lands in devastating spring floods and to pour itself unused into the sea.

CONGRESS COOPERATES

"We are pouring millions of gallons of water into the sea, uncontrolled and uncontrollable until we impound it," the general said.

He believes that this problem is not generally appreciated. It means saving water in every stream where it can be stored up. When that is done there will be water behind the dams for the use of an expanding industry, for electric power for industry, for irrigating the farms which must produce the food supply for a growing population and to maintain the levels in the river channels during the dry months so that the heavy freight of industry may be carried.

Congress has recognized the need of this water-conservation program. For the current fiscal year it has appropriated $633,000,000 for the Army engineers' rivers and harbors and flood-control work.

The engineers have water-conservation programs in the basins of practically all the major streams. The huge job on the upper Missouri River and its feeders, for example, will mean the construction of 110 dams.

SILTING PROBLEM

The water to be impounded is measured in acre-feet—that is, the amount of water covering an acre to a depth of 1 foot. The Garrison Dam in North Dakota will impound 23,000,000 acre-feet, the Oahe Dam at Pierre, S. Dak., 21,800,000, and the dam at Fort Randall, S. Dak., 6,800,000.

General Pick faces the problem of silting with confidence. He said the reservoirs are designed to take care of silt during the period the projects pay for themselves. Meanwhile, methods and machinery for moving earth have improved enormously. He is convinced that when the silt encroaches on the use of the reservoirs, resourceful engineers will develop a method of solving the problem and measures to prevent soil erosion will steadily reduce the silt content.

General Pick is perhaps the most widely known officer in the Army engineers. He is 59, a native of Brookneal, Va., and a graduate of the Virginia Polytechnic Institute in 1914. He entered the Army as a Reserve lieutenant in World War I and went into the Regular Army in 1920.

BUILT "PICK'S PIKE"

In World War II he directed the building of the Ledo Road section of the Burma Road to connect Burma and China. In 15 months 45,000 Americans and 42,000 natives constructed 483 miles of road through jungles and over mountains, built 155 bridges and laid 1,800 miles of pipe line. The workers referred to it facetiously and fondly as "Pick's Pike" and the Nation considered it to be one of the greatest engineering feats in Army history.

Befor that and in the 18 months after Pearl Harbor, General Pick directed 93,000 construction workers and the spending of $1,500,000,000 in building airfields, cantonments, hospitals, airplane, and munitions plants and relocation centers for the Japanese moved from the Pacific coast.

In that same period he found time to direct the fight against the Missouri River flood of the spring of 1943 and to draw up the Pick plan, a comprehensive program for over-all control and utilization of the full water resources of the Missouri.

The Army engineers and the Reclamation Bureau failed to agree on the Missouri River plan, but when General Pick was in the China-Burma-India war theater they reached a compromise with the Pick-Sloan plan. It became law in December 1944 and General Pick returned in the following November to direct its executive execution.

Last January President Truman named General Pick as Chief of the Engineer Corps to succeed Lt. Gen. Raymond A. Wheeler. It happened that at that time General Pick was tied up with another job, operation snowbound, directing the Army's relief of the areas of the West which were suffering their worst winter of 60 years.

He is concerned with no little plans.

Congressmen's Voting Records and Income

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill to provide that the Legislative Reference Service shall compile and make available the voting record of Members of Congress, and make available information relative to the income of Members of the House.

I feel that the wide dissemination of a Congressman's voting record should be made so that the people will know where he stands on each and every issue that is brought before the Congress for its consideration and disposal. Mr. Speaker, I feel that to provide more democracy in the operations of the United States House of Representatives, and to more effectively discharge its obligations, Members should file with the Clerk of the House a report containing full and complete statements as to, one, the amount and sources of all income received by such Member during the preceding year, including all fees, salaries, income from trusts or estates and dividends received or credited to his account, and, if such income is derived from a law firm or partnership, the names of the clients of such firm or partnership from whom fees were received; and, two, all dealings in securities or commodities by such Member, or by any person acting on behalf of, or pursuant to the direction of, such Member during the preceding year.

Under my measure the Clerk of the House will be directed to compile and to publish within 3 weeks after the close of the present session of Congress a tabulation of the voting record of its Members on all roll-call votes, together with brief descriptions of the issues voted upon. For the purpose of easy readability and quick reference, each Member's votes shall be gathered in one place. The Superintendent of Documents shall sell copies at cost, and shall print sufficient copies so that a supply is on hand at all times. It is impossible today for any voter to get such information from the Congress without authorization of the Member whose voting record is sought.

It is my hope that the Congress will see fit to consider this legislation and report it favorable at the earliest opportunity.

Socialism, Defined and Subversive

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I am submitting the following remarks I made to my friends of the Associated Industries of Vermont, last fall, at Woodstock, Vt.:

Mr. Toastmaster, shortly before Congress adjourned I told some of my friends that in my judgment Aaron Burr was indicted for treason for doing less in an attempt to set up an empire within this democratic republic than some of those of today were contemplating in an effort to establish little TVA monarchies all over the United States. I am still of that opinion. Their efforts are purely socialistic as socialism is defined by economists and lexicographers. Their attempts follow directly and specifically the theory of civil polity which aims at the public collective ownership, management, and control of land, water, and capital, and sets the pattern for the public collective management of all industries. They are an opening wedge which might and, if experience of other states and countries is a guide, surely would result in the establishment of a socialistic state, called welfare.

Inherent in the proposition to establish these empires within the state is the philosophy which holds that the modern social and economic conditions make for a Socialist order and which favors the principle of such an order as against the prevailing social sys-

tem. It is a threat to free enterprise as well as destructive of individualism. I am opposed to it as a matter of principle.

I am opposed to their philosophy because of what its adoption similarly as a policy has done world-wide to those who have sold their birthright for a mess of pottage.

Not so long ago Norman Thomas, perennial socialistic candidate for President, said, and it was in 1944. I quote: "The TVA has exemplified what Socialists may and can do and the technique used in the process."

And Carl D. Thompson, guiding spirit of the Public Ownership League of America, founded in 1914, a Socialist national committeeman in 1905; candidate for the nomination for President on the Socialist ticket in 1908; official campaign manager for the National Socialist ticket in 1916, manager of the information bureau of that party, issued a leaflet which contained this:

"The Socialists * * * will control State legislatures and finally the United States Congress and the Supreme Court * * * and finally the Nation will take over one after the other of the public utilities, mines, railroads, interurban electric lines, power plants, telegraph and telephone systems, waterways and forests."

In 1923, Thompson published a map showing his proposed superpower system. This was 10 years before the passage of the TVA Act by Congress, with its misleading preamble which never once mentioned power. In 1937—after the passage of the TVA bill—Thompson again published this same map in the Socialist Public Ownership magazine, with the following headlines:

"Our Dreams Come True."

"Our Plan for a Public Superpower System for the United States Outlined and Published in 1923 Is Slowly but Surely Being Realized."

The article itself, said this:

"Step by step this plan * * * is being * * * realized * * *. The Tennessee Valley has become an outstanding reality * * * Boulder Dam has been finished * * *. The Bonneville power system * * * is nearing completion * * * Grand Coulee is well on the way * * *. In the map * * * one can see the extent to which our dream of 1922-25 has already taken form."

However, those who are really carrying the torch for authorities are not those who developed the TVA. They are simply using the TVA as a smoke screen for their real intentions, which are:

The bringing of some type of national scialism to the United States. They are the Socialists who have been working behind the scenes in America for many years, and have seized upon authorities for river basins as the great step in their plans for national socialism.

My opposition to the TVA is of very long standing, at least 17 years. The reasons for it have been so often stated over the years I see nothing to be gained by repetition, so far as justification is involved. However, I will briefly state a few of the many reasons why I am opposed to the TVA, to the establishment of any similar authority in New England, as well as to the creation of a Vermont power authority. All three ideologies stem from the same school of economies and politics (meaning science of government). Each and all involve the destruction, ultimately, of our form of government. Vermonters should understand that a very determined effort is being made openly and sub rosa and has been made for some time by an easily definable group to socialize Vermont. This group follows the teachings of Norman Thomas and both privately and publicly endorse the socialistic program which has ruined England, and for that matter every country which has followed the fallacies of the have-everything-for-nothing theories on which socialism rests. Vermonters should not be misled by the very competent methods of approach of this group who support the vagaries of the welfare state, in ultimatum, which proposes to lay the foundation of a government program which will enable them to live off the workers from the womb to the tomb.

Upon returning from a recent trip to the TVA area some who were mesmerized by the magnitude of the project came back to sing its glories. They did not tell you, did they, that of all the cities of the world Chattanooga has the highest tax rate of all and every one of the cities on this continent. They did not tell you that the inhabitants of Chattanooga live under the cloud of possible destruction by the flood waters of the Tennessee, did they? They did not tell you that nowhere on the continent are such slums to be found as presently exist in the TVA area.

Poverty in the TVA region is caused by the high tax rates and low wages concerning which the pro-TVA visitors failed to speak. They do not tell you that the TVA area is the land of displaced persons, nobody knows how many; but 14,000 families were moved and over 30,000 different tracts of land were preempted.

Half a million acres of fertile land which once produced $27,000,000 worth of crops annually, at prewar prices were taken, flooded, and are under water today.

Did these opponents of progress and the development of more power at the Wilder Dam tell you about this? They did not. They did not tell you that at least 75,000 people were actually forced to leave their homes, farms, and businesses to make way for the taming of the Tennessee.

There was hell to pay on Tennessee when all this happened. There would be worse than that to pay in Vermont where we sing the slogan of "Not 1 acre of fertile land shall be flooded to produce power," when and after hundreds of acres are already to be flooded by agreement of parties and by the beavers.

The truth is the beavers have flooded more fertile land than all the land owned by the objectors and opponents of progress in Orange County, Vt.

It nevertheless is true that when good soil and farm homes are destroyed the loss should be compensated for in dollars so far as possible.

Where are the taxes coming from formerly paid by landowners in the flooded areas? They just don't come, that's all, and are passed on to the taxpayers living elsewhere.

They did not tell you that despite all they can say TVA is primarily a power show, though the development of power was hardly an item in the original plan as presented to Congress. I know because I was on the Military Affairs Committee as far back as 1934.

Did they visit the slums in Knoxville? You should see them, the worst in the world, next to ———. Do they tell you that the soil conservation program is frozen out by TVA? So Secretary Brannan told Congress or he said that the soil conservation program was operative as to only 5 percent of the farm lands in the TVA area.

Did these TVA zealots tell you that the rural electrification in Tennessee is the fourth worst in the country because the TVA rates are so low and the taxes too high? Did they tell you that the bonded debt of Knoxville is over $18,000,000 and its tax rate over 45 mills?

Did they tell you that from 60 to 70 percent of the farmers are unable to get any of the TVA products and are in fact denied the fertilizers they need? It is so. The TVA area has suffered from lack of solid nitrates perhaps more than any other section in the United States.

If state socialism is what you want that's what you get under TVA. It will be what you will get under a New England Valley Authority, and then some. No man in the Tennessee Valley from constable to United States Senator dares run unless he is first and foremost and always for TVA.

The socialistic implications of a New England Authority are appalling. The proposal is a definite threat to local self-government.

And by the way did these hypnotized visitors at the shrine of Lilienthal tell you that TVA's "personnel policy gives no protection to workers. Its fertilizer program is not well balanced, is susceptible to favoritism. Its power policy, without checks of any kind, is wide open to criticism. Its bookkeeping system, its arbitrary allocation of costs do not follow standard practice and discriminate against other public power agencies. Its treatment of land owners, competitive private enterprise and other Federal Agencies has been high-handed and capricious. TVA has too much power over human beings, their lives and fortunes and independence."

The truth is and it is acknowledged to be true, the TVA has cost too much, almost a billion dollars in tax funds, none of which has been or will ever be returned to the United States Treasury.

It has cost too much in terms of power capacity, for the benefits so far returned or possible to provide. It has cost too much in terms of rich agricultural land permanently flooded, some 500,000 acres, half of it good bottom land.

It has cost too much in the priceless coin of regional and local autonomy. It is an empire, a dictatorship, set up within a democracy. It is completely socialistic. You cannot afford to give an agency of government so much power over water and land and hydroelectric plants, and impose that authority upon a region. The people pay for it no matter how benevolent the purpose to establish a welfare state. It is time to stop the crowd which follows the flag on which is emblazoned the slogan "This is a good country to live in—so long as we can live off it."

Any such set-up would be simply obnoxious to the independent people of Vermont.

It is passing strange as I see it that hard-headed, thrifty Vermonters should for an instant fall for such an appeal to their selfishness and possible desire to get something for nothing. I doubt that there are very many who will, yet these socialistic-inclined TVAers, country-wide "do gooders," have an insatiable lust for power (not electric). They want the power to fix prices, to fix wages, to develop and to control electric energy; the authority to distribute and to ration it, and the authority to put Government into all kinds of business everywhere. Senator TAFT recently said that a farm plan involving complete power to impose production controls on farmers who make it possible for the Government to tell the farmers how many acres of wheat, corn, and soybeans they may raise; how many hogs they can sell; how many beef cattle they can feed, and dairy cattle they can handle, and how many chickens they can keep.

These welfare-state advocates want the Government to guarantee every man a job, but it can only do that if given power to tell every man what job he shall take, and at what wages. These proposals, if carried through, would give complete control of industry, commerce, and labor, including the repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, the socialization of medicine, the other usurpations of the privileges of the individual, the other free service to those who are not entitled to them, and "we shall have," said Senator TAFT, "almost a duplicate of the labor-socialist regime in England today."

I am against such a socialistic program and the time to kill it is now. I agree with John T. Flynn that among other aspects of the TVA, which is to be used as a pattern

for all authorities, the one which should interest us most and startle us to a recognition of where we stand, is found in the fact that TVA has operated and still operates as a provisional Government agency of a regional province.

It has operated as a Federal corporation under a charter which has enabled it to do an incredible number of things and to escape Government scrutiny. The Federal charter is a comparatively new device to enable the Federal Government to expand its powers immensely. Mr. Lilienthal, in his book "TVA—Democracy on the March," calls attention to the vast growth of Federal power. It has become so great that, he says, it cannot be wisely administered from Washington. But the power must not go back to the governors, mayors, legislatures and councils elected by the people. It must go to great regional areas administered by directors appointed by the President, to a corporation cunningly devised to accumulate power and to elude congressional authority. We will see the country split into a few great regional provinces run by corporate provincial governors. This is what Mr. Lilienthal calls "democracy on the march." I think it is democracy in retreat, a return to the European system of centrally controlled provincial governors. With TVA as a beginning the advocates of regionalism are planning under the guise of flood, navigation and forestry control and other excuses to blanket America with this new type of government which represents a complete revolution in our political system.

This attempt to establish such provinces as the TVA all over this land is not just a local issue. The basic issue involved is as important from the standpoint of what's going to happen to people as if the question were on a vote to socialize physician's services (the same group which is back of a valley authority and public power leans largely to socialized medicine); to nationalize the steel industry, the coal mines (to follow England into the ruin which confronts her), the oil wells, the railroads, telegraph and telephone lines, and radio and television and what have you. The issue confronts and merits the careful consideration of every citizen. Let's look at the record and talk figures for a minute or two.

TVA is the outstanding example of Federal power in the country today. It is urged by some as the pattern for all future Federal power developments. In 1947 the TVA and municipals and cooperatives paid approximately 5.4 percent of the total revenues in taxes and tax equivalents. This compares with 19.8 percent of total revenues paid in taxes by all electric companies in the United States. This 5.4 percent of TVA revenues paid in taxes or tax equivalents, including taxes paid by municipals and cooperatives reselling TVA power, compares with 16.1 percent in Arizona, 17.1 percent in Georgia, 19.5 percent in Oklahoma, 19.4 percent in South Carolina, 27.5 percent in Louisiana, 17.2 percent in Arkansas, 15.2 percent in Virginia, 12.3 percent in Michigan, 17.1 percent in Oregon, and 17.7 percent in Kansas (based on figures of a representative company in the State).

Taxes paid by an electric company are a cost of production, and in the final analysis they are paid by consumers of electricity. Consequently it is people who are being unfairly treated; it is business and heads of families who are being discriminated against, and this discrimination will continue either until the power industry is nationalized or until public power is made to pay full costs, including its rightful contribution to the cost of government.

Then there is in addition the question of interest. Interest-free money for public-power projects is a tremendous force leading to nationalization, for a basic economic fact of the electric utility industry is the proportionately large amounts of capital required, and therefore interest and dividend payments required per dollar of revenue. There are many, however, who do not regard interest as a cost that should be paid by Federal power projects, even though the United States taxpayer is paying in excess of $5,000,000,000 a year to the collectors of internal revenue so that the interest on the public debt can be promptly met.

TVA pays virtually no interest. TVA's annual 1948 report shows that it paid $558,637 interest in 1948 or an investment in power in excess of $400,000,000. At 2 percent—the approximate cost of money to the Federal Government—this item to cover its costs should have been about $8,000,000. With regard to interest the TVA annual report points out that "Funds for construction and operation have been obtained from congressional appropriations, requiring no return of interest. * * * No interest during construction is included in the costs of fixed assets, except for a relatively minor amount pertaining to contested condemnation awards."

If TVA paid full taxes and interest, its expenses would far exceed revenues and its accounting statements would reveal a staggering deficit. No degree of operating efficiency on the part of the full tax-paying electric companies can overcome such lavish subsidies.

We should not forget that free private enterprise as a basic principle of the American way of life is not something that belongs to the businessman, the industrialist, and the shopkeeper, or any special interest. Freedom of the press, for example, is not a concept that is the property of the newspaper publisher or the owner of the radio station. Freedom of the press, like free private enterprise, belongs to the people. Frequently we lose sight of this fact. Business has been known to lose sight of it, but when it has, the people have been quick to reestablish their claim and to make certain that it was made to operate to their advantage and not against them. Government, too, has been known to lose sight of the fact, but when it has, seldom has the ground lost ever been regained.

Free private enterprise is a way of producing wealth, goods, and services to satisfy human wants, and it is a plan just like socialism or communism is a plan. The major way in which a free economic system differs from socialism or communism is that the former is conducted by free individuals for free individuals, not by the state for those who might be the recipient of the state's favor.

I cannot agree with any plan for a New England River Authority based on the TVA plan, under which the New England States involved surrender their autonomy and our natural resources pass out of our hands and into the control of a government within our Government, made of bureaus owing allegiance only to their creator, the Federal Government.

Vermonters are strong believers in a maximum of local self-government. As you are already advised I am unalterably opposed to the establishment of powerful river valley empires to take the place of our 48 free and sovereign States.

I feel about and concerning the proposed valley authority for New England patterned after TVA, as does Representative JENSEN, of Iowa, with regard to the Missouri Valley Authority, as indicated by his reply to a letter requesting him to state his position in reference thereto. Here is a portion of his letter:

"My criticism of the TVA set-up is that a board of three men, appointed by the President, and not elected by the people, have, in effect, full and complete control over the very existence of the people living in the Tennessee Valley. We must bear in mind that he who has authority to control the electric power and water resources of America, or any given area in America in this electric age, can completely control America or that area under such control.

"Congress appropriates each session a lump sum for TVA to build power dams, transmission lines, flood control, forestry, navigation, and, in fact, for most everything to carry on the Federal functions in the valley. Then this Board of three men spend that money at will to run their empire, so you see in reality the TVA is a separate and distinct empire within our American Republic. Not only the people's elected Government officials have lost much of their authority, but this Board of three men have taken over too much of the States' authority, which was specifically delegated to the sovereign States by the Constitution.

Now, if this kind of autocratic regional control is carried on to its ultimate conclusion in the 11 river valleys of America, the Missouri being one of them, 33 men could completely control America. The 48 States could very well be expected to lose their sovereign rights and identity, and we would have in their place 11 separate, powerful regions or valley empires. I am quite certain you do not know that program is the recommendations and hope of the Communist Party of America. They know that so long as our Nation is composed of 48 States that are free and sovereign, whereby the people of the respective States elect their public servants, communism can never completely take over here.

The fact is the American people have deceived themselves far too long in thinking that our variety of socialism is different from the slave state of the Marxist. The trend in this country today is identical in principal to that in operation in other central governments which manage their people and their people's property. We are just about half way toward total socialism, the adoption of which, or the acceptance of which may have been caused by ignorance; which does not change the awful fact.

Most Americans have never stopped to define "socialism." They do not know what socialism is although right here in Vermont there are those who are nothing else but Socialists. They favor Government ownership and Government management of the Nation's economy. They would establish little empires governmentally controlled and operate within the State as they deny the right and capacity of individuals to manage their own business and their property. That's what socialism is. And Socialists and fellow travelers and Communists always move toward compulsion and violence and away from freedom.

Socialism is directly opposed to American constitutional freedom. Socialism and democracy are inherently inimical, yet socialism and absolutism and communism are natural partners. It is my well-considered judgment and long-entertained opinion that no government-controlled regime can equal a competitive system in furnishing to men and women producers the incentives to lead them to do their best along all lines. Only where everyone is free and rewarded adequately for services rendered are human energies released to the limit. Only under such conditions could the United States of America have become the world power that it is, and only under such conditions can all classes really prosper and enjoy life. Soft socialism, the idea of the welfare state, the steady increase in the Federal Government's power over the lives and purses of our citizens, are the greatest menaces confronting us today, not excluding Russia.

Former Secretary of State Byrnes well said:

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will wind up no one can tell. But if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, workers, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

An alluring, deceptive new term has been creeping into our political languare. The kind of government which promises to give everybody health, houses, security, and the comforts of life is being called the welfare state.

Nobody opposes welfare. By hard work and ingenuity we have been able, under American freedom, to produce a great deal of welfare and to distribute it widely among the people. The American record in this respect far exceeds any of any other nation in any time. We can carry it much further.

Promises of abundant welfare have been made by many governments from ancient Rome to Hitler and Cripps. And now Truman. Those governments have always eventually gone bankrupt, or to war, or both. The people have been left with less welfare than before.

The only governments that have achieved truly remarkable records for the welfare of their people are the very few that, like ours, have left the people fairly free from restrictions, and fairly free from the overwhelming taxes that welfare measures cost.

The people have then produced their own welfare by working for it. They have had to pay little percentage to bureaucrats for its enjoyment. They earned it and it was theirs. Having no Brannan plans, they were able to buy their own groceries.

An honest name for the "welfare state" would be the "farewell state," for once we go far enough toward Government guaranties of welfare we can say farewell to American freedom as Americans long knew that blessed condition, and to American standards of welfare.

No nation under any other system has come even close to our success. To be a party to any proposed change of our form of government would be folly, yet the America of tomorrow is threatened from within by ideologies foreign to our living. We must meet and overcome ideologies which use our freedom in an effort to destroy it.

I have just read John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead. It has been appearing in serial form in the Free Press. I commend it to your very serious consideration. One of the leading editorial writers of the country in reviewing the book had this to say:

"The Road Ahead is concerned with two subjects: The first of these is the misery and poverty to which the Labor (Socialist) Government has brought the once proud and powerful British people; the second is what Mr. Flynn sees as a far-flung conspiracy to bring the American people to those same levels of misery, poverty, and weakness.

Engaged in this conspiracy, according to the Flynn report, are a multitude of Socialists who are afraid to call themselves by that name, as the honest and forthright Norman Thomas is not. These people masquerade as economic planners, do-gooders, great lovers of the common people, and fervent believers in the "welfare state."

They are moving in on the Democratic Party, as Britain's Fabian Socialists once moved in on and then virtually killed off the old Liberal Party. "Indeed," says Mr. Flynn, and makes a good case for his assertion, "our masked Socialists already have made a prisoner of President Truman, and he can't break jail."

These conspirators also have infiltrated heavily in newspaper, magazine, radio, movie, church, and educational fields. Hence, they can spread their poison around in great quantity and with considerable effect. The essence of the poison is communism, but our masked Socialists are more subtle and clever about distributing it than are the United States Reds.

The over-all plan is to change your life in every detail that counts, and in the same ways as the Laborites are changing British lives. If the plan succeeds, you will become a slave to a Government which hammers your living standards downward all the time while it tells you you're happier every day in every way. Out-and-out Russian-style communism would come somewhat later, but inevitably.

Mr. Flynn in this book names names, rips off disguises, exposes many a fake lover of the people, and cites chapter and verse. If you like the life you lead in the United States as of now, better read this book. They are after you. They are playing for keeps. They may get you if you don't look alive.

Let us determine that we shall not allow the state to be our master, but that we shall be the masters of the state. The long road to history is lined with the ruins of those states which bought the souls and wills of their peoples by the lure of a granted security, and then led them to ruin by the same mirage. The world does not need even one more such ruin.

Freedom exists only where the people take care of the government. There is no freedom where the Government takes care of the people.

Address of Matthew Woll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave unanimously granted, I am inserting in the Appendix the following text of the memorable address of Mr. Matthew Woll, a vice president of the American Federation of Labor, at the Gompers centennial dinner at the Statler Hotel in Washington, D. C., on January 5, 1950:

Why are we meeting here tonight?

Why are men and women throughout the land and of most every calling and station of life gathering here this evening as a prelude to like gatherings to follow in most of our industrial cities during the year?

What is the purpose of this festive event?

What are the objectives of this eventful occasion—this remarkable demonstration?

The answer is quite simple:

We are here as free citizens—as sons and daughters of a great democracy—a great Republic—to pay honor to a man whose lifelong energies and remarkable talents and abilities have been singly devoted to the perpetuity and enhancement of the ennobling thoughts of freedom and the furtherance of the inspiring principles that have made our Nation a truly great nation and have bestowed on our people blessings never heretofore enjoyed by humankind.

We come as wage earners to pay tribute to one lowly born, yet, who through sheer force of intellect, foresight, understanding and persistency, has contributed immeasurably to the greater fullness of life enjoyed by all and who brought to fruition to a greater, a fairer, and more equitable degree, the division of the rewards of an ever growing and expanding economic order.

We gather here, and as we will elsewhere, to pay homage to one for his unswerving devotion to the cause that binds us in fraternity—for the structure he has founded and built to help men and women rise to higher levels of life and thought and to aid those economically and socially disadvantaged.

We are meeting tonight in deep reverence to the memory of one whose genius and abilities would have carried him far in the realm of earthly possessions, but who chose rather the path of the lowly—the unpossessed—and whose brilliant mind and eloquent voice were dedicated solely to conquer material things in order to uplift humankind and free the spirit of man.

Yes; we are assembled tonight to honor the memory of Samuel Gompers, born 100 years ago this coming January 27—a great patriot, a great emancipator of labor, leader and founder of the American Federation of Labor—a great humanitarian and a crusader in the cause of freedom, justice, and democracy the world over.

The life and labors of Gompers effectually and impressively dramatize and symbolize the growth and greatness of the American democracy and of its people. Here was an immigrant boy who came to the American shores and rose to the greatest achievements in our land and who has merited the overwhelming applause of its people. What a mighty tribute to the vitality and spirit of democracy of our Nation—a vitality and spirit deeply rooted in the diversity of our national and racial origin and in the opportunities presented to all of good will by our social order.

Yes; we are met here to praise and appraise one who has passed on, but whose spirit dwells in our midst and whose teachings will live on and on so long as freedom and free trade-unions endure.

We come not only to praise Sam Gompers, but to rededicate ourselves to the task to which he applied his great qualities of heart and mind, his untiring and unsparing efforts and energies. The spiritual motives that governed his leadership stand out conspicuously in our present-day world affairs.

Gompers was indeed a great leader—a great man—and we do well to honor him.

But what made for his greatness? What are the particular qualities and characteristics that have distinguished him from others?

Friend and foe alike will acknowledge his great breadth of mind. But other men before and since have had great minds. Yet little if anything is heard of them.

True, Gompers was gifted with an eloquent tongue and with exceptional analytical powers, capable of achieving eminent success in the professional world. Yet others have been born with equal endowments but they, too, are numbered among the unremembered.

Gompers was possessed of very rare executive abilities and could have achieved a great business career—entered the realm of wealth and of affluence as others have done. Yet, their names are engraved merely on marble or stone in the silent cities of the world.

And so, too, might Gompers have chosen a political career. No one doubts or questions his preeminence in the qualities that make for high statesmanship. Yet he chose the higher concept of duty which man owes to those with whom he works and for whom he works—an enriched understanding of human justice, an understanding of the finer effects of democracy in daily life, the realization that human brotherhood is, after all, a thoroughly practical ideal and the only lasting basis for human relations.

He cared nothing for what the world calls success; ignoring public office, wealth and preferment, he reached only for that higher thing shown to be of eternal value when the final curtain ends life's play.

As trade-unionists we are here to manifest our feelings of gratitude for his unswerving devotion to the cause of trade-unionism, for his tireless efforts and energies in founding and building up our great trade-union organization and in creating the cornerstone and directing the policies of the American Federation of Labor, which for the past 69 years have withstood successfully every attack from without and every assault from within, and, more than all else, has firmly implanted into hearts and minds of

American trade-unionists the great principles that have made the American Federation of Labor the strongest, most powerful and influential, the most enduring structure of labor ever experienced in history.

What are these great principles?

It is axiomatic today for any public figure—whether identified with labor, with government, or with industry—to make laudatory statements about the value and the necessity of collective bargaining and cooperative labor-management relations.

Some 50 years ago, however, the United States was faced with such phenomena as "robber barons," a "Wall Street" entrenched in finance and Government, and a political set-up in which every city of any size was controlled by unscrupulous bosses, whose judges and police force served the employers.

In those days collective bargaining met with great obstacles, such as the Sherman antitrust laws, injunction writs, yellow-dog contracts, and the like.

In those days, to suggest that collective bargaining, the striving together of labor and industry for amicable relations would be for the advancement and benefit of both, was an open invitation to ridicule and abuse. Yet Gompers seized every opportunity to advance the doctrine of mutual cooperation of industry and labor and to further collective bargaining despite bitter abuse by both radicals and ultraconservatives.

Today the entire political and social outlook of the United States has been one of increasing acceptance of the principles of collective bargaining and of labor-management cooperation.

Gompers was not only the architect who made the blueprints for the creation of the American Federation of Labor; he was also the builder who carried out the details of those plans, and the caretaker who zealously guarded the main principles upon which the organization was built. It was his conception that in the world of labor the chain could not be any stronger than its weakest link, and that the federation would be strong or weak, progressive or retrogressive in proportion to the strength and growth and temperament of its affiliates—its national and international unions.

Conversely, in an address he delivered in 1902, Gompers said prophetically:

"As the federation is constituted, it cannot be overwhelmed by its growth. The national and international unions of the various crafts and callings relieve the central body of this danger and leave it free to do what can be done with safety and advantage for the common welfare."

And this central organization, built on the principle of autonomy for the national and international unions, has in times past, been ridiculed by opponents as a "rope of sand."

An intensely interesting episode in this connection occurred shortly after Lenin had issued his famous "Open Letter to American Workers," which was published and distributed far and wide by the Communists in the United States. In this letter Lenin criticized the form of organization of the American Federation of Labor, and in connection with it used the epithet "a rope of sand."

It was at this time that a Bolshevik commissar, visiting the United States as a representative of Lenin, begged for an interview with Gompers. However, before the conversation began, Gompers, holding a copy of the letter of Lenin in his hand, turned to the commissar and said: "Before we go any further, I want you to tell Lenin that our 'rope of sand' will prove stronger than his iron chains."

This happened about 30 years ago, and last month, in London, the representatives of the free American trade unions, in association with those of 53 other countries, laid the foundation which will bring to reality the prophecy of Gompers of 30 years past.

This reference to a "rope of sand" and the principle upon which the American Federation of Labor has been set up, brings us to another point—the position of the AFL on political action.

The American Federation of Labor has never opposed free expression of political ideologies. Its point of view is best covered in a statement by Gompers, published in the February 1896 issue of the American Federationist—the year that Gompers was reelected as president of the federation after his only defeat the year before. In that statement he wrote as follows:

"I believe in the fullest opportunity for thorough discussion and proper presentation of all schools of thought in the labor movement. My only insistence has been, and is today, that a man shall be true to his trade-union in season and out of season, in spite of friend or foe, and that, apart from that, it is his province to believe in and advocate any reform which, in his judgment, is calculated to best advance the whole line of the trade-union movement."

But Gompers fought bitterly any clique or political party, for he foresaw the dangers of zealots, who, after gaining power in a union with the help of a political party, would then sacrifice the interest of that union in the interest of party considerations.

While Gompers was strongly in favor of political actions on the part of trade-unions, summarized in the well-known phrase, "Reward your friends and punish your enemies," he was as strongly opposed to the theory supported by radicals, that of independent trade-union party political action. Today the entire labor movement holds Gompers' point of view. Only the Communist Party is in disagreement with it.

It is because of Gompers' foresight, courage and watchfulness that the Communists have at no time had any hope of infiltrating into the house of labor. As a result, the Communists looked for other fields to conquer. Due to the precepts laid down by Gompers, the American Federation of Labor has never had to face the painful and distasteful necessity of expelling from its ranks, for ideological reasons, a number of its component unions.

Gompers never made a fetish of any dogmas. He was a man of an open mind. He allowed no clique to mar his thinking or to serve as a substitute for his thinking.

He never worshiped the status quo, nor was he fearful of change. In his testimony before the Industrial Relations Commission headed by the late Frank P. Walsh, he showed clearly the difference between dynamic progression and the dogmas of the sterile Socialist movement in the United States.

Gompers had vision but was not a visionary. He had dynamic vitality and never confused noise with militancy of rowdyism with effective action and struggle against the open-shoppers and other enemies of labor.

He saw clearly and distinctly the urgency and full implication of genuine international labor solidarity. He fathered the idea of and was the driving force for the organization of the International Federation of Trade Unions.

Gompers realized that the labor movement of no single country could remain free and stay prosperous long if the working people of other lands were not free and were subjected to low standards of life and labor. That is why he pioneered in the organization of the ILO and laid special stress on raising the standards and improving the conditions of the toiling folks in the underdeveloped countries.

The labor internationalism of Gompers takes on special living significance today in view of the recent developments in the organization of over 50,000,000 free-trade unionists under the banner of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. It is in this spirit and aspirations of Gompers that the activities of this new world confederation of free-trade unions will have to be activated if this new world labor body is to fulfill its intended mission.

More and more, freedom-loving people everywhere are coming to realize the grave menace of concentrating power in the hands of Government bureaucrats. The rise of various types of totalitarian despotism has focused attention on this growing menace to human rights and liberties won by peoples through centuries of struggle.

As a stanch advocate and stubborn defender and champion of democracy, he never for a moment was misled as to the true nature of communism. To Gompers, communism was nothing else but twentieth century slavery. From the very moment that Bolsheviks seized power in Russia, Gompers fought its dogmas and deeds. As a consequence, the Federation has served as the most persistent and effective opponent to communism in our country and on a worldwide scale.

Finally, Gompers was a great believer in the principle of voluntarism—in action through free, voluntary, nongovernmental bodies. In his conception, the fundamentals of human liberty rested squarely on the principles of voluntarism. It was his conviction that no lasting gain has ever come from compulsion.

When at the El Paso convention of the American Federation of Labor he realized he was too feeble to address that convention in person, and conscious that life was drawing near a close, he called upon then Vice President Green, now entering his twenty-fifth year of service as president of the American Federation of Labor, to present to the convention his last message, and in which he said among other things:

"Events of recent months have made me keenly aware that the time is not far distant when I must lay down my trust for others to carry forward. When one comes to close grips with the eternal things there comes a new sense of relative values, and the less worthy things lose significance.

"As I review the events of my 60 years of contact with the labor movement, and as I survey the problems of today and study the opportunites of the future, I want to say to you, men and women of the American labor movement, do not reject the cornerstone upon which labor's structure has been builded, but base your all upon voluntary principles and illumine your every problem by consecrated devotion to that highest of all purposes, human well-being in the fullest, widest, deepest sense.

"We have tried and proved these principles in economic, political, social, and international relations. They have been tried and not found wanting. Where we have tried other ways we have failed."

And then he concluded his final message in this ennobling appeal to you and all who are to follow:

"As we move upward to higher levels, a wider vision of service and responsibility will unfold itself. Let us keep the faith. There is no other way."

And so, in drawing to a close, may I suggest that our meeting here and elsewhere should not come to an end without a permanent objective. Twenty-five years ago the people of this country and of many foreign lands, industry, and commerce, all stopped in silent homage to him whose name was known and honored the world over because he gave his life in service for others. The United States turned from other matters to consider his life and work; the Mexican Parliament and that of the Philippines did likewise. Flags were ordered at half mast in many lands.

A great man, a great patriot, a great labor leader, and champion of free people and of their rights and prerogatives—had passed on.

But the soul of Samuel Gompers has continued to live on in its potent influence on our national life and customs. It lives today in the daily lives of millions of Americans.

May I, therefore, venture to propose that we give rise to a new conception of our evaluation of the services rendered by Samuel Gompers expressed in the setting aside of January 27 of each succeeding year as Samuel Gompers' Birthday and that this day be solemnized as a holiday to be observed throughout the Nation so that his rightful place among the great of America may no longer remain void and so that to labor of America be accorded, too, the honor of having contributed to the building up of a truly great democracy such as the world has never known before.

As a final and concluding word, may I join with the expression of Daniel J. Tobin, president of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen, and Helpers of America, where in his closing chapters of an article published in the Teamsters' magazine of January 1950, he said of President Gompers:

"Those who knew Sam will agree with me when I say that it is my personal judgment that there never was any greater leader in the labor movement in this country, in Germany, in England, or any other country than the man who was born 100 years ago in the slums of London and whose anniversary will be celebrated by the American Federation of Labor, opening with a banquet on January 5 at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C."

And then, too, I join with him in saying that "The only missing link to the chain which binds the men of labor together is that good old Sam will not be there instilling fire and courage and determination into those present." But some of us at least believe that he still lives on and that his spirit will be moving from table to table at the banquet whispering words of hope into the ears and into the hearts of the men who have come after him who are now endeavoring to carry the banner which he so successfully held aloft for more than 50 years, the banner of clean militant trade unionism as exemplified and practiced by the 8,000,000 members of the American Federation of Labor.

Statement by Hon. Paul H. Douglas, of Illinois, on the President's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement prepared by me on the subject of the budget submitted by the President on January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Although the President's budget indicates a deficit of $5,000,000,000 he has clearly made an honest effort to effect economies. Thus he has cut military expenditures by one and five-tenths billions below congressional appropriations for the current year, has reduced foreign aid by a billion and a quarter, and has had the courage to propose removing the $400,000,000 subsidy on second-, third-, and fourth-class mail. The President deserves a great deal of credit for these economies.

But still further savings can and should be made, and we in Congress should carry on in this same spirit and help the President to save another three billions of dollars. This can be done in the following ways:

(1) Reducing military expenditures by a further five hundred millions. (2) Reducing the lending powers of the Federal National Mortgage Association by eight hundred millions below the President's estimate. (3) Cutting the swollen staffs of Government civilian employees by from 8 to 10 percent and thus saving five hundred and fifty millions. (4) Cutting the present excessive vacation leave of 5½ weeks to a month, thus saving $100,000,000. (5) Cutting rivers and harbors or the modern pork-barrel bill by three hundred millions. (6) Slowing up the rate of construction of roads and dams by one hundred and fifty millions. (7) Eliminating the subsidies on silver, flax, etc., to save one hundred millions. (8) Saving $200,000,000 by consolidating all the Government agencies dealing with transportation and similarly those with engineering.

These further savings would amount to two and seven-tenths billions and if effected would reduce appropriations from the forty-two and four-tenths billions requested by the President to thirty-nine and seven-tenths billions. Furthermore, of the total of around a billion set aside for new legislation, there is probably about three hundred million which, as realists, we should recognize will not be authorized. This would bring expenditures down to thirty-nine and four-tenths billions.

While the Bureau of the Budget is apparently expecting revenues to reach thirty-seven and three-tenths billions for 1950–51, this would seem to be an understatement provided we have prosperity. For revenues in 1948–49 amounted to thirty-eight and three-tenths billions. Indeed allowing for the normal growth in the American economy, with the same average rate of taxation, receipts for 1950–51 should be over thirty-nine billions. By tightening the revenue laws in such matters as the abuse of charitable trusts and by stricter enforcement, we should be able to raise total revenues by from five hundred million to a billion dollars more.

In short, we can balance the budget if Congress and the country have the self-discipline needed to back up the President in the economies which he has already made and go further along the same path.

Proposals Affecting the Dairy Industry and Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk some material on the subject of grass-roots reactions of the dairymen of Wisconsin and in particular the reactions of one of their great cooperatives, the Pure Milk Products Co-op, of Fond du Lac, to proposals affecting the dairy industry and agriculture generally. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PURE MILK PRODUCTS COOPERATIVE RESOLUTIONS

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, from time to time, I have placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD grass-roots reports from my home State, resolutions adopted by leading organizations, editorials from newspapers, etc. I have felt that although these items obviously took up space in the RECORD, it was essential that each of us bring to the attention of our colleagues pertinent expressions from the rural crossroads and the cities of America, rather than just giving our own views and interpretations.

LARGEST MILK MARKETING CO-OP IN UNITED STATES

At this time, I have in my hand a very fine expression of opinion, consisting of resolutions adopted by one of the outstanding dairy organizations in the United States. I refer to the Pure Milk Products Cooperative of Fond du Lac, Wis. This, Mr. President, is the largest milk marketing cooperative in our country. Wisconsin has many famous cooperatives and is proud of them. In singling out this particular cooperative, at this time, I do so not with any underestimation of the importance of other fine groups, but with a recognition that here is a splendid and truly representative agricultural organization.

The Pure Milk Products Cooperative has some 26,000 members all over Wisconsin. It is owned and controlled exclusively by Badger milk producers.

Last year these producers sent to market 1,237,650,000 pounds of milk with sales valued at around $40,000,000.

I ask you to contemplate, Mr. President, the staggering amount of sweat and labor represented in that huge outpouring of milk. I ask you to contemplate the tremendous investment by small farmers in that output, and the investment by their cooperative in marketing. This is little business at its best; this is small family-type agriculture at its best; this is cooperative organization at its best.

For over two decades, the Pure Milk Products Cooperative has fought the Wisconsin milk producers' fight and has represented the dairy producer in all his legitimate needs.

CONFERENCE ON OLEO MENACE

During the last several days it has been my pleasure to confer at first hand on the crucial butter-oleomargarine subject with several of the outstanding leaders of this cooperative, including its distinguished president, Mr. William F. Groves, of Lodi, Wis., one of the most respected agricultural leaders of my State; and Mr. William O. Perdue, general manager at Fond du Lac, Wis., also one of the finest qualified individuals I know to speak for the dairyman's cause. Naturally, these leaders, like other dairy leaders who have assembled in Washington during the past week, are tremendously disturbed about the threat of the Oleo Trust against United States dairying.

DAIRY CO-OP REPRESENTS CONSUMERS AS WELL

These men, Mr. Groves, Mr. Perdue, and others in this organization have fought not only for the dairyman's view, however, but have always considered the larger interests of American agriculture and of the 150,000,000 American consumers who need nutritious dairy products.

Well, Mr. President, what do the 26,000 members of the cooperative think about the present agricultural situation? At the recent convention held in Fond du Lac, Wis., in October, 367 delegates representing 59 locals were on hand. I should like to present at this point some of their resolutions and comments. In so doing, I ask my colleagues

to bear in mind the fact that these men met at a time when dairy prices were continuing their 1949 decline throughout Wisconsin. Wisconsin farm income last year was 20 percent below that of 1948. The farmers' milk checks are sinking, and as they sink, the general economic health of the whole Badger State, indeed of the entire Midwest, is declining.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY PURE MILK PRODUCERS COOPERATIVE REGARDING ALTERNATIVE PLANS FOR PRICE SUPPORTS

Probably the most controversial, complex, and vital problem facing the farmer today is the problem of governmental price supports for agriculture. For this reason, your manager, president, State board, and this resolutions committee have devoted a great deal of time in analying and studying this important question. In this study we have not hesitated in asking the assistance and advice of the most prominent agricultural economists and leaders in America. We submit to you the following conclusions:

A. The principle of Government supports for vital industries is not new. This policy was inaugurated by Alexander Hamilton in Washington's first administration. The policy has been accepted and employed by every succeeding administration. Almost every branch of American industry has, at one time or another, received Government help through guaranties, tariffs, subsidies, direct grants, supports, or privileged legislation. To ask for a farm-income-support program is, therefore, in line with past and present Government policy.

B. The need for a price-support program for dairy products is obvious. During the past year dairy prices have declined over 33 percent. Wage rates have increased and the prices of industrial goods have declined very little during the same period. Thus the dairy farmer is forced to sell his product on a comparatively low market, over which he has insufficient control; and buy his needed supplies (including labor) on a high market over which labor and industry exercise considerable control. Further, organized labor and many branches of industry are subsidized or granted special protection by the Government. Even the necessary grains which the dairy farmer feeds to his cows are supported by the Government at prices which are high in comparison with the price of milk. It is evident that a continuation of this situation for any length of time will bankrupt the dairy farmer.

C. The question of whether farm-support prices should be high or low is irrelevant. The sole purpose of a farm-support program should be to provide the farmer his just minimum share of the national income. If we are to maintain a healthy national economy, the relationship of farm income, labor's wages, and industrial profits must be kept in balance. When the economy of a nation becomes unbalanced a depression inevitably follows. Farm supports are not only of interest to farmers, but are vital to the welfare and prosperity of every man, woman, and child in America. About one-fifth of our population is engaged in farming. This large segment of the population produces its just share of the Nation's wealth and is entitled to a proportionate part of the national income. The major justification for a support program is to give the farmer this just share.

D. The long-term price-support program should provide for—

1. Flexibility: By flexible we mean that the support program must be devised and administered so that the farmer will be induced to shift from one product to another to meet existing market conditions.

2. It should be inclusive: At present, primary support prices are accorded to only a few so-called basic commodities. Most dairy farmers buy large quantities of these basic commodities for feed. Dairy products and livestock are not classed as basic commodities. Feed prices, therefore, are comparatively higher than the price of milk. Any fair support program should include all important farm products, livestock, poultry, and poultry products.

3. A new or revised formula for computing farm support prices should be devised. The present formula for arriving at a parity price is outmoded. It harks back to the horse-and-buggy days. We recommend that a more recent period for determining the relationship of farm prices be used instead of the years 1910–14. We also believe that the costs of farm wages and farm labor should be included if we are to attain a real parity of farm income.

4. We realize that the present Anderson bill recently passed by Congress has taken steps at least partially to bring about the recommendations embodied in this section. We commend this action.

E. Three major methods for supporting farm prices have been recommended:

1. By Government loans and purchases. This is the method employed at the present time. Through loans and purchases the Government attempts to maintain a comparatively high and stable price on certain basic commodities. The Government is thereby assured an ever-normal granary. This policy, however, has a tendency to stimulate overproduction and often large surpluses pile up causing the Government great financial loss. This policy also has the very fatal tendency of pricing the lower income consumers out of the market.

2. The proportionate income support plan: This plan, devised by our own Dean Froker of the University of Wisconsin, would support farm income and allow farm prices to seek the natural levels dictated by the law of supply and demand. "Agriculture as a whole would be guaranteed a minimum share of the national income as a floor, below which total farm income would not be permitted to fall. If total net farm income from normal operations is below the prescribed minimum, then it should be supplemented with parity income payments direct to individual farmers in proportion to the market value of the product which they produce and sell." This plan is flexible, it is inclusive, it guarantees a balance between agricultural economy and the national economy. Control of the farmer would be negligible. "Payments would be made on the basis of production and sales rather than on the basis of curtailment of production and restrictions." Pure Milk Products recommends that Congress give this plan careful consideration.

3. Direct commodity payments to farmers: Under this method the Government fixes a parity on individual farm commodities but allows a reasonable free market. Farm prices, therefore, fluctuate with demand. Surpluses are absorbed by the consumer at low prices and the Government pays the difference to the farmer in direct payments.

We urge the Congress to consider all the above plans carefully. Each plan has some merit. We sincerely hope that partisan prejudice and bias will play no part in the evolution of a long-term-farm-support program.

F. It is a regrettable but unavoidable fact that Government aid and regulation go hand in hand. The membership of Pure Milk Products realizes that any price support program inevitably calls for some Government control of farm operations. We urge the Congress to keep such controls at a minimum and absolutely free of party bias. We also urge that the application of the program be placed in the hands of the farmer.

EXCERPTS FROM COMMENTS BY WILLIAM O. PERDUE AT PURE MILK PRODUCTS CONVENTION DESCRIBING WHY FEDERAL PRICE SUPPORTS ARE ESSENTIAL

It is generally conceded that support prices are needed to prevent below-cost-of-production farm prices due to a surplus of food products. However, complaints are still heard from some businessmen who are in a controllable type of business. They ask, "Why shouldn't we be guaranteed a profit on all the goods we manufacture, regardless of the amount we manufacture?" Their argument would be good if they were producing a product as necessary as food, and if their production unit, like the dairy farmer's cow, took about 3 years to make. Then if after the producing unit was acquired, it would be hooked up for continuous production and couldn't be stopped when started without ruining it for future operation. Even that production genius, Henry Ford, would have had a whale of a time balancing supply and demand if he had machine tools that couldn't be stopped from pouring out Fords, unless he wrecked the machine for future production. He would also be in difficulties if he depended upon the weather conditions for raw material. I believe he would have had more trouble operating under the conditions of the farmer than he did with the unions.

The milk producer is not asking for a guaranteed profit on his farm, but he does not admit that in the postwar adjustment that his prices should be the first to break, that his prices should decline more rapidly and that his prices should be cut more deeply than prices for goods that are less essential to the Nation. If prices of goods in controllable industry should decline at the same rate of speed, there would be no harm done. We have always found that industrial goods and services do not respond to supply and demand at the same speed as does the producer's price. Take our own product, for instance. The retail price for milk has not declined as fast or as far as the farmer's price. Gross margins for manufacturers and retailers, in many cases, are higher now than they were before our prices declined. Our reductions have not been passed on, and the result has been increased storage supplies, the need for Government purchases, and a threat of low prices for the producer.

It seems that people have to be a little hungry to appreciate food. A little scarcity is profitable for the producer, but in our country we have always provided abundantly. That's the way we want it. It seems logical that some method can be worked out to provide abundance and not wreck the whole economy.

Your cooperative has worked on this problem and supported and presented ideas to the Department of Agriculture and other branches of the Government that are in a position to help solve this matter. We continue to use the cooperative's influence in the milk producer's interest this year.

It may be that some farm plan can be worked out in the future that will be run by the farmer, but, at this time, we must depend upon the Government even though any plan they work out at this time will be a political compromise and not the best plan in the public interest.

Addresses by Hon. Lowell B. Mason and Hon. James M. Mead at Swearing-in Ceremonies

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, during the congressional recess, I had the occa-

sion to be present at the swearing-in ceremonies of former United States Senator James M. Mead as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, on November 16, 1949.

I felt that the address of welcome by Acting Chairman Lowell B. Mason, of the Commission, was such a fine tribute to the new Commissioner that many of his former colleagues here in the Senate would be interested in reading it, together with Senator Mead's speech of acceptance.

Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that these addresses be printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS OF WELCOME BY LOWELL B. MASON, ACTING CHAIRMAN, FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

My colleagues, Mr. Ayres, Mr. Carson, and the members of the Federal Trade Commission staff join me in welcoming you to the Commission. We know your many personal friends who had to be discouraged from coming to Washington to see your induction will realize that the desire to have the oath administered in the Commission's own home made it possible for only a small part of your friends and well-wishers to attend.

We are proud of this building, and with your help, we hope to make this building proud of us. The eyes of the business world are turned toward you for the law of the land makes the Commission the arbiter of what is fair play in our country's commerce. This means that much of the future conduct of business will come under your personal scrutiny.

The competitive 1950's will present problems which cannot be met by the technique of the 1914's. One may know all the precedents of past law from a legal staff, all the facts in a given case from a field force, and all the statistics and trends from economic advisers, but the alchemy of applying these separate wisdoms to maintain a free economy still rests on you and your colleagues' shoulders.

Nothing could augur better for the effective and beneficial relationship between business and Government than to have added to our membership a man who has slowly but steadily worked his way up from the lowest rung in the ladder of business to the highest legislative office in the world. People speak of fast, spectacular rises as though they were something to be especially proud of. I admire those who can win the summit in one easy jump. But none of your colleagues on this Commission was ever favored with such fortunes. I think it a happy circumstance which brings to our membership another who has struggled slowly but surely up the steps of man's development—for such a person brings to the Commission an experience rich in all phases of life.

Born on December 27, 1885, at Mount Morris, N. Y., of parents who were reared in the school of hard manual labor, Jim Mead rose from water boy on a railroad to tender of switch lamps, and maintenance-of-way man. His youth was not spent in idleness.

Seeking knowledge in the law, like many other young Americans who followed his example, Jim Mead took employment on the Capitol Police Force, so he could study law at night. This was followed by his election to the basic foundation of all local government—his home town county board of supervisors.

Along with his obligation to his Government, he did not neglect his loyalties to his fellow workers. In 1914 he became president of his local railroad union. Four terms as a member of the State legislature was but another seminar in the school of life for Jim Mead.

He did his job faithfully. His friends and constituents recognized his ability. They sent him to Congress in 1918. What a testing ground of a man's soul and character that great legislative body is. Many are called but few return. Reelection for three or four terms is something to be proud of, but it is the exception and not the rule. In this case however, the people kept him in Congress for 20 years, a tenure of office which would have been, in my opinion, still unbroken if he had not resigned to step into the United States Senate.

Again the people of New York showed their confidence and respect by sending him back to the Senate for another term. One need not dwell on the manner in which he handled his legislative duties. Suffice to say that as a member of the TNEC before the war, and as a member of Mr. Truman's committee during the war, his collateral legislative work was just as outstanding as his other senatorial accomplishments.

He was a Senator at a time which tried men's souls. In that august body where only strong characters and vital personalities exist, it must have been difficult to always obtain the cooperative teamwork so necessary to the political health of a nation. Yet with all this, it is interesting to note during Senator Mead's service as chairman of the Post Offices and Post Roads Committee, every peace of legislation reported out came to the floor with unanimous support.

I have given this factual sketch of James Mead, not to praise him but so that those in the Commission who do not know him may see what manner of man this is.

It is interesting to note his hobbies, for sometimes a man can be gaged not only by the company that he keeps, the books he reads, but by his hobbies. Former first baseman Mead is vice president of the Buffalo baseball team, and plain dirt farmer Mead tills the soil at Angola, N. Y. No one can say that he is one-sided in his activities or that he has a restricted view of the verities of life. Those of us who have read his speeches know that when he said, "There must be a more sympathetic administration of our social and legislative code," he was speaking as a man who had seen too much of the inequities and cynical lip service in the management of Government.

When he said that "industries must be encouraged by the enactment of legislation based on the theory that what is good for people is good for business," he may not have realized that one day he would sit on the quasi-judicial body whose main concern is that very ideal.

Ten years ago he said that he liked democracy because all men were a part of it and shared in its responsibilities. If those who come within the portals of the Federal Trade Commission could practice this homely ideal, we would never have any need for the prosecutions, the complaints, and the cease-and-desist orders that we must issue.

Your entrance on this bench, Mr. Mead, is the next step in a fruitful life and, in our opinion, will be even more valuable to your countrymen. Excepting that of President and Justice of the Supreme Court, this office is the most important in the Government. Even those who disagree with this statement will admit it is good for each of us to hold his own responsibilities in such high respect.

Commissioner Mead, we wish you good health, good fortune, and, above all, great usefulness to our country.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF COMMISSIONER JAMES M. MEAD

"Very naturally in the performance of my new duties as a member of the Federal Trade Commission, I shall endeavor to carry out the intent of Congress as contained in the Federal Trade Commission Act, as well as the other laws which confer jurisdiction upon the Commission.

"I am eager to perform my responsibilities in a way which will enhance the standing of the Commission, do justice to those who come before it, and, above all, serve the common good."

RECALLS WORDS OF PRESIDENT WILSON

"In our consideration of the problems of business that come before us, I am reminded of a passage in the message to Congress of President Woodrow Wilson which echoes my attitude in such matters: 'What we are purposing to do, therefore, is, happily, not to hamper or interfere with business as enlightened businessmen prefer to do it, or in any sense to put it under the bar.'

"Speaking further on the subject of our relations with business, President Wilson stated: 'The Government and businessmen are ready to meet each other halfway in a common effort to square business methods with both public opinion and the law. The best-informed men of the business world condemn the methods and processes and consequences of monopoly as we condemn them.'

"These opinions expressed by President Wilson are my sentiments and I am sure they are the sentiments of the vast majority of the business community of the country."

Senator Mead pays the highest respect to the other members of the Commission and to the staff and concludes his comments with the following statement, which should be inspiring to all:

"It shall be my ambition to do my job well and—as I said on the occasion of my being sworn in as a member of the Commission—to do justice, show mercy, and to walk humbly with the Lord."

An attitude of fairness could not be better expressed.

Booze Has No Conscience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Booze Has No Conscience," published in the Grand Rapids (Minn.) Herald-Review, of January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOOZE HAS NO CONSCIENCE

This newspaper does not publish hard-liquor advertising.

This policy is based upon a confidence that advertising does sell goods and the conviction that the use of strong drink ought to be diminished instead of increased.

Some would say that this decision is an example of prejudice. That may be, but it is also an indication that conviction is being backed with money, for hard-liquor advertising would bring a substantial amount of cash into the tills of this institution.

Down in Washington, Congress is wrestling with a proposed law which would ban liquor advertising in newspapers of interstate circulation.

The American Association of Advertising Agencies is opposing the bill. One reason for opposition is that it means less money for them and for publishers. Another reason, which has semblance of merit, is that

the Government should not regulate such matters.

A recent issue of the Advertising Age, that of December 26, 1949, tells of the opposition of the liquor interests to such a ban.

In other columns the publication reports the increased interest of large industries in the market of the American Negro and the increased use of the advertising columns of Negro newspapers. The largest advertiser in these newspapers is now the Schenley Co., the great distillers of strong drink.

Here is an interesting paragraph showing a trend in liquor advertising and selling:

"One of the major merchandising stories of the year in the Negro market is that of Distisales, a new research organization, which has been hired by Seagram distributors to help them do a better job of selling the Negro buyer.

"Last spring Distisales made a liquor survey in Baltimore—a favorite test city for the Negro market since its approximate 1,000,000 population is 20.98 percent Negro, and since it is considered to have both northern and southern characteristics. This study showed that the Negro population of Baltimore accounted for 44 percent of the total distilled spirits sales in the city."

In other words, while the Nation hopes to bring the money and morals of the Negro to higher levels by many humane actions, the liquor business helps, through advertising and kindred activities, to bring him down.

The Passing of a Great Man—Walter B. Wooden, 1882–1949—A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in the course of our allotted time here on earth it is occasionally our good fortune to know men and women who seem by their very nature to be clothed with heavenly grace. Such a soul was the late Walter Banfill Wooden. In all the years that Walter was my friend, so gracious was his personality and his spiritual outlook that the occasion never arose which would have injected into our relationship a moment of doubt as to his loyalty and devotion to his family, his friends, or his country.

WALTER WOODEN, A DISTINGUISHED ADVOCATE OF THE PUBLIC INTEREST

During the course of World War II, the public service rendered by Mr. Wooden was such that the Federal Trade Commission gave it recognition and cited it as specially meritorious service. That action was taken in accordance with the provisions of an act of Congress which provided for the recognition of especially meritorious services. The citation was based upon Mr. Wooden's expenditure of tireless effort, outstanding skill, and original thought in showing the way to more effective protection of the public interest. It was, in fact, based upon superior accomplishments. Specifically, he pointed out to the Federal Trade Commission and to the courts ways in which the antimonopoly laws could be applied to prohibit continued use of collusive and price-fixing devices, including the use of basing-point systems. It had long been recognized that basing-point systems had been used to frustrate and suppress price competition. The Temporary National Economic Committee, in its final report before the outbreak of World War II, recognized the use of basing-point systems as a force destructive of price competition in our basic industries. However, it failed to see how the antitrust laws as presently written could be utilized in challenging that evil. It recommended such new legislation as would be necessary to effectively and successfully challenge the evil. Those recommendations failed to bring congressional action. Thereupon, Mr. Wooden acted. He urged that the evils be challenged to the utmost with such tools as were at hand. He believed that the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Antitrust Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, could be used to further the public interest in challenging the evils of the basing-point and other artificial pricing systems. He recognized their weaknesses, but nevertheless urged that they be used to the extent of their limitations. That was done, but only after he alone showed the way in which it could be done.

WALTER WOODEN, A SPIRITUAL LEADER

Mr. Wooden was not only a leader in the public service; he was also a spiritual leader in his community. For approximately two decades he was a leader in the First Presbyterian Church of Riverdale, Md. Occasionally he led from the pulpit. On those occasions he delivered sermons which had been prepared with the utmost care. Frequently his theme was the goodness that could come from each of us in helping our fellow man who is unable to help himself. He was forever fighting for the cause of the oppressed. He despised bigotry, bias, and prejudice. He disliked and fought against discriminations in human relationships with no less ardor than he fought against price discriminations in business relationships which were found to be violative of our antitrust laws.

WALTER WOODEN, A CIVIC LEADER

His unselfishness added luster to his noble character. He never refrained from lending a helping hand to anyone whose cause he believed to be righteous. It mattered not to him whether the one he was helping stood alone or had the support of all in the community. That trait of unselfishness included his giving of effort, time, and financial aid. It was limited only by the limitations of his resources. His associates in public service received advice and help from him at any hour of day or night, workday or holiday, as they informed him they desired it. His associates noted how he extended help to the penniless on the streets in the different cities of the country where he was traveling on official business. The members of his church know not only of his contribution of effort and time but the substantial contributions of financial aid. At the time of his death, he was spearheading the work of a building committee to rebuild his church.

WALTER WOODEN, A FAITHFUL AND COURAGEOUS MAN ALWAYS

I do not believe that Walter Wooden would have his friends grieve that he had departed on that long journey to the eternal city beyond distant horizons. Rather, I am convinced that he would have his close friends among his fellow workers and in the orbit of his community life continue to wage battle in the public interest for those things which he thought were right and for those things in which he believed. At the time of his passing, Mr. Wooden had been designated by the Federal Trade Commission to present argument before the Supreme Court of the United States on the celebrated price-discrimination case of the Standard Oil Co. of Indiana. Despite a grave illness which had come upon him a few days previously, Mr. Wooden carried on the preparation of the briefs and arguments to be presented to the Supreme Court in this case. Almost at the very moment of his passing, his eager and scholarly mind looked forward to this last courageous effort in the public interest. It had been Mr. Wooden's plan to retire as of June 1950. His preparation of the argument in the Standard Oil case would have been the crowning effort of his public service.

It is appropriate to repeat in full the resolution adopted by the Federal Trade Commission the very day of his death:

Whereas Walter Banfill Wooden, born in Columbus, Ind., July 30, 1882, was graduated in law from Indiana University in 1905, and served in the Civil Service Commission August 2, 1905, to January 6, 1907, with the Bureau of Corporations until March 15, 1915, and with the Federal Trade Commission from March 16, 1915, the date of its organization, passed away suddenly on Monday, December 5, 1949, upon motion duly made and seconded, it is, by the Federal Trade Commission, unanimously—

Resolved, That the members of the Federal Trade Commission and its staff hereby express their deep sorrow and great sense of loss over the death of Walter Banfill Wooden, associate general counsel of the Commission, who has served with the Commission since its organization on March 16, 1915, as attorney-examiner, attorney in charge of the Chicago office, trial attorney, assistant chief counsel, and associate general counsel, covering the past 34 years, and who, throughout this period, by his devotion to the public interest and his faithful and distinguished service, has won the deep respect, admiration, and affection of his associates and of the members of the Commission.

With those who had the privilege of association with Walter Wooden in his work there will be always the remembrance of his fidelity to duty, his unwavering courage, his tireless energy, his capacity for friendship, and his constant devotion to the public interest, which was exceeded only by his devotion to the Christian principles by which he lived; be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be entered upon the records of the Federal Trade Commission and a copy thereof be sent to the family of Walter Banfill Wooden.

By the Commission.

LOWELL B. MASON,
Acting Chairman.

Adopted this 5th day of December A. D. 1949.

I shall miss Walter Wooden, his friendship and his counsel. Long ago he won my admiration and my respect, not only for his great knowledge in his field of

endeavor but because of his steadfast adherence to the fundamental principles in which he believed. Words and phrases, when one loses a friend and neighbor, often seem inadequate to convey one's real thoughts. Nevertheless, while deeply conscious of these limitations, the words "a great man, a great soul, a great patriot" come to mind. Walter Wooden was all of these—and more.

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek's Farewell Address to the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article on the farewell address of Mme. Chiang Kai-shek to the United States of January 8, 1950:

[From the New York Times of January 9, 1950]

MME. CHIANG VOWS LONG WAR ON REDS IN GOOD-BY TO UNITED STATES—SAYS SHE WILL JOIN HUSBAND ON FORMOSA IN FEW DAYS IN A BROADCAST HERE—AVOIDS APPEAL FOR HELP—ONLY CONSCIENCE OF AMERICANS CAN AID, SHE SAYS—CRIES "FOR SHAME" AT BRITAIN

Mme. Chiang Kai-shek bade farewell to the United States yesterday, announcing that "within a few days" she would leave for Formosa to be by her husband's side. She pledged unending guerrilla and propaganda warfare against the Communists on the Chinese mainland.

Speaking at noon over the full network of the National Broadcasting Co., Mme. Chiang sat alone, except for an engineer and an announcer, in the drawing room of the Riverdale home of her brother-in-law, Dr. H. H. Kung. A group of Chinese friends, reporters, and photographers listened to the speech over a radio in a adjoining dining room.

The climax of her talk came when she said:

"Should it be that some of us are killed in this battle for freedom, others will rise to take our places. There will not be a day of peace for the invader. No great powers can arrange treaties, no statesmen can write contracts that will stifle the Chinese yearning for liberty."

ABANDONED AND ALONE

She made no direct appeal for United States aid. "At such a time," she said, "no pleading can be with dignity." But she declared that China, "abandoned and alone, now shoulders the only rifle in the defense of liberty." Only America's own conscience, she added, can bring her again to China's side.

Mme. Chiang denounced Great Britain's recognition of the Communist regime.

"Already the moral weaklings are forsaking us," she said. "It is with heavy heart that I note that a former ally, Britain, which sacrificed millions of lives on the altar of freedom, has now been taken by its leaders into the wilderness of political intrigue.

"Britain has bartered the soul of a nation for a few pieces of silver. I say 'for shame' to Britain. One day these pieces of silver will bear interest in British blood, sweat, and tears on the battleground of freedom. For that which is morally wrong can never be politically right."

She described her husband, the generalissimo, as the first statesman who recognized the treachery of communism and said he had fought against it for 20 years.

CALLS HUSBAND RESOLUTE

"Times have changed, but the man has not changed," she went on. "My husband remains, resolute, to lead his people against the alien invaders and their alien ideas."

Then she declared:

"Our people will continue to fight for our country from some place from such an island as Formosa, or from the fastness of some mountain, as long as we live or as long as there is an alien enemy on China's soil.

"We shall fight fire with fire. Unremittingly and with tenacity of life, we shall fight and bleed the enemy. Everywhere in China's mainland our guerrillas will keep kindled the torch of liberty. The enemy's lies and deceit, their treachery and propaganda will be defeated not only with bullets but also with truth.

"The oppressed people on the mainland will be prepared so that at a given signal they will rise up simultaneously and overthrow the yoke of Communist domination with our returning armies. To this we are dedicated with our lives."

ROLE HELD INITIAL PHASE

Mme. Chiang stressed again and again the theme that although China is now fighting alone, the battle between freedom and communism is world-wide and must be brought to a conclusion. She described China's role as the initial phase of a gigantic conflict between good and evil, between liberty and communism.

Mme. Chiang came to Washington 13 months ago, flying from San Francisco in President Truman's plane, the Independence. She was received by the President only once, at tea, although she had two long conferences with the then Secretary of State, George C. Marshall, while he was in the Naval Hospital at Bethesda, Md.

Her Washington mission in search of large and immediate aid to the Nationalist forces was generally described as a failure. Shortly after the first of last year she came to New York, spent many weeks in a hospital for observation and later retired to Dr. Kung's home.

Constitutional Aspects of the Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 10 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Illinois Law Review, entitled "The Constitutional Aspects of the Truman Civil Rights Program." I am advised that to print the manuscript will require more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost; and the Government Printing Office estimates the cost of printing at $218.68.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONSTITUTIONAL ASPECTS OF THE TRUMAN CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

(By Charles Wallace Collins*)

When on February 2, 1948,[1] President Truman asserted Federal jurisdiction over the civil rights of individual persons throughout the United States he precipitated a conflict which involves the fundamental question of the nature and form of our system of government. It involves considerations of origin and destiny.

What are these civil rights? These words do not occur in the Constitution but the concept was debated in the Constitution Convention of 1787 and before the public at the time of the adoption of the Constitution. The question has also been adjudicated.

Elsworth, of Connecticut, when asked whether if his State entered into a national government he would not participate equally in national security, replied that he would but that he wanted domestic happiness as well as general security and that the general government could not know his wants or relieve his distress. He said his happiness depended as much on the existence of his State government as a new-born infant depends on its mother's milk. (He was talking about his civil rights.)[2]

Madison, in the Federalist, said that the powers delegated by the proposed Constitution to the Federal Government were few and defined but that those which were to remain in the State government were numerous and indefinite; that the Federal powers would be exercised principally on external objects such as war, peace, negotiation, and commerce, while the powers reserved to the several States would extend to all the objects which, in the ordinary course of affairs, concern the lives, liberties, and properties of the people; and the internal order, improvement and prosperity of the State.[3] This is the area of civil rights.

In the Slaughter-House cases[4] the Supreme Court held that the privileges and immunities of a citizen of a State embrace nearly every civil right for the establishment and protection of which organized government is instituted.

We see, therefore, that the term civil rights embraces those intimate relationships and contacts in the daily life of the individual person in his struggle for existence, in the pursuit of happiness, in sickness and in health, under the protection and restraint of his government.

HISTORY OF CIVIL RIGHTS

The civil liberties which we enjoy today are our English heritage. They are rooted in the great charters and traditions of the English people who fought for and won them from their rulers—Magna Carta, the common

*Member of the Alabama, Federal, and New York City bars. Law librarian of Congress, 1916–17; librarian of the Supreme Court, 1918–20; general counsel, Bureau of the Budget, 1921–23; Deputy Comptroller of the Currency and general counsel, 1924–27. Author, The Fourteenth Amendment and the States (Little, Brown & Co., 1912); The National Budget System and American Finance (Macmillan, 1917); The Branch Banking Question (Macmillan, 1926); Rural Banking Reform (Macmillan, 1931); Whither Solid South? (Pelican Press, 1948).

[1] 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Feb. 2, 1948, at 960.

[2] Documents on Formation of Union, H. Doc. 398, 69th Cong., 1st sess.

[3] The Federalist, No. 45 (Mittell Ed., 1938), 303.

[4] 83 U. S. 36 (1873). (Field, Swayne, Chase, and Bradley, JJ., dissenting).

law, the Petition of Right, and the confirmation of all of these in the Bill of Rights of 1689. When the English colonial arrived on the American shores he moved into the wilderness in full possession of these precious rights. Our Declaration of Independence is a complaint against the abuse of our civil rights by the Crown and an assertion of the determination of the Colonies to protect those rights themselves. Each Colony, upon becoming an independent State under its written constitution, preserved and protected the civil rights of its citizens.

It is at this point in our constitutional history that a new contribution was made to the freedom of man. The newly organized States were established upon the republican principle. This meant government founded upon the will of the people under a system of representation and agency, without distinction of class, with checks and balances in the separation of governmental powers and with the exercise of the sovereign power diffused at all levels of local self-government from the lowly precincts to the highest State authority. In other words, they each established the republican form of government.

When these States met in the Convention of 1787 they established also upon the republican principle, a Union of States in the form of a federated republic. Throughout the debates the chief concern of the States was the preservation of control of their own internal affairs and to delegate to the Central Government only those powers which were deemed necessary to enable it to perform the functions of a central government which were beyond the powers of a single State, such as military operations, public finance, postal service, commerce, and foreign affairs. Even after the Constitution had been submitted for ratification many feared that the Federal Government might invade their internal affairs notwithstanding the consideration that the Federal Government was charged with the duty to guarantee to every State in the Union a republican form of government.[5] Madison found it necessary to give assurances. He said it must be remembered that the General Government is not to be charged with the whole power of law-making and administration; that its jurisdiction would be limited to certain enumerated objects which concern the whole Republic but which cannot be reached by any one of the States; that the States would retain their due authority over their own affairs. "Were it," he said, "proposed by the plan of the Convention to abolish the governments of the particular States, its adversaries would have some ground for their objection; though it would not be difficult to show that if they were abolished the General Government would be compelled, by the principle of self-preservation, to reinstate them in their proper jurisdiction." [6] Nevertheless these fears continued after the Constitution was ratified and the First Congress, under the leadership of Madison, drafted and submitted to the States the first 10 amendments known as the Bill of Rights, which were forthwith ratified, the tenth article of which confirmed to the States that the power not delegated to the United States by the Constitution or prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States respectively, or to the people.

In *Barron* v. *Baltimore* [7] the question was for the first time presented to the Supreme Court whether the first eight articles of amendment to the Constitution, known as the Bill of Rights, operated as limitations upon the powers of the several States. Marshall ruled flatly that they did not but acted as restraints upon the Federal Government alone.

[5] U. S. Const., art IV, sec. 4.

[6] The Federalist, supra, note 3, No. 14, at 82.

[7] 32 U. S. (1833) (taking property without compensation).

This question did not arise again until 1866 when Congress enacted the Civil Rights Act,[8] over the President's veto, to implement the thirteenth amendment which abolished slavery. There were doubts in Congress as to its constitutionality and it was put aside. Its provisions were, however, incorporated in the subsequent reconstruction legislation after the fourteenth amendment and the fifteenth amendment had been ratified in 1868 and 1870, respectively. These were the Enforcement Act of May 31, 1870, as amended by the act of February 28, 1871 the Ku Klux Act of April 20, 1871,[9] and the Civil Rights Act of 1875.[10]

CIVIL RIGHTS SINCE THE FOURTEENTH AMENDMENT

During the debates on the adoption of the fourteenth amendment and at the time it was adopted there were among its sponsors and supporters those who held two separate but related opinions as to the effect of that article on civil rights. One was that it, in effect, reversed *Barron* v. *Baltimore* [11] and conferred jurisdiction upon the Federal Government to enforce the first eight articles of the Bill of Rights against the States and the other that, henceforth, the Federal Government had jurisdiction over the civil rights of individual persons. There are two separate lines of decisions on these points.

In the outstanding and leading case of *Twining* v. *New Jersey*,[12] in which the whole question was reviewed at length, counsel contended that by virtue of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment the privileges and immunities of citizens of the United States embraced all of the safeguards and personal rights which are enumerated in the first eight articles of the amendment to the Constitution. The Court held that this question was no longer open; that where the Court had ruled against a State for the violation of a right which is also protected from Federal interference by the Bill of Rights it was not because the fourteenth amendment gave jurisdiction to the Federal Government to enforce the Bill of Rights against the State, but because the State in that particular case had violated the fundamental concept of due process of law; that the test therefore is whether the State has violated the due process clause of the fourteenth amendment.

In *Palko* v. *Connecticut* [13] this question was again before the Court, counsel for appellant contending that whatever would be a violation of the original Bill of Rights (amendments 1 to 8) if done by the Federal Government is now equally unlawful by force of the fourteenth amendment if done by a State. The Court said: "There is no such general rule," and went on to cite a number of cases where the Court had held that there had been a denial of due process of law by the State for the deprivation of a person of some right secured against the Federal Government by the Bill of Rights.[14] *Twining* was affirmed.

In 1947, *Adamson* v. *California* [15] brought to the Court the almost identical issue as that of *Twining*,[16] decided 40 years before. It was the contention that the fifth amendment of the Bill of Rights was carried over into the fourteenth amendment as a privilege and immunity of national citizenship which a State could not lawfully violate. Here again is an able review of the whole question—going back to *Barron* v. *Baltimore*,[17] covering a period of 115 years. The majority of the Court reaffirmed the Twining and Palko cases and held that a State was free, "within the limits of the due process clause," to abridge the privileges and immunities flowing from State citizenship; that this was in accord with the constitutional doctrine of federalism by leaving to the States the responsibility of dealing with the privileges and immunities of their citizens except those inherent in national citizenship. The Court said: "This construction has become embedded in our Federal system as a functioning element in preserving the balance between national and State power."

These three cases, Twining, Palko, and Adamson, settle the question as to the relationship of civil rights to the Bill of Rights and the fourteenth amendment insofar as this can be done by the Court. Should the Court ever decide that the Federal Bill of Rights is covered in terms by the amendment, the question would then arise as to what extent civil rights had been nationalized and what, if any, powers Congress had acquired by way of implementation of the nationalization by legislation.

The discussion immediately preceding has dealt with the first and least important phase of the civil-rights question, namely, the restrictions upon the Federal and State governments. We come now to the larger and more vital question of the jurisdiction over the violation of the civil rights of one individual by another and whether the Federal jurisdiction had been extended in this respect by the fourteenth amendment.

Nearly 2 years before the Civil Rights Act of 1875 became law the Slaughter House cases [18] were decided by the Supreme Court. The question involved was whether certain persons had not been deprived of the privileges and immunities, as citizens of the United States, by State legislation. The Court held that while certain privileges and immunities of citizenship are derived from the Federal Constitution and these a State may not abridge, it was not the purpose of the fourteenth amendment to transfer the security and protection of all civil rights from the States to the Federal Government nor was it intended to bring within the power of Congress the entire domain of civil rights heretofore belonging exclusively to the States.

The next to reach the Court was *United States* v. *Cruikshank*.[19] This was a prosecution under the Enforcement Act of 1870, defendants being charged with depriving certain other persons of their civil rights. The Court held that the restraints of section 1 of the fourteenth amendment ran against the States only and not against individuals. The Court said: "The very highest duty of the States, when they entered into the Union under the Constitution, was to protect all persons within their boundaries in the enjoyment of these 'unalienable rights with which they were endowed by their Creator.' Sovereignty for this purpose rests alone with the States."

On October 15, 1883, all of that part of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which assumed direct jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals was declared to be unconstitutional by the Supreme Court in the Civil Rights case [20] Sections 1 and 2 of the act purported to abolish segregation of races in hotels, on public conveyances, in theaters, and other places of amusement. Five cases, respectively, from California, New York, Kansas, Missouri, and Tennessee, were consolidated

[8] To give the freedmen the right to own property, travel, and to make contracts. See Rhodes, History of the United States (1920), 66.

[9] Id. at 405, 424.

[10] 18 Stat. 335 (1875).

[11] Supra, note 4.

[12] 211 U. S. 78 (1908) (opinion by Moody, J., Harlan, J., dissenting. Self-incrimination).

[13] 302 U. S. 319 (1937) (opinion by Cardozo, J., Butler, J., dissenting but no opinion).

[14] Id. at 323.

[15] 332 U. S. 46 (1947) (Frankfurter, J., concurring. Black, Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge, JJ., dissenting).

[16] Supra, note 4.

[17] Supra, note 7.

[18] Supra, note 14.

[19] 92 U. S. 542 (1876).

[20] 109 U. S. 3 (1883) (Harlan, J., dissenting).

by the Court and treated as one. The Court held squarely that the prohibitions of the fourteenth amendment have no application to the wrongful acts of an individual, unsupported by the exercise of State authority; that such an act is only a private wrong or crime of that individual; that it may be an invasion of the rights of the injured party, but unless the State participates, the rights of the injured party remain in full force and effect and may be vindicated in the State courts. The Court held that Congress had "no countenance of authority" for the enactment of this legislation.

So far as the Constitution is concerned, the Supreme Court, and the legal profession generally, consider it settled law that the Bill of Rights is a limitation upon the Federal Government only and not upon the States; that the fourteenth amendment did not alter the rule in the Barron case; that Congress has not the power or jurisdiction over the question of the violation of the civil rights of an individual person by another individual person, in which violation the State has no part; that the power of restraint of the fourteenth amendment is in its "due process clause" which operates as a protection to all persons against violation by the States of fundamental rights; and that Congress has no power to legislate in respect to these rights but they must be asserted and vindicated in the courts of law by the person aggrieved. With this background let us now examine the so-called Truman program.

THE TRUMAN PROGRAM

The civil-rights program of legislation can only be attributed to President Truman in the sense that he has caused it to be formalized and has adopted it as his own. The component elements, however, reach back into the plans of the National Association for the Advancement of the Colored People and many lines of political support have been developed in support of some such legislation within recent years. When the CIO-PAC began to develop the idea of "full employment" for the United States, the Negro program for equality and nonsegregation became an integral part of that movement.[21] Anti-poll-tax and antilynching bills have been pending in Congress for several years and on June 25, 1941, President Roosevelt, by Executive order,[22] created the FEPC under his war powers. A bill to establish the FEPC in time of peace has been pending since January 17, 1944.[23] On January 11, 1944, Roosevelt in his annual message on the state of the Union laid before Congress his CIO-supported "economic bill of rights" [24] and the following year in support of the CIO plan for "full employment" in his last message to Congress on the state of the Union, he laid before it what he called "a second bill of rights." [25]

Now all of the foregoing measures and proposals made bold to assert Federal jurisdiction over the civil rights of individuals and all were to become effective without regard for religion, race, or "station." Mr. Truman, as a Senator, was familiar with them and gave them his consistent support. In his first message to Congress, after becoming President, he recommended the CIO program which embraced recommendations for Federal enforcement of the civil rights of individuals including an anti-poll-tax law, an antilynching law and the FEPC.[26] These failed of passage in the Seventy-ninth Congress.

The discussion upon which we are here engaged is not therefore ephemeral as though it came in with Truman. On the contrary it presents a great and developing constitutional issue which has now become interwoven in the fabric of our national politics. It is not easy to resolve and we shall have it with us, with perhaps increased intensity, in the years immediately ahead.

On December 5, 1946, the President appointed his Committee on Civil Rights. In the Executive order creating the committee,[27] he assigns three reasons for this action: (1) The necessity to preserve the civil rights guaranteed by the Constitution; (2) to prevent individuals from the injury of other individuals; and (3) to take all possible steps "to safeguard our civil rights."

As to (1), the constitutional guarantee of civil rights runs to the States to protect them in their republican form of government. It is a restraint upon the Federal Government and not a grant of power. As to (2), the Federal Government has no authority to concern itself with private conduct of individuals with respect to other individuals, no action by the State being involved. As to (3), it cannot concern itself with the question of safeguarding the civil rights generally of persons within such States. This has been abundantly shown in the cases cited above. The President therefore, in my opinion, had no authority to appoint the committee to consider those questions of civil rights, which, under the Constitution, rest solely under the jurisdiction of the States.

The report of the committee came out in 1947 [28] and formed the basis for President Truman's special message, on February 2, 1948,[29] to Congress on civil rights. The report contains 178 pages while the message is nothing more than a skeletonization of the report. The report therefore is the document which presents the constitutional question and will be so treated when we consider the nature of the measures proposed.

Neither President Truman, nor the report, submitted the proposed text of bills or resolutions to make effective their recommendations, consequently no concrete criticism or evaluation can be made as to their specific relationship to the Constitution in terms. For that we need words and phrases to give life and substance to the proposals. It is true, however, that there were pending before the Eightieth Congress complete drafts of bills on the subject of some of the recommendations of the President, but these were sponsored in committees controlled by the Republicans and the President did not publicly give his support to any of them. To consider them here therefore would be beyond the scope of this article.

Nevertheless, the grounds assigned as a basis for the proposed legislation present fundamental constitutional questions and are subject to critical analysis. President Truman in his message of February 2, 1948, says that the Federal Government has a clear duty to see that constitutional guaranties of individual liberties and of equal protection under the laws are not denied or abridged anywhere in our Union and that that duty is shared by all three branches of the Federal Government, but can be fulfilled only if Congress enacts comprehensive civil rights laws. As far as this statement appertains to individuals alone we have seen that there is no jurisdiction in the Federal Government and that in case a State is alleged to have deprived an individual of these rights no department of the Federal Government can take the initiative, but the person aggrieved may assert his rights in court.

The report of the committee is in part propaganda and in part a desperate speculation to find a way to overthrow or evade existing decisions of the Supreme Court. The argument runs through the report that although the American Government is dedicated to the democratic way of life where all are equal and should have equality of treatment by government and by individuals, this principle is being violated, particularly in the South, and it is time now to reconsider the whole question of civil rights with a view to understanding the causes of prejudices and to stamp them out. To this undertaking it says only the National Government is competent to come forward.

Having reached this conclusion, the task to which the committee assigned itself was to find ways and means. The present state of constitutional law on the subject is admitted. Members of the committee appear to have been familiar with most of the cases cited in this paper, which deny jurisdiction to the central grovernment. Nevertheless, they worked out a modus operandi, the first step in which was that the President and Congress, at the high policy level, and upon the advice of counsel as to the test of constitutionality, determine the wisdom of a broader civil-rights program. Consider next the marke developments in the Supreme Court within the last 10 years toward the protection of civil rights. Let Congress, upon recommendation of the President, therefore enact a series of laws which would put into effect this broader program and let it be fought through the Supreme Court.[30] In this connection the report conceives the possibility that the Supreme Court, in a new climate of opinion might reverse the opinion in the Civil Rights cases and substitute the dissenting opinion of Justice Harlan, in that case, as the basis for a proper ruling.[31]

The basis assigned by the committee for its recommendations for action are:

1. Moral. Burdens on the common conscience must be removed.

2. Economic. Heavy drain on human wealth cannot be afforded.

3. International. What foreigners think of our domestic record in democracy cannot be ignored.[32]

The committee then proceeded to recommend the enactment of 34 separate pieces of Federal legislation, ranging over the whole field of civil rights, including, an antilynching law, an antipoll tax law, FEPC, an enlarged FBI, a permanent Federal Civil Rights Commission, restoration of provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1875 which were annulled, and acts to enforce the thirteenth, the fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments.[33]

The committee states to the President that it believes a program of positive action by the National Government "falls well within the limits of governmental power established by our Constitution." [34] The following are cited as possible sources of legal support: Authority of Congress under the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments; a further enlargement of the application of *McCulloch* v. *Maryland* [35] to protect civil rights; the use of the war powers; the Interstate Commerce clause; the power to tax and expend; the postal power; "power derived from the Constitution as a whole to protect the rights essential to national citizens in a democratic nation"; [36] the power derived from the United Nations Charter and finally the clause of the Constitution which—God save

[21] CIO-PAC, The Negro in 1944. Reprinted in Gaer, The First Round (1944), 449.

[22] Executive Order No. 8802, 6 Federal Register 3109 (1941).

[23] H. R. 3986, 78th Cong.; H. R. 2232, 79th Cong.; S. 2048, 78th Cong.; S. 101, 79th Cong.; S. 984, 80th Cong.

[24] 90 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 57 (1944).

[25] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 70 (1945).

[26] 91 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD 8381 (1945).

[27] Executive Order No. 9808, 11 Federal Register 14153 (1946).

[28] Report, President's Committee on Civil Rights (Government Printing Office, 1947).

[29] 94 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, February 2, 1948, at 960.

[30] Op. cit., supra, note 28, at 107.

[31] Id. at 105.

[32] Id. at 139.

[33] Id. at 151–165.

[34] Id. at 105.

[35] 17 U. S. 316 (1819).

[36] Op. cit., supra, note 28, at 109.

the mark—guarantees to every State a republican form of government.

The report of the committee closes with the following statement, set up in a paragraph in italics in the center of page 175:

"As the committee concludes this report we would remind ourselves that the future of our Nation rests upon the character, the vision, the high principle of our people. Democracy, brotherhood, human rights—these are practical expressions of the eternal worth of every child of God. With His guidance and help we can move forward toward a nobler social order in which there will be equal opportunity for all."

Throughout the so-called Truman program there runs the fallacious assumption that certain groups of persons in the United States are not in possession of fundamental civil rights and that these rights should be bestowed as a boon from the Federal Government. The duality of our citizenship is ignored. The citizens of a State all have equality in civil rights and these rights are protected by the due process and equal protection clauses of the Constitution. In national citizenship each has the same privileges and immunities.

Such is the nature of President Truman's program of legislation for the protection of civil rights.

ARE WE NOW GIVING CONSIDERATION TO AN ABANDONMENT OF THE CONSTITUTION?

Our American ancestors sought and won freedom. They built on virgin soil a new form of government to make men free. In the short space of our national life—only 159 years—our republican form of government has shown how freedom can be achieved under the rule of law. Nevertheless the student of the Constitution must now face the fact that a considerable body of public opinion now supports radical changes in our theory of government with the emphasis on personal security rather than freedom.

The last 10 or 15 years have brought to bear upon the minds of the American people cataclysmic concepts of human relations and we have learned a new vocabulary. We became acquainted with national statism in Russia, Italy, and Germany. And in the war with the first as an ally, and with the other two as enemies, we also, under the centralizing forces of national defense and war, followed their example by going far into national statism ourselves. And the influence of this centralization and national planning of everything for everybody has been carried over into the post-war period. Thus many are now coming to look to the Federal Government for the satisfaction of all of their needs and desires. They look to the centralized state for succor and protection from the cradle to the grave. Rugged individualism—the symbol of freedom and adventure—has become to them a term of reproach.

Within this new school of thought which is trying to bend the Constitution to its will without seeking formal amendments, religious values are also playing a part and they are frankly stated in the report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights. They are supported as legitimate Federal aims by a number of influential religious organizations. The Federal Government is urged to make effective the brotherhood of man because all men are the children of God. The democratic way of life becomes of national concern. This also is a religious or moral concept because it denotes a rule of conduct of the individual. It is different from the concept of democracy as a form of government.

Under this civil rights plan the Federal legislation recommended would carry heavy civil and criminal penalties for violations by individual persons and by State officials. The strong arm of the Federal Government with its enlarged and specially trained secret police would go out to detect and punish those who failed to observe these new laws.

Although to an old line student of the Constitution this situation may present a constitutional nightmare, he cannot afford to ignore it. We have already come a long way in this movement to change the fundamental nature of our form of government by evasion, subterfuge, indirection, and emotionalism. In the near future it bids fair to become one of the chief political issues before the country. New party alinements may arise because of it. It has already been the occasion for the States' rights Democratic revolt in the South. But it is not a local or regional question. It is a question of the survival of the Constitution.

Multiple-Purpose Dams Fit in Development of Natural Resources

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by me which was published in the January issue of the Farm and Ranch magazine with the Southern Agriculturist.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By ESTES KEFAUVER, United States Senator)

It has long been recognized that the water in the streams of our country represents a vast natural resource which should be developed on a comprehensive scale. Rivers have played a big part in the life of man since earliest times, when they provided food, in the form of fish and mussels, and a simple means of travel and transportation.

As man has increased his mastery over nature through engineering and technology, the possibilities of obtaining maximum benefits from flowing water have increased. Once developments were planned and carried out for a single purpose, such as navigation, or at most for two. Today engineering advances have made it possible to develop streams for many purposes. Such multiple development is, practically speaking, a product of the past decade and a half. But the advantages of such developments were realized long before. In 1909, during the administration of President Theodore Roosevelt, a National Conservation Commission headed by Gifford Pinchot made a comprehensive report on natural resources in the United States, in which it said:

"The broad plan already framed by statesmen and experts and approved by the Executive should be put in effect. It provides for a system of waterway improvement extending to all the uses of the waters and benefits to be derived from their control, including the abatement of floods for the benefit of navigation, the extension of irrigation, the development and application of power, the prevention of soil wash, the purification of streams for water supply, and the drainage and utilization of the waters from swamp and overflow lands.

It is clear that the men who framed this statement were sound in their conception of the possibilities for development of water resources. They were also, without doubt, somewhat ahead of their time. Actual realization of their ideas was still some years off.

Even in those days, however, plans were being made to accomplish more than one objective of water control by construction of single structures. Several projects in the West envisaged the damming of streams for storage of irrigation water and at the same time the production of electric power. Such dams might be called dual-purpose dams. The damming of rivers for navigation, as on the Ohio River and other streams, had been carried on for years. These were single-purpose dams.

By the middle of 1920, and particularly after the 1927 flood of the Mississippi, it became apparent that flood control was an objective to which dams and reservoirs must be devoted. Previously, chief reliance had been placed in levees and similar works which averted damage at localized spots. At the same time, such works constricted the natural river channel in floodtime and often caused higher stages at other points along the river. Moreover, levees had been built higher and higher until they were reaching their maximum development, both from the standpoint of economic feasibility and safety. Each foot added to a levee not only added to the cost, but also increased the risk and damage in case the levee failed. Moreover, it was apparent that floods were often caused not by local rainfall and runoff, but were the result of waters falling on slopes hundreds of miles away.

Such considerations led inevitably, as public understanding grew, to the establishment of multiple-purpose projects which would carry out the objectives voiced in 1909 by the National Conservation Commission. The TVA project was the first in which the new concept was placed in effect on a major scale, and today the Tennessee and its tributaries still form the first and only entire large river system which has been brought under multiple-purpose control.

As such, this system of multiple-purpose dams is worthy of intensive study. On this river system, consisting of the Tennessee and its major tributaries, TVA has constructed 17 dams. In addition, it took over Wilson Dam at Muscle Shoals, built previously by the Government; it purchased four dams on the Tennessee system from a private company, and it worked out an agreement with the Aluminum Co. of America whereby its five major dams and reservoirs are operated as a part of a unified system. Thus the Tennessee River is controlled by a system of 27 major dams.

These dams, operated as a single system, control the run-off from an area of 41,000 square miles. They reduce flood heights during the rainy season, and they store water which is used during drier periods for maintaining the navigation channel and for producing power. Such a system is, of course, complex. It has to deal not only with a general weather cycle in the Valley, but with specific situations in limited localities.

The multiple-purpose system on the Tennessee achieves several purposes, and at bargain rates. Essentially it consists of two kinds of dams. On the main river, a series of dams creates a continuous chain of lakes from Paducah, Ky., to Knoxville, Tenn. On the tributary streams, high storage dams control the flow by storage and release of water at appropriate periods and seasons.

The system provides 11,000,000 acre-feet of storage for flood control which protects danger points in the Tennessee Valley and in the

rich areas along the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers below the mouth of the Tennessee. The Tennessee River has been made navigable for modern towboats and barges of 9-foot draft for its entire 650-mile length. And at the same time, the system of dams produces a tremendous quantity of electric power—some 15,000,000,000 kilowatts during the last year, or 10 times as much as was produced in the same region in 1933.

These are the major purposes as defined in the TVA Act of 1933. Today, the flood-control benefits of the system are estimated at $11,000,000 a year. Savings in transportation charges on automobiles, steel and iron products, wheat, corn, fertilizer, and many other items were estimated in 1948 at about four million, with nine million of such savings to be expected annually when traffic reaches mature development. The power produced by the system last year was sold for $100,000,000. In addition there are subsidiary benefits, such as the development of a recreation industry which has attracted so far—in its infancy—an investment by States, counties, cities, and private individuals of nearly sixteen million. The lakes have attracted an increasing number of wildfowl to the preserves which are spotted along their shores. Fishing has vastly increased. It has been found possible to so operate the reservoirs as to virtually eliminate the malaria hazard in areas where it once was a serious problem. States, cities, and industries are taking an increasing interest in stream sanitation in order to realize the greatest advantages from river development.

In operation, the system follows the annual cycle of rainfall and run-off. In the beginning of the flood season the reservoirs are drawn low so that they have space to store possible flood waters. As the danger of floods recedes in the spring, the reservoirs can be filled. Then, as the annual dry season makes itself felt in dwindling rainfall and run-off, the water stored in the reservoirs is released to maintain the level of the navigation channel and to produce power.

Thus the multiple-purpose system makes the most of one of the greatest of the natural resources in the Tennessee Valley, something which could never be done by piecemeal, single-purpose development of the stream flow. In the Tennessee Valley multiple-purpose developments provide a pioneering model showing the way to efficient development of water resources in other parts of the country where the streams are susceptible to similar treatment.

Agricultural Price Supports and the Brannan Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two editorials dealing with the agricultural price-support program and Secretary of Agriculture Brannan's views. The first, entitled "United States Price Props for Farm Crops Dip, Survey Reveals," appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch of December 12, 1949. The second, entitled "Brannan's Warning," appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press of December 14, 1949.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of December 12, 1949]

UNITED STATES PRICE PROPS FOR FARM CROPS DIP, SURVEY REVEALS

WASHINGTON.—Government price supports for farm products are going down.

A United Press survey indicated today that support prices for most farm products will be lower next year for the second straight year.

The decline in 1950—as compared to the peak price-support year of 1948—probably will range from more than 50 percent in the case of flaxseed to about 3 to 5 percent more in the case of wheat and corn.

Prospects are that price props for the 1950 cotton crop will be down at least 7 percent from the 1948 support level. Furthermore, cotton plantings will be curtailed by Government production controls.

Egg supports also will be cut in 1950, perhaps as much as 20 percent from this year's level.

Even a small drop in supports will be felt in farmers' pocketbooks next year. Two years ago most farm commodities sold far above the support prices. But most farm commodities now are hugging the support level. Only Government price guaranties are holding them up.

There are three reasons why price props are being lowered:

1. The parity prices for farm products have declined. That is, the farmer's dollar now will buy more—about 4 percent more—than it did 24 months ago. Price supports are set as a percentage of parity to maintain the farmers' purchasing power. When parity declines from one year to the next, the dollars-and-cents figures at which farm prices are pegged automatically drops.

2. In the case of some products the Government has deliberately slashed supports to hold down surplus production or to stimulate consumption through lower prices. This was down this year in the case of potatoes, flaxseed, beans, peas, and naval stores (gum turpentine and rosin).

3. New farm legislation in 1950 for the first time in 8 years strips mandatory high supports from hogs, chickens, and eggs. The Government plans to reduce egg props in hopes of curtailing production and getting people to eat more. It has had to buy more than 2,000,000,000 eggs to support prices this year. Prospects are that chicken and turkey supports also will be cut. There has been no indication as to where supports will be set for hogs or dairy products.

However, bucking the downward trend in supports are tobacco, rice, and wool. Prospects are that supports will be higher for these products next year. New farm legislation boosts the parity price for these products in 1950 and requires that supports be fixed at about the same percentage of parity as in the past.

The following table shows how farm supports are dropping. The support prices shown for 1950 are only preliminary and unofficial estimates.

One of the assumptions on which the estimates are based is that farm production and living costs will not drop in 1950. Actually, the Agriculture Department predicts these costs will drop slightly. If so, actual 1950 support prices would be lower than indicated in this price support table:

	1948	1949	1950
Commodity:			
Corn, bushel	$1.44	$1.40	$1.39
Wheat, do	2.00	1.95	1.91
Cotton, bale	.2879	.2723	.2678
Rice	1.84	1.78	2.03
Peanuts, pound	.108	.105	.1035
Wool, do	.423	.423	.448
Milk [1], 100 pounds	3.59	3.51	
Butter [1], pound	.634	.620	
Potatoes, bushel	1.67	1.08	.96
Eggs [2], dozen	.488	.470	
Hogs (during 6 months ending March 31), 100 pounds	15.57	16.38	15.84
Chickens [2], pound	.256	.250	
Turkeys, do	.323	.310	
Sweetpotatoes [3], bushel	1.98	1.72	
Dry beans [3], 100 pounds	7.61	6.55	
Soybeans [2], bushel	2.18	2.09	
Dry peas [3], 100 pounds	4.80	3.12	
Cottonseed [2], ton	0	46.50	
Turpentine and rosin, unit	131.58	114.08	82.27
Flaxseed [1] (at Minneapolis), bushel	6.00	3.99	2.82
Barley [3]	1.15	1.09	
Grain sorghums [3], 100 pounds	2.31	2.09	
Oats [3], bushel	1.29	1.27	
Honey [4]	0	0	
Mohair [4], pound	0	0	
Tung nuts [4], ton	0	0	
Tobacco:			
Flue-cured, pound	.439	.425	.442
Burley, do	.424	.403	.444
Fire-cured, do	.318	.302	.333
Dark air-cured, do	.283	.269	.296
Maryland, do	.439	.4195	.526

[1] Supports can be raised or lowered in 1950 within a range of 75 to 90 percent of parity. If estimated parity price remains unchanged, 1950 supports will be set somewhere between $3.29 to $3.94 for milk and 60.8 to 72.6 cents for butter.

[2] Supports can be eliminated in 1950 or set as high as current 90 percent of parity. If estimated parity prices remain unchanged, highest possible 1950 support level would be about 45 cents for eggs; an average of $16.92 for hogs; 25.9 cents for chickens; 33.4 cents for turkeys; $2.27 for soybeans; and $59.76 for cottonseed.

[3] Supports can be eliminated in 1950 or set as high as 90 percent of parity. If supports are fixed at the same percentage of parity as they were this year and estimated parity price doesn't change, 1950 supports would be barley $1.02 (72 percent); grain sorghums, $1.93 (70 percent); oats, 63.7 cents (70 percent); rye, $1.08 (72 percent); sweetpotatoes $1.82 (80 percent); dry beans, $6.74 (80 percent) and dry peas, $3.34 (60 percent).

[4] Must be supported in 1950. If present estimated parity prices remain unchanged, the maximum and minimum levels at which supports can be fixed are 10 to 15 cents a pound for extracted honey; $60 to $90 a ton for tung nuts; and 39.6 to 59.4 cents a pound for mohair.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of December 14, 1949]

BRANNAN'S WARNING

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan, in his address here last night, has put the position of agriculture before the Nation in a manner that should clear up much misunderstanding and will help to define the problem, In doing so he has performed a public service.

What Secretary Brannan has pointed out is that the classic and historical pattern of agricultural deflation is now repeating itself, although fortunately in much less violent and injurious fashion than in similar economic situations of the past. American experience is that agriculture takes a price decline before other segments of the economy and is the first to feel the effects of a post-war, post-inflationary readjustment.

A great deal of political ill-will has been aroused against agriculture in the populous sections of the country because of the price support policy, with its heavy burden of public costs, during a period of high consumer prices.

What Secretary Brannan shows is that despite these price supports, the net income of the farmers is already down 20 percent from 1947. It may decline another 15 percent next year. What reduction there has

been in the cost of food to the consumer has been principally at the farmer's expense. This is true, and is usually true, because farm prices are the least artificial, and the most sensitive to the law of supply and demand, of any major group of prices in the economy. While the other costs of labor, hauling and manufacture and distribution that go into the final price of food have remained high, farm prices have been declining quite sharply. But the final price of food does not reflect this decline in full because the cost of the crop as it leaves the farm is, in most cases, a small part of the total cost.

Had it not been for the price supports, the misfortune of agriculture would have been severe. And it must be remembered that misfortune, when it hits one great branch of economy, does not stand still but spreads throughout the Nation. As Secretary Brannan observed, "Haven't we seen before what the loss of agricultural purchasing power can mean in terms of declining sales, unemployment, and unless it is checked, in full-scale national depression?"

Hence it is of general national interest to see that the agricultural industry not again become the weak link in prosperity. There is no unanimity of opinion as to the mechanics of a permanent farm program. Secretary Brannan has his own plan. It is highly controversial. The new farm act of 1949, while perhaps an improvement over the Aiken Act, can hardly be scored as more than a hastily improvised stopgap.

Apart from the problem of method, Secretary Brannan has done well in pointing out to the Nation as a whole that it has a stake in farm prosperity, that there is a cloud over the farm scene, and that what is done to stop the slump in farm income is done not just for the farmer but for everyone.

Removal of Restrictions on Margarine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address which I delivered last night on America's Town Meeting of the Air entitled "Should the Senate Remove Restrictions on Margarine Now?"

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD THE SENATE REMOVE RESTRICTIONS ON MARGARINE NOW?

The only crime that margarine is guilty of is that it is cheap. The only reason that it is taxed and its sale restricted by law is that it is cheaper than butter. Margarine is made from the products of American farms, soybean oil, cottonseed oil, and milk. It is colored just as butter is colored—by a harmless artificial ingredient.

All that we are asking is that both of these perfectly legitimate, pure, nutritious food products be treated alike. If butter has the right to be colored freely—then so should margarine have that right.

Margarine sells on the average for one-half the price of butter. It is the poor man's spread. To tax and restrict its sale is to levy a further heavy burden on the backs of those who can least afford it, for the enrichment of a relatively few butter producers.

The fight between butter manufacturers and margarine manufacturers is only incidental. The 150,000,000 consumers of this country are the ones vitally interested in freeing margarine from its shackles.

Every time the people have a chance to speak on this issue, they vote for freedom of margarine. Only last November the people of Ohio—incidentally one of the greatest dairy States—the people of Ohio in a direct election spoke up for free margarine by a half-million majority. The House of Representatives twice has voted overwhelmingly by 3 to 1 to free margarine. If the butter interests will permit the Senate to vote—without confusing the issue with irrelevant amendments—the Senate, too, will express the will of the people.

The restrictions and red tape imposed upon the distributors of margarine are more burdensome than the 10-cent-a-pound tax. Most retailers refuse to handle colored margarine because the bookkeeping is similar to that of OPA days.

Butter is the only product I know of which insists that it owns a color and that its competitor can't use it.

What would you think if cotton manufacturers said rayon or nylon shirts or dresses could not be white, unless they paid a 30-percent tax? Would it be reasonable for leather manufacturers to prohibit artificial leather colored brown?

Imitation in color, in shape, in use is the essence of competition. Every new product of science to some degree imitates and supplants some existing product. Competition and change are characteristic of, and inherent in, a dynamic, progressive society.

Do any of you really believe that we should try to freeze the status quo upon our Nation by arbitrary legislation? I don't think so.

The butter people will tell you that there is great danger of fraud—that if the margarine restrictions are removed, consumers will not be able to distinguish margarine from butter. In 1886, when the antimargarine laws started, this argument carried some weight. In those days we did not have the pure food and drug laws. We do today, and it is those laws which require proper labeling. Those laws protect the consumer against impure or fraudulent products, rather than the taxes and regulations which single out margarine for punishment.

The butter people will tell you that repeal of these laws will ruin the dairy industry. But there is plenty of room in our economy for both margarine and butter. In fact, there is a serious shortage of table fats in the diets of many poor people, which the antimargarine laws accentuate by increasing its cost and by restricting its sale.

In Senator WILEY's own great dairy State of Wisconsin, butter represents a very small portion of the dairy farmer's income. In 1948, for instance, Wisconsin dairy farmers received only 1.77 percent of their income from the sale of butter. The reason for this is that butter is the least profitable outlet for milk.

There is no good argument for punitive, discriminatory legislation against a good food.

Gompers Centennial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Gompers Centennial," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOMPERS CENTENNIAL

The actual one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers will not occur until January 27, but the centennial celebration already is well under way. This interests organized workers especially, yet it by no means is limited to them. The great American Federation of Labor president was a national figure in the full sense of the phrase and even now, though he has been dead more than a quarter century, his influence still is felt throughout the Nation.

Mr. Gompers himself appreciated his place in the history of his times. Washingtonians remember him not simply as the head of the A. F. of L., but also as a publicist, a social philosopher, with ideas and opinions on everything under the sun. The little Dutch Jewish immigrant boy of 1863 grew to maturity in a world rapidly developing new issues, new conflicts, which claimed his attention and which he rarely, if ever, attempted to avoid. Throughout his career, he kept his mind and his heart open to what was going on about him. He was exceptionally sensitive to economic, social, and political developments, but he likewise was receptive to happenings in such distant fields as music and literature, drama and painting. The major enthusiasm of his life, however, was the cause of solidarity among working people. A cobbler and then a cigar maker, he realized that the individual laborer or craftsman was handicapped by his individuality. In order to bargain sucessfully at all it was necessary to bargain collectively. So Mr. Gompers applied himself to the task of discovering competent union leadership wherever it could be found, and he set a personal example for the young lieutenants he discovered. Thus the American Federation of Labor became a reflection of his conceptions, his methods, his objectives.

Perhaps the most important test of his whole life was that which emerged with America's participation in the First World War. Thousands of American working men and working women hated the Kaiser but were opposed to the United States being involved in the struggle to defeat him. Mr. Gompers at a tensely psychological moment chose the patriotic course. With all the ardor of his soul he threw himself into a campaign for national unity in the face of popular pacifism. He toured the country speaking at meetings, talking privately with local officers, arguing with stubborn critics. The effort was strenuous, but it was continued as long as there was need for it. His part in achieving victory in 1918 is one reason why the Government is bringing out a commemorative postage stamp for Mr. Gompers on his hundredth birthday anniversary.

The National Budget of Scientific Work for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted

in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, before the third National Men of Science and Industry dinner in Washington, D. C., December 2, 1949, on the subject "The National Budget of Scientific Work for 1950."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am greatly honored to be with you tonight and to have this opportunity of speaking to so distinguished a group in the field of science.

I had the privilege of meeting with you once before. Since that time I have given considerable thought to some aspects of our science programs and their relation to the public policy.

Within our lifetime science has provided the key to greater material progress than had been made within any period of hundreds of years before. Science will certainly alter the lives of mankind even more in the years ahead.

The importance of science to our national life has been dramatized for all Americans by the atom bomb and the tremendous potentialities of atomic power, but on a thousand less publicized fronts the researcher and the technician are working together in the search for truth. Each new discovery, each new germ of knowledge acquired makes it easier to push further into the deep recesses of the unknown in our search for scientific truths.

As the President said before a distinguished group last year, the knowledge that we now have is but a fraction of the knowledge that we must get, whether for peaceful purposes or national defense. He has expressed the faith that when more of the people of the world have learned the ways of thought of the scientist, we shall have better reason to expect lasting peace and a fuller life for all.

It is fitting, therefore, that we now consider the direction we are taking in utilizing the great reservoir of scientific knowledge already at our disposal and the paths we must follow to acquire the further knowledge that we must have.

Just as the work of the scientist is better understood today than ever before, so is it becoming more evident—and more important—that the pursuit and application of scientific knowledge must be a joint enterprise in which the institutions of higher learning, the private foundations, industry and government cooperate, each undertaking its proper role. We gave the world an example of such teamwork during the war—and without this teamwork, as we all know, the development of the weapons that brought us victory could not have been accomplished.

There may be differences of opinion as to how far in peacetime the Federal Government should go in directly supporting research, both basic and applied, but there is a general realization, growing out of the war, that scientific research is a vital element of public policy and must be supported and encouraged by the Government.

The responsibility of the Government in this connection is threefold. First, we must respect and guard freedom of research for all our scientists, whether they are directly employed by the Government or whether they work in the universities or industry. Second, the Government should continue to encourage private research, and where necessary to support promising research. Third, as the chief supporter of scientific research today, the Government must be prepared at all times to justify its program on the basis of soundness of content, balance of emphasis, and economy of manpower and money. This can be done only by judging the Government's efforts against something which is missing today, and which we must together supply—namely, a genuine national policy and a program for scientific research. There is a close and vital relationship between these factors which must be fully recognized if science is to serve our needs.

The safeguarding of principles of freedom of research means more than making a scientist safe from political harassment, important as that is. We all know that good men of science have come in for more than their share of such harassment since the war, and they, as well as all Americans, deserve to be protected from unwarranted attack. At the same time, we must recognize that today, more than ever before, our Nation's security depends in large measure on the security of our scientific effort.

There should be no grave incompatibility between the enforcement of necessary security measures and the safeguarding of the rights of scientists to engage in free and independent research. I do not think our policy in this regard can be better stated than it was stated, first in the Bush report, "Science, the Endless Frontier," and again in the reports which I made to the President as chairman of the President's Scientific Research Board. We said, "Scientific progress on a broad front results from the free play of intellects, working on subjects of their own choice, in the manner dictated by their curiosity for exploration of the universe. Freedom of inquiry must be preserved under any plan for government support of science."

The question of providing funds and adequate facilities for research involves more than determining how much money shall be spent. Already the Federal Government is spending at the rate of more than a billion dollars annually on science projects. The estimated expenditures for fiscal year 1950 which ends next June 30 are for $1,380,000,000, including money for the construction of facilities for scientific work. I might point out that excluding the expenditures of the Atomic Energy Commission, our expenditures for science this year, are still close to $1,000,000,000, and that excluding the science expenditures of the Military Establishment, we are spending as much for other purposes as we are spending on atomic energy.

In this connection I wish to point out a fact that all of you know but many others perhaps do not stop to realize—that medical and biological studies, to use an example, which are made by the armed services benefit civilians as well, just as many wartime discoveries, utilized at first by the military, now are adding to the comforts of life for all.

The impact of the billion dollars spent by the Federal Government on research and development projects is felt beyond the executive departments, for about 30 percent of the funds are spent off-site. In the 1950 budget off-site obligations run to a total of $425,000,000. This is money allocated both to institutions of higher education and to industry for a variety of purposes. In previous years, also, a sizable portion of the research budget was spent in non-Government laboratories. In 1948, to use a single example, when our Federal research and development budget totaled a little under $1,000,000,000, we allocated nearly $73,000,000, or about $1 out of every 12, to the institutions of higher learning. And in 1949, it is estimated, expenditures for Federal research at colleges and universities were approximately $100,000,000, and this year the amount is larger still.

Federal research funds constitute a substantial portion of the research budget in many institutions, often averaging well over 50 percent of their entire research budget. Since federally sponsored research is largely in the natural sciences, the funds allocated to the schools have had the effect of greatly increasing the research in these fields.

The impact of Federal programs has further affected the work done in the institutions of higher learning by broadening the base of research. In prewar years, when college research grants came largely from private sources, the program pattern was greatly influenced by the direction of industrial research. Many schools feel today that while Federal research funds available to them are not actually the cause of a trend toward a broader research effort, these grants have been of assistance in developing a trend that had already started.

Industry, of course, has benefited dollarwise even more than the colleges from the Federal research and development budget. This year alone between a quarter of a billion and three hundred million Federal research dollars will be spent in industrial laboratories. Today the operating burden of the development of atomic energy rests primarily on industry. In fact, the entire program, except for top policy direction, is carried on through industry and institutions of higher education.

Likewise, the development and advancement of aviation in this country have been made by an industry strongly supported and encouraged by the Government, both in war and peace.

It seems to me that the record of joint interest which these examples afford provides us with the answer to the oft-asked question of who shall promote science—government, industry, or the universities. The answer cannot be "either, or," but "all together" in the pursuit of our common objectives.

But our problem is not only who, but how much. The expenditures being made out of tax funds for research and development today are at a high level not only because scientific advances of the past generation, and particularly during the war, have given us a keener realization of the importance of science to our national survival and happiness as individuals, but because of current defense requirements.

The Bush report pointed out effectively that there must be more—and more adequate—military research in peacetime. But at the time this report was made, there was no public knowledge of our atomic-energy program, and even considerably later no one foresaw that this program would be of the magnitude we hold essential today, nor that the programs of the Office of Naval Research would remain at such a high level, nor that other military research would require the expenditures that we now consider to be necessary.

Prior to the war, most of the research done in this country was concentrated in a few large laboratories. The work in some of the larger universities and colleges was financed almost entirely from endowment gifts and foundation grants. In industry, a relatively small number of large companies employed a high percentage of all industrial research workers. While to some extent this situation remains true today, both in the schools and in industry, the increase in the government's scientific budget has brought about a great increase in research together with a mounting national expenditure.

Few would question the desirability of research expenditures of the magnitude now carried in the Federal budget. But it is a matter of concern to all of us that as our Federal budget for science increases—and it has increased each year since the war—we must get full value for the money spent.

Only 20 years ago the total private and Governmental expenditures for research were about 166 million dollars. By 1940 the amount so spent was $345,000,000, and today the Federal expenditures alone are nearly $1,400,000,000.

Prior to the war industry paid a high percentage of the cost of all research. In 1930, for instance, the Federal Government provided 14 cents of the research dollar, the

universities 12 cents, and industry 70 cents. During the war, understandably, this situation was reversed, with the Federal Government contributing 83 cents of the science research dollar.

This is the century of science. Never before in history has science so influenced human conduct. Never before have so many millions of people held science in such respect—and fear, as today. Our research budget of a billion dollars plus is itself dramatic emphasis of the vital role of scientific research in the shaping and conduct of public policy. For these reasons, we must assume that the Federal contribution to research and development will continue to be large.

The report of the President's Scientific Research Board gave estimates of the growth that will be necessary. It stated that by 1957 as a Nation—and that means not only the Federal Government, but the colleges and industry, all together—should be spending:

At least four times as much as in 1947 on basic research; at least three times as much on health and medical research, and at least twice as much as in 1947 on nonmilitary development.

These targets are high. There is a real question as to how much further the Government can go, under the existing critical budget pressures, in extending its support. There is a growing belief that the Government should not greatly step up its participation in the Nation's research effort until the total budget for research, private as well as public, can be appraised and redefined as to objectives and resources. But I believe strongly that the attainment of our goals of maximum employment and maximum productivity, based upon expanded business investment, will require a vigorous research and development program supported by private capital. New industries, new products, and new jobs must be created to maintain our prosperity. The Government's research program is heavily burdened by national defense needs, and in consequence the balance of its research funds are very largely limited to filling critical gaps in the nondefense areas. This situation is not conducive to the achievement of the balanced research program which the Nation requires for its human and economic well-being, and for the conservation and development of its natural resources. Government alone cannot do the whole job. I question whether, in the absence of an extraordinarily high peacetime national-defense program, there would exist sufficient public support for a Federal research program on a level comparable to what we now have. We must think ahead to the decisions which will confront us when more stable conditions prevail. I regard this problem as one of the really important issues of public policy facing us for the future.

Steps toward the development and integration of a national defense policy were made through the studies of the President's Scientific Research Board. The report made to the President considered the interrelation of Federal and non-Federal research and development, and contained recommendations for coordinating the Federal program for greater efficiency, and for more effective use of national scientific resources.

The report reemphasized the need for establishment of a National Science Foundation, which the President has repeatedly urged the Congress to authorize.

It is hoped that when the Congress returns in January prompt attention will be directed to this long-overdue legislation. Next year should mark the creation of this important Foundation. I firmly believe that this would constitute the most far-reaching and important step we have taken in the field of science in the postwar world.

In the foundation we should have a focal point for appraising and evaluating our national research needs, and through its operations we could expect the evolution of a national policy and the shaping of a truly national research budget which would make it possible to relate the activities of Government, industry, and higher education on a more balanced basis than has been the case up to now.

Pending the establishment of the foundation, the Federal Government is improving the administration of its own research activities through the work of the Interdepartmental Science Committee, which is composed of representatives of the Executive agencies engaged in research. This committee is concerned in an advisory capacity with a variety of common problems facing Government research organizations, and only recently has transmitted to me a report outlining a suggested course of action to improve Federal practices in the field of research contracts and grants.

The committee is also concerned with problems of budgeting for the Federal research program, dissemination of information about the Federal research program, and scientific personnel in the Federal program.

We must as a Nation take steps to increase the support of basic research. The creation of the National Science Foundation would be an important step in this direction. The Foundation would be empowered to make grants to universities and to offer scholarships and other incentives to scientific activity.

Thus, many top-flight scientists would be encouraged to remain in the schools where they could engage in research in which they are interested and continue their role as teachers. In this way, we would provide for an increasing number of scientists for the future. Under present conditions, lack of trained manpower is one of the limiting factors in research.

This gap in our science program is one that is of increasing concern to all of us, for in the final analysis, the value of any science program is determined by the caliber of the scientists who are doing the job. Since the war there has been no index, anywhere, of the special skills of scientists in this country. Nor is there any accurate information as to the extent and character of the science manpower deficit.

The National Security Resources Board, of which I am acting chairman, strongly feels that appropriate steps should be taken to formulate a national policy on scientific manpower, and it may be that this action should not wait on the establishment of the National Science Foundation, which if it existed would be the logical agency to deal with this urgent problem.

There is some reason to believe that in many important fields the national supply of fully trained scientists is insufficient to meet our needs—particularly as they apply to national security under emergency conditions. It is unquestionably true that nearly every research organization in the country today has unfilled positions—and this situation prevails in universities and in industry as well as in government.

This country, to maintain a place of leadership in science, must be constantly alert to the problems of manpower shortages, must encourage the development of new scientists—involving years of training—and must encourage the sound distribution of scientists.

The most important way in which the Federal Government can promote industrial research, in which you are primarily interested, is to make possible a continuing stream of new scientific knowledge. Basic research such as the Foundation would foster provides the means. But this requires skilled manpower, even more than dollars. It is important, also, in any expansion or redirection of the Federal research program, that Government activity be limited to fields of paramount public importance, which cannot adequately be carried on by private enterprise.

The intelligent and patriotic efforts of the men of science in industry, so well represented by this group tonight, have in large measure made possible our progress in science up to now.

Civilization owes an incalculable debt to the men who manage—and man—the large research programs. Many of them have names that are known around the world, but many more work in comparative anonymity that in nowise lessens their service to humanity.

As the President has said, it is to the scientists themselves that we owe the existence of our atomic-energy enterprise. And it is to the scientists, in industry and elsewhere, that we owe a wealth of knowledge that has made possible our war against disease, that has given us new products, new industries, more jobs—and the hope of still better things to come.

The common objective before us all—in industry, in the college, and in government—is the increase of human knowledge in order to promote the security and welfare of the Nation, and thus to help bring peace and happiness to people everywhere.

Last Year's Lynchings

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Last Year's Lynchings," published in the Washington Star of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LAST YEAR'S LYNCHINGS

The report of the Tuskegee Institute lists three lynchings in 1949. This seems to suggest a loss of ground in the fight against this racial crime, since there were but two lynchings reported in 1948 and only one in 1947. There are other factors, however, which bolster the hope that enlightened forces in the South are making progress in their determined efforts to extend to the Negro the same legal protection that is enjoyed by the white man.

For one thing, the 1949 Tuskegee report is open to some question. One of the offenses reported was unquestionably a lynching. An Irwinton, Ga., Negro was arrested on a charge of disturbing the peace. While in the custody of the arresting authorities, he was taken from jail by a mob and beaten to death. This clearly was a lynching within the commonly accepted meaning of the term.

There is room for doubt as to the classification of the two other offenses. In one case a Negro tenant farmer in Georgia was driving along a road in his wagon. Several white men in an automobile were unable to pass the wagon and, it is reported, accused the Negro of hogging the road. They dragged the farmer from his wagon and

killed him. The other killing also occurred in Georgia. A Negro farmer objected to white men fishing in his pond without first obtaining permission. Later, he was found dead with a number of bullet wounds in his body.

In both of these cases, a wanton crime was committed. But their classification as lynching is open to question. Had they occurred anywhere except in the South they would have been listed as murders, not as lynchings. These victims were not taken from jail or from the custody of police officials. There is no conclusive evidence in either case of the premeditated and organized mob action usually associated with lynchings. Had the victims been white men, they might have been beaten but probably would not have been killed. This, however, is not a certain basis for listing the crimes as lynchings rather than murders.

More important is the fact that in fourteen instances during the year attempted lynchings were frustrated. In one case the intended victim escaped by his own efforts. But in 13 others the would-be lynchers were turned back by the police officials.

This certainly is evidence of progress in the South. A few decades ago the police more often than not were apt to be indifferent to lynchings, if not active members of the lynch mob. But in 1949, in 13 out of 15 instances, they protected their prisoners from the lynchers. This is a fact that will be minimized by the politically minded advocates of a Federal antilynching law. But nevertheless it indicates that education and respect for the rights of Negroes are gaining in the Southern States, and that the vast majority of Southern white people are just as anxious as anyone else to wipe out the crime of lynching, once and for all.

Support for Margarine Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a letter written by Mr. Harold A. Young, president of the National Cotton Council, urging support for the margarine legislation now pending, published in the Progress Bulletin of Memphis, Tenn., of January 1, 1950, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MARGARINE SUPPORT URGED AS FIGHT IN FINAL ROUND

Congress is reconvening in Washington today. And that immediately brings up a mighty important issue insofar as cotton is concerned. The issue I'm talking about is the margarine tax-repeal bill.

Probably all of us need some refreshing as to just where we stand on the matter of margarine legislation. Well, here is the picture as I get it:

Right now we are closer than ever before to getting something done about the unfair and un-American laws that are strangling and restricting the sales of the product which was the second biggest outlet for our cottonseed oil in 1949.

In 1949, the House, by an overwhelming 3 to 1 vote, passed H. R. 2023 which would repeal all the Federal taxes and license fees on both yellow and white margarine. The Senate Finance Committee reported the House bill with one very minor amendment.

WILL BE FIRST

Now, Senator SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois, the Democratic majority leader in the Senate, has definitely promised that margarine legislation will be the first order of business in the new session.

In other words, we have reached the final round of the fight. And I don't have to tell anyone in the cotton industry that it is tremendously important that we win and win now.

For 63 years now we have seen margarine, which has become an increasingly great market for cottonseed and other vegetable oils, unjustly penalized by Federal laws which serve only to benefit one group of farmers at the expense of another. Frankly, I am getting pretty sick of being on the side that is being penalized. I think that in this respect, anyway, I can speak for every other cotton farmer as well as our friends who grow soy beans.

AREN'T ASKING PENALTY

We aren't asking that the dairy farmer be penalized through legislation. We don't believe in that. All we want is the privilege of selling our margarine—white and yellow—on a market where the consumer can make his choice without being swayed one way or the other by prices artificially elevated by taxes or by added labor requirements in coloring margarine.

All of us in the Cotton Belt know where our Senators stand on this issue. Most of them have gone on record as favoring margarine tax repeal. Now is the time for us to encourage them in their stand by telling them that we appreciate what they are trying to do for us and that we are backing them 100 percent.

This is our great opportunity to get a free and competitive market for our margarine. We must make the most of it.

HAROLD A. YOUNG.

Benefits Paid Minnesota War Vets Pass $105,000,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Benefits Paid Minnesota War Vets Pass $105,000,000," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of January 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BENEFITS PAID MINNESOTA WAR VETS PASS $105,000,000

Minnesota war veterans and their dependents received more than $105,000,000 in benefit payments through the Veterans' Administration in 1949.

This does not include more than ten million additional dollars spent to treat patients in veterans' hospitals and to administer the broad VA program.

Moreover, it does not include the $84,000,000 World War II bonus now being paid by the State.

In a year-end report, E. R. Benke, manager of the Fort Snelling VA center, said today that 1949 found most of Minnesota's World War II veterans back at full-time jobs.

Because of the continued return to normalcy, the VA during the year consolidated its offices and eliminated 679 employees from its work force.

The Fort Snelling center serves an estimated population of 346,000 veterans in 72 counties. Fifteen counties in western Minnesota are served by the VA office at Fargo. In all 87 counties in Minnesota there are an estimated 384,000 veterans—292,000 from World War II.

Benke said the major office changes during the year involved the abolition of branch-office functions at Fort Snelling last January and consolidation there last spring of VA offices formerly located in St. Paul and Minneapolis. The branch office was headquarters for VA divisions in five States.

Field offices throughout the State also were closed. The number of VA employees in Minnesota dropped from 2,918 as of December 31, 1948, to 2,239 as of December 31, 1949.

In the field of veterans activities, Benke's report showed that 20,898 former servicemen and women made initial application for education and training under the GI bill and public law 16 (the latter is for disabled veterans). In training at the end of the year were 43,919 veterans—29,821 in school studies, 6,451 taking on-the-job training, and 7,647 engaged in on-the-farm training.

Veterans made loans totaling $39,817,190 under the GI bill during the year. Of the total, the VA guaranteed or insured $18,816,027. Home loans were predominant with 5,503 veterans receiving $37,918,006 from the lenders; 285 veterans made business loans for $851,435, and another 256 veterans received farm loans totaling $1,047,749.

Readjustment allowances, which for most veterans expired last July, were paid to 18,904 veterans to the tune of $10,336,702.

Applications for disability compensation and pension were filed for the first time by 3,205 veterans. At the end of the year, 47,156 veterans were receiving disability payments and more than 10,100 dependents were drawing death compensation and pension payments.

Private doctors and dentists, reimbursed by the VA on a fee basis, handled nearly 84,000 out-patient medical and dental examination and treatment cases for veterans with service-connected disorders.

These included 54,000 medical treatments, 6,924 medical examinations, 14,000 dental treatments, and 8,934 dental examinations.

The VA clinic at Fort Snelling gave more than 102,000 medical and dental examinations and treatments during the year. Included were 17,000 medical treatments, 75,969 medical examinations, 2,000 dental treatments, and 7,215 dental examinations.

More than 12,000 patients were treated and discharged from VA hospitals at Fort Snelling and St. Cloud in 1949. At present there are about 2,200 patients in these hospitals. A 7-story, 350-bed addition to the Fort Snelling Hospital is to be built this year, with construction to get under way in the spring.

The Fort Snelling insurance office, serving veterans in Minnesota, Iowa, the Dakotas, and Nebraska, reports that more than 20,000 veterans in the area reinstated GI insurance during the year. This brings to about $1,750,000,000 the amount of protection afforded by the more than 264,000 policies now in force. Of the total, Minnesota veterans hold about 105,000 policies valued at an estimated $700,000,000.

The VA expended about $5,500,000 in salaries and other operating expenses to administer the $105,000,000 direct-benefit program. This does not include expenses of the five-State insurance office or the hospital program.

Senator Scott W. Lucas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article regarding the majority leader, the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LUCAS], written by Mr. Sidney Shalett, and published in the January 14, 1950, issue of Collier's magazine.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make 2⅔ pages of the RECORD, at an estimated cost of $218.68.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SENATOR ALMOST GOT AN ULCER

(By Sidney Shalett)

MAJORITY LEADER SCOTT LUCAS WORKED HIMSELF INTO A TIZZY AND WOUND UP IN THE HOSPITAL, BUT CONCLUSIONS HE REACHED THERE GAVE HIM A FRESH START

Up until January 20, 1949, the chief claim to fame of SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, Illinois, was the fact that he was a Member of the United States Senate. Some people outside of his own State had heard of him, for, during his 15 years in Congress, he had been far from a dummy; he even told off the late Franklin D. Roosevelt memorably on a couple of occasions, such as the effort (unsuccessful) to pack the Supreme Court and the effort (successful) to make Henry Wallace Vice President. But on the whole LUCAS was pretty much of a national unknown.

On the above-mentioned date, LUCAS, by unanimous choice of his party, became majority leader in the Senate of the Eighty-first Congress, which last year slugged its way through the longest and perhaps the bitterest peacetime congressional session in 27 years. From then on, SCOTT LUCAS was—and is—a national figure. Already he has graced radio and television programs with uncommon frequency; newsmen from national journals beseech his opinions on everything from politics to potato parity payments; a political columnist has likened him to Lincoln (a LUCAS hero); a society chronicler has written of "his handsome face rendered pleasantly haggard by grave responsibility," and the august New York Times, in its Sunday crossword puzzle written exclusively for intellectual giants, even has asked (No. 49, down) what President Truman's nickname is for the Senate majority leader. (Answer: "Scotty.") It now seems certain history is going to remember his name, though what history is going to say about him is still a matter for partisan debate.

One thing, however, is certain: If the final verdict on Majority Leader LUCAS' performance is favorable and he goes on, as his friends are predicting, to bigger things, he will be one of the few politicians, if not the only one, whose career was saved by a stomach ulcer. Even his best friends agree that, with the help of a GOP-Dixiecrat coalition, his own temper and some bum signals from quarterback Harry Truman, LUCAS was showing up as an ineffective if hard-fighting leader at the outset of his majority leadership. Early in the term, his ordinarily robust health temporarily deserted him and he worried himself into the hospital with the beginning of what promised to develop into a nasty ulcer.

"While I was in that hospital bed, practically starving to death and pining to be back in the Senate, on the golf course, in a duck blind, or anywhere but where I was, I did some thinking and reading," Senator LUCAS relates. "I discovered, largely from perusing Bancroft's History of the United States, that the Senate had been running along for 160 years before I got to be majority leader. I was forced to face the conclusion, though it was somewhat of a shock, that it probably would run along a bit longer without me. Call it a new philosophy or what you will, but since getting out of that hospital I haven't quarreled with any of my colleagues, my office staff, or my wife. I also think that the legislative program has moved along much better."

LUCAS' candor and his lack of stuffiness in commenting thus on his sickbed "conversion" are highly revealing of the man. He is a hard but nonhypocritical fighter, and he says what he thinks, even if it offends friends as well as foes. This frankness, while morally admirable in a man who has been a professional politician for nearly 30 of his 57 years, is not always suited to the job of leading a group of United States Senators, the most rugged individuals in the world, through the maze of disputed legislation. But more and more, particularly since he has learned occasionally to operate with scapel instead of meat ax, LUCAS has won the respect of his colleagues on the Democratic side of the aisle and even a few kind words from some Republicans.

He also has won the liking of his hard-boiled audience in the senatorial press gallery. Veteran reporters on Capitol Hill will tell you that LUCAS grew up tremendously in his job between last January and October adjournment. They admire his brutal honesty and his apparent disdain for "soft soap," and they also like the way he answers their questions with direct facts instead of oratory. "He doesn't try to sell you anything when you ask him a question," one reporter comments.

Many Republicans, including LUCAS' implacable and harsh-tongued foe, minority leader KENNETH S. WHERRY, have taken the position that the Eighty-first was the "Eighty-worst" Congress, and that its failures were the fault of the Democratic leadership—i. e., on the Senate side, SCOTT LUCAS. To counter these charges, the White House released a review of the Eighty-first's accomplishments, calling it "a remarkable record of achievement." The truth, of course, lies somewhere in between.

While the administration leadership failed spectacularly on such spotlighted issues as civil rights, Taft-Hartley repeal, a liberalized displaced persons bill, and so forth, it put through some notable victories in the foreign policy field by approving the North Atlantic Pact, extending the Marshall plan, and enacting kindred legislation. It also did some solid work in revising the reciprocal trade program, increasing storage space for grain crops, extending a modified form of rent control, setting up slum clearance and low-cost housing programs ad infinitum. As the New York Times' authoritative Arthur Krock wrote, there is no justification for trying to tag the Eighty-first Congress as a do-nothing body.

For all of this, the big, heavy-handed, stubborn majority leader from Illinois deserves much credit. This is true even though the Eighty-first was a highly mixed-up Congress and many of its praiseworthy accomplishments were the result of coalitions between Republicans and administration Democrats, just as some of its worst defeats were the result of line-ups between the GOP, Dixiecrats, and plain anti-Trumanites.

Solons find him a hard taskmaster

LUCAS is a man who, as one long-time associate remarked, "drives himself, drives those who work with him and cannot understand why the Senate of the United States should not be willing to work equally hard." Even though LUCAS lightly claims that after leaving the hospital with his appeased ulcer he hadn't "quarreled with any of my colleagues," he never ceased riding herd on intransigents on either side of the aisle; his strategy of deliberately holding the Senate in session for 9½ months, until out of sheer desire to go home it was willing to transact business, was an effective stroke of leadership.

Among other things, LUCAS unquestionably was the busiest man in the United States Senate during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. The Democratic Senators organize things differently than the Republicans. Not only does he serve as majority leader (against the GOP's WHERRY) but he also is chairman of the Democratic Policy Committee (against the GOP's TAFT), chairman of the Democratic caucus (against the GOP's MILLIKIN) and chairman of the Democratic Steering Committee (against the GOP's BUTLER). As a man who wears these four hats, in addition to representing the 8,000,000 citizens of Illinois and serving as a key member of the important Agriculture and Forestry and Finance Committees to boot, LUCAS finds himself perpetually scuttling between at least half a dozen offices and conference rooms. He also is a member of the Democratic "big four"—Vice President BARKLEY, Speaker RAYBURN, House Majority Leader MCCORMACK, and himself—which meets every Monday morning with President Truman at the White House.

The majority leader, incidentally, receives no extra compensation for his job; the only thing in the nature of material reward is a chauffeur and a shiny black limousine which are made available to him.

When he can manage it, his mornings are spent in his senatorial suite in the Senate Office Building, where he makes an effort to catch up with correspondence (his mail mounted from 10,000 pieces in March 1948 to 25,000 pieces in March 1949) and keep appointments with constituents. His walls there are covered with scores of autographed pictures, original cartoons, and framed letters. A post-1948 election thank-you note from Truman carries a handwritten postscript: "Yours was a prophetic message. I'm a long time answering it but I received 60,000. You'd better whet your knife. I'm after you in a 'penny' anti (sic) game."

Most of his time, however, is spent in the majority leader's suite in the Capitol, which conveniently adjoins the famous old Supreme Court chamber where the Senate has been meeting while its own chamber was undergoing repairs. This particular suite was the controversial retreat fixed up for himself by LUCAS' Illinois ex-colleague, the isolationist "Curly" Brooks, who was boss of the all-powerful Rules Committee before his 1948 defeat; it has such Hollywood touches as lush drapes, green sofas, and an electric icebox concealed in what appears to be a filing cabinet. LUCAS thinks it is ironic justice that he should have inherited such a fancy lay-out from his old enemy. It made a fine GHQ for Democratic strategy during the last session, but, as it also contained the washroom nearest to the Senate's emergency quarters, LUCAS, as a humanitarian gesture, was careful to keep the doors open to Senators of all political creeds.

SCOTT LUCAS, sometimes called, because of his classic Roman profile, the John Barrymore of the Senate, is an easy man to misunderstand. A farm boy in his youth, he still remains the countryman's go-slow instincts about shining up to strangers, until he knows they're not out to do him; even his later success as a big-city politician has not made him an out-and-out glad-hander. His size—he stands 6 feet 2½ inches and weighs close to 200 pounds—gives him a rather formidable appearance, and his face seems cold and brooding, particularly when he is

mediating or when the heat of debate has accentuated the naturally downward lines of his face; he seems to scowl more than smile.

Actually, however, the LUCAS scowl is a matter of facial lines rather than inner meanness, and, when he has made up his mind that someone is a fit and reliable companion, he is the best of fellows to be around. There's nothing of the Fancy Dan about him: he likes plain solid food, good bourbon, and male talk. Out in Illinois, he's said to be almost a legendary shot in the duck blinds; recently he brought down three mallards with one shot. He is highly respected as a golfer at the exclusively male Burning Tree Club in Washington. He has been a member of a Friday-night congressional poker game, of which Harry Truman is an alumnus, for some 14 years. It is typical of him that he plays hard and doesn't coddle his companions in either duck shooting, golf, or poker. On the golf course, you'll never hear him murmur sympathetically, "Nice try, old man," when a partner or opponent has muffed a shot, and his reaction to his own poor shots is to rip his weather-beaten plaid cap off his head, hurl it to the ground and stamp on it.

Golf, incidentally, is almost a fetish with LUCAS—so much so, in fact, that his good friend and golfing companion, Senator FULBRIGHT, of Arkansas, in praising LUCAS' leadership at the Senate's closing session, commented: "I have only one regret, that as his leadership in the Senate is developing, the quality of his golf game is rapidly deteriorating." LUCAS, who had shot a poor 85 the previous Sunday while worrying about the outcome of the farm bill, went out with a clear mind the morning after the Senate finally adjourned and shot a 76.

Colleagues need not be brilliant

LUCAS is a great believer in regularity and loyalty. He believes a party man should be regular, up to the limit of his conscience. He won his own start in Illinois State politics by going out and campaigning for William H. Dieterich who had beaten him in his first primary race for the Senate.

He was furious with Vice President BARKLEY last session for using his prerogative as chairman of the Senate to cast the deciding ballot (the vote had been tied) against a farm measure that LUCAS considered had been promised by the 1948 Democratic platform, and he was even angrier with President Truman for following the BARKLEY line on the same issue. As a regular he simply cannot understand how Truman, as head of the Democratic Party and an old member of the Senate club, and BARKLEY, his own predecessor as Democratic majority leader, could thus knife their floor general. In a cold speech from the Senate floor, he told the Vice President, in effect, that BARKLEY was breaking the party's pledge to the voters; his off-the-floor comments were reported to be far more explosive. Yet, again as a regular, he agreed later with BARKLEY to edit the bickering out of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Being a regular does not mean that LUCAS is a stereotyped politician. Last session he practically broke all precedent by going into a session of the Republican Policy Committee, on invitation of his good friend Senator IVES, of New York, to appeal for bipartisan support in prying loose from the Judiciary Committee the bill to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act. It was being blocked in that committee largely by the stubbornness of Chairman PAT MCCARRAN, a member of LUCAS' own party. Before entering the lion's den, LUCAS told his press secretary, Frank Kelly, that if he wasn't back in an hour you'll know where to look for the body. LUCAS still chuckles when he recalls the shocked expression on Minority Leader WHERRY's face when he walked in. LUCAS did succeed in bringing the DP measure to the floor, but it was lost in the dying days of the session because too many of its supporters, tiring of work, had drifted away from Washington. LUCAS felt this defeat keenly and is expected to press for the bill again this month.

Nor does being a regular mean, as both Truman and Roosevelt before him learned, that LUCAS is a rubber stamp for the administration. LUCAS has always been rated as a New Dealer, though considerably right-of-center in relation to the extremists of the clan. Yet, in 1937, as a Member of the House, he rose to make an 8-minute denunciation of Roosevelt's Supreme Court packing plan that LUCAS himself regards as "perhaps the greatest speech of my career." In it he declared: "It is full of destruction. * * * Unless those in power call a halt to this useless, selfish, and futile gesture I here and now predict that the evil path of this so-called progressive action may ultimately shatter the very foundations of American liberty and life."

Friends who have followed every step of LUCAS' career feel that this memorable speech probably "put him in the United States Senate but kept him out of the White House." They estimate this speech won him the support of 100,000 to 125,000 of Illinois' independent voters, but they also believe that President Roosevelt, though he used LUCAS, never quite forgave him and for this reason would not consider him as a Vice Presidential candidate.

A test of his party loyalty

In 1940, when Henry Wallace was nominated in Chicago, LUCAS arose to withdraw his own name from the Vice Presidential nominations with these stinging words: "Had this been a free and open convention, I would not have hesitated." The same year, however, F. D. R. telephoned LUCAS personally to request that he manage the Roosevelt-Wallace campaign in the 13-State belt area of the Midwest, a summons to which Party Man LUCAS could not say no. In 1944 LUCAS was a serious contender for the Vice Presidency, but apparently F. D. R.'s old grudge still rankled and the White House blessing was given to Harry Truman.

SCOTT WIKE LUCAS grew up with politics in his blood. He was born in the Lincoln country—in Cass County, Ill., only 12 miles from New Salem, where Abraham Lincoln studied law. An avid student of Lincolniana, LUCAS loves to take a visitor from the East to the restored village and reverently point out the replica of the cabin where young Lincoln studied by light from the fireplace.

LUCAS' people originally were from Virginia and Tennessee, and his great-grandfather Lucas, one of the first white settlers in Cass County, came north by ox-drawn covered wagon in 1823. LUCAS' own father was an erstwhile tenant farmer, justice of the peace, and county tax assessor who never quite earned enough to support his brood of four boys and two girls, of whom SCOTT was the youngest. His mother used to help out by setting a boarding table for itinerant peddlers and traveling salesmen. Chris Kreiling, now a leading civil engineer in Havana, Ill., still recalls the fine dinners of beef and gravy, potatoes, vegetables, and pie—"help yourself to all you want"—that Mother Lucas used to serve for 30 cents.

Though things were somewhat better by the time SCOTT was growing up, he knew the taste of poverty. Frank Shawgo, now a tavern keeper in Havana, who grew up with SCOTT after the Lucas family had moved to the little town of Bath, recalls that SCOTT—known then as "Wax," a nickname whose origin is long since forgotten—used to work in the cornfields on Grand Island in the Illinois River for 25 cents a day. At various times, SCOTT also earned money for his education by carrying newspapers, fishing the river for catfish and sheepshead, tending furnaces, playing professional baseball (for Bloomington in the Three-I League) and teaching in a one-room country schoolhouse.

The one heritage "Squire" Lucas did give SCOTT was a taste for politics. He even named the boy SCOTT WIKE, not after any member of the family but after a Congressman of the day who had boarded with the Lucases while campaigning.

While preparing for law at Illinois Wesleyan, athletics was the great thing in LUCAS' life, and he regrets none of it, not even the bad knee from his football days which still gives him trouble. Athletics, he says, gives a man a taste for a good scrap. He was a three-letter man, an all-conference player in both football and baseball, and he was aspiring for the same honor in basketball when the school authorities discovered he had played professional baseball the previous summer under the assumed name of "Weaver" and barred him from all athletics.

"I protested like hell," LUCAS recalls. "I couldn't see, and still can't see, why playing professional baseball should keep a man from playing college football or basketball. But the dean said no, so I turned in my suit though I shed tears about it."

Today, he takes great pleasure in the career of 18-year-old Scott Lucas, Jr., the only child in the Lucas family, as a football player at the Stuyvesant School at Warrenton, Va., near Washington. Whenever Stuyvesant plays, Senator LUCAS tacks one of the posters on the wall of the majority leader's office, right along with the pictures of Washington, Lincoln, and Jefferson and the bronze plaque attesting that the first meeting of the United States Supreme Court was held in the same room in 1801.

Another high light in LUCAS' formative years was his career for two seasons as a teacher at Blackjack School, which served a little community called Snicarte. "I had 56 pupils—grades, first through eighth, all in one room," he recalls. "I lived with a family 3 miles away, and I used to walk to school, often through snow and slush.

"The year before, the big kids had chased the teacher out of school. I guaranteed the supervisors that if they ran me out I'd quit and give them back their money, so I got the job at $60 a month. I fibbed a little on my age—I was supposed to be 18 and really was only 17. There were three boys older than I, including one who was 20. I made out all right because I was bigger than any of them."

After he was admitted to the bar in 1918, LUCAS picked Havana, Ill., as the site of his first law office. In the early days, Havana was a rough, tough river town," says its most distinguished citizen. "It was settled by a guy with a red handerkerchief around his neck, a keg of whisky on his back, and $10 in his pocket." For the record, Havana still is a free-and-easy town.

His first office was up a flight of stairs over a store building opposite the courthouse. To purchase a law library, he borrowed $1,000 from a bank in Chandlerville. His oldest brother, Thurman, a brilliant country lawyer, now deceased, had to sign the note. "One afternoon soon after I had gone into practice a friend came to sell me a dollar chance on a car that some organization was raffling off," the Senator relates. "I told him if the tickets were a dime instead of a dollar I might afford one. 'Take one anyway—I'll lend you the dollar,' he said, so I did. Blamed if I didn't win the car.

"I didn't have enough money to keep it in gas, so I sold it for $525, paid my friend back his dollar, and went over to Chandlerville to put $500 on my note. The banker asked me how come I was paying back so much so soon, and I told him just how I'd come into the money. 'This is the damnedest thing I've ever heard of in 40 years,' said

the banker. 'From now on, your credit's good for $5,000 on your own signature.'"

LUCAS quickly built up a reputation in the law business. He moved so fast that he attracted a certain amount of small-town envy, and some of the town's leading legal lights, looking out at him sourly as he walked across the village square, used to sneer, "There goes young Abe Lincoln." LUCAS, incidentally, still has prosperous law offices in Springfield and Chicago, in partnership with Charles A. Thomas, a Legion friend, and he also maintains his old office in Havana, largely for sentimental reasons.

In a little more than 10 years after hanging out his shingle, LUCAS had built up a nice practice; had been elected State's attorney for his country; gone into the Army as a private and come out a lieutenant, and served as State commander of the American Legion. He went on to storm national Legion politics with the aid of a jug band from Havana and, while he didn't make the grade as national commander, he did serve four terms as national judge advocate. In 1923 he was married to Edith Biggs, daughter of a well-to-do Havana businessman. Mrs. Lucas is a woman with a good sense of humor, who didn't want her husband to go into politics in the first place and who firmly believes wives of public figures should stay in the background.

In 1932, LUCAS, who professes to a schoolboy ambition to serve in the United States Senate, decided it was time to fulfill that ambition. He was defeated in the primary by the candidate being backed by the late Henry Horner, who was nominated for governor. LUCAS was a good sport about it and campaigned vigorously for both Horner and the man who had defeated him in the primary. Horner, when elected governor, rewarded LUCAS by appointing him chairman of the Illinois State Tax Commission and giving him a post on the Democratic patronage committee.

From then on, LUCAS' political star was on the rise. In 1934 he was elected to the congressional seat left vacant by the death of Speaker Rainey, of Illinois, and subsequently he was reelected once to the House and was elected twice to the Senate. In his 1938 primary Senate race, he even won against the opposition of the Kelly-Nash Democratic machine in Chicago, which had fallen out with LUCAS' political mentor, Governor Horner.

The considered verdict on SCOTT LUCAS in the national limelight today would seem to be this: In the domestic field, he is a practical politician—skilled, hard-working, and with an eye out for the interests of his constituents, though not without regard for the over-all welfare of the country. In the international field, he has risen to the stature of leader and statesman.

In this latter field, his record is clear: He is and always has been anti-isolationist, and he believes that the only way to achieve and preserve peace is for the United States to use its great influence and resources to work with other democratic powers against communism. He felt the same way about fascism and nazism, when they were active perils in the world. Persons who disagree with his beliefs can and do attack his judgment, but, from the record of what he has said and done, it would be hard to challenge his consistency, or to claim that LUCAS has straddled any issues.

In 1940, for instance, when the Roosevelt administration was trying desperately to enact its lend-lease program, LUCAS took an unequivocal stand in favor of lend-lease, although sentiment in his own State, whipped up by the archisolationist Chicago Tribune, was strongly against it. He received 100,000 letters from his constituents on lend-lease; 80,000 of them opposed it, still he voted with the administration.

Women hecklers besiege him

The battle of the isolationists against American preparedness gave LUCAS what he admits was his worst personal moment. One day Elizabeth Dilling, who was achieving notoriety through her violent attacks on Roosevelt policies, invaded LUCAS' office with a group of women. It seemed to the Senator's embattled office staff that there were at least 80 in the contingent, and that all of them were screaming. Phrases like "Blood money!" and "Don't kill our sons for England!" kept rising above the tumult. When LUCAS came out, as a still-awed witness puts it, "absolute hell broke loose." One woman flopped to the floor, grabbed his knees and howled, "Don't send us to war." LUCAS extended his hand to Mrs. Dilling, whereupon she said, "I wouldn't shake your hand—I'd rather spit in it."

He looked her in the eye, left his hand extended and said coldly, "Have a spit, lady."

There is no doubt that SCOTT LUCAS has mellowed with experience since his early, angry days as majority leader. Not for some time has anyone felt the full lash of his naturally sarcastic tongue—at least, not in public. Still, the new LUCAS has not gone flat. "You can be pushed so far—you gotta be an S. O. B. sometime," he says. He still can stick the knife and twist it into such antagonists as his No. 1 adversary, Minority Leader WHERRY, who, in a louder, more table-thumping way, is no mean knife sticker himself. The difference is that now he usually bows to WHERRY while doing it, and refers to him as "my delightful, genial, and efficacious friend."

As a means of keeping calm, LUCAS more and more has been falling back on a hobby of his that not many persons know about. He is an amateur poet, under the nom de plume of "Senator Sorghum." Once while keeping his temper in check he wrote this couplet on the back of an envelope:

"Senators who preside,
Shouldn't rhyme, shouldn't chide."

Few things make LUCAS angrier than Senators who habitually play hooky. Once last year he discovered there was not one Republican Senator on the floor. He got up and solemnly remarked that "now would be a good time to introduce a motion to abolish the Republican Party—we could get unanimous consent." Someone sent an S O S to GOP Generalissimo WHERRY and in a matter of minutes Republican Senators were panting into the Chamber.

LUCAS' own analysis of the record of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress is that, on the whole, the box score so far is good. He admits the humiliating defeats—civil rights, Taft-Hartley, and the others—of the early days, but points to the bulk of solid legislation that was enacted. What LUCAS does not point out—though many of his friends do—is the general consensus that President Truman wished an impossible job on his leaders when he sent such a staggering legislative load to the Hill for passage in one session; also, that LUCAS, if given his own way, never would have started the session by leading off with the civil-rights issue and embittering the southern Senators for the rest of the session. In fact, he so advised the President—but Truman wasn't listening. LUCAS, however, predicts:

"By the time the Eighty-first Congress completes its 1950 session, I believe we will have enacted 80 to 85 percent of the bills in President Truman's program."

Right now, LUCAS is facing what some Illinois observers regard as a serious fight for his political future. While LUCAS was tied up with his job of leading the Senate, former Representative Everett Dirksen, a Republican and a spellbinder on the hustings, announced that he was going to oppose LUCAS in the November 1950 election. Already, Dirksen has been stumping the State. LUCAS thinks he can take Dirksen's measure. In fact, he already has mapped out his strategy—the battle, if it materializes, will be waged on the issue of Dirksen versus Dirksen. In Congress, Representative Dirksen made many fervent speeches in favor of internationalism; now, perhaps with an eye toward support from Colonel McCormick's Chicago Tribune, he is declaring that his vote for the Marshall plan in 1948 was a mistake, and he seems all out for isolationism. LUCAS avers it will be a pleasure to fight a man on such an issue.

But SCOTT LUCAS, himself a formidable campaigner, does not take the threat lightly. "In this game of politics," he declares, "you've got to run scared.

"I learned that a long time ago when I made my second race for State's attorney in Mason County. Everybody said they were for me, and I was overconfident. It was raining that day and I didn't even bother to send cars to get out the votes. My opponent was not overconfident. He got out the votes, and he beat me by a handful."

Ever since then, LUCAS' friends say, he has followed a policy of running scared—whether it is in a political campaign or a battle to put over a piece of legislation. The Senator himself says that "it's always a good idea to expect the worst and come out a little better."

Samuel Gompers—His Story

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day, of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Samuel Gompers—His Story," published in the Minneapolis Labor Review of January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAMUEL GOMPERS—HIS STORY

To Samuel Gompers, as to few men, fell the opportunity at a historic time to lead an army of men with a bright torch down a broad highway.

The torch he raised is now held high by 8,000,000 workers and blazes its light around the world.

In brief, this is his story:

Samuel Gompers was born in East Side, London, January 27, 1850. He was the son of Solomon and Sarah (Rood) Gompers, both born in Holland. His parents and forebears were wage earners.

After but 4 years of schooling, it was necessary for Samuel, then 10 years old, to help bear the burdens of his family. He was apprenticed to learn the shoemakers' trade but found that distasteful and turned to the trade of his father—cigar making. When he was but 13 years of age the Gompers family moved to America.

After learning the cigarmakers' trade under his father's tutelage, the youth became a journeyman worker and joined the English-speaking cigarmakers union in New York City, old local union No. 15.

At first strongly attracted by the humanitarian work of fraternal organizations young Gompers gave his spare time to lodge work, but as he came to realize the constructive possibilities of the union, he concentrated all of his attention and ability on the promotion of the trade-union movement. He first became leader in his local union and then became prominent in labor affairs of New York City.

Rising to prominence in his international trade organization, the Cigarmakers International Union, he earned a standing and recognition that enabled him to take part in the effort to form a national federation of trade-unions in 1881. He was active in the old federation, serving 3 years as president and 2 years as a member of its legislative committee, and after the merging of the older federation with new unions under the name, American Federation of Labor, served continuously with the exception of 1895, as president.

Samuel Gompers continued to work as a cigarmaker until 37 years of age, giving all his spare time to organization work, sacrificing even the little home life that was accorded to the workers of those days. He held card No. 1 in his international union for many years. Although given numerous opportunities to hold political positions and participate in undertakings that would have made him a rich man, Samuel Gompers held fast to his ideal to make better the lives of the workers.

He became the only full-time representative of the American Federation of Labor in 1886. From then on he gave his full time to the work of developing the economic movement of wage earners for the establishing of higher standards of work and life. Under his purposeful, constructive leadership, gains were made.

It was a cardinal principle of his leadership that the economic organization could serve all the needs of the trade-union and hence he advocated the mobilization of the economic power of wage earners along nonpartisan political lines. Heading an aggressive, nonpartisan, political movement by labor in 1906, on behalf of labor he submitted a bill of grievances to responsible political representatives. This policy was followed with increasing success and substantial labor legislation enacted by Congress.

To Samuel Gompers chiefly is due the enactment into law of that fundamental economic principle: the labor of a human being is not a commodity.

By sympathy and training Samuel Gompers was a pacifist. But when this country was confronted with the possibility of war in 1916, he was among the first to pledge wholehearted support to his country for both himself and the organization he headed.

It was largely due to his influence and determination that the forces of labor were held intact despite subtle and alluring propaganda that might have caused disaster for the cause of the Allies. Labor stood behind the Government of the United States and gave its all to the cause of democracy under the leadership of Samuel Gompers. At a possible sacrifice of even life itself, he made several trips across the water during wartime to help cement the loyalty of the workers of allied countries at a critical hour.

He was appointed by President Wilson as a member of the Commission on International Labor Legislation of the Peace Conference at Versailles. At the first meeting of the commission he was unanimously elected president. The commission drafted the labor charter of the peace treaty guaranteeing to workers of all countries an equal opportunity for better conditions of life and work.

In the year after World War I, he was a dominant figure in helping to tide over a period of unemployment and restlessness which, without his help, might have become influenced by the germs of revolt prevalent the world over.

He was successful in maintaining the morale of his organization and resisting the efforts made toward the disintegration of the forces of labor during the period of readjustment. He was keenly interested in all attempts made to stabilize production and thus guarantee a higher standard of life for wage earners the world over.

The last weeks of his life witnessed a most extraordinary rounding out of plans and activity extending over years, in the thrilling international demonstrations at El Paso, Juarez and Mexico City. He helped to make possible a Mexican federation of labor and participated in the celebration of the first constitutional succession to office of a president, and that president was elected by the laborers of Mexico.

He had just been unanimously reelected president of the American Federation of Labor and of the Pan-American Federation of Labor, of which he was founder, and was engaged in most important service when the end came December 13, 1924. His last words were for the republic he loved so dearly:

"God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day."

We Are for Taft's Reelection

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD an editorial on our friend and colleague, Senator ROBERT A. TAFT, of Ohio, which appears in the current number of Collier's magazine, which I have read with interest. It is marked by a very careful and thorough analysis and a high degree of prophecy, in my judgment. I commend it to Members of the Senate and to the country at large.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WE ARE FOR TAFT'S REELECTION

Senator ROBERT A. TAFT'S campaign for reelection this year is a national issue. The leaders of organized labor who oppose him have made it so. They have promised to send men into Ohio, backed by proceeds of a country-wide fund-raising drive, to work for his defeat, which the A. F. of L. League for Political Education has called "the chief target for 1950."

It is not Collier's custom to take sides in State politics. But in these circumstances we do not hesitate to sa that we're for Senator TAFT. We think that his defeat would be costly to Congress and to the Nation. Congress needs men of his caliber if it is to function as a coequal branch of government under the two-party system. It needs men of his caliber if its legislation is not to become mere approval of the popular "mandate" of a President who got a minority of the popular vote in 1948.

Senator TAFT'S defeat would also vindicate the frustrated labor bosses' bitter propaganda attack on him as the author of a "slave labor law." The Taft-Hartley law, written by a bipartisan committee and supported by more than half the Democrats in Congress, has been in effect more than 2 years. It has enslaved no one. In those 2 years union membership has grown and better contracts have been signed with fewer days' pay lost through work stoppages. It is not a perfect law, as Mr. TAFT readily admits. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress he introduced and obtained Senate passage of 28 amendments to it, most of which were suggested by union representatives.

The persistent repetition of the slave-labor tommyrot is more insulting to union members' intelligence than it is to Mr. TAFT. Proof that many rank-and-filers realize this is found in the scores of supporting letters which they have sent the Senator, and which this writer has seen. A verbatim quote from one of them, written by a Milwaukeean, will give an idea of their general content: "I am a member of Union A. F. of L. I understand Mr. Green wants $16,000,000 to defeat you when you come up for reelection and wants a contribution from every union member for this purpose. Well, he doesn't get mine. * * * Instead you will accept my contribution for your reelection. You are a friend of labor—not its enemy."

Collier's has disagreed with Senator TAFT on several issues, among them his vote against the North Atlantic Pact and his proposal of recognition and aid for Franco Spain. We considered his legalistic quibbling over the Nuremberg trials ill-timed, to say the least. But even when we have thought him most wrong we have never doubted his motives or his honesty.

Mr. TAFT has been called a reactionary. (He has also been accused of socialism by conservative Republicans for leading the fight for a Federal housing program and Federal aid to education.) But it was the reactionary Mr. TAFT who, singlehanded, halted the administration steam roller which was pushing through Mr. Truman's bill to draft striking workers into the Armed Forces in 1946—probably the most reactionary, fascistic measure ever proposed by an American President.

These were some of the Senator's comments on the measure: "I think it offends not only the Constitution, but every basic principle for which the American Republic was established. * * * In this labor-problem situation we should give considered and unbiased consideration to the whole problem. I do not believe we should be moved by emotion, or by crisis, or by political views, or by resentment against unreasonable labor action, or unreasonable threats from labor leaders, or unreasonable demands for immediate action from thousands of persons who do not really, fundamentaly, understand the facts and difficulties involved in any labor situation."

In the past session of Congress it was a bitter opponent, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, who called the "reactionary" Mr. TAFT the "savior" of the 75-cent minimum-wage bill, according to the labor publication, Trade Union Courier.

Senator TAFT is an easy target for name callers. He won't get down in the mud and slug it out with detractors. He won't debase his intelligence to answer smear with smear. He is no glamor boy, no spellbinder, no backslapper. He will admit to doubts and confess that he may be wrong. He has little sense of public relations or of political timing. Forthrightness may prompt him to come out with a new idea at an inappropriate time, and to phrase it bluntly and awkwardly. But as a friend and admirer put it, "If he didn't make those blunders, he wouldn't be Taft."

Our search of his legislative record shows no instance where he supported a measure simply because it was a popular vote-catcher. He votes for what he thinks is right, and then only after a thorough study which few Members of this or any Congress can match.

He has risen to Republican leadership in the Senate through character and superior ability and nothing else. Efforts to dislodge him have failed because there was no one who could match him in knowledge, industry, experience, integrity, and absolute trustworthiness.

Perhaps the gentleman from Ohio can best be called an old-fashioned liberal, but he is hard to label. He is an individualist who believes in freedom for the individual,

though not at the price of unequal justice or opportunity. He is more interested in his conscience than in his popularity. He would rather be BOB TAFT than be President. And since there are too few like him, the voters of Ohio will do their country an important service by returning him to the Senate.

Turn of the Century

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Turn of the Century," published in the Minneapolis Tribune of January 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TURN OF THE CENTURY

This New Year's Day is widely celebrated as the beginning of a new half-century, the midpoint of mankind's journey through the twentieth millennium of the Christian era.

Those people are right, of course, who say it is nothing of the sort, and that the second half of the twentieth century won't begin until January 1, 1951. They have logic on their side; but they lose the argument. The world insists on celebrating the turning point of the twentieth century right now. And there is sense in that, if not logic, for its reflects the unquenchable human instinct to make a new start and to invest that new start with a special significance and hope.

So this is a Super-New Year's Day—one on which to study the entrails of the last half century in search of an omen for the next.

Where do we stand, we humans, at this turn of the century? What, in history's long view, has been the thing, in the last 50 years, which more than any other suggests the shape or the problem of the 50 years ahead?

It may well be that the first half of the twentieth century saw the end of nationalism as a sound basis for peace and world order.

If that is true, it is the most important happening of this century.

For almost four centuries the British Empire had been the stabilizing force in the world—fountainhead of liberal institutions, source and stimulator of economic development, world policeman through its navy. Like Rome and Spain before it, Britain had widened human horizons and fostered human progress; and no listing of its mistakes or tyrannies (and they were many) can outweigh the record of what it did to set men's energies and spirits free.

In this last half century, the world has outgrown the British political and economic framework. Two great world wars, a grievous economic depression, and now a "cold war" between two powers grown greater than Britain—these are symptoms of man's groping for a new basis of world order, something not only to take the place of the British system but to be the framework for a better way of life for all mankind.

That new framework of peace and order and progress cannot be imposed by any one nation. We in the Western World are determined that Soviet Russia shall not be the new Rome, the new Spain, the new Britain. The American people have no ambition to make Washington the capital of a new world imperialism. Even if there were less resistance to a Sovietized world than there is, even if there were a hot desire to set up American imperialism in the world, the chances are that neither would happen nor could be brought about.

For it is not likely that any nation ever again can or will rule the world as Rome or Spain or Britain did.

Mankind has grown up to a point where every segment of it insists increasingly on a voice in determining its own destinies and conditions of life.

That, of course, is all to the good; it is progress toward government by the consent of the governed.

But it means international anarchy until nations join together in an effective international government with the powers that any government must have to be effective.

To create an effective international government is, therefore, the foremost problem of the next half century. We shall never again know peace, or military or economic security, or an end to "cold war," until we achieve it.

The arguments over what and how will be long and hard and hot. United Nations? North Atlantic Union? World federalism? Or something else? The Tribune has expressed its views on all of these, and will again—as have and will millions of other voices. But we need have no doubt of mankind's ability to work out the best answer in such a great debate if we keep our eye on one central fact.

That fact is that we must want and work toward international government, not just because we think idealistically that it would be nice to have, but because we are convinced that it is the only answer to the problem of peace and security and progress in today's and tomorrow's world.

If we will carry that conviction, that lesson of the first half of the twentieth century, into the second half of the twentieth century, the travail of the last 50 years will not have been in vain.

Address Delivered by Mary Donlon Before New York State Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the recommendation presented by Mary Donlon, the national federation's program coordination chairman and chairman of the New York State Workmen's Compensation Board, at the meeting of the board of the New York State Federation, published in the Independent Woman of November 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GET INTO POLITICS UP TO YOUR EARS

It was my good fortune this summer to visit six European countries. There I had the opportunity of discussing social, economic, and political problems with many people, both the great and the not-so-great, including cabinet ministers, leaders of management, and officials of labor unions, Parliament members in the various countries, political leaders of different parties, teachers, clergymen, and especially with young people. This sampling of opinion offered a wide range of views.

Through their own efforts and the essential aid provided by the American reconstruction program for Europe, European countries have made real progress. What is difficult for us to realize, after this lapse of time since the cease-fire in 1945, is not so much the terrible and widespread destruction of physical facilities resulting from bombings and enemy occupation; what we really fail to grasp is the cumulative effect on the spirit of a people of doing without much that is essential to a standard of living, even of a poor sort, over a long period of years. I often wonder whether we would have been able to do as well as they have done.

Keep three important factors in mind, if you want to understand the political situation in the countries of western Europe at the present time.

First, as you would surmise, there is the fear of Russia. This is really the single unifying influence in Europe today. But it is not chiefly there, as it is here, based on ideology. Rather, fear of Russia in Europe today is essentially Europe's old distrust of Russian imperialism, now aroused and deepened by the close approach of Russia, through satellite countries, to western European boundaries. Again and again, as you talk with Russia's neighbors, you get the impression that their fear is less of communism, as such, than it is an uneasy distrust of the old Russian bear, once more erect and on the prowl.

Second of the facts that bear importantly on the political situation in Europe is the cruel burden, economic and social, of repairing physical plants and of satisfying even the most urgent consumer needs. There is something akin to battle fatigue affecting millions of persons in western Europe today. There was moral shock, as well as physical destruction, from the bombings and the enemy occupation. It is small wonder that in some of these countries the suicide rate is reaching new highs ,and that tuberculosis, venereal disease, and alcoholism are on the increase. Concerned as we are, and properly, with the physical rebuilding of western Europe, we must also be concerned, and even more deeply, with improving living conditions for the people in order to cushion social shock for those brave folks who stood and are still standing as the farthest outpost in defense of western civilization. We could ill afford to let China succumb to communism. We can even less afford to allow that to happen to western Europe.

Third, and closely related to these other two factors we need to keep in mind in reading the political news of Europe, is the trade vacuum that has followed the virtual collapse of the sterling area. This is, by far, the most urgent problem of western Europe today. I find that many Americans have very little comprehension of it, yet it is something we can do much about.

The sterling area was no myth. It was a real and powerful force, creating for tens of millions of people in many countries the trading opportunities that enabled them to prosper. World trade pivoted on the sterling area for over a hundred years, with England as the international merchant and banker making it possible for small countries to buy and sell.

Forces that we all know, but need not here recount, have deprived England of her position as world leader in international trade. The other countries of the sterling area are in desperate need of attaching themselves as quickly as possible to some other trade center. They cannot prosper by barter, although as a last resort they are now trying

to find markets through barter for their goods. They must have a firm currency in which to trade and a world market through which to buy and sell. They see no alternative, with sterling no longer firm, but to join up either with the ruble or with the dollar. The ruble seeks their trade; the dollar is curiously indifferent or, perhaps, unwilling. Only Americans, in today's world, are rich enough to afford the senseless luxury of economic isolationism.

The terms "right" and "left" have different connotations in Europe from the meanings we associate with them in the United States. There is no significant political movement in England or anywhere else in western Europe today that has the slightest resemblance to the conservative thinking of southern Democrats and some Republicans. All countries and all parties are committed to broad social-welfare programs.

The Conservative and Liberal Parties in England, as well as the Labor Party, have fully endorsed the new health and national insurance programs which have been the subject of far more controversy here than there. Actually the Conservative Party, in its party platform issued for the forthcoming election, claims for the Conservatives full credit for the provision of medical care on a national scale and for the expanded social-insurance program. In assessing election probabilities in England, don't count on differences with regard to Government-provided social welfare as affecting the result. The Labor Party will profit because they put the program into effect, while the Conservatives and Liberals blueprinted it and drafted the bills.

Monopolies and cartels were permitted to flourish in Europe under Conservative governments, and were not broken up as they were in the United States. This is important. The cartels created a distrust of capitalism among working people and are probably the real reason why in Europe the labor unions are the dominant political power pressing for socialization of industry. Socialism has not gained here the political strength it has in Europe because more than 50 years ago we broke the back of industrial monopoly. We are one up on Europe, politically, in that respect. But that tremendous advantage does not justify our confusing socialism with social welfare, as the Conservative Party did for far too long, with disastrous political results.

The recent German election cannot be credited as a great victory for the right, as some newspaper headlines would have you believe. Western Germany has become a new battleground, with the present British Government determined that private capitalism in production shall not be restored. Because they do not understand the political mechanisms of regulation as we do, the leaders of the British Government honestly fear returning to German industrialists the power that, so they believe, has twice led the world into war. Our political contribution should be to teach the techniques of regulating what needs regulation in the public interest, without destroying private enterprise. These techniques are not understood or practiced in Europe.

The Central Democrats in Germany, top party in the recent election, are an uneasy aggregation of divergent viewpoints. Probably the left wing of the Christian Democrats, rather than their right, contributed the necessary margin to the party's narrow victory in the west German election.

All over free Europe there is the confident exception that the Communists will lose much of their present political strength in the next elections. This was borne out by the German election. Of real significance in Germany, however, is the fact that the neo-Nazi parties mustered only approximately the same vote as did the Communists. When it is remembered that Germany since 1932 has known no political party save the National Socialists, it seems truly remarkable that the attempted renaissance of nazism could summon no more strength than did the Communists.

The great need of Europe today is to eliminate currency and exchange restrictions and to stimulate trade. Americans must become world-trade conscious. Unless we step into the international vacuum that has resulted from the default of Britsh leadership in international trade, the small nations that must sell their goods in order to buy their needs will either have to starve or accept the alluring trade proposals of Russia. They are too close to starvation now to make starvation seem their likely choice. It is all very well to discuss important subjects like civil rights, human needs, and political elections, but people who are hungry because they canont sell fish to buy wheat, or lumber to buy fertilizer, are bound to be more concerned with achieving the modest economic security essential to the protection of independence, freedom, and civil rights.

The challenge today is for us to accept responsibility for the elimination of trade barriers and to take leadership in the restoration of world trade, as England did a hundred years ago. Whether we like it or not, and like it we should, destiny has given us the obligations of leadership in a time of crisis. We cannot adequately fulfill these obligations by debates and discussions, covenants and conventions. Action is required, and that action must be in the market places of the world as missionaries of orderly and prosperous world trade. Unless we create opportunities for the small countries to sell what they have and buy what they have not, the trade isolationism now paralyzing the world behind national barriers will surely bring on a third world war.

This challenge, if America takes it up, can bring undreamed prosperity both to ourselves and to other countries, and at last that peace in our time we so earnestly seek. It is a challenge to political leadership, and that is where we women come in.

Women in other countries are making a larger contribution to political policy making than women are making here at home. Recently Mrs. India Edwards, chairman of the women's division of the Democratic National Committee, was quoted in the press as stating that if there were proportionately as many women in Congress as there are in the Indian Parliament, we would have 85 women in Congress. Instead, we have only nine.

Extending Mrs. Edwards' example, it should be noted that if American women were as prominent in Congress as Indian women are in their Parliament, there would be 15 women in the Senate—where there is only 1—and 70 women in the House—where there are now 8.

In New York—if we did as well proportionately as they do in India—there would be 7 women from our State in Congress instead of 1 woman; there would be 9 women in the State senate, where there is no woman now; and there would be 24 women in the State assembly, instead of 7 as now.

Women are not sufficiently represented in politics or government. If politics is the art of government—and it is—and if government is public housekeeping—and it is—then women's place, quite logically, is in politics.

If you honestly mean it when you say you're for freedom and peace, you have to get into politics up to your ears.

It's not good enough, in these troubled times, to be a good lawyer or physician, teacher, housewife; or merely to do well any career job you can name. History is pulling a fast trick, and you've got to lead a double life of career plus politics.

In your home town, in your State, for that matter in Washington, women's political power is not being used effectively. Yet here are eight important areas of policy determination that are being shaped by politics, and for the most part women are now excluded from the political councils where the decisions are being made:

1. World trade must be resumed. Neither people nor nations can live much above the subsistence level if their trade is wholly by barter.

2. A realistic and consistent foreign policy must be laid down and announced. Week-to-week hit-or-miss planning prevents other nations from adjusting themselves to reasonably predictable American attitudes.

3. Russia has to be contained within her present sphere of rule and ruin. Remember that the war started 10 years ago when Hitler spilled his legions over into still another country. Dictators can't stop. They have to be stopped.

4. Our own sound national economy is the single best assurance of world peace. It must be assured.

5. Government integrity at every level is essential, if for no other reason than to get good value for our hard-earned tax dollars.

6. Government must have, and must be known to have, both a head and a heart. The welfare of each of us concerns all of us.

7. Labor has a just claim to recognition as a partner in our free-production economy; but all the partners—capital, management, labor, and consumers—must be adult and responsible.

8. None can be assured of a good living, but all should have the chance to develop their fullest capacity for useful service without limitation because of race, creed, color, or sex.

Aren't these eight good reasons why women must insist that women shall be consulted and their voices heard and listened to in politics—in your city hall, the State capitol, and in the Halls of Congress and high administrative offices?

Today there is a ninth reason. Now it has been told; Russia, too, knows how to split an atom. Can women any longer hide their heads like ostriches to avoid looking at the facts of modern life?

There are matters that are the concern of all of us as people. If the brotherhood of man remains an unrealized ideal, with men alone shaping the policies that could achieve it, perhaps through a sisterhood of women and a share in policy making we can bring recognition that "above all nations is humanity."

Were the little Japanese women in Hiroshima and Nagasaki any less interested than we American women are in child bearing and child rearing in happy, contented homes? Do the women of the Italian villages and among the mountains of Greece, on Polish farms, and in busy cities of Czechoslovakia, care less than we do that their men and boys shall not again be marched off to kill and to be killed in some cruel war that nobody wins?

What are the women thinking today in Great Britain and in Germany, where no atomic bombs have yet fallen, but where death and destruction so recently came tearing out of the sky night after awful night?

Ours is almost the only remaining land of freedom, of opportunity. Our country is the haven of the harassed, the comforter of the afflicted, the friend of those whose serious needs threaten world peace. The challenge today is not for ourselves alone. With eyes toward Europe, Liberty looks out over New York Harbor, saying now, as of old:

"Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free."

Europe this year, seen through American eyes, hopes for a renewal of that noble invitation from us. Western Europe is eager for both the material and spiritual assistance we alone have to offer and which she so desperately needs if she is to stay free. That is why, now more than ever, the hard-headed soft-hearted businesswomen of America must get into politics.

Policy for Asia?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Policy for Asia?" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop, and published in the Washington Post of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POLICY FOR ASIA?

The period of American paralysis in Asia seems to be drawing to a close, judging by advance reports of the policy that Secretary of State Dean G. Acheson is to expound to the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Whether this is really so, is the practical test of the administration's decision to leave Formosa to its fate.

Formosa is, of course, immensely valuable, more because its surplus product can help to feed Japan, than because it has great strategic importance. By every possible test, however, whether economic or strategic or political, Formosa is infinitely less valuable than the populous, incalculably wealthy southeast Asiatic peninsula. The practical objection to the MacArthur-Louis Johnson policy for Formosa has been, simply, that it would impede and perhaps hamstring any attempt to hold southeast Asia against the Communist advance from China.

This is so, for three reasons. First, a Formosan adventure would arouse suspicions of American imperialism all over Asia. But the first principle of the new American policy in Asia must be, and is, to ally ourselves with and support the new nationalism which is the strongest Asiatic force today.

Second, a Formosan adventure would also hopelessly divide our Asiatic policy from the policies of the other western powers with Asiatic interests, and particularly from the policy of the British. Yet the second principle of our new Asiatic policy must be, and is, to secure the friendly cooperation of these former colonial powers, and particularly of the British, in the great task of putting the emerging new nations of Asia firmly on their feet.

Third, a Formosan adventure would surely alienate the leaders of the Asiatic nations, which are already independent, such as Pandit Nehru in India and President Soekarno and Premier Mohammed Hatta in Indonesia. Yet the third principle of our new Asiatic policy must be, and is, to induce Nehru and the others like him to take the lead in the effort to save Asia which we, as westerners, can only aid and back up.

Simply by stating the objections to a Formosan adventure, the main themes of the new Asiatic policy have also been stated. There are, of course, various trimmings, of greater or lesser importance. Opening up active trade between southeast Asia, with its great surplus of agricultural products, and underfed, highly industrialized Japan, is one piece of trimming of the utmost importance to this country. Other, quite obvious trimmings are ECA aid and some military aid for the new Asiatic nations. The whole adds up to the outline of an intelligent policy to halt communism's Asiatic advance.

Although it is still vitally important to know why we went wrong in China, there could be no greater error than to judge the new Asiatic policy by our old China policy. There is really only one danger from the past.

The mark of our postwar China policy was an extreme reluctance to engage the United States, in the way that we engaged ourselves in Greece, for example. Yet the new Asiatic policy will be doomed to rapid failure unless this country now engages itself very boldly, politically and strategically as well as economically.

This is so far the simplest possible reason. Burma and Indochina are the keys to southeast Asia. If Burma and Indochina go the way of China, a chain reaction will have started, which will first consume Siam, Malaya, and Indonesia, and then attack India, the Philippines, and Japan. Yet, Burma and Indochina are both in imminent peril from strong, well-armed Communist movements. Talking about trade between Japan and southeast Asia before Burma and Indochina have been made safe is like planning the garden while the house is burning down.

Since the situation is so critical, no serious effort to save Asia, coordinating as it must economic and military aid, political influence, and secret-service activity, can possibly be carried on from Washington on a committee system. Yet the Far Eastern Division of the State Department has steadfastly opposed all projects for a flexible special organization to save Asia.

Equally, saving Asia will require taking considerable political risks, and spending a good deal more money than the dribs and drabs now available. Yet the first requirement is contrary to all the present inclinations of the State Department, and the second cuts across the Truman line of holding down all foreign-policy outlays. In short, the Asiatic policy that looks so good in outline may prove to be inadequate in practice. We must be ready to put up the cash, get into the mess, and even get our hands dirty. If the Senators cannot satisfy themselves on this point, they will then be justified in reopening the Formosa issue.

Why Is Generation a Perennial Issue?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MILTON R. YOUNG
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article appearing in the January 1950 issue of the Rural Electrification magazine entitled "Why Is Generation a Perennial Issue?"

In this very timely and informative article Mr. Malcolm W. Wehrung ably presents one of the most important issues confronting the whole REA program.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY IS GENERATION A PERENNIAL ISSUE?

(By Malcolm W. Wehrung)

As the second session of the Eighty-first Congress gets under way, the towlines in the struggle of private power versus low-cost rural power are again being pulled taut and new footholds are eagerly being sought on both sides. This is as it should be. America from its earliest days permitted a path to be beaten to the door of the man inventing the better mousetrap, rendering the greater service, or selling the cheaper automobile.

Both sides have their feet firmly imbedded in deep-rooted American traditions, private power in the big-business traditions of free enterprise and profit making, and low-cost rural power in the pioneering traditions of free enterprise, mutual aid, and self-help. Low-cost rural power has developed to a large extent outside the profit-motive area and private power has developed without the elements of mutual aid and self-help.

Never before, however, have the paths of each run so nearly parallel nor created such an atmosphere of competition in the power field. In essence, there should be no conflict between private power and low-cost rural power and there is none except that which is promoted and staged by the private power interests. The low-cost-rural-power people naturally are resisting unprovoked attacks on their efforts to solve their own problems.

Perhaps nowhere in the entire field of utility operation does the Geiger counter of the private-utility proponent vibrate more actively than when directed toward generation and transmission projects of the rural electric cooperatives. It is here that the most excited overstatements are whispered (or sometimes shouted) and the most odious comparisons are made. Frequently, selected statistics are expertly manipulated to arrive at intentionally distorted conclusions.

For example, let us take a look at the lead article in the Edison Electric Institute Bulletin for November. It is a statement by Elmer L. Lindseth, president of the institute, as well as of the Cleveland Electric Illuminating Co. of Ohio. The statement is redolent with self-congratulatory pats-on-the-back for the electric utility industry generally, but the writer goes out of his way to attack what he calls extensive encroachment on the electric utility field by the Government, as though the profit-making companies for whom he speaks have preemptive rights to serve all people, even those whom these companies failed to serve for so many years prior to 1935. He classes all efforts of the people to serve themselves as encroachments by Government on private enterprise.

In one paragraph of Mr. Lindseth's statements he says: "Companies generally do not object to Federal subsidy of rural distribution lines—if this is the national policy—to service rural areas not already served. But they do object to (1) duplicating existing facilities, and (2) erecting competing plants."

NO EVIDENCE OF SUBSIDY

To answer the broad unsubstantiated intimation of the first part of this paragraph, one need merely say that nowhere either in congressional hearings or legislative enactments can it be found that Congress ever stated it to be the national policy that rural electric distribution lines were to be subsidized. The records simply do not bear out the time-worn charge of subsidization. The lines are not subsidized and no substantial block of public opinion seems to advocate that they should be.

Perhaps, if enough obstables are thrown in the paths of those striving for the principle of "area coverage" in serving the last 20 percent of the Nation's rural population, subsidies may eventually become necessary—to reach the most thinly populated areas. That is a question, however, for Congress to decide when the last miles of line on a self-liquidating basis have been built.

Incidentally, members of rural electric systems and their friends bitterly resent the implication that the lines which they have built for their own use, and are paying for in full with interest, are the result of subsidies.

NOT DUPLICATING OR COMPETITIVE

As for the remainder of the paragraph quoted above, in which Mr. Lindseth states that power companies object to duplicating existing facilities and erecting competing plants, it may be said that no unnecessary duplication of facilities has occurred in the REA program. Certainly, none are "unnecessary" from the point of view of those being served.

"Competition" is a word frequently used by private power spokesmen when a group of distribution co-ops band together to build generating and transmission facilities to serve their own needs. This is a misnomer. When an industrial user who has been buying energy from a private utility installs his own generating plant to serve his own needs he is not looked upon as a "competitor," even though the cost of operating his generating plant is materially less than the cost of energy would have been if purchased. Competition is actually present only when two or more producers of energy are vying for the same customers. When consumers, either actual or potential, decide to serve themselves they are no longer in the market as customers and therefore there can be no competition.

Power companies have no legitimate complaint when this occurs, since the loads which these cooperatives have built up are products of their own industry—not of the utilities. The utilities should be happy that the majority of cooperatives still buy their energy from them. Since 1940 well over 12,500,000,000 kilowatt-hours have been purchased from privately owned utilities at a cost of over $110,000,000. This is good business in anybody's league.

Gratitude should be the proper sentiment of the utilities since this business was not developed by any efforts on their part, but in spite of the opposition which most of them interposed. It should be remembered further that a large portion of this energy is a form of "dump" power which the utilities, at little or no added cost to their normal operations, produce from generating capacity which otherwise would be considered reserve or surplus.

In 1948 REA borrowers purchased 57 percent of their energy from the private profit-making companies and in the last 6 years the amount of this business has more than tripled. The proportion of rural electrics' wholesale power purchased from the power companies has also risen. It was only 51.4 percent in 1946.

COMPARING PEANUTS AND POTATOES

Probably nowhere does Mr. Lindseth disclose the propaganda purposes of his statement more than when he compares the noncomparable average cost of purchased energy with the average cost of generated energy by REA-financed systems. The comparison is bad and the conclusion unsound when he says the average price the companies charged cooperatives is 9.5 mills per kilowatt-hour, while the average price the REA generating stations charged the cooperatives they served is 13.6 mills—that is, 43 percent more than the companies charged. No one questions the accuracy of these 1947 statistics. Their juxtaposition, however, is like placing a 5-cent bag of peanuts next to a bushel of potatoes for comparison purposes.

No consideration, for instance, is given to the fact that most present rural electric power plants are in the high-cost fuel areas, where power supply is most critically short. The broad national figure alone is simply not representative.

REA-financed co-ops have never generated for their own use more than 5 percent of their energy, except in 1946, when it was 6 percent. Even if they generated as much energy as they purchased from the private profit-making companies the elemental answer to Mr. Lindseth's comparison is that (1) the administrative policy of REA (not by way of legislative enactment) has been to make loans for generating plants in areas generally where the wholesale costs of energy are considered unnecessarily high, (2) during the first years of operation of any generating plant while its load is developing—the average kilowatt-hour costs are relatively high (the average cost per kilowatt-hour estimated for the life of the plant is the usual and proper accounting figure to use for comparison with the cost of purchased energy), and (3) such comparison does not reflect the fact that the average cost per kilowatt-hour of purchased power is as low as it is only because of the REA generating loan program, and finally (4) such comparison does not reflect the intangible advantages of any type of distribution systems owning and controlling their own source of energy supply. One can only speculate as to the reasons why Mr. Lindseth would permit himself to be caught using such noncomparable statistics.

The first opposition to an REA generating plant loan usually takes the form of showing what appears to be reserve generating capacity in the area. This is generally done by the power company or companies using statistics which make no allowance for station usage, no allowance for repairs or breakdowns, by including name-plate kilowatt rating of obsolete and inefficient equipment and by not revealing existing unserved loads. In one instance at least where voluntary curtailment of energy usage was in effect and where no new unserved loads were being connected, the private power company serving the area reported no power shortage.

INTERCONNECTIONS HIDE SHORTAGES

If one company serving an area where a group of cooperatives propose to locate a generating plant cannot show reserve capacity even by using the ruses mentioned, it will join with as many other interconnected companies as is necessary to show the desired reserve. Some of these groups may even be subsidiaries of different holding companies. They are all blood brothers when it comes to opposing the erection of a cooperative generating plant. Immediately after the co-op plant was built, the nearest company asked for an interconnection and began buying power in huge blocks, in one case.

To visualize most clearly what happens when cooperatives are not banded together to supply their own power, take a look briefly into the New England area. A Maine cooperative now has a contract with a power company which provides for the lowest block of power at 9 mills. The contract has a fuel escalation clause. Now the power company is invoking that clause asking for an increase which would make the lowest block cost 12.5 mills, nearly a 40-percent increase. The company's data supplied to the Federal Power Commission show that only a fraction of 1 percent, namely 0.26 percent, of the company's power is generated by steam. Over 99 percent of it is hydro.

EXAMPLES OF DEALINGS CITED

An example of unfair, unbusinesslike dealing occurred just recently when a co-op attempted to renew its expired contract with a power company. The contract had a 20-mill rate and a provision that such rate shall be doubled unless the contract is renewed. The company demands a 10-year renewal or the rate shall be 40 mills. The company also refuses to relocate its substation closer to the cooperative's load center, thereby making the cooperative furnish a substation or continue to absorb line-loss of transmission at low voltage—an uneconomical practice regardless of who bears the loss.

Again, another New England cooperative has a contract with a power company which has 7 years to run. It is reported that the power company is asking for an increase in rates above those specified in the contract which would increase the cooperative's annual wholesale power bill by approximately $50,000. If the new rate is not paid, the power company threatens to go before the State public service commission to ask for a still higher rate. Another instance—several cooperatives have contracts with a company specifying voltage regulation within allowable commercial limits—10 percent. The voltage variation is now well in excess of 15 percent with some of them. Upon a request for better regulation the cooperatives were told that if they do not like the present service they should correct it themselves or go elsewhere for their energy needs.

POWER COST RATIO RISING

The importance to the cooperatives financed by REA of the Administrator having lending power for financing generating plants can be better understood when the statistics on the cost of power are compared with the cooperatives' operating ratios. In the early days of the program when power costs were much higher than today these items in the budgets were relatively small. Percentagewise they have been growing larger from year to year as loads continue to build up and operating ratios decline. The leveling off of kilowatt-hour usage in rural areas is not yet apparent in spite of the dilution of the average-use figures by continually adding newly connected member loads.

Only when area coverage has been reached will averages for consumer usage in rural areas become accurate and fully meaningful. In a few years the cost of power will be one-half of the entire operating budget. That is one important reason why rural electrics feel that they must continue to press for ever-lower power costs.

CONGRESS STUDY PROVES SAVINGS

The wisdom of Congress in giving the Administrator in the original REA Act of 1936 specific authority to make loans for financing the construction of generating plants is conclusively demonstrated by the known savings which have been achieved in power costs. In 1945 when the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce was considering H. R. 1742, the REA postwar planning bill, a comparison was made of the average rates charged by the power companies before certain REA loans for generating plants were considered in 13 States with (a) the average cost of power actually supplied by REA-financed generating plants and (b) the average rates charged by the power companies in those same States after the generating plant loans had been made.

This showed that an annual saving in power costs of $2,250,000 was effected by reason of these loans. More recent studies, using the same comparisons for the same States, show that almost $5,000,000 is now being saved annually as a result of these generating plant loans. It should be noted that this $5,000,000 annual saving is not all by any means. There are numerous instances where the mere announcement by a group of cooperatives that a study is being made to determine the feasibility of a cooperative generating plant has effected material lowering of wholesale rates in those areas.

The REA program could never have achieved such overwhelming success as it has had not Congress given the Administrator authority to make these generating loans. The right of rural electrics to generate their own power is their only protection against excessive power costs. The future of the program hinges on a continuation of this authority, and power company tacticians are probably well aware of this.

Formosa Stand Said To Put All Pacific in Jeopardy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, there appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on Wednesday, January 10, in the column entitled "The Air World" by Gill Robb Wilson, an article, the title of which is "Formosa Stand Said To Put All Pacific in Jeopardy." As I feel that this is a very important contribution to the pending debate on Formosa by one of the leading authorities in the United States on air power, I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE AIR WORLD
(By Gill Robb Wilson)
FORMOSA STAND SAID TO PUT ALL PACIFIC IN JEOPARDY

Foreign policy in the air age can never afford to be militarily unrealistic.

Prior to the rise of air power, national defense could be compromised occasionally with impunity. The past radius of military action was short and the tempo of movement slower. The time lag between mobilization and combat gave opportunity for strategic recovery of untenable situations. This is no longer the case.

The island of Formosa is an air staging ground easily maintained and supplied from the ports of the China coast. Formosa-based air power outflanks air power on Okinawa, Japan, and Luzon, which forces must be supplied from the United States mainland, approximately 6,000 miles distant. This being the case, it follows that air power based on Guam is also strategically vulnerable.

An inviolate tenet of air doctrine holds that strategic air power must be based where it is not vulnerable to medium or short-range counterattack. Communist air power on Formosa would bring the most effective weapon of the United States into a vulnerable position. With the Philippines and Japan untenable by virtue of Formosan-based air power the American position in the Pacific would be as tenuous as in the days when Bataan fell.

It is difficult to reconcile American realism as exemplified in the Greek war, the Berlin air lift, and in the rearmament of Europe through the North Atlantic Pact with the appeasement represented by the State Department stand in regard to Formosa.

Was there something in the Yalta Pact or some other give-away program which brought the American withdrawal from China and which is continuing to exert its influence in respect to Formosa? Why does American policy seek to contain the aggressor in eastern Europe and pursue a diametrically opposite position in Asia? What baleful influence has the State Department inherited which makes our foreign policy a contradictory mystery? Are we sincere in Europe and insincere in Asia or vice versa?

The viewpoint is advanced that positive American action in Formosa will throw the United States into focus as an aggressor. How can such a ridiculous proposal be advanced by presumably intelligent leaders when the whole world knows that the problem is one of stopping the global aggression of the police concept of government?

Granted that Chiang Kai-shek may be little better than any other war lord; granted that Formosans do not want Chinese overlords—either Nationalist or Communist. Is there anything wrong with the concept of a free Formosa whose integrity is guaranteed by the United States as is that of the Philippines?

Somewhere in the Pacific the United States must become militarily realistic. Is that point to be in the defense of Formosa or in the defense of Honolulu and ultimately San Francisco?

If the problem is one of war or peace, let it come now while military realism still has some chance in the Pacific. If the problem is one of preventing war, why follow one policy in Europe and another in Asia? If the problem is smoking out commitments that have been made in the past and unknown to the American people, let us also find that out.

Formosa is not only a place to stop aggression but also a place to ascertain the consistency of a foreign policy that the American people can know and trust. No less is safe or satisfactory in the air age.

A Political Program for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered on October 24, 1949, before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on A Political Program for Democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate your invitation to participate in this stimulating forum, to speak on the very important subject of the political program for our democracy. Tonight I use the term political as a descriptive term for the mechanics of decision making by government.

Professor Rogers has given us a good, succinct statement of the conditions that confront us in America as we attempt political reform. He lists federalism, localism, and seniority as formidable facts of our polity to be reckoned with. I agree. These conditions are obstacles to effective political leadership in this country.

The conduct of public affairs in these crucial days calls for positive direction and responsibility if we are to achieve the promises of the American life at home, and safeguard democracy in the world at large. What we seek, within the framework of our inherited form of government, is a series of arrangements which will at once promote better teamwork between the Congress and the President, avoid dangerous deadlocks, inculcate national rather than provincial loyalties, and give the spirit of youth a larger place in legislative halls.

Ours is a Federal system in constitutional theory, but it is increasingly becoming a national system in actual practice. While we have 48 State legislatures, we have one national economic and industrial system. The trend from State government to National Government has been fortified and accelerated by the Civil War, by the onward sweep of science and technology, by the unifying forces of transportation and communication, and by a long series of Supreme Court decisions. The same evolutionary influences are operating in our political system. There are still lags here and there, particularly in the South, but State bosses and local-party machines are slipping, as in Jersey City, Kansas City, and Virginia while national party organizations gain force and strength. The American people recognize the interdependence of our economy. They sense the necessity for broad national policy. Adequate testimony to this trend of American politics is found in the wide-scale activity of a host of educational, social, and political organizations. This is a healthy trend, and one that is helping to dissolve the traditional sectional divisions and political alignments of the American people.

One of the articles of our political faith has been our belief in the biparty system. We believe that political parties are the principal instruments of democratic government and that the party which wins a majority of the popular vote should have the responsibility and the power to govern the country.

The major party is the only political organization in American life which is in a position to claim that it can measure up to the requirements of modern public policy. It has sought and won a general control of the Government. It alone possesses the kind of political organization required to make government work. It alone may reasonably be held responsible for the general state of public policy. Of all the varieties of political organization, it alone gets a mandate from the people to govern the country. Party government is therefore as right as democracy itself. The American people have long accepted the principle of party responsibility for the conduct of our National Government. We must translate that principle into practice.

But why has the American party system not yet produced that fullness of authority which is necessary to make the Government work without recurring deadlocks and without lag, leak, and friction?

OBSTACLES TO PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

There are several explanations. The Federal structure, our inherited system of separated powers, and the piecemeal practices of American Government create formidable obstacles to effective government. Part of the explanation is to be found in the deep internal divisions within the majority party. Like the Republican Party, the Democratic Party has both conservative and liberal members who wear the same party emblem, but lack a common political philisophy.

Another contributing cause is the influence of special and sectional interests which receive a loyalty that transcends a sense of responsibility to the national interest, as in the tidelands oil controversy. The part is often valued above the whole; the district above the State; the State above the Nation.

Furthermore, legislative procedure, especially in the United States Senate, is such as to give every advantage to the tactics of obstruction by individual Members and minority blocs. The choice of committee chairmen by seniority rather than party regularity, and the unrepresentative character of the congressional committees are also part of the explanation. The fact that Senators and Representatives are responsible to State and local electorates, while the President is responsible to a national electorate, presents a basic difficulty of our system.

I have been a Member of the United States Senate for 10 months—not long enough to become indoctrinated and reconciled to the

ancient ways of that body—but long enough to have observed a fundamental obstacle to effective party government in Congress. I refer to the diffusion of party responsibility for legislative action in both houses among a variety of political mechanisms.

I had not long been a Member of the Senate before I made two discoveries: (1) that there are 28 stages in the enactment of a law and at each stage on the legislative highway a few legislators can lurk, like the pirates of Tripoli, and take toll of the passing traffic; and (2) that the power structure of Congress has been so constructed over the passing years that the control of legislative action in both Chambers is scattered and splintered so that effective party leadership is almost impossible to achieve.

Before the so-called congressional "revolution of 1910," control of the House of Representatives was in the party caucus, practically the only organ in Congress for formulating the party will. The Speaker was the only agency for carrying out the party will. The caucus selected the party's candidates for office in the Chamber and formulated and enforced the party's will with respect to legislative action. Decisions reached in caucus were binding upon the entire membership of the party. Caucus decisions of the majority party determined the action of the Congress itself. Thus, the line of party responsibility ran straight from the electorate through the majority caucus to the party leadership in Congress.

This type of party government existed in Congress during the first administration of President Wilson. The success he had during his administration, in having Congress adopt the greater part of his legislative program, has always been considered one of his great achievements. Undoubtedly he deserved credit for the masterly way in which he held together and led the Democratic Party. But the real credit for this achievement is due to the effective way in which the Democratic Party made use of its caucuses in both Houses of Congress. To an extent never equalled before or since, that administration adopted the policy of having all major legislative proposals first considered in caucus, and of binding its members to abide by the action of the caucus. As a result, differences were resolved and a majority vote was assured when they were taken up for consideration.

Contrast that situation with the conditions of today. The caucus has become a conference. Little attempt is made to unite the party membership and hold them responsible to vote for measures designed to carry out platform pledges. The powers formerly concentrated in responsible party leadership are now split up in both chambers and both parties among the committees on committees, the steering or policy committees, the floor leaders, and the party whips.

The function of leadership has been transferred from the Chair to the floor. The power of direction was broken up and diffused among a number of agencies; the appointing power was given to the committee on committees, the strategy function to the steering or policy committee, and the tactical function to the floor leader.

Moreover, the standing committees of Congress exercise large powers over legislation. They have the very important power of determining the whole agenda of the two Houses, by the rule which provides that all bills and resolutions, immediately upon their introduction, shall be referred to the appropriate standing committees for consideration and report. By this rule the House and Senate have declared that they will refrain from the consideration of any bill or resolution until it has been examined by its proper committee and has been reported back to the House or Senate with recommendations for action.

This rule gives great power to the committees because (1) it does not require them to consider or report back bills referred to them; and (2) in practice, only those bills are reported back which the committees favor. Thus, the DP bill and the District of Columbia home-rule bill were pigeonholed in committee for several months, despite party promises to pass them. In short, each committee, acting within its own jurisdiction, is almost sovereign with respect to the determination of the bills that shall come before the two Chambers for action. And their chairmen are immune to party discipline.

The standing committees also play a dominant part in controlling and directing proceedings on the floor when their bills are under consideration. This dominance is partly the result of formal rules and partly that of conventions which have acquired the force of written rules.

The long-standing custom of unlimited and irrelevant debate in the Senate is an additional heavy handicap to effective party leadership and political performance in the upper Chamber.

Thus, the dispersion of political responsibility in Congress, together with its archaic rules and customs, go far in my opinion to explain its repeated difficulties, regardless of which party is in control, in translating the will of the people into public policy. The party leadership is not to blame. Who can lead where others will not follow?

A DEMOCRATIC SOLUTION

There is a growing recognition among political leaders of the need of a more responsible and effective party system in the United States. Various proposals to this end are being advanced. In a forthcoming report a committee of the American Political Science Association crystallizes informed opinion on the means of strengthening party government. Their recommendations impress me as constructive, and worthy of wide consideraiton.

I have time here only to outline the steps which might well be taken toward the new party system. They are threefold:

First, I believe that we must try to integrate party membership and keep that membership at all levels informed through the discussions of party policy and the development of explicit party programs. Each party should be encouraged to reformulate its platform every 2 years—it might be that national conventions should be held every 2 years—and the platform should be regarded as commitments by all candidates for office and officeholders of the party. This would go far to make our congressional elections, as well as our presidential elections, more meaningful to the American people by providing them with an opportunity effectively to choose on basic issues rather than personalities. American politics should not be a beauty contest or a popularity contest. Policy and issues must be the standards for decisions. Party elections must increasingly become issue elections, otherwise more and more people may lose faith in representative government and become impatient with democratic processes. Despite platform pledges, for three decades now civil-rights bills have been repeatedly defeated in the Senate by various parliamentary strategies.

Second, our political parties must become more responsible to the American people and to their own membership. I believe we must reinvigorate party leadership at the national level by making that leadership more representative of the people. This can be accomplished only as the local and State political organizations more truly represent a broad cross-section of the electorate. This means politics becomes the business of the people, not the special privilege of the professionals. Then, too, party research and education are the political vitamins that insure strength and continuity to a political program. With an educated and informed party membership, party platforms on a national level will increasingly come to represent policy decisions made on the local level. It should be the function of the local party membership to express itself on national issues not only by choosing delegates to national conventions, but by making on a local level decisions on national issues which their representatives are to carry forward to the national convention. Party membership would come to feel that its views and decisions on policy matters have an effect on national party policy decision, and would be an alert and active and responsible membership.

Third, I believe that we must reorganize and modernize the machinery of party responsibility in Congress. This step calls for a number of subsidiary steps, none of which seems to me to be beyond the realm of practical politics, and seem worthy of further consideration and discussion.

1. We should revive and make more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy.

2. A joint congressional policy committee for both Houses of Congress should be created. It should be the function of this joint congressional policy committee to plan legislative strategy and programs, and to be held responsible for the legislative implementation of party policy.

3. The party policy committees should be allocated the function of making standing committee assignments. The party policy committees, or the membership of each committee, might well be allocated the function of selecting the standing committee chairman. Seniority is the most sacred cow in the legislative zoo, but it is not imbedded in the body of the Constitution nor the statutes. It is a custom that can be changed in party caucus.

Twentieth century America is a dynamic society facing complex problems. Our task is to evolve a political mechanism which will utilize the democratic process, place responsibility for action, and maintain an unobstructed connection between the electorate and the elected representatives in Government.

History of Laying of Cornerstone of the White House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH McKELLAR

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The present occupant of the chair asks unanimous consent of the Senate to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a history of the laying of the cornerstone of the White House on October 13, 1792, by Lodge No. 9 of Maryland, now known as Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia. This history includes a very interesting article from the Charleston (S. C.) City Gazette, as published in that newspaper on November 15, 1792.

The entire article is exceedingly interesting, and I call the attention of all Senators to it, and hope they will read it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAYING OF THE CORNERSTONE OF THE WHITE HOUSE, OCTOBER 13, 1792, BY LODGE NO. 9 OF MARYLAND, NOW KNOWN AS POTOMAC LODGE NO. 5 OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

(A report prepared for the lodge by R. Baker Harris, past master)

The Eighty-first Congress created a special Commission, at the recommendation of President Truman, to determine plans for the general renovation and partial reconstruction of the White House. Prior to turning work over to the contractor, the Commission has been making an extensive study of the historic old mansion.

Recently the Commission revealed it is believed the cornerstone has been located at the southwest corner of the original building. Using a new mine detector supplied by Army engineers, and with information that a brass plate was mounted under the cornerstone, the detector was used all around the building. The most distinct response was obtained at the southwest corner, about chest high from the present outside ground level. It was possible to obtain a cross-check on it, the location being at a corner.

Although no definite decision has yet been made, Maj. Gen. Glen H. Edgerton, executive secretary of the Commission, has stated it is entirely possible the cornerstone may be removed, examined, and replaced. Since 1950 is the National Capital's sequicentennial, such an examination of the stone and its contents, and its relaying, might well take an appropriate place in the year's ceremonies. An examination of the contents of the cornerstone would, of course, reveal additional historical information.

While the Commission feels reasonably certain the White House cornerstone has been located, because of its brass plate, by the mine detector, nevertheless the fact has yet to be confirmed by removing surrounding stonework and by actual examination of the brass plate and cornerstone.

CHARLESTON CITY GAZETTE, NOVEMBER 15, 1792

However, of equal if not greater interest, and certainly of particular importance to Potomac Lodge No. 5, is the Commission's discovery of a newspaper account of the cornerstone laying, published contemporary to the actual occasion. This account appeared in the City Gazette, a newspaper published at Charleston, S. C., in its issue of November 15, 1792.

It is believed that only one copy of this particular issue has survived, and this is located in the Charleston Library Society.

The fact that the only known contemporary newspaper account of the ceremony should have appeared in a newspaper at Charleston is not surprising. James Hoban, who designed both the Capitol and the White House [then referred to as the President's House, and later as the Executive Mansion] was a resident of Charleston at the time he submitted his designs. He was thereafter engaged as the supervising architect during construction.

The full text of the account as it appeared in the City Gazette's issue of November 15, 1792, taken from the original copy, is as follows:

[Extract of a letter from a gentleman in Philadelphia, to his friend in Charleston, dated October 20, 1792]

"On Saturday the 13th instant the first stone was laid in the southwest corner of the President's House, in the city of Washington, by the Free Masons of Georgetown and its vicinity, who assembled on the occasion. The procession was formed at the Fountain Inn, Georgetown, in the following order, viz:

"1. The Free Masons, in masonic order.

"2. The commissioners of the Federal buildings.

"3. Gentlemen of the town and neighborhood.

"4. The different artificers, et cetera.

"They proceeded in procession to the President's Square. The ceremony was performed by Brother Casenave, master of the lodge, who delivered an oration well adapted to the occasion. Under the stone was laid a plate of polished brass, with the following inscription:

" 'This first stone of the President's House was laid the 13th day of October 1792, and in the seventeenth year of the independence of the United States of America.

" 'GEORGE WASHINGTON, *President.*
" 'THOMAS JOHNSON,
" 'DOCTOR STEWART,
" 'DANIEL CARROLL,
" 'Commissioners.
" 'JAMES HOBAN, *Architect.*
" 'COLLEN WILLIAMSON,
" 'Master Mason.
" 'Vivat Republica.'

"After the ceremony was performed they returned in regular order, to Mr. Sutter's Fountain Inn, where an elegant dinner was provided, and the following toasts given in honor of the day:

"1. The 15 United States.

"2. The President of the United States.

"3. Our worthy brothers.

"4. District of Columbia: May it flourish as the center of the political and commercial interests of America.

"5. The city of Washington: May time render it worthy of the name it bears.

"7. The French Nation: A happy issue to their struggles for liberty and justice.

"8. Marquis de la Fayette.

"9. The Masonic brethren throughout the universe.

"10. The Rights of Man and the author of Common Sense.

"11. The fair daughters of America.

"12. The memory of those who have bled in the cause of liberty.

"13. General Wayne and the western army: May their efforts be crowned by a speedy and honorable peace.

"14. The Governor of the State of Maryland.

"15. The Governor of the State of Virginia.

"16. May peace, liberty, and order extend from pole to pole.

"The whole concluded with the greatest harmony and order."

THE MASONS OF GEORGETOWN

In the year 1792 there was only one regularly chartered lodge in the area now comprising the District of Columbia. This was Lodge No. 9 in Georgetown, then a separate and distinct community older than the newly established city of Washington. Lodge No. 9 had been chartered by the Grand Lodge of Maryland, meeting at Easton, Talbot County, Md., on April 21, 1789. On that date there was no President of the United States, no city of Washington, no District of Columbia, and the Congress of the United States had met for its first session, in New York, only the month before. But General George Washington was even then on his way to New York to be inaugurated first President of the United States. Lodge No. 9 had its birth in an historic month and time.

The earliest minute-books of the Georgetown lodge which have survived (now in possession of its lineal descendant, Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia) are those for the year 1795.

BROTHER CASANAVE, MASTER OF THE LODGE

It has long been known, from early Grand Lodge of Maryland records, that Peter Casanave was master of Lodge No. 9 in the year 1792. There has also survived an original document, issued by Lodge No. 9, a dispensation (for brethren to meet at Port Tobacco), dated June 25, 1792, which bears the signature P. Casanave, master.

He was a young man, probably in his middle twenties, in 1792. A copy of his will, signed Peter Casanave, dated April 14, 1856, and probated March 31, 1860, is in the archives of Potomac lodge.

In passing, it is interesting to note that the first master of Lodge No. 9, Charles Fierer, was not yet 30 when he presided over the lodge. He was a young Hessian officer, taken prisoner the night General Washington crossed the Delaware at Trenton. On parole at Dumfries, Va., he became attached to the American cause and served notably as an officer in the American forces throughout the remainder of the war. He edited the first newspaper in Georgetown, the Times, and Patowmack Packet.

MR. SUTER'S FOUNTAIN INN

John Suter was keeper of the famous inn (also known as Suter's Tavern) in Georgetown, where George Washington stayed on March 29, 1791, and the next day met Commissioners Charles L'Enfant and Andrew Elliott to sign agreements for acquiring the territory comprising the Federal District. (See A Manual on the Origin and Development of Washington, by H. Paul Caemmerer, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1939, pp. 19–20.)

From Charles Fierer's newspaper it is known meetings were sometimes held by Lodge No. 9 at Suter's Tavern, and that the brethren also met there to celebrate St. Johns' days.

Lodge No. 9 ceased to work in 1794. A number of its members had gone to the new lodge at Port Tobacco. It must be remembered that the total membership of the lodge in the seventeen nineties was never more than 15 Master Masons, so that the loss of even a few members could be a crippling handicap in those days.

John Suter was one of those who petitioned for the lodge to be reconstituted in 1795. The lodge was reconstituted as Lodge No. 19 of Maryland, and the minute-books for 1795 and 1796 show Brother Suter to have been present at nearly every meeting, holding office, and taking an active part in lodge labors.

JAMES HOBAN, ARCHITECT

James Hoban, a native of Ireland, and, like Peter Casanave, a devout Romanist and Freemason, was engaged to supervise the construction of the Capitol building and the President's house both of which he had designed.

In the year following the laying of the White House corner stone, 1793, James Hoban became first worshipful master of the first regularly chartered lodge in the new city of Washington, Lodge No. 15 of Maryland now Federal Lodge No. 1 of the District of Columbia. As of December 20, 1794, he was recorded as treasurer of the lodge, and he was closely identified with the first activities of Royal Arch Masonry in the city of Washington.

"THE CEREMONY WAS PERFORMED * * *"

Old guide books to the city of Washington had stated, without citing the source, that the White House cornerstone was laid October 13, 1792. The date is now confirmed by the Charleston newspaper account.

Kenton N. Harper in his History of the Grand Lodge and of Freemasonry in the District of Cilumbia, 1911, page 16 said:

"In the absence, however, of any evidence to the contrary, and taking into consideration the known fact that the leading men in the government and in the corps of architects and builders at that time were Master Masons, it is a reasonably fair assumption that the ceremony (laying the White House cornerstone) was Masonic, and while this is not historic it is given as an historic probability."

In 1792 there were only two lodges in the entire nearby area which might have conducted such a ceremony: Lodge No. 9 in

Georgetown, which was the nearest, or Alexandria Lodge No. 22 (now Alexandria Washington Lodge No. 22) across the river in Virginia. The Alexandria lodge minutes for that time showed no mention of the lodge participating in such a ceremony. The Lodge No. 9 minutes for 1792 were missing. The Charleston newspaper account now establishes that it was Lodge No. 9 which conducted this ceremony.

From the newspaper account it is apparent that this was not merely an informal occasion at which Masons were present. Any Mason will recognize immediately the significance of these phrases: "The first stone was laid * * * by the Free Masons of Georgetown. * * * The procession was formed. * * * The Free Masons in Masonic order * * * The ceremony was performed by brother Casaneva, master of the lodge. * * * After the ceremony was performed they returned, in regular order." The cornerstone was laid according to Masonic ceremony, in the tradition of the craft.

POTOMAC LODGE NO. 5

The foregoing is a notable new chapter to the history of Potomac Lodge, the lineal descendant of Lodge No. 9 of Maryland.

The valiant efforts of John Suter and others to continue an active lodge in Georgetown, when Lodge No. 9 was reconstituted as Lodge No. 19 in 1795, succeeded only through 1796. Early in 1797 the lodge again ceased to work. Lodge No. 19, beginning with 12 charter members, had held 22 meetings, received 7 petitions, raised 4, and lost 1 by death.

Remember again: That Georgetown in 1797 was a small community, entirely separate from the city of Washington; that the lodge's highest membership at any time was 15 members; that the loss of even several of these, or their temporary absence on business or travel, could make it impossible for the lodge to work.

Georgetown, for the next 9 years, remained in Masonic darkness. No other lodge was chartered in Georgetown during that time. No other lodge conferred degrees, assumed charge, or did any Masonic work in Georgetown.

During these intervening 9 years, the newly established capital city drew thousands of people to the area. Many settled in Georgetown, and by 1806 its population had grown phenomenally to more than 4,000 persons.

Early in 1806, Valentine Reintzel, who in 1793 had been worshipful master of Lodge No. 9, together with nine other brethren, most of whom had been members either of Lodge No. 9 or of Lodge No. 19, or both, petitioned to reestablish their lodge in Georgetown. These were not new Masons attempting to form a new lodge, but former members of the earlier Georgetown lodges who were petitioning to reestablish their lodge. The grand lodge of Maryland granted the petition on November 11, 1806, and designated the lodge as Potomac Lodge No. 43 of Maryland. This lodge has had continuous life, without interruption even during the anti-Masonic period, to the present time.

In 1811, the Grand Lodge of the District of Columbia was established. Potomac Lodge No. 43 was one of the lodges participating in the formation of the new Grand Lodge. As is customary, the lodges acquired new numbers based on the dates of the Maryland charters under which each was then working. By its Maryland charter of November 11, 1806, Potomac Lodge No. 43 became Potomac Lodge No. 5 of the District of Columbia.

Valentine Reintzel was elected the first grand master of Masons of the District of Columbia. Past masters of Potomac Lodge who have held the office of grand master are: Valentine Reintzel, 1811; Daniel Kurtz, 1819; John Mason, Jr., 1842; Thomas P. Chiffelle, 1886; Malcolm Seaton, 1902; Lemuel Towers, Jr., 1918.

THE CHARTER OF LODGE NO. 9

On the evening of April 21, 1939, Grand Master John H. Hesse, of Maryland, accompanied by officers of that grand lodge, visited Potomac Lodge No. 5 to participate in the sesquicentennial program. On this occasion, the grand master of Maryland, declaring that Potomac Lodge No. 5 had originally been chartered as Lodge No. 9 of Maryland, permanently returned to the lodge the original charter dated April 21, 1789. (See Proceedings of the Grand Lodge of Maryland, 1939, p. 21.)

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

To President Harry S. Truman, past grand master of Missouri, for his kind personal letter giving assurance that all information possible concerning the White House cornerstone would be furnished to Potomac Lodge for its archives.

To Miss Virginia Rugheimer, librarian, Charleston Library Society, Charleston, S. C., for giving permission to have a photostat reproduction made for us of the November 15, 1792, issue of the Charleston City Gazette.

To the Washington Post which, so far as we know, was the first newspaper to publish the complete story on the Commission's findings regarding the White House cornerstone, in a carefully written and authentic article by Post reporter, Chalmers M. Roberts.

At a stated communication of Potomac Lodge No. 5, November 21, 1949, on motion, ordered to be prepared and printed.

ANDREW D. PRICE, *Master.*

Attest:

RICHARD P. WADDEY, *Secretary.*

WASHINGTON GAVEL

First used by President George Washington September 18, 1793, to lay the cornerstone of the United States Capitol. Valentine Reintzel, then worshipful master of lodge No. 9, of Maryland, participated with the lodge in that historic ceremony.

The famous gavel has since been loaned by Potomac Lodge for use by each of the following Presidents of the United States: James K. Polk, in 1847; Millard Fillmore, in 1851; James Buchanan, in 1860; William McKinley, in 1899; Theodore Roosevelt, in 1902, 1906, 1907; William H. Taft, in 1913; Warren G. Harding, in 1921; Herbert Hoover, in 1929; Harry S. Truman, in 1948.

Program for Strengthening Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 11 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a letter which I recently received signed by Robert Heller, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress. I am happy to bring this letter to the attention of the Members of the Senate because of the very important contribution it makes to the whole problem of legislative reorganization. The Heller Committee made a significant contribution in its 1945 report, and I believe its present activities follow in that tradition. I am particularly interested in its report because, as Mr. Heller's letter indicates, it coincides with much of my own thinking on this subject. I plan, in fact, to introduce a joint resolution in the Senate very shortly to create a Joint Committee on the Organization of Congress.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., December 27, 1949.

MY DEAR SIR: With the opening of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress, we are writing, as we did last year, to present our observations and recommendations, for whatever they may be worth, to you who have on your shoulders the greatest legislative responsibility in the world.

The strengths and weaknesses of the internal organization and operation of our Congress were revealed with striking clarity in the session which adjourned on October 19.

Strength and improvement were seen as follows:

1. The maintenance and effective functioning of the committee structure as reorganized in 1946–47, including the marked decline in the use of special committees and subcommittees in the lower House.

2. The growing use of joint committees and joint action in the performance by Congress of its supervisory functions. Joint hearings between House and Senate committees and between committees of each House were helpful.

3. The expansion of the legislative reference and bill drafting services, the gradual transition to a professional status of committee staffs, and the increases in compensation for the legislative staffs.

4. The growing emphasis upon the congressional function of overseeing the operations of the Government, especially by the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

5. The gradual increase of registrations under the lobby law and the creation of a select House committee to modernize and improve operation of that law.

6. Adoption by the House of Representatives of the new 21-day rule to provide a procedure whereby blockades in its Rules Committee can be broken.

7. Passage by the House of all the general appropriation bills in record time by April 14.

8. Agreement in both Houses to include all general appropriation bills in one consolidated bill, beginning in 1950.

9. The submission by the Comptroller General of the report called for by section 205 of the Legislative Reorganization Act dealing with antiquated and obsolete restrictions on the expenditure of appropriated funds.

On the other hand, weakness and continued procedural defects were seen, as follows:

1. The failure of Congress to adopt a legislative budget on the ground that the procedure was unworkable.

2. The unprecedented delay in the passage by the Senate of some of the general supply bills, causing the worst log jam in congressional history and requiring the passage of six continuing appropriation resolutions to keep the Government going.

3. The continuance of a heavy work load of private claims and immigration bills, although this burden was somewhat reduced by the partial ban on the introduction of private bills imposed in 1946.

4. Certain defects in committee procedure, including the failure of the House Committee on Appropriations to hold open hearings.

5. The turn-over of one-third of the professional committee staffs in both Houses

with the change in party control at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress. Some of those released, however, were not fully qualified and some were patronage appointees of the Eightieth Congress.

6. The prolongation of the session for 11 weeks beyond the July 31 termination date set by the Reorganization Act, due largely to a 3-week filibuster in the Senate last March, large-scale time-consuming irrelevancy in Senate debate, extensive absenteeism in the upper Chamber, and deliberate slow-down of the legislative process in that body.

7. Amendment of the Senate cloture rule on March 17 which plugged some of the loopholes in the old rule, but also made it more difficult to limit debate hereafter by increasing the voting requirements, and which perpetuated the possibility of filibusters on future changes in the rules.

8. The marked increase of absenteeism in the Senate, affecting the pace of the legislative process, the fate of legislation, and public opinion of the upper Chamber.

9. The partial break-down of party government in the Senate, owing to a variety of political factors and social forces.

10. The continuation of antiquated, obsolescent, and duplicating organization and methods to administer the underlying housekeeping services of the Congress.

NEXT STEPS TOWARD STRENGTHENING CONGRESS

The first session of the Eighty-first Congress pointed up five main improvements upon which attention might well be focused. These are:

1. Creation of machinery for continuing improvement.
2. Better control of expenditures.
3. Modernized procedure in the Senate.
4. Increased party responsibility.
5. Reduction of work load.

PROVISION FOR CONTINUING IMPROVEMENT BY CREATION OF A JOINT STANDING COMMITTEE ON ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS

We recommend the establishment of a joint standing committee on the organization of Congress. The work of the La Follette-Monroney committee, and the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 which it fathered, went far to strengthen internal organization and operation. But the experience of the last 3 years, and especially of the past session, indicates that strengthening the Congress should be a continuous process and that much remains to be done to increase its efficiency. In controlling public expenditures, in performing the overseer function, in the staffing of Congress, in committee and floor procedures, in the regulation of lobbying, and in the lightening of the work load, there is much room for improvement.

In these as well as other respects, the reorganization of Congress to keep it abreast of the requirements of the time in an atomic age is a continuing problem which demands continuous attention. The executive branch of the Government is in process of reorganization after the disruptive influences of the late war. As a coordinate branch of the Government, Congress should also be organized and equipped to perform its vital functions effectively.

The joint committee should not be barred, we believe, from studying and making recommendations with regard to the rules and parliamentary procedures of either House. Such a prohibition was imposed upon the La Follette-Monroney committee, which was thus not at liberty to suggest any changes in floor procedure.

The appalling delays of the past session and the unprecedented log jam of appropriation bills have convinced us that the time has come for a reconsideration of the standing rules of the Senate, which have not been revised since 1884.

Preoccupied with a thousand tasks, Congress is not likely to make much headway in improving its internal organization and operation unless the continuing duty of making studies and reporting appropriate legislation is definitely assigned to one of its own committees. Everybody's business is nobody's business. We strongly recommend, therefore, that a joint committee with legislative authority be set up for this purpose early in the Eighty-second Congress.

Congress has within its own membership the wisdom and capacity, and should provide the organizational means, for continuously strengthening itself to meet its overwhelming present-day responsibilities.

BETTER CONTROL OF EXPENDITURES

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 provided, in section 138, that a Joint Budget Committee, or subcommittee thereof, should report to Congress by February 15 each year a legislative budget for the ensuing fiscal year, including estimated over-all Federal receipts and expenditures for such year. The act also provided that the report should be accompanied by a concurrent resolution adopting such budget and fixing the maximum amount to be appropriated for expenditure in such year.

The first attempt to apply the legislative budget provisions of the act failed in 1947. Although the Joint Budget Committee brought in its budget resolution, which was adopted by the House, and by the Senate with amendments, it became deadlocked in conference and died there. The conferees were unable to agree upon the division of an expected surplus between tax reduction and debt retirement.

In 1948 the Joint Budget Committee submitted its report on February 9, and the concurrent resolution passed both Houses. Thus, Congress complied with the law on its second application, but it was merely a formal gesture, for total appropriations that year exceeded the budget ceiling by more than $6,000,000,000.

This year—1949—both Houses agreed to postpone the date for reporting the legislative budget from February 15 to May 1. But the May 1 deadline came and went without further action.

While congressional fiscal policy leaders regard the legislative budget idea as laudable, in practice they say it has proved unworkable because: (1) the time allowed for preparation of the legislative budget—5 weeks—is too short; (2) the Joint Budget Committee is not adequately staffed to do the job; (3) unpredictable expenditure demands in the form of supplementary and deficiency bills render it impossible to keep total appropriations below the ceiling agreed upon early in the session; and (4) the piecemeal nature of the appropriation process. Thus, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, 17 separate appropriation bills were passed and became law.

The failure to give the legislative budget a reasonable trial is most unfortunate. It can be made to work in either of two ways:

1. Establish a Joint Budget Committee, reduced in size to about 20 members, to meet early in the session; examine the Treasury's revenue estimates and the President's expenditure estimates; and upon the basis of such a comparative view of over-all fiscal prospects, without undertaking a detailed scrutiny of individual items, to report to Congress by February 15 a concurrent resolution recommending such an increase or decrease in total appropriations or revenues for the next fiscal year as will produce either (1) a balanced budget of a Treasury surplus or (2) require an increase in the public debt, as the joint committee's total over-all view of the Federal fiscal picture seems to justify.

Congress would thus have before it a coordinated view of estimated income and outgo for the coming fiscal year, together with the recommendations of its Joint Budget Committee. A high-level debate would then ensue in both Houses on the general fiscal policy of the Government, and Congress would decide early in the session the basic question: (1) Whether to balance the budget by reducing expenditures or raising revenues, or to have a surplus for debt reduction, or (2) whether to incur further indebtedness.

Such action would be subject to a roll call vote in both Houses. This general decision would thereafter guide the revenue and spendings committees in their detailed deliberations, operating under predetermined ceilings on expenditures and revenues.

Under this conception of the legislative budget, the difficulties of the past 3 years would be obviated. It contemplates arriving at broad decisions, expressed in aggregate figures, rather than framing a detailed itemized budget comparable to the Executive budget. So conceived, the time allowed would be ample, if a proper staff of experts had given careful study to all details; an amount could be reserved for deficiencies based upon past experience; and the consolidated bill procedure would facilitate compliance with the general fiscal prescription.

The Appropriations Committee would retain control of the distribution of the grants as between and within the several supply bills. But they would have to keep the grand total of proposed expenditures, combined in one bill, within the budget ceiling set by Congress in the legislative budget.

2. Provide for a consolidated general appropriation bill and for its submission, on or about April 15, by the House Committee on Appropriations to the Joint Budget Committee which would review it in the light of the latest revenue estimates. On or about May 1 the Joint Budget Committee would report the consolidated appropriation bill to the Congress accompanied by a concurrent resolution recommending such increases or decreases in total appropriations or revenues for the next fiscal year, and/or such an increase or decrease in the public debt, as it thought wise.

Congress would then have before it the recommendations of the Appropriations and Budget Committees. After a major debate on over-all fiscal policy, the Congress would decide whether or not to accept the consolidated appropriation bill, as introduced, or to recommit it for appropriate pruning or enlargement.

If the task of preparing the legislative budget were assigned to the majority policy committee of the two Houses, acting jointly, and if these policy committees were composed of the chairmen of the standing committees, as recommended in Strengthening the Congress—the Heller report of December 1944, Congress would then have gone all the way in establishing a center of responsibility for the determination of legislative policy in all fields, fiscal and otherwise. The majority party leadership would thus be formally responsible to the people for the formulation and adoption of the legislative budget. In this case, a joint budget committee would not be necessary. This plan would presuppose the selection of standing committee chairmen on some basis other than seniority.

In addition to the enforcement of the legislative budget, we also recommend that Congress strengthen its control of fiscal policy by:

1. Expanding the staffs of its Committees on Appropriations by the appointment of expert accountants, statisticians, et cetera, on a full-time basis. Though highly competent, the existing staffs of these committees are too small to make a really intensive scrutiny of the departmental estimates. The staff of the House Appropriations Committee numbers only 12. This is a work load of more than 3,500,000,000 per staff member.

What was gained in time by the speedy reporting and passage of the supply bills in the lower House during the past session was lost in the lack of thorough review of the requests for funds. Economy can be gained

only by extensive knowledge of every request for funds and the actual need for them.

2. Amending its rules to provide that a point of order can be made against the omnibus appropriation bill if the Joint Budget Committee has not yet reported its concurrent resolution recommending a ceiling on expenditures.

3. Careful inspection of the reports of unnecessary expenditures of Government agencies and corporations which the Comptroller General submits from time to time to the Committees on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

4. Requiring the House Committee on Appropriations to comply with section 133 (f) of the Legislative Reorganization Act, which provides that "all hearings conducted by standing committees or their subcommittees shall be open to the public."

MODERNIZED PROCEDURE IN THE SENATE

The past session dramatized in unmistakable fashion certain long-standing defects in the legislative methods of the Senate. Senator ESTES KEFAUVER described these procedural defects in a cogent article What's To Be Done About Congress? which appeared in the New York Times Magazine on September 11. We refer to the continued tolerance by the Senate of unlimited and irrelevant debate, and the marked decline in the attendance of Senators in the Chamber. These practices, as the RECORD shows, exasperate the Members themselves.

As regards the limitation of Senate debate, we agree with Senator MYERS that the change in the cloture rule adopted last March, after a bitter 3-week filibuster, was a retrogressive step.

Certainly the old 1917 cloture rule had proved ineffectual in practice, having been successfully applied only four times in 32 years. The new rule makes it possible to stop a filibuster on the approval of the Senate Journal and on motions to take up bills. But by requiring the approval of 64 Senators to close debate, compared with two-thirds of those present under the old rule (which might be as few as 33), the new procedure so stiffens the voting requirements that we anticipate that it will be harder hereafter—rather than easier—to limit debate when it is designed not to instruct or persuade, but to prevent action.

Under these circumstances, we urge the Senate to reconsider its decision of last March and to liberalize its rules to enable a majority of its Members, or of those present, to limit debate on any motion, measure, or other pending matter after there has been an adequate opportunity to debate it fully.

The protracted delays of the past session were also due, in large part, to irrelevancy in debate, which we feel is a luxury that a busy Senate can no longer afford. We believe that there is growing sentiment in the Senate in favor of amending its rules to require debate to be germane to the pending business. The House of Representatives has had a rule of relevancy since 1789. We urge the Senate to adopt such a rule at its next session.

In regard to absenteeism, Vice President BARKLEY has said that it is growing worse each year. Hardly a day passes when the Senate is in session that several Senators do not ask for and obtain leaves of absence for periods of time ranging from a few hours to several weeks. More than 250 leaves of absence were granted Senators during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Such large-scale absenteeism is bound to affect the fate of legislation and to slow down the legislative process. We urge the Senate to be less lenient in permitting absences, to consider seriously Senator TAFT'S suggestion for staggering Senate sessions and committee meetings on alternate days, and to enforce the law which provides that a Member's pay shall be docked every day he is absent without leave except on account of illness.

Underlying the procedural defects which handicap the Senate in the efficient performance of its constitutional functions is a code of rules which has not been revised since 1884. There has been no general revision of the 1884 rules and only two important modifications have been made: First in 1917 when the cloture rule was adopted, and second in 1949 when this rule was retrogressively amended.

These rules may have been adequate for the parliamentary needs of the Senate in the leisurely days of the nineteenth century. But the need of a new, up-to-date codification to bring order and clarity into the patchwork of 65 years has long been evident and often expressed by twentieth-century Senators.

INCREASED PARTY RESPONSIBILITY

In my 1945 report, Strengthening the Congress, I said that "the attainment of a high degree of party responsibility and accountability * * * will aid strongly in a renewed effort to accomplish in fact as well as in form a government of the people, by the people, and for the people."

In the same report I went on to say that "there should be a focal point within Congress where the people could fix responsibility for Congress' action and inactions. * * * Expansion of party accountability is the most practical method of bringing responsibility to a focus."

I recommended in my report that "each House should establish a majority policy committee, composed of the chairman of each major standing committee and chairmaned by the majority leader, and a minority policy committee composed of ranking minority members."

This recommendation was endorsed in principle by the La Follette-Monroney committee in 1946, and majority and minority policy committees, partially constituted (the majority policy committee did not and does not include the chairmen of all standing committees), were created in the Senate in 1947. The House of Representatives did not follow suit. Experience with these senatorial policy committees in the Eightieth Congress was reasonably successful.

The partial break-down of party government, which occurred in the Senate during the last session, was primarily due not to procedural defects but to deep cleavages within the majority party on certain fundamental issues. So long as this condition exists, it will be difficult to achieve effective party government in Congress. But some progress in this desirable direction can be made, we believe, by further strengthening the machinery for it. Similar recommendations were made by Senator HUMPHREY, of Minnesota, in an address before the New York Herald Tribune Forum on October 24. We suggest the following steps:

1. Revival and more extensive use of the caucus as an instrument for the formation and promotion of party policy. Both parties have used this device effectively in both Houses in times past. It is the only known means by which the parties may formulate their legislative policies and by which the majority party can bind its members and execute its decisions.

Objection may be made that, if recalcitrant party members and chairmen are disciplined for not following the party line on a particular important issue, they cannot be relied upon to support the party program in other respects. The answer to this is:

(a) Their support is probably lost anyway on the fundamental matters, and

(b) Chairmen who cannot meet the test of party regularity should be deprived of their chairmanships.

2. Election of party policy committees every 2 years by party caucus without regard to seniority and collaboration between the majority policy committees in both Chambers in planning legislative strategy and program and implementing party policy.

3. Allocation of the function of making standing committee assignments and of selecting committee chairmen to these party policy committees, the chairmen to be chosen not on seniority but upon the basis of ability and willingness to cooperate in carrying out the party program as an arm of the majority administration.

4. Reconsideration of the committee assignments at certain intervals, say every 2 years, to allow the shifting of uncooperative members.

REDUCTION OF WORK LOAD

We call attention again to the need of reducing the work load on our national legislature. In the Heller report 5 years ago, I pointed out that "the congressional work load should be reduced or reallocated. * * * In large part, the burdensomeness of the congressional work load can be alleviated by Congress itself. * * * Unless some action is taken by Congress," I said, "it will remain overburdened and hence unnecessarily handicapped in its more important functions. * * * Members of Congress should not spend one working minute on anything that somebody else can do just as well."

To this end, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 imposed a partial ban upon the introduction of four categories of private bills. As a result, private bills introduced fell from 32 to 21 percent of the total from the Seventy-ninth to the Eightieth Congresses, and private bills passed dropped from 55 to 34 percent of the total in the same period.

So many loopholes were left in the ban on private bills, however, that Congress is still bedeviled by floods of private claims, immigration, and deportation bills which it cannot possibly handle on their merits. Forty-four percent of all the bills passed by the first session of the Eighty-first Congress were private bills.

The Reorganization Act also proposed home rule for the District of Columbia. But Congress still sits once every 2 weeks as the city council of Washington, a burden it ought not to bear.

With the present pressure upon Congress to decide momentous international issues and to act as a board of directors for our vast Federal machine, we believe that it should divest itself of its petty private and local business. We urge, therefore, that Congress complete the evolution so well begun in 1946 and eliminate all private and local legislation from its congested calendars.

We respectfully urge the second session of the Eighty-first Congress to consider the above recommendations seriously and to act upon them promptly. By creating a joint committee to study further improvement in its internal organization, by strengthening its power over the purse, by modernizing Senate procedure, by implementing party responsibility, and by reducing its work load, our National Legislature will go far to improve its efficiency and to justify popular confidence in representative government.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER, *Chairman.*

Address by Paul G. Hoffman Before Association of American Colleges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD a very able and illuminating address delivered by Paul G. Hoffman, Economic Cooperation Administrator, before the annual meeting of the Association of American Colleges, in Cincinnati, Ohio, on January 10, 1950. I commend the article to every Senator who is interested in the Marshall plan.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I feel sure that I have at least one thing in common with most college presidents. To me, and I think to you, a billion dollars looks like a lot of money. In my opinion, that is the way a billion dollars ought to look. It is a lot of money. It is so much money that some people are inclined to doubt whether anything which costs that much can possibly be worth it.

As you can imagine, I meet up with that kind of doubt about the Economic Cooperation Administration. Through the ECA, the United States is already committed for the expenditure of not one but ten billion dollars. To finish the job may cost us five billion more. It is no wonder that thoughtful taxpaying Americans want to know whether, at such a cost, the job is worth finishing. That's the question I want to try to answer tonight. I want to answer it first of all, because it is our money—yours and mine—that is being spent. I want to answer it also because of my convinction, a conviction that is rooted in the facts about the world we live in, that it is our future and nothing less than that that is involved in spending it.

Everyone of us has a vital stake in knowing just what the Economic Cooperation Administration is, just what it is up against, and exactly what in America's behalf it is achieving. We have a dollars-and-cents stake in knowing that. And we also have a stake which cannot be reckoned in dollars, even in billions of dollars.

The basis for the answers to those questions can be found in the fact that the ECA today is not only what it started out to be, it is much more than that. It is true that through ECA America's dollars are being used for foreign aid; but it is not true—in fact, it is dangerously untrue—to describe ECA any longer merely as foreign aid or to regard it any longer as merely a foreign-aid program, The truth is that ECA has become a first line of defense for western civilization. It is a first line of defense not only for America's freedoms, for America's free institutions, but for freedoms and free institutions everywhere. It is a first line of defense against those who ceaselessly aim and plot and threaten to destroy democracy. To regard ECA as any less than that is to reveal a perilous lack of knowledge about the menacing facts of our world. It is to reveal a perilous lack of understanding of what is required of us if we are to defend our freedom so that children of free men can live in that world in peace.

Now, it is neither by chance nor by design that ECA has become a first line of democracy's defense. It has become that under the pressure of dire events. We did not bring those events to pass, but America can no more escape their consequences than America could escape the consequences of Pearl Harbor.

The first broad principles which led to ECA were laid down by General Marshall, then Secretary of State, in his historic speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. In that speech General Marshall called upon the nations of Europe to join in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economic health as the only means whereby political stability could be restored, progress resumed, and freedom once more set firmly on its feet. For our part in that undertaking General Marshall declared that the Government of the United States stood ready to "do whatever it is able to do to assist." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer. It was an offer made in good faith. It was backed by good will. Its sole objective was a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be more secure. And when that offer was made we believe—or at least we hoped—that that was an objective which every government shared and that that was a task in which every government would be not merely willing but eager to join.

The nations of Europe quickly accepted our challenge. In Paris, hardly a week after General Marshall's speech, the representatives of most European nations—east and west—met to accept our offer and begin to turn that challenge into practical fact. That meeting was attended by the representative of the Soviet Union in the person of Mr. Molotov, its Foreign Minister. It looked for the moment as though, on this technical and desperately urgent level of economic recovery, something close to joint cooperative action for the common good was about to be achieved. For 3 days Molotov attended that Paris meeting, and for those 3 days the hopes of freedom-loving, peace-seeking nations ran high. Then on the third day Molotov, with his entourage of satellites in tow, walked out of the meeting and enplaned for Moscow.

That departure, as we now know, was not merely another uncouth Communist gesture. We know now, as Walter Lippmann so trenchantly said, that it was a declaration of a "cold war." It was a declaration of war by world communism against recovery in the free world. And the issues brought into conflict by that declaration were no less momentous for us because the tactics employed were those of a cold war rather than a hot war.

Make no mistake about it. When the leaders of the Soviet Union and of world communism declared war on recovery in western Europe they knew coldly and precisely what they were doing. Their aim to make the whole world Communist is no secret aim; it is written down for anyone to read; it has never been denied; it is continually being reaffirmed. And these men, being realists, know the conditions which are essential to that Communist success. They know that free and prosperous peoples do not choose voluntarily to pass under the Communist yoke; no free and prosperous people ever have. The conditions essential to Communist conquest are hunger, and misery, and hopelessness. The more hunger and misery and hopelessness, the more likelihood of Communist success. Mr. Molotov, when he enplaned for Moscow, and all of Mr. Molotov's colleagues, know perfectly well that if the Marshall plan were to succeed then the Communist program of world conquest would be placed in great jeopardy. At the time of that Paris conference in mid-1947 Mr. Molotov had good reason to believe that recovery could be halted.

Europe's productive machine, shattered in the war, was no more than patched up and pieced together. Industrial production was lagging, and owing partly to bad weather, a crop failure was in prospect. Too many people were hungry and there was far too much unrest and despair. Throughout much of western Europe, a powerful, highly trained, highly disciplined Communist Party was already mobilized and prepared at a signal from Moscow to use every weapon in the Communist arsenal to intensify Europe's hunger and unrest and despair in order that those evils could be turned to more evil account.

On his return to Moscow, Mr. Molotov gave the signal and the cold war was on. Ever since and unceasingly the Communists have used sabotage. They have used riots. They have used Moscow-directed strikes. They have flooded Europe with vicious, lying, poisonous propaganda. And back of all this they have spread terror with the dark threat of a march by the Red Army.

That is the world in which the Economic Cooperation Administration was called on to operate. That is the breach in which America was called to stand. That is what the ECA has been up against. That is the cold war in which the ECA has been a first line of defense. Now we need to know in what manner and with what success that defense has been conducted and that line held.

The weapons we have used in the cold war have been very different from the weapons of the Communists. As vastly different as our faith and our objectives are different from theirs.

Our faith is in man as an individual. Our objective is that kind of society in which men as individuals can live in decency and dignity, a society in which free inquiry and free institutions, such as our colleges and universities can flourish. Only weapons suitable to such objectives could be used by ECA.

We knew, of course, that only the people of Europe could save Europe. We could help, but our role was that of helping them to help themselves. We have fought hunger with food; we have helped increase production in both plants and on farms by providing materials and tools; we have fought against lying propaganda with the truth and nothing but the truth. Such have been the weapons we have used to restore confidence, to revive hope, and to help the people of Europe lift themselves by their own efforts and their growing strength beyond the reach of either the lure or the threats of communism.

And with what success has this unique campaign met? Perhaps my best answer is a quote from Anne O'Hare McCormick:

"Anyone who compares the picture today with that of 1947 can hardly believe that such progress could be made in 2 years. A miracle of recovery has been performed. To look back and see where Europe was when the war ended and where it would be now without American support, is to understand what the European recovery program has done for its beneficiaries—and for the United States."

To Mrs. McCormick's appraisal, may I add my own? Due to—and I repeat myself deliberately—the very great efforts of the Europeans themselves, the Communists are losing their battle to perpetuate hunger and misery and hopelessness in country after country, Communist-engineered riots have flopped; Communist-engineered strikes have miserably failed; and Communist propaganda and hate and lying have begun to backfire. Europe is recovering. Today, on an average, agricultural and industrial production is again up to the level of 1938. In fact, during 1949, levels of European industrial production reached an all-time peak. Today there are jobs and the people of these countries are working at them. There are tools of production and the people are using them productively. There are more things to buy and more of the means to buy them with. And as a result, the most powerful forces at work today are courage and self-confidence and hope.

This should be remembered: Every step that Europe takes toward recovery is, as the Communists knew it would be, a step away from communism and toward the strengthening of freedom and the establishment of a just and lasting peace. Events are proving that the Communists' fears as to the effects of recovery on their plans were well founded. Indeed, in these 2 years there have been many elections in these western European nations. The Communists, just when they thought they were on the threshold of their greatest gains have lost every one of those elections. More than that, in every one of them the

Communist vote has been dramatically reduced.

But we must not exaggerate the extent of our gains. The Communists who are realists know full well the significance of this fight for recovery that is going on in Europe. They know that as of the present that fight is being won by the free nations. But they know also, and you and I as Americans must face this fact, that the cold war, even in Europe, is not yet won. Freedom is being strengthened, but freedom is not yet secure. There is a better chance for peace, but we cannot yet be sure of it.

The Communists know that Europe is still faced with the stupendous problem of earning more dollars than she is now earning if she is to have the dollars she needs to buy the goods and services she can obtain only in the Western Hemisphere. They know that as long as the western European economy remains compartmentalized recovery will be uncertain and the prospects dim for building in western Europe that more dynamic expanding economy which alone can bring a steady improvement in the conditions of life for all its people. They know that Europe's economy grew to greatness when its trade was free and competitive. They know that if it is ever to achieve that greatness again compartmentalization must give way to integration and that the chokeweeds of high tariffs, cartels, and import, and exchange controls must be swept aside.

The men of the Kremlin know that if the Marshall plan should be stopped midway, or that if appropriations were reduced too drastically, progress both toward building up dollar earnings and toward the more enduring task of economic integration in Europe would be disastrously slowed down. They know also that in some countries a sharp reduction in Marshall plan aid would bring a return to short rations and a stoppage of the tooling programs now under way. Above all, they know that if as a result of our quitting they can bring a division among the free peoples once again a situation will have been created where a dictator can divide and conquer. Is it any wonder that they are eagerly awaiting word that the dollars needed to carry on the Marshall plan will not be forthcoming? This is their great hope.

Of course, even if the needed dollars are forthcoming, no one can guarantee that western Europe will take advantage of that aid sharply to step up her dollar earnings or boldly to reduce trade barriers and thus start to integrate her economies. But this is the historic moment when those goals must be won if they are to be won. Later the heads of governments in Europe may have neither aid from the West nor threats from the East to help them overcome the natural aversion to change. Later it may be too late to start building that new continent in western Europe which will be so strong and whose free people will be so prosperous that no dictator would dare march against them.

It is my hope that before Marshall aid ends that Europe will be well on the road toward achieving the goals which I have set forth. It is also my hope that the Russians will wait in vain for word that America is either pulling out or pulling down its aid to too low a level. I hold these hopes for Europe because Europe has already produced one miracle and can produce another. I hold these hopes for America because I am an American. It is not in the American tradition to fail to finish a job. Faced with a crisis it is not in the American tradition to give up and go on. It is our American tradition to stand by our guns, to carry on, and to see it through. And if we do—if we stand steadfast—there is a sound basis for the great hope that the free world will regain the initiative and in the second half of this twentieth century resume its forward march.

Local Public Works Planning and Hospital Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, while the Federal aid to local public works planning and hospital construction has not received the great publicity that other more controversial issues have gleaned from our press, this aid is, nevertheless, vitally important to all members of every community in the Nation, large or small. In a recent issue of my Washington News Letter to the people of Pennsylvania, I explained how the loans are made by the Federal Government and how each community may participate and obtain the expert help and funds necessary to better public works and hospitals in the community. I ask unanimous consent that this news letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Two of the administration-supported measures passed by the Eighty-first Congress almost without fanfare will be vitally important to almost every Pennsylvanian, and I want you to know about them. They involve local public works planning and hospital construction.

How big is the planning backlog in your community? Before any community can build a new school, enlarge its sewerage or water system, put up a bridge, or undertake any local public works, plans must be drawn up.

Making plans sounds easy, but it's frequently difficult, because local budgets provide small planning funds. But Congress has provided $100,000,000 in loans for local community planning during the next 2 years, and Pennsylvania communities can borrow $1,343,328 this coming year, and three times as much next year in Federal loans.

As I pointed out during the Senate debate on the bill, "these are loans—not grants—for engineering planning work—not for construction work, not for a new WPA or PWA, but for drafting plans and specifications only. There is absolutely no commitment that the Federal Government now—or in the future—intends to pay any part of the construction costs of these projects." (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 23, 1949, p. 13215.)

Loans are repaid to the Government when the community floats a bond issue to cover construction costs. Because planning is about 3 percent of total construction costs, local communities should be able to plan about $40,000,000 worth of needed projects this year.

This is a tested program. It was first passed in 1944, but the Eightieth Congress let it die. Hundreds of Pennsylvania communities planned $265,000,000 in local projects with less than $4,000,000 worth of loans under the earlier program.

Application blanks and details will be ready in a few days. Get your community off to an early start by writing for particulars. Address Mr. William J. Finley, Bureau of Community Facilities, U. S. General Services Administration, box 899, Harrisburg, Pa.

Are your local hospital facilities sufficient? If not, there may be something you can do about it soon. The Eighty-first Congress liberalized the highly praised and very successful Federal hospital assistance program initiated by the Seventy-ninth Congress in 1946. The 1946 act was enthusiastically received in Pennsylvania, and under it more than 20 hospitals have been approved for Federal grants amounting to more than $9,000,000 in the past 2 years.

Hospital construction can be greatly accelerated under this year's enlarged law.

Areas with the greatest need will still be helped first, and up to now most of the funds have gone to smaller communities because they needed help most. But many more communities, including some of the largest, will be able to participate in the enlarged program.

How does the program work? It's a three-way affair—local, State, and Federal. Federal grants used to meet one-third of the total cost of each project, but the new law will increase Federal contributions to about 40 percent for each Pennsylvania hospital. The local communities make their own plans and arrange for financing their share. Funds are available for public, or nonprofit, hospitals, and projects may cover entirely new hospitals or enlargement of existing ones. To obtain Federal grants the local projects must be approved by the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare and the United States Public Health Service. Approval by these agencies is based on a showing of local need.

Federal grants formerly amounted to $75,000,000 a year, with Pennsylvania getting $4,547,000 annually. The new law doubles this to $150,000,000 a year. So Pennsylvania will be eligible for $9,241,058 for each of the next 6 years.

Twenty-two Pennsylvania hospitals have been, or are about to be, authorized for grants—Altoona Hospital, Memorial Hospital of Bedford County, J. C. Blair Memorial Hospital at Huntingdon, Bradford Hospital, Brookville Hospital, Centre County Hospital at Bellefonte, Chambersburg Hospital, Citizens' General Hospital at New Kinsington, Clearfield Hospital, Corry Memorial Hospital, George F. Geisinger Hospital at Danville, Delaware County Hospital at Upper Darby, Harrisburg Hospital, Harrisburg Polyclinic Hospital, Gnaden Huetten Memorial Hospital at Lehighton, Lancaster General Hospital, Lewistown Hospital, General Hospital of Monroe County at East Stroudsburg, Ohio Valley General Hospital at McKees Rocks, Sunbury Community Hospital, Wayne County Memorial Hospital at Honesdale, and Williamsport Hospital.

Where do you get the details? If your community needs additional hospitals, and you're interested in helping out, write either to the Pennsylvania Department of Welfare, Harrisburg, or to Federal Security Agency, 42 Broadway, New York 4, N. Y.

Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, in my News Letter of December 1, 1949, to the people of Pennsylvania, I discussed just what the Hoover Report means to the

American people, and also the extent of Government reorganization already achieved during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 1, 1949.

You're getting your money's worth out of the Hoover report. A billion and a quarter tax dollars will be saved yearly by Government reorganization achieved in 1949.

The Hoover report is the first comprehensive survey of our Government in 160 years. It found a multitude of agencies, bureaus, boards, commissions, and administrations piled, one on top of another, by all the Congresses and Presidents since the start of our Republic. Obviously, in examining this complex pyramid of Government, which like Topsy, had "just grow'd," the Commission uncovered tremendous duplication of function, contradiction of effort, conflict of jurisdiction, and cumbersome accounting systems. The report is a blueprint for order out of this chaos.

Reorganization aims at getting the most out of every tax dollar and has the full support of President Truman, who said last summer: "I am taking steps to assure that there shall be a continuous and systematic effort throughout the executive branch to evaluate and improve the effectiveness and economy of Government operations."

Government reorganization is a tremendous task. It means revamping the biggest, most complex business in the world—a business for which the Congress has already authorized a $43,500,000,000 Federal budget for the present fiscal year.

To get an idea of how big a job reorganization really is, keep these facts in mind: The Hoover Commission devoted almost 2 years to its job; 300 experts participated in its comprehensive investigations; the Hoover report is a 2,000,000-word treatise on efficient government; its 300 recommendations are broad blueprints, not detailed specifications; 60 percent of the recommendations require legislative action by Congress.

The Eighty-first Congress and the President were determined from the start to translate these 2,000,000 words into action * * * and everyone is enthusiastic about the results to date. In October, noting what had been accomplished during the Eighty-first Congress, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report said, "During 3½ months, more reorganization has been accomplished than in any previous time in the Nation's history."

The Commission estimated its proposals would save $3,000,000,000 or $4,000,000,000 yearly. So far, we have already carried out 20 percent of their recommendations * * * reforms so far reaching that they will account for one-third of the total savings visualized by the entire report—a remarkable achievement in 1 year.

Where do we stand on reorganization to date? Here's a partial list of the solid accomplishments made in recent months by President Truman and the Eighty-first Congress:

The Military Unification Act of 1949 will probably save a billion a year.

The newly created General Services Administration should save $250,000,000 yearly by consolidating all Government "housekeeping" functions.

Secretary Acheson, former Vice Chairman of the Commission, is speeding into effect the State Department reorganization approved by the Eighty-first Congress.

Six reorganization plans submitted by President Truman were approved by Congress this year, renovating parts of the Labor Department and the Post Office Department; the Maritime and Civil Service Commissions; the Public Roads Administration; and the Executive Office of the President.

Long overdue salary increases went through to attract and hold skilled executive personnel in Government service.

Where do we go from here? Everyone recognized that the job was far too big to complete in a single session of Congress. The executive branch is making numerous recommended internal changes requiring no new laws. At the same time, committees of Congress are drafting technical language to accomplish additional reforms. I feel that we can take real pride in the progress we have made to date, and I am confident the job will be tackled with renewed vigor and determination when we reconvene in January.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Early Senate Legislative Calendar, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, during the interim between the two sessions of the Eighty-first Congress speculations began to run high as to what the second session would bring forth on its Legislative Calendar early in the year. In my news letter of December 15, 1949, I pointed out to the people of Pennsylvania some of the more important pieces of legislation that were due for action by the Senate. I ask unanimous consent to have this letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 15, 1949.

Count on a lot of talk in the Senate early next session. We will return in January to face a calendar that's a tinder box of filibuster issues. Here are some of them:

Civil-rights legislation, a hardy filibuster perennial, awaits us. A Federal fair employment practices bill is on the Senate Calendar, and the House of Representatives passed an anti-poll-tax bill last summer that is now pending before the Rules Committee of the Senate. Can't predict the outcome on either of these. My own moral convictions give them strong support, and I have fought, and shall continue to fight, for their enactment. I'm proud to note the progress made in enlarging the civil rights of our people in recent years, and I honestly believe a growing national maturity is responsible for this.

Oleomargarine (southerners aren't the only filibusters): Senators from dairy States have promised to talk down efforts to repeal the Federal tax on colored oleo.

Repealing the Federal oleo tax won't make any difference in Pennsylvania, because until the legislature at Harrisburg repeals the State law, it's illegal to sell colored oleo in Pennsylvania. So whatever happens in the United States Senate this winter, Pennsylvania housewives will stay busy adding color by hand; but in the 32 States where the sale of colored oleo is now legal, there will be new relief when the Federal tax is removed.

The displaced persons bill is due back on the Senate Calendar January 25, and as usual, faces a filibuster, but I believe we'll win this fight. The 1948 DP law is a vicious and discriminatory piece of legislation that is now blocking thousands of victims of fascism and communism from a haven in America, victims who can't return home because they have fought, and lost the battle for liberty and democracy in their own countries.

Displaced persons are proving to be fine Americans, and we should be proud that Pennsylvania has taken so many. Only New York has a larger DP population than we.

The basing-point issue is still in the air, and when the bill returns to the Senate January 20, it may set off a filibuster. Basing-point pricing has played an important role in the growth of Pennsylvania industry but ever since a decision of the Supreme Court a year and a half ago, there has been uncertainty in the business community as to whether delivered-pricing practices are legal.

I proposed a 2-year basing-point moratorium bill last winter, to give those who used delivered pricing systems in good faith a breather while Congress studied and overhauled our conflicting maze of antitrust laws, but my proposal was set aside during the Senate debate, and Congress has sought ever since to work out language which will safeguard small business and at the same time permit good-faith use of basing-point pricing.

So we're probably due for a lot of useless, time-consuming and expensive talk, as small, resolute bands of Senators seek to block legislation, and it will be more difficult than ever this year to apply cloture, as we call it, when the Senate seeks to limit the time for debate. The assent of 64 Senators is now required to invoke cloture, as a result of the new Senate rule adopted after our filibuster over filibustering of last winter. The new rule is a real victory for willful minorities who are long-winded enough to force a majority to abandon its fight in order to undertake other pressing, dead-line legislation.

If you're interested in more details on filibusters, and the problems they pose to expression of the majority will in a democracy, write me at the Senate Office Building, Washington, for a copy of an article I wrote recently for the Temple Law Quarterly.

Nineteen hundred and forty-nine draws to a close with America in good shape, and I sincerely hope that for all of you, the coming holiday season will prove the happiest, most peaceful and most prosperous you've ever had. My best wishes to you all for a

Very merry Christmas,

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Improvement of General Welfare in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my Washington News Letter of December 29, 1949, in which I discussed some of the striking achievements of the American free enterprise system during 1949.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

DECEMBER 29, 1949.

The American free-enterprise system gave the general welfare a big boost in 1949. Our standard of living moved up a few more notches as industry after industry turned in all-time high production records for commodities that vitally influence the way we live.

Almost a million new, non-farm homes were begun in 1949, a new record. It may come as a surprise to you, but the previous record for home building was set in 1925, almost a quarter of a century ago.

Home construction should be larger still in 1950, for two big reasons:

Private construction has increased steadily since the end of the war, and new building continued at high levels through August, September, October, and November, instead of dropping off in fall as it usually does. If this trend continues, as it should in view of the huge demand for housing, we should see private home building pass the million mark in 1950.

Construction under the low-rent Public Housing Act of 1949 will get under way shortly, and that program should start on new housing for 100,000 or more American families in 1950, thus swelling the total still further.

The automobile industry broke a 20-year-old production record this year by turning out some 6,200,000 cars and trucks. This is about 800,000 more vehicles than were made in 1929 when 5,358,420 set the record that has stood unbroken until this year.

And we traveled more than twice as far by motor this year than in 1929.

More people used more electricity in 1949 than ever before. Electric power production is up almost 28 percent this year over the 1944 wartime peak. This increase alone in the past 5 years is greater than our total use in 1925.

Television production reached 2,700,000 sets this year, as compared to about a million sets in 1948. The industry planned to make only 2,000,000 sets in 1949, but finding it could sell everything it made, stepped up its sights another 75 percent. And for 1950 a production of 3,500,000 is now planned.

This year about two out of every three American families have telephone service. This has risen in 10 years from about 2 families in 5—or from about 40 percent to almost 70 percent. Long-distance calls, as a result of improved service and wider usage, have increased from 750,000,000 in 1939 to about 2,000,000,000 in 1949.

These are some of the striking achievements of private American enterprise in 1949. They are signs of an expanding economy, and reflect the essential soundness of the give-and-take adaptability and resourcefulness of our system in which security and freedom of the individual are cornerstones.

Not all the signs on the economic front are good. There are, of course, rough spots which, if left uncorrected, threaten the whole health of our national life. With our employment this year close to peak levels, unemployment is up somewhat from last year. In some areas—such as our anthracite region—there are severe local dislocations. We're aware of them, and are determined as a Nation to do something about correcting them.

Promoting the general welfare means getting rid of the rough spots. Our Constitution charges the Government with this duty in the name of our people. Judging from our success over the 161 years our Republic has existed, we have done, I believe, a good job at our task of buttressing the free-enterprise system without shackling it, in promoting the general welfare of our people without regimenting them. I am proud of our achievements, and confident of our future.

A happy new year to you all.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Senator Green's Advocacy of Fisheries Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD L. LEAHY

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD an editorial from the Pawtucket Times. The editorial is a tribute to my colleage the senior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], and is entitled "GREEN for Conservation." The editorial was occasioned by the fact that my colleague has introduced a measure which would make effective an international treaty for conservation of fisheries off the New England coast.

I cannot let pass this opportunity to comment on the aptness of the title. The distinguished senior Senator from Rhode Island long has favored liberal legislation and his advocacy of progressive and humane government antedates by many years, in many instances, the time when measures for its accomplishment have been adopted. Throughout his long public life, however, he has been in the best sense a conservative and those of us who have known him and served with him over the years appreciate the very agreeable significance of GREEN for conservation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GREEN FOR CONSERVATION

Probably nothing which Senator GREEN of of our State will do at this current session of Congress will be more constructive than his proposal the Senate make effective an international treaty for conservation of fisheries off the New England coast.

The treaty which, we are reminded, is one of three signed by the United States in 1949, is designed to halt depletion of the 300-year-old fisheries of the Grand Banks and other banks from this State to Greenland. The Senator, we are told, suggests the means to carry out our obligations under the treaty in a bill he has drafted. The bill calls for appointment of three United States members to an international commission created under the treaty. These, with others, would name an advisory commission, who would advise the commissioners on all regulations affecting this country. Other signatories to the treaty are Canada, Denmark, France, Iceland, Italy, Norway, Portugal, Spain, and the United Kingdom.

There can be no lack of knowledge of the need of such conservation on the part of newspaper readers, even casual readers. For, in many articles by press associations and others, they have been told how modern methods of fishing at the Banks have taken fish too fast, have caught fish too young and have taken fish of too small a size. The result has been such a depletion of fish in the Atlantic grounds, that some steps must be taken if fish are to survive in numbers sufficient to make them valuable as a food.

It is being brought home to the human family on several fronts that conservation of resources is destined to be a factor for serious consideration by our Nation and others in the second half of this twentieth century. The old days of laissez-faire, of taking more than one needs are about at an end. This country needs to conserve oil, iron, fish, game, lead, and one hardly knows how many other natural resources. Other nations are confronted with a need of saving other precious and dwindling resources. So conserve, we all must. For when what we have is gone, nature is not going to quickly provide us with more. Even water is now a national problem, where once it was as cheap and plentiful as the air we breathe.

Senator Morse's Advice to the Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in a recent issue of the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, with reference to our friend and colleague the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A MAVERICK'S ADVICE TO THE GOP

What Senator WAYNE MORSE said about the Republicans sounded like good advice to his party—if this Oregon maverick is really a member of the GOP in good standing.

In St. Louis for a speech before the Liberal Forum, he said that the party needs a program—a real, meaningful program. The American voters cannot be scared with words like "statism." They cannot be dragooned into a crusade against the welfare state. It's their welfare which they have in mind when they mark their ballots.

Such tactics will make of the GOP, to the Senator's mind, a party exclusively of rich men. It will end up with far too many campaign contributions and not nearly enough votes. Senator MORSE does not want to see that happen. And he is right. The United States should not be politically divided according to the pocketbooks of its people. That way lies trouble.

It would be the undoing of even the more liberal of our two parties because that party would no longer have the discipline of genuine opposition. Sure of victory, it could go lax, forget principles and purposes.

Such a division of haves and have-nots of course, is not a novelty in the politics of a considerable number of modern nations. But elsewhere the impulse toward it comes from the Marxists. They work hard to create this cleavage and to deepen it. How odd that here in the United States those who have most to lose should be exposing us to this risk.

Yet how many men are saying—perhaps with the hope of nominations and campaign contributions in mind—that the Republican Party needs a rebirth of that kind. Apparently they know little of its birth and of its first successful candidate, Abraham Lincoln.

Senator MORSE does know. He knows what made Republicanism valid in the past. He knows what can make it valid in the future—in a nation ruled by the many rather than the few. Will he be heard? Or is his a voice in the wilderness?

Fiftieth Anniversary of the Nebraska State Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered on October 21, 1949, at the fiftieth anniversary meeting of the Nebraska State Bar Association at Omaha, Nebr.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am sincerely grateful for the high honor of your invitation to address this important meeting, celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Nebraska State Bar Association.

I share with all Americans a profound sense of pride in the progress of the Cornhusker State and the brilliant achievements of its sons and daughters.

Here the spirit of American freedom, enterprise, and self-reliance is deeply rooted. It lives in the tradition of the courageous pioneers who broke the prairie sod and transformed what had been called the Great American Desert into one of the leading agricultural States of America.

I have been greatly impressed by an inscription above the north doorway of your State capitol, which states:

"The salvation of the State is watchfulness in the citizen."

Nebraska citizens have followed that injunction. They are watchful over their government. They demonstrate their determination to have good government by electing to public office men of outstanding ability and strong patriotic conviction.

Such men represent Nebraska in the United States Senate. They have won the confidence, respect, and admiration of all their colleagues in the highest degree.

It is a sincere pleasure to express my personal high esteem and regard for HUGH BUTLER and KEN WHERRY. Their distinguished service to Nebraska and to the Nation is deserving of the highest praise.

I have had the honor of close association with Senator BUTLER in the work of the Senate Finance Committee, and I can assure you that his whole thinking is directed toward preserving the solvency of America through economy and efficiency in government.

When Senator WHERRY was selected as minority leader of the Senate it was in recognition of his courage, conviction, and ability. He has made a remarkably consistent record in the battle to restore sound fiscal policies in the Federal Government.

He has been a strong advocate of a clear-cut line between the two great political parties in order to give the American people a definite choice as to the principles they prefer to support.

Perhaps as a member of the Pennsylvania Bar, I should discuss with you some phase of the law in which you are all interested. Perhaps we could talk about the rule against perpetuities, or the rule in Shelley's case, or perhaps the two recent decisions of the Supreme Court, the Church and Spiegel estates, and what Congress has done to correct these two decisions.

But, this afternoon, instead of discussing some phase of the law, I want to discuss a matter which is of far greater importance—a development which means so much to every man, woman and child, and to the future of our great Nation.

I want to talk to you about an atomic bomb. We have heard a great deal about the atomic bomb since the first one was dropped on Japan. Recently, we have become even more bomb conscious and more apprehensive of the future because of the knowledge that Soviet Russia has made substantial advances in this field.

Only a short time ago, Bernard M. Baruch, elder statesman and adviser of Presidents, called for a stand-by mobilization plan to be ready in case we are attacked with atomic bombs some time in the future.

Today we are spending billions of dollars in preparation of such a plan; in stock piling critical war matériel; in the hope that we will be prepared to withstand such an enemy attack.

As a strong advocate of preparedness, I think that is the proper course.

But this atomic bomb, which gives us so much concern, is not the atomic bomb which I desire to discuss with you this afternoon. Another type of atomic bomb threatens America. One of these days that bomb will explode right here in America. It will cause as much suffering and destruction as the bomb produced by the atomic scientists.

The atomic bomb I have in mind is the bomb of national bankruptcy.

The danger of the bomb of national bankruptcy is not remote at all. It is something close at hand. Unless quick and drastic steps are taken it will shatter the framework of our Constitution and our way of life.

I am thoroughly convinced that national bankruptcy is more imminent and more dangerous to the freedom of the American people than atomic attack by Soviet Russia. Let me tell you why.

I am convinced that Russia cannot afford to go to war, nor does it need a shooting war so long as Russia can make progress in a cold war by bleeding us economically. Thus the Soviets are doing both on the international and on the domestic fronts. In world affairs, they are forcing us to spend billions upon billions of dollars each year for a defense program and to arm the nations of western Europe.

On our home front Soviet agents have infiltrated every sort of organization and pressure group. These people, their fellow travelers and their innocent dupes, wage a never ending war on Congress for greater and greater spending by the Government. Here again the Nation is being bled and weakened and forced deeper and deeper into debt, month by month.

Those who follow the Russian broadcasts to their own people and to the rest of the world, and the Russian propaganda newspapers, know that what I am saying is the absolute truth and absolute basic Soviet policy.

The Communist line that capitalism is a doomed way of life which must be forced to spend itself into destruction, was preached and laid down as basic doctrine by Karl Marx and Lenin. It has been followed and repeated by Stalin and others in the Kremlin. It is used constantly in the propaganda broadcasts and in the articles of which I speak.

The people of the Soviet Union are told repeatedly that America's economy is crumbling; that unemployment is growing worse here; that another great crash is in the making. They don't have to drop bombs on us. They are convinced that we will be the victims of economic self-destruction.

Soviet agents, working on this plan, are using every trick and every weapon at their command. They are seeking to speed up what they believe is the inevitable political and financial destruction of this country. They are being aided by pinks and pressure groups. They are also aided by thousands upon thousands of misguided do-gooders, by a spendthrift administration in Washington, and the spendthrift attitude of the people.

In this gasoline age we seem to have lost all of our horsesense.

Let us face the facts and figures and see what has happened to our Nation in the past 20 years. In 1929, only 20 years ago, the Federal Government spent less than $4,000,000,000. In this fiscal year our Government will spend more than 11 times as much, or approximately $46,000,000,000. It is impossible for the average man to comprehend just how much that is.

Let me make some comparisons that give a better idea of the amount the Federal Government will spend this year. If every life insurance policyholder in the United States cashed in all of his life insurance the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Federal Government for 1 year at the present rate of spending.

If every city home owner in this country disposed of his home the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That would run the Federal Government for about 8 months.

If every farmer sold his farm, all the equipment on it, and all the livestock, the total return would be $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run 7 months on that amount of money.

If every industry converted its net working capital into cash a total of $39,000,000,000 would be realized. That would not be enough to run the Government for 11 months. That is the pace at which the free spenders at Washington are burning up the Nation's wealth.

That is what I mean when I warn of the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy. Remember that when the Government takes on new services and new functions they are never withdrawn. Once established, they grow by leaps and bounds from year to year.

In view of this terrible spending spree, how can we face the future with any degree of confidence? Do you wonder why the masters of the Kremlin are in no hurry to engage in a shooting, atomic-bomb-dropping war?

Do you wonder why they believe all they have to do is to keep us spending at the present rate in order to bankrupt us and finally conquer us from within?

Amazingly prophetic are these words spoken by Abraham Lincoln, and I quote:

"'At what point then is the danger to be expected?' I answer: If it ever reaches us it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of free men, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

How significant are his words today.

The tax collections for this year will be far short of expenditures. We will undoubtedly end this peacetime fiscal year with a deficit of at least six to eight billion dollars. This will be the greatest peacetime deficit in the history of America.

It will also be the year of the greatest peacetime spending since the birth of our Nation.

Down in Washington, when Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, your own two great Senators, and many other economy-minded Senators fought to reduce by 10 percent the over-all spending for this fiscal year every legislative trick was resorted to by the administration to block economy and retrenchment.

Now let us continue our comparisons. In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later, it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

Since July 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, the Federal Government is already in the red approximately two and one-third billion dollars.

Do you wonder why radio Moscow blares out today and every day that America is headed for financial and economic disaster?

In 1929, the Federal Government had less than 600,000 employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

They are increasing daily and they will continue to increase if the present trend is not stopped.

Today approximately 30 percent of the total income of our people is being taken away from them to support local, State and Federal Government. In other words, we are working about 3½ months out of every year just to pay the cost of government. This is an alarming situation. It should arouse every patriotic citizen.

This deadly infection has not been confined to the Federal Government alone. It has spread from Washington to local governments and State governments all over the Nation.

Let me pause here to praise the courageous stand for efficiency and economy taken by your distinguished Governor, Val Peterson. He has won national recognition for his fight to maintain a sound economy in Nebraska in line with the State's historic pay-as-you-go tradition, based on conservatism and sound common sense. He has refused to follow the example of those who would spend State governments into the same dangerous condition as the Federal Government. I want to commend him. I wish there were more governors like him throughout the United States.

Seventeen years ago Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a candidate for President, made this statement:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse." Truer words were never spoken.

Since then the Federal Government has spent beyond its income every single year with the exception of 1946 and 1947.

Yes, the poorhouse is the end for the family that follows that policy. But in the family of governments the disastrous end is national bankruptcy and all of the tragedy that goes along with it.

What happens to a nation on the march toward national bankruptcy? Taxes become more excessive and burdensome. Inflation destroys the purchasing power of the worker. Wages decline. The standard of living is lowered. Unemployment is increased. Venture capital is dried up. The expansion of industry and business creating new jobs is stopped.

With this comes rationing of food, clothing, and all the necessities of life.

Confusion and unrest spreads among the people.

Then the bomb of bankruptcy explodes with all the horror and suffering of atomic warfare. Not a single citizen escapes its destructive force.

Savings are wiped out. Life-insurance policies become worthless. Values established by generations of toil, thrift, and sacrifice disappear.

Out of the rubble of a smashed and ruined economy, a socialistic form of dictatorship rises to take control. Government becomes the all-powerful and absolute master of the citizens.

The people are controlled and regulated in their daily lives by the iron hand of a planned and regimented police state.

The free-enterprise system is destroyed. All industry is taken over by the Government and free labor unions are outlawed.

Human rights, human dignity, and freedom of the individual are lost.

As so well stated by that outstanding statesman, James F. Byrnes: "Every individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will be an economic slave, pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

I regret that I have to paint such a tragic picture. But the record of history from ancient times to our own day proves that this picture is not exaggerated or overdrawn.

It depicts the downfall of ancient Greece and Rome. It tells a tragic chapter in the history of France. It is an accurate portrayal of the events which destroyed Germany under Hitler and Italy under Mussolini.

England, once the most powerful nation in the world, is today struggling for its very existence. The atomic bomb of bankruptcy threatens the British, largely because they have given up a part of their freedom in return for the promise of security, offered by their socialistic government.

Can we fail to take warning from these examples?

Can we sit idly by and permit the cost of government to consume the substance of the people through reckless spending without any thought of the day of reckoning?

Can we ignore the false and dangerous promises of the demagogue who offers the people security and an easy way of life at the expense of the Government?

Time is rapidly running out, but it is not too late to arouse the American people to the explosive power of national bankruptcy.

Only the people themselves can save our Republic from disaster.

As members of the bar you are leaders in your communities and in your State. Some of you are Democrats, some are Republicans, but in the fight to save American liberty we are all Americans.

That sacred cause transcends political partisanship. It must be a holy crusade to save our homes, our churches, our God given rights to liberty, opportunity and individual freedom.

I appeal to you to enlist in this crusade. I ask you to give it a part of your time and effort as a patriotic duty.

There is so much at stake for our country and the world.

It is imperative and most urgent that we awaken the people of America to the dangers of the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy.

The voice of the American people must be heard in the halls of Congress. It must come from the farms, the hamlets, villages, towns, and cities. It must come from the farmer, the worker, the manufacturer, the lawyer, the doctor, the housewife. It must be the voice of every man and woman who cherishes freedom and our American ideals and institutions.

If that voice is strong enough and loud enough it will not only be heard but it will be heeded.

The people of America get just the kind of Government they vote for.

As lawyers, and as Nebraskans, you are perhaps better qualified than any other group to take leadership in a great protest against spendthrift Government.

You can convince others that the American people are capable of governing themselves without an army of 2,200,000 bureaucrats supervising their lives.

You can discuss the problem of excessive Federal taxation with your associates, with business men and with your friends.

And above all, you can spread the gospel of Americanism and our great duty to keep the doors of opportunity open to the youth of our land so that they, too, may share in the blessings of American freedom.

Talk with the young people, the boys and girls in the high schools and in the colleges, just starting out in life. Tell them of the fundamental values that are embraced in freedom and the rewards that come from initiative, hard work and thrift.

Impress upon them the lessons of our Nation's greatness—that this country was built by sturdy God-fearing men and women who depended upon their own efforts. They did not look to the Government for a handout even when the going was rough.

They were willing to support the Government. They did not ask the Government to support them.

Humbly we pray for divine protection that the atomic bomb may never drop on our fair land. But let me say to you that the atomic bomb of national bankruptcy is one which we alone have the power and the ability to prevent.

Let us reread and reexamine the blueprint of American greatness. Hard work, thrift, courage, humbleness, self-reliance, and love of God directed the efforts of the founding fathers. They should direct us today.

Address by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania, Before the Pennsylvania Society of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on December 10, 1949, it was my unusual privilege and pleasure to address the Pennsylvania Society of New York at the annual dinner of that society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my address on that occasion be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It's customary for most speakers, and particularly those in political life, to start just about every speech to just about any group with the tested formula of how glad we are, how delighted and pleased we are, to have this wonderful opportunity to speak to such a group of fine, intelligent, patriotic men of such outstanding vision and leadership and so on; you're all familiar with the technique, and I'm sure many of you use it yourselves.

And yet I am pleased to be here and to have this opportunity to speak to the Pennsylvania Society.

I remember when I attended this dinner several years ago—one I enjoyed immensely—I was seated next to a friendly Pennsylvanian who made a very pleasant dinner companion. My partner was Thomas J. Watson, the think man, from International Business Machines. Mr. Watson, casting a practiced, thinking eye over the seating arrangements, confided to me why he thought we happened to be seated together.

"Together with Mayor Lawrence, we're probably the only Democrats here," he explained.

That may have been a slight exaggeration; there might have been a few others around, easily identifiable by the lean and hungry look ascribed by Shakespeare to dangerous

men, like Democrats, and so distinctive about Mr. Watson, Mayor Lawrence, and myself.

Obviously, this is not a branch of the New Deal Marching and Chowder Club. Since we Democrats are so badly outnumbered here, and since no speech by me or anyone else could logically be expected to change the political ratio here very significantly, I don't believe I shall attempt to tilt at any windmills.

I've tilted at lots of windmills in my time and there's always a challenge to one's eloquence or adroitness in a situation like this, but at the same time, all of us in public life eventually learn that in any fight, it always helps to have the votes.

I'm not going to try to convert the guests of the Pennsylvania Society here tonight to the Democratic Party. If any of you would like to come over, though—well, we always enjoy company.

I am reminded of what Congressman CHARLIE HALLECK, of Indiana, who was your speaker 2 years ago, had to say when asked what kind of a speech he was going to make in Philadelphia one evening. Charlie said it was going to be a nonpolitical Republican speech.

I don't think I'll even try a nonpolitical Democratic speech. Instead, I'd like for tonight to step out of the role of majority whip, and sometime acting majority leader of the United States Senate, out of the uniform of a spokesman for the Democratic administration and worker in the vineyard of the New Deal or Fair Deal, and instead, talk to you as one Pennsylvanian to another on some matters of politics in the highest sense, in the definition of politics as the science and art of government.

In nearly all of the big problems which face us conscientious citizens in a complex society, we have Republican solutions and Democratic solutions put forward to meet them, but in the rough and tumble of political controversy, it frequently happens that neither is a satisfactory American solution, that both may be special interest solutions of one sort or another. In the last analysis, it may be that neither is any kind of solution at all, but just a lot of political hot air designed to trick the voter into giving his support for what turns out to be an empty promise.

Our national structure and our political institutions are, and have been sound enough generally, to withstand the quadrennial verbal fratricide of our national political campaigns, in which each side ascribes to itself all the virtues and to the opposition, only vices, but I think that often those of us who participate in these orgies of partnership have been wasting a lot of time and campaign money because few of the electorate take it very seriously.

The growth of maturity in the American electorate has been a slow but consistent, day-to-day thing, like a child's growth, and, like a child's, has been almost imperceptible while it has been happening.

But when your son starts to tower over you, you suddenly realize he's grown up. And when we find the electorate consistently fails to fall for campaign double talk and hobgoblins, we might stop for a moment and consider that politics has got to grow up, too, if it is to be effective.

Those of us who engage in the science of politics, either as a career or as a hobby, either out of motives of the deepest sincerity in behalf of the public weal and the national safety (as, naturally, all of us here tonight do) or out of pure selfish interest of one sort or another (obviously, at this point, I'm talking about some other fellows and certainly no one here), in any event, those of us who participate in the political battles know that there is a good deal of sham and of distortion, of fakery and nonsense in them. While we on either side try to convince the public that our side is the more altruistic, more noble, more sincere, they may go out and vote on the practical reasoning, not that one side is better than the other, but that it is perhaps not so bad as the other.

So, recognizing that the people recognize what we in politics recognize, we might do well once in a while—particularly now, between election campaigns, when it isn't as difficult to do so—to come down off these pedestals of virtue each party erects for its chosen and admit that, fundamentally, the differences between us as Republican Americans and Democratic Americans, although important, are relatively few.

On the other hand, the areas of agreement among us as Americans are simply incredibly huge.

I don't know how many of you are particular students of congressional operation or machinery, but many of you know, I am sure, that a simply tremendous amount of the work of Congress in passing legislation is done by unanimous consent. A bill may be controversial when it is introduced—highly controversial—but after it has been worked over by the experts in this field in the House or Senate committee to which it is referred, it frequently comes out adroitly amended in such a way as to achieve the same goal in a manner which is not controversial at all.

In the Senate committees generally are established on a 7-to-6 or, in some cases, 8-to-5 ratio of majority to minority Members, depending upon the ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the Senate. The number of times in which all 13 agree, and they are usually regarded as the experts for the rest of the Senate on that particular issue, is tremendously high, and when it happens, as it frequently does, such a bill is almost certain to go through on the Consent Calendar, or perhaps, after short debate, to be passed without even a division.

In the realm of foreign policy particularly, admittedly our most important single concern these days, unanimity on the part of all 13 Senators of the Foreign Relations Committee has been the rule in recent years rather than the exception. The bills may be hard fought on the floor, but the results are seldom in doubt. If all of these Democrats and Republicans who specialize in the foreign-policy field can agree as they have in this Congress, and the results were much the same in the Eightieth Congress, most Senators are willing to take the advice of these experts.

That situation is frequently overlooked by those whose reading of congressional happenings is directed largely at the fights and disagreements—the fights are always a better show and get a better press and make more interesting reading. But the results are what counts, and results are what we generally get in the Congress despite the partisan political differences which arise continually.

As a good party man myself, and recognizing that many or most of you also are good party men, I want to make clear that I believe wholeheartedly in the political-party system, and I applaud any concrete definition of goals made by the respective parties demonstrating to the public their essential differences.

At the same time, however, as a Member of Congress for the past 11 years, as one who has been the target of all the pressures and propaganda from all sides on every major issue in that period, I am disappointed and sometimes distressed by the lack of common ordinary honesty in the presentation of facts on controversial issues to the public. This lack of honesty is evident on all sides, and is not restricted to any party or any lobby or any pressure group or any economic interest. I don't think it's so much a malicious and deliberate attempt to mislead the public—and the Congress—so much as it is a reflection of an unspoken and perhaps unconscious fear that unless the presentation of facts on political issues and problems is sketched in the jet blacks of deep villainy as against the gleaming whites of pure virtue, the average American, and particularly his representative in the National Legislature, could not be sophisticated enough to understand them or moved enough to do anything about them.

This whole practice seems to be based on the theory that Americans are fools and the people they send to Congress are particularly foolish.

Now I would be the last person to insist that the Congress, this Congress or any other, has never done anything foolish. And the rules of the Senate and House as to courtesy among Members and as to comity between the Houses—I once saw that referred to in print as "comedy between the Houses"—are not so strict that I cannot concede that fools have sometimes been elected to Congress.

But by and large, the men and women of the American electorate have been acutely aware in the last 20 years—since government began to affect them individually in so many ways—of the importance of national issues of war and peace, of taxes, full employment, public works, and general stability and prosperity. The mail received by every Member of Congress reflects this widespread interest, and shows it is highly informed interest.

And by and large, the men and women whom these Americans send to Congress are also not naive innocents; they are most often individuals who have made successes in a host of specialized fields before coming to Congress. And once there, regardless of party, most of them try conscientiously and hard to do a good job.

The Congress has suffered terribly in the past from lack of expert technical assistance and advice. We've been correcting that situation somewhat since the passage of the Legislative Reorganization Act, but even today, with our staff experts and our expanded Legislative Reference Service in the Library of Congress and with the experts of the administrative agencies downtown to draw from, we still find that the information we seek and need can come only from those directly engaged in the fields in which our studies must be made.

And that's where we get a good deal of our dishonest testimony, not perjured testimony, not untruths, but slanted testimony.

It is understandable enough and human enough that such should happen, for on the decisions of Congress rest, sometimes, profit or loss for a particular business, better or lower wages for some workers, better or smaller returns for some investors. Each economic interest so involved tries its best to color its presentation in the most convincing form. We have advocates before us, then, instead of advisers.

This is particularly true before the Joint Committee on the Economic Report, the committee set up under the Employment Act of 1946 to keep the Congress informed on all economic trends which threaten or advance the cause of a stable, high level of economic activity and to advise the legislative committees of Congress on appropriate steps for keeping the economy healthy.

In previous years, when the President's Economic Report came down, and the joint committee went into action to investigate the report and its recommendations and thus make our own recommendations to the Congress, we invited numerous businessmen, economists, and experts of various sorts to come and testify. It was interesting, but not very informative. Each gave us his own prejudices, partisan or otherwise, with a lot of material to back it up. We ended up arguing instead of investigating, and our results inevitably led to separate majority and minority reports, along strict party lines.

This year, we tried something new, and we are all intensely pleased with it.

Instead of having one businessman after another, one economist after another, and

one bureaucrat after another, come and make a formal presentation of his own views, we tried the round-table technique. The personal views were still expressed and ably so, but the intent was to find areas of agreement, rather than disagreement. We found substantial areas of agreement. We received, I believe, a much more rounded view of the whole.

When a CIO economist and an NAM economist can agree, and find their agreement also echoed by experts from Standard Oil and the Department of Labor, we are making some real progress and getting some real help. Of course, our round-table panel couldn't agree on everything—we would be in an awfully static economy and society if that ever happened—but we got what we were looking for, and that was informed, and generally frank and open, advice and help.

Whether we can solve the mysteries of the exact forces which cause collapse and depression, whether we can gage with any accuracy when Government should, or must, step in with affirmative action to head off collapse, whether we can draft any rule of thumb of investment in relation to employment which would serve as a weathervane, whether we can collectively help to maintain an ever-expanding economy without using collectivist methods—these are questions our joint committee seeks to explore.

Similarly, we are seeking the answers in the facts and in the informed knowledge of those who deal with the facts to the questions of Government debt, Government credit, Government fiscal problems.

We are assailed on every hand each year with demands that we cut the astronomical Federal budget. We get few specific suggestions on where these cuts are to be made. We are told to cut taxes, and also cut the national debt. These inconsistent but twin demands always go back to the first demand—that we must cut Federal spending. Federal spending can be cut, and must be cut, and in particulars is being cut every day by the Congress, but blanket demands to cut spending—backed up by no specific suggestions from most witnesses or in the mail we receive on this subject—are as helpful at this particular period in our international relations as a similar demand would have been at the height of the war. Indeed, blanket, across-the-board reductions in Federal expenditures could be as disastrous as blank-check appropriations.

The burden of this whole long discourse, if I have not already made it clear, is that our political responsibilities to our country and to its form of government go a whole lot further than merely voting or expressing our opinions on controversial issues, a whole lot further than campaigning for some candidates, and against others, a whole lot further than concentrating on political actions helpful to us individually or to our businesses or professions.

Each of our citizens who is in the possession of expert knowledge in any field in which the Congress must deal owes it to himself and to his country to give the Congress the facts which he has and to present them straightforwardly and honestly and completely.

The administration of this great country is not a game; it is a grim and earnest thing. In a football game, the idea is to overpower the opposition if you can, otherwise, outsmart him. With our complex economic interests and economic tensions, there is always the challenge to every party of interest to take home the bacon for his own gang. We in the Congress are the targets of these maneuvers.

We can be fooled—we have frequently been fooled. And one economic interest or another—it could be almost any economic interest—has made a fast play and scored a big victory. Over whom? Not just over the innocents in Congress who didn't know any better. No. Over the whole country, over the stability of the economy itself, perhaps; over their own best interests, when they stop to consider.

We can't go on with a high-level economy and real stability in this country if we play our national political and economic issues like a football game. For when this economy topples, as it did 20 years ago, it doesn't make much difference which side made the most brilliant plays or which interest outdid itself in performance—we all get hurt, and we all go down together.

As this country pulled together in war for a common goal of freedom at home, and for the opportunity for freedom to exist elsewhere where it was and still is in many cases denied, so we must soft pedal partisanship, the win-at-any-price theory of politics, and cooperate together on those ideals we hold in common, and they cover just about everything important in American life, and show a still unconvinced world that American democracy is going to continue to work effectively and efficiently for the stability of our own system and the achievement of a decent world of free people at peace.

The Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union of Saturday, December 24, 1949, entitled "The Genocide Convention."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The Genocide Convention should be ratified, despite opposition of the American Bar Association, which it disapproves because the convention involves vital constitutional questions, including "international tribunals, which might supersede American courts and endanger the self-governing power of American States."

Proponents of the convention argue that the association's objections are not substantiated by an objective and analytical study of the documents involved.

It is true that article VI of the Genocide Convention contains a reference to an international penal tribunal which might supersede American courts if established and set in operation. However, the convention neither creates such a court nor establishes its unequivocal jurisdiction at any time in the future.

Article VI merely states that "persons charged with genocide * * * shall be tried by a competent tribunal of the state in the territory of which the act was committed, or by such international penal tribunal as may have jurisdiction with respect to those contracting parties which shall have accepted its jurisdiction."

The text of the convention is thus quite clear; the parties to the convention, by signing the treaty, do not assume any obligation to assist in the creation of such a tribunal, nor to accept its jurisdiction once the court has been established. They have reserved full freedom to decide upon such acceptance whenever a plan for the setting up of such a tribunal has been elaborated and its composition and general jurisdiction stipulated.

Corroborating evidence is to be found in the fact that article VI does not even set forth the instances in which the international tribunal is to be called upon to exercise jurisdiction, the legal basis on which its decisions are to rest, or the manner in which its sentences are to be executed.

The fact is that the reference to an international tribunal was included in article VI mainly because a proposal to study the possibility of international jurisdiction was made by the sixth committee, which discussed the Genocide Convention.

It was felt by those who drafted the convention that since such a tribunal might become a reality in the future, it would be advisable to insert a reference to such a tribunal in the document in order to avoid the necessity of amending the convention at some future date.

Senate ratification of the Genocide Convention would not constitute an agreement to have American courts superseded by international tribunals. If and when the statutes of an international penal court are set forth, the United States will decide whether it will be bound by such statutes.

It will then be time enough to discuss the advisability of taking such a step from the point of view of safeguarding the self-governing power of the American States. Meanwhile, the United States Senate would set a favorable precedent by ratifying the Convention on Genocide which outlaws mass killings of innocent peoples.

New York Times Educational Survey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a regional break-down of a study undertaken by the New York Times through its education editor, Dr. Benjamin Fine, which appeared in the Times of January 9, 1950, and supporting statistics.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONDITIONS IN THE NATION'S SCHOOLS, WITH PLANS FOR YEAR, AS FOUND IN TIMES SURVEY

(The status of public school education in the United States at present, in contrast with its status a year ago, as shown regionally in a survey by the New York Times, follows:)

NEW YORK, MIDDLE ATLANTIC

Despite the improved conditions generally evident in the New York-Middle Atlantic area, the elementary teacher shortage is still acute. Reports reaching the New York Times indicate that many substandard teachers are employed by the States in this region.

To meet the present needs, these States would need an additional 10,000 teachers to replace the emergency instructors, and another 7,500 teachers to fill vacancies or reduce class size.

Current public school enrollments in New York State are considerably above those of last year, and the trend is steadily upward. The estimated enrollment for all public schools is 1,917,586, an increase of 27,410 over

that of last year. The gain is distributed over all types of districts—cities, villages, union free, central rural, and common school districts.

New York State has a total of 76,250 teachers—just about what it had in 1948–49. In all, 45,500 children will suffer in their education because of inadequate buildings, and another 40,101 because of double sessions or part-time instruction.

Thirty-seven hundred hold emergency permits

The number of teachers holding emergency permits has increased slightly, going from 3,633 to 3,700. The State is unable to get enough adequately trained teachers for the elementary schools, but with the exception of agriculture, home-making, industrial and practical arts teachers, it can get enough on the high-school level. In addition to 3,700 additional qualified teachers to replace those on emergency certificates, the State could use 400 for special subjects on the secondary level.

New Jersey lists similar problems. According to Dr. John H. Bosshart, New Jersey commissioner of education, nearly 70,000 of the State's children will suffer an impairment in their schooling because of inadequate buildings, lack of teachers, poorly prepared teachers and double sessions or part-time instruction.

Pennsylvania also is unable to get all the adequately trained teachers it needs for the elementary grades. There is also a serious shortage of secondary teachers in certain departments; but this shortage is neutralized by an excess in the fields of English, social studies, and languages. There is an insufficient supply in home economics, science, health, and physical education and special education.

Conditions generally better

In general, however, conditions in Pennsylvania are better this year, as they are in many other States, for these reasons, cited by the school officials:

1. The teacher supply is better.
2. The number of teachers on emergency certificates has been reduced.
3. The State-mandated salary schedule is higher.
4. Many new school buildings have been erected and additions constructed.
5. The supply of materials of instruction, including textbooks, supplementary books, general supplies, equipment, and audio-visual aids has increased.

Both Delaware and Maryland report that on the whole, school conditions are better this year than they were a year ago. In Maryland 13,400 children will suffer from double sessions or part-time instruction. The number of emergency teachers increased slightly in this State, going from 1,274 to 1,365. The State suffers from an inadequate supply of elementary teachers. Delaware reports that it needs teachers for both elementary and secondary schools. The salary average in both States has increased—it is now $3,449 in Maryland and $3,325 in Delaware.

Conditions in the District of Columbia are reported as being about the same as they were a year ago. There are still 408 teachers on emergency or substandard permits, compared with 477 last year. In the elementary field, the enrollment in the teachers college has been low for a number of years, and many graduates do not go into teaching. As a result, a rather serious shortage of adequately trained elementary teachers confronts the District. The average teacher salary is $3,793, a slight increase over last year's $3,733.

NEW ENGLAND

The New England States are not badly off, compared with other sections of the country. However, a serious teacher shortage still exists in most of the States, while emergency teachers are being employed to some extent. Operating expenses for the schools have gone up somewhat, although not any more proportionately than in the rest of the country.

Massachusetts indicates that it does not have a sufficient number of trained elementary teachers, although the danger of a teacher shortage on the high school level has vanished. Approximately 400 teachers have no more than a high school education, while 700 have had less than 2 years of college training. The State could use 200 additional qualified teachers.

Rhode Island, likewise, employs a number of teachers with less than college training. According to Dr. Michael F. Walsh, director of education, the state has 150 teachers with only a high-school education.

Seven hundred and fifty others have had 2 years of college or less. On the other hand, 2,150 hold college degrees, while 400 have more than 4 years of college. However, Dr. Walsh reports that an insufficient number of adequately trained teachers are available for the elementary fields.

Connecticut notes that 22,200 students will suffer an educational impairment because of inadequate buildings, 12,000 through poorly prepared teachers and 6,600 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. Four hundred and seventy-five teachers are employed on emergency or substandard permits, compared with 511 a year ago.

An adequate supply of well-trained teachers is not available in the State although in most subjects enough high-school teachers can be obtained. Four hundred and thirty additional qualified elementary teachers and 80 more high-school instructors could be used immediately. The average teacher's salary this year is $3,405 as compared with $3,328 a year ago, Connecticut needs $60,000,000 by September 1, 1951, for new buildings and $181,000,000 by 1960.

Both Maine and New Hampshire face serious educational problems during the coming year. Maine, in particular, is concerned at the difficulty in getting elementary teachers, although New Hampshire is hard hit too.

Officials in Maine estimate that 50,000 children will suffer because of inadequate buildings, 800 because of lack of teachers, 15,000 because of poorly prepared teachers and 5,400 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. At present 207 teachers are employed on an emergency basis compared with 500 a year ago. Because the rural communities neither pay adequately nor offer satisfactory living conditions, the schools are unable to get a sufficient supply of elementary teachers. Salaries in Maine range from $1,000 to $4,900 annually.

SOUTH

Nine of the twelve Southern States report that school conditions this year are better than they were in 1948–49. Only Alabama finds the situation is worse, while Mississippi and Kentucky say conditions are about the same.

Nevertheless, the educational picture for the South is gloomy. According to the Times survey, 1,125,000 pupils will receive an inferior education this year because of inadequate buildings, the lack of teachers, poorly prepared teachers, and doubled or part-time sessions.

The shortage of qualified teachers is a serious problem. Elementary teachers are in widespread demand; only three States—Arkansas, North Carolina, and South Carolina—say they can obtain all the secondary teachers they need.

Teachers of poor grade

The educational level of the South's teachers is not high. More than 23,000 teachers have only a high school or a year of college education at most. In fact, 887 teachers in Mississippi and 300 in North Carolina have never completed secondary school. Another 56,287 teachers have 2 or 3 years of college preparation, while the remainder, 135,170 teachers, have 4 or more years of higher education.

Salaries have risen, in some cases as much as $300 or $400, but as a whole teachers in the South are the most poorly paid in the Nation. Mississippi pays some teachers $500 a year and its average salary is only $1,393, the Nation's lowest. Kentucky has a low of $524, South Carolina $696, and Arkansas $700.

The present average salaries are far below the national average. Kentucky's $1,900, South Carolina's $1,795, and Arkansas' $1,675 are among the lowest salaries in the Nation.

Aware of the need for expanded school facilities, most Southern States have mapped building programs. By and large, they fall short of meeting needs. For example, six States, which say they need $594,000,000 to provide adequate facilities, report that they intend to spend only $283,379,014.

As in the case of teachers' salaries, the lack of sufficient funds is handicapping efforts to build new schools. Some officials concede that Federal aid is needed to help save the South's schools.

SOUTHWEST

More than 790,000 children in the Southwest—Oklahoma, Texas, New Mexico, and Arizona—are receiving a second-rate education this year, the Times survey discloses. Except for the South, conditions in the Southwest are probably the worst in the country.

More than half of those receiving impaired education are suffering because of inadequate school facilities. In addition, 138,000 pupils in Oklahoma are receiving inferior schooling because they have substandard teachers.

Despite this, conditions in the Southwest have improved—although much remains to be done. Although good elementary teachers are still in demand, the teacher situation is far less critical than it was a year ago. Oklahoma, however, which has nearly 18,000 teachers, added only 500 teachers this fall and could use 2,594 elementary and 608 high-school teachers.

All four States, in addition to hiring new teachers, have succeeded in cutting down the number of emergency teachers this year, though in varying degrees. Oklahoma reports a drop from 3,489 in 1948–49 to 2,412 for 1949–50; Texas, from 2,250 to 2,000; New Mexico, from 209 to 157, and Arizona, from 351 to 111.

Teachers' salaries in Oklahoma and Texas have risen. Oklahoma now pays an average annual wage of $2,726; last year it paid $2,327. Texas increased average salaries from $2,470 to $2,900. Municipal teachers in New Mexico now earn $3,091, while rural teachers receive $200 less. Salaries in Arizona average $3,575, about the same as last year, and are among the highest in the country. This State says it has no difficulty in obtaining all the teachers it wants. Moreover, the educational level of Arizona's teachers is exceptionally high. Five hundred teachers there have 4 years of college preparation; all the rest, 5,740, have more.

MIDWEST

Compared with other sections of the country, conditions in the 12 Midwest States show a slight improvement. Half of the States indicated that school conditions were better, while only one State—South Dakota—reported that they were worse than a year ago. The Midwest plans a total expenditure of $117,177,395 for buildings for the 1949–50 period, compared with $57,803,818 last year. During the next 5 years this region expects to spend $609,000,000.

More teachers are employed in the Midwest this year than last, while the number of emergency or substandard teachers has dropped substantially. Teachers' salaries are higher, although in some States the

average is considerably below that found elsewhere. Operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools have gone up considerably in the last 12 months.

All of the Midwest States reported that they faced a serious teacher shortage on the elementary level. Frequently, as in the case of Nebraska, the high school teachers receive higher salaries than elementary teachers. For this reason, more students in teacher training institutions prepare for high school teaching. The result is that the State could use 2,000 additional qualified elementary teachers, while only 200 high school teachers.

Dakotas face problems

Both North and South Dakota face fairly similar problems: the need for more buildings, better elementary teachers, and a plan to reorganize the school districts. About 600 teachers in North Dakota have not gone beyond high school, while most of the others have anywhere from 1 to 3 years of college. Ten percent of the children suffer because of inadequate buildings, 15 percent because of poorly prepared teachers, and 10 percent because of double sessions or part-time instruction. Similar conditions exist in South Dakota. Both States have a large number of teachers who lack regular teaching permits.

The school budget in Iowa is now up to $101,500,000, an increase of $7,000,000 in 1 year. A capital outlay of $15,000,000 is planned. Conditions, in general, are listed as better, although these needs are noted: Adequate salaries for elementary teachers, increased standards for beginning teachers, and school district reorganization.

One thousand teachers needed

Minnesota and Michigan report that the teacher shortage still exists in the elementary field. Minnesota can use 1,000 additional elementary teachers, while Michigan can use 6,500. Michigan at present has 7,000 teachers working on emergency certificates, about the same as last year's figure. As school improvements within the State, Michigan cites these: Improved teacher supply, additional buildings, enlargement of school districts, and extension of the school program to include thirteenth and fourteenth grades (junior college).

Indiana is in a much better position this year than it was in the past. The average annual salary for classroom teachers is $3,280, as compared with $3,096 a year ago. The salary ranges from a low of $1,600 to a high of $6,440. Although there are not enough elementary teachers, Dr. Deane E. Walker, State superintendent of public instruction, reports that enrollments are rapidly increasing in the training institutions of the State. One hundred million dollars will be needed for buildings in the next 5 years.

Wisconsin and Ohio report that their school conditions this year are about the same as they were a year ago. Wisconsin notes that 50,000 children will suffer an impairment in their education because of inadequate buildings and poorly trained teachers. Wisconsin employs 3,100 teachers on emergency licenses, while Ohio employs 3,767.

ROCKY MOUNTAIN

Educational conditions in the Rocky Mountain region continued to show a slight gain this year, but officials conceded they were far from good. With the exception of Nevada, which has only seven substandard teachers, the percentage of emergency teachers is still high; classes are overcrowded, facilities inadequate, and the salaries of teachers in two States are comparatively low.

Utah, which this year added 450 teachers to its schools, now has 807 emergency teachers in a total force of 5,400. This, however, is a decrease of 280 emergency teachers from last year. Wyoming reported a decrease of 12 substandard teachers to a present total of 170. Colorado, which has 9,000 teachers, now has 1,475, or 25 fewer, emergency teachers.

Teachers' salaries represent a contrast. Two States are above the national average and two are below. Wyoming gave teachers a $200 raise and now pays an average of $2,740. Colorado increased the salaries of its teachers from $2,480 to $2,650. On the other side of the national average are Utah, which increased salaries from $2,900 to $3,100, and Nevada, $3,004 to $3,058.

An extensive school-building program is underway in Wyoming, Ray E. Robertson, commissioner of education, said:

"School bond issues for approximately $13,000,000 have been floated since 1945 for the purpose of school-building construction. Seventy-seven new school buildings or additions are in the process of construction—a number which is significant when one considers the State has a total of only 88 4-year accredited high schools."

However, the picture is different for Nevada. Although the State needs $20,000,000 during the next 5 years for school construction, at most, it will spend $5,000,000.

NORTHWEST

Conditions in Idaho and Montana are reported slightly better this year, but the picture for the Northwest as a whole is still grim. The States are finding it difficult to obtain competent teachers, particularly on the elementary level, although in one respect they are fortunate: there is no heavy increase in school population and Montana reports a slight drop in the school enrollment.

The number of teachers on emergency certificates in Montana has decreased from 950 in 1948–49 to 700, while in Idaho there is a total of 840, or 160 less, substandard teachers. Montana this year has 160 fewer teachers, which may be partly explained by the drop in school attendance.

Of Montana's 4,620 teachers, only 2,230 have four or more years of college education. Four hundred and fifty teachers have 1 year of college training, 470 have 2 years, and 1,550 have 3 years. There are 50 openings for teachers in the State. An estimated 10,000 pupils will receive an inferior education because of poorly prepared teachers; an additional 10,000 will suffer because of inadequate facilities.

Salaries in the Northwest have risen only slightly. Montana pays its teachers an average annual wage of $2,930—$150 more than last year—and Idaho has increased salaries by only a few dollars. Idaho now pays $2,463 a year, which is far below the national average of $2,886. Some teachers in Montana and Idaho receive as low as $1,700 and $1,800, respectively.

FAR WEST

Although conditions in the far West have improved slightly in recent years, the number of children who will receive impaired instruction this year has doubled over 1948–49. Even without complete returns from Oregon, the number of pupils receiving second-rate education totals 449,700; last year it was 250,000.

A break-down indicates that 140,000 pupils in Washington and 60,000 in California are attending classes held in out-moded, overcrowded, and otherwise inadequate buildings; 90,000 pupils in Oregon have poorly prepared teachers; 150,000 in California are enrolled in double sessions or are receiving part-time instruction.

Contrasting pictures of education can be obtained by examining the reports from the three States. Oregon says conditions are better now than they were a year ago; California says it is about the same and Washington says conditions are worse.

Although salaries of teachers have improved to a point above the national average, the States are finding it difficult to obtain elementary teachers and in many cases there is a lack of qualified secondary teachers.

California raised teachers' salaries almost $200 to an average of $3,940—the highest in the Nation. Oregon initiated a $300 increase and Washington effected a $100 raise; both States now pay about $3,300—more than $400 above the national average.

Nevertheless, the teacher shortage there is critical. An official of the California State Education Department declares tersely: "The teachers simply are not available. Many have left the profession since 1942. Teacher-training institutions have graduated too few teacher candidates."

Likewise, Mrs. Pearl A. Wanamaker, superintendent of public instruction for Washington, comments: "The number of teachers graduating from teacher-training institutions are not adequate to make up the shortage of teachers suffered during the war years and to meet needs for additional teachers to take care of expanding school enrollments."

California, however, did succeed in improving its teacher problem. It added 9,000 new teachers during the year and now has the Nation's second largest staff—62,700 teachers. It also decreased the number of emergency teachers from 13,000 to 12,500.

UNITED STATES SCHOOLS STILL IMPAIRED DESPITE GAINS IN TEACHERS—MILLIONS OF CHILDREN ALSO HANDICAPPED BY LACK OF FACILITIES, SURVEY SHOWS—SOME STATES REPORT IMPROVEMENTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

More than 3,000,000 children attending public schools in the United States will receive an impaired education this year because of inadequate classroom facilities, overcrowded buildings and poorly trained teachers. Although conditions in the Nation's schools have improved somewhat in the last 12 months, a serious teacher shortage still exists, particularly on the elementary level.

With the exception of Arizona, every State in the Union reports that it is unable to get all the adequately trained teachers needed for elementary school teaching. Sixteen States lack a sufficient number of high-school teachers, although the situation on the secondary level is not as serious as it was in past years. The public schools now employ 86,000 teachers on emergency or substandard certificates, a drop of 19,000 since 1948–49. This amounts to approximately 1 emergency teacher in every 10 teachers employed, as compared with 1 in every 400 before the war.

These conclusions are reached in a Nationwide survey conducted by the New York Times, which analyzed public school data for each of the States and the District of Columbia. Many grave problems are faced by the Nation's schools, the survey showed. An unprecedented school population increase, coupled with inflationary building costs, have combined to check the upward advances that the school systems started to make in the last year, it also was found.

In the current school year the public elementary and high schools will reach an enrollment of 25,000,000, an increase of 750,000 over the figure for a year ago. From all indications available to this writer it appears that public school enrollment will continue to increase during the next 10 years at the rate of about 750,000 a year. This will add from seven to eight million children to the schools by the end of the next decade. As a result, the present inadequate school facilities and teaching staff will cause even greater grief to school administrators everywhere.

Twenty-four of the States reported that school conditions are better this year as compared with last. Interestingly enough, the greatest improvements, the Times study indicates, are found in the Southern States. Conditions are worse in the District of Columbia, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Alabama, South Dakota, and Washington.

Twelve States said that conditions are about the same as they were a year ago.

State commissioners of education and superintendents of instruction were asked to cite the most pressing needs for the improvement of education in their State. They listed many "needs" that plague their their school systems. Those most frequently mentioned by the educators were the following:

1. More elementary school teachers.
2. Better prepared teachers on both elementary and secondary levels.
3. More school buildings, equipment, and supplies.
4. Reorganization of school districts to eliminate the small, inefficient school unit.
5. A better, improved curriculum for the Nation's high schools.

By far the greatest needs, the country's top school administrators agree, are the necessity for more teachers and the urgent need to construct more school buildings. They estimate that they will need a minimum of $5,000,000,000 to provide adequate school facilities. However, they indicate that less than half of that amount will be available in the next 5 years. A number of State commissioners say that without some form of Federal aid, the necessary buildings will not be constructed.

VAST BUILDING PLANNED

However, even without aid from Washington, the States are planning a huge building program this year. Twenty States report they will spend $500,000,000 during the current school year—about double the amount spent last year. Probably never before has so much been allocated for school buildings. Every section of the country plans to construct schools, ranging from nearly $200,000,000 worth of buildings in the Middle Atlantic States to $35,000,000 in the Southwest. New York State, with an estimated expenditure of $95,000,000, leads the country.

Of equal importance with the serious building shortage is the teacher crisis. Educators are worried over the lack of a sufficient corps of elementary teachers. Although the number of emergency teachers has decreased, many are still employed 5 years after the end of the war. Many teachers on substandard certificates do not meet even the minimum educational requirements of their States, and are frequently lacking in teaching experience.

As shown in the study, 86,005 elementary and high school teachers are needed by the Nation's schools; the States indicate they could use 75,858 more elementary teachers and 10,147 additional high-school instructors. The greatest need was found to exist in the South and Midwest, where virtually every State reports that it could use more teachers.

As serious as the teacher shortage itself is the poor training and education many classroom teachers possess. The study shows that many teachers do not have a high-school education, while about half have not completed their college program. Actually, some States report that they employ teachers who have less than a high-school education. For example, Mississippi notes that 887 of its teachers have not finished high school, while North Carolina has 300 such teachers, and Texas has 60. All told, 70,000 teachers have 1 year of college training or less.

Probably as serious as any other factor is the large number of boys and girls receiving an inadequate or an impaired education because of incompetent teachers or the shortage of school facilities. A total of slightly more than 3,000,000 children will get a second-rate education this year because of poor teaching conditions. A break-down of the data reveals this picture: 1,596,145 will suffer because of inadequate buildings; 892,726 will be penalized as a result of poorly prepared teachers; another 202,740 will suffer because of a lack of teachers, and 333,590 will have their schooling impaired because of double sessions or part-time instruction.

SOUTH TO SUFFER MOST

The greatest number of children will be affected in the South, where more than 1,000,000 boys and girls are scheduled to get an impaired education. Georgia, for example, reports that 400,000 of its youth will suffer because of inadequate buildings and 125,000 because of poorly prepared teachers.

In Alabama the reports indicate that 200,000 children will get an impaired schooling because of poorly prepared teachers, and 150,000 will suffer as a result of inadequate buildings. Oklahoma presents the worst picture of all in this respect. It reports that 442,834 children will suffer because of inadequate buildings.

The Middle Atlantic States present the best picture. New York reports that 45,500 children will get an impaired education because of inadequate buildings, and 38,401 because of double sessions or part-time instruction. New Jersey lists 11,981 children as suffering through poor buildings, 374 because of the lack of teachers, 49,140 because of poorly prepared teachers, and 6,388 as the result of double sessions. The other States, with the exception of Pennsylvania, report few if any children suffering from a lack of adequate facilities or competent teachers.

For the fourth year in a row the average teacher salary has increased. This year the teachers will average $2,886, as compared with $2,676 in 1948–49—an increase of $210 a teacher. Almost every State reports that its salary schedule has increased this year, although in a few instances the averages reported are slightly below those of last year.

NEW YORK RANKS SECOND

For the first time, New York does not lead in the average salary paid to its teachers. California is now on top, with an average of $3,940. New York is second, with an average of $3,875, while the District of Columbia is third with $3,793. Other States, with averages above $3,000, include: Massachusetts, $3,625; Arizona, $3,575; Michigan, $3,550; New Jersey, $3,460; Maryland, $3,449; Delaware, $3,325; Oregon, $3,305; Washington, $3,300; Indiana, $3,280; Rhode Island, $3,100; Utah, $3,100 and Nevada, $3,058. More States have passed the $3,000 mark than ever before.

The highest average salaries are paid to teachers in the Far West and Middle Atlantic States. The lowest salaries are found in the South and Midwest. Mississippi remains on the bottom, with an average of $1,393, or $27.78 a week, compared with a national average of $55.37 a week. Arkansas is next to the bottom, with $1,675, followed by South Carolina, with $1,795. Kentucky, with $1,990, is the only other State that has an average of less than $2,000.

Although the salaries have been greatly increased in recent years, many educators note that the economic position of the average teacher today is not substantially better than it was just prior to the war. While the national average salary has doubled since 1939–40—it was $1,441 that year—it has gained only about $300 in purchasing power, the National Education Association says. Part of this gain has been offset by the Federal income tax, which did not apply to public school teachers before 1939.

Despite the high average, many teachers receive incredibly low salaries. The Times' study shows. In some States teachers are employed for less than $10 a week. For example, Nebraska reports a salary range going from $450 a year to $4,000. Mississippi has a range from $500 to $3,200. South Carolina from $696 to $3,048 and Kentucky from $524 to $4,300. Thirty States pay some of their teachers less than $2,000 a year.

"How can you expect to get a competent teacher for $500 a year?" one of the State commissioners asked incredulously. "Why, you can't even get a decent janitor at that price."

Every State reports a booming school population. In some instances the increased elementary enrollment is offset by a declining high school student body. However, the States report that the influx of the "war babies" is being felt. Some communities have jumped from 25 to 50 percent in their first two or three elementary grades. The situation, educators agree, will be much worse a year from now, and far more serious 5 years hence. By that time, they say, the high school enrollment will begin to rise, too, thus adding to the needs of the school system on both levels.

TEACHER PERSONNEL RISES

On the hopeful side is the increased number of teachers that are now found in the Nation's public schools. This year the schools report a total teacher staff of 942,530, an increase of 42,000 in a year. A number of States report substantial increases in the teaching staffs. California has employed 62,700 teachers this year, as compared with 53,824 a year ago. Washington has 10,500 teachers, 1,000 more than a year ago. Other States have made smaller gains.

Although the number of emergency or substandard teaching certificates has dropped, many educators are disturbed at the fact that 86,000 teachers are retained on an emergency basis. According to the Times' study, for the most part the emergency teachers lack the qualifications that the regular teachers possess. Many of the substandard teachers do not have much more than a high-school education; they have been "drafted" for classroom use because no competent teacher is available in the community.

OPERATING COSTS SET RECORD

The operating expenditures for the public elementary and secondary schools of the Nation is at a record high this year. The States report that the 1949–50 school budgets will amount to more than $4,600,000,000, as compared with $4,190,000,000 a year ago, roughly a 10-percent increase. Nearly every State points with pride to increased school operating expenditures. New York leads with an operating budget of $525,000,000, a $25,000,000 increase in the last 12 months (this represents the total for all local and State support).

Pennsylvania notes a substantial gain, going from $253,846,551 to $294,994,452. North Carolina has jumped from $87,000,000 to $103,600,000, while Texas has shot up from $217,000,000 to $275,000,000. The greatest gain made by any single State was recorded by Indiana, where the school budget increased from $78,256,696 to the present $155,000,000 California, with a budget of $380,000,000, shows an increase of $24,000,000 during the past year. By contrast, the smallest school budget is found in Nevada, where $6,629,640 has been allocated this year public elementary and high-school support.

Almost without exception, the States report that many serious problems remain to be solved. They are optimistic, however, that the necessary funds will come from the public. Even though money is at the bottom of many of the problems, money alone is not the answer. One of the major issues that a number of States face—particularly in the South and the Midwest—is that of reorganizing or modernizing their school districts. Several States still maintain the school districts that came down from the horse-and-buggy days, when it was impossible for the children to get to a school that was not within walking distance of their farm. With good roads and modern transportation facilities, however, the large number of inefficient, small units can be eliminated.

IMPROVED CONDITIONS SEEN

Although these problems remain to be solved, by and large the school leaders are convinced that conditions are slightly better this year than they were a year ago. The National Education Association believes that the deterioration of the war period in our school system has stopped. It observes that even though strenuous efforts by State legislatures, local school boards, the organized profession, and the public are producing results, much remains to be done.

It is evident that the downward trend has been stopped. More money is being allocated for the operating expenses of the schools, and a huge capital outlay budget has been set aside for the current year. Teachers' salaries have gone to record heights, and in general, the attitude of the public toward the free public schools has improved considerably within the last few years.

On the other hand, much remains to be done before the public can sit back complacently. The unprecedented birth rate, with the record school enrollments that are just around the corner, cannot be easily discounted. With an expected increase of at least 750,000 children a year during the next 10 years, the Nation's schools will be taxed as they never were before. It will require the combined energy, effort, and good will of all citizens, nonprofessional as well as professional, to meet the urgent school problems ahead.

Educators and responsible citizens everywhere are confident that the Nation will meet the coming school crises, as it has the grave postwar problems that for a time threatened to destroy America's valuable free public-school system. It has long been recognized by all segments of the Nation that the public schools are essential for the continuance of a strong, democratic form of government.

STATISTICS OF STATES ON SCHOOL TEACHING AND OPERATING

The present status of total teaching staff, emergency teachers, teachers' salaries, range of salaries, and operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools, as reported throughout the Nation is as follows:

	Number of teachers		Number of substandard or emergency teachers		Average salaries		Range of salaries (1949-50)		Operating expenditures for elementary and secondary schools	
	1949-50	1948-49	1949-50	1948-49	1949-50	1948-49	Lowest	Highest	1949-50	1948-49
Middle Atlantic:										
New York	76,250	76,480	3,700	3,633	$3,875	$3,652	$2,000	$6,200	$525,000,000	$500,000,000
New Jersey	27,006	26,121	2,100	1,976	3,460	3,262	2,200	5,600	155,000,000	158,606,084
Pennsylvania	59,560	60,137	2,500	2,643	2,896	2,770	2,000	4,000	294,994,452	253,846,551
Delaware	1,850	1,765	82	105	3,325	2,834	2,400	4,000	9,300,000	8,312,110
District of Columbia	3,307	3,353	408	477	3,793	3,733	2,830	4,830	22,593,935	21,593,157
Maryland	11,504	10,749	1,365	1,274	3,449	3,342	1,100	5,000	55,629,160	54,046,638
New England:										
Maine	6,200	6,198	207	494	2,150	2,080	1,000	4,900	21,500,000	21,000,000
New Hampshire	3,055	2,949	379	414	2,750	2,325	1,700	4,200	15,000,000	13,729,222
Vermont	2,602	2,615	536	424	2,332	2,205	1,500	5,600	10,200,000	9,872,178
Massachusetts	24,250	22,223	[1]		3,625	2,700	1,800	5,100	115,566,879	113,300,862
Connecticut	10,887	10,712	475	511	3,405	3,328	2,000	6,000	60,000,000	56,040,525
Rhode Island	3,950	3,816	35	35	3,100	3,095	1,600	6,300		18,496,455
South:										
Virginia	20,470	18,032	2,840	3,150	[2] 2,200	2,275	[2] 1,185	[2] 4,500	[2] 70,000,000	66,605,075
West Virginia	16,007	15,700	1,826	3,486	2,330	2,400	1,485	3,600	64,363,418	54,113,359
North Carolina	28,800	24,289	300	699	2,550	2,100	1,080	3,069	103,600,000	87,000,000
South Carolina	17,000	16,159	600	621	1,795	1,721	696	3,048	45,000,000	43,377,047
Tennessee	22,196	20,750	2,934	4,025	2,140	1,790	1,179	2,826	69,650,000	56,000,000
Georgia	24,506	23,595	3,000	4,321	1,990	1,890	1,128	2,200	69,000,000	61,251,862
Alabama	22,000	20,800	2,446	4,955	2,048	1,909	900	4,250	59,771,752	53,898,499
Mississippi	15,950	14,700	800	1,067	1,393	1,287	500	3,200	34,002,575	33,586,826
Arkansas	13,500	12,650	2,500	3,009	1,675	1,600	700	3,960	32,500,000	30,981,066
Louisiana	16,229	15,500	1,487	2,389	2,700	2,400	2,400	3,600		
Kentucky	19,000	18,929	3,800	4,600	1,900	1,880	524	4,300	55,000,000	54,206,000
Florida	17,760	15,266	2,000	2,453	2,832	2,782	2,100	3,600	91,577,916	66,716,175
Southwest:										
Oklahoma	17,900	17,393	2,412	3,489	2,726	2,327	1,500	4,200	70,000,000	59,000,000
Texas	50,250	46,000	2,000	2,250	2,900	2,470	1,834	5,600	275,000,000	217,000,000
New Mexico	[2] 5,300	4,350	157	209		3,678				
Arizona	6,240	4,303	111	351	3,575	3,500	2,100	4,800	31,912,812	28,294,336
Midwest:										
Ohio	45,299	43,921	3,767	4,400	2,893	2,800	1,500	4,600	206,000,000	205,293,184
Indiana	25,124	24,400	1,103	1,227	3,280	3,096	1,600	6,440	155,000,000	78,256,696
Illinois	45,400	46,647	1,500	2,066	[2] 2,700	2,475			252,248,185	240,236,367
Michigan	35,000	33,500	7,000	7,000	3,550	3,200	3,550	3,550	240,000,000	200,000,000
Wisconsin	20,600	22,000	3,100	3,350	2,625	2,450	1,800	4,650	98,000,000	96,500,000
Minnesota	20,539	20,500	622	892	2,750	2,700	1,000	4,800	105,000,000	96,097,978
Iowa	22,778	22,578	205	969		2,425	1,100	5,300	101,500,000	94,349,244
Missouri	25,000	24,300	2,000	2,360	2,259	2,300	1,150	4,750	195,000,000	187,000,000
North Dakota	6,388	6,481	670	1,371	2,100	1,573	1,150	4,100	23,500,000	19,009,671
South Dakota	7,014	7,469	1,356	1,377	2,100	1,990	1,125	4,200	25,000,000	23,852,762
Nebraska	12,000	12,000	1,460	2,467	2,113	2,065	450	4,000	39,000,000	39,000,000
Kansas	16,800	15,680	250	592	2,475	2,143	2,497	4,200	64,000,000	
Rocky Mountain:										
Wyoming	2,600	2,600	170	182	2,740	2,552			13,000,000	12,200,000
Colorado	9,000	9,150	1,475	1,500	[2] 2,650	2,480	1,200	4,500	40,000,000	30,618,000
Utah	5,400	4,957	870	1,153	3,100	2,900	2,300	3,900	25,500,000	25,143,000
Nevada	1,241	1,195	7	11	3,058	3,004	2,400	4,740	6,629,640	5,690,678
Northwest:										
Montana	4,620	4,780	700	950	2,930	2,779	1,700	4,600	24,000,000	21,598,005
Idaho	4,798	4,590	840	1,000	2,463	2,450	1,800	3,900	21,230,536	20,219,584
Far West:										
Washington	16,200	15,400	3,600	4,824	3,300	3,200	2,400	4,600	90,000,000	84,986,541
Oregon	10,500	9,500	1,619	1,467	3,305	3,000	2,100	5,300	64,000,000	56,000,000
California	62,700	53,824	12,500	13,000	3,940	3,740	2,400	6,000	380,000,000	356,000,000
Total, United States	942,530	901,006	86,293	105,218	2,886	2,676			[3] 4,524,771,260	[3] 4,032,925,737
Grand total									[4] 4,651,663,374	[4] 4,194,318,081

[1] No certification in Massachusetts.
[2] Estimate.
[3] Total for 45 States and District of Columbia.
[4] Projection for total United States.

TEACHER NEEDS BY STATES

The number of elementary and high-school teachers needed, as shown in the Times survey, is as follows:

	Elementary	Secondary
Middle Atlantic:		
New York	3,700	400
New Jersey	709	146
Middle Atlantic—Continued		
Pennsylvania	1,700	200
Delaware	75	7
District of Columbia	225	[1] 100
Maryland	[1] 50	None
New England:		
Maine	50	None
New Hampshire	300	50
New England—Continued		
Vermont	536	40
Massachusetts	200	None
Connecticut	430	80
Rhode Island	200	None
South:		
Virginia	5,132	
West Virginia	1,656	168
North Carolina	3,700	100
South Carolina	450	150

[1] Estimate.

	Elementary	Secondary
South—Continued		
Tennessee	3,000	300
Georgia	750	205
Alabama	2,000	446
Mississippi	1,000	200
Arkansas	1,900	600
Louisiana	2,500	1,500
Kentucky	3,500	300
Florida	1,200	125
Southwest:		
Oklahoma	2,594	609
Texas	None	None
New Mexico	None	None
Arizona	None	None
Midwest:		
Ohio	3,500	250
Indiana	700	None
Illinois	2,500	500
Iowa		
Michigan	6,500	500
Wisconsin	3,500	200
Minnesota	1,000	100
Missouri	2,500	1,500
North Dakota	1,306	65
South Dakota	1,800	200
Nebraska	2,000	200
Kansas	200	50
Rocky Mountain:		
Wyoming	200	None
Colorado	200	100
Utah	734	136
Nevada	None	None
Northwest:		
Montana	1,000	150
Idaho	75	25
Far West:		
Washington	1,000	300
Oregon	1,619	100
California	8,000	None
Total	75,858	10,147

Recognition of Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the interest which many of our Maryland people feel with regard to United States relations with Spain is reflected, I am sure, in a similar interest elsewhere throughout the country. For this reason I believe the attached column from the Washington Star of November 15, 1949, from Madrid, by Constantine Brown, concerning the results of the United States boycott of Spain offers information which our people and the Congress should have.

I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIS CHANGING WORLD—UNITED STATES BOYCOTT OF SPAIN HAS RALLIED PEOPLES BEHIND THE FRANCO BANNER

(By Constantine Brown)

MADRID.—The American boycott of Spain has accomplished something which the Communists and their associates have not been able to accomplish in 9 years of trying.

The Spaniards are wondering whether our Government, which has spent or is spending $20,000,000,000 to save western civilization, is really aware of what the situation in Europe would become if the Spanish economy collapsed.

Spanish politicians and economists maintain that the Communist threat to western Europe has not been removed yet. The Communists in Italy and France now are merely on the defensive. So long as the peoples in the Marshall-plan countries receive American gratuities to the tune of several billion dollars a year, so long as communism from the east is being contained, everything appears all right on the surface.

HEAVY SACRIFICE MADE

Spain has been able to carry on without any outside assistance for a number of years. It has been able to heal some of the more obvious wounds caused by the civil war. This has required hard work and heavy sacrifice, particularly on the part of her industrial and farm workers.

Since the end of 1948, when it became apparent that the present regime would not be overthrown by any internal move against General Franco, the western nations have resumed economic relations with this country.

Spain's trade agreements with all the Marshall-plan countries amount to nearly $750,000,000. But most of the goods thus obtained—by virtual barter—are not of real value to the economy of this country. None of the western European countries can provide Spain with oil refineries. Nor can they send her the tools needed for heavy industry or for the vital improvement of the Spanish transportation system, although British busses are one exception. They cannot provide Spain with motors for planes or the machinery for road building, electric power, and irrigation.

Because of our economic boycott and Spain's shortage of dollars trade with the United States has reached a new low. The Government as well as economic leaders in this country feel that Spain cannot recover without the active support of the United States. All their efforts to correct this condition have so far been useless. To their approaches they got the answer: "Change your regime, get rid of Franco, and we shall help you."

SPANISH PRIDE OFFENDED

The campaign against Franco, which was led originally by atheist Russia and her Communist mouthpieces throughout the world, has set these fanatically religious peoples at the side of their dictator. At one time there were definite movements, particularly among the high-ranking military, to dispose of General Franco to enable Spain to enter the concert of western European nations. But when the United Nations voted in 1946 to punish Spain by withdrawing ambassadors from Madrid, Spanish pride was offended and the Spaniards have been supporting Franco ever since.

Europe has realized its mistake and has started doing business with Spain again. The American Government is continuing its synthetic diplomacy and has refused to follow Europe's example. Our Government seems to believe that by continuing its policy of attrition now, when the Spaniards need our assistance desperately, we may still bring about General Franco's downfall.

A revolution in Spain might be fatal to recovery of the Continent, according to all realistic observers with whom this reporter has talked. It might spread across Spain's borders. The fall of Franco under such conditions might be a catastrophe since it would upset the shaky balance which we are striving to create in Europe.

Value of Inspection Trips by Members of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER FERGUSON

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Chicago Daily News of January 6, written by Mr. Fred Sparks, foreign correspondent for the Daily News.

I think it is a valuable article as it may serve to put in better perspective the inspection trips of Congressmen which are so easily passed off as junketing.

Mr. Sparks' observations also emphasize a point of great concern to me, that our great need in foreign lands today is a band of evangelists, rather than apologists, for the American system of life and government.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRESSMAN UPHELD—SPARKS DEFENDS JUNKETEERS' RIGHT TO CRITICIZE ALLIES—UNITED STATES OPINION OF OTHER NATIONS IS WHAT COUNTS, WRITER SAYS

(NOTE.—Recently there's been much excitement about Congressmen traveling in Europe and criticizing foreign affairs. Fred Sparks, Daily News correspondent, here offers his own opinion on this matter.)

(By Fred Sparks)

BELGRADE, YUGOSLAVIA.—I rise in defense of junketing Congressmen and their right to say what they please.

I don't necessarily go along with Senator THOMAS, who withered Sweden (that profitable nook of neutrality).

But rather than worry Congressmen into silence I'll put up with occasional speeches made in Rome, Italy, to impress voters in Rome, N. Y.

Congressmen—unlike the expanding army of bureaucrats abroad—are responsible directly to you and me.

If they don't have the diplomatic polish preferred by the State Department's tea-cup tipplers, well—neither have you and I.

I'm burning at the bureaucrat who applies finger to lip and stage whispers: "Shhhhh. Hush. Don't say that. Don't print that. It might offend the Dutch or the Norwegians or the Yugoslavs or the Ubangis."

Rubbish. Action, not chatter dominates history.

Who is picking up the world's dinner check today, anyhow?

It is not as important what they think of us—as what we think of them.

In my extensive travels I've met too many United States officials who automatically side with European governments against American critics.

Why? The average bureaucrat abroad doesn't care a bean about the natives. But he shivers in his payroll envelope, terrified that congressional criticism might shrink the next appropriation, and wash out his job.

Here are several disgusting incidents:

A diplomat in a central European country told me. "Six Senators arrive tomorrow. I'll exhaust them with sightseeing and cocktail parties. I'll tell them nothing. What I know goes directly to the State Department."

(Woodrow Wilson warned against the cancerizing danger of secret diplomacy.)

The directing general of a United States military mission invariably takes the advice of natives and overrules his own officers. His alibi, "Oh! They're very sensitive. We can't dare offend them."

An ECA mission chief said, "I often explode at the way this country wastes our grants. But Hoffman (ECA chief) would be furious if I spoke out—might offend the locals."

When a report showed the French press ignoring Marshall-plan activities, an ECA spokesman said, "We can't push them. We can't offend them."

On an air liner I met Congressmen leaving a land kept breathing by our dollars. When I told them some ECA scandals (moneys misappropriated; contracts bought and sold), they gasped, "The Embassy never told us that."

To offset the possibly critical impact of junketing Congressmen's statements, bureaucrats conduct a "smear" campaign.

Congressmen are jokingly depicted as village idiots, uncouth provincials, Rotarian bores, party hacks, "tools of the 'interests'," and just plain stumblebums.

A British diplomat once told me: "Before I met a visiting congressional committee, I was amazed by what your Embassy chaps said about them. They described them as the very worst type of American. Just what kind of people go into politics in your country?"

Unfortunately, too many editorial writers, groping for a daily space filler, join the howling pack to "smear" junketing Congressmen.

The whole thing discourages investigation into foreign expenditures. By abusing junketing Congressmen, who speak freely this year, bureaucrats hope to shut off next year's trippers.

Bureaucrats abroad spit hate for an American Congressman who sports a 10-gallon Texas hat. They are vicious about a southern Congressman who likes a few bourbons and the rebel yell.

Yet these "expatriates" sigh with artistic admiration in the atmosphere of a creepy left-bank bistro—a jernt where the waiter shoves his black fingernail in the coffee cup and the bartender hasn't washed below the neck since the liberation.

A good American said after a continental tour: "Too many of our officials feel that Marshall-plan funds should be mailed directly to foreign governments—and we should hide in a gopher hole.

"I wish everybody was as well fed as Americans. But I see no reason to be ashamed of our God-given prosperity, or our freedom to criticize our Government or our allies."

The Formosa Crusade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Formosa Crusade" by Walter Lippmann, which appeared in the Washington Post of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FORMOSA CRUSADE

A United Press dispatch from Tokyo, written after the President's clean and honorable statement on Formosa, says "that one veteran member of General MacArthur's staff, who talks to the Commander in Chief daily, said it was obvious that the State Department's views were not drawn up by anyone with military experience."

Perhaps it is about time to remind the veteran member of General MacArthur's staff who talks daily to the commander-in-chief that in this Republic the President of the United States is General MacArthur's commander-in-chief. And so, soldiers who respect the traditions of the Republic have a duty and a right to submit their views through official channels to their superior. But while they wear the uniform of the United States, and especially when they are in a foreign country, they have no right whatsoever to conduct a public agitation, using the press and politicians as their mouthpiece, to challenge and discredit the policies of their Government. If they disagree with those policies and feel it their duty to make a public issue, they should ask to be relieved, should come home, should take off their uniforms, and then as civilians should exercise their rights as citizens to express their views.

If they came out into the open and explained their views and had to debate them, it might just possibly become clearer than it is from the speeches of the interventionist Senators just what the Formosa business is about. It cannot be that these men of military experience really think that the island of Formosa, 100 miles from the coast of China, some 15 minutes by air, within easy range of long-range missiles, would be a desirable place to lock up American troops and American equipment. They cannot wish to tie down American forces in the defense of such an exposed fixed position, and to make of Formosa another and far more indefensible Bataan. Nor can they believe that the Red forces—Chinese or Russian—can do anything by sea, by air, or by invasion from Formosa that they cannot do far more conveniently from Shanghai, Foochow, Amoy, Canton and all the other ports and airfields along the 3,000 miles of coast from Kamchatka to the Gulf of Tonking.

It is difficult to believe that the veteran member of General MacArthur's staff, or any other military man, will care to argue that Formosa, in American hands, would be a necessary asset to our strategic security, and not a dangerous liability.

As a matter of fact, the case for military intervention in Formosa really rests on the argument that we should wage an undeclared war against Red China. The argument for the undeclared war is that if we commit ourselves in Formosa, which has been solemnly declared to be Chinese territory, we cannot be at peace with the Peking government. We cannot recognize it. We cannot have de facto relations with it. We shall be openly at war with it if it attempts to take over Formosa.

The idea behind this is that if we can keep Red China nominally at war with Chiang, but really with us, Red China will not be able to demobilize and, therefore, will be unable to consolidate its victory and to carry out the economic reconstruction. If I had not heard this idea expounded by Senator KNOWLAND himself, I would not have believed that anyone could think that the way to save Asia from communism was to make sure that the Communists had the biggest army in Asia.

The sheer lunacy of the idea comes from Senator KNOWLAND's failure to ask himself what Mao Tse-tung would do with his army if he had to keep it mobilized and if he could not feed the Chinese people. Mao would have the most powerful army in eastern Asia, sitting around eating its head off while his people were starving. Can anyone think of a greater inducement and a greater provocation to make him use his undemobilized army to raid the rich and almost undefended countries to the south of him—to burst into Burma, Siam, and Indochina?

And if that happens, because Senator KNOWLAND has contrived to keep Red China mobilized, will he and Mr. Hoover and Senator SMITH of New Jersey and Senator TAFT send the navy, or will they send General MacArthur, or will they merely send some military advisers, to defend human freedom in the jungles of Burma and in the ambuscades of Indochina?

All they can accomplish by this agitation is to prevent this country from playing any useful part in Asia. Their effort to keep us embroiled with Red China in order to prevent recognition will mean, if they succeed, that we cannot collaborate with anyone in Asia. For every other nation with interests in Asia will soon have recognized Red China. Those nations cannot be at peace with Mao and at the same time allied with a government that is in effect at war with Mao.

Surely as the night follows the day the absurdity and the practical confusion of such a posture on our part will soon be so self-evident that, in order to have any policy at all in Asia, we shall have to aline ourselves with our friends and we shall have to recognize Mao's government. But then recognition will not be, as it is in the case of Britain and the other members of the Commonwealth, a recognition that the facts are what they are. Our recognition, if it is long delayed, if it is preceded by fierce debate, will be a recognition of our own defeat.

To Peking and to Moscow it will bring the immense prestige of having the strongest of the western powers reverse itself and bow to the inevitable. The longer we wait the more we emphasize the importance of the issue; the more we quarrel over the fallacy that recognition means approval, the more we shall lose face before the world and among the peoples of Asia.

Problems of the Disabled Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an admirable and very penetrating statement recently made by Rev. Jeremiah M. Reardon, celebrated spiritual leader of South Barre, Mass., before a meeting of Massachusetts Members of Congress.

Father Reardon has for years given unselfishly of his great ability, energy, and talent to help the veteran, particularly the disabled, the hospitalized, and the distressed. His cogent views will be of great interest and valuable assistance to our membership.

STATEMENT OF FATHER JEREMIAH M. REARDON

Ladies and gentlemen of the Congress, I do not need notes to discuss this subject with you but I wish to be as brief as possible and to confine myself to the pertinent points. There are those of you who have given long and honorable services in the Congress of the United States and you know this subject as well as any of us. Others of you may not be so well acquainted with the beginnings of and the reasons for the Veterans' Administration. Briefly let us review the situations.

After the First World War there were two major problems facing the disabled veteran. His first was medical care for his wounds and disease. His second, some form of financial aid to compensate him for his inability to compete on equal terms with his fellow men in earning his living, because of the handicap of his war disabilities. Both had been promised to him. For the first he was to look to the Public Health Service. For the second to the Treasury Department. Some of you know of the tragedies this system caused. We speak of our own here in Massachusetts. You know the tragic influx of veterans into the Rutland area, spurred on by the hope of help there, either suffering from tuberculosis or the effects of poison gas. Nobody knew which. You know of the almost shacks that passed for sanatoriums in that area. You know of the sums of money the veterans paid for medical service they could not get. You know of the tragic deaths that daily took place there from tuberculosis or gas; nobody knew. Because nobody knew the exact effect of poison gas upon the human system; and apparently nobody cared. You know the tragic helplessness of disabled veterans trying to obtain the financial assistance guaranteed to them by the Congress of the United States and unable to do so—for seemingly nobody knew how and apparently nobody cared. For the system then in operation was one of divided authority, and so, one of divided responsibility, and nobody was responsible and nobody cared.

But the infant American Legion cared and a sympathetic Congress cared and out of the mutual labors of both there was created the Veterans Bureau, with a single task, a single authority, and a single responsibility; to care for the veteran in whatever might be his needs. The House established its Committee on Veterans' Affairs to consider those needs and provide for them justly and adequately. Working together we built the Veterans Bureau into a responsible unit. Working together we had a hospital in Rutland in 1922. In Northampton in 1925. We replaced the disgraceful old West Roxbury with Bedford in 1928. We aided in securing Newington as a medical hospital in 1931, and only through your magnificent work were able to secure our diagnostic center in the new West Roxbury in 1940. We had our contact units and our adjudication units, our training units, our medical section, and our finance section. In short we had a working unit. It was not without its headaches and its heartaches. We dislike to look back over the days of charges and countercharges; of investigators and hearings; of transfers and dismissals. Of human inefficiency and human dishonesty. But they were there and we weathered them and out of our trials and labors; out of headaches and heartaches we built a single efficient agency for the care of the veteran and his dependents. We dread to think of the chaos and the suffering; of the anguish and despair that would have resulted, did we not have that single unit for the Second World War. We dare not think of it.

And now, through the report of the Hoover Commission, you are asked to break up and disrupt that unit. You are being told that division is efficiency; and confusion is economy. Ladies and Gentlemen of the Congress—we submit that not one member of that commission knows anything about the disabled veteran and his problems. We submit to you the incontrovertible fact, that not one of us sitting here with you stands to gain or lose by the adoption or rejection of the Hoover report. It will not effect us personally. But we know that it will disrupt and destroy the work that we have carried on for more than a quarter of a century, and you cannot expect us to do other than protest. The medical section of the Veterans' Administration is the primary, essential section of our unit. We must have it, not alone for the care and treatment of the disabled veteran but for diagnosis, and for medical reports to the adjudication section. This work is so essential that we as an organization are compelled to employ one service officer and one contact representative in these hospitals. Can we render efficient service if you compel us to do business with a multiplicity of agencies in this work? We know from experience the confusion that is caused by division. We have it here in Boston. Because we are unable to locate the various sections of the Veterans' Administration in one building we must go from Tremont Street to Court Street to Causeway Street. We know that this means delay and confusion even within the Veterans' Administration. What then will be the delay and confusion in a multiplicity of agencies? We submit that a multiplicity of agencies means multiplied forms, multiplied letters, multiplied telephone service and consequently multiplied personnel. Division is confusion and confusion is waste. The day that you vote to transfer the medical section of the Veterans' Administration to any other agency is the day you vote to destroy the Veterans' Administration.

One brief word in regard to a constant bugbear. I like to recall my days in theology. Among others, we had a brilliant and kindly old professor. One day with a knowing twinkle in his eye, he called one of the students and said: "Compare the word 'lies'." We looked at each other, trying to guess what he wanted. Then he began: "Positive, lies; comparative, damn lies; superlative, statistics." He was about to demonstrate the age-old adage that statistics can be made to prove anything and are often the superlative lie; and he did not want us ever to forget it. Statistics are the bugbear in considering the cases of disabled veterans. You have been given the statistics of non-service-connected cases in veteran hospitals. But it is necessary to look beyond the statistics and consider the veteran. Often we are called upon to make a choice. We are given the case of a disabled veteran in need of hospitalization. The story of his disability convinces us that the case should be service connected. We must make the choice of delay while we connect the case; or else hospitalize the case as nonservice, and immediate hospitalization wins out. Then nothing can be done until hospitalization is complete and the veteran is discharged from the hospital; so that his medical record is complete for the rating board. But the case remains nonservice in the statistics. Veterans are hospitalized with nonservice long term disabilities, such as N. P. or T. B. Some of these cases are service connected after the veteran has been in the hospital for a year or even longer. But since the admission was listed as nonservice connected; it remains so in the statistics. The vast majority of the nonservice cases in veteran hospitals today are men of World War II; and yet it is but four short years since their discharge from service. Then, one of two things is certain. Either the statistics with regard to nonservice cases are grossly in error, or else the laws and regulations governing the granting of service connection are not broad enough to cover the majority of cases.

And so for the proponents of the Hoover report. They are dealing with statistics; we are dealing with disabled veterans. They offer you a promise, we give you performance. They offer you division; we give you unity. Their way is chaos; ours is order. They ask for divided authority. It is the experience of the human race that divided authority is divided responsibility. And it is axiomatic that divided responsibility is nobody's responsibility. These are lessons to be learned from Pearl Harbor other than those in the military field.

Laying Away the Colors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from an address delivered by me at the ceremony of laying away the colors in the hall of trophies, Pennsylvania State Museum, Harrisburg, Pa., on October 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Pennsylvania was founded to perpetuate the ideals of peace.

Yet it has tasted the horrors and the tragedies of war more bitterly than any of our sister States.

On the soil of Pennsylvania great and decisive battles have been fought.

Within the borders of our Commonwealth are many scenes of struggle, heroism, and sacrifice.

They stand as shrines of patriotic inspiration, dedicated to the honored and everlasting memory of brave men who suffered and died for the ideals of freedom.

We have Fort Necessity, where George Washington, military genius of American liberty, first commanded troops under fire, and Bushy Run, where Pontiac's Indian warriors were routed to give the settlers of the western part of the colony an opportunity to live in peace.

In the war for independence, Germantown, Brandywine, Whitemarsh, the Wyoming Massacre, the Battle of Thompson Island, and the terrible winter at Valley Forge, all recall the valor of a people struggling to maintain their God-given right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The battlefield of Gettysburg is sacred soil, consecrated by the blood of the North and the South. Here Pennsylvanians rallied in tragic and decisive conflict to preserve the Union, and for 3 days, led by Gen. George G. Meade, worthy son of the Keystone State, fought to glorious victory one of the greatest battles of all time.

Pennsylvania boasts of many distinguished names in industry, in craftsmanship, in the professions, in economics, in culture, and in religion. But none surpass the great figures of Pennsylvania's military history.

Wayne of the Army and Barry of the Navy were Pennsylvanian leaders in the Revolution.

In the War Between the States, Meade, Hancock, and Reynolds were among the many intrepid Pennsylvania leaders who covered themselves with fame and glory.

In World War I, March, Bliss, and Price led a galaxy of brilliant sons of Pennsylvania.

In World War II, Marshall, Arnold, Spaatz, Devers, Craig, Embick, Grunert, Patch, Brereton, McNarney, Gronenger, were only a few of the 1,300,000 gallant Pennsylvanians who wore the uniform in defense of human rights, freedom, and justice.

In every war we have waged that men might be free, Pennsylvania has contributed outstanding and historic military organizations. They were made up of legions of trained men whose devotion to duty and bravery under fire has never been excelled.

Pennsylvania was settled by men of diverse religious, political, and industrial ideals, but deep in the heart of each one of them was the ideal of freedom.

We meet tonight to place in this hall of trophies the honored flags of the Pennsylvania units of World War I and World War II.

The names of the Pennsylvania military units are indelibly written upon the records of the various communities from which they come. They fought in Mexico, the Philippines, Puerto Rico, in Europe, and the Far East.

All have proud histories.

The historical commission of our Commonwealth is to be congratulated upon creating this beautiful and permanent place for these priceless colors.

May they be an inspiration for future generations.

Our constant prayer should be that it may never again be necessary for our men to engage in war to preserve our freedoms.

But as Americans let us never forget that great armament alone will not defend us. We must retain the American way of life. Only total individual freedom will make our position secure. That freedom is our secret weapon in war and our security in peace.

Three things are necessary in the preservation of our country:

Economic stability, an adequate armed force based upon equal service, and a spiritual awakening as to the glories of our country.

We must be strong economically. Our fiscal policies must be sound. Centralized and costly government can destroy us.

We must have an organized defense. We must have the finest small Army, Navy, and Air Force in the world. It should be backed up by well-trained civilian components, directed by the best of our Regular Establishment.

We should step up industrial mobilization by stock-piling critical war materials, by organizing for scientific laboratory work, and by preparing plants for the production of the urgently needed materials of war.

Again our prayer is for peace. We cannot have peace unless there is a spiritual awakening in our country. We must have great mobilization of all the moral forces.

We must understand the greatness of America; we must understand our obligations as well as our rights; we must obey the law.

Tolerant religion, uniting all faith in obedience to the will of God, is the greatest of our spiritual resources.

Our greatest enemy is the ideology which teaches that man can better plan than God.

Should that enemy plunge us into armed conflict, we will fight a holy war.

Jews, Catholics, and Protestants, believing in an omnipotent God, will be massed together a wage a war against a godless people.

Let us put our house in order so we may be properly prepared.

The Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LeCOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Wapello County, Iowa, Farm Bureau held on October 24, 1949, a comprehensive set of resolutions were adopted by this fine organization. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include these resolutions in order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read and know the position that the Farm Bureau of Wapello County, Iowa, has taken with respect to the problems and proposals confronting our country at the present time.

The resolutions are as follows:

We believe that it is important to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

We believe that guarantics of 100 percent of parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic controls. It is important to keep controls at a minimum and still get desired results.

We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high.

We are in favor of flexible supports to average 90 percent of parity.

We believe flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by the law and the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

We do not believe that if production payments are used the prices of commodities to the consumer would drop enough to have a marked influence on consumption, however, a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress, however, we favor the use of production payments in support of perishables (nonstorable commodities).

We favor using surpluses for school-lunch, blue-stamp, and relief programs.

Satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

We are not in favor of abandoning the parity concept for the income support standard plan.

We are in favor of the human approach of mediator for settling labor disputes inasmuch as they are somewhat social, ethical, and economic in nature.

We favor the organization of a worker extension service similar to the Agricultural Extension Service which would work with labor groups for the purpose of helping them solve problems relative to family living.

We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

We are in favor of establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

We favor a farm program set up on the following bases:

Give Secretary of Agriculture power to set support prices on commodities in excess production as low as 75 or 80 percent of parity provided the support prices of commodities in which increase of production is desired be set high enough that if desired shifts of production are obtained total support prices plus soil-conservation payments equal at least 95 percent of parity—or modernized parity, if preferred?

Use European relief, school lunch, aid to disabled, underprivileged and aged groups (blue stamp) to increase consumption of farm products.

Use acreage controls and soil-conservation payments to prevent costly surpluses and keep down cost of program.

Announce support prices of livestock not later than November 1 of preceding year. Announce support prices on crops not later than March 1 of current year, or earlier if possible, especially in southern States.

We believe an all-weather road should be built to every farmstead in the State as soon as possible even if this should delay the construction of cross country superhighway indefinitely.

We believe rural children should have educational opportunities equal to those of urban children.

We favor increasing Federal aid to encourage more doctors to enter the medical profession.

We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan.

We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals.

We favor more Federal aid to aid for medical research.

We do believe we should revise our health program and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

National Phases of the Universal Water Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INDIANAPOLIS, *December 19, 1949.*

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: Remembering that you sponsored our Indiana law for conservation of ground or well water, and that you also took a leading part in the enactment of our statute setting up a flood control and water resources commission, I am taking the liberty of writing you on some national phases of the universal water problem. I wish to invite your attention to gross inequities that have crowded into the so-called regional-improvement program as it relates to flood control, irrigation, navigation, and hydroelectric power—all water problems.

Since then I've been examining the idea of regional development as a Federal function—not as a man in the electric-power business, nor as a member of the flood control commission, nor as a member of the Indiana Economic Council, but as a private, taxpaying citizen. With everybody wondering how we can put on the brakes, get back within our budget, and begin to reduce taxes, I've come to the conclusion that regional development is one obstacle we can either remove or whittle down substantially. And I'm go-

ing to ask you to read a personal discussion of the subject.

We may say regional development was born in the depression days, when, to assist in providing employment, WPA was set up to make jobs, and PWA was established to create public works of lasting value. Now, job making is not as vital as it was then, and we can, further, pass the point whether job making is a proper Federal function.

PWA started out soundly enough, offering to lend 70 percent and grant 30 percent of the cost of local public works jobs. There was relatively little criticism and much good was done. Then, half way along, PWA liberalized, lending 55 percent and granting 45 percent; and more good was done, with some increase, of course, in the griping from those who cannot see Uncle Sam as everybody's Santa Claus.

Now we have made two jumps—a broad jump from local to regional projects; and a high jump, from granting 45 percent to granting 100 percent. Planners assume blithely that we can afford it, and it is our duty. Nationally, our property is worth $1,043 per capita—assessed value—and we can afford (?) to pay Federal income taxes of $285 per capita. Whom, then, shall we help? How much? Look—

Per capita	1948 individual income	Property value	Income taxes
United States	$1,410	$1,043.00	$285.00
Indiana	1,403	684.56	258.30
Kentucky	909	743.20	308.00
Tennessee	955	539.50	111.00
Oregon	1,302	768.76	193.30
Washington	1,453	641.05	216.40

All figures, official sources.

Three fair indices of wealth. Oviously, Tennessee is the one we should help; Oregon and Washington don't need us—but wait, we have just finished giving Tennessee roughly $1,000,000,000. And we're better than half way to the billion-dollar mark for Oregon and Washington.

Where is a clue? Let's look back 10 years, to 1939, when the Federal income tax bill (including all kinds) was only $8.52 per capita. At that time, Indiana's total payments figured $5.23 per capita; Kentucky's, $3.71; Tennessee, $2.66; Oregon, $3; and Washington, $4.35. The billion we dumped in Tennessee increased her income-tax average by 4,073 percent, which indicates a phenomenal improvement in the economy of that area—or does it? Indiana's increase, without benefit of a billion not to be repaid, was 4,833 percent. And Kentucky, Oregon, and Washington, all three, jumped higher, in proportion, than Tennessee did.

Looking at the property valuation figures of Oregon, Kentucky, and Washington, you are bound to wonder whether we, in Indiana, should be contributing to their upkeep. (Kentucky is able to pay more income tax than we do, but that is probably excise on whisky.)

Indiana people are probably about as liberal as the next fellow who earned what he got. Too, we are doing fairly well on our own, without Federal largess. We might examine that angle:

	1947 farm income per capita (excluding Federal payments)	Manufactured goods per capita[1]
United States	$206.50	----------
Indiana	275.60	$760
Kentucky	203.00	261
Tennessee	153.10	300
Oregon	225.90	410
Washington	248.40	337

[1] Value added by manufacture, Census Bureau says.

This table makes us wonder again whether the billion we gave Tennessee has accomplished anything. Tennessee farm production is down because, perhaps, the TVA has flooded much of the best bottom land—more than was ever flooded temporarily; and her manufactures are not especially impressive. Federal bounty might help Oregon and Washington industrially, but both States are a long way from the center of population, and industry likes to be handy to the middle, for raw materials and sales-distribution reasons. Kentucky could do with some more farm income, but here again we are busy, as we were in Tennessee, drowning her more fertile river bottom lands.

As for navigation benefits in river improvements, if the railroads and trucks can handle our heavier loads of farm products and manufactured goods, it would seem the lighter loads of those other States could get to market without using up a lot of money for slow river barges.

Indiana, in the light of these two tables, would need a lot of crust to ask much in the way of Federal aid. And Indiana is not asking much, except for flood control in legitimate projects that are part of the Mississippi Valley program, started 21 years ago under President Hoover. (Strictly flood control, too, with no hydro, irrigation, or waterway transportation or other phonies as benefits in the picture.) One of these days we may need to add water supply to flood control, but I wonder whether the present beggar States will agree to let us insert it in the program.

More, doing well herself, maybe Indiana can afford to help the national effort at regional aid, if it is sound and not too expensive. Another table:

1950 PUBLIC-WORKS APPROPRIATION, FLOOD CONTROL AND RIVER WORK

United States (to spend) $5.04 per capita, total, $664,178,190.

Indiana (to receive) $1.96 per capita, total, $7,580,000.

Kentucky (to receive) $8.71 per capita, total, $24,966,000.

Tennessee (to receive) $3.10[1] per capita, total $9,030,000.

Oregon-Washington (to receive) $16.26 per capita, total $67,475,000.

This, of course, is the table that gives you a headache, following the two already studied. We have nothing at all against the people in those other States. We hope they do well. But—

Our property is as valuable to us as theirs is to them; there are more of us and we produce more and pay a better share of the taxes than most of them pay. We pay approximately as much Federal income tax as Tennessee, Oregon, and Washington combined, and we receive about 10 percent of what they get for flood control and river work.

Maybe something should be done to help Kentucky bring up farm production and industrial production, despite her high property valuation of property and high income-tax ranking. But should Indiana pay 50 percent more in total Federal income-tax dollars and then receive less than one-third the total dollars that Kentucky receives?

Moreover, if we are rich enough to carry more than our share of the load, and generous enough, too, how can we justify the sacrifice or discrimination in the face of the pitiful showing Tennessee makes after we've dumped a billion-odd dollars into her valleys? Actually, if the people of Kentucky, Oregon, and Washington really knew what we've done to Tennessee, wouldn't they lock the doors when we heave in sight with grants, appropriations, regional improvements, and what-not?

[1] Excluding fifty-seven millions for steam-power plant to firm the four to five hundred millions spent on hydro.

Again, which one honestly needs help most? Much of this regional development is tied up with electric power development, or public ownership. About half of Tennessee's billion-dollar grant is clearly and indisputably in electric power—and only half of Tennessee's farms have electric service. But Indiana farms, about 50–50 supplied by companies, and REMC's with borrowed-and-being-repaid Federal loans, are past 95 percent supplied. And Oregon and Washington farms, like Indiana's, are right at the saturation point on electric supply.

If industrial power supply is what is needed via hydro at dams demanded first and loudest for flood control and irrigation, in the Northwest, look again at the horrible example of Tennessee. Oak Ridge had to have dependable power for atomic development, so built its own steam-generating station, instead of relying on TVA. And now TVA is building steam plants itself—with taxpayers' money, of course. How long would it be, do you suppose, before Oregon and Washington, their billion exhausted for hydro, etc., will be back showing how necessary it is for them to have more funds for steam plants, to firm their hydro?

If we strain ourselves and pay more than our share for the Northwest, will it repeat the sad story of Tennessee? I didn't mean to bring electric power into this matter, but it has a definite bearing. Will you look at one more table, please?

	Per capita power supply	Power use per year	Industrial use
	Horsepower	*Kilowatt-hours*	*Kilowatt-hours*
United States	0.52	1,644	1,130
Indiana	.57	1,805	1,247
Kentucky	.33	----------	----------
Tennessee [1]	----------	----------	----------
Oregon	[2] .78	----------	----------
Washington	[3] 1.12	----------	----------

[1] Not 365 days calculable, because "infirm."
[2] Including some "infirm" hydro.
[3] Much of it "infirm"—witness 2 aluminum plants down recently due to hydro shortage.

Figures based on Edison Electric Institute survey, January 1949.

Indiana's power supply, as noted above, is about 10 percent above the national average for capacity, general usage, and industrial usage. That position directly reflects our strong positions in both industrial and agricultural production. (All three positions, we earned—nobody gave them to us.)

Washington has almost double our power supply on a per capita basis, but seems to accomplish about half what we do with it in Indiana. But like Tennessee, Washington is handicapped because its power supply is crippled periodically by river fluctuations—too high, or too low, water.

Should we spend more to help them? If they need help, can't they pay a little on the cost themselves? Are we sure, in the light of Tennessee, that dollars will really help them? If we can afford or spare them? We might balk and say, "Look, you guys, Indiana was a swamp woods once, but our folks licked it, can't you come through on your own?"

If you've come this far with me, Ralph, I'm much obliged. I should not have bothered you with this letter, except that I am convinced that economy is going to be dogoned good politics, beginning in a day or so from right now. I'm convinced that throwing money around is a long way from being an automatic, infallible answer to everything, regional improvements, or anything else.

Besides, didn't you stumble over that "vulgar" fraction—4,833-percent increase in Indiana's per capita income-tax payments?

Best regards, and merry Christmas.

JOHN C. MELLETT.

Contempt of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Tribune:

CONTEMPT OF CONGRESS

President Truman has created a temporary Water Resources Commission and named Leland Olds chairman. Olds is the radical, tyrannical, mischievous, egotistical chameleon whose predominant color is pink, as Senator JOHNSON of Colorado called him last year when the Senate refused, by a vote of more than 3 to 1, to confirm his reappointment to the Federal Power Commission. He has a long record of association with Communists.

This time Olds won't have to run the Senate gantlet. He and the other members of the Commission are being paid out of the President's emergency fund. Associated with him are old Morris L. Cooke, the original head of the Rural Electrification Administration, who at 78 is still ardent to bring private enterprise to the bureaucratic heel, and five college presidents and professors.

Appointment of a Water Resources Commission was recommended by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Federal Government. The pork-barrel competition between two Federal agencies, the Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department and the Army engineers, has already cost the taxpayers billions of wasted dollars.

No commission headed by Olds is going to save anyone anything. He is part of the socialist apparatus by which Mr. Truman and his totalitarian advisers are trying to concentrate the rule of every phase of American life in Washington.

There are, as there always have been and always will be, conflicting claims to the Nation's water resources. They are not so important in the Middle West, although we have a ground water deletion problem in Illinois and neighboring States, or in the East, except as municipal bureaucrats fall down on the job, as they did in engineering New York's shortage. But in the arid West water is of first importance and the rights to what there is of it for power and irrigation are the subject of bitter fueds between individuals and States.

Such a situation gives a Socialist the chance, in the guise of allocating the supply of water fairly, to make every individual, corporation, and municipality bow the knee to Washington authority. Beyond that, it offers the opportunity to spend billions of dollars in various fantastic schemes to develop water resources.

In these schemes the Socialists have little interest in irrigation, except as a means of bribery. Irrigation is for farmers, who are hard to push around politically. When the Socialists talk about conserving water resources their eye is on public power. The Tennessee Valley Authority, it may be remembered, was introduced as a great experiment in conservation. Except for a little social worker folderol, conservation is out the window in TVA, which is now building steam-engineering plants at points designed to serve areas far beyond the Tennessee Valley.

The Socialists want to control electric power because, with labor, it is the tool of production that all industry uses. By controlling it they expect to control industry. When they control industry they will also control its workmen and their jobs.

The Olds appointment demonstrates again Mr. Truman's contempt of Congress. A man held unfit for one job is placed in another of possibly greater importance.

Report From India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 12 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two articles by Mr. and Mrs. Harris Wofford; one in the November 1949 issue of the magazine, Common Cause, with one which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch of November 25, 1949. Mrs. Wofford is a former student of the University of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

[From Common Cause of November 1949]

REPORT FROM INDIA

(By Harris and Clare Wofford)

The Chicago Committee's Draft World Constitution raised the sights of many federalists, including the two of us, from the goal of an atomic emergency government to that of a positive world republic. In 1947 in Europe we sensed the existence of a "middle world" of perhaps a billion and a half human beings who desired neither America nor Russia as world master. If even the people of American-aided western Europe properly belonged in this category, then we guessed that most of the Asians, Africans, and South Americans belonged there more surely. Since the economic problems of these people seemed paramount, any world government seeking to win their allegiance would need wide economic powers. In this light, the Chicago constitution's maximalism looked like irreducible minimal political sense.

Because of this, some of us campaigned ardently though ineffectively to persuade our fellow federalists to move onto a new road leading to a full-fledged world republic, proceeding by means of a genuine world people's movement able to mobilize the middle world, and beginning with an unofficial world people's constituent assembly as the first step. We failed to convince them, and decided that rather than continue the repetitious debate or try somehow to commence separately we should first reassess our own position. We recognized that our arguments, although deeply felt, had only tender roots in real evidence.

A fellowship from the Foundation for World Government made it possible for us to come to study in India. We resigned our connections with the foundation and with United World Federalists, and for 6 months now, in this heartland of the middle world, we have been focusing on the history of Gandhi's Indian national congress and on the current economic situation—seeking light on the problem of world government. It is fitting that our first public report go to Common Cause.

India is a vast school offering lessons in all of life. We, in the first grades, have learned simple facts of world life which any students from the white, industrialized western one-fifth of mankind should be expected to learn from the Indian continent's one-fifth—or from any country among the colored, underdeveloped majority of mankind.

India made us acutely aware that two-thirds of the world's citizens are ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-housed. They are suffering and dying from diseases man knows how to cure, illiterate, without useful work much or all of the time, still using wooden tools and techniques which the industrial revolution antiquated. They are struggling for survival on overworked, unfertilized, tiny, and often rented plots of land; they are facing discrimination because of race, religion, class, or sex; unable to think, speak, or act politically as free men because of lack of facilities or because of direct governmental repression; and they are lacking democratic self-government because of national dictatorship, colonialism, or, in another sense, world anarchy.

From India, it seems certain that these once silent, sleeping masses are waking. One idea is arousing them: equality. The majority of poor or landless peasants in the villages—85 percent of India—are already questioning the right of one man to own a thousand acres and most men to have 1 acre or none. The majority of underemployed city workers, living 10 to a suffocating tenement room, are already questioning the right of a few thousands to live in their midst in luxurious western mansions. The majority of underfed Indians are questioning a world society in which their country is without food while the white countries of the west have plenty. The questioning is simple but goes deep. Likewise, equality is a simple but penetrating idea. The voiceless millions are finding their tongues. The questions have led to universal grumbling, the thunder of revolution.

Every step of reform taken to satisfy the demands for equality—abolishing feudal landlords, reducing land rent—only whets the appetite for fuller equality and further arouses the consciousness of the masses. The dam of complacency, lethargy, and ignorance has been pierced by the explosive idea of equality and an irresistible tide is pouring through.

In China the revolution has taken one form. It may take another in India and the rest of Asia.

This revolution fast overtaking us, which is destined to cut through the history of modern civilization, appears to be double-edged.

One side is toward world unification, as we federalists early realized. The other side—sharper for more of the world, and doing most of the initial cutting in the middle world—is toward equality.

The separate national state system is going to end in our time, whether the revolutionary change to a world state comes peacefully before war, or by conquest through war. But federalists will be blind and hopelessly lost if they fail to recognize and cope with the other side, the revolution against privilege.

This economic and social revolution is understood in most of the world in Marxian terms because none others have been suggested. In these terms, there is today a class struggle inside each country and between countries. Inside each country, particularly in Asia, four-fifths of the people, who were born to no choice but misery, are rising to end the hated status quo—by whatever means necessary—and to establish some kind of just social order. Equality of sacrifice and of opportunity, abolition of landlordism, land redistribution, establishment of cooperatives, public control of industry, planning for over-all economic development—all add up to the product labeled "socialism," which is almost universally approved and

desired. Some kind of socialism seems inevitable as well as desirable for these underdeveloped countries who in one generation aim to achieve the industrialization and modernization which took the West a hundred years.

Moreover, an even greater class struggle exists between the whole of the west and the rest of mankind.

Every poverty-stricken Indian peasant seems to know one thing about America—it is rich. (One out of four we questioned had heard that Negroes were badly treated.) In many forms we have been asked by villagers, "Why is it that Americans are all rich and happy, and we Indians are sad and poor?"

The Asian mind seems grimly determined to end this giant inequality. Hostility to the west, generated by centuries of imperialism and racialism, and now continued by gnawing contrast between American dominance and wealth and Asian misery, is growing. This is dynamite lodged in a hundred million minds.

Either the west takes rapid steps to eliminate the dynamite by eliminating the misery, or it will explode in war. One western businessman here prophesied: "Four hundred million Indians are going to industrialize, whether it takes 20 years or three times that, whether it takes a few thousand or a few million lives. If the west helps them enough and in time, we may end up pals. If not, then God help us."

Potentially, in any war today, the masses of India are on the side of the Soviet Union The same peasants who know that America is rich and racially prejudiced, believe that the Soviet Union is a workers' land, run for the good of the poor, with full economic and racial equality. One in four we talked to knew and approved of the Red revolution in China, where, they had heard, "the tiller of the soil was getting the land." Any world war now could easily develop into a war between the Western one-fifth of mankind and all the rest, led militantly by the billion bitter people of Asia, who could be fired with hatred for the pale-pink prejudiced people with the colonies, depressions, and wars. This would be one resolution of the world "class struggle."

Federalists are fools if they think that world government can be formed without coping with the problem of equality in each country, and between the West and the world. Such a world government, protecting the status quo, would soon be overwhelmed. It would explode from inside dissension, or be submerged by the tidal wave coming across Asia.

Nor can world-wide equality be established without world government. International anarchy means a fearful, frenzied climate of war preparation in which any steps toward social and economic reform become difficult. The economic development and planning required to solve such problems as food shortage can be successfully carried out only by world planning and mobilization of all human resources. Both sides of the world revolution make one problem which must be solved, for good or ill in our time.

In Asia, the Communists are the only forces, with positive proposals to solve both dilemmas rapidly. With courage, intelligence, and dedication the Communists propose proletarian armed revolution to end the status quo, Communist party dictatorship to establish equality, and a World Soviet Union with respect for national cultures to prevent war and to organize world economy rationally.

Among the billion Asian people, civil liberties are unknown. Misery, with its slow daily violence and starvation of body and mind, is their heritage. The Communists claim to offer a swift, violent way to end this. Communism is increasingly winning the allegiance of the young, educated, politically conscious citizens of India. Communist revolution seems like a clean knife to be used in an operation on a cancer that has resisted all other treatment.

World federalists may oppose the Communist solution—refusing to believe that equality, fraternity, and democracy can come through violence, dictatorship, and blood purges—but we must propose a better solution. We cannot and we as Democrats ought not oppose the revolution against injustice. The tide may be forced into terrible destructive channels but it cannot be stopped.

Sadly, from India, it seems abundantly evident that the American Government's policy has no positive proposals either for world equality or world unification. United States policy in Asia seems to consist of half-hearted, vacillating efforts, or gestures, to support the status quo. Chiang Kai-shek's collapse ought to suggest to us that the whole of the American Army plus the atom bomb might be insufficient to maintain the old order. Asia is villages, and the peasants there fear rain and sun, not unknown nuclear fission. The revolution in Asia takes place in each of these villages. To stop the coming changes in India alone would require 700,000 atomic bombs—1 for each village.

Democrats ought to rejoice at this awakening in Asia. Instead of opposing the tide, they should join in, and seek to ride and guide the wave to a successful conclusion through peaceful and democratic channels.

The only forces in India presenting any real alternative to communism are the Democratic Socialists, lead by Jayaprakash Narayan and a half dozen other outstanding young men of integrity and courage, such as Rammanohar Lohia, Achyt Patwardan, and Ashok Mehta. These men of the Gandhi Age, who spent their youth in jail (where they became the best-read politicians in the world), have hammered out in their own lives a union of socialism with Gandhism. Social democracy they conceive as a revolution, which should be achieved nonviolently, which begins by a Socialist living socialism in his own life. By their example of complete dedication and their ideology of full-fledged democratic socialism, these men have inspired confidence and their faith has won considerable allegiance. The Socialist Party is the most hopeful political fact in India.

However, Indian socialism seems insufficient compared with communism. The Socialists have no such direct international answer as have the Communists, and therefore their program goes only halfway at a time when either the whole revolution is achieved or none: halfway across the chasm means destruction. Socialism is so far half-baked because it has no program for world unification.

Indian people and Socialists particularly lean toward an Asian bloc, organized around the negative goal of opposing both the Russian and American blocs. We have suggested instead that India should lead in forging a bloc of world citizens, based on the "middle world" but extending into both power blocs, organized around the positive goal of a world federal republic.

A representative world federation, designed to establish justice, with its first aim the equalization and raising of living standards everywhere, copes with the revolutionary needs of our time.

Through such a world government, the "class struggle" between the west and the rest can be peacfully and voluntarily resolved, with beneficial results for every country. For example, a world development administration could mobilize all the world's resources, including the industrial machine of the west, for a full-production, full-employment, one-generation program to wipe out famine, illiteracy, mass disease, and to develop the vast economic resources of Asia, Africa, and South America for the welfare of all mankind.

Such a program has potential appeal for most people. The problem is how to bring this idea forward as a real alternative to American-Russian power politics. The existence of the "middle world," which we believe could include a majority of the American people, is the first cause for hope. Indians could lead in mobilizing this camp of world citizens. At least the history of India's own struggle for independence through nonviolent popular action throws light on this problem.

The national Indian aim was swa-raj—self-government. This required the development of a responsible consciousness of Indian national citizenship and the organization of a citizens' party, or, as Gandhi called it, army, which would force the British and the 500 state princes and rulers to turn over power to 1 common democratic Indian government.

Gandhi shaped the Indian National Congress into nonviolent revolutionary lines. At times it won such mass support that it acted as a de facto, unofficial parallel government to the British Raj. The Indian Congress met annually as the unofficial legislative body of the millions of Indians who had registered through it as free Indians. Gandhi geared the Congress to a constructive program of concrete, immediate, individual projects which put all politically conscious Indians to work in service of the people—which meant work in the villages. It aimed to end untouchability, establish village industries and cooperatives, promote Hindu-Muslim friendship. Do these things now, pleaded Gandhi, and you will not only convince the people that Swa-raj is worth fighting for but you will prepare yourselves and the country for good self-government. From the popular energy generated in this program the Congress was able to conduct a successful political program of action on immediate issues and later of actual contests for election to office. From this base Gandhi was able to lead the people in mass campaigns of satyagraha ("firmness on truth")—nonviolent direct action which threw the people's weight onto the scales against great armies and prison gates.

Our aim is world Swa-raj. We seek a peaceful world revolution establishing a world republic. This requires the development of world citizenship and the organization of a world-wide people's movement capable of persuading the national governments to transfer their world powers to a government of the people of the whole earth.

Why not a world citizens' congress? The world congress would consist of registered world citizens and affiliated public organizations fighting on some front for a united world community. These forces are powerful, although scattered and without common strategy. They include the forces for world government, UN strengthening, internationalism and one world, the democratic Socialists and other groups struggling for justice inside each country, and the national independence and liberation movements in the colonial areas. Under the banner of a world republic and a common assembly of the world congress sessions, they could develop a dynamic world program based on world constructive service. World citizens need to be put to work on immediate problems like food, health, and education, especially in seeing that refugees and children get a chance for the satisfaction of these needs. A world congress could initiate practical projects which would support the UN agencies already doing good but unsupported work and excellent but neglected planning. A constructive program should include local action for fuller establishment of the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights—which means that American world citizens must work to end racial inequalities at home.

A world congress could become a powerful people's lobby in the UN and in national

governments, applying to immediate political issues its principles of opposition to colonialism and war measures, and support of UN strengthening, development of backward areas, and economic steps to prevent depression.

Is mass world satyagraha inconceivable? The time may come when people everywhere could act concertedly and peacefully in effective demonstrations against war. Or, more constructively, the idea of an unofficial people's world constituent assembly might provide the issue around which nonviolent direct action could revolve. This can come only after a world congress has taken root and has real strength and vitality.

The real problem, as so often with Democrats, is to begin. So far, world government is nowhere to our knowledge a living, bread and butter political issue among the people. It has not yet become politics. We suggest that this is because it has not yet been linked to the social and economic issues in the world which are bread and butter, rice and chopati issues. Therefore, we federalists have talked nobly in a world of our own, while the real political forces have been out fighting on the social and economic frontiers. These forces need the unifying and inspiring common aim of a world republic just as much as federalists need their aid. Until the alliance between federalists and these forces is forged, neither will make real progress. Once forged, there would be a political program loose in the world which might accomplish strange and wonderful things.

If this course makes sense it can begin anywhere—with the world movement for world federal government, among Indian socialists, by American federalists in any city or State in the United States of America. We believe that the people of the world are waiting for something like this to be offered. Once started, there might result a chain reaction of hope and constructive work.

A peasant in a Kashmir paddy field stopped planting his rice to ask us just what world government would be like. We described the kind of government envisioned in the Chicago constitution and the sort of things it could do. He told us solemnly: "That world government would help the poor people. All the world is praying to God for such a government."

But as Gandhi insisted about Indian Swaraj, world government will not descend from heaven; it must be earned and deserved.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of November 25, 1947]

SEND WHEAT TO INDIA

(By Clare and Harris Wofford)

SIR: Indians are starving while America's wheat surplus overflows storage space and America's merchant marine lies underemployed in port. This fantastic contradiction faces us on our return home this Thanksgiving time after 6 months in India.

For lack of enough food, the hungry Indian people, especially the thin, undernourished children, lack the strength for long, useful lives. (An Indian's life-expectancy is about 25 years—an American's is over 65.) In their misery the Indians will one day turn, as the Chinese before them, to the Communists who promise a rapid, if ruthless, program to provide food, land and longer lives.

Yet for lack of enough people with dollars to buy America's vast surplus of wheat, our Government, which purchases the wheat to prevent a farm depression, is now spending more money to build great new storage depots. We hear that Victory ships are being tugged down the Hudson River to be reconditioned at great expense as warehouses for unused wheat. But we cannot stockpile wheat like atom bombs: wheat rots.

Is this a Christian—or businesslike—answer to a wheat surplus in a starving world? Cannot we work out some sensible way to send the wheat before it rots on our unused ships to the ill-fed children of India and other lands?

We spend billions of dollars arming ourselves and other governments; but the battle for democracy and peace will be won, not by atom bombs, not on the battlefields, but by bread in the rice fields.

India and the economically underdeveloped countries are unable to purchase our surplus food because they have no surplus dollars. They are trying to raise themselves by their own poor bootstraps out of poverty, away from violent revolution. Their race against starvation can be understood by two facts: If all Indians attempted to eat the amount of food that the United Nations considers the minimum for human beings, 115,000,000 Indians would have no food at all; yet 5,000,000 more Indians are born every year than die.

Let us remember that the Indian continent represents about one-fifth of the human race. The Chinese fifth of mankind has already gone Communist. What happens to India—whether it grows democratic or totalitarian—may decide the future of us all. Yet American policy sticks to western Europe, and India has seen none of our generosity—no vast lend-lease, no dollar loans, no UNRRA, no Marshall plan.

Why not apply Christian principles to common sense and put our wheat to work for peace in a better investment than a dozen battleships? Let Congress vote that our food surplus, above a safe reserve level, is available free to groups outside the regular market, such as the children or the 10,000,000 refugees in India.

Why not have this act of peace do double-duty and help to strengthen world organization as well as the democracy of India? Let the food be a direct contribution from America to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization for distribution in the name of mankind as a whole.

This is an issue for the people and their organizations—particularly the churches, women's and other civic groups. This is something our statesmen might like to do if they thought the people were behind them. We believe the people will be ahead of them.

Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a story of great courage by a fine young American, Matt Vucurovich, of Butte, Mont.

I want to extend my congratulations to Matt and Florence Vucurovich for the tremendous fight they have made and are making against great odds; to their family for the fine assistance they have rendered to them; and to their numerous friends—many of them personal friends of mine—for all they have done to help Matt and Florence.

It is an honor for me to have the opportunity to bring Matt's own story to the attention of Congress because it typifies the courage of an American boy and his sister, the devotion of his family, and the true meaning of friends.

To Matt and Florence, I extend my wishes and my prayers that their recovery will be complete and their courage and fighting spirit rewarded.

[From the Montana Standard, Butte-Anaconda, Mont., of October 16, 1949]

MATT VUCUROVICH TELLS HIS STORY OF SLOWLY REGAINING EYESIGHT

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—Matt Vucurovich, one of the finest all-round athletes ever produced at Butte High School, and his sister, Florence, became blind at almost the same time in 1944. Now, after many months of treatment, Matt's sight is slowly returning and Florence is showing some improvement. At the invitation of the Montana Standard, in the belief that their game fight points up a lesson to encourage others, Matt Vucurovich tells their story of a return from darkness.)

(By Matt Vucurovich)

After nearly six long years, the shadows are lifting at last, and there is sunlight again.

What manner of miracle this must be is hard to understand and much harder yet to describe. Perhaps "miracle" is not quite the right word for it, because I never weakened during these years of blindness in my conviction that some day I would see again. And now that day is here.

My sister Florence, who is 3 years younger, and I both lost our sight early in 1944. Florence, then in Butte High School, had complained of severe headaches, but nothing unusual happened since the school nurse was treating her for them.

Then one evening in February, while sitting here at home (101 South Oklahoma Street) doing her homework, she suddenly discovered that she couldn't see out of her right eye. There seemed to be a film-like cloud, she said. The eye was badly bloodshot.

When she went to a doctor, he told her she had "pinkeye" and sent her home.

The "pinkeye" turned out to be iritis, which is an inflammation of the iris. Her condition grew increasingly worse, and she went to a doctor in Billings.

"How bad is it?" she asked.

"About as bad as it could be," he told her. The doctor sought to send her to a doctor in St. Paul, but the man he knew there had developed a case of blood poisoning and couldn't take her then. So she came home. Meanwhile her left eye had been failing, and soon she couldn't see at all, except to distinguish shadow from light.

I had entered Compton, Calif., Junior College in September 1943 as a freshman student. When my sister Angie was married to Mike Samardich the next February, I came home for the wedding, and didn't go back.

Then, in April, it happened to me. My eyes suddenly became bloodshot, like Florence's had been. I went to a doctor, but I couldn't learn what was the matter. Both Florence and I had our tonsils out, but that didn't help.

We turned to Rochester and in May that year made the first of our seven trips back there. We stayed until November and then came home for Christmas.

That was when we began to learn how many loyal friends we had in Butte. A committee which included Midge Griffiths, Emett Sullivan, Wreck Donnelly, Mike Popovich, Ed Sullivan, and others sponsored a huge dance program at the American Legion and miners' union halls and the Serbian Orthodox church. Nearly $6,000 was raised, as I recall. It was a wonderful thing, an unforgettable demonstration of help from one's friends and neighbors. Babe Elliott of the Northern Pacific was a great friend in need.

Back to Rochester we went in January and remained until July. We were given gold shots to settle the infection, and the doctors

took their daily looks at us. Florence had three shots a week and the best I could do was two.

Our sister Angie stayed with us in an apartment. She took us around, occasionally to shows or the ice follies—things like that. The time went surprisingly fast. On our first trip, mother had stayed with us. She and Mrs. Clare Jones, one of the best landladies in the world, and Denny Higgins, who ran the other apartment house, got along famously.

My first operation came in November 1946. They worked on the left eye. They got the pupil open quite a bit, and they told me my light perception was very good. But then, somehow, the pupil closed again. I had been able to distinguish colors and differences in fabrics, but now I couldn't any more. Cars which went past were reduced to mere streaky looking shadows. I was pretty discouraged.

There were more trips to Rochester. There was a big ice show staged here as a benefit, and again our friends were wonderful to us. But it was getting to be rather rough going financially, nevertheless.

I had a grocery store at 500 East Park, with Angie coming from Anaconda every day to help out. But it was too much, and I had to give it up after 8 months.

Through the efforts of Midge Griffiths, of the high school, the brothers at Butte Central, the school board, and the chamber of commerce, I was able to establish the concessions at the Butte High School football stadium. The concession part had been abandoned during the war, you now.

Mayor Barry O'Leary and several councilmen, among them Walter Kinared, John Lindquist, Pete Sodja, Art Mehrens, and John McCartan, helped me obtain the concessions during the baseball season at Clark Park. The concession work took a lot of pressure off the nerves, and my contact with the ballplayers and fans aided tremendously.

I had lots of help. Besides those in my family, there were Johnny Kovacich, Leonard Stevens, Joe Roberts, Bronko Stanisich, Bronko Borozan, Bob and Margie Mirich, and Arleen Markovich. They worked without pay, and the business practically ran itself.

It was toward the end of the baseball season this year that I started making improvement. I had gone back to Rochester for a quick 2-minute operation, and was back in Butte 24 hours later.

The people at the ball park were becoming just a bit more distinct, and again I could distinguish colors of clothing. I didn't say anything about it, though.

It was a thrilling experience, and I didn't dare to hope for too much. The first real thing I saw, I think, was Florence's bandana. She was excited, and so was I.

"Isn't that a housecoat you're wearing?" I asked her. And it was.

"How do you know?" she asked.

"I think I can see it."

Then, riding in a car from the ball park, I could make out the white guard posts and rails on the Texas avenue overpass. After that, people weren't just voices any more. They were figures I could see—not very well, you know, but I could see them dimly just the same.

And so I'm on my way back, I'm sure. I bowled three games last week, with Pete, my brother, at Marty's alleys, helping to guide me. I shot 126, 112, and 80, which aren't bad scores for a guy who couldn't even see the floor 3 months ago.

I can read, too—only large type, of course—but that's real progress, too. But it's like learning to read all over again. I have to take it pretty slow.

There's still much to be done, especially in Florence's case. I'm hoping to land the concessions at the new civic center when it's ready, and that would be a big help. Florence hasn't had an operation yet, but probably will sometime this next year.

I had a fine letter from Dr. W. L. Benedict at Rochester a couple of weeks ago. He wrote that he is "very happy to know that you have regained some of your lost vision" and adds that "I know of no reason why your improvement should not continue. Let nature take its course."

It's a wonderful letter, probably the best letter I ever got from anybody in my whole life. And one of these days I'll be able to read it myself—right there in the small typewriter print where it says the 6 years of darkness are about over.

Why Congressmen Travel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Pittsburgh Sunday Sun-Telegraph of December 4, 1949:

WHY CONGRESSMEN TRAVEL

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Some displeasure is being expressed because Members of Congress have been going abroad in considerable numbers and at public expense.

It is not unlikely that part of the criticism is inspired by the bureaucracy which carries on our multifarious projects across the oceans—including the disbursements of very large sums of money.

For Senators and Representatives who visit the foreign scenes are expected to discuss what they observe, and their reports are not always complimentary to the agents and agencies involved.

Discouraging or discrediting congressional tours may thus be a protective political device.

In another phase, the criticism of Congress comes from sincere advocates of Federal economy.

For example, the New York Sun disclosed alliteratively that:

"From Belgium to Bermuda, from Sweden to Siam, more than 100 globe-hopping Congressmen have roamed this year on junkets or missions * * * which will cost the harassed American taxpayer nearly $750,000."

That may seem like a good deal of money. But is it?

Actually, $750,000—three-fourths of one million—is approximately 0.0002 percent of the $40,000,000,000-budget for the current fiscal year which was submitted by the administration and which the Congress was asked to approve—almost an infinitesimal proportion.

Including the expenses of the Marshall plan and of the American occupation forces in Germany, Austria, Trieste, and Japan, plus numerous grants or loans, literally billions of dollars of our appropriated funds are being spent in foreign places.

Why should anybody—even a bureaucrat—object if Members of Congress deem it their duty to do a little overseas auditing?

If the demand is put upon them to provide vast sums, and to levy the onerous taxes implied, why should not the National Legislature ascertain for itself how the funds are being dispensed—and to what good purposes, if any?

In fact, how could Congress legislate capably when recurrent appropriations are proposed unless Congress has more direct information than the interested bureaucracies may choose to submit?

What appears to be overlooked is that the United States is no longer a stay-at-home nation attending to its own business.

We have troops and fleets and squadrons of airplanes in virtually every foreign sea and alien continent.

We have assumed, whether wisely or not, the responsibility of rehabilitating the rest of the world and of supporting much of it.

We are in the United Nations, paying the major share of its bills; we are in the North Atlantic alliance, presumably in anticipation of another European war; we are implicated in diplomatic imbroglios in the Far East, the Middle East, and the Near East; and we are lending money in important amounts to remote countries like Afghanistan.

These far-flung adventures require appropriations of money which only the Congress can make.

Consequently, as the elected Representatives of the people, Members of Congress have an obligation in international affairs that belongs to them alone.

Since the foregoing are the facts—and the facts they are—why should any Member of Congress, or all Members of Congress, be criticized or aspersed because they go abroad to discover for themselves what we are financing?

What they would spend on a few information junkets may be saved for us a thousandfold in carefully edited future appropriations; and no foreign-expenditure lobbyists should be permitted to restrict this prerogative of Congress.

Civil-Rights Compromise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENDERSON LANHAM

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, under the auspices of the Atlanta Christian Council, the Honorable BROOKS HAYS, of the Fifth District of Arkansas, appeared in Atlanta on Monday and Tuesday, December 5 and 6, and discussed before various groups the civil-rights problem with especial reference to his own moderate and practical suggested method of settling this problem without resorting to punitive laws.

In connection with Mr. HAYS' appearance in Atlanta, the Atlanta Journal on December 3, commented upon Mr. HAYS' prospective appearance. With my own remarks I am including this editorial which seems to me to be a very fair and able résumé of the approach which Congressman HAYS and other southern liberals are proposing toward improving race relations.

It is truly tragic that many so-called leaders of both parties and both races are using this grave problem for political purposes and are seeking to make political capital out of the perplexing situation.

It is my fervent hope that the voice of understanding liberals like BROOKS HAYS will be heeded and that the problem

will be settled by moderate and reasonable means instead of by the drastic punitive proposals offered by the politicians. I am convinced that if these drastic proposals should be approved by the Congress, the position of the Negroes would not be improved but that progress toward the real solution would be set back a quarter of a century. This is a problem that cannot be settled by punitive laws but which must be settled by the raising of the economic and educational level of the minority races in our midst.

The editorial above referred to is as follows:

HAYS WILL SPEAK HERE ON CIVIL-RIGHTS COMPROMISE

Arkansas' able and intelligent Representative in Congress, BROOKS HAYS, of Little Rock, is a southern liberal who has made a real contribution toward improving race relations. He is the author of a civil-rights compromise which he believes will be acceptable to moderate, clear-thinking people of North and South alike. His proposal has attracted much attention since he first brought it to the floor of the House last February.

Monday and Tuesday, Atlantans will have an opportunity to hear Mr. HAYS discuss the civil-liberties issue in person. He is being brought here by the Atlanta Christian Council to fill a tight 2-day speaking schedule that will include addresses to the Ministers' Conference, to the Christian Council itself, and other interested groups.

As we understand it, Mr. HAYS thinks that if an agreement could be reached that no legislation will be passed on the subject of segregation, southerners would prove themselves quite open-minded on the other issues. He feels that southerners would not then fight for the anti-poll-tax bill, and that a modus vivendi could be reached on antilynch and FEPC proposals. With regard to the former, his thinking is that a Federal antilynch bill would be acceptable provided such a law operates only in States having no antilynch laws of their own, and he would handle the fair-employment question by setting up a division in the Labor Department to "counsel with management and labor for the elimination of discrimination and work toward wider employment opportunities for all groups." The FEPC machinery he suggests would carry no "legal sanctions." It would employ reason rather than a big stick.

Most southerners would agree, we think, that in selecting segregation as a point of no compromise, Mr. HAYS has put his finger on the issue where Federal interference with custom and tradition here would be least practicable, and most dangerous. And it is perfectly clear that segregation is an issue upon which Dixie congressmen will not and cannot yield an inch. Thus the Arkansan's proviso on the subject, whatever northern critics may think of it, is only common sense so far as practical politics are concerned.

The Atlanta Christian Council deserves high praise for inviting Mr. HAYS to this community. In our opinion it is through the churches—and the honest, thoughtful, God-fearing people of both races who belong to them—that the most encouraging progress in the field of race relations is being made. And here is a southerner, born in Arkansas and a Baptist by faith, who answers the civil rights zealots with a constructive counter-proposal of his own.

Mr. HAYS' plan will not be satisfactory to Dixie demagogues who get themselves elected to office by peddling race hatred; nor will it please the cynical politicians who cater to minority groups in the North. But it is worth thinking over, and we are glad Atlantans are getting an opportunity to hear all about it.

The REA Program in Montana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Rural Electrification Administration is an agency of the United States Department of Agriculture. It was established on May 11, 1935, by Executive order of the President under authority of the Emergency Relief Appropriation Act of 1935. The Rural Electrification Act of 1936 gave REA permanent status and authorized a 10-year lending program. In 1944 this lending program was extended by Congress indefinitely. Congress annually makes available the amount of funds REA may lend.

REA is headed by an Administrator who is appointed by the President for a 10-year term. His appointment is confirmed by the Senate, and in his official actions he is responsible to the Secretary of Agriculture. The present Administrator, Claude R. Wickard, of Indiana, took office in July 1945.

REA is empowered to make loans to qualified borrowers, with preference to nonprofit and cooperative organizations and to public bodies. Loans are made to cover the full cost of constructing power lines and other electric facilities to serve persons in rural areas who are without central station electric service. The loans bear 2 percent interest and are repaid over a maximum period of 35 years.

REA itself operates no rural-electric facilities, and no grants or subsidies are involved in its program. Its loans are repaid from the operating revenues of the locally owned, locally managed systems. A part of each individual consumer's monthly electric bill goes to pay off the Government loans. REA serves principally as a banker to the local systems. Its main functions are to lend money and give technical advice and counsel where needed in the construction and operation of the borrower's facilities.

Farm electrification had advanced very slowly in the United States during the 53-year period from 1882, when the first central generating system went into service, to 1935, when REA was created. A few farmers were connected to central-station power prior to World War I. The early twenties saw a short-lived spurt in which the progress made in electrical engineering was reflected by a small increase in the number of farms served. However, only 10.9 percent of all farms in the United States were receiving central-station electric service by 1935. Few power lines had been built beyond the immediate vicinities of cities and towns.

Farmers and farm organizations, chafing at the slow rate of progress, increased their demands for Government action in the field of rural electrification. The result was the establishment of REA, with an action program designed primarily to make electric service available to those farm people who were without electricity.

Since the establishment, REA has greatly stimulated the extension of service into rural areas. By July 1, 1949, a total of 3,838,062 additional farms had been connected to central power lines by all agencies, public and private. More than half of the farms connected to central station lines since 1935—about 57 percent—received electric service from REA-financed systems. The remainder were on lines of other suppliers, many of which were stimulated to greater activity in the rural field by the REA program.

REA estimated as of June 30, 1949, that 4,582,016 farms, or 78.2 percent of the Nation's total, were electrified. About 1,275,000 of the Nation's farms, more than 21 percent, still were unelectrified. In addition, there were hundreds of thousands of unelectrified rural nonfarm dwellings, crossroads businesses, schools, churches, and other rural establishments.

Many of these unelectrified farms are situated in isolated areas, or in areas of relatively low farm income. Consequently, the most difficult part of the rural electrification job remains to be completed. However, the REA program has succeeded in establishing a pattern which eventually can provide virtually every unserved farm in the country with electric service.

As of August 31, 1949, REA had approved $1,867,949,858 in loans to 1,054 borrowers. They include 968 cooperatives, 41 public power districts, 23 other public bodies, and 25 commercial power companies. At that time, REA had on file or in process in the field, additional loan applications totaling $424,111,000 for new system construction and various line improvements. Most of these applications are for expansion of existing systems financed by REA.

Some 968 of these REA borrowers had rural electric facilities in operation. Their facilities included 870,951 miles of line serving more than 2,871,701 farms and other rural consumers in about 2,500 counties of 46 States, Alaska, and the Virgin Islands. Additional lines are being built more rapidly now than ever before.

Of all the loans thus far approved by REA, over 85 percent have been for electric distribution facilities, to borrowers who buy their power at wholesale rather than generate it themselves. REA makes generation and transmission loans only when borrowers are unable to purchase an adequate supply of power or cannot buy it at reasonable wholesale rates. Only about 13 percent of the REA loans have been for construction of generating plants and transmission lines. About 1 percent of the loans have been made to power system operators for relending to their cussumers to finance installation of wiring, plumbing, and electrical equipment and appliances.

Membership in rural electric cooperatives is not confined to farmers. It is open to all people in a rural area who can be reached and who want electric service. More than three-fourths of all consumers on REA-financed coopera-

tive lines are farms. But also included are many thousands of rural nonfarm dwellings, schools, churches, stores, community buildings, and similar facilities. REA borrowers also serve thousands of rural industries and other commercial enterprises. Many of these rural industries themselves are operating on a cooperative plan.

As of August 31, 1949, REA had advanced $1,327,045,633 in loans to its borrowers. Under REA loan contracts, advances are made as the borrowers need funds with which to pay for construction that is under way or completed.

The difference between the amount of loans approved and the amount of funds advanced represents loan funds that are obligated to borrowers. Most of it has been further obligated by the borrowers to pay for materials ordered for the earliest possible delivery and will be advanced as construction proceeds.

As of September 30, 1949, the borrowers had returned to the Government $213,033,387 in principal and interest payments on their REA loans. This included $19,782,981 in payments on principal ahead of schedule. Only $965,241 was reported more than 30 days overdue. Only one REA loan foreclosure has been necessary to date on an operating power system; it was on a loan that had been made to a commercial power company.

REA has made more than 95 percent of its loans to cooperatives organized under State laws by rural people seeking electric service. These groups which make up about 92 percent of all REA borrowers are local independent private business enterprises. They are controlled by their consumer-members through boards of directors elected annually by and from the membership.

Rural electric cooperatives have proved the most effective instrument for carrying out the REA program because of their advantages as a method of making reasonable cost electric service available to farmers in rural areas. These advantages include:

First. REA-financed cooperatives operate on a nonprofit basis. This enables them to provide electric service at cost to their members.

Second. Directors of REA-financed cooperatives are elected because of their known interest in making electric service available to rural people at reasonable rates. They serve without compensation and keep operating expense at the lowest possible level consistent with good service.

Third. Members of REA-financed cooperatives also are interested in electric service at reasonable cost. For example, they help reduce operating expense by voluntarily reporting potential causes of service interruptions such as tree limbs touching the lines. Most of them read their own meters, and many make out their own bills.

Fourth. Previous experience of farmers with other types of cooperatives helps them to organize and operate rural electric cooperatives on a sound basis with a minimum of effort and expense.

Lines constructed by REA borrowers are built to serve entire areas, including less densely settled sections as well as those of greater population. This is known as area coverage. The test is no longer whether an individual line or section will be self-supporting, but whether the entire system as a whole is feasible. This policy has become increasingly important as the rural electrification job has progressed. Only through area coverage can electric service be extended to many of the more isolated farms, and to others which are remotely situated in pocketed areas far removed from any established source of power.

In every region in the United States rural electric cooperatives have demonstrated that farm electrification, far from constituting an additional cash drain on low-farm incomes, actually brings about a higher real-farm income and better farm living. It brings more business into rural communities. It encourages new local enterprises which come about when low-cost power is available. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities the farmer invests an additional $4.50 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances.

The use of electric power in farm production and processing is constantly expanding. To date about 400 farm uses for electricity have been reported. Electric power on the farm is an economic necessity which can pay its way with handsome profits for the farmer. Guidance is given consumers on REA-financed lines as to which uses are the most efficient and the most profitable in these times of power shortages.

In the State of Montana, at the time REA was established in 1935, only 2,768 farms, or 5.5 percent, were receiving central station electric service. REA estimated as of June 30, 1949, that 23,462 farms, or 62.2 percent of all farms in the State, were served. An estimated 14,285 farms in the State still were without service.

The first REA loan in Montana was approved in May 1936, and the first REA-financed line placed in operation on December 5, 1937, by the Lower Yellowstone Rural Electric Association of Sidney, Mont.

As of September 30, 1949, REA had approved $27,051,598 in loans in the State to 24 borrowers, all of them cooperatives. The loans will enable these borrowers to finance the construction of 16,236 miles of line and other rural electric facilities to serve 31,284 rural consumers. Some of these facilities already are in operation and additional lines are being built as rapidly as possible.

As of September 30, 1949, REA had advanced $20,370,126 as loans in Montana, and the State's borrowers were operating 12,556 miles of line serving 24,066 farms and other rural consumers.

The average monthly farm consumption on REA-financed lines in Montana increased from 76 kilowatt-hours in December 1941, to 211 kilowatt-hours in December 1948.

This increase reflects greater use of electrical equipment to save time and labor in performing farm and household tasks to help bring about a more comfortable rural living.

REA's latest debt-service summary, covering all transactions to September 30, 1949, shows that the Montana borrowers have paid $2,013,340 in principal and interest on their Government loans. This includes $242,158 paid on principal in advance of the date due. Nine borrowers were ahead on their payments and none were behind. None were overdue on loans in the State.

This is a great record for a great program in a great State. It is my hope that the day is not too far distant when every farm in Montana is electrified. I will do everything in my power to achieve that goal.

Resolution of Abington (Mass.) Republican Town Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD W. NICHOLSON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NICHOLSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Republican Town Committee of Abington, Mass.:

ABINGTON, MASS.

The Honorable GUY G. GABRIELSON,
Chairman, Republican National Committee, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GABRIELSON: We, the members of the Abington Republican Town Committee, realize that once again, as in 1776, Americans are confronted with "a design to reduce them under absolute despotism." The enemies of constitutional government aim to gain complete control of the national income, and they have nearly attained their goal.

Our money has been debauched. Our Government has a public debt over $50,000,000,000 greater than all our country's gold money, and bank deposits, and has concluded this year with a sizable deficit. Unless present expenses are cut, there is the same outlook for the years that lie ahead. Yet, despite this bankrupt condition, those in power have planned ever increasing ways to spend the national income, and sums far beyond it, in their despotic design to enslave our people by extorting the fruits of their labors.

We cannot stand idly by in the face of such threats to our liberty and the liberty of our children. We know that our only defense is to insist that those we send to Washington strive constantly to cut present expenses while blocking all efforts to spend additional money, no matter what the pretense. In that way, and that way only, lies our salvation, and we believe it is the sacred duty of every elected Republican to oppose this traitorous plot at each and every turn.

But this is still not being done. Today Republicans side with the New Dealers on issue after issue, in both foreign and domestic policy, so that we who work to elect Republicans are deprived of representation and are "taxed without our consent."

The situation has become unbearable, and unless we get representation immediately we will no longer support these Republicans. Indeed, we will actively oppose these appeasers at the polls, because we intend to oppose

the enemy wherever he exists; and if the Republican Party cannot offer us a fighting leadership, we will continue the fight alone. We will no longer tolerate bipartisanism by Republicans.

We believe every elected Republican should strive constantly to try to attain the following objectives:

1. To restore a sound monetary system which would stabilize American money and restore to the American people the right of redemption of paper money.

2. To adopt a systematic plan for payment of the national debt.

3. To balance the national budget. We will not condone deficit spending or tax increases.

4. To reduce Federal expenses and eliminate all unessential employees. Taxes must come down.

5. To withdraw the Federal Government from competition with private business.

6. To stop politicians from buying votes by promising Federal aid (resulting eventually in Federal control) for education, public housing, socialized medicine, and socialized agriculture.

7. To eliminate Federal subsidies.

8. To establish a sound tax system that will restore and protect the incentive to produce. We believe the power to tax should be limited by constitutional amendment.

9. To return to States' rights and the restoration of local self-government.

10. To return to the constitutional government of our founding fathers which guaranties to individuals "the right to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects," without fear of confiscation, and the right to work without fear of domination or control from any source.

We join with Abraham Lincoln to say:

"Let every man remember that to violate the Constitution is to trample on the blood of his father, and to tear the charter of his own and his children's liberty. As the patriots of seventy-six did to the support of the Declaration of Independence, so to the support of the Constitution and its laws, let every American pledge his life, his property, and his sacred honor."

As adopted by the members of the Abington Republican Town Committee.

WINSLOW A. ROBBINS,
Chairman.

United States Tariffs and Europe's Import Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, with the rapid recovery strides that have been made in Europe through American assistance, it becomes increasingly important that we recognize the necessity of some realistic thinking on the subject of tariffs and trade quotas. After all our ballyhoo about reciprocal trade, it now appears that the greatest hindrance to resumption of normal trade is not American tariffs but the import quotas imposed by European governments on many of the same commodities whose tariffs have been reduced.

The second most important point is that nearly all of the American concessions on tariffs have been against the interests of our own farmers and small manufacturers. In spite of all the Democrat administration's bleating about the plight of the small-business man, we find small businesses most sorely hurt by dumping of cheap foreign goods. In contrast, many of the items most highly protected by tariffs are made by American monopolies or near-monopolies. Of the 262 items which the ECA commerce mission reported European nations wanted to export to the United States and which were protected by tariffs of 25 percent or more, only 2 were farm products—wool grease and shelled almonds.

In the light of these facts, I have asked the United States Tariff Commission to prepare a statement showing the tariff situation on major commodities at the present time. Under permission to extend my remarks, I ask to include this statement at this point in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 29, 1949.

The Honorable WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HORAN: This is in reply to your letter of November 28 in which you requested a table showing the tariff duties charged by this and other countries on 25 or 50 representative commodities. We have prepared the enclosed table giving information on the treatment of imports of 17 commodities by the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Belgium-Luxemburg-Netherlands (Benelux). The data in the table are much less extensive than you requested but we believe any feasible extension of the material would leave it less significant for your purposes than you may have expected. The footnotes to the table and the discussion below will indicate that numerous complexities are involved. We shall be glad if you will inform us if we can assist you further in any analysis of the tariffs of this and other countries that you may wish to make.

We understand that your interest in the data requested arises from your desire to compare the degree of restrictiveness or protection in the import policies of this and other countries. One limitation on any conclusion in this matter that might be arrived at solely from the consideration of the tariff rates of different countries arises from the widespread use of import quotas and other nontariff controls referred to in your letter. Such controls have now superseded the tariff in importance for the bulk of the import trade of many foreign countries. Though these controls are in many cases regarded as temporary, to be moderated and withdrawn as balance-of-payments problems are overcome, it is uncertain when if ever the tariff may assume in many countries its former predominance. (We have not attempted in the enclosed table to indicate the bearing of such supposedly temporary restrictions on the imports of the commodities listed by the foreign countries covered. To do so would require more detailed information on the day-to-day administration of the controls than we are able to maintain.)

Even in the United States, which has not made such extensive use of nontariff trade controls as have many foreign countries, such controls have become of substantial importance or potential importance, particularly with respect to imports competitive with domestic agriculture. The sugar trade of the United States is conspicuously a case in point and United States imports of wheat and cotton and some other commodities are subject to quotas or import licenses. Moreover, section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act makes possible (to the extent not in conflict with international obligations) the application of such controls where imports would seriously interfere or threaten so to interfere with production, marketing, or price support programs brought into operation by the Department of Agriculture. You may wish to refer to our letter to you of October 17 for information regarding the more important aspects of our international obligations in this matter.

Another difficulty arises from the fact that the restrictiveness of the import policies of different countries is probably not properly to be judged by comparing the rates of duty applied by different countries to the same commodities. It would probably be better to use different lists of commodities for each country, each list to be made up in consideration of the character of the industries and resources of the respective countries. Some examples will be useful in explaining this point.

Wool growing is not of much importance to the economies of the United Kingdom, France, and the Benelux countries. These countries are more interested in encouraging their wool manufacturing industries than their production of raw wool. The fact, therefore, that imports of raw wool into these countries are free is probably not of itself to be regarded as an element of liberalism or of moderation in their protectionism. The United States has a wool-growing industry that is of substantial importance to certain areas of the country. In a comparison of the foreign-trade policies of the several countries, free entry of wool into the foreign countries named does not have the same significance as would similar treatment of imports of raw wool by the United States.

Different considerations from those suggested by the wool example give the tariff treatment of certain imports by different countries little significance for a comparison of the restrictiveness of their import policies. For example, the United States is on a large export basis with respect to automobiles and the probability is that imported automobiles would not offer important competition to at least the major part of the United States automobile industry (namely, that producing the standard size American cars) even if automobiles were imported into this country free of duty. For this reason the rate of duty applicable to automobiles imported into the United States is probably of much less importance to the United States automobile industry than are the rates of duty on imports of the automobiles into Canada, the United Kingdom, or France to the automobile industries of those countries. For similar reasons the tariff treatment of imports of newsprint paper into Canada, wool fabrics into the United Kingdom, and wines into France are of less importance than the tariff rates applied by other important trading countries to imports of these commodities.

Another consideration which limits the significance of the data you request arises from the fact that in some countries substantial duties are levied on the imports of some commodities for revenue purposes and with little or no protective intent or effect. For example, a very high duty is levied on imports of tobacco into the United Kingdom but the United Kingdom does not have any significant production of tobacco and the duties on imports are not levied with a view to promoting such production. These duties are primarily designed to secure governmental revenue and, at least in recent years, to some extent for the purpose of discouraging consumption of an imported commodity the bulk of which must be paid for in dol-

lar exchange. Somewhat similar considerations apply in respect of the duties which the United Kingdom, France and other western European countries levy on imports of petroleum and petroleum products. The United States does not use import duties to any considerable extent for revenue purposes.

A full discussion of the problems raised by your request would involve many wide and varied considerations. We trust, however, the foregoing may be sufficient for your purpose.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

Duties on imports of selected commodities in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, France, and Benelux, 1949 [1]

[Percentages are ad valorem rates]

Commodity [2]	United States	Canada [3]	United Kingdom [4 5]	France [5 6]	Benelux [5 7]
Caustic soda	½ cent per pound	0.3 cent per pound	10 percent	20 percent	8 percent.
Coconut oil [8]	3 cents per pound [9]	10 percent	15 percent	12 percent	5 percent.
Window glass	20 percent [10]	do	do	20 percent	6 percent.
Automobiles	10 percent	17½ percent	33⅓ percent	35 percent	24 percent.
Pig iron	67 cents per short ton [11]	$2.37 per short ton	25 percent [12]	5 percent	Free.
Lumber, rough softwood	$1 per thousand board feet [13]	Free	4s. thousand board feet (65 cents).[14]	14 percent	3 to 10 percent.
Sugar, refined	0.53 cent per pound [15]	1.7 cents per pound	11s. 8d. per hundredweight (1½ cents per pound).[16]	130 percent	(2 to 5 cents per pound).[17]
Tobacco, cigarette	15 or 30 cents per pound	1.8 cents per pound	£2 18s. 2d. per pound ($8.14) [18]	Free [19]	(2 to 4 cents per pound).[20]
Apples, raw	¼ cent per pound	0.7 cent per pound	Free [21]	8 to 12 percent [22]	6 to 12 percent.
Cotton, short-staple	Free [23]	Free	do	Free	Free.
Whisky (per proof gallon)	$1.50	$8.72 [24]	£4 5s. 5d. ($11.96) [25]	30 percent	(60 to 76 cents.) [26]
Cotton cloth, bleached	17¾ percent [27]	17½ percent, + 3 cents per pound.	20 percent	20 percent	18 percent.
Wool, raw	25½ cents per pound [28]	10 cents per pound	Free	Free	Free.
Wool fabrics, woven	37½ cents per pound + 25 percent.[29]	30 cents per pound + 27½ percent.	17½ percent	15 percent	10 percent.
Wool knit gloves	do [29]	25 percent	20 percent	30 percent	24 percent.
Newsprint paper	Free	12½ percent	Free	25 percent	6 percent.
Gasoline (per United States gallon).	1¼ cents [30]	0.8 cent	9d. (9 cents) [25]	18 percent	Free or (9 to 11 cents).[31]

[1] Latest possible information has been employed. Duties are mostly those which were in effect during November 1949. The tariff treatment may have been different in a few cases because of some temporary special measure. Rates of exchange employed in converting foreign specific rates of duty into United States currency are as of Nov. 1, 1949.

[2] The tariffs of countries covered provide for different rates on subclassifications of some of the commodities listed. In such cases the rate shown opposite the commodity for the particular country may be that for a subclassification believed to be important in the trade.

[3] Specific rates shown are expressed in terms of United States currency only. Commodities which are dutiable when imported into Canada from countries other than those of the British Commonwealth are for the most part dutiable at lower rates when imported from countries of the British Commonwealth. The rates shown are those applicable to imports from the United States.

[4] Of the commodities listed, imports into the United Kingdom from the countries of the British Commonwealth are, except for tobacco, whisky, and sugar, free of duty. The rates shown are those for imports from non-British-Commonwealth countries. Figures in parentheses are the equivalent in terms of United States currency of the British currency converted at the rate of $2.80 to £1.

[5] Quantitative controls for purpose of conserving foreign exchange are of great importance in restricting imports into the United Kingdom, France, and the Netherlands (but not in Belgium-Luxemburg).

[6] Imperial preferences in the French tariff system are relatively unimportant for most commodities.

[7] Belgium, the Netherlands, and Luxemburg have a common schedule of customs duties, as such; but the Netherlands has additional charges on many products, including the "monopoly fees" which are varied from time to time by quasigovernmental economic control boards. Belgium-Luxemburg and the Netherlands have made considerable progress toward a complete customs union, but tariff (and excise) treatment still differs on some products. Where a spread is given in the rates in this column, this is because the duty schedules have not been completely unified (lumber, sugar, tobacco, apples, whisky).

[8] Coconut oil is competitive in considerable degree with most fats and oils used in food and in soap, like lard, cottonseed oil, and tallow.

[9] This is the processing tax collected on the first domestic processing of Philippine coconut oil or on the oil made in the United States from imported Philippine copra. At the present time coconut oil derived from copra imported from sources other than the Philippines is subject to a processing tax of 5 cents a pound and imports of coconut oil as such to a duty of 1 cent a pound and in addition, to the processing tax of 5 cents a pound. The non-Philippine products are imported in very small volume. See U. S. Tariff Commission, Summaries of Tariff Information, vol. 1, pt. 4, pp. 89-92 for complicating details.

[10] The actual rate is in specific terms; 20 percent is the computed ad valorem equivalent: The average rate of duty of the first 3 import classes of common window glass in 1949 divided by average foreign value in 1948 (1.1 cent per pound divided by 5.5 cents per pound), both averages weighted according to 1948 volume of imports.

[11] Expressed as 75 cents per long ton in par. 301.

[12] Volume of imports is greatly affected by concerted action of the British iron and steel industry in conjunction with European cartel and under Government sponsorship.

[13] M board feet signifies "per thousand board feet." The United States rate of $1 per M board foot is made up of 25 cents duty and 75 cents import excise tax.

[14] Primarily for benefit of Canadian and other Commonwealth-country producers. This rate is for the classification in which the competition for the British market is quite active. It does not apply to all imports of coniferous lumber into the United Kingdom.

[15] Rate on Cuban sugar: Import quotas are of greatest importance in restricting the importation of refined sugar (as well as raw). A comprehensive system of Government intervention is in effect, including internal-market regulation and direct subsidies to domestic producers (not refiners of raw cane sugar).

[16] The British duty on imports of sugar originated as a revenue measure. When in the twenties the United Kingdom undertook to encourage and support the local production of beet sugar, a direct subsidy to the growers was quickly followed by a considerable expansion of output. A comprehensive system of marketing controls with considerable governmental participation developed later. The rate of duty shown is the one applicable on imports of sugar from non-Commonwealth sources. Imports from the Dominions enter at a somewhat lower rate and those from the colonies at an even lower rate. The excise tax on sugar closely parallels the customs duty.

[17] The duties as such are, for 100 kilos: 300 francs or 18.16 florins; to the former should be added the Belgian excise tax of 60 francs, a turn-over tax of 2 percent and a stamp tax of 0.45 francs; to the latter, the Dutch excise tax of 27 florins, crisis tax of 2¼ florins, sales tax of 3 percent, and others totaling about 1 percent.

[18] Largely for revenue: Preference for Commonwealth tobacco amounts to about 21 cents per pound. Tobacco is not grown in the United Kingdom; imports from Rhodesia and Canada have increased greatly.

[19] Imports of tobacco are adjusted by a Government monopoly in accordance with regulation of the internal market; operations are conducted so as to contribute substantially to the national treasury.

[20] The duties as such are, per 100 kilos: 413 francs and 25 florins (Belgian and Dutch, respectively). The various internal taxes are additional.

[21] Free during the main marketing season for American (and other Northern Hemisphere) apples. Otherwise dutiable.

[22] These are the rates which are in effect during the principal marketing season for American (and other Northern Hemisphere) apples. During other months of the year, higher rates of duty are in effect.

[23] Protection to cotton growers of the United States is afforded through quotas on the importation of cotton. The internal-market price is supported through Government loans on stored cotton belonging to growers.

[24] Largely for revenue: Excise tax collected on the Canadian product is equivalent to $8 per United States proof gallon.

[25] Duty is largely for revenue and roughly corresponds with excise tax on production in the United Kingdom.

[26] The duties as such are, per hectoliter: 1,000 francs and 60.53 florins (Belgian and Dutch, respectively). Various internal taxes are also collected. The internal taxes differ as between the imported products and those of Belgium and the Netherlands, presenting a definite possibility of further discrimination against the imported product. These are the rates for bottled goods; the alcohol content is not specified in the tariff schedule.

[27] Rate of duty varies with value of the cloth and fineness of the yarn, measured by yarn count. The rate shown applies to bleached cloth valued over 80 cents per pound and of 31-yarn count, one of the important categories of commerce.

[28] This is the rate per pound of clean content applicable to wools of apparel type, i. e., of grades finer than 44's; in the grease. This is the most important category of imports. Carpet wools are free of duty.

[29] The specific part of this compound rate of duty serves as an offset to the cost of the duty on the raw wool used by the domestic manufacturer, leaving the ad valorem part of the rate as that intended to be protective of domestic production of the fabrics. The rate shown for woven fabrics is for those over 4 ounces per square yard and valued at more than $2 per pound; for gloves, those valued at more than $4 per dozen pairs.

[30] Import-excise tax. No duty as such.

[31] Free for industrial use only.

Cotton-Acreage-Allotment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM MURRAY
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a timely, sensible resolution adopted by the directors of the Henderson County, Tenn., Farm Bureau, on December 17, 1949, and a letter from Mr. John H. Pitts, of Cerro Gordo, Tenn., who is one of the most prominent farmers in my congressional district with reference to the cotton-acreage-allotment program under Public Law 12 of the Eighty-first Congress. Both the resolution and the letter present recommendations for the elimination of inequities and injustices under this program.

RESOLUTION

We, the directors of Henderson County Farm Bureau, in regular meeting in Lexington, Tenn., on December 17, 1949, unanimously recommended that the Congress, as early as possible upon reconvening in January, amend Public Law 12—special legislation on cotton acreage allotment for 1950—to remove inequities in distribution of acreage to growers.

We object to present law for following reasons: (1) does not give some growers just share of county allotment which their farms help obtain; (2) ignores special adaptation of soil, capital investment, and farmer

experience on certain farms to favor those growers in more diversified areas of county who have less interest and are less dependent upon cotton growing; (3) discriminates against the small farmer who has been growing 15 to 50 acres of cotton and favors the larger diversified farmer; (4) sets a dangerous precedent—should history of corn growing, hog production, etc., be ignored on the individual farm in any future control program as in case of cotton, diversified farmers and areas would be ruined just as under present law; (5) while the high percentage of cropland devoted to cotton in the past on some farms cannot be strongly defended, we do challenge the wisdom of applying the cropland factor which forces a sudden and unsound change in farming. Many farmers are not prepared for this change and many tenants will lose their homes.

We recommend that the cotton acreage control law be amended to include the following: (1) that no farm be alloted less in 1950 than 75 percent of average acreage planted to cotton during years 1946, 1947, 1948; (2) that law be amended to put cotton allotments permanently on history of individual farm production beginning crop year 1951.

LETTER OF JOHN H. PITTS

HARBOUR-PITTS CO., INC.,
Cerro Gordo, Tenn., December 27, 1949.

Hon. KENNETH MCKELLAR,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

Hon. TOM MURRAY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR AND CONGRESSMAN: I have seen no darker future, since the days immediately following 1929, than that now facing us under the application of our present farm-cotton program.

My friends, it is not so much the cut-back or reduction of acreage, which is to put our tenants and sharecroppers off the farms and on the roads looking for other jobs and finally on relief, but the new process of allotments of acreage—allotting to farms on the basis of acreage and regardless of whether or not the farm is suitable to cotton or whether or not the same has been planted to cotton in former and recent years; in fact, it seems, whether or not the farm wants or has any use for cotton acreage.

Apparently, as I reason, this program is attempted as a permanent program, though untried; in my judgment it will largely bankrupt our cotton States in less than 12 months, as a temporary program, provided the injustices or inequities cannot be corrected in its application.

Let me cite you a few cases, of which there are no reasonable estimate of the thousands:

First. Myself and three brothers are the owners of a farm near the mouth of Indian Creek, about 900 to 1,000 acres, largely uplands suitable to cotton but little acreage suitable to other than cotton. In former years we have had as much as 200 acres in cotton. On this there are nine tenant families, a number of them heavily in debt for machinery and other necessities, and all equipped for raising cotton. This farm has an allotment for 1950 of 53 acres for cotton, a little over 5 acres to the family, and will produce under favorable conditions about one-half bale to the acre. How are these tenants or families to avoid bankruptcy?

The adjoining river bottom farm of about 400 acres, on which there is not a tenant house and which, as informed by the man who has it in charge, has had no cotton planted on it since 1941. Yet this farm has an allotment for 1950 of 26 acres and probably not an acre of it rented or wanted for cotton. As I understand it, this condition is common all through this Tennessee River section, if not all over the Cotton Belt.

Secondly, a man, tenant from the eighth district of this county (know him but can't recall the name) came to me yesterday, said: "Mr. Hardy, I'm here to see if you and your brothers can furnish me a crop for 1950, will take any kind of a crop of sufficient size to make a living for myself and my family—wife and four children, all except our baby raised in the cotton patch and know nothing else." When I advised him that we were wholly unable to supply him, that our allotment was no way near what our present tenants needed, he said, "I had my same lands rented for 1950, but now my landlord is so badly cut back in his allotment as to have no land for me and I have to move, and I've nowhere to go." Gentlemen, this poor man's voice was trembling and I thought I could see tears in his eyes. It was a heart-rending scene.

Thirdly, the above man was accompanied by a young man by the name of Bridges and said Bridges advised that his father had a good tenant and no acreage for him and that his father had offered to give his tenant $100, if he could find a location. Surely, my friends, we should find a better route than this.

Fourthly, a Mr. Samp Boroughs, just across Indian Creek from our aforesaid Indian Creek farm, bought in late 1948 some 88 acres of upland off a 400-acre tract, largely in Indian Creek bottom. The above purchase of 88 acres of upland from the tract composed more than half the entire suitable cotton lands of the whole and on which the said Boroughs had 8 acres of cotton in 1949. His allotment for 1950 is, as shown by his papers, one-half acre, and, as I further understand, Boroughs owes mainly the purchase price of the 88 acres. What's to happen to him?

My friends, we need a more equitable distribution of this cotton acreage. We need this acreage distributed to cotton lands and cotton farmers, not to lands not suitable and not wanted to be planted to cotton. Our cotton farmers are equipped to raise cotton and those who handle heavy lands, not suitable to cotton, are equipped to raise other crops and, as is common reason, have no use for cotton lands. In other words, use the old method of distributing according to former acreage, at least temporarily until our people can become adjusted to such radical changes and by which we would hope that all could manage to get by, at least to the extent to keep them in their little homes and off the relief rolls.

Senator and TOM, as a permanent plan for agriculture, which must be found if we are to maintain our present high standard of living and ever pay our Government debts, am fully convinced that our only chance for success in this great undertaking is to be found in some properly administered domestic allotment plan, giving the American producer the American market—that is, full parity on that portion of his production domestically consumed or used, freeing him to further produce as he sees fit for the world's market at the world prices, and as to cotton, it would seem to me that such should be based on baleage or pounds of lint cotton, rather than on acreage, in an effort to place all sections with lands rich or poor on an equal basis. Of course, in such plan our producers would have to be protected by tariff against pauper or less paid labor. I have no faith in any plan which restricts production—such plan as advocates doing nothing to create something.

Now in conclusion, back to our present farm program: It is my opinion that, if we cannot get these inequities out of this program, then we will need no further boosts to our next depression; think this will complete the job in the next 6 to 10 months and, although I am in my seventy-second year and have seen a number of depressions, in my further judgment, this will, or would, be the first depression to be forced upon our people and by a wrong application of a well-intended program.

Sincerely your friend,

JOHN H. PITTS.

Freight Forwarders and Federal Regulations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in including the splendid address delivered by United States Maritime Commissioner David J. Coddaire at the thirty-third annual dinner of the New York Freight Forwarders and Brokers Association, Inc. The subject of Commissioner Coddaire's address was most timely especially since it is recognized that he has become an outstanding expert on the subject. It would do well for all interested parties carefully to read Commissioner Coddaire's address in the light of the forthcoming proposed regulations of the freight-forwarding industry.

The address follows:

It would be difficult, indeed, to say anything about freight forwarders that you have not said about yourselves in the public record covering the recent cases before the Maritime Commission involving your industry. You have undoubtedly heard the old saying that the best way to teach a child to swim is to throw him in deep water. Shortly after I took office with the Maritime Commission, the Chairman referred to me the job of preparing the findings and recommendations in the then pending dockets concerning the freight-forwarding industry. There I was, a complete neophyte, thrown into the monstrous pool over 6,000 pages deep into which I had to dive and then work my way to the surface. Whether you feel I have learned to swim or merely to do a fast dog paddle depends upon your individual reactions to our decisions.

During the past two decades there has been a steady trend toward Federal regulation of all industry having an interstate or foreign-commerce aspect. Today, almost all such industry is subject, in some form or another, to Government-imposed restrictions. The freight-forwarding industry, as represented by your association, is no exception. Its sole distinction is that this regulation has been delayed longer than in most industries similarly situated. Whether one agrees with the concept of Government regulation in the public interest or not, the fact remains, it is here.

That the business of freight forwarding in the foreign commerce of the United States is subject to the jurisdiction of the Maritime Commission has been decided by the United States Supreme Court. Since then, the Commission has issued its reports in two cases involving freight forwarders and has taken action concerning the regulation of the forwarding of foreign relief and rehabilitation cargoes financed by our Government. While the various dockets are dissimilar, I feel it important to tell you of the principles upon which the Commission has made its decisions.

The public has an interest in every person's carrying on his trade freely; so has the individual. With respect to freight forwarders, among others, so has the Maritime Commission. There is justification for Federal regulation of individual business conduct only if such restriction is reasonable—reasonable, that is, in reference to the interests of the parties concerned and reasonable in reference to the interests of the public, so framed and so guarded as to afford adequate

protection to those in whose favor it is imposed, while at the same time not unnecessarily injurious to the regulated group. That, I think, is the fair result of the rules recently promulgated by the Maritime Commission in your interest.

I consider the Maritime Commission essentially as a public agency for the preservation of free enterprise and reasonably free competition in the carrying on of the foreign commerce of the United States. We have stated formally and to the world that freight forwarders play an important part in that commerce. We have prescribed measures of conduct for the forwarding industry based upon a common idea of reasonableness or fairness. Many of the complaints put forth in the investigation of freight forwarders contain a large moral element, so that the application of our rules calls for common sense and cooperation, not bureaucratic dictatorship or Government control.

If you have understood these comments, I must say you are possessed of astounding faculties of mental absorption and have been extremely attentive. I have read over the statements quite a few times since preparing them and must confess that they are somewhat involved. Boiled down, I merely have attempted to state my feeling that reasonable rules of conduct coupled with a voluntary code of ethics on the part of your association should result in the removal of most of the criticism that heretofore may have been directed toward some of those engaged in the business of freight forwarding. The ordinary shipper may be likened to the average purchaser, who is probably less informed than we think he is; he is generally inattentive, sometimes indifferent, and quite often careless. The shipper depends upon you gentlemen for the technical advice and professional handling of his export products. He is entitled to fair treatment, reasonable charges for the services performed, and freedom from discrimination.

Coming now to the brokerage case, I assume that you have heard about the recent decision in that proceeding. There again the freight forwarders offered page after page of testimony about themselves, and how indispensable they are. If nothing else, I must say you have not been bashful nor modest in the presentation of your facts. The Commission's decision in that case, concerning steamship conference prohibitions against brokerage, again recognizes the principle of free enterprise by holding that a carrier should, within stated limits, be free to pay brokerage or not as his individual managerial discretion dictates. Outright conference prohibitions against brokerage were condemned. Thus far no conference has amended its agreement or taken other necessary steps to accomplish the removal of the prohibition. As in any other case, my full support will be given to the enforcement of our decision. The Commission will, and must, on its own motion if necessary, enforce compliance with its official decisions.

May I point out to you that the Commission's authorities in connection with freight forwarding follow two patterns. On the one hand we have regulatory authority to protect the public against unfair and unreasonable actions by forwarders. Our second type of authority involves the protection and preservation of private freight forwarding facilities. We must always be astute to maintain a proper balance between the two purposes to be served.

The so-called Bland Freight Forwarding Act, section 217 of the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended, is illustrative of the Commission's authority to regulate for the benefit of the forwarding industry. While on that subject, I might mention that a major problem facing the freight forwarding industry during the coming year will revolve around the Bland Act. Enacted during wartime and under highly volatile conditions, that act is broad in its terms and lacks clear definition of what the Commission's policy and authority should be. In order to fulfill its duty under the act, the Commission must have a more concrete expression of what the orders from Congress are. Accordingly, the Commission is considering going to Congress on the future of the Bland Act. Some people have advocated complete repeal on the grounds that it is unenforceable in its present terms and unnecessary. Others have proposed modification and clarification by the Congress. What the ultimate action of the Congress will be, I cannot tell. It will be incumbent upon the individuals interested to make their views known to the Commission and the proper congressional committees.

The Maritime Commission has jurisdiction only over those types of unfair trade practices that violate the shipping laws, and, as I have indicated, appropriate proceedings will be taken by the Commission to prevent the continuance of such practices. Other trade practices exist in the forwarding industry, as well as other industries, which are not in themselves violations of law yet are considered either to be unethical, uneconomical, or otherwise objectionable. Here is a field in which voluntary associations such as yours can do much for your own benefit as well as the benefit of the commerce of the United States and the American merchant marine.

Within the last 18 months or so, I have noticed there has developed a measure of cooperation between the Maritime Commission and the freight forwarding industry. Your association has been a leader in developing these closer ties. I am sure the Chairman, other Commissioners, and the staff of the Commission stand ready to continue this cooperation and to work with you in building a voluntary code for the forwarding industry over and above the matters of pure regulatory authority of the Commission. Cooperation along these and other lines should develop during the coming year a practice which will assure the maintenance and growth of a privately owned American freight forwarding industry capable of handling what I hope will be an ever increasing volume of exports from this country to the other nations of the world.

Whither Are We Drifting?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial, which was published in the Fairmont Daily Sentinel, Fairmont, Minn., on January 2:

WHITHER ARE WE DRIFTING?

On this first day of the new year it is well to take stock of the prospects ahead, and with that in mind it will not be amiss to ponder the ultimate result of increasing governmental encroachment on individual initiative.

At the outset, let us say that what follows is not an attempt to decry, to view with alarm, or to point with horror. It is merely an attempt to encourage the individual, each for himself to take stock of what is transpiring.

Have we arrived at an age where we must be told how much we can produce, when our hens are permitted to lay, and at what price? Must we have such controls to protect ourselves against overproduction, glutting the markets, and destroying demand?

If such controls must be placed on corn, eggs, cotton, soybeans, poultry, livestock, peas, sweetpotatoes, dry beans, oats, barley, cottonseed, wool, turkeys, and grain sorghums and the number of hours we are permitted to work who shall say we shall not one day have controls that will determine what we may eat and when; what we may wear?

This Nation became great under a system that stressed individual initiative and incentive. It did not become great through governmental regulation that would stifle initiative and individual effort. The sky was the limit, and the men of that era took care of the Government instead of demanding the Government take care of them.

Congress will soon be in session, and now as never before, it behooves the public to keep a keen eye on what the visionaries have in their minds to further regiment and enslave under a crushing, mounting tax burden, the people of this Nation.

Christmas is over and we've played Santa Claus long enough.

Deficit Spending and Hidden Taxes Are Wrecking Our Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, on January 10, 1950, it was my privilege to address the Pennsylvania Poultrymen's Association banquet at the Penn-Harris Hotel, Harrisburg, Pa. This banquet is held each year during Pennsylvania's great farm show.

My remarks follow:

It is a genuine pleasure for me to be here tonight. I am always glad to get away from Washington and mingle with my fellow Pennsylvanians. You men and women are producers of food, income, and wealth. What a contrast there is between your group and the bureaucrats in Washington who spend a lot of time and energy devising ways and means of spending the income which you produce.

I find it gratifying and encouraging to be invited to speak to a group of your character. You are independent and self-reliant, able and wanting to stand on your own feet rather than waiting in line for Government handouts and subsidies. In this day and age after 17 years of New Deal-Fair Deal philosophy it is rather rare to find a producing group like you poultry growers who are not clamoring for more Government aid of one sort or another. Some of our people talk strongly for free enterprise but are first in line for the hand-outs. I consider it an honor to be invited to speak to you.

I come to you from Washington where, during the past week, we have had the second—perhaps it is even the seventh—veil dropped from the Fair Deal body. If there was ever any doubt what the veils covered before, that is no longer the case. Although the surface curves and lines may look superficially attractive and tempting, the bones and muscles are those of state socialism, the poorhouse state or what you may choose to call it, and they are nurtured by Government spending, and it is deficit spending at that.

On January 4 we heard the President deliver his annual message on the state of the

Union in which he spelled out once again his so-called Fair Deal programs. You may have judged from the newspaper and radio accounts that most everybody thought that it was just ducky. It is true that the President was in good speaking form and that his tone was conciliatory. He did not ridicule the Republicans and call his opponents vicious and reactionary. But just read his message and you will see that he is still calling for the same socialistic and spending programs as when he was openly declaring war on those who oppose their enactment. So I warn you not to believe that the leopard has changed his spots. No amount of camouflage can hide the socialistic spots.

On January 6 we heard the President's economic report which merely provides academic dressing for the Fair Deal program. On January 9 we got the full impact of the cost of Mr. Truman's plans with the submission of his budget for the fiscal year 1951, which is in excess of 42 billion dollars. Make no mistake, our pocketbooks are to be raided again and again unless we stand up and fight this trend toward more and more Government hand-outs and spending.

A colleague of mine in the House has summarized the issue well when he said:

"The issue * * * is the choice between freedom and Socialist baloney. They may call it planned economy, the Fair Deal, or social welfare. It's still the same old Socialist baloney any way you slice it. Believe me, I am well aware of the Communist threat, and I do not discount it. But I am convinced that an even greater threat to our free institutions is presented by that group of hypocritical and cynical men, who, under the guise of providing political cures for certain social and economic problems in our society, are selling the American birthright for a mess of political pottage. Slowly they are chipping away the freedoms which are essential to the survival of a healthy, strong, and productive nation."

Former Senator, Supreme Court Justice, and Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, gave us a vigorous warning last June when he said:

"We are going down the road to statism. Where we will end up, no one can state. But if some of these new programs, seriously proposed, should be adopted, there is danger that the individual, whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor, will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Now some of you may think and say to yourselves that what I have just said is nothing but Republican political oratory. You may say we are going along pretty well and haven't been hurt—at least hurt much—by these so-called socialistic and spending programs. I want to be doubly frank with you when I say—it is later than you think—and let me just give you a couple of examples.

Let's take this Government spending—and let me remind you that we are back to deficit spending again—spending more than we take in to the tune of $5,500,000,000 this fiscal year. Some of you—I hope most of you—may have seen the figures in the Reader's Digest for December which show that during the administrations of our first 32 Presidents (Washington through F. D. Roosevelt's second term, 1941, excluding the war years of 1941–45) our Federal Government spent nearly $180,000,000,000 while under President Harry S. Truman in less than 5 years (July 1, 1945–September 30, 1949) the Government has spent the stupendous sum of over $191,000,000,000. In other words Mr. Truman has spent more in 5 years than all other Presidents spent in 156 years.

And I also wish to add that the Fair Deal total is mounting daily so that by next June Government spending will amount to more than $225,000,000,000, which the mathematicians call one-quarter of a trillion dollars. Furthermore, you should know that during the first half of the current fiscal year, June–December 1949, the Truman administration spent $20,974,000,000 which was $3,300,000,000 more than the Government took in. The deficit piled up at the rate of $18,000,000 a day. It certainly takes a lot of poultry and eggs to make up that deficit. Our national debt is now $257,000,000,000 which is about $1,700 for each and every man, woman, and child in the United States.

Now let us look at it in a little different way. Government—Federal, State, and local—is costing us $55,000,000,000 to $60,000,000,000 a year and of course the Federal Government accounts for about three-quarters of the total. Do you know that since 1932 the cost of our Government has increased 100 percent and our population 20 percent? In 1931 the per capita cost of our Government was $33 and now it is $333.

About 25 percent of all the national income produced in this country goes to government. Look at it this way: One chicken out every four and three eggs out of every dozen which you produce is taken by government. You poultrymen work nearly 2 days a week for the Government.

Do you know that there are at least 100 taxes on a dozen eggs, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, 116 taxes on a man's suit, and 150 on a woman's hat?

There are about 11½ cents of taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, and $300 to $500 on a $2,000 car.

This year the average family pays about $700 in hidden taxes, beyond income taxes. The average family pays in a year, $45 on tobacco, and $49 in the cost of gasoline. Sales taxes take another $48 and corporation income taxes—which the consumer also pays in the form of higher prices—take a healthy $317 out of the average family's purse. (Newsweek, December 12, 1949.)

I am confident that you will agree with me that this condition of high taxes and high spending is cause for serious concern and united action to correct it. You know that we now have a big deficit in Washington but do you know that Mr. Truman is soon going to ask for higher taxes. He may do it in a way which appears to be painless but a tax is a tax and the Nation has to pay for it. We must reduce this Government spending by cutting appropriations to the bone. But that is not enough. We must stand together in opposing and resisting proposals for new programs which once established will require many billions in addition to our current spending. Moreover, once the foot is in the door programs such as socialized medicine cost more and more year by year.

For a moment let us consider the deficit of $5,500,000,000 for this fiscal year. If Congress were to be called upon to increase taxes to meet this deficit it would mean that corporate taxes and personal income taxes each would have to be increased 18 percent. Already we are paying 20 percent of our income to the Federal Government in personal income taxes, and an additional 18 percent would make a total of 38 percent of our personal income paid to our Government in personal income taxes.

It is interesting to observe that those nations who have suffered economic collapse did so when their citizens were taxed 35 percent of every dollar they earned. Here in the United States the average citizen is now paying better than 30 cents in taxes out of every dollar he earns. Because of available resources and the ingenuity of the American people, some believe we can safely pay 35 cents or possibly 40 cents in taxes out of every dollar earned. We are warned, however, that once you reach the danger zone of 35 cents, our Nation is flirting with national bankruptcy.

The stark truth of the matter is that if we at the time of high prosperity deliberately embark on a program of deficit spending it is doubtful—very doubtful—that the budget of the United States will ever be balanced, unless our fiscal system is destroyed and we undergo the terrific hardships of the reestablishment of a solvent currency.

Next, let us take a second example of how the Truman socialistic program affects or can affect you. I want to refer to the agricultural program, particularly the Brannan plan, which the President and his cohorts are trying to sell to the farmers and the Nation.

During the past few years you have had considerable experience with the parity price support, production goals, and other agricultural subsidy and control programs of the Federal Government. You have also had plenty of experience with price controls, rationing, and poultryless Thursdays under the "Kluckman plan" back in 1947. You know also about the price-support provisions of the wartime acts, the Agricultural Act of 1948 and that of 1949, which is now in effect.

Now we come to the Brannan plan, which would enslave the American farmer and poultry producer in return for a promised security which would cost billions of dollars. You no doubt know more about the details of the Brannan plan and how it would work out than I do. I am sure that you will not be lured into supporting such a program by the bait of direct-production payments to provide you the promised 100 percent of parity income. You know that in order to carry out such promises your whole production and distribution will be controlled from Washington, and we will go completely bankrupt meeting the costs. Using football terminology, the Brannan plan is a real mousetrap play—they open a hole and invite you in—and then you get smacked plenty from both sides.

Much as we would all like to get out of this business of price supports, subsidies, controls, etc., we know we cannot do it all at once. You did not ask for the supports but as long as the other segments of agriculture get Government assistance which increase your feed and other prices, you should be protected from disaster by some guarantees. That I understand is your position and I certainly concur. That is what we did in the Agricultural Act of 1948 and it has been continued in the 1949 act.

In conclusion let me say that it is a privilege to come here and speak to you. I have been very frank and forthright in attacking the socialistic trend that dominates the administration in Washington. I oppose it and want to do everything in my power to stop it. Government spending, yes, deficit spending, is its lifeblood. We must cut down that spending which is sapping the lifeblood of our economy. But we must also be hardheaded and reject the many proposals for more spending or we will have failed in our task.

I hope you agree with me that the danger is real and that it is later than you think. You people have demonstrated that you want to stand on your own feet and not live on Government subsidies. As farmers and poultry producers you see the threat to your liberties in the Brannan plan. As consumers and taxpayers you should know what this socialistic program is costing you. And remember that much of the cost is hidden in indirect taxes. But the cost is there just the same, and you and I and all the country, are paying dearly for it.

The Late Bernard W. Doyle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement which I recently made on the occasion of the passing of the late Bernard W. Doyle, of Leominster, Mass., one of the outstanding businessmen and philanthropists of our State.

He was such an amiable man, such a beautiful modest character, such an outstanding citizen and business genius, such a wholehearted supporter of worthy causes, such a generous unselfish giver that I could not possibly in such short space give adequate expression to the superb qualities which so endeared him to his friends and community.

Surely his good works, charity, benevolence, and unselfish character will long be a source of inspiration and example to his fellow citizens. His virtue and selflessness will long be remembered. We will miss him. But his memory will remain with us always.

I include herein several newspaper excerpts concerning his untimely passing:

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 27, 1949]

CONGRESSMAN PHILBIN LAUDS LIFE OF BERNARD W. DOYLE

Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, last night issued the following statement in connection with Mr. Doyle's death:

"In the untimely passing of Bernard W. Doyle the State and Nation have lost a great and most distinguished citizen, his home community a loyal, ever-thoughtful son, and his family a devoted husband and father.

"His career which started from humble beginnings and carried him to a foremost rank in the industrial and business life of the Nation vividly illustrates what the individual can achieve under our system of free opportunity when he is possessed of ability and imagination, is inspired by zeal and determination, and is motivated by ideals of service and love of humanity."

GAVE FREELY OF HIS TIME

"Great as his business achievements were, they were overshadowed by his sincere devotion and tireless work for the betterment of his fellowman.

"Bernard Doyle gave of himself unstintingly and unselfishly in all his many endeavors. He was a man of extraordinary and versatile talents, but the thing which distinguished him most was his profound sympathy for and eagerness to help the people of the rank and file.

"A very large part of his active and fruitful life was spent in quietly and modestly assisting the sick, the infirm, and the unfortunate. He was benefactor literally to thousands of fellow citizens. Many poor boys striving for an education know of his generosity."

AIDED MANY PROJECTS

"A philanthropist in the best sense, often anonymously, he not only gave of himself, his energy, his great administrative powers, but also lavished his fortune in order to sustain and expand numerous charitable, religious, and educational works which benefited many individuals and many worthy causes in his own city of Leominster, which he loved so dearly, and elsewhere.

"He was a man of noblest impulses, innately good, humane and kindly. By his unselfish and constructive life, he contributed immeasurably to the fulfillment of the age-old precept—'Love Thy Neighbor as Thyself.'

"No success story could excel his phenomenal rise from humble station to high place in industry, finance and charity. Yet he always was modest and unassuming. About him at times there was almost an air of self-effacement. He believed in sharing his success with others.

"Bernard Doyle was my friend for many years and I greatly esteemed and admired him. I am very deeply moved by his death and join with his family and friends in mourning the irreparable loss. He was a faithful and warm-hearted friend—a friend not alone of individuals but of great causes—causes of mercy, charity, justice and kindness—a friend of the common people.

"Of course, his place in the community can never be precisely filled because in this generation no man could succeed as he did through ability and effort in accumulating substantial wealth and then using it so wisely and so generously for the public good and for the good of so many not so fortunately situated.

"He will be widely mourned. His life's work will long remain as a monument to the great civic and spiritual virtues which he possessed in such abundance—his goodness of heart, his loyalty, his humility, his benevolence, his devotion to his fellow men and women.

"I extend deepest sympathy to his bereaved family for their irreparable loss.

"May he find rest and peace from worldly toil in his eternal reward."

[From the Leominster (Mass.) Daily Enterprise of December 27, 1949]

B. W. DOYLE DIES HERE AT HIS HOME ON LINDELL AVENUE—SERVICES TO BE CONDUCTED ON THURSDAY—ALL CITY DEPARTMENTS WILL CLOSE DURING FUNERAL OF FORMER MAYOR, WIDELY KNOWN BENEFACTOR AND CIVIC LEADER

Bernard Wendell Doyle, 76 years old, one of Leominster's most distinguished citizens, a pioneer in the city's industrial life, widely known for his philanthropies, his business and executive ability and public service, and a former mayor of Leominster, died yesterday at his home, 245 Lindell Avenue.

SERVICES

The funeral will be held Thursday morning from his late home at 9:15 o'clock followed by a solemn high requiem mass in St. Leo's Church at 10 o'clock. Burial will be in the mausoleum in Evergreen Cemetery.

Calling hours at the late home are 8 to 10 tonight and 3 to 5 and 8 to 10 p. m. tomorrow.

In a statement today Mayor Ralph W. Crossman said: "A truly great leader, who symbolizes what man should be. His memory will long live in the hearts of our Leominster people. How fortunate we have been here to have had the support and backing of the unselfish contributions of money, time, and energy of such a man as Mr. Doyle. He is ours, gone, but never to be forgotten."

DEPARTMENTS

All city departments will close during the funeral and all its employees are requested to attend the services. City Hall will be closed during the forenoon.

The Thomas F. Wright Funeral Home is in charge of arrangements.

Trustees of Leominster Hospital, the medical staff of the hospital and Leominster Hospital employees will attend the services in a body. They will meet in front of St. Leo's rectory at 9:45 o'clock Thursday morning.

Mayor Crossman ordered flags on all public buildings and on the common placed at half-mast out of respect for Mr. Doyle.

Born in Leominster, Mr. Doyle was the son of the late Mr. and Mrs. Bernard Doyle. He was educated in the public schools of Leominster, graduating from Leominster High School and entered the Eastman Business College in Poughkeepsie, N. Y.

EMPLOY

On completion of his studies there, Mr. Doyle entered the employ of the Horn Supply Co. here, and in 1897 became secretary and general manager of the company.

In 1901, in association with Alexander S. Patton and Ludwig Strauss, he established the Viscoloid Co., Inc., of which he was secretary and treasurer. The concern ranked as one of the largest of its kind in New England at that time.

In 1925 he became associated with the du Pont interests and the Viscoloid Co. was then reorganized as the du Point Viscoloid Co., serving as vice president and director.

KNOWLEDGE

Mr. Doyle's comprehensive knowledge of every phase of the business and his marked ability was considered one of the important factors for its continued success.

In 1925 he became mayor of Leominster and served the city for two terms as the chief executive during which time many improvements were undertaken.

In 1930 the Leominster plant was renamed the Doyle Works plant of the E. I. du Pont Co. in honor of Mr. Doyle and in appreciation for his contributions to the industrial life of Leominster and to the plastics industry as a whole. He retained an active interest in the company and served as vice president and a director until his retirement in 1938 at the age of 65.

ACTIVITIES

Mr. Doyle not only confined his interest to business activities of his company, but he was vitally interested in banking and financial affairs of Leominster and Fitchburg. He was director and one of the founders and organizers of the Merchants National Bank of Leominster and a director of the Safety Fund National Bank of Fitchburg. He was a trustee of the Leominster Savings Bank and was financially interested in other industrial concerns.

A stanch Republican in political affairs, Mr. Doyle in 1920 and 1924 was one of the delegates to the Republican National Convention from Massachusetts.

On taking over as the city's chief executive, the second in the city's history, Mr. Doyle sponsored projects for municipal improvements and was responsible, in part, for the erection of the junior high-school building and the start of development of the No-Town reservoir as a part of the city's water supply.

HOSPITAL

The city boasts several monuments which will perpetuate his memory. One of these is the Leominster Hospital, the site for which he presented to the city and through his zeal, generosity, and enthusiasm, and interest the hospital is rated as one of the best in Massachusetts.

Mr. Doyle served as president of the hospital association and as head of the trustees of the hospital and gave unstintingly of his time, finances, and energy toward its expansion.

On October 30, 1939, he established a $200,000 trust fund.

Still another monument to his memory is the beautiful 20-acre Doyle field stadium which bears his name. This was constructed at a cost in excess of $200,000 and given to the city by Mr. Doyle and dedicated to the youth of Leominster.

In keeping with his interest in youth and wholesome recreation and athletics, Mr.

Doyle also established, about the time Doyle field was opened in 1931, a scholarship fund to aid students to attend college and many have taken advantage of this scholarship fund since that time.

Many of his philanthropies will probably never be made known since he was always ready to lend a helping hand when the need was apparent.

In 1909 Mr. Doyle married the late Elizabeth H. P. Haley and they had two children, Marjorie Elizabeth, a graduate of the Bennett School at Millbrook, N. Y., and the Garland School of Boston, who is married to Richard C. Rockwell, and residing in New York; and Louise Doyle, a graduate of Mount Vernon Seminary in Washington, D. C., and Smith College.

He also has a sister, Mrs. Alice Sullivan, and a brother, Frank Doyle, both of Leominster, and two grandchildren.

On February 27, 1945, Mr. Doyle was elected a director of the Boston & Maine Railroad and at that time was a director of the Merchants National Bank of Boston, the Massachusetts Mutual Life Insurance Co. of Springfield, the Boston Edison Co., and the United States Rubber Co. He also served as a member of the finance committee of the board.

Mr. Doyle held memberships in the Boston A. A., the Oak Hill Country Club of Fitchburg, the Monoosnock Country Club, the Eastern and Corinthian Yacht Club of Marblehead, the Algonquin Club of Boston, the Fay Club of Fitchburg, the Homer Market Club of Boston, the State Republican Club, and was identified with the Boston Chamber of Commerce and Associated Industries of Massachusetts.

He was also a charter member of the Fitchburg Lodge of Elks, life member of the Leominster Sportsmen's Association, a member of the corporation of Northeastern University, trustee of Cushing Academy in Ashburnham, a member of Fitchburg Council, Knights of Columbus, and the Leominster Aerie of Eagles, the Links Club of New York, the United States Navy Club, and the Walsh Memorial Committee.

INTEREST

Mr. Doyle was interested in hunting, fishing, and cruising, and owned a yacht on which he made several cruises.

A stanch supporter of New England, he was ever optimistic over its future. Born in a typical New England manufacturing community he was a keen student of its history and a highly successful businessman who had risen to the highest position in an industry in which he was a pioneer.

On August 30 this year, Mr. Doyle married the former Rachel Butler Holbrook, of Palmer.

[From the Leominster (Mass.) Daily Enterprise of December 27, 1949]

BERNARD W. DOYLE

The passing of Mr. Doyle brings to the community a keen sense of great loss. For the city, both as a private citizen, as an industrial leader and as a public benefactor, and as a public official Mr. Doyle gave richly of time, of ability, and of help.

To him there will long stand many monuments. Those monuments will rise in the enduring esteem and affection in which a community held him. They will stand forth brightly in his many public benefactions, in those many things which he did in such generous measure for the good of the individual, for the advancement of the community.

Many of Mr. Doyle's benefactions are known. But there are those which are not, those kindnesses which he bestowed upon the many, that help which he gave to the many. In all things that were to aid others, to make their path easier, their life brighter, Mr. Doyle gave in the fullest and finest measure.

Doyle Field, one of the most magnificent football fields in the Nation, the Leominster Hospital, in its beginning and in its growth, are, to mention but a few things, evidences of his interest in the public good and in the welfare of that community which was so long his home and to which he gave his efforts in such full measure of devotion.

As mayor of Leominster, Mr. Doyle served with distinction. To the official task to which the people of the city called him, he devoted a fine and discerning touch, performed a work that was marked by that keen business judgment which had characterized his career as an industrialist of wide repute and marked distinction.

For Mr. Doyle to discern a need, one that was broad in its effect and one which when met would result in the greater good of the greater number, was for Mr. Doyle to appraise it, to study it, to apply to it that touch of judgment which was so richly his and, with generous act, to translate plans into the realities.

Fortunate beyond the power of reckoning is that community which has had a man such as Mr. Doyle for a citizen, and deep beyond reckoning is the loss of that community when such a man passes.

[From the Worcester (Mass.) Telegram of December 28, 1949]

BERNARD W. DOYLE

The passing of former Mayor Bernard W. Doyle is regretted in many circles, particularly in Leominster, where he had his home and lived all his life.

His career was a business romance. Starting as a bookkeeper, he became a great industrialist and a wealthy man. He was a director in many corporations in Leominster and elsewhere; his versatility matched his energy and enthusiasm; and he won all of his success by his own efforts.

He was a benefactor of his city, Leominster Hospital and Doyle Field being only two examples of his widespreading philanthropy. He was a generous contributor to his church and to many charities, and he helped many individuals who were sick and in need. He was especially interested in poor boys seeking an education.

He lived a useful life, freely sharing with others the riches which he gained. Yet with all his wealth he made no ostentation, and he never forgot his modest beginnings. He was a good man to know.

Vote Right—Or Else

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Haven (Conn.) Register of December 29, 1949:

VOTE RIGHT—OR ELSE

Taking a page from the CIO book, the American Federation of Labor has produced what amounts to a purge list of its own. In publishing a list of 107 Members of Congress whom it describes as having opposed the best interests of workers, the AFL gives notice of just how far this vote right—or else—spirit has come to dominate union thinking and to measure its arrogance and its disregard of not only national welfare but public welfare. Here, if anywhere, the average citizen finds the perfect example of the selfish interests President Truman is so fond of chastising when it suits his political purposes of the moment.

Publication of this list, particularly at this time, lets it be known that under administration coddling these unions have become so drunk with the wine of their own power that they can dictate as well as demand.

If they are not properly and soundly rebuked by a wrathful and aroused public for this cheeky piece of effrontery, we may soon reach a point where it can well be asked—why hold elections at all?

Why not allow the unions to select the candidates, conduct the elections, and pass upon the results? If the rank and file union membership is to be instructed in advance on not only how to vote but for whom to vote, why bother to send them to the polls at all? A single ballot cast by the national union secretary would then suffice.

It should be noted that the union makes passing bid for the approval of the farmers and small-business men. This is very "white" of them. However, the farmer and the businessman might like to retain the privilege of speaking for themselves, as the candidates and the issues might appeal to them as individuals, rather than as an organized and voiceless mass.

Because of long years of labor-slanted New Deal and Fair Deal legislation, the big union monopolists reached a height of power through which they could dictate what men could work and what men could not. As a country we came to a point where the economy was disrupted, slowed down, or brought to a halt at the whim of one man, or a small group of men. The tide of public anger brought a halt to such monopolistic advances, but was not of sufficient force to turn it back entirely.

Such antics as these should suffice to arouse the public to a point where a job but begun can be completed.

We Are Losing Patience

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the January 1950 issue of the Progressive Farmer:

WE ARE LOSING PATIENCE

American Government is big business. Able men of unquestioned honesty and integrity are required in its administration for the public. Yet, no sooner does an able, courageous man accept an important post in public service than he becomes a target for the sharpshooters. No matter how honest he may be, no matter how capable in carrying out the duties of his post, the villainous crew starts tearing him apart.

There's always room for difference of opinion. Difference of opinion invites argument. But an argument, even though it be heated, does not justify vilification.

We are losing patience with those who differ with others just for the sake of being different. We have long since lost patience with those who, in their effort to win an argument, stoop to vilification of the person with whom they differ.

We hold no brief for those few who seek public post with selfish intent. These few are soon unmasked and made to pay the

penalty. Such persons should be exposed and we honor those who bring their shame to light. But in seeking out these few, why crucify the far greater number who are working ably in behalf of the public good?

How can any man in position of public trust render best service when he is forced to spend much of his time in parrying personal slander? How can any man, feeling the dejection that comes from unjust attacks, be expected to render top service? How can any able businessman, one who enjoyed the accomplishment of building up and directing a successful business, one who has enjoyed the prestige that comes from such accomplishment, have the courage to accept a high position in Government where he will be the target for all types and classes of vicious snipers?

We have many, many able men who have been in public service over a long period of years. These men continue to flinch when hit by the barbs cast their way. These men still have feelings. But their appreciation of the importance of the work they are doing, their feeling of responsibility for the proper performance of this work goads them on, dulls the pain from the uncalled-for attacks.

We are losing patience with those who can see no good, those who can think nothing but evil of those who disagree with them.

A Message on Tolerance From Our Colonial History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, some weeks ago, on a Sunday afternoon—October 23, 1949, to be exact—about 35,000 people gathered on a hillside at Aaronsburg, Pa., to celebrate the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this village of 400 population. But more than the celebration of an anniversary—it was the celebration of an American ideal and a reaffirmation of the American way of life.

Aaronsburg, Pa., was founded by Aaron Levy, a Jewish immigrant from Europe, back in 1799. In the same year, the Salem Lutheran Church of Aaronsburg was founded on land donated by Aaron Levy. In recognition of this double anniversary and this act of early religious understanding, the people of Pennsylvania celebrated the occasion and the Governor of that State proclaimed Sunday, October 23, 1949, as "a day set apart for tolerance and understanding."

High dignitaries from all walks of public life joined in the special observances. All races and creeds which make up our country were represented. A great and inspiring patriotic community service was addressed by such eminent Americans as Gen. William "Wild Bill" Donovan, Supreme Court Justice Felix Frankfurter, the noted Christian minister, Dr. Daniel Poling, and Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, former mediator for the United Nations Commission on Palestine and now the director of the United Nations Trusteeship Division.

School children of the area presented a colorful pageant rededicating the lesson of brotherhood as it was understood and interpreted in the colonial period in American history. The events were broadcast by radio to the entire Nation. It was truly a memorable religious experience which touched many people throughout the country and brought to them a new appreciation of tolerance and democracy.

The message delivered that day by Dr. Bunche, it seems to me, is of significance to all Americans and should be read throughout the length and breadth of the country. He has succeeded so well in capturing the spirit of the occasion and in so thoroughly relating the full meaning of the message of Aaronsburg to present-day circumstances, that I am impelled to bring his words to the attention of all Members of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, the address by Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, entitled "The Aaronsburg Message," as reprinted in the Jewish Layman, of December 1949 is as follows:

THE AARONSBURG MESSAGE

(By Dr. Ralph J. Bunche)

One hundred and fifty years ago, the little village of Aaronsburg in Pennsylvania was founded by and named after Aaron Levy, a Dutch Jew. Aaron Levy, the Jew, was a citizen of the world. History attests that to him all men, irrespective of race or creed, were brothers. He was a man of tolerance and vision.

It is fitting that on the occasion of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the village which he founded we should gather to muster new strength for the ideals and human values which Aaron Levy personified.

Were Aaron Levy here with us today, he would find himself in a strange new world. His village is no more remote. Man's progress in science, in the harnessing of nature, in transportation and communications, would confront him with an amazing and incomprehensible world.

Yet, in another and unfortunate sense, he would find himself not in unfamiliar surroundings. For despite the spectacular progress which man has made in this past century and a half, in things material, no parallel progress has been made in the spiritual realm, in the art of human relations. Aaron Levy would find in the world of today, and in abundance, the same racial and religious intolerances and prejudices, the same bigotries, the same hostility toward that which is strange, as characterized in the life of his day and age. But why? Why is it that man, with all his genius, has never been able to master the art of living with himself?

Who can doubt that there is anything so sorely and urgently needed in the dangerous world of today as a universal recognition of a fraternal bond of kinship among peoples, the realization of a sense of brotherhood among all men, of human understanding, of a broad spirit of tolerance toward those whose races, creeds, cultures and ideologies may differ from one's own?

There can be but one secure foundation for peace and justice in the world. That foundation must be in the hearts and minds of men. Without an all-pervading spirit of human understanding and brotherhood, the most perfect international machinery for peace will be of little avail. It is not the atomic bomb we must fear. It is in man's perversity, suspicion, and intolerance that our real danger is to be found.

No mechanical devices, no charters or pacts, can serve to save mankind from self-destruction if man in his spirit remains mean and brutish. There is but one road to peace and that is the road of human understanding.

Throughout man's recorded history his inter-group relations have been cursed by intolerances and bigotries. Yet there have always been individual Aaron Levys, men and women whose souls have transcended the narrow pettiness of their fellow-beings. In the meanest circumstances, in situations of sharpest conflict, there can always be found instances of man's ability to let his essential goodness shine through.

EROTHERHOOD UNDER STRESS

In the past 2 years I have spent much time in the troubled Near East. In that region, the Palestine issue had stirred emotions and animosities mightily. People, Arabs and Jews, had been speaking grimly of bitter hatreds, of enemies, of fighting animal-like to the death. Arabs and Jews were shooting each other down like cattle. Yet, even in that frightening atmosphere I have witnessed many evidences of man's innate ability to love his fellow man. I have seen Jewish doctors and nurses of the Hadassah Hospital in Jerusalem attend Arab patients in that hospital with kindest solicitude. I have seen, in the midst of the war, Arab legion troops lining the road between Tel-Aviv and Jerusalem, daily watch unarmed convoys of indispensable food and medical supplies for the beleaguered civilian Jews of Jerusalem pass through their lines, unmolested. I have seen in the Hotel des Roses at Rhodes the head of the Israeli delegation in the room of a member of the Transjordan delegation, sharing, in deep compassion, the sorrow of the Arab delegate at the word he had just received of the loss of his entire family in a tragic accident at his home. As I walked into the Arab's room to express my own sorrow, I saw there in silent mourning, not an Arab and a Jew, but only two sorrowful men, who though enemies yesterday were bound together today in a warm bond of human brotherhood by the stark tragedy which had befallen one of them. I have seen, last Christmas, Arab and Israeli military commanders open their tense military lines in order that civilians might pass through to worship at Bethlehem.

DIGNITY OF MAN

It is of very great significance that the 59 members of the United Nations have solemnly pledged themselves in the preamble of the Charter:

"To reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women * * *"; and

"To practice tolerance and live together in peace with one another as good neighbors."

It is peoples with which the United Nations is concerned, for it is recognized that in the attitudes of peoples must depend the success or failure of this tremendous effort to achieve a peaceful and a just world. It is in the day-to-day relations of man with man that the future of all mankind is being determined.

In the modern world, the really challenging problem is the imperfect relations among its peoples. The costs to societies, domestic, and international, of bad human relations have been beyond calculation. In an atomic age, the future costs would appear prohibitive. Suspicions among peoples, group exclusiveness and chauvinistic pride, holier-than-thou attitudes, racial and religious bigotries, master race theories, nationalist egoisms—these are all cancerous growths which attack the very foundations of peace in the world. Indeed, the combination of bad human relations on the one hand and the development of the weapons of modern warfare on the other can only mean that all of us are living on borrowed time.

There is nothing in the nature of mankind which renders it impossible for men to master the art of tolerant and peaceful living.

The future before us would be bleak and hopeless indeed were it to be doubted for an instant that man has it in his power to purge himself of those iniquitous attitudes and practices which are leading him along

the road to doom. I do not doubt it. For I believe in man. I believe firmly in his reason and essential goodness. Bigotry, race-hate, intolerance, prejudice are not innate human traits. They are the products not of nature but of man's social experience. What society does it can undo. It is the will that we have lacked, not the means. We need desperately an intensive mobilization for world brotherhood. It is in our schools, our churches, our homes that the determined effort must be made, that the transformation in people's attitudes must take place. The obligation rests solemnly upon every individual who believes in democracy, who cherishes the American way of life, who loves peace.

It is to men of good will that the world today owes tribute. May their tribe increase.

Rent Decontrol Has Helped Spokane

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, in the Appendix of the RECORD, on pages A58 and A59, there appears a reprint of an article from the New York Times entitled "Upswing in Rents Is Found Where Controls Are Ended." While I cannot quarrel with any of the factual information quoted in the article, it appears obvious to me that the flavor of several statements therein is such as to indicate that excessive increases in rents were experienced in decontrolled areas.

Of the many cities discussed in the report, I am familiar with only one. Yet if the quotations on the city of Spokane, Wash., are a true sample of the fairness of the entire article, the writer of the story has badly distorted the national picture by omitting many important facts. Since the story of decontrol in Spokane has been fully and fairly told in the report of the Spokane rent advisory board to Housing Expediter Tighe Woods, dated December 14, 1949, I think readers of the Times report are entitled to view the full picture. For that reason I intend to insert the entire Spokane report at the end of my remarks.

The Times, for instance, quoted the Spokane report to the effect that rent increases since decontrol averaged 14.3 percent. That sounds like quite a bit but the reporter failed to mention that Spokane rents, prewar, were frozen at an abnormally low average. Even dozens of tenants in Spokane admitted that and asked for increases while controls were still on.

The Times' report further quoted the Advisory Board's report to the effect that "a few rental housing operators had taken advantage of the situation to put unreasonable increases into effect." What he failed to mention was that, after a week-long campaign urging tenants who thought they were being gouged to report to the Board, only 151 tenants out of a total of 21,000 home renters in the city filed complaints. That is just seven-tenths of 1 percent. Of these, most were tenants who had been beneficiaries of abnormally low rents—giving examples of two- and three-bedroom apartments at rents previously frozen at $35 per month.

Neither did the Times' reporter mention the reference to a number of landlords who actually reduced rents since decontrol.

Here, briefly, are a few other important facts on decontrol which the Times' reporter blandly overlooked:

First. New home construction has been accelerated in Spokane since decontrol.

Second. Rental units withheld from the market under control have now been rented.

Third. New construction for rentals has increased and homes previously built for sale are now being offered for rent.

Fourth. Landlords have been forced to clean up their premises, modernize facilities and reinstitute services abandoned under control, all to the benefit of tenants and prospective tenants.

Fifth. Distortions and inequities in rent values which controllers consistently refused to adjust have been leveled.

Finally, I should mention that the Spokane Rent Advisory Board, which made this survey, is a bipartisan body whose chairman, a Democratic State legislator, has made a record for fairness and impartiality in his work. Its report deserves to be interpreted by the press in the same spirit in which it was written and presented to the Housing Expediter.

SPOKANE, WASH., *December 14, 1949.*

Mr. TIGHE WOODS,
National Housing Expeditor,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WOODS: Four and one-half months have elapsed since Federal rent controls were lifted from Spokane by your order. This report, showing the results of decontrol in Spokane, has been compiled by the rental advisory board for your information.

In summary, the records indicate the following developments:

1. Rents in Spokane are leveling off at rates about 14.3 percent above the controlled schedules. At the time of decontrol, the rent average in Spokane was $28.50 a month. The average monthly increase is $5.25.

2. Rents are being held at this level by the pressure of an expanding supply of rental accommodations and a progressively mounting ratio of vacancies.

3. New home construction has increased 84 percent over the same period in 1948 when controls were in force.

4. The Washington State Department of Health in its allocation of State funds credits Spokane with an increase in 12 months of 19,000 people, which is substantially higher than any other city in the State. Neither local pride nor local wishes enter into this calculation—it is a coolly analytical estimate for the disbursement of State funds. The population estimate of Spokane City, as of July 1, 1949, is 170,000.

Data supporting these and other important conclusions follow an explanation of the board's activities.

During this period of a free rental economy in Spokane, the rental advisory board has been compiling data on rent trends, availability of rental housing, new construction, and other related statistics. To implement its purpose the board established an office through which data could be channeled for proper recording. The press and radio have given substantial publicity to the request that rent changes be reported to the board in person, in writing, or by telephone, with particular accent on rent increases which tenants felt were unreasonable. This has been a continuous program since the date of decontrol, July 26, 1949. A digest of the board's records follows:

A. THE EFFECT OF DECONTROL ON RENTS

1. Tenant complaints: 151 tenants, out of a total of 21,000 tenant-occupied units, have registered complaints of unreasonable rent increases. The average OPA ceiling of the cases reported by the complainants was $35.40 a month. The average of their increase is $13.02 a month, being a percentage increase of 37.1.

2. Report of property rental agencies surveyed by the board: 5 leading rental agencies reported an average increase of 21.6 percent on the 699 units under their management. The average OPA ceiling of this group was estimated to be about $40 a month, and their average increase about $8 a month.

3. Owner-operated units: 95 percent of all rental units in Spokane are privately managed by owners, or lessors. Individually their operations are small, averaging less than three units each. Their sum total, however, comprises about 20,000 units. The surveys in this group covered 1,059 units. The average of the OPA ceilings reported was $35.70. Their increases average $4.18 a month, or 11.7 percent.

From these surveys, which were unusually comprehensive, the Board feels justified in concluding that the over-all average of rent increases since decontrol is approximately $5.25 over the controlled rates, or 14.3 percent.

B. AVAILABILITY OF RENTAL HOUSING

1. A tabulation of classified rental ads taken from newspapers shows a progressive increase since decontrol, with listings now exceeding those of March 1939, which was the last normal rent year in Spokane prior to rent controls. Counts were made from the last Sunday edition of each month shown:

	For rent	
	Apartments	Houses
July 25, 1948	37	13
July 31, 1949 (decontrol)	45	10
Aug. 28, 1949	55	20
Sept. 25, 1949	53	22
Oct. 30, 1949	79	35
Nov. 30, 1949	85	29
Dec. 4, 1949	81	41
Dec. 10, 1949	91	48

A count of the classified ads in the for rent columns of a Sunday edition gives you approximately 10 percent of the total units available. This is proved by comparing the annual vacancy surveys with a count of the Sunday edition ads for any number of years. They run fairly true to this pattern. There are probably 1,200 to 1,500 vacant units in Spokane at this time.

2. Sources of this expanding supply of rental units.

(a) Return to the market of hundreds of locked-up units following the removal of rent controls. (The existence of 1,200 of these was established by a survey conducted by the board when it made its recommendation to you that the area be decontrolled.)

(b) Return to the rental market of homes previously held for sale only, by owners who refused to rent them while rent controls were in force. (Some had been rented and vacated and were thus still under control. Others feared the inclusion of their property by legislative action.)

(c) Release of rental units by tenants who have purchased new homes.

C. EFFECT OF DECONTROL ON THE CONSTRUCTION OF NEW RESIDENCES

1. New residence building permits:

Under rent control in 1948:	
August	156
September	99
October	87
November	100
Total	432
After decontrol (July 26, 1949):	
August	156
September	229
October	165
November	247
Total	797

This tabulation shows that building permits issued during the 4 months following decontrol of this year jumped 84.4 percent over those of the corresponding period of 1948. The Spokane Home Builders Association reports that the stimulus to new construction followed immediately the announcement of decontrol and came at a time when building activity was lagging severely. Tenants in numbers who would normally have purchased their own homes elected to remain in frozen rental quarters as long as possible. When decontrol was announced, they placed their orders. This activity is undiminished.

2. The sale of existing homes. Realtors report an increase in the sale of houses which parallels the record of new construction. They report a scarcity of listings. This record is confirmed by—

	1948	1949
Mortgages filed:		
August	458	621
September	257	570
October	445	688
Total	1,260	1,879

This is an increase of 48.2 percent, which reflects the improved position of the home sales market following decontrol.

D. GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

1. The removal of Government rent controls has set in motion all of those factors which tend naturally to keep rents under automatic control.

2. Better and cleaner accommodations are being offered. Owners are beginning to find it necessary to clean up and dress up their units in order to hold and attract tenants. This has opened up a long neglected business field to the finishing tradesmen and to those who supply them with materials.

3. There is a better relationship between tenants and landlords. The return of competitive conditions in the rental market is compelling owners to make their premises attractive to tenants, and tenants now realize that if they become undesirable residents they cannot retain possession of properties against their owners' wishes. Consequently each is anxious to retain the good will of the other.

4. Decontrol is ending the distortions and inequalities in rent values which resulted from years of changing regulations. According to the realtors and home builders, the natural leveling of these maladjustments is putting the whole housing industry here on a sounder foundation.

E. FOOTNOTE COMMENTARIES

Board members James P. Dillard and Wayne Durham personally investigated more than a score of the facilities where tenants had complained of unreasonable increases. In some instances they were able to effect a moderation of the proposed new rates. They found that most of the complaints came from tenants who had been the beneficiaries of abnormally low rents—such as two- and three-bedroom apartments having floor footages running up to 1,200 square feet or more, at rents frozen at $35 to $50 a month. Many were even less. The highest ratio of increases came from this type of accommodation.

The unusually low rent schedules which prevail in this community are the result of rents being frozen at a time when thousands of its citizens had moved to the coastal regions, where prewar preparedness activities were centered.

With the competitive factor already holding rents to a level only slightly above the OPA average, owners appear to be facing a permanent loss in income position in the national economy, as compared with that of the prewar years.

Word has just been received that Western Builders, Inc., the largest home construction and rental company in Spokane, announced that effective today there will be a $10 decrease in all vacant units under their control.

This report is sent to you in compliance with your request that boards continue to function and operate even in areas that are decontrolled. We would appreciate your comments. Any correspondence should be addressed to the board in Mr. Dillard's office, 202 Hyde Building, Spokane, Washington.

Very truly yours,

JAMES P. DILLARD,
Chairman, Rental Advisory Board.

The Forgotten Soldiers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY W. WIER
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. WIER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news item from a recent edition of the Minneapolis Star-Journal of that city entitled "The Forgotten Soldiers":

FORGOTTEN SOLDIERS—PHILIPPINE WAR VETERAN PUSHES FIGHT FOR PENSIONS

(By Ben Kern)

In May 1948, a car honked at James M. Hamilton, 66, 3546 Forty-first Avenue South, and he jumped so hard he strained his hip.

A sympathetic streetcar conductor took Hamilton aboard and let him off at Fort Snelling, where Hamilton confidently limped into the veterans' hospital.

Having been an American soldier in charge of an artillery range finder in several engagements with Moros in the Philippine uprising following the Spanish-American War and having previously been a patient at veterans' hospital, Hamilton thought his hip was as good as fixed when he walked in.

NOT CLASSED AS WAR

He was wrong. A Veterans' Administration employee looked at his file and noticed that his service was limited to the Philippine uprisings subsequent to July 4, 1902.

"They told me in a nice way to scram," Hamilton says.

Hamilton's previous hospitalization in the veterans' hospital had been a "mistake." The hitch was that the Philippine insurrection from July 5, 1902, to December 31, 1913, has never been designated by Congress as a "war" and that body has never voted its veterans any benefits.

In Hamilton's words: "No bonus—no pension—no hospitalization—no nothing. I guess there aren't enough of us around. We don't make enough noise."

Since the day when he strained his hip, Hamilton has been trying to make some "noise" by writing to Congressmen and Senators, but it hasn't done much good.

Four proposals to grant the Philippine Insurrection veterans pensions have failed in Congress since 1939, the latest last January.

Yesterday Hamilton walked into the Tribune and plunked down some Mankato newspaper clippings describing Philippine Insurrection battles, one Philippine Insurrection Medal, one first-class gunner's medal, two Veterans of Foreign Wars Medals, and a copy of his honorable discharge with character of "excellent" and a listing of seven battles, engagements, skirmishes, and expeditions in which he took part from January 27, 1905, to March 15, 1907.

TELLS OF BATTLE

Headlines on two of the clippings were: "Fight hard battle" and "Battle with Moros." The third quoted a letter he wrote to his mother in Mankato: "There were about 1,000 Moros killed. I saw the whole thing, as I was there all the time. Most of them were killed by our shell and shrapnel, and by the rapid-fire guns (the barrels were set in a circle and the hammer went around like the hand on a clock from a long distance)."

About 20 American soldiers were killed in this battle, Hamilton said, "and there were more men killed and wounded in the so-called peacetime battle of Bud-Dajo in March 1906 than in the wartime bombardment and capture of Manila."

(This last fact was cited in a speech by the chairman of the Philippine-Pacific War Veterans national legislative committee, an excerpt of which was among Hamilton's documents.)

"Some war veterans who never got out of the United States are getting pensions, but we get nothing," said Hamilton, "and if Congress doesn't get going, we'll all be dead."

Hamilton is a yardmaster for the Great Northern Railway Co. He has been a railroad man for 31 years and could get some railroad retirement pension, but not enough to suit him. "If I could get a veteran's pension, I'd walk off the job tomorrow," he said.

Economy and Competence in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Herbert Hoover before the National Reorganization Conference of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report, Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., December 12, 1949:

REMOVING OBSTACLES TO ECONOMY AND TO COMPETENCE IN GOVERNMENT

Six months have passed since our Commission finished its reports to the Congress on economics and improvements in the executive branch.

In the meantime, these recommendations have had a magnificent support by the press and the public. Added to this is the astonishing growth of your committee of citizens under the admirable leadership of President Johnson, of Temple University.

This has become a crusade for the intelligent reduction of the expense of government. It is a crusade to clear the track for competency. It is a nonpartisan crusade.

It is a job for citizenship rather than partisanship. The Commission itself represented both political parties. Its work is supported by President Truman and by the leaders from both sides in Congress. Your citizens committee embraces our two living and wise former Vice Presidents and five former Cabinet officers from both the Democratic and Republican side. You include educators, writers, editors, publishers, labor, and farm leaders. You come from every State and congressional district. You are a mighty host and you are in dead earnest.

It was not the field of our Commission to discuss the merit or demerit of governmental policies. Whatever those functions may be, our purpose is to make them work more economically, more efficiently, and with better service in their contacts with the people.

PROGRESS MADE

You can have confidence that you are succeeding.

The last session of Congress adopted several important recommendations of the Commission and of the President. These measures have already secured large savings. In the Defense Department alone they will soon be at the rate of about $1,000,000,000 a year, and Secretary Johnson believes they will amount to fully $2,000,000,000 without impairing national defense. And other measures have been enacted into law. We are already clearing the tracks for competence in Government.

I am going to make some suggestions as to what we should undertake next. But first, I want to tell you four reasons why this crusade of ours has wider implications than specific reforms.

1. Fiscal and economic survival

The first implication relates to our fiscal and economic survival.

During these last 6 months, the financial situation of our Government has become still more difficult. Federal expenditure of over $43,000,000,000 and a deficit of over $5,000,000,000 are announced for the present fiscal year. I believe it may be much greater for the next fiscal year. We may be turning two Frankensteins loose in the land. Their terrifying names are Higher Taxes and Inflation. We are interested here in combating them.

When you listen to "billions" over the radio, you no doubt try to size them up in terms of your church contributions. I might remark that the decimal point leads a restless and uneasy life in the Federal Government. Those groups of three ciphers which are separated by commas are moving steadily to the left.

Government spending and taxes must be related to increased per capita production. Therein lies the key of increasing new enterprise, increasing real wages to our workers, increasing real income to our farmers, and an increasing ability to give security to our youth and our aged. Government is a powerful element in this progress. The method and amount of taxes can seriously affect productivity.

Our economists seem to agree that taxation beyond 25 percent of our national income will bring disaster. Possibly your life has been brightened by some economists who dismiss the Federal expenditures as amounting to only 20 percent of the national income, anyway. On that subject, if you add up the actual and prospective annual expenditures of the Federal Government and the local governments, and if you truly compute the national income, you will find this warning red light no longer shines with an intensity of only 20 percent but with considerably over 30 percent. This means far more than 30 percent of the national income. It is a combustion of your savings and your possible standards of living.

Some one remarked that about the time we think we can make ends meet, somebody moves the ends. Despite this, you should not be discouraged in the work we have undertaken. Whatever we can accomplish helps confine the two Frankensteins. And we can ask our people to think it over.

2. Education in good government

Second, another of the wider implications of this crusade is its byproduct in public understanding. Millions of American people are receiving a lesson in the fundamentals and methods of good government. We are making some of the people economy-minded.

One of our results has been the setting up of Reorganization Commissions in 20 States and 10 municipalities for a treatment similar to that of our Commission. We are thus clearing other tracks of obstacles to competence in Government.

3. Preservation of the American experiment

Third, in a larger sense, this is a crusade to make democracy work. There is today much apprehension lest the American experiment will fail. We have need to reestablish faith that the whole of the preamble to the Declaration of Independence and the Gettysburg Address are still related to Government. If the Republic is not to be overwhelmed, the people must have such methods and systems as will enable good officials to give them good government.

Success in our crusade will help bring faith instead of cynicism and disillusionment.

4. Helping in the cold war

Fourth, success in our crusade to reduce cost of government is a necessary condition to winning the cold war. We are fighting this war at frightful cost. The way to win that war is to reduce our wastes, give competence a chance, and defer some Government ventures. By these reforms and these self-denials, we can help disappoint Mr. Stalin.

A PROGRAM FOR ACTION

The question before us now is how to further these reforms. Somebody said that wisdom consists not so much in knowing what to do with the ultimate as in knowing what to do next.

Obviously many of these reforms require legislation. Our congressional leaders requested the Commission staff to draft this legislation. The Budget Bureau is cooperating. Congress is a busy institution, and we cannot expect it to do everything all at once. It has the responsibility to inquire into these proposals, and it has the intricate job of putting them into law as far as they meet with its approval.

Having regard for the burdens of our Congress, it would be well to concentrate on some of the most urgent of these reforms. Some may differ on what this list should be. My own belief is that the following are in the most urgent category:

1. Reorganization of Civil Service—the personnel problem.
2. Reorganization of Budgeting and Accounting.
3. Reorganization of the Post Office.
4. Unification of the Federal hospital services.
5. Unification of water conservation services.
6. Unification of agricultural land services.
7. Unification of transportation services.
8. Relief for the President of the United States.

This is not the whole program, but it would do to go on with.

I believe that $2,000,000,000 of savings and more efficient service to the public is to be had in these areas alone.

The reports of the Commission are filled with facts in support of these eight reforms. I shall only mention them briefly here.

THE CIVIL SERVICE

Above all things, if we are to have economy and service to the people, the country must have a skilled, nonpolitical civil service, and one which will attract and hold the best in the land.

At present "Red Tape" himself dwells in the civil service of 2,200,000 employees. The result is an accumulation of waste and deadwood—and discouragement of good officials. The sword to cut this Gordian knot is to decentralize the engagement and control of these employees (except for certain general services) into the departments and agencies. This must be done under rules to be established by the Civil Service Commission and enforced by it.

BUDGETING AND ACCOUNTING

Next on our list of priorities comes budgeting and accounting. I am sure you will agree with me that this is one of the dullest subjects on earth, but it is potent nevertheless. The ghost of Alexander Hamilton still wanders in our fiscal machinery. I doubt whether more than 15 men in the world can make head or tail of the 10,000,000 words and sums in the present Federal budget—certainly not all at one time.

We urge that the budget be rebuilt on a functional or performance basis, by which the costs of a given function can be compared year by year. That is both before and after taking. This system has been written into the law as to the armed services. It should be made universal. Hitherto no one could know what it costs to operate a hospital or the forests. You would need a sort of Geiger counter to discover it in two dozen different appropriations.

The accounts, except for Government corporations, are kept by the Congress, not by the executive agencies. Any executive needs to sit on top of his accounts.

There has been no adequate personal or real-property accounting at all. We estimate that the Government has $27,000,000,000 of personal property. When officials know more about what all this property is composed of, and where it is, the departments might live off this fat for quite a while.

THE POST OFFICE

The Post Office is a big business. Our criticism is not directed to its 500,000 employees. They are courteous, helpful, hard-working, and the friends of everybody—the nearest agent of Santa Claus most of us meet. What we object to is the form of organization that is a relic of Ben Franklin plus 160 years of oft-conflicting laws. They cover more than 800 finely printed pages.

We want the Post Office set up as a modern business. We want it taken out of politics.

UNIFICATION OF GOVERNMENT HOSPITALS, PUBLIC HEALTH, AND MEDICAL RESEARCH

Next we propose a unification of the Government hospitals, health service, medical research and guidance to governmental grants-in-aid to civilian hospitals. As an indication of waste, there already existed in Federal hospitals at the time of our investigation beds for 225,000 patients, and only 155,000 were occupied. Yet Congress had made appropriations for, or authorized, hospitals with 50,000 additional beds, despite the fact that 70,000 are empty—at a cost of $1,300,000,000. President Truman canceled out $300,000,000 of this program, and Congress restored the authority.

But beyond savings, we are striving for something even greater. That is better medical service to our armed forces, our veterans, and our seamen. We also want this service set up better to stimulate preventive medicine. We want it not to deprive our civilian population of its doctors.

UNIFICATION OF OUR WATER-CONSERVATION SERVICES

Fifth on our list of priorities is the Federal conservation of water resources. At present this function is scattered over many agencies. They employ over 5,000 engineers and about 70,000 other people. They overlap;

they have duplicate offices; they compete in procurement of both supplies and skills and jobs to do. A pork barrel floats in those rivers.

We not alone want to save great sums of money but we want to save water.

UNIFICATION OF FEDERAL LAND MANAGEMENT

The sixth on this preferential list is Federal land management. In continental United States, the Federal Government has about 169,000,000 acres of grazing and forest lands administered by the Department of the Interior. We have about 65,000,000 acres of forests and grazing lands administered by the Department of Agriculture. In the Western States they compete with each other and, cheek by jowl, each maintains a staff in almost every county. Millions are being wasted "in them thar hills."

UNIFICATION OF TRANSPORTATION SERVICES

Seventh in these urgencies is solution of a major problem in Government services to transportation. Aside from the agencies regulating transportation rates and services, there are about a dozen agencies scattered over a dozen different parts of the Government to deal with these matters. We must eliminate their overlap and waste. We should give the people one central agency to go to when they seek Government service in these matters.

There is something even more vital. The Federal Government directly or indirectly subsidizes or provides facilities for aviation, highways, waterways, and overseas shipping. We loan money to the railroads. They are all an essential part of our national defense. We must have coordination of our national policies, aiming at the development of a balanced national transport system. The troubles of the railroads are a daily exhibit.

RELIEF FOR THE PRESIDENT

Finally, there are some 65 different agencies in the executive branch which report directly to the President. If he gave to each of them an hour a week for administration, he would have no time to formulate leadership in the major policies of the Government, or attend an occasional game. By our proposals we can ultimately reduce these 65 agencies by more than one-half.

Beyond this there is a big confusion of authorities between bureaus and between the Executive and the Congress. They form great barnacles on the ship of state. Under our Constitution, in logic and common sense, there can be only one Chief Executive officer in our Government, delegating authority ultimately down the line to the office boy. In executive matters Congress should be content to be the board of directors, with agencies of inspection and audit to see that their decisions are properly executed.

OTHER REFORMS

There are many reforms, other than the eight goals I have mentioned. We can furnish them on demand.

OPPOSITION

We have opposition of course. There are still people who hold to the theory of reduced Government expenses but not to its practice. Your job is to minister to their mental disorders. The best treatment is to persuade them to join in this historic movement toward progress and enduring national security.

IN CONCLUSION

These are not merely statistical assertions nor academic theories. These forces reach into every cottage in the land. They carry with them the future of our youth and of our country.

We must conserve our strength and stop wasting our heritage if we are to survive as a free people.

"Our Terrible Blunder Regarding Formosa Invites Disaster," Says the Editor of the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, a terrible blunder has been committed by the administration in its handling of Formosa.

This blunder is best illustrated by the following editorial dated January 6, 1950, from the pen of Mr. Robert W. Boyer, editor of the Altoona Tribune, Altoona, Pa.

(The editorial follows:)

A TERRIBLE BLUNDER

It is entirely possible that history a decade or so from the present will call President Truman's refusal to try to save Formosa from the Communists America's major policy error in the Far East, topping the whole China debacle.

It is, too, entirely possible that this Formosa declaration will be revealed as one of the most costly errors in American history, perhaps surpassing the tragic blunder committed by the American Government on Pearl Harbor.

Mr. Truman said Thursday that this country will not intervene to save Formosa from the Chinese Communists.

It seems almost beyond belief. In the light of events, it seems downright stupid. An invitation to disaster.

We do not want war, nor do we want anything that will cause war. No sane person does. Yet Formosa represents the crux of everything the administration says it has been fighting the Reds to obtain, except for this vital difference:

The administration, Mr. Truman and his cronies, have centered their attention on western Europe, persuaded thus by the world's ablest diplomats, the British.

In western Europe, we have provoked the Russians to the point of desperation, even while they have been provoking us likewise. We have risked war by sending military advisers to Greece, by sending arms to Greece and Turkey, by organizing the whole of western Europe against the Russians.

It is a strange thing, but true, that Greece and Turkey were far more vital to Britain than to us. Britain did not want Russia to gain domination of the Mediterranean—British life line to the east.

And so, we stuck our necks out for Britain.

But, what do we do for ourselves in the Far East? Formosa is vital to ultimate defense of the United States, so Mr. Truman turns it down.

In the Far East, Mr. Truman refuses to move to save this country's defense arch in the western Pacific, Formosa.

General MacArthur is regarded, not only in America but in London and other world capitals, as the foremost military authority on the Far East. Even the British have not hesitated to acknowledge his leadership in this respect, as demonstrated when he was given top command over Australians during World War II.

General MacArthur advocates that we endeavor to save Formosa. This island lies athwart a perimeter of potential United States defense bases in the western Pacific. Formosa in the hands of the Communists places us in exactly the same position we were in when Japan struck at Pearl Harbor. Even worse, for then we had free access to China. Now we haven't.

As we have said time and again, we need a President and Secretary of State who will not be overawed by European diplomats and who will assume real leadership in world affairs.

Observe how Britain follows its own course. It has decided to recognize the Chinese Communists.

Britain is playing the game of another Chamberlain Munich—by appeasing the Reds—who cannot be appeased.

Mr. Acheson says this country will not alter its position against Red China—but, he infers—"yet."

Senator CONNALLY says Formosa is not important enough to risk war over.

Was Greece? Was Turkey? Is western Europe?

Is it important that we let the Reds take China? Is it important that we give them leave to take all of Asia? Is it important that we give them Formosa, and thus give them, too, a terrible base for Russian naval and air strength to dominate the Philippines, to harass Hawaii, to menace Guam and Wake and even Alaska and our west coast?

If communism is a threat in western Europe, why is it not at least an equal threat in China, in Formosa, in Indochina, in Burma and Malaya?

The inconsistency—the utter weakness—of Mr. Truman's foreign policy is appalling.

He drives us down a road upon which we squander our strength in all quarters of the world, the while he rants about the dangers of Red Russia; then he proceeds to hand over to Russia the domination of all we fought to retain in World War II in the Pacific.

How Cheap Is Cheap Power?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the San Francisco Chronicle of January 7, 1950:

BOOKKEEPING AND CHEAP POWER

In one point particularly President Truman's statement Thursday on his water and power program was incomplete. He said that where private interests can transmit power as cheaply as the Government he will be glad to see them take on the job.

What did he mean by "as cheaply as the Government"?

Did he have in mind the cost figures as shown by the bookkeeping of Government enterprises as compared to the cost figures shown by the bookkeeping of private enterprises of the same nature?

The accounting of Government enterprises never presents a true picture. The Government pays no taxes to States and municipalities on the physical properties it installs and uses; it does not, at the end of the year, have to give up a large share of its income from them to the Internal Revenue Bureau.

The Government uses interest-free funds in its enterprises. It is true that some of these enterprises are supposed to return interest in time from their operations. But

this is a deferred return; the interest is not compounded as it would be in the case of private enterprise deferring its interest payments.

The Government puts into its enterprises all sorts of subsidies which do not appear in their cost accounting.

With the utilities it operates the Government sets up for itself a selected market through maintained priorities. In other words, it takes the cream, whereas the privately owned utility has to take the skim milk along with the cream in the areas it serves. If this gives the Government an advantage it also makes it tougher for consumers outside its priorities by making it tougher for the private enterprises that serve them.

Do these factors make Government enterprises cheaper to the people? Not by one penny. The people have to make up every one of them by taxes. The subsidies all come out of the Treasury, which gets its money from the people's pockets. The people have to dig up taxes to pay the interest on the funds the Treasury raises to put into the construction and operation of Government enterprises. The people go down into their jeans to make up the taxes which Government does not pay on its enterprises but which would be paid by private capital if it built and operated them.

Government bookkeeping brings the appearance of its cost figures down by omitting such factors, but it is only an appearance. The hidden cost to the people remains for them to pay.

Add the costs of bureaucratic red tape, which the Hoover Commission has shown to be excessive, and the human nature factor—the spenders of Government money have no critical stockholders on their necks—and it is altogether unlikely that Government can construct and operate any enterprise as cheaply as can private interests. This would be clearly shown if Government enterprises were compelled to keep their books in the manner State commissions compel privately owned utilities.

The President's statement needed clarification.

Remember Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address delivered recently by Miss Grace Humphrey, a graduate of Wellesley College and the author of several books. The address was broadcast under the sponsorship of the Western Massachusetts Congress. Miss Humphrey emphasizes the immortal moments in the history of Poland with which every free man and woman should be familiar. Our responsibility for the plight of this gallant nation is one of the black spots in our history. We should remind ourselves constantly of the words Miss Humphrey quotes from the Polish national hymn, "Poland is not yet dead, while our lives remain." When the day comes of Poland's liberation, may this Nation have done all within its power to that end and so, in some measure, have removed the guilt we now bear for the stupid, cowardly, disgraceful thing we joined in doing at Yalta.

The address follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, remember Pearl Harbor. Remember Dunkerque. Remember Stalingrad. I would ask you to remember Poland.

Twice Poland, the knight among nations, has saved western Europe from invaders from the east. In 1683 the Turks marched as far west as Vienna and only the timely arrival of the Polish king, Jan Sobieski, with his army saved the Austrian empire, saved western civilization. In 1920 Polish soldiers defeated the Bolshevists in the battle of Warsaw, which Poles call "the miracle of the Vistula," so hopeless resistance seemed at the outset—a 2-percent chance of winning, said their leader Pilsudski, but hour by hour that hot August day revised his figure upward until the Russians fled in utter rout. Have you forgotten those two victories and their results for Europe?

Poland, first to fight against Hitler's aggressions when, with no declaration of war his Brown Shirts invaded the so-called corridor in September of 1939, and entered Danzig, a so-called free city under the League of Nations, and World War II began. Have you forgotten listening to the broadcasts of Mayor Starzynski, telling the day-by-day events in Warsaw and reminding England of her promise to help?

People remember Mussolini's stabbing France in the back, dramatized by Churchill over the radio. Poland, too, had a stab in the back from Soviet Russia, despite the treaty of nonaggression, a bully's threat of attack with planes and tanks and artillery at the very time the Poles were doing their best to meet Hitler's blitzkrieg, until Warsaw burning, with no water to fight the fires breaking out everywhere, had to surrender. Polish military resistance on Polish soil was ended, but they fought on; 12,000 of their men in England's RAF made brilliant records during the bombing of London; their troops at the Cassino monastery added a new glory to the long list of Polish successes. Have you forgotten?

Then came a German army of occupation in Poland. The faculty of the university in Krakow summoned to a conference with the German governor and were carried off to concentration camp. That university is the oldest in Poland; its library endowed by the beautiful girl-queen Jadwiga, had the largest book collection in the country, with many rare volumes, some the only copy in the world. Soldiers sorted out the books printed in German, to be shipped to Berlin. All the rest they carried into the courtyard of that beautiful Gothic building where I have walked so often, piled them around the statue of Copernicus, once a student there, and set fire to them. Have you forgotten?

Poles are skillful plotters, thanks to the 120 years of the partitions. Scarcely had Warsaw surrendered than they organized the underground—some men and women with the same tasks as in 1915 and 1916 and 1918 when they lived through another occupation. They planned and waited till the fortunes of war brought a Soviet army westward in July of 1944. Approaching the Polish capital, they signaled the Poles to rise. Led by General Bor, the uprising broke out at an agreed-upon hour in one quarter of the city after another, timed like a radio program. The Russians were just across the bridge in the suburb called Praga.

"Can you hold out 5 days?" they had asked.

"Yes."

"We ought to make it in 2, but we'll say 5 days just in case—"

Some RAF planes flew over Warsaw, dropping medicines and ammunition at a certain minute at a certain street intersection—a perilous mission that, but many pilots volunteered. And just across the bridge were the Russians waiting. It's not a long bridge, shorter than our Brooklyn Bridge; I've often strolled across it. Meanwhile from this section held by the Poles to that one, from Pilsudski Square to Mokotow, from the suburb Zoliborz to the beautiful Stare Miasto, Polish women and high-school students carried messages and grenades and morphine, crawling through the sewers as Jean Valjean crawled through the sewers of Paris—but that was in a book; this was reality; I've talked with women who did it.

Not in 2 days nor in 5 did the Soviets cross the Vistula to Warsaw, nor in 10, nor yet 20 days. Sixty-three days the underground held out ar. ! General Bor surrendered then only because there was no more morphine for the wounded, no more bandages, no more ammunition, no more of anything. How proud I was to be invited to the city hall when the mayor of New York presented to that Polish general the freedom of the city.

To an American journalist who told the story to me, the Russians tried to explain the delay: "We had to rest our men. We had to regroup our divisions. And—anyway—the uprising wasn't well organized."

A refugee friend of mine who was in the underground all those weeks of bombardment exclaimed, "Not well organized. Why, I was 1 of 200,000 Warsaw women organized in 2-hour shifts for duty day and night. My turn was always midnight till 2 a. m.; but it made no difference—no one could sleep, ever; the German artillery never stopped firing. All the men, civilians and soldiers, were organized with the same meticulous care." Have you forgotten the uprising?

The Yalta Conference between Churchill and Roosevelt and Stalin meant one more partition for Poland. As once with Czechoslovakia, the Allies sold Poland down the river, giving Russia her eastern provinces and taking territory on the west from Germany to compensate her. No one consulted the Polish government in exile, no one asked the hundreds of thousands of people affected by this sudden change of frontiers. Poland sold down the river because, forsooth, Roosevelt and Churchill thought it necessary to give Stalin whatever he suggested. Have you forgotten Yalta?

Not one quisling could the Germans find in Warsaw. Have you forgotten that? And the much publicized parliamentary elections which the Allies promised would be honest, under their supervision. Honest? with opposition parties not allowed to hold meetings or publish their newspapers, even to put up candidates? The American Ambassador, Arthur Bliss Lane, watching affairs in Poland during those anxious months, wrote a book, I Saw Poland Betrayed, giving the story of the puppet government installed in Poland by Moscow. Have you forgotten that?

How long will America forget the Poles? Their stirring national hymn begins, "Poland is not yet dead while our lives remain." Justice will come, the enemy be expelled, freedom restored. Take courage, Americans and Poles alike.

"Their cause is just and their victory certain,
For God is always the upholder of justice."

"Slave Labor" or "Semiservitude"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, on the floor of the House last

Monday, January 9, my distinguished colleague Hon. CARL D. PERKINS, of Kentucky, made inquiry about the provisions of the Sugar Act, at which time I quoted from a letter from the Department of Agriculture. Under unanimous consent, I am placing this letter in the Appendix of the RECORD together with a newspaper article from the Washington Times-Herald of May 4, 1947:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND
MARKETING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., March 25, 1949.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in response to your telephone request to the Sugar Branch for information concerning features of the Sugar Act and its administration.

One of the basic features of the Sugar Act is the provision for making conditional payments to growers who comply with certain conditions. Appropriation requirements for these payments are more than offset by excise tax collections authorized by a provision in the Internal Revenue Code with respect to sugar processed or imported for direct consumption in the United States. This tax is equivalent to five-tenths cent per pound, raw value, or 0.535 cent per pound, refined value. Revenues from this tax amounted to approximately $71,247,000 in fiscal year 1948, and it is anticipated that they will approximate $72,800,000 in 1949.

The rates of payment under the Sugar Act are established in section 304 of the act and vary from 80 cents per 100 pounds of raw sugar produced for the smallest growers, to 30 cents per 100 pounds for the largest growers. Payments have averaged around $60,000,000 per year in recent years and are expected to be around $65,000,000 annually when production is equivalent to the quota in each of the domestic areas.

One of the conditions growers must comply with in order to obtain Sugar Act payments is the payment of wages not less than those determined by the Secretary of Agriculture to be fair and reasonable. The Secretary is required to consider differences in conditions among the various producing areas, and the standards established by him under the Agricultural Adjustment Act in making these determinations. Among the conditions considered in the establishment of minimum wage rates are the price of sugar and net returns to growers, as well as the cost of living. The degree of mechanization and the productivity per man-hour varies greatly for the different areas. To illustrate, Hawaii, with an annual production of close to 1,000,000 tons of sugar, employs only 25,000 workers to operate its plantations and raw-sugar mills, whereas Puerto Rico, with only a slightly larger production, employs 135,000 workers. A part of this difference can be explained by the fact that the Hawaiian harvesting and grinding season runs throughout most of the year, whereas the Puerto Rican harvesting and grinding season is much shorter. Nevertheless, the difference in degree of mechanization is primarily responsible for the difference in the labor requirement per ton of sugar between the two areas.

The small sugar-growing enterprise in the Virgin Islands should be considered more in the nature of a work-relief project than a commercial undertaking. Prior to the establishment of the Virgin Islands Company, private mills in that area had all closed and the population on the island of St. Croix was left without a major means of livelihood. Although both the yield per acre of cane and the sugar content per ton of cane are very low, the reestablishment of the sugar industry has afforded employment to a large number of workers on the island. Efforts are also being made to develop more remunerative enterprises.

In Louisiana and Puerto Rico the wage determinations provide escalator clauses requiring that wages paid farm labor in the production of sugar be increased with increases in the price of sugar. In the case of Hawaii, the wage rates are actually determined by the terms of the contracts between the various plantations and the labor union. Since such wage rates are high enough to meet the standards provided under the Sugar Act, the determination amounts to little more than the requirement that persons employed on the farms be paid in full for all such work as required in section 301 (c) (1) of the act.

The 1949 basic hourly rates for the several areas are as follows:

	Nonharvest	Harvest
	Cents	*Cents*
Sugar beets	60	65
Louisiana	32	39
Florida	45	45
Hawaii	78.5	78.5
Puerto Rico	29	29
Virgin Islands	25	25

It should be pointed out that the basic hourly rates shown above are for the lowest rate worker. Higher rates are provided for skilled or semiskilled workers in all areas except for the Virgin Islands.

In addition to the above cash payments, farmers in all of the domestic areas, except Hawaii, are required to provide laborers without charge the customary perquisites. These usually consist of housing, garden plots, and in some cases vegetables, meat, milk, and medical services. In Hawaii, the labor unions demanded and received in wages the cash equivalent of perquisites. In most of the areas piecework rates are used to a large extent. Payments to laborers per hour under piecework average about 50 percent higher than minimum rates established for work on a time basis.

You also asked for information on the restriction of imports of refined sugar and the way that such restrictions tie into the Sugar Act as a whole.

As a means of providing a supply of sugar that will be consumed at prices which will not be excessive to consumers and which will fairly and equitably maintain and protect the welfare of the domestic sugar industry, Congress provided in section 201 of the act that the Secretary of Agriculture determine for each year the amount of sugar needed to meet the requirements of consumers in the continental United States. In section 202 of the act Congress then established the maximum quantities of sugar that may be supplied by each of the domestic areas and the Republic of the Philippines. The remaining quantities required must, accordingly, come from Cuba and other foreign countries.

Although the Sugar Act is designed largely to maintain and protect the domestic sugar growing industry, it also provides for the maintenance of our mainland refining industry. Accordingly, Congress established quotas on the importation or shipment into the mainland of direct-consumption sugar (primarily refined sugar) as follows:

	Short tons
Puerto Rico	126,033
Hawaii	29,616
Philippines	56,000
Cuba	375,000

For a similar reason, quotas were established for the importation of liquid sugar in terms of wine gallons of 72 percent total sugar content as follows:

	Gallons
Cuba	7,970,558
Dominican Republic	830,894
Other foreign countries	0

Essentially the quotas on importation and shipments to the mainland of direct-consumption sugar were established at the levels such imports or shipments had attained prior to the enactment of the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act. Major attention was given to this feature of the legislation in the enactment of the Sugar Act of 1937. Without undertaking to review the matter in detail, it appears that Congress concluded that such imports and shipments reflected conditions prior to the enactment of special sugar legislation and that, since the major objective of the Sugar Act was to protect and maintain a limited domestic producing industry, it would be inconsistent to permit the market improvement anticipated from such legislation to result in an expansion of foreign and offshore refining industries at the expense of the established mainland refining industry.

You also ask for our comments on the degree of industry cooperation we have received in the administration of the Sugar Act. The Sugar Act is recognized to be of vital importance to the domestic sugar industry and we have received a very high degree of industry cooperation in its administration.

Sincerely yours,

RALPH S. TRIGG,
Administrator.

NEW ORLEANS, May 3.—A deeply shocked priest charged today that 150 displaced persons resettled on Louisiana sugarcane plantations are so ill-paid that their babies "are crying for food and milk."

But the priest, the Reverend Carl Schutten, said the DP's are no worse off than native-born Americans who plant, cultivate, and harvest sugarcane in Louisiana. A total of 25,000 to 30,000 persons is officially estimated to be working in the cane fields now.

PAID $2.90 A DAY

Men—American and foreign—are paid $2.90 each for a 9-hour day. Women are paid $2.80 each for an 8-hour day. Father Schutten said that when they can't work because of rain, they aren't paid. He estimated that cane-field workers average about four full days a week—a wage of less than $12.

Father Schutten and the Reverend J. Stanley Ormsby, of the national Catholic bishops' resettlement program, inspected the homes of DP's on four plantations last Saturday. Father Ormsby has returned to New York.

"Officials of the national Catholic bishops' resettlement program will probably take some action after receiving his report," Father Schutten said.

"I'm interested in the plight of them all—American or DP, white or black," he said. "My going to see the DP's merely opened my eyes to what exists."

Father Schutten said homes furnished for the DP's and other sugarcane workers are "not bad." But they have to furnish their homes, pay their electric and gas bills, and buy their food and clothes, he said.

CALLS IT SEMISERVITUDE

"The plantation commissary is the only place where the DP can cash his check. As a result, he has to do all his dealings there, where prices are considerably higher than they are in New Orleans," he said.

"When he gets into debt for $100 or $200 he finds that he can never leave the plantation because he will never have enough money to pay his debts."

Father Schutten said it amounted to semiservitude.

He said most sugarcane workers can't afford to wear shoes during the week; if they had shoes they have to save them for Sunday. He said he suspected that during rainy spells some women went without food so their children could eat.

"I was shocked beyond words," he said.

Mr. Speaker, while we hear much about slave labor, you will note that the newspaper article quotes Father Schutten as having used a more elegant term, "semiservitude."

Jesus Christ, the Prince of Peace, Who Towers Above All Others Who Ever Lived on This Earth—the Christian Religion, Whose Transforming Power Is the Miracle of History and the Spirit of Christmas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN JENNINGS, JR.
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. JENNINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I made over radio station WROL in Knoxville, Tenn., on Christmas Eve, December 24, 1949:

Good evening, ladies and gentleman, this is Congressman JOHN JENNINGS, Jr., speaking to you from radio station WROL in Knoxville, on this Christmas Eve.

For the past 3 years it has been my privilege and pleasure to discuss with my hearers current news items of local and national interest and also world-shaking events which have affected this country, Europe, Asia, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, the Hawaiian Islands, the Philippines, and other island peoples.

Let us now turn to the distant past. The three nations of ancient times that most profoundly influenced the course of human history are Rome and Greece in Europe and Israel in Asia. Rome was a colonizing power and the ancient Romans were preeminent as lawmakers and law administrators. It was justly said of ancient Rome that the arts, civilization, law and order followed where Rome's eagle flew. As a result, the law books of this country are filled with maxims and principles that are the product of Roman thought and the lofty Roman conceptions of law, equity, and the administration of justice.

The Greeks were primarily a nation of thinkers. They evolved and gave to the world the laws of the human mind—logic, philosophy, literature, architecture, the drama, poetry, and the eloquence of Demosthenes. Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, are immortal in the realm of thought and lofty living.

Hence we speak of the grandeur that was Rome and the glory that was Greece. The Greeks loved human liberty and more than once saved Europe from Asiatic despotism.

It is the peculiar glory of the Jewish race that through them, the people of the earth have the revealed religion of one God, the author and maker of mankind.

In 1860, the French Government sent to the Middle East a great French scholar, Ernest Renan, on an archeological mission. When Renan entered upon his study, he did not believe in the divinity of Jesus Christ and took but little stock in the word of God. As a result of his studies and what he saw and learned of the history of the Jewish race and of the life of the Saviour, he became a devout believer in the Christian religion.

As a result of his investigations of the facts surrounding the birth, the life, the ministry, the death, the resurrection of Jesus, Renan wrote one of the world's most informative, entrancing lives of the Saviour In his opening chapter of this book, he states that the great event of the history of the world is the revolution by which the noblest portions of humanity have passed from the pagan religions of ancient times to the religion founded on the conception of one God and the incarnation of the Son of God.

It has taken almost 2,000 years to accomplish this conversion.

The greatest life in human history is the life of Jesus. By His superior personality, His bold originality, by the love which He was able to inspire, around His life is built the faith of humanity in God and a future life. The Saviour was well versed in the Mosaic law and He emphasized that He did not come to destroy the law but to fulfill it.

He revealed God not as a tyrannical master who kills us, damns us or saves us according to his pleasure. The God of Jesus is our father. The God of Jesus is not the partial despot who chose Israel alone for His people; He is the God of humanity. Jesus boldly raised Himself above the prejudices of His nation and established the universal fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The true kingdom of heaven, which He came into the world to establish, is in the hearts of men.

In all literature there is no more touching, captivating account of the birth of a little child than the story of the birth of the Saviour by St. Luke. Referring to the mother of the Saviour and His birth, Luke wrote:

"7. And she brought forth her first-born son, and wrapped Him in swaddling clothes, and laid Him in a manger because there was no room for Him in the inn.

"8. And there were in the same country shepherds abiding in the field, keeping watch over their flocks by night.

"9. And lo, the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone around them, and they were sore afraid.

"10. And the angel said unto them, Fear not: for behold I bring you good tidings of great joy, which shall be to all people.

"11. For unto you is born this day, in the city of David, a Saviour, which is Christ the Lord.

"12. And this shall be a sign unto you: Ye shall find the babe wrapped in swaddling clothes, lying in a manger.

"13. And suddenly there was with the angel a multitude of the heavenly host praising God and saying,

"14. Glory to God in the highest, and on earth, peace, good will toward men.

"15. And it came to pass, as the angels were gone away from them into heaven, the shepherds said one to another, Let us now go even unto Bethlehem and see this thing which is come to pass, which the Lord has made known unto us.

"16. And they came with haste, and found Mary, and Joseph, and the babe lying in a manger.

"17. And when they had seen it, they made known abroad the saying which was told them concerning the child.

"18. And all they that heard it wondered at those things which were told them by the shepherds.

"19. But Mary kept all these things and pondered them in her heart."

But little is known of the childhood of the Saviour except that "He increased in stature and wisdom and in favor with God and man." At the age of twelve, He confounded the wise and the aged with His knowledge and His wisdom. At the carpenter's bench, in the synagogue, in the study of the Scriptures, in the mastery of human nature, for 30 years. He prepared for His ministry, and in the 3 years of that ministry in His daily, intimate life with His apostles spent in the open air, He laid the enduring foundations of a kingdom that shall never pass away. He performed miracles. He healed the sick, restored the sight of the blind, cleansed the leper, raised the dead, burst asunder the confines of the tomb, triumphed over death; the miracle of history is the transforming power of the Christian religion. It has been said that immortality is the glorious discovery of Christianity, that it is the twin sister of eternity. The Christ transcends all others who ever lived on earth, because He most profoundly influenced the thoughts and lives of mankind.

From the Old Testament, its history, its laws which underlie many of the enlightened institutions of civilized men, its prophesies, the poetry of the psalms, the wisdom of the proverbs, in natural sequence arises the New Testament. With the history of a great race as His background, at a time when the world was bankrupt morally, intellectually and spiritually, when there was not a hospital, a children's home, Jesus began His ministry. At thirty, He entered into His life's work, without social standing, with no influential friends, no property.

He spake as never man spake; He taught as never man taught, weeping with those who mourned, rejoicing with those who rejoiced, going up and down the dusty highways of Palestine, in His life and in His words, erecting an ideal so lofty that men must always look up to Him, so far ahead of mankind that we can never overtake or attain it.

In his great essay on John Milton, Lord Macaulay said that Judaism never made a convert. He pointed out that the abstract concept of God could not be grasped by men, but that when mankind saw God in the form of His son, when they came within the radiance of His divine personality, when they saw Him walking up and down the highways of Palestine, learned of His cruel trial and judicial murder by the sanction of Pontius Pilate, when they saw Him ascend the rugged steeps of Calvary, suffer and die upon the cross, they had a demonstration of the great truth of Christianity—that God is love and that all men are brothers. Only a thorn-crowned, bleeding Christ could win the love and consecrated belief of mankind. Macaulay pointed out that before the crucified, risen Christ, the doubts of the academy, the prejudices of the synagogue, the pride of the portico and the swords of the 30 legions were humbled in the dust.

Jean Paul Richter says of Him, "He was the mightiest among the lowly, the lowliest among the mighty. With His pierced hands He lifted the gates of empire from their hinges and turned the stream of the centuries into new channels."

He is God's farthest reach toward man and man's farthest reach toward God.

He set an angel beside each cradle, rendered the human body forever sacred and opened a pathway to the stars.

He made of Calvary the loftiest mountain in history and glorified the sacrificial cross as a conquering symbol, and in the triumph of the resurrection demonstrated the life immortal.

When the end came, as Jesus hung upon the cross, His disciples fled, with the exception of John. The devoted women of Galilee who had followed Jesus to Jerusalem did not abandon Him. They were with Him to the end. They were the last at the foot of the cross and the first at the tomb of the risen Saviour.

After the resurrection, the disciples who had deserted Him in death were imbued with faith in Him and surcharged with His courage and from then on they bore witness to His ministry and spread the new religion even at the cost of their lives.

"As the end approached He endured an agony of despair a thousand times more acute than all His torture and exclaimed, 'My God, My God, why hast Thou forsaken

Me?' But His divine instinct still prevailed. As the life of His body became extinguished, His soul became clear and returned to its celestial origin. He regained the idea of His mission; He saw in His death the salvation of the world; He lost sight of the hideous spectacle spread at His feet and united to His father He began upon the cross the divine life which He was to live in the heart of humanity through infinite ages."

Renan in his great Life of the Saviour concluded his account of the death of Jesus with these words:

"Rest now in Thy glory, noble initiator. Thy work is completed; Thy divinity is established. Fear no more to see the edifice of Thy efforts crumble through a flaw. Henceforth, beyond the reach of frailty, Thou shalt be present, from the height of Thy divine peace, in the infinite consequences of Thy acts. At the price of a few hours of suffering, which have not even touched Thy great soul, Thou hast purchased the most complete immortality. For thousands of years the world will extol Thee. Banner of our contradictions, Thou wilt be the sign around which will be fought the fiercest battles. A thousand times more living, a thousand times more loved since Thy death than during the days of Thy pilgrimage here below, Thou wilt become to such a degree the cornerstone of humanity, that to tear Thy name from this world would be to shake it to its foundations. Between Thee and God, men will no longer distinguish. Complete conqueror of death, take possession of Thy kingdom, whither, by the royal road Thou has traced, ages of adorers will follow Thee."

The spirit of Christmas is exemplified in the words, "It is more blessed to give than to receive." Governor Vardaman, of Mississippi, put this truth in deathless words when he said, "In the great bank of eternity, the greatest credit is given to Him who has contributed most to the sum of human joy, who has planted a flower in the fainting heart of despair and kissed it with the sunshine of hope and who has painted the pallid cheeks of care with the roses of health and happiness."

Labor Paper Defends Kaiser

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the December 15, 1949, issue of the Machinist, official weekly newspaper of the International Association of Machinists, which is published in Washington, D. C. The article was written by the paper's editor, Gordon H. Cole, who contributes this weekly column under the pen name of Joe Henry. It follows:

KAISER—AUTO MAKERS WISH HE'D GO BACK TO BOATBUILDING

(By Joe Henry)

Lots of families, our kind of families, are thinking kindly of Henry Kaiser these days. Henry is going to bring out a new, low-priced automobile. He says he's going to undersell Ford and Chevrolet by $200 or $300. On a standard-size car, too. And one that will give approximately twice the gas mileage you get out of your Ford or Chevrolet—if Kaiser's performance lives up to his claims.

We don't know any more than anyone else whether the small Kaiser car will even ride well, much less whether we will ever want to own one. We do know that if Henry Kaiser succeeds, the price of automobiles will come down. It isn't that Kaiser by some miracle is going to give us twice as much automobile for our money. But, he is going to separate the price of gadgets—the ash trays, the clocks that never run, the cigarette lighters, the arm rests, and all the other frills from the price of the car. If we want frills we can buy them extra. If your family can't afford frills, you won't have to pay for them to get a new car.

You'd think that everybody would agree that this is a step in the right direction. You'd think that everybody ought to be encouraging Kaiser. You'd think * * * well, stop thinking and read the newspaper columnists. Some of them are saying that Henry Kaiser is corrupting the Government. When he got into real financial difficulty, Kaiser went to Uncle in Washington for some help. Like 51,000 other businessmen before him, Kaiser got a loan from Uncle's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The RFC has lent out a lot of money to business and so far it has actually turned a profit for the Government—and the taxpayers—of $575,000,000 after paying all expenses.

Of course, there is a group of big-business men and their Congressmen who just don't like Henry Kaiser. They say he's not a healthy influence on the free-enterprise system. He thinks it's good business to get along with unions. And, he actually is trying to undersell the market. So they're going to throw as much mud as they know how at Henry Kaiser's new venture. They'd like to put him out of the automobile business.

Maybe they'll succeed. If they don't, Ford, General Motors, and Chrysler are going to have to bring out a new line of low-priced cars to compete with Kaiser. Somehow, we think most families feel that would be a good thing for the country.

The Engineers and Waterways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1950, the Shreveport Times, published at Shreveport, La., ran an editorial entitled "The Engineers and Waterways." This editorial presents strong views on a very controversial matter, and I, therefore, include the editorial as follows:

THE ENGINEERS AND WATERWAYS

The National Junior Chamber of Commerce has launched a campaign for full endorsement of the Hoover reports, seeking to arouse public support that will in turn arouse Congress to action toward bringing about the billions in savings of tax money which the reports are aimed at accomplishing.

The local junior chamber has launched a local campaign as its part of the national effort. The local chamber urges Shreveporters to give 100-percent endorsement of all of the recommendations of all of the various task forces whose recommendations make up what generally are called the Hoover reports, although Herbert Hoover personally simply was the guiding general in the investigations.

As we see it, the local junior chamber thus puts itself in a position of seeking support for action contrary to established local interests in relation to waterway development. The Red River Valley Association has devoted much effort and spent much money of citizenry up and down the Red River Valley for objectives which certainly would be endangered, in our opinion, if the Hoover report recommendations for placing the United States Army engineers under the Department of the Interior in their waterway development activities. Many business firms are strong financial supporters of both the junior chamber and the Red River Valley Association.

The Times itself has endorsed the general objectives of the Hoover reports—the infusion of efficiency into operation of Federal Government in a streamlining manner to eliminate billions of dollars of waste through extravagance, overlapping and duplication of operations, and general incompetency. But, that does not mean that we endorse any such plan as placing the age-old Army engineers, strictly nonpolitical and noted for their independence and efficiency through the decades, under a purely political—partisanly political—Government agency. We have stated that we oppose this phase of the Hoover reports and we repeat it now.

The recommendation to place the Army engineers under the Interior Department came from one of the Hoover Commission task forces and as such had the general approval of the Commission itself. The objectives sought in the recommendation are thoroughly worthy—unquestionably there is great duplication of expenditures in waterway surveys by the Interior Department and by the engineers.

But the answer is, as we see it—if there is to be consolidation—to put the Interior Department's waterway work under the engineers and thus get it out of a political setting and put it in a nonpolitical and strictly independent setting, rather than vice versa.

The engineers have a reputation through more than a century of recommending waterway development only on a basis of absolute impartiality, of absolute national need, and absolute economic soundness. No Government political agency possibly could have or build such a reputation or operate in such a manner continuously.

As a matter of fact, while Mr. Hoover—as member of his own Commission—has endorsed the reports of his task forces as a whole, it was noticeable that in a recent speech at a banquet in his honor he did not specifically recommend putting the engineers under Interior Department, as did his task force. He simply stated that there should be consolidation of operations of waterway operations of the Engineers and Interior to eliminate duplication and avoid waste. On that we agree. But the answer is not to put the independent engineers under a partisan political agency where they are subject to the whims of political appointees.

It is our belief that a vast number of junior chamber of commerce members locally hold pretty much the same view that we do on this point. But there should be—and we hope there will be—clarification from the organization's leadership. Otherwise it will lose much support it might otherwise gain in its campaign on the Hoover reports and arouse opposition it otherwise would not have.

It Need Not Have Happened

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I join with other Members in

the introduction of a resolution expressing the sense of the Congress that the President should immediately invoke the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act in an effort to end the paralyzing coal strike.

In this connection, I include as part of my remarks a letter I addressed to the President on October 19 requesting that he recognize the seriousness of the situation at that time and that he appoint a board of inquiry immediately as called for by the Taft-Hartley Act:

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully call your attention to a situation which requires immediate action by you if innocent people are not to suffer.

The vast Great Lakes region of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and upper Michigan is almost entirely dependent on coal that moves from Lake Erie ports during the shipping season. This season will end on November 15.

Because of the coal strike practically no coal is moving to the dock companies at the present time. If the strike continues, if no more coal moves into this area in the remaining days of the shipping season, the inevitable result will be closed-down industrial plants, unemployment, and heavy suffering among the populace during the bitter northern winter.

The Wisconsin Coal Bureau has already apprised you of these facts. I urge you to verify them by contacting any coal dealer in Wisconsin, Minnesota, or upper Michigan.

In my opinion, this threat to the health and safety of this great area, together with the many other serious effects of a prolonged coal strike upon our national economy, constitutes a clear and present peril of our national health and safety.

I therefore urge you to appoint immediately a board of inquiry into the coal strike as called for under sections 206–207 of the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947 and to request them to report to you forthwith. I further urge, if the report of the board justifies this course, that you proceed under sections 208–210 of this act in an effort to end this calamitous stoppage.

Any further delay, I assure you, Mr. President, is an invitation to a disaster which need not happen.

Yours very truly,

JOHN W. BYRNES,
Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, to this day I have received neither acknowledgment nor reply to this letter.

Mrs. Edna F. Kelly, First Woman Representative From New York City

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the New York City delegation to Congress has been enhanced by the addition of a new House Member, Mrs. EDNA F. KELLY, who was elected last November to represent the Tenth Congressional District of Brooklyn. Mrs. KELLY is the first woman Representative ever to be elected from New York City.

I feel quite certain she will be an excellent addition to our delegation. She comes to us after serving for 7 years in the legislative halls of Albany, where she gained considerable experience as research director for the Democratic delegation. Mrs. KELLY, who is a graduate of Hunter College in New York, where she majored in history and economics, is the widow of the late city court justice, Edward L. Kelly.

A devoted mother to her two children, a fully informed and intelligent citizen, and a loyal worker for the Democratic Party, Mrs. KELLY will prove to be a hard-working able legislator. We extend to her our hearty congratulations and sincerest wishes for a long, happy, and successful career.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an article about Mrs. EDNA KELLY, entitled "One of the 'Flannery Girls' Blazes Borough Political Trail," written by Violet Brown and published in the Brooklyn Eagle, November 13, 1949, as follows:

BROOKLYN'S WOMAN OF THE WEEK; ONE OF THE FLANNERY GIRLS BLAZES BOROUGH POLITICAL TRAIL

(By Violet Brown)

Disillusion was EDNA KELLY'S lot the first time she went to Washington.

Fresh from a class in high school civics, she went with her schoolmates to hear the bonus march debate—and found one droning speaker attended by a few men reading newspapers.

This time she knows what to expect. Flushed with victory as the first woman Representative elected from New York City, Mrs. KELLY has had 7 years' experience in the legislative halls of Albany as research director for the Democratic delegation.

She knows lawmakers can do their jobs without getting their ears bent—and she doesn't expect to do much speaking anyhow. She may not bow to any mid-Victorian dictum about woman's place being wholly in the home, but she knows a freshman's role in the House of Representatives.

Such good sense and balance is typical of the first lady of Brooklyn's Tenth Congressional District. With it she has been able to walk the delicate tightrope of being an inspired political worker and a devoted mother at one and the same time.

EDNA KELLY came into politics by marriage and remained to make it her lifework through necessity.

Her own family was stanchly Democratic, but more concerned with the doings of the seven girls (five of them their own and the other two adopted) that Patrick Flannery and his wife had to bring up.

One of the sisters married Charles R. Duryea, for 17 years Republican mayor of Amityville, and Edna, the youngest of the Flannerys, married Edward L. Kelly, son of William E. Kelly, postmaster of Brooklyn from 1916 to 1929, and right-hand man of County Leader John H. McCooey.

Politics was in Ed Kelly's blood and his bride adopted it. He became a city court justice and had a county court nomination when he was tragically killed in an automobile accident 7 years ago.

Mrs. KELLY, slim, dark-haired and attractive, left at 35 with 12-year-old Billy and 8-year-old Maura Patricia, stepped into the breach.

Now her son is a self-reliant undergraduate at Columbia University, eager to become a lawyer like his father, and Maura Patricia is a cute teen-ager at Marymount Academy, a pitcher on the softball team like her mother before her and a Dodger rooter second only to Branch Rickey.

The Kelly household runs like clockwork under the careful eye of Mrs. KELLY'S sister, Elizabeth, known as Lid to all and sundry, and Mrs. KELLY feels she can be spared "to carry the ball for women" on Capitol Hill.

She is completely informed on the concerns of women, both as citizens and as homemakers. She puts peace first on her legislative agenda and in swift order thereafter repeal of luxury taxes, broadening of social welfare, civil rights, the United Nations—in short, all the concomitants of a liberal Democratic platform.

But when she talks about "luxury taxes," she has a specifically feminine list of examples. She paid a $2 tax on $10 worth of drugstore necessities when she shopped for this summer's stays at her 82-year-old mother's home in East Hampton. She just had to buy Maura Patricia a school bag—with tax—but she hasn't bought a purse for herself since the extra fee was slapped on that wardrobe item.

And that represents a real moral sacrifice for a woman as beautifully turned-out as the five-foot-nine, 127-pound Mrs. KELLY. (Even her chic is home-based, incidentally. She has a dressmaker "living in the first assembly district," gets her hats made on Nostrand Avenue and looks like something out of Dior and Daché.)

Similarly, when she comes out in favor of housing for all, she mentions her gratitude for her own house at 1247 Carroll Street, bought "in the eighteenth assembly district and close to my church in the seventeenth." She knows the advantages of having your own roof over your head at first hand.

When she speaks of education, she has her own theories worked out with her own children. And she has already lived through a phase of social welfare in the very progressively orientated Madison Club, of which she is coleader—there have been many Red Cross drives, civil rights talks, cancer collections, bond rallies and blood donor collections at the club.

But it isn't all work with the Kellys, either. Mrs. KELLY, Edna to her kids, loves football as much as her son, who was on the Columbia team until a knee injury benched him. The family goes to football and baseball games together, goes skiing, ice skating, and golfing.

They dote on music—hot and sweet—and they have a real feeling for good food, as befit the child and grandchildren of a Flannery mother who made each one of her girls cook the meals for 1 day a week so she would learn that most important of arts.

Mrs. KELLY cooks all her own meals, is noted for her fried chicken, cakes, and pies, and herself likes best of all her own beach plum jam, made from fruit gathered on the dunes at East Hampton.

She regularly helps can the produce from the garden first planted by her late father, who was a horticulturist and a graduate of Black Rock College in Ireland. She can even sew, although the quality of her product does not quite come up to her own high standards for everything.

A graduate of Hunter College, where she majored in history and economics, Mrs. KELLY, unlike many legislators, is no lawyer. She did take a few law courses after her marriage—she was married the summer she got her B. A.—but "they were just so I could understand what Ed was talking about when he discussed cases with me."

She always had had a hankering to take more law courses, but now, thanks to the voice of the voters last Tuesday, it will hardly be necessary.

Mrs. KELLY isn't going to be learning law any more. She'll be making it.

S. 1008, the Basing-Point Bill, Vicious in Its Entirety—Its Real Backers Desire the Destruction of Robinson-Patman Act—Even the Saving Kefauver and Carroll Amendments Have Been Eliminated—No Compromise Can Now Be Trusted—Text of Statement Before National Association of Retail Druggists

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, last fall the National Association of Retail Druggists held its annual convention in New York City. Among other matters of vital interest to the thousands of home-town druggists has been the juggernaut bill—S. 1008—a bill designed to crush the amendment to the Clayton Act which has done more to protect our small-business economy than any other antitrust law. This amendment, the Robinson-Patman Act, was conceived and sponsored by the small-business interests of our country. It bears my name because I introduced the original bill and fought for it to final passage. I am proud of that fact, but even more proud of the fact that the Robinson-Patman Act has stood test after test in our courts. It has protected small business in every line of endeavor. I shall fight to preserve its integrity until my labors here are concluded.

S. 1008 A VICIOUS BILL IN ITS ENTIRETY—CARROLL AMENDMENT A PALLIATIVE

When I addressed the National Association of Retail Druggists, the so-called Carroll amendment, introduced by the gentleman from Colorado, was still in the bill. This amendment was an improvement on the so-called Kefauver amendment introduced in the Senate, and was a further attempt to mitigate the utterly destructive effects of the bill on the Robinson-Patman Act. Naturally, I was in favor of the Carroll amendment as far as it went. However, as I made abundantly clear in my supplementary statement to the druggists, I was against the bill with or without the Carroll amendment. I showed, by exact citation, that S. 1008 was loaded with provision after provision diametrically opposed to the Robinson-Patman Act, and that by their own statements the real supporters of the bill wanted nothing less than the complete emasculation of the Robinson-Patman Act. I also warned against compromise proposals, by the proponents of the bill, inasmuch as they would necessarily be made in bad faith since they would be entirely inconsistent with the basic objectives of destroying the Robinson-Patman Act and slashing the antitrust laws generally.

CONFEREES ELIMINATED EVEN THE CARROLL AMENDMENT (AS WELL AS THE KEFAUVER AMENDMENT)

Apparently I did not exaggerate in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists. The real backers and beneficiaries of the bill must have gone to work with ruthless zeal. What they could not, by reason of the Kefauver amendment, fully accomplish in the Senate, and what they could not, by reason of the even stronger Carroll amendment, fully accomplish in the House, they accomplished with almost absolute finality in conference. Most people thought that the conference committee could, and would, simply choose between the Kefauver amendment of the Senate and the Carroll amendment of the House, settling for nothing less than the Kefauver amendment. And it was also believed that the House conferees were virtually instructed not even to yield on the Carroll amendment in favor of the Kefauver amendment.

However, what did the conferees actually do? They reported the bill with neither one amendment nor the other, with neither the Kefauver nor with the Carroll amendment, nor with any variation of either. In other words, they reported this bill minus even these minimum safeguards to the provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act. Under the conference wording the Commission, in addition to all other proof, must prove that the effect on competition of the alleged illegal acts will be so-and-so and not merely that it may be. By the time the Commission would be in position to prove this specific effect, the victims, presumably, would have to be wiped out of business, even though the Commission's function is injunctive cease-and-desist relief, designed to prevent offenses in their incipiency, and no fines or criminal sentences are imposed. One Member did the signing for the House Members or managers, once for himself and twice as proxy for absent Members. To his credit, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee refused to sign or vote for the conference report.

CONFEREES ALSO ELIMINATED SECTION 4 AMENDMENT

The conferees went even further and added insult to injury by changing section 4 of the bill. Section 4 also had been modified in the House, and by the House Judiciary Committee itself, in at least token deference to the Robinson-Patman Act. The conferees, not satisfied by requiring proof of what the effect will be, rather than may be, inserted a specific requirement, in proving such effect, for reliable, probative, and substantial evidence, instead of a showing of reasonable probability as voted by the House. Their definition was even stiffer than the Senate version, which did not use the word "reliable." The definition, incidentally, was a complete reversal of high court decisions construing existing law, after years of litigation.

SENATE BLOCKS THE CONFEREES—EVEN SPONSOR OF BILL VOICES OPPOSITION

Although the House accepted the report, by the time it reached the Senate the full import of its radical changes had become so completely understood that the Senate voted to hold back its approval. Even the distinguished Senator who introduced the bill attacked its proponents for what he regarded as their greediness in insisting upon amendments which were not necessary to their immediate objectives, as avowed by them, but which put in peril the very foundations of the antitrust laws. The matter was put over by the Senate until January 20, which is now approaching rapidly and is a day small business and all believers in the Robinson-Patman Act and the antitrust laws generally should carefully mark on their calendars.

ANOTHER PROPOSED COMPROMISE WILL BE ANOTHER TROJAN HORSE

It is my opinion that the real proponents of this bill themselves now feel that they went too far when they amended section 4 to define so strictly the degree of proof required in showing the necessary statutory effect on competition. It is my opinion that they themselves probably feel that this was adding insult to injury, and that it would have been altogether sufficient if the conferees had merely knocked out the Carroll amendment by requiring, as they did, proof of what effect "will" be, instead of "may" be. For they must now realize that by going to such extremes, they have finally completely shown their hand. They have shown that their desire is not merely for a statutory declaration of the right of charging delivered prices and absorbing freight, a right which I say already exists. They have shown that their wish is to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act and to subvert all of the antitrust laws, not only in favor of the basing point and similar systems operated by means of identical delivered prices, practiced for so many years in the steel and cement industries in particular, but in favor of all monopolistic practices, whereby small-business men, including independent retailers, can be kept in line. However, inasmuch as they have inadvertently shown their hand by reason of their own greediness, to use the expression of the bill's own sponsor, I should not be surprised if they are now again going to try out the tune of alleged compromise, in favor of at least some of the opponents to the bill. Just as I said in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists, I think they will try—at least if it proves absolutely necessary—to rid themselves of the opposition of the retail associations of the country by specious concessions and specious reasoning designed to show that the retailers—the grocers, the druggists, and others—will not be hurt, at least not directly hurt, if they permit Big Steel, Big Cement, and all the Bigs to continue to sell for identical delivered prices charged by all competitors, as contemplated by the bill. The proponents of the bill may suddenly become generous and say they will not insist upon the amendment to section 4, to which the original sponsor of the bill has objected so strenuously. They may also suddenly agree to drop entirely section 3 of the bill which is an across-the-board amendment to the Robinson-Patman Act, and not confined to freight rates at all. Who knows but that the proponents will even agree to the restoration of the Carroll amendment, or of the Kefauver amendment? In desperation

they might even say they would be satisfied with section 1 alone of the bill which is the section which simply declares that delivered prices and freight absorption are legal. They may try to say that they have no designs on the Robinson-Patman Act at all and they will withdraw objectionable proposed amendments to that act. In this way they will hope to conquer by dividing, and to strengthen their own noncompetitive practices by claiming that these practices do not weaken competition in other fields.

What I said before in my statement to the National Association of Retail Druggists is therefore doubly pertinent now, and I therefore respectfully ask for permission to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of this statement, delivered last fall.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT BEFORE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS—WHY THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF RETAIL DRUGGISTS SHOULD DEMAND THE DEFEAT OF S. 1008—WITH OR WITHOUT THE CARROLL AMENDMENT

The Robinson-Patman Act, passed by the Congress in 1936, has been—I hope it is no exaggeration to say—a Rock of Gibraltar to the small-business men of this country.

The National Association of Retail Druggists was one of the earliest and strongest supporters of the Robinson-Patman Act. The NARD is looked upon as one of the most powerful friends today of the Robinson-Patman Act and as a sincere believer in the basic philosophy of the Robinson-Patman Act, namely, a fair deal for the little fellow in business.

The Robinson-Patman Act is under heavy fire. Big business does not like the Robinson-Patman Act and is engaged in a gigantic attempt to dynamite your Rock of Gibraltar, together with the many judicial decisions now fortifying the act, to the very bottom of the sea.

We all know of the Cement decision, rendered by the Supreme Court of the United States on April 26, 1948, with only one Justice dissenting. The decision held, after years of litigation, that the use of the basing-point system, as proved in that case, was a violation of the Robinson-Patman and of other antitrust provisions.

This decision, instead of being accepted with grace, was the signal for a barrage on the Robinson-Patman Act and on the antitrust laws in general, the like of which has seldom been seen in legislative history.

BASING-POINT LOBBYISTS STRIKE TO OVERRULE COURTS

In 1948, from June until December, we had the Capehart hearings in the Senate, directly arising out of the Cement decision. Committee counsel of the Senate, Mr. William Simon, was selected from a Chicago law firm, and it is significant that, now that his committee duties are finished, he is a registered lobbyist—and regarded as the chief lobbyist—for amending our antitrust laws, and the Robinson-Patman Act, in the interest of the basing-point system, euphemistically called the freight-absorption or delivered-price systems.

The big boys, having finally lost the Cement case after years of litigation, during which they kept right on with their illegal practices, decided on a new slogan, a new line. This new line was their alleged need for clarification of the law. They said that all they wanted was clarification of the Court's decision and of the antitrust laws as written on the books. They did not understand the words. No "speakee" English, if you please. They did not dare to admit that they were really seeking to amend the antitrust laws; so they said they were trying to clarify them.

S. 1008, as originally introduced, was a moratorium on the antitrust laws in connection with the Cement decision. However, on May 31, 1949, a substitute bill was offered in the Senate, making outright amendments to the antitrust laws, or so-called clarifications. When we refer to S. 1008 today, it is this substitute bill, with or without subsequent amendments.

All that this new S. 1008 was doing, according to its backers, was legalizing delivered pricing and so-called freight absorption. But there is nothing in the antitrust laws forbidding delivered pricing or forbidding freight absorption, provided buyers are treated equally and are not subjected to price discrimination.

S. 1008 GETS FAST RIDE TO FLOOR OF THE HOUSE

Actually, S. 1008 goes much further than to declare, by way of clarification, that delivered prices and freight absorption are legal. Having made this declaration, it goes on in subsequent sections to strike body blows to the Robinson-Patman Act, not only as to freight matters but as to all pricing matters. The real backers are interested not only in the basing-point boys, but in all big business. S. 1008 was to be a Roman holiday against the Robinson-Patman Act and the small-business men protected by it.

Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, always a champion of small business, promptly offered amendments which were accepted by the Senate and by the sponsor of the substitute and which had the effect somewhat of preserving our present law; whereupon on June 1 the bill was passed and sent to the House, where it was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee of the House reported the bill in a few days minus the Kefauver amendment. No public hearings were held by the House Judiciary Committee, and only three witnesses were heard in executive session, of whom I was one. When it became apparent that public hearings would not be held, small-business organizations, including the NARD, promptly requested the House Small Business Committee to afford them an opportunity to be heard. On June 28, the House Small Business Committee did start hearings, which were entitled "Small Business Objections on Basing Point Legislation, Particularly S. 1008." Before the hearings had fairly started—in fact, the very next day—the Rules Committee of the House granted a rule on the bill, and thereupon it was rushed to the floor for consideration. The House began consideration of the bill on July 7, and since prior knowledge of this date was available, the hearings before the House Small Business Committee were recessed on July 5, 1949. Actually, we had witnesses representing small-business organizations and many other organizations, as well as many distinguished lawyers and economists familiar with our antitrust laws and able to speak on them with authority, who were willing and anxious to testify against S. 1008.

S. 1008 SHOULD BE BEATEN EVEN WITH SAVING CARROLL[1] AMENDMENTS

It was my thought at that time that the bill should be beaten and I am still of the same opinion. However, amendments were offered which had a beneficial effect by several of my colleagues, among them Hon. JOHN A. CARROLL, of Colorado. Mr. CARROLL aptly described his amendments as so simple that even a lawyer could understand them. When the House saw the danger of Senator O'MAHONEY's substitute bill to the small-business institutions of this country, they promptly voted overwhelmingly for the Carroll amendments. Senator KEFAUVER later said that the Carroll amendments were an improvement upon his own, which had been struck by the House Judiciary Committee, and that he was glad to accept them.

Later, by a parliamentary maneuver, the Senate sent S. 1008 to conference, but not before the distinguished Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] moved to reconsider. The fight on reconsideration was stubbornly and ably fought, and it was one in which many distinguished Members of the Senate joined in the fight for small business. However, the vote to reconsider, as you all know, was lost, and the bill was sent to conference by the Senate. Later, upon public assurance on the floor of the House by those who would represent the House in the conference that the Carroll amendments would be preserved, the House permitted the bill to go to conference. Several meetings of the conferees took place, but no agreement could, at least up to the present date, be reached, since the House conferees stood firm and would not recede from the Carroll amendment.[1]

I repeat: This bill—S. 1008—should be killed. The Carroll amendment, good as it is, strikes down only one assault on the Robinson-Patman Act. S. 1008 is replete with assaults on the Robinson-Patman Act. Indeed I go further and state that S. 1008 is counted on by its real backers to crush and annihilate the Robinson-Patman Act.

BASING-POINT LOBBYIST FINALLY LETS CAT OUT OF THE BAG

These are not idle words when I say that S. 1008 is counted on to crush and to annihilate the Robinson-Patman Act. Now that the cat is out of the bag—as the result of Congress' quick reaction once it realized how fully the Robinson-Patman Act was truly involved in this so-called freight-absorption bill—Mr. William Simon, a lobbyist for clarification, calmly admits all and, instead of further indulging in denial or apology, not only confesses all but loudly proclaims that it was all for a most laudable purpose.

In a speech delivered before the American Bar Association on September 6, he blandly admitted that the bill is directed against the Robinson-Patman Act. But, said he in effect, the Robinson-Patman Act is no good. Why? Because it fosters soft competition among the buyers—that's you—instead of hard competition among the sellers; and because it keeps inefficient small concerns—that's you, the buyers—in business. And he spoke in contempt of the battle against S. 1008 and for the Carroll amendment—I now quote—"spearheaded by the associations of retail druggists and retail gasoline dealers." I note that he left the grocers out, and I hope if there are any here their feelings won't be hurt.

But we don't have to take this somewhat belated confession to find out that S. 1008 is designed to wreck the Robinson-Patman Act. The attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act are written all over S. 1008—although obscured and forgotten in the hot discussion on the Carroll amendment which was directed to only one of these attacks.

HOW S. 1008 EMASCULATES ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT REVEALED

I will now direct your attention to other attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act contained in S. 1008, and you will agree with me, I am sure, that they are equally vicious.

Let us take section 2 of S. 1008. This section creates two exceptions, A and B to section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act part of the Clayton Act. Exception A does not have the Carroll amendment, as does exception B, and I therefore shall discuss exception A first.

Exception A in the bill provides that it shall not be an unlawful discrimination in price for a seller, acting independently—I now quote—"to quote or sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different

See footnote at end of speech.

See footnote at end of speech.

delivery points." This is the zoning system, and its proponents admit that it is the zoning system. The zoning system, as the courts have stated, is a variation of the basing-point system. It has all the vices of the basing-point system—particularly, of course, for heavy products involving substantial freight rates. The zoning system, like the basing-point system, permits supposed competitors—engaging in hard competition, if you please—to employ identical pricing, branded by the Supreme Court in the Cement case—I quote—the "handy instrument" of monopoly and of phony competition. The zoning system, like the basing-point system, of which it is a variation, brings about atrocious price discrimination, compelling nearby purchasers to pay long-haul freight charges and giving giant producers and sellers the political power to build up one region of the country at the expense of another. Such a system, need I tell you, is a flat contradiction of the Robinson-Patman Act and of the fundamental philosophy which not only gave birth to this country but has made it great.

And, please remember, and please do not forget: This exception A in section 2 of S. 1008 is not limited by the Carroll [1] amendment. The Carroll amendment, although it should logically be here, too, appears only in exception B of the section. No doubt it was omitted in A by inadvertence, and in an attempt to do what seemed to be first things first.

S. 1008 GRANTS CLEAR CHARTER TO CHAIN-STORE MONOPOLISTS

I have read this so-called zoning-system provision and have reread it, both alone and in connection with the other provisions of the bill. I can tell you that I see no restriction whatever on this proposed exception A—except the equivocal one that the seller is acting independently. But I take it that a giant corporate seller, with any number of outlets, as long as it is acting by itself, can claim to be acting independently; it thus could do practically anything it wanted to within the framework of a zoning system authorized by this provision. And if such a giant were really not acting by itself, but simply following, as it might claim, the same zoning pattern as other giant producers, who is there who is going to prove, without actual and independent evidence of collusion, that it is not acting independently? Apart from this ambiguous wording of "acting independently," there would be an absolute legalization of delivered prices—I quote again—"if such prices are identical at different delivery points." The wording has a finality that is almost terrifying to any believer in the antitrust laws.

Actually this wording goes even much further than a zoning system, which at least pretends to be an equality of treatment, even though it may be the somewhat spurious equality of equal delivered prices to all buyers in the zone. Under this wording for the proposed exception "A", a seller could select two or more favorite customers in entirely different parts of the country, give them identical delivered prices no matter how great the difference in freight, but much lower prices than for any other customers, and thus, by the device of identical pricing to favorite customers, be legally able to discriminate pricewise against all other customers. Who could say with confidence that such a practice did not fit into the bill's wording authorizing the seller to "sell at delivered prices if such prices are identical at different delivery points"? The language of the bill does not use the words "zoning system." The words used, as quoted by me, are broad enough to include everything, including the kitchen sink, to pile on the prostrate body of the Robinson-Patman Act already laid low by the other sections of S. 1008.

See footnote at end of speech.

S. 1008 PERPETUATES AND LEGALIZES PRICE DISCRIMINATION NOW FORBIDDEN UNDER ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Now, let us look at the other exception to the Robinson-Patman Act as provided for in section 2 of the bill; namely, exception "B", which does, at least up to this date,[1] have the protection of the Carroll amendment. And let us assume, which I am not prepared to admit, that the Carroll amendment is fully sufficient to protect against freight-absorption abuses "to meet the equally low price of a competitor in good faith." But, mark this well, the provision goes on to say—I quote—"this may include the maintenance, above or below the price of such competitor, of a differential in price which such seller customarily maintains." In other words—if one of the giant suppliers now "customarily maintains" a price differential, by one device or another, it might continue to maintain this differential. This might be so even if the differential is unlawful under the present antitrust laws or the Robinson-Patman Act. The bill uses the word "customarily"; it does not also use the word "legally."

I am not splitting hairs when I read into the bill a sharp distinction between the words "customarily" and "legally." One of our great Senators, who is intimately connected with this bill, made a speech, after it had left the Senate, trying to reconcile his championship of small business with his sponsorship of this bill. He stated that, if business customs become firmly enough entrenched, it is the function of the law to bow to those customs. That is exactly what this language would do.

The provision contained in exception B of section 2 of the bill is absolution by past indulgence. It is a "grandfather's clause" in favor of antitrust law and Robinson-Patman Act violators. It is a "grandfather's clause" in favor of existing customary price differentials, even those now illegal. At least it would give this argument to the monopoly boys before the courts. It is not only a monstrous mutilation and desecration of the antitrust laws; it is a negation of the underlying American philosophy of free enterprise as we normally expect free enterprise to operate. I am confident that, if it were not for the heat engendered by the Carroll amendment and the failure to hold regular committee hearings, which would have brought out all the issues in advance, this language would have been stricken.

S. 1008 DEPRIVES BUYERS OF STRONGEST EVIDENTIAL WEAPON AGAINST PRICE DISCRIMINATION

Finally, we come to section 3 of S. 1008. This section knocks out the Robinson-Patman Act all across the board—not only as to delivered-price and freight-absorption situations. This is an outright amendment to the entire Robinson-Patman Act. It directly affects all of you people here and association members in all the cases which may be brought before the Federal Trade Commission involving discrimination as to price, discounts, services, etc.

Section 3 of the bill amends section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act part of the Clayton Act. The present section provides that, upon proof of price discrimination, a prima facie case is made out before the Federal Trade Commission. Nothing more need be proved to make out a prima facie case against the seller by the buyer. The respondent must then step forward, and "unless justification shall be affirmatively shown," a cease and desist order may be issued terminating the discrimination. This rule, putting the burden of proof largely upon the seller, is in the law because of the difficulty of proving this type of case where the facts are too often within the offender's peculiar knowledge. The proceeding is a civil, not a criminal, one; no fines or jail sentences are imposed. The rule is therefore in accord with principles of fairness and due process. Moreover, the Federal Trade Commission, so often maligned by big offenders for being oppressive, has not insisted on its strict enforcement. However, it is an altogether salutary provision to have on the books.

See footnote at end of speech.

What does section 3 of S. 1008 do with this salutary provision of the Robinson-Patman Act? It just throws it out the window. Section 3 makes it necessary and mandatory for the complainant to show not only price discrimination but also unlawful effect on competition. Even this enlarged showing is not called a prima facie case by section 3, although the section does state that the burden of justification then passes to the respondent.

Finally, believe it or not, section 3 also adopts the "grandfather's clause." It provides that justification may include not only meeting a competitor's price, by selling below or above it, but a differential which the seller "customarily" maintains.

Beautiful, beautiful, wonderful—for the monopolists. But I guess you can see why I oppose S. 1008, even with the Carroll amendment.

S. 1008 LOBBY DESPERATELY ATTEMPTS TROJAN-HORSE MANEUVER

I have been told that Bill Simon, leading lobbyist for clarification, has one more card up his sleeve. His hope has been, of course, that S. 1008, with all its attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act, would pass even without the partial protection to the Robinson-Patman Act afforded by the Carroll amendment. However, the bill is in the hands of the conferees and, by reason of the strong position taken by foes of monopoly, including the druggists, grocers, and other associations, there is considerable doubt as to whether the bill could be reported out without the Carroll amendment. I have been told that, under these circumstances, the ace which this resourceful gentleman is going to produce is an attempt to buy off the opposition of the druggists, grocers, and similar associations by a compromise on the Carroll amendment.[1]

How does he propose to do this? Well, first, he will forget that the whole bill is conceived in destroying the Robinson-Patman Act and that he openly stated only a week or so ago that he does not believe in the Robinson-Patman Act. He will have you forget that section 2 of the bill authorizes the zoning price system, a variation of the basing-point system, and authorizes it without any protection of the Carroll amendment. He will also have you forget that the same section contains the "grandfather's clause" authorizing the perpetuation of price differentials which sellers customarily maintain, even though they may have maintained them contrary to the Robinson-Patman Act. He will try to make you forget section 3 of the bill, the across-the-board attack on the Robinson-Patman Act, applying in all price-discrimination cases, not only freight-absorption cases, and also containing a "grandfather's clause."

BEWARE OF LOBBYISTS BEARING GIFTS

What will he propose? I am told that he will propose that the Carroll amendment [1] may still apply to protect competition among the buyers, but that there should be a change in the amendment so that it should no longer apply to protect competition among the sellers. Under this proposal, the sellers will be permitted to go their own sweet way, eliminating, as far as possible, bothersome competition among themselves. This will be the sellers' end of the bargain.

However, the sellers would still continue to be prohibited, as provided for under the present Robinson-Patman Act and under the Carroll amendment, from conduct which would affect competition among the buyers.

See footnote at end of speech.

This will be your end of the bargain. How it would be worked out in words I would like to see.

The sellers would be saying, in effect, to you buyers: Since you are so insistent upon the Carroll amendment, we are now ready to tell you that we would not think of doing anything adversely affecting competition among our various customers, such as discriminating in favor of one buyer, even in good faith, as against others; and you may have your Carroll amendment[1] for that purpose and your associations may go back to you and say that they won this victory for you. All that we ask is that, if we let you alone, you let us alone, and that in return for our concession to you you leave us to our own pricing and zoning devices. I am even told that they might be willing to give up section 8 of the bill, as a final inducement—inasmuch as nothing is mentioned therein, one way or another, about freight absorption. But they will not be willing to give up the zoning-price section, you can be pretty sure, and I doubt that they will give up the "grandfather's clause." They would want to keep these handy instruments of monopoly. They would want to keep all the essentials in the bill which will keep them in the price saddle.

They will be saying to you, "Just let the wolf get big and fat and you, Red Riding Hood, will have nothing to worry about, not a thing, either in the meantime or later."

SMALL BUSINESS WILL NOT BE DECEIVED BY HIGH-PRESSURE LOBBYING TACTICS

Well, this proposed compromise, of which I have been told, sounds a little different than the attacks on the Robinson-Patman Act made by the gentleman in question at the American Bar Association. But it is not too different. It is just reverse English. I am sure you will know how to handle that ball.

No matter what the compromise offered, if any, you will know that, if they decide that half a loaf is better than none, it is because they would be getting the bigger half—in fact, practically the whole loaf.

I think that the conferees on S. 1008 will know that, too; I think that small business will be the winner after all; and I think—and I certainly hope—that S. 1008 will not become a law in any form.

Small-business men are alert to the situation. Your organization is alert to the danger. The danger of any change of this nature in these parts of the Robinson-Patman Act—even a comma, as I so often say—is enough for the Robinson-Patman Act opponents, with their smart and well-paid lawyers, to defy the law again in the course of endless court litigation in construing the meaning of such changes. Years can go by in that process in the future—just like years have gone by in the past—and then when the Supreme Court hands down a clarifying decision they ask for a new law from Congress to clarify the decision by reversing it.

Finally, I am more than confident that small business will settle the S. 1008 controversy for nothing less than the Carroll amendment. Small business will not be misled or deceived by this last desperate drive to sabotage our antitrust laws—the only real protection of small business and free enterprise.

[1] On October 13, 1949, subsequent to the presentation of the above statements, the conference committee reported out the bill with a "compromise" omitting the saving language of both the Carroll amendment and the Kefauver amendment, and inserting absolutely reverse language in section 4 of the bill. Thus, the objectives of the real backers of the bill to destroy the Robinson-Patman Act, referred to in the above, were made quite explicit. Although the House approved the report, the Senate balked, and the matter is scheduled to come up again before the Senate on January 20.

We Must Not Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD, two fine, well-thought-out and well-expressed editorials from the Montana Kaimin, the official newspaper of Montana State University.

It is my hope that the Members of Congress will read these editorials because to me they represent thoughts which should always be in our minds in these troublous times.

To F. G. L. I want to express my thanks for putting into words the truths we must never forget.

HOPE—A 1949 THANKSGIVING THEME

This is Thanksgiving, 1949. It is the fifth since the end of World War II. In the span of five short years, the human mind has shown a resilience that has enabled us to all but forget the Dachaus, Belsens, and San Paulos.

Five short years have supplanted our revulsion of war's brutality with hope that maybe this time, someday, somehow, we will achieve our true destiny as human beings and act like human beings.

In the past 5 years of fumbling, stumbling, anger, fear, and selfishness; many times we have lost sight of our goals while looking for the mileposts. We have made many mistakes for which we cannot be thankful; but the role America has chosen for itself in the brave new world is not an easy one. Often we have stooped to tactics and practices that were once repulsive to us when used by others, but we have never lost hope—that abstract, undefinable something that enables mankind to rise from the muck and mire of its shortcomings and reaffirm pledges of peace for all generations to come.

Yes; there are many things for which we can feel only shame, but there are many other things for which we can truly be thankful.

We can be thankful for American justice. Judge Medina with his patient, impartial handling of the trial of would-be betrayers of our country, earned new greatness and added new dignity to the American concept of justice.

We can be thankful for the United Nations. The past year has seen this organization settle the disputes in Palestine and Indonesia in the sane, human way of using the conference table rather than the battlefield.

We can be thankful that American labor has the right and exercises the right to strike. What better answer can our democracy give to those criticis who call the American capitalist system a slave system. There are no strikes behind the iron curtain.

We can be thankful for the American people's assumption of responsibility as well as world leadership in the fight for a better world. With the Marshall plan we can, and are, restoring the war-torn democracies and with the Atlantic Pact we are underwriting the hopes that all these nations cherish for freedom.

We can be thankful for that softness in the American character that Hitler called decadence. This softness has enabled us to think of a world built on justice and freedom rather than revenge and hatred.

Above all we can be thankful for the laughter of children who live in a world that is the paradise man seeks to regain.—F. G. L.

THE BATTLE FOR PEACE MUST BE WON

It has been 8 years since Pearl Harbor. It has been 4 years since Hiroshima. It has been 8 years since men began dying that man might live.

The thousands of crosses that point heavenward in silent, symmetrical rows are the mute testimonials of faith to what men believed and died for.

In their faith, the dead have left us a sacred trust. A simple but vital trust that unless achieved, will mean more sacrifice of human lives, more degradation, more privation, and more shame.

These men died to win a battle—a battle that links vitally in the chain of struggle that eventually means peace. They have won their battle—the war. Now, lest what they have won be lost, we, the living, must win our battle for peace.

We must never lose sight of freedom from fear, freedom of religion, freedom from want, and freedom of expression. We must achieve these for them and for the dignity of mankind now living and yet to be born.

We must work hard for fulfillment of the dream reborn in the United Nations Charter at San Francisco. We must fight the battle of intolerance to achieve a more perfect democracy.

Hunger and ignorance must be defeated if our trust is to be fulfilled. Freedom of religion must be extended unless we want the moral basis of our society to decay and disappear.

Ours is a battle that does not end in armistices or treaties; but one that never ends because our enemies—intolerance, hunger, ignorance, and prejudice—are ever present waiting for us to relax or drop our guard.

They can destroy our dignity as men and destroy the trust left us by the dead, with appeals to our self-interests, our greeds, our vanities, and our human weaknesses.

To the men under those thousands of crosses, we owe this opportunity to seek truth, establish justice, and regain our human dignity. We owe it to them and to those that will follow our footsteps to wage a total war for peace and a better world for all men.

Anything short of total efforts on our part will make a mockery and a farce out of Pearl Harbor, D-day, Iwo Jima, Bastogne, and Anzio—and slaves of ourselves.—F. G. L.

Practical Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD I include therein a very thoughtful address by Mr. Walter Cenerazzo, national president of the American Watchworkers Union, before the International Student's Center at Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass. Mr. Cenerazzo, who is a brilliant and progressive young labor leader, is not only a keen student of Government but also a penetrating analyst of foreign and domestic economic trends.

His viewpoint is refreshingly American and he is a stanch believer in our free

competitive system as well as our basic political and parliamentary institutions.

The address follows:

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM

To address a group of students who come from many foreign lands to obtain an education in American colleges and universities is indeed a rare privilege for a labor leader whose avocation has been to study the economic conditions existing in foreign lands.

Today in this world there exists a sharp cleavage as to the systems of government. One trend of thought is predicated upon the outgrowth of the idea established in the Magna Carta of King John in the thirteenth century, which is that human dignity shall prevail; that men are not the chattel property of anyone, be it feudal lords, kings, or the politburo; that men shall have the right to choose their own religion, their own field of endeavor in employment, and live within their own family unit as dignified human beings.

The other trend of thought is that produced by totalitarian government, which claims as the first obligation from its citizens obedience to the government. Their theory is that men should work, eat, live where they are told, take their recreation as the government plans it, and that men have never the right to criticize their rulers. There is no difference between this modern-day totalitarianism and the slaves of Egypt. Both represent tyranny and lack of respect for human dignity.

The free nations of this earth have come a long way since the signing of the English Magna Carta by King John, and as each century has gone by men have gained more and more freedom in an economic way which has given to them freedom in other ways.

To me, one of the unsung heroes in his battle for the freedom of men was a great American—Benjamin Franklin. This man Franklin had an opportunity to observe conditions in England as a workman and later as a statesman. He visited France and lived there during the French Revolution. He was a student of governments, and it is my opinion that the citizens of the United States owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for our inalienable Bill of Rights—the first 10 amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The thinking that went into that Constitution, which separated the executive, the legislative, and judicial branches of government, was long-range thinking to forever bar any man or men from treating human beings as serfs within the boundaries of the United States of America.

In the century and a half that followed the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, men and women have lived with human dignity and in the industrial revolution have been the peoples of the only Nation in the world who are a great middle class. Nowhere else in this world will you find a lack of class struggle, nowhere else in this world will you find complete a way of life by which men and women can set their goals within the family unit and achieve them for that family.

In the past several years, I have visited the South American Continent and the European Continent. In South America I had the opportunity to visit Peru, Chili, Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. In Europe this summer I visited England, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, Switzerland, and western Germany.

In each of these countries I visited industrial plants to witness the engineering and research skills and to see how productive labor was. I asked many questions concerning living conditions, wages, government controls, and where the ideas in existence in the government of the country came from.

One basic element was missing from every single one of these countries—and that was a virile labor movement dedicated to collective labor bargaining with employers to obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity for the employees of industry.

Oh, yes, there was a labor movement in each and every one of these countries, but those that led it were either Socialists, Communists, Christian Union Democrats, Falangists, Apristas, or some other type of ism which was dedicated to curing economic ills by government fiat. In each case the labor leader of these countries was wrapped up in a political movement to take over the administration of the government. To me this is not the way that a great middle class of people is created within a nation. In these countries there are only the very rich and the very poor, and the purchasing power of the very poor is indeed very small. You cannot have prosperity for a nation unless the rank and file of the people have purchasing power in their hands and can purchase what they produce.

We in the United States, unfortunately, in my opinion, have at the helm of our State Department a group of men who have no understanding of business economics, and who have been in a daydream for many years on the problems of foreign trade. These men believe that you can purchase goods from a foreign country and give to that foreign country prosperity when the persons that made the goods obtained wages that would not enable them to feed themselves properly let alone clothe themselves properly. There can be no prosperity for any country unless the workers of that country obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity that will enable them to purchase the goods of other workers to consume themselves.

That's the key of the prosperity of the citizens of the United States. Purchasing power—consumer income—with which to purchase consumer goods.

The United States program for reciprocal trade does not and will not help either the American worker or foreign workers. All it does is make the importer richer at the expense of both the American worker and the foreign worker.

For this reason I have advocated for some time a twofold program in the field of foreign trade, which, in my opinion, if carried out would create a middle class of people with purchasing power in every country in this world.

I believe the United States should lead the way by creating a Board of Foreign Trade, composed of 15 persons. The fifteen to be appointed—five by the President of the United States, five by the United States Senate, and five by the United States House of Representatives. Three of each group should be appointed from the majority party in control, and two from the minority party.

This Board of Foreign Trade should have complete control and jurisdiction over all economics that have to do with foreign trade, and every other department of Government should be stripped of authority in this field.

This Board of Trade, with its 15 members, would negotiate agreements with a foreign country on a bilateral basis only, and every agreement with each country would have to stand on its own merit and what considerations that were granted to one country, would not necessarily have to be given to another country.

The type of men I would like to see appointed to this Board would be the best talent available in the field of business, finance, economics, agriculture, and labor. They should receive at least $25,000 per year for serving on the Board.

This Board of Trade should have established within it a statistical department with competent men to establish the production costs on every article produced in the United States, and these records should be kept up to date so that every time unit costs go up or down it is reflected in the records.

In negotiating an agreement with a foreign country this Board of Trade would ascertain the unit costs of production in the foreign country they are negotiating with, and they would establish tariffs equal only to the difference in the unit costs between the cost of production in the United States and the costs of production in the foreign country with consideration given for transportation and insurance costs to bring the article to the United States.

As wages were increased, or unit costs increased in the foreign country, the tariffs would be reduced accordingly. Thus, as more wages were paid to foreign workers, more purchasing power would be in their hands to buy consumer goods and more prosperity would be available for that nation.

This Board of Foreign Trade would have authority to put a limitation on amount of goods to come into the United States of any type; they would have the authority to impose quotas, raise tariffs, lower tariffs, and to negotiate in any manner they deemed essential.

All tariffs which they collected would be put into a fund which I would call the point 4 fund to be spent for the development of underdeveloped areas throughout the world. The Board would be given authority to refund all of the tariffs to a nation for its development if it deemed it wise.

Thus, a twofold purpose would be accomplished. No goods could compete in the United States except at equality at the border and importers' excess profits would be eliminated. The foreign worker would find his employer paying him more wages, for there would be no point in paying him low wages and then paying the difference in tariff to the United States.

In the distribution of point 4 money the second part of my program would come into play, for I would allow no nation to participate in obtaining any of this money unless they first adopt in the constitution of their country a bill of rights comparable to ours and establish a separation of the powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches so that dictators could no longer function or gain a foothold in the future.

With the adoption of this bill of rights would come a new day for the working men and women of foreign countries, for they would be guaranteed the right of free association and forming unions of their own choosing. And thus a virile labor movement would gather momentum and bring about a standard of living that creates a great middle class.

The reciprocal trade program of the United States establishes the same tariff regardless of the wage conditions between nations. Goods produced in a country paying 10 cents an hour wages come into the United States at the same tariff as goods produced in a country paying 50 cents an hour wages. Where do you think investment capital is going to open factories under such a tariff program?

This Board of Foreign Trade that I suggest should have industrial engineers in its employ to visit factories in the United States to make sure they are efficient and productive and have adopted modern technological improvements, and if they have not a leveling factor should be placed on their unit cost of production in the records to penalize them for their inefficiency.

There is no room in this world for inefficiency, obsolete methods, and failure to introduce modern production methods. Only in a world where there is efficiency and modern efficient production can the rank and file of people participate in the enjoyment of the goods they produce.

If every country established such a Board of Foreign Trade it would not be long before all the low wages in this world would gradually disappear and we would have fair living standards for all the workers in the freedom

loving nations of this world. And when misery, terrible housing, improper diet, and squalid living conditions disappear from a nation and an honest democratic labor movement does its job well in obtaining more and more each year in collective bargaining within the framework of prosperous corporate enterprise, those that represent totalitarianism will find the seeds of communism which they spread falling upon sterile ground, which refuses to accept their ideology.

To me there is no substitute for cooperative capitalism to achieve human dignity. Cooperative capitalism to me means adequate dividends to the investor for the risk that he takes in furnishing capital to purchase the tools and equipment, adequate payment to management for furnishing the brains of direction to the enterprise; fair wages to labor for fair work with the accompanying security that prosperous enterprise can give to its employees. And last, but not least, the lowest possible consumer prices for all that effective cooperation between investor, management, and labor can produce.

This is what has made America what it is. It is what has given more people opportunity for a better lot in life than any other economic system yet devised in this world. There is only one way we can preserve it—and that is for every other nation in this world that respects human dignity to achieve the same program and for our Nation to establish a flexible tariff system to protect American workingmen while point 4 does its work in building the production facilities of other nations.

Taxes Can Kill America's Growth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this editorial by Ray Hansen, editor of the Daily Jefferson County Union of Fort Atkinson, Wis.:

TAXES CAN KILL AMERICA'S GROWTH

The gravest and most far-reaching internal issue this country faces is the cost of its government. And of all issues, it is probably the least understood.

At a time when the Federal Government's income is at a near-record peak, and when the burden of taxation borne by the people is without precedent in days of peace, the Nation is unable to make both ends meet. It is running a heavy deficit which will be added to the towering national debt—a debt which is a direct obligation upon every man with an income, a piece of property, or material resources of any kind.

There is, of course, a glib answer to all of this. It is: "Tax the rich man and the rich business; let them carry the load for the rest of us." But the fact is that we could tax the rich into financial extinction and the proceeds wouldn't even come close to paying the bill. It is the tens of millions with moderate means—not the few with large means—who are hurt by extravagant government.

But that is not the end of the story. Something infinitely ominous is quietly happening in this country. Taxes are killing our economic growth.

A recent article in Newsweek describes this. Sales of common stock in industry largely determine whether we shall have good times or bad, an expanding economy or a static economy, more employment or less in the future. Yet, Newsweek says, last year trading in stocks accounted for only 4 percent of the national income where, in the 55 years prior to 1930, it averaged more than 40 percent. This means, the magazine goes on, that "if most of our corporations were not already in existence, it would be impossible today to create them." The money that once went into the enterprises upon which our living standards and world leadership are built is being taxed out of existence.

This is but one illustration out of many that could be cited. Every individual whose income is above the subsistence level knows how onerous taxes are. Practically everyone talks at one time or another about the cost of government and how something must be done. But talk is generally the beginning and the end of it.

This brings us to a fundamental fact. Wasteful, excessively costly government is simply a symptom of a condition of overwhelming significance. That condition cannot be described in cold figures. It exists in the minds and hearts of the people.

In the last 20 years there has been an insidious change in our concept of government. We have turned to it to perform tasks which always before were the duty of the individual and the local community. More and more of us look to Government to protect us in every way. We are losing our independence. We ask Government to protect our health, build our homes, care for us if we are unemployed, and see us through all the way from the cradle to the grave. We ask it to provide more and more goods and services. The polite term for this "gimme" habit is "the welfare state," a softer name for socialism. The welfare state always leads to one of two conclusions: It impoverishes and enslaves the people and subjects them to ruthless dictatorship, as in eastern Europe, or, finally, the people rid themselves of its worst manifestations, as the voters of New Zealand and Australia recently did. But even in the latter case the wealth of nations has been dissipated, and the tentacles of government have been woven so tight that it may take generations to recover.

Therefore, taxation directly affects all our liberties. Excessively expensive government is always supergovernment. It is paternalistic government; it is, in its more advanced stages, government by fiat and decree; it is, in its final stages, government by terror. The Russian Revolution was fought in the name of the common man, and now, in that huge "people's state," tens of millions of common men and women live miserably in medieval darkness and real liberty is unknown.

The basic troubles of the world, from war to human want, can in one way or another be charged to too much government. All-powerful government is simply a reflection of the loss of individual self-reliance, initiative, pride, independence of spirit, the will to work—the qualities which made possible the founding and the growth of this Republic. We, as a people, are fortunate that we have not yet gone so far on the welfare-state road that we cannot turn back. We can still have ourselves from the final disaster that has overcome so much of the world. But we, as a people, must do it ourselves. Big government will not do it for us. We must ask ourselves this question: "Are we willing, in return for a mirage of material security, for which we pay through exorbitant taxation, to sacrifice those liberties for which men have fought and struggled for 2,000 years?"

Immediate Vote on Statehood for Hawaii Recommended by Public Lands Subcommittee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to bring to the attention of the House a report submitted to the chairman of the House Committee on Public Lands, under date of January 10, by a subcommittee which recently toured the islands of the Central Pacific and the Far East, urging that H. R. 49 be brought to an immediate vote.

I wish especially to invite the attention of the Members of the House to the considerations which prompt this recommendation.

The report follows:

JANUARY 10, 1950.

Hon. J. HARDIN PETERSON,
Chairman, Committee on Public Lands, House of Representatives.

Mr. CHAIRMAN: Your Special Committee on Pacific Territories and Island Possessions strongly urges that steps be taken to bring to a vote immediately H. R. 49, the bill to admit Hawaii to the Union as a State. This measure has been pending on the House Calendar since last March, when it was reported by the Committee on Public Lands with only one dissenting vote.

En route to Samoa, the Trust Territory, Guam, and the Far East the committee stopped for 2 days at Honolulu. The headquarters of the Pacific Fleet Command and the government of the Trust Territory is stationed there. The officials charged with the government of Samoa, the Trust Territory, and Guam have drawn heavily upon the experience and the personnel of Hawaii in meeting many of their most important problems in the field of education, science, and agriculture. In traveling through these islands the committee found in many places the results of the very important influence being exerted by Hawaii. People of the Pacific look to Hawaii in many respects much as the French do to Paris, the British to London, and Americans to Washington and New York. It is unquestionably one of the principal cultural centers of the Pacific and recognized as such by those who have been charged with the responsibility for the administration of our Pacific possessions.

On its return from Tokyo the committee spent 4 days in Hawaii. Its members met with the principal public officials of the Territory and leaders in every field of civic activities. The committee was a guest at a community luncheon organized by the Honolulu Chamber of Commerce and conferred at length with members of the Hawaii Statehood Commission, an official agency of the Terirtorial government charged with the responsibility of promoting statehood for Hawaii.

The committee found Hawaii more aggressively determined to achieve statehood than at any time in the past. The overwhelming majority of people with whom its members talked expressed themselves emphatically in favor of the admission of Hawaii to the Union, believing this would serve not only

the best interest of the Territory but of the United States.

This point of view has been strengthened rather than weakened by the serious economic situation that has resulted first from the sharp reductions of the Military and Naval Establishment in Hawaii and second from a strike of longshoremen that lasted for a period of almost 6 months. The Territory is preparing to deal vigorously with the serious problem of unemployment that was brought about by the former development and takes pride in the action of its legislature which brought about a resumption of stevedoring operations and at least a limited amount of shipping during the period of the longshoremen's strike. The emphasis given to local responsibility by the Federal administration and the Congress in meeting these problems has caused people in Hawaii to feel more strongly than ever that the additional local authority and greater representation in Washington that would come with statehood should be granted at once.

Prompt enactment of H. R. 49 will strengthen the position of this country among people of the Pacific islands and the Far East. Many of these people regard the future with great apprehension. The advances of communism and the uncertainties as to what course this country might pursue to meet these advances in the Pacific has filled them with grave doubts. That they look to the United States for leadership in meeting this problem and all of the threat that it holds for the freedoms inherent in the democratic way of life is unmistakable. The committee found evidences of this both in the principal centers of population in the islands of the South and Central Pacific and in the Orient. These people are anxious to be reassured that the influence of this country will be exerted to the fullest in support of their efforts to achieve and sustain the freedom inherent in democracy.

The prompt admission of Hawaii to the Union as a State will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific, won at a great cost in World War II, and on the contrary proposes that every legitimate step be taken to preserve and strengthen the objectives achieved in that struggle.

It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence in Japan, the Philippines, Korea, and China, from whence many of Hawaii's people, now American citizens of long residence in the islands, originally migrated.

It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of government that militate against people of oriental origin.

It will serve to bring the people of Hawaii into closer relationship to the people of the rest of the country and the latter to a full appreciation of our responsibilities in the Pacific.

Hawaii has long been a proving ground of the American way of life. It has been a lighthouse of democracy in the Pacific. Its relationship to the Pacific and the Far East has been and is today important to the future of our country in this great area. It is both a gateway to the Pacific and the Far East and a common meeting ground of the divergent cultures of Occident and the Orient.

Your committee, therefore, recommends that the promise of statehood long held out to the people of Hawaii be promptly fulfilled. It believes that action at this time is in the national interest.

JOHN E. MILES,
Chairman.
FRED L. CRAWFORD.
WILLIAM LEMKE.
JAY LEFEVRE.
GEORGE P. MILLER.
EDWARD H. JENISON.
JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON,
Delegate from Hawaii.

Defenseless America—The Isolationists' Paradise Penny-Wise but Pound-Foolish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY
OF VERMONT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave heretofore granted, I would like to say that an old-time philosopher, one Will Rogers, used to preface his remarks by saying, facetiously, that all he knew about it was what he had read in the papers. He neglected to supply the unnecessary information that he read what he had told the papers.

So I am confronted with some newspaper items relating to what I told the newspapers' representatives. Here they are:

I see a headline in the Rutland Herald of the 10th ultimo, "PLUMLEY warns of United States Pacific defense needs" in big letters across the column. And then here comes another, "More than one big carrier is needed," declares PLUMLEY, who goes on to say as follows:

"The Communists have pushed us into Pacific and Asiatic waters up to our necks and we will need more than one big carrier as a life preserver," Congressman CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, Republican, of Vermont, told the press today as he emerged from a hearing of the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for Armed Services.

Today's was the first of daily hearings scheduled up to March 12 by the five-man subcommittee of which the Vermont Congressman is a member.

The subcommittee is considering a total appropriation of $13,500,000,000.

"Recent action of the State Department relative to Formosa," the Congressman said, "seems to make it necessary to protect ourselves at sea rather than on, off, or from land bases. Eventually, we'll fight either here or on the sea. And do not fool yourself," he warned, "we had better be prepared."

The Vermont Congressman was among Members of Congress who vigorously protested Secretary of Defense Johnson's order to abandon construction of a huge naval carrier last spring.

Now both of these things remind me of the fact that way back last March there appears an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD entitled "Our Place in the Far East," which, by reason of permission heretofore granted, I quote:

OUR PLACE IN THE FAR EAST

(Extension of remarks of Hon. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY, of Vermont, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, March 3, 1949)

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, by virtue of permission granted, I am including a letter I wrote the State Department and the answer thereto.

I am putting this correspondence into the RECORD as a matter of protection.

Some years ago while a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I protested the shipment of iron scrap to Japan. I insisted upon the building of stock piles of necessary material. While I made my position perfectly clear with regard to those two matters, I did not at that time make any statement in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. This time, however, I wish my position to be a matter of public record.

For some time I have disagreed with the State, Army, and Navy Departments relative to the policy we have pursued with respect to China.

While chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent around the world one very well qualified to make a report to me relative to our situation in the East, for the use of the subcommittee.

I have repeatedly announced my layman's opinion with regard to what should be done by us to maintain a world position we did not seek but which we must either sustain or quit.

Here are the letters which briefly outline my position concerning the present situation in the Far East. I am still compelled to think we are making the greatest mistake possible unless and until we assume the burden of our responsibility.

JANUARY 24, 1949.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Some time ago I informed the Secretary of Defense as to my intense interest in the matter of our lack of proper consideration of what our situation in China soon will be.

Last fall, as chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Navy, I sent a qualified representative to China to make an inspection and to report to me the result of his investigation. I have transmitted the substance of the report to the Secretary of the Navy.

I desire to be informed what has been done by the State Department looking toward the acquisition, under some kind of lease arrangement, of Tsingtao.

Tsingtao, German planned and built, "has almost everything to recommend it as a base for military and naval operations. As you know, it is situated on the coast of the strategic Shantung Peninsula and possesses one of the world's most excellent harbors. Here the Germans builded well and their handiwork remains in use even today. The topography of the area with rugged mountains surrounding it ideally recommends itself to military defenses. This fact was patently shown by the first German defense of Tsingtao during the First World War.

"The plain facts are that we are spending limited amounts of money here in the maintenance of our garrison on invitation of the present Chinese Government. Expenditures are made, however, only to that extent which is necessary to maintain it as a temporary makeshift base of operations with no real control over the area. This place has great

possibilities for development but as previously indicated we are here merely on invitation and common sense would dictate that it would be foolhardy to expend large sums to install those permanent installations so necessary for the creation of a modern naval establishment unless there were assurances forthcoming that we alone would be the recipients of the benefits of our own handiwork. In my judgment the acquisition of Tsingtao under lease arrangement should be attempted. It would require hard work and delicate diplomacy but it is well worth that try. Such an accomplishment would be of tremendous benefit to the United States of America.

"Tsingtao definitely lies across the Russian path southward down the coast of China. Developed, it would stand as a powerful checkmate to Russian communism at Dairen, Manchuria, and Vladivostok. Most important of all is the fact that it would be a toehold for America on the China coast in the event that all of China falls into the hands of the Chinese Communists. I am not one who believes that Russia will absorb China if this should take place. I do believe, however, that the Chinese Reds will, if they obtain the ascendancy, need economic aid and that should we be so located we would still be in a position to approach them—and they approach us—in the channels of trade. I am also not so sure but that this Chinese brand of communism in due time if properly handled could be changed to something less than Red. It is well worth noting that past events indicated that millions of Chinese are susceptible to the persuasion of economic conditions. At least the chances of modification or conversion of Chinese communism would be far greater than if we were nonexistent on the China coast.

"Most diabolical would be the withdrawal of American forces from China and the subsequent establishment of leased Russian bases along the Chinese coast provided by a Chinese Government friendly to and in obligation to Red Russia. To face such a situation, the United States as I see it would be forced to expend untold billions in Japan, Okinawa, Guam, and the Philippines or else be reconciled to a withdrawal from the Western Pacific. The latter would be a most dangerous step."

We should, if it now be possible, negotiate a lease of the old German base at Tsingtao, rebuild and modernize it, and that at the earliest possible moment.

We should not continue to be so inconsiderate of our own welfare as we were when, against the protests of many, we continued to ship scrap iron to Japan, neglected to afford ourselves a second waterway route from the Atlantic to the Pacific transisthmus, anchored our fleet in the harbor of Oahu as a target and an invitation to the massacre which occurred.

I feel very deeply about the matter of the lease of the fortifications at Tsingtao, as I have felt concerning the other matters to which I refer, and I am writing this letter as and for a matter of record in that respect.

Yours very truly,

CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
Member of Congress.

FEBRUARY 4, 1949.

The Honorable CHARLES A. PLUMLEY,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. PLUMLEY: The receipt is acknowledged of your letter of January 24, 1949, indicating your interest in the acquisition by the United States of the city of Tsingtao under a lease arrangement with the Chinese Government and asking that you be informed regarding the steps which the Department of State has taken to that end.

The Department of State had not previously been aware of your deep concern in this problem and your views have been received with interest. They have been made available to the immediately concerned officers in the Office of Far Eastern Affairs who are available for consultation with you at any time about the problems involved in your suggestion that this Government acquire Tsingtao under a lease arrangement. This Department has not been informed by the National Military Establishment that such action is desirable for military purposes and has taken no steps looking toward the negotiation of such a lease. Thank you for making your views available and be assured of this Department's interest in receiving them.

Sincerely yours,

CHARLES E. BOHLEN,
Counselor
(For the Secretary of State).

Mr. Speaker, it is a sorry story but, in the face and eyes of such a group as was confronting our civilization, we did nothing, as usual, under our alleged foreign policy of appeasement and on have come the Communists till they have reached Formosa as was to be anticipated. So, some months ago, I raised my feeble voice to suggest that we enter into a long-term lease with Chiang Kai-shek in order to try to cover us, that is to say, to protect us, and by us I mean the world, against the further advance of communism in Formosa, and I offered the suggestion that if such action in the premises were impossible of accomplishment or of performance, diplomatically, that in order to preserve the peace of the world, quietly, we might submit the possibility of the negotiation of some kind of leasehold right for us to a plebiscite for the consideration of the people of Formosa. So far as I know, no action was ever taken along the line which I, a nondiplomatic statesman and just a common Congressman, had suggested. Nothing was done, as usual, by us, but the Communists continued to advance.

DIPLOMACY RESPECTED

Now, I respect the necessity of diplomacy in world affairs and defer to diplomatic action, so long as it conserves our safety as a body politic. Nevertheless, I like 24 hours' notice in advance as to who is going to massacre me, even with words. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the people think we have a competent State Department to protect us, to protect you against Communist advances, which will hear nothing to suggestions made so practical, as everybody acknowledges, they would have resisted their advances?

PRO-RUSSIAN SYMPATHIZERS?

I regret I am compelled to believe, by reason of the reception accorded my suggestions, that the State Department of the United States is so saturated with pro-Russian sympathizers that we are vitally embarrassed. I think it is high time that we found out whether or not my suspicions are or are not well founded. Certainly no action taken by the State Department recently is in denial of my suspicions. Naturally, I would prefer that Russia be our friend but friendship is not to be bought by the sale of all that we hold dear nor by permitting her, I mean Russia, to tell us why and what to do and when to do it. It is time we stopped dead and started the clock which ticks appeasement.

SWITCH TO ALARM

It is time we switched it on to the alarm. Today we are not as capable as we would have the world think as to be thought transcendent militantly. That place can only be bought again at the cost of unnecessary blood and tears and treasure because of our unpreparedness which is the reason why we should properly prepare to so defend ourselves and so organize aggressively as to be able to make defense successfully and now.

It would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that since the State Department has declared we are to have no bases on, off, or land from which to fight to defend ourselves and our rights, the only answer is that we will have to fight from the sea. To do that with the contemplated inadequate Navy and Marine Corps provided by proposed appropriations is nothing more or less than a challenge to a catastrophe.

We should be the rulers and the masters of the sea. That we can be, but it will cost money so to be. That we will not be as is proposed.

Unless we are willing to pay the price, we might as well, in the language of the State Department, "fade out of the picture" as some of those who are undertaking to dictate our alleged foreign policies and our programs obviously would have us to do, I know not why except I know their background.

THE PLACE OF THE CARRIER

One who reads dispassionately, fairly, impartially, as between the armed services, the history of the last war as written by representatives of all the services, must be struck by the repetition of the statement, "and the battle would have been lost if not then had come the carriers." The truth is, seaborne planes won the war initially, and it is so admitted by all the services undeniably. It is the truth that without the carriers the war could not have been won and would not have been lost.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am for the big carrier and for a rescinding of the order blocking the building of the big carrier and for ordering it to be constructed at once. That was an act involving malice prepense.

As of today, more perhaps than at any other time in the history of this country, we need it, and others, for the protection and the safety it will afford us and insure. We need it, and more and others like it, and, in truth, a lot of small carriers.

The history of the last war proves my point, any civilian Secretary of Defense to the contrary notwithstanding.

I recognize the importance and the place of the airplane in the wars of the days that have to be as is evidenced by the position which I have taken. I am still more firmly convinced than ever, by reason of the position in which we find ourselves today, since Congress last met, and will find ourselves tomorrow that we need the big carrier, and more of them, and more now than ever.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent hours, days, weeks, months, and long years listening to and studying the advice of men who came up from Annapolis to be lieutenant commanders to captains to admirals, to membership on the Board of the Chiefs of Staff, and of graduates of West Point who have similarly become captains and major generals and members of those

boards to which I referred, as they tried to tell me the story of how a world war should be won, and as they demonstrated it should be won. Out of it all, I feel I have learned the lesson of the necessity for us this day to be able and capable and prepared to dominate and to control the sea primarily; and so it will ever be.

Sea power, Mr. Speaker, true sea power, is unique in military operations because it demands exclusiveness of possession. It becomes all or nothing at all. The security of the United States, and indeed the security of the western civilization, is dependent upon our maintenance of our present position in naval affairs. Maintenance of this position can only be continued as long as the Navy is provided the tools with which to carry out its responsibilities. Naval power requires air power in the fleet. World War II demonstrated that the airplane was the primary weapon of destruction and defense. The aircraft carriers of World War II paid for themselves over and over again by the efficiency and dispatch by which they destroyed both the German and Japanese sea power and brought the war to an early, successful conclusion. The carriers of World War II were mainly built in dire necessity for a specific period of operation. The submarine threat required a large number of small, easily built carriers known as the CVE's. These were built and performed their duty admirably but their continued use in the future is somewhat limited, except for special operations. The *Essex*-type carriers were mainly built for certain types or sizes of aircraft current in World War II. These too will pass into obsolescence in the next decade and are now limited to operation of present-day aircraft.

Since World War II the naval problem has been complicated. The problem of maintenance of naval superiority has been further threatened by the advent of faster and higher performance aircraft, the development of guided missiles, and the increased difficulties in handling the snorkel submarine.

The modern aircraft are mostly high-performance jet type. In order to get high rate of climb, high altitude performance, longer range, and greater striking power, these new aircraft have had to be built larger and stronger and hence are more dense. This density factor requires that the carrier decks be stronger than heretofore. The jet aircraft requires longer decks for take-off and for parking or handling a large number of bigger aircraft. The size of the new aircraft requires that the hangar deck space be larger than previously required. The heavier aircraft require heavier arresting gear and catapults. Jet aircraft are notoriously high fuel consumers and hence the new carriers must have a larger fuel capacity for aircraft. Efficient and continuous aircraft operations with high performance aircraft indicate the desirability for a flush deck carrier, such as was proposed for the U. S. S. *United States*. The increasing threat of the atomic bomb, guided missiles, and submarines to our shipping and naval forces requires greater protection by naval forces to reduce the losses to within acceptable limits. The lessons of Bikini must be applied to minimize damage from the A bomb. The lessons of World War II operations must find expression in new construction. These are the problems in a nutshell as I hope I have learned them.

I submit that the dynamics of air power and naval power requires new weapons to maintain the offensive capabilities, without which a navy is not capable of maintaining true sea power. It may be asked, "Why couldn't World War II carriers be modified to take care of these changes?" To some extent they can. I speak only as one who has listened trying to learn.

Two carriers of the *Essex* type are undergoing modernization at this time, and these modernizations are valuable. But to expect a World War II carrier to be suitable for extensive modernization is, in many ways, akin to recommending modernization of the B–17 and the B–29 aircraft of the Air Force for modern combat use. Major changes in structures and clearances and stowage space would make such attempts to modernize prohibitively costly and militarily and economically unsound. So I see it as a layman.

Time is a factor that is often overlooked in military affairs. The time required to design and construct a new carrier to incorporate the required improvements as were part of the U. S. S. *United States* was approximately 6 years. Preliminary talks and requirements were set up in 1945. The design took approximately 2 years, from 1946 to 1948. Construction was estimated between 36 and 48 months, giving the earlier date of completion somewhat in or after 1952. This carrier design was the result of studies of requirements to operate first-line aircraft developing today and operational in the next few years. This problem of a suitable carrier for the modern planes of the next decade is at present unsolved. It is still and will be a problem for years to come.

If this carrier is not built, two problems will face the Navy. The first is the gradual withdrawal from certain areas now under our control, such as the coastal waters of Europe, Mediterranean, and Middle East, due to the threat of modern and superior land-based aircraft. The second is the rapid obsolescence of United States naval power which no compensating gain by any other arm can overcome. This withering of naval power will result in the United States fleet becoming mainly a supply or logistic service which is liable to heavy losses and uncertain in performance due to its lack of combatant strength for exclusive control of the seas. Until the advent of guided missiles for primary missions of long-range attacks, the carrier task force capable of projecting high-speed, long-range, high-performance aircraft against the enemy, wherever he may be, is a necessity. Failure to build the new carrier automatically denies the Navy the tools required to discharge its responsibilities and to maintain its present superiority over all other navies. This fact has been amply supported before the congressional committees.

Who can say, that in the dynamics of weapons and aircraft changes, that the arresting of the carrier and naval aircraft development may not prevent our early and successful termination of world war III, if, and when it occurs. No competent naval man would take that responsibility for such stoppage in view of the high stakes involved.

We are primarily a maritime power and shipbuilding is vital to United States security. It must provide a base for ready expansion in time of war. It must be kept alive with new construction during times of peace to keep the art current and the skills retained. The supply activities for such shipbuilding must be maintained in some degree in order that the know-how procured in World War II will be ready for war mobilization. National readiness demands that these conditions be met.

In my opinion, the Navy is entirely correct in its demands to build the U. S. S. *United States*. It was a logical development in carriers and represented a new prototype with which the evaluations and operations techniques could be continued. It was a prototype, authorized by Congress, and within the right and duty of the Navy to develop.

Obsolete carriers require the operation of obsolete aircraft. Such operations can cause unnecessary losses of men and forces, in any emergencies in the face of first-class air opposition. The loss of any American boy, through lack of required modern fighting equipment, is a tragedy that we can ill afford to generate. We owe it to ourselves and the country to provide those who might fight to protect her the best available weapons for their mission.

I emphasize the fact that any new carriers built will be used to the fullest extent in supporting naval missions in conformity with the Key West and Newport agreements. The new fast snorkelling type submarine creates a threat against control of the seas many times greater than existed from the submarine of World Wars I and II which almost defeated us in these two wars. To combat this threat every means possible must be used. The Navy has two general methods that can be used; one is offensive and the other defensive. The former is composed of the carrier task force which seeks out the submarine at its source by mining of harbors and bombing the submarine and submarine facilities in enemy ports. The other seeks the submarine at sea by protecting convoys, by hunter-killer operations, which are teams of light carriers and destroyers, and various other means, such as blimps, patrol planes, and defensive mining of own harbors. The importance of containing the submarine threat can be realized only if one understands that unless the submarine is defeated no army, air force, or foreign ally can be supported overseas.

If first things come first, as normally they should, then an adequate carrier task force is one of the first requisites for the defense of this vast insular Nation of ours.

As a valedictory, I wish it to be distinctly understood I am unalterably opposed to the usurpation by the Executive

of the legislative prerogatives. When Congress, representing the people, undertakes specifically and definitively to say where dollars shall be spent, it is beyond the law and in derogation of the Constitution for any Secretary of Defense or any President to undertake to divert otherwise the expenditure of funds appropriated for a specific purpose by the representatives of the people. Any attempt to usurp the rights and the prerogatives of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government, by the Executive, is dictatorship, pure, simple, and undefiled, which Congress—that is, the people—should resent to the extent, if necessary, of impeaching those responsible for such acts in the premises. It is time to take notice.

Award for Distinguished Public Service to Gen. George C. Marshall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the United States conference of mayors is a well established and useful organization. It is unnecessary to remind my colleagues that the mayors of our cities directly represent the general thinking of the people of this great country. On January 19, 1949, formal action was taken by the trustees of the conference of mayors to make a national award for distinguished public service. That public service was specifically defined to include service to any level of government, whether it be Federal, State, or local.

In a ceremony at the White House on November 25, 1949, the President of the United States presented the first award authorized by this resolution to Gen. George C. Marshall.

In order that the House may know the basis for the award, the members of the award committee, and the language of the citation which was read by President Truman in presenting this recognition to General Marshall, I have asked for permission to include that information as a part of these remarks. They follow:

THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AWARD FOR DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE

HISTORY

On January 19, 1949, by formal action of the trustees of the United States Conference of Mayors, a national award for distinguished public service was authorized. Public service was specifically defined to include service to any level of government—either Federal, State or local.

Initiation of the United States Conference of Mayors Award for Distinguished Public Service was based upon the fact that in the United States outstanding and meritorious public service has not been nationally honored to the extent that individual achievements and major contributions in various professional fields of endeavor have been recognized.

THE AWARD

The award itself is in the form of a mounted bronze plaque, the model for which was designed by an eminent American sculptor. The plaque carries the words "Public service is a public trust."

The award will be granted from time to time as determined by the trustees of the conference of mayors. The trustees function as the award committee.

It is planned that, when circumstances permit, the award be presented to the recipient by the President of the United States on behalf of the United States Conference of Mayors.

By unanimous vote of the award committee the first award for distinguished public service was bestowed upon Gen. George C. Marshall by the President of the United States at the White House on November 25.

* * * * *

GEN. GEORGE C. MARSHALL CITATION READ BY PRESIDENT HARRY S. TRUMAN

Holder of the Nation's highest military office and honors, a truly great soldier and organizer, this award is given for distinguished and outstanding public service. At a time when retirement was justly earned, you accepted major public responsibilities in the field of our country's foreign affairs. You have again heeded another call to humanitarian duties. As Chief of Staff, Secretary of State, and now President of the American Red Cross, this award is richly deserved and is presented to you by the United States Conference of Mayors in grateful recognition of your distinguished public service.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF MAYORS AWARD PRESENTATION COMMITTEE

Mayor W. Cooper Green, of Birmingham, president, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, vice president, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Thomas A. Burke, of Cleveland, member of the executive committee, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Thomas D'Alesandro, Jr., of Baltimore, chairman, standing committee on legislation, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Mayor Michael V. DiSalle, of Toledo, chairman of the advisory board, the United States Conference of Mayors.

Paul V. Betters, Washington, D. C., executive director, the United States Conference of Mayors.

One Person We Know Gives Us a Greater Appreciation of Honor, Integrity, and of Truth; Another Gives Us a Fuller Appreciation of Patience, Earnestness, Courage, Steadfastness, While Others Give Us a Richer and Deeper Appreciation of Humility, Charity, Tolerance, or, Perchance, Understanding and Tact

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, sometime, somewhere, someone once said:

I would not grieve in the least if a friend of mine gave a great feast and did not invite me to share with him at his festive board; but, if I had a friend who was sorely tried, and had a great sorrow which he did not invite me to share, then, indeed, I would feel bereft, knowing that I was not permitted to participate in that which to me is the highest privilege of a true friend.

I think it is unnecessary, Mr. Speaker, to tell you that nothing in life could have caused my absence at the testimonial paid you by our mutual friends on the occasion of your sixty-eighth anniversary on Friday last except that which I regarded as my bounded privilege and duty to serve a friend and in that instance it was one not as fortunately situated, and surrounded by a multitude of his friends at that particular hour as was your own good self.

But I was with you in spirit SAM, throughout every waking hour of that happy, happy day. My good wife and I thrilled at the knowledge that you again had passed another milestone in the long years of service to your country and your fellow men.

I remember many, many years ago when in a discussion evaluating the elements and essence of friendship that a great savant made the statement that we only have friends for the things which they could give us, and that thought shocked every fiber of my being. Passionately I asked him what he meant when he said that we only have friends for what they can give us, and from the lips of that great man came words of wisdom that burned themselves into my very soul and which I shall remember until the day I die:

We meet, nurture, and cultivate friendship for someone whom we learn to know—

He explained—

because they personally in some undefined method give us something that feeds either or both our mind and our soul.

One person whom we know—

He continued—

gives us a fuller appreciation of patience, earnestness, courage, steadfastness, while others give us a richer and deeper appreciation of humility, charity, tolerance, or, perchance, understanding and tact.

From one we learn more fully the teachings of the Master himself—that we should clothe the naked, feed the hungry, minister to the sick—while another gives wisdom and knowledge as to the fruits of tolerance, patience, and a clear recognition of the dignity of man regardless of how humble his station in life.

Mr. Speaker, it is thus that we come to the realization that we nurture the friendship of any man who in some manner contributes something worth while to our lives. The more of the spiritual and the less material benefits which they contribute—the greater I have found is the bond of friendship that ensues.

SAM RAYBURN, I have been knowing you for a long, long time. You have not given me a greater understanding of any single one of the aforementioned attributes, you have contributed to me and to all of your legion of friends as well as to the friendships that you have bestowed upon human beings everywhere a greater understanding of all of the elements and virtues that go to make up the greatest of all friendships among men.

It is because of these facts that today you enjoy the fullest confidence and are

beloved by every person who knows you—from our great President sitting in the White House down to the humblest citizen of our land.

Mr. Speaker, this House has had other great Speakers, but it has never had a greater Speaker than Speaker SAM RAYBURN; and I know that in praying that your shadow never grows less I bespeak the sentiments of every man who sits on both sides of the aisle.

Of a certainty this body was never chaired by one who had at one and the same time a more complete understanding of the problems of his colleagues as well as the problems of his country.

In the administration of our proceedings it is, of course, impossible for the Speaker to please every individual, and where all are of equal rank as in such a body as constitutes the House of Representatives. But he can be fair; he can be impartial, unbiased, unprejudiced and rise above party or private preferment; and you, Sam, alway do so rise above them, and at the same time, as a true leader, spend your every talent in bringing harmony out of chaos and good out of everything you do.

Mr. Speaker, acknowledging that you have a heart as big as a Texas steer, we, your colleagues, hail you on this your sixty-eighth calendar year.

I pray that you will live another hundred in order that you will continue to spread the beneficence of your own soul to the benefit of your fellows everywhere throughout the world.

Federal Extension of Rent Controls Necessary To Maintain High Employment Figures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SIDNEY R. YATES
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, it is not premature for us to be thinking about one of the most crucial decisions which we will have to face later in this session of Congress, namely, the extension of the Federal rent control law after June 30, 1950.

In an effort to develop some unemotional thinking about rent control, there is reprinted below an excellent article on the subject by Mr. Leo Lerner, the editor of the Lincoln-Belmont Booster in Chicago, Ill.

The article follows:

THE QUESTION MARK OF 1950

In predicting that 1950 will be a good year, with purchasing power ascending, economists have soft-pedaled the big question mark of the coming year.

The big question mark is rent control.

Federal rent control expires next June. I have heard Members of the present House and Senate predict that there is little if any chance of squeezing through an effective rent-control measure in the next Congress. One reliable Senator has said flatly that there will be no rent control after June, period.

It is believed that Congress will fail to protect renters mainly because most rural areas are now decontrolled or not affected, and that there aren't enough city votes to swing the legislation alone. The seeds of the coming rent and housing crisis were sowed by the last rent bill, which did not provide adequate funds for enforcement and which opened the way for national as well as regional pressure by powerful lobbies.

The big cities, where housing is still very tight and only the rent law keeps many people in their present facilities, are going to suffer most if Congress fails to act. A suggestion has been made that the city or State could step into the breach if Federal control ends, but it must be admitted that Uncle Sam, even though he makes mistakes at times, is best fitted by authority and experience to save renters from the possibility of fantastic and sudden increases in rent. The city of Chicago does not have the funds for control, and there is the strong possibility that if we had a city rent control law, political considerations, which have certainly been at a minimum under Federal enforcement, would prevail. The State of Illinois would be a better medium for holding the line on the cost of having a roof over your head, but there is a real doubt as to whether the State legislature could pass an effective law considering that the farm districts dominate the legislature.

I admit that landlords have a good argument when they say that since everything else has been decontrolled, rents should be put back on a free enterprise basis. It is also true that some landlords have not had justice in their quest for fair compensation considering that all their costs have risen. Further, it must be said that many landlords have not cheated or profiteered, and don't intend to if rent controls go off. I know some landlords who say they are satisfied with present rents and wouldn't put through any further increases.

But the total economic picture would be vastly affected by a sudden lifting of controls in cities like Chicago. I look back with a shudder to the twenties, when rent ate up a disproportionate share of the family income. I wonder what would happen to family purchasing power if some rents jumped to much higher figures. Who would buy the automobiles and television sets and clothing and other products we are now producing in great quantities if housing, still the rarest commodity, were decontrolled? Maybe you will say you don't care who buys an automobile or a television set, but you will care eventually if the high employment figures we are now enjoying, because production is in full swing, take a sharp drop because rents skyrocket.

I heard a war veteran say the other day that although he had sympathy for the landlord, he looked upon housing as he did upon the gun and ammunition business. You have to control that business because it deals in dangerous weapons. The housing shortage, he said, makes shelter a weapon which is held against the head of the entire renting population and which needs to be strictly controlled until the power to provide housing or take it away is not a danger.

In the meantime, those concerned with this major problem of 1950 will have to continue to look to the Great White Father in Washington for a solution until all hope from that source must be abandoned. The people will have to do their best to persuade Congressmen that their votes on this issue in 1950 will be the deciding factor in the 1950 elections. Also, the economic effect of decontrol will have to be made crystal clear to all of those interested in having prosperity in the next several years.

That Filibuster Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. It has been clear from the beginning of the civil-rights controversy in the Eighty-first Congress that the Republicans have consciously chosen to take an effective, if indirect, position against major civil-rights legislation.

Any doubts about Republican action and motivation on civil rights were removed by the revised Senate cloture rule which ended last year's Republican-assisted filibuster. Devised by Senator WHERRY and his colleagues and publicly supported by a majority of Senate Republicans, the rule was advertised as smoothing the way to end filibusters and make easier the passage of civil-rights bills.

Administration Democrats rightly rejected the phony advertising at the time. To their support at this somewhat later date have come the National Committee for Strengthening Congress and the Milwaukee Journal, an outstanding independent newspaper, in an editorial statement of January 7. They now point out, as administration supporters did at the onset, that the new cloture rule is a backward step—that it actually makes passage of civil-rights legislation almost impossible because of its demand that 64 Senators must approve closing of debate.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include the following editorial:

THAT FILIBUSTER BUSINESS

There was a hot controversy last spring over Senate adoption of a revised cloture rule backed by southern Democrats and most of the Republicans. The action ended a southern filibuster on civil-rights legislation.

Republicans, led by WHERRY of Nebraska, one of the authors, said the new rule would make it easier to invoke cloture and pass civil-rights legislation. The Democrats vowed that it wouldn't and said that WHERRY and his followers had fallen into a southern Democratic trap. So noisy were the orators that it was difficult for the average citizen to figure out who was right.

A voice of authority has now been heard on the subject. It is that of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, a group of outstanding citizens concerned with making congressional procedures workable and efficient. It says, in a letter to Congressmen, that adoption of the new cloture rule was a retrogressive step and recommends its repeal.

"The new rule," writes the committee, "makes it possible to stop a filibuster on the approval of the Senate Journal and on motions to take up bills. But by requiring approval of 64 Senators to close debate, compared with two-thirds of those present under the old rule (which might be as few as 33), the new procedure so stiffens the voting requirements that we anticipate that it will be harder hereafter—rather than easier—to limit debate * * *"

The committee urges, as did the northern Democrats last spring, that Senate rules be

liberalized to enable a majority of those present to limit debate on any motion, measure, or other pending matter after there has been an adequate opportunity to debate it fully. This is the sensible and thoroughly democratic solution.

The coming session of Congress is to consider civil-rights legislation. That will undoubtedly bring another Dixie filibuster. If it does, the opportunity is perfect to make the rules change proposed by the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, thus ending filibusters for good. This time northern Republicans should be smart enough to vote on the right side—and let WHERRY play with the southerners, if he thinks that's politically wise.

Joseph Scott Denounces Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph Scott, of Los Angeles, recently made a speech in Pasadena, Calif., concerning the college and university professors who refused to denounce communism. A report of his speech was published in the Gaelic American, issue of January 7, which I am submitting herewith.

Mr. Scott is a stalwart American and has dedicated his life to advocating the high principles of good sound American government. He is a former president of the Los Angeles Board of Education and has been prominent in civic and political activities for the past 50 years. I am certain that the Members of Congress will be edified by his sound judgment as expressed in the following:

JOSEPH SCOTT FLAYS COLLEGE PROFESSORS ON RED TEACHINGS

LOS ANGELES, December.—At the dedication recently by His Excellency Archbishop McIntyre of the new St. Andrew's High School in Pasadena, Joseph Scott, the veteran warrior of many battles for truth and justice was the principal speaker.

Mr. Scott, who is national president of the American League for an Undivided Ireland, said:

"Some time ago, our venerable apostolic sovereign pontiff offered these words of warning: 'He only is at peace with God, who is at war with the forces of evil.'

"In the spirit of that admonition from our Holy Father, I am appealing to the officers and members of our various councils to renew their faith and zeal against the gigantic attack that confronts us, in the battle against atheistic communism.

"Recently, Dr. Robert G. Sproul, the distinguished president of the University of California and a native son of this State, felt compelled to arrest the attention of the delegates to the American Bankers' convention meeting in San Francisco, to the grave crisis that confronts himself and the regents of the university through the amazing attitude of many of the professors, some 700 in number, who declined to subscribe to the pledge of allegiance, as required by the regents. These professors demurred to this action on the ground of "academic freedom," because the oath required them to state that they were not Communists or in sympathy with the philosophy of the communistic ideology.

"The San Francisco Argonaut, referring to these professors, say: 'The teachers believe in a substitution known as academic freedom. What this means in reality is a license issued to every professor to say what he pleases in classrooms and laboratories, and be paid for doing it.'

"The late Thomas Woodrock described this substitution as a license for irresponsibility, contempt for authority and insubordination of the gravest kind.

"By contrast with that attitude we have the comforting demonstration of the reaction of the school teachers of the Los Angeles city schools, some 10,000 strong, all of whom, with only three exceptions, took this obligation without objection or protest.

"Dr. Alexander J. Stoddard, the superintendent of schools for Los Angeles, in a public address recently, deplored this attitude of the professors and applauded the wholesome example set by the teachers under his jurisdiction, saying, 'We should make it impossible for those who do not agree with the American viewpoint and way of life to be in a position to teach our prospective teachers.'

"Years ago, when the question of a branch of the University of California was under consideration, some of us old pioneers enlisted the regents of the California University to meet on a proposed site for the university, which is now known as Westwood. Little did we think as we urged the regents to give the young men and women at this end of the State the same opportunity that they had in the north, by opening a branch here, that we would live to see the day when a host of scholars and scientists would set such an unwarranted and diabolical example of lack of patriotism as the behavior of these professors.

"Some of these professors draw down salaries of $8,400 a year for 10 months' work, which could be equivalent to more than $10,000 for the normal 12 months' salary.

"We taxpayers, and that means all of us, are grinding our faces to supply that kind of people to mold the minds and hearts of young Californians.

"I quote this example to emphasize the necessity for continued and unceasing alertness and concern to our bounden American duty, to set our faces like flint against all kinds of subversive influence; they are all around and about us—in Hollywood movieland, in labor unions, among lawyers, the journalists, the authors—everywhere.

"We face this evil, diabolical philosophy of life, godless and unprecedented. We must face it without flinching and hearts full of trust in the omnipotence of God and the righteousness of our cause.

"Of old, the lonely Nazarene said: 'He that is not with Me is against Me.' Let that be our slogan, and individually or collectively, let us emulate the words of the immortal Lincoln, 'With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in'."

Food Surpluses Should Be Sent to the Needy in Other Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, those of us who come from agricultural States are deeply interested in the problems of farm production and farm surpluses. And we are also much concerned in creating American good will in the world by demonstrating that we want to help those who are less fortunate than we are. Since the end of the war, we have given generously of our wealth through governmental and international relief agencies and through the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Our citizens also have contributed to meet the needs of the world through the various private relief agencies such as the Protestant Church committees, the war-relief services of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, the American Friends Service Committee, Church World Service, CARE, the American Jewish joint distribution committee, and many others. And I believe that we must continue to help the world to the place where they have sufficient to eat and enough clothing to protect them and keep them warm. To do less is not only un-Christian, but leads to the kind of social and economic insecurity in which communism thrives.

The surplus agriculture products that we now hold could be, and should be, given to the peoples of the nations needing food and clothing. We have made the original investment and it would require only a small additional fund to ship them overseas where they would attest to our good will.

There are several ways of handling such a program, but I would prefer to see it handled by a nongovernmental agency, like CARE, which has done such a magnificent job in the past 4 years in distributing more than 9,000,000 packages worth nearly $90,000,000 in Europe and Asia. I know that on the basis of their experience they could see that our farm surplus goes to those in need as a friendly token of our desire to help them. I trust that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture will give serious consideration to this suggestion and invite the CARE organization to distribute such surpluses as are now in their possession.

It's Up to the People

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune:

IT'S UP TO THE PEOPLE

The answer to continued American freedom lies directly with the people. Our country now is deeply involved in the process of socialization, which brings with it constantly increasing regulation of the lives and efforts of the American people.

We are being placed under such a terrific tax and Government spending burden that as a people, we are in dire danger of being forced to ask Government for ordinary living subsidies.

The lowering value of the dollar, the taxes taken from us, the controls thrust upon us,

are all drawing more tightly the noose of regimentation, and the elimination of a free people under a free government.

Mr. Truman and his official family appear to be engaged mainly in playing politics. The President said from Key West a week ago that he favored streamlining Government according to the recommendations of the Hoover committee, which has been approved by most of the Nation's able business and industrial leaders.

Yet, while stating his belief in the Hoover report, the President, nevertheless, does not give up his fantastic program of spending which he outlined nearly a year ago.

Thus, he plays a politically expedient game, one day praising free enterprise, speaking highly of economy in Government, and a few days later, speaking up again for national health insurance pensions for all, and the rest of his costly and impractical proposals.

He has his official family doing the same thing. Secretary Maurice J. Tobin, who he counted upon to hold labor on the Truman bandwagon, one day speaks up for economy, and the American system. The next, he makes a speech advocating $100 a month pensions, socialized medicine, and higher farm payments.

If the American people will take time to look closely at the utterances of their leaders, they will find many an inconsistency in them.

Their praise of economy and the Hoover report scarcely fits in with plans to pension everybody with free medical and hospital service.

The administration in this country has found a rabble-rousing appeal in the soak-the-rich program. Yet, not long ago, Mr. Truman said he was in favor of more taxes on the $6,000 a year people.

In Britain, the wealthy class has been nearly all eliminated. Few really rich families are left in England. Great estates are being rented, or closed, or sold. Yet, the British working people are no better off than ever—in fact, much worse than they have been for 100 years.

Planned programs, of a vague and insidious kind little understood by the people, are weakening the fiber of America, and leading us directly into Government control.

The Government, through its huge propaganda machine, consisting of a costly publicity bureau in every main department, carefully nurtures the idea that profits are an evil thing, and thus, whereas it never before was considered a sin in this country to make money, or to be thrifty, and to save, or to invest savings, now, that philosophy has changed so that the amount of profit of an individual or corporation can make is carefully scrutinized by Government, and the amount of income that may be kept has been established and controlled by Government, which is thus seeking to do everything for everybody, even to the running of his private life.

Soon, such things as the Brannan plan, and other proposals indicate, every farmer may be told what he may plant, and how much he may market, besides how much profit he may make, and much income he may keep.

Government is fumbling from one thing to another, cracking down on great American industries under the antitrust act, yet allowing labor dictators like John L. Lewis to control industry's output, and to challenge the American workingman's right to stay on his job.

It is giving away billions in subsidies to some businesses, such as airlines, and taxing and regulating others like the railroads to death.

Obviously, only the public can do anything about this. It is up to the public, as Congress convenes, to tell its representatives that it is sick and tired of big Government, of Government spending, and taxing and controls, and that it wants the country given back into the hands of the people, and taken away from Government and labor dictators.

Congress is under pressure constantly by well-organized minority pressure groups. Only the vast bulk of the free public, men and women thinking like free Americans, can counteract these little but powerful pressure groups, and give Congress the real mandate of the people.

States' Rights and Lefts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, at this time the most articulate and effective editor in New Orleans on the side of consitutional government is William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States.

Billy Fitzpatrick has consistently stood up and declared himself against any form of socialistic government and has consistently denounced the tragic trends of the present administration in the direction of regimentation of the American people and centralized control of the daily existence of the people.

In a recent column Mr. Fitzpatrick hits right at the core of the proposed socialized medicine scheme.

For those who are inclined to think that there can be obtained something for nothing there is to be found reason for an examination of the facts. If the good of the country instead of political expediency for the purpose of vote catching is the sincere purpose of those who advocate this program of socialized medicine, then I suggest they reexamine the facts and then let the people of the Nation know whether it is votes or the welfare of all the people that is uppermost in their minds.

Here is Mr. Fitzpatrick's column as it appeared in the New Orleans States recently:

STATES' RIGHTS AND LEFTS

(By W. H. Fitzpatrick, editor, New Orleans States)

Well, you can always give up your New Year's resolutions for Lent, if they last that long.

The advocates of statism are going to try to put over their socialized medicine scheme again in the Congress which meets day after tomorrow.

The Federal Security Agency has made a study of the costs of the plan. That agency estimates the first year toll to be about $4,700,000,000. Doctors who have also studied this scheme say it will cost much more than that. It is not unusual for Federal agencies to underestimate costs and expenditures.

There are about 138,000 physicians in private practice in this country, most of whom would be driven to Government work if the panacea is adopted. It is being held out as a cure-all for many of our ills, but the treatment may very easily prove to be more painful than the disease.

We have seen what happened in England where socialized medicine was adopted. They gave wigs away and false teeth, and everyone who had an itch or an ailment, fanciful or real, hopped to the doctor's office for free treatment. The corridors were so crowded people who were really sick couldn't get in. The hypochondriacs were already there telling about the operation they were going to have.

Now the Commerce Department in Washington estimates the per capita income for 1948—the last year reported—at $1,410. And during 1948, the 41,578,000 Americans who paid income taxes paid a total of $18,079,000,000. Figure that up, and it amounts to roughly $535 each person paid.

And that is only Federal income tax.

Herbert Hoover, in his talk at Stanford University, showed that the average citizen works 61 days a year for the Government. What he earns in those 61 days goes to pay taxes. Mr. Hoover listed them as follows:

	Days
Obligations from former wars	11
Defense and cold war	24
Other Federal expenditures	12
State and local expenditures	14
Total	61

How many more days will we all be working for Uncle Sam if all the panaceas such as socialized medicine and the Brannan farm plan are adopted? Add the $4,700,000,000 the Federal Security Agency figures socialized medicine will cost to all your taxes and see how broke you're going to be.

Now if the Government is really interested in better health for the Nation and not just in starting up another agency to eat out our substance, we have a proposal we wish to make. And not in jest.

Why doesn't the Congress allow taxpayers to deduct from their income taxes all medical bills, and pharmacists' bills and all hospital and doctors' bills?

It wouldn't do the whole job of bettering Nation-wide health, but it would help a mighty lot. And it would save the people from paying more taxes, and it would keep our medical practice free of Government constraint. It would also end the very dangerous threat to medical advancement and learning which must follow any lessening of personal ambition.

Nobody can convince me that medical research will not decline in direct proportion to the amount of Government interference. Socialized medicine places the practice on a production-line basis, with doctors being paid so much per head per visit. It gives them the least possible time to attend individual patients or to devote to research and development.

The doctors are worried about it, and they ought to be. The reader of this column ought to be worried about it, too. Because a lot of the doctors feel like one young sawbones friend I have. He said:

"Listen, if they pass that socialized medicine proposition, anybody who calls me at 2 a. m. is going to get told to call up his congressman."

Hanley: Good Legionnaire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix to the RECORD, I wish to request the inclusion of a newspaper article regarding Joseph William Hanley, a Louisianian in the employ of the United States Government.

Mr. Hanley is one of the most active members of the American Legion in Washington, D. C., and has won many awards for obtaining membership for the American Legion posts in Washington.

In addition, Mr. Hanley takes active part in the affairs of the Louisiana State Society.

Mr. Speaker, the article to which I refer was published in the Natchitoches Enterprise, of Natchitoches, La., of date November 24, 1949, and is as follows:

GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE ON ANNUAL VISIT TO NATCHITOCHES

An annual visitor to Natchitoches, both city and parish, is Joseph William Hanley, who comes here from Washington, D. C., where he is a duly appointed employee of the United States Senate.

Mr. Hanley is a former resident of Chopin, which by the way is still his legal residence. He is at home to visit his hundreds of relatives in different parts of Louisiana and will return to his duties in Washington after the Christmas holidays.

He came via a most enjoyable trip down the eastern coast line, visiting cities in Florida before going to New Orleans. While in that city he paid tribute to the late Mrs. Allen Ellender, taking flowers to her grave.

Mr. Hanley is a veteran of World War I, having served overseas, and is a most active member of Vincent B. Costello Post No. 15, American Legion, Washington, D. C. He has won many awards for securing members for this organization.

The Potentialities of Local and State Government in Forestalling Further Centralization

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, one of the most thoughtful and scholarly speeches which it has been my privilege to hear in a long time was delivered by Prof. Edwin A. Cottrell, consultant on local government of the Haynes Foundation of Los Angeles, Calif., to the Institute of Public Affairs at Pomona College, December 3, 1949. The theme of the institute was, Can Voluntary Effort Do the Job?

I recommend Professor Cottrell's speech to everybody who is interested in the problems created by the growth of big government, with especial reference to the overlapping functions of State and Federal authority.

THE POTENTIALITIES OF LOCAL AND STATE GOVERNMENT IN FORESTALLING FURTHER CENTRALIZATION

(By Edwin A. Cottrell, consultant on local governments, Haynes Foundation, Los Angeles, Calif.; professor of political science, emeritus, Stanford University)

"Do not basely relinquish what the forefathers have with great difficulty maintained," is the Latin inscription on the gravestone of Governor Bradford in Plymouth, Mass.

Let me begin our consideration of centralization by quoting from a writer known to many of you:

"In the eleventh century of our era, the Chinese nation, under the dynasty of Sung, presented a spectacle nearly analogous to that seen in Europe, and France, especially, of late years. The great and knotty problems, questions of social and political economy filled all minds, and split into parties every class of society. Those people who at other times have seemed so indifferent to proceedings of their government, then flung themselves passionately into the discussion of systems which aimed at an immense social revolution. Matters had come to such a point, that the ordinary business of life was neglected; commerce, handicrafts, and even agriculture, were abandoned for polemical agitation. The nation was divided into two furious parties; pamphlets, libels, inflammatory writings of all kinds were daily flung profusely to the multitude, who devoured them with avidity.

"The reformer, or chief of the Socialist Party, was the famous Wang-ngan-che, a man of remarkable talent, who kept all classes of the empire in excitement during the reign of several emperors. * * *

"According to Wang-ngan-che, the carrying out of his scheme was to procure infallible happiness to the people in the development of the greatest possible material enjoyment for every one. * * *

"The first and most essential duty of the Government is to love the people and to procure them the real advantages of life, which are plenty and pleasure. To accomplish this object it would suffice to inspire everyone with the unvarying principles of rectitude; but as all might not observe them, the state should explain the manner of following these precepts, and enforce obedience by wise and inflexible laws. In order to prevent the oppression of man by man, the state should take possession of all the resources of the Empire, and become the sole master and employer. The state should take the entire management of commerce, industry, and agriculture into its own hands, with a view of succoring the working classes and preventing their being ground to the dust by the rich."

Wang-ngan-che maintained his ascendency throughout the reign of several Emperors. He overturned the country at his ease and put all his plans into execution. According to historians his plan lasted for over 100 years but, in the end, his social revolution was not successful, the nation being plunged more deeply into misery than ever.

These quotations of an early socialistic experiment, beginning in the year 1069, after the Emperor had been accused of being responsible for several epidemic maladies, earthquakes, and a severe drought, were taken from the story of the two Paulist fathers, M. Huc, who made the trip through Tartary, Tibet, and China in the years 1840 to 1857. (A Journey Through the Chinese Empire, Harper & Bros., New York, 1859, 2 vols.)

Confucius asked, "Is there a single sentence that can ruin a country? If men's words be good, is it not also good that no one oppose them? But if they are not good, and no one opposes them, may there not be expected from this one sentence the ruin of his country?" "Tax and tax; spend and spend; elect and elect" has become that single sentence in our middle twentieth century. Our own Lincoln, in 1854, gave us one of the best statements of the province of government. "The purpose of government," said Lincoln, "is to do for the people what they cannot do for themselves, or cannot do as well for themselves." Our historical past is well marked by the proposals of its statesmen to enlarge or diminish the sphere of governmental activities, mostly at the Federal level. The proposal of Henry Clay for internal improvements, public works, public schools, management and disposal of the public domain, the building of roads, canals, railroads, and harbors, were all in the interest of that familiar portion of the preamble of the Federal Constitution, and copied into many a State constitution, "promote the general welfare." The Hamiltonian theory of the duties of the Federal Government, now very generally followed by the leaders of the conservative wing of the Republican party, and recently characterized by Senator HUMPHREY as the "trickle down theory," was the establishment of all forms of tariffs and subsidies to aid manufacturers, agriculture, transportation, and other enterprises, and exemplified recently in the creation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under President Hoover; the increasing quantity of subsidies to the users and carriers of the mail; the safeguarding of waterways, and more recently of the airways; the subsidies to maritime and air service companies to assist in competition with foreign countries employing labor at a lower standard of pay than our own. All these, and others were based upon the proposition that they were, in large part at least, sustaining the national income of the people. We have accepted protectionism as a natural part of our American economy. Only the recent program of reciprocal agreements has focused attention on the abuses of the high tariff exclusion policy.

Lately the New Deal or Fair Deal theories have been uppermost in the attention of the American public mind. Security, productivity, and the basic prosperity of the people have been the justification for much of the legislation enacted during these past 16 years. We must keep up the levels of employment, provide a universal standard of common education, guaranty social security, and adequate low-cost public housing for all citizens unable to secure these benefits. We must improve conditions that encourage the maximum private and individual enterprise by placing minimum flooring under all economic undertakings—minimum wages, adequate farm-product prices; fair price laws to prevent cut-throat competition; guaranties on bank deposits; adequate retiring or old-age pensions; unemployment compensation; school lunches, school medical service, and transportation to and from home and school; development of public health facilities—clinics, hospitals, diagnostic centers, sanitoria, possibly an extension into low-cost voluntary or compulsory medical service; further development of rivers and harbors; seizure of tideland oil resources; flood control; irrigation and power works, some as individual operations, other under regional authorities, as the Tennessee Valley Authority, the California Central Valley project, or the proposed Missouri and Columbia River developments; sound soil conservation, coupled with adequate instruction to the farmer and ranger on the proper use of land and its products; rural electrification to those areas where the price of construction and distribution would be prohibitive otherwise; and assistance in slum clearance in our congested municipalities.

Subsidies or grants-in-aid have a long history. They were first introduced as land grants for schools and railroad development, a relic of the ancient glebe system of the colonies, later as monetary payments for the partial support of land-grant colleges, and more recently as 50–50 matching funds for a dozen or more programs of public works, health institutions, redevelopment of blighted areas, and sanitation projects. All of these grants stifle initiative and encourage dependency. They distort the spending program of the local units as they are obtained not for what is most needed, but for what will bring the maximum aid under a Federal or State grant. There is also considerable evidence that in handling someone else's money, or "manna from heaven," carelessness in spending and accounting has been common.

Federal-State-local relations in the field of taxation, grants-in-aid, regional development, transportation arteries, farming, resources, fuel and energy, rural electrification, RFC loans, low-rental housing, Federal ownership of nontaxable land in cities and rural areas, all pose a problem of segregation of authority. Intergovernmental fiscal competition to create and maintain activities demanded by the people has become a bankruptcy-developing race. There are, however, no sources of revenue that belong exclusively to any one Government level.

We are developing in our States a type of centralization that in some cases is wholly acceptable to all citizens and in others repugnant to the last degree. It is well establish that the administration of institutions for criminals incarcerated under State laws, mental and physical defectives; the construction and maintenance of the most important portions of the highway system, including freeways through the principal cities, and toll bridges are operations generally accepted. Under the recently repealed article XXV of the State constitution, all aid to the aged and blind was administered through central State administration rather than the counties. Many still maintain that this is better than county administration. The school system of the State is largely centralized in its administration through the standardization of curricula, textbooks, schoolhouse construction, safety, teachers' credentials, and other matters. School lunches, nursing and medical service, textbooks, bus transportation, building and facility construction are all supported, in part at least, by the State and Federal Governments. The State has administered systems of unemployment insurance, employers' compensations, pensions for public employees under direct grant of State authority or by contract with the local jurisdictions.

We like and support our public-school systems, socialistic or welfare, as many dub them. We encourage tuition-free colleges and universities, adequate teaching training, higher salaries for teachers, better school buildings and facilities, and for all the supplementary features of free lunches, transportation, textbooks, medical service, and even for an extension of these into other fields to take proper care of the younger generation. We are demanding and obtaining more and more junior colleges and extension of our State universities in order that more of our young may be able to obtain every sort of education which is advisable to aid their future careers. We don't even argue about these matters any more. We do believe, however, that there are too many small school districts with inadequate financial resources to give proper support to the necessary school operations. Distressed school districts, too proud or jealous to consolidate with larger and more prosperous districts, are a decided detriment to the education of the children within their restricted borders.

Federal aid to the secondary highway system of the country requires a coordinated or joint engineering study by all levels of government concerned in the selection of standards and programing. This makes a most complicated arrangement in our metropolitan communities where the various levels of government are all authorized to build and maintain highways and bridges. Planning, construction, and maintenance varies so widely that the traveling public suffers in its movement from one area to another. The question of freeway planning and construction has aroused considerable dispute between the local areas and the Federal and State engineering departments. The maintenance of standards to meet the requirements for the payment of subsidies or grants-in-aid from the higher to the lower governments always creates acrimonious discussion. Fluctuation in policy is due to the change of administrations, change of plans of policies of the superior government officials, and the pressure of influential groups favoring one plan or another, or advocating strong local autonomy or strong centralization in highway matters. Financial assistance from superior governments inevitably means the introduction of governmental direction of business policy, and that, in this day, is the forerunner of State control, domination, management, and ownership.

Local governments are seriously affected by national and international policies in the economic spheres. The removal or altering of a tariff schedule or rate, the assistance or lack of authorization in the development of rivers and harbors, the financing of the cold war and the European recovery program, and other policies have their direct influence in the improvement or harming of local economic conditions. Farm policies with their pegging of prices, storage of surpluses, control of acreage production, subsidies to maintain parity prices, the establishment of fair price or fair trade laws, protection of restrictive patents, all constitute a form of legal monopoly. We must all realize, however, that Government takes the responsibility to keep output at full production through long-range planning, which can be done only by some central authority.

I do not oppose Government assistance to farmers. Anyone who has to face the hazards of unpredictable weather, the rapid changes of consumption patterns, and the constantly changing price levels for things he has to purchase, is as much entitled to the artificial maintenance of high level of stable prosperity as other production groups. The whole country, in fact now, the whole world, more or less depends on the quantity of their production and level of prices to which they are entitled. The farmer must not be left to the mercy of the so-called free market. But, on the other hand, the farmer has no right to a guaranteed revenue income whether there is a demand for what he produces or not. The purchasing power must be effectively maintained at a level corresponding to the national productive capacity.

It must never be forgotten that to support the farmer, the manufacturer, and the importer, the consumer pays twice over for all his purchases, once at the store or office, and once again to the tax collector. Tariffs, subsidies for transportation, parity support, no matter what it is called, is Government placing a floor under production and distribution for the benefit of the producer at the expense of the consumer and taxpayer.

Fred G. Gurley, president of the A. T. & S. F. Railroad, speaking recently for the railroads, maintains that our entire governmental system is in danger from two groups. First, those who are opposed on ideological grounds to our system of private ownership and management of property, and, secondly, those who, while professing belief in the system, seemingly fail to see danger in accepting financial assistance from Government.

Government aid to maritime and internal waterways transportation, commercial air lines, trucking companies, and other modes of transportation through the construction and maintenance of lighthouses, harbors, wharves, warehouses, Coast Guard protection, marine hospitals, pilot service, air beacons, radio beams, special weather service, mail subsidies, airports, superhighways, and other assistance generally paid through taxation, is naturally resented by the various competitors who have been established over past years. What do people think of the subsidizing of airmail, transportation of newspapers and magazines, fishing and hunting grounds, child and prenatal clinics, recreational centers like beaches and parks, water and power supplies, forest and wild life protection, parcel post system, postal savings system, bank deposit insurance, and other operations?

States and local governments have universally furnished relief to the indigent in the form of food, clothing, and shelter; free medical and hospital services to those unable to pay the rates of the general practitioner or private hospital; free education to all; unemployment opportunities or insurance; and other services. The question now is only of wider or more adequate coverage, and by whom. We have current questions in the local economic, and unfortunately, in the political field, in the Central Valley project and Colorado River water distribution. We have depended on national and State agreements for sufficient flow of water to meet the needs of our southern California population and industry. Pressures now at work on a national scale are attempting to establish legislation which would seriously affect these agreements. Water, or the lack of it, is an ever-present threat to the economic stability of California. In the Central Valley project there is all the more reason why the people of this State should take a serious interest in this vast undertaking. This project was planned and started by the State of California and during the depression years 1933–37 was taken over by the Federal Government in order that the necessary work should be done to preserve and develop the agriculture of the State. The Bureau of Reclamation is spending something in the vicinity of $440,000,000 for irrigation and power development and the Corps of Engineers of the Army is spending many millions more in the guise of flood control of the rivers. Constant bickering between these two divisions of the Government, the local irrigation districts, and the State authorities, has brought this huge project under serious danger of failure. The important question is whether the people of California should surrender control of its agricultural development and irrigation districts in return for financial assistance from the Federal Government in the construction of the necessary works to impound and distribute the water and power.

The State might recover this necessary project and construct the remaining multiple-purpose dams and other facilities for the best interest of the farmers and people of the State. Expenditures of somewhere near the cost of construction are legally possible, either through a bond issue, borrowing from the RFC, or purchasing each segment of the plant from current income. The State has authority and the fiscal ability to acquire the entire undertaking. The needs of the local county and municipalities of the Central Valley, in fact those of the entire State would be benefited by such an acquisition. National political policy formation and control would thus be eliminated, in large part at least.

Recent court decisions regarding the tideland oil reserves which have upset the historical understanding concerning marginal and land-recovered waters, is another indication of the constant encroachment of the Federal Government over local jurisdictions. We have always known that the control of navigable rivers and harbors, no matter how shallow, was in the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. No bridge, pier, or other type of encroachment on a waterway is possible without Federal permission.

Enough of this partial listing of the operations of the central government or those of the State government which may or may not encroach on local governments. Which of these activities are subject to local control, operation, and financial support? Are we leaning on the Federal Government for too many functions, or for everything? Does the legislation which creates this condition destroy individual initiative? Where shall we draw the line of demarcation between what the individual should do for himself, what the Government should do for him, and which government is best fitted to perform

the services which he demands? What is the alternative road? We can't say take this road—follow us, without having a real program to present. The taxpayer is groaning under his burden, bound like a mummy in layer upon layer of government units. Disentangling him is not a pleasant but a thankless task.

We have introduced into our local political vocabulary lately the word "statism." In looking up this word in the dictionary, I was surprised to find, as I know others would be also, that statism is a belief in a State government, as in a republic, in contrast with belief in communism or a soviet government. The answer of those who are supporting this centralization of functions is that it offers more employment, more profits to the farmer and industrialist, more construction and expansion of plant and living facilities, more education, more service of all governmental operations to more people, and that the citizens are becoming initiative-conscious. If this is the welfare state, is the legislation which creates it demanded by the people whom it is designed to serve? Or is it improving the economic well-being of special groups in our society at the expense of others? Many people prefer to deal with a big national government and international problems rather than those of our local counties and cities. We often need a scandal in the local treasurer's office, a police shake-up, an epidemic of some controllable disease, a conflagration, a school lock-out of eligible pupils, inadequate playgrounds emphasized by street accidents to children, a failure of the water or power supply, or other function whose continuous and inconspicuous operation we take for granted, to arouse citizen interest in local affairs.

Duplication and overlapping services of several levels of government fail to disturb our people. That the milk, meat, vegetable, and other supplies that come to our tables are examined and certified by several sets of officers, all of whose salaries are charged in the cost of the articles, means little as long as someone is doing it. James F. Byrnes has stated recently: "Too many people are asking the Federal Government to perform the functions of State governments; too many people are asking the State government to perform the services needed by local governments; too many people are thinking of security instead of opportunity. They seem more afraid of life than death. * * * We are threatened with the concentration in Washington of the powers of the local governments, including the police powers, and with the imposition of creeping, but ever-advancing socialistic programs. Failure of State governments to provide more efficient government is generally due to the fact that the Federal Government has stepped in and monopolized most sources of taxation. Big government is more dangerous than big business."

Obviously the logical solution is a compromise, representing sufficient State authority to insure orderliness and uniform local improvement, with adequate retention of State investment of funds, while preserving local initiative and autonomy. Is there dictation to local units from superior Government officers? Yes, and found in practically every activity in which the superior government aids or subsidizes the inferior one. Education, welfare, health, highways, are all examples in which there is a real tendency for the Federal Government to set up rules and regulations and the local-Federal administrators to see that the local units set up the same rules and regulations with only the change of name at the top of the first page and the signature of the administrative officer at the end of the listing.

Localities differ greatly in their ability to pay for the necessary services needed by their populations. The demands made upon the governments to satisfy the social and economic needs of their populations vary widely, even within a relatively small metropolitan area. The size, density, and character of the population differ enough to make peculiar demands for particular kinds of service. City, county, and State governments must furnish more services which are absolutely needed and which, in many cases, are demanded by a vote of the people.

Functions and responsibilities of local governments expand, and we have to consider ways and means of improving the quality and efficiency of municipal government. Various arguments are used as means to kill off many progressive proposals, such as social-security measures or enlargement of the benefits of those already in operation, public housing, extension of medical facilities, and others, at the State as well as at the Federal level. Is this objection to centralization or is it to the liberal legislation wherever it is proposed?

If all governments did what they should do, including paying off their debts, furnishing sufficient and adequate public buildings, paying adequate salaries to their personnel at all levels, and operating all public services to meet popular demands, the total of all budgets would be in the vicinity of $75,000,000,000 as compared with some fifty billion at the present time. Seventy-five billion dollars is only one-third of the national income, less than one-half of all salaries and wages paid in the country last year.

The 1950 Federal budget now in operation contains 80 percent authorizations for meeting the expenses of past wars and the estimated requirements of the armed services. Twenty percent, or only eight billion out of forty-two billion, goes for natural resources, health, welfare, education, transportation, communication, postal service, and miscellaneous services.

A comparison of the budgets of 1939 and 1949 gives us some pause in understanding the road we are traveling:

Dollars per capita

1939:	
National defense	8
International affairs	15
Veterans	4
Debt payment	7
All others	49
1949:	
National defense	98
International affairs	46
Veterans	37
Debt payment	38
All others	68

"All others" in purchasing power is spending less in amount than in 1939.

A more startling presentation of the change which has taken place in our pattern of taxing and spending is illustrated in this table:

Cents on the dollar

1932:	
Federal	24.0
State	22.6
County	28.7
City	24.7
Total	100.0
1947:	
Federal	74.7
State	13.6
County	6.0
City	5.7
Total	100.0

In a total of $51,000,000,000, a peace-time high, the Federal Government has increased at the expense of local governments. In 1932 each level of government was receiving approximately one-quarter of the total tax revenue. In 1947 the proportion was three-quarters to the Federal Government and one-quarter to all the three lower levels combined.

The necessary increase in costs of government has brought with it the necessity for increasing the base of revenues. The ad valorem tax on real estate has been strained beyond the limit for many years. The introduction or adoption of taxes or fees on sales, personal or business income, trades and professions, amusements, luxuries, utilities, refuse collection, sewage disposal, automobile parking, and hotel transients, is becoming almost universal. More and more there is a demand on the State for a larger share in the centrally collected taxes such as those on automobiles, gasoline, sales, liquor, and others. The erection of an equitable and properly coordinated tax structure, with proper relationships between the Federal, State, and local governments has been long discussed, studied, reported upon, and adequately shelved for future reference. Financial self-help is the backbone of any successful democracy. Home rule and practical local autonomy must be based on ability to carry one's own fiscal load and cease mooching on superior governments—Federal and State—for financial assistance to local projects and activities.

How do we get the money to operate our local governments to the capacity demand for services? Taxes collected in California in 1948–49 amounted to $4,500,000,000, an increase from one billion in 1940–41. Of this amount the Federal Government took three billion, the State eight hundred and eighty-six million, and the local governments six hundred and eighty-seven million. The 397 largest cities in the country collected $4,000,000,000 in 1948, an increase of 16 percent over 1947. The Federal and State governments have practically monopolized all the major supplementary fields of taxation, leaving the dried-up property tax as the main source of local revenue.

Too many officials talk glibly of State and Federal aid. Aid is a false term, as all taxes, whether levied directly or indirectly, or by whatever government, come from the earnings of the people. State and Federal aid represents an avoidance of responsibility by our local officials. "He's a hero. He got us some money from Washington. He didn't tax us." Thus local public officials have not been backward in advancing on Washington, hat in hand, where temporary local enthusiasms have prompted the people of the community to go after something that Uncle Sam will give, or assist in building, primarily because the city or district next door has already received its grant. Cities have even opened headquarters in Washington for this purpose. "Living up to the Joneses," "Gimme mine," "It costs nothing; let's get ours," have all been magic words of local areas seeking relief from higher taxes assessed at home. And the sad part of the story is, that these same people never realize that they are paying the taxes which make these "free" grants possible and that those same taxes are higher than they would be if the same undertaking were done by local governments and paid for out of strictly local funds. If the local areas are in dire need, as many school districts are at the present time, then it is conceivable that some effective solution might be reached with the higher level government whereby the acute problem will be met and the local area allowed to reimburse the higher government. This is the solution, good or bad as it is, that was voted on proposition No. 1 at this last State election. There are distressed school districts where facilities for the increased pupil population are not adequate and where the taxing ability of that district has reached its legal limit, or in many cases the absolute economic limit of its residents to stand the cost of education required by our laws. Rather than depend on these superior governments, it would have been far better, and much safer for local autonomy to lay aside petty neighborhood dif-

ferences and act together to perform the necessary services on a major scale. Local governments must be given powers commensurate with the responsibilities which the State or people has placed upon them.

There is not one single major function of government in which governmental units on all four levels are not actively concerned. Fortunately, we are ignoring the old political jurisdictional boundaries in dealing with flood control, irrigation projects, soil conservation, air pollution, mosquito abatement, sanitation, water supply, and other services. Why should not the large overlapping metropolitan areas, some of them more populous and wealthier than half of our States, inaugurates more regional functional activities like our Metropolitan Water District, or the East Bay Municipal Utility District, and extend these same principles of organization and operation to transportation, street and freeway construction, recreation, schools and other cultural facilities, light and power services, collection and disposal of wastes, police protection, planning and zoning, and other operations?

We have in this State the "Joint Exercise of Powers Act of 1921" authorizing legislative or governing bodies of two or more public agencies to enter into agreements to exercise any common power jointly. Larger cities or counties may render technical assistance and professional services to smaller cities, or two or more counties or smaller cities may render a service jointly. Such joint undertakings have been programed and operated in the fields of law, planning, personnel, engineering, health, police, fire, recreation, library, water supply, power and light sanitation, and similar functions. All levels of government have developed programs within the same functional fields, and usually without any over-all planning or central coordinating agency. This procedure has brought about much overlapping, duplication, and waste. The Hoover Commission has been a prototype for many others in States and cities which are demonstrating this dislocation of functional operation.

Most of our local governments are going through a period of great financial strain. Communal housekeeping suffers the same economic struggles and pains as the individual pocketbook. There is always a demand for more and better service, modernization of housekeeping gadgets, conveniences and luxuries to keep up to the Joneses next door. The postponement of needed public works during the war caught the governments with a decreased purchasing power, necessary construction and equipment costs soaring beyond reasonable estimates, real estate values inflated and unreasonable, and personnel problems complicated by unionization of public employees demanding collective bargaining, cost of living bonuses or increased wages and salaries, specialized job assignments and featherbedding, shorter work day, longer vacations, more adequate insurance and pension allotments, and other types of industrial labor demands. Many of these may be justified and necessary in our present-day economy, but all press upon the citizen in both his personal and public capacity.

Local government officials or civic bodies must take the first step in improving the quality and amount of service rendered per tax dollar collected. Higher prices, deferred building programs, wage and salary increases, general reluctance of the voters to support bond issues or create new sources of revenue, all contribute to the dilemma of the legislator. Many liberals will agree that the present necessity of looking to Washington for the support or solution of our governmental problems can, over a period of time, result in a dangerous over-centralization of governmental power. In fact this is the very condition that will destroy utterly all semblance of local autonomy. I do not believe that this run on Washington for fiscal or security assistance is the fault of the President, of Congress, of the Republicans or Democrats, or of the local State, county, or municipal officials. This rush to the gold fields of Fort Knox is due to two conditions: First, the impatience of the people to obtain, as quickly as possible, solutions to pending troublesome conditions; and, secondly, the result of the fever of depression spending when necessity taught some of us that we could spend ourselves into prosperity and future security.

Now that we know the dangers of centralization, what are we going to do about it? What can the local governmental agencies do to prevent further centralization and avoid the evils of the present condition? What kind of government do we want in these United States? Is it to be a completely centralized one with the tax collecting, fund-appropriating, policy determination at national headquarters, or shall we preserve the historical prestige of the local control over all the problems which can be handled efficiently and economically by the smaller units of government? Are we to continue to ask the Federal Government to dole out money and to enlarge the size of its centralized control? The vanguard of our democracy has always been and must continue to be in the local community.

What shall we preserve? Where shall the line of demarcation be drawn? Have we a choice between annihilation and agreement? I sincerely believe that we have. There are three strong convictions in my mind. First, this country is going through a series of violent and rapid changes, some due to the depression of the thirties, the World War, the cold war, and others due to readjustments new to our economy. Second, the local governments are just becoming conscious of the dangers of extreme centralization of governmental activities in Washington. And third, the local governments have it within their power to bring about a new self-interest in local problems and to accomplish for themselves those services which the citizens want and for which they are able to pay. In other words, local autonomy and pay as you go, and not being dependent on second-hand money from the great Father in Washington.

The problem really is where the line should be drawn between central government expenditures for welfare of the people and opportunity of the people to develop programs for their own welfare. "You can't have a democracy until you have a certain standard of living. A people must have a certain amount of leisure in which to pay attention to the affairs of a democracy." (James T. Watkins IV.) Governor Warren, of California, has said recently, "Just as long as government is on a sound basis in our local communities, we can be sure that it will be sound nationally. If our own government is sound we will solve our national and international problems." Dr. Vannevar Bush in his newest book, "Modern Arms and Free Men," finds that the immediate danger in our country is a creeping socialism. He says that "the central problem is summarized in the idea of the welfare state. The dangers of rushing headlong into a full welfare state are very practical and very immediate," he warns. "A horde of bureaucrats takes $2 from Jones to furnish $1 to Smith and makes Smith stand in line to get it." "The next thing the United States knows," he says, "it will have taken care of everyone at the expense of everyone else, and failed to take care of the primary national interest. We cannot afford today to interfere unduly, even in the name of humanitarianism, with the diversified, vigorous, private initiative that has made us great." If the people ignore their responsibilities in their local governments, we will get the welfare state by default. For, as Bush points out, "A passion for personal security is an opiate which tends to destroy the virile characteristics which have made us great."

Suppose we were to review the operations of the Federal Government which, in many respects, parallel or overlap those of our local jurisdictions. Which of the following operations would we abolish; which would we leave in the Central Government; which would we embrace into the activities of our local governments? Taken at random we find the Federal Government carrying out the following activities of the so-called welfare state: regulation of production and distribution of food; control of exports; handling of admiralty and bankruptcy matters; supervising advertising to prevent fraud; control of the building of airports and operation of civil aeronautics; conservation of natural resources; control of farm production and prices; crop production loans; farm credit; farm mortgages; research and publications in farm operations; home loans; rural electrification; Federal Reserve supervision of commercial operations; insurance of bank deposits; control of rents; aid to the blind, aged, and crippled and dependent children; old-age and survivors' insurance; supervision of communications, power, trade, radio, interstate commerce, commodity exchanges, grain stabilization; loaning through the RFC; aids to marine and air navigation; movement of goods and crops by internal waterways; or the granting of aid to education, health institutions and hospitals, maternal and child clinics, public works, especially for irrigation and flood control, power projects like Hoover Dam, highways and bridges, tuberculosis control; unemployment insurance; workmen's compensation for injuries and industrial illness; venereal-disease control; vocational education; vocational rehabilitation; wildlife restoration; and many others. I repeat, which are you going to continue as Federal, which would you abolish, and which would you absorb for operation by the local governments?

The challenge to reestablish true democratic home rule is almost overpowering. Yes; we have the potentialities. Combined and enlightened intelligence of our citizens behind programs for recovering local autonomy can stop the trend toward centralization. We need agreement and leadership at home. We must elect and appoint men and women of real ability. We must pursue this program free from political party complexion or assistance. We have the authority. We have the fiscal ability. Local governments succeed in proportion to the efforts that citizens give attention to their communal needs, problems, and activities. They must promote a businesslike, honest, and efficient government. The quality of that government depends entirely on the quality and reasoned demands of its people. They must be alert to their situation, informed of the facts, and united in their action. It is the apathetic official and citizen with his sights on the Federal Treasury that is the greatest danger to our local institutions. Local communities are usually divided geographically and politically into clashing areas, districts, racial, religious, labor, industrial groups, school supporters versus welfare adherents, and others. Voters are seldom given an opportunity to vote intelligently on area-wide or regional problems. They are limited to expressing themselves on a small segment of a very important matter that concerns ultimately the whole region in which they live. Policies to improve regional problems of transportation, water supply, sanitation, educational facilities, police and fire services, and other matters of primary importance are not placed within their direct control. Thus it becomes an easy matter to pass these questions up to the State or Federal Government for solution. We must integrate our separate local political entities and fiscal economies to meet these larger regional problems.

Coordination or federation of local governments would simplify our fiscal problems, prevent duplication of functions, provide the necessary services more effectively and economically, destroy sectional or provincial jealousies and pride, recover an interest of the suburbanite who has left the crowded city for the freer living conditions of the country, but those vital interests are still within the more populous area, and more important of all, establish the local region as a control agency for the satisfaction of the necessities of communal living.

"The dog in the kennel barks at his fleas, but the dog who is hunting does not feel them."—Chinese maxim.

Cancer Research Should Be a Function of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the scourge of cancer kills off many thousands of people each year in the prime of their life. I have long urged that cancer research should not be left entirely in the hands of private scientific research with limited means, but that a concerted drive supported and financed by our Government should be undertaken at the earliest possible date. The aid of all scientists and specialists in this field should be enlisted in the hope of finding the causes of this dread disease and to conquer it as we have successfully conquered other diseases with which mankind was afflicted in the past.

A suggestion along these lines is contained in a recent article in the Brooklyn Eagle. I am sure many Members of this House will find the suggestion, made by Mr. Julius Miller, of Brooklyn, both interesting and stimulating. I am proud to number him among my friends. The article entitled "He'd Mass United States Scientists for All-Out Cancer Battle," written by Richard J. Roth, was published on December 4, 1949. It reads:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—HE'D MASS UNITED STATES SCIENTISTS FOR ALL-OUT CANCER BATTLE

(By Richard J. Roth)

Eagerness—about his work and family, about life itself, in fact—could well be considered the prime characteristic of Julius Miller. He radiates that quality and he continually encourages his associates to do the same.

"The word for personality is eagerness" is the way the energetic president of the Rand Stores, Brooklyn's giant cleaning chain, sums up what might be called his philosophy of life.

This enthusiasm has paid dividends for the 45-year-old executive, and it has paid dividends for Brooklyn. To it he attributes the rapid growth of the Rand chain, which began less than 20 years ago with a tiny Kings Highway store and now boasts 72 borough establishments.

HE AIMS AT CANCER

Mr. Miller has carried his spirit with him into other fields of endeavor with equally successful results. His greatest hope today is that his success will continue, that he'll be able to pass on this quality to his fellow Americans in his latest and most important activity—the marshaling of the American assembly line genius into the fight against cancer.

Not long ago, after cancer killed a close friend, Mr. Miller determined to do something about the scourge. Recalling the miracle that had been wrought at Oak Ridge during the war he posed a question for himself:

"Why shouldn't cancer research be a function of the Government, like the atomic project, with the greatest figures in science working together, perhaps under one roof, concentrating their efforts and collecting and collating the results of their experiments?"

WANTS CONCENTRATED ACTION

Mr. Miller is determined to have his question answered. Although acknowledging the value of public collections to help care for those stricken he feels that without the concentrated effort of the Nation's researchers only the surface of the real problem can be scratched.

"Are we going to have a project like finding the cure for cancer depend on the collection of dimes?" he asked. "This idea of getting people together to cooperate on something like this is not far-fetched. We shouldn't need a war to show us what can be done. We should be more farsighted."

The Miller campaign already is under way. A letter to President Truman brought a sympathetic reply, and Mr. Miller has contacted several members of Congress and other influential persons to rally their support. There are bills before Congress which would incorporate many of his ideas, and he is hopeful that the coming session will see some of them enacted.

Mr. Miller was born in lower Manhattan in 1904 and lived for a few years in the Bronx before he came to Brooklyn about 26 years ago. Following his graduation from Evander Childs High School he entered New York University, where he earned a law degree.

SEES BIG OPPORTUNITY

After successfully practicing law for a short time he decided to join his father, Philip Miller, and his brother, Leon, in the cleaning store they had started at 161 Kings Highway. From an investigation of chain-store cleaning methods he had made for a law client, Julius, who always has been interested in science, saw a great opportunity for a low-cost, big-volume cleaning business in Brooklyn.

As two decades slipped by new Rand Stores were added every year until today there are 72 scattered all over Brooklyn with a modern, 65,000 square-foot headquarters and plant at 4201 Avenue H. More than 650 men and women are employed and Mr. Miller prides himself on the fact that he knows the majority of his Rand workers—"they're a wonderful group with a wonderful spirit of eagerness"—by name.

HAS APPEARED ON TV

As expert at cleaning as any one in the industry, in which he is highly regarded, Mr. Miller has appeared on television programs to demonstrate effective methods of stain removal, a science which he finds fascinating. Generally, however, he can be seen at the receiving end of television, which he enjoys very much in his East Twenty-seventh Street home.

Chess captain in hig'ı school, Mr. Miller still finds time for a game now and then with his sons, Danny, 13, and Jimmy 8, both students in Public School 193. His wife, Belle, is active in many community affairs, particularly as vice president of the school's Parents Association and of Midwood chapter, B'nai B'rith. She's also a stanch supporter of the Mary Richter League of the National Children's Cardiac Home at Miami, a favorite charity of her husband.

Besides the 150 charities aided by Rand, the untiring executive holds office in both the United Jewish Appeal and the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies drives. He's also a member of the advisory board of the East Midwood Jewish Center.

In the professional field Mr. Miller is chairman of the board of the Empire State Chain Cleaning Stores Association and a director of the New York State Cleaners and Dyers Association. He is a vice chairman of the Brooklyn Orchestral Society.

Not long ago the Bear Club was organized at Rand to recognize employees who typify the initial letters of "Be Eager About Rand." The members, now numbering 53, are eligible for theater parties and other treats.

The club members are outstanding examples of the influence of Mr. Miller, but it's a cinch that none exemplifies eagerness more than their employer. He's eager about life and his contagious enthusiasm is making itself felt in Brooklyn.

The Unemployment Compensation Program Should Be Extended and Improved

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the text of the bill I am introducing today which provides for the extension and improvement of our unemployment compensation program. I also include a brief summary explaining the principal provisions of the bill. These follow:

A bill to extend and improve the unemployment compensation program, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the "Employment Security Amendments of 1950."

SEC. 2. Effective January 1, 1951, sections 301 and 302 of the Social Security Act, as amended, are amended to read as follows:

"FEDERAL UNEMPLOYMENT ACCOUNT

"SEC. 301. (a) There is hereby appropriated to the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund for the period beginning January 1, 1951, and ending June 30, 1951, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for each fiscal year thereafter, amounts equivalent to 100 percent of the taxes (including interest, penalties, and additions to the taxes) received after December 31, 1950, under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and covered into the Treasury. There is also authorized to be appropriated to the Federal unemployment account such additional sums as may be required to carry out the purposes of this title.

"(b) For the purpose of assisting the States in the administration of their unemployment compensation laws, and in the establishment and maintenance of a system of public employment offices in accordance with the provisions of the act of June 3, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, there is hereby authorized to be expended, for payments to the States, from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each fiscal year thereafter, sums not to exceed the amounts, including amounts to be expended only in the event of unforeseen changes in conditions, specified by Congress in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for each such fiscal year.

"(c) There is authorized to be expended from the Federal unemployment account

for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, and for each fiscal year thereafter, a sum not to exceed the amounts specified by Congress in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor to be necessary for the administration by the Department of Labor of its functions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and this title and titles IX and XII of the Social Security Act and the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended.

"PAYMENTS TO STATES

"SEC. 302. (a) The Secretary of Labor shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State which (a) has an unemployment compensation law approved by the Secretary under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act, and (b) which is in compliance with the act of June 6, 1933 (48 Stat. 113), as amended, such amounts as the Secretary determines to be necessary for the proper and efficient administration of such law during the fiscal year for which such payment is made. The Secretary's determination shall be based on (1) the population of the State; (2) an estimate of the number of persons covered by the State law and of the cost of proper and efficient administration of such law; and (3) such other factors as the Secretary finds relevant. The Secretary shall not certify for payment under this subsection in any fiscal year a total amount in excess of the amount specified for such purpose in the appropriation act or acts for the Department of Labor for such fiscal year.

"(b) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (a), pay from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 303 (a) (1) of the Social Security Act is amended by inserting after the words "when due" the following: "and such methods for the prevention, detection, and administrative adjudication of cases involving willful misrepresentation or nondisclosure of material facts as are found by the Secretary to be reasonably calculated to insure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto."

(b) Section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new paragraph:

"(10) Participation in plans and methods for the combining of wage credits earned under the State law and wage credits earned under the unemployment compensation law of other States or the Federal Government, and for the payment of interstate claims, as are found by the Secretary to be reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits in such situations."

SEC. 4. Title III of the Social Security Act is amended by adding the following section:

"SEC. 304. The term 'State' when used in this title includes Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia."

SEC. 5. Effective January 1, 1950, title XII of the Social Security Act is amended to read as follows:

"TITLE XII. GRANTS TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUNDS

"SEC. 1201. (a) A State shall be entitled to a reinsurance grant if on March 31, 1950, or on the last day of any ensuing calendar quarter, (1) the balance in a State unemployment fund does not exceed a sum equal to the amount of compensation paid under the unemployment compensation law of the State from the State fund during such quarter and the immediately preceding quarter, and (2) the minimum rate of contribution required to be paid into the State fund was not less than 1.2 percent during each of the taxable years after 1952, or after 1957, during each of the five most recently completed taxable years if, on the computation date for such taxable year, the balance in the State's fund did not exceed a sum equal to 6 percent of the most recent taxable pay roll or the amount of compensation paid under the State unemployment compensation law from the State fund during the 2 years immediately preceding such date whichever is the higher. A reinsurance grant shall be an amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor to be equal to three-fourths of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State law during the next calendar quarter over 2 percent of the remuneration paid during such quarter and subject to the State unemployment compensation law.

"(b) The Secretary is authorized and directed, on application of a State agency, to make findings as to whether the conditions entitling a State to a reinsurance grant provided for in subsection (a) hereof have been met; and if such conditions exist, the Secretary is directed to certify, to the Secretary of the Treasury, from time to time, the amount of such grant, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that the amounts granted for any prior quarter were greater or less than the amounts to which the State was entitled for such quarter. The application of a State agency shall be made on such forms, and contain such information and data, fiscal and otherwise concerning the operation and administration of the State law, as the Secretary deems necessary or relevant to the performance of his duties hereunder.

"(c) The Secretary of the Treasury shall, upon receiving a certification under subsection (b), pay from the Federal unemployment account in the unemployment trust fund, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, in accordance with such certification.

"(d) All money paid to a State under this title shall be used solely for unemployment compensation benefits; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury to the credit of the Federal Unemployment Account when such State is no longer eligible for a reinsurance grant."

SEC. 6. Section 904(h) of the Social Security Act is amended by striking out "1949," occurring in the second sentence after the words "December 31," and before the words "over the" and inserting in lieu thereof "1950;" and by striking out the third sentence thereof.

SEC. 7. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1600 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1600. Rate of tax.

"Every employer (as defined in sec. 1606 (a)) shall pay for the calendar year 1950 and for each calendar year thereafter an excise tax with respect to having individuals in his employ equal to 1.5 percent of the total wages (as defined in sec. 1606 (b)) paid by him during the calendar year with respect to employment (as defined in sec. 1606 (c)) after December 31, 1949."

SEC. 8. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1601 of the Internal Revenue Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1601. Credits against tax.

"(a) Contributions to State unemployment fund:

"(1) The taxpayer may, to the extent provided in this subsection and subsection (b), credit against the tax imposed by section 1600 the amount of contributions paid by him into an unemployment fund maintained during the taxable year under the unemployment compensation law of a State which is certified for the taxable year as provided in section 1602.

"(2) The credit shall be permitted against the tax for the taxable year only for the amount of contributions paid with respect to such taxable year.

"(3) The credit against the tax for any taxable year shall be permitted only for contributions paid on or before the last day upon which the taxpayer is required under section 1603 to file a return for such year; except that credit shall be permitted for contributions paid after such last day, but such credit shall not exceed 90 percent of the amount which would have been allowable as credit on account of such contributions had they been paid on or before such last day.

"(4) Upon the payment of contributions into the unemployment fund of a State which are required under the unemployment-compensation law of that State with respect to remuneration on the basis of which, prior to such payment into the proper fund, the taxpayer erroneously paid an amount as contributions under another unemployment compensation law, the payment into the proper fund shall, for purposes of credit against the tax, be deemed to have been made at the time of the erroneous payment. If, by reason of such other law, the taxpayer was entitled to cease paying contributions with respect to services subject to such other law, the payment into the proper fund, shall for purposes of credit against the tax, be deemed to have been made on the date the return for the taxable year was filed under section 1603.

"(b) Limit on credit: The credit allowed to a taxpayer under this subchapter shall not exceed 80 percent of the tax against which such credit is allowable.

"(c) Refund or credit: Refund or credit of the tax (including penalty and interest collected with respect thereto, if any), based on any credit allowable under this section, may be made in accordance with the provisions of law applicable in the case of erroneous or illegal collection of the tax (including statutes of limitations). No interest shall be allowed or paid on the amount of any such credit or refund."

SEC. 9. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1602 of the Internal Revenue Code is repealed.

SEC. 10. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1603 of the Internal Revenue Code is renumbered as section 1602 and amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 1602. Approval of State laws.

"(a) Requirements: The Secretary shall approve any State law submitted to him, within 30 days of such submission, which he finds provides that—

"(1) All compensation is to be paid through public employment offices or such other agencies as the Secretary may approve;

"(2) No compensation shall be payable with respect to any day of unemployment occurring within 2 years after the first day of the first period with respect to which contributions are required;

"(3) All money received in the unemployment fund shall (except for refunds of sums erroneously paid into such fund and except for refunds paid in accordance with the provisions of sec. 1606 (b)) immediately upon such receipt be paid over to the Secretary of the Treasury to the credit of the unemployment trust fund established by section 904 of the Social Security Act;

"(4) All money withdrawn from the unemployment fund of the State shall be used solely in the payment of unemployment compensation, exclusive of expenses of administration, and for refunds of sums erroneously paid into such fund and refunds paid in accordance with the provisions of section 1606 (b): *Provided*, That an amount equal to the amount of employee payments into the unemployment fund of a State may be used in the payment of cash benefits to individuals with respect to their disability, exclusive of expenses of administration;

"(5) All the rights, privileges, or immunities conferred by such law or by acts done pursuant thereto shall exist subject to the power of the legislature to amend or repeal such law at any time.

"(6) Effective July 1, 1952, compensation is payable to insured individuals for a week of total unemployment in amounts (up to a maximum of at least $30) generally equal to at least 50 percent of the weekly wages of such individuals if they have no dependents, 60 percent (up to a maximum of at least $36) for individuals with one dependent, 65 percent (up to a maximum of at least $39) for individuals with two dependents, and 70 percent (up to maximum of at least $42) for individuals with three or more dependents;

"(7) Effective July 1, 1952, compensation will not be denied to an insured individual (except in the case of willful misrepresentation or nondisclosure of material fact) by reason of exhaustion or reduction of his benefit rights or cancellation of his wage credits until he has been paid within his benefit year an amount equal to 26 times the weekly amount of compensation which he is entitled to receive for total unemployment;

"(8) Effective July 1, 1952, an individual shall be insured for compensation if he has been paid in his base period as much as 18 times his 'weekly wages' as defined herein.

"(9) Effective July 1, 1952, compensation will not be denied, except by reason of exhaustion of benefit rights, to any insured individual who is able to work and is available for suitable work: *Provided*, That such approval shall not be withheld because of provisions denying compensation under any of the following conditions: (A) For the first week of unemployment occurring within the benefit year; (B) for a period not in excess of the 4 weeks immediately following the week in which (i) the individual left suitable work without good cause (including compelling personal cause); or (ii) the individual was discharged or suspended for misconduct connected with his work; or (iii) the individual refused suitable work without good cause (including compelling personal cause); (C) for any week in which individual left or lost his employment due to a stoppage of work which exists because of a strike at the immediate factory, establishment, or other premises at which the individual is or was last employed and for any subsequent weeks not in excess of 8 weeks in which an individual, having so left or lost his employment, continues to be unemployed due to such stoppage of work and the individual is participating in or directly interested in the strike or is a member of a grade or class of workers any of whom were participating in or directly interested in the strike; (D) with respect to any individual who makes a false statement or representation with respect to a material fact knowing it to be false, or who knowingly fails to disclose a material fact with the intent to obtain or increase any payment of compensation.

"(10) Effective July 1, 1952, work under any of the following conditions shall not be deemed suitable for any individual:

"(A) If the position is vacant due directly to a strike, lock-out, or other labor dispute;

"(B) If, as a condition or consequence of being employed, the individual would be required to join a company union or to resign from, or refrain from joining, any bona fide labor organization;

"(C) If the wage rate, weekly earnings, hours, or other conditions of the work are substantially less favorable to the individual than those prevailing for similar work in the locality."

"(b) Notification: The Secretary shall, upon approving such law, notify the Governor of the State of his approval.

"(c) Certification: On December 31 of each taxable year the Secretary shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury each State whose law he had previously approved, except that he shall not certify any State which, after reasonable notice and opportunity for hearing to the State agency, the Secretary finds has changed its law so that it no longer contains the provisions specified in subsection (a) or has with respect to such taxable year failed to comply substantially with any such provision.

"(d) Notice of noncertification: If, at any time during the taxable year, the Secretary has reason to believe that a State whose law he has previously approved, may not be certified under subsection (c), he shall promptly so notify the Governor of such State."

SEC. 11. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by renumbering sections 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, 1608, and 1609 as sections 1603, 1604, 1605, 1606, 1607, and 1608, respectively.

SEC. 12. Effective January 1, 1952, section 1606 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(a) Employer: The term 'employer' means any person who, at at any time during the taxable year, has one or more individuals in employment."

SEC. 13. (a) Section 1606 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(b) Wages: The term 'wages' means all remuneration for employment, including the cash value of all remuneration paid in any medium other than cash; except that such term shall not include—

"(1) That part of the remuneration which, after remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection) equal to $4,800 with respect to employment has been paid to an individual by an employer during any calendar year, is paid to such individual by such employer during such calendar year. If an employer during any calendar year acquires substantially all the property used in a trade or business of another person (hereinafter referred to as a predecessor), or used in a separate unit of a trade or business of a predecessor, and immediately after the acquisition employs in his trade or business an individual who immediately prior to the acquisition was employed in the trade or business of such predecessor, then, for the purpose of determining whether such employer has paid remuneration (other than remuneration referred to in the succeeding paragraphs of this subsection) with respect to employment equal to $4,800 to such individual during such calendar year, any remuneration with respect to employment paid (or considered under this paragraph as having been paid) to such individual by such predecessor during such calendar year and prior to such acquisition shall be considered as having been paid by such employer;

"(2) The amount of any payment made to, or on behalf of, an employee under a plan or system established by an employer which makes provision for his employees generally or for a class or classes of his employees (including any amount paid by an employer for insurance or annuities, or into a fund, to provide for any such payment), on account of (A) retirement, or (B) sickness or accident disability, or (C) medical or hospitalization expenses in connection with sickness or accident disability, or (D) death;

"(3) Any payment made to an employee (including any amount paid by an employer for insurance or annuities, or into a fund, to provide for any such payment) on account of retirement;

"(4) Any payment on account of sickness or accident disability, or medical or hospitalization expenses in connection with sickness or accident disability, made by an employer to, or on behalf of, an employee after the expiration of six calendar months following the last calendar month in which the employees worked for such employer;

"(5) Any payment made to, or on behalf of, an employee (A) from or to a trust exempt from tax under section 165 (a) at the time of such payment unless such payment is made to an employee of the trust as remuneration for services rendered as such employee and not as a beneficiary of the trust, or (B) under or to an annuity plan which, at the time of such payment, meets the requirements of section 165 (a) (3), (4), and (6);

"(6) The payment by an employer (without deduction from the remuneration of the employee) (a) of the tax imposed upon an employee under section 1400, or (B) of any payment required from an employee under a State unemployment compensation law;

"(7) Remuneration paid in any medium other than cash to an employee for service not in the course of the employer's trade or business; or

"(8) Any payment (other than vacation or sick pay) made to an employee after the month in which he attains the age of 65, if he did not work for the employer in the period for which such payment is made.

"Tips and other cash remuneration customarily received by an employee in the course of his employment from persons other than the person employing him shall, for the purposes of this title, be considered as remuneration paid to him by his employer; except that, in the case of tips, only so much of the amount thereof received during any calendar quarter as the employee, before the expiration of 10 days after the close of such quarter, reports in writing to his employer as having been received by him in such quarter shall be considered as remuneration paid by his employer, and the amount so reported shall be considered as having been paid to him by his employer on the date on which such report is made to the employer."

(b) The amendment made by this section shall be applicable only with respect to remuneration paid after 1951. In the case of remuneration paid prior to 1952, the determination under section 1607 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code (prior to its amendment by this act) of whether or not such remuneration constituted wages shall be made as if subsection (a) had not been enacted and without inferences drawn from the fact that the amendment made by subsection (a) is not made applicable to periods prior to 1952.

SEC. 14. (a) Section 1606 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(c) Employment: The term 'employment' means any service performed prior to July 1, 1946, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed, and any services performed after July 1, 1946, and prior to January 1, 1952, which was employment as defined in this section as in effect at the time the service was performed, and any service of whatever nature performed after December 31, 1951, either (A) by an employee for the person employing him irrespective of the citizenship or residence or either, (i) within the United States, or (ii) on or in connection with an American vessel or American aircraft under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States or during the performance of which the vessel or aircraft touches a point in the United States, if the employee is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States, or (B) outside the United States by a citizen or resident of the United States as an employee for an American employer under a contract of service which is entered into within the United States; except that in the case of service performed after December 31, 1951, such term shall not include:

"(1) Agricultural labor (as defined in subsection (e));

"(2) Domestic service in a private home;

"(3) Service not in the course of the employer's trade or business performed in any

calendar quarter by an employee, unless the cash remuneration paid for such service is $25 or more and such service is performed by an individual who is regularly employed by such employer to perform such service. For the purposes of this paragraph, an individual shall be deemed to be regularly employed by an employer during a calendar quarter only if (A) such individual performs for such employer service not in the course of the employer's trade or business during some portion of at least 26 days during such quarter, or (B) if such individual was regularly employed (as determined under clause (A)), by such employer in the performance of such service during the preceding calendar quarter;

"(4) Service performed by an individual in the employ of his son, daughter, or spouse, and service performed by a child under the age of 21 in the employ of his father or mother;

"(5) Service performed by an individual on or in connection with a vessel not an American vessel or on or in connection with an aircraft not an American aircraft, if the individual is employed on and in connection with such vessel or aircraft when outside the United States;

"(6) Service performed in the employ of the United States Government or of an instrumentality of the United States which is (A) wholly owned by the United States, or (B) exempt from the tax imposed by section 1600 by virtue of any other provision of law;

"(7) Service which is performed in the employ of a State, or any political subdivision thereof, or any instrumentality of any one or more of the foregoing which is wholly owned by one or more States or political subdivisions; or which is performed in the employ of any instrumentality of one or more States or political subdivisions to the extent that the instrumentality is, with respect to such service, immune under the Constitution of the United States from the tax imposed by section 1600;

"(8) Service performed by a duly ordained, commissioned, or licensed minister of a church in the regular exercise of his ministry or service performed by a regular member of a religious order in the exercise of duties required by such order;

"(9) Service performed by an individual as an employee or employee representative as defined in section 1532;

"(10) (A) Service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of any organization exempt from income tax under section 101, if the remuneration for such service is less than $100;

"(B) Service performed in any calendar quarter in the employ of a school, college, or university, not exempt from income tax under section 101, if such service is performed by a student who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes at such school, college, or university and the remuneration for such service does not exceed $100, exclusive of room, board, and tuition.

"(11) Service performed in the employ of a foreign government (including service as a consular or other officer or employee or a nondiplomatic representative);

"(12) Service performed in the employ of an instrumentality wholly owned by a foreign government—

"(A) If the service is of a character similar to that performed in foreign countries by employees of the United States Government or of an instrumentality thereof; and

"(B) If the Secretary of State shall certify to the Secretary of the Treasury that the foreign government, with respect to whose instrumentality exemption is claimed, grants an equivalent exemption with respect to similar service performed in the foreign country by employees of the United States Government and of instrumentalities thereof;

"(13) Service performed as a student nurse in the employ of a hospital or a nurses' training school by an individual who is enrolled and is regularly attending classes in a nurses' training school chartered or approved pursuant to State law; and service performed as an interne in the employ of a hospital by an individual who has completed a 4 years' course in a medical school chartered or approved pursuant to State law;

"(14) (A) Service performed by an individual under the age of 18 in the delivery or distribution of newspapers or shopping news, not including delivery or distribution to any point for subsequent delivery or distribution;

"(B) Service performed by an individual in, and at the time of, the sale of newspapers or magazines to ultimate consumers, under an arrangement under which the newspapers or magazines are to be sold by him at a fixed price, his compensation being based on the retention of the excess of such price over the amount at which the newspapers or magazines are charged to him, whether or not he is guaranteed a minimum amount of compensation for such service, or is entitled to be credited with the unsold newspapers or magazines turned back.

"(15) Service performed in the employ of an international organization;

"(16) Service performed by an individual in (or as an officer or member of the crew of a vessel while it is engaged in) the catching, taking, harvesting, cultivating, or farming of any kind of fish, shellfish, crustacea, sponges, seaweeds, or other aquatic forms of animal and vegetable life (including service performed by any such individual as on ordinary incident to any such activity), except (A) service performed in connection with the catching or taking of salmon or halibut, for commercial purposes, and (B) service performed on or in connection with a vessel of more than 10 net tons (determined in the manner provided for determining the register tonnage of merchant vessels under the laws of the United States)."

(b) Section 1606 (i) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(i) Employee: the term 'employee' means——

"(1) any officer of a corporation; or

"(2) any individual who, under the usual common law rules applicable in determining the employer-employee relationship, has the status of an employee. For purposes of this paragraph, if an individual (either alone or as a member of a group) performs service for any other person under a written contract expressly reciting that such person shall have complete control over the performance of such service and that such individual is an employee, such individual with respect to such service shall, regardless of any modification not in writing, be deemed an employee of such person (or, if such person is an agent or employee with respect to the execution of such contract, the employee of the principal or employer of such person); or

"(3) any individual (other than an individual who is an employee under paragraph (1) or (2) of this subsection) who performs services for remuneration for any person——

"(A) as an outside salesman in the manufacturing or wholesale trade;

"(B) as a full-time life-insurance salesman;

"(C) as a driver-lessee of a taxicab;

"(D) as a home worker on materials or goods which are furnished by the person for whom the services are performed and which are required to be returned to such person or to a person designated by him;

"(E) as a contract logger;

"(F) as a lessee or licensee of space within a mine when substantially all of the product of such services is required to be sold or turned over to the lessor or licensor; or

"(G) as a house-to-house salesman if under the contract of service or in fact such individual (i) is required to meet a minimum sales quota, or (ii) is expressly or impliedly required to furnish the services with respect to designated or regular customers or customers along a prescribed route, or (iii) is prohibited from furnishing the same or similar services for any other person—

if the contract of service contemplates that substantially all of such services (other than the services described in subparagraph (F) are to be performed personally by such individual; except that an individual shall not be included in the term 'employee' under the provisions of this paragraph if such individual has a substantial investment (other than the investment by a salesman in facilities for transportation) in the facilities of the trade, occupation, business, or profession with respect to which the services are performed, or if the services are in the nature of a single transaction not part of a continuing relationship with the person for whom the services are performed; or

"(4) any individual who is not an employee under paragraph (1), (2), or (3) of this subsection but who, in the performance of service for any person for remuneration, has with respect to such service, the status of an employee, as determined by the combined effect of (A) control over the individual, (B) permanency of the relationship, (C) regularity and frequency of performance of the service, (D) integration of the individual's work in the business to which he renders service, (E) lack of skill required of the individual, (F) lack of investment by the individual in facilities for work, and (G) lack of opportunities of the individual for profit or loss."

(c) Section 1606 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by inserting "Puerto Rico," after "Hawaii," and by adding at the end thereof the following:

"The term 'United States' when used in the geographical sense includes Puerto Rico."

(d) Section 1606 (1) of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended to read as follows:

"(1) Agricultural labor: The term 'agricultural labor' includes all services performed—

"(1) On a farm, in the employ of any person, in connection with cultivating the soil, or in connection with raising or harvesting any agricultural or horticultural commodity, including the raising, shearing, feeding, caring for, training, and management of livestock, bees, poultry, and fur-bearing animals and wildlife.

"(2) In the employ of the owner or tenant or other operator of a farm, in connection with the operation, management, conservation, improvement, or maintenance of such farm and its tools and equipment, or in salvaging timber or clearing land of brush and other debris left by a hurricane, if the major part of such service is performed on a farm.

"(3) In connection with the production or harvesting of any commodity defined as an agricultural commodity in section 15 (g) of the Agricultural Marketing Act, as amended, or in connection with the ginning of cotton.

"(4) (A) In the employ of the operator of a farm in handling, planting, drying, packing, packaging, processing, freezing, grading, storing, or delivering to storage or to market or to a carrier for transportation to market, in its unmanufactured state, any agricultural or horticultural commodity; but only if such operator produced more than one-half of the commodity with respect to which such service is performed.

"(B) In the employ of a group of operators of farms (other than a cooperative organization) in the performance of services described in subparagraph (a), but only if such operators produced all of the commodity with respect to which such service is performed. For the purposes of this subparagraph, any unincorporated group of operators shall be

deemed a cooperative organization if the number of operators comprising such group is more than twenty at any time during the calendar quarter in which such service is performed.

"(C) The provisions of subparagraphs (A) and (B) shall not be deemed to be applicable with respect to service performed in connection with commercial canning or commercial freezing or in connection with any agricultural or horticultural commodity after its delivery to a terminal market for distribution for consumption. As used in this section, the term 'farm' includes stock, dairy, poultry, fruit, fur-bearing animal, and truck farms, plantations, ranches, nurseries, ranges, greenhouses or other similar structures used primarily for the raising of agricultural or horticultural commodities, and orchards."

(e) Section 1606 of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by striking out subsection (m) and (n) and adding the following new subsections:

"(m) American vessel and American aircraft: The term 'American vessel' means any vessel documented or numbered under the laws of the United States; and includes any vessel which is neither documented or numbered under the laws of the United States nor documented under the laws of any foreign country, if its crew is employed solely by one or more citizens or residents of the United States or corporations organized under the laws of the United States or of any State, and the term 'American aircraft' means an aircraft registered under the laws of the United States.

"(n) American employer: The term 'American employer' means (1) an individual who is a resident of the United States, (2) a partnership, if two-thirds or more of the partners are residents of the United States, (3) a trust if all of the trustees are residents of the United States, (4) a corporation organized under the laws of the United States or of any State.

"(o) Benefit year: The term 'benefit year' means the benefit period, not in excess of fifty-two consecutive weeks, prescribed in the State unemployment compensation law.

"(p) Base period: The term 'base period' means such period, not in excess of fifty-two consecutive weeks as may be defined in the State unemployment compensation law for the determination of the qualifying requirement.

"(q) Dependent: The term 'dependent' means, with respect to an individual as of the initiation of a benefit year, an unmarried child (including a stepchild or adopted child (who is under the age of 18 and who is living with such individual or receiving regular payments toward his support from such individual; and a wife (or a husband unable to work) who is living with or receiving regular support from such individual and who is not regularly engaged in rendering services for remuneration or in any occupation for profit, and who is not in receipt of unemployment compensation.

"(r) High quarter wages: The term 'high quarter wages' means with respect to an individual, the amount of wages (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law) paid to such individual in that calendar quarter of the base period in which the total of such wages was highest.

"(s) Weekly wages: The term 'weekly wages' means, with respect to an individual, the amount of wages (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law) paid to such individual during the period used for determining his compensation for a week of total unemployment (1) divided by 13 if it is the calendar quarter in which such individual was paid his high quarter wages; or (2) divided by the number of weeks, in the period used, in which he performed services in employment (as defined in the State unemployment compensation law).

"(t) Week of unemployment: The term 'week of unemployment' as used in paragraph 9 of section 1602 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended by section 11 of this act, means, with respect to an individual, a week during which such individual performs less than full-time services if the remuneration payable to him for such week is less than the compensation payable to him for a week of total unemployment."

(f) The amendments made by this section shall be effective January 1, 1952.

SEC. 15. Section 1608 of the Internal Revenue Code as renumbered herein is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "The Secretary of Labor shall utilize appropriate means for consulting with the States on matters of policy with respect to any rules or regulations affecting the States which he may make under this section for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this subchapter or for insuring effective compliance by the States with any of such provisions."

SEC. 16. The effective date of sections 4 and 11 (c) of this act shall be January 1 of the first calendar year which begins more than 90 days after the date on which the Governor of Puerto Rico certifies to the President of the United States that the legislature of Puerto Rico has by concurrent resolution resolved that it desires the extension to Puerto Rico of the provisions of titles III, IX, and XII of the Social Security Act, as amended, and of subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended.

SEC. 17. The Internal Revenue Code is hereby amended by inserting the following new section:

"SEC. 1609. Provisions relating to Puerto Rico: (a) Notwithstanding any other provision of law respecting taxation in Puerto Rico, all taxes imposed by this subchapter shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue under the direction of the Secretary and shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States as internal-revenue collections.

"(b) The provisions of section 1602 (a) (2) of subchapter C of the Internal Revenue Code, as amended, shall not be applicable with respect to Puerto Rico, and paragraphs (6), (7), and (8) of section 1602 (a) of such law, as hereby amended, shall not be applicable with respect to Puerto Rico until 4 years after the effective date of sections 4 and 11 (c) of this act.

SEC. 18. The Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new title at the end thereof:

"TITLE XIV. UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

"SEC. 1401. Definitions: When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'Federal services' means services including services performed outside the United States by a resident of the United States performed after 1948 for the United States, or any instrumentality thereof which are not included as employment under section 1607 of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act solely by reason of section 1607 (c) (6) except that the term shall not include services performed by an elective officer in the executive or legislative branches of the Government of the United States, or services performed in the military or naval forces of the United States.

"(b) The term 'Federal wages' means the remuneration paid for Federal services after 1948 including cash allowances and remuneration in any medium other than cash.

"(c) The term 'Federal employee' means an individual who has performed Federal services.

"(d) The term 'benefits' means cash benefits payable to individuals with respect to their unemployment (including any portion thereof payable with respect to dependents).

"SEC. 1402. Information concerning Federal services and wages: All Federal departments, agencies, and instrumentalities of the United States are directed to make available to State agencies who have entered into agreements under this title or to the Secretary of Labor, as the case may be, such information with respect to the Federal services and Federal wages of any individual as the Secretary of Labor may find practicable and necessary for the determination of the individual's entitlement to benefits under this title.

"SEC. 1403. Benefits for Federal employees:

"(a) The Secretary of Labor is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of benefits, on the basis provided in subsection (b) to Federal employees and (2) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State agencies in making payments of benefits authorized by this title.

"(b) Any such agreement shall provide that benefits will be paid to Federal employees, with respect to unemployment occurring after January 1, 1951, in the same amount, on the same terms and subject to the same conditions as the benefits which would be payable to such individuals under the unemployment compensation law of the State in which he last performed Federal services if such individual's Federal services and Federal wages had (subject to regulations of the Secretary concerning the allocation of such services and wages among the several States) been included as employment and wages under such law provided, that in the case of an individual who last performed Federal services outside of any State, his benefits shall be determined under the unemployment compensation law of the State of his residence.

"(c) If in the case of any State an agreement is not entered into under this section or the State agency of such State fails to make payments in accordance with such an agreement, the Secretary, in accordance with regulations prescribed by him, shall make payments of benefits to individuals who file a claim for benefits which is payable under such agreement, or would be payable if such agreement were entered into, on a basis which will provide that they will be paid benefits in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such agreements had been entered into and such agency made such payments. Final determination by the Secretary of entitlement to such payments shall be subject to review by the courts in the same manner and to the same extent as is provided in title II with respect to decisions by the Federal Security Administrator under such title.

"SEC. 1404. Adjustment of duplicate benefits: Where benefits are payable to an individual under this title and where for the same period an allowance is received under title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, the amount of such allowance shall be deducted from the benefits payable under this title under regulations prescribed by the Secretary.

"SEC. 1405. Operation:

"(a) Determination of entitlement to payments of benefits by a State agency under an agreement under this title shall be subject to review in the same manner and to the same extent as determinations under the State unemployment-compensation law, and only in such manner and to such extent.

"(b) For the purpose of payments made to a State under title III, administration by the State agency of such State pursuant to an agreement under this title shall be deemed to be a part of the administration of the State unemployment-compensation law.

"(c) The State agency of each State shall furnish to the Secretary such information as the Secretary may find necessary in carrying

out the provisions of this title, and such information shall be deemed reports required by the Secretary for the purposes of section 303 (a) (6).

"SEC. 1406. Payments to States:

"(a) Each State shall be entitled to be paid by the United States an amount equal to the additional cost to the State of payments of benefits made under and in accordance with an agreement under this title, which would not have been incurred by the State but for the agreement.

"(b) In making payments pursuant to subsection (a) of this section there shall be paid to the State, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, as may be determined by the Secretary, such sum as the Secretary estimates the State will be entitled to receive under this title for each calendar quarter, reduced or increased, as the case may be, by any sum by which the Secretary finds that his estimates for any prior calendar quarter were greater or less than the amounts which should have been paid to the State. The amount of such payments may be determined by such statistical, sampling, or other method as may be agreed upon by the Secretary and the State agency.

"(c) The Secretary shall from time to time certify to the Secretary of the Treasury for payment to each State the sums payable to such State under this section. The Secretary of the Treasury, prior to audit or settlement by the General Accounting Office, shall make payment at the time or times fixed by the Secretary of Labor in accordance with certification, from the funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(d) All money paid a State under this title shall be used solely for the purposes for which it is paid; and any money so paid which is not used for such purposes shall be returned to the Treasury upon termination of the agreement.

"(e) An agreement under this title may require any officer or employee of the State certifying payments or disbursing funds pursuant to the agreement, or otherwise participating in its performance, to give a surety bond to the United States in such amount as the Secretary may deem necessary, and may provide for the payment of the cost of such bond from funds for carrying out the purposes of this title.

"(f) No person designated by the Secretary, or designated pursuant to an agreement under this title, as a certifying officer, shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to the payment of any benefits certified by him under this title.

"(g) No disbursing officer shall, in the absence of gross negligence or intent to defraud the United States, be liable with respect to any payment by him under this title if it was based upon a voucher signed by a certifying officer designated as provided in subsection (f).

"(h) Whoever, for the purpose of causing any benefits to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder where none is authorized to be so paid, shall make or cause to be made any false statement or representation as to any wages paid or received, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement of a material fact in any claim for any compensation authorized to be paid under this title or under an agreement thereunder, or whoever makes or causes to be made any false statement, representation, affidavit, or document in connection with such claim, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"(i) Whoever shall obtain or receive any money, check, or benefit under this title or an agreement thereunder, without being entitled thereto and with intent to defraud the United States, shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than $1,000 or imprisoned for not more than 1 year, or both.

"SEC. 1407. Appropriations: There is hereby authorized to be expended out of any moneys not otherwise appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out the provisions of this title."

SEC. 19. The Social Security Act is amended by adding the following new title at the end thereof:

"TITLE XV. EXTENDED DURATION OF BENEFITS

"SEC. 1501. When used in this title—

"(a) The term 'weekly benefit amount' means the amount of compensation to which an individual is entitled with respect to a week of total unemployment, under the provisions of a State unemployment compensation law.

"(b) The term 'benefit year' means the benefit year prescribed in the applicable State unemployment compensation law; except that, if such State law does not prescribe any benefit year, such term means any period of 52 consecutive weeks specified in an applicable agreement made under this section, or, if there is no such applicable agreement, then any period of 52 consecutive weeks prescribed by the Secretary of Labor (hereafter in this section referred to as the Secretary).

"(c) 'Insured unemployment' means a week of unemployment as defined in section 1606 (t) of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to which an individual who has met the qualifying wage requirements of a State law and who has not exhaused his right to benefits under such law files a claim for benefits or waiting week credit.

"(d) The term 'State' includes the District of Columbia, Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico.

"SEC. 1502. (a) Upon the written request of the Governor of any State (or, in the case of the District of Columbia, upon the written request of the commissioners of said District), the Secretary is authorized on behalf of the United States to enter into an agreement with any State, or with the unemployment compensation agency of such State, under which such State agency (1) certifies that the insured unemployment of individuals covered under the State law during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months is in excess of 10 percent of the average monthly covered employment during the preceding calendar year, (2) will make, as agent of the United States, payments of compensation as authorized in this section and pursuant to such agreement with respect to unemployment, and (3) will otherwise cooperate with the Secretary and with other State unemployment compensation agencies in making payments of compensation authorized by this section. (b) Any such agreement shall provide for supplementing the amount of compensation payable to any individual during his benefit year in such amount that compensation will not be denied to any individual by reason of exhaustion of his benefit rights, until he has been paid an amount equal to 52 times his weekly benefit amount (or such lesser amount as may be specified in the agreement) and that such agreement shall be effective with the first day of any month in which the State agency makes the certification required by section 1502 (a) (1) and shall continue in effect until the Secretary determines that the insured unemployment of individuals covered by the State law during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months is less than 10 percent of the average monthly covered employment during the preceding calendar year.

"SEC. 1503. Sections 1302 (b), 1304, 1305, and 1306 of the Social Security Act, as amended, shall apply in the administration of this section."

BILL TO EXTEND AND IMPROVE THE UNEMPLOYMENT-COMPENSATION PROGRAM

Brief summary of the principal provisions of the bill to amend the Social Security Act and the Internal Revenue Code so as to extend and improve the unemployment-insurance program.

I. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

A. Changes with respect to financing States' costs of administering the State unemployment-compensation laws and public employment offices: Section 2 of the bill amends section 301 of the Social Security Act so as to—

1. Provide a permanent appropriation of the proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax, received after December 31, 1950, to the Federal unemployment account. It also authorizes the appropriation of such additional sums to this account as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill (sec. 301 (a), p. 1).

2. Authorize appropriation from the Federal unemployment account to the Department of Labor such sums as are necessary to provide payments to States to finance the administrative costs of their unemployment-compensation laws as well as their public employment offices under the Wagner-Peyser Act (sec. 301 (b), p. 1).

3. Authorize contingency appropriations to be available to States only when unforeseen emergencies arise (sec. 301 (b), pp. 1, 2).

4. Authorize appropriations from the Federal unemployment account the amounts necessary for the Department of Labor to carry out its functions under the Wagner-Peyser Act, and under the unemployment-insurance program as extended to provide reinsurance grants to States (sec. 301 (c), p. 2).

B. Payments to States (no substantial change): Section 302 is amended in technical respects to conform to changes made in section 301 (pp. 2, 3).

C. Additional provisions required to be incorporated into State laws in order for States to qualify for grants for administrative expenses: The bill amends section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States to incorporate into their laws two additional provisions in order to qualify for grants under section 302, namely:

1. Additional methods of administration (section 303 (a) (1)) which the Secretary finds are reasonably calculated to prevent the misuse of the unemployment compensation program by fraudulent claimants and to assure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto (sec. 3 (a), p. 3).

2. Participation in plans and method of combining wage credits and handling interstate claims which the Secretary finds are reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits to interstate claimants (sec. 3 (b), p. 3).

D. Extension of title III to Puerto Rico: The bill redefines the term "State" to include "Puerto Rico," making Puerto Rico, upon the concurrence of its legislature, eligible for participation in the Federal-State unemployment insurance program (sec. 4, p. 3; sec. 17 and 18, p. 27).

II. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE XII—REINSURANCE GRANTS TO STATE UNEMPLOYMENT FUND

Title XII of the Social Security Act presently authorizes the Secretary to make advance of funds to States if the State's unemployment trust fund falls below a certain minimum. Such advances carry no interest charges but the States are required to refund the advances so made. Such advances may be made only until January 1, 1950.

Section 5 of the bill rewrites title XII so as to authorize the Secretary to make outright grants of funds, from the Federal unemployment account, to States when the balance in the State's unemployment trust fund falls below a certain amount. The bill contains the formulae to be applied in determining when a State becomes entitled to a reinsurance grant, as well as the amount of such grant. The bill requires the repayment of any unexpended balance of a grant when

the State is no longer eligible for a reinsurance grant (sec. 5, pp. 3–5).

Section 6 continues indefinitely the present authorization to appropriate the excess of Federal unemployment tax collections over administrative grants for the years prior to 1950 (sec. 6, p. 5).

III. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 9, SUBCHAPTER C, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Sections 7 and 8 of the bill amend the Internal Revenue Code in the following principal respects:

A. Reduces the Federal unemployment tax from 3.0 to 1.5 percent of taxable wages and changes the offset for contributions to approved State laws from 90 to 80 percent. Repeals the "additional credit" conditions under which an employer can get credit for what he would have contributed except for a lower experience rate. The effect would be to establish a minimum State contribution rate of 1.2 percent (80 percent of 1.5 percent). The States would be free to experience rate above 1.2 percent in any form they see fit (sec 7, p. 6).

B. Added standards required to be incorporated into State laws in order for taxpayers to qualify for credit allowance of 90 percent of the 3-percent pay-roll tax:

1. Payment of unemployment benefits of at least 50 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $30 a week for individuals with no dependents; at least 60 percent of claimant's weekly wages up to at least $36 a week for individuals with one dependent; at least 65 percent of claimant's weekly wages up to at least $39 a week for individuals with two dependents; and at least 70 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $42 a week for individuals with three or more dependents (par. (6), p. 9).

2. Payment of benefits for 26 weeks in a benefit year if the claimant remains unemployed long enough to draw that many weeks of benefits. Cancellation of wage credits or the reduction in the number of weeks which a claimant may draw benefits is prohibited under all circumstances except in case of fraud (par. (7), p. 9).

3. Qualifications for benefits of all claimants who have acquired the minimum amount of wage credits set forth in paragraph (8) (par. (8), p. 9).

4. Payment of benefits to all claimants able and willing to work except that a State may require a 1-week waiting period; it may postpone (but not reduce the benefits potentially payable) up to 4 weeks if the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause, was discharged for misconduct connected with his work, or refused suitable work without good cause; a State may deny benefits while an employee is participating in a strike up to a maximum of 8 weeks; and a State may deny benefits to any person who has made a false claim for benefits (par. (9), p. 9).

5. Amends clause (B) of section 1603 (a) (5) by substituting the words "wage rate, weekly earnings" for the word "wages" (sec. 10, par. (10) (C), p. 10).

C. Increase in taxable wages: The term "wages" is redefined to exclude remuneration paid in excess of $4,800 (instead of $3,000, as at present). The $4,800 limit is applicable to wages paid either by the employer or by a predecessor employer (new provision). The bill provides that "tips" are to be counted as wages, and spells out in greater detail the payments which need not be counted as wages (see redefinition of term "wages," sec. 13, pp. 11–14).

D. Extension of coverage:

1. Extension of Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of one or more: Coverage is extended to every employer who has one or more individuals in his "employment" during a taxable year (sec. 14, pp. 14 ff.).

2. Extension of coverage by redefinition of term "employment": The bill redefines the term "employment" so as to bring within the coverage of the unemployment-insurance program many services which are presently excluded (see definition of "employment," pp. 14–19). Some of the more significant types of services which would be brought within the term "employment" are:

(1) Services performed abroad on American aircraft under a contract of services entered into with the United States or during the performance of which the aircraft touches a point in the United States (sec. 14 (a), p. 15).

(2) Services performed abroad for American employers by United States citizens or residents under contract of service entered into within the United States (sec. 14 (a), p. 15).

(3) Services performed for nonprofit institutions and organizations exempt from income tax under section 101, except in the case of clergymen and members of religious orders and part-time workers earning less than $100 a quarter (sec. 14 (a) (6), p. 17).

(4) The term "agricultural labor" is redefined as in H. R. 6000. The effect of the redefinition of this term would bring within the coverage of the unemployment insurance program many industrial operations performed on or off the farm on farm commodities which are presently excluded, and workers engaged in the handling, packing, packaging, and processing of agricultural commodities for other than the farmer (compare present definition of "agricultural labor" (Ti. 26, U. S. C., 1426 (h)) with proposed redefinition (pp. 22–24, incl.)).

3. Extension of coverage by redefinition of term "employee": The bill redefines the term "employee." Public Law 642, Eightieth Congress, excluded from the Federal Unemployment Tax Act all individuals who, under the common law rules, have the status of independent contractors. While the bill preserves this test, it specifically includes within the term "employee" many classes of individuals who are economically dependent upon the employer, such as outside salesmen, full-time insurance salesmen, driver-lessees of taxicabs, homeworkers, contract loggers, and certain classes of lessees or licensees of space within mines. The bill also includes within the term "employee" all individuals who meet certain tests which were used by the Supreme Court in determining whether an individual was an "employee" or an "independent contractor" within the meaning of the Social Security Act of 1935 prior to the enactment of Public Law 642, Eightieth Congress. (For definition of term "employee," see pp. 20–22, incl.)

IV. ADDITION OF TITLE XIV TO SOCIAL SECURITY ACT—UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL EMPLOYEES

Section 19 of the bill adds a new title to the Social Security Act providing for unemployment benefits for Federal employees. The amounts of the benefits would be determined by State law where the employee last performed Federal services. The benefits would be administered through State employment security agencies under agreements entered into between the States and the Secretary. Costs of the program would be met from a permanent indefinite appropriation. (For details of the plan, see section 18, pp. 28–34.)

Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, Mr. Glen I. Myers, of Denton, Tex., has asked me to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a quotation from Dr. Vannevar Bush's speech of December 5, 1949. This quotation is so sound and timely that I agree with Mr. Myers it should be as widely disseminated as possible.

Speaking of dictatorship, Dr. Bush says:

* * * but we cannot meet the threat of dictatorship if we turn this country into a wishy-washy imitation of totalitarianism, where every man's hand is out for pabulum, and virile creativeness has given place to the patronizing favor of swollen bureaucracy.

Dictatorship can compete with dictatorships, and a free virile democracy can outpace any such in the long pull. But a people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast disappearing rich, scrambling for subsidy, learning the arts of political logrolling and forgetting the rugged virtues of the pioneer, will not measure up to competition with a tough dictatorship.

A Positive Foreign Policy for the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM RIBICOFF
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RIBICOFF. Mr. Speaker, in September the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives appointed the Honorable THURMOND CHATHAM, of North Carolina, and myself as a special subcommittee to make a survey of western Europe in regard to the foreign policy of the United States.

On my return to the United States I made a speech in West Hartford, Conn., on November 28, 1949, and wrote a series of articles which were distributed to various newspapers by the North American Newspaper Alliance.

Pending the writing of a formal report by the subcommittee it has occurred to me that a reprint of these observations may be of interest to the other Members of the House. I, therefore, extend my remarks in the RECORD by including them together with editorial comment:

A POSITIVE FOREIGN POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

(Speech by Congressman A. A. RIBICOFF, November 28, 1949, at the Alfred Plant School, West Hartford, Conn., under the sponsorship of the West Hartford League of Women Voters and the Hartford Foreign Policy Association)

This evening I propose to discuss with you not the personalities of Europe, but the problems which the United States faces in Europe. These problems are not easy to describe, let alone to solve. They are harder and tougher today than they have ever been before; and in some ways the American people are less prepared now for the truth of their relations with Europe than they were some years ago. But it is incumbent upon me as a Congressman of the United States and as a Representative of this district, to state as clearly as I can, and as completely as I can, the essential difficulties with Europe. I can only hope that you will bear with me if at times the description becomes

excessively technical. This is a technical and complicated world in which we live; and we are certainly charged with the responsibility of understanding it. More than this, our very lives depend upon our understanding it.

As everyone in this room knows, Europe today stands between the colossus of Russian power on the east, and the gigantic power of the United States on the west. Europe, this middle ground, which is the traditional soil of our civilization, is no longer the leader of western thought and action. The force and direction of the future is coming not from the time-honored sources of Britain, France, Italy, and the rest of Europe; rather it is coming from the far steppes of Russia, and the very close Washington, D. C. The fact that Russia and the United States are unable to solve their mutual problems is the fact that creates the major problems in the middle ground. In Europe, between the two poles of power, dwell millions of people who have a right to life, and in our terms, the pursuit of happiness, just as you and I have that right; yet they are not in command of their own destiny, and they do not have the power to control the future.

Europe will never again have the political and economic balance which was hers during the nineteenth century. The past few years have seen the disappearance, as such, of two military and naval powers—Germany and Japan—and the eclipse of a third—Italy. It has witnessed the serious economic and military depletion of two western powers—England and France. The recovery of their former strength is by no means assured. It has seen the thrusting of Soviet power into central Europe, and, for a year, to the Adriatic. Further, the Politburo has extended its orbit into vast portions of eastern Asia.

Our traditional feeling of security has been blasted. An ocean doesn't mean very much any more in terms of defense. Airplanes can cross it in 10 hours, and a guided missile with an atomic warhead could probably cross it in 3. There isn't any security in water any longer—oceans are now highways instead of barriers.

While Europe declined, the United States has involuntarily emerged into the preeminent position of power among western nations. This pre-eminence is inherent and cannot be abdicated. It is doubtful that history gives us a precise parallel of such a shift in the power situation in so short a period. Such shifts in power do not lend themselves to fast balance. The adjustment is necessarily prolonged over many decades. The economic and security problems of Europe—and this Nation—will not be over in a year or in 25 years. They will continue to challenge our wisest thoughts and best efforts for many years to come. But our thinking will not be wise nor our striving adequate if we cling to the illusion that the situation is a transient one or that we can turn our backs upon it any time we wish and, at most, in just a few years.

The European knows this as well as we know it. He knows that we must depend upon him to go west rather than east. He knows we must depend upon him to keep from the panaceas of fascism and communism. He knows that the life of the United States, powerful as she is, is inexorably linked to the life of Europe.

Perhaps more important is the fact that the United States is no longer able to afford either economic or political isolationism. We could afford it once, in the years before the atomic bomb. If we look at it realistically, we should include only the years before 1914. It was only in these years that the American people could afford the luxury of separation from the rest of the world. We had a fairly well-balanced economy, we were pushing our own frontiers farther and farther West, we were developing a vast system of productive enterprise, and we were in general living well with ourselves and the rest of the world.

What we fail to realize, however, is that we were living this way because Europe was in a kind of balance. During the nineteenth century France became wealthy, Germany became highly industrialized and wealthy, Italy was able to live with a degree of security and a minimal fulfillment of her basic requirements. And so one could go through the list. The nineteenth century was a stabilized period in the history of western civilization. Ideas of freedom, justice and equality were important, and held to by large numbers of people. The dignity of man was not an idle phrase mouthed by politicians and stated with conviction only by a few; it was an actual living force in the lives of European people, low and high. There was a certain freedom of economic relationships which allowed men to change their jobs when they wanted to, rise to a higher standard of living if they had sufficient courage, and pass on productive wealth to future generations. It was not all rosy, for there were certainly situations which outraged decency and cried out for reform. Nevertheless, the Europe of the nineteenth century was a Europe that produced leadership for the world and a fairly adequate standard of living.

The changes have been wrought through a number of factors. For one thing, the population of Europe became too heavy for its semifeudal land system, and the strife between farmers and city dwellers came into the open. The productive plant of Europe became obsolete, especially since it was having to compete with a new and well integrated industry in the United States. The age of empire ended without the European mind or economy being prepared for the change. War was taken as the only way out, and all the wars did was to create new and more dangerous difficulties. Over and over again, vested privilege in Europe sought to preserve its traditional power through violence and intrigue. Instead of fairly facing the issues of the changing world, European statesmen allowed their moral resources to dry up, and were left simply with hollow phrases and finally with concentration camps.

The fortunate position of the United States, which was made possible by the balance and humanism of nineteenth century Europe, was consequently destroyed. The frontier of the United States ceased to be the Statue of Liberty, and suddenly became the Rhine. American statesmen, most especially those of the Woodrow Wilson variety, saw that we must have a positive government capable of making positive decisions and capable of planning for a positive future. But the old idea of isolation and insulation was hard to kill. Over and over again, Wilson warned that unless we made the League of Nations work, the future would be filled with bloody and terrible wars; and over and over again, those who could not see the change resented the idea of a positive government and retreated into the past. After all, they argued, we have gotten where we are by rigidly adhering to George Washington's dictum—no foreign entanglements. What they forgot was that George Washington lived some years earlier, and that change is as inevitable as life itself.

When Franklin Delano Roosevelt took over the Presidency in 1933, we had no positive government with regard to foreign policy, and we had no positive government regarding our domestic policy. Roosevelt was faced with the necessity of creating a positive government almost overnight. He had to throw together countless numbers of bureaus and agencies to solve pressing domestic problems. He of course made a large number of errors. But had he acted in the tradition of the past, the United States would have seen horrible, bloody strife. The bread lines were bad enough. The marches on Washington seemed almost impossible. The itinerant beggars who wanted to work, who had skills, but who could not find work, presented a picture that this country found revolting and rather incomprehensible. Out of the stuff that usually breeds revolution, Roosevelt was able, through a lot of luck and a real social vision, to fashion a positive state.

But this was the domestic side of our problem. He did little or nothing at that time with foreign affairs. As far as the rest of the world was concerned, we were still isolationists. Admittedly we were waking up to the fact that we could not live forever on an unconscious, unplanned road of happy prosperity. But we were not recognizing that the peace of the world was ultimately going to depend upon whether or not the United States could recognize its responsibilities and formulate a positive policy of leadership.

One thing, at least, should be pointed out. All during the period which stretched between the two world wars, the American people were giving money to Europe. It was not organized, and the fact that it wasn't was a very substantial cause of the 1929 crash. In those dim days European governments floated countless securities in the United States. Our banks, insurance companies, and individual investors bought these securities and soon found them worthless. Untold millions of dollars poured into European reconstruction, and untold numbers of investors lost their savings.

Because the United States Government had no positive idea of our relations to Europe, we individually and collectively through our banks and investors, helped to rearm Europe. We rebuilt German cities, and then the cities defaulted on their debt; we rebuilt French industry and got no return on our investment; and we did the same for other countries.

There is nothing to be gained by reviewing the years between 1933 and 1941 when the scrap metal from the Third Avenue El in New York City fell in Pearl Harbor. Perhaps it would be a good idea to review it simply to show how wrong we were, and how incapable we were of recognizing facts right before our noses. But the task is embarrassing, and I am sure that we all know the facts.

Now we are faced with the necessity of seeing into the future once again. We cannot afford an atomic war, and every American citizen knows it. We cannot afford to be guided by the clichés of the past which cry, "Peace, peace," when there is no peace. We cannot afford to be taken in by panaceas dreamed up in libraries or conference rooms throughout the world. We can actually afford only one thing, and that is to face the facts as squarely as we can and plan our future in the light of them.

What are the facts of Europe? Even if you leave aside Russia's threat, Europe is today a land of desperate people. Europe does not understand now, and it never has understood, the spiritual foundations of American democracy. The German people, for example, knew nothing about democracy, and consequently our attempt to impose the Weimar constitution upon them was little short of ridiculous. We must recognize that we cannot export American democracy and impress it upon Europe. Democracy grows out of a people; it cannot be imposed upon a people.

Another fact one learns when in Europe is that the idea of American free enterprise, as well as its practice, has long disappeared from the countries of its birth. Free enterprise as we know it is not a live option for present-day Europeans. We are going to have to live with a socialized Europe, and we might as well face it now. The surplus which makes our economy possible for us is not present in Europe, and it may never be revived. There are too many people and too few goods. Much of European land is worn out, and much of the possibility for

world trade has been taken away. England has been losing her surplus since the close of the First World War. She must pattern her life according to the greatest good for the greatest number. England and the rest of Europe have their backs against the wall. In many areas they cannot afford the type of freedom and liberty which the American people enjoy. In essence England's problem is no different from that of the rest of Europe.

If we look at England carefully we can see some of the reasons for Europe's present plight. About 30 years ago, when the world was coming out of its First Global War, England was burdened with a heavy internal debt for the first time since Henry VIII. She had always been dependent upon her export markets, and now she found them sadly shrunken. Many of her most important customers had become self-sufficient. And rapid strides in industrialization had raised up new competitors. The whole period between the two wars was a period of increasing difficulty for England's exporters.

Now, it must be remembered that England is an island economy. It is the least self-sufficient of all nations. It is a heavily populated, small section of the world. It must import some 50 percent of its food supply and over 80 percent of its raw materials. If there is no export of finished goods, there is no way of paying for the imports. With a shrinking of export markets, England had to find some other method for paying for her imports, or starve herself out of business.

England's salvation between the wars came in the form of interest on overseas investments and from shipping and insurance earnings. Interest on investment alone gave her a net income of about $800,000,000 each year. Through these earnings England paid for approximately one-third of her total imports.

England was living off her fat. Instead of reorganizing industry and setting off on an aggressive campaign to recapture world markets, the English took an almost wholly negative approach to their problem. Industrial management, unfettered by antitrust laws, got together and set prices and divided what markets they had. They set the prices high, high enough to keep the least efficient producer in business. They consequently aided the downward plunge of British business.

The labor unions did the same thing in their area. Instead of trying to achieve high production at low cost, the workers increased featherbedding and promoted the growth of restrictive practices. They wanted to make the work go as far as possible by dividing it up rather than by satisfying new demand.

When England went into the Second World War she went in with an inadequate productive capacity, and was consequently thrown on her overseas resources. Throughout the war she liquidated her investments to buy arms and food. Private holdings by individual Britons were confiscated, and the Government used the money. By the end of the war Britain had debts where she used to have investments. And her productive plant was even more obsolete. England came out of World War II with a heroic record for fighting totalitarianism, a terrific debt, and one of the lowest standards of living in Europe.

In varying degrees, England's history and problem illustrate the situation all over Europe. The two great World Wars have knocked out traditional wealth, and the people of Europe are looking for a new way to make a living and be free. They have been forced by their own short-sightedness and by the march of progress in non-European countries to discard many of their ancient patterns of thought and action. Not since the upheaval of the sixteenth century has Europe been forced to such a radical reexamination of her aims and purposes in life. In country after country that I visited, the people expressed the same confusion and the same sense of being violently uprooted from a traditional past.

The serious life and death question for Europe is whether or not it can discover a specific mission in the world. The European peoples are going to live, and what we want to know is how they are going to live. People can cooperate with each other to solve mutual problems in a number of ways. After all, Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin, all three, got people working together and the trains running on time. The trouble is that we can't live in a world where Europe solves its problems in the fashions proposed by these men, and it is my conviction that confused as they may be, the peoples of Europe don't want this kind of solution. They would like to be able to live in peace, they would like to be able to live harmoniously with others, they would like to be able to count innumerable friends all over the world. But they will forego that desire if it means death through starvation, or a very, very low subsistence living.

What the United States wants for Europe is not that it be a colonial possession of ours but rather that it be an independent association of nations living in peace and harmony with each other, and with us. What Russia wants is that Europe become a colony of the Kremlin. By so doing, Europe would be able to produce for the Russian people and Europeans would live in a slave-labor camp. It would further provide Russia with the opportunity for jumping to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately bringing to fruition the Communist dream of world revolution and domination. Without Europe, Russia is contained. With Europe, Russia will be able to gain absolute control over the peoples of this planet. The European peoples themselves have a vague recognition that this is the case. They don't want to go to Russia, but they are not quite sure that the United States has the plan or the understanding necessary for their salvation.

In the past years we have not offered a constructive alternative to fascism, nazism, and communism. In fact, if you take our public opinion as something measured by the editorials in the isolationist press and the speeches of unaware politicians, all we have done is to resent the fact that Europe has a problem. And this resentment is certainly no alternative to the totalitarian dictatorships.

The constant debate we conduct with ourselves—whether or not to participate in the affairs of Europe—is only a dilemma of the mind. In the real situation, there is no choice, no place else to go. We are not willing to submit to failure as a power and to abdicate the leadership which has been thrust upon us. The difficulty is that in keeping alive the illusion that we might do so we reduce the effectiveness of our efforts in world leadership.

We are today, whether we like it or not, the leader of western civilization. Whether we like it or not, we have to supply the saving grace for western Europe. There is no longer the buttress of British diplomacy, the British Navy, and a fairly stabilized economy of Europe. We have no way of escaping the role history has given us to play. When President Monroe issued the Monroe Doctrine, he issued it without a navy to back it up. He was confident, however, that the British Navy would defend the integrity of that doctrine. Over and over again in American history, we have counted on these buffers between us and a responsible role in Europe. Now the buffers are all gone. We will lead Europe, and we will either lead Europe into the death-trap of Communist dictatorship, or we will lead her into a tolerably well-ordered and tolerably free society. But willynilly, we are the leaders. This means that those of us who thought that at least by 1952 we would be able to pull out of Europe and that we would stop the ECA and get back to hunting, fishing, baseball and business as usual, have been all wrong. We will never be able to get out of Europe, because if we ever do leave, the vacuum created by our departure will be filled at once by an imperialistic Russia; and it is a simple step from a Russia-dominated Europe to a Russia-dominated United States. To remain alone as a sitting-duck with Russia dominating the productive capacity of Europe and their people and the people of Asia, would cast such a definite burden on the United States that our expenditures today would be insignificant and in the process free enterprise and democracy would vanish.

The running debate we conduct with ourselves—whether we will or will not participate in the affairs of Europe—is a gigantic illusion. It is carried on in our minds, not in our actions. Actually, of course, we have participated in European affairs in a large way since 1914. We were involved in two World Wars. It has been estimated that the American people have sent in cash to Europe, between 1914 and 1948, before the Marshall plan, some $50,000,000,000 for nonmilitary expenditures such as loans, private charities, immigrant remittances, UNRRA, buying of gold, etc. Now, at least, we should be thoroughly aware of the part we are to play. The real situation is now, as it has been for some time: we have no choice. We cannot abdicate, but we can play our part so badly that only disaster can result. The difficulty with keeping this illusory debate alive is that we reduce our effectiveness in world leadership. We were not good leaders in the twenties and thirties—but our very lives depend upon our being excellent leaders in this day.

World leadership has always been, and will always be, expensive. Leadership of any kind is expensive. It costs time to be a political leader, and, of course, it costs a lot of money. The men who are the leaders in our community are men who say that they are willing to devote time and effort and money to the good of the community. You don't elect as president of your local club a person who tells you at the outset that he will be glad to consult with you twice throughout the year, but not to expect time from him in actual leadership. Well, this is what the world expects of us—time. Time in the form of military aid and military personnel. Time in the form of conference time. But most important of all, time in that crystallized form known as money. After all, the thing which makes an object valuable is the time that went into its production. If it takes a great deal of time, it costs more in our money exchange than if it takes a small amount of time. So money is in a sense solidified time—the time that the American people as a Nation are willing to give to the leadership of the world. The expense of leadership must therefore be measured in terms of time. How much time are you and I willing to give for world peace? How much of our day's working time are we willing to give so that Europeans may find the proper answer to their life and death questions? When the Congress appropriates a fund for European relief, they are appropriating a portion of your time. If you are not willing to give it, then you are unwittingly aiding the imperialistic ambitions of one of the most vicious tyrannies civilization has seen. Don't forget that Britain paid heavily for her leadership of the world. Don't forget that the United States must pay heavily for its leadership of the world. We have a heavy burden or a heavy opportunity.

The only cement that holds Europe together is its confidence in the United States. American initiative is a must. Most of us who think about integration use it as a farm of escapism, thinking that if Europe organ-

izes we can give up the burden of leadership and go back to fishing and the old ball game.

The fact of the matter is, I suppose, that we don't want leadership. Of course, we would rather go hunting, fishing, see ball games, live quietly on tree-lined streets, have our children grow up in comfort and security—live in general the kind of independent life that we Americans mean by well-being. Unfortunately for us, we haven't the decision to make. We will lead. We have to lead. We are compelled to lead. And the question is only where we will lead.

The question, Where will we lead? is being asked all over Europe, and it should be asked all over the United States. What will we do about Germany? What we do about Germany may be the decisive force that will make the future one of war or peace. What should we do about President Truman's justly famous fourth point? Should we actually set to work to rebuild depressed areas, raise standards of living, create customers and prosperity? These and a host of other questions force themselves upon us when we ask the question, Where will we lead?

We still like to woo constancy with philandering words. In enacting the European recovery program we reserve our position not only with respect to the sequel, but also during the term of the program itself. Thus we make the leadership effective for only a year at a time, and each spring Congress renews the debate not only as to the amount to be spent in the ensuing year, but also upon the question of whether the program is to be continued or to be summarily dropped. Moreover, the relevant legislation reserves the right of the Congress to back out and call off the program by concurrent resolution at any moment it may choose to do so. Likewise with the mutual defense assistance program. This is supposed to supply the sinew of a solemn, permanent alliance, and yet the legislation is enacted for only a year at a time. Our Nation thus seeks the benefits of a permanent alliance while preserving the freedom of a companionate marriage. Again the legislation includes the statement of the right of the Congress to call the whole thing off by concurrent resolution.

My trip to Europe and the study I have undertaken in connection with my work on the Foreign Affairs Committee leads me to think that there are a number of steps which we must take at once. These steps point in the direction we should go, and give an indication at least of the kind of positive foreign policy we require.

1. Tactically we must think in short terms and be ready for quick shifts of position and changes of technique, but we must not let these characteristics, appropriate to the tactics of the situation affect our thinking in relation to general strategy. America must insure that any permanent preponderance of power, when realized, shall be on the side with which America is alined. To this end America must be willing to pledge the same steadfastness of policy and action, that it expects from its friends. These considerations are basic to any success we may achieve in general strategy. We cannot fully realize that if we continue the shallow pretense of facing the world a year at a time. The national mind must be made up. We must recognize that there are a number of cherished ideas which must be branded as illusions. We must recognize that the most dangerous illusion of our present situation is the one that tells us that short-term and short-run investments pay higher dividends than long term securities.

2. The Marshall plan and the military assistance program must be formulated and enacted on a long range basis. It is impractical and wasteful to think we can organize the economic and military life of many nations on a year to year basis. If after our careful and considered judgment the actions taken by the recipient are against ours, and their long term interest, we should impose conditions. These conditions should not be based on folklore but on a tough appraisal of the facts and required results.

3. Western Germany must be brought into a strong council of Europe and must not be permitted to make independent unilateral decisions. The Ruhr Valley should not be returned to the cartelists who so successfully stifled trade before the war and so successfully aided Hitler's rise to power. Western Germany must sit among democratic nations and must have her decisions checked and double checked by those who have been her victims in two wars. But it must be recognized that England cannot continue her policy of commonwealth isolation. She must be a part of the Council of Europe. Without England a strong council would be unworkable, and unnecessarily expensive to the United States. It would also give an unregenerated Germany independent power.

4. President Truman's proposal to aid in the reconstruction of depressed areas throughout the world should be implemented by Congress. If we allow vast numbers of people to starve, we are not only immoral, we are also inviting Russia to go in as their saviors. In addition, we are keeping alive by our own inaction situations which can only breed revolution and unrest. With atomic bombs in Russia and the possibility of atomic war hanging over our heads, such a course is suicidal. Also, we are, by inaction, restricting our markets and refusing to build a firm foundation for internal and world prosperity.

5. We should give governmental guaranties to businessmen who will enter the world with their risk capital. When I introduced the Ribicoff amendment to the ECA Act of 1949, I did so because I felt that no American businessman should be asked to take the nonbusiness political risks which investments abroad now entail, I still believe it, and I am happy to see that ECA officials and most all foreign experts are now in accord. We need investment in Europe, and we can get it only if there is some provision for converting earnings into dollars and guaranties against extraordinary political risks. Insofar as our Government insures this portion of the burden it eliminates to such an extent taxpayers' dollars. Private enterprise is needed—needed very badly as a cooperating part of our foreign program.

6. We should reexamine the immigration policies in the contemporary world. You will never solve the Italian and German problem until you solve the problem of their excess populations. Somehow a way must be found to resettle millions of people in other parts of the world. There are huge territories potentially rich in resources and presently unpopulated. Colonizing these areas could be dovetailed with President Truman's point 4. We cannot intelligently consider this problem without also a thorough study of our own capacity to absorb new immigrants and give them a chance for a decent life.

7. We must encourage multilateral and reciprocal trade. Our tariff structure must be reexamined over a period of time. We must recognize that Europe, which desperately needs dollars, can't earn them if they are not allowed into our market places. Trade is a two-way street. We either buy from them or continue to give them the large sum of free dollars to buy from us.

8. A Marshall plan for the Far East should be formulated with the non-Communist Asiatic peoples. We should encourage the welfare, economic strengthening and nationalistic strivings of the vast millions who heretofore have been mere pawns in an exploiting imperialism now dead.

9. The United Nations should be aided and encouraged by us as a very real instrument for preserving the peace. It should be strengthened. We are surely on the road to disaster if we allow the UN to perish. In spite of its ineffectiveness in the present East-West controversy, it is the only public forum for debate on world issues. As a mediating agency it did wonders in the dispute between Israel and the Arabs. In countless ways it is now breaking down the barriers which separate men and cause nations to resort to war. Its decisive activity in world affairs is, I am sure the fervent hope of all of us. The UN cannot be strong unless you and I seize each opportunity to aid it and understand it.

10. The American people should be directly and consistently in favor of world federalism. Today world federation is a dream, but like all good dreams it helps us see the direction we should take when specific issues present themselves. We want to move toward an association of peoples, federally united in the common cause of decent living for all. By being in favor of world federation, by understanding it, by seeing its vision, we set our minds and hearts on an ultimate goal that will furnish some pattern for our work for peace. We should not be deluded into thinking that we can gain the goal easily or in a short time. But hard or long as the road may be, it is certainly the one we should travel.

11. Finally, I suggest that we do all in our power to strengthen our atomic production and defenses. All of us abhor the economic wastefulness of an arms race. Paradoxical as it may seem to many, a strong American Military Establishment is today our best safeguard against war. A democratic nation does not, and our history proves it, engage in imperialistic warfare. We don't want colonies, we don't want subjected people, we don't want to control the world. We want other peoples to be independent, prosperous, and peaceful. If we can attain that, we will be satisfied with our leadership. Consequently, a strong Military Establishment serves only two purposes in peacetime: (1) it deters other nations from starting a shooting war, since they know that the United States is well prepared to defend itself; and (2) it provides us with the means for staying in existence if another nation should attack.

I am convinced that these steps will lead us in the direction of a positive foreign policy which will result in peace rather than war. They are all expensive. They will all take your time and mine. The preservation of western civilization is worth it. I am sure that my children and the children they will someday have are worth it. And I am further sure that you and I live in a Nation that will forthrightly accept the responsibility that history has thrust upon us.

[From the Hartford Courant of November 29, 1949]

MR. RIBICOFF REPORTS

Representative A. A. RIBICOFF has taken his courage in his hands. Fresh from a trip to Europe, in which he is interested because of his post on the House Foreign Affairs Committe, he spoke in West Hartford last night before the Foreign Policy Association and the League of Women Voters. What he said will hardly be popular. Many persons have become irked at and skeptical about the Marshall plan and other forms of aid. It is this, apparently, that leads Mr. RIBICOFF to say that the American people are less prepared for the truth about Europe now than in the recent past. In any case he insists that we face the facts, and act accordingly.

One fact Mr. RIBICOFF stresses is that we cannot export American democracy to the Continent. Self-government by the people as individuals thrives only where it takes root spontaneously. Again, Mr. RIBICOFF made a point noted by many another observer able to penetrate beyond the gay spots and the scenery abroad, namely that free enterprise

as we know it simply does not exist in Europe today. Nor is it "a live option." You have either the cartels that helped bring on two world wars, or you try something else. American individual business enterprise also cannot be exported and imposed. So "we are going to have to live with a socialized Europe, and we might as well face it now."

Mr. RIBICOFF points to Britain as an example of the rest of Europe. "England came out of World War II with a heroic record for fighting totalitarianism, a terrific war debt, and one of the lowest standards of living in Europe." Wars have sucked much of the old vitality out of Europe, and that is the chief source of the trouble. This leads Mr. RIBICOFF to his real argument, which is that we are involved in Europe up to our necks with no hope of escape. To think we can debate whether or not to help Europe is an illusion. Even if we do nothing we shall lead Europe. Hence we shall lead it either "into the death trap of Communist dictatorship, or * * * into a tolerantly well-ordered and tolerantly free society." And this is going to cost us time, effort, and money.

On this foundation Mr. RIBICOFF proposes several concrete steps. Instead of legislating from year to year, he wants us to formulate an enduring, long-term policy that will be as fixed as that of Great Britain when it led the world during the ninteenth century. The Marshall plan and military aid, Mr. RIBICOFF insists, cannot end next year, nor even in the supposed target date of 1952.

All this is controversial. But it will bear some thinking over. It is well to have Mr. RIBICOFF urge us to do so. It is, in fact, a challenge that should come not from an individual Representative, but from the President and his administration. Perhaps Mr. Truman finds Mr. RIBICOFF's conclusions politically unpopular. But they may not turn out to be so in the end. If a political figure speaks in accents that the people recognize as the truth, there is usually a response.

[From the Hartford Times of November 29, 1949]

IT'S A GOOD SYSTEM

Through the cooperation of the West Hartford League of Women Voters and the Hartford Foreign Policy Association, several hundred persons last night were privileged to hear Congressman ABRAHAM A. RIBICOFF in a demonstration of representative government at its best.

Mr. RIBICOFF has just returned from a survey of the principal countries of Europe where he went as a member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. His talk last night was a report to his constituents on his experiences, his interviews with top-rank leaders, his personal observations, and most important of all, his conclusions as to what the United States ought to do to develop a positive and long-term foreign policy. He spoke with engaging frankness, deep sincerity, and such evidences of a practical loyalty to American ideals as to make his address a vital occasion in realistic civics.

It was about a year ago that the voters of the First District decided to send Mr. RIBICOFF to Congress. He was a good choice then, but his talk last night showed that during the past 12 months he has grown to meet his greater responsibilities and opportunities. It is gratifying to know that this district is through him rendering real service in the constructive handling of large affairs in Washington. But it is no less satisfactory to have our Representative return from time to time and pay us the compliment of such a straightforward presentation of personal views and such a challenge to continued service in the advancement of American ideals as Mr. RIBICOFF brought home last night. It is evident that he has not become lost in the petty affairs that are supposed to endear a Congressman to his electorate and assure his reelection. As our Representative he has come to grips with large issues. As a dutiful public servant he had come home to tell us how this situation appears to him. It was an example of how our system works at its best.

Mr. Speaker, the following are a series of articles distributed throughout the United States by the North American Newspaper Alliance:

ENGLAND

England's problem is a world problem, perhaps even more so than they realize. Ever since the United States fought its war against England we have used England as a buffer against European dangers. England has been a kind of financial and political balance wheel which kept the Europe of the nineteenth century in a semblance of order. To be sure, there have been lapses and serious mistakes on her part. However, for a century the British have stabilized Europe through diplomacy. Today this stabilizing force is gone.

Many of Britain's present difficulties can be traced back to the First World War. Britain came out of the First World War with an extremely heavy load of internal debt. Her export markets were sadly shrunken and some of her most important nineteenth century customers had been forced by the war to become increasingly self-sufficient. The industrialization of the rest of the world had proceeded at a rapid pace and the small island economy was no longer as important as it had once been.

It must be remembered that England is the least self-sufficient of all the great nations. Dependent on overseas supplies, she imports approximately 50 percent of her food and about 80 percent of her raw materials. The entire industrial structure of the country is inevitably organized for export trade. When export markets shrink as they did following the First World War, England is faced with the real possibility of economic death.

The menace, however, was not nearly as great between the two wars as it is today. Although England's troubles began in 1914, she went into the Second World War with overseas investments which were valued at about $16,000,000,000 and which provided her with a net income of about $800,000,000. When this interest on investments was added to the earnings made in banking, shipping, and insurance, it left a sizable amount which was just about sufficient to absorb the losses incurred by shrunken industrial markets.

But the Second World War wiped out Britain's overseas assets, raised the shipping tonnage of the United States and other countries, and generally curtailed the number of services England could sell to the outside world. All her dollar-earning assets were taken from her people and used up for war material. As a consequence, England came out of the war a debtor rather than a creditor nation.

England's industrial plant is today more obsolete than it was when she was losing her markets before the war. Her industry has been badly managed since the close of the nineteenth century. Britain has no antitrust laws and, consequently, price fixing was and is a common practice. Business management was lead by stuffed-shirt directorates, with the emphasis being on social standing and cultural background. Nepotism was rife, with a hostility toward research. There was a dread of change and the worship of status quo.

On the worker's side there has been, since the First World War, a steady growth of restrictive practices designed to make a job last as long as possible, to keep in employment as many workers as possible. Any outside observer could have seen and certainly many did see that both management and labor were heading for disaster.

This negative approach on the part of both management and labor assumed that demand throughout the world was limited and that productive capacity should be related to demand. They seem to have lost the idea that demand can be increased by lowering prices. In the end, Britain turned out to be a high-cost producer with a low standard of living.

This is not to say that there is no real fight left in the British. It should be remembered that in the past year alone they have boosted productivity by 4 percent. The total industrial production of Britain is 31 percent higher than it was in 1938. Imports are down 18 percent and exports are up 56 percent. This is a record of national effort and sacrifice which is certainly not equalled by the United States or any other world power.

Those Americans who find it politically advantageous to point to England's troubles and say they all result from the policies of the labor government, engage in a dangerous falsification. The labor government came to power in 1945. England's troubles began many years earlier. Her social services are financed out of taxes raised at home, and Marshall plan dollars are not used for these purposes. It should be remembered that England is long on sterling and short on dollars. The dollars are used for food and raw material.

The serious question is what England must do now. First, she must reestablish her productive capacity and shift even more from a domestic to an export economy. She must reestablish and increase her productive capacity. This will require greater individual effort from each and every person, labor and management alike. Industry which is satisfied to do business in the sterling market only will have to be given incentives to change over to the dollar-earning market. This may well lead to the allocation of both labor and materials to such industries willing to make the change-over.

Currently she must have United States help if we expect England to return as a stabilizing factor in Europe. In so doing we not only help her, but we get an effective ally in the world today. England, however, should show in return a sincere and cooperative spirit, looking toward the economic and political integration of Europe. While this won't happen tomorrow, it will never be accomplished if the will to do so is lacking.

The United States, on the other hand, is not going to be able to keep on exporting and not importing. Trade is a two-way street. We either reexamine our tariff structure, which denies the English manufacturer competitive entry into this country, or we continue to give them the money to buy from us.

Twisting the lion's tail for local political advantage in this country must be replaced by a policy of broad understanding and the realization that England can still be a helpmate in a balanced world rather than a financial burden.

LABOR

There is very little constructive social thinking among the trade unionists of Europe. Some years ago all trade unionists were concerned to map out a plan for the future that would directly relate to the building up of the worker's economic position. Before Russia became a problem in a political sense, the trade-unions of Europe were filled with theoretical Marxists. These Marxists were not tied to any special political party nor were they particularly interested in furthering the imperialistic aims of Russia. Rather they used Marxism as a frame of reference and as a mode of interpretation.

The Communists today are no longer theoretical Marxists. They are totally unconcerned with the bettering of working conditions and their primary aim is to help Russia in whatever they can. World revolution then is more important than full stomachs and safe working conditions.

The non-Communist trade-union people of today are confused and fearful lest they fall into some Communist trap. They spend the greatest portion of their time fighting Communists for control of the unions. They have few economists and social scientists who advise them, and the ones that they do have are certainly not the best available.

As a consequence, the Communist unions in Europe are well-disciplined agents of Russian foreign policy and the non-Communist unions lack discipline and express the general confusion in the minds of European peoples.

All except the Communist unions are financially weak. Members do not have money enough to pay substantial dues with frozen wage scales (at rates equivalent to about $15 a week in United States dollars) and there is little possibility for a successful strike. Communists unions in both Italy and France are currently getting money from the outside and are using it for propaganda against the west and for fomenting possible internal revolution.

French trade unionists are baffled by the United States labor movement. For years now they have been educated to understand politics in terms of class lines. The two-party system in America where both parties include conservatives and liberals is almost incomprehensible. The lack of definite party responsibility in the United States also leads to their misunderstanding of us. Although the French unionists recognize that American labor is largely in the camp of the Democratic Party, they have no clear idea of how labor's influence is felt in the Democratic Party, nor do they have a very certain impression that labor is an important political force.

The syndicalist tradition in France makes open alinement with political parties impossible for the non-Communist unions. They do little or nothing to help the party select candidates or formulate party platforms. After the platforms and candidates have been designated most of the unions publish a paper indicating which parts of the party platforms and which candidates seem to them the most nearly in accord with their own aims. There is no feverish activity in the labor movement around election time and mostly labor's influence in Government is exerted through conversation and conference.

I asked innumerable labor leaders in all parts of Europe about the possibility of a labor party. In each case I was told that the trade unionists themselves do not want a political party but that they may be forced into organizing one if the established parties continue to disregard their interests.

All in all, the European labor movement presents a contrasting picture to that found in the United States. Here our unions spend a great deal of time thinking through the problems not only of their own unions but the total economy. European unionists, on the other hand, spend most of their time fighting either the Communists or the non-Communists. I got no clear impression from anyone in the labor movement regarding a well thought out plan for the future and a program of economic reconstruction.

It must be clearly understood by Americans that communism works primarily through labor unions and intellectuals. The European unions have a far better record than the European intellectuals. Most of the important unions have, like their brothers in the United States, taken a firm stand that communism means the end of the benefits trade unionism tries to achieve. Many European intellectuals are much less sure.

Through the excellent and knowing staff of labor experts from the ECA and the State Department, the non-Communist trade unions are being brought into closer cooperation with western policy makers. Through this cooperation, our efforts to reconstruct the economic life of Europe is made more realistic and more universal.

If it had not been for the Marshall plan, European labor would today be completely hopeless. The unions, without the Marshall plan, would long ago have been forced to the Communist position. Communists can offer nothing but Russian type slavery; the non-Communist union leaders can point to cooperation with ECA and the actual arrival of food and industrial equipment.

A conversation with Luigi Morelli, secretary for Union Activities, Free Italian General Confederation of Workers, had the following questions and answers on the Marshall plan:

"Mr. RIBICOFF. What does your union think of the Marshall plan?

"Mr. MORELLI. Our union is grateful to the American people for what they have done and for what the American workers have contributed in the form of taxes to this plan. Italian workers feel closer to the American workers because of this. I can also say this: I took a stand in favor of the Marshall plan before the Italian elections. I took this open stand at the mass meeting in the Piazza del Duomo in Milan when Louis Saillant, French Communist, secretary of the World Federation of Trade Unions, came out against the Marshall plan, together with Di Vittorio.

"Mr. RIBICOFF. What do you think would have happened in Italy without the Marshall plan?

"Mr. MORELLI. First, we wouldn't have been able to make the come-back materially that we have made; second, the standard of living of the Italian workers would be about 50 percent of what it is today; and third, politically, we would have more Communists, and possibly a Communist government."

These questions were asked in all of the western countries, and the answers were almost identical in every case.

The American people should not lose the interest and enthusiasm of the European workers. They are, through their unions, one of the most effective checks on Communist expansion.

CATHOLIC CHURCH

The Catholic Church is the most ancient single institution in Europe. It has seen many governments rise and many kings, dictators, presidents and premiers fall. To visit the Vatican is to wander back in time and have the whole range of western history pass in review.

The historic durability of the Roman Catholic Church was even more apparent in the attitudes and ideas expressed by the Pope. Pius XII, as the Popes before, takes a long view of history. He sees this present struggle with communism as the fourteenth century saw their struggle with Islam. Eventually, he is sure, the right side will be the victor. Yet, the present day church, as the church of the past, is charged with a responsibility to help bring about the victory.

One of the more memorable parts of my trip was the private audience with Pope Pius XII. Scheduled to last one-half hour, it extended for 57 minutes. As I entered his private library, he was seated behind his desk. Going to his right we shook hands, American style. Seventy-four years of age, with a frail physical constitution, the Pope has clear twinkling eyes and is unusually alert and keen. His grasp of world affairs is truly remarkable. The Pope speaks English and knows the United States. We discussed many international problems touching on the welfare of mankind, the cause of peace and human solidarity. He showed a sustained interest in peace, justice, freedom and the dignity of the individual.

Since the earliest days of Christianity, the church at Rome has been a potent political force. Rome picked up the pieces of the disintegration of the ancient Roman empire; the church pulled civilization out of the mire of the Dark Ages; and today the Vatican is faced with its most difficult political challenge—the defeat of Russian communism.

The present-day problem is couched in different terms and set in a different world. The world is no longer Europe and the Mediterranean—it is a total globe. Roman catholicism is no longer a highly centralized, closely knit and geographically localized institution. Today it is spread over the world. It has far-flung outposts in the Far East, Africa, South America, and the United States.

The terms of today's fight are different also. In the past, catholicism has fought paganisms and other religions which claim to understand God in a different fashion. Now, catholicism is fighting a gigantic, imperialistic, secular religion which knows no God. In fact, this secular religion claims that all religions which speak of God are "opiates of the people"—man's worst luxury.

Pope Pius XII and the other Vatican officials recognize that communism is a religion. They know that a person cannot declare absolute allegiance to the state, while at the same time serve the Roman Church. It is impossible for the church to admit that the state has absolute control, usurping the authority of God.

The soul of European man is, therefore, the prize for which Russia and the Catholic Church struggle. If Russia should win, the Vatican knows that a whole new generation of Europeans will be raised as Communists, not as Christians. If the Church should win, she will win in concert with the western democracies, and freedom of religion will be a practiced fact.

Roman catholicism works in a number of ways to achieve victory in its struggle. She offers herself as a point of resistance in the iron-curtain countries, even to the extent of having top church officials jailed and tortured; she works through trade unions to teach the lie of communism and the utter falsity of its economic claims; she answers the theoretical charges made by Marxist philosophers and points out in simple language how illogical and false are their claims; finally, the Catholic Church provides a strong bond of union among its 400,000,000 church members spread throughout the world.

But the Catholic Church is more than a powerful political foe of communism. In the parishes throughout Europe and the rest of the world, Catholic worship and moral teaching is helping to heal the wounds left by depression and war. Without fanfare, local priests daily perform their services to man, helping along with other spiritual leaders to build the kind of lives that will some day make possible a decent world.

Europe needs the services of their spiritual leaders—Catholic, Protestant, and Jewish—in this day more than at any other time in history. As far as I could judge, the leadership of all religious traditions are actively fulfilling their trust.

GERMANY

The American people have never had a thought-out policy with regard to Germany. When we established General Clay as the Military Governor of western Germany, we gave him no policy; we simply allowed him to play by ear. Congress never legislated on Germany. What policy we had that came out of Congress came through the Appropriations Committee. Clay as a consequence had only one real political responsibility, and that was a dollars and cents one.

General Clay, therefore, felt that he was doing his job adequately as long as it was being done as cheaply as possible.

In addition to this negative emphasis is the fact that the Army was running Germany. When an army runs anything, it sits on it. The strength of any soldier is in his ability to guard the state and to make real political decisions possible; but his job is to set the conditions for political decisions, not to make them. From the earliest times both the strength and the weakness of the soldier has been his limited frame of reference. He has never been a diplomat in any over-all sense.

General Clay's administration of Germany was a soldier's administration. As a soldier he did an excellent job; he wasn't expected to exercise political vision.

German recovery has been rapid and, as one would expect, efficient. It must be remembered that Germany is the industrial heart of Europe and the Ruhr Valley is the industrial heart of Germany. Russian actions with regard to the Berlin blockade and the general German problem are only understood as one recognizes that the clue to Europe is Germany.

The clue to Germany is the Ruhr Valley. If this highly industrialized section of Europe is turned over to the western German people, without effective strings attached, England, France, Belgium, Holland, and the rest of the sovereign states of western Europe have a right to be fearful. German industrialists and cartelists have been outstandingly responsible for two of the most horrible wars in history. They could not have had those wars had it not been for the Ruhr Valley.

Russia knows full well that the greatest propaganda weapon they can have is the reestablishment of German industrialism and German control of the Ruhr. What we have done about Germany is to really close our eyes to the problem. We have sent well-meaning people with well-meaning books to Germany and then asked the Germans why they did not want to become like the United States. German conditions and traditions are so different as to make this a foolish vision. We learned after the First World War when we tried to impose the Weimar constitution on Germany that democracy grows out of the spiritual resources of the people and is never imposed from the top. We know this now, but we still go on in a kind of simple way to ask these people if they will not really be good fellows and act like Americans.

The German problem is, therefore, twofold. On the one hand, it is a long, long process of education and realinement of values. On the other hand it is finding some workable way to use this tremendous industrial potential of the Ruhr as a means of peace rather than as a means of war.

I am frank to say that the solution to the total problem of Germany is complicated and not immediately apparent. Just as many other observers, I recognize that our diplomacy has been bad and that we should have substituted civilian control for the military some years ago. This does not mean, of course, that we should have pulled our Army out, but it does mean that we should have established a civilian policy over the Army at an early stage.

Whether we like it or not, Germany is going to be the center of power in Europe. We can lose this center of power if we do not begin today requiring of our Government and the governments of other western democracies hard practical thought. The other problems of Europe fade into insignificance when we realize that if Germany becomes strong again she can retreat to the old Bismarckian policy of pitting the east against the west. We should not be deceived; she will play footsie with Russia while using our resources for her recovery.

Germany must be made a part of a solid group of western democratic nations. She must never again be allowed to rebuild her industry for the purpose of war, and she must never again be permitted a chance to engage in imperialist expansion. The only way to insure the peaceful future of Germany is to make her a part of a strong, peaceful union.

I am particularly distressed to see that Britain is not aware that she must be an active partner in western union. She is still clinging to her traditional policy of commonwealth isolation. As long as she does, there is no hope of solving the German problem. The western European nations, Germany among them, cannot be economically or politically stable without the British. The prosperity of Europe, the health of Germany, and, in a large measure, the peace of the world depends upon an effective council of Europe. Such a council can only be effective with the full cooperation of a strong Britain.

If the British can be persuaded to change their minds, the talk of making Germany a neutral buffer state between east and west will vanish. And it should vanish. In Europe today, it is impossible to be neutral between communism and democracy—between peace and war—between security and insecurity. The British should know this; certainly the Americans are coming to know it.

One thing is absolutely certain. The American people cannot allow the soft sentimentality of the 1920's to guide the German policy in the 1950's. If Britain does not go into a strong western union, then the United States must. We cannot afford to leave a weak council of Europe with Germany in a position to rise again as an independent power capable of starting another war. All important decisions to be made by the Germans should be made in open meeting with strong democratic nations sitting on either side of her.

Germany, in the very nature of the case, cannot be neutral. We must have her positively seated in a strong western democratic bloc, with strong democratic nations determining the course of action.

PROTESTANT CHURCH

The Protestant Church leaders in Europe are trying to rediscover the specific mission for Europe in today's world. They recognize that the old bonds of unity in Europe are dead. The two world wars have destroyed the ancient bonds which bound the peoples of Europe together and now, if Europe is to be regenerated, something new must take the place of the old.

The Reverend W. A. Visser 'T Hooft said: "None of the old forces can do the trick. Roman Catholicism has thought too much in terms of the maintenance of its institutional life and has been too reactionary; Protestantism too divided and too abstractly spiritual; liberalism too superficial and too individualistic; scientific rationalism too bloodless; socialism too opportunistic; nationalism too destructive. And the classes are equally played out—above all the bourgeoisie with its eternal pursuit of false securities but also the labor class with its understandable but nevertheless sterile resentments."

Visser 'T Hooft's observations deal primarily with the institutions of Europe. His hope and the hope of other Protestant leaders in Europe is that there will be some kind of poltical unity which will emphasize the freedom of individual consciousness. The World Council of Churches in Geneva, of which Visser 'T Hooft is general secretary, is an anti-Fascist and anti-Communist force. In keeping with the Protestant tradition, they are little concerned with the differences of institutions as such and much more concerned with the development of individualism.

What they see as a goal is a kind of classless individualism which will allow very few economic privileges but a great deal of individual freedom in speech and worship.

In talking with various Protestant leaders it became clear that what they wanted the United States to do more than anything was to persuade Europe into union and perhaps make political union a condition for further aid from the United States. In asking for such a union they place very little emphasis upon specifically religious institutions which might be a part of it. By and large, they do not want established churches paid by the state. They would rather see a separation of church and state which will make it possible for them to give denominational expression to Christianity. If religious freedom is not a part of the new political union, Protestant leaders feel that the foundation of real liberty will be missing.

Protestant thought and action in the political real is less spectacular than that of the Catholic Church but is just as real. It is, of course, just as impossible to be a thorough-going Communist and remain a Protestant as it is to remain a Catholic.

I got the distinct impression that Protestant leadership was of a high quality and that if they are given the proper kind of assistance from the United States and from the American churches, their movement toward unity and their political consciousness would play an increasingly important role in the life of Europe.

But the Protestants have certain special problems which make their future difficult. In some iron-curtain countries the memory of the Reformation and the Hapsburg rule is still strong. This memory makes it almost impossible for Protestants and Catholics to unite against their common enemy. Although this fear and distrust is not confined to the Russian countries, the western churches are much less bound by tradition.

Western European Protestantism, as distinguished from eastern Protestantism, is more vital and more active in political affairs. Protestant pastors, like Catholic priests, offer themselves as organizers for anti-Communist resistance. In western Europe, Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish leaders continue to show their people what the alternatives are in the present situation. They know that religion in all its traditional manifestations is up against its most impressive challenge.

The German Lutheran Church has, it seems, learned a lesson from the experience under Hitler. For a long period, the German Lutherans said that they could not in all conscience criticize the state, except as the state interfered with worship. Hitler showed them that a state can be demoniac and utilimately the cause of man's spiritual death.

Now they recognize the same demoniac character in Russian communism. They know that unless tyranny, in whatever form, is defeated man will never have the chance or the strength to freely worship God.

Throughout western protestantism there is a real concern for a greater unity among the European countries. The nation is, after all, only a means by which man has tried to perfect his life and achieve justice. Many Protestant leaders think that nationalism has served its purpose and should now be discarded.

What should take the place of nationalism is not clearly seen. The Protestant leaders have no blueprint, but they do have a faith that somehow, somewhere, the proper answer will be found.

GENERAL

Europe will never again have the political and economic balance which was hers during the nineteenth century. The past few years have seen the disappearance, as such, of two military and naval powers, Germany and Japan, and the eclipse of a third, Italy. It has witnessed the serious economic and military depletion of two western powers, England and France. The recovery of their former strength is by no means assured. It has seen the thrusting of Soviet power into central Europe, and, for a year, to the Adriatic. Further, the Politburo has extended its orbit into vast portions of eastern Asia.

In the same period, the United States has involuntarily emerged into the preeminent position of power among western nations. This preeminence is inherent and cannot be adbicated. It is doubtful that history gives us a precise parallel of such a shift in the power situation in so short a period. Such shifts in power do not lend themselves to fast balance. The adjustment is necessarily prolonged over many decades. The economic and security problems of Europe—and this Nation—will not be over in a year or in 25 years. They will continue to challenge our wisest thoughts and best efforts for many years to come. But our thinking will not be wise nor our striving adequate if we cling to the illusion that the situation is a transient one or that we can turn our backs upon it any time we wish and, at most, in just a few years.

What the United States wants for Europe is not that it be a colonial possession of ours but rather that it be an independent association of nations living in peace and harmony with each other, and with us. What Russia wants is that Europe become a colony of the Kremlin. By so doing, Europe would be able to produce for the Russian people and Europeans would live in a slave-labor camp. It would further provide Russia with the opportunity for jumping to the Western Hemisphere and ultimately bringing to fruition the Communist dream of world revolution and domination. Without Europe, Russia is contained. With Europe, Russia will be able to gain absolute hegemony over the peoples of this planet. The European peoples themselves have a vague recognition that this is the case. They don't want to go to Russia, but they are not quite sure that the United States has the plan or the understanding necessary for their salvation.

The constant debate we conduct with ourselves—whether or not to participate in the affairs of Europe—is only a dilemma of the mind. In the real situation, there is no choice, no place else to go. We are not willing to submit to failure as a power and to abdicate the leadership which has been thrust upon us. The difficulty is that in keeping alive the illusion that we might do so we reduce the effectiveness of our efforts in world leadership.

We still like to woo constancy with philandering words. In enacting the European recovery program we reserve our position not only with respect to the sequel, but also during the term of the program itself. Thus we make the leadership effective for only a year at a time, and each spring Congress renews the debate not only as to the amount to be spent in the ensuing year, but also upon the question of whether the program is to be continued or to be summarily dropped. Moreover, the relevant legislation reserves the right of the Congress to back out and call off the program by concurrent resolution at any moment it may choose to do so. Likewise with the mutual defense assistance program. This is supposed to supply the sinew of a solemn, permanent alliance, and yet the legislation is enacted for only a year at a time. Our Nation thus seeks the benefits of a permanent alliance while preserving the freedom of a companionate marriage. Again the legislation includes the statement of the right of Congress to call the whole thing off by concurrent resolution.

In a sense, this is the result of our structure of government. In the United States it is necessary for us to elect Congressmen every 2 years, Presidents every 4 years, and Senators every 6 years. It is certainly true that anyone may run for these offices, against any particular point in our previous foreign policy. The Congress, which must be elected every 2 years, must defend its actions before its constituency. If their actions have not met with approval, the voters will send a man with a different viewpoint to Washington. As a consequence, no foreign policy can actually be formulated, at least in terms of appropriations, for an extended period of time.

This situation in American democracy places the major responsibility on the voter. The American voter must be fully aware of what he is voting for when any party presents a program or a candidate. If the voters do not understand America's position in the world today, they will not be adequately prepared to exercise their franchise in an intelligent fashion.

The voter, who for us is the ultimate formulator of foreign policy, must recognize that our stake in Europe is a long-term and an expensive one. Western civilization requires our leadership, and leadership has never been cheap. No person or nation has been a leader without paying heavily in time and money. So I would urge that we not delude ourselves into thinking that we have only an emergency and short-term problem.

Along with the recognition of an expensive and long-term future, the American people must be aware of the necessity for constancy and consistency in foreign policy. We cannot afford to allow isolationist rabble rousers to lull us to sleep and make us think that our frontier is the Missouri River. No voter who is realistically facing the world of fact will be misled, and it is part of our responsibility as citizens of this Nation and the world to make sure that all the facts are known and well understood.

The national mind must be made up. We must recognize that there are a number of cherished ideas which must be branded as illusions. We must recognize that the most dangerous illusion of our present situation is the one that tells us that short-term and short-run investments pay higher dividends than long-term securities. The American people must be willing to pledge the same steadfastness of policy and concern that it expects from its friends. We cannot afford the luxury of constant shifts and changes of mind. I do not think we will change our mind once we realize the new and different character of today's world.

Commodore Everett B. Drew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, not many of us have the time or the opportunity to become fully acquainted with the activities of many valuable groups and organizations which play a vital role in our country, or with the people who devote their time and energy to make these groups function successfully. One of these groups is the Coast Guard Auxiliary, which is the civilian arm of the oldest military service in the United States.

It is my privilege to be a member of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the Third Coast Guard District in Brooklyn, which is headed by Commodore Everett B. Drew, a friend of mine of long standing. He may be a commodore without a boat of his own, but he heads an organization which boasts a fleet of 1,206 vessels of various sizes and a membership of 3,032 men. The growth and importance of this auxiliary should be an encouragement to similar groups throughout the country and to the Coast Guard in general.

Mr. Speaker, the following article about Commander Drew appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of November 20, 1949, entitled "Yep, He's a Commodore With No Boat of His Own":

BROOKLYN'S MAN-OF-THE-WEEK—YEP, HE'S A COMMODORE WITH NO BOAT OF HIS OWN

(By Paul Blauvelt)

You've probably heard of the admiral who didn't have a navy. Brooklyn now has the nearest thing to him—a commodore who doesn't have a boat of his own.

Brooklyn's commodore does have a fleet, however, for he's head of an organization of 3,032 men who operate 1,206 vessels ranging from 16-foot runabouts and sailboats to 100-foot yachts.

He's Everett B. Drew, of 314 Stratford Road, just elected commodore of the Coast Guard Auxiliary in the third Coast Guard district. The auxiliary is a strictly civilian arm of the oldest military service in the country, made up of boating enthusiasts who occupy a sort of middle ground between the ranks of the Sunday motorboater and the enlisted forces of the Coast Guard.

The commodore, in fact, has never owned a boat, which may seem rather strange for some one selected by power boat enthusiasts to be their boss. But he's not shy on experience on the water, for he comes of a farm-bred but water-adopting family.

His father, Reuben, who lives at the Stratford Road address and, although in his seventies, is still an active harbor pilot, was born on a farm in North Carolina. He tired of the life, however, and came to Brooklyn to start the Red Hook Towing Co., which sold out many years ago to the Dalzell Towing Co. Later he ran a shipyard in New Baltimore, some 100 miles up the Hudson, but he sold that, too, to come back to piloting.

For many years he was skipper of the old *North Star*, popular fishing boat, and then retired for a time. The *North Star* several years ago became the *Traveller* and was put in the round-Manhattan tourist service. And who commands her? Captain Drew, of course.

It was all this water life of the elder Drew that got the new commodore interested in boating. He spent many a day on the old Red Hook towboats—they're never called tugs in marine circles—and later aboard the *North Star*.

"Actually, I never had to buy a boat," he explained. "I got more water experience with my dad than I ever would have in my own boat. And I still think he's the best pilot in the city."

Strangely enough in this strange half-land, half-water existence, the commodore now spends far more time on land then he ever did before. At least 3 nights a week are spent attending meetings and working on the 60-page manual of standards for the auxiliary which he is compiling—the first

such attempt to gather into on authoritative publication all the best in training procedures worked out by various flotillas and divisions in the district.

The auxiliary, little known among strict landlubbers, is rapidly becoming widely known among boating men, although it really dates only from 1939, when it was established as the Coast Guard Reserve. It functioned for 2 years and then became known as the auxiliary when a formal military Reserve was set up.

Thus, the Coast Guard now has three units—the Regular Guard, with men serving enlistments at full pay; the Reserve, with enlistees being paid only when on temporary service, and the auxiliary, composed of private boat owners who use their own craft, on their own time, and pay their own expenses to help out the Guard.

The commodore is sort of a liaison man between the wholly civilian auxiliary and the Regular Guard, passing on down to the various units Coast Guard calls for assistance.

What does the auxiliary do, and why do the members without any hope of financial compensation, devote their time, equipment, and personal funds to the various duties they assume?

"Our aim," says the commodore, "is the protection of the last outpost of an unregimented tribe."

More seriously, he explains that the auxiliary works "to avoid the headaches of strict Government supervision over boating in general."

By educating the casual boat owner in safe operating methods and by establishing ever higher standards of operation and maintenance of private power boats, he says, "We're hoping to keep the boating enthusiast free of unnecessary supervision, letting him show he is a responsible individual on his own."

The auxiliary is, in actuality, a collection of small units. The flotilla is the basic one, composed of at least 10 boats, planes or radio outfits in any combination. There are a number of private planes and a score or more of mobile short-wave transmitters listed as available in the district.

A division is the intermediate unit. It consists of two or more flotillas and covers a large area. For instance, Commodore Drew in 1947 became captain of the Rockaway Inlet division, which takes in all of Brooklyn's water front and Jamaica Bay. It had nine flotillas of varying sizes then; he consolidated them into two big ones, with a total membership of 176 men, about half of whom own boats.

The auxiliary, by the way, is not only a refuge for rugged individualists—it's one of the few remaining sanctuaries for males only.

Commodore Drew, for all practical purposes, is a native of Brooklyn. He was born in Bath, N. Y., in 1905, but he arrived there only because his mother went back to the old homestead just for the occasion. He was promptly brought back to Brooklyn—to Red Hook, where his parents lived for many years.

He went to Public Schools 142, 32, and 6, and Stuyvesant High School in Manhattan, then the only technical high school in the city. He also went to Virginia Polytechnic Institute with the intention of becoming a mechanical engineer. He never worked at it, however. Now he's a representative of the Photostat Corp., selling and installing equipment.

At Stuyvesant High he became coxswain of an eight-oared crew that, in 1922, set an all-time record for a mile on the Harlem River—4 minutes 29 seconds. His athletic operations being confined to playing coxswain, he was dubbed "Rowboat" Drew.

The name has stuck with him through the years. Come to think of it, it rather fits a commodore who doesn't have a boat.

British Oil Policy—Day of Reckoning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Amon G. Carter, president and publisher of the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, has for many years followed a middle-of-the-road position through his editorial columns on the problems of the petroleum industry and particularly the operations of that industry in the State of Texas.

The Star-Telegram issue of December 30, 1949, has an editorial entitled "Day of Reckoning" which contains some very significant comments on present Government policies of assisting British oil interests to the detriment of American interests doing business in world markets and the resultant effects on the domestic industry. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting this editorial:

DAY OF RECKONING

The United States Government has informed Great Britain of its concern over the announced British intention of drastically curtailing oil imports from dollar areas in 1950. The effect of this cut-back will be to contract sharply the market for American oil in the United Kingdom.

The concern being shown by the American Government is over a condition which it has helped to create and which it should have been able to foresee. Through increases made since the war in British petroleum production and refining capacity, and with continued gasoline rationing, Britain will be faced next year with an oil surplus. The curtailment of purchases of American oil, when Britain has more than enough oil of its own, is a natural decision.

The short-sightedness of the United States Government lies in the fact that it has assisted, through the use of Economic Cooperation Administrtation funds, in building up British capacity to a state of surplus. Only recently the ECA approved an allocation of $17,293,000 for two refineries which would increase British capacity by 94,100 barrels a day.

Now the expansion of the productive ability in western Europe is a sound aim of the European recovery program to which this country is committed. But it is hardly sound policy to increase productive facilities for any product to the point where they exceed actual or potential market demand.

The inevitable result of this mistaken policy, as reflected in the curb of oil imports into Britain, threatens to have a profound effect upon Texas and upon the domestic petroleum industry of the State and Nation. Most of the American oil sold in Britain comes from the Middle East. Blocking of the British outlet for Middle East production may mean an increase in the already heavy flood of foreign oil coming into the United States. With no other market, such an increase in United States oil imports, in fact, seems certain if the British order stands.

The inflow of oil from abroad already has caused the pinching back of domestic production. In Texas it has brought repeated reductions in the maximum allowable production of oil, which is one of the State's foremost industries and the most important source of State revenues.

The Government's concern over the British development seems to center largely upon its effect upon oil production by American companies in the Middle East and other overseas areas, which some Washington officials view as vital to this country's preparedness for war. These official appear totally unaware that the gradual destruction of the domestic oil industry, which would be accelerated by a further increase in oil imports to supplant native petroleum production, would constitute an even greater impairment of our defensive strength in case of war.

Surface Healthier Than Depths

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in the new brands of food for human consumption now flooding the markets, where chemicals take the place of vitamins in flour and by substituting chemicals for milk and lard, I think the hands of the Pure Food and Drug Administration should be sustained by appropriations that will safeguard the people of this country. To give just a glimpse of what is going on I desire to submit herewith an article by J. Richard Feeley published in New Physical Culture in the issue of January 1950:

SURFACE HEALTHIER THAN DEPTHS—BEWARE OF MINERAL OILS AND CHEMICAL FOOD SUBSTITUTES FROM THE BOWELS OF THE EARTH

(By J. Richard Feeley)

The people of the world are using mineral oils, and consuming foods which contain chemicals, derived from minerals, and derivatives of natural gas. Some cancer researchers suspect that some of them may produce cancer. It is possible that they may produce other diseases.

Chemical-oil-gas-fertilizers and insecticides are used on land upon which our cattle feed. They are also used on crops which are later consumed by humans.

It is not known, especially over a long period of years, what effect these mineral oils, chemicals, and gases may have on the human body. I believe that since we live on top of the earth, foods, etc., from the top of the earth, or nearer the top, are best for the human body. I believe that foods and products from down deep in the earth are detrimental to the human body.

With this thought in mind, I have contacted hundreds of people in all walks of life from top personalities of prominence right down to my wonderful neighbors in Amesbury, Mass. As a promoter of health, I have no strings attached. Many researchers have their hands tied by reason of receiving directly or indirectly financial assistance for research from large corporations or organizations which are interested in products for exploitation.

From the many letters I have received it is clear that the matter of chemicals in foods is just being investigated by researchers. But I maintain that common sense tells us that when nutritious items in foods are replaced by chemicals, that the human body over a period of years is bound to be affected. And these chemicals may slowly poison the human race. They were invented by the I. G. Farben trust in Germany during the last war because of food shortages. Some people think that these chemicals caused the sadism and hatred which made Nazis worse than beasts. It long has been a prediction that chemicals can make men into

animals. It was a chemical which was supposed to turn the charming Dr. Jekyll into the brutal Mr. Hyde.

After the war these chemical food substitutes were taken over by the United States Alien Property Custodian with permission given for American manufacture based on Nazi formulas. And American firms are now inventing new food chemicals until there are now about 300 used in foods consumed by Americans. The United States Pure Food and Drug Administration seems to need more money and expanded facilities to cope with the situation adequately.

There should be pure food and drug laws requiring manufacturers to indicate to the consumer just what the product contains. Many scientists say that coal, coal tar, and natural gas derivatives will ultimately supplant the cow. Scientists in Germany are making butter out of petroleum, coal, and natural gas.

Bread is supposed to be the staff of life. The B-1 is taken out of the wheat and sold on the market as a vitamin. Some of the bread made now has a chemical made from natural gas to supplant lard, and another chemical to supplant milk. These chemicals are put into foods because they appeal to the taste, sight, and smell. The matter of toxation or nutrition is not considered at all. Nothing matters to these synthetic food manufacturers other than the god of gold * * * that is my opinion.

Of course, the big argument is that flour cannot be kept from spoiling after 30 days from milling, so in order to make it a nonperishable product they take the life out of it by removing the germ. Then they try to replace that with chemical substitutes and claim the bread has been made richer than before. But man has never yet improved on nature, and never will. Whole grains should be kept in communities for monthly milling and sale within a month. Then people will not be robbed of natural nourishment that bread affords. Bread is no longer the staff of life—much of it is now the stuff of death—that is, devitalized bread of white flour and chemical substitutes.

Panama Sea Level Canal—An Engineer's Day Dream and Giant Bonanza for Machinery Manufacturers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, during the last session of Congress, I included in an extension of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 26, 1949, an instructive article under the title "Panama Canal—Stop, Look, and Listen!"

Another illuminating paper on that subject was published in the Reader's Forum of the Sandusky Register-Star-News of November 11, 1949, in the form of a letter to the editor by the Honorable William L. Fiesinger, formerly a distinguished Member of Congress from Ohio.

In his statement Judge Fiesinger corrects some of the most obvious fallacies and misconceptions that characterize so much of the public discussions of the Isthmian questions.

The full text of Judge Fiesinger's paper, under leave accorded, is included for the information of Congress:

THE PANAMA CANAL

EDITOR, REGISTER-STAR-NEWS:

For several years I have been intensely interested in the Panama Canal, especially since there has been talk of rebuilding the present canal, or building what is called a sea-level canal. In his article in your paper of October 18, 1949, Columnist Ray Tucker adverts to the subject in connection, he says, with our failure to implement an agreement for rearming of Latin-American nations. In his article Mr. Tucker says:

"In view of Russia's expected progress in making atomic bombs, the major and immediate need is a new sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama, probably in Nicaragua.

"The present waterway, which enables our warships to slip from the Atlantic to the Pacific, or vice versa, as circumstances dictated, is too vulnerable to ordinary or atomic bombing. Indeed, our 45,000-ton aircraft carriers cannot negotiate it now."

I think that statement should not go unchallenged for the reason that it affects a vital interest of all our people, and to treat the subject intelligently they should be informed of the following facts:

First. There is a definite proposal to rebuild the present canal conceived by Capt. Miles Duval, United States Navy, retired, called the Terminal Lake Plan, which would permit 45,000-ton aircraft carriers, as well as the largest battleships to conveniently and safely negotiate passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific and vice versa.

Second. The claim that a lock canal is more vulnerable to atomic bombs than a so-called sea-level canal has been definitely exploded by all responsible experts. Either type of canal is subject to be put out of commission by atomic bombs.

Third. The original conception of the Frenchman De Lesseps was a sea-level canal, but as matters at Panama really got under way, the French engineer Godin de Lepinay recognized that the idea of a sea-level waterway was impossible of fulfillment because the Canal must cross mountainous jungle country in one of the world's heaviest rainfall areas featured by turbulent rivers. Of course, that is just as true today, and is supported by every one of the American engineers still living who worked on the Canal.

Fourth. The cost of rebuilding the present Canal to permit ships of any size extant today to freely and safely negotiate would, it has been reliably estimated, cost less than $2,000,000,000, whereas a so-called sea-level canal would cost at least $6,000,000,000 and at that cost would only be an experiment.

It seems to me that a so-called sea-level canal is just another daydream of the spenders in Washington to saddle more taxes and debt on the American people goaded by the makers of machinery and equipment, who would have a bonanza in selling their product.

Finally, Mr. Tucker speaks of a sea-level canal across the Isthmus of Panama probably in Nicaragua. It seems to me that this is highly impractical, if not impossible, for the canal across Nicaragua would require draining of Lake Nicaragua which is 105 feet above sea level and has a water area of approximately 3,000 square miles.

I say let us stick to what we now have, and have had for approximately 40 years, and improve the same. I have several times indicated to Congressman WEICHEL where I stand and the reasons why.

W. L. FIESINGER.

Mr. Speaker, I am informed that the cost of the canal is as follows for study:

Sea level: $6,000,000,000 to $10,000,000,000, or repair present Canal for $130,000,000.

Lake canal: $435,000,000 to $600,000,000 is advocated by all the eminent engineers who participated in building the present Canal and know its problems.

Nicaragua canal is unnecessary, more costly, and less desirable, besides requiring duplicate defense installations.

Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks, I am inserting at this point two editorials, one entitled "Pensions and Inflation" and the other "Who Pays for Pensions." Both are timely, and I commend them to the attention of the Members of the House:

PENSIONS AND INFLATION

Bernard M. Baruch, discussing old-age pensions, does us all a service in stressing how inflation may defeat the best conceived plans for a comfortable old age. The "elder statesman" rightly says:

"Anything that saps the value of savings—and inflation is the worst single threat—is the enemy of the aged and of those who expect to grow old."

He believes that inflation must be licked and our price structure stabilized before there can be any permanent security for any of us.

Mr. Baruch here has in mind, for example, the man who retired, perhaps 10 years ago, at 65. He had created for himself through his savings an annuity paying $100 a month, ample in 1939 to maintain him in simple comfort. Everybody knows that that man has had several times in the last few years to lower his living standards as his $100 became worth less and less in terms of his needs.

Mr. Baruch also has in mind the man who is trying today to build for himself security in the future when he can no longer work. He can save more now, perhaps, than he could a few years ago, because he is saving 60-cent dollars. But what will he do if, when he retires, those dollars he saved have only a 30-cent purchasing power?

There are those who believe that it makes little difference how much a dollar will buy, so long as wages are increased to meet price increases. Mr. Baruch shows how wrong these people are. Part of what we earn today must be put away to take care of us in the future—by our own direct savings or by the accumulations we make for Federal old-age benefits.

WHO PAYS FOR PENSIONS?

Senator TAFT points to the fact that it would cost the people of this country $12,000,000,000 a year to give every worker on retirement the type of pension now set up for the Nation's steelworkers. If such a pension system were set up on an actuarial reserve basis, he points out, the pension

funds would have to own nearly all the country's property.

This is something for us all to think about, because the money for pensions will in the final analysis have to come from raised prices for the things we buy and from taxes. For the most part, those who work will have to support those who don't.

There are several factors in the situation which deserve emphasis. In the first place, the percentage of the aged in the population is constantly growing. In the second place, people begin work at a constantly higher age. In the third place, workers are producing fewer and fewer hours a week, as well as fewer days in a year.

The net result is to throw an increasing burden on a decreasing work span. Where a man used to work for nearly 60 years of his life, the average now is closer to 45. In that period he must produce enough to support himself, his children in school, and his elders in retirement. It is only because his productivity per hour has increased so markedly (through the use of power machinery), that he has been able to carry the load so far. It will be only through a further increase in productivity that the Nation can further expand educational opportunities, raise the level of living of the aged and, along with all this, perhaps also decrease still more the hours and years of labor.

Christian Churches Against FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ED GOSSETT
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, a letter received by me from the American Council of Christian Churches of California relative to FEPC legislation is so good that I feel it should be made a part of the permanent record.

To my mind it is unthinkable that an intelligent, democratic society would tolerate such unwise, totalitarian interference with their inalienable rights as is proposed by those advocating FEPC legislation.

We should commend the Los Angeles church for its letter of January 1, which follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
CIVIL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

Hon. ED GOSSETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation, and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would have work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20:15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislative body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups), only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God, and that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

G. M. LANE, *Chairman.*

Taxes That Are Paid by the Average Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the demagogue would have the public believe that the big fellow will pay the bills for most of the public-aid programs now being advocated. I am extending my remarks to include an editorial entitled "The Little Fellow's Tax Share."

THE LITTLE FELLOW'S TAX SHARE

If it is the little fellow who gets Government benefits, it is also the little fellow who, more than anybody else, pays the bills.

That was one of the themes of James F. Byrnes in a recent Biloxi (Miss.) speech. Byrnes, who was one of the architects of the New Deal and more recently a member of President Truman's Cabinet, says the United States has become a spendthrift state where "the people have been misled into regarding the Treasury as a Christmas tree, with the President and Members of Congress playing the role of Santa Claus."

The administration, he said, has boasted of what it has done for the little fellow but nobody has been stressing what "big government is doing to the little fellow."

Mr. Byrnes has a point there.

The little fellow today, as always, is paying his full share of taxes. Federal, State, and local governments all rely on him for a considerable part of their revenue. He pays relatively little directly and consciously, but he pays a lot indirectly and unconsciously.

The little man smokes, travels, goes to the theater and has a car. The Federal Government taxes him for all these things. In Wisconsin, the State government also taxes his cigarettes and his gasoline.

The little man's wife uses cosmetics, has furs and jewelry, buys electric-light bulbs and chats over the telephone. The Federal Government makes all these things more expensive through excises.

The little man's family likes a nice house. The local governments and the State tax him for the privilege. He sees this tax and he squawks. The hidden taxes, which are really bigger, he does not see.

But the little man's contribution to government does not stop with direct and more or less hidden taxes. In many cases, his biggest contribution of all comes in taxes levied on the corporations which make the goods he buys.

Government today is getting billions of dollars from the little fellow by the simple device of soaking business. The party leaders know very well that corporations can of themselves pay no taxes. The money they use for taxes they must get from the people who buy what the corporations have to sell. Business taxes are reflected in the prices we pay for what we need. But business taxes are safe for the politicians, because the little fellow has never yet realized that he pays a disproportionate part of the bill.

The fact is that the little fellow is now paying a larger part of the cost of government than ever. It is a thing he should bear in mind when he applauds some new and perhaps unnecessary benefit. It is a thing he should think of increasingly as government costs rise.

Flying Fryers Wing Way to Alaskan Tables

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the poultry industry is one of the leading industries of our section of Arkansas. One of the greatest boosters for that industry is C. Jimmie Carter, president of the Rogers Airport. He never lets an opportunity pass to boost the industry.

Therefore, it was not surprising that when it was necessary to get some fryers to Alaska, he volunteered to take the first lap in the transporting of these chickens. I would like to insert a news item by Dave Miller which appeared in the Tulsa Tribune of November 30, 1949, which indicates the everyday, never-say-die spirit of Jimmie Carter and the poultry boys of northwest Arkansas:

FLYING FRYERS WING WAY TO ALASKAN TABLES

(By Dave Miller)

From Arkansas to Alaska is a long haul to satisfy a craving for fried chicken, but that's the distance several thousand Arkansas fryers will travel before they find their way to some sourdough's table.

Today marked the beginning of a 1-year program in which chickens from the Arkansas Quality poultry farm at Springdale, Ark., will be flown to Anchorage.

The first 1,500-pound load of frozen fowl was flown from Rogers to Tulsa this morning where it was loaded on an airline cargo craft for the flight to the west coast. From there the chicken goes to Seattle, and then on to Anchorage.

Present at the Tulsa municipal airport this morning to witness the loading were E. T. Schmidt, manager of the poultry farm; C. Jimmie Carter, president of the Rogers airport; and Frank Rust, president, and Jay Frizzo, pilot for Rusty Air Service, which flew the chicken to Tulsa.

The chicken-by-air plan was arranged when a restaurant owner from Anchorage heard of the famous northwest Arkansas chickens. He signed a contract which called for a weekly shipment of about 1,000 birds averaging one and one-half pounds each.

The chickens are quick-frozen at Springdale and shipped to Rogers. Rust takes over from there and flies the shipment to Tulsa in his twin Cassna. In addition to flying frozen birds, Rust and his pilots annually fly more than 4,000,000 1-day-old chicks to Rogers.

The chickens left the Tulsa airport late this morning and will be in Anchorage Thursday noon. There they will be thawed and served to Alaskans at the rate of $4.50 for half a chicken.

"This isn't just a promotion stunt," said Carter. "We're proud of the chickens we raise around Rogers. Restaurants all over the country advertise Arkansas chickens, and now Alaskans will have a chance to see how good they are."

In addition to being president of the Rogers airport and a poultryman himself, Carter is one of the main forces behind an annual breakfast flight in which small plane pilots from all over the country fly to Rogers for a big breakfast of bacon and eggs, laid, of course, by northwest Arkansas hens.

The West Will Help

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Irrigation and Reclamation Subcommittee of the Committee on Public Lands, I have been greatly interested in the critical water problem that has developed in the humid and populous eastern part of the country.

In the West, where water is ever scant, planning for meeting water needs is as much a part of the growth as the roads over which people immigrate. I agree with William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior and long an expert in western water programs, who recently said, "It is about time for areas of eastern United States to begin longer-range planning for water development."

We of the West are thoroughly sympathetic with those who are now facing water shortages or the prospect of them. There is much experience in the arid region of the country that may be useful, but we also need to break much new ground. I have introduced new legislation toward that end.

I call attention to the report in the January 6 issue of Water Resources Review of the Geological Survey, Department of the Interior, on the New York City water shortage. It is as follows:

Since May 1943 New York City has used water at a greater rate than the total dependable yield of its several sources of supply. The consumption in recent years has been averaging 1,200,000,000 gallons per day, compared to a dependable yield of 1,045,000,000 gallons per day reported by the city of New York. The good fortune of above-normal run-off into its reservoirs prevented a shortage from developing earlier, but that condition and the associated avoidance of an accounting accentuated the difficulty because water demands have continued to increase meanwhile. This year a drought of moderate intensity has led to nearly serious consequences for New York City.

Run-off in the source areas of the New York City water supplies averaged about twice normal in the 3-month period December 1948 to February 1949. As a result, storage in reservoirs was well above normal at the end of February, and was approximately normal at the end of May. The total winter recharge to the reservoirs was about 90,000,000,000 gallons. The draft on storage from June 1 to December 1, 1949, was 159,000,000,000,000 gallons, equivalent to 870,000,000 gallons daily, about three-fourths of the water used by the city. Normally only about one-third of the water used during this period is obtained by draft on storage, the remainder coming from the summer and fall stream flow and from wells in southern Nassau County.

The reason for this abnormal draft was the dry period that began in June 1949, and the high rate of use. Run-off into the reservoirs during the 6-month period June to November averaged about 50 percent of normal, nearly setting a new low record. Lower flows for this period were recorded in 1909 and 1914. However, total run-off for the past water year was not particular low. Much lower flows were experienced without major difficulty as recently as 1941 and 1944, when the use of water was only about 80 percent of the current rate. If the rate of use that existed only as recently as 1944 had prevailed in 1949, the draft on storage probably would have been only about 100,000,000,000 gallons, leaving sufficient reserves to avoid critical shortages despite the drought.

The reservoirs now contain about 90,000,000,000 gallons, about 35 percent of capacity, equivalent to about 70 days' supply at the present rate of use. The normal increment in storage during the winter-spring period of high run-off is 60,000,000,000 gallons. Increments of twice this amount have occurred during past replenishment periods with abundant run-off, as in 1947 when the reservoirs were filled to capacity. However, owing to the depleted condition of the reservoirs, this abnormal recharge would not raise the contents to their normal volume of 242,000,000,000 gallons next spring. The dry period has also resulted in the depletion of soil moisture and ground water. These have first call on any rain and snow melt, ahead of the New York reservoirs.

The outlook, therefore, is that stream flow this winter will be lower than usual unless precipitation is far above the amount needed to satisfy the prior demands of Nature. The prospects are that continued care in the use of water will be necessary in New York until new supplies now being developed in the Delaware Basin can be added to the city's dependable sources. Heavy pumping of ground water in southern Nassau County to supplement the Croton up-State supplies has lowered the water table in the pumped areas to record low levels, and salt-water encroachment may result if pumping is continued.

Despite recurrent statements that our streams are drying up, the accompanying graphs of such long-term stream-flow records as are available in the Catskill Mountain region show no persistent downward trend, except for a slight apparent decline in flow of Schoharie Creek (one of the water sources of New York City). There have been large fluctuations in flow from year to year, characteristic of rivers everywhere, but the flows during the past decade in general have not been greatly different from those during the first decade of the century when records of flow were started. Discharge of Schoharie Creek during the second half of the 42-year period of record, however, averaged 90 percent of that during the first 21 years. None of the streams shown are materially affected by regulation or diversion.

The situation in New York City and in metropolitan New Jersey is largely the consequence of an acceleration in the mounting use of water that began during the war and has continued with undiminished rate since. Critical conditions portend wherever total use exceeds the dependable yield of the available supplies. Overdrafts are reported in a score of important areas throughout the country, mainly with respect to ground water, but some surface-water overdrafts are reported also. In certain communities the demand is exceeding the dependable supply. Although generally the problems are engineering and economic rather than ones of actual deficiency of water, as well as being largely localized in nature, and although there is no cause for undue alarm, the situation must not be ignored and requires prompt steps to obtain a Nation-wide appraisal of our water resources and of the expected future demands.

The Home-Rule Bill Should Be Enacted Into Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. USHER L. BURDICK

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, I have signed discharge petition No. 19. This petition will give this House an opportunity to vote on home-rule legislation for the District of Columbia. As you all know, this legislation passed the Senate last May. It is a measure that has been endorsed and enthusiastically supported by both major parties. It is nonpartisan measure which will relieve the Congress of its city council duties for the District of Columbia and will also bring the rights of citizenship to the disenfranchised residents of this community. I would like to take this opportunity to urge all of my colleagues to sign this discharge petition as soon as possible in order that this legislation may have its hearing before us.

I have a letter from the District League of Women Voters enclosing a copy of the President's letter to Speaker RAYBURN, which I would like to insert in the RECORD. The letter strongly urges that this

bill be enacted into law during this session:

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,
Washington, D. C., January 6, 1950.

Hon. USHER L. BURDICK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BURDICK: The President has called for home rule for the district of Columbia in his message to Congress. We therefore thought it timely to send you a copy of the President's statement of last July which amplifies his views on this important legislation.

We urge you to sign the discharge petition, No. 19, in order to give the House of Representatives an opportunity to vote on this measure.

Very truly yours,
GRACE H. BEATTY
(Mrs. Donald C. Beatty),
President.

(The following letter was sent by the President to the Honorable SAM RAYBURN, Speaker, House of Representatives:)

JULY 25, 1949.

MY DEAR MR. SPEAKER: On May 31, 1949, the Senate passed, without a dissenting vote, S. 1527, a bill to give home rule to the people of the District of Columbia. A subcommittee of the House Committee on the District of Columbia is now holding hearings on this legislation. I am writing to you to express my hope that the House will complete legislative action on a home rule bill and that it will be sent to me to sign into law before this session of the Eighty-first Congress adjourns.

As passed by the Senate, the bill has three major purposes: (1) to relieve the Congress as much as possible of the burden of District of Columbia affairs, without surrendering its constitutional powers; (2) to create a representative local government for the District of Columbia chosen by the qualified electors; and (3) to provide an efficient and economical government for the District of Columbia.

I am very much in favor of all of these objectives.

It is little short of fantastic that the Congress of the United States should—as it now does—devote a substantial percentage of its time to acting as a city council for the District of Columbia. During the past 2 years, during which it was confronted with many major problems of national and international importance, the Congress has had to find time to deal with such District matters as parking lots, the regulation of barbers, the removal of street obstructions, and the establishment of a Metropolitan Police Force band, to name only a few.

The people of the District of Columbia should not be placed in a different status from that of the people of all other American cities and almost all democratic capitals of the world insofar as local self-government is concerned. In my message to Congress transmitting the budget for the fiscal year 1947, I said:

"The District of Columbia, because of its special relation to the Federal Government, has been treated since 1800 as a dependent area. We should move toward a greater measure of local self-government consistent with the constitutional status of the District. We should take adequate steps to assure that citizens of the United States are not denied their franchise merely because they reside at the Nation's Capital."

It was not the intention of the architects of our Constitution to deprive the District of Columbia of home rule. Writing on this subject in the Federalist, James Madison said that the inhabitants of the District "will have * * * their choice in the election of the government which is to exercise authority over them" and that "a municipal legislature for local purposes, derived from their own suffrages, will of course be allowed them."

The establishment of a well-organized and efficient governmental system in the District of Columbia is a desirable adjunct to the successful operation of the home-rule principle. The present organization of the District government is complicated and administratively cumbersome. I am strongly in favor of better organization and greater efficiency throughout the executive branch. The District of Columbia government should not be an exception carved out from the general rule.

There is nothing partisan about this proposal. The platforms of both major parties urge home rule for the District. The bill which passed the Senate unanimously, received the support of both Republican and Democratic Members of that body. I am sure that the great majority of the people of Washington want home rule. I am equally sure that they ought to have it without further delay. I hope that the House will not adjourn this session without completing action on this important measure.

Very sincerely yours,
HARRY S. TRUMAN.

Good Will Makes Good Sense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, never before in world history was there greater need for human understanding, good will, and lasting peace than in the present postwar critical period. It is bad enough that mankind is rent asunder by conflicting ideologies and by false prophets interested in creating greater chaos in order to exploit their own selfish interests.

It is worse, however, when these false prophets and hatemongers in our own country spread doctrines of bigotry and hatred which serve only to undermine the unity of our people at a time when such unity is urgently needed for our very survival. There is no need for me to name names; we all know who these preachers of hatred and violence are.

Unfortunately, we sometimes pay undeserved attention to the demagogue while overlooking those who continue to fight for the highest American ideals. They are the true patriots of modern America. One of the finest and most loyal sons of modern America is the present national commander of the American Legion, George N. Craig.

In a recent speech, Commander Craig has shown that he possesses an excellent understanding and grasp of American ideals and some of the problems facing this country today. I believe the address which he made on Sunday, November 13, 1949, before the Joint Defense Appeal Conference in Detroit deserves wider attention. I set it forth in full as follows:

My fellow Americans, in a world which is shuddering under the tragic implications of its first wide open atomic armament race, mankind today faces a critical and an urgent choice.

We of this planet must learn to live together or perish. There is only one way to live together and that is by the Golden Rule. That means doing to others as we would have them do unto us.

The two major religions of the western word, Judaism and Christianity, have for centuries preached the formula for good-will living which is "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself."

Students of history agree that democracy was envisioned in religious terms long before it assumed a political terminology. Actually our American democracy was the first real political expression of the ideals of Judeo-Christianity.

Here in America the century-long teachings of religions have borne their greatest fruit. Our founding fathers built this Nation on the religious concept of the Fatherhood of God. They got that concept out of the Old Testament from the mouth of the prophet who said, "Hath we not one Father? Hath not one God created us?"

On that divine belief they developed the ideals of the brotherhood of mankind and of the intrinsic dignity and value of every human life. They drew on a religious tenet for their first political axiom which became the cornerstone of their Declaration of Indepence in these words:

"Man is endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights. Among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. To secure these rights governments are instituted among men."

These God-given rights of men were the key to the first promising solution to the problems of minorities. We recognized them politically first here in America. We established a government based upon a written Constitution and Bill of Rights to safeguard those rights.

As a result, America, the melting pot of the world's races, nationalities, and creeds, today represents mankind's greatest progress to date in the art of living together. This progress is our best authority for our leadership in the eleventh-hour effort to build a brave new world in which all nations can live in enduring peace and good will.

We have a solemn responsibility today of trying to teach the world that good will makes good sense.

We must succeed in this or face a world Armageddon. Man has conquered distance and finally pried from nature the secret of the incredible power of atomic fission. Now our social controls must match our mechanical skills. If we fail, then we face the physical destruction of a large portion of mankind and a return to the jungle by the broken and dazed survivors.

Our best propaganda today is the example we furnish to the rest of the world. We must demonstrate in our domestic life that we can live by the tenets of the rights of man. The way in which we meet the problems of our minority groups has a far-reaching influence. Every gain in human insight and in social justice in America today is a world gain, any set-back is a world loss.

We can be proud that in its every heroic moment our Nation has faced danger with complete national unity. We had that unity in the days when we fought to win a war. We need it today in the fight to win the peace.

Our national unity today is the target of well-financed, large-scale, and cunning campaigns to arouse and to aggravate racial, religious, and ethnic bigotry and tensions. The enemies of America are practicing the age-old strategy against us of "divide and conquer."

The fondest aim of communism today is to divide us by pitting class against class,

race against race, and creed against creed. They seek to exploit and magnify every difference, every prejudice, and every real or fancied slight.

Even worse than this Communist scum are those who seek to spread hatred and dissension for personal gain.

These peddlers of mental poisons must be stopped.

The controlling of group prejudices calls for a devoted united effort by all responsible citizens and organizations. It is because the American Legion is deeply concerned in doing its part in fighting intolerance, prejudice, and bigotry that I am happy to be speaking before this meeting of the Joint Defense Appeal. The American Legion wants to cooperate closely with the Anti-Defamation League of the B'nai B'rith, the American Jewish Committee, and every other loyal organization in promoting American ideals through the teaching of good will, tolerance, justice, and harmony.

Eleven times have national conventions of the American Legion taken vigorous stands against hatemongering in any form in our land. In recent months, I am proud to say, the American Legion has taken a leading role in the South in the moral condemnation and in legislative action designed to smash the Ku Klux Klan for once and for all time.

At its recent Thirty-first National Convention in Philadelphia, the American Legion adopted a number of vigorous Americanism resolutions. They are indicative of our policies in promoting good human relations among all Americans. One was a resolution which branded as a menace to our liberties any individual, group, or organization which fosters racial, religious, or class strife among our people.

In another resolution the American Legion urged the abolishment of racial and religious discrimination in education. It condemns all discrimination in education opportunity and declared that the only democratic basis for selection is scholastic qualification. We of the American Legion believe that every American citizen should enjoy equality of opportunity in education, regardless of color, religious belief or national origin.

The American Legion since 1946 by national convention action has opposed any type of discrimination for jobs because of race, creed, color, national origin, or religion.

At our recent Philadelphia convention, the American Legion endorsed in principle two resolutions on genocide. In this we followed the United Nations approval of the Genocide Convention. I want to advise you that the American Legion has from the beginning been one of the strongest supporters of the United Nations. The American Legion was the first large organization to urge the strengthening of the United Nations Charter. We propose that the veto power be abolished in all matters involving aggression, that there be effective international control of scientific weapons and that an adequate international police force be set up. We are backing the Marshall plan, the North Atlantic Pact and we are urging our Government to lend its immediate aid in forming a similar defense pact among the freedom-seeking nations in the Pacific and Far Eastern area.

Your organizations have contributed much to the cause of overcoming religious and racial animosities. One of your distinguished members, Judge Joseph M. Proskauer, is the author of a pledge for American unity to which the American Legion can subscribe wholeheartedly. It is only fitting that I should quote it:

"I will spread no rumor and no slander against any sect.

"I will never try to indict a whole people by reason of the delinquency of any member.

"I will daily deal with every man in business, in social, and in political relations, only on the basis of his true individual worth.

"In my daily conduct I will consecrate myself, hour by hour, to the achievement of the highest ideal of the dignity of mankind, human equality, human fellowship, and human brotherhood."

This is a golden blueprint for every-day living in a democracy. It is a basis on which all men of good will can make their personal influence count for tolerance and brotherhood.

There are no short cuts to honest human relations. "Every day in every way" applies here more truly than in any other aspect of human endeavors. Democracy is a way of life to be lived and experienced in hundreds of little routine situations day in and day out. We have a workable pattern. We have gone a long way under it. We must keep going forward. We must keep implementing our positive programs for better human relations.

Here in America our vital job is to teach true democracy by making it work so successfully that all other people will be sold on its advantages.

As the foremost champions of democracy we must put our whole moral weight into the condemnation of the abrogation of human rights anywhere in the world. Several weeks ago President Truman spoke at the dedication of the new United Nations headquarters in New York City. He said, and I quote, "The United Nations has learned that disregard of human rights is the beginning of tyranny and, too often, the beginning of war."

Then he spoke the words which underlie many of the reasons for this meeting here in Detroit today, "We believe strongly that the attainment of basic civil and political rights for men and women everywhere—without regard to race, language, or color—is essential to the peace we are seeking. The minds of men must be free from artificial and arbitrary restraints in order that they may seek the truth and apply their intelligence in the making of a better world."

The American Legion subscribes fully to this philosophy. So, I know, do the organizations represented here by the Joint Defense Appeal. Our methods for organization differ but our motives and purposes in promoting good human relations among all people are the same.

Americans of Jewish faith have filled enviable roles in all American wars. Their record in military service in World War II is outstanding. Although the Jewish people form only 3.33 percent of our population, the percentage of the members of the Hebrew faith in our armed forces was 4.23. More than 550,000 wore the uniform of Uncle Sam and 11,000 of them were killed and 40,000 were wounded. A total of 52,000 Jewish GI's won decorations, citations, and awards for distinguished gallantry and service.

The American Legion is proud to have veterans of Jewish faith in its ranks. They have never found any discrimination against them in the American Legion and never will. Today you will find Jewish Legionnaires, just as you will find those of Catholic and Protestant faiths, in our national offices, on our national staffs, on our national executive committee, on our national commissions, serving as State commanders and adjutants and filling every kind of responsible position on the district, county and post levels. We have had as many as four rabbis in one year serving as our State chaplains. Two rabbis were candidates for national chaplain at our recent national convention.

Veterans perhaps are in a best position to combat bigotry that is based on racial, religious and class prejudices. Men who have faced death together on the field of battle know that in the final showdown it isn't a man's color, place of birth, political belief or church affiliation that counts—it is only his courage to fight to the death, if need be, in defense of God and country.

Our form of government, our way of life and our society are based upon a belief in an Almighty God. Our basic creed is one of good will and love. It was on the basis of love for freedom that the first Americans were able to unite on this continent. Because of that love we have been able, here in America, to overcome the ancient European heritage of feuds and hatreds and build a great new nation. We must never acquire the ability to hate. We must rebuke and check those who would seek to turn one American against another. Every group must muzzle its own fools. Not a single one of us has a right to look down upon another as inferior to what he is himself. We are all brothers and sisters wandering through life to the same end.

That end is that every American today owes his best in creating conditions of life at home which will enable all to develop their noblest and purest instincts, their talents and their gifts. We can do this if we approach this task with a spirit of charity that will recognize there is good in every American and this element of good is the mighty bond of our national unity.

With the atomic bomb suspended today over all mankind, we Americans must be the first to see the truth that man is not doomed to futility and violence if he will but turn to the good sense that lies in good will.

"There is a destiny which makes us brothers
None goes his way alone:
All that we send into the lives of others
Comes back into our own."

United States Leadership in the Americas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "United States Leadership in the Americas," delivered today by Hon. Edward G. Miller, Jr., Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs, before the Rotary Club of Charleston, W. Va.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make two and a third pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $191.34.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I deeply appreciate the privilege of being with you here today. I feel at home in the friendly atmosphere of Charleston, which has been my sister's home since she married and settled here over 21 years ago. I have been well treated here each time that I have come to visit and it is always an exciting experience to see the great industrial activity of the Kanawha Valley.

West Virginia plays an important role in the National Capital today. Your distinguished Senators, KILGORE and NEELY, are

well known for their efforts to keep our economy sound and steady, and thus to frustrate the dearest wish of our enemies abroad who so earnestly keep hoping that we will return to a policy of boom and bust. Another great legislator from this State, the Honorable JOHN KEE, of Bluefield, as chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, performed great services in guiding through the last session of Congress the heaviest program of legislation in the foreign field that we have ever seen. Our dynamic Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson, of Clarksburg, is attacking with courage and decision problems of exceptional difficulty. Fortunately very effective working relations exist between his organization and the Department of State.

Before speaking of matters within my particular sphere of activity, I might begin with a few words about a general impression that has been made on me since my return to Washington 6 months ago.

The problems with which we deal today in the State Department, in the Department of Defense, in the Treasury Department and, especially in the White House and in the Congress, are so vast and so complex that they tend to surpass the power of human comprehension. It requires humility and patience to deal with these problems—as it does in the case of the people of the country to have to live with them. Above all, it requires the discipline of learning that to some problems there may not be any present solutions whatever—that our aim must be simply to bear them, not only during 1950 but perhaps for our entire lifetimes, until in the slow unfolding of history conditions change and solutions appear. This is a galling concept to Americans, who are accustomed to confronting problems and disposing of them in short order. Our natural tendency when we think of Russian-American relations, for example, is to say that the present state of affairs is intolerable and that we must do something about it. This tendency leads some of us to urge desperate measures upon our Government. Others of us think in broad and copious terms about sitting around a conference table and fixing everything up then and there, so that we can go home and never again have any worries.

All this is wishful thinking and cannot lead to real accomplishment. This Nation was not made great through panaceas but through patience and hard work. Nor is there any reason why war is inevitable in the world today. Let us put no faith in those who say that our system and the Soviet system cannot coexist in this world without war. As Secretary Acheson said to a group of us in Washington recently, good and evil have always coexisted in this world and always will. We have, therefore, had to face up to the necessity of assuming leadership in the free world. We have had to pick up the vast burden of this responsibility, without any assurance that we can lay the burden down again tomorrow.

One aspect of this new responsibility is the tremendous weight of work that is placed upon our Congress. The terrific load that is borne by the individual Members of Congress can hardly be appreciated unless you have been close to it. Senators and Representatives are among the most overworked people in the world today, and I regret that we in the Department of State cannot do more to make things easier for them. Much of the burden they have to bear takes the form of foreign problems that we put before them. For example, the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives during the last session considered 50 bills and joint resolutions of which 29 were favorably reported and 24 were passed by the House. The Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate in addition acted upon some 10 treaties including the North Atlantic Pact. To put the problem in another way, 48 percent of the bills introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress had to do with foreign relations or had an important bearing thereon.

Nor can we blink at the fact that our present programs in the foreign field are enormously expensive. One of the most sensible pieces of legislation ever passed was the law which repealed the exemption of Federal employees from United States income taxes. Let me assure you that we think hard every time we send up to Congress a bill involving new appropriations. As taxpayers ourselves, we know how the impact is felt. It is our objective to keep the cost of our foreign programs to a minimum. Yet we must recognize that the extent of our responsibility in the world is very great, and unwise economies would involve us in risks that could prove far more costly.

Our immediate objective in the world today is to weld together a group of free nations for the common purpose of creating conditions in which, as President Truman said last week, "Men may live in dignity, perform useful work, serve their communities, and worship God as they see fit." This, briefly, is our foreign policy. Our effort to repair the damage which the last war brought to Europe is an important expression of this policy. It has been expensive. It still is expensive. But the problem of European recovery affects every other problem with which we deal—foreign and domestic. While we have already done much in Europe, economic recovery is not facilitated by the continuing threat of evil which looms on the eastern horizon. We have not made the sacrifices of the past few years, however, in order to surrender all their fruits and beat a retreat. Though we still have a long way to go, having once taken up the challenge, we must follow through and persevere in meeting it.

The part of the world with which I am directly concerned is in the Western Hemisphere. The American Republics are sorely beset today by economic and social problems of their own. The great productive possibilities of these countries remain in large degree unrealized. There is, however, in this part of the world as in no other a real opportunity to work forward toward the democratic ideal. We have no iron curtain to divide us. We were spared the direct destruction of two wars. In short we do not have the same kind of road blocks to progress in this hemisphere as we confront elsewhere.

How is it, then, it may be asked, that we read so frequently of revolution and dictatorships in Latin America? Are our friends and allies to the south really making progress? Are they putting to good use the unexampled opportunity for freedom and democracy that the free world now enjoys?

The answer is quite frankly that the record could be better. There have been too many instances in which democracies have been subverted and the popular will thwarted. Such circumstances, where they exist, do not breed confidence. They do not make for enthusiastic collaboration on our part with the countries where they occur—if for no other reason than that our citizens would not favor it. On the other hand, before passing judgment on the situation as a whole, it is necessary to look at the evolution of Latin-American democracy in the long perspective of history.

Some of the American Republics are still relatively new and unpracticed in the ways of democracy. Their political instability and their failures may be in the historic view manifestations of the impact of new ideas upon social structures which had remained static for generations. I believe that on balance they are making progress in the direction of democracy. This becomes evident if we are willing to look at the good as well as the bad—at the positive as well as the negative. The democratic picture in Latin America today is brighter than it was 20 years ago, and a great deal brighter than at the beginning of the century.

One of the paradoxical signs of how democracy is growing in the hemisphere is the sense of shock and dismay that we all feel nowadays when any American republic suffers a set-back through the revolutionary overthrow of a constitutional government. What was accepted as commonplace and hardly worthy of comment a generation ago is conspicuous today. It can no longer be taken idly for granted in the light of the mobilization of sentiment for better government which exists throughout the hemisphere today.

We, the United States, have set the example and taken the lead in this democratic drive, although we are by no means the only good example that the hemisphere has to offer. More than anything else, however, the spectacle of our own thriving democracy has made subservience to dictators more and more intolerable to our neighbors in the south. Likewise, the standard of living that we have achieved in the United States under the regime of liberalism has aroused our neighbors against the grinding poverty that was once regarded as the common man's inescapable lot. In this sense we are, by our very example, responsible for much of the political ferment that marks the Latin-American scene today. If this is true, we may at least reflect that this kind of ferment has often in history marked a transition to better things. That ferment is also a great deal better than the stability of death which has been clamped onto the peoples of eastern Europe. It is certainly better than the compulsory political inactivity and lack of change which characterized many of the more enduring Latin-American dictatorships of the past.

As long as democracy continues to grow and thrive in our country it will grow, however erratically, in the other American countries. It could fail among them eventually only through failure here—and that is part of the international responsibility we bear. I do not believe, however, that there is going to be any failure here.

Our policy in Latin America, as in other areas, is one of positive cooperation for the realization of our democratic objectives. In terms of brass tacks, we are engaged with the other American countries in a variety of operating projects for economic and social development.

Now let me mention some examples.

It may seem far from this valley of the Kanawha River to the valley of the Sao Francisco River in Brazil, over 4,000 miles away. The difference between the two valleys, in the relative degree of their development, accentuates the effect of distance. Here you people have developed a degree of industrial activity and a utilization of your natural resources as intensive as any in the world. In the Sao Francisco Valley relatively little development of that sort has occurred. Yet, though the stages of development are so different and the distance so great, what happens in the Sao Francisco Valley in the next 10 years will affect in some measure the people of this valley in West Virginia.

There is today new energy and new vision in the leaders of Brazil. They want to put to better use the great natural resources of their country. As in many other Latin-American countries, however, they lack the capital funds and technical resources to achieve their goals expeditiously by their own energy alone. Therefore, and with our own self-interest in view, we are helping Brazil in a variety of ways to achieve these goals.

Last year our Government sent the so-called Abbink Mission to Brazil to help the Brazilians determine the measures which should be taken to promote the development of their country. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, of which, as you know, the United States is the principal stockholder and which is now perhaps a major source of foreign financing for Brazil, has also recently made a survey of the country to see how the bank's resources can best be used to advance Brazil's development. The bank also sent an engineer to Brazil specifically to look into the financial aspects of the Sao Francisco hydroelectric project. The bank's decision on the financing of that project is expected soon.

As we in the State Department see it there are certain types of projects which when soundly conceived may appropriately be financed through loans of public funds. The International Bank has already made one very large loan to a private company in Brazil precisely for the purpose of hydroelectric development.

These public loans, however, have private investment and private enterprise in view. A significant consideration regarding the feasibility of the Sao Francisco project is whether private industries will be attracted to the valley by the availability of power. There are believed to be heavy phosphate deposits in the general area which might be processed to help supply Brazil's great need for fertilizers. These in turn could help restore to fertility some of the worn-out coffee lands in southern Brazil, about which we have been hearing so much since the recent rise in coffee prices. Hydroelectric power might thus bring about the beginning of a chemical industry in the valley, which would in turn give rise to other industries. We have seen just that sort of thing happen in the Rio Doce Valley of Brazil, where important development has occurred just in the last 5 years, largely in consequence of the financing of certain basic projects by the Export-Import Bank, and incidentally because of assistance by our Institute of Inter-American Affairs in the improvement of health conditions. Tremendous impetus to Brazil's economy has also been provided by the construction of the great Volta Redonda steel mill with the help of funds from the Export-Import Bank.

We feel that the complementary industries must, in general, be financed by the investment of private funds. It is only through providing opportunities for private capital that sound economic development can be achieved. We in this country have, ourselves, never hesitated to welcome foreign capital. Even in recent years, since we attained a high degree of industrialization, foreign private capital has made great contributions to our development of new industries, notably in the field of chemicals and synthetic textiles. Our total national wealth and earning power has been substantially increased in consequence. We feel that in the same way much can be done by private capital in Latin America. We also believe, however, that the governments of our sister republics must determine for themselves whether and under what conditions they want private capital to work for them. If they do want it and will create the right conditions, they will find it available.

Our Congress now has before it two specific pieces of legislation that are closely related to our program of cooperation with the other American republics. The first would authorize a large increase in our present technical assistance to all foreign countries, including the Latin American. This technical assistance, in addition to taking the form of such undertakings as the Abbink Mission, is designed to help in the development and application of particular skills to the basic fields of agriculture, industry, education, and health.

Economic and social development cannot be brought about only through large-scale projects such as hydroelectric plants and steel mills. There are a great many smaller and less spectacular projects to be undertaken. You in West Virginia, for example, have had a great deal of experience with the control of silicosis. In Peru, silicosis has ravaged mines for generations. Now our Institute of Inter-American Affairs is working with the Peruvian Government on a modest but highly successful industrial hygiene program—the first of its kind in that country. At the same time, the Institute's agricultural mission is working with Peruvian farmers to help improve the breeds of corn, which are the same today as in the far-off days of the Incas. Other experts of the Institute, working with local experts in the highlands of Bolivia, have been teaching the Indians methods of animal culture by which they can improve their pitifully degenerated herds of sheep. I could cite hundreds of such examples of how our technical assistance is at work throughout Latin America. Although each project is small in itself, the aggregate is of tremendous significance in helping to increase productivity and the general welfare of the continent.

These programs of cooperation go beyond governments. They reach down to the people in the towns and villages, and on the farms. Country people in South America who have never before seen one of our citizens are thus brought into first-hand contact with our democracy in action. Nor do these programs involve a large outlay of money—in fact, the outlay is remarkably small by contrast with the results achieved. We hope, however, that the Congress will now authorize an expansion of these activities so that we may step up our whole policy of cooperation along these lines.

The second legislative proposal before our Congress is that the Export-Import Bank be authorized to use part of the funds it now has available to guarantee investors against certain risks peculiar to private investment abroad. Most important is the risk that dollars may not be available for the conversion of profits earned in foreign currencies. This is a new type of venture, and much experimentation will be called for before it is put into general practice. One of the greatest deterrents to private investment abroad today, however, is the scarcity of dollars to provide for remittances of earnings. The proposed guaranty system is designed to overcome this obstacle. Naturally, care will have to be taken that guaranteed investments will not receive preferential treatment over other American investments. I am confident that the Export-Import Bank, one of the most efficient agencies of our Government, will administer this new authority, if granted, with the same regard for established American businesses that it has always shown.

Now you have undoubtedly recognized that the two legislative proposals I have described to you are parts of the program outlined last year in point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address, which is designed to stimulate the development of underdeveloped parts of the world. This program is not a program of charity. The mood of our country today would not sanction any such thing. Rather the program is designed to serve our national interest by strengthening our friends, restoring stability, and creating a more prosperous world. Through it we and the United Nations are directly attacking the obstacles that stand in the way of democracy's growth.

Related to the point 4 legislation is another proposal, namely, that the Charter of the International Trade Organization be approved by Congress this session. We are already participating in the International Bank, the Monetary Fund, the Food and Agriculture Organization, and a number of other international agencies which are already active in their respective fields. The International Trade Organization will cover the vital field of international trade. In participating in it, we would be paving the road for liberalized foreign-trade practices among all countries—an objective entirely in keeping with point 4.

I have no doubt that the point 4 policy will take its place beside the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Pact as a historic contribution of President Truman's administration to world order. There are certain fundamental differences, however. Point 4 is not an emergency program or, like the Marshall plan, a temporary device to repair the damage of war. It represents, rather, a permanent measure of reinforcement. It is part of the enduring system of give and take by which our civilization will have to make progress if it makes progress at all. It is in fact a common undertaking in which each country is expected to contribute according to its means. Even the most underdeveloped countries cannot play a passive role. Assistance to any country would be wasted except as it was associated with vigorous steps toward development conducted by that country under its own steam.

This point 4 policy also differs from some of our big emergency programs in that it will not involve any great new outlay of public funds on our part. The International Bank and the Export-Import Bank already have adequate funds to take care of justifiable demands for development loans for some time to come. The lion's share of technical assistance, we expect, will come from private enterprise in connection with private investment.

It has been said that the foreign policy of the United States, as reflected in such programs as the Marshall plan and point 4, is the only foreign policy in the world which is truly revolutionary. We can be proud that, instead of being the slavish followers of old and outworn imperialistic traditions, we are the pioneers and prime builders of a new and positive tradition.

This imposes on us in the State Department the added duty to see to it that we keep our policies vigorous and dynamic. We must never let ourselves be smug and satisfied about our present policies. There will always be room for improvement. This is one reason why next Monday I am going to Habana to meet with our Ambassadors in the Middle American area for a complete review of our methods and procedures. A similar conference will be held in Rio in March with our Ambassadors in South America. We believe that in this way we can keep ourselves alert and looking forward.

I have one final word, which bears on the role of Rotary in making our foreign policy effective. In this country, as is not the case in dictatorships, the people have the final say in the development of foreign policy. Today, far more than ever before, our people are taking this responsibility seriously and making up their own minds about the issues involved. Such organizations as Rotary are prime instruments for giving form and expression to this sense of responsibility. We in the State Department look to you, as well as to our great free press, for democratic guidance.

I will go further and say that Rotary is itself involved in the actual conduct of our foreign relations. For our foreign relations, unlike those of some other countries, are not confined to contacts between arbitrary and all-powerful governments. They embrace

direct relations and interchanges among groups of citizens among the peoples themselves. In every capital of the Americas, from here to the southern tip of South America, you will find Rotary organized and playing an important, constructive role in local affairs. This sort of thing is an indispensable part of our good-neighbor policy, which rests upon the support of a myriad of commercial, personal and cultural contacts, between individuals and groups, back and forth across the international borders. I hope you will consider it no presumption on my part to say, therefore, that you in Rotary and we in the State Department are partners in a common enterprise. Let us see to it that our enterprise is successful.

Should Senate Remove Restrictions on Oleomargarine?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege on January 10 to debate over America's Town Meeting of the Air, with the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], the question, Should the Senate remove restrictions on oleomargarine? At that time the Senator and I were privileged to make 4-minute talks before engaging in the answering of questions. I ask that a copy of my 4-minute address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Friends, remember that, contrary to the impression you may have gotten from my genial Arkansas friend, we are all agreed that Federal taxes on oleo should be repealed.

In fact, we ask the oleo group: If you are so interested in the consumer's problems, why don't you agree (as we have) to simultaneous repeal of hundreds of other nuisance excise taxes on baby lotions, on cosmetics, admissions, phone calls, etc.?

Folks, the Oleo Trust is not interested in the consumer. It poured out millions in false propaganda so as to confuse the issue about taxes. Now, it comes into the open and says it wants to swindle the yellow color of butter and deceive the consumer. I say that if the 26 huge oleo corporations rob the natural trade-mark of butter—its yellow color—they will be violating every American principle—fair prices, fair play, fair business, and good health.

Senator FULBRIGHT says that if oleo robs butter's yellow color—that's just competition. Well, friends, if you tried to imitate the color of cabs of the Yellow Cab Co. on your own cabs, you'd be thrown into jail. If you stole the name of Mr. Denny's great radio program, he'd have the right to stop you.

So, friends, in all fairness, we're urging a substitute dairy amendment which will protect the yellow color of butter in interstate commerce.

This amendment will assure fair prices for the consumer. It will help assure inexpensive prices for vitamin-rich milk, butter, cheese, beef, yes, even oleo. Folks, remember, you won't, unfortunately, get fair prices if the oleo monopoly swindles the yellow color of butter and drives it from the market. Why? Because, then, the oleo trust will skyrocket the oleo price as it pleases.

Here is a second point, friends. We want fair play for the consumer. We don't want the consumer to be tricked into buying something other than what he or she wants. When the housewife orders beef from the butcher, she doesn't want to be cheated by getting horse meat. When she orders butter, she doesn't want to be cheated with oleo which has been concocted to resemble butter. I could cite hundreds of instances in restaurants and markets where you—the public—have been cheated and deceived into getting oleo when you thought you were getting butter.

A third point, my friends. We want fair business treatment for the Nation's great dairy industry—an industry of 2,250,000 honest, hard-working farmers in 48 States of the Union. Remember, folks, your income, your prosperity depends in part on the economic well-being of the vital dairy segment of America.

Fourth and last, we want good health for our population. As you so well know, youngsters and adults need wholesome, nutritious dairy foods. Folks, you won't be able to get those healthful foods if the oleo monopoly stabs the dairy industry in the back. If that happens, milk production will drop by a third. There'll be less milk for your children, for adults, for anyone. And it will be at higher prices because of the cutting down of dairy herds. The farmer won't profit; he'll be getting it in the neck. Only the Oleo Trust will profit.

Remember, folks, under the amendment I'm suggesting, the consumer could buy either uncolored oleo or colored oleo (that is, colored oleo, assuming his own State allows the manufacture of yellow oleo).

On the other hand, suppose the consumer buys uncolored oleo (either through preference or through a requirement of his own State law), then what? Then the consumer can easily color the oleo according to his desire in his or her own kitchen in 120 seconds.

The few seconds required to color oleo yellow in the kitchen may spell the difference between adequate supplies of milk and cheese at fair prices or a terrible shortage of these vital dairy foods in your home.

You, my friends, have a right to free choice between butter and oleo, both tax-free and both without restrictions on grocery men. So let oleo and butter be sold on their own merits, in fair competition, with their own different color. And don't let anyone kid you that cottonseed oil or soybean oil is yellow, it definitely is not.

You don't want to be swindled with horse meat when you order beef. You want to be treated fairly, and that's all I'm seeking tonight. Fair play, not oleo fraud; fair prices, not monopoly prices; fair business and protection of the good health of our youngsters and adults. Thank you.

RFC's New Place in the Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal, entitled "RFC's New Place in the Midcentury."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RFC'S NEW PLACE IN THE MIDCENTURY

Senator FULBRIGHT's suggestion for a review of activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has merit. Since the RFC was created in 1932 to save weakened banks and railroads in a time of national crisis it has performed an enormous task.

Its activities broadened to such a point that after 8 years the collateral on its loans included fox farms, hotels, whole towns, farmers' mules, and drainage projects. The Treasury paid out $500,000,000 for its capitalization. After operating under Jesse Jones through a period of terrible depression it proved that Government can be competent in business and its financial soundness was established beyond question.

The RFC served impressively during World War II, that other national emergency, to finance industries vital to national security. It is Senator FULBRIGHT's contention, however, that since then the RFC has tended more to make loans to big corporations than to small.

The cases of the Kaiser-Frazer and Lustron loans come immediately to mind, of course. In the case of the former, Senator FULBRIGHT maintains that the RFC's $44,500,000 loan was outside the province of the Corporation's proper activities. In the case of Lustron, the first loans were probably desirable from a standpoint of national interest, being designed to stimulate mass production of a low-cost house at a time when the housing shortage was most acute. Unfortunately it has not been possible to create Lustron houses at what could rightly be called a production-line rate. Neither has it been possible to bring their cost down to justify the tag of low-priced.

Senator FULBRIGHT has specifically mentioned, besides the Kaiser-Frazer loan, RFC financing of the bankrupt Waltham Watch Co. and the Southern Plywood Co. Both loans were granted on grounds of preventing unemployment, which, as Senator FULBRIGHT has remarked, is not now a national problem of critical proportions.

The point is not that the country could do without the RFC. It is generally accepted as one of the most valuable stabilizers of United States economy. However it does seem time for a review of the place of RFC in an economy which has changed radically from the days of the depression, and again from those of World War II.

The Chinese Situation as I Saw It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a memorandum of explanation, dated December 28, 1949, written by Roger D. Lapham, former mayor of San Francisco, representative of the ECA in China. It is a memorandum bringing up to date a speech which he made, entitled "The Chinese Situa-

tion as I Saw It," which was placed in the body of the RECORD by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], on October 19, 1949, at page 15037 of the RECORD. I ask unanimous consent to have the memorandum inserted, particularly because of its concluding paragraph.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIF., *December 28, 1949.*

MEMORANDUM OF EXPLANATION

On September 8, 1949, I spoke before the Commonwealth Club of Northern California, at San Francisco, on the subject, the Chinese Situation as I Saw It. This talk, prepared for a radio rebroadcast and necessarily limited as to time, described the activities of the ECA mission to China during the year ending June 1949. I pointed out the difficulties faced by the mission, expressed some personal opinions as to the shortcomings of the Nationalist Government, and ended by making certain recommendations. These were:

1. Continue American private business with the Chinese as far as it may be possible, in such a way as not to enhance to any dangerous degree the very limited war potential of the country.

2. Extend all possible help to American endowed enterprises—educational, medical, and missionary—efforts being made to promote the continuation of the private support which these enterprises have received in the past.

3. Keep open our embassy and consulates in China, staffing them with the ablest personnel procurable, in order that we may pit our best capacities against the serious problems still to be faced.

4. The only practical way to keep the door open, as well as to listen and observe what goes on behind the bamboo curtain, is to accept the fact that we may soon have to recognize in such areas as they control, the Communist Government, as the de facto Government, and be prepared to recognize it whether we like it or not.

Almost 4 months have passed since my talk was made; and today, the question of recognizing the Chinese Communists is becoming more and more debated. I have been asked what reasons prompted my recommendations; and this memorandum is written to explain the reasons why I think it is in the best interests of the United States to prepare, in the near future, to recognize the Chinese Communists, not only as the de facto government but very likely as the de jure one.

While 4 months ago, the Communists had not secured control of as much of the mainland of China as they have today, it was apparent then that, barring unforeseen miracles, what has happened, would happen. The collapse of the Kuomintang government both on the military and the economic fronts has been a continuing and an accelerating one. The strategic islands of Formosa (Taiwan) and Hainan still remain under Nationalist control; but there is good reason to believe—again barring unforeseen miracles, as well as possible but not probable affirmative action by the United States—that these two islands will fall to the Communists in the not too distant future. It seems plain that the Chinese Communist objective is to drive Chiang and the Kuomintang Party off all Chinese soil; and that every effort will be exerted to accomplish that objective as soon as possible. Before I made my definite recommendations last September, I considered certain alternatives:

(A) A vigorous and continued opposition to the Chinese Communist regime by the United States. Such a policy I assumed would require our support of any acceptable Chinese anti-Communist opposition both by military and economic means. At this late date it is plain that economic means would have to be subordinated to military means. This policy then would require active and open military support to what remains of the Nationalist Government; or failing that, support of some other Chinese group as yet unknown, which might be encouraged to resist the Communists. It is plain that any anti-Communist military resistance would not only have to be supported by arms and ammunition supplied by the United States but also would require direct military supervision by the United States along strategic as well as tactical lines. Few competent observers now believe that Chiang and what remains of the Kuomintang Party could accomplish anything even with our military support and supervision. Chiang has lost the confidence of his people, due to his recent failure as a military commander as well as his inability to prevent a collapse on the economic front. Without going into great detail, one thing stands out—the Nationalist military forces, ground troops, Navy, and Air Force, have been defeated by the Chinese Communists who, at the outset had fewer troops, were not as well equipped, and who had no air force or navy. This defeat can be attributed to an obstinate leader, unwilling to delegate authority, and giving preference to favorites rather than seeking the most competent assistance. I am convinced that it would be a down-the-rat-hole policy to even consider backing Chiang's leadership.

Nor can I believe trying now to find some untried or unknown leadership is either practical or feasible. Therefore, I give up the idea of vigorous and tenacious opposition to the Chinese Communist regime by backing Chiang, or anyone else, with military or economic aid.

(B) The next alternative might be classified as abandonment. Pull out of China altogether and close down what remains of our embassy and consular staffs. Then impose an economic blocade and leave those Americans still in China, whether businessmen, teachers, missionaries (medical or otherwise) to shift for themselves as best they can. This policy would be one of pulling down the iron curtain, ourselves; giving notice to the world, as well as to the many Chinese friends of the United States, that we are through. It can be argued that letting the Chinese Communists stew in their own juice might eventually result in their complete collapse; that somehow or other the great mass of the Chinese people would finally turn on their Communist leaders and, through a series of revolutions, throw them out. That may be—but I do not think so. Pulling down the iron curtain, ourselves, would give a free field to Moscow to use, unopposed, all the influence it could bring to bear to keep China in the Russian orbit. I don't like the idea of running away, nor can I believe temporary abandonment would create the situation hoped for. Therefore I discard that policy.

(C) Another alternative advanced is to let things drift as they are. Don't impose an economic or diplomatic blockade. The Chinese Communists will need to trade with the United States and other western powers—so let our businessmen as well as our missionaries and others interested in the welfare of the Chinese people do what they can without any assistance from Washington. It is hard to advocate a drifting, donothing policy of this kind—particularly as there is every evidence that Great Britain and other members of her Commonwealth are considering the affirmative action of recognition. It would appear the longer we follow a drifting policy, the harder it will be for the few Americans left in China to keep going.

Instinctively I react against the negative approach. It usually gets one nowhere. I cannot believe a drifting, stalling policy is the right one to follow.

By elimination then, what other policy can we consider?

First, let us pause for an over-all look around. In my opinion, the world today faces an underlying struggle between the type of government offered by the totalitarian Russian Politburo and the democracies of the United States and other western countries. I define democracy as self-government under law—the right of a people to choose its own form of government under free elections, and to change that form of government if the people so desire—whether the trend be toward state socialism or capitalism.

Under Moscow rule, the people are the absolute servants of the state—a state controlled by a dictator or a group of dictators. The people of those countries are allowed no freedom of movement, can read or listen only to what their leaders prescribe and have no opportunity to judge for themselves. It has become increasingly plain, mainly through Russia's actions in the United Nations, that you cannot reach an agreement with that government and count on observance. The teachings of Lenin clearly demonstrate that any means are justified by the end and the end is to impose Russia's will on all of us.

The only threat, military or otherwise, to our national security today is the Moscow Politburo. Our objective is, and must be, to contain the spread of Moscow influence whether it be in western Europe, the Far East, or any other part of the world. We hope, if we play our cards right, to avoid a hot war; but we have pretty well accepted the fact today that, to avoid a hot war, we must fight a cold war.

I believe that cold war can best be waged by ideas—trying to convince other peoples by what we say and do that they would be better off under self-government by law, than by following the Moscow pattern. That policy cannot be effectively carried out by statements from Washington or by Voice of America broadcasts. We must have Americans on the spot, willing and able to counteract the Moscow idealogies.

How best can this be accomplished in China?

If we are anxious to keep in China the few Americans who now remain there, whether businessmen or welfare people, we must not withdraw our diplomatic representatives. But how can our representatives do anything to help those few Americans unless we are ready to recognize and deal with the government in control, whether we like that type of government or not? Some argue that it is useless even to try to deal with the Chinese Communists because we know they won't carry out any understandings reached. That may be—but how are we to prove it unless we try it out?

Are we to assume that what has happened in eastern Europe is certain to be repeated in China? On the surface, I admit that the odds are all against us—the statements of Mao Tse-tung, the treatment of Consul General Ward—all point to impossibilities.

But remember that we have taken part recently in a Chinese civil war. We have supplied military and economic aid to an incompetent Nationalist Government which has lost out on all fronts. The Communists can rightly claim that we only delayed the collapse of this incompetent government.

When you have lost out by trying one means, why not try another? To date Moscow has played its cards well. So far it has not taken part, at least in the front lines, in the Chinese civil war.

But the big $64 question—which won't be answered this year or next year, and perhaps for many years—is whether or not, eventually, the Chinese Communist leadership is going to turn more Nationalist than Moscow-dominated?

If Russia attempts to impose more directly its will and control, perhaps the antiforeign feeling always prevalent in China may well be turned against Russia, rather than against us. So much depends upon how we play our cards as well as how well Russia plays hers.

Considering the various alternatives, I came to a definite conclusion: The best chance of restraining the spread of Moscow influence in China is to recognize the Chinese Communist regime. It appears to me that is the best practical method left today to accomplish our objective.

I cannot go along with those who think it is wrong in principle to even try to deal with the Chinese Communists on the assumption they are 100 percent followers of the Moscow Politburo and will remain followers indefinitely. Time only will prove or disprove that assumption.

In reaching this conclusion I have not overlooked what adverse psychological reactions it may have in such countries as Japan, the Philippines, and other nations in the Asian sphere. Many will take it as an about-face as well as implying approval of a type of government rather than a mere recognition of a government which controls.

The Chinese Communist victory is not a coup d'état. It is the outcome of a long civil war, in the closing years of which the United States backed the incompetent losers.

We have observed in Asia and elsewhere the rising urge of different peoples to run their own show, and in China the resentment of the treatment dealt out in past years by western nations which sought and acquired, by force majeur, concessions and extraterritorial privileges. Recognition now might be considered as an admission on our part that henceforth we will stand aside and not take part in a civil war as we have recently in China.

We can and should insist on the open-door policy in Asia. We should expect that China will accord no special, nor any greater, privileges to any one nation than to another.

I realize that so long as the Nationalist Government controls Formosa it will be difficult to accord recognition to the Chinese Communists on the mainland. The China Aid Act of April 1948 is still on the books, and that act provides aid only for the Nationalist Government.

If, as has been suggested, Washington takes affirmative action to make certain that the government of Formosa remains one friendly to the United States, then we face a very delicate situation. Any decision with respect to such affirmative action on Formosa can be dealt with only at the highest levels in Washington and with every consideration given as to the effect of such action on the over-all conflict between Russia and those nations which oppose the spread of Politburo power, and further consideration must be given to the effect such affirmative action might have on countries such as India, which is not anxious to take sides as between Moscow and the western democracies.

I am strongly opposed to any affirmative action on Formosa that would permit the use of that island as a base for military operations against the Communists on the mainland. The objective should be to make Formosa the Switzerland of the Pacific—a country to be governed for the benefit of the native Formosans and not to be maintained as the last Nationalist stronghold.

ROGER D. LAPHAM.

Blame for Vincennes Flood Conditions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Blame for Vincennes Flood Conditions," by Dan Kidney, published in the Indianapolis Times of January 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(By Dan Kidney)

WASHINGTON, January 11.—Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, of Indiana, told the Senate today that President Truman is to blame for the Wabash River flood conditions at Vincennes.

"His rule not to make any appropriations for new projects prevented the Vincennes flood wall from being included in the budget," Senator CAPEHART said.

"It is erroneous to say that Army engineers have not approved the project. I was with Col. J. L. Persons of the engineers in Vincennes 2 months ago and he said the $40,000 we appropriated for plans last session resulted in drawings for the project that are complete and ready for construction."

PLANS CAMPAIGN

"I intend to get $400,000 for the Vincennes flood wall this session, or conduct a filibuster against all the flood-control projects which the President has approved.

"It is outrageous that this administration can spend billions helping Europe and we cannot get such a sum to save Vincennes from a flood. It is a small outlay compared with the cost of bringing in a thousand troops there in 1943 and again today."

Community Chatter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Community Chatter," which appeared in the January 10 issue of the Nebraska City News-Press. I call attention to the fact that the editor of the paper is a former Member of the House of Representatives. The editorial itself carries the initials of his son, Mr. Arthur R. Sweet.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COMMUNITY CHATTER

Brother Truman, in one of his congressional election-year messages, spoke about real wages. He said before many years, the average American family will receive $12,000 in real wages.

What are real wages?

Does Mr. Truman believe that within a few years the $3,000-a-year man as of now will have four times his present buying power? If so, the man's real wages will have increased four times.

Probably what Mr. Truman meant was that when and if the average American family receives $12,000 in wages, it will cost $12,000 then for what $3,000 will buy now. Wages will have gone up, but buying power will have remained the same.

This is fine, except for a few little items:

The man with $12,000 in life insurance now will find its value diminished to $3,000 under the Truman no-poverty scheme of things.

And the $25 savings bond purchased during the war will be worth just $6.25 in real purchasing power when it is redeemed in the $12,000-per-year era.

The no-poverty era will be fine—probably—except for people with savings, annuities, pensions, fixed-value investments, and the like.

These people will realize, without studying text books, that inflation has caught up with them.

If what Truman says is true—and no one can foretell the future with certainty—the best investments will be those which fluctuate with the inflationary trend.

Of course this must be remembered, too: All fluctuations aren't upward. Sometimes values come down.

Everything, that is, except the Truman tax schedule.

A. R. S.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY C. DWORSHAK
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," which appeared on January 10 in the Seattle Post-Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safekeeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus, redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time, the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And, since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was accurately known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds; and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency: it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could "borrow" in multibillion-dollar installments on the "security" of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerges from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis for credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive check-book money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the supply of currency in circulation has increased from $8,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000; the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000; and the national debt—less than $20,000,000,000 in 1933—had mounted to $40,000,000,000 before the war, and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in European socialism and in the new economics sponsored by the late Lord Keynes and were imported here to socialize America.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its socialist welfare state—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with $24,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States, available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

Our Dangerous Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Wish-Washing United States to War," published in the Indianapolis Star of January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WISH-WASHING UNITED STATES TO WAR

With his eyes glued on the fall elections, President Truman is wish-washing this country into certain war with Russia. By a weak and vacillating foreign policy he is following in the footsteps of Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt. He deliberately is building up an argument for the fall elections that will enable him to go to the people with the phony slogan, "I kept you out of war."

By ditching China and refusing to defend our position in the Orient, President Truman is step by step giving the Russians every reason to believe that we are a weak and wishwash people who are afraid to assert our rights or to prove our strength. That same sort of wish-washing in foreign policy got the United States into World War I. It also was responsible for getting us into World War II. Neither war settled anything, neither accomplished anything for the American people.

Let's look at the record of how bad leadership got us into two world wars, the same sort of bad leadership that right now is leading us into another great conflict:

From 1914 to 1916 Woodrow Wilson wished and washed back and forth until the Germans were convinced we wouldn't fight. Wilson won reelection in 1916 on the sole issue that he "kept us out of war." Within 4 months after that election we were in World War I up to our necks.

From 1935 to 1940 President Franklin D. Roosevelt did nothing to persuade Hitler or the Japs that we would defend ourselves. He deliberately encouraged trade with both the Germans and the Japs. Finally, in 1939, he made the greatest speech of his life at Chicago in which he warned all nations that the United States would tolerate no aggression in the Western Hemisphere. But 2 months later he entirely repudiated his Chicago speech because his New Deal pals convinced him he could win the 1940 election on the slogan of "keeping us our of war." He went to the people with the repeated promise that "not a single American boy will ever be sent abroad to fight a foreign foe." A year later we were at war. But all that time Roosevelt was secretly conspiring with Churchill and had committed the United States to join in the war. He was so determined to save the British Empire and be glorified in the role of a great war President that he deceived the people with ruthlessly false promises in 1940 in order to gain his reelection.

The same thing is happening again. Dean Acheson is writing his pinky-wink protests to Hungary, Poland, Red China, and other Russian satellite countries in the same vein as the infamous "may I not" notes of Woodrow Wilson's prewar diplomacy. President Truman abandons China, deserts Formosa, slaps his Joint Chiefs of Staff in the face, and ignores the advice of Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the one man in all the world whose counsel should be followed at this time.

Had Woodrow Wilson taken a firm stand and revealed the strength of the United States to the Kaiser in 1915, we never would have been pulled into World War I. Had Franklin Roosevelt really desired to keep us out of war, he could have made known our strength to Hitler, and the outcome would have been a death struggle between Hitler and Stalin instead of the useless conflict in which we gained nothing and settled nothing. This is not opinion. This is history.

This is no time for soft words, either at home or abroad. The American people will be embroiled in another war just as surely as we were drawn into two previous wars unless we speak up with tremendous vigor now. Russia must be told in the only language she understands—the language of prepared strength—that we will not tolerate another international bully in the world. Russia will never go to war against us if we call her bluff now and call it in measures she understands.

President Truman's policy in the Orient may be good election-year propaganda, but it leads straight to war as the same policy did in 1916 and 1940. The pinky-wink notes and double-talk diplomacy of Truman's foreign policy add only dangerous fuel to certain war.

There is only one sure way to avoid war with Russia, and that is to make her understand now before it is too late that we have no fear of her or any other foe.

The Radio Program Assault and Flattery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 13 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, there is a program being broadcast in Washington under the title of "Assault and Flattery" over radio station WCFM, which may not have come to the attention of Senators but which is fast gaining attention and growing in popularity. It is conducted by the well-known radio commentator B. S. Bercovici. On this program, Assault and Flattery, Mr. Bercovici, instead of reviewing latest news or claiming the dubious distinction of receiving direct wires from the Kremlin or exclusive stories from the White House, it prefers to comment on what other radio personalities or programs discuss with the view to revealing the

other side of important controversies which touch on current issues.

On Sunday, January 1, Mr. Bercovici, in his program, Assault and Flattery, brought to the attention of the public a condition prevailing on the radio which ought to cause some alarm in the ranks of progressive Americans who, in these days of strife between the forces of darkness and the struggles of democracy, face the duty to emphasize the truth not only that men are created equal but that all men must be treated with equality.

I think Mr. Bercovici ought to be commended for his constructive work.

I ask unanimous consent that his broadcast of January 7, 1950, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It has been said that no work of art worthy of attention can escape being a work of propaganda, the minute you open your mouth to say something, the minute you dip your brush in the paint you become an agent of some propaganda. That is especially evident in the theatrical field, of which radio entertainment is an integral or a component part. Radio programs can be divided into a few categories; such as programs of pure entertainment and programs of information and enlightenment. The programs of information, to which radio comments and forums belong, have a definite and well-defined aim. Those who conduct them or participate in them expound their personal theories and convictions on a variety of subjects from football to the United Nations. Their aims are not concealed. You listen to them if you are so inclined, you agree with them if you think they are propounding ideas to which you are ready to subscribe, or you disagree with them. In short, they do not take you unawares. Then there are programs of supposedly pure entertainment, whose aim is to make you laugh or cry, or excite you with their bloodcurdling situations. You suspect nothing. Jack Benny, for example, is expected to be funny; you anticipate members of his cast are going to rib him for boasting about women; you know his reputation for being stingy is going to be emphasized, and while this gag is by now worn thin, you wonder when the writers are going to dig up some new and untried situations to show that Jack Benny can be funny without being a miser. Or you listen to Edgar Bergen and his Charlie McCarthy, who try desperately to make you laugh also with Bergen's stinginess—the same gimmick. The fun they dispense is innocent. For every radio comedian from Jack Benny to Al Jolson and back has been characterized as being a tightwad. The writers in their boundless wisdom seem to have tapped a source of comedy never exploited quite that way prior to the advent of radio. It has become a bore, but you hope someday another set of radio writers bent on being original will discover a technique to squeeze laughs out of spendthrifts.

But there is a type of comedy on the air which, while it does not specifically aim at distilling opinions out of situations and dialogue, nevertheless, diffuses a set of opinions which must not be ignored. One such outstanding program is Amos and Andy. It is funny most of the time, but not so funny that it fails to alarm. To begin, the spotlight is played on characters—the script is written around characters rather than around incidents, and what characters.

The Kingfish is a slippery, dishonest, conniving, for the most part, unintelligent person, since his schemes never reach fruition; heartless in all dealings, selfish in his dealings even with his best friends, a miserable husband, a social failure in a community where everybody seems to know him, and, generally speaking, a louse of the first magnitude. This is the Kingfish, the chief character in a program intended to amuse. But the program, I am afraid, does more than amuse. Among uninformed and biased elements, the program is apt to leave a lasting impression that the Kingfish is typical. And because the program is apt to do just that, we are faced with the problem of a program the aim of which is to entertain, but which, without knowing it, and perhaps without malice aforethought, becomes an organ of propagating a rather dangerous idea—that men of Kingfish's stripe are typical.

This would not necessarily be so if other characters in the program were given better credentials before they are launched into the world of radio listeners. So, let's look at the other characters in the program Amos and Andy. Andy Brown, a shiftless ne'er-do-well, who hasn't done a lick of work since he was created by his author, a kind of acceptable bum—and very often he is called a bum right in the script—ignorant to the nth degree, a malaprop, just as the Kingfish is a malaprop, stupid enough to be bamboozled even by his best friend who is no mental giant either, untouched by the niceties of civilization into which he has been launched, without pity, good natured, which in his case is not a virtue since it is obvious that he is too dumb to be anything else; gullible and unwashed. One script—the one broadcast last Sunday night—had Andy Brown say that the New York authorities can by no stretch of the imagination blame him for the shortage of water, so that added to his other vices, we were subtly permitted to discover that he has also escaped the civilized habit of bathing. This is the character of secondary importance in the program Amos and Andy, which is supposed to amuse and entertain us. Then there is Shorty, the barber; a stuttering imbecile who is never able to form an intelligent and intelligible sentence; to whom the Kingfish often goes for advice when he is deep in the trouble caused by his own cunning and idiotic dishonesty, but who never is able to produce sound and proper advice. The script presumes him to possess inherent common sense, yet it always robs him of the opportunity to be the sage he is supposed to be.

Then there is the lawyer—a shyster of the first water—whose legal advice is always on the periphery of the law and always on the shady side of professional honesty. Then you have the fifth character of importance, Sapphire, Kingfish's wife, a shrew with whom no man in his right senses could live in marital bliss for more than a week—ugly, demanding, shrill, and, generally speaking, a female monstrosity. There are others, neither of whom to my recollection are worth the powder to blow them up with. Here and there new characters are introduced, stimulating a hope in the minds of fair-minded listeners that he or she would bring into the script a ray of sunshine. But the hope is blasted the minute these new characters are launched. For example, there is the creature who came all the way from Texas to marry in response to a newspaper advertisement. She discovers the man she has set her heart on is the Kingfish himself, who already has a wife. But the Kingfish knows she has a few hundred dollars, so arrangements are cooked up by which the 250-pound monster is to go through a mock marriage, with Andy, the idiot, playing proxy. Nothing is too difficult or fantastic for the Kingfish if he can get his paws on a few hundred dollars. Well, the story says that Andy fell into a trap—the trap, of course, laid by his very best friend. The ceremony is about to reach a legal climax when Andy realizes that he is going to be married for good, so he escapes. The predatory female, knowing her rights, organizes a veritable manhunt, but does the Kingfish feel the pangs of remorse for having betrayed his friend, Andy, or for having attempted to swindle a total stranger? Nothing of the sort. Instead of feeling contrite, the Kingfish proceeds to paint a glowing picture of marital bliss with this monster and almost traps Andy into accepting his fate.

The stories vary, but the theme never does, nor for that matter does the nature or the quality of the moral derelicts. There is, however, one character with whom the average person would shake hands without fear of being contaminated: that is Amos, but the amazing thing about it is that Amos of late has had so little to do or say on the program that he has become a character of little or no effect on the story itself. Whatever Amos is or does is not of recent planning. Whatever he is, we remember from the days when he and Andy were close pals and carried the program alone. We remember him to be a hard-working lad, responsible, law abiding, a good husband, and a loving father—never venturing into shady schemes, never trying to get rich quick by puerile and idiotic schemes, the way Andy and the Kingfish do. But Amos is practically a stranger on his own program. Last Sunday's program gave him no more than a 2-minute opportunity to make his presence known. Amos so far as I have been able to detect, is the only decent human on that program.

Yet, his decency is not highlighted to a sufficient extent to make an impression on the audience. Now the trouble with this program is not so much that it is a theatrical dump heap of moral and social lepers, but that all its characters are Negroes. As I pointed out a few minutes ago, among uninformed elements, among biased people in centers where whites are eager and ready to believe that Negroes are inferior to whites, this program is just what the doctor ordered. There is the danger that these characters may be accepted as typical Negroes, and don't tell me that's not possible or probable.

True, anybody with a grain of sense knows that the Kingfish is not a typical Negro person, or that Negroes are shifty and lazy and unwilling to work, or that they are imbeciles like Shorty the barber, or shysters like the lawyer in the show. But anybody with a grain of sense also knows that there are among us far too many who are ready to accept the characterization as a typical one. And it is in this that you find the unwitting and unplanned propaganda that is apt to cause a lot of damage among the uninformed and the prejudiced. Because of these factors the program, in my judgment, ceases to be funny. It is in fact tragic. But since no criticism is accepted without some constructive contribution, I would suggest the best and perhaps only way to take the curse off the program is to inject into it a few worthy characters, honest, attractive men and women, hard-working people, God-fearing and church-going, men and women of Amos' type and quality, of whom there are among our Negro citizens an abundance equal in ratio to that of white citizens. Why the writers and the producers of this program never thought of it, or why in their fairness, they did not think this necessary, is difficult to understand. They must know that millions listen to their program and that many among those millions are apt to distill from the program unfair, untrue, and dangerous conclusions. This must be done, especially in these days when all or most of us talk glibly about democracy.

Now to tally the score: I have assaulted the program Amos and Andy for the reasons I expounded. No flattery tonight. It's been nice talking with you and until we meet again next Sunday at the same time, let us hope the assault will be received in the spirit of good sportsmanship.

Civil Rights Program—The FEPC in New York—Its Failure in Washington—White Americans Betrayed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, attempts are being made to ram down the throats of the American people the so-called civil-rights program, including the FEPC—the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this Nation has ever been threatened. It would not be adopted in a single State in this Nation, if the people of that State were permitted to vote on it.

CALIFORNIA

They put it on the ballot in California a few years ago, and it was defeated by a clear majority in every single individual county in California.

The same thing would happen again, not only in California but in every State.

Remember, this FEPC program was promulgated by Joe Stalin in 1920, and it is being pushed in this country by practically every Communist-front organization in the country.

PENNSYLVANIA

They have tried to ram it through two different legislatures in Pennsylvania. Somebody sent every member of that body a copy of my speech on the subject, which I am inserting as a part of these remarks, and they killed it as dead as Hector; and if the people of Pennsylvania themselves had been permitted to vote on it, they would have killed it even deader. Because they know that behind it is a communistic design to wreck not only every business in Pennsylvania but to subordinate them to alien control.

It would do the same thing to every other State in the Union.

MICHIGAN

They tried to ram it through the Legislature of Michigan. But the intelligent members of the Michigan Legislature were smart enough to refer it to a vote of the people, and the supreme court of that great Commonwealth declared the referendum illegal or unconstitutional, which ended it so far as Michigan was concerned.

I dare say that if the people of Michigan had been permitted to vote on this monstrosity they would have killed it even deader than they did in California.

ILLINOIS

They tried to force it through the Legislature of Illinois, and failed. If they had referred it to a vote of the people of Illinois, it probably would have been snowed under overwhelmingly in every single county in Illinois.

OHIO

They tried to force it through the Legislature of Ohio twice, and failed both times—one time, I understand, they had a Republican legislature and the other time a Democratic legislature. I dare say that if they had referred it to a vote of the people of Ohio it would not have carried in 1 precinct out of 10.

MINNESOTA

They tried to shove it through the Legislature of Minnesota at the last session, and failed miserably, because the people of Minnesota are beginning to realize what this communistic monstrosity would mean in paralyzing their industries and creating confusion all over the State.

COLORADO

They tried to shove it through the Legislature of Colorado at the last session, and failed, because the members of the legislature of that great State realized the communistic imports of this vicious measure.

Now they come and attempt to shove it through the Congress of the United States without consulting the people whose rights they are attempting to destroy.

NEW YORK

You remember a few years ago when it was forced through the Legislature of New York Mr. Dewey signed it with 22 pens. I said then that "All the perfumes of Arabia would not sweeten his little hand."

It is simply harassing many businessmen in New York out of business.

In other States where it has been adopted, it is hanging like the sword of Damocles over every businessman in the State, with the result that industries are moving out of the area.

Under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting at this point excerpts from two speeches I made in the House on this subject.

In discussing this matter in the House on February 13, 1947, I exposed the vicious regulations which had been adopted under this crazy legislation in the State of New York.

I said:

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed: "State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

"It would be unlawful practice to make inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next unlawful practice:

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the vinegar on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York under this law, to make inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist.

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into these questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York, even though one of them has a half-dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War; i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it, the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it. I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would screw his courage to the sticking place and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and has been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination 'when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these

boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emannel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer, who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division:

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reaves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called 'legal division' consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessman of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the National Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer.	----------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now, let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is a list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, "We have no Negro members on our board of directors." Then the question came back, "Why haven't you?" This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office personnel at St. Louis:

"St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.	----------	3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Marzen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

Pensions and General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement from one of my constituents, Mr. E. B. Clark, of Portland, Oreg.:

PENSIONS AND GENERAL WELFARE

Reference is made to the heading "Old-age pension plan maneuvered to stir excitement," on page 11 of the Oregon Journal, November 25, 1949, from Washington, D. C. This article shows without doubt that the question of pensions has been the subject of much diversified thinking by not only legislators but by all peoples, and is a subject of much concern. A workable and adequate pension plan is much desired and very necessary, that will cover everybody.

It is suggested, therefore, that a national nonpyramidal retail sales-tax plan of 5 percent be established, for minimum cost of living, of $75 per month, with practically no exemptions, for all retired at age 65, or earlier when physically handicapped and health conditions makes retirement necessary, including everybody, both rich and poor. To this should be added funds from all estates left without wills or heirs, plus opportunity for the philanthropic-minded to add large or small amounts thereto, in their wills, also interest on monthly balances at the highest Government rates paid for money. Under such a system, all would pay, and therefore all should participate in the same payments at age 65.

It is understood that over half the States now have adopted retail sales-tax systems of 3 percent and under (mostly under), which are very popular, but inadequate, which could be eliminated if the higher rate were made universal, and pensioners could live in any State desired without question.

The retail sales tax is probably the fairest of all taxation systems and most economical to administer, and by making payments low enough, yet adequate for minimum cost of living, no requirement to expend full amount each month would be necessary.

If such a pension bill were enacted by the Congress, the minimum cost of living would be provided for everyone at 65, to which all would contribute at the same percentage rate, and the same monthly payments would be distributed to all pensioners entitled thereto, which, no doubt, would eliminate depressions and unemployment, as everybody would either have a job or a check each month to cover actual living costs.

Employers and workmen of all classes could then provide, as they might severally determine, such additional private pension systems as desired, through unions, civil service, associations of all kinds, etc., for the basic uniform pension would have already been adopted. It would not necessarily interfere with present private systems and service pensions.

When the constantly accumulating general-welfare fund exceeded the need for pensions, allocations should be made therefrom to the present fast-growing voluntary-contributing Blue Cross group system for hospitalization and medical and dental care and other such State and local groups now sponsored and administered by the medical profession, for the constant and gradual enlargement of that valuable service, making it all-inclusive for pensioners and others whose modest incomes are insufficient to join the groups voluntarily.

Such a universal pension system, operating free from politics, with an immense fund constantly revolving, would have far-reaching and beneficial results in stabilizing our whole economic system, and would free us entirely from fear and want, and change our thinking to peace and plenty, giving the world a practical example of what can be done under free enterprise.

E. B. CLARK.

Statement on Behalf of United States Wine Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Philo Biane, Fruit Industries, Ltd., San Francisco, Calif., on behalf of the United States Wine Industry:

STATEMENT BEFORE THE SENATE INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE COMMITTEE ON S. 1847, JANUARY 12, 1950

My name is Philo Biane, in charge of wine production at Fruit Industries, Ltd., whose main offices are at 900 Minnesota Street, San Francisco, Calif.

Fruit Industries, Ltd., is a substantial grower cooperative producing wine from the grapes of approximately 1,200 growers in California and is a member of the Wine Institute. Originally Mr. Walter Taylor, manager of our firm, and chairman of the board of the Wine Institute, the trade association for the California wineries, had hoped to be able to appear before you but was unable to make the trip east at this time. I am, therefore, appearing in his place.

I am appearing not only on behalf of the Wine Institute and all the California wineries, but also on behalf of the 18 other wine associations making up the Wine Conference of America which represents practically the entire trade in American and imported wines in the United States.

When hearings on advertising were held before this committee on April 1948 on S. 265, a substantial amount of testimony was introduced on behalf of the United States wine industry which appears at pages 92–119 and 205–208 of the printed transcript. Consequently, in this appearance we do not wish to burden the committee by repeating too much of the data we submitted at that time and would appreciate permission to incorporate the 1948 testimony by reference without reprinting it in this record. We hope, however, the 1948 testimony will receive the committee's full consideration.

Briefly summarized, the 1948 testimony established in detail the following points:

1. Advertising by the wine industry has, with rare exceptions, been dignified and in good taste so that there is no justification

whatsoever for punitive legislation in this field.

2. The majority of families throughout the United States enjoy the use of wine as an accompaniment to food or as a moderate beverage for special occasions, and wine advertising has been primarily directed to this group of consumers to better acquaint them with the proper and moderate uses of our products.

3. The suppression by law of truthful information to the consumer on the proper and moderate uses of wine would not be in the public interest but would, on the contrary, actually foster the abuse rather than the proper use of our products.

4. Restrictive legislation in this field would, without any real justification whatever, ruin thousands of grape growers and wine producers distributed through 13 States, destroy millions of dollars worth of permanent vineyard investments, and adversely affect the employment and livelihood of many people—a body blow to an industry that, since national prohibition, has rapidly reestablished itself as a major factor in our agricultural economy.

We do not intend to burden the committee with any further discussion of the 1948 testimony because it has already been printed and also because no one, to our knowledge, has seriously attempted to controvert the points we established.

We have always felt that our advertising has been in good taste and generally acceptable to the public, and the 1948 hearings tended to confirm us in this view.

Our trade, however, has always recognized its advertising responsibilities, and after the 1948 hearings we voluntarily reviewed our advertising and analyzed it for any criticisms that might be directed at it. We also reviewed much of the proposed advertising that had been suggested but had never actually been printed. We found that in a number of instances proposed, unpublished advertising did not meet the canons of good taste generally accepted in our trade. We believe this was due to the fact that, after the war, many of the advertising agency personnel were new to the business. As a result, it quite frequently happened that advertising themes very common for many commodities distributed in the United States were being copied in the preparation of our wine advertising. There was nothing illegal about these themes or these advertising techniques, but they were quite at variance with what we had been doing and with what the wine industry as a whole felt was desirable.

We, therefore, thought that some statement should be made outlining the objectives of wine advertising which could be used as a guide for merchandisers and their advertising agencies and also by the printing and lithographic trades. Our view was that where advertising might be considered in questionable taste, its final publication was likely to be due largely to the fact that money had been invested in its preparation. We felt practically all difficulties resulting from poor taste could be avoided if some guide to proper preparation were furnished.

The preparation of this guide was done by the 19 associations forming the Wine Conference of America. We first met with Deputy Commissioner Mealey, of the Alcohol Tax Unit, who was of great assistance to us, particularly in furnishing samples of proposed, unpublished advertising and by making available the technical advice of his advertising staff. Further conferences were held within the various trade groups and with advertising experts. Finally, on April 8, 1949, the Wine Conference issued the document entitled "Statement of Principles for Advertising in the Wine Industry." This statement was subscribed to, through these 19 associations, by practically the entire wine trade in the United States.

This advertising code has been furnished to all individual members of these associations for redistribution to their sales personnel and to their advertising agencies. The Better Business Bureau has included it in its "Do's and Don'ts for Advertising." It has been made available to all Federal and State control agencies.

The code has received commendation wherever it has been distributed and, more important, it has accomplished the purposes for which it was designed. Since its adoption was voluntary, this may seem strange. Actually, it is not. Existing basic Federal and State laws dealing with advertising are stringent. Enforcement officials are in constant contact with industry members and their advertising agencies. Through the operation of the Federal and State licensing systems, the industry is highly integrated not only at the producer level, but also down through the wholesaling and retailing levels. Our industry trade associations are active in assisting their members in preparing public relations programs. On the whole, it would be more than surprising if the advertising code did not work.

We feel very strongly that no additional law is necessary or even desirable. The combination of basic law coupled with voluntary group action is becoming more and more common. In medieval times no one questioned the royal right to regulate the personal habits of the subject, and much of this concept passed into statutory law during the Reformation and during the earlier history of this country. But we believe almost everyone nowadays realizes not only the undesirability but also the basic unfairness of trying to use the criminal law to govern human conduct in phases of activity which are not even remotely criminal in the minds of most men.

What constitutes good taste, good manners, and just plain common sense in dealing with your neighbors, is really the only thing that is being discussed before this committee. Habits, customs, and basic thinking differ widely among our large population, both geographically and at various economic levels. Again, we believe it is basically unsound to use criminal law in dealing with activity in any field such as this where there is no question of deception or fraud—matters which are already fully and stringently covered by Federal and State law. This view of ours has been expressed by many eminent jurists, and we think it was aptly put by William Howard Taft before the Pennsylvania Bar Association in 1906 (12 Rep. Pa. Bar Ass'n 239, 240–245), when he gave his view of the function of law in part as follows:

"It is to offer equal opportunities for the improvement of the people rather than to command it by positive law, to be enforced by threatened or actual punishment. It is to furnish the means of maintaining justice, and then to let individualism have its sway in working out character and in adding to the sum of human happiness. The theory that by legislation the State can successfully command people to be righteous in the higher sense is at the bottom of much unsuccessful and obsolete legislation that stands as a monument to the obstacle that hearts overflowing with enthusiastic love for their race but without practical judgment have offered to real progress."

With the permission of the committee, I would like to introduce at this point the wine industry's Statement of Principles already mentioned, and which we think reflects in principle the line of thought just referred to.

On the first page of this advertising code there are three paragraphs explaining its purposes.

Then follow nine basic points covering good labeling and advertising of wine. The first eight points deal with the subject matter of good advertising regardless of media. The ninth point deals with advertising media themselves. This advertising code is attached as an appendix to my statement and I will not read it in full unless the committee desires me to do so.

In considering section 9 of the code dealing with advertising media, serious consideration was given to the use of radio and television. Since radio and television are generally accepted media for the transmission of information, including advertising, we believe their use is perfectly proper for the transmission of information on wine. We realize that certain types of radio and television commercials, based on the technique of the old-time circus barker, are obnoxious to a great many people regardless of the commodity advertised. We, therefore, provide in our code that the same good taste shall apply to these media as to others; namely that the advertiser shall avoid irritating the sensitivities of the normal consuming public and that commercials should be so prepared as to promote the proper and temperate use for which wine is intended, not to suggest that wine should be used for any but temperate purposes and not to bring wine into disrepute with the consuming public.

With the proper type of program we feel that we can contribute to the information and pleasure of the normal consuming public. In the last few months we have been experimenting with the visual system of giving information that television affords. The industry, through the Wine Advisory Board of the State of California, has sponsored cooking demonstrations showing the use of wine in the kitchen and at the table as a proper accompaniment to food. This program has appeared between 8:30 and 9 in the evening in the northeastern area of the United States and it has been highly appreciated by the many householders who really want to know how to cook with wine and enjoy it with their meals.

As to radio advertising by individual companies, I think there is one popular misconception about radio and radio advertising that should be mentioned. When commercial radio first started there were relatively few stations. Receiving sets were bought on their ability to get distance. Today, however, the situation has radically changed. The number of AM stations has more than doubled compared with before the war, and with the addition of FM and television stations, the total number of broadcasting outlets has tripled compared with prewar. Listening has become local and highly selective. Residents of the Washington area, for instance, normally listen only to Washington stations and rarely to stations as close as Baltimore. Programs prepared in Baltimore are prepared for the Baltimore listening area and not for the listeners in Washington who listen to the Washington stations. Furthermore, the increase in number of broadcasting outlets has resulted in a very substantial increase in the variety of programs available even within any given listening area and listeners can and do select the programs which meet their individual tastes. The fact that broadcasting has become local and selective as to audiences means that the advertiser today can and does select the marketing area in which he wishes to make a particular kind of advertising appeal and that he also selects the particular audience in that area whom he wishes to reach. In other words, it is perfectly possible for any member of the wine industry to handle radio and television in such a way as to be in conformity with the customs and habits of the people in any particular marketing area and to give those people who would normally be interested in wine the information they desire. Consequently, we feel that radio and television have a perfectly proper place in

the advertising of our products and should not be discriminated against by legislative action.

We feel very strongly that there is no need for further legislation. We believe we have demonstrated that it is perfectly possible to cover questions of good manners and good taste by voluntary group action. Further, we should like to reiterate our previous statement that the passage of S. 1847, or of any bills of a similar nature, would have the effect of suppressing desirable information concerning the proper and temperate uses of wine with the consequent effect of leading to the abuse of wine rather than to its proper use.

One last thing. This is not stated by way of complaint, because we recognize that some people have a different attitude toward alcoholic beverages than do most of the people in this country, and also that they have a right to their views. Nevertheless, this is the third hearing on this subject that has been held in the past 4 years and the proposals that have been made for legislative action all tend toward the destruction of the grape-growing industry in the United States. This is serious business for us. The retail value of our product is in the neighborhood of $500,000,000, yet the total advertising bill for our industry is only about $5,000,000. Five hundred million dollars implies a lot in the livelihood of about 300,000 retail establishments, 6,000 wholesale establishments, and almost 1,000 wineries located in 13 States.

Grape growing is one of the most important agricultural industries in the country. In California, which produces 85 percent of the wine consumed in the United States, wine provides an outlet for approximately one-half the total crop. This involves over one-half million acres of vineyard furnishing a livelihood for 50,000 farmers in that State.

The wine industry is a substantial part of the agricultural economy of the United States, and we believe we have just as much right to furnish truthful information about our products to those of the public who want to use them as any other industry in the United States. We believe that our conduct in this respect has standards as high as those of any other industry, perhaps a great deal higher than those for some commodities which are not under discussion here today.

May I here repeat in substance what I have already said—wine remains a natural product and a recognized part of the diet of most civilized men. We have no desire to, nor have we ever sought to force the use of our product on anyone. But the wine industry of this country, on whose behalf I appear today, feels its right to continue the normal and natural pursuit of its business should not be obstructed by the wholly unjustifiable types of legislation that have been proposed to this committee.

We think we have done a good job in an admittedly controversial field. We should like to continue as we have been doing. We hope that the Congress will not take any action that would jeopardize an industry which, despite the havoc created by national prohibition, has rapidly established the United States as one of the major wine producing countries in the world with products that are a credit to it.

STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES FOR ADVERTISING IN THE WINE INDUSTRY ISSUED APRIL 8, 1949, BY THE WINE CONFERENCE OF AMERICA

The purposes of this statement of principles are:

To maintain a high degree of public respect for wine as a temperate mealtime beverage used primarily in the home; to promote the uses for which wine is most particularly suited; and to present wine as an accompaniment to food, as an appetizer, as an appropriate and moderate beverage for social occasions and as a contribution to gracious American family and social living.

To furnish a guide of traditionally proper practices so as to obviate any usages in labeling and advertising that would injure the public's respect for the industry and its products.

To furnish a positive declaration of the industry's right to advertise and promote wine and its uses along traditional, ethical lines.

1. Good advertising and labeling of wine tend to promote the proper and temperate uses for which wine is intended; do not suggest that wine should be used for any but temperate purposes; and do not bring wine into disrepute with the consuming public.

2. Good advertising and labeling of wine include references in good taste to the generally accepted use of wine at neighborly and friendly gatherings, restaurant dining, weddings and anniversaries, and at festivities and celebrations such as Thanksgiving, Christmas, Easter, the New Year, Father's Day, and Independence Day, but do not associate wine or its use with days set aside to commemorate occasions of deep memorial significance such as Memorial Day and Armistice Day.

3. Good advertising and labeling of wine depict the proper and moderate use of wine on all family occasions including those when children are incidentally present, but do not permit pictorial representation of the consumption of wine by children, or illustrations or representations generally considered as appealing primarily to children, such as Santa Claus as historic fairy tale characters.

4. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally include the association of the product with friendly and recreational activities but do not suggest that wine is used by athletes as such nor allow any inference that the use of wine aids athletic prowess.

5. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally have included illustrations of the use of wine by the members of both sexes but do not permit any exploitation of the human form in an immodest, vulgar, or sensuous maner.

6. Good advertising and labeling of wine do not associate revered persons of public prominence, living or dead, with the brand or products of any company in such a manner as to imply the use or endorsement thereof. This does not require the abandonment or limitation of any brand names in use on the date of the adoption of this statement of principles.

7. Good advertising of wine brands traditionally utilizes endorsements and testimonials only from persons who have had actual experience in using or serving the product.

8. Good advertising and labeling of wine traditionally have included allusions to the historic development of the wine-growing industry in connection with the establishment of early religious communities, and allow the use of established and recognized illustrations, trademarks, brands, type designations, and names of recognized wine districts which may be associated with religious origins or development, but do not otherwise include, except for sacramental wines and the production for sale of brands of wine by religious orders or organizations, the association of any brand of wine or its use with contemporary religion.

9. Good advertising of wine includes the utilization of all types of advertising media, such as newspapers, magazines, radio, billboards, television, signs, displays, and other media customarily used by other industries. The choice of advertising media, insofar as practicable, should avoid irritating the sensitivities of the normal consuming public, e. g., it avoids advertising in those portions of publications designed primarily for children, and it avoids the use of sound trucks and skywriting.

The Wine Conference of America consists of the following associations of the wine industry: American Wine Association; Associated Vintners of the Middle West; Bottle Fermented Champagne Producers, Inc.; Council Bluffs Grape Growers Association; Finger Lakes Wine Growers Association; Maryland Institute of Wine and Spirits Distributors, Inc.; Michigan Wine Institute; National Association of Alcoholic Beverage Importers, Inc.; National Wine Association; Ohio Grape and Wine Producers Association; Ohio Grape Growers Institute; Ohio Wine Dealers Association; North Carolina Association for Wine Control; Texas Wine Association; Vermouth Institute; Washington Wine Council; Wine Association of Pennsylvania; Wine Distributors of Northern California; Wine Institute.

H. A. CADDOW,
Secretary.

Back to the Graveyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of January 16, 1950:

BACK TO THE GRAVEYARD

Almost the last word spoken in the House of Representatives last year was a well-merited eulogy of Congressman EBERHARTER for having sponsored the notable reform which had enabled the House to function as a legislative body free from dictation. With the aid of a memorandum prepared by the Legislative Reference Service, Congressman HOLIFIELD pointed out that the curb Mr. EBERHARTER had designed for the Rules Committee had saved four bills, possibly five, from the committee's legislative graveyard. In the case of the anti-poll-tax and rivers and harbors bills, the sponsoring committee chairmen had gone to the floor after being denied a rule and induced the House to take the measures from the Rules Committee and pass them. The threat of using the new rule forced the balky Rules Committee into action on the slum-clearance and minimum-wage bills and probably on the vitally important social-security bill.

In spite of this clear-cut demonstration that the new 21-day rule is essential to prevent minority dictation in the House, the Rules Committee has voted 9 to 2 for restoration of its former arbitrary powers. It is not satisfied to serve the House as "traffic director," with limited powers to delay bills approved by the legislative committees. It seeks to regain the power of erecting impassable road blocks against any bill that its members do not like. That is a power which, of course, should not be entrusted to any lesser body than the House itself.

The argument always made for a dictatorial Rules Committee is that it is needed to save the House from passing unwise legislation. Such an argument carries a strong appeal. Many citizens will agree with the Rules Committee, for example, that the rivers and harbors bill taken out of its hands last year was a pork-barrel measure and that the anti-poll-tax bill, which it tried to defeat, is unconstitutional. This newspaper is unalterably opposed to pork-barrel and unconstitutional bills, but we do not believe that it is safe to entrust 12 Congressmen with the power to say what measures approved

by regular legislative committees are too unwise to be submitted to the House for a vote. That is not representative government but oligarchy.

There are other methods of preventing the House from stampeding for unsound vote-getting measures. For many years the House has been urged to set up an effective majority policy committee which, in consultation with the President and a similar committee in the Senate, would shape a legislative program each year and then make every effort to hold members of the majority party to that program. It is unquestionably true that strong leadership is needed in an unwieldy body such as the House. But let it be leadership through the formulation of party programs and use of the caucus to keep members in line with those programs if necessary. The responsibility for what the House does should rest squarely upon the party in control of it, and that party, of course, is answerable to the people. If it indulges in a spending debauch, the voters will know what to do about it.

But for the House to slip back into the undemocratic practice of blocking issues that a little handful of Members deems too hot to handle would be a tragic retrogression. Instead of authorizing the Rules Committee to squat athwart the legislative highway once more, we think the House ought to rebuke its rule makers for not maintaining a smooth and orderly flow of bills to the floor.

Best-Kept Secret—Hidden Federal Tax Load in United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by John Beckley, from the Des Moines Sunday Register of December 18, 1949:

BEST-KEPT SECRET—HIDDEN FEDERAL TAX LOAD IN UNITED STATES

(By John Beckley)

Not one American in a hundred realizes that total tax collections now exceed the wartime peak. And not one in a thousand knows that hidden taxes—included in the price of everything he buys—will exceed $700 per family this year. In fact, the best-kept secret in the country today is the size of the tax load.

In 1945, when the United States was fighting a global war, with 11,000,000 men under arms, Federal, State, and local governments collected $52,500,000,000 in taxes. This year they are skimming off $55,000,000,000—25 percent of the national income, and more than the entire national income in 1932, 1933, or 1934.

To a modern Rip Van Winkle, rousing from a 20-year snooze, the sight of the Federal Government alone spending $43,500,000,000 a year would be unbelievable. In 1929 the total United States budget was about $3,000,000,000. The Government spent less than two-thirds of the personal income of the residents of California. Last year Federal expenditures were roughly equal to the entire income of all persons west of the Mississippi.

FROM 600,000 TO 2,000,000 EMPLOYEES

Twenty years ago the Federal Government had fewer than 600,000 civilian employees. Today more than 2,000,000 are on the pay roll. And to conduct its affairs the Government occupies 340,500,000 square feet of floor space—equal to 170 Empire State Buildings 102 stories tall.

To bankers and businessmen, Government spending figures conjure up pictures of national bankruptcy and the death of private enterprise. But the average citizen has no such fears.

Today there is a widespread belief that Government spending is essential to continued prosperity. Furthermore, people are in favor of spending money to promote the general welfare. And they are supremely confident that the United States is rich enough and powerful enough to finance any welfare program it sees fit to undertake.

But the most comforting thing is the belief that someone else is footing the bill—probably big business and people with big incomes. The average citizen still has no concept of the size of the hidden taxes he pays every day of his life.

TAXES PASSED ON TO THE CONSUMER

It is not suprising that we have little idea of what Government spending is actually costing us. Only half of the Federal Government's revenues and less than 10 percent of State and local receipts come from direct taxes on personal incomes. The rest comes mostly from taxes on business organizations.

And these taxes, in turn, are passed along to the consumer in the form of higher prices. As a result, for most people (those with incomes of $5,000 or less, which includes better than 9 out of every 10 taxpayers—the hidden tax burden is heavier than the income tax.

Tax snowball: Taxes accumulate all along the way from raw material to finished product on the store shelves. And at that point many States and cities add a retail sales tax. The Tax Foundation, a research organization which studies Government spending and taxes, has discovered 150 taxes levied on the manufacture and sale of a woman's hat, 116 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 151 on a loaf of bread, and at least 100 on a dozen eggs.

There are about 11½ cents of taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, $2.06 taxes on a $3.75 bottle of whisky, and $300 to $500 on a $2,000 car. That is one big reason, say auto makers, why a $1,000 car today is out of the question.

This year the average family will pay $69 in liquor taxes, $45 on tobacco, and $49 in the cost of gasoline. Property taxes—some paid directly, others indirectly in rents and prices—amount to $177 per family. Sales taxes will take another $48.

And corporation income taxes—which the consumer also pays in the form of higher prices—will take a whopping $317 out of the average family's purse.

Some economists do not believe that all business taxes, especially the corporation income tax, come out of the consumer's pocket. But the evidence is impressive. G. Sidney Houston, Minnesota banker, points out that in the 3 prosperous years 1927–29, net income after taxes of corporations which reported a profit amounted to 7.45 percent of gross income.

CORPORATION TAXES INCREASED 3½ TIMES

Since then there has been a three-and-a-half-fold jump in corporation income tax rates; hundreds of other business taxes have also been boosted. Yet in 1946, despite price control, profits after taxes were 6.89 percent of gross income. "It seems rather clear," says Houston, "that corporations did everything in their power to pass on to their customers practically all tax increases."

Last week Newsweek asked leading auto manufacturers a loaded question: "If corporation income taxes were reduced by one-half, would you cut the price of automobiles?" One corporation declined to answer, but from the others came a unanimous yes. Ernest Breech, Ford executive vice president and an old hand at cost accounting, reflected a typical businessman's viewpoint:

"Certainly they would cut prices. In the long run, every corporation must price its products so as to make a reasonable return after taxes in order to survive and grow. In the final analysis, income taxes are just as much a cost of doing business as pay roll."

And if a drop in corporate income taxes would bring a drop in auto prices, who, then, is bearing the cost of present taxes? The finger points directly at the consumer.

TAX FACTS OF LIFE

There is nothing vicious about this passing of taxes to the consumer. It is simply a fact of economic life. It must be recognized that business organizations, by their very nature, are merely tax collectors, not taxpayers. The cardinal rule of every business—the purpose of any profit-making organization—is to earn a fair return on the money invested.

To survive, it must pay its costs and have a fair profit left over. And taxes are just another item of cost. If income taxes take half of a corporation's profits, then it must set its prices high enough to earn twice as much before taxes in order to have the same return.

Death by taxes: If business could not pass taxes along to the consumer, the entire system would be automatically destroyed. In the case of many corporations, the total tax load already exceeds their total profits. Last year the giant American Telephone & Telegraph Co. paid $292,000,000 in taxes. Its profits after taxes amounted to $229,000,000. General Motors paid taxes of $694,000,000, compared with profits of $440,000,000.

If taxes on corporations were completely removed, State public-utility commissions would force A. T. & T. to reduce prices until its profits were probably not much greater than they are today. Public opinion and competition would cause GM to do the same.

If the present tax load were then reimposed—and could not be passed along to the consumer—profits would be completely wiped out.

INFLATION

Besides income taxes and hidden taxes, the average family bears still another cost of big government spending—inflation. During a depression, deficit spending does not necessarily cause higher prices. Some economists maintain it may actually cause more goods to be produced. But when production is running full blast, deficit spending merely increases the demand for a limited supply of goods. The $5,500,000,000 Federal deficit this year has forced everyone to pay higher prices. Inflation is a form of hidden taxation which is almost impossible to measure. Yet it is just as real as many other forms of taxation.

PROSPERITY UNDER A SMALL BUDGET

Is huge Government spending essential to prosperity? The idea that it is springs directly from our experience in the great depression of the thirties. We never did get rid of unemployment until the Government ripped its purse strings wide open to fight the Second World War.

Yet, somehow, in the 150 years preceding the thirties, we managed to prosper with very light taxes and a small Government budget.

And Government spending dropped from a wartime high of $99,000,000,000 in 1945 to $37,000,000,000 in 1948—a cut of nearly two-thirds—and we still enjoyed full employment. There is good reason to believe that we could cut it even farther with equally good results.

Some believe that we must support a certain number of people in the Government because there aren't enough jobs to go around. But the money the Government is now spending could easily be spent by the people from whom it is taken—by lower-income groups for milk, meat, and clothing; by

middle-income groups for homes, furnishings, insurance, and college educations; and by higher-income groups for investment in new tools for industry. Spent by individuals, the money would create productive jobs for those now on Government pay rolls.

MANY SMALL BUSINESSES HUNGRY FOR CAPITAL

Another hang-over from the thirties is the idea that big incomes must be taxed away or they will lie idle. At the time it might have been true, but today thousands of small businesses are hungry for capital. Big corporations which would like to sell stock to expand their operations cannot find enough buyers. And no kind of spending benefits the Nation more than spending which increases its ability to produce.

QUESTIONS

The objectives of Government spending are admirable, much of it is absolutely essential. But the people who foot the bill have a right to ask, Is the money being spent as efficiently and economically as possible?

We must spend huge sums for rearmament, but questions arise: Is the Army exercising reasonable care when it can locate only 16,000 of 25,000 tanks it supposedly had on hand at the end of the war? Is there any reason why, when the average stay for a tonsillectomy in a private hospital is 1.4 days, Army personnel on active duty should take 16.1 days?

And is it necessary that the Army put a simple order for buying onions through 288 separate steps, as discovered by an investigator for the house appropriations committee? Messengers handled the order 110 times in sending it through 18 subdivisions.

Aid to veterans is important, but should the Veterans Administration Insurance Service have a work load of only 450 policies per employee?

(That of private insurance-company employees is 1,762, 4 times as heavy.)

Ailing veterans need help, but how far should the Government go? Eighty-three out of every 100 veterans admitted to Government hospitals are suffering from ailments having no connection with war service.

The Government must keep records, but should it use 18,500,000 cubic feet of storage space—equivalent to six Pentagon buildings—to store records, especially when 35 percent of them are worthless? Should the State Department take as many as 35 steps to process a letter?

THIRTY DIFFERENT AGENCIES IN LOAN ACTIVITIES

Does the Government really need 30 different agencies engaged in making, guaranteeing, or insuring loans?

Does it require 75 different bureaus and agencies with a major interest in transportation problems, at least 15 dealing with public housing and no less than 65 engaged in statistical work?

The Hoover Commission, which studies the functioning of Federal Government, estimates that $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year could be saved simply through more efficient Government organization without eliminating any present functions.

WHO PAYS THE TAXES?

Can the average citizen shift much of his present and future tax load to someone else? The chances are relatively nil. The rich have already been soaked. And few people realize that less than 6 percent of the national income goes to people who make $25,000 a year or more.

The Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation estimates that at a national personal-income level of $208,000,000,000 people with incomes of $50,000 a year or more get only $4,470,000,000. Sixty-two percent of this already goes into Federal income taxes, with State and local governments taking another slice. People with incomes between $25,000 and $50,000 a year get $5,000,000,000, with 38 percent going into Federal income taxes. With United States industry panting for more equity capital, heavier taxes on these groups will merely mean smaller production in the future. And the tax yield will be small.

Next month, when President Truman presents the budget to Congress, the average citizen might well scan it with one important question in mind: Who can spend this money to greater advantage, the Government or me?

Congress May Not Scratch Truman Program's Surface

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Gould Lincoln, from the Washington Sunday Star of January 15, 1950:

CONGRESS MAY NOT SCRATCH TRUMAN PROGRAM'S SURFACE—EVEN PRESIDENT'S CAPITOL LIEUTENANTS SEE NO CHANCE OF PUTTING THROUGH LABOR, FARM, OR COMPULSORY HEALTH MEASURES

(By Gould Lincoln)

We have now seen everything. President Truman, in his state of the Union message to Congress, has added the last great group—business—to those whom he promises milk and honey—labor, farmers, and minority racial groups. In effect he told American businessmen that if they would go along with him and his program, their gains would be tremendous.

Mr. Truman pictured American production—and through production American wealth—in the year 2000 as four times as great as it is today. These gains, he told business, "cannot be achieved unless our businessmen maintain their spirit of initiative and enterprise and operate in a competitive economic system." He added that Government has its responsibility to help create the conditions necessary to permit growth. Foremost among these conditions, he said, is the need for a fair distribution of increasing prosperity among all the great groups of our population who help to bring it about. He mentioned business first in the prepared text of his message, but in delivering it, he shifted to labor, with business second and agriculture third.

The President went on: "Businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise." Inferentially, he promised businessmen all of that—and incentives mean profits.

But in promising great things to business, Mr. Truman did not forget to renew and increase his pledges to labor, to farmers, to the racial groups—and, indeed, to everyone in the country. Included in his legislative program, as revealed in this message to Congress, are repeal of the Taft-Hartley labor law, enactment of the Brannan farm plan with its production payments to keep the prices of all agricultural products at high points, a Federal fair employment practices law, antilynching law, and anti-poll-tax law, and other civil-rights measures, and compulsory health insurance through which free medicine is to be handed out to everyone.

EXTREMELY HEAVY PROGRAM

Mr. Truman's program—as it relates to the domestic picture alone—is extremely heavy, so heavy that it is doubtful the Democratic Eighty-first Congress will even scratch its surface—although in 1948 Mr. Truman complained bitterly because the Republican Eightieth Congress wouldn't put it through in a 2 weeks' special session he called.

In the first place, the President's own leaders on Capitol Hill say they see no prospect of the passage, or even the consideration at this session, of labor legislation, the Brannan farm plan, or compulsory national health insurance. Here are three major measures—the very foundation stones of Mr. Truman's program—which have no chance of enactment. They will, it is now predicted by administration leaders, go into the congressional campaign as major issues in the hope that the Eighty-second Congress will look with more favor upon them than does the present Congress. The Truman Fair Dealers and their allies, the labor union leaders, will do their utmost to put across candidates for the House and Senate pledged to Taft-Hartley Act repeal? A tremendous amount of propaganda work for the Brannan plan is now being done by both proponents and opponents, and that is the case, too, with the Truman proposal for compulsory health insurance—called socialized medicine by its opponents.

What can Mr. Truman expect from the Eighty-first Congress? It is generally agreed that legislative action will be completed on the bill which passed the House during the last session extending the coverage of the Social Security Act and increasing benefits. The Senate Finance Committee is soon going to work on this measure. It may be the most important of the Presidential recommendations enacted into law before the session ends.

The President's huge budget recommendations, covering proposed expenditures for all Government activities during the fiscal year 1951, totaling $42,439,000,000, will be enacted, though probably with modifications. The House Appropriations Committee, under the leadership of Chairman CANNON, of Missouri, is already working to draft a single, omnibus appropriation bill, to take the place of the nine regular annual appropriation bills which have been the practice in the past. Mr. CANNON and Senator BYRD, of Virginia, champion of governmental economy, insist that it will be far easier to approach a balanced budget with a single appropriation bill.

LOGROLLING POSSIBLE

The administration is inclined to look with suspicion on anything approved by Senator BYRD (the President has said "there are too many Byrds in Congress"). Further, Mr. Truman's new budget is a big-spending budget and a big-spending budget can be cared for more readily in a series of appropriation bills, passed independently of each other. So you now find some of the administration leaders on Capitol Hill throwing cold water on the single appropriation bill idea—among them Speaker RAYBURN. They talk of the possibilities of logrolling when the measure reaches the Senate—although why the House should be innocent of such tactics is not explained. By logrolling is meant a practice—reprehensible in itself—whereby one group of Senators favoring certain appropriations will join with another group favoring other appropriations, both groups agreeing to support the other's pet projects. Of course, logrolling is possible, and has been engaged in, when there have been a series of separate appropriation bills. The single appropriation bill still offers much to those who desire economy because when it is drafted and laid before the public, the people as well as Congress itself, can see just what is proposed in the matter

of expenditures as compared to the revenues of the Government.

Appropriations promise to become a major battlefield in this session, particularly as the President has frankly admitted in his budget message that a deficit of more than $5,000,000,000 may be expected at the close of the fiscal year 1951, to be piled on top of another $5,000,000,000 at the close of the present fiscal year next June 30. The Republicans are bent on making this deficit spending a great issue in the coming political campaign.

Only the President's recommendations on tax legislation remain still undisclosed, to prevent a complete picture of the administration's financial program for the next year. Predictions are made, however, that reduction or repeal of many of the wartime excise taxes will be proposed by the President, and as an offset to such revenue reduction he will ask that Congress increase income-tax rates on upper-bracket incomes—from $6,000 upward—an increase in taxes on corporations.

TAX REPEAL DEMANDS

Whatever Mr. Truman may do or not do about excise taxes, the demand for repeal of these wartime burdens is strong both among Democrats and Republicans alike in Congress, and a bill will be pushed for action. Certainly if the President asks repeal, Congress will respond affirmatively. However, when it comes to increasing taxes on individual incomes and on business, the opposition in Congress will be material, so material that the odds are the President will not get any increases.

The huge deficits which the President himself says are to be expected this year and next will make chances extremely slim for new, costly projects in the President's program. It will make the voters look askance at proposals, like the Brannan plan and the compulsory health-insurance program. The first might take billions more in tax money, and the second will take billions more from the pay envelopes of everyone—and if that is not enough, still more tax money.

Congress, however, has plenty of time on its hands, and will have, during the next 2 months, while it is waiting for the omnibus appropriation bill. Here is an ideal opportunity for the administration to try to force one or more of the civil-rights bills through the Senate—over the expected southern filibuster. The House may take up soon, Speaker RAYBURN says, the Federal fair employment practices bill.

This is the measure most bitterly opposed by the southerners in Congress. Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Democratic leader of the upper house, has promised, too, that he will bring an FEPC bill before the Senate and force a show-down on it. The days already are slipping by, however, with a long debate on the bill repealing the tax on oleomargarine. Senator LANGER, Republican, of North Dakota, has offered an FEPC amendmend to this bill, in an effort to kill the oleo bill.

Admittedly the FEPC bill is probably the most difficult of the civil-rights measures to get through the Senate—but it is the one which Mr. LUCAS and other administration leaders consider most potent as a vote winner in northern cities where there are great concentrations of minority racial groups. Republican senatorial floor leader, Senator WHERRY of Nebraska, has announced he will seek to have the antilynching bill substituted for the FEPC bill when Senator LUCAS moves to take up the latter. More political maneuvering which is not likely to advance civil-rights legislation.

OTHER OBJECTIVES

The President has asked Congress to extend the life of the Selective Service (draft) Act which is due to expire next June. This is a measure of national defense which should receive approval of Congress. The peacetime draft—even though it is not now being used—is not popular and there may be a real fight over it.

Mr. Truman has urged an extension, too, of the Rent Control Act. This will be the signal for another battle. Opponents say that this continued demand for rent control is just another proof the administration wishes to keep control of the people's affairs and the housing situation no longer requires rent control.

Among the other demands made by the President are the following: Federal assistance for housing for lower and middle-income groups, strengthening of the unemployment insurance law, Federal aid to education (a Senate bill has bogged down in the House Committee on Education and Labor), the St. Lawrence Seaway, a Columbia Valley Administration (comparable to the Tennessee Authority), statehood for Alaska and Hawaii and home rule for the District of Columbia.

Faced again by a strong anti-Fair Deal coalition of Republicans and Southern Democrats in Congress, the President has a tough 6 months ahead of him. And next November the Truman program must run the gantlet on election day.

Mysteries of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present for your reading and consideration a text of a column written by a very esteemed newspaper representative, Malcolm Epley, of the Long Beach Press-Telegram, January 10, 1950. Mr. Epley writes a column each day, which takes up a very valuable space one column wide and the full length of the page. It is widely read and said paper has a very wide circulation in my home city of Long Beach, Calif.

Mr. Epley's column on this date bears so directly upon what every Member of Congress has to face from time to time that I present it to you for your reading and consideration with a good deal of pleasure and satisfaction, as having come from a very wise and well-informed writer of my own home city. It follows:

BEACHCOMBING

(By Malcolm Epley)

One of the mysteries of politics is that there is nearly always a flock of candidates for every job. There is a deep-seated urge (to rule or to serve, or both) that prompts men and women to turn out for every opening from dog catcher to President, despite certain hazards and discouragements that they all must know about.

Of course, political-office holders have moments of triumph and power. To be sure, there are occasions when they receive cheers and bows and are pointed out as people of distinction if not honor.

But every politician knows that the cheers can turn to boos, that he who fawns over a public official one week may cuss him the next, that it is given to few to retire gracefully from office without the stigma of final rejection to spoil what should be pleasant memories.

He knows that hardly has the flush of an election triumph worn off before he has to start thinking about what can happen to him next time. He knows that overnight some development—possibly something he couldn't prevent—can shoot down his ascending star, yank a comfortable seat from under him, or snatch an unpunched meal ticket out of his hand.

In short, it's a rough business, and, as a citizen who knows we have to have candidates, I would hesitate to put down such a frank description if I thought it would scare anybody. But it won't.

We all know people who have vowed by all that's holy that they would never seek political office, but who, visited by a few delegations, or given an appointment, or otherwise treated to a smell of politics, became starry-eyed believers in their personal political destiny and never got over it.

We just couldn't have democracy if it wasn't that way.

And so, happily, right now people are coming out almost every day for the offices to be filled by the sovereign people at the 1950 elections. It's safe to say not a single job will go begging, and that in virtually all cases there'll be contests to excite interest and create suspense.

This is one of the most interesting periods of the political year. It is marked by considerable jockeying, by trial balloons, by tentative declarations, and conditional withdrawals.

It's all part of the game.

One example of preannouncement technique among hopeful politicians is to put out feelers in the shape of rumors that someone will run, and then feel for the public reaction.

It's easy to start a rumor. Just go down the street, or get a friend to do it, and mention the possibility that you might run for the office. Coming up the street on the other side, you'll probably hear it yourself.

Newsmen will usually oblige with a report that a candidate is considering running. That's fair enough, for it's true—he is considering it.

The prospective candidate can then keep his ear to the ground. If what he hears pleases him, he'll run. And if he really wants to run, the chances are he'll please pretty easily.

Announcements, of course, are virtually always preceded by the urgings of large numbers of citizens. They usually convey the picture of a shy and reluctant candidate virtually pushed into the political swimming hole by delegations of folks who just won't take no for an answer.

Little by little, as the deadline nears, the picture clears, and the public learns who is going to run against whom. Once the date passes when the last declaration can be made, the campaign gets under way.

That makes an equally interesting story, maybe worth some comment here later on. Meantime, consider, as they come out into the open, the courage and willingness for punishment of the good folks who run for office.

National Chaplain of the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address in honor of the Reverend Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., on his recent election as national chaplain of the American Legion, which I de-

livered at the reception and dinner tendered by the American Legion and the citizens of Greater Lawrence, Mass., at Central Catholic High Auditorium, on Sunday, December 4, 1949, in behalf of Father Carney:

I bring to Father Carney the greetings of the people in the Seventh Massachusetts Congressional District.

This is his day.

And deservedly so.

I know that Father Carney's heart is full of joy at the honor conferred upon him. It is but natural for any man to feel a glow of pride in the recognition accorded him by the free choice of his fellow men. This is followed by an awareness of the responsibility that goes with such an honor.

In keeping with his own friendly personality and the obligations of his sacred profession. I am sure that Father Carney is deeply grateful for this chance to be of service on a national scale to the young men with whom he shared spiritual comradeship during the trying days of the late war.

But as chaplain of our largest veteran organization he knows that its prestige, influence, and policies are not limited to veterans alone.

In these days when so many nations have lost or are losing their freedoms, victims of their own carelessness, we in the United States should be proud that we have such a vigilant group as the members of the American Legion.

They understand that the dangers brought on through indifference must be overcome at a fearful cost. That is why the Legion campaigns for preparedness not only in the military sense but through its programs to develop greater opportunities for our young people and to acquaint all of us with the rights, duties, and blessings of our American citizenship.

These are practical and realistic steps to safeguard our precious heritage.

The Legion, however, is not satisfied with defensive measures.

The Maginot line of fortifications did not bring security for France. The iron curtain alone will not protect Communist Russia from its own mistakes. Neither a radar screen nor a veto in the United Nations Security Council will guarantee safety to any nation from fears, real or imagined.

A more positive approach is necessary in this one world.

There is a desperate longing for peace among the peoples of this earth. They watch, with growing apprehension, the increase of military power on the one hand and the efforts to build a world organization to outlaw war on the other hand. And they wonder which will win out.

It seems to me that man with his limitations is putting too much of his trust in material power for the answer to all of his problems.

He is forgetting the strength and wisdom that come from moral rearmament.

In the past the office of chaplain in our fraternal organizations has been largely ornamental, concerned with the impressive, although somewhat exclusive, rituals attending the installation of officers.

I am sure that Father Carney will not be content with such a limited role.

How could he with his youthful vigor, his sincere faith, and his knowledge of the power of the Spirit that has sustained and guided men when all else failed?

Already he has called upon his comrades to mobilize the resources of prayer in a brief period of contemplation at the middle of each busy day for divine guidance on those issues which trouble a world in ferment.

This is an inspiring suggestion which merits the support of all people both in and out of the Legion.

"In God we trust" was the dedication of our founding fathers as they pioneered in the establishment of a new society where all men would have equal opportunity. In too many instances, modern man has forgotten this ideal. It may well be that in an age blessed with material abundance he finds himself beset with so many problems because he has turned his back on God.

If Father Carney has anything to do with it, this dangerous trend will be reversed. The Legion and the Nation will benefit from the refreshing zeal and high purpose which he brings to his new position.

We have known him for many years as the beloved spiritual adviser to thousands of communicants in St. Mary's parish. We remember his eagerness to leave the safety and comfort of his assignment in order to share the dangers and to be of help to his boys in the combat area of the Pacific during the war.

We are happy for his sake at this opportunity for wider service which has come to him. We are proud that he has brought this honor to our city.

He is a credit to his church and to his country.

If there is any way in which the people of Lawrence can be of assistance to him as national chaplain of the Legion, he has only to ask and the response will be unanimous.

Such is our regard for a true man of God and a real buddy to thousands of veterans.

Will Congress Sell Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson Democrat, Brookville, Pa., of January 12, 1950:

WILL CONGRESS SELL OUT?

The new session of Congress may do much to decide whether we are to continue down the road that ends in statism and dictatorial government, or whether we are to reaffirm the principles and the ideals that made us a great, free, and prosperous people.

A determined effort is being made to fasten the welfare state idea upon the country. Congress will be asked to appropriate billions for cradle-to-the-grave security measures—all of which, of course, would be compulsory. The only logical reasoning behind proposals of this character is that the American people are no longer capable of taking care of themselves; that independence, thrift, self-reliance and pride are obsolete virtues, and that we must follow the example of near-bankrupt England and dictator-ridden Russia.

An equally determined effort will be made to extend Government ownership and domination of industry and enterprise. This naturally goes hand in hand with the welfare state—the cloth is cut from the same bolt. The principal target of Socialists is and has long been the light and power industry. Inasmuch as electricity enters into almost every industrial, domestic, and agricultural activity, political control of it would create, in effect if not in name, a monopoly over land, water, basic natural resources, and the instruments of production. The completed and proposed valley authorities are perfect examples of this.

It is also possible that an effort will be made to increase the tax rates—despite the fact that they are excessively heavy now, cut deep into the purchasing power of every individual, and make it difficult and in some cases impossible for enterprises to obtain the investment capital they need. That is particularly true of new and smaller companies.

The basic issue was well put by General Eisenhower when he said, "Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management. * * * Its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects, absolute power over our lives." That fine statement should be on every Congressman's desk. We have come nearer than we realize to giving Government such power.

We Don't Quite Get It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. DEANE
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. DEANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include an editorial from the State, a weekly magazine having a wide circulation in North Carolina and edited by Carl Goerch. This editorial, We Don't Quite Get It, attracted my attention as containing much food for thought. I agree with the contents of the editorial that some of the press and certain radio commentators are not making their full contribution toward world peace. The big black headlines and exciting words by press and radio convey war hysteria that is disturbing, to say the least.

The editorial follows:

WE DON'T QUITE GET IT

Among the newspapers received at our office are a few which seem determined to foster a stronger feeling of ill will between this country and Russia, Argentina, Spain, and other foreign nations.

Every piece of news which in any way can stir up this feeling is played up prominently and is supplemented by editorial comment.

We don't see any reason why this attitude should be carried out in such persistent fashion.

Is it the desire of some editors, radio commentators, and other individuals to try to bring about another war? Is that why this kind of policy is being pursued? Are they opposed—for some reason unknown to us—to trying to build up a spirit of good will and cooperation among nations?

Perhaps they are trying to warn us of dangers that lie ahead, but isn't our Government in a better position to warn us of those dangers rather than some individual who, after all is said and done, can have very little first-hand information on what is going on?

Why should our country be expected to go around with a chip on its shoulder so far as relationship with other nations is concerned?

Seems to us that it's about time to put a stop to this jingoism and start working on a plan that will really help to promote world peace.

We never can hope for world peace so long as we foster an attitude of distrust and suspicion.

Address of Vice President Alben W. Barkley at Testimonial Dinner for William M. Boyle, Jr., Chairman, Democratic National Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a speech by Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY at the testimonial dinner for William M. Boyle, Jr., chairman, Democratic National Committee, at Kansas City, Mo., on September 29, 1949.

The Vice President's speech is not only a testimonial to the Democratic Party; it is also a testimonial to Bill Boyle, who has done such an outstanding job as our national chairman. The tribute to Bill Boyle is highly deserved and it is my hope that his sagacity and wisdom will continue to shine in the years ahead. The difficult times in which we live have placed tremendous responsibilities into his hands but I know that he will do all that he possibly can to uphold the views and the objectives of President Truman and the Democratic Party.

The address by Vice President BARKLEY follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mr. President, other distinguished guests, and fellow Missourians. There has always been an inseparable bond—an unbreakable bond—that has bound together Kentucky and Missouri. Until about 40 years ago, nearly every Governor of this State was born in Kentucky and now we have a president of the United States who has in his veins, on both sides of his family, Kentucky blood.

I am happy to be here this evening to honor my friend and your friend, the chairman of the Democratic National Committee. I am glad to be here because his career in the political life of his State and city and the country is symbolic of the sort of democracy in which we believe and which we undertake to practice; that democracy which holds out to the humblest boy in every community and in every State the hope that from humble circumstances he may rise to distinction and usefulness, and it is a source of great pleasure to come to Kansas City and to Jackson County, the home of Bill Boyle and Harry S. Truman.

What sort of democracy is it that careers like these two symbolize in this country? Not the democracy of special privilege, not the democracy of exclusive rights, not the democracy of aristocracy—unless it be the aristocracy of character—but the sort of democracy that Thomas Jefferson believed in when he wrote in the first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence, "We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal." The same sort of democracy that I might say Abraham Lincoln had in mind when he said at Gettysburg that we should have and preserve a government of and by and for the people. The same sort of democracy that Grover Cleveland visualized when he uttered that immortal sentence, "Public office is a public trust and not a private snap." The same sort of democracy which Woodrow Wilson undertook to blazon on the statutes of this Nation in his New Freedom; that Theodore Roosevelt called the Square Deal; that Franklin D. Roosevelt called the New Deal; and that Harry S. Truman calls a Fair Deal.

It is the sort of democracy that seeks to make the Government of the United States an agent and servant of the people; the sort of democracy that recognizes that as we have become more complex in our social and economic and political life—not only domestically but internationally—the Government of the United States and every political party that seeks to serve the people of the United States must be their agent, always alert, always progressive, always forward-looking—seeking not by whimsical exercise of power, but by the very democratic processes of civilization to make the Government of the United States the guide and friend and agent of the people of the United States to help solve their problems.

The people of this country do not look upon Uncle Sam as an old man off yonder in Washington, sitting astride the dome of the National Capitol, looking around with complacent self-satisfaction, drawing his salary and doing nothing; that is not the sort of democracy we believe in and that is not the sort of democracy the Democratic Party, from the days of Thomas Jefferson, has stood for and now stands for, in spite of all the criticism and all efforts to retard the progress of this great people which it represents.

We are being told now by the tree-sitters and hitching-posters that we are about to enter some chaotic, vague, inchoate existence called statism; that we are now heading toward the welfare state. Well, what of it? In the Preamble of the Constitution of the United States, giving the reasons why it was established, our forefathers said, "We, the people of the United States"—not we, the Senators; not we, the Congressmen; not we, the governors; not we, the mayors; not we, the sheriffs; not we, the county judges; not we, the Supreme Court, but we, the people of the United States "ordain and establish this Constitution in order to form a more perfect Union, establish justice, and promote the general welfare." That is what they said when the Constitution was adopted.

The Democratic Party, throughout all of its life, by every enactment of its history, has sought to promote the general welfare of the American people. Recently, we were told that we are now on the last mile toward collectivism in the United States. May I, with some propriety, inquire who set us on the first mile toward collectivism in the United States? What is a welfare state? What do they mean by statism? Where does individualism end and statism begin? Did individualism end and statism begin when back in the administration of Woodrow Wilson we passed a law providing for Federal aid to the States and counties in the construction of highways? Would any of those who are now complaining about the trend and course of our history rise in their places and recommend the repeal of Federal aid in the construction of highways? Does individualism end and statism begin when the Democratic Party, under the leadership of one of its greatest leaders in all of its history—Franklin Delano Roosevelt—passed a law providing for the guaranty of bank deposits, so that we no longer fear the closing of banks in this country? Does individualism end and statism begin when Congress under the Democratic administration passed a law declaring that flood control to protect our great cities and our farms and our people in the river valleys of this country is a national obligation, and providing over a long period of years for the effort to control flood waters coming down from a dozen States and damaging property and destroying lives?

We know that no county can do it; we know that no city can do it; we know that no State can do it; we know that only the United States Government can do it. I ask you whether statism begins and individualism ends when we seek to promote the general welfare of our country by protecting them against floods.

A few years ago, we awoke to discover that one-third of our soil had washed away down the rivers and into the oceans. We recognized that if our Nation should not become like China and India with three or four hundred million people and with our soil depleted, we must preserve the fertility of our land and restore that which had been wasted, and so in connection with our flood-control program we inaugurated soil conservation.

Did individualism end and statism begin when the Government of the United States under Democratic auspices provided flood control and soil conservation?

Did individualism end and statism begin when under the Democratic Party we provided for rural electrification all over this country so that today 5,000,000 farm houses and farms enjoy the boon of electric power and electric lights and the drudgery of housework has been lifted from the backs of millions of women?

Did individualism end and statism begin there? We know they could not do it. Only the Federal Government could do it.

Did individualism end and statism begin when under a great Democratic President and with a Democratic Congress we inaugurated social security, old-age pensions, unemployment insurance, and compensation?

Will some of these men who are now declaiming against what they call statism rise in their places and tell the people whether they propose to repeal these laws we enacted?

Did individualism end and statism begin when we passed the Home Owners' Loan Corporation Act that saved a million homes in the United States; when we passed the Farm Credit Act that saved a million farms in the United States; did individualism end and statism begin when we passed the Federal Housing Administration Act guaranteeing to banks the loans they made for the construction and reconstruction of houses in this country?

Did statism begin and individualism end when we inaugurated a great housing program in the United States in order that we might make some contribution to a wholesome situation where every child born involuntarily into this great Nation might have a chance for wholesome, healthy educational surroundings free from crime and disease, so that they might themselves help to elevate the standard of life in this country?

Let these men, to whom every tree frog is a roaring lion and every angle worm a spreading adder, tell the people in this country what is "statism" in regard to what we're talking about.

These are only a few of the examples that I have the time to give of what the Democratic Party has done and is doing.

We are not afraid of our record. We are not afraid of our proposals. We are not afraid of epithets, either. Thomas Jefferson was never afraid of an epithet. Samuel J. Tilden was never frightened by an epithet. Grover Cleveland was never frightened by an epithet. William J. Bryan was never frightened by an epithet. Franklin D. Roosevelt was never frightened by an epithet. Harry S. Truman isn't frightened by an epithet, and, if you want to know, I am not either.

The Democratic Party never has been and is not now and never will be frightened by an epithet that somebody applies to a great progressive program that it is seeking to inaugurate and to continue, and whenever those who are undertaking to destroy the confidence of the American people in these great enactments of which I have spoken, and many more that I might mention if I had the time.

I am reminded of a story of a preacher who one night preached a sermon on hellfire and damnation, and at the end of his sermon he said to his congregation, "My friends, if you die outside the church your soul will go to hell kerchug. And in that lake of fire and brimstone it'll burn and smoke and spew and fry and boil and sizzle forever and ever," and when he finished some old man with a bosom full of beard came up and he said to the parson, "Did I understand you to say that if I die outside the church my soul will go to hell kerchug? And in that lake of fire and brimstone it'll burn and smoke and spew and fry and boil and sizzle forever and ever?" "Well," the preacher said, "that is the doctrine." "Well," the old man said, "by the eternal God, the people won't stand for it."

Eighty-first Congress, First Session

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following radio address I delivered over WMEX, Boston, Mass., on Monday, November 28, 1949:

Once upon a time the story of your Congress, what it did or what it failed to do, was a far-away matter that seemed to have little bearing on your daily lives.

Today it is a real, true-life story—your story.

Because your Representatives at Washington vote the way you want them to vote.

Now, the people in any one congressional district are mainly concerned with protecting or advancing their interests.

However, there are hundreds of other districts which must also be considered.

Compromises are necessary to work out a program which tries to be fair to all, a program that will balance conflicting claims and promote the general welfare and security of our Nation.

No one district or group can ever expect to get all that it wants at the expense of others.

Compromise is therefore the workable formula that is responsible for our unity and our progress.

It is the major factor that must be kept in mind when we look at the record.

John Jones, who lives on the third floor of a tenement house with his wife and three small children and who works in the mill, may not understand that the business of the Congress is his business.

The vast programs designed by the Congress and the billions of dollars needed to carry them out may seem to be happening in another world apart from him.

He needs to know that the business of Congress affects him in a very personal way.

His job, his income, the prices he pays for his food, clothing, fuel, and shelter, to mention but a few, are influenced by the various laws which Congress passes.

Multiply the Joneses by the tens of millions of families in the United States and you have a huge program whose meaning is difficult for Jones to grasp.

But this is no excuse for shrugging his shoulders and then ignoring the business of Congress.

He is governed by it, in terms of dollars and cents.

With the growing power of Government it is important for him to keep tabs on it, and to check it when it threatens to go too far.

To neglect it is to neglect himself and his family.

That is why I want to outline the record of Congress from January to October, when it adjourned for the year.

We and one other nation are the leading world powers.

The two represent ways of life which are sharply opposed.

Those smaller countries who believe in freedom as we do were impoverished by the war.

They need help to recover.

That is one of the problems we have inherited as a leader.

We've got to lend a hand, at least temporarily, and that costs money.

Furthermore, until the United Nations can become an effective guarantor of the peace, common sense requires us to be strong in our own defense.

Otherwise, our rival might take it upon himself to attack us.

The temptation to conquer the United States, and thus control the world, would be too great if we became militarily weak.

Unfortunately, preparedness also costs money.

If we did not have to spend billions for this insurance, we would all have more money in our pockets.

But until we can become sure, really sure, that the UN can outlaw war we must spend for defense.

Although it hurts, it is certainly much—so much better—than the fate that would be ours as a conquered nation.

In fact, we would spend everything we had if need be to prevent that.

What has your Congress done this year in the field of international affairs and to promote national defense and internal security?

Happily, members of both parties have supported President Truman's program on these issues.

The Congress has authorized continuance of the Marshall plan that will help free peoples to help themselves and thus save themselves from communism.

We appropriated money to help Greece and Turkey and for the relief of occupied areas.

Through the North Atlantic Pact, we brought the western nations together and served notice that an attack on any one would be considered as an attack on all.

This was done within the rules of the United Nations and is intended to prevent war rather than provoke it.

An arms aid bill to give body to this declaration was also passed.

The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act was restored and extended.

Those who voted for it claimed that it would stimulate the free flow of commerce among nations.

I opposed it because a flood of foreign textiles will depress employment and wages among the thousands of textile workers in my district.

I still believe that it will sell out some American industries in the home market just to help the export market of other industries, and I consider such an approach unfair and dangerous.

The subsequent devaluation of the British pound tends to confirm my fears.

In the area of national defense, this Congress passed an armed services unification bill which was long overdue.

Its purpose was to set up efficiency and reduce costs.

The charges and counter-charges which have since been aired, would seem to indicate that the United States Air Force, Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are mortal enemies bent on destroying one another.

This phase is regrettable, because it may give a false impression of weakness in certain foreign circles.

But, in the long run and in the democratic manner, I think that full publicity will be better than smouldering resentment.

The American people are getting the facts.

The pros and cons of the new role to which each service must adjust itself are being discussed in the open.

The inevitable result will be a clearing of the air leading to a genuine unification in which the duties and powers of each service will be spelled out definitely.

The morale of our airmen, soldiers, sailors, and marines, depends on adequate pay as well as other factors.

It was encouraging to them and to their families that this Congress gave them a pay raise.

For some it had been the first since 1908.

In this modern air age, our first line of defense must be in the sky.

Alert to this need, the Congress has authorized a far-flung system of radar warning and control facilities.

The Air Force is empowered to maintain 48 groups of planes.

Research in guided missiles and in every other technical possibility that is needed for defense has been adequately provided for.

We have authorized the construction of permanent military public works in Alaska and Okinawa. We have set up an experimental submarine program and have strengthened our Central Intelligence Agency.

It was on the President's domestic program that die-hard opposition developed.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act was stymied and efforts to enact civil-rights legislation were halted by filibusters.

The House of Representatives late in this session did extend the coverage and increase the benefits of the social-security law.

I believe that the Senate will take similar action when Congress resumes its deliberations next January.

Waste and duplication would be fatal to any private business.

They are no less dangerous to the biggest business in the world—that of the Government of the United States.

During the emergency of the early 1930's, agency upon agency was created to deal with new and pressing problems.

That emergency and the emergency of war are past, now is the time for an overhaul.

There is no point in having a multiplicity of agencies stepping on each other's toes, smothering in red tape, and eating up an additional $3,000,000,000 of your money when a streamlined government could do the job better, quicker, and at less cost.

To unravel this situation, the Congress has authorized the President to reorganize the Executive departments in line with the Hoover Commission report.

Some progress has been made, but continued public interest is necessary if these healthy recommendations are to be put into practice completely.

This Congress increased salaries for Government workers from the President down to the letter carrier on your route.

It has liberalized disability compensation benefits for veterans.

In both cases, upward readjustments were necessary to bring them in line with the cost of living.

Support prices for farm products have been continued.

While on some commodities such as potatoes they are too high, I think that basically and with some modifications this policy has merit.

We cannot shut our eyes to the fact that if the farmer's income drops sharply, he cannot buy the products of our mills and factories.

Congress did not back up the members of the New England delegation in their demand that this area be included in public power development plans.

New England does not intend to be left in the wake of national progress.

The rent-control law was extended 15 months from March 31st, 1949, to protect tenants until such time as building catches up with demand.

Perhaps the outstanding achievement of this session was the passage of the Housing Act.

This is a Nation-wide program to eliminate our unsightly and dangerous slums and to provide public housing for our low-income families, many of whom now exist in deplorable accommodations.

It is now recognized that spending billions for national defense and aid to Europe will mean nothing if the morale of our own people suffers.

Every American must have a fair opportunity to earn a living and provide for his family with those decencies and comforts which are elemental in our prosperous Nation.

The dark, unsanitary, and rat-infested slums of our large cities, are no place to bring up children.

They must be replaced by clean, safe, and livable quarters in which the Americans of tomorrow will grow up strong, healthy, and with an invincible faith in the way of life which gives them opportunity.

This Congress was also concerned with the problem of underpaid workers.

To its credit, it passed the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1949, increasing with a few exceptions the minimum wage up to 75 cents an hour, thereby guaranteeing $30 a week pay for 40 hours of work.

The bill to provide Federal aid to education was defeated because it discriminated against private and parochial schools.

It is therefore possible that a bill to help all the school children of the United States, irrespective of their race, creed, or color, will be enacted in the second session.

I believe that the first session of the Eighty-first Congress did a fine job in the fields of international affairs, national defense, and internal security.

On the domestic front, its record was substantial.

During the coming months, before it resumes as the second session, you will have the chance to think over the unfinished business of Federal aid to education, stronger antimonopoly laws, and an expanded Social Security Act.

By doing so and communicating your opinions on these issues you will become part of that public opinion which we depend upon for guidance.

The second session of the Eighty-first Congress waits for you to speak.

Thank you for listening and good evening.

Prevent the Disease

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Jefferson Democrat, Brookville, Pa., of January 5, 1950:

PREVENT THE DISEASE

The recent elections in New Zealand and Australia have a world-wide significance. In both cases, long-established Socialist governments were decisively defeated. In both cases, they were replaced by governments which pledged themselves to halt further socialization and encourage private enterprise and industry, to reduce taxes, and to relax some of the onerous restrictions on individual freedom of action which their predecessors had placed in effect.

It is true that the new governments cannot immediately restore free enterprise as we understand it. Socialism has progressed too far in those countries to make it possible to get rid of it easily. But the vote certainly proves that New Zealanders and Australians have grown sick of political control of their lives—and of paying the huge tax bills that make socialism inevitable. Press reports stress the fact that the voters had become disillusioned with supergovernment and with the welfare state.

It remains to be seen how successful Australia and New Zealand will be in breaking loose from the fetters that socialism placed upon them. At best it will be a long and grueling process. In this country, luckily, we can still save ourselves. The advocates of the welfare state are in full cry. So are those whose main ambition in life is to socialize such basic enterprises as the power industry. But they haven't reached their goal and we can still stop them. We can close the door on socialism, and once more affirm our belief that government is the servant of the people, not the master.

The record speaks for itself. It is easy enough to denounce capitalism—but the fact remains that capitalism has given more people more abundance than any other system ever devised, and it has protected and maintained our liberties at the same time. Socialism, on the other hand, has invariably lowered living standards, destroyed initiative and independence, and made everyone a ward of the state. In its most intense form, as in Russia and eastern Europe, it has turned whole nations into slave states.

The people of New Zealand and Australia have rejected socialism—but they will still be paying the price of it for years to come. The people of the United States can prevent the disease, instead of having to try to cure it later on.

American Employment Threatened by Unwise Trade Treaties

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced today in the House a bill to reestablish the peril-point principle in the making of reciprocal trade treaties.

I fear that unless this peril-point principle, which was repealed last year by the Eighty-first Congress, is restored that American unemployment will increase, our American tax receipts be greatly reduced and our entire domestic economy be greatly weakened.

Under present and proposed reciprocal trade treaties increased quantities of goods from many low-wage, low-living-standard foreign countries are being dumped into the United States. These products from low-wage countries are supplanting goods produced by American workers. As a result many American workers are losing their jobs.

No section of our Nation will suffer more than the Pacific coast from trade treaties entered into without full possession of all the facts about the probable impact of such treaties upon our domestic industries and domestic employment.

During the first 10 months of 1949, Canada shipped 1,058,000,000 feet of lumber into the United States. We probably will import even larger quantities of Canadian lumber in 1950.

Every 1,000 feet of Canadian lumber imported into the United States last year meant the loss of 1 day of work for some United States logger and another day of work for some United States lumber mill worker. With each 1,000 feet of lumber imported costing two United States workers, the loss of 1 day of work each, the importation of more than a billion feet of Canadian lumber meant that more than 8,000 United States lumber area workers lost 250 days or a year's work each last year.

The tragedy of this may not be apparent while lumber production is at a high level, but if lumber output ever declines it will be. Then, because our United States lumber workers cannot compete with the lower wages of Canada, it will be the logging camps and lumber mills of the United States which will be first to close. It will be the mills and camps in Canada that will continue to operate while our plants are down.

This has been illustrated time and time again in the past by the history of the shingle industry.

In the past, when the demand for shingles was heavy, the shingle workers of both the United States and Canada operated full time. However, with the first sign of a slowing down in the demand for shingles, it always was the shingle mills of the United States that were first to close. Often while shingle mills in the United States were closed, those in Canada operated full blast.

The Canadian shingle mills operated while shingle mills in the United States were idle because on any declining market the Canadians, due to their much lower wage rates, could undersell the shingle producers of the United States. By offering lower prices, the Canadian shingle mill operators took away the market from United States mills. The result was that our American shingle industry workers were idle.

The same thing can happen to the lumber industry, and to some extent, is even now occurring.

In British Columbia, the lumber mill worker gets a minimum wage of 95 cents an hour. A lumber industry worker in the United States is paid $1.45 an hour. This is a difference of 50 cents an hour and amounts to a difference of $4 a day in the wage paid lumber workers in Canada and in the Pacific Coast States of the United States.

Since it requires one logger and one millworker about 1 day to produce 1,000 feet of lumber this means a cost of $8 more per 1,000 feet to produce lumber in the United States than in Canada.

Canadian lumber operators also save on freight rates in transporting their

product to market. Canada has no 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments as does the United States. Also her stumpage costs are less.

If the market for lumber becomes highly competitive, as it some day surely will, the Canadians will have a price advantage that will give them a larger and larger share of our American lumber market.

That is something we can protect our lumber workers against if we will restore the peril-point principle to reciprocal-trade treaty making.

The peril-point regulation merely means that the Tariff Commission, which is a nonpartisan, nonpolitical board, shall make studies prior to the reduction of any tariff to determine how far a tariff can be reduced without imperiling an industry.

Surely this is a very small but justified protection for the operators and employees of any industry to ask of their Government. And why should not tariff treaties be so made as to prevent the weakening of any domestic industry? Unless our domestic industries remain strong and their employment is maintained at a high level, there can be no continued national prosperity in this country. Without that continued prosperity this Nation cannot support the many costly programs in which we are now engaged.

OUR FISHERIES THREATENED

But the lumber industry is not the only one that will be injured by too much free trade, and of treaties entered into with low-wage countries without most careful consideration of what effect these treaties may have on domestic employment and pay rolls.

Last year we imported 473,000,000 pounds of fish from low-wage foreign countries. This was 50 percent more fish by weight than we imported in 1947.

We were buying, last year, enormous quantities of crab from Japan, tuna from Japan and Peru, and bottom fish from Newfoundland. Most of this fish could just as well as not have been bought from American boats operated by United States fishermen. It could have been purchased just as well as not from United States canneries employing United States workers.

If we continue to give away our American fish markets to the operators of canneries and the fishermen of low-wage countries, the end result will be that the hundreds of millions our fishermen have invested in boats and fishing gear and in canneries will become largely worthless. We will receive less taxes from our cannery operators, fish buyers, and fishermen with which to finance our already unbalanced budget.

Prior to 1941 the Japanese supplied 85 percent of all the canned crab that was sold in the United States. Our American crab fishermen supplied only 15 percent of the canned crab sold in American stores and eating places.

When Japanese airmen blew their country out of the American crab market by their sneak attack on Pearl Harbor, Americans immediately began to build boats and to catch crab and to take over the crab business which the Japanese had lost. Many Americans invested their life savings in fishing boats and gear. Many of them went into debt to acquire boats.

If through unwise trade treaties negotiated without possession of all the facts as to how such crab imports may destroy the American crab fishing industry, the millions invested by small American fishermen in crabbing boats will be largely wiped out.

The same fate would befall those who have invested money in canneries to process crab and other sea foods.

FILBERT NUTS

In my district we have about 800 filbert-nut orchardists. It has taken them years to build up a profitable business.

A few years ago a 10-cent tariff on filbert nuts was reduced to 8 cents. Now there is talk of reducing that nut tariff to 4 cents.

If it is reduced, the result will be that our American market will be flooded with nuts from the low-living-standard-ard nations of the Mediterranean countries. Many of the orchardists may be put out of business and the orchards they have devoted years to growing will be made far less valuable than these now are.

All my peril-point bill asks is that the operators and employees of every industry shall have a chance to be heard, a chance to state their case before any tariff treaty is entered into by the State Department.

The Tariff Commission is nonpolitical and nonpartisan. It is the body to conduct such hearings and make such studies as will insure the employees and operators of every industry just consideration before reciprocal trade treaties are entered into by the State Department.

This is to the interest of not only the employers and employees of all industries, but in the best interests of all the people of these United States. We must maintain a high state of employment if national prosperity is to be maintained at a high level. Unless it is maintained at a high level, there is no chance of ever obtaining a balanced budget.

I want the people of other countries to have full employment, but I am not willing to assure it by creating idleness and unemployment in our own country.

The First Amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America and the Separation of Church and State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received through the mail the other day, from the coordinating committee of lay activities, of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles, 674 West Twenty-third Street, Los Angeles, Calif., a small booklet in question-and-answer form, which set forth the view of the Roman Catholic Church with respect to the above-named subject.

I believe that the publication in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of not only this view but all other related views on this much-debated subject will do much to throw light upon this most controversial matter instead of heat, and help the people generally to form a more proper opinion in this matter.

The booklet is as follows:

THE FIRST AMENDMENT—AN INTERPRETATION OF THE FIRST AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES WITH REGARD TO FREEDOM OF RELIGION

1. Is the expression "Separation of church and state" a part of the first amendment to the Constitution of the United States of America?

No. The first amendment reads:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances."

2. What did the amendment mean by the "establishment of religion?"

In some of the countries from which the American colonists came, there was a state religion. This was called the established religion, as in England. An established religion was officially imposed upon the people; membership in it was required as a qualification for civil office, and other civic privileges.

An established religion always meant limitation of civil rights for those not professing the established religion. In 10 of the 13 American Colonies there was such an established religion. In none of these instances was this religion the Catholic religion.

Many of the residents of our colonies had come to America for the very purpose of avoiding the restrictions and burdens of such an imposed religion.

3. Are there any established religions in the world today?

The Lutheran Church is the established religion in the Scandinavian countries.

In England today the Anglican Church is the established religion. This was established by Henry the Eighth.

4. Has any State in the United States of America an established religion today?

No.

5. Does the Catholic Church today in any country possess the status of an established religion?

No. A few countries give it a preferred status, but grant religious freedom to all, and do not require membership in the Catholic Church as a condition for civil rights.

6. Did the founding fathers proclaim their conviction that belief and practice of religion was necessary for the preservation of democratic freedom?

Yes. In the very first paragraph of the Declaration of Independence the founding fathers proclaimed the supremacy of the laws of nature and of nature's god.

And they said: "We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

In the last sentence of that same memorable document we find these words: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor."

Therefore, the founding fathers believed sincerely in God, in the freedom of religion, and in aid to religion. They wished, however, that each be free in his worship of God.

That has been the American system and the reflection of the words of the well-known Northwest Ordinance which reads: "Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." This was written in 1787, and was the utterance of the then Congress. It would indicate that to the minds of the founding fathers, schools were intended to be a positive means for the promotion of religion and morality as well as knowledge.

8. What is the origin of the phrase "separation of church and state"?

In a letter of Thomas Jefferson to the Baptists of Danbury, January 1, 1802, Jefferson said: "I contemplate with sovereign reverence that act of the whole American people which declared that their legislature should (then quoting from the first amendment) make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof, thus building a wall of separation between church and state."

9. Is it to this quotation that reference was made in the recent decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Yes; but without complete reference to the context. Its meaning was illogically extended, for, as Justice Reed aptly stated in his dissenting opinion, in the McCollum case, "a rule of law should not be drawn from a figure of speech."

10. What was the meaning of Jefferson in uttering this statement?

From the writings of Jefferson and Madison and others, and from a careful reading of this quotation, it is obvious that Jefferson meant by "separation of church and state," there should be no established state religion; that each would be free to practice religion as his conscience dictated; that there would be no monopoly by any one group.

Established church meant monopoly and persecution. The writers of the Constitution wished that the practice current in some colonies be not extended to the National Government. In other words they believed in freedom of religion. They also believed in the practice of religion.

According to James Madison, as recorded in I Annals of Congress, 730, the meaning of the words of the first amendment was "that Congress should not establish a religion and enforce the legal observation of it by law, or compel men to worship God in any manner contrary to their conscience."

Thomas Jefferson himself had this to say regarding the purpose of the first amendment: "It was not to be understood that instruction in religious opinion and duties was meant to be precluded by the public authorities, as indifferent to the interests of society. On the contrary, the relations which exist between man and his Maker, and the duties resulting from these relations are the most interesting and important to every human being, and the most incumbent on his study and investigation." (The Writings of Thomas Jefferson; Memorial Edition, 1904, p. 414.)

11. If "separation of church and state" means only opposition to an "established" religion, a state religion, what connection is there between the expression "separation of church and state" and Federal aid to education?

There is no connection. Both the Supreme Court and the opponents of participation in Federal aid to education by non-tax-supported schools have adopted the phrase as a slogan without full comprehension of its true meaning. The slogan "separation of church and state" today is used as a shibboleth. It was used by Jefferson merely as a figure of speech and definitely referred to his opposition to any federally established religion.

12. In the Eighty-first Congress there was presented a so-called Barden bill. What did that provide?

It provided payment of $300,000,000 to be made to the several States for aid to education in tax-supported schools only. Its provisions contained a prohibition against the allocation of any of this aid to benefit children who attended non-tax-supported schools.

13. Did the proponents of this bill favor this prohibition and give as their reason belief in "separation of church and state?"

Yes. Despite the fact that there is no connection between the two ideas.

14. Do they base this use of "separation of church and state" on the contention that such a meaning of that phrase was implied in the first amendment?

Yes, though without foundation as noted above.

15. Is there an organization known as Protestants and Other Americans United for Separation of Church and State?

Yes. It is more commonly known by its initials POAU.

16. Does this organization explain definitely what it means by "separation of church and state?"

No.

17. Is this organization opposed to the granting of auxiliary education aids, like bus rides, school lunches, and school health examinations to pupils who attend Catholic and other non-tax-supported schools?

Yes.

18. Is the argument of the POAU valid that these helps to non-tax-supported schools would constitute union of church and state?

It is not even a remotely valid deduction from either Jefferson's figure of speech, or from a study of the preliminary discussions of the first amendment or the amendment itself.

The fact that many non-Catholics disagree with the POAU's position is evidenced by statements such as these: "not only must we refuse to play upon our parishioners' fears, but we should set ourselves to help rid society of those pestiferous writers, secretaries, broadcasters, and agitators who make a living rousing the prejudices of people by stirring up their fears of other groups." (Protestantism, issued by the commission of courses of study, Methodist Church.)

19. What would seem to be the objective of the effort to confine aid in education to tax-supported schools?

Since religious instruction of any kind is not permitted in tax-supported schools, the objective of the POAU and its followers would seem to be the elimination of religion from all school education, as well as the elimination of non-tax-supported schools in which religion is taught, leaving only tax-supported schools in which parents could fulfill the obligations of compulsory education.

20. Would such compulsory education be a violation of the rights of parents?

Yes, it would be a violation of their natural and civil rights.

The Supreme Court of the United States in the Oregon School case decision of 1925, ruled as follows: "The fundamental theory of liberty upon which all governments in this Union repose excludes any general power of the State to standardize its children by forcing them to accept instruction from public teachers only. The child is not the mere creature of the State; those who nurture him and direct his destiny have the right coupled with the high duty, to recognize and prepare him for additional obligations."

21. Was it the intention of the founding fathers to eliminate religion from education and government?

First. Obviously it was their belief that religion should be a part of education, since all their schools were religious foundations and there were no public schools as they exist today.

Second. It was equally obvious that they did not wish to eliminate religion from the lives of the people or to eliminate basic religious principles from the foundations of government. They were opposed to a state religion that was obligatory.

22. Does the first amendment of the Constitution command that any Federal aid to education exclude from its benefits all children attending non-tax-supported schools?

No.

The present public-schools system did not originate until about the middle of the nineteenth century. Previously the direct aid to education from the Government was confined to the frontier and missionary and Indian schools.

At the time of the framing of the first amendment there was no contemplation of a system of tax-supported schools.

23. Why would any Federal legislation granting aid exclusively to children attending tax-supported schools be considered objectionable?

Because it is discriminatory and contrary to the American principles of equality.

24. Wherein is this discrimination?

Because legislation for public-school children exclusively provides that Federal funds be distributed to the respective States in accordance with the total number of children in each State. Such legislation would further prescribe that the State would then distribute this money only for the benefit of children attending tax-supported schools. By this provision only the children attending tax-supported schools would benefit by the appropriation while the money was distributed to the States on the basis of the total number of children in the State. Thus, the money would be allotted to children in non-tax-supported schools but not paid for them.

25. What was the reason for this distinction?

Largely because of an unwillingness to give any support of pupils attending Catholic parochial public schools and similar schools.

26. Since the Catholic population pays taxes for the support of public schools the same as the rest of the population, is it just that they should be discriminated against when public funds to which Catholics have contributed are expended for aids to education?

No, it is not just.

27. Since Catholic people pay taxes the same as others, and since some elect to send their children to parochial public schools in accordance with their rights under our Constitution, should they be discriminated against?

No.

28. In sending their children to Catholic public parochial schools are they not exercising a right of citizenship and a right under the natural law, as well as the law of the land?

They are. (See Oregon quotation above—No. 19.)

29. What would be a logical sequence to such discrimination and exclusion?

The purpose would seem to be to force all children to the tax-supported schools, and to make them compulsory and do away with schools that teach religion.

30. What is the difference between a tax-supported school and a non-tax-supported school?

The tax-supported school is directed and controlled by the State and local governments and no formal religious instruction is allowed in these schools. In fact, religious instruction of any kind is forbidden. The parochial public school follows the same curriculum in required subjects as laid down by the State or county educational department and meets, and sometimes excels, the scholastic standards of the tax-supported

schools. In addition, however, the parochial schools teach religion and discipline. The regular curriculum suffers in no way by the teaching of religion which has the place of a subject in the schedule.

31. Is this effort to exclude religious instruction in all education in accordance with our Constitution?

No. It would be a direct violation of religious freedom as granted in our Bill of Rights.

32. Why would that be so?

Because education is compulsory by State laws. If that education is demanded by law in schools where religion is forbidden to be taught, the rights of citizens are infringed upon. Religion is at least equal to any other subject of the curriculum.

33. Is Federal aid to education desirable?

In most of the States there is no need for such aid. In a few States there may be need of some aid. But in no case should such aid be given at the cost of discrimination. Discrimination is entirely un-American. The innovation of such an un-American practice would bring greater damage to our country than any lack of education that might come without Federal aid.

The New York Times issue of October 24 quoted Dr. Ernest C. Colwell, president of the University of Chicago, from an address he made on Tolerance and Godlessness. The Times article reads:

"One reason for the noncommittal attitude toward religion, Dr. Colwell continued, is 'the strange twist which has been given to the separation of church and state. What began as a repudiation of one established church supported by the state has become a ban upon religion in the activities of any state-supported institution,' he asserted.

"If the doctrine of 'tolerance' toward different faiths means the elimination of religion in the education of all citizens, then the state should 'seriously consider whether tolerance can conceivably be as important to the continued existence of the country as religious faith,' Dr. Colwell declared."

United Lodge 889, Order Sons of Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD the following copy of the address I delivered on the occasion of the thirtieth anniversary of United Lodge 889, Order Sons of Italy, at the Oxford Club, Lynn, Mass., on January 8, 1950:

I am very happy to join with you on this happy occasion.

The thirtieth birthday of lodge 889 is the same number of years that we call a generation.

It was in this period, from 1920 to 1950, that Americans of Italian extraction made their greatest progress. By coincidence these were the years of crisis and change, when the peoples of this world were subjected to tests and trials such as no other generation in history has endured. Old empires disappeared. New nations were born. Some peoples instead of adjusting their lives to meet modern conditions, cut themselves off completely from their faith and culture and are now floundering in the strange, new world of their materialism where man has become just another "thing."

It was not so with the people of Italy, even though they had more difficult problems than other nations. There was art and culture and spirit in them, a rich heritage from past experience, which they would not sacrifice to the demands of economics. A system of land reform accompanied by scientific irrigation and conservation was necessary to make economics sustain human life and encourage human values. The Italian, with his fundamental love of home and family, did not propose to limit these in order to meet his material problems. Under a feudal system that failed to give him these opportunities, he was forced to emigrate.

He came to the United States in large numbers and here found the chance to develop his talents. And all of us are the beneficiaries of the contributions he is making to our way of life.

In the recent war, he gave his sons and daughters generously to the service of his adopted country. From Alaska to Iran and all around the globe they fought as Americans for those larger ideals which offer the best hope for this troubled world. By their loyalty and their heroism they demonstrated to others that we are not only strong in material things, but are creating a faith and confidence in one another without barriers of race or creed.

New American names are appearing in our business life and in the professions, pleasant names that add to the variety of American life. They are showing up among the public officials of our cities, States, and in the Federal Government. And with good reason. For the Italians have had a more extensive experience in the art of government than any other people. From the times of the Roman emperors through the city-states of the Renaissance down to the modern era they have lived under all conceivable forms of government. The most heartening lesson we can draw from this wealth of experience is that they have always thrown off the yoke of tyranny. For independence is a healthy characteristic of your people. You love life, you are neighborly, hospitable, and friendly, but you insist on doing your own thinking. That is good for you and good for the United States.

We live in an age where there is a dangerous trend toward concentration of power. We know that there are certain and necessary functions which only a central government can perform, but there is a limit to these. The problem for us is to determine where we should draw that line and say, "Thus far shall the Federal Government go, and no further." We cannot afford to drift into a situation where all local, State, or regional governments become the poor relatives of a master government at Washington. We want to do some things ourselves and not rely entirely upon others to do them for us.

We hear much these days about the dangers of monopoly and we should regulate it wherever it appears. But that places the responsibility and the initiative upon us to insist upon a proper share of control at the local level.

Now I believe in a social-security program that will cover all people and provide reasonable benefits. And I recognize the fact that only through the Federal Government can we set up such a Nation-wide program. Pensions for all the aged, within our capacity to provide such, is an objective for which I have consistently worked while a member of Congress and I will continue to do so as long as I have the privilege of being your Representative.

This does not mean, however, that I favor an extension of Federal controls without limit. Far from it. During the emergencies of depression and war we look to Washington for leadership in bold measures to meet such crises on a national scale. You and I were born in an age of transition. We have had to experiment in order to find answers to the serious problems we have faced. The Democratic Party has earned the confidence of the people because it has not hesitated to devise new instrumentalities within the Constitution to cope with these problems.

However, we do not expect that our children will live in an age of perpetual crisis. We believe that we are making progress toward the elimination of war and the elimination of economic insecurity. We foresee a future in which we will have helped to win the peace in which men can devote their talents to constructive purposes, free from the fears of our time.

The world of tomorrow will look different from the world of today. In many ways it will be different. But not at the expense of those precious freedoms guaranteed by our Constitution which inspired the remarkable progress we have made in our short history.

The Government did not boss this job. No one class among our people ordered it. If any group in our Nation attempts to set itself up as an arbitrary power, opposition can be found to checkmate it.

We believe in getting both sides of a story and arriving at a common area of understanding before we take action. You will find this at work in the Congress of the United States, where a Democratic majority initiates legislation and a Republican minority serves as a restraining influence. Both functions are necessary in a truly representative government, which stems from the people.

On the job, in business, throughout our educational system, and in every aspect of our lives as human beings no one person has a fixed priority over others. In the day-to-day circumstances of life there is constant opportunity for each person to learn, to better himself, and for us to become full-fledged personalities upon which a free society relies for intelligent and mature cooperation.

Even though such inventions as the airplane, the telephone, and television are bringing the people of this Nation closer together nothing can take the place of personal contacts for creating greater understanding.

Just as the unit of family life is the foundation of civilization the life of the community in which we live is the next area of importance, and we must not neglect it. I myself believe that we should develop our natural resources—like water power—for the benefit of people in the various regions of our country. But although the financial resources of the Federal Government are needed to act as a self-starter for such projects, the control and administration of such developments must be kept in the hands of the people who live in the respective river valleys.

We have come to the point where we must assume responsibility and not delegate it. The communities and the States have work to do, and they cannot shirk it. If the cities and States are permitted to collect some of the revenues now controlled by the Government at Washington they will be able to make improvements under the watchful eye and the immediate control of the people. In this way, the trend toward a massive, centralized government, remote from the average man, can be halted. And the individual will feel that government is still his servant and not in the process of becoming his master.

I congratulate you on calling yourselves the Sons of Italy. You have every right to take pride in that fact, as your fellow-Americans are proud of the contributions you are making to the stimulating variety of our Nation.

In this country we manufacture millions of automobiles every year that look very much alike, because the mass-production system is the only way we can produce them in quantity and at low cost. But we have no intention of standardizing our people. We

have learned that each race and creed can learn something from every other race and creed. It is in this interchange of values among its citizens that the United States is becoming the most vital and progressive Nation on earth and a model of human fellowship.

The individuality born of a long and splendid civilization is one of your greatest assets.

Through membership in the Sons of Italy you are preserving and extending that precious heritage.

This is encouraging to all Americans.

For belief in the dignity of the individual is the vigilant faith that will protect us from the encroachment of tyranny in any form.

I will rejoice with you on this thirtieth anniversary of United Lodge 889. And I wish for your organization an even greater future for years without end.

Taxes—The Lady Pays

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, David Camelon, writing in the American Weekly of January 15, has a very revealing article about the extent to which the American people are taxed. He explains in a very interesting manner that from the moment the people wake up, they are surrounded by taxes—taxes in everything they touch, in everything they look at. Some are so-called luxury taxes. Some are just plain nuisances. Mr. Camelon's article follows:

President Truman says he needs more taxes.

"Taxes?"

The lady shrugged her dainty shoulders in distaste. She wrinkled her pretty nose (pancake make-up tax, 20 percent) and repeated:

"Taxes? I don't worry about them. My husband pays them all."

Sister, how wrong can you be?

From the instant you woke up this morning, you were surrounded by taxes. Taxes in everything you touched. Taxes everywhere you looked. Dozens of taxes. Hundreds of them. Thousands.

Some were hidden taxes. Some were not so hidden. Some were "luxury" taxes. Some just plain nuisances. But whatever you call them—sister, you paid them. And you keep on paying—and so does your hubby.

Your day started when your alarm clock went off. (Price 06; tax $1.20.)

You yawned, stretched, and threw off the covers. (Sales taxes on them most places, of course.) You climbed out of bed. (Annual personal property tax, say, 75 cents.)

You looked at your husband (marriage license, $2) who was still gently snoring, and toddled into the kitchen. You flicked on the kitchen radio to get the news (electric current, tax 33 cents on a monthly bill of $10. Radio, cost $30, tax $1.80), and turned on the kitchen light. (Cost of bulb, 20 cents, tax 1 cent.)

Seven taxes—and you haven't even started breakfast.

But breakfast is coming—and so are the taxes. The Tax Foundation—a private research organization whose business is to figure such things out—has them listed for you.

You turn on the electric toaster (cost $16, tax 96 cents) and cut a few slices off a loaf of bread.

Let's stop a moment, and look at that loaf of bread. It doesn't seem big enough for them all—but the truth is that, without half trying, the Tax Foundation found at least 151 taxes hidden in it.

Tax Foundation took a loaf of bread sold by a grocer in Indianapolis. The grocer paid four Federal taxes—individual income tax, 15-percent telephone tax, 3 percent tax on transportation of property, and 20-percent tax on a safety deposit box. Not to mention taxes on light bulbs, refrigerators, and other equipment.

The baker who made the bread paid eight Federal taxes—corporation income tax, stamp tax on transfer of investments securities, telephone tax, telegram tax of 25 percent, transportation tax of 15 percent for salesmen and others on company business, transportation of property tax, safe deposit tax, 1-percent pay roll social security tax.

The baker and the grocer between them paid some 15 State taxes. The mill in Kansas City that made the flour paid seven Federal and eight Missouri State taxes. The railroad that hauled the flour to Indianapolis paid at least five Federal taxes, and State taxes in each State through which it passed—Missouri, Illinois, and Indiana.

The sugar came from a refining concern in New Orleans, which paid—but you get the idea.

So the bread (with the taxes) is in the toaster. The coffee goes on the gas stove (price, $190, tax $8.55) and the fruit juice comes out of the refrigerator (price $300, tax $13.50).

Time to scramble the eggs—and a hundred or so taxes along with them.

The Tax Foundation took an egg sold by a grocer on Pulaski Road in Chicago. The foundation found at least a hundred taxes inside its shell.

It started with the retailer. He accounted for 14 Federal, State, and local taxes. The trucker who delivered the egg to the grocer reckoned he paid 20. The wholesaler added about 17. Then there were the farmer, and the man he bought chicken feed from up in Minnesota, and all of those taxes enter indirectly into the price you paid for the egg.

Getting tired of taxes by now?

Shucks, sister, we've hardly started. Breakfast is barely over. The whole day is before you. You're going to pay, sister—you're going to pay.

Hubby's started for the train (15-percent tax on his ticket to the office). You light a cigarette (cost per pack, 8 cents; Federal tax, 7 cents; State taxes in addition) with a match (tax 5½ cents per thousand) and start to relax when a wail from junior reminds you that baby (birth registration, $1) has to be taken care of.

You talcum him (luxury tax 25 percent) and soothe his tender skin with baby oil (luxury tax again 20 percent). You wonder why such essentials for baby's health and well-being are called luxuries.

There's a shopping trip coming up. You get out the family car (cost $1,600, total taxes, $128, direct or indirect) and stop at the filling station for gas (national average State and Federal taxes, about 5.5 cents a gallon).

And you said you didn't worry about taxes?

This is going to be a special trip. The new fall suit you just have to have. And luxuries, the fur coat hubby at last consented to.

But first there are a few toilet articles you simply must get. Things like new shampoo oil; and shaving cream for hubby. Bath salts and foamy bubble bath. Face creams, lotions, and powders. The lipstick of that perfectly fascinating new shade. Rouge, cologne, a hair rinse, and that home permanent wave solution.

Sure, they're essentials to you. But you pay a luxury tax of 20 percent on all of them just the same.

Don't think that you'll escape those taxes by going to a beauty parlor. The law says that the proprietor of a beauty parlor is considered as buying those goods at retail, and must pay retail taxes on them—taxes, of course, which she considers as part of the cost of doing business, and passes on to you.

Now for that suit. The Tax Foundation found at least 116 taxes woven into hubby's suit—and yours won't be far from that. There's the retailer, and the manufacturer, the transportation of the suit, the railroad, the cotton grower, the wool grower, the weaver. * * *

You get tired of it, after a while. But the tax collector doesn't. Of course—you have to have a new hat to go with the suit. That's another 150 hidden taxes—so the Tax Foundation found out. It took an Easter bonnet sold in a New Canaan, Conn., store, and traced it back through its various processors.

It started with a ribbon maker in New Jersey, who paid a Federal corporation tax, and a Federal telephone tax, among many others.

Next your new fur coat.

No matter what the price, you pay a Federal excise tax of 20 percent. Then, of course, there are the taxes paid by the trapper, and the man who carried the fur to market, and the man who processed the furs, and the man who cut them, and the man who made them into a coat, and the man who carried the coat to a wholesaler, and the wholesaler, and the man who carried it to the retailer, and the retailer, and a few other people along the way.

The only one who doesn't seem to have paid a tax on it was the rabbit himself. But, of course, it was his skin.

Well, with a new suit and a new bonnet and a new coat, you've simply got to have some new jewelry. Dig up 20 percent again, sister.

Taxes on jewelry brought Uncle Sam $210,688,165 in the year ending June 30, 1949. Taxes on furs brought $61,946,247; taxes on cosmetics and toilet goods, $93,969,241; and taxes on luggage brought $82,607,133.

On the way home you remember to get a bottle of liquor for the party tonight. Uncle Sam gets an excise tax of $9 a gallon on distilled spirits; $2.25 a quart on bonded whiskey. On blended whiskey the gallonage taxes will run about $1.55 a fifth, plus another 5 cents as a tax on rectifiers who blend whiskey with grain neutrals spirits, and a cent for the stamp that tops the bottle.

State taxes will average about 29 cents a bottle—a total of $1.90 in Federal, State, and local taxes.

Regardless of that, hubby's ready for a nip when he comes home at the end of a hard day. This, it seems, is a red-letter day. He's been talking to the architect, about that new house you'd love to build.

Of course, there are a few taxes to think of—a thousand or more, of which the Tax Foundation has counted some 700, without doing much more than skimming the surface.

There's the bank, and the title insurance company, and the fire insurance company, and the builder, and the real-estate agent, and the architect.

All of them pay some, or all, of such Federal taxes as individual or corporate income taxes, stamp on security transfers, telephone and telegraph, taxes for the transportation of salesmen, officials, and such, taxes on the transportation of property, taxes on the lease of safe-deposit boxes, manufacturer's excise taxes, and pay-roll taxes.

They also pay some, or all, of such State taxes as corporation-organization fees, corporation-income tax, bank-income tax, insurance gross premiums tax, real-estate franchise tax, real-estate yearly dividends tax, unincorporated tax, motor-vehicle registration tax, mortgage tax, general property taxes, miscellaneous license taxes and inspection

fee, unemployment-compensation taxes, and such local taxes as property taxes and recording fees.

That's for the purchase, financing, and development of your home.

But that's only the beginning.

Involved in its construction are the subcontractor, dealers and jobbers, railroads that transport materials, and various manufacturers, including plumbing and heating, masonry, insulation, linoleum, roofing wallboard, electrical supplies and electrical fixtures, hardware, paint, steel, flooring, and millwork.

They each pay some, or all, of all the taxes we named above—and in a few cases some others. Then there are other manufacturers who supply the manufacturers who supplied material for your house. And they paid taxes.

True, most of those taxes are not charged directly to you. But they are part of the cost of doing business for the firms that contribute to your house. And, one way or the other, the bulk of them find their way into the total cost of your house.

Let's suppose the lady listened to her husband for a while, enumerating those taxes, her head in an increasing whirl. At last she interrupted:

"Darling," she said, "with all those taxes, we just can't afford a house. Let's just look for a new apartment where we won't have to pay them."

Sister, again, how wrong can you be?

Somebody had to build the apartment house. If it is a small house, up to six apartments, the list of taxes is roughly the same as those above. They became part of the cost of building the place.

And who pays many of them in the end?

The tenant, of course—through his monthly rents. That's true in a big multiapartment building, too. The details may change, but the taxes don't.

They go on forever.

Canadians pay taxes, too. But across the border in Canada the finance minister, D. C. Abbott, believes that taxes should cause as little harm and irritation as possible.

Midcentury Broadcast

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a radio broadcast entitled "Midcentury" to which I listened—and I assume millions of others did—that seemed to me to be of great historic importance. This broadcast brought together on the Columbia Broadcasting System, Sunday, January 1, 1950, Columbia's foreign correspondents as well as three others who are presently broadcasting in the United States. It follows:

MIDCENTURY

(Foreign correspondents for the Columbia Broadcasting System, flown to New York from major outposts of the world, participated in a special 45-minute round-table titled "Midcentury," Sunday, January 1, 5–5:45 p. m., eastern standard time. Edward R. Murrow, who broadcasts nightly over CBS, was chairman. The foreign correspondents were: Howard K. Smith, CBS European chief; Bill Downs, CBS correspondent in Germany; David Schoenbrun, CBS correspondent in France; Winston Burdett, CBS correspondent in Italy; Bill Costello, CBS news chief in the Far East, Tokyo. For the domestic portion of the program the participants were Eric Sevareid, chief CBS Washington correspondent, and Larry Lesueur, CBS United Nations correspondent. Mr. Murrow led the correspondents in an informal discussion of the last 50 years and in an evaluation of prospective global trends in the next 50 years.)

Mr. MURROW. I should like some friends of mine to introduce themselves to you.

Mr. SMITH. I am Howard K. Smith, born and reared in New Orleans, La., but in Europe for the past decade, covering all points between Manchester, England, and Moscow, U. S. S. R., from Bergen, Norway, down to Belgrade in Yugoslavia. Present address: 84 Hallam Street, London, England.

Mr. SEVAREID. My name is Eric Sevareid. I grew up in North Dakota and Minnesota, worked in France, England, various war fronts, South America, and the Orient, and now make home and headquarters in Washington on the Potomac.

Mr. DOWNS. Bill Downs, home town, Kansas City, Kans. Assignments: London blitz, Moscow, D-day to Berlin, Japanese surrender, Tokyo and Far East, Bikini, Akron Soap-Box Derby, Detroit, Washington. Present address: 20 Lindenthaler Allee, American sector, Berlin.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I'm David Schoenbrun. That's an Austrian name, but I'm a native New Yorker, and I'm stationed in Paris. These past 6 years I've been overseas, reporting from Casablanca to Warsaw. It's good to be back home today.

Mr. BURDETT. I'm Winston Burdett. My home is Brattleboro, Vt. Present assignment and address: Rome, Italy, by way of the Balkans and the Middle East; India, Cairo, the desert campaign, north Africa, Anzio, the Fifth Army, and Washington, D. C.

Mr. COSTELLO. I'm Bill Costello. St. Paul is what Asiatics call my native place, but it's hard now to say just where my home town is. I started newspapering in Minneapolis, while still at the University of Minnesota. And since then my stops in newspaper and radio reporting have included Honolulu, Omaha, Chicago, Washington, and Los Angeles. While I'm roving through Asia, my mailing address is APO 500, Tokyo, Japan.

Mr. LESUEUR. I'm Larry Lesueur, the CBS United Nations correspondent. Born in New York, reared in the Midwest, the son and grandson of newspapermen. My first assignment was the Lindbergh case; reported the war from Dunkerque to Stalingrad; landed with the American troops on D-day. Since then it's been my duty and pleasure to cover the United Nations.

Mr. MURROW. It is our purpose to examine briefly this afternoon, without benefit of statistics, without nominating any men of the year or men of the half century, to examine briefly where we've been, in an effort to see where we're going. No man around this table was alive when the century began. All are reporters, historians of the moment. Let's first examine briefly a few of the great pivots on which history has turned in the past 50 years. What are the big footprints in our own history, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, Ed, for Americans 1900 ended the age of the great barbecue, and 1950 begins the great age of anxiety. We conquered our continent, we saw our absolute physical security and, therefore, our political isolation disappear. We flirted with imperialism, gave it up because we really didn't care for it. We fought two World Wars, took the initiative for world government with the League, gave it up, took the initiative a second time, and now find ourselves, rather unwillingly, one of only two great powers in a bisected world. And upon our shoulders is the terrible responsibility of preserving the free civilization that western man has developed through laborious centuries. We may not succeed at that, but no one else can. In these 50 years we avowed the policy toward the Orient, restored a reasonable relationship with Latin America, and, finally, understood Europe as our indispensable bastion and partner, instead of a coming competitor.

We saw our broken South start to mend; we began to conserve our wasted natural resources; we saw the rise and decline of organized crime, the rise of organized labor; we saw government teach that preeminent rugged individualist, the farmer, to expect guaranties against failure. We built mammoth corporations protected by property laws that the founding fathers had intended for individuals and then tried, rather vainly, to break them up. We learned to produce goods magnificently, to share them out rather badly and thus failed to quiet our fears of unemployment. We saw the businessman decline as the idol of society and the power in politics and the partial decline, at least, of riches as our personal Holy Grail. Our art forms and literary language became American and not pseudo-European. We felt what the American way of life is, but found ourselves unable to really express it to others.

We believed in the eternity of our social ideals, but at the first warm breath of an alien philosophy many of us panicked, accused people without proof, hunted witches, and became political peeping Toms, until our native good sense rallied again.

All in all, Ed, I think we have used our new world power with uncertainty but with a gentleness which is without precedent in history.

Mr. MURROW. Howard Smith, could you sketch the big turnings in the road for Europe in the first half of the century?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the story of Europe these 50 years can be quickly told. Europe declined. After ruling the world with no competition for about 400 years and giving us our still-prevalent world culture, inventing modern industrialism and spreading it through the world, Europe's situation began to change radically around the year 1900. What caused the change, I believe, was two things: First, the social problems of industrial economy, like maldistribution of wealth, unemployment, and so on, caused the nations to divide within themselves. Second, the advance of science made Europe too small a space for thirty-odd-nation states to exist side by side, with no international order above them. In 1914 the frictions exploded in the first modern total war. The war, World War I, decided very little. It left the people disillusioned and defeatist in attitude, and it created the first Communist state, in Russia. Adolf Hitler was able to exploit both of those factors—the people's defeatism and their fear of communism—and he won his positions to launch World War II. By the skin of our teeth, we of the democracies won both world wars, but the cost was terrific to Europe. Once the seat of all the world powers, there is not a single big power left in western Europe. Communism has advanced to the verge of the west, fascism lies not very far at all below the surface.

The explosive problems that started it all are still there—the internal social problems, the international problem of some kind of world government. At mid-century, this is Europe's third, and probably last, chance to solve them.

Mr. MURROW. Well, most of us have ignored Asia in the past and most of us know that we can't do so in the future. Bill Costello knows more about that part of the world than any of the rest of us.

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Ed, in these last 50 years Asia has roused itself like a sleeping giant and rubbed from its eyes the crusted

traditions of centuries. In the long view of history, the transformation has been so swift as to be magical. The first major turning point came in 1905, when Japan emerged as victor in the Russo-Japanese War. That victory had three vital consequences: First, it challenged the nineteenth-century myth of white supremacy and paved the way for the decline and fall of western imperialism, for it demonstrated that Asiatic guns were as good as or better than western guns; second, it planted the dream of Japanese imperialism as a bargain-counter substitute for European domination; third, it set fire to the tinderbox of native nationalism, to the struggle for self-respect, political independence, and freedom from economic exploitation.

In the years that followed we have seen the progressive evolution of these three trends. The Manchu dynasty of China collapsed in 1911 because it was too enfeebled, too morally bankrupt to fight for anything. The First World War weakened the economic power of the west and gave impetus to Japan's imperialist ambitions. In one long, difficult step, Asia then began the transition from the iron age to the machine age. In the midst of this struggle for power and wealth, imperialism suffered a mortal blow when in 1936 the United States Congress approved an act promising freedom to the Philippine Islands in 1946. That action raised the Nationalist hopes of millions in Asia. It focused the issue, and the Japanese answer was, first, the invasion of China, and, finally, the attack on Pearl Harbor. In the war that followed the imperialist cycle came to an end, both for Japan and for the European nations. There were quick grants of independence to the Philippines, India, Burma, and Indonesia. The unequal treaties were abolished in China. By coincidence, communism won acceptance in China as the only visible means of achieving order and stability. The immediate accent now is on freedom and self-government, and the ultimate target of every starving peasant is a better standard of living.

At the end of the half-century, Asia has come of age politically, has made a powerful assertion of national feeling. Now it embarks on the vastly more difficult task of preserving its personal liberties while the causes of economy security are being advanced.

Mr. MURROW. Perhaps one of the best ways of measuring our good fortune at this half-century is to examine what people in foreign lands regard as luxuries.

Mr. SMITH. Well, in Britain, darn near everything British-made is a luxury. Hats, textiles and, alas, Scotch whiskey are all for export only.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, in Germany, it's doorknobs with houses on the other end.

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. And in France, hot tap water or a cake of fat soap.

Mr. BURDETT. In Italy, an orange or a clean, unfrayed shirt. In the countryside, a luxury is an electric light, a telephone, a paved road.

Mr. COSTELLO. Don't think this is exaggeration, but for 1,000,000,000 people in Asia—that's half the world's population—anything more than a pound of rice a day borders on luxury.

Mr. LESUEUR. At the United Nations, I guess, the only luxury is just one kind word.

Mr. MURROW. Now there's a list of luxuries, which we in this country regard and accept as ordinary essentials. In a world with such vast economic and social inequalities, debate, decision and joint action is difficult, if not impossible. The major instrument through which nation speaks to nation was born with high hope and much publicity in San Francisco. The future of the United Nations is uncertain, but we may perhaps measure what it can do, by what it has done. Larry Lesueur has reported its doings from the beginning.

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, Ed, like the United Nations headquarters going up on New York's East River, peace can't be built in a day. Some of the sensational political squabbles at the United Nations have obscured its real achievements. We've heard a lot about the atomic energy control deadlock, the misuse of the veto, the disarmament impasse. It's too easy to remember the failures of the United Nations and to forget its successes. But remember, that when the Big Four couldn't decide what to do about the Italian colonies, they tossed it to the United Nations and that when the big powers were up a tree over Iran 3 years ago, the moral force of the United Nations, focused by the Security Council, culminated in a Russian withdrawal from Persia. It's true that the men of Israel forged their own state, but it was the United Nations that originally created it, and the war in the Middle East was kept from spreading.

The mediation of the UN helped contain the conflicts in the Balkans and Indonesia. The war is now over in Greece, and 75,000,000 people in Indonesia got their freedom this very week. I think it was the debates at the United Nations that unmasked the true nature of Russian propaganda. Those debates certainly helped to consolidate world public opinion. And while these discussions go on before the people of the world, in the background are the continuing efforts of the UN's specialized agencies. They're trying to get after the roots of war by making this a better world to live in. The World Health Organization is attacking scourges more deadly than even war: Malaria, tuberculosis, VD. The International Refugee Organization has already settled a million displaced persons. And the International Trade Organization is reducing trade barriers between nations. I think there's a common desire among the UN delegates not to disappoint the hopes of the ordinary men and women of the world. Of course, the UN can't settle problems like the division of Germany. That, the big powers have reserved for themselves.

Mr. MURROW. Or, Larry, it may be that the Germans themselves will decide which way they're going. How does it look from your post in Berlin, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. Well, Murrow, I feel there's a distinct here-we-go-again atmosphere on this first day of the second half of the twentieth century. Many new things have been added politically and economically, but the problem that made Europe a battlefield shortly after the beginning of the century still exists. It is Germany and the 67,000,000 people who populate the heart of Europe. The German power potential that turned the continent into a battlefield the year I was born still exists. The revival of German power today once again is under consideration—not so much by the Germans this time, as by the super-nation groups now engaged in a cold war. The reason that no democratic internationalism, such as the United Nations, can solve the problem of their late unlamented enemy is that each of the two most powerful nation-states in the world is wooing Germany like a lovesick swain. Both Russia and the United States want to assure themselves that if Germany does not became an outright ally, at least the German economic and military power will not become a future enemy. This is the essence of the cold war in Germany. As you know, there are two Germanys, the West German Republic, based on Bonn and sponsored by the United States, Britain, and France; the East German State consists of the Soviet zone and is a Soviet satellite.

The Bonn government was chosen in free elections. The East German Government is the product of a Communist coup. But Germans are Germans before they're anything else. They are not Communists because the Kremlin says so; neither are they democrats—with a small "d"—just because we direct them to be democratic. The question of what happens in the world during the next 50 years will, to a large extent, fringe on what the German people will do when they eventually are united—as united they will be. Their spiritual home, their culture, and tradition are connected with the west, but their markets and their economy and their military opportunity will best serve them by joining with the east. Basically, the problem is: Will Germany finally follow the Red Star of the Kremlin or the freedom and promise of democracy? There are no answers apparent in Germany to these questions right now.

Mr. MURROW. Well, of course, it's not only in Germany where two philosophies, two ways of life are in conflict. In all nations, it seems to me, the fear of war, of the inevitability of conflict between these two great powers darkens men's minds. Do you think our policy of containment will work? Or, to put it another way, do you think war is inevitable? Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Well, I can't believe that war is inevitable. The cold war is a peculiar kind of conflict. Material interests are not directly involved. The Russians haven't got anything we want, and we haven't got anything the Russians can't do without. The conflict seems to me to be psychological, a matter of suspicions and ideologies. It seems to me that if there could be a period of mutual sufferance, on however vile terms, and the world could recover somewhat, ideologies might be confounded and suspicions could be dissolved. We can have a very long period of peace—for nothing breeds peace like peace.

Mr. MURROW. Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Well, nothing is inevitable, Ed. But I think war is likely as long as Russia remains a tight dictatorship. Russia's been a tyranny of sorts for centuries, but not always an aggressively expanding one and never before a mechanized one. I just don't see how you can teach people, teach generations of very tough people that destiny has called them to remake the world in their image, and then not expect them to try to act according to their religion.

Mr. MURROW. Do you think war is inevitable, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. Nations don't make 12-inch guns to shoot quail. They don't drop bombs in mid-Pacific lagoons to kill fish. War is inevitable until the time comes when nations give up their sovereign right to make war and learn to settle their problems peacefully.

Mr. MURROW. What do you say, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I'd say that the only inevitability is hatred for the nation that starts the war or drops the first atom bomb. As for the war itself, the Communists say they'll never fight against the Soviet Union. The anti-Communists in Europe say they will fight, if war comes, but only if Americans are in the battle lines with them from the start. As for the French, they say, "no more liberations, thank you, or you'll be rescuing a corpse."

Mr. MURROW. What do you say about the inevitability of war, Burdett?

Mr. BURDETT. Ed, you asked if containment will work. I certainly don't think that war is inevitable, but I don't think either that containment alone is going to prevent it. A straight military policy, designed to contain Russia, seems to me a negative thing. It can produce two armed camps, two civilizations arrayed against each other. It can never produce two worlds capable of living confidently and peacefully together. Europeans know this. I think they will be made to feel much more secure and confident by a solid recovery of their economies than by

any military alliance we can possibly give them.

Mr. MURROW. How does it look from Asia, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. In Asia the cold war is on every tongue, but nowhere except perhaps Japan, did I find any eagerness to fight aggressively against the expansion of communism. For that reason, few Asiatics think war would be inevitable. On the other hand, Stalinism is not much better off than we are. In China and India especially, the Russians are regarded as uncouth upstarts. In the ethical and moral sphere, these people feel better qualified to be leaders than followers. If there is to be Titoism in Asia, it will be a moral rather than a military defiance of Moscow.

Mr. MURROW. Well, this is a matter on which you might have something to say, Lesueur.

Mr. LESUEUR. That word "inevitable" has me stumped. If we cut it down to the foreseeable future I think that a final conflict between the United States and Russia doesn't have to take place. I think that Russia prefers political expansion and that the interests of the United States are certainly based on peace. But limited clashes between small allies are not only inevitable, they've already occurred. I think it's a question of hoping for the best, while we keep our powder dry.

Mr. MURROW. Well, this is an area where there is obvious disagreement as you've heard. But we can at least agree that even if it isn't an enduring peace it has endured a great deal already and there is still room for reasonable men to hope. We are agreed that no one can predict with certainty what the Russians are going to do. So, let's examine for a minute the direction in which the non-Communist world is moving, right, left, or down the middle; what do you say, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. I think to the right. The swing to socialism in Europe was sharply reversed in the last year. Socialists have been kicked out, sold out, bought out, or they've bowed out of governments throughout the west. In Belgium they're out of the government for the first time since the liberation. In Italy the Socialist Party divided itself like an amoeba—sterile cells warring on each other. In Germany a still strong Nazi undercurrent and an anti-Socialist majority.

And, in my own territory, France, I've watched the so-called third force—the democratic center—whittled away on both sides. The first half of this century looked for a moment like the golden age of socialism. Now it looks like the age of conflict—swirling tides running in all directions, and chances are that the currents of the next 50 years will depend on how the tides run in America and Asia, not Europe.

Mr. MURROW. Which way is the political tide running in Italy, Burdett?

Mr. BURDETT. In Italy there's a special phenomenon worth noting. At no time in this past half century has the Roman Catholic Church enjoyed such a florid period of prosperity and influence. This is not a religious phenomenon. It is not a spiritual revival. It is rather a sign of the remarkable political resurgence of catholicism. I think it's mainly due to the fact that after the wreck of fascism and the upheaval of war, the church emerged as the one intact and uncompromised symbol of stability and order. Conservatives rallied around it. Anxious people throughout western Europe turned toward Catholic leadership in their search for security. Right now in Italy the sharp political undercurrents are rightward. The left-running tide has ebbed. The floating mass of voters, the middle class, is again looking for security and right-wing leadership.

I think this is a deep trend, a long-term trend, and not a passing reaction.

Mr. MURROW. Costello, what would you say the general trend in politics is in Asia?

Mr. COSTELLO. Burdett's point raises an interesting contrast in Asia. People in the Orient are not drifting inexorably in any direction—either right or left. There's generally a sense of bewilderment and confusion. On the other hand Asia does have an asset which is conspicuously absent in Europe. There has been a kind of spiritual revival in this century. It's not in any sense a religious movement. It might be accurately compared with the humanist movement, which grew up in Europe during the latter Middle Ages. It consists mainly of a feeling of individual pride and self-respect. People no longer allow themselves to feel humiliated and degraded as the slavish property of some landlord or warlord or foreign overlord. The great symbol of their emancipation was Mahatma Gandhi, who emerged as the voice of Asia's conscience. Gandhi denounced the old moral law of fatalism and subservience, and, using nationalist feeling as a foundation, he created a new sense of personal worth and dignity, which today infuses the whole of Asia.

Mr. MURROW. Well, you fellows from overseas must remember that we have politics in this country too. Sevareid, what would you say the informed opinion is in Washington as to the direction in which we're going?

Mr. SEVAREID. My opinion, Ed—and I'm in Washington today—is that there are some basic differences. Europe, of course, had an old encrusted class society and we did not. We are now trying to level out our inequities, not by the Socialist means of state proprietorship, as in Europe, but developing a so-called welfare state and distributing benefits is not really socialism. It's hardly leftism or rightism. But we certainly have changed the function of our Government and our society. First, our Government was to stay aloof from the economic forces and preserve only civil freedoms, then it was to be a balance wheel preventing any economic forces from overwhelming others, now it's to provide benefits, not for classes, but for groups: farmers, labor, veterans, the aged, and so on. America's original motto was "Equality for all—special privilege for none." And now to try to preserve a rough kind of equality it is special privilege for all.

Mr. MURROW. I suppose it is true that the only people who complain about special privileges are those who haven't got them: and viewed from the outside, it seems to me that we in this country have more of them than anyone else.

How does this country look from the outside, anyway? All of you fellows have spent years abroad. Tell us how we are, as others see us, Mr. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Well, the British have been the world's money lender long enough to know that nobody loves a money lender, and they should be sympathetic with us. But even the British can't suppress a natural resentment of accepting charity. It has been said, and, I think, truthfully, that if either of the British political parties campaigned in the British elections on a policy of twisting Uncle Sam's coattails that party would probably win the elections. It's just human nature, I fear, and the resentment won't end until Europe recovers and can play the role of equal trade partner with us, rather than that of a poor relation with his hand outstretched.

Mr. MURROW. How do we appear to the Germans, Mr. Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. How we look to the Germans depends on which side of the dividing line your particular German lives. In the west we have the position of a stern and wealthy grandfather, meting out punishment and rewards at the same time. Some western Germans say behind our backs that we're a little foolish for being so good to them; while in Communist Germany the flood of antiwestern propaganda is beginning to have its effect. With little to counter the party line, we're coming more and more to be the capitalistic, monopolistic, war-mongering villains.

Mr. MURROW. How do we appear to the French, Mr. Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Depends on which Frenchman is doing the looking. A French automobile manufacturer sees us as giants. But a Paris fashion magazine editor thinks we're a little flashy. Tens of thousands of French war orphans think that an American is Santa Claus. But to many a nervous French mother you're a trigger-tempered kid brother who may get the family into a brawl. We're stern uncles to French Government officials; we pay their debts but try to run their lives. We're loved and hated in France; feared and admired, sneered at, flattered, envied, but we're not ignored.

Mr. MURROW. And the Italians, Mr. Burdett, what do they think of us?

Mr. BURDETT. Italy and Europe, looking at America, not Americans, mind you, but America, is like a proud man who has suddenly developed an inferiority complex late in life. Psychologically, it is not easy at Europe's age to have to be grateful for charity, to see your position at the center of the world suddenly eclipsed and taken over by a newcomer. Europeans are painfully conscious that they cannot get along without us and that there's very little they can really do to help us, even though we call them our allies. So they are irritated by this unpleasant sense of dependence. I think there's only one solution to the dilemma. There'll be a healthy mental balance again when Europe feels she's once more carrying her own weight in the world, even though she cannot hope again to lead it.

Mr. MURROW. And what sort of view do the Asiatics take of us, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Murrow, it's my impression that Asiatics treat Americans sometimes with exaggerated courtesy because we have both money and military power. That doesn't mean they like us as a nation or that they respect our leadership and our morality. Many of them are frankly suspicious even when they ask our help. They think of us as being potentially the authors of a new twentieth-century imperialism. They resent our ignorance about far-eastern history and culture and civilization. They don't like our brusque and sometimes patronizing attitude. We need to send Asia a lot of students as well as money if we want to build a permanent reservoir of good will.

Mr. MURROW. Of course, there's a number of foreigners in this country who are getting a rather closer look at us; those who are stationed at the United Nations. What do they think of us Lesueur?

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, as you say, the United Nations has 59 members. Some of them look upon us as imperialists, others as their protectors. None of them likes to be pushed around. But all of them regard us with respect. And no one will deny that the United States is the strongest influence in the UN, and that influence is constantly increasing.

No discussions can take place in a vacuum. The very physical presence of the United Nations in New York has made a tremendous impact on these representatives from all the corners of the earth. The one time everyone listens is when the delegate of the United States speaks. He reflects the power, the prestige, and the money of the strongest nation on earth. I won't say that every decision goes in the direction that we want it to. Far from it. But when the chips are down there are mighty few things that the United States can't get done at the UN if it really wants them.

Mr. MURROW. Let's pursue this matter of the United Nations for a moment. Of course, it wasn't set up to make the peace, but rather to keep it. How's it doing, Smith?

Mr. SMITH. Contrary to most people, I have been greatly encouraged by the UN this last year and mainly by one incident. When it became a question of Yugoslavia getting a seat on the Security Council all the skepticism and cynicism about the uselessness of the UN suddenly dissolved and the powers fought tooth and nail over that seat. I believe that the UN can develop into something like the world's conscience, if not the world's government.

Mr. MURROW. What do you say, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. Ed, as you said, the United Nations was not designed to make the peace after this war; it was designed to keep it once it was made.

So perhaps the UN hasn't really yet had its chance and won't until the powers do make the peace. But, anyway, I have doubts about the UN, unless by some magic it gets real enforcement powers. It's caught between two great eras, the rise of the era of passionate nationalism in the east and the decline of that era in the west. This is one world all right, but only in space; it's two worlds in time.

Mr. MURROW. What do the Germans think of the UN, Downs?

Mr. DOWNS. One might say, Murrow, that the Germans have a kind of cynical respect for the United Nations organization. They're interested in joining. But they remember Versailles and they see the east-west struggle outside the UN as the real fight and one that the UN seems powerless to settle. I stick to my original contention that the UN or any other international organization will have little real effectiveness until the nations' states are willing to give up those parts of their sovereignty to settle their problems by war.

Mr. MURROW. How do the French feel about the UN, Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. Two out of three Frenchmen always say "no" to anything. It's essentially a negative country. But on the UN France is positive; support is strong. There's also a big following for world government movements there and lots of friends of world citizen Gary Davis. Frenchmen are often cynical and pessimistic. But the United Nations still looks like an ideal that even a cynic can buy.

Mr. MURROW. Burdett, how does it look to the Italians?

Mr. BURDETT. The Italians have centuries of power politics behind them. They take what I'd call a dispassionate and utterly disenchanted European view of the UN, namely, that the UN is a collection of sovereign nations that can do no more than mirror the world pattern of power politics. It can do the job if the nations which have the power are able, ready, and willing to make it work. And Italians are only too acutely aware that the nations in question are just two.

Mr. MURROW. What's the view of the UN in Asia, Costello?

Mr. COSTELLO. Well, Murrow, it's a little ironic that the United Nations achieved one of its outstanding successes in settling the Indonesian problems as Larry Lesueur pointed out a moment ago. It's ironic because most Asiatics appear to give the UN very little thought. Each country, each locality is too preoccupied with its own renaissance to concern itself with distant international maneuverings. There's a tendency to oversimplify all their foreign problems by looking primarily to the United States for help and guidance. One prominent Indian statesman admitted to me frankly that it is the United States which is preparing the world for eventual world government.

Mr. MURROW. Larry Lesueur, you spend most of your time out at the United Nations. Do you want to add anything to what you said earlier on the subject?

Mr. LESUEUR. Well, I think your original question was "Can the UN do the job?" Ed, and I wish I could answer that one with a simple "yes," but I can't. The United Nations cannot accomplish more than the member states put into it. It can't provide military security for the world, but it can and it does provide moral authority. Its great strength lies in its ability to focus world public opinion. I can say this, that if the UN fails and the world goes up in flames, the first thing the survivors will do is form another United Nations. Men just can't live without hope.

Mr. MURROW. Certainly no one can deny to the UN its record of achievement in settling disputes of a minor nature, or its usefulness as a meeting ground for conversations between the major powers. But it's also true that the major powers are attempting to use it as they did the League of Nations for the promotion of their own national interests. The fact is that in a power world the United Nations itself is sadly lacking in power. But it remains the most massive achievement in international organization in the first half of this century.

Well, fellows, let's stop talking about nations and organizations and juggling hemispheres. I'd like to put a very simple question to all of you. You've flown here from a half a dozen different capitals a total distance of about 22,000 miles, just for this program. Tomorrow you'll all be flying back. We have enough time left for each of you to take just half a minute to say just anything you feel like saying. Smith?

Mr. SMITH. One thing has struck me in my reporting in Europe since the war. Almost every time I start tracing some individual European problem to the possible source of remedy, the road leads almost every time not to some place in Europe but to the U. S. A.

It's clear to me that the fate of the world in the next half century will be decided nowhere but here and with the American people and their wisdom or—God save us—their lack of it.

Mr. MURROW. What do you want to say in 30 seconds, Sevareid?

Mr. SEVAREID. I agree with Howard Smith. It's up to America to demonstrate that men can remain free and secure in a mechanized society. But, we can't prove it to others till we prove it first to ourselves. We tend to forget our own ideals. But the tough thing is that there is a basic conflict within those ideals, the conflict between our drive for equality and personal freedom on the one side, our drive for personal aggrandizement on the other. And I think, Ed, that half the world is waiting to see if we can fit them together.

Mr. MURROW. Now, Bill Downs.

Mr. DOWNS. Well, during the past 10 years that I've been a foreign correspondent, the events that stick in my mind are those that make me ashamed. I was ashamed for being fat when a hungry woman in Amsterdam was so overcome by a can of beans that I'd given her that she cried. In Moscow, I was ashamed at being powerless when one of my friends was shipped to Siberia by the secret police just because he was my friend. In America, I've been ashamed of the color of my white skin when encountering racial prejudice.

On D-day when I saw the crumpled body of a young kid that could have been your brother, I was ashamed in a way to be still alive. During the next half century, the part that I'll live through, I'd like to see this kind of shame abolished from the earth.

Mr. MURROW. Schoenbrun?

Mr. SCHOENBRUN. It struck me that we Americans have one characteristic that distinguishes us from all other nations. We want to be loved. We're not content just to have allies, they've also got to be pals, buddies, with a Presidential system just like ours and perhaps a dash of ketchup on their hamburgers. We seem to wear our hearts on our sleeves and we're easily hurt. Maybe the trouble is that our pocketbooks are as open as our hearts and we're secretly afraid that we're loved only for our money. I wish we'd grow a thicker skin in the next 50 years.

Mr. MURROW. Now 30 seconds for you, Burdett.

Mr. BURDETT. Well, I think, Murrow, that this problem of western Europe, which is now ours, is the problem of an insecure civilization. It seems to me that one main reason why Russian pressure seems so formidable and threatening is that the old society of the west is so unsure of itself. If that is so, then our task is enormous.

We can never accomplish it by a purely negative policy dedicated to the idea that everything anti-Russian is good. We can only do it by helping to build a new society, by giving the west a new sense of independent strength, of help, of permanence. By helping Europe to create conditions, the moral and social conditions, for a stable democracy and so for an abiding faith in democracy.

Mr. MURROW. Now, a half minute for you, Bill Costello.

Mr. COSTELLO. I'd say this, gentlemen: Asia today is a keg of dynamite with a lighted fuse and most Americans just don't realize it. We've got to revise our thinking. The old legend of the white man's burden in Asia has been tossed into the limbo of history. The people of Asia today want partnership not patronage. They're willing to buy and sell. But they won't be bought and sold. They don't even want to be dominated by their own governments. They feel just as the Americans do—that people are more important than institutions. In this next half century we've got to extend something more than just material aid. They'd like our money, yes, but they insist on having our respect.

Mr. MURROW. Now, a half-minute for Larry Lesueur.

Mr. LESUEUR. I guess, Ed Murrow, that my chief concern is that the question of war and peace must dominate the rest of our lives. There'll be some very dangerous periods ahead, especially after Stalin dies. A new and insecure Russian leader could plunge that country into war in an effort to preserve his power. On the other hand, the whole Communist movement may break up within the next 50 years. Look at Tito. I think our best hope lies in patience and the cultivation of allies and that one of our great problems will be to erase feelings of racial superiority between ourselves and those allies of another color.

Mr. MURROW. Gentlemen, it occurs to me to suggest that a great deal of sense was talked in those 20-second efforts you just made. And it seems to me, listening to this conversation, that there's been a theme running through this whole discussion—and it is that the last 50 years is a record of unceasing conflict between the individual and the state. When dictators have risen to power, it has happened because the individual has abdicated his political and economic rights and assigned his responsibility as a citizen and as a human being to an individual or to a political party. When dictators have been overthrown, it has been the result of the determination of people to retain or to regain that freedom.

We seem to be agreed that the struggle will continue in all of its various forms. The search for security, both national security and individual security, will continue and it'll be intensified. It seems to me that this discussion has demonstrated beyond doubt that what we in this county do—that is, what our Government does—will determine as never before the fate of civilization. The time when we could separate domestic and foreign issues has passed. Whether we like it or not, the awesome responsibility of the leadership of the free world has been thrust

upon us; we didn't seek it. We have come into our full inheritance at an early age, but youth has never been acceptable as an excuse for failure. We in this country are the fortunate few who live in a generous, bountiful and capacious land. We are, as you have heard, viewed abroad with a mixture of fear and admiration. But it seems to me that, having regard to our history, our heritage, and our strength, we can afford to greet the unknown with a cheer. And, fortunately, there is 10 seconds left, which gives me the opportunity of wishing all of you fellows much luck, good journey, and good news.

It Is Now or Never if We Are To Stop Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, only in 2 years out of the last twenty has the budget of the United States been in balance. Heavy deficits have occurred in all eighteen of the remaining years.

Our national debt as a result of this deficit spending has climbed from sixteen billions in 1930 to a total of two hundred and fifty-seven billions today.

In his most recent message the President proposed to continue this deficit spending during the next few years. It is my conviction that if we cannot balance the Federal budget now when employment and national income are at a high level we never will balance it.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Aberdeen Daily World, one of the leading newspapers of the State of Washington, because it expresses ideas that completely agree with my own:

DEBT COST HEAVY

President Truman's idea that we can go $10,600,000,000 deeper into debt this year and next as a temporary matter and then straighten things out in the following few years so that the budget will be balanced and there will be no need for further debt is puzzling. It is just as puzzling that he figures the interest on the national debt, increased under his program by $10,600,000,000 will be less in 1951 than it is this year. And it takes 13 cents of each tax dollar to pay the interest now. That is only 1 cent less than goes to the veterans. It is 2 cents more than goes to international aid, and more than twice as much as the 6 cents going to age pensions, health, and social welfare. How in the name of common sense and arithmetic you are going to add $10,600,000,000 to the national debt and at the same time reduce the interest, only an Einstein, operating under a relativity-gravitational theory, which no one understands, can explain.

Nor are additions to the national debt temporary. Only twice in the last 20 years—in 1947 and 1948—has the Government lived within its means, and in all that time the debt has mounted from sixteen billion in 1930 to a wartime peak of two hundred and seventy-eight billion. It dropped to about two hundred and fifty billion after the war but it is climbing again and will reach two hundred and fifty-eight billion by the end of next June. There is nothing temporary about that. Nor will there be anything temporary about an additional five billion, five hundred million in the fiscal year ending in June 1951.

The people ought not to allow themselves to be deceived in this matter. The huge public debt is a burden. It took five billion, four hundred million to pay the interest on the debt last year. If the country had been out of debt, that sum could have been devoted to other public services or the budget could have been brought into balance, including all the things the President proposes, without incurring more debt.

A nation, like an individual is better off without debt. And certainly there is no sense in going deeper into debt in a period of the highest national income in history. That is the time to pay the country's bills, not add to them. Not even politics can justify the President's deficit spending.

California Community Plans Disaster Relief

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, in the great Eighteenth Congressional District of my native State of California is situated the important community of Lynwood. I have now received from the town's newspaper, the Lynwood Tribune, a copy of paper dated September 22, 1949, the headlines of which say, "First disaster demonstration in Nation."

With a great deal of pride, Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I call to your attention that this demonstration is the first reported mutual-aid demonstration of the United States by a community with all agencies coordinated, with every organized unit in the city mobilized as it would have to be in case of some disaster. The outline, as reported by this splendid newspaper, is herewith printed. I know it will prove very valuable to other communities in the Nation. I congratulate this thriving, prosperous, and important community on taking the initiative in doing this.

The article referred to follows:

FIRST DISASTER DEMONSTRATION IN NATION—DISASTER GROUP READY FOR DEMONSTRATION ON D-DAY, SEPTEMBER 29, AT 6 P. M.—COMMANDER BRUNER ANNOUNCES CHIEFS IN ALL DEPARTMENTS, FUNCTIONS; MANPOWER, EQUIPMENT PREPARED FOR EXHIBITION

The first mutual-aid demonstration in the United States for relief of a community, with all agencies coordinated, will be conducted in Lynwood at the city park, zero hour 6 p. m. on Thursday, September 29. Personnel of all divisions will be called at a prearranged signal. Practically every organized unit in Lynwood will be mobilized for the demonstration which will combine the highest degree of communications, technical and professional aid with that of heavy duty. Lynwood, foremost in this movement in California has already enacted its ordinance governing this unusual, emergency organization and appointments were confirmed by appointment of the city council Tuesday night.

Vice commander is Art J. Smith, Lynwood veteran, active in the former servicemen's affairs through the American Legion. Other personnel chiefs are named in the following, which includes functions of all divisions, including that of executive officer which is vested in Police Chief Paul W. Kerr, whose facilities in this office have been made available to the disaster council:

LAW AND ORDER

Paul W. Kerr, chief.

Lieut. Claire Dedrick, first assistant.

Lieut. R. Y. O'Shaughnessy, second assistant.

Lieut. W. W. Fuller, third assistant.

Functions: Secure compliance with law and ordinances of the State, county, and city; guarding all facilities within said city; prevent all types of looting; generally assist all law enforcement agencies.

Duties: It shall be the duty of this division to enforce all laws of the State, county, and city for preservation of life and property, and to maintain peace and order.

Contributing organizations: Regular police officers; police reserves; police air squadron. L. A. Co. sheriff's office, humane society; mutual aid. Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, Knights of Columbus, etc.). Reserve units (California National Guard, U. S. Naval Reserve, U. S. Army Recruitment Service, Sea Scouts), American Legion; VFW.

FIRE DIVISION

Earl Gallaher, chief.

Functions: To maintain fire-fighting equipment and forces to meet any emergencies.

Duties: To fight fires, rescue persons, administer first aid, save property. Instruct residents regarding fire prevention and defense methods for individual citizen. To instruct in the methods of detecting fires and precautions to be observed in reducing fire hazards.

Contributing organizations: Regular firemen; reserve firemen; first-aid units; rescue squads. Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, Knights of Columbus, etc.).

MEDICAL DIVISION

A. J. Frishman, M. D., chief.

Function: To mobilize, organize, and direct the medical, dental, hospital, and first-aid activities.

Duties: Maintain up-to-date lists of names, addresses, and telephone numbers of physicians, dentists, nurses, in key positions, for immediate assignments.

Survey anticipated needs, outline duties, and planning for assignment of medical, nursing, and auxiliary personnel to shelters, emergency medical stations, hospitals, ambulances, morgues, immunization clinics, and public health nursing home visitation.

Contributing organizations and equipment: Red Cross, ambulances, Humane Society, first-aid units, canteens, emergency-aid centers.

Personnel: Medical, dental, and hospital groups; private health agencies and institutions; nursing groups; local druggists, and druggist associations; sanitary engineers from city and county health departments.

Service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

PUBLIC WORKS DIVISION

A. J. Bateman, chief.

Functions: To maintain public utilities, to keep all routes in disaster planning open for use, and assist in phases of utilities services.

Duties: To repair and maintain public utilities, repair roads, to restore normal flow of traffic as rapidly as possible, coordinate health

activities and medical services where needed in this division.

Contributing organizations: All publicly owned equipment. All privately owned equipment.

Personnel: City employees, American Legion, VFW, private contractors.

UTILITIES DIVISION

Charles Burke, chief.

Functions: To maintain the operations of all utilities throughout the city, and coordinate disaster planning of each utility services.

Duties: Duties will follow that which is described in the disaster manual of each utility company.

Contributing organizations: Privately owned utilities companies.

TRANSPORTATION DIVISION

Charles Sheaffer, chief.

Functions: To provide and maintain all necessary transportation and vehicle communication services.

Duties: Plan in advances for coordination and mobilization of available facilities so that it will be prepared to function promptly and efficiently in time of disaster.

Survey all transportation resources and obtain pledges of voluntary cooperation from organizations and individuals whose facilities would be essential in the event of disaster.

Contributing organizations: Equipment; auto dealers; taxicabs; busses; auto club, Southern California; truck companies.

Personnel: American Legion, American Legion Auxiliary; VFW and Auxiliary; service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, KC, etc.).

COMMUNICATIONS DIVISION

C. L. Blodsoe, chief.

Functions: To provide and maintain all voluntary communications services. To coordinate this service with existing governmental services.

Duties: Perform messenger service for all units of disaster council, operating various systems of communication including wire and radio communication facilities.

Plan in advance for coordinator and mobilization of available facilities so that it will be prepared to function promptly, and efficiently in time of disaster, obtaining pledges of voluntary cooperation from organizations, and individuals whose facilities or services would be essential in time of disaster.

Contributing organizations: Equipment, privately owned.

Personnel: Sons of Legion, VFW, women's club, junior women's club, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, coordinating council, 4–H Club.

PERSONNEL AND RECRUITMENT

Executive officer, chief.

Functions: Assist in volunteer planning by establishing a personnel list for all units of disaster council.

Duties: Assist in volunteer office, record keeping, clerical assistance, interviewing and campaigning for recruitment of volunteers.

Contributing organizations: American Legion and auxiliary; VFW and auxiliary; Sons of Legion, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4–H Club; service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.); coordinating council; PTA's.

AMERICAN RED CROSS

Mrs. Frances Killingsworth, chief.

See Red Cross Plan.

FOOD DIVISION

Phil Harris, chief.

Functions: To obtain, prepare, and serve food. To receive and dispense donated food.

Duties: Work in close cooperation with survey, medical, housing, and registration and information divisions. Arrange with housing divisions for buildings to be used as mass feeding centers and food depots. Work out arrangements to obtain food supplies at any time during day or night.

Make inventory of local and nearby sources of food supplies and information as to approximate quantities usually carried in stock. Inventory and arrange for immediate availability of equipment and facilities necessary for operations of canteens and feeding stations.

Contact restaurant owners and arrange for their places to be used for feeding should need arise.

Develop system of meal tickets and pattern menus.

Contributing organizations, equipment: Large markets, small markets, food warehouses.

Personnel: American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, Sons of Legion, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, 4–H Club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

HOUSING DIVISION

Herman Yaffe, chief.

Functions: To obtain and provide housing facilities for disaster sufferers, unable to provide shelter through their own resources.

To set up and operate refugee centers.

To set up and operate child-care centers.

To provide necessary tents, cots, blankets, and other equipment where needed.

To arrange to obtain necessary space for disaster headquarters, warehouse, food and clothing depots, canteens, and emergency hospitals.

Duties: Make survey and arrange for available housing facilities including city auditoriums, schools, churches, motels, vacant houses, lodge halls, armories, hotels, rooming houses. The sanitary, cooking, and fire hazard of each shall be considered and lighting and safe drinking water.

Contributing organizations: High school, elementary school, lodge halls, churches.

Personnel: PTA's, American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, chamber of commerce, post office employees, building contractors association, churches, real estate association, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, women's club, junior and senior, Sons of Legion, 4-H Club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

CLOTHING DIVISION

Louis Murray, chief.

Functions: To obtain through channels new clothing for disaster sufferers during emergency period. To receive and care for donated clothing.

Duties: To determine, prior to emergencies, what clothing supplies are available through local sources.

Make plans with local merchants.

Contributing organizations and equipment: Retail stores, wholesale warehouses, charitable institutions.

Personnel: PTA's, American Legion and Auxiliary, VFW and Auxiliary, chamber of commerce, post office employees, building contractors association, churches, real estate association, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, women's club, junior and senior, Sons of Legion, 4-H club, service clubs (Rotary, Kiwanis, Lions, Exchange, Optimist, KC, etc.).

REGISTRATION AND PUBLIC INFORMATION

Larry Hall, chief.

See personnel and recruitment plans.

CHURCHES AND CHAPLAINS

Rev. Ed. B. Wykoff, chief.

Chaplains, administering to the religious and spiritual needs of persons suffering from the effects of disaster.

YOUTH SERVICES UNIT

Arnold J. Robles, chief.

Assist in programs of youth organizations which are organized and directed toward the promotion of disaster preparedness programs including training thereof.

Mr. Speaker, and then, on Friday, September 30, 1949, the same Lynwood Tribune in big headlines stated, "Disaster relief preparations complete," and therein followed the itemized list of preparation. Without a doubt, this list will prove very valuable to other communities in the Nation.

The matter follows:

DISASTER RELIEF PREPARATIONS COMPLETE—SIRENS WILL ANNOUNCE ZERO HOUR, ALL GROUPS CALLED TO PARK AREAS—COMMANDER PRUNER AND CHIEFS READY. PUBLIC INVITED. CITY PARK WILL BE SCENE OF EXHIBITION THURSDAY NIGHT

Sirens will announce the zero hour, 6 p. m.

Go to Lynwood City Park in an orderly manner.

Assignments to groups on the ball diamond will be made and groups directed by officers of the Lynwood Police Department and of the reserves, who are participating.

Heavy equipment has been assigned to places on the outer perimeter of the park.

Lighter equipment will be placed inside the park.

Field kitchens will be set up in the regular manner.

Specially designated places are reserved for medical groups who will be directed by chiefs and police.

The field is reserved for participants in the disaster demonstration. The stands are open to spectators.

Several unusual features will be exhibited as surprise numbers in the plan for relief of disaster victims and evacuation.

Orders will come through the commander, executive officer, and division chiefs.

While facilities of the police and fire department of the city will be represented and available at the disaster demonstration, protection for homes is assured with officers and firemen on duty, according to Chiefs Kerr and Gallaher.

Public-utilities stand-bys are available on call for emergencies, Chief Carley Burke announced.

Commander P. L. Bruner, Jr., will send a radio message to Gov. Earl Warren. The message and answer will be broadcast at the park where public address facilities will be available.

All Lynwood is invited to the city park Thursday night for the disaster demonstration.

Problem No. 1, Dr. A. J. Frishman said at the Monday discussion, is "hysteria," and care of those who may be suffering from shock. There victims are cared for much in the same manner as neighbors who take over when somebody is in distress, at time of an accident. Their reassurance and a medical sedative takes care of numerous in this condition and leaves medics free to attend more seriously injured persons who must be brought to some central point for attention, leaving maximum of the medic's time for attention to the greatest number. Sixty percent treated in this manner may go on their way. In this the Red Cross and auxiliaries assist and of course the nearest hospital is available for this function, the doctor said.

Lynwood folks who called the police station on the night of the recent 'quake shock were excited and pointed in their questioning but not hysterical, according to desk dispatcher, Russ Bell, who was on the desk. Bell said he was fully occupied for 20 minutes answering calls but that once folks were satisfied there was no great damage and no probable imminent danger, the calls ceased. He gave them what information was available at the time.

According to Police Chief Paul W. Kerr the reaction indicates that great numbers of people are schooled in these matters

through past experiences and may be expected to respond in a cooperative manner in event of disaster emergency call.

The Aero Squadron, southern California's first unit of this kind outside the sheriff's flyers, with flight surgeon and planes available, according to Chief Bill Dalton will be divided into groups of three and four. I will keep contact with the grounds forces by short wave radio.

Trained technicians and nurses will be available through the Red Cross group. Station wagons will be available for the Red Cross, also nursing chairmen and staff assistants.

Police direction will be through the Reserves and the regular force, with assistance from the veteran groups, the Legion, VFW, etc.

Acheson Acts as Expert on United States Defense

REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, what could be more touching than the surprise, as reported in yesterday's papers, of Mr. W. Walton Butterworth, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, over the bad manners exhibited by the Communists in seizing our consulate in Peiping? Is he going to be surprised every time a consulate is seized by the Communists or a consul imprisoned? Perhaps sometime the State Department will learn that Communists do not respect rights or diplomatic immunities, unless it happens to serve their purpose, and that in this respect an Asiatic Communist is no better than a European Communist. At the present time, the State Department is quite incapable of facing any of the consequences of its own conduct.

Mr. Speaker, in this morning's paper, the Philadelphia Inquirer, there is an article by Ivan H. Peterman, Acheson Acts as Expert on United States Defense, and I ask unanimous consent to incorporate this article in my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The article is as follows:

ACHESON ACTS AS EXPERT ON UNITED STATES DEFENSE

(By Ivan H. Peterman)

It is rare for one man, however clever and accomplished in worldly affairs, to assume in one office the philosophic robes of a Confucius, and the strategic pose of a Napoleon, but such today is the simultaneous effort of Dean Gooderham Acheson, United States Secretary of State.

After several depressing days in Washington, D. C., your correspondent has discovered that not only has the Acheson view that we can do nothing whatever about China, or even more vital portions of Asia, been imposed upon the Truman administration, but the director of America's worst diplomatic bunglers in the history of this Republic seems also to be the authority for our security and defense.

Where are the military experts? What has happened to Louis Johnson, and his generals, his airmen, and admirals?

Apparently the row in the President's Cabinet drove the Nation's defenders to the hills, so that as we sat listening to Acheson's stream of defeatism in the National Press Club last week, the few recognized authorities on strategy and defense were such as retired Gen. Toohey Spaatz. The active brass from Army, Navy, and Air seem still in a unification haze, too dumbstruck to carry their cries to Congress. Acheson dismisses Formosa as unimportant, is seconded by Truman—and except for General MacArthur's far-off protest, there isn't a significant rebuttal in all the Nation.

Additionally disturbing is the fact that Acheson's glib words seem to have charmed all but a few Republicans, who are now dismissed from the debate not because they are unqualified but because they lost the election in 1948.

Any pretense at bipartisan foreign policy is, of course, gone. Although experienced Washington observers claim 90 percent of the row over Formosa is politics, Mr. Acheson's own revelations that Russia is hogging up China—Mongolia gone, Manchuria almost, Sinkiang going, and Tibet on deck—would suggest that a certain aspect must be international and real. But you'd never guess it in Washington. Nobody seems disturbed. Not even the newspapermen.

In one of the most contradictory utterances a Secretary of State ever uttered, Mr. Acheson pleaded with press and public not to expect too much logic or consistency. He pointed out that Asiatics were a mixed bag, must be treated in different ways—therefore Uncle Sam will proceed not to treat with them at all, but await their separate pleasures. Meanwhile, wringing his hands at the aggressive, well-designed, and entirely rapacious and plundering success of Soviet Russia.

I came away convinced of these things:

1. The United States declines to take any responsibility, however manifold and atrocious our mistakes that helped Chiang Kai-shek's government down the toboggan.

2. The Truman administration refuses to make any positive policy or declarations for the Far East, and intends to let everything drift.

3. Under the Acheson pro-Communist spell, the regime of Mao-Tse-tung will be recognized in the not-distant future, and Formosa will be tossed in as a bonus.

4. We are following the disasterous British line in China, which is appeasement in its greasiest form—predicated not on honor, or good faith with past allies (Chiang and the Nationalists), but is strictly trying to save investments, prolong trade, and salvage unsalvageable Hong Kong.

5. Our so-called Far East policy is now being molded by the same little group that advised the Nationalists into the ashcan, and blue printed the Stilwell fiasco and all our mistakes since then.

6. The State Department's justification for its calculated risk on China is the hope that Mao-Tse-tung will become another Tito. That, of course, will depend on whether he ever gets home from Moscow. He is now well overdue as the Kremlin plots and pressures for the usual one-way deal.

7. The recent shipments of tanks, vehicles, and munitions from Philadelphia mean nothing at all. Acheson said so. "Part of previous commitments, a private matter, pay no heed," was his summation. But all will fall to the Reds, who, once Chiang's last stand is liquidated, will have that much more United States equipment to threaten Burma, Malaya, Indochina, and India.

Opposition of the American Council of Christian Churches of California to the FEPC Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a letter from Mr. G. M. Lane, chairman of the American Council of Christian Churches of California. This letter is very significant in that it does not come from some southerner.

The council places the emphasis where it should be—the danger of regimentation of our people and the tendency toward a police State.

Mr. Speaker, as one who believes in the Jeffersonian principle—that that people is best governed who is least governed—I would be opposed to this vicious proposal or regimentation of our people if there were not a Negro in my State, and I should like to call the attention of the other Members of Congress and the people of the country generally to the fact that this proposal would mean, if enacted into law, the regimentation of businessmen, both large and small, in California and in New York and all other States, as well as in Mississippi. The letter from Mr. Lane is as follows:

AMERICAN COUNCIL OF
CHRISTIAN CHURCHES OF CALIFORNIA,
CIVIL AFFAIRS COMMITTEE,
Los Angeles, Calif., January 1, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM MEYERS COLMER,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Doubtless there will be FEPC legislation brought before the Congress this session.

We have consistently opposed this type of legislation and we still do.

FEPC legislation would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when He approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20: 15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We had no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe. We attended a meeting sponsored by an organization that was pushing FEPC and at which representatives of other allied groups were present. A call was made for any authentic cases of discrimination that could be brought before the California legislatve body that was considering their bill. Among all the organizations represented (all of which were left-wing groups) only two individuals were found in the ranks of these groups in all of the Los Angeles area who would go before a legislative hearing and testify that they had been discriminated against. Surely this does not indicate a very serious situation.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private enterprise system. This private enterprise system, which is our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

Sincerely,

G. M. LANE, *Chairman.*

Less Regimentation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOR C. TOLLEFSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. TOLLEFSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newport News in Oregon entitled "Less Regimentation" which merits the attention of those interested in farm price-support legislation:

LESS REGIMENTATION

Our farm price-support program needs overhauling and the Brannan plan is not the solution.

The Brannan plan is an improvement over our present policy in that it provides for disposal of surpluses to the advantage of the consumer instead of storage for ultimate dumping or spoilage. But it fails in the element of control of surplus production in that it must resort to a quota system, regimentation, the process of a police state.

Here is how the problem can be solved.

Consider a farm product; for example, wheat. Determine the average market price of wheat for the past 5 years. Promise the farmer a minimum of 80 percent of this 5-year average. If the price drops below this promised minimum, pay the farmer a subsidy equal to the difference between this minimum and the market price received for the wheat.

This plan could be used on any commodity, a few or all. Five years as the period for which the average should be taken may not be right. Maybe it should be 10, maybe 3. The 80 percent could be 90; maybe 70. These are details that would be determined after more detailed investigation.

This plan is economically sound. It provides for the disposal of surpluses to the benefit of the consumer. In times of rising stable prices it costs the taxpayer nothing. When prices drop, tax money will have to be used to pay the farmer's subsidy, but this will not be burdensome to the consumer, for he will also buy his commodities at lower prices.

Supply and demand, not regimentation, will control production.

Each year's minimum price would be announced before planting time, so the farmer could adjust acreage accordingly. If prices continue to drop, the promised minimum would also gradually come down. The marginal producer would then shift to some other product. If there were no other product for him to shift to, his land should probably be taken out of production as submarginal.

The plan allows the economic law of supply and demand to operate with a minimum of artificial interference. But farmers would be protected against the hardships of sudden price drops.

Keep the System That Works

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, "Keep the System That Works" is the title of a most interesting editorial in the Bridgeport (Conn.) Post of January 11, 1950. The editorial is in large measure a result of the comments on the President's message made by my friend and colleague the gentleman from the Fourth District of Connecticut [Mr. LODGE] and an endorsement of his views in contrast to the recommendations of the President in these particulars.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the editorial follows:

KEEP THE SYSTEM THAT WORKS

Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of this district, in a statement commenting on President Truman's message to Congress, points out that many of the acts of Congress (or failures to act, such as failure to repeal the Taft-Hartley law) for which the President strongly condemned the Republicans by inference, were supported by an overwhelming majority of the members of his own party in Congress. In other words, the Democratic President and the Democratic Members of Congress seem to be headed in opposite directions.

But we would particularly call attention to Congressman LODGE's criticism of the Oscar Ewing free medical-service plan because we believe this a matter which will come up for increasing attention in the near future and the public certainly needs to be informed about it. Said Congressman LODGE:

"He (the President) apparently favors the Oscar Ewing health plan which would deprive the American people of their choice of a doctor, lower the standards of the medical profession and generally encourage malingering."

If the experience of England is going to be any guide to us in the matter, that is exactly what would happen. There is probably no greater misuse of the English language than the attempt to call such plans free medical service. Every wage earner will pay for his medical services through pay-roll taxes, the difference being that while he still pays the bill, he no longer has his choice of the doctor. This Nation now has the most expensive medical service and the widest hospitalization and the most free clinics of all kinds of any nation on earth, or historically, any nation past or present. Allowing for the sake of argument that one-eighth of the people do not get all the medical service which they might well use or that some of them do not get any at all (and we think that even this figure is exaggerated) the immediate effect of the Oscar Ewing plan would be to reduce the medical service now enjoyed by the other seven-eighths of the population.

How much smarter it would be to improve our present system by extending it to the remote corners, the sparsely settled districts, or the mountain vastnesses where medical service is now scanty because of the sheer physical difficulty of rendering it. Why scrap the system which has produced the highest health standards in favor of something which we know, from the experience of other nations, will only give us something markedly inferior?

Why we should turn to those nations whose standards are already inferior to our own, and import their ideas to replace our more successful ones, is a mystery which can be explained in only one way, and that is, that a politician will resort to anything in order to create a glossy-looking issue.

What Does a Credit Man Think About Today?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN D. DINGELL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by M. S. Szymczak, member, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, before the Midwest conference of the Robert Morris Associates, Chicago, Ill., December 9, 1949:

WHAT DOES A CREDIT MAN THINK ABOUT TODAY?

One thing I'm not going to do is try to tell you how to run your business. Capable credit men need no such advice—and the others wouldn't take it anyway. A good credit man knows the many elements to be considered in granting a loan and he knows that he cannot afford to overlook any one of them in reaching his decision. Something of little importance today may, because of rapid economic and other changes, be of first importance tomorrow.

You members of the Robert Morris Associates are well aware of the need for evidence of the borrower's integrity, for assurance that the money he borrows will be employed for provident and productive purposes, and for reasonable certainty that the loan can and will be repaid upon the terms and conditions granted. You know that your advice and counsel must accompany many loans if the credit is to be used to best advantage. You are aware of the dangers of relying too heavily on the continued success of any one industry or enterprise, and of the need for diversification in your lending activities. In short, you know the many angles to this business of lending other peoples' money to other people, and you are endeavoring to consider all of them in an effort to protect your depositors, to provide a fair return on the investment of your stockholders, and to assure the maximum sound productive use of credit in your community.

It is not my purpose this evening to review the many detailed considerations that enter into the granting of a loan. Rather, as a native of this city and former associate of yours, I should like to discuss some of the broader problems of national and international credit policy with which I have been conversant for the past 16 years. In today's world, the conduct of economic affairs at home and abroad is greatly influenced by considerations of social responsibility. In the interest of the greatest good for the greatest number we as a Nation have set

ourselves the task of maintaining high employment, stable values, and a rising standard of living.

The attainment of these national economic objectives, in view of the growing complexity of our economy, gives rise to many perplexing problems. Considering the essential role of credit in our highly specialized system of producing and distributing goods and services, it is not surprising that these problems are a matter of concern to each and every credit man in our country.

The Robert Morris Associates deserve high praise for publicizing the essentials of constructive credit policies and for encouraging and facilitating the exchange of information and ideas among credit men. The associates' financial statement studies, which are continually being enlarged and refined, have provided members with standards of comparison that are extremely useful in analyzing and evaluating particular loan applications, and in detecting changes in business financial structure. Through its monthly bulletin and meetings such as this, the Robert Morris Associates are encouraging that sort of thoughtful analysis essential to a sound solution of our many problems and to the realization of our economic goals.

THE ROLE OF CREDIT AND CREDIT INSTITUTIONS

We all know that an adequate supply of credit at the right place, the right time, the right cost, and the right repayment terms is essential to the smooth functioning of our economy. There is hardly an individual, a businessman, a municipal or State government, or a national government that doesn't need credit from time to time. In order to meet these varied needs for credit, different types of lending and investment institutions have been developed. Some, like the commercial bank, evolved in response to a need for short-term business credit; others, such as the savings and loan association, were created for the purpose of supplying special types of longer-term credit. Still others, such as mutual savings banks and insurance companies, have, in recent years, turned to lending and investing funds normally supplied by commercial banks. The commercial bank, however, is still preeminent in the field of shorter-term credit. It must, because of the high proportion of its demand to its total liabilities, concentrate on shorter-term credit. In contrast, life insurance companies, the majority of whose obligations represent lifetime contracts with policyholders, and mutual savings banks, which hold peoples' savings, are able to extend credit for longer periods through the purchase of long-term bonds, obligations secured by real estate, and other investments of a long-term nature.

While the demand character of much of their deposit liability largely restricts commercial banks to short-term lending, member banks can, if confronted with unforeseen deposit withdrawals, obtain funds from their reserve banks. In its capacity of lender of last resort, the Federal Reserve System has introduced a much greater degree of flexibility into commercial bank lending than previously existed. In this respect, the powers of the System were broadly expanded in 1935. Banks can now grant loans without fear that tomorrow or the day after they may be forced to liquidate them on short notice in order to meet depositors' demands. On the other hand, we recognize that certain types of credit extension are not for commercial banks—among them, purchase and lease of business properties and investment in equity shares. In other words, the role of the commercial bank should continue to be largely that of provider of short- and medium-term credit to business corporations, unincorporated enterprises, farmers, consumers, home owners, and all levels of government.

In this connection, I should like to say a word about public lending institutions that provide emergency financial assistance to banks and business. I think most credit men would agree that Government competition in the field of direct lending is undesirable if private lending institutions can provide the amounts and types of credit needed. On the other hand, I think we should have some public credit agency or agencies available on a stand-by basis to render assistance in periods of financial stress—at least until such time as the commercial lending institutions are able to cope with any conceivable situation. In addition, there may be some remaining gaps in our present structure of financing agencies—for example, agencies that would provide long-term debt capital to small enterprises. Such gaps may have to be filled by new types of private or public financial institutions.

Whether the potential expansion of Government lending agencies poses any serious competitive threat for private credit institutions will depend, in my opinion, on our success in minimizing or eliminating cyclical expansion and contraction of business activity and credit and in filling any gaps with appropriate private lending institutions wherever possible.

The dual responsibility of the commercial banker on the one hand to protect the interests of his depositors and stockholders, and on the other hand to expedite the production of essential goods and services by granting credit, is a diffcult one. The desire to protect depositors may cause individual bankers to change their credit policies at the first signs of financial stress. The over-all effect of such action, by sharply curtailing or even liquidating credit lines, might seriously impede economic activity and hurt all bank depositors. Individual bankers might find it difficult to continue grantng credit freely when competitors are calling in their weaker loans and tightening up their credit terms.

The only real solution to this problem lies in the prevention, by means of over-all credit and monetary action, and other public and private means too numerous to mention on this occasion, of any economic development that might lead to sharp retrenchment and liquidation of credit.

ROLE OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM

The Federal Reserve System, as the central monetary and credit authority, is charged with responsibility for regulating the overall supply, availability, and cost of money with a view to contributing to the maintenance of high levels of employment, stable values, and a rising standard of living.

In an effort to meet its responsibilities the System takes positive action to curb or to encourage credit expansion, as circumstances require. It operates by using either quantitative or selective instruments, or both. Quantitative instruments, such as changing the required reserves of member banks or open market purchases or sales of Government securities, increase or decrease the reserve base for credit extension but leave to the individual bank the decision as to the type or types of credit that should be expanded or contracted. Selective credit instruments, such as margin requirements for the purchase or carrying of listed stocks or emergency regulation of consumer installment credit, apply to a particuluar type of credit, but impose no direct limit on the total amount of credit outstanding.

Generally speaking, action taken by the Federal Reserve System to influence the expansion or contraction of credit has the primary effect of suggesting rather than requiring certain responses on the part of individual lenders. This is particularly true in time of economic recession when the Federal Reserve can enlarge the basis for credit expansion, but is powerless to force additional credit into business and trade channels. The latter can be done only by aggressive response on the part of individual banks in extending credit and by willingness on the part of businessmen and others to utilize credit in expanding their operations. To make this possible both public and private policies should inspire confidence on the part of businessmen, bankers, and the general public.

In influencing credit policies in an effort to contribute to monetary and economic stability the Federal Reserve System must act in the public interest. Oftentimes such actions are unpopular, especially among the banking fraternity. Sometimes central banking officials resign, voluntarily or otherwise, because of the unpopularity of their actions. This is particularly true in periods of inflation, when most people do not want to see business activity curtailed. However, as recently demonstrated in a number of western European countries, the need for drastic action to insure monetary stability does arise and the results of such action are beneficial. In the end most groups recognize the wisdom of action which they at first opposed.

In the final analysis, the major contribution of the System to the smooth functioning of our economy lies in its early detection of undesirable economic trends and prompt action to guide commercial credit policy away from paths that may lead to serious inflation or deflation. Without the understanding and cooperation of the entire banking system and the public much of the effectiveness of Federal Reserve action is lost.

The organization of the Federal Reserve System, with its 12 regional banks and their 24 branches, provides grass-roots information on what our leaders in the fields of agriculture, industry, commerce, and banking are doing and planning. In a similar manner, the System obtains first-hand information about economic developments in foreign countries and in the field of international trade and finance through its membership in the National Advisory Council and from various Federal Reserve and other Government missions and representatives abroad. Much of this information is relayed to credit men through the publications of the System so that individual lending policies may be revieved in relation to national and worldwide economic developments.

THE CURRENT BUSINESS SITUATION AND OUTLOOK

In the first place, as you know, determination of appropriate credit policies depends in part on our longer-range economic objectives. But it depends also on the present and probable future course of business activity. Between November 1948 and July 1949 industrial production, as measured by the Federal Reserve index, declined roughly 17 percent; during the same period, wholesale prices, as measured by the all-commodity index, dropped 6 percent and business inventory holdings declined 5 percent. These declines in industrial activity and prices, together with smaller business credit demands on banks and other lending institutions, prompted several monetary and credit actions by the Federal Reserve System during the spring and summer of 1949. Down payment and repayment requirements on consumer installment loans were gradually moderated prior to the termination of Regulation W. Margin requirements on stock-exchange loans were decreased substantially, successive reductions in reserve requirements of member banks were instituted, and a policy of flexibility in open-market operations to permit freer play of general credit forces in the determination of market rates and yields was adopted.

The moderate recession in business activity that we experienced during the first half of this year probably reflected inventory and price readjustments, rather than any basic difficulties. Whether the recovery that began this summer may lead to further inflationary pressure or will be replaced by a resumption of the earlier downward readjustment is now a subject of considerable discussion.

Among the various aspects of the present situation that suggest continued high levels

of business actvity, one of the most significant is the record level of construction activity. In a recent joint report, the Department of Commerce and Department of Labor estimated that the total value of new construction put in place during 1949 would exceed $19,000,000,000, or slightly more than the 1948 total of $18,800,000,000. More over, these same sources predicted that the total of new construction expenditures in 1950 will equal that of 1949.

Consumer expenditures on goods and services of all types were still running at an annual rate of $179,000,000,000 a year in the third quarter of 1949—less than 2 percent under the peak annual rate reached in the fourth quarter of 1948. Moreover, recent Federal Reserve Board surveys have revealed the existence of continued large-scale demands on the part of individuals for automobiles, houses, and other durable goods. Not only is the demand great, but individuals have cash or other liquid assets, or are able to borrow, to finance purchases of these goods. National service life insurance premium refunds during the winter and spring of 1950 are counted upon to bolster consumer demand, while continued large-scale Government expenditures will sustain a demand for many types of goods and services. The over-all financial position of business is sound, despite a substantial increase in businesnes indebtednes during the past few years. In general, the supply of credit is large and elastic and the cost, both of short- and long-term credit, relatively low. Furthermore there is a marked absence of speculative excess, such as we had in the late twenties, while the great strength of the banking system enables it to deal effectively with any sort of economic development one might reasonably expect at this time.

At the same time, we should not overlook the fact that we have gone a long way toward satisfying the immediate postwar demands for industrial plant and equipment, business inventories, and consumers' goods. Business expenditures on new plant and equipment, which reached a peak of $5,400,000,000 in the fourth quarter of 1948, are estimated at $4,300,000,000 for the fourth quarter of 1949—a decline of about 20 percent. Business inventories, which expanded by $28,000,000,000 between December 1945 and December 1948, have since declined by roughly $4,000,000,000. Wholesale prices have continued to fall and at the end of October were about 8 percent below their level of a year ago. While industrial production has picked up since July, and is admittedly being held back by recent work stoppages in the coal and steel industries, the current level is still some 12 percent below the level reached in the same month last year.

Moreover, there is some possibility that business expenditures on new plant and equipment will continue to decline, and that further increases in business inventory holdings will be relatively small. Bumper crops in many lines of agricultural production foreshadow continued downward pressure on farm prices and incomes. It is evident to you, I am sure, that we are still confronted with marked price disparities, such as aluminum versus copper, synthetic fabric versus cotton and wool cloth, and lumber versus other buildings materials. For example, the price of lumber is still over three times its 1939 average, as compared with a current average price of building materials (excluding lumber) that is somewhat less than twice the 1939 level. More liberal pension-fund provisions, of the type recently negotiated in the steel industry, together with postwar wage increases in most lines of industry and trade, and the high cost of postwar additions to plant and equipment, have saddled many business concerns with relatively large and inflexible cost structures which may seriously impede price reductions that might be needed if demand should start to fall off.

All things considered, the credit man is faced with the rather formidable fact that the present balance between further inflation and deflation is a delicate one, which could easily be upset by expansion in Government expenditures and deficit financing on the one hand, or by any pronounced curtailment of consumer or business demand on the other. Such a situation calls for lending policies that will permit utilization of credit for continued production of goods and services, and at the same time will not encourage premature exhaustion of consumer demand. Later in my talk I shall mention several types of lending activity which credit men are watching closely in view of recent economic developments.

RECENT ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS ABROAD

If I learned anything in my several assignments abroad, it is the fact that time has long since passed when we could isolate our domestic economy from that of the rest of the world, particularly from the effects of economic developments in the western European countries. Immediate postwar European demand for food and manufactured products of various types provided a large export market for whatever could be spared in meeting our domestic requirements. At the same time, and especially as ECA aid became available, European countries began to rebuild their factories, reestablish their raw material supply lines, and resume production of manufactured goods. In order to attract private capital to their industries and place their own economies on a sound footing, most of the western European countries introduced drastic currency reforms for the purpose of stabilizing prices and money values.

Once the European countries succeeded in establishing some measure of internal stability, their next step on the road to economic recovery was to rebuild their export trade, particularly to this hemisphere. Devaluation of their currencies in relation to the dollar has had the effect of lowering the price of European goods in the American market and enabling European countries to sell more in this country. At the same time, it has raised the prices of our goods in foreign markets and curtailed their consumption to some extent. All these changes are no doubt reflected in your thinking and planning.

It is most important to us that the progress toward general economic stability, in which most countries of the world have participated, should continue. While United States aid has been essential to the progress that many foreign countries have made since the end of the war, I am confident that the contemplated gradual reduction in the amount of such aid will not interrupt nor delay such progress. However, this does mean that if foreign countries are to continue buying goods which they need from the United States, they must be able to expand sales of such of their goods as have a market in this country. To spend dollars here they must first earn dollars, directly or indirectly, and with much of their international transport, financial, and other dollar producing services destroyed or disrupted by the war, more emphasis must be placed on the sale of goods in the world market.

In this connection, the credit man today asks questions about the value of the dollar, not only from our own domestic viewpoint, but in relation to the currencies of other countries. Recently you have been hearing many rumors about devaluing the dollar in terms of the price of gold. Devaluation of foreign currencies was a necessary step toward trade expansion and recovery; undoing its effects by devaluing the dollar would have just the opposite consequences. Nor would dollar devaluation aid our domestic situation one iota. On the contrary, it would add to any inflationary tendencies that exist. There is no shortage of credit or gold reserves in this country, and an increase in the dollar price of gold, even if the legal obstacles to such action could be overcome, would merely mean an indiscriminate subsidy to domestic and foreign gold producers.

FINANCIAL DEVELOPMENT OF CURRENT SIGNIFICANCE

Thus far, we have been talking about some of the broader aspects of the domestic and international economic scene that have a bearing on credit policies. Now, let's take a look at a few of the more specific problems in the field of credit and commercial banking that are of interest to the credit man today.

Installment credit: Since June of this year, the amount of consumer installment credit outstanding has increased by nearly $1,000,000,000. Some thought is being given by the lending officer to the implication of too rapid an expansion of such credit at this time. Many people buy certain large items of furniture and major household appliances only once in their lifetime. To a certain extent, the same is true in the case of automobiles. Once immediate demands are fulfilled, they may recur only after the lapse of considerable time. Moreover, the use of installment credit enables people to buy now and pay for purchases out of future income. If we encourage too widespread a use of installment credit at a time when cash demands of consumers are high, we may exhaust not only the present market but a good part of the potential market of the future. The results of doing so should be perfectly obvious—sales of automobiles and other consumer goods may suddenly fall off and unemployment may ensue, while a larger proportion of the reduced income available would go to pay for goods purchased last year or the year before.

No credit man is in a position to say who shall or shall not buy with installment credit, provided the borrower can establish his credit worthiness. On the other hand, he can influence the use of installment credit by maintaining prudent down payment and amortization requirements.

Real estate credit: My comments with respect to installment credit are equally true of real estate credit. During the 4 years 1946–49 home mortgage debt alone has increased by an estimated net amount of some $17,000,000,000. In part, your concern is that the volume of debt incurred may be so large as to threaten a serious credit liquidation. In part, it is that the ability of individuals to purchase housing with the aid of mortgage credit is being exhausted so rapidly that the remaining demand will not be adequate to insure continued high levels of employment in the building and building-materials industries. Again, the banker cannot deny credit to credit-worthy borrowers. He can, however, require conservative owner equities and repayment provisions in times of abnormally high demand, and relax his requirements somewhat when the demand begins to slacken. These are powerful measures of influence, and I am certain that bankers want, in their own as well as in the general interest, to make them as effective as possible.

Term loans: Term loans are often employed by the borrower in the purchase of machinery, equipment, and other more or less fixed capital items, and are repaid out of future earnings. In recent years the well-informed credit man is making term loans with caution, for three reasons: First, construction and machinery and equipment costs are well above prewar levels and there is a good chance that such fixed assets may prove to be overvalued in the long run.

Second, there is always some uncertainty about the profitability of future business operations. Third, the situation with respect to business expenditures on machinery and equipment is somewhat analogous to purchasing of automobiles and housing by individuals—some restraint in the use of credit during boom times should be encouraged.

From time to time questions arise as to the feasibility of developing a formula, or of devising definitions and limits for the guidance of banks in determining what proportion of their assets may properly be invested in term loans. Such an undertaking would have little chance of success. In the first place, the diversity of type, purpose, and conditions of such loans makes satisfactory definition practically impossible. In the second place, the appropriate position for an individual lending institution can only be determined after careful analysis and consideration of the character and volatility of its liabilities, its relative capital position, and the probable credit demands to which it may be subject. The determination of an optimum amount of term loans involves problems similar to those in selecting an investment portfolio, and no rule of thumb applicable to all banks would appear to be practicable.

CONCLUSION

It is evident, therefore, that the time-honored distinction between the trees and the forest is equally true of credit. The individual credit man is primarily and rightfully concerned with the welfare of the individual trees; the central credit authority is charged with responsibility for promoting the welfare of the forest. While the interests of the two may appear to conflict in specific situations, the thoughtful credit man realizes that there are no fundamental differences in their ultimate objectives.

It is further evident that certain types of credit, notably consumer installment and home mortgage, have increased substantialy in recent years. In the interest of minimizing their inflationary pressure, spreading demand for automobiles, housing, and other consumer goods over a longer period of time and protecting loan portfolios against subsequent deterioration in value, credit men are examining down-payment and repayment provisions with particular care.

As we know, change has always been characteristic of human behavior, whether it be social, political, or economic. The principal difference in the economic changes that occur now and those of a hundred years ago is that present changes occur more rapidly and affect a much greater number of economic activities. No able credit man can isolate himself from change nor prevent it by ignoring it. On the contrary, he deems it his responsibility to maintain that prudent flexibility of thought and action that welcomes the opportunities for constructive service afforded by change. His is not a dull and routine duty. It is full of constant interest, not only in loans and lending policies but also in broader economic developments.

Indefensible Retreat

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ludwell Denny:

INDEFENSIBLE RETREAT
(By Ludwell Denny)

Secretary of State Acheson's tardy triple effort to stop growing criticism of the administration's far eastern policy—or lack of policy—has failed. His rapid-succession appearances before the two congressional foreign committees, and the National Press Club have raised more questions than he answered.

His failure is due both to faulty tactics and to the essential weakness of his position.

He seems to assume he is confronted merely by a partisan Republican maneuver, which he can counter with a combination of lofty sentiment and ridicule. This would not be effective if only GOP politicians were involved. It is even less effective when the administration is disregarding responsible military advice and challenging nonpartisan public opinion of considerable size, as is now the case.

But the best possible defense of the administration position could not make it a strong one. That is because it is negative. It represents retreat. The Secretary's reasons why China could not be saved, and why Formosa should not be aided, might be somewhat more plausible if the administration offered a vigorous, positive policy against Red advances elsewhere in Asia. There is no such policy.

That is what worries so many generals and admirals. That is what troubles many newspapers and citizens who have no partisan Republican ax to grind. Formosa is only a symbol of the much wider issue. But it is an exceedingly important one since Manchuria and China proper, which were the tests 2 years ago and last year, are gone.

Where is the stand to be made? We have retreated from Korea, where we had a direct United Nations responsibility. There is no policy to give effective aid to threatened Indochina and Burma, if indeed our help would be acceptable there. Where then?

The administration is right when it says the United States should not precipitate war, should not make imperialist claims, and should not send American troops to put down independence movements. But American military occupation is not proposed—only a naval patrol or military advisers. That would entail much less risks than we are taking in many other places.

As for the rights of colonial peoples and the functions of the UN, with which the Administration is properly concerned, its argument boomerangs in the case of Formosa. Legally the Formosans are wards of the victorious powers which liberated them from Japan, until their fate is decided by a Jap peace treaty.

Although President Roosevelt promised them to China, neither they nor Congress nor the UN were consulted. The Administration would be more convincing if it were proposing temporary UN protection of Formosa, rather than inviting Red conquest by its do-nothing policy.

Altoona Chamber of Commerce Has Done Much for the City of Altoona

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, Altoona, Pa., is the proud possessor of the largest railroad shops in the world which are owned and operated by the Pennsylvania Railroad.

Regardless of the many thousands employed in the Pennsylvania Railroad shops unemployment from time to time presents a disturbing problem and menaces the economy of the community.

Altoona has a wide-awake group of businessmen who through the Altoona Chamber of Commerce have given their effort and money to strengthen the economy of the community by expanding its industries and attracting new ones.

The Altoona Chamber of Commerce, speaking for the businessmen of Altoona, enjoyed a successful year in 1949 due to the untiring efforts of Mr. George C. Kelchner, Jr., president, and Mr. G. Stanley Ruth as secretary.

The following report contained in the Altoona Chamber of Commerce News Bulletin gives a detailed story of the Chamber's activities during 1949.

The report is as follows:

THE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE AT WORK IN 1949

The year 1949 has recorded many worthwhile accomplishments sponsored by the chamber of commerce for the city of Altoona. Many hours and days of time and money were expended to promote the general welfare of those projects which make for a better community.

Foremost in line of time expended and results achieved has been the subject of industrial expansion. Since the need for increased and diversified pay rolls is Altoona's first problem, the chamber of commerce has been devoting most of its time in this direction. Although results appear to be small, the fact is that the one new plant built by the chamber's financing vehicle, Altoona Enterprises, Inc., has increased the city's pay roll income by about $850,000 annually.

In order to establish greater continuity in this work, the industrial committee of the chamber under the direction of M. A. Miller, announced an ambitious plan known as the "Altoona industrial pay-roll insurance plan." Organization of the various committees is now in progress and it will consume much time and effort over the next 90 days.

Of course many of the other phases of chamber of commerce work have also gone ahead. Retailing has taken up the second largest phase of time and effort with a well-rounded program of its own.

Other subjects which will be explained in a bit more detail include agriculture, tax-study work, better-business-bureau work, airport development, fire prevention, publicity, and varied phases of daily office assistance.

We wish to take this opportunity to thank all those officers, directors, committee chairmen, and members for their time and contribution given to the various projects under consideration.

We owe a deep vote of thanks to the Altoona Mirror, the Altoona Tribune, and the radio stations, WFBG, WJSW, WRTA, and WVAM for their valuable assistance in publicizing the chamber activities consistently. Without their splendid assistance and cooperation, the work of the chamber would be extremely difficult.

We sincerely trust that the chamber of commerce through its program of work can continue to serve the civic, industrial, commercial, and general welfare of the city of Altoona. We hope that 1950 will afford an opportunity for many, many more people to work through this community channel for the building of a bigger and better city. With proper assistance and support, the chamber of commerce has the resources and access to any and all problems affecting every phase of community life. Its more than 100 years

of experiences in 3,000 communities in America are available to us. You have our promise of continued support for those community subjects which must be worked out to the mutual advantage of everyone in Altoona.

INDUSTRIAL

Early in January 1949 the total financing cost of the Butterick Co. project was squared away with the Prudential Insurance Co. by Altoona Enterprises. The total cost was $458,879.95. Local participation in this project amounted to $95,327.97.

In the meantime monthly installments have been paid on this total amount covering principal and interest at the rate of 4 percent. Principal payments started as of August 1948.

Early in 1949 negotiations were started with the Mylish, Mann & Drucker Shirt people for the construction of their 50,000-square-foot building. Ground breaking ceremonies took place for this building April 27, 1949, and the building was sufficiently completed to permit the company to start operation September 1.

In the meantime other industrial projects were under negotiation but were unable to reach a conclusion as yet.

The accomplishments of the local industrial program were high-lighted in Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, Department of Commerce page ads which appeared in United States News, Business Week, Chicago Journal of Commerce, Wall Street Journal, Herald Tribune. Copies of this publicity, together with an industrial prospectus prepared by the committee, were placed in the hands of more than 1,000 industrial firms during the forepart of 1949.

The industrial committee held several meetings to discuss ways and means of offsetting the Pennsylvania Railroad lay-offs in 1949. It was during these meetings that the germ was created for the present pay-roll insurance program.

It might be mentioned here that the increased postal receipts at the Altoona post office from the two industries established here in the last 2 years added more than $100,000 annually to their receipts, placing the office in a higher salary bracket and caused the office to employ a number of additional men.

The $1,000,000 industrial insurance plan was formulated by the industrial committee to provide more continuity and effectiveness for industrial expansion. The plan was announced to the public December 23, 1949. The program provides for the raising of $1,000,000 over a 5-year period and to be used as a revolving fund handled by a board of trustees.

It provides for the employment of a full-time industrial engineer who will work as an Altoona ambassador and will work toward the enlargement and promotion of local industries as well as prospective industries, in addition to the acquisition of new industries and the development of Altoona as a distribution center.

Although the direct effort will be made to all business groups in the city for raising of this fund, the door will always be open to everyone for participation through financial assistance or working assistance. The plan calls for the organization of each of 100 business and professional groups who in turn will be charged with the responsibility of raising their own quota. The work of organizing these groups alone will take much time and effort, but it is believed that the experience will prove valuable in clarifying many of the frequently discussed criticisms that seem to linger in the minds of so many.

In any event, this project will consume the largest portion of the chamber's time and effort in 1950.

RETAILING

The retail division is operating in its second year under the new annual budget financing program. This program has met with success and satisfaction among its members. The program carried out the usual sales promotional events such as dollar days, Altoona day, Pennsylvania week and the large-scale Christmas program.

The division set up a better business committee to call attention to undesirable methods of merchandising and advertising.

The solicitation control inaugurated 2 years ago is evidently working with increased success. Literally scores of unnecessary solicitation efforts have been discarded during 1949. Several of the stores claim that this procedure has saved them many times the annual budget allocation for the retail division. It is hoped that everyone will continue to refer all solicitation subjects to the chamber office for approval of the committee.

The division appointed a parking committee to study the problem of our parking-lot situation. This committee, chaired by J. E. Holtzinger, will be coming forth with an effective report in the near future.

The Christmas program started November 25 with a huge Santa Claus parade made up of many local objects which were to be simulated in toys. The parade drew the largest crowd that was ever witnessed at this annual event. One of the reasons for this was the fact that it was held in the morning.

The street decorations were erected as usual and although they are now 3 years old, they still are considered to be outstanding in cities of this size.

AGRICULTURE

The agricultural committee, chaired by W. S. Truby, staged a farm products show at the Jaffa Mosque in conjunction with the Altoona centennial celebration. Although this event met with a fair degree of success, it was considered inadvisable to stage a show of this kind in August.

The most successful agricultural event was the eleventh annual 4–H baby beef club show and sale held at the Frankstown Armory, October 19, 1949, where 49 animals were exhibited at the show. There were 14 meat buyers, which was twice the number to participate in the purchasing of these animals in former years.

The steers brought a good average price and the event was extremely well attended. Thanks for the impetus this year must go to Ted Holtzinger who brought about increased publicity efforts.

INTEREST IN MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS

The chamber has been active in keeping in touch with the new tax program in Altoona, both prior to the establishment of the business privilege taxes and their operation since enactment.

On January 10, 1949, the chamber called a membership meeting on the subject of local taxes at which time the local ordinances were explained and discussed by Leslie Reese and Dr. Kurtzman of the Pennsylvania Economy League. The Blair County branch of the Pennsylvania Economic League was introduced to the business people of Altoona by a special tax committee of the retail division in the fall of 1948.

AVIATION

The inauguration of regular commercial airline service at the Blair Country airport, March 28, 1949, marked an epoc in local transportation history. Since its inauguration, the All American Aviation Co., has been doing a favorable business. In fact their volume thus far is on a par with several of the other top cities on the route.

The chamber of commerce has maintained a constant interest in this subject for the past 18 years and it is of interest that they participate in the program through a membership on the Blair County Airport Commission.

OFFICE ROUTINE

The daily business done by telephone and personal calls at the office by members and others seeking every kind of community information actually absorbs a very large portion of time.

Increased activity has been noted in this direction during the past year when the office was designated last June by the United States Department of Commerce as a cooperating regional office. This means that all of the varied types of foreign and domestic information pamphlets, booklets, and magazines are supplied for the general information of business firms in the area.

In November 1949, the Altoona Chamber of Commerce Office was designated to receive invitations to bid on Government orders from the various procurement offices. This is in line with the fact that Altoona has been designated as a critical area having more than 12 percent of its total industrial employment unemployed.

A number of local firms have been applying for this work and on several instances, contracts were awarded to local people.

The chamber has increased its information service through the acquisition of several other business directories such as the Rand McNally Service, Thomas' Register in addition to the many out-of-town telephone and city directories.

FIRE PREVENTION

Fire prevention work in 1949 was carried out by a special committee under the chairmanship of Robert McDowell. This committee worked in cooperation with the city fire department and carried out a complete promotional program in all of the usual phases with the schools, service clubs, churches, and throughout the retail district.

This is a project carried out for the ultimate purpose of reducing fire losses and eventually reducing insurance premiums.

"INDUSTRIAL ALTOONA"

Shortly after the chamber of commerce moved its offices to the Penelec Building, July 15, 1949, a Penelec window was assigned to it for the purpose of displaying our local industries one at a time, twice each month.

This has been carried through regularly since that time. Each time the pertinent facts about the company are given on separate information cards such as the average annual pay roll, the number of employees, where the products are sold, together with a display of the products manufactured.

During Pennsylvania Week radio station WRTA offered to implement the program by high lighting an industry each week on a 15-minute radio broadcast. These broadcasts are tape-recorded Friday afternoon in the plant. Bill Clear MC's the program with a running description of what he sees as he travels with his roving mike through the plant. The program is then rebroadcast each Sunday at 12:15 p. m.

On November 14, the Altoona Mirror volunteered to cooperate with this community industrial education program by sending a reporter and a photographer into the plant to interview the management and employees and to run the human interest story each Saturday.

This public relations project has been developing a great deal of community interest as well as building employee morale in the industries. Thousands of people are learning for the first time what is being made in Altoona and that job opportunities here are not as scarce as they are sometimes led to believe.

It is not intended that this subject be confined strictly to basic industries, but to include all of those business and service establishments that contribute to the community basic income.

Civilian Control or Militarism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. W. STERLING COLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, there recently appeared in an issue of the United States News, an editorial introducing a complete reproduction of a report by the Committee for Economic Development entitled "Civilian Control or Militarism?" Because of the outstanding reputation and achievements of the members of the Research and Policy Committee of the CED and because of the timeliness of the matter which is discussed, I feel it is of widespread national interest and should be available to every citizen for calm consideration. Therefore, I am asking that it be included as an extension of my remarks.

The editorial and report are as follows:

WHERE IS THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF?

(By David Lawrence)

America's defenses are in a sorry state.

Billions are being spent in the name of defense but the American people are being deceived by an official propaganda of canned speeches and statements into believing that national security is being attained.

When a committee of America's most enlightened businessmen, speaking through a staff of educators and qualified observers of governmental functions, issues a comprehensive report calling attention to neglect and failure, it is time for the American people to become concerned.

As a service to the public, the text of the report of this group, known as the Committee for Economic Development, is printed in full on the pages immediately following this editorial.

The CED already has played a vital part in the formation of American opinion on questions of national and international importance. It has always taken a progressive view. It is liberal in its outlook. It is concerned with human rights as well as property rights. Until he came to the Government recently, Paul Hoffman was the head of this organization.

What the new report says should be read by every Member of Congress, because it is that body which has the final responsibility for our defenses. America has not yet succumbed to the general staff concept of militarism originated by the Germans and now the undercover objective of the military autocrats at the Pentagon.

The CED particularly stresses the tendency today to build up a military dictatorship. It doesn't call names or become a party to the tragic differences that have arisen at the top levels in Washington between the armed services. But it does pointedly call attention to palpable weaknesses in the structure and the threat to individual freedoms.

Loss of freedoms: Unlike many reports of criticism, the CED proposes solutions. It strikes at the heart of the issue—the lack of civilian control and the manner in which military bureaucracy has taken over in Washington. It emphasizes the loss of freedoms—the censorship, the suppression, the interference with individual liberties. It might well have added that the recent purges and the vindictiveness with which some personnel policies are administered in the armed services smack more of the methods of the Nazis and the Stalinites than it does of free America.

The report doesn't, of course, cover all the ground. Members of Congress who have ventured to go contrary to some of the demands of the military bureaucrats have actually been threatened with opposition at the polls by veterans' groups controlled in the Pentagon. The pressure to sway the Armed Services Committees of Congress is extraordinary.

One-man control: But with keen insight, the CED points at the root of the trouble—the tendency to let one bureaucrat control everything. In the passion for unification one man—the Secretary of Defense—has been given dictatorial powers, with virtually no checks and balances. If he falls under the influence of the military bureaucrats, there is no effective way to overcome his mistakes or for the public even to know about them.

So the CED suggests that there be added to the National Security Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities. It further recommends that one of these members be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security, and that one be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

It was also recommended that the role of the National Security Resources Board be clarified and developed and that a full-time Chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

Other recommendations of the CED are that within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developing and evaluating defense policy and that a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

Most of all, the CED stresses the importance of constant attention by the Nation to the security program in its relation to individual liberties and our free economy.

But as one reads the report, these vital questions come to mind: What has the Commander in Chief been doing? Who has been pulling the wool over his eyes? Does he know what is really going on in the defense set-up? Why has the situation been allowed to reach the state of inefficiency and scandalous confusion that now exists? Where is the Commander in Chief?

CIVILIAN CONTROL OR MILITARISM?—A STATEMENT ON NATIONAL POLICY BY THE RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

I. THE THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

1. We live in a world of insecurity, in a critical period which may last a generation

Since the surrender of Germany and Japan 4 years ago, there has been no peace. Peace conferences end in deadlock; peace treaties remain unsigned. The institutions of world government are unproved and indecisive. New weapons of destruction dominate the headlines.

The coalition that won the war has broken up; former allies have divided into hostile camps. The former enemy presents an uncertain problem. Arms expenditures do not fall to expected levels and the atom bomb seems to be no longer an American secret. A disturbing sense of insecurity is everywhere. This is cold war.

The fear of war may dominate our lives for a generation. The imminent threat of war will rise and fall; we may face alternating periods of optimism and pessimism, but the threat may last for decades. We must assume that war is not inevitable but we must also assume that there is little prospect of genuine peace in the near future. Large-scale measures for national security seem necessary for years to come.

2. We are now faced with entirely new problems

Changes in the world distribution of power, added to revolutionary developments in military weapons, have fundamentally changed the character of our security problem.

Historically, we have been slow to fight and quick to disarm. We have opposed large standing armies. We have opposed economic controls for military purposes except in a shooting war. We have opposed peacetime censorship.

Our past defense policy has been successful in large part because of our distance from potential aggressors. Our allies have had the strength to hold off the enemy while we rearmed. But, in today's era of atomic bombs, of planes faster than sound, of electronics, and of germ warfare, distance loses much of its value as a defensive barrier. Potential allies are no longer in a position to insure us time for rearmament. Possible aggressors can act swiftly, secretly, and with the cooperation of individuals within our borders. In such aggression, the great manufacturing, supply, and operating bases in America seem the natural targets of first attack.

For the first time in our history, we, in effect, share a common border with powerful potential enemies.

3. Today's conditions necessitate a major security program

In this new situation we Americans are painfully learning that our security program cannot be kept to a minor budget or to an incidental effect on our peacetime lives. While we continuously exert every effort to prevent war, at the same time we must be prepared to fight at a moment's notice.

On military defense alone we are now spending over $14,000,000,000 a year, fifteen times as much as before the last war. In addition, billions of dollars are to be spent on the rearming of other nations.

But our security program is only partly a matter of rearmament. The European recovery program on which we spent over $4,000,000,000 in fiscal 1949 is in large part a security measure. So also are such projects as atomic energy, our foreign broadcasts, and the conduct of much of our diplomacy in incoming intelligence.

Estimates of the cost for rearmament and other forms of security expenditure at home and abroad during the next few years amount to $20,000,000,000 or more as an annual minimum. This is nearly a tenth of our national production. It is truly a tremendous expenditure of national resources.

The security program affects our lives in still other ways. It is reflected in peacetime Selective Service. It is reflected in the loyalty investigations. It is reflected in high and still higher taxes and their effect on our behavior. It is reflected in censorship over scientific and technical information. It is reflected in the confusion of citizens unable to evaluate national policy because of limited knowledge and information.

The security program is a necessary and, at the same time, a dangerous force in our society.

4. Our security program threatens our individual freedoms

Though adequate security is essential to protect our freedoms, the program aimed at security raises new threats to our freedoms and to our way of life. Under it there has been a great increase in the role of the military in our Government, a great increase in bureaucracy, and expanding dominance of Government over industry and in increasing interference with individual freedoms.

Much of this is inevitable. When we increase our military defenses we necessarily increase the role of the military in our Government. When we increase the share of our resources devoted to armament, we unavoidably enlarge the scope of Government in industry, in politics, in science and education, and in every sphere of life.

We have already given up important freedoms without adequate challenge. Freedoms unexercised may be freedoms forfeited.

This trend, particularly if coupled with fear and hysteria or with complacency and ignorance, may produce policies which, in the name of security, endanger essential liberties. Security measures, uncurbed by the requirements of freedom, can undermine our free institutions. Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us along a dangerous road—a road that ends in what has aptly been called a garrison-police state.

In a garrison-police state, the soldier and political policeman rise to power while the institutions of civilian society and of freedom shrink. In the name of security, channels of public information dry up; the press becomes a mere purveyor of official hand-outs. Cut off from significant information, editors, commentators, and group leaders become less accurate in their judgments. The process of public discussion atrophies. Political parties decline. The power of Congress dwindles. Administration by civilians shrinks, relative to administration in uniform. The courts weaken. Cut off from information, the power of the citizen fades. Local plans are subordinated to central purposes. The free market is constricted. Labor is hedged in by special regulations. Consumers find their range of choice reduced. Decisions come to be made by an all-powerful Government. All freedoms suffer.

5. We must seek both national security and individual freedom

National security means national freedom—freedom to determine our own national policies without external coercion. This is a basic national goal. Our system of individual freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of opportunity, freedom of worship, and other freedoms—is an equally basic objective of national policy.

Yet neither national security nor individual freedom can be absolute. Both can be increased by improved efficiency and balance within the security program. But measures to increase one can operate to decrease the other. Where there is such conflict, the problem is to work out an acceptable balance. Just how much we allow security measures to impair freedom must depend on circumstances, and the relative risks to security on the one hand and to the survival of free institutions on the other.

In time of war, security takes temporary precedence over individual freedom. Restrictions of freedom are freely accepted when they seem necessary for national survival. The need for unity, swift action, and secrecy overrides normal resistance.

At the present time the balance must be weighted in the direction of freedom. Freedom itself contributes to security. Freedom of scientific inquiry contributes to the production of improved weapons. The maintenance of a free economy encourages the development of economic strength and the growth of a strong, self-reliant people. The maintenance of individual freedoms creates the greatest bulwark of our security—the energy and intelligence of freemen working together to build and to save their own and their country's freedom.

Even more important, freedom and the dignity of the individual are the very foundation of our society, and the ends for which we are striving. Without them security loses its purpose.

II. ON WHAT DOES OUR FREEDOM DEPEND?

Freedom depends on adequate security measures. But the security program threatens two major institutions on which our freedom depends: The traditional supremacy of the civilian over the military and our system of individual liberties. Herein lies the dilemma.

1. Civilian supremacy is essential to freedom

The men who drafted our Constitution provided that a civilian—the President—should be Commander in Chief of the armed forces. They insisted also on the civilian control represented by the authority of Congress and, beyond this, by the power of citizens to elect the Congress and the President. This civilian principle has been advanced in many other ways: by appointment of civilian Secretaries of the War and Navy (and now Defense) Departments, by civilian control of the War Production Board in World War II, by civilian control of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The purpose of this civilian control of the military is clear: (1) To protect free institutions; (2) to insure that military measures fit into the larger programs of national security and national policy of which the military is only a part, and (3) to promote efficiency in the Military Establishment itself.

There is today no direct challenge to the principle of civilian supremacy nor to the legal chain through which it can be exercised. But the magnitude and character of our security program make the effective exercise of civilian supremacy increasingly difficult and all the more necessary.

The Difficulties the President Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

As Chief Executive and as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, the President is the constitutional manager of our security system. In the discharge of his responsibilities he must work through many agencies. The Department of Defense is responsible for the military aspects of security. The Department of State is responsible for developing and carrying out a foreign policy geared to our security. Many other agencies play important roles, among them the Atomic Energy Commission and the Economic Cooperation Administration.

To assist in coordinating the work of these many agencies, the President relies upon his Cabinet, upon a few immediate advisers, and upon such staff agencies as the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, the National Security Council, and the National Security Resources Board.

The complexity of our security organization suggests the magnitude of the burdens placed upon the President. He urgently needs an effective staff to provide him with a comprehensive and balanced review of the security program. For such review the President requires the efficient operation of the two top-level Cabinet committees, the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

These two agencies, though not well known to the public, are potentially two of the most powerful and valuable agencies designed to assist the President on security matters. They were established by the National Security Act of 1947 (amended in 1949). The National Security Council was created to advise the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policy. It now consists of:

The President, the Vice President, the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board.

The President may add additional members.

So far, the National Security Council has not fully lived up to its high potential though it has made important progress. It has been effective in dealing with certain emergency matters, has developed increased coordination between the State and Defense Departments (including the Central Intelligence Agency and the Joint Chiefs of Staff) and has made progress in developing defense policies. But it does not appear that it has yet formulated a comprehensive set of current and long-range security policies covering both foreign and domestic aspects of the problem. As a result, the President is seriously handicapped in carrying out his responsibility to recommend a balanced and comprehensive security program to the Congress and the people.

The National Security Resources Board, which also reports directly to the President, was created to advise the President on the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. Under a civilian chairman, the Board consists of the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Treasury, the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Commerce, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Labor.

The National Security Resources Board has not lived up to its potential. It was established to prepare a sound mobilization plan, to formulate stock-pile policy, to relate the demands of our security policies to national capacities and resources, and in general to survey the impact of security programs upon the economy in times of peace or war. It has been characterized by lack of clarity of purpose and by inability to establish satisfactory working relationships with other security agencies. Its failure to fulfill its purposes not only handicaps the National Security Council in its policy deliberations but further weakens the hand of the President.

The National Security Act also set up a new executive department of the Government, the Defense Department, under a Secretary of Defense, who is designated as the principal assistant to the President in all matters relating to the Department of Defense. The act also provided for the Joint Chiefs of Staff as principal military advisers to the President, to the Secretary of Defense, and to the National Security Council. The act further established a War Council to advise the Secretary of Defense on broad policy matters affecting the armed forces. It established a Munitions Board to deal with such matters as procurement and the military phases of industrial mobilization plans. It established a Research and Development Board to deal with scientific research. Finally it reconstituted the three military departments of Army, Navy, and Air Force.

The Difficulties the Congress Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

The Congress also has encountered great difficulties in exercising its responsibilities for national security policy.

At least two-thirds of the committees of both Houses are concerned in one way or another with security policy. The Committees on Foreign Relations, Armed Services, and Appropriations are obviously concerned. But other standing committees such as Agriculture, Labor, and Finance also deal with aspects of security policy. And such joint committees as those on Atomic Energy, the Economic Report, and the Economic Recovery Program are likewise involved.

Problems come before Congress in piecemeal fashion. Present procedure exposes and irons out some inconsistencies. It eliminates some superfluous items and assures a certain degree of economy and efficiency. But no congressional agency is responsible for looking at all aspects of security policy with a view to inconsistencies, duplications, and oversights. Neither house has a committee structure designed to secure a balanced, comprehensive view of security policy as a whole.

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 went far toward improving the organization of Congress. The number of committees was reduced. The burden upon the individual legislator was to some extent lightened. The standing committee structure of both Houses was made more nearly parallel with the structure of the executive branch. But there is as yet no agency in the Congress to parallel the National Security Council. Congress is not yet organized to deal with security problems on a broad and balanced basis.

The Difficulties the Citizen Faces in Exercising Civilian Supremacy

Under our form of government the final review of security measures—and in many cases their initiation—lies with the public. To carry out this responsibility, the citizens should have the advantage of an efficient organization of the legislative and executive branches of government. The present faulty organization produces needless public confusion as to security policy.

The citizen also needs much basic information he now lacks. The Government must withhold certain specific information in order to keep it from potential enemies. The problem is where to draw the line.

Recently the line has been drawn heavily on the side of secrecy. Our Government is following a much more comprehensive program of secrecy than in any previous period when we were not at war. Moreover, our people have been cut off from important information through censorship, both formal and informal, by foreign governments. To an unprecedented degree, the public is depending for its foreign intelligence upon what our own Government agencies decide to disclose.

Great danger is inherent in a poorly informed public. Even more important is the public apathy toward security policies due to lack of adequate and reliable information necessary for responsible discussion and judgment. An alert and well-informed citizenry is essential to the effective working of civilian supremacy on which our democratic processes depend.

Each of the links in the chain of civilian control, carrying through the President and Congress to the citizen, can and must be strengthened. Without effective civilian control there is danger that security policy will be made more and more by the military alone and in terms of the individual problems of military defense for which they are responsible rather than in the larger terms of security and freedom.

2. Maintenance of our system of individual liberties is essential to freedom

The requirements of security and the fear and hysteria generated by the threats to our security require constant vigilance to preserve our individual liberties.

We must deal vigorously and effectively with subversive activities. But we must also maintain the safeguards to individual liberty. A threat to our liberty arises when the loyalty of individual American citizens is called into question. First, the loyalty of Government employees is examined. Then investigations extend to the managers and employees of industries working on defense contracts. Suspicion readily spreads to scientists, educators, and students engaged in research. An atmosphere of suspicion favors the growth of political police. Agencies with power to investigate sometimes degenerate into organs of oppression and intimidation. Necessary investigations into loyalty can deteriorate into witch hunts which threaten the whole structure of individual freedom.

A more indirect threat to individual liberties comes when the security program endangers the free economy which underlies so much of our individual freedom. Under conditions characteristic of a free economy—free markets, individual initiative, and a minimum of direct Government control—our great power as a Nation has developed. Our society looks to individuals to make the multitude of decisions about production, consumption, and other elements of economic activity. We depend on the action and interaction of individuals and enterprises to produce a sound and expanding economy.

While this free economy is not perfect, it is the most flexible instrument yet devised to provide the individual citizen with maximum opportunity for the development of his capacities. This is a statement often made, but perhaps it cannot be repeated too often.

A security program of the present size threatens our free economy in three major ways: (1) By the burden of taxes on economic incentives; (2) by the control of business activity through Government contracts; and (3) by the likelihood of recurrent proposals to impose direct controls over economic activity, in the name of security.

1. The new billions in taxes weaken the incentive imperative to the successful working of our free economy. Heavy taxes can weaken the incentive to produce. They can stifle new enterprise and reduce our long-range ability to produce both guns and butter. Their burden will depend both on their amount and how they are collected.

2. The more that Government purchases dominate the market, the more businessmen become, in effect, hired administrators of Government contracts. The free market is thus narrowed. As Government purchases rise, the power of Government to use uneconomic means to control production is increased. Carried far enough, the expansion in Government purchasing can destroy a free economy.

3. The pressure for direct controls to strengthen the military program is great. In wartime this pressure is overwhelming. The drafting of manpower and industry, the allocation of strategic materials, price and wage controls, and a host of other direct controls have become a necessary part of modern warfare. In war, the survival of the society takes precedence over immediate maintenance of a free economy. But, now, the question of direct controls is quite a different matter. The preservation of the free economy becomes an essential objective. The use of such powers for security or other reasons would reduce the area in which free market forces were able to operate and, carried far enough, will undermine the free economy.

Security bought at the cost of destroying our system of individual liberties or our free economy would be self-defeating.

3. An adequate and balanced security program is essential to freedom

Though our freedom is threatened by our security program it would be threatened even more gravely without it. Freedom cannot survive in today's world without reasonably adequate security.

An adequate security program obviously requires a large military establishment. But it must also include such nonmilitary weapons as diplomacy, world information, economic aid, and an effective intelligence service.

Diplomacy is, in a sense, our first line of security. Effective diplomacy can help in preventing war and can strengthen our position in case of war. It can help build up a network of understanding among all nations willing to act together for peaceful purposes. It can hinder the building up of hostile combinations of nations. It can enhance the authority of international organizations.

The program for supplying information to other peoples through the Voice of America and kindred activities is also a major instrument of national security. News about America is a corrective to the one-sided reports that distort the image of our country in the minds of the leaders as well as the peoples of so many areas of the world. It is a realistic influence for peace. It keeps hope alive among the oppressed.

Nondemocracies are likely to underestimate the strength of democracy. They seldom understand that the seeming disorder of democracy is not chaos but only a type of order that differs from a chain of command. The Kaiser and Hitler both erred by greatly underrating the strength and determination of the United States. We do not want such errors again.

Less formalized means of communication are equally important. The representatives of American business going abroad exercises a vital influence on the thinking of key individuals in foreign countries. American scholars abroad can do much to correct the distorted picture of America that some foreign leaders and peoples have formed. Foreign scholars and students who come here speak with an even more powerful voice when they return home as experts on the United States. The treatment of news by the American press services, radio commentators, and news films can have a profound impact upon our security position abroad.

The European recovery program also contributes to security. It speeds recovery and economic development abroad by increasing production, and reducing impediments to trade and so strengthens our allies. It can strengthen the will among our friends abroad to cooperate for peace and security. This will would be weakened if America existed as an island of prosperity in a poverty-ridden world.

An integrated and effective incoming intelligence service is a basic part of an adequate security program. An accurate appraisal of how our friends and potential enemies think and feel toward Americans and what they are doing about it is essential if we are to time our policies and production programs to the needs of every situation. We need to know of specific weapon developments in other nations and of the strategic disposition of military forces. Knowledge of impending attack may mean the difference between victory and defeat. An intelligence service, properly organized and staffed, can be equal in value to many ships, tanks, and planes.

In the working out of an adequate security program, the chain of civilian control has a dominant role to play. The military, whether Army, Navy, or Air, are specialists. They are trained to be responsible for military matters but not for the broad questions of security policy and other elements of national policy. Such broad questions are necessarily a civilian responsibility.

Even in military matters, civilian leadership can be important. In 1940, public opinion was ahead of the official military and administrative opinion as to the country's capacity to produce and use planes. Similarly, civilian pressure has been a primary force toward unification of the armed forces. An effective civilian control can offset any tendency for the military to prepare to fight a possible war III with the weapons and strategy of War II.

A satisfactory balance and timing must be maintained between the different parts of the security program and between this program and other national programs if it is to be effective and not a greater threat to freedom than is necessary. At the present time, there is reason to believe that our security program is neither efficient nor in balance. There are evidences of low efficiency and, despite the Unification Act of 1947 and the changes effected in the summer of 1949, the Nation's defense forces are characterized by deep-seated service rivalries, by widespread conflict over basic strategic concepts and weapons, and by an alleged low state of morale in one of the services.

Furthermore, a balance must be kept between the security program and programs serving other objectives of national policy. In particular, welfare programs compete with the security program for funds. Yet welfare programs can contribute to security by reducing inequities in our system that provide effective ammunition for hostile propaganda.

In the development of the security program, a fine quality of judgment is required at all levels. Recommendations need to be made by the executive branch after balanced consideration of all aspects of national policy. Our lawmakers must keep America solvent as

to both ideals and resources. An informed public needs to remain alert to the dangers to both security and freedom.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TOWARD IMPROVING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND PRESERVING OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

There can be no simple solution to the problems of security and freedom. We must look to time and the wisdom of public discussion to find the answers. But public wisdom cannot be brought to bear if the chain of civilian control is ineffective, if the basis for informed discussion is lacking, or if policy is approached in a piecemeal fashion.

The recommendations which follow offer only one step toward bringing public discussion to bear on these continuing problems. They are concerned almost entirely with organization and procedure. Their aim is to strengthen the machinery by which adequate and balanced discussion of security policy and its relation to freedom can be carried out at all levels. It is our belief that these recommendations, if put into effect, will lead to a powerful strengthening of both freedom and security. At the same time we realize that there may be alternative methods of organization and procedure which would be equally effective toward this end. Our basic concern is that there be effective control and that this lead to a balanced over-all review of security policies in order to provide adequate national security while preserving our individual freedom.

Toward more effective exercise of civilian supremacy

The strengthening of civilian control requires action at each level to aid the President, the Congress, and the individual citizen in the exercise of their respective responsibilities.

At the Executive Level

To aid the President in developing a balanced policy with respect to security and freedom, we recommend:

(1) That the National Security Council be developed as the principal executive agency on which the President relies for formulating and reviewing comprehensive and balanced security policies.

(2) That there be added to the Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities.

The suggestion has been made that a new civilian commission on security policy and freedom be set up as a means for strengthening civilian control. We do not recommend this more drastic step at the present time. Rather than experiment with an entirely new agency, we favor assigning a broader role to the National Security Council in the hope that this more moderate proposal will serve the end of adequate civilian control. The Council is already established. Since about the time of the Greek crisis in 1947 it has met regularly, perhaps averaging a meeting a week. The statute under which it operates is phrased broadly enough to allow the Council to advise on all phases of national security, including its impact on individual freedom.

The Security Council (in cooperation with the National Security Resources Board, the Bureau of the Budget, the Council of Economic Advisers, and other appropriate agencies) should continuously take the long view of all of America's goals and commitments, our human and material resources, our rapidly changing technology, and the vital problem of timing. It should, on an objective basis, consider our security program with respect, for instance, to such basic and diverse questions as the utilization of island bases, new approaches to the stock piling of critical materials, the integration of foreign aid, lend-lease, and our own military program, the peacetime and wartime uses of atomic energy and other scientific developments, the impact of specific military programs upon our natural resources, the character of direct controls required, if any, and the general trends of our diplomacy. In addition to these examples of more obvious problems, the Council should concern itself with the psychological aspects of security, such as the reorientation of Germany and Japan with relation to democracy and the use of propaganda as a weapon. Finally, it should concern itself with the relation of all these security policies to the problem of freedom.

To help achieve a balanced and well-rounded security program, the three new full-time civilian members of the Council should be chosen for breadth of experience and outstanding judgment. They should be appointed by the President with the approval of the Senate and serve at the will of the President. They should have the standing of Cabinet officers and should attend Cabinet meetings at the discretion of the President. They should be kept free from all duties not directly related to the work of the Council. At present, the regular statutory members of the Council are already overburdened with great administrative responsibilities. The three additional members would be available for continuous top-level work on security problems.

One new member should become a general assistant to the Chairman. The other two members should be given special responsibility with respect to public information and individual liberties in addition to their regular duties. These responsibilities are indicated later in specific recommendations.

We further recommend:

3. That the role of the National Security Resources Board be clarified and developed.

4. That a full-time Chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

The work of the National Security Resources Board is closely related to the over-all responsibility of the National Security Council. The Chairman of the Board is a member of the Council and should bring to bear in the Council's deliberations the views of a Board and staff concerned with the relationship of security needs to the Nation's economy. Only a full-time Chairman can perform this vital function. It is imperative that the President clarify the role of the Board and appoint a full-time Chairman who can concentrate his energies on the economic phases of our security problems.

Clarification of the role of the Board will involve consideration of its relations with other agencies such as the Department of Defense, and of its planning duties with respect to industrial mobilization, economic warfare, and stock piling.

We further recommend:

5. That within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developing and evaluating defense policy.

As far as the military aspects of the security program are concerned, the chain of civilian supremacy has to start in the Department of Defense. In order for civilian control to be effective and to make its contribution, civilians have to be in touch with the work where it is being done. For the Secretary of Defense to perform his civilian role he needs a strong civilian staff in close touch with the various aspects of defense policy as they are worked out.

We believe that with these five changes the President could exercise much more effectively his responsibilities in the chain of civilian direction.

At the Congressional Level

To strengthen the hand of Congress in achieving a proper balance of security and freedom, the Congress should take positive steps to coordinate the various aspects of security policy. To this end we recommend:

1. That a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

2. That as far as possible these Committees on National Security act together in the manner of a joint committee.

There are two clearly appropriate ways by which the Congress could provide itself with the means for viewing the security program as a whole. One is to create a Joint Committee on National Security. The other is to create a separate committee in each House. Both methods have advantages and disadvantages. We believe that on the whole the advantage lies in having two separate committees, particularly if some of the advantages of a joint committee can be obtained through joint meetings of the two committees and close collaboration by their staffs.

Each House would, of course, decide on the proper membership of its Committee on National Security. Presumably each committee would include members representing the standing committees chiefly responsible for security, including those for Armed Services, Foreign Relations, and Appropriations. Standing committees having to do with other significant parts of the total security program, such as Agriculture, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Labor, and Banking and Currency should also be represented. This would assure direct acquaintance on the part of all the committees responsible for legislation on a significant part of the security program with the state of specific legislative proposals and the problems involved.

Adequate staffs would be essential for the successful operation of the Security Committees. They are needed to assemble and organize the material on the basis of which balanced policy can be made.

These securities committees would parallel at the Congressional level the activities of the National Security Council. They would be reviewing rather than hearing bodies. With the help of competent staffs, they should maintain a comprehensive and balanced picture of the security policies of the nation and their relation to freedom, enabling them to report to the other Members of Congress and to the public on the picture as a whole or on particular aspects as occasion arose. There should be close cooperation between the security committees of the two chambers, and with the National Security Council.

At the Public Level

To encourage and assist the citizens in exercising his responsibility for security policy, we recommend:

1. That one full-time civilian member of the National Security Council be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security.

2. That the President devote a part of his annual message to the Congress and the public on the state of the Union to a discussion of the problems involved in the national security program and their relation to freedom.

3. That vigorous effort be made to stimulate discussion throughout the Nation on the problems of national security and their relation to freedom.

The assignment of one of the proposed full-time members of the National Security Council to be responsible for a more effective flow of information to the public would tend to counteract the present trend toward undue secrecy. This official should study all security regulations and recommend to the President changes designed to provide all possible access to information without sacrifice of basic security. He should examine the practical administration of security regulations with a view to creating an atmosphere favorable to legitimate disclosure. And he should constantly press for the release of information.

There is no more essential job to be done in America than to keep the sources of public opinion as free as possible from blocs and obstacles. The naming of a full-time member of the National Security Council to devote himself to this task would be a fitting recognition of its importance.

It will be necessary to keep security regulations under continual study to make sure that the curtain of secrecy is not drawn tighter than necessary. Some information must be withheld. But we believe that the regulations could be so drawn as to provide the citizen with much more information than he now receives.

More important than the letter of a regulation is the spirit in which it is administered. At present, there is one-sided emphasis upon the importance of secrecy in the indoctrination of officers, both military and nonmilitary. A Government official is rarely commended for disclosure. He may, however, be reprimanded or otherwise disciplined for "underclassification," that is, for failure to make material confidential or secret. Accumulations of overclassified material can be found in many offices. A better balance between secrecy and disclosure will give the citizen a sounder basis for exercising responsibility, without impairing the administration of security. Among the administrative practices to which attention needs to be paid is the custom of leaving classification in the hands of subordinates, especially clerks or secretaries. The resulting resistance to disclosure can be overcome only if there is positive pressure to release information.

The annual state of the Union message of the President has been throughout our history a vital means of providing Congress and the public with an over-all view of national policies and problems. Since it seems probable that the security-freedom problem will be a paramount issue for many years, it would be desirable that the President devote an important section of this message to the status of our security policies and their relation to freedom. This section could be based upon reports from the National Security Council and should be a comprehensive review of our security position and policies.

There is constant need for more intensive public discussion of the problems of security and freedom. Public opinion is not as effective as it should be so long as it depends largely on random exposure to news and comment. Unless there is a comprehensive framework of discussion, the public will be confused.

Various means are available for stimulating public discussion of security issues. Congressional hearings can act as a stimulus. The President's message on national security would provide a basis for discussion. News editors should invite discussion and radio time should be allocated to this purpose. Special forums throughout the Nation should be sponsored by universities, civic associations, and other groups of citizens. These activities should aim to clarify the goals of national-security policy and their relation to freedom, to review current trends affecting security and freedom, and to evaluate pending alternatives of policy.

Toward preserving our system of individual liberties

To strengthen the forces which operate to preserve our individual liberties, we recommend:

1. That one full-time civilian member of the National Security Council be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

2. That the section of the President's annual state of the union message devoted to the national security program (recommended above) include a review of the relation of the security program to individual liberties.

3. That the National Security Council, in reviewing the security program, give particular attention to the danger of undermining the free economy.

The preservation of individual liberties must rest primarily on an alert public opinion. By having a full-time civilian member of the National Security Council responsible for analyzing the effects of security policies and measures on our liberties the danger of unnecessary limitations on liberty can be reduced. These analyses can also provide the basis for the presidential review of the subject. Such periodic reports on the effects of the security program on liberties could greatly aid the public in exercising its responsibility for preserving liberty.

In appraising the threats of the security programs to the free economy, the National Security Council should give particular attention to the magnitude of the program both because of the resources it absorbs and the harmful effect on incentives which results from the heavy taxation necessary to support it. The Council should also give attention to the existing procurement machinery with the object of reducing to a minimum the danger of Government coercion of private business through contract controls and the danger of coercion of individuals through job assignments and similar restrictions. Finally, the Council should maintain a strong presumption against the use of direct controls to carry out a security program in a situation short of war, since direct controls tend to limit production, hold down the standard of living, and undermine the free economy on which so many of our freedoms depend.

Toward a more balanced and efficient security program

The recommendations made for preserving our freedom will also help to produce better balance and reduce waste in the security program. In particular, strengthening the Executive through broadening the role of the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board, strengthening the Congress through the establishment of committees on national security, and strengthening the citizen in exercising his responsibilities will all help the development of effective security. Measures for preserving our individual liberties and for preserving incentives and maintaining freedom of markets can also contribute to security.

In addition, we recommend that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government conduct a continuing review of the security program to see—

1. That waste and inefficiency in security expenditure is kept at a minimum;

2. That the security program itself is kept in internal balance, both as among the various types of military expenditure, and as between military and other forms of security expenditure;

3. That measures to further the security objective and measures to further other important objectives of national policy are kept in balance. An over-all review of all national policies, their timing and their economic cost is needed to appraise their effects on both security and freedom.

The committee believes that such a review is especially needed because, in its opinion, the present security program tends to be unbalanced; it tends to overemphasize the military at the expense of nonmilitary measures. An informed diplomatic service, a strengthened Voice of America and a more effective intelligence system would cost relatively little compared to military arms. Their contribution to security could be many times that of an equal expenditure. We believe that the desirability of expanding each of these activities should be given careful attention.

We also urge an effective foreign economic-assistance program. Economic assistance is not a cure-all or save-all; it can only be a means of helping other nations to help themselves. A failure of the economies of our potential allies would weaken our security.

Further, it is our opinion that the present security program has been developed with too little attention to its consequences upon other national objectives. We believe this to be true not only with regard to the objective of preserving and strengthening our free society, but also the objectives of increasing productivity and living standards and providing greater opportunities for all our people.

Better coordination of the separate aspects of security policy is needed. In particular, there needs to be a close integration between military policy and foreign policy.

The question of timing becomes tremendously important. We must not crystallize our weapons program lest we waste resources in weapons that become obsolete. The cold war is a matter of continually recurring crises. Scares will be frequent. It will take a fine judgment to use and retain the powerful assets and resources of America. Timing is a part of the balance.

The attainment of a balanced and efficient security program requires thoughtful, continuing attention by the President, by the Congress, and by all citizens. Given such attention, we believe that an adequate security program can be developed which will be consistent with a strengthened chain of civilian control, with the maintenance of our system of individual liberties and with the preservation of our free economy.

Vigilance is the price of freedom

In the last analysis, the economic strength and the freedom and security of this country rest on the moral and spiritual vigor of its people. The prestige and friendship we enjoy in many parts of the world arise not merely because of our power but because we have offered the world a unique brand of idealism—the determination to base our political organization on the capacity of individuals for self-government.

By holding to the principle of self-government, we give dignity to the individual and, at the same time, we place on him great responsibility. We are dedicated to the idea that individuals should have maximum opportunity to realize their individual capacities—spiritually, intellectually, and materially. But equally we rely on individuals to exercise the powers of self-government in a responsible fashion. A free society can be preserved only by responsible citizenship.

Under this system, we have fared well as a people. More of our people have enjoyed more freedom and greater material benefits than have the people of any other land. We have developed a nation of self-reliant individuals.

Now the new requirements of national security threaten our freedom. A major security program requires big Government and means greater interference in the lives of us all. The danger is likely to be with us a long time. We must, therefore, have a security program that is continuously in balance, both internally and with other Government programs. It must be efficiently administered and must avoid waste in the use of limited national resources. We must maintain our dynamic free economy and we must insure the flow of information to the public necessary to the operation of democratic government. We regard the recommendations we have made above as likely to contribute to these ends. But improvements in governmental organization and procedure are not, of themselves, sufficient. Only an alert and responsible citizenry can insure that adequate security is obtained without the loss of essential freedoms. We are confident that the American people can and will solve this problem.

RESEARCH AND POLICY COMMITTEE OF THE CED

Marion B. Folsom, chairman; treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co., Rochester, N. Y.

Beardsley Ruml, vice chairman, New York, N. Y.

William Benton, chairman of the board, Encyclopedia Britannica, Inc., and Muzak Corp., New York, N. Y.

John D. Biggers, president, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass Co., Toledo, Ohio.

James F. Brownlee, Fairfield, Conn.

W. L. Clayton, chairman of the board, Anderson, Clayton & Co., Houston, Tex.

S. Sloan Colt, president, Bankers Trust Co., New York, N. Y.

Gardner Cowles, president and publisher, Des Moines Register and Tribune, Des Moines, Iowa.

Chester C. Davis, president, Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.

Clarence Francis, chairman of the board, General Foods Corp., New York, N. Y.

Philip L. Graham, president and publisher, Washington Post, Washington, D. C.

John M. Hancock, partner, Lehman Bros., New York, N. Y.

George L. Harrison, chairman of the board, New York Life Insurance Co., New York, N. Y.

Robert Heller, president, Robert Heller & Associates, Inc., Cleveland, Ohio.

Jay C. Hormel, chairman of the board, Geo. A. Hormel & Co., Austin, Minn.

Amory Houghton, chairman of the board, Corning Glass Works, Corning, N. Y.

Eric Johnston, president, Motion Picture Association of America, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Ernest Kanzler, chairman of the board, Universal C. I. T. Credit Corp., Detroit, Mich.

Meyer Kestnbaum, president, Hart, Schaffner & Marx, Chicago, Ill.

Fred Lazarus, Jr., president, Federated Department Stores, Inc., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Fowler McCormick, chairman of the board, International Harvester Co., Chicago, Ill.

W. A. Patterson, president, United Air Lines, Chicago, Ill.

Philip D. Reed, chairman of the board, General Electric Co., New York, N. Y.

Harry Scherman, president, Book-of-the-Month Club, New York, N. Y.

H. Christian Sonne, president, Amsinck, Sonne & Co., New York, N. Y.

J. Cameron Thomson, president, Northwest Bank Corporation, Minneapolis, Minn.

W. Walter Williams, president, Continental, Inc., Seattle, Wash.

Theodore O. Yntema, vice president in charge of finance, Ford Motor Co., Dearborn, Mich.

Where Your Money Goes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, the Christmas season is supposedly over, but an editorial that appeared in the Hartford (Conn.) Courant of December 26, 1949, points up some thoughts about Santa Claus, especially how he, dressed in the garment of a beneficent government, is able to make presents to other sections of our great country from the contributions of my constituents in the Constitution State.

The editorial is as follows:

WHERE YOUR MONEY GOES

The Public Administration Clearing House is currently making a study of Federal grants. Some of these findings are worth pasting in your hat for future reference, particularly if you are one of those who believe that Uncle Sam is Santa Claus. Connecticut is contributing about $40 for every dollar it gets back from the Federal Government. Although it stands forty-fourth on the list for the total amount of Federal money returned, it stands fourth in the amount of money being siphoned from your pockets and the treasuries of Connecticut industries.

In 1947, for example, Connecticut paid $216,000,000 in Federal taxes. It got back a scant $5,023,000, far less even than the national average of $8,004,000. To add insult to injury, many of the States that are benefiting by this policy of robbing Peter to pay Paul, are offering all kinds of inducements to get Connecticut industries to move to a friendlier tax climate. Nor is the money being used in so-called poor States. Texas is an example, and a good one, because several thousand Connecticut jobs recently were transferred to that State. Although Texas paid a scant $96,000,000 in taxes, the twenty-eighth in order, it received in Federal benefits more than twice the amount Connecticut received. Oklahoma is another example. It placed second in grants received, four times that given Connecticut, but stood thirty-fifth in taxes paid.

North and South Carolina have been active in promoting the exodus of New England industries and both profited by this share-the-wealth program. For example, although South Carolina stood forty-sixth in taxes paid to the Federal Government, grants received were $8,067,000, or $3,000,000 more than Connecticut received.

As the Public Administration authorities point out quietly, "New York and Connecticut rank very low in per capita grants. This would indicate that grants are distributed so as to give the greatest benefit to the low-income States."

That may be a good idea. But for any politician in Connecticut to suggest that the Federal Government is helping Connecticut by these grants is sheer idiocy. The Federal Government is taking $40 away from Connecticut for every $1 it returns.

The demagog may weep crocodile tears over the plight of the unemployed and may seek to put on a poultice of liberalized unemployment benefits. Real statesmanship would look toward the causes which create a special emergency of unemployment during a time of great national prosperity. If such emergencies occur during prosperous times what have Connecticut citizens to look forward to in bad times? Certainly nothing very cheerful when State and Federal policies cause the atrophy of jobs and the exodus of industry to friendlier climates that are being subsidized by Connecticut taxes. Do you still believe in Santa Claus?

Income-Tax Allowance Plan for National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement by Mr. Sol M. Linowitz urging the passage of legislation to provide an income-tax allowance for the cost of health insurance as an alternative to the administration's program of political medicine. Its stress is upon inducement rather than compulsion, similar to that envisioned in H. R. 6727, which I introduced last week.

Mr. Linowitz, a prominent and able attorney of Rochester, N. Y., has done a great amount of pioneer work in this field. His research, his soundness, and his ability commend his views to careful study and favorable consideration.

A portion of his statement follows:

INCOME-TAX-ALLOWANCE PLAN FOR NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

The compulsory health-insurance program was formulated on the assumption that such a program would make available to most of the people necessary medical and hospital care as required. Its proponents maintain that voluntary plans have failed to do the job and give little promise of achieving the desired broad coverage in the future. The opponents of the program object primarily to its compulsory feature, claiming that the introduction of a Government-controlled medical system will drastically and detrimentally affect medical care and the doctor-patient relationship. They contend also that the cost of establishing and maintaining such a program will be exceedingly great and that only through some voluntary method can the problem be handled properly and in the best interests of all concerned.

Both factions appear to agree on the following:

1. The state of health of the country needs improvement, and Nation-wide prepaid medical and hospital insurance can go far to remedy this situation.

2. The primary aim of any health-insurance program adopted should be to assure adequate medical and hospital care for as many as possible.

3. The problem of the shortage of doctors, nurses, dentists, and hospitals involves a separate program of legislation and must be handled in such manner as will make available to the Nation medical facilities and services where and when required.

4. Medical care for a sizable number of people—the unemployed, the indigent, and the medically indigent—will, under any plan, have to be provided for by public funds, such as Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

The issues, therefore, can apparently be resolved in a manner acceptable to all if a program is adopted which will be voluntary in character yet lead to substantially Nation-wide insurance coverage against costs of medical and hospital care. My suggestion early this year regarding an income-tax allowance was designed to accomplish this objective. The following questions and answers may be helpful in evaluating the proposal:

I. WHAT IS THE PLAN?

The Government would provide that every person who insures himself and his dependents against the cost of medical (including hospital) care under an approved plan with a commercial or noncommercial group may claim a special and separate tax allowance (or credit) for the cost of such insurance. In other words, all taxpayers would be entitled to a tax benefit upon obtaining an approved plan of insurance affording requisite protection against medical costs. Blue Cross, Blue Shield, and other existing commercial or noncommercial groups would make such insurance available through the country. In addition, each community or group would be free to institute programs best designed to meet its own requirements. In some areas, the State itself might seek to offer such insurance to its citizens.

The object of the proposal is to induce rather than compel health insurance. Its essential value is that, by building upon established groups and practices, it offers a voluntary plan, adaptable to particular needs and free of Federal control, which would lead the average taxpayer to obtain health insurance. Furthermore, the millions of State and local employees and railroad workers not covered by the compulsory program would be eligible for coverage under this plan.

II. SHOULD THE INCOME TAX FIELD BE USED FOR THIS PURPOSE?

The Federal Government has long recognized the propriety and desirability of using the income-tax field to foster a governmental social purpose. The special tax exemptions for the blind and the aged, and the deductions for charitable contributions and extraordinary medical expenses are illustrative. In New York State the allowable tax deduction up to $150 for life-insurance premiums reflects the same philosophy. With reference to the instant proposal, the present income-tax regulations have already taken the first step in this direction by permitting the inclusion of health insurance cost in computing the right to an allowance for extraordinary medical expenses.

III. HOW WOULD THE PLAN BE IMPLEMENTED?

The most effective method for implementing such a proposal would be to allow a special tax credit to all taxpayers for a designated portion of the cost of an approved type of health insurance. Such a credit or allowance could properly vary in the different tax brackets, making the greatest allowance—and therefore offering the greatest inducement—to those in the lowest income classes. The precise nature and size of the tax allowance and the particular method of implementation will necessarily be determined by those charged with framing the required legislation.

IV. HOW MUCH WILL SUCH A PROGRAM COST?

The exact cost to the Government in lost taxes will depend on a number of factors, many of them under the control of the Government itself in setting up the program. For example, the type and size of the tax allowance offered will have tremendous bearing on this question. In addition, much will depend upon the effectiveness of the program in leading taxpayers to obtain health insurance since premiums will be directly affected by the number of people covered.

In this regard, it is important to recognize that the cost to wage earners of the compulsory insurance plan will be at least $6,000,000,000 per year. Moreover, the Government itself will admittedly be required to pay additional billions in order to make the plan effective and to administer it on a Nation-wide scale. The income-tax-allowance plan would make unnecessary any such costly Federal regulatory or administrative body.

Under any circumstances, therefore, implementation of the income-tax-allowance plan here proposed could be accomplished at substantially less cost than that involved in implementing and administering the compulsory-insurance program.

Letter on Behalf of International Union of Electrical, Radio, and Machine Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

INTERNATIONAL UNION OF ELECTRICAL,
RADIO AND MACHINE WORKERS,
Washington, D. C., January 14, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM J. GREEN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN GREEN: I am addressing this letter to you on behalf of the International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, a labor organization which was chartered by the CIO last November 2, following expulsion of the Communist-dominated United Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers.

We wish to bring to your attention an exceedingly ominous situation in our industry which we believe not only menaces democratic American trade unionism, but also involves grave questions of national security and defense.

The IUE-CIO is now engaged in a crucial Nation-wide contest with the UE over the right to represent more than a half-million men and women in our industry. Sometime in the near future that contest will culminate in a series of representation elections conducted by the National Labor Relations Board.

We of the IUE-CIO have bent every effort toward the earliest possible settlement of this representation question through NLRB elections, because: (1) We are confident that we represent the overwhelming majority of workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry; and (2) we are anxious that industrial stability be restored in this important field of production through the establishment of sound collective bargaining relations.

There have, however, been numerous obstacles placed in the way of a swift and amicable settlement of the representation issue. Most of these obstacles have been erected by UE in a deliberate and vicious campaign to postpone—and even prevent, if possible—the holding of elections. And in this campaign, as we shall show, certain sections of management, particularly the General Electric Co., have given active assistance to the discredited Communist-led minority represented by UE.

It would require a small volume to describe to you the insidious legal maneuverings and harassments employed by UE to block resolution of the representation question. In almost every city in the country where the electrical, radio, and machine industry is organized, UE has filed law suits, petitions for injunction and other court actions to prevent the membership from making their own democratic determination of their collective-bargaining agent. Suits to tie up union funds, suits to prevent use of our union's name, suits to prohibit union meetings, suits to force solvent local unions into bankruptcy—all have been commonplace. The deluge of disruptive judicial jockeying has spared no one; even the NLRB itself was sued for $100,000 by UE. Here again we claim that the position taken by management in this dispute has abetted and encouraged the UE in its prolonged legal wrangling.

We would like to emphasize as strongly as we can that this is definitely not a common jurisdictional squabble between two labor groups. This is a fundamental fight—which has long since passed from the cold-war to the hot-war stage—between two diametrically opposed concepts that affect the entire United States labor movement and, through it, our entire economy. It is a fight to the finish between democratic American trade unionism and the attempts of the Kremlin to preserve the UE as a mass base for the expression of Soviet foreign policy in this country. It is a fight, in one of the Nation's most critical industries, between loyalty to traditional American ideals and the menace to national security represented in a type of union leadership whose only loyalty is to a totalitarian foreign power. It is for these reasons that we have become increasingly apprehensive over the role that management is playing in offering aid and comfort to these implacable enemies of American liberties.

That the UE is Communist-led and Communist-dominated and that under this leadership it represents a direct threat to our national security has been recognized time and again by congressional committees and the Atomic Energy Commission among others. The accumulative evidence is overwhelming that in this "sensitive" industry, UE's leadership is more than 90 percent Communist or pro-Communist. The irrefutable truth of this was attested by the Atomic Energy Commission when it completely outlawed the UE as collective-bargaining representative for any workers employed on classified or secret atomic energy projects.

A subcommittee of the House Labor Committee, headed by Representative Charles J. Kersten, made a report on December 14, 1948, following an intensive investigation into UE. The report, which recommended contempt citations against 15 UE leaders including Leo Jandreau, the top Communist leader of UE in Schenectady and upstate New York, proposed several measures for tightening security regulations, all of which were clearly aimed at the threat to national safety represented by UE. The subcommittee declared that Communists have seized control of the UE's "national office, the executive board, the paid staff, the union newspaper and a number of its districts and locals."

Further, the subcommittee concluded: "The hold of the Communists on America's electrical industry is the hold of Communist Russia. It is communism in action—now. It is not a historical danger; it is a present danger."

This evidence of UE's flagrant subservience to Communist Party dictates and Kremlin control has, as I say, been documented repeatedly by other congressional and noncongressional groups. Consequently this information has been fully available to the employers in our industry such as General Electric.

Therefore, at no time could General Electric plead ignorance of the subversive character of the organization with which it was bargaining.

In my testimony before the Kersten subcommittee on September 2, 1948, I charged under oath that management in the electrical, radio, and machine industry has been guilty of aiding the Communist forces and discriminating against the anti-Communist elements among rank-and-file employees. I emphasized that "It has been my whole experience that the employers find it easy to get along with Communists because the Communists cannot be aggressive in adjustment of a grievance." In addition, I pointed out—giving the names of individuals—that in some instances management has even discharged known anti-Communists from their jobs at the behest of UE.

In the face of such evidence presented to the subcommittee, Congressman Kersten, not once, but twice, declared that the collusive arrangements between management and the Communist-controlled UE should be investigated.

At one point Congressman Kersten asserted, "Certainly if it is true that any management is so stupid as to cooperate with Communists, the light of day should be thrown on that situation as well as on any other situation where people are cooperating with the Communists. If there is cooperation on the management side, that should be brought out, too. I can see where it is probably even more dangerous where there is cooperation between management and the Communists."

On the same theme, Representative CARROLL D. KEARNS, who is still a member of the House Labor Committee, remarked, "I think the industry should be called upon to explain that type of action within their own industry, regardless of what it may be, if they are following procedures of that kind." Other members of the committee expressed similar sentiments.

I cite these facts for the reason that although these hearings were held in September and October 1948, there has been no move of any kind to investigate charges of

collusion between management and the totalitarian left. We in IUE-CIO believe it is a fine thing, and important, for Congress to be concerned about the Communist occupation of China and Formosa, about the containment of Soviet expansion in Europe, and the necessity of spending billions of dollars in Marshall plan funds to repel the threat of spreading bolshevism. But we also believe that Congress could wisely turn its eyes homeward toward the even greater danger constituted by opportunistic management collaborating with the Communists. It is the clear and immediate duty of Congress to investigate these charges; to ascertain, for example, whether management's patronage of Communist-controlled unions is dictated in any way by advantageous contracts the companies may hold with Amtorg, the Soviet trade agency. National security demands that the whole field of this question be publicly explored and exposed.

In this period of cold war with the world threatened by a new totalitarian wave, there can be no such thing as neutrality, particularly on the part of giant corporations whose functioning determines both the peacetime health and wartime strength of our economy. Yet management, General Electric conspicuously, pretends to a position of impartiality in this struggle which is concretely reflected in the current dispute in its plants between IUE and UE.

There is ample evidence that GE's impartially is not only a pose and a pretense but that it also disguises a definite pattern of collusion with the Communist UE. Let me offer just one example, a very recent one.

Last week, while IUE was preparing its campaign for the forthcoming NLRB elections in General Electric, more than 10,000 dues check-off cards were circulated through the vast GE plant in Schenectady, N. Y. The circulation and signing of several thousands of these cards was accomplished by UE within the space of a single day. We know that such an enormous undertaking as this could never have been accomplished without flagrant, illegal collusion between GE and UE, between foremen and other management representatives and leaders of the Communist minority of UE. We know that men were threatened with loss of their jobs, told that they would lose precious seniority, and deceived with the argument that by signing the cards the workers would only be speeding up the date of the NLRB elections. Foremen and other management representatives facilitated the distribution of these cards and actively promoted the threats and lies circulated by the UE representatives.

Such seemingly eccentric behavior by management becomes much more understandable when it is viewed against the background of the company's policies in the past. L. M. Boulware, GE's vice president in charge of labor relations, has for example, inserted full-page ads in daily newspapers titled "A Plague On Both Your Houses." This truly amazing statement by a major American corporation professed to find no difference between democratic American unionism and the revolutionary arm of the Kremlin in the United States which is dedicated to the overthrow of our form of government.

These advertisements, read by millions of Americans, expressed as GE's opinion:

"While frequently the leader and his associates on one side are termed left-wingers, and the leader and his associates are—wrongfully in our opinion, regarded as right wingers, we believe they have in the end the same objectives. We believe that what each side advocates would result in the long run in substantially the same thing for our employees, our company, and our country. In our opinion, whether they realize it or not, both are collectivists—believers in government being big and in people being little."

GE's attitude toward communistic control of its employees in wartime was disclosed when GE President Charles E. Wilson remarked during a session of the War Labor Board, "Matles and Emspak may be Communists but they are very easy to work with. It's just like having a company union and having the workers pay for it."

Time and again it has been indicated that GE would like to see the left and the right destroy each other or else bleed each other to such a point of weakness that collective bargaining would be reduced to the level of company unionism.

When we learned last week of GE's complicity with the Communist-led UE in the circulation of the 10,000 check-off cards through the Schenectady plant, we promptly sent the following telegram to GE President Wilson:

"The International Union of Electrical, Radio and Machine Workers, CIO, has learned that General Electric Company has entered into a collusive deal with Leo Jandreau of Local 301, UE, at Schenectady, N. Y., under which that local would be paid over check-off monies in return for turning in new signed check-off cards.

"This was done right in the plants, with UE working with the aid and abettance of management.

"This came at a time when an application for an election was pending with the National Labor Relations Board and at a time when GE has a suit pending in the Federal court of New York covering the Schenectady plant seeking a determination as to whether the dues should go to IUE-CIO or to the UE, and when GE has been proclaiming that it is impartial.

"This action by GE is a clear act of favoritism and a flagrant violation of the law. Such violation can be cleared only if GE extends the same privilege to IUE.

"Will GE agree to provide IUE-CIO with the same consideration in similar situations as with UE in Schenectady regarding the check-off or is this agreement confined to financing the Communist-controlled UE 301?

"We demand an explanation and an answer."

As of this date we have received no reply. If and when we do receive a reply we will be glad to forward a copy to you for your information. Possibly, however, you may wish to obtain a direct answer from General Electric to our charges of favoritism and violation of the law on behalf of UE-CP.

No objective observer of the labor scene in America today can escape the compelling fact that it is to management's temporary advantage to deal with Communist-led unions. Because they are the objects of public antipathy, because they have lost irretrievable ground numerically and financially, Communist "union leaders" today are willing to make any sort of deal, any sort of concessions to maintain their dwindling power over sections of American labor. We are prepared to show the extent to which management has found this situation immensely to its liking because the contracts it has been able to impose are frequently spineless and regressive. In some instances Communist "union leaders," to the intense satisfaction of management, have agreed to accept wage cuts for their members. But in nearly every case pay raises, pension plans, and other contract improvements have been measurably weaker where the union has had Communist leadership. An instance in point is UE's negotiations with General Electric over the entire year of 1949. UE's absurdly vague proposal of a "$500 package" increase, unprecedented in the history of American labor's contract demands, was borne out of the weakness, confusion, and disunity that has corrupted UE's strength in recent years. Management, of course, has simply laughed at the "$500 package" idea, and as a result workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry have gone without any wage increase, pension plan, or other benefits while hundreds of thousands of auto and steel-workers have won new and precedent-setting contract improvements.

When these facts are considered coolly and calmly, it can surprise none that GE publicly proclaims a policy of "plague on both your houses." It is to GE's very substantial advantage to give surreptitious aid to the Communist-led minority, to facilitate the circulation of dues check-off cards, and to compound the confusion of representation as much as possible.

But we in IUE-CIO hold the conviction that the masters of great corporate wealth and power in this country have a sacred responsibility to the American people and to American democratic principles. They must not be permitted, for purposes of financial expediency, to assume a fake pose of "impartiality" to cloak a policy which nourishes a fifth column in America.

The Nation has been exceedingly generous to the managers of this industry. Their profits have been enormous, their return on investments huge. They have benefited greatly by large tax rebates and through cost-plus contracts during the war. In numerous instances where companies, such as General Electric, have been found guilty of international cartel conspiracies or violation of the Sherman anti-trust law, they have escaped with astonishingly light penalties.

General Electric, for example, increased its net profits from $40,900,000 in 1939 to $131,600,000 in 1948, an increase of 222 percent. Profits after taxes rose from 3.5 percent in 1943 to 5.7 percent in 1946, to 7.6 percent in 1947, and 8.1 percent in 1948. GE's annual dividend rate of $1.40 per share in 1945 jumped to $2 in the third quarter of 1948 and to $2.50 in the fourth quarter of 1949. All other financial statistics involving this company provide proof of GE's growing power and profitability.

These facts offer additional reasons why GE's employees and the American public have a right to expect a degree of responsibility and devotion to democratic ideals that is not reflected in the company's policy of cooperation with a totalitarian "labor" organization.

It has long been established that UE's leaders are interested only in the proposition of proving that democracy cannot work. If in that undertaking they are given haven and sustenance by General Electric and other companies, the crime is an outrageous offense against American principles and national security.

For our part, we in IUE-CIO are wholly convinced that the employees of General Electric and the rest of the industry do not want to remain in a Communist-led union. Within the short space of 2½ months, more than 250,000 workers in the electrical, radio, and machine industry have given their blunt answer to the Communist control of UE by taking membership in 150 chartered local unions of the IUE-CIO. The UE will not win the right to represent the GE workers in Schenectady or in any other plant through default by the IUE. To retain control over the economic lives of thousands of workers in this industry, the Communists need the support of inaction or reaction on the part of management.

For these and other reasons we strongly urge you to propose an immediate investigation by the proper committee of Congress into the activities and policies of some sections of industrial management in providing collusive support and encouragement to totalitarian and anti-democratic elements that have infiltrated into American trade-unionism.

We cannot, of course, speak for GE or other corporations. We ask for your assistance in requiring them to speak for themselves on this grave question.

Please accept our assurance that the IUE-CIO, its leaders and representatives, will give the utmost cooperation to any congressional inquiry into this question, and will gladly

make available the evidence accumulated over many years of painful experience with this problem.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES B. CAREY,
Chairman, Administrative Committee.

Who's Isolationist Now?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Santa Monica (Calif.) Evening Outlook:

WHO'S ISOLATIONIST NOW?

Former President Herbert Hoover has joined Senator ROBERT TAFT in proposing that the United States do everything possible, including sending naval aid if necessary, to keep the Chinese Communists from seizing Formosa and other strategic islands off the China coast. "It is my strong belief," he wrote Senator KNOWLAND, "that we should not recognize the Communist government of China; that we must continue to recognize and support the Nationalist Government; that we should, if necessary, give it naval protection to the possession of Formosa, the Pescadores and possibly Hainan Islands."

Listing seven reasons why the United States must strengthen its China policy and help Chiang, Mr. Hoover said it is necessary to build a Pacific wall around communism, defend Japan and the Philippines, prevent Communist China from gaining a permanent seat on the United Nations Security Council and from participating in drafting a Japanese peace treaty, and that the United States would have a better chance of saving the southeastern area of Asia from communism if it maintains at least a symbol of resistance.

Every one of these points has invincible logic behind it, and together they make what seems to us an overwhelming argument for a strong American policy in the Far East. The arguments of the other side are chiefly two: (1) That it is too late for us to aid the Chinese leader who has already lost China; and (2) that such a policy might embroil us in a shooting war with the Chinese Reds, which in turn might become world war III.

Has anyone noticed how remarkably similar these do-nothing arguments are to those which were made by American isolationists of 1940 and 1941? Then it was a question of our giving aid to Britain after Hitler had gained control of the European continent; many believed that Britain was doomed to defeat, that American aid would be useless, and would only involve us in war with Hitler. As it turned out, we went to war, not because of our aid to Britain, but because the Japanese war lords made the stupid blunder of blasting us in. There is no exact parallel, because in 1940 most of the world was at war, while today both Russia and the western world want to keep the peace. But it is at least suggestive to note that the same defeatist arguments that were used against 1940 aid to Britain are now being made against our doing anything to save Formosa, and by people who formerly denounced isolationism.

We were against isolationism and defeatism in 1940, and we are against them today. If it had listened to such counsels in 1940, the United States would have lost World War II and would have been left to the mercy of Hitler and the Japanese war lords. Had it listened to such counsels in 1948, there would have been no Marshall plan and no Berlin air lift, and Russia today would be master of Europe. We do not believe that it is too late today, if the United States stops being weak and defeatist about China, to stop communism from taking over Formosa and southeastern Asia. And we emphatically do not believe that such action would lead to world war III.

United States Deserts China, as France and Britain Abandoned Czechs in 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edgar Ansel Mowrer, published January 6, 1950:

UNITED STATES DESERTS CHINA, AS FRANCE AND BRITAIN ABANDONED CZECHS IN 1938

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The American administration's apparent refusal to save Formosa from the Chinese Communists and Moscow resembles nothing so much as Britain and France's abandonment of Czechoslovakia in 1938. Five years after victory over the Axis, the United States has adopted the policy of appeasement.

Defenders of the do-nothing policy that is giving Asia to Stalin use the same arguments that Neville Chamberlain and Edouard Daladier used as excuses for bowing the neck to Hitler. At that time, British, French, and American pacifists took their policy from the Nazis.

The Americans, unfortunately, paced by the British, are taking their policy from the Communists. This policy—for 1949—as sent out by the American Communist Party—consisted of three points:

1. End aid to Nationalist China.
2. Prepare for the recognition of Communist China by the United States Government.
3. Reestablish trade with Communist China.

All three are likely to be accepted by the United States within the near future.

HISTORY REPEATS

In 1938 British and French appeasers argued that the Slavic Czechs mistreated the German Sudetens—and proceeded to hand the latter over to a regime that mistreated everybody.

Now it is the Chinese Nationalist Government that, by mistreating the Chinese people, justified Moscow in taking them over.

Then the appeasers argued that Britain and France lacked the military power to defend Czechoslovakia. Now the same sort of people insist that the "Asiatic mainland is outside the limits of effective military power." (But 1 year later, Britain and France went to war under more adverse circumstances when they finally understood that they had to fight to save themselves.) As matters are now going it will not be many years before the United States may be fighting a terrible rear guard action without any of the Asiatic peoples that we shall have meanwhile abandoned.

In 1938 Chamberlain and Bonnet said that the Sudetens were not worth fighting for. (And a year later, these people were at war for something much smaller, the city of Danzig.)

PACIFIST RED HERRINGS

Now the pacifists and pro-Communists are repeating that Formosa (or Indochina, or Tibet, or Burma, or even India, I suppose) is not worth fighting about.

They are trying to convince us that it is too late to save China, too late to save Formosa, too late to save Asia.

I say it is not. Ex-President Hoover is quite right in urging us to erect a wall against communism.

Again the appeasers protest. The neighbors of China do not want to resist, they say. These states want to negotiate, not to fight. In Asia the United States should defer to Thailand and Burma and come to terms with Communist Mao Tse-tung. If we try to defend Asia with our forces, then Prime Minister Nehru, of India, who has already recognized Communist China, will not like it. Pandit Nehru, another source informs us, is convinced that if we are nice to Mao, he will perhaps consent to play with us and not waste all his cookies on the Russians.

Moreover—the appeasers continue—our European friends do not want to resist in Asia. For us to attempt to use the aid we are giving them to induce them to accept our policy would be most wicked. Etc., etc.

OUR POTENTIAL GREAT

The facts are different. The United States has the means to provide a military force incomparably larger than the one we keep in being now. We can fight, if we have to, anywhere in the world. Some of the countries of southeastern Asia, beginning with the Philippines, want nothing better than to be protected by the United States. If the Government of India has another policy, then the United States should bid that country follow its own line with our blessing. But without us and without our money.

France, our second biggest ally in Europe, has, for the last 2 years, been asking for a common Franco-Britanno-American policy to prevent the further spread of communism.

In other words, a policy that will stop Russia in Asia just as it has been stopped in Europe is possible. We shall have the allies once we start to show both the means and the will.

But before we can get very far with any such salvage, two things are necessary: we shall have to begin to think primarily in terms of the vital interests of the United States; we shall have to exclude from policy making all those Americans, misguided or worse, whose pro-Communist sympathies or errors got us into the present plight.

Foreign Trade Agreements Being Made by the New Deal Are Proving Disastrous to Many American Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the efforts of some of our administration leaders to persuade the public to "buy abroad" is forcing labor and management in many industries in the United States to join together in the common cause of keeping alive.

Imports are increasing and exports decreasing. Employment keeps dropping

off as a result of the old New Deal doctrine that some industries should be sacrificed for the benefit of others.

Tomorrow there will be a big meeting here in Washington, participated in by labor and management on an equal basis, to discuss methods of meeting this challenge. The industries to be represented are important—they are especially important to the communities in which they operate. More than 50 top-ranking representatives of both labor and management in each of the industries participating will meet together to discuss this serious problem.

The industries to be represented produce pottery and glassware, matches, cedar shingles, fish and sea-food products, scientific instruments, leather and wool gloves, hats and millinery, hothouse vegetables, aluminum products, and kaolin. A number of other industries have expressed great interest, and other similar meetings will probably follow.

The public notices of this meeting contain some very pertinent information. Two of these are as follows:

[Press release for publication Thursday morning, December 15]

Alarmed at the prospect of increasingly heavy competition from European and other sources as a result of the ECA import program and the State Department's recent announcement of a third round of tariff cuts in 1950, a joint group of representatives of both labor and management in some 10 industries will meet in Washington, D. C., the 17th of January to map plans of defense.

The meeting was initiated by a group of AFL unions that are members of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, of which Matthew Woll, who is also second vice president of the AFL, is president. Among the industries that will participate are pottery and glassware, fisheries, hats and millinery, scientific instruments, jewelry, matches, and wallpaper.

Pointing out that these groups are representative of the miscellaneous industries in this country that will bear the brunt of any increased competition from abroad, O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of the labor group, stated today that the economic life of many long-established small and medium-sized industries in this country, devoted principally to the manufacture of consumers' goods, is at stake.

"Few people realize," Mr. Strackbein said, "that in order to hold our export markets at their present abnormally high level, our avowed national policy of opening ever wider our gates to imports, to make it possible for other countries to pay for our exports, is designed consciously or unconsciously to fatten our large mass-production industries which are our heaviest exporters, at the expense of the smaller industries scattered throughout the United States. The big exporters are the industrial giants that manufacture automobiles, iron and steel, electrical equipment and machinery, petroleum, agricultural implements, etc."

Expressing complete sympathy with the objective of European recovery, he said that the meeting scheduled for next January would explore alternative means of correcting the trade balance without bringing unemployment and depression to numerous industrial areas in this country. "There would be little point in gaining recovery for Europe which would be merely temporary," he said, "if this can be accomplished only by visiting a blight upon our own producers in competing lines. This should not be necessary."

In calling the meeting, Mr. Strackbein said, full cognizance was taken of the gravity of the dollar-gap problem. "We want to know whether we (the miscellaneous group of industries) are being peddled off by our diplomats to satisfy an untested theory or to satisfy the export interests, and whether there is some other way of meeting the problem. If further tariff reduction is no solution, considering its boomerang aspects, we want to know why we should be offered up as the sacrificial goats, simply as a disastrous experiment or a grand but empty gesture to impress western Europe.

"Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, who comes from the automobile industry, has so far offered no suggestion to show how the vast domestic automobile market might best be shared with European producers. His eagerness for imports falters at this point," Mr. Strackbein commented.

"As long as our exports continue at the post-war pace," he continued, "there is no hope of striking an import balance without bringing many of our industries to the brink of destruction. The statement that proposed increased imports of $2,000,000,000 a year from Europe would amount to less than 1 percent of the gross national product is true but must be known to be wholly meaningless by those who give it currency. This is like saying that a disastrous flood would represent only a small amount of rainfall if it were spread over the whole United States. Actually, a $2,000,000,000 increase in imports would not nearly bridge the present gap between exports and imports. To do that we would have to increase our imports by another two or three billion dollars, presumably from Asiatic countries.

"If we continue our foolish worship of exports and attribute special virtue to them, our problem will continue to be perplexing and will bedevil us and the rest of the world for years to come."

The meeting will consider beside the tariff and import program, the Charter of the International Trade Organization, and the escape clause in the trade agreements. "It will be the first joint meeting of its magnitude between management and labor where both will be talking the same language and seeing eye to eye, that I know of," Mr. Strackbein remarked. "Perhaps the idea will catch on in other directions."

AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

[For release Thursday morning, January 12, 1950]

Over 50 representatives of labor and management in 15 industries will meet in Washington on January 17 to attend the conference sponsored by America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference. The meeting will consider what action can be taken to safeguard American industry and labor against the impact of the increasing foreign competition resulting from the import-promotional work of the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Department of Commerce, supported by the tariff-cutting activities of the State Department.

The campaign to open wide the doors of the American market to billions of dollars of additional imports, as proposed by the ECA, was first challenged a month ago in a statement made by O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of the Wage Earners' Conference. In calling the meeting which will assemble here next week, Mr. Strackbein outlined the program as including beside the ECA-State Department import proposals, consideration of the Habana charter of the International Trade Organization which is before Congress for ratification.

Among the industries that will be present will be fishing, fish-canning, and sea-food-processing industries. Imports of fresh and frozen fillets have risen to levels far above prewar imports, principally from Canada and Iceland. Imports of canned tuna have alarmed the tuna fisheries and canneries of the west coast.

The pottery industry is confronted with rising imports of chinaware from Japan, Germany, and other European countries. Approximately $20,000,000 of pottery was imported in 1949 and the trend last year was still upward.

A sharp rise in the importation of women's fur felt hats took place in 1949, bringing the import level well above prewar years in terms of both quantity and value. Leather and woolen gloves and mittens have felt the keenness of competition from Japan and Europe, and it is feared that even without further duty reductions the domestic industry is faced with a substantial loss of market and shrinking employment.

Other industries among those that will be present are the makers of wallpaper and of matches. Imports of printed wallpaper have made extensive inroads into the market, with Canada the chief source. Matches, on which the duty was reduced in the recent Annecy agreements, face stiff competition from Scandinavian countries.

Pressed and blown glass tableware imports, coming principally from Czechoslovakia, have slackened employment in domestic plants making glassware for the American household. Japan last year joined Czechoslovakia as a shipper and began to loom as an important source of low-priced competition.

Makers of scientific apparatus, kaolin producers, and wool hat manufacturers have likewise felt the rising tide of imports at prices that are alarming to those who are interested in either jobs, wages, or profit.

The foregoing industries, represented by top executives of both management and of the labor organizations concerned, will be on hand for the meeting.

"Other industries asked to be represented," Strackbein said, "but we were unable because of the principle of parallel representation of both labor and management, to arrive at a satisfactory basis for invitation, for the present."

Top labor representative to attend the meeting will be Matthew Woll, president of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference and also vice president of the American Federation of Labor.

AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

Veterans' Benefits—A Matter of National Interest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, no nation can long survive which fails to reserve for the service of its war veterans a respect and recognition above and beyond that which is proper for simply living so many years or for meeting the responsibilities of civilized society. At the same time, the Veterans' Administration is neither sacred nor perfect and I shall continue to explore and expose waste or inefficiency if found there as I would in any other Government agency. That was my reply to the South Dakota American Legion which recently wired me asking my posi-

tion on certain proposals relative to veterans' benefits.

The text of the American Legion telegram to me and my reply follow:

YANKTON, S. DAK., *January 9, 1950.*
Hon. FRANCIS CASE,
United States Representative,
Washington, D. C.:

The American Legion of South Dakota is definitely against that part of the Hoover Commission report dealing with veteran affairs. Separating the Veterans' Administration into other and more Federal bureaus and commissions will not mean economy but rather complete chaos and confusion eventually ending in nonservice to the disabled veteran and family. Keeping all veteran affairs under one administration is our want, and watching economy in that administration is our aim. Will you wire me your exact position regarding veterans' affairs as contained in the Hoover report so that the American Legion of South Dakota will know where you stand on this vital issue.

C. O. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Department Commander.

My reply:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 11, 1950.*
Mr. C. O. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Department Commander,
American Legion,
Yankton, S. Dak.:

Re tel. Am opposed to any proposal that would destroy identity of Veterans' Administration hospitals or attempt to convert compensation for service disabilities or hazards as reflected in established veterans' pension system into any general social-security benefits.

This is not any new position for me. In fact in many talks I have cited such proposals why I thought recommendations of Hoover Commission should be acted upon selectively rather than in block. Similarly object to undertones in President Truman's budget message where he cited eligibility of veterans to benefits "under the general social-security program of the Government" and expressed concern over "special benefits for veterans."

Put me down as believing that no nation can long survive which fails to reserve for the service of its war veterans a respect and recognition above and beyond that which is proper for simply living so many years or for meeting the responsibilities of civilized society.

At the same time the Veterans' Administration is neither perfect nor sacred and I shall continue to explore and expose waste or inefficiency if found there as I would in any other Government agency.

FRANCIS CASE,
Representative in Congress,
Second District, South Dakota.

California and the River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Fortnight magazine for December 23, 1949:

CALIFORNIA AND THE RIVER—SOME FACTS AND CURIOUS FIGURES ON THE GREAT COLORADO CONTROVERSY WITH ARIZONA

A California fisherman aimed a plastic plug toward the east shore of Lake Havasu back of Parker Dam on the Colorado River. Almost immediately the little, barbed, mouse-like lure was seized by a 3-pound bass. The fisherman landed his prize, one of several, and was proud and happy, but only for a moment. During the excitement he had overlooked the drift of his skiff and the approach of a small power craft.

The Arizona game warden noted that he was fishing in Arizona water and demanded his Arizona fishing license. Not having one, the California-licensed fisherman was arrested, his gear confiscated, and he was ordered to appear before the justice of peace in Parker, Ariz., the following day.

As a retaliation measure, California wardens frequently arrest Arizona fishermen for taking their catch in California waters behind the dam and along the main stream of the river dividing the two States.

Such petty skirmishing marks the great California-Arizona-Colorado River controversy on the lower level. The issue extends from here on up and up, however, and involves every single consumer of water, user of power, and resident of southern California. The Governors and congressional delegations of both States are likewise deeply involved and both sides seek by every means at their command to enlist sympathy for their sides. The President, his Cabinet, fellow Members of Congress, and all manner of officialdom are buttonholed and belabored in the name of God and/or the devil to come to the aid of the contesting States.

The year 1950 will see an intensification of this controversy and it may see a decision in favor of one State or the other.

SHOW-DOWN

If California should be successful in establishing her rights to Colorado River water, the investment of billions and the hopes of millions will be secured. If California is unsuccessful in maintaining rights to water she has contracted for, the millions of people in urban areas of southern California can expect to share the desperate plight of residents of New York City with their water level down.

The full implication of such a circumstance is difficult to calculate and measure, but Dean Franklin Thomas of Cal Tech, one of the wisest and ablest citizens of the southland makes some of the meaning clear.

VIEWS

Although Dean Thomas is fully a California partisan, he is first of all a man of science, president of the American Society of Civil Engineers, and as such, he takes an objective view that is not always shared by his fellows on the board of the Southern California Metropolitan Water District. He is chairman of the board and oldest member in point of service and most adept at slide rule savvy. He says that if Arizona succeeds in its bid for a greatly expanded use of Colorado River water, there will be little, if any, left for the metropolitan areas of southern California.

Perhaps not so exactly, but certainly more colorfully, Congressman CLAIR ENGLE, Democrat, from the cow counties and squirrel gun country, states the issue this way: "The Central Arizona project proposes to use water which it doesn't own, lift it nearly twice as high as the Washington Monument, convey it farther than from Washington to New York, at a cost to the Federal Treasury of a billion dollars, to irrigate 200,000 acres of war-boom desert land, one-half of which is owned by only 420 landowners, who would not be required to repay any of the construction costs, and would raise only crops which are surplus in this country."

BOILED DOWN

The explosive force behind Congressman ENGLE'S multi-barrelled blast is distilled and refined from the mountain of evidence assembled over more than a quarter of a century in the bitter water issue between California and Arizona. His statement hints of the land speculation and the war profiteering, the national politicking and the savage contest for influence between powerful men and bureaus and special interests. Events are shaping up for a show-down between the two States at the forthcoming session of Congress and a delineation of the shadows and highlights of Arizona's program appears to dwarf other land speculation schemes and pork-barrel programs that have marked American westward expansion.

It is important for every Californian to understand that Colorado River development in the lower basin has been all California's doing. That the great conquest of the river has been financed by California although the benefits of these installations have extended to all States and to the Republic of Mexico.

The millions of newcomers to southern California would not be here but for the vision and courage of such men as Dean Thomas and many, many others, in staking out the water needs of southern California for years to come. And they won't stay here unless Arizona is checked in her designs upon California water.

NATURE'S CHOICE

Also, Californians should understand that the water of the Colorado is a variable amount, subject to the influence of drought, evaporation, and flood. Within man's ken to calculate such things, this short supply of water has been distributed between the upper-basin and lower-basin States under the Colorado River compact. These assignments were arrived at upon the basis of need and use and are subject to strict priority, based upon the length of use and international treaty.

The inescapable fact is that should Arizona succeed in her multimillion-dollar bid for water for the central Arizona project, more water would be assigned than flows in the Colorado and under the priority rights arrangement, urban areas of southern California would be among the first to dry up.

MINUS

Stated in acre-feet (sufficient water to cover 1 acre of land 1 foot deep) the river, according to Bureau of Reclamation estimates, is 300,000 acre-feet short of the water required to operate present projects contracted for with the Federal Government. The Arizona project would require an additional 1,200,000 acre-feet annually. This water could be supplied only at the expense of California.

So much for the threat to the present welfare and future of southern California contained in the Arizona program. But what of the project itself? An examination of the record of this scheme is another story and while Arizona likes to play up and portray itself in the sympathetic pattern of a "David and Goliath" role, the facts disclose a set-up for a swindle, a gigantic land-speculation deal that would pay off in millions to a few large Arizona landholders at the expense of taxpayers from all States and this with none of the risk and obligation with which California saddled itself in pioneering Colorado River development.

The California-Arizona controversy is highly technical, but generally involves three issues.

First. A disputed interpretation of the meaning of the terms "unapportioned" and "excess or surplus" as used in the original Colorado River compact. At least 500,000 acre-feet are at stake in this difference between the States.

Second. A difference of 600,000 acre-feet in favor of Arizona in determining beneficial consumptive use involving the Gila River, a Colorado tributary, whose waters are totally used within Arizona.

Third. Arizona's insistence that evaporation losses at Lake Mead behind Hoover Dam, calculated at 550,000 acre-feet yearly,

be subtracted from California's apportioned total share of Colorado River water.

IF

The stakes are indeed high, more than a million and a half acre-feet. In fact this is the water committed to supply the cities of southern California. The conflicting claims to the water are shrouded in more than a quarter of a century of bitter debate and controversy, but despite charges of water imperialism against California by Arizona and Author Carey McWilliams in his current book, California, the Great Exception, the record will show that California through the years has tried to resolve the differences with Arizona by arbitration and negotiation. Governor Warren's most recent words on the subject, spoken in Los Angeles before the Colorado River Association, only last fortnight, reflected the good-neighbor attitude to the disappointment, it might be pointed out, of many present who advocate a sterner, tougher dealing with Arizona.

California's congressional delegation, Republican and Democrat, has been in total harmony in this issue, seeking a Supreme Court hearing and settlement of the serious differences.

NO LAW

Arizona, on the other hand, has avoided and fought at every point against a judicial determination of the issues, relying upon a political resolution of the differences. Her strength and power in this sector is impressive for the chairman of the powerful Senate Appropriation Committee is Arizona's senior Senator, CARL HAYDEN. His horsetrading might win for Arizona. Too, Arizona apparently fearing the impartial judgment of the Court, has enlisted the politicians of the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Reclamation to her cause.

Her tactic is to oppose with all the considerable political force she has in Congress those California bills soliciting Supreme Court determination of the points in dispute and, at the same time, seeking a congressional approval of the construction of a billion dollar reclamation and power project, the central Arizona project. Clearly, the only water available for this project is the disputed 1,500,000 acre-feet, that California already has and seeks to assure title to through Supreme Court determination.

DATA

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON (Republican), of Santa Monica, a city 100 percent dependent upon Colorado River water, last July took dead aim on the "Arizona bubble" in a speech in the House of Representatives. His disclosure of the speculative nature of the land scheme has not been denied. His evidence was taken largely from the Bureau of Reclamation reports on the project and from the files available to Congress dealing with the matter.

"In every financial transaction there is a beneficiary," he said. "It might be well to approach the central Arizona project with this premise as a reference point. There is every indication and there is evidence to prove that the beneficiaries of the project, if approved and constructed would be a limited number of large landowners in the State of Arizona. At this time the landowners, together with others, have contributed thousands of dollars in an effort to promote the central Arizona project here in Congress.

"The proposed undertaking is a most complicated and involved one, but stripped of all extraneous issues, the entire proposition, boiled down to its essential factors, means simply that the United States Government is being asked to spend approximately a billion and a half dollars upon the construction of an irrigation project designed to transport Colorado River water several hundred miles into central Arizona. All other factors aside, the cost of the program is so great as to merit the preoccupation of every Member concerned with Federal expenditure and Federal income. There is nothing to indicate that the United States Treasury would reap any material return on the huge investment, but there is consideral evidence to support the belief that some Arizona sponsors would harvest a bumper financial crop for years to come at the expense of the American taxpayers in general."

SAVING

JACKSON pointed out that those who are beating the drums for the project would not pay 1 cent of the cost of the gigantic irrigation program, aside from the money, about $200,000 they have raised for promotion and publicity and he listed for the record the contributors and the amounts subscribed.

"Let us deal for a moment with the cost of the project," JACKSON said, "There is every reason to believe that the cost on completion would approximate $1,500,000,000. Those speaking on behalf of the project state that the cost would be about half this figure, but it must be said that those who so contend are either extremely naive or blind to current construction costs."

The speaker then let fly with an eight-point indictment of the project that has not yet been discounted by Arizona:

"First. All of the land in the proposed project area is privately owned. Farm land within the project area with water on it today is worth a maximum of $300 an acre. The land without water on it today, but actually within the proposed project area, is worth probably $50 an acre.

"Second. It is anticipated that 73,500 acres of land within the project area, now without water, would receive water under the project. Certainly, the irrigation of that much additional land for the benefit of homesteaders and others who sorely need land and water, would be a beneficial project. But the 73,500 acres is somehow mysteriously missing. No one to this time, including the Arizona advocates or the Bureau of Reclamation, has identified this land, nor have the names of those who own these acres been made public.

"Third. There are some 400 large landholders in the project area who would be likely to receive indivdual benefits averaging more than $500,000 apiece.

"Fourth. About 30,000 men, women, and children in the project area would stand to receive benefits of $50,000 each, all as a gift from the people of other States.

"Fifth. Up to April 1 of this year a sum of more than $178,000 has been contributed from private persons in Arizona to promote the central Arizona project. Of this amount, more than $57,000 was contributed by anonymous, or unidentified persons. The money so contributed went to the Central Arizona Project Association in Phoenix.

"Sixth. The proposed project would cost more than twice as much as the Panama Canal, and more than the combined cost of TVA and Hoover Dam.

"Seventh. To obtain an assured water supply for the project, water that now belongs to other States would, of necessity, have to be taken from the Colorado River. The other States now own this water under contracts with the United States Government. Advocates of the Arizona project are asking Congress to break these contracts, and to give the water to a few private landowners in central Arizona.

"Eighth. The project scheme would take two-thirds of the power revenues from the project to help pay for it. The other third of the power available would be used to operate a 1,000-foot pump lift on the project. All additional costs of the project would be an outright gift from the people of the United States."

DETAILS

Congressman JACKSON then detailed his eight points and quoted the Bureau of Reclamation report on the project regarding the matter of private ownership as follows:

"Six hundred and twenty-eight thousand seven hundred and sixty acres (in the project area) are practically all privately owned. It is estimated that 10 percent of the privately owned land is held by corporations. The total amount owned by the State and the counties is not significant."

Not one acre of the new land would be available to veterans or other worthy Americans who wished to find farm homes, JACKSON said, and continued with discussion of important 160-acre reclamation law as it applied to the project.

"In the Salt River area alone, which area contains more than two-thirds of the proposed Arizona project land, there are 995 ownerships in excess of reclamation law. About 32 percent of the irrigable land in this one area is held in excess ownership.

True, the Bureau of Reclamation says that the 160-acre law will be enforced if the Arizona project is built. But we know that this law has never been enforced there. There is no reason to believe it will be enforced in the future.

"But enforcement of the 160-acre limitation, or failure to enforce that law, will make little difference to the large landowners involved. They will not be injured in either case, for the idle land now held by the big landowners will immediately increase in value 6 to 10 times. If, on the other hand, the large landowners should be forced to sell all but 160 acres, they would, of course, sell at tremendous profit."

STRANGE DOINGS

The speaker then went into the curious subsidy pattern of the program, pointing out that 86 percent of the crops grown in the area are those common, competitive field crops already subsidized by the Government. Under the scheme, the Government s asked to pile the king-sized irrigation water subsidies on top of the crop subsidies.

Of the 73,500 waterless acres in the project area, JACKSON has this to say:

"This acreage has a value today of approximately $3,657,000. With water on these acres this privately owned land would have a minimum value in excess of $32,000,000."

Hidden, but nevertheless in evidence in the Bureau of Reclamation report, is the full dope on farm ownership. The report states that the proposed project area contains an estimated 6,000 farms and that 7 percent of these farms are of 500 acres or larger. The 7 percent contain 55 percent of the irrigated land.

Seven percent of 6,000 farms is 420 farms.

In other words, the 420 farms containing 55 percent of the irrigated land would get 55 percent of the irrigation benefits.

Fifty-five percent of the estimated cost of the irrigation feature of the project, $420,019,000, amounts to $231,010,450, or an average of about $500,000 for each of the 420 farms.

It must be pointed out that the President and many high Government officials have not been taken in by this scheme and have expressed their opposition to the engineering and economic aspects of the program. Look what happened to Secretary of Interior "Cap" Julius Krug. But Californians got little comfort in viewing the new Secretary, Oscar Chapman, a career Bureau of Reclamation man and, as Congressman JACKSON points out, the Bureau favors Arizona, apparently motivated by an interest in another gigantic project under its jurisdiction.

As JACKSON put it, "The Bureau obviously does not care whether the project is financially feasible. All the Bureau desires is more control over the economy of the West. Bad projects as well as good ones give the Bureau that control."

"War Outmoded," General Wedemeyer Says

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a speech by Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer before a chamber of commerce luncheon in Los Angeles on November 10. This outstanding military man calls attention to the dangers that lurk in the building of a gigantic military machine.

PLEADS FOR IDEAS TO REPLACE BULLETS AT CHAMBER OF COMMERCE LUNCHEON MEETING HERE

A military man, high in office and a professional soldier, yesterday pleaded for use of ideas in place of bullets, decrying war as an outmoded method of settling disputes.

"No satisfactory decision was ever reached by punching someone on the nose," Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer declared. "The puncher may have been satisfied, but the gentleman on the receiving end was more strongly entrenched in his original belief than before the punch was thrown."

That colloquialism was interjected in a scholarly address on world affairs before a luncheon meeting sponsored by the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce's military affairs committee headed by Morris B. Pendleton.

FIRST VISIT HERE

It was General Wedemeyer's first visit to Los Angeles since he took command at the Sixth Army Headquarters at the Presidio, San Francisco. In the war, he was commander of United States troops in China. He is a West Pointer.

The unusually tall, slender soldier in his trim uniform spoke with the deepest conviction. He was addressing an audience in the Biltmore Bowl which included high Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force officers in this area.

"I consider most important of all psychological or cultural resources," General Wedemeyer said. "Guns, tanks, planes, A-bombs—none of these can cope adequately with the tremendous force of ideas."

DANGEROUS IMPLICATIONS

"The destructive power of weapons made available by science indicates clearly the dangerous implications of employing military force in the future. From a strictly military standpoint, World War II was a conclusive victory for the Allies. But, paradoxically, today we are sacrificing lives and treasure to build up the political and economic structure of our former enemies.

"It seems inconceivable that any nation would start a war at the present time, especially with so much rebuilding necessary as the result of the last war. However, totalitarian governments are unpredictable. We should not destroy our military resources."

NO PEACE GUARANTY

"Both western democracy and communism claim the same ultimate objective—a good life for all, regardless of race, creed, or color. Methods for reaching this goal are so different that many think the final settlement can only be made by force of arms."

"A third world war would settle nothing. Even if one nation and its allies should conquer the world, a permanent peace would not be guaranteed. Our problem is to find a method whereby governments with vastly different political, economic, and social structures can live harmoniously in the world. This has been done. After all, the American people represent every shade of political, social, and religious thinking and work successfully together."

The speaker said the solution lies in finding a common denominator, a unanimity of purpose similar to that found in this country.

AFTER SAME THING

"Is it not that we are all seeking the good life, religious, social, and economic freedom to do what one wants to do, plus permanent security," he asked. "Certainly, the world's peoples are after the same thing.

"Marxian communism's ultimate objective was a sort of Utopian anarchy with everyone doing what he wants and getting what he wants. Present-day Communists are a long way from this step. Many will agree that the last step is merely impossible, wishful thinking. However, it does lend strength to the idea that the world's peoples already have a common denominator ready for exploitation in the name of permanent peace."

PLAN NEEDED

"Except for glittering generalities of the Atlantic Charter and occasional vague pronouncements by leaders of the allied nations, neither we nor our Allies during World War II enunciated realistic, common objectives for rebuilding a sound world order. Much of the world's suffering today stems from this failure. We must abandon, once and for all, the old habit of offering pious platitudes in the field of diplomacy. We must explain clearly the principles for which we are prepared to make any sacrifice.

"This must be done through a well-conditioned plan—in military terminology, a strategic plan. Strategy is the art and science of applying resources to accomplish national objectives. The resources that concern us now include the political, economic, psychological, and military. I place military last because it is my conviction that if we employ these other resources in a timely and intelligent manner we can avoid war with all of its dire consequences."

The Way To Balance Is To Begin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 10, 1950:

THE WAY TO BALANCE IS TO BEGIN

The most notable thing about the budget is that it does not begin to balance. President Truman estimates that under present tax laws intake would fall short of outgo by more than $5,000,000,000. He hopes to reduce that by new taxes—an exceedingly precarious hope considering the drive for tax cuts—but he does not pretend there will not be a whopping deficit. This he accepts.

Here is the basic policy decision which the American people and their Government have to make: Is an unbalanced budget necessary—or wise under the circumstances?

It certainly is not inescapable. It is true that 70 percent of the budget goes for interest, veterans' benefits, defense costs, and foreign aid, and it is widely assumed that these are virtually irreducible. Actually, every one can be cut, is being cut. Defense costs and foreign aid are being reduced more than $2,000,000,000 under current expenditures. Veterans' readjustment costs should decline. The President also expects a reduction in the cost of farm-price supports. Yet the budget he offers for 1951 is, at $42,500,000,000, less than a billion below this year's.

This figure is not, in fact, irreducible. The Committee for Economic Development has just proposed a budget more than $6,000,000,000 below this year's. The National Association of Manufacturers says the Government could be run on less than $34,000,000,000. The CED saving includes $2,800,000,000 for veterans' insurance dividends—which, although paid out in 1950, was not a charge on taxes collected in 1950. Indeed, we believe both organizations would find it almost impossible to achieve all these savings. But allow for a billion or two and they still indicate the possibility of balancing the budget.

Big savings are possible without destroying the foreign aid program, without dangerously reducing military requirements, and without demobilizing any essential service of the Government. The President is resisting some pressures, like those for excessive veterans' payments, and is putting some of the Hoover reforms into operation to obtain efficiency and economy. He has refrained also from embarking on new public works, except those for atomic defense and development. But he insists that new Federal projects like medical assistance programs, housing for middle-income families, and aid for education should be undertaken.

As we see it, some of these projects might be useful under normal conditions, but should not be undertaken while the Nation is still burdened with such heavy military and foreign aid costs. We do not believe a second housing program is so urgent as Mr. Truman says. On aid to education, why not limit it to the States which show the greatest need? And some of the existing public works projects could be slowed down.

The President implies that the Government must continue to spend at nearly the present level to prevent the national economy going into a tailspin. We can imagine circumstances in which a large program of public works should be launched to help head off a depression. But the Government through its vast military expenditures, crop supports, veterans' benefits, social security, and foreign aid program—the money buys mainly American goods—is already pouring out over $25,000,000,000 that helps to sustain the economy. A national economy bolstered by that amount of subsidy in boom times should begin to try its weight on its own legs. And the way to balance the budget is to begin.

Friendship With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I would like to include the following confirmation of the judgment of my friend, Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. The latter, writing in the New York Times, June 21, 1948, pointed out that the 1946 resolution of the United Nations General Assembly about Spain had been rendered invalid by the 1947 failure to pass the identical resolution. This is the view now proposed in some detail and with unanswerable logic by a

Washington attorney, Mr. William J. Byrne. As both Dr. Thorning and Mr. Byrne have emphasized, the attempt by Soviet Poland to censure the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was overwhelmingly defeated by a General Assembly United Nations vote of 1949. As a distinguished Senator recently said, all nations are now free to accredit ambassadors to Madrid. The United States can and should act, without delay.

AGREES THAT UN ANTI-FRANCO RESOLUTION NO LONGER IS VALID

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

Your editorial, The Spanish Fraud, approaches the question of our duties with regard to Spain in their true light and confirms the statement of the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Senator CONNALLY, to the effect that no resolution of the United Nations binds us to curtail our diplomatic relations with Spain.

With your leave I would like to develop this. In 1946 a recommendation was passed under Soviet pressure restricting diplomatic relations with Spain and recalling all chiefs of mission from Madrid. But in 1947 the same resolution was submitted again to the UN General Assembly. It was not approved because it did not get the necessary two-thirds majority. It is apparent that from that moment the original resolution is not valid; but the representative from Soviet Poland, disregarding this fact, immediately stated that the 1947 resolution was not valid. Why? Nobody knows. If the 1946 resolution was to be permanent, there was no need for its being considered again, but, if considered, as did happen, the result had to be binding. Or was it to be a privileged resolution according to which, no matter what the final result, it was to continue in force? Why vote in that case?

VOTE SEEN AS VALID

Some assert that it was only a negative vote. But is not a negative vote valid? If in our courts a jury is asked if the accused is guilty and it answers that he is not, the accused is a freeman even if the jury did not pass an affirmative vote as to the accused's innocence. The words of acquittal are "not guilty"; the man is released on a negative vote of the jury. It is a universally used form of parliamentary and legal procedure.

With a view to clearing up any doubts that might have existed in the minds of the respective governments, a new resolution favorable to Spain was presented to the Assembly—and this you mention in your editorial—by Brazil in 1949. This resolution did not get the required two-thirds majority. In his speech to the General Assembly Dr. Arce stated that he would vote for the resolution, although he thought it unnecessary as the Argentine considered that the 1946 resolution had been rescinded. All those nations which voted in favor of the resolution believed the same and considered it a mere symbolic act which, as you state, obtained a 26-to-15 majority. It is not illogical to suppose that some countries, such as Chile, China, and Haiti, might have cast their votes in favor of the resolution if the United States had done likewise. Moreover, of the 15 votes against, two—those of Australia and New Zealand—today would be either abstentions or favorable as a result of the recent elections in those countries. Without those two votes opposed the resolution would have been successful.

MARGIN WAS NARROW

As a point of fact the Brazilian effort failed, not by a margin of four votes as you say in your editorial, for as the number of votes cast, according to the Rules of Procedure of the General Assembly Nos. 76 and 78, was 41 (26 in favor, 15 against) and since two-thirds of 41 is 27.33 the margin really was only 1.33.

But the Assembly dealt again with Spain after the defeat of the Brazilian proposal. A Soviet-inspired Polish proposal was considered and can be taken as the UN's final word in the matter. As various nations considered the 1946 resolution annulled by that of 1947 and had appointed Ambassadors to Madrid, Poland attempted to have a vote of censure passed against them for it considered that their action constituted a flagrant violation of the high principles and purposes of the United Nations, undermined international confidence, and will convince the Spanish people that it has been abandoned by the United Nations.

The Polish proposal was defeated 36 to 6, with 11 abstentions. Thus it clearly was established that the May 16, 1946, recommendation no longer was in force and that the member nations were free to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain without transgressing any limits set up by the UN. There can be no legal quibbling in this respect and Senator CONNALLY was following a strict interpretation of the case when he stated that he did not regard the 1946 resolution as binding on this country.

WILLIAM J. BYRNE.

Red Conquest of Hainan and Formosa Will Increase United States Expenses in Japan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown in the Washington Star:

RED CONQUEST OF HAINAN AND FORMOSA WILL INCREASE UNITED STATES EXPENSES IN JAPAN

(By Constantine Brown)

The conquest of Hainan and Formosa Islands by the Chinese Reds would result in a heavy additional American expenditure in Japan—that is to say, another burden on the American taxpayer—according to reports from economists in Tokyo.

Hainan is considered the richest island in the world in iron ore. A mountain in the middle of the island yields a 70-percent ore. This is shipped to Japan, where it is used in the new Japanese factories.

As for Formosa, which is one of the richest islands in the Pacific, its loss to the Communists would create a serious food shortage in Japan. There are three rice crops a year. The large surplus is exported to the islands in the north.

The same thing applies to Formosa's tea and many other products, which are exported to Japan primarily on a barter basis. Raw materials are shipped to Japan and the ships return with cargoes of manufactured products for the island's 7,000,000 inhabitants.

CONDITIONS IMPROVE

According to most recent reports from American observers, it seems that conditions have improved since K. C. Wu, the progressive and scrupulously honest former mayor of Shanghai, was placed at the head of civil authorities in the island.

Realizing the mistakes and corrupt practices of his predecessors, he has organized the island on a Western economic basis and placed educated Formosa natives at the head of important departments. The local currency is pegged to the dollar. There is, of course, the inevitable black market, but the spread between the official rate of exchange and the black market rate has been reduced from 40 percent to about 10 percent.

The Nationalists' treasury is not completely empty yet, although the cost of government amounts to about $1,000,000 a week. Chiang Kai-shek transferred from Nanking about $250,000,000 in gold when he realized that his capital would be conquered by the Reds.

Although Chiang's action in removing the gold was denounced at the time by Chairman CONNALLY of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee as another indication of Chinese corruption—he accused Chiang of absconding with the Republic's funds—the money is coming in very handily now, when the Nationalist government has been almost entirely cut off from any further bonanza from the United States.

A Nationalist force of about 300,000 is being maintained now on Formosa. The morale of this army—mostly young recruits—is not bad. They might be able to offer a real show if Formosa is invaded. The main difficulty confronting the army commander has been that he has not been able to obtain necessary war material for his troops. The loading of 90 carloads of tanks and armored vehicles for the Nationalists on a ship at Philadelphia may alleviate this situation somewhat.

EARLIER PLEA RECALLED

Conditions are not much different from those which existed in northern China in 1948 when Gen. Fu Tso-yi had six armies at his disposal but had equipment for only three. He asked them, when he was still winning against the Communists, for only 4,000 machine guns and some 45,000 rifles with the necessary ammunition. His request was supported by the American military observers on the spot and those, like Vice Admiral Oscar Badger, United States Seventh Task Fleet commander, who visited his forces. After a long and fatal delay in Washington some 400 machine guns and 5,000 rifles reached the Chinese commander.

The Nationalists' armies were defeated and large-scale desertions followed. Officers and men became disheartened because they were being let down by their American friends. This is a matter of record available to those who might wish to investigate the truth of the defeat and desertions of the Nationalists' last combat forces on the Chinese mainland.

A similar situation may arise in Formosa. According to unbiased American observers the non-Communist ground, air, and naval forces might give a good accounting of themselves if they had the means to fight.

Amphibious operations which must be undertaken by the Reds are not easy when the opposing force is full of fight. Neither the Chinese nor the Russian armies have ever undertaken such actions in the past. It is true that the Russians now are training three Chinese paratroop divisions in central China. But even at this late hour a more liberal policy toward the non-Communists—such as providing them with arms, planes, and gasoline—might still be effective.

The Road To Ruin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, as an extension of my remarks, I

would like to include the following article written by George E. Stringfellow, past president of the Kiwanis Club of New York City, and which first appeared in the January issue of the Kiwanis magazine:

THE ROAD TO RUIN

Lenin, the chief architect of communism, said, "Some day we will force the United States to spend itself to destruction." The way we have squandered our wealth and pyramided our debt during the last 18 years must have gladdened the hearts of Communists everywhere.

Yet while a candidate for the Presidency in 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt emphasized the importance of economy in government. He said, "Too often in recent history liberal governments have been wrecked on the rocks of loose financial policy. We must avoid this danger."

The Federal debt in 1932, which Mr. Roosevelt had asserted was dangerously high, was less than $20,000,000,000, and the annual cost of government, which he promised to reduce by 25 percent, was a little over $5,000,000,000—less than the cost to service the national debt today.

Five years later the debt had risen to $36,500,000,000 or 82.5 percent and the annual cost of government had increased more than 60 percent.

How can President Roosevelt's about-face on cost of government and debt be reconciled with his announced policy of economy and debt reduction during the first 4 months of his first administration? Here I think is the answer to that question. Roosevelt embraced the philosophy of the late Lord John Maynard Keynes, British economist, who visited the United States in 1933, and, according to the British press, Keynes' ideas "captivated President Roosevelt." Those who are in a position to know say that Roosevelt's change in matters of debt and economy stemmed from this captivation. Since that time Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending—the essence of which seems to be that the more you spend the more you have—has been practiced by our Federal Government, and it has infiltrated the States and municipalities.

Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending has about bankrupted Britain. A similar philosophy destroyed the Roman Empire. Keynes' philosophy is advocated by the Communists for our destruction.

Those Americans who are today clamoring for more aid to Britain and other nations at the expense of the sorely pressed American taxpayer might well give thought to the fact that since World War I our Government gave Britain approximately $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we gave Britain and other nations $33,000,000,000. American money has kept socialism alive in Britain; it would have died on the vine without it.

And in some instances our grants have helped the Communists. For example, since World War II we have given Communist Russia more than $440,000,000 through lend-lease and other grants. To her satellite Poland we have given over $480,000,000 and are today buying rye from her, a grain of which America has a great surplus.

This gift of more than $900,000,000 of the American taxpayers' money to Communist Russia and Communist Poland since World War II is hard to believe, but the United States Department of Commerce and Senator HARRY F. BYRD are authorities for this statement. We are, therefore, using our money and our substance to fight communism in Italy, Greece, France, and other parts of the world while feeding it at the core.

If we continue our extravagance at county, State, and National levels, if we continue to live beyond our income, and if we continue our "loose fiscal policy" against which Franklin Roosevelt warned us, our living standard will drop to that of Britain and other socialist countries which may force us to adopt communism through the back door.

Rome was ruined by extravagance, Britain is being ruined by extravagance, and if we continue to follow her lead, we will certainly meet the same fate. Rome fell because her rulers gained and retained power through false promises and the use of taxpayers' money with which to corrupt the electorate, a procedure not different from that of our British cousins and our American politicians.

In speaking of Britain's Socialist government, Winston Churchill said: "Our Socialist spendthrifts and muddlers extracted from the British people a higher rate of taxation than was required in the very height of the war. Never before in the history of human government," concluded Britain's great wartime Premier, "has such a great havoc been wrought by such small men."

During President Roosevelt's three terms, the average yearly spending of the Federal Government was $31,000,000,000, including most of the military cost of World War II—and F. D. R. was no miser in spending public funds. In the four postwar years, the average yearly spending jumped from $14,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000—an increase of almost 150 percent.

Eighteen years ago a Roman holiday was declared by and for our "spendthrift and muddling" politicians. Since then governmental extravagance at county, State, and Federal levels has been the order of the day. The national debt has increased from $20,000,000,000 to $255,000,000,000—an increase of 1,175 percent. The cost of government has increased from $5,000,000,000 to $45,000,000,000, or 800 percent

In pursuing the welfare state we are following the precepts of the British Socialist leaders. We are following Keynes' philosophy of "compensatory" spending. We are following the philosophy advocated by the Communists for our destruction. We are on the Roman road to ruin.

Governor Dewey Says: Latham-Halpern-Preller, a Splendid Legislative Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I have always tried to work in close harmony with the State legislators of my district for the benefit of the people of my home county of Queens. One could not ask for finer or more cooperative legislative teammates than State Senator Seymour Halpern and Assemblyman Fred W. Preller.

The first citizen of our great State of New York, Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, has seen fit to recognize this teamwork in the following letter to Assemblyman Preller, and I take pride in setting it forth in the RECORD:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, January 11, 1950.

Hon. FRED W. PRELLER,
Member of Assembly,
Queens Village, N. Y.

DEAR FRED: I wish to take the opportunity to compliment you and your legislative colleagues from Queens, Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM and State Senator Seymour Halpern, on your vision and energy in the field of State-Federal fiscal relations.

For several years now this legislative team, working in close harmony, has sponsored bills looking toward the eventual elimination of tax competition and duplication between the Federal Government and the States, especially as concerns the taxes on gasoline and amusements.

As you know, I have made this subject one of my major proposals to the New York State Legislature this year. I believe strongly, as I said in my message to the legislature, that the rights and responsibilities of the people of our State are being nullified by the voracious appetite of the Federal budget which is now taking $8,000,000,000 in taxes from New York State citizens as against $1,500,000,000 in 1941. The effect of this policy is to impair the sovereignty of our State and reduce its spirit of self-determination.

Keep up the good work. Legislative teams like Latham, Halpern, and Preller are hard to find.

Sincerely,

THOMAS E. DEWEY.

Economy in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, never in peacetime since the United States Government was founded have the Members of Congress faced greater responsibilities to the American people than at this session. To fully meet them we must put the interest of our country first.

To properly meet and solve them, it will require clear thinking and courageous action, a determination to do our full duty in approaching legislation without the thought of how it may affect us politically, but how well the position we take on legislation will serve the people of our Nation.

We are faced with world chaos, and with a more dangerous situation on the home front. Certainly it is a time to approach every question with the highest standard of statesmanship we can bring into play in dealing with the momentous questions which are pressing for solution.

BIGGEST BUDGET EVER

In peacetime we are faced with the President's budget request of $42,400,000,000, the greatest ever asked in taxes of the American people, and at the same time the President predicts that this enormous amount will lack by over $5,000,000,000 paying the cost of the Government for the coming year. At the close of this fiscal year, June 30, we will also have this year's budget deficit of something like $5,000,000,000 in addition. In other words, at the end of the next fiscal year our deficit for the 2 years will be over $10,000,000,000.

This means that with the highest income in the history of the Nation during these 2 years, against which we have levied the highest rate of taxes in the history of the Nation, we will still lack

over $10,000,000,000 of paying the running expenses of the Government. Nothing like this has ever happened in peacetime before in our country.

Mr. Speaker, something must be done about it, and the time to start is now with the first appropriation bill that comes before this Congress. We must then continue to cut all appropriations to the very bone in an effort to reduce the cost of government as many billions of dollars as is possible in this session.

With the cooperation of the President, and with the cooperation of the Republicans and Democrats working harmoniously together, we should be able to effect savings that would wipe out the last year's deficit of $5,000,000,000.

We talk about the danger of another war in the future. The best strategy to prevent another war is to keep this Nation so prosperous and so sound financially that no other nation would dare attack us.

Our first line of national defense is the financial solvency of this Nation. Unless we protect this first line and keep this country in a sound financial condition we cannot defend ourselves against a foreign foe, nor can we preserve freedom and maintain our representative Government for our own people.

Mr. Speaker, with a national debt hanging over us of $256,000,000,000, if a serious depression would overtake us we would at once be in serious trouble financially. We must cut the cost of Government, balance the budget, and begin to reduce the national debt. We cannot increase our income and balance the budget by raising taxes. Taxes are as high now as we dare let them go. Higher taxes will slow down business, throw millions of people out of work and bring in less revenue. We have gone down the road of extravagance, waste, high taxes, and greater spending until we have reached the danger point that we must not pass.

Not a single piece of new legislation that is not absolutely necessary which will add to the cost of government should be enacted into law in this session. This is no time to give serious consideration to such legislation as the Brannan plan and socialized medicine, the two of which, it is estimated, will cost the Government an additional $10,000,000,000 a year.

We should approve the Hoover reports as quickly as possible in the hope that by so doing we can reduce the cost of government by $2,000,000,000.

We must vote against further waste and extravagance on every front.

We must drastically reduce the billions of dollars we have been giving to foreign nations for the past number of years. By adopting the Hoover report, refusing to pass new legislation that will add to the cost of government, and by reducing every appropriation bill as much as possible that comes before us, we ought to be able to cut the over-all cost of government by over $5,000,000,000 and balance the coming year's budget without any additional taxes. I hope and believe that the Members of Congress will cooperate to this end. We must not continue deficit spending.

Congress Must Save the Country

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it serves no good purpose for Members of this body to complain about governmental spending when we appropriate the money. The responsibility is ours. In this connection I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Janesville Gazette, Janesville, Wis., on January 10. This editorial is to the point and fixes our responsibility:

ONLY CONGRESS CAN SAVE US FROM SPENDING SPREE

President Truman has cast the die. He intends not only to continue his wild spending orgy but to expand it with another $5,000,000,000 deficit, taking the Nation further down the road to socialism. Only our Representatives and Senators in Congress can block his way.

While avoiding the subject entirely, President Truman in his budget message left the citizen the conclusion that the President and his advisers do not trust the individual American to handle his own affairs. Hereafter, he will be more and more dependent upon Washington hand-outs, if the Truman Fair Deal succeeds.

There is no alternative for the citizen. If he yields these powers to the Washington hierarchy, the powers to regiment his job, his income, his working conditions, his security, his employer, and the prices he pays for his daily needs—if he yields all this he yields the personal freedom of action which earlier Americans gave their lives to secure, which Americans of World Wars I and II fought to preserve.

Mr. Truman's message reflects fears that the American system will not stand up. He shows a lack of courage to face facts, fearing that our competitive-enterprise system is doomed to fail to provide jobs and income and production sufficient to sustain the needs of our people.

He as much as tells Americans, "You cannot provide your own security or jobs or welfare or housing or adequate education or manage your farms adequately, so we shall have to take over in Washington. To do this you will pay more and more, but Washington bureaucrats will relieve you of all your worries."

In Rock County we wonder why Washington does not cut wasteful spending to balance that budget. Why does Mr. Truman assume that Federal expenses of billions cannot be cut?

The truth is that President Truman does not intend that Government spending be cut. Why? Because he wants his regime to be one of bloated income and a bloated welfare state wherein the citizen, unconscious that he is giving up his freedom, must look to Truman and his cohorts for everything from necessities to luxuries.

Do we want industry looking to bureaucrats for loans, home builders for mortgages, the employed for security, the farmer for Brannan price supports, labor looking for Truman aid for pensions—with everyone reaching his hand out for Federal pap of some kind? How can Americans keep their individual freedom of action if they give up the precious right to remain independent?

How does the citizen, Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public on Main Street, come out? At first it all looks grand. The Fair Deal looks like a Fort Knox with the doors swung open. It looks as though Washington, with the appearance of a rich Uncle, could go on endlessly passing out doles to Mr. and Mrs. and all the children.

Who is going to pay? There is no rich uncle. There is no Santa Claus. There is no bottomless gold stock in Fort Knox or Washington or elsewhere. The billions which President Truman plans to spend he must first take from the worker, the farmer, the businessman.

Before the spending there comes the tax collector. This will be made as painless as possible, but his hand will be in Mr. Public's pocket every day, month in and month out. He must pay more and more and more and more—endlessly—and when he wakes up he asks himself, "Why work 3 hours a day for those bureaucrats?"

Right then he will realize that his initiative has been stolen and so have his personal freedoms. He sold his soul for a mess of hand-outs.

Performance Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the membership to the improved form and procedure used in drawing up the President's budget for the coming fiscal year.

In my opinion, this new performance budget will be an invaluable tool in achieving economical and efficient Government operation. It will assist us as Members of Congress to properly review and make appropriations for Federal Government activities, and it will assist those serving in the executive branch to more accurately plan their programs and their expenditures.

The performance budget is another important step forward in the reorganization of the executive branch of Government. Its use brings into practice modern budgeting procedures recommended by President Truman and the Hoover Commission.

Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in RECORD, I include a memorandum describing the performance budget prepared by Mr. Robert L. L. McCormick, Director of Research of the Citizens Committee for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government:

BACKGROUND MEMORANDUM ON THE FEDERAL PERFORMANCE BUDGET

WASHINGTON, January 7.—Within a few days Federal fiscal history will be made. The President will present the customary annual Executive budget to the Congress, but the form and quality of that instrument will be changed. For the first time, the budget estimates have been prepared according to a pattern based on logic instead of one based on antiquated custom.

WHAT BROUGHT ABOUT THE NEED FOR THIS CHANGE?

The dynamic circumstances of the twentieth century have made the Federal Government the largest business organization in the world. With the growth of Government services, the Federal budget—our financial plan—has grown in size and complexity, so

that it defies public comprehension. Members of Congress, Federal officials, and citizens have increasingly felt the need for an understandable and workable financial plan for Federal expenditures.

Early in 1949 the Hoover Commission recommended basic changes in the Federal budget process to replace a system instituted and largely unchanged since the Nation's earliest days. The Commission made performance budgeting its No. 1 recommendation on budget reform. Both Presidential and congressional endorsements of performance (sometimes called program) budgeting have followed the Hoover Report.

President Truman announced, in a message to Congress on June 20, that he had instructed the Director of the Budget to work out a system for preparing budget estimates on a performance basis. Both the House and Senate have passed bills requiring a performance budget in the case of the National Military Establishment, and the Senate Appropriations Committee, in its report on the 1950 military appropriations, endorsed this requirement.

HOW DOES THIS NEW FINANCIAL PLAN WORK?

Generally, the new plan places emphasis on achieving objectives rather than on how those goals are achieved. This means that attention is focused upon the general character and relative importance of the work to be done, or upon the service to be rendered. In the past, emphasis was upon the things to be acquired, such as personal services, supplies, and equipment. The all-important thing in budgeting is the work or the service to be accomplished, and what that work or service will cost.

In the 1951 budget, to be transmitted to Congress in a few days, will be incorporated textual statements on program and performance, on what work is to be done and for how much. Past budgets have presented a tabulation of the financial plan for the year, consisting primarily of the language of appropriation bills proposed for enactment by Congress and lists of expenditures. The new budget will present two plans: The financial plan, in tables of figures, and the "program" plan, in narrative style, with the two related through performance data.

RELATING WORK DONE TO DOLLARS

Another change which may be less noticeable in form but equally significant is the improvement of "activities schedules." Where more than half of the appropriations in the past have not been accompanied by any break-down showing how the dollars would be related to programs, the new budget will break down over 90 percent of the appropriations to show the programs, projects, or activities to be carried on and the dollars to be devoted to each.

The work output under many programs will be shown. It is hoped that in future years the work output under every program will be shown. Under each program will be indicated such things as how many checks were written, how many cases were handled, how many operations of such and such a type took place. By relating the workload under the program to the dollars spent, it will be possible to measure the unit costs. It will be possible to relate one operation to another. It will be possible to point out weaknesses and places where restrictive legislation runs up costs. It will be possible to relate like operations and to weed out the inefficient.

This work is not yet complete and will not be for several years, but remarkable strides have been made.

OTHER REFORMS

Four additional recommendations of the Commission on Organization also will be involved in performance budgeting, although it will take some time to put them into effect fully.

One of these recommendations is for improvement of the archaic appropriation structure. For example, the 1951 budget proposes that the number of appropriations for the Bureau of Mines be reduced from 19 to 4.

Another proposal of the Hoover Commission reflected in this budget is the separation of budget estimates between current expenses and capital outlay, as has been done in every major private enterprise for years. In addition, the activities schedules will show separately the money the Government spends in the form of grants, subsidies, and contributions. Thus current expense covers the current operations of the Government. Major capital outlay relates primarily to public works and improvements, loans, and other payments in which the Government exchanges cash for some other kind of an asset.

A third Hoover Commission recommendation involved in performance budgeting provides for extension of business-type budgets to 35 Federal organizations, including the Bonneville Power Administration and the Panama Canal. For the first time, we will be able to see profit and loss statements for these agencies.

Another important recommendation in this financial planning area provides for presentation of accounting information on an accrual basis. This will mean that we can see our expenditures for a year in terms of actual costs for services rendered and materials used.

COMPARISON WITH A HOUSEHOLD BUDGET

Specifically, compare this new Federal budgeting plan with planning expenditures in your own home. For example, under the earlier system, the Veterans' Administration could not tell how much it cost to run the veterans' life insurance program nor could the Navy say what it cost to operate the Brooklyn Navy Yard. Likewise, the Civil Aeronautics Authority could not reflect total operation and maintenance costs for civilian airway facilities. But they knew the costs for all "Personal services" or for "Supplies."

If, under this older Government system, in your household budget you would lump together under "Personal services" such items as plumbing repair jobs, baby sitting service, and haircuts, there would be no way in which you could tell how much you expected to spend for baby sitting or plumbing repairs. Likewise, in your home budget under "Supplies," you would not know the expected costs for food, or gasoline, or writing paper, because they all would be lumped under "Supplies."

On the other hand, the Federal Government and the taxpayer, with a performance (or program) budget have their attention centered on the function and activity—the accomplishment of the purpose. Thus, the new type of Government budget will eventually tell how much it costs on the average to service a single veteran's life insurance policy or to operate and maintain, in the aggregate, such civilian airway facilities as visual and electronic devices, traffic control towers, intermediate landing fields, and radio stations. Likewise, you can tell under a program type of household budget, how much food, or rent, or operating an automobile costs. Although the problem is a more complex one in the Government, the principle is the same for household and Federal budgets.

HOW WILL THE NEW-TYPE BUDGET AFFECT US?

The Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch cited advantages of performance budgeting as follows: (1) "Performance budgeting gives more comprehensive and reliable information to the President, the Congress, and the general public"; (2) it "helps the individual Congressman to understand what the Government is doing, how much it is doing, and what the costs are"; (3) it will "improve congressional examination of budgetary requirements," and "enable the Appropriations Committees more easily to decide the basic expenditure issue each year"; (4) it will "make it possible for the budget document to be submitted and acted upon in a shorter length of time"; (5) it will "enable administrators to place responsibility upon subordinate officials for the clear execution of the provisions made by the Congress."

In other words, individually, we are to be given a type of financial plan for the Federal Government which is much simplified and more meaningful. We have a better chance of seeing what we expect to buy in Government work and services, and how we expect to buy them. We will see with greater clarity more complete expenditure estimates and more accurate revenue figures for the next budget period.

For the President and the Congress, this new method of budgeting includes the same important implications as were outlined above for all American citizens. However, it has special uses for our National Government. In reality, this method concentrates congressional action and Executive direction on the scope and magnitude of the different Federal activities. It places both accomplishment and cost in a clear light before the Congress and the people. As for the executive branch, the budget and appropriation process is the heart of management and control.

In conclusion, it is important to remember that the 1951 budget will represent a distinct break with the past, and, from now on, efforts will be marshalled toward a program budget along the lines suggested by the Hoover Commission and others. The 1951 budget will look considerably different from the past documents.

The 1952 and 1953 documents will offer further improvements, as a result of additional experience, improvements in program reporting and accounting, and additional effort put on the budget. While this 1951 instrument is the first performance budget, it will be far from perfect, but it is a most significant step in national financial planning for every American.

ROBERT L. L. MCCORMICK,
Director of Research, Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report.

One Hundredth Anniversary of New York Typographical Union, No. 6

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD a story of the development of New York Typographical Union, No. 6, which this year will celebrate its one hundredth anniversary. This history has been submitted to me by Mr. Louis Rubin, chairman, centennial publicity committee, New York Typographical Union, No. 6:

NEW YORK TYPOGRAPHICAL UNION, No. 6,
New York N. Y., October 25, 1949.

Congressman L. GARY CLEMENTE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CLEMENTE: All correspondence requesting issuance of a special stamp to commemorate the one hundredth anniversary of Typographical Union No. 6 has been turned

over to me with the request that I supply you with at least a brief story of the long trek traveled by this union in its march down the corridor of American history.

Its official life began several decades before 1850, although its present official name, still in use, has been carried 100 continuous years. Horace Greeley, famous editor and founder of the New York Tribune was its first president. He was also a distinguished statesman, whose manifold services to the Nation constitute a major phase of American history.

From its very beginning, Big 6, as it came to be called, set up rules for governing its several functions. These were based on American principles, and they are given even greater emphasis today when the democratic ideals of the Nation are being challenged by ideologies which are so inimical to our way of life.

Love of country has been a preeminent phase of its membership. Shortly after it assumed its present name, it gave public expression to its patriotism when on July 20, 1850, it passed resolutions honoring the memory of General Zachary Taylor, president of the United States, who passed away on July 9 of that year. Well represented in the funeral pageant, Big 6 declared, in part:

"Our country has sustained the loss of a gallant soldier, a capable, humane, and victorious commander, a devoted patriot, and a truly honest man."

Within a fortnight after the attack upon Fort Sumter, on April 12, 1861, 13 of its members answered the call to arms. One year after hostilities, 83 of its members were at the front. At the close of the Civil War, 170 members of this New York union were in the Army, many of them having enlisted more than once. During those four perilous years, the union had a membership of 507, including those who went to war. Thus, the proportion of men who served their country reached the astounding figure of 33⅓ percent.

The Spanish-American War tells an identical story of patriotic devotion. Big Six went beyond its normal strength in standing behind the Nation. On October 20, 1895, it petitioned the Congress to grant belligerent rights to Cuba, and on January 3, 1897, it appealed to the National Legislature in gallant candidness:

"The citizens of Cuba are engaged in a struggle similar to that by which our forefathers gained our liberties—shook off the monarchial yoke and established the greatest Republic on earth—the United States of America.

"We hereby extend to the Cubans our sympathy in their notable fight, and we favor immediate legislation by Congress recognizing the independence of the new Republic of Cuba."

We have records in abundance which reveal the vigor with which Big Six pursued its responsibility in World Wars I and II. In the latter, 895 of its members were in the service, while those who were not privileged to serve in the military did all that was humanly possible to help the Nation in its supreme effort.

The story of No. 6's participation in the Nation's wars is only one phase of its services to the Nation. Its peacetime participations are equally notable, for it stood in the forefront of many of the country's most notable advances. For example, it took an active part in the celebration of the electro-magnetic telegraph invented by Samuel F. B. Morse on May 27, 1844. It played an active role in the celebration of the laying and completion of the Atlantic cable in 1858 which united Europe and America for the first time. Documents revealing its enthusiasm over these first-time performances manifestly show the elation with which Big 6 greeted these achievements which, like printing, were also means of communication.

As early as 1907, it was a principal factor in espousing peace among nations. On February 24, of that year, the National Arbitration and Peace Congress requested Big 6 President James J. Murphy to act as vice president at a gathering held for this purpose at Cooper Union, April 16, 1907. Efforts of this type are recorded in legion.

Its predecessor organization, the New York Typographical Society, also had illustrious names its councils. Samuel Woodworth, poet and author of The Old Oaken Bucket, was prominent in its affairs. He was the youngest son of a Revolutionary War patriot. The author of Woodman Spare That Tree, General George P. Morris, also became a member. On October 5, 1816, Thurlow Weed, union printer, journalist, and political figure, was admitted. Ellis Lewis, Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania, compositor on the old New York Courier, joined March 1, 1817. The list is incredibly long.

Even in our own day many illustrious sons of America were, and still are, members of Big 6. It would seem that the incomparable record of this organization induces one to the conviction that we have, here, something more than just another labor union to consider. Here, before our eyes, we have a living, vital, breathing entity which has seen and participated in the entire history of the Nation. That is rare. It is with pride, and not with egotistical affectation, that we, of Big 6, see our union as a brilliant and conspicuous thread in the inimitable American fabric, for in commemorating its one-hundredth anniversary, it also celebrates 100 years of American history, thus demonstrating, incontestably, to the world at large, that the freedoms of this country are not so many abstract phrases, but a reality concretized by the centennial itself.

In brief, the survival of this organization proves the continued and insuppressible duration of the American way of life from the very beginning of our country, and what better way can be point to the proof of America's magnanimity than by the fact that it can point to an American group of workingmen as typical of the freedom which has been extended to it for 100 years of its official existence.

It would seem, sir, that any organization so molded by a century of American history is the true offspring of that history, and that, accordingly, the creation of a Government stamp to commemorate so majestic a triumph would be granted in joyous recognition of pride in its millions of patriotic workers. What a glorious opportunity lies here for an adequate symbol to convey to the nations of the world America's infallible faith in the loyalty and devotion of those who comprise her ranks of labor.

Respectfully yours,

LOUIS RUBIN,
Chairman, Publicity, Centennial Committee.

William Scudder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, though the recent world war is behind us—and it is to be hoped that we do not face another in the lifetime of any of us here today—certainly any time is the right time to polish the medals of our militray heroes and to give public recognition to unique deeds of valor committed in the defense of the Nation.

It is in this spirit that I submit to the Congress the name of William Scudder, who now lives in San Jacinto, Calif., in my congressional district. Mr. Scudder claims the unusual distinction of being the only man alive who participated in both the conquest and the liberation of the Philippines.

As a beardless youth, he signed on the U. S. S. *Boston*, which was part of the fleet which met the Spaniards in Manila Bay on May 1, 1898. Our flotilla was under the command of the immortal Dewey, as you well remember.

There was a catchy little tune born of that conquest. It went:

Dewey was the morning upon the first of May;
And "dewey" were the Admiral's eyes down on Manila Bay.

No doubt that strain, or the distilled sentiment of it ran through the mind's eye of William Scudder when 46 years, 3 months and 3 days later, during World War II, he sailed into Guam. This time he was aboard the motor vessel *Pennant*, part of a Coast Guard unit bent on liberating the Philippines from the Japanese.

The quartermaster general of the Spanish War Veterans organization recognizes the yeoman service of Mr. Scudder in these words: "We salute you for your tenacity and we also applaud you as a Navy man."

As spokesman in the House of Representatives for the people of the Twenty-second District of California, I too commend Mr. Scudder and thank him for his patriotic service when the country was in danger.

It is a sorry indictment of our methods in international affairs that two world-encompassing wars and the incident of arms in 1898 should occur in the lifetime of one generation. However, such opportunities for patriotic service have only enhanced the usefulness and courage of such men as William Scudder.

Same Old Tune, Same Old Words

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, Henry Baker Reiley, editor and publisher of the Somerset Daily American, Somerset, Pa.—you can see the county courthouse from the turnpike—in the issue of January 10, gives us a couple of editorials which cannot only be read but acted upon with profit.

They follow:

BILLIONS

There is a markable resemblance between the talk of President Truman and that of his immediate predecessor. Their performances also exhibit their kinship.

Franklin D. Roosevelt, seeking the Presidency in 1932, went up and down the Republic promising to cut the Federal Government's expenses "at least one-fourth."

At that time it cost about four billions a year to operate the Federal establishment.

At that time the Federal debt was less than $20,000,000,000.

President Truman has asked Congress to appropriate more than ten times as much as the amount Mr. Roosevelt promised to reduce "at least one-fourth," for the operation of the Federal establishment next year, and the national debt is more than $250,000,000,000.

Speaking of appropriations while he was yet merely a Senator from Missouri, after the fashion of Mr. Roosevelt while he was a candidate for the Presidency, Mr. Truman said:

"It is easy to appropriate billions of dollars, but it is not so easy to obtain those billions of dollars.

"There is a limit to the amount by which we can safely increase our national debt. The American people are not willing and must not be asked to suffer unnecessary burden of waste, carelessness, and confusion."

Former President Herbert Hoover agrees with the President's warning. But Mr. Hoover has gone further. He has said that we have already reached the saturation point in taxation. By that he means that though we may levy higher taxes, or increase the levies already made, the proceeds of the levies will not produce according to calculations.

We Americans are suffering from unnecessary burdens of waste, carelessness, and confusion.

Congress would do well to agree upon a simple course:

1. There must be no unnecessary appropriation made.

2. There must be no new tax levies.

3. Waste, carelessness, and confusion must be eliminated.

BEWARE THE LION

The Associated Press carried a story several days ago about a trainer who monkeyed too much with a lioness.

His act was to stick his head in the animal's mouth. She evidently didn't think much of it, for one day she snapped as he was withdrawing it and took a hunk out of one arm. When his injury had healed sufficiently for him to go back to work, at the very first performance she nipped off the end of his nose and the end of his chin. Obviously, the lioness was trying to tell the trainer:

"Beware the lion."

Now the Government in Washington shied at the British lion during the Wilson, Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover administrations, after having rescued the brute from the Kaiser's armed forces in the First World War.

The Russian bear had shown the white feather during the First World War and had made peace with Germany. That is when the United States saw the necessity for entering that conflict. Except for the series of incidents that impelled the action of Washington, Britain might have been subjugated by Germany.

But the lesson was of little value to Britain, for at the first opportunity, the lion stuck his head into the mouth of the bear by resuming diplomatic and commercial relations.

The agreement between Russia and Germany which enabled Hitler to open the Second World War was a sort of nipping of the arm of Britain.

The eagle had watched the performance of the lion and the bear and had become eager to follow the lion's example. So, diplomatic and commercial relations between the United States and Russia were resumed.

The eagle was grieved to see what had happened to the lion when Hitler turned on the bear, but when Hitler turned on Stalin, its admiration for the bear was revived.

The Chinese Communists were mere imitators of the Russian, but the lion was brave, so when they had conquered China, in he rushed to make the Chinese partners of the bear.

The eagle lost a good many feathers as a result of following the tail of the lion after the First World War. Indeed, the Second World War was a logical sequence to the eagle's gleeful pursuit.

Both got nipped by the bear at Tehran, at Yalta, and at Potsdam. The bear has been ruminating ever since the end of the fighting in the Second World War. It has made a fuss in Manchuria, in Korea, and in China, to say nothing in a group of less important European nations.

But the lion is brave, and the eagle has a marvelous admiration for the lion's tail.

Economic Forces Operate Against Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED L. CRAWFORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, it is my firm belief that the economic forces operating against small business or enterprise in the United States are now running stronger than at any previous time since the inception of this Government. Furthermore, I am of the opinion that insofar as the Congress of the United States is concerned, there has been too much lip service and too little real service extended to those who, in the first place, live simply, exercise thrift, and who, in the second place, take their savings and invest them as equity capital in enterprise for the purpose of expanding the general foundation of so-called small business.

Anyone who strikes at the foundation roots of small business strikes at the very private enterprise which has made this country industrially what it is today. Those who are now attacking business simply because it is big and who, in the same breath, advocate big government for the purpose of taking over big business are not friends of the enterprise system upon which our people depend.

If reasonable management, with due regard for the worker, the investor, and the consuming public is to be had, management must be found outside the realms of politics. Government ownership and management simply means political ownership and management. If Government ownership and management is to prevail, this means that the quantity and quality of goods and services to the consumer will decline.

Anyone who moves in the direction of removing from the enterprise system the forces of competition, likewise overlooks the interests of the consumer. Under the free enterprise system the only economic protection the consumer has comes to him through the free play of the forces of competition.

In this connection, I wish to insert a statement made by Mr. DeWitt Emery, president of the National Small Business Men's Association:

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS MEN'S ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Chicago, Ill., December 2, 1949.

Mr. RAY TUCKER,
National Press Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TUCKER: My attention has just been called to your column published on November 21 in the Charlotte Observer, Charlotte, N. C., which column is devoted entirely to a smear attack on this association and the Small Business Economic Foundation.

According to this column, your information is based on disclosures made during an investigation conducted by Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), chairman of the Small Business Committee of the House.

If Mr. PATMAN told you, as you say he did, that the Small Business Economic Foundation is a lobbying organization or that it has ever done any lobbying of any kind or character, he's lied to you and I'll be glad to have you tell him I said so.

The foundation has never had anything whatsoever to do directly or indirectly with any Federal or any other kind of legislation or any kind or type of lobbying activity.

Mr. PATMAN knows this, and telling you otherwise can only mean that he deliberately deceived you so as to use you as a tool in his smear campaign against the foundation and our association.

Actually and as a matter of positive and absolute fact, the activities of the Small Business Economic Foundation are entirely—100 percent that is—educational. Its one and only purpose is to develop and promote a better understanding of the American way of life.

Also if Mr. PATMAN told you, as you claim he did, that the members of the National Small Business Men's Association are not fully informed concerning the objectives and activities of the Small Business Economic Foundation, he told you something which he knows is not true. He has on file in the office of the Small Business Committee of the House, copies of Pulling Together, the association's monthly bulletin to members—these bulletins, together with financial statements and a lot of other material, were filed with the committee at Mr. PATMAN's request—in which the foundation and its activities are discussed at considerable length.

The National Small Business Men's Association was started in 1937, its stated purpose being to give small-business men a voice in national affairs and to help preserve freedom of enterprise in the United States.

Obviously giving small-business men a voice in national affairs meant that the association would be active in connection with Federal legislation. Just as obviously, helping to preserve freedom of enterprise meant that the association would carry on an educational program, a program designed to make the largest possible contribution toward getting the man in the street to understand what freedom of enterprise is, how it operates, and what it means to him.

The association went along from 1937 until the latter part of 1946 carrying on its twofold legislative and educational program. In August 1946 Public Law No. 601 became effective. Title III of 601 is known as Federal regulation of lobbying. Under title III anyone, meaning any organization or any individual, who, as one of his principal activities, endeavors to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation must register with the Clerk of the House and file quarterly sworn financial statements.

One of the principal activities of the National Small-Business Men's Association very definitely was and is to influence the passage or defeat of Federal legislation; therefore, it was necessary for the association to register

as provided in title III, which it did and each quarter since has filed the required financial statement.

Shortly after the association registered, the trustees decided that a more extensive and more effective job could be done if our educational program was carried on by a separate organization which would devote itself exclusively to educational work. In accordance with this decision, the Small Business Economic Foundation was incorporated under the nonprofit statutes of Illinois in November 1946.

The association is a nonprofit membership organization incorporated under the laws of the State of Ohio and has its national headquarters office in Akron, Ohio. The association is financed 100 percent by dues paid by its members, all of whom are bona fide small-business men. The dues are $18 the first year and $15 each year thereafter.

The foundation has its office in Chicago. It does not have any members and is financed entirely by contributions made by anyone and everyone interested in its educational program who wants to help it carry through that program.

There may be something wrong with small business, medium-sized business, and big business jointly financing an educational program to develop and promote a better understanding of the American way of life, but if there is I frankly do not know what it is. I don't mean the things a publicity seeking, two-bit politician may rant and rave about, but rather something basically or fundamentally wrong with all businessmen working together to preserve constitutional government and freedom of enterprise in the United States.

Which has the biggest stake in preserving our American way of doing business, small business or big business? The answer is small business 10 times over. If you don't believe this, check with the Census Bureau of the Department of Commerce and you'll find that more than 90 percent of the 3,900,000 business establishments in this country have less than 100 employees.

How long could any big business organization in the country stay in business if it did not have the cooperation of thousands of small businesses as suppliers and dealers or sales agents? Take the big automobile manufacturers as an example. Not one of them could keep its assembly lines running without the bits and pieces furnished by several thousand small business suppliers, nor could any of these giant corporations keep their factories going for even a few months without each having more than 20,000 dealers—all of whom are small-business men—to sell and service their cars and trucks.

This interdependence between large and small business, which applies to our whole business structure up and down and across the board, gives small business a mighty important stake in big business and big business an equally important stake in small business. This being true, I'm sure neither Mr. PATMAN or you will deny that it is, why then shouldn't businessmen at both ends of the scale, top and bottom as well as those in the middle, unite in supporting an educational effort to give more people a better understanding of our American way of working and living together?

Your column is as full of untruths, half truths, and misstatements of fact as a cur dog is of fleas. You say, "Both lobbies are anti Taft-Hartley." The Small Business Economic Foundation is not a lobby so that's one misstatement of fact in these five words. The National Small Business Men's Association is very, very strong for the Taft-Hartley Act, which is the second misstatement of fact in the same five words.

Our association and its members ran the attached ad addressed to Mr. Green and Mr. Murray as a full page or a half page in 214 daily newspapers scattered all over the country and the tremendous public sentiment favorable to the Taft-Hartley Act which this ad generated is one of the principal reasons this act is still on the books. Also, if the truth were known, our effective opposition to the repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act is the principal reason Mr. PATMAN and some of his cohorts are doing their utmost to destroy or discredit the National Small Business Men's Association.

The foundation's educational program includes the distribution of hundreds of thousands of pamphlets to wage earners, to high school and college students, to high-school and college teachers, to professional people, to businessmen and others all over the country.

The foundation also sponsors a talking moving picture, Letter to a Rebel, which each week is being shown to more than one hundred 16-millimeter audiences of all kinds all over the country. This picture was recently given an honor award as an outstanding and distinguished educational effort by Freedoms Foundation, Inc.

Currently most of the foundation's effort is being concentrated on its series of full-page newspaper educational feature ads which in a short time will be running once a week for 52 weeks in more than 100 daily papers and eventually will run in more than 300 papers scattered over the 48 States. Last week the foundation was awarded a gold medal by Freedoms Foundation, Inc., for the first 13 ads in this series, which to date is all of the series that has appeared in one or more daily papers.

I could continue this discussion indefinitely but believe what I have said will serve to show that you haven't the slightest idea what you are talking about. Either that or you are the sort of person who will deliberately twist, distort, or misrepresent anything in order to turn out what he thinks is a good story.

Sincerely,

DEWITT EMERY,
President.

The World's Free Workingmen Unite

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the free and freedom-loving workingmen of the world are organizing to resist communism in labor unions and to combat totalitarianism. The great American labor organizations are joining in this world movement. It is one of the most significant and reassuring signs of these times to see workingmen everywhere repudiating the claims of Communist impostors that their movement befriends, protects and delivers labor from the shackles of non-Communist governments.

I find an excellent review of this free labor movement in Business Action, a publication of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, a copy of which I append herewith under leave to extend my remarks:

WORLD UNIONS GIRD TO FIGHT TOTALITARIANISM

(By Anthony P. Alfino, employer-employee relations)

A new world-wide labor organization has been established by trade unions to help workers everywhere resist totalitarian infiltration.

Meeting in London late in 1949, labor delegates from many parts of the world set up the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions (ICFTU) as opposed to Communist-dominated World Federation of Trade Unions (WFTU).

It all started about a year ago when representatives of CIO, British Trade Union Congress, and Dutch Union Center walked out of WFTU because of its Communist predominance.

JUSTICE AND SECURITY

The new group, ICFTU, proclaims the right of all workers to social justice, to job security, and to association in trade unions which shall be free bargaining instruments and which derive their authority from their members.

Although primary impetus came from those who pulled away from WFTU, many additional trade union groups were represented at London. The second report of the credentials committee, accepted by the conference, listed 261 labor officials from 53 countries in attendence, representing more than 48,000,000 members. Overtures to other trade unions to join, if successful, would raise this claimed total to 60,000,000 members.

Only CIO had been associated with WFTU. However, both AFL and CIO are participating in the new ICFTU, keeping apart their domestic rivalry in order to work together both in the initial preparations for the new world labor body and in the conference itself.

COMPROMISE ON PERSONNEL

Among important compromises was the question of geographic distribution of membership on the powerful executive board. As finally constituted, the board will consist of 19 members.

British delegates, aided by a group of European Socialist members, had proposed London as the permanent site for the organization while American delegates sought a continental city. Finally chosen, by unanimous vote, was Brussels, Belgium.

The conference decided to admit Christian trade-unions which promise to give up membership in the International Christian Federation within 2 years. The French Confederation of Christian Workers abstained from approval of the ICFTU constitution in order not to imply willingness to affiliate on the basis proposed. The Belgian Christian Unionists announced their affiliation, however, and the Italian group is believed definitely within the organization.

WORK WITH SECRETARIATS

ICFTU is considering provisions in its structure for close cooperation with the international trade-union secretariats, world-wide organizations devoted to workers' problems in specific trades and industries.

Figuring in ICFTU's present planning are these trades and industries: Transport, metal trades, building and woodwork, mines, communication, general factory, textile, boot and shoe, public service, clerical and technical work, farm laborers, diamond workers, printing trades, hotel and restaurant, tobacco, garment, food and drink, trade-unions in exile.

The ICFTU organizational set-up provides that it will be governed by a congress of delegates from all unions meeting once every 2 years. In the intervening years, a smaller group known as the general council will meet. Actual execution of decisions of the congress and council, as well as direction of ICFTU activities, will be handled by the executive board, to meet every 6 months.

The board has a seven-man subcommittee, to be on call between board meetings. Area representation on the subcommittee is distributed among Asia, Britain, Europe, Latin America, and North America, with Europe and North America each having two places.

BELGIAN ELECTED PRESIDENT

The confederation elected Paul Finet, of Belgium, as its first president, and J. H. Oldenbroek, of the Netherlands, its first secretary general. Oldenbroek for many years has been head of the International Transport Workers Federation.

United States labor unions have two places on both the executive board and on the subcommittee, filled by AFL President William Green, and CIO President Philip Murray. Green's alternates on the executive board are George Meany, AFL secretary-treasurer, and Irving Brown, AFL international representative for Europe; Murray's alternates are James B. Carey, CIO secretary-treasurer, and Elmer Cope, CIO international representative for Europe.

The other two members of the executive board from North America are Percy Bengough and Pat Conroy, both Canadian labor leaders.

Marine Corps Striking Force

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, the announcement during recent days that the Marine Corps striking force is to be reduced to six battalion landing teams has caused a great deal of concern to those of us who are interested in a balanced national defense. There is no question of the determination of some of defense officials, both in and out of the service, that the Army shall take over the functions of the Marine Corps. Apparently the battle is shortly to be joined and the decision should be made in the Congress. The editorial from the Christian Science Monitor which follows sheds light which is of interest to those of us who will be called upon to make the ultimate decision:

TELL IT TO THE PENTAGON

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—So the marines think they're tough, do they.

Montezuma, Tripoli, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima? Huh.

Never mind the howitzers, men. Belay those ready assault waves. Call off your close air support. Those marines aren't that tough. We've found a way to lick 'em.

Scuttle 'em in one sentence. Let 'em have it—smack in the budget.

Like this, see: "Six marine corps battalion landing teams will be maintained."

Six battalions of marines, a bare half a division, is all the new 1951 budget leaves the Nation's "first team"—instead of the two skeletonized divisions—of the fleet marine force Congress and the country have been counting on as the hard, steel spearhead of a force-in-readiness poised and ready to move by land or sea or air on less than 24 hours' notice.

This solar plexus punch by the Pentagon planners did not take the marines by surprise. The fact is they saw it coming.

They have been warning Congress about the fancy footwork of top defense officials, the familiar tactic of stroking the Marine Corps with one hand and yanking its funds out from under it with the other.

Gen. Clifton Cates, Marine Corps commandant, reminded the Vinson committee last October of the fears within the corps that the functions assigned it by law are being usurped by others, namely the Army General Staff.

The prevailing opinion around the Army section of the Pentagon seems to be that the Marine Corps is a luxury the country can do without. Generals Bradley and Collins have given the impression that there's nothing in the Marines' manual the Army can't do as well.

They admit that the marines pioneered and perfected the techniques of amphibious warfare. But look at the Army's record in Sicily, Southern France and Normandy, the generals say. They are especially proud of their webfooted exploits in Normandy where General Eisenhower's infantrymen swarmed out of the surf and over the German west wall.

General Cates told the Vinson committee last October that the corps was pared down to the limit of its bone and muscle. Any further reductions in combat strength, he intimated, would be fatal to the concept of the force-in-readiness, which Congress mapped out for the marines.

Now, the thing General Cates greatly feared has come upon the marines in the new 1951 defense budget, which cuts the present nucleus of two divisions in half. Marine Corps leaders say this reduces them to the role of policemen as effectively as though the issue had never been debated in Congress and decided in the Marine Corps' favor.

In writing the 1947 National Security Act, Congress plainly intended to safeguard the Marine Corps, especially its amphibious functions, and provide for its integrated mobilization in time of war.

But the trouble is that Congress didn't go far enough. It put a ceiling on the Marine Corps. It said the marines should not exceed 20 percent of the personnel of the Navy. But it failed to put a floor under the Marine Corps.

General Cates told the Vinson committee bluntly that the underlying effort on the part of the Army to contravene the act of Congress has never subsided. The Marine Commandant said furthermore that the Army was not seeking to have Congress redefine the roles and functions of the armed services but was proposing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff put to a vote the Army-sponsored proposal to transfer and reassign the traditional Marine Corps functions.

Each of those two budget-riddled fleet marine forces—one on each coast—has been regarded as the Nation's No. 1 force in readiness: Air-ground teams, developed during World War II when the Marines perfected the method of coordinating the striking power of air and ground forces in a new form of attack.

Under the roles and missions drawn up at Key West at a conference of Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders, the Marine Corps was designated as the amphibious force in readiness to move within the first 24 hours after the outbreak of war.

It was assumed at Key West the Nation was confronted with the possibility of a war in which an opponent would hold the initiative. Circumstances alone, it was agreed, would restrict the United States to a series of damage-control operations—the marine's job—against the time when the Nation could grapple with the enemy somewhere on the flaming outer fringes.

The marines may be in for their hardest fight—their last one or their best one—when that sentence in the budget reducing the fleet marine forces to six battalion landing teams comes up for consideration. There are signs that they will have considerable close support in Congress by the time the decisive battle begins.

A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, since my introduction of H. R. 6727, my attention has been called to the publication, entitled "A Voluntary Approach to a National Health Program," issued last year by the National Catholic Welfare Conference, in which that important organization advocates a plan quite similar to that envisioned in my bill.

I quote from pages 16 and 17 of this publication:

At the present time there are more than 33,000,000 people in the United States covered by hospital insurance in the Blue Cross and a rapidly growing number in the Blue Shield for medical or surgical benefits. There are approximately 52,000,000 if we include all types of hospital insurance. Another large group of Federal employees could also be included if prohibitions were removed. In order to stimulate enrollment in these voluntary insurance systems and to increase the benefits under Blue Shield so as to include full-scale medical and surgical care given in approved hospitals, we suggest that the Congress amend the income-tax law so as to permit a deduction of premiums up to $75 for health insurance from the net income tax of all individuals in the lower-income brackets, i. e., up to $5,000.

Although the above suggestion differs in detail from the income-tax credit provided in H. R. 6727, the same general principles apply. They are so well stated in the foreword to this brochure prepared by Most Rev. Karl J. Alter, bishop of Toledo, chairman of the bureau of health and hospitals, social action department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, that I have obtained permission to extend my remarks to include this foreword. The high motivation behind the recommendations of the National Catholic Welfare Conference is best expressed by the final paragraph in which it is stated:

It is our fervent hope and purpose by means of the system proposed in this statement to assure each citizen and the members of his family that they will enjoy under God's providence the best possible medical care.

The foreword prepared by Bishop Alter follows:

FOREWORD

The immediate problem under consideration in the following pages is that of developing an adequate national-health program. Interest in the subject has become quite intense and widespread. There has been much discussion and much controversy; but unfortunately there has been also much confusion. The confusion arises in large part from the tendency to oversimplify the problems involved and to assume that the cost of medical care is the only obstacle in the way of a great improvement. The lack of institutional facilities and professional personnel has

been greatly underestimated by reason of the emphasis placed on the former. In itself the latter is a primary obstacle and equally in need of remedy if the quality of medical care is not to deteriorate into a mere increase in the quantity of patients. A sound national program should provide for the elimination of both obstacles.

The controversy revolves in large part around the issue of an exclusive and compulsory Government health-insurance system versus private and voluntary effort supported by Government assistance instead of control. Many competent authorities fear that an exclusive state system under a compulsory tax will necessarily involve a loss of freedom for the voluntary health agencies and put an end to private initiative to the ultimate detriment of the health of the Nation. There is no controversy or disagreement concerning the advisability or advantage of a prepayment plan to meet the cost of medical care. Acceptance of such plans is practically unanimous. The division of opinion concerns the question whether there should be an exclusive state monopoly or whether there should be a cooperating partnership between the Government and voluntary health agencies. A right approach to the problem depends not only on a correct analysis of the concrete situation, but also on a correct social philosophy. The rights and duties of society, the state, and the individual must be considered in relationship to one another.

Society is a much broader and more comprehensive concept than that of the state. Government is indeed a necessary agency of society, but it is not the only one. There are many others. Because man is a social being he enters into association with others in order to achieve the benefits which are comprehended in the category of social welfare. These associations of a voluntary nature have as legitimate a right to exist as the state itself, provided they serve the common good. The state has a definite responsibility to help protect and promote the health of the Nation inasmuch as the Government is charged under the fundamental law with the duty of promoting the general welfare and inasmuch as the Government alone has adequate resources to implement a comprehensive program. Voluntary agencies, however, have a definite right and responsibility to exercise an important function in planning as well as in executing such a program. It is socially undesirable to neglect the contribution of either the one or the other.

Individualism as a philosophy of life has been discredited, not only because it has failed in practice, but because it stems from a false concept of human nature. Man has a twofold nature, both individual and social. His personal dignity and sacred rights originate in the fact that he is created as a distinct, intelligent, and responsible person, with a destiny of his own. His full development as a human being can be achieved only in as far as he is a member of society and only in as far as the obligations of social justice and social charity are fully activated. Ethical and religious ideals which furnish the highest motivation in the care of the sick as in all social service can function more effectively in voluntary associations than through the medium of the modern secularist state.

The bureau of health and hospitals of the social action department, NCWC, the administrative board of the Catholic Hospital Association, and the directors of Catholic charities have given careful consideration to the varied phases of a national health program, and in formulating their conclusions they approach the problem not from a negative but from a positive viewpoint. They recognize the existence of social responsibility, but at the same time they reject the concept of an exclusive state responsibility for the health and well-being of the American people. They reaffirm their conviction that a partnership between the state and voluntary associations provides the better solution and is more consistent with our democratic processes. Monopoly means control; partnership means freedom. They entertain the hope that the following statement will throw new light on the subject and that a genuine cooperation of all parties at interest will produce a constructive program adapted to the needs of the Nation and effective in promoting the highest standards of health and well-being.

KARL J. ALTER,
Bishop of Toledo, Episcopal Chairman, Bureau of Health and Hospitals, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, and Chairman, Administrative Board of the Catholic Hospital Association of the United States and Canada.

Amending the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LLOYD M. BENTSEN, JR.
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a three-sentence bill which I think merits your support. Its purpose is to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to alleviate the undue hardship which would otherwise befall two groups of veterans.

The first group is composed of veterans who, owning farms on January 1, 1950, have an old-growers allotment for 1950 less than the county percentage factor. It is my feeling that these veterans who returned late from the war and got started on their cotton slowly should not be held down by the greatest acreage limitation. Consistent with the policy of the over-all act, limiting total production, they should be allowed to produce up to the country average. My bill provides for this, but stays within the policy of the act by specifying that only acreage previously allotted to other farms and voluntarily released to the county committee be reapportioned to these veterans.

The second group is composed of veterans who, owning farms on January 1, 1950, are not eligible for a 1950 old growers allotment. Here I am principally concerned with veterans who planted to cotton in 1949, but not in a prior year, for which reason their farms were not considered when acreage allotments were computed. My bill would accord to these veterans an adjustment in their new growers allotments, and to an extent equal to the county percentage factor for old growers, but only so far as released acreage will permit.

I spoke of both these groups in a speech I delivered on the House floor February 2, 1949. My remarks were directed at H. R. 128, which subsequently became Public Law 28. While I agreed with the majority of the House that the purpose of the bill was most commendable, I pointed out that serious inequities would result unless in the final agricultural bill some allowances were made for these veterans off to a late start following their return from service.

It was at the encouragement and recommendation of the United States Government that many returning war veterans of south Texas took lands of very low economic value and at high cost to themselves cleared the brush and put the land into cultivation to grow cotton and feed crops. This arduous process of clearing mesquite and ebony trees to make the land suitable for cotton took a great deal of time, and when it is considered that many of these veterans were late in 1946 discarding their uniforms, and late, perhaps, in 1947, getting readjusted to civilian life and establishing themselves again, it is easy to understand how 1949 may have been the year of their first cotton crop. Or, if not the first, then easy to understand how very small the acreage actually put to cotton in 1948 may have been.

These veterans by their improvements to the land have taken property that was on the tax rolls at values of $2 and $3 and increased the valuations tremendously, with resultant benefit to the counties and State of Texas.

But while the counties and the State have profited, the veterans by their efforts have incurred heavy mortgages and debts in purchasing and developing the land. They bought and cleared their acreage with an eye to the future, and now must face that future uncertainly, as their dry land with its limited uses is further restricted by a law seriously curtailing any cotton quota they might obtain.

In my speech of last February I said:

If 1949 is not allowed in future cotton quotas, and the cotton-quota law, as yet to be drafted, does not provide a means of giving them quotas substantially up to the county average, it will bankrupt a number of men, including many World War II veterans who are planting new lands to cotton this year for the first time, since they would have their cotton allotment appreciably decreased in 1950.

I then went on to point out that much of this new land cannot be profitably farmed unless a large percentage of it is planted to cotton.

My bill, as I have said, is limited to three sentences. The heart of the amendment is contained in the first sentence. This is the provision which reallocates released acreage to veterans of either of the two groups that I have discussed. It reads as follows:

Any part of the acreage allotted to individual farms in any county under the provisions of this section which the owner or operator releases to the county committee shall be deducted from the allotments for such farms and apportioned to farms in the county which are owned by veterans who acquired such farms prior to January 1, 1950, and for which allotments for the 1950 crop are established under subsection (f) of this section, so as to provide, to the extent that the released acreage will permit, an allotment for

any such farm equal to the acreage determined for the farm by applying the percentage factor computed under subsection (f) (2) of this section.

The second sentence was put in the bill to provide for the disposition of released land not required by the veterans. The wording of this provision is:

Any released acreage not required for such veterans' farms shall be used by the county committee for making adjustments of other farm acreage allotments established under subsection (f) of this section so as to establish allotments which are fair and reasonable in relation to the factors set forth in paragraph (3) of that subsection.

The third and last sentence is intended to safeguard an annual supply of released acreage. Without this provision I believe most farmers would be extremely reluctant to give up any part of their quota. The provision reads:

For purposes of establishing farm acreage allotments for any subsequent year, any acreage transferred pursuant to this subsection shall be considered as acreage planted to cotton on the farm from which such acreage was transferred and shall not be considered as acreage planted to cotton on the farm to which such acreage was transferred.

I sincerely believe that the amendment I have introduced is a necessary and proper one. It is not a veterans' handout bill. Rather, it seeks to take into account certain factors now serving to penalize some veterans for their years in uniform, and to make an adjustment for them by putting their lands on a more workable, productive basis. I earnestly solicit your support for the passage of this important legislation.

The Lambs Go Traveling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include this revealing editorial from the Wisconsin State Journal of Madison, Wis.:

THE LAMBS GO TRAVELING

With all the genius Democrats can demonstrate when it comes to raising party slush funds, it's a wonder they can't balance the national budget, which, by Truman's own figuring, is $5,500,000,000 out of joint.

Take, for instance, the case of Charlie Cashin and his fellow United States attorneys across the country.

Charlie and his colleagues have been summoned to Washington for a conference with the United States Attorney General, Mr. Truman's former campaign manager.

The taxpayers will pay their traveling expenses. Nice trip for all the boys. But—

Once there, they're all expected—that's the official word, expected—to plunk down $100 apiece for the Democrats' Jefferson-Jackson day fund-raising feed. The shakedown dinner just happens to fall on the day of the conference's opening.

Neat. Quite neat.

The party-in-power, and power is the word, taps the public till to haul the sacrificial lambs into position for blood-letting. And everybody loses but the boys in power.

Yes, just as neat as the pattern in Wisconsin, where worried mail carriers, postal clerks, and other civil servants are getting those letters signed by Jerry Fox and Carl Thompson * * * "Our records do not show you listed as a contributor to the Democratic party * * *." Get going. Cough up. Bam! Slug! Squeeze! * * * "so that party activities and the 1950 campaign fund can be assured."

Neat as the way you get a census-taking job in Wisconsin.

"Come on up and join the Democratic Party!"

Neat, indeed. Very neat. And maybe just a little bit too gaudy.

Vote-Getting Fraud

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial which appeared in the Sioux City (Iowa) Journal under date of January 13, 1950, as follows:

VOTE-GETTING FRAUD

Harry S. Truman is President of the United States and in that position he deliberately is planning political fraud on the American people by promising them things he must know he cannot deliver. It is all part of a design for election victories. He promises, as someone has said, all things to all people, yet is bound to realize that he cannot make good on such extravagant assurances, the while he craftily calculates the vote-getting power of the attitude he thus announces.

When compared to his predecessor, Mr. Truman may not suffer as much, as a politician, as the average observer may think. Franklin D. Roosevelt for years was regarded as possibly the most astute politician in United States history. He was credited with knowing far in advance of the developments what the people would want and demand, with knowing before they had made up their minds what they were going to think later, with anticipating situations affecting the social and economic life of the country, and with making his plans accordingly. Harry S. Truman is not far behind him in political craftiness if, indeed, he is in that position at all. Both were opportunists, and it may be said of the Chief Executive of today that he works just as hard at it as did his predecessor.

It is common gossip in Washington among Members of Congress of both major parties, among newspaper correspondents of years of training and experience, that Mr. Truman, who is to make various demands on the House and the Senate for legislation, does not expect such measures as he champions to be put through. It also is whispered about that with reference to some of the things he will emphasize he actually does not want them to succeed. But—and this is the important thing—having advocated the reforms, which his own party members in Congress confidently are expected to reject, he can remind the electorate that he tried to put them over, that his heart was in the right place, that he was thinking of them, and was trying to do something for them, wherefore they ought to support him when election time came.

Members of Congress considered closest to the White House admit that in this session of Congress Mr. Truman already is as good as whipped on three things he will emphasize: Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act, compulsory health insurance, seen by many as socialized medicine, and substitution of the Brannan farm plan for the present price-control law. They also think he has little chance to put through his civil-rights program. Mr. Truman knows this as well as do others. But that does not worry him for he feels that various groups to which he makes his promises will vote as he wishes even if he isn't able to make good his pledges.

If Our Nation Would Remain Prosperous, Like the American Family It Must Balance Its Federal Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, so accustomed have the American people become to thinking in terms of billions of dollars when speaking of our Federal budget, that we have lost sight of the simple economics involved in the matter of remaining solvent, whether as an individual, a family, an institution, or the Government itself.

The following editorial published in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of January 11, 1950, entitled "This Is Not Fiction," translates into terms we all can understand the meaning of our Government's unbalanced budget. I ask unanimous consent to have the article from the Plain Dealer reprinted as follows:

THIS IS NOT FICTION

Will the reader pretend that he has an obscure neighbor by the name of Harry Truman? And will he pretend that Neighbor Truman has decided he must borrow money, a decision which many of us ordinary folks have reached at times in the tempestuous course of life?

Neighbor Truman, we're going to pretend, steps into the bank to apply for the loan, and we're going to have the privilege of observing the transaction.

"I want to borrow $500," says our neighbor. (Now most will anticipate the next few questions, having been through it.)

"Do you have any debts at the present time?" the banker inquires.

"Yes," says our neighbor. "I owe the bank at this moment about $25,800."

"What is your annual income, Mr. Truman?"

"I have take-home pay amounting to $3,750 a year," says he.

"Hmmmmm," the banker hmms. He at once is suspicious of the client's ability to pay the old debt without $500 more added. And aren't his eavesdropping neighbors suspicious, too?

But the banker gives allowance for unforeseen circumstance. So he asks Mr. Truman: "Do you think you will be able to save a large portion of your income this year and each succeeding year to reduce your indebtedness?"

"Oh, no," Neighbor Truman replies to the surprise of the banker, and the neighbors listening in. "My necessary living expenses

this year will be $4,250. I'll be forced to spend more than I earn."

"Pardon me," the startled banker interjects. "Do you mean that, owing already an amount that constitutes seven times what you'll take in during a year, you're going to spend more than you earn?"

"That's right," says Neighbor Truman. "You see I must provide tuition at private schools for my children. I must help a poor relative set up a new business in which he's going to lose money for a long time to come."

"Just what kind of business is that relative going to sink your money in?" the incredulous banker asks.

"Why," says Mr. Truman, "he's got a wonderful humanitarian idea. He's going to sell milk to the Hottentots at a price they can afford to pay."

"But just those things won't eat up your whole income this year; will they?"

"No; but that isn't all," says Mr. Truman. "I am building security for my children by putting price supports under them. My boys sell newspapers to the neighbors at a nickel apiece, but I give them an extra nickel. My daughters make lamp shades which they sell for $5, but I don't think that's a fair price, so I give an extra $2 for each one they sell. Besides, my wife wants a television set."

The banker now steps aside to get his breath. Here's a fellow who owes more than he can ever repay if he lives frugally below his income seeking to borrow still more, and at the same time boldly proclaiming his intention of carrying out fantastic money-spending schemes.

What will the banker do?

Will he lend the new money? It's silly even to ask the question.

This scene is not fiction. It constitutes a faithful reproduction of the program set forth in regal solemnity by President of the United States Harry S. Truman. Multiply all figures by 10,000,000 and you have the Truman budget, his plan of Government, the Government's income, and the Government's debt.

In this case Congress is the banker. If it makes the loan, Borrower Truman's note will have to be signed by the taxpayers, which is to say by all the people. Who, in his right mind, would voluntarily sign the note of such a profligate spender?

A Free Hand in the Far East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, I note an editorial in the Christian Science Monitor of January 6, 1950, which I regard as a clear and comprehensive view of the problems that confront us in dealing with the Far East. The conclusions reached by the Monitor I believe to be sound, when we take into consideration all the factors of the complex situation. It is not China alone that we are dealing with, but rather a world problem that calls for circumspection on our part as we endeavor to shape a far-reaching policy. Under leave to extend my remarks, I attach the editorial, as follows:

A FREE HAND IN THE FAR EAST

The choice for United States foreign policy on Formosa has been a choice of methods. Americans are agreed on stanch resistance to the spread of communism in the Far East. The differences arise over the most effective ways and means. In adopting a hands-off-Formosa position President Truman—with the advice of the National Security Council—has chosen, we believe, the wiser way.

Any other decision would have left American policy weighed down by the incubus of the émigré regime of Chiang Kai-shek. Armed intervention was the most dangerous venture into which that incubus would have forced the United States. In behalf of a regime plainly repudiated by the Chinese people, intervention would have risked war with the government which—little as we like it—now speaks for the Chinese people.

But as Mr. Truman indicated and Secretary Acheson has more fully explained, American policy now goes farther than mere rejection of armed intervention. It continues technically to recognize the Nationalist government, but practically cuts loose from the discredited Chiang. It refuses to send him military advisers. It confines aid for Formosa to ECA measures already authorized.

The United States refuses to quibble over the legal status of Formosa under the Cairo and Potsdam agreements—which, in the absence of a peace treaty, might have been used as an excuse for American occupation. Mr. Truman specifically renounces any American desire to obtain special rights or to set up military bases in Formosa.

These moves draw the poison fangs from Moscow's charge of imperialism. Americans know that charge is untrue. But the Chinese people, moved as much by anti-foreignism as by communism, have been influenced by it to regard the United States as an enemy. So, too, have millions of other Asiatic peoples.

It is not easy to cut loose from the only organized Chinese resistance to communism. If Chiang could reasonably claim to speak for China, aid for him even in exile might be justified. But when he has been so plainly rejected by the people and is particularly unwelcome in Formosa, continued active support of him was clearly a millstone about the neck of American policy.

Released now from this burden, the United States can begin, in cooperation with other anti-Communist governments—particularly those in the Far East—to regain the friendship of the Chinese people. Now, with hands freed, American policy should seek with renewed vigor to dissociate itself from the imperialism, racial discrimination, and feudalistic exploitation which give Moscow its main chance in the Far East.

The Time for Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLENN R. DAVIS
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many of us, in considering the way our gigantic national debt is being increased by deficit financing, wonder if it ever will be possible to balance the budget, since the present administration thinks it cannot be done in these relatively prosperous times. And the editor of the largest newspaper in my State wonders if the administration ever will see any need for economy. Under permission to extend my remarks, I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial from the Milwaukee Journal:

TRUMAN'S UNBALANCED BUDGET

President Truman in his wordy budget message says that the Federal budget must be balanced one of these days, but not in 1950, which, of course, is a political year.

Though his 1951 budget entails a $1,700,000,000 cut in foreign commitments and aids to veterans and a $1,500,000,000 increase in social security and postal revenues, it ends with a deficit only $400,000,000 less than in 1950.

Despite the $5,100,000,000 deficit in 1951, the President argues that he has taken the only possible realistic position—that every cent he asks for is minimum for our national safety and our domestic well being. He hints that, were it not for his realization of our fiscal difficulties, he would have set budget goals far higher. After all, the Fair Deal is being expanded by only a billion or so in 1951.

But why, if realism is a factor, must we increase a deficit by spending the $520,000,000 for Federal highways in 1951? Why must we expand relief grants to the States by $250,000,000? Why must we start a $300,000,000 program of educational aids? Why must we in 1951 do a dozen other things the President feels cannot be postponed?

The answer is, of course, that we do not have to extend our social experimentation, unless we choose to. The President's budget, made on the eve of (and with an eye on) the fall elections, can be cut materially without the slightest damage to worthwhile existing programs. The question is whether Congress, also with an eye to the elections, will do the job.

Congress always finds it difficult to cut expenses. Yet it is toying with the idea of reducing the war excises. If it does so, the deficit contemplated by the President may rise from $5,100,000,000 to around seven billion. Congress has never looked with favor on increasing postal revenues by raising second-class mail rates, as the President asks. If it turns down that suggestion, the deficit may approach seven and one-half billion, which is two billion more than this year.

Against this, we shall have the President's proposals for a revision of our taxes, to come later. The revision, he says, will be primarily to remove injustices and only secondarily to increase revenues.

The whole thing adds up to a new Truman policy of gradually decreasing deficits. He would expand expenditures almost to keep pace with future increases in revenue and would reach a balance sometime within the next decade or two.

The time for economy, says the President, is not now. We wonder whether, in his mind, there ever need be such a time.

After all, he has already asked for numerous programs that would boost expenditures far above those even envisaged in this budget message.

Forty-eight Sovereign States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Boston Herald of Friday, January 6, 1950:

FORTY-EIGHT SOVEREIGN STATES

The distinguishing mark of the Fair Deal is a sprawling array of social services imposed extravagantly on the entire country at the Federal level. In the first place the National Government does it and not the States, in the second the Government usually makes its reforms compulsory, and in the third it neglects the capacity of the economy to support the reforms.

This centralization is neatly annotated by Governor Dewey's message to the New York Legislature. Mr. Dewey reports on an impressive list of social services offered or proposed by the State government. But the services are untainted by governmental paternalism, and they are not expanding beyond the power of the State to support them.

It is particularly significant that while President Truman feels the need to ask for a moderate increase in Federal taxation, Governor Dewey prefers to cut State spending to remain within the present tax structure. In the nice adjustment of social welfare to the ability of the tax base to support it, Mr. Dewey wishes to remain on the black-ink side of the ledger.

Mr. Dewey declares that no person in New York State need go without medical care any more because he cannot afford it. This has been accomplished not by any compulsory insurance plan or by any elaborate system of general free services entailing heavy taxes on everyone. It has not interfered in any way with the traditional physician-patient relationship. There is no over-prescribing scandal such as hangs over the British system. It is done by carefully restricting the operation of the government to the area in which the system of individual initiative cannot effectively function.

There are other examples of this State administration of welfare. The point we would make here is that the Federal Government is crowding in on the States in setting up its own social services, and it does so partly by laying such a heavy Federal tax burden that the States cannot pursue their own programs.

There is no justification for saying that the Federal Government can do these things better. No national program can be tailored for the individual State, and what Mississippi might need in the way of social services won't do in New York or Massachusetts. Mr. Dewey brings home that the States can do it, and can do it within the bounds of free enterprise without Federal direction.

For Whom, the Rocks?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following interesting editorial from the Daily Belle Fourche (S. Dak.) Post of January 5, 1950:

FOR WHOM, THE ROCKS?

Unless something happens to change the atmosphere, the months between now and next November are going to be an accelerated repetition of the months between November a year ago and now. It's going to be a political campaign whirl during which facts generally are warped into campaign issues for public consumption. The citizen, meanwhile, poses as a lout who will swallow anything if it is poked at him often enough.

It will be a time for digging out campaign issues. And digging out campaign issues has come to mean unearthing petty issues that can be blown up so that they will be mistaken for vital issues.

The flat fact of the political picture today is that there is no between-election period when all officials buckle down to work for the good of the Nation. Campaign overlaps campaign, the only variety that of intensity.

In the meantime, the citizen looks at government as something apart from himself. He pokes fun at Congress, not once admitting that Congress is the people's branch of the Government, and that whatever it is or is not, he has made it. He pokes fun at Congress never realizing that he is poking fun at himself, at his failure in performing the duties of self-government.

Every Representative or Senator in Washington was elected by the people. He was chosen first by his party mates in a primary election. He was approved by the people of his State or district in a general election. But in spite of these common facts, people make jibes at Congress, not realizing that they are discrediting their own voice in the Government.

There is plenty of fodder to use in poking fun at Congress. The executive branch of the Government sees to that. It is only natural that the administration should try to weaken the force that provides its greatest check—the branch that limits its power.

Consequently, if there is one fact that needs to be hammered into the minds of the people it is this: To discredit Congress is to discredit themselves. To discredit Congress is to prove that men are not bright enough to rule themselves.

The Congress has just opened a new session. But reporters and commentators, before the first day was over, were poking at Congress as they might poke at a congress in Timbuktu—a congress in which they had no part. We belong to this commenting group. And we hang our heads in shame that any group can be so blind to what they are doing. It is all the more to their discredit that these writers, these commentators are among those who have profited most from our free government and its free system of education. Yet they are leading the pack in tearing it—and themselves—to pieces.

Whatever this Nation is, we the people, have made it. If Congress is weak, we, the people have made it so. There is not one among us who has the right to stand off and pitch rocks, as uninterested persons, at the Congress we, ourselves, elected.

Before it's too late, let's realize what we're doing. Before it's too late let us realize that now is the time to choose our best minds and our greatest hearts to represent us and manage the affairs of our Government. Our best in Congress, our best in the Senate, our best in the statehouses—this is the first demand in a democracy. And if it is otherwise, we have nobody to blame but ourselves.

The Need of Limiting by Congressional Amendment the Spending and Taxing Powers of Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Robert B. Dresser, Providence, R. I., on the Need of Limiting by Constitutional Amendment the Spending and Taxing Powers of Congress:

JANUARY 3, 1950.

In a speech on the floor of the United States Senate on July 14, 1949, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, speaking of President Truman's speech the night before on the Economic Report, said:

"I say that the fiscal program announced last night by the President is the certain road to ruin. Unless the Congress and the people can defeat this program, we will go over the precipice of financial disaster.

* * * * * *

"Such a program can only hold in prospect for business increased taxes or national insolvency. Increased taxes applied to a declining business probably would reach a point of confiscation, and insolvency would mean default on the public debt, in which is now invested a great part of the security of the American public. Confiscation would mean socialism, and default would mean national bankruptcy."

This speech was delivered in the current fiscal year, in which the estimated expenditures of the Federal Government, $43,500,000,000, are the largest in any peacetime fiscal year, and the estimated deficit, $5,500,000,000, the second largest, being exceeded only by the year ended June 30, 1941, when outlays on the defense program led to a deficit of $6,159,000,000. Moreover, in less than five peacetime years under President Truman, the Federal Government has spent $191,081,000,000, an amount greater than the total amount spent from 1789 to July 1, 1941. In 1931 the cost of the Federal Government was $30 for each man, woman, and child. In the current fiscal year it will be over $300.

According to ex-President Hoover, "Twenty years ago persons directly or indirectly receiving moneys from the Government * * * represented about one person in every 40 of the population. Today about one person out of seven in the population is a regular recipient of Government moneys. If all of those of age are married, they comprise about one-half of the voting strength of the last presidential election."

But this is not all. The present administration has proposed legislation that according to some estimates would eventually add over $20,000,000,000 to the present budget.

This alarming state of affairs has been brought about during the past 16 years by the policy on the part of our Federal managers of tax, spend, and elect, the formula for socialism proposed by the late Harry Hopkins.

If we are to retain our freedom, we must drastically reduce our spending and our taxes, and to prevent recurring abuses of the spending and taxing powers they should be limited by amendments to the Federal Constitution.

One amendment should eliminate the general-welfare clause and limit the spending power of Congress to the specific purposes enumerated in the Constitution. This would merely be an adoption of Mr. Madison's view, as opposed to that of Mr. Hamilton, that the general-welfare clause adds nothing to the purposes specified in the Constitution. The amendment should also give to any State the right to question in the courts the validity of an appropriation—a right which generally speaking no one possesses at the present time.

The other amendment should (1) deprive Congress of the power to impose death and gift taxes, and (2) limit the power of Congress to impose taxes on incomes in peacetime to a reasonable maximum rate. The adoption of this amendment would do the following things:

1. It would provide needed assurance, which statutory law cannot provide, against

recurring abuse of the Federal taxing power, and aid greatly in the formation of much needed venture capital.

2. It would increase the national wealth, and over the years, the Federal revenue.

3. It would aid greatly in saving our free-enterprise system.

4. It would free the States from Federal domination and aid in preserving our present form of constitutional government.

5. It would terminate the duplication of death and gift taxes by the Federal Government and the States, and leave that field of taxation exclusively to the States, the laws of which, and not the Federal law, determine the right to dispose of property by gift and on death and the rights of inheritance. The death taxes, running to a high of 77 percent, are extremely destructive of capital and will in the long run destroy the accumulations of capital so necessary for industrial activity and expansion, and for the full employment of labor and the payment of high wages. The revenue from these taxes is trivial, constituting less than 2 percent of the present Federal budget. The gift tax is auxiliary to the death tax, and both should be dealt with alike.

As to the income tax, both reason and our own Government's experience demonstrate that in peacetime a moderate rate of tax will in the long run produce more revenue than a high rate.

In the United States 90 percent of the work today is done by machinery. It is this machinery that has made the high wages and high standard of living possible. The capital required to provide this machinery comes from the savings of corporations and individuals. Only a small percentage of the people, probably not over 10 percent, save money for investment in such machinery. If these savings are taken in taxes, the capital is not available to provide the machinery needed to maintain and expand our industrial plants.

It is the heavy progressive income tax that does the damage by appropriating the savings of those taxpayers who supply the bulk of the capital needed by industry.

It is clear that unless Federal spending and taxes are drastically reduced, our venture in individual freedom will end and the socialistic state will take over, and it may be sooner than many realize.

In the words of the English historian, Thomas Hodgkin, in his book, Italy and Her Invaders, written in 1880:

"Whatever occasional ebbings there may be in the current, there can be little doubt that the tide of affairs in England and in all the countries of western Europe, as well as in the United States of America, sets permanently toward democracy. Will the great democracies of the twentieth century resist the temptation to use political power as a means of material self-enrichment? With a higher ideal of public duty than has been shown by some of the governing classes which preceded them, will they refrain from jobbing the Commonwealth? Warned by the experience of Rome, will they shrink from reproducing directly or indirectly the political heresy of Caius Gracchus, that he who votes in the forum must be fed by the state? If they do, perhaps the world may see democracies as long lived as the dynasties of Egypt or of China. If they do not, assuredly now as in the days of our Saxon forefathers, it will be found that he who is 'giver of bread' is also lord. The old weary round will recommence, democracy leading to anarchy, and anarchy to despotism, and the national workshops of some future Gracchus will build the palaces in which British or American despots, as incapable to rule as Arcadius or Honorius, will guide mighty empires to ruin amidst the acclamations of flatterers as eloquent and as hollow as the courtly Claudian."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

Acheson's Red Herring

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial which appeared in the Washington News of January 14:

MR. ACHESON'S RED HERRING

When a defense attorney can't make out a good case for a client, it's a common expedient to divert attention from the real issue by dragging out a red herring.

Secretary of State Acheson has done this in defending the State Department's blunders in China. Russia is the red herring—and no pun intended.

The Soviets, he points out, are annexing four northern areas of China—Outer Mongolia, Manchuria, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang. He predicts that this will provoke the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people, and explains that American policy in the Far East is based on that expectation.

Mr. Acheson seems to have forgotten that President Roosevelt agreed to the separation of Outer Mongolia and China in the Yalta deal of 1944, which China confirmed under American pressure in the Russian-Chinese treaty of 1945. We may be sure, however, that the Chinese people have not forgotten it.

Given uncontested control of Outer Mongolia, it was easy for the Russians to penetrate Inner Mongolia and Sinkiang.

What actually happened in Manchuria, after Russia invaded that area at our urgent request, is of even more recent memory. But, as far back as 1947, Lt. Gen. A. C. Wedemeyer saw that Russia planned to annex that vast area and advised our Government to put it under a United Nations trusteeship to save it from the Communist invasion. Mr. Acheson's predecessor in the State Department, General Marshall, vetoed that proposal.

In brief, the United States conceded Outer Mongolia to the Russians, and opened the doors of Manchuria to them. This much is recorded in the State Department's own white paper.

Possibly, as Mr. Acheson professes to hope, the Chinese people in time will rise in their wrath and drive the Russians out. Something remotely like that has happened in Yugoslavia. But it has not happened in Poland, despite the country's long tradition of hatred for all things Russian. It hasn't happened in any of the other satellite states.

It is no easy matter for unarmed peasants to overthrow a police-state dictatorship, however unpopular it may be.

Mr. Acheson also is a better defense attorney than historian in his explanation of Nationalist China's collapse.

A much different version is running currently in the Saturday Evening Post.

Chiang Kai-shek, according to Mr. Acheson, emerged from the war the undisputed leader of his people, opposed only by a few ragged Communists hiding in the hills. If that had been the case, by what right or reason did the United States intervene in China in 1946 and demand that Chiang take this unimportant minority into his government? We did that, through the Marshall mission.

Our intervention halted Chiang's armies in their tracks when they were at the point of knocking the Communists out of the war. His support melted away, as Mr. Acheson says it did, but that was because Chiang's war-weary country was unequal to the burden of maintaining his idle armies in the field during the long American-imposed truce, which Mr. Acheson does not mention.

Finally, when Chiang was at the end of his resources, American support was withdrawn from his government because it had failed to satisfy the Communists' demands.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOE L. EVINS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months the slow-down of work in the coal industry brought about by the dictatorial demands of John L. Lewis has served to increase in intensity the present coal situation. Although the weather in certain sections of the country continues to be favorable and thus averts a most critical situation, in other sections of the country where intense and severe cold weather prevails, with a resultant great use of coal, a most acute condition prevails.

To add to this, there continues to be a coal shortage in industry and many of the miners themselves are highly displeased and dissatisfied with the 3-day week and the slow-down in production ordered by Lewis. These miners are most anxious to go back to work.

Mr. Speaker, it is a deplorable situation in this country when one man can dictate to the laboring man when he shall work and for how long. John L. Lewis should be effectively dealt with and promptly. The provisions of the Taft-Hartley law should be invoked and the slow-down and crippling strike ended and coal production resumed, in the interest of the workingman, industry, and the people of America.

DICTATOR JOHN L. LEWIS SHOULD BE DEALT WITH PROMPTLY AND EFFECTIVELY

I have, heretofore, called upon the President to take action in this connection. I deem it of importance in the interest of the people of America.

Mr. Speaker, in this connection, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following two editorials:

[From the Nashville Banner of January 12, 1950]

HOW NOW, CONGRESS?

A resolution has been proposed in Congress which, if adopted, would urge President Truman to exercise the authority vested in him to get full production of coal resumed.

Here is Congress' opportunity to demonstrate clearly, for all to see, how it feels about the situation brought about by John L. Lewis' whims and hates.

It is clearly shown that President Truman is not disposed to take the action the law provides he can take to protect the public. Congress should show the President, and the people, what it thinks—one way or the other.

In no uncertain terms, the gravity of the situation has been presented at the White

House and on Capitol Hill by the people best acquainted with the Nation's fuel necessities.

From the White House has come nothing. From Capitol Hill will come—what?

[From the Nashville Tennessean of January 13, 1950]

ANY MONOPOLY SHOULD BE CURBED

Mr. John L. Lewis, who is probably more responsible than any other man for the Taft-Hartley Act, has now forced upon Congress the possible need of applying antitrust laws to labor unions in order to outlaw the sort of monopolistic restraint of trade that exists in coal production.

The antitrust laws were designed to prevent just such a condition as now exists. For the good of the country, it has been decreed, no man or group should have power enough to dictate the operations of any trade or industry, to fix prices to the detriment of the public, to manipulate production for private gain, and to eliminate competition.

Where coal mining is concerned, of course, there is little or no competition. But here again the question of tyranny arises, since all efforts to challengs the power of a dictator are promptly put down—by force, if necessary.

As an hypothesis let it be assumed that instead of a threat to the economic system by one man in control of the Nation's miners, this state of affairs had been brought about by a person or persons dominating one of the basic private or semiprivate industries. The rich and powerful steel industry may be taken as an example.

Big steel is not without its faults. Its leaders are smart; they take care of profits and, for themselves, handsome salaries and pensions. But no czar of steel has the power to manipulate the industry as coal production is manipulated, with utter disregard of the national public.

How long would a steel dictator last who systematically shut down operations to create shortages and unemployment, thereby starting a chain reaction affecting unfavorably the whole economy? Would the country thus permit its railroads to be partially paralyzed and operations to be curtailed or ended in a vast number of factories, power plants, and private homes? Would the people, to say nothing of the Government, be tolerant if result were to bring actual physical suffering to millions, as is the case when coal supplies are limited by one man's decree?

The result would be a quick declaration that no man or organization is greater than the Government and that ruthless restraint of trade through monopolistic power must stop.

Laws exist for dealing with an imaginary condition of the kind outlined. If they did not exist they would soon be enacted. The important thing, however, is that the American people would not tolerate such an outrage under any conditions.

In the present crisis, President Truman may be forced to application of the Taft-Hartley law. But that would mean only impermanent alleviation. In due time, the tyrant of the coal fields could return to his harassing tactics, as he has always done.

Temporary relief will be welcome, but the time is at hand when it should be made lasting. The right to strike is inherent, but the right to dominate a country is inimical to American principles.

Antitrust laws have been on the books a long time and have served a good purpose. They should be the Nation's safeguard against dangerous monopoly of any kind, and labor has Mr. Lewis to thank for the growing sentiment that its scope should be extended so that the habitual offender who heads the United Mine Workers can be cut down to size.

Rural Electrification

REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, as an ardent supporter of rural electrification, and being a bit skeptical of the ultimate intentions of the Southwestern Power Administration, I am alarmed at the report of a contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the rural electric cooperatives within my area, awaiting approval of the Rural Electrification Administration of Washington, having as its principal purpose the socialization of the rural people and the abolition of the fine intentions of the rural electrification program.

JUSTIFICATION FOR RURAL ELECTRIC COOPERATIVES

Rural electrification is a justifiable program within a free democracy operating under our free enterprise system—justifiable for the simple reason that existing private utilities could not in many instances economically reach the sparsely settled rural areas. These rural people have joined together in a true American spirit for the purpose of bringing into their respective communities a necessity and convenience to which they are entitled. These democratic groups who own and operate their own systems are just as free as the stockholders in any other corporation dealing in private enterprise under our system of government. Merely because banking institutions could not economically justify long-term loans at a sufficiently low rate of interest with which electricity could be brought to the sparsely settled rural sections accounts for the need of loans from the Federal Government, to which these people are as much entitled as any business that might borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation or any other loan agency of our Government. I have no hesitancy in further stating that the rural electrification program is economically sound, and there is no reason why every penny of the money will not be repaid to the Government.

INTENTIONS OF THE SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

The expressed intentions of the Southwestern Power Administration are legitimate, but I have always been a bit doubtful as to whether this organization actually intends to limit its activities to the borders of its expressed intentions. This organization has publicly contended that its existence was necessary for the pooling and proper distribution of power generated by the Federal Government at various multiple-purpose dams within the Southwest. There has been some doubt in my mind whether the Southwestern Power Administration does not in some ulterior manner intend to eventually generate and produce power from sources other than that provided by the Government Flood Control Act. However, along with many other Members of Congress, I have often been assured by officials of the Southwestern Power Administration that they never anticipate the operation of steam-power units for the generation of electricity, or to in anywise attempt the regimentation of our splendid rural electrification system which means so much to the rural people of this country.

However, we now find the Southwestern Power Administration entering into a contract with the rural electric cooperatives which will, in effect, through the back-door method and contrary to the intent of Congress, according to my interpretation of the contract, allow the Southwestern Power Administration to receive all benefits from steam-power electric generating units provided with rural electrification moneys within the Southwest; to operate and eventually own electric transmission lines built with rural electrification moneys that could well be used to extend distribution lines to unserved rural people within my area—which authority has been specifically denied by Congress; and to stranglehold the free operations now being enjoyed by the rural electric cooperatives by allowing the Government through the Southwestern Power Administration to dictate all policies of, and completely regulate the involved rural electric cooperatives.

My accusation that the Rural Electrification Administration is using moneys for purposes inferior to the need for distribution lines to unserved eligible people as provided in the law is advisedly made. For example, I have several times brought to the Administration's attention my personal knowledge of approximately 375 eligible rural people within Scott County, Ark., who have not as much as received consideration at the hands of the Rural Electrification Administration on a loan application filed in December 1947, while during this same time millions of dollars in loans have been approved for the construction of steam-power generating units which will, under the terms of the proposed Southwestern Power Administration-rural electric cooperatives contract, be used for the ulterior motives of the Southwestern Power Administration rather than for the benefit of rural electrification, which action and procedure, I maintain, is contrary to the intent of Congress.

AUTHORITY OF THE RURAL ELECTRIFICATION ADMINISTRATION

The Rural Electrification Act of 1936, signed by the President on May 20, 1936, is still the controlling law for loans to Rural Electric Cooperatives for rural electrification purposes by the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington. It provides for the loan of funds to rural electric cooperatives and others for the purpose of serving electric energy to persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service. It provides that loans in the opinion of the Administrator, must be liquidating over a period of originally 25 years, now 35 years. It defines rural areas as areas within the limits of towns of less than 1,500 inhabitants, and in strictly rural areas. The clear intent of this act is

that the moneys loaned by the Government from the Treasury of the United States is to be used under this act for the sole purpose of serving persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service.

AUTHORITY OF THE SOUTHWESTERN POWER ADMINISTRATION

On December 22, 1944, the Flood Control Act of 1944, was passed, which provides for the construction by the Army engineers at the expense of the Federal Government of a number of multiple-purpose projects, especially on the rivers of the Southwest, in the States of Missouri, Arkansas, Oklahoma, Texas, and Louisiana. Section 5 of this act provides that power and energy produced at multiple-purpose projects, constructed by the War Department, should be delivered at the dam to the Department of the Interior, who should transmit and dispose of such power so as to give the most widespread use thereof at rates to be set by the Federal Power Commission as low as reasonably possible consistent with good business principles. Preference is to be given in the quantities of power and energy available from such projects to public bodies and cooperatives.

In transmitting and disposing of power and energy from such multiple-purpose projects, the Department of the Interior was authorized from funds to be provided by the Congress to construct only such transmission lines and related facilities as are necessary to deliver power and energy at wholesale quantities to facilities owned and operated by Federal Government, public bodies, rural cooperatives, and privately owned companies. It will be readily seen from reading of section 5 of the Flood Control Act that the Southwestern Power Administration is not authorized to own, construct, lease, or otherwise acquire steam generating plants, nor is Southwestern Power Administration authorized to build any transmission lines that are not directly necessary for the delivery of power and energy to the facilities owned by others as described by section 5 of the Flood Control Act. Mr. Douglas Wright, Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration, has repeatedly testified before Congress and publicly stated that Congress has not authorized the Southwestern Power Administration to construct, own, or operate steam-power electric generating plants.

It will be further noted that section 5 of the Flood Control Act has no limitation as to what parties Southwestern Power Administration may sell and deliver the power and energy from such multiple-purpose dams. Preference as to quantities of power and energy is granted to public bodies and cooperatives, but even in the case of these agencies, if power and energy can be delivered over lines already in existence, Southwestern Power Administration is stopped from constructing duplicating lines to open up fields of competition with the existing industry in the area.

Thus we have two agencies, the Rural Electrification Administration, with practically a blank check to be loaned for service to unserved farmers, which authorizes the construction of steam plants and building of transmission lines from such steam plants to reach persons in rural areas who are not receiving central station service. Cooperative steam-power electric generating plants are justifiable provided the involved cooperatives are not otherwise receiving ample service at reasonable rates; but there can be no justification for the Rural Electrification Administration to provide facilities for the Southwestern Power Administration contrary to a direct denial of such facilities by Congress. There is a greater need for immediate service of available electricity to the rural people in my area than for generating plants where we have ample generating capacity. Congress now has no control over the moneys granted in a blank amount to the Rural Electrification Administration for loaning. This sum now amounts to more than $2,000,000,000.

PROPOSED SPA-REA CONTRACT

A plan has developed within my area of the Southwest in the form of a proposed contract between the rural electric cooperatives and the Southwestern Power Administration whereby the rural electric cooperatives, which have been highly successful under their present set-up as free agents, controlled and governed by their own board of directors, would be regimented under the dictatorship of the Southwestern Power Administration. The promoters of this super-cooperative propose to borrow money from the rural electrification program in Washington for the purpose of building steam-power units and transmission lines in the name of rural electrification but for the primary benefit of the Southwestern Power Administration, thereby authorizing the Southwestern Power Administration to in effect receive all benefits from steam-power electric generating units that Congress has heretofore denied them and to allow the SPA to lease transmission lines duplicating existing lines, contrary to the specific denial of Congress.

The contract provides that the super-cooperative—consisting of three or more distribution cooperatives—would borrow $9,565,000 from the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington, $4,825,000 of such sum to be used for the construction of a steam generating plant of 30,000 kilowatts capacity, and the remaining $4,740,000 to be used for the building of transmission lines from this steam plant over a wide area covered by a number of member cooperatives. The contract further provides for the Southwestern Power Administration to lease all of these transmission lines built by the super-cooperative with funds obtained from the Rural Electrification Administration for a period of 40 years, with a payment from the Southwestern Power Administration to the super cooperative in an amount large enough to retire the investment in the lines over a period of 40 years including interest on all outstanding balances. Southwestern Power Administration agrees to operate and maintain these lines, and at the expiration of 40 years these transmission lines are to become the property of Southwestern Power Administration without any additional payment.

In other words, the lines are right from the beginning constructed for the Southwestern Power Administration although section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 would actually prevent construction of these lines by the Department of the Interior.

The contract further provides that Southwestern Power Administration will buy the complete output of the steam plant constructed by the super cooperative on the basis of 85-percent full-load operation. This, in the case of a 30,000 kilowatts plant described herein, would amount to 225,000,000 kilowatt-hours per year, which would mean, at a minimum price, approximately $900,000 to $950,000 per year. Thus Southwestern Power Administration has, in effect, gone deliberately contrary to the expressed will of the Congress in attempting to construct unnecessary transmission lines and a steam generating plant for the purpose of accomplishing its ulterior motive of federalizing the electric utility business.

In this contract the Administrator proposes to apply rate schedule A, which has been approved by the Federal Power Commission for cooperatives, which rate is higher than the rate now being paid by the same cooperatives for electric energy in the involved area. The demand of super cooperative is limited to 30,000 kilowatts over the 40-year period, and the contract is cancelable on the part of the Southwestern Power Administration for power and energy to these cooperatives in the event they exceed this amount of energy at any time, and the contract does not provide arrangements for additional power and energy required over and above 30,000 kilowatts.

Cancellation of the service contract from Southwestern Power Administration to the cooperatives, however, does not cancel either the sale of all the power from the steam plant to Southwestern Power Administration or the lease by Southwestern Power Administration of the transmission lines constructed by the cooperatives. Thus, cooperatives can well find themselves without any power source whatsoever while it would have to continue the sale of all the output of its generating plant and the lease of all of its transmission lines to the Southwestern Power Administration. This could readily result in the liquidation of member cooperatives and their being taken over under the terms of the mortgage with Rural Electrification Administration by that agency.

Cooperatives are required to contract to purchase from the Southwestern Power Administration immediately upon the completion of the steam plant, 18,000 kilowatts for the first year. Whereas the present load of the member cooperatives, in a strictly rural area, largely occupied by national forests, or extremely mountainous territory, is less than 5,000 kilowatts. This provision might result in cost to the member cooperative or to the Federal Government, through inability of the cooperatives to meet their obligation to Southwestern Power Ad-

ministration, thousands of dollars. It is highly improvident and if enforceable could easily bankrupt the member cooperatives.

In addition to this vicious feature, the contract further provides that the supercooperative will make contracts with its member cooperatives that will provide that their books of record, bank account, and all transactions carried on by the member cooperatives, shall be open to the Southwestern Power Administration, and virtually provides that Southwestern Power Administration will have regulation of retail rates charged by member cooperatives to the farmers and rural establishments served by the member cooperatives.

I cannot believe that the affected cooperatives within the Southwest have been properly advised and fully realize the import of this proposed contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the Rural Electric Cooperatives within my area, which can amount to nothing less than to allow the Southwestern Power Administration to eventually gobble up the independent electric cooperatives in the southwest for the promotion of SPA's selfish aims, ambitions, and ulterior aspirations.

THE GRANDIOSE SCHEME TO FEDERALIZE ELECTRIC POWER

The entire agreement serves but one purpose and that is—to make use of funds from Rural Electrification Administration for the purpose of circumventing the clear and expressed will of the Congress in regard to operations of the Southwestern Power Administration as provided in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, and to circumvent the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 by permitting these Federal funds which are to be loaned for the purpose of serving persons in rural areas not receiving central station service to be used for the purpose of allowing Southwestern Power Administration to raid territories now adequately served.

This analysis covers only the contract for the one generating plant and its transmission lines in northwest Arkansas. The same pattern is followed by the supercooperatives and Southwestern Power Administration for similar purposes for the Western Electric Cooperative, at Anadarko, Okla., the Central Missouri Cooperative, Northwest Missouri Cooperative, the M & A in Missouri, and for two super cooperatives to be located in southern and northeastern Louisiana, and for a super cooperative to be constructed in southern Mississippi and northeastern Louisiana.

The pattern thus set for the southwest area—Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, east Texas, part of Mississippi, and all of Louisiana—will immediately provide a stepping stone for the same kind of subterfuge in the area covered by the Pick-Sloan plan in the Missouri Valley; for the area covered by the CVA bill now in the Congress; for the New England States; and for the southeastern United States now being investigated along similar lines to those covered by the Southwestern Power Administration. If approved by the Rural Electrification Administration in Washington, with the acquiescence of the Congress, it will inevitably result in the expenditure of several billions of dollars in absolutely unnecessary generating plants and transmission lines.

The Southwestern Power Administration is using the good name of Mr. Claude Wickard and his fine rural electrification program to foster their grandiose scheme at any cost. This contract is just another step toward complete Government regimentation of the farmers. It will not be long until the Government will be telling the farmers how many cows they can milk and how many chickens they can feed, just as the beet and the cotton growers are now being forced to farm under Government regulations. The whole thing is wrong. My conception of government is to legislate and regulate and not to dictate and operate our American way of life.

CONCLUSION

The rural electrification program stands today in the mind of Congress as one of the most successful and meritorious activities for which Federal funds are used. Its support comes from both sides of the aisle. For example, even the Republican Eightieth Congress, a Congress noted for the deep slashes in Federal spending, raised the amount of money made available to the Rural Electrification Administration to the $400,000,000 level. This is the same amount being requested by the President for use in the fiscal year 1951. There can be no doubt Congress wholeheartedly backs the REA program.

There is another Federal agency, however, that has injected itself into the REA program. This other agency lacks solid congressional support and it has always kept itself in political hot water. I refer to the Department of the Interior, which is represented in my area by the Southwestern Power Administration. The Department of the Interior is a Federal agency that has always borne watching. Throughout its entire political history this Department has itched for an increase in its bureaucratic power. Under the banner of serving the public interest and the common good of mankind, it has instead served only its special interest—bureaucratic power and growth.

The most notable administrative scandals in the history of the Federal Government have involved the Department of the Interior. Who will ever forget the famed Teapot Dome affair? It is obvious that the political ambitions of this department know no bounds.

It has been tireless in its effort to take over the forestry service from the Department of Agriculture. It would also like to take over many of the constructive programs for soil conservation now administered by the Department of Agriculture. In addition, it wants to take over the activities of the Corps of Engineers for flood control and rivers and harbors development. It even backed and pushed through Congress section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 under which it markets all power developed by the Corps of Engineers, even on rivers within the TVA service area. Under a sound national power policy this power would be marketed by TVA itself without the interference of the Interior Department as a no-good middle man.

This Department, the Department of the Interior, has always coveted the good reputation enjoyed by the Rural Electrification Administration in Congress and seeks to bring it under its domination just as it is now attempting to subjugate the Federal Power Commission, a regulatory agency of the Federal Government. Interior looks upon itself as the Federal agency that must have complete control over Federal activities and regulations relating to the generating, transmission, and distribution of power. Right now the Department of the Interior is quietly laying the groundwork for an eventual attempt to take over regulatory jurisdiction of the petroleum and natural gas industries, and it may be expected that the Department's pattern of operation may well follow a similar backdoor method for these great resources as has been followed in the case of their ruthless effort to socialize another great natural resource—electric power.

What it cannot do directly, it does by stealth and indirection. When the Congress said "No" and thereby thwarted the Department's ambitious scheme to build needless and wasteful duplicating electric facilities in my section of the country, it went underground and is now using the good name of the Rural Electrification Administration as its front organization.

Since the Department of the Interior cannot lay its hands directly on the $400,000,000 made available by Congress to the Rural Electrification Administration for making electric service available to farmers and other persons in rural areas, it is through leasing agreements getting the Rural Electrification Administration to divert funds from farm electrification to the carrying out of its ambitious program for socializing the southwestern area of the United States.

This is not, however, an issue that involves my section of the country alone. The Southeast and the Northeast as well as other sections of the country are deeply involved with the present attempt of the Department to shape policies that will be applicable all over the Nation. To realize the extent to which the Department has already moved into the East one needs only to familiarize himself with the contents of the 1951 budget document.

The Rural Electrification Administration is off base playing around with the Department of the Interior, and if it does not watch out it will find itself playing the role of Little Red Riding Hood to the wolf.

Until every farm in this country has the benefit of electric service, Rural Electrification Administration's major responsibility is to get adequate service to unserved rural persons. According to a recent REA statement, that agency still has 1,000,000 farms to electrify before the first phase of its work can be considered completed. This means that it still faces the job of getting electricity to

more than one out of every five farms in this country. Thus, it is altogether too soon for this agency to rest on its laurels and to take on the job of playing stooge for the socialistic plotters on the pay roll of the Interior Department.

The NRECA in the January 1950 issue of its magazine Rural Electrification notes that—

> Some (REA) borrowers are disturbed by delays in obtaining REA approval of loan applications during recent months—comparative figures indicate that they may have reason for impatience—less loans funds have been approved by REA during the last 6 months than during the comparable period of a year before.

According to this data, only $143,000,000 in REA loans were approved during the 6 months' period July to December 1949, compared with $193,000,000 during the 6 months July to December 1948.

I know first hand about the situation faced by REA borrowers in my district, I have hereinbefore mentioned the 375 eligible applicants of Scott County, Ark., who have a loan application pending since December 1947. This loan, if ever granted, will be used to serve 375 farmers who in this second half of the great twentieth century are living under conditions that were outmoded by the end of the nineteenth century.

There is a reason why the above loan to the cooperative in my district has not been made. There is a reason why we are not completing this job of electrifying rural America faster. That reason is not the fault of Congress which is making ample funds available for this purpose. It is not because REA lacks sufficient administrative personnel or sufficient funds.

The reason traces back to pressures exerted by the Department of the Interior forcing REA to make its money available for generating and transmission loans. An examination of REA loans during the last 6 months of 1949 reveals that out of the $143,000,000 of all funds loaned more than 50 percent went for the construction of generating and transmission facilities and not for distribution lines. Loans, as a consequence, are being made to further the objective of the Department of the Interior rather than the achievement of REA objectives. REA should follow its program—not the program of the Department of the Interior.

These maneuvers by the Department of the Interior are the work of underlings and little bureaucrats working in cahoots with outsiders. The outsiders, just as back in the days of Teapot Dome, are being motivated by the purposes of private gain. They are not even the true zealots of public power.

These outsiders are only interested in making a quick buck at the expense of American farmers and taxpayers generally. They include engineering firms, lawyers, lobbyists, and those who are willing to sell the traditions of 150 years of American freedom for the jingle of coins in their pockets today.

These are matters with which the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Interior, and the Secretary of Agriculture should become familiar. I feel certain they are unaware of what is going on. Certainly, this is a situation which Secretary of the Interior Chapman should examine at the earliest possible moment. He is involved, for the good name of his Department will suffer as it promotes such shabby tricks. Meanwhile, REA Administrator Wickard in dealing with the pressure exerted upon him for making questionable loans should proceed upon the assumption that his support for an REA program honestly administered comes from the Congress; it does not come from the Department of the Interior.

I am immediately introducing a bill which has for its purpose the prohibiting of loans by the Rural Electrification Administration for the building of electric generating plants or transmission lines to be owned, leased, used, or operated by any other than Rural Electrification Cooperatives, without the consent of Congress. I sincerely trust that any such loans now pending for approval of the Rural Electrification Administration will be held in abeyance until Congress is given an opportunity to act upon this bill.

The Small Farmer and the Farm Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the small farmer is the backbone of our economy. He should not be sacrificed to carry out a program of corporate farm production supported by huge Government subsidies.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by J. H. Carmical which appeared in the New York Times, Sunday, January 15, 1950:

BREAK-DOWN SEEN IN FARM PROGRAM—HUGE SURPLUSES UNDER SUPPORT HELD WEAKENING WHOLE UNITED STATES AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM—LITTLE MAN ENDANGERED—ACREAGE RESTRICTIONS BELIEVED AID TO LARGE OPERATORS WITH ASSURED PROFITS

(By J. H. Carmical)

With huge surpluses of farm products being accumulated by the United States Government as a result of price-support activities, there is fear in some quarters that the present agricultural program is breaking down.

Last week a bill was introduced in Congress to give the Commodity Credit Corporation, the Government agency that carries out price-support activities, an additional $2,000,000,000 to provide support for 1950 farm crops, since its previous authorization of $4,750,000,000 soon would be exhausted.

Under the present program, which provides for maintaining prices at an artificially high level through nonrecourse loans to farmers by the Government agency, the tendency of many farmers is to produce for the loan rather than for the disposal of their products in the regular commercial manner, it was said. Despite efforts to restrict acreage, surpluses may be expected to increase, barring some very unfavorable weather conditions. The program thus is held costly to the taxpayer, who must furnish funds for price-support activities, and also to the consumer, who must pay higher prices for both food and clothing.

In addition, the program is not proving beneficial to a large group of farmers, particularly the small producer, who has had to cut his acreage in order to qualify for benefits. While the large producer also has had to curtail, he has had a much higher base from which to cut his production, and still is able to operate on a large scale. With an assured price for his products, his profits usually have continued at a satisfactory level. In fact, it is that group which is producing mostly for the loan.

SMALL FARMER SEEN HURT

The present agricultural policy is believed also to be gradually eliminating the small farmer. Because of acreage restrictions, he in many instances is unable to produce enough to operate profitably. Consequently, thousands of small farmers are quitting each year and letting the big farmer, with his highly mechanized operation, take over.

In the past half century, the amount of labor required to produce a crop has declined sharply. To produce wheat, the amount of man labor has been reduced by about four-fifths, and corn by seven-tenths. On especially favorable terrain, where the largest tractors and combines may be used, the reduction is even greater.

Although the production of cotton is not so highly mechanized as that of grain, it is estimated that for the belt as a whole only about one-half as much man labor is required now as at the turn of the century. In Mississippi, an experiment was made that showed that by using mechanical methods an acre of cotton yielding nearly a bale could be produced and harvested with 21½ man-hours of labor in contrast to 160 man-hours required under standard, nonmechanized methods.

Present price-support activities do not take into consideration the change that has taken place in agriculture in recent years, many believe. That parity price of agricultural products is said to be based on most items, except tobacco, on conditions existing in the period 1909–14. Despite the higher prices that now must be paid by the farmer for everything that he buys, a bushel of grain or a pound of cotton may be produced cheaper under mechanization than in 1909–14. However, under the present price-support program, the Government assures the cooperating grower of roughly two and one-quarter times more for his products than in the base period.

Despite the fact that the high prices for agricultural products, especially cotton, are said to have tended to restrict consumption, it is unlikely that there will be any revision of the program that would eliminate price-support activities entirely. If for no other reason, the political power of the farm vote will insure that the farmer continue to receive benefit payments in one form or other and keep his income at a relatively high level.

President Truman, in his recent message to the Congress, pointed out that farm legislation still was not adequate and that price supports should be provided for commodities that at present are not included in the program. He mentioned direct subsidy payments to farmers to keep their incomes high while permitting the market price of agricultural products to seek their own level.

Many farmers and also the trade generally believe that the Brannan plan is unworkable, in that it would involve too much administrative apparatus and also that it would prove too costly. Under it, the prices of farm

products would seek their level and the Federal Government would pay the difference between that and the "normal prices" to the growers. In that it would insure a high income to the farmers and also lower prices to consumers, the proposal is calculated to appeal to those two groups.

A Proposed Solution to the European Economic Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have received a communication from Mr. T. K. Fuller 3d, 124 East Pharr Road, Decatur, Ga., giving his thoughts and suggestions for a solution to the European economic problem.

I am submitting herewith Mr. Fuller's suggestions for the information of the House:

A PROPOSED SOLUTION TO THE EUROPEAN ECONOMIC PROBLEM

In view of the fact that the cost of the European aid program continues to be a heavy burden on the American taxpayer, I wish to propose a new and entirely different method of financial settlement for trading between nations.

It is an obvious fact that without Marshall plan dollars, the affected nations would not have survived, but now that the nations have made some recovery, they need to stop depending on the dollar, especially for international trade, and strengthen their internal currency systems.

I propose that a clearing-house system be established in which every nation on earth would be invited to participate. This system would make use of a clearing house similar to the one now in use in the Marshall plan, plus an import-export bank in each participating nation, although neither the clearing house nor the import-export banks would operate as they do in their present capacities. The import-export bank in each participating nation would represent the importers and exporters of that nation with the clearing house. The import-export bank in each participating nation would collect that nation's currency from that nation's importers for their imports, and pay out the currency received to its exporters for their exports.

In turn, each import-export bank would accept a debit on the books of the clearing house in the like amount that was received from its importer. This debit on the books of the clearing house pays for the import insofar as the clearing house is concerned. When the same import-export bank pays out the cash received to exporters, it accepts a credit on the books of the clearing house in the same amount that it paid out to its exporter. Thus we see that the clearing house balances its account with each nation's bank through simple debits and credits on paper, and each nation's bank balances its cash account through collecting cash from its nation's importers and paying out that cash received to its nation's exporters.

The following transaction procedure shows how an English importer and an American exporter would settle their account in a transaction, yet each would deal only in the currency of his own nation:

1. The American exporter sells $100,000 worth of American machinery and tools to English importer.

2. A. American exporter files application with American Import-Export Bank for investigation of his contract.

B. English importer goes to English Import-Export Bank and files application to import $100,000 worth of machinery and tools from the United States.

3. A. American bank approves contract and files authority with clearing house to grant credit to English bank.

B. English bank approves contract and files approval with clearing house.

4. Clearing house approves transaction and notifies respective bank of each nation. The American bank automatically authorizes American exporter to make shipment.

5. Upon arrival of merchandise in English port each bank is notified. The English importer pays his bank in pounds, and the American bank pays its exporter in dollars.

6. The International Trading Clearing House credits the American bank $100,000 and debits the English bank in pounds in the equivalent of $100,000.

Several points to be noted in this type of clearing house are:

1. Each nation uses only its own currency. No currency ever passes between bank and bank, or between clearing house and bank.

2. Because each nation's bank would depend on the cash received from importers to pay out to exporters, its exports through these channels could never exceed its imports through these channels. This should be an inducement to each participating nation to import more in order to take more cash into its import-export bank with which to pay its exporters.

3. Because the clearing house settles accounts between nations on paper, there would be no question of whether a nation's currency was convertible or not. Each import-export bank would establish enough credit with the clearing house to cover any anticipated indebtedness.

The exchange rate between nations would be decided by the governing board of the clearing house for only those goods passing through the clearing house channels. By deciding a fixed exchange rate for a definite period, quarterly, semiannually or annually, there would be a tendency to stabilize international exchange.

4. Because this type of clearing house system would place all participating nations on an equal trading basis, it would permit them to trade freely with one another.

The clearing-house system would solve the problem of trading between nations, but each nation would still have its own individual internal problems, which I believe can be solved by application of the principles of free enterprise as we know them in America.

T. K. FULLER.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, hundreds of thousands of persons—the old, the ill, new-born babies, mothers, in our northern climate are shivering and chilled to the bone for want of fuel. Thousands from these groups are now afflicted with pneumonia, colds, and kindred ailments because of lack of coal to keep them warm. The traveling public, especially commuters to and from their jobs find their security threatened by a lack of train service caused by a shortage of coal. Is there no remedy? Congress has furnished President Truman with a law to meet the emergency but to him politics far outweighs the duty to enforce the law to alleviate the distress and suffering of the aged, new-born babies, TB cases and other persons, who are the helpless victims of the New Deal political cold-coal war.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks an article by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times, Friday, January 13, 1950:

IN THE NATION—THE WORD "THREATENED" SEEMS TO BE FORGOTTEN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 12.—Though the skies over the Capital were dark today, and little frozen pellets fell for a while before they melted into rain, the weather remained mild as the President for the umpteenth time told a press conference there is as yet no national emergency in the coal supply. In other parts of the country winter continued to withhold blizzards and other violent seasonal disturbances. Hence the President was able to repeat his estimate of the situation brought on by John L. Lewis' current tactics in an atmosphere of comparative public quiet which normal weather over a considerable area would quickly shatter.

FREEDOM OF CONCLUSION

He was buttressed also in his stubborn refusal to invoke the only specific legal corrective at his command (the Taft-Hartley Act, secs. 206–210, inclusive) by the finding of his labor assistant, John R. Steelman, that any emergency is still only spotty. Even Representative JACOBS, of Indianapolis, the pro-union Democrat who urges Mr. Truman to use the law they both condemn, certifies merely to a regional emergency. Thus the President can say if he wants to that its scope is not yet national, the law having been written to leave such conclusions to the President's opinion.

Substituting the practical for the technical side of the matter, it may be true that the empty bins of many retailers mean that most individual consumers of coal have stocked up fairly well for an ordinary winter. Since Mr. Lewis began last May the complicated series of maneuvers to produce the new contract he wants for his miners, consumers have had plenty of warning to imitate the ant and not the grasshopper in the fable.

THE LETTER OF THE LAW

But there is other language in section 202 that covers the present situation precisely, and the President and his advisers would have a difficult time to disprove this before any impartial jury. This language is quoted in the following extract:

"Whenever in the opinion of the President of the United States, a 'threatened' or actual strike or lock-out 'affecting an entire industry or a substantial part thereof,' • • • will, if permitted to occur or continue, 'imperil the national health or safety,' he may appoint a board of inquiry, etc."

Thereafter the text of the law enumerates prompt successive steps open to the President before soon applying to the courts for an injunction against the continuation of the strike or lock-out.

NOT THE DAY

On the test of plain facts there is an actual 2-day-a-week strike in the coal industry; and probably no one in the administration, though playing the trickiest kind of politics with the Taft-Hartley Act, would have the face to assert that this is not compliance by the union miners with the plans of Mr. Lewis. On a further factual test this condition definitely affects an entire industry and plainly threatens to imperil the national health or safety. So that Mr. Truman would be within the letter as well as the intent of the only legal instrument he has, or can get at this session, if he invoked it.

Nobody asked him today about that authority to meet the plainly existing threat. There is to be a big reception for Members of Congress tonight by the Democratic National Committee, and the conference was conducted in a manner to get it over quickly so the President could keep his early engagement. Social obligations may not seem a sufficient explanation for cursory treatment of the coal emergency, especially to persons and industries—including the coal-burning railroads whose service has been sharply reduced by the Interstate Commerce Commission—whose bins are nearing the point of total depletion. But Mr. Truman was giving short and uninforming replies to questions, and it was clear he would give short shrift to any effort to go into the coal crisis more deeply.

RESERVES AT VANISHING POINT

Meanwhile, for 3 days a week the miners are digging about 9,000,000 tons, which go fully into consumption, and the customary 30-day reserves of the season are going below 15 because of the 2-day strike. Beyond this exhibition of law being flouted by Mr. Lewis, and its flouting tolerated by the Chief Executive of the Nation, there is the great social and economic risk which is assumed by the union and by the Government.

Yet those advisers of the President who persuaded him to adopt his general and specific policies of favoritism toward union labor at the expense of other population groups are as deeply convinced as they ever were that this course will keep the administration indefinitely in office, and that the White House attitude toward the coal emergency is an integral part of it. The other day when the headlines announced that Republican Senators were demanding use of the Taft-Hartley Act a principal among these advisers remarked: "Stupid as ever. Can't they see they are playing right in our hands?"

Winter may be in a mood to make the game safe for a while longer. Or possibly Robert N. Denham, head of the independent law enforcement office of the National Labor Relations Board, may use his power to seek the injunction the President declines thus far to seek. Or Mr. Lewis may conclude to put his miners back on steady work. The President is leaving it at that.

Water Conservation Program for West Texas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LYNDON B. JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. President, on November 22, 1948, several hundred forward-looking west Texans met in Fort Worth to launch a most important long-range water conservation program. The occasion was the annual directors' assembly of the West Texas Chamber of Commerce.

The keynote of the meeting was set by the official slogan, "Dam west Texas or west Texas is damned." Over and over again, prominent west Texans made clear their determination to solve the water shortage which has for too long been a millstone on the progress of a potentially rich region.

High light of the meeting was the visit and address by Hon. William E. Warne, Assistant Secretary of the Interior, who outlined what the Department of the Interior through the Bureau of Reclamation is doing and can help the people of Texas do to solve this perplexing problem.

Secretary Warne's remarks are of great interest, I believe, and I ask unanimous consent that the text of his speech be included in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am happy to be in Fort Worth to discuss the conservation and use of water, a subject of vital concern not only here but throughout the entire Nation. Over all of the United States increasing water demands are outstripping developed supplies. In Texas, however, shortages are growing particularly acute. It is not a new problem, but it is one that is becoming increasingly important. This is recognized by your representatives in the Congress with whom I have discussed the Texas water situation many times in recent months.

Because of grave concern about the problem, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON early this year requested a study of the situation and the views of the Department of the Interior on the proper development of this valuable resource in Texas. An appraisal of the type and magnitude of the problem in different areas of the State was presented together with a suggested program in which the Department's services might be used to aid in finding satisfactory solutions.

Senator JOHNSON believes that the interests of your State could best be served by developing water resources through comprehensive programs for each river basin or for related groups of basins. In view of Interior's experience with western water problems and in the development of projects to solve those problems, we consider this view both realistic and farsighted. As conservationists, engineers, and builders, we in Interior endorse the conclusion without reservation. We advocate strongly the making for Texas of integrated economic and engineering plans with river basins as the basic unit.

I understand that the informal report of the Interior Department to Senator JOHNSON received wide circulation among those most concerned with development of the State's water resources. I am informed, too, that the views have been widely approved among those genuinely seeking such development in the best interests of all the people.

The essence of the statement was that the situation in Texas is by no means hopeless and that the Department of the Interior desires to work with you to achieve maximum benefits through integrated, multiple-purpose river basin developments.

The laws under which Interior operates in the prosecution of these programs for resource conservation and development were designed to meet western conditions. In this, the first year of the second century of service of Interior to the Nation, these programs are moving forward as never before and they are accomplishing miracles along the Missouri, Columbia, Sacramento, Colorado, Rio Grande, and other western streams. That such water development work is today at a maximum in other western States and is at a minimum in Texas forms another phase of our problem. Unless Texas is to fall behind and to permit her needs to outrun her water development, this imbalance should be corrected soon. There are several reasons for the lack of balance to have been developed. Among them is the hard physical fact that the high plains have traditionally been the most difficult of our areas of water deficiencies in which to find answers to the complex problems that are posed. But in Colorado, through a trans-mountains diversion project, a solution in a high plains area was found. And in North Dakota and South Dakota, through the Missouri basin project, a solution is being provided. In Nebraska and in Kansas, as a part of the basin-wide plan for the Missouri River, small streams are being dammed and their waters used by towns and farming areas to yield maximum benefits. Power is being generated at many multiple-purpose dams to help build a sound economy for the Missouri basin area and at the same time to strengthen the economic feasibility of the project. All of this activity elsewhere in the high plains demonstrates that it is possible when local, State, and Federal experts put their heads together to find solutions even for difficult water problem areas like west Texas. So far it has never been possible for solutions to be provided for the major problems by local leaders working alone, by State officials working alone, or by the Federal departments working alone. The cooperation between the various levels of government that has been achieved in the Missouri River basin is needed here.

Although the primary interest of this meeting is centered about the problems of west Texas, difficult water problems are not limited to the western part of your great State. There is desperate need for flood control along the lower streams on the Coastal Plain. The great opportunity for power generation that has been seized by the Lower Colorado River Authority and that is being capitalized by the Southwestern Power Administration exists elsewhere as well. Many other phases of the general water problem are presented in other parts of the State. Texas is not poor in water. The outflow of Texas streams to the Gulf of Mexico approximates 43,000,000 acre-feet of which at least 35,000,000 acre-feet originate in Texas. This amount of water, if it all could be controlled and used, would provide the municipal water needs of all the people of North America and leave enough to fill 325 reservoirs like Lake Waco. Of course most of Texas water falls in the humid parts of the State and is not available for use to meet the problems of west Texas. But let us narrow the focus to west Texas.

Unlike some other sections of the State, much of west Texas has meager ground water, to supply from that source only a small fraction of its water needs. Moreover, in west Texas areas where underground supplies were believed to be adequate, the water table is going down at a dangerous rate. As your population and industry expand, as agricultural production grows, more demands are made on the water supply to meet the requirements for human and industrial consumption, and for irrigation. As a consequence, you must look to your streams to obtain the additional water that is needed. Unfortunately, the run-off of the rivers in west Texas varies widely from year to year. The excess flows of wet years must be stored in reservoirs and held for use in times of drought. This situation is not unique in west Texas. We meet it throughout the High Plains, and generally throughout the West.

More than enough water rises in west Texas to provide the needs of your cities and industries. On the average, in excess of 2,000,000 acre-feet of water leave west Texas

each year through the Red, Brazos, and Colorado Rivers and their tributaries. This water is wasted. Not only would it be useful in west Texas but when it leaves you it constitutes a danger to lower reaches of the Texas valleys. It adds to flood hazards downstream.

Available water analyses indicate that much of this water is of poor quality for human consumption and industrial use because of gypsum and salt content. However, it is thought that through appropriate means much of this water can be used for irrigation. In any event, according to my preliminary information, about 1,000,000 acre-feet of water could be made available for your towns and cities and for industries if the wasted waters were captured and kept in west Texas. This is a very large quantity of water and will meet your needs and provide for growth for many years to come. So the immediate problem in west Texas comes down to lack of storage and distribution facilities for this water that is available and that is not now used.

That reduces your problem to one of finances and engineering. How to solve it is the question that brought all of us here tonight.

I know how similar problems have been solved in other sections of the West. Not just in isolated instances but over and over again along one river and another, through decade after decade, similar water problems in the West have been solved by that method of local, State, and Federal cooperation that is provided in the reclamation law, which is administered by the Department of the Interior through its Bureau of Reclamation.

In some parts of Texas some individuals call this "reclamationism". Or I should say that I guess that they mean "reclamationism" when they beat the tables and yell, "We don't want any program with an 'ism' attached to it." They surely do not mean "patriotism," which has the unfortunate ending. So I must conclude that they mean to say they favor no program with "reclamationism" incorporated to it. By such generalized attacks, usually intended to cover up opposition to public transmission of hydroelectric power or family-sized irrigated farms, these people have become ardent advocates of the continued disuse of your water. In that, certainly they operate against the best interests of the people who need the water to insure the growth and development of farms, homes, counties, and the great State of which you all are a part.

As the branch of the Federal Government historically charged by the Congress with the responsibility for assisting in developing and utilizing western water resources, the Department of the Interior is prepared to assist you.

You know that investigations are now in progress and that next March the Bureau of Reclamation will give you an analysis of the problems of control and use of the water in west Texas. This analysis will provide sufficient information for you to determine the extent and character of such additional assistance as you wish from Interior and the Federal Government.

We have already partially discharged our responsibility to the Panhandle-Plains area by investigation of the Canadian River project. The report on this project, which would furnish a dependable water supply for 11 cities in that section of the State, will soon be sent to the State of Texas for formal review after which it will be transmitted to the President and to the Congress. Here is being developed a new type of project to meet a set of circumstances that is peculiar to the area. It may hold suggestions for other parts of west Texas.

Acting on the request of the people of these 11 cities, we will, if given congressional authority, assume the further responsibility of building this important project on a sound amortization plan which in the end will see the Federal loan repaid by the municipalities as they use the water which will be impounded for them. In my opinion, this is sound economics, both for the local area in your State and for the Federal Government. The people will use Federal funds for a few years, then they will have a wonderful, continuously useful project of their own. The United States will get its money back through appropriate repayment and many times in addition through the new strength and prosperity of the Panhandle cities.

The investigation recently initiated by the Reclamation Bureau in Texas involves a considerably larger area, with many more complex problems than those of the Canadian River project area. This investigation covers that part of west Texas in the upper basins of the Brazos and Colorado Rivers, extending from Odessa on the west to Cisco, Ranger, and Eastland on the east; and from San Angelo on the south to the boundary between the Brazos and Red River watersheds on the north.

The basic problem in west Texas is one of conserving water and making that water available to the people who sharply feel the shortages now and, unless something constructive is done, must suffer them more acutely in the years to come.

Our investigation and report will be directed toward solving the most pressing problem which is to provide water supplies for your cities and industries. It will also include provisions for the development or irrigation, where feasible, by using surplus water not required or not suitable for municipal and industrial uses. Flood-control features will be incorporated in the plan where justified, as will any other appropriate consideration, including fish and wildlife conservation, and recreation.

It is our duty, and it is in your interest, as well as in the interest of Texas and the Nation, to provide for the fullest economic use of west Texas water. In this regard we recognize that municipal and industrial requirements have the highest priority, both under State laws and as a matter of national concern. In our planning we therefore must and will provide for other water uses only to the extent possible without lessening supplies to meet your primary requirements.

There is lots of experience behind those who undertook this task.

The reclamation program is 47 years old. It has made major contributions to the wealth and growth of the Western States. Federal projects have developed areas that have built and that now support such cities as Boise, Idaho; Yakima, Wash.; and Phoenix, Ariz. Scores of projects have been completed and these now provide irrigation water for nearly 5,000,000 acres of land. They also provide power for such growing cities as Los Angeles, Portland, Seattle, and Spokane. Some of them include provisions for municipal and industrial water which they supply directly to such cities as Salt Lake City, Utah, and indirectly to cities in southern California from San Diego to Pasadena.

The Bureau of Reclamation can point to a time-tested example of its policies and work here in Texas. I refer to the 155,000-acre reclamation project on the Rio Grande in Texas and New Mexico near El Paso. This project was constructed nearly 35 years ago. It cost more than $23,000,000. The value of the crops produced under irrigation on the project lands from 1914 through 1948 has totaled more than $400,000,000, and in 1948 alone $43,000,000. Only last month the Department of the Interior and the city of El Paso executed a contract that will permit that municipality to use spare river flow in the project area to meet its growing municipal needs. Thus we have cooperatively expanded again, as we have many times, the usefulness of a fine project and made it meet a new and growing need that could not have been anticipated by anyone a generation ago. These projects live and grow and serve with increasing effectiveness through the years.

No one knows what the life span of a well conceived and executed water project may be. A project that one of our engineers investigated in China was 1,500 years old, and a project near Damascus in Syria is still served by a dam that was built by Caesar's legions.

Some land in the Rio Grande project area was first irrigated 300 years ago when the Spanish conquistadores and padres first used El Paso del Norte.

There is every reason to believe that the projects that have been built under the reclamation law will serve well for generations to come. We do know that in the time since the first of them was built no insurmountable problems have been developed between the Department of the Interior and the people of the project areas. I am certain that none will.

I personally have worked in this field for nearly 15 years. I have visited all of the operating projects and most of those now being constructed. I have met with scores, even hundreds, of groups representing the people of these project areas. I have met with them in schoolhouses and grange halls, where they held their local meetings, and I have met with them in my office in Washington. We have discussed many problems and have exchanged experiences. I never held nor attended such a meeting at which there was a hostile atmosphere. The reason for this is that there has consistently been an attitude of cooperation on all sides.

In all of these meetings I have never had anyone who was living on one of these projects tell me that the Federal Government had tried to deprive him of his water right. In truth, the Bureau of Reclamation has not tried to deprive any of the people being helped through or affected by the reclamation program of any right, water or otherwise.

I make this personal reference because a cult has grown up in the West, vociferous much beyond its size, which would have people believe that there was a mysterious threat in the reclamation law to the rights of the individual to use the project water. It seems peculiarly left-handed and disingenious to me that the people of the West should be asked to believe such rot. Paid propagandists apparently will distort anything to attempt to gain an end. Actually the reclamation law is the only Federal water-control enactment which directs that its program must be carried out under the State laws by which water rights are perfected.

One more explanation. It is the policy of the Department of the Interior and of its Bureau of Reclamation to turn over for local operation water projects that are built under the reclamation law. Of 65 irrigation projects now in operation, 45 have been turned over to the water users to manage. These include such large and important projects as the North Platte project in Nebraska, the Boise project in Idaho, and the Salt River project in Arizona. These major examples of Reclamation's operations are conducted entirely by water users' organizations. The control is local and is as responsive and responsible to the people of the project as a city government is to its electorate. I point these facts out because as you consider great plans for meeting this complex and widefiung problem in west Texas you will want to know whether your projects will be locally controlled.

In addition, the Department of the Interior long has recognized the importance of conducting its operations near the affected people. This Department has been a leader in decentralization and is actively moving toward even greater shifting of planning and operating functions to the field. About a

year ago the Department established a Southwest field committee with headquarters at Albuquerque. This committee is composed of the top regional officials of each of the Interior agencies that operate in the region, and the chairman, with a small staff, reports to the Secretary in Washington. The Southwest region includes Texas, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and parts of Colorado, Kansas, Missouri, and New Mexico.

The Bureau of Reclamation, as you know, maintains close relations with local people. In the current west Texas investigation the Department of the Interior is represented locally by Reclamation's regional director, Mr. Howard Robbins, who has offices in Amarillo. He has conferred constantly with your leaders in the course of the present work and he will continue to do so until the assignment has been completed. He and all members of his staff and the staffs of all of the other Interior agencies in Texas are pledged to give you all the engineering and technical assistance that you need and desire.

After Interior's report on the west Texas projects has been prepared, all other interested agencies of the Federal Government, as well as those of the State of Texas through your Governor, will have full opportunity to review the report and comment on its findings.

I would emphasize, as well, that the reclamation program is conducted in accordance with well conceived fiscal requirements. The Federal Government finances the construction and requires repayment over a period of years by those who are the beneficiaries. Power that may be generated is sold with two objectives in mind in setting the rates; one, to carry with interest the cost of producing power and to repay a fair share of the total project cost, and the other to enable the energy to be sold at the lowest practicable rates so that maximum benefits may be extended to the people. Irrigation costs, for their repayment, bear no interest charges, and irrigation repayment contracts run for a maximum of 50 years. The costs of providing municipal water are repaid with an interest charge, where it is appropriate, that does not exceed 3½ percent. The cost of providing for control of floods in these projects is without requirement for repayment. In any particular case, the Congress may provide for special terms to meet peculiar conditions.

The first requirement is for an engineering plan of projects to meet the needs. The next is an economic appraisal of the proposed undertakings. Then follow consideration of the plans by the local people, the State, the Federal agencies of interest, the President, and the Congress. When the projects are authorized, appropriate contracts are negotiated between Interior and the water users, and the conditions of repayment are then fixed. Appropriations next are sought for construction, and the job is as good as done. I would not fool you into thinking that all of this requires only a few weeks or months. It takes time. I have seen a good many projects carried through this mill in my 15 years of service, so I know projects can be completed once the engineering surveys have been started.

Through the years the repayment record of reclamation projects have been good. Delinquencies in payments are almost negligible. At the same time, there has been no harsh treatment of project water users. In times of real emergency, special provisions have been authorized by the Congress, but these have rarely been required excepting during a part of the period of the depression.

The demand and necessity for conserving waste water in Texas is here, and the value of impounded supplies is known, not only by the rank and file, but by the big industries that have heavy investments in this section. With the great ground water reservoir in the high plains of Texas being depleted at a rate many times the natural annual rate of recharge, a problem has been created that it would be folly to ignore. If present trends continue, I am informed, some localities will be seriously affected within 10 years. The unused surface waters must be used to put out the fuse that has been lit on this time bomb, and to bring into safe balance the use of the ground water resource. You are fully aware of the fact that the economic loss being sustained in this area due to a lack of water can be overcome only by dynamic action.

I have been advised that only recently an opinion was given that Texas water problems are so acute that time does not permit perfection of a total, well-conceived plan of development. It is ironical that in the face of serious water shortages, coupled with ever-expanding demands for increased supplies, it is implied that the services of experienced engineers and careful investigations and multiple-purpose planning should be ignored. This is the time when west Texas can least afford to make a careless, piecemeal approach to its water problem. This is just exactly the time when comprehensive planning, expeditiously done, will bring the greatest returns.

Texas only now is entering its second stage of development. Until recently your greatest sources of wealth have been raw materials. Your cotton, wool, and mohair have brought relatively little manufacturing. Only a small part of your cotton production and even less of wool and mohair are consumed by Texas mills. You are justifiably proud of your cattle, but leather and shoe manufacture is another industry that has seen only small expansion within the State.

With continued development there should come a multitude of new industries. Water and power will bring them. As more water is impounded, Texas will reap great rewards in the field of chemurgy. In west Texas, once you have stored water now wasting, once you have your distribution systems to serve the cities and the irrigation projects, once such power as may be generated is made available, you will have overcome the obstacles standing between you and an even greater era of prosperity than the one you are now enjoying. There will then be a clear track into the future.

With characteristic courage and vigor you have gone about the job of seeing what can be accomplished in the full development of the water resources of this area. Through your Senators and representatives in Congress and through your community leaders, we in the Department of the Interior know that your goal is to sponsor projects that will be wealth-creating and that will contribute to permanent growth. We believe that the west Texas projects will provide a sound investment for our energies and for Federal funds; that will strengthen the economic security of this region and of the entire Nation. Speaker RAYBURN, Governor Shivers, and members of the Texas congressional delegation have shown a keen interest in this water problem. I am sure that their cooperation will continue. The Department of the Interior can bring to the solution of this problem the necessary technical know-how.

At times like this, I recall a wise and revealing comment made many years ago by one of the great water planners of southern California, my home. A hot debate was raging over whether the fledgling city of Los Angeles should build its first huge aqueduct. Mr. William Mulholland was the engineer-adviser. Finally the question was put to him. Would such a stupendous project be needed? He said, "If you don't build the aqueduct, Los Angeles will never need it." Everyone saw at once that this was true. The aqueduct was built. The water that it brought created the growth that required the capacity of that aqueduct. Since then two additional and more ambitious aqueducts have been built, and Los Angeles is now grown into a metropolis.

I am sure that we of the Department of the Interior and you west Texans will go forward together in understanding and good will through the difficult process of planning and constructing the projects that you similarly need so badly. You have recognized the need for comprehensive studies, leading to integrated design and construction of projects in the long reaches of your river basins and in behalf of all the people.

Speaking for myself and for the personnel in the various agencies in the Department of the Interior who are now engaged with your problems: We are proud to have been asked to assist in this program. I am certain that a solution acceptable to all can and will be found.

The Upset Down Under

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy from the Washington Star of January 16, 1950:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—AUSTRALIA, NEW ZEALAND REVOLT AGAINST PROSPEROUS SOCIALISM—PEOPLE WANT CHANGE AWAY FROM REGULATIONS AND ARE PREPARED TO PAY HIGH PRICE FOR IT

(First of a series)

(By Morley Cassidy)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 16.—Revolution is all around you, these bright blue summer days in the Antipodes.

It is one of the strangest revolutions in history. It defies every rule in the book.

"Stick around," says the newsstand man at King's Cross, the Times Square of Sydney. "You're going to see some changes around here. And quick."

Changes? Who would want to change things in Australia?

Australia can look around itself these days, from the great cities of Sydney and Melbourne to the sheep stations of its own far west, 2,000 miles away, and see abundant evidence that it is one of the world's luckiest lands.

It is in the middle of a boom, perhaps the biggest it has ever known. Since the war's end it has been riding a crest of flooding prosperity.

Half of Australia, right now, is on its way to the beaches, or just coming back from 4 weeks' holidays. The other half is at Randwick or some other race track, trying to outguess the horses.

There is money in every pocket. Sheep ranchers, counting their holdings in thousands of square miles, are getting 60 cents a pound for average wool; 8 years ago they were getting 10 or 11. Beef growers are doing as well. Dairymen have the world bidding for their butter and cheese.

Everybody has a job. There are 23 columns of "positions vacant" want ads in the Sydney Herald. Three people are advertising for work.

Wages are the best Australia has ever known. The basic wage of 6 pounds 4 shillings (about $13.90), which used to be high, is now a joke. Bright lads now are offered that to start and promised a bicycle as a year-end bonus. The Australian pound is valued at about $2.24. Before the recent devaluation, its exchange rate was about $3.23.

Over in New Zealand, 1,300 miles away across the Tasman Sea, the story is the same. There, as here, prosperity is bolstered with the most advanced social services in the world.

PEOPLE ARE IN REVOLT

If there is any country in the world—outside the United States—where, one would think, people should be happy and contented, it is in these two dominions.

But the peoples of both countries, today, are in revolt. They want changes, and are prepared to pay a stiff price to get them.

Within the past 6 weeks, both New Zealand and Australia have fired the governments under which all this prosperity has come about.

In New Zealand, the sedate and tranquil little England of the South Seas, the voters marched quietly to the polls and threw out the socialistic Labor government of Prime Minister Peter Fraser, which had been planning and creating a Socialist utopia for 14 years.

In Australia, they voted more rambunctiously, and with more grim bitterness on both sides.

The result was the same. The Labor government of Prime Minister Joseph B. Chifley, committed to a full program of socialization on the British model, which had carried Australia through 8 years of war and peace, was thrown out of office with an enthusiasm which leaves it, even today, stunned and mystified.

OUTWARD EXPRESSION OF REVOLT

These elections, startling as they were, are only the outward expression of a revolution—or, as the Marxists would say, a counter-revolution.

In Australia, particularly, every man in the street knows that last month's elections were only the first step on a hard, new path.

Its new government, headed by Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies, today is mapping the step-by-step program that it will pursue in the new direction Australia has chosen; and it knows even better than the man in the street that it faces a hard task, and bitter fights.

Already, in its first 2 weeks in office, it is faced with a waterside strike of dock workers whose union is Communist-controlled. As this is written, 30 vessels are standing idle over a seemingly frivolous complaint involving the first-aid men for the stevedore crews.

There will be more such strikes, many more. There will be industrial disorders, in all probability, on a scale and of a bitterness which even Australia has not seen before.

AUSTRALIANS UNDISMAYED

The prospect does not dismay Australians. They weighed this chance when they cast their votes. They voted to run this risk, with their eyes open.

Seldom has any party, anywhere, stated its purposes more clearly, and with less mumbo-jumbo and bait to unthinking voters, than the combined Liberal and Country Parties in the elections just past.

Every voter was told, in the firmest possible language, that a vote for the Liberal-Country Party ticket would be a vote for free enterprise against the Socialist state.

He would be voting for the outlawing of the Communist Party, and the purging of Communist trades-union officials.

He would be voting for a firmer hand in dealing with unjustified strikes which have crippled Australian industry. He would be voting for a program aimed at more production through wider use of such devices as incentive payments, anathema to the Socialist state.

He would be voting against a program of full employment based on public works; he would take his chances on the full employment growing out of healthy, productive industries.

VOTING TO DESOCIALIZE

He would be voting, finally, to desocialize much that has been done in the past 8 years—to fight side by side with the banks (imagine!) in repealing the legislation aimed at creating a state banking monopoly; to restore competition between national and private air lines and shipping companies. to wipe out the Government monopoly in FM broadcasting and television.

And in exchange, he got only these few promises of concrete benefits.

The social services (many of them first introduced by the Liberal Party) would be retained, and the benefits would not be reduced.

Their cash value would not be raised, but their real value—and the value of all wages—would be increased by putting value back into the pound.

The child endowment for families would be extended to give 5 shillings (about 60 cents) a week for the first child. (All others are already receiving 10 shillings.)

In industrial relations, the emphasis would be on ending class warfare through firm insistence on arbitration, promotion of consultations between employers and employees, and restoration of union democracy by the legal requirement of secret ballots for union elections and strike calls.

VOTED TO RETURN TO OLD PATH

Australians, in these days of full employment and mass prosperity, had every reason, it would seem, to vote for more of the same.

They didn't. They voted, instead, for a return to the old path of free enterprise and competition, a firmer hand with strikes, an end to Government monopolies.

And their vote left no room for argument. The united Liberal and Country Parties here, with an agreed joint program, polled 2,127,268 votes (at the latest count, about 99 percent complete). The Labor Party polled 1,896,986. These figures almost exactly reversed those in 1946.

In 6 years, the Labor Party had declined from 50.2 percent of the popular vote in 1943 to 47.9 in 1946, and now to 40.9 percent in 1949.

And in New Zealand, where the issues were almost identical, and the Labor Party even more firmly entrenched, the results were the same.

Why?

I have been asking that question of hundreds of people, in the course of nearly 5,000 miles of traveling across Australia, from Darwin in the steaming north to Sydney, Melbourne, and Canberra, in the southeast, and across the Tasman Sea to Auckland and Wellington in New Zealand.

TWO ANSWERS HOLD CLUE

Two typical answers seem to hold the clue.

Here's a truck driver in the outskirts of Newcastle, the Pittsburgh of Australia, where the great Broken Hill Proprietary processes most of Australia's steel:

"Why," he says, "it's this socialization. This Chifley bunch was out to take over everything, starting with the banks.

"Next would come steel. And then road transport—they've already hinted at it.

"I've got my own truck, and my eye on another. I could find work for a fleet of them. You think I'm going to nationalize myself into a bleeding government driver at 1-pound-10 (about $3.35) a day?"

And here's a young dairy farmer, with 23 head of Ayrshire cattle, on a farm near Camden, New South Wales—a modern little town with soda fountains in the heart of the eastern plains.

"I was beginning to think I'd been all wrong about things," he says, keeping one eye on the modern milk-cooling machine.

"I had 5 years in the war, and I was under the impression we were fighting dictatorship. At least, that's what I was fighting, myself."

FOUND DICTATORSHIP AT HOME

"And then I came back here to find that's what we were getting here at home. The State trying to run everything—telling you what to plant, and who could get machinery, and all that.

"Maybe I'm misinformed, but I don't see any difference between dictatorships. Some are left, some are right, but I was fighting against dictatorship, period.

"Now we're rid of it here, and you'll see Australia bounding ahead like a kangaroo."

These views, in a hundred variations, seem to me to reveal the full significance of the elections in New Zealand and Australia which have surprised the world.

The first conclusion, so widely and vigorously expressed by the voters that it cannot be escaped, is simply this:

In both Australia and New Zealand, the one great issue was the Socialist state and its program of a planned economy.

Out of this grew a host of secondary issues on which feelings ran high—in Australia, communism's part in the planned economy and how to wreck it, continued butter, tea and gasoline rationing, attributed to Socialist misplanning, and dawdling in last year's coal strike; in New Zealand, high taxes, high living costs, mismanagement of government-run business enterprises, the fumbling efforts to turn an agricultural country into a land of industry.

LABOR PARTY STOOD ON RECORD

In both countries the Labor Party, pledged to a full program of socialization, stood on its record of achievements. In New Zealand this was a 14-year record in which the "welfare state" was firmly established, and state management of industry tested in many fields.

In Australia, there was an 8-year record, including a fine war-time accomplishment, sound handling of finances, and a beginning—hardly more—of the socialization of industry.

In both countries, the vote was so conclusive as to show a genuine revolution in popular thought.

Whether the Socialist state had had time to prove its possibilities, as in New Zealand, or had given voters only a taste of what was to come as here, the voters wanted a return to free enterprise and the fuller production of all the necessities of life which, they seem convinced, free enterprise will bring.

The second conclusion, noted by most politicians and confirmed by scores of conversations, is less obvious but perhaps more significant. It is this:

REVOLUTION OF YOUTH

This return to free enterprise, has been primarily a revolution of youth.

The young Camden dairyman, back from the war, speaks what apparently is in the minds of hundreds of thousands of others in their twenties and thirties. It is a fact over which labor's leaders, too late, are grumbling.

"These young fellows," says a Melbourne railroad man, "have had it too easy. People begging them to go to work for £10 (about $22.40) a week, and all that.

"They take the money, and then complain because they can't get all the petrol they want for their motorbikes. They don't realize how their daddies had to fight to get things as they are."

Be that as it may, labor and socialism—the two here are identical—have become, in Australia and New Zealand, touched with age and a flavor of stodginess.

Their leaders, almost all, are oldsters whose doctrinaire political philosophies have lost all elasticity. The stern party hierarchy represses younger, more flexible men.

SEVENTY PERCENT EX-SERVICEMEN

By contrast, the opposition in the recent election—the men who will hold 74 of the 123

seats in the new Australian House of Representatives, and 46 of the 80 in the New Zealand—are, on the average, 15 to 20 years younger.

Of the Liberal candidates for the Australian House, 70 percent were ex-servicemen. The youngest was 22. More than 50 percent were between 30 and 40.

Australia is a young country, far younger than the United States. It feels its strength in these postwar days in much the same way that America in the burgeoning nineties began to see a vision of what it would become.

Its young muscles, inevitably, chafe at the restrictions of the planned, regimented, noncompetitive state. So now it has thrown them off. How it did it, and what lies ahead, is another story.

Minority or Majority Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, minority pressure groups are attempting and in some instances are dictating governmental policy.

Many of these groups apparently have no concern as to the ultimate results which the enactment of their pet legislation will have on the economy or welfare of the Nation as a whole.

Seventy-four new Congressmen came in with President Truman at the beginning of this Eighty-first Congress. Many of them honestly believe that they received a mandate from the people to enact the entire Fair Deal program.

Maybe they are correct in this assumption—but in my opinion 49 percent of the eligible voters does not express a mandate of all the people. If those eligible to vote continue to stay away from the polls—these minority pressure groups will completely dictate Government policy.

A survey of the last election was made in one typical Ohio county and it shows the percentage of various groups that did not even take the trouble to vote:

	Percent
School teachers	11.5
Auto dealers	37.5
Independent grocers	37.0
Clergymen	32.65
Independent druggists	26.67
Members, chambers of commerce	24.57
Physicians	19.58
Rotary Club members	14.01

If this class of citizens refuse to express an opinion, we will lose our freedom by default.

I would outlaw legislative activities of all paid lobbyists except such testimony as they might care to make on the record—before committees, hearing proposed bills, or letters sent over their signature.

I would disfranchise all eligible voters for a period of 4 years who failed to register and vote in 2 successive national elections wherein Members of Congress were up for election, unless they furnished a reasonable excuse, properly sworn to, as to why they failed to vote. If they then failed to vote at the next national election following this 4-year period, they would be disfranchised for another 4 years.

If we had a clear-cut issue before the people and a majority of all those eligible to vote made a choice, diagnosis would be easy. If a majority of my people then voted for this new socialistic order, I would know that I had been born 30 years too soon and would certainly step out of Congress. However, when less than one-half of those eligible to vote in a county, give a majority to President Truman and also a majority to the Republican Congressman who represents that county, diagnosis of the majority's views is difficult.

I want a majority opinion of all those I represent. What I now have is a majority opinion of minority groups. I have not always agreed with them. Still if they are the ones who go to the polls and express an opinion—I must eventually reflect their opinion in my voting. I certainly cannot reflect an opinion as that of the majority—especially if the majority do not vote.

Address by Hon. Edwin C. Johnson, of Colorado, Before Federal Communications Bar Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me on January 12 before the annual meeting of the Federal Communications Bar Association, at the Mayflower Hotel, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARRYING COALS TO NEWCASTLE

It is with some trepidation that I come here to speak to this gathering of communications notables, for no one realizes more than I that here we have the collective brains of the communications world. Present we have the Commissioners—and their staff; we must not overlook their staff. Out there sit the lawyers, calm and collected with their legalistic harpoons well concealed, who not only convince their clients that a Commission decision is illegal, incorrect, or stupid and should be fought through the highest court in the land in the interest of equity and justice, but get paid for it. So tonight, I have the dubious honor of telling the folks who make the wheels spin just how the spinning is done.

To discuss the problems in communications—common carrier and broadcasting—before so distinguished a group is, I know, foolhardy. But as you also know, Senators are inclined that way, and for a Senator to evince deep interest in radio matters requires an even greater degree of foolhardiness. Anyway, here I am.

First off, let me say I expect to be misunderstood. Everytime I say anything about radio, and particularly about color television, I read at least a half-dozen versions of my statement. I ascribe that merely to the fact that each person likes to read into what is said what he wants to hear. Maybe it's because Congressmen use too many weasel words when they bare their souls but it is beyond me how one can be positive in the radio world today with its constantly expanding technical horizons. Particularly does that apply in the field of communications. As a result of developments or discoveries in the laboratory, what one says today may well be fallacious tomorrow. Tonight, I intend to stick closely to broad policy matters which ought not be affected by the progress of the art.

Our Senate committee is interested—vitally interested—in communications policies. Since we have many other duties and many other problems, I ask you to be patient with us. I repeat, we are interested enough to give the matter a lot of our time and our energy; we are interested in the application of the laws which we have written; in the policies formulated by the regulatory agency; in its day by day administration; in its attitude and reactions; and in the efforts the industry makes to keep the Commission, and the Congress, on what it regards as the straight and narrow path. The trouble is, of course, that while everybody agrees that the proper yardstick for the operation of utilities and broadcasting is "the public interest" it seems to make a whole lot of difference in which corner one sits as to what constitutes the public interest.

In an address at Amherst College last month the Chairman of the Commission hit this nail squarely on the head when he quoted the late Justice Harlan Fisk Stone to the effect that "the issue * * * is between the conflicting interests of the individual and of society as a whole. * * * There comes a point in the organization of a complex society where individualism must yield to traffic regulations, where the right to do so as one will with his own must bow to zoning ordinances, or even on occasion to price-fixing regulations. Just where the line is to be drawn which marks the boundary between the appropriate field of individual liberty and right and that of Government action for the larger good * * * is the perpetual question of constitutional law."

Justice Stone's eloquent language states the problem which Congress and the Commission must deal with constantly, frequently against the violent opposition of the legal fraternity.

We in Congress regard the Commission as an extension of ourselves; we regard it as the arm of Congress created to administer the details and weigh the arguments which Congress has neither the time nor the facilities to do. To evaluate the work of the Commission, however, does not require a profound legal background; in fact, the act does not require that one be learned in the law to be a commissioner. So to the extent that the Commission performs legislative acts, we in Congress feel that not only are we competent to evaluate its actions, but that we have the constitutional duty of exercising a close supervisory interest in them.

And like a fond parent who desires his children to grow up to amount to something, we occasionally exercise strong and purposeful parental guidance when we feel that things are not going along as they should. There are two schools of thought nowadays with respect to bringing up children: the so-called progressive education system which follows the Freudian precept of not interfering with the child and allowing it to express its inner urges whatever they may be and never, never restricting or curbing its excesses, and then there is the old-fashioned school which still adheres to the philosophy that to spare the rod is to spoil the child. With respect to the Commission, most of us in Congress, being practical, find ourselves half-way between these extremes.

Seriously, this is a vital problem. The last two decades have witnessed a vicious totalitarian trend which insists that the quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative arms of Congress are administrative agencies under the Executive. The results have led to a prostitution of the original purpose of Congress in the creation of such agencies as the Trade Commission, the Interstate Commerce Commission, the Power Commission, the Communications Commission, and similar commissions. Under strong Presidents and complacent Congresses these agencies have not only come hopefully to regard themselves as arms of the executive, but they actually perform their functions as if they were part and parcel of the executive. Unfortunately too, the citizens who come under the regulation of these agencies have accepted this new theory—to their sorrow and ultimately to the eventual loss of their fundamental democratic rights.

Frankly, we in Congress believe these dangerous trends must be reversed and the constitutional powers of Congress restored. However, we cannot make much headway unless we have the cooperation of such groups as yours who should be vitally concerned with the totalitarian aspects of the present trend.

It must be obvious that there is great possibility of mischief if the arms of Congress finally become so wedded to the executive as to become inseparable from it. The agencies, under such a system, are bound to carry out the programs and policies of the particular administration in power rather than adhere to a strict and literal interpretation of the statute under which they operate. The viewpoint of an important party leader then becomes more compelling than reliance on the protection of the law. The rights of citizens to bring about changes through their legislative institutions are subrogated; to get something done frequently requires only influence in the proper places with the party in power. In such a political climate it is who you know and not what is equitable which counts. Not only is such a system intrinsically dangerous and a subversion of the original idea of the founding fathers, but it is bound to lead to the creation of a powerful and all-controlling centralized government. It must be resisted, even by those who gain temporary advantage from it for themselves and their clients because in the end it will swallow up even those who profit from it.

I am frank to admit that we in Congress are partly to blame for this unfortunate trend. We have been complacent when we should have been deeply concerned. We can do something about it and we should meet the issue head-on.

For myself, I believe that the existing system of giving the Executive the appointive power to the commissions which are arms of Congress is basically unsound. It is only natural that those who owe their jobs to the Executive would be reluctant to oppose Executive policy and suggestion. Perhaps, if the appointive power were vested in the Speaker of the House, with the Senate confirmation requirement remaining as at present, these important quasi-judicial, quasi-legislative agencies really would attain the independence so vital to democratic government. Moreover, there should be unified standards of tenure, salaries, cessation of office, selection of chairmen, and powers and duties of commissioners in all the independent agencies instead of the present hodgepodge. There should be a more formal and searching annual accounting of commission operations to the people, through the Congress. I am wedded to these principles because I believe in democracy and fear totalitarianism, and I offer them as suggestions which should concern you lawyers in the administrative field.

It is important to emphasize that recent studies and proposals for streamlining the Government, such as the Hoover Commission report, valuable and informative as it is, have a basic weakness. In the interest of unification and streamlining, the emphasis has been to bring about a tightly knit structure of Federal Government functioning under the Executive. Such recommendations stem from the managerial concept followed in big business of having, above all, an efficient administration. But it overlooks and actually denies the fundamental basis of our democracy because it sacrifices and impairs the rights of citizens to participate directly in their Government. Without disparaging loyal, able, and devoted civil-service employees, all of you know that bureaucrats, good and not so good, earnestly believe they know what is good for you; and if you don't like it, that's your misfortune. No Congressman or Senator dare tell his constituents that he knows their problems better than they. Democracy does not work that way.

The history of communications comprises a fascinating panorama of the progress of mankind. From the dawn of civilization, each improvement and advance in the means of communicating more effectively with one's fellows has added to man's spiritual and economic progress. Despite this century's progress in communications, all of us here know that in some respects we are only on the threshold of developments which will mark a new advance in man's climb toward his ultimate destiny.

And since our country and our people are in the forefront of each new development, it is important that we cling tenaciously to high standards and religiously follow those vital precepts which insure continued progress and full freedom of communications from both political and selfish private domination. The modern dictators have taught us that the primary essential step toward seizing control of a country is to take over communications.

Even in this country which is genuinely devoted to democracy we have gone far in some fields by putting Government into many activities that might be better done by private initiative. If this country would hold its position of world leadership, the private-enterprise system not only must survive, but it must be made to flourish and expand since it has proved to the world that it holds the best record for bringing the greatest good to the greatest number. Without the shining example of the free-enterprise system of this democracy, a dismal prospect indeed would face the world. Free enterprise and democracy are inseparable; one cannot function at its best without the other.

Therefore, my criticisms and suggestions are not those of one who regards further Government controls as beneficial, or socialization of enterprise as the dawn of a great new era for mankind. On the contrary, I fear such steps and no one regrets more than I do whenever industry adopts policies which inevitably compels more stringent controls.

Communications is peculiarly vulnerable to the creeping paralysis of bureaucratic control. In the first place, it is a licensed industry. Some think it ought not be licensed, but common sense and the nature of the art make it difficult for me to agree with them. Frequencies are limited, and even if they were not, the economics of the situation limits the number of licenses, and public utilities and broadcasting must be a regulated monopoly to render good service. Incidentally, we ought to be happy about this on both counts. I have recently visited areas where the economy won't support two stations but where two dozen or more stations are operating, simply because every politician thinks he must own a radio station to air his particular political views. If each Member of Congress and each member of the President's Cabinet plus the horde of political leaders in each State owned a radio station, what a racket there would be—in both meanings of that ugly word. And all of you know that such a situation in another neighboring country lies behind the difficulties experienced at the recent NARBA conference.

Licensing implies, and in fact requires, adherence to very definite standards based upon the public interest. To those who argue for standards which should be limited to electrical interference I say "bunk." Such advocates live in a dream world of fancy, not fact. That is their idea of free radio, but it isn't mine. In my judgment, radio wouldn't be free very long if their interpretation were followed. Reasonable men differentiate between private privilege and the public good. Under such criteria, it is plain that the licensing agency has a duty to see that the license is used always in the public interest. Otherwise it becomes not a license but a special prerogative and the so-called licensee the possessor of a facility which belongs to all the people but over which the people have lost control.

That isn't freedom; it isn't even competition. It is special privilege of the worst kind with all of the faults and errors inherent in absolute monopoly. Under such a system, the public would get what the licensee deemed fit; under such a system radio would deteriorate to just what it is in some other countries where the only standard is the political pull necessary to acquire a license.

Of course, regulations can be made arbitrary, capricious, onerous, and burdensome, or even static in the interest of those who profit by the status quo. But they are more likely to become that way only when the licensee is doing a minimum job. When the licensee persists upon skating on thin ice, always seeing how little he can get by with, he strengthens the hand of a bureaucratically inclined agency. It is faulty and sloppy operation that brings on a blue book; it is clever deals that brings on an AVCO rule; it is monopoly practices that bring on network regulations. Licensees and their lawyers constantly cry about the Commission and its greed for more power but the most effective way to pull the Commission's fangs—if fangs it has—is to do such a good job of broadcasting that there is little for the Commission to do except formulate technical regulation.

I am viewing with alarm quibbling against imaginary restrictions and I am not criticizing radio, for American radio has done a magnificent job. There are 10 to 1 more fine radio stations performing a great public service in this country than in all of the rest of the world combined. There are licensees—and a lot of them—whose sole aim is to render a great public service and they have profited handsomely by adhering to that policy. The tragedy is that this is not better known and better understood and appreciated. We only hear about the few chiselers who either aim to get a license so that they can peddle it at a profit, or who regard a license as a potential bonanza to be exploited for all it is worth. They give radio a bad name, and as long as they exist the regulatory agency will have the backing of public-spirited citizens to pursue arbitrary and distasteful policies if they deem such a course necessary.

We will always need a strong, alert FCC whose sole passion should be to regulate the industry in the public interest. I have not hesitated to criticize the Commission and its policies when I thought criticism was justified and to praise it when its work has been noteworthy. It is my particular congressional responsibility to maintain constant watchfulness of its operations.

The Commission should continue its wise policy of constantly raising its sights and stature. It is required to sit in a judicial

capacity on many matters and its best friends in Congress would like to have it attain in its proceedings the dignity and stature of the judiciary. We do not believe that the Commission as a body or individually should discuss or receive ex parte testimony in contested cases, either from its own lawyers or from counsel for one of the litigants. A proper observance of courtroom ethics and procedure would make false the back biting, the petty innuendos, and the snide remarks of its critics.

Our biggest complaint on Capitol Hill is the long delay in processing cases. I do not need to tell you lawyers that delay in many instances is more deadly to an applicant than a flat but prompt rejection. I dealt at some length with that problem in my report on communications to the Senate last April and I hope that I will have a brighter picture to present next April. Late last year, the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce requested and received a complete report on the status of the Commission's unfinished work. When we check again we are going to know definitely and clearly just how rapidly and how competently it performs at least one of its most important functions—the handling of broadcast cases.

Some of us think that the time has come for the Commission to overhaul its rules and regulations; to discard some procedures and revise others. We think that perhaps the network regulations require further scrutiny in the light of changing conditions. We think that the Commission might be able to do more in the purely scientific and technical field and that it could do more if some antiquated and unnecessary functions were dispensed with. Even though the majority of the Commission's engineering staff is engaged in monitoring and field engineering, there is some question as to how necessary this work really is now. We ought to know a good deal more about accounting practices in the telegraph and telephone field. Too, a revision of the tariffs in the common carrier field might well result in tremendous savings to millions of users throughout this country.

My views on the question of super power for standard radio broadcast stations are too well known to require elaboration here. I mention the subject only because I hope that the Commission will shortly provide for duplication of clears since the people of this country need more frequencies desperately. Certainly, it has the authority to do so. The maintenance of clear channels is an anachronism in modern radio practice. Unfortunately the clears cannot render the local service that many areas deserve hence they do not serve well. It is archaic to contend any longer that clear channels serve a useful purpose in the United States and the best proof is that the networks now frankly admit that their own seaboard clears might be duplicated without harm to them.

The question of power, of course, is a policy matter for the Congress to decide, since the vital issue of domestic monopoly and international comity are involved in it. We might have been in a much stronger position at Montreal in our efforts to reach a conference agreement had we first eliminated the problem of the clears. Most certainly then we could have dealt with cleaner hands with our Latin-American neighbors. I do not condone for one moment any attempt by any Nation to hold a pistol to our heads, and least of all by one whose entire economy depends on our friendly cooperation.

The United States ought to give serious consideration to the sensible proposal to assist Cuba and the whole Caribbean area in converting their local radio from AM to FM. FM renders better service than AM in areas where static interference is serious and where the area to be covered is not continental. Moreover, its use would eliminate pressing frequency problems and AM interference for us since there are ample FM frequencies. Rather than destroy or impair through a veritable babel of competing programs on the same frequency many of our splendid standard radio stations, which have been operating long and faithfully, it might pay us to make a loan or grant for the installation of FM stations, plus the replacement of all existing AM receivers with FM sets. This is a problem which should be studied seriously on behalf of all the smaller Central American countries where radio communication facilities are sparse or nonexistent. FM is an ideal instrumentality for the Tropics.

I am sorry there has been unavoidable delay in reaching a final decision on the color-television question. But I believe that the Commission's present hearing has been justified by the new interest it has aroused in this art. It is taking more time than anticipated, but a sound decision is more important than a speedy one. I have every confidence that the decision of the Commission will be a correct one, because I know that every member is aware of the vital importance of the question with which they are dealing. They must make sure that what they do is sound and permanent. The essential thing is a decision for the long pull; not something that will please a few powerful economic interests for today's profits. With respect to this matter the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce will have the advantage of a technical report by a committee of five impartial scientists, headed by Dr. Edward U. Condon, on the engineering practicality of color-television development. I am confident that report will fortify and bolster the Commission's decision that we are ready for color television now.

Television is a magnificent art which promises to bring finer entertainment and more information to the people of the United States. Its impact upon our culture and life socially and politically can hardly be evaluated. When the American people purchase 2,500,000 sets in 1 year they deserve and have every right to expect the best science can offer.

It is in the public interest, therefore, to promulgate quickly broad and sufficiently general standards for color so that this delightful improvement may be developed naturally in the traditional American, free enterprise, nonmonopolistic manner. Since it is generally agreed that color is practical, most emphatically the public interest would not be served by waiting until 30,000,000 families have invested upward of $6,000,000,000 in black and white sets before switching to color.

I hope, too, that the Commission will approve at the same time standards for the immediate commercial utilization of a large number of channels in the ultra-high-frequency band so that a realistic Nation-wide competitive system of television may be developed.

Certainly the public interest requires such an allocation. Easily identified selfish interests are laboring day and night to lift the freeze now and do nothing more. When the proposed 42 UHF channels are allocated on a city-by-city basis throughout the Nation and standards for their use promulgated there will remain no reason for continuing the present freeze on VHF licensing and, of course, it should then be lifted and not before.

All in all, the year ahead in communications promises to be fruitful, exciting, and eventful. Our Senate committee will pursue its studies on the operation of Federal communications systems in an effort to determine their necessity and desirability; we shall explore the entire question of frequency use with the purpose of making a more effective utilization and a more equitable distribution; we shall continue our studies of the serious and pressing problem of domestic and international record communications carriers with the hope that steps can be taken to combine their facilities with the purpose of bringing about lower costs and better service and at the same time improve this country's military and official position in common carrier communications; we shall continue to give attention to legislation which passed the Senate last session designed primarily to improve the administrative and quasi-judicial functioning of the Commission; and above all, we shall try diligently to meet our full congressional responsibilities by maintaining a policy of cooperation and watchfulness.

Commentary and Recommendations Upon the McKinsey & Co. Survey and Report Covering the Port Patrol Division of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following commentary and recommendations upon the McKinsey & Co. survey and report covering the Port Patrol Division of the Bureau of Customs, Treasury Department, respectfully submitted by Lodge No. 981, American Federation of Government Employees, to better serve the public welfare and security:

A FACTUAL RÉSUMÉ

The Port Patrol Division is one of the most important units within the customs service.

It is an armed police force, strategically stationed 24 hours each day at piers, airfields, and in radio cars on mobile patrol as a bulwark protecting the welfare and security of the American people.

In times of war it is as important as is our merchant fleet itself. It stands guard against the sabotage of bombs and incendiary devices, or other forms of sabotage, and against the operations of espionage rings.

In times of peace its services are legion and range from the detection of counterfeit money to the apprehension of narcotic smugglers. It protects the Government revenue. It safeguards the public health from various diseases which could be brought into the country with parrots, monkeys, or other animal life. It stops illegal entry of plant life which could bear destructive insects with it.

The narcotic control work performed by the port patrol is exceedingly important. The illegal narcotic business is detestably vile. It wrecks homes and families through addiction, produces murderous criminals who ruthlessly take other lives through gangsterism, spawns vice dens of degenerates and prostitutes and causes financial losses that are appalling.

Standing at the many doors of entry into our country, the port patrol seizes in single operations the large shipments of narcotics that are intended to supply thousands of individual peddlers.

The personnel of the port patrol is rightfully proud of its 40-year record of achievement and believes that a study of this record will always be illuminating and produce many surprises.

Any reorganization of such an important unit as the port patrol is attended with grave responsibility to the American people.

The National Customs Service Association is an employee organization that includes very few port patrol officers within its membership. The vast majority of the membership performs duties in the customs service that have no resemblance to the duties performed by the port patrol officers. This organization has, however, filed with the Congress a commentary and a set of recommendations upon the McKinsey report.

Lodge No. 981, the port patrol officers' representative organization, believes that a commentary compiled by the officers who rub elbows with the most lawless, yet the shrewdest, criminals and who have actual contact with the problems of this work, will be a definite contribution to the public welfare and security.

Concern is felt about many of the McKinsey recommendations which require only administrative acceptance to become effective. A lack of understanding of the deterrent effect of our work seems to prevail. The value of our work cannot be measured in the number of seizures alone. Three pertinent questions must be considered. What would happen if all port patrol officers were removed? What will happen if too few port patrol officers are there? What will happen if demoralizing working conditions destroy morale and efficiency?

In the interests of the public welfare and security, Lodge No. 981 respectfully requests your consideration of the following commentary, covering chapter VIII of the McKinsey report:

FROM THE M'KINSEY REPORT—PROTECTION, INVESTIGATION, AND ENFORCEMENT

"(a) Reduce the amount of merchandise guarding where study indicates other agencies should do more of the work."

We believe that a very important fact is being overlooked here.

During the time that a vessel is berthed at a pier, illegal merchandise or narcotics may easily be secreted on the pier, hidden with the cargo. We believe that the port patrol officer should remain at the pier as long as any cargo rests on the pier. If he is removed when the vessel sails, the door is opened for the entry of any such secreted merchandise or narcotics. There is no other agency sufficiently trained or authorized to perform this enforcement work. The agencies employed to reduce pilferage cannot be held responsible for the law-enforcement work of the port patrol.

"(b) Increase the mobile patrols where practical, thereby reducing costs."

Our contribution to the public welfare and security is the justification for our existence. Any worth-while contribution demands fixed posts of duty with very little shifting of personnel. The need of flexibility should only occasionally arise. The mobile patrol can spot check locations where there is no port patrol officer on a fixed post. As an adjunct to an officer on a fixed post, the mobile patrol is valuable, rendering assistance during the paying off of an entire crew or when large numbers of longshoremen are leaving the pier at one time. The mobile patrol is also valuable in spot checking areas of a large port where a fixed post is not practical. This spot checking cannot be otherwise than haphazard, however. They must be present at an unguarded location at the exact time that an illegal landing of merchandise or narcotics is being attempted. The persons who engage in the illegal narcotic traffic are smart enough to quickly learn to wait until the mobile patrol has spot checked their location and departed for a check at another unguarded location, realizing that they would then encounter no obstacle to their illegal landing.

We believe that the mobile patrol should never be employed as a substitute for the fixed post of duty. The amount saved would be so relatively small when measured against the great damage that may result, as to make it hardly worth while.

"(c) Expand the use of modern equipment and training to make patrols more flexible and effective."

We endorse the proposal that has been made to send the port patrol officers to the school operated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation if possible. We believe that such instruction would enable the port patrol officers to take better care of themselves in emergencies and enable them to render more efficient and better enforcement work.

"(d) Change New York roll-call practices. Test out operations with no roll call. Until results of test are known, decentralize roll call and require supervisors to prepare themselves to drive cars in order to facilitate speedier coverage and inspection of personnel."

The National Customs Service Association suggested a half hour lunch period in their commentary. This is impractical. The time allowance is too short. It would be very difficult to relieve all the port patrol officers who are assigned singly to many miles of New York and New Jersey dock areas. To permit a fixed post to be uncovered during any period of time would eradicate the benefit gained in the 8 hours that the port patrol officer was on duty.

"(e) Standardize vessel searching practices to achieve more uniform coverage and practices."

We believe the results obtained in the Port of New York indicate a superlative efficiency. We believe that more efficient enforcement can be obtained, however, through an interchange of information between ports relative to suspected vessels or persons. Some such information is presently supplied to the officers engaged in searching vessels, and to the customs inspectors by the investigative agency of the customs service. Such information is rarely known, however, to the port patrol officer on a fixed post or on mobile patrol. We believe that this information should be supplied to all port patrol officers by the investigative agency of the customs service and should be expanded if possible.

"(f) Deployment of personnel according to the work load to obtain greater uniformity and lower costs."

Such deployment of personnel other than the port patrol may be found advantageous and practical. Relative to the port patrol, however, we reiterate our previously expressed belief, that all locations where a vessel is berthed or where any cargo remains should be covered with a fixed post 24 hours each day, and the deployment of port patrol personnel should be avoided.

The fixed post is a door of entry into our country. The deployment of a port patrol officer from a fixed post opens this door of entry to anyone who may be waiting for such an opportunity.

ORGANIZATION

"(a) Establish two assistants to the deputy commissioner to allow for closer supervision and better coordination of customs enforcement work."

We wholeheartedly agree with this recommendation of the McKinsey Co. Lack of coordination between the various ports has greatly decreased efficiency. Seafaring men repeatedy express their belief that the port of New York is a more difficult customs port than other ports.

OUR CONCLUSIONS

If it is earnestly desired to maintain a strong and valuable wartime security link, if the public health is to be efficiently protected from foreign disease, if agriculture is to be screened from destructive insects, if Government revenue is to be adequately protected, if narcotic addiction and gangsterism is to be suppressed in any degree, if vice dens of degeneracy are to be eliminated in any measure, and if the general welfare of the American people is to be safeguarded the port patrol should be strengthened and not weakened.

The port patrol officer holds a position of trust and responsibility. He is exposed to various hazards, personal dangers, and occasionally to death while enforcing the laws enacted by Congress. His personal contacts while on duty include seamen of all nationalities as well as American citizens of all social standings. He is the representative of the United States Government and must avoid incidents that would lead to international correspondence, he must employ tact, and be able to transact his business with highly educated persons in such a manner as to reflect credit to his Government. In contrast, he must reflect firmness and strength to the loathsome narcotic smuggler. This calls for the exercise of a wide latitude of independent action.

It must be apparent that a very high type of person is required to fulfill the duties creditably and efficiently. A more appropriate civil service classification, a greater recognition of the hazards and individual integrity and a more equitable procedure of promotion and disciplinary action will aid greatly to attract the type of personnel required for this important work.

There are approximately 1,000 port patrol officers in the entire United States. They constitute a very small group that is rendering very valuable service to the American welfare and security. All the savings that can possibly be effected within the port patrol is relatively small to the national or Customs Bureau's annual budget and should be seriously studied against the type and many services rendered by the port patrol.

Local Level Selective Service Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, during the late war, Iowa was fortunate in having many patriotic and able citizens who gave unstintingly of their time and effort as members of local selective service boards. Among these was Mr. Vernon Denman, of Des Moines, Iowa, who served 6 years as member and chairman of a local board. Mr. Denman recently wrote a letter to the adjutant general of Iowa, Gen. Charles H. Grahl, outlining in detail the problems with which his local board was confronted, and how they were solved. Believing the letter would be helpful to all local board members in event that it becomes necessary to expand our armed services through Selective Service, and under permission granted me, I include in my remarks in the RECORD the letter of Mr. Denman to General Grahl:

OCTOBER 10, 1949.

To: Gen. Charles H. Grahl, State director of selective service, Des Moines, Iowa.

From: Vernon Denman, chairman, local board, No. 13–77, Des Moines, Iowa.

As promised some few weeks ago, I have prepared a brief symposium of public relations experienced during about 6 years as a

member and chairman of a local selective service board from the beginning to the end of the act of 1940. Should of necessity the personal pronoun I appear too frequently, please overlook and charge the apparent blunder to the inadequacy of the writer.

Very early in the fall of 1940, it was realized by myself that home front morale was and would continue to be an important factor in the successful conduct of the war. Complaints registered with the Commander in Chief, and other top men charged with heavy responsibilities, be they real or imaginary, could only confuse issues and waste valuable time of such important people, thus, to avoid as much waste as possible and to promote and to improve local morale of both employers, parents, and selectees, a special service was added to the task set aside for the chairman of the board.

As we have discussed this subject before, we have agreed that the following program could very well work both on a State and National basis, just as well as it did in the narrow limits of a local board. It is, therefore, with this thought in mind, that a more extensive use of the plan might be made should the Nation again become involved in a shooting war, that this paper is written.

No form of government survives long without the confidence of the people, in the strict honesty of purpose, in those who are engaged in the administration of that government, providing of course, the people are not by force compelled to admit confidence. Therefore, confidence must be won by actions and deeds and methods. Further, the better informed interested persons are, the less danger of complaints and misunderstandings and the easier to reach an amicable solution to all problems.

How can the Government teach the public as much as possible the mechanics of selective service? First, by intelligent and reliable releases to both the press and the radio, but far more important and satisfactory is for individual board members to take the time to explain the applicable rule or rules to the dissatisfied patron. Most people resent being called before a local board to air their positions. When inescapable that a person must appear, the board should go out of its may to make a hearing pleasant and to avoid embarrassment to that patron, almost at any cost. Harsh words should never be used and the show of authority should likewise be intolerable. When situations arise that are beyond the control of the local board or the State director, prompt solutions must be sought. If a local board member is out of line, then he should be removed and the press should be informed. When the State director or any member of his staff or the National director or any member of his staff become unreasonable or politically inclined, the local board should immediately inform the people via the press and cause removal of such person or persons.

The local boards build and acquire confidence by giving information, that is, all unrestricted information to reporters for the press and by talks to clubs, meetings, and individuals.

People generally have given the word "induction" an abhorrent meaning. They have associated the words of force, compulsion, and unwillingness to the term "induction." They are not very far wrong. Men should be conducted into service. Understandable leadership was never more important or imperative than when men are for the first time entering the armed services of the country.

How best, then, may the above be achieved? The suggestions following are based on several years of actual experience. Here, again, the local board must be well informed and willing to devote considerable time to their assignment.

Invitational meetings should be held to relate to new soldiers the complete story about their new life, especially the trials to be met for the first 3 or 4 days in service.

The invitation should include the parents, the wives, if any, and all friends they care to bring with them. The time of the meeting should be 3 p. m. the day before departure, providing the departure date is not on Monday, Saturday, or Sunday—those afternoon meetings are never successful. Invitations to others, as well as to the men themselves, increase the attendance of the men. An attempt to compel attendance should never be tried.

The meetings should never exceed 45 minutes in length. No speaker should talk more than 10 minutes. The chairman of the local board should conduct the meeting whenever possible. A variety of persons appearing before the audience creates interest. A jovial attitude and presentation of information is desired.

Other organizations should not attempt such meetings. They are doomed to failure. They cannot and never have followed through. An incomplete job is worse than no job at all.

The local board should obtain from the processing Army or Navy post an exact procedure, hour by hour, for the several days required to process a new recruit. This should be prepared under the direction of the commanding officer at the post or base with the cooperation of the chaplain. This permits the parents and wives to live the routine of their loved ones and eases the ties that have been broken. This paper should require not more than 10 minutes to read and should be read by some well-known citizen of the community.

An interesting speaker should then be given 10 minutes to present his subject.

The chairman of the board should then discuss more personal problems, such as, what to take with them, train time and conduct en route to post or base, and the need for officers and enlisted men. Minimize all fear of the needles and fantasies of processing. Warnings against the evils of mingling with women of the red-light districts. Explaining the purpose of USO and all other general information possible. This should not exceed 10 minutes. The final 15 minutes should be devoted to a question-and-answer period. If at all possible, a short social time should be had at the close with some group serving coffee and doughnuts.

It is highly important that the chairman of the board should be at the depot at least 1 hour before train time. Many questions are asked and should be answered. No depot employee should be permitted to march the boys to the train. Last-minute farewells are nobody's business except those who are being separated. A 10-minute warning should be made of departing time, men should not be required to board trains more than 3 or 4 minutes prior to departure. The chairman should board the cars to see that every man has a seat. He should see to it that the trains are clean and that drinking water and ventilation are available. Freedom of movement on the part of the departing boys should not be restricted prior to boarding time.

If the chairman resides within a short distance of the processing station, he should visit each class on the evening of the second day in camp. The board should obtain rules governing the visiting at camps by relatives of the soldiers and should keep their clerks fully informed so they can be of immediate help to all such people.

The chairman should, if at all possible, make himself available for visiting time with men home on furlough and should compliment the men if they have been elevated in rank. A local board that is willing to encourage new soldiers soon becomes well known and appreciated by the parents of the boys.

It is unnecessary to mollycoddle the boys. Far more to be desired is a sincere interest in their welfare and a genuine sympathetic and natural understanding of their emotions and an attempt to lead them toward a more cheerful future than they anticipate.

More detail can be provided if wanted. It is a further suggestion that the Office of the National Director of Selective Service could, during this quiet time, explore the possibilities of adopting the plan on a national scale and be prepared to instruct local boards in its operation, should the need arise. My limited services in the furtherance of the idea are at your command.

It has been my observation during the years I've been a member of a board that those men who have had service in some branch of our armed forces have been the most understanding, the most willing to devote time and energy to the duties of a board and the best all-around members from any standpoint.

Therefore, in selecting a membership for all local boards it would be advantageous to the Government if at least one former serviceman was chosen as a member. There may be a few exceptions to this suggestion but very few.

Respectfully,

VERNON DENMAN.

George Washington Carver: Pioneer in Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, a few days ago the city of Pittsburgh concluded a week set aside in the memory of the great American, George Washington Carver. At the end of that week one of our colleagues, the distinguished junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], was the principal speaker at a memorial service conducted at Trinity Cathedral in Pittsburgh. Senator GILLETTE's address was a stirring tribute to the splendid contributions Dr. Carver made to our national life, both in the field of scientific investigation and in the living example he set for all to see by the conduct of his own life. I feel strongly that the Congress will be interested in what Senator GILLETTE had to say, and I therefore ask unanimous consent to have his speech, "George Washington Carver: Pioneer in Human Rights," printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is truly a great honor to have been asked by the National Achievement Clubs to address this congregation of citizens gathered to celebrate a service in memory of Dr. George Washington Carver. Your president—Dr. Alma Illery—your national officers, your board of directors and all the members of the National Achievement Clubs deserve high praise for your sponsorship of these memorial services for one of our great Americans. I consider it a privilege to share

with all of you present today in this beautiful cathedral this brief moment of tribute to a man whose life and accomplishments have made so profound an impression upon our century.

For me it is also a personal gratification to participate in this occasion, since for many years I have followed with deep interest both the career and the scientific achievements of Dr. Carver.

In Iowa, you know, we are rightfully proud that one of our great universities, the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Ames, served as the springboard from which George Washington Carver leaped forward into his long and fruitful life as an agricultural scientist, as a discoverer of manifold secrets formerly hidden in nature, and as a pioneer in the art of human relations.

Of course, we make no undue claim for having been responsible in Iowa for the magnificent contributions to human welfare which Dr. Carver made in the course of his life. When George first came into Iowa on his search for knowledge, the seeds that were to make him one of our country's outstanding men had already produced a sturdy young tree.

Ames only gave direction to his natural talents as a "plant doctor," as people called him when he was still a child. Iowa gave him staunch friends like James G. Wilson, his professor at Ames, who later became Secretary of Agriculture, and like the many others who, once they came to know George Carver, remained his steadfast admirers.

Anyone who has read the story of the life of George Washington Carver knows that within Carver himself was the will power, the strength of purpose, and faith in himself and in his God, that were the real reasons why he was able to attain his goal and to serve his people. Sufficient obstacles were thrust in his way almost at birth to have stopped most any child before he even started life. An orphaned son of slaves, a puny, weak child, with an early speech impediment, a member of a downtrodden race, he could count on little but the qualities in his own heart and brain to overcome the obstacles before him.

His attitude toward life has been summed up as follows: He wanted to be exactly what he was and to develop along the road which his nature called him. What he did not want was to be told that he could go only so far but no farther. So he simply set out to go where he was going as if there were no possibility of his being stopped. This inner certainty was his greatest strength—yet it was not his only strength.

Even as an orphan wandering from town to town doing odd jobs as cook and launderer, at an age when most boys are living at home and going to grammar school, he showed an astonishing sense of independence—to such a degree that he always refused charity, feeling that people were kind, but unreasonable, to give something for nothing.

The driving force in his life was his unquenchable desire to know and his unalterable certainty that he could do whatever he set out to do.

His twin love of nature and of art formed a unity in his mind and permitted him to become both a fine painter and a scientific experimentalist. Nor was there ever any conflict in his mind between the presumably opposing doctrines of science and religion. Dr. Carver was deeply religious from childhood. His intimate association with nature, as well as his own personal misfortunes as a child, led him to prayer. And, according to his own testimony, his greatest discoveries in science were revelations from God. Of course, he did not merely sit down and wait for the Divine Power to place new ideas in his head. He went ahead to accomplish all that a man could—then resorted to simple faith. His faith and his natural genius, therefore, formed a single whole.

In the language of psychology, we may say that George Washington Carver had an integrated personality. He was not plagued by inner doubts or subconscious confusions. Life, he saw, was only meaningful as a whole, composed of God, nature, and man.

With this conception, how could he fail to regard human rights as ordained by God? His natural religious ardor would have led him to champion the rights of man, even if he had not been born a member of a race to whom the basic rights of man were being denied.

George Carver was a quiet man of simple dignity. He expected others to respect his dignity as he respected theirs—and was deeply hurt when, as was far too often the case, he was rebuffed or scorned. Yet he always hid his hurt and went quietly ahead spreading knowledge among the people as he believed it his mission to do.

His own character and manner were a moral influence as good for the soul of humanity as his scientific accomplishments were for its material existence. He lived what he preached to others. He never was highly paid. He refused many lucrative positions that would have forced him to leave his work in the South. He did not patent his discoveries, but allowed others freely to realize whatever commercial gain they could from his experiments.

Dr. Carver has been called the greatest single force since the turn of the century in creating racial understanding in this country. I regard him as a pioneer in the field of human rights.

Sixty years ago when he accepted Booker T. Washington's invitation to go South and teach agriculture at Tuskegee Institute in Alabama, Dr. Carver knew to a certain extent what he would be confronted with. But I imagine he was enormously shocked by the reality of the South in the 1890's. The economic, social, and racial conditions he found were far different from what they are today. I think a strong case could be made to show that a very large portion of the credit for the immense improvements in the South during the past 50 years should be given to George Washington Carver.

Applying his integrated and unified view of life to the problems of the South, Dr. Carver took one look at the eroded land, the worn-out soil, the low state of the economy, the one-crop system, the tenant farmers bound to the landowner, the cotton growing up to the cabin door, the poor whites and the poor Negroes alike in debt all their lives to the landlord, Jim Crow-ism reigning supreme—and he declared that the fertility of the land and the abundance of unskilled labor had been a curse, not a blessing. At the root of the problem was the complete dependence on cotton, the one-crop system. The solution, for the economy and for the relationships of the whites and the Negroes, was to free the South from its absolute subservience to King Cotton, and thereby free the people from the vicious circle of poverty, serfdom, illiteracy, and prejudice.

In other words, Dr. Carver pioneered in the field of human rights from all sides at once—religious, moral, economic, social, educational, racial, cultural, and economic. He sought to create the material and moral climate in which man's dignity would be respected by other men.

He persuaded farmers to grow vegetables and other foods in their own gardens, so as to liberate themselves from perpetual debt to the landowner's commissary. He taught housewives new recipes to make these foods palatable. He gave lectures with demonstrations throughout the South in order to teach agricultural science to people who could not read. He invited people to bring their problems to his laboratory if they could not write him letters. He corresponded with thousands of people by mail—his average receipt of mail was 150 letters a day.

As an artist—a painter of flowers and plants—he knew the importance of beauty in men's lives. So he taught his people to decorate their homes, and developed new stains and dyes from the earth and the plants of Alabama cheap enough for poor farmers to buy and use in beautifying their homes.

His accomplishments in experimental agriculture are too well known to need recounting. The development of the peanut alone nearly revolutionized southern agriculture. His research into new crops led him naturally to a search for new markets for these crops—and it is interesting to note there is at this time a subcommittee of the Senate Agriculture Committee which is engaged in precisely the same kind of work as Dr. Carver began years ago; seeking new ways to utilize farm products.

On the social plane, Dr. Carver's pioneering work in agriculture was to lead to the growth of a middle class in the South, a broad stratum of society which is secure in its position and which is automatically maintaining a balance between the social extremes inherited from the past. Without this development of an independent and substantial middle class, Dr. Carver knew, the system in the South would remain feudalistic, divided between masters and serfs.

In the sphere of race relations as such, Dr. Carver's contribution though more intangible, were no less real. In his work at Tuskegee and in his travels around the country, he helped white men as well as Negroes. He had a rare knowledge of human nature that told him that a person who does not answer another's plea kills him in his heart. His discoveries and his assistance were freely given to every man.

George Washington Carver was one of the first men to understand that the Negro problem was not the only southern problem. He knew that men of both races lacked the same things, and that this lack made their relations with each other even more complex and difficult.

Of all the many things that have been written and said about George Carver, I think one statement by Dr. Moton, who followed Booker T. Washington as head of Tuskegee Institute, sums up most succinctly the role of Dr. Carver as a pioneer in human rights: Dr. Moton said: "He has been an inspiration as a teacher and exemplification in his own person of the possibilities of the race. Thousands will be his debtor in race understanding who will never know his name."

We have come a long way from the days of the post-Civil War South. The present trend in this country, and in the world at large, is toward guaranteeing full human rights for all men. No one who remembers even part of what has been accomplished in the past 50 years in the United States in creating the physical and moral conditions for better human relations can remain pessimistic. Where 50 years ago there was perhaps only one Negro scientist working in the laboratory and the lecture hall for the benefit of his people and of the whole country, today there are thousands. It would be exaggerating to say that among them are more George Washington Carvers—there has been and will be only one like him. But the pioneering stage is past, and where Dr. Carver led, thousands can now follow.

Before closing, I should like to offer a thought that has been in my mind since I spoke Thursday of this week in my office with a fine, intelligent and highly educated African leader from Nigeria, who received his education in our American universities and who is today striving to lead his people to freedom and economic progress.

Just as Dr. Carver devoted his life to service to his people in the South, bringing them

knowledge by which to liberate themselves and the whole South from a one-group economy and a feudal-type master-serf relationship, so the future of many young Negro scientists and qualified experts in the 50 years lying ahead in this century may be to bring the knowledge they have obtained in America to the aid of the people of Africa.

A new field, such as under the point 4 development program, may soon be opening for a new type of missionary in Africa—for missionaries of civilization bringing not only religious teachings but medical, technical, agricultural and other knowledge, training people in cultivation of the land and in manufacture of products.

Who can better bring the light of knowledge and the incentive to progress to the peoples of Africa than the Negroes of America who have surmounted all obstacles, human and otherwise, set before them since their ancestors were brought to America as slaves? Many American Negroes may find a great and significant future in carrying the word to Africa.

The renascence of the African Continent, under the guiding hand of qualified Negro specialists, doctors, scientists, and technicians from America would, I believe, have an important byproduct in this country—it would simultaneously mean a quickening of the progress of the Negro people in the United States itself. As Africa develops and liberates itself from the outworn colonial system, there will be even less excuse than now for the type of willfully ignorant attitude of some Americans toward their fellow Negro Americans. When Africans are free and progressing, American Negroes—Afro-Americans—will be that much freer and that much farther along the road of their own progress.

What Dr. George Washington Carver saw as his mission in the 1890's—to aid his people in the southern United States—may appear to some young Negro Americans today as the model for their mission in the second half of the twentieth century.

It is now abundantly evident that the pioneering of George Washington Carver has accomplished already far more than the modest aims he set before himself. Everywhere in America today the trend is toward the elimination of those barriers that have prevented the Negro people from fully exercising their rights as human beings. I can imagine only one greater reward for Dr. Carver's pioneering efforts—and that would be if not only the Negro people in this country but also those in Africa were to achieve the full measure of their God-given dignity as men born to be free and equal.

The Modern Challenge to Business Leadership

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, it was my privilege, on January 10, to be permitted to talk to the Boston Board of Fire Underwriters at their annual meeting in the city of Boston, Mass. I ask unanimous consent that the text of my remarks may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is really a talk about the cooperation of business and government. It is a talk about the preservation of a democratic capitalistic system, about the establishment of an expanding domestic economy designed to promote the fullest utilization of all our human and natural resources. It is a talk about the preservation of the system of private property and the winning of world peace.

Not since the business leaders of the Thirteen Original Colonies voluntarily assumed the task of promoting the ratification of the Constitution of the United States has a greater challenge been presented to business leadership than that which is now offered. The commercial classes in 1788 knew that a stable national government was needed to prevent the economic and political ruin of the newly liberated American States. They financed the campaigns for ratification up and down the colonies, and, so great was their desire for a national government which would provide a rule of order under which the economic system could work, that they did not hesitate to throw their support behind the pledge that the first Congress would draft a Bill of Rights. It is not too much to say, therefore, that the commercial classes in the closing years of the eighteenth century were a most important factor in the establishment of the new Federal Government which, in our time, has twice saved the world from the reestablishment of central political tyranny.

It is altogether appropriate that we should discuss the modern challenge to business leadership in the city of Boston, because it was here on January 9, 1788, that the Massachusetts Convention assembled under the presidency of John Hancock to ratify the Federal Constitution in a resolution, which also supported a Bill of Rights. Because of what was done here in Boston with the cooperation and support of business leaders and in the other States which ratified the Constitution, 10 amendments were submitted to the States in the first session of Congress, protecting the individual rights of the people as individuals, and asserting their superiority over government.

The business classes of our time face a new challenge, which arises from the fact that excessive economic authority has accumulated in private hands in such a manner as to weaken the economic authority of the States and cause the expansion of the powers of the National Government. This generation has seen the erection of the totalitarian state, because, as in Italy and Germany, the concentration of economic power had become so great that the people, unable to provide employment for themselves, yielded to the false persuasions of Fascists, Nazis, and Communists that the all-powerful state would supply the answer to their problem.

We know that it does not supply that answer. We know that the totalitarian state exists only by the use of force, that it utterly destroys the liberty of the individual, and makes him economically as well as politically the slave of the state.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM IS AMERICAN GOAL

The people of America do not believe in the all-powerful state, but they do believe in individual freedom. They are as devoted today to the principles of the Bill of Rights as were the colleagues of John Hancock in the Massachusetts Convention of 1788. They believe that the authority of both political organizations and economic organizations proceeds from the people and they have not hesitated to contribute in unprecedented measure of their blood and treasure to the preservation of this ideal of human liberty. It is the desire of an overwhelming majority of them to do what lies in their power to win permanent world peace and to maintain a stable economic system in which the individual shall continue to have opportunity, not only to support himself, but to improve himself also.

The people know that these two great objectives are inseparable. There are no class divisions in America, so far as this great national purpose is concerned. Those who are engaged in agriculture or in industry, those who serve in the professions or in business, all believe in the traditional American ideals of popular sovereignty. Leaders in business and in government who desire to preserve this ideal, if they are to be successful in that effort, must first of all analyze the cause of the great crisis in which the world now finds itself. First of all, therefore, we must banish from our minds the false notion that World War II is over. Only the shooting has stopped. The peace treaties have not been written. Armed forces are still marching throughout the world. Our own troops are still in Europe and in Asia. A terrible armament race, the atom-bomb race, more appalling than any competition in armament that ever took place, is demanding a larger and larger proportion of the productive capacity of men. There are some who feel that a third world war is inevitable, although they must know that such a conflict would threaten the total destruction of civilization. It was Einstein who, when asked what the weapons in a third world war would be, replied that he could not answer, that he could only predict that the weapons of the fourth world war would be stones and bludgeons.

If the American aspiration for permanent world peace is to be realized we must not fail to maintain here among our own people a stable and expanding economy. For my own part, I believe that the maintenance of such an economy is incomparably the greatest task that our people were ever called upon to perform. We can make no contribution to world history that will exceed in value the certain establishment here of an expanding economy of opportunity for all the people.

If we do this, there is no iron curtain anywhere that will prevent the knowledge of our success from reaching the minds and hearts of people everywhere.

Surely, we know now that war has no victors. We destroyed our enemies in World War II; we crushed Hitler and Mussolini and the Japanese ruling class, but we have not yet begun to pay for that triumph. The national debt is still on a pinnacle of $250,000,000,000. We are paying $5,500,000,000 this year to meet the interest on this debt. The care of the veterans who fought in two world wars is costing $6,000,000,000 annually. Even though the President is refusing to expend the sums appropriated by the Congress for a 70-group air force, national defense this year will cost almost $13,000,000,000, and other billions have been made available for the economic rehabilitation and the arming of western Europe, thus accounting for almost 80 percent of the total cost of this Government. So the people here and throughout the world, hoping and praying for peace, with no personal desire except for liberty and opportunity, are condemned to pay for old wars and prepare for new ones.

MUST TRY THE WAYS OF PEACE

Is there no alternative for this futility? I think so. I think we should deliberately try the ways of peace. Surely the people of America, who have already demonstrated how freedom and opportunity can raise the standard of living of all the people to higher levels than have even been approximated in any other land, or at any other time, can find the answer in their own history. The only trouble is that we have not learned

how to prevent depression. The Kremlin is not planning aggressive war, because it is convinced that the capitalistic system is bound to go down in another economic crash which will create the vacuum into which communism can march unopposed. That is the challenge the modern world presents to business leadership—the achievement of an economic system constantly expanding and always affording opportunity for each oncoming generation.

It is an end which can be attained only by the united action of all our people. The whole is greater than any of its parts. None of the parts must imagine that it alone can prosper at the expense of any of the others. We all stand together or we shall fall together in this great struggle for freedom. We cannot here afford class conflict, for under the American ideal there are no classes. Farm and factory are interdependent. The worker and the manager alike are equal citizens of the United States. There are no classes in the armed forces which we sent to war. There can be no classes in the civilian army that must produce for peace. Production won the fighting war. Production will win the cold war. Production and only production can win permanent peace. Just as during the actual conflict all classes of Americans united without regard to their special interests, so now we must unite if we hope to hand on a peaceful world to the next generation.

We shall, however, find it difficult to perform the economic service which we and all mankind need, if utter disaster in a new scientific war is to be avoided, unless we understand the forces which created totalitarian communism. It calls itself the dictatorship of the proletariat. If there were no proletariate there would be no dictatorship. What, then, is the proletariat? It is the portion of society which is unable by its own capital and its own labor to produce the things that are necessary to maintain life. Though he may be politically free, if he is not also economically free the individual is a member of the proletariat and we must never forget that the proletariat is the raw material out of which communism is made. When the masses are unable to support themselves they turn to arbitrary government. The proletariat is the product of industrial collectivism.

THE DANGER OF A PROLETARIAT

The most important lesson that American leadership can learn, whether in business or in government, is that modern technology has created industrial collectivism through the ownership by a small segment of society of the means of production upon which all society depends. To save capitalism and the free-enterprise system it is necessary to make certain that we shall not permit the creation of a dominant proletariat in the United States. That means we must foster and expand the ability of the masses of the people to own property, including property in their jobs. The workers must have a stake in modern industrial organization. Those business leaders who have adopted the annual wage system or a profit-sharing plan have adopted an admirable means to promote industrial unity in which capital, labor, and management are all partners. Thus can organized enterprise keep itself free of Government control. Government regulation must not be confused with Government control. Regulation merely provides the rule under which free enterprise operates. Government control, on the other hand, is the assumption by public authority of the power to direct enterprise. The former is in complete harmony with the American tradition. The latter is the road that leads to national socialism and communism.

Let no one forget that the Constitution, which was ratified here in Massachusetts 162 years ago, in its first article gives to Congress the plenary power to regulate commerce. One of the primary reasons why the commercial classes of the Thirteen Colonies supported the Federal Constitution was because they recognized the indispensable necessity of establishing a general government to provide a rule of order for the conduct of commercial relations among the States and the people thereof.

KEEP OPPORTUNITY FREE

It is worthy of note that among the recommendations made by the Massachusetts convention for the amendment of the Constitution was that a provision should be adopted to prohibit Congress from creating any commercial monopoly. The Massachusetts founding fathers wanted no national monopolies to restrain trade and commerce in the States. They wanted freedom. Monopoly is the foe of free enterprise now as it was then and no amount of rationalization can make it otherwise. If opportunity is to remain free, then obviously restraint of trade and commerce must continue to be prohibited. It is because the United States had had an antitrust law while, on the other hand, the nations of Europe have permitted and encouraged monopolies, that we in America have outstripped all the nations of the world in productive enterprise. If we are to preserve free enterprise we must keep opportunity free. No group can contribute more to commercial freedom than can the leaders of business, and by their own choice they can avoid the practices which suppress competition.

A large enterprise is not necessarily a monopolistic enterprise. A large country needs big business, but no business, large or small, should be permitted to restrain the operations of any other business or to close the door of opportunity to any new business. If we desire to maintain competition, it is essential to recognize the difference between the business which is managed by its owners and the business which is owned by one group and managed by another. The latter, because it uses the collective capital of hundreds of thousands and the collective labor of other hundreds of thousands is a collectivist enterprise, altogether different from the small enterprises which are managed by their owners. Collectivist enterprise under private managers is but slightly different from collectivist enterprise under public managers. If we are not careful to see that the small owner-operated business is not pushed off the lot by private collectivism, it will be difficult indeed to avoid public collectivism.

Another fact which must be clearly understood if an expanding economy of opportunity is to be maintained, is the difference between agriculture, upon the one hand, and industry and commerce upon the other. Agriculture is still carried on by individuals in their individual capacity. Commerce and industry, which in the days of Hancock was also individual enterprise, is now carried on primarily by organizations. Agricultural prices are made in a free market. Industrial prices, on the other hand, are frequently fixed by combinations and understandings. The farmer sells his produce in a free market, but buys the things he needs in a controlled market.

The preservation of the free-enterprise system does not require that Government should not undertake any operation that might be carried on by private groups. There are some operations which serve the public interest best by being carried on by Government. Water systems, for example, once were privately owned and operated. That is a thing of the past like the operation of toll bridges. It is now generally recognized that the construction of public highways, airports, the control of floods, the operation of harbor facilities, the elimination of water pollution, etc., are all proper functions of Government. And, incidentally, public expenditures for these purposes create business.

PRODUCTIVE EXPENDITURES GOOD FOR BUSINESS

Economy in Government is highly desirable. Waste of public funds is indefensible, but it must never be overlooked that the indiscriminate slashing of Government expenditures can do more harm than good. Productive government expenditures are good for business. For example, rural electrification has created new markets for business and new opportunities for labor. Like public highways and modern airports, electricity on the farm contributes to what we most need, an expanding economy of private owners. The same is true of reclamation in the West, creating as it does new communities that add to the national income, increase purchasing power and provide revenue for local, State, and Federal Governments.

It is impossible to understand the Federal budget unless we compare it with the budgets that preceded the war. In 1939, the last year before the Government began to prepare for war, the total national budget was only a little more than $10,000,000,000, as compared with the estimate of forty-two billion four hundred million submitted by the President yesterday. But in 1939 only 29 percent of Federal expenditures had any relation to war. The rest of the ten billion budget of 1939, that is to say, 71 percent, went for the normal functions of Government and objectives which were designed to foster and stimulate business and improve the standard of living. Today, however, the situation is exactly reversed. Seventy-one percent of the forty-two billion four hundred million projected for fiscal year 1951 will go for war-connected expenditures, and only 29 percent for the normal functions of Government.

If anyone believes that expenditures to support the so-called welfare state are causing the much-discussed deficit, let him remember that only 6 cents out of the 1951 budget dollar will go for social welfare, health, and security, whereas 13 cents will go to pay the interest on the national debt. A balanced budget is, of course, highly desirable. Waste of public funds should be completely eliminated, but the task of Congress, when it examines the budget, is to be certain that it shall not unnecessarily cut the productive outlays that foster and encourage business and that it shall not weaken the capacity of the Government to preserve the national defense and to carry on the struggle for peace.

TO SAVE SYSTEM OF PRIVATE PROPERTY

Government as well as business has a function to perform to preserve the system of private property. It must, for example, reform the tax laws so as to provide incentives for the investment of private savings. War taxes which were designed primarily to obtain revenue with which to conduct the fighting war no matter what the cost must now be revised so that we may have a peace- and prosperity-promoting tax system. The Government at Washington is working to that end now.

The challenge to business is likewise a challenge to promote the investment of private capital by consciously doing away with impediments to private investment in competitive enterprise which too often are erected by business itself. No one knows better than the business leader how valuable competition is. No one knows better than the business leader the temptation to exploit the consumer by fixing prices, dividing territory, restraining production. Combinations and agreements to restrain trade and hamper competition have always been known to the business fraternity. That's why we enacted the antitrust laws with the support of all political parties. Business leadership, I am persuaded, can do more than Government to preserve competition.

It can do more than Government to promote the sense of partnership with labor. It can do more than Government to bring about fair dealing with the consumer. To sum it up, business leadership can do more than Government to preserve the system of private property. That is the challenge which modern times presents to the business leaders of America.

Read the story of the Massachusetts Ratification Convention of 1788. Learn there the manner in which the colonists united in the face of a great crisis to create a political system based upon individual freedom. If we read that story and respect it, we shall not fail in creating a stable economic system here in America based likewise on freedom and one which, like our political system, will be copied throughout the world without war because a free capitalistic system can do more for mankind than any other system.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD two editorials, one which appeared in the St. Paul Pioneer Press for January 3, 1950, and one which appeared in the St. Paul Dispatch for January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Pioneer Press of January 3, 1950]

UNPARALLELED STALLING

There is no legislation in the Nation's history on which there has been more of high-sounding verbal agreement than is the case with civil-rights legislation. Despite that, however, there is no legislation which has been as stubbornly stalled, postponed, and talked to death. Political parties have agreed and their platforms have pledged laws to stamp out racial discrimination, but that is as far as it has gone. There has been no action.

Democratic and Republican Party platform pledges have for years included Federal anti-poll-tax and antilynch laws. Last year the platforms of both parties even came out flatly for the most controversial of all civil-rights legislation—FEPC, designed to abolish discrimination in employment through legal decree.

The Democratic Party's southern wing is reported to be even more bitterly opposed to FEPC legislation than to their old-time filibuster targets, antilynch and anti-poll-tax measures. And revision of the Senate's cloture rule made last March will actually have the effect of making a filibuster harder to break than before.

Anti-poll-tax bills have passed the House 5 times in the past 8 years, each time by a two-thirds margin. Each time, however, all it took was a threatened or an actual filibuster in the Senate to kill the bill. Antilynch measures have had a harder time. There is broader feeling that they set what might be more dangerous precedents in entering local law enforcement situations. Yet, on at least three occasions, antilynch measures have been passed in the House, and they have gotten out of committee oftener than that. The Senate was always the final, immovable obstacle.

FEPC legislation, now spreading to a steadily growing number of States, actually had its biggest boost at the national level, when an Executive order of June 1941 banned discrimination on hirings to fill war contracts, as well as in Government employment itself. The Commission and its enforcement of rules went out of existence in 1946. Yet FEPC bills came out of committee in both House and Senate last session. They had done so, however, on three earlier occasions, and refinements of the congressional stalling technique disposed of them each time.

It is going to be increasingly difficult to continue repeating pledges that appear made only to be broken. That has been the history of solemn promises as to civil legislation from both parties. Sooner or later, a campaign pledge so often repeated will have to be fulfilled. President Truman and his party followers should know that; so should Republicans, at State and National levels.

[From the St. Paul (Minn.) Dispatch of January 5, 1950]

GAINS FOR TOLERANCE

The number of States adopting fair employment practices legislation increased from 6 to 10 during 1949, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People notes. It is a healthful sign for racial tolerance in America, but it goes far beyond that. It strikes at the very root of economic discrimination which has kept racial groups from working, voting, and providing for the future.

One of the outstanding gains for practical democracy is the opening of the National Guard in Minnesota to Negroes. Similar action has been taken by California, Connecticut, Illinois, Washington, Oregon, Pennsylvania, and Wisconsin. And because of the backing of the Federal courts, many Negro citizens throughout the South have continued to exercise their franchise rights. Wisconsin and Illinois have passed laws to end discrimination in the public schools.

But the failure of Congress to enact Federal civil-rights legislation and the failure of such legislation in several States, were condemned by the group. In spite of New York's FEPC law—to cite one example—one out of every five members of minority groups have reported that they have experienced some sort of discrimination. While the FEPC laws work out admirably as a rule, there can be a measure of prejudice they cannot touch. That prejudice is a matter of the individual conscience.

Lynchings already have been dealt with by the Tuskegee Institute, which reports one less authenticated lynching than the NAACP—or three to the NAACP's four. Whatever the outcome of this disagreement, the score during 1949 was heavily in favor of the elimination of the bars in society, industry, and the professions, on the basis of color. The year has made measurable gains for tolerance, regardless of the dilatory tactics of Congress.

City of Hope Award Dinner Honoring Ellis A. Gimbel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD my remarks at the City of Hope award dinner, held in the Bellevue Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, on Wednesday evening, December 7.

At that time, a Torch of Hope award was made to Mr. Ellis A. Gimbel for the magnificent work he has done in supporting the City of Hope Sanatorium and Research Center. The whole Gimbel family is symbolic of the achievements of our system of free private enterprise and of the sense of responsibility our leaders have for the bettering of the American way of life. It was indeed fitting that Mr. Gimbel be awarded the Torch of Hope award, for his aid to the City of Hope has been significant in helping to make the City of Hope a really great institution—one that has been formed to give medical aid wherever it is needed, without any restrictions whatsoever as to color, creed, or religion—an institution that is working for the benefit of all in the true American spirit.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I can imagine no greater tribute to the man we are gathered here to honor than is implied in the award he is being given tonight as noted on the front page of your invitation to this dinner.

In the invitation we are informed that a Torch of Hope award is being presented to Mr. Gimbel—a most distinguished Philadelphian who has just received the congratulations and good wishes of his fellow citizens on having successfully attained his eighty-fourth birthday.

America was still mourning the assassination of Abraham Lincoln, the Civil War had just ended, and Johnson was President of the United States when Ellis Gimbel was born.

Mr. Gimbel has lived through the most turbulent and critical days this country and the world ever have known. He has seen this Nation twice plunged into the horror and destruction of world wars on the successful outcome of which the survival of our civilization depended. He has seen a great depression which left its scars and its bitter memories with us. He has seen us rejoice over military victory in World War II won at a frightful cost in blood and resources only to be confronted with the sobering realization that peace has its price, too—and the price is not cheap—the realization that we must work as hard and as long, and we must be as united and as vigilant to win the peace as we were to win the war. He has observed the death of the League of Nations and the first groping steps of the new United Nations.

He has witnessed man's discovery and use of the deadliest weapon ever known—the atom bomb.

He has lived under 17 Presidents of the United States and heaven knows how many United States Senators, and still his outlook on life and his achievements are such that, at an age 14 years beyond the biblical threescore and ten, he is selected from among millions of his fellow citizens as the first winner in this eastern half of the United States of the Torch of Hope national award.

All I can say is, There is a man.

Of course, to those who know Ellis Gimbel the award will not come as any surprise but as one richly deserved. Hope is akin to faith, and the great Gimbel enterprises, both commercial and private, have been built on a foundation of unshakable faith in America and its future.

And all in all the years of Mr. Gimbel's lifetime, despite their occasional black days, have not been bad years as Mr. Gimbel would be the first to tell you. We have made great material advances in America during his life.

The lot of the average American is far better than it was. We have raised the living standards of our people far beyond what anyone would have believed possible when Mr. Gimbel was a boy. We have made great progress in the fields of tolerance and understanding and cooperation among racial and religious groups. We have attained a new awareness and appreciation of the dignity of man and the importance of individual liberty.

But our most important advance of the last half century or so, in my opinion, has been the widespread recognition of our responsibility to others who are less fortunate.

This is strikingly true in the field of government.

During Mr. Gimbel's lifetime, he has seen a change in America's attitude toward its responsibilities in world affairs, from a policy of extreme isolationism to one under which, through various Government programs, we are aiding freedom-loving people everywhere and our best interests as well. He has seen the enunciation and beginnings of a program that contemplates utilizing private capital, aided by government, in helping to develop the presently inaccessible or commercially unprofitable and still undeveloped natural resources of other nations throughout the world.

At home, he has seen the establishment of workmen's compensation, of unemployment compensation, of old-age and survivors' insurance, commonly called social security, of aid to dependent mothers and children, to the blind and handicapped and disabled. He has seen government and private medicine working together for the eradication of many diseases and he has seen us winning that fight on many fronts. Today these programs and this concept of responsibility to others less fortunate is deeply ingrained in the American people—and it all has happened during Mr. Gimbel's lifetime.

But there are things which government cannot and ought not to do. We, as private citizens, also have an obligation to those who are less fortunate.

Mr. Gimbel is a businessman—a merchant—and an eminently successful one. If we try to analyze why he and members of his family have been so successful in the merchandising field, we discover that their success has been due in large measure to their faithful adherence to a concept that was laid down by Mr. Gimbel's father, Adam Gimbel, when he started the Gimbel store.

That concept was one of service—service to the community. The old concept of a department store was that it was merely a merchandising mart. The Gimbel family were pioneers in changing that concept. They conceived of their stores as quasi-civic institutions. They accepted the responsibility of community leadership for worth-while projects. They gave a part of their facilities to provide accommodation for deserving groups that had no place to meet. They established a woman's center, where women's clubs and organizations could carry on their activities for the benefit of others less fortunate.

The many projects they have sponsored and aided would require several pages merely to list. I can think offhand of their wartime activities on behalf of our servicemen, of their assistance to projects for feeding the hungry abroad, of their sponsorship of the greater Philadelphia exhibition, of their work on behalf of the blind. Virtually every charitable, welfare, and educational group in the city has sought—and received—their aid at one time or another. And by following this policy they have prospered, as they should.

But Mr. Gimbel has not aided others who are less fortunate merely through the activities of his store. In his long career he has helped many in his capacity as a private citizen. He was first to establish Educational Week for the Blind, Hard-of-Hearing Week, and Orphans Day at the circus.

His latest project—one in which we all are interested—and the reason for our being here this evening is the City of Hope. Others will tell you in detail about this magnificent institution, how it was founded, the good it accomplishes, and how it operates.

It is sufficient for me to mention here only that it is an institution of which great things may be expected. Run along completely modern lines, it gives promise of becoming one of the outstanding sanatoriums and research centers of this country—and it will become that if we give it our support. It is an institution which recognizes no barriers of creed or religion, which recognizes only illness and need, which offers the best of medical care free.

It is performing a great work in the care and cure of persons suffering from chest diseases. But it, and other institutions of its kind, are still inadequate when compared with the need. The city of Hope must expand its facilities to care for more people—and even more important, it must have the funds for research—the kind of research that will enable man to cut down the death rate from killers like tuberculosis as we have conquered other premature killers of mankind.

I can think of no more fitting person to receive this award of the Torch of Hope than Mr. Gimbel. By his own example and unselfish help of those in need he has given hope to many of his fellow citizens. I would like to say a few words also about Mr. Eddie Cantor, one of America's top ranking comedians, who is representing the Hollywood film colony at this dinner in Mr. Gimbel's honor. Mr. Cantor deserves to be honored also for the numerous unselfish contributions of his incomparable talents in the furtherance of many charitable efforts extending over a period of 30 years.

Both men exemplify the spirit of brotherhood—of concern for the less fortunate—a spirit that, despite the destructive wars and violence and oppression we see in the world is still the distinguishing characteristic of this great age—at least in this great country.

To you, Mr. Gimbel, I hope you will carry the Torch of Hope for many, many years, and I know you will continue to derive your greatest satisfaction in life from helping your fellow man.

As long as men like you are active in the kind of projects to which you are contributing your time and efforts and money, despite the many grim and difficult problems facing us, I am confident we shall find much to be hopeful about.

Thank you, and thank all of you for your presence here tonight.

History and Its Meaning to a Community

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "History and Its Meaning to a Community," by Dr. Lewis E. Theiss, for many years head of the Department of Journalism at Bucknell University, which appeared in the Lewisburg Journal, of Lewisburg, Pa., on January 5, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISTORY AND ITS MEANANG TO A COMMUNITY

(By Dr. Lewis E. Theiss)

In a letter to a friend of mine, Hervey Allen, the novelist, recently remarked: "A nation that forgets its history may have to relive that history." That is a truth worth considering. In recent weeks the William Maclay chapter, Sons of the American Revolution, has been calling attention through its weekly broadcasts to the history of this region. Scalpings, murders, massacres, burnings marked that history. How would you like to go back to pioneer days and be forced to go through such horrors? If you forget them, you may have to go through worse.

Impossible, you say? Not at all. The Revolutionary War was as nothing compared to World War II. Bernard Baruch, in his recent list of significant happenings of the last 50 years, mentioned what he called the "unnecessary war," by which he meant the Second World War. "Preventable," he said, "if proper steps had been taken. No lessons learned from it or the First World War." If that is true, we sacrificed some hundreds of thousands of fine American youths on the altar of ignorance—ignorance of history, of the true meaning of history.

The reason why we should study history is mainly so that we may be guided by it, so that in future we may avoid the mistakes of the past. Therefore, it is something more than a desire for information that should induce us to study our history. Such study is a patriotic duty we owe to our Nation.

How are we going to bring history home to folks? How make them conscious of the inner meaning of history?

First, by improved teaching of history in our schools; by localizing history; by applying it to the lives of those who study it. The high prices of today, the housing shortage, the terrific taxes, the increasingly lower standard of living—all have a new meaning when coupled with history. Folks should be made to learn the lesson of cause and effect. History teaches that.

In every way possible we should encourage the study and understanding of history, the acute consciousness that certain causes inevitably lead to given effects. We can erect lasting memorials to refresh our memories. We can create and foster patriotic societies that help us to remember the past and learn its lessons. We can use newspapers, magazines, the radio, the lecture platform. In every manner possible we can and should emphasize the lessons of history. The big thing is not to let folks forget.

No one wants another war, another depression, another disaster of any sort. But unless we remember our history and the lessons it teaches, we shall surely blunder into the very thing we dread. The thing to do is to remember our history now, before we go any further along the road that leads to disaster. If we use our heads it won't be necessary to repeat the Revolutionary War or World Wars I and II. It won't be necessary to go through another depression. So let's keep the past, with its lessons, vividly in mind. Let us apply history to our lives as we have never done before.

Opposition of Prince Hall Masonry to Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ELMER THOMAS
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD copy of a statement relative to Prince Hall masonry and the opposition of such organization to communism as issued by the Grand Masters Conference of Prince Hall Masons.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRINCE HALL MASONRY REEMPHASIZES ITS OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM

(A statement issued by the Grand Masters Conference of Prince Hall Masons)

Prince Hall masonry enjoys and protects one of the noblest heritages that has come down to any group of Americans in the history of our beloved land. Generated and nurtured as it was by a free Negro who in pre- and post-revolutionary days was a courageous champion of human rights for all mankind and an indefatigable proponent of the brotherhood of man and of truth and justice, Prince Hall masonry has for 165 years adhered strictly to the lofty concepts held by America's first Negro Mason. Prince Hall, a man of learning, a businessman, a preacher, a soldier in the Revolutionary Army of George Washington, builded so well and enduringly that generation upon generation of Negro Americans have willingly and proudly followed in his footsteps, guided and directed by those great principles, spiritual and masonic, that guided and directed him.

Prince Hall, in harmony with his contemporaries, envisioned an America destined to be great because of its advocacy of such ideals as freedom to worship, think, act, and speak; freedom from tyranny and oppression; freedom of the people to have and maintain a government of, by, and for the people. To these ideals, Prince Hall devoted his life and since human bondage was as yet an item in the economic system of the young Nation, his added task was his labor for an America free of discrimination and differences based upon ethnic considerations. His followers labor on in his footsteps, quietly but persistently, without fanfare but with determination—with undiminished faith that the same God that brought answers to the prayers of the devout Prince Hall will, as ever, right all wrongs.

As an institution, Prince Hall masonry now represented in 37 States and the District of Columbia, by 38 Prince Hall grand lodges, has consistently stood for the best things in American society. It has been and is stanchly opposed to any and every attempt of foreign or alien ideologists to invade our way of thinking, acting, or living. Especially is it and its votaries categorically opposed to totalitarianism, communism, fascism or any like ism having for its purpose a change in the true American concept of government. Although we recognize the fact that American democracy has not as yet attained the high ideals of our founding fathers, that imperfections still exist, Prince Hall masonry is happy to reaffirm its traditional position and to continue to labor assiduously for the attainment of those high ideals and for the elimination of imperfections, such labor to be done within the framework of our present Government.

The contribution Prince Hall masonry is making in the current fight against communism and its nefarious doctrine is considerable and is being increased daily. Prince Hall masonry calls upon all its followers wheresoever dispersed around the globe, to be on the alert against the infiltration of communism into Negro groups. There can be no divided allegiance. There is room but for one ideology in the minds, hearts, and souls of all the people of this Christian Nation, and that is Americanism—the great light that illumines the paths of all of us, black and white, Jew and gentile, rich and poor.

Prince Hall masonry pledges itself anew to live and die for the ideals and principles that have made our Nation the greatest on the face of the globe.

CONFERENCE OF GRAND MASTERS OF PRINCE HALL MASONS,
By AMOS T. HALL, *President.*

Pearl Harbor Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, the lesson Pearl Harbor taught us 8 years ago—the lesson that the United States must take responsibility in world affairs, that it can no longer be isolationist in any respect—was a lesson we learned the hard way, but one which we cannot ever forget. The preservation of world peace depends to a very great extent on the willingness of the American people to bear their full share of responsibility.

On December 7, 1949, I had the honor of addressing the Pearl Harbor anniversary memorial meeting, sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars Women's Council, City of Hope, at Convention Hall in Philadelphia. I ask unanimous consent to have the remarks I made at that time printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Eight years have passed since the tragedy of Pearl Harbor taught this Nation its bitterest lesson.

Tonight we are gathered to pay reverence to the memory of the men and women who lost their lives in that sudden and despicable attack by a supposedly peaceful nation—an attack that plunged us into the bloody maelstrom of World War II.

We, in Philadelphia, are not alone in honoring tonight these gallant dead. Elsewhere in the Nation, in scores of cities and towns and villages, exercises similar to these are being conducted.

As of this night there has not been erected some great national physical memorial to those who lost their lives at Pearl Harbor. Probably it is more fitting that their memorial should be in the minds and hearts of their countrymen. Let them be remembered not so much in bronze or marble, but in the more imperishable and durable shrine of the spirit.

Let what happened at Pearl Harbor on the morning of December 7, 1941, live forever in the memory of the American people—a constant reminder and warning against complacency, against unpreparedness, against turning our backs on the rest of the world, and closing our eyes to the dangers that beset us.

If this can be their memorial—passed on from generation to generation of the American people—then, while many here died needlessly they did not die in vain.

Pearl Harbor was the end of an era in America. I believe historians will mark it as a turning point, a milestone from which there can be no turning back. Before Pearl Harbor there were many in this country who refused to recognize that we were part of one world, that war and tyranny in any part of the globe were our concern. Before Pearl Harbor there were many in this country who believed we could draw back into an armored shell and sit the war out until all of our potential allies having been conquered and subjugated, the forces of tyranny and oppression could, at their leisure and at a time suitable to them, turn their destructive weapons against us.

Today, the great majority of the American people are facing the difficult, discouraging and costly job of preserving the peace. The great majority of the American people are accepting the burden and responsibility of world leadership for peace. It is a responsibility we did not seek, but it was a responsibility we could not avoid if we wished to preserve our freedom.

There are in some quarters voices raised against the cost to us of preserving world peace—voices which say: "Let's get out of Europe; it's no concern of ours." "We must reduce taxes by cutting out foreign aid to freedom-loving people"; "Build up our own defenses and nobody will dare attack us."

These, fortunately, are not the voices of the overwhelming majority of Americans.

The struggle for peace is a continuing one. Peace must be worked for unceasingly. There can be no let-up. Peace must be preserved and won, like liberty, by each generation.

As we make progress in the struggle—as our potential allies grow stronger, more able to stand on their own feet, capable of supporting their own economies, the financial cost to us of preserving the peace will become less. But the need for constant effort, patience, tolerance, understanding, and a genuine willingness to cooperate on our part and on the part of our allies will be as great as ever.

I think it is apparent to everyone, that we are winning the fight for peace; that, with the help of the Marshall plan, the Truman doctrine, the North Atlantic Pact, the Economic Cooperation Administration, and the Greek and Turkish programs, we are making genuine progress.

Our potential allies daily are growing stronger. Totalitarian expansion has been stopped, at least for the moment, in its tracks.

But we must not relax or ever again grow complacent. Those who gave their lives at Pearl Harbor should be a constant reminder and warning to us of the dangers of complacency.

And so tonight, as we pay reverence to the gallant Americans who died at Pearl Harbor, let us dedicate ourselves to the difficult task of winning the peace, whatever its material cost, so that young Americans may never again have to shed their blood in far away places.

If we will really remember Pearl Harbor, it can never happen again.

"O Liberals!"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "O Liberals!" written by Bruce Barton and published in various newspapers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

"O LIBERALS!"

(By Bruce Barton)

As a general rule I want the bureaucracies in Washington to do less than they are now doing, not more. But there is one slight assignment that I now suggest to the Federal Trade Commission.

This commission, as you may know, has, among its other duties, authority to police the use of words and claims in advertising.

If, for example, you are advertising that your product will cure cancer, the Commission will order you to "cease and desist." You are not allowed to say that your margarine is butter, or that you have made your produce something new and wonderful when all you have really done is to change the wrapper.

My suggestion is that the FTC broaden its activities to the point of examining some political labels. And particularly the word "liberal."

This used to be a noble title, with an exalted but definite meaning. It described a man who loved his fellow men enough to sacrifice something valuable for them—his money, his safety, or his life.

Socrates was a liberal and his reward was the poisoned hemlock. Christ was a liberal and His liberalism meant the cross.

Joan of Arc was a liberal. Abraham Lincoln was a liberal. Eugene Debs was a liberal. They knew that true liberalism is a costly and dangerous business and they were not afraid to pay the price.

But the glorious word has fallen upon evil times. Vicious, cruel men have seized upon it as a cloak to hide their infamy. Mussolini started as a liberal; so did Hitler. Stalin is the heir to Lenin, who loved the proletariat so much that he did not hesitate to liquidate millions of the middle class.

Here at home liberalism is the cheap and easy path. Proclaim yourself a liberal and you are not crucified. Instead, you become a Governor, a Senator, a columnist, a radio commentator—at high pay. You do not even have to abide by such old-fashioned bourgeois obligations as contributing to hospitals, colleges, community chests. You can retain your title without sacrificing anything at all.

When I was first married I lived in the same apartment house with an idealist. He dreamed large dreams, gave lectures, and wrote books—and looked down on me because I was earning a living in trade.

I felt a little abashed in his presence until summer came, and he and his wife went to the country. They left their cat behind to starve. My wife and I, despised reactionaries, had to feed the cat.

I say to liberals: Before you look down on me, I want to know, have you sacrificed anything for your liberalism?

Or are you merely a money liberal—advertising yourself for revenue, or running for office so that you can be liberal with other people's dough?

"O Liberty," Madam Roland exclaimed, "how many crimes are committed in thy name."

She might have said, "O liberals."

Tributes to Florida by Vice President Barkley and J. Myer Schine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, while Florida is accustomed to playing host to the dignitaries of the world, my State had the unique honor of being visited twice in December by the distinguished Vice President of the United States. On the occasion of his visit to the Boca Raton Club, one of the premier resort hotels of the world, Vice President BARKLEY took occasion to say that—

Florida is becoming a living symbol of the achievements possible under the American way of life, and as we advance further toward our national goal the State will become of increasing importance in our economy.

Another distinguished American who has evidenced his faith in Florida is J. Myer Schine, owner of the Boca Raton Club, the Roney Plaza, McAllister Hotel and other Florida properties, and also the Ambassador Hotel in Los Angeles and the Ritz Carlton in Atlantic City. Mr. Schine preserves the highest traditions of hospitality in his hotels and has on many occasions confirmed his confidence in the future growth and soundness of Florida. He feels that "Florida in the Fifties" will be a noteworthy period in the growth of my State.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a statement made by Vice President BARKLEY on the occasion of his visit to Boca Raton, and also a statement made by J. Myer Schine high lighting his views on Florida's future.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOCA RATON, FLA., December 7.—Florida is becoming a living symbol of the achievements possible under the American way of life and as we advance further toward our national goals the State will become of increasing importance in our economy, ALBEN W. BARKLEY, Vice President of the United States declared here today.

"Too much emphasis has been placed on the strictly pleasure aspects of Florida," said the Vice President, "that not enough has been given to the steady population increase of the State, its high rank as an international airport serving Latin and South America, its status as one of the Nation's great fruit and vegetable baskets and the tremendous opportunities ahead.

"Florida may yet surpass even the dreams of the early pioneers, the Flaglers, the Carl Fishers, the Merricks and the others who had great visions of beauty and the highest in economic life combined here in this sunnyland."

On his first visit to Boca Raton, the Vice President said the simplicity and magnificence of this great resort challenges the imagination." He said that while he had visited Florida many times he had not realized the achievements made at Boca Raton in combining the natural beauty of Florida, with a classic of architecture and comfort.

Mr. BARKLEY said that only recently he had talked with J. Myer Schine, owner of Boca Raton and other Florida properties and was greatly interested in his plans for expansion, and his confidence in Florida. "Those who question the future of our great United States," said the Vice President, "should have the opportunity to see Boca Raton and other great Florida properties standing as living evidence that our country has just started."

NEW YORK, N. Y., December 31.—While foreign objectives will offer keen competition for American travel expenditures in 1950, the outlook for domestic resorts is exceedingly good and those which place new emphasis on comfort, service, and courtesy will enjoy banner seasons in all sections of the country.

This statement was made today by J. Myer Schine, owner of large resort properties in Florida, Atlantic City, and California, on the basis of bookings for the current 1949–50 winter season in Florida and interest evidenced in summer vacation plans. Mr. Schine owns and operates the Roney Plaza and Gulf Stream, Miami Beach, Fla.; McAllister, Miami; Boca Raton Club, Boca Raton, Fla.; Ritz Carlton, Atlantic City; Ambassador, Los Angeles; and other hotels.

Predicting that higher standards in accommodations and service in hotels and on transportation lines serving resorts and travel objectives can be expected in 1950 and the years ahead, Mr. Schine said that vacationists are showing a tendency to select their play places with more than usual care.

"The trends of the times—the uncertainties and the confusion of national and international affairs—are reflected in vacation demands," Mr. Schine declared, "as people more and more seek travel objectives away from the beaten paths." He cited the emphasis placed on beach facilities, room locations for quietness, and sports opportunities in inquiries coming from prospective patrons.

Mr. Schine believes that the trend of the times point to a period of sound growth in Florida more advantageous than the boom periods of the past. He feels that Florida in the fifties will be noteworthy from the standpoint of new economic growth, new play areas, and new attention from many parts of the world.

"While Florida has been much in the limelight for its winter sports," said Mr. Schine, "comparatively few people realize the tremendous progress made by the State. From a rank of thirty-third in State population in 1900, Florida now ranks as the twenty-first State in population, and growth continues. From a seaside village of 1,600 in 1900, Miami has grown to 172,000 permanent population and the tide of winter visitors swells that number many times."

Pointing out that the new emphasis on leisure time and retirement funds will prove most advantageous in drawing both visitors and permanent residents to Florida, Mr. Schine continued:

"While many sections of Florida hold advantages for those in search of playplaces, vacation objectives or homes after retirement, the 75-mile area along the ocean front on the east coast, which includes Miami Beach and Boca Raton, is one of the only areas in the world, outside of Egypt, offering

all-year bathing. It is already one of the outstanding of all recreational objectives. As the nearest Florida point to the Gulf Stream the Boca Raton area has less rain than surrounding areas and a steadier climate.

"Florida has undergone two important eras in its modern development since 1900 and the year 1950 will mark the beginning of the third and most important. The first era was marked by the advent of the railroads and the building of hotels, notably at Palm Beach. The second era was marked by the coming of the motor age, winding up with Miami as one of the leading ports of foreign trade by air. My own confidence in Florida is increasing year to year as evidenced by many investments in the Sunshine State."

Ninety-nine and Six-Tenths Percent Loyalty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of January 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NINETY-NINE AND SIX-TENTHS PERCENT LOYALTY

Figures from the FBI continue to attest to the loyalty of virtually all Federal employees. Latest statistics show that of the more than 2,700,000 Government workers investigated, 99.6 percent have been cleared. In 10,359 cases which the Loyalty Review Board turned over to the FBI for full field investigation, discharges were recommended in only 139 instances, though undoubtedly some other persons resigned voluntarily. These figures are eloquent contradiction of the Communists in Government charges that emanate from irresponsible sources. Not only that, but they speak well for the general moderation which, with a few flagrant exceptions, has characterized the conduct of the loyalty program.

All of this is reason why, if the screening of new employees is continued, as Chairman Richardson of the Loyalty Review Board recommends, it now should be possible to provide the safeguards the program lacks. The conspiratorial designs of the Communists give justification for some sort of checks in sensitive jobs. But this check has merit only as it is restricted to jobs of real importance to security and as it gives the greatest possible protection against rumor-mongering, malice, and circumstantial evidence.

Particularly is this definition necessary if the discretionary powers of heads of sensitive agencies to fire irresponsible employees are to be increased as the administration proposes. No one has a vested right to a Government job, least of all in a sensitive agency. But there is a world of difference between irresponsibility and disloyalty. Unless precise standards of procedure are drawn up, there is grave danger that security risks will be stigmatized as disloyal.

Such standards ought, in our opinion, to provide for the transfer of security risks to nonsensitive jobs wherever possible. If discharge of irresponsible employees is necessary, it should be on grounds of inefficiency or incompetence so that there is no possible stigma of disloyalty. Beyond this, it ought to be basic for all necessary loyalty investigations to include a full statement of the evidence, including a chance for the defendant to challenge his accusers. If the evidence is not of the sort that will stand up in court, then it is highly questionable whether it ought to be the basis for branding anyone as disloyal.

Every Man With an Income of $12,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Phillips County (Mont.) News:

EVERY MAN WITH AN INCOME OF $12,000

We do not presume to class President Truman with a ruthless buffoon like the late Huey Long but it must be admitted that Truman's latest pipe dream offering a minimum income of $12,000 for everybody may be likened to the late Louisiana rabble rouser's proposal to make every man a king. Like a good many other things, the king business isn't what it used to be but it still involves the right to order common folks around—at least in countries where royal working conditions are still considered reasonably closed shop and healthful. What Huey conveniently ignored was the fact that if he debased the king racket and crowned everybody, there'd be no common folks left to boss and the job wou'dn't be worth a mouthful of ashes. So it is with Truman's $12,000 minimum wage; it can be achieved by further debasement of our money, but if the $12,000 buys no more than $1,200 now we might as well have the $1,200 in more valuable currency.

We are currently having a dose of this kind of economics. Average wages have doubled, roughly, in 10 years and so has the cost of living, very roughly. So, who's any better off in actual cash? Corporation profits have doubled on paper but in dollars that doesn't buy any more than the workman's wages. Some of us often overlook that.

When pre-Nazi Germany ran her financial system with a printing press, beer got up to a million marks a stein. That is about $235,000 a glass in prewar money and a thin dime in pre-Nazi money. For a billion-mark note you got your change in a bushel basket and nobody counted it because it wasn't worth anything. With that kind of money we can create a $25,000 minimum income if we wish, but if at the same time the family car and grocery bill go up in proportion, does that make the posy smell any sweeter? There's an odor, all right, but it isn't a rose.

In addition to the famous good nickel cigar, what this Nation needs as much as anything right now is a few courageous statesmen willing to tell the public in simple words where this dizzy type of economic thinking is leading us. What it holds in store, for instance, for the savings of the thrifty; what it means to the old person living on a fixed pension. We need to ponder a little on the fact that what a dollar will buy means more than how many we get; that it's not what you pay, but what you get for what you pay, that counts.

According to our notion, any political or economic philosophy which promises to double everybody's income while at the same time doubling his outgo is as phony as a brass dollar. It's time, possibly, that we paid some attention to what is being done to us as well as for us.—J. R. L.

Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions on education adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO on October 31 to November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 18

Federal aid to education

Equality of educational opportunity and the continuing improvement of education are imperative if democracy is to survive in the United States. Our Nation must spend enough funds so that this equality is available, as guaranteed, to every child regardless of race, color, creed, or geographical location. Education in the United States today falls short of this standard in a number of respects.

American children are suffering a tragic injustice because of the inequality in educational services provided by the various States, and this is most glaringly demonstrated in the contrast between the facilities in the low income Southern States and those in wealthier industrial States; while within the Southern States, segregated schools for Negroes receive a fraction of the amounts, small to begin with, that are appropriated for white children. Schools for children in rural areas are receiving little more than half the expenditure per child that is being received by children in schools in urban areas.

In spite of an all-out campaign to raise teachers' salaries, teachers today are receiving in real wages only a little more than they were being paid in 1939.

And at least 2,000,000 American children of school age are not attending any school.

All competent studies show that the Nation will need school buildings for at least seven and a half million additional children during the next 6 years and that local and State schools groups cannot possibly finance a school-building program of such magnitude.

In both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, the United States Senate passed a Federal aid to education bill which would provide approximately $300,000,000 in Federal funds for aid to the Nations' schools. Twice, reactionary forces in the House of Representatives and lack of aggressive leadership to support the Senate bill have killed this legislation: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We urge the enactment by the Eighty-first Congress of legislation—

(1) To provide adequate Federal aid for education so that, together with appropriations by the various States, improved facilities on every level of the educational system, from nursery to university, shall be assured, so that every child shall have a good

education, every class a good teacher, and every teacher a good salary;

(2) To provide, in accordance with the principle of Senate bill 246, that the individual States shall make the decisions as to whether nonpublic schools shall be eligible for Federal aid and as to the kinds of services that shall be covered by Federal grants;

(3) To provide that at least 75 percent of funds appropriated go directly for teachers' salaries; and

(4) To provide at least $3,000,000,000 in Federal funds over a period of 5 years for a comprehensive, Nation-wide school-building program;

(5) To apply the full benefits of this program and the legislation above recommended to Puerto Rico as an integral part of the American economic unit.

Resolution 19

Labor extension service program

In a democracy education must be a continuing process which extends throughout adult life. American farmers have long enjoyed millions of dollars worth of educational benefits through the Federal Agricultural Extension Service, while management representatives can avail themselves of services provided by publicly supported universities and other institutions. But in the United States, public educational services for the nation's wage earners, other than the purely vocational, are almost entirely lacking.

Bills to establish a Labor Extension Service in the United States Department of Labor have been introduced in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, in an effort to provide the Nation's wage earners with a federally supported labor extension service operating through the cooperation of unions and universities within the States.

Early in the first session of the present Congress the labor extension service bill was approved by the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, but it has remained on the Senate Calendar without action for 8 months. Hearings on the bill have been held by the Subcommittee on Labor without action following from the full House Committee on Labor and Education: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We demand the immediate enactment by the Eighty-first Congress of the labor extension service bill (S. 110 and H. R. 1380); and

All affiliated international unions, councils, and local industrial unions are urged to support a campaign to enact a labor extension service bill by resolution, publicity, and communications with Members of Congress, and cooperation with the financial assistance to the National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, which is coordinating the drive for its enactment.

The full benefits of this program and the legislation above recommended shall be applied to Puerto Rico as an integral part of the American economic unit.

Resolution 29

Children

We reiterate our belief, expressed in Resolution No. 34 at the tenth constitutional convention of the CIO in 1948, that the first right of citizenship in a democracy is to grow throughout childhood in good physical, emotional, and social health and security.

We affirm our pledge to help achieve this right through policies and measures that will insure our next generation of citizens a better start in life than we or any earlier generation has had. This objective motivates our entire program. Higher wages, social security, better housing, and our other goals all are directed to providing a better life for our families. In addition, special measures for children are required: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the CIO, through its national, State, and local organizations, continue to lend its full support to—

The expansion of maternal- and child-health services until they are within reach of all mothers and children who wish to make use of such services, with special emphasis immediately on the expansion of health services for children of school age.

The expansion of public child-welfare services throughout the country which will give skilled help to orphaned, neglected, and delinquent children; to children of working mothers; and to communities in planning and directing wholesome recreational programs for their youngsters.

The expansion of research in child life which will help parents to a better understanding of what makes for healthy, happy childhood.

Federal aid to education and school construction, and State and local measures to assure opportunities for a good education to all our children.

Elimination of harmful child labor through improved Federal and State laws, strong labor law administration supported by adequate funds, and more fact-finding on child labor and youth employment problems.

Strengthening of public employment office systems so as to improve and extend counseling, placement, and follow-up services for young people.

The Midcentury White House Conference on Children and Youth, called by the President for the first week of December, 1950, when all citizens and organizations "to whom a child is important in himself and as the hope of a better tomorrow" will have an opportunity to forge new and better plans for assuring to all children that first right of citizenship in a democracy—the right to grow in good physical, emotional, and social health and security—to which we subscribe.

The work of the United Nations to bring better food, medical care and protective services to children in war-stricken and underdeveloped countries.

Shortage of Hospital Facilities for Veterans in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, California veterans have encountered constantly increasing difficulty in getting the services to which they are entitled from the Veterans' Administration due to an insufficient number of VA offices in California to handle the veteran claims, and an acute shortage of adequate hospital facilities to provide medical treatment.

The veteran population of California today is estimated by veteran service organizations at 1,750,000, and even the accepted estimate used by the Veterans' Administration places their number at 1,355,000. But only 20 Veterans' Administration offices are available to serve California veterans as compared to 55 VA offices which are provided for 1,310,000 veterans in the 6 New England States, and the 41 offices which have been established to serve 902,000 veterans in Texas.

The need for immediate establishment of additional Veterans' Administration offices in California to render proper service to California veterans is evident from these figures. The following letter from Mr. Lawrence C. Stevens, director of the State of California's Department of Veterans Affairs, and the article from the January issue of the department's news bulletin graphically illustrates this critical shortage of veterans' facilities in California and emphasizes the urgent need for relief:

STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS,
Sacramento, January 12, 1950.

Hon. GORDON L. McDONOUGH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. McDONOUGH: In order to call specially to your attention some figures illustrative of the Veterans' Administration central office attitude in discrimination against California and her veterans, I am sending you herewith an extra copy of the January issue of the department of veterans' affairs news bulletin. On page 2 of this issue, you will find what we consider some eye-opening figures, taken from the Veterans' Administration's own reports.

I know you are familiar with our acute shortage of VA hospital beds in this State in particular. It is hoped that the information contained in this news bulletin will provide some effective ammunition in your future battles in behalf of this State's growing veteran population.

Very truly yours,
LAWRENCE C. STEVENS, *Director.*

CALIFORNIA IS VA STEPCHILD, FIGURES DISCLOSE

On what basis does the Veterans' Administration make its services available to veterans, geographically speaking?

This question, repeatedly asked by veterans in California, is prompted anew, but not answered, by a study of the latest address list of VA field stations across the Nation.

California is the second largest State, geographically, and the second largest in population, having just passed Pennsylvania in the official estimate by the Bureau of the Census. It is also the second largest in veteran population, although the VA central office in Washington ranks it third, behind Pennsylvania as well as New York.

But in the number of VA offices, California ranks sixth.

CALIFORNIA BARELY TOPS MISSISSIPPI

Here is how the States stack up in number of field stations (excluding hospitals) of the Veterans' Administration:

State	Veteran population (VA estimate)	Number of VA offices
Texas	902,000	41
New York	2,060,000	33
Pennsylvania	1,437,000	30
Ohio	989,000	28
Massachusetts	678,000	23
California	[1] 1,355,000	20
Mississippi	226,000	18
Florida	302,000	17

[1] Veterans' organizations and the State department of veterans' affairs estimate California veteran population at 1,750,000.

In the number of VA offices per veteran, California ranks almost at the bottom of the list.

California has a total of 20 VA offices, including the three regional offices in its three principal metropolitan areas. By the VA's

official estimate, there are 1,355,000 veterans in the State, as of August 31, 1949.

This averages out to one VA office for every 67,750 veterans. Using the Department of Veterans' Affairs figure of 1,750,000 veterans in California, this State has one VA office for every 87,500 veterans.

The only State definitely worse off in this respect is Illinois, with 92,308 veterans per VA office. Nebraska is also in the stepchild class with one VA office for each 79,500 ex-servicemen.

The average for all States and Territories is one VA office for every 33,408 veterans.

On that basis, California should have 45 VA offices instead of its present 20 if the VA population distribution estimates were correct. On the higher estimate of 1,750,000 veterans, California would theoretically be entitled to 52 VA offices.

VARIOUS FACTORS

Obviously, VA offices cannot be allotted by slide-rule. Distances play a part, concentration of population must be taken into account, and perhaps other factors.

For example, no State except Delaware has fewer than two VA offices, even those with such small veteran populations as Nevada (21,000) and Wyoming (40,000). On the other hand, Nebraska has only two VA offices although the VA estimates that the State has 159,000 ex-servicemen.

And Texas, vastest of the States, has 41 VA offices, for an average of one per 22,000 veterans.

EXAMPLES POSE QUESTIONS

On the other hand, the study poses these questions:

Why does little Vermont, with about the same veteran population as Wyoming, have twice as many VA offices?

Why do Michigan and North Carolina (793,000 and 410,000 veterans' respectively) have the same number of VA offices (16)?

Why, in view of the relative sparseness of VA offices in Minnesota, Nebraska, Illinois, and California (64,000 or more veterans per office), are there so many in Florida, Kentucky, and Mississippi (25,000 or fewer veterans per office), and in New England?

Another interesting aspect of these tabulations has to do with the closing by the VA of 42 small offices throughout the Nation last June. California lost two offices in that retrenchment; Massachusetts, among the best served of all the States, lost only one.

New England Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, an unusual commentary because of its glaring foresight, faith in continuous scientific progress which has been so tremendously accelerated by World War II, is the editorial of January 11, 1950, appearing in the Sunday Republican published at Waterbury, Conn. Of course, it concerns the suggestion made by the President in his message on the State of the Union wherein he adds New England as a region "Where the benefits of large-scale public power development have not yet been experienced."

The editorial follows:

NEW ENGLAND POWER

When New England undertakes the needed expansion of electric power facilities there should be care to make certain that money and resources aren't being wasted on uneconomic hydroelectric developments which might, by that time, be made obsolescent by the advent of methods for using atomic fuel to drive electric generators.

The question of whether it is possible and economic to get appreciably large new quantities of hydroelectric power by more dams on New England rivers has been raised by President Truman. This is a matter of real importance to New England. New England needs more electric power. It needs cheaper electric power.

A Federal Power Commission survey that was made several years ago purported to show that an additional 3,000,000 kilowatts of electric power could be generated by harnessing New England rivers. That wasn't to say, however, that it would be feasible for private industry to undertake the necessary developments. This estimate contemplated Government-built installations.

The New England Council made its own survey of the situation and reported that as far as private industry is concerned any program that contemplated the production of more than 500,000 additional kilowatts would not pay off.

A third canvass of the possibilities was made by the Providence Journal last year. This disputed the claims of the FPC. The Journal claimed that 1,000,000 kilowatts rather than 3,000,000 was all that could be developed by any kind of engineering, no matter how many practical considerations were disregarded. The same study indicated that unless the projects were federally subsidized it wouldn't be practical to try for more than the 500,000 kilowatts the New England Council visualized.

From the conflicting estimates reached in the studies made so far, it is evident that there would have to be a very careful and definitive assessment by the Government before any Federal program can be undertaken. Thus it might be some years before any start will be made.

Also, from the facts already gathered it is evident that Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts would derive most of the benefits from any large-scale Federal power projects in New England and Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine would make most of the sacrifices. It seems likely that more years would be required to settle the questions raised by this situation.

The possibility of electric power generating plants using atomic fuel shouldn't be overlooked either. In the New England Council's report in 1948 it was stated that it would probably be "at least a decade" before atomic energy became commercially usable in this connection. But once atomic fuel has arrived on the scene it seems almost certain that the development of anything but the most efficient and economic hydroelectric installations will be out of the question.

New England, surely, has nothing to lose by going ahead with as much hydroelectric development as now appears economic from a private-industry standpoint. David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, has stated that "atomic power will almost certainly follow the course of supplementing rather than supplanting existing economical sources of energy supply."

But this much is certain. New England will want to be the first section of the country to turn to the use of atomic energy for electric power rather than the last section of the country to try the TVA formula. When the time comes for putting up atomic-powered steam turbines, we don't want to be in the course of condemning vast areas of fertile farm land and flooding our river valleys behind huge dams and paying the bills for obsolete methods and poor planning.

A Reporter Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the penetrating research and high quality of reporting which characterizes a series of recent articles on the Federal Government commend them to the careful study of the Members. The author, Mr. Paul Martin, of the Gannett News Service, deserves our gratitude for his forthright presentation of the facts relating to bigness in government.

Under leave to extend my remarks, three in this series are included today, and two will follow tomorrow.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 12, 1949]

FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S SIZE: NO. 1 UNITED STATES PROBLEM

(How big is our Federal Government? How much does it cost you? What are you getting for your money? What are the possible future trends? The Times-Union presents today the first of five articles designed as a comprehensive analysis of how the Federal Government has mushroomed in the last 20 years to become the dominant factor in American economic and political life.)

(By Paul Martin)

The Federal Government has become the Nation's biggest employer, biggest merchant, biggest banker, biggest consumer, and biggest spender.

All this has developed in the course of the last 20 years.

The Budget Bureau estimates Congress will be called upon to appropriate or authorize $47,900,000,000 in the current fiscal year—a new peacetime peak.

The national debt is going upward again as the administration engages in deficit financing in a period of exceptional prosperity.

Within the last 6 or 7 months the debt has gained from around $252,000,000,000 to nearly $257,000,000,000. It will go higher still.

Approximately 36,000,000 Americans are drawing regular, direct payments from Federal, State, and local governments.

One out of every eight persons employed in the United States is working directly for the Government—around 7,600,000,000 Federal, State, and local employees.

Vast segments of our national economy are being supported by Government subsidies, paid out of the general taxes contributed by the people.

The Federal tax structure now reaches down to collect from individuals earning $1,000 a year or less.

Subsidized industries include the Nation's two largest—agriculture and construction.

There are many others—aviation, merchant marine, finance, minerals and metals, utilites, small business, new business.

Many are hidden subsidies, or protective legislation, or can't-lose guaranties.

Some are aimed at special-interest blocs of voters, such as veterans, farmers, teachers, organized labor, ranchers, miners, low-income groups, civil-liberties groups, the aged, needy, and blind.

Many State and local governments now look to Washington for support, after finding the Federal Government is usurping tax fields upon which they formerly depended for local revenues.

There have been at least 60 State-aid programs started by the Federal Government since 1933. Each has a different formula, different matching basis, and different administrative requirements.

They account for an expenditure of around $3,000,000,000 a year. There are forms galore and a host of Federal employees in each State to administer the programs.

Some come out of specific tax accounts, but the great majority drain out of the Treasury general fund.

The Government Reorganization Commission, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, found that the Federal Government, far from being an impartial arbiter of affairs of state, owns or operates or has a commanding financial interest in at least 100 important business enterprises—many in competition with private industry.

The Government's direct investment in these enterprises is in excess of $20,000,000,000, with authorized commitments to supply another $14,000,000,000, if necessary.

Said the Hoover Commission:

"The Government guarantees, directly or indirectly, about $90,000,000,000 of deposits or mortgages, and life insurance written by Government agencies approaches $40,000,000,000."

These agencies have at least 300 offices and branches scattered around the country.

In the power field alone the Government up to June 30, 1947, had built 56 hydroelectric or steam plants and had another 37 generating plants under construction. Congress had authorized for construction an additional 79 plants. And the Government owned 14,000 miles of power-transmission lines.

The Hoover Commission estimated it would cost $30,000,000,000 to build the new plants authorized for construction, not counting the ones already built or in progress.

No one, apparently, has ever been able to define clearly and comprehensively the full extent of Government subsidies, open or hidden.

The Hoover Commission, for all its task-force reports and expert research consultants, couldn't tote up the score.

The Committee on Reduction of Nonessential Expenditures, headed by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, asked the Budget Bureau to report or estimate all Federal subsidies to business and farmers from 1934 to the current fiscal year.

The Bureau came up with these estimates:

Agriculture	$11,500,000,000
Business, through RFC	3,500,000,000
Maritime	450,000,000

But the Bureau excluded from its subsidy definition (1) Federal grants to State or local governments; (2) pensions, retirement benefits, and public assistance; (3) payments to foreign governments or individuals; (4) subscriptions to international organizations; (5) loans and loan guaranties.

Obviously the report was far from complete.

Yet it gives a partial picture of how the Federal Government has mushroomed in the last 20 years to become the dominant factor in American economic life.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 13, 1949]

NORTH, EAST ARE PAYING FOR RESHUFFLE OF WEALTH

(Why are tax dollars of the North and East flowing south and west and overseas? Are the industrial States losing out in Federal-State-aid programs to the agricultural regions? Here is the second in a series of articles designed to give a comprehensive picture of the power and influence of government today, and how it redistributes the wealth of the land.)

(By Paul Martin)

The Federal Government today is carrying out what amounts to a gigantic redistribution of the wealth of the land.

This is being accomplished not only on a personal basis, by leveling off incomes and inheritances of individuals through stepped-up tax rates.

It is taking place on a State and regional pattern, through Federal-State-aid programs; and grants, loans, and subsidies to industry and agriculture.

The greatest percentage of Federal grants-in-aid goes to States which pay the lowest pro rata share of Federal taxes.

During the 1948 fiscal year, 34 States plus the District of Columbia, the Territories, and possessions, received back more in Federal grants than the pro rata share of taxes they paid to support these State-aid programs.

These States and Territories paid in proportionately around $650,000,000 for allocation to State-aid programs; got back around a billion dollars.

All States west of the Mississippi River and south of the Mason and Dixon's line received back more than the pro rata share of what they contributed except one—Virginia.

New York got back the same amount as Texas, and paid in four times as much tax money to support these programs. Connecticut put in twice as much as the State got back. Illinois invested $40,000,000 more than was received in return.

Here's how these States stood in the 1948 Federal-aid programs:

New York was on the bottom of the list for all States—a 43-percent return on tax money which New Yorkers paid to the Federal Government.

Connecticut was third from the bottom. New Jersey and Illinois were in fifth and sixth places respectively.

Over the long haul; from 1933 to date, New York has got back only around 6 percent of her total Federal taxes in the form of State-aid grants.

Connecticut received 7 cents on the dollar. Illinois and New Jersey got back about 10 percent each.

Tax moneys of the industrial North and East are flowing south and west and overseas.

Each new social-welfare program that is proposed will tend to accelerate this redistribution of the wealth.

These include Federal aid to education, compulsory health insurance, expanded social security, hospital construction, insurance against temporary or permanent disability, public power, and home relief.

The economy of the South and West are expanding into diversified agriculture and industry, through Government grants and loans, tax incentives, wage differentials, defense planning, and political influence in the administration and Congress.

During 1947 the South obtained 17.3 percent of its total income from Government sources, compared to 13.8 percent in the non-South.

Per capita payments rose 250 percent in the South between 1929 and 1947, compared to 184 percent for the non-South.

Manufacturing in the TVA region alone between 1933 and 1946 jumped by 140 percent, compared to 88 percent for the Nation as a whole.

Between 1940 and 1946 bank assets in the South rose 231 percent compared to a gain of 131 percent in the North.

The Golden West also is sharing in this Government-directed boom through loans, grants, wool support, silver and gold purchase, stock piling of minerals and metals, reclamation, irrigation, public power, reforestation, public parks and lands, and a natural gravitation of population.

Senator RALPH E. FLANDERS, Republican, of Vermont, member of the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, once declared that every State west of the Mississippi is living on a Government dole.

Meanwhile, what has happened in the North?

During the last 10 years the Nation as a whole gained 204 percent in income and productivity.

But New York State gained proportionately 191 percent—13 percent below national average.

Connecticut gained 174 percent—30 percent below average. New Jersey hit 175 percent—29 percent below average.

Illinois barely topped the national average with 205 percent.

In 1939 the average income of New York State citizens was 50 percent above national average. By 1948 it was only 34 percent higher than the national average.

A study of the Middle Atlantic region, including New York and New Jersey, by United States News and World Report, shows that between 1940 and 1946 these States lost proportionately 3 percent of all United States population, 5 percent of factory workers, 6 percent in value added by manufacturing, 24 percent of all bank deposits, and 42 percent in value of home building.

A similar study of New England States over the same period shows they lost proportionately 2 percent of population, 6 percent of home-building value, 8 percent of value added by manufacturing, 13 percent of factory workers, and 23 percent of bank deposits.

There were 37,000 production workers employed by textiles alone in Connecticut in 1939 compared to 35,000 in 1947.

New Jersey is losing out gradually in two important industries—chemicals and electrical machinery.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 14, 1949]

TAXES FEED 36,000,000 ON GOVERNMENT PAY ROLLS

(Where do your tax dollars go? Who are you helping to support? How much is the Federal Government spending today? Here is the third in a series of articles designed to give a comprehensive picture for the first time of how the colossus of government reaches out into every State and every walk of life.)

(By Paul Martin)

How big is government today, and what is the extent of its power?

Here are some indications:

Approximately 36,000,000 Americans are drawing regular, direct payments from Federal, State, and local governments.

One out of every eight employed persons in the United States is working directly for the Government—or 7,600,000 Federal, State, and local employees.

Total Federal, State, and local spending will run close to $70,000,000,000 in the current 1950 fiscal year. This means around $30,000,000,000 in farm or business channels, around $40,000,000,000 to individuals.

The total Federal spending in prewar 1940 was $10,000,000,000, and even then the Nation was girding for an emergency. In the 1930's the first $4,000,000,000-a-year budget was considered a back-breaker.

The total 1950 budget has been estimated at $47,900,000,000 in total appropriations and authorizations.

The Federal Government has become the most dynamic factor in the entire American economy. It dominates business, agriculture, and foreign commerce. It exercises a powerful influence over what State and municipal governments are able to do.

If Federal loans, guaranties, and subsidies were withdrawn immediately, the national economy would suffer extreme shock.

Around 33 percent of what the average citizen earns today goes into a combination of Federal, State, and local taxes—many of them hidden taxes.

To keep the Federal Government going, we are spending annually around six billion for new material, supplies, and equipment.

The administration since VJ-day has or will export around thirty-two billions to keep communism out of Europe and restore the economic balance of the western world.

The Federal Government has accumulated an inventory of more than thirty billions in military or civilian supplies. This includes more than two billions invested in rolling stock alone, trucks, automobiles, staff cars, etc.

Uncle Sam pays more than $1,000,000,000 every year for transporting public property, mostly over the railroads.

There is a shelf of planned public works in excess of one hundred billions, which might be put under construction in event of a depression.

For all contemplated multiple-use water projects, an expenditure of thirty billions would be required. These activities keep 100,000 on the Federal pay roll alone, plus additional thousands under private contractors.

Agricultural activities of the Government has mushroomed from 22,000 to around 100,000 employees in the last 20 years. There are nine separate agencies providing Government credit to farmers on different terms and for different purposes.

Veterans' Administration will spend around six billions this year to aid directly more than 5,000,000 individual veterans, exclusive of the GI insurance dividend.

The Hoover Commission found VA was publishing 88 different technical manuals, 665 different technical bulletins, and over 400 circulars of various kinds.

Where does the money go?

The Budget Bureau says 81 cents out of your tax dollar this year will go to support four big areas of Federal interest—defense, international affairs, veterans, and debt service.

In 1939 the Federal Government spent $83 for every man, woman, and child in America. This year the Government will spend upwards of $287 for every single individual and there are around 17,000,000 more of us.

Here's where the money goes:

For 1939:	
Defense	$8.00
International	.15
Veterans	4.00
Debt service	7.00
All other	49.00
For 1950:	
Defense	98.00
International	46.00
Veterans	38.00
Debt service	37.00
All other	68.00

Total funds to be spent or obligated by the Federal Government in the 1950 fiscal period will be distributed in approximately this fashion:

Salaries: Ten and two-tenths billions for three and seven-tenths million Federal employees, including the military.

Services: Two and four-tenths billions for communications, transportation, rents, etc.

Goods: Ten billions including two and five-tenths billions for construction, one and seven-tenths billions for aircraft.

Benefits: Seventeen and three-tenths billions for subsidies, pensions, and grants, including more than two billions for welfare and old-age pensions, one and six-tenths billions for the unemployed.

Farmers: Direct payments in excess of a half billion, plus crop loans and purchases which may exhaust the near-five-billion borrowing capacity of commodity credit corporation.

Foreign governments: Five and six-tenths billions to be spent mostly in United States markets.

Debt: Five and five-tenths billions for interest alone, nothing for debt retirement.

Loans: Two billions to farmers, real-estate operators, businessmen, veterans.

Where are the Federal employees located? The greatest number, of course, are in the District of Columbia, or around 220,000. But the State of California alone has 205,000 Federal workers, runs the district a close second.

There are three States with more than 100,000 Federal employees each—California, New York, and Pennsylvania. Illinois, with 99,000, is close to the mark.

Control of Alcoholic Beverage Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

DIVISION OF ALCOHOLIC
BEVERAGE CONTROL,
STATE LIQUOR AUTHORITY,
New York City, January 11, 1950.

Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN TAURIELLO: The New York State Liquor Authority today adopted a resolution (copy attached) which summarizes our position on an issue that we consider timely and important. Although this resolution is self-explanatory, it seems worth while to mention here certain facts and principles that are germane and probative.

We approach this subject from the standpoint of public servants entrusted by the government of this State with the difficult task of administering the restrictions, regulations, and provisions of the ABC law which, by the terms of that statute, were enacted in the name of the protection, health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State.

We refrain advisedly from recommendations of specific legislation by the Congress because we have no peculiar qualifications by virtue of our office or official experience to determine what taxes should be imposed or the amount thereof.

We recognize clearly that the American citizen who consumes alcoholic beverages and who ultimately pays whatever taxes are collected on these commodities, has merit in his position when he insists on fair, equitable, and just treatment. We feel that he has been paying the heavy excise taxes on these commodities originally as a contribution to the winning of the war, and, subsequent to that accomplishment, with a feeling of resignation engendered by his observations that, while such discriminatory taxes as those on baby oil and ladies' purses are being collected, he should not object too strenuously to his lot. But we have no commission, privilege, or intention to represent the taxpayer or to plead his cause, however just, since such action is not within the scope of our official duties.

Nor do we undertake to advocate the cause of the industry whose members pay to the Government and then pass along to the consumer the taxes imposed by law on their businesses. We agree, of course, with their belief that any tax which destroys a lawful business or fosters its illegitimate competitor is unwarranted, unjust, and unrealistic. Again, we have no commission, right, or intention to present the case of the alcoholic beverage industry or to state its position, however meritorious, since to do so would take us beyond the prerogatives of our office.

Yet, sensible to our official obligations, we are deeply concerned with the social evils that are privy to the illicit manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages. We find cause for concern in the figures of the Alcohol Tax Unit of the United States Treasury Department reflecting the seizure by that agency alone during the fiscal year 1949 of 8,008 stills and 3,661,432 gallons of mash. Compared with figures reported by the ATU for the fiscal year 1948 in those two categories (6,757 stills and 1,710,833 gallons of mash) it will be seen that increases of 18.5 percent in still seizures and 114 percent in mash seizures have occurred. These figures give expression to the fact that the consumer demands alcoholic beverages and that, although he is willing to buy them at high prices when he can afford to do so, he will buy the illicitly produced, non-tax-paid produce when he is confronted with the alternatives of abstinence or excessive price. Of interest on this point is a comment by Mr. Virgil W. Peterson, the distinguished operating director of the Chicago Crime Commission and an expert on law observance and law enforcement. Writing in the July-August 1949 issue of Northwestern University's Journal of Criminal Law and Criminology, Mr. Peterson asserted:

"In America the tendency is present in large segments of the population to consider it a constitutional right to disregard any law or legal restrictions which may not meet with an individual's approval. Consequently, a tightening of the closing hours in some cities has resulted in open and notorious violation of the closing hours with attending political and police corruption. High taxes have frequently resulted in bootlegging."

Prohibition by price excesses is potentially as destructive a force as prohibition by decree. Both cause irreparable injury to legitimate business and good government. The havoc wrought by national prohibition can be correctly appraised only with the passage of years and through the verdict of history. To those who have devoted themselves over the years to the cause of good government, to combating the kidnaping wave of the early thirties, and to smashing the industrial, vice, and other rackets in later years, it is clear beyond doubt that prohibition spawned the greatest conglomeration of vicious criminals and aggravated crime that our country ever experienced. All of us, regardless of experience, know that prohibition not only failed to accomplish its stated objective but in addition so tarnished the luster of government itself and so corroded its framework that the after-effects will long remain to be seen. Public servants, students of government, and lawmakers in particular should never lose sight of these facts, nor should they underestimate the lessons they teach. Public opinion must be kept on the side of law observance and behind law enforcement.

During the 16 years of its existence the New York State Liquor Authority has sought to attain the objectives of our ABC law by insisting on strict compliance with rigid standards in the hope that this policy and procedure would induce honest, honorable, and respected business people to participate in the business of supplying legitimately produced, potable, tax-paid alcoholic beverages for the moderate and temperate use of the consuming public. We feel that this effort has been rewarded and that a high percentage of the large number of carefully screened persons who have been licensed to engage in this business in this State have exercised the privileges conferred thereby in a responsible and meritorious manner. We believe that any effort to brand these licensees otherwise than as legitimate business people serving a public need and demand would appear to be highly inconsistent with the objectives of liquor control and would be prejudicial to the efforts of the States to attain those objectives through insuring high standards of compliance with the letter and spirit of the law by licensees who are themselves law-abiding, self-respecting, and capable business people.

We trust that this statement of our position is constructive and that it will be of value to you and your colleagues in resolving the direct and related issues that are involved. Should you feel that we can be otherwise helpful, please feel free to command us.

Very truly yours,

STATE LIQUOR AUTHORITY,
JOHN F. O'CONNELL,
Chairman.

RESOLUTION

Whereas under the powers refunded to them by the twenty-first amendment to the Constitution of the United States, 46 of the individual States have enacted laws to control the alcoholic beverage business; and

Whereas although variously expressed, the purpose of these laws is to protect the health, welfare, safety, and morals of the people of those States by fostering and promoting temperance and moderation and respect for obedience to law; and

Whereas this objective depends for accomplishment upon a sound law effectively administered; and

Whereas to be sound in concept and susceptible of effective administration, particularly as to acts that are not intrinsically wrong, penal statutes, including those relating to liquor control, must be in substantial conformity with public thinking; and

Whereas taxes on alcoholic beverages which are so excessive as to cause public resentment create a condition tolerant of the bootlegger and the bootlegging business and thereby compromise temperance and moderation and undermine respect for and obedience to law: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the New York State Liquor Authority respectfully urge all members of the delegation of this State in the Congress of the United States to consider these facts carefully and to weigh them judiciously in their deliberations on proposals to reduce the high excise taxes which were imposed as wartime measures.

(Resolution adopted by the New York State Liquor Authority in New York City, January 11, 1950.)

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in recent months I have had numerous letters from individuals suffering with the dreaded and little-known disease, multiple sclerosis. Naturally, they have written to urge me to support several bills now pending in Congress to grant funds for research in multiple sclerosis, and I have in each case assured the writer than I am indeed in favor of funds for such purposes. However, the mail brought me a few days ago another such letter, this time from a fine young woman who has been a good friend of the Murdock family for years. She has written to tell us that her doctor has now diagnosed her trouble as multiple sclerosis.

After reading her letter, I felt that I should redouble my efforts for this legislation, and I think that perhaps other Members of Congress will have similar reaction. Her letter is as follows:

DENVER COLO., *January 11, 1950.*

Hon. and Mrs. JOHN R. MURDOCK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. AND MRS. MURDOCK: It was so good to see you both last summer when I stopped in Washington with Bert and his family. At the time I could have told you my tale of woe but I didn't see any point in bothering you with it since I did not realize you might become involved in the matter.

My Christmas letter sent as I left Twin Falls for Denver told of my peculiar disease being diagnosed as multiple sclerosis. How much do you know about it?

Do you know that it is the disease of which Lou Gehrig died? But of course you know of it because of Arizona's late Governor. They are the exceptions; few of the victims are fortunate enough to die. Instead we face years and years ahead of paralysis. Though the paralysis has not yet set in for me it may come gradually or I may not be able to move a single muscle by tomorrow. A year ago right now I was completely numb from the tips of my toes to my diaphragm. Much of the numbness has disappeared but I can put my whole right leg in scalding water and not feel it. Since February 23 I have been in constant pain though the intensity varies. There are other ways in which I have been affected but this is enough for you to know how important a matter it is to me and to millions of others.

Yes, I say millions. New York City alone has over 10,000 cases. A rare disease? Not in the number of victims (it hits chiefly the healthiest between 20 and 40), but in what is known of it. The disease has been known for nearly 100 years but nothing has been done about finding out the cause or possible cure until 3 years ago next month when patients themselves, together with their families and friends, organized the National Multiple Sclerosis Society (270 Park Avenue, New York). Still the cause and cure are unknown. There is no medicine I can take—nothing to keep my health in the state it is in now or improving it, nothing to stop the disease from progressing.

Government-sponsored research in multiple sclerosis received a boost with the passage by the Senate on September 27 of S. 2591. This bill provides for the establishment of a national institute on neurological diseases, specifically citing research in MS as a purpose of the act. Will you vote in favor of this bill when it comes before the House?

As you know I have left my work as a director of Christian education. I started this week in a strictly 9 to 5 office job with the Denver Council of Churches. I have been fortunate in finding a place to live and mother and dad will join me the first of next week to make their home with me and take care of me when and if I can no longer do so myself.

Do not worry about my mental state; I have not become morbid. I seldom say as much as I have just written you. Perhaps your vote will be the difference between discovery of a cure before I become incapacitated and the present lack of knowledge on the subject.

Perhaps my next will be on a more cheerful note.

Sincerely,

FLORENCE LUDY.

Federal Fair Employment Practice Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am enclosing the resolution that I have received from the board of aldermen, legislative department, city of Chelsea, Mass.:

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Congress the Federal Fair Employment Practice Act; and

Whereas the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already adopted such an act; and

Whereas it is the sense of this board of aldermen that it is vital to the best interests of this country that such an act be adopted in line with the report of the President's Commission on Civil Rights: Now therefore it is

Resolved, That this board of aldermen go on record that it officially endorses the FEPC and urges its Senators and Representatives in Congress to use their good offices in order to successfully enact this legislation;

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Congressman LANE, and Senators SALTONSTALL and LODGE.

Harry Coltun, Joseph B. Greenfield, Joseph E. Thornton, Joseph Margolis, James A. Hanlon, George J. Gallant, Daniel E. Carroll, Andrew P. Murphy, Alexander Dzengelewski.

In board of aldermen, January 9, 1950, adopted.

Approved January 11, 1950.

JOSEPH A. MELLEY, *Mayor*.

A true copy. Attest:

JOSEPH A. TYRRELL, *City Clerk*.

We Must Not Be Afraid of Change

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article by Raymond B. Fosdick, which appeared in the New York Times magazine of April 3, 1949.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

WE MUST NOT BE AFRAID OF CHANGE

(By Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation)

When the last glacier retreated northward from what is now Connecticut, it left behind, as mementos of its visit, great boulders of rock strewn lavishly across the State. Several of them, larger than corncribs and many tons in weight, were deposited on my farm, and for 15 years I have watched one of them fight a losing battle with an ash tree. The tree evidently started in a seed lodged in a tiny pocket in the top of the rock. When I first saw it, it was a sturdy sapling that had made itself a comfortable crevice for its roots. Today its irresistible growth has torn the massive rock into fragments.

This is the law of life. The future belongs not to rigid absolutes, whether they are primal rock or unyielding social arrangements, but to the thing that can grow, whether it is a tree or a democracy.

It is strange that a principle as familiar as this should today need underscoring, but we are living in years of uncertainty and fear, and fear induces a kind of spiritual astigmatism. To be sure, in our generation, we have reason for our fears and every justification to resist the threat that creates them. But I am thinking of fear as an evil in itself and what it does to human emotions and reactions.

For one thing, fear breeds an instinctive hostility to growth, because growth means change, and in anxious hours men tend to cling to the shelter of the present or to put their faith in nostalgia for the past. But history's current is sweeping us into the future, and we cannot stand still, nor is there now any place left to go back to. The illusion that security can be found in immobility, or that safety is dependent upon the absence of change, is perhaps the most dangerous form of imbalance which plagues the minds of men.

Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and reexpressed in contemporary idiom to accord with contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the Revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of Magna Carta.

Today the conception of freedom is once again taking on a larger meaning. Our generation is thinking of the threat to freedom which comes from poverty and insecurity, from sickness and the slum, from social and economic conditions in which human beings cannot be free. In many countries, including our own, this new conception of freedom is struggling to make itself articulate, and irrestible change in older points of view is taking place before our eyes.

Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society. This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very essence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

Here again we have a familiar concept to which most of us would doubtless subscribe. But it needs to be underscored today because our current fear of communism is driving some of us to believe that change is somehow subversive, and that anyone who advocates new ideas is probably a fellow-traveler who should be watched. Not only the House Un-American Activities Committee but similar State committees and various self-appointed groups are creating a climate of opinion definitely hostile to those who fail to conform to predetermined standards, and suspicion is thrown on individuals and organizations who dare to think in unorthodox and nonconformist terms.

With the possible exception of John Adams' administration, there is a risk today in being a liberal that has never existed before in the history of this Republic. If you sign a petition to admit colored people to public housing developments, if you favor fair employment practices or are concerned about civil liberties, if you fight for the protection of the rights of the foreign born, if you oppose religious prejudice and Jim Crowism, if you sanction cultural exchange with foreign countries, if you aline yourself with those who are working for more effective labor unions or more adequate medical care, if you take any point of view which involves the implementation of the Declaration of Independence that all men are created equal, you are apt to be suspected in some circles as a knowing participant in the Communist front, or, at the very least, as a witless dupe of Moscow's hypnotic influences.

There is hardly a progressive organization or undertaking in the country to which the adjective "communistic" has not been applied in the last few years—from the Tennessee Valley Authority and water-power developments generally, all the way to farmers' and consumers' cooperatives and plans for rural electrification. Fingers are even pointed at organizations like the YMCA, the YWCA, and the defunct Epworth League. In many States, teachers and college professors have been freightened into steril silence, and even the pulpit has not been free from fear.

The tragedy of this business is that it plays into the hands of the Communists. It identifies Russia with the process of social change at the same time that it limits us to a bleak and hopeless status quo. It concedes the Soviet claim of concern for the underprivileged while it stigmatizes the achievement and promise of democracy toward this same goal. A prominent doctor, head of a State medical society, recently condemned the idea of the broader distribution of medical care on the grounds that it was being pushed "by Soviet agents in this country."

That is the kind of reckless statement which creates an atmosphere favorable to communism. If the idea of making available to all the people of our country the curative techniques of modern medicine is communism, if communism has a patent on the idea, then communism has something for us which we very much want. But it isn't communism. It is democracy. Its roots go back to the Declaration of Independence, long before Karl Marx was born. It is a translation in social terms of a concept that was first conceived as a political idea. It is part of our developing spiritual testament. It is in line with all that is best in our tradition and hope. It is democracy facing the responsibilities of its maturity.

Those frightened people who use the word communism so easily had better reckon with its implications. There are plenty of arguments against communism. It is a facade for a ruthless tyranny. It is a brutal hoax by which millions of confused and hungry people are persuaded or coerced to sign away their freedom in exchange for utopian promises. But to paste a label of communism on the yearnings of men everywhere for a better life, to classify as subversive those goals of equality and human service toward which our democracy is moving, is to concede to the Communists all the best arguments and make a mockery of the faith that sustains us.

It is undoubtedly part of the Communist strategy to frighten us into a position which seems to identify our democracy, not with forward-looking movements related to the hopes of men, but with outmoded patterns of social thinking. If in the eyes of the nations, America could appear as a victim of spiritual paralysis, frozen to the present, deaf to the impact of new ideas of human equality which are sweeping the world, it would be an overriding victory for Soviet policy. That is the picture the Communists are trying to paint of us, and that, unfortunately, is the picture that some thoughtless and panicky people in this country are trying, unwittingly, to help them paint.

I do not underestimate the necessity which we face in times like these of keeping the Communists clear of our Government and rooting out treachery wherever it may be found. Split loyalties or loyalties that respond to strings pulled in Moscow cannot be tolerated in positions of power. We must know who our enemies are. But this is a task requiring consummate judgment and skill. If, in a clumsy attempt to exorcise evil, we proscribe the good as well, the damage will be irreparable. To act as if the term "communism" covers all the plans and dreams of men for making this world an inviting home to live in instead of a place to freeze and fight and starve in is no more intelligent than using a steam shovel to weed a flower garden.

In our concern over what communism may do to democracy we have overlooked the danger of what we ourselves may do to democracy under the stimulus of fear. Fighting fire with fire is an easy but misleading

slogan which has betrayed more than one cause in the past. Challenged by authoritarianism, men begin to build an authoritarianism of their own; they tend to take on the mood and techniques of their opponents; they answer heresy-hunting with heresy-hunting; they become like the thing they fight. That is what fear does to people. If the tactics of the Soviets succeed in inducing us to try to stamp out dissent and to measure loyalty by conformity, if they scare us into a denial of our historic goals, then they have maneuvered us into retreating from the field before the battle has even begun.

If democracy means anything at all it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom.

This is what our democracy has always meant. We have given it its preeminent place in the world because we have welcomed diversity of opinion, because there has been no fixed creed to which our citizens have had to subscribe, no Siberia for our intellectual and spiritual nonconformists. Our national life has been healthy and vigorous because dissenters have been encouraged to think critically of the political, social, and economic order in which we live.

Indeed, as we look back on our history we realize that the periods when we rose to moral greatness were periods of nonconformity—when Thoreau wrote his essay on civil disobedience; when Seward appealed to the country with his revolutionary thesis, "There is a law higher than the Constitution"; when Theodore Parker from his pulpit in Boston denounced the iniquity of our war on Mexico in words that burned their way into the conscience of the Nation. "If there is any fixed star in our constitutional constellation," said the Supreme Court in the Barnette flag-salute case in 1943, "it is that no official, high or petty, can prescribe what shall be orthodox in politics, nationalism, religion, or other matters of opinion, or force citizens to confess by word or act their faith therein."

It is this kind of tolerance and adaptability that makes the evolving will of the people effective in reaching new definitions of liberty and equality. It is this philosophy of growth that gives us assurance in the present crisis. The only adequate way to answer the challenge of communism is to continue the building of an economic and social system whose concrete results in terms of the welfare of mankind will far outstrip anything that communism can even promise. Democracy thus interpreted as a positive force can create new hopes and new initiatives in human life and can capture the imagination of the world.

Here is a faith worth fighting for. Stalin boasts of his "new order." We have a new order, too, based on the capacity of each generation to experience what Lincoln called "a new birth of freedom." The Communists extol the youth and virility of totalitarianism. In the evolution of democracy we have a world that is perpetually young.

I started by saying that the future belongs to the thing that can grow; a tree can demolish a rock. In spite of the present impetus of its revolutionary program, communism, by encasing itself in an iron-clad orthodoxy, is sealing its own ultimate doom. Whether the field is science or economics or literature or art or music, the Kremlin has circumscribed it with an adamantine authoritarianism. The conformist reaction which holds the intellectual and humanistic life of Russia in a viselike grip can end only by strangling the vitality of the system it seeks to preserve.

In such an atmosphere there can be no flowering of the human spirit; it withers and dies from suffocation. The Communists are fighting against the laws of nature. In their fanaticism they have forgotten, if they ever knew, that stagnation and death await ideas as well as social and economic arrangements which have lost their power to grow. They taunt us for being the supporters of a crumbling status quo, but it is they who are looking backward, they who are trying to build a status quo far more rigid and absolute than anything the world has ever seen. It is they who would put blinders on men and establish boundaries beyond which ideas and dreams shall not be allowed to go.

Four hundred years ago, Galileo shook the world with the question: "Who is willing to set limits to the human intellect?" Well, the Communists are not only willing to do it, they are attempting to do it; and in that attempt which flies in the face of history lie the seeds of their own ultimate disintegration.

There is no future for such a system, any more than there is a future for a rock stranded by a glacier. Ultimately the irresistible power of a thing that can grow will shatter it. That is why democracy, rightly interpreted, is the last best hope of earth. It is rooted in the principle of growth; it is adaptable to new concepts of social justice. It is built, not on a fixed creed or on a system of regimented concepts, but on the sure knowledge that frontiers are never stationary, that the thrust of events is steadily forward, that there are no privileged ideas around which magic circles can be drawn to protect them from competition. It is only free men who dare to think, and it is only through free thought, freely expressed, that the soul of a people can be kept alive.

Federal Scholarship Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include, and with pleasure, a splendid and deserving article written by Russell Collins, and appearing in the Boston Globe of January 15, 1950, relating to some of the constructive and effective efforts of our outstanding colleague from Massachusetts [Mr. FURCOLO]:

FURCOLO CALLED TO WHITE HOUSE TO EXPLAIN SCHOLARSHIP PLAN—HOW UNCLE SAM WOULD SEND 5,000 TO COLLEGE

(By Russell Collins)

SPRINGFIELD, January 14.—The Federal scholarship plan of FOSTER FURCOLO, freshman Congressman from the Second District, received the "green light" this week when President Truman in his budget message asked Congress to provide $1,000,000 to help capable youths get a college education.

The President's request was regarded here and in Washington as the first step toward establishment of the Furcolo plan under which the Federal Government would finance the college education of at least 5,000 high-school graduates annually, on a self-sustaining loan plan.

Although the plan appeared certain of having opposition before it is adopted, Congressman FURCOLO says he is confident Congress will act favorably upon this initial phase of his bill as asked by the President.

Congressman FURCOLO attracted national attention last spring when he was invited to the White House to discuss his proposed Federal scholarship plan with the President. Veteran newsmen at Washington said they couldn't remember when a freshman Congressman had been similarly honored.

Discussing his proposal this week, following the President's budget message, Congressman FURCOLO said it is based on two major premises:

First, no qualified high-school or college student should be deprived of a higher education because of financial inability to pay for it.

Second, in its present financial condition, the country is unable to provide that education free of charge.

"The aim of the Federal scholarship plan is to enable at least 5,000 high-school students a year to complete a college education when in the absence of the Federal scholarship plan they would be unable to do so," FURCOLO told a Globe reporter in his first detailed explanation of how his proposal would operate.

"The plan also would serve the same purpose for at least 500 college students a year to continue through postgraduate work," he added.

In its present state the Furcolo bill (now awaiting action by the Labor and Education Committee of the House) refers only to college and postgraduate higher education, he said. Actually it is intended to include students who will continue their education after high school whether it be in a college or some other institution of learning.

NO COST TO GOVERNMENT

"The initial plan is based on a college period of 4 years or a postgraduate period of 4 years," FURCOLO explained. "Since many courses would not take that length of time it is probable that the Federal scholarship plan would benefit 7,000 to 8,000 students a year, rather than the figure of about 5,000 or 5,500 upon which the plan is based.

"The benefits of the Federal scholarship plan are intended to be furnished at no actual cost to the Federal Government. The Government does provide money in the initial period of operation of the plan, but this money is not provided in the form of the usual appropriation. It is with this understanding that I say the benefits are made possible by the Federal Government but still at no actual cost to the Federal Government.

"I hope that eventually the time will come when this country can offer higher education to scholastically qualified students at absolutely no expense to the student. Post-high-school education should be free to those of our students who want and are qualified to continue higher education.

"The country has not yet reached the stage where it feels able to provide higher education free of charge. Until that time comes, I advocate the expedient of what I am terming the Federal scholarship plan."

FURCOLO, himself a graduate of Yale, where he paid for his education by working, said, "We must not lose sight of the fact that the country suffers in losing the potential qualities that have not been brought to fruition simply because thousands of individuals have been deprived of educations to fit their individual abilities. It is a public problem directly affecting the welfare of the community."

TEN-YEAR REPAYMENT PERIOD

In its working details, the plan provides for money to be advanced to students and then repaid at stated intervals over a period of 10 years, beginning after the educational period.

The amount of money to be advanced to those students continuing on from high school to college studies is fixed at a maximum of $1,000 per year. College students who are going on to postgraduate schools will receive a maximum of $1,500 a year.

The maximum time period for either group is 4 years of college studies for high-school graduates, or 4 years of postgraduate work for college students.

Those granted aid for college or post-high-school studies will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 4 years and $500 a year for the next 6 years.

Postgraduate students will repay the Government at the rate of $250 a year for the first 2 years, $500 a year for the next 2 years, and $750 a year for the next 6 years.

Repayments do not begin until the first year after the study period is completed.

In the year after such payments have been completed so that the entire loan has been repaid to the Federal Government, the student will make a gratuity payment equal to 10 percent of the total amount advanced to him by the Government.

On the above basis, the Federal Government would appropriate about $167,000,000 over a period of 14 years or a little less than $12,000,000 a year for the plan. Fourteen years after the start of the program it is unnecessary for the Government to make further appropriations because the plan has a self-sustaining revolving fund that finances itself.

STATES WOULD CONTRIBUTE

In addition to the Federal appropriations those States that accept the terms of the plan will contribute at the ratio of $100 for every $1,000 advanced by the Federal Government. After the first 14 years of operation of the plan, the total expense to the States is figured at $1,150,000 a year or $50 for every $1,000 loaned to the student. The amount per State will depend upon the population of the State. The yearly contribution of an average State would be about $48,000 for the first 14 years and about $24,000 thereafter.

The contribution of the States differs from that of the Federal Government in that the Federal Government's contribution is a loan and that of the States is an outright gift.

There is an estimated 10 percent loss on loans not repaid by students because of deaths, poor risks, and similar reasons. By the fourteenth year the yearly repayments of students come to $20,700,000. The total amount of the gratuity payment of 10 percent the student makes is $2,300,000 or again, deducting the estimated 10-percent loss, $2,070,000.

Beginning with the fifteenth year and continuing after that time, the yearly administration expenses are estimated at a maximum of $500,000.

When the plan gets under way a total of $23,000,000 will be given to approximately 20,000 college students and 2,000 postgraduate students. Beginning with the fifteenth year the Government would have a surplus of $420,000 annually to reduce the amount of the States' contributions or cover any error in the estimated costs of administration.

SELECTION UP TO STATES

FURCOLO said the method of selecting students would be determined after the program had been accepted by Congress. The selection would be left, insofar as is possible, to the individual State. The student would be allowed to choose the institution he wanted to attend. The plan would not interfere with any Federal-aid-to-education program.

After FURCOLO had outlined his bill in Congress last spring, he received a telephone call from the White House that an appointment had been made for him to see the President. He was with President Truman for about a half hour, during which the President asked him many questions about the proposals. FURCOLO admitted he was surprised at the knowledge of his proposal that the President apparently had.

President Truman told him a program to provide financial assistance to college students was close to his heart, FURCOLO said, and that the White House was giving it considerable study.

Thus, it was no surprise to the Congressman or to others familiar with the proposal when Mr. Truman this week presented his request for an initial appropriation of money to help provide college training for capable youth.

Seafarers International Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, I recently availed myself of an invitation extended to all Members of Congress by the Seafarers International Union to visit their headquarters branch at 51 Beaver Street, New York City. I was pleased to have the opportunity to see the hiring hall in action, and to learn what Paul Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic and Gulf district, Al Bernstein, their international representative, and others, are trying to accomplish.

I was convinced, that because of problems peculiar to the maritime industry, the union hiring halls have injected stability into the industry and have given to seafaring men a proper dignity and security that was impossible under the previous hiring practices.

Because I was so impressed with what I learned during my visit, I wish to take this opportunity to report to my colleagues on my experiences, and to give them the facts which were made available to me.

World War II proved conclusively that a large, strong, and efficient merchant marine is absolutely essential to our national security. Were it not for the fact that we were able to keep our ships sailing when the vessels of our allies virtually had been destroyed, it is not improbable that years would have been added to the conflict. In fact, victory might not have been ours.

It is important here to remember that the hiring hall was the backbone in keeping the ships crewed and moving in wartime to all theaters of operation.

The merchant marine has properly been called our second line of defense by those who shouldered the responsibility for the successful prosecution of our war effort. Just as we must maintain an Army and Navy strong enough to meet any emergency, so must we take the necessary steps to insure the continued efficient functioning of our merchant fleet. We should take no false comfort in the thought that Allied Nations are rebuilding their maritime industries. Constantly changing political alinements mean that the ally of today might well be the enemy of tomorrow.

There is no question that the highly successful operation of our merchant marine during the war was due to the stability achieved in the maritime industry over the past years. That stability should not be threatened, unless we are foolhardy enough not to have learned anything from the past conflict.

Yet the stability of this vital industry, and the job security of the workers dependent upon it for their livelihoods—and the security of the Nation—is threatened because of a serious shortcoming in the Taft-Hartley law.

Because of the ban on the closed shop, the existence of the maritime unions' hiring halls is in jeopardy. If the view of the lower courts is upheld by the Supreme Court, the ban will not only end the current hiring hall procedure with its democratic rotary system of shipping, it will destroy the maritime unions themselves and all their hard-won gains in behalf of their seafaring members.

It is possible that failure to exempt the union hiring halls from the provisions of the Taft-Hartley law was due to a lack of understanding on the part of many Members of Congress as to the nature of the hiring hall and its manner of operation.

As I saw it, the rotary hiring system is the most equitable method of dispatching men to jobs that has yet been devised, with seamen registering for jobs as they come off the ships and then being dispatched on a first-come, first-served basis.

Under the rotary hiring system, seamen who have been issued certificates by the United States Coast Guard testifying to their qualifications to sail in their particular ratings obtain jobs fairly and squarely. When a man wants employment, he registers at the union hiring hall, where he is issued a shipping card bearing the date of his registration.

As jobs come in, they are posted on the shipping board, listing the vessels, their destinations and other pertinent data. In addition, the dispatcher calls out the available jobs and those men who are qualified and wish to apply throw in their cards. Of those throwing in, the men with the oldest cards, or those who have been on the "beach"—unemployed—the longest, get the jobs. No one is compelled to take any employment. If an eligible seaman does not want a particular job, he simply does not throw in for it. He merely waits for one more to his liking to be called out. The date of his registration and the fact that he is qualified are the only considerations determining his right to the job.

I spoke with Paul Hall, secretary-treasurer of the Atlantic and Gulf district, and with his members of the SIU, and their sentiment in favor of this democratic system of obtaining jobs was overwhelming. The older seafarers were especially vigorous in their approval and in no uncertain terms they denounced

the degrading crimp halls and the shanghaiing methods that prevailed in the industry before the advent of the union hiring hall.

Crimp halls were generally seamen's boarding houses, whose unscrupulous proprietors served as employment agencies for equally unscrupulous shipowners. Crimps fleeced their seamen-guests, sinking them deeper and deeper into debt, until they were forced to accept one of the jobs offered them as a means of getting out of debt. The seamen's wages were then used to pay off the debt and, in addition, the crimp received a commission from the shipowner. It was a vicious cycle with the seamen never getting any more than a sum necessary to dispose of his obligation to the crimp.

Shanghaiing was an even more despicable method of supplying men to ships in those days. Manpower needs of a shipowner were satisfied by coercing or kidnapping seamen by crimps and saloon proprietors who would ply them with drugs and liquor, and then hustle them aboard ship.

The union hiring hall wiped out crimps' halls and shanghaiing, and the maritime industry is better off for it.

The union hiring hall also stepped up the efficiency and stability of the merchant marine by ending the employment of "summer sailors," generally well-to-do college students with connections who were pushed through Coast Guard qualification tests so that they could go to sea for a few months as a lark. As a result of this practice, qualified seamen who made a career of sailing and whose families were dependent upon them for sustenance were deprived of employment opportunities. They were forced to sit on the beach until these part-time sailors went back to school.

The union hiring hall not only provides fair treatment for the seamen, it has resulted in considerable advantage to the shipowners themselves, for with the innovation of union hiring came a stability that the industry never before enjoyed.

The Seafarers International Union maintains—and apparently without contradiction—that the end product of a strong union and the democratically administered system of rotary shipping is a membership that is conscientious and fully cognizant of its responsibilities as an important part of an important industry.

The Seafarers point out further that the destruction of the union hiring hall would wipe out many hard-won gains realized by organized seamen over the past 10 years, and chaos, confusion and all the sordid conditions that are now part of an inglorious history would return. And there is sound basis for this prediction.

The Congress of the United States can act to avert such a calamity. I believe all legislators share with me the desire to see our Nation move forward, not backward. I believe, therefore, that it is incumbent upon us to exempt the maritime unions from the closed shop ban. It is in the seamen's, the industry's, and Nation's interest that we do so.

Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Henry McLemore in the Washington Star of January 16:

SAYS FEDERAL SPENDING WILL COST OUR LIBERTY

(By Henry McLemore)

Up until the time of President Truman's budget talk I was against his national health program.

I had not read more than half of the President's budget speech before I realized that his national health program was completely necessary.

With that sort of budget someone has got to take care of a fellow when he becomes ill—he certainly won't be able to take care of himself. If this budget goes through, as it undoubtedly will, most of us will never have a penny any more.

When we get a cold, or a touch of croup, or a giddy spell in our head, we won't be able to call up doctors the way we used to, because we won't have any money to pay them with. Any money we have will be long gone to such places as the Maritime Commission ($162,230,466), Railroad Retirement Board ($612,881,136), and funds appropriated to the President ($4,133,988,085).

FIGURES OUT SACRIFICE

I hate to see the passing of doctors. In many ways they have been closer to the American family than any other professional men. The family doctor was the one man you could talk to. He was the one man who would get up at all sorts of hours and come to see you. He was the one man who knew you were being alarmed over nothing, but was still nice enough to come and allay your fears.

I wonder if Mr. Truman has ever completely figured out what he is asking this country to give up.

In case he hasn't figured it all out, I'll save him the trouble, because I have.

He and his advisers are asking Americans to give up America. If a halt is not called this country will not be the United States of America. Our heritage is being poured right down the drain. And it is much too fine a heritage to come to such an end. Our heritage is based absolutely on liberty—and that's what is being taken from us every time the clock ticks.

RECORD OF GENEROSITY

Speaking as an American, I would rather have it all taken in one big bite instead of having it nibbled away. I consider it an insult to my intelligence for my Government to think that I don't know what's going on. If all we were going to lose was money, I don't think many of us would complain. This country has proved its willingness to give away money to the world. This country has an unmatched record of generosity and decency. No one ever called for help and went unanswered.

But there has come a time when we are being asked, under the guise of politics, to quit being Americans. Day by day, slowly and surely, we are being asked to give away our pattern of life for the pattern of life of the Old World. Ours was the pattern of life of the New World. This country is known as the New World. It seems to me a shame that this country should be asked to walk in the footsteps of countries which have proved themselves failures.

This country was founded on strength and in my book there comes a time when the strong should be protected as much as the weak lest there come a time when there are no more strong to take care of the weak. Excuse my philosophy, readers, but I just had to get it off my chest.

Committed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Woman's Home Companion for December 1949:

COMMITTED

Where do you expect to be when you're a grandmother? Possibly you haven't a very definite idea but I doubt whether you expect to be in a mental hospital. Yet that's exactly where thousands of aged men and women end up every year—falsely labeled insane. Our mental hospitals are becoming a dumping ground for old people who don't belong there any more than you or I.

Says Dr. George S. Stevenson, president of the American Psychiatric Association and medical director of the National Committee for Mental Hygiene: "It is intolerable for a civilized society to permit the continuance of this situation—especially when solutions are at hand."

I have visited more than 40 public mental hospitals in recent years. I have seen rows on rows of old people waiting in numb despair for death to end their miserable existence. Few mental-hospital superintendents will deny that many should not have been there. Most superintendents are eager to have the public know the appalling facts.

When I visited Manhattan State Hospital in New York, I saw plentiful evidence of railroading. Three out of 5 of Manhattan's 25,000 patients are more than 60 years old. Most of the old people occupy the overcrowded back wards—the wards of the hopeless. They are huddled together during their waking hours in unearthly silence in gloomy dayrooms, arms folded, eyes riveted on bleak walls. At night they are herded into huge barnlike dormitories with beds so tightly packed that they almost touch one another.

They suffer from no mental disease; but they are the victims of a social disease—rejections Dr. John H. Travis, Manhattan State's superintendent, readily admits that his institution is no place for these people but adds that he is powerless to stem the tide of unjust commitments.

In my rounds of mental hospitals from New York to California, north and south, I have seen thousands of such elderly patients. One head of a mental hospital told me: "Our chronic troubles—overcrowding, understaffing, financial malnutrition, antiquated buildings and the like—are grave enough, without thrusting the unwanted aged upon us. It is not merely a medical problem. It is an ethical problem and the fault lies not with us but with the community."

The clinical director of a large New England hospital tugged vigorously at my coat and said with repressed emotion: "Many of these old folks die within a few days or weeks after they arrive here. They don't die of any

mental or physical disease. They die of a broken heart. They feel themselves betrayed. They no longer want to live. They commit psychic suicide."

In a large midwest State hospital for the insane, I found a lovely 68-year-old woman who looked strikingly like Whistler's famous portrait of his mother. She answered my questions sensibly and with dignity. As we left, the superintendent who was escorting me through the wards remarked: "They had no more right to commit that woman than you or me. She's a widow and was living with her son and daughter-in-law. Lately she's been a bit confused and forgetful, as often happens when people get old.

"With her son working all day and his wife busy taking care of their two children and the household, nobody could give her the little attentions she needed. The family finally felt it couldn't put up with her any longer. The good homes for the aged were too expensive. Then somebody told them that the State mental hospital had to take in almost anybody, that this was the place that would take her off her family's hands.

"So they went to their family doctor, greatly exaggerated her eccentricities, got a commitment order and here she is. There are many like her here. It's a disgrace. There ought to be more suitable places for them to live out their last years if they can't do it at home."

A psychiatrist in charge of one hospital's chronic ward showed me a stack of commitment papers recently received. "These are all court orders requiring us to admit elderly persons into our hospital," the doctor explained. "We can't ignore them even if we doubt the validity of the diagnosis."

I was shocked by the casual way many of the orders were drafted. Some merely stated that so-and-so was adjudged insane and should be admitted to the State mental hospital, without further explanation. Many were evidently based on perfunctory court hearings or medical examinations by general practitioners with no special training in psychiatry.

Of course, not all the old people in our mental institutions are victims of railroading. Many are suffering from the two main mental diseases that afflict the aged: psychosis with cerebral arteriosclerosis (hardening of the brain's arteries), and senile psychosis (serious deterioration of the mental capacities resulting from the aging process).

The railroaded ones of our time are the victims of two trends that, ironically, have brought material progress to our country. One is the fact that more of us are living longer because of the great advances in health and medicine. In 1900 there were only 3,000,000 persons over 65 in the United States, or slightly more than 4 percent of the total population. Today there are 11,000,000, or more than 7 percent.

The second trend is the gradual transformation of our society from a farming to an industrial economy. American families have been moving from roomy homes in rural areas, where several generations of a single family were accustomed to live together, to small apartments in crowded cities, where the family breaks up into separate units with every marriage.

Thus as the aged among us grow more numerous, the living space for them dwindles steadily. This aspect not only makes elderly people the displaced persons of the family home but actually precipitates them into real nervous break-downs. Their presence in a cramped apartment creates problems which too many of us are not prepared to solve. We may resent the curbs on freedom of movement. Young children in the family may be hostile and refuse to bring their friends home.

Dr. David A. Boyd, Jr., well-known psychiatrist on the staff of the Mayo Clinic, says: "Many of the acute psychoses of the aged necessitating admission to a psychiatric hospital are the upshot of family quarrels. After a short hospitalization the psychosis often recedes and the family is again faced with the same problem. Too frequently they refuse to accept it and the psychiatric hospital has another permanent resident."

Dr. Boyd also notes that a large portion of our mental hospital personnel and funds is diverted to what amounts to custodial care for the aged, in place of an active curative program for younger patients, thus seriously hampering the latter's chances for recovery.

What can be done? There is no single over-all solution; but a combination of steps can effectively eliminate the evil.

Here are some suggestions drawn up after consultations with leading experts in the field:

1. The old-time respect and tolerance for elderly people must be reawakened. The pernicious notion that they are used up, ready for the scrapheap must be eliminated. This change in attitude would be an important kind of insurance policy for all of us who must in time face the problem of growing old.

2. A great deal of mental and emotional disorder—and unhappiness—among older people could be prevented by giving them a chance for continued active participation in our social and economic life. Dr. Winfred Overholser, superintendent of St. Elizabeths Hospital in Washington, D. C. has wisely observed: "To force people, formerly active, to give up completely the work they have been doing and sit at home contemplating their difficulties is very likely to hasten their complete demoralization and distintegration."

3. Public opinion and professional resistance should be mobilized against the practice of railroading noninsane elderly folk to mental hospitals. Expanded community provision for housekeeping services and home nursing could keep many enfeebled old folk at home while helping to relieve family tensions.

4. Adequate alternatives to mental-hospital care must be devised for mentally enfeebled old folks. Some States are stepping up their family-care programs, placing more mentally enfeebled patients, including the aged, in selected private homes where they can obtain individualized attention and be more content than they can in mental hospitals.

5. Many experts agree with Dr. Boyd, of the Mayo Clinic, who urges the establishment by all States of a new type of institution for mentally enfeebled old people who cannot be kept at home. These institutions, exclusively for the aged, would be built on the colony or village plan—to minimize physical dangers while permitting maximum freedom of movement.

Such State homes, says Dr. Boyd, should be large enough to be operated economically and yet small enough to provide individualized attention. The staff would include physicians with special interest in geriatrics—the treatment of old age—together with nurses, occupational and recreational therapists, and social workers. The residents would be encouraged to use the skills they still have to the utmost degree compatible with their physical reserves.

This may sound visionary to the uninformed. But such a set-up would actually cost us no more than the wasteful practice of consigning the elderly noninsane to expensive buildings equipped for active hospital treatment. It would help restore public mental hospitals to their primary function of active curative treatment. And it would help erase from our souls the stigma of tolerating such an evil as railroading the sane to "insane" asylums.

Civil Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the resolutions on civil rights adopted at the eleventh constitutional convention of the CIO on October 31 to November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the resolutions were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Resolution 20

Civil rights and the extension of democracy

We of the Congress of Industrial Organizations are proud of the American quest for liberty and the struggle for equality. We seek to implement this great heritage. We are dedicated to the responsibility for furthering economic opportunity, religious freedom, and political participation. Our ultimate goal is full economic, political, and social equality for all groups and individual American citizens in thought, expression, and action, without discrimination because of race, creed, or national origin.

Our American heritage of freedom and equality has given us prestige among the nations of the world and a strong feeling of national pride at home. There is much reason for that pride. But pride is a poor substitute for steady and honest performance, and the record shows that at varying times in American history the gulf between ideals and practice has been shockingly wide. We have had human slavery. We have religious persecution. We have mob violence. We have erected an elaborate system of legal segregation based on race. We have shown at times a complete disregard for the constitutional rights of minorities with whose ideas the majority disagrees.

Our system of segregation that the dead hand of the past has fastened upon our generation does not only establish a system of segregation enforced by the sanction of law, but it penalizes the citizen who has no prejudices. A citizen who desires his children to be educated with all the children in the community, both black and white, is forbidden this privilege by law. These laws do not only merely carry out the prejudices of some members of the community; they compel everybody else to abide by such prejudices. The effects of segregation are not confined to those who are colored. They extend to everyone; they bear vitally upon the interest of the Nation as a whole.

To be free, men must be subject to discipline by society only for the commission of offenses clearly defined by law and only after trial by due process of law. Preservation of civil liberties is the highest duty of every government, whether it be Federal, State, or local. Wherever the law enforcement measures and the authority of government are unused or inadequate to discharge this primary function of government, this authority must be strengthened.

Recognizing these facts, President Truman created the President's Committee on Civil Rights on December 5, 1946, with the specific responsibility of preparing recommendations for more effective means and procedures for the protection of the civil rights of the people of the United States.

The findings and recommendations of this committee, in the form of the report, To Secure These Rights, will rank in history as a charter for human dignity and freedom. With courage and devotion to these principles, the President has steadily moved forward in implementing them. He has requested each succeeding Congress to translate this report into legislative reality. He has implemented the report by Executive orders. Progress is being made in the Armed Forces—slow, but the trend is forward. The Department of Justice petitioned the Supreme Court to outlaw racially restrictive covenants in housing. The Department of Justice petitioned the Supreme Court during the October 1949 term to declare segregation in interstate travel illegal.

The CIO unreservedly supports President Truman's civil rights program. We are determined to secure the adoption of these recommendations on the Federal and State level. We feel that the enactment of this program will enable America in actual practice to show the world that we intend to close the gap between our stated ideals and our day-to-day practices. We firmly oppose segregation based upon race, wherever it exists, and pledge our efforts toward the elimination of segregation. Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Eleventh Constitutional Convention of the Congress of Industrial Organizations hereby pledges itself to continue the struggle to achieve the full, equal enjoyment of all the rights guaranteed in the Constitution of the United States, regardless of race, color, creed, or national origin.

We recommend:

That each CIO affiliate create a Civil Rights Committee or Department on Fair Practices within its respective organizations; and that each international union seek to have incorporated in their collective bargaining agreements non-discrimination clauses particularly pertaining to hiring.

We demand:

1. The passage of Federal and State Fair Employment Practice Acts.
2. The enactment of a Federal antilynching bill.
3. The passage of Federal and State legislation outlawing poll taxes and other restrictions on the right to vote.
4. The abolition of segregation in the armed forces.
5. The passage of measures to ban segregation in interstate travel.
6. The enactment of safeguards against racial discrimination in Federal appropriations for State aid.
7. The enactment of civil rights laws in all States which now do not have such laws eliminating segregation.
8. The abolition of the Wood committee.
9. The enactment of laws protecting aliens long resident in the United States and regularizing their status.
10. The establishment of guarantees to protect the freedom of thought and the freedom of political views of Government workers and the revocation of Executive Order 9835.

Resolution 53

Due process in loyalty and security cases

The constitutional rights of the individual under our democratic American system require that he shall not be put in jeopardy or have his opportunity to earn a livelihood impaired or destroyed or have his reputation and peace of mind destroyed without a full and fair hearing subject to all the constitutional safeguards of our system of law.

It is the duty of our Government to protect the Nation against spies, saboteurs in the service or interest of foreign powers and agents acting to undermine or overthrow our Government. But it is equally the duty of our Government to make sure that the security measures employed to protect our democracy do not destroy the very democratic rights they are designed to protect. The most subtle and deadly advantage that totalitarianism can win is for democracy to destroy itself in its effort to defeat the upside-down morality of totalitarian states in which the individual becomes the creature, tool, and slave of dictatorial rule by terror. Thus would be accomplished the atomization of the masses which Hitler declared desirable and which the late Justice Rutledge denounced in declaring unconstitutional the attempt of the Taft-Hartley Act to prevent political action by workers through their unions.

The irresponsible, witch-hunting, headline-seeking proceedings of the House Un-American Activities Committee over the years have created an atmosphere of hysteria which, heightened by the cold war between democracy and aggressive totalitarianism, seriously endangers every individual's democratic rights. This hysteria does more to defeat than to accomplish the legitimate purpose of national security. We cannot be strong if every man is afraid of his brothers. That is not freedom; it is the paralyzing tyranny of fear.

Loyalty and security investigations of government employees and workers in private employment engaged in classified government contracts lack the safeguards which are essential to a fair hearing and they frequently violate the democratic rights of the individuals accused. The all too frequent use of unevaluated, unverified accusations by the security and investigatory agents in loyalty and security investigations, has brought to light the hazards to which loyal citizens are subjected without their knowledge and without opportunity to protect themselves.

Investigations, charges, hearings and dismissals carried on in this irresponsible manner have marked men and women for life, have impaired their ability to earn a living, and have irreparably damaged the reputations of themselves and their families. They have been punished without fair trial.

When applied to workers in private employment, loyalty and security investigations and dismissals conducted in this manner impair the morale of all workers in the plants, interfere with their union organizing activities and threaten their right to be effectively represented in the processing of grievances and in collective bargaining by shop stewards and union officers of their own choosing. Citizens of democratic nations who are known anti-Communist liberals, including democratically elected delegates to union conventions, have arbitrarily been barred from entry into the United States without stated cause or fair and timely hearing. Thus the rule of fear started by the Un-American Activities Committee spreads out to undermine the rights of individuals as citizens, and now, as the arms program and the atomic energy program expand, threatens to destroy the democratic unions of free workers: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, This Convention of the CIO calls upon President Truman to create a national commission of outstanding citizens from all walks of life to make an exhaustive review of all so-called loyalty and security procedures of all agencies of the Government, and to report and recommend measures that will fully protect the democratic rights of every individual while guaranteeing the necessary measure of national security.

The procedure employed to determine loyalty or reliability in a security sense of accused persons, including the procedures employed in deportation proceedings, must be revised to provide all the safeguards of our system of law which forms the basis of protection of civil rights. The accused must be presumed innocent until proven guilty. He must be informed of the charges against him and the evidence upon which such charges are based. He must have the right to be represented by counsel and must be given the opportunity to face and question his accusers. He must not be presumed guilty merely by alleged association with alleged subversive organizations, and the listing by the Attorney General of alleged subversive organizations without full and fair public hearings must be discontinued, and any organization listed as subversive by the Attorney General shall have the right to a full judicial review.

The decision must be made by responsible and informed persons competent to distinguish between rumor and evidence and who understand and respect our democratic ideals of due process, who clearly see and respect the distinction between disloyalty on the one hand and belief in a liberal social and economic philosophy or adherence to unpopular ideas on the other, and who appreciate the value of untarnished democratic ideals and practices in the global contest between the idea of freedom and the idea of totalitarianism.

The accused person must have the right to appeal an adverse decision to the regularly constituted courts.

In every case, employees who are cleared of charges of disloyalty or unreliability in a security sense must be given notice thereof and must be reimbursed for costs and loss of income caused by such loyalty or security procedures, and notice that they have been cleared of such charges must be given to all neighbors, friends, and others who were interviewed in the course of the investigation.

We applaud the courageous defense of academic freedom by those colleges and universities which defied the presumptuous attempt of the House Committee on Un-American Activities to censor textbooks, and who have opposed the loyalty oath, and we renew our demand for the abolition of that committee.

We endorse such measures as H. R. 14 by Congresswoman DOUGLAS, of California, which proposes to define rules for the conduct of investigations by all congressional investigating committees so as to protect the rights of persons appearing before such committees.

Resolution 62

Discrimination by American Bowling Congress

The constitution of the American Bowling Congress restricts membership in its affiliated associations to "individuals of the white male sex."

The American Bowling Congress exercises a monopoly of the sport of bowling and ousts from membership individuals who participate in tournaments which it does not approve.

The American Bowling Congress has consistently refused to change its discriminatory and monopolistic policies.

Proceedings to revoke the Illinois charter of the American Bowling Congress have been urged upon the State of Illinois and upon Cook County, Ill., by President Philip Murray, Secretary-Treasurer James B. Carey, Illinois IUC President Joseph Germano, regional director of the United Auto Workers, Pat Greathouse, and CIO Regional Director Michael Mann, and such proceedings have been instituted by John S. Boyle, States attorney: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, We commend our officers and we commend States Attorney Boyle for bringing about this action to revoke the charter of the American Bowling Congress and we urge them to continue in their efforts to rid the sport of bowling of this monopoly control and of this discrimination against Negroes.

We urge all CIO councils and international unions to discourage participation by their members in ABC leagues and tournaments, and to support bowling establishments, and leagues and tournaments where all people may bowl without discrimination.

Resolution 50

Amnesty for conscientious objectors

It is our firm belief that men who, under the compulsion of conscience, take a stand against military conscription in peacetime do not merit confinement in penitentiaries or the resulting loss of civil rights. Such treatment of a minority violates basic human and democratic principles of individual liberty and freedom of conscience. While we oppose the dangerous trend toward state control of religious and minority belief in other lands, it does not become us to make a crime of conscience in this country.

The legal machinery to stop these prosecutions has already been set up. Provisions exist in our law to get men now imprisoned released and the President has the power to grant an amnesty which would end discrimination against conscientious objectors: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Congress of Industrial Organizations, reaffirming a high tradition of the American labor movement, asks that the prosecution of men solely on account of their conscientious opposition to war cease; and we urge the immediate release of those conscientious objectors currently behind prison bars.

We call upon the President to grant amnesty to all conscientious objectors heretofore convicted for violations of the Selective Service Acts of 1940 and 1948.

(Copies of these resolutions be sent to the President of the United States and to the Attorney General of the United States.)

Formosa: How To Save It From Conquest by Chinese Communists—A Filipino's Suggestions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the island of Formosa is today the most vitally strategic point in the entire Pacific area. In the hands of the Communists it will break the American wall of defense in the western Pacific, exposing the American mid-Pacific and south Pacific region, the Philippines, and Indonesia to Communist strategical and tactical offensive planning.

The question is: What could be done to save Formosa from Chinese Communist conquest? The question is urgent. It must have a definite answer soon.

There is a suggestion that the United States give Gen. Chiang Kai-shek and his remaining Nationalist forces military aid. And yet it is apparent that, despite that aid, it is inevitable that the Communists will capture that island. And then, too, the United States Government is not considering giving that aid for broader reasons of foreign policy.

Mr. Speaker, an article which appeared in the Manila Daily Bulletin, published in Manila, Philippines, contains plausible suggestions to save Formosa from Communist conquest. The suggestions are of a legal and political nature whose aim is to remove Formosa from the area of fighting between the Chinese Communist and Nationalists.

Mr. Vicente Villamin, Filipino lawyer, economist and writer, the author of the article, suggests three alternatives: (a) The return of Formosa to Japan and be under General MacArthur's control by the revocation of the Cairo Declaration of 1943 upon the request of Nationalist China; (b) the granting of independence to Formosa by Nationalist China; and (3) the transfer by Nationalist China of Formosa to the United Nations for administration as a trusteeship territory.

Either one of the three alternatives, Mr. Villamin contends, would remove Formosa from the field of belligerency.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member of Congress to read Mr. Villamin's enlightening and timely article, which follows:

FORMOSA'S HOPE AGAINST CONQUEST

(By Vicente Villamin)

LOS ANGELES, December 8.—The immediate future of Formosa is of vital concern to the security of the Philippines. If it came under the control of the Communists, that security would become exceedingly precarious. It will be recalled that the invasion of the Philippines by the Japanese in the last war came from their military concentrations on Formosa.

What could the Philippines do in the present circumstances to prevent Formosa from falling in the hands of the Chinese Communist government? Practically nothing. And what could the United States do, as obviously the control of Formosa by the Communists would affect disadvantageously her strategic position in the Pacific area and her plans to "contain and counteract" communism in the Far East?

The situation demands a bold and immediate treatment. Formosa could be returned to Japan and thus remove it from the area of belligerency between the Chinese Nationalists and Communists—and its permanent future status left for the forthcoming peace conference to determine. Is this legally feasible?

Formosa was detached from Japanese control after the war and restored to China. This was done in conformity with the Cairo Declaration, issued on December 1, 1943, by President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill and Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek, following their meeting at Cairo, Egypt. By the same declaration, Manchuria and Pescadores Island were similarly restored. This declaration could be rescinded, resulting in Formosa reverting to Japan.

It will be noted that Russia was not represented at the meeting and did not take part in the declaration. Thus if the declaration is to be rescinded as to Formosa and the Pescadores, which were taken over by Japan after the Sino-Japanese War in 1895, it could be done by the three governments of the United States, Great Britain, and Nationalist China. And if it is to be done, it should be effected before Chiang's government totally goes out of existence.

Generalissimo Chiang is reported to be making preparations for stiff resistance to the Communists on Formosa. But military authorities are of the opinion that it would not take long for the Communists to capture that island. If they accomplished that before its political status was changed, then the Communists would have legitimate ground to incorporate the island in the new Chinese Communist Republic.

The rescission of the Cairo declaration with respect to Formosa and the Pescadores, leaving out Manchuria for obvious reasons, would not be politically irregular or diplomatically revolutionary if it were proposed by Generalissimo Chiang himself on behalf of his government. Such a proposal by him would have to be accompanied by his simultaneous stoppage of all war preparations on and the withdrawal of his government from the islands.

Another step Generalissimo Chiang could take to remove Formosa from military and political investment by the Communists would be to grant sovereign independence to that island. There are leading Chinese Formosans who have been working on Formosan independence from Japan and who would welcome now that independence from China. A Formosan Republic would, indeed, be militarily weak and vulnerable to attack by Chinese Communist invaders, but such attack, if unprovoked by Formosan action, would bring the full force of world opinion against it to the point where the Chinese Communists would most likely be convinced that they might lose much more than what they could gain in invading the new island nation.

Of course, once an independent nation, Formosa would have to pursue a policy of strict neutrality, at least until the peace conference was held and her independence firmly established. Later, she might make some arrangements with the United States, like permitting it to have military and naval bases as in the Philippines and placing herself with other far-eastern countries in a position to receive American military assistance.

Still another possibility to segregate Formosa from the area of the present Chinese belligerency would be for the Nationalist government to turn the island over to the United Nations for administration as a trust territory. That would have the effect of placing it, roughly, in a status of a country under a neutralization treaty.

The foregoing suggestions could be taken up on behalf of China after determination of who is the head of the Nationalist government—General Chiang or General Li. The latter is now in the United States, while the former is reported to be in Formosa. The two leaders are both patriotic and anti-Communist, and they would not want to see Formosa fall under Communist domination if they could help it.

Lewis and the Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, the failure of the President to recognize the current coal crisis, which is not only crippling one of our basic industries, but threatening to slow down or stop completely production in thousands of others, despite the pleadings from every side—is perfidious behavior—and a violation of faith.

When he steadfastly refuses to use the power given him under the special provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, or the Constitution, he places himself in the position of a man whose actions are a direct contradiction of his professed image of longing—the welfare state. This disparity between his actions and his words should not be condoned by the American people.

The President occupies the position of a political magistracy, and while such, is in a position of great trust. It is my opinion that unless the President takes action—and immediate action—he will

be forever ashamed, as a man always is, of the things he has left undone.

The attitude of the Government since 1933—NIRA—has forced both workers and their employers into a state of conciliation which, under the leadership of men like Lewis, of the United Mine Workers, has caused an impasse which threatens to undermine not only the coal industry, but our national economy as well as our national health and safety.

Despite my rigorous efforts to prevent the complete nullification of the Taft-Hartley Act, and I consistently voted for its modification—I have studied the situation which confronts us with the cold impartiality of a neutral judge. And I can only say that I find the present attempt to sabotage the Taft-Hartley Act, one of the most dismaying betrayals of democracy that has ever been perpetrated.

Things have reached an intolerable situation when one man not only can, but does so ruthlessly control the destinies of all the members of his union, and who can, and does—either by suggestion or intimation call them out or send them back to suit his whims of the moment, with utter and complete disregard for either their welfare, or that of their families. This same disregard extends to the industry which employs them, and on to the thousands of other industries which are dependent upon it.

This man is too ambitious and too autocratic. His influence is reaching out, by way of trade-unionism, like the tentacles of an octopus until, if he is permitted to continue unchecked by some device, could create such a havoc as will leave us an easy prey to communism.

I call your specific attention to the catch-all union of John L. Lewis. Through this organization, known as District 50, United Mine Workers, and completely apart from his influence in the coal industry by operation of the UMW proper, he can cripple transportation in New York's suburban area, shut off gas in Boston, halt the production of nylon wearing apparel, disrupt the du Pont chemical works, tie up the port of Philadelphia, halt traffic on a dozen railroads, and cause cessation of labor and thus the stoppage of production in a score or more of other important industries.

What is District 50?

I must first point out what it is not:

(a) It is not a district.

(b) It is not No. 50.

(c) It is not a miner's union.

But it is an organization dedicated to the task of grabbing membership in any field or industry not securely controlled by some other powerful union. Its membership, though secret, is rumored to be less than 300,000, but it has more than 300 skilled organizers, working in 48 industries, and has established 1,200 locals in 644 cities of 45 States in the United States and Canada.

It is also reliably reported that district 50 is organizing everything everywhere; that it had contracts with 15 railroads and covers such diverse occupations as salt plants and taxi drivers, and from du Pont's chemical works to entire southern cities. In this last instance I cite Buena Vista, Va., where almost everyone who works for wages pays dues to District 50.

With Lewis and his UMW occupying such an autonomous position in so many industries, it is difficult to understand why he or they should enjoy immunity from prosecution under the antitrust laws, or why these laws should not be amended as suggested by the Senate Banking Committee, to curb labor monopolies.

We are faced with the fact that too much power is concentrated in the hands of one man and his union. We cannot revoke that power, under existing laws, but we can legislate to prevent the complete demoralization of industries like the fuel field. To allow John L. Lewis, or any other labor boss, to exercise monopolistic powers unchecked will, in my opinion, irreparably damage our system of government.

There is a limit at which forebearance ceases to be a virtue. It is impossible to overlook or disregard facts like the following:

The recent telegraphic survey made in the United States, reports widespread suffering and hardships because of the bituminous coal dispute in the 10 following principal bituminous using States: Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Ohio, Pennsylvania, New York, and Wisconsin.

The shut-down of school systems was reported imminent. Hospitals and institutions face alarming shortages. In several areas a state of emergency has been declared. Rationing has been and is being employed in others, while the machinery for rationing was being set up in the remainder of the 36 towns, all of which reported less than a week's supply of coal. All report that acute suffering has been offset only by mild weather.

Dealers in all 10 States reported they were unable to supply the needs for homes. A majority of coal dealers reported it will be next to impossible to supply home needs even though the mine work week of 5 days is restored at once. The dealers also pointed out that a delay is inevitable even though the President should decide to exercise his powers to order the restoration of the 5-day workweek, as he did in 1946.

Precedent for Presidential action is set by the fact that since the Taft-Hartley law went into effect the White House has acknowledged seven disputes in the national emergency category. Six court injunctions have been issued as a result of pleas by the Attorney General at the direction of the President. They were:

March 19, 1948: Strike of atomic energy workers at Oak Ridge.

April 21, 1948: Strike of United Mine Workers.

August 25, 1948: Strike of the International Longshoremen.

June 14, 1948: Strike of the Maritime Union workers—west coast.

June 14, 1948: Strike of the National Maritime Union—Great Lakes.

June 23, 1948: Strike of the National Maritime Union.

In the seventh case, involving a packing house strike, the White House appointed a board of inquiry, but no injunction was sought.

Unfortunately the precedents deliberately established by the Chief Executive, regarding the antics and tactics of the United Mine Workers' Mr. Lewis, may make it difficult for him to do an about-face, in his general attitude toward the UMW, especially when it might mean using the law he has tried so hard to outlaw. However, Henry Clay said in his speech on appointments and removals in the United States Senate on February 18, 1835, "Precedents which have never been reexamined can not be conclusive."

But should the President not choose to use the act he has found so distasteful he has no such excuse for the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. Under this clause he could intervene in this national catastrophe, as is his privilege when the best interests of the people of the United States are threatened.

I call these facts on the coal strike briefly to your attention:

June 30, 1949: The contract between the United Mine Workers and the operators expired. John L. Lewis put miners on a 3-day workweek without making his demands known to the public.

September 19: Lewis called a total strike of the Nation's soft-coal miners as a protest against the withholding of welfare royalty payments by some southern operators who claimed they could not meet the payments on a 3-day production schedule.

November 9: Lewis, without explanation suddenly called off this strike and all restrictions on coal production were lifted by him for 3 weeks.

December 1: Lewis, again without explanation, ordered miners back to a 3-day workweek.

He announced new contracts signed with independent coal mines and his union, but did not disclose the high-handed methods he used. In two instances he closed down mines completely, not even permitting them a 3-day workweek, and it was reported by a prominent Washington columnist that he had sworn and signed affidavits by the owners of those mines, namely the Cove Fork Coal Co. and the Elkhorn Coal Co., both in Pike County, Ky., and operated by Jack Picklesimer and Fon M. Johnson, who stated they were expected to sign contracts they were not allowed to see or study.

I quote from the column, the Washington Merry-Go-Round, in the Washington Post, which appeared Saturday, December 31, 1949, in which the statements of Picklesimer and Johnson appeared:

> We were called to a meeting at the United Mine Workers' headquarters of the truck mine operators on December 2, 1949, at 6 o'clock. We attended, and Sam Caddy, president of the United Mine Workers, District 30, proposed that we sign a contract with the mine workers which was to extend to September 1, 1951.
>
> A part of the terms were disclosed to us. Included in the terms about which we were told was a 95-cents-per-day increase in wages, a 15-cents-per-ton increase in the welfare fund payments, and a broadening and alteration of the "able and willing" clause which, we were told was to enable the

mine workers to control the production of the various mines in the country to prevent an overproduction of coal.

January 4, 1950: Despite President Truman's insistence that the coal strike had not created a national emergency, the Interstate Commerce Commission held that a national emergency did in fact exist, and ordered all coal-burning passenger service reduced by one-third by January 8. This order is effective for 60 days, and, of course, would be rescinded should the conditions in the coal industry improve.

But I call your attention to the fact that 27 percent of the total passenger service in this country is operated by coal-burning steam locomotives. The other 73 percent are either Diesels or electric, or are, as in the cases of railroads in the Southwest, have converted their equipment to use oil in steam engines.

At the time the cut in operation was ordered few of the railroads in the country had more than a 25-day supply, whereas they normally keep from 30 to 40 days' supply on hand. The railroads as a whole averaged a 19-day supply. Six or seven of the railroads in the country were reported already at the danger stage, having less than 10 days' supply on hand.

In the opinion of the Interstate Commerce Commission a 3-day workweek is not sufficient for this time of year when normally 13,000,000 to 14,000,000 tons are mined in full production. Only about 7,000,000 to 8,000,000 tons can be mined during the curtailed week, leaving a shortage of more than 5,000,000 tons. Should the country be hit by a severe cold wave, such as resulted in the deaths of 30 people over the week end, in less than 2 weeks we would have no coal at all. Our supplies would be completely depleted.

On January 6, 1950, faced by the seriousness of the coal situation of which the President refuses to take cognizance, Democratic Members of both the House and Senate pleaded with him to take action, and as a direct result have been thrown into one of the most grave situations in their history. This serves to emphasize the unworthiness and the why of his reluctance to use, and his campaign against the Taft-Hartley Act, which is gaining support daily from earnest and conscientious men who put the needs of their constituents, and the welfare of the country as a whole, above their party politics.

Their appeal came 3 days after the President, in his state of the Union message renewed his demand for the repeal of the labor statute, which would leave the country facing the same old abuses it suffered under the Wagner Labor Act passed in 1935, in which there were no provisions for checking arrogance and autocratic power, when wielded unjustly, to the detriment of the public interests, like Mr. Lewis is now exercising.

The President's reluctance to act might charitably be construed that he does not want to act in haste—or that he does not honestly believe that the crisis does exist—these reasons might be understandable—but his continued attack on the law itself is not. The law is designed, not to punish unions, but to protect the people from excessive punishment and hardships at the hands of irresponsible labor leaders, such as Mr. Lewis has proven himself to be, and from irresponsible employers and owners as well.

On January 9, 1950, Lewis pulled his miners out of the pits of two of the biggest soft-coal producers—Consolidation Coal Co., and the United States Steel Corp. By midweek this walk-out increased until about 60,000 miners in 7 States were completely idle and more than 400,000 tons of daily production were eliminated from the Nation's shrinking coal supply, and its rapidly dwindling stock pile.

This was possible under the contracts signed July 8, 1947, by 75 percent of the soft-coal operators, in which the "able and willing" clause appeared for the first time, and which was designed to write the United Mine Workers out from under the Taft-Hartley Act. This same contract increased hourly pay 44⅝ percent—the largest per hour increase granted any union in any industry since the beginning of the war. And it nearly doubled the total average increase granted both the CIO and the AFL unions. In addition the welfare and retirement fund royalties were increased to 10 cents per ton, for the period ending June 30, 1948.

The 3-day order has been denounced by the Senate Banking Committee, who declared in their report made after a survey last summer, that this order by Lewis imposing the short week, was the very antithesis of collective bargaining. They not only admit but agree that Lewis has been pursuing for months the policy of curtailing production in order to force operators to accede to his contract demands.

Neither the President, nor Robert N. Denham, general counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, whom 45 mine groups had asked to end the short workweek, made any move to take action on the demands made upon them—that they seek court injunctions to force the miners back to a 5-day week.

On January 11, Lewis ordered these 60,000 to 75,000 striking miners back to a 3-day workweek beginning the 16th. As the coal strike progresses the coal operators are filing unfair labor practice charges against Lewis and his mine union before the National Labor Relations Board. Mr. Lewis' only comment was that the only issue at present in the labor dispute is wages.

The President was again besought by Members of both House and Senate to invoke an antistrike injunction—on a regional basis in Indiana and Michigan, and in any other place where there is an emergency.

Others were busy seeking legislative weapons, and in ascertaining whether or not Mr. Lewis can be prosecuted under the antitrust laws, and whether or not they are applicable to unions such as the United Mine Workers.

Mine owners again declared that all of the off-and-on-again strikes were simply harrassment to needle them into accepting the UMW demands for a 95 cents per day wage increase from the present $14.05, and a 35-cent instead of a 20-cent tonnage royalty for the miner's pension fund, and for a further easing of the able-and-willing clause. They point out that their employees have lost, because of the strikes in 1949, more than $1,000 in wages per union mine worker.

The Southern Coal Producers' Association, in their letter to the President of January 12, asked that he instruct the Attorney General to ascertain whether or not Lewis and the UMW could be prosecuted for an illegal conspiracy in restraint of trade. They also asked that if such action is impossible under existing laws and the decisions of the courts that Congress should amend the antitrust laws so that unions and their leaders can no longer willfully and recklessly use their monopoly powers.

I quote the following from their letter:

If a combination of employers to restrain trade and curtail production is against the public welfare, why is not the restraint of trade and curtailment of production in a basic industry by a union against the public welfare?

Not only the Southern Coal Producers found it impossible to bargain successfully with the union this year, but all others as well, who did not completely capitulate to Mr. Lewis' demands—especially as far as the "able and willing" clause is concerned in a new contract.

It is through this clause that Lewis not only hopes to evade the restrictions of the Taft-Hartley Act, but to set himself up as the marketing boss of the bituminous-coal industry as well, and through this power measure out coal to the country.

The Southern Coal producers further point out that the country's coal supply was the smallest in a period covering 25 years, and considerably under the levels when the President twice declared national emergencies. According to available statistics, the Nation's stock pile had dipped to 23,000,000 tons, most of which is in the hands of steel companies and large utilities, while most consumers had little more than a ton or two.

In November 1946, before the passage of the Taft-Hartley Act, the President first used the weapon of injunction to force the miners to end a strike, by declaring a national emergency. In March of 1948, President Truman again declared an emergency, using the 80-day Taft-Hartley injunction to end a mine strike over pensions.

On both these occasions, according to Joseph E. Moody, president of the Southern Coal Producer's Association, the coal supplies were larger than they are today, and that only once in the last 25 years has the total national supply of coal dipped below the 25,000,000 mark, and that was in June 1933—at the bottom of the depression.

If, in 1946—and again in 1948, the President could recognize a national crisis when he saw one—and hasten to corrrect it by declaring a national emergency—what is wrong with his eyesight today?

Since 1947 in the southern area alone, there have been 414 work stoppages during which 483,552 man-days were lost and

more than 2,812,000 tons of coal were lost because of these wildcat strikes—at a time when there was a demand for every ton of coal produced.

He insists there is no emergency in the face of the foregoing facts, and refuses to act—despite urgent demands from every side—but it is not reasonable to assume he will not allow himself to be aware of the following facts:

Coal producers in Pennsylvania are threatening to stop all research and experiments to produce liquid fuel from coal.

That due to wildcat strikes called by Lewis the export market has been practically lost, due to the fact they could not get the grades or sizes of coal they needed in sufficient quantities to supply their markets, and countries who have borrowed money from us to finance their rehabilitation have been forced to divert coal scheduled for other purposes to make up the deficit, which slows down their recovery program and takes more dollars out of the taxpayers' pockets.

Schools, churches, and other public buildings face the prospect of being closed even if the miners return to a 3-day workweek. Factories, industries, and manufacturing plants face shut-downs so that the coal they normally consume can be channeled into household furnaces, thereby throwing countless thousands out of work.

This year, for the first time since the war, the operators in all sections face problems created by a shrinking demand for coal and increasingly stiff competition from oil and gas.

Prices have dropped and further reductions may be necessary to prevent additional inroads on the coal market. In 1942 coal accounted for 51.4 percent of the country's supply of energy. Last year the figure was cut to 42.4 percent, and will take a further drop as industries tire of the cat-and-mouse game of Mr. Lewis which keeps them on the griddle of suspense.

These drops, coupled with the development of enormously productive new mine machinery, create problems also for the members of Mr. Lewis' union, as well as for the operators. In 1923 there were 704,793 men employed in the soft coal fields. Last year a larger quantity of coal was mined by 435,000 men. In less than 10 years it is forecast that only 250,000 men will be required to keep the country in coal.

The first concern of the public is a stabilized coal supply. There must be no stoppage of work. To prevent such occurrences there must be invoked the legal tenets compatible with the situation at hand.

It was in the public interest that the Chamber of Commerce of the United States made their telegraphic survey of 36 cities—all of which reported critical shortages—most of them having less than a week's supply.

In the face of this report the President issued a statement at a news conference that he had no immediate plans to restore full coal production by using the Taft-Hartley Act's injunction emergency powers against Mr. Lewis and his union.

Following the President's statement a further report by the Senate Banking Committee suggested a bill forbidding labor to monopolize control of industry. Such a measure, the report said, would stop the usurpation and abuse of power as demonstrated by the 3-day-work-week order. Seven Democrats and three Republicans made up the committee membership. Their report has been sent to the Senate Judiciary Committee, which attends to antitrust legislation.

Mr. Ben Moreell, president of Jones & Laughlin Steel Corp., of Pittsburgh, suggested that the 7-month coal contract dispute between Mr. Lewis and the mine operators could be settled on the lines of the agreement which ended last fall's big steel strike.

He went on record as saying:

> J. & L. wants its miners to receive the same dependable pensions, insurance, and social benefits as all our other employees, and it is willing to extend to the miners the same plan for these benefits as it now has in effect for all of our other wage earners.

You will remember that the steel strike referred to was settled through a fact-finding board, appointed by the President, which recommended that the steel workers receive monthly pensions of $100 per month, plus social insurance.

Announcement has also been made that several Federal agencies have been unable to attract bids for coal supplies, and that the Interior Department was also making a survey. It was reported that Army camps within, and surrounding the District, are virtually without coal.

Following its survey, Herman W. Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, proposed, when the President failed to take action, that the Department of Labor be reorganized to promote peace between the worker and the boss and that this Department should then be called the Department of Labor and Management, to meet the requirements of the times, and added:

> When the Labor Department was established in 1913—to promote the welfare of wage earners, improve their working conditions and advance their employment opportunities, labor needed the assistance of the Government to correct injustices and encourage fair bargaining between labor and management. This has been accomplished.

Robert N. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, issued a statement revealing how an important law has been sabotaged and its principals ignored just because the President of the United States, who appoints the members of the Board, does not like the statute and is urging its repeal.

The Constitution stipulates that a President when he takes the oath of office must swear to execute the laws of the land. Civil officers and members of the boards take the same oath.

Mr. Denham had this to say about the National Labor Relations Board:

> When you have spent 10 years or so, saturated with the statutory and administrative theory that one segment of our economic society must be protected, no matter what, and that the offsetting segment of that society must be saddled with the blame for everything that happens, even though the actual offender may be frequently found in the protected group, that kind of thinking and acting is hard to eradicate.

CIO President Philip Murray urged President Truman to remove Denham from office, saying that he had again demonstrated his antilabor bias, and his unfitness for office.

Joseph A. Bierne, president of the CIO communication workers, accused Denham of stalling labor cases, which would be helpful to unions.

Al Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists, unaffiliated, said he was "shocked" that a responsible public official of the Government "should use his high office to cast doubt on the integrity of that agency and agitate among employers to nullify its work."

Mr. Denham's reply to his unionistic critics was to the effect that he might be expected to seek a writ against the UMW which would in effect accuse them of "unfair" practices and using coercion in contract dealings with operators. He is now studying the mine operator's requests for an injunction against the 3-day workweek, production stoppage, and failure to bargain collectively.

There has been word from the coal fields that many of the men would not respond to the "request" of Mr. Lewis that they return to the mines on a 3-day basis. In many sections they have voted to stay away. They are reported both angry and impatient over the failure of Mr. Lewis to obtain contracts after a 6 months' delay with which to replace the industry-wide agreement which expired last June 30. So far 68,000 remain idle in 7 States.

"It's 5 days or nothing," one miner remarked after his Pennsylvania local had decided to stay on strike. "We're tired of going in, then going out, then going in again."

Another reason for the discontent of the miners is the mismanagement and squandering of their welfare fund. This unforeseen collapse of union benefits, coupled with the erratic work schedule imposed by Lewis, has dumped unbudgeted relief obligations on local authorities.

This fund was established in 1946, and coal was taxed 5 cents per ton to raise money for its operations. In the 1948 contract, the tax had risen to 20 cents per ton, and Mr. Lewis now demands 15 to 20 cents in addition to keep it going. This would amount to $175,000,000 to $200,000,000 per annum, and is added to the cost of producing coal, and without any guaranty to the miners that the trustees of the fund would not dissipate it again because it is still set up to operate on an unsound actuarial basis, as it was when payments were suspended on September 17, 1949.

For the benefit of the miners this fund should be put on a sound actuarial basis with the standards of benefits and the rules of eligibility clearly established, and written into the contracts covering this fund signed by the union and the operators, instead of being squandered as mad money.

Announcement has also been made by prominent members of the Senate Labor

Committee that influential Democrats will attempt to see that there is no action taken in the current congressional session to write a new labor-management law or strengthen the teeth of the present Taft-Hartley law.

Apparently this is the decision of the CIO and AFL high command, aided and abetted by President Truman and the politicians in the Democratic Party who think they have a prize issue on which to gain a bigger majority for their party in Congress in 1950.

It means that all efforts to get a two-sided law which would be fair to labor and management alike, are to be abandoned in favor of a drive to obtain at the polls a majority dedicated to the principle of special privilege and monopolistic power by single economic groups over the lives and rights of others.

For 2 years now, since the Taft-Hartley Act was passed, union-labor bosses, who brazenly promise blocks of votes—regimented by economic coercion—in return for special legislative favors, have fought against any course of mutual concessions and have insisted instead on an extreme position of all or none. They have served notice that they want the old Wagner Act, with its provisions loaded in behalf of labor unions, restored.

And this, despite the fact that labor unions have enjoyed the largest membership and their greatest gains under collective-bargaining processes that they have known in all the previous history of the trade-union movement in America.

And although President Truman has called the act punitive and one-sided a national survey of opinion is not shared generally by voters outside of labor union circles. One in six said laws governing unions are too strict. Vote of labor union members interviewed showed that 29 percent felt they were too strict; 35 percent felt they were about right; 23 percent felt they were not strict enough; only 13 percent had no opinion.

Congress then, has no reason to wait for invocation of the Taft-Hartley Act by the President before it takes action on this phenomenon of industrial dictatorship.

What the Nation must deal with is something far more serious than a temporary paralysis of industry and commerce because of a deadlock between employers and a powerful union.

Mr. Lewis has asserted a one-man control over a great industry on which a vast number of factories, plants, power plants, railroads, and private homes are dependent for fuel. He says in effect that the industry must meet his demands or cease to operate.

Even during the war he called four strikes to force his edicts—and since that time has repeatedly interrupted coal production for the same purpose.

His conviction for contempt of court for extending a strike in the face of judicial orders has not restrained him.

The immediate problem before Congress is how to go about ending dictation of the Lewis brand—the President may veto any action we might take on the matter—but we cannot escape our responsibility.

Unless Congress is willing to let both industry and the rank and file of miners go through the wringer at the autom-onous dictation of this tyrant, we must take up this problem from a more basic viewpoint than the 80-day injunction clause.

A miners' union is a necessity to keep conditions from reverting to where they were 20 years ago. But the operators must also be protected in certain details and left to exercise their managerial duties based on sound business, and with the welfare of the people, as a whole, firmly in mind.

Lewis has fought a long battle against the Government—putting himself above it. There are still those who strongly believe he should have been tried for treason in both World Wars. His record as a whole is a most unsavory one.

A world to be rebuilt needs coal—and the things it makes possible to manufacture.

We are all being enjoined by the people of the United States to substitute reason for tyrannical action, and to this end, I wish to go on record as recommending not only strong legislative restrictions, but the establishment of a permanent fact-finding board to handle all such disputes as may arise between labor and management; and that this board be nonpolitical, so that it may be free from any arbitrary compulsion, with the full power and the dignity of the Government behind it.

What Price Freedom?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an address by Robert M. Hutchins, chancelor, University of Chicago, before the Chicago University convocation in June 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT PRICE FREEDOM?

We hear on every side that the American way of life is in danger. I think it is. I also think that many of those who talk the loudest about the dangers to the American way of life have no idea what it is and consequently no idea what the dangers are that it is in.

You would suppose, to listen to these people, that the American way of life consisted in unanimous tribal self-adoration. Down with criticism; down with protests; down with unpopular opinions; down with independent thought. Yet the history and tradition of our country make it perfectly plain that the essence of the American way of life is its hospitality to criticism, protest, unpopular opinions, and independent thought. A few dates like 1620, 1776, and 1848 are enough to remind us of the motives and attitudes of our ancestors. The great American virtue was courage.

We ought to be afraid of some things. We ought to be afraid of being stupid and unjust. We are told that we must be afraid of Russia, yet we are busily engaged in adopting the most stupid and unjust of the ideas prevalent in Russia, and are doing so in the name of Americanism. The worst Russian ideas are the police state, the abolition of freedom of speech, thought, and association, and the notion that the individual exists for the state. These ideas are the basis of the cleavage between east and west.

Yet every day in this country men and women are being deprived of their livelihood, or at least their reputation, by unsubstantiated charges. These charges are then treated as facts in further charges against their relatives or associates. We do not throw people into jail because they are alleged to differ with the official dogma. We throw them out of work and do our best to create the impression that they are subversive and hence dangerous, not only to the state, but also to everybody who comes near them.

The result is that every public servant must try to remember every tea party his wife has gone to in the past 10 years and endeavor to recall what representatives of which foreign powers she may have met on these occasions. A professor cannot take a position on any public question without looking into the background of everybody who may be taking the same position on the same question. If he finds that any person who is taking the same position on this question has been charged with taking an unpopular position on another question, the professor had better not take any position on this question, or he may be haled before some committee to explain himself.

Is this the American way of life? The great American word is freedom, and in particular, freedom of thought, speech, and assembly. Asserting the dignity of man, and of every man, America has proclaimed and protected the freedom to differ. Each man is supposed to think for himself. The sum of the thoughts of all is the wisdom of the community. Difference, disagreement, discussion decided by democratic processes are required to bring out the best in the citizens. America has grown strong on criticism. It would be quite as consistent with the American way of life to offer prizes for the most penetrating criticism of our country as it would be to offer prizes to those who have done the best job of advertising it.

The heart of Americanism is independent thought. The cloak-and-stiletto work that is now going on will not merely mean that many persons will suffer for acts that they did not commit, or for acts that were legal when committed, or for no acts at all. Far worse is the end result, which will be that critics, even of the mildest sort, will be frightened into silence. Stupidity and injustice will go unchallenged because no one will dare to speak against them.

To persecute people into conformity by the nonlegal methods popular today is little better than doing it by purges and pogroms. The dreadful unanimity of tribal self-adoration was characteristic of the Nazi state. It is sedulously fostered in Russia. It is to the last degree un-American.

American education has not been constructed on such un-American principles. In general, the practice has been to give the student the facts, to try to help them learn to think, and to urge him to reach his own conclusions. It is not surprising that the heart of American education is the same as that of Americanism: It is independent thought. American education has not tried to produce indoctrinated automatons, but individuals who can think, and who will think always for themselves. The basic principle of American Government, and one that accounts for the importance of education in this country, is that if the citizens

learn to think and if they will think for themselves, the Republic is secure. The basic principle of the Russian dictatorship is that the people cannot think or cannot be trusted to think for themselves.

The American doctrine rests on the proposition that it is the individual himself that counts. It is not who his father was, or how much money he has, or what his color or creed is, or what party he belongs to, or who his friends are, but who and what is he. So the test of a teacher is whether he is competent. The professional competence of a teacher is hardly a question on which lay bodies, or even administrators or trustees, would wish to pass without the advice of persons professionally competent in the teacher's field.

If we apply any other test than competence in determining the qualifications of teachers we shall find that pressures and prejudice will determine them. In 1928 it was said that Al Smith could not be President because he would be subservient to a foreign power; and today in many places, and if not today it may happen tomorrow, anti-Catholic or anti-Jewish campaigns may mean that teachers who belong to those churches will not be able to practice their profession.

Teachers may be expected to obey the law of the land. But it is still permissible, I hope, to ask whether a law is wise. To discriminate against teachers—to act as though they were all disloyal—and to put them under special legal disabilities seems injudicious if we want able, independent men to go into the teaching profession.

The assumption appears to be that American education is full of Reds, an assumption that is the precise reverse of the truth. All the excitement of the last few years, all the hearings, investigations, and publicity releases, have not turned up more than four or five Communist professors, even though membership in the party has been perfectly legal up to now. To require oaths of loyalty from all because of the eccentricity of an infinitesimal minority is an unnecessary and derogatory act. And, of course, it will not effect any useful purpose; for teachers who are disloyal will certainly be dishonest; they will not shrink from a little perjury.

The way to fight ideas is to show that you have better ideas. No idea is any good unless it is good in a crisis. You demonstrate the failure of your ideas if, when the crisis comes, you abandon them or lose faith in them or get confused about them to the point of forgetting what they are. The American idea is freedom. Freedom necessarily implies that the status quo may come under the criticism of those who think it can be improved. The American idea is that the state exists for its citizens and that change in society must occur to meet their developing needs. The whole theory of our form of government is a theory of peaceful change. Many of the changes that Marx and Engels demand in the Communist Manifesto have taken place in this country, and they have taken place without communism, without dictatorship, and without revolution, thus disproving, incidentally, one of the central theses of Marx and Engels, that such things cannot be accomplished without communism, dictatorship, and revolution.

These reflections on the Communist Manifesto lead me to say that labeling some thing or some man Communist because Communists happen to favor it or agree with him, that easy process by which one disposes of different views by applying a dirty name to them, involves the negation of thought of any kind. If it had been applied consistently in American history it would have deprived us of some ideas and some men that we are proud to think characteristically American. For example, the Communist Manifesto demands free education for all. Are we therefore to recant, and renounce the American doctrine of free education for all?

And what would the FBI say of Thomas Jefferson, who calmly remarked in his first inaugural, "If there be any among us who wish to dissolve this Union, or change its republican form, let them stand undisturbed, as monuments of the safety with which error of opinion may be tolerated where reason is left free to combat it."

Jefferson was not in favor of revolution; he was serene in the face of talk of it because he had confidence in our people, in our institutions, in democracy, and in the value, power, and results of independent thought.

We are now in the midst of a cold war. We must protect ourselves against external enemies, their representatives in this country, and any citizens who may be conspiring to overthrow or betray the Government. But the statute books are already filled with laws directed to these ends. It has never been shown that there are so many spies or traitors in this country, or that the external danger is so great and imminent that we have to divert the entire attention of our people into one great repressive preoccupation, into one great counter-revolution in which the freedoms of our citizens must be thrown overboard as too burdensome for the floundering ship of state to carry.

It is useful to remember that Jefferson spoke in 1801, when our Constitution was 12 years old, and when the infant republic was in dreadful danger from deep divisions within and from the wars that were raging between the great powers. If he were right in speaking in such a way at such a time, we cannot be far wrong if now, when America is the most powerful nation on earth, we seek to recapture some of his sanity and courage.

How is the educated man to show the fruits of his education in times like these? He must do it by showing that he can and will think for himself. He must keep his head, and use it. He must never push other people around, or acquiesce when he sees it done. He must struggle to retain the perspective and the sense of proportion that his studies have given him and decline to be carried away by waves of hysteria. He must be prepared to pay the penalty of unpopularity. He must hold fast to his faith in freedom. He must insist that freedom is the chief glory of mankind and that to repress it is in effect to repress the human spirit.

Decline of West Leading to Slav Domination

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson which appeared in the Washington Star January 3, 1949, just a year ago. In the year that passed since it was first published there have been few, if any, signs of a reversal of the trend she described, which, unless checked, can lead only to destruction of our civilization. If the decline is not checked the Soviets will not need to make war on the west. All they will need to do is wait with oriental patience and take us over as we go down, country by country, during the next few decades. Where is the leadership to call people to higher and nobler thinking and living, instead of appealing just to men's acquisitiveness and desire for selfish gain?

DECLINE OF WEST LEADING TO SLAV DOMINATION?

(By Dorothy Thompson)

When the history of this epoch is seen in historical perspective and treated by objective historians (if such survive or are revived), it will record that western civilization perished (or came close to perishing) by its own hand.

The tremendous Soviet political victories—which bid fair to fulfill Russian nineteenth-century dreams of an age of the Slavs dominating the globe—have been achieved, in every case, by default of the west. It seems as though western civilization had become too tired to think and too skeptical to hold to the values which hitherto have assured its survival.

A great and brilliant culture—whose supremacy a generation ago was recognized throughout the globe; which gave the world the first concepts of liberty under law; which recognized the menace of unchecked power; which created the most humanistic societies; whose policies were submitted to reason and inhibited by Christian ethics; from which came nine-tenths of modern science; which in the last two centuries produced the most fantastic wealth and so distributed it as to make the poverty of its least fortunate citizens richness, compared to the condition of their predecessors—has fallen into a condition of such self-distrust, mental confusion, false alliances, and indecision as to prepare the way for a receiver who has but to wait to take over the wreckage.

CHARACTERISTICS EVIDENT

The characteristics of a decaying society always show themselves long in advance of its collapse. Such characteristics are the contempt into which traditional values sink; the growth and impudence of criminality and public indifference to it or justification of it; the secularizing of ethical conceptions; the decline in decorum among all classes; an ever-increasing demand for rights and an ever-decreasing sense of obligation and responsibility; the flattery of masses by leadership and the struggle of leaders to keep their power by satisfying every public whim, in default of personality, reason, and principle; the passage of authority from the hands of those who create values, economic or cultural, into the hands of those who control them—the bosses of workers, makers of formulas, filers of papers, catalogers, critics, bureaucrats; the mechanization of politics; the disorder of sexual life; the commercialization of art; the timidity of intellect; the substitution of slogans for ideas.

All these are the way breakers for internal anarchy, leading to foreign rule—opening a great state for barbarians to despoil, and always with the aid of the barbarous forces present within every society.

MUST OVERCOME FLAWS

No great civilization ever has fallen without all these phenomena manifesting themselves long in advance. To attempt to fight those barbarians, the Communists, without overcoming these phenomena is futile. Communism never wins on its own strength; like bacteria it flourishes in the corruption created for it. Every person mocking at sanctities, spreading demagogic slogans, breaking down decorums, defending criminals, laughing at patriotism, agitating mobs, clamoring for spoils, debasing language, scoring principles—all these prepare the ground.

In this country today vigorous and precise intellect wins admiring recognition only in the sciences. But know-how will not save us unless it is combined with know-why. Rome, when the barbarians took it over—

and ushered in the 400 years of the dark ages—had reached a point in scientific and engineering civilization with attendant creature comforts which was not again achieved in Europe for a thousand years.

Louis XIV did not have the bathing facilities of the Emperor Hadrian. But running hot water did not save Rome, whose history perennially is worth rereading.

Philip O'Donnell

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address at the banquet in behalf of Councilor Philip O'Donnell, ward 4, Peabody, Mass., on Saturday, January 14, 1950:

During the 1930's, when so many people looked to Government to provide employment for them, the honor of being a town or city official was not an easy one.

It was not uncommon in those days for the representatives of the people to discontinue their phone service and to have a secret exit from their offices. These were purely defensive measures. By avoiding his constituents, the official would be saved the anguish of saying: "No, no, a thousand times no" to the hundreds seeking jobs for whom there were no jobs.

We have learned much from that grim experience.

By establishing an unemployment compensation system, by setting up old-age pensions, insuring bank deposits, regulating investments, controlling credit, and extending loans to business in times of stress, by means of these and many other devices, we can move swiftly to prevent our economy from going into a tailspin.

It is not the prime purpose of Government to provide jobs for the people. In other countries where the private enterprise system failed to distribute the profits of production on a reasonable basis, the government has taken over completely. Jobs of a kind are provided in return for complete enslavement to the will of the State.

We in this country have a different system. In spite of the need for occasional adjustments, it is a successful system that has and is providing the highest standard of living in the world.

It is by no mere coincidence that this is so.

A man not only receives pay for his work, but has the right through voluntary association with his fellow-workers, to have some say concerning the conditions under which he works.

He is a member of the first team, which is composed of labor and management.

Government is the all-American substitute, rushed in to hold the line if and when employment is pushed back too far.

But Government is only the substitute, the stand-by strength upon whom we call when an emergency threatens.

Ours is a competitive system which inspires every man to give his best. The greatest amount of freedom for business and the workers consistent with the public interest pays off. In a totalitarian country a worker does only what he is forced to do. He does not give that extra something to the job, springing from his own belief in it and from his own ambition to improve himself. In the United States, on the other hand, he is encouraged to employ his full talents, and will be paid for the extra contributions he gives to his work. This is not a mere Horatio Alger story. In the arts and sciences, in professional life, in government, and in every business there are cases too numerous to mention where a man started at the very bottom without wealth or influence and made his own way to the top. This is because the doors of opportunity will open to any average man who makes a real and continuing effort.

The danger in our mass-production system is that the worker never gets to meet and know his employer. The worker feels that he is an insignificant cog in the machine and that he is up against something which is too big for him to buck. To compensate for this he joins with his fellow workers in a labor union to build up a collective, balancing strength.

But if he should lose his job through a falling off in orders at the factory where he works, it is hard for him to get a job in another industry because he has no seniority there. He cannot support himself off the vegetable plot in his back yard or by doing handiwork for the neighbors. Unless he has saved and acquired a little capital, it becomes increasingly difficult for him to start up in a private enterprise of his own.

You and I look forward to the day when economic emergencies and wars will be a thing of the past, when taxes can be lowered and Government restrictions eased, to provide a greater opportunity for small business.

In the meantime, it is hard for many people to do it alone. Those graduates of our business and technical schools must now seek their opportunities, and there are many such, within the framework of a big organization already established.

But the individual drive and sturdy independence that built up our country do not always find complete fulfillment in this manner. Every man wants a little elbow room in which he can produce something of value from his own ideas and on his personal initiative.

We cannot afford to lose these precious possibilities in our present concentration on group security.

True there are people who are handicapped by disability, age, or other circumstances beyond their control. By collective action, through which the strong are assessed to help the weak, we are striving to eliminate these economic hazards, and I believe that we will succeed in this objective.

But once that we have established this base, we should then provide encouragement for extra initiative.

How to reconcile the claims of the individual and society is the stand-out problem of our age.

We find this adjustment taking place even in the area of Government.

In the beginning, the community was the Government.

It had a peace officer, a rudimentary school system, and a volunteer fire department. Its fiscal problems were simple, and a small levy on farms and buildings was enough to make both ends meet.

But, in place of yesterday's villages, we now have towns and cities. The art of government is no longer a part-time job. The business of public administration is now big league, requiring a high degree of ability and character.

With an ever-expanding educational system, with the paved highways and traffic problems of the automobile age, and with a host of other civic problems, the modern community has been forced to tax real estate to the point of confiscation in order to raise the necessary revenues. This has not been enough. The States now turn back a certain percentage of their revenues to help the communities.

When the depression paralyzed the American economy and millions of able-bodied people could find no jobs, the Federal Government tried to make up for the slack by borrowing far in excess of its revenues and authorizing make-work projects in each community with the emergency funds at its disposal.

Towns and cities were the beneficiaries of new schools, roads, bridges, and other improvements which they could not have financed otherwise.

The war diverted our energies in other directions. Materials were needed for military purposes. All other construction was postponed, and the ability of cities to provide a gradual replacement of worn-out facilities was deferred indefinitely. Furthermore, with the growing complexity of life in the cities, more extensive public services were needed.

After the war, there was such a tremendous backlog of demand, that the price of construction materials went sky high. Cities and towns had to cut back their programs, waiting for a more favorable opportunity, but this could not continue indefinitely without impairing the functions of local government.

Either the communities would have to seek new sources of revenue through some such medium as a sales tax which is always unpopular and often unfair, or seek grants-in-aid from the Federal Government.

They are doing the latter in meeting the critical housing shortage which faces the veteran and the new family he is establishing. Plainly, this is a large-scale need in most cities, and it deservedly merits top priority.

Other than this, the Federal Government does not contemplate a broad program of grants-in-aid to States and cities at this time for public works. Heavy appropriations for national defense and to implement our foreign policy, will have to be cut before we can make room for other projects.

However, under Public Law 352, the Congress is providing loans or advances to the States and their political subdivisions, such as cities, to aid in financing the blueprints for non-Federal public works to be constructed when the economic situation may make such action desirable.

And under Public Law 380, Federal aid is provided for the construction of hospitals by public or nonprofit organizations. Under this program operated by the United States Public Health Service, the Federal Government assumes one-third of the cost, the State one-third, and the applicant one-third.

My point in citing these laws is to assure you that the communities can get help if they will first help themselves, under the developing program of local, State, and Federal participation. Although it is limited at the present time, I believe that it will expand as the international sky brightens and we can devote more of the resources of the United States Government to the solution of our State and municipal problems.

The comparison I drew between the individual human being and the group of which he is a member may be applied to the individual community in relation to the United States of which it is a part.

Only the people of a city and the members of its local government know its needs and its capacity. There are certain things which only they can do for themselves. In other matters, they require some help from outside.

This banquet is being held in honor of Phil O'Donnell who you have elected to the city council of Peabody. Your judgment in selecting him is proof of his popularity and of the faith and confidence you have in him.

But do not expect Phil or any other member of the city government to do the impossible.

Just try to imagine yourself as a public official and honestly answer these questions:

Would you be able to find jobs for all the people you would like to help?

Would you be able to provide your city with every public improvement it might need immediately and without cost?

The realistic answer to both questions is the same and it is "No."

Phil O'Donnell is a warm-hearted and generous human being who hates to say "No." So why not make it easier for him by not asking? Give him and every man in public life the chance to do their job without having to cut the telephone wires to their offices or to duck out the back alleys as some officials did in the days when government was expected to provide employment for all.

Remember that as your city councilor he needs your help to make Peabody function as a busy, happy city whose public administration is a source of pride for all of its citizens.

Growing Cotton With a Fox Hole History

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, in view of the present discussions among the Members, as well as in the House Committee on Agriculture on the subject of limiting cotton acreages, I would like to present the following letter which came to me this week. It expresses in a few words the difficulties one ex-GI will have if the present limitation is continued on his cotton acreage. It also gives a concise example of the inequalities and inconsistencies of Government controls.

THERMAL, CALIF., *January 5, 1950.*
The Honorable JOHN PHILLIPS,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PHILLIPS: The following is presented as evidence of the inequities of the cotton program:

As a returning GI I invested my life's savings in 160 acres of raw land under the Coachella Valley (Bureau of Reclamation) project. With War Assets Administration credit, I equipped the farm with machinery; with a Federal farm loan, I leveled and piped the land for irrigation; with a Production Credit loan I raised 100 acres of cotton in 1948 and 120 acres in 1949.

Now, after the Government has loaned me the money to equip for raising cotton, I am told I can plant only 21 acres this season (21 percent of 1948's 100 acres). This means I am out of business. The Government can take my equipment and farm but that does not solve the inequities of a law which says to an ex-soldier "The boys who stayed home and built up a cotton history are the only ones allowed to raise cotton." By enlisting and putting in 4 years in the service (serial No. O132040) was I making the wrong kind of history or making history in the wrong place?

Why don't I plant something else? The answer is the same. You can't raise a price-supported crop without a crop history and financing is not available for other than parity crops.

Please do not think of this as concerning an individual. Just multiply it by all the ex-GI's who are being told they cannot farm with a "fox hole history."

Respectfully yours,

HOMER D. FETTY.

The Future of Foreign Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Henry Hazlitt who writes Business Tides for Newsweek, in the January 16 issue of that magazine, calls attention to a very important matter which this House will soon be called upon to consider again, namely, more money for our foreign-aid programs. Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the article in question:

The Marshall plan was based on a wrong diagnosis of the sickness of Europe and a wrong conception of its cure. Its sponsors now hail it as a great success. They attribute to it every economic and political improvement in Europe since it was put into effect. Every set-back or deterioration, they explain, has been in spite of the Marshall plan.

This one-way post hoc, ergo propter hoc logic does not seem to be shared by the beneficiaries. In a recent poll conducted for the ECA in Europe, for example, only 4 Frenchmen in every 100 questioned thought the Marshall plan had been a factor in French recovery.

On purely economic grounds, it would do no harm to terminate ERP when the present appropriation expires on June 30. Unfortunately, though there was not the slightest good reason for our doing so, we made an implied promise to the European governments that we would continue our Marshall aid for at least 4 years. We would only bring on recriminations and charges of bad faith if we were to terminate it now.

On the other hand, even the ECA now talks of terminating aid in 1952 and of cutting next year's appropriations by 25 percent below that for the current year. But if ERP is to run for only 2 years more, the logical way to taper off would be to cut the appropriation by one-third now and by a second third for the following year. The appropriation for the current fiscal year was $3,778,000,000. This should be cut to, say, $2,520,000,000 for the 1951 fiscal year and to $1,260,000,000 for 1952.

To cut the appropriation by only 25 percent now would either imply at least a 3 years' continuance or require European governments to make a disproportionate adjustment at the end of the second year. It seems more reasonable to reduce Marshall aid by $1,260,000,000 in each of the next 3 years than to cut it by only $944,000,000 in the first (and second?) year and by the remaining $1,890,000,000 in the third.

In tapering off Marshall aid in this simple, proportionate way, Congress should act as soon as possible—long before the end of the current fiscal year. And it should authorize now the appropriation both for 1951 and 1952. This would give European governments plenty of advance notice concerning how much they could expect to receive from us. It would enable them to make their plans accordingly. It would also forestall what would otherwise be constant propaganda for larger and continuing aid.

The truth is that the amount set for ERP aid has always been an entirely arbitrary figure. To recognize this frankly would lead to enormous administrative simplification. Congress could simply direct that the reduced total sums it appropriated should be divided among the individual governments in the same ratio as in the current year. This would take from ECA officials a burden of decision that should never have been placed upon them.

In fact, the whole ECA bureaucracy was unnecessary from the first. The elaborate ritual of counterpart funds and other such special earmarked accounts is meaningless as a real control. It merely befuddles both Europeans and ourselves. All Congress need do is to authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to pay checks at regular intervals to the ambassadors of the recipient European governments. The ineffective but much-resented interferences of the ECA in the economic policies of these governments would halt. These governments would still have as strong an incentive to reform as any ECA pressure provides. It would be the definite knowledge that the aid was coming to an end.

Such a plan would be far superior to the proposed new clearing union for Europe. This union would be merely one more futile effort to do what the existing International Monetary Fund is already supposed to do. It would actually apply incentives in reverse by giving the most to the countries that succeeded in getting themselves the biggest trade deficits.

If we cannot have sound foreign-aid plans we can at least have simple ones.

President Truman Wants Only Fair Deal Congressmen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend by remarks, I include a newspaper article released by INS from which I quote:

WANTS ONLY FAIR DEAL CONGRESSMEN

President Truman made it clear today that he wants only Fair Deal Democrats in Congress.

The Chief Executive indicated in strong terms at a Democratic Party gathering that a new purge is on to get rid of those who oppose his program.

This article makes it clear the President is going to purge anyone who opposes his program.

I have always opposed any program which, in my opinion, would lead us down the road to socialism and communism, and I definitely oppose the President's program of taking power from the people back home and placing it in the hands of Federal bureaus here in Washington. I am not in accord with the President's socialized-medicine program and I will continue to strenuously oppose unnecessary Federal expenditures and the philosophy of spend and spend—tax and tax. I am not in accord with his demand for increased taxes nor do I believe in deficit spending. The time has arrived to cut down expenditures, reduce taxes, and apply a reasonable amount to our national debt.

Because I believe as above stated, I will be one who will be on the "get rid of" list of the President. The Fair Deal candidate who will receive the support of the

President will be one who agrees with the philosophy of statism and is in accord with the views of President Truman and his Fair Deal. This philosophy, in my opinion, is not in accord with the views and beliefs of the people, Democrats as well as Republicans, of the Seventeenth Ohio District.

Mr. Speaker, the President is to be congratulated for his outright statement which makes the issues of the coming election clearly defined, freedom and security against bureaucratic control and socialism, a challenge I shall gladly accept.

Partition of Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the attached article which appeared in the Boston Traveler of Wednesday, December 14, 1949:

DEMANDS ENGLAND BE COMPELLED TO TURN BACK SIX COUNTIES

(By Charles J. O'Malley)

One of the most troublesome problems involved in international affairs is that of the partition of Ireland. It is getting worse instead of better, and the only means of stopping this outrageous injustice against Ireland is to compel England to turn back the six counties which she now holds in Ireland.

The situation would be comparable to that of England if when she lost the Thirteen Colonies in America she claims that the New England States belonged to her and that she was entitled to retain them. How would that stupidity appeal to the Americans of the present day?

It is 29 years since this infamous assault on justice by partition was passed by England. She didn't attempt to do this in India, the Malay Peninsula, or other sections which she was compelled to turn back.

APPLIED SEVERITY

But England has always been an efficient spoils master and she has applied her methods severely in her treatment of Ireland, going back many centuries. Her reservation of the six counties is not a new achievement. It occurred several hundred years ago. Before the introduction of the feudal English system of tenure, the lands of Ireland belonged to the people of Ireland, but through the efforts of Queen Elizabeth, all of this was destroyed and the property of Ireland was seized for the benefit of English adventurers.

A proclamation was issued then confiscating and vesting the Crown six counties in Ulster—Tyrone, Derry, Donegal, Armagh, Fermanagh, and Cavan, comprising in all three and three-quarter millions of acres.

The scheme of settlement was carefully designed to avoid the errors of former plantations. Those in previous reigns had been acknowledged failures, by reason of the enormous size of the grants made to the "undertakers."

The "undertakers," as Sir Walter Raleigh and his countrymen were called, found their grants too large to settle and farm personally. They returned for the most part to England, took no trouble to plant English farmers in the land, suffered the Irish to remain on the land, and drew their rents in peace.

GROUPED FOR PROTECTION

In Ulster, however, the tracts were to be of manageable extent; the natives were to have locations of their own to which they were to be removed; the new settlers, drawn from England and Scotland, were to be massed and grouped together for mutual protection.

The lands were to be divided into lots of from 1,000 to 2,000 acres, at rents of 3 cents to 5 cents per acre, and distributed partly among the new settlers from Scotland, partly among English servitors, and partly among the well-affected natives.

Every "undertaker" bound himself to plant on the soil a certain number of fee-farmers, leaseholders, artisans, and laborers, down to the lowest grade; all grantees and their tenants were to take the oath of supremacy, and none was permitted to employ natives or Catholics in any capacity whatsoever.

Of the 8,750,000 acres which were confiscated, about one-fifth was valuable or fat land, and this was mainly apportioned in this manner: Fifty Englishmen and 59 Scots (the needy countrymen of the King) got among them 162,500 acres.

TYPICAL NAMES

The most noticeable names among the English planters were Powell, Heron, Ridgway, Willoughbie, Parsons, Audley, Davis, Blennerhasset, Wilson, Cornwall, Mansfield, and Archdale, and among the Scots Douglas, Abercorn, Boyd, Stewart, Cunningham, Rallston, and the prolific breed of the Hamiltons, who obtained estates by the 1,000 acres in every one of the six counties, and whose descendants are to be found today in every office of profit and emolument in the country.

To emphasize the attitude of America on the Irish question, it will be well to quote here the opinion of Congressman LANE, who demands that the United States take action and compel England to stop her aggressive attitude against the Irish people.

"This is a moral issue on which we will never compromise. In every dealing with the British Government we shall press for the one, decent, and fair solution to the Irish question because it is inseparable from the truly democratic aspirations of the American people who learned from their own bitter experience that no nation can exist half slave and half free."

If England expects America to back her to prevent her becoming a bankrupt nation, which she is close to being at the present moment, she will have to give justice to Ireland.

Gen. H. H. Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, it was my great privilege to know Gen. "Hap" Arnold way back in the early days of American aviation, when it was extremely difficult to secure the help and support so necessary in the proper development of a new weapon of war. No one who knew him then could resist his enthusiasm, his zealous devotion to aviation and all of its ramifications.

His was not an easy role, for he served through those trying years of the "Billy" Mitchell controversy. He was a strong and active supporter of General Mitchell's theory of the importance of air power in national defense. He served through those equally difficult days when the Air Corps was called upon to fly the air mail, when so many fine young pilots lost their lives because they were called upon to perform a service for which their equipment was most inadequate.

Through all these years General Arnold grew in stature, and the United States was most fortunate in having a soldier of his ability and experience when the need for such leadership was vital. As Chief of the United States Air Force he justly and deservedly earned the acclaim and praise of civilians and military men alike. To him goes the credit for organizing and operating the Air Force that knocked the German Luftwaffe out of the skies, that brought Japan to its knees through the operations of the Twentieth Air Force and its use of the atomic bomb.

General Arnold was not only a great soldier; he was a great man, a kindly, sympathetic individual who hated war and loved peace. Even in his last days he called upon his reserve strength and fading vitality to prepare newspaper articles calling upon our country to maintain a strong defense, with the Air Force as its keystone.

"Hap" Arnold will be mourned by the enlisted man as well as by the commissioned officer. He was that kind of a soldier. Our country will miss him greatly. His friends were numbered in the thousands; his admirers were legion.

A Weather Vane of Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent editorial discussion of our foreign policy by Mr. Robert Letts Jones, of the Salem (Oreg.) Capital Journal:

A WEATHER VANE OF POLICY

Chaos is the word to describe the situation in the Orient.

Chiang Kai-shek takes last-stand position on Formosa off the Chinese mainland. Chinese Communist attempts to land on two islands off the mainland have been smashed. General strike threatens Hong Kong. India recognizes the Chinese Communist regime.

Into this turmoil, the United States sends an aircraft carrier and two destroyers to bolster Asiatic naval forces. And at the same time, Washington announces that a new vigorous policy to block the spread of communism in the Far East is coming up.

The carrier and destroyers are mere indicators of what is happening and what is likely to be American policy in the Far East. For years the people of the Pacific coast have called for a definite policy on the Orient. A do-nothing policy during the thirties

which led to war is still too fresh in the minds of the people of the far West. And it looked as if that onlooker attitude was to continue despite the obvious lesson of the recent war in the Pacific that what happened in Asia affected this country.

This outward indication of a far eastern policy has all the suggestion of filling one of the gaps in a global policy for the United States. Several weeks ago one of the gaps in the Balkans policy was filled by the rather casual announcement that this country was opposed to aggression against any nation—with that announcement being offered for the sake of Yugoslavia, threatened by Moscow.

Following along this same line of reasoning, how can the United States avoid direct complications in China? How can the United States offer to help Tito repulse aggression and not do the same for Chiang? Aggression against Tito could be made to look as much like a revolution, an inside job, as did General Mao's revolt in China.

The time is far past when President Truman should make a formal statement on what this Nation's commitments are and what he intends they should be for a global policy. Letting casual remarks at a press conference tend to reveal points of foreign policy is not fair to the people themselves.

As for the naval vessels going to the Far East, that is the most ironic part of the whole affair. The administration, which has belittled the position of the Navy, finds that it must call on that Navy to act as weather vane of policy.

Water Power To Revitalize New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address in connection with my radio remarks as participant in the Public Power Panel over Station WNAC, Boston, Mass., on Thursday, December 1, 1949:

In a few weeks we will be in the year 1950, which is the half-century mark.

It is time to stop, look, and take stock.

The world has made such progress in the past 50 years that the year 1900 seems to be 500 years back in time.

Some people and some areas have failed to keep up with the remarkable advance.

New England is one of these.

We have been busy, it is true, but on a treadmill.

We are not making progress proportionate with the rest of the country.

Why?

Because in this power age we have failed to develop that abundance of low-cost energy which is the lifeblood of industry.

In 1900 we were leaders.

Today we are also-rans.

As proof of this, take a look at any New England industrial community.

With a few exceptions, of course, the buildings are the same ones that were in use in the period from 1900 to 1910.

They are obsolete, for one reason.

For another, they house the same industries, only there are less of them.

The cotton mills which once dominated the scene have moved south.

Many smaller units have moved in.

New England has receded to a second-place position, content to serve as an auxiliary to big business.

The reason is not hard to find.

New England power rates are the highest in the Nation.

Even in this, the fifth year of the atomic age, we are clinging to old-fashioned and expensive methods of producing energy, dependent on sources of fuel supply that are many hundreds of miles away.

Stubbornly we have refused to develop the God-given water-wealth in our own six States.

Once upon a time we prided ourselves on New England enterprise.

That was in 1900.

Where is it now?

Go down the list of the great industries which have come into being since 1900.

Motorcars, airplanes, radio and television, plastics, we have lost out on all of these.

Or consider the coming industries such as atomic energy, light metal alloys, glass fibers, new packaging specialties, electromatic controls, and new textile fibers.

Will we get our share of these?

Not under our present, rigid, and extravagant power set-up.

Stand-pat New England must wake up and get going or be bypassed by progress.

Once upon a time we prided ourselves upon our independence, but more and more we are becoming dependent on other sections of the country that have the vision and the energy to go forward.

The Tennessee Valley area is one of these.

For many years it was a hopelessly backward region.

But the late Senator George Norris was a man of progressive ideas who saw that if you give the people a chance they will make the most of it.

And as he looked at the depression-ridden Tennessee Valley he wondered why the vast resources of nature could not be harnessed to improve the opportunities of the people.

For years he fought for the establishment of a Tennessee Valley Authority, a huge project which only the Federal Government could set in motion.

At last, in President Franklin D. Roosevelt, he found a man of similar vision.

They foresaw the huge dams, the tremendous network of transmission lines, the millions of acres of reclaimed and rejuvenated farm soil, vast new industries, and a prosperous and happy people.

In 1933, the TVA was created.

One year later, Secretary of State Cordell Hull said, and I quote: "In magnitude and importance this vast undertaking stands alone.

"Its beneficial results will, in my judgment, extend far beyond present calculations."

And they have.

The valley has bloomed.

Private enterprise has been stimulated.

Incomes of the people have increased, enabling them to pay $2,000,000,000 in additional taxes to Uncle Sam, more than twice the cost of all TVA's dams and physical plant.

Average residential use of electricity per consumer in the 1948 fiscal year was 2,520 kilowatt-hours, four times greater than in 1933.

Five months ago the millionth TVA power consumer was added to the rolls, which is three and one-half times the number served by the power companies in the same area in 1933.

Due to the 630-mile navigation channel, river traffic has increased, with freight savings of $3,000,000 annually.

Superphosphate fertilizers introduced by TVA on a mass-production basis have revolutionized the entire fertilizer industry.

Test demonstrations of these fertilizers on 13,000 Valley-State farms have increased farm production three and four times.

Hundreds of industries have moved to this miracle valley.

Many new ones are being born there.

David E. Lilienthal, former TVA board chairman, predicts that the Tennessee Valley and the South will become the Nation's No. 1 region in 20 years with TVA's continued technical aid.

And why not, especially if other regions like New England fail to modernize.

It was at Oak Ridge, Tenn., that the atom bomb was manufactured, shortening the war by many months and saving hundreds of thousands of lives.

Oak Ridge was chosen because only this region could supply power in sufficient quantity—abundant, low-cost hydroelectric power.

And atomic power is the key to the future, with untold possibilities for industrial progress and in the advancement of medical science.

But to benefit from peacetime uses of nuclear energy, you must have the resources of a TVA to put the atom to work.

TVA has conferred benefits too numerous to mention.

At the same time it is also paying its way.

And during the fiscal year which ended on June 30, 1949, it poured $4,600,000 into State and county treasuries as payments in lieu of taxes.

This is approximately $1,460,000 more than former property taxes on all reservoir lands and on all privately owned power properties acquired by the TVA and distributing agencies.

Ask me how TVA is operated.

TVA was established on a nonpartisan, nonpolitical basis and the merit system it employs in selecting personnel has been used as a model for many other organizations, both private and governmental.

There is hardly a nation in the world that has not sent experts to study in the hope of duplicating this marvelous creation of a people's government.

Well, what are we in New England waiting for?

We have the idle waterpower.

We have the skilled labor.

And we have the highest private power rates in the Nation which handcuff our industries, and withhold from thousands of homes the many convenient and labor-saving appliances which would be used if power were plentiful and cheap.

We have the Connecticut, the Merrimack, the Penobscott, the Kennebec, the Androscoggin.

We use these rivers as sewers, sometimes using the water over again, after it has been filtered, for drinking purposes.

These same rivers drain off the topsoil of our farmlands.

Occasionally they visit us with floods.

However, they are of little use for navigation or recreation.

They just flow past our antiquated factories down to the sea after providing us with a minimum of power.

There are a few of our people who, for personal reasons, will not give up this 1900 viewpoint concerning the function of our rivers.

But there are millions of other New Englanders who, when informed of the facts, will demand a public program for the development of our river basins.

The past has no right to hold down the present or to prevent the birth of the future.

The TVA is an accomplished fact which mocks the words of the faltering opposition who stand in the way of progress.

It is a challenge to us to meet this competition by insisting on multiple-purpose water-control systems for our region.

Whenever you meet anyone who might try to becloud the issue, remember what I say.

There is no form of private enterprise which can handle flood control, develop the transportation and recreational facilities of our rivers, conserve the soil, engage in reforestation and provide enough low-cost power for our homes and factories, all in one program.

Neither can the individual States or separate and conflicting agencies of the Federal Government.

An integrated plan to cover a whole river basin is the only answer.

The TVA is proof positive that our flexible form of government can be adapted to meet new situations through new instrumentalities created by the people.

In a historic decision, the Supreme Court of the United States has solemnly decreed that the people own the right to the produce of their rivers.

The Democratic Party will hold a regional conference in Boston early next year and it will go on record as favoring TVA's for New England.

I know of Republican leaders who will also support this enterprising program.

The rest is up to you, the people of New England.

We will not get these projects unless you speak up for them until you organize your citizens committees in every city, town, and village and let every Member of Congress know from Maine to Florida and from New York to California that this region is not asleep.

The right of petition is your opportunity to ask for river-basin developments that will revitalize New England and open up a greater future for our children.

The President's Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER NORBLAD

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an outstanding editorial written by Mr. C. E. Ingalls in the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette Times:

THE PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE

There was so little logic and so little regard for fundamentals and so great an appeal to prejudice in the President's message that it would be inclined to make an honest thinker sick at the stomach. It was a plain plea all the way through for Government interference in business and Government general supervision of everything under the sun from house building to socialized medicine. It was enough of demagogery to make a man ashamed that such a creature could be elected to be President of the United States. This country has reached the highest civilization in history and it has done so without the aid of the Federal Government supervising of man's affairs. True, other men have appealed for Government control of nearly everything, but it remained for Mr. Truman to be specific and urge Congress to perform miracles and demand that taxpayers come to the aid of every socialistic experiment that the radicals of this country have suggested. It is hard to believe that they themselves believe in the things they advocate, but that they advocate them purely because they are popular with the great mass of our people who pay no taxes.

Labor Injunction Law Here May Lead to the Conditions They Have in England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the account of present political and labor conditions in England is taken from the book, The Road Ahead, by the economist, John T. Flynn, submitted for the consideration of my colleagues:

By the fall of 1947 the British planners discovered their plans were going awry. Cripps must have felt a sense of desperation.

Adequate supplies of labor and full effort by workmen were not forthcoming in the industries the Government wished to stimulate. Cripps made an appeal to the workers. He begged them to consider if what they were producing were the things the country most needed. He told them they had no right to complain about shortages of coal and underclothing and housing when they refused to work in sufficient numbers in these industries. The appeal fell on deaf ears—not wicked ears, but the ears of ordinary working people who, by the very limitations of nature, cannot escape making the decisions affecting their habits and conduct in time of peace upon highly practical premises based on their personal and family interests. Great numbers of miners refused to work more than 4 days a week. Even high pay failed to tempt workers away from their accustomed crafts or their home towns.

And so in the end Sir Stafford and his colleagues had to yield to the inevitable and enact a law which says that no man between the ages of 18 and 50, or woman between the ages of 18 and 40, could change occupations at will. The Minister of Labor had the power to direct such workers to the employment he considered best for the national interest. This is the notorious Control of Engagements Act. Professor Jewkes observes that the "Government had the choice between freedom of occupation and planning, and they chose planning." And he notes that the Prime Minister in February 1947 had said that 17 ministries had power to enter private homes for inspections without a search warrant and that over 10,000 officials had the power to make such entries.

No end of devious apology has been offered for this dark stain on Britain's shield. Mr. Walter Scott-Elliot, MP, wrote the London Times on June 16, 1949, minimizing the character of this compulsive order. Oddly, he ruled out compulsion as fit only for the totalitarian state, and he insisted the Control of Engagements Order was not compulsion. He points out that the order provides that a worker can obtain work in only one way—by applying to the local office of the Ministry of Labor. This puts him, as to a job, wholly at the mercy of the Minister. The choice would be, in the first instance, between the job offered by the Ministry and starvation. But refusal may be treated as a public offense. The Minister may seek to guide the applicant to work in an industry where he can best serve the national interest. But he admits that in the end, the Minister of Labor has power to issue directions. And he adds that this power is seldom exercised—which means, of course, it is exercised upon occasion. It has been exercised and men have been put in jail for resisting it. Exercising it often is obviously not necessary.

The rudimentary muscle of ruthlessness does not stop at the factory. It has made its way to the farm. Over the head of the farmer hangs a threat perhaps more serious than that applied to the worker. The farmers are paid heavy subsidies to produce more food. But there is a regular inspection of every farm and a record kept of its produce. If the farmer falls short of the kind of job expected of him in following the instructions from London he gets a warning and if he does not mend his ways the Government will walk in, put a price upon his property, pay him for it and put him off the farm, which then passes into the hands of a government manager.

Now the British Socialist, faced with the problem of compelling the Englishman to comply with his plans, has turned his hand to compulsions. The Government has plenty of machinery for this, since it now possesses electric power, transportation, credit, and fuel—without which no man can operate a business. The Government can grant or withhold these. But it has gone much further. It asserts the right to tell a man where he shall work or not work and even to force him to change his habitation from one part of England to another. It still permits him to own or to buy land, though where he will get the money to buy in the future I do not know. And, of course, part of the Socialist program is ultimately to take all the land and transform every Briton into a state tenant. His right to spend his income as he chooses is almost permanently abolished, since the Government takes so much of it in taxes that the vast mass of the people have no more left than will cover the bare necessities of life.

More on Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, much has recently been written and said with reference to the matter of the relationship between the United States and Spain. In order that the record may be complete it is desirable that there should be included the following editorials which appeared in the Washington Evening Star of January 2 and 12 and the Washington Post of January 13, in which the editors of these papers present some factual objective views that will be of help in arriving at a proper and immediate solution. The editorials are as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 2, 1950]

THE SPANISH FRAUD

Senator CONNALLY's statement that he believes this country could properly exchange ambassadors with Spain if it wanted to do so is interesting as a subject for speculation.

In 1946 the UN General Assembly adopted a resolution requesting member nations to withdraw their ambassadors from Madrid. This was a phony show of morality that was rooted in deceit and tainted with fraud. The pretense was that the Spanish Government had aided the Axis, that it was a dictatorship, and that it suppressed civil rights and religious freedom. And, of all things, the leader of this crusade for decency was that inverted model of democracy—the Communist-dominated Government of Poland.

Evidently Senator CONNALLY is not in sympathy with this shabby performance by the General Assembly. And since he says that he does not regard the 1946 resolution as legally binding on this country, the inference is that he may use his influence as chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in an effort to persuade this Government to resume full diplomatic relations with Spain.

If so, he will be working in a good cause. And this is true, not because of any especially compelling reason of self-interest, but because this country, if it aspires to a position of moral leadership in the world, ought to purge itself of the intellectual dishonesty inherent in its position on the Spanish issue.

There is reason to believe that the State Department, or many of the top men in the State Department, would like to see an American Ambassador at Madrid. But they wring their hands and say that this cannot be done while the UN resolution remains in force. Perhaps there is some merit to that contention. Even if one believes that we were mouse-trapped by the iron-curtain delegations when the resolution was passed, there is still some force to the argument that the United States ought not to act in defiance of the Assembly.

But when these arguments are appraised in the light of the position taken last spring, they are found wanting in simple honesty. There was an effort last May to rescind the 1946 resolution. The vote was 26 to 15 in favor of repeal, but since a two-thirds majority was needed, the effort failed by a margin of 4 votes.

And what was our delegate doing in this attempt to cure the injustice of snubbing Spain while maintaining relations with the iron-curtain dictators? He was doing nothing. Under instructions from the State Department, he sat on his hands and abstained from voting.

It is this aspect of the matter which is most offensive to any concept of integrity. The United States should support the UN. But there is no valid reason why it should refuse to go on record as between right and wrong. If our Government believes the original action was a fraud, it should have voted to rescind it. If it does not believe this, its vote should have been cast against the repealer. In one breath we proclaim our greatness and our moral principles. And then we stultify ourselves by refusing to stand up and be counted on a clear-cut issue which bears not only on our own integrity, but on the integrity of the UN as well.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 12, 1950]

SOME TRUTH ABOUT SPAIN

Chairman JOHN KEE of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has delivered a carefully prepared address on our relations with Spain, and it deserves attention. It is deserving because it is a sensible and, for these times at least, a singularly candid discussion of a blunder which reflects discreditably on this country.

There have been reports that Mr. KEE's speech was delivered with the blessing of the State Department. This is not confirmed, but if true that is a fact to be welcomed.

In 1946 the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted a resolution recommending that the member nations withdraw their Ambassadors from Spain. This move was spearheaded by the Communists. Its intent presumably was to weaken the position of General Franco and pave the way for his downfall.

Of course, it has had the opposite result, as might have been expected. The Spaniards, resenting this attempt at coercion and the atmosphere of intellectual dishonesty in which it was conceived, probably stand more firmly behind Franco today than they did in 1946. That the policy has been a failure, in addition to being a kind of international fraud, has been evident for some time. There have been attempts in the General Assembly to rescind it, the latest effort mustering more than a majority but less than the required two-thirds vote. The Government of the United States, however, with all of its talk of world leadership, with all of its pleas for international morality, has been unable to make up its mind on this issue. It has been unwilling to say whether it believes that the Assembly's recommendation is right or wrong. And when the decisive vote was taken last year, when the nations were asked to stand up and be counted, our representative—the representative of the greatest power in the world—sat on his hands, closed his lips, and looked the other way. Rather than take a stand as between right and wrong, we sought refuge in the timid device of abstaining from the vote.

Now Mr. KEE comes forward and urges a different course of action. He says that the policy of withdrawing our Ambassador has failed as a "moral demonstration." The Star does not agree that there was ever anything moral about the policy, but at least there can be no doubt that it has failed. And this being so, Mr. KEE says he believes that the action of the General Assembly should be rescinded, that we should support such rescission, and that when the recommendation has been repealed we should send the best man who can be found as our Ambassador to Madrid.

It is to be hoped that this reflects the present thinking at the State Department and in the White House. If so, we can look forward to the day when our Spanish blunder will be rectified, and when, with respect to Spain, we will begin to serve our own interests rather than the interests of other nations, including all of those who have lined up against us in the cold war.

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of January 13, 1950]

RECOGNIZING FRANCO

Representative KEE in the House on Monday clarified a good many matters relating to the question of full recognition of Franco's Spain. The first and most important is the fact that the United States already recognizes the Franco government and has done so continuously since shortly after the final collapse of the Loyalist government in the early part of 1939. The question, therefore, is whether we should resume now an exchange of embassies with the Spanish Government. For some years the United States has been represented at Madrid only by a charge d'affaires, who is accredited to the foreign minister rather than to the generalissimo himself. Mr. KEE suggested that one obstacle is the difficulty of finding a man suitably qualified for so delicate and important a mission. An Ambassador to Spain, as Mr. KEE observed, "must be able to deal with Spanish problems * * * as part of our western European policy. * * * A solution of issues with Spain is devoutly to be desired—but not at the price of impairing our objectives among Spain's neighbors. Our next envoy must be broad in his comprehension of those objectives and resolute in his devotion to them. The American public must have complete faith in his disposition to represent them 100 percent of the way. With an envoy of such caliber in Madrid, we should find the restoration of an ambassador there much to our advantage."

Another obstacle to the restoration of an embassy to Spain is the resolution adopted 4 years ago by the General Assembly of the United Nations, specifically debarring Spain from membership in that body "until a new and acceptable government is formed there," and recommending that the member nations "immediately recall from Madrid their Ambassadors and Ministers Plenipotentiary." Thus unless the United States is prepared for unilateral action, contrary to the expressed will of the United Nations, the resolution must first be rescinded. We should not, Mr. KEE believes, act in such a way as to weaken in the slightest degree our unity with the nations with which we have entered into great commitments.

It is plain, however, that the resolution was badly advised. The mistake that led to its adoption lay in assuming the perpetuation of the political conditions existing at the time. It is probably true, as Representative KEE says, that the fundamental character of the Spanish Government has not changed since the resolution, but the character of international politics has altered radically.

The whole difficulty, it seems to us, arises from a confusion about what is implied in recognition. In earlier times this difficulty did not exist, for recognition implied nothing more than the power of the government to govern. Thus, the policy was to recognize all de facto governments as soon as they had demonstrated themselves to be such. Indeed, Mr. KEE admitted that whenever the United States has departed from this tradition, whenever it has awarded its recognition as a moral endorsement of a government or its leaders, "we have usually involved ourselves in more problems than we solved."

This being so, the question of full recognition to Spain should not, in our opinion, be weighed according to the theoretic merits or defects of its form of government, or according to the personal qualities of the ruler, but solely according to its advantages or disadvantages in the present state of international affairs. Now, whether we like Franco or not, the fact remains that Spain is part of western Europe. Thus the sending of an embassy to Madrid must be undertaken sooner or later; and, in our opinion, it would be better sooner than later—for the longer it is delayed the more the full recognition of Spain, when it comes, will seem like a moral endorsement of its leader.

Congress of Industrial Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a copy of my address at the third anniversary banquet, Greater Lawrence joint board, Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, in St. Mary's auditorium, Lawrence, Mass., on Sunday, December 4, 1949:

Ten years ago the CIO in Lawrence was just learning to walk.

Today it is big and still growing.

And it is the new partner in the textile industry, a partnership that will never be dissolved as long as labor and management work together for the improvement of our free-enterprise system.

You have done a remarkable job in organizing the mills and in making collective bargaining work.

Whenever I see the letters TWUA I also thing of TWA, which happens to represent the name of an air line, the most modern means of transportation. I think that the two have much in common. Both are devel-

opments of the twentieth century. Both have made swift progress, and they have an even greater future before them.

The CIO has transported the textile workers from the feudalism of yesterday to the higher wages and improved working conditions of today without a hitch. In doing this you have not only helped the workers but have brought great credit to Lawrence by the example you have set in harmonious labor-management relations.

Before the workers were organized we used to have a little trouble now and again, which made Nation-wide headlines and gave the mistaken impression that the people of Lawrence were tough guys and gangsters' molls.

Happily, those days are gone.

Proof of this is in the experience we have gone through during the year 1949. Last spring and early summer there were 24,000 people on the unemployment compensation rolls. Lawrence was harder hit than any other city in this Nation. Reporters from New York papers and national magazines came here to get the story. And what did they find? That the people, with an understanding of the situation, were taking their hardships in stride, knowing that textile management and workers were in the same boat.

We are not out of the woods yet but employment in the mills has and is continuing to pick up.

Recalling a little bit of recent history if I may, even though it happens to be history made by the Democratic Party, I would like to remind you of the great social legislation, including unemployment compensation, that was engineered under President Roosevelt. The people of Lawrence have reason to be grateful to his vision and his memory. The value of such legislation was never more clearly demonstrated than in the experience of this city during the first half of this year. Men out of work were able to make some provision for their families, and merchants were able to pay their bills because of the income which replaced in part the loss of wages.

Labor leaders had much to do with the passage of such foresighted legislation. And the unions, even now, are leading the way in promoting new social and economic gains that will mean greater security for all our people.

I was interested in a suggestion made not so long ago by Walter Reuther, head of the huge automobile workers union which is affiliated with the CIO. The industry whose workers he represents has been building cars at the rate of 5,000,000 a year, which will break all previous records. But Walter Reuther knows that this pace cannot be kept up forever. Supply will pass demand and there is bound to be some unemployment. Reuther is not waiting for this to happen. Ahead of time, he is making plans to take up the slack. He suggests that airplane plants, presently not in production, be made available to displaced auto workers for other types of production.

Only industrial experts from the fields of labor and management can make an evaluation of this idea. The point is that Reuther is ahead in his thinking.

This, in turn, is evidence of the vital and intelligent leadership that has come up from the ranks of labor in a truly democratic fashion, producing men who are qualified to deal with the difficult economic problems of our times.

They say that there is no substitute for experience, and the labor movement bears out this contention. Only a man who has himself worked in a steel factory or at a textile loom can know the real meaning of wages and working conditions and the uncertainties that attend such employment. As he goes up the ladder to union leadership and faces management across the conference table, he speaks from life and not from words.

I do not think it an exaggeration to say that the future of American civilization depends upon a responsible and forward-looking labor movement. The quest for economic justice is finding fulfillment through our unions, in the progressive American tradition, that delivers the goods. Communism will never make any inroads in our country as long as we have a free labor crusade to work for security, social and human.

Today, the initiative is in the hands of labor.

A prime example of this concerns pensions.

When conservative elements in the Congress blocked the increase of benefits and extension of coverage under the social security law, they thought they had progress tied down.

But they had not figured on the dynamic leadership of the CIO, which is also an instrument of the people's will, having won for itself the right to make its own arrangements with management in the workers' interests.

Promptly, the CIO brought the matter of pensions to the foreground and made this the principal issue in collective bargaining negotiations. Strangely enough, management agreed with the big unions on private pensions without too much opposition, leaving the Dixiecrats and some others high and dry.

This accomplished fact puts the reactionaries in Congress on the spot.

They now find themselves definitely behind the thinking of the American people and have been served notice that progress will continue with or without them.

The only recourse they have is to try and catch up.

Therefore I predict that the expanded social security law which we in the House of Representatives passed this year will break through the Senate blockade in 1950. If any of the old guard should try to filibuster against it, the people will laugh them down. The unions are proving that the cause of economic justice cannot be pigeonholed. It is now leading the way.

Most of the road blocks which stood in the way of the worker's right to enjoy a better share of his productive efforts, have been cleared away. As we face the future, we can take heart from the fact that a small group of people by their excesses cannot stall the American economy as they did in 1929.

It is no mere coincidence that the CIO was organized after that collapse. It was a movement that developed from the workers along new lines to meet their present-day problems. It was an extension of democracy from the political to the economic field. It is your insurance against a return of the old days.

We in Lawrence, the whole community, have benefited from the work of your union.

On this your tenth anniversary we offer our thanks and our best wishes for continued success to the Greater Lawrence Joint Board of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO.

Our Hidden Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Truman administration is trying to find some way to win votes by eliminating a few excise taxes to appease the rising wrath of the people against taxes, and then win favor with the radicals by soaking corporations. Instead of being forthright with the taxpayers of the country, and tell them that corporation taxes are passed on to the overburdened taxpayers, they seek to accomplish their deception by making it appear that they are giving relief to the small taxpayers.

There are many proposals for tax reduction, and under consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Robert S. Bird which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 17, 1950. The purpose of extending this is to show the interest which different groups are taking in this all-important question, not only of taxation but of retrenchment in Government expenditures.

The article follows:

OUR HIDDEN TAXES—EVERYONE AGREES ON OBJECTIVES OF TAX REFORM; PHILOSOPHIES COLLIDE ON HOW TO ATTAIN THEM

(By Robert S. Bird)

Tax reform starts with the question: How can the Nation keep and strengthen its system of American democracy, preserve its national security, and, at the same time, finance the social programs its people are demanding?

Everyone agrees that these are the desired objectives; but political philosophies collide on how they shall be attained.

An answer by the Truman administration is given in the new proposals for an enlarged program of deficit spending which would add this year another $5,500,000,000 to the more than one-quarter of a trillion-dollar debt.

These funds would extend social-welfare benefits and would provide for the national security in both military defense and foreign assistance. The administration says that deficit spending in this prosperous period can be continued a little longer without danger, and the American system can be preserved and strengthened, too.

CRITICS FEAR BANKRUPTCY

Leading critics of the administration assert that Federal policies already have weakened that traditional economic system which has won for the American people a living standard higher than any the world has ever known. They say that some of the President's proposals would impair it further, and that his continued deficit spending would take the Nation down the road to bankruptcy. They would drastically curtail Federal functions and expenditures; and, arguing that social security presupposes national security, they would use the ax first on some of the more costly domestic programs.

On specific tax policy there is just as wide disagreement. Labor, laying down the ability-to-pay principle as its guide, insists that the present tax burden is too heavy for the American working people. It views the administration's welfare proposals as necessities, even at the expense of an unbalanced budget. It would diminish or remove those taxes which seem to bear heaviest on the lower brackets and would "soak the rich"—both individuals and corporations—by increasing the tax cut on large personal and corporate incomes.

BYRD SEES DILEMMA

Business says this would be killing the goose that lays the golden eggs. It points out that the bulk of the national income lies at the bottom of the pyramid. Personal income-tax rates on incomes above $25,000 a year already are so high as to discourage initiative, it argues, and even total confiscation

of all personal salaries over $50,000 would add scarcely $500,000,000 to revenues. The tax burden on corporations is so heavy now, it asserts; that the risk capital needed for new plants and tools to provide jobs and products for the expanding population is drying up.

Senator HARRY S. BYRD, Democrat, of Virginia, depicts the Nation on the horns of a dilemma where to increase taxes would be to invoke the law of diminishing returns, and to lower them would not compensate in stimulated business activity for the loss in revenues. He sees no way today of assuring sound prosperity for the Nation; not until the spending trend is reversed.

A Republican answer to President Truman on his spending and taxing proposals was offered in the present session of Congress in a bill which would give tax relief all along the line. Introduced by Representative DANIEL A. REED, of New York, ranking member of the tax-writing House Ways and Means Committee, it would raise personal income-tax exemptions from $600 to $700, at a 50-percent tax-rate ceiling on all incomes, reduce most excise taxes by 10 to 20 percent, permit deduction from gross income of dividends received up to a maximum of $500 and lower the capital-gains provision from 50 to 40 percent.

In pressing for an extension of the administration's social measures, labor represents 18,000,000 union members and their families, comprising the biggest single entity in the Nation having common social and economic aims. Its view of the spending policy of the Federal Government, as set forth in a tax study last year by the CIO, is that a balanced budget at times is secondary to considerations of full employment, high national income, and general social welfare.

VIEWPOINT OF THE CIO

"As in all things, choices must be made, and the immediate choice involves balancing the budget in a way that will not prevent tax cuts for low-income individuals, but will, instead, seek additional sources of revenue whose burden does not fall on low-income groups," it said.

"So long as the public debt is an internal debt held by residents of the United States, as ours is," the CIO study continued, "it cannot be said to impoverish us as a nation, since all that is involved is an internal transfer of assets, as compared to an external transfer if the debt were foreign-held."

Getting down to cases, the CIO at its last national convention called for increased income-tax exemptions in the lower brackets, repeal of all wartime excise taxes and nonregulatory excises, enactment of an undistributed-profits and excess-profits tax, repeal of provisions for splitting income so as to prevent its use for reducing income-tax payments, a tightening of estate and gift-tax structure, elimination of exemption for tax-exempt bonds, increasing the capital-gains tax, closing "the many existing loopholes in our present tax structure," and prevention of business organizations' evasion of taxation by the devices of nonprofit and charitable set-ups.

SALES TAXES OPPOSED

Then it declared itself "to be unequivocally opposed to all forms of sales taxes, manufacturing taxes, transaction taxes, and wage pay-roll taxes" in States, cities, and localities, asking instead new State income and corporation taxes.

Business asks, above all, for tax relief to permit it to expand and operate with a safe degree of flexibility. Especially it seeks to have eased the provisions of law which impose penalties on corporations deemed to have accumulated reserves in excess of "reasonable" needs, more liberal depreciation allowances, and removal of double taxation of dividends. These are serving to hamper the flow of capital and business expansion, forcing business to depend on "plow-backs" out of earnings to make what growth it can, it says.

At the present high rate of population growth, business estimates that 700,000 new jobs must be made available each year for new recruits to the labor force, and that $5,000,000,000 in new capital is required annually for the plant expansion and equipment necessary to furnish these jobs. The venture capital for this expansion is lacking; excessive taxation has driven it into other channels.

It complains that personal consumption is increasing faster than private investment in new business enterprise, and while corporation sales are up over predepression boom years, taxes are far higher.

VARIED SOLUTIONS PROPOSED

Whereas labor views all the excises with distaste, and industry finds many of them discriminatory against it, varied solutions are proposed. The National Association of Manufacturers would eliminate all the existing excises and supplant them with a single uniform excise tax on all manufactured goods, which would amount to a Federal sales tax. This association would cut the budget by $13,000,000,000.

Most middle-of-the-road advocates of tax revision see a need for continued high revenue, and their budget shaving would not go much further than the $5,500,000,000 needed to eliminate the deficit. They would accomplish this by strictest economies of the kind outlined by the Hoover Commission and by a paring down largely of those outlays which lie between the rigidly fixed items and those providing for national security—including foreign aid.

They are worried about the debt, which, after all, is owned in large part by the people through insurance company, public bodies, and bank investment. And they are concerned about inflation which, if unchecked, would make repayment in a fraction of the dollars originally paid in good faith.

There is little disagreement on the importance of eliminating the overlapping of taxation as between Federal, State, and local governments. This adds to the tax burden for all groups of taxpayers and is a main factor in the present unbalance of the tax load. Roswell Magill, professor of law at Columbia University and former Under Secretary of the Treasury, who served as chairman of the committee on postwar tax policy, has urged a drastic separation of tax sources.

A PLAN FOR DIVIDING TAXES

He would assign to the Federal Government the income tax, which now accounts for 72 percent of its tax receipts, and customs, liquor, and tobacco taxes; to the States, inheritance, gasoline, retail sales, admissions, and unemployment taxes. In the case of corporation taxes levied by both Federal and State governments, he would permit the States to make their own tax laws for enterprises doing business within the State, but would have a uniform corporation-tax law by all States for those whose transactions extend beyond one State's boundaries. This would conform more closely to the traditional areas of responsibility between the governments.

The present tax structure is a patchwork which everybody agrees needs revision. Everybody also wants tax reduction. Tax reduction hinges in the end on Government expenditures, and Treasury Department figures are as plain as they are conclusive; everybody pays for Government expenditures. What Congress does about taxes in this session, and in future sessions, will depend on how the taxpayers speak up concerning which programs they consider to be vital and which can be dispensed with in this time of unprecedented demands. Tax awareness today is just common sense for everybody who wants a strong and prosperous American democracy.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks today, I wish to include an editorial from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer for January 10, 1950, which contains one of the most brief and simple statements of the folly of our present state of fiscal insanity I have yet read. I recommend it to all Members as they pore over the tremendous budget and variety of new governmental experiments which have been presented to us this year.

The editorial follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safekeeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus, redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was accurately known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds, and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency: it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could borrow in multi-billion-dollar installments on the security of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerges from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis of credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive checkbook money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the supply of currency in circulation has increased from $8,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000, the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000, and the national debt—less than $20,000,000,000 in 1933—had mounted to $40,000,000,000 before the war and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in Europeans socialism and in the new economics sponsored by the late Lord Keynes, and were imported here to socialize America.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its Socialist welfare state—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with $24,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States, available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

Socialism Penalizes the Useful Citizen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an editorial that appeared in the Chicago Tribune and which points out the penalties of state socialism as applied to the ordinary citizen:

PENALIZING THE USEFUL CITIZEN

A British market gardener named George Thomas Fidler was prosecuted by the Socialist government and compelled to pay a fine of $2,000 for spending money in excess of what the Socialists thought ought to be spent to rebuild some wrecked greenhouses. He used the greenhouses to grow 22 tons of tomatoes when food was rationed because of short supply and the government was urging increased food production.

In a somewhat analogous case a builder named Ronald A. Stokes, who built himself a bungalow, was jailed for 6 months and fined the equivalent of $2,700 because he did not obtain a government license to provide himself housing.

The treatment of these men by the Socialist Government, though different in particular, is the same in effect as the New Deal gives American landlords. They provide shelter and a needed service for their fellows, and, as a reward, are penalized for their pains by the form of property confiscation known as rent control.

American landlords who are denied fair rents are forced constantly to pay heavier local, State and Federal taxes out of dwindling income. The tax they pay the Federal Government helps to subsidize the construction of competing Federal housing with artificially low rents which will further debase the return from their properties when and if control is lifted.

In England the local governments must meet deficits on government housing through higher taxes on the owners of nongovernment housing. Each new government house adds to the burden on the private home owner or his tenant. There is a prospect that the load on private houses will eventually become so heavy that the houses will be seized for unpaid taxes and the government will have the monopoly in home ownership that socialists seek.

Under the socialism of England and the developing socialism of the New Deal, the stage has been reached where a citizen who does something useful is regarded as a criminal who deserves punishment.

Men's Class of Riverside Church Endorses World Federation Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, rumors of a dread hydrogen bomb which could obliterate our civilization again underline the necessity for passage of House Concurrent Resolution 64. This resolution, introduced by 102 Representatives and 22 Senators, calls for strengthening of the United Nations and its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law. Hearings on this measure have today been made available by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs—these hearings emphasize the importance of this legislation in the establishment of a permanent world peace.

Appended hereto is the unanimously passed resolution of the men's class of the Riverside Church of New York City which endorses House Concurrent Resolution 64:

Whereas we the members of the forum of the men's class of the Riverside Church, in a resolution adopted in June 1943, have expressed ourselves in favor of the formation of a world government with powers sufficient to insure the preservation of peace and of the participation of the United States therein; and

Whereas House Concurrent Resolution 64, sponsored by United World Federalists, and advocating the development of the UN into a world federation is now before Congress; and

Whereas this resolution seems to provide the initial step toward the attainment of world peace: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the forum of the men's class of the Riverside Church, do hereby endorse the principles inherent in House Concurrent Resolution 64, and that we urge our elected Representatives to lend their support to this measure.

Isthmian Canals: The Panama Canal and Diplomatic Relationships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, along with many other Members, I have closely followed the Isthmian Canal subject now before the Congress, especially with reference to the national defense. From time to time I have included in extensions of my remarks informative articles. The special attention of the Congress, particularly those Members on committees having legislative cognizance of Isthmian canals, is invited to a comprehensive bibliographical list on the Isthmian Canal policy of the United States which was placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 25, 1949, by Representative CLARK W. THOMPSON, chairman of the special subcommittee investigating the financial operation of the Panama Canal under House Resolution 44, Eighty-first Congress. This bibliographical list is a most useful reference when seeking independent information relating to the canal question and is a contribution of national importance.

A new and most instructive article on the Panama Canal by the distinguished author, Arthur Stanley Riggs, was published in the November 1949 issue of Forum, volume CXII, No. 5, page 267. In this article Commander Riggs summarizes four centuries of Isthmian history, clarifies some of the major issues of the present canal question, and emphasizes the diplomatic angles of the all-important treaty subject which was ignored by those who conducted the investigations and made the report under Public Law 280, Seventy-ninth Congress. The failure to consider this intricate question and allow for the huge indemnity and increased annuity—both of which would undoubtedly be required by the Republic of Panama for the granting of a new treaty—is a serious omission that cannot be overlooked by the Congress.

Furthermore, it emphasizes the gross inadequacy of the cost estimates of the Panama sea-level project as presented in the indicated report and tends to discredit the entire document.

The text of Commander Riggs' article follows:

THE BRIDGE OF FEAR

(By Arthur Stanley Riggs)

(Commander Riggs is a retired officer of the United States Naval Reserve and a special student of the Panama Canal. The views expressed in this article are exclusively his own and do not represent those of the Navy Department.)

Now that the capacity of the Panama Canal is being taxed by ocean traffic, which continues to grow steadily with the world's postwar recovery, we, as its operators, are faced with two interrelated problems. How can we best secure the needed extra facilities which by 1960 will be imperative if the Canal is not to cause confusion and serious, costly delay? The second is equally vital. How can we do this without resorting to means similar to those President Theodore Roosevelt used when the United States first undertook to see that the Canal was built? We do not, instinctively, distrust our own motives, but the world may. We should remember the long history of Panama and the tremendous part continuous fear has played in it.

To most of us, fortunately, fear is merely a word. We have nothing actually to fear, and knowing that, we carry ourselves perhaps with a slightly self-righteous attitude toward fear's victims.

It is not altogether an academic question to ask ourselves what we should be and what we should do if for 450 years we had lived constantly in an atmosphere charged heavily not with one fear but with many fears. We might also gage the true greatness of the Spain of the past by remembering De Tocqueville's remark that the "physiognomy of a government can best be judged in its colonies, for there its characteristic traits usually appear larger and more distinct." The false vision, the deep religious fanaticism, the individual cruelty of reckless adventurers, despite clear government orders to the contrary, the wild lust for both gold and power in Tierra Firme, paint for us a picture of the Spanish homeland that goes far to explain the steady retrogression of the realm of Don Quixote.

For centuries a whole people lived in daily fear of being robbed of everything they possessed; of having their homes burned to the ground; of being obliged to flee into swamp or jungle or inhospitable hills with their children, their aged, and their sick; of being hideously tortured or of being killed without provocation. The women and children feared being actually eaten by demons in human form. With four centuries of this horror behind them, came a brief respite and then another set of fears: national collapse under the pressures of a powerful neighbor, the loss of independence and of most of the rights that accompany political and religious freedom.

That unhappy people lives between the Americas. It is the mixed population of the bridge of fear that connects North and South America, the Isthmus of Panama. Secure in our own borders and confident in our natural and intellectual wealth, we have not understood our Panamanian neighbors. The benefits we have thought we conferred upon them are of dubious quality in many instances. We have completely overlooked the fact that our mere shadow weighs more in Panama than all the rest of the Americas and Europe combined. The Panama Canal and Railroad have profoundly affected Panama's economy and brought the little Republic many good things. But they have also vastly increased her domestic problems by indirectly affecting social and educational imbalance, health, crime, and so on. To understand all this it is necessary to glance back over the history of the Isthmus, and to evaluate the evidence largely disregarded hitherto in our imperialistic plans and our slightly noxious do-good talking points.

When on his fourth voyage in 1504 Columbus touched the Atlantic side of the Isthmus, he took the lid from a veritable Pandora's box. The Spanish conquerors promptly turned a country into a road. They had no interest in Panama beyond exploiting such wealth as might easily be appropriated. The Camino Real, or Royal Highway, in reality little more than a villainously bad trail between Panama on the south and Nombre de Dios at the north, the Spaniards made the artery through which flowed a flood of gold, pearls, emeralds, silver, and other precious goods. The results for Spain were tragic enough, and we have a fairly accurate estimate of them. What we have never bothered about is the effect those four black centuries had upon the people of the Isthmus.

The centuries saw Francis Drake and Henry Morgan plundering Spain at will. Pizarro started his conquest of Peru and the pillaging of the wealth of the Incas from the bridge of Panama. Admiral-of-the-Blue Vernon in 1739–40 smashed up the fortifications of the Atlantic side of the bridge with a formidable British fleet and so impressed his young lieutenant, Lawrence Washington, that Mount Vernon was named in his honor. Balboa first saw the great South Sea in 1513 from the summit of the Continental Divide that spines the Isthmus, and Drake, years later, was the first Englishman to sail across it. In every direction and in every way this in-between country is not only of surpassing interest, but as the crossroads of the world, present and future as well as past, its preservation is a matter of concern to civilization.

The Republic of Panama is larger than we usually believe. Its area in square miles is only a trifle less than that of the four States of Vermont, New Hampshire, Massachusetts, and Delaware—29,065 miles compared with 29,541. But the compact industrialization of the New England group comfortably supports a population now running to well beyond 5,000,000. Undeveloped Panama, with its hundreds of miles of infertile and untillable land disposed in mountains, swamps, pestilential jungles, and eroded areas, has a white population of a mere 26,906, and a black, yellow, and half-breed population of 145,073, according to the last Panamanian census. The Government, under whatever name it functions, is necessarily an oligarchy and behaves accordingly. This is something distinctly foreign to our North American way of thinking. As we do not send either military men or Government representatives to the Isthmus who themselves seem to understand this, certainly frictions have developed which could have been avoided.[1]

Two years ago, because I have been the most outspoken figure in the fight over improvements to the Panama Canal, a Panamanian engineer attacked me in the daily papers of the capital city. His arguments and mathematics were open to serious question, but his psychology was sound. He said that whatever the United States does the verdict of the world will be rendered on the basis "that it is precisely by what they do in Panama that the United States must be judged." In other words, if we treat Panama fairly and without pressure, the Americas and, in turn, Europe, Asia, and Africa, will find their suspicions of us slightly less tinctured with apprehension.

If we apply pressures to get everything we think we want and Panama feels affronted or robbed, the whole flimsy fabric of our good-neighbor boast vanishes overnight. Every Central and South American state, with the possible exception of Brazil, will feel insecure, aggressively distrustful of our pronouncements, acutely aware that we are the mightiest Nation in the world in a commercial and financial sense—and morally bankrupt. All these countries know how easily power is abused and to what distress such abuse inevitably leads. We face a danger on the Isthmus quite as real as Panama faces from us. Its effects, if we boggle our opportunities, will have tremendous impact upon the world.

Though our detailed knowledge of the Isthmus begins only with the bold railway project and the finale of the gold rush in 1851, the stormy story goes back centuries. Panamá had its first major shock on April 20, 1550, when the two bandit grandsons of its founder captured the city, looted it thoroughly, abused many of the citizens, and tied the new Bishop, Fray Pablo Torres, to a stake in the main plaza. There they insulted him, mocked him, spat upon him, and threatened even worse. After they had left, the outraged townsfolk released him, organized a pursuit, and drove the bandits into contact with a government armed force. Between the two groups the despoilers had a merry time. Not one escaped.

Fires played a terrifying role in the grim story. A few of the conflagrations that swept the largely wood-and-straw constructions occurred in 1539, 1563, 1644, 1671, 1737, 1756, and 1781. The constant raids of English, French, and Dutch pirates began on a large scale with Drake's foray of 1572. They forced Spain to spend millions to fortify and garrison her American ports, and at intervals became so vicious and alarming that men more than once slept for weeks on their arms. Henry Morgan took and looted Panamá in 1671, and in the bloody argument outside the city—the Spaniards lost 600 men and Morgan 200—no quarter was asked or given. When the Spanish governor saw the city was lost, he blew up the magazines, and in the fire that resulted the city was so thoroughly destroyed that it was abandoned and built anew a year or so later on its present site.

As many of the African slaves as could revolted, joined the native Indians in the bush, and bred a new and savage enemy for the colonists, the Cimarrones. Cimarron in Spanish means wild or unruly, and as used in the colonial records it indicates the savage runaway slaves and their descendants. The English called them "Maroons." Their abiding hatred of everything Spanish frequently led them to make friends with the English adventurers, and to inflict hideous reprisals upon every Spaniard unfortunate enough to come into their power. Mere gold had no meaning for them, but they understood thoroughly the Spaniards' lust for it. They partly evened the score on one occasion by giving the Christians all the gold they could take—melted and poured bubbling into their opened bowels.

Besides these purely material terrors, whites and Indians alike were made to feel the horrible, chill fear inspired and assiduously cultivated by the Inquisition. As Englishmen by this time were all nominally heretics, any awkward or particularly annoying cases the civil authorities could not or did not believe it wise to handle, were turned over to the grim bigots of the holy office. This was a convenient arrangement while it lasted, and no foreign pirate or adventurer questioned survived to tell tales. Civil, religious, and military authorities were also frequently at open enmity, and both the distant king and the local colonists suffered. As we gaze back over the dark record of in-

[1] This criticism does not apply in any way to our present Ambassador Monett Davis. He has repeatedly displayed his understanding, tact, and initiative, and is giving us excellent representation, besides winning the respect and friendship of the Panamanians.

competence, flagrant dishonesty, meanness, intrigue, jealousies, and inertia, the parallel of Spanish colonial administration with Democratic administrations today, both Federal and local, is startingly clear.

TREASURE

The answer to our doubts regarding Spain is embodied in the name given the Isthmus early in its tragic story: Castilla del Oro, Golden Castile. Spain echoed from Barcelona to Lisbon with tales of the unimaginable wealth to be picked up there without effort. Some of the stories were partly true. Spaniards had stumbled upon nuggets of pure gold in certain rivers. Placer deposits yielded fabulous sums. The proof lay in the whole shiploads of treasure—silver by untold tons, gold by the hundredweight, pearls, emeralds beyond price—pouring into Spain with the regularity of a ferry service. But the treasure tales that drew men as sugar draws ants failed to enlarge upon the Indians with poisoned arrows, the deadly jungle snakes, the fevers that more than decimated whole companies and towns, and the murderous pirates who raided not only shipping and seaports but penetrated far into the interior. Some of the marauders were so terrible that a great Frenchman called them tigers with reasoning powers.

Sixteenth-century Spaniards were tough, hard to kill. Those who went to the Ultramar were especially lusty and ferocious. They had to be to survive, and their own historians have recorded so black a chronicle of their behavior that the depredations of the pirates seem hardly more than a balancing of the scale. The whole story is one of such complete misconception of opportunity, such mismanagement in administration through fear, treachery, bigotry, cruelty, self-seeking, and outright hate that the Panama of the twentieth century is little short of a miracle in survival. With such a background, it is easy to understand Isthmian suspicion of our slightest move, jealousy of our power and wealth, and bitter resentment at much of the treatment we have accorded a republic we facetiously style "an equal sovereign state."

The worst of it is that an oligarchy of 27,000 whites surrounded by five or six times as many hybrids of color is clearly not the equal of a state of more than a hundred million whites, a democracy with extraordinarily firm foundations. Nobody knows this better than the educated Panamanians, and the knowledge is not pleasant. That is the real reason for the delicate political situation that faces us upon the Isthmus and makes what we do so important in the eyes of all the rest of Latin America, whose backgrounds and experience parallel those of Panama, and whose feeling is identical.

* * * * *

Since 1851 the Panama Railroad has been functioning admirably, and besides performing its planned duties has accomplished much incidental good for Panama. The Canal, which operates the railroad as an adjunct, has served the entire world's commerce and shipping for 35 years. Now it is regarded as likely to prove inadequate by 1960. Various powerful interests have demanded improvement to insure its adequacy, the construction of a sea-level canal partly following the present waterway, or the adoption of an alternate route in another location, with the building of one of any number of fantastic systems for transit from ocean to ocean. These schemes include a railway to drag ships overland, bombproof tunnels through the Continental Divide, sea-level, high-lake-level, and mixed-type canals, all regardless of cost.

Those individuals and groups who have declared for the sea-level plan at Panama have gone far out on a very dubious limb. They are sawing it off behind themselves by approving specifications and plans based upon largely theoretical conclusions that every engineer who had actual experience in building the present Canal regards as fallacious and misleading to the point of disaster. The record is clear and conclusive in innumerable documents published by the Government and in technical papers and discussions in naval, marine, and engineering periodicals, some of them republished as documents of national significance in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There is also in the background the sane and conservative plan for the Pacific terminal lake, balancing and making adequate to foreseeable demands the present Canal without interfering for a moment with its operation. It was slowly worked out by Capt. Miles P. Du Val, United States Navy, retired, as a result of his more than 3 years' experience as port captain at Balboa during the war. This is, moreover, the first and only plan for improving the Canal based upon the experience acquired in putting ships through in all conditions, including stress. Casting all theory aside, the terminal-lake plan is based soundly upon actual operating experience, published official data, common sense, and a cost well within the bounds of reason. Its appeal to an economy-minded Congress is indisputable.

What does not appear on the surface of any of these plans, aside from the terminal lake, is their complete disregard of several major factors. We are blithely informed that costs mounting into the billions are negligible. Comment is superfluous, but the annual interest at 3 percent on $2,480,000,000 comes to $73,000,000 a year. We are emphatically not told that before we could dig one spadeful of earth for a sea-level canal we should have to negotiate an entirely new and distinctly different treaty with Panama at high costs to ourselves. We are assailed by raucous nonsense about atomic bombing, national security and the like, though all canals, regardless of type, are vulnerable to the atom bomb or to any bombing. Last, and perhaps most significant of all from the purely economic standpoint, nothing is said about the profits of the manufacturers of special and heavy machinery, new fangled and unproven dredges; the never-too-modest emoluments of the purveyors of the innumerable goods and supplies required by such an undertaking, from dynamite to diapers. Then there are the appalling pay rolls of labor for years to come; the costs of new construction and, in the case of a canal at an alternate location, the astronomical figures to cover the establishment of complete terminal port facilities, which involve the building of whole cities.

Panama naturally regards most of these schemes with dismay. Our more sober-minded legislators also recognize the seriousness of the problem. Many of them have made personal investigations on the spot so that when the matter comes to public hearings and debate before a congressional committee, they will be able to understand and even perhaps to evaluate the different arguments advanced. If Congress blunders when it decides the question, and foists a large increment upon the already huge national debt, the taxpaying public will suffer. Our already perniciously anemic merchant marine may come perilously close to disappearing. With the experience of what the need for ships drove us to in World War II, with its floating coffins, we know that, should another world struggle involve us, we might easily lose control of the sea.

Of all the points at issue in the canal controversy, the matter of a new treaty with Panama is the most complicated and brings us directly back to the fear with which we began. We, as well as Panama, have reason to be afraid of the consequences of blundering. The results of such stupidity and venality could easily spread over incalculable time, and lead to such a frittering away of our resources as to prove almost fatal in the national sense. The incredibly muddy thinking that led us straight from the hot war of shooting into the cold war that still rages, could easily manifest itself in another shocking folly.

THE TREATY

To return to the treaty, the plans for the sea-level canal show the divergence of its route from that of the present ditch at several points. That alone invalidates the present treaty by encroaching upon Panamanian territory. The width of the Canal Zone is figured as a distance of 5 miles on each side of the axial line of the canal, except for the sprawling out of Lake Gatun. The sea-level plan not only changes that axis in part but, if the scheme could be carried out as planned, it would drain and expose thousands of acres of pestilential muck now deep under water, thereby creating a new hazard to health which might easily entail very serious consequences. In addition to this, the present outlet of the Chagres River would be shifted some 10 miles. Villages and individual farms now occupied would be drowned out.

Anyone who imagines that Panama or any other State would acquiesce to all this and more without demanding adequate reparation is unusually naive, even for a North American. Moreover, the definition of adequacy is barbed and poisoned for both countries. Our idea of it may be the opposite of what Panama and the rest of Latin America feel it is. * * *

There is vastly more to understanding the Panama question than is even suggested here. It is high time, too, that we justify our pretense of the good friend to mankind by seeking a modicum of wisdom. The Bridge of Fear is again a region where angels fear to tread, and the ghosts of half a millenium gibber at us to beware as we venture upon it.

Truman Inflation Is Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks heretofore granted, I am inserting the following article by Mark Sullivan which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of January 18, 1950:

TRUMAN PROGRAM CALLED THREAT TO THOSE HAVING FIXED INCOMES—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS ECONOMIC PLAN FAILS TO CARE FOR SAVERS WHOSE REVENUE CANNOT INCREASE

(By Mark Sullivan)

President Truman, projecting an increase in national income, defined that it is the total of all the income received by all the people in the United States. "All the people" is an appealing phrase. It is repeated by Mr. Truman in effect in his projected economic plan for the next 5 years, in which increase of national income is the cornerstone. "The benefits," Mr. Truman says, must extend to all groups."

But there is one kind of income that cannot increase—it is the kind called "fixed income." Wages of workers can be increased.

Prices received by farmers for crops can be increased. Prices received by manufacturers of goods can be increased. But the group who depend on fixed incomes can have no increase.

This group is very large. It includes beneficiaries of pensions, both government and industrial, which are usually fixed in amount. It includes beneficiaries of social security, the amounts of which are fixed by law. It includes persons receiving life-insurance annuities. In the same situation are persons who put savings into Government bonds, the interest and principal of which are fixed. The group as a whole includes nearly all who save from their earnings and who depend on their savings for income after they have ceased to be earners, 10 or 20 or 30 years from now.

FIXED INCOMES IN DANGER

Hardly any of these can benefit from Mr. Truman's projected increase in national income; on the contrary they are set back by it. For out of their fixed incomes they must pay higher prices for what they buy.

If wages of large numbers of workers are increased from $2,000 a year to $4,000, as Mr. Truman projects for a future period, then the services of these workers will cost more, and the goods they make will cost more. Similarly, when farmers are paid more for their crops, food costs more. What is increase of income for these groups is for the receivers of fixed incomes merely increased cost of what they must buy.

Those who depend on fixed income or on fixed amounts of savings—in effect nearly all savers—these are the aggregate "forgotten man" in the country's economy, so far as the economy is shaped by the Administration. They are more than merely neglected, they are discriminated against.

The administration urges people to save, conducts campaigns urging them to buy Government bonds. By the social-security law, an immense number of workers are compelled to save by paying taxes based on their earnings. The administration exerts pressure for pension systems in industry, whereby employers add to workers' wages an amount set aside for pensions when the workers come to retirement age, some years in the future.

Simultaneously with urging or compulsion of savings for income at a future time, the administration has practiced policies which cause savings to have a smaller purchasing power when they come back to the saver than when the saving was made.

The administration encourages raises in wages—in some cases the raises are decreed by the Government. This causes higher costs of goods, and of services which savers and others must pay for. In some cases the higher costs are decreed by Government bodies, the Interstate Commerce Commission has decreed several increases in railroad passenger and freight rates. And the Government supports prices of farm crops, causing prices of food to be higher than they would otherwise be. The consequence of all this to savers has been reduction in their purchasing power. The saver gets the number of dollars stipulated in his pension or Government bond or social security, but each dollar buys him less goods.

A FAMILIAR EXPERIENCE

This has become a familiar experience. When a person 10 years ago put a thousand dollars into Government bonds or other form of savings, that was the price of a new automobile. When 10 years later he gets his savings back, it is only half the price of the same automobile. A saved dollar 10 years ago was in effect a saved bushel of wheat; it is now only half a bushel. This reduction in purchasing power has gone on as respects practically all lines of goods and services.

It is the savers who actually are, in Mr. Truman's phrase, "all the people," though he does not seem to comprehend this. The aggregate of holders of Government bonds, pensioners, and beneficiaries of social security and life insurance is, with overlapping, more than the total population. The Government policies which work detriment to these is an injustice to the people and a dangerous distortion of the country's economy.

Old Age and Survivors Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place the following article by Eugene Bertram Willard, which appeared in the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on January 12, 1950:

EDITOR, CHELSEA RECORD:

The number of Chelsea folks who have reached 65 years of age and who will be eligible for and accept social-security benefits when they are upped by the second session of the Eighty-first Congress cannot be stated definitely. But we do know that many of our elderly citizens are still at work even though many of these would like to take things a lot easier in their last years, but certainly cannot make both ends meet on the paltry present benefit payments.

Less than 10 percent of the folks now on the old-age-assistance rolls, a set-up bearing all the stigma of welfare, are eligible for old-age and survivors insurance. Many now on OAA do not want to be there at all but because of their inability to find work or because of physical disabilities to retain employment are compelled to accept the State's hand-out and along with this have to suffer the visitations of the snoopers known as case workers. The Federal old-age and survivors insurance system employs no visitors and after an application is filed that is the end of the matter. No embarrassing questions are asked and the beneficiaries accept the payments as a matter of right. As long as a person has been in covered employment long enough to be eligible for the old-age and survivors insurance benefits that is all that is necessary. In certain hardship cases beneficiaries have had to ask for supplementary help from OAA. However, under the proposed increased benefits by the Congress much of this supplementary aid will not be necessary and beneficiaries will not have to suffer the humiliation of bowing and scraping to the welfare department which will have nothing to do with helping the old folks. This certainly will not hurt the feelings of worthy aged persons many of whom now resent the prying into their affairs by welfare workers chiefly interested in their own pay checks.

If we are to preserve the American way of life in Chelsea and elsewhere in the Nation, old-age assistance as we now know it, must be tossed out the window. Its place must be taken by the Federal old-age and survivors insurance system by providing adequate benefits for eligible folks. The older group of American citizens have earned retirement. Many of these are not covered by the Social Security Act. Something will have to be done for these other than making them members of the OAA group which is distasteful to every red-blooded American. The Congress must act to make possible the payment of a pension to every American who has reached 65 so that he or she can hold up one's head and not have to bear the stigma of welfare.

Between the retirement payments and a modest national old-age pension the whole process of our business activity will be stabilized. Retirement payments will provide continuous buying power, will provide the needed balance in market demand, and will help to provide mass consumption, without which our mass-production economy cannot function successfully. It will lead the way to greater prosperity in America.

In discussing this subject we must not overlook that the Chelsea Bureau of Old-Age Assistance does not make its own laws, and any deficiencies in it are the result of mandates from Beacon Hill. It is a safe conclusion that Director George R. Morse has little sympathy with many of the rules and regulations governing OAA clients, but he and his assistants have to do as they are mandated by the law, or else. We know that many will agree with us that the present system of OAA is all wrong because it is beset with so many humiliating musts; we also know that the present system of sending snoopers into the home of aged is all wrong and not the American way of doing things. Maybe somebody borrowed the idea from Moscow. The rank and file of Chelsea citizens, like the rank and file of good Americans everywhere, want to see the aged get a decent break at long last, and they will never get a break under the old-age assistance set-up where closely scrutinized budgets are the rule. Americans must look for something better than the present hand-out by OAA. The hand-out is bad enough of itself, but the conditions imposed upon the recipient a thousand times worse. It is encouraging to know that the progress of the social-security movement in the Congress may be traced by those who have eyes to see; the works of those interested in the welfare of America's aged speak persuasively to those who have ears to hear; the pulsations of the heart humanitarian may be felt by those who have hearts to feel. In their needs, in their tendencies, and in their weaknesses the Eighty-first Congress, just opened for its second session, will be mindful of Chelsea's aged, of the Commonwealth's aged, of America's aged.

EUGENE BERTRAM WILLARD.

Miners' Welfare Fund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to a unanimous-consent request, I insert herewith the following copy of an article appearing in the United Mine Workers Journal for January 15, 1950:

WEST VIRGINIA MEDICAL JOURNAL PRAISES WELFARE FUND, DEBUNKS STATE MEDICINE CHARGE

Unfounded charges intended to discredit the medical services offered by the welfare and retirement fund were thoroughly "debunked" in the January issue of the West Virginia Medical Journal, an official publication of the medical profession. Its editorial comment was directed especially at the loose talk that the UMWA program was in some way related to state medicine or that it destroyed the traditional doctor-patient relationship.

Text of the editorial follows:

"We have heard whisperings to the effect that the United Mine Workers welfare fund

has been wrecked by the inroads of the medical profession; that it will lead to state medicine, etc.

"While exact figures as to medical costs are not yet available, we have information to the effect that, by and large, the fees charged by individual physicians have been reasonable and satisfactory to the fund management; so satisfactory, indeed, that there is no contemplated fee schedule in the offing.

"The questionable fees submitted have been very occasional and far between, although a few have been exorbitant. These have been so few, however, as to be practically negligible.

"As to the charge that the operation of the welfare fund will lead to state medicine, it will in our judgment have exactly the opposite tendency. As set up, the working of the fund certainly is at least a corollary of free enterprise, so to speak. The plan has been worked out in the various States in conjunction with the organized medical profession, and, in those States which have liaison committees of the State medical associations, controversies have been even fewer than elsewhere.

"The plan actually gives the patient reasonably free choice of physician and hospital, certainly along the lines of normal patient flow from his home community, and there is in actual practice no disturbance of the time-honored doctor-patient relationship. The doctor is not hampered as to examination and treatment; he gives the patient what, in his own judgment, is necessary, and submits his bill for service rendered.

"There is no compulsory legal element or tax in the procedure. Certainly this is the very antithesis of compulsory governmental health insurance.

"As far as our observation of the fund has gone, the profession is satisfied and the patients are likewise satisfied. Certainly it has ameliorated the lot of the miner medically and has pioneered in the field of labor-medical relationships. Experiences have been gathered and guideposts have been erected which might well be considered by other welfare funds now being set up when they come to furnishing actual medical service to their beneficiaries."

Be It Known

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I am proud and honored to have in my district the Palm Beach Post-Times, whose editor and publisher, Charles Francis Coe, has received national recognition and an award from Freedoms Foundation, Inc., for the most constructive and outstanding editorial of the year. The award is for recognition for his contribution to the American way of life by speaking up for freedom. The presentation to Editor Coe was made at Valley Forge, Pa., by Gen. Dwight Eisenhower and consisted of a gold medal and $2,000.

The greatest of metropolitan dailies had entries before the jury which made the award. This jury consisted of justices of the supreme courts of various States. The award comes to Charles Francis Coe in competition with the great editorial writers of the Nation.

These are times when liberty and freedom should be fortified by fearless expressions. I hope every Member of the Congress, as well as the readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will read this editorial.

The editorial is as follows:

BE IT KNOWN

Be it known by the peoples of the world that there is in the earth a government conceived in simple principles, established by and for the average man, strong through nearly two centuries of consecrated growth.

Be it known that this is the Government of the United States.

Be it known that the name of this Government derives from its nature. It is a federation of separate States, each of which of its own sovereignty. These States originally united in a wise and common effort, each to support and serve the other, in a public policy of common defense, and common freedom for the governed.

Be it known that in these States united, the individual dignity and right of a citizen is the first governmental proviso. One hundred and forty-odd million John Does and Mary Does reside in this Utopia of man's creation, under God's guidance.

Schools abound. Libraries are free. Institutions for the betterment of the individual are as common as the very trees. A network of roads binds these States united in a common ground of play and work for all. There is no barrier of customs at any State line. There is no passport or visa needed by the traveler between States.

There is free and unrestricted intercommunication between States, and between men within those States. If a man wishes to move from one State to another, no governmental restrictions retard him. His is the right of citizenship in the State of his own election; and of common sovereignty in the federation of all the States.

Be it known that in this federation, the God of a man's uncontrolled selection, is the God of his worship. The home of John Doe is his inviolable sanctuary, free from unlawful search and seizure. The right of John Doe and Mary Doe to assemble in public meeting is a guaranteed right. The right of each to seek redress for governmental wrong, is of like nature.

Be it known that this Government has so prospered as to become the mightiest among nations. This Government has vested its final and ultimate authority in John Doe and Mary Doe, its constituent citizens.

It knows no monarchs. It repudiates the "divine right to rule." It asserts and maintains the supreme dignity of the average man. It has done so for nearly two centuries of constant growth. It is the manifest expression on earth of man's capacity to be man.

Be it known that lesser governments, though older and more selfish civilizations, in envy and gross ambition of leadership, have sought, and are now seeking, the overthrow of this Federation.

They would replace it with oppression, and the spurious "divine right of kings."

Be it known that such forces have developed, and are developing, a new technique of subversion by using freedom, to annihilate freedom. They are "boring from within." They are polluting the instrumentalities of this Federation. They would destroy the tools which manufacture common liberty. They mock the idea that a government should be accountable to its people. They insist that a people must be accountable to its government.

Be it known that such forces abhor the philosophy of a written contract between government and governed. Such forces are frustrated by such an equitable and specific contract. They insist that the government must tell the people what to do. They deny that the people must tell the government what to do.

So these destructionists are faced with the first task of invalidating the contract between these States and the federation they joined. The contract is the Constitution of the United States. The States refused to ratify it, until 10 amendments were made to guarantee the rights of the States, and of Mary and John Doe.

This contract does not say what the Federal Government can do. It says what the Federal Government cannot do. That keeps Mary and John in control. That defeats the monarchs and the dictators. It will do these things so long as it remains undestroyed.

That is why it is great. That is why Mary and John Doe, and their children, and children's children, live and laugh and learn and labor and love, in a liberty of God's recognition.

Be it known that the forces opposed to such liberty have fomented endless wars, and are still so fomenting wars. Such wars are costly in worldly goods. These destructive forces have come to realize that there may be cheaper ways to destroy freedom and reestablish the "divine right to rule" than by war.

Be it known, therefore, that these forces are providing vast sums of money to finance subversive efforts among Mary and John Doe, in the hope that weariness, and a desire for international peace, will deceive Mary and John into relinquishment of their contract for freedom.

Be it known that traitors are financed and finagled into positions of high trust and power within the federation. Some are now open candidates. These dress lechery in the habiliments of freedom; garb license in the gowns of liberty; bribe treasonists into terror campaigns, and subvert supine politicians with the blandishments of diplomacy along with the gangrenous gold of dictatorship.

Be it known that Mary and John Doe, cherishing their liberty, treasuring their individual dignity, faithful to their trust as custodians of the world of the average man, conscious of the presence of God in the earth, stalwart in the valor and fortitude of their sacred dead, have roused themselves, at lingering last.

Be it known that Moscow money must not buy American liberty. That communism must not overthrow world freedom. That these States in unison will not surrender the prerogatives ordained of God and sanctified by the generations of human devotion and sacrifice.

Be it known, aye, be it known.

Let Mary and John Doe make it known, for the hour is late and, through the ballot, the means are at hand.

CHARLES FRANCIS COE.

Formosa

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the following article by Charles J. O'Malley which

appeared in the Boston Traveler, Boston, Mass., on Tuesday, January 10, 1950:

BOSTON INVESTORS CALLED PART OWNERS OF FORMOSA

(By Charles J. O'Malley)

Considering the news emanating from China and coming through the newspaper channels and the airways, the situation there seems to be deplorable, but the facts bearing on Formosa, which is a crucial point in the Chinese survey, are so different from what has been expressed that it has induced me to present the facts as they are and not what they might be.

The people of Boston and New England have greater ownership interest in Formosa than the Chinese or Japanese.

The facts are these:

When Japan defeated China, she sold the island of Formosa to the Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. for a sum equal to about five million American dollars. The Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. was the most important industrial development in Japan. It owned and controlled the electric light and power all over the Empire and the taking over of Formosa was one of its activities. When this was accomplished it was decided that America would pay for it, and bonds, equivalent to $22,800,000 were issued. These bonds were sold in Boston, New England, New York, and other parts of the United States. In order to accomplish this, the company secured the services of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the National City Co., the First National Bank of the City of New York, and the Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd. When this was accomplished, through the Yokohama Specie Bank, which was the interest involved in Japan, practically all the leading brokerage houses in this country were engaged in the sale of these bonds. Hayden Stone & Co. sold a great many of these bonds in Boston.

Before the agreement was completed the Imperial Japanese Government guaranteed as follows:

"The Imperial Japanese Government hereby unconditionally guarantees the due and punctual payment of the principal, interest, and sinking fund of the within bond in accordance with its terms; in faith of which it has expressly authorized Juichi Tsushima to sign these presents in person or by his nominee.

"Dated, July 1, 1931.

"For the Imperial Japanese Government.
"JUICHI TSUSHIMA."

I have visited the island of Taiwan, or Formosa, on two occasions. The island is about the size of Ireland and has a population of 6,000,000. These people consider themselves as a part of the United States possessions. The island had, when I was there, about 34 forts protecting it. This island is very rocky and has very steep cliffs.

I was personally interested in this enterprise and knew that the bonds were of some value, for the interest on the bond was paid regularly from July 1931 untily July 1, 1941. Then trouble began.

The island of Formosa in 1938 was called the island of Taiwan after the ownership was conveyed to that company. I have been in Japan several times, and a few months ago I contacted the foreign department of the Industrial Bank of Japan, the representative of the Japanese Government in Tokyo. I saw Mr. Togama Araki, the promanager of the bank. He informed me that the people of the United States owned the island of Formosa and that the bonds which were sold for that purpose were the actual ownership of Formosa. This gentleman stated that our bonds are the first obligation of the Government of Japan. The Japanese agreed to pay for these bonds in full with interest when the peace treaty is signed, and every cent was to be returned to the owners in Boston, New England, New York and other parts of the country. In reference to this matter, the United States administration has taken bold action to stop communism in Europe and is now fighting it in Formosa, or the island of Taiwan which the people of Japan call Formosa.

I was talking with Gen. Douglas MacArthur, the Supreme Commander of the Allied Powers in the Pacific, and he informed me that we should hang on to Formosa, it belongs to us and should be our property.

I was told by Mr. Togama Araki that the bonds are worth every cent that was invested in them. They were purchased at 93½ per bond instead of the $100 which was the reputed value. The island of Formosa was the guarantee of the payment of the bonds, and when I was in Japan, a few months ago, I was fully informed that the Americans owned the island and they should keep it. It is now up to us to decide what to do about it.

England has recognized the Communists in China so it is said and the reason is quite obvious. Hong Kong was taken by England from the Chinese in 1841 with the understanding that Hong Kong would protect China from the advent of opium from India, and it was to be returned to China in 1941. When that time came, the Nationalist Chinese did not insist on the return of Hong Kong to China, but the Communists did. In order to placate the Communists, England is now recognizing them, thus protecting Hong Kong from their assault.

United States Naval Officers in Diplomacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS E. MARTIN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, the diplomatic history of the United States has many great chapters, some of them formed by the actions of our naval officers when on cruises to distant foreign lands.

Among these, none is more brilliant than the opening of Japan in the middle of the nineteeth century by a naval expedition commanded by Commodore Matthew Calbraith Perry. This eminent naval officer, like many others before and since, by personally viewing an historic movement and evaluating its significance, was able to foresee events with remarkable precision and to state his conclusions in words of power.

During his famous Asiatic cruise Commodore Perry not only visited the Japanese Empire and other islands of that region but also the mainland of eastern Asia. He was thus able to interpret realistically the movements he discerned. His conclusions have been recently quoted in a letter of Mr. John Frank Stevens to the editor of the New York Herald Tribune, published in the December 8, 1949, edition of that paper.

Mr. Stevens, by the way, is the son of the world-famed engineer, John F. Stevens, who, as Chief Engineer of the Isthmian Canal Commission and, later its Chairman, was primarily responsible for the decision in favor of the high-level lake canal at Panama and laid out the great engineering organization under which the Panama Canal was constructed— a work essential to the realization of Commodore Perry's prophecy.

To make Commodore Perry's farvisioned pronouncement available to the Government of the United States and the Nation at large, under leave accorded, I am extending my remarks to include the full text of Mr. Stevens' letter, which follows:

PROPHECY BY PERRY—READER QUOTES WORDS OF THE FAMOUS COMMODORE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

As I lived in the Orient for 17 years, I am very much interested in the political and economic conditions and developments in that part of the world, and now that Communist China has taken over practically all of the continent of that country my thoughts go back to the contents of a paper written by Commodore M. C. Perry, United States Navy, read before the American Geographical and Statistical Society at a meeting held March 6, 1856, in New York City, and published by D. Appleton & Co., 1856, page 28:

"It requires no sage to predict events as strongly foreshadowed to us all; still westward will the course of empire take its way. But the last act in the drama is yet to be unfolded, and notwithstanding the reasoning of political empires—westward, northward, and southward—to me it seems that the people of America will, in some form or other, extend their dominion and their power until they shall have brought within their mighty embrace multitudes of the islands of the great Pacific, and placed the Saxon race upon the eastern shores of Asia; and I think, too, that eastward and southward will her great rival of future aggrandizement (Russia) stretch forth her power to the coast of China and Siam, and thus the Saxon and the Cossack will meet once more, in strife or in friendship, on another field. Will it be in friendship? I fear not. The antagonistic exponents of freedom and absolutism must thus meet at last, and then will be fought that mighty battle on which the world will look with breathless interest, for on its issue will depend the freedom or the slavery of the world—despotism or rational liberty must be the fate of civilized man. I think I see in the distance the giants that are growing up for that fierce and final encounter; in the progress of events that battle must sooner or later inevitably be fought."

For some time it has been the opinion of some of us who are seasoned students of far eastern affairs that the last struggle between the two largest countries would be probably in north China—perhaps in Shantung or Manchuria—and certainly Commodore Perry's paper points to something of this kind. However, let us hope that it can be settled amicably between these two physically very powerful nations.

JOHN FRANK STEVENS.
NEW YORK, *December 4, 1949.*

Abject Failure in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, during the past few weeks an increasing number of thoughtful citizens have spoken or written to me expressing their concern about the manner in which our Department of State has handled, or mishandled, our relations with China.

They realize that China has been one of our finest allies and staunchest friends. They further realize that the eyes of the peoples of the entire world are focused on Americans and that the future security of our Nation, as well as many others, may very well depend on what action our Government takes with respect to China and other far eastern nations.

To all of those who have written and spoken to me about China and to all the others who are puzzled about this matter, I say that their interest and deep concern cannot be any greater than mine. The confusion with respect to the State Department's policy, or lack of it, concerning China is tremendous. So far as I am concerned, no explanation yet given by our State Department, including its 1,054-page white paper report, has eliminated this confusion or justified the Department's inconsistencies and wait-until-the-dust-settles attitude. The dust has settled, and what we now see is the entire mainland of China in the hands of Communists—and Burma, southern Korea, Indochina, Siam, and other far eastern nations, including India, squarely faced with this same Communist threat.

Let us compare this actual situation with what the President said in his state of the Union message on January 4, 1950. Said the Chief Executive:

> In foreign policy * * * we can never be tolerant of oppression or tyranny. * * * We must throw our weight on the side of greater freedom and a better life for all peoples.

The very next day the President announced that we were forsaking Formosa.

Because I have been fortunate in having many American friends who spent long years in China and because I have been able to discuss this matter with several Chinese leaders and plain citizens, I long ago became deeply interested in China's problems as they relate to the United States and to the future peace and security of the world.

Partially with that interest and knowledge in mind, I said in May 1947—almost 3 years ago—in connection with the proposal for assistance to Greece and Turkey:

> What we need as a realistic Nation, before we attempt to rebuilt the political and economic structures of other countries, is a clearly defined, forthright, widely accepted policy which will provide us with a fully charted, integrated course of action.

In October 1947—more than 2 years ago—I wrote to the Secretary of State, saying:

> It is a matter of concern to me that almost our entire attention—with respect to foreign assistance and foreign economic recovery—is directed toward the European nations when it appears that China, a former loyal ally, is much more certainly in need of urgent assistance than such western nations as Switzerland, Sweden, and Turkey. This becomes a matter of even greater concern when on the basis of apparently reliable information in the public press, economic stability and recovery in China are not only urgent but could be effected at a very much lower cost to this country.

In reply I received this statement from the Under Secretary of State:

> I can assure you that this Government is thoroughly aware of the critical conditions which exist in China and is giving earnest attention to the question of how the United States can most effectively aid China in overcoming the present difficulties.

At the time of that exchange of correspondence Nationalist China had successfully contained the Chinese Communists in Manchuria, which, incidentally, had been made available to the Communists through the secret agreements made at Yalta. In the slightly more than 2 years which have intervened, the entire vast mainland of China has been lost to the Communists.

In spite of what has taken place in China in the past 2 years our State Department said loftily and without a noticeable twinge of conscience that—

> Nothing this country did or could have done * * * could have changed the result; nothing that was left undone by this country could have contributed to it.

This is a self-satisfying, self-serving statement of the Department of State, with which I emphatically do not agree.

During the past 2 years, in the face of State Department opposition, the Congress has appropriated funds for assistance to China. Even now the President has funds made available by the Congress for use at his discretion for assistance to China which have not been and are not being used. Adding to the general confusion were pictures and stories in last week's newspapers showing tanks and other war matériel destined for China being loaded aboard ship at an eastern port. This equipment was purchased by the Chinese Nationalist Government with American funds authorized in 1948. The matériel itself is surplus and, therefore, presumably was available when these funds were appropriated in 1948. It is no wonder, therefore, that questions are being asked as to why it has taken more than a year for this sorely needed matériel to be made available for shipping.

At this point I would like to direct attention to some of the conditions established by our State Department in 1948, as reported in the white paper, with which the Chinese Nationalist Government was expected to comply in order to receive American aid.

We find that China was asked to establish budgetary control in the hands of a central fiscal authority, with sufficient political strength to resist demands for unnecessary expenditures. Now, compare this for a moment with the operation of our own Government. Concerning Federal budgeting and accounting systems, the Hoover Commission reported that they found such systems in this country to be an antiquated, accretion of practices dating back to Alexander Hamilton. Although it would be possible to understand the existence of deficit financing in war-wracked China, it is difficult, if at all possible, to understand or condone peacetime deficit financing in our own country, which is the most prosperous in the world. Nevertheless, the fact remains that this Nation is today spending in excess of its revenues even though we already have an accumulated debt in excess of one-quarter of a trillion dollars.

In 1948 the Chinese Government was asked to eliminate nonproductive expenditures not essential to civic administration and prosecution of the war. In peacetime United States, however, as Senator BYRD's committee repeatedly pointed out, we have had one civilian employee for every two persons in uniform.

The Chinese were told to make administrative improvements in taxation. In our own country the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation reported in January 1948:

> Unnecessary, cumbersome, outmoded, and wasteful practices have continued unchanged in the Bureau [of Internal Revenue] for decades.

In 1948 our State Department asked the Chinese Government to make a conscientious reduction of civil and military rolls to eliminate unnecessary employees. This and the other State Department recommendations to China are highly commendable. But let us compare again what we recommended for China and what we continue to do at home. We find that in December 1932, Federal civilian employment in the executive branch totaled less than 600,000. Seven years later, in 1939, this number had increased by 50 percent and was slightly more than 900,000. As of June 30, last year, the total number of Federal civilian employees in the executive branch exceeded 2,900,000 and was reported by Senator BYRD to be increasing at the rate of 300 a day.

Let us consider another worthy recommendation made to the Chinese in 1948. They were told at that time that coordination and elimination of duplication in civil and military agencies was essential. What is the situation in our own country, according to the Hoover Commission and the Byrd committee? Those groups reported that there was almost fantastic duplication and overlapping among the 1,816 component parts of the executive branch of our Government. Here are but a few examples. We have 37 Federal agencies engaged in public health activities; 1[illegible] in electric and water power; 34 in the acquisition of land; 12 in home and community planning; no less than 16 in wildlife preservation; a total of 65 agencies engaged in gathering statistics; and 21 agencies in the field of transportation. This whole situation was very ably described by Comptroller Gen. Lindsay Warren as "a hodgepodge and crazy-quilt of duplications, overlappings, inefficiencies, and inconsistencies with their attendant extravagance."

In 1948 we made many other excellent recommendations to the Chinese Government, but I shall mention only one more. The Chinese Government was told to "clarify, by action as well as by statement, the fields open to private enterprise without government intrusion." On the other hand, in the opinion of many of us, our own Government's continued intrusion into many fields of private enterprise in direct competition with taxpaying private businesses has

become a matter of serious national concern. We find that our Government now owns, or is actively interested in, approximately 100 important business enterprises. Some of these fields of private endeavor into which our Government has entered extensively include banking, electric power production, life insurance, transportation, housing, and purchase and sale of farm products. In the electric power field alone our Government has already invested over $3,000,000,000 of the taxpayers' money in multipurpose power projects. But this is only the beginning. Our Government has, in addition, a planned program for further public power development entailing an ultimate aggregate cost of over $40,000,000,000.

Again, let me emphasize the fact that the recommendations we made to China in 1948 are extremely commendable. However, I am unable to understand why these same conditions or requirements were not established with respect to other nations to which we have made available billions of dollars, and why our own Government should not in effect "practice what it preaches."

I mentioned in the preceding sentence that such preaid conditions as were established for China were not applicable with respect to other nations which we are supporting with loans and gifts in tremendous sums. When it was suggested by many Members of Congress that requirements of this nature be made applicable, for example, to the European nations receiving Marshall-plan aid, the reply was given by our Department of State that this could not be considered because we would be interfering with the internal operations of these other governments. I fail to see any consistency in the policies established on the one hand for China and on the other hand for European nations, and yet I believe that the reconstruction and postwar development of nations in Europe and in Asia were of similar significance and importance to Americans and people throughout the world.

Let me repeat—the future peace and security of the world depend in a great measure upon American policy in the Far East. Bipartisan support for our foreign policy is much to be desired. But bipartisan support cannot be expected and should not be given unless both parties are fully and completely informed and unless both parties formulate, in fact and not in theory, that foreign policy.

In view of the foregoing, I earnestly urge that there be an immediate, intensive, and nonpartisan investigation of the forces within and without the Department of State which have caused our weak and wavering China policy to result in abject failure, the loss of China and its friendly people, and the very real threat to peace and security which the continued spread of communism in the Far East represents.

I hope that the pressure of public opinion will force the administration to take fearless and positive action of this nature. If this is done honestly and at once, I am confident that unity of purpose will thereafter produce "a clearly defined, forthright, widely accepted policy which will provide us with a fully charted, integrated course of action"—and support for a truly bipartisan policy which will be recognized by all the world as eminently just and worthy of freedom-, peace-loving Americans.

Lucien J. Bourgoin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I place the following address which I delivered at the dedication of the West Street playground to a Franco-American veteran of World War II, Lucien J. Bourgoin, on December 4, 1949, at Lawrence, Mass.:

This is just a field now set apart as a playground, but it is rich in memories of youth that has gone.

Of Lucien Bourgoin and of so many others, some of whom have come back to West Street this day as mothers, fathers, or grandparents. Others have moved to far off places. There are some who sleep forever on the western hills just beyond the railroad tracks, close to the scene of this, their childhood land.

As far back as most of us can remember this was an open space which the young claimed for the sports and games of their happy, carefree years.

If by some magic we could have all the boys and girls who found their freedom here come back today, as they were then, this field would be filled to overflowing and it would ring with their gay little voices.

But youth does not last forever. Sometimes it is taken by the early frost of death and it is so difficult to believe that journey's end has come so soon.

So it was with Lucien Bourgoin, who gave up the brightest years of his life that we might live.

Those of us who have not been called upon to make his sacrifice move on to middle age and to the quiet, thoughtful, later years when the reaper claims us in due season.

We look back on the young who follow us, identifying ourselves with them, trying to recapture the joy and the wonder that once was ours.

Perhaps Lucien's father told him of the ward 5 football and baseball games that were played here long ago, of the championship boxing bouts that drew people from near and far, of the carnivals that strung pearls of light against the night sky, of all the excitement and mystery when the circus came to West Street.

And maybe the boy's eyes went wide with the adventure of life even more so when his dad told him of the Archibald Wheel Co., which once stood just north of here.

It made wheels for the wagons which delivered food and coal and ice and furniture to the homes and wagon wheels which transported goods from the freight depot to the stores. It was a useful industry that served the needs of peace.

But in 1917 and 1918 it made wheels for a different purpose, and it was a busy place in those days. Every few weeks one saw a freight train pull away south along those very same tracks over there [pointing], its open cars loaded with wheels, each one daubed with different colors of paint, as if done by a child.

They called them camouflaged wheels because, at a distance they blended into the background and they were hard to see.

Those wheels were on their way to France as parts of the mobile guns that were helping the American and French Armies to save those freedoms in which our two countries believed.

Sometime later, after the war had ended, I remember those same wheels were carrying the body of a soldier who died of his wounds after his return home, carrying him along the street which flanks the northern end of this one, up to the Legion lot beyond the bridge.

In the meantime, automobiles were crowding out horse-drawn vehicles and the Archibald Wheel Co., having outlived its usefulness, went out of business.

The war to end all wars was over, and life in Lawrence resumed its normal ways.

The field was still here.

A new generation of children played on it. And the games they played were much the same as those played by children of 1900 to 1910, who had since grown up and gone to war and had come home if they were lucky, older, wiser, and disillusioned.

The new ones paid little attention to them, except on Memorial and Armistice Days, and then only in the passing parade.

The young of 1920 to 1930 had other things to do, such as "playing soldier," for instance, little dreaming that they would be called to follow in their fathers' footsteps, and that the game would become cruel, bloody, and in deadly earnest.

Even we, the older ones, did not think that it would happen.

It did, in a war more frightful than the one of 1917.

And we who were older and thought we were wiser failed to stop it. By our carelessness and our failure to concern ourselves with the problems of the Nation and the world we did this to our children.

We sent them off to fight and suffer and die to pay for our mistakes.

And now we receive back their still and broken bodies. Belatedly we grieve and raise monuments in their honor.

Too late for remorse? It is never too late for us to mend our ways and do something for another generation which is growing up in their likeness, and by something I mean that we exert ourselves to the fullest in building an international organization that will curb aggression and banish war forevermore from the face of this earth.

It will not be easy. It cannot be done in a year or 10. But it must be done, for the sake of the children here at this dedication who look up to us in such trust and confidence as their protectors.

Lucien Bourgoin would wish it so.

And as an everlasting reminder to us of our obligations, he would like his name associated with this playground of his boyhood.

To his gallant memory, symbolic of all the Franco-American young men and women who went from this neighborhood to fight our battles for us, we dedicate this playground.

That the children of today—and all children who follow them—may grow up to be happy, healthy citizens in a peaceful world which Lucien Bourgoin inspired us to win for them.

The Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Pittsburgh Press for Monday, January 16, 1950:

DON'T GO BACK

A battle impends in Congress over whether the House Rules Committee's former power to bottle up legislation shall be restored.

Last year the House voted, 275 to 142, to deprive the committee of that power.

The system then adopted provides that, if the Rules Committee fails to clear a bill in 21 calendar days, the chairman of the legislative committee which originally approved the measure can demand a vote by the House membership on whether it shall be brought out for debate.

Nine of the Rules Committee's 12 members have now asked the House to abandon the new system. Their request should be denied.

The system they would bring back was undemocratic. Under it the Rules Committee too often functioned, not as a traffic signal to keep the flow of proposed legislation orderly, but as a blockade.

Unless a bill could get approval by a Rules Committee majority it was held up indefinitely. Six committee members could prevent 429 other representatives of the people from debating and voting on measures which a majority of them might favor.

It is argued, on behalf of returning to that system, that danger of crackpot and spendthrift legislation would be lessened.

The Rules Committee, that is, could spare the House the necessity of voting on proposed laws and expenditures which most representatives recognize as unwise but shrink from opposing openly for fear of angering potent pressure groups.

Republicans and southern Democrats on the Rules Committee, for example, could prevent enactment of much of President Truman's program.

We question the wisdom of many things in the Truman program. But in the past the power which the Rules Committee now seeks to regain often was abused for the purpose of blocking legislation we favored.

We said, then, that it was wrong for the committee to have such power. We believe, now, that it would be wrong for the committee to recapture such power. What House Members need is enough backbone to stand up for their own convictions, not a device to shield political cowards.

Wind Power as a Possible Source of Power Is Not in Missouri River Basin Power Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. L. Huntsman:

WIND POWER AS A POSSIBLE SOURCE OF POWER IS NOT IN MISSOURI RIVER BASIN POWER PLAN

(By O. L. Huntsman, Washington, D. C.)

In connection with the power plan for the Missouri Basin development B. H. Greene, regional engineer at Chicago of the FPC gave the Inter-Agency Committee a report upon various aspects of the situation confronting it. Among the phases treated by him is the estimated required capacity for the next 20 years in that region and as to it the conclusion was that the required capacity of generating facilities would be far short. "To complete the 1970 generating capacity, and additional 8,922,000 kilowatts or 41 percent of the total, will have to come from new sources," the FPC engineer declared.

The new sources of supply of the required power, as suggested in Mr. Green's report, do not mention wind-generated power, but steam power and atomic energy are the contemplated sources or means to be developed.

The significance of the fact that the use of the aerogenerator, in this Great Plains area where wind movement is the most constant of any comparable part of this country, has not been mentioned by this Federal Power Commission engineer shows that within the Commission where the aerogenerator research work was done that the Bureau of Power there is either unfriendly, unfamiliar, or not interested with the new invention as an auxiliary supplier of power.

Wherever a condition exists in a Government agency such as is illustrated above, it becomes a poor policy to delegate administrative power to it—aimed at the development of a proposition—to a group of men who have undertaken the development of a competitive matter. That is to say, that if electricity can be generated by the wind cheaper than it can by water or steam power, those engaged in the construction of hydroelectric projects could not be expected to promote the development of facilities which may render obsolete the water-power or steam-power projects. For these reasons the cause of progress in the field of producing electrical power by the use of the wind should not be entrusted to the Federal Power Commission and its staff.

There are in existence other reports and studies made by the staff of the Federal Power Commission concerning the power development in other river basins, including one of particular interest to Arkansas. These reports are made by different segments of the staff at different times and plans but they show, with an exception, that no thought has been given to augmentation of electric needs of the area covered by use of the wind. In all of the reports on hydroelectric development plans, the demands are greater than the possible potential capacity of water-power resources.

It may be well to obtain copies of these various engineering reports from the Federal Power Commission and have them spread upon the record for information to the people who may be able to see the trends and thereby be able to understand them.

Labor Unions in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert an article from the International Teamster on labor unions in Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia by Rev. Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.:

LABOR UNIONS IN NAZI GERMANY AND SOVIET RUSSIA

(By the Reverend Edmund A. Walsh, S. J.)

In the early stages of nazism and as preparation for seizing total power, Hitler leveled one of his first attacks against the labor unions of Germany. No organized group of that type could be tolerated, since such associations of freemen are always a thorn in the side of dictators. Hence, labor, the church, education, youth organizations, cultural associations, agricultural societies, industry, finance, the press, literature, art, science, and every other agency which had a voice and a will of its own were systematically surrounded, absorbed, and reduced to silence.

When Germany had lost its freedom by this planned conspiracy, Hitler launched his legions on the series of conquests which nearly wrecked the continent of Europe and plunged mankind into the misery from which we are still suffering.

A similar enslavement of labor is the policy of Soviet Russia. No such thing as an independent labor union is tolerated. What are called unions are merely state-controlled armies of workmen regimented to obedience and subject to the iron discipline of the Communist government. Those who attempt opposition or even speculate out loud quickly disappear into concentration camps or are quietly liquidated by the all-powerful NKVD, which can arrest, try men in secret, and even execute them without recourse to legal forms. It is estimated that the number of victims from all levels of society at present in Soviet labor camps reaches the appalling total of from twelve to fifteen million persons. They are slowly being worked to death behind a second iron curtain.

It is an error to imagine that Hitler invented labor battalions or concentration camps. Both existed in Soviet Russia from the earliest years of the Communist regime. Hitler imitated the iniquity but improved the technique and surpassed the barbarity.

These two historic examples demonstrate how brutal and inhuman men can become when they lose respect for the dignity of human personality and degrade immortal souls to the level of mere machines and handy tools to be used until they are worn out and then cast on the scrap pile. It must never be forgotten that the loud claims of Communists to be the protector and champion of workingmen is only a smooth lie to cover up the new slavery and gain recruits for the Kremlin's world-wide campaign against Christianity and democracy. One has only to examine the condition of workers in Russia and compare the known facts in that police state to appreciate the liberty, the strength, and the progress of free labor in the United States of America.

Floods in the Twenty-sixth District of Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. C. W. (RUNT) BISHOP
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BISHOP. Mr. Speaker, so that the Members of the House may have the opportunity to get accurate information about the dangers of the floodwaters in the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, I am inserting the statement made by Mr. Peyton Berbling before the Appropriations Committee today.

I trust that when this comes before the House, we will receive the unanimous support of the Members in the effort to reduce the loss of life and property in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District.

The statement follows:

My name is Peyton Berbling and I am the corporation counsel of the city of Cairo, Ill., and attorney for the Cairo drainage district. The Cairo drainage district is the industrial district of the city of Cairo, and in this statement the area is treated as one unit, and considered as the Cairo area.

Cairo, which is at the head of year-round deep-water navigation on the Mississippi River, is situated at the extreme southern tip of Illinois. We are literally and actually surrounded by rivers. At our front doorstep is the Ohio River. At our back door is the mighty Mississippi River, and the north boundary of the Cairo drainage district is the south bank of Cache River. Our levee system, for protection against floods in these rivers, is approximately 22 miles in length, and while these levees are in the process of being brought to standard grade and section, they are not completed. Being thus surrounded by rivers, we of the Cairo area are probably more flood conscious than any people in the United States. We have more flood problems than any other river dwellers, and any failure to adequately protect the people against floods in the Mississippi Valley threatens the security of Cairo. Because of that fact, I am here, as a representative of the Cairo area, to urge this committee to give serious consideration to the flood protection in the Mississippi Valley, not on a basis of economy, not on the basis of expediency, but on the basis of common sense and necessity.

Flood protection is a never-ending job. It cannot be done in 1 year or 2. It requires constant attention and improvement, from the little creek to the mighty river. Possibly stabilization of flood control will eventually come, but certainly the goal is not yet in sight. It is a project that will require for some years an annual expenditure by the Federal Government of at least $100,000,000 on the lower Mississippi River alone. The river is a shifting, changing, unpredictable foe. To spend less is to invite disaster. To spend less is to waste a great part of what is actually spent. And in these days of $40,000,000,000 budgets, $100,000,000 is a very small amount to spend for the protection of our own American citizens and our own possessions. Adequate flood protection is not money wasted. It is a very good type of insurance, for the benefit of the Nation as a whole, because with adequate flood protection the people behind those levees can farm their fertile fields and raise the foodstuffs this Nation requires. If a flood comes, that breaks or overtops the levee, the cost cannot be easily measured, but certainly it will exceed many, many times the cost of adequate protection. A flood protection that doesn't protect is like a broken chain.

Possibly this is an old story to this committee. But if the members of this committee will read the newspaper headlines of the last few days, they can easily grasp the widespread devastation floodwaters are at this very minute doing to the hundreds and thousands of people in the Mississippi Valley. Today, the Ohio River floodwaters stand some 14 feet higher than the streets of Cairo—held back only by the levees. We have had over 10 inches of rain in 15 days. The Wabash, the Tennessee, the Cumberland, the St. Francis, the Ouchita, and many other rivers are rampaging out of their banks, forcing hundreds of families out of their homes, drowning livestock, destroying property, and the end is not yet in sight. If the rains continue we may well have another flood like the terrible 1937 flood.

I am sure that if I could take this committee with me, to see the thousands upon thousands of acres of fine farmland covered with swirling, yellow, river waters, if they could see the hundreds of families living in boxcars, and other makeshift shelters, if they could visualize the great loss in livestock and property already suffered, this committee would need no urging on my part to allocate sufficient funds for the protection of the people of the valley against floods. The scenes of desolation and destruction by the angry floodwaters of the rivers would be a far more potent advocate than I.

Therefore I am glad to appear before this committee at this time. I think the time most opportune because the facts are here for all of us to see. We are a generous Nation. Please be just as generous with the people of the Mississippi Valley as we are with others. If economy is necessary, then let us economize some other place, and not at the expense of flood protection, which is so vital and necessary.

As the representative of the Cairo area, but also as a vital part of the Mississippi Valley, I respectfully urge this committee to consider this matter in the light of its urgency, and give to the United States engineers sufficient money to go ahead with this great work.

The Close of a Chapter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Close of a Chapter," written by Felix Morley, and published in the weekly publication Human Events of January 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CLOSE OF A CHAPTER

(By Felix Morley)

The British recognition of Communist China, coming on the heels of President Truman's final abandonment of the Nationalist cause, has brought to a close the most miserable chapter in the whole history of American diplomacy. Even the New York Times, stanch follower of the Roosevelt-Truman line, is forced to admit editorially that: "We have taken a terrible beating in the Far East."

As yet, however, there is little realization of what the results of that beating are likely to be. The Communist conquest of China is in itself an event of historical importance second only to the Bolshevik revolution of 1917. But the loss of China is, to paraphrase Winston Churchill, only "the end of the beginning." With Mr. Truman's unconditional surrender of Formosa, initiative in the cold war everywhere passes to the clever men in the Kremlin. We can be sure they will exploit their advantages to the full.

Among the results to be anticipated is the further deterioration of the United Nations. In spite of Soviet sabotage this Organization has heretofore been able to function in a fumbling manner. Russia has stultified the Council by use of the veto power, but with the Soviet bloc a small minority of the Assembly there has been some prospect that the veto difficulty could be bypassed.

This likelihood is now diminished. It is not merely that before long Vishinsky will have an oriental colleague to give Moscow control of two out of the five permanent Council seats. The Soviet influence in the Assembly will also be strengthened. From now on, as in the recent test on the internationalization of Jerusalem, the Government of the United States can expect to be outvoted in the more democratic organ of UN. Continuing enthusiasm for an international organization in which we are continuously outsmarted by Russia is not to be expected.

The growing reaction toward isolationism was obvious in President Truman's noninterventionist statement on Formosa. This reaction is certain to be stimulated by the British recognition of the Mao Tze-tung regime, not less so because we shall ultimately follow the British lead in this matter.

If our foreign policy since 1945 could point to a single tangible accomplishment, it was the solidification of Anglo-American relations. The substance of even this one achievement has now been largely whittled away. In domestic affairs our British ally has moved a long distance toward a national socialism which is anathema to traditional American thinking. In western Europe the British are openly skeptical about the economic "integration" that Mr. Hoffman has been vainly preaching. Now, in the Far East, Great Britain moves to make friends with a Chinese regime that has humiliation of the United States as its clear objective.

II

There is, of course, a body of American opinion that would gladly follow Britain into national socialism as domestic policy, and into military alliances in the foreign field. But the task of those who would push the American people down these devious paths is becoming increasingly difficult. The inconsistencies are too clear, and, what is more influential, they are too costly to be passively endured.

Senator TAFT has been prompt to point out the contradiction between the early Truman doctrine of intervention in Greece and the present Truman doctrine of nonintervention in China. If it makes sense to pour money and supplies into the Greek civil war, it should make at least equal sense to do the same in the Chinese civil war. Mr. Truman's assertion that we have no predatory designs on Formosa is close to admission that we have predatory designs on Greece.

The appalling tangle into which opportunism has brought us is the more deplorable, because the Department of State could easily have advanced a reasonable explanation for its flounderings. Secretary Acheson could have said frankly that while the principle of containing communism is sound, this country simply cannot afford to apply it on a global basis. Mr. Acheson could have said that our Greek adventure has been too expensive, and too dubious in its accomplishment, to risk repetition on a far larger scale in China. Such an explanation would have been frank and honorable, and the more impressive when backed by the explicit and implicit revelations in the President's budget message.

But this admission would be out of character for the present administration. Taking the cue from his predecessor, Mr. Truman refuses to admit that anything is beyond his power. Then, when the inevitable frustrations arise, they are glossed over with hypocritical and sanctimonious phrases which can only serve to play into Communist hands.

Actually, we should be grateful to the British for their forthright, if painful, decision to recognize Red China. It knocks the props from under the whole jerry-built structure of our postwar diplomacy. With increasing insistence Americans will now ask why we should pour billions into the containment of communism in Europe if our allies there are willing to make terms with Communist regimes in Asia.

This is a reasonable question which the Department of State will find increasingly difficult either to evade or answer. Perhaps the only satisfactory answer now would be the cry of confession: "Oh, what a tangled web we weave when first we practice to deceive."

III

The tragedy of China is the more poignant, and the more dangerous, because our

recent policy toward that tragic country has been lacking in elementary honesty. Secretary Acheson asserted at his press conference on January 5 that "when the United States takes a position it sticks to that position and does not change it by reason of transitory expediency or advantage." Unfortunately the record says otherwise.

On November 26, 1941, in the virtual ultimatum to which Japan replied by attacking Pearl Harbor, the State Department demanded that Japan should not support "militarily, politically, economically, any government or regime in China other than the National Government" headed by Chiang Kai-shek. If it were true that when we take a position we stick to it, we should be sending a similar ultimatum to Great Britain today.

The record further shows that at Yalta, on February 11, 1945, Roosevelt, Churchill, and Stalin agreed that Soviet Russia should receive important territorial and economic concessions in the Far East. These concessions, providing the springboard from which the Communists proceeded to conquer all of China, included the complete surrender of Outer Mongolia to Russia and recognition of "the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union" in Manchuria.

Stalin was not merely given these priceless advantages at Chinese expense, he was given them without any consultation with our Chinese ally. As Secretary Acheson himself has written in the letter transmitting the China white paper to President Truman: "It was not until June 15, 1945, that General Hurley was authorized to inform Chiang Kai-shek of the [Yalta] agreement," concluded behind Chiang's back 4 months earlier. The white paper itself says (p. 115): "It was unfortunate that China was not previously consulted."

Diplomatic chicanery of this sort is bad enough in itself. But when followed by rhetorical asservations of "the fundamental integrity" of our policy toward China, the hypocrisy becomes intolerable.

IV

Since the sell-out at Yalta it has been impossible for those who have studied the record objectively to regard our Chinese policy with anything but contempt.

In his letter transmitting the Chinese white paper to President Truman, an attempt to gloss the ugly facts was made by Secretary Acheson. So that the war might be quickly ended, he said: "We * * * were prepared to and did pay the requisite price." But Mr. Acheson failed to emphasize that the price paid to Stalin, for 1 week of Russian participation in the war against Japan, was paid at Chinese expense, and without informing the Chinese of the secret transaction. Against this black background Mr. Acheson now says that we stand for principle, that we are honorable and that we do not put forward words, as propagandists do in other countries, to win a temporary advantage.

All that we can accomplish, by this sanctimony, is to consolidate the Chinese behind the Mao Tze-tung regime. The Chinese Nationalists realize, if we do not, that the United States has sold them down the river. It will be wholly understandable if all in a position to do so rally behind the Communist government, the more so since the latter shows every disposition to pay us off in our own coin.

The background also explains why the British, reluctantly but firmly, are dissociating their far-eastern policy from our unpredictable and indefensible gyrations. As the friendly Manchester Guardian observed, in its weekly issue of January 5: "It is rare for a government to repeat its mistakes so exactly and so quickly as Mr. Truman's administration has now done." Perhaps we can afford a blundering diplomacy. The British cannot. So they have split with us to recognize the Red China that we have done so much to consolidate.

Of course, this split between Britain and the United States weakens the whole basis of our European policy, simultaneously with the complete collapse of our policy in Asia. It is not surprising that Moscow should choose this moment to open a propaganda offensive in Finland, in Italy, and in Germany. The time to cash in on our mistakes is at hand.

It is a dismal picture; one that presages a swift and sweeping revulsion in popular thinking. Indeed, an outstanding question now is which of the two parties will more quickly see the domestic implications of growing disillusion. In November 1940 both Democratic and Republican leadership were for intervention. In November 1950, as the tide is running, a bipartisan policy of isolationism would not be surprising.

B. H. Greene's Report on Missouri River Basin Plan Omits Mention of Possibilities of Wind Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by O. L. Huntsman:

B. H. GREENE'S REPORT ON MISSOURI RIVER BASIN PLAN OMITS MENTION OF POSSIBILITIES OF WIND POWER

(By O. L. Huntsman, Washington, D. C.)

It may be of interest to note some facts which indicate the nature of varied interests that some people have, who are engaged in various phases of power development work. One of these manifestations came to light recently in an official report submitted by an engineer employed by the Government. B. H. Greene, regional engineer of the Federal Power Commission at Chicago, gave the Inter-Agency Committee a technical report upon various aspects of the situation confronting it and among the phases treated is one in the form of an estimate of required generating capacity for the Missouri River Basin power plant in the next 20 years. The conclusion reached by this engineer was that the required capacity of generating facilities in that region would be far short. Using his words, it was said, "to complete the 1970 generating capacity an additional 3,922,000 kilowatts, or 41 percent of the total will have to come from new sources."

The sources or possible sources of this added needed supply suggested by Mr. Greene are atomic energy and steam power. There is no mention of wind power as a possible source, which omission is of significance from another viewpoint.

This is not to criticize Mr. Greene, but to point out the fact that because the constituency of the Federal Power Commission is composed of engineers whose interests and training gravitate around the two conventional types of electric generation—water power and steam power—it may not be sound policy to entrust to it the task of developing wind-power instrumentalities to meet present needs. The steam locomotive is passing into the limbo, but there are thousands of earnest men who still believe that steam power is best notwithstanding the demonstrated fact regarding Diesel engines which are supplanting them, because of efficiencies and economies.

Since the Eighty-first Congress, second session, has before it through the President's messages the public power program, it may be that now is the proper time to inject into it the subject of the aerogenerators as sources of cheap auxiliary power to complement the vast hydroelectric developments which are being designed.

Mr. Truman did not mention the scientific development of wind power for generating electricity among those things enumerated in his message and I doubt whether it has ever been brought to his attention. He did specify the need for power development in the Southwest region embracing parts of Oklahoma and Arkansas.

Here, as I have stated in my memo on wind velocities, may be found the best locations in the country for the use of an aerogenerator, because of the constancy of the wind.

If aerogenerators can be built and installed in that region in connection with the dams on those small rivers, how well the windmill and the water turbine can work together. When the wind blows the water wheel can be shut down, thus conserving that source of power for days when there is no wind, and thus a constant supply of power can be maintained at a minimum cost.

This feature should be considered in the matter of the Southwest power development. I am calling it to your attention for whatever importance you may see fit to attribute to it.

A Reporter Looks at Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, there follow the final two articles in the series on bigness in Government authored by Mr. Paul Martin, of the Gannett News Service. The first three in this series appeared in yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

[From the Rochester (N. Y.) Times-Union of December 15, 1949]

SPEND-FOR-PROSPERITY POLICY FEARED

(What is there to fear in Government planning? Can the managed economy succeed? Are we on the way to a one-party system of government? This is the fourth in a series of articles on the magnitude and power of the Federal Government, supported by taxes of the people.)

(By Paul Martin)

There are many citizens today who fear the growing concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government.

This is evidenced by the variety of American leaders who have spoken out against present trends, including former President Herbert Hoover, Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, and former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes.

Congressmen who have returned to Washington during the recess say the one thing uppermost in the minds of the folks back home is the high rate of Federal spending without being able to make ends meet.

What is there to be apprehensive about today? Sometimes it is the hidden trend in government, rather than the accomplished fact.

Here are some trends which have not become fully apparent:

First, there is the theory of the boom economy.

President Truman's economic advisers have what might be termed a 10-year plan. The object is to channel Federal spending into such avenues that we may be able to pump up the national economy from an output of goods and services of around $260,000,000,000 a year as at present, to three hundred or three hundred and fifty billion dollars annually.

This inflationary program contemplates such goals as a $4,000-a-year minimum income for every family—35 percent higher earnings for farmers, pensions of at least $100 a month for the aged, business profits of $40,000,000,000 a year, instead of fifteen or twenty billion dollars.

Fiscal planners are veering away from the old-fashioned notion of a balanced budget, in favor of a what-can-the-economy-stand formula.

Federal spending will be kept high, even inflationary, to pump more money into production and employment, and keep the stream of currency moving. This in turn should create a broader base for collection of more Federal taxes.

In this managed economy, the national debt itself becomes an instrument for expanding credit, and booming business.

There is a rule of thumb that the national debt could go safely to twice the amount of the national income.

Thus with output of goods and services running around $260,000,000,000, the debt could hit a peak of $520,000,000,000 without endangering the national economy. If the economy could be pumped up to the Truman goal of over $300,000,000,000, the debt could go even higher.

Then there, is the roll-it-over theory.

So long as the Treasury can meet interest payments on the debt, why worry about the principal? When one set of securities comes due, buy it in, then issue another series.

After all, the full faith and credit of the United States is behind these notes, and if the Government's credit isn't good, whose is?

Another trend affects the future role of State and local governments.

An unpublished report of the Hoover commission recommended that the Federal Government reduce State-aid grants, and leave to the various States all control and responsibility for such activities as:

(1) Education, (2) public health, (3) welfare and public assistance, (4) employment security, (5) housing and slum clearance.

The report also urged the Federal Government to retire from the following tax fields, and leave them to State or municipal governments:

(1) Estate tax fields. (2) Levies on gasoline and oil. (3) Excises and retail sales taxes.

The Treasury collects around $4,000,000,000 a year from these sources, excluding the old-line, prewar excises on alcohol, tobacco, etc.

This report, prepared for publication, was not released because of objections from at least 2 out of the 12 members of the Hoover Commission.

One dissenter was Secretary of State Dean Acheson, the Commission's Vice Chairman. Acheson is said to hold the view that in this new era of internationalism, State governments are archaic and old-fashioned.

The trend of Government planning in Washington today is that there should be no expansion in the direction of more State government, but rather a gathering in and consolidation of power in a strong Federal Government.

Finally, some believe there is under way an irresistible movement of voters into one single majority party, welded out of many minorities.

A whole new generation of voters has grown up during the last 20 years, with no concept of the old ebb and flow of political power between the two great parties.

And the Government is getting credit for redistributing the tax money of the people, often in reverse ratio to what they paid in, or how it was collected from the various States.

Businessmen, who formerly resented Government invasion into the field of private enterprise, are being more and more tempted by the easy credit of Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Grants, loans, guaranties, price supports, State-aid programs, and benefits to veterans, the aged, the needy, the unemployed, hold a magnetic political attraction.

Some political observers today feel that the United States is in danger of losing its traditional two-party system of government.

[From the Rochester Times-Union of December 16, 1949]

A "Spending Spree" Into Socialism

(By Paul Martin)

Who is responsible for runaway Federal spending and dangerous trends in government?

There are some hopeful signs. But in the last analysis, it's the individual wage earner-taxpayer citizen who counts.

Your direct link to better government is through your home-town Congressman.

What is being done today to protect the United States from economic or political danger?

There are several hopeful signs. But none, in itself, amounts to a firm guarantee that this country is not following bankrupt Great Britain on a spending spree into socialism.

Here are the encouraging signals:

HOOVER COMMISSION

Work of the Hoover Commission probably holds the most immediate promise for future economy and efficiency in government.

This bipartisan group, headed by former President Herbert Hoover, avoiding any semblance of politics, made 288 separate recommendations for Government reorganization.

Mr. Hoover estimated these could save American taxpayers $3,000,000,000 to $5,000,000,000 a year.

In its concluding report the Commission said:

"Federal Government has become the largest enterprise on earth. In less than 20 years its civil employment has increased from 570,000 to over 2,000,000. Its bureaus, sections, and units have increased fourfold to over 1,800.

"Annual expenditures have soared from $3,000,000,000 to over $42,000,000,000. It now costs more each year to pay the interest on the national debt than it did to pay the total cost of the Federal Government 16 years ago."

Around 20 percent of the Commission's recommendations have been enacted to date. Many additional reforms remain for the next session of Congress.

ADMINISTRATION

The White House expects to send a performance-type budget to Congress in January, for the first time in history.

This is designed to show more clearly where the money goes, make it easier to determine where to cut Federal spending.

Mr. Truman also has shown some gestures in the direction of economy.

He vetoed a number of private bills of the Eighty-first Congress which would have upped the cash outlay of the Treasury. He also impounded $615,000,000 in Air Force funds which Congress voted over and above the President's recommendations.

CONGRESS

The practical opposition to more costly social-welfare programs in recent years has come from Congress.

This has been due to a loose coalition of conservative, midwest Republicans and southern Democrats, who have held in check runaway spending plans of the administrative agencies.

Congress next year will attempt for the first time an omnibus appropriations bill, in which all funds for the 1951 fiscal year will be shown under a single cover, instead of 15 to 20 separate bills.

This may or may not add to economy, but it should give a clearer picture of the Federal spending.

Yet Congress, itself, is at fault in failing to keep spending within confines of the Federal revenues, and failing to establish a debt-reduction program.

Members who in theory are for economy give in to practical politics when an appropriations bill affects some pet project in their own districts.

And they swap votes for subsidies to farmers, veterans, business, home-building, miners, ranchers, aviation, merchant marine, and the like.

Proposals to direct the President to make a flat 5 or 10 percent cut in appropriations, already voted by Congress, are a tacit admission that the legislators don't want to do an item-by-item job of pruning their own money bills.

Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes summed it up this way:

"Our real trouble is debt and taxes. We cannot cure it by more debt and taxes. We should devote to cutting expenditures some of the thought we are devoting to taxing and borrowing.

"But cutting expenditures is not seriously considered in the executive departments. And new taxes will not be considered in Congress. So deficit spending will continue."

A seasoned politician once gave this advice to a new Member of Congress:

"To stay in politics, you must vote for every appropriation bill—against every tax bill."

POLITICS

The trend to one-party politics may arise in large part from the fact that present political symbols have become almost meaningless.

Study the composition of Congress, and what do you find?

So-called liberals are distributed more or less on a regional basis, not according to party lines.

There are the well-defined areas—New England, the Middle Atlantic States including New York and New Jersey, the agrarian radicals around Minnesota and North Dakota, the far West, and the Pacific coast.

No one knows exactly what a liberal stands for, but it sounds more attractive to many than conservative.

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower recently defined a liberal as a "man in Washington who wants to play the Almighty with our money."

So-called conservatives reflect largely the sentiment of the Midwest in the GOP, that of the South for Democrats.

If there were a new alinement according to basic economic and social beliefs, many Members would shed their traditional Democrat and Republican labels, and a new two-party system would emerge.

THE PUBLIC

In the past, it has been difficult to interest the average wage earner in such things as taxes and deficits and socialism.

That era may be on the way out. For taxes now hit just about everybody. Federal, State, and local taxes take around 33 percent of the pay check of the average worker.

Major complaints in the congressional mail this year were against excessive Government spending and high taxes.

It is still difficult to put across the concept of socialism or statism in contrast to individual freedom, competition, and private property.

But former Gov. HERBERT H. LEHMAN, of New York, while campaigning for the Senate on President Truman's Fair Deal program, shied away from socialized medicine.

SOLUTION

Then what is the solution to run-away Federal spending and dangerous trends in the body politic?

Obviously, no one has the final answer, or there would be no problems today.

But in the last analysis, the direct link between the individual and his representative form of government is Congress.

That means the home district Congressman, and on a larger scale, the two United States Senators.

Congressmen are remarkably allergic to mail from home. They tend to ignore form letters, telegrams, and mimeographed postcards from lobby blocs and pressure groups.

But they consider carefully all well-reasoned, personal letters from constituents.

Material Aid to Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I recently made:

My fellow citizens, already most of the first day of this new year, 1950, has passed into history. It is quite possible that many of my listeners have made resolutions for the new year. Personally, I prefer to use the word "determination."

The time has come in the world and certainly in our own country when we must take a very positive position on all fundamental questions if we are to meet the world-wide responsibilities which are ours whether we want those responsibilities or not. There is no doubt but what the rest of the world is looking to us for many things. I wonder sometimes if we have not encouraged peoples everywhere to look our way for too much material help. It may be that as we seek to divide that which is stored in our plenteous warehouses, we forget that real advice, counsel, precept, and example should accompany the liberal sharing of our physical resources. Would it not be wise for us as a country to ponder a more realistic return to the fundamentals which have brought this country to the height of prosperity, mass production, good health, good schools, good recreation, sanitation, good roads, automobile ownership, and opportunities of all character which we enjoy under the democratic way of life?

It must be remembered that our Southland has prospered greatly since the Civil War. We had no Marshall plan to aid us. In fact we had few of the labor-saving devices which we enjoy today. Houses were built by hand; the gasoline plow was unknown. The mechanical cotton picker was but a dream. Children came into the world in private homes instead of maternity hospitals. Sensitiveness to certain foods held no place in the medical fraternity. Miracle drugs remained in undeveloped scientific fields. The automobile was not about us, not even to suggest the absence of the airplane, the radio, and now television. The development of the atom was suggested but not even the most erudite scholar knew where to start and certainly no one dreamed that it would cost more than $2,000,000,000 to build a plant in the State of Tennessee, wherein science in cooperation with business management, architects, engineers, contractors, and skilled workmen would finally produce an instrument so powerful as to not only shorten the most horrible war in the world's history but to bring it to a conclusion. All of this suggests to me that we could have never done any of these remarkable things without the fundamentals of hard work, thrift, honesty, the development of good character as individuals and as subdivisions of a great Federal Government.

All of these accomplishments resulted from an ambitious people ever looking toward the future and ever recognizing the need for bringing real happiness to the world in the development of the sciences and the professions, labor, and business. With all of these remarkable physical advantages about us, without the dedication of sound education to useful gains, with this general prosperity and physical happiness so common to most of the citizens of this great country and with so many luxuries in other parts of the world, accepted as simple necessities here, I am afraid that we have lost some of the substantial foundation in the training of some of our teachers and leaders who would have a utopia reached in a day without the hard and difficult and rugged steps which brought us to this place now and which must be continued if the fondest dreams of the idealists are to be further realized in the future.

The President of the United States has announced that he will again press for the passage of his civil-rights program in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress which convenes day after tomorrow. I list the 10 points in that program for you in order that you may be refreshed as to its details:

1. Set up a permanent Civil Rights Commission, a Joint Congressional Committee on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division in the Justice Department.
2. Strengthen existing civil rights laws.
3. Provide Federal protection against lynching.
4. Give more adequate protection to the right to vote.
5 Set up an FEPC.
6. Prohibit discrimination in interstate transportation facilities.
7. Provide home rule and Presidential election suffrage for the District of Columbia.
8. Authorize statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.
9. Equalize the naturalization opportunities for residents of this country.
10. Settle the evacuation claims of Japanese-Americans.

Immediately you will recognize the highly controversial nature of several of these proposals. Just as quickly, I am sure, you will appreciate that some of these suggestions, though very noble in character, are not such as will become a part of the very nature of the individual citizen by simply enacting a law and writing language, which, if violated, will carry a penalty of imprisonment in a Federal penitentiary or the payment of a fine in dollars and cents, or both.

Years ago when I sat as judge of the city court of Memphis, I found out that a great many people believe in the rigid and strict enforcement of the law just so long as those laws are not being enforced against "me or a member of my household." A great many people believe that laws prohibiting the excessive use of speed in the operation of automobiles should be promptly and severely enforced, but many of the same people are just as quick to believe that an exception should be made in a particular case if a member of his household is found exceeding the speed limit. Should that arise many find it very convenient to suggest mitigating circumstances, sometimes claiming that the youth or age of the person committing the violation was the reason behind the excessive speed so as to minimize the charge or completely excuse the offender.

All of us know that you cannot legislate morals. Education is most important. But if a man have an evil heart and you educate that heart you but make it better possible for him to execute his evil design. On the contrary, if a man have a good heart and you give him that broad and understanding education, you make it possible for that individual to render a genuine, a true, and an unselfish service to his fellowman.

I recognize that I have been making a general statement thus far. God willing, I shall be talking to you each Sunday night all this year. I shall discuss specific legislation which is being considered by the Congress. To the very best of my ability I shall report to you the reasons behind some of the proposed laws. I could not let this night go by, however, without stating the premise that this country was not made great and secure, prosperous, and the leading Nation of the world on any basis of socialism. We are truly a capitalistic Nation and our people are essentially capitalists. Our people are both superior and supreme in this land of opportunity. The individual citizen in this country is superior because he has unlimited opportunities. We own more telephones than all of the other nations of the world put together. The same may be said of automobiles. The great majority of people in the United States accept a bathtub as a simple necessity, while millions and millions of people have never heard of one. The people in this country are supreme as capitalists because they buy on a free market everything they want with money earned at the highest wage scale and salary scale enjoyed in the world. The more diligently a man applies himself, the more money he naturally makes and the more material blessings he enjoys. That is all fundamental. From time to time I expect to have much more to say about this thought which any thinking person must accept as axiomatic.

Thomas Jefferson many years ago said this and I ask you to pay close attention to the quotation:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labor of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy. The same prudence which in private life would forbid our paying our money for unexplained projects, forbids it in the disposition of public money."

What Jefferson said then is just as true as can be today. This is no time to add further Federal taxes to the citizens of this country. We must raise the efficiency of public service and that can only be raised by the interest of each individual who is employed by the Government.

We must have a complete reorganization and administration of the civil service, and do not let anyone say that I propose the abolition of the Department recognized to administer those laws which cover the regulation of employment and employees and which gives assurance of job security. What I do mean most positively is that red tape must be abolished and foolish regulations, which in themselves add to the pattern of administration and call for literally thousands of unnecessary employees, must go and should go at once. The head of a department should be graded and recognized for efficiency on the basis of the least number of competent people who can do a public service courteously and well, rather than be judged and many times promoted because he is in charge of an extraordinary number of incompetent, discourteous, and unsatisfactory employees. I have had too many Government

employees to agree with me on this to feel for one moment that I am taking an improper or unfair attitude. If there should be a tightening up of inefficiency within the civil service itself, and if that same degree of competence be required in all Federal departments and agencies, much money would be saved and the employees as well as the country would be much safer, much more secure, and certainly happier.

The time has come to follow the expenditure of American dollars into the countries under the Marshall plan. Too many of my colleagues have come back in recent weeks and have reported that many thinking people in other countries of the world have come to the conclusion that the Marshall plan means far more to us than it does to them. Many have said that in our whole complex problem, they have but increased the burden by spending the dollars we allow them in this country which but adds to inflation, when if they had the will to build and to produce the same food, machinery, and other items in their own countries—they would be far better off.

The women of this country are absolutely correct in asking the question as to why there is a 20-percent excise tax on cosmetics, when the same does not apply to men's shaving cream. These items are just as necessary under our way of living for one as to the other. We must have taxes to run good public services, but far more important at the moment is the problem of reducing unnecessary expenses so that our tax burden shall most certainly not be increased, and we hope decreased, so that all businesses, large and small, may extend themselves, grow and profit.

I have already in recent broadcasts made the statement that it was never intended for the post office to go into the express business. I expect to introduce a bill at the earliest possible time in this session, which, if passed, will return the weight and size limits to the original law and will result in the restoration of thousands of employees to private enterprise, reducing not a single person in the Post Office Department, and make unnecessary the tremendous building program which will otherwise be incumbent upon the Post Office Department if post-office express is continued under the present regulations.

As soon as possible I shall state why I am against social medicine. Our professional medical standards are the highest in the world, and we must keep them there.

I expect to take up the so-called civil-rights program item by item and will develop as studiously and sincerely as I know how problems affecting housing, taxes, the development of our rivers and harbors, the Hoover reorganization plan, and all other public questions which I may be called upon to vote as your accredited Representative in the Congress of the United States. I will continue my efforts to stabilize the employment of the civil employees of the engineer depot in Memphis.

I shall leave for Washington early in the morning. The past 2½ months have made possible the longest stay at home since you sent me to Congress February 15, 1940. My secretary, Carl Lemser, and I opened the Memphis office promptly upon adjournment and have sought to answer every call and to meet every demand which came to us. Many organizations and clubs were kind enough to invite me to talk to them personally. To some it may have appeared a strenuous task, but I received a very great reward in the privilege of seeing many friends and meeting newcomers during that period of time. Our office in Washington has remained opened all the while with a most adequate staff. This has made possible more prompt service on many matters because we were in touch daily with that office.

I express the deep appreciation of all of my family and of all of my staff for the many notes of encouragement received during this holiday period. While we go back to Washington without any respite from our assigned task, we do approach this next session of Congress with enthusiasm and determination, and with the hope that we may give a good accounting of our stewardship.

Since reading the prayer of St. Francis of Assisi on a recent broadcast, a great number of requests have come in—that I repeat it—with the hope that it brings you as much inspiration and challenge as it has me. I shall wish all of you the happiest New Year of your lives with this beautiful prayer in my heart.

"Lord make me an instrument of Thy peace; where there is hatred, let me sow love; where there is injury, pardon; where there is doubt, faith; where there is despair, hope; where there is darkness, light; and where there is sadness, joy.

"O Divine Master, grant that I may not so much seek to be consoled as to console; to be understood, as to understand; to be loved, as to love; for it is in giving that we receive, it is in pardoning that we are pardoned, and it is in dying that we are born to eternal life."—St. Francis of Assisi.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD four broadcasts by me on October 24, November 7, November 21, and December 5, 1949, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." These embrace programs Nos. 10, 11, 12, and 13.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 10)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Well, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress has finally ended. Unless called back into special session, we will not meet again until next January.

Under the Reorganization Act, Congress is required to complete its business on or before July 31 of each year.

When that date arrived Congress was so far behind in its work that a technical ruling was made by the Democratic leadership holding that World War II had not yet ended.

Under that ruling Congress continued in session for 3½ months longer.

In this broadcast I want to give you a brief report on the accomplishments and the failures of this long session of Congress. Usually such reports are routine. This year, however, the situation is different.

Recently, in a most unusual step, the President issued a summary of the legislation considered and praised the accomplishments of this session of the Eighty-first Congress. The White House sought to show that this Congress was much superior to the Republican Eightieth Congress which preceded it.

As I said, that was a most unusual step by a President of the United States. It was especially odd, because, as I shall prove to you, the facts do not justify the claim.

First, let us keep some simple figures in mind. In the Eighty-first Congress there were 54 Democratic Senators and 42 Republicans. That was a solid Democratic majority of 12 votes. In the House of Representatives the Democrats had 263 Members, the Republicans 171, and there was 1 Member of the American Labor Party, who nearly always voted with the Democrats. That gave the Democrats an overwhelming majority of 92 votes.

In view of Mr. Truman's summary, I ask you to keep these figures in mind, because they prove conclusively that in the session just closed the Democrats could pass any bill they wanted to pass, and, by the same token, they could defeat any bill they wanted defeated. They had the votes in both Houses.

Now let us turn to the accomplishments and failures of the recent session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Do you remember the Democratic national convention in Philadelphia in July of 1948? At that time President Truman announced that he was calling the Eightieth Congress back into special session. He read a 29-point program, all of which he described as of a highly emergency nature which could not wait. If it were not passed, he said, the country would go to rack and ruin.

What were these emergency measures which Mr. Truman asserted were needed to prevent national disaster? I have listed some of the 29:

The President wanted stand-by authority for price control, wage control, and rationing of scarce commodities.

He wanted to reestablish an excess-profits tax.

He wanted Federal aid to education; socialized medicine; a 50-percent increase in old-age pensions.

He demanded the repeal of the Taft-Hartley bill.

He wanted to establish universal military training.

He wanted civil-rights legislation, including an anti-poll-tax bill, an antilynching bill, and a FEPC bill.

He wanted approval of the St. Lawrence Waterway Treaty and the establishment of a national science foundation.

Do you remember these recommendations? And do you remember that the President said in July 1948 that if Congress wanted to buckle down to work it could roll through his entire program in 15 days. I am sure you remember that statement.

None of these recommendations were enacted into law in that special session of 1948. Then the President went up and down the country asking the people to give him a Democratic Congress. He promised that such a Congress would enact his entire program into law and that it would do it promptly.

Well, the people gave him the kind of a Congress he asked for—a strong Democratic Senate and an overwhelming Democratic House.

Now let's see what happened during the first 15 days of the Eighty-first Congress.

It didn't pass the President's 29 points—not a single one of them. In those 15 days it passed just two bills. One of these gave the President, the Vice President, and the Speaker of the House substantial pay increases.

In addition, the President was given an allowance of $50,000 a year, free of income taxes. This raised his total salary to the equivalent of approximately $300,000 a year if all of it were subject to tax.

The other bill gave Government employees a 4-day holiday for the inauguration.

That is the first thing I want to report to my fellow Pennsylvanians about the Eighty-first Congress and its accomplishments in the first 15 days of the session.

But you may say they couldn't put through that program in 15 days. Of course the Democratic Congress could not do it in 15 days, any more than a Republican Congress could. I agree with you there.

Now, let us survey the record of the entire first session of this Congress—a session lasting 9½ months. This session must be recorded as the slowest in American history.

The fiscal year in the Federal Government begins on July 1 of each year. Appropriation bills should all be passed before that date. During the Eightieth Congress the last appropriation bill was approved on June 19, 1948, but in this session we did not complete action on many important appropriation measures, involving billions of dollars, until a few days ago.

Since July 1, the Government has been operating on a stop-gap legislation which provided funds for the various departments, boards, and agencies. Nothing like this ever happened before.

Now let us consider some phases of the program which the President promised would be enacted if he got a Democratic Congress. He promised civil rights. He promised a FEPC law. He promised anti-lynching and anti-poll-tax laws. Now, let me tell you about that.

It was nearly 4 months after the Eighty-first Congress commenced before the administration bills were even introduced in the Senate. Not one of them has been reported out by the Senate committee handling it.

Remember that at the beginning of the session the Democratic majority was increased in every one of these committees so that they would have absolute control. Each committee has a Democratic chairman and a substantial Democratic majority, so that if every Republican member of those committees were to oppose the bills, the Democrats were still strong enough to send them to the floor and pass them, if they were so minded.

The only bill on civil rights which reached the floor of the Senate was a bill introduced by a Republican, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan. It was an anti-lynching bill. It has been on the calendar since June 6, and at no time did the majority leader of the Senate make any effort or attempt to have this bill taken up for consideration.

It so happens that the large majority of Republican Members of Congress favor civil-rights legislation. You know, as well as I do, that the opposition is centered in the Democratic Party.

When we tried to push some of this civil-rights program through the Eightieth Congress, it was the Democrats who filibustered and prevented its passage. Mr. Truman failed to explain that to you in his report on Congress the other day.

Another promise was to liberalize the existing law with reference to the admission into this country of displaced persons. That bill was bottled up in committee until a few days before the end of the session when it was finally reported to the Senate without any recommendation. Mr. Truman failed to explain that in his report on the Eighty-first Congress.

Among Mr. Truman's recommendations was a 10-percent increase in taxes. Both parties joined in killing that proposal. I know you are not sorry for that.

Important groups of domestic measures which became law were those reorganizing and merging certain executive departments and agencies. Those were based on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. That Commission was created by the Republican Eightieth Congress and the legislation which was passed, putting its recommendations into effect, had bipartisan support.

The administration admits it was weakest in the fulfillment of its domestic program. It has been concealing these failures by attempting to emphasize the accomplishments in the field of foreign relations.

Let me remind you, my fellow Pennsylvanians, that the accomplishments in the field of foreign relations was a bipartisan affair. Prominent Republicans like Senators ARTHUR VANDENBERG, of Michigan, and John Foster Dulles, of New York, actually led and managed the debate on the floor.

Under their patriotic guidance, partisan politics was put aside to strengthen American leadership for peace and security in the world.

They must be given full measure of credit for any claim of accomplishment in this field by the present administration.

I voted for nearly all of these measures. My principal disagreement was over the administration's extension of the reciprocal trade agreements. I voted to amend this law and to write into the bill the peril-point provision which would have given some degree of protection to the American worker and farmer.

The recently disclosed list of products on which tariffs were further reduced, at Annecy, France, is convincing evidence that Congress blundered in rejecting the peril-point amendment.

The recent devaluation of the currency of foreign countries will have the same effect as a further reduction in the tariff rates. Workers in the glass and pottery plants of western Pennsylvania, and many other industries which I have mentioned in previous broadcasts, are learning this the hard way. They are among them any whose jobs are being taken away by the influx of low priced foreign goods.

Mark my words—those conditions will become worse—and more Pennsylvanians will be out of jobs because of the blundering mistake of this session of Congress.

In the summer of 1948, Mr. Truman issued a "box score" of legislation which he claimed was vital to the public welfare.

In denouncing the Eightieth Congress, he wrote after many of these points, "Failed to Act."

Among the points on which Congress had failed to act were such Presidential demands as anti-poll-tax legislation antilynching; FEPC; compulsory health insurance; Federalized medicine; repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act; universal military training; St. Lawrence waterway treaty; stand-by rationing authority; wage and price controls; Federal aid to education; a national science foundation, and many others.

Well, the Eightieth Congress did not act on them in 15 days. The Eighty-first Congress did not act on them in nine and a half months.

Now, I want to make a flat charge about the majority leadership in this Congress. I charge that the administration leaders of the Eighty-first Congress never made an honest effort to push some of these bills through, although they had the votes and could have done so.

It is common talk here in Washington that the administration leaders have put many of these bills in the deep freeze in order to keep them and bring them out as major political issues for 1950. They seem to like it better that way.

This Eighty-first Congress might well be termed a "5-percenter Congress." It has given President Truman about 5 percent of what he recommended.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 11)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

With the close of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, I have almost reached the half-way mark in my 6-year term as your representative in the United States Senate.

This is an appropriate time, therefore, to look back over the 3 years of my service at Washington and to report to you on some basic principles of government which are the foundation of American freedom, opportunity, and progress.

Throughout my public career I have supported the idea of a proper division of powers, functions, and duties among the three levels of government—Federal, State, and local.

I have opposed the increasing trend toward concentration of authority in an all-powerful supergovernment at Washington.

I have fought against the encroachment of Federal control upon functions that rightfully belong to the State.

I have supported the principle of local control of local affairs, because the closer government is brought to the people the more efficiently and the more economically it is administered.

Most of all, I have fought to protect the American plan of individual freedom, individual initiative, and self-reliance from the false and corrupting promise by government that it can provide everything needed by the people for their happiness, prosperity, and security.

Those were the fundamental principles that I brought to Washington when I took my seat in the Senate 3 years ago. My experience in the Senate has confirmed my belief, more strongly than ever, that local government is government by the people and must be preserved.

For 3 years I have been watching at first hand the process by which our local and State levels of government are being stripped of power and authority while the Federal Government assumes absolute control over one function after another.

At every opportunity I have spoken in protest against this unwarranted and dangerous course. My votes in the Senate have been in opposition to its further extension.

But the process goes on. Supported by so-called grants in aid, it has spread year by year until today Federal funds are being used to impose bureaucratic control upon practically every important local and State government service.

Who is to blame?

First, I blame the power-hungry men, who want more and more control over the political and economic life of our Republic and who seek to achieve their objectives by unlimited and reckless spending.

But all the blame does not rest there. A portion of the blame must be placed upon those State and local governments that have been careless of their responsibilities and have failed to do the job which had to be done.

They made no protest when Washington moved in. In fact, they welcomed Federal funds as something for nothing.

Finally, some of the blame must attach to the individual citizens—the taxpayers and the voters—not only in Pennsylvania but in all of the States.

Let me tell you why.

I know from long experience that the average citizen is watchful over local expenditures. He will fight vigorously against an increase in local taxation.

He will oppose proposed new projects, no matter how desirable, if the cost is beyond

what his community can afford. He will frequently upset his local government when he believes it is spending his tax money in waste or extravagance.

But here is the great difference. The same citizen does not object with equal vigor when the more distant Government in Washington wastes his money or spends too freely.

He does not become aroused over high Federal taxes. He does not become indignant when deficit financing adds billions to the national debt. He does not rise up in his wrath against Washington.

At home he demands prudence, efficiency, and economy, because he knows he pays the bills. But when Federal funds are being spent—that's Government money; he feels it doesn't cost him anything.

That is one reason why local and State governments have not done their full job. They have become dependent upon Washington.

Local responsibility has been undermined by a constant flow of power into big Government control at Washington.

There is another thing we must not forget. When the National Government takes over a project that should be done at the local level the price invariably goes up. Overhead costs are greater. Administrative expenses are higher. More people go on the pay roll.

Experts have estimated that it costs the taxpayers $1 for every 60 cents worth of actual construction when they use Federal funds to build roads or improve their schools or airports.

Now what about that citizen who thinks what he gets from the Government doesn't cost him anything?

Let me remind you again—there is no such thing as government money. There are no free gifts from Washington.

The Federal Government has nothing to give that it does not first take from the earnings of the worker and the farmer.

The only way Washington can get funds to turn back to the States and local communities is by taxing all the people in Pennsylvania and all the people in the other 47 States.

The next time someone tells you that Government money is something for nothing, just remember this:

Of every dollar you pay in taxes, 25 cents goes to the State and its local subdivisions. That includes county, township, school district, borough and city taxes.

The other 75 cents is taken by Uncle Sam's tax collectors.

When someone tells you of the benefits which flow from Washington, just remember that you are paying—and paying a high price—for all of them.

Just keep in mind that out of every month you work, it takes one week to pay the various taxes, direct and hidden, which all levels of government collect from you.

And three-fourths of that week is put in to earn the money you pay in Federal taxes.

But that's not all.

In this fiscal year the Federal Government is operating at a deficit which will surely exceed $5,000,000,000 and may go as high as $8,000,000,000—I said billions, not millions.

Let me put it this way. As late as 1934, Federal expenses for all purposes—operating all the departments, boards, commissions and agencies, Congress, national defense, interest on the public debt, pensions—cost the taxpayers less than the deficit alone will be in this fiscal year.

That is how much Washington is going into the red during this 1 year alone.

What did Mr. Truman say about this the other day?

Well, he said it was impossible to cut expenses. He said the only way to close the gap was to raise taxes. In other words, you would have to work more days a month to support the National Government in Washington.

This is why I have been fighting the spread of Federal spending. When your city or town proposes something like that, you crack down hard. You demand economy. Local government costs are lower because people take more interest in their local government than they do at any other level.

But what I have just been telling you is not the whole story of how your money is spent in Washington.

The Federal Government is proposing even greater spending. It wants to get into new projects—Federal aid to education, socialized medicine, low-rent housing at the public expense, higher subsidies for farmers, for the shipping industry, and many other things.

Powerful organizations are lobbying for all these proposals. Many people, misled into thinking that it will be something for nothing, are urging their Representatives in Congress to vote for these things.

They refuse to believe there is no such thing as free "Government money".

But, you and I know better.

You and I know that Washington, despite the present high national income, cannot make ends meet. It is running billions of dollars in the red.

Therefore, if new so-called benefits are to come as handouts from Washington, the price must be paid in higher taxation, or a much greater debt, or both. That debt must be paid by the people.

It cannot be paid within the lifetime of anyone listening to me today. We will hand it down as a mortgage on the future of our children, our grandchildren and generations yet unborn.

I believe that essential new projects, should be taxed and managed at the local and State levels. There they will cost less and they can be designed specifically to meet the needs of Pennsylvania.

I shall keep on fighting and voting in Washington for less expensive Federal Government—for less frills and less waste. Not for higher taxes to support bigger and more expensive Federal Government.

And I should like to see all the people of our State join in this fight.

There is only one way to get results in Washington. That is for the people to demand as much efficiency and as little waste there as they do on local community levels.

One way to help is this: When Washington offers to take over new functions from the States and local subdivisions, you folks must say, "No" in a loud, clear voice.

You must insist that if the job is to be done, it should be down at the State and local levels. You must be willing to provide the tax money to have it performed at those levels.

The State and local governments must be willing to bear the responsibility and to do the job.

Not until then will we get more home rule and better government at lower cost.

Remember always that good government begins at the local level.

We cannot have good government at the higher levels unless it begins in our home communities.

Local elections are most important because upon them we build the foundation for good government in the State and in the Nation.

Next Tuesday the people of Pennsylvania will go to the polls to name public officials who will serve in our city halls, borough, and township buildings, and in many of our courts.

American citizenship has no more important duty than the election of men of upright character and honest principles—men who will accept responsibility and have the courage to carry out those responsibilities with fidelity to the public interest.

Regardless of party affiliation I urge every man and woman voter in Pennsylvania to exercise the right of franchise on election day.

Vote for candidates in whom you have trust and confidence. But do not fail to vote.

It is a patriotic duty that must not be neglected or ignored.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention

---

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 12)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

In my last talk, a few days before the recent election, I appealed to the people of Pennsylvania to turn out and vote. At that time I said, and I quote: "Regardless of party affiliation I urge every man and woman voter in Pennsylvania to exercise the right of franchise on election day. Vote for candidates in whom you have trust and confidence. But do not fail to vote. It is a patriotic duty that must not be neglected or ignored."

Now that the election is over and the smoke of the political battle has cleared away, it is most gratifying to know that so many of the citizens of Pennsylvania fulfilled their obligation as free Americans by casting their ballot on November 8.

It was a record-breaking vote in a year in which Pennsylvanians were not voting for President, or Senator, Congressmen, or Governor.

The only State-wide office voted upon in the last election was for a judge of the superior court. Yet, of the approximately 4,900,000 eligible to vote in Pennsylvania, more than 3,500,000 ballots were cast.

This was a splendid demonstration of self-government at work. There is no more patriotic service that can be rendered in peacetime than the intelligent exercise of the right of franchise. I hope we shall have even larger turn-outs in future elections.

In some counties more than 75 percent of the registered voters went to the polls. In my home county of Washington, with approximately 100,000 registered, more than 78,000 ballots were cast. That was true in many other places.

Since the election I have been asked by many of my constituents whether the results in our State and elsewhere had national significance.

It is only natural that each political party should attempt to place the most favorable interpretation upon the returns.

Earlier this year, a special election was held in the Twenty-sixth Congressional District, comprising Cambria, Armstrong, and Indiana Counties. It resulted in a smashing Republican victory. Naturally, Republicans regarded this as a rejection of the policies of the Truman administration.

Now, with the election of the Democratic candidate, HERBERT LEHMAN, as the United States Senator from New York State, it is natural for the Democrats to claim this was approval of the administration's program.

On the other hand, the Republicans, with equal right, claim that the reelection of Governor Driscoll in New Jersey was a repudiation of those same Truman policies.

Certainly there was nothing in the Pennsylvania returns to indicate a national trend.

In the only State-wide contest, Judge William E. Hirt, the Republican candidate for the Superior Court, was reelected in spite of overwhelming Democratic victories in Philadelphia and Allegheny counties.

Pennsylvania's election was a crazy quilt of strictly local campaigns and local issues from which no general interpretation can be drawn.

For example, while Philadelphia elected four Democrats to county offices, the voters in Erie, at the other end of the State, ousted

a Democratic mayor and city administration, and elected every Republican on the ticket.

Meadville and Shamokin replaced Republican mayors with Democrats.

In three heavily Democratic counties—Berks, Fayette and my own county of Washington—Republican judges were elected. There were numerous similar situations. It is apparent, therefore, that in Pennsylvania the elections were determined by the local issues. There was no over-all pattern.

Unquestionably the heavy vote was, in a large measure, due to the efforts of the veterans who organized in support of the soldier's bonus.

I hope that these veterans will take the same active interest in future elections. They can do so much to help solve the great problems which confront the Nation.

Since the adjournment of Congress last month, I have talked with many Pennsylvanians—not only my own neighbors in Washington county, but with men and women from all sections of our State. This has given me an opportunity to find out what is foremost in the minds of our people.

What seems to be most disturbing to the average man is the fiscal policy of the Truman administration. People consistently ask me how long the Government can continue to spend more money than it takes in and still escape disaster.

The President's recent announcement that we would end this fiscal year with a deficit of five and one-half billion dollars—which, by the way, is a very conservative estimate—shocked many people. I have been pointing out for several months that the deficit would probably reach eight billions, and perhaps more.

The people I have been talking with remind me that they cannot keep out of trouble if they continually spend more than they earn. They ask me if there is any way that a government can spend itself in the red year after year and still avoid national bankruptcy.

The answer is obvious. The Government has no mysterious source of revenue. It receives no money except what it takes from the earnings of the people.

Abraham Lincoln, perhaps the greatest of all our Presidents, answered the question of Government overspending most emphatically when he said, and I quote:

"As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and, next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government."

This statement by President Lincoln is a simple truth. It cannot be challenged successfully by name calling directed against those who question the wisdom of going deeper and deeper into debt.

Today we are spending each year in interest on the Federal debt alone more money than we spent to run the entire National Government as recently as the early 1930's.

Franklin D. Roosevelt was another who answered the question of whether a recklessly spending government can avoid disaster. In 1932, when he was a candidate, Mr. Roosevelt declared:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Well, that is what our Federal Government has been doing year after year since that statement was made—living far beyond its means and going deeper into debt.

I find that the people of Pennsylvania are alarmed about this situation. They want the budget balanced. But they make it clear that they do not favor the recent suggestion of Mr. Truman that the only way it can be done is by raising taxes.

They point out that in July of this year the President said a tax increase would be detrimental to our national economy—that it would dry up business and result in unemployment.

Then, in October, only 3 months later, Mr. Truman stated that he knew of only one way to balance the budget—and that was to increase taxes. He said he would recommend such increases when Congress comes back to Washington in January.

Some of the people I have talked with have suffered as the result of the great strikes—coal miners, steelworkers, storekeepers, and housewives. They have had to adjust their budgets and to cut down on their spending. Things haven't been good with them and they can't afford to have their taxes raised.

They suggest that the Government, like themselves, should take a hitch in its belt and reduce spending to fit its income.

But Mr. Truman says it can't be done. He claimed the other day that he just could not see how he could reduce the Federal spending, now running at the rate of more than $43,000,000,000 a year—the highest rate of peacetime Government spending in the history of our Nation.

Each week since July 1, when the Government's fiscal year began, Washington has spent an average of $160,000,000 more than it has taken in.

I know it is hard for people to grasp these sums. Their vast size makes them something beyond our comprehension. But let me try. Let me put it this way.

Pennsylvania is the Nation's greatest factory State, so I'm going to give you some figures about factory wages.

The Federal Department of Commerce recently announced that the average weekly wage of the factory workers in America in September was $55.64—the second highest level on record for factory workers.

There are 12,000,000 factory workers in our Nation and their weekly wages add up to more than $667,500,000 a week.

That is a lot of money, you will agree. Yet, if they were to take every cent of their earnings and give it to the Federal Government, it still would not be enough to pay the bills at the rate Washington is pouring out the cash.

In fact, the $830,000,000 the Government spends each week is nearly $163,000,000 more than all our factory workers earn.

Now, President Truman says that the only way to make up his estimated deficit of $5,500,000,000 is to raise taxes. Well, let's see what that would do.

To close the gap would require an average increase of 18 percent in the income tax paid by every individual and 18 percent in the corporate tax paid by every business.

Are you ready to shoulder an increase of 18 percent in your income tax?

I think such a burden should not be added to the heavy tax load our people are already carrying.

I remember, even if Mr. Truman seems to have forgotten, that Federal taxes are not the only ones we pay in this country. I remember that our people also pay taxes to their States and their counties and their school districts and cities. This is no time to add to the load.

If there is to be any change in Federal tax levels, I favor reducing them. If we are in the red today—and of course we are deeply in the red in Washington—the solution lies not in taxing more, but in spending less.

The solution lies in Government at lower cost. It lies in cutting expenses to the level of what we can afford.

No more serious problem confronts the American people today than preserving their national solvency and preventing this march down the road toward national bankruptcy.

You, and you alone, have the power to stop it. You must demand less spending and make this demand heard in the Halls of Congress.

In a speech out in Minneapolis the other day, President Truman cited Thomas Jefferson in support of the administration's spending policy. Mr. Truman set up the great patron saint of the Democratic Party as a good authority. I accept the authority.

But let me tell you what Thomas Jefferson had to say about spending policies like those being followed in Washington today. He said, and I quote:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty, or profusion and servitude. If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

My fellow Pennsylvanians, those are the words of Thomas Jefferson, the great authority referred to by President Truman.

Those are living words still. Today they apply more forcefully than ever, because we are more deeply in debt than ever.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 13)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

In previous talks I have discussed the high cost of Government and the dangerous increase in Government spending.

In this broadcast I want to discuss Government lending, which is just as dangerous as Government spending because it adds to the tax burden of every American citizen, every worker, and every farmer.

Recently I have had many letters from Pennsylvanians asking:

"What about those millions of dollars in Government loans to Henry Kaiser?"

"What about the loans to the Lustron Corp. and others?"

"How can the Government make all these loans to private business and agriculture?"

"Who hands out that money down there in Washington?"

"Why don't they get private loans from banks the way most people have to?"

These are very interesting questions.

Many of us, both in and out of Congress, have been trying to get the answers.

There have been several investigations by congressional committees. The Hoover Commission made an exhaustive study of the Government lending and business enterprises financed by Government funds.

Another investigation is going on right now and I am confident that next year we will get to the bottom of the Federal Government's confused and tangled ventures in competition with private business.

Remember it is your money that is being poured out in loans and business investments. You have a right to know where it is going, how it is being handled, and what protection you are being given.

Since the Federal Government went into the business of lending money, its operations have become involved in a trackless jungle.

Uncle Sam is today the biggest banker in the world. In direct loans to businessmen, farmers, housing projects, and foreign governments we have handed out over $10,000,000,000.

In addition, your Government has guaranteed over $100,000,000,000 in bank deposits, mortgages, loans on farm commodities, and loans to veterans. Your Government has issued life-insurance policies totaling $40,000,000,000.

On top of that, your Government has an investment of more than $20,000,000,000 in a wide variety of business enterprises which compete with private business.

Your Government is producing and selling electric power. It is producing and selling fertilizers. It is buying and selling farm products. It is smelting and selling metals. It is operating railways and ships.

In all, there are about 100 important business ventures which the Federal Government owns outright, or has a substantial financial interest.

As I said before, this is all your money. All of it is money which was taken from you in taxes or borrowed from you when you bought Government bonds.

I regret to report to you that there is so much confusion that no one seems to know where we stand.

The figures I have just given you are only a partial picture of our Government in the small- and large-loan business and our Government in private business. It is an appalling situation, bordering on chaos.

Let me try to explain it this way. Among the more than 2,000,000 Government employees there are thousands of economists and fiscal experts. I doubt if you could find one of them who could even name the various Federal Government lending agencies or could describe the functions of each.

Let me give you an example. A year or two ago the Senate Judiciary Committee looked into this situation. The committee found that there were 20 Government agencies making loans in the field of agriculture alone. There were many cases of overlapping and duplication.

Some of these agencies were in competition with each other in lending out the taxpayers' money. They worked at cross purposes. Naturally your money was frittered away in waste and duplication.

But agriculture is only one field of operation. There are loan agencies in housing, veterans' affairs, general business, and international relations, all with the same confusion, duplication, and waste.

In addition to the confusion which occurs within each category, there is similar confusion, similar overlapping, and similar waste in the constant tug of war among agencies in different departments.

These lending agencies are forever at war with each other, striving always to become bigger and more powerful. All too often it is utterly impossible to tell where the authority of one agency stops and the next begins.

This may sound very confusing to you. But it is not surprising because of the story of these lending agencies is one of utter confusion.

One of the principal lending agencies of the Government is the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It was set up as a temporary organization to make direct loans for the purpose of saving banks and business from bankruptcy during the depression years. It was to operate for 1 year but today, 17 years later, we find it is still operating on a tremendous scale.

Let us now take a look at the Henry Kaiser loans which have been the subject of so much discussion and concerning which some of you have written to me. With the latest loan of $34,400,000 recently authorized, he has received from the Federal Government a total of $226,795,000 in loans and mortgages. Of that sum he now owes $194,442,000.

The announced purpose of the latest loan was to finance the production of a new car in the low-price field. That new car would be in competition with the Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth.

Now, Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth financed themselves without Government loans. They are also big taxpayers. Yet, part of the money they pay in taxes is being used to build up competition against them.

The RFC is authorized to make direct loans to private business where bank loans are not available. But it has been brought out that Henry Kaiser is using part of this latest Government loan to pay off his bank debts.

Here is a situation worth considering. If Henry Kaiser may do this then any other businessman should have the same right to borrow Government money to pay off his bank loans.

Believing as I do in free enterprise and in keeping the Government out of business as much as possible, I am strongly opposed to that kind of transaction.

The trouble with some of these Government loans—such as this one—is that the Government soon finds itself committed to protecting its investment by advancing more money.

One example is the Lustron Corp., which was organized to build prefabricated steel and enamel homes on a mass-production basis to relieve the housing shortage.

In 2 years the Government has invested $37,500,000 of the taxpayers' money in this experiment without making a dent in the housing shortage.

Most of the millions advanced by the Government have been spent on pay rolls, material, machinery, and other equipment. The company has been losing money ever since it started in business and is reported to be going in the red at the rate of $1,000,000 a month.

If the company is to continue in business, it must have more working capital and now the Government is asked to put up another $15,000,000.

Now that looks like throwing good money after bad. Nevertheless the RFC must either keep the business going or write off its $37,500,000 investment as a total loss.

Now, whose money figured in this fanciful and unprofitable scheme? Your money of course. The Government borrowed it from you and then loaned it to the RFC at a lower rate of interest than it pays to you.

If it all should be lost, how would you be repaid?

That's easy. The Government would increase your taxes in order to raise enough money to pay off the Government bonds you bought.

Let me give you just a few typical examples of what has been going on.

Not long ago it was decided for the Federal Reserve Board to tighten credit in order to check the rising threat of inflation. In line with that ruling, banks put the brakes on their lending and rejected some loan applications that might otherwise have been granted.

But the Reconstruction Finance Corporation paid no attention to that. Under its regulations it may grant direct loans to businesses which cannot be obtained through normal banking channels.

So we had the RFC operating in direct conflict with the Government's anti-inflation policy.

In other cases Federal business agencies, operating on money advanced by the United States Treasury, invest their surplus funds in Government securities and collect the interest. This means that the Government pays interest on its own investment. Of course, that means you pay the interest.

The Hoover Commission, in its survey of Government administration, figured that elimination of this practice by six agencies would reduce the interest-bearing debt of the Government by $350,000,000.

We all recognize that many of these agencies were created in the depression period. They were temporary, emergency organizations to provide employment and to lift the Nation's economy over the hump.

We've long been over the hump but we still have the agencies, bigger and more powerful than ever.

They are no longer emergency propositions. They are permanent. We shall continue to have them until the people rise up and demand that they be done away with.

You will recall that one of the principal objectives of Government lending was to help small business. How that has worked out is shown by testimony given a few weeks ago before the Congressional Economy Inquiry, headed by Senator DOUGLAS, of Illinois.

It was brought out that the RFC has 127,000 loans of all types now outstanding with a total of $1,682,000,000. Of this total nearly one-half, or $733,000,000, have been advanced in loans of more than a half-million dollars each to 207 concerns.

That looks like big business, not small business.

There are many reasons why the Government should get out of the business of making direct loans to individuals or business organizations.

The Hoover Commission, in its report had this to say, and I quote:

"Direct lending by the Government opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism to individuals or enterprises. It invites political and private pressure, or even corruption.

"Emergencies may arise in depression, war, national defense, or disaster which should be met in this way. But direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

That is bad enough but, in my opinion, the greatest danger lies in the increasing trend toward Government regulation and control of the Nation's economy.

That, my fellow Pennsylvanians, is the road to socialism.

Free enterprise built the great industrial strength of America, not a socialistic system, controlled and directed by an all-powerful government.

Government in business is notoriously inefficient and costly to the taxpayer.

That is why you should call upon your Government and your Congress to get out of this business of private loans and to get out of all enterprises which compete with private initiative.

Aside from the cost, a great principle is involved. We must decide whether we are to continue under a system of free enterprise or whether we are to permit the Government to dominate the economic life and progress of our people.

I hope all Pennsylvanians will make their wishes known on this most important question.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Statement by Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts on Atlantic Union

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts on the subject of Atlantic Union.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts said today that passage of the Atlantic Union resolution by Congress in 1950 would be the first step toward unifying the foreign policies of the democracies, thus strengthening the United Nations and helping to avert the threat of a hydrogen bomb war.

Roberts cited division of opinion between Great Britain and the United States on recognition of the Chinese Communist Government as the most recent example of divided sentiment among the democracies.

"The old American motto—United We Stand, Divided We Fall—is still good," he said. "Division between the remaining democracies encourages the Kremlin which hopes through its current boycott of UN sessions, to force the democracies to give way one after the other in recognition of its puppet government in China.

"On the other hand, a Federal convention of sponsors of the Atlantic Pact, called to consider turning our present defensive military association into a positive political union of free peoples, would present a united front against the advance of dictatorship and would lend hope to advocates of freedom in countries now dominated by Communist minorities. The Atlantic Union resolution authorizes President Truman to call such a convention. Our delegation of Atlantic Union members from 15 states will discuss with the President the world-wide significance of this step when we call on him Friday."

Practical Internationalism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Practical Internationalism," delivered by Walter Cenerazzo, national president, American Watchworkers Union, before the International Students' Center, Cambridge, Mass., on January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRACTICAL INTERNATIONALISM

To address a group of students who come from many foreign lands to obtain an education in American colleges and universities, is indeed a rare privilege for a labor leader whose avocation has been to study the economic conditions existing in foreign lands.

Today in this world there exists a sharp cleavage as to the systems of government. One trend of thought is predicated upon the outgrowth of the idea established in the Magna Carta of King John in the thirteenth century which is that human dignity shall prevail, that men are not the chattel property of anyone, be it feudal lords, kings, or the politburo; that men shall have the right to choose their own religion, their own field of endeavor in employment, and live within their own family unit as dignified human beings.

The other trend of thought is that produced by totalitarian government, which claims as the first obligation from its citizens obedience to the government. Their theory is that men should work, eat, live where they are told, take their recreation as the government plans it and that men have never the right to criticize their rulers. There is no difference between this modern day totalitarianism and the slaves of Egypt. Both represent tyranny and lack of respect for human dignity.

The free nations of this earth have come a long way since the signing of the English Magna Carta by King John, and as each century has gone by, men have gained more and more freedom in an economic way which has given to them freedom in other ways.

To me, one of the unsung heroes in his battle for the freedom of men was a great American—Benjamin Franklin. This man Franklin had an opportunity to observe conditions in England as a workman and later as a statesman. He visited France and lived there during the French Revolution. He was a student of governments, and it is my opinion that the citizens of the United States owe to this man a deep debt of gratitude for our today—that inalienable Bill of Rights—the first ten amendments to the Constitution of the United States. The thinking that went into that Constitution which separated the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of government was long-range thinking to forever bar any man or men from treating human beings as serfs within the boundaries of the United States of America.

In the century and a half that followed the adoption of the Constitution of the United States, men and women have lived with human dignity and in the industrial revolution have been the peoples of the only nation in the world who are a great middle class. Nowhere else in this world will you find a lack of class struggle, nowhere else in this world will you find complete a way of life by which men and women can set their goals within the family unit and achieve them for that family.

In the past several years, I have visited the South American continent and the European continent. In South America I had the opportunity to visit Peru, Chili, Uruguay, Argentina, and Brazil. In Europe this summer, I visited England, Scotland, Belgium, Holland, France, Italy, Switzerland, and western Germany.

In each of these countries I visited industrial plants to witness the engineering and research skills and to see how productive labor was. I asked many questions concerning living conditions, wages, government controls, and where the ideas in existence in the government of the country came from.

One basic element was missing from every single one of these countries—and that was a virile labor movement dedicated to collective labor bargaining with employers to obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity for the employees of industry.

Oh, yes; there was a labor movement in each and every one of these countries, but those that led it were either Socialists, Communists, Christian Union Democrats, Falangists, Apristas, or some other type of ism which was dedicated to curing economic ills by government fiat. In each case the labor leader of these countries was wrapped up in a political movement to take over the administration of the government. To me this is not the way that a great middle class of people is created within a nation. In these countries there are only the very rich and the very poor, and the purchasing power of the very poor is, indeed, very small. You cannot have prosperity for a nation unless the rank and file of the people have purchasing power in their hands and can purchase what they produce.

We in the United States, unfortunately in my opinion, have at the helm of our State Department a group of men who have no understanding of business economics, and who have been in a daydream for many years on the problems of foreign trade. These men believe that you can purchase goods from a foreign country and give to that foreign country prosperity when the persons that made the goods obtained wages that would not enable them to feed themselves properly, let alone clothe themselves properly. There can be no prosperity for any country unless the workers of that country obtain a fair share of the fruits of productivity that will enable them to purchase the goods of other workers to consume themselves.

That's the key of the prosperity of the citizens of the United States. Purchasing power—consumer income—with which to purchase consumer goods.

The United States program for reciprocal trade does not and will not help either the American worker or foreign worker. All it does is make the importer richer at the expense of both the American worker and the foreign worker.

For this reason I have advocated for some time a twofold program in the field of foreign trade which, in my opinion, if carried out, would create a middle class of people with purchasing power in every country in this world.

I believe the United States should lead the way by creating a Board of Foreign Trade composed of 15 persons, the 15 to be appointed, 5 by the President of the United States, 5 by the United States Senate, and 5 by the United States House of Representatives. Three of each group should be appointed from the majority party in control and two from the minority party.

This Board of Foreign Trade should have complete control and jurisdiction over all economics that have to do with foreign trade, and every other department of Government should be stripped of authority in this field.

This Board of Trade, with its 15 members, would negotiate agreements with a foreign country on a bilateral basis only, and every agreement with each country would have to stand on its own merit, and what considerations that were granted to one country would not necessarily have to be given to another country.

The type of men I would like to see appointed to this board would be the best talent available in the field of business, finance, economics, agriculture, and labor. They should receive at least $25,000 per year for serving on the Board.

This board of trade should have established within it a statistical department with competent men to establish the production costs on every article produced in the United States, and these records should be kept up-to-date so that every time unit costs go up or down it is reflected in the records.

In negotiating an agreement with a foreign country this board of trade would ascertain the unit cost of production in the foreign country they are negotiating with, and they would establish tariffs equal only to the difference in the unit costs between the costs of production in the United States and the costs of production in the foreign country with consideration given for transportation and insurance costs to bring the article to the United States.

As wages were increased, or unit costs increased in the foreign country, the tariff would be reduced accordingly. Thus, as more wages were paid to foreign workers, more purchasing power would be in their hands to buy consumer goods and more prosperity would be available for that nation.

This board of foreign trade would have authority to put a limitation on amount of

goods to come into the United States of any type; they would have the authority to impose quotas, raise tariffs, lower tariffs, and to negotiate in any manner they deemed essential.

All tariffs which they collected would be put in a fund which I would call the point 4 fund to be spent for the development of underdeveloped areas throughout the world. The board would be given authority to refund all of the tariffs to a nation for its development if it deemed it wise.

Thus a two-fold purpose would be accomplished. No goods would compete in the United States except at equality at the border and importers' excess profits would be eliminated. The foreign worker would find his employer paying him more wages for there would be no point in paying him low wages, and then paying the difference in tariff to the United States.

In the distribution of point-four money the second part of my program would come into play for I would allow no nation to participate in obtaining any of this money unless they first adopt in the constitution of their country a bill of rights comparable to ours and establish a separation of the powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches, so that dictators could no longer function or gain a foothold in the future.

With the adoption of this bill of rights would come a new day for the working men and women of foreign countries, for they would be guaranteed the right of free association and forming unions of their own choosing. And thus a virile labor movement would gather momentum and bring about a standard of living that creates a great middle class.

The reciprocal trade program of the United States establishes the same tariff regardless of the wage conditions between nations. Goods produced in a country paying 10 cents an hour wages come into the United States at the same tariff as goods produced in a country paying 50 cents an hour wages. Where do you think investment capital is going to open factories under such a tariff program?

This board of foreign trade that I suggest should have industrial engineers in its employ to visit factories in the United States to make sure they are efficient and productive, and have adopted modern technological improvements, and if they have not a leveling factor should be placed on their unit cost of production in the records to penalize them for their inefficiency.

There is no room in this world for inefficiency, obsolete methods and failure to introduce modern production methods. Only in a world where there is efficiency and modern efficient production can the rank and file of people participate in the enjoyment of the goods they produce.

If every country established such a board of foreign trade, it would not be long before all the low wages in this world would gradually disappear and we would have fair living standards for all the workers in the freedom loving nations in this world. And when misery, terrible housing, improper diet and squalid living conditions disappear from a nation and an honest democratic labor movement does its job well in obtaining more and more each year in collective bargaining within the framework of prosperous corporate enterprise, those that represent totalitarianism will find the seeds of communism which they spread falling upon sterile ground, which refuses to accept their ideology.

To me there is no substitute for cooperative capitalism to achieve human dignity. Cooperative capitalism to me means adequate dividends to the investor for the risk that he takes in furnishing capital to purchase the tools and equipment, adequate payment to manage for furnishing the brains of direction to the enterprise; fair wages to labor for fair work with the accompanying security that prosperous enterprise can give to its employees. And last, but not least, the lowest possible consumer prices for all that effective cooperation between investor, management and labor can produce.

That is what has made America what it is. It is what has given more people opportunity for a better lot in life than any other economic system yet devised in this world. There is only one way we can preserve it—and that is for every nation in this world that respects human dignity to achieve the same program and for our Nation to establish a flexible tariff system to protect American working men while point 4 does its work in building the production facilities of other nations.

The Taft-Hartley Act to the Aid of Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, the situation in my State with reference to fertilizer is very serious. In this morning's issue of the Washington Times-Herald, an editorial entitled "The Taft-Hartley Act to the Aid of Farmers" was published. The editorial speaks very well of a former Member of this body, and I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE TAFT-HARTLEY ACT TO THE AID OF FARMERS

Two strikes now threaten to tie the national economy in knots. One is John L. Lewis' 40-percent strike in the coal fields—the 3-day week. The other is a strike of workers in the potash plants at Carlsbad, N. Mex.

Mr. Truman is about the only person in the country who refuses to admit that the coal slowdown constitutes a national emergency. He has taken his stand against the Taft-Hartley Act, and he refuses to use its powers even if the whole country freezes.

The National Labor Relations Board, however, has invoked the Labor Act in an effort to protect several million American farmers from crop failures caused by lack of fertilizers.

Potash is one of the three essential ingredients in all standard fertilizers. The three companies at Carlsbad produce 85 percent of the American supply. This is their busiest season. Before the strike they had been working around the clock and had had no opportunity to accumulate stock piles.

Three-fifths of American crops now depend upon commercial fertilizers and 70 percent of the demand is during the first 4 months of the year, as farmers customarily spread the fertilizer when they seed their crops. Furthermore, it takes 6 weeks to dig potash from the mines, process it, and ship the refined product to fertilizer makers.

The Carlsbad strike thus has cut off virtually the whole of American agriculture's 1950 fertilizer supply at one stroke. This was not accidental.

Investigators for the National Labor Board discovered that the Washington representative of the CIO Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers had made extensive inquiries of the Department of Agriculture about fertilizer sources and peak demand periods shortly before the union called the strike in mid-November.

VIOLATION CHARGED

The Mine, Mill, and Smelter Workers, although at the moment in good standing in the CIO, face an investigation of Communist control of their union. At Carlsbad the union conducted mass picketing to keep employees who wanted to work out of the plants and conducted a campaign of threats against nonstrikers.

These practices violate the Taft-Hartley Act. The employers filed charges of unfair labor practices against the union. Counsel for the National Labor Relations Board then went before Federal Judge Carl A. Hatch, who enjoined the goons from interfering with the operation of the plants.

On Monday several hundred employees, most of them members of nonstriking AFL unions, were able to enter the plants from which they had been barred previously by picket mobs. The struck companies say that they expect to resume production with this force.

This strike puts to the acid test the CIO's professions of friendship to the farmers. Philip Murray and his followers are urging farmers to unite with them behind the Truman program for a poorhouse state, particularly on the nonsensical Brannan plan to pay for groceries out of our tax bills.

The claim of a community of interest between labor and farmers is shown up by the CIO strike to inflict crop failures on the Nation.

Get the Real Facts Before Judging Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the transcription of my biweekly broadcast for the week end October 14 to 16, inclusive, in which I discussed the achievements of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

What has the Eighty-first Congress done in its first session, and how do these things affect you?

Politically speaking, of course, these are the $64 questions of the year. And, just as naturally, the answers you get often depend upon the politics of the expert who gives you his opinion.

Now, I don't intend to answer the $64 questions on this broadcast, although I will comment on some of the achievements and failures of this session, from a factual standpoint, and then let you decide, if you will, whether the Congress has done a good job or a bad job, and whether the actions it took affect you for good or for ill.

In connection with these broadcasts, I'd like to thank this station for providing me with this opportunity every 2 weeks to report to the people of Pennsylvania on the doings of your National Government, par-

ticularly as they affect you as a citizen of Pennsylvania; I feel that the station thus makes a real contribution to its public trust. As a United States Senator, my actions take on great importance to you, whether you agree with all of them or not, and it is equally important for you to know why I take these actions. By providing time every 2 weeks for me to report to you, this station and others participating in this series have made possible the full and complete report I feel you should have.

Those of you who are already familiar with what I have covered in my past broadcasts in this biweekly series are aware that most of the matters I have discussed have been right in the midst of some great battle in the Congress over the particular form that the various pieces of vital legislation should take. So in large part, the measures I've discussed haven't been in the final form of a public law.

And, as you know, until both Houses do agree in identical detail on every detail of a bill—and sometimes that takes weeks or even months, as in the case of the flood-control appropriations bill which we finally sent on to the White House for signature last week—all we have is a combination of separate bills, one bill passed by the House, and a separate and different bill, usually, passed by the Senate. So until both Houses iron out their differences, the bills can't become law.

So what I've discussed in most of my previous broadcasts in this series was forced by events, by the inconclusiveness of legislative action, to remain restricted to the possibilities or the probabilities of proposed legislation, rather than the finished public law.

Your newspapers over the months have given you the step-by-step and play-by-play and day-by-day developments in legislation. But I gather from the conversations I've had with numerous Pennsylvanians that what most of you would really like to know is how these laws will actually be administered, how the working of these vital pieces of legislation will actually operate in their effect on you, and on Pennsylvania, and on the Nation.

I haven't had an opportunity yet to make firm plans as to the details of any future broadcasts, but what I have in mind is to bring before the microphone with me some of the top men—and also some of the operating officials who are experts on particular phases of the work—from such departments and agencies as agriculture, labor, public health, social security, public housing, and others, and have them tell you in their own words, in plain and understandable terms—not in "Government-ese" or gobbledegook—just how these new laws will be administered, and, much more important, how the laws will affect you.

As I say, the details aren't worked out, but I feel you'd find such broadcasts informative and interesting. The big question in the minds of all of us when we hear or read about gigantic Government operations is why—and the why of them is what I want to help to bring to you with the assistance of these experts in the departments and agencies who do the actual administering of the laws we pass—laws we often pass in broad-gaged terms, leaving the detail determinations to the so-called bureaucrats.

I have often found it necessary to defend these officials against what I considered extremely unfair criticism voiced in general terms about all Government officials without discrimination and without identification, but on these future broadcasts I will let them speak for themselves. And in order to obtain a full and complete picture, I intend to ask all of them the hot-potato questions, including, in the case of agriculture, the one about the potato itself.

And now, let's take a look at the Eighty-first Congress. In speaking to you on this question, I am acutely conscious of my own position in that Congress as majority whip, as assistant majority leader, in the Senate, a position which carries with it the obligation to lead in pushing through to enactment the administration program. And since that program, in most details conforms to the 1948 Democratic platform, and since I was chairman of the committee at Philadelphia which battled over every detail of that platform before we finally drafted it, I am in close identification with the administration point of view.

Nevertheless, I have always tried in these broadcasts to you to keep them as nonpolitical as possible, as factual and as much above partisanship as possible, on the theory that you are interested primarily in the facts, and not in the politics, and I approach this review of the Eighty-first Congress activities with that idea uppermost.

Now don't get me wrong: I personally am quite proud of the achievements of this Congress thus far. I don't hear very often any more the term "Eighty-worst" Congress used about this Eighty-first, for the achievements in many fields, particularly in the international affairs, but also in some domestic fields, have been solid achievements, and I am proud of them. But, at the same time, recognizing this as a nonpartisan program, I would rather let the facts speak for themselves, and let you decide on our accomplishments.

On the international front, this Congress gave the President and the State Department virtually everything they asked for—not out of loyalty to the administration, or blind acceptance, but out of thoroughgoing, intensive, critical and extended study of the merits.

It is still a source of amazement to me that despite a tremendous outcry in the Congress and in some sections of the public, the Congress has sent onto the President—with simply overwhelming majorities in the votes—measures which renewed the Marshall plan, ratified the Atlantic Pact, together with provision of adequate funds for the arming of the nations participating with us in that Atlantic Pact. The votes were obviously of bipartisan origin, and had almost universal public support. The credit here is not so much to the administration or to the majority leadership in the Congress—but to the people, to the public, who got behind these programs and stayed behind them and refused to be panicked into opposing them by hysteria or by misleading and unsupportable attacks.

One other piece of significant foreign policy legislation passed by this Congress differed from the others in that strong bipartisan support for it was conspicuously lacking. The extremely successful and highly important reciprocal-trade program inaugurated by our great former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull in 1934, almost had the rug pulled out from under it by the amendments put through the Eightieth Congress last year. I am pleased, and very proud, that the reciprocal-trade program has been restored to its full vitality by the Eighty-first Congress, and is now effectively at work. And the bill we put back on the books this year provides ample safeguards to American industries against undercutting by vicious and unfair slave labor competition from foreign producers. The law as it now stands will go forward to produce greater wealth for all free nations through its encouragement of international trade.

But it's on the domestic front, on the legislation that begins and ends at home, that we can really take the measure of the Eighty-first Congress. Here's just a partial list and because my time is short on the remaining part of this broadcast, it is only a list, and it is only partial:

This present Congress, the Eighty-first, has passed a new low-cost public housing bill which, during the next 6 years will permit 810,000 families all over the country to move from slums into decent and adequate American housing. This same legislation had failed to get through in two previous sessions, but this time we got it through. Even though the act is just a few months old, it has already been announced that at least 12 Pennsylvania communities have agreed to go forward with construction during the next 2 years—Philadelphia, Pittsburgh, Johnstown, Allentown, Bethlehem, Pottstown, Farrell, Beaver Falls, Aliquippa, Ambridge, Harrisburg, and Williamsport having already been approved for Federal assistance in their separate programs.

We got rent control extended, after dire prophecies that it would die in this Congress. But after a really major fight, we were able to pass, finally, a good bill which I believe is a pretty fair bill for both sides—landlords and tenants.

After years of talking about Government reorganization, the Eighty-first Congress approved six major reorganization plans submitted by President Truman on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. And in addition to the big improvements made possible under those six specific bills, there have been several other reorganization plans approved by the Congress that were passed in connection with other legislation affecting the particular agencies.

On the farm front, the Eighty-first Congress has made it possible for the Commodity Credit Corporation to assist in providing adequate storage facilities for grain, after this problem had haunted farmers in recent years when they saw bumper crops rot away because there were no storage facilities. Efforts had been made to pass this legislation in the Eightieth Congress, but they failed. The Eighty-first Congress, too, has provided for a gradual expansion of crop insurance, a measure of vital importance to farmers which will enable them to help themselves over rough spots when acts of nature unexpectedly wipe out whole crops in a particular neighborhood.

The Eighty-first Congress has renewed for the next 6 years the splendid program which will assist local communities in the construction of needed hospital facilities. Under the new bill, the Government will put up $150,000,000 annually to pay for two-thirds of the cost of building new hospitals, leaving to the communities the job of planning for their needs and raising the balance of the funds.

And I might mention, too, that since I last discussed it on this series of broadcasts, that the House has now approved the bill previously passed by the Senate to provide $100,000,000 in loans to local communities for use in planning schools, sewer and water facilities, and other public needs. These loans will permit cities and towns and counties all over Pennsylvania and the Nation to make plans for local improvements which they expect to put under construction with their own funds.

As I said earlier, this list of accomplishments of the Eighty-first Congress—and I might mention the minimum wage bill passed by the Congress—is only a partial one, only a part of what I proudly regard as an impressive total accomplishment. There are many, many more things, and if I am any judge of the present political scene, I believe all of you are due to hear a great deal during the next few weeks over the question of what the Eighty-first Congress has done. You will hear those who will deny with a good bit of fervor that we have accomplished much in our long months here in Washington—and you'll hear others say that we've done a great deal.

I notice that my time on this broadcast is running out, but I'd like to leave this thought with you:

When you hear a debate over the record of the Eighty-first Congress, make every effort you can to sift out the political arguments,

and do your best to glean the real facts. Listen carefully to what we've done—and what we haven't done, on such failures as civil-rights legislation and the promise of this administration to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Look at the record. Weigh the good against the bad. Weigh the facts, all of them you can get. Ask yourself what the accomplishments mean to you. Then decide for yourself where this Congress stands.

I'm proud of what we've done in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, and I believe, when you look squarely at the record, most of you will be proud, too.

I invite you to be with me in 2 weeks when I hope to get under way my rather ambitious proposal to bring before you the men who will administer the laws we in the Congress have passed.

Low-Rent Housing Program of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on my biweekly broadcast of the week end of October 28–30, inclusive, I chose as my discussion topic the new low-rent housing program authorized by the Eighty-first Congress. I invited Mr. Walter Alessandroni, executive director of the Philadelphia housing authority, and Mr. Charles Levy, director of the Philadelphia field office of the Public Housing Administration, to join me in discussing just how the new housing program would work in a State such as Pennsylvania; how it would help to alleviate the tremendous lack of housing in all of our cities, not only in Pennsylvania but in the other 47 States as well. I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Officially, at least, the Congress is out of business for the rest of 1949, and we aren't due to go back into session until January of next year. This doesn't mean, of course, that our duties and responsibilities to constituents are over and done with for the next 2 months or so. Between now and January, all of us in Congress will want to take stock of what we accomplished in the last session by looking into the way the new laws are working out in practice, and then, too, we'll have to look over unfinished business and new business in order to make plans for next session.

Now I can't think of a better way for us to evaluate the achievements of the Eighty-first Congress than to follow up with the people who administer these laws, and have them fill out the details left to their discretion, supervising and administering the broad legislative instructions that we in the Congress have established.

Because housing is a subject of such vital importance to Americans, I intend to devote this broadcast to the new low-rent public housing program authorized by the Eighty-first Congress, and I hope in this way to reduce this vast program down into terms familiar to us as Pennsylvanians. I was a cosponsor of the housing bill in the Senate, and I am very gratified at the vigorous and enthusiastic fashion in which communities all over Pennsylvania have participated in the program. The public housing law authorizes Federal assistance to communities for the next 6 years, during which period it is expected that 810,000 low-rent nonfarm public housing units will be constructed. The new law, in addition, will provide for direct grants to communities for the purpose of slum clearance, and it also establishes a research program which will be used to develop better and less expensive methods of housing construction.

Now what does all this mean to Pennsylvania? Well, I have invited as my guests on this broadcast two Pennsylvanians who are prominently identified with public housing. I intend to ask each of them a few questions, and I believe their answers will do a great deal to explain just what this does mean to Pennsylvania and Pennsylvanians.

My first guest is Mr. Walter Alessandroni, executive director of the Philadelphia Housing Authority. Mr. Alessandroni, as the State commander of the American Legion, as former chairman of the national housing committee of the American Legion, and as a past national vice commander of the American Legion, you are exceptionally well qualified to discuss public housing on two counts—first, how the local public-housing program is working out in Philadelphia and, secondly, the importance of this program to veterans. I don't think there is any doubt at all but that your efforts have been largely responsible for the Legion's present position in support of public housing. And so why, Walter, have you led the all-out fight, year after year, to get the Legion to adopt its present, enthusiastic support of public housing?

Mr. ALESSANDRONI. Well, first of all, Senator MYERS, this act provides for a priority to veterans, and the American Legion feels that the Congress very wisely gave the veterans a priority because certainly, as a group, they are most sorely in need of housing accommodations. Secondly, the housing legislation which was adopted in the Eighty-first Congress—which was known variously as the W-E-T bill, or "wet bill," and then the T-E-W bill, and now as the National Housing Act of 1949—offered the most comprehensive and forthright solution for providing decent, safe, and sanitary housing for a large segment of our population who never would have been able to provide themselves with adequate shelter otherwise. This legislation also received the full public discussion and debate in the Congress for some 4 years, and no better alternative was ever offered. The act which provided assistance for the present public-housing units has been in operation for over 10 years, and we believe has been found satisfactory.

Senator MYERS. Well, Commander Alessandroni, when the first public housing act of the Federal Government was passed, back in the late thirties, you and I both remember that the municipal government in Philadelphia was dead set against participating in that program at first. Now, of course, the entire municipal government in Philadelphia has swung around completely on public housing, as have most communities and most community officials all over Pennsylvania in the past few years. And when we passed the new housing law this summer, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh were the first two cities in Pennsylvania to be approved for participation in this new program, the Philadelphia Housing Authority having been allocated 10,000 units to be constructed during the next 2 years. Will these 10,000 new low-cost units answer all of Philadelphia's problems, Walter?

Mr. ALESSANDRONI. No, Senator MYERS, they will not answer all Philadelphia's problems, but they certainly will go a long way toward alleviating a situation which has been with Philadelphia and all great cities for many years. I might say that Philadelphia was slow in accepting public housing some 10 years ago, but then in all pioneering efforts, cities as well as people are slow to lead the way. Philadelphia I think at that time was concerned about its local autonomy. I believe, however, that the experience of the past 10 years with public housing has led Philadelphians and public officials to the inescapable conclusion that Philadelphia will retain its autonomy, and that this bill is merely one of Federal money assistance.

Senator MYERS. Well, I think what you have said, Commander Alessandroni, makes it clear why low-rent public housing should be a completely nonpartisan issue, and it makes it equally clear that the national policy which this program reflects is simply one that's above politics, and is squarely a question of getting done with a vital and a necessary job, if we're going to see to it that all Americans are giving a real opportunity to become full-fledged Americans, self-sustaining, and productive.

Thank you very much for joining me, Commander Alessandroni, My next guest is Mr. Charles Levy, who has recently become Director of the Philadelphia Field Office of the Public Housing Administration, which office has jurisdiction over Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and the District of Columbia. Mr. Levy, because you have had years of professional experience in the Public Housing Administration, having grown up as it were under this Federal program that was in existence before the war, I think you are exceptionally well qualified to answer several questions I have about the new housing law we passed a few months back. In the Housing Act of 1949, the Congress provided that a total of 810,000 low-rent, nonfarm units could be constructed all over the country with Federal help during the next 6 years. Now I understand that the Public Housing Administration is allocating these housing units on the basis of a program to be undertaken only for the next year, or next 2 years. And since a 2-year program is a third of the total we provided for in the law this year, this means, I believe, that you will parcel out 270,000 units to communities all over the country for the next 2 years. This doesn't mean that all these units will be allocated to the first communities that send in requests for allocations, does it, Mr. Levy?

Mr. LEVY. No, indeed, Senator MYERS, the Public Housing Administration can't allocate 270,000 units in the next 2 years on a first-come, first-served basis. That wouldn't be fair at all. We've taken a lot of things into consideration. There is a far greater need for public housing than can be filled with the 270,000 units, or 810,000, for that matter. To allocate these units fairly, we have to consider the relative needs for slum clearance for new housing in all our communities. We have to consider the amount of bad housing, the number of low-income families living alone, or doubled up, in the various communities and the states. So what it is, is a question of fitting all these things together, not inflexibly, but as best we can, to give every community with housing problems a chance to be helped by the new law.

Senator MYERS. There is another limitation in the law, as I recall it, Mr. Levy, which provides and sets up and limits the allocations to any particular ones of the larger States more than 10 percent of the total of all units. Now Pennsylvania is one of our largest States, and as I understand it that means that we in Pennsylvania couldn't get more than 27,000 units—or 10 percent of the 270,000 units that are allocated for the entire country for the next 2 years. The last figures, as I saw them, indicated that nearly 20,500 units have already been allocated to a total of 18 communities in Pennsylvania. And I think my listeners might be interested in the names and the alloca-

tions to those communities. There was an allocation of 10,000 units to Philadelphia, 5,000 to Pittsburgh, 750 to Johnstown, 600 to Allentown, 400 to Bethlehem, 200 to Pottstown, 100 units to Farrell, 100 units to Beaver Falls, 175 to Aliquippa, 150 to Ambridge, 750 to Harrisburg, 300 to Williamsport, 150 units to Uniontown, 100 to Brownsville, 50 to Masontown, 400 to Chester, 628 to Reading, and I believe, 600 units to McKeesport. Now what kind of an opportunity, Mr. Levy, will other communities in Pennsylvania have where allocations have not yet been made?

Mr. LEVY. A very good opportunity, Senator MYERS. You see, the list of cities you mentioned already contains almost all the large communities in Pennsylvania. The largest communities naturally tend to have the greatest need, and as would be expected, they take up a substantial part of the total. The 18 communities have been allocated as you have indicated approximately 20,500 units for the programs in the next 2 years. We have also received applications from the city of York, Darby Township, and Upper Dublin Township. There have been inquiries from a number of other communities, large and small. I feel confident that not only will these communities receive programs, but that communities which do not have active local authorities will have time to examine their needs, organize an authority where required, and make requests to participate in the first 2-year portion of the program. New authorities have recently been formed in Connellsville, Lancaster, York, Lycoming and elsewhere, and any interested community can do the same thing.

Senator MYERS. Well, what if some of the people listening to this broadcast, either municipal officials, or just plain private citizens, are interested in seeing local housing authorities established in their communities if they haven't already got a local authority? What would you suggest to such communities, Mr. Levy, and what would you advise them to do?

Mr. LEVY. Well, Senator, you are familiar with the 30-page pamphlet on the Housing Act of 1949, what it is, and how it works. That was put out by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee. I think it is an excellent job, and the Public Housing Administration, Washington, D. C., or the Public Housing Administration, 3701 North Broad St., Philadelphia, will be happy to send it to anyone who writes. It's got the facts, and it's good.

Senator MYERS. That's a fine suggestion, Mr. Levy, and I might also say that if they write to my office, 307 Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C., we might also be able to provide them with a copy of this pamphlet. And incidentally, I have a number of these pamphlets already on hand, and as I say, these folks to whom you have just made the suggestion that they procure such a pamphlet can obtain it from my office, or they can obtain it from your office, as you have said, Mr. Levy, or from the Public Housing Administration in Washington.

Now all our discussion on this program has been devoted to the low-rent public housing problems in our cities. The Housing Act initiates a brand new program which we haven't discussed; it will undertake the building of low-rent farm housing, the getting rid of rural slum conditions.

The two gentlemen who have been with me on this program have been best acquainted with the city problem, and so we have stuck to that. The Farm Housing Program is under the Department of Agriculture, and later when I hope to have with me on one of these broadcasts some high officials from the Department of Agriculture, I intend to discuss this program of rural housing. And then I haven't discussed the slum clearance provisions of the new housing law. Most of the communities with local housing authorities are familiar with this important phase of the law, and perhaps in a later broadcast we can go into this in detail.

Well, my time on this broadcast is running out, and so I'd like to close by saying I will be back with you again in 2 weeks.

Farm Bill of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on my regular biweekly broadcast of November 11–13, inclusive, I was indeed fortunate to have our Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. Charles F. Brannan, join me in discussing the services rendered by the Department of Agriculture, the problems faced by the whole agricultural industry of our great country, and the meaning of the farm bill passed by the Eighty-first Congress to both the farmer and the consumer. I request unanimous consent to have the text of that broadcast printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

When most Americans think of Pennsylvania, they think of us as having one of the greatest of the industrial States. But I don't think they are aware that Pennsylvania is also one of the great agricultural States.

We in Pennsylvania know this, of course. We know that there is scarcely a spot in the State which is more than a few minutes distant by car from really fine farming country.

Our agriculture is diversified. We aren't a one-crop State—and we haven't got the huge factory farms that you find on the Great Plains of the West. But we do produce a great deal of the food we eat—and in some instances, such as buckwheat, we are among the largest producers in the country.

So that means that I, as a United States Senator from Pennsylvania, must keep up with farm legislation just as carefully as I must with matters like minimum wage, housing, social security, reciprocal trade, and many other important issues.

But farm legislation is important to Pennsylvania not only because we have a great agricultural State. Whether you're a farmer, or a businessman, or a housewife, you are very much interested in what your food costs you. You are interested in seeing that we continue to find markets for the countless products of our industries and our mines—and because the farmer is an important consumer of the products we make, we're interested in the farmer's ability to buy them.

I'm fortunate in having at the microphone with me on this broadcast the Secretary of Agriculture, Charles F. Brannan.

Most of you are, I imagine, aware that Mr. Brannan moved up through the ranks of the Department of Agriculture to become its top boss, bringing with him to that job about 15 years of distinguished accomplishment and a widely varied experience in some of the most important phases of the Department's many activities.

Well, Secretary Brannan, since the Department of Agriculture is one that annually receives hundreds of millions of dollars in appropriations—I think it is only fair to ask you what the American people get for their money. You employ more than 60,000 people to get your job done, and I can't think of a single aspect of our economy that isn't affected in some way or another by what the Department of Agriculture does. So I do think it's fair to ask what the Department's goals are—and what the American people actually got for their money.

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Senator MYERS, as you know, the Department of Agriculture has various kinds of responsibilities. They have, and maintain, one of the greatest research and educational institutions in the field of agriculture in the world.

Then they do a great deal of regulatory work, keeping the foods that move in the channels of commerce in the best possible condition for the consuming public. They regulate the grain market so that the speculating that is essential to some phases of trading in grain and some of the other commodities is not carried on to the penalty or disadvantage of farmers.

Then there are a wide variety of services to farmers, in addition to research—the crop reporting which gives farmers some indication of what the volumes of crops this year are so they can plan for next year—and an economic analysis of what farmers might expect in the way of prices, etc., for their various crops.

The Department of Agriculture also has a great lending institution, the Farm Credit Administration of the Farmers Home Administration—and collateral to that, lending institutions which make it possible for farmers to build their own cooperative enterprises in the field of rural electrification and now, perhaps, in telephone. There is also going to be an agency now concentrating on improved housing.

Then, basically, they are trying to assure the American farmer, through the price-support mechanism, the opportunity to earn a fair return on the marketplace. And then, when we get too much of one commodity, or another, we take some of those commodities and put them into the school-lunch program.

Senator MYERS. I'd like to interrupt you right there, Charlie, to ask you to explain a bit more about the school-lunch program. Every child in Pennsylvania is eligible for that program—and while it doesn't represent the largest item in the Department of Agriculture's budget, I think it is exceedingly important.

How's the school-lunch program working out, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Senator, it's doing a tremendously important job in my opinion. Of course, even now it isn't big enough to serve all our school children, but it represents a big advance over where we were a few years back.

In the Nation last year, it provided over a billion meals—42,500,000 of them in Pennsylvania. That was a 13-percent increase for Pennsylvania over previous years, and shows an appreciation of the program. The amount of good any State gets out of the program depends, of course, on how the people take hold of it. At the peak of the program last year, the Nation had 7,000,000 children in about 48,000 schools participating in the program—and Pennsylvania had 259,000 in about 2,036 schools.

The program will give us an opportunity to help farmers who are producing abundantly, as we want them to, and also in some cases where we have surpluses, to handle the surpluses in a way which is not wasteful and destructive of good food.

Senator MYERS. Of course, Secretary Brannan, putting some of our surplus food to work in the school-lunch program is just one minor phase of our food-surplus problem. But food surpluses do suggest the price-support issue, and I'd like to talk about

that new farm bill we just passed in Congress.

The problem of surpluses is a national question, and both parties agree on that completely. Republicans and Democrats agree, too, that we must strive to produce some reasonable surplus of food every year to avoid shortages, high prices, and the privation that would result from serious droughts or other natural calamities. Both agree we must produce this food at reasonable prices people can afford to pay. And both agree we must at the same time see to it that our farmers incomes stay at a decent level—and avoid the wild ups and downs that have plagued farmers in the past. And that's just about as far as general agreement goes.

We don't agree on how we're going to accomplish all this. Our national agricultural policy at the moment is in a period of transition. Partly this is because we increased our food production so tremendously during the war—and even though we're eating better today, we don't know what to do with surpluses. Some say we should use fixed price supports—and others say they should be flexible. Some say we should use rigid crop controls—and others say crop controls are the worst kind of regimentation. And there are innumerable variations.

So with all these different ideas, it's pretty obvious we in the Congress this year didn't solve all the basic issues that make up our so-called "farm problem." You might say the new bill just postpones these issues until we find a more satisfactory solution. The bill we passed was a compromise of these conflicts—and like any compromise, I doubt that anyone was completely satisfied with it.

But it was an honest compromise, fought out in the traditional American manner of give-and-take, and now we've got to wait and see if the issues we compromised in this bill actually lend themselves to compromise. The ultimate solution may, in a few more years, turn out to lie in the Brannan plan, or some variation of it, or in some other plan that hasn't even been suggested yet. But I know that the Congress is sincere in wanting to find a practical, long-range, enduring solution, and I honestly believe our compromise bill was a pretty good bill. In view of all the conflicts, I know it was the best bill we could get at this time.

What's your reaction, Mr. Secretary, to the bill we in Congress gave you? Could you compare it briefly with your own suggestions?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, Frank, I look upon this new act of 1949 very much in the same way as you just analyzed it. Certainly, it is a much better law than the one which it replaces—the one passed by the Eightieth Congress. It does provide better protection against declining farm prices, and helps us maintain farm income at a level which the American people, both farmers and others, are entitled to see it retained.

However, it does leave important problems unanswered. It does not encourage shifts in production so as to balance supply with realistic demand. It does not meet the dual objective of assuring farmers the opportunity to earn fair returns from abundant production, and at the same time assuring consumers the opportunity to use the products the farmers have produced.

Those are objectives that I'm sure we all agree upon. The question is just how you do it. The administration has recommended certain ways of meeting these outstanding problems. But if anybody can find better methods of doing the same thing, and if the Congress will agree that they are better methods, the administration will wholeheartedly undertake to make those new methods work. We aren't fighting over a narrow difference of detail. We're interested in seeing the farmers have a decent return, and we're interested in seeing that the consumers of this country have access to the food we can produce abundantly at reasonable prices. In my opinion, the job is partly done, but there is much yet to do, and I am glad to hear you say, and I agree with you, that the Congress has done a fine job so far, and is in a mood to continue to work on it.

Senator MYERS. Well, Secretary Brannan, I think everyone will agree that the consumer has a very real interest in the prices he has to pay for food. In fact, I recall that on an earlier broadcast in this series, I promised I'd ask you the question about the potato—which for the consumer has really been a question of the $64 variety in the last couple of years. I know we had to increase our potato production during the war, then wound up with too many—and the Government had to buy the surplus. But the housewife had to continue paying high prices for potatoes she used at home. How do you answer that one, Charlie?

Secretary BRANNAN. Well, there's no really brief answer, FRANK. The problem is very complicated. Farmers have learned to produce potatoes in ever increasing quantities. I think the yields per acre have jumped perhaps as much as a hundred bushels to the acre in the last few years. And at the same time, the capacity of the American people to consume potatoes has not increased proportionately.

And then, you must remember, you just can't export potatoes. So we've got to consume them domestically—or they become a very serious surplus.

We at the same time tried to assure the potato growers of the country a fair return because they have been in business a long time, and we got them in business during the war. Trying to assure them a fair return, and then at the same time, making the potato acceptable at reasonable prices to American consumers is the job that we have not gotten done legislatively these past 5 or 6 years. And frankly, it's not done yet.

Senator MYERS. Well, Secretary Brannan, your answer certainly tosses the hot potato back into the laps of Congress. But I will say I'm glad our farms were able to produce so much more food than before when we really needed it to feed ourselves and so many other people.

Thank you, Secretary Brannan, for joining me.

I notice now that my time has just about run out, and I'll close by saying that I hope you'll join in listening again in 2 weeks.

Wage-Hour Bill of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my broadcast to the people of Pennsylvania of the week end of November 25–27 printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. At that time I was privileged to have join me Mr. William R. McComb, the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator, and we discussed the background of minimum-wage legislation and the effects of the new minimum-wage law on the American worker.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

In earlier broadcasts while the Congress was still in session, I made periodic progress reports on the status of the new wage-hour bill as it made its way through the House and Senate to final enactment along in October.

When President Truman put his signature on the wage-hour—or minimum-wage—bill as it's sometimes called, a fight which had gone on for years ended in victory, a victory for a higher American standard of living.

Because this will mean added purchasing power for a great many Americans, we in Pennsylvania will benefit from the law in a number of ways. For one thing, we know that purchasing power measures the health of our whole productive economy. For us in Pennsylvania, it is exceedingly important that we find markets for the things we produce in our factories and our mines and on our farms—and thus any change which increases the ability of more people to buy the things we make has a very real effect upon our prosperity.

This is one of the many reasons why I want you to know something of the details of the wage-hour law and I hope in the course of this broadcast to develop for you some of the things which will be accomplished by the new act recently passed by the Eighty-first Congress.

Now the wage-hour law isn't a new idea. Congress passed the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1938, so we've had the basic law on the books for more than 11 years. The Eighty-first Congress this year changed many of the details of the 1938 act, but we left the fundamental features of the old law pretty much as they were, so I think I should begin by telling briefly about the essential purposes of the Fair Labor Standards Act.

For one thing, the terms of the original act provide a floor under the wages of more than 22,000,000 Americans whose work flows through the channel of interstate commerce. But because we usually think of it as the minimum-wage law, we frequently overlook the fact that the 1938 law also established, for millions of Americans, the 40-hour workweek as the usual standard, and provided that overtime payments should be made for any work above that amount. And lastly, among the really important features, the 1938 act contained certain provisions which marked a real beginning toward a decent child-labor law.

I have invited Mr. William R. McComb, the Federal Wage and Hour Administrator, to join me in this broadcast because he has been the top administrator of the old law, and will, after January 25, 1950, when the new amendments go into effect, be responsible for carrying out the administrative provisions of the new duties we have provided for him as well.

Mr. McComb, you've heard my brief description of the provisions contained in the wage-hour law, and as my first question I'd like to ask you what you consider to be the most important change we made in the Fair Labor Standards Act by the amendments we passed this year.

Mr. MCCOMB. Well, Senator MYERS, I don't think there's much doubt as to the most important feature; that is, the increase in the minimum hourly rate from 40 cents to 75 cents an hour. That is the change which has received most of the attention, and it certainly deserved to.

Senator MYERS. I agree with you, Mr. McComb, that the new 75-cent hourly minimum is the really important new feature, but I'd like to say something more about the 40-cent-an-hour minimum in the old law.

As I recall, while the 1938 act did provide for a 40-cent hourly minimum, we didn't plan that it would immediately bring every worker covered by the law up to 40 cents an hour. If we'd pushed the minimum up to 40 cents at once, it would have wiped out many businesses, and so the law visualized a gradual, step-by-step increase up to 40 cents.

In fact, as I remember it, the minimum wage that was established for 1938 was only 25 cents an hour, or $10 for a 40-hour week. That still makes me shudder when I think that we could ever have considered $10 a week as a satisfactory minimum wage, even in 1938—but that's where we had to start.

Mr. McCOMB. Ten dollars a week wasn't much money at all, Senator, but it gave us a start, low as it was, and we were able to get some valuable experience in administering the law at a time when many of its features were more or less untried.

Then, as you've said, the law made it possible for the minimum to move up year after year when, after careful study, it appeared that could be done without serious hardship to employers, and it wasn't until 1944 that we finally reached the over-all 40 cents an hour for everyone covered by the law.

Senator MYERS. Well, Mr. McComb, 1944 was right at the peak of our wartime production, and virtually everybody who wanted a job could get one. You shouldn't have had much trouble enforcing a 40-cent minimum wage rate at that point because almost everyone could find a job that paid at least that much money.

Mr. McCOMB. You're perfectly correct, Senator. The 40-cent-an-hour minimum wage under the law became rather meaningless at that time.

Senator MYERS. Yes; but if it was rather meaningless in 1944, it became completely meaningless in the postwar years. Remember that though a lot of us in the Congress fought hard to stave off inflation, the major wartime price controls died in 1946, and, of course, inflation followed.

So in the postwar years, it's obvious that 40 cents an hour—$16 for a full working week—certainly wasn't a realistic minimum wage when the cost of living rose the way it did. You'll recall that the Senate actually did pass a bill in 1946 to increase the hourly rate above 40 cents, but the House refused to go along, and the question was held over for the Eightieth Congress when it convened in 1947. And, as all of us know, the Eightieth Congress didn't budge on minimum wage.

Mr. McCOMB. That's right, Senator MYERS, and I recall that you tried to amend the act from the floor of the Senate in 1947. Didn't you offer an amendment to the Portal to Portal Act of that year which would have increased the hourly minimum under the wage-and-hour law to 60 cents?

Senator MYERS. Yes; I submitted such an amendment, Mr. McComb, but unfortunately the Senate voted it down without debate, because we were then operating under a strict application of Senate rules during a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on various aspects of the portal bill.

But immediately after my amendment was voted down, Senator TAFT, as chairman of what was then the majority policy committee, and also as chairman of the Senate Labor Committee, promised that the Labor Committee would report out a wage and hour bill promptly. I regret to say that didn't happen, although the Eightieth Congress didn't end for almost another year and a half. In fact, there never was a wage-and-hour-bill reported out of a Senate or a House committee during the Eightieth Congress.

That's history now, and the Eighty-first Congress has amended the wage-hour law, adopting, among other changes, a 75-cent minimum wage.

How many wage earners are due for an increase to that figure under the new provision?

Mr. McCOMB. The best estimates, Senator, indicate that about a million and a half people covered by the law are making less than 75 cents an hour, and thus that number will receive direct increases to the 75-cent level.

Senator MYERS. Where do these million and and half work, Mr. McComb?

Mr. McCOMB. The best available information we have, Senator MYERS, shows that these lowest-paid workers who will get direct increases under the new 75-cent provision are employed principally in segments of these manufacturing industries: Lumber, leather, apparel, furniture, and food products. Then there are some others in nonmanufacturing industries such as trade and communications. And they're scattered throughout practically every State in the country where these industries are to be found.

Senator MYERS. We have every one of these industries in Pennsylvania, so I imagine there will be a number of Pennsylvanians who'll get direct increases to the new 75-cent minimum.

But Pennsylvania working people, by and large, earn wages that are well above the 75-cent level. I know, though, that some of the very employers who pay these higher wages in Pennsylvania are threatened by competition from other manufacturers who now pay less than 75 cents an hour. So this will be a big protection to employers who pay more than 75 cents, because low-paying competitors will now be required to raise their wages at least to the 75-cent minimum—in other words, the new amendment will do a lot to end unfair, sweat-shop competition against fairer-minded employers.

Now, Mr. McComb, before our time runs out, I believe we should go over some of the other important changes we made this year. For one, I'm proud that we strengthened the child-labor provisions of the wage-hour law, and eliminated, as I hope we did, one of the worst loopholes in it. How is this going to work out?

Mr. McCOMB. It's a big improvement, Senator. A child under 16 can't work at any industrial job covered by this act—and if it's a hazardous job, the minimum age is 18. Before this new amendment, the act did not directly forbid child labor in these jobs. About the best we could do was to restrict and discourage child labor, but the law could be evaded, and we were powerless to stop it.

Senator MYERS. Another change we made this year was along the lines you suggested to the Congress, Mr. McComb. The 1938 wage-hour law didn't provide a satisfactory means of computing overtime pay—and a lot of trouble resulted. The famous "overtime on overtime" case went to the Supreme Court, and there were a number of others. You pointed out we could get around much of that difficulty by defining the term "regular rate of pay"—and so we incorporated a new definition in the law. Just how will that definition help out?

Mr. McCOMB. What we did this year, Senator MYERS, was to give employers and employees something concrete to work with, whereas before, the law hadn't been clear as to what was intended. By enumerating some of the types of payments which do not have to be considered in determining an employee's regular rate of pay for purposes of overtime computation, much of the confusion and uncertainty we experienced will be eliminated.

Senator MYERS. Thank you very much for joining me, Mr. McComb. I appreciate your visit, and I know our listening audience does, too.

Incidentally, Mr. McComb told me before the broadcast that anyone—whether an employer or an employee—can get more details on the new wage-hour law by writing the Wage and Hour Division at the Widener Building in Philadelphia or the Wage and Hour Division at the Victory Building in Pittsburgh—or I'll be glad to send you the material if you'll write to me, United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Thank you for listening. I hope you've enjoyed this broadcast.

Achievements of ECA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on the week end of December 9 to 11, inclusive, I had the honor of having Mr. Paul Hoffman, ECA Administrator, join me on my regular biweekly broadcast. Mr. Hoffman's work has been invaluable to the achievements of the Marshall plan, and I felt it a great privilege to have such a public servant with me to discuss just how our programs in Europe have helped the nations of Europe fight communism and rebuild their own economies. I ask unanimous consent that the text of that broadcast be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator MYERS. At this time of year, when the words "peace upon earth and good will among men" are frequently heard, I think we may be grateful that the spirit of peace has more substance this year than it's had for some time.

Too often, recent years have been marked by the tragedy, destruction, and pestilence of war, or threat of war. At the end of 1947, two years and a half after the European war ended, many Americans feared we were losing the peace. World War II veterans cast anxious eyes at their discarded uniforms, and there were rumors of a third world war in a matter of weeks.

Communism, a new threat to Europe's liberty, rolled out of the east Europe's democracies, their economies close to collapse, their people on the verge of starvation, seemed ready for Communist masters to take over. There were rumblings in France, and dire prophecies that the Communists would win at the Italian polls in the spring of 1948.

Today, 2 years later, we face a vastly different picture. The Communist march has been halted. The western democracies have a new strength and vitality. There is real confidence now that we are winning the peace.

We can't explain this change or this new confidence by any one reason, but we do know without doubt that Marshall plan assistance has played a huge role in shaping our success to date.

I've asked Mr. Paul Hoffman, the ECA Administrator, to join me on this broadcast in bringing you a report on the progress the Marshall plan has made during the 19 months it's been in operation.

I recall in the spring of 1948, Mr. Hoffman, when we first debated the ECA bill in Congress, that those of us who were all out in support of the Marshall plan got behind General Marshall's proposal because it was

the only solution we could see for giving the free European democracies a chance to prove that liberty could be retained while a worn-out, hungry and broken Europe got back on its feet, rebuilt its factories, restored its agriculture, and reestablished its trade.

But the ECA blueprint of 1948 was merely a hope—really our only immediate chance—to save the day for democracy. You've been close to this right from the beginning, Mr. Hoffman. How do you feel we've progressed in translating this hope into reality?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Senator MYERS, I believe it can be said in all honesty that the Marshall plan is ahead of schedule. That doesn't mean for a moment, of course, that our task is near completion. It isn't. More—much more—remains to be done. But we do feel that the first phase of the recovery job has largely been done.

Senator MYERS. And that means?

Mr. HOFFMAN. First, and most importantly, that the Communists in Europe have been stopped cold. They have been turned down in election after election. Norway in its recent election, practically obliterated the Communist Party. As a result, there is a new political vitality flowing through the veins of the European democracies. I think it is accurate to say that Europe is well on the way to becoming freer and more democratic than ever. On the economic front, I can report with some gratification that in all the Marshall plan countries the people now have a sustaining diet. It isn't a luxury diet, but is enough to grow on and work. That is a warm and human accomplishment that should make all of us very happy. I can also report that the people in Europe are working, and working hard. They have jobs.

That is the human meaning behind the statistics that European production is now 50 percent above what it was when the Marshall plan was conceived, and 20 percent above what it was before the war.

Defeatism has been replaced by hope. The people now have confidence in themselves and in their future. That, as General Marshall saw so clearly, is all important to the success of the program.

Senator MYERS. Of course, Mr. Hoffman, the success of this first phase of recovery—that is, the rebuilding of production to levels that in most instances are well above prewar—has depended a lot on the equipment and food we've furnished Europe during the past year and a half.

But Europe's productive efficiency was low—and that was true long before World War II. Now we in America are very proud of our industrial know-how because, with this know-how we've been able to turn out tremendous volumes of goods at low cost, while at the same time paying much higher wages than were received in Europe.

It seems obvious that Europe must step up her efficiency—and the purchasing power of her people—if she is to play an important part in a flourishing world economy in the future. Have European nations shown much interest in our know-how, Mr. Hoffman?

Mr. HOFFMAN. You are familiar, of course, Senator MYERS, with the technical assistance program through which we are translating our know-how into European terms. The Europeans are cooperating enthusiastically. The British have, in fact, set up an Anglo-American Council on Productivity which envisages a permanent exchange of information on techniques and procedures.

All of the Marshall plan countries have sent, or are sending, teams representing both management and labor to visit our factories, farms, and mines. These teams return home to spread the information collected. I am convinced that this program will have both short- and long-range results. It has proven to be, furthermore, a most inspiring adventure in human relations. The foreigners who have visited here have learned to know America and like Americans. Our people who have entertained them have learned to know and like them.

Senator MYERS. I am delighted to hear that, Paul.

Now I suppose we might regard as the second phase of European recovery the economic integration of western Europe. We've heard a lot about that word "integration"—and I think everyone understands it to mean the western European nations will act as an economic unit, more or less in the same sense our 48 United States do.

I can't imagine what America would be like if people in New York and every other State had to pay a tariff on something manufactured in Pennsylvania—yet that is the way tariff walls between the European countries work. Worse still, most European countries also have trade restrictions—restrictions that actually limit the amount of a particular goods that can be brought in from another country.

You made a big point of this in your recent visit to Europe, Mr. Hoffman, and I'd like to know whether you expect many European tariffs and trade restrictions will be lifted in the next year or so.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The long-range goal I put before representatives of the participating countries was the effective integration of the economy of western Europe, the building of a single market of 270,000,000 consumers, in which quantitative restrictions on the movement of goods, monetary barriers to the flow of payments, and eventually all tariffs should be permanently swept away. We in ECA are, of course, fully aware of the difficulties in the way of such a program.We realize it cannot be done overnight. Therefore, I pointed out that as a practical approach to their long-range goal, smaller regional groups might make faster progress within their own areas. I suggested that the small groups push ahead with such a plan, keeping, of course, their ultimate objective constantly in view.

The suggestions I offered were accepted, and have been embodied in resolutions which are now before the governments of the member countries. There is no magic, of course, in resolutions. I am confident, however, that we will see quick action on these short-term objectives. I, also, have high hopes for rapid and early progress toward the longer-range goal of European integration. The Europeans themselves, I think, see this as the only answer to their problems.

Senator MYERS. I hope we do see that kind of progress, Mr. Hoffman, but it will be a difficult job.

We've had a hard time lowering American tariffs; yet we know that tariffs cut down on world trade; and we know that our own economy is most prosperous when world trade is greatest. The reciprocal-trade program, initiated by our former great Secretary of State, Mr. Cordell Hull, back in 1934, has always faced a tough fight in Congress simply because it aimed at reducing American tariffs. I'm happy, though, that the Eighty-first Congress restored reciprocal trade to its original vitality this year, by repairing the damage done to the program last year by the Eightieth Congress. Now the reciprocal-trade program is back at work, and is assisting the Marshall plan in restoring and encouraging world trade.

In our discussion thus far, Mr. Hoffman, we've confined ourselves to talking about the way Europe is getting back on its economic feet. I think it's extremely important to consider what probably would have happened if there'd never been a Marshall plan, there had never been an ECA. I'm convinced Europe, without the Marshall plan, would have fallen to the Communists, perhaps we'd be at war with Russia today, or if not, we'd be watching the Communists consolidate their hold on the continent of Europe.

We've helped Europe rid itself of the conditions that breed communism. Without the help of the interim-aid program, and especially ECA, Europe simply couldn't have come back fast enough to avoid trouble. But Europe's getting along toward recovery—and when free men can find a way to feed themselves and their families, and can see hope in the future, then the rash promises that communism can provide security through dictatorship are promises that fall on deaf ears.

Of course, we're spending about $15,000,000,000 this year on national defense alone, but even without going to war our national defense would probably cost us two or three times that much if the Communists controlled western Europe and its industries.

We estimate the Marshall plan will cost about $15,000,000,000 to carry it through to its end in 1952, and we'll have spent close to $10,000,000,000 of this when the present law expires in July of 1950.

Do you think, Mr. Hoffman, that we can end ECA in 1950, instead of 1952, as originally planned, and still have any assurance that democracy could survive in western Europe?

Mr. HOFFMAN. If our aid to Europe were halted now, it would not take 6 months to undo all the accomplishments of the past 20 months. We have not yet passed the halfway point in getting our job done. Europe is still highly vulnerable. The Marshall plan will not have accomplished its purpose until Europe has ceased to be vulnerable. Let us not fool ourselves. The frank truth is that while the flames of economic and political catastrophe have been dampened down and are no longer easily visible, the fire has not yet been put out. The free world, and that includes the United States, will not be safe until it is.

You, Senator MYERS, I think, have shown an appreciation of this fact. I have not forgotten how ably, as acting majority leader, you supported our program for European recovery.

Senator MYERS. There will be a fight about this in the next session of Congress, Paul, but I'm confident the American people want to stay with the job until it's done. They know we can't afford the alternative of allowing Europe to fall to the Communists because of economic collapse in the democracies. If a total of $15,000,000,000 will put Europe back on its feet, this is a far better bargain than spending twenty or thirty or forty billion dollars every year for national defense, as we'd have to do if the Communists controlled western Europe and her industries.

Thank you for joining me, Mr. Paul Hoffman, and I congratulate you upon the splendid progress which has been made in the recovery of western Europe. Your magnificent and inspiring leadership has had a great deal to do with the success of the program.

I hope our listeners have enjoyed this broadcast and will join me again in 2 weeks.

Christmas 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, Christmas week end of 1949 was the occasion of one of my regular biweekly broadcasts to the people of Pennsylvania. In that broadcast I reviewed the achievements of the year of the American people—and in the year 1949 they were, in many re-

spects, greater than any preceding year in our history. I pointed out, however, that we cannot be self-satisfied with our progress—we still have a long, hard road to pull to world peace and security. I ask unanimous consent that my remarks on this broadcast be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This is a very special time of year for all of us; a time when the Christ Child and the Three Wise Men, when thoughts of home, of our families, and of our closest friends are uppermost in our minds, a time when the words "Peace on earth and good will unto men" have a special significance.

On Christmas Day of 1949, we can pretty much settle down, relax, enjoy the holidays and reminisce. We can talk and laugh about the difficulties we had with our Christmas shopping; about the troubles getting train, or bus, or plane reservations to get us home as soon as possible; and about what a particularly fine Christmas this one really is.

And I honestly believe this is a good Christmas. I believe most of us will look back upon this season in 1949 as a truly memorable one. America is in pretty good shape—very good shape, in fact. We're at peace, and our prospects for the future look good.

The world has quieted down a good bit this year. It's true, of course, that lasting world peace isn't a sure thing yet, but the outlook is better than it's been in a long, long time.

Christmas, the time of peace, has scarcely meant that to the world for many years. But this year, for a change, we can go back to the old Yuletide vocabulary without having it marred by earth-shaking terms like "Blitz," "Pearl Harbor," "Stalingrad," "The Battle of the Bulge," and the "cold war," all of these, and many others that have been the important words in our hearts at Christmas time for a decade or so.

So, this Christmas we can settle back and relax—relax and be pretty well satisfied that 1949 represents, by and large, a job pretty well done. And in its own way, 1949 has been something of a record breaker.

True, in other years we've produced more tanks, more machine guns, more war planes, and all the other things that played their part in making America the arsenal of democracy. I recall in that connection the time some years back when we talked of shifting our production from guns to butter.

Well, this year we turned that phrase around, and to use the same terms, we really went to town on our butter production. We're back in production for peace again, and I'd like to point out several significant instances where we broke some records this year.

Perhaps our most spectacular domestic accomplishment for 1949 was in the field of housing. As all of you know, we have lived with a serious shortage of adequate housing for years, and it may surprise you to know that until this year our record year for new home construction occurred 'way back in 1925, and it's taken us 24 years to break that record. The final figures for 1949 aren't in yet, but we're already sure that the 1925 record has been shattered.

It is almost certain now that very close to one million new, non-farm dwellings will have been put under construction between the first day of January and the last day of December 1949. The most hopeful note of all, however, is the fact that the trend in home construction is steadily upward, and if the trend continues, as we have every reason to believe it will in view of the great need for housing, I'm confident we will see well over a million new units begun during 1950.

We aren't going to lick our housing problems over night, but we're moving in the right direction. Another factor which will increase construction next year is, of course, the new public housing program authorized by the Congress last summer. That new program came along too late to have any noticeable effect on our building program in 1949, but by 1950, I think we're safe in saying that it will add another hundred thousand or so dwellings over and above the private construction—which is almost certain to increase as well.

All of this adds up to the fact that this time next year, another million or so American families will be living in brand-new, decent homes.

Another important old record has already been broken this year. Just 20 years ago, 1929, America produced the record number of almost 5,500,000 automobiles and trucks. We've come close to breaking that record twice before this year—first in 1941, and again last year, in 1948—but in neither case did we quite make the grade.

But this year, the automotive industry will smash that 20-year-old record to smithereens by turning out almost 6,250,000 cars and trucks—or about three-fourths of a million above the 1929 production level.

There is another factor of real significance behind this tremendous automobile output in that the largest increases in production were made in the less expensive models, the cars that give us a lot for our dollars in the form of sturdy, dependable, and economical transportation.

Too, we've seen the disappearance this year of the endless waiting to get anything with wheels, and what is more, we don't have to buy every gadget under the sun in order to get delivery. For a change, the prospective automobile buyer doesn't have to take the first thing that comes along, he can shop around until he gets just what he's looking for. That kind of condition is healthy, and I think everyone benefits by it.

The radio industry's big achievement this year was in the field of television. After turning out about a million TV sets in 1948, the industry set its sights on the figure of 2,000,000 sets for 1949 * * * then surprised itself and everyone else by stepping up its production goals all year long with the result that some 2,750,000 TV sets will have been manufactured this year. And the plans for next year are even bigger.

Now these big strides in some of our primary producer industries are among the outstanding ones, but they certainly don't represent all the examples we find in looking over the production records for 1949. And, of course on the other hand, there are plenty of instances where production this year is below the high points of other years.

But for the most part our producer industries are rolling along pretty close to peak levels, if not actually exceeding them.

So, as I've already said, we can settle back and be pretty well satisfied at the way 1949 has turned out. Our economy is humming along in good shape for the most part, with plenty of signs that the future looks good.

Perhaps we can be most encouraged by the fact that this free-enterprise system of ours is not only meeting the heavy burden of our domestic needs but is shouldering the load of our staggering and absolutely essential international obligations as well. Not only have we turned out nearly a million new homes, more than 6,000,000 cars and trucks, and all the other domestic requirements, but in addition, our economy is footing the bill on about $6,000,000,000 worth of Marshall plan assistance and arms for the military assistance program.

Six billion dollars a year for foreign commitments is a tremendous investment, but where the stake involved is world peace we simply can't afford to gamble. In less than 2 years we've pretty well dampened down the fears that a cold war might, at a moment's notice, become a shooting war. The concerted efforts during the last 2 years of the western democracies have stopped the advance of communism in Europe, and we can be proud that our American contributions to those efforts have made us a principal architect of world peace.

We can be proud, too, that the American economy this year came sailing through what the gloomy prophets of last spring were heralding as the next depression.

Yes; we can be satisfied—quite satisfied. But there is a big difference between satisfaction and smugness.

We can't be smug. Not everything in this old world of ours has been patched up properly. There are still plenty of trouble spots, plenty of instances where the machinery of our national and international life isn't operating as smoothly as the machinery should. We can be satisfied, I think, that the steps we've taken thus far to oil the machinery or to remodel it are proving out to be steps in the right direction, and most indications show pretty clearly that our progress to date has been basically sound.

Some of our trouble spots are rough to handle, but we're going after them in a realistic fashion. Right here in America, on this very day, there are, I regret to say self-respecting, capable, dignified, and conscientious people who are not at work, and many of them haven't been able to find work for some time. Still worse, there are a great many who haven't been able to provide for themselves and their families the kind of livelihood we like to regard as the American standard of living.

Some of these Americans are Pennsylvanians—our neighbors, living in our communities. It is frequently a vexing problem to find opportunities for these people to work and earn their way in order that they, and their families, may live decently.

There are perhaps three and one-fourth million people unemployed, as compared to about 60,000,000 who are at work. This unemployment is spotty; it's concentrated in particular communities, and in some of those communities it has had an almost paralyzing effect on the life of the entire community.

The important point, of course, is that whatever may be the reason for poverty, insecurity, and unhappiness, the problem of doing away with fear and insecurity is a national problem, and it is being approached as such. As a Nation, we have no intention of sitting idly by. Unemployment is eradicated by continuing to expand our economy through the encouragement of private initiative buttressed by affirmative Government cooperation. We are determined in our efforts to keep our economy expanding, and the results show that we're getting places.

Elsewhere in the world today there are other trouble spots. On this day there are hundreds of millions of people who, fettered by vicious dictatorships, are unable to think freely, act freely, and worship freely. The precious freedoms which we in America regard as so essential in our way of life are denied the victims of totalitarian regimes.

These trouble spots mean not only the oppression of human beings in far away places, but they exist as stark threats to the democracy under which we in the United States live, and in which we believe.

So long as we keep our Nation healthy, so long as we are capable and willing to undertake our responsibilities of world leadership in the cause of liberty and peace, I have no fear of the future.

America is setting for the world the lesson of the good example. With a scant 7 percent of the world's population, we are responsible for about half of the total industrial production, and our margin of productivity is increasing steadily. Without being smug about it at all, we do represent an example which other nations wish to follow. The truth about America is a persuasive truth that is permeating all corners of the world. No iron curtain can keep it out, and the truth

is ultimately capable of corroding away the most impervious of curtains, iron or otherwise. By continuing our example, and by continuing our good works toward world peace, a lasting kind of world peace, we will surely wear away the barriers to full understanding and freedom throughout the world.

It is a slow job, but we're making steady progress. We are dedicated to that task, the task of giving peace its true meaning, the meaning intended by the Prince of Peace in that holy era so long ago, and we will succeed.

And so we Americans do have cause for rejoicing during this blessed season of 1949.

A merry Christmas and the happiest of New Years to you all.

Liquor and Free Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Liquor and Free Speech," published in the Christian Science Monitor of January 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIQUOR AND FREE SPEECH

A determined audience packed the big Senate caucus room to overflowing the other day, in support of a bill to ban interstate transmission of alcoholic beverage advertising. A duplicate of the Capper bill, for which that Senator worked so earnestly while in Congress has just been introduced by Senator WILLIAM LANGER.

Here, perhaps, is the most promising single weapon for attacking the liquor evil through legislation. For it strikes at the multimillion-dollar efforts of the liquor industry to expand the market for the very product which lies at the root of that evil.

Spokesmen in behalf of that industry have contended before, and doubtless will contend again, that since the manufacture and sale of alcoholic beverages is lawful, there is an accompanying right to use any means to merchandise it that are open to other businesses. That contention is not valid.

Liquor is a tolerated product, as the universal practice of licensing attests. It is already controlled because it is dangerous. And society has a clear right to control it further in the public interest—as it forbids indiscriminate merchandising of firearms and narcotics.

Friends of the industry have claimed before, and doubtless will claim again, that banning liquor advertising would violate the right of free speech. It would not.

Anyone and everyone, including the liquor industry itself, would continue to have the right to speak freely through any medium he chooses to influence public policy in his behalf.

And that is what free speech means. It does not mean that there is an inalienable right to persuade boys to take up pistol toting, teen agers to try marijuana—or youngsters to begin on beer, or even sober, workaday citizens to acquire "distinction" through the social drinking of branded whisky.

The Pine Tree

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAUDE PEPPER
OF FLORIDA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, the pine tree is extremely important to the southeastern area of the United States, especially in my section of the country. On Pine Festival Day, at Macclenny, Fla., a very attractive young student in high school gave a very magnificent dissertation on the pine tree and its importance and possibilities to Baker County. I ask unanimous consent that a letter from this young lady, Miss Jackie Douberly, together with the excellent discourse which she delivered on that occasion, be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter and essay were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MACCLENNY, FLA., *January 3, 1950.*

Senator CLAUDE PEPPER,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR PEPPER: Enclosed you will find my essay, which I read on Pine Festival Day, here in Macclenny. I hope I have not waited too late to send it to you.

I cannot tell you how glad I was when you told me that it would probably be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I hope I have not waited too long for you to do so.

Please, let me know if it was put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Thanks, for making me feel so wonderful.

Sincerely yours,

JACKIE DOUBERLY.

THE PINE TREE: ITS IMPORTANCE AND POSSIBILITIES TO BAKER COUNTY

Pine, the name of a family of cone-bearing evergreen trees, distinguished as the oldest living trees that have descended from the forests of geological time. Within this great family, which includes larches, spruces, hemlocks, firs, and others, is the genus Pinus, made up of 80 different species. It is the trees of this genus that we usually have in mind when we speak of the pines.

The pines may be distinguished from the rest of the cone bearing trees by the arrangement of their needles; these are borne singly or in groups of two to five, and have paperlike sheaths around their bases. The pines called soft, because of their soft wood, shed these sheaths when the needles reach full growth, but the resinous pitch pines keep them until the leaves fall. While the trunks are straight and tall, sometimes reaching 250 feet, the shapes of the trees vary from round to pyramidal; the lengths of the cones range from 1 to 18 inches or more. Although the pines thrive in almost any soil and place, they prefer sandy uplands, and can live but a short time in unusually smoky cities, where, it is believed, the gases choke them. To the pine genus belong some of the world's most important timber trees; many species, moreover, are valued for ornamental purposes.

Foremost among all the pines is the white pine. The wood of this pine is soft but compact, straight-grained and easily worked, and takes a fine polish. The bark yields a sap that is used in cough mixtures.

The Georgia, yellow, southern, or long-leaf pine, most important and widely spread of southern timber trees, ranking next to the white pine, may be recognized by its orange-brown branches, large cones, and needles more than a foot long. From the needles is obtained an oil much like turpentine, and a fiber used for making bagging and for stuffing pillows. The long-leaf pine is valuable, not because its wood is easily worked, but because it is hard and strong.

Naval stores, which include the gathering of turpentine and tar, is of great importance to Baker County. Naval stores are produced from slash and long-leaf pines. When these trees are wounded or chipped, they exude a resinous gum to aid in healing the scar and to prevent insect attack. Man has taken advantage of this and systematically chips the trees and collects the gum by means of cups and gutters. Every 2 or 4 weeks, except during the winter months, the gum which has flowed into the cup is collected and taken to a still. At the still, the gum is distilled into turpentine and rosin.

The long-leaf and slash pines are referred to as dual-purpose trees because after being worked out for naval stores they may be cut into sawlogs, poles, pulpwood, and other forest products.

The first naval stores sale on a national forest was made on the Chactawhatchee National Forest in 1910. Since then better practices and more efficient management of lands for naval stores production have been developed on the national forests and elsewhere, especially on the Osceola National Forest. This forest with a gross area of 161,813 acres, is located in northeastern Florida in Columbia and Baker Counties, 12 miles south of the Georgia line. The Suwanee River, made famous by song and story, flows within 2 miles of its western boundary, and the St. Marys River within the same distance of its eastern boundary. The Old Spanish Trail, US 90, and the Seaboard Air Line railroad run along the southern boundary.

The entire forest is extremely flat, and the area is dotted with numerous small ponds and swamps where the soil is covered with water varying in depth from a few inches to several feet. Long-leaf and slash pine grow on the higher areas, and with adequate protection from fire the pine reproduction has become well established. Slash pine and cypress predominate in the shallow swamps, and hardwood and cypress on the muck soil in the deep swamps. In the larger swamps are virgin stands of cypress.

The Osceola National Forest is managed primarily for naval stores and saw timber. After the trees have been worked out for turpentine, the larger trees are taken as saw timber and poles, the small trees and tops are sold as pulpwood and the turpentined butts, as fuel wood. Cypress in the large swamps is being cut as saw timber, and much of the Cypress in the ponds is being taken out as cross ties.

The forest was established primarily as a naval stores demonstration area to show that proper forest management could be practiced economically and effectively in the naval-stores belt. Because the area favors intensive management, research, and demonstration, many permanent improvements have been constructed. The most important of these are located near Olustee, 12 miles east of Lake City. Three miles east of town is Olustee guard station. Here the key fire-lookout tower and a modern equipment depot and machine shop are located, also a complete modern seed extractory which furnishes pine seed for national forest nurseries elsewhere.

At Olustee is located the naval-stores branch of the southern forest experiment station and the naval-stores laboratory of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils. The southern forest experiment station manages 3,000 acres of the Osceola National Forest as an experimental and demonstrational

area, and conducts large-scale experiments on the management of southern pines for naval stores. The naval-stores station of the Bureau of Chemistry and Soils conducts studies to determine the most efficient methods of harvesting raw gum and distilling and refining turpentine and rosin. Many of the theories that are worked out in an experimental way by these agencies are practiced in a commercial way on the Osceola Forest. Since the establishment of the Osceola forest in 1931, it has produced revenue in excess of a quarter of a million dollars, and has increased its annual cuppage of naval stores and its sale of pulpwood, saw timber, and other forest products.

Several species of pine trees yield turpentine. Cuts are made through the bark into the wood of the tree. The crude turpentine then runs from the tree into little cavities cut for the purpose, when it can be collected as a semisolid substance. About every 10 days the bark is cut at a higher point, and so the flow is kept up right through the summer.

This process goes on for a number of years, but the product is best in the first few years after the tree is tapped. The hardened turpentine is often sold as frankincence, though this product is also the gum of several other kinds of trees.

Seedlings should be planted while in a dormant condition. Trees are usually dormant from the first of December, to the first of February. Best survivals have resulted from planting before the middle of January and effort should be made to plant not later than the end of that month. Moisture conditions at the time of planting are important and, if on a dry site, planting should be done when there is some assurance of rainy weather.

Pines weakened by rot, disease, fire, grazing animals, logging, or storms offer good homes for thousands of kinds of insects, some of which do great damage. But insects can also damage trees that seem to be perfectly healthy, with no weakness noticeable.

Leaf-eating insects are easily seen, of course. Fine sawdust and sometimes sap or gum may come out of the holes that boring or girdling insects make. Bark beetles make regular wavy passages or galleries on the inner side of the bark. Under certain kinds of insect attack the leaves of the hardwoods change to their fall colors, while the softwoods turn brown or red.

Careful forest management, which prevents injuries to trees and removes those already sick or weak, helps to prevent insect attack. Tiny parasites destroy some of the insects.

Each year fires cost Baker County thousands of dollars. Yet the cash value of the wood destroyed is only a part of the damage. Burning kills some of the larger trees and weakens and slows down the growth of others. Bark beetles and diseases enter easily through the burned places. Seedlings and young trees needed to establish another forest are killed. Fire may destroy the fertile, moisture-holding litter on the forest floor, robbing trees of nourishment and perhaps starting erosion. Woods fires sometimes take human life.

It is estimated that 25 percent of forest fires are caused by smokers—persons who go into the woods for camping, hunting, and recreation. A carelessly discarded burning match, cigar butt, or glowing pipe heel may in a few moments be converted into a disastrous forest fire which, before sufficient manpower or equipment can be brought to the scene, results in a desolate, blackened wilderness of smoking ruins. If the forests of Baker County are protected from fire, they can be made to fulfill the highest objectives of forestry.

Among many tributes to the pine, the following, by Robert Service, the Canadian poet, is especially appropriate:

"On the flanks of the storm-gorged ridges our black battalions massed,
We surge in a host to the sullen coast, and we sing in the ocean blast;
From empire of sea to empire of snow, we grip our empire fast.

"To the niggard lands were we driven, 'twist desert and foes are we penned;
To us was the Northland given, ours to stronghold and defend;
Ours till the world be riven in the crash of the utter end;
Ours from the bleak beginning, through the aeons of deathlike sleep;
Ours from the shock when the naked rock was hurled from the hissing deep;
Ours through the twilight ages of weary glacier creep.

"Wind of the East, Wind of the West, wandering to and fro,
Chant your songs in our topmost boughs, that the sons of men may know
The peerless pine was the first to come, and the pine will be last to go!"

Mr. Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excellent editorial entitled "Mr. Truman's Budget," published in the Nevada (Mo.) Daily Mail of Tuesday, January 10, 1950. I think this editorial will be of general interest, appearing as it does in an avowedly Democratic newspaper in President Truman's home State. As a Missourian, who sent the editorial to me, remarked, "It is evident that the people are beginning to think for themselves."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MR. TRUMAN'S BUDGET

President Truman's annual budget message to the Congress, yesterday, set most of us back a peg. His schedule of expenditures indicates that the Nation will operate again next year more than $5,000,000,000 in the red.

This, a commentator explains, is an "anti-deflation budget, as economists view it. The Government would be putting more money into the public's pocket than it takes out in the year starting July 1."

Somehow we had higher hopes for Mr. Truman and the Government than this anti-deflation gobbledygook. His message certainly wasn't antideflating. We definitely feel deflated.

To the ordinary, run-of-the-mill citizen, who sees a fair share of his pay check go to the Government each week, the fact that Uncle Sam proposes to keep on going into debt is a source of uneasiness. Although it may be sound enough theoretically, to most of us it doesn't make common sense.

One of the hardest lessons of life, and one that every person must learn if he is to get along satisfactorily, is that he must not spend more than he earns. Anything else means overdrawn bank accounts, bill collectors at the door, mortgage foreclosures, mechanics' liens and all the other things with which the improvident are daily hounded.

When a government continues to go into debt, year after year, one can't help but wonder if it is sound policy. We are not expert in taking a budget apart to see what's wrong but, from what little of the document has been exposed thus far, it would appear that there were certain expenditures recommended which might well be put off until there is more hay in the barn.

Surely we can wait for fatter days before we begin the costly experiment with a national health plan. Nor does this seem to be the time to expend $50,000,000 to "aid middle-income groups to obtain adequate housing they can afford." Nor can we justify financing out of a deficit a million-dollar program to assist capable youth to get a college education, a $30,000,000 subsidy to medical schools, nor a $290,000,000 grant to grammar and high schools.

The Government needs to share some of the facts of life with which its citizens are faced, and in the doing both will be infinitely better off.

Atomic Energy Commission Report Makes Mandatory Plans for Removal of the Seat of Government—Shocking Implications of Report Should Blast Complacency—Even in Peacetime Washington Not Geared Up To Service Million Citizens and Government Functions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, on September 16 of last year I introduced House Resolution 358 which would authorize the Rules Committee to investigate the possibility of removing the seat of Government west of the Mississippi River, preferably in the Colorado area. Public reaction to this proposal, as reflected in letters, telegrams, and newspaper editorials, indicates that it has strong national support. It is obvious that forward-looking citizens concur in the belief that while Washington may be an archeologist's dream spot it is unsuited to the demands of modern government. It is generally agreed that the time has arrived when the removal of the Capitol should at least be brought up to the blueprint stages.

A major undertaking such as the removal of the seat of Government to a more centrally-located area necessarily will require much study and planning before it can be executed. It was primarily to stimulate thought on this project, in the hope that discussion would ultimately lead to action, that I introduced my resolution.

Since I introduced this resolution certain official information has come to light which bears out the urgency of my

proposal and the irresistible logic behind it. The Atomic Energy Commission recently issued a report of its study of the effects of an atom bomb on the city of Washington. The report is enough to cause a national nightmare.

This report, which I am discussing in detail, reveals some of the shocking possibilities in the event of war. The report alone, with its terrifying implications, should be sufficient to shatter our complacency and to force plans now for any future contingency. The report makes such planning mandatory. In times of prosperity and relative security such as we now enjoy in this country, it is difficult almost repugnant, to consider the frightful possibilities contained in this report. While it is difficult for a peace-loving people such as we are to even contemplate the horrors of war, we must overcome this national inertia if we are to survive.

In cold, detached and simple prose, the Atomic Energy Commission raises disaster warnings for all of us to see. One atom bomb dropped on Washington would blow the city sky high, wreck its communications and, since it is the nerve center of the Nation, would cripple the country. That is the gist of the scientific study made by the Atomic Energy Commission. The inescapable conclusion is that the seat of Government should be removed inland or at least should be greatly decentralized.

David E. Lilienthal himself expresses grave concern for immediate action on the subject of decentralizing Government agencies in preparation for an enemy attack. Mr. Lilienthal recognizes the urgency for planning for such an event. No thinking person can brush off this warning contained in Mr. Lilienthal's letter to the National Security Resources Board, which ordered the study:

> The recent atomic explosion in Russia brings closer the time when decisions must be made on major issues of civilian defense, including the matter of dispersal out from congested urban areas of facilities such as those of Government in Washington.

Unfortunately, the Atomic Energy Commission's report has not gained the currency to which it is entitled. The implications of the report are a matter of vital national concern to all of us. Since it was given only piece-meal treatment by newspapers, I am including its full text at this point in my remarks:

THE CITY OF WASHINGTON AND AN ATOMIC-BOMB ATTACK

(Report by the staff, Division of Biology and Medicine, to the Atomic Energy Commission)

The effects of the explosion of an atomic bomb in a metropolitan area and the problems of civil defense that ensue differ in both quality and quantity from those of high-explosive bombing.

The experience of the bombed cities of England and Germany may be utilized for lessons in fighting fires, rescue of trapped personnel, and large-scale care for the wounded and homeless. Knowledge of the problems which are peculiar to an atomic-bomb attack, on the contrary, must come from a study of what occurred at Hiroshima and Nagasaki where the bombs were fused to detonate high in the air. The Japanese estimated that the heights of burst were 550 to 600 meters, that is, approximately 1,800 to 1,970 feet. While there is no assurance that an enemy might not detonate his bomb in water adjacent to a city, on the surface of the ground, or underground—each of which would bring its own unique problems—it is more likely that he would resort to an air burst because the latter would devastate a larger area on the surface of the ground. That is, a bomb equal in power to the Nagasaki bomb, if detonated in air over an American or European city, would crush or otherwise render useless the residences, as an example, over an area of 6 to 8 square miles. It presents not only a radiation hazard, but an explosive hazard beyond any blockbusters, and a fire hazard beyond any incendiaries.

From such a burst there would be four effects near the surface of the ground: (1) Blast, that is, a wave traveling with approximately the velocity of sound would engulf objects in a high pressure; (2) wind of considerable velocity would follow the blast as the highly heated air near the point of detonation expanded; (3) heat traveling with the velocity of light would strike exposed objects and kindle fires; and (4) radiation would penetrate the bodies of exposed personnel. Two additional effects should be mentioned. First, from the detonation of the bomb there would result highly radioactive fission products which would rise with the cloud from the bomb to be scattered harmlessly at great distances by the air. Second, near ground zero—the point on the ground directly beneath the point of burst—the radiation would cause objects to become radioactive but at a level which, to judge by Japanese experience, would be harmless to those who entered the area on rescue missions immediately after the incident.

If an atomic bomb is exploded quite close to the ground, as at Alamagordo, there will be a small area of residual radioactivity. If a bomb is exploded in water, such as Test Baker at Bikini, there will be considerable amounts of residual radioactivity, depending upon wind, currents, tides, and the size of the body of water.

The blast and wind, which may be considered together, would crush or render unusable the ordinary load-bearing brick wall dwellings for a distance of 7,000 or 8,000 feet from ground zero, would severely damage steel mill-type buildings for a distance of 4,000 to 5,000 feet, and would cause substantial structure damage in multistory steel or reinforced concrete buildings up to distances of 2,500 feet.

Accordingly, in an instant the usually dependable telephone, telegraph, electric service, and transportation (both public and private) would cease to exist in the damaged area. Also, because of the numerous broken pipes in houses, water pressure would fall to near nothing.

In addition to the direct fires which would follow the flash heat, there would be many more which would start from broken gas and electric lines and in particular, from combustible material coming into contact with cooking and process fires. Fire-fighting equipment inside the damaged area would probably be crushed by the collapse of the firehouses and with water pressure gone the many fires would speedily merge to destroy the greater part of the crushed area.

While this is happening, what would be the fate of the people? In Japan, the number of casualties was enormous because the attacking planes were not heeded and people were caught in the open or with inadequate cover. Consequently great numbers were badly burned by the flash, many so severely that they died within a short time, or were exposed to such a level of radiation that they died. As radiation passes through the body in any considerable amount a number of tissues which are necessary for normal health are damaged. At Hiroshima and Nagasaki everyone within one-half mile not protected by earth, steel or concrete died and the incidence of radiation injury was very high up to approximately one and a quarter miles from ground zero.

With adequate warning which was heeded and adequate shelters which were occupied the casualties could be greatly reduced. Furthermore, doctors with ample medical supplies, hospital facilities, and blood banks would save many of those who were injured by blast or burns.

No one can do the enemy's thinking for him and decide what he would select as his aiming point in Washington. In addition to some purely military establishments like the Naval Gun Factory, there are three obvious targets: (1) The Pentagon, (2) the area near the Capitol which includes the Senate and House Office Buildings and the Union Station, and (3) assuming 5,000 feet as the diameter of the circle in which there would be severe damage, the area in which is located the White House, Treasury Department, Executive Office, State Department, Interior Department, Navy Department, Pan American Union, Federal Power Commission, Court of Claims, Brookings Institution, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, Inter-American Defense Board, American Council on Education, Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Red Cross, Federal Works Agency, Veterans' Administration, Federal Reserve, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and Atomic Energy Commission. Aiming accuracy being something less than perfect, it is clear that other sites on the rim of the area would also be endangered.

The 5,000-foot-diameter circle has been assumed somewhat arbitrarily. It is known from the experience in Japan that at distances of 2,500 feet from ground zero substantial modern tall buildings would suffer such damage that 10 to 15 percent of their main columns and beams would require replacement, much of their outer-wall shell would be stripped off, and they would lose their partitions and their windows. As the distances to ground zero became less the damage would become progressively greater.

Because it represents modern construction and because the data are available, the Atomic Energy Commission Building is selected as an object for study. Would it protect its population in an attack? From its plans it is found that the building has the following above its floors:

Cover above:	*Inches of concrete*
Attic floor	2½
Third floor	9½
Second floor	17½
First floor	25½
Basement	33½

The maximum thickness mentioned, that is, 32 to 34 inches, may protect against the radiation hazard from a bomb detonating overhead at a height of 1,800 feet. No one can predict the strength of an enemy's bomb. Furthermore, windows, partitions, and possibly walls would become missiles. There would be approximately 80 percent casualties and added to this an unknown number of radiation deaths. Naturally, less substantial buildings and their inhabitants would suffer much greater damage. The inevitable conclusion is that the building should be abandoned in the event of an impending attack, or well before. The predictions for AEC building are generally applicable to Government buildings in Washington.

Metropolitan business districts, in which there are great concentrations of population during working hours, are additional vulnerable areas. Shelters for these populations may be provided in basements and in the interior of lower stories of large buildings if the work is undertaken in time. However, adequate warnings must be assumed for any

shelter to be effective. Hence, dispersal is far preferable.

It must be regarded as probable that fire will spread from the outside to buildings which have been opened by blast and that, in the absence of firefighting, their contents will be destroyed. In consequence, valuable records or microfilm copies should be removed to storage vaults.

The hard fact is that a shelter system, while saving the lives of the persons who take shelter, does not guarantee the resumption of vital functions. For example, in the event of an attack upon the Atomic Energy Commission building the building would be completely destroyed and following the attack those who emerged from the shelter would be quite helpless to carry on the far-flung operations of the atomic energy program.

The alternative to the shelter system and an alternative which not only saves the lives of key personnel but also permits at the same time a continuance of the vital governmental operating functions is—dispersal. The problems which it presents, physical, financial and psychological, are obviously tremendous and beyond the scope of this paper and the authority of this agency.

Long-range community planning to place projected hospital, fire stations and other essential emergency services in properly dispersed fashion should be encouraged. Routes available for emergency evacuation should be planned. These may well provide effective fire lanes through areas now highly vulnerable.

The attractiveness of the target vanishes with dispersal of some or all of the above-mentioned agencies. Scattered in the outskirts of the Washington area with distances of perhaps 2 miles between targets, the agencies would have a fair measure of security because no single one of them would be likely to warrant the expenditure of a bomb. Also, and equally important, persons who live adjacent to the original area would be less in jeopardy because the enemy would seek his target elsewhere.

From the experience at Hiroshima and Nagasaki it is clear that if an attack comes to an unwarned population the most that can be expected of them will be that the uninjured will rescue those who are trapped or injured before they are reached by fire. Because of the confusion and destruction which will follow a bomb burst, general relief must come from the outside. Washington, if attacked, would look for help—that is, for workers, supplies, and equipment—from its outlying undamaged ring and its suburban areas and from cities as distant as Baltimore, Philadelphia, and Richmond. Relief must be organized with this in view. Supplies, supplementary fire-fighting equipment and new hospitals must be kept outside vulnerable areas.

Safety will in large measure depend upon adequate warning of an attack, warning which it must be assumed will come from the radar system of the National Military Establishment. Such warning when combined with shelters for those who must stay in threatened areas, will minimize, or even eliminate, casualties. Less effective measures may result in panic, suffering, and 80,000 deaths as at Hiroshima.

Mr. Speaker, the conviction of those who have studied this problem that the seat of government should be removed west of the Mississippi River is further confirmed by the recent public statement of Secretary of Defense Johnson. His statement reveals that already plans are under way for the removal or decentralization of the three branches of the armed forces in anticipation of an enemy attack. His statement said:

Recognizing the fact that it is not beyond the bounds of possibility for Washington to be the target of a devastating or damaging attack, and that the seat of government might have to be moved as a result, it follows that plans should be prepared to cover this contingency. Such plans are in the course of preparation.

Specifically, these plans include the movement of the three service elements of the Department of Defense to other locations and the designation of successors to military command.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OVERGROWN WHISTLE STOP CRUSHED IN, JAM OF TWENTIETH-CENTURY PROGRESS—ITS HORSE-AND-BUGGY STRUCTURE NOT SUITED FOR SPEED AND EFFICIENCY OF FORWARD MARCH OF ATOMIC ERA

Even in peacetime the seat of government should be removed from Washington. The District of Columbia is an overgrown whistle stop. It is not geared up to serve the ordinary needs of its million residents. It has passed its absorptive capacity for people, homes, office buildings, and apartments.

In 25 years the town has built only one hotel of major importance. The city, supposed to reflect the glory and power and culture of a free people selected by the Creator to receive the richest blessings in all history, does not even have a legitimate theater. The town is a national disgrace to the dignity of a great nation.

In establishing the village in 1800 as the seat of government, officials never dreamed of the march of events that would turn the muggy marshland into a swollen metropolis teeming with automobiles that drag along at a snail's pace during rush hours. Because of this hardening of traffic arteries, which borders on paralysis, it often requires 40 minutes to traverse 7 miles in a straight line.

Washington, the horse-and-buggy town, cannot keep step with the swift pace of the atomic era. It has outlived its usefulness in peacetime and constitutes a threat to our national security in wartime.

The time has arrived for a serious study of the proposal to remove the seat of government to a more centrally located area. I trust that the Rules Committee will see fit to adopt my resolution without further delay.

At this point in my remarks I wish to insert an editorial on the subject from the Nevada (Mo.) Herald:

A NEW CAPITAL

Recently Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN, of Texas, suggested that the Nation's Capital should be moved from Washington to some point West of the Mississippi. Either that or have a second capital established, a sort of substitute capital, as it were. In this atomic age, Washington's location on the eastern seaboard is too exposed and definitely hazardous.

Mr. PATMAN's suggestion isn't original. Roger Babson not only made a similar suggestion several years back but actually did move some of his establishments to Eureka, Kans., within what he calls the "magic circle"—an arc which takes in much of Kansas, western Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma.

Of course everyone out in this part of the country will embrace the Congressman's suggestion with a view toward converting their home town into the new Nation's Capital—or substitute capital. After all, possession of the Congress, several hundred lobbyists, the Supreme Court, and a dozen or so bureaus would be a far better prize for any chamber of commerce than an egg-breaking plant that employed only a few thousand people.

We strongly suspect that Congressman PATMAN in making the suggestion had some spot in Texas already picked out for the new capital. If he didn't support such a move Texas would surely be the first State in the Nation to launch lynching proceedings.

Our neighbor city to the south, Joplin, has put in its bid for the new capital.

Says the Joplin Globe:

"Let them erect a new capital between Joplin and Webb City. While it is true that almost any point in the United States is equidistant from Russia, via the North Pole, our important official records should not be housed in a large city. Then in this district, if cold war developed so much hidden fire it threatened to burst into flame and an atomic attack was feared, the records and official operating personnel could retire to the safe and commodious underground caverns of our worked-out sheet ground mines.

"Maybe you think this is a bizarre suggestion, offered only with facetious intent, and maybe it is, but don't be too sure it won't seem 100-percent practical and desirable some day in the future."

Although we know of no Kansas towns that have made a bid for the new capital, some are sure to do so on the specious grounds that both the geographical and geodetic centers of the United States lie within the borders of Kansas. As we see it, those are about the only bases on which any Kansas town can lay much of a claim. Kansas just don't do. Although it has recently voted itself wet, liquor is still something of a novelty in the State and the cosmopolitan crowd that hovers around our Nation's Capital would find itself uncomfortable in such a new-wet environment.

Oklahoma would have to be ruled out of the picture because it is legally a dry State. Arkansas might qualify but it is too hard to get to. The only place left is Missouri.

Big cities, with their factories and war plants, can't qualify. So the choice narrows down to a smaller Missouri city and, of course, there is only one that can meet every sort of test. Needless to say, that's Nevada.

Nevada already is a cosmopolitan city. The High Lama from Tibet or the Minister of the Exchequer from Britain could walk through Nevada streets now and feel perfectly at home. The town's ability to absorb strangers, and make them feel not strange, is practically unlimited.

Nevada has railroads (at least part of the time), highways, and a big air field that could handle any number of traveling dignitaries.

The Government already owns considerable real estate in this vicinity—Camp Clark—with its own water and sewage disposal system which could be converted into the Capitol grounds on short order and a minimum of expense.

True, Nevada has no caves. We presume some could be dug if it seemed expedient. But it appears to us that the virtue of keeping Government aboveboard and on the up-and-up outweigh whatever perils are threatened by the atomic bomb.

And if the Government is really interested in this move, we presume the Nevada Country Club would let Mr. Truman bid on one of the lots out at their auction Sunday afternoon, even though the President isn't a member of the club. After all, they could afford to be generous if it meant having the White House on top of their hill.

What Is Right in the "Left"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, an article by David Lawrence entitled "What is Right in the 'Left'" covers a subject of general interest and merits wide circulation. Under permission of the HOUSE, I submit it herewith for printing in the RECORD:

WHAT IS RIGHT IN THE "LEFT"
(By David Lawrence)

"Left wingism" was defeated in Australia and New Zealand, but not by a negative attitude on the part of the conservatives toward those good things which the "left" had brought through social welfare legislation.

To allow emotional prejudice to shape the course of a political party anywhere is to invite defeat. The Republican leaders in our own country are discussing what kind of a program or platform they should write for the coming elections. The Democratic conservatives in their primary campaigns also are discussing how to fight "left wingism." No political group in either party can make progress by assuming that the Nation does not want some of the basic principles retained which have enabled America to deal with social welfare problems during the last several decades.

When Governor Dewey, as a presidential nominee in the autumn of 1944, announced, in a speech at Portland, Oreg., that he favored the principle of Government intervention in the economic life of the country, he was promptly criticized by many conservatives in his party. They began then—and have echoed ever since—an attack on what they call me-tooism. The argument runs that the Republican candidate, who favors any activity a Democratic administration has sponsored through legislation and merely claims he can do a better job, either by amending the existing law or by better execution of the task, is simply crying "Me, too."

Yet the principle of Federal intervention in the conomic life of the country is older than the Republican Party itself. It was first pronounced by Alexander Hamilton when he and the founding fathers declared that infant industries must be protected by a tariff. The Federal Government started social security in the form of pensions and granted land to the soldiers of the Revolution. It made land grants to pioneers who headed west. It later built good roads. It helped the railroads to get land grants. It not only assisted the growth of land and water transportation through the building of bridges and the dredging of rivers and harbors but, in the Republican administration of William Howard Taft 40 years ago, it entered the express business by carrying parcel post.

The Federal Government has helped to do countless things for the farmers, from free seeds to better crop information. It even began, under a Republican Congress in the 1920's, to regulate labor-management relations on the railroads.

Federal intervention in the economic life of business and the individual is no longer vulnerable as a principle. It is rather the scope and degree and quality thereof which is debatable.

Political strategists always court defeat if they attempt to fight a battle on a battlefield favorable to their opponents. Good strategy requires a different battlefield. If the conservatives in the United States would only grant in a few words—as did the conservatives in Australia and New Zealand—that they plan to retain the good things the "left" has brought and to do them even better, it would enable the conservative strategy to be devoted 90 percent or more to the subjects on which "left wingism" is injuring social welfare.

Principal among these is the interference by "left wingism" in the individual liberty of the citizen and his family—his right to liberty and the pursuit of happiness. To dissipate the workers' dues paid to certain unions, to intimidate a worker, to threaten his family, to overturn his car at the factory gates, and inflict violence upon him when he asserts his right to work is not social welfare. It is despotism.

To permit a union boss to regulate the production of coal or any other commodity is to sanction monopoly. This is not social welfare.

To impose on the citizen such tax burdens that in the price of food and clothing and the necessities of life there are hidden imposts which cut down the net purchasing power of the worker's dollar is to bring social ill and not social good.

To allow the Federal budget to remain unbalanced and to add to the national debt at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year is to threaten the solvency and hence the social welfare of the Nation.

The primary meaning of the word "conservative" is one who wishes to conserve. The problem of conserving America's national and individual resources presents the biggest conservation issue the Nation has ever faced.

Conservation of natural resources as against the exploiters was a big political issue of 1912 and a mark of progressivism.

Conservation of individual resources and of the precious freedoms of the individual as against the exploiters is even more important today.

Failure of Peace on Earth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Emil Fredrich, of Garrison, N. Dak., addressed to the editor of the Garrison (N. Dak.) Independent.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LETTERBOX

DEAR EDITOR: Christmas will come and Christmas will go and bells will toll throughout the world, peace on earth, good will toward men. Children are singing in cathedrals in all lands: Glory to God in the highest. Peace on earth, good will toward men, is one of the greatest philosophies put into a few words, which is meant for the benefit of humanity, not for 1 day, but for 365 days a year. These few words and their meaning have failed utterly. Their teaching can be put into reality by parents and educators, educating children from childhood, when the brain is fertile, love toward your neighbor and fellow man, which will bring out the beauties of life, and to abhor the wickedness and the cruelties of war.

The teaching of the great Master has failed up to the present day. Universal is the cry of peace, and in silent meditation, they come from everywhere, to meet in holy assemblage, people of all nations, whether in peace or war. What is the highest order that will bring peace to man? Surely not weapons, to destroy what the Creator of the universe has created alive.

We create pretention calling to our people, saying that we must arm and be a strong Nation, and tell them to take up arms for patriotism's sake. We make it greater than God's commandment, "Thou shalt not kill." We multiplied widows and orphans by the thousands; we have caused poverty to reign in a land of abundance, we have rained death upon helpless old men and women, small children that have harmed no one, little infants in their cradles, the most precious being in the eyes of the Creator. When the helpless looked toward the heavens, and pray to their Heavenly Father for protection, its death out of the blue skies. To the man who says there shall come a time of peace, we mock and say, "Thou fool, we have become more terrible than the beast in the forest."

Why be selfish, greedy, corrupt, and self-centered? It would be more beautiful to be pleasant, amiable, tolerant, honest, and serviceable to each other than to be mean, nasty, and dishonest in our dealings with our fellowman. That holds true to nations; we are now standing at the very threshold of a new day, for recent technological advances have wiped out all cause for selfishness which heretofore has barred the way. A little united effort and the victory is ours.

We must stop prattling the Lords Prayer like a bunch of parrots and work for it, praying fervently in our hearts, "Thy Kingdom come, Thy will be done on earth," etc. We have been deceived and been told that Mammon must reign his thousand years, as if he not already reigned far overtime, but his power is waning. It is the Creator's aim that all mankind shall be one loving family here on earth, living in peace, harmony, and comfort. Although he has found few loyal helpers, he has gone steadily forward, building to that end by teaching us the great principles upon which all human happiness must rest, altruism.

You were put here to bring this about. Man has clung to individualism and selfishness, but the Creator has continually taught him the opposite. "Love thy neighbor as thy self" fits into an individualist society just like Thou shall not kill, fits any army. Are you helping bring the Creator's kingdom on earth? What has been accomplished the last 2,000 years. Love one another has failed. Are men more tolerant today than yesterday? Do they not hate each other more than ever before? Men against men, nationality against nationality, their efforts wasted. They have spend hundreds of years, and millions of dollars in preaching, converting the heathens, teaching brotherly love. The sad part of it is, they have failed and utterly failed, not only in other countries, but right here in this great country of ours. One of the greatest inscriptions I have seen on the bulkhead of a coal bunker, inscribed by a humble coal passer, in the year of 1918. "You cannot have peace on earth, not until civilization becomes civilized, humanity humanized, christianity christianized, not until then will you have peace on earth, good will towards men." I say "Amen" to that. I do not intend to lecture on this subject, nor do I care to listen to everlasting preachings, but it sure would be a world of beauty and a paradise on earth, if there would be more action and less empty verbiage.

EMIL FREDRICH.

GARRISON, N. DAK.

I Adjure You To Watch Please Where the Illegitimate Propaganda Babies Are Being Laid and by Whom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to advise, and thus I hope alert, my fellow Congressmen to a realization of the fact that the superlatively selfish reactionary political and financial alliance in our Republic has been quite busy for some time, like a rogue in the night, laying illegitimate propaganda babies upon the doorsteps of some of the unsuspecting, sleeping Americans, among said babies being the following:

First. By blaming John L. Lewis and his United Mine Workers and not the coal barons, mine owners, and operators of the Nation for causing or threatening to cause the banking or putting out of the fires in the factories and homes of America by failing, neglecting, and refusing to bargain collectively, honestly, and in good faith with Mr. Lewis and his miners, and jamming the listening posts of America with calamity howlings that the wheels of industry will stop for want of coal and the home fires of America will sputter out, until today the conjured-up cold causes the substitute teeth of some people to chatter and their aging knees to knock in sequence until you cannot distinguish any more the old clippity clop in the mule-train song from the noises these calamity howlers are making, all to the great detriment of hill-, mountain-, and plain-billy music.

Second. Seeking by deeds to retain and by words to polish and gloss over the vicious and idiotic Taft-Hartley slave-labor law, and without cause, force President Truman to invoke its foul provisions so as to make for them campaign talk for the 1950 elections.

Third. By causing certain precocious, child-minded doctors of the medical profession to wax wroth in the contention that national health insurance is socialized medicine, and that it would lead us into England's present plight, sans bombs, sans bombings, sans total war's devastating everything.

Fourth. By stirring up and fomenting religious strife in the Republic and driving a cruel wedge of discrimination into the heretofore tolerant and peaceful educational systems of the Nation by denying to poor nonoffending, impressionable children attending private and all parochial schools the duly-paid-for benefits they are entitled to, such as bus rides, free nonsectarian books, health programs, and so forth.

Fifth. By demanding restrictive alcoholic advertising legislation in an attempt to prop up the ugly, deadhead of the Republican Party's so-called noble experiment and breathe life into the putrid prohibition carcass.

Sixth. By encouraging and promoting legislative road-blocking in sundry ways including a return to the old bottle-'em-up rule of the House of Representatives Rules Committee.

Seventh. By encouraging the use of unpatriotic, gutter language in referring to the high office of the Presidency of the United States and its present incumbent, who is a real friend of the people and not an enemy of any man, woman, child, or institution, big or little, in the Republic.

Eighth. By giving encouragement, aid, and comfort to Joe Stalin and other enemies of the Republic in libeling and slandering the state of the Nation as far as the honor and integrity of its executives is concerned, and its much-desired, worth-while currency, and its financial solvency, stability, and over-all honesty of purpose and efficiency of operation.

Ninth. By encouraging the enemies of the Republic into believing that the Republic is disorganized and wastefully weak and impotent, is practically bankrupt, and thus hastening world war III with vulture No. 1.

Tenth. By attempting to divide the households of America and thus, in Hitler, Mussolini, and Stalin fashion, disunite the Nation and thus divide it in order to conquer it for themselves.

Eleventh. By carrying on a campaign of lies and attempting to convince the people that their friends are their enemies.

Twelfth. By wickedly infiltrating, for politically shameful purposes, otherwise good intentioned and respectable organizations.

Thirteenth. By claiming that the present administration, and not the greatest war in the history of the world, is responsible for the present huge public debt and unbalanced budget.

Fourteenth. By pretending that an unbalanced budget and deficit spending is new, novel, and original for the Republic and was authored by the present Democratic administration, when the truth of the matter is that the budget of the Nation has never been balanced, beginning with the administration of Calvin Coolidge, the Republican mummer, who after all had sense enough to keep his tongue from wagging potential treason.

Fifteenth. By working to build up huge monopolies and trusts and causing the free enterprise system of America to become an exclusive enterprise system for them.

Sixteenth. By attempting to pervert with money the great free press of the Nation into an unfair press and a sordid hireling of glorified gangsterism.

Seventeenth. By attempting to ruthlessly scare and frustrate people into a depression.

Eighteenth. By ignobly attempting through the circulation of falsehoods to destroy the high purpose and prestige of our country at the council tables of the other nations of the world.

Nineteenth. By spending propaganda money like drunken sailors in expectation of a return to political power so as to again enslave and debauch the people of the Nation.

Twentieth. By resisting civil-rights legislation and approving of second-class citizenships.

Twenty-first. By the coalition of evil forces to fuse the thoughts, words, and deeds of reaction into one octopus whole.

Twenty-second. By pretending to ride again with Paul Revere in the interests of freedom and the Constitution when in truth and in fact they are striving to attain economic slavery over others in violation of natural and moral law and of the United States Constitution and proper human law.

Twenty-third. By pseudo-endowment of self-created pressure-group organizations to fight public hydroelectric and other power projects of the people behind the masked face of inordinate greed and selfishness.

Twenty-fourth. By funneling money into various and sundry lobbying activities.

Twenty-fifth. By hiring persons and other entities to endeavor to lure people into following the crooked and winding ways of the financial serpent and go basely upon their ignoble bellies and not upon their stalwart feet.

Basing-Point Law Condemned by Farmers Union Herald—Cites Clash of Big Business With Farm, Labor, Co-op, and Small-Business Groups—Many Groups Aroused in Opposition to False Issue of Clarification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Farmers Union Herald of January 9, 1950, in a short but direct leading article on its front page, signals the danger to many groups embodied in the basing-point bill, S. 1008. The Herald says:

> A head-on clash of big business versus the major farm, labor, co-op, and small-business groups has shaped up. Big business wants a basing-point clarification bill passed which, in effect, overrules the Supreme Court.

This refers to the Supreme Court decision in the Cement case on April 26, 1948, outlawing the basing-point system.

FARMERS OPPOSED TO IDENTICAL PRICES

The Farmers Union Herald article describes the basing-point system as a gentlemanly form of business monopoly. Farmers are opposed to monopoly because in the past they have been victims of monopoly in the purchase of supplies and equipment for use on the farm and in the sale of farm products. Any system of fixed prices by an industry levies its toll from every walk of life, either by direct consumer purchases or by taxes used for materials to build our great public works.

FARMERS UNION POSITION IS SOUND

The position of the Farmers Union on S. 1008, the basing-point bill up for consideration on January 20 by the Senate, is the correct one. The Farmers Union

has consistently opposed S. 1008 and predecessor bills of like nature since the beginning of this fight shortly after the Cement decision. I commend this short article to my colleagues as it concisely describes the situation. The article follows:

BASING-POINT LAW FIRST ORDER OF SENATE BUSINESS

The basing-point system—a gentlemanly form of business monopoly—may again be legalized when Congress takes up S. 1008 on January 20. Under a Supreme Court order, the basing-point system is now outlawed.

A head-on clash of big business versus the major farm, labor, co-op, and small business groups has shaped up. Big business wants a basing point clarification bill passed which, in effect, overrules the Supreme Court.

The system is used to make sure all manufacturers give uniform prices and bids on material—such as steel and cement—throughout an area. Any producer who wanted to offer bids could be sure no one else would offer less.

If it turned out that someone put in a lower bid and took the business, he was regarded as a chiseler who ought to be punished. The other companies would teach him a lesson by offering low prices in his territory, even at a loss, until he was faced with bankruptcy and decided to be good.

Thus a basing-point system is a much more civilized and gentlemanly way to set up a monopoly than the old-fashioned system. But it is just as effective.

The great cry on Capitol Hill now is going to be a demand that Congress clarify the law so everyone will know just how far he can go on the basing-point system. "This is like demanding that Congress clarify the law against murder, saying just what weapons you must not kill a man with," said spokesmen of the National Farmers Union last week.

Reception in Honor of William Warrick, of Scranton, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an excellent address delivered by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, before a group of veteran representatives and city officials in Lynn, Mass., on the occasion of the reception which was given William Warrick, of Scranton, Pa., when he visited the widow and children of his late buddy, Maurice Goldstein, who was killed in the Battle of the Bulge in 1945:

It is a rare privilege for me to be here tonight and to bring to you the official greetings of the Department of Massachusetts Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America and to join with you in welcoming our guest and his charming wife into this great city, in a great State, of the greatest of all lands, on the eve of a great day, Mr. Warrick has come here on a great and noble mission—to pay, as he himself has described it—a long-delayed visit to the widow and children of his former buddy, and to bring to them a measure of solace. To a large degree, Mr. Warrick's visit with us tonight, as also this entire assemblage by this group, represents combined effort on our part to answer the question to the young lad of a war hero, "Why did my daddy have to die?" and to help in the solution of the Nation's No. 1 problem, internal friction. I hope that you will forgive me if I digress for a moment and inject what may seem a personal note.

To me personally, standing before you tonight breaking bread with my comrades and fellow Americans is of special significance. Tonight marks the twenty-eighth anniversary of my stepping onto American soil for the first time. My first meal in this blessed land of ours was a traditional Thanksgiving dinner, such as the one we are having tonight.

I left Europe 28 years a week ago, and came to this land 28 years ago tonight. I left behind me a country, a continent, which was a malignant sea of hate. I came to a land where love and brotherhood was the order of the day. It was then, as it is now, a haven and refuge for many people. And as I look back and trace the happenings in the world during these past 28 years, and as I draw in my mind a quick comparison between the many countries of Europe, each of them set against one another and the peoples within the borders of each of them divided among themselves, and the unity that exists among our people, I cannot help but see where that sea of hate in Europe has engulfed and drowned millions of its people, and the countries have gone from bad to worse; while our country has been going forward all the time and has since become the hope of the world. If you will accept the benefit of thinking by one who has spent the first part of his life in the Old World, and the major part of his mature years in the New World, then I am sure you will agree with me that the reason for the big gap that exists between the conditions in the two worlds is to be found in the two words "hate" and "love."

Where hate creeps in, no matter in what small doses, division follows. Internal harmony suffers, the structure weakens, and collapse is the inevitable result. We must be alert to learn from the bitter lessons of the Old World, and make the elimination of group hatred and the substitution for it of love and respect as the first order of business on the agenda of every American. We must reject and combat the false teachings of the Old World which have been making inroads into our way of life during the past decade. This gathering represents a milestone in the history of our people. We have reached a point in the life of our Nation where we find that we have all too long delayed our program of house cleaning. We should embark on it now, not only to secure ourselves by preserving harmony in our land, not only to perpetuate and preserve a way of life for which men like Maurice Goldstein gave their lives, and men like William Warrick gave so much, but also to abide by the teachings of Christianity and Judaism which command us to "scorch the bad from our midst."

This program of house cleaning could begin in nearly any city or town in our land. That it began in Lynn, Mass., is no reason for any aspersions on this cosmopolitan city.

On the contrary, I do not share the opinion of some of the people of this city that the Goldstein incident puts our city here in bad light in the eyes of the Nation. Which of the cities and towns here in this State or in any State in the Union can claim immunity from the disease of hatred and bigotry, so that it might lie in the mouths of its people to take issue with us here. I submit to you, my friends, that the people of the city of Lynn are at this moment writing a golden page in the history of our Nation. They will be recorded to the credit side of the history of our people as having had the courage to ask the question which was on the lips and in the hearts of millions of people in our land, but which was not asked, much less was the answer given. The question in our language would probably be, "How long will we continue to tolerate the bigot in our midst; how long will we permit the daily desecration of the principles for which the flower of our people gave their lives; how much longer will we delay housecleaning?" The Goldstein lad, having received an unmerited beating for no other reason than he was the son of an American who chose to abide by the faith of his fathers, a Jew, asked the question in much simpler but deeply rooted question, "Why did my daddy have to die?"

The press of this country has quoted our guest as saying that the incident has impelled him to pay a long-delayed visit to the widow of his buddy. I am very much intrigued by the phrase "long delayed." Is that not characteristic of our people, and of our country. Here is a fine man, who for several years harbored in him a longing, a desire to do something nice, something noble. We are a busy people, we are a hard-working people; a good portion of the time we are busy carrying on our backs the people of Europe, feeding them and pulling their chestnuts out of the fires, and we have not the time to do the things that are most dear to us. Then something comes along and shocks us into action. That is what happened to Mr. Warrick. When he heard of the beating administered to the son of his buddy, whom he saw dying for the American way of life, he could not tolerate his postponement any longer. He is here tonight joining with us in some housecleaning. The same, my friends, is true of our entire country. This incident has shocked the Nation, the American people are doing a bit of extra thinking and self-searching, and that means, we are going to do some long-delayed housecleaning, and that means we are moving forward along the lines of the principles for which our men and women gave their lives.

HOW MUCH OF HATRED AND BIGOTRY?

You are going to tell me perhaps that we are making too much of an issue of an isolated incident that has happened so many times, and perhaps happened to some of you in your young days, and you are going to ask me, "How much of bigotry and hatred between groups in this country is there? How serious is it?" I am afraid that I cannot answer you the first part of your question. But I can attempt to tell you how serious the existence of any of it is to our security, to our reputation, and to the daily well-being of ourselves and our children.

PULLORUM CLEAN

I come from a family where there are a number of individuals engaged in farming. Two of my brothers run one of the largest turkey farms in Middlesex County. My uncle operates one of the big farms in Norfolk County. Now I am not trying to canvass any of your business; it would be late in the day to do it, especially after you have already had your dinner. But I want you to bear with me while I attempt to answer your question, "How serious any measure of bigotry is."

For a number of years I have watched State inspectors coming to the farm of my uncle and my brothers, at their invitation, and take blood tests from each and every one of some 6,000 birds. Finally I heard them rejoice in the fact that their stocks were declared by the State to be "Pullorum clean." I heard so much of that word "pullorum," that I decided to betray my ignorance and to inquire.

I said to my brother, "What is this business 'pullorum,' that you talk so much about it." "Why, that is a disease of the blood stream," came the answer. "It gives you a bad repu-

tation, people refuse to deal with you, and any morning, you might get up and find your entire flock succumbed to the disease. You are never certain." Having become interested, I proceeded to ask him, "Well, do you want to tell me that all these years until now, all of your 6,000 birds were pullorum-affected?" In answer, I received one of those amazed and inquiring looks, and after a moment of silence the answer came, "No, only perhaps about 15 or 20 birds in the entire flock were diseased." "And is that so serious?" I inquired. "Very serious," was the answer. "Permitted to remain, the entire flock would become infected, the blood stream of every bird might become diseased, and I would lose my entire business, my whole life savings." Buyers would shy away from him, he would lose his credit and standing. Because of that, he is going through annually a process of testing and checking at great expense, and painstaking effort. "But," he says, "it pays big dividends." He is in a healthy state; he has a sense of security. He enjoys a good reputation; he is making money, and he is happy. His stock is pullorum clean.

My friends, bigotry, the practice and the teaching of hate on account of race, creed, color, or national origin, is a disease of the blood stream. It is the pullorum of the human race, and if permitted to go unabated, if not checked at its source, we are endangering the well-being of our entire people, our national security, and the future of our children. We shall leave them an inheritance of hate, which they may not survive.

I hope that the mother of this young lad will forgive me for what I am about to say. I know she is an understanding person. At this time, I am not concerned with the beating that her son received at the hands of youngsters, by whatever description we want to call them. Young Larry will soon forget this, if he has not already. I will go a step further; though here I may be going on thin ice, and I will say to you that for the time being, I am not too much concerned by the fact that he was beaten by the youngsters for no apparent reason except that he was called a Jew while being beaten, though that is very serious. I submit to you that he was assaulted and insulted by youngsters. We can retrain these youngsters to our way of thinking and understanding, which is the American way.

But I am gravely concerned, and so should you and so should every American be concerned, about another phase of this matter. I want to know where did these boys learn that you must beat Jews because they are Jews. I want to trace that to its source and give it a thorough cleaning there. I want to find those individuals who are undermining our youth, who are disseminating imported un-American, un-Christian doctrines in our midst, and deal with them as befits a free, democratic people. I want to get at that disease-spreading human pullorum, at its source, and check it before it is too late. We have made a good start.

Last week, following the incident, I called at the home of Mrs. Goldstein and presented young Larry with a volume entitled "Jews in American Wars." I told him that there he would find many stories which will parallel the heroic story of his dad, and there he would "find part of the answer" to his question. I turned over to his mother a letter which I addressed to her son, requesting Mrs. Goldstein to let him read it when she thought her son was mature enough to understand it. But I want to tell one or two of the things that I told Larry, and then I will conclude.

First, I cautioned Larry against the fixation that his father alone died for his country. I informed him that more than 300,000 American men and women died during World War II for the American way of life; that 18,000,000 more Americans were in uniform ready to die; and if 18,000,000 more Americans had been asked to die, they would have gone. It is our America. All of us will defend it and its institutions in every generation, even as his father and Mr. Warrick did.

Secondly, I cautioned him against the belief that he was assaulted by Christian kids. I told him that Christian kids do not beat Jews. That Christianity like Judaism teaches love, respect, and dignity, and I told him that even though these kids may be of Christian parentage, the moment they beat him because of the fact that he is a Jew they took themselves out of the Christian faith, or any religion practiced in our land.

My friends, I would like to go one step further tonight. The word "America" has long since ceased to mean just a land, just another country. To us and to the whole world it has come to mean more than that. It is a philosophy of life synonymous with Christianity and Judaism, and any person who practices the false teachings of hate, bigotry, and the monolithic doctrines of a people browbeaten into unity through uniformity is also un-American. He or she belongs to that small poisonous group of people in our midst who live in America, but are not Americans, because they don't practice America. They are our real enemies.

Let us also remember that the whole world is presently engaged in an ideological war. We must prove to the world that our way of life is the best. Our enemies will not fail to even magnify and exploit the situation to their unholy designs. Let us be ready to tell them that this is a "family situation" of which we are able to acquit ourselves honorably. But as for ourselves, and between ourselves, let us remember that the elimination of hatred and group tensions in our land is a major and serious problem, and the solution of that problem cannot be delayed with impunity. Tonight, and from now on.

Treaty of Friendship With Uruguay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I have been informed that the President has sent to the Senate for its consideration and for ratification, a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development with the Republic of Uruguay.

As the Speaker and my colleagues know, I was the chairman of the South American Study Mission of the Committee on Foreign Affairs which toured Latin America last fall. On November 23 we were fortunate to be present when the Uruguayan Foreign Minister, Dr. Charlone, and our Ambassador, Mr. Ravndal, signed the treaty in Montevideo. Accordingly, I wish to express a few thoughts with regard to Uruguay and to the treaty.

I was most favorably impressed with Uruguay and its people. They have a progressive country with one of the highest standards of living in Latin America. As a democratic nation Uruguay unquestionably ranks among the world's first. The Uruguayans are friendly and their make-up and viewpoint, while predominantly Latin, are very much like our own.

The Uruguayan economy is similar to that of our Great Plains area, for the most part. Cattle and sheep raising and the production of wheat and corn predominate. The country does, however, produce considerable fruits, wines, rice, and fresh vegetables. Since the beginning of the last war the United States has been Uruguay's best customer for wool of a high quality. Also since that time, Uruguay has obtained most of its manufactured goods and many of its raw materials from the United States.

A long period of stability, democracy, and social consciousness has allowed a progress which is very commendable. Uruguay has large meat packing plants in which United States capital has a heavy share. Virtually all the country's cement is produced by a United States owned plant. Most of the other industries are owned by Uruguayan capital which has been of sufficient amount to sustain a moderately wealthy economy and one which allows universal and free education of a high standard as well as an enviable public health system including health security benefits to the whole population.

All this has been possible in South America's smallest country. For Uruguay has only about 71,000 square miles inhabited by approximately two and a half million people. But this small country has many firsts to its credit. The friendship, commerce, and economic development treaty to which I refer is the first modern treaty of this type which the United States has signed with a Latin-American nation. It is similar to the treaty with Italy which went into effect in 1949 but is more comprehensive. Additional features are intended for the most part to encourage technical collaboration for the economic development which is heralded in the title of the treaty itself. These features are further evidence, if any is required, that the days of dollar diplomacy are forever gone and that the United States intends diligently to pursue a constructive course in its dealings with other nations, always with careful provision for the maintenance of mutual guaranties to safeguard legitimate private and national interests.

Mr. Speaker, I consider this treaty a highly important foundation stone in the structure we are trying to build of international interchange and reciprocal help. It is for this reason that I wish to invite your attention and that of my colleagues to the President's message to the Senate requesting its approval.

Alaska in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of January 12, 1950:

ALASKA IN THE BUDGET

Alaskan appropriations of $185,000,000 which President Truman is asking for in his budget are certainly none too much. These relatively few millions will go to make the United States' most vulnerable outpost more defensible, and to create something better than poverty and privation out of its potentially rich resources.

One of the major items in the budget figure is for construction of roads and reconstruction of the Alaska Railroad. If the country should ever be called on to defend Alaska, and to defend itself through the defense of Alaska, roads will be indispensable—roads between the United States and Alaska, roads from one part of Alaska to another. Yet the highway connecting the United States and Alaska is primitive, and there are fewer highways within Alaska than in the tiny State of Delaware.

The railroad is also of critical strategic value, and the heavier rails, the new shops being built at Fairbanks and the terminal improvements there would be worth many times their cost in event of an emergency.

Other major items are for health, education and welfare, including the construction of hospitals, schools, electric and telephone systems, water and sewage systems. Alaska has little more than an elementary school system, and a scattered one at that. Its health problems are acute, its tuberculosis death rate shameful. In peace times these conditions are a national disgrace. In war times they could be a national debacle, for the defense of the territory can be no stronger than the people who live there, on whom defenders would have to rely for many forms of assistance and cooperation.

When the economizers get down to Alaska on the budget, they would do well to realize that the best way to use money economically at this stage of the game in Alaska is to use quite a fair amount of it. There is quite a good deal to be done.

The Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegrams:

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House Office Building:

DEAR MR. GRAHAM: All industry in Beaver County notified today by Duquesne Light Co. that all industrial power will be shut off completely unless coal is received before Friday, January 20. Over 200 industries affected. Means complete shut-down in 90 percent of plants. Have wired an appeal to President Truman. Hope you will lend your efforts in our behalf. Imperative that we have coal.

Sincerely,
MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION OF BEAVER COUNTY,
C. E. MARTIN, *Secretary.*

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.:

Beaver County industries face a shut-down of electrical power effective Friday, January 20, midnight, by Duquesne Light Co., unless coal supplies are made available. The economy of Beaver County will be drastically affected by the coal situation, which has progressed beyond the emergency stage. We hereby appeal to you for assistance.

BEAVER FALLS BOARD OF TRADE,
S. E. STEWART, *Secretary.*

NEW CASTLE, PA., *January 17, 1950.*
LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal situation in New Castle critical. Government action requested.

NEW CASTLE COAL MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION,
EARL L. MILLER, *Secretary.*

MONACA, PA., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
New House Office Building:

Have been notified by Duquesne Light, our supplier of power, that all production operations must cease Friday, twentieth, account of coal crisis. Major effect upon rubber and other enterprises using our product, zinc oxide, which is now in critically short supply, as well as those consumers of zinc metal. How much longer must the business lifeblood and millions of workers and consumers of this country be pushed around by a few big goons and several thousand small goons who practice absolute tyranny and monopoly while our legislators and the Department of Justice debate, sue, and otherwise harass so-called big business, which has an important part in maintaining our great Nation?

ST. JOSEPH LEAD CO. OF PENNSYLVANIA.
GEORGE F. WEATON.

BEAVER FALLS, PA., *January 17, 1950.*
Hon. LOUIS E. GRAHAM,
Congressional Representative From Pennsylvania, House Building, Washington, D. C.:

Is coal situation critical? Local power company advised us today they were obliged to suspend service to us midnight Friday, the twentieth, for productive use in our plant until further notice. Understand same restriction issued to other manufacturers served by Duquesne Light Co. This means shutting down our plant and laying off 300 people. We urge your immediate attention to assist in demanding a proper legal approach to stop coal-strike difficulties.

INGRAM RICHARDSON MANUFACTURING CO.,
J. F. INGRAM, *President.*

Economic Deadlock in Coal Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week for January 7, 1950:

STILL OVER LEWIS' BARREL

WASHINGTON DOUBTS THAT AN INJUNCTION WILL BE MUCH HELP TO COAL OPERATORS—REASON: A COURT PROBABLY WOULDN'T ACT ON THE 3-DAY WEEK, WOULD ONLY TELL LEWIS TO RESUME BARGAINING

Can the coal operators' attempt to enjoin John L. Lewis break the economic headlock he has on the industry? That has Washington wondering.

Pinned down

The consensus seems to be that the operators' charge of unfair labor practices brought before the National Labor Relations Board can't get them off the floor.

Here are the reasons:

The charges—that Lewis is refusing to bargain, that he is insisting on forcing the operators to accept an illegal contract—aren't enough. Any NLRB order or court injunction based on these charges can only tell Lewis and the union to go back to the bargaining table—and Lewis can do that without letting up on his headlock. Such an order, even if obeyed by both sides, will not result in anything but an eventual Lewis-dictated contract. Few people believe the courts can enjoin the 3-day week on the basis of unfair labor practices in bargaining proceedings.

Taft-Hartley health-welfare injunctive powers cannot be used against Lewis because the public health and welfare aren't endangered. Coal stocks above ground, coupled with the 9-million-plus tons of coal coming out of the ground each week (Business Week, December 24, 1949, p. 36) are enough to keep industrial and home-heating customers going until April. There may be a few "spot" shortages in home-heating coal, but nothing on a national scale, barring very bad weather which would slow down or stop transportation of coal. And then it would be too late to do anything.

Lewis prevailing

Few people in Washington believe that a court injunction would be issued against the 3-day week. They say that:

1. You can't make a man work—particularly when he has no contract.

2. The charges by the operators that the 3-day week is coercive are not stated in a way that makes the sin a separate issue. It's tied to bargaining.

Thus, Washington opinion (made up of pro-Lewis, pro-operator, and neutral government statisticians) points to a continuation of the deadlock in coal. Most debators won't bet on the outcome, because they can't outguess a court. But they believe that Lewis will win in the long run.

Apportionment

The economic strategy that Lewis is using was planned more than a year ago. As far back as October 1948, Lewis was thinking of spreading the work (Business Week, December 25, 1948, p. 21). Even then the bloom was coming off the coal market, both here and more particularly, abroad. With the UMW's 400,000 members spread between low-cost good-coal mines and marginal low-grade pits, a depression in coal would put the marginal operators out of business. And Lewis didn't want part of his union unemployed.

The answer had to be an apportionment scheme along the lines of the prewar Guffey coal act, which "divvied" up production of coal among the entire industry.

Here was where Lewis was in a dilemma. He couldn't think up an angle to write into a contract—and Congress was cold to another Guffey act.

Backfire

The get tough attitude of the operators—they let it be known that they wanted more work, less pay, and no royalty on tonnage—finally worked to Lewis's benefit. When the 1948 contract expired in June, Lewis was faced with the alternative of striking or knuckling under to the operators. He couldn't do either.

With the "spread-the-work" idea in the back of his mind, Lewis came up with a temporary solution—the three-day week. This spread the work. And it was not a strike, but still put pressure on the operators where it really hurt—in their pocketbooks.

The beautiful thing about the 3-day week—to Lewis—is that the only charge against it, a monopoly in labor, can't be prosecuted because the law exempts labor unions from monopoly restraint.

New twist

Meanwhile, while the country waits for the outcome of this latest version of the slow-down, a new twist on the old saw about carrying coals to Newcastle, has shown up.

This week a ship from England will unload coal at Boston. A year ago we were shipping the stuff to England. Now we are getting it back.

Predatory Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. AREND S. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the New York Daily Mirror of Tuesday, January 10. This editorial refers to the slogan of my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Congressman RICH, to which slogan the House and the country might well pay attention. Either we give serious consideration to the matter of reducing Federal expenditures or our whole financial house will be in a state of collapse.

PREDATORY GOVERNMENT

The most hopeful bit of news out of Washington yesterday was simply a slogan coined by Representative ROBERT F. RICH, veteran Pennsylvania Republican, who, in the past, has been fond of asking the question most embarrassing to politicians, namely, Where are we going to get the money?

Representative RICH's slogan for this session, he told the House, is "Be nifty and thrifty in '50."

Perhaps that is no great shakes for sloganizing, but the idea is there by which we can throw the spenders out if it is only hammered home again and again.

Because taxation is the hottest issue in this country today; it burns everybody's pocket; it jeopardizes everybody's job and everybody's future.

That brings us to the most vital news from Washington yesterday—President Truman's proposed budget for the next fiscal year, starting July 1, in which he plans to spend $42,439,000,000, or $5,133,000,000 more than the Federal Government will take in.

Prorated among our 150,000,000 population, that means the Federal Government's expenses would cost $283 for every man, woman, and child in the country.

The deficit alone figures out to $34 per person.

The national debt at the end of the next fiscal year—after 2 years in which deficits have totaled more than $5,000,000,000—will stand at $263,800,000,000.

That, if divided among the 150,000,000 of us, figures out to a mortgage of about $1,700 on each of us; and the annual interest costs each of us $35.

Of course, Truman budgets are hard to understand. They are so big. They are like the Einstein theories.

But Samuel B. Pettingill, former Congressman, simplifies it in an article for the Gold Standard League. He says:

"If every one who holds life insurance cashed his policies, the amount would not run the Federal Government 1 year. If every urban home owner sold his home, the total would finance the politicians on the Potomac for 8 months. If every farmer sold his farm, equipment, and livestock, the total would run the Government for only 7 months. If every industry converted its net working capital into cash, it would last the Federal politicians less than a year."

Or, think of Government spending, in the terms used by Herbert Hoover in his famous 75th birthday speech; that—

Twenty years ago, all Government (Federal, State, and local), omitting Federal debt service, cost the average family $200 annually; today the bill is $1,300. And—

Today, the average working citizen must work 61 days for government before he can take care of his own family.

The spenders hurt you also in invisible ways.

President Truman's deficits are covered with printing press money—inflation, which drives down the value of your dollars. Your insurance, savings, Government bonds, pay off in dollars worth less than the dollars you put into them.

A $10,000 insurance policy, paid up in 1940, has lost about $4,000 in terms of what it will buy today.

We have a predatory Government, warring on its people, stealing their substance. The Republicans, this year and in 1952, should fight it out on that overwhelming issue.

NLRB Schism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of today under the heading "NLRB schism."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NLRB SCHISM

Robert N. Denham, general counsel for the National Labor Relations Board, may have legitimate grievances against the Board, but it is difficult to see why he chose to air them before the Building Trades Employers Association in New York. It was inevitable from the very nature of the separate status that Congress gave to the general counsel in the Taft-Hartley Act that differences would arise between him and the Board. But we doubt that Congress ever contemplated the general counsel attacking the Board in public in this fashion. In our opinion, Mr. Denham has raised a serious question as to whether the present system will continue to be workable with this sort of strain upon it.

Mr. Denham's chief complaint is that the Board is misinterpreting the Taft-Hartley Act—presumably twisting it toward the grooves of the old Wagner Act. Whether or not his charge has substance is an extremely complicated question that we do not presume to discuss here. But in no event could the Board be expected to agree with the general counsel all the time. Out of 20 cases in which the courts have granted temporary injunctions while waiting for the Board to hear the testimony and decide the cases on their merits, the Board has sustained the position taken by Mr. Denham 13 times and overruled his contentions 7 times. This seems to be a fair batting average for the general counsel's office. If the Board were to agree with the general counsel in all cases, the purpose of Congress in separating the prosecuting and judging functions would obviously be flouted.

It is a distortion of facts, moreover, for Mr. Denham to say that "the courts have apparently been held by the Board to be in error in issuing injunctions at the behest of the general counsel, in cases which the board has later dismissed." The courts have issued injunctions only to prevent irreparable damage from being inflicted while the case is being disposed of on its merits. Representatives of the general counsel have repeatedly requested injunctions with the understanding that the cases were not presented to the court on their merits. For Mr. Denham to assume that the court is being overruled by the NLRB when the court never considered the merits of the case is distortion of a type that a public servant should not indulge in. Of course, there is no way in which the NLRB can overrule a court after the court has heard a case on its merits.

More serious is the fact that when appeals from the Board's decision are carried to the courts, the Board must be represented by the general counsel. The general counsel has now said in public that he thinks the position taken by the Board in numerous cases about to go to the courts is wrong. In effect he has invited employers dissatisfied with the Board's rulings to appeal to the courts, knowing that he himself will represent the Board when it is challenged. How can he or his subordinates conscientiously present the Board's case before the court in these circumstances? The effect of the speech is thus to bring to light a grave weakness in the present set-up of the NLRB and to accentuate doubts as to the advisability of giving the general counsel as much power as he now has.

What Can Nazi Victims Expect?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, through the aid and insistence of United States authorities a law was recently adopted in western Germany to indemnify Nazi victims for their suffering and losses under the Hitler regime. While the principle is a sound one, the law unfortunately does not go far enough and the rate of compensation is far too small. Nevertheless, I think American officials in Germany who were instrumental in getting the law into effect should be congratulated:

The following is an article entitled "What Can Nazi Victims Expect?" by Murray Frank, was published in the National Jewish Monthly, in the January 1950 issue:

WHAT CAN NAZI VICTIMS EXPECT?

(By Murray Frank)

When United States High Commissioner for Germany John J. McCloy announced last

August that the American Military Government had approved the draft of an indemnification law to compensate Jewish and non-Jewish victims of Nazi Germany, the action was hailed as a just and courageous step.

Mr. McCloy unquestionably deserves the praise and gratitude which greeted his announcement. His action is evidence of the serious and fair manner in which he approached this problem, and indicates how quickly he realized the righteousness of the principle of compensating the victims of Hitlerism for their losses and for the injustices they suffered at the hands of the Nazis.

The indemnification law—its official title is "Law Concerning Redress of National Socialist Wrongs (General Claims Law)," but the designation, "General Claims Law," has been adopted in common usage—has been in the making several years. Some of its basic clauses date back to 1946, when the Restitution law was promulgated in the United States zone in Germany, but that law dealt mainly with the restitution of identifiable property, tangible or intangible.

In 1947, the combined Chiefs of Staff to the Military Government in Germany issued a directive (MGR 23-2050) which listed as one of the occupation aims the payment of compensation for bodily injuries suffered under the Nazi regime. Thus, the general claims law seeks to fill this gap.

It had been reported that important elements in AMG were opposed to the law; opposition was also reported in the State Department, as well as in the British military government, which objected to enactment of the law in the British zone. Despite this opposition, Mr. McCloy overruled the military authorities and on August 10, 1949, he approved the indemnification law.

That, in brief, is the history of the law. It now remains for the German provinces of the United States zone to formally put it into effect. Incidentally, it has since been reported that plans are under way to put the law into effect also in the British zone.

Thousands of DP's and other Nazi victims, now in the United States, Israel, and elsewhere, are presently seeking an answer to such questions as: Who is entitled to indemnity under the general claims law? How much? How does one go about collecting? How and when will it be paid? This writer has given careful study to the matter in recent weeks; he has consulted State Department officials who are working on this problem in Washington or who have been to Germany in connection with it, and he has also obtained a complete copy of the indemnification law, of which only a limited number are presently available in English translation. It is not a simple matter to go through the text of this law. It consists of 27 legal-size mimeographed pages, single spaced, of legal language.

Here it will be possible to deal only with the high lights. Despite its verbosity, the law lacks certain details pertaining to procedure and remuneration which makes it impossible to answer fully the above questions. These details are in preparation at this time and will be announced at the time the law goes into effect. It should also be emphasized that for the time being the law applies only to the United States zone; nor does it include Berlin. It is believed, however, that it will eventually be adopted by the west German federal government for the area under its jurisdiction.

The five major sections of the indemnification law are:

I. General provisions, in which are established the restitution claim, liability, assertion of the claim, and transfer.

II. Restitution cases, dealing with damage to life and limb, health and liberty, possessions and property, and damages to economic advancement.

III. Priority of restitution payments, indicating the various groups or classes of claimants and the sequence in which payments are to be made.

IV. Procedure, specifying the time limit and the prescribed form for filing claims.

V. Penalties and final provisions, enumerating causes for rejection and cancellation of claims, special decrees, and time when law becomes effective.

The most important of all is article 1, which establishes the right to indemnification. It provides that all those who were persecuted under the Nazi dictatorship, from January 30, 1933, to May 8, 1945, "because of political conviction or for racial, religious, or ideological grounds" and who suffered damage to life, health, liberty, possessions, or economic advancement, are entitled to compensation.

Claimants must show that on January 1, 1947, they had their legitimate domicile in the area now constituting the United States zone as a refugee or resident of a DP camp, or that they emigrated prior to this date, or that the victims on whose behalf they are seeking indemnification died before that date. Claims can pass on to legal heirs, such as the widow, children, or near relatives who were supported by the deceased, but such claims cannot be transferred beyond the second order, such as grandchildren.

The law recognizes as claimants not only individuals, but also institutions or unincorporated associations which previously functioned in Germany and were forced to dissolve because of political or other reasons. This means that Jewish communities are enabled to claim compensation for the destruction of their synagogues or other property. In the case of institutions or associations, however, the claimants must establish that they are the legal successors to the dissolved agency.

Where indemnification is sought in the death of a close relative, the claimant must show that the relative was killed or driven to his death at the instigation or with the approval of an agency or functionary of the Nazi regime. The law stipulates that "existence of these prerequisites is assumed in favor of the claimant, if the persecutee has died during deportation or political imprisonment or immediately thereafter," which means that relatives of those who died in the concentration camps or during deportation will have no difficulty in establishing their claims.

Compensation will be paid in the form of annuities as follows: To a widow, until her remarriage or death; to children, until the end of their sixteenth year; to relatives formerly maintained by the deceased, for the duration of their need. Claims are neither transferable nor inheritable.

Indemnification for damage to body or health will be made where the working capacity of an individual has been reduced by at least 30 percent; if the mental and physical efficiency of the claimant have not been reduced over a longer period of time, such damages will be considered as negligible.

Loss of liberty will be compensated if the claimant has been imprisoned under the Nazi regime for political, racial, or other motives, detained for investigation, kept in a concentration camp or ghetto, or assigned to a penal unit of the Nazi army. The compensation in such cases shall be at the rate of 150 deutsche marks for every month of detention. (The deutsche or west German mark was formerly worth 30 cents, but was devalued in September to 23.8 cents).

In cases of damages to possessions and property, the indemnification in each individual case cannot exceed 75,000 marks. The provincial government will determine the extent of damage and the amount of compensation.

Special taxes imposed upon those who were persecuted, either through legal or arbitrary acts by Nazi agencies or functionaries, shall be refunded in annual installments. The tax imposed on German Jews who wished to emigrate after January 30, 1933, shall be refunded up to a sum of 50,000 marks. Fines paid or exacted under pressure shall also be refunded.

Then follows a series of articles which defines damages to economic advancement as far back as 1933, provided such damage was inflicted by special laws instituted by the Nazis, such as the national citizenship law of 1935, the law excluding the Jews from the German economy in November 1938, the law on utilization of Jewish property of December 1938, etc. Damage is recognized as loss of a person's public or private service career, professional activities, trade, or business. In each case, a method for indemnification is prescribed. One or two examples will explain the point. Professionals, such as physicians, lawyers, engineers, etc., who were removed from their profession as a result of persecution measures, shall be allowed to resume practice of their profession and the necessary licenses and in some cases subsidies will be granted them. Another illustration concerns persons who have been deprived of maintenance benefits which they enjoyed prior to the rise of the Nazis and who subsequently emigrated from Germany or have even become nationals of another country. Their benefits shall be regranted them retroactively from the time of their deprivation, but the total sum is limited to 5,000 marks.

Indemnification claims will be arranged according to a system of priority, with preference given to those in the first group. Class I includes payments for medical treatment, annuities to relatives of victims who were killed, annuities to victims who lost their earning capacity, pensions to civil servants who lost their jobs due to persecution, maintenance benefits, half of the indemnification to those who lost their freedom, etc. Class II includes the balance of indemnification for loss of freedom, compensation for damages to property and possessions, fines and special taxes, payments to former civil servants and to those engaged in the professions. All other claims will come under class III.

The section dealing with procedure does not indicate sufficient details, other than to state that claims must be filed in the prescribed form not later than 1 year after enforcement of the law, except that in certain cases the time limit may be extended. A State Department official told this writer that for the time being, until further and exact procedure is announced, all applications for indemnification should be sent to United States High Commissioner McCloy at Frankfurt, with the request that it be forwarded to the appropriate agency for consideration.

So much for the law itself and its major clauses. It should be remembered that while it has been approved by the United States occupation authorities, the law has not yet become effective and that many important details remain to be worked out by the Germans themselves. The entire indemnification program will be administered by the Germans. They will determine the amount of compensation to which the Nazi victims are entitled; they will determine who is or is not entitled to indemnification, they will decide how and when to make the payments. The American authorities will have supervisory functions limited primarily to the task of seeing to it that the law remains in effect.

Payment will not be made in United States dollars, but in German marks. Although it has not yet been announced, one State Department official who had returned from Germany the day before I discussed the matter with him told me he was certain that the Germans will not permit any of the money paid out under the indemnification law to be taken out of the country, nor will it be convertible. The only possible concession may be that the German authorities may allow

the purchase of German goods for this money for shipment out of the country; otherwise the money will be deposited to the account of the claimant, who can come to Germany and spend it there.

It is difficult to say what claimants may expect to receive as compensation. Some general estimates have been mentioned, i. e., that 850,000,000 marks will be distributed, and that the average claimant will receive 70 marks per month. State Department officials were reluctant to discuss such general figures. By way of comparison, it is interesting to note that refugee authorities in Israel estimate that the damage to Jewish property destroyed or confiscated by the Nazis in Germany and the European countries which came under their domination amounted to $9,000,000,000.

The wording of many clauses is so ambiguous that interpretation of the law becomes difficult and may provide loopholes and excuses for rejecting indemnification to many claimants. In fact, it is difficult to see how any claimant can succeed in collecting his due compensation without professional advice. Furthermore, it should be remembered that execution of the law depends largely upon political developments in Germany in the years ahead. Will the law remain in effect after the occupation powers withdraw from Germany?

Weak and ineffective as the law is, its greatest weakness lies in the fact that it is limited to the area comprising the United States zone in Germany. What about the Jews and other peoples who perished in other parts of Germany? What about the millions of Jews who were exterminated by the Nazis in the crematoria and gas chambers established on Polish soil? Or in concentration camps established by the Nazis in other Europeon countries? Indemnification—if the Germans can ever really indemnify the Nazi victims for the magnitude of the crime they committed against them—should be made applicable to all victims in all countries which came under the Nazi regime. Relatively few will benefit from the law.

Another weakness is the meager compensation prescribed under the law. A concentration camp victim will be entitled to 150 marks a month or 5 marks a day, equivalent to $1.19 a day for "enjoying" the benefits of life in the hells of Nazi Germany.

The indemnification law is more of a gesture than anything else. The victims of Nazi Germany will benefit little from it. It is no atonement for the wrongs committed against the Jewish people. Yet it is important that the principle of indemnification be clearly established, and that is what the law primarily amounts to—a law in principle, in theory, but not in practice.

Reduction of Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter reprinted from the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick:

EDITOR, DERRICK: Remember during the war emergency the Federal Government called on certain capable individuals in private industry to head up important posts to organize and expedite the production of war matériel. As I see it, an emergency exists today which is equally as serious and just as much a threat to the well-being of our country and the continuance of what we call the American way, as war, viz, the deficit spending and waste in Washington.

The stock reply by anyone in the administration, from the President down, is "Where would you cut?" when they are urged to decrease the budget by eliminating waste, overlapping, duplication, etc., in the Federal administration. This reply is an admission of utter incompetence, in my opinion. They are spending more money than they are taking in, and they don't know how to stop.

I would respectfully suggest a plan to meet this emergency; viz, that the President appoint a special committee of, say, six or more individuals selected from the personnel of the management of the larger corporations in the United States. This committee would be given supreme authority to go to work and put the Nation's house in order. There is no doubt any of the major corporations in the country—the genius of whose management really has made America great—would be willing to allocate one of their executives as a member on such a committee, and I would also recommend that a representative be secured from the administrative department of the greatest circus on earth, whose efficiency is the wonder of the world. If it were possible to put such a scheme into action, it would be only necessary to give these men about a week to organize and then turn them loose on the Washington scene. It is reasonable to expect that results would become evident within a relatively short time and we could be sure that there would be a prompt cancellation of further research, for instance, on the Love Life of the Frog; the Government Printing Office would be reorganized on an economical basis and many of the ridiculous and uneconomical situations that the Hoover Commission report brought to light would be quickly corrected.

This idea may cause many people to smile, but it can be seriously considered and put into effect if there was a nonpolitical desire to do so. Incidentally, after this committee got down to business, the income of all transportation companies out of Washington and other places where there are Federal offices should be greatly increased. In fact, it might prove to be the greatest exodus in history.

OBSERVER.

OIL CITY, PA., *December 21, 1949.*

Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to include a proclamation issued by the mayor of the city of Newark, N. J., the Honorable Ralph A. Villani, on December 22, 1949, in connection with the Prayers-for-Peace Movement:

PROCLAMATION—PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

Whereas two frightful wars have been witnessed within our life's span, the havoc of which has remained with all its incumbent threats, circumstances, and international maladjustments and influences; and

Whereas in taking cognizance of these destructive and trying conditions, a prayers-for-peace movement came into being by way of a resolution introduced by Mr. Herve Joseph L'Heureux, Chief, Visa Division of the State Department, and adopted by the Last Man's Club, William H. Jutras Post No. 43, American Legion, at Manchester, N. H., on October 28, 1948; and

Whereas subsequently veterans' groups of all religious denominations, Americanization committee of the Army and Navy Union, units of the Gold Star Mothers and the Blue Star Mothers, Rotary Clubs, industrial and other firms, student bodies of schools and universities, religious groups of every sect, newspapers, through editorials and governmental leadership, have adopted the prayers-for-peace movement, calling for a 1-minute noonday prayer; and

Whereas we are now on the threshold of holy season, dedicated to good will and peace among all men.

Now, therefore, I, Ralph A. Villani, mayor of the city of Newark, do hereby proclaim this endeavor as prayers-for-peace movement in our city, and ask that the fullest measure of recognition by our press, radio, churches, synagogues, schools, civic, industrial, and business groups, toward the purpose of this peace movement be given. I further urge that each of us pause for 1 minute each day at noontime and offer fervent prayer for guidance toward the adjustment of ourselves to one another, to eradicate bigotry, to help us build for better understanding and pray for tranquillity to the end that we may become unified of purpose toward our chief desire—peace.

RALPH A. VILLANI,
Mayor.

Dated December 22, 1949.

Article by Congressman Vito Marcantonio, Daily Compass, January 15, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

TRUMAN CAN PASS OR KILL FEPC, SAYS MARCANTONIO

The bill to establish a Fair Employment Practices Committee can be passed by the House of Representatives next Monday.

Or it can be bottled up forever in the Rules Committee.

Whether the FEPC bill is to be passed or is to die is entirely up to President Truman.

The chips are down.

Monday is the crucial day. On that day the country will discover whether the Truman administration's devotion to civil rights is real and honest, or mere demogogy for vote-getting purposes.

The American people will discover on Monday whether the Democratic platform was a statement of the honest principles of honest men, or a hypocritical sham.

If it comes before the House, the FEPC bill will pass, probably with 50 or 60 votes to spare. I say that as one who has canvassed the situation thoroughly, as one who in 1940 introduced the first FEPC bill in history, as one whose anti-poll tax bill was passed by the House in the Seventy-eight and Seventy-ninth Congresses, as one who has lived with the problem of civil-rights legislation every day and every night for 13 years.

But the problem is to get the FEPC bill before the House.

Monday is the last day that can be done.

Whether it is done then depends upon the action of three Congressmen. They are not

Dixiecrats. They are not Republicans. They are not enemies of President Truman.

On the contrary, they are Administration stalwarts. They are the leaders of the Truman Democrats. They are the prophets of the Fair Deal.

The three men are:

SAM RAYBURN, Democrat (Texas), Speaker of the House.

ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat (Illinois), chairman of the Rules Committee.

JOHN LESINSKI, Democrat (Michigan), chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor.

What they do will depend on what President Truman tells them to do.

Here is the parliamentary situation:

The present Congress—the Eighty-first—passed a resolution on the first day it met, in January 1949, which took away from the Rules Committee its power to sit forever on legislation it didn't like.

The new rule provided that when a committee of the House reported out a bill, the Rules Committee had only 21 days in which to set a date for debate on that bill by the full House.

If the Rules Committee sat on a bill for more than 21 calendar days, the chairman of the committee which had originally reported out the bill had the right to bring it before the House for debate and action.

Two days of each month were set aside for this purpose, the second and fourth Mondays.

On those days—and only those days—the chairman of any committee whose bill had been bottled up in the Rules Committee for more than 21 days could rise, obtain recognition from the Speaker, and bring the bill before the House. The Speaker was required to recognize the committee chairman for such purpose.

The Committee on Education and Labor, of which Representative LESINSKI is chairman, reported out the FEPC bill during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, last summer. The Rules Committee failed to bring it before the House in 21 days.

Chairman LESINSKI could have brought the bill out and forced a vote on it by exercising his privilege on the remaining second and fourth Mondays of the session. I urged that this be done, but the administration decision was to let it go until the second session, beginning in January 1950.

Immediately the new session convened I issued a statement to the press demanding that the FEPC bill be brought before the House at the earliest possible date, the second Monday of the month, January 9.

This was not done. Chairman LESINSKI failed to ask the Speaker for recognition.

However, he promised to seek recognition on the fourth Monday of January. That is next Monday, the twenty-third.

If the administration had permitted LESINSKI to act at the first opportunity the present dangerous situation would not exist.

After that opportunity had been allowed to pass unused a new factor entered the situation.

The Rules Committee, by a vote of 9 to 2, approved a resolution which would abolish the 21-day rule and return to the committee its power to bottle up legislation indefinitely.

That resolution, approved by the Rules Committee last Friday, was the fruit of an alliance between Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats to block civil-rights legislation.

When it comes before the House that resolution may be approved.

That will end any chance to bring the FEPC bill before the House for a vote.

The FEPC bill must therefore be brought out for action before the resolution abolishing the 21-day rule is presented to the House.

This can be done. It must be done next Monday, January 23.

It depends on the action of three men, the three administration stalwarts, the three men whom President Truman can tell what to do: Speaker RAYBURN, Representative SABATH, and Representative LESINSKI.

Here is what President Truman must do if he really wants the FEPC bill passed:

1. He must see to it that SABATH, the chairman of the Rules Committee, holds up for the full 10 days allowed by House rules the resolution abolishing the 21-day rule. After 10 legislative days from last Friday, any member of the Rules Committee can bring the resolution out for a vote. But for 10 days, until after next Monday, SABATH is perfectly within his rights in not bringing up the resolution.

2. President Truman must see to it that Lesinski, chairman of the committee which approved the FEPC bill, jumps up and seeks recognition as soon as Corgress convenes Monday.

3. President Truman must see to it that Speaker RAYBURN recognizes LESINSKI, rather than some other committee chairman seeking to bring his own committee's bill to the floor.

It is entirely discretionary with Speaker RAYBURN which committee chairman he recognizes.

As President Truman's general directing the administration's program in the House, he is responsible for carrying out the President's wishes. If the President is sincere in his protestations about civil rights, RAYBURN will recognize LESINSKI.

The President can no longer pass the buck to Congress. He can no longer blame the Republicans or the Dixiecrats for blocking civil-rights legislation. His own men now hold the key to success or failure.

Unless administration Democrat SABATH holds up the 21-day resolution until after Monday, unless administration Democrat LESINSKI seeks recognition on Monday, unless administration Democrat RAYBURN recognizes LESINSKI, the FEPC bill is doomed. And only one man will be to blame.

The country will know who that one man is.

The Upset Down Under—No. 3

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star for January 18, 1950:

WOMEN OF AUSTRALIA CREDITED WITH BIG PART IN LABOR DEFEAT

(The Upset Down Under—No. 3)

(By Morley Cassidy)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 18.—"These women!" The Labor Party organizer in a South Sydney suburb shook his head gloomily as he doodled on his green desk blotter.

"I just can't figure them out," he complained. "Look what we've done for them in the last 8 years:

"We've doubled the child endowment, from 5 shillings to 10 for every child after the first one.

"We've given them a basic wage of six pounds four shillings a week. We've given them child care centers, pharmaceutical benefits, old-age and widow's pensions. We've given their husbands full employment, more leisure, and better wages than they ever got before.

"And are these women grateful? Haw! They see a chance to get an extra five shillings a week, and they go running to the other side like sheep.

"Women," he concluded sadly, "just don't think straight."

Australia's Labor Party, from top to bottom, is pondering the strange and fickle ways of women these days, as it prepares for a party executive meeting at which it will conduct a rueful post mortem into the recent election which threw it out of office.

VOTED CONTRARY TO HUSBANDS

The winners—men of the combined Liberal and Country parties—don't go quite so far in assigning credit for their sweeping victory.

But their best political brains, too, say that Australia's women did more than their share in casting the votes that reversed the tide of socialism in this part of the world.

Tens of thousands of women whose husbands voted Labor, ward workers say, marched to the polls to cast their own votes for the other side—to throw out the party that could point to an excellent war record, 4 postwar years of booming prosperity, full employment, high wages, short hours, a free health plan and an elaborate program of social benefits.

In New Zealand, the story was the same. Women, the politicians agree, cutdid the men in overturning a Labor government which, in 14 years, had created the most advanced social services in the world.

Why?

Labor still wonders. In the winners' minds the explanation is simple.

"Women are realists," says Mrs. Thelma Kirkby, a dainty little housewife of Bellata, N. S. W., who did more damage than 50 wildcats to Australia's Socialists.

"The workingman's wife may not know economic terms, but she sees the difference between money wages and real wages when she does her shopping at the green grocers or the drapers."

HAD TASTE OF SOCIALISM

"She knows, as buyer for the household, that the family is worse off, not better, if wages rise 40 percent and meat and clothes and shoes rise 50 or 60 or 80.

"And when she sees her husband and the other men, working a 4-day week, or limiting their day's production, she sees a connection between this crippled production and the fact that she can't get a new stove, or new plumbing, or a home of her own.

"Australian women have had their taste of socialism, and want no more of it."

Labor's leaders don't agree with this interpretation of the women's vote. Most of the women who normally voted for Labor, and switched their vote this year, were lured, they think, by the promise of an extra five shillings a week through "child endowment."

The present law (passed, incidentally, by the Menzies Liberal Government in 1941) gives parents an allowance of 10 shillings (about $1.10) a week for each child after the first, on the theory that the basic wage is computed to provide for a husband, wife, and 1 child.

The non-Labor parties, in this election, promised to give 5 shillings for the first child as well. The Labor Government refused to match this promise, contending that it would require a revision of the basic wage rate.

But Labor may be deluding itself in thinking that this "5-shilling bribe" swung the women's vote.

POLLS SCORES OF HOUSEWIVES

I have talked since the election with scores of housewives in Australia's cities and small towns who formerly voted for Labor,

but switched this time to the Liberal or Country Parties. I asked them why.

Five out of six have the same answer, and in ringing, indignant tones.

"Why, on account of this socialization," they say. "Chifley and his bunch were out to nationalize everything. Look what they tried to do with the banks. If the high court hadn't stopped them, we wouldn't have a private bank left."

It seems strange, hearing this concern for banks from a tired-looking woman in a workingman's cottage in Sydney's Haymarket section, where the soot from Central Station begrimes the walls. She'd be one of the last, it seems, to worry about private banks.

"But this was just one step in their plans," she says belligerently. "Look what they did to the air lines.

"My husband's a taxi driver. Supposing they decide next to socialize transport? My husband would be working for the Government, for whatever they chose to pay. Oh, no! Not for me!"

Hundreds of thousands of Australian women, obviously, felt as strongly on this subject. Their bitter objections to socialization or nationalization, frequently coupled with references to communism, are only matched by their expressions of relief that the danger has been scotched.

WOMAN LED CRUSADE

It was Mrs. Kirkby and a half-dozen like-minded housewives who turned dislike into a crusade.

Mrs. Kirkby, slim, blue-eyed, and pretty, still in her 30's, the wife of a sheep rancher in New South Wales, is a bit of an amateur politician.

Australians first heard of her a few years ago when she locked words with a cabinet minister, one Mr. Tulley, in a public meeting, and in a whispery little-girl voice proved that he didn't know as much about his own department as she did.

She was immediately tagged as "Mr. Tulley's problem child."

Eighteen months ago, when the Labor government was still pressing its efforts to nationalize all banks, Mrs. Kirkby became the problem child of the whole Labor government.

She and Mrs. Crawford Vaughan, of Sydney, a leading Liberal, and four or five others decided that it was time to mobilize women's opposition to Socialist doctrines.

Firmly eschewing financial aid from any party, they organized their own Australian Women's Movement Against Socialization.

CAMPAIGNED WITH EDUCATION

"We decided first of all," says Mrs. Kirkby, in a deceptively shy whisper, "that our best weapon was simply a program of education, to show Australian women where socialism was taking them.

"We started out by educating ourselves. Then we gathered a group of about a dozen women—not politicians, but women whom other women would want to listen to.

"One was Marion Doughtery, who won her title in the Royal Red Cross for her work in charge of the sick at Belsen prison camp.

"Another was Helina Kozuvowska, whose brother was head of the Polish resistance movement. She rescued two Australian aviators during the war, taught them Polish, and found places for them in the Polish underground. After the war they helped bring her here.

"Another was Jennie Broad, a famous English ferry pilot. Another, Nancy Bird, an Australian flier famous for piloting bush nurses through our far West.

"All of them, like us, started learning about socialism from its beginning. We studied Karl Marx and Engels, the works of the Fabian Socialists, and all the rest.

"At our first public meeting, in Sydney, we had 2,400 people. But from then on we concentrated on little meetings in private homes."

NEW BRANCHES ORGANIZED

"We promised to supply a speaker for anyone who would open her home and get together a group of 20 or 30 women. Invariably, each meeting resulted in the organization of a new branch.

"We managed to send a speaker to every meeting.

"Our speakers proved, out of Labor's own words, where it planned to take us. We showed the connection between socialistic planning and the shortage of bricks, and housing crisis.

"Our meetings got bigger, and we had to use public halls. Then the Communists began to take notice. They'd crowd in first, get seats near the microphones, and break up our meetings with their heckling or chants of 'We Want Peace.'

"We learned to deal with them. We kept the doors closed until our own people had all the seats near the microphones.

"We were determined not to get 'tagged' as a political organization, for we had many labor women among our workers—women who could see that their gains had been illusory.

"So we wouldn't take a sixpence from any party. Our branches supported themselves with bazaars and cake sales and what we call 'American teas'—only you probably never heard of them—where everyone brings a gif' and buys a gift."

AMAZED AT SUPPORT

"We were amazed at the support we found. "I remember one instance well. It was a dreadfully poor little house in a workingman's quarter, and I thought it seemed almost useless to stop and try to point out the danger of nationalizing banks.

"The woman who came to the door was middle-aged, weary, with a baby in her arms and another tugging at her skirts. I began explaining my purpose, when she interrupted me.

"She said, 'Too right, luv, I've 'ad this mob.' In American, that would be, 'You bet, dearie, I've had my fill of this bunch.'"

Labor's chieftains, of course, can't believe that so many women could be so indignant over such a heavy subject as bank nationalization. They prefer to think it was that five-shilling bonus.

They may be right, or they may be wrong. But they're out.

Letter Addressed to Son of Veteran Killed in Battle of the Bulge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein copy of letter addressed to Master Laurence Goldstein, of Lynn, Mass., by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts Department commander of the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America. Master Goldstein's father made the supreme sacrifice during the Battle of the Bulge in 1945.

The letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF MASSACHUSETTS,
JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Boston, Mass., November 17, 1949.

Master LAURENCE GOLDSTEIN,
Lynn, Mass.

MY DEAR SON: You have received an undeserved beating at the hands of ill-bred and misinformed youngsters who were brought up in an unwholesome atmosphere, perhaps by un-American parents. This, my boy, has made you think like a man three or four times your age. You have asked a very basic and troublesome question. You asked it like a mature man and you deserve being answered like a grown man.

I know, my son, that you did not complain for your physical injury as much as you did for the injury to your dignity as a child of God, as an American, and as a son of a war hero.

Your question, "Why did my daddy have to die?" cannot be answered in words, but it is being answered every day by good and decent people of this country in every nook and corner; it is being answered by Americans of every color, age, and religious conviction. Your question is being answered every day of the year by organizations such as the Jewish War Veterans of the United States, the American Legion, the VFW, the AMVETS, the Marine Corps League, and others, of whom your father is an honorary member. Your question is being answered, not in words, not in speeches, but with small and big deeds; deeds that preserve and perpetuate the good things and institutions for which your father, as one of the 300,000 Americans, died.

Last Friday, as you know, people all over the country observed Armistice Day. Thousands of former servicemen and women marched in parades. Millions of Americans watched the parades. These same people and millions more filled the synagogues and churches throughout the country. Jews, Christians, whites, yellows, and blacks all mingled together just like during the wars. We prayed and we paid tribute to your father and to thousands of other American heroes. The President of the United States, on that day, delivered a great historic address, explaining, in part, why your father had to die.

But more important than that, every one of us on that day once more rededicated himself to do something in memory of the war heroes. On that day all of us good Americans resolved to do something good so that we may deserve to enjoy the freedoms which your father defended heroically and for which he died.

It so happened that last Friday, my boy, I was talking to several hundred people who filled a synagogue in Dorchester and just like yourself, I too, a man four times your age, asked that question. I asked it somewhat different. I asked the people who were there, what right one group of human beings in this country has to ask another group to go to war and to die. There is but one answer to it, my boy. The answer is that all of us fought to protect something that was going to be taken away from us and then life would become worthless. It wasn't only your father who was asked to fight but 18,000,000 other Americans went to fight and if 18,000,000 more had been asked, they too would have gone to fight. But all of us, including your dad, went to fight for one thing and one thing only, and that is the American way of life.

Under the American way of life, people make no distinction between Jew, Christian, white, colored, born American or immigrant. Under the American way of life, we have a right to pray to God as we wish and we have a right to express our minds as freely as we want. Under the American way of life, we strive for self-discipline and for greater

freedoms. Had your father not gone to war, had he and the others not died, those freedoms would have been taken away from us as they were taken away from the people of Europe and you and I would surely have been dead today or at best, we would have been slaves.

Your father didn't want that; he wanted his sons and all American sons, regardless of race or creed to live and grow as free men. Your life and the life of future generations of Americans was to your father dearer than his own life. That is why your father died and that is what makes him a hero to all Americans.

You have a right to say to yourself that every time you see an American do a good deed, he is doing it in tribute to and in memory of your father. Every time someone does like what the kids did to you, they are desecrating the memory of American heroes and you have a right to stop them. But in stopping them, you must live up to the tradition and heritage of your father. You must try to do it with persuasion, with love and kindness, with teaching and arguing, but with force only when forced to do so. You are a descendant of the Maccabeans. You will never run away from bullies.

Now there is one more thing I should like to say to you. I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you "Jew," you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want you to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like our own religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christians. I venture to say to you, my boy, that these fellows are not even of Christian parentage. Had their parents been Christians, they would have attended to their business of bringing up their children in the spirit of love and respect for other human beings, regardless of faith.

Do not, as you might be tempted, pass judgment on these kids or on other Christian kids. Christians do not hate Jews. It isn't Christians, it is nonreligious people that hate. Christianity like Judiasm teaches to love, to help, and to share.

Another thing, it is very natural for you, as it would be for me, a man four times your age, to want to see those kids punished. You would want to hear a judge say so. Ask yourself what good would it do and would it be a tribute to your father. You may not know it but your mature sense and courage of conviction has already set in motion the greatest judging machinery in this country. It is even higher than the Supreme Court of the United States. You have aroused the indignation of the people of the United States. Your question has made them think hard and whenever the American people think hard and act much good comes out. A hundred bias laws passed by legislatures and a thousand judgments pronounced by courts will not accomplish as much good for this country as you have through your action. A million dollars could not have built a greater monument for the 300,000 men and women heroes of our country, of which your father is one, than your courageous action.

I am herewith sending you a book entitled "Jews in American Wars"; also one for your younger brother. This book was written in a hurry and does not contain all the stories of all the heroic men and women of our faith in their fight for this country. But somewhere in that bock you will find a story which is just like your father's. When you are through reading this book, I am sure that sensible a boy as you are you will gain an added sense of faith in our great country and in the good people that inhabit it.

Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who don't understand America don't get hold of it and spoil it.

Be humble, brave, and courageous.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR J. TOYE,
Department Commander.

Hunting for a Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Business Week for January 14, 1950:

HUNTING FOR A COAL CRISIS

Need to find a weapon against John L. Lewis, more than any real coal shortage, accounts for Government moves in situation created by 3-day week in the mines.

It's easy to be bewildered over coal this week.

On the one hand you find such signs of serious trouble as these: An Interstate Commerce Commission order directing most of the country's railroad lines to cut service on coal-burning passenger runs by 25 percent; and preparations in Washington for a court injunction against John L. Lewis' United Mine Workers.

PARADOX

All that has the sound of crisis. But against it you can set these facts: Nowhere in the country is anyone actually out of coal. A year ago, in another warm January, most of the mines were working 2- and 3-day weeks for strictly market reasons. And today—on the statistics—coal production matches consumption.

FIGURES

Weekly production on the 3-day week ranges from 8,500,000 tons to a little over 9,000,000 tons as compared with a normal 12,000,000 on a 5-day week. In November, the most recent figures, consumption totaled 34,600,000 tons.

Consumption may have been a little higher in December, but stocks were in good shape. On December 1, industrial stocks averaged 51 days, ranging from 24 days for the railroads to 87 for electric utilities. Retail dealers had 5 days' supply, normal for the season. Over-all, the country had 39 days' supply above ground.

WHY CUT SERVICE?

The railroads had the lowest industrial stocks but plenty of coal. Weeks ago they were empowered to seize coal cars at the mines. The limitation on service was a conservation measure. ICC Chairman Johnson told Business Week, "I am not worried about anything until February. After that, in some of the northern and northwestern areas there may be a shortage."

Elsewhere, the coal situation is a nuisance. Some industrial users, unable to get coal from regular suppliers, are paying 50 cents a ton premium, taking inferior grades. In St. Louis, hit simultaneously by a quickie strike and a cold snap, dealers warned of empty yards. Dealers everywhere see customers turning to other fuels.

And in Washington, NLRB Counsel Denham's lawyers, doubtful that they can make a case for a health-and-welfare emergency, are shaping up their case for a court order enjoining the 3-day week as an unfair labor practice. Whether that will prove to be a weapon to defeat Lewis' subtle strategy—(Business Week, January 7, 1950, p. 61) will be up to the court—probably next week.

The Upset Down Under—No. 2

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star of January 17, 1950:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—NO. 2—ATTEMPT TO NATIONALIZE BANKS AROUSED VOTERS IN AUSTRALIA—LABOR REGIME OUSTED WHEN PUBLIC FEARED INDUSTRIES WOULD SUFFER SIMILAR FATE

(By Morley Cassidy)

MELBOURNE, AUSTRALIA, January 17.—Most of America's practical politicians, I feel reasonably sure, would laugh themselves right out of their suspenders if anyone suggested they run for office on a slogan of Vote for Whoozis and Dear Old First National Bank.

Pure suicide, they'd say. But their eyes might pop if they talked to some of the voters who have just thrown Australia's Socialist-minded Labor government out of office.

They'd find Australians still boiling with indignation over what Labor tried to do to our banks.

The tone is almost as though they were speaking of an outrage against our Nell. It makes a stranger blink.

A WAITER EXPLAINS

The brisk little waiter in a Collins Street restaurant, here in Melbourne, a good union man, says he voted Labor in 1943, naturally. This time he switched.

"I couldn't go for this bank nationalization," he says earnestly. "You know, that's just one step from dictatorship."

"Personally," he explains, "I don't have any dealings with banks, outside of my savings account. But suppose I decided to start a restaurant.

"If I needed a loan, there's a half dozen banks I could go to. If one turned me down, I could go to another.

"But under this nationalization scheme, there'd be just one bank—the Commonwealth Bank. If I went to them for a loan and they turned me down, I'd be out of luck. That's dictatorship."

He is no rare specimen. Three out of four people, among the hundreds I have talked to in Australia, have cited the Labor government's attempt to nationalize the banks, and the prospect that it quickly would take over other industries, as a major reason for their vote to oust the Labor government that had held office since 1941.

I know as well as any ward politician that this is incredible. But there you are. And Labor is out.

OUTPROMISING FAILED

It is the more astounding, according to one of the master-minds who mapped out the victorious Liberals' campaign, when compared with what happened 3 years ago.

"In 1946 we tried to outpromise Labor," says this man, too modest to let his name be used.

"We promised to extend child endowment, to raise old-age and invalid pensions, and a list of other benefits. We cut Labor's vote by about 2 percent. But we lost.

"This time we promised nothing in the way of easy vote-catchers, so-called. We did promise, as before, to extend the child endowment to cover the first child, but only because we believe it should be done."

DIDN'T MINCE WORDS

"We didn't renew our promises to eliminate the means test, or raise the pensions. On national insurance we simply said we would examine the possibilities with a view to submitting a plan in 1952.

"We didn't mince words about a lot of things that seemed like dynamite. We said the nation's defense called for selective training—call it conscription. We said we'd be tough with illegal strikes.

"Our whole campaign was simply this:

"Here's the socialist state. Here's what it has done to you so far. Here, from its own statements, is what it plans to do in the future. How do you like it?

"The result was a landslide. How do I account for it?"

MAKING THE ISSUE CLEAR

He doodled for a minute or so on his desk blotter.

"I'd put it this way: There's no use trying to out-promise the socialists.

"They'll always get the people who want promises of easy benefits, no matter what the other side offers. So you can save your breath—and the taxpayers' pocketbook.

"Socialism, fortunately, seems to answer itself with its works. Let people have a good taste of it, with all its mistakes. Then put the issue squarely, as an issue that touches every aspect of people's daily life, the issue of government monopoly, controls and a planned state, or individual freedom and free competition.

"We fought the campaign on that issue."

BANKS ARE A SYMBOL

The socialists' effort to seize the banks was held in the spotlight, as a sort of visible symbol that the Labor party wasn't just mouthing words when it talked of creating a socialist state.

Many Australians, it seemed, had taken it for granted that Labor's socialization plank was an empty political slogan. Now, suddenly, it was brought home to them that the socialist state meant business.

And from that time on, it is clear today, every man's and woman's grievance became, miraculously, the work of "these ruddy socialists."

A sheep rancher in New South Wales' outback country, near Gunnedah, waves his hand at a field full of rabbits, the great pest of Australia.

"That's what a coal strike does," he says bitterly. "No coal, no steel. No steel, no wire netting.

"This country needs 300,000 miles—miles, mind you—of netting to protect its grazing lands. A lot of us have to fence our fields. So it rusts in the grange. How can you fence in a field on two sides?

"There are your socialists and their planning."

FARMER WANTS A TRACTOR

A farmer has been waiting 2 years for an American tractor.

"My dealer got two last year," he says. "At that rate I'll get mine in 1960. Why? Because the dealers can't get permission to pay dollars.

"There's socialist prosperity for you."

Every man with a car or truck has a grievance against the stingy ration of gasoline, or petrol as it's called here.

"Who won this war, anyway?" growls a Newcastle truck driver. "Four years after it's over I'm getting 5 gallons a day for this truck, and I need 10."

STRIKES STIR ANGER

A Sydney businessman speaks grimly of his shipping costs. Much of the increase is due to trouble on the docks.

"Out on Glebe Island," he says, "we've got mechanical loaders. In 1939 we were loading 37.6 tons an hour. Today, with the same equipment, we're loading 21.3—and today the men are on strike again."

The complaints are endless. The most frequent involve the Labor government's refusal to deal firmly with Communists in trades-unions; with its acceptance of "drags," the unions' restrictive practice limiting output, its handling of strikes, most of all its tardy action in dealing with last summer's great coal strike.

And, to top it all, there is the rise in prices. "We've got a 12-shilling pound," say the housewives. It takes 20 shillings now, that is, to buy what 12 shillings bought at the end of the war.

One gathers, in talking to ex-Prime Minister Joseph B. Chilfey and men of his staff, that they are still hurt and a little bewildered at the fury of the public's reaction to the assault upon "our banks."

They speak glumly of the fear complex created by their enemies. Actually, they point out, they had taken only the bare first steps toward a truly Socialist state.

This is true. By comparison with Britain, for instance, Australia is a land of riotously free enterprise.

SOCIAL SERVICES MODERATE

Its social services—old age, invalids' and widows' pensions, unemployment and sickness benefits, and the like—are well advanced, but no one calls them excessive, or the mark of a welfare state. They have been created by all parties, all parties promised to maintain them, and they were never an issue.

The railroads have always been state-owned, as have the telephone and telegraph systems. City tramways and transport have been publicly owned for many years.

There has been no seizure of whole industries, as Britain took over its coal mines and railroads. But that, Labor's enemies quickly point out, is not the fault of Labor. It tried.

STARTED AFTER THE WAR

Australians have known, in a vague way, that every Labor candidate since 1921 has signed a party pledge to work for the socialization of the means of production, distribution, and exchange.

Most people, no doubt, had regarded it as a pious expression and little more. But when the Labor government of John Curtin faced a wartime election in 1943, the public had misgivings. To allay them, Mr. Curtin and his cabinet pledged that there would be no effort to nationalize industry during hostilities.

Mr. Chilfey, who succeeded Mr. Curtin on the latter's death in 1945, was quickly freed of this pledge. Almost immediately, Australians were jolted by the establishment of Trans-Australian Airlines, under a commission empowered to take over all Australian air lines.

ELECTIONS OF 1946

The high court, Australia's Supreme Court, declared this seizure illegal, but approved the state's operation of its own line. The state-owned line now operates in competition with private lines.

This dispute still was sputtering when the elections of 1946 were held. Nationalization was not an issue; but Labor ministers, soon afterward, were asserting that the party's platform pledge was well known, and that the election, therefore, had approved a program of full socialization.

Fairly soon thereafter, startled Australians found themselves with a state-owned shipping line, a state-owned broadcasting corporation, a government monopoly in television and frequency-modulation broadcasting.

Finally, in 1947, socialization hit full force, with the measure authorizing the commonwealth to take over all trading or commercial banks, making them a part of the government-owned commonwealth bank.

It is doubtful that any Labor Party official guessed what a storm would follow. Protest committees sprang up like magic. The bill was carried to the high court and declared unconstitutional. The Labor Government—in defiance of its own pledges to abolish appeal to the Privy Council in London—carried the case to that council and lost again.

It lost more than it knew. For now Australia was rallied behind "our banks," and opposition brochures were telling people that no one, from now on, could say that "he didn't know it was loaded" if he voted for Labor.

Loan Guaranty Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Mr. T. B. King, Director of the Loan Guaranty Service, Veterans' Administration, concerning the work of his department. I believe the Members of the House will be interested in the information concerning the veterans' loans for homes, farms, and business.

VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1950.

Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: In accordance with your telephone request I am pleased to advise you with respect to the salient factors in the loan-guaranty program. Attached is a statistical summary of the loan-guaranty operation compiled as of November 25, 1949.

You will note that approximately 41,000 applications were received during the month of November of which over 39,000 were for home loans and the balance were applications for farm or business loans. This figure is double that of the all-time low in applications which occurred in March 1949 during which approximately 20,500 applications were received. The increase in volume is due primarily to (1) the 100-percent secondary market for section 501 loans which has been made available through the facilities of the Federal National Mortgage Association and (2) the decrease in the yield on long-term Government bonds and the lack of other sound investments makes the 4 percent guaranteed mortgage attractive.

We are extremely gratified with our default and claim experience to date. There have been 108,000 defaults reported on home loans of which more than 72,000, or 66.9 percent, have been cured. We have paid an aggregate of 5,200 claims which is approximately one-third of 1 percent of the number of home loans closed. Of the 53,000 farm

loans closed, we have had defaults reported in approximately 5,700 cases of which 62.1 percent, or 3,500, have been cured and 861 farm-loan claims have been paid. We have received 19,700 default notices on the 112,000 business loans that were closed. Nine thousand of the defaults, or 45.7 percent, have been cured and we have paid claims in 6,950 cases. There have been 141,266 paid-in-full loans of which 87,157 were home loans, 12,407 farm loans, and 41,702 business loans. It will thus be noted that 8 percent of all loans closed to date have been paid in full and less than 1 percent (0.8) have resulted in claim payments. There have been no marked increases in the number of defaults reported or claims filed during the past year. We have been confronted with certain local situations involving unemployment due to industry shut-downs and strikes. However, the mortgagees have been extremely cooperative during such periods and have extended indulgence to the veterans. It is my sincere hope, as I am sure it is yours, that this fine record of our former GI's will be maintained.

If I can be of any further service, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Very truly yours,

T. B. KING,
Director, Loan Guaranty Service.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and resolution:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR
REPEAL OF WARTIME EXCISE TAXES,
New York, N. Y., January 16, 1950.

Hon. A. F. TAURIELLO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your bill H. R. 5735, concerning the reduction of the rates to eliminate war increases, indicates your interest in the repeal of the wartime excise taxes.

Mr. Frank M. Mayfield, chairman of the National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, as well as the members of his committee, have requested me to forward to you the attached copy of the resolution adopted unanimously by the committee, at its meeting on January 12, at the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York.

Respectfully,

H. LEIGH WHITELAW,
Secretary.

Whereas the undersigned have associated themselves together as a committee of principals under the name National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes for the purpose of undertaking to secure the repeal of the discriminatory wartime excise taxes so as to leave in effect only the pre-1941 excises, and have included in their objective all such excises except those on alcohol, tobacco, and gasoline; and

Whereas this committee of principals believes that these unfair and discriminatory taxes should be repealed for the following reasons, among others:

1. The strongest reason for their enactment was that they were admittedly repressive and would put a brake on the businesses affected. They were intentionally diversionary and punitive in order to meet wartime necessities. Since they continue to repress and to divert in peacetime, they are discriminatory and unfair.

2. They are rationing by taxation—the last of the wartime controls.

3. They dictate to the consumer how he shall spend his dollar; a severe limitation on his freedom of choice.

4. Since they strike deeply into whole communities and particular businesses, their unfairness causes bitterness when unemployment results to the individual worker.

5. The Congress has a moral commitment to the American people to end the high wartime excise taxes. This pledge is woven through the laws, their legislative history, and the very logic of their original enactment.

6. Since they increase prices to the consumer, they produce a maximum of mass irritation at a minimum of return, with their greatest impact on the low-income group, least able to pay.

7. Because they are arbitrarily selective by peacetime standards, they have injured particular industries.

8. More people and more businesses are subjected to the repeated bite of these taxes than any other, without exception.

9. Consumer-spending (which we must increase in order to sustain high-level employment) is decreased by these taxes.

10. The term "luxury taxes" is misleading, confusing, and in fact false, since the wartime excise taxes were not imposed on "luxuries." They were imposed on goods and services that interfered with wartime necessities.

11. Only complete repeal (restoration of the pre-1941 status) can be effective; mere reduction in rates would be a serious mistake—the irritant would remain; the moral commitment would be unfulfilled; the discrimination and unfairness would continue.

12. These are bad taxes; they are placed on gross revenues, not on net profits.

13. If it is wrong to keep the discriminatory wartime rates, and right to repeal them, America cannot afford not to do the right.

14. Tax repeal action rather than public works is the only way to reach the skills unemployed by consumer resistance to wartime excise taxes.

15. If these taxes are now repealed, the Government will have exerted itself positively in the direction of continued high-level employment and increasing national income throughout 1950.

16. When taxes enacted for an emergency purpose are permitted to remain after the emergency has passed, the faith of the people in their government is shaken.

17. Because of the general belief that these taxes will be repealed, quick action to this end is necessary, as the public is curtailing its purchases of many products and services in the affected industries.

Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, That the aforesaid unfair and discriminatory excises should be repealed, and the pre-1941 status restored at the earliest possible date.

This 12th day of January 1950.

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes: Frank M. Mayfield, Chairman, President, Scruggs-Vandervoort-Barney; Arde Bulova, Vice Chairman, Chairman, Bulova Watch Co., Eric Johnston, Vice Chairman, President, Motion Picture Producers & Distributors of America; Louis Ruthenburg, Vice Chairman, Chairman, Servel Inc.; James J. Newman, Treasurer, Vice President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; J. Carlton Bagnall, Sr., Executive Vice President, Swank Incorporated; Lester Baker, Treasurer, Dayton Rubber Co.; Robert F. Bensinger, President, Brunswick-Balke-Collender Co.; John M. Biggins, Vice President and Treasurer, Elgin National Watch Co.; Harold Bozell, President, General Telephone Co.; Henry P. Bristol, President, Bristol-Myers Co.; Thomas A. Buckley, President, The Buxton Co.; J. H. Carmichael, President, Capital Airlines, Inc.; John S. Coleman, President, Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; John Collyer, President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Robert Driscoll, Vice President, Greyhound Corp.; Samuel B. Edison, Vice President, Edison Bros. Stores, Inc; Albert J. Feldman, Secretary and Treasurer, A. Hollander & Son; Marion B. Folsom, Treasurer, Eastman-Kodak Co.; John A. Fry, President, Detroit-Michigan Stove Co.; Leonard H. Goldenson, President, United Paramount Theatres, Inc.; Julius Green, President, Julius Green Fur Co.; C. R. Harding, President, The Pullman Co.; Lyle C. Harvey, President, Affiliated Gas Equipment Corp.; J. V. Heffernan, Vice President, Radio Corporation of America; Oscar Heyman, President, Oscar Heyman & Bros., Inc.; Stanley H. Hobson, President, George D. Roper Corp.; R. J. Irish, Executive Administrator, A. O. Smith Corp.; Stanley Klein, President, Mendel-Drucker, Inc.; R. A. Lumpkin, President, Illinois Consolidated Telephone; John H. Moore, President, John Hudson Moore, Inc.; Daniel J. O'Brien, President, Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo; Brock Pemberton, President, League of New York Theatres, Inc.; B. Earl Puckett, President, Allied Stores Corp.; Milton R. Rackmil, President, Decca Records, Inc.; Carl P. Ray, Assistant to President, Underwood Corp.; Vincent P. Ring, Treasurer, Knapp-Monarch Co.; Carl Rosenberger, Chairman, Coro, Inc.; Nicholas M. Schenck, President, Loew's, Inc.; Glenwood J. Sherrard, President, Parker House Hotel, Boston; Spyros P. Skouras, President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.; C. R. Smith, President, American Airlines, Inc.; E. D. Taylor, Administrative Vice President, Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute; Edward Wallerstein, President, Columbia Records, Inc.; Harry M. Warner, President, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Howard V. Widdoes, Vice President, Remington-Rand, Inc.; Edward T. T. Williams, President, The Lambert Co.

Christmas Festivities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD DAVIS
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech I recently made:

My fellow citizens, I am grateful to radio station WREC for this generous extension of my time. Never in all my life have I enjoyed anything quite as much as this opportunity to visit informally with so many of my friends on each Sabbath Day evening at 10 minutes after 10 o'clock. To all of you who have written me notes and who have spoken to me personally in acknowledgement of these humble efforts, I express my very deep gratitude.

On next Sunday night I plan to outline some of the subjects which must have attention in the early days of the second session of the Eighty-first Congress. As you know we return to our duties in Washington on January 3. Because of the many complex domestic issues to be considered, I expect this

session to be rather a difficult one and certainly filled with highly controversial questions. As I go along through life, I recognize that all of us cannot be in entire agreement on all things. But if we have an honest purpose and a studious mind and an open heart, we can find a way to reconcile minor differences and adjust our understandings.

Tonight as time is reckoned in our part of the world, this holy day has just about been concluded. I do hope that you and your families have found happiness during the all too-swift passing moments of this Christmas.

The great event of 1,950 years ago made mankind reckon with B. C. and A. D. Our risen Lord is still the dividing factor but our only hope. There is no argument anywhere about the real disciple of the Master. It is that spirit, that character, and that kind of life which conveys the answer to human problems and echoes the song of Bethlehem and the music of the angels. To all such He becomes the unifying factor above party, race, or creed.

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given: and the government shall be upon his shoulder; and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counselor, The Mighty God, The Everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace.

"Of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom, to order it, and to establish it with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for ever. The zeal of the Lord of Hosts will perform this."

It may interest you to know that the first certain mention of December 25 is in the calendar of Philocalus. This records that Christ the Lord Jesus was born on December 25, a Friday, the fifteenth day of the new moon in year 1. However, December 25 A. D. 1, was a Sunday. So to me the Christmas Day of 1949, falling on the first day of the week bears more than ordinary significance.

Christmas was not among the earliest festivals of the church. Before the fifth century there was no general concensus of opinion as to when it should come in the calendar, whether on January 6, March 25, or December 25. The earliest identification of December 25 with the birthday of Christ is in a passage, otherwise unknown and probably spurious, of Theophilus of Antioch, preserved in Latin by the Magdeburg centuriators, to the effect that the Gauls contended that as they celebrated the birth of the Lord on December 25, so ought they to celebrate the ressurrection on March 25. As late as A. D. 245, Origen repudiated the idea of keeping the birthday of Christ, as if he were a king Pharaoh.

Certain Latins as early as 354 set the birthday at December 25, which was then a Mithraic feast day. The Syrians and Armenians clung to January 6. We are certain that the date originated in the West, but spread quickly eastwards. In A. D. 350, it was observed at the Court of Constantius; Basil of Caesarea adopted it in 379. Honorius, emperor in the West, told his mother and brother Arcadius how the feast was kept at Rome. The patriarchs Theophilus of Alexandria, John of Jerusalem, and Flavian of Antioch were won over to the date in A. D. 398. As early as 400, an imperial rescript includes Christmas among the three feasts on which theaters must be closed. Then as late as 1644, Christmas, as a day of observance, was forbidden by an act of Parliament. Charles II revived the feast, but the Scots adhered to the Puritan view. But so much for that part of sacred history.

I have never seen Memphis quite as beautifully decorated as during this holiday season. Perhaps there are some in my audience who have never paid particular attention to the origin of Christmas customs, the singing of carols, the beginning of the big Christmas Day dinner, the use of the term "St. Nicholas," and the giving of gifts.

The Mesopotamian god, Marduk and his court of gods have long disappeared, but their winter festivals survive in our Christmas celebration. In the Balkans and in central Europe, on the 12 days of Christmas, troupes of masqueraders go about, headed by a "fool" or a "wild man"; also troupes of carol singers, not unlike those we know from merrie England. There are still bonfires, and a special log which a young man fells and brings home; and over this log a ritual is performed (with praise, now, to the Christian God); and on Christmas Eve it is burned in the fireplace.

The Roman festival of Saturnalia began around the middle of December and continued until January 1. In its midst was December 25, the day as the Romans calculated, when the sun was at its lowest ebb, ready to increase again and impart its strength to the growing things of the earth. Hard upon this day came the Calendae of January—January 1. The word itself has become the name which the Slavic and Baltic peoples use for the days of the Christmas festivities: Koleda, Kolyada, Koledos, etc. The Roman Saturnalia and the holidays which followed were boisterous indeed. The citizenry masqueraded through the streets, ate big dinners, feasted their friends, wished them good luck at this time of tender fortune, and gave each other good-luck gifts called Strenae. The halls of the Romans were decked with boughs of laurel and green trees, with lighted candles and with lamps—for the hovering spirits of darkness were afraid of light.

To the pagans, the Saturnalia were fun. To the Christians, the Saturnalia were an abomination. As there were more and more immigrants into the ranks of the Christians the church fathers discovered to their alarm that they were facing an invasion of pagan customs. The church leaders tried strenuously to keep Christmas strictly a churchly celebration. But though pagan Rome became Christian, the Saturnalia remained and became adapted to Christian purpose. The church finally took the merriment, the greenery, the lights, and the gifts from Saturn and gave them to the Babe of Bethlehem.

To the old pagan Germanics, December was the time to slaughter the extra animals and preserve the meat, a good time to invite friends in for a bit of feasting. The god who cared for the fertile herd was Frey, after whom Friday is named; his animal symbol was the boar. The boar sacrifice was too enjoyable to be forgotten, so it survives in the feast of merrie old England in which the boar is treated as if it were some royal personage—first the trumpets blow, the door swings open, in marches a platter bearing a steaming boar's head, an apple in its mouth; behind it troops a procession of lusting puddings. This, too, is Christmas.

Woden (Wednesday: Woden's Day), the chief among the Northland gods, came originally from the Near East and became, by amalgamation with the real St. Nicholas, the St. Nicholas or Santa Claus of Christmas. In Europe St. Nicholas wears Woton's broad-brimmed hat and rides his faithful old white horse. In Europe he does not come on Christmas Eve but on the eve of December 6; St. Nicholas, archbishop of Myra, a seaport town in Asia Minor, died on December 6, in the year 326.

St. Nicholas must have been a remarkable person, judging by the varied and numerous legends which have gathered about his life on earth and his life as a saint after his death. From England to Greece and Orthodox Russia, he rides the storm at sea, saving the lives of sailormen for whom he is the last and only help.

St. Nicholas overleaped the frontiers of Christianity itself to become the helper of the pagan Samoyed and Laplanders—the men of the reindeer, the fishermen of the Arctic Ocean. So, in America, we tend to believe that the Arctic is his one and only residence.

By saving ships at sea, St. Nicholas saves the landlubber merchants who are their passengers; surely he protects them on land as well. By this reasoning, he becomes the patron saint of travelers everywhere, protecting their goods, and insuring them safe passage. His three bags of gold became the symbol, as three golden balls, of the pawnbroker: a man's goods, that is, are safe under the sign of St. Nicholas. He is the protector of all humble and small folk and he is special guardian of unmarried girls. He had the habit of slipping gifts into the homes of worthy folk, for he had inherited a fortune which he gave away without letting anyone know from whence it came.

So when the children of the lower Rhineland, on both sides of Dutch-German border, set out their clogs for "Santeklas" (there are many versions of the name St. Nicholas) to fill on the eve, not of December twenty-fifth, but of December sixth, they put hay in them for the white horse, and their parents set out a sheaf of grain. Sometimes, instead of clogs, they set out little wooden ships. But, clogs or ships, they always place them by the chimney, for the saint still prefers to deliver his presents secretly in the night.

The exact origin of the Christmas tree is unknown. Limbs of evergreens were used in the Saturnalia and, in northern Europe, box, bay, ivy, holly, yew, larch, juniper, pine, spruce, fir—the plants that remain green when all else turns brown and dead—were the enemies of winter's white death and shields against the witches and demons of the long winter nights. Also the veneration of some particular tree as being the property or dwelling place of a spirit was so widespread and so varied among the pagan Europeans, that the customs which grew up around it have provided a wide range for those who like to make guesses.

Throughout history trees have been set up and decorated in almost every important holiday. The May-pole itself was a tree, and it even bore the same ornaments which were used on the Christmas tree; but garnished trees stood also on Shrovetide, Palm Sunday, Easter, Ascension Day, Harvest Home, St. Martin's, St. Nicholas', New Year's, and others. If the tree of Christianity in particular belongs to this family, then somehow, and unaccountably, it is a lone survivor.

There are many accounts of Christmas festivities going back into the Middle Ages; but they never mention the Christmas tree. A forest ordinance from Ammerschweier in Alsace, dated 1561, says that no burgher "shall have for Christmas more than one bush of more than eight shoes' length. This seems to be the first mention of anything that can be recognized as the tree. In a travel book dated 1605, there is this passage: At Christmastime in Strassburg they set up fir trees in the rooms, and they hang on them roses cut of many colored paper, apples, wafers, gilt, sugar, and so on. So it appears that the Alsatians were the first people to pass from hanging greens to a standing tree.

To the collection of false ideas we may assign the widespread notion that Martin Luther was out walking one night, and the stars suggested to him lights, which he then placed upon a fir tree to brighten the Christmas of his son. Nor can a good case be made for the Yule log as the ancestor of the Christmas tree. One favorite notion has been that it is the symbol of the Tree of

Life which stood in the Garden of Eden. Indeed, in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, in northern Germany, that is precisely the way people regarded it; in Hamburg, for instance, you could buy little figurines of Adam and Eve and the serpent, to place under the tree. In the treasure chest of folklore the church keeps the story that on the first Noel, in defiance of the snow and the night's darkness, trees put forth blossoms and fruits; so the Christmas tree bears flowers and fruits. Some southern Germans cut cherry and hawthorn boughs on St. Andrew's Day (November 30) and place them in a pot of water in a warm room. By Christmas they spread and put forth full bloom.

The devotion of the southern colonies in America, with their predominantly English population, to the old customs of the mother country indicate that Christmas there was a day, not simply of religious celebrations and worship, but of family reunions, social gatherings, feastings, and frolic.

In New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, and Delaware the observance of Christmas was naturally affected by continental European Christmas customs derived from Holland, Sweden, and Germany. Practice varied among these peoples. Some of the more radical religious sects minimized the day. Among the Moravian Germans, Christmas appears to have been purely religious. Dutch, Swedes, and Germans of the Reformed or Lutheran churches, however, added new features to the traditional English way of celebration. St. Nicholas, or Santa Claus, was a feature of the Dutch, Swedish, and German Christmas. The Germans in colonial days introduced the Christmas tree, with toys, trinkets, figures of angels, and numerous little lighted tapers, into America.

In Philadelphia, Christmas was not, so we are told, generally observed. The Quakers, whether English or German, did not incline to the commemoration of holidays. Nor was Christmas popular among the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians.

Throughout the colonial period Christmas was frowned upon in New England. The Puritans were opposed to Christmas. From the earliest settlement at Plymouth, constant effort was made to prevent its observance. Massachusetts, in 1659, passed a law which reads as follows: "Whosoever shall be found observing any such day as Christmas or the like, either by forbearing of labor, feasting, or in any other way, as a festival, shall be fined 5 shillings." By 1800, Puritanism had lost much of its force even in New England, but Christmas Day was not made a legal holiday in Massachusetts until late in the first half of the nineteenth century.

The research to review the establishment of December 25, with the customs which followed has been stimulating. We may find ourselves wholly accepting, or denying, this historical background but far more stimulating to me is my simple faith that the Christ Child did come into the world, that he grew to young manhood, died, rose again, and that those of us who believe that he did live and died and rose will have everlasting life.

I am thoroughly convinced that our own country is thinking more about religion today. Men in every walk of life are turning to deep and more spiritual thinking. We are still just as frail as ever—we make just as many mistakes or more, but we do know that real peace will never come to the world until we live by the Golden Rule and we can more faithfully keep the 10 and, yea, the 2 great commandments.

It was He whose birthday we honor today who taught us to pray—

"Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be Thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors. And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. For Thine is the kingdom and the power and the glory forever." Amen.

Judge Albert Conway, Guardian of Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, Brooklyn is very proud of its senior jurist, Albert Conway, associate judge of the court of appeals. He is one of the great jurists of our State and country.

On Thursday, January 19, Judge Conway will be guest of honor at the golden jubilee dinner of the Cathedral Club in Brooklyn. It is a deserving tribute to a scholar, a teacher, a lawyer, a judge, but above all to a man—a good man.

The Brooklyn Eagle of January 8, 1950, designated him as Brooklyn's man of the week. The article, written by Wendell Hanmer, reads as follows:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—CONWAY'S CREED: A JUDGE IS A GUARDIAN OF LIBERTY

(By Wendell Hanmer)

Brooklyn's senior judge, who also is senior judge of the entire City of New York and third ranking jurist of the State, will be the guest of honor at the Cathedral Club's golden jubilee dinner in the Hotel St. George on January 19. He is Associate Judge Albert Conway of the court of appeals.

A member of the club 38 years, he resisted previous attempts by the club to honor him and again protested this year that the distinction should be accorded a younger man, that he is "getting old—not going anywhere."

If he is not going anywhere, any member of the legal profession will tell you, it is because he has arrived. And Judge Conway's philosophy of life would bear them out.

Judge Conway is well-satisfied with his life to date. Could he start it over, it would be the same. Again he would become a lawyer or, he added a moment later, a doctor.

"Well, eh—doctors serve the people," he said when asked to explain.

"Do lawyers?" he was asked.

"Lawyers and judges," he replied instantly, "stand between the State and the people. They're the guardians of the liberty of the common man."

DEMOCRACY

"Would you be thinking of democracy?" he was asked. "And, if so, what is your interpretation of democracy?"

"I was," he said, "and of democracy as it should be. What it should be to the man in the street."

Judge Conway abruptly leaned back in his chair in his chambers in the Appellate Division Court House on Monroe Place. From an inner pocket he took a billfold, removed a printed card and thrust it forward.

"Here," he said, "is the best definition of democracy I know."

The card bore this:

"On my honor I will do my best to do my duty to God and my country and to obey the Scout Law—to help other people at all times—to keep myself physically strong, mentally awake and morally strong."—The Scout Oath.

"A Scout is trustworthy, loyal, helpful, friendly, courteous, kind, obedient, cheerful, thrifty, brave, clean, reverent."—The Scout Law.

ACTIVE IN SCOUTING

The Scout movement is his chief, almost his sole, nonprofessional interest. He has no hobbies. For relaxation he reads detective stories.

Judge Conway's interest in scouting was born of his admiration for James C. Cropsey, who was active in the movement throughout his lifetime. When Cropsey, then a Supreme Court justice, died in 1936, Judge Conway succeeded him as president of Brooklyn Council, Boy Scouts of America. Thereafter he was chairman of the council's board of directors and is now its vice chairman. He also is a member of the executive committee of region 2, which embraces the scout organizations of New York and New Jersey.

Judge Conway first met Cropsey in 1913, when the latter, a Republican and district attorney of Kings County, gave him a 3-month summer appointment as a deputy assistant district attorney. The temporary appointment was on recommendation of the Republican lawyer Cropsey had just engaged to head the appeals bureau of the district attorney's office. That lawyer had been Conway's employer.

STEPPING STONES

Like his lawyer father, the late Joseph P. Conway, Judge Conway always has been a Democrat. With a promotion to assistant district attorney, his temporary appointment continued until April 1, 1920, when he resigned to enter private practice.

In 1928 Gov. Franklin D. Roosevelt appointed him superintendent of insurance. Eighteen months later he was appointed a county judge, and eighteen months after that elected a justice of the Supreme Court on a joint Republican-Democratic nomination.

Designated a member of the appellate division in 1937, he was detached and assigned by Governor Lehman to preside throughout 1939 over an extraordinary term of the supreme court in Buffalo concerned with charges of municipal corruption.

On January 1, 1940, Governor LEHMAN appointed him to the court of appeals in Albany, the State's highest tribunal. He was elected to a full 14-year term on that bench in November of that year.

WHAT HE LIKED BEST

Asked which phase of his long and varied legal career he had enjoyed most, he grinned boyishly and said:

"My 17 months on homicide in the district attorney's office. It was a day and night job, on duty 24 hours of each day, including Sunday. I'd go back tomorrow for my present pay ($28,000 a year), except that at my age I couldn't take it. I have to read detective stories now."

While nothing in his physical appearance indicates that time has treated him other than kindly, Judge Conway concedes at least one major sacrifice to the passing years.

"I used to smoke all the time," he said, "cigarettes, cigars, and pipe. I really enjoyed it. But it began to slow me down. Six years ago I quit."

Born in Brooklyn on April 3, 1889, Judge Conway is a graduate of Boys' High School, where he was a classmate of the school's present principal, Alfred Tausk. He attended St. John's University briefly, then, when 16, obtained a job in a law office and began attending evening classes at Fordham. He graduated cum laude from Fordham with an LL. B. in 1911. Since then he has received honorary degrees of LL. D. from both Fordham and St. John's, and also from Syracuse University.

In 1917 he married Irene M. Hewitt, and they had four children. She died in 1929.

In 1933 he married the former Irene M. O'Neil, with whom he lives at 845 Carroll Street.

"I Speak for Democracy"—Prize Winning Essay by Miss Gloria Chomiak

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 18 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, in a recent contest sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Radio Manufacturers Association, and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce, which sought the best radio script among 1,000,000 high school students in the Nation on the subject I Speak for Democracy, Miss Gloria Chomiak, of 510 South Heald Street, Wilmington, Del., a student of the Wilmington High School, was designated as one of the four winners. This Delaware girl is the daughter of a former immigrant from the Ukraine and spent most of her childhood in Fort Vermillion, Canada, and in recent years came to live in Delaware.

In winning this contest on democracy, Miss Chomiak, a senior in Wilmington High School, has brought great honor not only to herself and to the State of Delaware but also to the students of our Nation. This essay should be read not only by every student but more important, it should be read by every adult in this country. Far too often we who have always enjoyed the advantages of a democracy have failed to appreciate the real benefits of self-government.

When we stop to consider that during the recent elections in our country nearly one-half of our citizens failed to exercise their privilege to vote, it is high time that we who claim to be citizens of this great Republic, the last stronghold of democracy, awaken to the warning cited in this essay.

Before asking unanimous consent to have this entire essay incorporated in the RECORD, I want to call the attention of the Senate to the first paragraph, in which Miss Chomiak said, "I speak for democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone. We must stand up, and speak and be heard in its cause."

Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to have this entire essay embodied in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the essay was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak for Democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone. We must stand up, and speak and be heard in its cause.

And what is this thing called democracy? It is a thought discovered in ancient Greece; a thing a Slavic serf dreamed of too much and paid for with his life; an ideal, started in its practice by a model Parliament of England; and bitterly struggled for in Louis' France. It is a leavening of revolutions, a stepchild of utopia; a system, first defined as a government for and by the people in our own country, where it has grown to what we know and love today.

It is a government that has been developing for hundreds of years, and shall develop for hundreds more; a government that has outgrown an initial stage wherein it served the citizens of Greece—citizens who did not include the underprivileged and the captive and who constituted but a fraction of the population. It is a government that has weathered the time when a land-laden Polish baron frowned upon it, thinking of his foreign serfs, tilling their foreign fields for his benefit alone. He worried little for he could dispose of them at his pleasure if he found one who thought in their number.

DEMOCRACY GROWN GREAT

It is a government that has grown great since that medieval year when England's people first had representatives before their king—the first representatives before authority a people ever had.

It won a place for itself during the bitter civil war of France, when people were hungry and angered with the extravagant caprices of those who ruled through heritage, and it found a home in the New World when honest colonists learned to demand a rule by their own choice.

It has grown from a privilege of the few to a right of the common, risen from a persecuted idea to a mighty ideal upheld in safety by millions. It has developed into a system whose imperfections can be remedied, and whose virtues are a God-given right.

For this democracy is a natural system. Men were created equal in their rights and their responsibilities. And is not intelligent participation in governing among them? Men were given individual minds and desires. Ought not they have a right to voice them?

Democracy is a system with flaws, because through the ages men have erred and do err, and a democracy is only as right as its people. Democracy is able to abolish its principles by its own excess.

A cynic spoke the truth about it when he said that democracy can make each man his own oppressor. Yet, I believe that greater men have said a truer thing about democracy: that the people's government cannot—shall not perish from the earth.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD immediately following the essay itself an editorial which appeared in the Wilmington Morning News under date of January 17, 1950, extending their congratulations and the congratulations of every citizen of Delaware to Gloria Chomiak.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONGRATULATIONS TO GLORIA

A very recent newcomer to this community has brought honor to Wilmington and the State of Delaware. Gloria Chomiak, 17-year-old Wilmington high school student who came here only 2 years ago from Canada, is one of the four winners of the fourth annual Voice of Democracy contest.

That is, the address she wrote and later delivered over a radio station here has been adjudged one of the four best among approximately a million produced by boys and girls in the 48 States, the District of Columbia, Alaska, and Puerto Rico. So she will go to Washington to receive a $500 college scholarship, meet the President, attend sessions of Congress, and broadcast over the radio networks and the Voice of America.

These are substantial rewards. Gloria, whose parents were born in the Ukraine and who spent most of her childhood in Fort Vermillion, Alberta—so far from the centers of population that she went to school by correspondence under the supervision of an adult—might be in a quandary to say which she likes best. But they will all contribute to her knowledge of the democratic way.

We congratulate her. And we also congratulate the National Association of Broadcasters and the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for sponsoring this worthwhile competition. It is good to know that young Americans, and young immigrants, can speak for democracy with force and conviction.

Ship Operations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank Reil, director of information for the American Merchant Marine Institute, which appeared in the current issue of Railway Progress:

SHIP OPERATIONS

(By Frank Reil)

"Nobody likes subsidies or likes to admit getting them," said the November Railway Progress in its Behind the Washington Ticker column. And to this perhaps should be added: "Don't talk about my subsidy; pick on the other fellow's."

However, the same November issue did same talking about subsidies for the merchant marine but it didn't tell the whole story. It was chiefly concerned with Federal aid for new ship construction, which in the final analysis is a subsidy for shipbuilders. But another type of assistance for operating the merchant marine was hardly mentioned and it deserves much better notice.

Can you imagine a subsidy in which Uncle Sam gets his money back? Or one that has been so small over the years that it ranks last on the long list of Government aid?

This oddity is the ship operating differential subsidy and is the only one of all the Federal grants that is subject to recapture by the United States Treasury.

The price-support programs for a wide variety of agricultural production, mining, and other industries are strictly a one-way proposition. The air lines have their mail payments—the merchant marine said good riddance to this type of assistance in 1933—but there are no recapture provisions.

Other forms of indirect Government aid, such as protective tariffs, land grants for some railroads, and the second-class mailing privileges for newspapers and periodicals,

are of such a type that recapture or refunds to the Government are not feasible. [Not only feasible but actual when it comes to those land grants. The railroads got land worth $489,000,000 from the Government, and over the years gave the Government preferential rate treatment worth $1,649,000,000. Net profit to the Government on that deal: $1,160,000,000.—EDITOR.]

EXAGGERATED SCOPE

Having taken care of the "other fellow's subsidy," let us now examine this unique one for American shipping. At the outset it can be said that its scope and amount has been greatly exaggerated. Actually, it is relatively picayune when compared to others paid, and, as will be seen later, Cheddar cheese has received greater financial assistance than the operation of the American merchant marine.

Operating subsidies are restricted to American ships engaged in the foreign commerce of the United States. Our ships in the coastwise and intercoastal services are not eligible for them. Out of 60 companies only 13 are subsidized—a fact which will surprise many who think that all steamship companies are subsidized. In September 1939, before world shipping became affected by the war, there were 141 American subsidized ships, or 55 percent of our dry-cargo tonnage, in foreign trade. Today, with an expanded merchant marine, there are less than 250 ships receiving subsidy, or 38 percent. Incidentally, no payments were made after Pearl Harbor, and they were not resumed until 1947.

The sole purpose of the operating differential is to place an American company at approximately the same cost level as that of his foreign competitors. The payments do not give an American operator full parity with his foreign competitors, as they cover only the difference in wages, subsistence, stores and supplies, repairs and maintenance, and marine insurance. Students of business accounting will note that such higher fixed charges as management, depreciation, and other items are not considered.

VOYAGE BASIS

The Maritime Commission carefully determines this differential between United States and foreign costs for the five items mentioned and payments are made to a company on a voyage basis. Roughly, the vessel expenses on these five items are approximately 45 percent lower under a foreign flag.

A company that accepts an operating subsidy must agree to many regulations imposed upon it by the Maritime Commission under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936. The company must operate a certain number of ships over specified routes on approved schedules and may not operate them on other routes. The size of the crew and wages must not be less than Government requirements. Even the limit of salaries to be paid company executives is set by law. The company is also obliged to set aside reserve funds for new construction. These are only a few of the restrictions placed on a subsidized company and many shipowners find them so confining that they prefer to operate without Government assistance.

Moreover, these payments do not assure a profit or guarantee against a loss. The American company must still solicit cargo and compete for the available cargo. If there is to be a profit, he must operate efficiently. If there are profits of more than 10 percent, they must be held in reserve for a 10-year period. At the end of that time, one-half of this reserve must be returned to the Government, up to the total amount of subsidy paid.

How has this recapture worked out in actual practice? For 10 of the subsidized companies, the first 10-year recapture period has recently expired. Five of the companies have paid back in full every dollar received from Uncle Sam. Another company's earnings were such that the Government recovered 90 percent of its payments. On an over-all basis, 72.5 percent of the subsidy paid the 10 companies has been returned to the Treasury. Of the $40,400,000 paid these companies during the 10 years, some $29,300,000 has been given back. In other words, the subsidy has been at the rate of only $1,100,000 a year.

As to how this compares with other Federal aid let us turn to Senate Document 13, Eightieth Congress, first session, prepared by the Bureau of the Budget, containing a listing of Federal subsidy payment to business and farmers for the fiscal years 1934 through 1946. Topped off by more than $4,000,000,000 in land-conservation payments, it reaches the staggering total of $13,000,000,000.

The figure for ship operating subsidy, covering all companies, is $48,700,000, which places it behind the Commodity Credit Corporation subsidy for cheddar cheese at $67,700,000 and of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation payments for coffee at $51,800,000.

But the Budget Bureau's figures do not include recapture for ship operation and according to the Maritime Commission, the recapture position for all lines in 1947 indicated this subsidy total could be reduced to $21,200,000.

At this figure ship operation slips to the very bottom of the list, dropping below the subsidies for coffee, sheep and lamb, beef production, milk fluid, and wheat for alcohol.

In view of the importance of the American merchant marine as an instrument of national defense and a servant of our overseas commerce, the American taxpayer should have little reason for concern about the modest Government expenses for operating on the oceans of the world the finest merchant marine in our history.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two broadcasts by me, on December 19, 1949, and January 2, 1950, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." They cover programs Nos. 14 and 15.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 14, December 19, 1949)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and extending sincere and whole-hearted Christmas greetings to my fellow citizens of Pennsylvania.

This is a great season of the year for all mankind—for all men and women of good will, regardless of color or creed, who worship one God.

It is, as all know, the most important religious holiday for Christians the world over—the most solemn and, at the same time, the most joyous. This is a monumental season in history and in religion.

It is also a most important time for American citizens of the Jewish faith, as well as for Jews the world over. In this season, falling each year just before Christmas week, is the ancient Jewish holiday of Chanukah, the feast of the candles. One of the important religious celebrations of the Jewish religion, it tends further to emphasize the importance of the season.

This is a time of brotherhood, of kindness and of homage to the spiritual things of life.

It is a time also to count our blessings. We can rejoice that America has been blessed in greater measure than any other nation in history.

As Pennsylvanians we rejoice doubly because so much has been given to our State. I refer not alone to material blessings, although Pennsylvania's portion is so large—with its 171,000 flourishing farms, its 17,000 diversified industrial plants, its annual pay roll of $5,000,000,000.

I speak rather of spiritual blessings.

William Penn, the founder, was a religious, understanding man. Love of God and faith in his fellow men were his inspiration when he launched his holy experiment in the New World. He was a man of peace. The great State's foundations were of social, political, and religious freedom. The brotherhood of man was engraved on its cornerstone. Work, tolerance, and thrift were the principles which guided and built Pennsylvania.

From its beginnings our State has continued in its tradition of Christian tolerance.

Although it has grown great economically, it has never outgrown the spiritual touch which it received at the beginning.

That is why, today, we have more places of worship—cathedrals and churches, meetinghouses, synagogues and temples—than any other State. That is why we have a greater active church membership than other States.

These are good things for Pennsylvanians to keep in mind in the Christmas season.

This fundamentally spiritual side is doubly important.

It has been a priceless end in itself. Americans are better for having it.

But it has also helped our people to build our strong structure of liberty and independence.

In our land the seed of human dignity and freedom was planted in the good soil of love of God, tolerance, work, and thrift. From this seed has grown the tree of America. It is sturdy and strong. Its branches are widespreading enough today to provide shelter, security, and opportunity for 150,000,000 men, women, and children.

So long as we water and cultivate this tree, it will continue to flourish and to serve us as it has served our forefathers.

But we must water it; we must cultivate it. This tree cannot grow in the future as it has in the past if we fail to do our parts.

It is here today because our fathers, our grandfathers, and those who came before them had the will to work, to save, to build, to plan ahead, and to live at peace with the world and with each other. They were courageous. They were self-reliant. They were tolerant.

They did not assume that what had been handed down to them was theirs alone to profit from without effort on their part. They did not assume that no effort on their part was necessary to provide themselves and their families with security.

Today, unfortunately, a substantial number of people in this country accept false assumptions. They think that men no longer have to work for security—that they can simply conjure it up at the ballot box.

They think that a vote for this man or that, for this political party or that, is all that is necessary to assure themselves prosperity, security, peace, and independence.

My fellow Pennsylvanians, the history of the world teaches us that we cannot have these things by substituting legislation for perspiration. We cannot have them by substituting wishful thinking for toil and effort.

The really precious things of life—security, peace, freedom, and human dignity, must be earned the hard way. And, once they are earned in any nation, each succeeding generation must earn them again—or they shall be lost.

History is full of examples that prove this. Ancient Rome built the greatest empire and the finest civilization until comparatively modern times. But, what happened?

The people of Rome, the hard core of this vast empire, grew soft. They refused to work and fight. They said they had done their share of toiling. They said they had reached the pinnacle, and that others should now do the working and fighting for them.

They enlisted legions of mercenaries to fight for them. They brought in slaves to do the work.

The average Roman—the little fellow—what we call "the man in the street"—wound up as the beneficiary, and eventually, as the victim, of bread and circuses.

He demanded hand-outs from his Government—free food and free entertainment. He was a citizen, so his legislators gave him what he wanted.

That was security by legislation substituted for security earned by work.

From that point on the Roman was a goner. The fate of the Roman Empire was sealed.

Hard-muscled barbarians who did not fear work and who did their own fighting closed in. They broke up the greatest empire the world had seen up to that point.

As a footnote, this should be pointed out. These were mostly the same tribes of barbarians whose ancestors had been beaten in war again and again by the fighting, hard-working Romans of the earlier days.

In Great Britain today people are seeking security through legislation. They have turned their country into a socialistic state. The Government is moving in to take over industry after industry. The most recent is steel. In exchange for social services, they are sacrificing freedom. The right to strike has been going out the window. The right to work at a job of one's choice is being restricted. The right of a man to start up a little business of his own is being narrowed sharply.

Taxes are far higher than anything we know in this country. Long after such countries as Belgium, Holland, France, Italy—all very hard hit by the war—have removed nearly all, if not all, of the wartime restrictions—socialistic England continues under rigid ration controls of what a man may buy with his money. He continues to use ration coupons.

Britain, thank heaven, still permits a man to stand up and publicly criticize his Government. It permits him to go to the ballot box to change the party and the system in power.

But how long can these freedoms remain if the spread of socialism—which means leaning on the Government for more and more services and benefits—continues?

My fellow Pennsylvanians, these are matters for us to consider in this holiday season and in all seasons. We must not sacrifice the basic things which gave our Nation such a solid foundation and which fostered its growth until today it has become the world's richest and strongest nation.

We must not assume that because we are in this exalted position today, it is permanent.

We must not assume that toiling and fighting and striving are ended for Americans.

We must not assume that we can permit others to do our work for us and to fight our battles for us.

We must not assume that we no longer need to earn security—that we only have to vote for it.

We must not assume that if we trade individual initiative, individual freedom, the right to do our own thinking and our own acting—for hand-outs from Washington—we can regain these precious rights any time we want to.

Our forefathers in America knew better. They knew the price was eternal vigilance, hard work, and an abiding trust in God.

Earlier, I said this was a time to count our blessings.

Today there is no greater blessing for any man than to be able to say, "I am an American."

To be an American means one may choose his rulers and discard them. It means he may stand in a public place and voice his opinions and views without fear of secret police. It means he may have his day in court if his rights are challenged or threatened, and be protected from arrest at the whim of a dictator.

It means protection by the world's greatest nation.

It means the right to worship openly at the shrine of his choice.

It means greater economic prosperity and greater economic opportunity for all the people, than have ever been offered or enjoyed anywhere else.

Yes, my fellow Pennsylvanians, there is no greater blessing than to be able to say, "I am an American."

In all the rest of the world there is nothing comparable to what we have in our country.

Consider the other nations.

There are dictatorships. There are police states. There are vast areas where religious freedom has been abolished and where such religion as remains is being bent to the will of political dictators.

There are great areas of poverty and hunger. There are large portions of the globe where fear for their lives prevents men from speaking their views of their rulers. There are areas of revolution and turmoil and weakness.

Yes, it is great to be able to say, "I am an American."

You and I can say it today with pride and dignity because our forefathers worked hard, trusted God, and were ever vigilant against encroachments of their freedom.

To keep what we have, I urge that we follow in their footsteps.

Let us work hard.

Let us trust God.

Let us be on guard against encroachments of our rights, no matter what the source.

Then we shall have earned the right to the blessing of being an American.

I think back a few years ago to a wartime Christmas season in 1944. As Governor of Pennsylvania, I spoke at the Christmas tree lighting in the rotunda of the State Capitol Building in Harrisburg.

I spoke of our State's great patriotic service, with approximately 900,000 men in uniform with 4,000,000 other Pennsylvanians producing food and munitions for the United States and our allies.

I reminded that, throughout our history, Pennsylvanians had always responded in the hour of their Nation's need.

Today the shooting war is over. But, today there is still need—as there will always be the need—for men and women to be vigiliantly on guard to protect our heritage. We must protect them so that we can hand on to our posterity the kind of free, independent, God-fearing land which was given into our keeping.

And now, I should like to quote the final sentences of that 1944 Christmas message in the rotunda of the State capitol. They are equally true today:

"All our hopes and aspirations are embraced in the spirit of Christmas. We rejoice that the Christmas spirit lives forever to gladden the hearts of men and to lift them above the cares and strife of a darkened world.

"We rejoice that Christmas manifests itself in love and kindness and brings hope to those who live in the shadow of tyranny and oppression.

"We are thankful that Christmas brings assurance of brighter, happier times to come, when justice and brotherhood will rule, under God, in a world of universal freedom and peace."

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. The season's greetings and God bless you all.

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 15, January 2, 1950)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

As we go into a new year, the Eighty-first Congress is about to open its second session. Congress must handle many critical issues in the months ahead.

It will be called upon to determine whether we shall protect our national solvency by returning to sound fiscal policies.

On the international front it must face vital new problems due to the Communist conquest of all China.

In a time like this, you have a right to know where your Senator stands on the big issues ahead. It gives you an opportunity to tell him how you—the people—feel on these matters. As your Senator, and before that, as your Governor, I have sought and welcomed the views and opinions of the people of our State.

In this broadcast I propose to discuss where I stand on the big issues which will reach Congress.

But first I would like to point out some encouraging signs that I have encountered among the people back home. I have found that more and more Pennsylvanians have developed a deeper interest in the kind of government they have been getting from Washington.

They are showing greater concern over socialized proposals, deficit financing, increased taxes, foreign policy, and Government inefficiency.

More and more they are asking these questions:

"How can we continue as a free government if we spend more than we take in?"

"How can we have all of these so-called social-welfare benefits without paying for them in higher taxes?"

And the question that stands out above the others is this:

"How can we have security from the cradle to the grave without surrendering our liberty and freedom to an all-powerful central government?"

I am happy to report that the people have made it clear to me that they prefer liberty and opportunity under the American system of individual freedom rather than the false hope of security under a socialized state. I shall be guided by that fundamental principle.

On the subject of Federal taxing and spending I stand just where I stood when I came to Washington 3 years ago.

I believe government costs too much and reaches too deeply into the pockets of our people. Government has grown too big and too complex. I favor, and shall vote for, lower taxes and less expensive government. That means I shall work for a balanced budget, economy, efficiency, and the elimination of waste and extravagance.

I favor removal of nearly all of the wartime excise taxes. These taxes, in peacetime, are an unfair burden on the individual consumer. They are a drag on business. Elimination of these taxes will stimulate buying. It will increase the number of

productive jobs. It will create new income for workers. And in the end the increase in income-tax payments will offset any revenue loss caused by the removal of these nuisance taxes.

The matter of civil-rights legislation will be coming up early in this session and may become involved in filibustering tactics.

Never in my life have I tried, by filibuster, to prevent a vote on any issue. I believe that, after reasonable debate, every important bill should come to a vote for an honest decision. Last year I voted for a change in the Senate rules to curb unlimited debate and to give bills a chance. I shall continue my efforts to bring the civil-rights bill to a final vote and shall support a sound civil-rights program.

Let me remind my fellow Pennsylvanians of this—the filibuster has never been used by Republicans to block a vote on civil rights. I regret this fact is sometimes forgotten.

Early in the session legislation to liberalize the Displaced Persons Act will come before the Senate. The present law, for which I voted in the Eightieth Congress, is being carefully studied by the Senate Judiciary Committee. That committee is required to report its findings not later than January 25. I shall give this report careful consideration and will vote for amendments to remove any injustices or inequalities in the existing law.

We Pennsylvanians live in a State which is a true melting pot. Our people are of all creeds and races. Our people come from many different nationality stocks.

Pennsylvania is proof that diverse races and nationality groups can live together and work together in harmony. Pennsylvania's greatness has been built upon this blending.

In the field of labor, I shall continue to support the principles of the Taft-Hartley Act. Like many others, I do not believe that the law today is perfect. I think it can be improved in several respects. A few months ago Republicans and Democrats joined in an effort to improve it. We brought forth a score of amendments to remove inequities. What happened?

Why, the administration pigeonholed our bill. It did not want the Taft-Hartley Act improved. It would accept nothing short of outright repeal.

The Taft-Hartley law was not improved in 1949 solely because the administration leaders in the House blocked the proposed amendments after they had passed the Senate.

They called it a slave-labor law. Well, look around. After 3 years, nobody has been enslaved—not even a little bit. The individual worker is better off than ever. The only thing that has happened is this. His union leaders now have a greater responsibility to him and to the public.

Our State Department is close to recognition of Communist China. I am flatly opposed to such recognition. I believe the President and the State Department are guilty of a terrible blunder in China. In coming years, this might prove to be the worst blunder in our entire international history.

The administration in power and the State Department betrayed China at Yalta and Potsdam. Later they refused to aid the Nationalist Chinese Government—our wartime ally. Instead, they permitted the Nationalist Government to go down to defeat, crushed by Communist forces, armed and advised by Soviet Russia. Thus, our administration surrendered 500,000,000 Chinese to communism. The way was opened for the expansion of communism all over east Asia.

Now the administration proposes to compound its colossal blunder. It would give its recognition and its blessing to the Chinese Communist Government. I have opposed our Chinese policy and I shall continue to oppose it.

If our kind of government is to survive, we must not compromise with communism anywhere.

I have supported the Hoover program for the reorganization and consolidation of the sprawling and conflicting agencies which clutter up Washington. The Hoover Commission recommendations would eliminate waste, overlapping, and duplication. They would save from three to four billion dollars a year for the taxpayers. I shall continue to vote for sound reorganization proposals in the interest of economy and efficiency.

Another bill, slated for Senate action early this year, would legalize the basing point method of freight charges on commodities, except where such basing points are in restraint of trade. This bill is important for the protection of jobs in our Pennsylvania factories. I have had many communications from Pennsylvania businessmen and labor organizations approving it. I shall vote for the passage of this measure.

Shortly before the close of the last session of Congress, the House passed a measure to extend social security. I am in favor of broadening the base of our social-security system to provide protection for more people. For example, I shall vote to permit coverage for the self-employed. At present the self-employed have no protection under the law, although they are taxed for its upkeep.

There are some measures expected to reach the Senate this year which I shall continue to oppose as I have opposed them in the past. I refer particularly to the Brannan plan of farm subsidies, socialized medicine and Federal aid to education.

If you study these three measures you will discover that they share the same objectionable feature—they open the door to strong, centralized Federal control over large segments of American life.

They promise something for nothing. Actually, they must result in extra taxes on our workers to pay the bill.

The Brannan plan was beaten in Congress in 1949. But it is expected to be revived in 1950. Under the Brannan plan, the Federal Government would have the American farmer by the throat. The Government would be able to dictate to the farmer, to an extent far greater than ever before, what he could and could not grow and how he must use his land.

Once that principle is established, there is no telling how far future administrations might carry it. The national farm organizations have been fighting this scheme bitterly. They know it means the end of free enterprise on the farm.

Under socialized medicine, the Government would move in on the Nation's physicians and dentists. They would be controlled just as the farmer would be controlled. The average citizen would suffer under assembly line, mass production treatment. He is being told this would be free. Actually, he would be taxed heavily to pay for inadequate service plus the cost of Government red tape, just as in England.

I voted against Federal aid to education in 1949, when it was before the Senate. The measure is now in the House of Representatives. If the bill should be amended by the House, the Senate would be asked to vote again on the new version.

I shall continue to vote "no." This bill shatters a fundamental cornerstone of the American school system.

It opens the door to very strong central control over education from Washington. It breaks down our traditional State and local controls. It threatens to destroy the free educational system of America.

As Pennsylvanians, there is another thing we must keep in mind on all these proposed new services from Washington—the high price we must pay.

Invariably such new experiments are costly for Pennsylvanians. They involve new spending, with Washington collecting the money and reallocating it among the States.

Under this system Pennsylvania always gets back—as its share—a small percentage of what it contributes. It is always taxed for the benefit of other States.

As a Member of the United States Senate, I must naturally consider legislation from the viewpoint of what is good for the Nation. But as a Senator from Pennsylvania, I must also consider legislation as it affects the interest of our State and all its people.

And when I find— as I find in these cases— that what is best for the State in the long run, and what is best for the Nation in the long run—is exactly the same, then I know that I am right.

I have discussed the outstanding problems that will come before Congress early in the session.

But to my mind the greatest issue, involving the stability of our Republic and the preservation of American freedom, is the threat of national bankruptcy.

We cannot continue deficit financing. We must balance the budget. The administration argues that a balanced budget can be achieved only by increasing taxes.

I challenge that philosophy.

The traditional American way is to cut spending to fit our income.

Let us save America by returning to that sound, time-tested plan as an established policy of government.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and extending to all my fellow Pennsylvanians my sincere wishes for a happy and prosperous new year.

A Suggestion for Reducing Federal Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting editorial written by John A. Kennedy, editor and publisher of the San Diego Journal. The suggestions made deserve full consideration and public discussion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FROM THE EDITOR'S DESK

As I sat in the press gallery on Capitol Hill this week listening to congressional debate over the budget deficit, it occurred to me one more or less painless way to cut Federal spending would be to put Government services on a cafeteria-style or pay-for-what-you-get basis.

What I propose is simply to fix a charge on some of the many important and special functions Uncle Sam now renders free to his citizens. They are worth hard cash to groups and individuals now receiving them gratuitously.

For example, Joe Doe thinks nothing of paying the county $2 for a marriage license

or the State a similar amount for a driver's permit. If the city lays a new road and sidewalk in front of his home, he expects to pay a pro rata share of the cost. His gasoline taxes generally build and maintain highways.

But almost without exception, the Federal Government makes no charge, or a nominal one, for licensing and inspection which directly benefit special interests and individuals.

Why, for example, should Uncle Sam not exact a payment for the valuable export licenses the Department of Commerce issues to businessmen? Or for the certificates of operation, charters and inspection services given gratis to interstate motor and freight carriers by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why shouldn't the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Maritime Commission be reimbursed at least for the paper work involved in issuing charters to aviation and shipping companies?

Is there any reason why the Federal Communications Commission should not charge for the valuable franchises it dispenses in the form of licenses every 3 years to the more than 2,000 broadcasting stations on the air? These broadcasters are in business not only as a public service but obviously because radio appeals to them as a pleasant way of earning their bread and butter.

Many hundreds of free services performed by the Agriculture and Interior Departments for farm and other interests are even more to the point.

Take the case of the proposed purchase of American Overseas Airlines by Pan American for $17,500,000. An examiner and Federal staffs have been working on the case for many months. Why shouldn't the buyer and seller reimburse the Government for its costs in handling the sought-after approval.

Drew Pearson, Bob Allen, and a Baltimore group are seeking the frequency of WBAL, Baltimore, after the FCC set the station's license renewal for hearing over alleged rules' infractions. This Pearson et al. request probably has cost the Government more than $50,000 already. The Pearson group probably would be glad to pay their way.

I am also in the radio and television business. Why shouldn't I pay the Government for servicing my various requests which have helped make my radio businesses profitable?

The railroads want about $100,000,000 more a year for handling mail. Let them pay the cost of their hearing before the Interstate Commerce Commission.

When the telephone company wants a rate increase or something of value from the FCC let it pay for the cost of the hearings.

Power companies seek grants from the Federal Power Commission—corporations want Securities and Exchange Commission approval for issuing stocks and bonds. You can multiply the examples a thousandfold. Let them pay for what they get and not cause a tax boost from the rest of the public.

To take other examples more directly affecting the man in the street rather than the entrepreneur, over 500,000 pilots and technicians hold CAA licenses for which they pay absolutely nothing. Another 80,000 amateur radio "hams" and 60,000 commercial radio operators get their 5-year licenses at no cost from the FCC. Could payment of a token $2 to $5 for the paper work involved in preparation of these valuable pieces of paper be considered discriminating by these licensees?

Then there is the mammoth Government Printing Office, which distributes the bulk of its output without cost. It is true that a nominal charge, reflecting only actual printing, not preparation, costs is placed on these documents prepared at the request of individual Government agencies. But those folk enterprising and knowing enough to ask for the publications at their congressional offices or at the originating Government agency usually get them "for free." Why?

In 1947, the Public Printer sold 36,000,000 pamphlets for $3,238,000. But over twice that number—86,000,000—were distributed free through offices on Capitol Hill and elsewhere.

Despite the hue and cry against pyramiding high taxes, we have long since accepted at least the principle of taxation according to ability to pay. Why should we object, therefore, to paying directly cash-on-the-line for specific services rendered particular groups by Government agencies?

I imagine that some skeptics will look down their noses at this suggestion as providing too little in additional Government moneys to offset the added headaches of bureaucratic bookkeeping.

But this is to ignore the basic fact that multiplied throughout the whole fabric of Government, such fees could be fixed on the cost of services performed and could add up to a lot of money for the Treasury.

We are headed for an estimated $5,000,000,000 deficit this year.

About 80 cents of every budget dollar is earmarked for defense purposes or in payment of past wars, leaving only 20 cents for peacetime expenditures. This 20 cents must be shaved to bring us within sight of a balanced economy.

Proposals of the Hoover Commission for streamlining the clumsy superstructure of Government—most of which have already been endorsed by this paper—will help.

But I respectfully suggest that putting Uncle Sam more on a cash-on-the-line basis in his dealings with John Q. Public—in the best tradition of American business—might help to take some of the red out of our national bookkeeping.

JOHN A. KENNEDY,
Editor and Publisher.

Nonagricultural Employment in North Dakota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by William R. Waind, cooperating representative of the North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, dated December 19, 1949, and the analysis and table dealing with the nonagricultural-employment situation in North Dakota enclosed with his letter.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, Bismarck, N. Dak., in cooperation with U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics]

DECEMBER 19, 1949.

GENTLEMEN: On November 18 we forwarded to you our first estimates on nonagricultural employment for manufacturing industries in North Dakota, based on figures obtained from cooperating employers. At that time, we stated that in the near future we would be able to release estimates on total nonagricultural employment. We are enclosing our estimates on total nonagricultural employment for the years 1947, 1948 and the first 11 months of 1949.

Please note that estimates of employment in the construction industry for 1949 are not available. These estimates have been included for the years of 1947 and 1948, and we hope to be able to provide current estimates for this industry in a short time.

Month-to-month estimates of nonagricultural employment will be forwarded to you on a regular monthly basis.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM R. WAIND,
Cooperating Representative.

[North Dakota State Employment Service and North Dakota Unemployment Compensation Division, Bismarck, N. Dak., in cooperation with U. S. Bureau of Labor Statistics, November 1949]

An analysis of nonagricultural employment (excluding construction) in North Dakota shows that in 1949 average employment during the first 11 months has come within 0.3 percent of that obtained in the peak year of 1948. Specifically for the first 11 months of the year nonagricultural employment (excluding construction) has averaged 100,047 per month, while averaging 100,380 per month during 1948.

Month to month figures show that we exceeded 1948 employment during the period March through September, but have fallen below 1948 during the months January, February, October, and November. Current estimates put November employment at 102,120, a decline of 1,000 from November of 1948.

The principle contributing factor to the over-all decline in employment in 1948 was the decline in the number employed in the railroad industry. This industry employed an average of 1,433 less per month in 1949 than in 1948 due largely to the completion of the construction program carried on in the State by the railroads in 1948.

Industries reporting major gains over 1948 were Government, with an average monthly increase of 858 (due to such projects as Garrison Dam, Reclamation projects, etc.); communication and other public utilities up 334 per month; and wholesale and retail trade up 313.

Manufacturing employment recorded a decline (average 258 per month) from 1948. This decline was centered entirely in the nondurable group and was largely due a decline in employment in the manufacture of food and kindred products. The durable goods group reported an over-all gain largely as a result of increased employment in the stone, clay, and glass industry.

The 1949 employment averaged 6.1 percent more than the 1947 average monthly employment of 94,310. Here, too, major increases were reported in the Government, wholesale, and retail trade, and communication and other public utilities groups. These gains were offset somewhat by declines in manufacturing and in railroad employment.

In the period under consideration (1947–49) the largest increase in nonagricultural employment (including construction) came between 1947 and 1948. The 1948 employment averaged 8,113 more per month than it did in 1947. Increases in construction (up 2,042 per month), railroads (up 1,238 per month), wholesale and retail trade (up 2,783 per month), and Government (up 1,442 per month) were the principal factors behind the over-all increase. During this period the only industries recording declines were mining, down 29 per month, and manufacturing, down 36.

Estimated nonagricultural employment

JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1947

Industry	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May	June	July	Aug.	Sept.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.
Total nonagricultural employment [1]	93,330	93,110	94,770	96,430	98,380	99,920	100,480	101,130	102,160	102,460	102,910	103,460
Mining	800	770	730	740	770	770	800	820	780	900	900	830
Construction	3,010	2,910	2,830	3,540	4,840	5,520	6,180	6,470	6,190	5,830	5,220	4,330
Building construction	1,190	1,130	1,100	1,410	1,760	1,920	2,180	2,280	2,250	2,070	1,870	1,640
General construction	550	490	390	660	1,340	1,790	2,130	2,290	2,030	1,830	1,470	890
Special trade construction	1,270	1,290	1,340	1,470	1,740	1,810	1,870	1,900	1,910	1,930	1,880	1,800
Manufacturing	5,800	5,700	5,930	6,020	6,100	6,270	6,430	6,350	6,260	6,230	6,380	6,190
Durable goods	700	710	740	770	810	850	860	820	760	840	830	830
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	20
Stone, clay, and glass	130	130	140	160	200	250	260	230	210	230	200	160
Primary and fabricated metals	230	230	260	250	250	240	210	190	180	170	200	260
Machinery and transportation equipment	220	230	220	230	230	230	270	280	250	310	300	300
Other durable goods	90	90	90	100	100	100	90	90	90	100	100	90
Nondurable goods	5,100	4,990	5,190	5,250	5,290	5,420	5,570	5,530	5,500	5,390	5,550	5,360
Food and kindred products	3,850	3,740	3,930	3,990	4,050	4,170	4,300	4,300	4,260	4,150	4,290	4,070
Printing and publishing	1,010	1,000	1,020	1,030	1,020	1,040	1,050	1,010	1,020	1,030	1,040	1,070
Other nondurable goods	240	250	240	230	220	210	220	220	220	210	220	220
Railroads	7,990	7,980	7,940	8,220	8,340	8,500	8,530	8,540	8,440	8,370	8,360	8,110
Transportation	1,900	1,940	1,860	1,760	1,840	1,870	1,940	1,950	1,970	2,050	2,100	2,120
Communication and other public utilities	3,000	2,960	3,040	2,950	3,020	3,220	3,250	3,240	3,240	3,150	3,150	3,100
Trade	30,690	30,390	31,110	31,440	31,670	32,400	32,510	32,990	33,720	34,080	34,800	35,530
Wholesale trade	8,630	8,600	8,790	9,160	9,290	9,610	9,470	9,740	9,800	9,770	9,950	9,830
Retail trade	22,060	21,790	22,320	22,280	22,380	22,790	23,040	23,250	23,920	24,310	24,850	25,700
Finance, insurance, and real estate	2,770	2,750	2,820	2,890	2,940	3,010	3,040	3,040	3,070	3,070	3,000	3,030
Service (excludes domestic)	12,370	12,410	12,710	12,770	12,760	12,660	12,600	12,530	12,690	12,780	12,900	12,820
Government	25,000	25,300	25,800	26,100	26,100	25,700	25,200	25,200	25,800	26,000	26,100	27,400

JANUARY TO DECEMBER 1948

Total nonagricultural employment [1]	101,540	101,240	101,260	103,530	106,330	110,000	109,650	109,940	110,670	111,200	110,950	109,580
Mining	760	730	720	690	720	760	780	810	850	840	820	780
Construction	3,920	3,780	3,630	4,900	6,890	8,740	9,090	9,370	8,980	8,610	7,830	5,630
Building construction	1,310	1,270	1,380	1,940	2,610	3,490	3,250	3,420	3,260	3,180	2,880	2,170
General construction	720	680	590	1,040	2,080	2,680	3,180	3,200	3,060	2,660	2,050	990
Special trade construction	1,890	1,830	1,660	1,920	2,210	2,560	2,660	2,750	2,660	2,770	2,900	2,470
Manufacturing	5,810	5,620	5,620	5,750	6,090	6,370	6,350	6,440	6,460	6,280	6,380	6,060
Durable goods	810	850	880	960	910	930	890	890	850	870	860	870
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	30	40	40	50	50	50	40	50	60	60	40	40
Stone, clay and glass	160	170	180	210	250	290	310	310	260	240	240	220
Primary and fabricated metals	280	290	300	380	300	270	210	200	190	230	240	260
Machinery and transportation equipment	250	260	260	230	220	230	240	240	250	250	250	250
Other durable goods	90	90	100	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	100
Nondurable goods	5,000	4,770	4,740	4,790	5,180	5,440	5,460	5,550	5,610	5,410	5,520	5,190
Food and kindred products	3,720	3,490	3,440	3,480	3,850	4,110	4,110	4,200	4,260	4,000	4,110	3,800
Printing and publishing	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,070	1,100	1,090	1,120	1,130	1,120	1,170	1,170	1,160
Other nondurable goods	210	210	230	240	230	240	230	220	230	240	240	230
Railroads	9,330	9,230	9,240	9,480	9,460	9,710	9,800	9,810	9,710	9,650	9,460	9,290
Transportation	1,990	1,930	1,900	1,840	1,900	2,020	2,000	2,010	2,020	2,180	2,190	2,140
Communication and other public utilities	3,210	3,290	3,270	3,340	3,440	3,580	3,670	3,650	3,630	3,590	3,640	3,560
Trade	33,600	33,780	33,770	34,050	34,510	35,820	35,790	35,650	35,940	36,820	37,350	37,650
Wholesale trade	9,250	9,270	9,170	9,290	9,380	9,800	9,770	9,780	9,950	9,990	9,960	9,790
Retail trade	24,350	24,510	24,600	24,760	25,130	26,020	26,020	25,870	25,990	26,830	27,390	27,860
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3,070	3,040	3,060	3,130	3,110	3,290	3,220	3,230	3,220	3,230	3,200	3,220
Service (excludes domestic)	12,650	12,640	12,450	12,450	12,510	12,810	12,850	12,770	12,760	12,700	12,780	12,750
Government	27,200	27,200	27,600	27,900	27,700	26,900	26,100	26,200	27,100	27,300	27,300	28,500

JANUARY TO NOVEMBER 1949 [2]

Industry	January	February	March	April	May	June	July	August	September	October	November
Total nonagricultural employment [1]	97,410	96,100	97,710	99,600	99,820	101,450	100,960	101,040	102,060	102,250	102,120
Mining	760	790	780	650	690	760	770	770	790	820	810
Manufacturing	5,730	5,380	5,620	5,700	5,660	6,010	5,950	5,970	5,920	6,090	6,040
Durable goods	850	780	860	910	930	1,030	1,050	1,060	1,040	1,050	990
Lumber, wood products, furniture and fixtures	50	60	60	50	50	60	60	60	60	60	60
Stone, clay, and glass	190	160	200	260	310	340	360	370	370	360	310
Primary and fabricated metals	290	250	270	280	230	260	250	240	240	250	250
Machinery and transportation equipment	230	220	240	230	250	280	290	300	280	290	280
Other durable goods	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90	90
Nondurable goods	4,880	4,600	4,760	4,790	4,730	4,980	4,900	4,910	4,880	5,040	5,050
Food and kindred products	3,500	3,220	3,370	3,390	3,350	3,580	3,550	3,530	3,490	3,630	3,650
Printing and publishing	1,150	1,140	1,160	1,160	1,150	1,150	1,140	1,170	1,180	1,200	1,190
Other nondurable goods	230	240	230	240	230	250	210	210	210	210	210
Railroads	7,610	7,630	7,520	7,920	8,040	8,320	8,500	8,430	8,170	7,830	7,710
Transportation	1,980	1,970	1,980	1,910	1,890	1,820	1,880	2,010	1,970	2,050	2,040
Communication and other public utilities	3,460	3,550	3,590	3,740	3,840	4,000	4,080	4,110	4,090	3,940	3,920
Trade	34,260	33,510	33,940	35,700	35,600	36,420	36,010	35,690	36,200	36,580	36,920
Wholesale trade	9,420	9,370	9,320	9,730	9,800	10,150	10,170	10,120	10,300	10,240	10,170
Retail trade	24,840	24,140	24,620	25,970	25,800	26,270	25,840	25,570	25,900	26,340	26,750
Finance, insurance, and real estate	3,290	3,230	3,240	3,260	3,280	3,360	3,390	3,410	3,370	3,380	3,390
Service (excludes domestic)	12,420	12,340	13,140	12,820	12,720	12,760	12,780	12,750	12,850	12,860	12,890
Government	27,900	27,700	27,900	27,900	28,100	28,000	27,600	27,900	28,700	28,700	28,400

[1] Figures rounded to nearest 10.
[2] Estimates not available for construction workers.

Definition of employment: Data include all full- and part-time wage and salary workers who were employed during the pay period nearest the 15th of the month. Proprietors, self-employed, and members of the armed forces are excluded. Government employment excludes fourth-class postmasters and substitute rural mail carriers. State and local government data excludes those who receive only nominal amounts of pay. Regular teachers on unpaid as well as paid vacations are included. These estimates are based on employers' reports to the North Dakota unemployment compensation division and the State employment service in cooperation with the Bureau of Labor Statistics.

A World in Which Right Will Be the Master of Might, and Peace Will Reign in the Hearts of Men

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, last night I had the very great pleasure of listening to the recently elected junior Senator from my own beloved State of New York, the Honorable HERBERT H. LEHMAN, as he addressed the 600 guests present at the dinner given by the Men's Club of the Adas Israel Congregation of Washington.

It was a remarkable gathering, Mr. Speaker, and it was a remarkable speech, which I am proud and happy to insert in the RECORD, under leave, as part of my remarks.

The Adas Israel Temple is, I believe, the largest congregation of Judaism in Washington, and the largest conservative Jewish congregation in the southeastern part of the United States.

I am sure that many of those present reflected, as I did, on the fact that only in the English-speaking democracies of the Western World would this gathering have been possible; and that, of course, is the reason that those of us who love and honor America for its hospitality to all minorities oppose, with all our strength and courage, any deliberate incitation of bigotry or discrimination, and work equally hard to make sure that where discrimination exists it is destroyed, as a surgeon might cut out and destroy a diseased organ to save the whole.

It seems to me especially significant that it was in the victory of Senator LEHMAN that President Truman's Fair Deal administration—a philosophy of government stemming straight from Jefferson and Jackson by way of Wilson and Roosevelt—was vindicated and confirmed as the choice of the people of the United States.

As you read the words of his address you will understand why the people of New York, who twice chose him governor, chose him last fall as their Senator.

Senator LEHMAN'S speech follows, Mr. Speaker; and I am sure that you will agree with me that it is an expression of democratic philosophy worthy of the late Franklin D. Roosevelt's successor as Governor of the great State of New York.

It is not too hopeful, I am sure, to believe that the day will come when we will have built a world in which men will seek to help their neighbors, and not to harm them; a world in which right will be the master of might, and peace will reign in the hearts of men; and a world in which there will be no hatred or prejudice as to race, creed, or nationality.

No, I do not think that this is too visionary. I do not think that it is impossible or impractical to build a world in which the basic principle of the brotherhood of man—the oneness of the human race under God—will be recognized and accepted as the first law and the Gospel of all humankind. Yet, for the construction of this bright but not impossible world, certain rules must be observed, certain conditions must be accepted by those of us who would build and who would lay the stones for this shining future.

If we are to build a world of security and lasting peace, we must fashion the structure on the immortal words of the prophet Micah: "What doth the Lord require of thee, but to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with thy God." The very hope of lasting peace is destroyed if we permit injustice to any group, or any individual, or any nation. Spiritual freedom, as well as social and economic security, can survive only where there is exact and even-handed justice to all. There can be no security for one unless there is justice for all.

NEED NOT YIELD

In spite of obvious disappointments and discouragements, I still believe with all my heart that a world of security and lasting peace can be built, providing we show enough patience, good will, and understanding. We need not yield any of our fundamental principles to do so. On my many trips to war-ravaged countries both during and since the war I met and talked to peoples as well as to governments. I found that peoples generally wherever they lived, deep in their hearts, want just about the same things that we want—freedom, security, and lasting peace. It is the solemn duty of all of us, regardless of creed or race, to give the utmost of our strength and faith to the secure building of a world society in which peoples and nations will work together for their common welfare and for lasting security. Men must be freed from fear and blind hatreds. Hatred and fear can tear down but cannot create.

In this country, the well-being of the individual is the concern of all. This is our chief advantage, our blessing, in contrast to many other great areas of the earth. This is the most precious heritage we received from the founding fathers. But this heritage, wrung from centuries of inspiration and struggle in the old world, was not lightly preserved here. It took vigilance and courage, pain and suffering, and heroism and sacrifice to protect this heritage, to enhance it and to adapt it to an everchanging nation.

In other parts of the world this ideal of individualism and the national concern for the individual have never taken root. And because of this fact, evil men have been able to seize power in some of those areas and crush the individual under the heavy heel of oppression and tyranny.

Thus we must never take for granted those rights which we call inalienable. We can never afford to be supine or complacent in the enjoyment of these rights. We must win them anew each year, and again each generation. We must extend them and protect them against onslaught from without or decay from within.

THE URGENT QUESTION

Nor is that all. We can never really have these rights, and certainly not retain them, if the opportunity to enjoy them is not shared by all the people, equally, without regard to economic, social, or racial origin. "No one can be perfectly free until all are free", said Herbert Spencer, the philosopher. And those of us who do not wage unremitting war to free all men, and to extend equal rights to all our neighbors, will end by losing our rights too.

The urgent question for us is how we can solve our social and economic problems upon a reasonable basis, and by the application of truly democratic principles. We must prove that democracy is not an insensible machine of Government, but a living thing; that its soul is the soul of its people and that it grows and develops to meet the needs and ideals of its citizens. Only so long as democracy remains alive to the needs and aspirations of its people, will it continue to retain its strength. It is our duty and our responsibility to see that it does so. Any other course leads to stagnation, and ultimate decay.

Perhaps these words sound a trifle unreal, perhaps even empty and hollow in a world convulsed by fear, and overshadowed by the atom bomb and the hydrogen bomb, and in an atmosphere heavy with hate and foreboding. Yet we must not, we cannot, lose faith in the truths by which we live, even in the valley of the shadow through which we now walk. We must believe and practice the truths of a living faith, although we are beset on every side by the dangers and temptations of apostasy.

Recently we emerged, or thought we had emerged, from a trial of strength with the forces of evil and darkness. We had vanquished fascism, or so we thought, and now the world could bind up its wounds and return to the ways of peace, to the unsolved problems of everyday living. But almost immediately our dream of peace and quiet was rudely disturbed. A new assault upon our civilization, upon our values, and our truths gathered and struck.

SPIRITUALLY IDEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

We are in the midst of that crisis today. We have, I hope, successfully passed through a major part of it. We have built up the bulwarks of other nations against aggression from without and have helped strengthen their internal fiber against subversion from within. But while we have done much, and must continue to do much in this material way, we are, I fear, inclined to neglect our own defenses and to neglect some of our most important resources for this great struggle.

No; I do not refer to our military defenses or to our physical resources. We are doing as well as can be expected with those. I refer instead to our spiritual defenses and our ideological resources.

Today the battle of ideas precedes the battle of arms. The initial assault is by infiltration of sinister philosophies and concepts. The method of attack is subtle. In many countries it has been effective. Its object is to weaken morale, to sabotage loyalty, to divide the nation into groups which can be played one against the other. Our best defense against such attacks is to rededicate ourselves to the democratic and religious principles by which we live and which our enemies hate and seek to destroy. Attempts to weaken morale must be answered by a crusading faith. Attempts to divide us must be answered by complete unity and by a militant devotion to the principles of religious freedom and civil equality. Injustice to any group or any individual will eventually tear down the structure of democracy itself. Democracy can survive only where there is exact and even-handed justice to all.

A FULL DEMOCRACY

Should we let down our defenses in our democratic practices, should we permit the rights of some of our people to be denied or withheld, for any reason, should we deny equal justice to any in our midst—even to those who would deny it to us—should we do any of these things, we invite defeat and disaster. The fortress is only as strong as its weakest point. Our Nation is weakest where its democracy is weakest—in the partial denial of rights and privileges to racial minorities, and in the withholding of full

social justice from vast numbers of the underprivileged. Democracy, like religion, is an expression of faith, a call to duty from which no man may draw back. Democracy must be supported by a militant faith, and by a willingness to crusade for that faith, and to abide by it in all ways and in all relationships. Democracy is not a faith to be held only when it is pleasant and convenient. Democracy is not a habit to be worn only on fair days. Sometimes democracy is awkward, and uncomfortable. Sometimes it involves danger. But if it is good at all, it is good all the time.

But even democracy is mere form without content, unless it bears at its center an inner faith in the goodness of God. In the sanctity of the human soul, and in the brotherhood of man under God. First we must be loyal to these concepts, or our devotion to democracy is tinsel and dross. If our spiritual faith is weakened, we will not prevail in the struggles ahead.

So let us proceed, let us go forward, arm in arm and shoulder to shoulder, full in our faith, full in our devotion to each other and to all our countrymen, resolved to combat evil from whatever source, and to shout in chorus, so that all the world will hear, "freedom is for every man." As we would not be slaves, so we do not wish to be masters.

Rise up with us, look up with us. Join us. See how, just over the horizon, lie the green valleys, of peace, and brotherhood and understanding.

Bills Endanger Farm Radios

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLINTON P. ANDERSON
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Bills Endanger Farm Radios," published in the December issue of the National Live Stock Producer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BILLS ENDANGER FARM RADIOS

When Congress convenes next January renewed efforts will probably be made to pass legislation which well-informed opponents declare would seriously affect radio service to a large part of the Nation's farm population.

Adequate service to rural and sparsely populated parts of the country is a major problem of national broadcasting and Federal regulation. Most radio listeners do not realize that there is any distinction between service in city areas and that available to the farm population. Not only is there a great difference in favor of the city listener, but pending legislation which the average city radio fan knows nothing about would move him in on the already inadequate farm service according to evidence placed before the Federal Communications Commission. This agency has been hearing about the matter for 3 years. Incidentally, national farm organizations have taken note of the situation. While the result so far has been to postpone passage of pending bills, the threat is still present.

Radio listeners in metropolitan areas have a wide choice of programs and strong, clear reception, due to being served by several or as many as 20 stations in their immediate vicinity. Millions of farm listeners, however, must put up with weak signals, much static, and a limited number of stations. The only way they can get anything approaching adequate service is through what are termed "clear channel" stations. Broadly speaking, these are stations which do not share their frequency at night.

These clear-channel stations, it is estimated, furnish the only night-time broadcast service available to people in more than 75 percent of the country's area. In behalf of this bloc of radio listeners, the Federal Commission has been told that they do not now receive adequate night-time broadcast service in terms of signal strength. This is due to the presence of static and other interference. Some areas receive no broadcast service during the day.

Instead of curtailing clear-channel service, it is argued that the only way to properly serve a large part of the Nation's population in rural areas is to not only maintain clear-channel broadcasting but also to increase their power. Where they now have only 50-kilowatt power it is believed that the present signal strength of such stations should be greatly increased.

This is where pending legislation comes in. Two bills, S. 491 and H. R. 4004, it is charged by farm opponents as well as by the clear-channel stations affected, would limit the Federal Commission's authority by forbidding the licensing of clear-channel stations with power in excess of 50 kilowatts. The bills also would require "duplication" on clear channels; in short, the placing of other stations, each operating with power up to 50 kilowatts on each clear channel.

It is considered virtually certain that the effect would be to increase the number of stations serving city listeners, at the expense of cutting in on the reception strength of the rural listener. While some farm organizations have taken a stand opposing these bills, many farm listeners are not sufficiently aware of the situation.

Federal Spending Facts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a review of the President's budget for fiscal year 1951, under the heading "Federal spending facts," prepared by Mr. Alvin A. Burger, director of research, Council of State Chambers of Commerce.

An estimate from the Government Printing Office indicates that the manuscript will make in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD one-fourth of a page more than the two printed pages allowed under the rule without a statement of cost, and that the cost will be $184.50.

There being no objection, the review was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Federal spending facts, Council of State Chambers of Commerce]

A REVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT'S BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 1951

The 1951 budget at a glance—Estimated expenditures

Function:	
International affairs and finance	$4,711,000,000
National defense	13,545,000,000
Veterans' services and benefits	6,080,000,000
Social welfare, health, and security	2,714,000,000
Housing and community development	1,329,000,000
Education and general research	434,000,000
Agriculture and agricultural resources	2,206,000,000
Natural resources	2,218,000,000
Transportation and communication	1,682,000,000
Finance, commerce, and industry	212,000,000
Labor	243,000,000
General government	1,267,000,000
Interest on the public debt	5,625,000,000
Reserve for contingencies	175,000,000
Total expenditures	42,439,000,000
Estimated receipts	[1] 37,306,000,000
Estimated deficit	5,133,000,000

[1] The President will shortly recommend to Congress "certain adjustments" in the tax laws which, if approved, would produce some net additional revenue in 1951.

Here are some of the salient facts which stand out in a review of the President's 1951 budget message as submitted to Congress on January 9:

1. For the fourth successive year since the end of World War II President Truman has presented to Congress a Federal spending budget higher in amount than the one submitted by him the year before. Each successive request has set a new all-time record for Government spending in peacetime.

2. By requesting authority to spend some $5,000,000,000 in excess of anticipated revenues in 1951, the President beckons us to take another long step in the deficit-financing abyss down which this Nation has traveled for 18 out of the last 20 years.

3. According to the President, $12,100,000,000 or 29 percent of the $42,400,000,000 budget total for 1951 will go to meet obligations incurred in 1950 or earlier. This illustrates the costly effect of "foot-in-the-door" commitments made in previous years for the starting of new spending programs and new public works projects financed at the outset by small initial appropriations or by contract authorizations.

4. The proposed budget contains $956,300,000 to initiate 34 new spending programs proposed by the President, many of which are continuing. This would represent the first year's cost only, for we estimate that these continuing programs would eventually add as much as $3,900,000,000 annually to future Federal budgets, to be financed out of general tax revenues.

5. In addition to the above, the President proposes new and expanded social-security programs to be financed by pay-roll taxes. We estimate that these proposals, if adopted, would eventually add between seventeen and twenty-four and one-half billion dollars annually to the pay-roll taxes exacted from workers and from employers. This would mean an increase over present employment taxes of between 12 and 17 percent on wages and salaries up to $4,800.

6. The budget message reflects a commendable determination by the President to carry out numerous recommendations made by the bipartisan Hoover Commission to improve administrative efficiency. This is noted particularly in the improvements made in the form of the budget itself, and in proposals relating to the military establishment, veterans' services, the postal service, and certain other functions.

7. On the other hand, other important findings and recommendations in the Hoover report are ignored or flouted. This pertains particularly to the Commission's recommendations aimed at circumscribing Federal expansion into the fields of banking, electric power and other forms of business enterprise, and at curbing the growth of the Federal grant-in-aid evil.

8. Despite efforts by the President to hold public works spending at a minimum in 1951, the budget provides for a record-breaking expenditure of $3,500,000,000 for public works next year. (This sum includes $419,000,000 of expenditures for rural-electrification programs.) Most of this amount is accounted for by outlays for projects already authorized or under way. While the President appears to have succeeded fairly well in keeping the lid on appropriations for new projects, it remains to be seen whether special interest pressure groups can persuade Congress to blow the lid off again.

RECORD PEACETIME BUDGET REQUEST

In elaborating on some of the above observations, let us begin with the first one.

In January 1946 the President requested authority to spend in fiscal 1947 the sum of $35,900,000,000.

In January 1947 he requested for fiscal 1948, $37,500,000,000.

In January 1948 he requested for fiscal 1949, $39,700,000,000.

In January 1949 he requested for fiscal 1950, $41,900,000,000.

On January 9, 1950, he requested for fiscal 1951, $42,400,000,000.

It should be pointed out that actual expenditures for each of the above fiscal years differed in amount from the President's original budget estimate because of three things which happened subsequent to the submission of his January messages: (1) His original recommendations were followed each year by a steady stream of supplemental and deficiency appropriation requests, the effect of which was to increase the January estimates; (2) congressional action on appropriation and new spending measures further altered the total amount of spending authority, either increasing or reducing it; and (3) some departments spent less than the sums allotted them, while others overspent their original appropriations.

Thus, while the President's budget message of a year ago estimated 1950 expenditures at $41,900,000,000, subsequent supplemental and deficiency requests are expected to bring actual 1950 spending up to an estimated $43,300,000,000.

Whether and to what extent the President's 1951 budget estimate of $42,400,000,000 may be increased by supplemental appropriations and by congressional enactment of new spending measures not listed in the budget message is up to the Congress.

FOOT-IN-THE-DOOR SPENDING

One of the chief reasons why the proposed 1951 budget has swelled to the size it has is the increasing tendency of both Congress and the executive branch to resort to foot-in-the-door financing devices to speed approval of new spending legislation which would otherwise encounter rough sledding on Capitol Hill.

For instance, passage of new spending programs of a continuing nature is often made easy because the legislators are told that a very modest appropriation will suffice to get them under way the first year. The extent to which the annual cost will rise in succeeding years is a matter which is seldom explored or divulged. The 1951 budget is full of large expenditures for items which once began modestly enough but have grown steadily through the years. This should provide a warning to Congress, then, to look carefully at the price tags on the many new spending measures advocated by the President or initiated by congressional committees.

Three examples of projected programs bearing a low down-payment tag but destined ultimately to require huge annual appropriations include: (1) The bill creating a National Science Foundation, which would spend only $400,000 the first year but would eventually entail annual outlays of $100,000,000 and up; (2) the St. Lawrence seaway, which would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year but would eventually shoot up to a minimum of $82,000,000 annually for the next 7 years; and (3) Federal aid to education, which contemplates a $290,000,000 expenditure at the start but would reach $2,000,000,000 or more annually as soon as possible, according to the commitments of its sponsors. So on down a long list.

Another foot-in-the-door device to get new projects started is the contract authorization, which is a grant of authority to a Federal agency to contract for construction or other services in a given amount. This is a sound and even necessary procedure when properly used, but in recent years it has been much abused. For instance, Congress has frequently replaced part or all of a requested appropriation with a grant of contract authority in order to show a budget cut. The taxpaying public, we believe, would rather see Congress make bona fide reductions in appropriations and put an end to such subterfuges as this.

The President's 1951 budget message asks Congress to approve $3,363,000,000 in contract authorizations, of which $1,280,000,000 is for programs requiring new legislation. These sums for the most part are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total proposed for 1951. They are in addition to this total, and their cost would be reflected in increased expenditures for 1952 and thereafter.

PAY ROLL TAX-SUPPORTED SOCIAL WELFARE PROGRAMS

The budget message also proposes important new legislation for social welfare programs financed by pay-roll taxes. The large expenditures which would be required by these measures are outside of, and in addition to, the $42,400,000,000 of regular 1951 budget expenditures financed out of general tax revenues.

There is now before the Senate Finance Committee a bill already passed by the House (H. R. 6000) which would expand considerably various social security benefits provided under existing legislation. For instance, liberalization of the old-age and survivors insurance program under H. R. 6000 would immediately add some $600,000,000 to present costs. The additional cost of H. R. 6000 would eventually increase to $3,250,000,000 annually for this generation and to about $5,000,000,000 for the next. The President's proposals for liberalizing this program would result in costs far exceeding the cost of H. R. 6000. They would add to the costs of benefits under existing statutes over $6,000,000,000 annually for this generation and about $10,000,000,000 for the next—all to be supported by taxes on pay rolls.

Administration estimates of the cost of the pay roll tax-supported socialized medicine program advocated by the President are about $6,000,000,000 annually. Independent authorities place the cost much higher, from at least $11,000,000,000 to $14,500,000,000 annually.

Taking both these programs together, they would impose an additional tax load upon the present pay rolls of the Nation's wage and salary earners amounting to a minimum of $12,000,000,000 annually. Ultimately this additional tax load would increase to as much as seventeen to twenty-four and five-tenths billion dollars annually, or between 12 and 17 percent on wages and salaries up to $4,800.

THE PORK BARREL AT A RECORD HIGH

Despite efforts by the President to hold 1951 outlays for public-works construction to a minimum, we find that the total amount requested for such projects would set a new all-time record. Here is the way these expenditures have skyrocketed in the postwar period:

1947 actual expenditures	$1,422,000,000
1948 actual expenditures	1,620,000,000
1949 actual expenditures	1,998,000,000
1950 estimated expenditures	2,907,000,000
1951 requested expenditures	3,530,000,000

(NOTE.—Funds for rural electrification projects are included in all the above figures.)

Although the President has tried to hold the lid down on the starting of new public works programs, it is noted that new projects call for first-year expenditures of $156,100,000 in 1951 and a total of $919,800,000 additional in later years. The largest of these is the St. Lawrence River power and navigation project, which calls for an initial expenditure of only $4,000,000 in 1951, but will require a total of at least $569,000,000 later to complete it. In the light of past experience it is certain that the final costs of all these new projects will be much larger than presently estimated. Some Federal public works programs when completed have been found to cost several times the original estimate.

These pork-barrel expenditures offer Congress one of its best opportunities to do some effective budget-cutting, particularly by rejecting new starts. What usually happens, however, is that spending interests in Washington go to work to generate pressure from allied interests back in the home districts in behalf of larger pork-barrel outlays, often defeating efforts by responsible Members of Congress to whittle down unnecessary spending in the interest of a balanced budget.

FOREIGN AID AND NATIONAL DEFENSE

The largest item in the proposed $4,700,000,000 estimated expenditure for International Affairs, including foreign aid, is the $3,250,000,000 estimated to carry the European recovery program through its third year. This represents a reduction of $812,000,000 below the estimated 1950 expenditure. If the original schedule for this aid program is adhered to, the Federal budget for 1952 should contain the fourth and last annual appropriation for it.

The budget message asks a $648,000,000 appropriation and a $500,000,000 grant of contract authority for the mutual defense assistance program for European nations which was initiated last year. The program's sponsors last year would not admit at congressional hearings that this program would require funds beyond 1 year, but this is now clarified by the budget message, which makes it plain that further appropriations for this purpose will be sought in 1952 and thereafter, and that the amount of these future requests may rise somewhat further.

National defense expenditures for 1951 are estimated at $13,545,000,000 as against $13,148,000,000 to be spent this year. But what counts here is the fact that new defense spending authority sought for 1951 totals $12,800,000,000 as against $14,576,000,000 approved by Congress last year for fiscal 1950, or a reduction of $1,776,000,000. These figures reflect the first results of efforts by Defense

Secretary Louis Johnson to reduce unnecessary civilian personnel in the armed forces and to effect other economies made possible by the recent integration of these services. While there is undoubtedly much more room for economies, at least a good start has been made in squeezing the huge waste out of military expenditures.

THE 1951 BUDGET AND THE HOOVER COMMISSION PROGRAM

As we pointed out earlier, the budget message gives evidence of commendable efforts by the President to carry out some of the administrative reforms proposed last year by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch (known as the Hoover Commission). First steps have been taken to provide a performance budget in line with the Commission's recommendations. Passages in the message relating to veterans' services and benefits also reflect much of the sound thinking expressed in the Commission's reports.

The President gives attention to Hoover Commission proposals in tackling the problem of the $555,000,000 deficit of the postal service. He points out that the Postmaster General "is exploring fully all opportunities for reducing the cost of the postal operation"—an activity which, if diligently pursued, should result in a very substantial reduction in operating costs. The President recommends legislation to increase certain postal rates "so as to bring them into line with postwar costs"—this also being in line with Hoover Commission suggestions.

IMPORTANT HOOVER COMMISSION PROPOSALS IGNORED

The Hoover Commission recommendations on business functions conducted by the Government sought to establish a clearer demarcation between the fields of taxpaying private enterprise and Government enterprise. This was particularly true with respect to commercial banking and lending activities, electric power utilities, and certain other forms of business enterprise. Many of the Hoover recommendations were aimed at restricting Federal expansion in these fields. Of direct Government lending, for instance, the Commission said: "It opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism. * * * It invites political and private pressure or even corruption. * * * Direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

The President's budget message, however, advocates large Federal expansion in these various fields. It seeks additional lending powers for the RFC, an agency whose operations the Hoover Commission roundly criticized. It calls for further expansion of Federal electric power activities, including the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration in the Northwest, and it suggests similar authorities in other parts of the country. As we have pointed out in previous bulletins, such a program adds up to nothing less than the eventual nationalization of the electric power industry—an objective certainly not entertained by the Hoover Commission.

The message also backs legislation to enlarge the Government's part in the Nation's home-building industry by launching a program to provide housing for middle-income groups. Other proposals for new ventures into business fields are indicated in competition with taxpaying private enterprise—all adding up to more bureaucracies, more waste, and more tax demands upon the people's pocketbooks.

FEDERAL GRANTS-IN-AID BOOSTED

The Hoover task-force committee on Federal-State relations expressed concern about "the trend toward National Government encroachment on the fields traditionally reserved for State and local governments." It called for Federal withdrawal from tax fields properly belonging to State and local governments and for an overhauling of the Federal grant-in-aid structure.

The budget message virtually ignores these proposals. Instead it asks Congress to approve grants-in-aid for 1951 totaling $2,999,000,000—an increase of $738,000,000 over 1950 outlays and an all-time high figure. This increase would include $290,000,000 to initiate the controversial Federal-aid-to-education measure now before Congress, which is opposed by most Governors and State legislatures and by many leading educators as an unwarranted attempt by the Federal Government to intrude upon a public service which is constitutionally and traditionally a State responsibility.

CONCLUSION

It is significant that this is the first budget submitted by President Truman in which he has failed to offer proposals for balancing expenditures with revenues, at least by increasing the latter through new taxes. His tax proposals for 1951 are admittedly not expected to raise enough new money to come close to meeting the anticipated $5,100,000,000 deficit.

The President expresses a belief that deficit financing will come to an end a few years hence when foreign aid and national defense outlays are reduced, and when a hoped-for higher national income will yield greater tax revenues for Federal spending.

The budget message takes no account of the fact that State and local government taxation is also on the increase, thus adding to the Nation's over-all tax burdens. Nor does it recognize the fact that future outlays for all the new spending programs advocated by the President, including social-welfare measures financed by pay-roll taxes, would eventually impose new tax burdens of such staggering size as to dwarf any possible reductions in national defense and foreign aid, however substantial these might be.

So we had better face up to the deficit situation now and solve it. To this end Congress should take advantage of a blueprint for a $36,000,000,000 budget for 1951 recently made public by Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, an acknowledged expert on Federal fiscal affairs. In this, Senator BYRD throws in the very teeth of the spending pressure groups and their adherents in Congress the answer to the cynical question often shot at economy advocates, Where would you cut the budget? Senator BYRD shows that the Federal establishment can live within its income and provide services essential to the Nation's welfare and economic well-being. The chief difference between the President's budget for 1951 and the budget of progress of Senator BYRD is $6,400,000,000 of wasteful and unnecessary spending.

ALVIN A. BURGER,
Director of Research.

Truman's Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Truman's Budget," published in the Uniontown (Pa.) Evening Standard of January 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRUMAN'S BUDGET

We're afraid the millennium for the American people of which President Truman has spoken with so much optimism will never be reached through plunging the Nation deeper into debt.

The President on the one hand talks of bigger and better prosperity and on the other recommends the very character of unprincipled Federal spending sure to represent a serious block on the road to that prosperity.

His budget for the 1951 fiscal year, handed to Congress yesterday, figures up close to $42,500,000,000. That is $5,000,000,000 more than the anticipated revenue for the year. It means continued deficit spending, deficit financing, and, we're convinced, very apparent danger to the national economy.

We think it's time this country starts living within its income. There would be nothing complicated about the start. Merely a simple matter of keeping the outgo within limits of anticipated tax revenue. A lot of Government hand-outs and synthetic services might have to be suspended, and real economy in the executive branch of the Government might have to be inaugurated, but the result would be more than worth the effort.

If prosperity is to be as far as we can see into the future, then the Government's going to have to represent one of the prime contributing factors. It can command neither confidence nor respect as long as it continues its unlimited spending binge.

Farm Renters

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter addressed to me by Mrs. Frank Bohn, of Hannah, N. Dak., under date of January 2, 1950, dealing with the situation in which farm renters now find themselves.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HANNAH, N. DAK., *January 2, 1950.*

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: Perhaps you can bring our problem, and that of many other farm renters, before this session of Congress. We are farm renters; my husband has farmed since 1941 with his own machinery. Before that he worked on farms—he was born and reared on a farm. He is a good worker and knows how to manage a farm. He has a full line of power machinery. Our problem is this: We can't find a place to rent that has decent buildings. Yes, we can find farms with buildings. The houses are livable—but no shops, no granaries, poor barns, and even no wells. How can a family man live on a place like that? The landlords want to rent on a one-third, two-thirds basis, but they are unwilling to spend any money on their buildings. Here in this section of North Dakota, and we believe it is true in the rest of the State as well, there are too many big farmers—men who are farming 10, 12, or more quarters of land. Consequently the man who wants and needs three or four quarters can't find them. If we don't find a farm by spring, we will have to sell out, and my husband will have to learn a completely new method of earning a living. Is it fair? This would be my solution to the problem: Let any man own as much land as he wishes to. But let's limit him to the amount of land he can actually operate. Possibly we could tax him double on each quarter he operates above three or four quarters. Any one man can make a good living on that amount of land.

This would divide the land more evenly—would perhaps draw men back to farming—thus easing the growing unemployment problem. Of course, some will say that my solution is undemocratic—it is taking away their freedom to farm the amount of land they want to. Granted, it is. But the condition as it exists now is taking away our freedom to farm. Whose freedom is more important? The United States has always been known as a country where the little man has an equal chance with the big man. It is a land of opportunity. What is happening to that equality? I know we aren't the only ones facing this problem. There are many others like us. People ask, "Why don't you buy a farm of your own and get away from this moving?" We aren't financially able to buy a farm at current land prices. Someone else suggests a loan. We investigated the FHA loans. Twelve thousand dollars is the maximum amount they will loan, and with this they expect one to buy three quarters—almost an impossibility. Prices around here range from $15,000 to $20,000 for three quarters.

If we had no children, we probably could rent land with no buildings, living in a house trailer. We think too much of our three children to expect them to grow up in such an environment. My sister and her husband, who are vacationing in the South for the winter, have opened their home to us. Had it not been for their generosity, we would have been among the homeless.

We're hoping that you can do something to ease this situation. Perhaps my solution isn't too practical. You can, no doubt, work out a better one.

Thank you for taking time to read my letter. And thank you, too, for any help you may give.

Yours sincerely,

Mrs. FRANK BOHN.

Making Democracy Work Is a Basic Ingredient of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there is a vast difference of meaning between the national unity of idealism which most of us advocate, and the dead level of conformity which is too often enforced by economic and political sanctions.

The glory of democratic living lies in the freedom of the individual—an equality of freedom, in which the limitation on my freedom is the point at which my freedom interferes with yours or another of my neighbors.

The indivisibility of American citizenship is one of the precious heritages which we must preserve and strengthen in spite of that small minority in the screwball fringe who continue to preach religious intolerance and racial discrimination. In consonance with my general policies, I was one of those who were shocked into protest by the attempt to turn Jefferson Military College, an ancient institution with an honorable history and tradition, into a citadel of racism. My protest found its way to the desk of the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of National Defense; and in reply I received a letter which I shall long treasure because of its succinct statement of the fundamentals of democratic living. Under consent, I am inserting Secretary Johnson's letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to extend its influence and give it the immortality of the published word:

MY DEAR MR. KLEIN: The President has requested me to reply to your telegram to him of October 28 concerning early press reports that Jefferson Military College had accepted a $50,000,000 gift on condition that the school exclude persons of African or Asiatic origin, and that it teach the superiority of the Anglo-Saxon and Latin-American races. In your telegram you urged that the President, "as Commander in Chief, take the only act which appears to be open under existing law to express the deep disapprobation of all true Americans by ordering the removal of Jefferson College from the list of recognized accredited schools of the Naval and Military Academies."

As you know, since your telegram was received at the White House trustees of Jefferson Military College announced that "superiority of one race over another has never been taught in Jefferson College. No such study is anticipated." With this announcement, it was reported in the news that the five- to fifty-million-dollar offer had been withdrawn. I think, therefore, it is reasonable to assume that the matter has come to a satisfactory close—not only to the credit of Jefferson Military College but also to the cause of education in a free society.

For your promptness in denouncing bigotry when it arises, I wish to offer my congratulations, as well as to all like-minded citizens who pay the price of liberty by their eternal vigilance.

Racial and religious prejudice are inimical to freedom and democracy, just as the proponents of the extreme right and left who foment intolerance are saboteurs of our way of life. Making democracy work is a basic ingredient of the national security, and, therefore, of world peace and freedom. It is the No. 1 job of all Americans, as well as all citizens of the democratic countries of the world.

With warm personal regards, I am,

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS JOHNSON.

Should Farmers Get Federal Pensions?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GUY M. GILLETTE
OF IOWA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 19 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Farmers Get Federal Pensions?" published in the Des Moines Sunday Register of January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD FARMERS GET FEDERAL PENSIONS?

Do farmers and farm workers want to be included in the expansion of the Federal Social Security Old-Age and Survivors Insurance System? They are the one big group conspicuously left out of the bill which passed the House and is now up for consideration by the Senate. They were left out because they didn't put up a fuss to be included. Several Congressmen said so plainly for the record in October.

But, since then, some of them are kicking up a fuss. The Idaho State Grange passed a resolution in December favoring inclusion of farm people, and circulated arguments for it to local granges.

The arguments point out that the impact of our two supplementary systems of old-age pensions under the Federal social-security law is very different in agricultural and industrial States.

In industrial States, the contributory system (old-age and survivors insurance—OASI) is bearing a large and increasing part of the load—roughly half now, and more if the benefits are raised. In agricultural States, the relief system of pensions (old-age assistance—OAA) carries an overwhelming part of the load, because agricultural workers are not eligible for the contributory system.

Is this an injustice to farmers? To farm States? The Idaho folks are thinking this over, and Iowans will confront it soon.

On this lofty statistical level, the question is not a simple one. The arguments being circulated in Idaho assume that the contributory system (OASI) pensions are paid out of the stored-up contributions of the contributors, which is good, whereas the relief pensions (OAA) are paid out of taxes, which is bad.

This is an optical illusion. Both are paid for out of taxes: OAA out of general State and Federal taxes, chiefly sales and income; OASI out of a special payroll tax on "covered" individuals and their employers.

Both sorts of taxes are in some degree shifted (through prices of goods and services sold by those taxed to the general consuming public), and no one can be at all certain where the burden ends up ultimately.

The big difference between OASI and OAA is not the source of funds, but the way they are paid out.

OAA pensions are paid out only to the needy, in amounts based on individual needs as determined by local welfare departments, within the limits of State appropriations and State and Federal regulations. OASI pensions are paid out to everybody in covered industries, regardless of need, in amounts based on what the individual has paid in as pay-roll deductions.

So the real question for farmers is: Would they like to be taxed on their current earnings for the sake of survivors insurance or a pension, based on how long they have paid in and how much they were making?

As long as the rates remain away below cost (as they are now, and have been since 1935), this is a tremendous bargain for individuals—at the expense of those who are paying taxes when this generation retires.

Commercial and industrial employees have been getting the benefit of this bargain since 1935, and the Federal House of Representatives has passed a bill to extend it to public employees and to the nonfarm self-employed.

Well-to-do farmers might take it or leave it. Farm laborers, sharecroppers, and the like, however, need it worse than most industrial and commercial employees. But they won't get it unless somebody—preferably among farm organizations—speaks up for them.

A broader question remains for all of us. Should we go ahead and expand the contributory system until it all but replaces the relief system of old-age pensions?

Under the present hybrid system, we have ridiculous duplication. Many who are getting OASI pensions cannot live on them and must get supplementary grants from OAA.

But if we increase benefits under the contributory system to levels which make this unnecessary, and if we extend coverage till nearly everybody comes in on it, that will mean a perfectly terrific cost which will have to be met by much higher pay-roll taxes, general taxes, or both.

Can we afford pensions for everybody, regardless of need, on a level so that everybody could live on them if necessary?

Bonneville Power Is an Investment, Not an Expense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a very fine and most informative editorial from the Longview (Wash.) Daily News, on the fine performance of the Bonneville Administration.

It is my hope that all Members of Congress will read this editorial because the subject is one that will soon be discussed on the House floor. We are properly concerned over the increasing amounts we are asked to appropriate each year. The justification for these requests should be carefully studied.

Congress has and should continue to appropriate the necessary funds for the development of hydroelectric power in the Northwest. The record shows that these projects are actually a sound investment of Government funds. They are not only paying back the entire amount appropriated, with interest, but have already increased national income and production many times their cost.

The editorial follows:

BONNEVILLE FIGURES PROVE ITS WORTH TO PACIFIC NORTHWEST

One of the troubles with publicly owned enterprises, we often hear, is that they are monopolies and therefore don't have competition keeping them on their toes to provide the best possible service to the public. In the case of one of the biggest public enterprises in the Northwest—the Bonneville Power Administration—there is something of a substitute for competition that keeps that vast business striving for a good record. That something is the necessity for congressional approval of its annual budget and the expenditures it makes for improvements and extensions to the power-distribution system.

As a result Bonneville is not above tooting its own horn when it has something to toot about and we do not blame it in the least. Bonneville points with some pride to the fact that it recently paid a $2,000,000 surplus into the Treasury, thereby advancing repayments on its indebtedness about 10 years ahead of date due.

Bonneville Dam itself cost $87,500,000 and $59,000,000 of that was to be repaid from power revenues. Already power has paid back on that indebtedness $31,208,000 including interest and operating expenses. The huge network of transmission lines cost $133,000,000. And power revenues have paid back on that indebtedness $27,400,000.

Keeping ahead of its debt payments has been possible for Bonneville despite the fact that its wholesale rate of $17.50 per kilowatt year—the lowest in the Nation—has not been increased.

Bonneville also has cause to boast about the wealth it has brought to the Northwest in terms of pay rolls and the addition of property to tax rolls of various counties.

It reports that 11 plants built in the Northwest because of Bonneville represents an investment of about $200,000,000. This compares with the Federal investment in power facilities of $340,000,000. Through December 31, 1948, the 11 factories produced more than $750,000,000 worth of aluminum ingots, aluminum sheets, and other rolled products, ferrosilicon, chlorates, calcium carbide, and other chemicals. These firms have paid $35,000,000 in Federal income and excess-profits taxes on their production at these plants and $4,400,000 in local property taxes.

These 11 plants include the two Permanente Metals Co. mills at Spokane; two ferrosilicon plants, one at Spokane and one at Rock Island; aluminum plants at Tacoma, Troutdale, Vancouver, and Longview; two calcium carbide plants in Portland and a chlorate DDT manufacturing establishment in Portland.

The contribution of Reynolds to Cowlitz County, attributable directly to the advent of cheap hydroelectric power in the Northwest, is considerable. Bonneville reports that Reynolds Metals property in the county accounts for 4.6 percent of the total assessed valuation of $34,519,740 in 1949. The taxes it paid came to more than $188,000. In addition the Reynolds plant has provided jobs for nearly 500 workers since 1941.

All these figures, of course, are meaningful to us in the Northwest and we appreciate their significance. The problem each year is to get Congress to appreciate their meaning. For the Bonneville Administration still must go begging to Congress each year for its operating expenses and any money it needs to improve its system. It makes a profit but it is not allowed to keep that profit, having to turn all of its revenues into the Treasury.

It might be further noted that when there is talk about the creation of a CVA in the Northwest to take over various Federal functions, it is never pointed out that the Bonneville operation is such that it requires consolidation with some new Federal agency. About the only criticism about Bonneville we ever heard comes from those who oppose its efforts to extend transmission lines into territory now served exclusively by private power companies. And that is a matter of ideology and not operations. All in all, the region has many reasons to be proud of and well satisfied with this agency, which has proved its worth many times over.

Christmas Is a Challenge

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article written by one of my constituents, Mr. Harry Karp, of 156 Second Avenue, New York, and printed in the December 17 issue of The Flash, a house organ of the Radio-Keith-Orpheum Corp.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that you will agree that Mr. Karp has presented a challenge of good will to the contemporary world. Another world war will destroy our civilization, our democracy, our material and spiritual heritage of past generations. In organized religion, teaching the kinship of all men, lies one of the great hopes of peace.

CHRISTMAS IS A CHALLENGE

What is Christmas? Perhaps one of the most challenging answers comes from the national commander of the American Legion, who, unwittingly, may have given it to a query from a young boy, mercilessly beaten for his religion. The lad, whose father had perished during the Battle of the Bulge, was on his way home from a Scout meeting when the attack occurred. Embittered and angered at the injustice, he asked just why his father had to die. The commander's response to the question was that as long as evil men seek to destroy the dignity of freemen, the world will engage in wars and tribulations will persist. Until man learns to adopt a code of morals that outlaw injustice, attacks of the sort will continue. Almost two thousand years ago a teacher stood at the gates of Gethsemane preaching the very same doctrine, that all men are in reality brothers; that the greatest blessing the Lord could bestow upon them was that of living in peace together. What wonderful words they were and yet for Him too there was scorn, derision, hatred, utter cruelty, and finally crucifixion. But the words could not be forgotten. They have stood the test of time. They have not been dimmed by the years and at His birthday, people, everywhere, see almost too clearly the need and meaning of the teachings. Christmas is a children's holiday. It is then that we try to instill in them the beauties of laughter and of home. It is also a world holiday if it reminds us that man does not have to destroy himself by hates and envies. The air is free and the earth is large; man can share in its beauties and in its harvest, acting as brothers and respecting the views of each other. On the 25th day of December we celebrate the birth of the child who was destined to bring eternal hope of peace on earth and to all mankind good will. Despite the wars and threats of wars, His theme has stood its ground. If man can sing the glories of peace and God with his tongue may he yet learn to live the glories of peace and God with his heart and mind. Christmas opens the challenge. Can man accept that challenge before it is too late?

HARRY KARP.

A Pioneer Aviator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Daily Evening Item, Lynn, Mass., of Tuesday, January 17, 1950:

GEN. "HAP" ARNOLD

Gen. Henry H. "Hap" Arnold, who led the mightiest air armada of all time to victory in World War II, was a soldier's soldier in the strictest sense of the word. Outspoken, courageous, and patriotic enough to put his country's needs above his personal health, Arnold has been ill of a heart condition since 1944, but refused to retire until June 1946. He preferred to take his chances with the rest of the Nation's fighting men and went back to duty.

A pioneer aviator—he was taught to fly by the Wright brothers—General Arnold was a lifelong battler for the development of a strong air arm in the Nation's defenses and his sound judgment was vindicated by our overwhelming success in the air in the recent conflict. Even in retirement he continued to urge the maintenance of an unrivaled air force, declaring that Russia fears neither armies nor nations, but only a far-reaching bomber strength. In his death the country has lost a great patriot and a distinguished soldier.

The Welfare State—What It Means to Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, on December 1 I had the pleasure of addressing the Luncheon Club of the Fraternal Order of Eagles in my home city of Milwaukee. This splendid organization has long served a most useful purpose in bringing discussion of current problems before its members. The club's programs are broadcast, thus greatly widening its audience. I desire to insert my speech, the Welfare State—What It Means to Business, in the RECORD, as follows:

THE WELFARE STATE—WHAT IT MEANS TO BUSINESS

How frightened would you be if someone hissed in your ear, "Beware the Jabberwock." Maybe the panicky tone might scare you, but I think you'd wonder what on earth they were talking about.

And yet that's just about what's been going on for the last few months—a kind of panic campaign, lifted right out of Alice's Adventures Through the Looking Glass. The only difference is that when Lewis Carroll wrote that famous story, he intended it to be nonsense. But in this case, people—a few people—have been moaning "Danger! Here comes statism!" or else, "Look out! look out! It's the welfare state!" Then they expect you to run in all directions.

Now it really can't be the terms themselves that are scaring Mr. Dulles and Mr. Dewey. The dictionary defines welfare as "prosperity" and "exemption from pain and discomfort." And it defines statism as "belief in a state government, as in a republic, in contrast with belief in communism or a Soviet government."

Obviously, it can't be the words that are worrying them. In fact it seems much more likely that these gentlemen's terror is induced by having followed Alice through the looking glass into that land where everything goes backward and no one thinks it necessary to use words that make sense. So, since it's apparently impossible to understand this jabberwocky, we can only go over all the possible reasons that might be causing this hysteria.

WELFARE STATE GOOD AMERICANISM

Do you suppose they think a government concerned with the welfare of its people is un-American? To some of their exponents, Stalin has long dominated the policies of the present administration. Mr. Steinkraus, president of the United States Chamber of Commerce, recently claimed the present Government was completely discarding the American system.

Well, let's go back to the days of the inception of our country and see whether Mr. Steinkraus' fears are justified. I suppose we could consider the signing of the Constitution as perhaps the very first official act taken by the Government of the United States. And in it, the new Government is specifically charged with the responsibility of promoting the general welfare.

This clause in our Constitution is well known to the wanderers through the looking glass. A confidential big-business news service goes so far as to advise its members that the only way left to prevent the Government from promoting the welfare of its people is by constitutional amendment. Then, in typical mirror language, they go on to mention casually that the concept of the welfare state is so well liked by the American people that Mr. Dewey himself warned Republicans it would be political suicide to deny it. This leaves me as puzzled as I was at their original outcry. How, I wonder, do these gentlemen then propose to amend the Constitution?

SUBSIDIES OLD AS THE COUNTRY

But the general welfare is not only our constitutional concern. Historically, it has always been considered our primary responsibility—by Federalists, Democrats, and Republicans alike. Jefferson assumed that Federal subsidies for education were the definite and specific responsibility of the Government. Lincoln's Congress passed the Homestead Act, distributing vast areas of land to individual families in family-size units, and thus establishing what was the equivalent to an employment and social-security program. As early as 1887, under Cleveland, Congress provided grants for agriculture—and long before the New Deal the Government was already giving subsidies to the States for 15 major welfare purposes.

So I can hardly think that even the looking-glass boys, on their nostalgic progress backward, can be finding a concern for welfare un-American.

Perhaps they think that statism is a great plot on the part of the Government to undermine business.

Even looking backward, that can hardly be proven. Under that same dreadful clause in the Constitution, Alexander Hamilton established the national bank, which was certainly clearly designed for the business and property interests of the country.

And ever since then the Government has shown a great concern for business. In the first days of our Republic, subsidies were given to shipowners and manufacturers, and land was donated for all sorts of private purposes, including not less than 179,000,000 acres to the railroads. But, strangely enough, it was not until the United States was taken over by this wicked and dangerous Jabberwock—first under the New Deal and then under the Fair Deal—that our Government really went into the business of saving business.

If you will recall, when President Roosevelt closed the banks, it was to save the banks, not abolish them. When the RFC was established, it was to enable business to carry on and expand, not to close down factories. When the FHA was set up, it was to make it possible for private builders to continue, not for Government construction.

GOVERNMENT HELP PREVENTS DEPRESSION

In fact, so conservative a periodical as the U. S. News and World Report recently listed some of the many ways in which the Government is at present supporting business. In their opinion, it is this very support that makes it impossible for the kind of calamity to overcome us that occurred under that looking-glass President, Mr. Hoover.

First, they point out, in 1929 there was wild stock-market speculation. In 1949, this is protected by that very subversive agency, the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Second, 20 years ago, the building boom was over, and there was of course almost no public construction. Today, the private building cycle is in its early stages, and there is a $5,000,000 public building program under this administration that is one of the important reasons that business' position is so secure right now.

Next, under Herbert Hoover, there were widespread bank failures. Now, that tool of the welfare state, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, insures deposits, and keeps banks sound.

Fourth, in the "good old days" when prosperity disappeared around the corner, mortgage loans were unprotected, and there were thousands of foreclosures. Now, again the doing of that wicked welfare state, mortgage loans are insured.

PURCHASING POWER MAINTAINED

But let's go on. The U. S. News comments on the fact that in Hoover days personal incomes and puchasing power were helped by only $1,000,000,000 in Government benefits. When the factories shut down, when businesses had to cut their staffs, the people who were thrown out of work had no way to keep going—or, incidentally, to keep business going. Now, the monster of the welfare state supports personal incomes by $12,000,000,000 in Government insurance schemes, such as social security, unemployment insurance, and old-age benefits.

Another of the reverberations of the great crash was the drop—with a thud—of farm prices. Now, the Government supports farm prices and keeps us from having a large portion of our population completely stranded, with the inevitable repercussions on the business firms with which they deal.

Also, in the aftermath of the roaring twenties, unions were weak, and wages spiraled down. Thanks to the Wagner Act, unionism is strong, and the combination of healthy unions and the minimum-wage law protect wage income—and therefore protect purchasing power. After all, it doesn't matter how much you have to sell, if no one can afford to buy it.

So I simply cannot see how these Lewis Carroll characters see a menace to business in their jabberwock. Let's try another tack.

I've been talking about business. But I haven't been referring to business that is so big it becomes monopoly. One of the firm foundations of our Government and of our way of life is free enterprise. Our forefathers believed in it—and our present administration believes in it.

However, in spite of the looking glass protestations of the moguls and mouthpieces of big business, I'm not at all sure that they really want free enterprise at all. I haven't seen any of the mammoth trusts encouraging competition. But the welfare state does want free enterprise. It cannot be interested in helping to increase the profits of a few arrogant men, who at the end of the nineteenth century practically owned the country. On the other hand, there was not anyone so upsetting to monopolies as President Truman, or so shocking as the Fair Deal that first recognized the dangers of the growth of trusts. By the beginning of the twentieth century the power of the barons of Wall Street was already so well recognized that Bryan answered John Pierpont Morgan's smug comment that "America is good enough for me," with the retort, "Whenever he doesn't like it, he can give it back to us." And it was Theodore, not Franklin, Roosevelt who first prosecuted monopolies.

I think we are getting closer to the real meaning of the Alices walking through the looking glass. They are truly afraid of a government who might want to put some restraints on big business to prevent it from swallowing the rest of the economy. But more than that, there is another thing they are afraid of.

WELFARE FOR ALL THE PEOPLE

The present government is legitimately concerned about business, and has shown this concern through many concrete actions. But it does not limit its concern to business. It recognizes its responsibility to all its citizens. It recognizes the need of all citizens to live free from the fears of poverty and serfdom. In this richest of all countries in the world, the Government has thought it proper to share its wealth with all its people, not in the way of totalitarian states which offer the lure of bread at the price of liberty, but by helping people to help themselves, by protecting them from

dangers beyond their control, by allowing them to grow strong enough to protect their own interests against exploiters.

So the Fair Deal has insisted on public housing, in order that everyone may have a chance to live decently, not only the rich. And we've fought for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act so that labor will not be forced back into the position of accepting whatever scraps are offered by what a notorious company spokesman once called "the Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given control of the property interests of this country."

And the welfare state is concerned about the economic security of its workers, and with that of its citizens who are out of work. We have increased the minimum-wage law so that it is more in keeping with present-day living costs—and, may I add, present-day business profits. We still consider it imperative to keep up farm prices—and we would like to see it done in such a way that the consumer will also reap the benefits, as Secretary Brannan has proposed. We are pressing for a decent increase in old-age benefits. This is an amendment to the Social Security Act which I am sure all of you will support since, as members of our great lodge, the Fraternal Order of Eagles, you worked so hard to obtain the original act. We are striving to obtain a good education for all American children. We are working for equal rights and opportunities to all Americans. And as members of a state deeply interested in the welfare of its people, we are going to do everything we can to provide adequate health services for everyone.

WHO WANTS TO GO BACKWARD?

Ah! Now I think we have the answer. This is what jabberwock means, at last. It means fear of a government which takes its responsibilities seriously. It means horror of a state that can and does recognize that its obligations are not primarily to a few industrial giants or to a handful of their bootlickers.

And to that definition, we proudly plead guilty. We gladly agree that the Government's responsibility is to the farmers—not to the cotton kings; to the storekeepers and shopowners—not to the president of the A & P or United States Steel; to the workingmen—not to Wall Street.

And if these travelers in looking-glass land want to go forever backward, do you think what they want reflects the will of the people? Do you think their program of cuts in relief, abolition of social security, withdrawal of farm-price supports, breaking of labor unions, and reincarnation of slums—do you think their program would ever have a chance so long as we are a democracy?

Have the election returns in 1948 and in 1949 suggested that the people of this country want a government by millionaires? Or legislation for private privilege? Do you really believe that anyone wishes to change the word welfare to farewell?

Traffic Director

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following excellent article from the Boston Herald, Boston, Mass., January 18, 1950:

BACKTRACKING ON RULES

There is nothing particularly surprising about the current effort of the House Rules Committee to recapture its former life-and-death power over legislation in the lower House. But it is both surprising and shocking to find this effort abetted by responsible persons outside the committee.

The function of the Rules Committee is to serve as "traffic director" for bills previously reported by other standing committees of the House. The committee is not set up to review bills on their merits, but merely to arrange for their orderly presentation to the House.

When, as frequently happened prior to the last session, the committee refused to grant a rule to a properly reported bill, or made the rule conditional on substantive changes in the bill, it was unsurping a function which never belonged to it. It was making a joke of majority rule in the lower Chamber.

This Congress performed one of its most constructive acts by finally curbing these activities last January. It would be criminal to backtrack now.

But one hears again all the old slippery arguments for Rules Committee control. Before the new discharge arrangement, it is recalled, the committee held up a lot of bad bills as well as good ones. Sometimes the Members of the House didn't want to record themselves on a measure, as was the case with the universal military training bill, and counted on the committee to kill it. Sometimes, as in veterans' legislation, the committee was less vulnerable to minority pressures than the House as a whole.

Currently the leading advocates of restoration are the economizers. The President, it is said, has abandoned hope of a balanced budget and is off on a spending spree. His supporters are in a majority in Congress. Those who would save the country must therefore resort to extreme measures. A restored Rules Committee would now certainly sabotage and obstruct for a worthy purpose.

Alas, democracy is not that simple. Of course, it is desirable to curb spending. Of course, it is desirable that Congress be prevented from swallowing any more political welfarism. But we cannot be saved by hiding behind the skirts of a Rules Committee. We can't have economy until the people want it and their elected Representatives in Congress vote for it. We can't have democracy by avoiding its responsibilities.

The House of Representatives is the popular branch of Congress. It must act according to majority rule and face the consequences. No amount of quibbling can justify a voluntary resubmission to the old Rules Committee shackles.

We hope the Representatives stick by their guns.

Heritage and Destiny in Advertising

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SAMUEL K. McCONNELL, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. McCONNELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Walter D. Fuller, president of the Curtis Publishing Co., recently made a very interesting and informative address dedicating the Advertising Hall of Fame of the Advertising Club of New York. He has pointed out the tremendous effect which advertising has had on the people of the United States and upon American business methods. Very important from the point of view of Congress, the speech demonstrates the extent to which our national prosperity parallels a high volume of advertising.

It has been stated recently that a 20-percent drop in business turn-over would reduce Federal revenue by sixteen to eighteen billion dollars a year. Turnover could easily be reduced by that amount if the volume of advertising were substantially reduced by the businessmen in this country.

I feel sure that Mr. Fuller's address will give Members of Congress a greater appreciation of advertising and its importance to national income. I am therefore having the entire speech inserted in the RECORD, as follows:

HERITAGE AND DESTINY IN ADVERTISING

(By Walter D. Fuller)

Some fourscore years ago modern advertising was born. There had been faint stirrings before the War Between the States, but in the flood of energy and ideas released by the ending of that war came the first glimpses of advertising as we know it today.

With and through the coming of modern advertising came a great increase in sales and distribution volume, which ultimately made possible the miracles of American mass-manufacturing production. There also gradually developed very wide dissemination of general information among Americans from coast to coast at little or no cost to them. This was probably the most remarkable development of widespread mass adult education in the history of the world.

Advertising and advertising media—magazines, newspapers, direct mail, outdoor, and, more recently, radio and television—have literally tied America together. Through advertising the women of New York, Hollywood, and Dallas, of the farm, the small town and the large city, know and wear the same styles in clothes, discuss the same subjects in their clubs and equally share in their responsibilities of citizenship. The mass education brought about through advertising has had an even more direct effect upon the men of America and upon American business methods and operation. All these things and much more, advertising has brought to our country.

Modern advertising as we know it, is essentially American and it is no accident that the terrific progress of the United States of America toward world leadership parallels our advances in advertising. Other nations have no form of mass communication which can compare with our advertising.

So much to set the picture.

Now let us look back over these fourscore years and see the names of the men who were the pioneers and leaders in advertising during this time. Someone has said that progress is the lengthening shadow of a man, and this can be plural as well as singular.

THERE WILL BE OTHER PIONEERS

Tonight we have listened to the citations prepared by your committee for 10 of the great men of advertising during this 80-year period. To 4 of the 10, in order of birth dates, Wanamaker, Curtis, Jones, and Johns, your committee has applied the word "pioneer." I mention the point only to make clear that some great men in any field may, by their ability and their opportunity, fill the role of pioneers—all honor to them, yet other great men will follow, in service, in the establishment of integrity, and in vision for the ever-expanding future. I think we will agree that all who lead and whose deeds become keystones of progress should merit the honors which rightfully come to them. Certainly, these 10 men whom your committee has so carefully selected will receive equal niches

in the Hall of Fame. Washington was a great national pioneer, but that fact does not diminish the luster of Lincoln as a great American.

I shall not attempt to review the magnificent history of John Wanamaker or of Cyrus Curtis, both of whom are now almost legendary in the advertising, mercantile, and publishng world. I knew Mr. Wanamaker slightly, but, peculiarly, I always see him in memory from the early prints of John Wanamaker, a very young man, wheeling his handcart full of goods for his pioneer store on lower Market Street in Philadelphia. While there was over 150 years' difference in time, somehow I always class Mr. Wanamaker's pioneer beginning with another pioneer American who strolled up Market Street in Philadelphia one autumn day in 1723, munching buns and hoping that Philadelphia would show him opportunity. Which brings me naturally to Cyrus Curtis, who rebuilt in his lifetime the publication which this last young man originated in 1728.

Of course, I knew Mr. Curtis very well indeed. I saw many examples of his great courage, his ability to reach into every problem for its nucleus, and to brush aside the secondary details. I saw him making brilliant innovations and I also saw him make mistakes, but the mistakes were few and the successes were many. He was, indeed, a pioneer in publishing and in advertising. His life is an epic of free enterprise, of the wise realization of opportunities, of high honesty in all things, no matter how it hurt, and of the development of careers for able and diligent associates.

These two men, Mr. Curtis and Mr. Wanamaker, are of an earlier generation than the other eight men you are honoring.

Mr. Jones of Eastman was instrumental in building a new industry and in spreading Kodaks throughout the world to a point where the name is as familiar in Hindustan or China as it is in the United States of America. Mr. Johns was all the things listed in the citation. In addition, he had a sympathy and a depth of conviction which made his influence in advertising unique and unusual.

These four are the men your committee mentions as "pioneers." If I may insert a personal word, I believe I would support the right of Edwin Meredith to a similar designation, although in a different way and at a later date. The citation tells you why.

Likewise I personally believe that T. F. MacManus also deserves the term for his brave and unusual handling of advertising in the early days of the automobile industry. Certainly if he were not a pioneer, he was indeed close to it.

I knew all these men personally except Messrs. Strong and Ayers. Some I knew much better than others and of course I knew all by the great reputations they acquired during their lifetimes.

MANY HAVE CONTRIBUTED TO ADVERTISING

Messrs. Romer, Erickson, Ayers, and Strong each exerted a great beneficial influence upon the advance of advertising. All were its strong proponents and each in his own way was among the great of cur profession.

After careful study and much consideration, these ten were the selections of your committee, but I am sure that your committee would agree that during these fourscore years there have been hundreds of other men of advertising who have given greatly to the growth, accomplishments, and success of advertising. To the memory of all such people, men or women, who have passed on to their eternal reward, I am sure we tonight give our homage, and honor them for what they have done.

Let us now survey the results of those years as they are disclosed by the provable facts. I shall start with the year 1900, when the tempo of advertising progress really began to become national and to hit its stride.

If you will take the record for the years since the beginning of the twentieth century, you will find that from 1900 to 1930, with only one yearly exception, the total annual expenditures for advertising in America have been over 3 percent of national income. During the 1920's this ratio at times almost reached 4 percent. I repeat that for 29 of those growing prosperous years, advertising expenditures reached or exceeded 3 percent of national income. And please note that during this whole period there were only two periods of serious unemployment and both were relatively brief in duration.

The years of preparation up to 1900 and of realization and expansion from 1900 to 1930 were the years in which the men we honor tonight were most active.

I think I can show you that their accomplishments and that of the other men of advertising during those hectic and resultful years up to 1930 are far more than merely a matter of pride for us tonight.

EXAMINE OUR RECENT RECORD

It seems to me that the things they did, the obstacles they overcame and the magnificent results they achieved, when compared with the record of our generation since 1930, is a challenge to us and to those who will follow us.

Because, gentlemen of advertising, our record in recent years is not so good. Listen.

In 1930 the depression came. Both advertising expenditures and national income fell abruptly during the early 1930's. All through the latter 1930's our ratio of advertising expenditures never rose as high as 3 percent of national income and all through this period we had heavy unemployment. During the 1930's, except for 2 years, average unemployment was in excess of 8,000,000 persons until we came to the period of war preparation in the early 1940's. Then during the war we experienced a strong sellers' market and advertising promotion dropped to as low as 1.5 percent of national income.

We are now completing the year 1949. We are almost wholly back in a buyers' market. Many of our businessmen have become accustomed to the standards of, either the sellers' market of the postwar period, or of the depression period. Many younger men have had no experience with the prosperous predepression days. It has been almost 20 years since we have been building soundly prosperous times.

For 30 years, from 1900 to 1930, America experienced an almost unbroken buyers' market. During that time the ratio of advertising expenditures to national income was well over 3 percent. In 1948 advertising investments were but 2.2 percent of national income. In 1949 they will probably be slightly lower. This must be a matter of very grave concern for us men of advertising. It should be a matter of grave concern to Congress. It is of grave concern to manufacturers and to merchants. Regardless of actual dollar increases, advertising expenditures when compared to national income are 1 percent less than they were during the first 30 years of this century, and remember 1 percent of current national income, my friends, is over $2,000,000,000.

A PICTURE OF OUR INADEQUACY

We all need to look at these figures of current advertising inadequacy in order to get a clear impression of the situation. Here are the gory details:

Over 3 percent of national income was spent for advertising during every year from 1900 to 1930 except for 1918; a peak of 3.9 percent was spent for advertising during the 1920's.

A steady drop in this percentage during the depression, down to 2.6 percent by 1940.

Never over 1.6 percent during the war; 1.9 percent in 1946; 2.1 percent in 1947; 2.2 percent in 1948; probably not much over 2 percent in 1949.

Here we are 5 years after the war, and only about two-thirds as much advertising as 30 years of successful experience have shown to be needed to move America ahead to real progress and prosperity.

The following figures are even more embarrassing to us men of advertising than the figures I have just quoted.

Through the period from 1900 up to 1930, total national selling expenditure for all kinds of selling, averaged a little over 36 percent of national income. This included advertising, of course. During the depression years, the percentage of total selling expense held up far better than did the percentage of advertising. In 1940, when the ratio of advertising to national income had dropped nearly one-quarter below the 1900 to 1930 average, the ratio of total selling cost showed an almost negligible drop from the 30-year average. Through the war, of course, the selling percentage dropped sharply, but in 1946 this total selling ratio, even in a buyers' market, was back to 35.4 percent and in 1948 it was 37 percent, or higher than the average of the 1900 to 1930 period.

WHAT IS THE MATTER?

Don't ask me what this means, but it certainly is a sorry showing for advertising. We have new and unique advertising methods and media. We can prove the power of the impact of advertising, but volume—by ratio—is way off, about 33⅓ percent off as I see it. What is the matter? Can you be proud of these figures? I certainly cannot.

Let us take a common-sense look at the situation.

Business today is on a see-saw. Will it turn up or down? If it is going to turn upward, it will need power to climb the hill and that power is advertising. You know what happens if it turns downward—there will be unemployment, inventories will mount, and that will mean less sales, still more unemployment, closing factories and stores and all the rest of the dismal downward spiral.

We are here tonight to do honor to great advertising men of the past. They did their job magnificently and left us a great heritage. Through the mists and fogs of their futures, they dreamed great dreams and they saw colossal mirages of progress. They made the dreams and the mirages come true—far more true than they could possibly have imagined.

Are we so dreaming today, have we the vision, the energy, the conviction, and the courage to do our duty to our future as they did to theirs? That is the question we face tonight, my friends, we in this room and thousands of other advertising men throughout America.

Let us dream just a little in our turn. Let me give you a taste of my dreams for advertising's future.

I believe advertising is the surest way to bring prosperity to America and to the world, the most certain road to true security, and the real solution to the problems of almost universal happiness. I think advertising can lower the cost of government, and that is the only way to greatly reduce taxes. I believe it can pay off the national debt. I believe that through advertising lies the best hope of the world for universal peace. I believe all these wonderful results are possible if the men of advertising have the vision, courage, and honesty possessed by the men we are honoring tonight. We shall need help, of course.

A few weeks ago, Mr. David F. Austin, vice president of Big Steel in charge of sales, said that the half million salesmen of America must save the world if it is to be saved. I would only add my conviction that the several thousand influential men of advertising who naturally are a part of Mr. Austin's half million have got pretty much to be the leaders in the job.

PROSPERITY IS ESSENTIAL

How can this ambitious program be accomplished? First, we certainly must have prosperity in America.

Sumner Slichter, in an article in the November Atlantic, predicts that by 1980 the annual national income will be at least $416,000,000,000, and is more likely to be in excess of $550,000,000,000. Figure 3 percent of that amount you agency and media men. The $550,000,000,000 figure will be easy if the trends of the last 50 years are continued. There will be more people in America by 1980, probably at least an extra 25,000,000. There are already seven or eight million more children than was anticipated 10 years ago. In addition, there is the steadily increasing unit production per man-hour which on the average and for many years has moved ahead at about 2 percent a year. This is the result of invention, of the developments of machinery and power, of the increasing efficiency of management, and of the dexterity and intelligence of American men and women.

In addition, in many directions there has been an increase in the buying power of the dollar. A surprisingly large number of products are today priced far below the prices for which they sold in past years, and when this has happened, it has been principally because of the enormous increases in demand brought about through advertising.

Look also at the record of increasing individual income—in 1914, the year the First World War was started, the average per capita income in this country, adjusted for changes in cost of living, was $472. In 1948 it was $825—these figures are adjusted so that they are comparable. This tendency has followed a continuous pattern in America almost from the beginning. There is no evidence that it will change.

The whole trend of events indicates that we probably will have continuing prosperity in America. At least for the long run, that seems likely.

TWO DANGERS CITED

Now what could prevent such a to-be-desired development? There are twin dangers: First, the development of a completely Socialist state in the United States of America. Such a development, through its destruction of initiative, incentive and competition, could stop American and probably world progress for centuries. The second danger is war with its terrific destruction of property and human life and with the probability that it would leave us with a military or police state and with an utterly ruinous national debt. Remember, Einstein said recently, "I do not know all the weapons which would be used in a third world war, but I do know that if there is a third world war, then the weapon for the fourth world war will be clubs."

How can advertising keep America away from these desperately dangerous trends?

Continuing prosperity is the sure way to combat socialism and communism.

Americans are strong free enterprisers today. We must keep them so. And by that statement I do not mean that we can safely live in a world that favors either end of the spectrum. Neutral tints have always been the natural colors of nature.

Federal old-age pensions, for example, within reason and on a subsistence level are not socialistic, they are just plain common sense. This is equally true of other forms of well-managed public operations such as the maintenance of adequate Federal defense, our public schools, police and fire departments, etc. Common sense and local conditions are the judge, not arbitrary rule. In the town in which I grew up, the cemeteries were owned by the city. Was this socialistic? I do not think so. If we could persuade some of our well-intentioned but mentally blind friends to view current events with common sense and not with choler and utterly fixed convictions, that the future can be built entirely from the past, we businessmen would travel faster and leave less ammunition for our opponents. I think it was Louis XIV of France to whom his prime minister once said, "Sire, if you would but once concede that you could be wrong—" We need some of that sort of realization in certain high places today.

Common sense says that we must have competition, keen competition. Where monopoly is desirable for public reasons as, for example, with public utilities, we need reasonable and intelligent regulation. We want competition because it breeds incentive and invention and adventure. We must have no limits upon size where size is beneficial to the public. These are the things that manufacture prosperity. America has found the way. We must develop and improve it, and you know that advertising and publicity are principal tools by which the desired results can be achieved.

Almost everyone agrees that production of goods and services is essential if people are to have more things and better living. But there seems to be a blind spot with many people about the difference between the actual manufacturing production and the use of the materials produced. It is neither good economics nor profitable to produce any sort of material if it does not move off the shipping platforms. It is only as customers take goods that the goods become of value. The production of customers and of sales is as important as the production of goods, and the process, stimulus, and speed with which the products of the factory or the farm or the mine reach the consumer is of paramount importance to prosperity.

During 1948, American manufacturers and merchants spent over a billion dollars for national advertising in magazines, newspapers, and radio. These were practical businessmen who know the value of an advertising dollar. They did not spend this money because they loved the publishers or the radio stations. Rather they spent it to stimulate the sale and turn-over of their goods in our country's market places. These businessmen backed their choices to the extent of a billion dollars in 1 year because they knew, from experience, that this was the best way to accomplish the results they sought. You will agree, I know, that this expenditure must have provided a great stimulus to the turn-over of goods. In addition hundreds of thousands of dollars were spent in other forms of advertising.

SPEED OF TURN-OVER IMPORTANT

Speed in the turn-over of goods and services is one of the principal forces which is instrumental in creating national income. The best estimates indicate that the inventories of American manufacturers had an average turnover of slightly more than seven times in 1948. Suppose expenditures for national advertising were reduced to a point where the net effect of the reduced advertising volume and the subsequent reduced sale was to slow the manufacturing turnover from seven to six times. This would result in serious unemployment and in a cut in Federal tax revenues of many billions of dollars a year. That is just how important national advertising is to the national turnover rate and to Federal tax revenues. Advertising not only creates a market for a product, but it also adds dollars to Federal income.[1]

[1] The following quotation is from a speech made by Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of Brookings Institution, in New York on December 8, 1949, before the Congress of American Industry:

"Because of the highly sensitive character of our tax system, even a moderate recession, such as a 20-percent decline, would involve a drop in tax receipts of something like sixteen to eighteen billions of dollars."

A few moments ago I said that advertising can lower the cost of government and thus greatly reduce taxes. The figures indicate strongly that we people of advertising have an economic value to the Nation considerably broader than merely the selling of goods and services.

On the average each time an extra dollar of advertising is expended, it means that more goods are being sold, greater employment is being provided, and the revenue of the Federal Government is being increased by—I think—several dollars for each dollar spent for advertising.

Obviously, if advertising can do these things, it can reduce taxes and in time pay off the national debt. The debt can never be paid by saving—it is too big—our one hope is a greater volume of sales, ever growing and steadily prosperous. The answer is all in the cards, my friends; it is just a question of how well we play them.

ADVERTISING AN AID TO PEACE

I said earlier that advertising can be a major factor in bringing peace to the world. I meant just that. I think our country has been missing a perfectly enormous opportunity. We are spending tens of billions of dollars each year to arm ourselves and we expect to spend a good many more billions to arm our allies. We expect to continue such expenditures indefinitely into the future. I do not quarrel with these expenditures today, but I ask what are we doing to make such mammoth expenditures unnecessary in the future? It is not true that the major cause of war is lack of understanding between the peoples of different nations? Isn't the danger and the expense of today's defense preparation due to the fact that leaders of a certain country have been propagandizing their people and much of the rest of the world with completely false doctrines and with vicious lies about America?

We certainly know that most of the troubles of the world have their foundations in mass movements. People are lead into things en bloc. The farewell state in England is an example. Have we not drifted a considerable distance down such false lanes in America? Does not the correction of such a drift and the insurance against its reoccurrence lie in the education of the individual to his personal responsibilities as a citizen? The men you honor tonight were individuals with one thing in common and that was a crusader's zeal to promote and sustain the integrity and development of advertising. The same opportunity is open to all of us. We may never occupy the same broad stage, but we can each be effective in our own field of activity no matter how limited it may be. All of us in this room tonight have strong convictions as to the importance and efficiency of advertising. Most of us have assumed I think that Americans are the premier advertisers of the world? But are we? Are we the great salesmen we used to be? Advertising today must be viewed not alone from the economic angle but also from political and social angles. America has been built on a selling foundation since the days of the fur traders and the Yankee clippers, yet we are letting a group of relatively rank amateurs from behind the iron curtain successfully sell their political doctrines throughout the world. Isn't it about time we did a better job in that connection? I have no doubt that our international propaganda has been well done, but obviously we, as a Nation, have been doing a boy's job in this regard rather than a man's—else 5 years after the end of the war we would not be facing the defense expenditures that we do face today. If a commercial advertising campaign was still inadequate at the end of 5 years, what would happen to the advertising manager or to the advertising agent?

Surely more convincing propaganda internationally about our American way of life—and floods of it—could bring long-lasting peace. If we remove the cause for the need for extreme defense, then we save untold billions.

NATIONAL ADVERTISING EXPENDITURES DIP

Anybody or anything that puts an obstacle in the way of advertising today is doing our Nation a great disservice. That is what I have been telling Congressmen this year in Washington because at this time of all times it would be terrible to unnecessarily increase the burdens upon advertising, when we need its unlimited expansion so desperately.

There is today a decrease in the ratios of expenditures for national advertising. All business history in this country points to the fact that as a Nation we have been prosperous and have had full employment when business turnover was high, and we have usually had depression when the reverse was the case. The speed of the turnover of goods in American markets is influenced to a substantial degree by advertising—in fact the stimulation of the speed of turnover is a principal reason for advertising.

The high employment which has existed since the end of the war is the result of wartime shortages and a sellers' market. In 1950 we will be completely in a buyers' market. Conditions will then be different—coming problems of unemployment must be met by hard selling, lead by advertising.

We people in the advertising field have done a remarkable job in stimulating the sale of goods to customers. Equally we have done a very poor job in selling the importance of our own business to the American public. We have hardly scratched the surface in developing or transmitting effective political and social advertising. Isn't it about time that we people of today's generation of advertising men go to work and do a lot better job in this connection? Incidentally, it seems to me that success in this sort of mission would be the best sort of way for us to earn for advertising eternal appreciation of its merit; and for everyone, happiness and security. These problems we have before us are both an opportunity and an obligation. They mean harder work in the days ahead for each one of us.

That is my story tonight, gentlemen. We have honored ten great men of advertising history. Where shall we stand when the advertising men of the future call the roll of our accomplishments? That is the challenge you and I must answer. If we have the sales ability and the energy, we can carry advertising's banners to far greater heights than they have ever reached before. Let me wish you success in our forward march.

Gag Procedure

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following article from the Christian Science Monitor, January 17, 1950:

BACK TO GAG RULE

The vote of the Rules Committee in the House of Representatives to try to restore to itself the power to hold back legislation favored by other responsible House committees reflects little credit on that group.

Gag rule is no respectable rule in a democracy. It may appear to make the handling of some situations easier, as Republicans and conservative southern Democrats seem to think with reference to the proposed fair-employment-practices bill in President Truman's civil-rights program.

This newspaper, as it has indicated before, does not believe it is wise to try to change suddenly by Nation-wide legislation the social and industrial customs of large sections of the population. But it does believe the subject is entitled to debate in Congress and should be decided by a vote, not by subterfuge or the dictatorship of a clique.

Frank discussion would throw light on the subject and might make for more political honesty in the writing of party platforms.

A change in the rules such as the committee seeks would affect all legislation and might hinder various proposals of genuine merit. Ordinarily, bills recommended by legislative committees of the House in their respective fields must wait for the Rules Committee to give them a place on the calendar. A year ago the Administration obtained adoption of a rule under which, if the Rules Committee ignores a reported bill for 21 days, the chairman of the committee sponsoring the bill may call it up for consideration.

To repeal this rule would be a backward step. The Rules Committee in the Eightieth Congress usurped its powers by bottling up the selective-service bill, the Taft-Wagner-Ellender housing bill, and other legislation. To retain a right to vote on legislation which properly should come before it, the House should repudiate the present proposal of its Rules Committee.

Communists and American Ships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, in the press today it is stated that the State Department has taken action to get back 42 merchant ships sold to China, saying it does not want them falling into Communist hands. Surely we do not want to give aid and encouragement to the communists by leaving our ships where they can be easily taken. However, the same personnel in the State Department since 1945, did little to get back the nearly 100 American merchant ships that the Russian Communists have belonging to the United States Government. The State Department announced that it has instructed American representatives to ask local authorities in Far East ports to prevent the sailing of any of the ships, which may be there. Presuming that they might fall in Communist hands.

Yet these American merchant ships in the possession of Russia have been to our shores on hundreds of occasions since the ending of the war. They have carried free goods to Russia in the way of tractors, trucks, and heavy machinery, all usable in war. Yet the same Department of State did nothing to keep them on the American shores. Surely the State Department is doing a lip service in taking away the ships from Chinese Nationalists while for years past it has been loading American ships belonging to the taxpayers of this country and permitting the Russians to keep the ships. Only a few have been returned and when these American-owned ships in the hands of Russia were loaded with gasoline and fuel oils and tied up on the Pacific coast in 1948 they were ordered released so that the Communists could continue to have these American-owned ships.

In addition to all of this the Russians had in their possession a great number of naval ships some of which have been returned from time to time. If the same State Department would have given even lip service to returning the American ships they would not be of use for the march of communism to the east. Russian communism has thrived and moved to the east with the aid of American trucks, tractors, and heavy machinery taken to Russia by American-owned merchant ships still in possession of Russia of which the State Department did nothing to apprehend when they were tied to the docks on American shores. If the State Department had done something since the ending of the war in 1945 by keeping from Russia the American-owned ships and the billion dollars of heavy goods and materials we would not be fearing the march of communism in the east.

Where a Reserve Fund Becomes Meaningless

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THRUSTON B. MORTON
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. MORTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal:

WHERE A RESERVE FUND BECOMES MEANINGLESS

On January 1, 1950, social-security taxes for old-age benefits will be increased from the present rate of 1 percent to 1½ percent, and the increase will bring an additional $667,000,000 into the fund which now totals $11,600,000,000. This huge fund is now invested in obligations of the United States Government.

Since there is mounting pressure for increasing the amount of old-age benefits—and this pressure has been greatly heightened by the recent pension settlements made in the steel and automobile industries—it is worth while to try to take an objective view of the whole Federal old-age-benefit scheme.

The first aspect of the situation which is readily apparent is that pensions are and must be paid from current production at the time paid. That which a pensioner wears, eats, or otherwise consumes is not something stored up as Joseph stored grain in ancient Egypt, but is rather the wool, the corn, and the fuel produced at the time of consumption. The source of the funds used to pay for the items consumed does not alter the fact at all just as the source of the funds used in the recent war to pay for war material did not alter the fact that the material which we consumed during the war was in

general the result of production during the war. Consequently, pensions, however paid for, are charges against current production.

The idea of funding pensions, that is, providing sufficient money and investing it so as to produce a total fund of principal and interest sufficient to meet liabilities as they accrue, is essentially a private industry idea. It is the principle upon which all life-insurance companies operate and upon which private pension funds and annuities are set up. There is a certain plausibility in transferring this idea to Federal pensions and creating a fund sufficient to meet all liabilities. That is what has been done and the funds are invested in United States Government bonds, which are admittedly the safest investments available. However, in this assumption that such a fund can be set up is a very basic fallacy. The security of the fund is based upon the taxing power of the Government because it is only that which can make the bonds good. If there were no fund, the taxing power of the Government would still be the basis of security of the pensions.

In any one year any drafts upon the fund can be paid only from (1) interest on the bonds held in the fund which comes from taxation, (2) from bonds paid off, which comes from taxation, (3) from additional social-security taxes collected, which is taxation, or (4) sale of bonds to private investors, which is merely postponed taxation, in that the bond will ultimately have to be paid. If this analysis is correct, it seems to us that the creation of a Federal pension fund serves no purpose that could not be served by direct taxation and appropriation each year.

There are, however, certain undesirable features of the present scheme. The amassing of bonds in the Federal pension fund tends to create a sense of financial security independent of Government which does not exist. It gives a distorted picture of the Federal debt in the absurdity of one branch of Government owning obligations of another branch. It distorts annual budgets in that the true cost of pensions paid in any year is what is paid out in that year, whereas under the funding system these costs may be concealed in interest paid, bonds sold, or other transactions. It is perfectly true that Federal pensions, even at present levels, will constitute an ever-increasing cost each year as more and more people arrive at pension age and as life expectancy increases. But to think that in an insurance scheme covering the whole population a financial fund can be set up in anticipation of those requirements is an illusion. Such a fund can be only a claim against future taxation.

Let's get rid of the illusion and face up to the facts. If we are to pay Federal pensions to everyone eligible, we should tax and appropriate the sums required each year. Then we will have some accurate idea of what we are doing. The insurance concept on a national basis is self-contradictory in that by embracing the whole population the distribution of risk becomes meaningless.

Address Before Daughters of the Confederacy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Daughters of the Confederacy at Confederate Memorial Hall, Washington, D. C., Wednesday evening, January 18, 1950:

We are highly honored in the privilege to join with you descendants of the brave Confederate soldiers who followed the matchless leaders of the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, Thomas J. Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury, whose memory we now honor.

On first thought it may seem rather strange and at the same time gratifying that in this Capital City we are permitted to thus unfurl the Confederate flag and observe the birthday anniversaries of these great leaders. But when we look into the lives of those men and calculate their true greatness, then we must conclude that it would be strange indeed if Americans anywhere were reluctant to pay them honor.

It is remarkable indeed that a nation which endured only a few short years should produce military leaders of such matchless ability, integrity, and enduring fame. The events which led to the formation of the Confederacy and its ultimate defeat on the field of battle may be forgotten, or buried within the history of our now united Nation, but the names of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury will never be forgotten. Those names will live in the hearts and minds of our people as long as mankind recognizes the merit of true heroism and nobility of thought and deed, which qualities of character were so truly exemplified in the lives of those Confederate leaders.

It is a happy coincidence that the birthdays of Lee, Jackson, and Maury fall so nearly on the same day—Lee's on the 19th, Jackson's on the 21st, and Maury's on the 24th of January—for because of their inseparable ties in the history of the Confederacy we can hardly honor one without at the same time honoring the others. They lived and died for the same cause.

First of all let us have a closer look at General Lee and inquire what makes his life appear so immeasurably grand.

It must be the fact that he went beyond the heights of greatness and on to peaks of nobility.

"His life was gentle, and the elements so mix'd in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: 'This was a man.'"

We have only to witness the degree of fortitude and courage with which Lee accepted adversity as well as the gracious manner in which he bore pain, suffering, and even defeat to appreciate the true stature of his greatness. Everything about Lee, the loftiness of his ideals, manliness of his actions, and the unselfishness of his deeds, seemed firmly anchored in the bedrock of Christian faith, hope, and charity.

Both by nature and necessity General Lee was a lover of hard work; he cared little for the social or lighter pursuits of life. He liked the soldier's hardships, the soldier's toil, even the soldier's fare, as well as the soldier's glory.

General Lee was born in Virginia January 19, 1807. In 1825 through the generosity of that great South Carolinian, my own predecessor in Congress, then Secretary of War, John C. Calhoun, young Lee was admitted to West Point, graduating therefrom 4 years later without a demerit, second in his class.

Probably the most unusual experience ever coming to an individual came to Lee in March 1861, when at the Blair House here in Washington, where the President now lives, he was confronted with the decision as to whether he should command the Federal forces or the poorly organized, scantily clad troops of Virginia. He assumed command of the Confederate forces in 1861 with the rank of General which he held until his surrender at Appomattox on April 9, 1865.

Someone has said that the presence of Napoleon in battle line was equal to the presence of 100,000 troops. If that be true, how could we estimate the value of the presence of the matchless Lee as he recklessly rode among his troops in his modest uniform of grey, bearing only the stars to indicate his rank?

The late Benjamin H. Hill, of Georgia, has described the character of Lee in these beautiful and striking words: "He was a foe without hate; a friend without treachery; a soldier without cruelty; a victor without oppression, and a victim without murmuring. He was a public officer without vice; a private citizen without wrong; a neighbor without reproach; a Christian without hypocrisy; and a man without guile. He was a Caesar without his ambition; Frederick without his tyranny; Napoleon without his selfishness; and Washington without his reward. He was as obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, and modest and pure as a virgin in thought; watchful as a Roman vestal in duty; submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battle as Achilles."

So, like the varicolored threads of a rich tapestry which combine to produce one perfect, balanced design of beauty, the attributes of Lee's greatness, that is, his outstanding ability and talent, his sterling character, his high moral caliber, his Christian faith and devotion, together without the nameless other qualitative attainments and representations of his life were joined, it seemed, to create the world's grandest and most enduring design for noble living.

Theodore Roosevelt once said: "The world has never seen better soldiers than those who followed Lee; and their leader will undoubtedly rank, without any exception, as the very greatest of all the great captains that the English-speaking people have brought forth."

British Field Marshal Wolseley said of Lee: "He was the ablest general, and to me seemed the greatest man I have ever conversed with. * * * General Lee was one of the few men who ever seriously impressed and awed me with their natural and inherent greatness."

Turning now to Gen. Thomas J. (Stonewall) Jackson, we find that he, too, was a military leader of rare genius. It would be entirely pointless to attempt to draw a comparison between Lee and Jackson. Historians and military experts agree that those two southern generals are unexcelled in leadership and strategy as they carried out their respective assignments in the Confederate Army. John Warwick Daniel says of Lee and Jackson: "They were complements of each other, and like David and Jonathan, their souls were knit together."

Jackson has been quoted as saying of his chief: "Lee is a phenomenon. I would follow him blindfold," and Lee, upon learning that his chief lieutenant had been mortally wounded, exclaimed: "Jackson has lost his left arm; I have lost my right arm."

Both Lee and Jackson were Christian gentlemen of the highest order, temperate in all things and total abstainers from intoxicants.

Jackson's strength was in his simplicity of life and an almost childlike humility; his brilliance was in his unwavering devotion to duty and concentration on the task at hand.

A devoutly religious man, Jackson gave thanks to divine providence for every victory in battle. He once told a friend that he prayed constantly.

From his boyhood onward, the life of this fearless warrior was the very model of a Christian gentleman. Fearless and strong, self-dependent and ambitious, he had within him the making of a Napoleon, and yet his name is without spot or blemish.

He was daring and brilliant in leading his troops, but for success in battle he gave God the praise; he was bold, aggressive, and un-

relenting in attack, but was the humblest of men, and his own will was always submissive to the will of God.

As would be expected of a man of such unwavering Christian devotion, Stonewall Jackson, although one of the greatest military leaders of all time, prayed and longed constantly for peace. In almost every letter he dispatched to his wife during the Virginia campaign, Jackson expressed his fervent prayer for speedy peace.

Field Marshal Wolseley has described Jackson in the following words:

"Shy as a lad, reserved as a man, speaking little but thinking much, he led his own life, devouring the experiences of great men, as recorded in military history, in order that when his time came he should be capable of handling his troops as they did. A man of very simple tastes and habits, but of strong religious principles, drawing directly from the Bible; a child in purity; a child in faith; the Almighty always in his thoughts, his stay in trouble, his guide in every difficulty, Jackson's individuality was more striking and more complete than that of all others who played leading parts in the great tragedy of secession. * * * With that innate love of virtue and real worth which has always distinguished the American people, there has long been growing up, even among those who were the fiercest foes of the South, a feeling of love and reverence for the memory of this great and true-hearted man of war, who fell in what he firmly believed to be a sacred cause. The fame of Stonewall Jackson is no longer the exclusive property of Virginia and the South; it has become the birthright of every man privileged to call himself an American."

G. F. R. Henderson, the British military historian, concludes his outstanding book, "Stonewall Jackson and the American Civil War," with the following words which are particularly appropriate today as we wage a relentless struggle against the enemies of freedom:

"The hero who lies buried at Lexington, in the Valley of Virginia, belongs to a race that is not confined to a single continent; and to those who speak the same tongue, and in whose veins the same blood flows, his words come home like an echo of all that is noblest in their history: 'What is life without honour? Degradation is worse than death. We must think of the living and of those who are to come after us, and see that by God's blessing we transmit to them the freedom we have ourselves inherited.' "

Matthew Fontaine Maury, though not so generally known for his contribution to the southern cause, is nonetheless outstanding. He came from a family of distinction, having been born in Spottsylvania County, Va., January 24, 1806, and died in Lexington, Va., February 1, 1873. Like other great men who were physically handicapped, his accomplishments and services to mankind were without limit. His philosophy of life is expressed in the following sentence: "I don't think that so much depends upon intellect as is generally supposed; but industry and steadiness of purpose, they are the things."

The work of Maury in compiling charts of the seas has never been improved upon. His observations and findings even to this day are held to be the most dependable authorities in the world on naval shipping. Though less conspicuous in his service than Generals Lee and Jackson, his, too, was most outstanding.

To be sure, there is no longer any feeling of sectionalism, no South, no North, no East, no West—all of us are now sons and brothers of our great common country. It is with a feeling of pride, however, that those of us from the South extol the virtues of our heroes and count their contributions to history. At the top of the great roster of our southern heroes will forever be found the names of Robert E. Lee, Stonewall Jackson, and Matthew Fontaine Maury.

The Tempted Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I issued a statement pointing to the likelihood that some Republican Members would use back-alley techniques to restore the Rules Committee's powers as a way of killing FEPC, the whole civil-rights program, and all Fair Deal legislation. I wish to bring to the attention of these same Republican Members this editorial from this morning's edition of the country's leading Republican newspaper, the New York Herold Tribune. It properly recalls to the Republican Members their obligations to their party, to the Congress, and to the people of our country. One more Republican finagle on civil rights will prove once and for all the hypocrisy in all Republican protestations in favor of civil rights.

THE TEMPTED REPUBLICANS

Mr. Truman likes to make large statements. Sounding off on the durable issue of civil rights, he promises that a Senate vote will be forced if it takes all summer. Such a bugle blast makes a snappy headline, but we doubt that the President is really quite that much of an optimist. Nothing has appeared to indicate any great change of temper in the Senate. With a congressional election coming up, there is less taste than ever for sitting out the summer in Washington. The filibuster is still the southerners' effective weapon, as Mr. Truman knows. One can only assume that the White House cry was intended for external consumption, with civil rights intended again for the purposes of vote getting in November.

A far more immediate test of civil rights rests in the House, where the Rules Committee is on a rampage to regain its autocratic powers over legislation. Southern Democrats and Republicans are in coalition to put the Rules Committee back in control, able to pigeonhole not only civil rights but every other bill which meets their common opposition. The vote is imminent, and the prospect for the Truman Democrats is scarcely comforting.

What concerns us is the Republican danger. For the sake of putting the majority party in a hole, a considerable number of Republicans appear willing to go along with the ultraconservative southerners who are consecrated to the one purpose of defeating civil rights. This is an alliance that violates principle and purpose. The Republican position on civil rights is historic and forthright, even stronger than that which Mr. Truman so fondly trumpets. But when Representative Cox, of Georgia, suddenly proposes restoring the Rules Committee's life-or-death authority over the legislative stream (and this by neat coincidence in the midst of hearings on fair employment practices), the Republicans on the committee wheel right into line. It is not an inspiring picture.

There has been a lot of pious talk that the Rules Committee is a private conscience, an enlightened combination of old heads, that saves an unruly House from much bad and costly legislation. If such a device is required to balk Mr. RANKIN's pension schemes, it is a sad commentary on congressional intellect and courage. This contradiction of majority will, the ability to sit on bills and keep them from coming to vote, cuts in both directions. The House is directly responsible to all the people, and why should the encrusted Rules Committee, operating by its own set of prejudices, be allowed a superior authority? Legislative traffic controls we need; effective party policy committees are required. But having clipped the Rules Committee's wings only last year, let us hold to the gains of open responsibility. The Senate has its entrenched filibuster; spare the return to the House Rules Committee. That is the challenge to Republicans in the coming House vote, to stick up for party principle and shun the Dixiecrat tempters.

Communist Approach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Observer, of Kearny, N. J., published under date of January 12, 1950.

Under the title, "Communist Approach," the editor has written a revealing article on the technique employed by agents of the Kremlin—the wolves in sheep's clothing. It is well that we acquaint ourselves so that we be equipped to stand guard.

COMMUNIST APPROACH

Many Americans must still wonder if the Soviet Union actually calls the tune within the satellite states or if these states, as the Kremlin claims, are actually independent "people's democracies." They must wonder, too, just how communism manages to overrun a state—Czechoslovakia, for example—which had always had a high degree of individual freedom.

The October issue of Foreign Affairs carried a revealing answer to these questions. It was written by Jozsef Reval, whom the magazine terms "the leading theorist of Hungarian communism," and was published in a Hungarian Marxist journal.

The gist of Reval's remarkable article is found in this paragraph: "We were a minority in parliament * * * but at the same time we represented the leading force. We had decisive control over the police forces. Our force * * * was multiplied by the fact that the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Army, were always there to support us with their assistance. * * * When we struggled directly and apparently only for steadfast achievement of bourgeois-democratic tasks, we fought as well for the establishment and assurance of the conditions which made possible the socialistic transformation. The change in the development of our people's democracy into the dictatorship of the proletariat began with the destruction of the right wing of the Smallholders' Party, with the liquidation of the conspiracy and the fall of Ferenc Nagy (Nagy headed a Hungarian coalition government). Then the kulak (the more prosperous class of farmer) became an enemy, then the leading role of our party and the working class was strengthened. * * * This development, our development into a dictatorship of the proletariat, was crowned and definitely assured * * * by the destruction of the right wing of the Socialist Party and the establishment of the unified Workers' Party."

That is a frank and accurate description of the standard Communist technique, written from the inside. It applies in principle to every country which has adopted the Marxist religion. The Kremlin actively aids and abets the movement, and the threat of Red Army action always exists. The wolf-in-sheep's-clothing device is always employed to disarm the people. And, once power is seized, all opposition is liquidated—including even the more moderate elements within the Socialist ranks.

Reval's article implies one more fact of the highest importance. The Communists must win an election or any form of political struggle only once—then they are in for good, unless war or revolution unseats them. Those who believe in free, representative government must win every time if they are to survive.

Gerald J. Doyle Wins Speaking Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, Gerald J. Doyle is a modest youngster, 18 years of age, who is a senior at Bishop McDonnell Memorial High School. He resides with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Leo J. Doyle, at 196 Clinton Avenue, Brooklyn, which is located in my congressional district.

Gerald's ambition is to become a radio announcer. He works after school hours as a switchboard operator in Kings County Medical Society, but finds time to write on timely subjects, showing a keen grasp of problems which confront our Nation.

On May 22, 1949 he was awarded first prize in a public speaking contest conducted at his high school. I have read some of his writings, and I am happy to have the opportunity to commend to the reading of my colleagues one of his speeches entitled "I Speak for Democracy."

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I speak for democracy because the democratic way of life gives me the assurance that I will be considered as an individual, a person—instead of a cog in the machinery of an all-embracing state. We, the high-school students of this country, are fortunate in that we are in the United States, where democracy means what it should mean—liberty to one's own life without government interference. We may prepare ourselves for and enter upon any walk of life we may choose, without let or hindrance from any bureaucratic or Government agency. All over this country, young men and women are finishing high school and seeking to enter college, so that they may be prepared to shoulder the burden that will preserve real democracy for themselves and those that come after them. Why? Because only in a true democracy, such as the United States, can a man achieve success and happiness.

Democracy gives me freedom of conscience, my right to worship my Creator as and when I see fit, to live my life according to the moral code sanctioned by my religion and to be educated in the faith of my fathers. I am guaranteed this by the basic law of my country. We have no state religion, but may render unto Caesar the things that belong to Caesar and to God the things that are God's, according to our religious concepts.

I hope to go to college—I want to gain all the knowledge I can, because free enterprise calls for the person with training. My training will help me to succeed in business; it should help me to safeguard that democracy which gives me all these opportunities.

Democracy can only exist and grow when the citizenry of a country is interested in government, and in those who run the government. My representatives, to whom I and my fellows have given the task of running my Government, should be helped by me in every way, so that the ship of state may safely sail the seas and weather the storms that beset her, be these storms national or international.

When things go wrong, I must be capable of voicing my dissatisfaction with those responsible; my criticism, however, should be constructive. Only a trained citizenry can give constructive suggestions to those who have been placed in power. All over this land, my fellows and our elders are taking keen interest in governmental affairs. The radio, newspapers, commentators, by voice or in writing, are enlightening us. Both sides of public questions are presented for our information, so that when our fathers, and later when we exercise our power of franchise, knowledge, and good judgment, will be called in to play when we choose those who will stand in our places in the legislative halls of our Government.

We, who speak for democracy, realize that there will always be a struggle to set on the right track those who lose faith in our system of government. Knowing that it is not perfect, we must be prepared to better it; but, in our attempt to better it, we must not lose the fundamental principle of our freedom. We must keep before us the true democratic ideal, that man, without regard to race, creed, or color, must be given the dignity which belongs to a rational being. I am the voice of youth. I believe in true democracy. I believe in my United States of America—may it always be the land of the free and the haven of the oppressed.

The Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for Saturday, January 14, 1950:

THE RULES COMMITTEE

A curious item of news originating in Washington yesterday was that the House Rules Committee had voted 9 to 2 to regain its old power of holding up legislation indefinitely. Readers may recall that the House deprived the committee of this regal prerogative a year ago. The vote in that case was 275 to 142. All that the committee can do now is to hold up bills approved by standing committees for 21 calendar days. After that the chairman of any standing committee so involved may call the measure up on the floor of the House on the second or fourth Monday of any month during a session. To the older-fashioned members of the committee this situation apparently seems cruel and unusual. Chairman SABATH, who made the announcement, stated that he himself had voted "no." This was consistent, since Mr. SABATH last year was the author of the motion to curtail the committee powers.

This particular action at this particular time must have some connection with the bill to establish a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, which was approved by the House Labor Committee last year and is now before the Rules Committee. The Rules Committee has delayed action on this measure until it can hear some more opponents. Practically speaking, we need not expect this or any other civil-rights measure to become law at this session. The FEPC might pass the House but if it did it would be killed by the filibuster in the Senate. Just as the Rules Committee is fighting for the dictatorship of a minority in the House, the opponents of effective cloture in the Senate have always fought for and won—as they did last March—the dictatorship of a minority in the Senate. It is odd that 6 members of the House Rules Committee or 20 Senators should be able to veto measures possibly desired by a majority of the Senate, a majority of the House of Representatives and a majority of the 48,489,217 voters who went to the polls in November, 1948. Such, however, may sometimes be the case. This is a point at which our democracy is still imperfect and needs attention.

Asia Out of Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article written by William Henry Chamberlin for the Wall Street Journal of Thursday, January 19, 1950:

ASIA OUT OF CONTROL—MOST OF CONTINENT IS NOW RULED BY NATIONALIST REGIMES OVER WHICH UNITED STATES CAN EXERT VERY LITTLE INFLUENCE

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The gist of Secretary of State Acheson's long speech at the National Press Club on America's Far Eastern policy could be summed up in two short sentences. Asia is out of control. And there is little we can do about it.

In discussing what has happened in China Mr. Acheson argued like a lawyer with a case to prove, not like a dispassionate historian. He very much exaggerated the strength of Chiang Kai-shek and the weakness of the Communists at the end of the war. He passed over in silence two substantial contributions which the Roosevelt administration made to the Chinese debacle.

One was the obsession of the terrible-tempered Gen. Joseph Stilwell, highest American military authority in China until 1944, with the idea of fighting a campaign in the jungles of Burma. This led to the diversion and withholding of supplies which might have made it possible to save large areas of southern China from Japanese conquest in 1944. And wherever the Japanese went the foundations of Chinese administration and social order were destroyed and a vacuum was created which the Communists were quick to fill as soon as the Japanese were eliminated.

SELL-OUT AT YALTA

The other contribution was the discreditable and stupid sell-out of China's eco-

nomic rights and interests in Manchuria to Stalin at Yalta. Mr. Acheson denounced the Soviet Union for detaching the northern provinces of China, Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia, and attaching these regions to the Soviet Union. He failed to mention the relevant if embarrassing fact that the late President Roosevelt at Yalta gave a considerable impetus to this process of encroachment on China's territorial integrity.

Nor did the Secretary explain how we got into the confused and contradictory position of being so eager to bribe Stalin to take part in a war, which wild horses couldn't have kept him out of, that we offered Russia on a silver platter the things which we had pronounced it utterly inadmissible that Japan should take.

Mr. Acheson derived some consolation from predicting for the Russians the righteous anger and the wrath and the hatred of the Chinese people. But this is largely guesswork. There has been nothing in the record of the Chinese Communists thus far to prove that they will not subordinate the interests of their own country to those of the Soviet Union.

The Soviet Union inflicted upon Poland about every cruelty and indignity that one nation could inflict upon another. It annexed almost half of Poland's prewar territory. It deported hundreds of thousands of Poles to slave labor concentration camps. It massacred thousands of Polish officers in the Katyn Forest. Yet it has been possible to maintain in Warsaw a Moscow-oriented government and to compensate the Poles to some extent by giving them territory and natural resources which rightfully belong to Germany.

Who can be sure that Stalin will not be able to offer Mao Tse-tung attractive prospects of expansion southward, into Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, to say nothing of Formosa and Hong Kong, and thereby reconcile him to the idea of Russian domination of the northern Chinese provinces? Communists do have a way of making life uncomfortable for those who build great expectations on their good behavior.

THE OLD ORDER IS GONE

Although Mr. Acheson is deficient as a historian of what has happened in China and is indulging in wishful guessing about the possibility of the Chinese Communists turning against Moscow, there is no reason to dispute his main conclusions about other parts of Asia. That continent has broken loose from its old moorings.

Before the war the British, Dutch, and French Empires maintained stability over a wide area of southern and southeastern Asia. Now the old-fashioned colonialism symbolized by Kipling's phrase, "the white man's burden," is dead and nothing very firm has taken its place.

India and Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon are independent states. After years of fighting and negotiation the Dutch have recognized the independence and sovereignty of their former vast imperial possessions in Indonesia. The Philippines had been freed by the United States before the war and have taken up where they left off before the Japanese invasion. The French are fighting a costly, wasting, no-decision war in their big colony, Indochina.

Asiatic nationalism had been gaining strength before the war and gained irresistible impetus during the war, when the Japanese for a time overran almost all southeastern Asia. The Japanese carried on much propaganda against white imperialism. And the speed with which the French, British, and Dutch possessions fell before the first sweep on the Japanese onslaught certainly helped to destroy native belief in the invincibility of their foreign rulers.

It has been American policy to favor the emergence of moderate nationalist regimes as the most hopeful barriers against communism. It was largely under American pressure that the Dutch Government, to the dissatisfaction of a considerable section of Dutch public opinion, came to terms with the Indonesian nationalists.

NEW NATIONALIST REGIMES ARE UNTRIED

The French experience in Indo-China certainly shows the difficulty, perhaps the impossibility, of trying to restore old-fashioned colonial relations. But we do not have and cannot have any assurance that non-communist national regimes will be able to function smoothly and efficiently. The masses in these Asiatic lands are poor and illiterate; the new governing classes are inexperienced and doctrinaire. Burma has fallen into complete chaos and there are occasional ominous earthquake rumblings in India and Indonesia. The British have been fighting a hit-and-run guerilla war in Malaya, although they have been more successful there than the French have been in Indo-China.

Obviously it is not in America's power to take over and run countries where the old forms of foreign rule have broken down or are breaking down. Nor is our economic power so strong a weapon in Asia as it was in Europe. For, even if the new nationalist governments appreciate the advantages of American trade and investment, their hold on their peoples is precarious and uncertain.

There may be a suggestion of wholesome humility in recognizing that Asia is out of control, that we cannot run the whole world. If we had acted on that principle 10 years ago we would probably have saved ourselves many lives, a vast amount of treasure and innumerable frustrations and disillusionments.

Kenosha's Civic Spirit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of my progressive cities—Kenosha, Wis.—has done an outstanding piece of work in civic betterment. On Sunday, December 25, the Hearst newspapers in this country featured Kenosha and pointed out that the Kenosha Manufacturers' Association and other civic organizations had made a significant contribution to civic life by coordinating important elements in that community to the end that industry, labor, and business had a common goal, namely, the good of all its citizens. As part of my remarks, I am enclosing an editorial that appeared in the Kenosha Evening News on December 20, 1949:

KENOSHA'S CIVIC SPIRIT GETS NATIONAL RECOGNITION

"Kenosha, the City Where People All Work Together" is the title of an article by Rev. Paul Mitchell which is being presented Sunday, December 25, in Hearst papers. A number of pictures were taken of Kenosha's institutions and of the individuals connected with them. Because of the extensive distribution of this article, which will appear in 22 city editions and in special editions in 36 States, various combinations of the pictures taken will be used in different localities; thus pictures not used in the Chicago-Milwaukee area will be used in other sections of the country.

This article is the result of attention attracted to Kenosha by the booklet, The Story of an Industrial Association, recently issued by the Kenosha Manufacturers Association. Rev. Mitchell, who is pastor of Kenosha's Peniel Tabernacle Church, became interested in the civic activities of the Kenosha manufacturers through contacts made with the KMA in his capacity as president of the Kenosha Ministerial Association.

Early this year the booklet won a top national award for its description of programs and activities carried on by the manufacturers of the community through the KMA and in cooperation with individuals and groups throughout Kenosha. This award created a widespread demand for the book.

CAN WORK TOGETHER

Many of the letters subsequently received from top management and industrial and public relations men, as well as from labor leaders, clergymen, and educators who had received the book, expressed the belief that Kenosha's accomplishment was evidence that all citizens in a manufacturing city can work together in harmony and understanding to solve industrial and community problems.

Commenting on the article, J. C. Stump, executive director of the manufacturers association, said: "The manufacturers of Kenosha recognize the importance of industry to the community, as well as the tremendous responsibility that industry has to the community. As individuals, as corporations and as a group through their association, they are constantly striving to fulfill and meet that responsibility.

"The association is carrying forward the manufacturer's proven ideal: The final solution to any problem, product, or program must be for the best interests of the public, the stockholders, the employees, management, and the community."

Stump further poined out that, "The association in its regular daily work and services for industry and the community has had the outstanding cooperation and support of all manufacturers, members of their staffs, industrial employees, and every other individual and segment of the community. Without their cooperation and support the programs could not have been successful. This is fully appreciated and it is the constant goal of the association that it will always prove worthy of that highly regarded confidence, cooperation, and support."

The Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

WATERTOWN, MASS., *January 19, 1950.*
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives:

We have been notified by St. Josephs Lead Co. they will suspend shipments zinc oxide because Duquesne Power Co. will cut off power January 20 on account of coal shortage. Our other supplier New Jersey Zinc Co. has been closed by strikes for 5 months. Zinc oxide being essential ingredient in our process we face shut-down of our plant employing 250 people. Can anything be done?

MASON, INC.,
J. H. MASON HAARTZ.

Everyday Miracle at Fishersville, Va.: The Lame Learn To Walk

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article from the pen of Hamilton Crockford, published in the Sunday, January 8, 1950, edition of the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch, and also an editorial from the same paper on the subject of rehabilitation.

Within the past 3 months I have, upon two occasions, taken advantage of opportunities to visit the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center at Fishersville. What I witnessed there was something not only surprising in the methods employed in the rehabilitation of the handicapped, but the evidence on every hand of successful accomplishment was nothing less than astounding. I feel that the story of this rehabilitation center and its achievements in the work of restoring to handicapped persons both the will and ability to take their rightful places in the world of effort, will be of interest to all who may read it. The article and the editorial follow:

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1950]

EVERYDAY MIRACLE AT FISHERSVILLE: THE LAME LEARN TO WALK

(By Hamilton Crockford)

Fishersville: The man on crutches moved slowly down the corridor. He slipped and fell.

The physical therapist standing nearby didn't make a move to help him. She simply looked at him and laughed.

"Did you hurt your knees?" she said.

As though he'd never expected anything else from her, the man picked himself and his crutches up unaided. Then he laughed, too. He was a double amputee, and the knees were artificial.

"You'd think we're the most brutal people in the world," said Dr. Josephine Buchanan, supervisor of medical services at the Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center, recalling the incident later. "But it's all calculated."

The man, you learned, had been taught how to fall, and how to get up, too. He wasn't hurt. It was all in his daily curriculum.

"You see, we teach them independence first of all," Dr. Buchanan elaborated, "and they love it. Some of them have been so pampered at home it's pathetic. We have to rehabilitate their families as well as the students."

An elderly man moved through the room with the aid of a pair of canes, strange noises emanating from his artificial legs, as the doctor was talking. She took time out to observe, "You're squeaking."

"Yes, I need oil," he said, and grinned broadly.

A UNIQUE VENTURE

This kind of banter between staff and students sets the pace for Virginia's unique venture in the rehabilitation of handicapped civilians here.

The treatment combines complete physical therapy with vocational training in a rounded program, with the specific objective of putting ultimately employable men and women back in shape to hold a job.

And a high heart plays a high role in it. When you're a paraplegic, or have lost your legs, had polio, or speech or hearing defects, severe asthma, arrested tuberculosis, or epilepsy, it takes that.

The "ultimately employable" category might not seem to include all those. But with modern techniques, the center has handled each of those types of cases since it started up in September 1947, and many others. In its first 2 years it served 394 men and women whose cases fell under 45 different diagnoses.

And a mental lift was the first thing on the program for them. Countless seemingly casual little factors contribute to create it.

There are no "patients," for instance, at Woodrow Wilson, and indeed the term wouldn't fit. They're students. And nothing is simpler than the short wooden handbars on walls next to beds and showers by which the students can lift themselves. But the devices enable people to dress and bathe themselves who never could before. It's a long first step to independence.

[Economy-minded folk will note it also eliminates the need for a number of attendants the State would have to pay.]

LEARNING TO WALK

The results of all this are as obvious as the thick black beard on William Yancha's face. Yancha, a Pennsylvania miner who lost one leg below the knee and another above in an accident on the job a few months ago, started growing that bushy ornament soon after he reached the center. He won't shave, he declared, until he walks again without canes. The beard, he figures, is coming off early in the New Year.

It's the kind of extra something that crops up here in addition to the treatment.

The initiative for the over-all program here came from within the State, according to Supervisor Frank O. Birdsall, who succeeded W. K. Barnett, the first director, as head of the staff at the center. Plans for such a center were refined and expanded in the summer and fall of 1945 through cooperation from the Baruch Committee on Physical Medicine, he noted.

Then after long negotiations the former Woodrow Wilson Army General Hospital was deeded to the State and Augusta County July 25, 1947, for educational purposes. The 150-building, 400-acre installation was valued at more than $6,000,000. Along with its utilities, and furnishings and equipment worth $350,000, it was transferred at no cost by the Government.

Making the most of the opportunity, the county opened a consolidated high school for some 1,000 students in its part, and the State also established a regional vocational school, the sixth in Virginia.

The rehabilitation center, utilizing 50 of the one-story brick buildings, completed the three-way integrated set-up. With training as well as treatment available on the spot, it thus afforded a complete program such as no other State has yet provided.

Some have medical centers for the handicapped, but none offer the combined facilities. Even Texas, Birdsall noted with a smile, admitted at last fall's national meeting of rehabilitation workers that Virginia was ahead of it.

STATES COOPERATE

Representatives of several States and a half dozen foreign countries have visited the center to take notes. Some 12 States have entered a few of their own handicapped students here, and the experience has led Birdsall to conclude that centers should be planned to serve several States rather than a single one. A pooling of cases and resources, he explained, assures better and more varied services at lower cost.

Under the State rehabilitation program, created following the enactment of State and Federal laws in 1920, the Federal Government matches on a 50-50 basis the case service funds appropriated by the general assembly for such work.

Rehabilitation is not limited to Fishersville. Across the State 22 field supervisors carry the guidance and training program to disabled persons in their home localities—those who qualify as being old enough to work, but not too old to hold a job, and having some ability left which can be used to make a living.

The State board of education, which administers the program, estimates there are 30,000 such persons in Virginia, between the extremes of the helpless and the nonhandicapped, though many are not reported. In fiscal 1947-48, those enrolled in the projects numbered 2,004. The board reported that the 982 who completed their training that year were supporting not only themselves but 1,415 dependents the next. It noted the cost of rehabilitating them averaged $393 each, and the next year they averaged earnings $1,699 each.

The center here now accommodates about 200 students at a time—the severely disabled—for an average 6-month stay Some 65 of them are from other States.

Those who come here pay all their maintenance and medical fees if able, or whatever portion they or their families can meet, with public funds making up only what is left. Public funds cover tuition costs. The State provides any capital outlay funds for the others.

CHARGES VARY

Virginia students pay $45 per month for maintenance, out-of-State students $60, based on cost analyses worked out by auditors. Some people injured in industry are admitted under the sponsorship of insurance companies, and others financed by such sources as the United Mine Workers or the National Polio Foundation also are accepted in limited numbers.

The total budget of the center for all purposes figures to about $4 per capita per day, and Birdsall, noting that the costs during the first years will be high, expects this to drop when more students are entered.

For that kind of money, 19-year-old Iris Dove, who never walked in her life, is going to walk. She'll need crutches, but life will be far different from what she knew before. And she'll be equipped to become an alteration seamstress.

A spastic paraplegic from birth, the Roanoke girl had had numerous operations in past years. She never attended public school. Home bound instruction provided by the Roanoke school system and other instruction in hospitals gave her the equivalent of an eighth grade education.

Now, while the technical school teaches her a vocation, the physical medicine department of the center is reeducating her unused muscles. First the therapists exercised her legs, a slow, methodical process, and now she exercises them herself, walking alone with the aid of hand rails.

LEARN TO WALK

But Iris Dove's case is no more striking than many another. Paraplegics and double above-knee amputees are, however, the most difficult cases that come to the center, according to Dr. Buchanan. And these individuals, who seldom ever got back on their legs before, are getting back on them here.

It's the first time, the doctor said, that civilians generally have had a chance to get this kind of rebuilding, which heretofore has been pretty much limited to veterans in Government hospitals.

The techniques, she explained, are largely the result of knowledge gained in the Government's program for rehabilitating war casualties. It's a new specialty in medicine which did not exist 2 years ago, she noted, and numbers of doctors just now are entering it.

Hard work by a cheerful group of skilled physical therapists, exercising the student's

leg stumps or paralyzed limbs, starts off the treatment. Then the student takes over, walking, falling, climbing hand rails, climbing steps like those on a bus or in front of buildings. Before he "graduates," Dr. Buchanan explained, he has to walk around the building on crutches, cross a ditch, fall and get up, and do numerous other stunts, all unaided.

There are other courses for other handicaps. A speech therapy department is one of the recent additions. Consultants on all medical services visit the center and advise on treatments.

But students spend only part of their day in physical rehabilitation. They've selected, with the help of Guidance Counselor J. Paul Glick, the kind of vocational training they want. They get it in the adjoining technical school, headed by W. T. Sinclair. The lay-out of the corridors is such that they can travel to class in their wheel chairs or on foot without going outdoors.

EDUCATION, TOO

The school, with an enrollment of 283, including those from the center, offers them choices of business courses, watch repairing, cabinet making, laundering, shoe repair, sewing, and numerous other subjects.

After hours a social center is available for recreation.

Students admitted to the rehabilitation program are those with disabilities remaining after surgical or medical treatment is done. For some 50 percent of these, physical therapy and rehabilitation can reduce and sometimes eliminate the disability, Dr. Buchanan explained.

But the others, for whom no further treatment is feasible, still benefit by getting training in the technical school which they couldn't get elsewhere because of the pace they'd have to keep or the physical surroundings. Here the program is paced to their need and the equipment is adjusted in every conceivable way so that they can work at it.

Thus, an undermanned center staff, conscious of the need for saving taxpayers' dollars, is able to say that there are none who come here whom it is unable to help.

Assistant Supervisor W. G. Chrisman pointed out this fact is pretty well assured beforehand by the screening work done in home localities. No applicant is admitted direct to the center.

Students are accepted only after the field supervisors in their territory, backed by expert medical opinion, certify they can be improved by the program here. The plan, Chrisman noted, saves the State many dollars it might otherwise spend on cases which couldn't be helped.

The center, Dr. Buchanan reiterated, "is not a haven for the chronically disabled or unemployed." Its program, she stressed, "is an active program, and when the students are sufficiently improved, they are sent on their way to make way for others."

"The amount of money you spend rehabilitating a man," she added, "is far less than you spend just to maintain him in helpless condition. Eventually he gets a job and starts paying taxes back to the State."

URGES MORE FUNDS

Meanwhile, it's the kind of program on which the State could afford to spend more money, in the opinion of one interested observer from Hawaii, M. O. Ekern, director of the vocational rehabilitation service in Honolulu's department of public instruction. Mr. Ekern declared he found the project is a 24-hour job for Birdsall and his assistants. They badly need more help, he said, if the job is to be done most efficiently.

A 65-year-old student amputee, who walked out recently with the aid of a pair of canes after being graduated in 6 months, had his own comment. George H. Caperton, a Beckley, W. Va., coal purchasing agent, who lost a foot when gangrene set in because of diabetes, was leaving to get married.

"I'd been off my legs since July 1948," he said, "and doctors told me I wouldn't walk again. I never would have if I hadn't gotten here."

Said Caperton's brother, William, of Washington, who came for him, "It's a darned shame more people don't know about the place."

[From the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch of January 8, 1950]

TAX MONEY WELL SPENT

From both a humanitarian and a dollars-and-cents standpoint, expenditures of tax money for vocational rehabilitation seem to be among the most fruitful made by the Federal and State governments.

During the last 5 years, 222,000 disabled civilians have been restored to a self-supporting status at a cost to the Federal Treasury of $76,000,000, according to figures announced by the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation of the Federal Security Agency. The FSA says these rehabilitated people already have returned $70,000,000 to the Treasury in Federal income taxes and eventually, it is estimated, will pay $10 in such taxes for each $1 of taxpayers' money spent on them.

The Federal Government pays about 70 percent of the cost of the over-all rehabilitation program, with the States putting up the other 30 percent. Just as they return money to the Federal Treasury, so do the rehabilitated persons pay taxes to the State.

Virginia has been accused of being a backward State in the matter of per capita expenditures for public education and for other purposes considered by some analysts in determining relative progressiveness among the States. In the matter of vocational rehabilitation, however, Virginia is in the forefront. Its Woodrow Wilson Rehabilitation Center near Staunton is the only State-owned facility of its kind. The valuable work done there, with the aid of Federal funds, is described by Hamilton Crockford in an interesting article in this section of today's Times-Dispatch.

About 2,000 disabled Virginians now are actively engaged in some phases of the rehabilitation program, receiving either medical treatment or vocational training. Another 2,000 are in the active file, in that they are being given counselling service and ultimately will go into the medical or vocational phases of the program, which is administered in Virginia through the State department of education. Cases are referred from the State industrial commission, the department of public welfare, the State employment service, schools, hospitals, physicians, and other sources.

The vocational rehabilitation program began nearly 30 years ago, and the system was greatly enlarged 5 years ago. Since its inception, more than 30,000 persons have been aided in Virginia and approximately 430,000 in the Nation as a whole. But the FSA says that only one in five disabled persons is receiving the training needed and that many more are being disabled each year than are being rehabilitated.

Welcome Thrifty Fifty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a poem, Welcome Thrifty Fifty, by James Lewis, one of my constituents from Bradford, Pa.:

WELCOME THRIFTY FIFTY

We managed to muddle through
The years right up to date,
But now the babe called '50
Is coming t' rough the gate.

He has a happy Truman smile
But no ribbon round his axis,
Instead he totes a sign
Announcing forty-three billion taxes.

"Living costs too much," sez he,
"I'm going to give you, all for free,
Education, insurance, security
From woes and foes, immunity."

"Labor must have much more pay
For working less and shorter day.
The farmer much more for his crop,
We'll tax-support them if they drop."

"Billions overseas we'll send,
Billions more we'll spend and lend
For steel mills, dams, and various plants,
You gave your shirts—here go your pants."

—*James Lewis.*

While His Naval Critics Assail Unification, the Committee for the Hoover Report Presents Secretary Louis Johnson "a Citation of Merit for Encouragingly Applying to His Department the Recommendations of the Report of the Hoover Commission and Thereby Achieving Notable Economies While Maintaining the Effectiveness of Our National Defense"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under the extension of remarks as recited in the Appendix of the RECORD on last Friday I read an address headed "The problem of unification of the armed forces." The article could well have been entitled "Creating Disunity in the Armed Service Forces of the United States."

Certainly, in his approach to the problem of unifying our armed services, Admiral H. E. Yarnell, United States Navy, retired, made no effort whatever to indicate what should be accomplished by those charged with administering the National Security Act nor did he suggest what benefits could be had under that law as it was passed by this Congress.

Admiral Yarnell exhibited personal opposition to the act as it was passed by this Congress in starting out by saying in part, "The passage of the National Security Act was a serious blunder," this he said despite the fact that under the act and through Secretary Louis Johnson, President Truman has already saved the taxpayers of the country not hundreds but, I might say, thousands of millions of dollars.

Stressing all points of difference—the admiral made no mention of the many

points of agreement that have long since been reached between the official heads of various armed services and other bodies charged with the defense of this country.

It seems no happenstance that his speech preceded another outburst by Navy Captain Crommelin and was followed by an article written in the same vein which was headed "If This Be Treason" and published in Collier magazine this week.

Altogether they add up to what I sincerely hope will prove a futile endeavor to continue to spread discord, misunderstanding, and dissension among the armed services, and spread it at a time when our country needs nothing more in the world than to close ranks and address every last talent of its citizenship to the solution of the vexatious problems now at hand and which lie ahead.

What a contrast exists between the words spoken by Admiral Yarnell and the motive that prompted the little heralded or publicized presentation of a simple but eloquent testimonial and citation bestowed upon our great Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, a few short weeks ago.

The idea of making the bestowal of that testimonial did not stem from some prejudiced source nor was it the expression of some opinionated individual. It was, on the other hand, the grateful recognition of a tremendous group of representative citizens from all over these United States. It was, moreover, the expression of men who, without regard to their political affiliations or their pride in our Army, Navy, or Air Force, expressed publicly their acknowledgment of the things already accomplished by the Secretary of Defense in achieving—

First. The declared purpose and the objectives of a Republican Congress which passed the National Security Act of 1947.

Second. The objectives and purposes of a Democratic controlled Congress which amended that act as of August 10 last year in order to insure the attainment of the objectives previously expressed.

Mr. Speaker, the year of 1949, insofar as the administration of government is concerned, saw no greater tribute given to any man in public life than was the recognition given to my good and longtime friend and the friend of every man in Congress, the Hon. Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, by the National Committee on the Hoover Commission.

You will recall that the Commission itself was set up by a Republican Congress. You will recall, moreover, that it was given several million dollars to report back to the Congress the ways and means by which we could achieve greater efficiency, economy, and businesslike administration of the Executive Departments of the Federal Government, with a minimum expenditure of the taxpayers' dollar.

The proposal, although it was sponsored by the Republicans, met the warmhearted support of the Democratic delegation and President Harry Truman signed the bill that gave birth to the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Speaker, nowhere but in a true democracy can I vision leaders of diametrically opposed political forces, and meeting in an election year at that, and dispensing with partisan politics, paying tribute to a great Democratic public official for the deeds which he has already accomplished in the performance of his duties.

Mr. Speaker, that is in fact what happened on Tuesday, December 13 last. On that occasion a Nation-wide committee representative of American citizens in every State of the Union and made up of men concerned solely with advancing the well-being of these United States expressed their faith in and their recognition of the abilities of the Hon. Louis Johnson to coordinate, perfect, and administer the most sacred trust outside of the Presidency of the United States that could be given to any man—the security and peace of these United States.

The chief spokesman on that occasion was the Hon. Frank Pace, Jr., Director, Bureau of the Budget. Second to him on the program was the Hon. Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, chairman of the Citizens Committee on the Hoover Report of the Commission for Reorganization of Government, and who personally presented the committee's award to Louis Johnson.

Mr. Speaker, the words spoken on that occasion need no embellishment of mine. They are of such great interest to the Members of this House that I am inserting them into our proceedings today with the sincere hope that every Member on both sides of the aisle will read and learn of the tribute paid by a great group of fellow Americans to one who is doing his job as his God and conscience dictate that it should be done in behalf of our country.

Centuries ago it was written that "By their fruits ye shall know them."

Despite the critics of unification, in and out of service, who, in this election year, and on the eve of the political "dog days" which lie ahead, are snapping at the heels of our great Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson continues on his way of translating planned economies into actual action programs in behalf of national economy, security, and the American taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, may God preserve Louis Johnson to continue his work knowing that the President and Americans everywhere are behind him to a man.

The presentation of the award was made by Dr. Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University, Philadelphia, Pa., chairman of the Citizens Committee.

Dr. Johnson spoke as follows:

Mr. Secretary, Under Secretary, Mr. Colts, other distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, some 9 months ago when we first started to think in terms of establishing a citizens committee that would carry on a program to implement the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on the Reorganization of the Executive Departments of Government, I discussed the same with Mr. Herbert Hoover. It seemed to Mr. Hoover, as it also seemed to me, that one of the first steps taken should be to visit with President Truman—tell him what we had in mind and to receive his blessing and approval for the project. I would have you believe that the President was most generous in giving his approval.

It then occurred to me that it would be a good thing also for me to talk to some top-flight governmental officials and get their viewpoints and support. One of the first men whom I had an opportunity to meet was our great Secretary of Defense, the Honorable Louis Johnson. I met him first in Philadelphia and at the time he was there to christen the *Roanoke*, the ship named after his home town in Virginia.

I shall never forget the observations and the statements which he made that day. There was a something about the quality of his speech, his spirit, his devotion and affection for his mother, for his home town and, above all else, the sensatory thrill he exhibited of being of service to his country and cooperating with all of those working with him in his new job bespoke his great sincerity.

I then, for the first time, realized that we had in Mr. Louis Johnson a truly great public servant and as I got to know him better we discussed intimately the difficulties and hurdles that would have to be taken before he could effectuate the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. I found solace and comfort in his remarkable perception and complete understanding of the importance of the findings of the Hoover Commission and I knew that we could count on him for advice, counsel, and forthright action on his part.

So, my friends, it gives me great pleasure today to hand over to one of the finest public officials that I have ever had the pleasure of knowing and whose personal support of our objectives has meant so much to all of us on the Committee, an award for distinguished service in line with the recommendations of the Hoover report.

Now my friends I would like, if I may, to read this memorial:

"The Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report presents this citation of merit to the Honorable Louis Johnson in recognition of distinguished service to the American people in encouragingly applying to the Department of Defense the recommendations of the report of the Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of Government and thereby achieving notable economies while maintaining the effectiveness and efficiency of the Defense Establishment."

Now Mr. Secretary Louis Johnson it gives me great pleasure to present you with this citation.

Secretary Johnson's response was as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dr. Johnson, my colleague, Steve Early, Frank Pace, ladies and gentlemen of the Hoover Commission.

Dr. Johnson, I particularly want to thank you for the kind reference you made with respect to both my mother and my home town.

I told Steve Early about an hour ago that I could speak all that I had to tell you in about 2 minutes and, frankly, now I don't remember what it was that I was going to say.

Dr. Johnson, someone once wrote that there are some who collect old pictures, some old china, others old linen and, as I recall it, the writer went on to say that while all were precious and worth while, that all of these things were fragile and that the only imperishables of life are the memories.

Mr. Chairman, when the going was rough, and I would have you know it was rough at the time we first started on unification—there was the memory of the yesteryear in the War Department and my knowledge of the things that then needed to be done that spurred me on to the doing of those things.

Additionally thereto I have enjoyed the wholehearted support of our President, Harry

Truman. But the one thing above all others that made it possible, in addition to our President's support of unification, was the understanding memory and sympathetic support and cooperation of the Honorable Herbert Hoover and your committee—and now Mr. Chairman I want publicly to express my appreciation of that support.

But a short time ago I saw on the wall of the home of a friend an original letter written and signed by Gen. Robert E. Lee in 1867. I thought as I read that letter how eloquently it expressed the philosophy of ex-President Herbert Hoover. The thought impinged itself upon my mind that in our generation there was probably none other than Herbert Hoover himself who could have written such a letter as that great American, Robert E. Lee wrote to Col. Charles Marshall in the distant year of 1867.

May I ask the indulgence of you, my friends, to read that letter to you? I do so because it makes me better understand why Herbert Hoover, treasured then by his friends, while he was railed at by those who worked for and under him, is now treasured and respected by good Americans everywhere throughout our land.

That letter of Gen. Robert E. Lee read in part as follows:

"My experience with men has newly disposed me to think worse of them nor indisposed me to serve them, nor in spite of failures, which I lament, of errors I now see and acknowledge, or of the present aspect of affairs do I despair of the future. The truth is this. The march of providence is so slow and our desire so impatient, the work of progress so immense, and our means of aiding it so feeble, the life of humanity is so long and that of the individual so brief that we often see only the ebb of the advancing waves and are thus discouraged. It is history that teaches us to hope."

Therein, Mr. Chairman, is to me the philosophy that makes Herbert Hoover tick, and inspire people like you to work with him.

I accept, sir, this citation of merit with humility and with full appreciation that it comes not to Louis Johnson but that it comes to all of those on a team that is now on fire with the zeal of doing a good job in behalf of our Nation.

Men like Steve Early, Secretary of Army; Gordon Gray, the Secretary of the Navy; Frank Matthews, the Secretary of the Air Force, Stu Symington, General Bradley, and the three grand Chiefs of Staff who serve on the War Council advising me as Secretary of Defense on all matters relating to the armed services. The Joint Chiefs of Staff, as you know, act as the principal military advisers to the President and the Secretary of Defense with specific responsibility for preparing strategic plans and providing for the strategic direction of the military forces.

All of these splendid men, I am happy to say, are of one mind with me in realizing that the defense dollar is a sacred dollar. Moreover, they realize that the taxpayers' dollar that is entrusted to the Secretary of Defense by the Congress is being spent more economically and without waste and extravagance in producing greater results than the same dollars produced before we went to work to cut out waste and extravagance.

The spirit that recognizes that economy is now actually effecting efficiency in operations is strikingly illustrated, as you well know, Steve, by the splendid work being done by the congressionally established War Council.

While the proceedings of the War Council are usually secret, I can tell you this much. A few days ago one of the departments reported that where they had cut civilian strength in that department by about 30 percent they were turning out more and better work than they did before they made the cut in their personnel.

Dr. Johnson, it is to these splendid officials from the highest and operating down to the lowest echelons to whom this citation should be awarded; it is on their behalf that I accept it from the Hoover Commission.

Mr. Chairman, this is the first time since I have been Secretary of Defense where I did not have to sing for my supper and make a speech. I am indeed glad that on this first occasion where I was not billed as a speaker I heard one of the most factually sound and inspiring speeches I have ever heard. The speech was delivered by my good friend, Frank Pace, Director, Bureau of the Budget.

May I say that, in my opinion, there is no man in this country that has a more comprehensive view of the fiscal problems of all branches of Government than does your own good self. The speech made here this evening, coming as it did from one charged by Congress to assist the President in the preparation of the budget and the formulation of the fiscal program of the Government, was a speech that should make all of us sit up, take notice, and go forward despite all obstacles or criticism to do an even better job.

Believe me when I say, Frank, that that talk has inspired Steve, myself, and the rest of us all to do a better job.

Moreover, we will do our best to serve America as you, Dr. Johnson, President Hoover, those of the Hoover Commission, and fellow Americans everywhere, would have America served.

High Spots in the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include a radio speech which was delivered originally over radio station WHP in Harrisburg and WLBR in Lebanon, Pa., discussing some of the major trends outlined in the President's message on the budget for the fiscal year 1950:

SUMMARY

Nothing whatever was done in the House this week. It convened merely as a formality—to meet the rule that it cannot adjourn for more than 3 days unless the Senate gives permission for a longer recess. The flood of new legislation is just working its way into committee sessions. None of it is ready for floor debate. However, the Senate is more active. A great deal of legislation passed by the House last fall had not been acted upon by the Senate. Included in these bills are those on displaced persons, extension of social security, abolition of the poll tax and repeal of oleomargarine taxes, and a number of others. The order of business in the Senate is the oleomargarine bill. This week only the Korean aid bill is scheduled for House action. It is due to come up on Thursday.

HIGH SPOTS IN THE 1951 BUDGET

The budget of the United States Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951, is a 6-pound volume of 1,402 closely printed pages. It contains literally hundreds of tables giving in detail the costs of government, even down to items such as $150 for snow removal in front of the Supreme Court Building. When outlining how the budget was prepared last week, I neglected to mention that prior to September 15, when Mr. Pace, the head of the Budget Bureau, called for formal budget estimates, there had been a long series of preliminary conferences with the various departments and agencies. These had lasted for at least 6 months previous. Obviously, I have not been able to go through this massive book in detail. Already it has been analyzed by many. There are some striking facts which stand out from it clearly. There can be no dispute about them.

First. This is the fourth year in a row in which President Truman has sent to Congress a Federal spending budget higher in amount than the one submitted the year before. Each one has established a new all-time high for Government spending in peacetime. In January 1946, he asked for $35,900,000,000 to spend in fiscal year 1947. Each year since then, he has sought and secured more.

Actually, the final figures for Presidential spending for the present fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, are now estimated at $43,300,000,000 or more than the $42,400,000,000 he asked last January for fiscal 1951. However, the President's original budget request made for that same period was for slightly under $42,000,000,000. This increase during the year over the preliminary figures is customary and will probably happen again this year. Each year the original recommendations were followed by a steady stream of supplementary and deficiency appropriation requests which had to be added to the original figures so that the final total was always much higher than the first.

Secondly, over $12,000,000,000—or 29 percent of the new $42,400,000,000 budget—goes to pay for debts or obligations incurred in this present fiscal year or earlier. Nearly every one of these prior obligations began in bygone days, with a small—even tiny—initial appropriation or by a contract authorization. Then these programs grew and grew and grew. As I pointed out last week, new programs, such as the low-cost housing subsidy one passed by the Eighty-first Congress in its first session in 1949, have not yet begun to "take"—that is, to require the outlay which we know for a mathematical certainty they must ultimately demand. All this shows the grave danger to the solvency and credit of the Federal Government from these opening wedges, these camel's-nose-under-the-tent, or foot-in-the-door methods. Nearly all of the past and the new spending proposals are of a continuing nature. They will last for years and years. The odds are 10 to 1—or greater—that they will grow more costly each succeeding year.

Thirdly. In view of what I have just said about the foot-in-the-door method, it is startling indeed—and a matter of grave concern—to find that this new budget asks for nearly $1,000,000,000 to start 34 new spending programs. Many of these are continuing ones. But this $1,000,000,000 is only the cost for the first year for these new ideas. It is reliably estimated that in time—and in not so long a time—these continuing projects will require an outlay each year of about $4,000,000,000 (to be financed almost entirely out of general tax revenues).

Fourthly. The next fact to hit us in the face is this: Mr. Truman wants Congress to give him the power and authority to enter into contracts, placing on you and your pocketbook the duty and obligation to pay out at some future time, nearly $3,500,000,000 additional. Of this $3,500,000,000, $1,250,000,000 is for projects on which new legislation is required. In general, these sums are pure contract authorizations. They are not appropriations and, therefore, are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total called for by the budget. They are on top and over and above that total. Their costs will not begin to be part of the national budget until 1952 and following years.

As a matter of fact, the average yearly rate of Federal spending during President Truman's 4 years in offiec in peacetime, is

$14,000,000,000 per year higher already than the annual average during President Roosevelt's three terms in office, although the average for President Roosevelt's 12 years in the Presidency, included the cost of World War II. Did you ever stop to realize that?

What I am driving home is a double-edged argument. First, this is the largest peacetice budget in history. And secondly, it definitely plans, and lays the ground work for, far larger budgets in 1952 and succeeding years. Indeed, you can truthfully say that the approval of this budget by Congress, in whole or in major part, will force higher outgo in 1952 and following years.

I should mention here that the budget total does not include the large expenditures needed for social-welfare programs, which either are now covered or might be covered, if and when enacted, by pay-roll taxes. Those would be outside of and in addition to the $42,400,000,000 to be met out of general tax revenues—as distinguished from pay-roll-tax revenues.

The railroad-retirement taxes, on the other hand, are included in the total budget receipts and are transferred to its accounts as a budget expenditure.

Representative JOHN TABER, of New York, the ranking minority member of the Appropriations Committee, in a statement released shortly after the budget message was issued, said this: "If you add the new appropriations that he is asking for, including the contract authorizations, the deficiency which this Congress is asked to provide, the new authorizations which this Congress is asked to provide, and the items provided for in new legislation carrying an over-all picture of what the President is asking the Congress to give him in this session, you get a total of $50,833,000,000."

Let me give you an illustration of how these little acorns grow into large oaks. Last session $3,500,000 was provided to start a steam-generating plant in the Tennessee Valley Authority. This is certainly a tiny fraction of the budget. However, before this project gets through, it is admitted that it will cost at least $89,000,000, and in all probability, it will cost much more than that. Later, other steam plants to generate electricity will be pushed through in like manner and with small beginnings. All this will pyramid this cost further.

The President asks for the development of the St. Lawrence seaway. This would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year. But thereafter it would rise up to a minimum expenditure of $82,000,000 annually for 7 years. Even the proponents agree that this project would cost at least $570,000,000 to complete. Past history shows that all similar projects have cost double or more than the original estimates of the proponents. So my guess is that the St. Lawrence seaway would end up by costing close to $1,500,000,000. Of course, I have always been opposed to the St. Lawrence project on principle. I am against it also because of the disastrous effect it would have on our section of the country and on Pennsylvania to institute subsidized transportation down the St. Lawrence to compete with transportation now available in this section and to give lower rates through Government subsidy to Canadian and northwestern commerce. That gives those areas an unfair competitive advantage against you. That is taking your money in taxes and spending it to put you out of business. The mouth of the St. Lawrence is in Canada and our northern neighbor would reap the major benefit of any good results which might accrue. However, my point in mentioning it here is to show how great oaks from little acorns grow. And to show how the $4,000,000 for the St. Lawrence in this budget, if approved, would force far larger annual appropriations each year thereafter for many years.

This is the first budget submitted by President Truman in which he has failed to pay at least lip service to the theory of balancing expenditures with revenue. In the past, he has demanded new taxes for the purpose of bringing the two into balance, thereby admitting the necessity for budget balancing and the wisdom of so doing. But he has already stated that his tax proposals for 1951 will not raise enough new money to come even close to meeting the anticipated $5,000,000,000 deficit.

Past history proves, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that governments will never restrain their spending without some compulsion. One of the greatest brakes is the inability to impose new taxes, or the promise to reduce existing taxes. If new taxes are granted at this time, then it seems almost inevitable that Government spending will automatically go higher and higher, to be followed in due course by new demands for more and more taxes. The President's economists, in their recent review of economic conditions, stated at one point: "The principle of annual budget balancing is difficult in practice and unsound in principle." President Truman apparently adopts this theory. While he did not say so in so many words, the general tenor of all three of his messages and the figures in the budget, indicate his endorsement of this idea. No one is more ready to admit that budget balancing is difficult in practice. It is tough for the ordinary citizen to do it in respect to his family expense account. It is even tougher for the Government. But I disagree emphatically with the proposition that it is unsound in practice. On the contrary, I believe it is absolutely essential, if we are to retain national solvency and our form of government. It is most important to do it today—when taxation is near its peak, when employment is at its peak, when national income and national production are at or near their all-time highs. If we can't live within our income under these conditions, when can we ever hope or expect to do so?

How About the Alleged Coal Shortage?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, for a number of days now, "Old Southern King Coal," the merry old soul, instead of calling for his bowl and calling for his pipe and calling for his fiddlers three, has boldly and brazenly, in a single spaced, seven-paged harangue, via special messenger, if you please, ordered the President of the United States to—

1. Proceed immediately under the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in an effort to put an end to the coal crisis and to restore the genuine collective bargaining which must be the cornerstone of any equitable and enduring agreement between employers and their employees.

2. Direct the Attorney General to consider proceedings immediately against the United Mine Workers of America for violation of the antitrust laws, and if he finds there is no basis under existing law for prosecution of the union, that you send a message to the Congress upon its return in January, requesting amendment of the statutes to make labor unions properly subject to the antitrust laws.

This ill-advised, impudent, unauthorized directive reminded me of a great piece of literature because it was so darned different.

All of us, I am sure, are interested in ascertaining just what the true national coal situation is at this time. We hear of complaints from various parts of the country about impending coal shortages, factory shut-downs, black-outs, and discontinuance of railroad-train service and diverse other emergency curtailments of home and business efforts.

When I want to know the truth about some general news matter, I have learned to turn to a great daily newspaper which to my observation has always fairly reported the true facts, uncolored by bias or prejudice. I refer to the Christian Science Monitor. This is what that splendid newspaper said about the alleged coal shortage on January 16 last:

TRUMAN STILL SEES NO COAL SHORTAGE

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—Is there a critical Nationwide coal shortage or isn't there?

Is there mutiny in the ranks of John L. Lewis' miners or isn't there?

Controversy over these two questions is increasing as Mr. Lewis' "40-percent strike," which his 3-day workweek is called, continues to spread into 100-percent strikes in mines throughout Pennsylvania and West Virginia.

The administration's answer to the first question is "No."

President Truman is sticking by his guns. He has told his congressional leaders again that the coal situation does not warrant declaring a national emergency and using the Taft-Hartley law to restore full production in the coal mines.

Mr. Truman's attitude was reported by Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, of Illinois, Senate Democratic leader, who told the White House for the second time in 10 days that a serious coal shortage exists in Illinois because of the 3-day week being enforced by the United Mine Workers.

WEEKLY CONFERENCE

Senator LUCAS was at the White House with other Democratic congressional leaders for their weekly legislative conference with the President.

The Senate leader told a reporter he had shown Mr. Truman "a brief case full of letters, telegrams, and newspaper clippings" about the coal situation in Illinois.

The President replied that he was aware of the situation and has his top advisers reporting to him daily, Senator Lucas reported.

However, Mr. Truman was said to have described coal stocks above ground as the key factor and that while there were "spotty situations that were bad," he did not believe the facts warranted declaring an emergency under the Taft-Hartley law now.

Senator LUCAS said Mr. Truman noted that the use of the Taft-Hartley emergency weapons would require him to substantiate a finding in court that the coal dispute had created a national emergency.

BUREAU BACKS TRUMAN

The administration is backed up by Dr. James Boyd, director of the United States Bureau of Mines. Dr. Boyd says the Bureau has been trying its best to find out how the Nation's coal stocks stand.

The Bureau reports that there is more coal above ground than at any time in a long time. Dr. Boyd is a Republican, by the way, and Republican leaders in Congress have been insisting there is a critical coal short-

age and that the President should invoke the Taft-Hartley Act to restrain Mr. Lewis from holding down production by his arbitrary campaign for stabilizing employment by letting his men dig coal only 3 days a week instead of 5.

While Dr. Boyd might have political reasons for upholding the crisis claims of Republican leaders, nevertheless he asserts he cannot honestly say there is any serious soft-coal shortage.

Unfortunately, this impartial Government report on the real state of the Nation's coal stocks lends weight to charges published by the weekly newspaper, Labor, that big United States and Canadian railroads are using a trumped-up coal crisis to justify drastic curtailment of passenger train service.

The article in the January 14 issue of Labor says in part:

"Protests swept the dominion this week as the big Canadian National Railways, apparently following the lead of carriers in the States, also slashed passenger trains, blaming the move on the coal shortage.

"The Halifax Chronicle-Herald in Nova Scotia ran a front-page editorial blasting the Canadian National. In Nova Scotia, the paper said, the mines had huge stock piles of unsold coal—at the very time the CNR claimed a shortage. It raised the question of whether lack of coal was the real reason for the slash in service, or just an alibi.

"By contrast, the Canadian Pacific Railway did not cut off any trains. It declared it had ample coal on hand.

"What is the issue in the dispute between the United Mine Workers and the coal operators? The question is supremely important, because the newspapers, the mine owners, and reactionary lawmakers are using it to stir up hysteria."

LEWIS STRATEGY

Many observers here believe the situation is in no way near so critical as the industry is trying to make out or as Mr. Lewis wishes it were.

They think the mutiny among the miners, their refusal to work 3 days a week, linking their refusal to a demand for a contract calling for production 5 days or none is not a revolt against their union leader but a Lewis-inspired stratagem—a foxy one at that—to tighten the screws on management in his effort to force a new contract out of the industry.

It should be noticed that the latest 100 percent walk-outs of rebellious miners are aimed at Mr. Lewis' chief protagonists, the big works of Pittsburgh Consolidation Coal and the Frick interests in the Pittsburgh seam.

Pittsburgh Consolidation is said to be the largest commercial coal company in the world. Frick is the coal-producing branch of the United States Steel Corp.

Mr. Speaker, there seems to be a serious question as to whether or not there is a real shortage in the coal supplies of the Nation. I have heard it stated in the House of Representatives, and have read in some newspapers, that in many communities, the reserve coal on hand has dwindled down, in some instances, to a few coalscuttlesful.

Other people and newspapers have contended that President Truman was correct in claiming that no such national emergency exists, as yet, which would warrant the use of the injunctive provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

In reading the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1950, it is stated by its Mr. Joseph C. Harsch, the chief of its Washington News Bureau in a front page article, that although the coal piles of the Nation are shrinking daily, no real national emergency presently exists which would be compelling upon President Truman to apply for an injunction under the Taft-Hartley Act. In discussing the coal supply, he had the following to say:

They are shrinking now. December production is estimated at 35,000,000 tons. (Final figures for the month are not in yet.) This compares to a November consumption of 43,737,000 tons. That is, the mines produced about 9,000,000 tons less in December than was consumed in November. The December shrinkage in coal piles might run as high as 10,000,000 tons. But on December 1, total stocks on hand amounted to 45,264,000 tons, meaning that there is today about 35,000,000 tons on hand—which is about a 30-day reserve."

In conclusion I wish to say that this whole vocal uproar about acute coal shortages reminds me of the remarks of the man who had just finished shearing the scabby sheep that had kept up a continuous bleat, " 'Twas a great cry indeed for such little wool."

The Upset Down Under—No. 4

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—NO. 4—AUSTRALIAN LABORITES WATCHING TO SEE HOW FOES WIPE OUT REDS

(By Morley Cassidy)

CANBERRA, AUSTRALIA, January 19.—And now comes the big question: How do you unscramble a Socialist omelette?

How do you take a socialized or partly socialized state, dedicate it to free enterprise and make it work?

Australia, which has voted to do exactly that, knows part of the answer. It begins: "First you get rid of your Communists—"

But how?

No one is waiting with more grim anticipation than members of the late labor government who first tried to kill Communists with kindness, finally tried toughness, and failed with both.

One day when Sydney's latest dock strike was getting well under way, and seemed to be shaping up as the Communists' challenge to the new Liberal-Country party government of Prime Minister Robert G. Menzies, I was in the Sydney office of a leading figure in the late labor government.

On his desk was a newspaper with black banner lines reading "56 Ships Now Idle Here—40,000,000 Pounds Cargo Tied Up—Strike Spreading."

PROSPERITY MASKS PROBLEMS

This man, who was tearing his hair 6 months ago trying to end Australia's big Communist-led coal strike, rapped his knuckles on the headlines.

"Menzies thinks it's going to be so simple to stop these strikes," he snorted. "He'll just outlaw Communists, and make it illegal for them to hold union office. That will stop the trouble.

"Well—that's his baby. Now let's see him wash it."

Many of Australia's gravest problems have been masked, temporarily, behind the surface appearance of prosperity created by the post-war boom in wool and wheat prices.

Everybody has a job, and every factory, office, and farm is crying for more help. Wages are the best in Australia's history, and hours the shortest.

But Australia's voters have discovered, their votes seem to show, that full employment and good wages do not necessarily add up to real prosperity.

It's not hard to see why, talking to Australian people.

"What kind of prosperity is this, anyway?" says a young ex-service man, clerk in a Sydney hardware store, who lives with his wife and 2-year-old daughter in a four-room flat with her parents.

"We've all got jobs, and we haven't got houses. We get more money but it doesn't buy the things we want."

UNABLE TO GET BRICKS

"If we try to build a house, we can't get bricks because there isn't enough coal to make them. The farmer can't buy a plow because there's not enough steel. If you get a car, you can't get gasoline because the the labor government thought we shouldn't have it.

"And how long will we have money when the bubble goes out of the wool market?"

His views, apparently shared by a majority of Australia's voters, brought the downfall of the labor government of Prime Minister Joseph B. Chifley. And they point directly at the deep-seated problems which the new free-enterprise regime inherits.

Australia's socialization of industry has not approached the sweeping scale of Britain's nationalizations. Labor's efforts to set up government monopolies of banks, air lines, shipping, and coal mining have been frustrated by the constitution and the high court.

But the new government must unscramble the affairs of the Australian Shipping Board, which had lost £10,188,720 (about $22,000,000) in the last 4 years, trying to run shipping lines.

AIR LINES SETS SUBSIDY

It must deal with Trans-Australian Airlines, created to take over all air lines, but now limited to competing with private lines with the advantage of an annual subsidy of £700,000 (about $1,500,000).

It must take over management of the government's huge collective farm in northern Queensland, designed to boost the production of sorghum as a food for pigs. With the help of a fleet of 30 tractors, 30 headers, and 30 combines that private growers cannot buy, it has managed to raise 300,000 bushels of sorghum where 400,000 grew before.

There is also the problem of the government pay roll, which has grown until the government now employs 635,400 people, more than one-fourth of all employed workers in the Commonwealth. There is a maze and restrictions and controls through which the state has sought to effect its planned economy.

There is a sticky problem of state's rights. Australia's six states, as jealous of their right as Georgia ever was, have seen more and more of their powers gather into the central hand of Conberra, the federal capital.

They boil, especially, because the labor government took over the right to levy income taxes, and then bargained with each state over the amount to be remitted for state purposes.

DECENTRALIZATION IS ISSUE

Decentralization is a burning issue, and the new government favors it; but because of the social-benefits program it will not be easy to turn back the taxing power.

All these problems are minor, however, compared with the one fundamental task of putting value back into the pound.

This campaign slogan is a short way of saying that the new government intends to turn back inflation and the high prices that hit every household.

It can do it only by making it possible for private enterprise to step up production—a field in which the Labor government failed conspicuously.

Take housing, for instance: Four years ago the Australian Housing Commission found that the nation was short 300,000 homes.

It mapped a plan to wipe this out in 4 years at the rate of 80,000 homes a year, in addition to providing 40,000 new homes yearly to meet the normal growth in population.

Four years have now gone and home building has not even kept up with normal requirements, so the shortage now is greater than ever.

BUILDING WORKERS LACKING

Part of the difficulty is a shortage of building workers. Despite the crying need for more skilled hands, the Building Workers' Industrial Union, Communist controlled, has firmly closed its ranks to new members.

A Labor government program for training ex-servicemen for these trades has been frustrated. At the moment 4,000 veterans are awaiting training as plumbers. The union is permitting the training of 16. No training classes for bricklayers or carpenters have been authorized for a year.

The housing problem and many others run into the problem of coal and steel shortages. So take coal:

Despite the Labor government's desperate efforts to woo the miners' Communist leaders, strikes have blocked every effort to raise production.

Since the war strikes have taken a heavier toll each year of coal production, rising to 2,000,000 tons in both 1948 and 1949. So production from the deep pits is now just about equal to prewar.

For lack of coal the steel production, on which Australia's rosy hopes of great industrial development were built, has dropped steadily since the war.

In 1940 and 1941, with smaller manpower, the mills were producing 1,000,000 tons of ingots yearly. In the last 3 years they have been able to turn out only 75 percent of that. Today the biggest mill, Broken Hill Proprietary, is down to 64 percent of capacity for lack of coking coal.

GREAT HOPES FOR FARMS

Finally, take food and the farms. Australia had great postwar hopes there.

In the 8 years of the Labor Government, with prices high and world demand at its peak, the crop area has dropped from 23,500,000 acres to 22,200,000. The sheep on the ranges have declined from 111,000,000 to 102,000,000. Exports of food of all kinds have dropped from 886,730 tons to 591,685.

So how is production to be achieved? Obviously, the new prime minister thinks, there must be a new spirit of cooperation between employers and organized labor.

He has promised to put an end to the spirit of class warfare, through strengthening the arbitration courts—extensively weakened by the Labor Government as a concession to Communist union leaders—and through restoring trade-union democracy.

The first step toward industrial peace, Menzies is convinced, must be the elimination of Communists from control of Australian labor.

But communism's hold is strong. It was broken temporarily in 1940 and 1941 when Menzies, then in power, outlawed the party. It went underground, but when labor returned and lifted the ban in 1941, to win unity during the war, the party instantly sprang to life.

Labor Party appeasement has helped to strengthen the Communist hold since the war. Militant avowed Communists were appointed to the stevedoring and shipping boards and to other government agencies.

REDS CONTROL MANY UNIONS

Today admitted Communists hold either complete or effective control of the unions of ironworkers, blacksmiths, boilermakers, sheetmetal workers, miners, building workers, dockers, seamen, and clerks, and are influential in the unions of teachers, scientific workers and many others.

How is their grip to be broken? Menzies and all Liberal and Country Party candidates—now the majority in the House of Representatives—promised drastic action in their campaign speeches.

They promised to declare the party subversive and unlawful, and to dissolve it. They promised that the attorney general, subject to appeal, would be given the power to declare other organizations substantially Communist, and to follow the party into whatever new form it may attempt to take.

They promised a law banning Communists from any paid post in government, or any office in a registered industrial organization.

"These are far-reaching proposals," says Menzies, "but half-measures are no good."

Leaders of the late Labor Government are grimly waiting to see if Menzies can do what they could not. They doubt it.

"He may get a surprise," says one of them sourly, echoing many others. The toughest Communists we have are Jim Healy, secretary of the waterside workers, and E. V. Eliott, secretary of the seamen.

They are also among our most efficient union executives. The Communists didn't have to rig their election. They got elected for the same reason your John L. Lewis gets elected—because they get results.

Bureaucrats Die Hard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in yesterday's New York World-Telegram. There is certainly more truth than poetry in this statement and for those of us who can see where centralizing government from Washington is leading us, we would do well to heed this advice.

BUREAUCRATS DIE HARD

Rent Director Tighe E. Woods is asking the public and the Congress to swallow his story that it's necessary to extend Federal rent control for another year. To support his stand, Woods has dug up a set of figures that are supposed to show, but don't, that dire things happen to rents that have gotten out from under the fist of the Great White Father in Washington.

The Rent Director has announced that rents in six big cities increased 16 to 41 percent when Federal controls went off. Now this does make a case for some system of rent control. But it is by no means proof that the Federal plan is the one to do the job.

Woods failed to point out that the various States still do have legislative power that could be used to control rents. If the people of these six States feel that the rent increases granted were excessive and unjustified, let the various legislatures pass their own control laws to handle the separate situations according to their own individual needs.

The Federal rent law has been proven to be unfair, too complicated, and unnecessary. The Rent Director's fight to extend it can only be taken as a bureaucratic attempt to perpetuate centralized governmental control where there is not the slightest need for it. Congress would do well to recognize the Woods extension campaign for what it is and let this measure die.

Is There Poorhouse Space for 149,000,000 People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, there is a great concern today throughout America because of vast Government expenditures and that a continuation of the policy of deficit financing and extravagance in Government will lead us to national bankruptcy. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, therefore, I submit the following editorial which appeared in a recent issue of the Allentown Evening Chronicle:

IS THERE POORHOUSE SPACE FOR 149,000,000 PEOPLE?

Is there room in the poorhouse for 149,000,000 people?

In 1932, Franklin D. Roosevelt, then a Presidential candidate, had this to say about Government spending:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Those words, important 17 years ago, have even greater significance today. Why? Because in every year since 1932 (with the exception of the two fiscal years immediately following the war) our Federal Government has spent more than it has collected.

Surely the time has come to make our present administration realize that a government which continually spends more than it collects cannot long remain strong and healthy.

In 1932, our Federal Government spent $4,500,000,000. For the fiscal year of 1950, it is estimated that our Federal Government will spend 10 times that amount—$45,000,000,000.

To give you an idea of just how much money this is, consider these facts:

1. If everyone in the United States cashed in all of his life-insurance policies, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. This would not be enough money to run the Government for 1 year.

2. About 11,000,000 urban families own the homes they occupy, valued at $30,000,000,000. If converted into cash, this amount would run the Government for only 8 months.

3. About 3,900,000 farmers farm their own land, valued at $17,000,000,000. Besides this, they own tools and livestock valued at $8,000,000,000. If converted into cash, the total of $25,000,000,000 would operate our Government for less than 7 months.

4. If every manufacturing corporation converted its net working capital into cash, the total would amount to $39,000,000,000. That's hardly enough to run the Government for 11 months.

These facts put a new light on the staggering size of our Federal Government's planned $45,000,000,000 expenditure for the fiscal year of 1950. And remember, this excessive spending is in the face of a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000.

Isn't it as true today, as it was in 1932, that "a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse?"

Just what are you doing to end excessive spending by our Federal Government? Have you written your Congressman? Have you appealed to your Senators? Have you discussed the problem with your business associates, with other businessmen, with your friends, with your employees?

Let's make sure our Representatives in Government know how we at home feel about the continuance of a habit that "means the poorhouse."

The time for action is now.

Concerning the Reactionary Prophets of Gloom and Doom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, since coming to the House of Representatives as a Member from the Second Nebraska Congressional District 1 year ago, I have sat day in and day out listening to some of the most dire and outlandish predictions of national doom ever heretofore told perhaps outside of the comical house.

I have heard the reactionary Republicans bewail and fairly keen, that we were heading for national bankruptcy, socialism, the welfare state, inflation, recession, national unemployment, regimentation, economic slavery, spend-thrift-ism, going busted-ism, and lastly, going-to-freeze-to-death-ism, and every other conceivable awful, terrible thing which could happen to a great Nation, yet not one of these frightful and frightening things have come true, yet the prophets of gloom are still going strong and sometimes even predicting that two diametrically opposite things were going to happen to the Republic at one and the same time.

Methinks, old Gloomy and Doomy Gus was just a piker after all.

The foregoing conduct, however, is not confined to Congress. An old friend of mine was wont to say "some people would kick if you hanged them with a new rope."

I know an old Irish farmer who lived at O'Neill, Nebr., who was reported to have complained about the bumper crops he raised because they were so hard on the ground.

Instead of appealing to my fears, this conduct of some of my reactionary colleagues made great contributions to my sense of humor, and I was reminded often of the poem, Said Hanrahan, written by Father John O'Brien, of Australia, and contained in the book, Witness to the Stars, edited by Paul L. Grano, LL. B. So that you may become also a member of The O'Sullivan Share-the-Laughter Club, I herein set it forth at length:

SAID HANRAHAN

"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
In accents most forlorn.
Outside the church, ere Mass began,
One frosty Sunday morn.

The congregation stood about,
Coat collars to the ears,
And talked of stock, and crops, and drought,
As it had done for years.

"It's lookin' crook," said Daniel Croke;
"Bedad, it's cruke, me lad,
For never since the banks went broke
Has seasons been so bad."

"It's dry, all right," said young O'Neil,
With which astute remark
He squatted down upon his heel
And chewed a piece of bark.

And so around the chorus ran
"It's keepin' dry, no doubt."
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out.

"The crops are done; ye'll have your work
To save one bag of grain;
From here way out to Back-o'-Bourke
They're singin' out for rain.

"They're singin' out for rain," he said,
"And all the tanks are dry."
The congregation scratched its head,
And gazed around the sky.

"There won't be grass, in any case,
Enough to feed an ass;
There's not a blade on Casey's place
As I came down to mass."

"If rain don't come this month," said Dan,
And cleared his throat to speak—
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"If rain don't come this week."

A heavy silence seemed to steal
On all at this remark;
And each man squatted on his heel,
And chewed a piece of bark.

"We want an inch of rain, we do,"
O'Neil observed at last;
But Croke 'maintained' we wanted two
To put the danger past.

"If we don't get three inches, man,
Or four to break this drought,
We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out."

In God's good time down came the rain;
And all the afternoon
On iron roof and windowpane
It drummed a homely tune.

And through the night it pattered still,
And lightsome, gladsome elves
On dripping spout and window-sill
Kept talking to themselves.

It pelted, pelted all day long,
A-singing at its work,
Till every heart took up the song
Way out to Back-o'-Bourke.

And every creek a banker ran,
And dams filled overtop;
"We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"If this rain doesn't stop."

And stop it did, in God's good time;
And spring came in to fold
A mantle o'er the hill sublime
Of green and pink and gold.

And days went by on dancing feet,
With harvest-hopes immense,
And laughing eyes beheld the wheat
Nid-nodding o'er the fence.

And, oh, the smiles on every face,
As happy lad and lass
Through grass knee-deep on Casey's place
Went riding down to Mass.

While round the church in clothes genteel
Discoursed the men of mark,
And each man squatted on his heel,
And chewed his piece of bark.

"There'll be bush-fires for sure, me man,
There will, without a doubt;
We'll all be rooned," said Hanrahan,
"Before the year is out."

In conclusion, I wish to observe that poor old Hanrahan surely must have quite a few mental kinfolks and blood brothers in our branch of the Congress.

Empire Builder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following column, The Federal Diary, edited by Jerry Kluttz in the Washington Post, in which there appeared on January 19, 1950, the poem, Empire Builder:

THE FEDERAL DIARY
(By Jerry Kluttz)

If you'd like to start off today with a chuckle, I recommend the reading of the delightful poem below. The Federal worker author prefers to remain anonymous.

EMPIRE BUILDER

This is the way, I'm telling you
A large percent of our Government grew.
There was once a man, who with good intent,
Gave his friend a job in the Government.
"With nothing to do, he won't stay long,"
He told an assistant, but was he wrong?

They found an office as it was bare,
They moved in a desk and a chair.
And so the friend wouldn't feel alone
In this office they put a telephone.
For several weeks the new man stayed
And in doing nothing, progress made.

For several months our friend sat there
With never a worry and never a care.
With nothing to do, he was on his own,
Till they gave him a girl to answer the phone.
But now our hero was in a stew
To find a task for the girl to do.

After some thinking he solved his plight,
By dictating letters for her to write.
She wrote so much, that after a while,
She had to have help for she couldn't file.
So that is how it came to be
The group in her office grew to three.

Another was added, for number three,
As good a filer as she could be.
Seemed to have something on her mind,
For though she could file, she couldn't find.
Adding this finder made one more,
And they got more space as they numbered four.

After a while three and four fell out,
Though it was comic to see them pout.
While looking for letters they couldn't find,
A rather bright idea came to mind.

So now no one is ever vexed—
Five keeps the letters all indexed.

Everything now was going strong,
When a wave of economy happened along.
When the big boss checked on his worthy friend
To find that the force had grown to 10.
The big boss' big boss said, said he:
"How in the hell has this come to be?"

Economy pruned both left and right,
And everyone grew pale with fright.
As reduction in force now was the rule,
But the clerks of our friend kept calm and cool.
And after all of the stir was through,
Instead of one unit, our friend had two.

And the one who gave his friend a start,
And did his best to take his part;
Yes, you have guessed it without a doubt,
He was the one who was left out.
And the friend was promoted up instead,
Until he became division head.

Still doing the same thing as at first,
He wasn't the best, he wasn't the worst.
What little he did he did with vim,
As all above thought well of him.
Knowing naught of worry or grief,
Our friend was made a bureau chief.

As bureau chief he got a break,
In a good assistant, made no mistake.
Lost at poker to prominent men
Held everyone as his good friend
Was very careful of what he said
Became at last, department head.

The Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times for Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

THE CIVIL-RIGHTS PROGRAM

President Truman disclosed yesterday that the administration intends to get a vote in Congress on its civil-rights program even if it takes all summer to do so. The principal items in this program are repeal of the poll tax, an antilynching law, and a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act. The President's continued willingness to do battle for these measures is commendable, but it has long since been made evident that on each of these issues his own party is deeply, and at least for the time being, irreconcilably, divided.

What is puzzling is the failure of the Republican Party to take advantage of this Democratic split, in order to assert more actively Republican initiative and leadership in these matters. The Republican Party itself is pledged (by its 1948 Republican platform) to the enactment of each of these three measures—anti-poll-tax, antilynching, FEPC. Yet Republicans helped last year to make it more difficult to apply cloture in the Senate to end a threatened filibuster, and Republicans are now lending support in the House to a proposed revival of the power of the Rules Committee to keep measures of this kind from coming to the floor.

There are, of course, individual Republicans who favor action on these bills. But the party as a whole is letting an opportunity for leadership go by default.

A Young Woman Going Places

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article from the Michigan Voter in its issue of December 1949:

A YOUNG WOMAN GOING PLACES

(By Phil Williams, member, Wayne County Republican executive committee)

She's a young woman going places—a Republican who one day will hold high office in her party and her government. Perhaps she will be Michigan's first woman member of the administrative board, for it is high time that we had a woman as secretary of state or as State treasurer.

She is Blanche Parent Wise, mother of five children, successful automobile and truck saleswoman, Detroit's woman of the year for 1946, and recent nominee for common council.

Mrs. Wise's race for the council was one of the most astonishing developments in the city's political history. For membership on that body is a most difficult attainment and can be achieved usually only by one of two types of politicians. Most successful in the past like John C. Lodge, former Gov. William A. Comstock, or former Mayor Edward J. Jeffries, Jr. But the city also has turned at times to name candidates like former Councilman Fred Castator and Councilman-elect William Rogell, whose popularity results from his baseball career.

Nine were elected this November, and Mrs. Wise finished eleventh.

For a woman running for office the first time and having a name that is not known to the voters, that accomplishment is sensational, to say the least. It could be called a miracle, for if she had found another 12,000 votes in this city of 816,000 registered voters, she would have been elected.

Billy Rogell, famed ball player and former councilman, was ninth with 192,000. Mrs. Wise, who staged a brilliant campaign almost alone, had 180,000.

True, the city elected its first woman council member in Miss Mary Beck. But Miss Beck has been active in city politics for many years, has been identified with the probate court, and has run for office unsuccessfully in the past, including the council. Finishing in sixth place, Miss Beck had only 38,000 votes more than Mrs. Wise, and it was a near-record turn-out.

Politics is an inexorable taskmaster, and so mysterious in its values even veteran office holders are frequently confused by the course the voters follow. But the charm of Mrs. Wise is so potent, and captivating, the voters seemed to discover early in the campaign that this woman was no ordinary candidate. It was something they sensed, and they were right.

Mrs. Wise was no glory seeker or publicity seeker. She was running for common council only because she was convinced she could add to the city government a value that it has not had. She knows the intricate and baffling problems of government, and she is equipped by sound background and understanding.

As a saleswoman for John Hettche's Ford agency, Mrs. Wise is near the top of her profession and has sold more cars and trucks than any woman in the world. It was because of her professional career, and her keen interest in government, that she was chosen "Woman of the Year."

But there were other reasons for this honor—five of them to be exact. There is Penny, who is 15; Kay, 14; John, Jr., 12; Mark, 9; and Rick, 7.

How can a woman become successful in business, maintain an interest in government, and yet be equally successful as a mother and homemaker? Mrs. Wise was asked that once by the Detroit Federation of Women's Clubs, and she answered:

"I was trained by my own mother to be a competent housekeeper. I have continued her teachings in my own home.

"The work is organized and each of my five children has a definte job. Remember, that from 8:30 a. m. until 4 p. m., from September until June, my children are under the supervision of school teachers. When they are not in school, I am with them a large part of the time. Our interests—music, reading, play—are parallel. I couldn't have the kind of children I have if they didn't have supervision. But I believe in freedom with responsibility."

Mrs. Wise was born in Detroit. Her ancestors came to Michigan with Cadillac. She will be running for office again, but not because she needs a job.

"It was a wonderful experience," she said. "Like any candidate, I was disappointed when I did not win, but the vote I received was certainly a compliment I will not soon forget.

"I think the community conscience should be represented more effectively in the local, State, and national governments. Men in many ways are better organizers than women, and are probably keener in handling the practical politics of public office. But, left to their own devises, men are inclined to be just a little too practical and too often the community's interests take second place.

"I think a woman, if equipped to serve, can bring to government a tremendous force toward good."

Mrs. Wise, whose husband, John Wise, is an architect, was a school teacher in Detroit early in her life. Her long career of quiet public service includes activities with the Detroit Girl Scout Council; the governing board of the Community Chest and a divisional chairman; legislative and public affairs chairman of the League of Catholic Women, member of the women's committee of the Detroit Round Table of Catholic, Protestants, and Jews; a first vice president of the Inter-Group Council for Woman as Public Policymakers, and a member of the League of Women Voters.

She made the owl famous during her campaign, using a picture of the bird on her advertising and cards.

"Just remember the owl and you'll remember the name when you reach the polling booth," she preached, "the wise old owl—remember it."

A lot more voters will before she is through.

Pennsylvania Counts the Cost

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BENJAMIN F. JAMES
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. JAMES. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting the following article which appeared in the Chester Times of Chester, Pa., on January 16, 1950. This article makes particular reference to the administration's proposed budget cost to the people of Delaware County, which county I have the honor to represent.

The sum of $104,453,000, our share of the $4,400,000,000 budget, is almost one-half of the total capital invested in the 305 industrial enterprises in Delaware County—$213,641,000—in the year 1949. It is nearly 70 percent of all salaries and wages, combined, paid to the 50,611 persons employed by those industries in the same year—$152,165,000.

It is nearly 15½ percent of the total value of all products produced by those industries—$677,818,800—and it is over seven times the value of all farms in Delaware County—land and buildings—$14,653,600.

Where is Delaware County, Pa., going to get the money? They still have to pay modest county and local taxes.

TRUMAN BUDGET TO COST PENNSYLVANIANS $3,000,000,000

HARRISBURG.—Pennsylvanians could finance their government for the next six years on the amount they would have to pay in Federal taxes under President Truman's proposed 1951 budget, the State Chamber of Commerce claimed today.

If Congress approves Truman's $42,000,000,000 budget the chamber said, residents of this State will have to pay $3,233,852,000 in direct and hidden taxes for Federal coffers.

Based on the current all-time-high State budget of $1,028,000,000 for the 1949–51 biennium, this sum would be sufficient to finance normal operations of Pennsylvania's State government for the next 6 years, the chamber estimated.

"The $3,233,852,000 cost to Pennsylvanians is more than one-third of the total assessed value of taxable real estate in this State in 1948," the chamber asserted.

"It is equal to 14.4 percent of the $22,381,745,000 market value of taxable real estate in Pennsylvania as determined by the State tax equalization board," it continued.

The State chamber's general secretary, Leonard P. Fox, called upon Congress to slash "a staggering budget under which the Federal Government would continue to live beyond its income and beyond the reasonable ability of the people to pay."

"Congress should thoroughly explore all possibilities for reducing nonessential expenditures just as every farm and business and household has had to do in these days of high taxes and high prices," Fox said.

An estimate of the cost to the people in each of the State's 67 counties also was made. The estimates were based on each county's population, buying income and taxable payrolls under the Federal social security program. Philadelphia's share, under these figures, was put at $813,961,000.

The cost to Delaware County was put at $104,453,000.

Peanut Acreage Changes Sought

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT C. BONNER
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Hertford County Herald, Ahoskie, N. C.:

PEANUT ACREAGE CHANGES SOUGHT

SCOTLAND NECK.—Growers of what is called the Virginia type of peanut, the producing area of which is confined principally to Virginia, North Carolina, and a small area in South Carolina, decided here Thursday to attempt to secure amendments to national peanut quota legislation which will permit the allocation of peanut acreage quotas on the basis of need and demand for peanuts by types rather than the present method of national consideration of all types together.

The decision was made at a meeting of the peanut commodity committee of the North Carolina Farm Bureau jointly with a representative group of Virginia peanut producers, members of the Virginia peanut and Hog Growers Association.

The conference was presided over by R. V. Knight, Tarboro, chairman of the North Carolina Farm Bureau peanut commodity committee, with Parker Brinkley, executive secretary of the Virginia Peanut and Hog Growers Association, and R. Flake Shaw, executive vice president of the North Carolina Farm Bureau, taking a prominent part in the discussions. J. B. Blalock, president of the Virginia Farm Bureau, was among those present and took part in the discussions also.

The action of the North Carolina and Virginia farmers was prompted by the fact that there is a shortage at present time of the better grades of Virginia-type peanuts, notwithstanding the reported oversupply of other types of peanuts and the announced intention of the Secretary of Agriculture to further reduce peanut-acreage quotas this year.

Under the present quota law and its application, North Carolina and Virginia farmers face a further reduction in peanut quotas while not hving sufficient acreage in production under quotas last year to meet the demand for their product, it was pointed out by Brinkley, Mayon Parker, president of the Growers' Peanut Cooperative, Inc., and others who took part in the discussions.

In North Carolina it is proposed to reduce peanut acreage approximately 7 percent from last year's acreages.

A committee of seven North Carolina and seven Virginia farmers was named to press forward the effort to secure passage through Congress of the amendments to the law necessary to make the decision of the group effective. Parker Brinkley and R. Flake Shaw were named joint chairmen of the committee and instructed to proceed immediately with preliminary contacts to secure the support of legislators and other farm groups.

If the proposed change in the law is accepted and passed by Congress, peanut-acreage quotas in the producing area for the Virginia-type peanut will be allocated solely upon the basis of supply and demand for the Virginia type.

The Virginia type is known generally for its larger size, oblong type of kernel, and nutty flavor, with lower oil content than the runner and Spanish types produced in the Southeast and Southwest peanut areas.

For purposes of sale in the shell, for salting, and many other edible uses, the Virginia-type peanut carries a premium in demand and in price, it was pointed out during the conference here.

Because of the demand for and preference of consumers for Virginia-type peanuts for edible purposes, it is believed that acreage allotments in the Virginia-Carolina area can be protected against further decreases and possibly increased, if the change advocated by the group can be brought about.

Acreage quotas for tobacco are allocated under a similar program, with quotas fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture according to the need for and supplies of tobacco according to the various types, such as flue cured, burley, air cured, Maryland, shade-grown, and others.

The group present here also discussed changes in the Government's price-support program that would be desirable to encourage the production of Virginia-type peanuts of the larger and more distinctly Virginia types but took no definite action on them. It was decided that the committee appointed to work for the legislative changes sought by the group should also confer with Department of Agriculture officials as to changes in the price-support schedules as applied to Virginia-type peanuts.

LOCAL PEOPLE

Attending the conference from this area were: Bertie County, W. L. Powell, and C. W. Spruill; Northampton County, J. F. Turner and P. H. Jamieson; Hertford County, Davis Spiers, C. Gordon Maddrey, and Mayon Parker.

Planes to Rome

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE L. HAYS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include therein an editorial from the Washington Post of January 19. I think perhaps it is time the Congress paid a little attention to some of the current maneuverings of the Civil Aeronautics Board and perhaps to some of the apparent connections between certain high officials in the Government and Pan American Air Lines. I shall have more to say about this matter at a later date.

PLANES TO ROME

Pan American Airways has received a nice little windfall from the Civil Aeronautics Board in the form of preliminary sanction to conduct charter flights to Rome during the Catholic Holy Year. The only scheduled United States airline operating to Rome is Trans World. In view of the current recommendation of a CAB examiner that Pan American be permitted to purchase American Overseas Airlines—which would remove the third competitor from the field and place Trans World at a disadvantage—the sanction will look like favoritism. It is no wonder that a TWA protest has led the board to defer final action.

Actually there may be a good deal of point to the board's feeling that the Holy Year traffic will be large enough to support all the flights American lines can provide. Also it may be that Trans World was slow to appreciate the potential, and that Pan American merely showed more initiative in completing an arrangement with Felix Roma, the Catholic travel agency promoting Holy Year tours. Certainly Pan Am has demonstrated initiative in circularizing American Catholics.

Nonetheless, the CAB has played fast and easy with someone else's market. This is especially true in light of the fact that Pan Am's charter flights actually would amount to regular service. Yet, the special excursion rate authorized for Pan American tours is considerably below the fare TWA is compelled to charge on regular flights. Moreover, TWA still has a considerable number of vacant seats on flights to Rome, and it is augmenting its capacity by 30 percent. TWA's grievances have been fanned by Pan Am's undaunted ambition for the chosen instrument—or single American airline abroad in which Pan Am would play a dominant role—and by the curious lack of publicity preceding the CAB's sudden approval.

Now the CAB has remedied the outright favoritism by opening charter flights to Europe to all regular and large irregular carriers. This removes some of the discrimination; but the proper time to have announced such a policy would be if and after Trans World found itself unable to accommodate the traffic to Rome. It is of course important to promote American travel to Europe. But it is no less important to maintain the integrity of the certificates of convenience and necessity which are the law of regular air transportation. On the Rome run the certificate is in danger of being reduced to a point where it does not mean very much.

Keep Draft Registration Machinery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, our most able and most conservative chairman of the Armed Services Committee recently stated that one of the all important bills to come before the House at this session of Congress was a bill to provide for the extension of the Selective Service Act's registration machinery.

I am not unmindful of the fact that the original bill which included the draft phase met with quite some opposition when it passed the House 2 years ago—and certainly there is no member who would like to see the reason for its enactment come to an end any more than I would myself.

I am myself satisfied that there is no man in America who would like to see it terminated more than would my good friend, Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, but, yet, it is Louis Johnson who will have to come before the Armed Services Committee to urge that it be again extended even though it is not now made effective with respect to the induction of new men and new manpower in any of our armed services forces.

Mr. Speaker, no living man can foretell what lies ahead. All thoughtful men are convinced that if and when war again comes to us it will come out of the clear blue and without warning. There will be no time to waste in organizing the thousands of draft boards that would have to be implemented in order to get the manpower immediately needed to defend the country against continued enemy attack. The thing to do is to have the registration mechanism kept functioning at all times in order that it can be ready for immediate use when Congress presses the button by enacting a new draft law.

All the machinery of war is costly. To continue to register, give physical examinations, to classify and set the youth of America in readiness for mobilization against that fateful hour will cost money.

It costs money—plenty of money—to build tanks, ships, and planes in order to have them stand by and in readiness for use when needed.

If we appropriate money for weapons why not for manpower? The records clearly disclose that the Selective Service Act, while not made effective with respect to the induction of men into our armed services for some time past, has been of inestimable value in providing men in the various Reserve components of our Army, Navy, and Air Force, to say nothing of what it has done to help recruit new men to maintain the established strength of our Regular forces.

The machinery of selective service, which is an essential insurance policy, necessitates the payment of a premium on a policy which this Congress can ill afford to drop.

We can all take comfort in knowing that selective service, as administered by Secretary Louis Johnson, whatever the cost, will be kept at an irreducible minimum.

Mr. Speaker, may I now ask the indulgence of this House to insert into the RECORD as of this day a very short editorial on this subject clipped from the New York Times, which cites the necessity of keeping the registration machinery in operation, and which reads as follows:

KEEPING THE DRAFT

A bill to maintain the machinery of selective service has been introduced in the Senate by the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, Senator TYDINGS. It should be enacted. It is an unpleasant thing to have even the machinery of a draft in peacetime. It is a necessary thing, because many factors in the world situation are themselves unpleasant. This would be a much happier world if we didn't have to think about armies and navies and weapons of destruction. But it wouldn't be the world in which we happen to live at this moment. The draft machinery is essentially an insurance policy and at this time the premiums must be kept up.

Additional weight is given to the argument for the draft machinery on grounds of security by the fact that abandonment of the machinery at this time would be widely interpreted as a sign of indecision if not outright defeatism. We need, at the moment, not only to be strong ourselves but also to inspire the confidence of others. Any step that would weaken that confidence should be avoided.

It's Our Own Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Morning Tribune, Minneapolis, Minn., of January 17, 1950:

IT'S OUR OWN CONGRESS

As the new session gets under way, it is well to remember that Congress, for all its frailties and faults, consists largely of conscientious Americans who are trying to do a good job according to their lights. The tendency to hold Congress up to ridicule, and to impugn its sincerity and good faith at every opportunity is not a wholesome one, in our opinion.

There are, to be sure, charlatans and demagogues in every legislative body, but we should be careful not to judge the whole by its least admirable parts. Congress is a product of the American system of representative government, and the chronic scoffers at Congress are in effect belittling and deriding that system.

Selective criticism of Congress is proper and desirable, but steady sniping for the sake of sniping is a bad habit. In the last analysis, the American people are responsible for Congress, and regardless of the party controlling it, it remains a symbol of some of our best American traditions.

Seventeen-Year-Old Delaware Girl Speaks for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, 2 days ago a 17-year-old Wilmington, Del., high-school senior stood up before distinguished State and city officials, her teachers and her fellow students and said, "I thank America; her kindness and hospitality are so wonderful.

The girl who made that statement was Gloria Chomiak. The occasion was a special high school assembly in her honor, because she had just been selected as one of four national winners in a "I Speak for Democracy" contest, in which there were more than 1,000,000 entries. The competition was sponsored by the National Junior Chamber of Commerce and the National Association of Broadcasters.

Mr. Speaker, I hope every Member of this distinguished body will read with care Miss Chomiak's statement on democracy. It is as fine an expression of faith in democracy as it has been my pleasure at any time to read. And, Mr. Speaker, an unusual and important feature of this matter is that Miss Chomiak has been in the United States only since September 1948. She came here at that time from an extremely remote section of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, all Delawareans are proud of Gloria Chomiak and the honor which she has brought to the first State. I am confident that all Americans who read her statement will feel the same sense of pride and realize the responsibility which each of us as individuals has to protect the democracy of which Miss Chomiak spoke.

The following is a complete text of Miss Chomiak's statement—I Speak for Democracy:

I speak for democracy, because two generations back my ancestors could not; because if I do not speak of it—if many more do not speak of it, there may come a time when we, too, will not have the right to do so. For today more than at any other time governing powers are pitted one against another. It seems a crisis has been reached, and must be broken. We who believe in democracy cannot trust to our living it alone.

We must stand up and speak and be heard in its cause.

And what is this thing called democracy? It is a thought discovered in ancient Greece; a thing a Slavic serf dreamed of too much and paid for with his life; an ideal, started in its practice by a model Parliament of England; and bitterly struggled for in Louis' France. It is a leavening of revolutions, a stepchild of Utopia; a system, first defined as a government for and by the people in our own country, where it has grown to what we know and love today.

It is a government that has been developing for hundreds of years, and shall develop for hundreds more; a government that has outgrown an initial stage wherein it served the citizens of Greece; citizens who did not include the underprivileged and the captive, and who constituted but a fraction of the population. It is a government that has weathered the time when a land-laden Polish baron frowned upon it, thinking of his foreign serfs, tilling their foreign fields for his benefit alone. He worried little for he could dispose of them at his pleasure if he found one who thought in their number.

It is a government that has grown great since that medieval year when England's people first had representatives before their King—the first representatives before authority a people ever had.

It won a place for itself during the bitter civil war of France, when people were hungry, and angered with the extravagant caprices of those who ruled through heritage and it found a home in the New World when honest colonists learned to demand a rule by their own choice.

It has grown from a privilege of the few to a right of the common, risen from a persecuted idea to a mighty ideal upheld in safety by millions. It has developed into a system whose imperfections can be remedied, and whose virtues are a God-given right.

For this democracy is a natural system. Men were created equal in their rights and their responsibilities. And is not intelligent participation in governing among them? Men were given individual minds and desires. Ought not they have a right to voice them?

Democracy is a system with flaws, because through the ages men have erred and do err, and a democracy is only as right as its people. Democracy is able to abolish its principles by its own excess.

A cynic spoke the truth about it when he said that democracy can make each man his own oppressor. Yet, I believe that greater men have said a truer thing about democracy: That the people's government cannot—shall not perish from the earth.

A Mission of Good Will

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. J. CARNAHAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. CARNAHAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from El Imparcial, Santiago, Chile, of November 17, 1949.

Such friendly and sincere expressions of mutual concern are appreciated and will add to the many reasons why the friendship between the American Republics should grow stronger as the years go by.

The editorial follows:

A MISSION OF GOOD WILL

In fulfillment of a carefully planned program, three distinguished Members of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress are our guests since yesterday. They are Mr. A. S. J. CARNAHAN, Representative from Missouri, a former teacher and an influential public official; Mr. OMAR BURLESON, Representative from Texas, a lawyer and former head of the housing department of the District of Columbia, and OLIN E. TEAGUE, Representative from Texas. These distinguished Members of Congress were accompanied by Mr. George Millikan, adviser to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives; Mr. Donald William Smith, representative of the State Department; Capt. Charles Lutz of the Air Force, and the delegation's secretary, Mr. Charles Schneider.

Their high office and their neighborly determination to further friendly relations between their country and the Spanish-American peoples, endow this visit with a special significance. The press of Mexico City, Panama, and Lima, where they received a warm welcome from the governments and social institutions, agreed on this point.

This cordial reception has been well deserved since the guests have shown keen interest in acquainting themselves with the work carried on by the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, which recently received additional funds from the United States Congress to continue its program for another 5-year period.

To accomplish this end, the American Congressmen and members of their delegation will study the work done in this city by the Health Center and Trudeau Hospital; will visit the construction of the sewerage system in North Santiago and other projects of this Institute.

Furthermore, they will hold private conferences with high officials of the government agencies of this country regarding problems which are common to Chile and the United States.

We appreciate the coming of these American Congressmen and in saying so, wish to leave on record our approval of these tours of good will, since the increase in mutual understanding which is already to be seen, indicates practical trends which will result in common benefits, notwithstanding the base intentions of the Muscovite sect, which are directed against the White House accusing it of an arbitrary and selfish imperialism.

Mr. Millikan, as consultant for the Foreign Relations Committee of the House of Representatives, will be in a position to inform his colleagues of the friendly attitude prevailing toward the United States on the part of the governments and peoples of Latin America. His own experience in diplomatic work will permit him to discover the basic reasons for the attacks from those who, calling themselves partisans of the democratic regime, conspire against it and attempt to destroy it by weakening the power of the United States.

American Legion Legislative Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the splendid statement of Hon. George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, on Tuesday, January 17.

Commander Craig's statement follows:

Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Rogers, members of the committee. As National Commander of the American Legion, I would feel honored to appear before this committee under any circumstances. I am conscious of a particular honor and pride today, however, for the reason that here in your chamber and through your courtesy, we are marking a memorable event in the history of organized veterans. For the first time, the elected leaders of the major veterans organizations appear before you as a group to present their respective programs for the current legislative year.

I speak for the American Legion. I neither have nor profess the right to represent another organization. But let me assure you, ladies and gentlemen, that the unity expressed by our joint appearance is a unity of fundamentals, not merely of front.

It is because the principle and the entire structure of veterans' services built upon it are in imminent danger of destruction that the American Legion stands side by side with our brother organizations represented here today.

The threat to which I refer is contained in legislation pending or proposed in the report of the Hoover Commission having to do with the Veterans' Administration and the veterans' program. My remarks this morning will be directed solely to that subject.

The American Legion is for real economy in the Government's discharge of the Nation's obligations to its 19,000,000 veterans. The American Legion has always abhorred waste in Government effort. It realizes that improvements can be achieved in the operations of the present Veterans' Administration. But it believes very strongly that such improvements in services and savings in costs can best be made within the existing framework of the Veterans' Administration.

The framework of this agency is sound. It has successfully resisted for years all political pressure and all pork-barrel raids. Today, the VA handling all veteran affairs exclusively, is a one-stop service station for all veterans.

For the stated purpose of promoting greater efficiency and economy in the Veterans' Administration, the Hoover Commission asks that the VA be stripped of the following major functions:

1. Hospital and medical services: Under Hoover Commission plans, these duties would be the part-time concern of a colossal new Federal medical bureau to be called the united medical administration.

2. Hospital construction: The Hoover Commission would farm out this job to the Department of the Interior.

3. Veterans' insurance: Another brand new creation, the Veterans' Insurance Corporation, would inherit all matters pertaining to United States Government and National Service Life Insurance.

4. Home loans: The Hoover Commission believes that the loan guaranty program set up under the GI bill of rights should be relocated somewhere in the Housing and Home Finance Agency.

Other services would be left to the remnants of the Veterans' Administration.

I say to you that these proposals would bring about the dismemberment of the Veterans' Administration and, eventually, of the veterans' program. They would mass produce red tape of such quantity and quality that the intended beneficiaries of legislation generously provided by this committee and the Congress would be denied their rights. The eventual consequence will be that the

veteran will be trimmed but that costs will not.

Let's look at this proposed amputation, limb by limb.

The Veterans' Administration has been 20 years building and refining what is now universally hailed by civilian medical leaders as an outstanding hospital system. Veterans' Administration hospitals and medical personnel are among the finest in America, and they got that way because experience and devoted individuals, in and out of Government, were willing to contribute their time and skills at great personal sacrifice. You are now asked by the Hoover Commission to scrap this system with all of its accumulated advantages and bury it in the new proposed United Medical Administration along with three other adjuncts of Government medicine whose standards are not so high and whose services are not related.

Veterans' Administration hospitals even today cannot accommodate all of the eligible patients. The last Veterans' Administration report shows 20,319 disabled and sick veterans on the waiting list unable to get a hospital bed. This is the situation with only veterans competing for hospitalization. Under the United Medical Administration set-up the veteran would have to compete with the merchant mariner, the civil-service employee, and the personnel of the armed forces and their dependents—and his admission would hinge on the availability of beds not occupied by nonveterans.

The establishment of a new United Medical Administration would involve the creation of thousands of new jobs. It would mean the training of many new officials. It would entail many duplicating functions and, worse still, many specialized functions, with special case files for each of the numerous classes of patients. It would result in more costs, more red tape, and more grief—for the veterans and all other taxpayers.

The Hoover plan would transfer hospital construction from the Veterans' Administration to the Department of the Interior, notwithstanding the fact that the Hoover Commission itself scored that Department for its apparent inability to properly estimate the cost of proposed construction.

On page 6 of its report on the Department of the Interior, it charged that the Department was guilty of inadequate evaluation and underestimation on such vast jobs as the Colorado-Big Thompson project in which its estimate was $44,000,000 and actual cost was $131,800,000. It estimated $6,300,000 as the cost of the Hungry Horse project in Montana which actually cost taxpayers $93,500,000.

I am sure your committee appreciates, as we do, the importance of a close working relationship between the builders and designers of medical structures on the one hand, and those who are responsible for maintenance and additions. Such a relationship now exists within the Veterans' Administration. It would be shattered by the Hoover plan. In the American Legion's judgment, transfer of Veterans' Administration hospital construction to any other Federal agency would bring on serious repercussions—and economy and efficiency would not be among them.

By still another Hoover dismemberment plan, the Veterans' Administration would lose the veterans' insurance business. We are told that a new Federal creature, the Government Insurance Corporation, must be introduced to handle the servicing of some eight million national service life and United States Government insurance policies. We challenge this process on two counts. In the first place, the proposal comes up for action at a time when the peak insurance burden on the Government has long since passed; the VA finally has perfected its insurance operation to the point where the job is now getting done in reasonably good time and order. Secondly, in recommending an insurance corporation, the Hoover Commission turned down the advice of its own task force of experts who investigated this matter. The task force, men who were nearest the problem, reported that shortcomings of the agency should and could be corrected administratively within the VA.

Under the loan guaranty provisions of the GI bill of rights, 1,625,329 young veterans have been enabled to purchase their own homes. There has been only 1.3 percent of defaults among all home loans approved by the Veterans' Administration. If any one phase of the veterans' program were to be singled out as a model of efficiency, loan guaranty would merit priority consideration.

In spite of this record, the Hoover Commission proposes to carve up this smoothly functioning activity by turning over the actual lending operation to another Government agency while leaving the certification for home loans with the Veterans' Administration. The Commission fails to specify what will be done with the two corollary features of the program—farm and business loan guarantees. Apparently the idea is to strip away only the best third of the loan-guaranty operation.

The American Legion condemns this move as violating the principle and jeopardizing the administration of the GI bill. The loan-guaranty program was designed to give preferential treatment to veterans. That objective can be best fulfilled through administration by an agency primarily interested in the welfare of veterans. But the Hoover plan would take the job away from that agency—the Veterans' Administration—and give it to another—the Housing and Home Finance Agency—which provides sundry services for the general population and has no specific interest in veterans.

In addition to dismembering the Veterans' Administration, the effect of the Hoover plan would be to do away with the present system of processing veterans' legislation through the Congress. Many of you will recall that in the early 1920's legislation pertaining to veterans was handled in the House by a number of different committees. It was to relieve the resulting confusion and bottlenecks that the Committee on Veterans' Affairs was created in 1924. Since that time your group has served—and served superbly—as the monitor and author of all the important bills having to do with the veterans' program.

Whether there is an implied criticism of this committee in proposals of the Hoover Commission that would virtually nullify the need for the committee I leave to your judgment. The American Legion believes you have done and are doing a job that is indispensable to the veteran and Congress alike. We want no turning back of the legislative clock that would see veterans' legislation again miscarry for lack of interested and experienced champions.

President Hoover himself in 1929 told the Nation that efficiency, economy, and more uniform administration required consolidation of the three separate agencies then handling veterans' matters. The Congress responded by replacing the Veterans' Bureau, the Pension Bureau, and the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers with the new Veterans' Administration. Now, 20 years later, we are told that for the same reasons of economy and efficiency the VA must be carved up into not just three agencies but five. Was Mr. Hoover wrong in 1929, or is his commission wrong now?

There is absolutely nothing in the Hoover recommendations on veterans' affairs that cannot be accomplished administratively by the Veterans' Administration. There is no existing defect that cannot and should not be corrected within the four walls of the Veterans' Administration. The American Legion is never satisfied with the VA, just as we are never satisfied with the performance of our own rehabilitation forces. We have criticized the Veterans' Administration whenever we believed criticism was warranted, and we will continue to do so. But we do not intend to see real or imagined weaknesses of the agency used as an excuse for destroying the veterans' program.

The Hoover task force on veterans' affairs completely ignored the American Legion in reaching its findings. For 2 years, these people went about their work in offices four doors removed from our headquarters in Washington. Four times we asked to be heard to present the side of the veteran, and the request went unanswered. It might be pertinent to ask of this committee how many of you were invited to give your views on the agency and the program you deal with so effectively from day to day.

The practice of according deserving preferences and services to veterans is as old as America. There are those who contend that the tradition is fictitious—that it came into being as a concession to sentiment and endured only because responsible authorities dared not challenge it.

The members of this committee have reason to resent that charge, as we do. There is just one reason why the veteran over the years has commanded the special attention of his Government, and that is because the American people have always been convinced in their own minds that he is entitled to it. Only once, and then at a time of great stress, have the people speaking through Congress permitted a violation of this trust. In 1933 there was an Economy Act, and veterans' hospitals were purged, compensations whittled, and claims rejected in wholesale lots. Did that Economy Act bring about savings? Sure it did, at the expense of battle casualties and war widows who saw their means of livelihood wiped out even as they were being assured that the law would not touch them.

There are striking similarities between the antiveteran trends in 1933 and in 1950. Then, as now, the movement marched under the holy banner of economy. Then, as now, it attracted the zealous support of a small but well-organized and financially potent group of individuals who were able to give an exaggerated impression of numerical strength. Then, as now, they relied upon the apathy and forgetfulness of the people to put across their grand design.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the Hoover Commissioners have no corner in the economy market. The veteran of this Nation has a very personal interest in economy. He and his family represent approximately one-half of all the taxpayers in the country. To a greater extent than any other group, he feels the high cost of government and wants to bring it down. But he is not going to accept just any road to economy, and he will fight to the finish to forestall an economy move that spells the betrayal of his Government's obligation to his disabled and sick comrades, and the widows and orphans of his fighting friends who did not come back.

As national commander of the American Legion, and as one of the millions who are receiving no benefits, and ask none for themselves, I appeal to you to help the American Legion win this fight by defeating the Hoover Commission legislation that comes up for consideration by your committee. And may I say in conclusion that the American Legion is proud to close ranks with the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and AMVETS, in a united effort to protect, for those who are unable to speak for themselves, the benefits and rights provided by a grateful people.

Basing-Point Bill, S. 1008, Makes for Higher Prices in West and South—Eminent Northwest Educator Urges Defeat of S. 1008—West Subjected to Price Discrimination Through Operation of Basing-Point System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, Prof. Vernon A. Mund, of the department of economics, University of Washington, has forwarded me a copy of the letter which he wrote to one of his colleagues at Washington State College, Pullman, Wash. Dr. Mund pointed out that S. 1008 was due for consideration on January 20, and, in the interests of the West, should be defeated. He said:

I am convinced that, if this bill * * * becomes law, it will prove injurious to the economic freedom of the West and South.

NOTED STUDENT OF PRICING SYSTEMS

Dr. Mund is known throughout the country as an authority on artificial pricing systems and has often given testimony to congressional committees on the economics of such systems. Dr. Mund's opinion is worthy of consideration by all Members of Congress from the West and far West who have any lingering doubt as to what should be the fate of S. 1008. Dr. Mund thinks the bill should be killed, and in that thought I am happy to say he is joined by many Members of the Congress. Dr. Mund's letter, in part, follows:

In my own opinion, basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems operate not only to eliminate price competition, but also to prevent a decentralization of industry. The use of an eastern base price makes for high-cost prices in the West and South and discourages the development of local fabricating industries. Local fabricators which do develop, moreover, cannot ship eastward to any significant extent in competition with fabricators located near an eastern basing point, for the delivered costs of their basic supplies are higher.

When basic products (such as aluminum) are produced in the West and South and sold "freight allowed," the development of local fabricators is likewise restricted. Local prices are high—as high as elsewhere in the country—and fabricators find no cost advantage in building plants near the sources of supply. The sale of fabricated products (such as copper wire, cable, and tubing) by eastern mills at freight-allowed prices (based upon an average freight item) also serves to discourage the development of distant fabricators, for the established mills, in effect, are able to dump into the distant areas by absorbing some or all of the freight—at the expense of their nearby customers.

Congressional leaders who are actively opposing S. 1008 include Senators PAUL DOUGLAS, ESTES KEFAUVER, WAYNE MORSE, WILLIAM LANGER, RUSSELL B. LONG, and Congressman WRIGHT PATMAN. I am sure that each of these men would appreciate any word of encouragement which you might give them before January 20.

Our Nation's Capital, Washington, D. C.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, Americans can be justly proud of the beauty and simplicity of Washington, D. C., and my wish is that all of our citizens could visit here.

Holiday magazine has devoted its February issue to pictures and articles on Washington and the following article was written by Walter Winchell which has emphasized the fact that Washington belongs to all Americans and is not just the city of its residents.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include Mr. Winchell's statement as it appeared in the Washington Post on January 18, 1950:

WASHINGTON—A TALE OF THREE CITIES

(By Walter Winchell)

All solid objects including cities have three dimensions, except Washington, D. C., which has four. The extra one is in time. Washington, D. C., is a city located in the middle of twentieth-century history at the exact center of its political forces. Nothing in the twentieth-century world can be done without a calculation of its effect on Washington; and very few things are done in Washington without careful appraisal of the effect on the rest of the world. Washington is really three cities: Washington the world capital; Washington the capital of the United States; and Washington the city of nearly a million people solely engaged in the serious business of government and who, ironically, have no vote.

This, in itself, is unusual, but not for Washington. Washington as the queen city of the complex twentieth century is also the king city of all of its paradoxes. Among the first is its politics. In Washington, politics is the fascinating way of life for the lucky unlucky few. They are lucky in that their slightest whim is reflected in the lives of millions of people, and that fame and glory necessarily attach to persons who wield that much power. They are unlucky in that the price of making history is to be broken by it. The higher the pinnacle, the greater the blast and the less the shelter. The ascent is incredibly difficult and the descent impossibly dangerous; but, paradoxically, the lure is irresistible. For every broken man carried down the slope there are a hundred pressing upward under the magnificent illusion that fate deals in names and not in numbers.

Washington, primarily, is the capital of the United States of America—a fact which is more often overlooked than not. Washington's politics is to the United States Government what a steering wheel is to an automobile. It gives direction, but the power and the strength are below in the engine. The engine of government carries on 99 percent of the work through anonymous assistants—the Government people—mostly career people—who know and live with the job below the whirlpool of politics. This is merely saying the obvious: that for every Postmaster General there are tens of thousands of postmen who deliver the mail; for every Surgeon General there are thousands of nurses caring for the sick; and for every conservation commissioner there are hundreds of fire wardens patrolling the forest trails.

Thus, paradoxically again, Washington, the seat of government, is only the headquarters of the work. Washington is present in every county in the United States and in every country abroad through its field men. Washington in the real sense, is everywhere. Indeed, it is a twentieth century miracle that you can summon Washington to your doorstep with a 3-cent stamp. Practically all of the experience of civilized man is at your beck and call upon inquiry to the United States Information Service. It will tell you anything and everything, from how to feed the baby to how to kill a Japanese beetle. Indeed, if their only signature for the ages were the Library of Congress, it alone would establish the timeless greatness of the American people.

But it is the far-flung Washington field men who are the immediate and effective Government of the United States. Washington radiates government authority and the delegation of power starts with the push buttons on the secretary's desk. It is axiomatic to those who know Washington that the Secretary's secretaries run the Department; but it is also axiomatic that it is the man in the field who finds the facts which control the decisions of the secretaries. The capillaries, paradoxically, control the action of the heart.

Washington's work is all-pervasive almost beyond the belief of the average citizen. There is no function of our national existence—from the lonely blinking lights off the Florida Keys to the signal towers of the Alaska Railroad—whose operations are not the responsibility of some unknown but very responsible person in the Nation's Capital. Tens of thousands of faithful, anonymous people give the civil services the same selfless devotion that the flag receives from the armed ones. Their work varies all the way from testing steel to producing antidotes for snake venom. Their heartbreaking role is that their effectiveness is taken for granted. They are noticed only when and if their service fails to function.

Government people, as distinguished from the politicians, also are part of the Washington paradox. Battle fleets are commanded by underpaid admirals who wait in line for the street car; billions are expended by men who return home at night to worry about sending their children to college on a salary of $8,000 a year. Yet few would leave willingly the bleak bridge of the ship of state for the comparatively comfortable quarters—and minor importance—of private business.

American Government is a study in reflex. Washington has a great effect on the Nation, but not nearly the effect that the Nation has on Washington. Washington governs America, but America governs Washington.

Washington as a city is famous for its physical beauty. But the historians, probably more than the architects, will record its broad approaches, great avenues, grand vistas, and magnificent perspectives. Because no less than that describes their mighty Capital at Washington, D. C., it also describes the mind, the spirit, and the heart of the American people.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Dedication of the Mellon Dormitory, Washington and Jefferson College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the dedication of the Mellon Dormitory at Washington and Jefferson College, Washington, Pa., on October 29, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The beautiful dormitory we dedicate today stands as a memorial to the honorable career and distinguished achievements of a great American, an alumnus of Washington and Jefferson College, James Ross Mellon.

It is a tribute of honor and respect from his son, William Larimer Mellon, who, with his wife, May Taylor Mellon, 10 years ago, established a foundation for the advancement of religious, charitable, scientific, and educational purposes.

We are saddened that William Larimer Mellon is not with us today to participate in these ceremonies. His death 3 weeks ago today brought to a close a life of brilliant accomplishment in many fields of endeavor.

William L. Mellon was a kindly man, retiring and soft-spoken. One of his outstanding qualities was modesty. He avoided the limelight. All forms of personal publicity were distasteful to him.

He could have chosen an easy way of life. His tastes were simple and his needs were modest. He did not have to work and search for riches.

But he was not of that stock. He wanted to create and to build.

He plunged into business and industry. He took great financial risks in his commercial ventures. He created jobs for men and women in many parts of the world. Success rewarded his vision, energy, and enterprise.

His business interests expanded tremendously but his real greatness is revealed by the fact that in the midst of his busy life he found time for active participation in his church and in government. He took part in politics but never sought his own advancement.

He wanted to build a better and more prosperous, stronger America.

W. L., as he was known to his intimate friends, wanted to help his fellow man. His contributions to churches, schools, hospitals, and for charitable purposes were generous and without ostentation.

W. L. Mellon was of the third generation of the Mellon family in America. The Mellon family name is associated with the progress and development of southwestern Pennsylvania. It is symbolic of the industrial and financial strength of our Commonwealth.

The story of the Mellon economic empire is most fascinating. Thomas Mellon, or Judge Mellon, the founder, was a poor immigrant from Ireland. Without social or economic background he brought assets of great value to America. He brought courage, the will to work, honesty, integrity, and strength of character. He cherished the principles of America—individual freedom and opportunity.

The same fine American characteristics descended to his four sons.

With the growth of the Mellon industrial and banking interests the gifts, endowments, and foundations of the Mellon family for the public benefit grew correspondingly.

They included such noble benefactions as the Mellon Institute, the site where the Cathedral of Learning now stands, the National Gallery of Art, located in the Nation's Capital, the School of Public Health of the University of Pittsburgh, the Graduate School of Industrial Administration at Carnegie Tech and many others well known to this audience.

Today the honorable traditions and the responsibilities of the Mellon family are carried forward by Gen. Richard K. Mellon, able and public-spirited son of R. B. Mellon.

Like the Mellons, other individuals and families have used accumulated wealth for the benefit of their fellow man. They have established industries, churches, hospitals, and colleges. They have created foundations for scientific and medical research.

This giving accumulated wealth for public service has been a mightly stimulant to American culture and the national welfare.

The roll of public benefactors includes the names of Peter Cooper, Johns Hopkins, United States Senator Leland Stanford, Andrew Carnegie, Julius Rosenwald, Henry C. Frick, Russell Sage, and George Eastman.

The great gifts of John D. Rockefeller have totaled over $500,000,000.

Others on the long and impressive list are Charles Hayden, James B. Duke, Mrs. Edward Bok, Augustus D. Julliard, United States Senator James Couzens, and Edsel Ford.

Here in Pennsylvania two great schools for the education of orphan boys were established by Stephen Girard and Milton S. Hershey.

Other Pennsylvania foundations bear the names of Falk, Buhl, and Drexel.

There are hundreds of others who have followed the road marked by the creators of these institutions and foundations.

During one 10-year period 100 foundations in the United States spent $500,000,000 for the public benefit in these seven classifications:

Education, two hundred and twenty-three millions.

Health, one hundred and seventy-two millions.

Social welfare, seventy-five millions.

Recreation, nine millions.

Internal relations, eight millions.

Religion, seven million, five hundred thousand.

Law and government, seven millions.

This does not include money spent for missionary and similar work.

No other country in the world has established such a magnificent record.

What made it possible?

As measured by the hourglass of nations, it is only a short time since the Western Hemisphere was discovered.

Its two continents were developed by groups having opposite objectives. To South America came men in search of gold. North America was settled by men seeking God.

That is the reason why material progress in our country has so far outstripped that of the South American countries.

Here God-fearing men established a form of government based on the theory that all men are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights—and among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

They established an economic plan based on the theory that men must be free to own property and to have the reward of their own courage, initiative, and resourcefulness.

That freedom of economy, together with the other freedoms enjoyed by them, has built the greatest empire of agriculture, transportation, and industry of all history. It has given the people of the United States the highest living standard of all times. In addition, the people have enjoyed great culture and high spiritual attainments.

Other nations have had greater population and more of the world's natural resources. Although we have only 7 percent of the world's population, and occupy only 6 percent of the world's land area, we produce more than one-third of the world's goods.

What do we possess that the others do not have?

Just one thing—freedom of the individual.

As a result of our God-given freedoms we have more automobiles, more radios, more telephones, more newspapers, more colleges, more foundations, more life-insurance policies, more savings accounts, more homes, and more churches than any country in the history of the world.

In our free economy, many men of humble origin have become leaders in the professions, science, in commerce, and industrial development. The great endowments and foundations I have discussed were established with the accumulated wealth of such men.

These foundations offer a great and lasting argument for the incentive, capitalistic or free enterprise system of our country. That is a system built upon the solid rock, the firm foundation of free men and free women working in freedom.

They demonstrate clearly that free men will carry out the impulses of human brotherhood so much better than it can be done by government.

The gift of this beautiful dormitory to Washington and Jefferson College is representative of such an impulse.

It honors the memory of a private citizen—but also it is a monument to the system of free government and opportunity that made it possible.

The same system created and sustained nearly all the liberal arts colleges.

They have done an outstanding job in developing leadership in this country. They trained the men who founded this Republic. Their sons and daughters have developed the culture, the science, the philosophy, and the religious thinking of this Nation.

Their curricula have been broad. They have tried to teach men to think straight and analytically rather than along the lines of political doctrine or to dream of economic utopias.

They have given us great military, political, industrial, educational, and religious leaders. They have kept the lamps of learning lighted. They have done all this, however, without any agency of Government or any commissar of education, directing the way in which our leadership must be trained.

The small colleges of Pennsylvania have kept their doors open to students of all faiths and creeds, and all races. Upon them largely depends the tolerance of our people and the respect that is due every religion and every form of worship.

These small colleges are the guardians of the religious tradition in education. For generations they have combined mental and moral training.

They must have freedom in their cultural, academic and spiritual policies. The standards of the faculty and the quality of the student body must be judged by the institutions themselves. We must not receive young men and women without the mental and spiritual qualifications needed to make them worthy of the great history of our small colleges. There is no room for any student or faculty member who lacks spiritual interest or concern for the ideals of our country.

I am proud of Washington and Jefferson. It is a free institution. It has never accepted Government help. It teaches freedom, tolerance, and patriotic Americanism. We must keep it that way.

Yes, we must keep all our colleges free, uncontrolled, and unregimented. We must protect the American system of education

from the dangers which have arisen in recent years.

First, there is the trend toward Government control of education to be enforced by so-called Federal aid. That eventually would mean bureaucratic dictatorship of educational policies.

Should our schools and colleges ever come to depend upon the Federal Government for their support, academic freedom would be destroyed.

When Washington dictates what our schools shall teach, the foundations of American freedom will have been shaken.

Just as we hold sacred the principles of religious liberty, so must we be vigilant in the cause of educational freedom.

The second danger grows out of excessive taxation and the vastly increased cost of government.

Twenty years ago the Federal Government was operated at a cost of less than $4,000,000,000 a year.

This year Congress passed appropriation bills totaling almost forty-six and one-half billions—and contract authorizations for four and one-half billion more—making a total spending program of nearly $51,000,000,000.

This is frightening, but if the new and expanded spending proposals now before Congress are enacted, the cost of Federal Government will skyrocket to double that figure.

Today approximately 30 percent of all the earnings of the worker and the farmer is collected in taxes to support all levels of government.

If that drain upon the national income continues it will be impossible for any individual or any family to accumulate the wealth necessary to establish endowments and foundations such as have been created in the past.

Unless the present trend of reckless and unlimited spending by government is checked, we will soon dry up the sources of voluntary contributions needed for the support of our colleges.

It will force many of our colleges to close their doors. The others will become dependent upon financial aid from the Government. When that day comes, the American educational system, as we have known it, will be a thing of the past.

That is why I urge you to follow the example of W. L. Mellon in personal and active interest in the affairs of government.

A great educator and a great President, Woodrow Wilson, summed up his educational philosophy in these words, and I quote:

"No more vital truth was ever uttered than that freedom and free institutions cannot long be maintained by any people who do not understand the nature of their own government."

That is the end of the quotation.

Woodrow Wilson's words are a clear warning that unless we fully understand the nature of our Government we cannot maintain freedom and the free institutions of which our small colleges are such an important part.

Our system of free enterprise laid the foundations of our colleges at a time when the state did not concern itself with education. That system created those other great foundations for the improvement of health, morals, culture, and human welfare that exist in America.

It was that system of free enterprise that made it possible for our missionaries, both spiritual and medical, to go into all parts of the earth and teach the great underlying principles of religion and our American way of life.

The free-enterprise system made it possible to operate the millions of American farms by machinery and probably did more to drive famine from the world than any other thing under the sun.

Without that system the small colleges of the Nation cannot endure.

I am hopeful that the colleges of America will teach young men and women how to think and how to live.

I hope the students will acquire a proud knowledge of our form of government, its traditions, and its freedoms.

I hope they may come to revere the great men and women—church leaders, soldiers, statesmen, industrialists, educators, legislators, and craftsmen—the Americans who have made this country a great Nation.

I hope they may be so trained that they may teach others how to use the instruments created by our scientists and technicians for human progress, and not misuse them against mankind.

Above everything else, religious culture must be emphasized.

In this country our form of government is one of laws and not of men. Government by men is maintained by force and fear. Government by law is by independence and a willingness to live as free men, just as righteous men ought to live.

Here in America the object of education should be to fit our people for good citizenship and God-fearing lives. That objective is the special responsibility of the colleges of America.

We thank God for the small college, for America, and for men like W. L. Mellon, who have helped so much in building our great Republic.

Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial concerning the record of accomplishment of Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, published in the Newark (N. J.) Star-Ledger of Wednesday, January 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SUBSTANCE IS THERE

Governor Driscoll appeared for his first inauguration 3 years ago as a new figure in the affairs of the State—a young man who was neither a machine creature nor a flamboyant crusader, but a thoughtful citizen who had learned the art of government in his home town, in the legislature and in an exacting administrative post as head of the alcoholic beverage department. He aroused high hopes 3 years ago, but there was also apprehension among his friends that he might prove too idealistic and inflexible to cope successfully with the tough and unyielding men and conditions that constitute the political scene in New Jersey.

The same man was inaugurated a second time as governor yesterday. That in itself was an eloquent commentary on the fact that he had met the tough men and the tough conditions and, in his own way, had managed to live with them and influence them for the better.

The fact of his second inauguration in itself reflects the story of a remarkable peaceful revolution in the very climate of government in this State—a revolution that swept away an obsolete, cumbersome form of government and paved the way for the sensational demise of the Hague machine in Hudson County.

In his address to the legislature yesterday the Governor could speak with the conviction and authority of one who had already simplified many a complexity. He took the long and broad view of government, calling attention to its failure to keep abreast of the sweeping industrial and social changes of the age and demanding that the present hodge-podge of confusion and costly overlapping among Federal, State, and local governments be rationalized in order to bring government close to the people.

While his message dealt primarily with the wisdom of providing the State with a clearly defined field in relation to the Federal Government, the Governor's philosophy of a federalism resting upon a maximum of local self-government and effective State government received its most cogent expression.

In an age when the doctrine of "one world" is receiving increasing consideration, the need for rationalizing big government along with bigness in industry, business, and labor becomes imperative and even desperate. Thus, the man who strongly urges that the Federal Government, in order to make itself more effective as a world leader, divest itself of those functions that properly belong to the States, also emphasizes the urgent necessity of municipal reform, in order that our cities may play their full role in making sense and order out of the enormous complexities of modern life.

The Driscoll viewpoint on government, a viewpoint that is definitely his contribution to our political thinking, has yet to be marked by the fighting, or the alluring, or the sensational phrase. Nothing quite so brief and easily remembered as New Deal or Fair Deal or private enterprise or good old days is available as the label of the Driscoll philosophy. But the substance of a new political movement is decidedly present.

Here is a man who is skeptical of all ideologies, firmly devoted to religious value and civil liberties, rooted in experience with local and neighborhood problems and profoundly aware of the flow of history. On the basis of successful performance in State government and his contribution to political thought, he has clearly earned a high place in the national councils of his party.

Since Governor Dewey's rise to the national scene in 1936, Governor Driscoll is the first Republican personality to offer successful experience in government administration as well as political achievement; and he is the only one among newer Republican personalities to offer a solution to our towering national problems of Government that is not rooted in obsolete controversies.

It is not with relation to 1952 that we point to Governor Driscoll's place in the national scene. It is 1950 that must pave the way for 1952, and the thinking for 1952 must be done now.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at 1949 Campaign Dinner of the Republican City Committee of Philadelphia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered at the 1949 campaign dinner of the Republican City Committee of Philadelphia, at the Bellevue-Stratford Hotel, Philadelphia, October 28, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President Truman thinks you are not paying enough income tax.

In fact he thinks the Federal Government is not spending enough of your money.

He wants to reach deeper and deeper into your pocket. He wants to take another chunk out of the pay envelope of every wage earner in America.

That's what Harry Truman meant last week when he announced that at the next session of Congress he will demand an increase in Federal taxes.

Does that make sense to you?

Can you swallow that without choking?

For the current fiscal year which began July 1 the Democrats in control at Washington appropriated and authorized the spending of nearly $50,000,000,000.

That is $350 for every man, woman, and child in the United States or $1,400 for the average family of four.

Of course the Federal revenue will not reach $50,000,000,000. It will fall short by twelve or thirteen billions.

But that doesn't worry Harry Truman and his spendthrift crew.

Oh, no. They just climb on the merry-go-round of deficit financing and the national debt—now more than a quarter trillion dollars—is pushed up, higher and higher.

Never in the history of our Republic have we traveled at such a dizzy pace around the vicious circle of more spending, more taxes, more debt, more spending, more taxes, and more debt.

Around and around it goes and where it stops nobody knows.

And there's no end in sight while the Democratic squander crowd remains in power.

The only solution they offer for any problem is more and more spending—not in millions but in billions.

If all the schemes now before Congress, and all the proposed experiments in socialism are enacted, the cost of Federal Government will eventually skyrocket up to $100,000,000,000 a year.

President Truman's own economic adviser, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, couldn't take that. He fought a losing battle for sound common sense and when he resigned the other day he gave blunt warning that the administration's "monetary and fiscal tricks have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery."

Keep that in mind—a slippery road to misery.

President Truman's demand for higher taxes is further convincing evidence that he has no intention whatsoever of curtailing the waste and extravagance that have led us into a deficit which may reach seven or eight billion dollars this year.

But he had an alibi ready. He blamed it all on the tax cuts made by the Republican Eightieth Congress. He called it a rich man's tax-reduction bill.

That is a typical example of the reckless and irresponsible statements to which Harry Truman resorts to cover up the real facts.

In Washington we have to fight continuously against such false and misleading statements at the national level.

I notice that in this campaign you have the same kind of fight at the local level.

It seems that the whole philosophy of the Democratic Party, from top to bottom, is based on loose, reckless, and irresponsible statements.

Let me illustrate.

When President Truman called the tax-reduction bill enacted by the Eightieth Congress a rich man's bill it was another move in his campaign to array one class of Americans against another.

He conveniently forgot that 71 percent of the four billion eight hundred million tax reduction went to people with incomes of less than $5,000 a year.

He conveniently overlooked the fact that more than 7,000,000 people in the lowest-income brackets were removed entirely from the Federal income-tax rolls.

Let me give you another illustration of the loose talk down in Washington that is being echoed here in Philadelphia.

The Democratic leadership, and that includes President Truman, have been talking about civil rights. They have promised all kinds of legislation for the protection of minority groups.

Now the Democrats had majorities in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. They packed the committees and had absolute control of the Eighty-first Congress.

But in all the 9½ months that this Democratic Congress was in session not one civil-rights bill was enacted into law.

The only civil-rights bill that was reported on the calendar of the Senate was an anti-lynching bill introduced by a Republican, Senator FERGUSON, of Michigan.

That bill was on the calendar for 4 months, but the Democratic leadership in the Senate refused to bring it up for action.

There was plenty of double talk, but not a single civil-rights promise was fulfilled.

The Republican Party may have its faults but it keeps its promises.

Don't let anyone tell you that your local election has nothing to do with national issues.

If we are to return to sane, sound, economical, constitutional government it must begin back here at home.

It must be built from the ground up, it cannot start at the top.

We hear a lot about getting down to the grass roots. In politics that means getting out in the field and digging for votes.

Here in Philadelphia you have a golden opportunity to make your Republicanism count.

You have nominated the finest candidates ever offered by any party anywhere in the United States.

They are men of outstanding ability, upright character—and unquestioned integrity.

Every public-spirited citizen can support your candidates with pride and complete confidence that they will give the people of Philadelphia distinguished service in their respective offices.

Remember that this election is the forerunner of 1950 and 1952.

Therefore, I say that any Republican who fails to give this splendid ticket his active and wholehearted support is guilty of a disservice, not only to the city of Philadelphia, but also to the State and Nation.

Legislative Program, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday of this week, Commander in Chief Clyde A. Lewis, and other officials of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, of which I am chairman, to present that organization's legislative program.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including the very fine statement made by Commander Lewis to the committee on that occasion.

Mr. Lewis' statement follows:

STATEMENT OF CLYDE A. LEWIS, COMMANDER IN CHIEF, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, IN REGARD TO THE VFW LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM, BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am grateful for this opportunity to appear before your committee and discuss briefly some highlights of the legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. I have spent most of my time since my election traveling throughout the East, Middle West, and the South. In a few days I plan to be in California for a series of visits in that State, as well as in Oregon and Washington.

I can think of no congressional committee more important to our veterans and their dependents than your Committee on Veterans Affairs. The congressional reorganization plan, which consolidated jurisdiction of all House veteran bills in this one committee, had the full support of the Veterans of Foreign Wars. This committee, originally designated as the World War Veterans Committee, has had a long and constructive history. Your distinguished chairman has served with the committee since its inception, and others of you have been on it for many years. We are proud of the fact that one of our past commanders in chief, Gen. PAT KEARNEY, is now an old-timer on your committee, and another past commander, Capt. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, rendered long and valuable service before moving to Armed Services. Notwithstanding the changing make-up over the years, the traditions and policy of the committee have remained steadfast. In good and bad times we have always been able to count on this committee to give every reasonable consideration to the needs of our veterans and their dependents.

I have with me today three of the ablest members of our staff who are outstanding in their field. I refer to Mr. Omar B. Ketchum, director of the national legislative service; Col. George E. Ijams, director of the national rehabilitation service; and Admiral Leland Lovett, director of public relations. I am sure they are well known to you.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars today consist of more than 1,100,000 men who have served on foreign soil or in hostile waters in the United States armed forces during some war, campaign, or expedition in which the United States has been engaged and for which a service or campaign medal or ribbon has been authorized. Of our membership, approximately 1,000,000 are overseas veterans of World War II.

The current legislative program of the Veterans of Foreign Wars is a broad and comprehensive one. Although the objectives to which I respectfully invite your attention this morning concern the welfare of our veterans and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans, they are by no means the complete program adopted by our Golden Jubilee Convention held in Miami, Fla., in August 1949. The delegates at that convention, representing 10,000 posts throughout the Nation and beyond the seas—a true cross-section of American life—were also concerned with the problems of national security, housing, foreign affairs, employment, the welfare of our armed services, our national economy, and the fight against the evil of communism.

In keeping with the program for this meeting I shall confine my remarks to a few of the highlights of our legislative program. A detailed outline of all of our objectives which come before this committee will be offered for insertion in the record by our legislative director. Subsequent meetings of your committee will provide an opportunity for full discussion of bills under consideration.

SERVICE PENSION

Before discussing other important points in our legislative program, I would like to commend your committee for its sincere and painstaking consideration of the pension program during the first session of this Congress. While the bill, H. R. 4617, which this committee approved and which passed the House on June 1, 1949, falls short of the VFW objective for a uniform pension for all war veterans—similar to the pensions authorized for veterans of the Spanish-American and previous wars; nevertheless, the bill represents a decided step forward. Despite the President's attempt, in his recent Budget Message, to sound a cataclysmic note at the prospect of future expenditures in behalf of our Nation's veterans, we shall not be deterred in our efforts to achieve a sound and equitable pension program. We believe that our old and crippled veterans are entitled to special consideration—at least equal consideration with our European neighbors.

In our pledge to continue the fight for enactment of the pension bill, H. R. 4617, we voice our opposition to the President's stand, as intimated in his budget message, that the pension bill represents an "overlapping and unwarranted * * * special benefit for veterans. The issue is clear and the battle lines are drawn. We shall not waver from our announced purpose that the traditional pension for our Nation's war veterans must be extended to the veterans of World Wars I and II.

COST-OF-LIVING INCREASE IN DISABILITY COMPENSATION AND PENSION

Our organization strongly favors an increase in disability compensation and pensions payable pursuant to laws administered by the Veterans' Administration. The Congress has been generous in the past in the matter of adjusting these rates, but unfortunately it has not kept pace with the rise in the cost of living.

In 1939 a veteran totally disabled, service-connected, received $100 per month. Today he receives $150 per month. It is more dollars but less purchasing power than in 1939. To provide a purchasing power equal to 1939 dollars, the compensation for total disability should be not less than $160. We are recommending an increase which would bring the rate for a 100-percent disabled veteran, service-connected, to $172. It is our hope that some day the Congress will put the totally disabled veteran on a standard of living comparable to that enjoyed by the citizen making an average wage in industry.

REVISION OF INCOME LIMITATIONS

The Members who served on the committee in the Eightieth Congress recall the extensive hearings devoted to this question.

Existing income limitations governing eligibility for veterans' part III non-service-connected disability pension and the widows' non-service-connected death pension are $1,000 where the veteran of the widow has no dependents, and $2,500 where the widow or veteran has dependents. These income limitations were written into the law in 1934 and the figures applied were those used for personal exemption for income-tax purposes.

Fifteen years have elapsed since the fixing of these limitations and for the past several years they have become arbitrary and lost their meaning. We believe, as this committee did in 1948, that these figures should be increased in order for the law governing eligibility for these pensions to have the same meaning that they had in 1934. We ask this committee to again consider this matter and to increase the limitations to $2,000 for the veteran and widow without dependents and $3,000 for the veteran and widow with dependents.

ADJUSTED SERVICE COMPENSATION

Since the close of World War II the national encampments of the Veterans of Foreign Wars have adopted resolutions calling upon the Congress to enact adjusted service compensation legislation which would tend to alleviate the economic disparity as between the young man who spent the war years in the military services and the young man who remained at home as part of the civilian war effort. Such legislation, in the form of readjustment insurance, was introduced in the Eightieth Congress and again in this Congress by your chairman as H. R. 914, at the request of our organization.

This legislation would place the veteran who, because of age, family commitments, or economic reasons, was unable to participate substantially in any of the benefits of the GI bill of rights, on a par with the veteran who did fully participate in the benefits of that bill. We do not believe, for example, that the veteran who had to go out and make a living for his family should be denied a benefit comparable to those received by veterans drawing readjustment allowances or who were able to go to school for several years. Accordingly, in this legislation we have suggested that the Congress deduct from adjusted compensation the tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran through the operation of the GI bill of rights.

INSURANCE

Twelve resolutions were adopted by our recent national encampment calling for certain amendments to the National Service Life Insurance Act so as to encourage more veterans to retain their policies and to facilitate reinstatement for those who have permitted their policies to lapse. Many of these resolutions are embodied in the bill H. R. 5574, introduced by the chairman at the request of the four major veterans' organizations. We are hopeful that the committee will hold hearings on this important bill in the very near future.

VETERANS' HOSPITAL PROGRAM

More than a year has elapsed since the promulgation of Executive order which reduced the VA hospital-construction program by approximately 16,000 beds. At that time we were shocked that the President, pursuant to recommendations of the Bureau of the Budget, acted so summarily without soliciting the advice of the Congress which had authorized this construction program.

We continue to insist that the President was poorly advised; and since then we have been supported in our contentions by action of the Congress in the independent offices appropriation bill for 1950, which continued the authorization of $237,000,000 for the projects which were ordered curtailed.

Your committee, rising to the occasion, reported favorably the bill H. R. 5965, which directs the Administrator for Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the construction of additional facilities to provide 16,000 more hospital beds. We are hopeful the Congress will enact this legislation before adjournment.

Distressing as was the action of the President in reducing the hospital-construction program, there is an even more dangerous threat to deprive thousands of veterans of an entitlement to hospitalization which was granted by the Congress many years ago. One of the proposals of the so-called Hoover report on Government reorganization would, if approved, sound the death knell of the veterans' hospital program.

The particular recommendation to which I refer is that which would transfer all the medical functions and hospital services, including VA hospitals, to a united medical administration operating directly under the President. There is much more than meets the eye in this proposal. Disguised with a veil of economy, the recommendation, if carried out, would mean the end of the veterans' medical and hospital program as we have known it for the past 25 years. And there is no assurance that economy and efficiency would result in such a consolidated medical set-up.

The Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States will fight to the utmost against such a reorganization plan. We remember only too well the almost tragic consequences of a generation ago when treatment and hospitalization for the disabled veteran was identified with an other Federal medical agency. The Congress, after an exhaustive survey by a special commission, then created a distinct and identifiable veterans' hospital program in the Veterans' Administration, and we pray that our friends on this committee and in the Congress will join us to defeat this particular recommendation of the Hoover Commission.

In closing, let me again thank you for your courtesy in permitting me to appear before your committee and I will now yield to Legislative Director Ketchum, who will conclude our presentation.

Oscar Chapman, Secretary of the Interior

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON

OF COLORADO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article about the new Secretary of the Interior, Oscar Chapman. The article appeared in the Sunday Denver Post of January 8.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CHAPMAN CAPS NOTABLE CAREER—NEW INTERIOR CHIEF RATED LIBERAL, CONSERVATIONIST

(By Barnet Nover)

WASHINGTON.—Oscar Littleton Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, is a modest man with a ready smile, a serene disposition, and a great capacity for friendship. Temperamentally, he is the exact opposite of the rambunctious Honest Harold Ickes, the self-styled old curmudgeon, under whom he served ably, amicably, and self-effacing, for more than 12 tempestuous years.

Indeed, Chapman is the only top-flight official of the Interior Department who had come in with Ickes in 1933 and was still around when Ickes made his sulfurous exit early in 1946.

That fact is proof of Chapman's capacity to get along with people, his skill in avoiding those fierce jealousies and that intense struggle for power and place which tend to make Washington the graveyard of many of man's ambitions.

A CONSISTENT CAREER

Survival is, of course, no virtue in itself. Otherwise, the galapago turtle, which reckons its life span in centuries, would have to be admired as the noblest of animals.

The fact that, first as Assistant Secretary, later as Undersecretary, and now as Secretary of the Interior, Chapman has broken all

records for continuous service at the little Cabinet and Cabinet level is not in itself of great significance.

What is significant is that Chapman's long tenure in the Government, all of it in the same department, forms an amazingly coherent pattern that is consistent within itself and consistent, as well, with the social-minded philosophy that has dominated his life and thought since his very early years.

The only time I ever saw Chapman display anything resembling a touch of temper—and I have known him for well over a decade—was when I sought his reaction to the charge made in a magazine that, while outwardly a liberal, he is actually only a coldly calculating careerist who has always trimmed his sails to the winds of political expediency and his own high-flung ambitions.

RECORD OF LOYALTY

Chapman dismissed that charge with asperity.

"I haven't the slightest interest in politics," he told me. "I have never wanted to run for any office and do not intend to."

To those who have watched Chapman's career in the Government closely this fact is certainly clear: He did not seek the job which, back in 1933, first brought him into the national picture. Nor is there the slightest shred of evidence to suggest that he ever participated in any intrigue to advance himself. The truth is he leaned backward to avoid it.

He was passed over in 1935 when the post of Under Secretary of the Interior was created; it went to Charles West. He was regularly passed over whenever that post became vacant, as it did no fewer than five times in the course of the last 10 years of Ickes' stay in office.

But while under secretaries and first assistant secretaries came and went, Chapman stayed on, loyally cooperating with them all and giving no indication that he was anything but happy to remain just where he was and continue doing the job he was doing.

Chapman's ambition has never been either in the direction of piling up a fortune or of scaling the dizzy political heights that lead to the pinnacles of power.

Had wealth been his goal, he would have retired from the Government long ago; indeed, he would probably never have gone into the Government in the first place.

The offer of an assistant secretaryship of the Interior came to Chapman not through his direct seeking but as a result of fortuitous circumstances and at a time when he was in a position to earn more money in private life than he had ever earned before.

He and the late Edward P. Costigan, whose successful campaign for the United States Senate in 1930 he had managed, went to Albany after the election of 1932 to discuss with President-elect Franklin D. Roosevelt certain problems of legislation that were due to come up when the new Congress met in March 1933.

It was the first time Chapman had ever met Roosevelt.

"Ed," said Roosevelt to Costigan when the conference ended, "I want to keep this young man in Washington. He is the kind of man we want in the Government."

CHANCE TAKES A HAND

At that time Chapman had no thought of entering the Government. His plans were to return to Denver and run Costigan's law office while the latter served in the Senate.

Roosevelt's remark put ideas in Costigan's head. He suggested to Chapman, whose attitude toward Costigan was just this side of adoration, that 2 or 3 years in Washington would be helpful experience for a young lawyer. There would then be time enough to go back to Denver and take over the law office.

One day in Costigan's Washington office, Chapman and Costigan's secretary, Marguerite Owens, were having a talk. Chapman happened to mention what the Senator had said about the usefulness of a spell of Government service to a lawyer.

"Here," said Miss Owens, laughing, while pulling the Congressional Directory on her desk toward her, "let's see what kind of job we can find for you."

F. D. R. APPROVED

With Chapman peering over her shoulder, she opened the book at random. On one of the exposed pages there was a description of the duties of the Assistant Secretary of Interior, including supervision of the General Land Office, the Office of Education, Howard University, the Indian Service and the administration of islands and Territories.

"Now that's the job I want," said the grinning Chapman. At that point Costigan entered the room and was made privy to the joke.

"But that's wonderful," Costigan said. "I'll talk to Roosevelt about it."

Roosevelt was agreeable to the idea. So was Bronson Cutting, Senator from New Mexico, who had been offered the secretaryship of the Interior and was then considering whether to take it. When Cutting refused the job, Harold Ickes was named.

VIEWS WON ICKES

Costigan took Chapman over to see Ickes.

"What is your philosophy of conservation?" Ickes asked.

"I am in complete accord with what Gifford Pinchot and Theodore Roosevelt have done."

"That's good enough for any man," said Ickes, adding: "Can you get Farley's endorsement?"

Farley was friendly, but revealed that he was committed to a Montanan named Harry B. Mitchell. An hour later, Farley called up Chapman and offered him the job of President of the Civil Service Commission, a job paying substantially more than that of Assistant Secretary.

STARTED WITH LINDSEY

Chapman suggested that Farley offer the Civil Service Commission post to the man from Montana, which, if the latter agreed to take it, would leave open the Interior post. Mitchell agreed to this swap. Chapman was willing to work for a lower salary in order to get a job in which he could be useful.

So it came about that Oscar Chapman began on a new career that was ultimately to lead to a Cabinet post.

Like so many ardent Coloradans, Chapman was born elsewhere and went to the State for reasons of health.

Born in the little Virginia town of Omega, in the tobacco belt, he received his education at Randolph-Macon academy at Bedford. During World War I he served in the Navy as a pharmacist's mate. In the course of his service he crossed the Atlantic 36 times and contracted tuberculosis which resulted in his moving to Colorado.

It is a familiar story in Denver how, enormously attracted by the personality and genius of Judge Ben Lindsey, Chapman determined to work for the latter and by sheer persistence and after countless disappointments finally managed to see him and be given a job.

BACKED THREE PARTIES

In 1922 Chapman became assistant chief probation officer of the juvenile court which, under Lindsey, had attracted world-wide attention. He was named chief probation officer in 1924.

Together with Costigan and Ickes, Lindsey was one of the three men who had the greatest impact on Chapman's life and philosophy.

All three had begun life as Republicans. All three had followed Theodore Roosevelt into the Bull Moose camp in 1912. All three had ultimately sought the carrying out of the programs they favored through the Democratic Party

The term "welfare state" had not been invented in their day. But Theodore Roosevelt's fair deal and Woodrow Wilson's new freedom were precursors of the movement that led to Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal and Harry Truman's Fair Deal.

Characteristic of all of them was their emphasis on the need of conserving both natural resources and human resources as well.

With this viewpoint Chapman has always been in complete sympathy. And his successive posts in the Interior Department have enabled him to put that program into action.

PROJECTS LEADER

As Assistant Secretary of the Interior, Chapman was largely responsible for the administration of the Taylor Grazing Act regulating grazing on public lands. To acquaint the cattle and sheep people with the law and also to give them a chance to be heard, Chapman held hearings in 11 States.

His was also the responsibility, under Secretary Ickes, for assigning oil leases, a particularly ticklish matter in view of the acute memories of the Teapot Dome scandal. Chapman is proud to recall that Ickes never approved an oil lease over his Assistant Secretary's disapproval.

Chapman also played a dominant part in the efforts to rehabilitate the Virgin Islands which President Hoover had once described as an effective poorhouse. He took a deep interest in the efforts to develop Alaska, improve conditions in Puerto Rico, bring statehood to Hawaii. He was largely responsible, again with the strong support of Ickes, for the program of developing synthetic fuels, including the oil-shale-extraction experiment at Rifle which appears to have succeeded beyond all dreams. He led the fight for creation of the Jackson Hole National Monument and has been vigorous in his efforts to build up the great national parks that have come into being since Franklin D. Roosevelt's first administration.

These represent but a small part of the contributions which, as an official, Chapman has made in the cause of the best use and wisest conservation of our natural resources.

They have not been his only contributions. Having no formal hobbies, he has spent much of his spare time working on behalf of minorities. He master-minded the famous concert given by Marian Anderson on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial after the noted Negro had been refused permission to sing in Constitution Hall. Behind the scenes he did much on behalf of the efforts that led to creation of the Republic of Israel. He regards the political work he has done, first on behalf of Roosevelt and, during the 1948 campaign, on behalf of Truman, as the least of his efforts.

In 1940 he took a leave of absence without pay to help organize the 11 Western States on behalf of Roosevelt's reelection campaign.

BOOMED FOR TRUMAN

In 1948 he was Truman's advance man, helping organize meetings for the President and drumming up support for him where such support was likely to count. Since he believed in what Truman stood for, he was willing to go all out in working for the latter, regardless of how dismal Truman's chances appeared to be.

Seeking no publicity; working quietly and effectively, the genial Chapman was one of the real architects of the surprise Truman victory of November 1948.

At 53, Chapman looks a lot younger than his years. He is happily married to the charming and attractive former Anne Kendrick, who for 3 years was his secretary. They have one child—a son.

A teetotaler and nonsmoker, Chapman is no hermit. He likes people and is liked by them; no Washington official is more popular. But he is no gad-about. Nobody in the Capital spends more time at his desk.

But with all of the vast responsibilities that have now descended on him—the administration of a department that spends more than $600,000,000 a year and has more than 60,000 in its employ—Chapman remains unharassed, unruffled, and unhurried. After 16½ years in public life he knows how to get things done.

Civil-Rights Program for America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD excerpts from an address which I delivered at the National Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization on January 15, 1950, in Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civil rights in America is on the march. This meeting is proof of that fact, because you who represent millions of Americans all over the United States are demonstrating by your presence the wish of the American people to enact into law the principles of brotherhood and human equality which democracy stands for.

All over this land the people of America, in their churches, in their trade-unions, in their fraternal organizations, in their farm co-ops, through their city and State FEPC laws and antidiscrimination laws, are telling the Congress of the United States, "Enact civil-rights legislation." They are telling the nations of the world, "We, the people of America, believe in the democratic principles we profess. We, the people of America, call upon our Congress to carry out the will of the electorate." The responsibility of American Government is to legislate for the people, not to consolidate the entrenched power of the minority by political manipulation of parliamentary rules.

The most vital issue facing the American Congress today is that of civil rights. The preservation of human rights is the paramount issue of our generation. The extension and the guarantee of human rights and civil rights is the core of our struggle with the totalitarian forces. The denial of human liberty, the betrayal of democratic ideals, is the sin and the crime of communism and other totalitarian doctrines. This great Nation of ours has poured out billions of dollars of the people's money in a struggle against the aggression of Communist ideology. We are sapping the economic strength of our economy to maintain a powerful military establishment because of the threat of Communist aggression. We live in a psychosis of fear because of the evil and ruthlessness of the totalitarian power.

How blind can we be? Are we incapable of seeing that neither communism nor fascism can be stopped by the mere demonstration of military power and financial resources? Our secret weapon in this great struggle is the fulfillment of the democratic ideal of human equality. This ideal is embodied in political form in the civil-rights proposals which are now before the Congress of the United States.

The issue of civil rights penetrates our foreign policy and adulterates our domestic policy. It penetrates our foreign policy because by our failure to guarantee basic civil liberties to all peoples, regardless of race, color, or creed, we are denying acceptance of the principles of human equality.

The underprivileged long-exploited peoples of Asia and Africa wish to be accepted as free and equal members of the human society. They will place their faith in the nation and the people who accept them and work with them as free and equal peoples. A foreign policy that does not include the issue of human dignity and human equality is one that is doomed to failure. As it has been stated again and again, the struggle we are now engaged in is one for men's minds. Respect, understanding, and affection cannot be purchased by loans, gifts, or grants. A unity of freedom-loving people cannot be molded by power and military might. The intangibles of human freedom, equality, and individual dignity are the only real forces and weapons on the side of democratic faith.

Our moral standing in the eyes of the world hinges on whether we pass civil rights legislation. The moral and political health of our own economy depends on whether or not we adopt civil rights legislation. We can scarcely call ourselves a democratic nation if we fail to guarantee the right to vote and the right of personal security. We jeopardize our economic strength if we deny people an opportunity for employment because of such factors as race, color, or creed. We weaken our national strength in direct proportion to the number of people that we discriminate against either in the exercise of their political liberties or their economic opportunities. We can no longer afford the luxury and the waste of second-class citizenship.

The facts of international politics, the moral obligation of our own political faith, the economic and political needs of our times, call upon the Congress of the United States to fulfill the pledges on civil rights legislation which have been given to the people.

It would seem to the casual observer that the enactment of civil-rights legislation would be a routine matter. Our entire history is one filled with the ideals of freedom, individual dignity, and brotherhood. The forward movement of our developing democracy has been that of human liberation. The Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the Emancipation Proclamation—all are testimonies to the will of the people of this Nation to liberate ourselves from our sense of guilt and shame. The people of our country have carried a great moral burden for too long a time. We have cried out for democracy in other nations at the same time that we denied democracy at home. This hypocrisy has developed a sense of national moral guilt that calls for an immediate answer. Americans now realize that discrimination is a denial of our creed. We have been a Nation plagued with a guilty conscience.

We made an auspicious step toward absolving ourselves of this sense of guilt with the publication of the precedent-breaking report of the President's Committee on Civil Rights, organized labor, business, all religious groups—almost all sections of our public life were represented in this report which called—in ringing words—for an end to discrimination, the right of all citizens to live free of terror and oppression and to participate fully in the responsibility and benefits of their Government. This was a landmark in our march toward the realization of genuine democracy. The next step, and the step we now face, is the implementation of the Committee's recommendations.

In 1943 at the convention of the Democratic Party, the decision was abruptly made. When the delegates were challenged to get out of the shadow of States' rights and to walk forth in the bright sunshine of human rights, they voted to relieve themselves of their guilty consciences. They voted against discrimination and against bigotry. They justified the freedom of freemen.

Again, on last November the third, our faith in the American citizen was tested and affirmed. There can be no doubt now about the American people's passion for liberation. They voted to liberate themselves from their guilt as well as to liberate minority groups from their displacement. The American voter showed to all the world that he had the courage of his convictions.

In spite of that great demonstration in November, a minority in the Senate of the United States withstands the national tide. They will fail, because history is against them, the people are against them, the President of the United States is against them, the times are against them. Our President risked his political career to bring the issue of civil rights to the people. He traveled many miles to proclaim his vigorous views on this issue. He has broken all precedent in the degree of his strength and leadership to the end that man's inviolate dignity shall be accorded to all men equally. President Truman has truly shown that he would rather be right than be President.

As a Democrat I call upon my party to carry out its promises to the people. Those promises were embodied in the platform under four specific proposals: (1) The right of equal treatment in the armed forces; (2) legislation to abolish the poll tax; (3) a meaningful and effective antilynching bill; and (4) fair employment practices legislation.

I do not underestimate the difficulties that lie before us. Already in the Eighty-first Congress the people of the world have been betrayed by the sell-out of human rights known as the Wherry compromise which changed the rules of the United States Senate on the matter of curbing a filibuster. It was the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition just a year ago which passed the Wherry Resolution that requires a two-thirds vote of the entire membership of the United States Senate to stop a filibuster. This was indeed a Machiavellian body blow. It was the Republican-Dixiecrat coalition which made a political issue out of human rights. As a Member of the Congress, as one who has been given the honor to serve my Nation, I am ashamed and am heartsick that this tragic mistake and sell-out has taken place.

This is no time, however, for acrimonious attack or bitter words. This is the time for a call to reason and a plea for justice. Just because the rules were changed thereby making it extremely difficult to curb a filibuster, so now the obligation is all the more upon us to overcome the difficulties that have been placed in the path of human freedom by delivering the votes needed to break a filibuster and to pass civil-rights legislation.

That which has been done by men can be undone. The mistakes of yesterday can and must be corrected by the positive accomplishments of today.

I call upon the Republican Party and upon my own party, the Democratic Party, to come clean on the issue of civil rights. No man has a right to play politics with human lives and human dignity. To exploit the oppressed, to gain power or advantage by political expediency at the expense of human beings is not only a denial of democratic ideals, but is immoral.

The issue of civil rights should be a nonpartisan matter. The passage of civil rights legislation is a bipartisan obligation. Neither the Republicans nor the Democrats can honestly say to the millions of Americans who are suffering under the yoke of discrimination or bigotry that this Congress did not have the votes to pass the civil-rights proposals. The Republican Party is committed by platform and by pronouncement to this program. The Democratic Party is equally committed. It will not make much sense to the American people for the leaders of either political party to try to explain

their failure by the fact that a handful of opponents stopped action. This is but to say that the process of democracy has been stopped dead by a willful obstinate minority that was vastly outnumbered by the Democratic-Republican majority.

The President of the United States, who stands as the leader not only of this Nation but of his party, has given the call to action. He had every right to expect the support of all Members of Congress who have declared themselves for this legislation. Tonight I share the platform with a distinguished leader of the Republican Party, my friend and colleague, Senator WAYNE MORSE of Oregon. I appeal to the Republican membership of the Senate to follow the leadership of Senator MORSE and his liberal associates on this vital issue of civil rights. I know of no demonstration on the part of the Congress that would instill more faith in the hearts of our people as to the honesty and the integrity of the democratic processes than a bipartisan effort to pass civil-rights legislation.

Soon we shall come to grips with the issue of fair-employment practices legislation. The FEPC bill listed on the Senate Calendar as S. 1728 will be brought up for debate on the floor of the Senate within a matter of weeks. This bill has the support of the majority of the Senate Labor and Public Welfare Committee. This bill represents a reasonable, moderate, and constructive approach to a very serious problem. The principles of fair-employment practices legislation are neither new nor untried. The President's Committee on FEPC during the war years has an enviable record of accomplishment. Already 10 States have FEPC laws on their statute books. Many of the large cities have pioneered in this all-important field of legislation. Roughly speaking, about 50,000,000 people, or more than a third of our country's population, is already covered by State or local FEPC laws. It cannot be too strongly emphasized, however, that the problems of discrimination are Nation-wide. In discussing them, no State, section, nor community should feel that it is being singled out for criticism. To pass FEPC legislation is not to legislate against any section of the country. The problem of discrimination is present in all sections in some form or other. It is therefore the responsibility of the National Government through its Congress to establish a basic standard for human rights and problems of employment.

The passage of FEPC and other civil-rights legislation is, as I have stated before, jeopardized by the Wherry resolution. I do not want to underestimate the difficulties which are placed in our path. However, I am convinced that belief in the Golden Rule can overcome a Senate rule. If we should fail, there is but one alternative, an old, true, tried, and tested alternative, namely, a free election. I am sure that every Member of Congress can understand the meaning of this language. The time for political politeness is over. The clubby atmosphere of the Congress does not carry through to the country. It is not enough just to be a good fellow and to be liked by your colleagues. The American people did not send 531 Members of the Congress of the United States to Washington in order to develop our social life. We are here for the purpose of developing, protecting, and extending the democratic way of life. That way of life is being challenged by bigotry, hypocrisy, intolerance, and discrimination right here in America. It will require much more courage to stand up against the antidemocratic forces within America than it does to vote the people's money to fight the Communist forces outside of America. The eyes of the people of the United States are focused on Washington. They say: "Whether you are Democrat or Republican is not the issue. By your deeds shall ye be known."

Heywood Broun's Gifted Pen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, last month occurred the tenth anniversary of the death of Heywood Broun, journalist, humanitarian, and founder of the American Guild, one of the great unions in the American labor movement. At the time of Mr. Broun's death, our great President, Franklin Delano Roosevelt, said:

Heywood Broun lived a full life and leaves a noble heritage. His great gifts of heart and mind and soul were ever directed toward his purposes.

Neither slander nor calumny nor thought of personal consequences ever deterred him once he had entered a fight in the cause of right and justice as he saw it.

He was a hard fighter but always a fair adversary and no matter for whom he worked he wore no man's collar.

He will be missed and mourned particularly by the underprivileged whose staunch champion he always was.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article, Jottings From Broun's Gifted Pen, which appeared in the Guild Reporter for December 9, 1949, a newspaper published by the American Newspaper Guild.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

SOME JOTTINGS FROM BROUN'S GIFTED PEN

(Broun wielded a gifted pen. It could cut, it could bring chuckles, and it could state an issue in simple, logical terms. Here are some random samples, culled from his columns in the World, the World-Telegram, the News Republic, and from speeches.)

A newspaper is, among other things, a business. And, even so, it must be more than that. * * *

A newspaper is a rule unto itself. It has a soul for salvation or damnation. * * *

A newspaper can neither rise nor fall beyond or below its staff. * * *

I've always had the feeling that newspapers most of all were fit subjects for some sort of socialization. I've never known even the most obscure reporter who didn't think he knew more about running a paper than the man who owned it. I've always felt that way myself. And once I was right.

There is no force which can stand against a fierce, a free, and stalwart spirit. The voice of such a one is louder than the roll of guns.

Liberals need not be born. They can be trained by care and kindness.

The word "liberal" itself has fallen into disrepute. To a radical it is a label for a man who professes friendship and then rushes away for his 30 pieces of silver as soon as the crisis comes. In the eyes of the conservatives a liberal is a dirty Red who probably bought his dinner coat with Russian gold.

Neither interpretation is correct and it should not be impossible to expose the fallacy of such reasoning.

Nobody has a right to demand that an editor shall never change his mind. New facts on any given situation may require a complete right-about-face.

I am not so much interested in the freedom of the press as in the integrity of the press. Freedom means any man who owns a large paper can print or throw into the wastepaper basket what he likes. A man who poisons news is more dangerous than a man who poisons wells and springs.

There can be no such thing as a free press and no such thing as the integrity of the news if the men and women who write the news live in fear of the security of their jobs.

He had the harassed look of a flapjack cook in a lumber camp.

Free speech is about as good a cause as the world has ever known. But, like the poor, it is always with us and gets shoved aside in favor of things which seem at some given moment more vital.

They never are more vital. Not when you look back at them from a distance. When the necessity of free speech is most important we shut it off. Everybody favors free speech in the slack moments when no axes are being ground.

The weakness of communism has always been in its basic dependence upon leadership which was far away and unfamiliar with American conditions.

Quite inadvertently, I am sure, some of the publishers have allowed the feeling to grow and spread that newspaper men and women who join organizations of their own creation will be subject to penalties.

The penalty may not be dismissal. All newspapermen know of an institution known as the Chinese torture room. A reporter who incurs the displeasure of the boss by organizing activity may find himself writing obits for the rest of his life.

A press that rests upon the fears and apprehensions of reporters who are frightened and who feel that they have good reason to be frightened is not free.

It is a curious tradition of American journalism that no one is supposed to speak well of it until he has left that part of his life behind.

At 51 I have more faith than I ever had before. People are better than I thought they were going to be—myself included.

But at 51 I'm a better fighter than at 21. Things which once were just a sort of sentimental solace are now realities. Brotherhood is not just a Bible word. Out of comradeship can come and will come the happy life for all. The underdog can and will lick his weight in the wildcats of the world.

Broun's description of Al Smith, at the 1932 Democratic National Convention:

"That curious voice, half Caruso and half Tenth Avenue. When Al speaks the nose has it. It cuts like a sharp blade, a fish knife, through the uproar. Al carries his own gavel in his larynx."

No body politic is in a healthy state until it begins to itch.

Anger isn't the same thing as hatred. It is a flash of feeling which goes over the dam

upon the instant. No man who has expressed his anger with reasonable fluency need go back to it again.

Revenge is a form of procrastination. The man who eases his soul by paying off a score at the end of 20 years confesses that he didn't have the nerve or the mental alertness to handle the situation when it lay immediately in front of him.

I still think that the lawless employers should be restrained, and if they don't like it here, I see no possible objection to sending them back where they came from.

I've been fired in the spring, the summer, and the early winter. I like it best in the summer. Three times in the 31 years isn't so much to be fired.

The first firing is often worse than the last. It's very discouraging to get canned when you're young. That's the way it was with me.

I was 21 and working on the Morning Telegraph. My stall in the old Eighth Avenue car barn was right next to Bide Dudley. He was getting $35 a week and my salary was $28. I wanted $30 but when I asked for it they fired me.

Public opinion in this country runs like a shower bath. We have no temperatures between hot and cold.

With all deference to tradition, I do not think that news, either in peace or war, is limited to the recital of overt acts. True reporting should be a great deal more than a recital of oddities. It should go deeper into the commonplace and ordinary.

Journalism at its best is current history, and in the long run history is compounded out of things which may seem trivial at the moment. There ought to be an eye for acorns as well as oaks.

All too frequently a daily paper takes on the form of cataloging the folk in a sideshow. The silliest sort of playboy can earn himself headlines by semi-insane antics. Lunatic acts and kindred deeds are overplayed, in my opinion.

There is no poorer rule for the approximation of news than the familiar adage about dogs and men. Unless there is some special setting for the event, I deny the existence of news in the fact that a man bites a dog. An editor's reaction to such an event should be to spike the story, saying, "It's just another nut or one of those press agents."

Wanting things is fun. Getting them ruins your appetite.

Newspaper reporters have the habit of bestowing the title of "sage" somewhat too readily. They speak of sages almost as often as dramatic critics and book reviewers refer to "genius."

I was a child prodigy myself. That is, at the age of 5 I always required 12-year-old pants.

It is not inevitable that today's strip of newsprint should be no more than tattered scraps in tomorrow's dust bin. The man who writes well enough and thinks through the thing before him can win his immortality, even though his piece appears obscurely in a Wall Street edition.

Most of us on papers, for all our swagger, are at least five and a half times too humble. We are apt to say, "Oh, I'm just a newspaperman." When called upon to justify ourselves we smirk and behave as if the thing we did were really of but small importance.

We know better than that. There is no reason why a first-rate man on any newspaper should yield precedence to every novelist and minor poet and and little essayist. In city rooms I've known the whole crowd to gape at some member of the staff in considerable awe and whisper behind his back, "He's written a book."

There's no special magic in getting between boards. Last year's novel is just as dead as last year's paper. Indeed, I know few sights more horrible than second-hand book stalls on which dead volumes are exposed to wind and weather, completely dead and lacking only decent burial.

Independent liberals always get beaten in American elections because they reserve their commitments until a month or so before election. * * * Organization can't be beaten without organization.

We're More Tax Conscious

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chico (Calif.) Enterprise-Record of Saturday, January 7, 1950:

THERE'S MUCH TALK ABOUT TAXES

At the moment the people of the United States must be acutely tax conscious. There are several good reasons why they should be.

Every person in the country who draws a pay check this week, from which his tax deductions are made at the source, probably will blink and take a second look at the figures. His tax for social security has taken a bigger bite out of his check. The percentage deducted has gone up from 1 to 1½ percent. Instead of the deduction stopping when he has earned $3,000 this year, if he has a job which pays that kind of money, it'll go right on until he's earned more than $3,600.

Employers, too, may do a little blinking and give certain figures a quick double-take when they note at the end of the month that their contributions to social security for their employees have gone up correspondingly. They may fume a little, too, over the new requirement for monthly reports. Bookkeepers already are tugging at their hair because State and Federal deductions are no longer alike, and each must now be figured separately.

A great many people, the self-employed as well as the employed, must have been made very much tax-conscious by what they've been reading about Washington activities this week. Quite a bit has been said in Washington lately about those wartime emergency excise taxes, which somehow continued to hang on after the war ended to bear heavily and probably unfairly on certain lines of business. It develops now that the excise taxes, once designed to discourage buying of certain goods and wares, haven't really been going to help pay for the war. The Government found other places to spend the excise-tax money. Other things are now dependent upon the excise taxes, and if the excise taxes are taken off we'll have to dig up other tax money to keep these things going.

What has happened in the case of the excise taxes has happened before in other governmental activity. We're the darndest nation to get ourselves into an emergency of some kind, take emergency steps to relieve the emergency and then be unable to step back into normal position when the emergency is over.

A great many people, who were already well aware that the Government is now spending tax money it doesn't have, must have been made considerably more tax-conscious when President Truman talked to Congress this week. Mr. Truman asked Congress for a moderate tax increase, and asked again for some new ways to spend more tax money.

A great deal has been said about taxes down Washington way since the President's message to Congress on Tuesday. As of today, the big umbrella issue which hangs over all others in Washington is the issue of taxation. It's pretty plain to everybody.

The Associated Press felt Congress' pulse day before yesterday, after the President's tax request, and reported that at least a half dozen of his proposals are doomed to die a quick death. And it wasn't just those heel-dragging Republicans who were making that forecast, either. There were some Democratic voices which could be heard even above the Republican pleas for trimming expenses. Men of both parties are convinced that the Federal budget can be deflated to the point of eliminating deficit spending, and perhaps even paying a little on the grandpappy of all national debts.

If a great many people have been made tax-conscious, it's about time. Taxes are imposed by the Federal Government only by sanction of the people themselves. The people themselves have not only sanctioned, but actually have been responsible for much of the tax burden now weighing heavily upon them. They've done it by demanding more services, more facilities, more benefits from a government that has had to obtain the money from the only source of money the Government has—the same people.

So long as any taxpayer labors under the mistaken idea that anything government gives him will be paid for by someone else we're going to go right on being more and more tax-conscious.

Desk Memo for Congressmen and President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a desk memo for Congressmen and President Truman, which you and other Members of the Texas delegation may wish to read at the Jefferson Democratic dinner. It may be that this quotation has escaped the attention of the Democrats during the great spending orgy that has now brought the Nation to the brink of insolvency.

I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave to extend heretofore granted, the memo from J. Constantin, 508 Continental Building, Dallas, Tex.:

DESK MEMO FOR CONGRESSMEN AND PRESIDENT TRUMAN BY THOMAS JEFFERSON

(Quotation from Reader's Digest, October 1949)

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt.

* * * We must make our choice between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude. * * *

"If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Most of you in the past several years have made yourselves heard either over the radio or in the press crying for the stabilization of the country's economy.

I know of no better way to stabilize our economy than by following the concepts of the above statement made by Thomas Jefferson, a great American, nearly 150 years ago.

Army Open Door

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post this morning.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARMY OPEN DOOR

If promises about the Army's new racial policy may be taken at face value, a major milestone has been passed. Under a new circular, Negro soldiers will be assigned on the basis of their skills and qualifications without regard to race. This sensible assignment policy is what is needed to implement the previously announced opening of Army schools and military occupational specialties to Negroes. These advances represent achievement of three of the four principal goals of the Fahy Committee on Equality of Opportunity in the Armed Services. The fourth, abandonment of the racial-quota system, remains to be met, but there is reason to hope that the Army will soon adopt the same criteria of intelligence rather than race that obtain in the Air Force and Navy.

It is the principle, rather than the immediate effects of this new policy, that is significant. The Army has at last shorn itself of the negative influence of the foot-draggers who insisted on strict segregation because of the Negro problem. This influence frustrated the recent decision to open schools and occupational specialties by preventing qualified Negroes from using their training except in Negro units or overhead installations.

Caution is still warranted by the well-known ability of individual Army commanders to sabotage policies with which they disagree, and it will be necessary for Secretary Gray to do some policing in order to insure that his orders are carried out in good faith. But an excellent start is being made in the unequivocal directive to assign critical specialists to any unit, white or otherwise, and to fill other vacancies with Negroes wherever practicable.

Aside from considerations of equal treatment, this move is fully warranted on practical grounds. The Army is short of certain skills which qualified Negroes are competent to fill. Efficient use of the best available manpower also dictates the substitution of intelligence tests for racial quotas—a practice which in the Air Force has worked out to maintain approximately the same ratio of Negroes to whites. As the Army moves toward integration, which is the only defensible standard for an American fighting force, we believe that its Negro problem will disappear.

Everybody Gets "Soaked"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert an editorial from the Los Angeles Examiner:

The collectivist conspirators of the Fair Deal constantly strive to convince people with small incomes that they get material benefits from socialistic Government policies while others pay for them.

A research just completed by Representative HAROLD LOVRE, of South Dakota, demonstrates how completely untrue that is.

The national income for the fiscal year ended last June 30 was $225,000,000,000, of which Federal, State, and local taxes amounted to $56,000,000,000—about 25 percent.

Figures compiled by Representative LOVRE, with the help of the Federal Bureaus of the Census, Internal Revenue, and Labor Statistics, show that the average family with an income of $3,000 paid—in Federal income taxes, in corporate taxes passed along in the prices of goods, in social-security taxes, and in the various excise impositions—a total of $510.75 Federal taxes.

It paid $196.15 in State and local taxes.

The family's total taxes amounted, therefore, to $706.90, or 23.56 percent of its income.

The average family on a $5,000 income paid out $1,238.45 for taxes, or 24.75 percent of its income; and in the case of the $7,500 family the total taxes amounted to $1,970.70, or 26.27 percent.

The $3,000 family, as these figures clearly show, paid out in taxes only a very slightly lower percentage of its income as did other Americans, one-fourth of whose total earnings were taken by government.

So obviously the rich are not paying the taxes for the man of smaller income.

He is paying them himself, and if he wants to keep more of his income for his own family he can accomplish it only by insisting that the Truman administration stop squandering his money on socialistic schemes designed to buy his vote.

Mr. Speaker, the country and the Congress are indebted to Congressman LOVRE for undertaking the research which gives the facts as to who is paying the taxes which are forced on the people by the present administration. It is time that we realize that even those in the average income groups are not getting something for nothing and that the so-called security offered by the Fair Deal is only the old, well-known scheme of robbing Peter to pay Paul. I personally want to commend Congressman LOVRE for his great job of completing the research he has undertaken. It gives me a great deal of pleasure to present this editorial to the full body of the House of Representatives.

No Submission to Federal Blackmail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arizona Daily Star of January 6, 1950.

The Federal Security Agency informed the State of Arizona that funds for the crippled children's program were being withheld effective January 1, 1950, unless the State of Arizona would make available to the children residing on Indian reservations all facilities afforded under the crippled children's program. This action by the Federal Security Agency has caused a serious situation in the State of Arizona, and has caused the crippled children, now being cared for, and the parents of those children, undue mental anguish.

The Arizona State Board of Social Security and Welfare submitted a compromise plan for the consideration of the Federal Board which was as follows:

1. That we will withdraw from our plan all reference to any class or group.
2. We will accept all applications on the rheumatic-fever program for Indian children who would make application and take them in the order received. (This is a wholly Federal project.)
3. If and when a special session of the legislature is called, we will ask for addition funds for crippled Indian children and discuss with our doctors a process for handling them.

This plan as presented was rejected by the Federal Security Agency and, with the continued withholding of funds, the situation is becoming more serious day by day.

The State department in Arizona does not have available any publicly owned or operated hospitals of any kind. The convalescent home for crippled children has very limited facilities and is used for convalescence purposes only. In contrast to this the Indian Bureau of the Department of the Interior has had, and now has, available hospital and nursing facilities which are for the use of Indian children only. The State, through its crippled children's program, has afforded clinical service to all Indian children whether they resided on or off the reservation. Those needing medical or surgical care were then referred to the Indian Bureau.

The Federal Security Agency has demanded that the State of Arizona give the same treatment and hospitalization to children residing on Indian reservations if they are to have their Federal funds restored. Considering the fact that the appropriations by the State legislature are limited, if the State were to concur in the demands made by the Federal Social Security Administration, it would not extend any great amount of service to reservation children and would curtail the service now being furnished

to other crippled children in the State. Arizona has a situation that is peculiar in that it has approximately 16.5 percent of the total reservation Indian population in the United States; also in excess of 70 percent of the total land in the State is owned by or is under the control of the Federal Government.

The reservation Indian children have, at the present time, available more facilities for medical care than any other group of children in the State of Arizona. The State department of social security and welfare will not accede to the demands being made by the Federal Security Agency. It would appear that the Federal Security Agency in this move is trying to set a precedent whereby the State of Arizona will be forced to assume all Indians that would qualify for aid under the various categories of the social-security program. The State is not financially able to carry this program nor is it responsible for the care of reservatiotn Indians, since that is a duty of the Indian Bureau and their responsibility in every respect.

The editorial follows:

NO SUBMISSION TO FEDERAL BLACKMAIL

We have just had a good lesson in what happens when a State starts accepting doles of Federal money to support new social work sponsored by the Federal Government.

Because Arizona would not make any kind of an agreement to accept responsibility for reservation Indians, the children's bureau of the Federal Security Agency in Washington has arbitrarily shut off funds that have been financing the care of crippled children and some others suffering from rheumatic fever.

After getting Arizona to start this new social work, the Federal agency comes along and says, "Do what we tell you, or we will shut off your funds."

Arizona properly refused. Certainly the Arizona director of the social welfare board would be exceeding his authority to take on the responsibility of caring for crippled children of reservation Indians. Yet that is what the Federal bureaucrats demanded. If that precedent were once established in Arizona, it would in time lead to the spectacle of the State of Arizona assuming the social welfare burden of these Indians, over which it has no authority.

So few people, outside of Arizona in particular, realize what this distinction means. The Federal Government sets aside the Indian reservation for reservation Indians. Over these Indians and their reservations the State of Arizona has no authority. Indeed, it is denied the right to exercise the least bit of authority over Indians living on reservations. For that reason Arizona now refuses to accept any financial responsibility for reservation Indian children, who are crippled.

This position can possibly be appreciated better when it is understood that Arizona discriminates in no way against Indians who do not live on reservations. They enjoy every right that every other citizen does. Their crippled children are entitled to just as much care as other children. But these Indians pay taxes. They are not wards of the Federal Government.

Moreover, Arizona has an additional reason for refusing to get trapped in the present controversy. On every Indian reservation there are hospitals for the exclusive use of Indians. Arizona citizens have no right to receive care in such Federal hospitals.

Behind all of this controversy is the determination in Washington, by certain top bureaucrats in the Indian Bureau and the Federal Security Agency, to browbeat Arizona into setting a precedent of recognizing responsibility for reservation Indians.

Arizona is not going to do it. It will be cheaper to forego Federal appropriations. It would be wrong to assume responsibility over something where authority is specifically denied, as it is in the case of Indians and their reservations.

Employment and the Tax Incentive Act of 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an address made by me on January 11, last, at a luncheon meeting of the Bond Club of New York. The meeting was presided over by Mr. C. L. Morse, Jr., president of the club.

The address entitled, "Employment and the Tax Incentive Act of 1950," follows:

I have had two surprises in connection with my appearance here today. The first was when I received the invitation, for I could think of no other organization whose members would care less to meet a Democratic Member of Congress. Coupled with the fact that I am a Bronx Democrat—than whom there is no more of a Democrat—and a member of the tax-symbolic Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, I submit I had real cause for astonishment. My second surprise came today when I saw so many of those in the securities business present. I did not think there were that many of you left in Wall Street. I assume that is due in no small part to my good friend Ed Hanrahan, who, as a member and later as Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, has been a real friend of your business and, at the same time, an able champion of the public interest.

I am sorry not to see here present my good friend Emil Schram. He is one man who, when he appears before our committee, or, in fact, before any committee either of the House or Senate, commands the attention and respect of his listeners. I believe that he has done a wonderful job—not only for the New York Stock Exchange—but for the whole securities business and the entire country. I am glad to know that he is out of the hospital and on his way to Florida for a much-needed rest.

You may get the idea from the topic of my address and the title of my bill and its provisions that I am moving in various directions. At the very outset may I say that pure logic is not the language of statesmanship or democratic policy. These characteristics are to be found in the spirit of moderation and compromise which gets things done without creating irreparable rancor. In the pulls and twists from the various great interests of the public as producers and consumers and investors, successful policy steers clear of letting any group have its way completely. You may say that irreconcilables can be reconciled, and I will not argue the point on grounds of logic. I maintain, however, that seemingly irreconcilable interests often have more in common than the differences that part them.

Particularly in the field of Federal taxation is the acceptance of the second best often imperative, and this acceptance comes with easier grace when one has a full and complete understanding of all the facts and viewpoints. Would that the Ways and Means Committee could bring forth a tax measure, wholly new, unmarred by ambiguities and undistorted by Treasury regulations and court decisions. Would that we could fashion a tax structure that would reach out and collect all the revenue the Treasury sought, and, at the same time, fill the taxpayer with delight at the prospect of filing the annual fright known as the income-tax return. Alas, that is the illusive ideal.

I wish more interest were displayed by the public in the process out of which the final figures on the income-tax form eventually emerge. As you know, the Constitution provides that all revenue bills must originate in the House. The underlying idea is that the lower House of the legislature is closer to the public opinion. However, direct election of Senators, made effective in 1913 by the enactment of the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution, has weakened this theory. In any event, the Senate has an important part in revenue bills because it may amend. The Ways and Means Committee is the tax committee of the House of Representatives and, together with the Senate Committee on Finance, is in charge of the preparation of revenue bills. My membership on the Committee on Ways and Means runs back to 1943. Our respected chairman, Hon ROBERT L. DOUGHTON, a really young and vigorous man of 86 years, has been a member since 1932. Membership on the committee, I say without boast, is a liberal education in economics and politics. The committee is made up of 25 members, with the usual division among the majority and minority parties. Every important group—and, sometimes we are inclined to think, every articulate individual—has bright ideas about taxes and presents them to members of the Ways and Means Committee, whose work often continues between sessions of the Congress. Hearings on a revenue bill are usually opened by the Secretary of the Treasury and members of his staff, preliminary to which private conferences have been held on many phases of proposed measures, including both basic issues and administrative and technical matters.

Hearings of the committee are public. You will readily recall occasions in recent years when Treasury officials have been questioned by committee members searchingly and without favor. While there have been far-reaching changes in the relation between the Chief Executive and the Congress in the past several decades, I am happy to state that the members of the Ways and Means Committee take their constitutional responsibilities very seriously and maintain an admirable degree of independence. Following the administration's presentation of the case for the bill, representatives of various groups appear to testify for or against the proposals in whole or in part. The committee also has the benefit of the comment of publicists, economists, and resolutions of various commercial and other organizations.

At times the Senate Finance Committee's proposed amendments having proved unacceptable to the committee, a conference or series of conferences are held between members of the committees of both Chambers. The agreement reached by the conference usually is approved, particularly as the time may now be short. A European statesman is credited with the thought that whoever wishes to keep his respect for sausages and laws should not see how either is made. I I can't speak for sausages, and there may be a measure of truth in the statement with reference to some bills. As to revenue measures in general, subject to the closest scrutiny of public opinion and picked apart by interested groups with little forbearance and less restraint, I can say only that they mirror

the fiscal needs of the country and reflect the best judgment of the committee as to how these needs are to be met.

To return to home base, and one revenue bill in particular which has still to run the gauntlet of the whole legislative process, H. R. 6393 was introduced by me on October 13, 1949, shortly before the first session of the Eighty-first Congress came to a close. As a little background material, you will remember that the President a year ago insisted on increasing the rates of individual income taxes in the middle and higher brackets and on corporations, except those with very small earnings. You will recall, too, that the President has consistently declared that the Revenue Act of 1948, which was passed over his veto, was responsible for the Federal Government's deficit. The present fiscal situation you are all familiar with from a reading of the President's budget message.

I would be less than frank if I pretended that my bill has the blessings of the administration, and I would be yielding to self-deception if I thought that you, reflecting the views of the world of finance, would greet all of my proposals enthusiastically. When I am through, perhaps it will be said that we disagreed only in opinion; but this is my bill; I have given it my name; and I am willing to make this essay in the art of persuasion, let the chips fall where they may.

H. R. 6393 provides that wartime excises be reduced on toilet preparations, long-distance and local telephone services, telegrams, photographic equipment and supplies, and the transportation of persons. Furthermore, the bill eliminates excises on electric-light bulbs and such preparations used in the care of infants as baby powder and baby oil. The bill provides for the exemption from excise duties of jewelry items selling for less than $50, furs selling for less than $500, and luggage retailing for less than $25. In this way the full rates now in effect are retained on jewelry, furs, and luggage, which are in the luxury class, whereas taxes on such things as costume jewelry and on inexpensive fur coats, handbags, wallets, suitcases, and the like, which are, in reality, necessities, and are bought by the average man and woman, are eliminated entirely. I suppose that this part of my bill, standing alone, will not invite much criticism. According to the best estimates obtainable, the revenue loss from these proposed changes in the aptly described "nuisance taxes" is around $620,000,000. But these provisions do not stand alone.

Secondly, H. R. 6393 provides for the following changes in capital-gains taxation: (1) A reduction of the tax rate on long-term gains to 10 percent, (2) an increase to $5,000 in the amount by which capital losses may be offset against ordinary income in any one year, and (3) shortening the holding period to 3 months. At this point, I would merely note that these provisions, designed to make possible increased production—the only source from which an increase in national income such as the President projected can flow—also do not stand alone, but are a part of a four-pronged measure meeting the President's tests of moderate fiscal reform. Capital-gains taxes are not primarily regarded as revenue features of the tax system. It is impossible to gage the effects of the proposed changes, although I believe studies of the consequences of our present set-up lead to the conclusion that the greater mobility of capital assets would more than offset the lower rates and, as a result, the Treasury would gain rather than lose income.

It is my considered judgment that these proposed changes in capital-gains taxation will encourage the flow of investment funds that will provide the machines and tools for well-paid job opportunities in industry. It takes an average investment of $8,000 to provide one job in modern industry. It is a matter of simple arithmetic to multiply this figure by the 700,000 new entrants into the labor market annually to see that billions of dollars of new money are required by private enterprise each year if full employment is to be maintained. It is through full employment that the prosperity of the country can be maintained.

Like everyone else, I am not insensitive to a favorable reception from my listeners, and I have anticipated that this part of my bill would meet your approval. Nevertheless, if I thought the proposals regarding capital gains would lead to unbridled activity in the securities markets, I would not for a moment countenance such changes. So long as the Federal Reserve Board has broad powers over margin requirements and the SEC retains its vigilance under the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 and the Securities Act of 1933, the possibility of a recurrence of the late twenties can be dismissed with confidence.

There is a strong and well-founded public opinion that double taxation of dividend income is unjust. Bearing the Treasury's revenue needs in mind, I have provided for only a 10-percent-dividend-income credit on income received from common-stock investments, which, however, will cause a revenue loss to the Government of approximately $575,000,000. This will not completely remedy the inequities of double taxation of dividends but will serve as a token recognition of the evil and, it is hoped, will convince the investing public that the administration is sympathetic with their problems. When I ask for sympathetic consideration of the taxpayer, may I also inject a plea for kindly consideration for an administration that is confronted with a gigantic war debt, a further tremendous financial outlay in a cold war that threatens the security of the world, and the complex domestic problems arising out of the natural desires of our people for a higher standard of living. And, when, on occasions, you hear Congress assailed and, unfortunately, too often made a target of ridicule, give sympathetic consideration to the 25 men, Republicans and Democrats, who are sincerely and earnestly and, I think, intelligently, facing these tremendous financial responsibilities and, when you think of them, remember that they are only typical of the rest of Congress.

Having, I hope, enlisted your sympathetic consideration, I now come to the most difficult part of H. R. 6393, which is the proposal to increase corporate income taxes by 4 percentage points this year and next. The added revenues resulting from this temporary increase would amount to about $1,200,000,000, or just enough to cancel the revenue losses resulting from the excise and dividend proposals.

I like to believe that H. R. 6393—I almost said, the Revenue Act of 1950—as a whole is stronger than the sum of its parts. The overarching consideration have been moderation, realism, and, if you will, a double-barreled philosophy. Let me elaborate.

For the past 15 years or more two broad schools of thought have sought to win over public opinion. On the one hand it has been said that national economic well-being can be promoted solely by direct methods of lifting mass consumer buying power. On the other hand, it is contended that the dynamic quality of our society lies in the use of ever larger amounts of labor-saving devices, which raise productivity. Not being an economist, I may not understand all the refinements of economic theory and I sometimes find myself almost unable to resist the arguments of those whom I have heard last. In H. R. 6393 I have tried to frame a a synthesis that will avoid extremes, improve the balance of the tax structure, provide immediately recognizable benefits, and make a beginning in the direction of solving several widely acknowledged faults in the Federal tax structure. Consumption obviously would benefit from the lower burden of excises. That excise taxes bear most heavily on the lower income groups cannot be denied. Not only would the lower income groups be relieved of these excise taxes but the heightened demand for consumer goods would more strongly fortify them in their jobs and give encouragement for the expansion of business and the development of job opportunities.

Changes in capital-gains taxes and the dividend credit are addressed to the need of keeping investment in new business equipment and machinery high. I have been impressed with the fact that the President and his economic advisers seem to agree that undeveloped foreign countries can be helped most effectively by the application of American capital goods and technical know-how. In these countries, consumption is pathetically low by our standards. Supplies of consumer goods, clothing, etc., would certainly be of assistance, assuming their ability to buy, yet it is recognized that the slower way of expanding production, heightening productivity and creating job opportunities is the sounder, more economic, and more lasting way in the long run. If this is true beyond our borders, it must be true in the United States.

I am also impressed by the fact that Government economists look for a run-off in expenditures on plant and equipment in the months ahead. Manufacturing employment is presently somewhat below the level of a year ago and while 3,400,000 unemployed at this time of the year is not a cause of alarm, it is a danger signal that should not be ignored. With November construction at $1,700,000,000 or 6 percent higher than in 1948, with steel production bouncing back to 97 percent, with the automobile industry in Detroit hitting toward its first 6,000,000-car year and with the New York Stock Exchange, during the first 10 days of January, doing twice as much business as in the same period in 1949, I am firmly convinced the evidence points overwhelmingly to greater prosperity for labor and the investor if the Government would moderately loosen the tax chains that presently hinder the normal flow of investment in the capital market. If we are to maintain high employment at high wages, we must not only have jobs for our present employables, but we must have the wherewithal to invest in the production of the machinery and the tools that will give employment to 700,000 who annually enter the labor field.

My innermost concern in a highly populous district is to do everything I can to maintain gainful employment, for I have watched at first hand the frustrations of uncertain and intermittent employment. I believe that the problem can best be solved by simultaneously attacking both underconsumption and underinvestment. I will concede it is simpler to see the relation between economic progress and consumption than to follow through the steps by which investment, by first adding to the production potential, finally leads to more work at higher rates of pay and makes possible a permanent improvement in living standards. I am not wedded to either economic theory. To my mind they are not inconsistent. They are different approaches to the same objective. We will, under H. R. 6393, advance both along the road of increased consumption by means of reduction of excise taxes and the road of increased productivity via capital gains changes and dividend credit, to the goal of fuller and more permanent employment.

To the extent that higher corporate taxes are involved, you may accuse me of a backward step. I am extremely reluctant to recommend even a temporary increase in corporate taxes. Unfortunately, I see no other

way of obtaining the other parts of H. R. 6393. My assumption is that business will be stimulated by the simultaneous advantages to investment and consumption contained in the remainder of the bill. In consequence, the actual addition to business costs would be reduced materially.

However, you may be certain that before there is any increase of corporate taxes, even to the limited degree contained in H. R. 6393, every effort will be made by the Ways and Means Committee to plug up the loopholes of tax evasion. I believe that a step in that direction will be taken this month when I expect that the House will pass a bill which will make life insurance companies pay income taxes. I expect that the burden upon you and me and the other American taxpayers will be reduced by $93,000,000, when we get the life insurance companies to pay 1947, 1948, and 1949 income taxes. And I can assure you that never again will life insurance companies go scot-free on income taxes as they have been doing for the past 3 years.

I am chairman of the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies. I think we have caught up with them. You wonder not only that they haven't paid any taxes, but you are astounded when you are told that some of them don't think they should pay any taxes. Let me tell you bond men that not only are the life insurance companies invading your field and taking your business away from you, but some of them want you to pay their taxes besides. I think, in fairness to the life insurance industry, it should be said that the overwhelming majority of the industry is willing to accept this legislation. The real leaders of the industry realize the tax-consciousness of the country and the utterly untenable position of the life insurance companies in not paying their fair share of the cost of the government under which they exist and prosper. The two life insurance associations, representing 95 percent of the industry in their membership, have approved the proposed legislation and thanked the subcommittee for the fair and courteous treatment accorded them. Several small companies, and one large company—the Equitable Life Assurance Society of New York—feel that, while you and I and other Americans were breaking our backs under the tax load in 1947, 1948 and 1949, they should pay no tax.

The battle will be fought in the courts and in the district I represent. I expect every one of Parkinson's agents will be briefed on the alleged unconstitutionality of making the Equitable pay income taxes and they will thereupon contact every Equitable policy holder in my district. Using the technique of the modern radio commentator, I predict that "come election day, Lynch will still be in Congress and the Equitable will be paying Federal income taxes."

While talking of plugging loopholes, I might just as well say that those nonprofit institutions, founded for the intellectual and cultural development of our youth, which have gone in for the manufacture of macaroni, ball bearings, and similar scientific research and production, or have gone into the business of operating department stores and the like, all with a 38-percent tax advantage over their business competitors, may face the future somewhat grimly, but nonetheless secure, in the fact that the free ride has ended. Thirty-eight percent is a big tax advantage to give one competitor over another in the manufacture of even so humble a commodity as macaroni. Profits from department stores, whether operated by Macy's, Gimbel's, or the University of Pennsylvania, will be taxed. Profits from the sale of macaroni, whether manufactured by Angelo Baccigalupi or New York University, will be taxed, even if we have to plug up not only the holes in the tax law, but the holes in the macaroni as well.

Timing is all important in tax legislation as well as in decisions involving an investment portfolio. Right now I believe, in all earnestness, that my program will keep the economy on an even keel. It is not at all improbable that in several years, if business outlays for capital equipment lag, more emphasis may have to be placed on stimulating investment, or, in the less likely eventuality, should optimism be so prevalent as to create excessive business spending or profits, be maintained by a failure to pass on to the consumer any savings in operation, then a shift to emphasis on consumption would be in order. At this time the accent is properly on balance. H. R. 6393 is, I submit, a balanced tax bill.

Just a month ago you listened to the able finance minister of Canada, Mr. Abbott, in this very room. He set forth the wholesome effects of well-timed tax reforms centering around a dividend credit. There is entirely too much skepticism about the prospects of sound tax legislation at this session of the Congress. We will do a good job. It may not be all that you would like, but you are sensible businessmen and patriotic Americans. You know that almost 75 percent of the total Federal appropriations are in payment of the cost of the war or to maintain our defense in the event of another war. I doubt if the budget can be trimmed down on the rest of the appropriations to bring it into balance without tax receipts. I cannot, for one, advocate a tax bill that in a year of great prosperity and while the country is at peace would increase the deficit gap between the revenues and expenditures of our Government. Deficit spending in time of prosperity and peace will, if continued, lead to national bankruptcy.

I am convinced, however, that H. R. 6393 will not cause a revenue loss to the Government in 1950, and that in 1951 an expanding economy will result in increased revenues to the Government. I believe that H. R. 6393, or any bill containing its provisions, together with amendments to plug up loopholes in our present tax structure, will increase consumption and production, and, therefore, employment. I have no illusions about H. R. 6393. It is not the greatest tax bill ever introduced into Congress. It would, however, surely help the people of my district hold their jobs and get better jobs. It would develop job opportunities for young folks entering the labor field for the first time, so that they would enter upon their life work with the enthusiasm instead of the despair of the boys and girls of the '30's of even getting the most humble job by which they could maintain themselves. Furthermore, the enactment of H. R. 6393 will spread on the record, for all to see, that ownership capital in the world's greatest capitalistic nation is to be encouraged, that free enterprise and government can work together, and that the American economy, although heavily burdened by the costs of a world-wide war and by a humane, yet protective, program for the rehabilitation of the devastated countries, is still sound.

We have a great country. We have years of prosperity ahead as labor buckles to the job, as investors supply the needed savings for the machines and tools of production and as the Government—as I am confident it will—slackens off tax restraints, as the threat of inflation disappears and as the assurances of fuller employment and greater capital investment become more evident in year 1950. Yes, we have a great country and 1950 is the year.

Mr. Truman's Mystery Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include in the Appendix of the RECORD an article which appeared in the Saturday Evening Post, issue of December 24, 1949, entitled "Mr. Truman's Mystery Man," by Alfred Steinberg:

MR. TRUMAN'S MYSTERY MAN

(By Alfred Steinberg)

EVEN HIS BEST FRIENDS CAN'T TELL YOU WHAT DAVID NILES DOES FOR TRUMAN—ALL THEY KNOW IS THAT HIS TRIPLE LIFE PROBABLY CONCEALS SOME OF THE FANCIEST POLITICAL FOOTWORK IN WASHINGTON

David K. Niles, a round-faced little man who is one of President Truman's most important official advisers, has spent the last three decades making himself mysterious. In this enterprise he has been a brilliant success. Some of the men who have played cards with him week after week and year after year don't know much more about him than the fact that he is excellent at bridge, fair at gin rummy, and mediocre at poker. Niles' secretiveness has evidently served his own purposes well, for his White House influence unquestionably is enormous. This is not without its penalties, however. Any political figure who operates from the shadows is bound to excite suspicion. Opinions of Niles, necessarily uninformed, range from laudatory cries that he is the one idealist of the Truman administration to gloomy apprehensions that he must be, at the very least, an agent of the Kremlin.

Niles has played a major role in every presidential-election campaign since 1924. Such events are not readily confused with the deliberations of a secret society. Yet Niles, if noticed at all, has never appeared to be anything more than an unidentified political bystander. If some men have made achievement of their own obscurity a talent, Niles has elevated this accomplishment to a level of genius.

Niles spent years at the left elbow of the late President Franklin D. Roosevelt. With the exception of Stephen T. Early, now the Under Secretary of Defense, he is the last Roosevelt intimate who is still situated importantly in the executive branch of the Government. Niles helped the late Harry Hopkins cook up the third-term draft of Mr. Roosevelt, and Niles gave the President daily comfort and advice during the fourth-term campaign. Almost alone, despite his frequent ritualistic efforts to resign, he has survived the advent of the "Pal Harry" coterie in Mr. Truman's Washington, for he has proved invaluable as a liaison man with organized labor and all of the racial and religious minorities.

In his time, Niles has dispensed Federal patronage, built political machines, and honeycombed the Government with his protégés. Many a Cabinet member or other top official today has an uneasy feeling that he might rise or fall on a casual word from Niles. Currently, if he cared to, Niles could lay claim to master-minding the independence of Israel and President Truman's controversial civil-rights program. On the side, Niles is a minor angel of Broadway plays, a director of several private foundations, and an entrepreneur of the guest-lecturer industry. With all this, Niles has done the neatest

possible job of losing himself in the crowd. "I am a man of no importance," he says.

Niles, officially, is an administrative assistant to the President at $15,000 a year, one of those White House helpers whom President Roosevelt once proclaimed to be equipped with a passion for anonymity. In Niles' case, this definition was a magnificent understatement "I would say," a Niles acquaintance remarked the other day, "that the passion might be more accurately described as a mania."

Not long ago, a Boston Congressman telephoned Niles' secretary to ask what the K in David K. Niles stands for. "I haven't the slightest idea," she replied.

"I guess," said the Congressman, "that it must be K as in Kingmaker."

For that matter, the same secretary told a recent visitor, with patent sincerity, that I really don't know anything about Mr. Niles. In depression days, when Niles was the Federal relief distributor in Boston, a partition was built around his desk. Niles took one look and ordered pongee curtains for the windows in the partition. "I'm rather shy," he explained.

"I am glad that someone is writing about Dave Niles," Roger N. Baldwin, director of the American Civil Liberties Union, informed me a few weeks ago. "I have known him for 30 years and I would like to find out something about him."

Niles is convinced that his telephone is tapped by the FBI. If so, the G-men who have to listen in on him must be bored to death. Niles' phone conversations consist largely of such illuminating phrases as "You are misquoting me," or "You don't mean what you're saying," or "This should not be discussed over the phone." Recently, Niles was credited with a major role in mediating the public quarrel between Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt and Francis Cardinal Spellman. "You flatter me," Niles told reporters. "I had nothing to do with it." The reporters nodded and looked wise.

As a virtuoso of obscurity, Niles is physically suited for the part he has chosen to play. His eyes are pale blue, peering nearsightedly through horn-rimmed glasses. He is short, plump, and altogether unremarkable. Niles' hair is thin and graying; he is somewhere in his late fifties—how late Niles won't say and nobody else seems to know for sure, except that he is about 58 or 59. His accent is a cultured Bostonese with overtones of Oxford, although Niles' formal education ended with high school. If he had not been involved in politics, Niles might have been an excellent private detective. No one would have given him a second glance.

Some of his close associates—it would be inaccurate to say that Niles has intimate friends—look upon Niles with something approaching the detachment of a psychiatrist. "I have about decided," says a long-time gin-rummy opponent, "that Dave has worked himself into a state of frustration. He knows so much because he keeps his mouth shut, but he is dying to tell what he knows to prove that nobody else knows more than he does, and he can't because then he wouldn't have a chance to know so much."

Some people, upon meeting Niles for the first time, come away with an impression that he is "a cold fish," others find him warm and affable. Behind whatever facade he may set up, Niles is a complex and emotional man. Companions have seen him weep when he walked through a slum area. He was extremely attached to his mother, and badly broken up by her death a little more than 2 years ago.

Niles has a curious reluctance to affirm or deny anything about himself. I asked Niles about the statement, reprinted for years as a fact, that he was the man who persuaded John L. Lewis to give nearly half a million dollars to the Democratic Presidential campaign of 1936, with the understanding that Lewis would be made Vice President of the United States. Niles responded instantly with a perfect Nilesian clarification. "Oh," he said, "John L. will get so angry again."

One Congressman declared inaccurately, in 1940, that Niles was Harry Hopkins' brother-in-law. Three years later, the assertion having gone unchallenged, the Congressman repeated it. Only then was the record corrected—and not by any statement from Niles, either. People who have known Niles for years assume he has always been a bachelor, but one former Federal official insisted that he saw a Government job questionnaire on which Niles wrote that he had been married and divorced. Niles was asked to comment. "Well," he said, "it's a good story."

Marriage, as a matter of fact, would be impractical for Niles today, for he leads a triple life. From Monday morning through Wednesday afternoon, he does his confidential chores for the President in Washington. From late Wednesday through Friday, he is a New York man about town. The rest of the week he is a Boston man of culture.

Early on Monday morning, Niles arrives back in Washington, fresh from a hectic week end in Boston, and unpacks his bag in his room at the Carlton Hotel. He has occupied this room for years and has thoroughly littered it with books and card tables. Then he hurries over to his drab office on the second floor of the decrepit old State, War, and Navy Building, next door to the White House and across the street from Blair House, where the Trumans are living temporarily.

Niles' job, basically, is that of political trouble shooter and buffer between the President and certain segments of the public. In addition to keeping labor and the minority groups happy, he dabbles in such things as New England patronage, Israeli matters and preparing for the next election. Currently, he is operating on the theory that President Truman will seek reelection in 1952, and that Gov. Chester Bowles, of Connecticut, is the man Truman will have to beat at the next Democratic National Convention—at least, that is the impression of people who have talked politics with him recently.

Niles spends many office hours listening to the requests of an endless line of people who want him to intercede for them, both within and without the Government. "I came to Washington with a little problem and a letter of introduction to Dave Niles," an awestruck young Boston doctor recalled recently, "and the next thing I knew I was talking to Attorney General Clark." Actually, most seekers of favors receive little more from Niles than the impression that he will use his influence to help them. As an unofficial employment agency, however, Niles has been hailed—and condemned—as a close competitor of his friend, Justice Felix Frankfurter, in placing Frankfurter-Niles type liberals with Government agencies. The Niles clique in the Government has been diminishing in size ever since the death of President Roosevelt, but a few of those who have remained have risen steadily in influence and importance.

Niles is a shrewd political manipulator, but his Washington personality is difficult for either the average politician or idealist to take. His behind-the-scenes operations make him immediately suspect to the politician, and his concern with votes and patronage gives pause to the idealist. As one politician put it the other day, "Anybody who sees the President as much as Dave Niles must be knifing somebody." Washington folklore widely credited Niles with leading a campaign to oust the late James Forrestal as Secretary of Defense in favor of Louis Johnson. "Jim called me up one day and asked me about that," Niles told me recently. "I had lunch with him and assured him there was nothing to it." Then, grabbing me by the arm and looking me straight in the eye, Niles said, "You don't think I'm that kind of a fellow, do you?"

White House circles are agreed that Niles was a key man in the achievement of independence for Israel. When the Palestine issue came up after President Truman had taken office, Mr. Truman pushed the whole problem over to Niles, to be decided in terms of Democratic Party justice.

From Truman's opening shot that the British permit 100,000 Jewish displaced persons to enter Palestine, through the long-drawn-out international hearings that followed in the next year and a half, Niles cagily planned a series of Presidential moves which, despite certain inconsistencies and divisions among the Zionsts themselves, forced the reluctant British into a position in which there was nothing for them to do but agree to an independent Jewish state.

After a day of dealing with such heady matters, Niles retires to his hotel room for interminable gin rummy or bridge games with his cronies, many of whom are lawyers, both in and out of the Government. Niles never appears at cocktail parties or State dinners, which are hotbeds of verbal indiscretions.

Wednesday afternoon, Niles bustles back to the Carlton, flings some fresh clothing into his suitcase—he is usually somewhat rumpled in appearance, although he dislikes untidiness in others—and takes a taxi to the airport. A few hours later Niles, the man about town, takes up residence in the Roosevelt Hotel in New York. This is a more easy-going Niles. Enjoyment is the thing, plus a little business. Thursday is theater night. Niles usually has a few investments on Broadway, and currently is supposed to have small pieces of Mister Roberts and South Pacific.

If time permits, Niles looks into the Roosevelt Memorial Foundation, of which he is a trustee, and which at present is considering establishment of exchange scholarships between American and foreign schools. When something special comes up in Washington and Niles cannot be located on Broadway or at the foundation, he usually can be found at a Jewish restaurant on the lower East Side, happily consuming potato pancakes with salami or tongue, and sipping tea from a glass.

By noon on Friday, the glamour of Broadway begins to fade, and Niles heads for Boston, his natural habitat. Early on Saturday morning Niles can be seen at the Touraine Hotel breaking bread with Boston's young liberal set. The discussion begins on a lofty plane, but usually reaches realistic political levels long before the coffee cups are filled again. But even with these intimates, some of them former Washington protégés, Niles speaks guardedly.

In season, Niles attends Harvard's home football games. He dines at a Chinese restaurant on Saturday evening, then moves along with the crowd to the Boston Symphony. Niles the music lover, recently merged with Niles the politician, when he engaged in a bit of genteel lobbying over who should succeed Serge Koussevitzky as conductor of the orchestra. When the orchestra is on the road, Niles heads for a card game at the Preston Hotel in Swampscott or at the Belmont Country Club, in a Boston suburb.

Niles has an office in the Little Building, in the heart of Boston, and on Sunday mornings the door is open to visitors. There for many years before his death, Rabbi Joshua Liebman used to discuss psychology, philosophy, and religion with Niles, and together they hashed over much of the material in Rabbi Liebman's best seller, Peace of Mind. Mayor James Curley, Boston's favorite no-matter-what, is an old political crony, and so are Gov. Paul A. Dever and House Majority Leader John McCormack. Although he pro-

fesses to regard great personal wealth as a bad thing, Niles makes it a point to be friendly with wealthy people. One of the Boston Filenes, upon Niles' urging, established a cooperative department store and a cooperative grocery in the Washington area, and supported Niles earlier in establishment of the Twentieth Century Fund, a well-heeled private-research and public-education concern. Brandeis University, at Waltham, Mass., is another Niles project, named for the late Justice Louis D. Brandeis, another Niles friend.

By Sunday afternoon Niles is ready for business as one of the most successful practitioners of the traveling-lecturer industry. As director of Ford Hall Forum in Boston, one of the oldest such organizations in the United States, he goes out to greet the guest speaker who will appear that evening, goes over his speech, takes him to dinner, leads him to Ford Hall, shows him the stage entrance, and then disappears into the audience. Ford Hall Forum, which has heard many an avant-garde political thinker in its day, was the springboard Niles used 25 years ago to jump into his extraordinary career. Niles clings to it today as much for sentimental reasons as for the fresh contacts it gives him. After the forum, Niles makes a last-minute check into the Open Forum Speakers' Bureau, which he also directs. The speakers' bureau, a handy tool for molding public opinion, is one of the largest of its kind in America. After this inspection, he packs his bag to return to Washington. This weekly routine is broken only by political-trouble-shooting trips around the country, and by his summer vacation. For the latter, he holes up in a hotel at Poland, Maine, or at Martha's Vineyard, plays cards day and night for a few weeks, then returns, refreshed, to his lives in three cities.

Niles was born in the slum heap of North Boston, the son of Russian immigrants named Ascher and Sophie Neyhus. Somewhere along the line, Niles and two of his brothers changed their name from Neyhus to Niles, although another brother and his parents clung to the family name.

Niles' father was a tailor, and the family was poor. His mother encouraged in young David a burning desire to get somewhere in life, but when he finished high school there was no money for college. Niles went to work in a Boston department store, but he was restless and unhappy. His only fun came on Sunday evenings, when he would go to Ford Hall for the lectures and discussions. Niles soon took to hanging around the hall in his off hours, attracting the attention of George W. Coleman, a goateed Republican who then ran the forum and was the Dale Carnegie of his day. Soon Niles was Coleman's protégé, then a regular assistant. In 1915, Niles took a job with the extension department of the Milwaukee public-school system, where he helped develop an adult-education program. Homesick, he returned to Boston and Ford Hall 2 years later. When World War I broke out and Coleman went to Washington as Assistant Director of the Labor Department's information office, he took Niles along as his assistant.

In Washington, Coleman had a good opportunity to study his young helper at close range, and he liked what he saw. There was depth to Niles' mind. He did not push himself, but was quiet and self-effacing.

Although the Labor Department had little to do, Niles developed an appetite for Government service and politics. The end of the war eliminated his job, but experience he picked up in making movie trailers for the Labor Department landed him a job on Long Island with Paramount Pictures. Some months later, Niles switched to a new movie company organized by a group of Boston businessmen. Whether he wore puttees, a cap turned backward and a wide-mouthed megaphone, as was then the style for movie makers, cannot be determined, but Niles helped make a hit picture called The Miracle Man, starring Lon Chaney, Thomas Meighan, and Betty Compton. The Miracle Man was such a box-office miracle that the company overexpanded and went broke. Niles went on to a third movie outfit, also on Long Island—Hollywood had not yet become the film capital—but by this time he was beginning to doubt that he would make millions in the movies.

When a new job in 1921 tied up so much of Coleman's time that he had little left for Ford Hall Forum, he sent Niles an S O S. Niles turned his back on the movies and returned to Boston. In 1924 Niles was promoted from Coleman's assistant to associate director of the forum, and already he had surrounded himself in mystery. A close associate, in a book about the forum, reported that "the Ford Hall folks and Mr. Coleman have been only too pleased to recognize Mr. Niles' amazing talents, talents which are surpassed only by a modesty which renders impossible any accurate narration of his generous and unselfish devotion."

The same year, 1924, the elder Bob La Follette and Burton K. Wheeler established the Progressive Party and ran, respectively, for the Presidency and Vice Presidency of the United States. The candidates had been acquainted with Ford Hall Forum and they asked Niles to head their speakers' bureau. Niles accepted and in a short time was running the whole campaign. The regular campaign manager was so religious that he spent half of every day studying his Bible. Not so preoccupied himself, Niles dashed about the country, making wild predictions as to the outcome of the election. When voting day passed the Progressives had won only Wisconsin's 13 electoral votes, but Niles had learned a great deal about politics and had attracted virtually no attention to himself.

Two years later Niles found himself involved through Boston friends in the famous Sacco-Vanzetti case. This cause célèbre had already dragged along 6 years, but with the help of Felix Frankfurter, Niles soon brought the save-Sacco-and-Vanzettil forces together and whipped them up to a fever pitch. There were thousands of mass meetings, speeches, pamphlets, and demonstrations. Niles' major job was to coordinate the various defense groups, a most difficult job in view of the many factions primarily interested in using the two men as a symbol for whatever political product they were selling. Niles did some of the most skillful behind-the-scenes wirepulling of his career, but it was all in vain. Sacco and Vanzetti were executed on August 23, 1927.

By now, Niles was an incurable political manipulator. He went to New York in 1928 to direct the National Committee of Independent Voters for Al Smith. His work was of uncertain value to Smith, but of great value to himself, for it brought him into close contact with the Hyde Park Roosevelts and their social-worker friend, Harry Hopkins. In 1932, Niles and the insurgent Republican, George W. Norris, ran the National Progressive League for Roosevelt, another of the fringe political organizations in which Niles was fast becoming an adept. Niles was rewarded with the chairmanship of the Massachusetts NRA Adjustment Board, then made Federal Emergency Relief Administrator for his home State. Oldline Democratic politicians in Massachuetts didn't like this too well—many of them had never heard of Niles—but Niles made friends with them, handled himself shrewdly, avoided scandal and distributed millions where he thought they would do the most good. When WPA was established in 1935, headed by Hopkins, Niles was brought to Washington as Hopkins' general assistant on labor liaison.

Niles' first big Washington job was to obtain the 1936 campaign contribution from John L. Lewis. This success assured Niles' future, although his reputation for effectiveness was somewhat tarnished in 1938, when he was assigned to make Jimmy Roosevelt Governor of Massachusetts, and the effort fizzled badly, when the opposition discovered, among other things, that the President's eldest son was not even a registered Massachusetts voter.

Shortly after President Roosevelt began his second term, Harry Hopkins decided that the Nation needed Hopkins for President in 1940. Niles franked out thousands of copies of a speech in which Hopkins hailed deficit spending and pump priming as the best ways to insure prosperity. Howls of rage rose up in Congress, and increased when WPA scandals in Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Tennessee broke into the headlines in 1936 and 1937. Then Hopkins' wife died and Hopkins underwent an operation. Momentarily, Hopkins lost his taste for the Presidency, dismantled the controversial theater and arts groups of WPA which Niles had established originally, and finally resigned as chief of WPA.

After a rest, however, Hopkins got the Presidential bug again. Mr. Roosevelt expressed no objection and even helped him along by making Hopkins Secretary of Commerce in December 1938. Niles went along to Commerce as Hopkins' assistant. Beyond pushing Hopkins' candidacy, his main job was to distribute 100,000 jobs necessary for taking the 1940 census. This Niles did to the satisfaction of hungry Democratic Congressmen, operating for months from an office with no name plate on the door until some Republican Congressmen inquired as to just who this mysterious figure was with so much patronage in his control. Congressman McCormack made it all very clear: "Mr. Niles is a fine gentleman, a very fine American, and equally a very fine public servant." Niles himself couldn't have done better.

Niles concocted the second Hopkins build-up for the Presidency on a foundation of pure corn. First Hopkins made a speech defending free enterprise, to the considerable astonishment of free enterprisers. Then he held a small-business men's conference in Washington, which proved unfortunate, because the small-business men got out of hand and raucous with their temporary importance. Then Hopkins bought a 340-acre farm in Iowa, announced to the curious press that he loved the soil, and was photographed in farm kitchens unhappily chewing on homemade cookies.

The second Hopkins build-up fell apart in August 1939, when Hopkins became ill again and left political ambition behind for good. In the spring of 1940, Hopkins moved to the White House as companion to F. D. R. Later in the summer, a few days before the Democratic National Convention opened in Chicago, Hopkins and Niles went to the convention city, and established themselves on the third floor of the Blackstone Hotel with a direct telephone line to the White House. Hopkins got on one end of the line, Mr. Roosevelt on the other, and Niles scurried about lining up delegates to make the third-term draft a certainty. The usually astute Jim Farley, who somehow thought he was in line for the top post, suddenly found himself out in the cold, with Roosevelt nominated and Hopkins and Niles advising the key delegates that the chief wanted Henry Wallace as his running mate. This was accomplished to a protesting chorus of boos which rattled the rafters of Chicago Stadium.

After the convention, Hopkins resigned as Secretary of Commerce and Niles went back to fringe-machine politicking. Niles, too, resigned from the Commerce Department, organized the LaGuardia-Norris Independents for Roosevelt, and thus further established his influence with Democratic irregulars throughout the country. This activity also further endeared him to the President, who

had no way of determining the importance of the job Niles had done, and shortly after the election, Mr. Roosevelt found Niles a desk in the White House as a key assistant and trouble shooter.

In those hectic days when William Knudsen and Sidney Hillman jointly headed the Office of Production Management, bickering daily in their respective accents, Niles was rushed over to help Hillman win some of the arguments. Once this unfortunate experiment was concluded, Niles was brought back to the White House and given the title he bears today—Administrative Assistant to the President. In the fourth-term campaign, Hopkins was overseas, so it was Niles upon whom the President leaned most heavily. Niles had been Harry Hopkins' "Harry Hopkins" for years; now he was playing the role of Hopkins himself. Niles also worked closely with his friend Sidney Hillman and Hillman's newly organized CIO Political Action Committee to bring out the labor vote. In addition, he directed independent groups for Roosevelt and passed out patronage to hard-working independents after the election.

When Mr. Truman came into office, Niles resigned. But so loud were the protests from minority organizations, who feared they would be without a sure entree to the White House if Niles pulled out, that Truman insisted he stay. Since then he has resigned several more times. It reassures him of the need for his services, associates report, to have the President turn down his resignation so regularly. Niles is as close to Mr. Truman today as we once was to Mr. Roosevelt, or to Harry Hopkins, or to Coleman, and he served cleverly and inconspicuously on the Truman board of campaign strategy last fall.

Since he is so modest, Niles' friends have often wondered what would be inscribed on his tombstone. It is not too difficult to predict, even at this time. There will be no tombstone.

For Equality in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the New York Times of January 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOR EQUALITY IN THE ARMY

It is gratifying to know that the United States Army has completed, and will shortly carry out, its program for integration of Negro personnel on a basis of skills only, without regard to discriminatory quotas of any sort. This is as it should be, from every point of view. National defense is too big and the Army is too good to have any place for race and color bars. When we get to a sense of basic values we have a chance to further basic human justice.

The basic value here is skill, and it has nothing to do with the accident of pigmentation, one way or another. To impose any sort of quota in such a field is unintelligent as well as inhumane. We have come to understand this valuation in many fields, such as sport, for example, and there is no reason why we should not apply it to all.

Beyond that is still another basic value, that of our common humanity; the thing that Jefferson had in mind when he said that we held it to be self-evident that all men were created equal and that they were endowed, obviously equally, with unalienable rights. What the Army is doing is working toward that broader concept of values and every step in that direction is a mark of human progress.

Equal-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an article by Dr. Alice Hamilton, of Hadlyme Ferry, Conn. Dr. Hamilton is an outstanding authority on industrial medicine and is professor emeritus of Harvard University Medical School.

[From the Ladies' Home Journal]

WHY I AM AGAINST THE EQUAL-RIGHTS AMENDMENT

(By Alice Hamilton, M. D., president of the National Consumers League)

We hear a good deal nowadays about the Equal Rights Amendment, which, after more than 20 years of ardent effort on the part of a group of feminists, the Woman's Party, seems to have reached a point where its passage by Congress is possible. Both parties in the last election declared themselves in favor of it, and it has been passed on favorably by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

What is this amendment to the Constitution which may be put up to the State legislatures in the near future? It reads very simply:

"Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex. Congress and the several States shall have power, within their respective jurisdictions, to enforce this article by appropriate legislation."

Well, that sounds only fair and reasonable. No woman wants to have her rights denied or abridged. The amendment seems to open a closed door, to clear away difficulties that have been in her path. Perhaps she is working in an office where some man, not nearly so efficient and conscientious as she, has a higher place, just because he is a man. Perhaps she is a physician who, because she is a woman, cannot get on the staff of a hospital. Perhaps she is a teacher who knows that when the principal retires she would get his place if she were a man, but no matter how much she deserves it she will be bypassed and a man put in. Or perhaps she is a businesswoman like one who said to me, "Women in business are like the Red Queen in Alice; we have to run as hard as we can to keep in the place."

These women see in the amendment a means of wiping away all such sex discriminations; they see themselves placed on a real equality with men. But are these hopes justified? Will such a law do that? Will it give women more than it will take away from them? I do not think so, and I will tell you why.

No law can compel a man to employ a woman or to promote her, no law can compel a hospital to place women doctors on its staff or to admit them as interns and residents, no law can prevent an employer from passing by a competent woman and appointing a less competent man. These are matters which lie outside the domain of law; they are decided by men who are often swayed by the old prejudices, the instictive inhibitions and compulsions which centuries have implanted in us. I do not mean that these obstacles cannot be overcome; the history of the past century shows how far the emancipation of women has advanced already, but the advance cannot be brought about by law, by compulsion. Only the slow growth of a genuine feeling of sex equality can bring it about; but surely when we see the attitude of the young generation we cannot fail to be heartened by the striking signs of increasing equality between the sexes.

It is true, as the advocates of the equal-rights amendment insist, that there are still in some States inequalities that can be removed by legal action, and have been in the more advanced States. To that I would answer that it is in the power of such States to follow the example of their sister States, that it is not necessary to bring about such relatively simple reforms by so cumbersome a method as an amendment to the Constitution.

But why should we—I speak as president of the National Consumers League and as a member of the National Women's Trade Union League, the League of Women Voters, the Association of University Women—why should we who call ourselves feminists oppose a measure which, even if it does not do all its proponents claim, will still help to remove women's disabilities? It is because we know that women would lose more than they would gain if, at one stroke, all the laws which treat women as women and not only as persons were revoked. Now to the strictly orthodox feminist, women should be treated only as persons. I remember a debate before a women's club in which I took the side opposed to the amendment and the side defending it was taken by an eager, attractive, but very young woman. I argued that the laws, so general in the older countries, which provide vacation with pay for pregnant women in industry were necessary for the good of the race. She opposed it, of course, but finally gave way. "All right," she said impatiently, "if you say 'pregnant persons' we won't object, but not 'women'." I assured her we would be quite content with that.

This is, of course, an extreme instance of what one might call feminist fundamentalism, and I am not suggesting that it is typical of the Woman's Party. But I do think it is typical of that group to ignore the real physical and social differences between men and women, differences which lie at the base of the laws applying only to women and not to men. The fact that these differences have often been exaggerated in the past and that nowadays we ignore many of them does not mean that we can sweep them all away and act as if that settled it. Women still have to bear the babies and still ought to rear the children, and I ask any young mother if that is not a real handicap which deserves consideration.

The proposed amendment would do away with the protection of women as homemakers and mothers; it would either make the wife equally responsible with her husband for the support of the family or it would remove responsibility from both. In such a case, which parent would be more likely to get out from under? Ask any social worker. Surely it is only common sense to hold the husband responsible for the support of his family.

And what about alimony after divorce? So far the laws relating to alimony (passed by male legislators) have been much more favorable to women than to men; in fact, they have shown an absurdly sentimental attitude

and often they have worked great injustice. But to abolish them altogether and to put the woman on an equal footing with the man would work even more injustice. Take the middle-aged woman who has no professional or industrial experience, who knows no skill but amateur housekeeping and child care. When her husband tires of her and seeks a younger mate, is she to be left penniless to find her own support? Alimony laws need strict revision, but not abolition.

The laws of property as they affect married women are too complicated to be covered in this discussion. It is quite true that in backward States such laws are unfair to women, but in most of the States they have changed with the changing times and those disabilities that still remain can be removed if ardent feminists will only carry on the sort of intensive campaign which we of the older generation devoted ourselves to, some 40 to 50 years ago. They would then know exactly what they were trying to achieve, for they would be attacking a definite evil, not a system which is part evil and part good.

It is in connection with labor legislation that my opposition to the equal-rights amendment is strongest, for my field for 35 years has been the protection of working people against the harmful features of industrial work, against dangerous dusts, poisons, excessive heat and heavy exertion, long hours, low wages. Dangerous dusts cause silicosis, followed sometimes by tuberculosis; poisons used in industry include lead, mercury, mineral acids, carbon monoxide, and a host of volatile solvents which act like ether and chloroform, only sometimes more harmfully. Our efforts have always been to protect both men and women against these dangers, but when we could not do that, when legislators were willing to protect only the women, then we took gladly what we could get.

And in some respects protection is needed more by the women. For one thing, they have the handicap of youth; and, as we all know, the younger the worker, the more susceptible to a poison and to fatigue and to the harmful effects of dangerous dusts. Men in industry are divided into the different age groups just as men are in nonindustrial work, but women in industry are massed overwhelmingly in the early age groups. This means that they are more susceptible to all the harmful elements in their work, they are less prudent than older women, they are reckless and they have the silliest ideas about food and about protection against cold and wet. Partly because they are young, partly because they draw the lowest wages, young women workers have a higher tuberculosis rate than men. Young women workers cannot stand for long hours on their feet as well as men can, nor can they lift heavy weights; older women have their special handicap, housework and the care of children added to the hours of factory work.

It is true that the Walsh-Healey wage-and-hour law applies to men as well as women, but it covers only those industries that enter into interstate trade, not those that are strictly within the State—restaurants, hotels, laundries, stores, and the white-collar industries. For these, State laws are necessary, to prescribe a minimum wage and maximum hours. Of course, it would be better to extend such laws to cover men also, but this has never been done. We should be giving up a reality for a vain hope.

We do not need, we older women, to ask what will happen if all the laws protecting workingwomen should be revoked, for we remember only too well what happened before those laws were passed. In Illinois we fought for years for a 10-hour law for women. I knew a young Irish girl in Chicago who had a job as night waitress in an all-night eating place out near the stockyards. She worked 6 nights a week, 12 hours a night, 72 hours a week, and it could have been raised to 84 so far as the law was concerned. There were no minimum-wage laws in 1912 when, out of 5,000,000 workingwomen in the United States, half under 24 years of age, a million earned less than $4 a week.

In those days I hated to shop in Chicago stores, for I knew so well the lot of the girls who worked in them. There was no vacation; not even in the hot summer months could the employers be persuaded to close for 1 weekday. It was a 10-hour day with plenty of overtime—paid for usually by a lunch—especially before Christmas; wages ran from $2.50 to $10 a week and very few ever reached that latter figure, yet a girl could not then support herself in Chicago on less than $8 a week. Even to get seats for these girls meant a long fight. I remember a girl who was a worn-out, middle-aged woman at 24, after 10 years' work in a department store for never more than $7 a week, all of which went to her widowed mother. She had no normal girlhood, no fun ever, for her Sundays must be spent in sleep or in mending and laundering.

The women who are pushing the equal-rights amendment insist that to limit the hours of work for women and to insist on pauses for lunch, on separate toilets, on provision of seats—all these things handicap women in getting jobs and that they want to be free to compete with men on equal terms. I think that is probably true of a small number of women in industry, such as linotypists on morning papers, and ticket sellers on elevated roads and subways, who are not allowed to work on the night shift. But in normal times their number is infinitesimal compared with the number of women who welcome these safeguards. Of course in wartime all restrictions are suspended in most of the States.

I can assure you that when Ohio passed laws for the protection of women workers, Ohio women did not envy the freedom of the women of Kentucky to work as long hours and for as low a wage as they pleased; Massachusetts textile workers did not move to Rhode Island to free themselves from the wages-and-hours laws; the women of the Northern States did not look with longing at the untrammeled freedom of the South. There is no articulate organization of workingwomen that favors the equal-rights amendment.

For more than half a century the struggle to alleviate the lot of women workers has gone on, and we can point with pride to what has been gained. Twenty-six States have minimum-wage laws, and this means that some 4,000,000 women in hotels, restaurants, laundries, and so on, must be paid a decent wage. Forty-three States limit the hours which a woman may be required to work. Less essential, but still important, are the regulations which require seats—and their use—separate toilets, time off for lunch, and so on, and these are in force in practically all States. And such laws have not limited the employment of women, handicapped them in their search for jobs; on the contrary, it is during that past 25 years, when these laws were passed, that the employment of women has increased steadily—not only during the war—and in just those States where labor laws are strict. All this gain would be swept away by the adoption of the equal-rights amendment. Is it any wonder that workingwomen have dubbed it the unequal-rights amendment?

In theory, of course, women should fight for their rights as men do, but in actual fact they seldom do. Even now, in wartime, only about three million of the seventeen and a half million women wage earners belong to unions, and the majority of these are in war industries, aircraft, and automotive production. When the war is over few of them will remain in those industries; they will have to go back to their old jobs, most of them in unorganized industries or with far less strong unions. Surely they will need as much protection as they did before the war.

The equal-rights amendment will not free women from discrimination; no laws can do that. It will not make it easier for professional women to advance nor for workingwomen to get or to hold jobs, but it will sweep away the few measures which now make the lives of the wage-earning women less hard. It will remove from the wife and mother all consideration for her as a woman and will place her on a legal equality with her husband, an equality that is mostly imaginary, has little basis in hard fact. The legal injustices under which women in some States still suffer can be removed one by one with far less effort than was needed in earlier years, and without sacrificing what is good in order to get rid of what is bad. If women in and out of industry understood clearly what the proposed amendment would do, it could never be passed.

Why Does Uncle Sam Pick on Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Carl A. Gray from the Saturday Evening Post:

WHY DOES UNCLE SAM PICK ON US?

(By Carl A. Gray, president, Grenby Manufacturing Co., makers of electronic equipment)

(Condensed from the Saturday Evening Post)

My son Harvey is 10 years old and already a businessman. He has a paper route. I am flattered that he has decided to follow in my footsteps. I have been a businessman ever since I left college some 25 years ago. Harvey is more enthusiastic about being in business than I am. According to his lights, being in business means supplying needed services or articles for a modest profit. He looks forward to a lifetime of following this simple formula.

I don't know whether to tell Harvey the economic facts of life or to let him enjoy his illusion. I cannot decide whether to tell him that the future of the small-business man is in jeopardy; that a generation hence he may be extinct.

Along with thousands of others, as a small employer I am today staggering along in a labyrinthine economy of uncertainty, weakened by the bloodletting of excessive taxation and faced at every turn by inquisitive agents of government. Today the margin of safety is so tenuous that one costly mistake of judgment in buying, selling, or engineering could wipe out not only the year's profit but the business as well. If the squeezing process continues, there won't be any small-business men when Harvey grows up. Then everybody will be working for the Government.

One day I walked into my office, and it was as busy as Grand Central Terminal. There were eight Government agents there, representing a variety of bureaus. They were checking our files, looking for statistical information, studying time cards, examining our books, and conning our personal records. It was just a coincidence that they arrived on the same day, but it started me thinking.

That night I went home and totted up the advantages and disadvantages of operating one's own business.

I was appalled to find that the debits more than outweighed the credits. A lot of things had happened, I discovered, since 1939, when my partner and I started in a tiny plant with three employees. Now we have 175, and the headaches have increased by geometrical progression.

Here are just a few of the Government agents who drop in to see us, sometimes in twos and threes, sometime like small hordes of locusts: State sales tax, State labor department, factory inspectors, Federal unemployment, State unemployment, revaluation and conversion, Internal Revenue, War Assets, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, Government auditors on contracts, renegotiation representatives, and, last but not least, wage-and-hour representatives. Many are pleasant fellows, but they all take time.

When you get a contract with some Government agency—your troubles really begin. We had one that ran for 7 months, back in 1945. Our monthly reports were filed and approved; we received payment, and final releases were signed.

Then out of a clear sky in June 1947 two men walked in and said they were going to audit all transactions on this contract. They stayed 4 weeks.

Three months later we got a letter saying our records were incomplete and we were liable to a penalty of $10,531. We yelped loud enough and the case was reopened. New auditors arrived and started from scratch. After a couple of weeks, one of them got sick and left. A week later his partner left. We put everything back in the files.

In June 1948 a stranger walked in. He explained that he was there to audit the contract. He stayed so long that I began to mistake him for one of the help. Then one fine morning he came up with an answer: The Government owed us $2.09.

But hold. A couple of months later two grim gentlemen from Washington arrived to tell us that they were going to do another once-over-lightly. That was early in 1949, and we were still holding our breath. Then a new 64-page set of regulations arrived, superseding everything else.

Sometimes it is impossible to find out what certain Government rulings mean. Not long ago we called the Collector of Internal Revenue to ask him if contracts secured from the Government prior to May 21, 1948, were renegotiable. He told us to call the office at Hartford. We did. They told us to call the main office in another city 40 miles away. We did. They told us to write to Washington. We did. Several weeks later we got a suggestion that the answer was included in certain sections of an enclosed document that covered 145 pages of legal-size paper. A few days later we received a note telling us to "please destroy the copy of part 423 sent to you earlier." Accompanying this note was another fat volume of 64 pages of legal-size paper. Somewhere in it is the answer.

Far worse, however, than these day-by-day pinpricks is the tragic siphoning of money out of business through taxation and dispersal of dividends. If we're lucky enough to make a profit of $100,000 in 1 year, here's what happens: Instantly that shrinks to $62,000 as the Federal Government takes its cut of 38 percent. Then the State government gets a whack at it. I'd like to keep most of what's left in the business for a rainy day. But section 102 of the Internal Revenue Code stipulates a penalty of from 27½ to 38½ percent unless I parcel out a large part of the balance for dividends. That way, of course, the Government gets still another lick at it through personal-income taxes of the stockholders. But it leaves me with less than $20,000, probably nearer $10,000, to go into surplus. You can't win.

At the present time our company has five good new devices gathering dust on the shelves. We just don't have the money to finance their production. And if we did, there's the inevitable feeling, "What's the use? We're only adding to our headaches."

You can't blame private investors for being skeptical. The owner of a business which makes small castings for us told me that he was trying to get more equipment and modernize his plant. It called for venture capital. He talked to a friend who has considerable money. Here is the answer he got: "If I put money into your company, even though it is in excellent shape, I am just risking money. And if I make money, it means that I have to pay more to Uncle Sam. The risks are too great for the sake of paying more income taxes."

Suppose, then, that you try to float a public stock issue to raise money. That's a nightmare I've been through. You've got to file a prospectus with the SEC. Minimum legal advice for this costs about $15,000. Minimum charges for SEC audits run to another $15,000. Bankers also like to have special reports from outside engineers. These cost another $10,000. If the small entrepreneur wants public financing, he's got to put about $40,000 on the line before his application is considered. With that kind of money lying around he probably wouldn't be applying in the first place.

Have I broken your heart yet? Then perhaps you'd like to hear about the sleeper in the wage-hour law. We got rooked by it.

There's a provision in the law that says if a foreman spends as much as 20 percent of his time doing any of the work of his men, he is entitled to time-and-one-half for overtime. Well, we bought out a New York concern and took several of their old employees on our pay roll. One of these newcomers slapped an attachment on our factory. It seems that during the war years this foreman had more on his mind than winning the war. He kept careful tab of the hours worked. He felt he had $20,000 coming to him.

Understand, all this had happened before we even came into the picture. But all our assets were permitted to be frozen by State law. The pay of our employees was in jeopardy until I scurried around and posted a bond. I have a friend who got nicked for nearly $75,000 by several of these sudden suits for overtime. The suits were stimulated by overenthusiastic representatives of government.

There are a lot of things I'd like to be doing if we had a proper margin of safety for operations. I have lots of swell youngsters coming to me wanting to learn a trade. It takes a couple of years to train a good machine operator. Even a graduate engineer needs a year or so under mature guidance before he earns his keep. We've had to pass up some of this good raw material, letting it go to bigger companies or, even worse, to seed.

I'm not being mealymouthed when I say I'm in business for more reasons than just to make a profit. I want profit because I want job security as much as the next fellow. But I also like to feel that I am contributing to the welfare and prosperity of my community. And I like to feel that my small company can do its part in creating a strong industrial fabric for war or peace.

I think my country is more secure with thousands of small plants like ours than with just a few big ones under centralized control. Recently we underbid one of the largest corporations in the country. The purchaser is saving $400,000 on this transaction because we carry no excess baggage on the pay roll.

There's not a small manufacturer I know who wouldn't be satisfied with a decent annual profit and the chance to operate in a friendly and secure atmosphere. By profits I mean not only money to put into stockholders' pockets, but profits to plow back into business; profits to make new products and to create new jobs.

My company is in good financial shape—better than most. Yet for 2 years during conversion from war to peace we made no profit at all. This year we will make a reasonable profit. But it will sift through our hands like sand through a sieve. During the year I have risked all my capital and worked day and night. I will have little to show for it even in this good year.

Why should I take all these risks? There is an easy way out. I can retire and invest my money in tax-exempt securities. I'd see more of my family. I'd stop waking up at night and asking, "Have we done this right? Are we violating a law or regulation if we do this?"

But I have no use for parasites. To me there is only one real wealth. It is the product of man's mind and skill and sweat. Anybody who tells you that Government produces wealth is kidding. Government consumes it. But you and I, when we take the raw stuff of nature and transform it into something usable, are creating wealth. That's why when we kill off the small entrepreneur we are killing off the real wealth makers of the country.

If we don't believe in a free competitive system, then, for heaven's sake, let's junk it manfully and cleanly. This slow suffocation is a painful sight to those of us who believe that free competition is best for all of us individually and collectively. I believe it is worse than a direct frontal attack from men who do not believe in the dignity of the individual or the worth of private brains, private capital, and private sweat. It is worse because small business is today slowly being throttled by the ignorance, stupidity, and suspicions of the very men who protest their faith in the American system.

And what of my son Harvey? I watch him as he walks down the street whistling and delivering his papers. One of my neighbors told me, "I tried to tip him, but he refused to take the money. He said, 'One price and the same good service to everybody.' "

I am old-fashioned enough to feel proud about that. Harvey finished the summer with a total profit of about $45 and a belief that he had discovered the American system. Do your job, display enterprise, give people the service they're glad to pay for. In return, you get the security of a good business and a steady income. It will pain me to disillusion Harvey. Someday soon, however, he's got to learn that the planned economy of the welfare state is here. In that state men seek pensions, not profits. They eschew adventure in favor of security.

I am not completely despairing. I think men like myself at 50 are probably too old to carry on the fight. I think that the generation that followed right on my heels is too enervated in its search for the illusion of security. They are too pension-bent, too hypnotized by the idea of the state as the all-in-all.

I know in the future, though, that still another generation must cut cleanly through these cobwebs. These are the post-depression babies and I hope they can rediscover America. They must come as a courageous, adventuring troupe, intent on the development of their own potentialities and inner resources. A man who is concerned only with security is only a half man, because he does not live up to the promise as a creative creature made in the image and likeness of God.

And when that clean, creative wind sweeps through this country of ours, I hope fervently that my son Harvey will have the honor of being among those present and doing something about it.

The 19 Hoover Reports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article by Harold Stein appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic entitled "The 19 Hoover Reports":

THE 19 HOOVER REPORTS
(By Harold Stein)

(Harold Stein is staff director of the Committee on Public Administration Cases in Washington, an organization sponsored by the graduate schools of Public Administration of Cornell, Harvard, Princeton, and Syracuse Universities. He is a graduate of Yale who has spent most of the past 15 years in Government service.)

The Hoover report is back in the news again. A Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report has been created on a Nation-wide basis, to build a fire under Congress; it has held a conference in Washington, at which the former President was himself one of the speakers. His remarks caused the resignation of Dewey Anderson, director of the Public Affairs Institute, who said that Hoover's observations made it clear that the committee is "no place for a liberal." Among those pushing the report is the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States. It is sending out 1,300,000 pamphlets to businessmen, repeating the familiar claim that millions of dollars are being wasted every day in the operation of the Government.

There is, of course, no such thing as the Hoover Commission report. The 12 Commissioners issued 19 reports, of varying quality and with a wealth of dissents (many admirable), and about the same number of so-called task-force reports, the latter ranging from excellent studies to documents that read like campaign speeches for John Foster Dulles. But even though there is no "report," the Commission did assemble and publish a set of recommendations for the organization of the Federal Government that provides a solid base for action. Most important, the reports show the wholehearted acceptance (with only occasional lapses) of the doctrine of Presidential accountability and responsibility and make a strong plea that the President be granted adequate authority to carry out that responsibility.

On this basic issue there already has been important progress. In June the Congress passed the Reorganization Act of 1949. As recommended by the Commission, the act exempts no agencies—except the General Accounting Office, considered, with dubious accuracy, an arm of Congress. However, the act does have other shortcomings; it will expire on April 1, 1953, and any Presidential reorganization plan can be defeated either by 49 votes in the Senate or by 218 in the House, within the 60-day period. The Commission had recommended a statute under which reorganization plans could be defeated only by a majority vote of both Houses.

The President's success in achieving major improvements depends on a variety of factors: his own prestige, the ability of the opposition to mobilize for the attack, the effectiveness of party leadership in Congress. A favorable item is the bipartisan support he has been getting from the Citizen's Committee for the Hoover Report, backed up by Hoover's own prestige. The committee's usefulness is limited by the fact that it is automatically committed to all the majority proposals—good, bad, or indifferent—and by its own unfortunate decision to sell the program on the basis of dollar savings. Most of the announced savings are quite mythical, and the public is left with the impression that our Government is staffed by incompetent and greedy bureaucrats. But on the whole its influence lies on the side of virtue.

During the past session of Congress, the arithmetical score on Presidential reorganization plans was good: eight plans sent up, six adopted, one superseded by new legislation; only the proposal for a Department of Welfare, which happened to arouse a curious mixture of congressional antagonisms, was defeated.

By reorganization plan and by legislation a good start has been made on modernizing and giving the President more effective control over the housekeeping functions of the Government. There is a new law clearing part of the statutory jungle of property legislation, and a General Services Administration has been established to combine in one agency a variety of formerly scattered functions. Congress has raised the salaries of key Federal employees and has passed an improved Classification Act. A more intelligible and useful form of budget is being put into effect and Congress seems to be rationalizing the appropriations structure to correspond. Minor improvements in the Government's archaic accounting practices are in prospect. The National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board have been placed squarely in the Executive Office of the President, where they belong.

Most of the President's responsibilities must be carried out through the Cabinet departments; if the President is to have effective authority, the heads must also have authority to organize and direct their own departments. In this field, useful advances have been made in State and elsewhere.

The one great achievement in departmental control is the Unification Act of 1949 for the National Military Establishment. The recent terrifying exhibition on Captiol Hill should not mislead us. Many of the attacks and counter attacks of the generals and the admirals received no effective reply, while the performance of the civilian chiefs gave no convincing assurance of their wise understanding of strategy. But at least it did appear that the President and the Secretary of Defense now have a chance to establish a defense policy that is something more than a military pork barrel.

Part of the problem of making the Government work better is straightening out some of the anomalies in the assignment of functions to the different departments and within departments. This is, of course, a never ending process. New stresses in our society, new concepts of Federal responsibility require adaptations in our governmental structure. This is peculiarly the area covered by the new Reorganization Act. The President has begun to move. Administrative responsibility has been lodged in the chairmen of the Civil Service Commission and the Maritime Commission, giving hope of improvement in those creaking agencies. Public Roads Administration has gone to the Department of Commerce as a first step in making Commerce the center of all nonregulatory transportation activities. The perpetual squabble over the location of the Employment Service and Unemployment Compensation has been settled—again—by transferring both to the Department of Labor.

These are the main points of action consequent upon the Hoover Commission report. For such a short period of time, it is an impressive showing. It carries on wisely from the great reforms proposed by the President's Committee on Administrative Management in 1937, and accomplished in 1939, notably in the establishment of the Executive Office of the President, the transfer of the Budget Bureau from Treasury to that office, and the strengthening of the White House staff. The Hoover Commission has built on that achievement; the total area of its impact, already astonishingly wide, promises to be still wider.

Much, very much, remains to be done. No arithmetical measurement of the Commission's work has any significance, because the recommendations range from the important to those that should be buried. To the latter class belongs the proposal for a united medical administration, of, by and for the doctors, or more probably, the AMA. (Item, a proposal for a permanent commission to "study Federal-State relations" that would inevitably push toward an abdication by the Federal Government of fields of taxation and control that can never be managed within State boundaries. (Item, a proposal to liquidate the Farmers Home Administration.) But there are many valid recommendations that have not been acted on.

The Civil Service Commission remains a hybrid body, ill adapted to carrying out a vigorous and liberal personnel policy. Beyond that, the present personnel laws are archaic, rigid, and utterly confused by veterans' preferences that work badly for the veterans and abominably for everyone else. New legislation has been introduced and more is in preparation. The chances for passage in the next session are good, but veterans and other groups may succeed in reintroducing many of the rigidities and defects that should be discarded. The Government is a good employer in the sense that public service can be deeply rewarding, but modern personnel practices are urgently needed.

The General Accounting Office should be transformed into an effective auditing agency for Congress—which it is not—and accounting responsibility should be restored to the executive branch. The majority of the Hoover Commission recommended an unhappy compromise, but there is no reason to believe that the Eighty-first Congress would touch the subject in any event. The present Comptroller General's great personal popularity reinforces the normal congressional belief that any disliked by the Executive is good for Congress.

One important reform in the President's own family was recommended by the Commission. That is to change the Council of Economic Advisers—now operating in the full glare of publicity and erratically for themselves, for congressional committees, for various interest groups, and for the President—to an economic adviser whose exclusive job will be to help the Chief Executive. The President must have informed assistance on the economic impact of his whole program and all its parts: paradoxically, he needs the assistance because he must do many things (like maintaining a large defense program in times of inflation) that are noneconomic. He can never hope to get unbiased advice if the advice is constantly made public. Most of the opposition to the Commission's recommendation has come from liberal groups in and out of Congress; their policy seems painfully short-sighted.

Another urgent need in Presidential staffing is a Board of Review for natural-resource-development projects. This was recommended in a dissent. Even the majority's somewhat confused proposals for a Board of Impartial Analysis for engineering and architectural projects would fill the gap created by the unseemly abolition of the National Resources Planning Board. Perhaps with the horrid word "planning" omitted, Congress might be willing to go along.

In the area of interdepartmental shifts there are two badly needed consolidations, both in the field of natural resources: the civil functions (rivers and harbors, and flood control) of the Army Corps of Engineers

should be united with the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, and similarly, though the need is not quite so urgent, the Forest Service (Agriculture) and the Bureau of Land Management (Interior), which includes the Grazing Service and the old General Land Office, clearly belong together in one agency.

The question of who should control a combined Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management is not a simple matter; both parent agencies can make out a pretty good claim. Along with the dissenters on the Commission, I plunk for Interior. This seems to me a good time to emphasize conservation in the public domain. The on-the-farm conservation job of Agriculture can and should go ahead anyway. Nobody knows what the President will do, and even if he recommends a transfer to Interior, Congress will probably defeat the plan, because the prestige of Agriculture and the Forest Service probably outweigh the political appeal of Interior and BLM.

The other case is clear-cut. River-basin development from the source in the mountains clear down to the sea should be handled by one agency and that agency belongs in the Interior Department, or in a new Department of Natural Resources, which is what Interior should become. Power, flood control, navigation, irrigation—all must be planned simultaneously and by one agency, and the basic function is civilian, not military. If the engineers need this kind of training, let them be given assignments with Interior. As they did in the WPA, they will learn much from working in a civilian agency and they will have something of their own to contribute. The present system gives only partial training to about 215 engineer officers at any one time and bids fair to wreck the effective use of our magnificent water resources.

I know of no one in Washington who thinks that a reoganization plan transferring rivers and harbors and flood control to Interior could get by Congress unless—and this is a big unless—and until enough people in this country wake up to the significance of the problem and tell their Senators and Representatives about it.

The Law of Reverence and the Law of Fear

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, January 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the sermon delivered by the Right Reverend John K. Cartwright at the Red Mass, on January 15, 1950, in the Shrine of the Immaculate Conception, Washington, D. C.

There being no objection, the sermon was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Human society must be ruled by law. As inexorable as the force of gravity or the movement of the tides is the principle that all gatherings of men must establish rules for their order and their peace.

Even today, in the midst of unexampled disturbance and conflict there is by and large over all the earth a regimen of law. Anarchy exists only sporadically and momentarily. In the nature of things mankind must keep coming back to forms of stable understanding that we call law.

However, there is a wide diversity in the character of the laws that rule the world. Broadly speaking, the world is divided into two parts. In one the law is that of reverence. In the other it is the law of fear.

Of course law everywhere makes use of coercion and therefore imposes fear. But in free societies the fear operates only against the minority: the fractious, the unreasonable, the criminal. In a free society the good citizen does not fear the law for he does not intend to break it. But even in a free society the good citizen does pay the law the homage of his reverence. In last analysis the law rests, not upon the coercion which it applies to the few, but upon the reverence of the many which is its chief support, and without which society could not combine order and freedom.

In reading history we find that through vast reaches of human experience law has tended to repose on fear. Even in the classical republics where liberty was born, liberty was for an elite rather than for every man. In the enormous slave states of our own time, whether the nationalistic tyrannies which have been accounted for, or the socialistic tyrannies under which half the world now groans and which the rest of us look upon with dread, in these great areas the law of fear dominates with unexampled power. For fear in our age has acquired techniques and procedures quite unknown to man in any other age. In past time tyranny no less than beneficence suffered from lack of efficiency. In the present all the discoveries of science and the modern genius for organization put themselves at the disposal of terror. One-half mankind lies under the daily imminence, personal to every trembling heart, of espionage, imprisonment, torture, and cruel death.

We used to think that evils like these had fallen into desuetude by the mere fact that time had passed and man had outgrown them. Instead the slave state is among us in a form of effectiveness in which no past century could know it. And, as far as regards the techniques of fear, it is impossible to prophesy their exhaustion. They could be with us for centuries, for millennia, forever. And they could absorb not only the countries now cursed by them, but our own country and all the earth. There is unfortunately nothing about our climate, or our latitude and longitude, or our inherited blood-strains which would forbid the establishment among us of this law of fear. There is nothing to prevent it, except the virtues of our people maintaining the institutions of freedom under the providence of God, and making these institutions valid by the power of the spirit of reverence.

Our history has been one of reverence for the inherited principles of a great tradition, a tradition that began with the beginnings of European civilization and that reached a high point of enlargement and perfecting in the experiences of our own Nation. While other peoples were still living under stagnant tribal custom or under the futile restlessness of barbaric military states, the peoples who formed Christendom set about the august task of building the polities of freedom. The experiments of the Greek cities and the Roman republic with limited freedom, the inculcation of human dignity by the two testaments, the bringing of these teachings into universal popularity by the teaching of the church, the building of the statutes and jurisprudence of the Roman law, the writing of the great charters and documents of the Middle Ages like Magna Carta, the working out of the pacts and treaties that brought peace out of the religious wars, the charter of religious freedom of the Maryland settlers of 1634, the Bill of Rights of England of 1692 and of the United States of 1789, the Declaration of Independence, and the Proclamation of Emancipation—all these are high points of advancement in a progression through many ages of turmoil and battle toward a greater and greater heritage of honor and wisdom.

These problems we did not solve. They were solved for us and the answers belong to us and to mankind forever. These principles are the application to man's difficulties of eternally valid truths embodied in the natural law. They are not to be treated merely as rules of a game to be used pragmatically. They are to be regarded as emanations of truth and as the sacred foundations of all law. If they are so cherished then the body of statutes will be enlightened by them and will serve the uses of man's freedom. If they are so cherished then mankind will reverence the law he lives by and obey it. But if they are not so reverenced then the law of freemen must fail. And since man, free or not free, must have some law, since society cannot exist without it, the law which replaces the law of reverence can only be the law of fear.

The law of freedom and reverence is our heritage. But like all our heritage it is being attacked from without and sapped from within. An irreverent and irresponsible philosophy is growing daily in its influence. Positions of social prestige and intellectual power are being rapidly won by those whom a great English writer describes as vicious and ignorant children picking the mortar out of the foundations of society. There is no part of our inherited legal and jurisprudential wisdom which is sacred to this spirit of irreverence.

When our people built a residence for its highest court it tried very properly to express reverence for one of its greatest institutions by the majesty of the building. Have you noticed in recent years the sarcasm with which in certain circles of thought it is customary to ridicule this action?

When people are to be subjected to the guidance of law and some of them to law's sanctions and coercions, we might properly expect on the part of their judges a responsible and reverential concept of the human person so made subject to him. What can be looked for when a judge can say as one judge did say that for him there is no essential difference between a man, a baboon, and a grain of sand? This was the personal philosophy of one judge. But many a jurist has been to school at the feet of teachers of a similar philosophy. And if such came to be the thought not of a judge but of the judiciary, what reverence for the law beneath the laws would temper justice with mercy, what criterion would restrain the judging mind from any vagary to which politics or personal caprice might incline it? What might the people think of such a system by which they would no longer be law's beneficiaries but its victims?

When people are accused of violating the law, our system gives them the benefit of the doubt, the right to trial by jury, the right of expert counsel, the value of all the delays that can safeguard justice. In compensation the law expects from them the attitude of respect that makes the processes of trial orderly and indeed possible. Such an attitude it can commonly presume even when it deals with the thief and the murderer. But we have seen the scandal of organized and deliberate mockery introduced to our courtrooms by people whose intelligence makes them all the more guilty. They are the pawns and servants of a law that works by fear and they seek by deliberate destruction of the law of reverence to bring in here the law of fear.

The withdrawal of reverence from law is as yet exceptional. But it is frequent and its frequency increases. It increases because it is being diverted at its source.

For law, though it be the object of reverence, does not create reverence. Reverence comes out of the conscience of man. And the conscience of man needs to be both en-

lightened and animated by religion. Without religion the conscience atrophies. Without a conscience reverence dries up. Without reverence the law of free men cannot function. But society must have law. If it cannot be the law that rests on reverence it must be the law that rests on fear.

It is no accident or mere coincidence that in this divided world the habitat of official atheism is also the habitat of the law of fear. In the lands where the people are held in hourly terror, where the very rulers tremble together in a wretched loyalty of fear, in that land there is no use for reverence. Those rulers must not be inhibited from any savagery that by respect for men would prevent the application of effective fear. They must not be hampered in their mathematical justice by the irregularities and individualities of those who know they have a soul. Law must be supreme over all interests, unexceptionable, undeterred in merciless effectiveness. Away with those who call on constitutions and writs of habeas corpus. Away with those who talk of rights. Away with those who claim for man personality instead of number. Away with those who speak of souls and honor and truth and reverence. There can be no law of nature which is the will of God with reason to understand it and reverence to maintain it. There can be only laws—and torture to enforce them.

On the other hand the habitat of the law of freedom is the habitat of reverence. Here only the evil and the violent need fear the law. The citizen respects it and upholds it. He understands society's need for reasonable arrangement of its basic interests, and perceives that without this basic arrangement of law no other arrangement of any other interest either of business or of education, or of art or of friendship or of pleasure would be possible. Since human law is so basic to all forms of human society it springs out of the natural law which is only another word for the will of God. Therefore it has about it in a free society something that is sacred and that appeals not only to the intelligence but to the conscience. And this appeal to the conscience must be kept alive if a free society is to endure. The law of fear can operate in the mathematical functioning of the state when welfare is maintained by a secret police in its torture chambers. The law of freedom can function only when the masses and multitudes of men reverence the law of freedom as the gift of God.

Our country since its inception has been a country of freemen's law. It originated in the repudiation of the law of fear. It was able to substitute reverence for fear very easily, because its founders, its heroes, its common people had the religious conscience which is the first element in citizenship. They were rebels but not anarchists. Therefore they set up a government with an enlightened Constitution as the basis of its laws. And that Constitution was enshrined in their reverence.

Our traditions, particularly our traditional jurisprudence, have developed in the light of that understanding. Our law has understood how it is rooted in the religious conscience and for that reason among others it has respected the position of religion in society. It did not resuscitate the forms of religious establishment which history had found so lamentably wanting. On the other hand the religion of the citizen never asked or wished that there should be a reversal to these outmoded experiments. The religion of the citizen did not ask this and does not ask it and, please God, shall never ask it. Denominations as such and ministries as such do not ask from American law establishment or union or abusive privilege. But religion as such has at our law its full right to exist, to worship, to teach, to inspire, to console and to form the conscience of the citizen out of which comes reverence for society and law. American law has always respected religion not only for what it is in itself, the deepest-rooted of all human rights, but for its civilizing function of creating in the public mind the climate of reverence which is the only climate in which the law of freedom can exist.

God has blessed America in the beauty of her mountains and prairies. God has blessed her with abundance. God has blessed her in the energies and talents of her people. But God has given her no greater blessing than this of the working together of her free laws and of the religious conscience of her people. It is the law of reverence which makes possible the abolition of the law of fear. May it forever be so. And may the wisdom of our lawmakers and judges always make secure the honor of their own exalted ministry by maintaining the American tradition of the law of freedom enshrined in the reverential conscience of the citizen.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following article by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of World Affairs. Dr. Thorning, who is my friend and the friend of many Members of the Congress, gave this interpretation of international law in the New York Times, January 13, 1950. His explanation is not only clear and logical; it is also unanswerable, from the standpoint of sound juridical principles. An immediate exchange of Ambassadors with Spain would satisfy the claims of ethics and, at the same time, enable the peoples of the world to champion the cause of freedom and representative government. Full diplomatic friendship will pave the way to many other constructive acts of statesmanship. I recommend Dr. Thorning's analysis to the attention of my colleagues:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 10, 1950.*

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

In the current discussion about friendship with Spain, an important admission was made in the Times' editorial Recognizing Franco, December 22, 1949. This reads as follows:

"It was wrong and short-sighted to withdraw the chiefs of diplomatic missions in the first place."

One could go further and acknowledge that the policy of attempted ostracism, adopted under an impression that the Soviets would be suitably appeased, has proved not only bad in principle but also a failure in practice. It had exactly the opposite effect to that intended: It consolidated overwhelming popular sentiment behind the head of the Spanish state as the symbol of resistance against outside interference. Indeed, according to the Madrid correspondent of the New York Times, the present administration in Spain is stronger than ever. For that result, the constant drum-fire of foreign dictation is largely responsible.

The Times is correct—and so was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG—in pointing out that the Spanish question should be considered in its "proper framework" and in the light of all pertinent resolutions of the UN General Assembly. But readers of the Times have a right to expect the whole record to be rehearsed and studied.

Although the so-called Franco Fascist regime, without any opportunity for self-defense, was denounced and a resolution was passed in 1946 recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic missions from Madrid, it is untrue to assert that such a policy has been "reaffirmed by the Assembly."

When the "identical 1946 resolution" was brought up again in 1947, "according to the rules," by the Soviet-dominated Polish delegation, it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and, in the official minutes of the General Assembly reporter, was recorded as rejected.

This is one reason why many experts on international law, including Dr. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, and Dr. George Finch, former editor of the American Journal of International Law, judge the 1946 resolution to be invalid. Consequently, a number of nations, including some in the Western Hemisphere, considered themselves free to maintain, or to restore, a full complement of diplomatic officials in Spain.

More recently, in May 1949, a decisive majority (26 to 15, with 16 abstentions) supported the motion proposed by Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru, to leave all nations free to send, or not to send, Ambassadors and Ministers Plenipotentiary to Madrid.

At the same time, and this is a point of genuine importance, the proposal of sovietized Poland to repeat the 1945–46 denunciation of the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was soundly beaten by a vote of 32 to 11. A similar fate, by more resounding majorities, was inflicted upon all other resolutions urged upon the UN by the iron-curtain bloc in the General Assembly. With the defeat of these Soviet-inspired motions, the whole case against Spain fell to the ground.

In view of this historical sequence, it would appear to be reasonable to expect our country, democratically, to review its Spanish policy without delay. Since a mistake, admittedly, was made in 1946, the sooner we admit our error and try to repair the damage done, the more secure will be the people of the United States and the more advantageously we can provide for our national interests.

If we do what is right, there is no solid ground for belief that the shock to public opinion in western Europe, and especially in France and Great Britain, would be enormous. Has not the wartime Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Winston Churchill, called, repeatedly, for a revision of bankrupt policy toward Spain? Did not the French Government, despite leftist clamors, reopen its Pyrenees frontier and resume a lucrative trade with the Spanish people? Has it been forgotten that the Times (London) calling for an end to hypocrisy in a powerful leading article (April 25, 1949), described the attempted ostracism of Spain a futile gesture?

"Without offending political honor or popular sentiment," the same editorial advises, "it would be both possible and wise to extend to Spain the normal facilities and courtesies which smooth the relations between sovereign states. * * * There is also a strong case on grounds of humanity and efficiency for admitting Spain to membership of United Nations agencies, if not to the United Nations itself. It is illogical to deprive the Spanish people of all international benefits because of the nature of their Government."

The public, here and abroad, will recognize a policy of good will and fairness toward the people of Spain.

Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs.

The Australian Immigrant Aims at a Sitting Duck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert in the RECORD an article that is worth 3 minutes of anybody's time to read. It is entitled "The Australian Immigrant Aims at a Sitting Duck," from the Washington Daily News, by Robert C. Ruark.

THE AUSTRALIAN IMMIGRANT AIMS AT A SITTING DUCK

(By Robert C. Ruark)

SYDNEY, AUSTRALIA, January 19.—It's been my privilege to observe a wonderfully gratifying thing, a sight denied me in America by virtue of my tender years.

This would be the influx of foreigners to a new, raw, nation, much as the Italians and Irish and Poles came aboard America in the last century, to remodel the land to their own specifications.

Australia flung open its postwar doors to the homeless, and the people flocked to a land where there was breathing space and room to flex a muscle. They are people of all countries, save the black and the yellow, for the Aussies still operate on a slogan of white Australia. In an odd sort of way, even this is pardonable, since you folks back home cannot imagine being a small oasis in a desert of alien culture. In the upsurge of nationalism among the Asiatics, Australia figures there are enough Asiatics ringing them without inviting them to come in.

But the gate has gaped wide to the folk who were stripped of their homes and identities by the European war, and they have eagerly seized the opportunity to begin afresh in a country where space is so vast that a million-acre sheep station is not peculiar. Australia's eight million live largely in the principal cities of Sydney, Melbourne, Adelaide, Brisbane, Perth, Darwin, and Townsville. The rest of the land is laid out there, panting for development.

These people, who have come down under to dwell, are folk who are accustomed to living in postage-stamp nations. The broadness of this land is new and wondrous in concept to them. They are pioneers in an age when pioneering is obsolescent. They have stars in their eyes, and limitless endurance in their muscles. These are dedicated men and women.

They have already begun to integrate themselves into the nation, even as our immigrants dug into America, by doing chores nobody else wants to do. They take the tough jobs, at small pay. They work the extra hours. They serve as menials, as rough laborers, and always they save. They save intently, fiercely. They squirrel away their small earnings, paring their expenses to bone, against the day they will be able to start their own business and found a new dream.

The job, for these new pioneers, is going to be pathetically easy. They are plumped into an economy of state-endorsed sloth, where the man in the street has knocked off work a couple of generations before his time. Australia is a beautiful object lesson in state interference with individual endeavor today.

There is no real overtime in Australia. One industrialist was trying to describe to me the difference between the Australian worker and the American worker. He said: "If you pay the Yank enough, he'll work a night shift, or even week ends. But you can't pay an Australian enough to work more than his 40 hours a week."

That is where the non-clock-watching migrant has his opportunity. He is aiming at a sitting duck. Australia will develop and expand, and people with "ski" on the hind end of their names will be a potent force in the development. It's a healthy thing all around for my Aussie friends, because with their tight inheritance of Scotch, English, and Irish, they were getting to look overmuch alike anyhow. This is one continent that can use some new blood—economically as well as physically.

Resolutions of Mahaska County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, at the annual meeting of the Mahaska County (Iowa) Farm Bureau, a comprehensive set of resolutions were adopted by this fine organization. Under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include these resolutions in order that all Members of Congress may have an opportunity to read and know the position that the Farm Bureau of Mahaska County, Iowa, has taken with respect to the problems and proposals confronting our country at the present time.

The resolutions are as follows:

MAHASKA COUNTY RESOLUTIONS, 1949–50

I. APPRECIATION

We express our appreciation for the assistance given to the county committee by the various townships. It is from the information submitted by the townships and by individuals that these resolutions have been prepared.

We commend the county, State, and National Farm Bureau officers for their untiring efforts to secure for the farmers of America a fair share of the national income.

II. NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

A. Political implications: We reiterate our belief that farm programs should be developed through bipartisan approach.

B. Controls: We believe that controls should be kept at a minimum since it is apparent that guaranties of 100 percent of parity as compared to lower supports would result in more drastic controls.

C. Cost: We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high. We recognize the fact that guaranteeing farmers 100 percent of parity would cost an untold number of dollars and it would be necessary to make a definite increase in taxes to carry out such a program.

D. Level of supports: We favor minimum guaranties or floors under farm prices. We are convinced that the free-enterprise system cannot exist under full guaranties.

E. Flexibility: We favor flexible price supports tied to the amount commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by the law and the Secretary of Agriculture have the authority to set price supports from this minimum up.

F. Production payments: We believe it would be dangerous to establish a cheap-food philosophy in minds of consumers at the expense of the Government and that the use of production payments would not noticeably affect consumption. We are opposed to farmers becoming dependent upon direct appropriation from Congress, however, in support of perishables we do favor the use of production payments.

G. Limits on production: We are opposed to limiting production of a farmer to approximately $26,000 gross if he is to be eligible for provisions of price supports. There is very little correlation between gross and net income and certain types of farms must be operated on a large scale to support one family.

H. Soil-conservation payments: We believe that satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be required of all farmers in order for them to be eligible for price supports.

I. Parity versus income-support standards: We are opposed to abandoning the parity concept for the income standard plan. We believe in the parity concept since it is a true relationship between the price of the products the farmer sells and those that he must buy.

III. NATIONAL AND STATE HEALTH PROGRAMS

We believe the $2,000,000,000 the Federal Government is spending is sufficient to better the health of our country. Due to limited facilities we do not feel an increased appropriation in Federal aid to encourage more doctors to enter the medical profession would be a wise expenditure at this time. However, we do favor increased Federal aid for construction of more hospitals and medical research.

If we have a Federal prepayment health-insurance program, we favor voluntary participation.

We believe we should revise our State health programs and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

IV. LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSHIP

We believe labor-management disputes should be settled through the human approach of mediation.

We favor the establishment of a worker-extension service for labor groups that would be similar to the agriculture extension service.

V. GENERAL

A. Rural mail delivery: We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

B. Rural telephones: We believe a Federal agency should be established for the purpose of expanding rural telephone service.

C. Hoover Commission: The rapid growth of our Federal Government has resulted in an establishment of a great many Federal agencies whose duties at the present time have created a considerable amount of overlapping and duplication within each department. To eliminate a great deal of confusion and waste of tax money, we aggressively support the report of the Hoover Commission.

VI. STATE

Speed-limit law: We favor the enactment of the speed-limit law with maximum limit being set at 60 miles per hour during the day and 50 miles per hour at night.

VII. COUNTY

Health: We believe Mahaska County should have a county health nurse; therefore, we urge the board of directors of the Mahaska County Farm Bureau to contact the proper authorities in an effort to encourage the employment of a county health nurse.

Roads: We recommend that a committee be appointed by the board of directors of the Mahaska County Farm Bureau to contact the county board of supervisors and urge them to instruct the county maintenance crews to do a better job of maintaining secondary roads.

VIII. PEACE

Everyone can recognize the present worldwide feeling of unrest, suspicion, and insecurity, and the need for a greater faith in a workable plan for peace. At the moment, it appears that the fate of civilization rests upon the Russian-American relations and the atomic bomb. As immediate action toward a more satisfactory world peace policy, be it resolved that the United States take the lead by cooperation in—

1. Increasing east-west trade in Europe.
2. The world-wide reduction of armaments.
3. Strengthening and supporting the United Nations.

COUNTY RESOLUTIONS COMMITTEE,
WALTER H. COLVILLE, *Chairman*,
HARRY HEDGE,
CORNIE VANDER LINDEN,
CLIFFORD BUSBY,
Mrs. FRANK RANDELL,
Mrs. ALVIN WIMER,
Mrs. ROYD MCCURDY.

Federal Fiscal Picture Alarming

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, indicative of the alarm which is noticeable throughout my congressional district is the editorial in the Hammonton News of December 15, 1949, entitled "Federal Fiscal Picture Alarming." This is not a partisan matter but is a problem for all of us if we want to preserve our solvency and the solvency of future generations. The editorial follows:

FEDERAL FISCAL PICTURE ALARMING

The Federal Government's current fiscal picture cries out for the earnest consideration of New Jersey's delegates in Congress.

The $43,500,000,000 Federal spending program authorized by Congress for the fiscal year 1950 not only is the largest peacetime spending budget in the Nation's history, but contains many new projects which commit the Government to ever-increasing outlays in the years ahead.

The Bureau of the Budget estimates that 1950 receipts will amount to $38,000,000,000, which is $5,500,000,000 under the $43,500,000,000 spending total. This impending $5,500,000,000 deficit is larger than the total taxes collected by the Federal Government in any peacetime year prior to 1938.

The Federal Government's return to deficit spending depreciate the value of every dollar in the hands of American wage earners, housewives, pensioners, and local governing bodies.

The tragic thing about this sad picture is that Congress and the executive branch could have avoided deficit financing by forthrightly eliminating billions of dollars worth of wasteful spending and by exercising restraint in starting costly new spending programs and in dipping deep into the pork barrel.

Prospending Republicans must share the blame with their similarly disposed Democratic brethren in the Eighty-first Congress for the complete capitulation of Congress this year to the spending bureaucracies and pressure groups in Washington. Tens of thousands of letters received by Members of Congress from folks back home pleading for drastic cuts in excessive and wasteful Federal spending went practically unheeded insofar as effective affirmative action was concerned.

It is futile for us to aid and arm the rest of the world in the fight to arrest communism if, at the same time, we allow the financial structure of our Nation to crumble simply to satisfy the avarice and greed of selfish, short-sighted spending pressure groups.

Inexcusable Political Maneuver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the time has come when those who believe in civil-rights proposals, to which both major parties are pledged, should be fully informed of the facts as they exist in the House of Representatives.

It has been announced by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor that he will seek recognition on Monday next to call up the FEPC bill. Whether he is recognized or not depends on the decision of the Democratic leadership of the House.

It so happens that there is also pending a proposal by the House Rules Committee to alter the very rule under which the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor will seek recognition. It is the recommendation of the Rules Committee that this rule be repealed and that the committee's previous authority as traffic policeman of the House be fully restored.

So that the FEPC bill might be considered on Monday, it was the intent of those sponsoring the rules change not to have it brought up until the Thursday after that vote. However, the Democratic leadership, through a parliamentary ruse, has scheduled the rules-change proposal for action in the House today, thus endangering the possibility of any vote on FEPC on Monday. Should the House adopt the proposed rules change, then the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor would no longer be privileged to seek recognition on Monday. This is the peril to civil-rights legislation for which the Democratic leadership is solely responsible. It is as craven a disregard of party pledges as this House has ever witnessed.

From my talks with my Republican colleagues I know that they stanchly believe that the FEPC legislation should be considered on Monday and that no proposals should be taken up by the House in the intervening days that might jeopardize consideration of FEPC. They intend, as I do, to vote for adjournment of the House today so that the rules change cannot be considered until after action on FEPC.

The Democratic Party has turned the civil-rights program into a travesty by endless maneuvers and delays which it mistakenly believes give it a political advantage. When it is realized that the FEPC legislation enjoyed a privileged position and could have been called up at any time after last August by the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and when it is recalled that the Senate Democratic leader announced that FEPC legislation should be considered in the Senate as the first order of business this year, only later to withdraw that promise, then it should be clear to all that the Democratic Party has no intention of ever enacting civil-rights legislation.

The overwhelming majority of House Republicans want the FEPC legislation to be brought to vote. We not only will oppose the efforts to bring up the rules change today but we will oppose all other efforts of the administration to keep the civil-rights program dangling like bait before the American people. The entire program should be brought to a vote at the earliest possible date.

Hon. Gerald R. Ford, Jr., of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I am highly honored to report to this distinguished body today that one of our Members has been chosen as one of the 10 outstanding young men of the country by the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce for 1950.

The annual dinner to honor these 10 young men is to be given at Peoria, Ill., in the district which I am honored to represent. Our colleague who has been singularly honored is the distinguished young gentleman from Michigan, the Honorable GERALD R. FORD, JR., and I am sure that we can all agree that the JC's made no mistake in his selection.

Representative FORD is an outstanding practicing attorney from Grand Rapids, Mich., holding degrees from both the University of Michigan and Yale University Law School. He was in the thick of the fight during World War II in the Pacific serving on board the U. S. S. *Monterey* as assistant navigator.

My good friend and colleague has played an active role in politics, both as a delegate to State conventions and as a candidate for the office which he now holds. Since becoming a Member of our body, Mr. FORD has distinguished himself time and time again by his forthright stand on various issues presented before this body.

I am sure my Republican friends will all agree that he has been most able and sincere in representing the principles of the Grand Old Party here in Congress. We likewise feel sure that he will be returned by the electorate of his district to the Eighty-second Congress and as long as he chooses to represent the good State of Michigan.

Much Disconnected Ado About Something

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, we all must agree that it is a bad state of affairs, which medically should be inquired into immediately, if one hears voices and no one is physically present, such as Hamlet did and some present-day left- and right-winged reactionaries do.

We all must agree also that if a person has a copious oral cavity and uses his voice and does not say anything which even the most credulous could believe, like some present-day political left- and right-winged reactionaries do, that too is a very bad state of affairs and is very possibly a pressing personal and community problem and is a matter which medically should be inquired into immediately.

We all must agree likewise that some left- and right-winged reactionaries who have whopping voice boxes and mouths to match them, use their natural noise-making apparatus to spew and roar about horrors and horrible fates which the Republic and its people will endure in an attempt to describe President Hoover's ridiculously conjured up last mile toward his dreamed up governmental chaos, when in truth and in fact the alleged last mile is the goal of true progress in human government, that also is a frightfully bad state of affairs and is a strait-jacket and padded-cell matter suggesting and requiring immediate restraint and long political rest and quiet if the parties are public officeholders.

Of course you do not necessarily need to be crazy to be either an extreme left- or right-winged reactionary, but I must admit that it should help a lot.

There should be, and I am sure that there is, some way of stopping this political flitting and roaring about of some people through the towns and countrysides of America like evil spirits and fairly making "the welkins ring" with their oh, so patent airy nothings. The votes of the people—the common stockholders of the Republic—can put every Mister Effervescent Worry Wart officeholder, however, where he needs to be—in retirement.

The following is a portion of a letter which I received recently from one of my constituents:

I believe that divine providence has put a mark upon people who wittingly or unwittingly have determined to pursue with eagerness, by violent expostulation, the causes of evil and selfishness. Their harsh, croaking, rasping, and indistinct voices, betray them. It has been said of old, in substance, that by their works or deeds and not their mouthings, ye shall know them. Basic notions, however, have changed since the days of these utterances. Time was when I could tell a Communist from a reactionary just by looking at them, but now I cannot tell them apart because both of them, are today, equally bug-eyed and wild. Of course, sometimes a right-winged reactionary dresses a little better and eats a little better food and is housed a little better and has a little better automobile, and of course, all that helps to differentiate between these political species.

However, I have always been able to tell a reactionary and a Communist by their voices. When you stop to ponder the statement and think about bird and animal life and all of the other creatures whom God privileged to make noises, the truth of the statement that the voice is the key to the heart seems to be indisputable. Carrion birds, such as the vultures, ravens, and crows, have bad voices and look and smell bad also. Also the great pillagers and devourers such as lions, tigers, hyenas, and leopards, have alarming, soul-penetrating, back-shivering, blood-curdling voices. Look at the simeon brood such as the orangutan, chimpanzee, and gorilla and their voice box concoctions are anything but music to the ear, or should I say a discordant harmony not yet understood.

This is the advice which I give to all. If you hear a noneuphonious, or any other inhuman voice over the radio or otherwise, tune it out of your life because it is a dead certainty that a reactionary is offending your auditory nerves.

If, however, you hear a nice, bold, pleasing, manly voice, that's probably President Harry S. Truman or some other liberal, so just turn him on louder and give that voice profound attention because he is talking for the purpose of doing you some good and not to enslave you financially or otherwise, or to pick the gold fillings out of your teeth, if you have any, while he talks to you as many of our reactionary trumpeters and brayers do.

Another constituent writes:

Today, due to the ignoble efforts of right- and left-winged reactionaries, some of the inhabitants of our zoos and circuses and the household pets fare much better than some of the men, women, and children in America.

I know of no present-day opportunity to play wild animal any more. To illustrate, I am reminded of an old story I heard some years ago about an Irishman who was out of work and answered a circus advertisement to secure employment. He was hired and told to put on a lion's skin and get in the cage and play lion. He followed the directions and when he was in the cage a little while he observed another bristling lion at the other end of the cage and a great fear momentarily overcame him, but his terror vanished when the other lion called out, "Fear not Pat, I am an Irishman too," and he recognized the voice and lo and behold it was his long lost brother Mike.

Today, I believe, we have passed from the great era of harmless deception into the age of harmful deception. I believe that there is now a crying need for all Democratic officeholders to determine to be servants of the people and not their masters or their deceivers. We must, as President Cleveland so aptly put it, be ever mindful that "a public office is a public trust." We must move with intelligence and decision toward the goal of our great Democratic Party—the fulfillment of the promises made to the people in the last Democratic platform. We must aid and assist our truly great President, Harry S. Truman, in making this great country safe and comfortable for the people by promoting the general welfare and not let it again be a hunting ground for the greedy and the selfish who it seems have never yet learned that everything in this world was not made for them exclusively, but for mankind, generally.

I would like to requisition your attention for a little while longer and present to you the following rhyme which may or may not be pertinent or of any use to you in cultivating your sense of humor and adding to your storehouse of wisdom in these restless, trying times, when it seems to be so difficult to keep political and other heads supplied with common bay-horse sense:

A DREAMING WITH GARGANTUA THE GREAT

(Inspired by the following news item: "The 550-pound carcass of Ringling Bros.' Gargantua the Great, circus gorilla, is to be a permanent exhibit at the Peabody Museum of Yale University," and written in collaboration by Joseph M. Lovely and Eugene D. O'Sullivan of Omaha, Nebr.)

My children list whilst I relate,
The tale of old Gargantua's fate.
An ape was he, yea anthropoid,
And all through life was unemployed.

No love he made, and hence unmarried,
He lived a life unvexed, unharried.
He reached the age of maturity,
Neck deep in caged security.

He had no worries, and never a care
O'er what to do, or eat or wear.
He saw the dawn of the atom age
Safe in his air-conditioned cage.

No servant problems, no income tax,
Nothing to do but just relax.
Safe from fevers, and aches, and chills,
No rent to pay and no doctor bills.

No bugaboos of welfare state,
Screeched forth at him from frenzied pate,
To mar his sweet monotony,
As lolled, clad he, in nature's botany.

His precious freedoms, three in all,
He always had at beck and call.
His life was full as was his paunch,
No Gabrielson at him could "faunch."

Dear Harry's talks, he never heard
Nor those of prudish goppy-birds.
The lobby "gelt" and selfish greed,
His life's fat plan did not impede.

At friendly man he bold leered out,
With rightist jungle mien and pout,
As if he knew that apes like him
Ran loose and wild amidst life's din.

Who would not love to emulate,
The life of old Gargantua the Great?
Fine home, fine care and yea, well fed,
Then off to Yale when you are dead.

Query: If an ape can fare so well, why cannot human beings fare better?

Will Fight for Silver

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report recently has committed the absurdity of recommending the repeal of the Silver Purchase Act and suggests that the Government buy no more silver for coinage purposes. As may be expected, Senator GREEN of Rhode Island, front man for the silver fabricators and arch-enemy of monetary silver, has taken the opportunity to introduce a bill to give force to the recommendations of the joint

committee The cheaper the price of raw silver and the higher the price of tableware, the better the dapper Senator from Rhode Island likes it.

In spite of these moves, the New York Times reports that there is a growing interest among western countries in the coinage of silver. This I consider to be a healthy trend. In the case of silver we have a curious and perhaps unparalleled situation where the silver miner is subsidizing the Treasury—hence the average citizen—rather than getting subsidies from the Government. Every ounce the silver miner sells to the Treasury at ninety-odd cents becomes worth $1.29 when coined into dollars, thus making the general public a profit of 30 cents at the expense of the miner.

The late Senator Key Pittman, of Nevada, fought all his life for the Silver Purchase Act, and I intend to continue the fight with all I am worth. I shall oppose the efforts of any eastern Congressman to repeal this act which is so vital to the state of Nevada and western silver producers.

A Brave Little Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic, entitled "A Brave Little Band":

A BRAVE LITTLE BAND

Edward A. Rumely, accused of acting for Germany in World War I, has extended his activities to a new organization called Fighters for Freedom, an offshoot of the Committee for Constitutional Government.

Rumely's name doesn't appear in any of the advance promotion material his organization is putting out, but transmittal and business letters are signed by him as executive secretary. On the letterhead are the names of Dr. Willford I. King, as chairman, and Sumner Gerard as treasurer, plus a partial list of trustees and advisory board, including ex-Senator Edward H. Moore, Tulsa, Okla.; Frank E. Gannett, Rochester, N. Y.; Lamar Fleming, Jr., of Houston, Tex., and others.

The FFF is commencing an advertising and personal-fund-solicitation campaign among business and professional men who can be scared by the threat of a socialist-labor-union conspiracy to take over the Government. The organization argues: If you don't give us $50 or $100 or $500, then the labor unions, which are organizing politically, will move in to get the Taft-Hartley Act repealed and bring on a welfare state, and the only way to stop that is for businessmen to organize politically.

In Texas, the organizing drive is scheduled to begin soon after the first of the year, with Dallas and Fort Worth as the starting points. The FFF sets 1,460,000 as its Nation-wide minimum membership goal—1 percent of the population in each community. With that minimum membership, the propaganda says, "each radiating his or her influence to five or eight others, this 1 percent can build a block strong enough to tip the scales at the bar of public opinion and reverse the drift into socialism."

As an important part in the campaign, the FFF plans to distribute 2,000,000 copies of John T. Flynn's The Road Ahead, which it describes as the most important book of this decade. It exposes how, in secret, planners at top level in Washington have been working for a stealthy revolution in collaboration with labor monopolists, according to one letter. The legislation they have forced through fits together as the pieces of a jigsaw puzzle, each piece part of a general plan to drive America into collectivism exactly as have the Fabians in collaboration with British trade-unions in England.

The FFF divides its fighters into four classifications: Group A, or grass-roots fighters (goal: 1,250,000), will pay $2 and will get limited amounts of literature. Group B, or associate fighters (goal: 500,000), will pay $5 and will get more literature, including biweekly mailings from Representative RALPH GWINN, Republican, New York, and Dr. King. Group C, or cooperating fighters (goal: 250,000), will pay $10 and will get more literature. Group D, the sustaining fighters (goal: 50,000), will qualify by contributing $25 or more or by buying that much literature.

Telegram of New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following telegram:

NEW ORLEANS, LA., *January 19, 1950.*
Congressman OTTO PASSMAN,
House Office Building:

The New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association, at a special meeting, adopted in resolution form the following press statement of Mr. Ben J. Williams and respectfully call it to your attention. It will be appreciated if you will insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as the quickest and best means of calling it to the attention of other Members. Your expressions to Mr. Wilson are greatly appreciated.

"The report from unofficial but authoritative sources that the Federal Government is about to engage in the barter of American cotton for critical materials is causing wide concern. Such a program is viewed as threatening to the commodity marketing system as well as the whole structure of private enterprise," Ben J. Williams, prominent New Orleans cotton merchant, said today.

"It is expected that businessmen everywhere will join commodity merchants and traders in taking immediate steps to acquaint the Congress with public disapproval of such a plan. A barter program is both contrary to proven methods of trade and a threat to our own economy and that of other nations," Mr. Williams stated. "Since price is normally arrived at on the basis of supply and demand, the principal danger of exchange of goods for goods is that price becomes unimportant. The sale price of cotton exported against a barter transaction may be fixed at a completely arbitrary level—at whatever price is deemed necessary to offset prices also arbitrarily set for the things imported. Therefore, this deviation from the established system of buying and selling through separate and distinct competitive channels will be ruinous," Mr. Williams continued. "Hardest hit will be small business, because the break-down of our established marketing procedure will result in only large corporations with world-wide organizations participating in what is done. It is hard to understand how our Government can consider the substitution of peremptory methods for free enterprise at home on one hand and condemn the same bureaucratic domination of individual rights by other nations. It is likewise difficult to understand the thinking behind a program which will destroy the very fundamental values we have and are spending billions of dollars to salvage out of a chaotic world situation," Mr. Williams concluded.

J. E. GOULD,
President, New Orleans Spot Cotton Merchants' Association.

Put the Peril Point Back in the Reciprocal Trade Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, there is now on the lawbooks of this land a measure known as the Reciprocal Trade Act, a statute which has as its stated—and very worth-while—aim the breaking down of trade barriers between the United States and other nations. I am very favorable to the aim and favorable to the principle of world trade insofar as it can be carried on without undermining the economic enterprises of the United States. But I do not want to have a treaty which, in effect, disregards protection to American factories, to American working men, and to American farmers.

The bill as it stands today allows the State Department to carry out reciprocal trade agreements with various nations. It allows the State Department to say to those nations, if it desires, that the United States will reciprocate for their favors by allowing our own industries to go into bankruptcy.

In the Eightieth Congress a new clause was written into the Reciprocal Trade Act—a clause which required the establishment of what is called the peril point at which importation of cheap foreign goods or products would be destructive to American industry or agriculture producing a similar item. In extending this act the first session of the Eighty-first Congress eliminated this section.

Restoration of this peril-point clause will not erect the tariff walls of years ago around these United States. It will not prohibit competition, nor will it restrict it unduly. What it does is assure that foreign producers will not be able to take unfair advantage of the wages they pay workers in order to mass-produce cheaply for American consumption. Fair competition will then be maintained—as it should be—on the basis of the quality of goods rather than on how low a wage can be paid to a worker.

If the Truman administration would rather have the United States act as a society for promoting economic uplift among our overseas friends instead of collecting money for our depleted Treasury, let it hint to foreign manufacturers that they might spend some of their money which might otherwise go to tariffs on improving the lot of their workers.

Let me cite an example of how the reciprocal agreements affect industry. Many thousands of Californians depend upon lumbering for their livelihood. The employees receive wages of about $1.45 an hour for their work, while in Canada workers in the lumber mills receive 95 cents an hour. This amounts to $4 a day less pay for a Canadian worker than for an American. It requires one logger and one millworker about 1 day to produce 1,000 board feet of lumber. This means a cost of $8 more per 1,000 feet to produce lumber in the United States than in Canada. Since Canada does not have the 3-percent excise tax on freight shipments—a tax which, incidentally, I am seeking to equalize through passage of H. R. 3374—it costs her lumber producers less to ship to market. Thus they can sell on the American market much more cheaply than American firms can. In boom times, this differential is not easily noticeable since all the output of American mills is bought. But when the demand for building materials is contracting—as, indeed, it is today—the pinch is on. Cheap foreign lumber is bought; American lumber goes begging. Americans, who have worked for many years to achieve and maintain a high standard of living, will be thrown out of work. The poison of unemployment will choke off the arteries of commerce, for without purchasing power by our workers there can be but one result—a slow-down of the Nation's economic life.

The fishing industry, too, faces ruinous competition from abroad. An unskilled male worker in the California fishing industry is paid $1.55 an hour. If no protection is afforded to the industry and to this worker, American-caught fish would have to compete on the open market with fish caught by a Japanese fisherman earning the equivalent of 31 cents, American money, for an entire day's work. There is no assurance under the existing law that foreign fish, such as that from Japan, could not be brought into the United States in greater and greater quantities and dumped onto the market to the detriment of the American producer.

Take for another example the producing of olive oil. In 1948, 15,554,968 pounds of edible olive oil was imported from Italy and Greece. Despite the fact that olive oil produced in California was filling the warehouses to capacity, the President saw fit last year to reduce the duty on Italian olive oil packaged in drums of less than 40 pounds from 8 to 4¾ cents per pound; and on Italian and Greek olive oil, packed in drums of more than 40 pounds, from 6½ to 3¼ cents per pound. Such reductions have proven ruinous to the California olive-oil industry.

California also has an extensive almond-growing industry. The Mediterranean nations, with a climate similar to California's, also produce large quantities of almonds. These nuts are shipped to the United States for consumption. The situation in this case is much the same as in the olive-oil industry; there is ruinous competition from abroad. Have not our producers a right to protection by our Government against economic aggression from outsiders?

Just today I have been informed that a cut in the present low tariff rate on brined cherries—the raw material for maraschino cherries—is on the new list for possible cutting this year under the Reciprocal Trade Act. Already there is a surplus of such cherries on the Pacific coast, yet it is proposed that the duties be lowered to allow more Italian cherries into this country for cutthroat competition. More sweet cherries today are brined than are canned; in California, Oregon, and Washington, brined cherries account for 28 percent of the annual crop. A substantial volume of brined cherries come from other States, too—principally from Michigan, New York, Wisconsin, and Pennsylvania. A cut in the tariffs at this time would be ruinous to the cherry industry.

The peril-point legislation I propose asks only that the employers and employees of industries have a chance to be heard before the nonpolitical and nonpartisan Tariff Commission prior to the State Department's entrance into reciprocal trade treaties. The Commission has only the power to investigate and recommend. The Commission would determine the peril point below which importation would be damaging to domestic industries. If the President desired to reduce the tariffs lower than this figure, he would then be required to obtain approval by the Congress.

I favor full employment throughout the entire world. But I oppose our creating such full employment through deliberately allowing idleness and unemployment in our own United States.

Lee Evans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer:

LEE EVANS

It is all in the day's work for a newspaper reporter to write obituaries or for an editorialist to pen tributes to leading citizens when they pass away. It is a little different when they are doing a piece on a colleague—and particularly on a colleague who held such a warm spot in the hearts of his fellow workers as did Lee Evans.

Lee Evans was a member of the Enquirer staff from January 1914, until January 1950, and that is a long time. During this period he served as a reporter, financial editor, city editor, and more recently, as head of this newspaper's New York bureau.

Mr. Evans was a man of fine understanding and deep feeling. He had real affection for the multitude of persons he genuinely liked and a fine tolerance for the far fewer people for whom he cared little.

Dozens of able nwspapermen today can thank Lee Evans for their starts to successful careers. He always was willing to lend a helping hand to boys who wanted to become journalists, and he did help many of them. He was an unusual character, honest to the core, and a first-rate newspaperman.

Lee Evans counted his friends by the hundreds and they were in all walks of life. These men and women will miss him but, most of all, he will be missed by his fellow workers on the Enquirer who knew and loved him best.

The Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I had the pleasure of addressing the Milwaukee Junior Bar Association in my home city on December 12 and, permission being granted, wish to insert in the RECORD my speech before that group on the welfare state.

The address follows:

I once read a poem—or a sort of poem—by a very modern writer indeed, Gertrude Stein. She is, in fact, so modern that many think she has become completely unintelligible. She starts this one in a fashion that is certainly at the least unusual. The opening words are printed in a circle and go, if you wish to read them in this sequence: "Rose is a rose is a rose is a." Or if you prefer to start at another point: "Is a rose is a rose is a rose?"

Recently I was reminded of this ring-around-the-rosy by two articles that I read in order to prepare myself for this particular occasion. Since I myself am a legislator, rather than a lawyer, I thought I might be better equipped to discuss the—shall we call them legal—aspects of some of the current political questions if I learned more of the legal point of view, so I glanced through the most recent copies of the periodical which, I gather, is the official organ of the legal profession, the Journal of the American Bar Association.

The two articles which interested me particularly were on the subject with which I, in my capacity as Congressman, am as closely concerned as any lawyer—the welfare state. One was written by a gentleman from Alabama, Mr. William Logan Martin, who, I understand, is not only a member of the Alabama bar, but is a representative to the American Bar Association's house of delegates. The other was written by a man to whom the members of the legal profession gave the recognition of electing president of the American Bar Association, Mr. Frank E. Holman.

These two treatises, although different in style, are extremely similar in content. They are both on the subject of the welfare state—called variously by the two distinguished authors by what they consider equivalent terms of opprobrium—"welfare state," "statism," "socialism," and "social justice." They both start with the premise that since the time of Mr. Franklin Delano Roosevelt, this country has been—not drifting, but catapulting—down the road toward totalitarian-

ism, and that the shocking reason for this shocking fact is the Government's presumably new-found concern with the security of the masses of its people.

ARGUMENTS NOT NEW

These arguments are not exactly novel to me. I have heard them before. In fact, in studying the history of our country, I have come across them many times. But I must admit that I have never read statements so frank and direct in presenting this viewpoint since I marveled at a pronouncement made by John D. Rockefeller in the eighteen seventies—another story about a rose—when he said blandly, "The growth of a large business is merely a survival of the fittest. The American Beauty rose can be produced in the splendor and fragrance which bring cheer to its beholder only by sacrificing the early buds which grow up around it. This is not an evil tendency in business. It is merely the working out of a law of nature and a law of God."

After my reminiscent gasp of amazement, I decided to read the articles more carefully. After all, since I had not had legal training, I thought I might have missed the point. Possibly this was a technique used by lawyers in order to put their own positions into a sharper and more dramatic contrast. So I went on reading.

This is what I found. First, a welfare state, as defined by Mr. Holman, is a state "which provides for the social and economic well-being of the citizenry." That sounded fine to me. But, continues Mr. Holman, by that very fact, it is—and I quote again—"a form of collectivism."

Secondly, a state concerned with the welfare of its people is unconstitutional. Third, such a form of government is beyond the remotest conception of the founders of this country.

Those are the three major general conclusions. But these gentlemen do not limit themselves to generalities. They are quite specific. They itemize, carefully, and in logical sequence, the particular pieces of legislation that support their thesis. And this is an even more fascinating study.

BAR PRESIDENT AGAINST RACIAL EQUALITY

Mr. Holman is primarily concerned with what he considers the dangerous and foreign-inspired theory of racial equality. He argues vehemently against it, asserting that our forefathers, when they declared "all men are created equal" did not at all mean social or economic equality, but merely—and in case you may think I am taking liberties with his presentation, I give you his own words again—"intended to permit any inequalities to rest solely on the basis of actual differences in personality and ability." It is therefore, the president of the American Bar Association deduces, not only a historical fallacy, but basically unconstitutional, for the Government to interest itself in civil liberties, or to do anything to assist in equalizing opportunity.

Mr. Holman carries this argument all the way to the Supreme Court, and questions the constitutionality of the Court's recent decision, which declared that anyone who was able to buy property must be allowed to live on it. This seems to me to place so eminent a lawyer in a curious position. It is my understanding that the Supreme Court is the arm of the Government which has the right to decide on the constitutionality of laws made by nonlegal persons such as myself. Or is it, not the administration, but the very basis of our Government itself that Mr. Holman is questioning?

The defender of the Constitution does not stop with his theory of racial inequality. He also despairs of other things. He considers the idea of Federal aid to education equally vicious and un-American. The fact that Federal assistance to educational institutions was started in 1806, by Thomas Jefferson, would not, I think, convince him. After all, if Mr. Holman had lived in those days—and I wonder, perhaps, whether he still doesn't—he would very probably have been against such Government interference even then. I'm sure he, like many of his Federalist contemporaries, would have considered Mr. Jefferson a dangerous revolutionary. In fact, he would probably have called him a republican—a term then associated with the French Revolution and used with as much abhorrence as the author of this current tirade attaches to the words "social justice."

Mr. Martin agrees entirely with Mr. Holman on all the points I have mentioned. But he goes into more detail. He itemizes all the social legislation which—he seems to think—sprang full-grown from the pagan head of Franklin Roosevelt—social security, labor legislation, farm-price supports, public utilities, and public housing—and blasts all these with the same logic and virulence that his colleague used. These are the things, he announces, that lead to communism—that are unconstitutional—that our forefathers would never have thought of.

But there are more. Under President Truman, Mr. Martin thinks, the Fair Deal makes even the New Deal look old. He uses pages of small print exposing the enormity of the Government's interest in the health of the Nation. And he spends his best prose efforts being horrified in elaborate language at the two new proposals which he, as a member of the bar, is now fighting most actively. According to Mr. Martin, you all, as fellow members, will immediately recognize what these two issues are. Which two recent proposals are the most illegal, the most destructive, to our system of government—the most dangerous to the welfare of cultivated and white and Christian people?

HUMAN-RIGHTS CONVENTION CRITICIZED

I am amazed that you do not seem to identify these proposals automatically. Mr. Martin assures me no member of the legal profession could possibly be blind to the perils of the proposed convention on human rights. Apparently our representatives to the United Nations—not only Mrs. Roosevelt, who, of course, might by some be regarded as contaminated by humanity—but, if I am not mistaken, including, at that time, that great protagonist of social progress, Mr. John Foster Dulles—apparently these two, among many others, were so blinded.

But not so the member of the Alabama bar. It is presumably a shocking thing that a statement should even be proposed—particularly in the company of other nations—which attempts to secure to all persons these basic civil and political rights: The right to life; the right to protection against torture, slavery, forced labor, arbitrary arrest or detention; the right to freedom of movement and residence; the right to a fair and public hearing; the right to freedom of religion, assembly, and association; and the right to the equal protection of the law.

To attempt to secure these rights for all mankind—this is the monstrous hoax Mr. Martin claims would violate and abolish the rights of the individual—and would be the last step toward a totalitarian state.

The second pitfall the lawyer from Alabama is afraid we shall plunge into—and which he points out the President has already sent to the Senate for ratification—is the Genocide Convention. Do you realize the dangers of this subversive document? This is a statement, again worked out with trial and tribulation in the United Nations, and with the participation of revolutionaries such as members of our Department of State—proposing, in essence, to prevent the mass slaughter of any race—no matter how much Mr. Martin doesn't like it.

There have been, recently in the world's history, incidents which suggest why these wicked people at Lake Success thought such a convention relevant. You may have read in the paper only a few weeks ago of the discovery of a new mass grave which answered the question of where some of the millions of Jewish bodies had been hidden—bodies which a man named Hitler had ordered killed because he didn't like their race.

But to propose the outlawing of the crime of genocide, and for nations to agree to punish any individual who commits this crime—this Mr. Martin calls the "destruction of the 'indestructible union of the indestructible states'."

I realize I have gone into considerable detail discussing two articles—or shall I call them philosophies—which I do not, and I am sure you do not, sponsor. But I make no apologies. I have done it partly because I find them quite literally breath taking, and partly because I think it important to discuss with you the opinions—almost the official voice—of your profession. Primarily, however, I have presented these legal anachronisms in such detail because they state my own position so clearly. All you need to do is start at another point in that circle of "rose-is-a-rose-is-a-rose."

Actually these articles show more clearly than I would otherwise have known how to do—exactly why I am for everything their authors are against.

May I review again some of the key statements to show what I mean?

JUSTICE DOUGLAS DISAGREES

Mr. Holman's definition of the welfare state is, in my opinion, excellent—a state "which provides for the social and economic well-being of its citizenry." It is only that he thinks this is a communistic goal, and I think it is the very heart of our democracy. As Mr. Justice William O. Douglas put it—and he, I gather, can be considered as quite as learned in the law as the president of the American Bar Association:

"The human welfare state is the great political invention of the twentieth century. It is the instrument of politics that the Communists fear above all else. * * * The greatest assets of a nation, greater than any material resources, are its men and women. The industrial system was designed to serve mankind. Human welfare is the measure of its service. There is a place for justice in the factories as well as the courts. Human rights transcend property rights."

And later he states: "We place our faith in a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual yet secures the masses in their basic needs."

I am, of course, not so well equipped as any one of you here to argue the legal aspects of the charge that an interest in human welfare is unconstitutional. However, long before the present era—long enough ago to be nostalgically acceptable to the most unreconstructed southern legal practitioner, in 1837—Justice Barbour, of the Supreme Court of the United States, handed down a decision which said in part:

"It is not only the right but the bounden and solemn duty of a state to advance the safety, happiness, and prosperity of its people and to provide for its general welfare."

A hundred years later this opinion was reaffirmed and extended by another distinguished jurist, also a member of the Supreme Court of our land, when Mr. Justice Cardozo stated for the Court:

"Congress may spend money in aid of the general welfare. * * * The purge of the Nation-wide calamity that began in 1929 has taught us many lessons, not least, of the solidarity of interests that may once have seemed to be divided. * * * The problem is mainly national in area and dimensions. Moreover, laws of the separate States cannot deal with it effectively. Congress, at least, had a basis for that belief. * * * Only a power that is national can serve the interests of all."

WELFARE IS LEGITIMATE CONCERN

In view of these legal opinions, I think I have a sound basis, grounded in law, for my contention that an interest—and an active interest—in the general welfare is a legitimate concern of government. But there is another basic argument—a sort of obbligato that runs through both the Bar Journal compositions—a plaintive repetition that "our forefathers would not have done this." Here, again, I am in perfect accord. I am sure that the theory of a state concerned with social security, with public housing, with industrial relationships, with farm-price supports, was, in the words of Mr. Holman, "not conceived by our forefathers."

I can only add that in the eighteenth century, in an almost totally agrarian economy, years before the industrial revolution, before steam and electricity, in the time of small-farm owners, each of whom could produce for himself more than enough food for his own needs—at that time in our and in the world's history it would have seemed rather odd for our forefathers to base their plans on a twentieth-century civilization. Even the imaginative men who form our Union could hardly have been expected to visualize modern factories and skyscrapers, radios, and airplanes. It seems to me that what these gentlemen are saying is much like crying out, "Take a horse," to the driver of a 1950 convertible.

So I am not dismayed by the fact that our ancestors did not conceive of the necessity for certain kinds of social legislation—I would be much more startled if they had. However, there is one point I think our two historians ignore. These same progenitors of our democracy felt strongly and deeply the need for defending it, and took every measure they knew in order to preserve it.

When Thomas Jefferson argued passionately for States' rights, it was at a time when the new Federal Government was dominated by the bankers and a few rich landowners. The democratic participation of the people was in those days only possible in the local communities. Jefferson was defending, not the prerogatives of the states to supersede the Nation, but the prerogatives of the people—of the masses of the people—as opposed to the interests of the small wealthy group who were trying to take control of the Government.

When Andrew Jackson vetoed the Bank Charter, it was because he considered that the bank would make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and he proclaimed it his duty to take a stand against all new grants * * * of exclusive privileges, against any prostitution of our Government to the advancement of the few at the expense of the many.

When Lincoln had the sad obligation to lead the Nation into a civil war, it was because he believed the responsibility of the Nation to all its people came before the economic interest of some of the States in maintaining slavery—that human rights came above States' rights.

And this, I think, is perhaps the most important issue of all. The president of the bar association twists the meaning of our forefathers by a redefinition of the statement that all men are created equal. He turns this into all men are not created equal. It is an interesting reinterpretation. He makes it, because, he argues, otherwise the shiftless and the industrious would have to be considered equal. And, of course, therefore there would be no more incentive for private enterprise.

I find these arguments extraordinary. I never knew that equality of opportunity was equivalent to the division of the world's goods into equal portions. But since we do not live in 1789, as Mr. Holman seems to deplore, what kind of government would we have if we did not at least try to equalize the chances for everyone?

REAL EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY

If Mr. Holman had been black instead of white, if he had been a factory worker instead of a member of the bar, he might well listen differently to words such as those of Woodrow Wilson, who in his first inaugural address, pointed out that:

"There can be no equality of opportunity, if men and women and children be not shielded in their lives, their very vitality, from the consequences of great industrial and social processes which they cannot alter, control, or singly cope with. Society must see to it that it does not itself crush or weaken or damage its own constituent parts. The first duty of law is to keep sound the society it serves. Sanitary laws, pure-food laws, and laws determining conditions of labor which individuals are powerless to determine for themselves are intimate parts of the very business of justice and legal efficiency."

Mr. Martin goes even further than his colleague in his denunciation of the interference of government in defending human rights. He not only considers the protection of human rights an inappropriate function for the Federal Government, or for the nations of the world. He believes that genocide—homicide compounded—should not be considered a crime, or at the most, that no one should be punished for it if the very persons who committed it do not so wish it. Do you by any chance notice any similarity between this point of view and some of the lynching trials that have taken place in Mr. Martin's part of the country?

But again, the definitions made by Messrs. Holman and Martin are excellent. I, too, think the concept of the welfare state is inseparable from an acceptance—more than that, an insistence—on the rights of all people to be treated as human beings, and to have equal opportunities and equal justice.

So, altogether, these two legal writers have helped to state my position succinctly. I believe a welfare state is a state concerned with the welfare of all its people not only with the interests of the few and powerful. I believe such a state in the society of today must make provision for the social and economic security of its members, since society is so constructed that there are many factors beyond the control of the individual. I believe that in an industrial system, where the machine might otherwise dominate the man, and the employer the employee, the Government has an obligation to see that the worker is protected in his right to work. I believe that in a country dedicated to free enterprise, the Government must be responsible for protecting free enterprise against the encroachment of monopolies. And above all, I believe that a country rooted in the concept that all men are created equal should be the leader of the world in carrying that concept to the far corners of the globe.

My two legal references concluded their denunciations with an exhortation to the legal profession, in the important and strategic posts they hold throughout the country—to put aside personal ambition in order to preserve our Nation against destructive forces. I can do no more than echo their sentiments. And I am convinced that as members of a profession which should, above all others, know the meaning and stand for the principles of justice, and as Americans, who should, above all other nationals, know the meaning and stand for the principles of democracy, you will agree with me—not with those two isolated legal secessionists—that we have no other course, except to preserve our system from the dangers of both the right and the left. To accomplish this, we have grave responsibilities, responsibilities of which we were reminded by President Roosevelt in the dark days of 1938, when he warned us:

"Democracy has disappeared in several other great nations, not because the people of those nations disliked democracy, but because they had grown tired of unemployment and insecurity. * * * In desperation they chose to sacrifice liberty in the hope of getting something to eat. We in America know that our democratic institutions can be preserved and made to work. But in order to preserve them we need * * * to prove that the practical operation of democratic government is equal to the task of protecting the security of the people."

One World

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from an outstanding American who, because of his experience and training, has a wide and accurate knowledge of foreign affairs, comes a copy of a letter written to a member of another body.

This letter is so timely, so thoroughly American in its sentiment, that it is printed herewith:

JANUARY 19, 1950.

Hon. WALTER J. MAHONEY,
Chairman, Finance Committee
of the Senate,
Capitol, Albany, N. Y.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I have known you for some time by reputation as one of the ablest members of the senate, and you may be sure that I do not question the sincerity of your belief that by the development of a world government, peace can be assured to the world. While I differ with you in regard to this proposition, I trust you will credit me with equal sincerity in the expression of the belief, that had you lived among the teeming millions in India and Burma, even for a brief period, as I did in my youth—not merely traveling but actually living in the jungles among the people—you would hardly be inclined to sponsor the resolution you now have before the senate.

I say this, not because I think you would have been prejudiced against these people by reason of their color or their race—certainly, I was not, and that this lack of prejudice was reciprocated was proved by the circumstance that one man whose life I saved in upper Burma, and another to whom I had rendered some service in Ceylon, on bended knees and with their hands around my ankles, sought to enter my service for life—but, because I think you would have appreciated that these people, by and large, can only be governed by some form of paternalistic dictatorship. The historic native style was as often kindly as harsh. The British system was unquestionably irritating but benevolent. However, since the evacuation, I venture to believe that it will be the ultimate fate of all India to bear the Russian yoke.

Inasmuch as you may wonder at my basis for advancing this contention, perhaps I should say that for 9 months during World War I, as an officer of the United States Army, I was assigned to collaborate with a representative of the British Government in connection with the revolutionary movement in India insofar as it affected the interests of the United States. For this reason, I believe that I know who had a large part in instigating the revolutionary movement, and who fostered it after the war against Germany was concluded. That, however, is

another story. In any event, all Asia has a population of approximately one billion and a quarter. Popular government to this mass of human beings is a chimera but if ever this great horde could be made to understand its principles, Asia could outvote the world and her ideologies would be supreme.

In a comprehensive study of war initiated by the University of Chicago in 1926, which was carried forward under the direction of Prof. Quincy Wright, you will find a statement to the affect that a list of all revolutions, insurrections, interventions, punitive expeditions, pacifications, and explorations involving the use of armed forces would probably be more than 10 times as long as the 278 wars listed between the years 1500 and 1940. You will also find that although the United States had been involved in only 12 wars in its history, according to Professor Wright, it was in addition engaged in over 170 distinct military campaigns. (Cf. A Study of War, p. 636, et seq.) In other words, the inference is inescapable that the mere creation of a great state like our Federal Union does not preclude the possibility, and, I should be inclined rather to say, the inevitability of war.

The Pax Romana was probably the nearest thing to universal peace the world ever attained. It was a peace imposed upon a mixed and discordant population by a ruthless dictatorship and supported by a magnificent army. When that army became corrupted and was infiltrated by recruits derived from subject people, the Roman Empire collapsed. That result was, of course, as inevitable as it was logical.

Let us be realistic, Senator, so I ask you what kind of an army can we conceive would come into existence to support a world government today, if its recruits were apportioned fairly among all the peoples of the world. Who would command such an army? Our people represent only 6 percent of the world's population, so I venture to say, that on the basis of popular representation we certainly would not be in control, at least not for long after we surrendered the position we now hold.

In a speech entitled "Un-American Internationalism," delivered in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, June 14, 1949, by Congressman ROY O. WOODRUFF, an important point was brought out which should not be lost to sight. "There is," said Congressman WOODRUFF, "actually in existence today a government whose fundamental purpose is known to be the establishment of the supremacy of its system over all peoples of the earth. I refer, of course, to the Soviet Union. The population of that country is composed of 182 different nationalities, speaking 149 different languages or dialects, and the Government of the Soviet Union only maintains itself in power by the exercise of a ruthless dictatorship, which is utterly unthinkable to people who believe in popular self-government.

Let me add to this quotation that it is, I believe, common knowledge that the Soviet Government now has under restraint in terrible concentration camps some ten to fifteen million of its people.

As I, and the people associated with me in the American Coalition, which is an organization of 85 of the leading patriotic societies in our country, believe in a government of the people and by the people, as set forth by Lincoln in his Gettysburg Address, we cannot contemplate, therefore, with equanimity the submergence of our system in a world government composed of people who, by traditions, customs, and habits of life belong, or are subject to the control of, wholly different ideologies, and, above all, of widely divergent interests.

The United States at the present moment, and has, since we granted the loan of $3,750,000,000 to Great Britain, been supporting a Socialist government whose fundamental program is, in substance, like that laid down by Karl Marx. It differs in fact only in a minor degree from the professed ideals now set forth by the rulers of Soviet Russia. Likewise, we are financing regimes on the continent of Europe which are socialistic in character, and differ only in varying degrees from that of Britain and Russia in the ideologies professed by their rulers. In other words, we are paying for the maintenance in power of a number of these governments, who, by reason of their special interests only are not, at this moment, sympathetic with those in control of the Soviet Government in Moscow .

I suggest, my dear Senator, that the only way concord can be maintained between such divergent interests in the ultimate is by force ruthlessly applied. For my part, and that of my associates in the American coalition, it seems that the United States can render a greater service to humanity by upholding the torch of liberty as an example to the world than in burying our sovereignty in a world government. We Americans in the American Coalition loathe fascism, we detest communism, and we abhor all forms of dictatorship.

Now, let me say a few words regarding the economic aspects of this proposal. I have before me a copy of a leaflet entitled "Beliefs, Purposes, and Policies," of the United World Federalists, Inc., and I see on the second page:

"Resolved, That a world federal government must initially be based upon the following principles and include the following powers:

"PRINCIPLES

"1. Basic structure: The world federal government should include the following basic organs: (a) a world legislature to enact all laws necessary to carry out the functions delegated to the world federal government; (b) a world executive agency to administer and enforce the laws; (c) world courts to interpret the constitution and laws, and to try and to sentence lawbreakers.

* * * * *

"4. Enforcement of world law: World law should be enforceable directly upon individuals.

* * * * *

"7. Revenue: The world federal government should have authority to raise dependable revenue under a carefully defined and limited but direct taxing power independent of national taxation."

There is the program. If it goes into effect, we would cease to be free. We would be a minority of 6 percent in the face of 94 percent of the world population. What that means I suggest would be well set forth in an analysis of the races of the world and their degrees of civilization. The Dictionary of Races and Peoples, published by the Immigration Commission of the Senate in 1911, is a source authority to which I respectfully refer you. We Americans would be subject to tribunals manned by people foreign to us in a multitude of ways. In this connection I suggest a rereading of our Declaration of Independence.

Finally, consider the power to tax which it is proposed to confer upon the superstate which the world federalists envisage. It is a well-worn, but, nevertheless, true axiom that the power to tax is the power to destroy.

I venture to say, Senator, that it is no answer to assert that the taxing power would be limited under the constitution of the world government because once our country entered the arms of this Frankenstein our power to resist unjust impositions would be gone, and our right to secede is specifically denied in the program.

There is, my dear Senator, in a magazine entitled "American Affairs," volume X, No. 3, dated July 1948, an extremely interesting article entitled "How To Equalize the Wealth of the World." In this article it sets forth, in substance, that, according to the latest estimates (1938–39), the population of the world amounts to 2,145,000,000. A corresponding estimate of the population of the United States at that time was 130,000,000, or around 6 percent of the world's total population.

The article also sets forth that the wealth of the world amounts to $1,100,000,000,000, and that of the United States around $330,000,000,000, or 30 percent of the total.

The income of the world is given as around $210,000,000,000, and the income of the United States, as of 1940, from $72,000,000,000 to $75,000,000,000, or a percentage of the world's total of 34 to 36 percent.

Now let me quote from the article:

"In order to establish equality throughout the world, the United States must retain only her per capita share of the total world income, i. e., she must reduce her income to 6 percent of the total, and must give away the remaining 30 percent of the world income which she now holds, so that 94 percent of the population outside the United States will also receive 94 percent of the world income. This operation would theoretically raise the rest of the world to an average per capita income of one unit—which is a theoretical gain of 50 percent from the present average. But the average citizen of the United States would, in the process, lose five-sixths of his income."

Now, Senator, let me suggest to you as a practical politician, that in the face of the virtual bankruptcy of the world, the inevitable result of our submergence in a world government would be the reapportionment of our wealth and the destruction of our immigration barriers, so that the overpopulation of Europe and Asia could swarm upon us and destroy the magnificent structure, whose foundations were laid by the men who brought about our separation from the British Empire.

This is a long letter, and I trust that you will pardon the scope which it encompasses, but the subject, I believe, is vital to the continuance of our existence, and that is my excuse for burdening you with this communication.

Respectfully yours.

JOHN B. TREVOR.

A Good Tag Game

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an editorial from the Christian Science Monitor of January 18, 1950:

A GOOD TAG GAME

Republican leaders have come up with two fresh ideas in the new session of Congress. One is a dud and the other a dandy. The first is the notion that next November's election is going to be one on the island of Formosa. The project for military intervention would play Moscow's game by fastening Chinese attention on "American imperialism" while Russia seizes Manchuria. It's a game that holds many pitfalls, few votes.

But the second idea—that of putting price tags on Fair Deal projects—carries a lot of promise. The idea of telling the people how much each slice of Truman pie-in-the-sky is going to cost strikes us as not only good

sport but good politics. It's a fair game, for the administration has either refused or neglected to let the voter know what the bill will be for several of its more glamorous offerings. For instance, the Brannan farm plan and the Ewing medical insurance plan have been well advertised—with the price tag carefully omitted.

A really fair deal would give citizens an honest accounting. And we trust that if the Republicans start this tag game they will be scrupulously careful to give accurate and clear statements of the cost for each project before Congress—including their own pets. Of course, there are some folk to whom prices mean nothing—especially if they think somebody else is paying. For this reason it might be useful to tell voters who think they pay no taxes how much each project will cost in hidden taxes—of which the average family pays $700 a year.

But we believe the great majority of Americans are honestly ready to pay their own way—refusing to buy when they can't. Even those willing to "charge it" want to see the price tag. Let's have the goods on the counter, plainly marked.

Power Grabbers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of December 22, 1948:

POWER GRABBERS

Representative EBERHARTER reports that 25 percent of the House Members have responded to his recent proposal for curbing the dictatorial Rules Committee, and nearly all the replies are favorable. If this reform is adequately presented to Members of the House, it will probably have the support of a large majority. For the average Congressman is interested in getting legislation enacted and is as disgusted as other citizens when the Rules Committee takes upon itself the responsibility of saying that the House shall not vote on measures that a majority may favor.

Legislators of the Seventy-ninth Congress will remember that when the House Labor Committee reported out a labor-relations bill the Rules Committee impertinently discarded it and gave a special rule to the much more drastic Case bill. The latter bill had been introduced only 2 days previously and had never been considered by a legislative committee. In other words, the Rules Committee usurped the function of the Labor Committee and disrupted the orderly process of lawmaking instead of aiding it. This year the Rules Committee forced the emasculation of the Taft-Ellender-Wagner bill before permitting it to go to the floor. It was responsible in very large measure for the defeat of that bill and thus contributed immeasurably to the Republican debacle in November.

Of course, the House never intended to give any small group of men such arbitrary power. It created the Rules Committee only to facilitate the flow of legislation by granting priority to important bills and prescribing conditions under which they may be debated. The rule makers have come to be dictators only because House leaders and a long-suffering membership have tolerated that breach of trust. Once before the House surrendered its powers of legislation in accord with the wishes of the majority, but those abuses were swept away in the revolt against Uncle Joe Cannon in 1910. Now another uprising must curb the powers of the Rules Committee if the House is to become a reliable instrument of the popular will. The first duty of every progressive, democratic, and liberal-minded Representative in the Eighty-first Congress will be to reduce the power-grabbing Rules Committee to its proper status as a legislative traffic director.

Real Estate Road Show

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include in the RECORD an article appearing in the January 2, 1950, issue of the New Republic entitled "Real Estate Road Show":

REAL ESTATE ROAD SHOW

Unable to defeat the slum-clearance and public-housing sections of the Housing Act in Congress last session, the real-estate lobby is putting pressure on local city councils throughout the country to refuse Federal assistance for construction of low-cost housing. The lobby opened its drive early this month when the National Associaton of Real Estate Boards passed a resolution opposing the "$15,000,000,000 socialized-housing program," urging State and local home builders to "carry on the fight" by referenda, and recommending that Congress amend the act to limit "occupancy in all socialized housing to the indigent." Since that convention, the lobby has appeared before city councils in St. Petersburg, Norfolk, Dallas, and other sizable cities in its all-out effort to scuttle the low-cost-housing program.

At St. Petersburg, the owners of slum property teamed up with the apartment house owners, and hotel men's association, the local real estate board, and private builders and contractors. Through advertisements in the local papers and personal contact with a friendly city council, they charged that the housing program would jeopardize the income of units normally rented to tourists, that construction of new housing units would absorb all skilled labor in this field, crippling the builders, and, following the lead of NAREB, that public housing would kill private enterprise and initiative. The city council and the mayor openly opposed the Federal program and are referring the matter to the voters in a referendum.

The lobby was not so successful in Norfolk. Last week, the city council adopted an ordinance paving the way for construction of some 3,000 low-rent housing units which will cost an estimated $28,000,000.

The real-estate interests are now concentrating on Texas, where the lobby hopes to force referenda in Dallas, San Antonio, Beaumont, and Corpus Christi. If the request for a referendum is turned down by the city council, the group has threatened to circulate a petition in an effort to force the action.

Tell It to the Pentagon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Harlan Trott from the Christian Science Monitor of January 12, 1950:

TELL IT TO THE PENTAGON

(By Harlan Trott)

WASHINGTON.—So the marines think they're tough, do they.

Montezuma, Tripoli, Chateau-Thierry, Guadalcanal, Iwo Jima? Huh.

Never mind the howitzers, men. Belay those ready assault waves. Call off your close-air support. Those marines aren't that tough. We've found a way to lick 'em.

Scuttle 'em in one sentence. Let 'em have it—smack in the budget.

Like this, see: "Six Marine Corps battalion landing teams will be maintained."

Six battalions of marines, a bare half a division, is all the new 1951 budget leaves the Nation's "first team"—instead of the two skeletonized divisions of the fleet marine force Congress and the country have been counting on as the hard, steel spearhead of a force-in-readinness poised and ready to move by land or sea or air on less than 24 hours' notice.

This solar plexus punch by the Pentagon planners did not take the marines by surprise. The fact is they saw it coming.

They have been warning Congress about the fancy footwork of top defense officials, the familiar tactic of stroking the Marine Corps with one hand and yanking its funds out from under it with the other.

Gen. Clifton Cates, Marine Corps Commandant, reminded the Vinson committee last October of the fears within the corps that the functions assigned it by law are being unsurped by others, namely the Army General Staff.

The prevailing opinion around the Army section of the Pentagon seems to be that the Marine Corps is a luxury the country can do without. Generals Bradley and Collins have given the impression that there's nothing in the Marines' Manual the Army can't do as well.

They admit that the marines pioneered and perfected the techniques of amphibious warfare. But look at the Army's record in Sicily, southern France, and Normandy, the generals say. They are especially proud of their webfooted exploits in Normandy where General Eisenhower's infantrymen swarmed out of the surf and over the German west wall.

General Cates told the Vinson committee last October that the corps was pared down to the limit of its bone and muscle. Any further reductions in combat strength, he intimated, would be fatal to the concept of the force-in-readiness which Congress mapped out for the marines.

Now, the thing General Cates greatly feared has come upon the marines in the new 1951 defense budget, which cuts the present nucleus of two divisions in half. Marine Corps leaders say this reduces them to the role of policemen as effectively as though the issue had never been debated in Congress and decided in the Marine Corp's favor.

In writing the 1947 National Security Act, Congress plainly intended to safeguard the

Marine Corps, especially its amphibious functions, and provide for its integrated mobilization in time of war.

But the trouble is that Congress didn't go far enough. It put a ceiling on the Marine Corps. It said the marines should not exceed 20 percent of the personnel of the Navy. But it failed to put a floor under the Marine Corps.

General Cates told the Vinson committee bluntly that the underlying effort on the part of the Army to contravene the act of Congress has never subsided. The Marine Commandant said furthermore that the Army was not seeking to have Congress redefine the roles and functions of the armed services but was proposing that the Joint Chiefs of Staff put to a vote the Army-sponsored proposal to transfer and reassign the traditional Marine Corps functions.

Each of those two budget-riddled Fleet Marine Forces—one on each coast—has been regarded as the Nation's No. 1 "force-in-readiness": Air-ground teams, developed during World War II when the marines perfected the method of coordinating the striking power of air and ground forces in a new form of attack.

Under the roles and missions drawn up at Key West at a conference of Army, Navy, and Air Force leaders, the Marine Corps was designated as the amphibious force-in-readiness to move within the first 24 hours after the outbreak of war.

It was assumed at Key West the Nation was confronted with the possibility of a war in which an opponent would hold the initiative. Circumstances alone, it was agreed, would restrict the United States to a series of damage-control operations—the marines' job—against the time when the Nation could grapple with the enemy somewhere on the flaming outer fringes.

The marines may be in for their hardest fight—their last one or their best one—when that sentence in the budget reducing the Fleet Marine Force to six battalion landing teams comes up for consideration. There are signs that they will have considerable close support in Congress by the time the decisive battle begins.

Opposition to FEPC Not Confined to South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I submit herewith a letter from Mr. Kern Dodge, engineer, Lewis Tower Building, Philadelphia, Pa., expressing in clear and forceful terms his opposition to the FEPC and his reasons therefor.

I commend his letter particularly to the attention of my colleagues who come from the Northern and Western States. As I have previously pointed out, the FEPC means regimentation of the employer wherever he may be, in Pennsylvania, in Michigan, in California, as well as in Mississippi. Behind the pious label and the lofty objectives of the bill lies the dark threat of the further intrusion of government into the liberties of the individual, of the further vesting of autocratic power in a bureaucratic body, of a further tendency toward a police state.

The letter from Mr. Dodge is as follows:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 16, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: By all means, vote against any so-called civil-rights measures, especially those having to do with fair-employment practices. Such a bill would—

Deny employer freedom of contract;

Deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees;

Deny to fellow employees the right of selecting associates;

Deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

It would subject the employer to endless investigation, harassment, and possible fines and penalties, determined by a commission.

It would deny the employer the right of trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the commission.

It would compel the employer to give testimony against himself and expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the commission.

It would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and deny him the privilege of selecting an employee of his own choice.

Such a commission would have the power to make rules and regulations which have the effect of laws, of which we have more than enough, and which hamstring business.

I am sure you would not vote for a bill which would require a person of a certain race or color to work for another against his will. Therefore, you should not vote for any bill which would require another person to employ someone to work for him against such employers will.

This whole civil-rights program is being pressed by certain minority groups who are not satisfied with life in the finest country in the world, but who wish to remake it for their own special selfish benefit.

Yours very truly,

KERN DODGE.

Confederate Memorial Day—Robert E. Lee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an address which I delivered to the Daughters of the Confederacy in Statuary Hall this afternoon, the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee.

The address referred to follows:

Madam Chairman, United Daughters of the Confederacy, ladies and gentlemen, first, permit me to thank your distinguished chairman for her flattering introduction.

It is a real pleasure to appear before you today, on this the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of the birth of Robert E. Lee, and to pay my humble tribute, not only to that distinguished leader, but to all the other heroes of the War Between the States.

I first want to pay my tribute to the glorious Daughters of the Confederacy, one of the greatest women's organizations the world has ever known. They, together with the Daughters of the American Revolution, have probably done more to protect our form of government and our American way of life than all the other women's organizations combined.

The Daughters of the Confederacy are due the credit for establishing our Memorial Day. On April 25, 1866, just 1 year after the war closed, the Daughters of the Confederacy at Columbus, Miss., in the district which I have the honor to represent in Congress, while decorating the graves of the Confederate dead, decorated alike the graves of about 40 Federal soldiers who had been buried there.

The news of this incident spread throughout the country and brought from the pen of the Honorable Francis Miles Finch, a distinguished northern writer, a little poem called the Blue and the Gray, that will live as long as this Republic lasts.

This incident occurred on the banks of the Tombigbee River, the inland river to which Judge Finch refers in his beautiful poem, in which he said:

"By the flow of the inland river,
Whence the fleets of iron have fled,
Where the blades of the grave grass quiver,
Asleep are the ranks of the dead;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the one the blue,
Under the other the gray.

"These in the robings of glory,
Those in the gloom of defeat,
All with the battle blood gory,
In the dusk of eternity meet;
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Under the laurel, the blue,
Under the willow, the gray."

He closed with this verse:

"No more shall the war cry sever,
Or the winding rivers be red;
They banish our anger forever
When they laurel the graves of our dead.
Under the sod and the dew,
Waiting the judgment day;
Love and tears for the blue,
Tears and love for the gray."

Standing back of me, or I should say almost beside me here, are the statues of two outstanding figures of the Confederacy, Robert E. Lee, the great commander of the Confederate forces—the War Between the States—and probably the greatest commander of men the world has ever known, and Jefferson Davis, the only President of the Confederacy.

Theodore Roosevelt characterized Lee as the greatest commander of the English-speaking race.

Field Marshal Wolseley, of the British Army, once said Lee was the ablest general and to him the greatest man he had ever conversed with. He said "I was simply awed with his inherent greatness."

As Senator Ben Hill, of Georgia, once said:

"When the future historian shall come to survey the character of Lee, he will find it rising like a huge mountain above the undulating plain of humanity, and he must lift his eyes high toward heaven to catch its summit. He possessed every virtue of other great commanders without their vices.

"He was a foe without hate, a friend without treachery, a soldier without cruelty, a victor without oppression, and a victim without murmuring.

"He was a public officer without vices, a private citizen without wrong, a neighbor without reproach, a Christian without hypocrisy, and a man without guile.

"He was Caesar without his ambition, Frederick without his tyranny, Napoleon without his selfishness, and Washington without his reward.

"He was obedient to authority as a servant, and royal in authority as a true king. He was gentle as a woman in life, modest

and pure as a virgin in thought, watchful as a Roman vestry in duty, submissive to law as Socrates, and grand in battles as Achilles."

In the words of Oliver Goldsmith—

"As some tall cliff that lifts its awful form
Swells from the vale, and midway leaves the storm—
Though round its breast the rolling clouds are spread
Eternal sunshine settles on its head."

He stands today the most commanding, the most masterly, the most serenely inspiring figure upon the horizon of human history.

I cannot let this opportunity pass without pausing to pay my respects to Jefferson Davis, the great president of the Confederacy, whom Caleb Cushing once characterized as being "eloquent among the most eloquent in debate, wise among the wisest in counsel, and brave among the bravest on the battlefield."

He was the real victim of the War Between the States; but as time goes on, and the people of the world learn the facts, his stature will grow with the passing years.

Bishop Galloway once said of him:

"Marvelous, many-sided, masterful man, his virtues will grow brighter and his name be writ larger with each passing century. Soldier, hero, statesman, gentleman, American—a prince of Christian chivalry, the uncrowned chief of an invisible republic of loving and loyal hearts—when another 100 years have passed no intelligent voice will fail to praise him and no patriotic hand will refuse to place a laurel wreath upon his radiant brow."

If Jefferson Davis, Robert E. Lee, U. S. Grant, Abraham Lincoln, and all those brave men who wore the gray and the ones who wore the blue in the War Between the States, could come back today and see what is going on in this country, they would probably forget their differences and join hands in a supreme effort to save this Republic, this great constitutional Government of ours, as well as our American way of life, from being destroyed by our enemies abroad, who are aided and abetted by the enemies within our gates.

We, the sons, grandsons, and collateral relatives of the men on both sides of that great conflict, are joining hands today, across the walls of party politics, to try to protect this Nation, and to protect American liberty—that proud heritage of patriotism, conceived in the minds of the greatest statesmen the world has ever produced, guarded and protected by the undyng loyalty of a noble ancestry—to preserve and defend that liberty in our time and transmit it unimpaired to our posterity, that this grand old Republic, with its free institutions, its guaranties of liberty, and our American way of life, may go on down to the future with strength in her loins, hope in her soul, and the eternal song of triumph on her lips.

New Russian Diversionary Moves Expected by Diplomatic Observers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Constantine Brown concerning future courses of action by Russia which appeared in the Washington (D. C.) Evening Star of January 19, 1950:

NEW RUSSIAN DIVERSIONARY MOVES EXPECTED BY DIPLOMATIC OBSERVERS

(By Constantine Brown)

The time is approaching, according to a number of diplomatic and military observers, when a new Russian blowup should be expected somewhere in Europe or the Near East.

These observers do not claim to have positive information as to when and where it may happen. Their fears are based principally on the Russian strategy of creating diversions in one sector of the world in order to help themselves in another.

The Berlin blockade and airlift are mentioned as particular instances of Russia's deceptive diplomatic strategy.

From the strictly military point of view Berlin was of no consequence either to the Russians or the Western Powers. At the time when the blockade was established Moscow's plans for the conquest of China had ripened.

INCIDENTS COOKED UP

The reorganization of the Chinese Communist armies had been completed and they were facing fairly efficient nationalistic forces, which were weakened by the State Department's undeclared embargo on arms shipments.

The Nationalist forces were supported, however, by the American Congress. The Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress was determined to carry out the commitments of President Roosevelt to the Nationalist Government. Moreover, at that time—the winter of 1948—President Truman himself wished to follow the policies of his predecessor.

It became essential to distract the minds of the American Government and its people from the Far East. The Berlin incidents and blockade then were cooked up.

This was countered by an American-British move in which prestige took precedence over military necessity. We were not going to be pushed out of the shambles of the former German capital by the Russians, it was said, and the spectacular airlift was decided on as an answer to the Soviet blockade.

For more than a year the attentions of the western peoples were focused on Berlin. Whenever it appeared that public attention in American and western Europe was relaxing, as the airlift became routine, inflammatory incidents—such as collisions between airlift planes and Soviet fighters—were concocted by the Russian authorities. This revived western interest and rumbles of an immediate war between East and West began to spread in the West.

But all this time the real Soviet action was taking place on the Chinese mainland. With America chiefly interested in the airlift, little thought could be given to China.

REDS GAINED OBJECTIVE

The Nationalist armies gradually lost heart, while the Chinese Communist forces gained strength. Finally, the Russians gave up their spectacular plan of deception in Berlin and lifted the blockade. By this time, however, they had achieved their objectives.

The Soviet puppets in China defeated the Nationalists. Moscow helped itself to three juicy slices—Mongolia, Sinkiang, and Manchuria, while the rest of that vast country was placed under the leadership of Moscow's Charlie McCarthy—Mao Tze-tung.

By the time we awoke to what had happened to us in the Far East it was too late. We were faced with an accomplished fact in China, alteration of which we are neither willing, prepared, nor capable.

We discovered belatedly—despite statements to the contrary by those who muffed the ball—that our strategic position in the Pacific and Indian Oceans had been dangerously weakened. The arguments advanced by the administration supporters, both in and out of Congress, and the unprecedented official attacks on Chiang Kai-shek, chief of state of one of our allies, are clear indication that American officials feel our policy may have missed fire.

While we were looking across the Atlantic the Soviets stole China. Now we are looking across the Pacific, wondering what happened. It is probable that this interest on the part of politicians and the people in general will continue for some time.

Meanwhile, the Russians are suspected, and not without well-founded reason, of preparing to resume their diversionary tactics somewhere in Europe or the Near East.

The Upset Down Under—No. 5

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Morley Cassidy, from the Washington Evening Star:

THE UPSET DOWN UNDER—V—BRIGHT PLANS THICK AS BLOSSOMS IN NEW ZEALAND'S LITTLE EDEN

(By Morley Cassidy)

WELLINGTON, NEW ZEALAND, January 20.—Bright new plans are busting out all over this little Garden of Eden, thick as the Pohutukawa blossoms in the midsummer air.

"You won't see me driving a cab much longer," says Frank Choate, 33, a veteran of the New Guinea campaign, as he drives you to your hotel.

"My chum and I, we are going in business for ourselves, making the best fruit drink you ever tasted.

"We've been trying to do it for 3 years but the old government wouldn't give us a license. Said it wasn't economic.

"Now we can go ahead. And you watch—you'll be drinking our product in the States one of these days."

HE'LL RAISE SHEEP

Up in Auckland, Hartley C. Peeres, an insurance salesman, has a gleam in his eye. He's going to raise sheep, a job he was born to.

"I've been trying since 1947 to buy a place down south on the island," he says. "An old chap there has been running 1,000 ewes and I told him I could double that so we made a fair deal. But the old government stopped it. It fixed the price so low the old chap wouldn't sell. Now maybe we can get together."

Plans are blooming everywhere. An elderly gentleman sunning himself on the Parliament House grounds happily tells of his hope that he now can sell his Wellington home for enough to build a cottage near his old home at Dunedin. A bustling grocer on Lambton quay brings out his plans for modernizing his shop by putting in a frozen-food department.

In the Hawkes Bay area a group of businessmen are organizing a new building company to turn out prefabricated houses. Everywhere tens of thousands see a chance at last to buy their own homes.

All New Zealand, in short, is tasting the intoxicating pleasures of an exciting idea.

The idea? Don't laugh. Free enterprise.

It may be a phrase to scoff at in other places. But not here. While other countries have been enjoying free enterprise and sometimes jeering at it in recent years, New Zealand has been getting a man-sized dose of its alternative, socialism.

SOCIALISTS ARE MYSTIFIED

Why? Socialism's leaders, wandering idly through the halls of Parliament House, where they ruled for 14 years, are mystified and saddened.

They thought they had made New Zealand a happy land. Their Labor government had given the people the most advanced social-security system in the world.

Sociologists came from all over the world to study its generous old-age, widow's, and invalid's pensions, its free medical and hospital care, its unemployment payments, sickness benefits, veterans' allowances, and dozens of other safeguards against misfortune.

They could point to such full employment that a waiter in a Lambton quay restaurant boasts, "I could step into a dozen other jobs tomorrow."

They could point to the best wage level and shortest hours in the nation's history, and to more legal paid holidays than any land in the world. But New Zealand has quietly but firmly turned out the men who did all this, and today is preparing to gallop down the reactionary road of free enterprise.

"It was the vote of the young people that turned the scales," says Walter Nash, genial, kindly Minister of Finance, who was New Zealand's wartime envoy to the United States.

He shakes his head sadly. "Young chaps don't remember what times were like in the depression. It's a pity. They talk of restrictions because they never knew what hard times were like."

And that, say New Zealanders of all ages, is exactly the spirit which they have finally cast aside.

GHOSTS OF 1932

"For 14 years," says a 38-year-old Wellington haberdasher, "the Labor Party has kept us living in the midst of a slump that ended in 1936. They've kept ghosts of 1932 dancing before our eyes every minute.

"At every election they have bombarded us with speeches about 'eating the bitter bread of charity,' about the days of the soup kitchens and of cast-off clothing.

"But we have discovered slowly that we were buying security at the cost of freedom."

New Zealand, eagerly setting out on the road of free enterprise under the government of Prime Minister S. G. Holland, is not casting security aside. Its social-security program, much less sweeping than England's, much less generous in many respects than those in many American States, was never an issue in the recent elections.

It is almost universally approved and the new government is pledged to maintain and safeguard it.

"We didn't shoot Santa Claus," says a young Wellington professor. "We voted to keep him alive when he was about to die of arteriosclerosis."

When New Zealanders today tell why they turned against the socialistic theories of the Labor government, and what they hope for from the new regime of free enterprise, one word inevitably pops out: "restrictions."

It is a word that stands for hardening of the bureaucratic arteries, a disease which a majority of New Zealanders find has grown with every year of Socialist planning.

IDEAS HELD BLOCKED BY PLANNERS

"It had just got so nobody could turn around," says an earnest young policeman. "We just had to turn the people loose to get things rolling." Every second New Zealander today is eager to tell how restrictions have crippled New Zealand's normal progress.

Tens of thousands are like Choate, the taxi driver, who has been wanting to set up his own business. Labor planners have compelled every man to get a license to go into business. Licenses were never granted if the new business threatened to compete with Government-run enterprises or were not economically essential to the community.

So tens of thousands of ideas for earning British pounds or American dollars have been blocked at the outset because planners couldn't see the possibilities.

Peres, the insurance salesman, is an example of another hated restriction—land-sales control.

Four classes have been hit here—farmers and would-be farmers, home owners, and home seekers.

With noble intentions—avoiding land-price inflation—Socialist planners limited farm land prices to 22 times the value of the land's 1942 production. Well and good, but today's production is far higher and the prices of products have doubled. No one has been willing to sell.

Old owners have held the land, often restricting the number of sheep to avoid the risk that any farm with over 1,000 ewes might be divided under another Government rule, and eager ex-servicemen haven't been able to buy farms under any circumstances.

Home owners and home seekers have been hit the same way, with prices frozen at 1942 values. The old gentleman in the Parliament House Grounds is a perfect example of how bureaucratic rigidity has frustrated its own purposes.

WHY SHOULD I SELL?

"Government assessors put my four-room house down at £1,100, about $3,000," he says. "I could find 20 people tomorrow to pay me £2,000, and it would cost me £1,400 to build a three-room cottage at Dunedin. Why should I sell?"

Tens of thousands of home seekers, as a result, are still waiting for homes which owners are only too eager to sell at a price based on replacement costs.

One of the most effective posters for the recent campaign was headed, "Everything under control" and showed the Labor government dangling from a cluster of balloons labeled "coal-mine control, egg control, waterfront control, land-sales control, and rent control."

New Zealanders might have endured the controls willingly if the benefits were clearly visible, but a disastrous series of experiments in Government-run enterprises and the mounting costs of social services have brought steadily soaring taxes.

But the greatest evil seen by the new generation of New Zealanders is in controls which have blocked individual effort and competition which would reduce prices.

It is this that makes free enterprise appeal to New Zealanders as an exciting idea full of promise for the future of the last happy land of earth.

Policy for China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dorothy Thompson relative to our China policy which appeared in the Washington Evening Star on January 19:

ON THE RECORD—POLICY ADVANCED BY ACHESON FOR CHINA DECLARED SO EXTREMELY COMFORTABLE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, speaking at the National Press Club last Thursday, advanced a policy for China (and we presume, for the rest of the world) which has all the charm of extreme novelty.

"The single, most important fact shaping American policy in the Far East," Mr. Acheson said, "was the attaching by the Soviet Union of the four northern areas of China." The United States must not now do anything which might divert Chinese attention from Russia, he continued, for the division of China "must bring upon the Russians the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people."

PLANNED IT THAT WAY?

So we planned it that way? The reason for the secret treaty at Yalta, giving Russia special privileges in Manchuria, was just to encourage Russia to overreach herself? The reason for forcing the truce upon Chiang Kai-shek in November 1945, and allowing tens of thousands of Communist troops to escape; and for insisting in 1946 that the Kalgan Pass be opened to permit a million Communists to move into Manchuria and be armed by the Russians with the entire equipment of the Japanese Kwantung Army, was to be sure that by Russian encroachment in China, the Chinese people would recognize their real enemy?

Do we, perhaps, have a secret agent in the Russian Politburo who directed the Soviet Union to annex the four northern provinces of China, since this is going to make the Chinese people awfully sore?

We don't like the Nationalist Government—runs the argument—so it is well for the Communists to defeat it. But communism being synonymous with Russian imperialism is hostile to the real interest of the people of China, and they will revolt. Ergo, the more successful Russian communism is, the less successful it will be.

No wonder George Kennan, author of the containment policy, resigned from the State Department. To contain communism is putting the cart before the horse, said Secretary Acheson. "It is the United States aim to develop within the people a resistance to communism based on the dignity and right of every people to develop their own way * * * anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest."

But, apparently, you can't develop a resistance to communism until you first have it, nor rise in righteous anger against the violation of territorial integrity until it is violated.

This is certainly a subtlety outsubtling the Kremlin.

ANOTHER TITO, OBVIOUSLY?

What we want to know, however, is just how the indignation of the Chinese (and other) peoples is going to express itself once the Russian noose is around their necks and all anti-Communist leaders assassinated or exiled?

There are at present some million Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland. There are 300,000 Chinese Nationalist troops (trained by the United States) in Formosa. There is a leadership, now very reduced, but still a leadership, and all these express the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people.

But we mustn't support them. No, we must wait for something more inspiring—obviously another Tito.

Maybe Secretary Acheson has one in mind. We suggest, however, that the Russians have

thought of that possibility, and aren't going to let it happen twice.

At any rate, we have a new foreign policy, surely the most remarkable in our history—and so extremely comfortable. Under it we don't have to do a thing except keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, perfectly aboveboard, and our enemies will do all the rest for us.

Stalin doesn't know it, but he's our ally. The more people's he subjects, the more he will be hated and, conversely, the more we, sitting still in our perfect purity, will be loved.

Obviously, too, we were wrong about Hitler. If we had just let him take the world, people would have been plenty sore, and would have revolted—the Jews, for instance.

It is incredible. But it's true; it's the policy.

Coal Shortage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, the continuing stoppage in the soft-coal fields is doing irreparable harm to our Nation. The effects are being felt more every day by both domestic and industrial users. The midwestern home owners are suffering for the arrogant attitude of one man—John L. Lewis. Although bituminous coal is rarely used for domestic heating purposes in New England, its industrial use is almost universal.

Telegrams and letters I have received from the Bristol (Conn.) Brass Corp.; the Naugatuck (Conn.) Chemical Co.; the Chase Brass & Copper Co., Waterbury, Conn.; and the Scovill Manufacturing Co., Waterbury, Conn., outline the difficulties faced by these concerns in maintaining production of essential products. A continuance of this unwarranted work stoppage will result in the unemployment of thousands of workers in Connecticut who can ill afford to be idle.

The President is evidently reluctant to invoke the provisions of a statute duly passed by the Congress to halt this one-man dictation to the whole Nation. Whether the President approves or disapproves of the Taft-Hartley Act is of no consequence. It is his sworn duty to administer the laws of our country, notwithstanding the pressure of certain groups who exert tremendous influence.

The telegrams follow:

JANUARY 17, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

On acount of coal shortage St. Joseph Zinc Co. have notified us that they will have to suspend shipments of zinc from their Josephtown Smelter at Josephtown, Pa., because Duquesne Power Co. will cut off power this Friday. Zinc is one of our basic metals and will affect our operations if this condition is not remedied. Please see if you cannot do something which will help this situation.

BRISTOL BRASS CORP.,
A. D. WILSON, *Chairman.*

JANUARY 19, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Coal shortage increasingly affecting supply of essential materials. For example shutdown of Duquesne Power Co. for lack of coal will paralyze production by St. Joseph Lead Co., of zinc oxide, an indispensable material for rubber and chemical industries. Urgently request you use your influence to effect use of existing legal measures to end this intolerable slow-down of vital industrial activities.

NAUGATUCK CHEMICAL CO.,
P. E. RICE, *Factory Manager.*

CHASE BRASS & COPPER CO.,
Waterbury, Conn., January 18, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PATTERSON: We have just been advised by one of our suppliers of zinc that they will be forced to suspend shipments because of the action of the Duquesne Power Co. in shutting off industrial power due to the coal shortage.

Any interruption in the supply of zinc will be serious for the brass industry, and, if continued, result in curtailment of operations with resulting unemployment throughout the brass industry.

Settlement of the present difficulty in the coal industry is, we feel, of vital importance, and we urge that every possible effort will be made to bring this about promptly.

Very truly yours,
CHASE BRASS & COPPER CO.,
W. E. HUSTED,
Executive Vice President.

SCOVILL MANUFACTURING CO.,
Waterbury, Conn., January 18, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JIM: I thought you would be interested in knowing that the brass industry faces a very serious situation with reference to high-grade zinc.

We have been notified by one of our important sources that the Duquesne Power Co., which supplies the electric power for their thermic unit at Josephtown, Pa., is shutting off power commencing Friday due to coal shortage; and as you probably know, the New Jersey Zinc Co. has been closed for some time due to labor difficulties. The matter of power at the high-grade zinc plants about the country due to the coal shortage is very serious, and while we read in the papers there is no emergency due to the coal situation, we also hear of possible shut-downs all through the Middle West and the serious effect that this will have on Connecticut manufacturers, and I urge you to do all possible to endeavor to alleviate this situation.

Kind personal regards.

Very truly yours,
SCOVILL MANUFACTURING CO.,
W. M. GOSS,
Executive Vice President.

Medical Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an article appearing in the Washington Evening Star on Thursday, January 19. This article is by Dr. Walter A. Bloedorn, who is the dean of the George Washington University School of Medicine.

Dr. Bloedorn is a former citizen of Nebraska and a graduate from one of its medical schools. You will find his article, which is in answer to an editorial, "We Need More Doctors," to be factual and well written.

The article follows:

MEDICAL EDUCATION—DR. BLOEDORN DISSENTS FROM STAR EDITORIAL AND VIEWS AIRED AT ACADEMIC DEANS' CONFERENCE

To the EDITOR OF THE STAR:

I am writing you regarding the editorial We Need More Doctors published in the January 11, 1950, issue of the Evening Star. This editorial is based on statements reportedly made at the American Conference of Academic Deans held in Cincinnati on January 9, 1950.

Although the editorial admits that such a charge may be grossly unfair, it cites a statement which it asserts lends plausibility to the charge that the medical profession and the medical schools are protecting physicians from the competition of outsiders in keeping down the number of new students by extraordinary limitations placed upon admissions to our medical schools—wholesale exclusion of potentially good students—no matter how eligible many of them may be.

The idea is too naive to warrant the characterization of grossly unfair.

The Association of American Medical Colleges' headquarters' office in Chicago reports that for the year 1948–49 there were 6,514 freshmen enrolled in the medical schools. The number enrolled in 1949–50 was 6,887 which represents an increase of 373 over the previous year.

It is true that more students apply for admission to medical schools each year than are or can be admitted. The process, however, is one of selection and not of exclusion. The fact is that anyone, no matter how ill-prepared or ill-suited to undertake the long and difficult study of medicine, can apply. The fact is that thousands of those who do apply are wholly unqualified.

The careful selection of students for the practice and study of medicine is one of the most important functions of the medical school. Students are selected for admission on the basis of demonstration ability to do creditable work in premedical studies, tested medical aptitude, character, and motivation. The sole purpose of this careful selection is to assure, as nearly as possible at the outset, the training of physicians in whose hands patients would be willing to place the health and often the lives of themselves and their families.

FACTORS CONTROLLING ADMISSIONS

The actual number of students admitted to the medical school each year is determined, not by an arbitrary limit set in conspiracy by the medical profession and the medical schools, but by several more fundamental, if less sensational factors:

1. The capacity of the physical plant of the individual medical school; lectures and laboratory work cannot be conducted in the public parks.

2. The number of qualified teachers available to instruct the students; students cannot teach each other.

3. The number of hospital beds available for clinical instruction; students cannot learn medicine from books alone.

The physical plants and the teaching staffs of the medical schools are limited by budgets. Tuition fees cover but a fraction of the cost of medical education. At the present time the Nation's medical schools require addi-

tional financial support even to maintain existing facilities and faculties at the present standards.

The Nations' medical schools, at the moment, are training medical students at the limit of their capacity. The accelerated program in effect during World War II, in the opinion of most medical educators, lowers the standard of performance of the medical schools.

The number of students admitted to medical schools could, of course, be doubled overnight if standards regarding selection of students, adequacy of equipment, availability of qualified teachers, and sufficiency of clinical facilities were thrown overboard.

It is unlikely that the critics of the present system of medical education would willingly consult a physician trained under such circumstances.

The editorial also implies criticism of "the long years of costly study, the added years of internship, and the widespread tendency to concentrate on a specialty instead of on general practice." If any adequate substitute for long years of study and internship can be suggested which will provide well-trained physicians, the thousands of men now undergoing the hardships and sacrifices of this discipline undoubtedly will welcome them.

It would, of course, be possible to establish diploma mills to turn out thousands of doctors and additional thousands of specialists with training limited to short periods of instruction.

ONE DOCTOR FOR EVERY 710 PERSONS

The Star's editorial criticizes the medical schools chiefly, because, it states, "there simply are not enough doctors to cope with the health needs of our greatly increased and still growing population." "There exists," the editorial states, "a doctor shortage"—"especially in the nonurban areas." The fact is there are more doctors in the United States in proportion to the population than in any other country in the world—with the sole exception of Palestine, where many refugee physicians have gone from Europe.

There is 1 doctor for every 710 persons in the United States.

As to the needs of our increasing population, the fact is that during the past 20 years the number of physicians has increased at a greater rate than the population as a whole.

Since the beginning of World War II, new medical colleges or expansions of former 2-year schools of basic medical sciences have been developed in Alabama, Washington, California, North Carolina, Texas, Utah, and Illinois. Others are being considered in Mississippi, Florida, West Virginia, North Carolina, and elsewhere.

It is true that there is a relative shortage of physicians in some rural areas. This shortage exists independently of the relative abundance of physicians in the Nation as a whole, however. Merely increasing the number of students admitted to medical schools will not solve that problem.

There are today many small communities without newspapers or colleges, and in these communities there are no editors or college professors. Similarly, there are communities without hospitals, health centers, laboratories, and many of the other facilities necessary for the practice of modern scientific medicine; for this reason, there are communities without physicians. The solution to this problem is not the wholesale turning out of ill-trained physicians. The solution is to be found more likely in furthering local, State, and national programs for the establishment at well-selected points of clinics, health centers, and hospitals to provide facilities which will make it possible and attractive for physicians to practice good medicine in these areas.

Medical education is not perfect. No one knows this better than medical educators. Medical education is the foundation of our national health and welfare. The importance of the medical schools to the Nation is far out of proportion to their number, their size, and their costs of operation. It is important that undergraduate medical education be maintained at a high level of quality.

WALTER A. BLOEDORN, M. D.,
Dean, the George Washington University School of Medicine.

Washington—Disgrace to the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include an article appearing in the New York Times of Friday, January 20, 1950, taken from the February issue of the Woman's Home Companion, entitled "Washington—Disgrace to the Nation":

WASHINGTON—DISGRACE TO THE NATION—EVERYBODY KNOWS THAT AMERICA IS THE WORLD'S FINEST DEMOCRACY; BUT BEHIND THE BEAUTIFUL FACADE OF THE NATION'S CAPITAL LIES SQUALOR, BIGOTRY, POLITICAL SLAVERY—LET'S CORRECT THESE CONDITIONS TO IMPROVE OUR POSITION IN WORLD AFFAIRS, URGES HOWARD WHITMAN

Washington, the Nation's Capital, has hidden long enough beneath its glistening white facades as America's show window, democracy's living monument the world over. What is the Capital City really like? Let's take a tour no sightseer ever took.

We'll find slums so vile that Michigan Senator, HOMER FERGUSON, after he saw them, scrubbed his hands and said, "But you can't scrub out your soul after sights like these." We'll see men with trousers rolled up to avoid the vermin and women carrying sticks to protect them against rats. We'll find a city touted as the heart of democracy—with its 1,000,000 people deprived of the right to vote. Worse, we'll find a dread lest democracy be turned loose in the District of Columbia and drive out special privilege.

We'll find city hospital facilities so bad that doctors and nurses all but weep at what their patients suffer. At Gallinger, Washington's big city hospital, we'll see a man virtually rotting to death because facilities for his proper treatment are lacking. We'll find a Jim Crow town. In the citadel of democracy we'll see Americans barred from restaurants, hotels, movies, hospitals and schools because of the color of their skin. This is the lame-duck District of Columbia, governed by a Congress which is too busy pleasing the folks back home to give two hoots about a million voteless people on the Potomac.

The District of Columbia contains more than a hundred thousand dwellings. Of these, reports the National Capital Housing Authority, 44,000 are substandard. Nearly half of the dwellings in the Capital of the richest nation on earth do not meet civilized standards of safety, health and fitness for human habitation. "In these squalid slums," reports Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, Surgeon General of the United States Public Health Service, "the tuberculosis death rate is 99 percent higher than for the rest of the population, the pneumonia rate 25 percent higher."

Perhaps you have been to Washington. Perhaps, as I did, you regarded Washington as a city of beauty and inspiration. The illusion smashed abruptly for me. I was touring Washington in a police scout car. Suddenly it turned off one of the large open streets, nosed into an alleyway. "Like going through a rathole, eh?" one officer joked. My eyes darted over rows of filthy tumbledown shacks, with people swarming in and out of them; unpainted gray boards and sagging walls; a litter of garbage and bones, with scavenging dogs and cats and buzzing clouds of flies.

It was the center of a city block, hollowed out to make a slum. You could walk around that block for days and never dream such a rotten inner core existed. "But I had no idea Washington had slums like these," I said. "Nobody does—they're hidden," replied the policeman. I came to know dozens of other rotten hollow cores of city blocks that look respectable on the outside. I found rats so abundant that I learned to flush them by tapping a stick ahead of me as I walked up dark smelly stairways.

Would you expect to find outhouses in Washington, D. C.—within sight of the Capitol? The courts and alleys are full of rows of ramshackle privies, some with slats broken out and doors that don't close, sitting in the garbage-cluttered back yards, emitting a horrible stench. The slum dwellings, occupied by Negroes mostly, have neither steam heat nor running water. Kerosene lamps and candles provide light; coal stoves provide heat—for those who can afford to buy coal. In the yards there are water spigots, one to half a dozen families. Some are cross-connected with toilet plumbing so there is no telling when bacteria from the toilet wastes pour out in the drinking water.

Senator Ferguson, during his tour of the slums, blurted in astonishment, "Aren't there any health laws?" No, Senator, there is no modern plumbing and sanitation code in Washington. The Housing Authority drew one up 10 years ago. It would have ruled these slums off the map. But for 10 years the code has gathered dust in the District Commissioners' desks. Meanwhile the district clinic must continue treating the babies who are brought in with festering red holes on their fingers and foreheads—rat bites.

The main reason for Washington's failure as the world show window of democracy is that Washington is not a democracy. It is a disenfranchised little protectorate where 1,000,000 Americans are denied the right to vote. They are placed in the same category as felons, aliens, and the certified mentally ill. The world champion of democracy has seen fit to turn away democracy on its own doorstep.

Washington's rulers are three Commissioners appointed by the President and they can do nothing without the approval of Congress—Congress acting as a sort of board of aldermen. Congressmen must waste their time over every smidge of local legislation. Recently, with world emergencies breathing down its neck, Congress had to wrangle over a bill for the disposal of weeds.

The District government is a morass of accretions, improvisations, and confusions. It is doubtful if 10 percent of the Members of Congress understand it themselves. There are over a hundred departments, divisions, agencies, subboards, and miscellaneous bureas—each with a finger in the pie. Its fumbling is grievously seen in the inside story of Gallinger Municipal Hospital. Yet Gallinger looks trim and first-class on the outside.

Gallinger is Washington's only city hospital. It has 1,500 beds—for a city of 1,000,000. It is forced to pack the pneumonia cases so close together they cross-infect one another. "We don't have enough anesthetists to keep our surgical service going," reports Dr. Joseph Fazekas, chief of staff. "Patients who need elective surgery just don't get it." A doctor described the X-ray department as "the worst equipped I've seen in any hospital." Last August the American Medical Association refused to okay it for residency training.

The hospital is so short of drugs that Dr. Fazekas must beg for hand-outs from the large drug companies. Nurses have impossible loads—up to 60 patients. One nurse said, "We don't even know what's ailing some of the patients. We haven't time to find out." The staff wants to change Gallinger's name to the Nation's Capital Hospital. Why? Because that might shame somebody into doing something, Dr. Fazekas explains.

Self-government for Washington may seem to most Americans a simple question to settle. But is it? Washington's population is 22 percent Negro. The desire of many Congressmen to keep it a segregated city is hidden behind much of the opposition to home rule. Negroes would vote. And if Negroes voted, segregation—by democratic process—might go.

Many Americans would be shocked to realize that when they set foot in the Capital of their country they are in a city where Negroes must eat in Jim Crow restaurants, where Negro children are barred from white schools, where a Negro can't even go to the same movies as his fellow citizens of lighter complexion.

This is doubly shocking to many of us because we feel that the rest of America has gone far in recent years toward ending racial and religious discrimination. Much remains to be done but much has been done, officially and privately—the various State fair-employment laws, the removal of restrictions in our armed forces, for example; the inspiring Springfield plans and good neighbor clubs, the dropping of bars in many college fraternities. And let's not do any finger-pointing at Georgia or Alabama until we have taken a good hard look at Washington, D. C.

Segregation of human beings because of race, color, or creed is tragic enough anywhere in the world. It is doubly tragic in the capital city of a nation dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal. I met a judge in Washington—a Negro appointed to the Department of Justice by Theodore Roosevelt and later to the bench by Calvin Coolidge. At noon every day this judge must walk a mile to the Union Station to get his lunch because no restaurant near his office will serve him. I met a taxi driver who served 4 years overseas in the war but is not permitted to drive a veteran's cab. Such cabs are for white veterans only.

Countless incidents—an African foreign minister turned away from a hotel, a Puerto Rican senator forced to sleep on an office couch, a Bolivian educator turned out of a restaurant—reached an ironic climax last spring when the Negro diplomat, Dr. Ralph J. Bunche, refused the post of Assistant Secretary of State. Life in Jim Crow Washington was something he didn't want to inflict upon his three children.

There is a bill in the congressional hopper, written by Congressman ARTHUR G. KLEIN, of New York, to end segregation in the Nation's Capital. It hasn't a ghost of a chance of passing. But there is a sentence in it to remember. The failure to close this gap between the principles of democracy and the prevailing racial practices in Washington, D. C., materially impairs the leadership of the United States in the cause of a democratic world.

How can we sell democracy if we don't dare open our sample case? How can we try to democratize the outside world until we have really democratized Washington, D. C.? Washington belongs to all of us. We want our children to go there with their high school classes and see American ideals brought to shining flower. We know the American way of life. We know it is the finest way of life man has yet found. Let Washington exemplify it through and through. Washington should be a national shrine—not a national disgrace.

Timely Observations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. PHIL J. WELCH

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following articles from the St. Joseph News-Press, St. Joseph, Mo., of January 16 and January 18, 1950:

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of January 16, 1950]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

May we quote Dana? It was Charles A. Dana, journalistic giant of the famed New York Sun. When criticized for printing news happenings of tragedy and disaster, he remarked something in this vein: "What the good Lord in His omnipotent wisdom sees fit to let occur, I in my humble role as editor of a newspaper shall not deem myself too lofty to report." That story on the great Dana comes to mind as we read of that United States Senate committee which is toying with the idea of a Federal law banning advertising hard liquor, beer, or wine in interstate commerce.

Sincerely and frankly we leave out any thought now of income to a newspaper from liquor advertising. (Why ration department stores' advertising if our only concern for liquor is to get their money?) We oppose a prohibition of liquor advertising on sound ground. This newspaper is for temperance. It has repeatedly over many years deplored the abuse of liquor. But this newspaper opposed national prohibition with all the force at its command. It predicted that national prohibition would be a failure. It made only one error in that prediction. It failed miserably to estimate the enormity of that failure.

But the people spoke, or so we thought. The eighteenth amendment became law. It was opposed by two great leaders of that day, Woodrow Wilson, then President, and James Cardinal Gibbons, archbishop of Baltimore and a beloved churchman and friend of many Presidents. Woodrow Wilson so bitterly opposed a constitutional amendment against liquor he vetoed the Volstead Act, the enforcing law for that amendment. The story of national prohibition is a sordid tale of terror, of gangsterism which is still felt in the States. It brought the worst forms of official corruption. Washington hired prohibition agents to spy on fellow agents and then a third set of spies to spy on the spies. No fooling. And all three sets of the spies took graft. Look at the record.

Then, again the people spoke. Prohibition was repealed in one of the most complete and fastest reversals of public opinion this Nation has ever known. When prohibition was repealed liquor became legal and newspapers of the land then again accepted legally advertising of whisky, beer, and wine. That is the situation today.

If the people of St. Joseph and Buchanan County through local option want a ban on liquor, fine, extra fine. If the people of Nodaway County or Gentry or Platte or Andrew—any of them—through local option want a ban on liquor we heartily agree. There are many counties in Missouri that through local option permit no liquor. In Kentucky, the home of bourbon, there are more dry, by local option, counties than there are wet.

But local autonomy must prevail. National prohibition cannot succeed unless the mind of the people, the mass mind, undergoes a tremendous change. Many of us remember Czar Wayne Wheeler and his methods with the old Antisaloon League. A Congressman could be so drunk he could just stumble to his desk to record his vote for prohibition. To Wheeler and the professional drys that was all right. Congressman John Q. Souse, who lived wet but voted dry, got the support of the monumental political machine of the professional drys and was returned to office time and again.

This newspaper deplores the abuse of liquor. It hails such groups as the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and Alcoholics Anonymous. And yet legislatively it is against letting other States force their views on moral issues such as this upon the State of Missouri. And as long as sale of liquor is legal, so long must it be legal to advertise it in newspapers and magazines. Let's not return to the witchcraft, crackpot era of regulating our lives by a law that created more grafters and perjurers than any law in the history of America.

Some of our good friends will not like these observations. There will be some who will willfully accuse us of being swayed by the cash register's tinkle. Not at all. No more than we would be influenced by the owner of that store or factory or shop whose son got arrested, and we were threatened, almost politely, but firmly nevertheless, that unless we kept sonny's name out of the paper, papa would withdraw his advertising. Want to know how we react to that? And the "we" there means the whole staff, both papers. Want to know what we do when someone makes a threat or even boasts to a friend that he can "square off" so and so "up at the paper"? It goes page one.

One more thought on the drive against liquor advertising in the United States Senate. This newspaper and this column have deepest reverential respect for that great Protestant church that maintains an official board of temperance and morals. Yet it regrets its radical approach to national prohibition a generation ago. It regrets that today one of its great bishops is spearheading the drive to ban liquor advertising. That man is taking advantage of his profession. He is using the dignity of the cloth in a manner unworthy of his sacred calling.

[From the St. Joseph (Mo.) News-Press of January 18, 1950]

TIMELY OBSERVATIONS

For the first time that can be recalled, Timely Observations has a guest contributor today, that is, one who has no connection with the staff of the News-Press. He is our valued friend, the highly respected pastor of First Baptist Church, Dr. Adiel Moncrief. There are so many things on which the good cleric and this column do agree, it seems unfortunate that there must be any difference at all. But Timely Observations did some observing on advertising liquor, which Dr. Moncrief resents. His letter, intended for the Forum, appears herewith in full:

"EDITOR, THE NEWS-PRESS,
St. Joseph, Mo.:

"DEAR SIR: Your observations on the subject of advertising liquor make one point clear: You favor such advertising and seek to justify it. I was under the impression this was the case. Mr. Editor, what has your lengthy excursion into the evils of the late prohibition era, gangsterism, political corruption, lawlessness, and a kind word for the late Cardinal Gibbons who opposed national prohibition, to do with the subject?

"You reject the obvious reason why a newspaper might favor this kind of advertising. You say it is not the profits, since the paper could substitute department-store advertising for liquor ads and there would be no loss of revenue. Then you assert that the paper is 'for temperance.' You say it has deplored the abuse of liquor while 'opposing national prohibition with all the force at its command. It predicted that national prohibition would be a failure.' Again, what has all this to do with a straight answer to the question, Why is your newspaper advertising liquor and determined to continue doing so?

"I have always believed that there are three reasons why a person favors the manufacture, sale, and use of intoxicants. (1) He likes the liquor and wants to drink it, (2) he likes the profits and wants to sell it, (3) he likes the business and wishes to engage in it.

"I would agree with you that national prohibition is not the way to curb the evils and tragedies of the tremendous liquor business in America. But I do not agree with you that advertising of liquor has any logical justification in political wisdom and social sanity. Why continue through newspapers, magazines, movies (where the drinking scenes are dragged in in the most disgusting manner), and even radio with its beer and wine promotion, to ever increase the consumption of drink and the billions of profits to this harmful beverage industry?

"There is good reason why the liquor trade ought to be curbed and controlled far more than it is today. The bills which constantly appear in the Congress and in State assemblies reveal a growing sentiment among the people to impose by law such restrictions. But I do not have great faith in the law. St. Paul said of man's moral reformation, 'What the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh (God did in the revelation of goodness in His Son) who condemned sin in the flesh.' Our hope lies in moral changes.

"We have got to stop making drinking so attractive and smart to youth. It ought to be treated with a realistic attitude as it is in some countries. A stigma is attached to drinking in excess.

"A young college student, speaking recently to a civic club in our city, made my cheeks burn and my heart sick, as he described the attitude of European peoples to America because of the false presentation of American life they have had through the Hollywood movies with their orgies of drunkenness and crime. We seem to be in the unhappy position of being accepted as a stupid, lustful people who have nothing but money and sex as the end-all and be-all of life. This false picture of America is dangerous in a day like this and it should not be tolerated for a moment.

"I respectfully renew my appeal to the editor of the News-Press to seriously consider the elimination of liquor advertising in the newspaper as one step in the direction of temperance—for which the newspaper stands, according to your own testimony.

"ADIEL J. MONCRIEF."

Timely Observations has no desire to quarrel with the brilliant minister at First Baptist. Long, long ago we learned never to pick a quarrel with a priest, a rabbi, or a minister. It's no good. Furthermore, it's bad luck. Then, too, laymen should have too much veneration for the ministry to permit themselves to appear to say or do anything to hold that ministry in disrespect.

Dr. Moncrief does ask why we mentioned the late Cardinal Gibbons. The Baptist minister seems to think we went out of our way to say a kind word for a Roman Catholic prelate. Dead right, Doctor. But there was a purpose. Cardinal Gibbons at the time the eighteenth amendment was adopted was the chief representative of one of the three great Christian churches that opposed national prohibition.

But let us assure the good minister that there are many radical Catholics on the subject of liquor. Surely he is familiar with the Knights of Father Mathew, a total-abstinence society for Catholics. And all Protestants do not see eye to eye on the advantages of national prohibition. American citizen No. 1 today happens to be Baptist layman No. 1, the President of the United States. We believe his views on liquor are more in accord with ours than Dr. Moncrief's. It sums up to this: Dr. Moncrief is opposed to the use of liquor, we to the abuse of it.

The Common Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Paul de Kruif, from the Reader's Digest:

IS THIS, AT LAST, GOOD-BY TO THE COMMON COLD?

(By Paul de Kruif)

November 15, 1949, marked the beginning of a great step ahead in the comfort of mankind. On that date occurred the scientific publication—in the New York State Journal of Medicine—of a powerful and practical preventive and cure for the common cold.

The new cold-killer is no tantalizing laboratory curiosity; it's available to everybody. It is safe, and it is not limited to expensive prescriptions; the Federal Government permits its direct sale to the public in drugstores.

Until 4 years ago just about all that anyone knew about colds was that they were catching and were caused by a virus. Cures? Here was the gloomy advice of Dr. Perrin H. Long, famed therapeutist of Johns Hopkins: "The only rational treatment * * * is to be put to bed at the onset and remain there for 2 or 3 days." But in 1945—with no fanfare whatever—came the hint of a clue for a cure.

Dr. Elizabeth Troescher-Elam and coworkers in San Francisco proved that the sneezes and sniffles of hay fever were scientifically identical to the sniffles and sneezes of acute cold in the head. The culprit in both troubles was a chemical, histamine, released by the human body in all its allergic explosions. As the Journal of the American Medical Association put it in an editorial comment last September 10, "the common cold is an allergic response in susceptible persons."

Physicians in 1945 were getting their hands on a battery of new antidotes for allergies—chemicals called antihistamines. Dr. John M. Brewster of the United States Navy Medical Corps dosed more than 100 victims of the common cold with benadryl. Ninety-five percent of the sick sailors got marked relief and had much shorter colds than usual. Ten percent, treated very early, had their colds quickly cured, aborted, an event truly unique.

But there was a catch. Benadryl made many of the sailors very sleepy. Pyribenzamine (PBZ), a more powerful and less drowsy antihistamine, was launched against the colds of nearly 400 factory workers in Framingham, Mass., by Dr. H. G. Murray. Caught early, the colds of 110 workers were blitzed completely within 24 hours after the patients started swallowing pills of PBZ. Most of the others were markedly benefited; as were also 89 percent of sneezy students in Charlotte, N. C.

But, alas, PBZ and other antihistamine pills, though acting effectively against early head colds, all sang a troublesome chemical lullaby. Too many of those cured grew deeply dopey. No antihistamine could be sold except by prescription.

And how many of us go to our doctor at the first unhappy harbinger of our colds in the head?

Hope for a more practical cold killer came out of Yonkers, N. Y., in the autumn of 1947. Chemists of Nepera Chemical Co., Inc., under the direction of Dr. Edmond T. Tisza, vice president in charge of research, synthesized a new antihistamine they named neohetramine. Powerful against allergies, neohetramine did not make folks sleepy. The Council on Pharmacy and Chemistry of the American Medical Association declared it the least toxic of available antihistamines.

In the autumn of 1948, at Sing Sing prison in Ossining, N. Y., began a comprehensive and truly scientific test. Dr. Charles C. Sweet, medical superintendent of the prison, called in an expert allergist, Dr. J. J. Arminio. From volunteers among the prisoners Dr. Arminio chose 311 who gave no history of hay fever. He divided them into three groups. When colds developed among the men that winter he gave neohetramine tablets to one group, blank tablets looking just like neohetramine to the second group, and the traditional doses of aspirin, nose drops, and lozenges to the third group.

The result made history. The men getting the blanks or the aspirin ran through all three phases of colds in the head—the sneezy and nose-running first phase, the stuffy-headed second phase, and the third phase with its thick discharge caused by the secondarily invading microbes that followed the attack of the cold virus. The colds averaged the 5 to 6 days that all of us suffer.

But the colds of the lucky fellows getting neohetramine within 24 hours of onset were cured in just a bit over 1 day; and those beginning treatment within 48 hours were restored to health in 2.8 days. However, when treatment was begun after 2 days—in the third, purulent phase—it did no good at all.

None of the prisoners got sleepy or showed any other side effects from the neohetramine treatment.

But an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Drs. Arminio and Sweet began testing neohetramine's preventive power upon Sisters at the Maryknoll Convent and students at the Maryknoll Seminary, near Ossining. One hundred took one 50-milligram neohetramine pill once a day; 100 took two pills a day; 100 took three. Again it was an impartial experiment, for all mixed up with these 300 nuns and students were 300 more getting blank pills; and none of the 600 knew which was which.

The results were astounding. All 600, intermingled, had the same chance of exposure to the cold virus. Of the 300 getting the blank pills every day for 6 months, 241 caught one or more colds, some of them five or six. One hundred seventy-nine of them developed real "blingers" going through to the phase of secondary infections; some developed pneumonitis, bronchitis, or misery of their sinuses.

Among the 200 getting neohetramine pills 2 and 3 times a day during that 6 months, 182 (91 percent) had no colds at all. And the others, who developed a bit of a sneeze and stuffiness, were well in 1 to 2 days. No headache. No sinus. No cough. No fever. No work loss. A few of the group getting three pills a day had some throat dryness; the three daily pills were cut down to two. Twelve subjects of the one-pill-a-day group got well-established colds, but even these were mild.

During all those 6 months none of the 300 experienced any sleepiness, dizziness or any other discomfort.

The Federal Food and Drug Administration, recognizing the safety of neohetramine, has now permitted its over-the-counter sale direct to the public. It is the first antihistamine so approved, but there will unquestionably soon be others. Neohetramine will continue to be known by that name to physicians. The public will purchase it under the trade-name Anahist. The tablets are 25 milligrams. They can be given to children as well as to adults. One large electrical company has already introduced Anahist cold prevention among its 10,000 workers.

Use of Anahist at a cold's first warning signal, with regular dosages thereafter, will likely kill a cold within 36 hours. It will also minimize the sneezing and coughing and runny noses that now spread the virus to others. It may break the ages-old chain of infection. Thus it seems within the range of possibility at last to wipe out the curse of the cold in the head.

Governmental Costs for Pay Rolls Near Twenty-two-Billion Mark

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a recent article from the Washington Evening Star:

GOVERNMENTAL COSTS FOR PAY ROLLS NEAR TWENTY-TWO-BILLION MARK

Governmental pay-roll costs are approaching a $22,000,000,000-a-year mark, an Associated Press survey showed yesterday.

These pay and allowance outlays by Federal, State and local Governments account for nearly $1 of each $6 paid out for wages and salaries in this country. They were surpassed only during the 1943–45 wartime period.

By official records, 7,685,000 persons—about one out of every eight workers in the country—are drawing Government pay.

The total includes members of the armed forces and school system employees.

Commerce Department data showed Government pay rolls hit a peacetime peak of $21,900,000,000 a year in November, and it appeared the climb was continuing.

Officials helping to analyze President Truman's budget for fiscal 1951—the 12 months beginning next July—said total Federal pay-roll outlays in that period will approximate $11,000,000,000.

That means a $600,000,000 increase over this year, split about equally between 1,500,000 members of the armed forces and approximately 2,000,000 civilian workers.

TWO HUNDRED AND FORTY-FOUR DOLLARS FOR EACH TAXPAYER

The $11,000,000,000 Federal total averages out to $244 for each of the 45,000,000 Federal income taxpayers. The increase over the current fiscal year is due to boosts in military and civilian pay voted by the last Congress.

Precise figures were not available on the number of employees of the Congress and courts, but pay and allowances in those departments were budgeted at around $50,000,000.

The budget called for 1,960,000 civilians in the executive branch of the Government. The all-time peak, in wartime 1945, was 8,770,000.

The Decisive Decade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert the content of an address by Herman Steinkraus, president, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, in Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 10, 1950.

Mr. Steinkraus, a Connecticut citizen and outstanding industrialist, is well qualified to speak out on the issues facing this country, as he has done in this address. I commend its reading to all who may peruse the RECORD.

I am very happy to be here this evening in Pittsburgh. It was just 30 years ago this month that I first came here for a company in Cleveland, on my first job as a traveling salesman. I remember Pittsburgh made quite an impression on me—or rather, what I could see of it—if you get what I mean. I remember my laundry bills were very big. I realize all that is changed now, so I shouldn't bring up those old days.

But at least my enthusiastic impression of this fine city still remains, and it is a pleasure to be here to speak to you, in this place which has always been so much the industrial heart of our country.

At this time I am conscious as you are that we are at the beginning of a new year, a year of great promise, but also of grave significance. Within the last few days we have heard the President's message on the State of the Union, the economic outlook, and his budget message. We have also heard many predictions from economists, bankers, and businessmen as to the outlook for 1950. The prophets are optimistic. They say business will be good.

Far be it for me to throw cold water on such optimism, but I believe that while this short-range view is helpful and interesting, yet when we consider the trend of our times it is much more important for us to have a long-range view, not for the next year alone, but for the next 10 years, which may well be for us the decisive decade.

Great events don't happen full-blown in a single year. They cast their shadows before, and the world lives in their aftermath. Events that will mark our future are shaping all about us today.

Pick up the daily newspaper, and you read of world-wide changes. The quiet course of day-to-day living of the early part of our century is gone forever. Changes come so swiftly it is hard for us to keep up with them, much less develop programs to handle them.

These dynamic, and in some cases catastrophic, changes seem to fall into three general spheres. First, the physical. The whole map of the world is different. Boundary lines, we learned in school, for Europe and for Asia have passed into history.

The great British Empire, whose bonds held tight for centuries, now finds those ties are loosened. New nations are born. We see ne wnames appear in parts of India, China, and the satellite countries. The last new nation—at least unless a new one has happened today—is the United States of Indonesia, comprising an area almost as large as that of our own country.

In fact, map makers are hard pressed to get out maps fast enough to make the correct changes of just the last few months.

Along with these are major population shifts, millions of people moving from one place to another—in Russia, China, and Europe, with its millions of refugees from Poland and Germany and elsewhere. A million people went to Israel alone in the last 12 months; many came to this country.

All this brings some nations closer to the realization of freedom, while others who have struggled for years to win their freedom now have lost it. Still others mark time, like patriotic little Finland, using her wits to save her soul, or Czechoslovakia, living on hope.

So, the physical changes of our world are vast and numerous.

The second sphere of change is in the field of science, with more new inventions and discoveries than at any time in the world's history. We absorb them quickly. It took a century to make full use of the invention of the power engine which brought about the industrial age. Today, with the growth of our technical knowledge, our skilled engineers, and our lightning speed of communications it is a very short time from the scientific discovery to its actual practical use.

Think of the march of science in just the last few years—radar, electronics, atomic energy, not to mention new metals, chemicals, and wonder drugs. Scientists tell us that there are many more discoveries on our doorstep in every one of these fields. In medicine doctors feel they are very near the answer to diseases that have ravaged man since history began. Last week 10,000 scientists met in New York City and announced the latest discoveries in many fields, including Einstein's new formula.

The other evening as I came home on the train a fellow commuter was studying the page before him with the picture of the new Einstein formula on it, with its numbers and letters. As he looked at it intently I said, "Do you understand that formula?" "Are you kidding?" he said, smiling. "It looks to me like a formula is a formula is a formula."

I presume some of you scientists here in Pittsburgh do understand it.

The third sphere of changes is the most important of all. That is the sphere of ideas—new concepts arising to challenge the old. Ideas about people, about governments, about life. The one that affects us the most today is the concept of totalitarianism which has been revived, challenging the principle of freedom which has been with us since the French Revolution. Many astute thinkers believe this challenge between totalitarianism and democracy will come to a head and be resolved in this decisive decade that lies ahead. It threatens the very way of life as we have known it.

As Dr. Vannevar Bush expressed it at MIT recently when he said: "The fundamental question of our times is the strength of the democratic system as compared with the strength of the totalitarianism system and the ability of each system to grow in strength in the years to come. By and large,

all questions of policy, national or international, economic or political, immediate or long-range, take on importance and urgency to the degree and only to the degree that they bear on this basic issue."

The danger for us lies in the fact that totalitarianism extends itself by conquest; it holds its conquest, not by persuasion, but by force and terror. There can be no freedom. We hate such methods. Yet there is no use in our burying our heads in the sand, ostrichlike, and not facing the unpleasant facts, such as the military expansion of Russia, her tremendous standing army, her so-called German police guard in the eastern zone, her Arctic air force, her submarines, her development of missile planes, and now the atom bomb.

In the last few months we have had the benefit of reports from many observers in Russia—journalists, businessmen, and others, including our former Ambassador, Gen. Bedell Smith. Almost without exception they tell the same story. They have no doubt whatever that Russia is bent on world extension of her communistic ideas. Incidentally, with their curious habit of calling things by names which they are not, Russians call it, not communism, but democracy, or socialism.

The reason Russia is so ready to use force to eradicate free forms of government is that she doesn't believe the two systems can exist peaceably in the same world. One or the other must be conquered.

As Stalin once expressed it, "In the future progress of international revolution two world centers will be formed: the Socialist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward socialism, and the capitalist center, attracting to itself all the countries gravitating toward capitalism; the struggle between these two centers for the conquest of world economy will decide the fate of capitalism and communism throughout the entire world."

But our observers of Russia also say, almost without exception, "This does not necessarily mean war." But they add the proviso—"provided the United States remains strong."

I have dwelt on this world issue because I feel it should be perfectly clear that our economic strength is a subject that is linked very closely to the survival of democracy and to the cause of freedom in the world.

To keep our country strong in every sense is the best protection we can have, and the best thing we can do for world peace. We know Russia expects and waits for our weakness. In the past she has never attacked the strong; instead, she has absorbed the weak.

If we are militarily protected, and keep our economy and industry sound, time and history will work for us. The records show no aggressor nation has been able permanently to hold together different peoples in far places, with different customs, ideals and beliefs. It is not likely that Stalin or the men in the Kremlin can succeed where Alexander the Great, Caesar, Napoleon, and Hitler failed. But the "if"—and it is a big "if"—is, if we remain strong, not merely in means of wartime defense, but strong in our industry, sound in our finances, and strong in purpose.

I do not wish to be an alarmist, but many of our leaders are deeply concerned, and feel the situation is even more serious than I have indicated. Only last Friday Mr. Tom Beck, the publisher of Collier's, said, "The Russians have got China. Next is Formosa, then Indochina, Malaya, and Siam. They'll take Japan when we get out. There's trouble in Kashmir on the border of Russia and India right now. The Russian boast is that they could take India in 60 days. Communist infiltration is taking place in Nigeria and Eritrea in Africa."

He believes that some day the Russians will overstep the bounds of caution, such as with the imprisonment of American nationals, and go too far in their undeclared war on the United States. For when America decides she has had enough, the strength of the two systems will be put to a test, and a severe one.

Are we building our Nation strong enough to meet this emergency or any other that may arise? That is the question. One thing we are sure of, the opposition is working day and night and making great sacrifices to grow militarily stronger than we are. Furthermore, Lenin said just before he died: "We shall force the United States to spend itself to destruction."

Let's look at the question of our financial strength, which is basic to any other kind of national strength. We are now entering upon the third year of major deficit spending. The annual deficits of this fiscal year and the next one, for which the President has just released his budget message, are actually greater than the entire annual costs of our National Government in the years before the war.

Now the President proposes still greater expenditures on more programs. He asks for still higher taxes, and estimates a deficit of $5,100,000,000 for 1951. What would happen to us in the midst of this period of bountiful spending if a serious crisis would occur?

We can all remember those years of $100,000,000,000 budgets during the Second World War. Could our economy stand such a strain today on top of our already huge debt of $259,000,000,000? If such a catastrophe comes, we can't count this time on some other nation holding the aggressor off until we get ready. Other nations are still so weak from the last war that we must help them with our ECA funds to put them back on their feet. We can't expect a year or two of grace, as we had in the previous two World Wars, when our Allies and two oceans kept our enemies from our shores.

I fear we would be in for a lot of trouble if we had to face such a situation tomorrow. I hope it doesn't happen at all, but we can't depend on hopes alone when our eyes and ears tell us what is going on throughout the world. We ought to plan for the worst that might happen, and that in itself is the best guaranty that the worst will not happen.

So I think we should ask ourselves this question right now: With the highest rate of national income in our history, and the highest level of taxes in our history, and the largest Federal debt in our history, and the biggest threat to the future of democracy in its history, is this the time for greater spending, and greater taxes, and greater deficits? Or is it about time to stop that course, reverse the direction in which we are going, and resist the demands for still greater benefits for all—out of the public purse?

I say, the American people should wake up to the danger at their door. They should be aroused to insist on economy in Government, in balancing the budget, and on preserving our industrial strength.

We have a number of men in the Senate and the House who have tried to show how this could be done. Senator BYRD, who for 16 years has had to do intimately with fiscal policies of our Government, has proposed a budget of $36,000,000,000, without curtailing any of our defense program or other essential programs, but cutting down waste and many high-riding items we don't need. Only recently he warned that without solvency and stability our form of government cannot survive.

Yet, in the face of such wise counsel from devoted Americans in high places, the program for the coming year is one of still greater spending, still more deficits, still higher taxes. Few people realize that even a $36,000,000,000 budget is $2,000,000,000 higher than the budget for 1948. This year we are spending $43,300,000,000. For next year the President asks for $42,400,000,000. But there is little if any reference at all in any of the President's three messages about economy.

I have read over the President's economic message several times. It is about 8,000 words long. It uses the word "economy" 34 different times. In each case, however, it is business economy, peacetime economy, expanding economy, and so forth. Apparently the President's economic advisers know only one meaning of the word, and that pertains to business. They never, not even once, mention Government economy, the kind we need worst of all.

Some people have the impression that this increased spending program is due to larger amounts going for defense, and our aid to Europe. This is not exactly true. In fact, the Defense Department has been making savings for a number of months. The deficit of five and one-half billions for fiscal 1949 is due to an increase over $6,000,000,000 in our domestic spending alone, for different programs of our administration, for social welfare, housing, and other items.

Probably in themselves they are all desirable things to have, just as each of us can think of many things we would like to have for our families if we had the money. But in times like these our desires must be tempered with good judgment and foresight. When the course of this Nation for the future hinges on what we do now, our tax and expenditure program should be a sound one.

Our American voters shouldn't be lulled into a feeling that the future is completely rosy for 50 years to come, and everyone should earn a thousand dollars a year more in 5 years, and building air castles about the year 2000. What we need most right now is one simple word of advice: "Economize."

There is another way in which we must be strong in any emergency. That is, in our industrial strength. I don't have to recall to you that basically that is what saved us in the last war. We had the production, miracles of it. The world had never seen anything like it. Even Russia benefited from our industry to the tune of $11,000,000,000 worth of goods—everything from raw materials to machines and tanks and trucks and ships. But Washington has apparently forgotten about that. For in the feverish activity for the redistribution of wealth under the New Deal and Fair Deal programs, our Government has devoted little thought or attention toward helping our industry create more wealth.

For only American industry and agriculture and business and labor can create wealth. The Government can't do it; but it can hinder the rest from creating it. Unfortunately, I fear that is what has been happening. Attacks on business from high Government places have hampered us for many years.

Right now many of our most successful companies are being attacked for the very bigness which made it possible for them to serve our Nation so well. You know who they are. Some of them are represented right here tonight. How Russia would love to see the bigness of these basic industries destroyed.

Industry is being taxed so heavily, investment capital is slowing down. Even the President recognizes that such investments went down an alarming 18 percent in 1949, and are still dropping.

We need all business, big and small, to grow steadily to provide the growing number of jobs we need in every town. Each year an additional six to eight hundred thousand young people come into our labor force. To provide jobs we must attract more people's savings which they are willing to risk in common stocks of business corporations. That means the risk must be made worth while. A basic 83 percent of corporation

tax, which is threatened to be raised still higher, plus a double taxation on dividends, is shown by very simple arithmetic to mean that under the most favorable circumstances the Government takes more than 50 percent of a company's earnings. In the most adverse circumstances the Government takes as much as 82 cents out of every dollar of profits, and the owner is left with less than 18 cents.

Unless we have drastic changes in this tax set-up, middle- and small-sized companies will find it harder and harder to get capital for their business to grow. They will stagnate; some will want to sell out to the very same bigger ones, which the administration wants to trim down.

In the most earnest way I can put it, I urge the present administration to correct this growing discouragement of venture capital. We cannot remain strong or grow any stronger unless our Government leaders understand better, or perhaps I should say, act better toward the problems of business. The Nation must look to American businessmen for the creation of jobs, production, and the creation of wealth. That is the only fountain source from which all the benefits they promise can possibly come, these benefits to be distributed by a generous and loving government.

This change in attitude on the part of the Government should certainly include stopping the damaging attacks on business and having the constructive one of helping business to become stronger. It also should include an end of Government competition with business, an end of threats. For example, such threats that if private enterprise decides against building a certain number of certain priced houses in a certain city, then the Government will. An end to threats that if the steel industry is unwilling to accept Government figures on how much productive capacity is needed, the Government will build it. An end to such plans as dividing the country into nine regions ostensibly for flood control. Practically it would mean complete control of the basic power facilities of the entire Nation under the direction of 27 appointed commissioners with responsibility only to the White House. It is just too much power in one place.

Finally, if we are to be stronger industrially we must by all means have greater unity in relations between management, labor, and the Government. Many of you here tonight could speak eloquently about the need for better leadership of our Nation's top officials to stop the loss in income for workers and management, the cost to the American people, and the destruction of good will and violence that come in the path of strikes.

I can see we are making some slow progress.

But oh, for an end to the class struggle, the false accusations, the play for power and for votes, and the loss and distress to the public, who are the ones who always pay in the long run. Pittsburgh could write a history of sad and bitter experience perhaps not equaled by any one other city in the country.

But every section of the country suffers from labor strife, and every man, woman, and child pays for it.

I have two specific suggestions as to how we might start to build a happier, better relationship between government, managemen, and labor. It might not work, but I think it would. It is worth a try. It is something we could do right now.

First, I think the Taft-Hartley law should be given a fair chance to operate without the continuous blanket condemnation that it isn't any good, and without schemes to avoid its fair application, as in such instances as the coal situation today. This law was put on the books after one of the most thorough hearings from all sides as to what kind of a law was needed ever experienced in Washington.

Of course, it has restricted some privileges of union leaders, but it has also set up strict rules which management must follow. I believe most workers are for it, because it protects them against abuses which had crept into the labor movement. It also protects the public from some of the abuses it used to take, under the old laws, from management and labor both.

Such statements as that which the President recently made condemning the law impedes its fair trial.

Under this law an avalanche of strikes was curbed; under this law Communists have been driven out of many unions; under this law workers and management both have had the best set of rules for collective bargaining they have ever had; during this period we have had the best conciliation and mediation service we have ever had.

No matter what is said to the contrary, experience all across the country shows it has helped the collective-bargaining process, and it will do still better if given a reasonable chance. It is unfortunate that it has had to operate under continued attacks on the part of labor leaders and holders of public office.

My second proposal is that the Department of Labor be reorganized to become the Department of Labor and Industry, or perhaps it might be called the Department of Labor and Management.

I have given this matter considerable thought for a number of years, and have discussed it with a number of Government officials. Reaction has been so favorable, I would like to suggest it tonight. Here is the reason for this proposal.

When the Department of Labor was first organized back in 1913, labor needed the help of the Government in order to bargain with management on a fair and equal basis. The Department of Labor was given the specific purpose by law to further the interests of labor, and nobody else.

But now labor has grown into great strength, and the situation has changed completely, and a further step is needed. Such a reorganized department would be charged with the responsibility of promoting better understanding between labor and management, and to develop methods of avoiding strife and strikes, which cause such distress and financial loss.

Secondly, the new Department would be charged with safeguarding the interests of the public. As it is now, frequently both sides are partly right and partly wrong, and the public gets caught in the middle.

Such a Department would clarify many of our labor problems, I believe, because there would be some unity in the handling of such matters. Consider the lack of logic in our present situation where the Bureaus of Conciliation and Mediation have nothing whatsoever to do with the Department of Labor, and for a good reason, too. The Department of Labor does have a Bureau which compiles labor statistics, and a very good Bureau it is, too.

But the fact is, the present Department of Labor, as a whole, is completely outmoded. It does not meet our present or future needs. The reorganization I propose would serve all parties, and become an instrument of service to all. For the basic interests of both labor and management are the same. A union can only be successful when connected with a successful company. The sale of the New York Sun last week is an example. When labor and management share the responsibilities more successfully, then, and then only can they also share the rewards of teamwork.

The atmosphere in which business blames labor and labor blames business only injures the industrial health of our Nation. No matter who is right or who is wrong, or whether both are partly right and partly wrong, the fact is that strife between them weakens the whole Nation.

If my analysis of the No. 1 problem of this year and the decade to come is correct—all of us will have to sacrifice some of our pet ideas—all of us will have to give up the idea of benefits which right now we would like to have, but which we cannot afford. All of us will have to rededicate ourselves to the protection of our great heritage.

I sincerely hope that in this session Congress will devote its talents and energies to these urgent matters; that it will face up squarely to the realities of the situation and will not permit an impending election to cause them to play politics with the future of our Nation and the democratic world.

Fortunately for us, we have men of great leadership on both sides, whose devotion to country surmounts all other considerations, and whose advice if followed will lead us to a successful conclusion to the critical years that lie ahead. But businessmen too must rise from their lethargy and let their voices be heard. We should be sure that our representatives in Washington know our views.

The challenge of this decisive decade is not a challenge of material things; it is a challenge to the character of our people, a challenge to their willingness to face realities, and put the things first that ought to come first. Give them courageous leadership, but please don't fool them with honeyed promises of greater benefits, at this time when we face a danger which we can only meet if we are a united, strong people. God grant our leaders the wisdom to lead us right.

Gary, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial by editor H. B. Snyder of the Gary (Ind.) Post Tribune again reveals that the Calumet region of Indiana is today recognized as the No. 1 steel-manufacturing center in America. We have Carnegie, Illinois, Inland, Youngstown, and other large steel mills in Gary, East Chicago, Hammond, and Whiting, Ind.

The largest oil refineries, cement plants, and almost every branch of heavy industry makes its home in the Calumet region of Indiana.

GARY MEN TAKE OVER

The Gary-Chicago district has been taking over Pittsburgh's place as the Nation's steel capital, so it's quite fitting that Gary steel men should be taking over top executive positions in Carnegie-Illinois Steel Corp.

Selection of S. M. Jenks to be Carnegie's vice president in charge of operations means that three former Gary plant executives now are in key posts with the No. 1 subsidiary of United States Steel.

In addition to Jenks, there is Earl Moore, who preceded him as Gary Works general superintendent, as Carnegie's vice president for industrial relations. And there's James Darbaker, former top man of the Gary Sheet and Tin Mill, as Carnegie's manager of sales.

Gary was a proving ground in their development as top-level executives with Carnegie-Illinois. And so it was with Austin J. Paddock, former manager of the American

Bridge plant here who is now operating vice president of the company, and with Laurence S. Dahl, former hot strip mill superintendent of the Gary Sheet and Tin Mill, who now is operations vice president of Columbia Steel, United States Steel's west-coast subsidiary.

The Midwest is continuing to be an expanding-market area for the steel industry. Pittsburgh steel men regretfully admit that the smoky city is definitely losing its preeminence in steel and that it never will be regained.

We aren't so optimistic as to believe operating headquarters therefore will be moved from Pittsburgh to this district, but it is encouraging to know that three of the key executives in the Carnegie-Illinois set-up are former Gary men who know and understand the potentialities of the industry in the Calumet.

Example of Ultra Vires Action by Rules Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERMAN P. EBERHARTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. EBERHARTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Post of June 5, 1949:

HOUSING STALL

With Chairman SPENCE of the House Banking Committee moving to bypass the obstructionist Rules Committee, a vote on the housing bill now appears to be a certainty. That is good news, for failure of Congress to pass any comprehensive housing legislation at this session would not only undermine the hopes of a vast number of poorly housed families, it would also be regarded as a repudiation of the pledges made in the last campaign by both major parties and would thus be a blow to confidence in popular government.

The Rules Committee has followed its traditional head-in-the-sand policy. When it received the housing bill from the Banking Committee 3 weeks ago, any well-informed citizen on the street could have told it that this was an important measure which should be sent to the floor promptly with a rule allowing ample consideration. A similar bill had passed the Senate by a vote of 57 to 13. But the committee stalled, held hearings for 3 days, and stalled some more. Its conduct seems especially unenlightened in view of the new rule which permits the Banking Committee to take its appeal directly to the House 3 weeks hence. One can only conclude that the Rules Committee majority has learned nothing from the revolt of last January against its tyranny.

The high-handed nature of the Rules Committee's action is illustrated by its probing into cost figures and the extent of the Government's obligation under the bill. These are problems for the committee reporting the bill, the Appropriations Committee, and the House itself. So far as we can see, they have nothing to do with the Rules Committee's function of routing measures to the floor in an orderly fashion.

As to the merits of the bill, we do not think that economy is the major issue. Of course, the total amount that is to be spent under this measure must be determined by the resources available. Even for the replacement of slums with decent housing for low-income families, expenditures must be kept within the limits of a sound fiscal policy. But that does not minimize the desirability of getting this program started—of getting a sound public housing act on the books. A long-range policy is envisaged under which the Government will help local communities to meet their slum problems. We think that policy is sound and practicable even though it may have to be inaugurated on a small scale compared to the need.

Nor is socialism the issue. Americans have never regarded it as socialistic to aid families who, by reason of misfortune or low income, are forced to live in squalor or unhealthful environment. The current housing bill is merely a means of making such help practicable. It is predicated on the belief that private enterprise should provide housing for all the families that it can possibly serve. Beyond its reach, however, are vast slum areas that must be wiped out by governmental effort to save our cities from an incredible burden of crime, delinquency, disease and social malaise. Our highly integrated society cannot neglect this problem without risking its own health and stability.

Government Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BYRNES
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BYRNES of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Marinette County Pomona Grange has forwarded to me a resolution recently adopted by that fine organization. The resolution comes like a fresh breeze on a sultry summer day. So that all Members may dwell upon it, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed at this point in the RECORD. The resolution follows:

Whereas it has been intimated that we can make very little progress toward economy and business in Government this year because most of the Members of Congress are up for election;

Whereas if this intimation is valid, it means that America is in grave danger of being governed by fear rather than democratic principles, and that its citizens are voting to protect selfish interests rather than the general welfare—that they have sunk to the depth of selling their vote to the highest bidder; and

Whereas the report of the Hoover Commission, which has been received enthusiastically by the country as a whole, under such reasoning, would be subject to the whims of selfish Government employees rather than put to work for the common good: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Marinette County Pomona Grange go on record with the following convictions:

1. That there are enough loyal citizens, whether employed by the Government or not to elect officials pledged to good government and sane economy.

2. That the intimation that we cannot foster good government during an election year is an insult to the American people, and is not worthy of the consideration and publicity it has been given.

3. That we firmly believe in the ideals of the great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, and call upon every citizen to do his best to insure that we keep the Government of the people, by the people, and for the people: Be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to the press, our Congressmen and Senators, to each subordinate Grange and to the State and National Grange.

House Resolution 133

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW JACOBS
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, speaking to House Resolution 133, I reported to the people I represent as follows:

Good evening. Within a week democracy will face a severe test here in Washington.

This test will not be directly concerned with any particular legislation.

But the very bedrock foundation of democracy is to be tried. A terrific strain will be brought to bear upon the cardinal principle of democracy.

That principle is the right of the majority to govern this country within its constitutional framework.

The attack upon the democratic principle of majority rule is a subtle one. But it is very simple indeed when all the hocus-pocus is exposed.

Here is the issue in stark simplicity: Shall 7 Congressmen be empowered to veto the right of 428 Congressmen to vote yea or nay upon a bill—a bill, if you please—that has been studied and recommended for passage by another legally constituted congressional committee.

Now, having stated the issue, let's see how it is coming up. A little background will make it perfectly clear.

I hope all of you will follow me carefully. The issue is vital, but, I repeat, it is simple. It is one which every man, woman, and child in America should understand.

We are a nation of some 150,000,000 people. We are committed to the sacred principle of self-government.

This principle is embodied in the historic documents upon which our Republic was, and is, founded.

Our Declaration of Independence declared that all men are created equal and that we are each endowed by our Creator with the inalienable rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

That immortal document then asserted that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Thus the fundamental principle of your government is your consent, which means your approval of a proposed new law. One hundred and fifty million people cannot meet, consider, and give their individual decisions on each proposed law. We Americans have, therefore, resorted to representative government.

Each district sends a Representative to Congress. You of the Eleventh Indiana District sent me.

There are 435 of us in Congress. Thus we are a large parliamentary body. We could not operate without rules.

In the absence of parliamentary laws and a code of procedure, we would fall into utter confusion.

The Constitution gives us the power to write our own rules of procedure. This we have done.

Our membership is divided into committees. Each committee—usually consisting

of 25 Congressmen—is charged with the duty of studying legislation in its given field, like Labor or Education or Foreign Affairs, Agriculture, Armed Services, etc.

There are 19 standing committees. One is the Rules Committee. We will discuss it and its function later.

The 18 remaining committees are charged with the responsibility of studying and holding hearings on proposed legislation.

If a majority of such committee approves such legislation, it is voted out with recommendation that it pass.

The public hearings are printed and the committee prepares a report. These are for the information of the public and other Congressmen.

The bill then goes to the House of Representatives for consideration of the Representatives of all the 150,000,000 people in the United States.

Here, however, we must have further rules of procedure. Otherwise, the chairman of the 18 standing committees would never agree upon the order of business.

Members are entitled to know what bills are on the calendar for debate and vote. They are thus enabled to concentrate their study upon these bills, reports, and hearings.

Therefore, there must be a calendar; and since the 18 chairmen of the standing committees would probably each consider his bill of greatest importance, they would never agree upon a calendar.

It is, therefore, necessary to empower someone to make up the legislative calendar.

Here is where the nineteenth standing committee comes in.

It is the Rules Committee. It has charge of the order of business. In other words, the Rules Committee makes up the calendar for the House. It has no power to write the rules governing the House.

Some bills are long and complex. Some are short and simple.

Thus it requires more debate and consideration for some than for other bills.

Accordingly, it is proper and necessary that more time be assigned some bills than others.

Someone must decide the time allotted for each bill.

The Rules Committee's duty is to decide as to time allotted for debate on a bill—as well as certain control of its place on the House Calendar.

In order to allot time, the Rules Committee must know something about the bill under consideration.

Therefore, it is proper that the Rules Committee hear evidence as to the nature of the bill.

Naturally, as the members of the Rules Committee hear what the bill is about—and what it provides, these members form opinions.

Such is the course of the human mind—a course that is inevitable—and concerning which there can be no objection.

After all, the members of the Rules Committee are also Members of Congress. They will be called upon to vote upon the bill; that is, once it is scheduled for consideration on the floor of the House of Representatives.

But there is the rub. There is where the issue—the crucial test of democracy is coming up. The members of this committee want the power to decide that bills they don't like can't come up on the floor.

Let's keep in mind the real function of the Rules Committee. Its duty and responsibility is to schedule business in the House of Representatives—to act, as it were, as a traffic engineer—to assist the orderly flow of business in the House of Representatives.

It is not the duty of a traffic engineer to stop every person and decide whether he should be allowed to make his particular trip—to pass judgment on whether I should go to a lecture or you should go to your grandmother's for a Thanksgiving dinner. The traffic cop should decide when you cross the intersection, but he hasn't the right to say you shall never cross.

The Chief Justice of the Supreme Court may be authorized to make up the court's calendar.

Then, when a case is heard, he can cast his one, out of nine votes, for a decision.

But the Chief Justice has no power to conclude that your case shouldn't be decided and, therefore, refuse to schedule it for hearing; perhaps because he thinks a majority of the Justices will decide your case differently than he would.

When he does that, he is usurping the entire power of the Court; of which he is but one of nine members.

But that is exactly what the Rules Committee has done in the past.

As the years rolled by, its members gradually lost sight of the distinction. They overlooked the great difference between the standards and quantum of their vote as members of the Rules Committee and as Members of Congress.

They began to support their views as Members of Congress, where they were just 1 of 435 men; yes, they backed up their individual views by refusing to schedule bills they opposed.

Congressional committees of 25 have heard from the public on many bills and voted to recommend passage. But the Rules Committee usurped the power to decide that it was a bad bill. So the Rules Committee simply denied the bill a hearing before the House.

In many cases the bill was one that had been an issue in a national election, and the party sponsoring it won.

So these 12 men sit in the Rules Committee and just 7 of them, a majority, decide the people made a mistake; that the other 428 Congressmen can't be trusted; and therefore, the bill goes into the proverbial pigeonhole.

Now that was the situation in the House of Representatives when the Eighty-first Congress met.

Congressman EBERHARTER, of Pennsylvania, proposed a way to stop this usurpation of power. He proposed that on certain days the chairman of a standing committee could call up any bill his committee had approved; without consent of the Rules Committee.

We adopted this new rule by almost 2 to 1. Some of you may recall my mentioning this in my broadcast of January 22, 1949. At that time I said:

"I recall my first vote in Congress. It was on the question of whether or not we would change congressional rules so that we Congressmen could force the leaders to bring legislation out on the floor of the House so that the Members could have the opportunity to vote or be forced to vote upon it.

"A member of the Rules Committee who spoke against our proposition said, 'For every man who has asked me to bring a bill out on the floor, there have been 10 who asked me not to bring it out because if they were forced to vote upon it, they would be defeated in the next election.' It was my judgment that any man who didn't have the courage to vote on legislation had no business in Congress and, therefore, I voted for the change."

I have not changed my mind.

However, the Rules Committee has voted out a resolution to repeal the Eberharter rule. It will probably come up next Tuesday. In other words, this committee is trying to again arrogate to itself the power that belongs to the House of Representatives.

The Senate has its filibusters—the House had Rules Committee procedure that permitted 7 men to stop dead in its tracks a constitutional body of 435 elected Representatives of 150,000,000 people.

We took that power away from it. Now it hopes to regain that power—places its hopes on the fear of some Congressmen to vote on controversial legislation—in this case, the Fair Employment Practices Commission, known as FEPC.

Strange as it seems, this legislation was, in effect, pledged by both major parties.

However, the well-known coalition between certain Democrats and Republicans is spearheading this movement.

None of these people has the responsibility to represent any except his own district.

Yet they want to decide what I shall be privileged to vote for.

I calculate that you folks in Indianapolis don't expect me to be afraid to vote on any measure. I further calculate that you elected me to represent you; and that you aren't relying upon any of the 12 men on the Rules Committee to do that job.

Naturally, many of you will disagree with me; some on one measure, some on others. And in the end, a majority of you may be dissatisfied with how I have represented you generally.

But, it is not representative government when men from distant parts of the country say that your Representative can't represent you.

Nor do I have a right to hide behind the Rules Committee's skirts. Nor do I want to. Nor should any other Congressman want to.

Congressmen aren't supposed to be weaklings. If they can't stand on their own feet, the sooner that's discovered, the better.

For these reasons I think democracy is now in danger in the House of Representatives.

For the same reasons, I am going to vigorously oppose repeal of the Eberharter rule and the return of this unwarranted and usurped power to the Rules Committee.

Goodnight.

Strengthening Liberty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by the Honorable James A. Farley at the annual meeting of the Manhattan Council of the Boy Scouts of America, held at the Hotel Commodore, New York City, on January 16, 1950:

This introduction makes me feel very humble, for as I face this great audience I realize how much more many of you are contributing to the cause of Scouting and the boys who are growing up among us in New York City that it is within my power to do. Right here I would like to pay tribute to the hundreds of unselfish leaders in the Manhattan council who are giving their time and effort and intelligence to bring the Scout program to the boys of this area. The cubmasters, the scoutmasters, and the explorer advisers, with their assistants, are directly affecting the lives of boys who in the future may make a contribution to the happiness of millions of people. They are dealing with deathless values. Then there are the commissioners, members of committees, and hundreds who serve in other positions, all of you engaged in this great undertaking of building the human foundations of our country's future. The thanks of New York City and of the Nation go to you for the work you are doing. The results will extend further than you and I may ever know.

It must give you great satisfaction that because of your efforts during the past year your council has made the greatest gain in membership in all its history. Your president has told me that the upswing in the number of units, and in the number of boys and leaders in those units, far surpasses anything you have previously achieved. I congratulate all those whose hard work made this record possible.

Yet, I wish to remind you that this record should be interpreted always in human terms, in terms of boys growing up to manhood on the streets of the city of New York, growing up, many thousands of them, into upright, responsible, God-fearing citizens because of the exertion made on their behalf by the men and women in this audience. Only by continuing and extending these efforts can we help to overcome some of the handicaps of the living conditions which we have imposed upon the boys in New York City.

Some of you may know that I am not a city-bred man. I grew up in a small town, and the things which we as boys took for granted as part of our daily lives, would be privileges beyond the purchase of even the well-to-do boys in New York City today. It is true that we had no neighborhood clubs, no movie houses, no radios. But we had the open fields and the hills and the streams and the woods. In the summer we could go fishing or get up a game of baseball on a vacant lot. In the winter we skated or coasted down hill or sometimes got together in someone's big kitchen to pop corn or make candy and play games. We were rich, though by the economic standards of today we would be considered underprivileged. We were rich in a hundred opportunities which the boys growing up around us can never hope to experience, unless we bring them such a program as Scouting; unless we take them out of this walled city of steel and concrete, out to where they can see the blue sky, hear a bird call through the quiet woods, and live through some of the simple primitive experiences that are the natural heritage of every boy.

These boys shouting over their games in the midst of the city traffic are living the most impressionable years of their lives. Right now their lifetime habits are being formed. Right now, they are being permanently influenced for good or for bad, by the sights around them, the people they meet, and the ideals which we present to them.

I believe that under God and the fitness of things, we owe to them the best preparation within our power to give, for the burdens which we are going to lay upon their shoulders. In a few years, these boys are going to take over where we have left off, and upon their integrity and clear thinking and hard work will depend the future not only of our city, but of our entire country which we love so dearly.

For the conditions which confront the young people in New York City are not just a local problem. They are pretty universal throughout the country, and I wish that at least in these few minutes which I spend with you, you would mentally extend your horizons, and think of your Scout work not just in terms of the Manhattan council and the boys that it serves, but in terms of the Nation as a whole, and your contribution to the future of America and, indeed, the entire world.

You are taking part in a Nation-wide crusade which should bring to American boys a vision of their heritage as free-born citizens of the greatest country on the face of the earth, and furthermore help them to realize, in terms of a boy's language and a boy's ideals, that they as citizens of this great country, have definite responsibilities toward themselves and toward other people.

I have been studying what you call the targets of your campaign, and it seems to me that you have been wise in selecting as your first one, good leadership, because the effectiveness of any kind of training for young people depends upon the effectiveness of the leadership. A top-notch leader, a man whom boys admire and want to imitate, can have more influence on his boys even without a program, than the finest system the mind of man could devise, if it is administered by a man they do not respect. Influencing young people is a delicate business. Older people frequently think they know how to do it, and they often succeed without realizing just how. Influence depends upon who the leader is, and how the boy feels about him. I think everyone in this group can probably recall some person who has made a lasting impression upon his thinking and acting.

A man well known in public affairs once told that never since he was 12 years old had he ever pointed anything, even a stick, let alone a gun, at anybody. He had received his first instructions in handling firearms from a man whom he respected greatly. This man was a veteran of the Civil War, and a woodsman, an expert marksman, and when he urged caution, the boy treasured what he had to say, because the boy had faith in his teacher. That boy was taught by the right sort of man under the right conditions. Yes. undoubtedly, the Boy Scouts learn a great many more things from their Scout leaders than technical Scouting.

Now, the second thing that you have set up in your targets comes under the heading "Program," and this is where you catch your boys. Don't fool yourselves on this. You feel that the Scout program offers good training in democracy, that it prepares boys to be cooperative citizens, and helps develop the kind of character you want to see in your son. But the boy first, last, and always joins the Scouts, not because he wants to be done good to, but because he wants to have a good time, and he thinks that the Scouts will give it to him.

Who says the future is menacing and the world is out of joint? Not the boy. He sees the world as a splendid, exhilarating jamboree that meets in a jungle especially designed for his purpose. As long as your program gives him adventure, something to do in the woods and the fields, boys will want to be Scouts.

You have a lot of competition for the boy's interest these days, so you have to be on your toes to keep your program up. All sorts of commercial amusements are available on every street corner, many more now than when this Scout movement was first developed. But the nature of boys has not changed in the past 40 years nor in the past 400 years, psychologists tell us, and most boys still will prefer the adventure the Scout program offers, if you make sure that you give it to them—camping, a chance to sleep out in the open, build a fire and cook dinner over it, to learn first aid, life saving, how to take care of themselves and other people.

It is not altogether easy for you folks in a big city like this to give these outdoor experiences to boys. I realize there are unusual problems. But of course it can be done, and I am glad to learn that you have been doing it, and that you had more boys in camp in 1949 than ever before.

Did you ever drive in the dusk of a late afternoon in autumn through the outskirts of the city? In the open fields and in the vacant lots you will see them, the boys of the neighborhood, gathered together in little groups. And the thing that holds them fascinated in the gathering darkness is a bonfire, their campfire. Maybe it is crudely built of just a few old slats or broken boxes, but to them it means adventure and magic. That is a need deep in the heart of every boy. That is the quality you have to keep in your program if you expect to get across to boys some of the other fine things like citizenship that you want to teach them.

Another feature in your program that attracts the boy—the chance to learn and do things that seem to him worth while. It is an appeal to the man that is beginning to take shape in him, a chance to be recognized, to stand out in his community as someone to be relied upon. Boys have a great deal more idealism than some people give them credit for, and are eager to work hard and make personal sacrifice, if the cause seems to them to justify their effort. For instance, look at what Boy Scouts accomplished during the war. These boys, most of them in their early teens, worked at back-breaking tasks, collecting and salvaging tons of material which the Government requested; they drudged cheerfully for millions of hours at all sorts of unspectacular jobs, because they believed they were helping to win the war. If any of you ever have any doubt of the fiery idealism that burns in American boys, I suggest that you look over the record of Scout war service.

Through his Scout unit, the boy finds a chance to help in many projects for his community and other people. He gets training that he knows will qualify him to be of service to others. Because he wants to help, he works hard.

One thing always impresses me when I read the reports of service that Scouts have rendered, and that is the amount of hard work that boys do almost automatically as a part of their Scout program. Paradoxically, although as individuals I think we are not sufficiently alert to our obligations to youth, we often ask too little actual work from them in this mechanical age. It is true that in rural areas boys are usually obliged to take a definite share in the duties of the farm and home, but in a city like New York, boys are not expected to assume many duties, compared to those required of us when I was a boy.

The ability to work is the foundation of good citizenship, and the opportunity to work is a part of our American heritage. The men who built America were workers. Unfortunately, a good many people today overlook this fact, and believe that if a man is smart enough he can find ways to live without working. Maybe an individual can for a while, but a nation never. The trend of the times seems to be to get as much as we can and to contribute as little as possible. We cannot build our house upon sand, and there are certain principles which have stood the test of time and upon which we must still stand, if our American institutions are to go forward. One of these is loyalty, and the other is work. The time must come when our able-bodied men and women must settle down to work and earn and save. That is our priceless American heritage which we must pass on to our children—the privilege of work.

Another feature in the Scout program which appeals to me strongly is that it is not based upon a mere materialistic foundation, but upon the consciousness that there is a God who is to be honored and served. The Scout is taught in our American scheme of things. Let me recall to you the judgment of George Washington, the father of our country. He said, "Let no one cherish the illusion that without religion and morality the security and well-being of the Nation can long survive."

Religion is the foundation of society, the basis on which our civil government rests. It was religion which braced the founders of this country against the dangers of the ocean and the perils of the wilderness and helped them to build here a true democracy. A few years ago I saw an interchurch world survey of church relations in cities with a population of over 300,000. The picture is not a bright one—52.7 percent of the population, so the survey showed, were nonchurch-going people. In rural areas, the percentage was even higher. Now speaking to you as a father, and as a churchman, I ask you what can we expect of our boys and

young men when more than half our homes are "religious jungles?" How important it is that you men in Scouting should emphasize by every means within your power the importance of the twelfth Scout law: "A Scout is reverent. He is reverent toward God. He is faithful in his religious duties, and respects the convictions of others in matters of custom and religion."

It is not going to be easy in the years ahead to protect our democratic way of life. We can help to do so by making religion a living reality in the lives of the boys of America. We must teach our children to respect the convictions of others, and recognize the inspiration of religion and power of Almighty God. The American future cannot be guaranteed by a few slick tricks of economic manipulation. We need to get something akin to a vast religious awakening that will give new dignity and new valuation to our lives.

I notice you have set up as your third target, an increase in your membership. Speaking as one outside your organization, that would seem to be automatic. If you have the right leaders and the right program, the boys will come knocking at your doors. It is important that you set up the machinery to take care of it. As a businessman, I find your organization plan for taking care of boys good procedure. Anybody can throw a basketball up in the air and collect a gang of boys. But when you build on a church, or a men's club, or some other group, you give a stability and permanence to your units, and that is the way you are building them.

There is only one danger there as I see it, the human tendency which we all have, to relax when we are doing a good job. Sure, your church has a Cub Pack, and maybe your Legion post has a troop. It takes care of ten, twenty, perhaps even more boys. But maybe that church or Legion post ought to be serving a hundred others. Maybe there are that many boys in your neighborhood wanting to come in, only there's no place for them. Soon they may get tired and look for their recreation elsewhere. Soon it may be too late to reach them. So I hope that you will make sure, if you feel that you are doing your share, that you really are. Maybe your church ought to have a group of older fellows, those too old to join your troop. Or the younger one—they can get some mighty valuable experiences if your board of directors votes to get a pack started for them.

What a debt we owe these boys! Don't forget that a few years ago it was our young men who flew our planes, drove our tanks, died in fox holes and won the war for us. We owe our youth a debt we can never pay. We have the finest young people in the world right here on the sidewalks of New York. I am always impressed as I meet with them and talk to them by their sincerity, their frankness, their fine sense of loyalty and capacity for devotion. And yet the majority of our criminals are boys and young men. Eighty percent of them are less than 25 years of age. Our rate of juvenile delinquency is equally depressing. If the good people of the borough of Manhattan ask why so many youths become delinquents and criminals, I can tell them why. Experience shows that the majority of these young people have had bad influence during the impressionable years covered by the span of Scouting, from 8 to 18. During these years every boy needs the influence of the right kind of man. He needs such a man to supply his ideals and become his hero. The reason so many boys become criminals is because they follow the wrong leaders.

This condition is a challenge to the men of our city. Nightly these thousands of boys roam our streets, looking for amusement, longing for adventure, yearning for companionship. Many come from broken homes. Few have had a chance for church influence. Should we shut the doors of Scouting in their faces? Should we not provide a place where they can meet and find wholesome activities under the right kind of leader?

This is a practical thing. It can be done. You have made a beginning, with wonderful results. Why should you not undertake it in a bigger way? Will you not, each one of you, here and now accept the challenge and do your part for the boys who are knocking on the door?

I do not think we should spend too much time looking into the past. The world is not finished. We have just started. As long as we have the desire to go ahead, we shall progress. What we need is to help with all our might the young people who are going to carry it on. We can make the future what we want it to be if we will equip them to carry on what we have begun. When we compare our democracy to the forces that beset us, forces that stand for the suppression of religion, of free speech, free press, and the dignity of the individual, for the perversion of youth by propaganda, we realize how necessary are such movements as the Boy Scouts, devoted to the development of character, integrity, reverence, and the American principle of fair play.

The symbol of America, the Statue of Liberty, represents liberty and justice. It stands for everything we hold good. Americans should be prouder than ever of their country today, and the ideals on which it is founded. You have embarked upon what you term a crusade to strengthen the arm of liberty. I urge that you step in and win it. Make this a crusade of decency, for democracy, for the sanctity of the individual and the cleansing of the moral fabric, through constructive training for youth.

I think this crusade can make a real contribution if it helps boys to realize what real Americanism is, so that they can grow up to live by it. Our forefathers instilled into their children a love for the blessings of freedom and liberty. It is now our turn to teach the next generation that liberty and honor are a precious heritage which must be guarded with all our strength. The continued freedom of this Nation depends upon generation after generation of citizens holding fast to the truths without which no people shall ever achieve national greatness.

Generation after generation of fine boys and girls have grown up to defend these principles. Strong in body, keen in mind, brave in heart, generous in spirit, these young people are the glory of the present, and the hope of the future. God is sending us such young people today as he has sent them to every generation in the past. In them and in God Almighty we put our trust. To them we pledge our best today, and as long as life lasts.

Nationalists Can Hold Off Formosa Foe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a first-hand report on conditions in Formosa. The State Department constantly passes out stories about allegedly worsening conditions in Formosa, threatened revolt against the Chinese Government, or defection to the Communists. It continues its obvious determination to produce all the bad things it has predicted in order to justify its miscalculations about the Chinese Government whose downfall it has been solemnly forecasting "within a few months" since 1944. What are its sources of information? I have talked to many Americans and Chinese who have been in Formosa in the last few months. None of them confirms the picture of hopelessness. Almost all report improving conditions. The following article shows the heroic efforts Chinese and Formosans are making to stay free. Would it be wrong for us, the descendants of Valley Forge, to encourage those efforts and, for a change, reorganize and commend good where it exists as well as condemn bad?

The following article by Walter Simmons appeared in the Washington Times-Herald January 20, 1950:

NATIONALISTS CAN HOLD OFF FORMOSA FOE

(By Walter Simmons)

TAKAO, FORMOSA, January 19.—With their backs to the wall, the Chinese Nationalists will surprise the world by holding Formosa without American military aid for many months, most qualified American observers agree. This forecast was confirmed by the writer's independent survey of defense installations.

Hainan Island is not being defended seriously and will be lost to the Communists soon. But on Formosa the picture has changed so rapidly in recent weeks that there is a move to get the American Joint Chiefs of Staff, due to visit Japan in February, to see the encouraging new situation for themselves. Here are the high lights:

1. Reforms plus the incorporation of Formosan youths into the army for the first time have roused the islanders to a wild patriotic fervor. Grumbling natives, bitterly antagonistic to their Chinese rulers a month ago, have become their rabid backers.

TROOPS READY TO FIGHT

2. Under the inspiring leadership of a new commander, Lt. Gen. Sun Li-jen, the defense garrison has developed the greatest fighting spirit ever observed in Nationalist troops.

3. Ransacking forgotten Japanese arms depots, the Chinese have found thousands of weapons and large supplies of ammunition. Although the soldiers are pitifully underequipped, they still have enough arms to repel any assault the Communists are likely to mount this year.

4. New government leaders have risen to power, replacing most—but not all—the crooks and incompetent who lost the mainland war.

5. The weakest spot is the island's economy which, under the burden of the present military effort, will collapse within an estimated 6 months without substantial outside aid.

This correspondent, who watched General Sun's men in beach defense maneuvers today on the island's southern coast, was impressed by the dash and physical condition of the troops.

Although about only half of the troops had rifles and they lacked shoes, helmets and adequate transport, they repelled a mock landing with fierceness, reflecting General Sun's Americanized training methods. The beaches are guarded with new concrete pillboxes, barbed wire and automatic weapons. Coastal guns up to 150 millimeters and 75 millimeters pack artillery overlook the landing sites. Underwater obstacles are being placed. Land mines are ready for placing. The defenses are being manned 24 hours a day.

The Japanese intended to defend Formosa against American attack with 200,000 infantry and artillery troops. Sun has more than

this, together with aerial and naval superiority which the Japanese lacked.

SEVEN THOUSAND YOUTHS VOLUNTEER

The armies have a strong backbone of determined men. They include 7,000 youths who, ignoring the traditional student immunity from military service in China, slipped through the Communist lines to volunteer. Five hundred officers from the beaten first army in Manchuria escaped to Formosa to rejoin Sun, who had trained them in Burma.

Hundreds of American light tanks will utilize the island's excellent paved road network as mobile defense forces poised to guard the best landing beaches.

Conscripted last week, 4,500 Formosan students already are uniformed and drilling at Fengshan near here. The Nationalists had feared the results of conscripting natives but it was a political masterstroke.

Sun's problem is to defend a 13,900 square mile area included within a 708-mile ccast line.

At a south Formosa arsenal, moved bodily from Nanking last year with 1,400 workers and 2,000 machine tools, old Japanese .25 caliber rifles, rusting since VJ-day, were being repaired to fit .30 caliber ammunition. Already 100,000 had been modified and 20,000 more were stacked nearby.

No Answer From Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to include therein a copy of a letter written by our Ambassador the Honorable Arthur Bliss Lane to His Excellency Andrei Y. Vishinsky, Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R., Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y., under date of November 7, 1949, touching on the Katyn incident and asking an authentic report of the massacre of more than 4,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and the disappearance of another 10,000 Polish prisoners elsewhere in the U. S. S. R. during the last war.

I am informed through reliable sources that this letter has never been accorded the courtesy of a reply, in other words, it has been disregarded.

AMBASSADOR ARTHUR BLISS LANE'S LETTER TO MR. ANDREI Y. VISHINSKY

NOVEMBER 17, 1949.

His Excellency ANDREI Y. VISHINSKY,
Foreign Minister of the U. S. S. R.,
Lake Success, Long Island, N. Y.

YOUR EXCELLENCY: As chairman of the American Committee for the Investigation of the Katyn Massacre, Inc., I have the honor to request Your Excellency's assistance to this committee to establish the truth regarding the massacre of more than 4,000 Polish officers in the Katyn Forest and the disappearance of another 10,000 Polish prisoners elsewhere in the U. S. S. R. during the last war.

We appeal to you not only as the present Foreign Minister of the Soviet Union but also as an official who was Soviet Vice Commissar for Foreign Affairs in 1940 and 1941, and who was in charge of Polish affairs during that period when it is alleged this war crime was committed.

As you will recall, you had many highly important conversations with the representatives of the Polish Government on this subject, specifically with the Polish Amabassador, Prof. S. Kot, on the following dates: September 20, October 6, October 14, November 2, and November 12, 1941, and July 6, 1942

More than 4 years have passed since the end of hostilities. During this period a sufficiently large number of new facts concerning the war crime of Katyn have come to light to warrant a new investigation. To conduct such an investigation is the purpose of this committee. It is the aim of the committee to establish the truth beyond any shadow of doubt.

Therefore, this committee will appeal to the whole world for assistance in its endeavor to establish the truth. It will accept testimony from any direct or indirect witness of the crime regardless of nationality, creed, or race. It will carefully listen to all the direct and circumstantial evidence available, and, in evaluating this evidence, it will be guided only by the measure of credibility and veracity of the evidence produced. The committee pledges itself not to abandon its task of establishing the truth about the mass slaughter of the more than 4,000 Polish officers at Katyn and the disappearance of more than 10,000 other Polish prisoners of war in Russia, no matter how long the task will require.

May I express, not only in my own name, but also in the name of every member of this committee, the deep hope that Your Excellency will either be good enough to appear before this committee or will delegate a duly qualified representative to do so, in order to further our work which will be guided by the promise to humanity as expressed in the joint declaration issued on the close of the Moscow Conference in October 1943 over the signatures of President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Premier Stalin, reading as follows:

"Let those who have hitherto not imbued their hands with innocent blood beware lest they join the ranks of the guilty, for most assuredly the three Allied powers will pursue them to the uttermost ends of the earth and will deliver them to their accusers in order that justice may be done."

With the expression of my esteem, believe me, Excellency,

Very sincerely yours,

ARTHUR BLISS LANE,
Chairman.

Gas Rate at Jacksonville, Fla.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the following is submitted for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at the request of officials of the city government of Jacksonville, Fla.:

Whereas at the request of the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville the Federal Power Commission made available to the city three of its staff experts in proceedings instituted by the city commission to fix a fair and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville by the Jacksonville Gas Corp. and on the appeal by said gas corporation from the action of the city commission to the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission; and

Whereas the services rendered by said staff experts Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds have been of invaluable assistance to the city of Jacksonville and to consumers or manufactured gas in this city, and have contributed in a large measure toward the rendition of an order by the Florida Railroad and Public Utilities Commission reducing present rates for the sale of manufactured gas in the city of Jacksonville: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the City Commission of the City of Jacksonville, That the grateful appreciation of this commission be extended to the Federal Power Commission for the assistance rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings to establish a just and reasonable rate for the sale of manufactured gas to consumers thereof in the city of Jacksonville, Fla.; and be it further

Resolved, That the sincere thanks of this commission are hereby extended individually to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds for their untiring, efficient, and valuable services rendered to the city of Jacksonville in the aforesaid proceedings; and be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Secretary of this commission to the Federal Power Commission and to Messrs. Edward L. Dunn, Carl T. Kallina, and Robert Simonds.

A true copy.

Attest:

EARLE E. JONES,
Secretary, City Commission.

Newspaper Advises Landlords and Tenants Re Decontrol

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to call to the attention of all the Members of this House what appears to me to be a very worthy newspaper article, which appeared Friday morning, January 13, 1950, in the Long Beach Independent, at Long Beach, Calif. Long Beach is the largest community in the State of California which has voted decontrol of rents by its duly constituted city council.

There are several other similar communities in California which had previously done so.

I present this for both landlord and tenant, not only in Long Beach, Calif., but for landlords and tenants in every city in America, as they meet this problem of cooperative adjustment, when necessary, as a result of decontrol.

The article follows:

LANDLORDS BEWARE

Rent controls are not off. The Governor has approved decontrol, but until officially decontrolled by the Federal Housing Expediter, it is not official. He must decontrol, but landlords must await that official action, which should be in about 2 weeks. It is hoped the action will make little difference between landlord and tenant. But above all, landlords should recognize their responsibility and danger.

First reaction of both tenant and landlord will be emotional. Many tenants will expect

eviction or rent increases where none is intended. Some landlords may hope to use decontrol to gouge tenants with unreasonable rent increases. This type landlord is the greatest menace now faced by the property owners who seek only the right to operate their own properties.

The President only this week asked Congress to renew rent control for another year after June 1. What happens in Long Beach can mean his request will be granted. If rents soar here it will be used as an example of why Nation-wide controls are necessary. Long Beach is the largest city yet decontrolled. What happens here will be watched by all who seek permanent socialization of housing. It can mean only a few months of decontrol then permanent control.

There are certain to be some adjustments. If they are reasonable, tenants should expect them. Rents have increased an average of 15 percent while all other commodities and services have increased much more. On the other hand, landlords have had a steady income for 10 years which they did not have before and again soon may not have. It is an emergency that calls for decency and sound thinking, free from emotions and selfishness by both tenants and landlords.

There will be evictions. Some will be for good reasons where tenants have deliberately misused property and been obnoxious. No one can criticize landlords in such cases. But even in these cases, landlords would be wise to go slowly, lest they dig their own grave by controls being reenacted. It is a good time to stop, look, and listen before jumping.

Surveys have shown rentals are becoming daily more plentiful. It is only a short step to seeing vacancy signs in every block. A year ago, we were begging for newsprint for the paper. Today, we have far more available than we can use. Few publishers expected that condition for at least 3 years. The same thing can happen to housing. It is common sense to keep tenants who pay regularly rather than to be seeking new tenants. It is also common sense to hold down criticism of decontrol by not raising rents or promiscuous evictions.

All owners of rental properties are on a spot. We hope they make of Long Beach an example of why decontrols are justified and not an example that will be used by those who seek control of all private property.—L. A. C.

Canada Succeeds in Cutting Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, this country if it is to maintain its pay rolls and create more jobs will have to lift the crushing burden of taxation from those who create venture capital through thrift and savings.

Canada has had the vision and wisdom to approach this problem realistically by reducing its excise taxes and other tax burdens without resorting to deception by increasing the taxes of their corporations, and thus passing the excise-tax load back onto the people.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD the following article which appeared in the New York Journal-American of January 10, 1950:

CANADA SUCCEEDS IN CUTTING TAXES

(By Don Hassell)

What goes on across the border?

That's what tax-conscious United States legislators wanted to know when Canada's Finance Minister Douglas Abbott presented a 1949–50 budget that not only called for heavy tax reductions but provided for further slashes in the national debt.

To Congressmen belabored by constituents demanding tax relief, the whole Canadian program—if it worked—was potent ammunition to be trained against the Fair Deal's announced tax-and-spend policy.

Even Canadian conservatives admit now—with only 3 months of the fiscal year to go—that Abbott's estimate of an $87,000,000 surplus, to be applied toward debt retirement, will hold. In short, Canada has reduced taxes and pared her public debt again: a feat few, if any, nations in the world have achieved since the war.

What is even more significant, however, is the basis for corporate tax relief. As Abbott puts it:

"These reforms were undertaken, not because of any deterioration in the profit position of Canadian corporations, but because in the Government's view, the economic development of Canada depends upon the willingness of our people to risk their money in constructive enterprises."

Taxes have been going down in Canada, in gradual stages, for about 4 years, but the 1949–50 over-all 32-percent slash in personal income-tax revenues is the healthiest cut of them all. Most of this relief took the form of higher exemptions, removing some 750,000 Canadians from the income-tax rolls which formerly totaled 2,000,000. And it meant a revenue drop of $235,000,000.

But other forms of taxation figured in the new budget.

The rate on the first $10,000 of corporate profits was cut to 10 percent to protect the small family type of business. Profits in excess of $10,000, however, were taxed an added 3 percent. Net result: $8,000,000 added revenue.

Individual Canadian shareholders were allowed a credit against their personal income taxes equal to 10 percent of the dividends they received from common shares of Canadian taxpaying corporations. This represented the first step toward removal of double taxation of dividends, and accounted for a revenue cut of $9,000,000.

Numerous wartime excise taxes were repealed. These included, with their corresponding revenue reductions, soft drinks, $24,500,000; candy, $16,600,000; chewing gum, $1,700,000; transportation, $19,200,000; communications, $6,500,000.

Other excise taxes—sales, toilet articles, luggage, matches, smokers supplies, pens and pencils, cigarette lighters—were cut to 10 percent for an over-all revenue slash of $17,300,000.

Americans who reckon the public debt, taxes, and Government expenditures in terms of billions of dollars may at first glance look upon Canada's tax-relief program and its debt retirement as "small potatoes." But when it is pointed out that population across the border is a mere thirteen and one-half million and the total net national debt by March 31 will be only $11,600,000,000 (after a $1,700,000,000 reduction in 4 years), the picture is a little clearer.

For example, if the same debt-retirement program undertaken by Canada in the last 4 years had been put in effect in the United States, our public debt would have been reduced by nearly $30,000,000,000.

While Canadians were enjoying the fruits of a balanced budget, the main cogs in its economic wheel looked like this:

Steel output last year hit 2,200,000 tons against 2,100,000 in 1948, the previous high; oil production soared to 21,000,000 barrels from 12,300,000 in 1948, the previous peak; banks were in the strongest position in their history; telephones in use jumped to a new record of 1,500,000; automobile production hit 280,000, an all-time peak; power output jumped to 46,200,000,000 kilowatt-hours, another record.

Value of shares listed on the Montreal Stock Exchange was estimated at $8,200,000,000 against $8,700,000,000 in 1948 and 1947. Newspaper advertising and circulation was at an all-time peak, but increased costs cut into profits; employment was high and the country was free of strikes in the key industries of the economy; newsprint production was 5,100,000 tons against 4,900,000 in 1948, the previous record.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Northampton County Republican Campaign Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered at the Northampton County Republican campaign dinner, at Easton, Pa., on Friday, November 4, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor to meet with you tonight in old Northampton County.

When my good friend, your chairman, Ken Kressler, invited me to attend this grand Republican rally, I accepted with pleasure.

I welcomed this opportunity to come to Easton because I have so many friends here with whom I have had such pleasant associations.

I like to come to Northampton County political gatherings because your leadership and your organization preaches and practices the kind of politics that strives for good government. You take part in politics because you want to preserve America as a land of freedom and opportunity. That, my friends, is real peacetime patriotism.

We are in another important political campaign.

All campaigns in America are important no matter whether they are local, State, or National. Under our system of self-government in the United States, every vote cast in every election means something.

Daniel Webster, one of the greatest of American statesmen, expressed a strong and classic political truth when he said:

"The first object of a free people is the preservation of their liberty."

And I say to you that the preservation of our liberty begins at the ballot box in your own community and in your own voting precinct.

All good government has its foundation in municipal or local elections such as we are having next Tuesday. The offices we fill in this election are of so much importance to the people because their duties and responsibilities bring them in direct contact with the people.

Schools, roads, streets, elections, police and fire protection, health services, and your county courts come under their jurisdiction.

Local government is self-government. It is home rule. It is the bulwark of our freedoms.

Local government is the last line of defense against the advance of centralized bureaucracy. It must be maintained in health and vigor or we will be defeated by those who would control and regiment the lives of our people under a socialistic planned economy which destroys freedom of the individual.

There have been great changes in government in the United States in 20 years.

Let us make a few comparisons.

In 1929, only 20 years ago, we spent less than $4,000,000,000 to operate all the functions of the Federal Government.

In this fiscal year our Government will spend more than 11 times as much—approximately $46,500,000,000. In addition, Congress in the session just closed, passed contract authorizations of $4,500,000,000, making a total of almost $51,000,000,000.

Now, you know, it is impossible for any of us to comprehend just how much that is.

Let me make some comparisons that give a better idea of the amount the Federal Government will spend this year.

If every life-insurance policyholder in the United States cashed in all of his life insurance, the total would amount to $44,000,000,000. That would not be enough money to run the Federal Government for 1 year at the present rate of spending.

If every city home owner in the whole country disposed of his home, the total would amount to $30,000,000,000. That would run the Federal Government for about 8 months.

If every farmer sold his farm, all the equipment on it, and all the livestock, the total return would be $25,000,000,000. The Government could not run 7 months on that amount of money.

If every industry converted its net working capital into cash, a total of $39,000,000,000 would be realized. That would not be enough to run the Government for 11 months.

The cost of local government in the whole country is about $10,000,000,000 a year. That would only support the Federal Government 2½ months.

All the 48 State governments collect another 10 billion, which would only keep Uncle Sam going 2½ months.

Let us continue our comparisons. In 1929 the national debt was $16,500,000,000. Today, just 20 years later, it is 15½ times as big, or approximately $256,000,000,000.

Since July 1, the beginning of this fiscal year, the Federal Government is already in the red approximately $2,300,000,000.

In 1929 the Federal Government had less than 600,000 employees on its pay rolls. Today the number of persons working for Uncle Sam is more than 2,200,000.

They are increasing daily and will continue to increase if the present trend is not stopped.

These figures should serve as a warning signal. They reveal the dangerous pace at which the free spenders at Washington are burning up the Nation's wealth and the earnings of its workers.

Today approximately 30 percent of the total income of our people is being taken away from them to support local, State, and Federal government.

We spend more to govern ourselves than we pay for food. Government costs us 13 times as much as we spend for education and 40 times as much as we contribute to our churches.

In other words, we are working about 3½ months out of every year just to pay the cost of government.

Forty years ago, of all the taxes collected, 55 percent went to local government. Now it is only 13 percent. Forty years ago, 10 percent went to the States. Now it is 13 percent. Forty years ago, only 35 percent went to the Federal Government. Now it is 75 percent.

This will be the year of the greatest peacetime spending since the birth of our Nation.

The tax collections for this year will be far short of expenditures. We will undoubtedly end this fiscal year with a deficit of at least six to eight billion dollars. That will be the greatest peacetime deficit in the history of America.

This is an alarming situation. It should cause every American possessed of common sense to stop, look, and listen.

But it doesn't worry the spendthrift crowd that is in charge of the Government at Washington.

Two weeks ago President Truman announced the most brazen plan in the long history of reckless extravagance by Democratic administrations.

With the Federal Government spending about $8,000,000,000 a year beyond its income, Mr. Truman says that's not enough. When Congress comes back into session next January his first demand will be for higher taxes.

President Truman says he knows no way to balance the budget except by increased taxation. He wants to reach deeper into the wages of the worker and the earnings of the farmer.

I would like to suggest to Mr. Truman that he could get some very good advice if he would come up here to Easton and talk with some of the good housewives in your community.

They could tell him how to make expenses balance with income. They could tell him what they do when it becomes necessary to economize. They could tell him how they cut down on the family expenditures and live within their means.

But it seems that Mr. Truman has never learned that simple principle of economics. From his early business experience down to the present time, he still thinks he can get ahead by spending more than he takes in.

That is what we mean by deficit financing. It means living on borrowed money, and going deeper and deeper into debt. Mr. Truman thinks that's good for the country.

Actually, it is like cutting off a dog's tail in order to provide him with meat. You end up by whittling away the dog.

In the same way we are allowing our Government to be destroyed.

Not higher taxes, not more spending, but prudence, efficiency, and economy in government are America's needs today. We need better management, better housekeeping, and a realization of the fact that the course we have taken is the road to national bankruptcy. It is the road which ends in the loss of freedom under tyranny and dictatorship.

When President Truman's own economic adviser, Dr. Henry G. Nourse, resigned 2 weeks ago he gave blunt warning that the administration's monetary and fiscal policies have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery.

How long can we stay on that road without rushing headlong into disaster?

How far can we travel along our present course and preserve the American system of individual freedom?

How long can we, as a nation, spend billions beyond our means and continue to enjoy the highest living standards in the world?

President Roosevelt, when he was a candidate in 1932, gave the answer when he said:

"Any government, like any family, can for a year, spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

That was a sound statement. Unfortunately, it was soon forgotten. It was overwhelmed in a mad rush of bigger and bigger spending.

We cannot, we must not, keep it up much longer.

I predict that if it continues another decade the great blessings we have enjoyed as Americans will be lost.

What has brought all this about?

Are we not as understanding about Government matters as were our fathers?

Are we not attentive enough to our duties as citizens?

I am afraid we are neglecting the obligation we owe to our country.

We are thinking too much about our rights and not enough about our responsibilities.

We are listening too much to the demagogues who buy votes by promising ease, comfort, and security to be paid for with your own money.

We are listening too much to the agents of the Soviet Union. The Communists have predicted that America would spend itself into economic collapse.

They have infiltrated every sort of organization and group. These people, their fellow travelers, and their innocent dupes, wage a never-ending war on Congress for greater and greater spending by the Government.

We are listening too much to thousands upon thousands of misguided "do-gooders."

We are listening too much to the demands of pressure groups for new governmental services. Once established they grow by leaps and bounds from year to year.

All this results in a great centralized bureaucracy at Washington which, slowly but surely, takes away the power, authority, and functions of State and local government.

What can we do about it? How can we prevent the loss of local government and home rule?

There is only one way and that is for every American to take part in government.

To take part in government effectively we must take part in politics.

Only through the ballot box can we rebuild local control and local responsibility in every community.

Good government begins by electing qualified men of upright character and unquestioned integrity to local office.

I hope there will be a full turn-out in all the election districts of Pennsylvania on Tuesday.

If we place good Republicans in our city halls, our township and borough buildings and in our court houses in this election, we will have a solid foundation for Republican victories in 1950 and 1952.

It Is Appeasement of Aggression, Not Resistance, That Leads to War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Bridgeport Post of January 18, 1950. Its recognition that it is attempted appeasement of aggression, not firm resistance to it, that leads to war is as irrefutable as the quotation from our colleague the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. LODGE], whose words it takes as its text.

The editorial follows:

M'MAHON AS AN APPEASER

It may surprise some Connecticut citizens to find Senator BRIEN MCMAHON depicted as an appeaser on Formosa, or in general, an appeaser of the Communist domination of

China, but in the opinion of Congressman JOHN DAVIS LODGE, who is a member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, that is what the Senator's conduct amounts to.

"Unlike MCMAHON," says LODGE, "I do not believe in compromising with communism. I believe that the policy of military aid and advice which succeeded in repelling the godless forces of communism in Greece and Turkey can also succeed in Formosa. Doesn't he know that the policy of resistance to communism has been successful in preserving freedom in both Greece and Turkey without precipitating a world conflict?

"For my part I am convinced that peace is a product of strength, that war is the result of weakness, and that the administration's policy in the Far East, actually a do-nothing policy, increases the chances of war. I am convinced that if Asia succumbs to Communist aggression, Europe cannot endure as a free area. If Europe goes under, the very survival of our Nation is at stake * * * I wonder what the Senator has learned from the tragic events which led to World War II."

Senator MCMAHON'S expressed opinion is that if we take an aggressive stand to aid the Chinese Government in Formosa or to prevent the further spread of communism, it will lead to war.

But historically Congressman LODGE is right. We got into World War I not by doing something, but by doing nothing. We got into World War II, as most persons can easily remember if they will prod their memories a bit, in exactly the same way. We did nothing, we convinced the aggressors that we would do nothing and as a result of that conviction, Japan struck at Pearl Harbor, and we were in.

We do not believe that the Communist-dominated nations want war or are prepared to wage war. But they are only too pleased to take advantage of our timidity at no cost to themselves. What they want above all else is time in which to consolidate their gains, perfect their weapons, increase their armies, and become strong enough to defy us or even to conquer us by force.

Chase National Bank Fund To Aid Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article from the New York Times of January 20, 1950, indicating a loan fund established by the Chase National Bank to aid small business. I trust that other banks of the country will follow suit.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOAN FUND SET UP BY CHASE NATIONAL—$10,000,000 CREDITS ESTABLISHED TO AID SMALL BUSINESS THROUGH CORRESPONDENTS—LATTER ALL OVER COUNTRY—LOCAL BANKS TO HANDLE MATTERS UP TO $25,000 FOR 3 YEARS AT OWN DISCRETION

The Chase National Bank has established an initial $10,000,000 loan fund to participate with its correspondent banks in extending loans to small business in their communities throughout the Nation, Winthrop W. Aldrich, chairman, announced yesterday.

More than 3,700 banks, at least one of which is in virtually every county in the 48 States, have a correspondent relationship with the Chase, it was pointed out, and over a period of years the Chase has participated in many credits with them.

"This plan has been devised to meet, at least in part, the contention that some small businesses are unable to obtain the intermediate term credit they require," Mr. Aldrich said. "Whether or not this is true, we believe the commercial banks of this country can, and will meet the legitimate credit needs of small business for bank credit.

"The Chase National Bank is anxious to help meet whatever need does exist. Our plan is an offer of cooperation to banks in all sections of the country which may, because of local circumstances, need additional lending capacity for intermediate term loans to local business concerns. Our offer of assistance is made on a voluntary and friendly basis for the sole purpose of helping our correspondents in meeting this problem."

Correspondent banks of Chase will soon be supplied with full details of the plan, Mr. Aldrich said. Under the plan all applications for small business loans must be made through local banks, not directly to the Chase, which will offer to take up to 90 percent of the dollar amount of each loan, subject to a 5-day review period, it was explained.

The local banks are to have discretion in arranging the terms of these loans up to a $25,000 maximum amount and for not longer than 3 years. Chase will allow the local bank one-half of 1 percent as a service fee for handling the loan and will request for itself a minimum net interest rate of 4½ percent.

Excerpt From Inaugural Address of Carl B. Rechner Before Real-Estate Board of Kansas City, Mo.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the inaugural address of Mr. Carl B. Rechner as president of the Real-Estate Board, Kansas City, Mo., January 6, 1950.

There being no objection, the excerpt was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

And now may I discuss briefly an issue which outweighs all others and is trying to stamp out the pattern for generations. I refer to the drift away from independent, free initiative and enterprise, and the trend toward building the security welfare state with its plan of socializing our lives and business. No political party or special group alone is responsible. But by expecting something for nothing, by fear, laziness, and the attempt to divide by class, too large a number of our people are looking to a paternalistic Central Government to wet nurse us through every contingency of life. Our reward system, the free-enterprise system, under the grace of God, has steadily given the great masses of our people a standard of living far beyond our neighbor nations and is the envy of the world. Our great incentive system, backed by education, research and development has won two world wars largely through production. Yet this same system has failed to use its great salesmanship and ability in simply furnishing the truth of its results and worth, so that it is more fully understood and appreciated by all our people from school child to housewife and wage earner. This is our system, yours and mine. Our values, efforts, and future are built on this premise. People in alarming numbers are demanding of Government on all levels, additional services and direct security without knowing the cost in taxes.

The cost of government has now risen to the point considered by the best economists to be close to the limit of our ability to support. To illustrate, take your four principal items of expense from each dollar:

	Cents
In 1929:	
Food	23
Shelter	23
Clothing	13
Government	12
In 1949:	
Food, no change	23
Shelter, one-third decrease	18
Clothing, a decrease	11
Government, almost 100 percent increase	23

The source of these statistics is the United States Department of Commerce.

Our job is to be alert to the cost of government, to intelligently formulate and work for a better understanding of this great system of free enterprise, which has given us these unlimited advantages we accept as commonplace. This basic knowledge must be taught in the schools to children, be understood by school teachers, by parents, and be our watchword. The spreading of this truth is real security, our real welfare. The Government will reflect our thinking and desires as long as we stockholders, the American public, speak. Many thinking citizens are aware of this influence. Effective action is being launched now by private and trade organizations.

Enlightenment on this issue will bring the right results. We have always had problems but if we are alert and willing, we can master and solve these new problems with certainty.

Again our objections are not directed at politics or individuals but apply to principles. We demand progress. Business must furnish untiring leadership for the improvement of all men. We can never achieve this noble objective if we are broke, divided and beaten. We must continue to build internal strength. Strong and unified, we then can continue to be the light of the world.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Fifty-first Annual Dinner of Pennsylvania Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address which I delivered before the fifty-first annual dinner of the Pennsylvania Society at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel, New York, N. Y., on December 10, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a rare privilege to be a member of this fine assembly.

Over us tonight hovers the spirit of William Penn and Benjamin Franklin and the other illustrious Pennsylvanians whose memory we honor in praise and gratitude.

In no other country of the world could a group like this, with widely divergent views and opinions, meet in friendly relations to discuss the problems confronting our Nation and its people.

I am particularly pleased to express my deep appreciation of the fine association I have enjoyed with my distinguished colleague, Senator MYERS.

As you well know, we are frequently on opposite sides on questions before the Senate, but that has not interfered with our sincere personal friendship and fine understanding.

Tonight I want to talk with you about some of the things that have been happening in Washington.

It would be pleasant to report that the State of the Union is perfect. It is always pleasant to view our country through rose-colored glasses. There are those who would have us wear those rose-colored glasses permanently. But we would only be deceiving ourselves, if we were to accept the rosy picture as natural color.

For the sake of our land, for the preservation of our liberties, for those who will come after us, we must face up to facts, not technicolored fiction.

In recent years we have witnessed radical changes in the philosophy of government and dangerous departures from traditional American course.

We have seen a vast increase in the size and complexity of the Federal Government. We have seen its power encroaching more and more upon the functions and authority of State and local government.

We have seen the cost of Government multiplied eightfold in 20 years. We have seen excessive taxation drain away the earnings of the worker, the farmer, and the resources of industry.

We have witnessed the tragic spectacle of an administration unaware of the danger of national bankruptcy and the threat to American freedom that is inherent in a national debt exceeding a quarter of a trillion dollars.

We have witnessed the wildest spending spree in our Nation's history. This year alone it may add $8,000,000,000 to our present crushing burden of debt.

For the first time in the peacetime history of our Republic, an administration spokesman—the Secretary of the Treasury—has advocated deficit financing as a definite policy of government.

That is a shocking reversal of our historic policy of balanced budgets. It must not go unchallenged.

You will recall that President Truman told the Nation he knew only one way to balance the budget.

Just raise taxes, he said.

Don't try to economize. Don't eliminate waste and extravagance. Don't cut away the thick undergrowth of needless and useless Government functions. Don't do away with duplication and overlapping.

Just raise taxes.

But everyone knows that today the American people are trapped in a great jungle of taxes, both hidden and direct.

Thirty cents out of every dollar of every one of us—worker, farmer, preacher, lawyer, doctor, and businessman—goes for government.

With this big tax bill confronting us there are important and critical questions which must be answered.

How much of the national income can be taken in taxes and still leave enough to continue high employment and operate industry at full capacity?

How large a cut can we take for taxes and still maintain our high living standards?

How far can we go without everyone getting hurt in the tax squeeze?

If we cut down taxes more people will have more money to spend for automobiles, homes, household appliances, and the necessities of life. That is the way real income should be increased, not by inflation through borrowed money.

Deficit financing is like cutting off a dog's tail in order to provide him with meat. You end up by whittling away the dog.

Unfortunately, too many of our people do not recognize the fact that every increase in the national debt is another step toward inflation.

It is the dangerous process by which we water our currency and depreciate the value of the dollar.

Let me give you an example.

President Truman told the country recently that under his policies the income level of $4,000 per family per year could be established.

And he envisioned an increase of $75,000,000,000 in the national income in a short time.

However, we must remember that these figures don't really mean all they appear to mean on the surface. An income of $4,000 per family today is not double an income of $2,000 for the same family 10 years ago.

Let me explain that.

Suppose, 10 years ago, in 1939, you invested $18.75 and purchased a $25 United States savings bond.

This year, 10 years later, your bond has matured. You cash it in and get $25. You have deferred use of your money for 10 long years. It has increased by one-third, or $6.25.

But has it really? The answer, I am compelled to say, is "No."

Under the inflationary policies fostered by this administration, you can buy less goods for $25 today than you could buy for your original $18.75 in 1939.

Thus, you have gone without the use of your money for 10 years to find you have less than when you started. This administration's inflationary policies are largely responsible for that.

The same depreciation in real value, as represented by the reduced purchasing power of the dollar, strikes at savings funds, insurance policies, annuities, pensions, and all other forms of fixed payments.

Labor, agriculture, and business are entitled to a stable dollar.

We are told, however, that if the Government bureaucrats are given greater control of our national economy we can have security against all the contingencies of life.

But I assure you that all the fiscal tricks of the present administration at Washington will not produce a magic formula that can provide security for 150,000,000 people.

Real security must be bought and paid for by work and sweat, individual thrift, and sacrifice. It is the reward of enterprise, initiative, and prudence.

Security cannot be achieved by the simple method of having the earnings of the people spent, not by themselves, but by a spendthrift Government bureaucracy.

The Federal Government has made itself the biggest single distributor of income in the United States. More than 19,000,000 men and women get a check of some kind from the Federal Government at regular intervals.

History teaches us that one of the causes of the fall of the great Roman Empire was the steady trend toward turning citizens into pensioners. When the Roman masses got their minds firmly fixed on free bread and circuses, they soon became indifferent to liberty and freedom.

In modern times we see the abuses of democracy in the constantly increasing pressure and demand upon the Government for support of destructive programs that reach into every activity of our daily lives.

When Government control goes far enough into medicine, education, agriculture, labor, and business, the freedoms which made us such a great nation will be lost.

These are only a few of the trends and dangers.

What are we to do? Is there any way to curb the danger? Or do we want our lives planned, controlled, and regimented by an all-powerful central government? The answer must be given by the people. It can be given only through our political parties.

There are some of us—not divided by party lines—who have been fighting to bring economy and a balanced budget to Washington. We seek to end this reckless spending, these endless deficits. We want to reverse the dangerous trend toward a socialistic economy which robs youth of freedom, opportunity, and incentive.

Because we are making this fight we have been ridiculed as representing selfish interests. We have been told we are 160 years behind the times, that we are reactionaries and do-nothings, that our principles are vicious and against the interests of the people.

Those who attack us call themselves liberals. They claim Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as their patron saints. But they pay only lip service to the principles of those American statesmen. They do not follow the teachings of Jefferson and Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was a great prophet of the evils of government debt and government grown to monstrous size.

It was no reactionary, no Republican, it was Thomas Jefferson who cried out in warning:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that 'the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be' and that 'a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise.' "

It was Thomas Jefferson again—and I hope they are listening down there in Washington—who said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues—and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty * * * or profusion and servitude."

Yes, that was Thomas Jefferson talking.

And what of that other patron saint, Andrew Jackson? This is what he believed:

"From our past experience it cannot be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred."

Later he told the Congress:

"No people can hope to perpetuate their liberties who long acquiesce in a policy which taxes them for objects not necessary to the legitimate and real wants of their government."

Let me remind the free spenders at Washington that these quotations express the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. Let me ask:

"Will you brand them as reactionaries and tories because they, too, preached economy and limitations upon the growth of the central bureaucracy?"

Let us step forward to the year 1893.

The great Grover Cleveland, first Democratic President after the Civil War, is being inaugurated for his second term. In his inaugural address he said:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people."

Will they in Washington sneer at Grover Cleveland and disown his great memory?

Then, in 1913, the next Democratic President occupied the White House—Woodrow Wilson. Let me quote briefly from Mr. Wilson. He said:

"There is a point at which, in peacetime, rates of income and profits taxes discourage

energy, remove the incentive to new enterprises, encourage extravagant expenditures, and other attendant evils."

Again, it was Wilson who declared:

"The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative."

I turn now to the Democratic National Convention of 1932. The platform adopted contains this language:

We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagance, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

May I point out that in that year the entire cost of operating the Federal Government was less—I repeat, less—than this year's interest on the national debt alone.

Running on that platform was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who declared in a major address:

"Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Ladies and gentlemen, those are magnificent words. They should be hung in every office in every department and bureau in Washington—and I include the President's own offices in the White House.

Then in 1943 a Democratic Member arises in the United States Senate. He says:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

At that time we were engaged in total war. The Senator who made that statement was the chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. It was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri.

And so, when I hear them call those of us who are economy minded, reactionaries, and horse-and-buggy folks, I remember the strong stand of every great Democratic President in our history, down to the time of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal.

Were they all wrong? Were they all reactionaries? Were they all horse-and-buggy tories?

Were all these great men fools because they feared deficit financing and growing Federal encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens?

Were Roosevelt, the candidate, and Truman, the Senator, reactionaries, and tories?

We who are called tories and reactionaries because we fight for economy and solvency are struggling to preserve the greatest product given by God to mankind—freedom and opportunity.

The American people have become so accustomed to it that they have forgotten its real worth. They have forgotten that no other country in all the world offers this great product so freely.

They are trading it off, day by day, in exchange for fool's gold, wrapped in the most seductive, vote-getting package of all history.

We must find a way to make all our people understand that what they are sacrificing is infinitely more precious than the gaudy, tinsel-covered package whose glitter must fade away and leave nothing but broken hopes and disillusionment.

Heaven help our Nation if the ideals upon which it was founded and upon which it has grown great, are now to be regarded as false principles.

Heaven help America if, like Esau, we sell out the birthright of future generations—and their heritage for the temporary gain of hand-outs from Washington.

We glory in the greatness of America. We boast of the miracle of American progress in a comparatively brief span of years from a trackless wilderness to the mightiest nation of the world.

We are proud of the vast productive capacity of our giant industrial strength.

We rejoice in our high cultural and spiritual attainments, and in the high living standards of our people.

What has been responsible for all these unparalleled achievements? Why have we surpassed other nations with equal or greater population and richer natural resources?

What does the United States possess that other nations do not have?

It is individual freedom. It is the right to work at the job of our choice; the right to retain the results of our enterprise, courage, and resourcefulness; the right to take part in our Government; the right to worship God as our conscience dictates.

To secure all these blessings the Atlantic seaboard was the stage for the greatest drama of all history. Here was enacted the story of man's fight for individual freedom.

The players in that stirring drama were the greatest men and women of their time. They had been trained for their parts in the most exacting school—that of hard work, courage, and necessity. They came to this country seeking God, truth, and freedom.

The freedom they established has been preserved by the blood and sacrifice of heroes in every generation. It is too precious to be lost through indifference or neglect of our responsibilities.

If we are to help save America we must all interest ourselves in politics, because the kind of government we are to have is decided at the ballot box.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics—the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of our country.

With those standards as our guide we can spread the gospel of true Americanism. We can preach what our precious freedom means to us as individuals and as a Nation.

It's great to be an American. Let us have the courage to be real Americans.

Let us have pride in the past and look with confidence to the future.

Let us put our trust in the sovereignty of God rather than the sovereignty of an all-powerful central state.

The Coal Situation in Delaware

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. ALLEN FREAR, JR.

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FREAR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a telegram which I received from Mr. Leon Walker, president, Delaware State Coal Club, and also a letter from the same gentleman.

There being no objection, the telegram and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Reports received from representative retail coal dealers throughout Delaware show present stock of prepared sizes of anthracite for domestic heating, also for broiler growers use, are extremely low. Many dealers are already out of sizes. A spell of cold weather will quickly exhaust present stock and 3-day operation of mines, resulting in curtailed and delayed shipments, will not then be able to take care of an acute situation. An emergency does now exist and immediate steps should be taken to place operation on a normal basis. Letter follows.

LEON WALKER,
President, Delaware State Coal Club.

DELAWARE STATE COAL CLUB,
Wilmington 1, Del., January 21, 1950.

Hon. J. ALLEN FREAR, Jr.,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR ALLEN: Confirming my telegram of date, copy enclosed, reports received from representative retail coal dealers throughout the State show their present stock of prepared sizes of anthracite for domestic heating purposes is extremely low and should we have normal winter weather a critical emergency will exist within a period of 3 or 4 days, or at least a week. Many dealers are now out of sizes and due to the 3-day operation at the mines, shipments are necessarily confined to those days and if not then made no shipments can be made until the following week, plus a further delay of a week to 10 days for rail movement before any coal can be received. The present 3-day production schedule cannot possibly meet normal winter weather demands and with stocks exhausted and limited shipments, an acute emergency will quickly develop.

Reports from the lower end of the State also indicate that the stocks of nut coal on hand by dealers supplying broiler growers will not exceed 1 week's normal winter requirements. The only solution is for immediate resumption of anthracite production on a normal weekly basis. Should we have a spell of cold weather, further delay in handling the present situation will be disastrous. The President should act before it is too late.

I have taken the liberty of addressing you on the subject because of its importance.

With kindest regards,

LEON WALKER, *President.*

Illusory Women's Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that an editorial on the subject of the equal-rights amendment be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington (D. C.) Post of July 19, 1945]

ILLUSORY WOMEN'S RIGHTS

We have always had difficulty in taking seriously the campaign to secure equal rights for women by amending the Constitution. However, with both the Democratic and Republican Parties on record in favor of such an amendment and the present House Judiciary Committee approving the proposal, it is no longer possible to assume that common sense will save us from the folly of incorporating a meaningless and mischievous slogan into our basic law.

The proposed amendment has an attractively egalitarian ring that may commend it to the thoughtless because it proclaims that "equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." It is

only when we undertake to find out just what this amendment would do for women that doubts arise. There is no denying that in some States women are subject to legal discriminations that should be abolished. But in contradistinction to such discriminatory laws, which are being whittled away year by year under the pressure of an increasingly enlightened public opinion, there is a vast body of legislation applicable to women that is primarily protective in character.

Most States limit the number of hours women may work, require minimum wages and provide other forms of protection for their health and efficiency. Married women and widows also receive preferential treatment under State laws. The wife, for example, is entitled to support under State laws. That fact alone justifies differences in laws relating to the property rights of men and women.

Assuming that the proposed amendment might succeed in effecting complete equality of men and women before the law, women would soon find that they had paid a heavy price for limited gains. For the effect would be to eliminate all the special legislation designed to safeguard women in industry and in the home along with the laws that are unfairly discriminatory. In short, the proponents of this equal-rights amendment have set up standards for guidance that are utterly unrealistic, being based on the untenable assumption that women are in a position to make their way and fend for themselves quite as well as men. Nobody knows better than the working women how false that notion is.

The handicaps—physical and social—under which women, especially wage earners, labor are often formidable; many of them are purely physical handicaps that it would be sheer folly to ignore. Others are an outgrowth of prejudice and customs that legislation cannot alter. Only time, education, and slowly changing public opinion can assure women a perfectly fair deal in the competitive rough and tumble of modern life, even in those occupations for which they are by nature and training well fitted. Hence, it is not surprising to find major labor groups and outstanding women leaders, such as former Secretary of Labor Perkins, who are intimately acquainted with labor problems, actively opposing the equal-rights amendment. They realize that equality before the law is worse than an empty formula.

It is an invitation to oppression for the law to disregard differences between the sexes that affect earning capacity and to refuse to make allowance for the different social positions of men and women as members of family groups. As the minority members of the House Judiciary Committee said, "using the Constitution for a broom with which to sweep away indiscriminately the good with the bad is neither sound law nor sane behavior." Where State laws unjust to women exist, efforts should be directed toward their revision or elimination; that is, there should be a separate bill for a separate ill.

The proposed amendment sets up no legislative standards to replace existing laws it would invalidate. It is purely negative and essentially destructive. Nor is it clear what is meant by the second paragraph of the amendment to the effect that Congress and the several States shall have power within their respective jurisdictions to enforce this article by appropriate legislation. Conflicting interpretations and endless litigation would be the result of incorporating any such vague amendment into the fundamental law of the land. However, there appears to be general agreement on one point: the amendment would wipe out all the laws, State and Federal, that give special protection to women and would also make it impossible to provide for their protection in the future, without extending a like degree of protection to men who may not desire nor require it.

Willie Six

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the column Next to the News, by Alfred Mynders, which appeared in the Chattanooga Times of Sunday, January 15, 1950. Mr. Mynders tells of the passing of a distinguished American Negro whose life was a tribute to Christian usefulness. What has been related by Mr. Mynders about the late Willie Six amounts to a eulogy to be desired by any man, whatever his color or creed or religion may be.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT TO THE NEWS

(By Alfred Mynders)

Today and for the next decade or two, the so-called color line will be a controversial issue to all who are of and who love the South. "Crossing the color line," a phrase which must have been invented by someone not of the South, is in current use. But this column deals with something entirely different. It is the story of a man who transcended the color line. So powerful was the force of his spirit, so convincing was the quality of his devotion, that he took with him in his flight across the mystical barrier many hundreds, certainly, and perhaps thousands.

His name, Willie Six, might seem almost whimsical to someone not knowing Sewanee athletes and their fierce loyalty to this unusual man. But he came by the name honestly. He wore a discarded football jersey with the numeral "6" on it. His name already was Willie Sims, so quite simply the transition was effected. The new name pleased "his young men" and in that it coincided precisely with his life's motive.

He was building a church in 1908 when Coach Harris G. Cope asked him to become trainer for the team the following year. It was about half finished when Willie turned to the gymnasium in 1909, and half finished it remains, under the name of All Saints' Chapel at the University of the South.

It is not given to many to be buried from a church which they helped to build, but that is one of Willie's honors. He was buried last Saturday in the rocky soil of the mountain top which he loved and which loved him. The story of his death had been flashed throughout the land and brought some comments which are notable. A major general telephoned from North Carolina to say, "I feel a personal loss. Having known Willie since 1912, I can say that in that time and in my experience on several continents, I've never seen greater devotion to duty, greater loyalty. I've come to think of him as exemplifying the real spirit of a Sewanee man."

Telegrams from bishops in Florida, Virginia, and New Mexico, from a lieutenant general in Atlanta, from the head of the largest of the world's broadcasting companies * * * these were only a few of the messages which revealed a relationship beyond the power of words to express.

The junior Senator from Washington, Senator HARRY P. CAIN, arose in the United States Senate Friday to eulogize a friend—Willie Six, who had watched over him when he was a well-known Sewanee athlete years ago. He noted the passing of this good Christian gentleman and he said: "The junior Senator from Washington has risen to express his personal feeling of loss and to extend his sympathy to the family of Willie Six."

Many of the virtues which Christ talked about were qualities whose desirability he was reiterating, qualities which had been recommended before by the philosophers of ancient Israel, as well as those of China and India. But some of the meaning which Christ gave to that virtue called humility and to that dynamic outpouring called love had a new quality and gave a novel flavor to His teaching.

If we are to believe the testimony of witnesses who can be called nothing less than reliable, then we have seen an humble colored man whose love was so great that he left a lasting mark on his time.

One of his closest friends, Gordon Clark, for 20 years athletic director at Sewanee, has perhaps said what needs to be said: "Willie Six was a great Christian gentleman. I have never known a greater one. He brought to a relatively lowly station in life a dignity, an integrity, a charity which would do credit to the highest office. He loved more people and thought more continually about their welfare and comfort than anyone I have ever seen. He leaves countless friends to mourn the passing of a rare spirit."

Valete, Willie Six. Your example has not been lost nor your sacrifices made in vain.

A Forecast of Conditions Under Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "All of Us," by Wheeler McMillen, editor in chief of the Farm Journal, appearing in the February 1950 issue of that publication. As I read the article I could not help feeling that it might happen to the people of the United States, as it has already happened to the British people.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALL OF US

Here all of us are, facing the last February of the first half of the twentieth century. A few days after you receive this issue of Farm Journal I shall be observing another birthday. Since I was born in the nineteenth century, before another 25 years roll by I may be old enough to write reminiscences. So this month let me be old and cantankerous and pessimistic, and imagine that I am already 25 years older. Would I, perhaps, be writing notes like these?

February 1975: I can remember clearly how, back in 1950, nearly every family had an automobile. People were putting television sets in their homes. New houses were being built by individual families. No one used ration coupons for anything, although some had been used during the Second World War, and people knew what they were. All meat and grocery stores were then owned and operated by private individuals and companies, who competed with each other on price and quality.

March 1975: My neighbor was arrested today and they say he will be sent to jail for 2 years. His sow raised a litter of nine pigs, but he reported only eight to the meat administration. He had managed to hide the other one from the farm inspectors, but someone found it out when he butchered the pig. He had hoped to give his four youngsters a little home-grown meat. The meat administration says that not nearly enough meat can be produced or imported, and that the ration must be reduced to a half-pound per week.

April 1975: Our hens, encouraged by spring, laid an extra egg today. It would be nice to have two for breakfast again some morning, but it has become too dangerous to try to dodge the law. Besides, for many years now one egg a week has been the allowance, and we have got used to getting along. We never appreciated our good fortune when it was possible to have two eggs and bacon, too, every morning for breakfast, and even cream for our coffee. I remember how sorry I felt for the English, back in 1949, when they had only one egg a week.

May 1975: I went down to the Lumber Administration today to apply for three two-by-fours to brace up the barn. Had to fill out three sets of application blanks, six copies of each, and to draw a diagram to show just where the pieces would be used.

June 1975: This morning I stood in line until noon before the Health Administration offices. Wanted to get the tooth pulled that has kept me awake most of three nights. I couldn't get in to see the clerk. Long ago, before we had this "free" medicine for everybody, one could generally find a doctor or dentist fairly quickly. They took a personal interest in our troubles. Now they just jot our number down in the book and hurry us through, if we get to see them at all.

July 1975: The Fourth of July reminds an old fellow of his younger days, when we celebrated or not, according to how we felt. Today, as is usual now, everybody had to appear in town to listen to the official program, and watch and hear the President make his speech on the municipal television. He ranted about freedom, like his father used to do, but what he says and what he does are two different things.

August 1975: The Lumber Administration refused my application for the three two-by-fours. They said it was improperly made out.

September 1975: I have been trying to figure out in my own mind just when these present conditions had their beginning. Some say it was when the Government bought all the railroads. Next they took the coal mines, then the steel mills, then the truck hauling business, then the whole petroleum industry. They said they had to have the mines and the oil business to get fuel for the trains and trucks, and the steel mills to get enough steel for everybody. Just try to buy some now. Now the Government runs nearly every kind of business, just as Russia did when I was a young fellow. Then production started going on down, and the country has been getting poorer ever since.

October 1975: I think the beginning was further back. It might have been about 1936, when the politicians discovered they really could buy votes in quantities with borrowed public money, through the WPA and other things. Some of the younger people now can't even remember when we used to have elections.

November 1975: I've got it now. Our freedom began to be lost in 1913. That was the year the income-tax amendment was ratified. The idea would have been all right, probably, if it had contained a provision that no more than one-fourth of any ordinary man's earnings could be taken in taxes, and no more than half of the biggest incomes. Since there were no limits on taxes the politicians eventually discovered that there were no limits on the amounts they could spend. They kept taking more and more from everybody to give more "free" help, until no one could save. Then there had to be still bigger pensions for us old people, and more Government services of every kind. No one could save up for investment, so the Government said it would have to take over business.

December 1975: Kind of hard to be cheerful at holiday time. Can't help remembering the great days when every American out of jail was free and full of hope for the future.

July 1976: Just two centuries ago the Declaration of Independence was adopted. Two hundred years. Years that saw the United States produce the highest standard of living that ever has been. And years that saw us, in my time, fritter away our freedom until all of us once proud Americans are no better off than serfs. Except the Government crowd, of course.

August 1976: They'll shoot me if I print these paragraphs. And suppress Farm Journal. After all, this isn't 1950 any more, when one could still say what he believed. All right, let 'em shoot.

Are my "reminiscences" exaggerated? I hope so. But I have mentioned nothing that doesn't happen today in England or Russia. And the United States of America has been faithfully following the English route. Next month I'll write about the cheerful and wonderful prospects that can be realized if the United States of America is left free to go ahead.

WHEELER MCMILLEN.

Louis Houck

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Louis Houck," delivered by Hon. Norwin D. Houser, of Perryville, Mo., judge of the Twenty-seventh Judicial Circuit of Missouri, at the Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo., on October 15, 1949.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COL. LOUIS HOUCK

(A speech delivered by Judge Norwin D. Houser at Southeast Missouri State College, Cape Girardeau, Mo.)

FOREWORD

Institutions, quite appropriately, honor their founders and those who played leading roles in their early histories. At the homecoming ceremonies held at the Southeast Missouri State College, October 15, 1949, the memory of the late Col. Louis Houck, a man who loomed large in the early history of the college and southeast Missouri, was honored. For 39 years he served as a member of the board of regents and for 36 years as the president of the board.

The speaker chosen for the occasion by the alumni association was Hon. Norwin D. Houser, a former student of the college, now judge of the Twenty-seventh Missouri Circuit. This brochure presents in full the address which he delivered. Those who heard the address adjudged it an eloquent and comprehensive analysis and evaluation of the achievements of Colonel Houck, one of the recognized builders of this region. Undaunted by recurrent obstacles, he was able to realize the objects of his dreams. To quote Judge Houser: "Louis Houck felt the hand of destiny on his shoulders."

The Southeast Missouri State College and its alumni association are under obligation to Judge Houser for his most excellent address and to the Cape Girardeau News for making it available in this form.

W. W. PARKER,
President, Southeast Missouri State College.

The complete text of Judge Houser's speech follows:

"I regard it as a high compliment to have been chosen to do honor to Louis Houck, southeast Missouri's most illustrious citizen, and I want to acknowledge my debt of gratitude to M. Leming, and the other members of the committee.

"Nearly a quarter of a century after his death in 1925, the commanding figure of Louis Houck continues to stand out in bold relief in the Hall of Fame.

"Fifty years from now—a century hence—indeed, as long as men can read of the glories of the past, his achievements will be indelibly stamped and recorded as an integral part of the legal, historical, academic, and commercial development of the land we live in.

"A new generation has sprung up since he departed. Many of you were yet unborn during the time of his great deeds, whereas many others of us congregated here tonight were his contemporaries.

" 'Too often we forget the men of the past. Soon all memory of their labor vanishes from the common recollection of men * * *. Yet it is the work of the men of the past bequeathed to us that is our priceless heritage. It is because they labored and suffered, dared and did, thought and executed, because they laid deep the foundations of our civic institutions that we today are enjoying a material prosperity, the marvel of the world.' (From a tribute by Louis Houck to Alexander Buckner, delivered September 28, 1897.)

"And so it is fitting and proper that we pause for a few moments to honor this indomitable man, this resolute spirit, this distinguished newspaperman, lawyer, public servant, author, historian, railroad builder, and educator-administrator.

"And it is quite appropriate that these exercises be held here, on the campus of this great college which was so dear to him; on the very steps which he caused to be built as part of a beautiful and symmetrical plan."

MOVED TO CAPE

"Born in St. Clair County, Ill., while William Henry Harrison was still President of the United States, Louis Houck came to Cape Giradeau when he was 28 years of age. Already he had made a name for himself in the fields of journalism and law, and had served as Assistant United States District Attorney at St. Louis.

"When this gifted young man settled here, in 1869, 4 years after the conclusion of the War Between the States, southeast Missouri was a wilderness of isolated villages and malaria-ridden swamps. Cape Girardeau, an unimportant river landing, with a population of 2,500 souls, was going through the dark reconstruction days. There were no railroads. There was no system of drainage districts.

"What a contrast between the meager opportunities open to Louis Houck in 1869, in a comparatively primitive civilization, and the marvelous opportunities for the young men and women of 1949, in this, one of the most highly developed areas of America.

"He practiced law here during the seventies, married Miss Mary Hunter Giboney in

1872, developed into one of the best lawyers who ever practiced at this bar, and during the late seventies developed an interest in railroad building, and a vision of the importance of transportation by rail to the commercial development of southeast Missouri.

"This was a frontier-like country. The principal products, outside of the minerals produced in the area, were timber, furs, wheat, and corn. There was no way to market these products, except by river transportation after long overland hauls by team and wagon, over tortuous dirt roads, trails and through bog and swamp. Remember that there were no highways; no farm-to-market roads, and no railroads closer than than Iron Mountain."

RAILROAD BUILDER

"Houck, with prophetic vision, knew that if the isolated communities of southeast Missouri could be welded together into one unit; if the millions of acres under water could be drained and reclaimed, their rich alluvial soil would yield a harvest sufficient unto the needs of an empire. He believed that a system of railroads linking together the entire area would transform these raw wastelands into a garden spot of production. Louis Houck felt the hand of destiny on his shoulder, and he undertook the prodigious task of making his dream come true.

"He pioneered in the railroad business with little previous knowledge of the engineering, construction and financing problems involved. All he knew was that he wanted to build railroads, and by the eternal, he was going to build them.

"He started out with $5,000 in cash, an iron will, and the determination to succeed.

"During the next 25 years, from 1880 to 1905, he pierced the swamplands and highlands of southeast Missouri with 500 miles of railroads, which feat was accomplished in the face of seemingly insurmountable adversities, which he overcame by virtue of dogged persistence, adroit (and sometimes unconventional) financing, ingenious resourcefulness and rugged individualism.

"Some have said that he failed; that he lost his railroads; that he became entangled in a morass of litigation. But let it ever be remembered by his critics that when this empire-builder passed from the scene of his labors in 1925, trains were operating daily over almost every mile of right-of-way he procured; trains carrying wheat, corn and cotton; lead, cobalt and iron; cement, limestone and brick; shoes and shirts and the myriad other products of modern factories; livestock and lumber and a thousand other products of our area, into the marketplaces of the world.

"And in that 45 years, this section of the country had been transformed from a strictly provincial outpost into a prosperous, diversified, thriving community.

"The 'Open Sesame' was Louis Houck."

CAPE TO DELTA

"Resourceful? Let me tell you that Louis Houck was resourceful.

"The first railroad he built was from Delta to Cape Girardeau. He contracted to put the road through and drive an engine into Cape Girardeau by midnight, December 31, 1880. On this condition he was assured of a subscription list and bonus of $10,000. The distance was 16 miles. The time limit was 6 months. He had no engine, rails, ties. He had no previous experience. Trestles had to be built—everything done from scratch. He contracted with the Iron Mountain Railroad for rails. There was an unbroken forest primeval along the line of the right-of-way, and he chopped his ties from the virgin woods. It was hard to get laborers. There were no quarters with which to provide them housing. The winter of 1880 was one of the worst ever known, snow beginning to fall on the 18th day of October, and zero weather up to January. The Iron Mountain was slow in delivering rails. Many difficulties were encountered. When at last they got to a point 1,000 feet from Cape Girardeau they ran out of rails. The Iron Mountain failed to deliver under their agreement. No rails could be produced elsewhere, and if they could have been found they could not have been brought in, for the river was frozen solid. The time was getting short. So, with characteristic vigor, Louis Houck ordered the engine run to the end of the uncompleted track, then ordered his men to tear up the rails laid behind, fixed them in place on the Cape Girardeau end, laid the rails straight into the city. Time was so short that old residents, swore that it was 3 minutes before midnight on the last day of the contract when Houck's decrepit, wood-burning engine, borrowed from the Illinois Central, steamed into Cape Girardeau, in literal compliance with his contract.

"Time does not permit any extensive delineation of the hardships, litigation, and competition thrown in the way of this tenacious, bold, self-reliant, independent, adventurous, and far-seeing man."

DEFEATED JAY GOULD

"The story of his defeat of Jay Gould, the railroad tycoon, of his encounters with the Missouri Pacific and Frisco, of the floods that washed out miles of his tracks, of the methods of construction sometimes resorted to to get the trains rolling, of the experiences of those early days of trains jumping the tracks on soft spots in the roadbeds, all makes one of the most fascinating, romantic, and delightful chapters in the history of railroading, and all testify to the astuteness, the insatiable ambition, and the uncompromising drive of this remarkable man, who, in spite of hell and high water, Gould and the receiverships, creditors, and competitors, was bound to, and did, connect southeast Missouri into one railroad circuit."

PROLIFIC WRITER

"During this period of creative activity, which would have occupied the full time of a dozen ordinary remarkable men, Louis Houck found the time, and had the intelligence and scholarly attainments necessary, to give to the world a history of Missouri from the earliest recorded times down to the admission of Missouri into the union of the States. Houck's history of Missouri is the foundation upon which all subsequent histories of the Commonwealth have been written.

"Another work, the Spanish Regime in Missouri, published in 1908, is rated by many critics as a highly authoritative account of the Spanish settlements in this country. It earned for him a place in the Encyclopedia Britannica.

"His other literary achievements included the Boundaries of the Louisiana Purchase and Law of Liens.

"Louis Houck not only scattered the seeds of learning and lighted the fires of knowledge with his hand and pen, but, more than any other one man, is responsible for the development of this great educational institution from whose portals have issued an innumerable throng of teachers, educators, and scholars, to bring light to dark corners, to disseminate knowledge, to contribute to the profession, arts, the skills, and the crafts throughout the far reaches of the earth."

CHAIRMAN OF THE BOARD

"For 39 years he was a member of the board of regents. For 36 of these years he was president of the board, and chairman of the executive committee.

"He was working for this college even before it was located here. When the General Assembly, in 1872, passed the law which authorized the establishment of a college in southeast Missouri Louis Houck became instrumental and influential in inducing the commission to select Cape Girardeau as the location for the college.

"When it came to selecting the ground upon which the institution should be built, Louis Houck offered 10 acres of ground, free of cost, in the South part of the city, near Ford D. as a site for the building.

"Instead the board purchased the ground where Academic Hall stands, some 9 acres at that time, for $1000, actuated by a desire to establish the school upon a high eminence, visible from all parts of the surrounding territory."

NINE TEACHERS

"When he first entered on his duties as a board member, in 1886, there were 9 teachers on the faculty, a total of 278 students enrolled, one building, and 9 acres of campus.

"When he passed on in 1925, still a member of the board, the faculty and administrative staff consisted of 60 persons, the annual enrollment topped the 2,000 mark, and the campus and grounds had been enlarged from 9 to 190 acres; and the educational plant consisted of seven monumental stone buildings.

"In those early days the terrain surrounding the spot where we are gathered tonight consisted of steep hills, deep gullies and ravines. There was a gaping quarry 30 feet deep where Leming Hall now stands. The site of Kent Library was the top of a high hill. The college was built far from town. There were no sidewalks, no paved streets leading to the college—many of the present streets and avenues were fields, forests, and creeks. There were only one or two houses in the vicinity of the college. There were only two or three houses on North Pacific Street. Where these beautiful approaches rise now, there was an ugly ravine 20 feet deep, which ran all the way down to Pacific Street, and in order to make the grounds accessible, a bridge 30 or 40 feet long was constructed.

"There was no system of terraces; there were no trees, no dormitories, and none of the present buildings existed."

HAD VISION

"A man of small vision would have failed to provide for the enormous expansion of this institution; would have allowed the city of Cape Girardeau to grow up and surround the original 9-acre tract; but Louis Houck was a man of far-flung vision, who could and did foresee the time when this city would be a metropolis, and this institution a major center of education and culture, required to meet the needs of a populous and enlightened civilization."

BUY MORE LAND

"To prepare for things to come, he immediately began to insist on enlarging the college grounds. In the eighties, he caused his board to purchase 3½ acres, now known as 'The Home of the Birds,' for the sum of $85 which, although insignificant in these days, was no doubt an item of importance in their meager budget. They purchased 24 acres from the Kaiser estate, paying for it at the rate of $200 a month. Mr. Houck purchased individually and donated to the college two tracts of land, one of which was 10 acres east and north and east of the city water reservoir, land he bought from L. R. Johnson, no doubt the land where the tennis courts and Cheney Hall are now located. The site for Kent Library was purchased, the top of the hill graded off, and for years that part of the campus was known as the Athletic Field. Other tracts were secured, the board, under the direction of Mr. Houck, sometimes making small down payments, paying for the properties on the installment plan out of incidental funds.

"Many of these purchases were made over determined opposition, which did not deter Mr. Houck, for he knew what he was doing.

"Streets were laid out, sidewalks built, trees planted, terraces established, barns and unsightly structures removed, hills graded

down, appropriations fought for, and buildings erected, all under the proud and watchful eye of the man whom we honor tonight."

BUILD DORMITORIES

"Dormitories were needed for the students. Three public-spirited citizens, Mr. Houck, Mr. M. E. Leming, and Mr. Leon Albert, realizing the need, and having the best interests of the college at heart, organized a company, advanced the money, and built Albert Hall, employing the same architect who designed Academic Hall. Thereafter they built Leming Hall, with their own funds, renting the halls to the college for only enough to pay the interest on the money they had borrowed to build them. Thereafter the legislature appropriated $80,000 to buy these buildings, which was $10,000 less than they cost originally.

"Another willingness to sacrifice for the college was demonstrated by Mr. Houck when he offered to donate the stone to be used in the construction of the Education Building in 1922.

"Thus, largely through the vision and foresight of Louis Houck, the physical plant and environs of this delightful college were bounded on a scale sufficient for the needs of a growing institution for a century to come, and the basis laid for what is today the most beautiful college campus in the Midwest.

"In 1925 a committee consisting of Dr. Serena, R. S. Douglass, and Judge James A. Finch, in drafting a memorial about Louis Houck, said this, among other things."

CULTURE AND BEAUTY

" 'His interests, however, were not in the buildings alone, nor even in the rapid increase in the number of students. He believed in culture and beauty. His concern for the library, that it might always possess the world's greatest books, his love of the humanities, especially the classics, and his gift to the college of the fine group of statuary, reproductions of many of the world's masterpieces, are mute evidence of his real interests. It was through his effort that the Beckwith collections—archeological and historical—were secured, and largely through his efforts that other invaluable collections were added to the institution's possessions.

" 'He believed that this college is placed in its wonderful setting, a veritable light upon a hill, to hold ever aloft the torch of learning, beckoning to it the youth from the thousand hills and the rolling plains of southeast Missouri that here they might pursue learning.

" 'In the years of richest life experiences he more and more turned aside from a development of the natural resources of southeast Missouri to the pioneer in developing the intellectual and spiritual power of the youth of this new empire. It is not an exaggeration to say that in his last years this college became the ruling passion of his life, and that in the years to come the (Southeast Missouri State Teachers) College, for which he wrought so well and did so much, will be his proudest monument.' "

RESPECTED CHURCH

"Other monuments to this great man are to be found in many of the churches of this section which were the object of his bounty, and at least one of which was wholly built by him, and deeded to the members of the congregation, acts of charity not noised about, and known of but by few. Mr. M. E. Leming once said that Mr. Houck contributed to more churches than any other man in the country, and that no man had greater respect for the church.

"Senator James A. Reed, a close, personal, and political friend of Louis Houck, in speaking of Mr. Houck's political belief, said at a memorial service in 1925:

" 'He stood for the Constitution, because he knew that so long as it remains unimpaired, so long as it is revered and loved, the liberties of the American people will be secure. And if our country ever fails, it will not be by attacks from without, but from corruption and indifference within. He knew that corruption and indifference will not come if we continue to cultivate a spirit of individual liberty, and to teach the doctrine that each man stand upon his own feet; fight his own battles; receive the rewards of success and suffer the contumely of failure—asking from the Government no protection, save that which is guaranteed by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. He knew that by thus proceeding we would be every day developing the character of our race, putting iron into its blood, steel into its nerves, and courage and exaltation into its soul.' "

STOOD ON OWN FEET

"Yes, my friends, here was a man. Here was the personification of the spirit of individual enterprise. Here was a man who stood upon his own feet, and fought his own battles, and hewed out his own destiny with his own mind and hands; who received the rewards of success; who knew no discouragement, and recognized no defeat; who operated on his own and created his own opportunities.

"Louis Houck despised the despairing creed that the world owed him or any man a living. His pride was in his strength and courage; in his will to serve family, community, and nation.

"His life was gloriously fulfilled, both materially and spiritually, because, in an atmosphere of freedom and opportunity, in a system free of governmental regulation and restriction, he loosed his individual powers and employed his will, his courage, his enterprise, and his faith, to the attainment of his objectives.

"His life and deeds are an object lesson of the accomplishments which are possible in America, under a governmental system which is based upon free, competitive, individual, private enterprise.

"I conclude with the following extract from a tribute to Louis Houck by his lifelong friend, Allan H. Hinchey:

" 'The civilization of today has come through the Louis Houcks of the past; the civilization of the future rests upon the Louis Houcks to come, for in all ages there must be such as he.' "

That Mandate Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a New York Herald Tribune editorial which was reprinted in the February issue of Reader's Digest:

[From the Reader's Digest of February 1950]

THAT MANDATE AGAIN

(Editorial in New York Herald Tribune)

Mr. Truman is determined that the country shall accept his version of the mandate which was conferred upon him in November 1948.

The real question is whether the Government can now insure good wages for labor, a fair opportunity for small business and cooperatives, an insured income for the aged, protection against loss of income for the ill and unemployed, decent housing at prices they can afford for the citizenry, educational opportunities for all our young people, a fair price for farmers, better health and medical care for everyone, and equal participation in our national life, free from fear and discrimination for all Americans.

No one disputes the desirability of the goals, no one doubts that the American system has within itself the power to attain them to a degree known to no other nation. But to achieve them demands more than mere faith, more than a political formula, more than the denunciation of reactionaries. It is not enough to laugh off the question of cost, or the infringement on personal freedom which the injection of Government intervention into these spheres entails, as simply the propaganda of the reactionaries. The program which Mr. Truman puts forth in so debonair a fashion is as complicated, difficult, and costly as anything which could well be imagined. Combined with the vast commitments for defense and foreign aid which the United States has undertaken, it would constitute a crushing burden on the productive energies of America. This is not what the will of the people demanded, nor what Mr. Truman told the voters in the 1948 campaign. He spoke then, and he speaks now, as if a goal has only to be stated in legislation to be won, painlessly and finally. The experience of too many countries with this kind of wishful thinking, however, has proved it to be futile and dangerous.

Moscow Can Thank Tito for Western Recognition of Mao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Human Events written by the brilliant French observer Bertrand de Jouvenel. His penetrating insight that Tito's removal of Yugoslavia, at least temporarily, from Russia's direct control is likely to be the factor which by its influence on sentimentalist wishful thinkers in the West, brings Asia under Russian control in only a part of his brilliant analysis of the fatal malady—loss of convictions—which afflicts the West, including ourselves:

THANKS TO TITO

(By Bertrand de Jouvenel)

PARIS, January.—The British have recognized Mao Tse-tung as the rightful government of China. When Mao celebrated the new year with Stalin they were aware of this impending move. They must have dedicated a kind thought to Tito. For they owe him his great diplomatic victory. His unpunished secession has encouraged western policy makers to put their hopes in further secessions: Mao is to be another Tito.

Seceding Communist tyrants are to be offered, according to an already established pattern, British advice, British trade agreements, American money and machines, American protection; ultimately they are to be provided with arms and drawn into a wide scheme of collective security, including national Communist with democratic societies.

From the angle of Realpolitik the test of this grand strategy is its success. The bigger the battalions the better the chances. Let

us however be clear that we are thereby rejecting moral standards in international affairs, and that the American sword is henceforth to be drawn equally in defense of tyranny and of liberty.

It can be forcibly argued that alliances are a matter of expediency, ruled by the necessity of containing dangerously expanding powers. Did not liberal England uphold in the nineteenth century the rotten Ottoman despotism? And is it not true that Europe paid dearly for the reversal of this policy? This line may be taken, but it is then a palpable inconsistency to exclude from our alliance such non-Communist states, the internal regime of which does not meet with our approval.

If history can provide many arguments in favor of the Realpolitiker outlook, the student of our own times must stress the monstrous danger of this line in our democratic societies. It is very much to the credit of the people that the forces of public opinion cannot be marshalled without an appeal to the moral sense. If our cause is the right one, it is not easy to explain that some of our allies are just as bad as our opponents. Nor do some intellectuals make it any easier by their curious propensity to sugar-coat with moralism the bitter pill of expediency.

It has taken the West all of 5 years to emerge from the moral befuddlement attendant upon the Russian alliance. Of course the condemnation of Germans for crimes against humanity was marred by the presence among the judges of those responsible for many Katyns. Of course, the penance done by Germany for its aggressive imperialism fails to drive home its lesson while Germany's original accomplice wallows in its conquests. In September 1939 Leon Blum branded Stalin as responsible for the war: "Had he signed with England and France, war would have been impossible or highly improbable, his signing with Germany made it almost inevitable." (Le Populaire, September 21, 1939.)

We have lived through years of scandalous would-be moralism, deferentially consulting mass murderers on the right wording of a charter of the rights of man. It was a stifling atmosphere, a nightmare of values. We are at long last emerging from it. Is it to be plunged again into confusion?

Let us beware. We have in the West a mass of morally spineless intellectuals whose impotent desire for boldness, discipline and strength turns to a female craving for Communist company. The present explosion of moral disapproval against Stalinism has frightened them away from the Moscow shrine; they are offered an unhoped-for alternative; they can do their pilgrimage to Belgrade. Who will blame them for praising on their return the institutions of a valued ally? There are not a few signs that Tito may prove the Trojan horse in the western camp.

EUROPEAN NIHILISM

We want Tito and other such to help us defend western Europe which we do not feel strong enough to defend by ourselves. In the same manner the declining Roman Empire called upon barbarian allies. They caused the corruption, breaking apart, and downfall of Rome: so will it be with us. For our lack of strength which makes them desirable associates also makes their influence irresistible. It is a lack of moral strength. There never was in Europe a more numerous population than there is today to withstand the assault of Asia. Nor was the Roman Empire lacking in numbers or equipment: on the eve of its collapse it stood incomparably superior in quantities of men and arms to what Rome was when she ranged the known world under her laws. But one thing had departed: virtue.

Europe is internally eaten away by doubt, distrust, and cynicism. It is perhaps the tragedy of our age that socialism—practically, reliance on others—is offered as a cure for a feeling of insecurity which could only be cured by a restoration of self-reliance. Nor are great physical assets a condition of such self-reliance. Men are not cowards: they have the courage of their convictions; it is the convictions that they need. Nihilism is Europe's malady.

It is not fear of the Cossacks which reduces Europe to a helpless jelly. It is doubt of the justice of our cause, a vague feeling that the Communists may have right and history on their side. Perhaps after all their system is the fulfillment of democracy—and here the follies of western war propaganda comes to roost—and is not their creed the tail end of our prevailing beliefs?

We can be thankful for the crazy Valhalla lyricism which made the Nazi creed unpalatable and ridiculous to the West. The Soviets on the contrary speak the language of utilitarian technocracy which is the common language of the West. In my country the youth who was tempted by naziism was usually a romanticist. In direct contrast it is striking to see juveniles simultaneously buying a magazine about engineering and a pamphlet about Russia. Minds cluttered with factual knowledge avidly absorb the dreary tale of figures uttered by the Moscow radio.

Taught by their masters to doubt all beliefs and by too many surrounding examples to deride them, their gods are machines and the building of socialism is to them as entrancing as a gigantic game of meccano. Stalin is to them a more tangible Einstein, who has also written out the laws of the world on his blackboard.

The watcher who sees them merrily putting in their little rivet is apt to be moved by their boyish enthusiasm. We must be prepared to have again and again the sort of thing American correspondents in China have been giving us: That the Communists entered Shanghai in admirable order and seemed animated by excellent feelings. Whoever thinks that great things, even bad, can be achieved without an appeal to virtue and the play of virtues, knows little of man. All the dangerous seductions of our age have owed their effectiveness to the virtues they enrolled.

So there can be no antipathy in the heart of the watcher who in a small village, in a suburb, sees a youth enthusiastically enrolling his good will in the Communist cause. He tries to argue this recruit away, and finds no effective weapon in the armory of his nineteenth-century ideas. Shall he speak of progress, of evolution, of enlightenment? This is it, answers the youth. Society moves forward, rejects the last of superstitions, the new man emerges, the rebuilder of the world. Yes; but freedom of thought? Why, would you not, the youth retorts, move to the foot of the class those who do not give the right answer in the right figures? But must you crush human beings? Why not, if it is to benefit a greater number?

The watcher moves on, troubled in his nineteenth-century mind. He has no answers. The nineteenth-century biological outlook provides no justification for the absolute value of the individual life. Nineteenth-century relativism in regard to truth must logically emerge into a pragmatism which admits that deviationist beliefs are bad because they are deviations and enervate the collective effort. Thus, the nineteenth-century utilitarian must give up. But as he moves on he sees the priest moving in to the Communist lair. The priest, indeed, is the only one who, in fact, tackles the venture. His is the only non-Communist voice which makes itself heard in Communist circles; a situation which is not without its dangers for religion itself which some nonbelievers would use as a social weapon. But the very existence of this situation testifies to the inherent weakness of current humanism, incapable of making an effective appeal to the people in its own name.

The weakness of Europe lies in the absence of convictions, and consequent lack of power to convince, of its great mass of intellectuals.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN M. VORYS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Speaker, I am in favor of this resolution eliminating the power of the 21-day discharge rule.

To me there is something unreal about all of the sound and fury of this debate. It is amazing to have the Democratic Speaker arguing against rules that his party put in force in 1931 and operated under all through the days of the New Deal. This is even more astounding when it has been stated by members of the Rules Committee of both parties that a rule was never denied on a bill when the Speaker, Democrat or Republican, demanded it.

Under the 1931 rule, which was in effect until 1949, any bill could be brought to the floor by a discharge petition or by the committee on Calendar Wednesday. It takes unanimous consent to dispense with Calendar Wednesday, yet I can remember the call of committees on Calendar Wednesday just once during the past decade. The present rule, giving every chairman the theoretical power to bring a bill to the floor has not meant very much during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. In theory the rule can bring anything to the floor that any committee wants, in practice it depends entirely upon the Speaker. All he has to do is to fail to recognize the chairmen on the days when committee discharges are permitted, and the bill does not get to the floor.

Representative government in Congress is no different in essentials from representative government in lodges, unions, clubs, churches, and other organizations that everybody knows about. Pure democracy will not work, because all of the people cannot get together at one time to talk things over; therefore, they choose representatives. In any organization as big as the House of Representatives, with a membership of 435, the membership cannot work out an intelligent program except through representation of the members on committees, and through leaders acting formally or informally. The rules of the House are not perfect, but they represent the experience of nearly a thousand years of striving toward workable, representative, parliamentary government. As one wise Member has put it, the problem is to strike a balance between the rights of the individual Member and a majority; to permit a majority to work its will after due consideration of the views of the minority, but in all of this to have machinery and rules to get the work done.

Under our rules the party in power has control of the program, of what is to come up. This is as it should be. This power is exercised through a majority on every committee, including the Rules Committee, and through selection of the Speaker, who holds a very powerful office. There has always been considerable

bluffing and stalling and buckpassing under the Rules Committee system, but this applies equally to the 21-day discharge rule, as it has been in effect this year. For instance, FEPC could have been brought to the floor any time on at least a dozen occasions during the past 6 or 7 months by the Speaker and the committee chairman. I voted to adjourn until Monday to make doubly sure that FEPC could be brought up then, but as both sides in this argument today have stated, FEPC is not the real question involved in this rules fight.

This skirmish today arises from the fact that the Democratic Party, which has a paper majority in the House, does not have a responsible working majority capable of developing an intelligent working program for Congress. Tinkering with the rules will not change this situation. I prefer the old system, that centered power and responsibility, but, as has been stated repeatedly today, and not denied, that system was under the control of the Speaker and the majority party leadership in the House. I think that the continuation of the 21-day discharge rule will simply add to the confusion and make it harder to have any orderly program at all. Having a majority of each committee decide what shall come up on the floor means control of the time of all the rest of us by a very small minority in Congress.

We have been reminded today that our financial resources are not limitless, and that some group must have over-all responsibility for coordinating the actions of the various committees into a Federal financial budget. What has been forgotten is that our time resources are not limitless; the time of Congress must be budgeted. We have seen in the past year, after an unusually long and futile 10 months' session, that the new rule budgets neither time nor money. We can run up a deficit in dollars, but inexorable laws over which we have no control make it impossible to pay back time already spent. Whether we change our rules or not, we will be wasting time and money this session because of the composition of the Democratic paper majority in the House.

Federal Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a transcript of a broadcast over Columbia Broadcasting System by Housing Expediter Tighe E. Woods, January 16, 1950, at 11 p. m. This is a case-by-case history of why Federal rent control is absolutely essential to American families throughout the country. It shows what has happened where there has been premature decontrol of rents. Through this broadcast individual American families are able to tell their side of the story.

At 526 East Seventh South Street in Salt Lake City, Utah, Nicholas Franks lives with his wife and 6-year-old daughter. Nicholas Franks is a machinist for the Denver and Rio Grande Railroad. In the last few months his take-home pay has dropped about 40 percent. Any cut in family income is serious enough these days. But it is even more serious for the Franks family, because their rent has been increased. They used to pay $32.50 a month. Now they pay $45 a month, and the rent comes due every month.

Salt Lake City is only one of many cities where increases in rent have occurred. These are the cities where rent control has been wiped out, where rent control no longer protects tenants from unreasonable increases in rent.

But what has brought about this situation? How was rent control lifted in these cities?

Under the present rent-control law, Congress provided three ways by which controls can be ended by States and municipalities, by local rent-advisory boards, and by the Housing Expediter. When a State or local government ends rent control, it cannot be restored, no matter how high rents may go. When controls are lifted on the recommendation of local rent board, or when the Expediter ends them, they can be put back into effect if rents go up too high.

Since the present law went into effect, last April, four States have taken action to end controls—Nebraska, Texas, Wisconsin, and Alabama. In the same period, local governments have wiped out rent control in 200 towns and cities. Local rent advisory boards, which are made up of groups of representative citizens in each town where rent control is in effect, have eliminated controls in only five communities. As Housing Expediter, I have lifted rent control in 467 communities.

I have been criticized for lifting rent controls in such a large number of towns and cities. But I am under a mandate from the Congress to decontrol wherever possible. However, the Housing Expediter has the authority to put controls back into effect if rents rise unreasonably, but the action of the States or local government cannot be recalled.

In only three of the communities which I have decontrolled has it been necessary to restore controls. In one city, Spokane, Wash., which was decontrolled, about half of the dwellings covered in a recent survey had increases in rent. The increases averaged 18½ percent. We are now making a further study of housing in this city to determine whether controls should be put back into effect.

During the past few months, statements have been made to the effect that rents have not increased very much in communities where State and local governments have ended rent control. Until now we have not had accurate information on these towns and cities. But tonight I can give you the real facts.

Recently, the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, which is an independent, fact-finding agency, made surveys of rents in six of the largest cities now without rent control as a result of State or local action.

They found widespread rent increases.

In Dallas, Tex., and Knoxville, Tenn., two out of every three of the families in the survey have had their rents boosted.

In Jacksonville, Fla., and Salt Lake City, rent increases hit about half of the families.

Forty percent have had their rents raised in Topeka, Kans.; 31 percent in Houston, Tex.; and in every one of those cities more rents are being raised, month-after-month.

These increases are not small. They are substantial increases.

In Dallas, these families are paying 35 percent more rent each month.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30, in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 percent in Jacksonville.

But that is only a part of the story.

The people who are hit the hardest are those who are least able to pay higher rents.

Take Dallas for example.

In Dallas, almost three out of every four families included in this survey who earn less than $40 a week have had their rent increased approximately 50 percent.

The rent comes due every month. If you don't pay, you get tossed out. But you can't run the risk of being out on the street, because you can't find another place to rent. At least not at the price a family making $40 a week can afford.

The same thing is true in Topeka, Kans., where Mrs. Erlene Kistler lives. Mrs. Kistler is a widow. She has a 6-year-old daughter whose name is Rita. They live at 417½ West Seventh Street in Topeka. Mrs. Kistler has had a lot of trouble trying to find a place to live where they don't object to children. The apartment where she lives at present used to rent for $45 a month. Now the rent is $60, an increase of almost 35 percent. This winter Rita needed a new coat to wear. But the family budget is too small. Mrs. Kistler has had to make over an old coat of her own.

I told you that in Salt Lake City, where the Franks family lives, half of the families surveyed have had their rent increased. At the time the survey was made, the increases in rent in Salt Lake City averaged 16 percent. Of course, that is 16 percent on top of the increases they had already received under rent control. But there is another angle to the story of Salt Lake City that is important.

The Salt Lake Tribune of December 23 printed a news item in which Mr. Darrell Welling, executive vice president of the Salt Lake Real Estate Board, denied reports that landlords were contemplating a new rent increase on January 1. The news story said—and I quote: "Landlords, on January 1, will have a free market on their properties to work out problems with their tenants, Mr. Welling noted. Pledges signed by landlords not to increase rents more than 10 percent will expire at that time." That is the end of the quotation. Mr. Welling added that he thinks some landlords in Salt Lake City may decrease rents. We hope he is right.

I make this point about the rumors of more increases in Salt Lake City because similar conditions apparently apply to other cities where rent control has been ended by State or local governments. On the basis of the BLS survey, it appears that the longer a city has been without rent control, the greater the number of families who receive rent increases. Houston, Tex., had been decontrolled 1 month when the survey was made. Thirty-one percent of the tenants were paying increased rents. Dallas had been decontrolled 5 months when the survey was made. Sixty-seven percent of the families were paying higher rents. This clearly contradicts the contention of opponents of rent control that when a city ends rent control prematurely rents will only raise a little at first and then level off at reasonable rates.

The BLS surveys were made in only a few cities where controls have been lifted by local and State governments. But hundreds of families in other cities now without controls have reported similar increases.

In Omaha, Nebr., rent control was lifted by action of the State legislature. "Moon" Mullen who lives at 201 South Thirty-sixth Street in Omaha, is only one of many people there who are now paying increases in rents. "Moon" has three children. One girl is in high school. Their rent used to be $42.50 a month, now it is $80. The children have been needing new shoes for some time. But "Moon" can't afford to buy new shoes for them, now that his rent has been increased about a hundred percent.

Day after day dozens of letters come to me in Washington asking if there is anything I can do to help families whose rent has been raised. Here is just one example of the kind of letter I receive. It is dated December 20, and it is from a housewife in Oklahoma City:

She says:

"DEAR MR. WOODS: Please put rent control on again in Oklahoma City. Our landlord has raised the rent from $45 to $65 a month, and we can't pay it. We have one boy 11 years old and no one will take a child. We looked at a place Sunday which rented under rent control for $20 a month. Now it is $65. I don't know what we and dozens and dozens of families are going to do."

This housewife went on to say that she would have to move from her home on January 9. That was a week ago. I hope she was able to find a new place to live.

I wish I could have done something to help her. But I couldn't. Oklahoma City was decontrolled by action of the local city council.

There is another factor which now faces families in cities where rent control has been lifted prematurely. It is fear of eviction.

A moment ago, I said to you that hundreds of families have reported increases in rent. But for every family who reports an increase, there are thousands more who are afraid to do so for fear of being evicted. Time after time, as we talked to people in the cities I have told you about, we were met with this statement: "I can't let you use my name because I might be evicted if my landlord found out that I reported the increase."

Some people argue that rent control should be abolished right away. Landlords have been particularly vocal about it. And I am the first to admit that they have their side of the story. In a short time I expect to issue a statement on our present liberal policy for granting increases in rent to landlords.

Some people argue that rent control should be abolished right away. No one wants controls any longer than is absolutely necessary. But we still have rent control because the need for housing is so critical in many cities and towns that the premature lifting of controls forces tenants to pay exorbitant increases in rent.

I have already told you what has happened to rents in some cities. Let me repeat the amounts of those increases.

In Dallas, rent increases average 35 percent.

In Houston, 41 percent; 30 percent in Topeka; Knoxville, 27; Salt Lake City, 16; and 26 in Jacksonville.

If you want to know what it would mean to you to pay an increase in rent like families in these cities and others are paying, just take a piece of paper and pencil and figure out how much of a dent it would make in your own budget to pay an increase of 35 percent.

Last year, committees in the Senate and the House of Representatives held hearings on rent control and reported to the Congress that controls should be continued. Both of these reports made statements concerning the effect of lifting rent control which are very significant. The Senate report says: "If rent controls are relaxed, or lifted entirely so that rents continue to go up, we are likely to find that the farm groups, industry, retail trade, the whole economy would suffer a severe blow. * * * Any increase in rents today would be at the expense of diets, medical care, clothing, and other necessities of life of millions of American citizens."

This report to the Senate has proven to be "the handwriting on the wall." The prophecy has come true. You have heard what happens when rent control is lifted too soon. The families who are paying increased rents cannot afford clothing they need, and other necessities of life, such as food and medical care. This cut in their purchasing power has already had its effect upon retail trade and will continue to do so, because the increased rents come due every month.

As I said, we still have rent control because the shortage of housing in many cities is still so critical that the lifting of controls forces tenants to pay increases in rent that result in actual hardship. The removal of rent control is not the solution to our continuing housing shortage. That is like taking away a sick man's medicine to see whether he will get worse. The way to end the housing shortage and get rid of rent control is to build more homes. And when it is possible for the average family with an income of around $50 a week to get a place to rent at a price they can afford, then, and not until then, can we abolish rent control.

Your Taxes Can Be Cut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the people are demanding some relief from the overwhelming burden of taxation which they have borne with patience during the spending orgy of the Fabian socialistic administration.

When the average burden of taxes from excises alone amount to about $700 per family in the United States to furnish boondoggling funds for the spendthrift administration it is more than the people will bear.

Under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by David Camelon which appeared in the American Weekly of January 22, 1950:

YOUR TAXES CAN BE CUT

CANADA HAS PROVED THAT IT'S GOOD BUSINESS FOR EVERYONE, INCLUDING THE GOVERNMENT, TO PUT MORE SPENDING MONEY IN THE POCKETS OF ITS PEOPLE

(By David Camelon)

The lady gasped at the list of the thousands of taxes she had to pay.

"Oo-o-o-o-h," she said with a shudder, "no wonder my budget won't stretch."

Wait, sweetheart. You could be wrong again.

We gave you the bad news in the American Weekly last week. It was a tough jolt. We told you all the taxes you pay every day. Hidden taxes—luxury taxes—nuisance taxes—taxes on everything you touch from the moment you wake up.

But maybe something can be done about it.

You want more spending money, sweetheart? There isn't a reason in the world why you shouldn't have it. How? By cutting taxes.

That way, you can have more money—the government can have more money—and everybody can be happy.

Sounds like double talk? It isn't sweetheart. Many of our best-informed men—men like Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, veteran chairman of the Senate Finance Committee—say that it is just plain common sense.

Why? We'll get to that.

First, let's take a look at Canada. Canada believed it made sense, too. But Canada didn't stop there. Canada acted. It cut taxes. It gave your cousins across the border more money to spend. And the idea, Canadians say, is working out fine for everyone—including the Canadian Government.

Suppose you were sitting by your radio in Canada one evening not so long ago. You wouldn't have heard President Truman asking for more taxes. You'd have heard Canada's Minister of Finance, the Honorable D. C. Abbott, announcing a program of tax reduction "such as no parliament has ever made before, here or anywhere else, I believe."

He spoke with pride of Canada:

"During the past year this community of free people has produced a record quantity of consumer goods, and at the same time has produced and installed a huge amount of new and improved capital equipment which promises still greater output in the years immediately ahead."

He said he was going to make sure that the people would have more money, so that they could buy the goods they were making. He said that was good for the people.

"Consumers should have more money to spend this year than last," he said. He added that that would happen partly as a result of the tax reductions which I shall be inviting this House (Parliament) to approve.

He pointed out that there were so many things in the stores for the people to buy that in some cases we can observe the occasional emergence * * * of bargain sales by retailers, something which we had almost forgotten to be a normal part of business.

He wanted you—if you were a Canadian—to have enough money in your purse to take advantage of those bargains.

Mr. Abbott said that taxes should cause as little harm and irritation as possible. He explained that he was cutting taxes because the people wanted him to. He said:

"I have been led to believe in recent months * * * that most of the Canadian people would support, and even welcome, an enlarged measure of tax reduction this year."

Here's what Mr. Abbott did:

He repealed the tax on transportation. (You still pay 15 percent.)

He repealed (a year ago) the tax on amusements. (You still pay 20 percent.)

He repealed the tax on telephone calls. (You still pay it.)

He reduced the tax on jewelry to 10 percent—and he applied it, not to the retail price, but to the manufacturer's price. That's a double reduction—because the manufacturer's price is, frequently, only half of the retail price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced the tax on cosmetics to 10 percent on the manufacturer's price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced the tax on luggage, bags, purses, fountain pens, cigaret lighters, and similar goods to 10 percent—again on the manufacturer's price. (You pay 20 percent of the retail price.)

He reduced and adjusted the excise taxes on several other things.

And for the third time since the end of the war, he reduced income taxes—by increasing personal exemptions, and lowering the rates.

The personal exemption for a single person was raised from $750 to $1,000. (Here in the United States a single person's exemption is only $600.)

The personal exemption of a married person was increased from $1,500 to $2,000. (If you're married, in the United States, your exemption is $1,200.)

Families with children got an even better break. In the United States, a family with two children would get a total exemption of $2,400. In Canada, in addition to exemptions for children, the Government pays a family $72 a year for each child. On this

basis, a married man with two children who made $3,000 a year in Canada would find the Government owing him a balance of $39.

And a married man with two children, making $5,000 a year, got a tax reduction of $177—or 28 percent.

You can buy a lot of pork chops—and pancake make-up—with $177, sweetheart. Particularly when the cosmetic tax has been cut.

By those changes, Mr. Abbott said, Canada had returned to the prewar level of personal exemptions. He estimated that an additional 725,000 men and women wouldn't have to pay any income taxes at all. In the United States, with a population 12 times as big as Canada's, that would be the same as excusing 9,000,000 more people from paying income taxes.

Sounds good, doesn't it?

And don't let anyone tell you Canada could cut taxes because her debt wasn't as big as ours. In proportion to her income, Canada owes more. Her national income, in 1947, was only 5 percent of ours, but her national debt was 6 percent. The war cost Canada money, too.

What has been the result of Canada's tax cuts? A responsible government official said:

"The tax program has already given the people more money to spend. Business is booming. From every side we get reports of increased business—increased income.

"We have avoided the business slump—and the increase in unemployment—that the United States experienced recently. We're tremendously optimistic. We are sure, now, that the revenue flowing from the increase in business and in our national income will more than offset the immediate loss of revenue from the tax cuts."

Why can't the same thing be done here? It can.

Senator GEORGE said:

"Canada is moving in the right direction. We can, and must, follow a similar path."

Among the first to go, Senator GEORGE said, must be the wartime excise taxes—those luxury taxes that Canada has already repealed or reduced. He said:

"Those taxes were imposed during the war largely to discourage civilian buying. The purpose was to save raw materials and labor for essential war work.

"They were deliberately repressive on business. They tended to produce unemployment in civilian fields."

High income taxes had the same effect.

In time of war, the Senator said, that may be necessary. But high taxes—taxes that act as a brake on business, that tend to produce unemployment—are precisely what we don't need in time of peace.

Follow the Senator through some figures here. They aren't hard to get—and they'll show you why taxes not only can, but must, be cut.

Our total taxes—Federal, State and local, are running close to $60,000,000,000 a year. Senator GEORGE didn't believe—apart from wishful thinking—that there was much real hope of making any material reduction in that $60,000,000,000 revenue in the next few years.

Even with that enormous revenue, the Senator said, the Federal Government will face a deficit at the end of its fiscal year next June 30 of from $5,000,000,000 to $6,000,000,000.

President Truman has asked for more taxes to cover that deficit. Senator GEORGE said:

"I regret to say that I feel the President's theory of covering a deficit by higher taxes is entirely erroneous. I know of no way to meet that deficit except by easing the tax burden and increasing the income of the people who must produce those taxes.

"I know of no way in which you can get more income and production in a sound economy by increasing the burden on the producers."

America's national income, he pointed out, is slightly more than $200,000,000,000 a year. With a total tax of $60,000,000,000, that means that roughly 30 percent of our national income goes to pay taxes.

If we should increase the already repressive taxes, the Senator said, the national income would drop. If it went down to $150,000,000,000, we would have to pay 40 percent of it to meet the tax bill.

"That would be a crushing tax burden on the people," Senator GEORGE said. "It in turn would constitute an even greater brake on business. We would see tax collections dropping—and the deficit increasing."

If, however, we did what Canada did—if we cut taxes now, if we took the brake off business and employment, the national income would, in Senator GEORGE's opinion, increase immediately. He said:

"The national income is simply what every person in the country gets for the goods and services he produces. If we lift the tax burden from the people who produce that income—from every man and woman—I believe that within 3 to 5 years our national income may rise to $300,000,000,000.

"With a national income that big, we would have to pay only 20 percent of it to meet the tax load. That in itself would be a tremendous spur to our business."

With lower taxes, the Senator said, the people will have an incentive to produce more—and will have more money to buy their increased products.

He endorsed another of Canada's tax-reduction moves—the elimination of double taxation on corporate profits. In announcing that move to Parliament, Mr. Abbott said:

"Today we find governments in this country, as well as in most other countries, taxing away at least a third of corporate profits.

"In addition, the personal income-tax rates apply in full to what is distributed out of the remaining two-thirds. The tax may be as high as 80 percent upon distribution to shareholders.

"It seems to me that under a system of private enterprise which depends for its existence on a steady flow of venture capital we cannot afford to neglect the implication of this defect in our tax system."

Mr. Abbott reduced the tax on corporate profits to 10 percent in the case of small business. And he allowed every individual to take a credit against his personal income tax equal to 10 percent of the dividends received from Canadian corporations.

He announced that this was only a start on the problem of eliminating double taxation on profits.

Such a move, Senator GEORGE agreed, will encourage Canadians to use their money to buy the tools and new plants necessary to keep production climbing—in the words of Mr. Abbott, to produce even more of the capital equipment which "promises still greater output in the years immediately ahead."

Senator GEORGE said we can do one of two things:

We can raise taxes, with the risk of depressing business and reducing our income; or we can lower taxes, taking a temporary loss in tax revenue, with the certainty that any loss will be more than made up by the stimulation to business, more employment, and greater national income.

Well, there you've got it, sweetheart.

Which would you rather do?

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, on January 3, 1949, I voted against the rule change, as at that time I believed much undesirable legislation would be proposed to the House unless adequately screened by a responsible Rules Committee.

The Democratic Party's tremendous spending and tax program, designed to bring socialism to this country, in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress has proven that I was right.

The Democratic leadership now, through political maneuvering, has tried to couple the civil-rights program with this proposed rule change. They use the civil-rights issue only as a smoke screen, and I deplore such tactics. The Republican Party is pledged to support FEPC and other component parts of the civil-rights program. I have long been an advocate of this, and shall vote for it when it comes before the House. Failure to change the rules last Friday gave the Speaker of the House today opportunity to recognize the chairman of the Education and Labor Committee, in order to bring up the civil-rights bill. He chose, instead, to recognize another chairman and by his action it must be obvious to all that the Democratic leadership of this House has no desire to act on civil rights despite their many empty promises.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the effect of application of the provision of the proposed FEPC law as presented in a letter from Mr. Kern Dodge, a prominent engineer of Philadelphia, is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

PHILADELPHIA, PA., *January 16, 1950.*

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: By all means, vote against any so-called civil-rights measures, especially those having to do with fair-employment practices. Such a bill would deny employer freedom of contract; deny the employer the right of selective judgment in procuring his employees; deny to fellow employees the right of selecting associates; deny the employer the right to hire, promote, or discharge employees upon the basis of their efficiency, merit, or faithfulness.

It would subject the employer to endless investigation, harassment, and possible fines and penalties, determined by a commission.

It would deny the employer the right of

trial by jury, and give him no right to a review of the facts found by the commission.

It would compel the employer to give testimony against himself and expose his private letters, books, and papers for the inspection and investigation of a horde of employees of the commission.

It would compel the employer to hire a person whom he did not wish to have in his employ, and deny him the privilege of selecting an employee of his own choice.

Such a commission would have the power to make rules and regulations which have the effect of laws, of which we have more than enough, and which hamstring business.

I am sure you would not vote for a bill which would require a person of a certain race or color to work for another against his will. Therefore, you should not vote for any bill which would require another person to employ someone to work for him against such employer's will.

This whole civil-rights program is being pressed by certain minority groups who are not satisfied with life in the finest country in the world, but who wish to remake it for their own special selfish benefit.

Yours very truly,

KERN DODGE.

How Congress Makes a Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, we in the Senate of the United States work with the complex machinery of national legislation every day. An idea is born. We know that it must pass over a long and rocky road to become a law. This knowledge has become almost of second nature to us—so much so, perhaps, that in the turmoil of our busy days we are apt to forget how important it is that every American understand, at least in a general way, the "whats," "wheres," and "whys" of our legislative process. And it is helpful too, I believe, that every once in a while we in the Congress, as well as the American public, be reminded of all these complicated steps in our national law-making.

I feel that now, while the Eighty-first Congress is still in the early days of its second session, is a good time for all of us to review once again how we in the United States get a national law, and so here, in broad and easily understood terms, in the text of my regular biweekly broadcast of the week end of January 20–22, inclusive, to the people of Pennsylvania, is a discussion of the steps and pitfalls that lie ahead of any proposed legislation before it can become law. I ask unanimous consent to have my remarks printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

(Radio address by United States Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, of Pennsylvania)

I have intended in one of these regular radio reports to the people of Pennsylvania to paint in broad strokes a picture of the way a piece of legislation is born, and the fashion in which it ultimately grows up to become a public law.

Of course, to those of us who are Members of the House of Representatives or the Senate, knowledge of this sort is part of our stock-in-trade, but I have often been surprised, in reading over my mail, or in talking to Pennsylvanians who come to see me, when I realize that relatively little is understood about the way the Congress operates.

RESEARCH NECESSARY TO DRAW UP BILLS

Let us suppose that a matter comes to my attention with the indication that it would be desirable to pass a law relating to it. The first step, naturally, involves quite a bit of research into the existing laws we already have on the books to make absolutely certain that there is no legislative provision which covers the situation. When I am satisfied that no suitable legislation exists, the next step is one of collecting all of the factual background I can possibly get in order that I may be sure the proposal has merit.

In gathering these facts, it is frequently necessary to call upon experts in Pennsylvania who are acquainted with the matter, and who can explain what this will mean to the people of our State. It is also necessary, quite frequently, to call upon representatives of the local, or the State, or the Federal Government, for their comments and recommendations regarding the proposal.

Then, with all the facts before me, I go over the various means which have been suggested for accomplishing the desired result. Then follows the job of drawing up a bill, which, in appropriate legal terms, will carry out the intended purpose of the law. Members of the Senate are assisted in drafting this legal language by an official group known as the Legislative Counsel, a body of skilled lawyers, who are expert in drawing up legislation.

The steps I have enumerated thus far may, in the case of comprehensive legislation, consume weeks, or even months, before I am satisfied that we have come up with a proposal suitable for the purpose at hand. On the other hand, of course, there are occasions where the facts are clear from the start, where the remedy needed is a simple one that may be accomplished with the passage of a short, concise piece of legislation.

INTRODUCING THE BILL

In any event, once the bill is drafted, the rules of the Senate permit any Member to introduce a bill at any time, or at least there are very few occasions in the Senate when we may not interrupt debate long enough to introduce a piece of proposed legislation. This is accomplished by rising from your chair on the Senate floor and being recognized by the Presiding Officer, explaining that you wish to submit a bill.

Only under the most unusual circumstances does the Senate proceed immediately to consider and vote on the proposal at the time it is introduced. Instead, the Presiding Officer of the Senate refers the proposal to one of the standing legislative committees.

WORK OF LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEES

Now let me explain to you just what these legislative committees do. We have, in the Senate, a total of 15 such committees, and I will name each of them now in order that you can see the type of legislation which each of these considers. We have a Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, a Committee on Appropriations, on Armed Services, on Banking and Currency, a Committee on the District of Columbia, on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, on Finance, a Committee on Foreign Relations, and then on Interior and Insular Affairs, a Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and on the Judiciary, a Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and one on Post Office and Civil Service, another on Public Works, and on Rules and Administration.

With the exception of the Appropriations Committee, each of these 15 committees is composed of 13 of the 96 Members of the Senate. As a general practice, every Senator serves on two such legislative committees. I, for example, am a member of the Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. In the Eighty-first Congress, in which, as you know, the Democrats outnumber the Republicans in both Houses, there are usually 8 Democrats and 5 Republicans to make up the 13 members of the committees, since this ratio is approximately proportional to the ratio of Democrats to Republicans in the Senate.

When you stop to think about it, it is obvious why we must have a committee system in the Congress. Let me illustrate this by pointing out that 2,675 separate bills were introduced by the 96 Members of the Senate in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. It's obvious that no Member of the Senate could be familiar with all of the provisions of all of these bills. It's obvious, too, that there may be 3 or 4, or sometimes as many as 15 or 20, bills introduced by different Senators, all of which deal with aspects of the same problem.

So the primary purpose of our legislative committees is to provide the Senate with a relatively small group which becomes expert, say, in matters of the armed services. All of the bills that relate to the armed services are referred to that committee. It is the committee's duty to examine them all. The committee may decide it would be preferable to group a number of bills together, consider them all at once and report out a single piece of legislation which covers all of the situations visualized by those separate measures. On the other hand, the committee may have before it only one bill which relates to a given proposal, and in that event, the measure will be considered separately.

It is surprising how few of the bills referred to any committee are controversial. And under these circumstances, the committee will examine the merits of the proposal and perhaps vote to report the original bill pretty much in the form it was submitted, recommending, at the same time, that the Senate act favorably upon it.

HOW CONTROVERSIAL MEASURES ARE HANDLED

Where a number of bills are considered at the same time, however, where the matters involved are steeped in controversy over the way a situation should be handled, the usual practice of the committee is to appoint a subcommittee and conduct public hearings. To these hearings are invited the representatives of groups interested in the legislation being considered. These witnesses explain to the subcommittee why they favor or oppose the various proposals under discussion. Particularly when the subject matter is comprehensive in its scope and controversial in its nature, subcommittee hearings may go on for months and months in an endeavor to put all of the facts of the case before the subcommittee.

When at last the committee is satisfied that no new facts will be brought to light, the hearings are brought to a close, and the members go into what is known as executive session. Here they debate among themselves all the various proposals, rejecting those that are clearly unsuitable and attempting to work out provisions upon which all the members can agree.

During the course of executive sessions efforts are made to draft a single bill containing the proposals agreed to, and ultimately the 13 members vote to recommend the new bill to the Senate. Such a committee vote may produce any number of results. All 13

members may agree unanimously to the bill as it then stands. This has been especially true in the field of foreign policy, where Republicans and Democrats alike on that committee have agreed down to the last comma on virtually every measure reported from that committee. Unanimous agreement by the 13 members characterizes the vote in most committees on most legislation.

There are, of course, the few occasions—occasions that are always given tremendous publicity—in which a committee divides right down the middle and votes squarely along party lines, the Democrats voting one way, the Republicans the other. As I say, this doesn't happen often among the experts who know most about the legislation before them. When a committee does vote 8 to 5 to report a bill in a particular form, the five minority members almost invariably write a dissenting report, and you can generally count on a fight when such a measure hits the Senate floor.

I will say a brief word about the reports which accompany each bill as it is voted out of committee and sent to the Senate. These reports usually outline the provisions of the bill and summarize the committee's reasons for recommending passage of the measure. A minority report points a finger at the provisions in the bill which the minority does not endorse and gives the reasons for its opposition.

There is a final possibility that may result from a committee vote. The committee may vote to report out no legislation at all, thus bottling a bill up in committee and, in effect, killing any chance that the Senate might consider it at all.

When this happens, about the only way in which the Senate may bring the issue to a vote is through the extraordinary tactic of the Senate itself voting to discharge the committee of further consideration of the bill. You may recall that this tactic was proposed late last summer as a means of bringing the displaced-persons bill out to the Senate floor. Before that tactic had been attempted, however, the Judiciary Committee did vote to report out the bill.

THE SENATE CALENDAR

Once a bill has been reported out of committee, it is placed upon the calendar of the Senate. The calendar is simply a list of bills upon which committee work has been completed and that are all ready for action.

It may surprise many of you, but almost all the bills passed by the Senate are passed with the unanimous consent of the entire body. This is accomplished by what we refer to as calling the calendar. When this is done, we read down the list of bills, and if no objection is heard to the bill at the time its number is called, the measure is passed by unanimous consent. However, if only one Senator opposes a bill, he may enter an objection when the number is called, and the bill is held over to be brought up later for debate, and ultimately to be voted upon.

DUTIES OF MAJORITY POLICY COMMITTEE

Once a bill has been objected to and passed over, it remains on the Senate Calendar. Thereafter, it becomes the duty of the Majority Policy Committee of the Senate to determine the time at which the measure will be brought up for debate. In my capacity as the assistant majority leader of the Senate, or the whip, as the job is otherwise known, I am one of the eight Democratic Senators who serve on the Majority Policy Committee. Our job, as I've already indicated, is, first, to determine the sequence in which legislation is brought up for debate. The Policy Committee has the further function of mapping the general strategy which will be used in guiding the legislative program of the administration.

When the Policy Committee met shortly before the first day of this session of the Eighty-first Congress, we decided to bring up the oleo bill as the initial measure the Senate would consider.

Once a measure has been selected for debate, the efforts to obtain passage of the bill are usually assumed by the Senators who serve on the committee which processed the legislation, since they are the real experts on the measure, and the Senate necessarily must rely on their special knowledge of the facts. The committee members are, of course, assisted by the Senate leaders, and for that matter, by any other Senators who wish to participate in the debate.

FINAL STEPS

The bill, as you realize, must be agreed to in every respect by both the House and the Senate before it can be sent to the President for his signature, making it a Public Law. So, if the Senate is the first to pass the bill, it is referred then to the House of Representatives for consideration. If, on the other hand, the House has already passed the measure, but in a slightly different form from the Senate version, a conference committee, composed of a few Representatives and a few Senators, is appointed, and the compromise agreement is ultimately sent back to each House for its approval before sending it to the President.

Thus it is that a law is passed by the Congress.

The Quack

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Quack," appearing in the Omaha Evening World-Herald of January 20.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE QUACK

If a faith healer were named medical czar of the United States, it is likely that the past presidents of the American Medical Association would have some salty things to say about the fellow.

A situation similar to that has arisen among economists, now that Leon Keyserling has become the No. 1 economist in the Truman administration. It is widely predicted that he will shortly be named chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, of which he is acting chairman at present.

Mr. Keyserling is an ersatz economist. C. P. Ives, of the Baltimore Sun, in looking into the man's qualifications, discovered that he has practically no preparation or standing in the field in which he is now so prominent. He holds no academic degrees in economics. His sole published work in the field is described by Mr. Ives as "a second-prize essay on postwar economic policy in a promotion contest run by a brewing company."

His experience amounted to 1 year as an assistant in economics at Columbia University when he was 24 years old. Mr. Keyserling became a member of the American Economic Association, the professional society of working economists, only after he had been appointed an economic adviser to the President in 1947.

Four past presidents of the American Economic Association have paid their respects to Mr. Keyserling in uniformly uncomplimentary fashion.

Dr. Edwin C. Nourse, a former AEA head, made known his sharp differences with Mr. Keyserling when he (Dr. Nourse) resigned as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers.

Senator PAUL DOUGLAS, Democrat, of Illinois, who once headed the AEA, crossed swords with Keyserling over the latter's insistence upon restrictive controls a year ago when practically everyone else knew that inflation had ebbed. A Senate committee headed by Mr. DOUGLAS has noted "how unsafe it is to base fiscal policy" upon economic predictions.

Dr. E. H. Ellis, who headed the economists' group last year, is the sharpest Keyserling critic. He has accused Mr. Keyserling of befuddlement or dissimulation and casuistry. "Honesty," says Dr. Ellis, referring to the policies of Dr. Nourse, "is apt to be better long-run policy than Keyserling's (congressional) testimony."

Another critic is Princeton's Dr. Jacob Viner, outstanding economist who headed the AEA in 1939, and who once worked for the Federal Government. He once told Keyserling at a public meeting that if a Government official speaks to the public, he has to speak his master's voice. When Mr. Keyserling objected to Dr. Viner being the keeper of my conscience, the Princeton professor snapped:

"I am not interested in your conscience, Mr. Keyserling. I have enough trouble with my own. I am interested in institutions—American institutions."

Such is the indictment of Economist Keyserling by some of the country's leading economists.

Whether it will sway the President of the United States in naming a new chairman for the CEA remains to be seen. Mr. Truman ordinarily is more concerned with loyalty than with competence. And Mr. Keyserling has been loyal.

The most effective way to rid the Federal Government of Mr. Keyserling and his odd theories would be for Congress to abolish the Council of Economic Advisers, on the grounds that it has become simply a political tool of the White House.

Formosa and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Tears of the Crocodile," published in the Washington Post of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEARS OF THE CROCODILE

Among the myths that are being sedulously circulated as a result of the Formosa decision is that the administration has killed its own Truman doctrine. The funeral orations have been delivered by one after the other of the China interventionists in Congress. Some of them never favored the Truman doctrine, anyway, but that fact, far from moderating their wailing, has made their lamentations even more shrill. A flock

of commentators has seconded the dirge, and the only person who seems unperturbed by the outcry is the parent who is accused of the foul murder of his child, viz, President Truman.

Mr. Truman is not as hard-hearted as the serenity he maintains in the midst of this Irish wake would seem to indicate. We have consulted the child's birth certificate, dated March 13, 1947, and can vouch for the fact that whatever has been killed, it is not the Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine, contrary to the burial notices, was not a declaration to "contain" Communist expansion. Indeed, a reading and rereading of the message does not disclose either the word "containment" or the word "communism." The message, inspired by Britain's announcement that it could no longer help Greece, laid down this general policy:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The first thing to notice about the declaration is its positiveness; it was for, not against. It emphasizes aid, to be given in one or more of a variety of forms, depending upon circumstances. However, the doctrine indicated what kind of aid was primarily meant; it was economic:

"Our help should be primarily economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes."

On the basis of the Truman doctrine, economic and financial aid and then military aid started to flow to Greece and also to Turkey. The reason was that Greece and Turkey were struggling to prevent the Russians from cutting the Mediterranean and encircling the Middle East. Ask any military strategist and you will find that this was all-important to American security. There is only one Mediterranean, only one Greece; and, as Secretary Acheson has said, the American interest differs with locality. In this sense the Truman doctrine has been administered—is still being administered. It is being applied all over the world according to the requirements of situations and geography and the limitations of American resources.

Out of the Truman doctrine, for instance, stemmed the Marshall plan in Europe and the Far East. The Marshall plan followed the wise maxim underlying the Truman doctrine of helping people who helped themselves. It would have been money down the drain to have any other rule. Wherever there was a contrary practice, as in China, the result has been worse than wasteful; it has been a boomerang. The Marshall plan, moreover, was followed by the North Atlantic Pact and the arms program—all tracing back to the Truman doctrine. They all sprang from the original concept of supporting free peoples who were struggling to keep themselves free which was expressed in the Truman doctrine. The conclusion is that the crocodile tears now being shed over the demise of the Truman doctrine are all eyewash.

Wheat for India

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter written by Mr. J. J. Singh, president of the India League of America. This letter appeared in the columns of the New York Times on December 25, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INDIA LEAGUE OF AMERICA,
New York, N. Y., December 20, 1949.

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

During the visit of Prime Minister Nehru to this country, several newspaper stories appeared indicating that a barter deal was in progress, whereby the United States would sell 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India in exchange for such raw materials as mica, manganese, etc., which the United States needs.

It is very regrettable that, according to information available, this barter deal has met snags and has bogged down. This means that the urgently needed wheat for the hungry in India is not available.

One of the snags is that India will not be able to supply mica, manganese, and other raw materials of a similar nature for several years to come. The reasons being (a) the next 3 or 4 years' supplies are already pledged, and (b) that with the devaluation of the rupee, 40 percent additional quantities have to be produced.

It seems very unfortunate that due to red tape and technicalities, valuable time is being lost and India's food situation is being allowed to deteriorate.

Surely, with the cooperation of the State Department, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Commodity Credit Corporation, a way could be found to overcome some of the technical difficulties—and if a barter deal is not feasible at this stage, then wheat should be sold to India on a long-range credit basis. The sale has to be on a credit basis for the simple reason that India, like many other countries, does not have the necessary dollars to purchase and pay on the barrel.

Sale of a million tons of wheat to India on a long-range credit basis is a two-way street. It will help India and it will also lessen the burden of the United States taxpayer.

It is authoritatively reported that under the farm price-support program, the United States Government has bought, paid for, and is storing surplus farm commodities valued at millions of dollars. It is costing United States taxpayers $237,000 a day for storage and carrying charges on these farm products. By selling 1,000,000 tons of wheat to India, the American taxpayers' burden will be lessened.

India's economy is in a critical condition. And it is chiefly due to the lack of food. The Indian Government has had to buy, at very high prices, food in different parts of the world, to avert a large-scale famine. Such heavy expenditures for food grains have reduced India's capacity to import other essential capital goods to help India's economy.

A loan of a million tons of wheat would stabilize food grain prices in India and will feed millions of hungry mouths. This in turn will keep the masses satisfied and reduce the possibilities of Communist propaganda amongst the hungry people.

I do not believe in flaunting the danger of communism at every stage and turn. However, this aspect cannot be overlooked.

Strong and surging Communist forces are nearing the borders of India. The defection of the Governor of the Sikang Province to the Communists brings real danger to Tibet.

From all reports available, the Chinese Communists plan to move into Tibet in the very near future. Some reports indicate that infiltration has already taken place. This is to presage a fake internal revolution to depose the young Lama. The irony is that there is very little that India and the western democracies can do in this instance. No military or material aid is possible. Also, Communist China could probably make a good legal case for hoisting their flag at Lhasa. Tibet has been considered part of China since early seventh century A. D. The Chiang Kai-shek regime, too, has consistently maintained that position.

Once Tibet comes under the control of the Communists, serious troubles for India are likely to begin. Because it would be easier then for the Communists to infiltrate into India through the two small Himalayan kingdoms of Nepal and Bhutan whose northern borders join Tibet and southern borders join India.

It is true that the reigning house of Nepal is very friendly toward India (a treaty of friendship and commerce is being negotiated) and the western democracies, and the Government of the United States has a full-fledged mission stationed there. And Bhutan, which receives a large subsidy from India and whose foreign affairs, since August 1949, have been in the hands of the Government of India, is being more or less run by India. Yet, it must not be forgotten that ethnologically, the Nepalese and Bhutanese are Mongoloids like the Tibetans. This will make "infiltration" very easy.

Then, too, there are no democratic institutions in these kingdoms. The Communists are sure to take full advantage of that by appealing to the poor masses against the rule by the few.

Solutions are hard to find under such conditions. However, one of the apparent solutions is to encourage and strengthen the democratic forces in India. And one of the ways to achieve that end is for the United States to help India in putting more food into hungry mouths and in stabilizing food prices.

Such a gesture from this democracy will mean a lot to democratic forces all over Asia. It may even give India a chance to counteract Communist propaganda in Nepal and Bhutan, thus stopping the Communists on the border of Tibet.

J. J. SINGH, President,
India League of America.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, a couple of my colleagues have conscientiously protested my opposition to the activities of the Southwestern Power Administration, which is their privilege under our great American heritage. It is noted with interest that these eminent gentlemen purport to justify the activities of the Southwestern Power Administration by emphasizing the success of the rural electrification program. Perhaps these two good friends of mine are unconsciously influenced by the fact that the activities of the SPA deserve no praise and cannot be justified.

REA AND SPA ARE SEPARATE

When a boy on the farm, like my neighboring boyhood friends, I longed for the day when I could live in the small town nearby that I might enjoy some of the comforts and entitlements of life principally afforded by electric service. However, it is now possible to visualize

a near future when the people of the metropolitan areas will be living for that day when it will be possible for them to move to and reside within the wide open rural spaces where they will at the same time be afforded equal comforts of life to those within the metropolitan areas.

Hamstring the rural electrification program? No. I would do absolutely nothing detrimental to this great enterprise and will always use every honorable means at my command to further this most meritorious project. I am a devout advocate of rural electrification, and I am just as anxious as any person in this country to see every farm within the United States electrified at the earliest possible date.

Actions speak louder than words. Therefore, I suggest that some of the proponents of the SPA activities who would accuse me of being unfriendly to the REA program scrutinize my past activities concerning this subject. I have a public record of several years, and the people within my area know of my activities on behalf of the rural electric cooperatives. During my tenure in Congress I have consistently supported the REA program. In every one of my 62 speeches before civic organizations in Arkansas during the 45 days immediately preceding this last Christmas I highly praised the rural electrification program and, at the same time, lost no opportunity to advise the people that in my opinion the Southwestern Power Administration would eventually attempt to do just exactly what it is now doing by means of the SPA-REA contract. I sincerely feel that my efforts to prohibit the SPA from taking over the facilities and privileges of the involved electric cooperatives is my duty as a friend and representative of the farmers and electric cooperative membership within my district.

The REA and the SPA are distinct and separate programs, and the SPA has contributed nothing to advance or promote the high standards of rural electrification. The rural electrification program is a successful, meritorious, free, and independent organization—the respective electric cooperatives being owned, controlled, governed, and operated by and for the membership, with justifiable authority under our American way of life to freely engage in bringing electric service to the rural areas of our country.

The Southwestern Power Administration, on the other hand, is an agency of the Federal Government under the Department of the Interior with limited congressional authority to pool power and energy produced from Government multiple-purpose dams and distribute such power and energy as provided by law at rates to be approved by the Federal Power Commission.

I wholeheartedly concur in the statements of one of my fellow colleagues that rural electrification has been a long and hard struggle; that the remaining unserved 33 percent of rural Arkansas should be electrified under the splendid rural electrification program without delay; and that rural electrification is just now coming into full fruition. However, these facts do not in anywise justify the activities of the SPA. It cannot be contended that the SPA should be credited with having electrified 67 percent of the rural areas within the State of Arkansas, but, to the contrary, these achievements have been realized under the authority granted by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936. It is not necessary to allow the Department of the Interior, through the Southwestern Power Administration, to nationalize, federalize, and socialize the rural electric cooperatives in order to bring electricity to the remaining 33 percent of the unserved rural area of our State.

GENERATING PLANTS AND TRANSMISSION LINES

Yes; the rural electric cooperatives should be and are authorized and entitled to construct electric generating units and transmission lines that the cheapest possible electric energy may be made available to the membership in accordance with good business principles under our system of free enterprise. However, I insist that the Southwestern Power Administration is not justifiably entitled to similar authorizations if we are to maintain our principles of democracy, assist our rural electrification program, and uphold our belief in private ownership.

To allow the Federal Government, through its SPA agency, to establish and dictate policies for the rural electric cooperatives, and to use, control, and receive all benefits from electric generating and transmission facilities constructed by the cooperatives is nothing less than an authorization to federalize the rural electric cooperatives, permit the SPA to expand its legal jurisdiction, and place the Government in direct competition with its citizens.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AS A COMPETITOR

As brought to our attention by one of my colleagues, I likewise know of but very few, especially within our section, who do not believe in free, competitive enterprise. Perhaps it should be added that I know of even a lesser number in our area who believe that one of the competitors in free competition should be the Federal Government. I would not hazard the contention that the rural cooperatives or others engaged in the power industry could produce electricity as cheaply as the nontaxpaying Federal Government. No doubt we could buy our food and clothing a lot cheaper at Government-owned grocery and clothing stores.

Those proposing to place the Government, through its SPA agency, into the power field as a competitor in order to assure cheaper energy than the taxpaying electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry can produce could just as successfully contend that we should have Government-owned parallel and duplicating railway and streetcar tracks; airplane, boat, bus, and truck routes; telephone and telegraph lines; and radio and television channels. Petroleum, gas, and coal could be produced cheaper by the Government. No doubt all of these businesses are in the plans of those seeking to use the Government as a competitor to free enterprise. The ultimate results of such a plan can only mean Government operation and eventual ownership.

SPA-REA CONTRACT ABOLISHES COMPETITION

Prior to the approval of the SPA-REA contract the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest have today three sources of electricity:

First. Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves;

Second. Private power companies;

Third. Electric generating plants that the cooperatives build, own and operate themselves.

Right now the rural cooperatives have the private companies and the Federal Government SPA agency right where they should want them. Both are doing everything possible to do business with the cooperatives. The Southwestern Power Administration and the private companies are competing for the cooperatives' business, and they fully realize the possibility of the cooperatives' building their own steam-power units and transmission lines should the electric rates not be sufficiently low to make justifiable such action on behalf of their membership. As long as this situation prevails it is the rural electric cooperatives within the Southwest that stand to benefit by not becoming involved in a long-term contract. They have their freedom of choice—the American way.

Once, however, these cooperatives lose their advantage by negotiating a long-term contract, permitting themselves to be tied irrevocably to the apron strings of the SPA for a period of 40 years, the opportunity to buy electricity upon a competitive market is gone and the right to produce and transmit electricity by means of their own facilities has vanished.

SPA is not in the power field with the rural cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry with my good graces. TVA was established not only for flood control and navigation but as a "yardstick" of electric costs for regulating private-power companies. The Public Service Commission in my State of Arkansas as well as the Federal Power Commission regulates the involved electric rates. The SPA must sell electricity from the Government flood-control dams at rates approved by the Federal Power Commission. The SPA renders only a power marketing service. The Corps of Engineers build and operate the flood-control dams, and could distribute the electricity from that source to the rural electric cooperatives and others engaged in the power industry over transmission lines built by the engineers, the private companies, or the cooperatives at a great savings to the taxpayers. Were the SPA completely out of the power field the rural electric cooperatives could still obtain electricity from the Government flood-control dams over transmission lines owned by the Government, the private companies, or those that the cooperatives build, own, and operate themselves. Alternative sources would come from private power companies or from electric-generating plants that the co-

operatives build, own, operate themselves, and tie in with the Federal power projects.

CONCLUSION

A memorandum as of the 17th day of January from the Washington executive manager of the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association to all managers, State presidents, State papers, and NRECA directors is a fair example of the misinterpretation of my bill by those who hope to see the rural electrification movement in the Southwest completely controlled by the Federal Government SPA agency. This memorandum can only serve to misinform our rural people who have the most to lose if the REA is taken away from them and put under the control of the Federal Government. Could it be that the Washington office of the NRECA is afraid to allow the affected people to know the truth?

The afore-mentioned NRECA memorandum out of Washington incorrectly charges, among other things, that my bill will:

First. Stop all REA loans for transmission and generation where lines would be tied into any other power source except where they are individually authorized by Congress;

Second. Stop advances (of funds) on all such generation and transmission loans already made except as they are hereinafter specifically authorized by Congress.

It is well known by the Washington manager of the NRECA that my bill in no way affects the authority of the REA to make any loans except for the building of electric generating plants or transmission lines to be used, leased, owned, or operated by others than the rural electric cooperatives. I merely want to keep the SPA from federalizing the rural cooperatives until authorized to do so by Congress. I am at a loss to know how anyone could object to Congress being given an opportunity to determine whether the Federal Government, through the SPA, should enter into the power field as a competitor with its citizens by regimenting and federalizing the rural-electric cooperatives.

The proposed legislation does not attempt to curtail the present authority of the REA to loan funds for electric service lines; for generating and transmission systems; for transmission lines to carry hydro power from Federal projects, generating plants, or from any other source; or for any other purpose than the building of generating plants and transmission lines to be used by others than the electric cooperatives.

As a freshman Member of Congress, of course I do not have at my disposal the excellent means of reaching the cooperative members throughout the Nation as does the Washington manager of the NRECA. In my district, however, it will be my pleasure and privilege to take this issue to my own farmers. If the rural-electric cooperative membership throughout this country could in some manner be given the true picture of the situation at hand, it would take no action by Congress to preclude the federalization efforts now being made through the SPA plan. A great majority of the people are aware of the Federal Government gradually encroaching more and more upon the lives, happiness, and freedom of the American people. My people do not want Federal regimentation; they will not stand for it; and so long as I am a Member of Congress I shall do all in my power to keep it from being forced upon them.

I hold no brief for the private electric utilities; recognize them as monopolies requiring strict Federal regulation and supervision; but I feel that all water, telephone, electric, fuel, and like utilities have a definite place in our economic picture, and should not be permitted to be abolished by the competition of the Federal Government. No monopoly could ever exist so dangerous and devastating to democracy as a Federal Government monopoly.

However, you may be assured that I do hold a brief, and a strong one, for the American system of free enterprise upon which this Nation was founded and has become the greatest upon the face of this earth. It alarms me and it should concern all of us tremendously when we see the Federal Government taking steps toward nationalization, which would result eventually in a completely socialized state. The founders of American democracy never intended that we employ such a system. The great strength of America today lies in the fact that our individuals and industries have been encouraged and inspired by the right of free enterprise—the right to earn a legitimate, honest dollar without working in direct competition with the Federal Government, or without being taken over, lock, stock, and barrel, by the Federal Government, as some of our "planners" would like.

The Southwestern Power Administration activities are of far-reaching significance—going beyond the electric-power field—going into the very heart of our right for free enterprise which was guaranteed to each and everyone of us by the pioneers who built our Nation and our Government. I, for one, want to preserve that right, and I shall do everything within my power to preserve it, regardless of politics and regardless of criticism by "do-gooders" who would like to see the Government take over everything, including the future rights of our children to which they are justly entitled by American democracy.

New Mining Bill To Secure Venture Capital

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, having just come back to Washington from Nevada, where among other places the Committee on Public Lands held hearings on western problems, I heard a great deal about the troubles of the domestic mining industry.

High costs and comparatively low prices have caused a serious economic crisis which is surely and rapidly strangling to death the small and marginal mines of Nevada and elsewhere, causing a greater and greater dependence upon foreign sources of minerals—and, I may add, a largely unnecessary dependence. There are a number of contributing factors, among which are high taxes, low tariffs, lack of a Federal system of mine incentive payments such as is contemplated in the Murray-Engle bill, and failure of the Bureau of Federal Supply to apply the buy American clause of the Stock Pile Act of 1946.

Congress provided in the Stock Pile Act of 1946 a mechanism (the "buy American" clause) especially designed to prevent too great a dependence upon foreign sources of minerals and metals and laid down a policy to govern the executive branch of the Government in dealing with this problem. The first section of Public Law 520, Seventy-ninth Congress, second session, states clearly that one of the purposes of the act is "to encourage * * * the development of sources of these materials within the United States, and thereby decrease and prevent wherever possible a dangerous and costly dependence of the United States upon foreign nations for supplies of these materials in time of national emergency." This policy has been almost completely nullified by the executive. As not infrequently happens, Mr. Speaker, the Congress saw more clearly than the advisers of the President who in his message of approval of the Stock Pile Act stated his "reluctance to signing a bill which reaffirms the application to stock-pile purchases" of the buy American clause. This statement by the President ever since has controlled the policy of the executive agencies. I cannot believe the President intended to bring about the results which have stemmed from this unfortunate statement, and I feel he has been ill advised.

However that may be, Mr. Speaker, it is up to the Congress to reaffirm its stand and policy and to implement it.

One of the difficulties in getting private capital to develop and open new mines is the extremely speculative nature of the enterprises and, because of double taxation of any income at the mine and again when it reaches the investor. Only small tax advantages can be taken of losses, and at the same time the net income to an investor from a successful venture is so small as to make it extremely unattractive to risk one's capital in such ventures. Investment in tax-free securities or in safe, low-income industrial issues, or in bonds, has become the popular way of safeguarding one's capital, and the idea of making money through speculative ventures in new enterprises has well-nigh had to be abandoned. Mining has been the chief sufferer in this respect. It may be that the SEC regulations have restricted new investments to some extent, but the real trouble is the reluctance of the investor

to take the risk of "heads you win, tails I lose" in playing the tax game with Uncle Sam.

I believe that mining can be made attractive to the investing public by the right sort of tax relief. I now am talking of new ventures which hit the jackpot, not mines which are unable to make both ends meet. No amount of Federal tax relief can help those who have no operating profit. If, however, one stood a chance of keeping the jackpot when he hit it, one might well afford to invest in a number of projects and take the losses from the unsuccessful ventures.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I introduced a new bill, H. R. 6896, which strikes a blow against double taxation of the income from new mining enterprises. The effect of this will be to keep the mine free from Federal taxation for 5 years after its first commercial production, and to make the profits to the investor tax-free for 5 years after the first dividends are declared. This is a radical and drastic departure from other tax-relief plans, but the situation is desperate and requires drastic action.

I trust, Mr. Speaker, that the Members will give this new plan careful study and consideration. I know of no other way to induce private venture capital into this basic industry so as to extend our ore reserves. If the Governmen will not help, the stage must be set so that the industry can help itself, and improve our basic economy at the same time. This bill should be given hearings and cleared for the consideration of the House at the earliest possible moment. I hope for prompt and favorable action.

A Popular Start

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under date of January 12, 1950, the editor of The Observer, of the town of Kearny, N. J., wrote a very timely and encouraging editorial entitled "A Popular Start." It suggests that Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public will be pleased with the new administration which will guide the destiny of the town of Kearny under the able hand of Mayor Joseph P. Healey.

The projected program of Mayor Healey, one of my closest friends, has won the admiration and respect of his townspeople. The editor of The Observer is to be commended for his remarks which will do much to spur well-intentioned public servants to give of their best efforts.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the editorial:

A POPULAR START

There was ample evidence this week that Kearny's new Democratic administration means to fulfill promises to provide improved municipal services. The sharp warning given to street department employees by Councilman Bergen, street committee chairman, has been received with complimentary reactions from all parts of the town.

The crack-down orders and subsequent warnings issued by Bergen along with Mayor Healey have been applauded by the public who pay the tax bills and who are deserving of better garbage collection service.

Administration officials promised there would be no political reprisals, but that department employees would be expected to perform the jobs assigned to them with courtesy and efficiency. Complaints that refuse collectors in past years had acquired a habit of arbitrarily leaving certain refuse at the curb have been justified and the new orders that everything is to be picked up and garbage cans completely emptied promises immediate improvement in a service that is close to home.

The mayor told municipal workers that harmony and cooperation with the street department's new policy will be required to improve this vital service. Employees of other departments are due to be told the same things very soon, all of which will continue to please Mr. and Mrs. John Q. Public.

Legislative Program of Disabled American Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, January 17, 1950, David M. Brown, national commander of the Disabled American Veterans, together with other officials of that organization, appeared before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs for the purpose of presenting their legislative program to the committee.

Under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the very comprehensive statement of Commander Brown to the committee on that occasion.

Mr. Brown's statement follows:

(Statement of David M. Brown, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, before the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, January 17, 1950)

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen of the committee: In accord with annual custom, it is my privilege as national commander of the Disabled American Veterans to appear before you today to present our legislative program. First and foremost, I would be remiss in my duty if I did not take this opportunity to express the deep appreciation of my organization to the chairman and to each member of the committee for the splendid and intelligent record you have established in behalf of the service-connected disabled veteran, his dependents and for his widow and orphans.

As is well known, the DAV is a single-purpose organization. We devote our activities to the wartime service-connected disabled, his dependents, and survivors of deceased veterans. We are indeed grateful for the many excellent laws your committee has had placed on the statute books. Your approach to this legislation has been considerate and understanding.

Of course, we are aware that there is a strong economy movement under way and all too often these movements are directed at veterans and veterans' benefits. Those of us who recall the effects of the vicious Economy Act of 1933 are most apprehensive. We of the DAV observe the billions of dollars being sent overseas. While the veterans of this country are as charitable as the next person, we do hope and pray that drastic reductions will not be made at their expense for the benefit of foreign nations and their nationals.

High in priority on our legislative list is the continuation of the 16,000 hospital-bed construction program. Appropriations have been made by a generous Congress for this construction, plans completed, and many sites acquired. Mr. RANKIN, chairman of your committee, introduced H. R. 5965, which would direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to proceed with the necessary construction of additional facilities for the 16,000 hospital beds previously authorized. Your committee favorably reported this measure, but there was objection to it when it came up on the floor of the House in the closing days of the last session. Every member of the DAV and of its Auxiliary will support you in your efforts to have H. R. 5965 enacted into law. I hope this will be very soon.

Our insistence in this program is due to our thorough and complete knowledge of a disgraceful situation which exists even now where seriously ill disabled veterans are being denied hospitalization because of the lack of beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals. The need now and in the immediate future is not questioned by any unbiased medical authority.

Our insistence on this program is due to committee for having given favorable consideration in the Eightieth Congress to the measure which became Public Law 877 and established an allowance for the dependents of service-connected disabled veterans with a disability of 60 percent or more in degree. Again in the last session your committee gave further consideration to this and the degree of disability was reduced so that veterans with a service-connected disability of 50 percent are now eligible to an allowance for their dependents. We of the DAV respectfully recommend that early and further consideration be given to this subject so that the dependents of veterans with lesser degrees of disability than 50 percent may be included within the benefits of the act. Chairman RANKIN has introduced for the DAV the bill H. R. 6738 which would carry this recommendation into effect.

Being a single-purpose organization, the DAV took no position on H. R. 4617, the so-called general pension bill. We were very happy, however, that this measure carries a provision dealing with income limitations. Of course, we have no knowledge as to what the Senate Finance Committee may do with H. R. 4617, but we do hope action will be taken on some measure whereby income limitations with respect to eligibility for part III benefits will be raised. The DAV's mandate urges the Congress to increase the annual income limitation for widows without dependents from $1,000 to $2,000, and for widows with dependents from $2,500 to $3,500. The existing annual income limitation was placed on the statute books at a time when a dollar more nearly equaled 100 cents in purchasing value. Today the dollar is worth far less, so existing income limitation places an inequitable restriction on the eligibility of thousands of widows and children to receive pensions. Also, we of the DAV recommend that the Congress specifically exclude proceeds of commercial insurance policies when computing the annual income of widows for purposes of determining their eligibility for pensions.

While we of the DAV have bills affecting statutory awards pending before the committee, we are making a further study on the subject and hope to submit recommendations at an early date. Our concern is directed to those horribly disabled boys in an

eastern Veterans' Administration hospital with practically all the face, or the nose, or the jaw, or other parts of the face disfigured and destroyed by shot or fire. Also, we are giving consideration to statutory awards for the blind. We believe there exists an inequity under Public Law 182, Seventy-ninth Congress. Presently, a veteran is entitled to a statutory award of $42 monthly for blindness of one eye, having only light perception. However, if in addition to blindness of one eye, the veteran also has suffered the loss or loss of use of one foot or one hand, he is entitled to but one stautory award. The DAV will seek to amend this law so that any veteran having suffered the anatomical loss or loss of use of one foot or one hand and blindness of one eye, having only light perception, will be entitled to an award of special monthly compensation of $42 for each such loss.

At a later date we shall submit for your consideration our findings on the foregoing and other statutory awards.

We appreciate your efforts which resulted in enactment of Public Law 339, Eighty-first Congress. During the last session we suggested a straight 25-percent across-the-board increase in awards of compensation and pension. In view of the 8.7-percent increase granted by Public Law 339, we recommend additional consideration of this subject with a view to a further increase of 15 percent in monthly awards of compensation and pensions. Chairman RANKIN has introduced for us H. R. 6737 which would accomplish this result. We ask your favorable consideration.

In the field of insurance the DAV is supporting H. R. 5574 (introduced by Representative RANKIN and pending before your committee). It would amend the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, in several respects. Because insurance is such a technical subject and it would consume too much time to explain the provisions of H. R. 5574, I shall not take the time of your committee to do so at this time. At a later date, however, if and when hearings are held on insurance matters, the DAV's legislative and insurance representatives will attend such hearings and present appropriate supporting testimony. We of the DAV are hopeful that hearings will be held on insurance matters at an early date.

It is my understanding there is divided committee jurisdiction over housing matters. By national convention mandate, our organization is opposed to any increase in interest rates on GI loans to veterans, a subject which would be referred to your committee if consideration is given to it. You will recall that there were movements afoot in recent sessions of Congress to increase interest rates on GI loans from the existing 4 percent to 4½ percent. We specifically endorse legislation to authorize the Veterans' Administration to make direct loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of a dwelling whenever the veteran can show he is unable to secure a loan at not in excess of 4 percent from private lending sources. This subject has received some consideration from the Committees on Banking and Currency. Also in the field of housing, the DAV has recommended that disability compensation be excluded in computing income for purposes of eligibility for admission to and the rental for public housing units. I believe this subject will also be considered by the Banking and Currency Committee, however.

Closely related to the current economy movement are proposals to change the Veterns' Preference Act of 1944. I realize this subject will be considered by another committee, but I know each of you is interested in all legislative proposals affecting veterans. By several national convention mandates we of the DAV will oppose changes in the Veterans' Preference Act which would tend to lessen job opportunities for disabled veterans and we will continue to endorse proposed legislation providing additional retention credits to all service-connected disabled veterans who have achieved permanent status and who are entitled to and in receipt of disability compensation.

The foregoing specific objectives are but a part of our legislative program. Time does not permit presentation of each one at this time. At the conclusion of my statement I request permission to insert for the record more detailed information regarding our program. Our resolutions and mandates cover a wide range of subjects, but all stem from a desire on the part of the Disabled American Veterans to relieve the suffering of America's wartime disabled and improve his material welfare.

In conclusion, I should like to revert to the current economy movement. Apparently there is an organized and well-financed campaign under way to sell the American people on the adoption of the Hoover reorganization proposal in its entirety. In communities all over this Nation, citizens' committees are urging that the Hoover Commission report on the reorganization of the execuive branch of the Federal Government will bring about efficiency and economy in Government. It is safe to say that many of these people have never read the Hoover Commission report and do not have the slightest conception as to what it contains.

We of the DAV are particularly opposed to those sections of the report which would destroy the identity and status of veterans, as veterans. For example, the report recommends that all Federal hospitals be consolidated under a single Government agency. Under such a system there would be no distinction between a public-health hospital patient and a service-connected disabled veteran. Another section would establish a Federal corporation to deal with veterans' insurance. Other recommendations would destroy veterans' preference. Such recommendations do not constitute progress. There are members of this committee who recall the early World War I postwar years when it was necessary for a veteran to apply to one or a dozen different agencies for various benefits. The end result was confusion and chaos. The members of our organization and of our auxiliary will militantly oppose and attempt to deprive disabled veterans and the dependents of battle casualties of their rights and benefits under a guise of economy in Government. We of the DAV are confident that if and when recommendations are presented to you in legislative form, the members of your committee will be in the forefront in the Halls of Congress protecting the rights of veterans.

(Supplemental statement of David M. Brown, national commander, Disabled American Veterans, January 17, 1950)

By permission of the chairman and members of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, I submit this outline of resolutions adopted at the 1949 national convention of the Disabled American Veterans held at Cleveland, Ohio, for the information of the members of the committee.

1. The DAV urges Congress to enact H. R. 5965, or other similar legislation, and that we vigorously oppose the proposed reduction of the hospital building program as contrary to the expressed desire of Congress and the pressing need of America's war-disabled. Likewise, we militantly oppose any merger of the Veterans' Administration hospitals with hospitals operated by the Army or any other branch of the Government (Hospitals, Hospitalization, and Medical Treatment Res. 9, Legislative Res. 11) (H. R. 5965).

2. That a cost-of-living increase of 15 percent in all compensations and pensions be granted (Legislative Res. 18) (H. R. 6737).

3. That Congress be requested to amend Public Law 877, as amended, to include dependents of veterans rated 10 percent or more disabled (Rehabilitation Res. 17) (H. R. 6738).

4. That the annual income limitation on eligibility to receive pension be increased (Rehabilitation Res. 1).

5. That Public Law 182, subparagraph (k), Seventy-ninth Congress, be amended to provide awards of special monthly compensation for each anatomical loss enumerated therein (Rehabilitation Res. 29) (H. R. 285).

6. That a 10-percent disability rating be granted to all veterans who received gunshot wounds in combat and who are not compensated for these wounds and the residuals thereof by the 1945 rating schedule (Rehabilitation Res. 26) (H. R. 289).

7. That the Veterans' Administration rating schedule be amended to increase the rating for Hansen's disease, or leprosy, to 100 percent for life (Rehabilitation Res. 9).

8. That any veteran having a service-connected malaria condition be compensated 10 percent or more for at least 5 years from the date of the original rating and that if the residuals of such disease can be determined definitely as after effects of malaria, that Veterans' Administration rating boards be directed to consider such fact in fixing the rate of compensation for such veteran (Rehabilitation Res. 24).

9. That the widows and children of veterans of World War II receive pensions equivalent to those of veterans of World War I without regard to service connection (Rehabilitation Res. 2) (H. R. 904).

10. That section 602 (d) of Public Law 801, Seventy-Sixth Congress, as amended, be further amended to remove existing inequities in the law (Rehabilitation Res. 6) (H. R. 5574).

11. That the insurance service of the Veterans' Administration be required to consider service-connected disabilities as having been directly service incurred in considering applications for new insurance or reinstatement of National Service Life Insurance and that the time limit for making these applications be extended (Rehabilitation Res. 5) (H. R. 5574).

12. That Public Law 801, Seventy-sixth Congress, as amended, be further amended to require the Veterans' Administration to accept letters, affidavits, or other adequate evidence from friends or relatives of the deceased veteran as presumptive that the veteran had applied for additional insurance (Rehabilitation Res. 3) (H. R. 5574).

13. That Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to make direct loans to veterans for the purchase or construction of dwellings in all cases where the veteran is unable to secure a loan at not in excess of 4-percent interest from private lending sources (Legislative Res. 16) (H. R. 2436).

14. That Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to authorize rehabilitated veterans who have used less than 4 years of their entitlement to enroll in other courses consonant with their occupation or vocation and that such courses shall not exceed the maximum period of entitlement (Rehabilitation Res. 30) (H. R. 4444).

15. That Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, as amended, be further amended to give the unremarried widow or one child of any serviceman who died in service or who died subsequent to discharge from a service-connected disability the same education and loan benefits as the veteran would have been entitled to if he had lived (Legislative Res. 6) (H. R. 3280; H. R. 1433).

16. That Public Law 663, Seventy-ninth Congress, be extended and liberalized (Legislative Res. 1; Rehabilitation Res. 32) (H. R. 6565).

17. That subsection 200 (e) of Public Law 346, Seventy-eighth Congress, be amended to provide stenographic assistance to those veterans' organizations chartered by act of Congress (Legislative Res. 1) (H. R. 912).

18. That there be established within the Veterans' Administration a board to review certain decisions of the Board of Appeals (N. E. C. Res. 3) (H. R. 294; H. R. 2690).

Coal Stocks Above Ground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
BUREAU OF MINES,
Washington, D. C., January 20, 1950.

Hon. MICHAEL J. KIRWAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. KIRWAN: In accordance with the request of Congressman JENSEN that members of the Interior Department Appropriations Subcommittee be supplied with data pertaining to coal stocks above ground, enclosed are published reports of the Bureau of Mines, and a press release by the Department of the Interior, that, together with the fact that retailer stocks were 1,394,000 tons on January 1, 1950, give the latest information in this matter.

These data show that bituminous coal stocks above ground on December 1, 1949, totaled 45,624,000 tons, representing an average of 39 days' supply, as compared to 69,579,000 tons, representing 47 days' supply on December 1, 1948. Broken down as between industrial and retail dealer stocks of coal the figures are as follows: Industrial stocks—43,819,000 tons (51 days' supply) on December 1, 1949, as compared to 66,500,000 tons (53 days' supply) on December 1, 1948; Retail dealer stocks—1,445,000 tons (5 days' supply) on December 1, 1949, as compared to 3,079,000 tons (15 days' supply) on December 1, 1948.

Because of the concern regarding bituminous coal supplies for retail consumers, we requested retail coal dealers to submit their reports for December 1949 earlier than usual. Accordingly, we now have the retail dealer stock figure for January 1, 1950, which is 1,394,000 tons (4 days' supply at the December 1949 rate of dealer deliveries) as compared to 2,706,000 tons (9 days' supply) on January 1, 1949. Figures on industrial stocks on January 1, 1950, will be available on February 3.

For your further information there also is enclosed our latest report on anthracite stocks, which were as follows:

	Dec. 1, 1948	Dec. 1, 1949
Railroad (class I)	103,847	68,502
Electric power utilities	2,545,109	4,298,783
Upper lake docks:		
Lake Superior	243,202	159,358
Lake Michigan	205,842	163,244
Producers' stocks [1]	971,123	1,138,350

[1] Mostly in small buckwheat sizes.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES BOYD,
Director.

Social Security and the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I was happy recently to have the privilege of speaking before the Milwaukee Chapter of the American Association of Social Workers on the subject Social Security and the Welfare State. It was a particular pleasure to address this fine group, who constantly seek to solve in a constructive manner the social problems which beset our country, on a subject of such direct concern to them. This address, delivered in my home city of Milwaukee on December 13, follows:

(Address by ANDREW J. BIEMILLER, Member of Congress, before the American Association of Social Workers, Milwaukee Chapter)

The current controversy being waged about welfare must be particularly interesting to you in this group. How many times most of you must have heard arguments, entered into discussions, and participated in heated emotional debate over that one little word. And how triumphant you must feel, to find that the word "welfare" has, possibly because of all the excitement, finally come back into its own.

Again it means "the welfare of the people," the "general welfare" that our forefathers wrote into the Constitution. It no longer is saddled with the unpleasant connotation of "relief" or "charity" with which all of you are unfortunately only too familiar.

I was one of the severer critics of that sort of "welfare"—of the kind that "did good" to the poor, with the Lord Bountiful approach that really broke people down rather than built them up. But that approach is, I hope, a thing of the past. To any professional person the whole basis of welfare has always been construction, not destruction. Let us leave to the lovers of old-fashioned days, like Senator TAFT and ex-President Hoover, the concept of charity—both private and public—of a Government that doles out baskets to the worthy poor if they thank you prettily. Do you remember, during the first years of the depression, when millions were unemployed, when millions were ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-clothed? Do you remember Hoover's famous statement? "I am opposed," he announced, "to any direct or indirect Government dole." This, he pointed out, was a job for private charity.

TRUE CONCEPT OF WELFARE

If President Roosevelt had followed his advice, I am sure that Mr. Hoover's prosperity would still be around that mythical corner, from which he was always trying to summon it. But in 1934, we began to develop, or rather, regain a true concept of welfare, and of the responsibilities and obligations of a democratic Government for its citizens.

I am proud to regard our Government as a welfare state. And by that I mean a state devoted to the welfare of all its members, concerned with the needs and desires of its total population.

Abraham Lincoln, in the middle of the nineteenth century, once stated that the object of Government "is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all, or do so well." In the middle of the twentieth century, Mr. Justice William O. Douglas defined what he called the "human welfare state" as "a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual, yet secures the masses in their basic needs." It is in the framework of these two definitions that I want to discuss some aspects of current legislation and administration policies.

"To do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all, or do so well." Who could quarrel with that concept? What man, believing in democracy, could question that aim?

And, yet, many do. Or at least a few do in such a loud voice that they are sometimes mistaken for many. They argue that, first of all, that is a foreign idea, and, secondly, that it is not only foreign, it is communistic.

Next, it is in any case unconstitutional. Fourth, even if it were not unconstitutional, it was never in the minds of the founders of our country. Fifth, whatever it is, and notwithstanding all the other arguments, the welfare state destroys individual effort and incentive.

I should like to examine these arguments very briefly with you. I think that some of the things we find will be illuminating.

NOTHING NEW ABOUT WELFARE CONCEPT

Is the welfare state really a foreign concept? Well, we can go back to 1789, to the Constitution, where the Government is first charged with the responsibility of promoting the general welfare, and is given taxing powers to fulfill this duty. We can trace recognition of this responsibility in some fields even farther back. In the Northwest Ordinance of 1785 a section of every township to be established in the new territory was set aside for the maintenance of public schools within the township. In 1806 Thomas Jefferson, in his annual message to Congress requested a donation of Federal lands for a national establishment of education, and specified that these lands be income-bearing, not merely to be used for the site of the buildings.

These are not isolated examples. Land, which in that period of our country's development was more valuable than a money subsidy is now, was granted for all sorts of welfare purposes: For public buildings, for public transportation, and for various types of schools. Going on, we come to the Homestead Act of 1862 when hundreds of thousands of acres of land were divided into family-sized portions and allocated to individual citizens to enable them to maintain themselves. This was not only a public-welfare program, but in reality a social-security project, giving economic security and a way of life to tens of thousands of Americans who had not been able to compete successfully in the industrialized East. I shan't go into all the details of the development and extension of the system of Government subsidies for welfare purposes, but I would like to point out that by 1920—not 1934 as some would like to have us think—Federal grants were already being made to the States for 15 major welfare purposes.

So whatever the welfare state is, it can hardly be called un-American.

But perhaps it's an American brand of communism we are advocating. Let's examine that hypothesis—which has certainly had a great deal of publicity, even if very little factual substantiation.

DIRE PROPHECIES

Actually, our opponents do not go so far as to explain what they mean by this scare word. They belong to the horrible-consequence school of prophets. You know, where people mutter dire prophecies about "What will become of us?" and attach to all their warnings, words that have frightening connotations—but they never, never define what they mean. If they did, they might realize their own confusion.

Communism, according to its original protagonist—and to this extent even in its present style in the Russia of today—is based on government ownership and management of the means of production, of capital, of land, and of property. This can hardly be claimed comparable to our method of government. Private enterprise and private property is the very backbone of our system. But, mind you, belief in private ownership does not go so far—in a welfare state—that the means of production, and all capital and land and property, end up in the hands of a few individuals who run them at the expense of the masses. This would merely be substituting a dictatorship of the millionaires for the Russian kind of dictatorship.

So, whatever it is, the welfare state cannot be validly called communistic.

UNCONSTITUTIONAL CHARGE "IGNORANT"

The next cry is that it is unconstitutional. That I find almost the most ignorant of all the arguments. Not only is the very phrase "to promote the general welfare" explicitly in our Constitution, but concern for the welfare of its members has been interpreted to be the basic responsibility of government by the Supreme Court, the arm of government which was set up to determine the constitutionality of laws. An this interpretation dates as far back as 1837, although it has, as you all know, been reaffirmed and fortified by the famous decision of Mr. Justice Cardozo establishing the constitutionality of the first Social Security Act. In fact, although the usual public cry of those opposing the welfare state is that it is unconstitutional, I recently came across a confidential news letter to businessmen, which admitted—sadly—to its members that the only way to circumvent the Government from extending its activities to more and more fields of the public interest, would be by constitutional amendment.

So, whatever it is, it seems somewhat uninformed to call the welfare state unconstitutional.

CROCODILE TEARS

Perhaps we should examine the claim that it was not conceived of by our ancestors. Many crocodile tears have been shed about that. It is apparently not only unfilial, but immoral, for our Government in 1949 to be different from the one established in 1789. This is an argument particularly much used by lawyers and historians of the give-me-the-good-old-days school, who seem to think that by turning back the pages of history we would arrive at the best of all possible worlds.

I think they misjudge the founders of our country. Those were imaginative men who tried to establish a flexible pattern for a democratic way of life—who believed, above all, in human rights and the principles that "all men were created equal." On the basis of those beliefs, they fashioned a Constitution and laws that could best express them in the framework of the world they lived in at that time. But it is hardly likely that they conceived, in the eighteenth century, of a twentieth-century civilization. Remember, this was before the industrial revolution—before the use of steam and electricity—before the growth of modern factories—when our country was a land made up primarily of small farmers, when almost all household articles were made by hand—when the machine did not yet threaten the man. It would have been strange indeed, if our forefathers had attempted to legislate in such an economy for a situation they could not possibly conceive. The statement that our forefathers did not conceive of the type of government we now have is in a sense true—no more than they could have foretold the coming of the airplane or the atomic bomb.

But whatever the welfare state is, it is ludicrous to try to pretend it should be a colonial in modern dress.

The final complaint—and perhaps the most serious charge—is that the concept of a welfare state—of a government that attempts to give security to its people—is dangerous because it destroys individual effort.

EXAMINE FAIR DEAL PROGRAM

Since the term "welfare state" is used as synonymous with the present administration, I think the best way to examine oft-reiterated statement is by a review of the particular legislation which the President of the United States has presented to the Eighty-first Congress. These are the laws, proposed or passed, that are the basis for the complaints. And it is through this specific examination that we may get a glimpse of the features of those who are opposing these laws.

One of the basic planks of the administration's platform is a determination to do everything in its power to ensure civil liberties and to guarantee basic human rights to everyone. I don't think I need to argue the merits of this theory—especially to you. From the time of the Declaration of Independence, through the bloody Civil War this Nation fought to maintain this principle, the equality of every human being has been accepted by all but a few fanatics and bigots. But we all recognize that we have a long way still to go to carry this principle out into practice. And those who fight any attempt to implement this philosophy are the ones who say that Government action, for example, to prevent discrimination in being hired for a job, would destroy individual initative. I wonder how much individual initiative is encouraged by a lynching?

I wonder how much individual effort is required by a Negro to get a job at a factory that has a sign out front saying "whites only." It is also interesting that the gentlemen who oppose any Government action in equalizing opportunity for all its citizens happen to benefit economically by restricting job possibilities for one portion of its population.

Then there's the administration's proposal for farm price supports and for a fair program for farmers which would also benefit the consumer. This is criticized on the same basis that the Government subsidies take all incentive away from the farmers. I ask: When a farmer's crop fails, how much individual effort will he need to manufacture synthetic potatoes? Or when he has a bumper crop and discovers it will cost him more to dig them up than he will be paid, what form of iniative does he have to keep himself and his family alive?

WHO OPPOSES FARM SUPPORTS?

But let's glimpse the other side of the coin. Who is it who is most violent against Government price supports for farmers? It's curious—the opposition seems to consist of those who make their money at the farmer's expense—who make their fortunes out of the crop the farmer has to sell at less than cost.

There seems to be something familiar in this pattern, doesn't there? For example, there's the perennial cry against any legislation helping labor. The general implication is that labor unions are wicked, all-powerful monsters which are killing private enterprise. I wish the proponents of this theory would read some history beyond the days of George Washington, and learn a little about the growth of the labor movement. I wish they would study about the 13-hour days in the factory, the sweatshops, the hired strikebreakers, the starvation wages, instead of limiting their hindsight to the beautiful view from Mount Vernon.

How far do you think an individual worker would have gotten if, before unions and before Government protection of unions, he had gone to Henry Ford, or Andrew Carnegie, and said: "Look, I can't live on what you pay me. And you're making enough profit to pay me more." And who would benefit right now if the back of organized labor were broken? I detect a certain unconcern for "the will of the people" in the groups that oppose legislation to protect labor—possibly even a hope, do you think, that the golden time might return when an employer can say, "Take it or leave it: All I'll pay is 20 cents an hour. There are plenty of hungry men to do the job."

Labor legislation is decried by employers of labor. The housing legislation is even more violently decried—by housing speculators, of course. I don't mean things like the FHA. That is the type of Government legislation very pleasing to private contractors and real-estate owners; what I'm talking about is public housing. That is regarded as a vicious, undemocratic practice—by the people who make their profits selling and renting houses—they argue violently that public housing makes it possible for low-income groups to live as well as others, and that this is clearly destroying all incentive and individual effort. Can anyone here explain how much individual effort would be required by a tenement dweller to tear down the building he's living in, and build instead a decent house, where he can live for a monthly rental he can afford? And is there, do you think, any correlation between the protests of the apartment-house owners' associations and the profits they are making through renting substandard dwellings?

AMA IN ACT, TOO

Let's go on. The AMA, for instance, is spending a million dollars to carry on a campaign against a national health program. Their arguments against health legislation—dismissing for the moment their complete, and intentional, misstatements of facts—are primarily based on the belief that doctors would, under compulsory health insurance, lose their incentive. It is significant they do not talk of the patients. Apparently they think that people do not or, at least, should not, become ill if they can't afford it. I want to quote to you an editorial statement, printed this August in the New York State Journal of Medicine, the State medical society's official publication. This extraordinary confession goes as follows: "We readily admit that under the present system a certain number of cases of early tuberculosis and cancer, for example, may go undetected. Is it not better that a few such should perish than that the majority of the population should be encouraged on every occasion to run sniveling to the doctor?" This statement stands as a masterpiece of explanation. It needs no comment. But it does give an interesting insight into the thinking of the opponents of legislation planned to meet the needs of the people, rather than the pockets of physicians, doesn't it?

Do the features of the opponents get into focus?

Altogether, the pattern is slowly emerging. The faces of the ones opposing the welfare state are becoming clearer, aren't they? And they all have one feature in common, that of self-interest. It is the industrialist who opposes labor, the real-estate speculator who opposes public housing, the profiteer in farm crops who fights price supports, the employer of cheap labor who doesn't want Negroes able to choose their own occupations, the doctor who is afraid his fees will be cut. Very few of them are thinking of government as a society that preserves the greatest possible freedom for the individual, yet secures the masses in their basic needs.

SOCIAL SECURITY ACT IS FOCUS

I think, of all the legislation proposed or discussed or passed during this session, the amendments to the Social Security Act, passed by the House before we adjourned, best illustrate the point made by Mr. Justice Douglas, and best clarify the issues of the welfare state.

Sometimes, while this bill was being argued on the floor of the House, I thought I

was back in 1935—the moans and the groans with which the air was filled were so similar to the original arguments against establishing a social-insurance program. In fact, they were so much alike that they often sounded as though the gentlemen protesting might have been sound asleep during the intervening period, and just woke up to continue what they thought was an uninterrupted argument.

Manufacturers' associations, or at least their congressional mouthpieces, argued that the proposed amendments would wreck business, would take away incentive from workers who were not now covered—in other words, that people would work harder because they were facing the poorhouse at the end of their lives. They protested the amendments would increase unemployment, because they would decrease purchasing power—that was their interpretation of the effects of slightly increased employer contributions—they weren't interested in the similar increase of the employee's contribution. Finally—inevitably—with much the effect of a broken record—it would stifle individual responsibility.

I want you to answer this charge—not me. This group—above all others—ought to have had sufficient experience with the problems that gave rise to passing the original Social Security Act—and with the problems that make it necessary now to amend it.

OLD-AGE-INSURANCE PROVISIONS

Let's look at the provisions for old-age insurance. I imagine many of you have been talking to people who are receiving old-age insurance now. How much are they getting? How many of them are retired from firms that went bankrupt in the process of putting in the employers' contribution? And how many of them are able to live on even a minimum decent level on the insurance benefits they are now receiving? And don't forget, this is insurance, to which the worker has contributed as much as his employer, and which he only receives on the basis of work he has already performed. This is the type of retirement pension that every big firm in the United States takes for granted—for their executives. The only difference—and that is a big one—is in the number of zeros after the dollar sign in the monthly amount.

When you get to old-age assistance—when you look at the amounts to which the Federal Government contributes—on a percentage basis—for those who are not covered by the insurance provisions—then the arguments become even more ridiculous. The average monthly payment in Wisconsin to persons receiving old-age assistance is at this moment $41.50. Exactly how luxuriously can one live on that? If I, when I became 65, was dependent upon that munificent sum to live on, I think I would get rather annoyed at some millionaire industrialist who pointed at me as an example of shiftlessness.

As you all know full well, the other forms of assistance authorized under the Social Security Act—the aid to dependent children, the aid to the blind, the small amount for child-welfare services—they are all equally meager. They really never intended to cover the needs of all our people or to cover all the needs of any one person. It was a start, that's all. It was really only the basic recognition on the part of the Government that it was responsible for the welfare of its members, and that it would try to find ways of meeting this responsibility.

PRESENT PAYMENTS PITTANCES

That was the original act. Since then we have had experience and have learned of some of the basic needs that have not yet even been touched. We have been able to see that the insurance scheme which was intended to be the primary program—the one that would give workers a sense of security without making them feel like paupers—that if this program is not extended it would not serve its initial purpose. The majority of older people are still being cared for on an assistance basis, submitted to the indignity of a "means test," and granted a pittance, with the dispensing agencies acting in the capacity of lord of the manor. Also, in 1949 the cost of living is very much more than it was in 1935. So that the amounts allowed, even on a minimum subsistence basis, 15 years ago are completely out of relation to present conditions.

These were some of the considerations that led the administration to propose changes in the Social Security Act. The bill, H. R. 6000, as it passed the House before the end of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress incorporated these basic changes.

HOUSE APPROVED CHANGES

First of all, it increased the coverage for old-age insurance from the present 35,000,000 to abcut 46,000,000. This includes the following:

Persons who are self-employed. This provides the same security for small shopkeepers and people in business for themselves as for persons employed by others.

Secondly, the bill includes domestic servants. I think that the coverage of this group is one of the things that is most important about this bill, because here is a group who have heretofore had the least security, who have been the most dependent on the bounty, on the personal and unpredictable whims of the people for whom they work. And, to me, it is this attitude, this residual of a feudal philosophy, that is the most antipathetic to a democracy, to a state where every citizen is entitled to freedom of opportunity.

Third, salesmen are included—that notoriously neglected group of white-collar workers who seem heretofore to have represented a curious philosophy, suggesting we had a society which made insecurity the badge of office for any man who didn't work with his hands.

Fourth, employees of State governments have an opportunity of being covered in those States where existing retirement systems are not already adequate. And in this group are also included those Federal employees who are not covered by the present Federal retirement schemes.

Fifth, employees of nonprofit institutions are included, although in this instance employers' contributions will be made at the option of the agency. This section takes the first step in rectifying the omission that those most interested in public welfare themselves insisted on at the time of the passage of the original act. It was not, even then, that social workers thought those who worked all their lives for the betterment of others were not entitled to the same economic security as those they served, but because the leaders in the public-welfare field felt, at the time they were fighting to give everyone basic security, that they might jeopardize the good of all by including their own profession. They wanted to be sure, above all, that they would not be open, even in warped minds, to the criticism of pressing for something in their own interest.

Finally, agricultural-processing workers will be included. Some of us had hoped to include all agricultural labor, but in the final version of the bill, all those employed in such jobs as canning, food-processing, and other jobs which are connected with agriculture, but are essentially of a commercial or industrial nature.

OTHER PROVISIONS

Besides this increase in coverage, the bill does several other equally important things. Insurance benefits are increased, not—unfortunately—on the basis of actual increased costs of living, but to an extent to make the word "insurance" a little more realistic. For those currently receiving old-age benefits, the monthly amount will be raised from 50 to 150 percent, with the higher percentage increases for those now receiving the least. And, because the bill also increases the amount contributed to the insurance fund by both employers and employees, it will be possible to increase the monthly benefits of those who become eligible after it goes into effect to an average of almost double the present amounts.

Two other additions to the present old-age-insurance provisions are also noteworthy. Veterans will get a wage credit toward their insurance on the basis of $160 a month for the time they spent in military service, and everyone who is covered by the new bill will be insured against permanent total disability as well as old age: they will receive the same monthly benefit they would have been eligible for when they became 65—on the basis, of course, of their earnings up to the time they became incapacitated—whenever they become totally disabled.

Of course, the insurance provisions of the act are not the only ones affected by the proposed legislation. H. R. 6000 provides for increases in the Federal contributions to the States for all the assistance schemes for which the Government is now providing grants, and, further, makes allowance for additional grants for persons who are permanently disabled, but who do not qualify under the new category of insurance.

These additions indicate in general the main provisions of the amendments proposed by the House of Representatives to the Social Security Act. I have left out a great deal, and I have perforce much oversimplified a complicated piece of legislation. Many of you here have been technically trained to understand this type of legislation, and I am sure you will recognize the impossibility of analyzing such a bill in detail in the course of a discussion such as this.

ESSENCE IMPORTANT

But I would like to return to the essence of these amendments. This type of legislation represents what I consider one of the cornerstones of a welfare state. It represents the concern of a government with the needs of its members, and the needs of human beings for basic securities. It makes provision for these needs on a basis that recognizes human dignity, and gives to all the possibility of participation in securing these benefits.

And that is what I mean when I speak of the welfare state. That is what I think we should all be fighting for—and of all the professions I know of I think yours is the one which should be in the forefront of this fight. We must keep our Government and our country out of the role of being kind—when some of us want to—to what the rich used to call the worthy poor; we must bury any remnants of the system personified by Rockefeller giving dimes to beggars; we must change the connotation of charity back to its original meaning of interest and understanding of other people's problems, instead of a kind of smug largesse; we must not condone a pauper state; we must build up a welfare state.

We Pay the Interest on National Debts at Home and Abroad; How Long Can We Stand It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, the Treasury reports today that the na-

tional debt as of January 20, this year, is $256,899,219,802.03 with an interest charge for the fiscal year of $5,700,000,000.

While we are paying this interest at home, we are contributing the money to buy farm commodities and machinery to give to the governments of the European countries—the so-called Marshall-plan countries. The word "governments" should be underscored, because we do not give the things we buy with the $8,750,000,000 we have appropriated for the ECA to the people of the Marshall-plan countries because our gifts are made to these governments, and the people must bring in their money and pay their governments for the goods we donate, and when the interest-money comes due on the national debts of these governments the money that has been paid in for the goods we have donated is in their treasuries and is ready for the European bondholders.

The following, taken from the book of the economist John Flynn, the Road Ahead, is enlightening:

In taking over the railroads, the coal industry, and others, they—the British—have bought the properties outright from the corporations and stockholders who owned them. They have paid for them with British bonds paying 3 percent interest. With each new industry taken over, the Government has added another mass of obligations to its already crushing national debt. Now the folly of this lies in the fact that, under the old order, the stockholders had no claim for profit if none were made by the industry. But all these stocks—pure risk investments—have been converted into Government bonds, which are a fixed charged upon the Government whether the industry makes a profit or not. And as all these industries have been operating at a greater or lesser loss, the Government has had to find in taxes the means of paying this debt. Indeed, it has been charged in the United States Senate that the British Government had got permission from the United States Commission to use $82,000,000 of the American funds granted Britain to pay interest on its debt which it was unable to meet because of the additions to it created by these nationalization schemes.

Tendency To Look Down on Political Career Real Weakness of the American System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this being an election year the air will soon be full of incrimination and recriminations on the political front. In some places a loud clamor will be set up by the holier-than-thou citizens whose only participation in things political is to complain.

The following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of January 22, 1950, written by Robert M. Grannis, is most apropos:

TENDENCY TO LOOK DOWN ON POLITICAL CAREER REAL WEAKNESS OF THE AMERICAN SYSTEM

At the expense of being considered naive, I am amazed to discover there are a lot of people with ambitions for public office who'd rather forget the whole thing than subject their lily white hides to contact with a system which they consider pernicious. As one man said to me the other day: "I figure you can't step into the gutter without getting dirty."

I don't know how dirty the American political scene is, but I do know there is a suspicion there are things about it less than clean. And I know that ethical standards have reached a point where a man has to toss a coin to decide which is the greatest menace to a decent civilization—the atom bomb or the cavalier attitude that prevails in many official places.

In my travels, I encounter people who insist that a man can't enter politics and make a career of it without the sacrifice of his principles. To me, that is so much rot, and one of the real reasons why any sort of happy-go-lucky standard of procedure is accepted without a quiver. Indifference of this sort paints all officeholders with the same brush and creates a cynical approach to the most important phase of modern existence. A nation, a State, or even a city, cannot prosper long or hold up its head without good government as the major prop beneath it.

We have a nasty habit of looking at people in office as members of a certain party instead of as a duly-elected representative of the people. We are so ready to take it for granted that party considerations must come first that only the stalwarts here and there resist the tide and operate on the courage of their convictions.

I think it is disgraceful that any American should consider that a political career, here, is beneath him, beneath his dignity. In a sense his attitude so often expressed loosely, tossed to the four winds and blown hither and yon, is the real weakness of the American system and, in time, could lead to the utter decay of good government.

Public acceptance of a standard in anything is what actually calls the shots, and nobody can tell me today that most folks don't wear a silly smile when someone dares to suggest that Joe Doakes, who works for the Government, is a thoroughly honest guy. When Joe sees the smile he finds he is no less than human, and his resolve to stick to the straight and narrow and fight for what he knows to be right sinks a little lower. He begins to hear the small voice, hitherto silent, that suggests—why stick my neck out?

An honest man in office shouldn't have to feel that he will be made the goat if he refuses to fall in line with a loose trend of conduct. He shouldn't have to look in vain for the wholehearted support of the people who pulled the lever for him back on election day.

I'd like to see the day return when all of us believed that the finest career a young American can follow is a political career, which is another way of expressing service to the citizens of the Nation, and the highest type of service. But as long as there are a great many people who see only the dirty side of politics and go out of their way to spread the "good word" wherever they go, I'm afraid that day is far off.

I'm convinced that we get exactly what we are willing to accept, and if we are apathetic to what we envision as a downward trend in politics, we have no right to expect anything else. A good start would be to offer every encouragement to the square shooter in office, regardless of party, and make it clear that by his example we intend to set an over-all pattern. The sly smile is the sure road to ruin. Pride in the system is needed and some of the dark spots can be made to disappear.

District Home Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my own remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call the attention of the membership of the House to the letter written this week to all Members of the House on home rule for the District of Columbia.

This letter, from Robert Heller, chairman of the National Committee for Strengthening Congress, urges the consideration of the Kefauver bill, S. 1527, as one of the most important means of lightening the extraneous work load on the National Congress.

May I call the attention of the membership to the fact that this recommendation of ending the use of the National Congress for the purely local job of being city council for the District of Columbia was made by your former Joint Committee for the Strengthening of the Congress. It was not included in the reorganization bill because of its length and complexity. Now, many months of hearings have been held in the past on the measure, recommended by many leaders of the District of Columbia. I would appreciate the consideration of the membership in this important measure.

The letter follows:

NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR
STRENGTHENING CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C., January 21, 1950.

The Honorable A. S. MONRONEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: We urge you to take every possible step, in this session, to enact S. 1527, a bill to provide home rule in the District of Columbia. As a first step we ask that you sign Discharge Petition No. 19 as soon as possible, so that the bill may reach the floor of the House for vote without delay.

Congress must act promptly to get rid of its extraneous work load, if it is to give adequate attention to the tremendously important matters before it. Passage of S. 1527 is an essential step necessary to reduce that work load. The bill would vest power in a city council, composed of residents of the District of Columbia, to pass laws to govern the District. Congress would keep the power to override the city council at any time. Thus the interest of the Nation in its National Capital would always be protected. At the same time Congress would be relieved of having to take positive action in order to pass laws for the District. We enclose a more detailed statement of how the bill will work and why it should be passed.

The bill has already passed the Senate by overwhelming bipartisan vote. We believe that a solid bipartisan majority in the House likewise favors it. After it passed the Senate, however, the House District Committee voted not to report out the bill. If this is not now corrected by action of the whole House, Congress will have failed to relieve itself of a burden which is wholly unnecessary, undesirable, and contrary to sound government.

Passage of S. 1527 is therefore essential. Discharge Petition No. 19 will bring the bill to the floor of the House for vote. We urge

you to go to the Speaker's desk at the first opportunity and sign the petition. If you have already signed it, we urge you to ask other Members to sign also, and to support the bill in the House.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT HELLER.

STATEMENT TO MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE BY ROBERT HELLER, CHAIRMAN, NATIONAL COMMITTEE FOR STRENGTHENING CONGRESS, IN SUPPORT OF S. 1527, THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME-RULE BILL

WHY S. 1527 IS NECESSARY

Our letter of December 27, 1949, to Members of the House and Senate, pointed out the strengths and weaknesses in the operations of the last session of Congress. We emphasized that Congress, to discharge adequately its responsibilities to the Nation and to the world, must act promptly to reduce its extraneous work load. Passage of S. 1527, the home-rule bill, is an essential step in this direction. It will virtually eliminate the necessity for Congress to act as a city council on day-to-day matters which relate solely to the workings of the city of Washington. The bill also assures that Congress retains full authority to intervene in District affairs whenever the situation so demands.

In the last session of Congress alone, several thousand valuable man-hours were spent by busy Congressmen and Senators on purely District matters. These included such local trivia as the elimination of weeds, the regulation of podiatry, and the destruction of starlings. The time for Congress to relieve itself of the necessity to sit once every 2 weeks as the city council for the District of Columbia and consider such purely local matters is long overdue.

HOW S. 1527 WILL HELP THE CONGRESS

The bill would vest power in a city council, composed of District citizens, to pass local laws to govern the District of Columbia. The council would be composed of nine members elected by District residents and two additional members appointed by the President. Except for minor ordinances, any laws passed by the city council would, before becoming effective, lie over for 45 days while Congress is in session. During this period Congress could by concurrent resolution veto the proposed law. As a result, neither the District Committees of the House or Senate, or the House and Senate as a whole, would need to take positive action in order that necessary legislation for the District become law. Congress would always be in a position to modify or revoke the action of the District council. In fact it could abolish the council or modify its powers. In this way the interest of the Nation in the affairs of its National Capital would at all times be protected.

Establishing a local legislature to relieve Congress' work load is not new. It is substantially the same method that Congress has used successfully for years in governing the Territories, such as Hawaii and Puerto Rico, which are under its exclusive jurisdiction. The Territorial legislatures are at all times answerable to Congress, and Congress may step in and take over at any time. Congress is, however, relieved of the burden of passing day-to-day regulations for Territorial government. Enactment of S. 1527 would put this satisfactory method to work in the District of Columbia.

S. 1527 IS THE PRODUCT OF YEARS OF CAREFUL WORK AND HAS STRONG BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

The home-rule bill is the result of exhaustive study and work by congressional committees and by interested local and national groups, both partisan and nonpartisan. In the Seventy-ninth Congress, the Joint Congressional Committee on the Organization of Congress, in its report which led to the enactment of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, urged that Congress divest itself of the duty of acting as city council for the District. A joint committee in the Eightieth Congress, headed by Representative AUCHINCLOSS, Republican, of New Jersey, and Senator BALL, Republican, of Minnesota, held exhaustive hearings and drafted the basic home-rule bill, H. R. 6227. This bill was reported out but reached the floor of the House too late to come up for final vote before the end of that Congress. The 1948 platforms of both the major parties urged home rule for the District. A Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, in the present Congress held further hearings and reported out the present bill, S. 1527. This bill is based in large part on the Auchincloss bill of the previous session, but embodies a number of improvements which add strength to the measure. It passed the Senate by overwhelming vote in May 1949, with heavy bipartisan support. Senators KEFAUVER, Democrat, of Tennessee, and TAFT, Republican, of Ohio, were the proponents of the bill for their respective parties on the floor. We have reason to believe that, when the bill reaches the floor of the House, a solid bipartisan majority will likewise vote for it.

YOUR ACTION IS NEEDED TO ASSURE PASSAGE OF S. 1527

Despite the strong support local and national groups gave S. 1527 in the House District Committee after the bill passed the Senate, the House committee voted not to report out the bill. If this action of the committee is not now corrected by action of the whole House, Congress will have failed to relieve itself of a burden which is wholly unnecessary, undesirable, and contrary to sound government. Congress can no longer afford to carry the burden of acting as a municipal council for the District in the second half of the twentieth century. The present arrangement is wholly incompatible with the kind of organization which Congress must have if it is to meet its national and worldwide responsibilities during the years to come.

Passage of S. 1527 is therefore essential. We ask you to sign Discharge Petition No. 19 and to support the bill on the floor of the House. We ask this in the belief that passage of the home-rule bill will be an important step forward in creating the stronger and more effective Congress the United States must have in order to meet the difficult problems that lie ahead.

The Lawyer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the American lawyer has won a distinguished place in the development of our political and economic system. He has played a powerful part in the establishment of the institution of government, the dispensation of justice, and the protection and enforcement of the inherent rights of the people.

I take great pleasure in asking that the impressive eulogy of the American lawyer, written by my friend and former classmate at New York University Law School, Mr. Louis Lande, reprinted from The Lawyer and Law Notes, volume 3, No. 2, 1949, be inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the eulogy was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE LAWYER

I am the lawyer.

I displaced brute force with mercy, justice, and equity.

I taught mankind to respect the rights of others to their property, to their personal liberty, to freedom of conscience, to free speech and free assembly.

I am the spokesman of righteous causes.

I plead for the poor, the persecuted, the widow and the orphan.

I maintain honor in the market place.

I am the champion of unpopular causes.

I am the foe of tyranny, oppression, and bureaucracy.

I prepared the way for the Ten Commandments.

I pleaded for the freedom of the slave in Greece and for the captive in Rome.

I fought the Stamp Act.

I wrote the Declaration of Independence and the rights of man.

I defended the slave. I was an abolitionist. I issued the Emanicipation Proclamation.

In every land, in every clime, I punish the wicked, protect the innocent, raise up the lowly, and oppose brutality and injustice.

I fought in every war for liberty.

I stand in the way of public clamor and the tyranny of the majority.

I plead for the rich man lest prejudice prevent him from getting justice, and I insist that the poor man be accorded all his rights and privileges.

I seek the equality of mankind, regardless of race, color, caste, sex, or religion.

I hate fraud, deceit, or trickery.

I am forbidden to serve two masters or to compromise justice.

I am the conservative of the past, the liberal of the present, and the radical of the future.

I believe in convention, but I cut the Gordian knot of formalism and red tape to do justice and equality.

I am the leader of mankind in every crisis.

I am the scapegoat of the world.

I hold the rights of mankind in the hollow of my hand, but am unable to obtain recognition of my own.

I am the pioneer. I am the last to renounce the past and to overturn the present.

I am the just judge and the righteous ruler.

I hear before I condemn. I seek the best in everyone.

I am the lawyer.

LOUIS LANDE.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Zionism in Brooklyn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, on January 22, 1950, the Brooklyn region of the Zionist Organization of America held its annual dinner. More than 1,200 persons attended, including leading Christians and Jews of the community, Hon. Maximilian Moss, president of the board of education of the city of New York, was the chairman of the evening. The meeting was addressed by Philip H. Lassar, president of the Brooklyn Zionist region, the Honorable Arthur Lourie, consul general of Israel, and Louis Lip-

sky, chairman of the American Zionist Council. The Honorable Albert D. Schanzer, on behalf of the organization, presented an award to the New York Herald Tribune for its outstanding work on behalf of the Zionist cause. Walter Kerr, foreign editor of the Herald Tribune, in the absence of Mrs. Ogden Reid, the owner and publisher of the paper, accepted the award.

The dinner was originally planned as a tribute to William O'Dwyer, mayor of the city of New York, who unfortunately could not attend because of illness.

The highlight of the evening was an address by Benjamin G. Browdy, acting president of the Zionist Organization of America, which is set forth in full as follows:

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies, and gentlemen, I am glad to be here with you tonight to add my tribute to our guest of honor whose forced absence from this testimonial dinner we all regret, and to say a word or two about the situation in Israel and in the United States which confronts us today.

The Zionist movement has placed its reliance mainly on the Jewish people itself. Herzl kept on reiterating that the creation of the Jewish state is largely in our own hands, if only we will it. He called the Jewish masses to rally to the cause, realizing that it's their strength that can bring about the miracle of all ages—the Jewish state.

Hand in hand with the faith in the Jewish people, has gone the faith in the conscience of mankind. Herzl opened the first Zionist Congress with a fervent appeal to world public opinion in behalf of the Jewish people. Since then, the Zionist movement has never wearied in its attempt to influence and bring to our side the leaders of public opinion, of political power, and of government. In this endeavor we have scored some signal successes, particularly with those great leaders whose vast power has been paralleled by their tender and sensitive conscience. In the United States we have been particularly fortunate in enlisting the sympathy and the support of the Presidents of the United States from President Wilson to President Truman, and a great many other political leaders whose sense of justice and of fairness ranged them on our side.

I daresay, none has excelled in zeal and in devotion to justice and fairness for the Jewish people, our guest of honor, the mayor of the city, William O'Dwyer. No fair-weather friend was he. Rather he has been a friend in need. While some talked and talked, made promises which always lagged behind performance, he acted in our behalf with an energy and determination which I sometimes wished I could discern in many a high-placed Jew in Washington or elsewhere. I could give you many an instance of his unflagging support in time of crisis, but I think it will suffice when I recall the rescue action in the fall of 1947, when he undertook to save the UN resolution for a Jewish state, then practically abandoned by Washington, from complete collapse, and similar rescuing expeditions on which he launched in 1948, when the Bernadotte plan threatened to crush us, depriving the Jewish state of a large part of its territory.

I think the future historian, busy as he will be with the many phenomena of the life of our era, will note that in William O'Dwyer, the Jewish community of New York, the greatest Jewish community on earth, has found a warm friend and great champion. And I believe that the debt of gratitude which we owe Mr. O'Dwyer is yet to be repaid in full, and that he has yet a great role to play in the days that lie ahead.

I would be remiss in my duty as acting president of the Zionist Organization of America were I not to call your attention to the fact that as Zionists and as Jews we are heading for stormy weather. The Jerusalem issue is assuming alarming proportions. Some of our friends on whom we have relied for assistance are beginning to shift their positions, leaving us to wonder as to what we are to expect from them in the near future. The Jews of America have applauded the stand of their Government opposing the Soviet-Australian resolution calling for the internationalization of the ancient capital of Israel. However, only the other day the State Department announced that America will "participate constructively" in the Geneva meeting of the Trusteeship Council for the internationalization of Jerusalem. That the American Government should now lend itself to the implementation of a policy it fought so hard, is indeed a source of deep disappointment to us.

Mr. Acheson, in another statement issued by the State Department in reply to Representative JAVITS, assures us that he sees no danger in Britain's shipment of arms to the Arab states. American Jews, however, cannot share the State Secretary's equanimity on that score. On the contrary, they have reason to fear that the rearmament of the Arab states might serve as a prelude to the reopening of war with Israel, to a second round for which the Arabs have been priming themselves since their defeat on the field of battle.

In the days that lie ahead we shall have need of the strength of the Jewish people. On this, the Zionist movement has always relied and will continue to rely. But we shall also have need, and in an increasing measure, of the powerful help of our friends and allies, of whom Mayor William O'Dwyer is so shining an example.

To all of you I say: Let's rally around the Zionist Organization of America; let's build it into the greatest instrumentality for Jewish action both in Israel and on the American scene. Only after we shall have done that, will we be able to look forward to our future and the future of our children with confidence and hope.

Resolution of Young Republican Club of the University of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and a resolution of the Young Republican Club of the University of Michigan:

JANUARY 18, 1950.

Representative GERALD R. FORD, JR.,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR JERRY: The following resolution was passed at a club membership meeting on the above date:

"*Be it resolved,* That the University of Michigan Young Republican Club goes on record as wholeheartedly supporting and standing firmly behind the development of the unpartisan foreign policy established and led by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, of Michigan."

Very sincerely yours,
THE UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
YOUNG REPUBLICAN CLUB,
LEONARD A. WILCOX, *Secretary.*

Your Dollars at Stake: The War on Trusts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, the history of the last century teaches us that unrestrained private enterprise ceases to be free enterprise early in the history of every industry.

The industrial revolution of the early nineteenth century brought in its train a new economy with new ills.

Traditionally, the democratic countries have attempted to remedy those ills, not by turning the clock back to the Middle Ages and not by destroying private enterprise, but by regulating private enterprise in the public interest, to keep it free.

In the February issue of Everybody's Digest I have found an article entitled "Your Dollars at Stake: The War on Trusts" by Ben Atlas, a widely known newspaper and magazine correspondent of Washington.

In this brief essay on the work of the Congress and the Department of Justice Ben Atlas makes a number of trenchant and telling points.

He shows, first, that private enterprise is not necessarily free; second, that bigness in itself is not good or bad—that it is the consequences of bigness which may be good or bad for the country; third, that bureaucracy exists in private industry wherever it has an opportunity to arise; fourth, that in spite of our antitrust laws and in spite of the work of the Department of Justice there is a constantly increasing concentration of economic power and resources which bring us face to face with two equally abhorrent alternatives in the future—some form of nationalization which must inevitably be socialism or communism, or an industrial fascism.

The Monopoly Subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary, under the enlightened leadership of our beloved colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. CELLER], is striving to find the democratic answer to this dilemma.

There is a tendency on the part of Fascist-minded big industry to ridicule the subcommittee efforts as socialistic and on the part of the extreme left to ridicule it as ineffective. The fact is that all of us who believe in genuine free enterprise in an atmosphere of political freedom and democratic processes should support the subcommittee with enthusiasm.

Under leave, I am inserting the text of Mr. Atlas' article in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR DOLLARS AT STAKE—THE GROWING WAR AGAINST TRUSTS

(By Benjamin J. Atlas)

When Tom C. Clark moved from the Justice Department to the Supreme Court bench last summer, most observers were surprised to learn that the mild-mannered Texan had piled up four times more antitrust suits than any previous Attorney General.

If Clark fooled the experts, his genial successor is confounding them again. Attorney General J. Howard McGrath and his lieutenants have been adding feverishly to the record number of cases with the help of the fattest congressional outlay for trust-busting in history.

While Washington dopesters are diverting themselves with a guessing game about who's next on McGrath's list, the jackpot question for most of us could well be: What's this biggest trust-busting jamboree about and what effect does it have on us?

Look in on any courtroom battle scene in a monopoly case and you'd be justifiably bored—but don't let that fool you. Scratch beneath the legal jargon of both sides and you'll find that the battle is right inside your door. The ordinary Joe Citizen is a fellow whose freedom both sides claim to be championing.

The king-sized struggle involves down-to-earth things in our daily lives. It's about such matters as how much we pay for bread, meat, and butter; what are our opportunities to get and hold jobs; who'll do the hiring and firing; what chances we have to start a business and survive.

When Attorney General McGrath slapped an antitrust suit recently against a small Ohio newspaper even a McGrath confederate couldn't refrain from commenting that the obscure publisher had one consolation—"He's in damned high-and-mighty company." The current line-up of defendants reads, as usual, like a blue book of American industry. The list resounds with names like American Telephone & Telegraph, United States Rubber, and Aluminum Co. of America.

As for protagonists on the Government side, rarely has there been a less spectacular crew of antitrusters. McGrath's cohorts are shrinking violets compared with the crusaders of the New Deal heyday. In the entire Government there's no personality like the late President Roosevelt's top trust buster, Thurman Arnold, whose flair for dramatizing issues made monopoly in his day a horrid word.

Today's antitrusters insist they don't need a Thurman Arnold. In the New Deal era the idea was to sell folks on the antitrust laws; our job is to enforce them.

The Antitrust Division under Herbert A. Bergson is a bailiwick of solemn lawyers who eschew public oratory and shy away from the press with more resourcefulness than Greta Garbo. Despite ample proof by many a defense lawyer that a well-timed public speech or press conference is sometimes worth more than weeks of argument before a dozing jurist, Bergson's team has doggedly followed a slogan, "If there's anything to say, tell it to the judge."

A fellow New Englander of McGrath's, Bergson has been a Justice Department work horse practically from the time he got his law degree at Harvard in 1933. Ever since he advanced to antitrust chief in 1948, his team has been made up more and more of Government careerists like himself, most of them about his own age—40—and all of them, like Bergson, as devoted to their task as the seekers of the Holy Grail.

Industry spokesmen charge that the Government is hell-bent on driving big business to the ground and saddling the Nation with a blundering bureaucracy. If little businesses are finding it hard to stay afloat, say some of the corporation lawyers, it's because the dinosaur in Washington is snowing them under with a plethora of taxes, regulations, restrictions.

The Government men checkmate this by pointing out that big business can also be a blundering bureaucracy with dime-a-dozen tinhorn executives and wasteful duplications. But Bergson adds that even where some industries grow too big for efficiency he doesn't care, "any more than I object to a man living in a mansion when a three-room apartment is all he needs."

"What is bad both economically and legally," declares the antitrust chief, "is when one reaches the point where he alone, or in conjunction with two or three others, is in a position to so dominate an industry that there is no longer room for competition. Then he, rather than the economic laws of supply and demand, controls prices and production."

To deal with juggernauts like that, the Government has been slugging with its heaviest weapon, the Sherman Antimonopoly Act. Fondly revered by antitrusters as the magna carta of free enterprise, this law has been on the books since 1890. The law's chief target is any industry which alone or in a group fixes prices to knock out competition.

Anybody convicted of violating the Sherman Act in a criminal suit is liable to a $5,000 fine or a year's imprisonment, or both, on each count. In civil suits won by the Government, the law empowers the court to hack the monopoly into smaller businesses, such as the courts tried to do in the famous split-up of Standard Oil.

Besides the Sherman Act, there's some important subsequent legislation, including the Clayton Act, the Federal Trade Commission Act, and the Robinson-Patman Act, all of which attack monopoly by imposing penalties on businessmen who try to smash rivals by unfair advertising, price discriminations, and other shenanigans.

The antitrusters, according to their critics, are using the laws as a year-'round hunting license to fire away wildly at big business without stopping to find out if monopoly exists. The language of the laws, they say, is so general that the courts, and not Congress, have in effect been doing the legislating.

On the contrary, says Bergson, the strength of the Sherman Act is its broad language making it as useful today as it was 60 years ago. Every antitrust case, he says, is a suit "by the Government on behalf of the public and on behalf of the law-abiding businessman who seeks to compete in a market free from artificial restraints."

If the antitrust suits have been popping with increasing frequency, it's because monopolies have been growing and little businessmen have been complaining about the pinch, says Bergson. Nine out of every ten trust-bust cases originate with a complaint from some hard-pressed businessman, and there's been hardly a day in the last few years when at least five complaints haven't come into the Justice Department.

Bergson's hard-working lads, referred to by private lawyers as "Bergson's beavers," confide that once they get on the scent of a law violator, there's less trouble than one usually suspects in digging up the facts. After all, explained one of Bergson's stalwarts, business, like government, is living in a bureaucratic age of "one yellow, three blue and four salmon carbon copies." So, antitrust agents have found quite legible samples of exchanges of correspondence that have become especially incriminating when the letters were carefully marked, "Please destroy after you read."

An antitruster tells of one particular case in which a businessman, "perhaps wishing to make the game of antitrust enforcement really exciting for us," directed a staff of stenographers and clerks to work overtime one night to destroy his files with a paper shredding machine. One of the stenographers in canceling a date with her boyfriend explained the highly exhilarating nature of the overtime work. The next day the entire staff appeared before the grand jury.

In the last 5 years, the antitrusters have won 151 cases either by court decisions or decrees, against 36 lost. More cases were filed in the last 10 years than in the previous half century, with one in every four suits won without coming to trial.

Although Bergson's boys have been getting results in the courts, they haven't been faring so well with public fancy of late. When the Justice Department filed a civil antitrust suit against the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., the grocery titan thundered back with a weekly series of full-page newspaper advertisements in 2,000 newspapers and stuffed reprints of the ad in every bag of groceries. The corporation's angry outcry, "Do you want your A. & P. put out of business?" reached the American kitchen with a clamor that fairly rattled the dishes.

At the A. & P.'s New York City headquarters, five trunklines were kept open to handle phone calls from sympathetic housewives. Checks and cash ranging from a dollar to $20 poured in by the hundreds from customers anxious to help support the defense. Civic groups in several cities voted resolutions endorsing the chain outfit's position.

When the Government planked an antimonopoly suit against du Pont de Nemours & Co., the corporation's executives opened a barrage of speechmaking that reached into hamlets all over the country. Crawford Greenewalt, du Pont president, rushed letters to stockholders and to 30,000 firms from which du Pont buys materials and Greenewalt himself got one of his most prized audiences at a National Press Club luncheon in Washington where a few hundred of the capital's newsmen and Assistant Attorney General Bergson were present to hear dire warnings about what the Government was doing to private enterprise.

Topping that for ingenuity was a National Press Club fete last summer arranged by a Washington public-relations firm for the American Society of Composers, Authors and Publishers, which has been up to its musical ears in monopoly and cartel suits. For 3 hours the audience of newsmen and Government officials was regaled with hit songs from the Broadway shows of Richard Rodgers and Oscar Hammerstein II, who were there in person to give out with a fast patter of humor that offset a dull speech from ASCAP President Fred E. Ahlert.

As the public hears more and more from antitrust defendants, a lot of people are seriously wondering if the Sherman Act is worth while in a fast-paced twentieth centurn economy. They're wondering whether trimming giant monopolies down to human size is worth the loss of efficiency, employment, and low prices, as critics of the antitrusters have been telling them.

The answer is in the records of courts, congressional committees and countless surveys. The monopolist selling below his competitor's prices today is likely to be the fellow hiking prices sky-high as soon as his rival gives up the ghost.

As a matter of court evidence, Bergson cites the A. & P. case. The grocery chain, he says, has paid a mere $175,000 in fines for criminal conviction in which the court found that the outfit's bigness "was not due to efficiency and enterprise but to the 'predatory application of its mass purchasing power' and the abuse of that power through boycotts, blacklisting, preferential rebates, price wars, and below-cost retailing in selected areas."

The court found, adds Bergson, that "A. & P. prices were reduced in as many as 30 percent of its 6,0000 stores only long enough to drive out local competition." By selling at higher prices in the rest of the stores, located in noncompetitive communities, "A. & P. was

able to accomplish this at the expense of its customers and at no cost to itself," says Bergson.

If antitrust suits are being filed at the fastest rate in history, it's because the Government is worried about an ominous trend of mergers in which control of the Nation's economy has been passing into fewer and fewer hands. Forty years ago the 200 biggest nonbanking firms owned about a third of all corporate assets. In 1928, their control swelled to nearly half of all assets, and today it's approaching two-thirds.

Four out of every five bars of soap bought by housewives are the products of only three companies. If you own a car, in 9 cases out of 10 your tires and tubes could only have come from one of four rubber companies. If you smoke cigarettes, four chances out of five the brand you puff comes from one of the Big Three of the tobacco industry. And so on.

What this means for the consumer, according to the records, is that he pays stiffer prices as the mergers move toward saturation where there can be no competition in pricing. As for business, its style is already badly cramped. Nineteen out of every twenty little businesses that start are doomed to flop as the small fellows come under the sway of the big threes and fours. As for jobs, they're governed by fewer and fewer Gullivers. And money for business? It's getting scarcer. Most of it, according to recent Government reports, is tied up by corporations in the process of swallowing lesser fry and spreading to unrelated businesses.

The story is told with monotonous repetition in the Government's array of antimonopoly charges. In suits against some of the kingpin investment banks of Wall Street, the Government has charged them with gang play in determining who gets loans and who doesn't. A suit against the Big Four meat packers charges a similar kind of action that has practically killed competition in the industry. Elsewhere the antitrusters are trying to open up trade in the shoe-machinery industry, break up combines in the movie industry, establish competition in the aluminum industry, divorce A. T. & T. from a manufacturing subsidy which practically monopolizes the output of telephones, and end integration of the three giant industries of du Pont, General Motors, and United States Rubber.

The antitrust laws are facing the worst assault in recent years. Ever since the Supreme Court handed down a decision forbidding industries from absorbing freight rates to fix prices, Capitol Hill has felt the pressure of what Representative WRIGHT PATMAN has described as the greatest lobbies in the history of our country to force enactment of a law nullifying the Court decision.

Antitrusters are getting some solace, however, both from their winning streak in the courts and from a hope that for every conviction hundreds of would-be violators are scared into conformity.

But trust-busting will have to improve even on that impressive record. Merger, PATMAN warned the House recently, must be stopped now or else the big corporations will become so big that there will be nothing left to do except for the Government to take them over—socialism in the United States, as in Great Britain, where they never had our antimonopoly laws. The other alternative, as the late President Roosevelt once said, is industrial fascism.

The average little citizen can logically ask, "Where do I come in?" Judging from the charges and counter-charges of the protagonists, the little man's question is shaping up as one of the biggest issues of our time.

Service or $ervice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAYMOND W. KARST
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KARST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following excellent article from the January 1950, Postal Record, which is a monthly journal of the National Association of Letter Carriers:

SERVICE OR $ERVICE

SHALL SENSE OR CENTS DETERMINE A SOUND POSTAL POLICY?

In seeking legislation, postal employees are constantly confronted with the objection that their legislation cannot be given favorable consideration because there is a postal deficit. This hue and cry is not new. It has been in existence during practically the entire history of the Post Office Department. It is peculiar that none of the other departments of Government are ever accused of having a deficit. It stems from the oft-repeated statement that the Post Office Department operates one of the world's largest businesses. It is true that the Post Office Department operates a very large business. The revenue of the Post Office Department today amounts to $1,500,000,000. In 1790 the revenue amounted to only $38,000. Today the Post Office Department contracts for tens of millions of dollars yearly for rail, ship, airline, and trucking transportation.

On Monday, December 12, I attended a forum conducted by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report. Mr. George H. Mead, a member of the committee, delivered an address on the subject, Streamlining the Post Office. Among other things, he declared:

"We should not, however, measure the problem only in terms of that huge deficit. Four hundred years ago, European rulers thought of their postal monopolies as producers of revenue. Our founding fathers are cited as having felt that the service should pay its own way. Today there apparently is a growing concept that the whole country should share in the cost of the post office and recover only part of this cost by direct charges.

"The Hoover Commission felt, however, that Congress should decide whether the price of ordinary post office services should cover the cost of post office operation. The Commission did not recommend any changes in first-, second-, third-, or fourth-class mail rates. We said that the rates for certain special services—special delivery, special handling, money orders, and the like—should be sufficient to cover their costs. But in general we stuck to our task as we saw it: Streamlining the management of the post office. There were, and are, millions to be saved by adapting the best management practices of modern American business to this huge Government enterprise of carrying the mail."

It might be well to point out that the European rulers referred to by Mr. Mead either sacrificed service or profit. Where service is extended to everyone, there is no profit. The principle of a postal system with service the paramount consideration was first espoused in America by Benjamin Franklin. Postmaster General Robert E. Hannegan was true to the Franklin tradition in his report for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1946, when he stated, "During the past 100 years the financial ideal sought by the management of the postal establishment, which has been to make the institution substantially self-sustaining, has rarely been achieved, and then usually during war years. The service ideal as differentiated from the financial has been, as it always should be, held paramount. In the development of our country, in the furtherance of social improvement, and in the fostering of business enterprise, the long-time policy of Congress and the Post Office Department has been to recognize that service must be provided and extensions made even though the costs far exceed the revenues obtained."

Fundamentally, however, the Post Office Department is not a business. It is a service. Postal operations are always managed by government. There isn't a single country in the world where the postal service is owned and operated by private capital. There are obvious reasons why the government must operate the postal system. The transportation of mail is exceedingly important to the daily business life of a country. The result of a break-down in mail transportation for as much as a week would be chaotic. Communication is the cornerstone of unity. Even today in this great country of ours the postal service is the only universal public service. There are millions of people who do not have telephones; there are millions of people who do not have access to telegraphic service; there are millions who do not have running water; there are millions who are not served by public transportation; there are millions who do not have the benefit of electricity.

Indeed, the Government has deemed it necessary to subsidize the extension of electric power lines throughout the rural sections of America. For this purpose they have established the REA, a most commendable program. The Eighty-first Congress found it desirable to subsidize the extension of telephone service throughout the United States of America and they set up a system of subsidies for the extension of telephones. The postal service is the only universal means of communication in America. If a candidate for office, for example, wishes to contact every single one of his constituents he well knows that the only way he can do it is through the postal service. Every citizen in the United States has mail service every working day in the year. To bring this service to people in rural areas the Post Office Department has established rural free delivery. They have established post offices at practically every cross road town in America. According to the 1948 Report of the Postmaster General, there was a total of 41,695 post offices in the United States. Of these, 20,546 were fourth-class post offices; 13,195 were third-class post offices. These 33,890 post offices were operated at a loss. The volume of mail in these offices is not great enough to pay the expenses of operating these offices. They were maintained, however, for the purpose of bringing the mail to the American people.

Elsewhere in the Postal Record you will find a story of carrying the mail in Roaring Hells Canyon on Snake River. There are many other similar instances where mail service is maintained at a considerable loss to the taxpayers. Yet it is important; it is American; it is justified.

There have been a great many investigations relative to the operation of the Post Office Department. Every one of these investigations costs several hundred thousand dollars. Generally speaking, they are conducted by accountants who confine their analyses to figures and reports; they do not take into consideration the many ramifications of the postal service.

During its entire history it has been the traditional policy of Congress to regard the Post Office Department as a service to the American people. Likewise, it has been the traditional policy of Congress to branch into new fields of transportation and communication by experimentation in the postal service. In the early days encouragement was given to the operation of railroad lines by granting subsidies to the lines for transporting mail. That policy continues even to the present day.

The Pony Express, a glamorous story of romance (the details of which have been recited on pages of the Postal Record in previous issues) was established and operated by the Post Office Department without any thought as to whether or not the operation would be profitable. As a matter of fact, the operation of the Pony Express was very expensive, but it did bridge the gap from St. Joseph, Mo., to Sacramento, Calif., and did tie the business, social and cultural life of these early Californians to the other peoples of the United States of America.

The Post Office Department also helped finance the operation of the early stage coach lines. It helped break roads into the wilderness. Moreover, if it were not for the financial help and practical experience in flying airplanes gained through the operation of the mail service, our aviation industry would not have progressed to the point it has reached today. Many romantic and glamorous stories could be told about the operation of the air-mail service. Even today it is only by virtue of subsidies received for transporting the mail that many of the commercial air lines are able to keep their planes in the air.

The entire history of the postal service discloses that the foundation and the method of establishing postal rates definitely places emphasis on service to the American people. As evidence of this contention, it can be cited that mail within counties is transported free. This service is established to encourage the smaller newspapers. Again, religious, scientific and fraternal magazines are given preferential rates.

The Postmaster General has been endeavoring for the past 2 years to secure an increase in postage rates. Certainly no one can quarrel with him in his general objective of securing some additional revenue. Many of the postage rates today are but slightly increased over the rates charged in the twenties. With the cost of other commodities rising, certainly a comparative increase in postage rates is justified. We believe that to be self-evident. Rates, however, cannot be increased sufficiently to eliminate the so-called deficit. To attempt to do so would drive the most lucrative business out of the Post Office and at the same time saddle the Department with the high cost operations.

The postal service is an unusual organization. It is not always easy to decide what is the proper rate to charge. As we have pointed out previously, the postal service, strictly speaking, is not a business. Service must be maintained in localities where the operation is bound to result in a loss. The telegraph company, the express company, and transportation companies do not maintain service except where such service can and is operated at a profit. No business organization maintains branch offices except where branch offices render a profit. Yet the Post Office Department, in order to fulfill its fundamental purpose of bringing the mail to the American people, is compelled to maintain approximately 30,000 post offices that are operated at a loss. No one in America would suggest for a minute that these post offices be closed, yet some people insistently demand that the so-called postal deficit be eliminated.

In many other respects the Post Office Department is a very peculiar operation. It is peculiar as far as government organizations are concerned. In determining appropriations for the Post Office Department no one can describe or confine the operation of the service to a certain finite limit. The volume of business dictates to a great extent how much money must be used in operating the Post Office Department. Mail volume fluctuates, of course, in tune with the economic rise and fall of business and other circumstances. In deciding upon the rate to be charged, Congress must give careful consideration to public welfare. They must decide on a rate that is socially desirable. At the same time they must confine the rate to an amount that will not bring about a decline in the volume of business reaching the point of diminishing returns. Obviously, if the rate on a certain class of mail were increased to an amount that would compel mailers to distribute their commodity through some other channel, it would result in the loss of all of that business in your larger centers of population where the unit cost of delivery is small, but more important, it would mean that the Post Office Department, being a public service operated by the Government, would have to retain the delivery of that commodity in Hells Canyon and in other scattered rural areas—places where the unit cost of the delivery of that product is extremely high.

The late Clyde Kelly, of sacred memory, a distinguished Congressman from Pennsylvania, probably understood the subject of postal policy better than anyone of recent history. Through his activity, legislation was passed whereby credit was given to the Post Office Department for handling certain types of mail.

In the Postmaster General's report of 1948 the following credits were shown:

Penalty mail	$53,195,697
Free registry	23,412,641
Free for blind	90,929
Free-in-county publications	772,837
Differentials in second-class postage favoring religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations	459,129
Franked mail	1,202,982
Estimated excess on cost of aircraft service over postage revenues on air mail	17,088,124
Total	96,222,339

It can well be noted, however, that there are many fields of operation where it is difficult to determine the loss and no attempt has been made to take credit for the loss in these particular directions. Clyde Kelly knew this well and in his many speeches and writings he developed this thesis at length.

There is no attempt to show that the railroads of this country are subsidized by the Post Office Department. The Post Office Department is the only shipper who is required to pay for the hire of railway cars two ways even if the car is empty on the return trip. There is no attempt to assess the cost of operating post offices in the far-flung corners of the United States. There is no attempt to estimate the cost of rural delivery. A complete study would go far beyond the so-called free services and less-than-cost items carried in the Report of the Postmaster General. It is rather absurd to expect the Post Office Department to operate as a business. The Post Office Department has saddled on it by other agencies many services for which they receive little or no reimbursement.

First, they are required to maintain a country-wide information service on civil-service examinations for the Civil Service Commission. Secondly, they sell United States savings bonds for the Treasury Department. Third, they sell documentary stamps for the Treasury. Fourth, they sell migratory-bird stamps for the Department of the Interior. Fifth, they perform custodial services in Federal buildings in which post offices are housed. They are partially reimbursed for the sale of Treasury bonds and bird stamps. They receive no reimbursement whatsoever for the other services.

The Post Office Department has no right to bargain on the rates paid the railroads. This is handled and determined by the Interstate Commerce Commission. They have no right to bargain or determine the amount paid to the air-line companies. This is determined by the Civil Aeronautics Administration. Outside of a limited control for the establishment of parcel-post rates, the rates themselves are determined, not by the Post Office Department but by the Congress of the United States. It is rather peculiar, too, in analyzing a Government operation to find that there is so much hue and cry relative to the so-called postal deficit. The postal deficit is merely the amount paid by the Government for operating the Post Office Department. All of the revenues collected by the Post Office Department are turned over to the Treasury of the United States. The Post Office Department then must go before the Congress of the United States and secure an appropriation which has been rigidly confined to 59 separate items. I am happy to report that this has been reduced to five items in the 1951 budget. The difference between the amount that the Department collects and turns in and the amount appropriated by the Congress of the United States represents the so-called deficit. The Commerce Department of the United States spends in excess of a billion dollars, but this expenditure is never referred to as a deficit. The Agricultural Department of the United States spends $2,000,000,000; this is never referred to as a deficit. The Department of the Interior spends over a billion dollars, but this is not referred to as a deficit. The Federal aid to State and local governments in 1949 amounted to almost $2,000,000,000, but this is never referred to as a deficit. After listening to the voluble protests on the postal deficit, one would almost come to the conclusion that the expenditure for the Post Office Department was the major portion of governmental expenditure.

Let us briefly analyze Federal expenditures. Thirty-four percent of the $42,000,000,000 expended by the Federal Government goes to the military; 16 percent is sent to Europe; 13 percent goes to pay interest on the Federal debt; 13 percent goes to provide care for the veterans of previous wars; and 6 percent goes to social security and other welfare expenditures. Only 18 percent of the money spent by the Federal Government goes to provide for the normal operations of Government. The cost of operating the Post Office Department is a small part of this, one-fifteenth of the 18 percent, to be exact. The history of progress and the stability of the Nation rests upon the maintenance of sound, efficient, orderly communication and transportation. Throughout history and to date the Post Office Department has been the backbone of both communication and transportation. Even if the money spent by the Post Office Department were two or three times greater than it is, it is money well spent to maintain this great Nation of ours.

The Post Office Department is operated as a service. It is up to Congress to establish rates that it feels are fair and equitable. It is also the responsibility of Congress and the responsibility of the officials of the Post Office Department to secure sufficient funds to operate the postal service so that the American people are given the service that they are entitled to. The depression and the war have left serious scars upon the standards of service that have been maintained throughout the years. The instructions sent out by the postal officials in Washington generally uphold a high standard of service. Unfortunately, the philosophy of many of

the people carrying out those orders does not uphold the philosophy of good service. We have many chronic curtailers, who in reality are assassins of the postal service. The Hoover Commission criticizes the Department on the grounds that many people in it are conscious of expense but not of cost. The expense-conscious administrator curtails today but spends tomorrow. There is only one way to deliver mail efficiently, that is to deliver it immediately. Every time a piece of mail is rehandled it increases the unit cost. Poor mail service costs the American public thousands and thousands of dollars. Certainly, a doctrine that the postal service should be operated fundamentally to give good service to the American people is absolutely necessary. Poor service gives great distress to conscientious postal employees.

The Truman Tax Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the taxpayers of the country can look behind the tax curtain set up by the President to obscure the view of what he is really doing to the economy of the country. If the Congress were to adopt the various proposals which he has outlined it would send business into a tailspin and throw hundreds of thousands of people out of work. I hope that the citizens, who are after all the sovereign power of this Nation, will bring pressure to bear on their representatives sufficient to make sure that the wild and reckless tax proposals of the President are not carried out. The few crumbs in the way of excise taxes promised the public are only bait to set the trap for more taxes for the administration to spend.

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following editorial which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

THE TAX PROGRAM

In his message on the state of the union President Truman promised a tax program which, in providing adequately for present fiscal needs, would "reduce present inequities, stimulate business activity, and yield a moderate amount of additional revenue." It seemed a neat trick in the prospectus; now that the mystery has been unveiled it seems rather a neat trick still, though its adroitness is much more apparent in its political than in its economic implicatons.

Evidently, the real problem was concerned only indirectly with the financial and economic soundness of the American system. The real problem was to win the 1950 elections. This imposed certain conditions: no drastic curtailment of the "welfare state"; no important increase in taxes; a show, however, of economic orthodoxy at least sufficient to forestall criticism; an adequate amount of lip service to the popularly attractive aim of releasing private enterprise to produce where government cannot do so. These seemingly contradictory requirements have not proved too difficult for the administration experts.

Orthodoxy is served by taking another billion out of the corporation income tax (few voters will mind this, since few will be aware of its effects, and it is sweetened anyway by the proposal to reduce somewhat the burden on middle-sized corporations). The administration's interest in private enterprise is demonstrated by a willingness at least to reduce the excise taxes (especially those of which the voter is most aware). But to avoid any suggestion that this is risking the spending state, the reduction has to be made up by tax increases elsewhere. Here a little terminological adjustment (easy for any expert in modern government) proves helpful. What is wanted is to soak increased taxes on all available sources or groups which are so small or so unpopuar that nobody will mind. By describing this process as "removing the inequities of under-taxation" it is made much more palatable.

It is wonderful, in this connection, how the only tax inequities which ever interest a Government expert are those of "under-," not over-taxation. Such staggering inequities as those of double taxation on corporate dividends, or the State governments' unpleasant habit of taxing what one pays in Federal taxes, are passed over in silence. But since few love the oil men, the insurance companies, the larger corporations, the rich testators, or the Hollywood glamor merchants, it is just removing the inequities to sock them again. So the skillful structure has been built. Like so many other Truman programs, it is designed to do everything and avoid the political consequences of any of them. But the fact that in reality it does next to none of them is still likely to be rather painfully obvious.

For the principles ostensibly underlying the Truman tax program there is much to be said. The main elements in the present deficit may prove temporary. There is reason for attempting to meet it only in part at present. To revamp the tax structure so as moderately to increase the yield, to remove its real injustices, to make it an effective encouragement for private production and to put it on a sounder permanent basis would, if all this were done with a firm grasp over long-range fiscal and economic policy, be a high act of statesmanship. To pretend to do these things without suffering the pains of any of them is perhaps skillful politics; it is certainly little more.

Truman Doctrine Has Been Effective

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial entitled "Tears of the Crocodile" which appeared in the Washington Post, Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

TEARS OF THE CROCODILE

Among the myths that are being sedulously circulated as a result of the Formosa decision is that the administration has killed its own Truman doctrine. The funeral orations have been delivered by one after the other of the China interventionists in Congress. Some of them never favored the Truman doctrine, anyway; but that fact, far from moderating their wailing, has made their lamentations even more shrill. A flock of commentators has seconded the dirge, and the only person who seems unperturbed by the outcry is the parent who is accused of the foul murder of his child, viz, President Truman.

Mr. Truman is not as hard-hearted as the serenity he maintains in the midst of this Irish wake would seem to indicate. We have consulted the child's birth certificate, dated March 13, 1947, and can vouch for the fact that whatever has been killed, it is not the Truman doctrine. The Truman doctrine, contrary to the burial notices, was not a declaration to contain Communist expansion. Indeed, a reading and rereading of the message does not disclose either the word containment or the word communism. The message, inspired by Britains' announcement that it could no longer help Greece, laid down this general policy:

"It must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressure."

The first thing to notice about the declaration is its positiveness; it was for, not against. It emphasizes aid, to be given in one or more of a variety of forms, depending upon circumstances. However, the doctrine indicated what kind of aid was primarily meant; it was economic:

"Our help should be primarily economic and financial aid which is essential to economic stability and orderly political processes."

On the basis of the Truman doctrine, economic and financial aid and then military aid started to flow to Greece and also to Turkey. The reason was that Greece and Turkey were struggling to prevent the Russians from cutting the Mediterranean and encircling the Middle East. Ask any military strategist and you will find that this was all-important to American security. There is only one Mediterranean, only one Greece; and, as Secretary Acheson has said, the American interest differs with locality. In this sense the Truman doctrine has been administered—is still being administered. It is being applied all over the world according to the requirements of situations and geography and the limitations of American resources.

Out of the Truman doctrine, for instance, stemmed the Marshall plan in Europe and the Far East. The Marshall plan followed the wise maxim underlying the Truman doctrine of helping people who helped themselves. It would have been money down the drain to have any other rule. Wherever there was a contrary practice, as in China, the result has been worse than wasteful; it has been a boomerang. The Marshall plan, moreover, was followed by the North Atlantic Pact and the arms program—all tracing back to the Truman doctrine. They all sprang from the original concept of supporting free peoples who were struggling to keep themselves free which was expressed in the Truman doctrine. The conclusion is that the crocodile tears now being shed over the demise of the Truman doctrine are all eyewash.

Controversies in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the

Punxsutawney Spirit of January 18, 1950:

CONTROVERSIES IN CONGRESS

This session of Congress will consider some of the most controversial legislative proposals in history. Yet no one seems to expect that much definite action will be taken one way or the other.

The fireworks began with Mr. Truman's State of the Union message, which contained nothing new, nothing that had not been anticipated. The President asked, as he has on many occasions in the past, for broadened social security, the compulsory Federal-health-insurance bill, some tax increases and adjustments, his civil-rights program, repeal of the Taft-Hartley law, and the Brannan farm price plan. The response to his speech divided pretty much along party lines. The Democrats, with a number of exceptions—particularly the southern bloc, which is prepared to fight the civil-rights proposals to the bitter end—praised his program as being just what the country needs. The Republicans, almost to a man, denounced it, some vehemently—about 100 GOP Representatives signed a round-robin statement to the effect that Mr. Truman is firmly committed to the eventual socialization of the United States.

A change in the President's mannerisms and attitude was noted. The rather somber humbleness he first showed on taking office has gone. In its place, he shows utter confidence that he is right and his opponents are dead wrong.

If, as is expected, Congress turns down or defers most of the President's program, will it be a defeat for the administration? That brings up a very curious situation. Some of the canniest commentators have been saying that Mr. Truman does not really want the program to pass at this time—that, indeed, its passage would actually amount to a severe set-back to administration plans and strategy. The reasoning back of this point of view is simple enough. The Democrats, like the Republicans, are looking to 1952. Recent events certainly indicate that Mr. Truman will run again, though he has not said so. Therefore, the argument goes, Mr. Truman wants the stage set so that he can go to the country, point to congressional refusal to give him what he wants, and base his campaign on that. His advisers seem to feel that this would be sound politics, and that it would enable the President to paint his opponents as black reactionaries and tools of special interests.

Practically everything that this Congress does and says will be colored by the race for the Presidency that is to be run almost 3 years hence—as well as by the elections of next fall. As has often been noted, Senator TAFT's campaign for reelection will command principal national interest in 1950. On domestic policy, he is the unquestioned leader of his party. If he wins, he will have the inside track for the 1952 nomination.

The Trial of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it was gratifying to follow the recent trial of Alger Hiss and note the unfailing efforts of Federal Judge Henry W. Goddard to render justice in an impartial and unbiased manner. His judicial aptitude deserves the acclaim of the American people. Likewise does the brilliant performance of Assistant Attorney General Thomas F. Murphy deserve mention and praise.

The recent trial brings to mind the gross impropriety and acts bordering on judicial misconduct so apparent in the first trial conducted by Judge Samuel Kaufman. These acts were pointed out by me and other Members here on the floor of the House a little more than 6 months ago. At that time I enumerated six examples of judicial impropriety on the part of Judge Kaufman which were flagrant violations of our principles of American justice. By referral to the record, we must all agree that there was no repetition of these improprieties in the second trial. Some Members suggested at that time that impeachment proceedings could be brought then. But upon the announcement that Kaufman would not act as trial judge in the second trial, most of us thought it would be wise to forego such proceedings for fear of the effect it would have upon retrial of the case. We were all interested in determining the guilt of Alger Hiss in a trial which would exemplify our traditional spirit of justice and fairness to both the people of the United States and the defendant.

The authority and duty of the Congress to survey the conduct of the Federal judiciary was exercised with this spirit in mind. Our chief question now is: Would impeachment proceedings against Judge Kaufman serve now the purpose of further protecting the integrity of our courts? In answering this question we must be reminded that this was the first trial of national significance heard by Judge Kaufman and he had little judicial experience otherwise. In addition to that, the pressure from members and friends in the executive department of government and other nationally known personalities must have been terrific—in fact so terrific that only a seasoned and experienced judge could withstand it as Henry W. Goddard did. So I maintain that since justice has finally been done, impeachment proceedings against Judge Kaufman should not be further considered. The American people have long been noted for their tolerance and understanding of the difficulties of the inexperienced and are steeped in the spirit of forgiveness of the mistakes of their fellow men. Vindictiveness for political purposes does not befit us as representatives of the people. So I urge that we drop consideration of this matter now and turn our attention to other serious threats to our internal security and the peace of the world.

The trial and conviction of Alger Hiss remind us that our security is still being threatened by subversive forces within our country and within the executive department of Government itself. The diabolical plans of the forces of communism are exemplified by several as yet unprosecuted cases of treason, espionage, sedition, and perjury. Last November, the Un-American Activities Committee unanimously recommended that the files in the case of Dr. Joseph W. Weinburg, known also as Scientist X, be turned over to the Department of Justice for further consideration with the view in mind of indictment and prosecution for perjury. So far this case has not been brought to a Federal grand jury nor has any report been made by the Justice Department. While we demand that the Attorney General's office act fairly in the consideration of this case, we also demand that he act promptly.

There are numerous other Russian espionage agents and subversives still running loose in this country busily engaged in activities aimed at overthrowing our Republic with force and violence. The Un-American Activities Committee on several occasions has had before it Steve Nelson, alias Steve Mesarosh, who is alleged to be an active member and organizer of the Communist Party in the United States and a former member of the executive council of the American Communist Party. On these occasions Nelson has openly defied the committee and refused to answer questions directed to him regarding his activities in conjunction with atomic bomb scientists at the University of California in the years 1942 to 1945 and his subsequent activities as a Communist agent in western Pennsylvania. The contempt he has shown for the committee is most certainly a travesty on American justice.

Such performances cannot be tolerated by a free people and will, I hope and pray, be eventually brought to light and vindicated. I personally have no intention of letting these cases become lost in the bewildering jungles of bureaucracy and shall, from time to time, remind the Justice Department, publicly and privately, that the cases are pending, until action is taken.

Korean Economic Aid Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE D. O'BRIEN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by President Syngman Rhee of the Republic of Korea:

STATEMENT ISSUED AT SEOUL BY PRESIDENT SYNGMAN RHEE ON RECEIPT OF THE NEWS OF THE DEFEAT OF THE KOREAN ECONOMIC AID BILL

I have just learned with the greatest regret that the United States Congress by a close vote failed to pass the enabling act for ECA aid for Korea yesterday. Despite the most unexpected defeat of this bill, I remain confident that the Congress and Government of the United States of America, upon further and more careful reflection will not fail to grant to Korea this aid which is most essential for the development of a sound domestic economy, enabling the Korean Republic to continue its successful resistance to the persistent, militaristic Communist threat. The Republic of Korea is the only country of Asia today which is determinedly, wholeheartedly, and daily fighting off, and succesfully fighting against the armed attempts of Communist imperialism to invade and overthrow. Some Asiatic

nations waiver, some recoil in fear, one great nation has gone down in defeat, but the Korean Republic continues to resist and fight with unflagging determination, courage, and success. Past American aid, added to strong Korean hearts, has made this remarkable success possible. But continued ECA aid, to establish a strong basis for our economy, is essential to sustain those strong Korean hearts in this difficult transition period. Let those who say that the risk is too great, that the U. S. S. R. is too powerful, that money for Korea is water down some rat hole, remember Berlin. There was risk, there was a powerful Soviet army itself, potential basis for attack in itself, but with courage, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France took the great risk; Berlin and even all western Germany were saved by courageous risks despite enormous expense. Korea, the only free spot of northeastern Asia continent, can and will be held by courageous Korean men and women for the free world and for an independent Korea if the United States continues to risk a few more millions of its hard-earned wealth. Despite yesterday's vote in the United States Congress, I remain certain that further and wise consideration will be given to the cause of an independent Korea to insure that this Republic and these people will have the chance to remain within the orbit of the free world.

The Dairy Farmer Begins To Worry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter and statement by E. E. Pfeiffer:

BIOCHEMICAL RESEARCH LABORATORY,
Spring Valley, N. Y., January 20, 1950.
Representative KATHARINE ST. GEORGE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MADAM: I would like, in the enclosed brief material, to call your attention to the situation of the dairy farmer, not only in Orange County, but in many other counties of the northeastern States. I am a dairy farmer myself and also a consultant to other farmers.

In addition to the facts on the milk-price situation, there are two things which I would like to bring to your notice.

So far, I have not met a single farmer who is in favor of the Brannan plan for agriculture.

Nor have I met a single farmer who is in favor of the recent development known under the name of "statism."

Coming from Europe (I was raised in Switzerland and came to this country as a Swiss citizen), I had the opportunity, as an agricultural consultant, to travel widely there before the last war. I have seen a lot of "statism" abroad and I think that if the present development goes in the direction of something only nearly similar to what was then already developing in European countries, it will be contrary to good American traditions, of which I am a great admirer.

It may perhaps be due to this background of experience that I have followed political trends in the United States with keen interest during the more than 10 years I have been here. As a naturalized citizen, having become this about a year ago, I naturally place great value on the maintenance of all that has made our country great.

Faithfully yours,

E. E. PFEIFFER.

THE DAIRY FARMER BEGINS TO WORRY

In the daily press and magazines we read so much about how well the farmer has been doing over the last years. This may be true for those who grow corn and wheat and mine their soils. The dairy farmer has to care for the maintenance of his soil's fertility and works conservatively. Generalized statistics do not reflect the actual situation, at least not that of the Eastern States dairy farmer.

The writer operates a dairy farm in Orange County, N. Y., and is a consultant to farmers in several Eastern States. He knows the figures of these farms. The following is quoted from the balances of a farm where the owner makes a living from dairying, i. e., these are actual figures reflecting facts.

Comparing the average annual milk price which was received by this farmer for his milk, the average feed cost for 18 percent protein feed in dollars per ton, the total labor cost and the total feed cost, the picture is as follows:

	Average milk price per 100 pounds	Average feed price per ton	Total feed cost per year	Total labor cost per year
1946	$5.772	$65	$3,532	$1,739
1947	5.135	76	2,855	2,858
1948	5.774	105	3,685	3,957
1949	4.55	80	[1] 5,739	3,371

[1] Unusual increase caused by the drought.

Using 1946 as a basis and setting it as equal to 100 percent, the increase and decrease in prices and costs looks as follows:

	Increase and decrease of milk price	Feed price per ton	Total feed cost	Total labor cost
	Percent	*Percent*	*Percent*	*Percent*
1946	100	100	100	100
1947	89	117	81	164
1948	100	162	104	230
1949	79	123	[1] 163	196

[1] Unusual increase caused by the drought.

While in 1943 one could still hire a dairyman for $80 per month, the wages increased to $100 in 1945, to $120 in 1946, to $150 per month in 1948, and stayed at $150 in 1949. Right now it would be difficult or almost impossible to get a good dairyman below that wage in our area. Evidently the dairy farmer is in a squeeze. The milk price declines. Feed and labor costs decline more slowly, or not at all.

The dairy farmer works 11 hours a day, 7 days a week. His pay is among the lowest. With strikes still going on in order to increase or adjust the wage level to the high cost of living, the dairy farmer does not appreciate being the first one to whom the price squeeze is applied. Of course, we all agree that the cost of living should be reduced, and the dairy farmer, more than anyone else, wants the city people to have cheaper milk. But the reductions should be fair, taking into account both the producing and the selling ends. The production cost, feed, and labor costs, should parallel the milk price. The milk price is determined by the law of demand and production, but the basis for this calculation is not a parity basis which meets reality. Then too, the milk-price control is outside the range of the dairy farmer. He gets paid 3 weeks after delivery and actually does not know in advance how much he will receive while producing the milk.

Our Government urges the employment of as many people as possible; 64,000,000 are spoken of as a goal. With the present price squeeze, the only way out the farmer can find is to work more with less help. At 11 hours per day, 7 days a week, this solution does not sound attractive. The authorities who determine the milk price are cordially invited to come to our farms and try to make a living as dairy farmers.

We dairy farmers have already reduced manpower to the minimum in order to make a go of things. The other way out is to increase milk production so as to make up for the decrease in milk prices. Here, however, there is a biological limit even with the most skillful management. The writer has increased the production on his farm over the reported period by 30 percent, with the same number of cows.

There is another gripe we eastern dairy farmers have right now. Last summer we had a prolonged drought. Even the population of New York City is beginning to know something about drought. To the farmers in this area it did not only mean that some wells and springs went dry, it meant that we had to start feeding our winter reserves already in August. The increased cost of feeding is thus reflected in the above-mentioned figures. In the reported case an increase of about $1,500 was due to the drought. The milk price does not reflect this emergency. Some wise man of the USDA published in September that there was no need of support on account of the drought "since the drought was over, inasmuch as it had rained in September." It rained over the New York City watershed, too, didn't it?

The dairy farmer begins to worry.

E. E. PFEIFFER.

Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DONALD L. JACKSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news release:

Congressman DONALD L. JACKSON, of the Sixteenth Congressional District, this week applauded the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department employee and adviser to President Roosevelt at the Cairo Conference. Hiss was found guilty on two counts of perjury against him in a New York Federal court, after a first trial some months ago had resulted in a hung jury. JACKSON also lauded the effective work of Congressman RICHARD NIXON, of California, candidate for the United States Senate and member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

In his statement, delivered on the floor of the House last Monday, Representative JACKSON said:

"The present administration's keen and unfailing sense of bad judgment has been again sustained with the conviction of Alger Hiss which stamps him publicly as a liar and a spy. The former bright boy of the State Department * * * the confidante and one-time adviser of highly placed administration officials * * * was last Saturday found guilty in a New York Federal court on two counts of perjury. The finding by the jury was made in spite of frantic efforts on the part of many highly placed officials to prevent the case being brought to trial.

"Hiss was a leading exponent of the policies which have led to disaster in China. Together with others of like mind in the Department of State, he advocated abandonment of our Chinese allies. He was part and parcel of the international conspiracy which sought a world-wide vote of no confidence in the Chinese National Government. He was a mental carpetbagger who served the cause of world communism with energy and enthusiasm. His conviction will meet with the approval of all good Americans.

"Congratulations and the thanks of all America are due Judge Henry W. Goddard, who presided at the Hiss trial, to the jury which made the finding, to Prosecutor Murphy, and to our own distinguished colleagues, Representative RICHARD NIXON, of California, and Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, who almost single-handed forced the present administration to bring the Hiss case to trial.

"The American people themselves," JACKSON concluded, "will decide whether or not such trials are worth while or whether the President was being honest or just political in branding investigations of this kind as 'hysteria and a red herring.'"

Tariffs and Monopoly Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of Mr. O. R. Strackbein, executive secretary of America's Wage Earners' Protective Conference, before the subcommittee of the House Judiciary Committee on the study of monopoly power:

STATEMENT OF O. R. STRACKBEIN, EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF AMERICA'S WAGE EARNERS' PROTECTIVE CONFERENCE, BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE ON THE STUDY OF MONOPOLY POWER, NOVEMBER 9, 1949

This conference is composed exclusively of national and international unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. Among them are unions that are organized in the glassware and pottery industries, in hat and millinery manufacturing, in fisheries, photoengraving, wallpaper, etc. The aggregate membership is upward of 500,000.

We wish to call to the attention of the Committee on the Study of Monopoly Power certain aspects of our national tariff policy that have a direct bearing on the question to which the committee has addressed itself, namely industrial bigness and monopoly power.

We think it important that we do this because the policies of a government, aimed in one direction and having perhaps admirable objectives, may produce effects in other directions that are of a quite opposite character.

Thus, our Government has certain antimonopoly policies; and this very hearing is dedicated to learning more about monopoly and bigness so that remedial measures may be recommended. The purpose, we assume, is to prevent further concentration of business into aggregates that will smother small and independent enterprise and lead to other undesirable results, such as the need of excessive public control.

This means, we take it, that the Government is concerned about the future of small- or medium-sized independent enterprise. Presumably, present trends toward concentration of business and, in fact, the great size already attained by some of our corporations, are a source of worry. The Sherman and Clayton Acts, the Federal Trade Commission Act, the Robinson-Patman Act, and the various governmental efforts to aid and protect small business, to the contrary notwithstanding, the fact remains that the trend of business continues in the direction of still greater size in ownership and management. In recent times the growth of parallel labor organizations to great size and power, as a counterpoise in the field of bargaining, has also attracted attention. The fear is that between these two forces, freedom of the individual and freedom of enterprise will be crushed.

Against this background we wish to pose the current policy of our Government as it bears upon international trade. To a very important degree, in our estimation, the effects of this policy will be to discourage, hamper, injure and in some cases to destroy small industries, while, on the other hand, it will encourage, help, and promote the large, mass-production enterprises. In other words, the execution of the policy will give impetus to the very forces about which this committee and other parts of the Government avow growing apprehension. This is not to say or to imply that such effects are contemplated or sought by those who have formulated our international trade policy or by those who are charged with carrying it out.

The relationship between the current policy to reduce tariffs and to encourage imports, on the one hand, and the growth of already gigantic industrial enterprise, on the other, is not apparent at first blush. Quite to the contrary, protective tariffs have long been associated in the minds of economists and others with the growth of trusts. In fact, the tariff has been called the mother of trusts. Could it then possibly be true that the reduction of tariffs will help the so-called trusts or big business and do harm to the smaller industries and the smaller companies in big industries?

We raise this question at this time before this committee because the policy of reducing tariffs in order to increase imports is finding powerful added support from those who are seeking an escape from the condition of dollar-shortages that afflicts many foreign countries. The dilemma is real and the problem is unmercifully difficult. Either we import more, much more, or we continue to make grants of billions of dollars to the dollar-short countries; or else we cut these countries off to shift for themselves. These are the alternatives that are generally held out to us. The least painful of the alternatives, then, seems to lie in a further reduction of our tariff so that imports may flow more freely into this country. Therefore our Government embarks on a vast educational program to condition the minds and hearts of the American people to the kinder reception and more willing purchase of imported products.

The increased imports would put more dollars into the pockets of those who export the goods to us; and this would reduce the dollar-shortage overseas and thus help the rest of the world to balance its trade with us. Incidentally, it would help us to maintain our present volume of exports, a good part of which is now paid for by the American taxpayer. We could, by receiving more imports, so the argument goes, reduce or eventually perhaps eliminate this indirect subsidy that our exporters now enjoy.

The logic of this argument seems inescapable.

Before answering the questions that we have raised, and before addressing ourselves to the alternative of the present policy, we wish to offer a very brief analysis of our exports.

It is perhaps not generally known that some of our large industries, notably those in which capital concentration has reached huge proportions, regularly export a larger volume of products than the total output of some of our other industries. A suitable example is found in the automobile industry. Average annual exports, classified by 5-year periods, of this industry from 1925 to 1940, have been as follows:

United States exports: Automobiles, parts, and accessories

Annual average:	
1926–30	$406,164,000
1931–35	146,503,000
1936–40	417,439,000
Actual:	
1948	929,294,000

Source: Statistical Abstract of the United States, and Summary of Foreign Commerce of the United States.

Compare these export figures with the gross annual product of other industries, as reported by the Bureau of the Census (Census of Manufactures):

	1939 value of product
Concrete, gypsum and plastic products	$257,598,000
Cement	192,611,000
Glassware, pressed and blown, including glass containers	255,589,000
Flat glass	102,389,000
Books, printed or published, or both	236,752,000
Hats and millinery	206,857,000
Professional, scientific, surgical, medical instruments	180,014,000
Jewelry, costume jewelry and miscellaneous products	176,509,000
Toys and sporting and athletic goods	151,404,000
Liquors, distilled, rectified, or blended	105,224,000
Wines	32,782,000
Pottery and related products	98,884,000
Fish and shellfish, canned or cured	81,071,000
Silverware and plated ware	62,771,000
Cutlery and edge tools, except silver and plated ware	59,924,000
Leather luggage (suitcases, bags, briefcases, etc.)	36,591,000
Wallpaper	24,969,000
Feathers; plumes and artificial flowers	18,504,000
Small leather goods	14,334,000
Umbrellas, parasols and canes	11,520,000

From this table it is clear that the exports of automobiles, parts, and accessories during the 5-year period of 1936–40 averaged higher in value per year than the total output of the entire glass industry, including all glass tableware, scientific and laboratory ware, bottles, and window and plate glass. Again, these exports were as great as the total output of the cement and the hat and millinery industries combined. Once more, they were as great as the combined product of the last nine industries listed in the table, namely, pottery and related products, fish and shellfish, canned or cured, silverware and plated ware, cutlery and edge tools, leather luggage, etc.

Another of the exporting giants is the petroleum industry. We show the exports below:

United States exports: Petroleum and products

Annual average:	
1926–30	$524,364,000
1931–35	231,352,000
1936–40	345,619,000
Actual: 1948	656,881,000

Other heavy exporters of industrial products are the iron and steel industry, manufacturers of electrical machinery and apparatus, and of agricultural machinery and implements. Important but less heavy shippers to other countries are the meat packers and manufacturers of office machinery and appliances. The table immediately below gives the export figures for these various products:

United States exports

Product	Annual average			Actual, 1948
	1926–30	1931–35	1936–40	
Iron and steel products	$248,844,000	$90,091,000	$319,876,000	$861,623,000
Electrical machinery and apparatus	102,711,000	62,635,000	105,605,000	490,383,000
Agricultural machinery and implements	109,901,000	26,750,000	68,027,000	381,926,000
Meat products	77,988,000	28,724,000	26,409,000	56,752,000
Office appliances and equipment	44,969,000	21,268,000	29,370,000	86,942,000

Source: Statistical Abstract; Summary of Foreign Commerce.

Examination of the foregoing statistics reveals that the average annual exports from 1936–40 of the four leading export industries listed in the foregoing and preceding tables, namely, producers of automobiles, petroleum, iron and steel, and electrical machinery and apparatus, were as great as the total annual product of the following industries in 1939: glassware, bottles and flat glass; book printing and publishing, hats and millinery, pottery, fish and shellfish canning and curing; liquor and wine, and cutlery and edge tools.

Of course, other comparisons could be made. Other industries could be used as examples. However, the predominant position in our exports of the large mass-production industries, wherein resides much of the bigness and monopoly power which are the subject of complaint and inquiry, is very clear and indisputable. Most of the industries that we have presented for comparison with the giants of export are those which would receive much of the impact of stimulated and increased foreign competition, such as is contemplated.

Very few of these smaller industries are afflicted with monopoly power. They are industries that are devoted predominantly to the production of consumers' goods, and are widely scattered throughout the United States. The individual establishments are generally very small in comparison with the plants of the large iron and steel companies, the large electrical equipment manufacturers, the automotive vehicle producers, etc., which are our heavy exporters of industrial products.

The question is how the proposed program of increased imports, fostered by further reduction of our tariff, would promote bigness and monopoly; or, to say it differently, how could the surrender of protective measures which purportedly nurtured the trusts during their growth, now, after they have matured, advance their entrenchment and add to their power?

The answer should be clear. The economies of mass production have enabled the large industries not only to meet foreign competition in our home market (with some exceptions) but to compete successfully in foreign markets with foreign producers. The further reduction of our tariff would not injure these titans, if at all, in any degree comparable to the injury that would be inflicted on the smaller industries that manufacture the principal classes of goods whereof imports would be stimulated.

Failure to open wider our market for a miscellany of goods manufactured in the countries that suffer from a dollar-shortage, would in time, no doubt, decrease our export trade, assuming a contraction of our foreign aid program. The greatest exporters would undoubtedly suffer most from such an ebb in our overseas trade. In the industrial field the mass-production industries, the prime examples of bigness and wielders of great power, whether monopolistic or not, would absorb most of the impact.

However, the need for export markets as exemplified by the United Kingdom, Germany, Japan and other industrial nations, is not limited to the American outlet. There are other important markets. Should those countries regain the overseas markets outside this country which they enjoyed before World War II, much of the present pressure for exports to the United States would slacken.

The exigencies of war delivered many of these overseas markets to us. Our exporters were virtually the only ones in the world who could undertake to fill the partial vacuum created in those markets by the withdrawal of England, Germany, Japan, and other industrialized countries as suppliers of manufactured products. We did export more extensively than ever before, and while we were unable to meet the great demand and found it necessary to ration our exports, we came into a predominant position as suppliers.

It is perhaps natural and human that our exporters should seek to retain these war-gained markets. However, if this retention should impede the postwar adjustment and hinder the restoration of multilateral trade and therefore the basis for correcting trade balances, the price might be too high.

By insisting upon retention we will delay the necessary adjustment and at the same time will aggravate the problems confronting our occupation forces in Germany and Japan in seeking to restore the exports of these countries to their prewar channels.

It is in very considerable degree the failure to restore these overseas markets to their prewar suppliers that creates the demand for a substitute market in the United States. In bowing to this demand as a matter of policy we will contribute to the bigness and monopoly power of our mass producers and sacrifice the smaller producers of a wide miscellany of goods.

All the concern over bigness and monopoly and all the solicitude for small business professed by our Government will ring hollow if our gates are opened yet wider to imports that come into competition with our producers of miscellaneous goods. Our tariff has already been reduced an average of 50 percent. Should our smaller producers be asked to shoulder the whole burden of the necessary adjustment? Should the taxpayer be asked to continue his subsidy of the large exporters?

This committee is concerned with influences that make for monopoly power and result in oppressing the smaller independent enterprises. We strongly urge that it pursue the question raised here and consider the wisdom or unwisdom of the policy now being pressed in the field of foreign trade by other branches of our Government.

The question in the end is: If some of our industries must get hurt, should our policy be so shaped that the injury would fall principally upon the smaller producers?

Oklahoma Pioneers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to call attention of the House to the honors paid to the pioneers of Oklahoma on the national radio hook-up of American Broadcasting Co.'s program recently.

On Friday, January 20, our pioneers who came West from the State of Virginia were recognized for their daring on the Lone Ranger series, in a broadcast called The Banner of Virginia.

The broadcast had to do with a group of Virginia veterans of the Civil War who had settled in the rich lands of the then Oklahoma Territory, and who were reminded by the Lone Ranger of the glorious heritage left them by such men as Gen. Robert E. Lee. The broadcast was coincident with the one hundred and forty-third anniversary of Lee's birth, which was on January 19.

In the broadcast, the Lone Ranger reminded these pioneers of their great traditions and urged them to resist the enemy—whether it be ruthless desperadoes or bad weather. The future—he advised them—was incredibly promising if they would work out a new State from the pioneer life they found. How significant these words to the Oklahoma pioneers.

We in Oklahoma appreciate the recognition given our pioneers and the veterans of Virginia by George V. Trendle, creator of the Lone Ranger show and civic leader of Detroit; also to Mr. Frank Stricker, chief writer of the radio series which, in its nineteenth year, dips into the history of the West for its story themes.

Practical Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Greenfield (Ind.) Daily Reporter:

PRACTICAL AID TO EDUCATION

One of the greatly publicized objectives of the present administration in Washington has been to inaugurate greatly enlarged Federal aid to education.

This would mean the expenditure of great sums of Federal moneys and has been quite a debatable issue, chiefly for three objections:

1. Elementary education has been declared a local problem, which should be financed primarily by the local community benefited, and perhaps in a secondary way and where necessary, with lesser amounts of State assistance.

2. The fear has been expressed that strings tied to Federal money would inevitably take school control away from local authorities and place them under Federal domination.

3. Areas which have already made the necessary expenditures and sacrifices, if necessary, to maintain their own schools at an adequate level, would have to pay again into funds for either areas that have been derelict in this regard and reused to pay proper amounts at local levels for the purpose.

However, it was granted that schools in certain areas are in need of improvement.

How idealistic, impractical and fraught with political bait the Federal declaration in this regard is, happens to be demonstrated in incidental fashion by the coal strike emergency.

Schools all over the country are closing because of lack of coal. The Federal Government has the legal machinery to correct the situation. The cost would be nothing. It would be practical and cheap Federal aid to education. Up to now not a finger has been lifted in Washington to get schools a supply of coal. No emergency exists.

Seek and demand added millions in the name of better schools, but no move to get even an extra hod of coal to keep the ones open which now exist.

Ain't that sumpin'?

Take-Home Pay Isn't All We Earn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, David K. Steenbergh, publisher of the Feed Bag, a national trade magazine, has written a timely editorial which was contained in the December issue of that publication. Mr. Steenbergh calls attention to an important matter so far as pay is concerned, and as part of my remarks I am including it at this point:

The eyes of the working world, which includes most all of us, are focused on take-home pay. The rate of pay per hour, gross wage per week or monthly salary no longer means anything. Withholding taxes and social-security assessments are simply classified as "deductions" and the worker no longer assumes any conscious responsibility toward meeting the constantly rising cost of government.

We do not believe this was the intent of Congress. It merely shifted the cost of collecting taxes from Government to industry. In so doing, however, it destroyed individual responsibility to Government and thereby made possible the vast spending sprees of the New Deal and the Fair Deal, of FDR and Truman.

Historically, March 15 was established as the date for payment of all taxes due the Government on income received during the previous year. Imagine if you can, then, what would happen if all workers had actually received their gross wage or salary for 1949 and were now forced to scrimp, save, scrape, and borrow to pay their taxes by March 15, 1950. The hue and cry would quickly bring an end to reckless government spending, the New Deal and the Fair Deal notwithstanding.

Industry did not want the job of collecting income and social-security taxes for the Government. To do so has required the employment of thousands of additional bookkeeping and clerical workers with no saving anywhere, as the United States Treasury Department also now has many more employees. Emphasis on take-home pay rather than gross income has accelerated the demand for higher and higher wages and salaries. All this has boosted the cost of doing business and increased the price of all the things we buy.

This effect is bad enough but not nearly as serious as the resulting lack of responsibility to and for the Government. Taxes which do not pinch the individual pocketbook fail to impress the average worker. He sees no connection between his income—of which he considers only his take-home pay—and the rapidly rising cost of reckless and wasteful Government spending.

The really great men of our country have and are warning us that deficit spending is rapidly leading our Nation to bankruptcy. Deficit spending will continue, however, until the majority of our citizens realize the personal stake they have in the rising cost of Government and the staggering national debt.

As now collected, income taxes are hidden taxes. They were never intended to be and Government reform will not come until they are uncovered. If we are employers, let's explain their tax interest and its relation to Government spending and debt when we supply the withholding tax reports to our employees. If we are employees, let's examine our withholding tax report carefully and note what taxes we are paying as related to our actual earned income.

Take-home pay is important to all of us but how long can it be sufficient to meet our needs if the Government continues to take a larger and larger percentage of our earned income for unnecessary and wasteful expenditures at home and abroad.

DAVID K. STEENBERGH.

It's High Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WINT SMITH
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, from time to time we read and see quoted editorials from the New York Times, Wall Street Journal, Chicago Tribune, Kansas City Star, and other metropolitan newspapers. These editorials express certain opinions and receive a lot of attention. There is a feeling that these opinions are the last word in editorial comment because they came from the big papers. The small-town paper from Main Street is generally overlooked. I hope that my colleagues will read the following editorial coming from the pen of Byron L. Lehmbeck of the Meade Globe News. It is so typical of the way rural America is thinking these days.

IT'S HIGH TIME

All that stuff your mammy and pappy done told you about thrift and enterprise is just so much hooey.

If you don't believe it just review the rules of the great game "robbing Peter to pay Paul" that has been going on for years in this country.

For example, it has been and is the popular thing to berate, belittle, and damn the thrifty and enterprising. If you are a person that is a producer, one with initiative, resource, stamina, ambition, vision, perseverance, or with any of the other qualities that are necessary to get ahead you have been classed as being a conniver of the first order.

If you are a Paul, however, a person who has become indolent, shiftless, and careless you are classed as being the salt of the earth. You are the bright boy who has seen the light. You'll be taken care of from the cradle to the grave, and at Peter's expense.

The Pauls and those advocating that Paul be top man are making life rough for the Peters. The Peters are the ones who must work harder and longer to meet the many taxes and expenses imposed upon them.

But how long are the Peters—the person who trys to lay up something for a new car, a home, or to educate their kids—going to be able and willing to work to pay the Pauls? When, and if the Peters are forced or get tired and quit, it's going to be a sad day for all of us.

At the present time there is too much effort being made to discourage enterprise, thrift, endeavor, and planning by those who are able and willing.

As an old boy out in Utah recently summed the issue up, "The present course is like cutting down the fruit trees, one after the other, to make the fruit easier to pick. Soon there will be no trees—and no fruit."

It's time to make an about face. It's time to reward thrift, industry, and foresight. It's time to penalize shiftlessness, indolence, arrogance, and the desire—yes, demanded by the Pauls—of something for nothing.

It's high time the issue was clearly put: socialism versus freedom.

An Occasion for Great Pride

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I take pleasure in calling to the attention of my colleagues the following editorial from the Watsonville Register-Pajaronian.

We can all be thankful that the United States of America is still a working democracy.

AN OCCASION FOR GREAT PRIDE

We're about to bust our buttons with pride in our city today.

There was a real Vishinsky-type oration at the high school study hall last night.

Of the twenty-five-thousand-odd people who live in the Pajaro Valley, around 24,968 of them stayed home or went elsewhere.

But what makes us proud is this: this speaker, who hates the capitalist system and thinks Russia is just fine, was permitted to speak to anyone who wanted to hear him—without heckling, without violence, without demonstration.

In contrast to some cities like Peekskill, N. Y., whose citizens have made themselves notorious by senseless rioting against speakers they disagree with, Watsonville is a very bright spot indeed this week.

Not that we're asking for more of the same—but there's a valuable lesson for other communities in what happened, or didn't happen, Thursday night. These Stalin-

loving screwballs thrive on demonstrations, bans, and hecklers; they die for lack of audiences when they're let alone. Gerald L. K. Smith, the Christian Front rabble-rouser, drew big crowds in San Francisco when he was denied the use of public buildings and demonstrated against. When he was ignored, his appearances became a colossal flop.

We think the same thing will work here, just fine. Watsonville has preserved the right of free speech, which extends even to the right to be ridiculous. By so doing, it has tremendously strengthened the cause of democracy.

Our congratulations, therefore, and hearty thanks to the members of veterans' organizations and others who—like ourselves—are vigorously and unalterably opposed to Communist tyranny and dedicated to freedom and democracy. Their restraint and good judgment, in refraining from raising a fuss and making a martyr out of the speaker, have immeasurably weakened his cause and strengthened ours.

The fallacies expounded by Mr. Lohr during his speech are too numerous for rebuttal all at once. In fact, his words were so like those of other Communist apologists that they are entirely familiar to most of us, and carry their own rebuttal.

One familiar phrase made us prick up our ears: "the stench and rottenness of the system under which we are compelled to live." We're not sure just where Mr. Lohr came from. But even were he a native-born American, we're reasonably sure he isn't compelled to live in the United States. There should be little trouble in getting a passport for one of the "people's democracies" like Poland, China, or the Soviet Union, and hardly any compulsion to come back.

Another random thought, that came as we watched Mr. Lohr denounce our decadent democracy. Over his shoulder, hanging on the wall, was the American flag which guaranteed him the right to speak his warped thoughts.

How many citizens of the people's democracy of the Soviet Union, we wondered, went in automobiles last night to little Red schoolhouses, to hear a speaker freely denounce Stalin and praise capitalism?

There, we think, lies the overpowering strength of American democracy and freedom. There lies the answer to any speaker who prattles of the glorious freedom of Communist dictatorship.

The best way to insure ourselves against losing the fight against communism, we're convinced, is to let 'em pop off; reason their arguments out; and come to your own conclusion—would you rather live in a country where free men can speak their minds, even to the point of foolishness, or in one where an improper thought will send you to a Siberian salt mine?

The kind of good sense demonstrated by Watsonville citizens Thursday night is the best insurance that freedom will continue to exist.

Peekskill, N. Y., papers please copy.

Women Speak Out Against Socialized Medicine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, there is a growing concern on the part of the women of this country that Congress should not adopt a socialized-medicine program. A very interesting letter has just been received from Mrs. George D. Richardson, president, the City Federation of Women's Clubs of Brodhead, Wis. It is so pertinent and timely that I am including it as part of my remarks:

BRODHEAD, WIS., *January 18, 1950.*

Representative LAWRENCE H. SMITH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: The City Federation of Women's Clubs of Brodhead, Green County, Wis., a group of 250 legally qualified voters, have delegated me to write you what we are thinking, and this is perhaps the consensus of most voters in the Middle West. Green County, with 25,000 intelligent citizens, is one of the richest and finest dairy and farming areas in the United States of America. We are nationally famous for cheese. We consider that there is a definite coal shortage in our area and we urge you to do something about the coal situation right now.

We also want to go on record as follows:

We definitely do not want socialized medicine.

We do not want Federal supervision of schools.

We do not want the Brannan farm program.

We do not want more taxes.

We would like to keep our liberties and not give up our heritage, our American way of life, by being asked to walk in the footsteps of countries where such methods have failed.

We deplore the tremendous governmental spending.

We do approve the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

Some of our ancestors came to Wisconsin as early as 1670 and from that time on, without hand-outs, by their courage, ambition, integrity, perseverance, and pride of achievement managed to earn a living, then came comforts and prosperity, and we believe we can still carry on that program. Description of Green County, I know, was not necessary for you, Mr. SMITH. This is a copy of the letter sent to President Truman. Do you approve? If it meets with your approval perhaps a movement could be started among club women all over the State. Could you offer suggestions?

Now, should I be sent to the guillotine for this, please ship the remains back to Green County; at least, they will erect a monument saying, "She died trying."

Very respectfully yours,

LEONE RICHARDSON.

Flow of Foreign Oils Into United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WINGATE H. LUCAS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, we in the oil-producing States are becoming increasingly concerned about the tremendous flow of foreign oils into the United States. The people of Texas—my own State—are being penalized in the sum of $30,000,000 in State revenues because these alien oils have taken so much of the domestic market. It is time that our Government take cognizance of the seriousness of the situation and provide protection to domestic producers, before domestic production is eliminated, because that is exactly what will happen unless action is taken. Then America will be a have-not nation with regard to petroleum. I urge my fellow Members to study the following statement in order to understand the gravity of the situation we are in.

THE PRESENT OIL SITUATION

Since World War II there has been a rapid development of the production of oil in foreign areas at a rate greater than could be absorbed by foreign markets. The resulting surplus has been an important factor in the following changes in the operations of the domestic petroleum industry.

1. Oil production: Domestic production, according to Government statistics, averaged 5,380,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949. This was a reduction of 10.3 percent as compared with the same period in 1948.

2. Producing capacity: Domestic capacity under sound conservation practices averaged 6,380,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949, according to authoritative estimates by industry experts. This represents an increase of 6.3 percent over 1948 productive capacity.

3. "Shut-in" production: The difference between capacity and actual production shows that the domestic industry was "shut-in" by an amount averaging 1,000,000 barrels per day or 17 percent during the last 6 months of 1949.

4. Oil imports: Imports of foreign oil during the last half of 1949 averaged 680,000 barrels, according to Government statistics. This was an increase of 23.6 percent over the imports during the same period of 1948.

5. Oil exports: Government statistics show that exports averaged 290,000 barrels daily during the last half of 1949, a decrease of 23.3 percent as compared with the previous year.

6. Oil producers' income: On January 1, 1950, the United States Department of Interior reported that the total income of domestic crude oil producers in 1949 was $507,000,000 less than in 1948.

Decreased oil activity in the United States and reduced income from oil production affect American labor, Federal and State tax revenues, the prosperity of hundreds of communities in oil-producing areas, and the income and general welfare of the Nation. The experience of the industry proves conclusively that a loss in income means decreased drilling activity and a lessened ability to maintain producing capacity to meet national oil requirements. As this takes place, the Nation shifts its dependence for oil supplies from thousands of domestic producers to foreign oil controlled by a few large oil concerns operating on a world-wide basis.

World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, at the request of Alan Cranston, president of the United World Federalists, I am including herewith a petition from various interested citizens in Palo Alto, Calif.

PALO ALTO, CALIFORNIA,
January 1, 1950.

Believing that the achievement of a World Federation, with limited and defined powers, is essential to the preservation of the

peace and that the United States should take the lead in working to this end, we, the undersigned, citizens of Palo Alto, Calif., urge the Congress to pass House Concurrent Resolution No. 64, introduced last fall, which reads:

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it shall be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

G. A. Casaday, minister, Congregational Church; Arnold Rumwell, attorney at law; D. J. MacLachlan, major, United States Army retired; Russel V. Lee, M. D.; A. Guerard, Professor Emeritus, Stanford; Mrs. David Starr Jordan; Everett C. Thomson, pastor, First Presbyterian Church, Adron Beene, attorney at law; Byrl R. Salsman; Oscar F. Green, rector, All Saints Church; Grace R. Helliwell, librarian; A. Marvin Stuart, minister, First Methodist Church; Don Edwards, executive vice president, San Jose Abstract & Title Insurance Co.; W. Stanley Pearce, insurance agent; Andrew W. Spears, attorney at law; Charles E. Allen, assistant to the chairman, Hoover Institute; John H. Leecing; F. Danford Lion, minister, Unitarian church; Henry L. McIntyre, secretary - treasurer, United Helicopters, Inc.; Eugene Santschi, Jr.; Mary Curry Tresidder.

Information Relating to Federal Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of Congress I have received a great number of letters urging me to work and vote for the repeal of Federal excise taxes. Many persons do not realize the amount of Federal excise taxes and upon what items Federal excise taxes are collected at the wholesale level and at the retail level.

In order to apprise the people of the amount, nature, and extent of such taxes. I wish to quote the following from the December 2, 1949, La Salle Washington Letter, written by Harold K. Howe, manager of the Washington office of the La Salle Steel Co., which figures in the hasty check which I made, appear to be quite authentic. He states that the total excise taxes collected during the fiscal year of 1949 was $7,506,017,641.55. He lists the following items as those upon which Federal excise taxes are paid at the wholesale level:

Beer, wines, and distilled spirits, 75 cents to $2 per quart (plus special occupational taxes for brewers, distillers, wholesalers, and retailers from $22 to $222 per year).
Cigars, $2.50 to $20 per thousand.
Cigarettes, 70 cents to $1.68 per carton.
Oleomargarine, colored, 10 cents per pound; uncolored, one-fourth cent per pound (plus occupational taxes for manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers from $6 to $600 per year).

He then points out that he has ignored the taxes on narcotics, opium, and marihuana.

Playing cards, 13 cents per pack.
Lubricating oils, 6 cents per gallon.
Gasoline (Federal tax only), 1½ cents per gallon.
Tires, 5 cents per pound.
Inner tubes, 9 cents per pound.
Automobile and motorcycle accessories and parts, 5 percent.
Automobile truck chassis and bodies, 5 percent.
Other automobile chassis and bodies and motorcycles, 7 percent.
Electric power and light, 3⅓ percent.
Mechanical refrigerators, air conditioners, etc., 10 percent.
Radio sets and parts, 10 percent.
Matches, 2 cents to 5½ cents per thousand.
Sporting goods, 10 percent.
Photographic equipment and films, etc., 15 to 25 percent.
Firearms, shells, and cartridges, 11 percent.
Musical instruments, 10 percent.
Luggage, 10 percent.
Electric, gas, and oil appliances, 10 percent.
Phonograph records, 10 percent.
Electric light bulbs, 10 percent.

He also lists the following items as those upon which Federal excise taxes are paid at the retail level:

Jewelry, 20 percent.
Furs, 20 percent.
Luggage, 20 percent.
Toilet goods, 20 percent.
Admissions (movies, etc.) 1 cent on each 5 cents paid.
Ticket brokers, 20 percent.
Roof gardens, cabarets, etc., 20 percent.
Club dues and initiation fees, 20 percent.
Sugar, ½ cent per pound.
Telephone and telegraph service, 15 to 25 percent.
Safe deposit boxes, 20 percent.
Pipe-line transmission, 4½ percent.
Bowling alleys, pool tables, $10 each alley or table.
Coin-operated devices, $10.
Coin-operated gaming devices, $100 per year.
Passenger transportation, 15 percent.
Property transportation, 3 percent of freight paid.
Coal transportation, 4 percent of freight paid.

One may readily see that when people are demanding that they be freed from the paying of all Federal excise taxes they probably are demanding something which they do not really want and could never expect to secure.

One can readily understand that if $7,506,017,641.55 excise-tax revenue was eliminated that the national budget would be just that much more out of balance, and consequently, the reason for President Truman's approach in his annual tax message of a repeal of certain Federal excise taxes is quite proper and should be understood easily by everyone.

I have heretofore pointed out to many of my constituents that a number of the more burdensome Federal excise taxes placed on articles during the war period might have been repealed if the Eightieth Congress had done its plain duty to the people, and had not entered into an unholy alliance to relieve some of the big Federal income-tax payers of their proper share of the tax burdens.

In informing my constituents of this conduct of the Eightieth Congress, I said in part in a letter to them as follows:

I have received recently a number of communications in reference to the prospect of having Congress repeal the present burdensome excise taxes on everything but true luxury items, and I refrained from answering them until it had been definitely established that the first session of the Eighty-first Congress could do nothing about repealing these Federal war tax measures.

None of us would have been further plagued at this time by such taxes if the repudiated, Republican controlled Eightieth Congress had done its plain duty to the people and others who have been worried and burdened far too long by such Federal excise taxes.

Lest you might feel that the facts do not bear out my last statement I want to submit to you that when the Democratic controlled Congress passed the bill providing for wartime Federal excise taxes in the year 1943 there was a proviso in the bill that the collection of such taxes could not be made 6 months after the cessation of World War II hostilities. On December 31, 1946, His Excellency Harry S. Truman, President of the United States declared that hostilities had ceased. Therefore under the law passed by the Democratic administration in 1943, the collection of these Federal wartime excise taxes would have ceased automatically on June 30, 1947.

The Republican-controlled Eightieth Congress decided not to let this happen and rushed a bill through the House of Representatives in January of 1947 which bill was enacted speedily into law in March 1947 making these excise taxes permanent.

President Truman recommended to the Congress that this bill extend the excise taxes for 1 year only, for the purpose of making a study to determine if any of these excise taxes should remain law, but the Eightieth Congress was adamant and made these excise taxes permanent.

The record shows that on January 28, 1947, at page 692 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a vote by yeas and nays was taken on H. R. 1030, a bill to continue war excise taxes permanently, and it passed with the helpful votes of the Republican majority including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

The record shows further than on February 2, 1948, at page 926 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a vote by yeas and nays was taken on H. R. 4790, a bill to reduce individual income-tax payments and for other purposes, and it also passed with the helpful votes of the Republican majority including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

President Truman vetoed this bill, H. R. 4790.

The record then shows that on April 2, 1948, at page 4053 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, a vote by the yeas and nays was taken to override President Truman's veto of H. R. 4790, and it passed also with the helpful votes of the Republican majority, including the votes of all of the then four Republican Representatives from Nebraska.

This information I hope brings the reader up to date on why he has been plagued and harried with Federal war excise taxes and who is to blame for same at this time.

This Republican strategy was not understood clearly for a time, but later it developed that they decided to make these excise taxes permanent so that they could pass an income-tax reduction bill which would enable many greedy and selfish people to prune some $5,000,000,000 a year from their then income-tax payments to the United States Government. These doings demonstrate how the reactionary Republican legislative mind

functions. To give the rich relief they saddle some of their tax share onto the middle and poor classes of people, and then the budget balances; don't you see? I am sorry that you now find that you have been since March 1947, along with myself and other good Democrats and Republicans, a budget balancer for the rich people.

Of course to sugarcoat their financial pill they permitted 7,000,000 poor and ordinary taxpayers to get slight income-tax reductions so that rich taxpayers could get the lion's share of income-tax reductions.

What President Truman wants to do is put the income-tax saddle back where it belongs, so that some of these excise taxes may be repealed, but the reactionary Republicans have shouted No! No! No! for the past months in Congress, and have introduced a bill to repeal all of the excise taxes, but have made no provision for getting this much needed tax money from any other source. They want to heartlessly and heedlessly put the budget further out of balance by fooling the people who have to pay and put up with burdensome excise taxes into thinking that they are their friends and not their slippery thinking enemies.

I feel that President Truman's recent tax message to Congress was an excellent one and should receive the support of every Congressman who is endeavoring to be truly helpful in tax matters. I am sure that it will be interesting to watch the way that some Congressmen will respond to the President's sound and sensible approach to the elimination of some of the war excise taxes and the aid which will be given by them to find other proper tax sources so as to try to balance the budget.

A Permanent FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, the importance of the fight now being waged for FEPC is best described by the text of a report by Walter L. Kirschenbaum, a delegate of the Greater New York Council for a Permanent FEPC, which is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues:

Fellow fighters for civil rights: I was honored and privileged to represent this council in Washington, D. C. You can feel proud that those of us who represented the New York delegation gave leadership to the mobilization, and at times inspiration. I say this in all due modesty, in view of the great sacrifices that were made by the delegates and by those who arranged the mobilization.

There was a great deal in the press prior to our departure for Washington indicating that certain groups of political bigots were determined to take the mobilization over, and to use it for their own nefarious purposes. I think I can report here that the latter group suffered the worst defeat in the city of Washington since the retreat of the other redcoats in the War of 1812. By and large the vast majority of our fellow delegates from the other cities and States gave a vivid demonstration of faith in democratic ideals. All of us conducted our business, both in work sessions and on the Hill, in a spirit which threw the lie into the faces of the Ku Klux Klan, who said that we were a group of Communists, and we likewise threw the same lie into the faces of the Red Ku Klux Klan who had announced that they would take us over.

There is not a New York Senator nor is there a New York Congressman who does not know that his constituents are wholely in favor of FEPC, and, with few exceptions, we have received the assurances of our senatorial and congressional delegations that they will vote for an FEPC law.

Tomorrow what were merely skirmishes will blossom into full-fledged battle. The New York delegation has already told our Congressmen that we expect every one of them to be in Washington tomorrow to vote against any change in the rules, and for them to be in Washington Monday, January 23, to vote for FEPC. We reaffirm that position here tonight. We shall reaffirm that position next election day should any member of the New York delegation fail to vote against the rules change and fail to vote for FEPC. The New York delegation in Washington helped weld together the forces of the fifty-some-odd organizations who sponsored the mobilization and who are dedicated, as we are, to that fundamental principle that civil rights in the United States for the Negroes, the Puerto Ricans, the Jewish, Catholic, Protestant, and other minority peoples must be matched by civil rights for everyone, everywhere in the world. We did not appease and we did not compromise with those who would qualify on the subject of civil rights.

The mobilization did not pass any resolutions because we did not come to Washington to write words—we came to Washington to write history. We did not speak from the floor to one another at the mobilization, but we went up to the Hill to speak to our congressional leaders and to make them fully responsible for the fulfillment of the President's civil-rights program.

Our mobilization spoke to the colonial peoples; spoke to the people behind the iron curtain; spoke to every man who has been turned away from a job because of race or religion or color; spoke to the student who is forbidden to enter a college or a university or a school because of race, color, or religion; we spoke to these people and to others and we told them that those of us who believe in civil rights and who will fight for civil rights have not forsaken them. We do not offer them demagogy; we do not offer them chauvinistic appeals, but we do offer them the handshake of friendship and the resolute determination of free men and women in fighting our battles in a democratic manner without fear and without compromise. It was with that spirit that the New York delegation went up on the Hill. We did not go meekly, but we went with determined spirit to get FEPC and civil rights passed, once and for all, and we will not relax in our determination.

In closing, I want to reiterate that the fight which we waged in but a few brief days was accomplished because it was led, not by those who have made civil rights a crusade for their own political party but because it was led by men and women, both young and old, both Negro and white, who have faith in democratic principles, and will never surrender to the racial bigots on the right or the political bigots on the extreme reactionary left.

Let it be clearly understood that the mobilization was not the property or the monopoly of any political party or any private organization, but was the collective efforts of all the ingredients that go to make democracy. It was a mobilization for human rights, and we in the New York delegation were proud to be part of that fight.

Ninety Percent of Parity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Farm Bureau is probably the largest organization of farmers in the United States. In Iowa there is a Farm Bureau organization, and an active one, in every county. Recently the Farm Bureau members of Lucas County, Iowa, met at an annual county meeting and on this occasion adopted a set of resolutions setting forth the position of the members of this county with respect to National and State issues.

I ask consent to extend my remarks and include the resolutions so that all Members of Congress may know the attitude of these progressive and leading farmers with respect to national issues and problems. The resolutions are as follows:

LUCAS COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS

NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

I. We believe there should be some type of price-support program and we favor 90 percent of parity with parity being adjusted in line with a 10-year moving average.

II. We believe that it is necessary to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

III. We believe it is important to keep control at a minimum.

IV. We believe a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interest of farmers.

V. We believe food and wages should be on a comparable ratio.

VI. We do not favor having the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon the direct appropriations from Congress.

VII. We favor the use of compensatory payments in support of perishables. (Nonstorable commodities.)

VIII. We favor satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices to be eligible for price support.

IX. We do not favor abandoning the parity concept for the income-support standard plan.

X. We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan.

XI. We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals.

XII. We favor more Federal aid for medical research.

XIII. We believe we should revise our health programs and adopt a county health unit program in Iowa.

XIV. We favor increasing Federal aid for training facilities for doctors.

XV. We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principles of free delivery become an actuality to all rural families.

XVI. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

STATE RESOLUTIONS

I. We favor increasing the State aid up to 50 percent of the total cost of operating the schools on the need basis for the continuation of a better educational program for the benefit of the children of Iowa.

II. We recommend for your consideration the replacement of the present wool-purchase program by a "nonrecourse loan" or a "guaranteed advance."

COUNTY RESOLUTION

We believe that there are many miles of Lucas County roads that could be and should be annulled so that the money spent on these roads could be spent on unimproved roads that would accommodate many more families and get them out of this mud.

FARM BUREAU RESOLUTION

We favor the farm bureau continuing the high level of emphasis on the legislative and educational programs and increase emphasis on the service for member program.

Who Is Responsible?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an article entitled "Who Is Responsible?" from the January issue of the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees Railway Journal. This article will bring serious reflection to all those interested in railway safety.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE?—A SPEEDING STREAMLINER, ROARING THROUGH THE NIGHT, LEAVES THE RAILS, THERE IS A CRASH AND DEATH VISITS WORKERS SLEEPING IN DILAPIDATED BOXCARS

On November 1, 1949, the Interstate Commerce Commission released their report on the investigation of the accident on the Cincinnati, New Orleans & Texas Pacific Railway which occurred near Graysville, Tenn., on September 9, 1949. In determining the cause, the Commission stated: "It is found that the accident was caused by a broken wheel."

Examination of the track structure revealed occasional nicks in the rail head throughout a distance of 11.5 miles. Inspection was made at Oakdale, 40.7 miles north of Graysville, and no indication of defective equipment was found. The train (second No. 53) was traveling approximately 50 miles per hour when the rear truck of the forty-fourth car was derailed. A short time later a general derailment occurred which literally demolished three of the extra-gang outfit cars standing on the spur track south of the station.

KILLED WHILE SLEEPING

A broken wheel on a car in transit in the majority of cases results in a derailment; but when it involves the death of a maintenance-of-way employee, sleeping in his outfit car, more than our curiosity should be aroused.

It was 3:04 a. m. and the extra gang workers were asleep when cars of the southbound train tore into the sides of their outfit cars. One would not have to be an eyewitness to the crash to imagine the wild confusion among those who were shaken by the terrific impact which ripped the ramshackle cars apart. Nerves of steel could not withstand the shock. Still in the cause of railroad progress thousands of workers have traveled and slept in such pitiful accommodations, all because the problem of human relations is assumed to be an equation not to be solved.

Management has always argued that the employees must get a good night's rest in order to perform their duties efficiently. We ask how this is possible when the records reveal several instances where outfit cars were reduced to rubble while the employees were sleeping. This occurred on the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway in June 1947 and again on September 9, 1949, at Graysville, Tenn.

Must every chapter of railroad progress be written with the blood of an employee who, through the negligence of others, becomes a martyr? Railroad workers are drilled in the theory "safety is of the first importance in the discharge of duty"; but if the employee is no longer on duty, is his care left in the hands of the Creator? The employee killed in the accident was just an extra gang laborer, but he was also a human being, and his death was unnecessary.

NEGLECT OF DUTY

We are unable to predict the intentions of the Southern Railway to remove all wooden under-frame cars from service in the maintenance of way department, but the incident should serve as an inspiration toward that end. What occurred at Graysville cannot be termed an unavoidable accident, or act of God—it must be written in the records as neglect of duty.

It cannot be denied that the railroads have made great strides in their modernization programs and huge sums have been spent for new equipment. The expenditures for such rolling stock was of necessity, but in the end the revenues realized cushioned the initial cost. There is quite a contrast to the picture involving the welfare of the employees. Many roads are still clinging to the practice of permitting the penny to hide the dollar of efficiency in promoting the welfare of the employees. Every request for a wage increase or improved working conditions has been met with vigorous opposition by the carriers. Human relations is an unproven theory and safety has definite boundary lines.

Volumes could be written of the efforts made by the representatives of the employees to obtain safe and suitable outfit cars. In practically every case management argued the cost first and then bolstered their arguments to prolong the issue of the impractical problem with which they were faced but unable to define.

In February 1947 the War Assets Administration offered for sale 871 special troop-sleeping cars at $2,880 each which were built by the Pullman Standard Car Manufacturing Co. There was also another type steel sleeper offered for sale at $3,780 each, as well as several hundred kitchen cars for $3,240. Every effort was made by our general chairmen to induce their management to purchase some of these cars for maintenance-of-way service, but only a few of the railroad companies saw fit to do so.

COSTLY LESSONS

It is not our intention to criticize the policy of any carrier but the managerial prerogative has in many cases been exercised to the detriment of the employee. Outfit cars with wooden center sills do not harmonize with Diesel locomotives and steel gondolas on roads with a streamline design. At Graysville, one maintenance-of-way employee was killed and two injured. There is one consolidation, three of the boxcar booby traps were damaged to the extent that they cannot again be placed in service. Experience is a dear teacher and the railroads evidently wish to learn the hard way.

Veterans Ladies' Auxiliary on Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following letter received from Ladies' Auxiliary, Veterans of Foreign Wars of United States, Sergeant Harold O. Young Post, No. 2394, of Melrose, Mass.:

LADIES' AUXILIARY, VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF UNITED STATES,
SERGEANT HAROLD O. YOUNG POST, NO. 2394,
Melrose, Mass., January 20, 1950.

Congressman ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Whereas the American veteran in two world wars has defended the American free-enterprise system which has made possible the development in this country of the highest standards of medical care and the finest medical institutions attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas, having experienced the shortcomings of impersonal, assembly-line medical care inherent in the form of Government-controlled medicine necessary in time of war, the veteran understands the dangers of imposing such a system permanently on the entire population; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would impose an unjust tax on the veteran's pay check for medical care to which he is now entitled free of charge as a reward for his service to his country; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance would force a tax of 3 percent on the income of the employed veteran, rising to a tax of at least 6 percent within a few years, creating new financial burdens which would increase the costs of necessities of life and lower the standard of living for veterans and other citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Ladies' Auxiliary to Sergeant Harold O. Young Post, No. 2394, Veterans of Foreign Wars, does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

Respectfully yours,
MARY E. CONLEY, *President.*
EVELYN MACMONAGLE,
Secretary.

Elimination of Expensive Combination Loans to Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a memorandum in opposition to the so-called combination loans to veterans. The memorandum

was prepared by Mr. Omar Ketchum, director of national legislative service of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The elimination of combination loans (Sec. 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944) has been recognized by Congress as imperative. The Administrator of FHA should coordinate his administrative procedures with the intent of Congress, as recently set forth in the housing legislation of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

MEMORANDUM BRIEF IN OPPOSITION TO FURTHER COMMITMENTS BY FHA AND VA OF GI HOME LOANS UNDER SECTION 505 (A) OF THE GI BILL OF RIGHTS

I. STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLE

A great injustice was perpetrated against the veteran on June 22, 1944, when section 505 (a) of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944 (GI bill of rights) was enacted into law along with an otherwise highly commendable and monumental piece of legislation. This particular section was inspired by well-meaning legislators who visualized it as a proper vehicle through which the efforts of veterans to purchase homes would be greatly facilitated.

In view of the Congressional intent for elimination of this uneconomical and burdensome section 505 (a) loan, as evidenced by provisions for such elimination in S. 2246 approved by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, and H. R. 6070 approved by the House of Representatives; and further in view of the fact that in actual practice the operation of this section has been most unfortunate and costly to the veteran, further commitments by the FHA and VA involving its continued application should and ought to cease for the reasons herein set forth.

II. THE SECTION 505 (A) LOAN

Section 505 (a) of the GI bill of rights authorized the Veterans Administration to approve a second loan (actually a second mortgage) by a veteran to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost of a home, or a part thereof, where the principal loan (first mortgage) had been approved by the Federal Housing Administration.

III. HOW THE SECTION 505 (A) LOAN PREJUDICES THE VETERAN

(a) *It causes him to pay a higher interest rate for his loan*

The FHA-insured first mortgage carried an interest rate of 4½ percent plus an insurance premium of one-half of 1 percent or an effective interest rate of 5 percent. Lenders, logically, sought to insure the greater portion of the loan under FHA leaving the minimum for the VA guaranty, the interest rate for which was fixed by law at 4 percent. The exercise of the section 505 (a) loan therefore resulted in an increased interest rate to the veteran of approximately 0.8 percent over the straight GI loan of 4 percent.

(b) *It causes him to pay more in brokerage fees and other charges*

FHA-insured loans—remember, this is the greater portion of the veteran's loan—permitted certain brokerage and other charges which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration.

(c) *It causes him to pay more in financing costs*

The section 505 (a) FHA-VA combination loan involving two mortgages results in double recording and notarial fees, title policies, and of course double appraisals.

(d) *It causes him to lose part of his $160 gratuity payment from the VA*

On an FHA-VA combination loan for the purchase of an $8,000 home, the VA guaranteed portion cannot exceed 20 percent of the total, or $1,600. Under the GI bill of rights, the VA makes a gratuity payment amounting to 4 percent of this, or $64, which is applied to payment on the loan. However, on a straight VA guaranteed loan for the full $8,000, the guaranteed portion is $4,000, and the gratuity payment is $160. Thus, the veteran loses $96 right at the start on the section 505 (a) FHA-VA combination loan.

IV. HOW HAS THE CONGRESS MET THE CHALLENGE OF THE SECTION 505 (A) LOAN?

On August 22, 1949, the House Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the bill, H. R. 6070, providing among other things for the elimination of the section 505 (a) loan. In its report to the House (H. Rept. No. 1295, p. 8), the committee stated:

"This existing authority for an FHA-insured first mortgage at 4½ percent interest plus the insurance premium, in combination with a VA-insured second mortgage at 4 percent results in an increase in the interest a veteran pays in excess of that provided for in the GI bill."

The House passed H. R. 6070 on August 25, 1949, including the provision to eliminate the section 505 (a) loan.

On August 11, 1949, the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency reported favorably the bill, S. 2246 (companion bill to H. R. 6070), and in its report to the Senate (S. Rept. No. 892, pp. 52–53), the committee stated:

"Your subcommittee has found that the present second-mortgage type of home-purchase plan raises financing costs to the veteran at least 10 percent above the costs of a 'straight' 4 percent first-mortgage GI loan. This is true because of the higher rate of interest (4½ percent) and insurance premium (one-half of 1 percent) charged for the underlying FHA-insured first mortgage, because of duplication of costs and because of brokerage and other charges permitted on FHA-insured loans which are not allowable on GI loans guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration. All of the veterans groups which gave testimony on the bill concurred in the desirability of eliminating this burdensome form of financing for veterans."

The bill, S. 2246, is on the Senate Calendar scheduled for consideration by the Senate upon the reconvening of the Congress in January 1950.

On October 25, 1949, Public Law 387, Eighty-first Congress, was enacted which extended FHA and FNMA authorization; and in addition provided an unlimited secondary market in FNMA for all GI section 501 loans where the original principal amount does not exceed $10,000 per dwelling unit. This, of course, should enhance the opportunities of veterans seeking a straight GI loan without the onerous aspects of the combination loan.

V. THE FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION AND THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATOR SHOULD HEED THIS INTENT OF THE CONGRESS AND DECLINE TO ACCEPT FURTHER APPLICATIONS FOR SECTION 505 (A) LOANS

There is ample precedent for the Administrators to refuse to process further applications for combination FHA-VA loans.

The basic authority for the section 505 (a) loan (Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended) reposed discretion in both the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and by indirection the Administrator of the Federal Housing Administration as to the approval and processing of such loans. Such discretion is evident from the language used by the Congress in providing the basic authority:

"SEC. 505 (a) In any case wherein a principal loan, for any of the purposes stated in section 501, 502, or 503, is approved by a Federal agency to be made or guaranteed or insured by it pursuant to applicable law and regulations, and the veteran is in need of a second loan to cover the remainder of the purchase price or cost, or a part thereof, the Administrator, subject otherwise to the provisions of this title, may guarantee the full amount of the second loan: *Provided*, That such second loan shall not exceed 20 percent of the purchase price or cost: *And provided further*, That regulations to be promulgated jointly by the Administrator and the head of such agency may provide for servicing of both loans by such agency * * *."

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation recently announced that it would not approve further requests for loans to the Lustron Corp. despite the authority contained in existing law for such loans. The RFC was prompted in its decision by repeated statements made by Members of the Congress on the floor of the House of Representatives and before the House Banking and Currency Committee during the first session, Eighty-first Congress, evidencing an intention to inquire into the need for and the propriety of such loans. The RFC thereupon announced that it would heed the intent of the Congress in this respect, and refrain from exercising its discretion until the Congress noted a change in intent in this regard.

Regardless of this or any other precedent, the authority of an official of the executive branch to refrain from exercising a discretionary authority, even when the exercise itself is discretionary, is fundamental in our legal system. The Supreme Court of the United States has reiterated this doctrine repeatedly in denying petitions for writs of mandamus compelling an official of the executive branch to exercise a discretionary authority (55 Corpus Juris Secundum 220 and cases cited).

As there is no question as to the authority of the administrators to cease processing further applications for section 505 (a) loans, there remains but the decision and will of the administrators to so do. This, we submit, for the reasons set forth above, should and ought to be resolved in favor of the veteran home buyer; and we therefore urge that the Federal Housing Administrator and the Veterans' Administrator deny further applications from lenders for approval of section 505 (a) loans.

Respectfully submitted.

OMAR B. KETCHUM, *Director,*
National Legislative Service, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States.

Where Are We Headed and What Is It Costing Us?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I had the opportunity to visit with my constituents in each of the 12 counties of the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa. They expressed grave concern over the high cost of government and almost everyone asked the same two questions: "Where are we headed in government?" and "What is it costing us?"

So that my constituents might have the facts regarding their share in the cost of government, I have prepared the following itemized statement showing the share of each individual county in the Eighth Congressional District of Iowa of the $42,439,000,000 spending budget proposed by President Truman for 1951. I also set out the cost of the national debt to each county of my district. The President estimates that the national debt will be $263,800,000,000 at the end of the fiscal year 1951. The cost to the counties of the spending budget is based on 1948 consumer income figures and the cost of the national debt to the counties is based on population estimates as of January 1, 1949, and per capita debt of $1,759. The following figures will give my constituents some idea as to their share in the cost of government under the Truman administration this year. It should also throw some light on their question of "Where are we headed in government?"

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,439,000,000	Share of Federal debt of $263,800,000,000 at end of fiscal 1951
Buena Vista	$4,734,000	$39,401,600
Clay	4,693,800	31,837,900
Cherokee	4,526,100	39,401,600
Dickinson	2,796,100	19,876,700
Ida	2,595,000	17,765,900
Lyon	3,258,800	26,033,200
O'Brien	4,801,000	31,486,100
Osceola	2,326,800	18,645,400
Plymouth	4,371,900	39,753,400
Sac	4,056,700	30,782,500
Sioux	4,620,000	48,020,700
Woodbury	37,006,900	184,870,900
Total	79,787,100	527,875,900

Substitute for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has offered a substitute for the administration's FEPC proposal which should appeal to all those who feel that in these desperate days in world affairs we should do all we can to create good will among our people. My colleague believes that the use of force by the Government between the employer and employee will not work. I agree with him in his fears.

In his approach to this difficult problem, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. HAYS] has proposed that we rely upon conciliation and mediation as the method for achieving worthy objectives in employment. This proposal has been widely discussed and has attracted much favorable comment. As an example, I wish to call the attention of Members of the House to a syndicated column written by the distinguished newspaperman, Marquis Childs, which appeared in the Washington Post of Saturday, January 21. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from Mr. Childs' column:

The all-out adherents of the administration's fair-employment-practices law will, of course, denounce the substitute put forward by Representative BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas as milk and water. HAYS does not provide powers of punishment to be directed by the Federal Government against those who discriminate for reasons of race, color or creed in hiring and firing.

The Hays substitute would set up a Minorities Employment Bureau in the Department of Labor. This bureau would be authorized to set up local, State and regional advisory councils to aid in carrying out a policy of nondiscrimination.

In other words, the reliance would be on education and persuasion. Any fair-minded person must admit to doubt as to whether prejudice can be legislated away by punitive powers exercised by the long arm of the Federal Government. On the other hand, we have let this matter of prejudice fester for a long time and the process of education is slow. One of the chief arguments for the administration measure is that without a stick behind the door there will be no progress.

Eleven States now have fair-employment-practice laws of one kind or another. As has been aptly said, the States are laboratories for testing legislation. It would seem to me that a wise preliminary move would be to canvass carefully the results that have been achieved. From what I have been able to learn, those States that have the power to punish employers have not used the punitive provisions.

Why is that so? Has any substantial progress been made in breaking down prejudice in employment? The answers to these and a number of related questions should be helpful to Congress.

Representative HAYS also has a substitute antilynching bill. It provides that where both the community and the State fail to take action when a lynching has occurred, Federal officials may go before a Federal judge and argue that the State has failed in its duty. If the judge finds this is true, then the Federal Government would take jurisdiction with authority to apprehend and try the lynchers.

It seems to me that these are both valid compromises that an honest man could vote for without any suspicion of evasion or face-saving. They both recognize that the power of law is limited, a lesson this country should have learned through the tragic experiment of prohibition when alcohol was presumably legislated out of existence.

The Real Issue This Fall

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NOAH M. MASON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the battle is on. The issues are drawn. Union bosses are using their power to tax union members in order to collect war chests for the 1950 congressional elections. They state they propose to defeat labor's foes and elect labor's friends. That slogan sounds good, but when analyzed it simply means: Defeat any Congressman—no matter what his record—if he voted for the Taft-Hartley bill, and elect anyone—no matter what his qualifications—if he will promise to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Speaker, the scarcest thing in Congress today is not brains, it is courage, grit, backbone, intestinal fortitude, guts. And if the powers that be have their way—and by powers that be, I mean the leaders of organized labor—courage in Congress will be more scarce after the 1950 election. Make no mistake about it, that is the issue this fall.

This issue has been so well expressed by Samuel J. Kornhauser, of the Cleveland bar, in connection with the campaign of misrepresentation against Senator TAFT, that I include his article as a part of my remarks:

WHY LABOR LEADERS ASSAIL SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT

(By Samuel J. Kornhauser, of the Cleveland bar)

The struggle to unseat Senator TAFT, already moving toward its climax a year hence is no ordinary election campaign. On its result may hinge the future course of America.

The captains and kings of union labor are amassing resources and mustering their forces, the tumult and the shouting are in full cry. Men whose vision is not blurred by passion and prejudice, nor perverted by inordinate ambition, see in this savage onset a portent of disaster to our country. During more than 2 years much has been said and written for and against the Taft-Hartley Act, yet there is reason to doubt that the general public has an adequate understanding of the inherent implications of the issue raised, and particularly of the underlying motives which give rise to this strenuous opposition to Senator TAFT.

What, then, is it that has evoked the frantic ejaculations of these captains and kings of union labor? What is there in this law to justify the charge that it creates slave labor? What is there about Senator TAFT which should lead anyone to stoop to such slanderous epithets and innuendoes as have been hurled at him from places high and low?

TAFT-HARTLEY LAW

In the 2 years which have elapsed since the Taft-Hartley law became effective, not a single instance can be found of loss by workingmen of any right or privilege, designed for their well-being, which they previously enjoyed. Not only is freedom of organization, and protection against employer coercion, left unimpaired, not only is collective bargaining fully maintained, but they are in fact strengthened by the new legislation.

Even the prohibition of the closed shop did not remove the obnoxious practice which that term signifies, for the union shop may continue to exist under this law; and the difference between a closed shop and a union shop is merely the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee.

Employees, by resort to the union-shop indulgence, may, if they choose, still compel their employer to retain only union members in his service. This subterfuge makes union membership the price which a man must pay in order to hold his job. Further, the check-off, that is, collection of union dues and assessments by the employer through compulsory deductions from wages, which are paid over to the union officials—that invaluable contrivance by which union income is made secure—has remained without substantial alteration, and without lessening the grip of union leaders on the members.

THAT OATH

Then, take all the sound and fury because of the anti-Communist oath required of union officials. How is the workingman injured because his union leaders are called

upon to swear that they are not engaged in treason against the United States? A man elected President must take an oath to protect and defend the Constitution before he can serve in the office. Congressmen, judges, indeed all important public officials take a similar oath. Almost everywhere, directors of corporations qualify by swearing fealty to the Constitution of the United States, and to that of the State in which they perform their duties. An immigrant, to become a naturalized citizen, must forswear allegiance to any foreign government or potentate, and make oath to support our Constitution. Why, then, should any decent citizen complain when asked to manifest by solemn affirmation that he is not allied with Soviet Russia, nor with any persons whatever bent on overthrowing our Government by force or other unconstitutional or unlawful means?

UNTENABLE ASSERTION

Moreover, during more than 2 years under the Taft-Hartley law union membership has increased, wages have been substantially advanced, and there has been no bar to strikes, which have occurred as usual whenever union leaders willed to call men out. Indeed, no conscientious labor leader has yet asserted that the workingman has in any respect suffered privation because of this law. And the outcry against it does not come from the wage earners themselves who are unable to see any difference in their status and opportunities since its enactment.

Recently Mr. Carey, national CIO secretary, subjected himself on the Meet the Press radio program to the incisive questioning of several well-informed, unhampered journalists. Mr. Carey was too honest to defend his opposition to the Taft-Hartley Act and to Senator TAFT by the usual claptrap about "slave labor" and hostility to wage earners. When cornered by persistent questioners, the only excuse he could give for advocating repeal of the law and defeat of Senator TAFT was that this legislation had "made it more difficult to organize labor in the South"—not generally, mind you, but only in the South. And though he was obliged to acknowledge that during the past 2 years union membership had increased even in the South, all efforts to elicit further comment and explanation brought forth nothing except constant reiteration of his original sterile answer. His inability to present even a vestige of tenable ground for his hostility to the law and the Senator made his performance a significant manifestation of the infirmity of the union position.

TRIBUTE TO TAFT

As to Senator TAFT, himself, it is acknowledged by unbiased men of all parties and interests, who know his facts, and are free to express them, that intellectually he has no superior, perhaps no equal, in the Senate, and that his character, courage, and patriotism rise to exalted heights. When Mr. Carey was asked if he believed that only Congressmen who supported the views and demands of labor unions should be elected, he quickly conceded that all shades of public opinion should be represented in the National Legislature. But when pressed to explain why, under that theory, the widely held opinions which Senator TAFT espouses should be deprived of his able voice in the Senate, Mr. Carey was entirely at a loss for an answer. He remained mute, and his silence was an abject confession that the ostensible objections to the Taft-Hartley law and to the Senator are a mere pretext.

THE REAL REASON

What, then, is the real reason for the frenzied resistance of Green, Murray, Lewis, and their collaborators to this law and its sponsor? They know well that the workingman has not been shorn of any legitimate privilege. The fact is that their envenomed attacks burst forth not because something was taken from union members, but because something of inestimable value to the rank and file was bestowed by the first steps taken to secure genuine self-government in labor unions.

These intrenched labor lords see in this law a serious threat to their continued autocratic domination. Though, in effect, the act does not presently reduce their vast power, they fear, and not without ample reason, that if the Taft-Hartley law remains, further legislation will surely follow which will thoroughly break their grip. There is your underlying reason.

DEMOCRATIZING LABOR

The act goes but a short way toward democratizing labor organizations; but it is an entering wedge aimed at arbitrary dominion. It recognizes the principle that workingmen shall not be subjected to restraint and coercion from any source, neither from those who head industry, nor those who head labor. But what has most aroused the fear, and consequent hatred, of the labor lords is that section of the law by which it is sought to bring the internal operation of labor unions into the light. In this they see, as well they may, the greatest threat to their excessive power.

Here again, the law makes only a moderate and insufficient advance. Unions are required to file copies of their constitution and bylaws, to report the names, compensation and allowances of their three principal officers, the manner in which they were elected or appointed, the amount of initiation fees and dues levied, the qualifications and restrictions as to membership, the procedure relating to elections, assessments, imposition of fines, authorization of strikes, audits of financial accounts, and expulsion of members. Finally, they are compelled to file annual accounts of receipts, expenditures, assets and liabilities, and also furnish them to the members.

WHY THE ANGER?

Now, in all this there is nothing which should cause any untainted labor leader to fly into a rage. If their affairs are honestly and properly conceived and conducted, there is nothing to hide. Corporations are required to submit similar data, and more, and their stockholders are provided by law with ample means to make their will effective. But it is not these publicity provisions which in and of themselves disturb the labor leaders so greatly, for they impose relatively little restraint and, such as they are, can be easily evaded. What engenders their animosity is the realization that if this law stands it will be expanded until the hidden practices by which their arbitrary rule is maintained will be completely exposed to the view of the union membership and the public, and they well know that if this occurs they will be ousted.

If union members were supplied with indubitable proof that they were being victimized by their own officers, that they were being beguiled by crafty manipulations, pretense, and chicanery to elect chosen serving men of their leaders as officers and delegates; if they were shown the graft by which the insiders feather their nests, and the collusion between unscrupulous unionists and equally unscrupulous employers by which the loot is divided between them; if they were made safe against violence to themselves, their homes, their wives and children, so that they became free to speak and vote as they pleased, how long would they leave the Greens and Murrays and Lewises in the seats of the mighty? And a man like Carey could speak frankly and be unashamed.

REIGN OF TERROR

We talk glibly about labor being for this and labor being against that, when in point of fact it is the labor leaders, who, having herded the men under their sway, originate policies and make decisions, first and foremost to maintain power and profit for themselves. It is these labor lords, and not the great body of robust, right-minded American workmen, who inspired this crusade against Senator TAFT, and they resort to every available expedient to defeat him. It is their purpose to strike terror into the heart of every public official, to establish that no matter how honest, well-meaning and salutary the views and efforts of a man in office, or seeking office, may be, if he is against labor-union autocracy, he will be marked for inescapable slaughter.

And that is precisely what will happen if Senator TAFT becomes the victim of labor-leader vengeance. There is nothing in the law which bears his name which interferes with the legitimate functions of the honest union official; it strikes only at the guilty who, in turn, have selected him for conspicuous immolation to serve as a horrible example.

THE ISSUE

Exploitation and extortion are no less obnoxious whether they emanate from industrial barons or labor-union chiefs. It became necessary, in due course, to curb the unbridled power of captains of industry; now, it is equally imperative that arbitrary control by labor leaders, which is at once a menace to workingmen, to the public in general, and to American institutions shall be conclusively ended. Those institutions will perish unless we demolish the separate dominion in our midst which we have allowed to grow up and become formidable.

The election of Senator TAFT involves an issue which is not confined to the people of Ohio; it is a vital concern of the whole American people. So far as Senator TAFT, himself, is concerned, 25 years from now, it will matter little whether or not he retained his seat in the 1950 election. But for the babes of today who will then be men and women aspiring to rear families and to gain the satisfactions of a good life, for them it will be of the utmost importance what kind of America they inherit.

He's Fed Up With Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include two letters to the editor of the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune of Indianola, Iowa.

HE'S FED UP WITH DISPLACED PERSONS

FARMER NEAR SWAN WRITES ABOUT HIS EXPERIENCES

EDITOR'S NOTE.—Several weeks ago the Record-Herald and Indianola Tribune was informed by Mrs. W. B. Schooler, our correspondent at Hartford, about a young married couple from a displaced-persons camp in Europe who had come to make their home with Mr. and Mrs. C. E. Hunt on a farm near Swan.

Before a reporter and photographer could find time to go to Swan to interview Mr. Hunt and his newly acquired farm laborers, it was learned that Mr. Hunt was not too well satisfied with the arrangement. Recently, after the couple had left his farm, Mr. Hunt

wrote a letter telling of his experiences with displaced persons.

The letter follows:

FERNDALE FARM,
C. E. HUNT & SONS,
Swan, Iowa.

DEAR FRIEND DON: I am sending you my experience with a married couple from a DP camp in Europe. You may publish it.

Last February, I wrote the C. W. S. (Church World Service) at New York City giving my assurance and asking for a farm or country boy of 16 to 18 years of Protestant faith willing to come to an Iowa farm, willing to work and live with us as a member of our family. That it was our wish and intention as soon as he was capable, for him to rent the farm. Until such a time, we expected to furnish every requirement the same as a son. I guess I wanted and expected a Sam Bober. C. W. S. thanked us for our assurance.

The first of July we received a letter from a young woman of 24 and a newly acquired husband, 25, telling us they had signed our assurance. They were in Battic DP camp, United States zone, Augsburg, Germany, where they had been for 4 years. Frankly, we thought our prayers had been answered. They arrived here October 2, when the oaks and maples were at their best, the weather perfect, and with Iowa's wonderful crop everywhere. We welcomed them with open arms. A fine chicken dinner with everything to ice cream and angel food cake. They had cost me $115. We never got one "thank you" nor heard a single word of gratitude for America in all the 3 weeks they were with us. They spoke Russian when together, yet they could write and read American and she could speak it very well.

WOULD BUILD HOME

We extended the same proposition to these folks, to live with us 1 year, board free, that I would build a new home for them next summer and I expected them to work out the $115. Beginning January 1, they were to start sharing the income of the farm, one-fourth of calves, we had 25 females, one-fourth of pigs, one-fourth of crops off the farm, less one-fourth of seed and gasoline, I to furnish everything. Also they were to have half the cream after groceries were bought. We expected to work along with them for at least 1 year.

The first week they could do very little since they were not farm folks and had not lived in the country. The second week we got some services, but we had discovered they had no intention whatever of becoming farmers and signed our assurance only to get to America. The third week we got very little work from them. They had become so disagreeable, insulting, even to calling me a liar when I told them I had paid $30 for their baggage and living from New York. They were large, robust and did not look like they had been hungry in their lives nor had seen a hardship. He was 6 foot 2 inches and weighed about 185. They complained of farm work, that it was ruining their health and that they would not do such work—and believe me they did very little. We always had to call them to get up; and several mornings she lay in bed while my wife prepared breakfast. They had good clothes. Her dresses were of velvet and several of them woolen. She had five pairs of good shoes that we saw, a new blue raincoat, sweaters, and so forth. They told me they had no money except $4 of the $30 I sent to C. W. S. for them, yet I am told they cashed an $80 postal money order the day they left, which was just 3 weeks after coming.

REGRETS GIVING ASSURANCE

America does not want such people and I shall regret to my dying day that I gave an assurance. That was used only as a means to get to America. They had lived some 4 years in this displaced-persons camp provided by the generosity of America, three square meals every day, a bed at night, with no cost and very little work required. They, like many others, were fed up on "Rich America." They expected big wages, short hours with no manual labor.

They told us they wanted $1.50 per hour or $150 per month with board, and that they would buy a fine American car in 90 days, the only thing they seemed to want. The more you give people, the more they want and expect. It destroys their backbone and leaves a wishbone. I am wondering when the United States is going to wake up to this fact.

Sincerely,

C. E. HUNT.

Mr. DON BERRY,
Indianola Tribune.

DEAR SIR: Just finished reading the letter account of the DP couple that the Mr. Hunt was so generous with and can't resist commenting.

We never know just why some folks are so generous to someone with a sad story from across the sea; no doubt they do have every intention of doing a very fine and noble deed.

Being the mother of a son who paid almost all for our right to keep this America a fine place to live with a 70-percent lifetime disability at Pearl Harbor, and a husband who earned a DSC in War I, having myself cared for four motherless boys besides my own family of seven during the war so their daddies could go into uniform, I can't understand why Mr. Hunt or any other Iowa farmer would seek someone needing aid across miles of ocean, when these same men who wore their shoes full of mud for days, went hungry, sick, gave up their families and homes so we here, yes, in Warren County, Iowa, we at home were safe and sound by these fine boys, the same boys, lots of them, have never had the chance offered them to get a start that was given this family from across that did nothing for us.

The past year I have been working in a large company in Des Moines that has taken in many of these DP's. I have never heard one yet say, how wonderful, how grand to live here. They complain how dirty, how hard, little pay, on and on, wish they were in Chicago, or back in New York, one told me he hoped to go back across in 2 years. Can't we find deserving folks in our own State? Yes; I think in our own Warren County.

MRS. ARTHUR CLARK,
Warren County Democratic Vice Chairman.

P. S.—This all brings to my mind a request of wartime for farmers to take Japanese into their farm homes and relieve their own sons to go to the front. We were asked to take such. Please don't ask for the terms of my answer. Soon after, I attended church. There sat an able-bodied Jap, who had come to live in a sonless family, while my son, along with many others just as fine, had gone to make it fine and grand for someone whose grandfathers surely had not been pioneers of this good old United States. A healthy by war free man, in the seat my son, as treasurer of that Sunday school, had given up to go to war.

Let's take care of our own first.

Our Departing Hat Shops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Boston Daily Record of January 23, 1950. Here is a succinct and cogent statement of what threatens New England jobs and New England prosperity and ought to give pause to those who favor reciprocal trade extension at least without the peril-point provision. The editorial follows:

OUR DEPARTING HAT SHOPS

It's no secret that bureaucrats have short memories, particularly when scant recollections are convenient for them, but hardly anybody expected them to forget the wrecking of the New England shoe industry so soon.

Before the war the so-called reciprocal trade treaties, which were reciprocal mainly in former Secretary Cordell Hull's imagination, exported the Lynn and Haverhill shoe business to Japan and Czechoslovakia and caused ruinous unemployment.

Later Japan waged war against us, using the dollars she piled up through our senseless generosity, and Czechoslovakia slipped behind the iron curtain, where she can scarcely be regarded as a boon companion for Uncle Sam.

Ignoring all this now, the bureaucrats in Washington are busily engaged in an even more nonsensical program calculated to set up various European countries in the hat-making business—at American expense, of course.

The United Hat, Cap, and Millinery Workers and other labor organizations are understandably incensed, since they don't relish the possibility of eating in bread lines while the British and other people are tasting the caviar of prosperity.

Maybe this latest exportation of New England jobs will stir our Senators and Congressmen, especially the ones who gave the reciprocal trade idiocy an extended lease on life.

But don't expect too much from them. It's your job that's threatened. Theirs are safe for a year at least.

Brinks Robbery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

ROBBERS AND RICHES—CRIME STORY OF LAST WEEK USED TO POINT MORAL OF WEALTH NO THIEF MAY TAKE AWAY

(By the Reverend Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., Litt. D.)

Audacious and cunning thieves are loose in the land. The entire Nation is aghast at a sensational robbery which, in the huge loot snatched and made away with, involves the greatest amount of currency ever to be thus bagged at one haul. A million and a half dollars is an immense amount to fall into the hands of desperate connivers who defy the laws of God and man. The alerted armed constabulary symbolizes the Nation's grim determination to track down robbers and other criminals and to enforce law and order. That network of detection suggests wealth that always is in danger of being filched from its rightful owners and appro-

priated by those whose twisted moral sense brands them as public enemies.

But there is another armed representative of We, the People, who ceaselessly paces to and fro at his marble post and who speaks of a national heritage whose opulence no scheming robber can molest. That lonely figure silhouetted against the storied stones of Arlington is not there to prevent thieves from confiscating the mammoth block of flawless marble or disturbing the last rest of a soldier known only to God. It was for visions that the unknown warrior fell, and upon such treasure can be put no mark of the dollar.

An astounding robbery such as has captured the headlines this past week brings to vivid remembrance wealth that is in no danger of being so confiscated. In the immortal Pilgrim's Progress, John Bunyan deals with deathless experience which the passing years never can outmode or outdate. There we come upon Mr. Little Faith, who was held up by highwaymen in Dead Man's Lane. Poor Mr. Little Faith. It seemed, as one looked at him, that the thieves had taken everything that they could get their hands on. As a matter of fact, they had. But the remarkable things about that hold-up was that when the victim recovered his senses and was able to investigate the extent of his loss he found that his assailants had taken only his spending money: "The place where his jewels were they never ransacked. So these he kept still." Highwaymen can do little to disturb the inner peace of a man like that, who finds his jewels still intact even though his spending money has been snatched from him. Not in our marts of trade nor in our guarded vaults are the symbols of our highest wealth.

In this Capital City, set on a high hill of hope in the gaze of the whole world, on Mount St. Alban's is the expanding and rising Cathedral of St. Peter and St. Paul.

St. Peter, who had heard uttered the Master's great word about riches that moths and rust and thieves cannot touch, long afterward in writing to the scattered and persecuted Christians spoke of the inheritance that is incorruptible and that fadeth not away. And St. Paul has a great word regarding that wealth not reachable by robbers' hands. Having suffered the loss of all things, he, too, wrote to an infant church. The letter was penned when he himself was a prisoner in Rome. Judged by all the commercial standards of Corinth, the members of that church were paupers. Their names were not in the Who's Who of the city. Yet it was to them that Paul wrote, "All things are yours." For, he assured them, in substance, you can claim the past with all its great names. They all belong to you. You can claim the world with all its entrancing beauty. You can claim life with all its unfolding and enlarging capacities. You can claim the present and transform even a cup of pain and loss into a chalice of victory. You own the future. You can even claim death, for it is but your servant to usher you into a glory that eyes cannot see or mind conceive.

That indeed is a great passage about riches and robbers.

In lilting verse the story is told of the robbers who came to rob a wealthy man. They picked the locks of his palace gate. They seized his jewels and gold and priceless ornaments. All this was taken by the robbers who came to rob him.

"But loud laughed he in the morning red,
For of what had the robbers robbed him?
They robbed him not of a golden shred.
Of the radiant dreams in his wise old head.
And they're welcome to all things else, he said,
When the robbers came to rob him."

The Late Gen. H. H. Arnold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a statement by Paul A. Johnson, of Denison, Iowa:

"The difficult, we do immediately, the impossible may take longer" was the motto that was above his desk in his Washington office. Those young men that flew to win a war for their country worshiped. Gen. "Hap" Arnold as much or more than they had their athletic coaches they had played under in school.

He remembered these fellows. They were individuals to him, not mere cogs in a war machine. When our son graduated at the Victorville school, General Arnold was there and presented the pilot's wings to the graduating class. Among the prized letters in the memory book we have of Bob is the letter sent us. It may have been one of the difficult things he felt had to be done, sending letters to the parents of those young men that gave their all. Reading this letter again we know why Bob thought he had a commander that could do the impossible.

Part of it was as follows: "It is with regret that I have learned of the untimely death of your son First Lt. Robert Allen Johnson on December 7 in an engagement in the North African theater of war operations. While a cadet in the Victorville Army Flying School he attained a fine record. As an officer he repeatedly demonstrated courage and trustworthy performance of duty winning the praise of his superior officers and the friendly respect of all who knew him well."

Written in the midst of his most busy and trying time, this letter did help some to soften the blow of knowing that our son would not return to us.

We will not forget General Arnold and his kind words.

Our Blunders in War Built Russia's Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Edward J. Meeman from the New York World-Telegram of January 21, 1950:

OUR BLUNDERS IN WAR BUILT RUSSIA'S POWER—ERRORS MADE SOVIET STRONG ENOUGH TO SWALLOW BALKANS AND CHINA

(By Edward J. Meeman)

When Hitler attacked his ally, Stalin, in 1941 the Scripps-Howard newspapers said editorially:

"When crooks fall out, justice is the gainer.

"It was the 'treaty of friendship' signed by those two bloodthirsty and power lustful dictators in the summer of 1939 which kindled the flames that swept across Poland, Finland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, France, and the Balkans, and subjected the British people to inhuman assault.

"It will be poetic and moral justice if Hitler and Stalin are now consumed in the conflagration of their own making.

"They are both enemies of our way of life. They have both maintained in this country fifth columns of agitators, propagandists and saboteurs, seeking to destroy the unity and security of the American people.

"These two dictatorships by force and terror have extended their conscienceless rule over hundreds of innocent people. The fact that they have fallen out over the loot before their conquests were completed is a great break for our friends of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and a great break for us.

"While our enemies, the Nazis and Communists, are fighting each other, let's redouble our efforts to produce guns and tanks and planes and bombs for the British—and redouble our efforts to make our own defenses impregnable."

That was a realistic appraisal of the situation.

But the makers of American foreign policy forgot realism. They forgot that Soviet Russia was our enemy and did not cease to be when Hitler attacked her.

So the result of our tremendous expenditure of men and resources was not victory. The result was simply to destroy one enemy and make the other stronger.

Hanson W. Baldwin, military editor of the New York Times, is writing a history of World War II. In preparation for it he is recounting "Our Worst Blunders in World War II," in articles in the Atlantic Monthly for January and February. He says:

"There is no doubt whatsoever that it would have been to the interest of Britain, the United States, and the world to have allowed—and indeed encouraged—the world's two great dictatorships to fight each other to a frazzle. Such a struggle, with its resultant weakening of both communism and nazism, could only have aided in the establishment of a more stable peace. It would have placed the democracies in supreme power in the world, instead of elevating one totalitarianism at the expense of another and of the democracies."

Out of the great misconception that Soviet Russia had become our friend grew many blunders.

Of these, Mr. Baldwin puts "unconditional surrender" first. He says:

"In the First World War Wilson took care to distingush between the Kaiser and militaristic Junker class and the German people. The opportunity of driving a wedge between rulers and ruled * * * was muffed by Roosevelt and Churchill. Unconditional surrender was an open invitation to unconditional resistance, it discouraged opposition to Hitler, probably lengthened the war, cost us lives, and led to the present abortive peace."

Another major blunder was in not invading Europe through the Balkans, rather than western Europe. Had our armies been in central Europe we would not have lost those lands to the Reds and found ourselves later pushed around in an isolated Berlin. Says Mr. Baldwin:

"Russia had to have our help; we did not to the same extent, require hers. * * * In retrospect, how stupid we were. A man being strangled to death struggles with all that's in him: Russia could not quit.

"In the same manner and for much the same reasons we reversed the policy we should have followed in the Pacific war. Instead of recognizing that Russia * * * would have to participate in that war if she was to serve her own interests, we 'bribed' her to enter it."

And so we invited Russia to start taking over China. We sacrificed the very thing

that caused us to send an ultimatum to Japan—the freedom and independence of China.

Yet some people still think Roosevelt and Truman led us to victory and peace.

Strikes in Potash Plants Threaten Massachusetts Farmers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following letter from the Massachusetts Farm Bureau Federation calling attention to a scarcity of potash available for Massachusetts farmers in fertilizer needed for the spring producing season by reason of pending strikes:

MASSACHUSETTS FARM
BUREAU FEDERATION, INC.,
Waltham, Mass., January 18, 1950.
Representative ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: All users of commercial fertilizer in Massachusetts are gravely threatened by the fact that we have almost no potash available for the spring producing season.

Potash is one of the three major ingredients of every commercial fertilizer. It is necessary for our pasture lands and vital to the growing of all fresh vegetables. The impairment of the quality and nutritional values of foods produced with a lack of potash can and will adversely affect public health. We cannot get potash because there are strikes which have been going on since November 19 in the three potash companies in Carlsbad, N. Mex., which produce practically all of the potash used in New England and 85 percent of all the potash consumed in the United States. These three plants operate on a 24-hour-day basis at the full capacity of their facilities. Every day that they have been on strike and every day that they continue to be on strike has lost for us forever that day's production and we need every bit of production that was possible for them to put out. If there is no other way to protect the American public, the Taft-Hartley Act must be invoked.

This is one of the most serious things that has come to my attention in a long time and I ask you to do everything in your power for the time is growing pitifully short.

Respectfully yours,
CARLETON I. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary.

China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting an editorial by William Green, president of the American Federation of Labor which appears in the January 1950 issue of the American Federationist which is the official monthly magazine of the American Federation of Labor.

I think it is most heartening that the leader of this important labor union, of which I am a member, should express himself so forcefully, so eloquently on a matter of such grave importance to our national security and to world peace. He makes it clear beyond the shadow of a doubt that, as a leader of the American Federation of Labor, he understands far better than does Mr. Truman the true nature of the Communist challenge. President Green is well aware of the threatening implications of the conquest of China by Stalin's Communist agents. I hope that my colleagues will ponder the full meaning of his words, bearing in mind that he speaks for many millions of the working men and women of our country. Our Department of State is supposed to provide leadership. It is their function to anticipate trouble rather than simply to act after the trouble has occurred. In this instance the trouble is hard upon us and still they are doing nothing. This editorial constitutes additional evidence that once again the people of America are way ahead of Mr. Truman and the State Department in understanding the great issue which confronts us.

CHINA

Stalin has carried out the plot against China which he initiated at Yalta. The concession which Stalin won at Yalta gave him Manchuria and a foothold in China. He has moved steadily and relentlessly ahead until now Communist troops control China with her 475,000,000 people. With possession of this heartland of Asia, Stalin can expand in any direction. His position is well-nigh impregnable. Formosa is still left—the key to attack on the Philippines, Japan, and our own west coast.

There were those who told us Chinese Communists were different from those of Moscow—that they were "agrarian reformers." But now we see their leader Mao responding to the call to Moscow and received with greatest ceremony. He is being integrated into Moscow control.

With immense territories in eastern Europe and in north and eastern Asia, Stalin has achieved what czars, Napoleon, and Alexander the Great dreamed of, as he moves toward world dominion. Wherever he rules he sets up a regime which is in exact contradiction of what we have called progress for the past 2,000 years. Individuals do not count. There is no freedom and no personal rights. Each must conform to the pattern which Stalin approves or go to concentration camps or a quicker road to death.

The people of China have been friends of the United States for many years. They have come to our schools, lived among us, worked with us to learn our way, but they have never come here as spies to get from us the means to injure and betray us. They are weary of wars that have wasted their land, their substance, and their people. Without modern arms, Chinese Nationalists were unequipped to meet Communist armies in combat. Communist armies, led by Stalin's agents and generals, now are in control of much of China and are poised for southeast Asia, which holds resources invaluable to our economy.

We face the issue of political recognition of this government by conquest or nonrecognition because we do not approve for moral reasons. We have had experience with appeasement and have learned that it eventually costs millions of lives. We have also refused to recognize other governments which failed to conform to our ideas of human justice and welfare.

There are at stake grave moral issues. Nationalist China was one of the five major world powers which underwrote the United Nations Charter. One of the purposes of that organization is "to develop friendly relations among nations based on respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples."

Can we honorably recognize a government set up by aggression instituted and led by the agents of a foreign government? Our last convention included in a program for action to help China the following: "Have our Government give all-out support to the Chinese delegation to the United Nations in its effort to have the United Nations investigate and pass judgment on the Russian role in (a) fostering and financing civil war in China against the legitimate government recognized as such until a few days ago by all nations including Russia itself, in (b) flagrantly flouting its solemn treaty obligations in China, and (c) deliberately endangering world peace."

The least that we can do for a great people—the Chinese people—is to refuse to recognize the government set up by Russian aggression and conquest.

The House Rules

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDNA F. KELLY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, by 53 votes, the House of Representatives defeated a reactionary proposal which, if passed, would have had the effect of choking the wishes of the majority. The resolution was an autocratic attempt to keep controversial issues from reaching a vote on the floor of the House of Representatives. It is incomprehensible that so many members voted in favor of this curbing resolution.

My vote, naturally, was against this attempt of the House Rules Committee, supported by many Republicans and southern Democrats, to restore its old power to pigeonhole legislation.

For many years, this method of bottling up legislation has been a major impediment of true democratic method. It was repealed in the first session of the Democratic Eighty-first Congress and was hailed as a major step in improvement of parliamentary processes. The attempt to return to the antiquated practice was repulsed by the Democratic Party.

It is to be fervently hoped that the House of Representatives will never return to this system which kept Representatives from performing their legislative duties in an unimpeded and democratic manner.

Oleo

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

OLEO'S MAJOR VICTORY

The Senate's overwhelming vote for repeal of Federal taxes on oleomargarine is a victory for the housewives of the country as well as for a long-oppressed industry. There is no way of knowing just how much influence the "housewives' revolt" had on the final vote in the upper House, but it must have been considerable. For the consumers of margarine who resented being forced to work yellow coloring into their oleo because of the punitive 10-cent tax on factory-colored margarine have become increasingly articulate in recent years.

The oleo forces included other resentful and powerful groups, too, not the least of which were the farmers whose cottonseeds and soybeans provided the oils from which the butter substitute is made. The oleo-butter fight long since had ceased to be a war between farmers (of the dairy variety) on the one hand and processors of animal fats on the other—as it was more than half a century ago when oleomargarine was compounded largely by packing-house byproducts. In recent years the fight found farmers ranged against farmers, with the vegetable-oil farmers rebelling against discriminatory taxes imposed on margarine for the protection of dairy farmers from competition.

First the House and now the Senate have recognized the unfairness of the restrictive Federal taxes on margarine and have, in effect, restored free competition to the field of butter and butter substitutes. There are minor differences to be adjusted between the House and Senate bills, but, in the main objective, they are alike. Withdrawal of Federal taxes does not mean that the fight for complete emancipation of oleo is entirely won, however. Sixteen of the States still outlaw the sale of yellow margarine, as compared with 32 States in 1901. Five States abolished yellow-margarine bans in 1948 and four more States lifted restrictions last year. The winning of the margarine fight in Congress no doubt will spur the campaign to remove all State restrictions of an unfair nature. That will be a happy day for all who believe in free competition between dairy and other farm products.

Final Chapter in American Treachery Against Wartime Ally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Sarasota Herald-Tribune of January 12, 1950:

WHERE IS AMERICA'S PRIDE?

Formosa, if Secretary of State Dean Acheson has his way, will go down in infamy as the final chapter in American treachery against our wartime ally, the Republic of China. Despite the death and suffering of thousands of Americans who fought for China during World War II, despite the millions of dollars supplied by our taxpayers, and despite the pledging of American support to the Chinese Government, the leftists in our State Department and other Government departments have succeeded in undermining Chiang Kai-shek and aiding the Communists in their conquest of the vast portion of the world's land and population that is China.

Those Sarasotans and other Americans who fought in China know that the Chiang government was far from perfect. But they also know how close Chiang came to unifying the war-lord-ruled provinces and of the valiant fight for year after year against the Japanese invaders. They know how supplies destined for China's defenders were diverted to the Communists by our State Department and General Stilwell, the American commander in Asia. They know that while our own pilots were dying to fly supplies over the Hump, while our soldiers were suffering disease and hardship to advise Chinese combat troops, the State Department was lauding the Communists as agrarian reformers and Stilwell was saying that he wished he could shoulder a rifle with the Communist troops.

The full story of America in China is a sordid one, despite the glorious chapters written by General Chennault and our other fighting men. It is a story that other governments which we seek to hold as allies are sure to read and study. They will learn that American and British leaders, without even consulting China, bargained away to Russia at the Yalta Conference huge areas of China's territory including Manchuria. They will read that to force Chiang to take Communists into his government, our leaders withheld ammunition for the guns we had furnished China as an ally.

Now, unless the arguments of the Joint Chiefs of Staff win President Truman's favor over those of dapper, appeasement-minded Secretary Acheson, the world will read that we are finally to desert Chiang and abandon the rich island of Formosa, because the Communists "might want to attack it." Perhaps the world will see a parallel to the case of Mihailivitch, of Yugoslavia, who was honored as a hero for a while in our Government propaganda, and then abandoned to execution by the Communist leader, Tito. With the record in view, can we expect the leaders of India, Indonesia, and other nations in the path of Communist world expansion, to align themselves with us? Can we expect them to take refuge from the Red firing squads behind our promises?

We should by now have learned from Munich, from Yalta, from Berlin, that appeasement is simply surrender by installments. We should have learned that our only victories in the cold war with Russia have been won when we stood our ground and displayed our force.

Formosa is a vital link in our defense lines from the Philippines and Okinawa to Japan. It lies a hundred miles off the China coast, readily defensible. It was liberated from the Japanese by American forces, and our legal position in defending it would be clear. The line must somewhere be drawn against the Communists in Asia. Our national honor and our security require that the west boundary of Formosa be on the American side of that line. If we clearly announce to the world that the American Navy and Air Force will prohibit passage of invasion troops across the Straits of Formosa, that warning will be respected.

Rather than casting aside Formosa and our allies of so many years, we should cast out the appeasers and the Communist sympathizers of our Government who are nullifying the victories won by the courage and sacrifices of our armed forces.

Iowa Newspaper Comments on Arizona's Fantastic Project

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the interest of other States in the water controversy between Arizona and California has been aroused by the discussions over the proposed Central Arizona project. The Mason City Globe-Gazette under date of January 2, 1950, has an editorial entitled "A Fantastic Project," which in my opinion is an appropriate title and designation of that project. The editorial reads as follows:

A FANTASTIC PROJECT

Two bills which will be before the next session of Congress will have slight favor if our Senators and Representatives take the time to examine their nature. One is S. 75, the other H. R. 934.

These companion measures would authorize an irrigation project in Arizona at an outlay out of Federal funds of at least $738,000,000, or a cost per acre of $1,858, 11 times the average of other western irrigation projects.

Nor is that the whole of the story.

The project would give to 420 large land owners benefits averaging $550,000 each. It would not open public land for entry and development by veterans and other worthy Americans.

Plans call for lifting water from the Colorado River a total height of 895 feet. Incidentally, it would deprive Californians of water to which they are entitled under existing Government contracts.

The proposal has every appearance of being a scheme for bringing enormous benefits to a few Arizona land owners at the expense of the Nation's taxpayers. The deal should be nipped in the bud.

State Department Hypocrisy or What?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Star of January 17, 1950:

HYPOCRISY OR WHAT?

Secretary of State Acheson must have a short memory. Either that or his recent

restatement of United States policy on China is a barefaced piece of self-righteous hypocrisy.

Acheson, who now says, "Anyone who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China," was Assistant Secretary of State 5 years ago when the United States, Russia, and Britain signed the Yalta agreement. That agreement violated the integrity of China.

Acheson today proclaims that as the second basic rule of United States policy we must "keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, and perfectly above board." But the Yalta agreement secretly violated the rights of China, an ally in the war against Japan, as a bribe to Russia, a nonbelligerent.

Was it pure and aboveboard to make concessions at China's expense, behind the Chinese Government's back, and then promise President Roosevelt would take measures to obtain the concurrence of Chiang Kai-shek so that the claims of the Soviet Union would be unquestionably fulfilled?

And on what were those claims based? On czarist Russia's violation of Chinese territorial integrity in the latter part of the nineteenth century. China was weak, and Russia and Japan growled at each other over the remnants of the collapsing Manchu empire.

The Liaotung Peninsula, which includes Dairen and Port Arthur, was ceded to Japan by China in 1895. Then in 1898 Russia forced Japan to withdraw and took over. Finally in 1904, following what the Yalta document calls the treacherous attack of Japan, the Japanece kicked the Russians out and settled down until the end of World War II.

(In connection with the treacherous attack, it is interesting to note that Russia, too, was preparing for war, but the cautious czar wired his far-eastern commander: "It is desirable that the Japanese, and not we, be the ones to start military operations. * * *")

It's all a sorry story of cynical big-power imperialism, and little can be accomplished merely by condemning it out of 50 years' hindsight. But no good and much harm is done by our perpetuating such cynical practices in an agreement like the Yalta deal—and then talking about traditional pure and aboveboard purposes.

"You cannot sit around in Washington or London or Paris or The Hague and determine what the policies are going to be in these areas," says the righteous Acheson of today.

Nor Yalta, Mr. Secretary.

Real Democrats Given Wrong Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial, reprinted from the Gazette, of Farmerville, La., of January 5, 1950, as follows:

REAL DEMOCRATS GIVEN WRONG NAME

(Reprint from the Gazette, Farmerville, La., January 5, 1950)

It is noticed in many press articles and comments of columnists that the word "Dixiecrat" is used in referring to the genuine Democrats of the South and elsewhere, who are battling against the present trend toward centralization and domination of everything by the Federal Government. And it is regrettable that some of those enlisted in that fight seem to be content to let it go at that. All should resent it, for it is out of place and smacks of Civil War sentiment of eighty-odd years ago—long settled.

The so-called States' rights element in the Democratic Party are not Dixiecrats nor any other sort of crats except real, old-fashioned Democrats who have become quickened of the spirit of patriotism and love of country to arouse the whole land—North, South, East, and West—against this head-long rush toward the precipice of socialism into which England has fallen. If we, at last, go over that horrible precipice, we shall not return, for it has no bottom.

Why should we be dubbed "Dixiecrats" anyhow? The term sounds provincial and sectional; and we are neither, for we fight for the right of every State to enjoy home rule and to exercise the functions of government reserved to it by the Constitution of the founders. The principle of home rule, community independence, and self-government, and the withholding from Washington of undelegated powers and bureaucratic control of our very lives is a vital one to every State in this Union—North, South, East, and West.

The so-called Dixiecrats are the real, simon-pure Democrats. And the rest of the country is fast finding that out. They are beginning to see that what we contend for is as vital to them as to us; as important for serious reflection to one section as to another.

The Democratic Party of our fathers has always been a national party, seeking equal and exact justice to all, reserving to each and every State and community the right and responsibility of doing all for itself, except certain Federal functions, comparatively few, stipulated in the Federal Constitution. To any power, anywhere, assuming a contrary attitude, seeking to destroy this principle, the democracy, of old, always cried out, "Thou shalt not."

This new-fangled name "Dixiecrat" has been coined by the enemies of real democracy and hurled at real Democrats. To refer to real Democrats in a certain State or a certain section as "Dixiecrats," is out of place, a misnomer, and should be resented. It should be resented by every true Democrat everywhere, no matter where he lives. It should be resented by every true American citizen.

We have a faith that, sooner or later, the element in the party of Jefferson and Jackson, which is now hypocritically trying to tear it from its proper moorings, will scatter as chaff before the winds of an aroused, indignant people, without regard to party label, which no longer means very much. Surely the people of this great country have too much common sense and patriotism to allow a group of vote-seeking "gimmecrats" to drag them down the hill their fathers climbed.

Every Democrat in this country, regardless of where he lives; yea, every American who believes this rush toward socialism should be arrested before it is everlastingly too late, should resent the name and slur of "Dixiecrat." It is all wrong. We are only genuine Democrats, and we shall remain such and fight within the lines of the national democracy to redeem it from the ills of recent years.

An Employer Does Have the God-Given Right To Choose Whom He Will To Work for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 23, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting the following letter from the St. Louis Area Council of Christian Churches, which, in my opinion, sets forth one of the more objectionable features of the proposed FEPC legislation. I concur in the expressions contained in this letter:

THE ST. LOUIS AREA COUNCIL
OF CHRISTIAN CHURCHES,
St. Louis, Mo., January 18, 1950.

The Hon. PAUL C. JONES,
United States Representative from Missouri, House of Representatives
Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: From time to time I am sure you are interested in the churches' reaction to certain types of legislation. Some church groups, I am sure, have been working hard for the passage of House bill H. R. 4453, known as FEPC legislation. Our group—about twenty churches in the St. Louis area affiliated with the American Council of Christian Churches and the International Council of Christian Churches—are solidly against the passage of such a bill.

FEPC would rob the employer of the right to choose whom he would to work for him. This right was upheld by Jesus Christ when he approvingly quoted the employer as saying, "Is it not lawful for me to do what I will with mine own?" (Matthew 20: 15). An employer does have the God-given right to choose whom he will to work for him. There is a kind of discrimination that is not wrong.

We realize that there is a kind of discrimination that is wrong. We hold no brief for the one who hates another or for one who discriminates solely because of the color of the skin. However, we are convinced that this discrimination is not as prevalent as some of our liberal friends would have us believe.

FEPC, if adopted, would act as an effective extension of the police state. To set up a Government agency as the arbiter of employment in private business is to add one more control to the already burdensome load which is being borne by the private-enterprise system. This private-enterprise system, which in our modern world is so distinctively American, is the only economic system which is stamped with the approval of the word of God. And that private-enterprise system is the economic system which has made our Nation great.

We cannot correct discrimination against employees by establishing discrimination against employers. FEPC would only tend to increase tensions between classes and groups and could really benefit only those who desire to sow discord and confusion among our people. In this connection it is interesting to note that the Communist Party is always one of the very active proponents of FEPC legislation. They must have some stake in it.

It is our hope that you will carefully respect the convictions of our constituency and

do what you can to defeat this proposed legislation which strikes at the very heart and life of our glorious democratic way of life.

Sincerely yours,

Rev. CALVIN H. HARRAH,
President, the St. Louis Area Council of Christian Churches.

Hordes of Jews Flee Red Terror by Underground

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1949

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following International News Service report on the underground operation which enabled thousands of persons to escape from Russia and her satellites. This news item appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of January 21, 1950.

HORDES OF JEWS FLEE RED TERROR BY UNDERGROUND

SOMEWHERE IN FRANCE, January 20.—An "alias army" of tens of thousands of Jews, some of whom hacked off their fingers to escape slow death in slave camps, have escaped from Russia and her satellite lands in a highly successful underground operation.

Their story can be told today in part for the first time—how they dealt Premier Stalin what they term perhaps his first big internal defeat.

AIDED BY FUNDS FROM UNITED STATES

It has been a well-kept postwar secret, this operation which ended early last year. The Jews, most of them Orthodox, escaped to western Europe from Russia proper through faked papers.

Funds obtained in the United States aided the inexpensive machine.

Tens of thousands escaped from Soviet satellite lands to find religious freedom and relief from persecution.

Men like Samuel Davidson, Isaac Goldin and Nissan Pinson brought with them "case histories" which reveal Soviet slave camps, religious persecution and widespread Soviet official corruption which partly aided their emigration.

The young Jews include former Soviet officers and peasants who fought the Germans.

RELIGION OFFICIALLY FREE

Goldin is a former Russian officer. With money used in the right Soviet spots he was allowed to escape as a repatriate.

Goldin said religion officially is "free" in Russia.

"For instance," he said, "circumcision, a fundamental of Judaism, is officially legal. But the man who performs the operation is arrested.

"Again, a teacher of religious law faces deportation to the Arctic regions."

Goldin said Zionism, which the Communists claim has such a great friend in Russia, still is officially banned. So is the teaching of Hebrew. Despite all Soviet obstacles, Goldin said, thousands of Jewish families are able to bring up their children true to their religion.

Davidson is 45—but looks 60. He spent 8 years near Murmansk in the Arctic region, in a camp where he said thousands of Jews have perished for only one sin; they remained true to their religion.

Davidson said the religious prisoners are fed a diet of bread and colored water called tea. No vegetables, no meat, no fish. The condemned deportees, he said, work from dawn until after dark chopping wood.

Nissan Pinson told how he organized a synagogue service in Moscow in 1945 after getting out of the army. This was still the "honeymoon period" between the Allies and Russia, and Pinson was cheered by the simulated appearance of religious tolerance in Moscow.

"Many Red Army men and women showed up for the service," he said, "but they subsequently began disappearing. The remaining believers long since have ceased speaking to each other for fear of police agents who always are on the watch."

SOME CAUGHT, EXECUTED

Finally Pinson, with the aid of false papers, led a group of Jews to another country and subsequently to the transitory camp in the suburbs of a modern French city.

It was a risky trip and the underground route was closed when Soviet border vigilance increased and after some Jewish operators were captured and presumably executed.

Pinson said at many way stations the Jewish group he led bribed train officials and government agents.

Near Lwow, former Polish city seized by Russia, Pinson said one mother became too ill and had to be left behind. He added:

"But she would not keep her child with her.

"She gave her son to her friends, saying 'at least my son will have a chance to live'."

Aid to Korea

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, no more eloquent statement was made in the debate on this bill in the House than that of the President of the Republic of Korea himself, issued under date of January 20, 1950, and which is appended hereto:

I have just learned with the greatest regret that the United States Congress by a close vote failed to pass the enabling act for ECA aid for Korea yesterday. Despite the most unexpected defeat of this bill, I remain confident that the Congress and Government of the United States of America, upon further and more careful reflection will not fail to grant to Korea this aid which is most essential for the development of a sound domestic economy, enabling the Korean Republic to continue its successful resistance to the persistent, militaristic Communist threat. The Republic of Korea is the only country of Asia today which is determinedly, wholeheartedly, and daily fighting off, and successfully fighting against, the armed attempts of Communist imperialism to invade and overthrow. Some Asiatic nations waiver, some recoil in fear, one great nation has gone down in defeat, but the Korean Republic continues to resist and fight with unflagging determination, courage, and success. Past American aid, added to strong Korean hearts, has made this remarkable success possible. But continued ECA aid, to establish a strong basis for our economy, is essential to sustain those strong Korean hearts in this difficult transition period. Let those who say that the risk is too great, that the U. S. S. R. is too powerful, that money for Korea is water down some rat hole, remember Berlin. There was risk, there was a powerful Soviet Army itself, potential basis for attack in itself, but with courage, the United States, the United Kingdom, and France took the great risk; Berlin and even all western Germany were saved by courageous risks despite enormous expense. Korea, the only free spot of northeastern Asia continent, can and will be held by courageous Korean men and women for the free world and for an independent Korea if the United States continues to risk a few more millions of its hard-earned wealth. Despite yesterday's vote in the United States Congress, I remain certain that further and wise consideration will be given to the cause of an independent Korea to insure that this Republic and these people will have the chance to remain within the orbit of the free world.

Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Star of January 22, 1950:

SPANISH REVERSAL

When experience has shown a governmental policy to be both a failure and morally insupportable, it is time to change the policy. That is what Secretary Acheson has done with respect to our Spanish policy, and he has done it with a degree of forthrightness which merits commendation.

Pursuant to a resolution adopted by the UN General Assembly in 1946, we have not assigned an Ambassador to Madrid. Our position has been that this country, as a firm supporter of the United Nations, could not send an Ambassador to Madrid in contravention of the Assembly's recommendation. That is a contention, however, which does not tell the whole story.

The prime movers in the UN campaign against Spain have been the Communists. They have been supported by non-Communists, but the main drive came from the delegates who were under the Kremlin's thumb. Their motives in trying to overthrow the Franco regime have not been even remotely related to the motives of the non-Communists who played the game with them. This became evident soon after the 1946 resolution had been adopted, and attempts were made to reverse the 1946 decision. Although a majority favored reversal last spring, the effort failed for lack of the required two-thirds vote.

It was in this setting that our Government put forward its worst diplomatic foot. Although it was clear that the policy was wrong, and that it had failed, this Government could not bring itself to join the other countries voting to rescind it. Instead of taking a position on a matter of some importance, it sought refuge in the timid device of not voting at all. That is not an attitude which becomes the most powerful

Nation in the world, a Nation which boasts of its moral leadership and to which smaller countries are bound to look for guidance.

The gist of Secretary Acheson's announcement is that we will no longer seek to dodge the Spanish issue. We will not take the lead. But when the question of rescinding the 1946 resolution again comes before the Assembly we will vote in favor of lifting the ban and permitting the member nations to do as they see fit in the matter of exchanging Ambassadors or Ministers with Spain.

There is still some foot-dragging in the Acheson announcement. He frowns on Spanish participation in the European recovery program, for instance, because the Franco government is unacceptable to many western European nations. Considering our role in ECA, that looks like a case of the tail wagging the dog. And when one recalls the effort made to bring into ECA some of the cutthroat regimes behind the iron curtain, it is a bit hard to swallow any implication that Franco should be debarred on grounds of political morality or immorality.

There may be practical reasons, however, which justify this Government in its unwillingness to attempt to introduce Spain into the western European community. Franco is a dictator and he did come to power with the aid of Hitler and Mussolini. If, because of these facts, he continues to be persona non grata with our allies in western Europe, we should not attempt to force him on them. No argument in behalf of Spain could justify a policy on our part which would disrupt the western European coalition. The attainment of a proper relationship between Spain and its neighbors can be left to the processes of time. Meanwhile, it is good to know that we have abandoned a policy which denoted moral disapproval of Franco at the price of implying moral approval of governments whose conduct makes the Franco regime seem like a model of good democratic practices.

Order of Sons of Italy for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I enclose the following resolution recently adopted by the grand lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy in America, calling for the enactment of a Federal fair-employment-practices bill:

Whereas there is now pending in the United States Senate S. 1728, and

Whereas this proposed legislation makes provision for Federal fair employment practices and tends to eliminate the evils of racial, religious and national discrimination from our democracy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the grand executive council of the Grand Lodge of Massachusetts, Order of Sons of Italy in America, in meeting assembled on January 4, 1950, at Boston, cognizant of the great need for this legislation and representing, as we do, some 22,000 members in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, do hereby unanimously endorse S. 1728 and urge its immediate enactment; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, and to the Senators and Representatives in Congress from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

Internationalization of Jerusalem Unnecessary and Impractical

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is a news report and editorial from the New York Times of January 20 and 21, respectively, giving a survey of the situation by distinguished churchmen deeply interested in the security of the holy places. These facts are more important than reams of argument:

[From the New York Times of January 20, 1950]

FACT BODY OPPOSES UN ON JERUSALEM—GROUP OF SIX CHRISTIAN LEADERS HOLDS INTERNATIONALIZATION IS DANGEROUS, UNNECESSARY

A fact-finding mission of six Christian leaders, just returned from Jerusalem, announced yesterday its conviction that internationalization of the Holy City was dangerous and unnecessary.

The group recommended, instead, the establishment of a United Nations commission with no territorial sovereignty to assure the free accessibility of the Christian world to the holy places of Jerusalem.

Guaranties should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel, the report said, assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. This is all that the Christian world has a right to require of two sovereign states, which we believe will in time compose their differences.

This making of the peace will be accomplished all the more if Israel and Jordan are encouraged in their negotiations by the western powers.

Members of the investigation mission, who traveled under auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, 41 East Forty-second Street, included Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, member of the Federal Council of Churches' Commission of International Goodwill; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn., and president of the National Council of Presbyterian Laymen; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights and field representative of the Southern Regional Council.

Also Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor of the Watchman-Examiner, national Baptist magazine; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of the American Baptist Theological Seminary, and Prof. Victor Obenhaus of the University of Chicago, national chairman of the Council of Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America.

The group's findings were made public at a conference in the Commodore Hotel, with Dr. Inman and Dr. Bradbury as spokesmen. They announced that copies of the report had been sent to Secretary of State Dean Acheson, Roger Garreau, president of the United Nations Trusteeship Council, and Francis B. Sayre, United States delegate to the council.

The report said that the overwhelming majority of religious leaders interviewed in Israel had felt that the internationalization plan would not work.

"Many held it was impractical and certain to add confusion and impede peace negotiations now in progress," the report declared, and added:

"Total internationalization is not necessary for the protection of the holy places. Neither the Arabs nor Israel has any other plan or purpose than to protect and preserve them. Moslems have kept these places inviolate for many centuries, and virtually all of them are now in Arab hands. There is not the slightest evidence that Israel will molest or limit the use of any religious institution or shrine."

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM COMPLETE

The group said it found "complete religious freedom" in Israel and that the religious leaders interviewed "all declared they were in no wise interfered with in their functions."

"The prevailing conviction was," the report went on, "that when the bitterness created by the recent war will have diminished, Israel and the Arabs would yet come to an agreement in these controversial matters providing external interference did not complicate the problem."

The mission denounced as "utterly false and without any factual support" reports that the Israelis had desecrated religious institutions, churches or shrines since the fighting ceased. It pointed out that the Government of Israel had established a Department of Religious Affairs to deal "constructively and fairly with the complex religious communities in her territory."

The report referred to the plan advanced by Mr. Garreau, which provides that the international zone should include principally the Wailing Wall, sacred to the Jewish faith, and those holy places sacred to Christians, and said the plan, while an improvement over previous proposals, was "still too inclusive."

CRITICIZES PROPOSAL

"It is hardly justifiable to exclude so obvious a holy place as the Mosque of Omar of the Old City from an internationalized zone, and the entire Mount Scopus where absolutely no legally established holy places are to be found," the report observed.

"To advance such a plan on the ground that the territory to be taken from Israel and Jordan must be equalized is to condemn the plan by demonstrating that the major consideration is not concern for the holy places."

The group called on on the United States Government to press for a reconsideration of the United Nations Assembly decision on internationalization. Formulation, instead, of a just and workable plan for guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places would enhance the United Nations prestige and power, the report asserted.

The group noted that, during its 3-week investigation, it had observed conditions in both Jewish and Arab areas and that it had discussed the internationalization problem with representatives of the Israeli Government, the Coptic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, the Copt Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church, and Protestant churches. It talked with Arabs, both Christian and Moslem, as well as with city officials and administrative officers.

[From the New York Times of January 21, 1950]

THE JERUSALEM DILEMMA

The Trusteeship Council of the United Nations has now convened at Geneva with the thankless task of working out an internationalization plan for Jerusalem in conformity with the general assembly's ill-advised resolution of last December. There is always the possibility, however remote, that the Council may come up with a proposal acceptable to Israel and Jordan, the two countries most directly concerned. The latest draft, put forward by Roger Garreau, president of the Council, is certainly a step in the right direction.

Meanwhile six eminent Christian leaders, just back from the Holy Land, have expressed

the opinion that the whole concept of internationalization of Jerusalem is dangerous and unnecessary. We agree with them that the only necessity is for guaranteeing * * * assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within the two countries. There should be no difficulty in obtaining such guaranties once the idea of internationalizing secular territory is ruled out, or at least brought down to the narrowest possible limits. To achieve this end, it is likely that the Assembly will eventually have to modify its uncompromising position in accordance with the justice and the realities of the situation.

Coal Shortage at Pontiac, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, further information has reached me from Mr. J. Byron Judd, secretary-manager of the Pontiac Lumber, Fuel and Builders' Supply Exchange, regarding the coal shortage at Pontiac, Mich., and vicinity.

There are 17 dealers in the area. They have on hand, as of January 19, counting coal and coke in transit, 5,647 tons. The average daily requirements in that city of 80,000 people and many thousands living in the immediate area is approximately 900 tons daily. This indicates only a 5-day supply on hand.

During the calendar year 1949 the coal and coke receipts were 32.5 percent less than the year previous and 30.5 percent less than the previous 5-year average. The total coal and coke inventory for January 1, 1950, was but 18.5 percent of the inventory for January 1, 1949.

In view of this record, this fuel exchange warns that a critical coal shortage is not only imminent but actually exists. The dealers have been rationing consumers with 1-ton and half-ton deliveries.

This condition is a dangerous threat to the health and welfare of the people in that area. The President should act and act immediately with the powers which Congress has given him to relieve this emergency.

Mr. Judd's report follows:

PONTIAC LUMBER, FUEL, AND BUILDERS' SUPPLY EXCHANGE,
Pontiac, Mich., January 19, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GEORGE: It is observed you, with some other Members of the Congress, were present at a round-table conference in Washington January 9 on the invitation of the American Retail Coal Merchants Association to listen to the general problem of the retail-coal merchants operating in the bituminous-coal-burning areas of the Nation. On behalf of the retail coal merchants of Oakland County, I desire to express their gratitude and appreciation for your obvious interest in the problems of supply to satisfy consumer coal service demand for the past many months.

Supplementing what was reported at the January 9 conference, I desire to report the coal supply-and-demand picture as presently exists in this local area as revealed by a survey completed this date as follows:

Trade area, Pontiac City, Mich.—Total 17 dealers and 17 reporting

	Tons
Total inventories domestic coal and coke	4,312
In transit 25 cars coal (estimate 52 tons per car)	1,300
In transit 1 car coke (estimate 35 tons per car)	35
Total on hand and in transit January 17, 1950	5,647

In calendar year 1948 Grand Trunk Railway reports these same 17 dealers received 2,903 cars of coal and 174 cars of coke, an estimated total of 141,351 tons. Assuming this was normal annual requirements for this area and that the month of January normal requirements as generally admitted is 19.5 percent of the total annual requirements for spaceheating, we find January normal requirements for this area are 889 tons per day. If these actual stocks of coal and coke on hand and in transit and the estimates of requirements are accepted, this survey reveals, if all coal and coke in transit would arrive within 5 days, we would only have presently a 5-day supply.

It should be further realized coal supplying this market is normally in transit from 7 to 11 days.

That coal and coke rail receipts in this area for calendar year 1949 were 32.5 percent less than year previous, and 30.5 percent less than the previous 5-year average. Also that in the 6-month period, May 1 to October 31, 1949, the coal and coke rail receipts were only 46.7 percent of the same comparable period previous year. It may be further stated this condition is the major factor why these 17 local dealers report coal and coke inventories January 1, 1950, were an average of only 18.5 percent of inventories January 1, 1949.

It may be stated the inventory of one dealer January 1, 1949 was more than the combined inventories of all 17 dealers January 1, 1950. Another dealer January 1, 1949, 75 percent of all dealers January 1, 1950.

Survey completed of inventories, etc. in other Oakland County areas about reconcile with the prevailing conditions in Pontiac area. Four county areas have no coal or coke for delivery while three areas are in somewhat better position than Pontiac area.

You may consider all statements furnished as reliable and according to authentic record.

On behalf of the citizens who are dependent on retail coal services and the retail coal merchants of Oakland County, we venture the opinion, according to the record, that a critical coal shortage is not only imminent but does actually exist in this area. We therefore solicit your influence to not only correct this current condition but also attempt by legislation or otherwise that in the future our experience may not be repeated.

Dealers generally, for many weeks, have been rationing consumers with 1-ton and ½-ton deliveries and definitely dealers and consumers alike know that an emergency does actually exist impairing their health and economy.

Thanking you in advance for your consideration and that your influence and action may be helpful in correcting this intolerable condition.

Very respectfully,

J. BYRON JUDD,
Secretary-Manager.

A Look at the Compass

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as Republicans prepare for the 1950 and 1952 campaigns, it might be well to get our bearings and locate the harbor for which we are steering.

Some of us here in Congress, remembering Mr. Truman's flippant remark that our efforts to uncover and expose the Communists in his administration were only a "red herring," are encouraged by the conviction of Mr. Alger Hiss; made more determined in our effort to oust the Communists and communism from positions of power and influence in Mr. Truman's administration.

Five-percenters and adherents to the Pendergast type of machine politics are bad enough, but Communists are, if that be possible, more dangerous.

Of almost equal danger is Mr. Truman's socialistic program, his determination to purchase the political support of first one group, then another, either by appropriations of Federal funds or the enactment and enforcement of discriminatory laws.

In the morning Times-Herald is an editorial by George Rothwell Brown which gives at least one view of the present situation.

The editorial which suggests "me-tooism" is still powerful in the Republican Party is as follows:

POLITICAL PARADE

(By George Rothwell Brown)

President Truman stands as of today the undisputed master of a thoroughly cowed House of Representatives.

Under terrific pressure from the White House and its allied labor bosses, a temporary coalition of radical Democrats and Republicans courting the votes of minority groups who deserted their party leadership by the score, has opened the door of the Rules Committee to the FEPC bill, and probably to more of the welfare state, involving a threatened multi-billion-dollar Treasury raid.

The conviction of Alger Hiss, fair-haired protégé of the Roosevelt New Deal, on charges tantamount to those of treason at a time when he was a State Department official, probably will have the psychological effect of greatly discrediting the whole Communist program in this country, high at the top of which stands FEPC.

If the FEPC bill should be approved by the House—and it was to obtain this action that most of the Republican deserters ran out—the southern filibuster against it in the Senate would be strengthened by the reaction to the Hiss verdict.

Once this controversial question is out of the way it may be possible for the coalition of conservative House Republicans and southern Democrats to unite their forces once more in opposition to the rest of the President's socialistic program.

But this coalition, the sole remaining hope of stopping the welfare state in the House has been seriously torn asunder.

It is upon the continuation of this smash-up of the conservative allies that the permanence of Mr. Truman's bossism of the House of Representatives depends.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned the failure of the effort to restore a legislative traffic power to the Rules Committee threatens with disaster its entire campaign for control of Congress in this year's elections.

The wide-open split thus revealed in the party has rendered utterly farcical the attempts now being made in Washington by the GOP National Committee and State and congressional leaders to determine a party policy upon which all its candidates could stand united in the approaching campaign.

With such a large percentage of Republican Members of the House voting to pave an easy roadway for the enactment of a Federal FEPC law and the whole welfare program, it is extremely improbable that the conservative businessmen and industrialists of the country will be willing to contribute any important money to the Republican campaign fund.

Why should they?

Save for one possible course of action, it will now be difficult for the Republican Party as a party to go into this year's congressional campaign on a platform of opposition to the socialistic welfare state.

It may still be possible to prevent the renomination of those Republicans who voted on this vital issue with the Truman-Rayburn-McCormack axis, by putting up a conservative Republican against them in each of the Congressional districts involved in this mass desertion.

If the British people repudiate Socialism in in their February elections, indicating a world-wide reaction against left-wing radicalism, it may be easier for real Republican candidates to defeat these welfare-staters than perhaps they realize.

If such a large part of the party in the House of Representatives is permitted to embrace "me-tooism" unchallenged, the Republican Party can hardly hope to survive the 1952 presidential election.

The processes of demoralization will be accelerated. As against 64 members who went over to Trumanism on this crucial vote, only 49 deserted their party leadership on January 3, 1949, when the destruction of the traffic power of the Rules Committee was first accomplished.

The rot within the party thus appears to be spreading.

The way is now open for a motion this week to bring the President's FEPC bill to the floor for a vote, subject to the recognition by Speaker RAYBURN of the chairman in charge of that measure.

American Jewish Committee for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include a resolution recently adopted by Boston chapter, American Jewish Committee, urging enactment of a Federal fair employment practices bill:

THE AMERICAN JEWISH COMMITTEE,
New York, N. Y., January 18, 1950.

It is the unanimous opinion of the membership of the American Jewish Committee, Boston chapter, that fundamental to our American democracy and to our American economy is the right to employment opportunity without reference to race, color, or creed; that this right can be properly protected throughout the Nation only through the establishment of a Federal law, in conformity with the platforms of both major political parties: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Congress at the present session enact the bill known as the Fair Employment Practices Act (S. 1728).

Which Road for the United States—Right, Left, or the Middle Way?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following copy of my radio address over WMEX, Boston, Mass., January 23, 1950:

We hear some people splitting hairs over the question; "When does the first half of the first half of the twentieth century end and the second half begin, on January 1, 1950, or January 1, 1951?"

There are others who point to a new method of reckoning which reduces the century-yardstick to the smaller proportions of years, days, or even less. They insist that an entirely new age in the history of man opening the doors to an unknown future began in the fateful month of August in 1945.

It is not the day or the year that is important, but the fact that we face great changes in our way of life. There are some who would avoid responsibility in this matter because it requires serious thought and special effort. There are others who clearly see that we must grapple with these strange problems for which there are no ready-made answers. Within the flexible framework of our democratic institutions we must devise new methods which will provide the greatest security and freedom for all.

It will not be easy to bring these opposites into a workable relationship.

Your Government with a green light from you is trying to do it.

It is watching the experiments going on in other democratic nations and is learning much from their mistakes. Australia and New Zealand have ousted their labor or socialist governments. There is a possibility that the English may do the same, or falling short of that may increase the Conservative minority to the point where it may serve as a restraining influence upon an extreme program.

And yet much that has been put into practice will never be repealed by the Conservatives. The pendulum swings from side to side but we cannot ignore the fact that the housing of the pendulum is moving forward with the times.

In the United States we have accomplished much in the way of readjusting our society to present-day realities. To do this we have had to experiment. In the process we have started some programs which now need expansion. Others which served an emergency purpose have been discarded. We have not been afraid to meet change with change. We have made a few mistakes which can and will be corrected, but they are the mistakes of positive action which clears the way. We can look back for a moment over the past 17 years and honestly say that the comeback from the low point of 1933 has been remarkable.

Our Nation is now a world power. More goods are being produced, more people are employed, and the standard of living has increased. The base of this progress has broadened to include greater numbers of our people and it will continue to do so.

I do not mean to paint a perfect picture of the present situation for that would be false. Even though they may be reduced, the expenditures for our Military Establishment and for economic aid to other countries will continue to be heavy. These are necessary to protect our own security and to promote world recovery and world peace.

We also have problems at home.

This is an election year. The various measures requested by President Truman will be approved or rejected on the basis of public opinion toward them as interpreted by individual Congressmen. These will vary from district to district but the composite will reflect the majority opinion of the people of the United States.

I believe that this year will also be one of pause or digestion before we set our sights toward the second half of the twentieth century.

The Congress as I see it will take the following action during the current session. I will try to make an objective estimate, asking you to bear in mind that it will not coincide with my own position and my own votes on some issues.

Taxes on income will not be increased.

Health insurance and temporary-disability insurance will be debated but that's as far as they will get.

The bill proposing a Fair Employment Practice Act will be hotly contested and defeated.

Repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act will be blocked.

No special old-age pensions for veterans will be provided.

Neither the Columbia River Authority nor the St. Lawrence Seaway will muster a majority vote.

Federal aid to education looks dubious.

The Brannan plan for farm aid will not pass.

On the affirmative side of the ledger, Congress will probably appropriate more money for public housing and public works.

Rent control on a limited scale will be retained.

More money for arms but less for economic aid will be voted to aid western Europe.

Some excise taxes such as those on travel tickets and on cosmetics will be cut.

The draft law will be extended but restricted as to its use.

Some postal rates may be revised upward.

The most significant development will concern old-age insurance. More people will be included and benefits will be increased.

Which brings us to the key question of our age which is the quest for security. And it is not a matter of if, but how.

The one worry uppermost in the minds of most people is how to find personal security against the economic hazards of old age, sickness, disability, and unemployment.

Man has had to deal with these problems since the beginning of time. Why is it, then, that so many millions are unable to cope with them in this the greatest wealth-producing age known to man?

Once upon a time most people were self-employed on their own small farms or with the tools of their trade. Those were the days of individual craftsmen. But now we are faced with an entirely new situation. Three-quarters of all who work for a living in the United States today are employees. The ownership and control of the means of production have passed out of the hands of the individual. Today every individual needs and wants a job—a steady job at

decent wages. In most cases he cannot create this for himself, but must depend on others to provide it for him. And he does not believe that the right to property shall stand in the way of his right to employment.

Our founding fathers emphasized the "unalienable" rights of man—the individual's right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The right to liberty guarantees certain protections and privileges which may be called political, such as free speech. The right of the individual to pursue his happiness, to find fulfillment as he may choose, guarantees his spiritual and cultural freedoms.

But what does the right to life mean? Simply protection from violence? No. In the complex economic society of today, where the average man cannot support himself with his own hands, without help from others, it means something more.

Take my home city of Lawrence, in Massachusetts. It is an area, including adjoining communities, of some 125,000 people. They are largely dependent for their livelihood upon the operations of several large textile mills. Not only the income of the workers, but that of every storekeeper, businessman, and public servant, is affected by the level of activity at the mills. These in turn depend upon sources of raw materials and markets far removed from Lawrence, over which management and workers have little control.

There is not enough food produced in this industrial area to feed the people for 1 day. You cannot feed cattle or grow crops on hard-surfaced city streets. Therefore, when workers are laid off because the mills have no orders, they cannot eat, which means that they cannot live. The rights of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, necessary as they are, cannot make up for the right to life which is threatened by unemployment.

We are recognizing the fact that man has economic rights which must be protected if the right to life is to have real meaning. To implement this expanded concept, we have started a program to provide unemployment compensation and old-age security.

The former was a lifesaver for Lawrence in the spring and early summer of 1949, when 24,000 people were out of work for weeks on end. Without this transfusion to support purchasing power, the life of the whole community would have been threatened.

Fortunately, the mills have picked up considerably since then. Some thousands are still out of work, and many of these are included in the figure of 12,179 claimants who had exhausted their benefit checks at the end of 1949. A lesser number may not have any unemployment compensation accruing to them in 1950.

I hope that the Congress will pass legislation which I will support, to improve our unemployment-compensation program so that it will take care of such local emergencies.

The people of Lawrence, caught in the rip tide of economic forces beyond their control, were given a helping hand through unemployment compensation. They believe in it because it protected their right to live.

It is, in this day and age, "promoting the general welfare," which were the words used by our forefathers in the preamble to the Constitution of the United States.

Now the word "welfare" is open to many interpretations and it is sometimes misused to scare people.

As we Americans see it, "welfare" means basic protections against unemployment, sickness, disability, and old age provided by cooperation between management and labor.

It means the stabilization of employment to the highest possible degree. It means every encouragement to a dynamic American economy. It means insurance paid for by all of the people, and paid out by the Government as an agent of the people, only under clearly specified conditions.

Some people think we have only two choices: capitalism of the right, or socialism of the left. But I believe that the road we are taking is the middle one of voluntary cooperation.

There is a better distribution of income in the United States today than ever before. Power is fairly well balanced throughout our economic structure. Even in Washington, with a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats gives conservatism some voice in our national affairs. Neither capitalism nor socialism dominates the American scene.

In our scheme of things Government is not a god but just a combination of umpire, first-aid man, and substitute employer.

Our aim is to keep it in that subordinate role.

Most Americans are ambitious and want to advance themselves. It is this vitality which spurs us to accomplishment and sometimes—sometimes leads to excesses. The only thing we have to fear from this is mass unemployment, which will not be tolerated.

However, warned by a previous experience which should be our last one of that kind, the Congress will authorize those temporary and compensatory techniques to fill the void, if and when necessary.

Labor, the farmers, liberal groups all these are organized and are facing the future today. Only the business groups seem to be lagging behind, failing to assume their share of the initiative.

Collective bargaining is the first step toward the humanization of industry, but it is not enough. The worker needs the security of belonging. Experts in such matters tell us that while material efficiency has been increasing for 200 years, the human capacity for working together has, in the same period, continually diminished.

Management has a great opportunity in helping us to keep to the middle road by promoting its own insurance and pension plans, by applying the annual-wage method where feasible, by scheduling maintenance work in slack seasons, and by privately insuring against lay-offs as a supplement to Government unemployment insurance.

By building this genuine and effective good will, it will help to create that loyal friendship between employer and employee which will protect and encourage the full development of all three human rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

What the Truman Program Is Costing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from the January 14 issue of the Sturgis Journal, published by Mark P. Haines at Sturgis, Mich., comes an editorial on the subject of what Mr. Truman's program is costing the Nation.

The editorial carries a picture, which cannot, of course, be reproduced in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, showing three stacks of $1 bills, representing the increase in the per capita cost of running the Federal Government.

From there on the editorial is as follows:

WHAT IT'S COSTING

At left is a stack of bills totaling $101.14. This was what it cost every man, woman and child to run the United States Government in the fiscal year 1941.

The middle pile shows what it will cost each of us in 1951 as proposed by Mr. Truman's budget. The figure is $282.17—almost triple the 1941 amount.

At right is $1,758.66—what each of us can claim as his share of the national debt at the end of fiscal year 1951 (June 30, 1951) if Mr. Truman's budget is adopted.

Mr. Truman's budget calls for an outlay of $42,439,000,000 in the 1951 fiscal year beginning July 7. Mr. Truman has a reputation for underestimating expenses in his budget messages. For fiscal 1950, Congress will be asked to approve $5,863,816,000 in supplemental appropriations.

Estimated Federal income for 1951 is $37,306,000,000, leaving a deficit of $5,100,000,000 for the year, Mr. Truman blames the Republicans for the deficit, saying that the 1951 deficit is equal to the tax cut put through when the Republicans controlled the Eightieth Congress.

Over 70 percent of Mr. Truman's budget is wrapped up in spending for past, present, and future cold and hot wars. These are the items of national defense, veterans' program, foreign affairs, and debt interest. Congress will find it hard to cut these expenses.

But on the domestic side, economy-minded solons of both parties will have better chances of reducing Mr. Truman's budgetary program. For example, his $300,000,000 request for aid to education includes a new system of Federal college scholarships which are desirable but not wise in these days of deficit spending. Another request which the administration will find difficult to enact is that of a housing program for the middle-income class.

Critics of Mr. Truman's policy of deficit spending are not confined to the Republican Party. Senator HARRY F. BYRD, Virginia Democrat who is a long-time advocate of Government economy, has proposed a $36,000,000,000 budget to Congress. Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, Illinois Democrat, thinks $3,000,000,000 can be shaved from the President's budget without any trouble. The Committee on Economic Development says a $6,000,000,000 reduction is possible.

Mr. Truman is not expected to ask for added revenue which would balance the budget. A balanced budget will not be possible for several years, according to the President.

The moderate increase is expected to apply to individual income, corporation, estate and gift taxes while at the same time some of the wartime excise taxes will be lessened or removed.

Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following resolution of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, local union No. 275, Newton, Mass., January 14, 1950:

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

We, the undersigned, members of Local Union No. 275 of the Carpenters and Joiners

of America, citizens of the United States of America, do wish to commend the efforts of the General Welfare Federation of America for the efforts they are exerting, and the work they are doing, to secure legislation authorizing old-age pensions for all citizens 65 years of age and over.

We commend them for the part they have had in causing the passage of H. R. 6000, passed by the House of Representatives in the Eighty-first Congressional First Session, and now before the United States Senate for their consideration.

In expressing these commendations, we do now, and hereby, request that the said G. W. F. of A., Inc., continue their good work, and that in their efforts that they advocate nothing less than a $100 monthly pension.

We further pledge our cooperation to the extent of our ability.

ERNEST C. RUGGLES,
President.
ANGUS MACLEAN,
Treasurer.
JOHN SBARDELLI,
Secretary.

How We Can Help Prevent Tuberculosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an excellent article written by 15-year-old Nancy Allworth, of Corvallis, Oreg., High School, which won first prize in that school in a contest sponsored by the Oregon Tuberculosis Association:

[From the Corvallis (Oreg.) Gazette-Times of January 18, 1950]

HOW WE CAN HELP PREVENT TUBERCULOSIS

Tuberculosis, or TB, is a contagious disease that is caused by a germ called tubercle bacillus. It may be spread by direct or indirect contact, or through milk. The germs usually do most of their activity in the lung; however, they can attack any part of the body. This action, while in process, will not be noticed by the victim, who could be any individual on earth. To be more specific, it could be you.

Everyone can, and should, try to help prevent tuberculosis. If you might be at a loss as to how you can help, begin brushing up on your knowledge of it by reading some of the numerous publications put out by health and tuberculosis organizations. It may save you time and money in the long run; they are free.

First, learn all you can about tuberculosis: its cause, its symptoms, its effect, and its prevention and cure. Next, put what you have learned to work. Here are some simple hints to help you out:

Every year a tuberculosis chest X-ray unit comes or should come to your town. If it does not, you be the one to look into it; if it does, don't neglect to have an X-ray and don't let your friends neglect it either. If you should discover that you have tuberculosis, you are lucky that you had the X-ray. Too many people have it and never suspect it until it is almost too late. Sometimes it is. Be careful of how you treat yourself and other people. Consider the happiness and health of others as much as you do your own. You may be endangering your and their lives by neglecting tuberculosis symptoms.

Articles that you, or any other tuberculosis victim, have used are contaminated; so the best thing to do with them is to burn them. If they are not disposable, do the next best, which is baking or boiling them for 10 or 20 minutes.

Let us peek into the hall of a typical city high school and view an everyday occurrence.

Our scene will take place at Jane's locker, Jane is one of our characters, a sophomore girl. The remainder of our cast is made up of Betty, Jane's classmate, Joe, the first germ, and George, the second germ.

Joe and George are sitting uncomfortably on the end of the sticky lipstick in Jane's locker.

"If she only knew," chuckled Joe.

"I almost wish she did," moaned George, who was holding his nose. "The perfume in this stuff is terrible, I'll be asphyxiated if someone doesn't come."

Betty, rushing down the hall, sees Jane near her locker.

"Jeeps! Jane, may I borrow your lipstick? I forgot my compact and purse and everything."

"Sure, Betty, I've got a little cough but I don't think it's anything. Oh, by the way, wasn't that dumb stuff we learned in health about all those old diseases? I don't see why we have to learn it, anyway."

"Bother! You made me smear this all over my face, uh, huh! Isn't it boring though?

Meanwhile Joe and George, the TB germs, have picked up their overnight bags and hopped onto another likely victim.

This instance, excluding the germs, is a familiar one in almost any high school, but there can be germs. How can we stop this?

Begin now. You be the one who refuses to loan your personal belongings even to a friend. If everyone did this, fewer germs would be spread. You be the one who does not borrow other peoples' things.

If you have a cough without apparent reason, don't hesitate to see a doctor; you may be the cause of hundreds of cases of TB without realizing it.

Our standards for preventing TB should be built around a rule similar to the golden one. Your rule may read something like this: Be considerate of others by covering sneezes and coughs, avoid lending or borrowing, and do everything in your power to make our world freer of a dreaded disease. Remember, we are the ones who can cut another chunk out of a diminishing number of mortalities due to tuberculosis.

Little germs so apparently small
Can bring sad death to one and all.
Just keep your habits clean and true,
And they'll refrain from both'ring you.

NANCY ALLWORTH,
Grade 10, Corvallis High School.
CORVALLIS, OREG.

Monopoly Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power will soon resume hearings. They will be two-pronged. One phase will be upon three distinct bills prepared by the staff of the subcommittee. The introduction of these bills is justified by the two sets of general hearings heretofore held.

The other phase will be a third series of hearings on specific industries. While the two previous sets were generally on the subject of monopoly, undue restraint, and concentration in industry and commerce, the subcommittee may, starting in February, address itself to a number of specific industries where such undue concentrations and financial power are alleged to threaten our economy, such as, for example: First, United States Steel; second, newsprint; third, du Pont complex; fourth, Lever Bros., that is, Unilever of Netherlands and Unilever of Great Britain; fifth, monopoly in the legitimate theater; and sixth, distilling industry.

With reference to the legitimate theater monopoly, charges have reached us that a group, headed by Schubert Enterprises in New York, control over 60 percent of the chain of legitimate theaters of the country, and the tribute exacted from producers, authors, directors, actors, composers, and so forth, are unfair, affecting drastically the whole sphere of the theater. It is also claimed that a theater ticket racket stems in part from this combination.

All the foregoing, of course, involves a great deal of research and investigation. The subcommittee may not have time to consider all these charges and complaints in addition to others. During the remainder of the Eighty-first Congress, the subcommittee shall proceed with its work to the fullest possible extent within the limitations of time and, of course, appropriations.

The subcommittee on study of monopoly power has set Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday, February 1, 2, and 3, 1950, for hearings on three specific bills:

First. H. R. 6679, introduced by Mr. WALTER, to increase criminal penalties under the Sherman and Clayton Antitrust Acts.

Second. A bill to require the Department of Justice to report to Congress on the nature, number, and reasons for consent decrees and pleas of nolo contendere in antitrust cases.

Third. Amendments to the Webb-Pomerene Act, which Mr. CELLER will introduce.

A number of witnesses, scheduled to be heard last autumn, were unavoidably unable to attend. Of these, Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer will be invited to appear; also Charles Luckman, recently resigned president of Lever Bros., and Henry J. Kaiser.

The subcommittee will also study the recent recommendations for changes in the Sherman and Clayton Acts proposed by the Federal Trade Commission.

Civilian Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1949

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to see that the New York Times in a leading editorial today recognizes the need of a federally coordinated system of civilian defense of American cities.

The House will recall I wrote President Truman last September, shortly after his report of an atomic explosion in Russia, that further neglect in building up such a defense would be unconscionable. Later, I addressed the House stressing the meager efforts that had just begun and pointing to the New Jersey program inaugurated under the leadership of the far-sighted Governor Driscoll.

I still contend that Dr. John R. Steelman, assistant to the President, is too busy to be acting chairman of the National Security Resources Board, in charge of civilian defense, and all governors and States are not cooperating in the present program.

The Times editorial follows:

CIVILIAN DEFENSE

It is a dismaying fact, more than 4 years after the end of the Second World War, that we still need a civilian defense organization. Many thousands of Americans got some psychological satisfaction and did some real service during the Second World War by enforcing black-outs, practicing first aid and watching for enemy airplanes. The enemy airplanes did not come during that war. If there were to be another war, they would come. Melancholy as the task may be, we have to be ready for them. Civilian preparedness is part of the entire preparedness of the country to defend itself.

This subject comes up with the appointment of Dr. Paul J. Larsen, formerly a director of atomic research at Los Alamos and Albuquerque, to be chairman of the newly reorganized Civilian Mobilization Office of the National Security Resources Board. Health, housing, censorship and the strategic placing of industry and Government facilities will all be parts of Dr. Larsen's job. This phase of preparedness, too, has its role in preventing war, since it is intended to lessen the effectiveness of any enemy attack. At the same time, it need cause no alarm in any other country. A group of American civilians try to minimize dangers to other American civilians in case of an alien invasion will be no menace to anybody.

Federal Aid to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place the following very interesting editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., on January 21, 1950:

The proposal for Federal aid to education will be before Congress again this year. The House is supposed to get a chance to consider the measure, passed by the Senate, which would appropriate $300,000,000 for the purpose, leaving the use of the money up to the individual States.

There is a growing inequality of educational opportunity among various sections of the Nation. It is due to the plain economic fact that some sections have far more resources of wealth than the national average and other sections have far less than average wealth. The education offered to children in the areas less well off may in the future have a great effect on the areas now more wealthy. The question to be decided is whether the entire Nation would not be benefited if Federal funds, obviously coming from taxes collected in the wealthier areas, were used to improve educational facilities and opportunities in the less wealthy sections. This question, standing by itself and on its own merits, ought to get a thoughtful answer.

Imports Peril New England Hat Firms

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1949, this House passed the so-called reciprocal trade agreements without the peril clauses, which would have provided safeguards to American industry and to industry in my district, the State of Connecticut, when such would be jeopardized by the effects of these agreements. At that time the unemployment situation in Connecticut indicated a tendency of increasing from week to week, and, as a matter of fact, the number of unemployed in February 1949, as indicated by the weekly reports of the commissioner of labor, listing the number of unemployment benefits, approximated 50,000 unemployed. By October 1949 the number of claimants for unemployment benefits exceeded 100,000. At the present time the number of claimants, according to the last report by the Employment Security Division, Department of Labor, lists 48,431—a drop of 53,840 for the previous week. Added to this total must be the number of claimants who have exhausted their unemployment benefits in Connecticut, and such total of exhaustions approximate 55,000. In view of these facts, it seems to me that the article that appeared in the Boston Daily Record on January 23, written by Mr. Dan Markel, entitled, "Imports Peril New England Hat Firms," is a matter which, I feel sure, will be of great interest to my colleagues in the House. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article:

IMPORTS PERIL NEW ENGLAND HAT FIRMS

(By Dan Markel)

WASHINGTON.—Hat makers of New England and Pennsylvania and chinaware and pottery workers of the Midwest and California are battling State Department boosts of foreign imports and its direct purchases abroad.

For the 40,000 organized hat makers and 50,000 chinaware producers it's a fight for life.

State Department trade deals with foreign countries, principally Italy and Communist-controlled Czechoslovakia, have jeopardized their industries.

For hats or hat bodies costing $30 to $48 a dozen the duty used to be $13 plus 25 percent of value per dozen.

The generous State Department has fixed a new rate of $8 plus 12½ percent per dozen.

That means for the $48 per dozen hat bodies the old rate was $25; the new rate $14.

OTHER GRADES CUT

Similar cuts have been made on other grades.

In secret contracts the State Department already has purchased $280,000 worth of dinnerware in Germany for its embassies and consulates around the world.

It did this following tariff cuts amounting to virtually 50 percent on such items as vases, statuettes, steins, cups, lamps, clock cases, plaques, and other earthenware and china articles imported from abroad.

Senator HUGH BUTLER, Republican, of Nebraska, exposed the secret purchase deals, and said the State Department now is negotiating a third.

America's diplomats, he pointed out, will no longer dine off American chinaware.

UNITED STATES FIRMS IGNORED

BUTLER emphasized that the secret State Department chinaware deals were engineered without American producers even being granted an opportunity to bid. And at a time when unemployment, cancellation of orders, and a slow-down of American production is occurring.

The vitrified-china industry wrote to the British Embassy here inquiring whether the British would consider using American china in its Embassy services. It got a tart reply:

"As the United Kingdom is itself the manufacturer of some of the finest chinaware in the world, we are not in the market for china manufactured elsewhere."

Grants-in-Aid for Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of public discussion about the effect of Federal grants-in-aid on the initiative and independence of local agencies.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article on grants-in-aid for public health, by Dr. C. E. A. Winslow, the distinguished editor of the American Journal of Public Health, in the October issue of that magazine.

The article terms the first 10 years of Federal grants for public health "a record of an outstanding public service and a guide for future policy." It adds that Federal grants have not resulted in a decreased sense of responsibility, but exactly the reverse.

The article follows:

GRANTS-IN-AID FOR PUBLIC HEALTH

A recent bulletin of the United States Public Health Service (Public Health Bulletin, No. 300, USPHS 1949) telling the story of Ten Years of Federal Grants for Public Health, is significant as a record of an outstanding public service and as a guide for future policy.

The first Federal Social Security Act of 1935, among its general provisions, authorized substantial Federal grants to the States for assistance in the development and support of State and local public-health services. Formulation of the basic policies under which this program was carried out we owe largely to Dr. C. E. Waller in charge of the Division of Domestic Quarantine of the United States Public Health Service from 1931 to 1939. Grants for general health services actually began in 1937; for venereal disease control in 1939; for tuberculosis control in 1946; and cancer control, mental hygiene,

and hospital planning and construction are now also specifically included.

Allotments to the Public Health Service for such grants-in-aid have increased from under 8,000,000 in 1937 to under 22,000,000 in 1946 and over 35,000,000 in 1948.

Small as these appropriations are in relation to the total Federal budget, the results accomplished have been nothing less than spectacular. During the period 1935 to 1946, the number of State health departments reporting specific identified projects in various specialized fields, in or prior to the designated year, increased as follows: Tuberculosis control, 19 States to 46 States; venereal-disease control, 28 to 45; industrial hygiene, 4 to 38; public health nursing, 30 to 46; public health education, 16 to 43; dental hygiene, 16 to 43; cancer control, 5 to 27; nutrition, 7 to 29. The significance of such broadening of scope is great, and the major stimulus to such development has come from the grants-in-aid. In the same period, and largely under the same stimulus, full-time local health units have increased from 561 to 980.

It is encouraging to note that the Federal program has not, as some had feared, tended in any way to diminish local initiative. Under the system of administration in force (using in most cases a matching requirement), the increase in State and local funds has exceeded the increase in Federal funds. In 1937 a grand total of $22,000,000 was spent for all State and local services, of which 37 percent came from Federal sources (including both the United States Public Health Service and the United States Children's Bureau). In 1946 the grand total was $109,000,000, of which only 28 percent came from Washington. Federal grants have not resulted in a decreased sense of local responsibility, but exactly the reverse. They have primed the pump for more and more fruitful drafts on State and country resources.

The Bulletin under review is a purely factual one, and very properly contains no discussion of the basic philosophy of Federal grants-in-aid. This is a subject, however, on which this Journal, as the organ of the public health profession (which is on the receiving end of the process) may properly express an opinion. Every now and then an address is delivered, or an essay is written, which views with alarm the fearful prospects of Federal domination of State policies supposedly involved in grants from Washington. It happens that the writer of this editorial has for more than 30 years been a member of a State public-health council which has been the recipient of Federal grants, and is in position to testify that such fears are wholly illusory. Experience has shown that Federal fund-granting agencies are normally highly conscious of the fact that each State has two Senators, who are quite readily accessible to a word from the State capitol. It is reasonably certain that if there are faults in the actual operation of the program, they lie in too much, and not too little, deference of Washington agencies to local opinion.

We sometimes meet with statements which contrast the alleged bureaucratic control supposed to be involved in Government grants with the freedom of initiative characteristic of the contributions of voluntary agencies. This contrast again is fallacious. We do not for a moment imply that voluntary agencies have, in practice, exercised undue pressure. Such is not the case. That they could exert such pressure, if unwisely directed, is, however, clear. Their managing boards are, in actual fact, largely self perpetuating and the general public has no control over their conduct. Governmental agencies, on the other hand, are responsible to the citizenship which supports them. They are highly susceptible to pressure from individual citizens or groups of citizens. It may be suggested that those who lie awake at night in fear of Federal domination have at the bottom of their minds a different concept of government, which assumes that domination by someone is essential and that such domination can best be exercised by themselves. In a democracy, as we conceive it, the government is our Government. It cannot tyrannize over us because we control it, and we accept the underlying faith of the founding fathers in the ultimate soundness of the democratic process.

The American Parents Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the New York Times, which describes the legislative objectives of the American Parents Committee. I am familiar with the program of the committee and am cognizant of its work here in Washington and throughout the Nation to improve conditions affecting children. Mr. George J. Hecht, chairman, and the Washington representatives of the American Parents Committee are doing an effective and worth-while job in this worthy cause:

NINE-POINT CHILD AID ASKED OF CONGRESS—PARENTS' COMMITTEE OUTLINES ITS PROGRAM FOR 46,000,000 UNDER CABINET-RANK UNIT

WASHINGTON, January 2.—A nine-point program for the advancement of stated goals in the child-welfare field was announced today by the American Parents Committee. The committee added that the proposals were designed especially for the attention and action of Congress.

In a final analysis, the program is a request for enactment of legislation to improve the health, education, and welfare facilities for the Nation's 46,000,000 children.

Organized 3 years ago to put forward a national program for the benefit of children, the APC is headed by George J. Hecht, publisher of Parents' magazine. As chairman, Mr. Hecht has the assistance of these vice chairmen:

Dr. Henry Noble MacCracken, former president of Vassar College; Dorothy Canfield Fisher, author and educator; Walt Disney, motion-picture producer; and Robert L. Johnson, president of Temple University and chairman of the citizens committee for the Hoover Report.

Legislative goals for which the APC will press include:

1. The national school health services bill, calling for an annual $35,000,000 grants-in-aid program for school health examinations and treatment of all school children. This measure already had been passed by the Senate.

2. The public school construction bill, which asks $5,000,000 to match the States for a Nation-wide survey of needs, and other sums for emergency school construction. This has been voted by the Senate.

CONTROVERSIAL MEASURE BACKED

3. The Federal aid for education bill, which provides $300,000,000 for grants-in-aid to the States under a formula which gives a larger proportion of funds to the needier States. This bill has passed the Senate, but is blocked in the House by a controversy over whether Federal funds could go to the parochial schools for services such as bus transportation.

4. The national child research bill, which proposes a grant of $7,500,000 annually for research in child life and development. Hearings have been conducted in the Senate, but not yet by the House.

5. To the bill on revisions in the social-security system, and already passed by the House, the Senate will be asked to add: Increased benefits for dependent children and needy mothers under the insurance program; increased grants-in-aid for needy children when the father is unemployed; and benefits for dependent children and mothers in the program of total and permanent disability insurance.

6. The local public health units bill, which has for its purpose an increase in the number of public health units until the entire population is served, thus insuring to children safe-drinking water, milk inspection, sanitation inspection, and other health benefits. This bill has been endorsed by the Senate.

MORE FUNDS FOR CHILDREN'S BUREAU

7. To carry out basic purposes for which the Federal Children's Bureau was established by Congress in 1912, an increased appropriation will be urged, above the $600,000 currently appropriated to the Bureau, and aside from its grants-in-aid program, to total $2,250,000.

8. An increased appropriation, also, for the national school-lunch program. An increase from $83,500,000 to $100,000,000 is sought by the APC.

9. Establishment of a Federal Department of Welfare with Cabinet status. This the committee's Federal statement emphasized was long overdue, and represented a movement to help all individuals and particularly to improve the effectiveness of the many child-health and welfare programs administered under the Federal Security Agency.

Are the TV Boys Color-Blind?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT GORE
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. GORE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

ARE THE TV BOYS COLOR-BLIND?

(By Robert F. Jones, FCC Commissioner)

WASHINGTON.—Although the 3,500 pages and 100 exhibits of the color television hearing are significant sometimes for lack of sound scientific data from witnesses and parties from whom more might be expected, the hearing isn't half over and, therefore, it's a little early for the inside story that color's rigor mortis has set in. Some folks may be intoxicated by their own propaganda or they may be tuning an eager ear to their wishful thinking but the record at this stage doesn't justify the reckless conclusions bandied about by some members of the industry who haven't had the courage to enter a formal appearance for their individual companies.

In the hearing, aside from proponents of color and their witnesses, only DuMont, Philco, and American Television, Inc., appeared and testified in behalf of their own firms. Allen B. DuMont complained that the current color hearing was the first hearing of its nature not requested by the industry. When questioned on this point, he buttressed his

contention further by saying, "I don't believe there has been any general discussion, say, between the Commission, the RMA (Radio Manufacturers Assn.) and the TBA (Television Broadcasting Assn.) and other organizations before the hearing was called." David Smith of Philco, testifying for RMA, followed the party line in his direct testimony that the industry wanted color. When it seemed that RMA and the industry were tossing brickbats at color while they sanctimoniously said they were for it, Commissioner Frieda B. Hennock asked Smith the $64 question: "How are we going to get color television, we in the Commission? Where are we going to get it from?" Smith replied for RMA, "I think you are going to get it from industry, Miss Hennock."

I've heard a lot in the last 16 years about a nebulous supergovernment of the vested interests. I've heard victories asserted in the name of the common man in every national election since I entered public life. For several years preceding the current congressional investigation of lobbyists, I heard of the sinister conduct of "the interests" in seeking self-serving legislation; but I never heard of any manufacturer chiding a Senator or Representative in Congress because a hearing was held on a bill affecting his economic interest before it was cleared with the National Association of Manufacturers or the United States Chamber of Commerce.

RMA'S APPROACH OUTDATED

To understand how outdated is RMA's approach, one has only to review some recent American history. When Sam Insull's perverted sense of public service dominated the private utilities industry, he had about the same notions as Smith expressed for RMA. But the utilities have long since learned that they cannot set the low-water mark for public service. And I do not believe that the private television industry will make the same mistake despite the views expressed by Smith for the RMA that the Commission must get new developments of the television art from the television industry exclusively.

The colossal engineering feats of Hoover and Grand Coulee Dams, not to mention the enormous engineering plans for further development of the Columbia River Valley in the northwest, the Central Valley in California, and the Missouri Valley are testimonials that the Government is capable of doing a comprehensive engineering job. One only has to look at the stormy career of the TVA to understand that the Government's development of the Tennessee Valley was accomplished in spite of the bitter opposition of private interests. On a number of fronts in the Southwest, West, and Midwest, private utilities have had the lesson dramatically brought home to them in the last 16 years that Government doesn't have to and hasn't waited for private enterprise to furnish the engineering answers.

Let us get clearly in mind that I'm talking about developmental engineering jobs and I'm not proposing that Government go into the broadcasting business in competition with private broadcasters. Although it was written about the same time that the Bonneville Power Act put the Government in the power business in the Northwest, the Communications Act provided that broadcasting was the business of private enterprise alone. That philosophy I heartily indorse and I'm emphatically not advocating a change.

I am what some would term an old-fashioned conservative. In public and private life I have stood for private enterprise, lock, stock, and barrel and have stuck by my guns when it was easier politically to ride the popular tide of putting Government into business as a recrimination against some faults of business and businessmen. During my 2 years as a bureaucrat, I believe my record bears out this philosophy in dealing with licensees whose problems are properly before the Commission. You'll invariably find me on the side of strict interpretation of the act for the same reasons I tried, as a Member of Congress, to cut appropriations and write into appropriation bills limitations upon the unbounded activities of some Government agencies. The motive is simple—I believe and have believed all along that the least government is the best government.

It does not follow, however, that the Government doesn't have a job to keep private enterprise honest and to make it abide by some fair rules for the game. The antitrust laws, the Fair Trade Act, the Food and Drug Act, and the Securities and Exchange Act are pertinent examples of the Government's proper role as a referee. Who would say that we would have any of these acts fostered by both Democratic and Republican administrations if we had to clear them with Wall Street, the National Association of Manufacturers, or the United States Chamber of Commerce? These statutes dealt with proper subjects for legislative action and no one but the President had the veto power. The color hearings are likewise quasi-legislative proceedings and the act does not give any veto power or signal-calling to the RMA, Joint Television Advisory Committee, Institute of Radio Engineers or any other organization of industry. As Commissioner Walker pointed out to Dr. DuMont in the hearings, the mandate to the FCC is clearly drafted in the Comunications Act that "the Commission shall from time to time as public convenience, interest, and necessity requires study new uses for radio * * * and generally encourage the larger and more effective use of radio in the public interest." The current color television hearings fall squarely within this statutory mandate.

INDUSTRY ROAD BLOCKS

What is all this noise about then? We have some color proposals and we have the industry practically unanimously throwing up road blocks in front of the Commission's hearing schedule to dispose of them. I say road blocks because they've posed field tests, studies and time limits from 6 months to the wild blue yonder before they can be ready to recommend standards for color.

Their intention to veto the color hearings was pretty well spelled out early in the hearings when no noticeable effort was made by the manufacturers and their alter egoes—the RMA, JTAC, and IRE—to program, plan, or report methods to the Commission by which they would build the receivers for public reaction, and for laboratory tests of color signals and color systems. Once having posed these questions, without turning a hand toward furnishing the wherewithal to answer them, it is not surprising that RMA is having labor pains forming a new National Television Systems Committee. Do they propose answers by February 27 when the hearing resumes? Apparently not. They appear merely to want time to draw up another color system with the FCC to serve as the practical nurse from now until labor is over.

You may ask why does the RMA want Commission blessing of a new NTSC? The answer is simple. The FCC engineering bureau hasn't grown with the phenomenal use of the radio spectrum. The Commission has, therefore, relied upon engineering committees whose personnel is drawn largely from the radio industry to solve its problems.

Compare, however, the Interior Department. Whether I agree with it or not, the Interior Department has a hydraulic engineer hanging from every crag in the West and an electrical engineer in every potential power market because they recognized early that they couldn't rely upon private utility engineers to carry out their conception of the development of the natural resources of power and water of the West and Midwest.

There were obviously going to be conflicts between private and public interests. The radio spectrum is one of the most precious natural resources the American public has today and I believe we are now at the crossroads, deciding whether we should let private interests exploit it for private profit and time each new development of the art for their balance sheets; or whether we should ourselves do the job that the statute imposed upon us for the public interest alone.

What does failure to build color receiving sets to determine public reaction, failure to schedule tests of the proponents' systems mean in the face of the Commission's order of November 21 urging manufacturers to build color receivers and cooperate in the tests to get the answers to the questions they themselves have posed? It means they are giving the Vishinsky veto to the color hearings. They're making the last stand for a supergovernment. What they may not win by direct methods, they apparently hope to win by acting in a semiofficial status as FCC engineers—paid for by the industry.

If Henry Kaiser had to get the approval of his automobile from the automotive industry before he could sell a car, do you think he'd have sold one yet? Or suppose the Government back in the early twenties had thrown its weight against the public's desire to buy and play with crystal sets, against receivers with morning glory loudspeakers and howling signals, on the theory that none should be sold until the superheterodyne and FM were invented. This is precisely what RMA wants to do with color proposals. The tycoons of television would be dwarfs today if Government had done this in the beginning. The radio pioneers are very short-sighted if they try to let reservoirs of knowledge run dry in this color hearing.

Religious Bigotry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, at a time when religious feeling is running high it is regrettable that the alleged ill-treatment of Texan Protestant missionaries in Italy is being used to stir up bigotry into action. The following letter has been circularized throughout parts of Texas, and it is in the interest of justice and fair play that its false and malicious character be now exposed:

MARY MOTHER OF GOD
NOCTURNAL ADORATION SOCIETY,
New York, N. Y., January 9, 1950.

Rev. J. WOOD,
Crescent Hill Church,
Brownfield, Tex.

SIR: We have read the protests you made concerning the illegal missionary activity of your workers in Italy, and of the just punishment they have received from the faithful. Worse is in store for you, as you will soon find out.

Let me assure you that you, together with all other false heretics and agents of hell, will surely burn forever in purgatory for your damnable acts. His Holiness, the Most Holy Father Pope Pius XII, Vicar of Jesus Christ on Earth, has said there is one true church and one only—and not your false, so-called Church of Christ—which is the Devil's own church.

You have absolutely no right to be in Italy. The Italians are members of the true church, and they don't need your lousy Protestant missionaries to confuse and mislead them, so you had better stay out of where you don't belong.

Furthermore, unless you repent and confess your sin and come back to the true Roman Catholic Church the agonies of perpetual torture in purgatory and hell await you—together with Mrs. Roosevelt, Bishop Oxnam, and all others who dare attack the Holy Roman Church and our Holy Father Pope Pius XII.

I am asking the holy sisters and nuns of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Mother of God to pray for you, and maybe you will be converted to the true faith. If the Roman Catholic Church were not true, it would not be the largest, richest, biggest, and best church on earth, which it most surely is. Furthermore, hundreds of thousands of former false Protestants are daily being converted to the church by Monsignor Sheen and others.

Yours in the Bleeding Heart of Mary,
FRANCES XAVIER O'TOOLE.

The Official Catholic Directory which lists every recognized Catholic ecclesiastical organization, and which lists as well every Catholic priest in good standing in the United States, has no record of a priest by the name of Francis Xavier O'Toole. Nor is there any such organization as the Society of the Immaculate Heart of Mary Mother of God. A further check with the chancery office of the archdiocese of New York confirms the Official Catholic Directory.

What then can be said of any religious group or any individual connected with a religious group who will make use of a letter which is not only malicious but libelous in character and false in its representation of Catholic teaching, without bothering to investigate its authenticity. Surely there can be little point in appealing to civil rights for Americans overseas, if those who are pleading for those rights contravene the fundamental right that Catholics as well as Protestants have to their good name.

In the publicity which has surrounded the so-called Frascati case, the impression has been conveyed to the American people that Protestants have no rights in Italy. As against this impression, Dr. Guido Comba, secretary-treasurer of the Waldensian Church of Italy, told a news service correspondent last week that Protestants in Italy have the same legal standing as Catholics. "Our church has never been molested in any of its charitable activities," Dr. Comba said. "All the institutions owned and conducted by the Waldensian Church can do their work without interference by anybody." There are over 200 Waldensian pastors in Italy who go about their regular work without interference. There are 17 Waldensian institutions in Italy: 5 orphanages, 4 homes for the aged, 2 hospitals, 2 colleges, 2 hostels for boys, an industrial home, and a home for incurables. Surely it cannot be said that Protestants are not allowed to have their institutions in Italy.

It is not Protestant missionary activity or charitable works which occasion bitterness in predominantly Catholic countries. Rather it is the method or methods used by missionaries. It seems almost naive that Italians whose Catholic culture has produced a Michelangelo, a Dante, a Thomas Aquinas, a Palestrina, and a Francis of Assisi, should sit idly by and show no emotional reaction when Texan missionaries hold that culture up to ridicule and tell the Italian people that they have been living in error all these many years.

There certainly is some point to the comment made by Carl Victor Little, who is a Protestant, and who conducts a column in the Houston Press. He expressed the hope that the State Department would return home the group of American Protestant missionaries, including the 11 Texans, who have complained that they were ill-treated by the people in some Italian villages.

These missionaries—

Mr. Little wrote—

supported by money raised in Texas, have been preaching in communities in the Italian hinterland that have been Catholic since the dawn of Christianity, that their concept of the gospel is the only tr e one.

We wonder what those Texans who were missionarying in Italy expect the plain, uneducated people to whom they are preaching to do, serve them spaghetti and give them a bouquet? Mr. Little asked.

These innocents abroad, the Texans, go right into the backyard of the papacy and denounce the Vatican and all its works. Then they cry and protest to the State Department, because the peasants greeted them with a shower of stones, but, according to a dispatch there were no injuries except perhaps to their delicate feelings. We wonder what would happen if a group of Italian missionaries from Rome would come to some sections of Texas and tell us Protestants that we have been talking through our theological hat and that ours is not the only true belief after all—

Mr. Little continued.

A shower of stones would more than likely be the minimum that these hypothetical Italian missionaries would receive for their trouble in trying to save the heathen of Texas—

He concluded.

Mr. Little certainly has a good point in what he says. The attempt to make use of a phony letter whose object is to foment bigotry and discord, has little place in the American scheme of things, and it is a matter of profound regret that any use of this letter has been made at all, without an attempt being made to determine whether such a society existed and whether its name was used with permission.

A Transparent Evasion of the FEPC Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, failure of the Democrat leadership to give the green light yesterday to FEPC legislation is capable of two interpretations. At best, it is an admission of division and disunity within the party that demonstrates its unfitness to govern. At worst, it is evidence of a callous repudiation of solemn and oft-repeated pledges.

Let us hear no more anywhere about a GOP-Dixiecrat coalition bottling up the civil-rights problem. The Republicans want to vote and wanted to vote yesterday. The country expected us to do so. The transparent dodge of this issue yesterday by the administration leaders will not fool anybody. They have dangled this civil-rights bait before the voting public long enough. For depriving us of the chance to vote on this issue, the responsibility rests squarely on the Democrat Party.

Tomorrow, on Calendar Wednesday, they will have an opportunity to right the wrong they committed yesterday. The country expects them to live up to their platform pledge. The Republican Party is prepared to demonstrate its sincerity, if given a chance by those who control the scheduling of legislation.

Real Fights Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, my attention has just been invited to an able and understanding editorial in the Raleigh (N. C.) News and Observer, entitled "Real Fights Ahead."

It presents a clear picture of the Rules Committee problem which confronted the House last week, and which still puzzles some of our Members, and even more of the general public.

I commend it to those of each group as enlightening and informative reading. It follows:

REAL FIGHTS AHEAD

"Who won the election in 1948, anyhow?" That is the way Speaker SAM RAYBURN stated the issue on yesterday's vote to change the rules of the House of Representatives. So far as the House is concerned, the issue was not overstated.

The effort of a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats to return autocratic powers to bury legislation to the House Rules Committee, which they control, has been defeated.

The real fights lie ahead, however. It is true, as its proponents gleefully admitted, that if the proposed change in rules had been adopted, President Truman's entire program would have been thrown overboard. It does not follow, however, that the President's program has been saved in its entirety. It will have to be saved, so much of it as can be saved, item by item and bill by bill.

Fortunately, yesterday's vote broke party lines on both sides of the aisle which, theoretically at least, separates the two parties.

The administration was supported by 171 Democrats, 64 Republicans, and 1 Laborite and was opposed by 98 Republicans and 85 Democrats.

There will be shifting alinements on individual bills. Many southern Democrats are

so much opposed to parts of the President's program that they were willing to vote, in effect, against the whole program in order to make sure of defeating part of it. Some of the 85 who favored changing the rules will vote for individual items on the President's program.

On the other hand, Republican leaders will be able to corral more of their followers against individual items on the President's program than they were able to muster in yesterday's vote.

The Democratic Party and Democratic government stood to lose a great deal in yesterday's vote. About all it has gained is chance to fight again, item by item, bill by bill. It is disheartening that on a vote that might have meant so much, one-third of the Democratic members deserted their party leadership. * * *

Needless to say this vote is not typical of the record of the North Carolina delegation in the Eighty-first Congress when that record is viewed as a whole. It is safe to predict that in the votes to come the North Carolina delegation will make a much better record.

And there are real fights ahead.

Franking Privileges

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, the 11-year fight against EDWIN ARTHUR HALL as a Representative of the people by the newspapers of Binghamton is still raging.

I have never failed to strike back when attacked and I never will fail whenever the ruthless foes of our types of representation challenge me.

The latest beef these ancient enemies are featuring is their same old gripe about the franking privilege.

To the folks back home who have voted for me year after year in the face of this stirring issue, it must seem slightly threadbare and tiresome to have them keep harping on this question.

They cite a cost to the taxpayers of twenty-six million annually that Government mail runs and then single me out as the greatest abuser of all. Actually my franked mail is slight by comparison.

For their information, I will frank messages telling the true side of the story every time these newspapers smear me with false innuendoes, ridicule, and genuine viciousness.

They know I can reach more people than they can, because most of their readers turn to the sports page and the funnies anyway and cannot be bothered with their editorial tripe. To the contrary, every voter reads my direct letter.

This is why these newssheets in my native city would give their eye teeth to deprive me of the franking privilege. You see they just want to cut me off from all contacts with the people I represent.

It is O. K. for them to distort my position on every subject under the sun and to make fun of the elected representative of the people. But they are determined to give me no quarter to give the public the real truth.

For over a decade they have waged in my direction the greatest character belittling campaign ever directed against a public official, at least in our part of the country. But as long as I can enjoy the privilege of striking back with the only weapon a Member of Congress now has left to defend his reputation, my voice shall not be silenced.

Let them editorialize, write poison-pen letters, set up their stooges to attack me. It will avail them nothing, especially in view of the fact that their sports pages and funny section are much more enlightening.

They deplore the fact that I use the frank. A sure way, then, for me to use the frank less will be for them to lay off. This will save us all a lot of frustrated energy.

So if they are really sincere and not just shedding crocodile tears for public benefit, let them desist.

The Special Services Program of the Veterans' Administration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, during the recent congressional recess, I had the pleasure of speaking to the meeting of the nineteenth district hospital commission, American Legion, department of California, at my home city, Long Beach, Calif., December 11, 1949. I also had the very great benefit of listening to an address to the large number in attendance by Douglas Dashiell, assistant chief, Veterans' Administration, on the subject The Special Services Program of the Veterans' Administration. It was recognized that the important subject matter he related was so clearly and succinctly stated and was of such valuable import to all Members of Congress, and the general public as well, permission was granted that I should ask to have this splendid address printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I respectfully commend the reading of it by all.

Madam Chairman, distinguished guests, Legionnaires and members of the American Legion Auxiliary, during World War II, the motto of a well-known general hospital under Army control was happiness, kindness, and efficiency. In the Veterans' Administration we take pride in the fact that our hospitals provide medical service second to none. But, no hospital can achieve the goal of a medical service second to none, unless it serves its patients with the humanizing element paramount in all of its phases, for medicine used in its broadcast sense is founded in human sympathy. No man can live alone, since we are servants of each other. We are under constant and lasting obligations to one another. The policies of the Veterans' Administration embody this motto; since its goal cannot be achieved without kindness to the patients, happiness for the patient, and efficiency in serving the patient, first, last, and always.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley, now chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and formerly administrator of veterans' affairs gave recognition to this fact when he emphasized that sick and wounded veterans have certain human needs to be cared for, over and above the minimum physical needs.

Medical service second to none is based upon a well-thought-out plan of operation of the medical team. This concept represents the functioning of groups of professional and associated, qualified lay employees working in close coordination to the end that the most complete and efficient care, consistent with rigid standards of governmental economy, be employed in the treatment of hospital patients and in the care of home members. This medical team consists of these groups: (1) Doctors, nurses, and allied professional people; (2) medical rehabilitation; (3) Special Services; and (4) volunteer workers.

Today, I shall briefly discuss one of the programs of the Veterans' Administration which is designed to satisfy the human needs of our hospitalized veterans, namely, the third member of the medical team—Special Services.

The Special Services Division—on coequal staff status with operating agencies such as, Claims, Insurance, Personnel, etc.—includes the following services or fields of activity: Recreation and entertainment, sports, library, chaplaincy, and canteen services. Each section is staffed by specialists in the particular field. All special services activities are coordinated with and integrated into the over-all hospital program, as set forth by the manager and chief medical officer of a hospital.

The primary purpose in the operation of the special services program in the Veterans' Administration is to raise the morale of patients in the hospitals and members in the domiciliaries by furnishing those things which can make their stay more pleasant and thus facilitate their recovery. Special services, as such, is something new in the Veterans' Administration. During World War II, special services was a very important branch of the Army and the Air Force. In the Navy, the same services, known as welfare and recreation, received just as much emphasis and made an equally worthwhile contribution to that branch of the service. With the influx of veterans of World War II into Veterans' Administration hospitals and homes, and the accelerated program of veterans affairs, it was a logical step to incorporate the special services program into the Veterans' Administration. Veterans of World War II were used to a highly geared program of recreation and entertainment. They were used to the finest of sports facilities and equipment. They were used to new books, new motion pictures, church services for all faiths, modern PX's. Above all, they were not used to depending upon the charity of individuals at will as to whether or not they received these things.

The aim of Special Services is twofold: To assist in giving the patient a will to get well, and, at the same time, to keep his interest alive in the normal activities of life so that he may be better prepared to take his place in normal living when he is released from the hospital. That latter point is an important one to remember, for it is fundamental in our thinking and planning that our efforts be constantly aimed at returning the veteran to his community, to assist him in taking his place in that community as a valuable citizen.

Now, let's take a look at the Special Services program in progress in the Veterans' Administration. Naturally, each activity is designed and conducted to meet the needs of the patients and members for whom it is intended. This is a tremendous challenge when you analyze the personnel which our

beneficiaries represent—the presence of Spanish-American War veterans and young men of World War II, the present of nurses of World War I and younger ex-service-women of World War II, and the varying degrees of physical and mental health.

RECREATION AND ENTERTAINMENT

The recreational program comprises both active and passive recreation. Practically every patient and member is reached by this program. If his condition prohibits freedom of conduct or physical ability to go and come as he pleases, the activities are brought to him. We stress patient participation throughout the program. The Recreation Service plans and supervises programs in the fields of motion pictures, radio, hospital newspaper, music, hobby clubs, games, dramatics, and personal appearances of both professional and amateur groups. Trips into the community are a fine morale booster. The recreational program is planned and supervised by our professional staff, and a great number of volunteers are utilized in its execution.

SPORTS

A second field of activity included in Special Services is sports. The mission of the Sports Service is to provide patients and members the opportunity to participate in an enjoyable and healthful voluntary sports program. Patients and members engage in impromptu sports activities of their choice. They learn to participate better in, and to gain a fuller appreciation of sports in which they are interested. Patients compete with others of their own approximate level of athletic ability. All patients are cleared in writing by the appropriate medical service prior to participation in the sports program, in order to determine activities in which the patient may safely participate, limits of participation, and any other information needed to safeguard the patient. In addition, both patients and members are provided opportunities to attend off-station sports activities with spectator appeal.

LIBRARY SERVICE

Library service is a third responsibility of the Special Services Division. Various phases of hospital library service include:

Book truck service to wards which contacts all patients. These trucks, carrying 75 books and 150 magazines, are accompanied by a trained librarian who exchanges books and magazines, recommends reading, and notes requests for reference material and books not on the truck.

Messenger service from the library to the bed patient in the delivery of material requested on truck schedules or reserve material.

Reserve service by which books requested, which are not immediately available, are flagged in circulation and are forwarded to readers when available.

Reading room service, where readers have opportunity to examine or read books, magazines, and newspapers in comfortable surroundings.

Reference service, which requires the answering by the librarian of all types of reference questions and the forwarding of desired information to the bed patient.

Medical library service to the medical and auxiliary medical staffs.

Interlibrary loan service, by which books located in one station library are available to other libraries.

Other library services, such as projected book—the projection on ceiling or wall of complete books filmed on 16 millimeter film—thus bringing considerable enjoyment to the bed patient.

Distribution of cross-word and jig-saw puzzles which many readers request as mental relaxation.

CANTEEN SERVICE

The Veterans Canteen Service is an instrumentality of the United States established by law in the Veterans' Administration. It supplies merchandise and services to specified classes of persons, and is financed by appropriated funds accounted for in the form of a revolving fund.

A hospital station canteen operation consists of:

1. Retail stores.
2. Warehouses.
3. Soda fountains.
4. Restaurant or cafeterias.
5. Barber shops.
6. Beauty shops.
7. Laundry, tailor, dry-cleaning and pressing services.
8. Shoe-repair services.
9. Vending and amusement machines.

Our canteen service provides the patient with those articles of use and convenience which, because of his hospitalization, he is unable to procure otherwise. When the patient is ambulatory, he has the opportunity of going to the store, of going himself to the canteen to make his purchases. When he is bedfast, a portable canteen, or ward cart, is brought to his bedside on a regular schedule. Careful attention is given to the choice of items made available in the canteens, as well as to the display of the merchandise in an attractive manner. The emphasis, as indicated before, is on surrounding the patients with as much normalcy as possible. Because the canteen service is a business organization, it is strictly controlled by adequate audits and inspection. Prices are kept low and any profits that accrue revert to the Federal Treasury.

CHAPLAINCY SERVICE

For administrative purposes, the chaplaincy service is a part of the Special Services Division. In the endeavor to give attention to our patients as individuals, careful thought has been given to their spiritual needs. A chaplaincy service was established in which recognition is given to the three major faiths—Protestant, Catholic, and Jewish. A quota is maintained to insure equitable representation for all so that every patient may follow his religious inclination. The chaplaincy service is organized to provide one full-time chaplain for (approximately) every 500 patients, with part-time chaplains as needed. The major emphasis in this highly important service is placed on bedside ministry. In this personalized and individualized service the chaplain has the opportunity to learn intimately the spiritual needs of the patients and to bring them courage and the solace of the church.

May I summarize by saying that these special services are designed and conducted to combat the evils of inactivity and to provide some of the conveniences, stimulations, and comforts of every-day life. When supervised and conducted by adequately trained personnel—both staff personnel and voluntary personnel—Special Services can go far in aiding the veterans to recovery, increasing their vision of opportunities by provision of incentives, and help restore them to their rightful places in the community.

No official of the Veterans' Administration could discuss the hospitalized veteran without paying tribute to the splendid contribution which volunteer workers have made, and are making to the service of veterans.

A source of vast potentiality that has been brought forward by the war, though it is as old as human nature, is volunteers. No more valuable aid to therapy exists than those who come because they want to and are not paid, who bring in the breath of the outside world and keep a hospitalized patient from losing his contact. There comes with such people the visible evidence of the love and affection of America for its veterans—patients see from day to day not only doctors, nurses, orderlies, technicians, professionals in the field allied to medicine previously mentioned, who must perforce, under the best of circumstances remind a man that he is ill, but the butcher, the baker, the candlestick maker, lawyer, merchant chief, the champion boxer, local athlete, well-known artists, prominent people, pretty girls, stars of the amusement world. Leaders of organizations have selected good citizens, old and young, to visit and work with the men and women of our hospitals and home. Volunteers from the local community by and large are of more value than casual visitors, for they come often enough to get acquainted and form a lasting influence. Both are valuable.

With regard to the function of volunteers, we are operating on the principle that a volunteer plays an essential part in the total job of aiding in the recovery of a patient, that he has certain specific functions with regard to doing specific jobs with certain patients, and, in addition he has general functions which have to do with the background, environment, and other connections of the patient before and after the treatment, and an important relationship to the community at large.

The compensation which a volunteer receives is not financial, but it behooves everyone concerned with the volunteer in an administrative and promotional capacity to keep in mind the very important consideration of satisfaction, appreciation, and other forms of compensation which the volunteer worker must have if his work will remain steady and show gradual improvement.

Effective utilization of volunteer assistance is a prime essential for a working voluntary service program. The planning and the coordination of the volunteer program, orientation and indoctrination of the volunteer, on-the-job instruction, and proper supervision of the volunteer are essential factors in the establishment of a voluntary service program. These factors are the responsibility of each staff member supervising the activities of volunteer workers in the special services phases of the voluntary service program. The career of the volunteer in the hospital program is in the hands of VA staff members supervising the volunteer. This career will have significance for the volunteer only if the supervisor gives meaning to the assignment, clarifies the responsibility involved, and works closely with the volunteer.

Each VA Special Services staff member is asked to analyze his program with respect to its further development through the use of volunteer assistance, and with respect to the qualifications and requirements necessary for volunteers participating in specific assignments.

By supplementing the work of the VA staff members, you are enriching and expanding the organized accomplishments of the Veterans' Administration. In great number, you have shouldered a heavy burden of hospital visitation and work. You have generously given of your time and of your money. You have built and kept alive the fire of service. Your efforts have not been in vain, because you have done the job courageously, and the veterans have benefited thereby through your devotion. For this, you are the recipients of the gratitude of the Veterans' Administration.

In the realm of rendering service, let us give recognition to the fact that the Veterans' Administration represents our Nation's plan and determination to care for our veterans. This great governmental agency is symbolic of the principle of serving those who served. It is the official assurance, as expressed by the representatives of a great people, that America has not forgotten and will not forget a job well done.

There will always be hospitals. There will always be patients in those hospitals. There will always be members in the homes. There will always be the need for that extra measure of personalized attention that means so much to living human beings.

The job of helping to restore lost opportunities to a whole generation of Americans calls for the active support of all Americans.

It has been a privilege to meet with you today. Thank you.

Senator Byrd's Budget Would Save Taxpayers Six and One-half Billions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 16, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on January 9 President Truman recommended to Congress a spending budget for the fiscal year 1951 totaling $42,400,000,000.

On that same afternoon Senator HARRY F. BYRD, of Virginia, an authority on Federal fiscal affairs, submitted for the record his own budget proposals for 1951 totaling $36,000,000,000, which was $6,400,000,000 less than the amount requested by the President.

Inasmuch as all Federal spending must be met in full by taxation, and all Federal taxes come from the residents of the 48 States, the District of Columbia, and the several Territories, the following tabulation is offered to show (a) what the Truman budget would cost the people of each State; (b) what the Byrd budget would cost the people of each State; and (c) the amount which the people of each State would save in taxes if Congress were to adopt Senator BYRD's proposals instead of the President's:

	Percent of Federal taxes borne by State	Cost of Truman budget	Cost of Byrd budget	Saving under Byrd budget
United States total	100.00	$42,439,000,000	$36,000,000,000	$6,439,000,000
Alabama	1.17	496,536,300	421,200,000	75,336,300
Arizona	.37	157,024,300	133,200,000	23,824,300
Arkansas	.72	305,560,800	259,200,000	46,360,800
California	8.32	3,530,924,800	2,995,200,000	535,724,800
Colorado	.80	339,512,000	288,000,000	51,512,000
Connecticut	1.67	708,731,300	601,200,000	107,531,300
Delaware	.40	169,756,000	144,000,000	25,756,000
Florida	1.29	547,463,100	464,400,000	83,063,100
Georgia	1.40	594,146,000	504,000,000	90,146,000
Idaho	.32	135,804,800	115,200,000	20,604,800
Illinois	7.59	3,221,120,100	2,732,400,000	488,720,100
Indiana	2.29	971,853,100	824,400,000	147,453,100
Iowa	1.58	670,536,200	568,800,000	101,736,200
Kansas	1.15	488,048,500	414,000,000	74,048,500
Kentucky	1.20	509,268,000	432,000,000	77,268,000
Louisiana	1.22	517,755,800	439,200,000	78,555,800
Maine	0.44	186,731,600	158,400,000	28,331,600
Maryland	1.68	712,975,200	604,800,000	108,175,200
Massachusetts	3.40	1,442,926,000	1,224,000,000	218,926,000
Michigan	4.71	1,998,876,900	1,695,600,000	303,276,900
Minnesota	1.86	789,365,400	669,600,000	119,765,400
Mississippi	.71	301,316,900	255,600,000	45,716,900
Missouri	2.53	1,073,706,700	910,800,000	162,906,700
Montana	.35	148,536,500	126,000,000	22,536,500
Nebraska	.86	364,975,400	309,600,000	55,375,400
Nevada	.13	55,170,700	46,800,000	8,370,700
New Hampshire	.29	123,073,100	104,400,000	18,673,100
New Jersey	3.29	1,396,243,100	1,184,400,000	211,843,100
New Mexico	.28	118,829,200	100,800,000	18,029,200
New York	14.67	6,225,801,300	5,281,200,000	944,601,300
North Carolina	1.59	674,780,100	572,400,000	102,380,100
North Dakota	.34	144,292,600	122,400,000	21,892,600
Ohio	5.78	2,452,974,200	2,080,800,000	372,174,200
Oklahoma	1.17	496,536,300	421,200,000	75,336,300
Oregon	1.04	441,365,600	374,400,000	66,965,600
Pennsylvania	7.62	3,233,851,800	2,743,200,000	490,651,800
Rhode Island	.56	237,658,400	201,600,000	36,058,400
South Carolina	.76	322,536,400	273,600,000	48,936,400
South Dakota	.36	152,780,400	129,600,000	23,180,400
Tennessee	1.37	581,414,300	493,200,000	88,214,300
Texas	4.38	1,858,828,200	1,576,800,000	282,028,200
Utah	.34	144,292,600	122,400,000	21,892,600
Vermont	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
Virginia	1.49	632,341,100	536,400,000	95,941,100
Washington	1.65	700,243,500	594,000,000	106,243,500
West Virginia	.92	390,438,800	331,200,000	59,238,800
Wisconsin	2.10	891,219,000	756,000,000	135,219,000
Wyoming	.18	76,390,200	64,800,000	11,590,200
District of Columbia, Hawaii, and Alaska	1.48	628,097,200	532,800,000	95,297,200

The formula used in estimating each State's share of Federal expenditures consists of three factors: First, the percent of individual income taxes collected from each State; second, the proportion of corporate income taxes borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of the national income; and, third, the proportion of excise and miscellaneous taxes—excluding social-security taxes—borne by each State, measured by the State's percent of total population. Thus we get a picture of Federal taxes borne by rather than collected from, each State, which we believe more nearly reflects the true distribution of the Federal tax burden. Each of the three factors is weighted according to the percent each tax bears of the total Federal tax revenue—1949 figures: Individual income taxes 47.52 percent, corporation taxes 30.42 percent, and excise and miscellaneous taxes 22.06 percent. Total 100 percent.

Brave Finland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the Portland (Oreg.) Journal of recent date paying just tribute to the people of brave Finland:

BRAVE FINLAND

Voting in the 13° below zero weather did not give the Finns shivers in Tuesday's election despite a campaign of intimidation conducted by the Soviets.

Once more, and by a greater majority than ever, little Finland has turned a cold shoulder at the polls to Communist candidates, notwithstanding political aid from Russia. Before Tuesday's election for the Finnish Parliament, which chooses the President of the country, Moscow, with much fanfare, charged the Finnish Government with harboring and aiding escape of 300 war criminals. Pravda earlier poured out poison against the rightist trend in Finnish politics.

In Tuesday's election a tough-minded old man, who refused to be a "yes man" when Finland twice lost wars to Russia, was elected President. In addition to carrying 107 electoral votes, the largest party bloc in Finland, Juho Paasikivi, who heads the right-wing party of the Conservative Liberals and the Swedish-speaking Liberals, also was pledged the 67 votes of the Social Democrats, giving him a total of 170 against two opponents with 150.

There was heroism in the Finnish election.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Hiss Verdict," published in the Indianapolis News of January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE HISS VERDICT

There must be some very red faces in Washington today, as a result of the conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department official, on two counts of perjury by a New York Federal court jury. The reddest face of all, undoubtedly, should be that of President Truman, who brushed off the charges that Mr. Hiss had betrayed his country by passing important secret documents to Soviet spies; the case was, Mr. Truman said airily, only a "red herring," and he may live to

regret those words—if he has not already done so.

It would be enlightening, also, to know the reaction of Justice Felix Frankfurter who not only was responsible for introducing Mr. Hiss into the Government service, but also was one of the two Supreme Court Justices who broke legal precedents by appearing as character witnesses in the first Hiss trial. Mr. Justice Frankfurter will be in an interesting position if and when the case is carried on appeal to the Supreme Court.

The verdict of the jury in New York removes much of the uncertainty from what has been, from the first, a confusing and complicated case. In the tradition of American justice, Mr. Hiss has been given every opportunity to establish a reasonable doubt of his guilt. In the eyes of the American people, as well as of the jury that listened to the evidence, Alger Hiss stands convicted. And the people of the Nation are asking: "What is to be done about other trusted Government officials against whom similar charges have been directed?"

Two points of significance appear in the wake of the trial. The first is that it took the legislative and judicial branches of the Government to uncover this sordid story of betrayal in the executive branch. The second is a warning to the American people, and a revelation. The Nation's security has been menaced by one whose highest trust should have been to guard it. That must not be allowed to happen again.

Hiss Case Lessons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Case Lessons," published in the Indianapolis Times, of January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS CASE LESSONS

The conviction of Alger Hiss should cause some soul-searching in the White House and the State Department.

This man was found guilty of perjury—of trying to lie himself out of charges that he betrayed his country and its government, under which he held positions of responsibility and trust.

Yet it has taken 11 years for justice to triumph over political pressures in this infamous case.

The diligent prosecutor who won the case before a Federal court jury must have wondered sometimes which side the Government was on.

President Truman called the congressional investigation which brought to light the charges against Alger Hiss a "red herring."

Two justices of the United States Supreme Court testified as character witneses for Hiss at his first trial last year.

Ambassador at Large Philip C. Jessup testified in behalf of Hiss at both trials.

Secretary of State Acheson publicly expressed confidence in Hiss as recently as January 1949, although by that time most of the evidence which has resulted in the conviction was known.

Nor was that Mr. Acheson's first introduction to the Hiss case. When existence of a spy ring in the State Department was reported to the Government in 1939, an investigating official was told that Dean Acheson and Justice Felix Frankfurter would vouch for the Hiss boys. (Donald Hiss, brother of Alger, is a member of the Acheson law firm.)

It is admirable for a man to stand by a friend in trouble. But an official sworn to uphold and defend his Government has a duty that transcends friendship.

It is pertinent to ask where Secretary Acheson now stands on this issue.

For it would be assuming too much to conclude that Alger Hiss was the only person in the State Department or elsewhere in Government service who transmitted official secrets to agents of Soviet Russia.

It would be assuming perilously too much to conclude that the State Department and other Government agencies are now free of traitorous enemies within.

Imprisonment of Alger Hiss will do little to protect this country unless there is drastic change in the attitude of high officials who sought to belittle the charges against him and to help him escape punishment.

Hiss Is Guilty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Hiss Is Guilty," published in the January 23 issue of the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram, of Richmond, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HISS IS GUILTY

A Federal court jury Saturday found Alger Hiss guilty of perjury on two counts. He will be sentenced Wednesday.

The finding of the jury labels Hiss as more than untruthful in his testimony, before a New York grand jury. It confirms him as a former Government official who stole State Department secrets.

Whittaker Chambers, self-confessed former Communist courier, said it was Hiss who gave the secret State Department papers to him to be copied for transmission to Communists.

In charging the jury before it retired, the Federal judge said that they need not be convinced that Hiss gave the stolen documents to Chambers. Rather it was up to the jury to decide whether or not Hiss was guilty of the thefts.

But the jury also found that Hiss was guilty of lying when he said he had not seen Chambers after January 1, 1937. Evidence presented by the prosecution convinced the jurors that Hiss had seen Chambers after that date, and knew him well.

The conviction of Hiss is a historic decision.

It is historic because it establishes the connection between the Communist spy system and our own State Department in a crucial period in world history.

Later this same Alger Hiss was an adviser to President Roosevelt in his conferences with Josef Stalin during World War II. It was at these meetings of Roosevelt, Stalin, and Winston Churchill, England's Prime Minister, that the fate of millions of people was decided.

From these decisions came many of the concessions to Communist Russia which led to a policy of appeasement and stalemates between our own country and the power-seeking Red regime of Russia.

The Hiss conviction confirms the successful operation of Red spy rings in the Nation's Capital. It also lends more importance to the dangerous clique of fellow travelers who have leaned and still lean toward bowing before Communist government leaders rather than establishing a strong American policy looking toward the preservation of our own democratic principles.

Many of those friends of Russia still operate and wield their influence in Government circles to the disadvantage of the American people.

Other Accused Subversives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, January 25 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Next?" appearing in the Columbus Evening Dispatch of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEXT?

Whittaker Chambers does not regard the conviction of Alger Hiss as a closing of the book on the subject of traitors for communism in the United States Government. Last week-end, on being notified of the Hiss conviction, Chambers stuck his neck out again and reminded reporters that Hiss wasn't the only person in Government whom he had accused of working for the Soviet Union in the same Communist group as Alger Hiss.

Mr. Chambers stoutly recalled that he had accused the following, and that nothing has been done about them as yet:

Lee Pressman, a former Government attorney, later general counsel for the CIO (belatedly fired) and a strong supporter of Henry Wallace.

John Abt, another former Government attorney and Wallaceite.

Charles Kramer (born Kravitsky) a former employee of a Senate subcommittee.

Nathan Witt, still another former Government attorney and former executive secretary of the National Labor Relations Board.

Abraham George Silverman and Henry Collins, both former Federal employees.

All right. What about these worthies? Some of them have been on the carpet before, but they took refuge in that familiar refusal to comment lest they degrade or incriminate themselves. Certainly Alger Hiss was no lone wolf. Certainly, in view of the strenuous efforts made to defend him, conceal for him, and dissemble for him by persons too high to be making off-hand statements, there was more than just Hiss in this business. Are other clues to the mess to be found through Pressman, Abt, Kramer, Witt, et al.?

Mr. Chambers is willing to put himself in difficulty if not jeopardy again to cast more light. Is the Government willing, too?

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio program which was broadcast from Station WSPR in Springfield, Mass., on January 8, in which Attorney Joseph A. Nowak and I took part.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY ATTORNEY JOSEPH A. NOWAK

Friends of Poland, the title of this series of weekly programs, "Justice for Poland," is symbolic of the aspirations of a brave people for their freedom and independence. That freedom and independence of which they were despoiled because of the policy of appeasement of Stalin that was adopted by our diplomats. Congressman HARDIE SCOTT of Pennsylvania best expressed the weakness of our diplomatic behavior at Teheran, Yalta, and Potsdam, when he said in the House of Representatives at Washington recently, "The American people saw and deeply felt the suffering of the Polish people. We, in the name of the Atlantic Charter, promised that at the end of the war, both Germany and Russia would leave Polish soil. We solemnly promised that Poland again would be free. But that solemn promise was never kept. On the contrary Poland was betrayed. She was not only the sad victim of the onslaught of her enemies, but she also has been the victim of the cruel deceit of her friends. At Yalta, the fifth partitioning of Poland was sanctioned, at Potsdam it was confirmed by President Truman. Yes, we won the war. But we have yet to win the peace. We have failed to win the peace because our national leadership lacked that courage and devotion to the principle of freedom that characterized the life of Casimir Pulaski. Our national leadership was willing to compromise principle for expediency. And on the altar of expediency the freedom of the people of Poland, indeed, the freedom of the people of half the world was sacrificed."

The plight of the displaced persons of Poland is another result of the weakness our diplomats displayed at those conferences, but as to that I will let you hear from our speaker of today who has seen those displaced persons, been with them and knows of them.

He is the scion of an old and prominent Massachusetts family. After graduating from Harvard University in 1924, he entered the field of journalism and worked as a reporter for the Boston Transcript and in New York for the Herald Tribune. He served in the Massachusetts General Court and in 1936 was elected to the United States Senate from Massachusetts. When our country was attacked during World War II, he left the Senate and joined the Army of the United States. He fought in Libya, Italy, France, and Germany. He was promoted by grades to the rank of lieutenant colonel. In Italy he had the opportunity to observe the heroic attack made upon Monte Cassino by the courageous Polish Army under General Anders, which spearheaded the Allied Armies victory and opened up the road on the march to Rome. There he saw those men exultant in victory. Later, when the news of the betrayal of Poland at Yalta became known he had the sad experience of seeing tragedy in the eyes of those men. There he saw those men despondent in abandonment. There he saw them become displaced persons. Friends of Poland, I feel highly honored to present to you for your consideration the transcribed address of the speaker of today, the junior Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. Mr. LODGE.

ADDRESS BY HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS

It is always a great pleasure for me to have the opportunity of being on this Justice for Poland Hour, to discuss the matters of interest to you and to me, and to all citizens who believe in and cherish the idea of justice. It is particularly appropriate to discuss today the subject of displaced persons. It is a timely subject for it is expected that the Senate will shortly have before it a new bill dealing with this important question. But not only is the subject of displaced persons a timely one, it is conspicuously a most fitting one to discuss on a radio program whose fundamental theme is justice.

I believe that Congress should enact a liberalized displaced persons law, seeking to make more workable and more practical the law which Congress passed in 1948. These unfortunate men, women, and children, whom we call displaced persons, have been waiting and praying for many years for an opportunity to start a new and decent life. They have been living under subhuman conditions. Many of them could make a splendid contribution to our common country.

This country of ours has a glorious tradition as a haven for the oppressed, and the land of hope and opportunity for those less fortunate than ourselves who subscribe to our ideals and principles, and who turn to us for a helping hand in their struggle toward a new and better life.

Somehow, many people seem to have obtained the incorrect idea that the United States already has taken a larger share of the displaced persons than is actually true. As a matter of fact this country, according to the best information I can obtain, has accepted only about 15 percent of all the displaced persons who have been resettled in new homelands.

The House of Representatives passed a bill liberalizing our displaced persons law last year, and it is with reference to this bill that the Senate is expected to act at this session. This bill will permit the admission of an additional 134,000 persons, distributed properly throughout all the 48 States, in rural and urban areas, in all walks of life.

Because my time is brief, I would like to dwell on one particular provision of this bill, which I think alone justifies our giving it the stamp of justice.

Through the years there have existed strong cultural and political ties between the people of America and the people of Poland. During World War II, members of the Polish armed forces fought with heroic determination to vanquish the common enemy. They fought with conspicuous valor in the skies over England; they fought at Narvik; they fought on the Maginot Line; they fought with stubborn fortitude at Tobruk; they fought in the terrible hell of Monte Cassino. On the slopes of this Italian town alone 3,600 of these brave men gave their lives, and I was at that cemetery myself last summer.

They gave their lives, and in so doing they saved the lives of many of the Americans in General Clark's Fifth Army; they saved the lives of many Britishers in the Eighth Army; they saved the lives of many Frenchmen in the French Expeditionary Corps. They gave their lives in a common cause, but they have not reaped the fruits of a common victory. In the eloquent and very moving words which form the title of the book written by the former Polish Ambassador to the United States, Jan Ciechanowski, they suffered "Defeat in Victory." Not for them the return to their homes and loved ones; not for them the freedom which their allies are now enjoying; not for them the dignity of independence for which they fought and for which so many of their valiant comrades sacrificed their lives.

Many of these Polish soldiers have refused to return to Poland. This refusal is, of course, due to the somber fact that Poland is enslaved today as totally and brutally as she was enslaved by the Nazis. The men of the Polish Army who fought Hitler's panzer divisions in September 1939, and went on to fight the battles which I have just mentioned, have lost their country. These men, the flower of Polish manhood, have not seen their native land or their loved ones for over 9 years. Many of them will never see their loved ones again. No man is wise enough to say when or at what cost Poland will be liberated. Since the enslavement by Stalin's henchmen, cumulative crises have created a world crisis so vast and so complex that this original sin is all but swallowed up in the gathering clouds of conflict. The fate of Poland must wait upon the fate of the world—it will not be decided until a general settlement has been arrived at.

In the meantime, however, there is something we can do to express our sympathy for the Polish people, our interest in the Polish tragedy, and our desire to bring them some measure of comfort and justice. All citizens who pay more than lip service to the idea of justice have been deeply sympathetic with the plight of the displaced persons, and I have always so felt that it was urgent and just that members of the Polish armed forces should be included in that group. We give preference to our veterans in this country, we should certainly not discriminate against the veterans of a martyred ally, who are in truth displaced. Virtually the only foreign veterans who are displaced are the Poles.

Since Poland is still under the domination of a despotic power it is time to give tangible evidence of our desire to help these people. It is time to give active recognition to the part these men played in achieving the peace which is their just heritage, but the sad truth of the matter is that we have done nothing for the Polish soldiers. England has offered them temporary haven, but they are living under conditions which are not very different from those under which all the other displaced persons are living. Many of them are very unhappy, their living conditions are bleak, their ration is austere, few of them, I am told, have settled down to a normal family life in England. Many of them want to come to the United States, where they feel they can have a future. It seems to me a matter of simple justice that they be permitted to do so.

I was gratified that the House of Representatives included a provision in the displaced-persons bill, which they passed during the first session, permitting a generous quota, 18,000 of these veterans, to enter the United States under the law. Incidentally, if I may be permitted to add a personal word, it was my brother, Representative JOHN LODGE, of Connecticut, who successfully sponsored this amendment in the House and, as soon as he had done so, I addressed an appeal to the Senate Committee to retain that language in the bill, which so far has been done. Let me say also that I am the author of a bill which passed the Senate, which will authorize the enlistment into the United States Army of a few selected young Poles, who will then become officers in our Army.

The displaced-persons bill is now in the Senate committee, and it is expected that this committee will report a new bill to the Senate in January. I shall support the Polish provision of the displaced-persons bill because I think it is just and fair. It is more than a gesture and more than words alone. It is a concrete action which will prove that

we in America have not forgotten the debt we owe these valiant men, and in a very constructive way it represents definite assurance that we have not deserted the idea of justice for Poles.

Doubt as to Soundness of Old-Age System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Casts Doubt on Soundness of Old-Age System," from the Chicago Tribune of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CASTS DOUBT ON SOUNDNESS OF OLD-AGE SYSTEM—BROOKINGS STUDY URGES PLAN BE SCRAPPED

WASHINGTON, January 24.—The Brookings Institution in a study of the cost of financing of social security released tonight, seriously questions the financial soundness of the present social-security system and of the administration's proposals for its expansion. It recommends a pay-as-you-go system in which each generation would take care of its own dependents.

The study says the actuaries in the social-security administration estimate annual benefit payments in the year 2000 at from $13,200,000,000 to $20,600,000,000, and non-Government experts place the figures twice as high.

RECOMMENDS CHANGES IN SYSTEM

The present offers an opportunity to reconsider the fundamentals of the social-insurance system that may not come again, the report says. Mushrooming benefit costs, expanding annually for the next 50 years, may result in a burden of taxation beyond the capacity of the economy to support without a substantial increase in the price level, the report continues. Increases in prices may impair if not destroy the real utility of the elaborate and administratively costly system.

The study recommends fundamental changes in the system, because of the magnitude of future costs and the uncertainties in foreign and domestic conditions confronting the Nation.

ABANDON IT ENTIRELY

"The way to avoid the dilemma of the current pattern of old-age and survivors insurance, with its pseudo resemblance to private insurance, is to abandon it entirely," the report says. "In its place should be instituted a system that assumes responsibility for the full current load to the extent that provision seems socially desirable and can be made within our present capacity to pay. Then we can be on a genuine pay-as-you-go basis.

"Each year benefits will be paid to those in need of them and current taxpayers will supply the required funds. There will be no reserves, no level premiums, no taxes being increased according to a schedule contained in an act of Congress attempting to forecast the distant future and to bind children and grandchildren. Our generation would take care of its own and trust future generations to do likewise."

EARLIER SYSTEMS FAILED

Lewis Meriam and Karl T. Schlotterbeck, who conducted the study, recalled that in the early years of the century many private and municipal retirement systems went on the rocks because they had promised old-age benefits which, as the systems matured, proved too costly to finance.

The report said that because the present system started without any benefit load and will not take on its full load for 50 years, the present collection of taxes on all covered workers produces far more revenue than is immediately needed to pay benefits.

The reserves thus created are borrowed and used by the Government for current expenses, and the assets of the reserve fund are simply promises that the Government at some future time will obtain the cash by one means or another and place it in the fund, the report asserts. Such reserves do not give financial security, it adds.

Long continuance of the present international uncertainties and the resulting necessity for heavy expenditures for national defense and aid to friendly foreign nations would seriously jeopardize the utility of the social-security program, the study asserts. It also says that an upward spiraling of wages and prices, resulting from unsound governmental financing would seriously impair the purchasing power of all the fixed money benefits.

The National Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a speech recently made at Boston by the able and distinguished Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, in which he answered an inquiry submitted by the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], received from a department store clerk, and also dealing with other vital phases of the national defense. The inquiry of the clerk submitted by Senator LODGE read as follows:

Mr. Secretary, my job pays me $38.45 per week, less Federal income tax. Why do you need $68 from people like me? What are you doing with the money? Why not get along with less?

I believe it will be very helpful to those interested in the cost of national defense to read the views of Secretary Johnson, and particularly his analysis of the defense budget and efforts being made by his Department to effectuate policies of economy consistent with our military needs and requirements in a world which is seething with turmoil and danger.

In my opinion, Congress is keenly aware of the urgent need of conducting governmental affairs with economy, efficiency, and accountability. Secretary Johnson has ably set forth his own opinions as to how these ends can be secured in his Department without impairing the national security.

His speech is thoughtful and pointed. It evidences his desire, shared by many, to keep expenditures for national defense at the minimum level compatible with our security in a troubled world and is a definite contribution to current discussions on national economy. The distinguished Secretary has ably presented his viewpoint.

ADDRESS BY HON. LOUIS JOHNSON, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Eleven years ago—to the very day, by strange coincidence—it was my privilege, as the Assistant Secretary of War, to address the Annual New England Conference of the New England Council here in Boston. At that time, the facilities afforded by your forum, served as the means of my delivering a message destined to have an impact throughout the whole world. And what I have to say to you today though it may not on the surface seem as explosive, I trust may prove of like significance.

On that November 18 in 1938, we were living in ominous times. The ink had just dried on the Munich agreement. The world was beginning to realize its sordid implications. The Sudetenland of Czechoslovakia had been handed over to Germany as an act of appeasement. A ruthless and intensive program of Nazi suppression and massacre of minorities had quickly followed. President Roosevelt, outraged by this shocking behavior, had declared that he could "scarcely believe that such things could happen in a twentieth century civilization." Secretary of State Hull, foreseeing the road to war that was being thus paved by these Nazi acts of aggression, publicly had warned that the world was at the crucial crossroads of its history, and had urged all to return to the ways of peace before it was too late.

The Axis powers, however, heeded no warnings. Drunk with their triumphs and determined in their mad plan of world conquest, they continued their aggressive ways—augmenting their military forces—mobilizing their industry—and embarking upon a production program which, above all, was intended to give them world supremacy of the air.

Realizing the potential scope of this increasing Nazi menace, and anticipating the role that the United States might have to play in an impending world crisis as the arsenal of democracy, President Roosevelt decided to meet the threat in characteristic American fashion—then and there—on the assembly lines of our factories, by the joint efforts of progressive management and free labor.

It became my duty to advise the country and inform the world that the United States had accepted the production challenge of the Nazis, and that we would start forthwith converting our pruning hooks and plowshares into airplanes, engines and propellers, to preserve our national integrity and the freedoms we cherish. Your invitation to me at that time to address you in Boston, 11 years ago, seemed a most fitting and appropriate occasion to launch the announcement of our grim determination to prepare ourselves to meet world conditions.

Among other things that I said to you then, and I give you my exact words, were: "To meet the tremendous pace that the rest of the world is setting we must double, yes treble, and perhaps even quadruple our present Air Force with the best airplanes that can possibly be purchased."

Up to that time our goal had been an Air Force of 2,500 planes. My remarks were thus interpreted as meaning that we were going to expand toward 10,000 planes, an unheard-of figure in those days. This statement of mine received wide notice. It was featured throughout the free world as a welcome announcement indicating a new and hopeful development in American policy. But in many circles, both here and behind the Siegfried line, I was criticized for what was characterized as "warmongering." In

the main, however, what I said to you on that occasion did receive most kind and generous support—especially here in New England—among people everywhere whose opinions I deeply respected.

Outstanding in my memory of that event, a recollection I will forever treasure, was the laconic comment of my Commander in Chief, the late President Roosevelt, which he wrote across the copy of my speech after he read it. He simply noted: "L. J. Grand."

Today, however, I shall discuss another challenge. It may not be as spectacular as the one I discussed in 1938, but it is for us today of equally grave importance. It will not be in the nature of an exhortation to meet any production figures of overseas airplane factories, but will be in the form of an answer to a simple inquiry from a woman clerk in a Washington department store. Her message was relayed to me by your own junior United States Senator, HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

And, if I may digress for a moment, let me take this opportunity to tell you that we in the Department of Defense look upon Senator LODGE and upon your senior Senator, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL—both of them battle veterans—as men who always place the national security above considerations of party, both of them stalwarts with rare insight into the intricacies of our problems, and always ready to render their utmost support to all efforts to assure the national security in these crucial times.

And, let me add, that likewise in the entire Massachusetts delegation to the House, led by Congressman JOHN W. MCCORMACK, majority floor leader, the cause of national defense—regardless of party ties—has found many of its strongest adherents in the Congress. And this is true of the congressional delegations of the other New England States. In fact, I would be remiss indeed if I did not take the opportunity of my visit to Boston to express the appreciation of the Department of Defense to all those patriotic political leaders from New England, who are doing so much in Washington to help us in meeting our defense needs.

But let us get back to the challenge of that department-store clerk. In effect, this is what she said:

"I have a job which pays me $38.45 a week. Out of that I have to take a weekly deduction to pay my Federal income tax. I have been told that $68 a year out of my Federal income tax goes toward the support of the Pentagon. Sixty-eight dollars is a lot of money and means an awful lot to me. So I humbly ask you, Mr. Secretary, why do you need $68 from people like me? What are you doing with the money? And why don't you try to get along with a whole lot less?"

Here is a $64 question with a $4 bonus, that goes to the heart of national defense. The department-store clerk is certainly entitled to an answer and so is every American taxpayer. My remarks to you today are directed to such an answer.

We spend $68 contributed by women like the Washington department-store clerk, and proportionate and equitable amounts paid by all of our American taxpayers, first, because we need adequate national defense, and second, because its cost in the United States comes high.

We need national defense because in the world of today, as in the year 1938, there are forces at work against us—forces which tend to capitalize on national, military, and economic weaknesses to achieve their sinister aims. In the long run, aggressive communism as practiced today must lose, because like nazism and fascism and all of its other tyrannical forebears it panders to bestiality and destroys human dignity, because it is economically unsound and spiritually bankrupt. Its fanatical zealots have not yet been convinced of the inherent folly of their blind drives for conquest, and between now and the time it has run its full course to limbo it is capable of spreading misery, suffering, and war in its march. We must, therefore, be always alert to its dangers. We must be unfaltering in our aroused determination not to fall victim to any of its aggressions, now or in the future. We must stand on guard, ready to resist—with force, if need be—any attack that may be leveled against us.

Such a state of readiness in the world today, demands a mobilization of armed forces larger than we ever had before—except in time of war; and the cost comes high. Our defense needs must be realistically related to existing global conditions and to the array of forces most likely to be pitted against us. Our military planners are skilled in the art and science of warfare, and in their assumptions work on the premise that those likely to be on the other side may be just as smart, just as calculating, just as capable of making right decisions as we are. Our probable adversaries undoubtedly recognize that just to plan aggressive war against us is not enough. Before attacking they must give themselves a possibility of victory—with more than an even chance. Otherwise, they know they doom themselves to certain defeat.

We can assume, therefore, that no one will attack us who is logical in his planning, if he knows in advance that the probabilities of victory are too doubtful. We therefore must present to the world the spectacle of an Army, Navy, and Air Force so unified, and so strong, that an attack against us would be exposing an aggressor to certain defeat.

Our planning however, must go beyond this reasoning. We must also take into consideration a possible attack against us which to a prudent aggressor would seem foolhardy. To assure our security, we must calculate the risk of a dictator, who in self-centered frenzy will toss aside the counsel of logical prudent planners and go berserk, Hitlerlike, and depend on his own inspiration as the guide to his military conduct. Of course, the ultimate defeat of that type of self-inspired, military-untutored dictator would be inevitable. No war can be indefinitely maintained by flashes and hunches. Yet, based on little more, such wars have taken place and, in the process of waging that type of losing war, dictators have brought in their wake death and destruction to millions, among them many precious American lives. The American planner therefore has to take into his close consideration the possibility of that kind of poorly calculated war by a potential enemy, also.

We have another factor to consider, and that is the effect of heavy spending on armament on the economic system of our country. What will preparedness or even victory in battle avail us, we must ask ourselves, if our free democratic system is crushed in the process?

So, in the American defense plan, we must figure on armed forces large enough to protect America from all foreseeable danger but yet, at the same time, not costing so much as to jeopardize our national solvency—and that is indeed a very delicate job. It calls for compromise and restraint by all. It means adjustments and readjustments among the services with the full knowledge that no service will get all that it honestly believes that it needs. It means adjustments and readjustments between the defense and the over-all national budget in the complete realization that no taxpayer can get all the relief he needs to keep himself solvent and still risk his capital in new enterprise.

After all these calculations have been made in the consideration of our defense budget, we find that presently it costs somewhere between thirteen to fifteen billion dollars a year to support the kind of military forces we basically need. True, some other country needing the same amount of armament could get it for a lot less, but the pay and the standards of living—both of the men in the services, who must prepare themselves if need be to use our weapons and equipment, and of the men and women in the factories who must produce our armament, come much higher in the United States. That factor pushes up considerably our cost of national defense.

There is another hurdle. The United States has no design on any other nation, and has no intention of attacking first. That principle is basic to our national democratic psychology, and properly so. Our planners must therefore be defense-minded. That does not mean that they must think in terms of Maginot lines on the land, sea, or in the air, or that they should rely exclusively upon the deterrent effects of any single type of weapon of destruction. But it does mean that we must build around a strategy which will parry the first blow and keep it from becoming a Pearl Harbor or a series of Pearl Harbors, while being able to let loose against the enemy almost simultaneously our full might in a crushing counteroffensive. We must plan to have enough reserve resources in men and matériel to exploit, swiftly and finally, the strategic success of that counteroffensive, through a powerful army safely transported to overseas theaters of operations by a powerful navy, and supported in its landings and in its operations by the added might of adequate tactical air forces.

But "Why don't you try to get along with a whole lot less?" asks the department store clerk.

First, let me say categorically that we not only are trying to get along with a whole lot less, we will get along with a whole lot less. Moreover, we will get a lot more for our money. It will be a matter of less money and more defense.

We are already effecting many savings, savings in overhead, savings in operations and installations no longer needed, savings by reducing waste and duplication; and we are doing so without reducing the capabilities of our armed forces to defend America in the kind of war that we are most likely to be called upon to face in this modern world.

We in the Defense Department are appreciative of the need for national economy. To become dollar conscious is not only good economics but good military discipline for our military and naval men. We now have courses in economics at West Point, at Annapolis, at our National War College, at the Industrial College of Armed Forces, and other schools. Our men in uniform in all echelons are being made to appreciate the cost of national defense and the relations of those costs to the financial structure of our whole economy. They are now applying to their budget planning in particular, and to their peacetime administration in general, the doctrine of the economy of force which has been a fundamental principle of war throughout the ages.

Its application to military manpower problems is well understood by our fighting men. It has been hammered continuously into their minds in all their service schools, in maneuvers and map exercises, and in the conduct of battle operations. They know well that whether leading hordes of Genghis Khan, a select band of Gideon's men, French poilus, Russian cossacks, or American doughboys, the successful military leader—first and foremost, always saves his troops, keeps his men healthy, strong and aggressive—and commits no more of his troops to action than are absolutely necessary to achieve his objective.

This principle of economy of force also has its application to logistics. For in all wars supplies have played a vital though too often an unpublicized role in the success of battle. In our military and naval training today we devote a great deal of attention to logistics. Since there cannot be enough tonnage available, for instance, to take care of all possible needs of overseas forces in war, the logisticians must ration it among the respective users, and each user, in turn, must get the

most out of the tonnage space allotted to him. That means calling only for what is most needed, and then using judicially what one gets.

The military and naval minds of our country that have won our wars with the full realization of the meaning of economy of force as applied to manpower and to munitions power, are, I am happy to report, learning today to apply that doctrine also to the use of America's money power. In the past, there often crept into military and naval budgets exaggerated demands for specific appropriations because, it being a foregone conclusion that Congress would cut the amount, there was a feeling such a practice of asking for more was justified to assure at least the minimum required for adequate defense. We hope to correct that situation. From now on we expect to present a scientific budget on behalf of the armed forces which will be more definitely indicative of rock bottom needs and I am confident that disciplined minds of our services, brought up on the doctrine of economy of force, will make a decided contribution toward holding down costs. They will make cuts, but they will make them on the basis of sound military and economic analysis. Arbitrary cuts just to effect savings for savings' sake have not been ordered, and will not be ordered. However, no project will be regarded so sacred that it will not have to submit itself to close scrutiny to justify its allotment of funds and, on the other hand, none will be so prejudged that it will not have an opportunity to prove its value. We have set our sights for a budget of $13,000,000,000 next year as against the $15,000,000,000 given us by Congress this year. We shall make every effort to achieve such a savings but we shall still remain adequately prepared to face any military crisis.

We are going to get along on this lesser amount because we know our economic system cannot afford to pay much more. In doing so, we hope to win the full confidence not only of the department store clerk who sent this inquiry, but of all of our American taxpayers no matter how large their tax burden. We are determined to give to each of you your full money's worth, and money for defense well spent, no citizen will begrudge.

Even reduced to $13,000,000,000, the cost of defense is still high. But it is necessary at this time. All of us, however, look forward hopefully to that day of lesser armaments when war and the threat of war will no longer occupy as much of our time and thought, and absorb so much of our resources, as they do now. That time, however, has not yet been reached. When and if it comes, I pledge you that our armed forces will be the first to ask for reductions themselves. They are learning how closely tied together are the national solvency and the national defense of our country. They can be depended upon to do their utmost to help achieve what is best for the national interest.

We have an economic system and a way of life of which the men and women in service—military and civilian—are very proud. Most of those now in uniform have seen service overseas. They have seen other systems at work. They have had intimate opportunity to determine for themselves how superior the American democratic system is in comparison with the others in achieving for all its citizens—security, happiness, freedom, and better standards of living. The men in the services understand the issues we face. Rest assured that the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force will cooperate in every way in meeting the challenge of these trying days. They are prepared to do more with less, and they will be prepared to give more and more—and, if need be, their all—for the defense of our country.

Social Security Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFF CLEVENGER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, last fall I was 1 of 14 Members to vote "no" on the social-security bill. Certainly I voted my convictions as I always try to do, regardless of the political implications involved. Certain it is too that we should stop this "Ponzi" operation that bilks Americans by the millions for billions of their treasure and finally must pay them from the wages of the Americans then gainfully employed. A private concern would wind up in jail for such an operation. The Security and Exchange Commission would put them out of business.

Why not an honest pay-as-you-go system without this hocus-pocus that savors of the old shell game at the county fair?

The following editorial is from the Cleveland Plain Dealer of December 8, 1949:

THIS IS FANTASTIC

The Federal Social Security Administration has discovered a neat way of making money. It takes the employer-employee contributions to the social-security fund and invests them in Government bonds. These bonds pay up to 2½ percent in interest annually. With $10,000,000,000 of social-security money so invested, the profit is approximately one quarter of a billion dollars annually.

These are the facts related in an article distributed by the North American Newspaper Alliance. Social Security Commissioner Arthur J. Altmeyer is the authority for them.

At this point, no doubt, the public is supposed to stand up and applaud the faithful public servants who are handling the social-security money so prudently and actually making a profit with it instead of piling up a deficit.

But where does the quarter of a billion dollars in interest, which the social-security funds earn, come from? Why, from the Government, of course. And where does the Government get it? Why, from the taxpayers, the only source of money the Government has.

Consequently, those taxpayers, who happen also to be employers or employees, are making two contributions to social security. One is made directly in the form of a pay-roll deduction which is matched by the employer. The other is made indirectly in the form of a tax to pay the interest on the first contribution.

Thus the intended beneficiary of social security gets soaked twice to pay for it. But that isn't all.

What happens to the social-security money which is invested in Government bonds? Is it stacked up in neat piles in the Treasury, awaiting the day when the people who paid it are ready to retire and to start drawing it out in monthly benefits?

Don't be silly. There isn't any social-security money in the Treasury. The Government has already spent it.

Then where is the Social Security Administration going to get the money to meet the claims of the people who are 65 or over and who want to retire? That's easy. The administration will simply cash in some of the bonds it is holding. Since they are Government bonds, the Government will have to redeem them.

But where is the Government going to get the money with which to redeem the bonds, if it has already spent the money it borrowed on them? Why, from the taxpayers, of course. Where else can the Government get money? Of course, the Government might issue new bonds, and sell them to the banks, but eventually they would have to be paid off, too, and the money would have to come from the taxpayers.

Thus the taxpayers are going to be soaked a third time for social security.

Calling this system social security is probably one of the biggest frauds ever put over on the American people. What it amounts to is simply a device to compel everyone who has a job to contribute to the pensions of those who have retired.

Labor Conflicts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Newark (N. J.) Sunday News for January 22, 1950:

LABOR CONFLICTS

Industrial relations experts are agreed that the most promising path to industrial peace is through wholehearted collective bargaining. Its contribution to economic stability was stated by the labor committee of the Twentieth Century Fund some years ago in these words:

"Collective bargaining can be, and should increasingly become, a technique to help insure a larger and more regular output of goods and services, to maintain high levels of purchasing power, to establish clear lines of communication between employer and employee, and to inspire and intensify their joint responsibility."

Early this month Cyrus Ching, chief of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, exhibited an optimistic view of the progress in collective bargaining techniques. The contrast is furnished by David L. Cole of Paterson, a nationally known arbitrator who was a member of the President's inquiry board in the recent steel dispute and currently is serving as chairman of a fact-finding board appointed by Mayor O'Dwyer to study the demands of New York City's transportation workers.

Speaking in this city, Mr. Cole said it was a tragedy that the true possibilities of collective bargaining were being neglected. Although deriving part of his livelihood therefrom, he deprecated the need of having Government boards intervene in labor disputes instead of settling them by direct negotiation. Most of the blame he laid to the "philosophy of irreconcilable conflict" by management and union alike.

Labor conflict has its origin in many and varied causes. Perhaps the most prolific cause of disagreement, leading to intervention by constituted authority, is the innate tendency of management and union to regard collective bargaining as mainly a horse-trading proposition instead of a cooperative undertaking to be pursued in good faith. No simple and effective cure may be immediately available, but Mr. Cole indicates the danger of the present situation as he sees it in these words:

"If Government has to tell employees how long to work and for how much, and employers what conditions they should provide and what welfare funds, the next step will be toward complete totalitarianism."

Thus is presented a crucial issue in the American economy that concerns each of us, whether or not we own a business or whether or not we belong to a union.

Defense Secretary Johnson Says "Unification Means Dollars and Makes Sense—That While It Would Be Disastrous To Wreck Our Economy by Inordinate Military Expenses, It Would Be Equally Disastrous To Be Penny-Pinching—The Watchword Must Be Military Security First, and Economy Second"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a copy of an address delivered by Secretary Johnson to the New York Bar Association. It is a talk such as you would expect from a great direct actionist like Louis Johnson—a talk which lays right on the line, the administration policies he has established in order to achieve the economy, efficiency, and national security which the Congress of these United States declared to be its policy when it passed the act to unify the defense establishments, inclusive of the armed services.

Louis Johnson is no stranger, either to the Members of this Congress or the problems of administering the Nation's defense.

His marvelous work as the Assistant Secretary of War in mobilizing the industrial forces of this country during President Roosevelt's administration was an achievement of which America will always be proud.

A lawyer himself, and a conciliator of no mean ability, he reminded his fellow barristers of the personal differences, the financial, administrative and other difficulties which arise when one endeavors to effect the merger of two or three great corporations.

Congressionally dictated, the decision to unify the three services under a single department of defense was neither the brain-child of a superefficiency expert nor a bureaucratic planner with an uncontrollable itch to bring the independent services within the confines of a flow chart. Unification was a practical decision, dictated by experience and imposed by this Congress to meet the need of security in an insecure world.

Mr. Speaker, it is because I deem Louis Johnson's address to the New York Bar Association a statement of deep and vital interest to every Member of this House that I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include the same in the records of our proceedings. I do this with a recommendation to all my colleagues that they study every word that our great Defense Secretary has uttered.

The talk is as follows:

UNIFICATION MEANS DOLLARS AND MAKES SENSE

I want to talk to you tonight about unification of our armed forces and its vital contribution to the national security.

Let's begin by defining our terms. What is the national security? It is not just the strength of our arms. It is the sum of all our strength—our political, economic, moral and military strength—and the strength of all the other peaceful nations of the world. My job is concerned primarily with our military strength. Our policy to attain this aspect of national security is based on three principles—each dependent on the others.

The first principle is that peace can only be maintained through preparedness. In the light of recent history this needs little argument or justification. Our preparedness has been generally recognized as a major stabilizing factor in these unsettled times. But what kind of military strength do we need? Obviously, to build up our military power to the point where it overburdened our peacetime economy and hurts that prop of our national security, would be disastrous. Such folly would help the cold aims of potential aggressors, would play right into their hands, and would not be preparedness at all.

But, while it would be disastrous to wreck our economy by inordinate military expenses, it would be equally disastrous to be penny pinching. The watchword must be military security first; economy second. And if we are realistic, we must face the fact that our military requirements are not static, but flexible. They are bound to be affected by major shifts in the international situation and new developments in science and warfare.

The second principle on which our military policy is based is that military security must by its very nature be relative. Obviously it is impossible to be absolutely secure. The cost of such security and the risks of obsolescence in a fast moving scientific age tend to negate efforts to achieve absolute security. This means that our military organization must be adequate, efficient and readily adaptable to change; our planning must always look to the future as well as the present. We must have an up-to-date fighting force in being, rapidly enlargeable in wartime, capable, in concert with our natural allies, of defeating any potential enemy. The maintenance of that kind of a fighting force, backed up by a sound economy, and high public morale, will give us relative security.

The third principle underlying our military policy deals with unification of the armed forces—one of the means by which the Department of Defense is developing this up-to-date fighting force designed for relative security. And it is this third principle—that unification is absolutely necessary to the maintenance of our national security—with which I wish to deal tonight.

Your own association, the New York County Lawyers Association, and the other bar associations of this city, have been having some experience with unification recently. The project before you is one of unification of the courts of the State, as proposed by the presiding justice of the appellate division of the first department and by other thoughtful leaders of the bar. You have all seen how difficult it is to carry out in practice what seems so sound and unassailable in theory. Opposition comes quickly—and in great force. Questions of history and tradition, of vested rights and national inertia, arise to plague us wherever we try to merge or consolidate two or more historic agencies. Doubts are expressed about trying the unknown, when the known has proven adequate at least in the recent past. Conflicting claims come up about priorities and superiorities and about respective jurisdictions. I need not tell you lawyers about that. You come across it every time you try to merge two corporations. You have come across it in a public way in your efforts to consolidate courts.

So you, above all others, have some idea of what I am up against.

World War II taught us that unified planning, unified command, unified research, and unified procurement are essential to success in modern war. The day before Pearl Harbor, unification, as we understand it, had not even been conceived. The tragedy of December 7 compelled us to adopt unification as the only sane method of fighting the war. But it took months and years to get unification into effective operation in the overseas theaters. If war should ever come again, the armed services won't have the luxury of years then to get organized for war; we might not have even days or hours to get organized properly. The national security requires that the Military Establishment be unified properly—now.

The problem since the war, then, has not been to determine whether, but how closely, our land, naval, and air forces should be joined together. The seat of most of the difficulty in the past has been the reluctance of some elements in some services to accept the functions assigned to their service.

These functions are determined by the Joint Chiefs of Staff under the direction of the President and his assistant, the Secretary of Defense. The sum of the roles and missions of the various services adds up to the whole military problem of being prepared for—and, if necessary, waging and winning—a modern war.

Under unification, the Army, Navy, and Air Force are each responsible for carrying out specific roles and missions. Obviously, we must constantly evaluate the effectiveness of this assignment, and we must make necessary adjustments whenever performance does not measure up to plan or need.

This process of assessment and adjustment of our state of preparedness, made practicable by unification, is essential to the maintenance of relative security. It is constantly being conducted—in whole or in part—by the President, the National Security Council, the Secretary of Defense, the Armed Forces Policy Council, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and the services themselves.

The criterion for deciding how closely the services should be joined together is simple: How much integration will most effectively carry out the services' roles and missions? All policies and procedures of the Armed Forces must be examined exhaustively to see that they fit into this pattern of integration for relative security.

Furthermore, because of developments in the international situation, in concepts of war, and in weapons, this yardstick of unification must constantly be applied and reapplied to every operation of the Military Establishment. Unification, therefore, is an evolutionary and never-ending process.

Unification is not to be considered an end in itself; it is the means by which we achieve relative security. Unification is not simply an administrative device for securing economies in military expenditure. Nor is it simply a streamlined system of double-entry bookkeeping.

Neither is it a scheme for reducing the three services, and the several branches of the three services, to a common, colorless, undifferentiated denominator. It is not an administrative device, which, in the interest of a supposed efficiency, would strip the individual services in their history, their traditions, their distinctions, which form so large a part of their morale.

There are those crisp, starched experts who would have men enlist in the Department of Defense, and be assigned willy-nilly, regardless of their individual wishes, and solely according to the results of scientific intelligence and aptitude tests, to the Army, Navy, or Air Force. I am not one of those experts.

I do not favor a common uniform, which would take away the paratrooper's distinctive insigne, or deprive the Marines of the distinguishing devices that identify the units which have made history in the wars we have fought for freedom and the minds of men.

It is easy to make fun of "the wild blue yonder," "Anchors Aweigh," "the Shores of Tripoli," or "stand up and hook up." But the "wild blue yonder, "Anchors Aweigh," the Shores of Tripoli," and "stand up and hook up," in the world of the imagination—which, after all, is the world in which morale has its life and being—represent to the airman, sailor, marine, and paratrooper certain definite accomplishments of which they are proud and which they will always seek to emulate. They represent the Eighth Air Force over Schweinfurt, the fleet on the move in the Pacific, the landing on Tarawa, and Normandy on D minus 1. We ought not to dim those memories, or to tarnish the visible symbols of them.

If, then, unification is not merely the common procurement of T-shirts, nor the reduction of three services to an agglomerate mass, what is it?

Unification is a state of mind that grew out of the experience of the war—so right, so forceful, so undeniable that those who had experienced that state of mind during the war were convinced that it must control the thinking and planning of the Military Establishment in peace.

To get some notion of that state of mind, and how it arose, take your thoughts back to the invasion of Normandy, to the invasion of the Philippines. What were the essential conditions of combat, without which success in those invasions would have been impossible? They were the same as for every engagement in the war. For this was not simply a land war, not simply a war of aerial bombardment, not simply a war of naval engagement—but a war in which the three arms had to play, and were eager to play, their part in securing a grand objective.

If this unification, if this state of mind, was the prerequisite of victory in modern war, then, all responsible and disinterested military men finally agreed, it had to furnish the guide for the Military Establishment which was to secure the peace so hardly won.

The decision to unify the three services under a single department of defense was not, then, the brain child of a superefficiency expert, a bureaucratic planner with an uncontrollable itch to bring the independent services within the confines of a flow chart. Unification was a practical decision, dictated by experience and imposed by the need of security in an insecure world.

The decision to unify is one thing. The degree of unification, the act of unification—I need not tell you—is something else again. Honest men can, and do, differ as to the extent of unification which security required. It is relatively easy to get agreement on joint medical research, or even on joint research on weapons. These are matters on the periphery of the unification idea, and do not so closely engage the loyalties and jealousies of the three services.

It is far more difficult to get agreement on the roles and missions which are assigned to the services in the event of war. This is not surprising. The Army, Navy, and Air Force are not merely units on paper. They are institutions, living institutions, human institutions. And, like any human institution that has salt and savor in it, each of them has a proud history. It may be true that this history is at times an encumbrance to clear thinking in the present. It may be true that some officers are sometimes self-seeking like other men, and that their self-seeking narrows the range of their vision. Even conceding these things, still we must ask ourselves whether these very defects have not played some part in building up the efficiency of the services. It is true that narrow regard for the interest of the individual service may result in a disregard for the national interest. Yet, we must admit that in the past this narrow self-interest, this fierce independence, this rivalry, this competition have also acted to keep our services at the top of their forms; these elements were active ingredients in service morale; and they have, as a result, played a part in the victories which our arms have won.

Edmund Burke, criticizing the attempt of the French revolutionaries to wipe clean the slate of history, declared that while society was indeed a contract—as the French revolutionary philosophers maintained—it was not a contract in tea and calico and spices. It was, said Burke, a contract in every science, in every art, in every virtue; it was a contract between the living and the dead, between the living and those yet to be born. In the same way our three services are not paper organizations—no mere collection of bodies and weapons. They are proud institutions with every right to be proud. They have a contract with their past—and with their future as well. That contract must, and shall, be honored.

But they also have a contract with their country—as they have always had. And while the object of that contract remains what it has always been—the security and defense of the Nation—the terms of that contract have changed. The terms have changed because science has changed the nature of war, and the roles and missions of the three services. The safety of the Nation no longer reposes in the skill and valor of its individual arms, individually engaged, but in its combined arms jointly engaged. The decision to combine and unify, to subvert the individual role to the common end, is a decision that is taken rather easily when the Nation is fighting for its life. It is a decision that is much harder to take in peacetime—especially when the planning is for an indeterminate future. But that decision is necessary. It has already been made. The decision to unify has been made by the Congress, approved by the President, and endorsed by the American public. And that decision is going to be carried out.

In carrying it out we have found that decisions which affect the autonomy of the services—or what they have regarded as their autonomy—have resulted in prolonged resistance and, at times, acrimonious debate which culminated in public hearings on Capitol Hill. And while the debate has often been wearisome and feelings have been bruised, this process is to some extent a part of our democracy. I cannot help but add that the process might have been expedited by the use of some more imagination and common sense and less self-interest.

To my mind, however, the wonder is not that the first 2 years of unification have generated differences. The remarkable thing is that unification has progressed as far and as rapidly as it has. Far more progress has been made than is generally realized. The state of mind, which is unification, is becoming more widely accepted, and more widely diffused, both in the services and out. This is especially so since the recent public hearings before the House committee.

One thing which these hearings did bring out, and which I would like to emphasize, is the lack of substance behind the frequently reiterated statement that in the councils of the Joint Chiefs of Staff the Navy has been consistently outvoted 2 to 1.

Now the facts of the matter are these: The concept that decisions are made by a 2-to-1 vote in the Joint Chiefs of Staff is a fallacy, from start to finish. The Joint Chiefs of Staff do not vote; neither do they decide. Instead, the Joint Chiefs recommend; and the Secretary of Defense, as the representative of the Commander in Chief, and where appropriate the President himself, does the deciding—all within the provisions of the Constitution and the unification law enacted by the Congress. The ultimate decision of the Secretary of Defense or the President is not necessarily governed by the fact that two of the Chiefs may recommend substantially identical courses of action, while a third Chief recommends something quite different. All that any difference of opinion means is that the issue is one which must be decided by someone other than the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

This is somewhat comparable to a situation where you have a petition for a writ of certiorari from a circuit court of appeals to the Supreme Court of the United States. The fact that the expression of views in the circuit court of appeals was 2 to 1 for or against your client does not determine what the Supreme Court will do. Many of us here tonight as lawyers have had occasion to find that out from time to time. It is true, of course, that the client who has both a good case and a good lawyer when the issue reaches the Supreme Court can have greater confidence than the client who is less fortunate. I can assure you that in the forums which Congress has provided for the purpose—the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Armed Forces Policy Council—all issues are being argued effectively and persuasively by excellent advocates of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

In conclusion, may I venture to say that we have now reached a point where unification has about weathered the stormy seas of service controversy. It is now emerging into the comparatively calm waters of greater understanding and acceptance. It is sailing toward the safe harbor, where decisions, because they have been jointly arrived at, can command not only obedience but obedience freely and cheerfully given.

Your Dollars for a Delusion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed ir. the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Your Dollars for a Delusion," by E. F. Tompkins, from the Chicago Sunday Herald-American for January 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUR DOLLARS FOR A DELUSION

(By E. F. Tompkins)

Tomorrow the Finance Committee of the United States Senate will start public hearings on a new social-security bill.

This is a bill which was passed by the House of Representatives at the last session of Congress by a vote of 333 to 14, to increase the payments of old-age pensions by the Federal Government.

The overwhelming favorable majority indicates that virtually everyone believes in security.

Even more, it indicates that politicians are somewhat afraid of the question as a political issue; they are willing to vote security when actually there is no assurance that the security will be provided.

And, because of the nature of the Federal social-security system, and the New Deal's fiscal practices, there is no such assurance.

The Federal social-security system is not a sound insurance system.

It is financed by taxing pay rolls, and the tax money is not saved up to meet the obligation.

Instead, the money goes into the general fund of the Treasury and is spent by the Treasury.

In lieu of the money, the social-security fund receives investment paper from the Treasury, which the Treasury must repurchase when the insurance fund needs the money.

And the Treasury can obtain the money only from taxpayers—including the workers and employers who already have been taxed once—or by borrowing against future taxes.

Until now, the pay-roll taxes have exceeded the annual payments, so that the fund has a mythical surplus.

But the time approaches when the annual payments will exceed the pay-roll taxes, and the Treasury will have to meet the deficiency by more taxes—whether on pay rolls or otherwise.

The only remedy for this defect—one which the Hearst newspapers have advocated—is to provide old-age pensions according to need, and to revise the whole tax system in order to provide for them.

Otherwise, both the Government's obligation and the pay-roll taxes will become excessive and damage or destroy the free-enterprise system.

Furthermore, an insurance system cannot be any better than the monetary system of the Nation.

A worker who pays for a retirement pension with one kind of dollars is entitled to receive the pension in dollars that are just as good.

At present, because of the New Deal's deficit financing and its substitution of fiat dollars for gold dollars, we have inflation, and inflation is the thief of security.

We no longer have a 100-cent dollar.

Our unredeemable paper dollar is worth only about 50 cents in comparative purchasing power.

If the administration continues its financial methods, the dollar is likely to diminish to a dime in actual values of goods.

And a pension of $100 a month, promised now, may be equal merely to $10 when the retired worker gets it.

It is no investment to pay a dollar for a dime's worth of security.

One of the best appraisals of inflation and social security was made recently by Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, a long-time advocate of social legislation.

In a copyrighted interview with the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, he said:

"No plan for old-age security can work unless savings have a sound, stable value."

Taking notice of some of the fancy pension schemes that are being promoted now, Mr. Baruch observed:

"We mustn't let ourselves become victims of the delusion that all we have to do is to vote the older people money."

Calling attention to the fact that the cost of living has increased something like 65 percent since 1939, Mr. Baruch concluded:

"Each pension or old-age insurance or social-security check buys that much less than before the war.

"It means that workers who paid their taxes expecting pensions when they retired are now being shortchanged."

The Senate Finance Committee should have Mr. Baruch in as a witness when it opens its hearings in mid-January on the pending social-security legislation.

Governor Driscoll's Second Inaugural Address

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of January 18, 1950:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S ADDRESS

The statement of principles with which Governor Driscoll begins his second term will be read with interest outside New Jersey for its strong affirmation of the desirability of self-reliance at the lower levels of government. This is in the nature of reiteration; the Governor made the same point last December in an address here, when he said, "We want to do more and more for ourselves and ask less and less from others." It is a theme that echoes with frequency of late. It was dominant in Governor Dewey's recent message opening the New York legislative session. It was emphasized, we are especially pleased to note, in the letter published yesterday of the State conference of mayors to Governor Dewey and the legislature.

Our cities and States might well take to heart one warning uttered by Governor Driscoll in his inaugural speech. "One sure way," he remarked, "to destroy our Federal system and home rule is for the States to fail to provide for the general welfare of their citizens." The same lesson applies to the relations between the State and its localities, a fact recognized when Mr. Driscoll urges strengthening of the capacity of cities to govern themselves and to "mold their form of government to fit the needs of their citizens."

Most of the problems of New Jersey are not unique, except in emphasis. Some of these, and the general philosophy for dealing with them, bear a marked similarity with the pattern of Governor Dewey's message. The fiscal situation is troublesome. The demands for services by our citizens far exceed available revenues. After reviewing the several fields in which he hopes to extend progress already made and others in which new ground needs to be broken, Governor Driscoll reminds us that "despite the pessimism of some, we live in a good world." He sees this as a world of opportunity for government, but his fundamental interest is in keeping government close to the people. We wish the Governor well in his second term as he seeks to continue in New Jersey the progress acknowledged by the voters in returning him to office.

Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes

REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, like many other Members of the House, I was gratified to note that President Truman has recommended the repeal of certain wartime excise taxes.

It seems to me, as I have stated many times before, that the continuance of these wartime taxes is untenable on any principle of governmental finance or social policy. I see no possible justification for continuing to impose such heavy and detrimental levies upon so many articles and commodities of ordinary use. These taxes have been well termed a national nuisance. They strike at many classes of our American body politic and some of them are ridiculous.

Is it arguable that we should continue to tax baby oils, women's handbags, telegram and telephone messages, transportation, recreation of the rank and file of our people, cooking appliances and water heaters and other things so indispensable to the American home? The President will have widespread support of his proposal to eliminate many of these onerous levies.

I have again joined with many of our colleagues in urging the House Ways and Means Committee to formulate appropriate legislation to repeal these inequitable, illogical, and repressive wartimes taxes.

I am not unmindful of the fact that when these taxes are repealed the Congress will have to provide other sources of revenue to replenish the Treasury for the losses sustained. In the first instance lifting the taxes on many of these commodities will unquestionably result in larger profits to industries and businesses affected and hence additional income to the Treasury.

Whether this additional income will be sufficient to offset the loss of revenue due to repeal is debatable. There is expert opinion both ways. Measuring the various opinions, I am inclined to the view that the additional income will not equalize the losses.

Assuming this fact, the Congress has two choices. It can provide new taxes to make up the difference, or it can endeavor to effect further savings and economies in expenditures. If it is at all possible, without impairing essential services, I should be disposed to favor the latter course. Otherwise, it will be necessary, and I very reluctantly reach this conclusion, to impose new taxes to make up the difference. Congress should exercise utmost care not to impose further onerous taxes, if avoidable.

The other alternative is continued deficit spending and in my judgment that would be most undesirable and unhealthy for the national economic well-being. Whatever this Congress does regarding revenues and appropriations, we

should work together in a wholehearted spirit to avoid an unbalanced budget and further deficit spending.

Industrially and economically the Nation is near the peak of prosperity. Over 60 millions of our citizens are gainfully employed. Business and industrial profits have been unprecedented. The national income has been greater than ever. Great and desirable social gains have been achieved. The Congress must hold and extend these gains by promoting sound financial and fiscal policies which alone can form the enduring, solid basis for full employment, high wages, prosperity, and security for the American people.

We are all aware that this Government creates and produces no wealth on its own account. Our matchless economic system animated by the incentive and energy of our people performs that function. The Government can encourage and direct and guide business by pursuing wise policies and rendering necessary counsel and assistance and by maintaining basic conditions under which finance, industry, business, and agriculture may flourish and prosper. But we must have it constantly in mind that our economic system upon which the Government and our people must depend can be seriously impaired in its efficiency and, in the end, broken and destroyed on the rock of high taxes and regimentation. We have many examples before us in Europe of this fact of which we should take stern cognizance because they clearly point to the dangers and catastrophy involved in over-spending, over-taxing, and over-regulating by the Government.

Such unsound policies will lead us as a nation down the road to totalitarian serfdom. I think and hope that this Congress can and will take effective steps to avoid the sad experiences of other nations which have departed from the fundamentals of the free way of life.

I hope we will not seek to serve special privilege, greed, avarice and over-reaching by any class or group. If we move to secure to the average American citizen the protection of his basic rights and opportunities, his fundamental right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, we can best serve our Nation to build even a stronger citadel for a well-ordered government, a flourishing economy and a progressive and humane democracy.

The Strange Career of Teddy Hayes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a story entitled "The Strange Career of Teddy Hayes," as written by Joe Williams, sports columnist of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STRANGE CAREER OF TEDDY HAYES
(By Joe Williams)

NEW YORK, January 20.—There was quite a to-do on the city side yesterday when it became known that one Theodore T. Hayes had been named assistant to Oscar (Ole Oss) Ewing who is head coach of the welfare State varsity, or, as it reads on the door of Washington office, the Federal Security Administrator.

Who was Hayes and how did he come to be an authority on such vital and controversial items as social security and health insurance? I go back a long way with Hayes—back to the days when he was using his square monicker, Teddy Weinstein, and, as a lightweight, was fighting ham and eggers for small change out of Chicago.

TOWEL WELL SWUNG

It is an illuminating commentary on his fighting genius he did not become nationally prominent until he joined up with the two Jacks—Dempsey and Kearns—and was assigned to corner work such as carrying the champion's bucket and swinging a towel between rounds.

I regret I am unable to contribute anything to the search for information as to his qualifications as a social worker except to point out he never was a dumb cluck when it came to looking out after his own security and health.

I do happen to recall Mr. Hayes was connected with a Mexican lottery several years ago as a barker or shill. This may have been when he experienced the first twinges of a social conscience. I used to read his letters with tear-dimmed eyes. All the money was to go to helping the poor, the sick, the illiterate. Mr. Hayes needed publicity. First prize was $100,000. Obviously, Mr. Hayes was hopeful Americans would switch from Irish sweeps to Mex.

A SENSITIVE SOUL

Mr. Hayes' admirable program to bring sunlight, happiness, tequilla and tortillas to the underprivileged, unfortunately, was not a smashing success. Very few of the American winners collected. Some of the more heartless went to court. Such unwholesome descriptives as racket and larceny were applied to the operation. Naturally, Mr. Hayes, a sensitive soul, was distressed. But it is to his credit that, undaunted, he continued to fight the good fight for the oppressed, and when the call came from Oscar (Ole Oss) Ewing to help sell the welfare state to Congress he responded without the slightest hesitation.

I first came across Mr. Hayes as a representative of the Government when he was serving as Ed Flynn's assistant at a world's fair we had around here. Later, I believe, he became the commissioner of the fair. And still later Flynn, ardent New Dealer, sent him on the road hustling up young Republicans for the Dems. Little Teddy Weinstein, who used to carry Dempsey's bucket, had come far.

FOR HIS BROTHERS

I don't know how Mr. Hayes happened to go for the Mex deal unless he feared, as so many other Truman loyalists did at the time, that the joy ride was over and Tom Dewey was going to take over. Still, it couldn't have been too difficult a choice, considering that Mr. Hayes was going where he could do so much good for his less fortunate brothers south of the border.

The last time I saw Mr. Hayes in a prize ring was the night before the 1930 derby—or the Gallant Fox derby, as the pros put it—and on this occasion he was helping Jack Kearns master-mind Mickey Walker, the middleweight champion, against a large slab of suet named Paul Swiderski. This one turned out to be a lulu.

The weather had been bad all day, seat sales worse, and Walker had been told, or was under the impression, the fight had been canceled, but around 7 o'clock the promoters decided to go through with it anyway. Which was fine except in the meantime Walker had gone out and got himself so full of food and beverages he was scarcely the picture of the perfect warrior.

BOTTLE RINGS

But since this was supposed to be one of those pleasantries in which the less impeccable members of the profession sometimes engage, there was nothing to fear. That's what Kearns, Walker, and Mr. Hayes thought. Swiderski, noting Walker's condition and seeing a chance to steal the title, came out swinging. Walker was down five or six times before the bell rang to end the first round.

The end, it developed, came prematurely. Kearns had slipped around the ring and banged the bell with a beer bottle. In an instant there was wild confusion in the ring. Mr. Hayes punched Harry Lenny, Swiderski's manager, right between the eyes. In came the cops. Presently everybody was in the cat. It must have been 15 minutes before the ring was cleared. By then Walker had recovered, which was the main idea, and from there he went on to win like the remarkable fighter he was.

Unlike Mr. Hayes, Lenny never had an official Washington tie-up, but as an expert masseur he treated the late President at Hyde Park several times and has letters to show his ministrations gave Mr. Roosevelt at least a few moments of relief from time to time.

The Coal Situation

REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, which comes first—the national welfare or the selfish demands of a few arrogant labor union monopolists? Whose interests are paramount—those of the general public or those of a highly organized pressure group? Whom do we serve, the inarticulate mass of American people or a noisy dictatorial minority?

Those are questions which I should like to address particularly to the House Committee on Education and Labor. For weeks a number of us have been endeavoring to impress upon the President the great hardship and suffering being experienced by our people in the coal shortage. To this end a number of us have introduced a resolution calling upon the President to invoke the national emergency provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act.

I wrote the chairman of the House Committee on Education and Labor, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LESINSKI], urging him to grant us a hearing that we might present persuasive and conclusive evidence of this emergency.

I have in my hand his letter of January 24 in reply.

He refuses to schedule a hearing. He not only thereby refuses to recognize the existence of an emergency, he even refuses to permit us to prove by evidence the existence of one.

In refusing us a hearing he uses as an excuse that his committee has agreed to hold executive sessions on measures previously reported by the subcommittees. He says, and I quote his exact words, "There will be no hearings scheduled before this committee until all pending business is concluded."

In other words, the Chairman of our Committee on Education and Labor tells us that regardless of how cold it becomes, regardless of whether or not industries shut down, regardless of the hardship experienced by innocent people who find themselves without heat, light, and jobs, he does not intend to depart from the routine business of his committee. He will not even let us prove how grave this emergency is.

Incidentally, the committee did not meet today on any business. I asked for a hearing last week, and it could have been scheduled for today.

Am I to believe that the prejudice against the Taft-Hartley Act is so great and certain labor union leaders so politically powerful that we cannot even be allowed to prove a need for use of the act?

At long last, at least one person connected with this administration admits the existing crisis in the current coal shortage. As you have noted from the press accounts, Dr. James Boyd, of the Bureau of Mines, admitted in his testimony before the Senate Committee on Labor yesterday that a national emergency exists.

These are his exact words:

Accordingly, it is believed that unless there is an immediate resumption of substantial increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare of the Nation is now or soon will be imperiled.

Mr. Speaker, I again call upon President Truman to act immediately. Does this Government belong to all the people, or is it being run solely for the benefit of a politically powerful few?

JANUARY 20, 1950.

Hon. JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR JOHN: I respectfully call your attention to House Concurrent Resolution 157, which I introduced on January 12 last, and respectfully urge that your Committee on Education and Labor give immediate consideration of this resolution.

It is my understanding that around 24 like resolutions have been introduced and referred to your committee. This in itself indicates the serious situation existing in various sections of the country because of the current strike in the coal industry. We are prepared to present to your committee, at a hearing I hope you will grant, persuasive and compelling evidence that this strike imperils our national health and safety.

The purpose of this proposed resolution is to call the attention of the President to the acute coal shortage resulting from the strike and to urge him to invoke the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947. As representatives of the people we are seeking by this resolution to express the views of the people we represent. I hope your committee will grant us such an opportunity by a public hearing and prompt consideration of these resolutions.

With kindest personal regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

RALPH E. CHURCH.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR,
Washington, D. C., January 24, 1950.

Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter of January 20, in which you ask for hearings on House Concurrent Resolution 157, a resolution favoring the invoking by the President of the United States of the national emergency provisions of the Labor Management Relations Act, 1947, in the pending coal strike.

Please be advised that on January 16, 1950, in executive session, the Committee on Education and Labor adopted a resolution to hold executive sessions daily on bills that have been previously reported to them by the subcommittees.

Therefore, there will be no new hearings scheduled before this committee until all pending business is concluded.

Very sincerely yours,

JOHN LESINSKI,
Chairman, Committee on Education and Labor.

Capturing Revenue From Income Labeled "Tips"

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDGAR A. JONAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, an innocent gesture, originally intended to demonstrate a superlative feeling of satisfaction and gratitude for some special favor rendered, has expanded into an institution which has reached the height of promiscuity and insolence. I am referring to the tipping habit, or perhaps I should say "racket."

The President in his budget report the other day announced that if we are to do away with luxury taxes, additional ways and means must be found to replace this loss in current revenue. I know of no better source from which additional revenue can be obtained than the income from tips.

Time and time again, investigations started by the Internal Revenue Department, seeking to uncover income obtained from tips have been both ineffective and unsatisfactory. Recently our appeals courts have laid down a definite rule as to what constitutes income, and they say tips must be considered as such.

A thorough investigation relating to the receipt of gratuities and tips, together with the resultant loss of revenue is a matter I believe Members of the House should seriously consider at this time.

The tax burden as it now prevails, should be distributed equitably, and that presumes that moneys received and classified as income are not to be omitted from taxation, except when specifically so earmarked by law.

I have filed a resolution asking that a more thorough investigation be made by the Bureau of Internal Revenue into incidental income from tips, which represents additional income for workers in a score or more of classifications.

From the meager reports available it is reasonable to assume that more than three-fourths of the income derived by means of tips are never reported, and the Government thereby loses an inestimable amount of money in revenue; plus an additional source of taxable income, which quite conceivably add enough money to the Treasury to allow for the reduction of taxes which have become a harassing burden to the American people.

The liberal interpretation of the tipping situation as presently applied, has reached a point where it can no longer be ignored. While the costs of all necessities of life have risen sharply during the 10 years—so has the scales of expected tips risen.

From 1939 to 1949 retail food prices have risen from 95.2 percent to 204.8. The cost of wearing apparel has risen from 100.5 percent in 1939 to 190.9 in 1949. Rents have increased from 100 percent to 120.5 in 1949. Railroad passenger rates have increased from 100 percent to 133.8 during the same period.

It has been conservatively estimated that the tipping practice has reached the point where several billions of dollars per annum are extracted from the pockets of wage earners in other fields—and on this, at the present time, the Government has no definite check.

As a point of illustration, I enumerate the number of gratuities which are usually given on an ordinary overnight trip from one city to another. Not less than 11 tips are regarded as necessary from hotel to hotel. These are:

First. Tip to bellboy to carry baggage from room.
Second. Tip to doorman for getting taxi.
Third. Tip to taxi driver.
Fourth. Tip to station redcap.
Fifth. Tip for dinner service on train.
Sixth. Tip for service in club car.
Seventh. Tip for service to pullman porter.
Eighth. Tip for breakfast service.
Ninth. Tip to station redcap.
Tenth. Tip to taxi driver.
Eleventh. Tip to bellboy to convey luggage to room.

The average traveler can hardly manage to escape from some of these voluntary returns for favors or services rendered; but he or she will find still other occasions for tipping, should they require any additional services at all.

As for the hotels themselves, there are no ceilings on rooms occupied by transients, with the result that hotel owners and innkeepers have upped their tariffs to as much as the traffic will bear without

leaving them enough empty rooms to curtail the hotels' income, thus the patron shoulders this burden, and the increases in the amounts required for tipping as well.

Hotelkeepers indicate that they can justify the increases in rates, and the tipping practice. During the Senate hearings, when rent controls were being considered in 1949, Mr. Glenwood J. Sherrard, speaking for the American Hotel Association, stated that since decontrol of hotel rooms there had only been an increase of 29 percent. This amount, he stated was more than consumed by the increase of wages and maintenance.

However, this figure was much different from the increase reported by the Housing Expediter, Mr. Woods, who testified before the same committee that hotel rates had increased since decontrol more than 47 percent.

Other checks have ascertained that a hotel room costing approximately $10 per day, costs its temporary tenant no less than an average of 33⅓ percent additional. Thus, his or her room, because of incidentals reflected in tips, costs $13.34 cents per day, not including food.

All this is in the face of wage increases. For the 10-year period ending in 1949 the average hourly earnings had increased 110 percent. Average weekly wages had increased 115 percent. The average weekly average of all groups, including clerical, salaried, and so forth, had increased 103 percent. The all-over increase for every single group and type of worker has almost doubled—or has increased 99 percent to be exact. It is known that employers encourage and countenance the tipping system, and are parties to it, despite the fact they have increased the cost of their commodities time after time.

Increased wages, instead of decreasing this drain on the public, has given way to unwritten laws setting up a regular scale to be expected in tips, which, if ignored by customers and patrons, makes them the target of derision, sneers, and other embarrassing outward evidences of the servitors' disdain and displeasure. This scale, although flexible, frequently amounts to 33⅓ percent for personal services over and above the basic charge.

The investigation I request should probe all categories of employment where tips are allowed and a thorough examination be made of wage scales; increases in business incomes, including the increases in costs to the customer and consumer.

Judicial precedent has already been established in this matter: I cite the case of Roberts against Commissioner of Internal Revenue, No. 11999, which was heard in the United States Court of Appeals, Ninth Circuit, wherein the court said:

> Generally a payment cannot at the same time be a gift and taxable income, but a gift cannot be excluded from gross income unless it is a genuine gift, and the essential characteristics of a gift, including absence of consideration, must be present.

Tipping lacks the essential element of a gift, which is the free bestowing of a gratuity without consideration.

The decision pointed out that tips received by people who render services to the public are an incident to the service, and constitute compensation for personal services so as to require their inclusion in taxable income.

In this decision Roberts was ordered to pay an additional 10 percent prorated on his basic salary.

When the recipient of tips is confronted with a complaint and asked for an accounting he usually resorts to a well-developed and carefully thought-out pattern in justification for his demeanor. He maintains that he, by no outward sign or suggestion, has asked for the tip, and that it is the giver's expression of exhibitionism or showoffishness, a mere manifestation of his personal vanity, and therefore is a gift.

But the court, in the Roberts against Commissioner of Internal Revenue case, did not concur with this line of thinking. It stated that tipping had become so commonly accepted an incidence of certain types of service that "he who fails to give it may incur the haughty stare of the servant when he leaves, or expect a haughtier stare if he appears again," and that "the giving of a tip is tied to the service, without which the occasion would not have arisen."

This decision leaves no doubt as to just how "voluntary" the act of tipping has become. While it is almost automatic, still the court was moved to comment that any patron who failed to tip found it impossible to escape the "grumbling and sour faces" superinduced by a tip considered insufficient or inadequate by the recipient, just as Sir Walter Scott found the situation more than a century ago.

General Hershey Makes Masterful Statement in Support of Continuance of Selective Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to leave granted me I am including a statement made by Gen. Lewis B. Hershey as a part of these remarks. During the recent war General Hershey performed a remarkable job as head of our Selective Service System. During practically the whole time between the wars he was studying the selective-service principle. He, more than any other man, is responsible for the system as it was finally enacted into law and for its administration.

His performance in carrying out the mission of providing the manpower for our armed forces was superb. We are now in the postwar world that we all thought would be a peaceful one. But to our surprise and disappointment the world is still unsettled. On the horizon we see many menacing clouds of discord, misunderstanding, distrust, and conduct that menaces the peace of the world. We have seen over a dozen nations lose control of their domestic affairs through the relentless penetration of one large nation that apparently is trying to dominate the internal affairs of these countries. This relentless drive to take away from large populations the right to select and operate their own governments is going on in various parts of the world.

From day to day we do not know what incident might bring war upon a war-weary world. For this reason we should keep ourselves in a strong military posture to indicate to the world that we are prepared to take care of ourselves in any kind of a contest. General Hershey made a statement to the Armed Services Committee of the House of the benefits to us and the world by the continuance of Selective Service by the United States of America. I wish every Member of Congress could find time to read this statement. He points out that this step now is really good peace insurance at a low premium rate. His statement follows:

STATEMENT BY MAJ. GEN. LEWIS B. HERSHEY, DIRECTOR OF SELECTIVE SERVICE, BEFORE THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES ON EXTENSION OF SELECTIVE SERVICE

Mr. Chairman and the members of the committee, I recommend the extension of the selective service law. My reasons for this recommendation are: First, the presence of the law is a vital factor in the preservation of the present precarious peace; and second, should all efforts to maintain the peace fail the existence of this law will be a most favorable factor in the expeditious procurement of manpower for the winning of the war and the reestablishment of the lost peace.

I believe that the preservation of the selective-service law is the cheapest insurance the United States can buy for the prevention of war. This is true for three reasons: First, continuation of this law is a pledge of good faith to friendly nations. Those nations, like us, are interested in maintaining and extending democratic principles upon which this Government has been founded and under which it has lived. On the other hand, failure to extend this law cannot but raise questions as to the intentions of the United States to support to the limit of her manpower resources the course upon which the community of nations has embarked.

Second, extension of this act is a notice to all who may not view with friendliness the ideals and the policies of the United States. Extension is evidence of continuing intention of the United States to use all its manpower resources in support of its policies. Had such action been taken, and such an intent been crystal clear to the aggressors prior to World Wars I and II, it is most doubtful that it would have been necessary for the United States to have become involved in either of these wars.

Third, and last, the most important of all, the extension of selective service is not only a pledge to our friends and a notice to others, but it is a dedication of Americans themselves in a forthright manner to indicate an understanding on the part of the Congress and on the part of the people of the United States that the troubled world in

which we live cannot be safely lived in without the cooperative efforts of the whole people. The experiences of World War I and World War II indicate that if war comes all of our citizens will be under the necessity of giving their maximum efforts. There has never been a question of the intentions and willingness of the American people when once the gage is down. It is worth the effort, in an attempt to prevent World War III, for our people to indicate in advance—and to understand in advance—that requirements for service will be upon all who are able to bear it. If that is the inescapable consequence of war, how wise and how honest to understand and to be willing to give a very small portion of the unity and support that is a part of the preparation for service in order to prevent a war which requires so many more times the effort and so much more of the individual's time to win.

The presence of a Selective Service Act not only is one of the many factors which go to preserve the peace, but constitutes an insurance policy which contains many other benefits. In cost it is less than one-tenth of 1 percent of the Federal budget for survival. Like insurance, it must be bought before the time when its benefits become due. Once that day arrives the favorable insurability has been lost. It is only in peace that we may buy at minimum rates the protection which may well be the difference between peace and war.

The second reason for recommending the extension of selective service is based upon its value in increasing the potential of the United States should peace be lost. Our experience in the past indicates that should war come it is inevitable that manpower of this Nation would be furnished to the armed forces by some orderly, expeditious, fair, and just method of selection and induction. It is no small task to register and classify the 50,000,000 of our manpower as we did in World War II. It requires a machine which covers the entire United States. It requires organization; it requires training; it requires teamwork; it requires a morale which comes with a feeling of esprit de corps for an organization in which all of its members can take a well-deserved pride. Such an organization is not built overnight. The Selective Service Act of 1940, which was passed in September, did not produce men at the rate of 400,000 a month until October of 1942. Fortunately it was not called upon for this rate of production earlier.

It will remain controversial as to the date that this production level could have been achieved by the Selective Service System organized under the act of 1940. It is my considered judgment, based upon every inquiry that I can make of our historical experience, that when we have said that 4 to 6 months would be required to organize and train a system, imbue it with its objectives and its ideals, while at the same time registering several millions of people and running them through this recently organized system up to this point where it was capable of producing even 300,000 a month, this estimate I believe to be in error on the side of optimism, rather than the contrary. I fear that we should inevitably find ourselves consuming at least a year to reach the production level of 500,000. There is no experience that we have had in this Nation that could lead us to any other conclusion.

In that particular I should like to state I believe that we lead ourselves into error in our thinking and planning when we presume that a critical situation with the country in chaos will permit and force a more rapid organization which is efficient and orderly than under circumstances in which we have more time and less interference. I believe firmly that if we should be attacked it would be much more difficult to perfect this organization than it was in 1940 and again in 1948. The present system, torn into segments, will operate each in its own area much better than an organization which must be brought together under circumstances that are disintegrating in their nature. There is no question, and can be none, of the inevitableness of the use of some selective sort of a system for the procurement of men for the armed forces should we be forced into war. There is likewise no question that the existence of this organization with men registered and classified will save months of time, billions of dollars, and hundreds of thousands of lives.

I have tried to indicate that the extension of the Selective Service System, is a positive and powerful move for peace—by its encouragement to our friends, by its warning to others, and by reminding each and every one of us of the responsibilities that survival in this present world entails. I have tried to indicate what it would mean to have this law and the system which it organizes in being in the event every effort which we have put forth failed to hold the peace.

I should like to discuss just briefly the law as it has operated for the past 2 years. I shall make no defense of the law. I believe that history when written with the distance from its occurrence which insures objectivity will give it a place that is not recognized now. There are on this committee most of the individuals responsible for this legislation in the House of Representatives. Because it has not been used to the extent that it might, because it has functioned to provide men by indirect means, there has at times, certainly on the part of many, been a feeling that it was not necessary. I am sure that the verdict of objective history will be otherwise. Discount the fact if you will that we have not deteriorated toward war since the passage of this law. Precarious as it may be, we still have a peace of a sort. I shall not claim that this act saved this peace, but it helped. This law would have been used a great deal more if we had gone to war, but how much better it is that we can be satisfied its presence was a great factor in preventing its maximum use.

We are prone at times to forget what it did do, especially in its early days. It is often said that the Navy and the Air Force never inducted any men under it, and yet their recruiting in the months immediately subsequent to the passage of this act tripled over what it had been the months before. I am sure that 250,000 men entered into the services, including the National Guard, under the impetus of this law in addition to the rate which had been in existence for the 6 months preceding the passage of this act. It is true that the Army is now permitting men to go to swell our ever ebbing trained reserve after they have served 1 year. Let us not forget that there are undoubtedly over 200,000 men now serving in our armed forces who are there as a direct result of the wisdom of our Congress in the passage of the Selective Service Act.

It is one of the strange experiences of life that we pay the premium on our life insurance when we live, and certainly we would not be wise to criticize our insurance policy at the end of 2 years from its purchase date because we had spent our premiums then and still had not collected because we are still alive. Protection we pay for, and one of the commodities bought is the absence of war. It is the same with the fire department or the police department. Do we ask as we pay each week or each month the individual fireman whether or not he has attended a fire that particular pay period, and then abolish his job, close up the fire house because it has not been used?

We are content with the policemen when there is no crime. How ridiculous it would be to ask each policeman on stated occasions whether or not he had shot a citizen during that period, and if his answer was "No" ask him to turn in his badge and get his pay at the office, because obviously if he was killing no one, there was no need for his services.

Selective service, like the armed forces, performs its duty just as much when it succeeds without its use, as when it is forced to rescue a war that is already in existence, a war generated by circumstances before the selective service could influence those circumstances. I am sure the members of this committee need not apologize to their colleagues, or to the United States, for the fact that they did their full measure of duty in the passage of the Selective Service Act of 1948 and thereby made a major contribution in strengthening America's position, and, by strengthening that position, avoided the loss of peace. Had the Congress passed a Selective Service Act in 1936 as it did in 1948 we might have avoided World War II in 1941 as we avoided world war III in 1948 and 1949.

It is so much easier to see this pertinent need which existed for the selective service law in 1940 than it is to see the same need in 1948. Saving and winning a war are steps that are visible daily, hourly, to our citizens. Preventing war, as well as keeping peace, is a 24-hour-a-day, month-by-month, year-by-year job. It has no glamour, but it has no casualties.

The fireman on his chair in the engine house is not a glamorous figure. He looks like a load on the taxpayer's purse. The same fireman though, up on his ladder in the blaze, is understood; and yet when he by his presence and his timely arrival at the fire puts out with his hand extinguisher a blaze that might be a seven- or eight-alarm affair, he is most useful, if not most glamorous. Preventing war by strength, by declaration of intentions, and by continual dedication of our citizenry needs no apology.

To keep our strength, to be ready, and to keep the peace, I recommend the extension of the Selective Service Act.

Is Hiss Alone?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Is Hiss Alone?" from the Indianapolis Star for January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IS HISS ALONE?

The conviction of Alger Hiss climaxes the most dramatic and important criminal trial in recent history. The jury has unanimously decided that Hiss lied and that his accuser, Whittaker Chambers, told the truth. Hiss denied that he gave secret State Department documents to Chambers for transmittal to the Communist underground. The jury's decision that this denial was a lie brands him as a traitor to his country.

The astounding thing about this decision is the fact that a young, brilliant, and ambitious man who was engaged in a Communist conspiracy against his own country should rise so high in the service of the Government. The frightening thing is the proof here given that a servant of communism did become a

very important member of the inner councils of Government, was given a position of great power and influence, and successfully hid the fact that all the time he was supposedly serving the people of the United States he was actually serving the ruthless tyrants of Moscow.

Alger Hiss held one of the top jobs in the State Department. He was an assistant to Francis B. Sayre, Assistant Secretary of State. He was Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference which wrote the United Nations Charter. The imperfections of that Charter are now being used by Soviet Russia to block all hopes of peace and national independence through collective action.

But most significant of all, Alger Hiss was a member of that small group of advisers who went to Yalta and traded the freedom of half the world for the empty promises of Joseph Stalin. At Yalta the United States turned over half of Europe and all of China to the Communist regime. We abandoned the traditional policy of the United States in China. We violated the high principles to which this country subscribed in the Atlantic Charter. We produced the greatest debacle in foreign relations in the history of the American Republic, the conquest of China by communism.

During a period in which the American State Department was making decisions that might mean life or death to the people of this Nation, this man, this convicted liar who is now branded a traitor to his country, was helping to formulate those decisions. Alger Hiss has been accused and convicted as a plotter against the system of government which he was sworn on oath to protect and defend and preserve.

Of course, Hiss was only one of many people who created the policies that today find this Nation backed against the wall in a terrible struggle for the preservation of all the things America and our form of government mean to the people of this Nation. His influence may not have been decisive. But now we cannot help but ask, was Hiss alone? Were there others who were equally adept at hiding their servitude to Russian communism working in the same way for the dissolution of American power and principle. Are there still others like Hiss in important positions in this Government?

President Truman called the investigations that finally led to the conviction of Hiss "a red herring." He can no longer do so with any justification. The part Hiss played was a real part, not the figment of somebody's imagination. The safety of this Nation, the rightness of our future foreign and domestic policies depend on the Government's clear and proved answer to this question: Is Alger Hiss alone?

Resolution by the Atlanta Chapter of the Military Order of the World Wars Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, although in some quarters in Washington there is a disposition to ignore it, the fact is that the people of the United States know that Communists and Communist sympathizers have infiltrated into our Government, and they are tired of it. The people are tired of Communist coddling.

I have on two occasions within the last few days expressed my sentiments regarding this question.

I am inserting herewith resolution regarding this subject, adopted on January 11, 1950, by the Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars.

I am in hearty accord with the sentiments expressed in this resolution.

RESOLUTION BY THE ATLANTA CHAPTER OF THE MILITARY ORDER OF THE WORLD WARS AGAINST COMMUNISM

Whereas communism as a political ideology and as a way of life is a danger that threatens to subject the world, including the United States, to tyranny and cruel suffering wherever it can fasten itself upon a people; and

Whereas communism is an aggressive, greedy, proselyting form of political disease that feeds upon the apathy of governments and of people, spreading like a cancer where the body politic is not always awake to its terrors and growth; and

Whereas communism is spotted upon the United States in frequent enough incidence to be a dangerous threat to the freedom and existence of this Nation and its peaceful way of life; and

Whereas communism here is by its publicly avowed and confessed doctrine a part of the pattern of world communism, alien to us in every sense, inimical to our safety and happiness, and working to poison our institutions to our destruction: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to take measures to prevent the infiltration of Communists and of known Communist sympathizers into any position with the Government of this country, national, State, county, or city; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress of the United States is urged to adopt such measures as may be necessary to guarantee that no quiet seizure of this Nation by such enemies shall go forward, whether through its press, its schools, its radio, its public forums of any kind, or through clandestine organizations which work unmolested to destroy us; and be it further

Resolved, That the Congress recognize the awful extent to which communism has grown in the United States, and take steps to establish effective security and counter-Communist agencies adequate to the mission of affirmatively stopping communism and Communists here.

Adopted by the Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars, at Atlanta, Ga., January 11, 1950, with instructions to transmit a copy to each Member from Georgia in the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States.

Attest:

T. CLINT HUGULEY,
Commander, Atlanta Chapter, Military Order of the World Wars, Atlanta, Ga.

Britain's Hand in Uncle Sam's Pocket—Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, I read with a great deal of interest an editorial appearing in today's Times-Herald, headed "Britain's hand in Uncle Sam's pocket—Again."

Two years ago I pointed out how the Marshall plan was born, having been conceived by a group of Wall Street bankers and war profiteers and those connected with and interested in the I. G. Farben cartels of Germany.

This editorial throws additional light, not only upon some of these men, but it also makes clear Britain's influence and interest in these German cartels. I feel the American people should have this brought to their attention. Consequently, I ask permission to embody this editorial in my remarks in the RECORD for their enlightenment.

The editorial follows:

BRITAIN'S HAND IN UNCLE SAM'S POCKET—AGAIN

A move to give more billions to the British is gathering momentum, Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, one of the best-informed Members of Congress on financial matters and a delegate to the Bretton Woods conference in 1944 by appointment of President Roosevelt, said in a statement last week that an attempt soon would be made to have the United States assume the debt of Britain to India, Egypt, and other foreign countries.

NEW SCHEME REVEALED

WOLCOTT was the first to describe the details of the new scheme. He said that the United States would pay these British debts by accepting sterling now frozen in London in payment, first, for agricultural products accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and then for machinery and other items.

All this ties up with the proposal made in December by a study group of United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The scheme released by that group was the first suggestion of using money obtained from the American taxpayers to pay old and stale debts of the British Government.

The study group limited the donation to 15 percent of the British debts. The idea now, according to Representative WOLCOTT, is to have the United States assume the entire debt.

The composition of the group in the International Chamber of Commerce which made the original proposal shows the motivating influence. The interests back of the new eight-billion-dollar donation to Britain are the same ones which put over the Marshall plan and then made huge profits out of it. They are also the same ones which backed every other donation of American funds to Britain.

MARSHALL PLAN BUSINESS

One of the 21 named as authors of the scheme is Lamar Fleming, Jr. Mr. Fleming is president of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the principal business of William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Clayton was the principal architect of the Marshall plan, directed negotiations with foreign countries in working out the plan, and directed the drive for the passage of the first ECA act. Mr. Clayton's firm has supplied at least $100,000,000 worth of cotton paid for with ECA funds. ECA transactions with Anderson, Clayton & Co., tabulated by the Tribune, total $79,000,000, with no figures available since September nor between February 1, 1949 and April 30, 1949.

Another member of the International Chamber of Commerce group which suggested unloading British debts on the American taxpayer is S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers' Trust Co. of New York.

His bank has, from the first of ECA, had a large percentage of the letter of credit business. Through the end of the year, Mr. Colt's bank has had $281,000,000 worth of business from the Marshall plan. Two directors of the Bankers' Trust Co., Philip

Reed and Ward Melville, were members of the committee for the Marshall plan—the propaganda group which agitated for passage of the act originally. Reed also is president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The National City Bank of New York, which has had $310,000,000 worth of ECA business, was represented on the committee to put over the Marshall plan by two of its directors, Sosthenes Behn and Gerard Swope. Now we find two officers of the bank, W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of its executive committee, and Leo N. Shaw, a vice president, on the roster of the study group which brought out the new British aid plan.

BANKS GET THEIR SHARE

Two Irving Trust Co. directors, Henry P. Bristol and David L. Luke, worked hard to get the Marshall plan through Congress. The bank has cashed in on their efforts thus far with $220,000,000 worth of letter-of-credit business. A vice president of the bank, August Maffry, took a leading part in preparing the International Chamber of Commerce report.

J. P. Morgan & Co. has had $238,000,000 worth of business out of the ECA. I. C. Raymond Atkin, a Morgan vice president, was one of the study group which brought out the suggestion for a new lot of British aid. The Bank of America also can see the point that foreign aid is good for the country or at least the financiers' end of it, as its share of the ECA banking business so far has been $197,000,000. Russell G. Smith, an executive vice president, is on the international chamber's committee.

Those who had the misfortune to invest in foreign bonds which are not being paid or serviced would like to see their debtors helped; so the membership of the chamber's committee of James Grafton Rogers, president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, is understandable. For like reasons, so is that of William S. Robertson, president of the American & Foreign Power Co.

The new plea for British aid at the expense of the American taxpayer is not being promoted by patriotic people who have only the welfare of all the people of the country in mind. It has been launched by persons who have their own private interests in mind. The influence of these people, when combined with that of the eastern Anglophiles, proved sufficient to put over the $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain in 1946 and the Marshall plan.

Unloading upon the United States old and stale debts of the British Government does seem a little more outrageous than the other schemes, but it will all look sweet and reasonable when the internationalists' propaganda has had a chance to dress it up.

Shaky United States Economy Resulting in New Kind of Isolationism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Shaky United States Economy Resulting in New Kind of Isolationism," written by Constantine Brown, and published in the Charlotte (N. C.) Observer for Sunday, January 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHAKY UNITED STATES ECONOMY RESULTING IN NEW KIND OF ISOLATIONISM

(By Constantine Brown)

A new kind of isolationism is developing rapidly among thinking political men, some voiceless military men, and others who, in the past, have been inveterate foreign interventionists.

One of the reasons for this reaction is the disappointment suffered by so many because of the failure of our leaders to secure a stable peace after we had won an overwhelming victory in World War II.

Another reason is deep concern over the possibility that our economy will become so shaky, as the result of extravagant expenditures abroad, that we shall be incapable of defending ourselves against the Soviet Frankenstein monster we helped to create.

And, finally, there is a growing feeling that the billions we are planning to spend in rearmament of western Europe may be thrown away because of the war-weariness of the peoples of the Atlantic Pact.

The American Government is committed to provide the equipment for about 25 divisions among the nations of the Atlantic Pact. But there is increasing fear, even among the advocates of that plan, that the war material may not be used if the Russians decide to strike at a time when we can scarcely spare the money to build up properly our own national defense against a Soviet attack from Siberia.

This neo-isolationism is different from that advocated before the last war by the America First organization. The America Firsters were opposed to any military preparedness. They maintained that a substantial increase in our Military Establishment would only lead to intervention in the war going on across the Atlantic.

The neo-isolationists believe in the strongest possible military preparedness at home. They believe in a substantial increase of our air arm, our ground forces, and to a lesser extent the naval forces. But looking at our budget—which is in the red—and at the commitments we have made across the seas, they do not think an increase in the cost of our national defense is feasible.

So far we have spent nearly $35,000,000,000 since VJ-day on all kinds of stop-communism-in-Europe schemes. We are the only country in the history of the world which is paying indemnity to the defeated nations. After having crushed Germany, Italy, and Japan we now are spending more than $3,000,000,000 a year to put them back on their feet. If we had not done that, it is argued, all those countries—with a population of nearly 170,000,000—might have gone over to the Communist side.

In Italy alone we spent nearly $2,000,000,000 in cash to defeat the Communist Party at the last election. In order to prevent the Communists from making real gains in a prostrate Germany we have to spend more than $1,000,000,000 a year in helping to put the German economy back on its feet.

It is difficult to guess when we will be able to stop our subsidies to western Germany. The Germans are working hard and would like to be on their own. But many difficulties lie in the way of their full economic recovery.

Neither France nor Britain, our closest allies, like the idea of meeting German economic competition. This explains their determination to dismantle the German factories. Officially we were told that if German industry is permitted to remain intact—even after a large portion has been dismantled—the risk of another German aggression would be great.

This argument, however, concealed the real reason, namely, the fear of the French and British Governments to compete once more with the hard-working Germans in a restricted world market.

Both the British and French can afford to adopt such a policy. It does not cost their taxpayers a nickel. But with us the situation is different. The American taxpayer must foot the bill not only for the armies of occupation in the Reich but also for many of the Bonn government's requirements. If we refuse, we are told, the whole structure of that democratic government will go to pieces and we will be faced with a Communist Germany in that area which is so close to the western union.

Over and above that, we are spending money on the Marshall plan to keep the Communist bear away from the western European countries and we are now to ship war materials of all kinds to the Atlantic Pact nations to permit them to organize their armies as a defensive force on the Rhine. But whether the European nations actually will use that war material if the Russians strike is another question.

Our Government has been assured by the governments of western Europe that they will fight if they have the means to do so. The European generals and admirals have assured their American opposite numbers of the same thing. But nobody has ever attempted to ascertain—even through some kind of poll—how the peoples of those countries, who would have to do the fighting, feel about it.

In private conversations our top military men admit that it is not humanly possible to give a clear-cut answer to such a question. They are compelled, however, to assume that what they are told by responsible officials across the Atlantic is correct. We must assume that by spending between $5,000,000,000 and $6,000,000,000 in the next 3 years we will provide the armies of our allies with sufficient equipment for them to put up actual resistance to possible aggression.

When these American military men are asked how they reconcile their optimism with the historical fact of the Nazi conquest of western Europe in 1940—when 81 French and British divisions melted away under the attack by a much smaller German force—they reply that the situation was different then. We had not committed ourselves to help the western democracies before the defeat occurred and the French felt themselves hopelessly alone.

Now that they know we are committed to fight any aggressor, they say, they will have a greater inducement to fight. Thus it is hoped that the western armies behind the Rhine will be able to fight off a numerically stronger Russian force with less than one-third of the forces they had in 1940.

The neoisolationists take this with a grain of salt. They ask quite frankly what would happen if the Russians, while holding the European front, decided to strike directly at us through Alaska, Greenland, or Iceland. None of these vital strategic points is prepared to withstand a Russian aggression.

At this time we have no ground forces in Alaska. The reason is that there is not enough money to meet all our domestic requirements and our international obligations and at the same time build houses for a minimum of one combat division in that Territory.

There are no military agreements between the United States and the government of Iceland, or with the Danish Government which controls Greenland, to provide for common defense of those strategic areas. All the American troops stationed in Iceland during the war were withdrawn—and properly so—soon after VJ-day. The military installations, to a great extent, have been destroyed.

The neo-isolationists say that in the event that Russia fools us and strikes at the strategic positions which would bring their air forces close to American territory, there

is more than an even chance that our western European allies would protest, sympathize with us, and offer every conceivable moral support. But no western European government would remain in office for half an hour if it attempted to live up to the provisions of the Atlantic Pact and created a diversion by striking at the U. S. S. R. in Europe.

Hence, our neo-isolationists say, we must be prepared to face the music alone and rely only on our own efforts. The fear that Russia might attempt to strike directly at us is due to the fact that America, it now is obvious, is considered enemy No. 1 of the Soviet imperialism. If it had not been for our intervention, western Europe might already be behind the iron curtain. And if it had not been for our unbelievable policy in the Far East the U. S. S. R. would not now be the dominating power on the Asiatic mainland, free to do whatever she likes in that area.

A strong non-Communist China would have been a thorn in the side of the Russians and would have deferred any plans to use Siberia as a jumping-off place if the Kremlin decides to attack America and bypass its western allies.

The possibility that we will have to fight the Soviet forces alone is strong in the minds of many people, who now are called neo-isolationists. Because of that possibility they believe that we must start soon to pay far more attention to the defense of the United States on its own soil than to continue to throw our wealth, which is not inexhaustible, about in the world.

These views are likely to be heard soon when Congress starts to scrutinize the new budget, particularly those sections containing provision for the Marshall plan and military aid to Europe. Secretary of Defense Johnson and the senior officers of the Air Force will be asked pertinent questions as to whether they are able to assume the defense of the United States with the present 48 groups provided for in the budget. The Army will be asked whether it can assume full responsibility for defense of Alaska with the one combat division it intends to send there during the summer and whether the three divisions available in the United States are sufficient to guarantee the country's security in the event of Russian aggression.

The Joint Chiefs of Staff in all probability will be asked whether they are planning on physical help from our western European allies in the event of a surprise attack.

A substantial improvement in the actual defense of the United States is demanded by many who are afraid that we are dissipating our substance abroad and not providing for our own defense in case an aggressor bypasses western Europe. At this time, they say, we are planning to fight another war exactly as if the German strategy of World War II is to be adopted by the Russians. But what will happen if they decide to alter the strategy and leave the ripe European plum hanging loosely on the tree and turn their full power against America itself?

Oil and Gas Depletion Tax

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, to satisfy the ravenous appetite of this administration to secure more taxes rather than to practice economy and cut the cost of Government, the President in his tax message this week asked for a reduction of the oil and gas depletion tax which has worked successfully and to the benefit of the Nation for many years. This ill-advised recommendation of the President should and, in my judgment, will be soundly defeated by this Congress.

If this tax-depletion recommendation is approved it will drive all independent oil producers in the Nation out of business. The independent producers who risk their capital and open up new oil fields cannot and will not be able to operate without the benefit of this tax depletion.

This move on the part of the administration, if successful, would place them in a position where their only alternative would be to sell out to major companies who would be able to name their own terms. It is a gigantic move which will favor big monopoly.

In addition hundreds of small refineries would be put out of business. Hundreds of thousands of men operating throughout the oil fields would no longer be employed.

This move to destroy the thousands of independent oil producers must be defeated in the interest of national defense because without the independent producers to discover new fields our oil reserves would dwindle, oil production would slump and in the event of another war the Nation would find itself short of oil and gas to supply the motive power for our Air Force, Fleet, and the Army.

Independent producers throughout my district tell me that if the proposed attempt to tamper with the depletion allowance is successful they will have no choice but to get out of the business. In selling they will be at the mercy of a few buyers consisting of the major oil companies and large financial corporations. Such a move which will produce less oil would not only throw a half million out of work but would cause the price of oil to increase to the consuming public. I ask, Which is preferable, to soak the consumer of petroleum products, or to keep back enough from the clutches of a wasteful bureaucracy to carry on a work that is a safeguard to the national security and which provides necessary and useful employment to hundreds of thousands?

These are the exact conditions that will follow unless this Congress defeats the attempt of the tax authorities to grab this power.

This depletion tax allowance has played a major part in extending the search and discovery of new oil and gas reserves throughout the United States. Because of this incentive we have been well supplied with oil products in time of peace, and we had an additional producing capacity which carried us successfully through the recent world war beginning with the critical hour when the Japs struck in December 1941.

The efforts to hamstring the oil producing business have been tried before. Congress has each time refused to let it happen. The weight of the evidence should again bury those who would sacrifice this industry so that their insatiable appetite for new tax can be gratified.

The process of finding new fields is expensive and hazardous. A majority of the wells drilled at great expense are dry with a terrific loss to the producers. This depletion tax is fair and just. It is the same type of a depreciation tax provided for the aging of buildings or the wear and tear on machinery. When an oil well is discovered it may produce well, but within a few years the oil in the ground supporting this well is pumped out. The well becomes worthless—that is the reason the Congress has wisely provided for the 27½ percent income tax depletion on oil well production.

United States Superforts to Great Britain—What Military Assistance to Arabian Countries?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, my attention was attracted to an Associated Press release from London appearing in the Chicago Sun-Times of January 25, calling attention to the fact that Great Britain is to get about 70 of our superfortresses.

Inasmuch as Great Britain is supplying various Arabian countries with weapons of war, I wonder whether these superforts will also be sold to those countries by Great Britain after having received them gratis from us?

In view of this situation I think our country should cease furnishing war material to Great Britain to further their purpose of supplying these countries in their war preparations. Surely they do not intend to war against one another. If there is any intent of war, it would naturally be against the new state of Israel, which is doing everything possible to bring about peace with the Arabs, has taken care of over 60,000 Arabs, and notifying them to return, which they have and are doing in large numbers. Though the new state of Israel has aided them in every conceivable way, there are some who, for political reasons, are creating discord with the assistance of British authorities.

The Associated Press report is as follows:

BRITAIN REPORTED DUE TO GET SUPERFORTS

LONDON, January 25.—The United States will give Britain about 70 Superfortresses and some sorely needed raw materials under an arms aid agreement now nearly complete.

Diplomatic officials who reported this last night said the agreement probably will be signed in Washington this week end.

The Anglo-American pact is one of eight being worked out under the American $1,000,000,000 military aid program for the nations of the North Atlantic alliance.

Britain recently objected to some of the conditions which the United States wanted in the accord. The informants said these difficulties have now been ironed out.

Flow of arms to Europe will begin about a month after the pacts have been signed and President Truman approves the strategic plans already drafted for defending the Atlantic area. The President's approval is expected this week.

A new meeting of the Atlantic Defense Council—made up of the defense ministers of the 12 partners—is due in the spring.

Socialism in Britain Hits Church and Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Socialism in Britain Hits Church and Home," written by Stephen C. Noland and published in the South Bend Tribune for January 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOCIALISM IN BRITAIN HITS CHURCH AND HOME

(This is the first of a series of articles prepared as a result of a recent personal visit to England and study of conditions under its Socialist Government. The writer, Stephen C. Noland, was for 15 years editor of the Indianapolis News. His recent visit to England was for the specific purpose of learning first hand of the conditions and attitude of the rank-and-file residents of England. Every person who reads the articles, and all should, will learn the truth about socialism in that country and should ask himself whether he desires such conditions in America.—Editor, Tribune.)

(By Stephen C. Noland)

LONDON, ENGLAND.—You may have heard the rumor that British farmer now can be permently "kicked off" his land for not farming it to suit a government committee.

Is that really true under today's British Socialist Government under the Labor Party, which is now in power? As a Midwestern American newspaperman, farm-born and farm-minded, I looked for the answer not in a book or magazine article or merely in a printed British Government regulation but rather on an actual visit to a farmer in Durham County, England.

And the answer is "Yes," British farmers now can be "kicked off" their land.

That's the way the information for this series of articles was dug out. All of it came from the everyday lives and experiences of common people in England, Wales, Scotland, and northern Ireland who are really living under socialism.

WISDOM TOOTH PERMIT

Can a dentist in Britain pull a wisdom tooth without a Government permit? No, he can't. And you'll get the details straight from a British dentist in one of these articles.

What about socialized medicine? These stories won't stem from books or propaganda broadcasts but from doctors' own waiting rooms and inner offices. One will be about my own attempt to get free medical service to which foreigners are entitled. Another will be an interview with a doctor driven to the verge of a break-down by people demanding his signature on "sick cards" so they could stay home on sick pay for 13 weeks.

LABOR STEPS ON LABOR

How are the steelworkers doing and why? How are the coal miners getting along and why? You'll read their own answer given to me at the pit heads and down in a mine 2½ miles under the North Sea and in their own cottages in talks with their wives and children.

What has happened in Britain to the right to strike, the right for which labor has struggled more than a century? To get right down to the point, What happened to that right when workers in an electric power plant near London walked out in protest against a phony wage boost which netted them no more take-home money? Their own leaders, now running the government, denounced them as unpatriotic and sent armed soldiers into the struck plant to run it. The way that was done, leaving labor union members helpless to use their hard-won right to strike and their leaders gagged and out on their feet, will be told in one of these stories direct from the strike scene.

BREAK UP THE CHURCH

How much headway is British socialism making in its admitted effort to break up the church and the home as the "two greatest obstacles" to its complete control of the people through government? How is the church being beaten down until today only 20 percent of the British people claim church membership as compared with 50 percent in the United States? Are mothers permitted to feed their children the milk, orange juice, and cod liver oil prescribed by the government?

What is the Socialist diet, 9 years of it now, doing to the physical strength of the British people? How do men hold up on one meat meal a week, a dab of butter now and then, only one egg a week? Can they keep going on potatoes, bread, and fish?

IT HOLDS NO HOPE

What happens to the normal ambition of men in a country which takes $4 out of every $10 they earn for taxes and holds out no hope for better days? Have these conditions in Socialist Britain been caused by some of the same policies which the United States is pursuing today?

You'll read answers to these any many of your other questions straight from British common people themselves in the articles in this series.

Stop the Chinese Reds Now—Or Else!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from a recent edition of the magazine See. Why has the State Department insisted for 4 years on following the advice regarding China of those who have consistently miscalculated the nature and objectives of the Chinese Communists instead of the advice of men like General Wedemeyer, Admiral Cooke, and many other eminent authorities who have been as consistently correct in their analyses. None has been more profoundly accurate than General Chennault, whose article follows:

STOP THE CHINESE REDS NOW—THE FAMED LEADER OF THE FLYING TIGERS, A WORLD-KNOWN EXPERT ON THE FAR EASTERN MILITARY SITUATION, OFFERS A DYNAMIC PROGRAM TO BLOCK COMMUNIST TIDE IN ASIA—FORESEES DISASTROUS RESULTS IF UNITED STATES FAILS TO ACT DECISIVELY

(By Maj. Gen. Claire Lee Chennault, U. S. Army (retired))

In ancient Peiping today functions an iron-handed People's Government established last October by Communist forces who came down from Manchuria to conquer northern China. Russia formally recognized it a few hours after it was proclaimed. Since then, it has sought recognition from the world.

This fanfare has served to cloud the real and desperate issue which the United States must face in China. Careless thinkers, instead of championing non-Communist forces forlornly holding China's south and west, parrot false hopes that the Chinese will develop a Tito brand of communism or absorb the Communists and evolve a kind of socialism.

That kind of talk reminds me of a conversation I had with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek in 1939, in his Chungking office. Madame Chiang, as usual, interpreted for her husband. I mentioned Japanese gains.

"Don't worry about those," the generalissimo said, "we'll defeat the Japanese if it takes a hundred years."

I thought a moment. "Madame," I said, "will you tell the Generalissimo, with all due respect, that neither he nor I will be here for a 100 years?

It is quite possible that Chinese communism will be modified in a century or two. but western hope for a free Far East will disappear in the meantime. If we let all China go under Communist domination, it will be a downhill ride for the Reds over the rest of Asia.

The United States must protect its position in Asia now, or risk maturity of an enemy power so enormous that it may destroy, first, the American system of free enterprise and, finally, American freedom itself.

Imbalances of strategic power, even more than new weapons like the atomic bomb, bring on wars. If the increasing imbalance in the Far East continues, we ultimately will have no choice but to fight a third world war—from a disadvantageous position.

Power-greedy despots start the wheels turning. Once the monster gathers momentum, its creators cannot stop it. To save themselves, they must go on. In China, the Communists put their war machine into low gear 5 years ago, and began chugging slowly southward, gathering force. Today that machine is in second gear. If we let it move into high, it will be all the harder—and it may be impossible for us to stop it.

Once the Reds have mopped up China, they will turn loose a well-organized, tremendously powerful force against smaller targets to the South. Below China in Asia, they can choose and conquer victims, one at a time.

CHENNAULT SUGGESTS THREE STEPS

Last year, for 5 months in Washington, I listened to the tugging over United States policy in the Far East. Asked to express my convictions, I examined them carefully. They stem from sympathy for the Chinese people, including my Chinese wife. But, much more, they stem from a judgment I reached during many years in China: the United States must frame and aggressively execute a realistic anti-Communist policy toward the Orient, or jeopardize freedom in this world.

As I see it, there is a realistic solution to the problem. I believe we must take three steps:

1. Create a military and economic supreme authority for rehabilitation of the Far East, with American personnel in charge initially.

2. Have this authority execute a definite United States policy for close economic and military integration of all non-Communist areas in the Far East.

3. Extend financial and military-equipment aid to Chinese military leaders fighting the Reds.

I believe the head of the proposed supreme authority must be an American at the outset. Only an American would be trusted by everybody. And he must have military and economic knowledge of the Far East.

I would like to see Gen. Douglas MacArthur in charge of this supreme authority. He has the respect and admiration, not only of non-Communist China, but of the entire Orient. He is decisive, objective in performance of work. Finally, the American people know him well enough to rely on him.

The supreme authority should be given adequate powers and a moderate sum of money, to be spent at the supreme's commander's discretion. His staff would consist of men from the Department of Defense for military work, and from the State Department for economic and diplomatic work.

Around the supreme authority all non-Communist elements in the Far East could rally. It would participate in military planning for Chinese and all other anti-Communist Asiatic military leaders. Its military experts would apply their talents to tactics, logistics, and strategy in opposing the Reds in China and Asia in general.

This authority would determine just which military leader, at what locale, needed weapons, ammunition, equipment; would supply the needed items, and would see that they were used.

No American troops would be involved. The authority would be a planning, supply, and advisory mechanism, with power and money to act. Unquestionably, the anti-Communist Chinese leaders—all of them, including those in China's constitutional government—would welcome it.

When a vigorous anti-Communist nationalism had been created throughout Asia, leaders of the Far East would themselves take control of the supreme authority.

In offering this plan, I will be accused of submitting too simple and too inexpensive solutions. I plead not guilty.

The American people have grown used to having financial problems discussed in enormous figures and complicated formulas. But in the Far East, it is still an axiom that the best way to do a job is the simplest. And, properly used, money goes a long way in money-poor Asia, where $1 will get as much done as $100 in Europe.

It is therefore unnecessary to write a philosophic analysis of the Orient into a plan for action in the Far East. Besides, we don't have time. The Far East is in critical economic and military condition—a condition on which communism thrives.

IT'S A JOB FOR EXPERTS ON ASIA

One of the most embarrassing questions I am asked in free China is this: "If you Americans won't help us because you don't like our Government, or don't like Chiang, why don't you tell us what or whom you want?"

I can hardly answer: "The truth is, we don't tell you because we don't know."

But if, in Europe-minded Washington, we cannot decide what we want in the completely different situation in Asia, then let's deputize the job to our most expert Asiatic experts.

Fundamentally, the long-pull task in the Far East is economic, because only a healthy economy and a happy people can contain the Communist virus permanently. At the present stage, however, the task is to stop the Communist war machine—and stop it in China. The least we can do in China is to buy time for the rest of non-Communist Asia to get organized for what is coming.

Despite Communist victories, there are 200,000,000 Chinese outside Red control. The great majority are violently opposed to communism and given any kind of encouragement and ammunition will fight. Their non-Communist territory is largely in the western and southern areas. It is rugged country, easy—and relatively inexpensive—to defend with small forces.

ANTI-RED CHINA CAN BE SUPPLIED

The mountainous character of the terrain precludes the use of expensive and complex military equipment. Financial support—silver—to pay troops, plus small arms and ammunition, some pack howitzers, 75-millimeter mountain guns, and a few mortars would do the job, in my opinion. I have seen these mountain military leaders. In their strongholds they are almost invincible. Supplies of all kinds could be flown in to them, or hauled in by human pack work through the mountain passes, or both. It has been done before.

Here in the high western and southwestern portions of China is the key to the conquest of the remainder of continental Asia. Here we must hold against the Reds, or be faced with the infinitely harder task of trying to restore freedom in Asia at some future time. From the high southwest Province of Yunnan, the downhill approaches to French Indochina, Siam, and Burma, and ultimately Malaya and India, are extremely vulnerable.

It is essential to United States security that Formosa and Hainan Islands, Formosa especially, be denied to unfriendly powers. Both have good harbors suitable for submarines, and many good airfields. Our American lines of communication and transport in the western Pacific—from Japan through Okinawa to the Philippines—and the British line—stretching from Ceylon to Singapore and Malaya and up to Hong Kong—can be dominated by enemy submarines and planes based on Formosa and Hainan.

A FRIENDLY FORMOSA IS VITAL

If we were absolutely forced to it, there would be no legal reason why the United States itself could not move in and occupy Formosa, just as we did in Japan. Formosa was not given to China after it was taken from the Japanese. Chinese Communists, conquering it, would succeed to no Chinese Nationalist title. The Chinese Nationalists have the same status in Formosa we have in Japan. They are conquerors, holding the island until a treaty of peace with Japan finally determines ownership.

Communist plans for Asia's future are plain, were blared boastfully over the radio as the Red soldiers moved south. They involve:

1. Conquest of China.
2. Immediate aid to Communist allies in Indochina, Siam, Malaya, Burma, and India.
3. Rapid extension of this pattern in Indonesia, the Philippines, and Japan.

TROUBLE IN ASIA IS WIDESPREAD

With accomplishment of these steps, free civilization would have lost a strategic asset perhaps more essential to American security than all of Europe. An over-all look at the Far East begins to tell the story:

In addition to a large-scale war in China, there is Communist trouble in French Indochina, Burma, Malaya. The Communist leader in Indochina, Ho Chi-minh, has been fighting the French more than 4 years. There is Communist disturbance in Siam. I have information that the Bengal Province of India is rotten with communism. The Philippines are troubled with Communist-inspired and Communist-armed guerrillas.

Against a Red force in control of China, Formosa, and Hainan, these southward areas, already infected with communism, could offer very little resistance.

The burden of opposing the Reds' southward march could not safely be based on Hindu military operations. India's potential of course is enormous, and Prime Minister Nehru is a brilliant man, but the road to Indian consolidation and cohesion will be long and hard.

WHAT AN ALL-RED ASIA WOULD MEAN

Hindu passive resistance is no weapon with which to fight communism. Wherever this type of opposition prevails, there lies the most vulnerable point for the Communist pattern of conquest—infiltration, indoctrination and, only then, arms.

An all-Communist Asia would be a disaster to the United States. All of Asia's great resources and wealth would be available to Communist Russia. A Russian Far East merchant marine would spring up like magic, bringing new strategic dangers to democracies and gobbling up the rich eastern trade.

With the past 5 years Communist Russia has built at least 20 industrial cities along the Trans-Siberian Railway. Their factories need Asia's rich resources—iron, tin, wolfram, antimony, aluminum, rubber (and slave labor)—to build guns, tanks, airplanes, railroads, ships.

Moreover, if Russia established her Communist pattern in Asia, her industry would be so decentralized that it would offer no critical target to hostile bombers. Her vast industrial set-up would extend, almost unattackable, from Vladivostock to Poland. And the only good airfields for massive operations against the Russian atomic plants, known to lie in Siberia's Lake Baikal area, are in China—airfields built by the United States Army for B-29 operations in the last war.

Another important point: with China consolidated into Russia, it would be impossible to keep Japan in the American orbit. Communists would be free to cross the Bering Straits directly into Alaska, meeting only United States frontal defense. Today the invader also would be exposed to attack from Japan, on the southern flank.

With all Asia conquered, more than half of the population of the world would go behind the iron curtain. All the results of Christianized education, built up in the Far East over more than a century, also would go down the Communist drain. Any Christian or any western-educated Chinese would be considered seeds of infection under a Communist form of government.

The United States, therefore, would lose a tremendous human asset. It consists of thousands, maybe hundreds of thousands, of Chinese educated in the United States or in American mission schools in China; converts of American missions; sons and daughters of earlier-generation Chinese who made their fortunes in the United States and returned to raise their children in western traditions. In no other Asiatic country—not in Japan, not in India, possibly not even in the Philippines—are there so many people of Asiatic blood with an American intellectual inheritance.

We must, therefore, find, and keep, some piece of China free; a place where our Chinese friends can find sanctuary to plan and carry out a program for freedom in the Far East.

NO HOPE IN A CHINESE UNDERGROUND

Talk of supplying underground Chinese opposition to communism makes no sense so long as there is fighting strength overground. Even overground armies are expensive. The leakage through a thousand crevices in an underground would be 10 times more wasteful.

Today millions of Chinese working people stand ready to fight with the west for freedom against Communist domination. When the Chinese are criticized as a people who cannot or will not fight, I sometimes think of the war conference at Cairo to which the late President Roosevelt invited, among many others, Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and myself.

Generalissimo Chiang and Madame Chiang had gone out to visit the pyramids. I came

along later. The Generalissimo was standing still, looking up at the Great Pyramid, solemn, obviously impressed.

"Madame," I said, "remind the Generalissimo for me that we put more rock in the big airplane runways at Chengtu than they've got here.

"My Chinese built four B-29 runways and three fighter fields, two taxi ramps and hardstands for 48 planes, simultaneously. Every ounce of the rock had to be hauled and crushed by hand, and pounded into the runway excavations. Those runways were 2,600 meters long, 60 centimeters deep. If you ground up two of those pyramids, you wouldn't have enough rock to make those runways."

The sightseeing Generalissimo suddenly looked less awestricken.

The mountain men of western China, who built our B-29 runways, will toil and fight to be free, as they always have been free. All they need besides arms is advice to match the modern advice Russia is giving to the other side.

It is not too late—nor would it be too costly—to stop the Reds in China now, before they launch a downhill rampage into southern Asia from the Chinese provinces on the southwest slopes. Unless we do, we will have more on our hands than a struggle back uphill. America and the free western world in general may find that they have become an embattled island, fighting desperately for life.

Franco Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, during the last few days I have read with amazement various reports of the intention to bring about early recognition of Franco Spain.

In this connection I read an editorial appearing in the January 23 issue of the Chicago Sun-Times entitled "Inching Toward Franco," expressing, as I believe, the viewpoint of a vast majority of the American people. It is as follows:

INCHING TOWARD FRANCO

What to do about Spain is an emotionally charged issue in this country. It is worth while to try to decide what is important and what not important in our relations with that nation.

Whether this country is represented in Madrid by an Ambassador or by a Chargé d'Affaires is not of the highest importance. Recognition is not at issue. We recognized Spain in 1939 and have never reneged. During the war we had an ambassador there. After the war we went along with the UN General Assembly's recommendation that Ambassadors be withdrawn.

Now Secretary of State Acheson says this country will support an Assembly resolution permitting any member to restore its Embassy if it wishes.

There is no very strong reason why this should not be done—even though the reasons often given for doing it ring exceedingly hollow. Those who tell us what a fine fellow Franco is, and how badly we need him in our struggle with communism, overlook the one fact that distinguishes Franco from every other ruler in the world.

The fact is that Franco was our enemy during the war. He did what he could, as long as he thought it safe, to support Hitler's cause. He was a Fascist tyrant when he come into power, he rode the wave of fascism as long as he dared, and he remains a Fascist tyrant today.

Franco should have been knocked off at the end of the war, when it would have taken only a slight push to do so. But he wasn't. Today there seems little doubt that the mere withholding of ambassadors is not going to force him out of power. Nor will the mere dispatch of ambassadors to Madrid significantly alter his situation or Spain's.

What is important in our relations with Spain is that we should not act alone in defining them. We should take no steps that are not thoroughly discussed with and approved by our friends in western Europe.

The most ardent promoters of Franco's cause obviously hope that sending an ambassador to Madrid will be the prelude to bringing Spain into the Atlantic Pact and making her eligible for economic aid. These are the really important issues. Before we decide them, we ought to recognize that we cannot squeeze Franco into the Atlantic community without totally destroying the conception of a community based upon a common devotion to freedom and democracy.

Franco's promoters would do well to recognize something else—namely, that the dispatch of an ambassador to Madrid will shatter any ideological grounds for failure to recognize Red China. There may be other reasons for withholding recognition of China—for example, the need for assurance that our diplomats won't be pushed around—but once we have an ambassador in Madrid we can hardly decline to send one to Peking because we don't like Red China's ideology. If you can stand Franco you can stand anything.

Money, Inflation, and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Money, Inflation, and Socialism," written by Burris Jenkins, Jr., and published in the Seattle Post Intelligencer for Tuesday, January 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MONEY, INFLATION, AND SOCIALISM

(By Burris Jenkins, Jr.)

Gold, in the long experience of the ages, is the best kind of money that can be contrived.

Every other kind of money has genuine value and validity only to the extent that it is related to gold.

In the modern era, the usefulness of gold as money was augmented by the auxiliary device of paper money which was redeemable in gold and was therefore the equivalent of gold.

Under this arrangement, a government issuing and guaranteeing the paper money for which the gold was security served as the custodian but not the actual owner of the gold.

The real owners were the holders of the gold-redeemable paper against which the gold had been pledged.

And the gold could lie in safe keeping while the paper passed around in circulation as currency.

Thus redeemable printed currency was like warehouse certificates denoting title to merchandise.

It was not necessary to move the goods—or the gold—in order to change the ownership.

At the same time, the issuance of certificates—or currency—was necessarily limited by the amount of gold available for redemptive purposes.

This prevented demoralizing monetary inflation.

Likewise, public expenditures and public debt were similarly restricted, which served as a brake on credit inflation in all banking operations.

And, since all transactions had to be liquidated eventually with money, and the money had to be either gold itself or else redeemable in gold, the system was accurately known as the gold standard.

Gold, with not very many variations, was the fixed common denominator of all values and of all currencies.

Now, among its other excellences, the gold standard tended to prevent frauds; and frauds can be perpetrated by governments as well as by individuals.

Frauds committed by individuals are punishable by statute.

Government, however, is not only the source of legal currency; it is also the fountain of statutory power.

Consequently, by illicit use of power, government could subvert the gold standard.

Government could substitute deficit financing for balanced budgets.

Government could replace fiat money for redeemable currency—even in the payment of its own obligations.

And the Government of the United States did these immoral things in 1933.

It confiscated all the monetary gold in the country, and devalued the dollar, thereby reducing the worth of pensions and insurance policies by nearly 50 percent.

It took over the Federal Reserve System—that is, the national banks—as a tool and agent of the Treasury.

Thereafter, the Government could borrow in multi-billion-dollar installments on the security of its own debt and monetize the debts—part of which emerges from the banks in the form of fiat currency but the bulk of which comprises the basis for credit inflation, making itself evident in low interest rates or cheap money, in excessive check-book money and in swollen bank reserves.

These manipulations liberated the Government from dependence on taxes.

They made inflation the Federal fiscal policy.

As a result, the "supply" of currency in circulation has increased from $8,000,000,000 to $20,000,000,000; the volume of bank credit—about $30,000,000,000 in 1933—now exceeds $100,000,000,000 and the national debt—less than $20,000,000,000 in 1933—had mounted to $40,000,000,000 before the war, and is now more than a quarter of a trillion dollars.

Of course, much of the pyramidal debt and pervading inflation have been due to the war.

And the effect of this has been to obscure the truth.

For the truth is that inflation became the New Deal's policy before the war and has remained the New Deal's policy since the war.

The methods pursued originated in European socialism and in the "new economics"

sponsored by the late Lord Keynes, and were imported here to socialize America.

The theory is to be found in the Marxist gospel of Lenin, who taught that the surest way to socialize an industrial society is to debauch its currency.

Without inflation, the New Deal could not undertake the fantastic schemes of its Socialist "welfare state"—and without inflation it could find no excuse for undertaking them.

But inflation—either by means of managed currency or deficit financing—is an illusion for which the people must pay.

They must pay in labor and production without corresponding progress and prosperity, if not in industrial stagnation and degraded standards of living.

And with $24,000,000,000 worth of idle gold in the United States available for a return to the honest gold standard, there is a remedy at hand.

A Dental-Health Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, at the ninetieth annual session of the American Dental Association held in San Francisco last October, a dental-health program for the community, the State, and the Nation was unanimously approved by our house of delegates.

In order that the public may know the objectives of the 70,000 ethical dentists holding membership in the American Dental Association, I herewith submit our dental-health program:

A DENTAL-HEALTH PROGRAM

The dental profession in this country long has urged a constructive approach to the national dental-health problem. The dental profession's proposals represent a scientific, feasible, economical, and rational approach to the problems of dental diseases in direct contrast with the costly and unrealistic proposals bound up with a system of Federal compulsory-health insurance.

In the past decade or more, there has been increasing recognition by the public of the value of dentistry as an essential health service. New methods of prevention and control have been discovered and these promise to give the profession more effective weapons in its fight against dental diseases. This progress has been accompanied by a general reawakening to the fact that American life traditionally is based on community life, that needs can best be determined and met through individual and community effort.

In the light of these developments, the American Dental Association reiterates the basic principles which have guided the development of dental-health programs and offers additional suggestions and recommendations which experience has demonstrated will be useful in the development of better local community programs for dental health.

THE NATIONAL PROGRAM

The American Dental Association believes that the following elements are essential for the success of a national program for the promotion of dental health.

Federal department of health: A Federal department of health, with Cabinet status, should be established independently of welfare and educational agencies and should be administered by persons trained in the health sciences and qualified to coordinate all Federal health activities except those of the military services.

Dental research: Dental research should be promoted through the National Institute of Dental Research and through grants to public and private agencies and individuals qualified to carry on significant research. New resources for dental research should be sought continuously from private agencies.

Dental-health education: Dental-health education should be carried on through appropriate State and community agencies to provide authentic information on health practices, to motivate people to assume personal responsibility for health and to inform them of the facilities available for dental health care.

Dental care: Dental care should be available to all regardless of income or geographic location as rapidly as resources will permit. Private and community programs should provide for priority treatment, prevention and control of dental disease in children, and for the elimination of pain and infection in adults. The community in all cases shall determine its methods for providing services.

Program planning: In all major conferences that may lead to the formation of a national dental-health program, authorized representatives of the American Dental Association should participate. Similarly, in all major conferences that may lead to the formation of a community or State dental-health program, authorized representatives appointed by constituent or component dental societies should participate that public health and welfare may be best protected.

Councils on dental health: The establishment of councils on dental health at State and local levels should be completed as rapidly as possible in order to provide a mechanism through which the development of dental-health programs can be facilitated. Such councils should have lay and consumer consultants.

General health plans and programs: It should be the consistent policy of all dental groups to cooperate as fully as possible with other health groups in the development of programs designed to promote the total health of the patient.

Public-health dentistry: Each of the States should be urged to establish a division of dental health within the department of health and the administration of the dental program should be in the hands of a qualified dental officer who is directly responsible to the State health officer.

Veterans' dental care: The dental care of veterans should be maintained at a high standard and should be provided under a State program in which the veteran has free choice of practitioners in private practice.

Hospitals and health centers: The construction or addition of adequate dental facilities should be undertaken in all hospital and health centers. Such dental facilities should be operated and maintained in accord with standards established by the American Dental Association and administered by a qualified dentist.

Methods of payment: Voluntary prepayment and postpayment plans consistent with sound experience should be developed as rapidly as possible. A Federal compulsory health-insurance program should be opposed on the ground that it is not in the interest of the public or of the profession.

Dental education and personnel: Facilities for the training of dental personnel should be expanded. Such expansion should be consistent with local and regional needs. Improved support for dental education should be sought provided that such support does not entail a loss of independence on the part of the educational institutions.

Dentistry in military services: Dental programs in the military services should provide high-quality care for the military patient. All policies dealing with dentistry should be developed, administered, and controlled by the dental officer.

THE STATE PROGRAM

The State dental-health program should be developed within the broad framework of policies established by the dental profession through the State dental society and the American Dental Association. The right of determination on all points which vary from State to State should be reserved to the individual States.

General policies: The State dental-health program should be developed specifically after a consideration of the 13 points outlined in the national program of the American Dental Association.

Grants-in-aid: Grants-in-aid should be considered as an acceptable method of supporting State dental-health programs provided that the right of the State to adapt any program to meet its own needs is safeguarded.

Dental-health inventory: In order to formulate the objectives, principles, and policies for a State-wide program based primarily on community dental-health programs, provision should be made for the examination and analysis of dental-health needs, for an appraisal of resources available for meeting those needs and for determination of the methods and means for utilizing and supplementing those resources.

Dental-health conferences: Dental-health conferences, sponsored by the State dental society and the State health department, are tested and successful devices for making a dental-health inventory and for planning a State-wide program based on prevention of dental disease, dental health education and dental care especially for children.

Continuing education for dentists: At the State level, the dental and other professional schools should be encouraged to coordinate their undergraduate teaching programs with the general program of dental-health service in the State. Short postgraduate courses should be made available regularly to practicing dentists, and an extension teaching program may be organized to reach dentists in areas more remote from the dental school. Where there is no dental school, a State-wide program of annual seminars or refresher courses may be developed cooperatively by the dental society and the health department, and conducted in the various districts, drawing qualified teachers from outside the State if necessary. Library service also should be made available to dental practitioners, so far as is practicable.

Courses of study for teachers: Opportunities should be provided for teachers in training to learn dental health facts and methods for integrating dental-health subjects in routine classroom instruction in elementary and secondary grades. Every teachers' college should include in the curriculum a course of study devoted to dental health.

Experiments and demonstrations: Experiments and demonstrations designed to teach or disseminate new facts of value in providing dental-health care should be encouraged by the State provided that there is approval by the State dental society of the type and duration of the experiment or demonstration.

THE COMMUNITY PROGRAM

The community dental health program should be developed with the advice and assistance of the dental profession. In all major conferences that are held for the purpose of planning a community dental health program there should be participation by authorized representatives of the component or constituent dental society. These representatives are to be selected by the dental society either by presidential appointment or by other means. It is vitally essential that all community dental health programs be developed with special consideration for local needs, traditions, and practices.

General policies: The community dental health program should be developed after consideration of the 13 points outlined in the basic program of the American Dental Association and of the elements of the State program outlined by the American Dental Association and after consultation with authorized officials of the constituent and component dental societies involved and with officials of recognized health agencies.

Objectives of a community dental health program: The objectives of a community dental health program should be to:

1. Help every American appreciate the importance of a healthy mouth.
2. Help every American appreciate the relationship of dental health to general health and appearance.
3. Encourage the observance of dental-health practices, including personal care, professional care, proper diet, and oral habits.
4. Enlist the aid of all groups and agencies interested in the promotion of health.
5. Correlate dental health activities with generalized health programs.
6. Stimulate the development of resources for making dental care available to all children and youth.
7. Stimulate all dentists to perform adequate dental health services for children.

Organization of community dental health program: The following initial steps are recommended to communities in the development of dental health programs:

1. A conference of key persons in a community should be called to develop a plan of action.
2. A procedure should be developed for the appraisal of the community's dental health needs and resources.
3. The general public, and community leaders in particular, should be made aware of existing dental health needs through publicity and group meetings.
4. The local dental society should be consulted to obtain advice on technical and professional matters.
5. A plan based on the dental health education, prevention of dental disease, and dental care for children should be adopted after it has been related to the needs of the community.
6. The responsibility for administering the program should be delegated to the individuals and agencies best suited to this task.

Financing the program: Whenever possible, local funds should be utilized for the institution and maintenance of community programs. In communities where funds are inadequate for this purpose, State and, if necessary, Federal funds may be sought. The appropriation of local, State, and Federal funds should be in keeping with the magnitude of the dental health problem. Funds for health care from public and private sources are generally interpreted to be available for dental care. Public health, welfare, and voluntary organizations, therefore, should be asked to budget a portion of their funds to assist in meeting dental health needs.

Local, State, and Federal funds are available under specific conditions for dental health programs. Federal funds include those allocated by the Children's Bureau and by the Public Health Service. Federal funds allocated by these agencies are appropriated to State health departments. Some State governments provide funds for dental treatment programs for specific groups. Some county and local departments of health, local boards of education, and welfare departments provide funds or facilities for the treatment of children whose parents have low incomes. Voluntary groups, such as the Red Cross, parent-teacher associations, and others also are sources of funds for initiating experimental or permanent dental health programs.

Appraisal of community dental health problems: In order to provide a sound basis for planning and executing an effective community dental health program, an appraisal of the community's dental health needs and resources must be made. The appraisal may be sponsored by the local dental society, the local health department, voluntary health agencies, educational authorities, and other interested community groups. The appraisal should include: (1) an analysis of the community's dental service needs and specific dental health hazards; (2) a census of available dental personnel, including dentists, dental hygienists, dental assistants, and dental laboratory technicians; (3) delimitation of those oral health procedures essential for optimal oral health; (4) a list of accessible service facilities, including private dental offices, hospital dental clinics, and other public and private clinics; (5) an estimate of public and private funds expended for dental services in the community; (6) an estimate of the effective demand for dental care in the area; (7) a study of individual variations in income and in the ability to pay for dental care; (8) an estimate of the community's potential or unused resources in providing dental health services.

Dental-health education: The community program should make specific provision for the education of the public in matters relating to dental-health hazards and diseases and to desirable and undesirable health habits and practices. Instructions in dental health for school children should be an integral part of the school curriculum. Dental-health facts and proven methods for imparting them to children should be available to all school teachers. Speakers should be furnished for meetings of special groups which can be interested in dental health. Factual, simple, and attractive dental health pamphlets should be provided and the press, radio, posters, motion pictures, television, newspapers, and magazines should be employed in a continuing program of education for the general public. Whenever possible, dental health education activities should be directed or supervised by a person qualified in the field of health education.

Continuing professional education: Continuing education for the professional personnel involved should be an integral part of the community program. Opportunities should be provided for practicing dentists and dental hygienists to keep abreast of scientific knowledge in their fields, for public health workers to develop and maintain familiarity with basic dental-health principles and practices, and for physicians and nurses to understand and accept their responsibilities in the dental-health program.

As a part of the community program, dental societies should be encouraged and assisted in the development of well-planned discussions on community dental-health problems, as well as on scientific subjects, in connection with their regular meetings. Joint sessions with local physicians and public-health workers can be helpful in consolidating various phases of the community health program. In addition, study groups and clubs may be formed locally to encourage day-to-day individual study and periodic group discussion of special problems and fields of mutual interest.

Efforts should be made to relate the continuing education program for professional personnel in communities with the same program conducted at the State level.

Methods of payment: The need for finding a more satisfactory financing plan to meet dental health service costs, especially for the medium and low income groups, suggests the desirability of establishing experimental voluntary prepayment and postpayment plans. Although the successful application of the prepayment principle in meeting hospital and medical care costs has been well established, present knowledge of the subject is inadequate to determine whether a similar budgeting plan can be applied to dentistry.

Experimental prepayment plans for dental service should be inaugurated by dental societies. With proper management, it is believed that actuarial data can be obtained to analyze the now unknown factors of a prepayment system as they are related to dental care.

Efforts to develop satisfactory postpayment plans should be encouraged and the dental health education program should motivate the public to budget for dental care.

Eligibility for dental health care: The determination of those eligible to receive dental care at the expense of the public should be made under a plan acceptable to the concerned groups of the local community and should be related to ability to pay. Priority should be given to dental care for children and to the relief of pain and infection and the rehabilitation for employment in adults.

Facilities for dental health services: Every effort should be made to use to the maximum extent existing facilities for rendering dental health service. Such facilities should include the offices of private practitioners, hospital dental clinics, mobile dental units, and other private and public facilities.

Dental fees: Payments to dentists participating in the program may be made on a full-time, part-time, hourly or unit-of-service basis. The dental fee schedule should be determined by authorized representatives of the dentists who will render the dental services. In all cases payments should be consistent with the provision of a high grade dental service.

Preventive services: Certain preventive procedures which lend themselves to mass application on a public health basis may serve as effective agents of community dental health education. The community dental health plan should include such preventive measures for the control of dental disease as are approved by recognized dental authorities.

Treatment services: Although priorities in treatment service are usually listed separately for children and adults, certain services, such as the relief of pain and the treatment of acute infection, should be available to all regardless of age classification. The following priority classification of treatment services is recommended:

For children

1. Relief of pain and treatment of acute infections.
2. Elimination of pathosis and extraction of unsavable teeth.
3. Treatment of permanent teeth with exposed vital pulps.
4. Treatment of bone and soft tissue diseases and anomalies.
5. Repair of injured or carious permanent teeth.
6. Repair of injured or carious primary teeth.
7. Prosthodontic and orthodontic services.

For adults

1. Relief of pain and treatment of acute infections.
2. Elimination of pathosis and extraction of unsavable teeth.
3. Removal of irritating conditions which may lead to malignancies.
4. Treatment of bone and soft tissue diseases.
5. Repair of injured or carious teeth.
6. Replacement of lost teeth and restoration of function.

Program evaluation: All persons interested in health and community affairs will be interested in the accomplishments, soundness, and cost of the community dental health program. Data for evaluating the program may be obtained through follow-up services

and the maintenance of simple records. Simplified dental health indexes should be applied periodically to provide comparative data for evaluating the effectiveness of the program and improvement in the dental health status of the community. Accountability for the expenditure of funds will require the maintenance of records of costs and of services.

Legislative Program, AMVETS

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a very splendid statement made before the Committee on Veterans' Affairs on last Tuesday, January 17, by Mr. Harold Russell, national commander of American Veterans of World War II, better known as AMVETS, covering his organization's legislative objectives.

Mr. Russell's statement follows:

STATEMENT OF HAROLD RUSSELL, NATIONAL COMMANDER, AMVETS, BEFORE HOUSE VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE, JANUARY 17, 1950

AMVETS expresses its appreciation to the committee for this opportunity to appear before it and present its program.

We endorse the statements of our colleagues, Commander Craig, of the American Legion; Commander Lewis, of the Veterans of Foreign Wars; and Commander Brown, of the Disabled American Veterans, in censuring the Hoover Commission report as it pertains to the veteran and the Veterans' Administration. We believe that if this Hoover Commission report were implemented the result would be not economy and efficiency, but additional costs and drastic cuts in service to the veterans.

There is no question in our minds but that there is ample room for increasing efficiency and creating economies in the Veterans' Administration; to this end we have watched with pleasure the establishment by Congress of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. But to take these services and place them in other Government agencies to be handled with nonbenefit legislation would be chaotic. We claim that the common denominator in the administration and effective utilization of the rights and benefits as enacted by Congress is the veteran himself and not the program, such as medical service; that for the most efficient operation of these programs it is necessary to maintain these services within the Veterans' Administration. Congress has enacted certain so-called benefit legislation in recognition of the fact that the veteran suffered certain handicaps and losses because of his service in time of war. Because of the special nature of this legislation, the Veterans' Administration was created. Now the Hoover Commission report would negate this basic concept and philosophy of veterans' benefits and say in effect that the veteran does not have any special problem, did not suffer certain special handicaps and losses in time of war. We refute this philosophy. If Congress is right in setting up the VA and passing this legislation, then the Hoover Commission is wrong.

Therefore we call upon this committee to guard against such attacks which we recognize as the mouthings of the same philosophy expressed by the economy league of 1933 and the effect of which you gentlemen will remember.

AMVETS urge the enactment of the so-called escalator bill in relation to compensation. Compensation, today, is still out of line with the cost of living in America. The Bureau of Labor Statistics indicates that the cost of living index rests at 168.7 as of November 15, 1949. It is inconceivable that this Nation should desire its disabled veterans to exist on present compensation levels. Recognizing the tremendous legislative work which must go into every change in the structure of compensation, AMVETS urge that this compensation be tied to the cost of living index of the Bureau of Labor Statistics and that for each 10 percent increase in the cost of living index, so shall compensation be increased, and likewise decreased so as to at all times honestly reflect the needs of these men in relationship to the purchasing power of their dollar.

Gentlemen, we bring to your attention the non-service-connected pensions for widows and orphans of World War II. We ask for equalization of these benefits with benefits allowed to widows and orphans of World War I. Hunger and want is common to all people. A generation's difference does not change the needs of those who have lost husbands and fathers.

AMVETS support H. R. 5574, a bill to liberalize the provisions of National Service Life Insurance. This is a particularly long and technical bill and AMVETS will appreciate the opportunity of appearing before this committee at a later date on it. This bill would serve to further equalize the insurance opportunities of World War I and World War II veterans.

At our last national convention, AMVETS voted in favor of adjusted service compensation payable in Government bonds maturing in 1960—10 years hence. Fifty-six percent of the delegates at this convention voted in favor of the bonus.

Thus, to put it bluntly, AMVETS favor a World War II soldiers' bonus computed at the rate of $3 per day for domestic service and $4 per day for foreign service to an individual maximum of $4,500.

We recognize that in some quarters this is an unpopular issue—that it has always aroused the wrath of the economy-minded in the press and even in the Congress. But by every standard of equity, the bonus is justifiable. It is inequitable to spend literally billions of dollars helping young, married, nondisabled veterans to make up their lost schooling, to spend other billions in European countries and to ignore completely the problems of older veterans with long-standing family obligations who were forced to give up their jobs, their businesses, and often their homes to go to war.

There are many thousand veterans, particularly in the older age brackets, who cannot collect a dime under the GI bill of rights and whose right to some form of financial reward for their wartime services has been utterly neglected. The bonus would adjust this inequity.

We support S. 2596, the Taft-Teague bill, which will redefine the rights of veterans to education under Public Law 346.

AMVETS also wishes to record a digest of all of our resolutions as enacted by our 1949 national convention, as a part of my remarks.

(The matter referred to follows:)

DIGEST OF AMVETS 1950 RESOLUTIONS

Resolution 1. That national headquarters and the national legislative director support legislation providing stenographic assistance for full-time paid representatives of certain congressionally chartered organizations that have been assigned office space in VA offices.

Resolution 2. That AMVETS urge congressional committees handling veterans' bills to make copies of reports on such bills from Government agencies and departments available to any congressionally chartered organization requesting them; and that if necessary, the rules of Congress be amended to make this possible.

Resolution 3. That AMVETS take steps to gain Federal and State recognition of service time in the WAAC for the purpose of veterans' privileges and benefits, when such service time was followed consecutively and uninterruptedly by service in the WAC.

Resolution 4. That in conjunction with the conscription of any citizens for the armed forces in the event of a future war, a proper and effectual mobilization of all resources, including industry and labor, be effected.

Resolution 5. That AMVETS favor enactment of legislation granting employees in the field service of the Post Office Department the same vacation and sick privileges accorded to other Federal Government employees.

Resolution 6. That AMVETS national legislative director support legislation whereby veterans who are discharged from the VA or other hospitals by reason of confinement or hospitalization for service-connected illnesses and who are not able to follow a substantially gainful occupation for a period of 6 months shall be given convalescent ratings entitling them to disability payments for that period of time; and that further such period of time be extended for periods not greater than 6 months where the physical examination discloses the veteran to be physically unemployable.

Resolution 7. That AMVETS recommend that a request be made of the President in the name of AMVETS that the first vacancy occurring in the membership of the Civil Service Commission be filled by a qualified World War II veteran.

Resolution 8. That we urge the President and the Congress to enact legislation providing that amounts of compensation payable to disabled veterans and dependents of disabled veterans shall be immediately increased to take care of the increase in cost of living, and in the future be automatically increased by 10 percent for each 10-percent increase in the cost of living, as determined by the Secretary of Labor, provided that such payments shall be reduced in the same manner, but that such compensation shall not be reduced automatically below the basic rate in effect on the date of enactment of such legislation.

Resolution 9. That we urge Congress to enact legislation to give holders of national service life insurance the same rates, benefits, and privileges as are enjoyed by holders of insurance of World War I.

Resolution 10. That AMVETS will work for the passage of such laws and amendments as will give credit on social-security benefits for honorable service in the armed services between September 16, 1940, and April 30, 1947, at the rate of compensation of $250 per month.

Resolution 11. That the national legislative director is instructed to prepare and support legislation providing for special rating for veterans of World War II who have suffered loss or loss of use of a creative organ in line of duty.

Resolution 12. That AMVETS support the permanent extension of that portion of Public Law 663 of the Seventy-ninth Congress providing for the supplying of an automobile or other conveyance to veterans who have lost or lost the use of one or both legs above the ankle, cost to the Government on each not to exceed $1,600.

Resolution 13. That AMVETS strongly recommend to the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, and if necessary to Congress, that the VA accept as evidence for rating purposes, examinations made at any hospital

approved by the American Hospital Association.

Resolution 14. That Congress is urgently requested to appropriate adequate funds to the State employment services and the USES to provide for sufficient personnel for effective job placement and employment counseling for veterans.

Resolution 15. That AMVETS recommend legislation to double the dependency allowance of veterans who receive service-connected disability compensation and that such allowance be granted on a prorated basis comparable to the veteran's degree of disability rating.

Resolution 16. That AMVETS recommend a women's ward be included in each VA hospital throughout the country.

Resolution 17. That AMVETS recommend that VA regulations be amended to permit eligible veterans a minimum of two prosthetic appliances per year in addition to those provided by the service hospitals upon discharge and that additional appliances need be furnished only after the veteran has proven need.

Resolution 18. That AMVETS support legislation permitting veterans eligible by reason of loss of one or both legs at or above the ankle as a result of service to purchase a car of their own choice; if the price be greater than $1,600, permit the veteran to pay the difference between purchase price and the $1,600 full liability of the VA as prescribed by law.

Resolution 19. That AMVETS support legislation providing for full benefits of veterans disabled in line of duty be given to WAAC personnel who suffered disabilities in line of duty prior to July 1, 1943, and who were unable to become members of the WAC because of these disabilities.

Resolution 20. That AMVETS support legislation raising income limitations to $1,800 per year for an unremarried widow without children and to $3,000 per year for an unremarried widow with children, and the limitation on permanently and totally disabled veterans without dependents entitled to non-service-connected pensions be raised to $2,000 and to $3,000 for such veterans with dependents.

Resolution 21. That AMVETS support the establishment of a national cemetery in each of the 48 States.

Resolution 22. That AMVETS urge amendments to existing laws providing an increase in burial allowance from $150 to $250.

Resolution 23. That AMVETS urge legislation exempting income from private or commercial insurance for the annual income limitations governing payment of death pensions.

Resolution 24. That AMVETS urge legislation placing widows and children of World War II veterans on a level with widows and children of World War I veterans with reference to non-service-connected death pensions.

Resolution 25. That AMVETS request adequate funds for the Civil Service Commission so that it may adjudicate veterans appeals, process examinations and AMVETS oppose any decentralization or reorganization of the Civil Service Commission.

Resolution 26. That AMVETS believe that veterans in Federal civil service should be separated only under section 12 of the act of 1944; also in the widening areas of competition; also that preference eligibles should be allowed to displace nonveterans if the veterans meet the minimum requirements of the new position.

Resolution 27. AMVETS request the Civil Service Commission and the several Federal agencies to amend leave regulations so that a veteran with service-connected disability who because of that disability needs hospitalization for longer than a year shall be granted such leave without pay so that he shall not lose seniority rights.

Resolution 28. AMVETS support H. R. 87 and S. 689 of the Eighty-first Congress (postal employees military credit bills).

Resolution 29. That AMVETS petition Congress for legislation extending the period of filing for gratuitous insurance to a period of 10 years from the veteran's death; further requests the parent be allowed to prove dependency within a period of 2 years from date of death of the insured.

Resolution 30. That AMVETS consider National Employ the Physically Handicapped Week as a continuing 52-week program.

Resolution 31. That AMVETS petition Congress to amend the national service life insurance laws to provide that the total and permanent disability rider now available on World War I insurance be made available on a like basis for veterans of World War II.

Resolution 32. That AMVETS request the VA to release to all newspapers and service organizations the method whereby the amount of refund on national service life insurance is computed.

Resolution 33. That AMVETS recommend the VA make available to all veterans with a service-connected disability an identification card.

Resolution 34. That AMVETS recommend a substantial raise in pay be given to VA hospital attendants, especially those in mental hospitals.

Resolution 35 That in regard to extension 2A of the 1945 rating schedule, AMVETS recommends to the VA if a veteran is released from a VA hospital in cast or other condition necessitating return to the hospital he be released on pass or furlough and not be discharged, so that his extension 2A benefits will be continuous.

Resolution 36. That national headquarters is mandated to do everything possible to have the Servicemen's Readjustment Act extended for 2 years.

Resolution 37. That AMVETS favor the extension of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act as specified in the Rankin bill with the following exceptions: (1) Closing date be extended from June 30, 1950 to July 25, 1951; (2) the proviso dealing with one or more years of training under the auspices of the VA be removed from the bill; (3) that the benefits of this bill be made retroactive to the date of expiration, July 25, 1949.

Resolution 38. That AMVETS recommend a contingent fund to enable the Veterans Employment Service to expand its facilities similar to the contingent fund now available for the Unemployment Compensation Facilities.

Resolution 39. That AMVETS recommend continuation of veterans' reemployment rights program on its present basis without any reduction in personnel.

Resolution 40. That AMVETS urge the statutory award for all World War II veterans with arrested tuberculosis similar to World War I benefits.

Resolution 41. That AMVETS favor the release of some part of the $33,000,000 now held in the Treasury contributed by the veterans of the National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., to be used for the expansion of that facility.

Resolution 42. That AMVETS recommend the VA amend its regulations to permit eligible veterans a minimum of four pair of shoes per year at the veterans' request.

Resolution 43. That the national executive director and national legislative director publicly post at the next convention all resolutions adopted at this convention, together with notations of all action taken on such resolutions.

Resolution 44. That the position of our national legislative program be carried as a column of the National AMVET.

Resolution 45. That approval of posts effected by any State or national fund raising activities be secured prior to the start of such activities.

Resolution 46. That the national executive committee make a review of all items of expenditure at national headquarters.

Resolution 47. That national headquarters and the national executive committee are urged to take steps to establish a national joint veterans' council.

Resolution 48. That AMVETS strongly oppose section 3 of the Judd bill, concerning immigration of Chinese nationals as it applies to wives and children of ex-service personnel.

Resolution 49. That AMVETS believe the maximum efficiency in achieving agreement among labor and management will result when there is a minimum of outside interference; further this convention recommends that national legislation dealing with labor-management be limited in scope to definition of minimum working conditions, the right of organization and expression of workmen, protection of fundamental property rights and the proper staffing and operation of the United States Conciliation Service.

Resolution 50. That AMVETS exert all means to influence the ending of discrimination in the armed forces and commend Secretary Johnson on the initial action taken toward accomplishing that purpose; that AMVETS urge the American Bowling Congress to drop its racial barriers; and that AMVETS generally support such pieces of legislation in the Congress designed to afford full, free, and unrestricted life to all classes and groups of the population.

Resolution 51. That AMVETS urge prompt action on the admission of Alaska and Hawaii as States.

Resolution 52. That AMVETS urge the privilege of naturalization be accorded to parents of honorably discharged Japanese-American veterans of World War II.

Resolution 53. That AMVETS urge that American Indians be made citizens in the full sense of the word to give them all privileges and rights of American citizenship.

Resolution 54. That AMVETS urge that the citizens legally domiciled in the District of Columbia be allowed the right to vote.

Resolution 55. That AMVETS commend those national and State legislators who have given careful consideration to the great body of veterans' legislation proposed.

Resolution 56. That AMVETS commend post 8, of Wichita, Kans., for its action in giving 15 percent of its profits from its new clubrooms to the National Service Foundation.

Resolution 57. That AMVETS instruct its quartermaster department to establish an independent budget; distribute catalogs as widely as possible; arrange for furnishing women members with WAC-type hats; instruct its suppliers to use forest green piping on caps instead of Kelly green; reemphasize cap colors as green with gold lettering for posts, white with green lettering for State, and white with gold lettering for national; contract for, stock, or sell any pins not authorized by a national convention; remind AMVETS that a key has been established as an official reward to past post, State, and national commanders; to inform uniform manufacturers to comply with specifications laid down by a previous national convention; to provide suitable publicity in the National AMVET on quartermaster items; and to arrange for delivery of caps within 2 weeks.

Resolution 58. That AMVETS oppose compulsory health insurance by the Federal Government in any way, shape, or form.

Resolution 59. That AMVETS go on record favoring the Hoover Commission report in principle.

Resolution 60. That the national commander of AMVETS should instruct all State commanders to appoint State agricultural committees and to do all in their power to have post agricultural committees established.

Resolution 61. That AMVETS do all possible to assure that the Government in its spending programs for maintaining the farmers' purchasing power provide funds for the addition of organic matter to the soils of the United States.

Resolution 62. That AMVETS urge close scrutiny of all bills as a result of the work of the Hoover Commission pertaining to the facilities and benefits for veterans.

Resolution 63. That AMVETS urge the following housing legislation: (1) Establishment of complete secondary market for GI home loans through an agency of the United States Government, retroactive to the time full secondary market lapsed, with a continuation of present 50-percent market for FHA loans; (2) abolition of the section 505 combination FHA-GI loans; (3) Government-guaranteed mortgages on individual homes be limited to the same rate of interest as provided by the GI bill so the GI loan will be as attractive as other loans; (4) extension of amortization period from 25 to 30 years, and income of Government guaranty from 50 percent to 60 percent, with a maximum limit of guaranty increased from $4,000 to $7,500; (5) establishment of a Government agency, when and if necessary, to aid and assist veteran home owners facing loss of homes through economic circumstances beyond control; (6) Congress and/or Department of Justice make a complete investigation as to the amount of favoritism, 5 percentism, malpractice, and other irregularities existing in branches of the Housing and Home Finance Agency and the Veterans' Administration; (7) adequate appropriations be provided for the VA to maintain and enlarge, if necessary, that division which has been so successful in preventing foreclosures on homes owned by veterans through successful counseling and advice to the veteran home owner; (8) secure similar financing arrangements for veteran cooperatives as now provided by the GI bill; (9) give priority to veterans of World War II in the purchase of Lanham Act property; (10) the VA and FHA use only competent and trained appraisers, with an appraisal panel available for final adjudication of appraisals held to be unfair; (11) AMVETS establish a continuous national housing committee; and (12) AMVETS oppose any legislation which eliminates or precludes any existing rights and privileges now held by the veteran under Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended.

Resolution 64. That AMVETS national executive committee create an AMVET National Youth Foundation.

Resolution 65. That AMVETS adopt peace and preparedness program as follows: (1) United States to support the UN and seek its development into a world federal government open to all nations; (2) eliminate the veto in matters pertaining to aggression and preparation for aggression within the UN Charter; (3) eliminate present armament race by international control and inspection and treat violating nations as aggressors against members of UN; (4) create an international court with jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to aggression within the UN and to establish and maintain a police force to carry out the court's decisions; (5) national headquarters to implement AMVETS bylaws by appointment of the directors of the AMVETS division of international affairs; (6) continue support of the Marshall plan, Atlantic Pact, and the armed implementation thereof; (7) encourage removal of trade barriers in our commerce with Marshall-plan countries; (8) continue the reciprocal-trade program, but prohibit shipment of all goods from the United States to Russia and her satellites; (9) urge the United States to promote an economic and political union of Europe leading toward a United States of Europe; (10) encourage development of regional pacts for collective self-defense, including a Pacific Pact; (11) reiterate our support of the good-neighbor policy in the Western Hemisphere, the Rio Pact, and support stronger economic and cultural ties among the nations of the Americas; (12) support requests of the armed services for full appropriation, and provide for their organic composition to insure the most effective armed force in the world; (13) continue selective service to keep America prepared and encourage appointment of World War II combat veterans to selective-service boards; (14) improve and unify the administration of justice in the armed services to permit qualified enlisted men to serve on courts martial, to authorize the appointment of a civilian inspector general, and to separate the functions of the inspector general and judge advocate general from the chain of command; (15) enact legislation requiring the registration of all Communists, Communist-front organizations, and all other people or groups advocating the overthrow of the United States by force or by subversion; (16) intensify the Nation's efforts in the fields of military intelligence, scientific research and development, and the world-wide dissemination of the truth about American democracy; (17) establish a program of economic mobilization to include industry and labor in case of war and eliminate excess profits; (18) support the St. Lawrence seaway and power project; (19) support moves for strengthening the four freedoms in all countries of the world; and (20) urge that Americans accept as a duty and responsibility the opportunities for service to our State Department when they are called upon to do so; we urge the Government to recruit more World War II veterans for State Department and foreign service.

Resolution 66. That AMVETS favor equal educational opportunities for all at the highest possible level and thus favor Federal aid to education.

Resolution 67. That AMVETS favor enactment of legislation providing for adjusted compensation with the following features: (1) Adjusted compensation be paid to veterans with honorable service in the armed forces of not less than 60 days unless sooner discharged by reasons of a service-incurred or service-connected disability during the period of time between December 7, 1941, and September 2, 1945; payment to be computed on the actual time in service from September 16, 1940, to and including December 31, 1946. (2) Totally disabled veterans and unremarried widows and children or dependent parents of veterans who died in service to receive the maximum amount; said adjusted compensation to be computed upon the amounts of $3 for each day of duty in the continental limits of the United States, including the Territory of Alaska, with a maximum of $4,500. (3) Said adjusted compensation shall be payable by issuance of United States Government bonds to mature in 1955, bearing an interest rate of 4 percent per annum; bonds to be nonnegotiable, nonattachable for debt, or for any other reason, and shall not be subject to pledge or security.

A Plan To Cut Your Income Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. SIMPSON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from Coronet magazine:

A NEW PLAN TO CUT YOUR INCOME TAX

(By Gwilym A. Price, president of the Westinghouse Electric Corp.)

HERE IS A PROGRAM DESIGNED TO HELP THE TAXPAYER AND BOLSTER OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

At the heart of any conviction that America's future can be greater than her past lies the problem of taxation. Here, perhaps, is the most significant single factor in our national economy today.

More than 1 dollar in every four that we earn is taken directly from us by tax collectors for city, county, State, and Federal Governments, or is consumed by hundreds of hidden taxes on everything from cigarettes to limousines. Hence, how these taxes are levied is of supreme importance in determining what kind of an economy we are to have, and which way our country is to go. It can be either a dead hand or a force for progress.

A tax program which I believe can be a powerful force for progress is the incentive income tax plan, designed by my fellow-Pittsburghers, Frank Wilbur Main and M. C. Conick. Their plan is not designed as a cure-all for the problems of taxation, but it will go far, I feel, toward relieving the American people of the many inequities under our present income-tax laws.

Listed below are the main planks of the plan which I am convinced will benefit and encourage: (a) Labor; (b) business enterprise; (c) savings and investment; and (d) the intelligent spending that leads to better living:

1. All income should be taxed at the same rates, whether it is received by an individual or by a corporation.

2. Exemptions should be raised to $1,000 for a single person, and $2,000 for a married couple, and remain at $600 for each dependent.

3. The new graduated rates should begin at 15 percent on the first $2,500 of taxable income, and rise to a maximum of 50 percent at the $50,000 level and above.

4. Eliminate the double tax on corporation dividends by freeing the stockholder of tax liability.

To these recommendations, I would add this proposal:

5. Allow corporations to retain untaxed more of their earnings, insofar as they are used for modernization of plants and machinery.

Now, how could these tax revisions help our people to a better tomorrow? First, consider the small-income earner, like the average farmer and the person who lives on a modest salary or pension.

To start with, 20,000,000 individuals who now pay income taxes would be released from paying anything at all. This would be accomplished by raising the exemption from the present $600 per person to $2,000 for husband and wife.

Assuming the customary 10 percent in deductions for contributions, interest, local taxes, and the like, a family of four today pays tax on all wages above $51 a week. Under the incentive plan, the family would have to earn $68—or $17 more a week—before the tax collector got anything.

Now, let's see how the plan would work for a family of the same size which earns more. If the husband and father makes $3,500 a year, he now pays about $125 in income taxes. Under the incentive plan, he would pay nothing. The $5,000-a-year man who now pays about $350 would pay only $195. In the $7,000 bracket, where he now turns over about $650, even after taking advantage of the new joint-income provisions, his bill would be cut to $465. If he is at the

$10,000 level, his $1,167 tax would drop to $890.

For the big earners, the incentive tax would rise to a limit of 50 percent on incomes of $50,000 or more, putting into practice the popular belief that any man deserves a 50–50 break from the tax collector.

So much for the individual earner. What about the company for which he works?

Obviously, as head of a corporation, I do not find palatable an increase in the corporate maximum income rate from 38 to 50 percent. I could not possibly support such a provision, except as part of a total plan which I am convinced would be in the best interests of stockholders, employees, management, and customers, and therefore of the corporation itself.

Today, a business with more than $50,000 net earnings pays in income tax a top rate of 38 cents of every $1 it earns. Under the incentive plan, the corporation would pay in graduated amounts up to 34 percent of the first $50,000 earned, but would pay 50 percent on all earnings over $50,000. This would be an unbearable burden, unless it were offset by such benefits as:

1. Elimination of the double tax on dividends.

2. Greater freedom for corporations to retain more of their earnings for growth.

Elimination of dual taxes on dividends, along with the freeing of millions of small earners from income taxes, would be the most important boost our lawmakers could give to America's financial welfare. To appreciate the importance of this step, let us see how the dollars which buy stock—and provide the capital to make jobs—are now doubly penalized for taking that risk.

In the first place, the profits these dollars earn are taxed as corporation income—the tax that now goes up to 38 percent. Then, when the corporation pays part of what it has left to the stockholder in return for the use of his money, the investor in the top bracket is asked to pay as much as 82 percent on that.

For example, before Westinghouse pays a stockholder a dividend of $1.25 a share for using his money, it must first pay Federal and State taxes of about 85 cents a share. But that is only tax No. 1. The investor in turn must pay a second tax, running anywhere up to 82 percent or $1.03 of the $1.25 he gets.

Even if he is only a moderately wealthy man, he will pay enough tax to reduce the return on his investment to a mere 3 percent. Three percent. What incentive is there in such a return to persuade the investor to put his money into corporation stock, to turn over his savings to help make jobs for others, to help produce more and better products at lower prices?

The United States has become the world's greatest Nation only because its founding fathers and the pioneers who followed them were willing to take a chance. But who would have opened the West, built the railroads, prospected for oil, or labored to perfect the automobile if the rule had been: "If you succeed, the Government takes most of your profit. If you fail, the loss is all yours"? Removal of the double tax on dividends is at the very core of the argument that the best financial policy for a democracy is the one which leaves the greatest initiative in the hands of its people.

The incentive tax plan is not perfect. What are the principal drawbacks against it?

Frankly, it won't raise as much money for the Government as our present tax program does. On the basis of the 1948 national income, this new plan would have cut the Government's total take from $29,000,000,000 to an estimated $25,000,000,000.

Even in these days of big Federal spending, $4,000,000,000 is a lot of money. But it needn't be all lost. In the first place, it happens to be just about the amount the Hoover Commission says could be cut from the Government's expenses by reorganizing Federal agencies. Maybe if there were $4,000,000,000 less coming in, the President and Congress would have a little incentive of their own to bear down harder on spending.

There are other incentives, too. By removing 20,000,000 persons from the tax rolls and cutting the bills of others, there will be more money in their hands to buy the things they need. This, in turn, will bring increased business and higher tax yields. And more of the same would be accomplished by removing the double tax on dividends, prompting the creation of new enterprises and new jobs.

The second complaint against the incentive plan charges that freeing millions from paying taxes will make them less insistent that their Government operate economically and efficiently. But if you look at the record of recent years, you will find little support for this argument. With one-third of all Americans on the tax rolls, where is the proof that our Government has become economy-minded?

To me, it seems essential that tax relief be given to those in the lower income brackets so that they can keep their families' living standards as high as possible. Too much of these low incomes is currently going for taxes. Take just one example:

Think of the wage-earner's tax bill and his life-insurance bill. It is the exceptional worker who does not pay far more in taxes than he pays to protect his family's future.

One of the major advantages of the incentive plan is that it is easy for the taxpayer to comprehend and easy for the Government to operate. How different from our present complicated tax laws, which have been described as a code for penalizing success. The incentive plan is a forward-looking program, based on the belief that our greatest days as a Nation are still ahead.

To go forward confidently, our country needs nearly 700,000 new jobs a year. That figure represents the margin by which young men and women looking for jobs outnumber the oldsters who quit.

But today's worker does not depend on his hands alone. He uses the best and most efficient tools in the world, and they cost a lot of money—on the average, perhaps $8,000 per job. This means we have to pour about $5,500,000,000 of new money into business each year just to provide new jobs for all who want them. That money should come only from voluntary investment by individuals.

In recent months, we have seen the increasing tendency of pressure groups to turn to the Government for help in fighting a slow-down of our business machine. That is all part of the idea that government can provide security for all, that government can protect us from loss and guarantee us a profit.

But the idea is a fallacy. Government does not earn any money. It has for spending only what it takes from its citizens in the form of taxes. It cannot create jobs, income, or guaranties of any sort except by taking money from one group and giving it to another.

Far better, it seems to me, is a government that gives its citizens the incentive to make their own way—an incentive to work harder and risk more because both worker and investor will earn and keep their fair share of the wealth thus created. I am convinced that a tax structure based on such confidence in ourselves as a free people will yield increased prosperity and bring higher living standards to every family in the United States.

Tribute to Brig. Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski

REMARKS
OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, at the time that freedom-loving people of the world mourned the death of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, another great Pole, Gen. Wladimir B. Krzyzanowski, also a champion of liberty, was born on July 9, 1824, in Roznowo, a small town in an already enslaved Poland. Having lived his early years in an atmosphere of servitude, he grew up with the determination to seek freedom for himself and to help win it for others.

As a young man, Wladimir Krzyzanowski organized a strong student underground movement to rid his native land of German domination. Branded a conspirator and hunted by the German police, Wladimir fled to America in 1846. He came here as a humble immigrant. A young man, 22 years old, possessing a powerful physique and a burning desire to succeed, he faced the challenge of a new country—a land of liberty and opportunity.

Krzyzanowski's first undertaking was learning the English language. He spent several years pursuing an education, finally completing a course in engineering. With America's constantly expanding boundaries, he used his knowledge to chart railroad lines in America's westward move.

His career was interrupted by the outbreak of the Civil War. Two reasons prompted Krzyzanowski to join the Union Army at once. First was his strong love of freedom. Remembering his youthful years spent in servitude and oppression in a partitioned Poland, he pledged himself to save the freedom he came to know and embrace in America. Second was his knowledge of engineering which was invaluable to the Union Army. He was willing to forsake a promising career to volunteer his services in strengthening the Union forces.

Wladimir Krzyzanowski enlisted as a private on April 11, 1861, in Washington, D. C. At once he distinguished himself as an organizer. Just as in his early days in Poland, he inspired the student underground movement for throwing off the German yoke, so now in the United States he recruited a company of fighting men to help save the Union.

Because of his military skill and outstanding leadership, Krzyzanowski soon rose to the rank of brigadier general. His great achievement during the Civil War was recruiting a regiment of infantry, named the United States Rifles, which later merged with the Polish Legion to become the Fifty-eighth Regiment of New York. This regiment was composed of Danes, Frenchmen, Germans, Poles, and Russians, all of whom were eager to devote their services to the

cause of justice. Under the leadership of Krzyzanowski, the Fifty-eighth Regiment fought gallantly in the battles of Cross Keys, Sulphur Springs, Waterloo Springs, Fox Ford, and Bull Run. On May 1, 1863, Krzyzanowski's men were the only ones to stop Gen. Stonewall Jackson at Chancellorsville. His regiment also saw heroic action in the Battle of Gettysburg. In each of these battles he contributed to the victory of the Union Army.

The outcome of the war saw the preservation of the Union. In Krzyzanowski's own words, "The ideals and freedom of America" were saved. Thus, through his contributions in the Civil War, Brigadier General Krzyzanowski has gone down in history as a great soldier. Though his deeds are not known as well as those of Kosciuszko and Pulaski, his name has always been inscribed brilliantly in the chapters of the Polish Legion of American Veterans.

After the Civil War, his job as a soldier done, he continued serving the United States Government in a civil capacity. His restless spirit took him on a mission first to Alaska where he started the first United States supervision of the Territory, then to Panama. Later he served as a special agent of the Treasury Department. Krzyzanowski died at the age of 62 on January 31, 1887. He was given a soldier's farewell and his body was laid to rest in the Greenwood Cemetery in Brooklyn, N. Y. Many years later, through the efforts of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, his body was moved to Arlington Cemetery to rest among the heroes, all of whom served the country so well.

This year, the Polish Legion of American Veterans will commemorate the sixty-third anniversary of Brigadier General Krzyzanowski's death by placing a wreath on his grave. It is in behalf of this organization that I am extending an invitation to all Members of Congress and their friends to participate in this memorializing ceremony which will be held at 10 a. m. next Tuesday, January 31, at the Arlington Cemetery.

Multiple Sclerosis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I understand that H. R. 3943, which is designed to fight the frightful, insidious condition known as multiple sclerosis, has been favorably reported by the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

It is not necessary to recite the merits of this legislation. Its title is self-explanatory and its objectives so commendable and praiseworthy that I believe there will be little, if any, opposition in this House to its enactment.

The statistics show that a surprising number of persons throughout the United States are suffering from this dread disease. Science has made comparatively little headway in counteracting its ravages. Government research and Government cooperation with scientific bodies already studying this condition will be of inestimable value. Perhaps new treatments can be developed. Perhaps new formulae and new drugs can be developed which will attack this fearful enemy of mankind. Perhaps so-called atomic medicine holds the secret to the solution of the treatment and cure of multiple sclerosis.

The recent advance of science has been phenomenal and in no field nearly so beneficial to the human race as in the field of medicine. Newly discovered drugs are rapidly obliterating physical ailments and diseases which formerly took a cruel toll of lives of the American people. The sulfa drugs and penicillin, and now cortisone and acth, have worked near miracles in combatting infections and diseases heretofore fatal or disabling or crippling to unfortunate individuals. The science of chemistry is advancing so fast in developing new drugs and the science of medicine is proceeding so rapidly with new methods of treatment and techniques that in truth a frontal attack against many dread diseases is steadily expanding average life expectancy and eliminating pain, misery, and disability.

It may well be that in the future, except for cases resulting from trauma, accidents, and other limited types of injury or physical ailments, chemistry will replace surgery as an effective means of fighting disease. The Government should not only encourage medical science and chemistry in striving to develop and perfect these modern drugs but it should assume a definite leadership and guidance in setting up and effecting programs designed to accelerate not only the paths of discovery but the development of these chemical substances which hold out so much hope for the alleviation of human suffering and the restoration to active useful lives of so many Americans.

I urge the House leadership to take early action concerning H. R. 3943 and related measures so that this House will be able to move toward speedy enactment of this vital legislation.

Our Crumbling World Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by my colleague from New York, Hon. RALPH W. GWINN:

OUR CRUMBLING WORLD POWER

My colleagues in Congress are deeply concerned about our policy in China, and with good reason. Our China policy touches the military security of our Pacific coast and the whole continental United States.

At the end of the war the United States was head and center of a military coalition whose power stretched round the world. Its pincers closed in on our enemies and destroyed their military power completely.

Only 5 years later the Communists' military power stretches in a huge semicircle from eastern Germany across Russia and Siberia, through China to the Pacific. It is marching on without resistance to Formosa, Okinawa, and Japan. Our power is crumbling. We are the country being encircled, not Russia.

In the last year of the war, there were 1,800,000,000 people in the countries making up the United Nations. Only one-ninth of this vast population, the old U. S. S. R. was under totalitarian rule, while 1,625,000,000 were antitotalitarian. Today the antitotalitarian group has shrunk to 540,000,000. The group under totalitarian control has grown to four times its former size, while our futile foreign policy has lost 700,000,000. Nations like India and Sweden have fallen away to a neutral group in the struggle between freedom and barbarian power.

This new danger is not like nazism, removed by thousands of miles of impassable ocear. Russia is only a few miles from our frontiers in Alaska. She is threatening our Pacific island defenses, which we are losing by stupidity and cowardice, if not treason.

We fought the last war from the island aircraft carrier of Great Britain, but if Japan falls and Okinawa is untenable, we shall fight the next one from California or Oregon, or perhaps behind the ramparts of the Rockies.

The people of the west coast are seriously alarmed. Husbands and fathers are thinking now of how they can protect their own families in a new Pearl Harbor. The east coast is not on the front line. We are not worried about invaders in our homes. But we certainly ought to understand what the danger is.

Who brought the proud American Nation to this dreadful pass? We let President Truman have $191,000,000,000 of our money in 3 years. The Reader's Digest made a table showing that he had spent more than all the other Presidents of the United States put together, including 12 years of Franklin Roosevelt.

Most of this money has been spent for military affairs or foreign aid. How could any President bring us to such a humiliating political and military defeat with over $200,000,000,000 to implement his foreign policy?

The answer is that the New Deal does not have a foreign policy. It has only one policy, the old familiar cheap political policy of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect. Every dollar spent on its foreign aid is carefully designed—judging from results—to win votes among farmers, businessmen and the rest.

Meanwhile the Communists insult and imprison our consuls. We ask Siam and Czechoslovakia to intervene on our behalf. We haul down the American flag from Peiping and call our foreign representatives home. The Communists imprison two members of our armed forces and we say, "Please, oh please, won't you let them go?" In every test the Communists have set to trap us we have given way.

The working heads of our armed forces know that we are in danger, but they are silenced by the politicians as Denfeld was silenced. Just so they silenced our admirals before Pearl Harbor.

Husbands and wives, fathers and mothers of this country! Any public official who knowingly exposes our land to the danger of invasion by a foreign foe is a traitor! The brilliant young men like Alger Hiss, American-born and American-educated, who

gave away our secrets to a foreign power were traitors. But the petty politicians in high office who protected, promoted, and sheltered them for years, in order to get the collectivized vote, are just as much traitors as those who dealt directly with the agents of a foreign enemy.

How many other bright young Communists is Mr. Acheson sheltering in the State Department today as he sheltered Hiss? How many members of this Communist cell are still heading up our roving delegations in Asia, in the United Nations, in the Foreign Service, and in the Office of the Secretary?

When is President Truman going to be serious? When will he clean out the Communists who make our foreign policy? Can we sleep safely until we find and remove every one of the traitors?

In a moment of peril in the Continental Army, General Washington issued the order, "Put none but Americans on guard tonight." Our country is again in peril. Our first line of defense is to have in positions of honor and trust only those men who will put their country's welfare ahead of any personal or political gain.

Flood Control, Lower Mississippi River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me before the Civil Functions Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, January 19, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am most grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the budget item of $72,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries.

I realize the very great importance of keeping Government costs down to a minimum and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I state without any reservation that I expect to be a party to keeping Government costs down wherever possible. I am fully aware of the fact that the House Appropriations Committee has a tremendous responsibility to discharge when considering appropriations for the fiscal year 1951, and may I further state that, in my opinion, with the high degree of prosperity that we are now enjoying, deficit financing is undesirable and unsound. Nevertheless, I am convinced that certain budget recommendations should not be reduced too drastically; specifically I refer to the recommendations for flood-control appropriations because there is proof that for every dollar invested in flood-control improvements, the value of America is enhanced $2.15. If these figures are accurate—and I believe they are—then funds invested in flood-control construction are a good investment.

In appearing before your committee, I am not necessarily asking for special consideration for any flood-control project in my district nor for the State of Louisiana. My interest is in the entire lower Mississippi Valley because Congress appropriates a lump sum for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries. Therefore, if the authorized projects in my district and State are to receive Federal funds, the over-all appropriation for the Mississippi River and its tributaries must be adequate; otherwise certain projects cannot be continued.

The Mississippi River and its tributaries is the oldest Federal authorized flood-control project in America and it is the No. 1 flood-control problem of the entire United States.

No doubt it has been directed to the attention of this committee that 42 percent of all the floodwaters of the United States must necessarily pass through the lower Mississippi Valley to reach the Gulf of Mexico. The $72,000,000 budget item for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries will be used against authorizations totaling $1,038,000,000. A study of the record will disclose that progress on the main stem of the Mississippi River and the off-river projects is progressing too slowly to be completed economically. I am sure this committee will be pleased to learn that out of the $72,000,000 requested, none of the funds will be used to start new projects. All of the funds will be used on projects already under construction.

I have been told, on good authority, that the Corps of Army Engineers asked the Bureau of the Budget to recommend $117,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for the fiscal year 1951. I might state further than the Mississippi Valley Flood Control Association, of which I am vice president, expressed a fear that if the Bureau of the Budget recommended less than $100,000,000 for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries for the fiscal year 1951, that many of the projects now under construction would have to be curtailed. That is history because the Bureau of the Budget saw fit to recommend only $72,000,000.

It is my hope that this committee in its wisdom can justify the amount recommended by the Bureau of the Budget which, in my opinion, is a very minimum by which the work on the main Mississippi River and off-river projects can progress economically. I am sure it has been directed to the attention of this committee that when funds are appropriated for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries, the lives and property of a great majority of the people living in the States of Kentucky, Missouri, Illinois, Tennessee, Arkansas, Mississippi, and Louisiana are protected. Available information will disclose that it requires a very minimum of $47,000,000 for maintenance and work on the main stem of the Mississippi River. Therefore, any reduction that you make will affect only the off-river projects.

There are projects in my district only 6 percent completed, others only 28 to 43 percent completed. This condition has been brought about by lack of funds and as businessmen I am sure you will agree that when work of this kind is prolonged over a period of many years, it makes the completed job much more expensive, which is nothing less than false economy.

I have appeared before this committee many times to testify in support of sufficient funds for the lower Mississippi and its tributaries and knowing that you have heard many other witnesses on the same project, I should not like to consume any more of the committee's time than is absolutely necessary, but I should like to point out to the committee that floods and soil erosion are costing the American people in excess of $1,000,000,000 annually. I am sure you will agree that if we permit this waste to continue, especially in face of an increasing population, this country may find itself in the same condition as many foreign countries; that is, without sufficient cultivatable land to produce the food to maintain our present standard of living.

I wish there were some way that expenditures in the field of flood control and reclamation could be considered on a capital-investment basis rather than as an expense, because on such a basis we could evaluate the benefits and check the return received on the investment.

Mr. Chairman, flood-control problems in the lower Mississippi Valley are great. I repeat, that we are working against a $1,038,000 authorization and I am thoroughly convinced that the $72,000,000 requested by the Bureau of the Budget is the very minimum by which the projects under construction in the lower Mississippi Valley can be continued economically. If the committee grants the $72,000,000, it will make possible the continuation of a minimum of work on the main stem of the Mississippi River and the off-river projects. I am sure that this committee has in its possession all the technical data and statistics dealing with the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Therefore, I shall not incur additional expense to the Government by filing additional statistics and technical data in the record. In conclusion, I should like to say that it is my sincere hope that this committee will grant the $72,000,000 recommended by the Bureau of the Budget and if you do, then the projects in my own district and the State of Louisiana will benefit along with the other 6 States in the lower Mississippi Valley.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, the Iowa State Dental Society, in convention assembled, has adopted a set of resolutions on the subject of compulsory health insurance and has memorialized Congress of the opposition of this organization toward any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include these resolutions so that all Members of Congress may know the position of this great organization:

Whereas the American dental and medical professions have established the world's highest standard of dental and medical care, thereby helping the United States to become the healthiest major Nation in the world; and

Whereas the great advances which have been made in the profession of dentistry under the stimulus of private practice would be impeded by enactment of a Federal system of compulsory health insurance: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the University District Dental Society does hereby memorialize the Congress of the United States not to enact any legislation containing the principle of compulsory health insurance,

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative now in the Congress from this State, and to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the Congress of the United States.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the council on legislation, American Dental Association, 222 East Superior Street, Chicago, Ill.

P. M. HERRICK,
President.

FREDRICK B. LEHMAN,
Secretary.

CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA, *January 17, 1950.*

The Democratic Program for a Growing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson at the Springfield Public Forum, Springfield, Mass., Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

THE DEMOCRATIC PROGRAM FOR A GROWING AMERICA

The Democratic Party has a vigorous, positive program for meeting our many and diverse problems. If I were to cover them all, I could do no more than list the points in that program in the time available to us tonight.

Instead I shall address myself to some of the basic objectives which underlie that program.

For the Democrats, the first objective of our democracy must be to guarantee opportunity, security, and liberty for all our people. This aim is as old as the Constitution itself, which was drawn up to establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense. But that is not all. The Constitution lists this further purpose of our American Government—to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

To Democrats it is obvious that our Government is directed to carry out this last-named purpose as well as the others. We have undertaken the action needed to promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty.

We believe that all Americans should share in the bounties which this rich land can provide. We believe too that all should share in the responsibility for developing and utilizing these riches. The workingman must have an opportunity to earn his living and to participate in setting the conditions for his employment. The businessmen must have access to materials and markets in a freely competitive economy. The farmer must be secure in the preservation of his land and is entitled to a fair return for his products.

Every one of us has a right to security in old age, to adequate schooling, to a decent home, to medical care, and to protection from discrimination. Thus secure in the essentials of life, a man has an opportunity to make his contribution to a fully-functioning democracy and to an ever-expanding economy. He can face the future unafraid.

Unable or unwilling to accept the implications of a democratic society, the Republicans have attempted to debase these noble objectives of our founding fathers. They have ducked the job ahead and turned instead to the invention of slogans. In tones sometimes fearful, sometimes sneering, they have attempted to breathe unwholesome connotations into the phrase "the welfare state." Frightened by the revelation of true democracy, they have labeled it a bogieman to frighten others.

We Democrats are not afraid of the welfare state. We are proud of it. The welfare state is meeting the needs of the people. That is our aim.

To achieve security, opportunity, and liberty, we must have a balanced expanding economy. Even the most old-fashioned of our economists have now admitted that this is possible, that catastrophic depressions are not inevitable. Last year we proved it. Well-conceived measures enacted earlier by the Government enabled us to slip out of a difficult inflationary period without serious economic upheaval.

Never has America been more in need of a stable economy that grows year after year. The entire free world depends for its prosperity, and for its continuing liberties, on a balanced economy in the United States. The masters of that portion of the globe which has lost its freedom lick their chops greedily in anticipation of our relapse into economic chaos.

A balanced economy calls for steadily expanding production to meet the needs of a growing population. Expanding production guarantees jobs for all. Expanding production guarantees goods for all in quantity to assure the American standard of living for everyone.

There must be a steady stream of investment to finance this new productive capacity. There must be a steady stream of wage and salary payments so consumers can purchase the goods turned out by this expanded industrial plant. This calls for a balance in the distribution of our national income: A proper share to create consumer purchasing power.

This is a delicate and dynamic balance, changing month to month and year to year. Industry, labor, and agriculture, freed from fear and firm in their faith in a growing America, could make the shifts to preserve the balance. But our Government must help by reading aloud the signposts as we move forward so we all know the road. And sometimes our Government must put a shoulder to one or another of the wheels which get caught in the mire, lest the balance be disrupted.

The concept of a balanced economy is not too big for the American people, who have foresworn depressions forevermore.

But the leaders of the Republican Party have not yet shown that they understand this fundamental objective of our society. They have whittled down this broad goal which promises a better life for all of us. Republicans prate about balancing the budget.

Twenty years ago, the Republicans balanced the budget. The year was 1930. They balanced it with bread lines.

Because the Republicans balanced the Federal budget, millions of family budgets became unbalanced. People found that the red ink in their books could not be eaten or worn or lived in. People stopped buying, and a lot of business budgets went out of balance. Next down the slide went the budgets of manufacturers, so more men were thrown out of work. Relief payments by localities and States mounted and—since the Federal budget insisted on its ivory-tower equilibrium—these States and local govment budgets went out of kilter.

Anybody could balance the Federal budget any time—if it were an important end in itself. The recipe is universally known. All you do is lop off some disbursements or levy some new taxes.

But it is not an end in itself. Balancing the Federal budget today must not be done at the expense of unbalancing other budgets elsewhere in the Nation, and very probably torpedoing entirely budgets overseas in some democratic countries dependent upon us.

Fifteen years ago, the orthodox economists viewed with alarm our unbalanced budget. This can't go on, they said. Government securities will become worthless, they warned. The Republicans echoed their gloomy predictions.

While the Republicans continued to prattle about budget balancing, the rest of us went to work on building the economy. We learned some basic economic facts. We found the Federal budget could be a useful tool. We discovered that what we did with an unbalanced budget was a large factor in promoting a balanced economy. To the Republican leadership, however, the Federal budget is still like the rubber ball to the trained seal, a toy to juggle.

President Truman reiterated these economic truths in his budget message and economic report earlier this month. He acknowledged that we could balance the budget today—but only by means of dangerous and crippling economies. Instead he chose a program which would raise our levels of production and income. This would bring us to the point where additional revenue coming from increased production and income would in time balance a budget providing for all the services necessary in this land of opportunity.

President Truman stated the proposition plainly: Either we can shrink or we can grow. Guided by the forward-looking spirit of the American people, he made his choice: "Let us grow," he said.

The President set out the goals of a hopeful people with faith in themselves and in the future. "Within 5 years," he stated, "we can achieve an annual output in excess of $300,000,000,000—a gain in national income equal to an average of nearly $1,000 for every family in the United States."

Such goals are not fanciful, but merely projections of our rate of progress over the past few years. But their achievement is not automatic. Government fiscal policy can help to assure them.

Public development of our rivers, our soils, our forests, and our minerals will give private industry and agriculture new fields for investment so that they can raise production. Public encouragement of housing and transportation will serve the same ends. Public expenditures for social security, health, education, and housing will maintain and expand consumer purchasing power to provide wider markets for expanded production.

The resultant increase in income will generate additional revenues to strengthen the fiscal position of the Government—and balance the budget.

How do the Republicans reply to this statement of goals for a growing America, for a higher standard of living. "It can't be done," they intone mournfully. They search for reasons why these goals cannot be achieved.

America was not wrested from the wilderness by men and women with an it-can't-be-done attitude. Today, too, our problems call for the same type of positive effort, for daring and bold imagination. Today the Democratic Party has reflected the frontier spirit in its bold proposals for the welfare state.

The people know the difference between construction and obstruction, between proposing and opposing. The people are not misled by Republican double talk about a balanced budget. The people say, let the Republicans leave their negative attitude behind. Let's all join in searching for a way to reach the goals of more jobs, more income, and more good things for all of us.

We forget that the Republicans once were crusaders for democracy. In its first year, the Republican Party freed the slaves, preserved the Federal Union, and set up free farmers on homesteads in the west. These acts were fully consistent with President Lincoln's pronouncement. "The legitimate object of Government," he said, "is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well for themselves."

Thus Lincoln perfectly defined the welfare state. The Democrats today are pleased to accept his leadership. We are striving for the creation of Lincoln's welfare state, even though he is now forsaken his own party.

The present-day critics of the welfare state aren't really opposed to welfare by government—if it's for them.

Businessmen aren't complaining about RFC loans, not even Mr. Guy Gabrielson, Chairman of the Republican Party, whose Carthage Hydrocol Corp. has received more than $13,000,000 in RFC loans. They aren't objecting to 90 percent FHA guaranties to builders. They don't oppose subsidies to air lines and steamships. The railroads never fussed over accepting a gift of the public lands equal to the size of France.

The question here is whose welfare?

Low-cost housing for the welfare of the workers? Oh, no, they caution us; that kills incentive. But let's have some more loans to industry.

Control monopolies to allow the small-business man a chance to compete? Definitely not, they say; that will destroy free enterprise. But let's slap some more injunctions on the unions.

Parity payments to assure the farmer a steady income? Beware, they warn us; that is the road to socialism. But can you get us a shipping subsidy?

We Democrats admit we are confused by this double talk. In our way of thinking, prosperity for one group does not require repression on another. All have to gain together or the laggard becomes a drag on the economy. The Government is dedicated to the welfare of all its citizens, and should assist any of them suffering from inequities or unable to play their part in the economy. That's why the Democrats are for the welfare state.

I always find that I can get a better understanding of a problem if I examine it in my own backyard, in terms of things close to home which are familiar to me. We might do the same thing with the goals of the Democratic Party. Let's take our objectives of opportunity, security, liberty, and a balanced economy and relate them to the problems of New England. Let's see how New England might use the principles of the welfare state.

You are all familiar with the region's economic picture. Production and income are falling off, unemployment is comparatively high. The fact is, New England in recent years is playing a progressively smaller role in the life of the Nation. Since 1929 manufacturing in New England, as measured by value added, has increased only 109 percent as compared to 133 for the whole country.

Now let's see what's happening to the natural resources which might provide a firm base for an expanding economy.

No one knows better than you residents of the Connecticut Valley what great damage floods have done to your communities. Pollution of the river and the destruction of fisheries is also a familiar story here. You have seen once rich cropland leached by erosion and taken out of cultivation. You have felt the lack of an adequate channel for river navigation.

Although New England has about 3,000,000 kilowatts of undeveloped hydroelectric generating capacity in its streams, its electric rates are the highest of any region in the Nation. For the same amount of electricity, the average householder pays twice as much here in Springfield as he does in Tacoma, Wash. Industry also suffers from the same differential, and many of the southbound plants have given high power rates as one of the main reasons for leaving New England.

Let's see what the welfare state has done about similar problems in other regions. This year, for instance, the Federal budget earmarks about $2,000,000,000 for development of natural resources. This will be spent for flood control, for irrigating new land, for protection of fisheries, for navigation, for soil conservation, for forest management, and for generating low-cost hydropower. A surprisingly small amount of this money will be spent in New England.

We have seen how this kind of Federal investment stimulates industry. TVA operations resulted in cutting retail power rates by two-thirds in the Tennessee Valley. Initiation of Federal power projects in the Southwest brought an immediate cut of one-half in wholesale power rates to preference customers. As a result of the full development of the river by TVA, the Tennessee Valley region is now growing economically much faster than the country as a whole. Federal resource developments in the Pacific Northwest have brought in hundreds of power-hungry new industries.

If conditions in this region warrant it, New England has a right to expect some Federal investment in development of its resources. Although the effect may not be as spectacular as in other regions, it may well help you to reestablish the stable economy New England used to know.

The time has come to get the facts. Your own Congressman, FOSTER FURCOLO, has introduced a bill to survey the prospects of the Merrimac and others providing for a Connecticut Valley Administration. And one of your distinguished New England Senators has already worked out a way to get the facts on the entire region. Senator GREEN has introduced a bill in Congress for setting up a New England River Basin Survey Commission. It would study the whole region, not just pieces of it. It would study all possible uses of rivers, not only water power. It would bring together the proposals of all parties into a unified program for regional growth.

This Commission would be seeking a firm base for a balanced economy in New England. It would try to point the ways to new opportunities for industry, for agriculture, for employment of labor. It would show what steps are necessary to realize these opportunities. These are true functions of a welfare state.

Here is a Democratic proposal for meeting some of the basic problems of New England. It is only one example of how the Democratic Party proposes to meet domestic problems. We intend to see that the Federal Government does its share of the job of expanding America's economy, of providing better security for its citizens, and of seeking a fair distribution of the fruits of the labors of our people.

We propose to do these things because we have unbounded faith in the people of America, in the strength and vitality of our democratic Government and of the dynamic upward drive of our free-enterprise economy. We are firmly convinced that the path America must take is not to the left, not to the right, not to the rear, but forward to a life of ever-increasing abundance and a peaceful world.

Jackie Robinson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, I know that most of the American public are highly pleased with the signing a day or so ago of that great ball player, Jackie Robinson, at an annual salary which is said to be the highest for a player in Dodger history. The Brooklyn Eagle claims that it took less than 5 minutes for Jackie and President Branch Rickey to agree. This fact is a tribute to both of them. The annual signing of Dodger ball players is not always so easy. My good friend in Brooklyn, Jim Ryan, the father and founder of the famous Anvil Chorus, points this out in the following limerick which he recently wrote:

"SIGN-US" TROUBLE

From Rickey we've wrung the admission
That headaches with him are tradition,
And they grow more severe
In the spring of the year
Which is due to a "sign-us" condition.

Man's Economic Background

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Chester D. Tripp, publisher of Economic Trend Line Studies. He points to the weaknesses of man which have led to the downfall of each of the five major economic systems man has devised, and will lead people to abandon ours unless they are corrected:

MAN'S ECONOMIC BACKGROUND

It might be said that no social economic system devised by man has ever been proved successful. One might come to this conclusion by a process of elimination: No system, as yet devised, has worked well enough to maintain itself over any great period of time.

There are many instances where the world has tried communism, and there are many places today, where it is still the common practice, but, without exception, no lasting high culture has ever been developed under its auspices. The same may be said for the economic systems involving barter, or exchange carried on through currency. These latter systems are as old as the hills; they still exist in large parts of the world, enjoying, if one may use that expression, shockingly low standards of living for the great majority of the practitioners.

As for capitalism, which should be considered exchange through the facilities of central banking, there is no long, uninterrupted records of its use. In Helenistic times, the Near East was more capitalistic than it is today, and, incidentally, at that time had a much higher standard of living. The late Imperial Roman period was partially capitalistic and partially currency-minded. The Far East, Indian and China have to all appearances been barter- and currency-minded since the beginning of history, and, although we think of the Chinese social structure as being one of the oldest in the world, a detailed study of it shows many upsets and fully as many changes in government as have been experienced in Europe itself.

No one of these economic systems has ever been tried in its pure form, so far as the record shows. In currency-minded parts of the world, the hinterland still leans heavily on barter. Communism, whether practiced in seventeenth-century America or among the natives in Mexico, was and still is heavily tinctured with currency trading and even with rudimentary forms of capitalism.

Capitalism itself did not develop on a grand scale until after the seventeenth century, but, even today, half the capitalism of

the world, if one can judge by bank debits, is carried on by North America, a third by Europe, and the remaining percentage pretty much limits itself to coastal cities around the world and to capital areas where international trade takes place.

It is a fair question under such circumstances to ask, What is the reason for these 5,000 years of failure or only partial success of any one of these systems? They have all been tried either in relative purity or in combination, and all have clearly left something to be desired.

Currently, we have an articulate minority decrying the evils of capitalism. This is particularly true in western Europe, and, to some extent, in the United States. I have little doubt that in other parts of the world where other systems are used, there are other articulate minorities raising their voices against the standing order of things, strongly suggesting social and economic shifts in one direction or another on the theory that the suggestions they have in mind would cure the trouble and make abundance universal.

The sad part of the situation is that, historically, these shifts have been going on for centuries in both hemispheres. One economic technique after another has been overthrown, with conditions as likely as not going from bad to worse, the suggested panaceas having been proven time and again to have been inadequate. Why this long series of failures? Why is it that even today, right under our noses, the state-controlled economy hailed as liberalism is proving itself bankrupt.

On the face of it, and in pure theory, any one of the systems could work reasonably well if honestly practiced. Communism, under certain conditions, has developed a social atmosphere that is to say the least, tolerable; barter and currency certainly have much to recommend them; and capitalism, at least on paper, seems to solve a good many of the shortcomings of all of the systems, and seems to present the possibilities of a way of life much more abundant than anything that has been attained to date.

Very important literatures have been built up on the pros and cons of these systems. There are numberless books on why socialism, for instance, would solve our problems, and the political theories, based on the practice of socialism are without end. I wonder if we should not look elsewhere for the real cause of these failures. I would like to present the thesis that in none of these cases is it the fault of the system or of the theory of the system. I have a strong feeling that some systems could produce an abundance far greater than others, but I think it is safe to maintain that any one of them could work toward creating a social environment at least better than the days of the cave man. Criticisms of the different systems point out fundamental weaknesses within the systems themselves: Lack of incentive in socialism and in communism, the ponderance of actual money operations in currency trading; and the inability to easily tap distant markets in the case of barter. These disabilities are only important in degree and they in no way account for the widespread social unrest and dissatisfaction which have continuously driven humanity to further experimentation and to continual revision.

It is my opinion that the great fundamental weakness in all the systems is the inherent weakness of a substantial majority to operate under any system. If education were really widespread, if honest effort were more universal, and if personal unselfishness were more the rule than the exception, any of the systems could operate. It is, in my opinion, the weakness of us humans that gives the subject matter to the articulate minority for airing their dissatisfaction in the system and in so doing, trying to interest the masses in experimental changes. Endless examples can be brought up to support this theory.

Let us start with capitalism. The accomplishments in the name of capitalism have been exceedingly great. This economic system has done more to raise the standard of living than any system or combination of systems ever tried. Yet capitalism has its back to the wall today in defense of itself. It is my opinion that the dissatisfaction with the system is not based on the workings of the theory involved. As a matter of fact, I find the theory of capitalism rarely discussed, and I believe it is little understood. It is the individual impositions of a small number of ruthless and selfish people that continuously produce irritations which become socially significant.

What is happening today in the countries that are again experimenting with socialism? Why does not England produce more? Why is continental Europe torn with bickerings concerning the division of the tax load and the dominance of one party or another? Again, it is the question of the individual selfishness of a fair part of the population in not cooperating with the theoretical scheme of things.

The individual in Britain lacks incentive. He would like to get something for nothing. In spite of a splendid theory of individual cooperation, his very lack of incentive is causing the standard of living of that large section of the world to be lowered at a much faster pace than he realizes. I have no doubt that this same thing is true in Soviet Russia. Russia's swing in the last few years toward piecework and incentive production strongly indicates that the communism of brotherly love on paper has to be tempered to the facts of human nature, and supported by the prison camp and the iron fist if it is going to work at all.

It has often been said that what the world really needs is a spiritual revival. I probably read into this statement a deeper meaning than the proponents of this theory intend, but I cannot help feeling that there is something to this if by spiritual revival is meant a simple and earnest desire to pull one's own oar, to be fair and friendly with one's fellows, and to be deeply concerned with the welfare of one's community.

If the basic trouble with capitalism is the human factor, the problem of setting up the ultimate perfect social organization may be far in the future. Blueprints and theories will never solve the problem. What our society, or any other, must be concerned with is not the question of individual security, but of a widespread realization that any working system must be based on honesty, fairness and understanding. Every person in this great population wants to see a better day, wants to have more abundance, and to enjoy greater personal freedom from the risks of life, but, if there is ever going to be any fundamental change for the better, of more permannce than history has shown to date, that change will have to originate in the human heart and mind, and not in any temporarily espoused social order.

Let me summarize this great problem with its historical background in mind. To begin, mankind has been particularly unfruitful in originating economic procedures. Broadly speaking, the essential qualities of a workable system can be counted on the fingers of one hand. For clarity, they might be listed in order, the order mainly taking the position in which they appear in history. First, we have the economy of self-sufficiency: The original hunter and fisherman, who, in the course of centuries, supplemented his activities by adding primitive agriculture. The societies practicing this technique were wanderers who of necessity were continuously changing their locale. Obviously, their standard of living was exceedingly low. Often, too, the population was controlled through starvation, mostly due to this low standard of living.

Thousands of years later the self-sufficient nomad began to settle down. Stock raising became characteristic of his economy, agriculture became somewhat advanced and consumed a greater percentage of his activities. The new life involved the creation of settlements, and, as a result, there developed the primitive mechanical arts, such as potttery making and house building. It was at this stage of the development that barter, almost automatically, became the economy of the day, and with barter, labor began to specialize, and the standard of living was raised.

Communism is the next form clearly indicated. All primitive societies have gone through it. As late as medieval times, it was practiced even in advanced England, the English Commons being a survival of the technique. Sixteenth century America practiced communism to a marked degree, and the more advanced states of Central and South America even today carry on communistic activities, little knowing that certain parts of the world are trying to introduce the technique as a new discovery.

Beginning about 500 B. C., or possibly a little earlier, the Mediterranean economy became currency minded. With the minting of coins in the Greek colonies, the whole tempo of exchange suddenly changed: Trade expanded greatly, and with it, individual well-being improved. A very few hundred years later in the Near East, a capitalistic economy was practiced in a crude way, and then for 1,500 years, the known world floundered, using one of these forms or another, or combinations of all three. The high standards of living in the creative periods, however, are closely associated with either the use of sound currency or simple forms of capitalism.

In the seventeenth century, the English and the Dutch established central banking and a capitalistic economy followed on a broad basis. Almost immediately the scope of world trade was enlarged. The dispatch possible in bringing materials from the ends of the earth by self-liquidating credit instead of by barter or the use of hard money was most spectacular. As we would say in modern terms, the velocity of trade increased largely due to the elimination of obstacles. The new trade of the world greatly expanded the importance and position of the middle classes and it was at this time that European civilization began to develop what Gladstone called the social backbone of England, and what the modern Russian refers to as the degenerate bourgeois.

Since the seventeenth century, the institution of capitalism has increased spectacularly in the United States, but it has been much more slowly accepted in other parts of the world than the average American appreciates. At the best, it is a thin veneer that simply facilitates final accumulation of goods for shipment, probably originating in many places under the mechanism of barter or a currency economy. I think it would be safe to say that three-quarters of the population of the world have no idea that great quantities of goods can be handled on bills of exchange, without the use of money in any tangible form.

The record is fairly simple and as I have said, earnestly presents a question as to why history shows so much shifting and so much retrogression when it is so obvious that the capitalistic economy is the greatest trade-creating mechanism that society has ever used. To my mind, the answer lies in the endless series of impositions practiced by ruthless or selfish individuals that on the very face of it demands the greatest exercise of honor and fairness. If I am right in this, the solution does not lie in going back to first principles and primitive forms. What we need is an enlightened and efficient police power and an awakening on the part of

everybody through education and understanding that an economic method that is essentially based on honesty and fair dealing can be very easily sabotaged. Capitalism in its pure theoretical form has never been broadly tried nor has there ever been a demonstration, on the record to date, that any large group of humans has yet displayed the qualities in their personal dealings that might make this latest economic discovery a success. If and when that day ever comes, the well-being of the world can be increased beyond measure.

Minimum Wage

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act went into effect. A million and a half workers are getting higher pay because the law now says that everyone who is employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce must get not less than 75 cents an hour. No oppressive child labor can now be employed in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, and no children may be employed in agriculture during school hours.

For the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act the 75-cent minimum wage means that they once more have real protection for their own living standard even though they may be getting much more than 75 cents an hour. The business health of the whole country is strengthened, and the children of this country are given greater protection. The entire country benefits from this great advance in the improvement of the Federal law establishing minimum fair labor standards.

I think it is important for all of the citizens of this country to realize how great an achievement this Federal establishment of minimum fair labor standards has been. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was made the law of the land by the Democratic Party under President Roosevelt and has been expanded and modernized in line with our changed economic conditions by the Democratic Party under President Truman.

The earnest and untiring efforts of fair-minded and forward-looking people to outlaw substandard labor conditions have had a long history in this country. More than 100 years ago the Commonwealth of Massachusetts moved to limit the workday of children to 10 hours.

Today we are far beyond such meager and pitiful beginnings. But year after year and decade after decade the record was one of frustration and of painfully slow progress.

The great impetus given in 1933 to the idea that the Federal Government itself could protect the people as individuals has brought results that are now plain for all to see. The protection of the worker against hardships that befell him when the country experienced a downturn of economic activity required a basic floor under wages. The attempt to do this under the National Recovery Administration was declared unconstitutional. This was a grave set-back to those of us who wanted to establish decent minimum fair labor standards as the law of the land. But it was not accepted as defeat. Our efforts did not stop. Nor did the need for our efforts disappear. By 1938 much had been done to improve the economic health of the country and to relieve the suffering of its working men and women. But great numbers were still working extremely long hours at desperately low wages. These people bore the crushing burden of weary hours of toil while others looked in vain for jobs.

Too many people were working 60 hours a week or more for 10 or 15 cents an hour. In too many households was industrial work being done by children as well as their parents, with the entire family earning six or seven dollars a week with their combined efforts. These conditions had to be corrected.

A start had already been made in 1936 in establishing fair labor standards for the workers who produced goods bought by the Government in the Walsh-Healey Public Contracts Act. This law applied to the important but limited field of the Government contracting for goods and supplies.

In 1938 the first Federal statute of broad application was put into effect. It met tests on constitutional grounds because it lies squarely within the framework of our Constitution. It met the tests of actual operation in preventing substandard labor conditions in the channels of interstate commerce and in the production of goods for interstate commerce. It helped the individual worker in these employments to attain more nearly the minimum of material sufficiency that he needs for his self-maintenance as a worker and for his self-respect as a man and as a citizen of our country.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 provided for a minimum wage of 40 cents an hour. It required the payment of one and a half times the worker's regular rate of pay if he worked more than 40 hours in a week for each hour in excess of 40. It prohibited the shipment in interstate commerce of goods produced in an establishment in which oppressive child labor had been employed during the 30 days before such shipment.

The purpose of the minimum wage was to correct a condition under which a man might work a full week and still find himself unable to feed himself and his family. There was no reason why a man who contributed a full week of his efforts to the economy should have to go outside the economy to get relief payments for his sustenance. There was no reason why the enterprise that employed him should be permitted to meet part of its necessary pay roll with relief money. The floor under wages was established to correct this condition.

The overtime-pay requirement was set up to spread employment and the child-labor provision was an effort, although an indirect one, to prevent oppressive child labor.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 has proved itself an effective instrument for carrying out its humanitarian aims and its beneficial economic purposes. It has been a good law for the worker and a good law for the employer. It went far to correct substandard labor conditions. It went far toward removing from the great majority of employers of this country who are fair-minded and who want to maintain decent labor standards the fear and the pressure of unfair competition from those who would seek to win an order or gain a market at the expense of their own employees.

But conditions have changed greatly since 1938. We have moved to a $250,000,000,000 economy, and the 40-cent minimum wage had become out of date. It was time to reexamine the law. It was time to bring it in line with conditions of today, and to strengthen it. This the Congress has now done under the leadership of a Democratic administration.

The new minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour directly benefits a million and a half workers whose pay had lagged behind the times. Indirectly, it affords protection to the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the law. And it is an additional protection of the Nation's economy.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act as it stands today there is vastly greater protection for the children of our country. Oppressive child labor is now directly prohibited in the production of goods for commerce. For the first time oppressive child labor is now also prohibited in commerce which brings this protection to such activities as transportation and communication. The act now provides clearly and directly the authority needed to deal with the vicious aspects of industrial homework.

The Fair Labor Standards Act, modernized, strengthened, and improved, is a great achievement and another great step forward in our unceasing efforts of the past 17 years to promote the general welfare of all the people.

Modernization Work on Aircraft Carriers in Brooklyn Navy Yard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. ROONEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle of Saturday, January 21, 1950, which commends my friend and colleague, Representative LOUIS B. HELLER, for his efforts to secure the assignment of one of the two giant aircraft carriers for modernization work to the Brooklyn Navy Yard. The navy yard is

situated in Representative HELLER's congressional district and he has won the admiration and respect of the employees of the yard for his consistent efforts to provide them with additional work and increased employment. In that connection, he has had the wholehearted cooperation and support of the other eight Representatives in Congress from Brooklyn.

The editorial follows:

NAVY SHOULD GIVE ONE OF CARRIER MODERNIZATION JOBS TO BOROUGH YARD

Representative LOUIS B. HELLER has made a timely appeal to the Navy high command to assign to the Brooklyn Navy Yard one of the two giant aircraft carriers slated for modernization work. As he points out, the Brooklyn yard has pioneered in the work of rebuilding carriers along the lines dictated by postwar scientific developments and atomic research. And, as he adds, the work would provide employment for hundreds of Brooklyn workers who face dismissal on completion of several current jobs.

It should be pointed out here that when the economy cut-back in navy yard personnel was ordered throughout the country last year, Brooklyn suffered heavily but demanded that it receive its fair share of the necessary, continuing work which must be done by the Navy's shipyards unless our fleet is to rust away or fall into complete obsolescence.

Now, just the situation that was foreseen at that time is upon us. Additional workers, beyond those contemplated by the economy slash, face dismissal at the Brooklyn yard. They face that dismissal unless a share of the work which is to be done is awarded to the yard in Brooklyn. In terms of individual workers and their families, this means tragedy. In terms of maintaining the usefulness of the borough navy yard and its trained personnel for possible emergency, it would be another type of tragedy.

Brooklyn does not demand that the work at its navy yard be increased beyond the economy standards set last fall. It does demand that it have its fair share of the work which must be done, that it not be victimized by increasing the work of navy yards elsewhere.

The Eagle is glad to add its voice to that of Congressman HELLER in demanding assignment of one of the two carrier modernization jobs to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

Ambassador to Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. DELANEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, this morning we received the announcement from the State Department of the elevation of our diplomatic mission to Ireland from the rank of legation to that of embassy. I should like at this time to extend my congratulations through the medium of this House and its RECORD, to the State Department for this acknowledgment of the importance of carrying on diplomatic relations with Ireland on the highest level.

When Ireland took its proper place among the free and independent nations of the world, the United States quickly accorded recognition to the Irish Government, and welcomed to this capital the first minister to come from Dublin.

The establishment of the Irish Legation in Washington and the concurrent arrival of our Minister in Dublin signalized a new and happier era in Ireland's long and troubled history. Today's announcement by our Department of State marks a new milestone in American and Irish history.

This week is indeed a joyful one for the people of both Nations. It was only last Friday that our Government announced the signing of a historic treaty which restates and renews the long friendship which has marked the relations of the American and Irish peoples.

Today we can point not only to a treaty of friendship, but, more, to a sealing of that compact with a still further earnest of friendship and high esteem—the elevation of our diplomatic missions to full rank.

What has happened today will, I am sure, lift up the hearts of millions of Americans of Irish descent. I sincerely hope that these two great strides in Ireland's glorious history will be harbingers of a third great advance—to the complete unity of all the provinces and counties of Ireland under the one free and independent Government in Ireland, the Government whose seat is in Dublin.

Hawaii Welcomes Inquiry of Un-American Activities Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, January 18, 1950, the Honolulu Star-Bulletin published the following editorial:

THAT INVESTIGATION OF UN-AMERICANISM NEARS

A visit here by members of the National House Committee on Un-American Activities is expected within the next 60 days.

It's to study the scope and effect of alleged Communist influence here.

The Washington bureau of the Star-Bulletin clearly describes the plans being made now at the Capital.

First, one of the two special investigators sent here a few months ago by the House committee is coming back. He'll be here in a week or 10 days, to set the stage for the private inquiry and for the public hearings, if any.

He will be followed by the subcommittee, which will come at such a time as its members can get away from Washington.

The subcommittee will bring one or two of its own staff members. Other staff workers may be engaged here.

No limit has been set on the length of the committee's stay in Hawaii. That depends on the job they find to do, and the thoroughness with which they do it.

The proposed inquiry should be a salutary thing.

If carried out in a spirit of objective investigation, it can be, for Hawaii, a most helpful thing.

We are confident that any objective, completely unprejudiced inquiry will prove that the great majority, the overwhelming majority, of Hawaii's people are thoroughly loyal.

They are neither Communists and fellow-travelers nor under the influence and domination of such Communists and fellow-travelers as may be skulking in the dark and working in their sinister way to undermine an American community.

We note in some quarters a disposition to sniff at the proposed investigation—to dismiss the projected visit of the Congressmen as merely a junket for their personal pleasure.

One such sneer comes from Willard K. Bassett, the mayor's administrative assistant and often the mayor's mouthpiece.

Another sniff is from Ralph Vossbrink, president of the Oahu CIO council.

And a similar crack comes from Jack Hall, ILWU regional director. Says he: "It is nothing but a political smear committee."

Such an attitude does none of them credit. It is particularly ill-becoming in the assistant to the mayor. For it amounts to a jeer at the processes of democratic government, and he himself has been the long-time beneficiary, through appointment to public jobs, of that kind of government.

We should welcome any investigation which will produce facts on the Communist situation here, whatever it is.

Anyone who has facts or reliable leads on communism here should join heartily in making those facts and leads available.

And because this Territory has now for a long time been under fire from a few quarters as a nation rampant with communism, we should insist, as a matter of common justice, that the climax of the committee's work be the production of established facts.

Its findings, moreover, should clearly set the Hawaii situation in proper relation to the whole national picture.

For nothing is more certain, more clear, than that communism is alien to Hawaii. If it is here, it has been imported, or has entered by stealth, as secretly as the termite, the fruitfly, the leafhopper, the cane borer, or any other pest which has plagued the islands.

Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES J. HEFFERNAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HEFFERNAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Brooklyn Eagle of January 22, 1950, by Clarence Greenbaum, paying tribute to Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller:

RABBI HELLER, OF FLATBUSH, A PREACHER AND TEACHER

(By Clarence Greenbaum)

Erudite Rabbi Abraham Mayer Heller's lifelong philosophy is that community educational activities are necessary adjuncts to the conduct of religious rites.

Dr. Heller, to whom many honors came last week as his congregation marked the twenty-fifth anniversary of his affiliation with the Flatbush Jewish Center, has applied this educational theme of preacher and teacher well. In practice, under his guidance, the center has thrived from the point 25 years ago when it attracted but 35 families to its present stage as a magnet for more than 700 families.

When one thinks of the center at 500 Church Avenue, one cannot help but think

of Dr. Heller, who was made life rabbi there 5 years ago. The 51-year-old spiritual leader, who springs from a long line of rabbis, is the only rabbi the center has ever had. It was organized in 1921, but services were conducted by visiting rabbis before Dr. Heller was engaged.

HIS SCHOOLING

By the same token, the center is the only religious institution which Dr. Heller has served. Born in Lithuania, he was brought here by his family when he was 11 years old. He was graduated from Towsend Harris Hall High School, and attended the College of Arts and Sciences of New York University before finishing his undergraduate work at the University of Minnesota. There he received a bachelor of arts degree.

Then he did graduate work at Columbia University, where he received a master of arts degree in social science. He was graduated from the Jewish Theological Seminary of America, Manhattan, in June 1924, with the degree of master of Hebrew literature, qualified, in his own words, to serve the community as a preacher and teacher.

In 1930, Dr. Heller received the degree of bachelor of laws from St. John's. He was admitted to the State bar in 1931, although he has never practiced law. It was his thirst for knowledge and his desire to have as much background as possible to serve the needs of his community that prompted him to study law.

WROTE TWO BOOKS

Dr. Heller is the author of two fairly popular books on Jewish religion. One titled "Jewish Survival," is a collection of his selected essays and sermons. It was published in 1939.

The other volume, The Vocabulary of Jewish Life, published in 1942, is a study of Hebrew customs and rituals. It is used extensively as a textbook for adult education classes in various schools. Additionally, he has contributed many articles to various publications.

Besides being one of the best-attended synagogues in the borough as far as services are concerned, the center's education department includes Brooklyn's largest daily afternoon religious school for children between the ages of 6 and 14. This school supplements the youngsters' secular education.

ADULT CLASSES

Under the guidance of Dr. Heller, the educational program also features departments for high-school students and adult classes. There is being erected a seven-story community house and educational institute on the Ocean Parkway side of the center which, when completed by this fall, will house an experimental Jewish progressive day school. All the curriculum requirements of the board of education will be conformed to, plus Hebrew teachings. For this purpose, the Bialik Hebrew Academy at 400 Stone Street, recently chartered by the board of regents, will be moved to the center. There will be an 8-year curriculum, plus a nursery school and kindergarten. The new edifice will also house a gymnasium, library, and other educational and recreational facilities.

HONORS NOT NEW

Dr. Heller is proud of the fact that the center serves as a beehive for community events. Many organizations and clubs, such as the Jewish War Veterans B'nai B'rith, meet there. During the war the center supplied a record number of blood donors for the Brooklyn Red Cross. Now the Flatbush division of the Red Cross is housed in the center for the annual appeal. The center also was among the four leading religious institutions in the sale of war bonds.

Honors, like those heaped upon Dr. Heller this past week, are not exactly new to him. Five years ago, to mark the twentieth anniversary of his affiliation with the center, a grove of 5,000 trees was planted in his honor near Jerusalem.

He is a founder and past president of the Brooklyn Board of Rabbis, and served two consecutive terms, in 1946 and 1947, as president of the New York Board of Rabbis. He has been prominently identified with Zionism and various philanthropic endeavors, and during the war he led movements for the escape of as many Jews as possible from Germany and other Hitler-controlled lands.

As chairman of the New York Board of Rabbis committee on chaplaincy, it is his duty to provide some 50 Jewish chaplains for city institutions like Bellevue Hospital, as well as for private institutions.

TO GET SABBATICAL

Dr. Heller's long and distinguished services to the community are in no small part due to his wife, the former Frances Lesser, of Boston, whom he married in March 1932. At that time, she was national president of Junior Hadassah. They live with their one son, Zachary, 11, at 188 Stratford Road.

So greatly esteemed is Dr. Heller by the members of his congregation that last night they surprised him by announcing that, when the new religious school is completed, he will have a 6-month sabbatical leave, with his family, to Israel with all expenses paid. Besides, they took out a special insurance policy for him, naming his family as beneficiaries, and presented it to Dr. Heller as a token of their warm affection for their "preacher and teacher."

Problems Before Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on November 14, 1949, the members of the Farm Bureau of Davis County, Iowa, met in annual meeting at Bloomfield and adopted a set of comprehensive resolutions expressing the position of this great organization with respect to issues and problems that are before this country.

I desire to give to the Members of Congress the opportunity of knowing the position of the Farm Bureau of Davis County, Iowa, at this time, and I include these resolutions in my extension of remarks:

We, the resolutions committee, present the following declarations of principles and suggestions for consideration to the members of the Davis County Farm Bureau:

1. We feel it is imperative for the future success of any farm program to have that program developed through the combined approach of our two major political parties.

2. We believe that guaranties of 100 percent parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic governmental controls. It is important, therefore, to keep controls at a minimum and still get satisfactory and desired results.

3. We believe that if the cost of administering and carrying out a farm program becomes too high, in the minds of our consumer public, the agriculture segment of our society will stand in danger of losing its farm program.

4. We are in favor of flexible supports to average 90 percent of parity.

5. We favor flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by law and giving the Secretary of Agriculture the discretionary authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

6. We feel that, if production payments are made directly to a farmer, the prices paid by consumers for farm commodities will not drop enough to have a noticeable influence on the amount of farm commodities consumed. We believe that production payments would establish a cheap food philosophy in the minds of consumers. This philosophy might be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

7. We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress. We do, however, favor use of production payments in support of perishable nonstorable commodities. We go on record as being opposed to the destroying of any farm commodity that is in physical surplus as this destruction is both wasteful and sinful.

8. It is reported that half the families in the United States are not eating right. Part of this is due to insufficient family income and part to not knowing how to eat right even though the family income is sufficient. We favor promotion and extension of a school-lunch program that will give each and every school child in the United States an equal chance to have at least one square meal a day.

9. We favor the using of farm surpluses for school-lunch programs, blue stamp and relief programs.

10. We favor more research by Government farm agencies in expanding the farm market and finding new and alternate uses for farm commodities.

11. Use European relief, school lunch, aid to disabled, underprivileged, and aged groups (blue stamp) to increase consumption of farm products.

12. Satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

13. We feel that when acreage allotments are used the base for computing them should depend upon fertility of land and good soil-conservation practices rather than past history of production in that area.

14. We would like to personally commend the Soil Conservation Service for the services they have rendered to farmers in Davis County during the past year. We strongly urge the farmers in Davis County to take advantage of the services available to them through our local soil-conservation unit. We would like to see the farmers make more use of the services of our soil technicians.

15. We strongly favor having the Soil Conservation Service set as their ultimate goal the charting of every farm in Davis County for that farm's capabilities.

16. We are not in favor of abandoning the parity concept for the income-support standard. We believe that parity should be modernized to reflect changes in technology and regions that have taken place in agriculture during the past 35 years.

17. We are in favor of the human approach of mediation in settling labor-management disputes since these disputes are somewhat social, ethical, and economic in nature.

18. We favor the organization of a Worker Extension Service, similiar to the Agricultural Extension Service, to work with labor groups for the purpose of helping them solve problems relative to family living.

19. We favor the changing of mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families.

20. We are in favor of the establishment of a Federal agency, similar to the REA for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

21. We believe that road funds should be distributed on a need rather than an area basis.

22. We, in the Farm Bureau, recognize that there is duplication and overlapping of services among our governmental farm agencies. For this reason we favor the coordination of the farm agencies to the fullest extent possible in an effort to correct this situation.

23. We favor a farm program set up on the following basis: Give the Secretary of Agriculture the power to set support prices, for those commodities in excess production, as low as 75 or 80 percent of parity. At the same time making provisions to set support prices of commodities in which an increase of production is desired high enough so that, if desired shifts of production are obtained, total support prices plus soil conservation payments equal at least 95 percent of parity.

24. The United States has become the greatest creditor nation the world has ever known. It is her responsibility, therefore, to promote good will in international trade and do away with artificial barriers to trade. This would be one method of raising the standard of living in other nations. This would also promote more trade thereby giving other countries a chance to pay their debts.

A. We go on record as favoring a gradual reduction of tariffs and the lifting of other free-trade barriers.

B. We favor the establishment of more reciprocal trade agreements between the United States and other nations.

25. We would like to take a few moments to mourn the loss by death of five of our oldest Farm Bureau members, George Good, William Wagler, Ed Blasi, V. G. Warner, and H. J. Craig. It was they who stood solidly in support of our farm organization from humble beginnings to its present place of power and prestige. We can only hope that community-minded young men will replace them by accepting the responsibility that was theirs.

26. In closing, we feel all of us should pledge ourselves to the procurement of membership in every way possible, so that we will have help in carrying the tremendous load our Farm Bureau organization has assumed for the benefit of all farmers.

The Study of Bigness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the New York State Bar Association on January 25, 1950:

THE STUDY OF BIGNESS

There are many valid reasons which prompted me, as chairman of the House Committee on the Judiciary, to set up a Subcommittee on the Study of Monopoly Power.[1] One, frankly, was to shake the public lethargy, to prod the people into awareness that the middle nineteen hundreds was as different from the turn of the century as handicraft is from mass production. This commonplace thought is most readily agreed to, generally, but meets with fiercest resistance when an attempt is made to apply it to a realistic definition of monopoly.

There are two main reasons why I am concerned about concentration of economic power in the United States. One is that concentration of business unavoidably leads to some kind of socialism, which is not the desire of the American people. The other is that a concentrated system is inefficient compared with a system of free competition.

We have seen what happened to the other industrial countries of the Western World. They allowed a free growth of monopolies and cartels until these private concentrations grew so strong that either big business would own the government or the government would have to seize control of big business. The most extreme case was in Germany, where the big-business men thought they could take over the Government by using Adolf Hitler as their puppet. Hitler turned tables on them, so Germany passed from private monopoly to dictatorship and disaster.

In a report of experts sent to our Secretary of the Army we find this significant statement:

"Germany built up a great series of industrial monopolies in steel, rubber, coal, and other materials. The monopolies soon got control of Germany, brought Hitler to power, and forced virtually the whole world into war."

We must deplore the weaving in this country of the pattern that gave us in Nazi Germany the Krug, Thyssen, and I. G. Farben industrial empires.

There are clearest indications that unless checked our economy will become more and more controlled by a handful of giant corporations. The Federal Trade Commission just reported[2] that 46 percent of the total capital assets of all manufacturing corporations in the United States as of 1947 were concentrated in the 113 largest manufacturers, which in turn owned over sixteen billions of net capital assets. Three companies already control 100 percent of our aluminum output, three companies make over 95 percent of all tin cans and tinware, three make over 90 percent of all linoleum, three huge oligopolies control cigarettes, three control whisky, three control soap, three control autos. A Department of Commerce study corroborates this dangerous trend: A Big Four controlling at least 50 percent of production dominates 150 of 452 industries recently surveyed by the Department.[3] It is time we stopped, looked, and listened.

The Sherman Act is 90 years old. The Clayton Act, 36. They are horse-and-buggy statutes applied to an automotive and jet-propelled era.[4] These antitrust laws have not been kept current with today's facts of life.

All amendments to them have weakened, not strengthened, the antitrust laws.[5] The end sought, that of a free and open competitive society, has been steadily constricted by such acts as the Shipping Act of 1916,[6] the Civil Aeronautics Act,[7] the Reed-Bulwinkle,[8] the Webb-Pomerene,[9] and the Insurance Moratorium Acts.[10] All these amendments permit restrictive arrangements and agreements to lessen or soften competition. They chip away the underlying principle of the Sherman, Clayton Acts. They are economic crutches for certain groups—mainly pressure groups—at the expense of the general public.

The time has come to reexamine all these enactments that have weakened our antitrust fabric. The loopholes through which those seeking monopolistic advantages easily crawl must be plugged, whether the loopholes were hollowed out by amendments such as I named or by holes in the acts themselves.

Let me examine with you one such obvious hole in the antitrust laws. When the Clayton Act[11] was passed in 1914, Congress clearly intended to prevent prospective concentration achieved through the merger of competing concerns.[12] Section 7 of the act prohibited one corporation from acquiring the stock of another where the effect of such acquisition would be substantially to lessen competition, restrain commerce, or tend to create a monopoly. Absurdly enough, it is not violative of the act to acquire the assets of a corporation for possible monopolistic purposes.[13] I have proposed the cure in the Celler bill, H. R. 2734, which has passed the House and now awaits action in the Senate. Again, it is 1950 and the agents of resistance to change (no matter how logical and necessitous the change) and public apathy leave the issue still in doubt.

Yes, we hear the complaints that the law is not clear, that court decisions cannot be predicted,[14] and that the trend of interpretation is wrong. But you know, as good lawyers (and that you are) in most instances whether or not a particular activity violates the antitrust laws. There is, of course, a borderline area, but how narrow a strip that is. Even one as wise as Solomon could not envisage a law to cover all compounds in a conjuring cup which you able members of the bar can mix. As Mr. Herbert Bergson, of the Department of Justice, puts it, "* * * one who does not wish to run the risk of falling in should not persist in skating out as far as he possibly can on thinning ice; or for that matter skating on no ice at all."[15]

It is safe to say if there were not so many circuitous routes taken to skirt the intent of the antitrust laws—the maintenance of a competitive society—we'd hear less complaints about the obscurities and misinterpretations of our antitrust laws. The burglar wouldn't have to worry about the complexities of a Yale lock if he didn't intend to break through in the first place.

I want to make it clear I would vigorously oppose any antitrust laws that attempted to particularize violations, giving bills of particulars to replace general principles and the basic philosophy of free enterprise. The law must remain fluid allowing for a dynamic society. Otherwise, to put it bluntly, the process would become a rat race between the monopolist seizing upon omissions and the Congress trying to fill them into the law, always 18 steps behind. As I pointed out before, after 36 years Congress hasn't caught up yet to plugging section 7 of the Clayton Act.

True everybody is publicly against monopoly as he is publicly against sin. It reads well in publicity releases. A president of one of our billion-dollar companies, a very able

---

[1] See H. Res. 137 (H. Res. 156), 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949).

[2] Report of the Federal Trade Commission on the Concentration of Productive Facilities, 1947 (1949).

[3] Report, Secretary of Commerce, December 1, 1949, p. 12.

[4] TNEC Monograph No. 16, Antitrust in Action, 76th Cong., 3d sess. (1940), pp. 5, 12–20, 101–105.

[5] See laws cited in Hearings Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 728–750.

[6] 39 Stat. 733; 46 U. S. C. 814; Public, No. 260, 64th Cong. (1916).

[7] 52 Stat. 973; 49 U. S. C. 401 ff.; Public, No. 706, 75th Cong. (1938).

[8] 62 Stat. 472; 49 U. S. C. 5b; Public Law 662, 80th Cong. (1948).

[9] 40 Stat. 516; 15 U. S. C. 61–65; Public, No. 126, 65th Cong. (1918).

[10] 59 Stat. 33; 15 U. S. C. 1011 ff.; Public Law 15, 79th Cong. (1945), as amended July 25, 1947, 61 Stat. 448; Public Law 238, 80th Cong.

[11] 38 Stat. 730; 15 U. S. C. 12 ff.; Public, No. 212, 63d Cong. (1914).

[12] H. Rept. No. 1191, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 3–4.

[13] See *Fed. Trade Commission* v. *Western Meat Co.* (272 U. S. 554 (1926)); *Arrow-Hart & Hegeman Electric Co.* v. *Fed. Trade Commission* (291 U. S. 587 (1934)).

[14] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 396, 430, 437, 514.

[15] Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 380.

and estimable gentleman, in testifying, proclaimed his approval of the antitrust principles with no little emphasis,[16] yet his company has 16 antitrust suits filed against it by the Department of Justice and a number of similar complaints filed against it by the Federal Trade Commission. In the last two suits, two district judges within a year, one Judge Knox[17] and the other Judge Forman,[18] excoriated the baneful practices of the company. That kind of support for the antitrust laws as expressed by the president of that company is like the support the rope gives to the hanged.

And what about bigness as such—the power of size aside from what it may or may not do? That seems to me the question which has gone begging, and which only a very few have the courage to face up to. What inhibiting fear blocks even the asking of the question? Business giants are a fact in our economic life. Is then not an examination of their impact on our society a healthy and even a necessary one? Judging from the repercussions there are those in big business who do not think any question of their position is proper.

Recently a new judicial trend appeared, striking at bigness. Judge Learned Hand in the Aluminum case[19] made it abundantly clear that mere size could reach a point in which the power to restrain trade was so great as to make it illegal. The numerical measurement of size in this case was 90 percent of the industry under consideration.[20] Judge Hand's decision was cited with approval by the Supreme Court in the Tobacco case,[21] where the defendants, although conspiracy was charged, together controlled over two-thirds of the domestic field of cigarettes and 80 percent of the field of comparable cigarettes. But the Supreme Court apparently is unwilling to follow to the end of the line, leading to the principle that power is more significant than specific intent. The Court has yet to depart from its established principle that "the law does not make mere size an offense * * *"[22] Whether sound economic theory and industrial history have antiquated this principle is the question we must face.

The facts in the Columbia Steel case[23] revealed that the acquisition of the Geneva plant from the War Assets Administration gave the United States Steel Corp. ownership of over 51 percent of the rolled steel or ingot capacity of the Pacific coast area. With this background of size, the court nevertheless held that the acquisition of Consolidated Steel Corp., coupled with the 180 acquisitions of the United States Steel Corp. prior to 1920 and 8 acquisitions from 1924 to 1943, was not persuasive enough to compel the conclusion that there was present the necessary specific intent to monopolize

The majority of the court, in this case, failed to strike down the immunity which it has granted to bigness under the Sherman Act. At the present time, therefore, the problem of bigness as such is still far from judicial solution.

Many of our expert witnesses, and witnesses from small business, have stressed the idea that bigness is dangerous to free enterprise and to political freedom.[24] This view was contradicted by witnesses representing big business, who asserted that the antitrust laws and the pressure of competition can be counted upon to prevent abuse of the supposed powers of large size.

The viewpoint that power is dangerous has best been summed up by Justice Douglas in the Columbia Steel case where he stated in his dissenting opinion, "For all power tends to develop into a government in itself. * * * Industrial power should be decentralized. It should be scattered into many hands so that the fortunes of the people will not be dependent on the whim or caprice, the political prejudices, the emotional stability of a few self-appointed men."[25] Those in agreement with Justice Douglas believe that some concentration of power, both private and public, are unavoidable. Technology has to be accepted for the great benefits it offers, and some aspects of technology require large organizations for their efficient use. Many such applications as we all know, take the form of natural monopolies that fall under public regulation as public utilities, or in some cases become public services like the TVA, reclamation, and the Post Office. But all concentrations, public or private, are liable to abuse and require constant public vigilance to keep them devoted to the services of the public.

They believe, too, that private corporations may have to be large in order to do some kinds of work; other kinds of work can be efficiently carried on by small or middle-sized organizations. The relative size actually required for efficiency leave plenty of scope for free enterprise and competition, but only provided the big firms are prevented from using their power to take over the areas in which bigness has no technical justification.

Often we are told, and often it has been stated that not only has the process of concentration become accelerated, but that the units of concentration, the concentrates themselves, have grown to gargantuan size. The du Pont complex is often pointed to as an example of conglomerate concentration. It embraces not only the du Pont operations, vast as they are, but likewise has a significant relationship and control over General Motors, United States Rubber, Libbey-Owens-Ford Glass and numerous other huge entities. Each one of these outfits controlled by the du Pont dynasty is, in itself, an empire which has grown from without as well as from within, by natural growth or by merger, consolidation and the elimination of rivals. They have acquired the companies of their suppliers, distributing companies, mines and quarries as well as absorbing their customers and competitors.[26]

The Federal Communications Commission in its report of the investigation of the telephone industry in 1939 points to the relationship between the American Telephone & Telegraph Co., and its subsidiary, the Western Electric Co., which resulted in sales at noncompetitive prices and effected as well the rate structures for telephone services, since a large part of the total investment in the Bell System, as well as a part of its operating expenses, represents the purchase price of telephone apparatus, equipment, and material.

It has likewise been pointed out to the subcommittee that a tremendous amount of risk capital is in the hands of large companies in the form of profits that are not distributed to the stockholders.[27] These corporate savings, we are told, are usually available for expanding the plant of the big company or for acquisition of either a substantial or complete control of other companies. We have likewise been asked to note that many great companies, for example, have not offered any issue to the public for years. They don't need to.[28]

In 1938, Fortune magazine, a magazine nobody could remotely associate with the baiting of big business, ran a series of articles on bigness. I want to read two short paragraphs to you:

"In the progress of mankind there are times for everything. There was a time for the dark ages, another for a renaissance, another for an industrial revolution. There was a time for the building of America, for the creation of bigger markets and bigger pay rolls, and, inevitably, bigger industrial units. In our time men have been conditioned to the idea of bigness. They believe that to grow big is almost of necessity to progress. They believe that the expansion of American enterprise necessarily involves the corporate expansion of its units. And they are taught that the corporate expansion of the units should result in bigger profits, individually and to the economy as a whole.

"But it is possible to question this: Not that our time has been wrong, but that it may be time for something else. It may be time to weigh the notion that there is some necessary connection between economic expansion and corporate bigness. It may be time to wonder whether profits and the national income would not be bigger if the corporate units of industry were not so big."[29]

I have dwelt lengthily, I know, on the question of bigness and while the subcommittee is in the process of examining it, I believe it is necessary for a group like the members of this esteemed bar association to examine the premise as well, to give us the benefit of your approach, your understanding, and your studied criticism. You must ultimately concern yourselves with the question: Should Congress legislate on the problem of bigness?

An adequate answer to the questions presented by giantism and bigness is fraught with innumerable economic, legal, and political pitfalls. Brave, indeed, is he who would tread upon the hallowed grounds preempted by size. Yet several suggestions have been volunteered by those who have considered the broad implications of the problem with care. I do not consider any of these proposals a panacea; nor do I present them to you as possibilities other than tentative in nature. I do feel, however, that they offer fertile soil for stimulated thinking on the part of both members of the bar and the American public.

Prof. Howard J. Trienens, in his recent testimony before the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power,[30] emphasized the strong analogy between the Public Utility Act of 1935[31] and dissolution procedure under the

[16] Wilson, Big Progress and Big Business Go Together (1949), p. 7.

[17] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (80 F. Supp. 989 (1948)).

[18] *United States* v. *General Electric Co.* (82 F. Supp. 753 (1949)).

[19] *United States* v. *Aluminum Co. of America* (148 F. 2d 416 (1945)).

[20] Judge Hand declared: "That percentage is enough to constitute a monopoly; it is doubtful whether 60 or 64 percent would be enough; and certainly 33 percent is not." P. 424.

[21] *American Tobacco Company* v. *United* States (328 U. S. 781 (1946)).

[22] *United States* v. *U. S. Steel Corp.* (251 U. S. 417, 451 (1920)).

[23] *United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.* (334 U. S. 495 (1948)).

[24] See, e. g., Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), pp. 71, 146, 251–252, 300, 362, 537).

[25] Op. cit. supra, note 24, p. 536.

[26] See Edwards, Maintaining Competition (1949), p. 100, footnote 14.

[27] See Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess., pp. 257–259.

[28] See hearings, op. cit. supra, p. 232.

[29] Fortune, March 1938.

[30] Testimony Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, December 1, 1949; see, also, Trienens, the Utility Act as a Solution to Sherman Act Problems, 44 Ill. L. Rev. 331 (1949).

[31] 49 Stat. 803; 15 U. S. C. 79a et seq.; Public, No. 333, 74th Cong. (1935).

Sherman Act,[32] the former being closely patterned after the decree of the court in the Tobacco case of 1911.[33] On the theory that public utility holding companies should be legally treated in a manner no different from other holding companies engaged in interstate commerce, a bill was drafted by Dr. Walter Adams of Michigan State College applying the principles of the Holding Company Act of 1935 to all corporations of excessive size.[34] The bill goes little further than to embody in legal language the suggestions outlined in Fortune magazine as early as 1938[35] and merits attentive consideration.

Another line of attack was suggested by one of the prominent "experts" in the field of antitrust law. This solution would amend the Federal Trade Commission Act by adding a new section empowering the Commission to order the dissolution of a company whenever its size and power was so great as to substantially lessen competition or create a monopoly in any line of commerce.[36] It, too, is worthy of thorough study.

A third avenue of approach suggests an amendment to section 2 of the Sherman Act which would give a statutory definition to the concept of monopoly.[37] "Up to the present time the antitrust laws have not been successful in the monopolization field."[38] The legal definition of "monopoly" has failed to square with the economic realities of the current market place despite optimistic predictions to the contrary.[39] Any such action on the part of the Congress would have to be done with great care and studied preparation. But the idea that the hiatus in the antitrust laws which suffers the spawning of unwieldy mammoths to go unchecked may be closed by legislative language defining "monopoly" is certainly worth exploration.

We all seek the same goal, a free and competitive society. The primary question lies before all of us, gentlemen—How shall we maintain and expand it?

---

[32] 26 Stat. 209; 15 U. S. C. 1–7; Public, No. 190, 51st Cong. (1890).

[33] *United States* v. *American Tobacco Co.* (221 U. S. 106 (1911)).

[34] See Testimony Before Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, December 1, 1949; the bill is printed in full in Special Supplement, Bureau of National Affairs, Daily Report for Executives, December 1, 1949.

[35] See Fortune, March 1938; id., April 1938.

[36] The full text of the amendment, as presently drawn, reads: "Any corporation whose size and power are such as substantially to lessen competition or to create a monopoly in any line of commerce in any section of the country shall be dissolved into a number of independent enterprises sufficient to restore competition in such line of commerce, provided that no action under this section shall be taken if the corporation proceeded against can demonstrate that the proposed action would materially lessen efficiency in any line of commerce." See Interview, U. S. News & World Report, September 23, 1949, p. 30.

[37] See Hearings, Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, serial 14, pt. 1, 81st Cong., 1st sess. (1949), p. 353.

[38] Levi, the Antitrust Laws and Monopoly, 14 U. Chi. L. Rev. 153, 181 (1947).

[39] See Rostow, the new Sherman Act: A Positive Instrument of Progress, 14 U. Chi. L. Rev. 567, 576 (1947), who says: "The Supreme Court is on the threshold of recognizing what the economists call monopolistic competition as the offense of monopoly under sec. 2 of the Sherman Act." Cf. Douglas, J., dissenting in the *United States* v. *Columbia Steel Co.*, 334 U. S. 495, 534 (1948), and Black, J., dissenting in *United States* v. *Yellow Cab Co.*, — U. S. — (Dec. 5, 1949).

A British Warning To Preserve the American Watchmaking Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, on repeated occasions, during the past 3 years, I have urged the Members of this House to concentrate their attention upon the gradually increasing disintegration of the American watchmaking industry, and the paramount need for corrective action to preserve it.

I have emphasized that, while I am not personally opposed to the cooperative economic theory at the basis of our trade-agreements program, it has been my understanding, which I am sure is shared by every other Member of the Congress, the negotiation of such a program was not intended or designed to eliminate our own domestic industries.

Especially so when such domestic industry involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship and a vital contribution to our national security resources. I have already introduced in the RECORD the testimony of high Government officials that the continuation of watch-manufacturing operations is essential to the defense of the United States.

I have asked the State Department, again and again, to take cognizance of this vital fact in their trade-agreement negotiations with Switzerland, which country is subsidizing their own watchmaking industry with clear purpose of controlling the world watch market and eliminating American competition.

Although the State Department has no qualms about asking the American taxpayers, through their elected Representatives, to support almost every country on the globe, they are yet unconcerned about our national security and community employment problems with respect to the watchmaking industry.

It has been said that our State Department follows the lead of, and takes its instructions from, the British school of diplomacy. In this regard, I should like to call the attention of the State Department, and my colleagues, to a pertinent article entitled, "Watch and Clock Making Revives in the United Kingdom," written by Mr. A. H. Stuart, Consumers Merchandise Branch, Commodities Division, OIT, United States Department of Commerce, which appeared in the Foreign Commerce Weekly of January 16, 1950.

This article, without bias or prejudice, but with scholarly, factual detail, traces the history of domestic watchmaking in the British Empire. It decisively proves that the British have learned, from sad experience, that watchmaking is an essential industry, and they are being wise enough to admit past mistakes and take measure to rectify them.

It is my hope that the State Department high command will perhaps see fit to consult with Commerce Department experts to coordinate their primary joint purpose of administering the departments of this Government for the good of the people of the United States.

I earnestly ask each of you, my colleagues, to read this warning message, and join your efforts to prevent the American people and our Armed Forces from being deprived of sufficient precision instruments to conduct a possible atomic war, God forbid!

The article follows:

WATCH AND CLOCK MAKING REVIVES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM—BRITAIN'S BURGEONING CLOCK INDUSTRY SCORES FORTY-FIVE-FOLD GROWTH IN 9-YEAR PERIOD

(By A. H. Stuart, Consumers' Merchandise Branch, Commodities Division, OIT, U. S. Department of Commerce)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What is happening in timepiece production in the United Kingdom provides an interesting case study of the neglect and rehabilitation of a national asset. The very problems that are now of concern to watch manufacturers in the United States were encountered earlier and more severely by the British. It is well to note how the wartime shortage of watches and clocks has induced a remarkable change in improving British methods of production and in minimizing reliance on imports. If this program is carried forward vigorously, the British industry's output will—after satisfying accumulated demand at home—again be flowing into the channels of international commerce, earning exchange for Great Britain. The impact of this renewed competition is likely to be felt chiefly by the Swiss watch industry and the United States clock industry.)

Considered at one time to be the greatest of its kind in the world, the British watch and clock industry, after a long period of dormancy, was reestablished during the war. It is possible that it will again become a principal source of horological products, as the British Government has decided that a flourishing watch and clock industry must be maintained for security reasons (the Government's general policy of building up domestic manufacturing in order to provide employment and reduce imports was of secondary importance in arriving at this decision).

To encourage increased domestic production of watches and clocks, the Government is giving practical aid to the industry. The success of this program may be measured by the increase in production in 1948, when 580,000 watches and 2,700,000 clocks were manufactured, compared with 1939 output of only 18,000 watches and 60,000 clocks.

DEVELOPMENT AND DECLINE OF THE INDUSTRY

For hundreds of years English craftsmen specialized in making timepieces. The earliest clock worthy of our modern definition was made by Peter Lightfoot, an English monk, about 1335. By 1655 approximately 70,000 persons were employed in making and repairing timepieces, and British exports of horological products in that year were valued at more than £400,000. In 1675, the Greenwich Observatory was founded and was to become the basic reference point for measurement of time throughout the globe.

Englishmen have been responsible for many of the foremost inventions connected with horology. In 1661, Robert Hooke introduced the first balance spring (because he used a pig bristle, it became known as the hair spring). A few years later, Thomas Thompion, the father of English watchmaking, developed the cylinder escapement with horizontal wheels. Other master craftsmen were Thomas Mudge, inventor of the

gravity escapement, and George Graham, designer of balance wheels. In 1759, a self-educated Yorkshire carpenter named John Harrison crowned 50 years of self-denial, unremitting toil, and ceaseless concentration with the development of the first accurate portable timepiece—the marine chronometer. After a 10-week trial of one of his chronometers, it was in error by only 4½ seconds—less than one-tenth of a second in 24 hours. His instruments won for Harrison a prize of £20,000 offered by the British Government for development of a method to determine accurately longitude at sea. With Harrison's chronometer, longitude could be obtained from the difference in time measured from a standard meridian.

By 1800, Britain was the world's leading watch- and clock-making country, and its artisans were supreme masters of their craft. Tradition and individual craftsmanship, however, were insufficient to sustain the industry permanently. By 1850, the craftsmen's apathy toward the American system [1] of making timepieces from interchangeable parts manufactured by machinery was beginning to result in the progressive decline of the English industry, and some of the most skillful artisans were emigrating to other countries. By 1900, the industry could no longer meet domestic requirements and the United Kingdom was importing considerable numbers of watches and clocks from Switzerland, France, and Germany.

During World War I, the United Kingdom met essential requirements for timepieces by supplementing domestic production with Swiss imports. Following the war, the British industry continued to decline, and by 1935 the United Kingdom was importing approximately 5,000,000 clocks annually. At that time efforts were made to revive the industry. Several new clock factories were established by substantial concerns which believed that they had sufficient resources to withstand the foreign competition that was expected to be directed at them. However, the severity of this competition was much greater than anticipated. Prices of German clocks were reduced by more than 50 percent, and within 5 years some of the new firms were obliged to go out of business.

United Kingdom's imports and exports of watches, clocks, and parts, 1938 and 1947–48

[Quantity in thousands of units, value in thousands of U. S. dollars]

Item	Imports						Exports					
	1938 [1]		1947		1948		1938 [1]		1947		1948	
	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value	Quantity	Value
Watches	7,548	6,517	1,333	4,672	1,519	5,072	214	284	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Watch movements	554	1,181	295	1,361	352	1,712	19	66	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Clocks	4,153	2,099	853	1,577	1,141	2,197	105	370	532	2,495	849	3,270
Clock movements	837	794	14	67	24	112	14	40	(2)	(2)	(2)	(2)
Watch and clock parts	(3)	567	(3)	1,437	(3)	2,257	(3)	370	(3)	2,765	(3)	2,623
Total value	-------	12,058	-------	9,114	-------	11,350	-------	1,230	-------	[4] 5,260	-------	[5] 5,893

[1] In 1938 reexports of imported watch and clock products amounted to $785,420 and consisted of 196,674 watches valued at $307,910; 18,838 watch movements valued at $63,570; 50,566 clocks valued at $84,590; 6,631 clock movements valued at $11,660; and watch and clock parts valued at $317,690.
[2] Included in watch and clock parts.
[3] Quantity not reported.
[4] Includes reexports of imported merchandise valued at $637,830.
[5] Includes reexports of imported merchandise valued at $550,280.
SOURCE: Accounts Relating to Trade and Navigation of the United Kingdom.

Germany appreciated the importance of a horological industry to the war potential of a nation, and undoubtedly the policy of undercutting pursued in the British market was motivated largely by military considerations.[2] During that period, German manufacturers received Government subsidies on exports to the United Kingdom ranging from 25 to 40 percent of production costs.

The fall of France in World War II and the subsequent cutting off of trade with Switzerland resulted in an acute shortage of precision timing instruments needed by the British military establishment. Some relief was obtained by imports from the United States, but after 1941 the United States own requirements sharply curtailed supplies from this source. The then existing British industry was too small for expansion on a mass-production scale. The United Kingdom was of necessity obliged to start from the primary stages of industrial tooling and labor training and produce as best it could the timing devices essential in modern military and civilian activities.

GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE TO THE WATCH AND CLOCK INDUSTRY

At the close of the war, the British Government decided that the necessities of national defense made imperative the continued development of the domestic watch and clock industry. On October 16, 1945, Sir Stafford Cripps, then president of the board of trade, asked the House of Commons for a vote of credit for assistance to the industry. The vote was agreed to, and a government credit of £320,000 (approximately US$1,300,000 at the then existing exchange rate) was established. Provision was also made to increase this amount to £1,000,000, should additional funds be needed.

In commenting on this action, the Manchester Guardian on October 18, 1945, stated that "Britain has now as a result of the successful production of watches and instruments during the war a national capital asset of equipment, skill, and experience which would be wasted unless some encouragement is given to its use for commercial ventures. To maintain a body of trained instrument makers and a basis for research in this field is desired, both for reasons of future defense and for the sake of precision standards in British industry generally."

The Government at once made available £200,000 for the establishment of a National Horological College at London. This college was opened in 1947 and provides facilities for training essential technicians. The remaining £120,000 was used to encourage the establishment of watch and clock factories in distressed areas of Scotland and Wales.[3]

Under this phase of the government's aid program, fully equipped plants are leased to selected manufacturers for 5 years at an annual rental of 4 percent of their value—half the usual rate—with an option to purchase at the end of the period at prices then prevailing. As some equipment costs have risen by more than 300 percent over prewar levels, the offer of plants to users 5 years hence at current market prices eliminates the possibility of the industry being burdened with inflated capital charges, should equipment costs decline.

All firms taking advantage of these benefits are required to make full use of plant facilities, to undertake research development, and to take all possible steps to reduce costs in order that their products may become competitive as rapidly as possible. Several factories at Dundee, Glasgow, and Swansea are now operating under this system.

COLLABORATION WITH THE SWISS WATCH INDUSTRY

One of the most urgent problems facing the British was that of obtaining certain highly specialized watchmaking machines that were available only in Switzerland but which the Swiss refused to export, with the idea of protecting their own watch industry. However, when it became apparent that the British Government was determined to expand domestic production of watches, the Swiss realized that the British precision machine-tool industry could eventually supply the required machines. This would be possible because the decision was based on the necessities of national defense and initial capital costs were not, therefore, a controlling factor.

Under the circumstances, the Swiss felt that it would be to their best interest to collaborate with the British, and, as a result negotiations took place between representatives of the watch industries of both countries. An agreement was signed March 12, 1946, under which the Swiss agreed to make available, on a rental basis and under certain conditions, the special machines which the British needed. However, the decision as to whether a particular British manufacturer would receive such machines remained expressly with the Swiss, who also have the right to inspect the British factories to see that the machines are being operated according to Swiss methods. The Swiss also agreed to furnish to the British jewel bearings and certain watch parts. The British established acceptable import quotas for Swiss watches and movements at increased maximum prices.[4] Furthermore, the

[1] About 1800, the American inventor Eli Whitney, realizing the limitations of handicraft production, developed the idea of making mechanical devices from accurate interchangeable parts produced by machinery. In 1807, a New England clockmaker, Eli Terry, adopted this revolutionary principle and within a short time had reduced production costs by more than 75 percent. In the late 1840's, at Waltham, Mass., Aaron L. Dennison applied Whitney's idea to the manufacture of watches. British failure to accept the new method of manufacture at this vital transition stage is ironical, as an English clockmaker, Henry Hindley, is credited with making and using the first jig, a fundamental device in machine operations. Also, Eli Terry was an English clockmaker who had emigrated to Connecticut. The Swiss adopted the American system of watchmaking in the 1880's.

[2] Germany's watch and clock industry made important contributions to that country's war effort in World War II. One factory employing 2,800 workers produced more than 5,000,000 88-millimeter AA mechanical time fuzes and 15,000,000 20-millimeter point detonating self-destroying fuzes, in addition to supplying several types of timepieces required by the armed forces.

[3] Subsidies paid by the Exchequer to the watch and clock industry during the period July 1, 1946, through June 30, 1949, were as follows (expressed in United States currency): $310,000 in 1946–47; $730,000 in 1947–48; and $590,000 in 1948–49.

[4] Following devaluation of the pound, the British Board of Trade agreed to sanction the import of Swiss watches on a numerical basis instead of by value so that the same number of Swiss watches could be imported irrespective of their now-greater cost.

British agreed that Swiss principles regarding control of output would be applied to the British use of Swiss machines.

The official Swiss announcement on the agreement stated that the Swiss Federal Council was convinced that the evolution of the British watch industry could not be prevented, and that it would be better for Switzerland to collaborate with the British industry than to permit it to develop independently.

DESCRIPTION OF THE PRESENT INDUSTRY

Approximately 70 firms are now producing watches and clocks in the United Kingdom, of which about 12 can be classed as large. The leading manufacturer employs more than 50 percent of the workers in the entire industry and accounts for nearly 60 percent of total output. To achieve efficient mass production, this company has integrated a number of specialist units into an organization which is as nearly self-contained as possible. The firm controls 13 large factories and several smaller units. Each factory specializes on either a single finished product or a related group of component parts.

This type of organization is designed to reduce costs to a minimum through mass production based on an intensive division of labor and on the use of a large number of specialized machines—a system that has been highly successful in Switzerland. It is understood that several other firms in the British watch and clock industry are being organized along similar lines.

Approximately 21,000 men and 14,000 women are employed in the industry, an increase of more than 31,000 workers over 1938, when total employment was less than 4,000. The average wage (as of August 1949) is 30 cents an hour for a 44-hour week, an increase of about 35 percent over the prewar average. A considerable number of youths are employed at a starting wage of 22 cents an hour. Most firms grant a 2-week vacation with pay each year. Unemployment has been slight and has been due primarily to temporary stoppages resulting from material shortages. The number of home workers in the industry is estimated to be extremely small.

PRODUCTION

Production of watches in 1948 was estimated at 580,000 units, of which 200,000 were entirely of British manufacture, while some imported components were used in the others. Production of clocks was 2,700,000 units, 2,000,000 of which were alarm clocks. All types of watches and clocks are being produced in a wide variety of styles. Clock cases are made of plastics and glass, as well as of wood and metal. One firm has developed a magnetic escapement for clocks which is said to make clocks silent, more accurate, and cheaper to produce.

It is expected that by 1950 annual production of clocks will exceed 7,000,000 units, and that this rate of output will be sufficient to meet domestic requirements and leave an exportable surplus of some 3,000,000 clocks. It is estimated that annnual clock production by types will be as follows: Alarm, 4,000,000; half-hour striking, 400,000; chiming, 150,000; 30-hour, 500,000; and electric, 2,000,000.

Because of labor-training problems and the difficulties entailed in obtaining certain machinery, a corresponding increase in watch production will require a longer time. However, the National Horological College should eventually provide the technical personnel needed to design watches, and the machines leased from the Swiss will assist materially in solving the machinery problem.

At present the shortage of certain raw materials and component parts is a problem. Some special types of brass and steel are allocated to manufacturers in ratio to the amount of their production which they export. Several firms have installed plants to manufacture jewel bearings, mainsprings, hairsprings, and small screws. Ample quantities of these items should soon be available.

PRICES AND DISTRIBUTION

Although prices in the domestic market are subject to strict Government control, the retail prices of timepieces in the United Kingdom are high and are subject to a purchase tax of 33⅓ percent of the wholesale value. Alarm clocks are priced from $6 to $15 and electric clocks from $10 to $50, depending on the type and quality of the case.

Traditional outlets for watches and clocks are some 7,000 retail jewelers. However, chain stores are now selling a considerable number of alarm clocks, and many electrical contractors are selling electric clocks. Most of the leading manufacturers arrange window displays in the stores handling their products. Although advertising is limited by the paper and newsprint shortages, the industry has expressed slight concern over this, as well as other marketing problems, because it can readily sell in the domestic market just about every timepiece that can be produced.

IMPORTS

Prior to World War II, annual imports were approximately 7,000,000 watches and watch movements and 5,000,000 clocks and clock movements. Switzerland was the principal supplier of watches and Germany and France supplied most of the clocks. In 1948, imports of watches and movements declined by 77 percent from 1938 and imports of clocks by 73 percent. Only 24,119 clock movements were imported in 1948, compared with 836,710 in 1938. Switzerland supplied most of the watches and movements and 50 percent of the watch parts. The United States supplied 40 percent of the watch parts. Switzerland and France were principal sources of imports of clocks and parts.

In view of the British Government's program for developing the domestic industry and of its general policy of limiting imports, it is probable that imports of timepieces will continue to decline. As a result of the quota provisions of the agreement of March 17, 1946, with Switzerland, that country will undoubtedly continue to supply most of Britain's imports of horological products.

Imports of alarm clocks valued at not more than 12 shillings[5] each are subject to an import duty of 25 percent ad valorem, or 4 shillings each, whichever is the greater. British Empire countries receive a preferential rate of 16⅔ percent or 2 shillings 8 pence[6] each, whichever is the greater. Imports of all other clocks, watches, and parts are subject to an import duty of 33⅓ percent ad valorem, except imports from Empire countries, which receive a preferential rate of 22⅔ percent ad valorem. Imported watches and clocks are also subject to the purchase tax of 33⅓ percent of the wholesale value.

United Kingdom imports and exports of watch and clock products in 1938 and 1947–48 are given in the table on page 4.

EXPORTS

In 1938 the United Kingdom exported domestically manufactured watch and clock products valued at $506,850; in 1948 such exports amounted to $5,346,840 and consisted of clocks valued at $3,270,300 and watch and clock parts valued at $2,076,540. Most of the 1948 exports were to countries in the sterling area.

The Government is placing great emphasis on increasing exports of timepieces as a means of obtaining foreign exchange. Each manufacturer is assigned an individual export quota and, as previously stated, is allocated scarce materials in ratio to his success in meeting his quotas. To meet foreign competition and achieve export goals, some manufacturers have reduced export prices below cost. With export quotas made and materials assured, it is then possible to make up the loss in the domestic market.

CONCLUSION

It will probably be several years before British domestic demand for watches and clocks is satisfied. During the war, few timepieces were available for civilian purchase and use, and a large replacement demand exists which cannot soon be filled under the current policy of reducing imports and increasing exports.

The continued success of the United Kingdom's export program is dependent primarily upon further increases in production. However, increased foreign competition or the imposition of prohibitive import tariffs and other restrictions by importing countries would tend to limit British exports of watches and clocks.

[5] One shilling is equal to 14 cents, United States currency.

[6] One penny is equal to 1.17 cents United States currency.

Rural Electrification

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRED MARSHALL

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of the Members of the House of Representatives an article by Wilfrid Parsons, S. J., which appeared in America, the weekly review, on December 3, 1949.

Like Father Parsons, many Members may not be aware of the very fine record that has been made by REA in bringing electricity to the American farm. It is a record that Mr. Claude Wickard and his associates in REA and in the Department of Agriculture can well be proud of.

WASHINGTON FRONT

After a recent visit from a former student of mine, now an employee of the Rural Electrification Administration, it occurred to me that we had there a very good example of the "welfare state" in action. Accordingly, I procured a kit of material which that agency has prepared for public information. Since few city people are even aware of the agency, still less of how it works, some of my urban readers may be interested.

When the Rural Electrification Act was passed in 1936, less than 11 percent of the country's farms had electricity wired into them. Farm work was muscle work, or at best gas-engine work; lighting was by oil lamp; housework was done by hand. In 1949, more than 78 percent of the farms have electricity, and I have before me a list of 22 farm-home and 37 field-and-barn appliances run by electricity, which are now most commonly used by "electrified" farmers. Formerly, the utility companies did not find it profitable to join the farms by wire, or, if they did, the price per kilowatt-hour was too exorbitant for all but a few of the most prosperous farm families. Cheaper distribution makes the difference.

Not by any means all the difference, however. Nearly 60 percent of all the farms electrified since 1936 get service from REA-

financed facilities. For REA does not build; it only finances. Generating plants and lines are built by the borrowers themselves, with money loaned by REA at low-interest rates and long terms of payment.

Now the interesting point about all this is that the vast majority of the borrowers and users are farm cooperatives, in most instances formed directly for this purpose. These co-ops follow the classical form; one vote for each member, and distribution of savings back to members each year. Borrowers own a million miles of line, serving 3,000,000 consumers. They either generate their own power, or buy it wholesale.

Since its foundation, REA has loaned an aggregate of $1,105,876,987; it has received $78,000,000 in interest, and $106,000,000 in repaid principal. Less than 1 percent of borrowers are in arrears. One interesting thing is that within 30 years or so, REA will go out of business, since by then the borrowers will have 100 percent equity, and REA will have all its money back—unless, of course, new forms of electrical power are invented meanwhile.

This is, of course, a tremendous economic revolution, which has profited the utilities, the appliance manufacturers and the farmers, not to speak of the United States Treasury, which will earn a handsome profit in interest. It is, also, still private corporate enterprise, of the cooperative type. But it is still more tremendous social revolution. Few city people can realize what a social change has been operated on the farms by that very electricity which they have always taken for granted. That would merit a separate essay by itself.

WILFRID PARSONS.

American Income, Its Sources and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the first article on American Income, Its Sources and Distribution, by Justus L. Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., former Republican State chairman of Illinois and one of the ablest political economists of our State:

I. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION

What the future has in store greatly concerns us. Not all people agree, neither do the experts produce the same conclusions.

Up in Wisconsin there is a manufacturing company whose chief line of production supplies the hospitals of the Nation. They have been greatly concerned because the hospital needs have been growing faster than the income of these institutions. They do not want to reduce the number of their workers because hospitals receive insufficient gifts to pay for goods needed.

This concern, the Hamilton Manufacturing Co., issues a bulletin of information designated "Hi-Lites." It is worthy of attention and analysis and is here presented with full credit to E. P. Hamilton, president of said corporation.

HOW IS INCOME DISTRIBUTED?

Preachers and teachers are among America's foremost opinion molders. Enjoying this place of influence, as they do, should carry a deep responsibility in presenting true facts. Unfortunately, some facts they present are inaccurate and is resulting today in a great deal of harm to our American way of life.

I don't think these groups are deliberately falsifying actual facts. Some no doubt are, because among preachers and teachers, we have some persons who want to twist facts around, just as this is being done by some persons in any group. Fortunately, the number is small and they account for only a very small part of the damage being done.

The real cause for the damage which results from wrong information is because of the lack of knowing what the true facts are. If preachers and teachers, who are among the best read people in our country, have incorrect facts, is it any wonder that the vast majority of our citizens are misinformed? Dr. Claude Robinson, president of the Opinion Research Corp., conducted a poll in American communities of over 2,500 population, among representatives of the clergy and teaching profession, on the subject of how American income was distributed. The clergymen were from all denominations and the teachers were social science teachers. Three questions were asked on this subject of income distribution—

(a) Wages and salaries.
(b) Dividends and interest.
(c) Rents.

In each case the persons interviewed were asked, "What portion of this form of income goes to persons whose total income is under $5,000 per year, and what portion goes to persons with incomes of over $5,000 per year?"

WAGES AND SALARIES

The average of the answers received showed that 66 percent of wages and salaries paid went to those with income under $5,000 and 34 percent to those with income over $5,000 per year.

This result was in great variance to the true facts. What are the true facts, and what is the source giving out these facts? The source of the facts I have taken from a pamphlet entitled, "The National Income and Its Distribution," published by Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University. Father Keller's source was from figures published by the United States Department of Commerce and the United States Treasury Department. Here are the true facts.

Instead of those with incomes of under $5,000 per year receiving 66 percent of all wages and salaries paid (as Opinion Research showed preachers and teachers thought to be true), 89.8 percent was the correct figure. Likewise, instead of those with incomes over $5,000 per year receiving 34 percent of the national income, they received only 10.1 percent of the national income from these sources.

An interesting thing to note at this point is that those with incomes of over $5,000 per year who receive 10.1 percent of the national income, have only 5.5 percent left after paying taxes. This means that income taxes take nearly half of this total income. It should be obvious that if all the income in excess of $5,000 was confiscated from those receiving more than $5,000 per year, it could not even make a dent in the taxes paid by those receiving less than $5,000 per year.

DIVIDENDS AND INTEREST

Now, let's take a look at dividends paid by corporations and interest paid on bonds, bank deposits, insurance premiums, building and loan associations, and so forth. Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers thought that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year received 29 percent of interest and dividend payments, and that those with incomes of over $5,000 per year received 71 percent.

Again, the true facts are far from what these preachers and teachers thought. Father Keller points out that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year actually receive 69.4 percent, not 29 percent and those with incomes of over $5,000 receive only 30.6 percent of all income received from these sources, not 71 percent. Also, of this 30.6 percent after taxes, those with incomes of over $5,000 per year have only 17.3 percent left.

Now, dividends and interest are the foundation of our capitalistic or free-enterprise system. They represent profit or a return on an investment that was made out of savings, savings that were the result of somebody spending less than they received, even possibly denying themselves some pleasure in order to create them. Is a profit disgraceful? Some, today, seem to think it is. Then let it also be understood that the overwhelming bulk of this disgrace, 69.4 percent of it, goes to those with incomes of less than $5,000 per year.

RENTS

Now let us consider that individual whom many consider an obnoxious character, namely, the landlord, who collects the rents.

Dr. Robinson's preachers and teachers think that people with incomes of over $5,000 per year receive 70 percent of all the rents collected in the country, and that those with incomes of under $5,000 per year receive 30 percent of these rentals.

What are the real facts? Again, Father Keller's survey indicates that all of the rentals collected in the country, 83.1 percent is collected by persons with incomes of under $5,000 per year, and only 16.9 percent is collected by those with incomes of over $5,000 per year. Again after taxes the 16.9 percent collected by those having incomes of over $5,000 per year have 9.6 percent remaining.

In most countries being a landlord is the habit of a few, but in these United States it is the habit of millions.

Next Sunday the balance of the article of Mr. Hamilton will appear. It presents an analysis of "What has happened" to the income groups in America.

Californian Wants TVA There

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CECIL F. WHITE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WHITE of California. Mr. Speaker, I quote below a letter which reveals the typical attitude of the people of California on Federal development and distribution of electric power. My people feel that since the flow of mountain streams belongs to all the people there is no reason why the electricity created by these streams should be turned over to the private power interests and sold back to the people at a profit.

The letter speaks for itself:

MORRO BAY, CALIF., *January 15, 1950.*
Congressman CECIL F. WHITE,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. WHITE: I read the enclosed clipping in the Fresno Bee regarding your bill to have the Federal Government build dams on the Kings River to generate electricity, and I was wondering what, if anything an ordinary citizen can do to help along this project. I live in Morro Bay, Calif., and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. have control of

this district and the people are at their mercy. They raised the rates in November and they are getting beyond the limit of the person of moderate means.

A friend from Chattanooga, Tenn., has told me of the wonderful things that have been done there since the TVA went in, because of the low rates of electricity. Why can't we have the same advantages, as the taxpayers pay for the dams that create these projects?

Respectfully.

Egg and Grain Price Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, many Members of the House have spoken of the low price of eggs and the high price of grain. They will be interested in the following letter to me from the Department of Agriculture dated January 25, 1950:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.
Hon. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: This is in reply to your letter of December 27, 1949, and newspaper clipping from the Lowell Sun regarding the egg price situation.

In recent weeks farm sales of eggs throughout the Nation expanded tremendously as a result of a relatively large pullet flock and exceedingly favorable weather conditions. Market prices declined substantially due to this increased production of eggs. Moreover, the egg driers in the Midwest who were cooperating under the egg price-support program were offered more eggs than they could use in their plants, with the result that in many communities egg prices declined below the certified price of 35 cents which driers were required to pay. The Department seriously considered this problem and came to the conclusion that the only alternative would have been to inaugurate a comprehensive purchase program for both frozen and shell eggs in addition to dried-egg purchases. Since the support program for 1949 terminated on December 31, 1949, it did not appear advisable to broaden the program so late in the year and for such a relatively short period of time. As a result, the egg market during December sought lower levels based upon supply and demand conditions.

Under the provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949, eggs and poultry products are in a large group of commodities for which price support is nonmandatory. The law requires that if any of these products are supported, the support price may not exceed 90 percent of parity. The law sets forth eight factors which are to be considered in determining whether price-support operations shall be undertaken and in determining the level of such support. After full consideration of these eight factors, it was decided to announce the support of egg prices in 1950 at a national annual average producer price of 37 cents per dozen. In order to help achieve this objective, the Department announced on December 30, 1949, that it would buy dried eggs from midwestern processing plants that would agree to pay farmers an average of 25 cents at the farm, or 27 cents at the drying plant. Copies of three press releases and a background statement which explains the price-support program in detail are enclosed.

Laying flocks have not yet reached their peak in production, and in many cases sales of eggs at this time of year probably do not completely offset feed costs. However, it is expected that producers who follow good poultry husbandry practices will begin to show some returns over feed costs as their flocks come into full production during the next month or so. As was indicated in the press release of December 21, poultrymen are urged to give careful consideration to their management practices and adopt those practices that lead to the greatest possible efficiency in production and marketing. Such practices will include careful culling and efficient use of feed.

Although corn and wheat are supported at 90 percent of parity, oats, sorghum, and barley are supported at 70 to 72 percent of parity. It should also be remembered that the market prices of some of these grains are not always at their respective support levels because all farmers do not make use of the price-support programs. During December the average percentage of parity received for the grains used in poultry feed was about 75 percent of parity. This is the same level, in terms of parity, as is the announced price-support level on eggs.

Sincerely yours,
K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Assistant Secretary.

If This Editor Went to Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am herewith including the following newspaper article from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat in which Charles L. Blanton, Jr., managing editor of one of the outstanding newspapers in southeast Missouri, gives his views on some of the problems which are confronting this Congress:

IF THIS EDITOR WENT TO CONGRESS

(C. L. Blanton, Jr., managing editor of the Sikeston (Mo.) Daily Standard, views the national scene and outlines what he would do in a legislative way to correct current errors and omissions. He frankly concludes that he would "serve only one term in any legislative body in which we attempted to enact our views into law.")

Today we feel as though we were going to Congress and will set down for our readers' perusal legislation we would enact if we were all-powerful in the halls of the lawmaking bodies.

If we were in Washington today the first thing to fight on our calendar would be any change in the Taft-Hartley labor law. Our discussion with individual laboring men has convinced us that in spite of the leaders' hue and cry, the individual feels that the Taft-Hartley law is his sole protection from labor goons.

We would see that Government costs were cut, with a major reduction in the number of Federal employees, a reduction of funds for aiding foreign countries, a reduction in funds for farm subsidies; in fact, we would be tempted to fight for across-the-board cuts in all Government departments.

We would reduce taxes immediately regardless of whether the budget was balanced or not. We would repeal the so-called luxury or excise tax imposed as a wartime measure. We would increase the taxes on liquors and cigarettes. If the income-tax law should be rewritten, we would continue the exemptions for contributions, medical expenses, dependents, etc., and apply a reduction to the middle income group first. We would expand the social-security program to include everyone.

We would approve an increase for benefits from social security if the recipient made a proportionate contribution.

We would not favor a compulsory health program applicable to individuals but would approve contributions to States to assist cities and counties.

We would not prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages so long as the statements contained in the advertisements were truthful.

We would not support the return of prohibition.

We would favor military training.

We would penalize the Department of Justice for every charge brought against big business or small business that it was unable to substantiate in courts.

We believe that a majority of Government authority and expense should be in the hands of the State of Missouri or the individual State.

We are sincerely afraid of the present trend and power and growth of non-tax-paying consumer cooperatives.

We would not support the proposed Civil Rights or Fair Employment Acts.

If we could transfer all power to the State legislature we would prohibit drunkards and seniles to the State mental hospitals. If it were not the obligation of the children to help the seniles, we would have a separate institution for them exclusively.

We would have a statute enacted covering the case of Dr. Hermann N. Sander, or like cases, on the merciful removal of suffering patients with incurable diseases provided the requests were made and substantiated by the patient and his or her husband, wife, and children.

We would provide for sterilization of all child sex offenders upon the first offense. We do not wait for two murders.

We would make it mandatory that all patrons of all theaters and picture shows receive the return of their price of admission if they were unable to find scenes in the moving picture or on the stage which are shown in the newspaper ads, billboards, and placards.

And, our final pet peeve—we would ask the legislature to reenact the good-roads-and-gas-tax-increase bill ex-Gov. Lloyd Stark and his committee originally submitted, giving to the highway department 2 cents to be spent as they are now spending, 1 cent to be spent on rural roads by the State Highway Department, and 1 cent to be spent on streets in cities, towns, and villages by the highway department.

We are confident we would serve only one term in any legislative body in which we attempted to enact our views into law.

Friendship, Trade, and Navigation Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, much has been said in the past on the partition of Ireland and raising the status of the representation between the United States and Ireland.

Today I would like to congratulate the State Department on its wisdom and prudence in arranging the treaty of friendship between the United States and Ireland which was signed on January 21, 1950. This treaty registers, for the first time, in writing, the strong feeling of amity and, indeed, almost a devotion which exists between our two countries. I trust that from it will spring a great good and that our State Department will show further interest in Ireland by using its influence to end the unhappy state of partition which still exists in the country to which we are now pledged in friendship. This treaty deeply recognizes the close association between the people of the United States and Ireland.

The Coal Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, on three different occasions I have written the President of the United States asking that he take action in connection with the critical coal shortage which is paralyzing the Nation. I have received telegrams and letters from people in Aberdeen, Sioux Falls, and Vermillion, S. Dak., explaining to me that the shortage of coal has reached emergency conditions.

In Aberdeen there was not enough coal last week to operate the schools, and there was a shortage in the hospitals. In Sioux Falls and Vermillion rail service had been seriously impaired.

In the last few days a serious blizzard has swept South Dakota sending the temperatures to lower than 20° below zero in many parts of the State. It is obvious that there is a critical need for coal at this time. There is already serious suffering and there will be more if this coal shortage continues for any length of time.

Perhaps the President, enjoying the June-in-January weather now prevailing in Washington, is unaware of the predicament out in the Middle West where people are cold and where schools are closing and trains are not running because of the failure of the miners to provide a sufficient supply of fuel for them.

Mr. Speaker, I tell you the situation has already passed the emergency stage in South Dakota. It is now in the critical stage. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, why should one man be allowed to tie up the transportation and economy and jeopardize the health and welfare of thousands of people. That is what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I said one man is allowing this. I should say two men. One is the head of the miners and the other, upon whose shoulders there is an even more grave responsibility, is the President of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, the Bureau of Mines yesterday reported that the coal shortage had reached an emergency stage. The Bureau of Mines should be in a position to know the effects of the shortage on a Nation-wide basis.

The Taft-Hartley law clearly gives the President the authority to step in and correct this situation when strikes create a national emergency. I say that that national emergency is now at hand—and has been—for several days. The time has long passed for action.

This is no time for politics. If it is, then the President is playing politics with the health and welfare of a great Nation. The people stranded in chilly homes on the farms and in the towns of South Dakota are in no mood for a game of politics. They are demanding action. I believe they have a right to expect their Chief Executive to take this action.

The reason none has been forthcoming is simple. The President does not want to use this law because a Republican Congress wrote it. But I say the people do not care what kind of a Congress wrote the law. It is on the books—the administration refused to repeal it at the last session of the Congress—and the people want relief from their inconvenience and suffering.

Mr. Speaker, the President has the power to stop this foolish, stubborn obstruction. I suggest once again that he use it. There is no excuse. The President can look at the weather report from South Dakota if he wants a convincing answer to his question if the report from the Bureau of Mines is not enough to convince him to use the injunction provisions of the Taft-Hartley law.

Distribution of Relief in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Communist Government of Poland has taken control of Caritas, the chief charitable organization of the Roman Catholic Church in this country, the Polish Press Agency has announced.

Caritas operates orphanages and other institutions in Poland.

The Communist government says that those in charge of Caritas will be jailed.

The Red determination to halt any display of faith has reached the point where even the abodes of homeless waifs are to be, not supervised, but controlled by the Moscow-trained Communists most of whom are not Polish by nationality but are recognized as the Government of Poland

We have seen the present alien rulers of Poland join hands with Soviet Russia in a vicious campaign of vilification of the United States, its Government, and its democratic institutions.

We have seen the faithful of all creeds kept from church and prevented from any demonstration of faith.

I ask that the Secretary of State protest to the present so-called leaders of Poland against this latest despicable show of authority in taking from its rightful supervisors the organization that has so ably directed the distribution of supplies received from the American relief to Poland and American Catholics and that the care and guidance of the orphanages be given back to those who are trained and faithful to the proper rearing of the youngsters who are parentless and homeless.

Cars for War Amputees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, all of us in the routine of our congressional work receive sincere and sometimes very touching letters. I want to read one I received this morning because the writer, who is an amputee of World War II, so well represents the cheerful attitude and the fine outlook on life I have always found among those men who gave so much for you and me. He writes:

DEAR MRS. ROGERS: I am an arm amputee so I hope you will forgive my handwriting. I have three and a half fingers left on my left hand, so I know you will pardon me in my efforts to write legibly enough for you to read this letter.

I wrote to you once before, in 1947, in regard to automobiles for men who lost an arm in World War II. I received your most kind reply and I wish to thank you very much for your efforts to grant us wounded veterans a $1,600 car. You certainly don't give up. I believe anyone else would have given up long ago. I've written countless letters to other Congressmen and in their replies they were all for it. As you know, our honorable President vetoed said bill. Needless to say, we arm amputees were disappointed; I've hoped for the past 2 years we would receive the same as the boys who lost legs. One loss is as bad as the other.

I've a car now, 1940 vintage, which is always in need of repair. I keep it nice, because I take my wife and two small children riding every Sunday. I sure thought last October I'd have a new car. When the car bill was vetoed we were a sad lot indeed. However, I think I'm a lucky guy, don't you? I have a swell wife, two small kids, I live in a free country, and I have people like you looking after us ex-servicemen who were wounded.

I've heard your name mentioned so often in veterans' groups and am happy to say they are all for you. They, the veterans, know they aren't forgotten when people like yourself see to it that they aren't.

I received my DAV paper in today's mail, and I saw a bill, H. R. 6565, entered by Mrs. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS (Republican, Massachusetts). I smiled to myself, and thought, boy, Mrs. ROGERS will never give up. How can we fail. I think you will win this time Mrs. ROGERS, as you don't take defeat. I think the honorable President will pass it this time.

May I say again, Mrs. ROGERS, thank you and may God bless you and yours.

Sincerely yours,

———.

A Vote Against House Resolution 133 Not a Vote for FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL C. JONES
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, since many Members through their remarks made on the floor of the House have apparently sought to confuse the issue and have attempted to interpret the recent vote on House Resolution 133 as having placed some Members on record as being opposed to or favoring certain pending legislation, I would like to take this opportunity to state my position.

Herewith is the current release of a weekly newspaper article which I have prepared and which will appear this week in most of the newspapers published in the Tenth Congressional District in southeast Missouri:

REPORT FROM WASHINGTON
(By PAUL C. JONES, Representative in Congress, Tenth Missouri District)

Now that one of the most controversial nonlegislative issues is out of the way, perhaps the House can get down to work and begin dealing with some of the real legislative problems that face this Congress. On last Friday an overwhelming majority of the membership (236 to 173) reaffirmed the action taken by the House at the opening of the Eighty-first Congress a little more than a year ago when the powerful Rules Committee was relieved of some of its dictatorial powers.

Since 1931 and up until January 1949, the 12-man Rules Committee, with a membership including 8 members of the majority and 4 of the minority, not only served as a traffic director by determining the order in which bills would be considered on the floor, but in addition had the authority, not infrequently used, to exercise a veto power over the action of the regularly constituted legislative committees.

By the practical operation of the powers given to the Rules Committee, any seven members of that committee could block any bill even though it had the unanimous approval of the committee to which any bill or resolution had been referred and which had given detailed study to the legislation.

Last January this procedure was changed by the adoption of what was known as the "21-day rule" which provided that in the event the Committee on Rules failed to report within 21 calendar days any resolution providing for an order of business for the consideration of any bill or resolution favorably reported by a committee of the House, the chairman of the committee which originally recommended the bill or resolution could call up for consideration by the entire membership of the House the resolution which the Committee on Rules failed to report.

Naturally, there were times and occasions when the operation of the Committee on Rules under the old procedure suited the convenience of most of the Members. For instance, if a Member was opposed to some highly controversial bill, he might be relieved of the obligation and the necessity of taking a position on this bill if a majority of the Members of the Rules Committee, being of the same mind, would vote in committee to prevent this bill from reaching the floor.

Despite the fact that the leadership of both parties in the House attempted to make a political issue out of the proposed change, and despite the many different arguments which were advanced by individual Members participating in the debate, it seems to me that the question was based on the principle, "Does the end justify the means?" I can understand and appreciate the position of most of the southerners who in their unalterable opposition to any FEPC legislation, and who realizing that if the dictatorial powers could be restored to the Rules Committee that the FEPC bill would not come up for a vote in the House at this session, were willing to take this drastic action. There is no question in my mind but that an overwhelming majority of those who voted for this change were influenced entirely by the FEPC legislation. Voting on the bill did not follow party lines since 85 Democrats, practically all of them from the extreme South, joined 98 Republicans in their unsuccessful attempt to change the rules. Likewise, despite the urgent pleading of their leadership, some 64 Republicans joined with 171 Democrats in defeating this proposed change.

I think Speaker RAYBURN, who relinquished his chair to come down on the floor of the House to discuss this issue, stated the proposition very clearly when he said: "There is a lot of talk here about civil rights being involved in this matter. As far as I am concerned there is no element of the civil-rights program involved in the rules as they exist today and as, in my opinion, they should exist. The rules of a legislative body should be such at all times as to allow the majority of a legislative body to work its will. Under our present set-up, I am sorry to say, that is not the case in many instances.

"When a legislative committee of the House of Representatives has labored long and honestly, and by overwhelming majority brings in a bill and reports it to the House, and it asks for the privilege of being granted the right to try their case before the elected representatives of the people of the United States, there should be something in the rules of the House, regardless of one other committee which is not a legislative committee, allowing the House to work its will on that bill.

"That is the issue here, and I do trust that the membership of the House in their wisdom will leave the rules of the House as they are so that a majority of the House of Representatives on any and all occasions may have the opportunity to register its will."

While I did not join those who voted for the change in the rule, it has been my intention and I have announced that I do not expect to support the proposed FEPC legislation which will now come upon the floor of the House for a vote of the entire membership. In this same connection I think that, generally speaking, southern Members have placed too much emphasis upon the racial question involved in this legislation and have overlooked or minimized many of the other more important principles.

American Income, Its Sources and Distribution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, with leave to extend my remarks, I herewith submit the second of a series of articles entitled "American Income, Its Sources and Distribution" by Justice L. Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., former Republican State chairman of Illinois:

II. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES AND DISTRIBUTION

Last Sunday the article reprinted in the Now and Then column concerned itself with the sources of income, it covered wages and salaries, dividends and interest, and rents, and gave us some insight into its distribution.

Today, we present the balance of Mr. Hamilton's bulletin, which analyzes what is happening to the country and who must furnish additional taxes if national programs are extended. The article follows:

WHAT HAS HAPPENED

We constantly hear derogatory references to those in this country who have, or are considered to have, large incomes. Even our highest governmental offices refer to them as economic royalists, princes of privilege, the selfish few, etc. The Government has even published their incomes in the daily press. The figures quoted are, of course, always before taxes. Why don't these figures show the income of these people after income taxes? The reason is that it would not make a good story for those who want to stir up class prejudice in this country.

Father Keller points out that in 1917 persons with incomes of $25,000 or more had, after paying Federal income taxes, received 6.7 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. In 1932, under President Hoover, this same group received 3.4 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. Under President Roosevelt they continued to sink. In 1938 this group received 3 percent; in 1941 they received 2.5 percent; and in 1944 they received 1.3 percent of the national income distributed to individuals. Since 1944 the trend is still downward.

When the national income received by those with incomes of over $25,000 per year shrinks from 6.7 percent in 1917 to 1.3 percent in 1944, which is 80 percent, why do our starry-eyed crystal gazers still keep shouting about the "privileged few"? It apparently is popular to blame all our troubles on a few by making the people of this country think a few persons receive most of our national income. The facts cited above by Father Keller, who got his information from Government sources, makes it clear that the exact opposite is true.

GIFTS DIMINISH

The citizens of this country must realize that up to 10 years ago our colleges, hospitals, research foundations, etc., were built and supported by gifts from persons with incomes of over $25,000 per year. Gifts of this kind contributed in no small way to the advancement of the standard of living we enjoy in this country. Now that this group has been nearly wiped out, those who remain because of high taxes can no longer make these gifts.

The question is, Who is going to make money available in the future for colleges, hospitals, etc., if we are to continue our way of life in America? The answer is that the Government must supply the money.

The next question is, Where will the Government get the money? The answer is, From the people, because that is the Government's only source of revenue.

The next question is, From what group of people will the Government get the money? The answer is, From those people with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. Why is this so? Because persons with incomes of less than $5,000 per year now receive, as shown above, 89.8 percent of all the wages and salaries distributed. This group receives 69.4 percent of all dividends and interest distributed. This group receives 83.1 percent of all rents paid.

BIG BUSINESS

Another popular slogan our crystal gazers like to harp on is big business. Who actually owns big business? The magazine, Trusts and Estates, recently pointed out the result of a survey of 120 of our biggest United States manufacturing companies.

These 120 companies were owned by 6,126,716 stockholders. These same companies had 4,464,000 employees. These companies had 40 percent more stockholders than they had employees.

Sixty-two of these one hundred and twenty companies were able to supply a break-down of their stockholders, with this result:

(a) Twenty-four companies reported that no individual owned more than 1 percent of the stock.

(b) Five out of six holders owned 100 shares or less.

(c) About 9 percent of the stockholders, accounting for 41 percent of the stock, were institutions (schools, hospitals, cemeteries, and insurance companies). These institutions in turn represented millions of individuals.

Eighteen million people (one out of every seven United States citizens) own this country's corporations.

American Telephone & Telegraph Co., one of the largest, if not the largest, United States corporation, is owned by 764,000 persons. These people own an average of 30 shares each. The great majority are working people with small incomes. Are they the privileged few?

General Motors is owned by 433,000 people * * * 320,000 own 50 shares or less * * * 140,000 own 10 shares * * * about $600 in the business. Are these the privileged few?

General electric is owned by 249,000 people. United States Steel is owned by 227,000 people. Pennsylvania Railroad is owned by 207,000 people. Radio Corp. of America is owned by 206,000 people. Standard Oil Co. is owned by 200,000 people. Are these the privileged few?

LIFE INSURANCE

In 1948 there were 78,000,000 people who owned life insurance policies. This represents 90 percent of all families in the United States. If the assets of all insurance companies are divided by these 78,000,000 policy holders, we find that $690 is the average individual stake. Thirty-one percent of this $690 individual stake is invested in American business. Dividends and the payment of benefits to beneficiaries is dependent, of course, to a large extent on business profits. Can you picture what could happen if business failed to earn enough profits to show an adequate return on the investments that are made to guarantee life insurance?

Something must be done in this country to awaken the citizens as to what is taking place. This country has gone far along the road to socialism, more so than most persons realize. The greatest factor in this socialistic trend is government spending.

It is considered good politics to talk as if the privileged few will pay for all these securities that our Government officials are sponsoring. The privileged few is a phantom. They no longer exist. The people of this country must understand that from here on in the cost of government must be paid principally by the group with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. They must realize that the only way that their taxes can possibly be lowered is by the Government spending less money, hence collecting less money by taxation.

Those with incomes of under $5,000 per year are the persons who can and must stop the present trend of Government subsidies, Government securities of all kinds, and various other Government spending activities. On this group hinges the future course of America. Their understanding of what has made their standard of living the highest of all countries will determine whether they will continue to enjoy and improve their way of life, or whether they will enjoy the way of life now not enjoyed by the peoples of Europe.

Next Sunday article III will examine how the American worker is getting hurt by the adoption here of European patterns of control.

Odd Fellows Donate Occupational Therapy Building to Veterans' Home of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEROY JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, when I was home during the recent recess of Congress Mrs. Hazel Hannan, of Stockton, told me of a most unusual project that the Odd Fellows, and its affiliated organizations, had carried to completion. This order had raised and donated $244,000 for the construction of an occupational therapy building at the Veterans' Home of California. This institution is located in my district in the beautiful Napa Valley. It provides a home for about 1,200 veterans of our various wars. The operation of this home takes a big financial load off the back of the United States. The National Government recognizes this and does make a contribution of $500 per veteran per year toward the operation of this home. The cost to care for these veterans has risen during the past few years and is now about $1,200 per veteran per year. This institution is administered by Nelson W. Holderman, who was one of the great heroes of the First World War, receiving the Congressional Medal of Honor for his heroic service as second in command of the famous Lost Battalion. Colonel Holderman has made a magnificent record in administering this great institution.

When Mrs. Hannan told me about the project of the Odd Fellows, I thought it was so unique and constructive that I asked her to write me about it so I might place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. When a group of people dig down in their pockets and raise a quarter of a million dollars to take care of veterans, which is the obligation of the National Government, that effort should be an example to others who might be similarly inclined. The purpose which the order had in mind when it raised this fund was also a uniquely constructive one. It was to furnish a facility which would help veterans rehabilitate themselves vocationally. What could be more constructive or humane than to provide a means whereby men who have been injured while in the defense of our country should be provided with an opportunity to overcome their disability and again become useful and self-supporting citizens? Just think of the personal happiness this facility will bring to these veterans, to say nothing of the economic benefits.

The following letter, which I make part of my remarks, explains the matter fully:

CALIFORNIA I. O. O. F. OCCUPATIONAL THERAPY PROJECT FOR THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA,
Stockton, Calif., January 16, 1950.

MR. LEROY JOHNSON,
Congressman, Third District of California, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: At the request of Mrs. Hazel Hannan, of Stockton, Calif., I am writing to you the following information:

At the annual session of the Grand Lodge, I. O. O. F. of California, held in Sacramento, in May 1944, a resolution was adopted, wherein a committee was appointed for the purpose of raising a fund in the amount of $250,000, to be donated to the State Veterans' Home of California, to be used for the construction of an occupational therapy building for use in rehabilitating the veteran members of said home, and to be dedicated to the members of our order who gave their all in World War II.

As chairman of the committee appointed (67 members) we solicited our entire membership of Odd Fellows and Rebekahs throughout the State for free-will contributions. As is the case in all such projects, there was some opposition. But through untiring efforts and constant work of the committee by personal appearance in the lodges and thousands of letters, we finally succeeded in completing the raising of the funds in May of 1948, in the total sum of $244,000, said amount being delivered to the administration in the office of Gov. Earl Warren, on April 20, 1949, at 2:30 p. m., with appropriate ceremonies, pictures, etc. (Governor Warren is a member of the order).

Recently I have been informed that the contract for drawing of the plans and specifications has been awarded to a firm in San Francisco, and as soon as said plans have been completed and accepted, a date will be set for ground breaking, on which occasion many officers and members of both the Odd Fellows and Rebekahs will assemble at the veterans' home to participate in the breaking of ground for said building, then later another occasion will be laying of the cornerstone, and finally will come the great day of dedication. All of which our entire membership are looking forward to with great pleasure.

It will be my pleasure to advise you of the date of each of the above-mentioned occasions, and we shall be very happy to welcome you to be present at any one or all of them.

While it was a very large undertaking for our committee, and all of us worked very hard, we feel gratified that we accomplished our goal.

A large portion of credit for the work done, is due to the untiring and persistent efforts of our sisters, the Rebekahs, for they went into it wholeheartedly and never faltered for a moment. Sister Hazel Hannan, being one of them.

As you may know, our officers of both the Grand Lodge IOOF and the Rebekah Assembly are changed each year. Therefore, due credit goes to each and all of those fine ladies who took up the work, each in turn, and worked untiringly to the final accomplishment.

It will be my pleasure to be present at each of the occasions as stated above, and as chairman of the committee, will be one of the speakers.

If there be any further information you desire, kindly feel free to call upon me for the same.

Sister Hazel Hannan has stated that you desired this information so that you might put it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

This will be greatly appreciated, and when so done, I will be very happy to receive a copy of same.

Thanking you for your interest, and looking forward to seeing you at the Veterans' Home, when we all gather there for the abovementioned occasions, I wish to remain,

Sincerely yours,

WM. V. McCOY,
General Chairman of the Committee.

The Polish Heritage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include a radio address recently given by Prof. Eric P. Kelly, of Dartmouth College, over Station WSPR, in Springfield, Mass., on the Justice for Poland program. The address follows:

THE POLISH HERITAGE

The Polish heritage and its contribution to western civilization is one of the most valuable assets that we possess here in America. For more than a thousand years the Polish people have struggled amidst the most devastating conditions to preserve the rights of a free people, and not only their example but their actions have had a tremendous effect upon us all in preserving our own freedom.

By acting as a buffer state against eastern and despotic civilizations, Poland has in the past saved European civilization from destruction many times. The Polish state repelled more than a dozen Tartar invasions which would have devastated Europe. It turned back the Turks when it seemed at the time that the Ottoman Empire would extend clear to France. It opposed the spread of Nazi Germany by forcing Hitler to fight before he had completed the manufacture of his secret weapons, the atomic bomb among them, and undoubtedly saved England and America thereby from slaughter and destruction.

And yet, although the population of Poland dropped from 35,000,000 to 20,000,000 during the war, the spirit of resistance against despotism is still going on despite the fact that Poland is now ruled by a stooge set-up put in power by Stalin. There is a strong underground in Poland, ready to act at the proper moment—a psychological underground rather than a military underground, for people don't gather in old-fashioned cellars any more to make bombs in any romantic fashion. They are wisely playing the nonresistance game and waiting.

Along with Poland in central Europe are some 200,000,000 other peoples in Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, eastern Germany, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Austria, Rumania, and Yugoslavia simply waiting for a chance to attain their freedom. These peoples, whom the western nations allowed to slip to Stalin's control after Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam, belong to the nations of western civilization. They will never be content to be stooge states under Communist dictatorship.

How will the break come, as it certainly will come? War? Who but Stalin dares prate of war in this atomic age? Who but Stalin uses the threat of war to spread fear throughout the world? Fear of war never prevented it. One must hate war and not fear it if war is to be prevented. No; I think the redeeming of these people from slavery and concentration camps will come about in some other way. Just what that way is is yet to be determined, but I am sure that we have enough brains in America, England, France, and the other western nations to devise some other method.

Poland is the key to peace in Europe. Mr. Raymond Leslie Buell pointed that out a few years ago. It has always been and will always be the keystone of Continental Europe. A partitioned Poland poisoned Europe for nearly 150 years, causing strife on all sides. Hitler signed his own death warrant when he invaded Poland and broke down the barrier against eastern tyranny.

Poland has been a center of democratic thinking since its earliest days. The freedom of the individual to speak, worship, and carry on his own work as he chooses has ever been a passion. If any fault is more noticeable in Poland than in other nations, it has been on the side of individualistic freedom and lack of cohesion in the whole state. Most of the propaganda hurled at Poland in recent years, stemming first from Hitler and then from Stalin, accusing Poland of landlordism and class society has been wholly false. Poland was one of the earliest states in Europe to elect its rulers by vote of its citizens, it has ever been liberal in its attitude toward religion, it has always possessed high ideals of education and justice, and has been a refuge place for many racial groups persecuted elsewhere.

The world will never be safe until Poland regains its liberty again. The great mistake of England and America in allowing Poland to be partitioned and in allowing Stalin to have control there is something that not only smacks of the greatest ingratitude for Poland's tremendous service in the war, but it endangers the life of every inhabitant of the world, since it sets up a heart of discontent and poison in the very center of Europe which may lead to one of the greatest tragedies of all time unless the wrong is righted.

United States Should Not Recognize Communist Regime in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, recent developments in China and the proposals in some quarters that the United States grant recognition to the Communist regime imposed by internal aggression and forced on the Chinese people, make even more pertinent now than when they were given the remarks on this subject by our distinguished colleague the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, before the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York on December 1, 1949:

[Excerpts from the remarks of the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, Member of Congress, Fairfield County, Conn., in a speech to the Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, in New York City on December 1, 1949.]

There is, at the moment, an attempt to prepare American public opinion for the recognition of Communist China. It has also been suggested that the Department of State may set up three legalistic criteria to decide whether or not to recognize the Communist government of China. Yet the Communists cannot even meet these criteria:

1. They are not yet and—pray God—will never be in full control of the territory of China.

2. They cannot be relied upon to discharge their international commitments. This is illustrated most dramatically in their incarceration of Angus Ward, the American Consul General at Mukden. Indeed, there is virtually no evidence that any Communist government feels bound by its word. Moreover, it is clear, beyond peradventure of doubt and by their own admission that Mao Tse Tung and his followers are not agrarian reformers, but are the disciplined agents of Stalin. And it is well known that the Soviet Union has been guilty of repeated breaches of treaties and agreements.

3. The Communist government in China does not represent the free choice of the Chinese people. It has been reliably reported that not more than 3 percent of the Chinese in the territory overrun by the Communist armies actively support the Chinese Communist government. The many millions of refugees from Communist-dominated China testify to the instinctive fear and revulsion which the Chinese people feel toward the Communist state.

But aside from these somewhat soulless tests there are certain unimpeachable State Department precedents.

For instance, we did not recognize the Hitler puppet government in Norway. Acting on the Stimson doctrine of nonrecognition of territories acquired by force, we refused recognition of Japan's puppet government in Manchuria. Woodrow Wilson declined to recognize the revoluntary government of Mexico which took over following the political murder of President Francisco Madero and his Vice President.

Accordingly, refusal by our Government to grant recognition to the Communist regime in China would be in accord with well-established practice.

Some hold the view that we can do business with the Chinese communists. At one time it was also contended that we could do business with Hitler. While there might be some temporary limited commercial gains, recognition would increase the threat to world peace and to American national security, thereby jeopardizing the entire American community on the preservation of which all Americans depend for their prosperity and for their freedom. Communism is by definition and by design opposed to private property and is dedicated to its destruction.

It is argued that the reestablishment of Japan's trade with China is important to us in our efforts to stabilize the economy of Japan, and that Japan's foreign policy should not conflict with our own. But it is also true that the hard-pressed Chinese Communists need the Japanese market. If we are not willing to help the anti-Communists in China with military aid, we should at least use the economic weapons available to us to help our friends in their struggle against those who seem to be determined to destroy us. After all, we are using the Marshall plan to create elsewhere on the Eurasian Continent, where there is a cold war, a political climate propitious for the preservation of freedom. We can do no less in China where the war is hot. If we cannot achieve victory in economic warfare, we can hardly expect to avoid another war.

Moreover, the recognition of Communist China would enable the Communists to obtain supplies which they badly need, while the American people are spending billions of dollars in their global struggle against this very same communism. These American supplies would help to subvert this gigantic

and costly American effort. The scrap iron and oil which was sent to Japan in the pre-Pearl Harbor days, not only destroyed life and property in China, our lifelong friend and ally, but also destroyed American life and property in the terrible war which followed. Let us not repeat this tragic and shameful mistake. Let us not allow short-term expediencies to overcome long-term principles. Let us realize that these American supplies may some day become blood-soaked and tear-drenched reminders of crass materialism and vacillation at a time when lofty leadership and high resolve were called for.

For it is an incontrovertible fact that the recognition of Communist China by the Government of the United States would give help to the self-styled enemies of America. Any action which assists Soviet imperialism or bolsters the economy of any of the Russian satellites may well capsize the tenuous balance of power in the east-west conflict.

Such recognition would open up every Chinese Embassy, legation, and consulate to espionage, fifth-column activities, and subversive attacks on free peoples. It would give the Soviet bloc an additional vote on the Security Council of the United Nations and would automatically range us on the side of the Soviets in their vicious attacks on the duly accredited Chinese delegation. Let us then abandon the policy of business as usual. Let us awaken to the hard fact that there is no sharp dividing line between war and peace. Let us realize that the cold war in Europe is irrevocably intertwined with the hot war in China, and that if we do not win the cold war we shall have war. Let us at long last make a start on a vigorous, far-sighted far-eastern policy by refusing to recognize the Chinese Communists and by recognizing with limited and directed aid those who are still fighting to prevent the subjugation of more than a billion human beings.

The recognition of Communist China by the United States Government would encourage Communist elements everywhere. It would discourage the valiant, freedom-loving people whom we are pledged to assist and who, although confronted by overwhelming odds and desperately weakened by war and invasion, are still fighting this godless tyranny.

It would compound the tragic results of our cynical, hesitant, and unworthy China policy at a time when our national interest as well as our solemn obligations demand that we look for inspired remedies rather than timid excuses. It would ratify in advance the brutal conquest of Pacific territories for the preservation of which 108,000 Americans gave their lives in freedom's cause.

It would, in the eyes of the world, constitute American approval of Soviet methods and objectives in China which are inseparable from their methods and objectives in Europe. It would consecrate Soviet imperialism. It would brand us as people of little faith in the freedom for which we fought two world wars and which we have publicly sworn to preserve. It would commit us to a course which, while it might be in accord with our postwar China policy, is not in keeping with our declared global policy to oppose rather than to appease the forces of Communist aggression. It would, in all probability, foreclose the possibility which still exists of aiding the anti-Communists in China, thereby at long last forsaking the dreadful doctrine that we can run with the hare in China while we hunt with the hounds in western Europe. It would strike a heavy blow at the security of our own Nation and the peace with freedom which is our sacred objective.

Repeal the Excise Tax on Jobs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, as has frequently happened in the past, great news came out of Albany, N. Y., yesterday. The New York State Senate, by unanimous vote, and the New York State Assembly, with but a single dissenting vote, passed a resolution urging Congress to repeal immediately the Federal sales taxes, euphemistically referred to as excise taxes, imposed during the war and still retained as a burden on the American people.

It is significant that every member of the Democratic Party in the New York State Legislature voted for this resolution. I hope that the members of that party who serve in the Congress of the United States will share the view of their colleagues in New York. Since the Republican pressure has been strong for more than a year to repeal these wartime levies, all we need is to convince the Democrats down here, as has been so successfully done in Albany.

I understand that an opportunity may be presented to us today to state our position on the repeal of these taxes when the distinguished minority leader offers an amendment to House Joint Resolution 371. This amendment, while granting relief on the commodities singled out in the President's recent message, lacks the discriminatory feature which characterized the President's recommendations, since the amendment applies to all commodities subject to the wartime taxes and restores them to their prewar level.

This action of the minority leader, as contrasted with that of the President, will certainly be greeted with enthusiasm in the community which I represent. More people are employed there in the photographic industry than in all the rest of the country. Yet the President's recommendations were silent on the subject of reducing the discriminatory and outrageously high sales tax on photographic equipment and films. Indeed, he expressly limited his recommendations to retail taxes, which excludes any relief to the photographic industry.

The thousands employed in this business, now the victims of the highest Federal tax of any, forgotten by the President, will certainly welcome the fight which the minority leader is making to help them. On their behalf, I tender to him my grateful appreciation.

These are taxes on the right to work. It is estimated that they caused 5,000 people in my congressional district to lose their jobs last year and thousands of others to be forced to work part time. These levies were imposed during wartime to discourage civilian consumption. Yet they are still stubbornly retained, bearing in their wake loss of business, short workweeks, and unemployment with all of their attendant hardships and suffering.

Although the photographic industry is perhaps the most seriously affected by these taxes, there are, of course, many others where much the same situation exists. I hope the Members will solidly get behind our colleague from Massachusetts in the valiant fight he is putting up to convince the administration forces that action to relieve this situation is imperative.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an editorial from the Rochester Times-Union. The editorial follows:

REPEAL EXCISE TAX ON ROCHESTER JOBS

Months after jobs were lost in New York State by the thousands because of continuance of wartime excise taxes, the President has agreed to modify some of them, but he offers no relief for Rochester.

If Congress can raise enough revenue to replace them, the President will accept reductions in certain excises collected at retail—on handbags, luggage, furs, jewelry, and so forth. But he ignores entirely those collected from the manufacturer, including the 25 percent tax on cameras and 15 percent on films.

These taxes cost the jobs of 5,000 persons in Rochester last year and skip-week work schedules for thousands of others, because trade in these lines declined more than four times faster than general trade in the first quarter of last year.

At the same time the Government's receipts from the tax dwindled 41 percent below the year before. The camera tax is no longer an important source of revenue but of fundamental importance to Rochester.

Senator GEORGE recalls that Congress promised when these taxes were imposed to repeal them within 6 months after the end of the war. That promise has been ignored.

These taxes were designed to discourage consumer buying during the war so that manpower could be channeled away from civilian markets and into the war effort. That need disappeared 5 years ago. How far can an emergency be stretched?

Many of the other wartime excise taxes should be repealed outright, rather than reduced. They are hidden taxes on the cost of everything. A tax on freight, for example, defensible in wartime to discourage civilian shipping, is ridiculous in peacetime in a Nation so dependent upon transportation for most of the things we buy.

The same applies to taxes on communications. They are an added cost of doing any sort of business which the consumer pays.

The President's message makes clear again that so long as we have an administration that shuts its eyes to the spending side of the ledger, we shall have no tax relief.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the national legislative body of a nation which was founded on the principles of democracy should proceed in such a manner that free discussion of issues is encouraged.

At the same time, however, it is necessary that rules be in effect which make it possible to sift from the great volume of legislation introduced those measures which are of the greatest importance and urgency to the people as a whole. Without such rules legislative chaos would surely result.

Our problem, then, in considering a change in the rules of the House is how we can establish a rule which will best implement the two requirements stated above. The rule in effect since January 1949, allows a committee chairman to call up for debate a measure cleared by his committee after it has been in the Rules Committee 21 days. It permits consideration of bills which might otherwise be blocked. But this rule also makes it possible for committee chairmen who are understandably zealous about the importance of legislation from their own committees to call up bills recognized by the House leadership or by the rank and file of both parties as not being in the best interests of the country.

It was instructive to note the unchallenged statement by the gentleman from Georgia that "there has never been a time when the present Speaker of this body or his predecessor, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], made request of the Rules Committee for a rule on any bill but what the request was honored." This is another evidence of the undeniable fact that it has always been possible to get up for debate any measure that a majority of the Members really approve and want.

The resolution before us today would eliminate the 21-day rule and return to complete control by the Rules Committee unless 218 signatures to a discharge petition can be obtained or Calendar Wednesday used. The latter device has proved impracticable because dilatory motions can be made to waste a whole afternoon without even getting to the bill involved. I oppose the Cox resolution to repeal the 21-day rule for the same reason I voted for the rule last year—it is the lesser evil of the only two alternatives we are being permitted to choose between.

What we need is something in between the extremes of "gag" rule by the Rules Committee, or a ship almost rudderless as the House is under the 21-day rule. A workable middle ground could be obtained in two ways. One method would be to amend the discharge petition rule so the number of signatures required would be reduced from 218 to 150 (as was the case prior to the Democratic Congress of 1931–33). The other method would be to amend the Calendar Wednesday procedure so that no dilatory motions or quorum calls could be permitted by the Speaker. Either of these methods of amending the rules would serve the purpose of limiting power in the hands of the Rules Committee and yet preventing confusion and waste of time in dilatory quorum calls or debate on bills which are not considered important or advisable by a substantial group of Representatives. Unfortunately we are not being permitted to offer debate and vote on such amendments.

Our Congress is one of the few legislative bodies left in the world which is actually responsible to the people and which has power to initiate, without executive sanction, measures it feels are in the best interest of the people. We must endeavor to keep it this way and to make it a model to be admired and emulated by other people in the world who hope for a truly democratic type of government. The present rule is not the best way to achieve these ends because it does not promote maximum efficiency in the use of our time. It allows a minority of either the ardent proponents or the bitter opponents of a measure to make a spectacle of this body and to weaken public confidence in the legislative process. The 21-day rule will be retained by today's vote, but it is not an adequate answer. We must continue to seek a better solution to the problem.

White House or Transport House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Peter Barry which appeared in the English weekly magazine Truth:

WHITE HOUSE OR TRANSPORT HOUSE

(By Peter Barry)

Benedict Arnold was the great American traitor. He was one of George Washington's officers in the War of Independence, and he decided to betray his own side. He made a bargain with Major Andre, of the British Army. But the bargain went wrong. The Americans caught Andre and hanged him. Arnold escaped—and the Americans have execrated him ever since as the man who propitiated his enemies at the expense of his friends.

I dare say that Mr. Lewis Douglas, the American Ambassador in London, would be startled and outraged to hear himself compared, however remotely, to Benedict Arnold. So would Mr. Averell Harriman. So would Mr. Thomas K. Finletter, the United States Minister now administering Marshall aid in London. But let us see.

It is not suggested, of course, that any of these gentlemen is venal or in any other way personally disreputable. On the contrary. Their intentions are undoubtedly excellent. Unfortunately, it is not their intentions that matter.

Objectively (as the Communists say), Mr. Douglas and his two colleagues are—however unconsciously—betraying the American way of life. They are betraying the free enterprise system on which the United States is based. They are giving aid and comfort to the enemies of that system; and they are doing so not at all from any unworthy motive but because of credulity and ignorance. The difference between them and Benedict Arnold is that Arnold knew what he was doing and they do not know.

Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter have now become three of the principal assets of the British Socialist Pary. To judge from their public utterances they take their inspiration not from the United States but from the Socialist headquarters at Transport House. They are like a ventriloquist's dolls, Mr. Herbert Morrison's Charlie McCarthy's.

In the last 12 months these three innocent gentlemen have provided a whole series of unsolicited testimonials to British socialism. Almost every time they open their mouths they proclaim their belief in the ultimate success of the Socialist experiment. They swallow without a gulp the crudest propaganda balderdash put out by Mr. Morrison's machine. For capacity to be duped and humbugged and bamboozled Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman and Mr. Finletter bear away the palm.

Their utterances could not be more useful, from the Socialist point of view, if Mr. Morrison had written them himself. They are featured on the front pages and in the editorial columns of the Socialist press; they are circulated in thousands of leaflets and handbills; they are part of the equipment of every Socialist propagandist; they are quoted incessantly by canvassers and hecklers and saloon-bar oracles. Whenever a Socialist politician finds himself in a debating difficulty he falls back triumphantly on Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter. If there is any gratitude in politics, and the Socialists win the next election, Mr. Attlee should celebrate the victory by offering peerages to Mr. Douglas, Mr. Harriman, and Mr. Finletter. No man will have done more to earn them.

Let us look at the facts. At the present moment the Socialist experiment in Britain is drifting rapidly toward the rocks. It has been kept afloat from the beginning by American dollars and by nothing else. (Without those dollars, as Mr. Arthur Greenwood candidly confessed in a speech during the Hammersmith by-election, there would now be 5,000,000 unemployed in this country.)

But, in spite of the dollars, disaster is near; and the British voter is beginning to realize it. The Socialists have lost his confidence. He sees the muddle, the mismanagement, the jobbery, the incompetence all around him. With that slow-moving sagacity that is his distinguishing characteristic the British voter is coming gradually to the conclusion that socialism will not work.

It is being borne in upon him that the Tories are right; that we cannot keep a population of 50,000,000 alive on this island by passing resolutions; that Britain must choose, literally, between capitalism and starvation. We must produce more or we shall perish. In order to produce more we must go back to profit-making, to competition, to thrift, to investment, to exploitation and inequality and imperialism and all the other Socialist bogies.

A disagreeable conclusion; and it is not surprising that the British voter moves toward it slowly. He has been told so often that socialism can take the place of sweat. But move toward it he does.

This is the moment chosen by Messrs. Douglas and Harriman and Finletter to assure him, loudly and repeatedly, that the Socialists are right after all. Let us begin with Mr. Finletter. Mr. Finletter arrived in this country in June 1948. Within a few hours of his arrival he was holding a press conference at the American Embassy, at which he said: "The United Kingdom has made an extraordinary effort of recovery. Production has increased by 10 percent over the 1938 figure."

If Mr. Finletter calls this extraordinary, he must be, indeed, easy to astonish. He has, in fact, swallowed hook, line, and sinker, the crudest of all Socialist tricks, the trick of ignoring the increase in our population between 1938 and 1948. There are over 2,000,000 more people in this country now than there were then—a fact which makes nonsense of all the Socialist statistics. (Comparisons between our food supplies now

and prewar, for instance, are completely nullified by the 2,000,000 additional mouths to feed.)

But this elementary fact is concealed from Mr. Finletter. If he does not know it (and apparently he does not), and if there is nobody in Mr. Douglas' Embassy who knows it (as apparently there is not), he should ring up the Conservative Central Office, who will be glad to tell him about it. The telephone number is Whitehall 8181.

Having begun by talking nonsense, Mr. Finletter went on to talk more nonsense. On January 12 last he journeyed to Manchester to address the chamber of commerce there. He told his audience—who must have been puzzled to know whether they were listening to a spokesman of free-enterprise America or to a member of the Socialist government—that there had been highly satisfactory gains in British production, and that "austerity is a misnomer. It should be called the self-discipline program, because it is not as austere as all that." And so on, and so on.

The Socialists hailed this speech with jubilation. It was printed at length, in the first person, on the front page of the Socialist Daily Herald next day, with a jeering headline inviting Mr. Churchill to read it. Ever since, Mr. Morrison's orators have been using it systematically, on the widest possible scale, in order to persuade their dupes that socialism is doing fine. Here is a spokesman from capitalist America who says so; and here is the Socialist press using this capitalist spokesman as material for mud to throw at the Tory Churchill.

In addition to talking nonsense in London and Manchester, Mr. Finletter has found time to talk similar nonsense in Washington, too. Last February he had the assurance to tell the Foreign Relations Committee of the United States Senate that the proposed nationalization of the British steel industry would not affect general production here. He also handed to the committee a document praising the "responsible attitude of the British trade-union movement in facing the nation's economic difficulties."

Presumably he meant something by those words; it would be interesting to know what. At the present moment the miners' trade-union, led by its Communist secretary, will not permit its members to work as hard as they did before the war. At the present moment the transport union and the engineers' union are forbidding the use of labor-saving machinery by their members. At the present moment the postal workers' union are forbidding under threat of a strike, any restoration of prewar postal services. At the present moment the railwaymen's union is blackmailing the public (to whom the railways now belong) with demands for higher wages that are not being earned. And so on, and so on.

Yet Mr. Finletter talks about "the responsible attitude" of the trade-union movement.

At the same meeting of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Mr. Averell Harriman also saluted the Red flag. He said: "I have seen no change for the worse in Britain as the result of socialism. I have seen no indication that the Labor Party does not believe in the free process just as we do."

It may be that Mr. Harriman is compelled to talk like this—or believes he is—because of the requirements of American politics. Marshall aid is the responsibility of the Truman administration, and therefore it must be defended against the opponents of that administration.

Agreed—but is it necessary for Mr. Harriman, in striking at the opposition in America, to strike at the opposition in this country too? Is he really so naive as not to know that the words he utters in Washington will be used—as they have been and are being used—to plaster the cracks in British Socialist propaganda?

Senator WILEY, from Wisconsin, did his best to enlighten Mr. Harriman. "It is an historic fact," said Senator WILEY very properly, "that every attempt at European socialism has degenerated into totalitarianism. Do you see any steps in that direction in Britain?" To this Mr. Harriman replied: "None whatsoever."

If Mr. Harriman believes that, he is capable of believing anything. He will have no difficulty, none whatsoever, in believing that there are fairies at the bottom of his garden.

Next let us look at Mr. Lewis Douglas. To judge from his speeches Mr. Douglas should be accredited not to the Court of St. James's but to Transport House. He seems to have swallowed the Socialist policy at one gulp; he is the complete marionette.

He testified before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee last January; and he made a statement then about the nationalized British mining industry that might have been written for him by Mr. Morrison. Here are three sentences from it: "By 1951 Britain hopes to produce 249,000,000 tons of coal a year. If the problems of the industry are tackled with the vigor of the past three or four months, Britain will attain her target. This is all the more remarkable considering the mines' history of neglect and mismanagement."

An Ambassador who knows no more than this about the principal industry of the country to which he is accredited is a luxury that only the United States can afford. The mixture of ignorance and credulity in those sentences would hardly pass muster on a Socialist soapbox. Every statement in them is demonstrably untrue. It is nothing less than scandalous that the American Ambassador should soil his tongue with the Socialist lie of Tory misrule—the most contemptible lie in British political history.

Since the Americans are so willing to offer advice to this country they will not object, I am sure, if this paper offers some advice in return.

It is the business of the United States to uphold democracy and the American way of life. Democracy and free enterprise are two sides of the same coin. If free enterprise is destroyed then democracy dies with it.

Now a Socialist victory in 1950 will mean the end of free enterprise in Britain. It will put this country so far on the road to totalitarianism that there will be no turning back. Does the United States want that?

The answer, presumably, is "No." Let the United States therefore tell Messrs. Douglas, Harriman, and Finletter to stop acting as the chief unwitting propagandists for British socialism. If the Socialists win the 1950 election a very large part of the responsibility for that disaster will rest on the shoulders of three Americans.

NOTE.—This issue of Truth contains an article which will cause everybody who reads it concern, and may cause some resentment. It is no light thing to criticise the accredited Ambassador of a friendly power, but it is equally no light thing that an Ambassador should, however inadvertently, lay himself open to criticism.

The article White House or Transport House is written in no carping spirit but to demonstrate that three distinguished Americans, presumably devoted to the American way of life, which is founded on free enterprise, are by their utterances helping to destroy that way of life.

It need hardly be said that Truth will most gladly put its space at the disposal of any of these distinguished gentlemen should he feel that its contributor has been guilty of misconstruction or misrepresentation.

EDITOR.

Marine Battle Position 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD an article by Maj. William P. McCahill, USMCR, which appeared in the January 1950 edition of the Reserve Officer.

Major McCahill is the executive director of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association—MCROA—and is well qualified to speak on the subject he has discussed in his article.

There are many Members of Congress who are aware of the attempts being made to reduce the duties and functions of the Marine Corps. We have noted with regret the language and budget estimates as they affect the Corps in the 1951 budget, but we have also noted with some satisfaction the statement by Secretary of Defense Johnson at his press conference when he unequivocally said that the Marine Corps would maintain two divisions at reduced strength. This would indicate that more than the six marine battalion landing teams mentioned in the budget message will be considered.

Mr. Speaker, it is my hope that both the Armed Services Committee, under Chairman CARL VINSON, and the Armed Services Appropriation Subcommittee, under Chairman GEORGE MAHON, will keep in mind the real and practical needs of the Marine Corps and will do what they can to see that it is maintained as it should be and protected in its functions and duties.

MARINE BATTLE POSITION 1950

(By Maj. William P. McCahill, USMCR)

"In spite of sugary words and fair phrases from high places, the Regular marine and his civilian counterpart in the Reserve has a jaundiced eye cocked at recent developments in national defense."—So says a marine and here he tells why.

The marine reserve today finds himself in a peculiar role. He is on the defensive. After almost making a fetish of the offensive spirit since 1775 the marine of today is both baffled and belligerent over the role assigned him in the peace of 1950. The Pacific champ almost has to apologize for being around.

In spite of sugary words and fair phrases from high places, the regular marine and his civilian counterpart in the Reserve has a jaundiced eye cocked at recent developments in national defense. Some of the oratory we take at face value. The rest of it we consider strictly double talk for the record, a double talk we consider dangerous.

After having had a fair share of annoying moments from Guadalcanal through the occupation of Japan and North China the corps might expect that its professional and volunteer marines could take a breather. But such has not been the case and it was General Cates who as Commandant of the Corps described the Marine Corps as occupying "a battle position which must be defended in full force."

At a time when defense spokesmen are assuring the public we will strike back and

retaliate in force in event of another "4 o'clock Sunday morning attack" the Department has recommended to the Congress through the Budget Bureau that the offensive strength of Marine aviation be pared 50 percent. It is also an established but as yet unpublished fact that Marine ground elements of the Fleet Marine Force, the Navy's instant landing force in readiness, will receive a substantial cut.

Such is the magic of the word "economy" today. You can't tell a marine about economy. We are used to it. We have been a shoestring service for so long that it is a known fact that for every fighting marine we put on the field it costs some $3,000 less than for his soldier counterpart.

Marine Reserve officers have much more to do than run down their sister services and their brother reservists. Yet, the professional publicists would have the Nation believe that we are essentially opposed to "unification," unable to give credit anywhere else but within our own corps, and violently antagonistic to the Army, the Air Force and even the Navy at times.

If a man strikes back after being pushed around, after being ignored, after being studiously insulted by inference if not in actuality, he isn't picking a fight. And yet, there are brother officers in the civilian reserve who resent the treatment the corps has been getting in postwar policies almost as much as marines themselves. Generally, they are people who either served with or alongside marines and are familiar with the way a marine can handle a dirty assignment nobody else wants.

If anyone still thinks we are looking under the bed, if the scoffers actually believe that we are poking lances at windmills or setting up men of straw they should read the record and balance words against deeds. It may be that the budget cuts planned for 1951 and the ones already instituted for 1950 are not disproportionate. We doubt it. It may be that the country doesn't need a strong Marine Corps capable of instant field operation and air support. We also doubt that. It may be that certain Pentagon planners love the Marine Corps. However, when the commandant breaks a long and studied silence, a silence predicated on trying desperately to do a job for the country without rocking the boat, we prefer to listen to him. When the commandants says that planned budget pruning deliberately strikes at the combat efficiency of the corps we have no alternative but to believe him and discount other sweet sentiment so liberally dished out.

Because they have had the courage to stand up and take their case to the Congress and the people, marines may yet win this greatest of their bloodless battles. And because the American people respect a battler the battle may be resolved in the next meeting of Congress if the issue can be sufficiently clarified in an age which worships at the shrine of economy.

ROA SUPPORT

It won't be easy. But the corps has many friends. The Reserve Officers Association, at its recent national convention, was the first national group to get behind a program aimed at an ultimate safeguard for the corps and the country, the present legislation establishing a minimum flooring on corps strength. Midway in the last session of the Congress some 55 Representatives and 4 Senators tossed bills into the hopper in support of Admiral "Bull" Halsey's suggestion that the corps should always be 6 percent of the total armed forces personnel strength. The bills also call for an Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Marine Corps.

ROA was willing to go along with and lend active support to the proposition that the average of the last 20 years, 6 percent, was a legitimate request. But the legislation is almost sure to have unanimous opposition from the Defense Establishment and perhaps all three of the Departments.

Col. Melvin J. Maas, a former national officer of ROA and long time national president of the Marine Corps Reserve Officers Association, has pounded away at the need for a corps that can get up and go anywhere, any time. He has pointed out that 87 percent of Marine aviators are graduates of the amphibious schools and know what the gyrene on the ground is thinking about planning to do and how he's probably going to react under a given situation. He has emphasized that because of their very training and background the Marine is at home on all elements.

Sometimes it's the little things that indicate a man's thinking. In a speech December 7 titled "The Ramparts We Watch," Secretary Johnson made two references to the Marines but consistently referred to the three services. This slight constantly irks Marines. We feel that if the Congress says we are a service then the Secretary of Defense should recognize it and so should the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is true that there are three Departments. But as long as Congress says there are four services we'll insist on at least that minimum recognition.

Recent developments in the Naval Establishment indicate that we may be well on the way toward winning our point. Admiral Forrest Sherman has ordered Col. John Smith, Congressional Medal of Honor Guadalcanal ace, to duty in the office of the Chief of Naval Operations. John Smith is to see to it that Admiral Sherman doesn't forget to let General Cates in on anything that he should know or on any pending plans which concern the corps.

The Civilian Components Policy Board which is carving our future Reserve policy carefully and professionally now refers to the four services and is perhaps better indoctrinated to the capabilities of the corps than either the Joint Chiefs or the Little Joint Chiefs. But it's an uphill battle.

Marines freely admit that they are biased when it comes to the corps. But so is America biased when it recalls Tarawa, Iwo, and Midway, as it too infrequently does today. It seems today that it was the Army that took Guadalcanal. There are a lot of guys who still get hot and cold with malaria that might give you an argument on that one.

However, in spite of our acknowledged bias, many of us are sincerely and seriously concerned about our military security as a nation. If a set line of thinking can set the stage for practical disintegration of the corps as a combat unit, the same thing could happen tomorrow or a year from tomorrow to another arm of our defense team. We are the first to concede the reasonableness of a balanced team for our national security. But, as David Lawrence so ably pointed out, we are puzzled when the Defense Secretary jumbles the context of the amendments of the National Defense Act passed in 1949 and comes up with a quarterback in the garb of the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The next speaker within my earshot who piously proclaims that he has no intention of abolishing the Marine Corps is not only going to have to define his term "abolish" but answer a few pointed questions, at least better than did the eminent chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee last summer.

CONGRESSIONAL DISCUSSION

In recent Senate debate Senators KNOWLAND and TYDINGS scoffed at any danger to the corps. However, when Marine Lt. Col. PAUL DOUGLAS, junior Senator from Illinois, asked Senator TYDINGS a direct question, he received an evasive answer. Senator DOUGLAS asked, "Does the Senator from Maryland know of any persons anywhere in the National Military Establishment who would wish to abolish the Marine Corps?"

Senator TYDINGS failed to answer the pointed question simply because there are men in high places who have this intention. Senator TYDINGS, speaking as chairman of the powerful Armed Services Committee, said: "The Senator from Maryland, so long as he is in the Congress, will resist any attempt to abolish the Marine Corps, because it has been of tremendously valuable assistance to the United States and is worth millions or billions of dollars to our country."

In the language of economy-minded legislators and officers we probably will again hear the specious argument that we do not need "two armies and two air forces" which is another way of saying that marines should be confined to interior guard duty and thrilling the folks at home with snappy parades. During 1947 debates on the so-called Unification Act, both the Army and the Air Force wanted the marines cut down to size. Their statements are available for all who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD (p. 9306, July 12, 1949) and provide much light on today's controversy where it appears that some people neither mean what they say nor say what they mean with regard to the corps.

General Eisenhower, as Army Chief of Staff, recommended:

1. The Marine Corps is maintained as an adjunct to the fleet and participates only in minor shore combat operations in which the Navy alone is interested.

2. That it be recognized that the land aspect of major amphibious operations in the future will be undertaken by the Army and consequently the marine forces will not be appreciably expanded in time of war.

3. That it be agreed that the Navy will not develop a land army or a so-called amphibious army, marine units to be limited in size to the equivalent of the regiment, and the total size of the Marine Corps, therefore, limited to some 50,000 or 60,000 men.

General Spaatz, as Air Force Chief of Staff, said:

"I recommend therefore that the size of the Marine Corps be limited to small, readily available and lightly armed units, no larger than a regiment, to protect United States interests ashore in foreign countries and to provide interior guard of naval ships and naval shore establishments."

There is no question here of good faith. It is merely a matter of opinion. Marines and others feel that in an atomic age there is still great need for shock troops ready to pack up and go at a moment's notice. There are some other matters which require consideration, such as the evident fact that the Marines serve as a measuring stick against which to measure the effectiveness and economy of other American military units. Maybe some commanders would prefer not to have such a handy measuring stick around. Maybe some people in high places would find it difficult to explain the number of generals per men in the Army as against the Marine ratio. Maybe the Army would be embarrassed if tomorrow we were to be mobilized and the corps could put two streamlined divisions with air support in the field in a few hours or days while the giant Army was able to provide only about an equal number of troops in the same time.

Last year in summer maneuvers the Marine Reserve air arm actually transported 28,000 Reserve ground troops either to or from training at Camp Lejeune or Camp Pendleton. Marine fighter, bomber, and transport planes converged in 24-hour periods under Reserve control at the coastal bases at Cherry Point, N. C., and El Toro, Calif. This past year countless companies and battalions of the Organized Reserve and thousands of volunteer reservists took part in amphibious training designed to keep them ready if the call should come. The Marine Corps Reserve is almost 130,000 strong and represents an elite corps of trained specialists ready to more

than double present Marine strength in case of war or serious emergency. Yet, if present budget plans are carried out—and they have not been officially denied—Marines will find themselves with insufficient planes available for reserve training and probably with none in the world.

Never before in its history has the corps needed friends so badly as it needs them today. Senator SALTONSTALL, of Massachusetts, recently said very frankly to a marine audience that no Congressman or Senator would dare risk political suicide by advocating abolishment of the corps. Most of his colleagues probably would echo his remarks. But this is not the danger. The abolition of the corps is not the immediate goal but rather the stripping of its ability to ever spearhead another war as it did in the Pacific.

So when a person scoffs at any real or presumed danger to the corps, it is well to check not only his motives but also his interpretation of danger. A corps of the size proposed by Pentagon planners would certainly be incapable of carrying out its assigned missions and functions as laid down at the Key West conference and subsequent agreements.

Whether on guard in the Near East or the Pacific, whether aboard capital ships of our shrinking Navy or at domestic and foreign land and air bases, the Marine Corps today stands ready, as in the past. Its future readiness is in the hands of the Congress and the American people. May they be as faithful to the marines as the corps has been to them.

Between the Lines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks at this time to include a poem by Mr. Tex Reynolds, of the Racine Journal Times, Racine, Wis., which seems to point out a moral which the American people should be thinking about quite seriously:

WITH ABJECT APOLOGIES TO ROBERT W. SERVICE, WHO AUTHORED THE SHOOTING OF DAN MCGREW

A bunch of the boys were whooping it up,
In the new White House saloon,
And Harry that hammers the music box
Was playing a party tune.

When out of the night, which was gosh awful cold,
And into the political air,
There staggered a mailman, fresh from the truck,
Bowlegged with all he could bear.

He looked like a man who needed a shot,
With scarce the strength of a louse,
But while Harry hit a gay musical bit
He called for a drink on the house.

There are men who somehow grip your eyes
And hold them hard like a spell,
Such was he, and he looked to me,
Like a man who was madder than hops.

But he had the poise and amid all the noise,
He raised his hand with a sway—
"If you will just please quit pounding those keys,
"There is something I want to say."

Then Harry stopped with a kind of a laugh,
And his manner was cute and droll,
"I suppose," he said, with a wag of his head,
"Some more cities are out of coal."

"Oh, smile if you wish," the mail carrier cried,
"But let me my story unfold.
"These missives right here, from far and from near,
"Mean that a lot of good people are cold.

"For weeks and for weeks these letters have come,
"To tell of the cost and the toll,
"That you could soon end if you'd only unbend
"And put a stop to the strike in coal."

But Harry replied with a grin that was wide,
And his voice it was calm and cool,
"I'm playing it smart with my head, not my heart—
"I'm nobody's political fool."

"So the coal piles are shrinking and citizens freeze?
"Well, tell 'em to put on their wings,
"I know of a clime where it's warm all the time—
"Why don't they go to Palm Spring?"

Then he whirled right around and started to pound,
And the number was lilting and light,
And the music it rang while his Margaret sang,
"Hot Time in the Old Town Tonight."

So those are the simple facts of the case,
And I guess I ought to know,
They say the mailman was dumb like a goose,
And I'm not denying it's so.

If he had been wise like the "fixer" guys,
Just between us two,
He'd slyly have gone to General Vaughan—
The White House "Lady Lou."

Why Can't We Unmask Old King Coal?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, there is no real coal shortage emergency at this time, according to the best informed sources, among them being the Christian Science Monitor. The real shortage is one of facts to substantiate the coal operator's false and futile claim. The principal shortage is a shortage of truth in this matter and an abundance of make-believe. The alleged coal shortage has been self-created by the unholy coal barons and their ilk which is indirectly putting the coal squeeze, at this time upon many unsuspecting small communities, coal users and small-business institutions, who in turn, as was expected, are pleading with certain of their unsuspecting Congressmen to compel President Truman to declare that an emergency exists, when it does not exist in fact, and invoke the provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act, which its first-named author admits has 27 things wrong with it.

No sensible person blames our great President, even in a proper case, for being hesitant about making use of such an un-American, grotesque legislative monster.

If the supposed authors of this act, had 27 things wrong with their handkerchiefs, socks, shoes, underwear, shirt, tie, pants, vests, coat, overcoat, gloves, or hat, would they want to use them further or throw them on the scrap heap. If they did want to make use of them further everyone would be justified in believing that there were 27 things also wrong with their heads.

There is in this Nation, right now, a large supply of coal piled above ground, on railroad sidings, joyriding in transit from place to place, and stock piled in the coal yards of favorite manufacturers and dealers. Some of the railroads are helping to put the squeeze on those who are now in want of coal by laying off trains and squalling loudly but falsely that they, too, are also hard hit because of a coal shortage. Something should be done immediately to stop this latest reactionary rascality.

No, my dear readers, I am forced to come to the conclusion that the whole thing about a national coal crisis is a flatulent conspiracy of extreme right-winged, bad, big business, spearheaded by reactionaries and the innocent uninformed, and is without basis in fact and dreamed up to crush out the United Mine Workers and John L. Lewis, whom I believe to be in most instances, a fearless and great man truly working in the interests of the United Mine Workers of the Nation, their families, and their communities.

With due apologies to the author of a hopeful present day song hit, I dedicate the following humble filched words to today's reactionary jewels of misrepresentation and deceit, the coal clique.

Oh our ears are full of tears,
Lying on our backs in our beds,
Crying over you.

Adventurous Aroostook Farmers Have Seen Both Prosperity and Adversity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, so much publicity has been accorded to subsidy payments made to the potato growers of Aroostook County, Maine, that I should like to call attention to an article in the Boston Globe of January 1, 1950, which gives a little perspective on Aroostook County history. Aroostook County does not happen to be in my district but I know the county well and I know that the Aroostook farmer does not want to raise unwanted potatoes or to be paid beyond his deserts. He has fully complied with acreage allocations, and current surpluses arise almost wholly from importations from Canada.

The article in question is as follows:

ADVENTUROUS AROOSTOOK FARMERS HAVE SEEN BOTH PROSPERITY AND ADVERSITY

(By Herbert W. Moore, executive secretary, the Potato Industry Council of Maine, Inc.)

You have been reading much about the Maine potato industry in recent months. It has been the favorite subject for various political writers, who with little regard for the

truth, have sought to create an exceedingly distorted and false picture of its way of life.

All of these writings have centered about the wartime price support program which ceased to exist a year ago, and have given absolutely no recognition to the picturesque and romantic development of an industry which within the past century has transformed a bleak impenetrable forest land into the most concentrated, and most heavily mechanized agricultural area in New England.

Aroostook, a county the size of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and Rhode Island combined but with only 10 percent of its area cleared of timber, and its gigantic potato industry which each year harvests 15 percent of the total national potato production, is by reason of its unique development perhaps far more removed psychologically than it is geographically from the rest of New England agriculture.

As with the progress and development of our great Nation and its historic expansion from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the progress and development of the Aroostook potato industry has also centered around the railroad. In our case, however, the direction has been northward rather than westward and for the most part has taken place in the first half of the twentieth century.

AROOSTOOK'S WESTERN ATMOSPHERE

Since the Civil War, Aroostook has been actively engaged in the production of potatoes, but without adequate transportation facilities its potato production was converted in its entirety to the manufacture of starch for use in the New England textile industry.

With the coming of the railroads in the later part of the nineteenth century, however, the development of the Maine potato as a national delicacy began and it was only a matter of a few years before it assumed a commanding role in the life and diet of the entire population of the eastern seaboard.

Perhaps because of the nature of our growth, more analogous to the development of the West than of New England, a westerner would feel right at home in Aroostook. Instead of grain elevators beside the tracks, however, he would see potato houses. Since the direction of our growth has been northward he probably would find weather conditions more severe, but he would recognize the general atmosphere and feeling which permeates the area as distinctly that of the cattle country, the wheat country, or the irrigated country.

By reason of the nature of this industry which involves such tremendous financial risks as to stagger the imagination, there has developed a people who by virtue of their past experiences are hardy, adventurous, keen, and tenacious.

In fact, their willingness to take risks has resulted in the development of a production know-how that is without peer. Nor have they stopped there. With the same energy and aggressiveness, by means of self-imposed taxes, they are financing continual projects aimed at the betterment of storing and merchandising their great crop to insure the consuming public of superior quality at minimum cost.

LOSSES MIXED WITH PROFITS

Let's take a moment and review the financial history of Aroostook, where until now the potato has been king and where diversification has been very limited in scope. Here are the figures for the profit or loss that the average farmer received per barrel, charging all the costs and all the returns. These figures are exceptionally dependable as cost figures go. They were assembled by an impartial expert. They are based on hundreds of farms. Starting with 1926 the figures run like this: 1926, profit 78 cents a barrel; 1927, loss 9 cents; 1928, loss $1.40; 1929, profit $1.50; 1930, loss 44 cents; 1931, loss $1.06; 1932, loss 65 cents; 1933, profit 54 cents; 1934, loss 65 cents; 1935, profit 29 cents; 1936, profit 89 cents; 1937, loss 55 cents; 1938, loss 16 cents; 1939, profit 14 cents; 1940, loss 67 cents.

No wonder bankruptcy was general, that mortgage companies were desperately trying to get out. No wonder the potato country is inhabited by men more adventurous than the typical New England farmer, men who can take it. They have had to.

Since 1940 there have been the war and price support. The area has had a period of stability and relative prosperity heretofore unknown. The prosperity however has been much more modest than the most lurid stories that have gone out have led the general public to believe. Here are the profit figures for these years every one a profit, but a modest one: 1941, 43 cents; 1942, 70 cents; 1943, 31 cents; 1944, 34 cents; 1945, 95 cents; 1946, 53 cents; 1947, 53 cents. This, remember, is per barrel. A barrel is 3 bushels. To get the profit per bushel divide by 3.

Unfortunately, figures from this authoritative source are not available since 1947.

Nineteen hundred and forty-eight was a year of profits, the last year of operation under wartime legislation and the subject for so much publicity in recent months. The estimate for that year is 90 cents per barrel of merchantable potatoes (less than for the year 1936). In consumer's terms, one-half cent a pound. And that profit includes the Government payments that have been so widely advertised.

MOST OF FARMS SMALL

These 8 years constitute the only period for which there is authentic history of stable prosperity in the potato country.

To get an even more realistic picture of the degree of the prosperity of our area let us look for a moment at a typical farm.

It distinctly is not a big operation that has been pictured so widely. In Aroostook County, where 90 percent of Maine's potato acreage exists, there were 4,338 potato farmers in 1949. Of these only 21 had over 200 acres of potatoes; 90 more had between 100 and 200 acres, 4,227, or 97 percent, had less than 100 acres. Most of them less than 50. Nearly one-half of all the farms were limited to less than 20 acres. These farms are farmer-owned and operated with 95 percent of the growers actually living on the farms. True the ordinary farmer has lived a little better than usual these last few years. More of the houses are painted. The machinery on most of the farms is fairly modern and fairly adequate and much of it is paid for. Mortgages are smaller and in better shape. But the farmer still has to borrow money to buy his fertilizer and seed and pay the potato pickers. He hasn't gotten far enough ahead to finance his next year's operations by himself and there are seasons of the year when the financial shoe pinches pretty tight.

Even in the face of this, however, these farmers of their own initiative sought the abandonment of high level wartime price supports.

They did not want profits to be guaranteed by the Government. This is not the way the industry had been developed up here. Only through Yankee ingenuity and thrift had it survived the economic rigors of the past and it had no desire to radically change this position in the future.

It did recognize, however, that because of its very nature—an industry consisting of thousands of small growers—it did not of itself possess the machinery by which it could effect even a reasonable stability. Therefore, it decided to experiment with a new idea—that of letting Government provide the machinery whereby its economy could be brought more nearly into line with that of industry, labor, and other segments of agriculture in the area.

"FIRE INSURANCE" SUPPORT

They have thus come up with a "fire insurance" price support, the level of which will not even cover the farmer's costs. This experimental plan has just begun to operate in 1949, but it is too early to determine what all the effects will be. We do know this much, however: The 1949 crop will bring in less than two-thirds what the 1948 crop brought in, despite a record yield. In 1949 the average farmer will go behind. He won't go down and out—not yet.

The ordinary farmer will dig into savings, if he has any. He will go further into debt if his credit will stand it. He will stop repairs and replacements and live partly on the depreciation of his buildings and equipment.

In 1950 the potato country faces a further cut in acreage—nearly 15 percent more. The 30-acre farmer therefore will become a 25-acre farmer. And price support will be lower still. It will not and cannot underwrite the stabilized moderate prosperity that Aroostook enjoyed for the first time in its life from 1941 to 1948.

That is the true picture of Aroostook.

EIGHTEEN POUNDS IN 1909, FORTY-ONE NOW

Where will we go from here? The next few years will tell us that. If our present experiments indicate still more controls and continued restrictions in acreage we will not be able to put up with it for long. At least not for what we are getting out of it now.

Then we shall try again.

We hear much talk about the Brannan plan, the features of which have been under study in this area for years, but its practical operation has created many doubts in the mind of the farmer.

In any event, in the firm belief that a reasonably stabilized and a reasonably prosperous agriculture is a primary requisite for a healthy national economy, and with bitter memories of the depressions in the past half century, all of which started on the farm, the residents of Aroostook are earnestly seeking some means of maintaining some of the stability they have enjoyed for the past 8 years.

Many accusations have been made that price supports have caused high potato prices. True, potatoes cost somewhat more than they did several years ago, but so does everything else. It is interesting to note however that in the period 1909 to 1914 1 hour of labor in industry would purchase 18.2 pounds of potatoes at the farm, whereas in 1948, 1 hour of labor in industry would buy 41 pounds. And still we hear that potatoes are high priced.

We continue to hear also that the farmer is responsible for higher potato costs. This is not true. In years gone by, when potatoes were sold in bulk the housewife loaded herself down with potatoes when she went to market. Now storekeepers do not want to sell potatoes that way. They want them in small packages so that the housewife will have room to carry out other merchandise. The housewife also wants them that way for her own convenience in handling. Fancy packaging in small lots costs money. That is why even if we gave the potatoes away here at the farm the housewife would still pay anywhere from 1½ to 4½ cents per pound for them at her local store as a result of the costs of packaging, distribution and merchandising.

RAISING OF BEEF CATTLE

As far as 1950 is concerned, and with or without support, the only hope of fair returns is that by some miracle the national average yield per acre which has been mounting year by year should suddenly turn downward resulting in a relative shortage of potatoes and prices well above support levels. There is a chance of that—a bigger chance than in recent years—but not big enough on which to pin very substantial hopes.

There is one other ground for hope in the potato country on the long-time basis. It doesn't promise much for the immediate future. It can't be done that fast. That is the farmer will be able to expand the pro-

duction of other farm products to supplement his potato sales.

He won't give up potato raising unless he has to. But potato acreages are down and down permanently. The great increase in yields per acre—nearly doubled nationally—and the spectacular drop in potato consumption make old acreages entirely out of the picture. The Aroostook farmer now has more acres not needed for potatoes. With the lower returns from the potatoes he does grow he must put these idle acres to work if he is to survive.

At the present time the biggest development appears to be the expansion of dairying, although the raising of beef cattle is also assuming considerable proportions.

We are not going to go out of the potato business, but rather will add other farm products to what potato business we have left. The combination seems a very sound one, and brings about a diversification never before experienced in the area.

That is our history and that is our story—certainly unique in modern New England history and certainly less remunerative than others would have you believe.

This past 50 years has seen our complete development and growth. Our troubles have been many, our heartaches great, but they have been overcome.

Our progress will continue to be governed by the adventurous, hard-headed, and progressive thinking of our people and regardless of the obstacles we shall continue to maintain our place in the economic life of New England and the Nation.

Admiral Yarnell Warns United States of Greater Loss in Orient

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the New York Journal-American of January 15, 1950.

In it Admiral Harry E. Yarnell, noted author and student of Far Eastern affairs and former Commander in Chief of the Asiatic Fleet, warns that our failure to live up to our commitments to our ally, the Government in China, not only will cost us our prestige and influence in the Orient, but will lead to certain loss of Formosa, which he terms a vital link in America's Pacific defense perimeter. He declares that America must abandon her do-nothing policy in the Far East and adopt a dynamic course of positive action against the spread of communism in Asia. It was Admiral Yarnell who foresaw better than any other high official the menace of Japan and the attack on Pearl Harbor. He was ignored then. Are his warnings to be ignored now?

YARNELL WARNS UNITED STATES OF GREATER LOSS IN ORIENT—CALL FOR ACTION ON FORMOSA

(By Admiral H. E. Yarnell, U. S. Navy, retired)

There have been few periods in the diplomatic records of the United States that can compare in ineptitude with that displayed in our relations with China during the past 13 years; this has been especially true since the occupation in recent months of most of that unfortunate country by Communist armies.

We have openly adopted a "wait and see" attitude inspired by lack of any plan for assistance to the Nationalist Government in its resistance to an enemy, whose advance in Europe is being halted by the billions of dollars we are pouring out to that end.

In fact, there are those both in the Government and out who feel that the time has come to recognize the Communists as the de facto government of China. They argue that by such action our trade and the Americans remaining in China will be safeguarded.

WEAK ARGUMENT

Judging by the treatment of our nationals in other Communist countries, there is scant support for such an argument. Worst of all, results of such recognition would be the effect on Indochina, the Philippines, and Indonesia.

It would mean our abandonment of the Nationalist Government, and would encourage and strengthen the Communist elements in their plans for control of the remainder of eastern Asia.

Furthermore, it would mean the eventual surrender of Formosa to a Communist regime, and a break in our island defense barrier in the western Pacific.

NEED FIRM POLICY

While the State Department has announced a policy that it proposes to follow in regard to Formosa, there are certain factors in the situation that should receive consideration.

There must be, sooner or later, and the sooner the better, a definite policy concerning our attitude toward communism in the Far East.

It seems strange to have one policy entirely opposing communism in Europe, and an entirely passive one in regard to communism in the Far East. For that reason, a policy similar to that proposed in this article should be given urgent attention.

The recognition of a de facto Communist regime would be a betrayal of the Government that fought Japan for more than 4 years before Pearl Harbor and suffered losses of life and property beyond computation.

Many hundreds of thousands of American lives were saved by the 8 years of Chinese resistance to the common enemy. Surely the debt we owe the Chinese leaders and people merits more than a passive attitude and the criticism that is being directed against the Nationalist Government today.

HATRED FOR UNITED STATES

We need have no illusions as to the treatment the United States, its nationals and its trade, will receive at the hands of a Communist regime. Their leaders have openly avowed their allegiance to Moscow and their hatred of the imperialist America.

Furthermore, it does not make sense to contribute billions of dollars from our depleted purse to resist the advance of communism in Europe while leaving the back door open to its spread over the other half of the world.

The time has come for a clearly stated, dynamic course of action against the Chinese Communist regime and a discontinuance of the passive, do-nothing, "wait and see," procedure that prevails at present.

The consequences of a do-nothing policy are obvious. Communism will sweep the entire Far East. Formosa will be lost and our island barrier against Moscow in the western Pacific will be shattered. American prestige and influence in the Far East will disappear. A third world war becomes more probable.

WOULD SNUB SATELLITES

Only a positive stand on our part will influence the Communists who respect nothing but strength. To that end we should aid by political, economic, and military means those people who are resisting its advance in the Far East.

Moral support alone will be of great value, and to that end a statement should be issued that the United States will not recognize any regime in the Far East which is dominated by Moscow and the ideals of communism.

On the other hand, support will be given to democratic national governments, which guarantee the rights and freedom of the people and are willing to work with other nations to establish peace throughout the world.

Since we have established the precedent in Europe we should support a "Pacific pact" of the far-eastern nations opposed to communism.

NEED MILITARY AID

We should also declare that the United States will have no economic dealing with Moscow-dominated Communist regimes, but will make every consistent effort to improve its economic relations with democratic governments in the Far East.

Military aid must be given also, but this need not be on the grand scale of that now being given western Europe.

The Nationalist Government of China has established itself on Formosa, and from that stronghold its navy and air force, with our help, can exert a powerful influence in the eventual defeat of communism. An efficient military force can be built up in Formosa at moderate cost on our part for arms and equipment.

Propaganda and guerrilla warfare can be utilized to great advantage and at small cost on the Chinese mainland. In many ways these are the most useful methods of combating communism. It is the use of weapons which they themselves have found most effective.

CITES EUROPE AID

An early settlement of the Japanese problem with a just treaty of peace, which must provide, however, that she cannot go on the warpath again, will add a note of stability to the far-eastern situation.

A staff of diplomatic, economic, and military personnel under the direction of an outstanding authority on far-eastern affairs would be valuable in coordinating the campaign and the part to be played by the several agencies.

Nothing has been recommended in the foregoing suggestions that has not already been done in Europe on a much grander scale. Whether the Asiatic area is more or less important than the European area is a moot question.

One fact is plain, however, and that is that failure to contain Russia and communism in their drive for control of the Far East will eventually result in the United States being driven back to our Pacific coast with Hawaii as our outpost.

The situation demands positive action—not passivity. The first method may, or may not, succeed. The latter will certainly fail.

WOULD LEAD WAY

The announcement of such courses of action and their execution will inform the Far East and the world that the United States is determined to resist the spread of communism in Asia as well as in Europe. It will strengthen greatly the hands of those elements which are opposed to Moscow and its philosophy.

We are a world power, so let us act as one, not only in Europe but in Asia. Such action as proposed, if taken at once, and directed strongly and wisely to a common end may do more for our national security than many billions for armament. The friendship of the people of Asia is a necessary rampart of our defenses. Let it not be lost by indecision and procrastination.

General MacArthur at 70

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. L. MILLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a splendid story on that great general, MacArthur. He will be 70 years old tomorrow and has given 50 years of his life to the service of his country:

MACARTHUR AT 70, DRESSED IN FRAYED KHAKI, WORKS 12 HOURS EVERY DAY

(By Walter Simmons)

TOKYO, JAPAN.—It is somehow symbolic of Douglas MacArthur that America's standard military uniform has insufficient space for the 47 decorations and 10 campaign ribbons he has won in more than 50 years as a soldier.

On his seventieth birthday next Thursday the great soldier-statesman can look back on the most fantastically successful military career of any American since Washington.

In his own lifetime General MacArthur has become a legend. His likeness has appeared on stamps and coins. No American has ever worn his country's uniform for so long. His public career has spanned three generations of the Nation's life, from service as President Theodore Roosevelt's military aide to the colossal responsibility he now bears in Japan.

At an age when most men have retired his reputation is so high that whenever a global problem arises somebody in Washington is certain to suggest hopefully, "Let's turn it over to MacArthur."

Not in 150 years has any American so combined the skills of the soldier and statesman. Two foreign ministers, who had remained unmoved by the most skilful Washington diplomacy, changed their international policies after talking with General MacArthur in Tokyo.

RUSSIANS OUTGUESSED

His extraordinary success has extended even to dealings with the Russians. After pocketing the big diplomatic winnings of Yalta and Potsdam the Soviets have made no headway in Japan or Korea. Relations between General MacArthur and the Russians in Tokyo were courteous but firm from the beginning.

Trying to outguess him has led them into some ludicrous mistakes—they passed up, for instance, an opportunity to send an occupation force to Japan's northerly island of Hokkaido, where opportunities for mischief would have been tremendous.

Once, after listening to a long discourse from Lt. Gen. Kuzma Derevyanko, Moscow's top emissary in Japan, General MacArthur reportedly snorted, "Baloney!" That closed the discussion.

Soviet efforts to propagandize in Japan by insisting American sponsored reforms were answered with such shattering vigor that the Reds have kept quiet since early last summer.

Japanese Communists, too, have failed to make much progress despite the rich opportunities offered by the nation's low living standard and the apparently hopeless prospect of ever bettering it much. Since summer the Communists have suffered one defeat after another.

A carefully timed campaign of civil violence, synchronized with the return of thousands of Communist-indoctrinated war prisoners from Russian areas, backfired with stunning force. Millions of Japanese unionists rebelled against Communist leadership within a few months.

All this vindicated General MacArthur's judgment that the Japanese were capable of taking care of communism themselves without resort to the repressive sort of police action used before the war.

HIS UNIFORMS FADED

Those who knew General MacArthur as the Beau Brummell of the Army during his years as Chief of Staff are surprised at the simplicity of his life in Tokyo.

His summer khakis—some of them dating back to days on Corregidor—are faded and frayed. His winter olive drabs are strictly GI and fit none too well. He wears no insignia or ornaments aside from the five-star token of his rank as general of the Army.

General MacArthur has probably done the hardest work of his life in Tokyo. His schedule is 12 hours a day, 7 days a week. In 4½ years he has missed only a few days at his desk, due to colds.

Working tropical hours—a trick learned during his tours of duty in the Philippines—helps conserve energy and also ties in better with the 14-hour time differential between Tokyo and Washington.

The general rises at 7 and over a leisurely breakfast, enjoys a visit with his son, Arthur, 12. By 8:30 breakfast is over and he goes to his study to read Washington cables that have arrived during the night.

Between 10:30 and 11 he sets out for the office in a big car bearing five-star plates front and rear. Formerly he was followed by jeeploads of honor guard men, but now a few Japanese policemen spaced along the 5-minute route between his American embassy home and GHQ are his only protection.

HIS KNOWLEDGE PROFOUND

The simplicity of his office often astonishes visitors. It contains little besides a telephoneless desk, a leather davenport, several chairs, and an undistinguished marble bust.

Hundreds of prominent Americans have visited him here since the war. They have run the gamut from Ike Eisenhower (MacArthur's one-time aide) to ex-President Hoover, the late Father Flanagan, of Boys' Town fame, and Showman Billy Rose.

General MacArthur has been around so long, seen and experienced so much, read so widely, and known so many different kinds of people that he is quickly on terms of easy intimacy with any visitor.

Congressmen are astonished at his broad grasp of politics. (He was one of the few who foresaw Truman's victory over Dewey.) Labor leaders find him a great deal more liberal than they had supposed.

Educators are confounded by his knowledge of their field, until they recall he had to wrestle with the problem of a university president when he was superintendent of West Point back in the twenties.

But it is when he starts discussing far-eastern matters that he leaves his visitors with their mouths hanging open. His personal knowledge goes back 45 years to the time he observed the Russo-Japanese War with his father, Lt. Gen. Arthur MacArthur.

Those who have heard him discuss the Orient agree that his grasp of it—military, political, economic, and historical—is more profound than that of any other American.

OPPOSED HUMILIATION

Something of the sort is to be expected, of course, since he has been in the Far East since 1935 without a trip home. After his unprecedented 5 years (1930–35) as Army Chief of Staff, he went to Manila as military adviser to the Philippine Commonwealth government.

Since the war, which resulted in his storied journey to Australia, New Guinea, and back to the Philippines, he has officiated at the birth of two new Governments—the Philippine Republic (July 4, 1946) and the South Korea Republic (August 15, 1948).

The general's industrious study of things Japanese before and during the war equipped him with unique qualifications for the job of supreme commander for the allied powers in Tokyo.

It was not necessary for him to unlearn such favorite American wartime oddments as "the favorite diet of the Japanese is fish heads" or "the average Japanese can live for weeks on a tobacco sackful of rice." (Actually fish heads are used for fertilizer, and the average Japanese is miserable unless he eats approximately a wastebasket full of cooked rice every day.)

The wise decision to keep Emperor Hirohito on the job was made in Washington, of course, but it was General MacArthur's sure handling of a difficult protocol problem that helped make the occupation such a success.

Most Americans in 1945 and 1946 wanted to see the Emperor publicly humiliated. The general would not permit it. He did not even summon the Emperor to his headquarters, as many expected.

After a while the Emperor called on General MacArthur. These courtesy calls have recurred at 6-month intervals ever since. What is discussed is never divulged, but it is probably nothing of major importance.

ARMY A FRIENDLY GARRISON

The supreme commander himself has never claimed Japan is completely democratized, or will be by any such foreseeable date. He made this plain on St. Patrick's Day, 1947, when he gave Tokyo correspondents his only interview of the occupation.

The interview became one of history's landmarks, for at that early date General MacArthur urged an immediate peace treaty, a settlement of the reparations problem and an end to the economic blockade that still stifles Japan.

He also warned that a long occupation would defeat its own purpose. When it became plain last year that the occupation was going into its fifth year without a peace treaty he moved swiftly to sever connections between American troops and Japanese life.

Today the occupation is over to all intents and purposes and the Army has been turned into a friendly, protective garrison force.

Military government is a thing of the past.

INFLATION STOPPED

Increased production of necessities has made it possible to brush aside the vast web of controls that had tangled business for more than 10 years.

This action, which Commander MacArthur earlier had promised as soon as practicable, virtually eliminated the black market. Prices of many commodities dropped and quality has greatly improved.

Other far-reaching changes have taken place within the year. Inflation was stopped by balancing the national budget for the first time in 15 years. Occupation costs to the Japanese were slashed to the bone. Subsidies were drastically pared. Coal production now exceeds demand for the first time.

Industrial output has been shoved close to the 1930–34 level by prodigious effort, but living standards are only about 70 percent of that level because of a 17,000,000 increase in population.

American unilateral action finally broke the reparations impasse, but Japan's foreign-trade picture remains clouded because of the determination of several nations, notably Britain, to keep their war-won markets. General MacArthur has gone ahead, nevertheless, by returning nearly all trade to private hands.

As the complexity of his task has increased General MacArthur, far from attempting to run a one-man show, has not hesitated to ask the services of numerous technical experts from the United States.

The modern techniques they have imported have increased efficiency in government, industry, agriculture, and many other fields. For instance, Blaine Hoover of Chicago, a civil-service expert, threw the feudalistic bureaucratic system out of the window and replaced it with modern personnel methods.

NO MEMOIRS YET

The Japanese Government's recent accomplishments in budget balancing, tax reduction, elimination of controls and subsidies and the firing of 170,000 surplus government workers are food for thought for Americans here who reflect that General MacArthur was passed over as a Presidential possibility in 1948.

Actually he refused to cooperate with those who sought to get him the nomination. He refused to give interviews or pose for pictures.

This was admittedly his last chance at the Presidency. Perhaps it is just as well, many of his friends agree, that Americans no longer view him through the red haze of political passion.

As his long and lonely job draws to a brilliant close General MacArthur gives no indication of what he might do after leaving Japan. Friends point out that he is the only great war figure who has not written his memoirs. Asked about this long ago, he smiled and said:

"Well, I've got 20-foot lockers full of papers up at the house."

A Story of Bravery and High Courage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IVOR D. FENTON
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. FENTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an editorial from the Record-American, Mahanoy City, Pa., under date of January 19, 1950, relative to the mine tragedy that attracted Nation-wide attention.

By the heroism of the anthracite mine workers, who daily risk their lives in the bowels of the earth, and by the wholehearted cooperation of all who aided in the rescue, the life of one World War II veteran was saved, but that of his brother, who also served his country with honor, was lost.

Our heartfelt sympathy goes out to Mr. and Mrs. Michael Burda, of Morea Colliery, Pa., in the loss of their son Edward, who after returning home from the horrors of war, met such an untimely and tragic death in the region where he had hoped to find peace and contentment. Such is the lot of hundreds of coal miners who in their daily duties to earn a living risk their lives to recover a precious natural resource to keep the wheels of industry moving, the home fires burning, and contribute to the national security.

A STORY OF BRAVERY AND HIGH COURAGE

The Burda brothers have been brought up from the bottom of their independent mine slope at New Boston—Joseph, alive, and Edward, dead. The saga of their rescue from the depths of the earth adds another brilliant chapter to many other such rescue projects that are part of the history of the anthracite region.

Certainly the spirit of unselfish courage that motivates men to brave all dangers and work like galley slaves when called upon to come to the rescue of those in distress was splendidly exemplified by all those directly connected with the operations near New Boston that began when word was flashed around Friday afternoon that two men were trapped inside a bootleg mine. Only those who were privileged to view the work at first hand are in position to appreciate the unselfish devotion those scores of men exhibited once they heard the call of distress.

Outside newspapermen on the scene were indelibly impressed with the nonchalance the force of mine workers displayed as they arrived on the scene volunteering their labors in the great effort that was to be made to free the entombed men. There was no question of pay—you can't offer money for a task which men take up knowing that it may cost them their lives. They were only interested in reaching the mine prisoners and getting them to the surface, dead or alive. They gathered at the mine mouth, smoked, chatted in low tones and when one or more emerged from the opening there were others there to silently take their places without even a question. Thus it went until the limp body of Edward was brought to the surface near noon on Wednesday.

And there were others. The call went out for equipment needed on clearing the way for rescuers to enter the blocked slope. Owners of power shovels, bulldozers, and the crews that manned them heeded all requests made for help and willingly sent valuable machines to the scene all the time knowing it was a humanitarian job with no recompense promised or expected.

And there was the splendid gesture of the coal companies whose managements responded generously to the call for materials, timber, and so forth, so vitally needed in the job ahead. The P. & R. C. & I. Co. magnanimously sent in a force of expert mine workers headed by leaders trained in mine-rescue work and continued them on the job until their task was accomplished. It was a work that surely must have struck a chord of high appreciation in the hearts of men whose fate it possibly may be to face a similar fate as long as they are engaged in a hazardous occupation.

All honor and credit to the State mine inspectors who took charge of the work and who relayed each other until their job was finished and when they could take pride in accomplishment well and faithfully done.

And there were those others who, while not necessarily engaged in the direct work of going into the earth, nevertheless did their part in attending to the wants of those who did. The devoted members of the Salvation Army crew who supplied food and drink to the workers; the Red Cross who were on hand with offers of financial or other assistance; the truck owners who provided transportation of men and materials when needed. The good people of Morea and New Boston, generally, who stood by at all times ready to do anything in their power to advance the work that lay ahead.

There were leaders from among the mine workers who provided needed guidance to those who volunteered; who brought the plight of the entombed to the attention of those who might help in a big way; to owners of equipment; to mine managers for timber and other supplies. As with all the others they threw themselves wholeheartedly into the job before them and played an important role in the project completed successfully.

Shortage of Doctors Becoming a National Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, as the years go by the shortage of doctors in this country is growing proportionately larger and is becoming a real national problem. According to reports the number of doctors in relation to population is less now than it was 40 years ago. Unless we take steps to solve this ever-increasing problem in time, we may some day have to pay a terrible price in the event of some unforeseen national emergency.

Various plans are now before Congress aiming to aid medical students and medical schools so that we may attain a larger supply of doctors and a better national health program. I can think of no better investment in the future of our people than in safeguarding its health. The sooner we do it, the more economical it will prove to be in the long run.

I am placing in the RECORD an article, Not Enough Doctors—Subsidy Planned, which appeared in United States News and World Report, January 27, 1950:

NOT ENOUGH DOCTORS—SUBSIDY PLANNED—GOVERNMENT WANTS 20,000 MORE IN 10 YEARS

(Forced growth of the doctor supply is coming closer. It's a $312,000,000 project, as it stands in Congress. Federal aid for medical students is one phase. So is cash help for medical schools. Bigger enrollments—more doctors in training—is the first goal. Idea is to spread the supply of doctors more evenly over the Nation, get enough to man a national-health program.)

A new subsidy is not far from approval by Congress. This subsidy is one of $312,000,000. If it clears final hurdles, it will be used over a 5-year period to finance the training of more physicians, dentists, nurses, osteopaths, public-health officers, and maybe optometrists.

The doctor supply has reached the stage of a national problem. The Senate already has voted to do something about it. A House committee has recommended action. Barring last-minute hitches. Congress will approve a subsidy for medical schools and for students, designed to step up training of physicians and others in the health field.

Physicians in relation to population are fewer at this time than 40 years ago. The supply is not uniform. In some parts of the country there is one physician for every 1,640 persons; in others, one for 555 persons. That situation is leading to political pressures, reflected in Congress, for more physicians in shortage areas.

Congress shows interest too, in the fact that many youths who want to enter the medical profession are unable to get a chance at training. In the 1949 autumn term, about 25,000 sought admittance to medical schools, with 6,986 accepted.

A subsidy plan is offered as a partial solution to the problem.

A subsidy is urged by many medical schools, and a committee of doctors helped to write the present plan. The White House favors it, because a larger doctor supply is essential for a national health-insurance program. The American Medical Association opposes the idea, on the ground that each

doctor can care for more patients now, so that there is no need for a great expansion in numbers of doctors.

Schools are to get several subsidies under the plan as it passed the Senate. One subsidy is to be a United States fee of $500 a year per student, to schools of medicine and osteopathy. If a school enrolls more students than in the past, it will get $1,000 a year for each added student.

Similar payments, on a lower scale, will be offered to other types of schools, such as those teaching dentistry and nursing.

Another subsidy is to come from a fund of $5,000,000 a year, for buildings and equipment. The United States Surgeon General will allocate the money where it is needed most. Some of this money may be used to start new schools. States such as Florida and South Dakota, with no medical schools, are keenly interested in this possibility.

These grants are to help the schools meet their present financial losses. Medical schools figure they lose about $1,600 per year on every student. They say that is one reason why enrollments are held to a low level in many institutions.

A few medical schools are reported to be on the verge of closing down, unless they get more income. For their financial relief, and the aid of other schools in the field of health, the Senate plan calls for a total Federal subsidy of $230,000,000 in the 5 years starting next July 1. Another $25,000,000 is set aside for vocational training of practical nurses.

Students are to get some Federal aid also. Scholarships costing an average of $11,000,000 a year are promised to students in dentistry, nursing, and public-health courses. It is assumed that 1 out of every 10 will get a scholarship to study dentistry, starting in 1951. The sum to be allowed is $2,000 a year per student for tuition, fees, living expenses.

Dental hygienists and nurses are to get scholarships of $1,800 a year. About 30 percent of the nurses are expected to win scholarships. Students preparing for public-health careers will be allowed $4,500 a year. No scholarships are provided for medical students under present plans. This limitation may be removed in future years.

What this plan produces, in the way of additional medical workers, will depend on many factors. Without the plan medical schools will graduate about 57,000 new physicians between now and 1960. With the plan officials estimate that an additional 15,000 physicians may be trained during the next 10 years. They figure that the plan also will produce 5,000 more dentists than would be trained otherwise.

In other fields these results are hoped for: An 8-percent increase in the number of osteopaths trained each year; a rise in the enrollment of nursing schools, from 43,000 at present to 50,000 by 1951; a 9-percent increase in the number of dental hygienists turned out each year; a 25-percent increase in graduates of public-health training; a 60-percent increase in the number of sanitary engineers.

Actually, the increases might fall below these estimates. There is no assurance that medical schools can find enough physicians to teach many more students, in the next few years at least. The money promised for construction, $25,000,000, in all, is called a drop in the bucket compared with needs by the schools. Medical schools alone count up a need for about $200,000,000 to bring facilities up to date.

Any serious delays in the expansion program will be reported to Congress by the National Council on Education for Health Professions. This new group is to advise the Surgeon General on administration of the training subsidies.

The council also is directed, in the proposed legislation, to draw up a permanent Federal program to encourage medical education. This long-range plan is to be ready by 1952. The subsidy system now being considered is only the emergency first step of aid.

Lack of doctors in rural areas goes a long way to explain why Congress suddenly is getting excited about medical training. The chart above shows one aspect of the doctor-supply situation. It shows that there are 137 physicians per 100,000 people now, where there were 149 in 1909. In other words, there is one physician for 730 persons now, where there used to be one physician for 671 people.

Nobody can prove whether or not this is enough physicians. The American Medical Association says that it is, and cites an estimated one-third increase in each physician's productivity since 1940, due to new drugs, better equipment. The Federal Security Agency has adopted as its goal a supply of not less than one for every 585 persons.

What interests Congress, in any case, is that the proportion of physicians is far below the national average in many rural areas.

There has been a steady increase in the number of physicians in relation to population since 1929 for the country as a whole. But the new ones have flocked into cities, away from rural places. Low pay and professional isolation, in rural communities, are the usual reasons.

Many rural areas point to a record like that of Kansas. That State had 2,732 physicians for 1,545,000 people in 1906. Now there are 1,900 for 1,900,000 people.

The East has gained notably in the number of physicians, while other areas have lagged. In Massachusetts there is one pediatrician for every 5,000 children; in Mississippi, one for every 35,000 children.

The regions line up this way, as to supply of physicians:

New England States, plus New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey, have 1 physician for every 575 people now, far more physicians than there were 27 years ago.

South Atlantic States have 1 physician for every 800 people. These States have also gained sharply.

All other regions in the country have fewer physicians now than they had in 1923, in proportion to population. That is true of the Midwestern States as a group, the South, the Mountain and Pacific regions.

These facts and figures, as outlined here on the basis of official surveys, form the background for the plan to expand medical training. This plan has been taking shape, largely unnoticed, in the shadow of political battles over national health insurance. It appears to have widespread support in Congress.

But, even if the plan is approved, an economy-minded Congress may cut down on the subsidy when the time comes to appropriate the cash.

Charity Begins at Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, early this month, at the joint session of Congress, President Truman delivered his annual message on the state of the Union. This was not a message of defeatism and dejection. It was a fearless and constructive message. It was a timely message outlining the hopes and ambitions of the American people, not only for the next year, but for the next half century.

The message had depth, breadth, and vibrated with hope for peace and progress for all the people of the world. Truly this was the finest message that President Truman has ever given to the Congress of the United States.

This splendid document tells the whole world that the President intends to carry out the Democratic platform of 1948, and calls upon the Congress to back him up.

This bold and fearless message, which foretold of the fulfillment of our democratic pledges at home and our support for the people of the world in their struggle for freedom and liberty, struck fear into the hearts of the reactionaries. The wheels of sabotage were set in motion. How to stop Truman was the $64 question.

Last week the coalition of reactionary Republicans and reactionary southern Democrats showed their hand. They brought out a resolution to give back to the 12-man Rules Committee autocratic veto power over House legislation. The vote was taken last Friday, and without doubt, it was the most important, the most far-reaching, the most crucial battle of this Congress. Fortunately the Truman forces, with the help of a few progressive Republicans, won this fight. If the opposition had won, it meant that the Democratic platform and all of the Truman Fair Deal program was killed for this session.

In the past, pledges and party platforms were absolutely meaningless, a huge joke and a hoax upon the people. They were meaningless because of the veto mechanisms that were set up in the House and Senate, by which a small minority could block the will of the majority and defy the pledges of political parties made in open conventions and approved by the majority of the voters in the Nation.

In the Senate the mechanism for minority veto is the filibuster. The power of the filibuster was increased when the reactionary Republicans and the reactionary southern Democratic coalition got together and emasculated the cloture rule.

Previously cloture could be applied to choke off debate by a majority of those present, which might be 33. The anti-administration coalition raised the number required to 64, thus virtually throwing cloture out of the window.

In the House the 12-man Rules Committee had exercised veto power over legislation since 1884. The Rules Committee was originally designed to control the order of business. This authority was soon perverted and the committee became autocratic and domineering. They took upon themselves the right to pass judgment on the merits of all legislation.

Of course, membership on the powerful Rules Committee was much sought after. It was a great privilege to be 1 of 12 men in the House who could say "yes" or "no" on vital bills. Of these 12 members 8 are Democrats and 4 are Republicans. Of the eight Democrats, four are from the South and on most issues they see eye to eye with the four Republican Members. They like to call themselves "strongly conservative." So,

whether we call them conservative or reactionary, the fact is that this anti-Truman, anti-Fair Deal coalition, has 8 of the 12 votes on this powerful committee. They do not all have to be present at a meeting because six votes is sufficient to block any positive action. So, Government by majority becomes a farce. American democracy cannot meet the challenge of the times. Legislative machinery could not be speeded up. The will of the majority is made ineffective.

The Rules Committee, originally organized as a traffic light for House legislation, had become a road block for everything that it opposed and could smother any bill that it desired to.

When a bill is introduced in the House it is referred to a standing legislative committee, usually made up of 25 members. Many weeks are spent in hearings and deliberations; after much study and hard work the legislative committee would report out a bill only to have it languish in a pigeon-hole in the Rules Committee. So, last year the House took this power away from the Rules Committee. The new system provided that after a 21-day wait a committee chairman can call to the floor any bill on which the Rules Committee has not acted.

On Friday the Truman opposition tried to abolish the liberalized rule adopted last year. They were beaten by a vote of 236 to 183. It was a great victory for the people. No longer can 6 or 7 men on the Rules Committee thwart the will of 435 elected Representatives of 150,000,000 people.

It is too soon to say that the battle is over, however. This powerful coalition will try again when the proper opportunity presents itself. The second and fourth Mondays of the month are reserved for chairmen of legislative committees to call up bills under the 21-day rule.

Last Monday, by forcing six or seven unnecessary roll calls, thereby stalling the legislative machinery and preventing chairmen of legislative committees from calling up the bills pigeonholed in the Rules Committee, this hard and unrelenting coalition showed that it is still unwilling to accept the verdict of the people in the 1948 elections, and in defiance of the wishes of the American people, this group, with the Republican leadership in the vanguard, has shown that it will resort to every dilatory tactic to bottle up important legislation included in the program submitted to Congress by the President of the United States.

Yes, the people have rejected the Republican Party in five consecutive presidential elections, but still by political chicanery, with the aid of some reactionary southern Democrats, they may yet gain control of the legislative machinery.

In recent months we have heard much moaning and groaning about the welfare state, statism, socialism, and just generally, that Truman and the Democrats are driving the country to the dogs. This propaganda was played up strongly in the last 3 or 4 months of 1949.

But since the annual reports have been published showing corporate and business earnings for last year, those political and professional wailers have slowed down to a mere sniffle here and there.

Here, I hold a Detroit newspaper dated January 17, with the headline "Profit sets record for all firms," and that General Motors Corp. earned more profits last year—over $600,000,000—than any other company ever made in a similar period, Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., chairman of the board, revealed today.

Addressing 500 leaders in industry, finance, and civic affairs at a Forward From Fifty luncheon, preliminary to the company's annual auto show—the Midcentury Motorama—opening Thursday, Sloan termed 1949 a satisfactory year for the industry and for General Motors. Last year's profits, he said, "are likely to move up to over $600,000,000. Such a figure is well over $13 a share on outstanding common stock, on which 1949 dividends totaled $8 a share.

EXCEEDS 1948 FIGURE

In 1948, net income amounted to $440,447,724, or $9.72 a common share, while common dividends that year aggregated $4.50 a share.

When I presented this to some of our Republican groaners and moaners in Congress, the answer was "Well doggone it anyhow. You Democrats are not supposed to read the financial pages."

But in a couple of weeks when they feel sure that the people have forgotten all about these earnings and huge profits, out will come the big red bandana handkerchiefs and the tears will be profuse and voluminous, the wailing, the moaning, and the groaning will increase in tempo every week—yes, sir, right up to November, because there is an election this year.

One of the problems that I am most deeply interested in is that of old-age pensions, and adequate social security. For years this problem has been bantered about. Finally, last year, the Ways and Means Committee reported out H. R. 6000 which passed the House with only 14 votes against it. This bill is now before the Senate for consideration. I hope that the Senate will liberalize the provisions of this bill because it was brought up under the so-called gag rule in the House and there was no opportunity to amend it on the floor.

Now, since the House passed H. R. 6000 the whole pension issue has broken wide open as a result of labor-management conflicts. The auto workers, steelworkers, and coal miners have fought a strong and determined battle for a $100 monthly pension. The Townsend-plan workers are more active than ever. Big business, headed by Herman Steinkraus, president of the Chamber of Commerce, fearful of the effect on private business of the private pension-plan agreements won by the unions, is now supporting a broader Federal-aid program. Private industry therefore will support bigger Federal benefits in order to shift some of the burden of private pensions.

So, the lesson learned is that when you hit the company pocketbook, they too will join in the parade for adequate Federal aid for the aged.

Under the bill passed by the House, the vast majority of needy aged would not receive pension insurance as their right, but would still have to rely on charity from the assistance programs. I believe that these old people should remain as a group of active consumers. That is the position that the Townsend plan people take. I also believe that annuities should begin at the age of 60 years.

The one thing that this Nation can afford and must provide is a real measure of security for its old people and its disabled citizens.

To keep our internal economy sound and to guard against any sudden emergency, I believe that the Federal-State unemployment insurance system should be strengthened by establishing a minimum standard of $30 a week benefits—with additional amounts for dependents—for all parts of the country and extending coverage up to 26 weeks.

All of those big business and big banking interests who have been so loud and insistent in their support of the Marshall plan and China-aid programs are always quick to point out that a certain portion of these free Treasury dollars will be spent for United States goods and services. That the expenditure of this money means markets for farm products, automobiles, and tools.

Well, how about a little domestic Marshall plan for our own people—those who are sick, aged, unemployed—for those communities that need hospitals, schools, teachers, and nurses?

Is not every one of these dollars going to be spent right in our own country for farm products and manufactured goods?

Why is it that the same people, the same big and powerful interests who are so anxious to raid the United States Treasury to spend money in Europe and Asia are always leading the parade in opposition to domestic programs in the best interest and welfare of our own people? The only obvious answer is that there is money and profits in the European and Asiatic deals, and they cannot snip anything off on the domestic programs. Therefore, our program is called the welfare state and socialism.

I think that it is a simple truth that full employment in our country depends on the ability of consumer purchasing power to keep pace with the steady increase in production of goods and services. To guarantee steady and expanding markets there must be an increased flow of real income to the American people. This also calls for an economic uplifting of our substandard families. I feel that our domestic welfare programs have been slashed too deeply already, and that we are endangering our paramount objective which is permanent full employment. I believe that substantial cuts can be made in appropriations for the Marshall plan and the military. More than one-half of our tax dollar is going to those two sources.

President Roosevelt laid down a postwar program for peace and prosperity. The foundation for this is the United Nations and two of the cornerstones are the International Trade Organization and the World Bank. Roosevelt had told the Congress and the whole world, including Mr. Churchill, right after the second UNRRA appropriation, that there would be no more free dollars available, that the American economy could no longer stand the strain. Mr. Roosevelt had proposed the International Trade

Organization and the World Bank as a means of financing world trade for the postwar period. The ITO was to provide multilateral agreements so as to give to all the nations an equal opportunity to trade in all the markets of the world for raw materials, supplies, and machinery. The bank was to finance this world trade. We have 38 percent of the stock in this bank; the bank was to issue bonds paying 2½ percent interest, and the bank was to charge 4½ percent interest for the loans that it made. This was sound business policy. We were assured of the return of our money; yes, not only the return of it, but 2½ percent interest upon the bonds that we bought. Now, would any Member of Congress oppose the purchase of ten or fifteen billion dollars worth of these interest-bearing bonds? I do not think so. Was this not a better program than the Marshall plan? Yes; but the recovery of the world would have been assured, and there would be no necessity for bilateral trade agreements which are aimed at destroying the trade of the United States of America and putting us out of the world markets. Yes, by doing business through the World Bank we were assured the return of our money or the defaulting nations would lose faith and credit in the whole family of nations.

Well, now of course, this program did not suit Mr. Churchill, who was looking for more free hand-outs for England. This proposal did not suit those Americans who had a $1,000,000,000 prewar investment in Germany and were seeking free United States Treasury dollars to triple or quadruple this kitty. Of course, this program did not suit the international cartelists, monopolists, and the big international banking houses, who worked hand in hand with the international cartelists—but then Franklin D. Roosevelt died. So Mr. Churchill came to Fulton, Mo., made his famous speech that left America shaking and quivering with fear. The hysteria grew and mounted, and the free American dollars started to roll out again. Mr. Churchill won, England got her money, the German barons and the Japanese zaibatsu will be handed back their war plants and industries, nicely restored with the latest American equipment and machinery, and the latest American production methods. It is time to stop, look, and listen. Charity begins at home.

You'd Smile, Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. R. GROSS
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, as one who last year opposed the tax exempt $50,000 expense allowance increase for President Truman, it is with pleasure that I insert in the RECORD the following editorial from the Bremer County Independent, a newspaper published at Waverly, Iowa:

Ever see a picture of President Truman when he wasn't smiling? Well, if we had $54,000 left out of our salary after paying Federal taxes, got an extra $40,000 expense allowance, plus an additional $50,000 expense money in January, all tax-exempt, we wouldn't just smile—we'd laugh out loud!

Haym Salomon, a Hero of the American Revolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, one of the heroes of the American Revolution was that great patriot Haym Salomon. We remember this month the one hundred sixty-fifth anniversary of the death of this man who carved for himself a place of honor and dignity in the annals of American history by his selfless support of the cause of American democracy.

Haym Salomon, who is described by American historians as "the financier of the American Revolution," was a Jewish immigrant from Poland. He was born at Lissa, Poland, in 1740 and arrived in New York in 1772. He settled in New York and opened a brokerage office on Broad Street. He was among the early supporters of a little group of American patriots who advocated independence for the American Colonies. Because of his ardent activities in this patriotic organization, known as Sons of Liberty, he was arrested by the British on September 26, 1776, and confined at the famous Citadel.

About a year later he was released, continued his activities with the American patriots, and early in 1778 was again arrested by the British, court-martialed for spying for the patriots and sentenced to be hanged. With the aid of the Sons of Liberty, he succeeded in escaping and fled to Philadelphia. There he reestablished his business connections which enabled him to make contributions of vast sums for the patriotic cause during this crucial period in American history.

I am privileged to call your attention to the following article by Harry H. Schlacht, which appeared in the New York Journal-American and other papers throughout the country on January 13, 1950:

HAYM SALOMON: THE FORGOTTEN MAN OF HISTORY

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

We open the golden book of memory. We thank God for our heroes of yesteryear who have by their vision and their faith, who have by their courage and their lives, bequeathed to us our priceless heritage.

We remember with gratitude the one hundred and sixty-fifth anniversary of the death of Haym Salomon. He was the great Jewish revolutionary patriot whose qualities of mind and heart endeared him to our founding fathers.

Let America remember and acclaim this great benefactor and patriot. Here was a man of great character, of noble self-sacrifice, of wholehearted patriotism, of martyr-like devotion to high ideals.

If our Nation is great, it is because such men have made it great.

Haym Salomon came here seeking liberty. He came here to help build a nation which gives to bigotry no sanction, no persecution no assistance. He was a man of humility. He was a man of self-denial. He was a simple man, the badge of a great soul.

The American Revolution was a time that tried men's souls. It was a time that also tried men's purses. When Gen. George Washington called upon him for aid, Haym Salomon placed at his service his wealth and fortitude, his enthusiasm and energy in freedom's holy cause. He was an institution in himself. He became part of our glorious inheritance. It was he who helped raise the money to equip the Continental Army. It was he who contributed his entire personal fortune of $640,000. It was he who gave his all, and all he could borrow to enable General Washington to keep his tattered forces on the march until victory was won.

Haym Salomon died penniless.

From the very birth of our Nation to the present day, the descendants of Haym Salomon have been the dauntless defenders of American liberty. They have written their names in flaming letters upon the treasured pages of American history. They have played a noble role in the Government of our country. They were identified with our colonial growth. They have fought with glory in all the wars of the Republic. They have won the highest commendation from every President of our Nation. They have helped write liberty in the skies all over the world.

Haym Salomon belongs to America. He is part of the very heart of our Nation. He is ours by more than patriotic self-devotion. He is ours by the unshakable gratitude for his services in the crisis of our fate. He belongs to America by that tie of love which is stronger than death, which links his name for the endless ages with the names of Washington and Jefferson, Morris and Madison, and the other great immortals of our glorious history.

Let America remember Haym Salomon. Let Congress set aside a Haym Salomon Day. Let the President sign this resolution. Let his name be revered as long as America shall live. Let his example be a beacon light to all Americans. Let us be strong in the faith of Haym Salomon, whose memory we honor.

Mr. Speaker, as suggested by Mr. Schlacht in his very fine editorial, I have today introduced a joint resolution making January 6 of each year Haym Salomon Day. I hope that it will soon be adopted by the Congress.

An Honorable Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am including an editorial from the Lock Haven Express, of Lock Haven, Pa. This editorial speaks for itself and expresses exactly my own sentiment and what I believe to be the sentiment of almost every Member of Congress:

AN HONORABLE CAREER

Congress won't be the same without BOB RICH.

His decision not to be a candidate for reelection in this year's campaign is received with sincere regret by his host of friends and admirers, including many who may have opposed him politically but could not fail to recognize his sincere purpose and sturdy convictions on matters of principle.

During his 18 years in Congress, and even including the 2-year term when he surrendered his seat to stay on the sidelines, Mr. RICH has been a consistent and sturdy spokesman for the fundamental principles to which he has been committed throughout his 20 years in public life on the national scale—solvency in government. He has been one Congressman whose record has been steadily consistent in two predictable areas—Federal economy and service to his constituents.

There is a sort of poetic compensation in the fact that, after years of what Williamsport Grit yesterday described as "crying in the wilderness," Mr. RICH now retires from Congress in an atmosphere of an increasing Nation-wide concern for governmental economy.

He may have been a prophet without honor among some of his congressional colleagues during the past 20 years, as he insistently demanded to know where the money was to be found to finance expanding governmental operations, but even the skeptics now can see the day of reckoning approaching. He will leave Congress at a time when the old-fashioned virtue of economy, which he championed through the season of scoffings and scornings, is winning respect and even popularity as Congress and the country see the national deficit growing by billions each year.

The Fifteenth District owes Mr. RICH a real tribute of gratitude for his congressional service, for he has turned in an amazing performance of conscientious and careful service on behalf of his district.

Regardless of party, residents of the Fifteenth District could be sure that any request or query they might make to Mr. RICH'S office would be attended to as swiftly and satisfactorily as possible. The Congressman and his efficient office assistants have given this district outstandingly efficient day-to-day service on the multitude of matters in which a Congressman must act as the Washington spokesman for the people of his district.

It is no exaggeration that Mr. RICH has set an extremely high standard of service in this respect—a standard any successor will have a hard time to match, certainly during the first years of his career as a new Congressman.

Tree Farming Increases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Commercial Appeal of January 20, 1950:

TREE FARMING INCREASES

Reports from American Forest Products, Inc., say that tree-farm acreage passed the 20,000,000 mark in this country last year. At year's end the Nation had 20,000,102 acres of privately owned timberlands dedicated to the perpetual production of wood for commercial use. This acreage represents 2,242 different ownerships in a total of 27 States.

Of special interest is the fact that the reports show the South led the Nation, and for the fifth consecutive year, in increasing its tree-farming acreage. During 1949 the South added 1,151,759 acres to the total number set aside to do nothing but grow wood. Alabama leads the South in the number of tree farms, with 325, but Arkansas, with 251 farms, is ahead in acreage with 3,009,843. Mississippi has 226 tree farms amounting to 738,792 acres and Tennessee has 231 farms totaling 290,193 acres.

It is to be hoped that the South continues to advance rapidly along these lines. That they have profitable possibilities was vividly illustrated just recently when a new $32,000,000 paper plant began operations near Childersburg, Ala., to offer landowners in the area a steady income from tree farming.

Legislative Objectives, Veterans of Foreign Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a digest of the legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The matter referred to follows:

LEGISLATIVE OBJECTIVES OF THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS OF THE UNITED STATES, SUBJECT TO THE JURISDICTION OF THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

JANUARY 17, 1950.

The following legislative objectives of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States are subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and are based on resolutions adopted by the 1949 national convention of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States:

1. To increase disability compensation and pensions for World War I and World War II veterans and widows and orphans (Resolution 337). H. R. 909 by Mr. RANKIN.

2. To urge the enactment of the veterans pension bill H. R. 4617, now pending before the Senate Finance Committee (Resolution 211). H. R. 4617 by Mr. RANKIN.

3. To increase the income limitations governing eligibility for widows' and veterans' non-service-connected death pension to $2,000 for those with no children, and $3,000 for those with children (Resolution 343). H. R. 921 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts.

4. To enact legislation which would provide an equitable adjusted service compensation for veterans of World War II of $3 per day for home service (maximum $3,500), $4 per day for overseas service (maximum $4,500), plus an additional $500 for a wound or wounds received in combat; and that all tangible monetary benefits received by any veteran pursuant to the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944, as amended, be deducted from such adjusted service pay (Resolution 335). H. R. 914 by Mr. RANKIN.

5. To urge the President of the United States, (a) to rescind his order for the cutback of the 16,000 beds announced on January 10, 1949, and (b) to issue orders for the prompt construction of these and such other beds as may be required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans (Resolution 432). H. R. 5965 by Mr. RANKIN.

6. To provide a statutory seniority equal to the time spent in the armed forces during World War II for those veterans employed in an industry governed by the seniority system (Resolution 357). H. R. 5509 by Mr. RANKIN.

7. To amend Public Law 16, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that any rehabilitated physically handicapped veteran would be allowed to complete a further training course on part-time or night-school basis, provided that such additional training will not exceed the maximum of 4 years, as authorized under existing law (Resolution 226).

8. To provide statutory award for arrested tuberculosis, service-connected, for World War II veterans on same basis as World War I veterans (Resolution 284).

9. To enact legislation providing that all honorably discharged veterans who have served in any and all past armed expeditions on foreign soil and in which the United States took part, be entitled to receive the same medical aid and hospitalization as is extended to veterans of war service (Resolution 57). H. R. 3575 by Mr. KEARNEY.

10. To liberalize existing law relating to the granting of automobiles to disabled veterans so that the Government contribution will be $2,000 instead of $1,600, or in the alternative to support the passage of S. 2115, Eighty-first Congress (Resolution 393). S. 2115 by Mr. PEPPER.

11. To enact legislation providing for chiropractic service in the medical facilities of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 436). H. R. 1512 by Mr. HUBER; and S. 2025 by Mr. PEPPER.

12. To urge that all cost of training programs for Veterans' Administration medical and other professional personnel shall be charged to an appropriation separate from the Veterans' Administration appropriation and that any such trainees shall be required to serve for 2 years with the Veterans' Administration upon completing such training (Resolution 450).

13. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, to provide death-pension benefits where the serviceman incurred a permanent disability but his death while in the service was not considered in line of duty, although not under dishonorable conditions (Resolution 401). H. R. 5619 by Mr. EVINS.

14. Endorsing H. R. 1776, which denies apportionment of compensation or pension to the wife of a veteran unless there was continuous cohabitation from the date of marriage or where separation was due to the veteran's misconduct without the fault of the wife (Resolution 451). H. R. 1776 by Mr. RANKIN.

15. To amend part III, Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a), as amended, to provide that constitutional and developmental abnormalities producing unemployability shall be treated as disability for this purpose (Resolution 395). Covered by H. R. 899 by Mr. RANKIN.

16. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that widows of World War II veterans would be eligible for pensions on the same basis as now provided widows of World War I veterans (Resolution 234). H. R. 6188 by Mrs. ROGERS.

17. To provide pensions for veterans of the Confederate Army on the same basis as pensions now provided veterans of the Union Army (Resolution 325). H. R. 5821 by Mr. HARE.

18. To enact legislation to exclude commercial insurance payments from consideration as income in determining eligibility for non-service-connected death pensions (Resolution 294). H. R. 3821 by Mr. RANKIN.

19. To enact legislation providing that the interval between technical release from active duty and arrival home within a reasonable period shall be considered active duty for compensation purposes, provided, that disability or death during such period is not attributable to the veteran's own willful misconduct (Resolution 394).

20. To oppose any legislation that would reduce the hospital benefits now available to

veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities (Resolution 18).

21. To enact legislation increasing compensation by 20 percent for those having combat-incurred disabilities and diseases (Resolution 251). , H. R. 903 by Mr. RANKIN.

22. To urge the enactment of H. R. 4074, which would presume as service-connected the disabilities of veterans of the Spanish-American War for the purposes of obtaining out-patient treatment and hospitalization in facilities of the Veterans' Administration (Resolution 19). H. R. 4074 by Mr. RANKIN.

23. To enact legislation excluding pensions derived from contributory systems in determining income for pension eligibility (Resolution 272).

24. To increase monetary veterans' benefits by 25 percent in the cases of veterans residing in Alaska in order to meet the higher cost of living in that territory (Resolution 1).

25. To amend Veterans Regulation 2676 (B) (4) so as to permit the acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria (Resolution 34).

26. To provide a uniform pension program for war veterans, based on attained age or non-service-connected disability as follows (Resolution 360)—H. R. 2512 by Mr. RANKIN:

Upon being rated 60-percent disability, $60.

Upon being rated permanent and total disability, $90.

Upon reaching the age of 65 years, $90.

Where an aide or attendant is required, $120.

27. To amend Public Law 182, Seventy-eighth Congress, providing for payment of a statutory award for enucleation or loss of use of an eye and loss of use or amputation of an arm, or enucleation or loss of use of one eye and loss of use or amputation of a leg (Resolution 207). H. R. 1220 by Mr. HINSHAW.

28. To extend the time for administrative presumption of service connection for World War II veterans to August 1, 1953, and limit presumption to the diseases now provided for in World War I presumptions (Resolution 208). H. R. 2311 by Mr. MILLS.

29. To enact legislation making permanent the present Federal-aid allotment of $500 per annum per veteran domiciled in State and Territorial veterans' homes (Resolution 20).

30. To enact legislation providing out-patient treatment and medication for those veterans who have been hospitalized and are in need of further treatment; or, if hospitalization has been requested, treatment may be authorized when beds are not available, for those suffering from non-service-connected disabilities and who are in receipt of part III benefits (Resolution 202).

31. To extend for 2 years the period during which World War II veterans may receive readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act (Resolution 15). H. R. 1374 by Mr. HUBER.

32. To endorse the bill, H. R. 5479, which provides for reimbursement by the Veterans' Administration of medical expenses incurred by a veteran under certain emergency conditions (Resolution 391). H. R. 5479 by Mr. RANKIN.

33. To enact legislation providing World War I veterans status to those persons serving with the army of occupation between November 12, 1918, and July 2, 1921 (Resolution 86).

34. To enact legislation abolishing or reducing the 5-percent compound interest on insurance liens under World War I insurance (Resolution 47). H. R. 38 by Mr. DAVIS.

35. To enact legislation to enable veterans rated totally disabled service-connected to reinstate Government insurance (Resolution 114). H. R. 4234 by Mr. RANKIN.

36. To endorse H. R. 5574, providing for certain liberal changes in the NSLI Act of 1940 (Resolutions 407–417). H. R. 5574 by Mr. RANKIN.

37. To oppose the proposal of the Hoover Commission to operate the insurance activity of the Veterans' Administration in a different manner than the other major services of that organization, and to assure that the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs retain his present full control over all phases of the Veterans' Administration activities, and operate the Veterans' Administration as one administrative entity (Resolution 430).

38. To endorse the bill H. R. 5331, Eighty-first Congress, which authorizes an equitable adjustment of certain NSLI policies by applying contemplated dividends to unpaid premiums so as to revise lapsed policies (Resolution 433). H. R. 5331 by Mr. RANKIN.

39. To oppose any effort to transfer from the Veterans' Administration its Loan Guaranty Division or any other divisions, departments, or functions (Resolution 255).

40. To oppose any plan which would take from the immediate control and jurisdiction of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, any of the functions of Government which have to do with the care and treatment of veterans (Resolution 431).

Without Issues Voters Fail

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEO E. ALLEN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include the expressions and beliefs of an outstanding American, Justus L. Johnson, clerk of the Appellate Court for the Second District of Illinois since 1920.

His statement is sound and logical. It should be given sincere thought by every taxpayer.

His statement follows:

WITHOUT ISSUES VOTERS FAIL—INCOME, OWNERSHIP AND OPERATION AFFECTED BY REVENUE SYSTEM

Too many people of small incomes have been led to believe that the rich and corporations are carrying the heavy Government expenditures. Many feel the Government actually grants them advantages.

The true facts show that 89.8 of salaries and wages, 69.4 percent of dividends and interest, 83.1 percent of rents go to persons with incomes of less than $5,000 per year. This is the compilation of Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University, in his pamphlet "The National Income and Its Distribution." The figures are from the United States Department of Commerce and the United States Treasury Department.

From whom can more national revenue be obtained? The country's corporations are owned by 18,000,000 stockholders. There are only a very few large corporations having individual stockholders possessing over 1 percent of that company's stock. The exceptions are institutions, schools, hospitals, cemeteries, insurance companies, etc., who account for 41 percent of the ownership of these corporation stocks. But these associations represent millions of people.

The Government already imposes a heavy corporation tax and also taxes the individual stockholder's dividends, which makes a double tax. To increase the corporation taxes will reduce individual stockholder income. The great pool of national income already is in the hands of those receiving $5,000 or less per year. From here on the pinch is more tightly on small incomes if the Government cannot reduce its operating costs.

Every new regulation or tax imposition adds to the cost of production. The business operation or corporation must add the overhead on its output, if it is to continue. There is only one place from which it can get a return—the user and consumer. He is at the end of the line and pays the added cost. He has been made the goat for all added costs. Every time the Government socks the producer or corporation up goes the cost of his article. The hurt is passed on to the ultimate purchaser, who is the fellow with the income less than $5,000 a year. He constitutes more than 90 percent of the purchasing needs.

The producer and the consumer constitutes the neglected groups in the United States. The heavier the added cost of production the higher the price structure. This increases buyer resistance and lessens the volume of production and reduces employment. The fellow who uses the article or goods, pays for everything that has been added to the price. He does not escape because corporation taxes have been upped or the rich have been soaked. These clear by attaching the added costs. As a matter of fact, the consumers, who have nothing to pass on, have been made suckers to supply the income for Government programs he does not understand.

In addition to the millions of employees who work for the Government for pay, other millions are strait-jacketed to become tax collectors, without pay, to build up revenues for Federal spending. Every salesman, every business operator, every assembler and producer, every worker under social security, anyone that sells goods, pays or collects from others to build up accumulations for Federal spending. Services and time that could be used by people, for people, are absorbed in satisfying Government inquiries and reports and overcoming buyer resistance on heavily tax-loaded prices. This is also an overhead on production and distribution and the expense becomes part of the price that the customer must pay. No one speaks up for him in terms he understands. He is the beast of burden who provides for the absorption and carrying of all these weights. Is there not a leader or party who is able enough to become his champion?

We wonder how politicians have so successfully hoodwinked the two largest classes of citizens—the producers and the consumers.

It is time to have new issues in campaigns—freedom—the Constitution—liberty—trade and commerce—your brother's keeper—suffering Europe and starving people—as issues have been worked to death while the producer and consumer in America pays the bil. Strange how this has been camouflaged—how the people receiving less than $5,000 per year are kept from understanding that they are 90 percent of the consuming class and to them is "passed the buck" to provide the payment for making the world "safe for democracy."

Is it not time that someone should arise and speak? Point out the groups that continue to make the little fellow the beast of burden for grandiose schemes and world-wide give-aways?

TAKES ONE-FOURTH OF INCOME

The tax bill in the Nation is above $50,000,000,000 annually, 25 percent of the

whole national income. Forty billion dollars is taken by the Federal Government. Some escape income tax because of exemptions and low earnings. Do they escape paying? Everything carries that indirect burden—that package added to production. In many cases it far exceeds any direct tax load that might have been imposed on the individual. Certainly it is time for the consumers of the Nation, especially those with families to support, to get off the "sucker list" put together by these "Princes of Power and Politics."

Let us get our bearings and understand that the two important groups of people in our country are the producers and the consumers. If a healthy atmosphere exists for these two groups, the remainder fare all right. When materials and goods are produced there is trade and commerce. Without production there will be disaster and it will fall first on business institutions. The American public has been distracted too long. Let's get on the beam—understand our problems. Give adherence to leaders who lead—voices that get their guidance from production centers and from the consumers. Ghost writers and propaganda-inspired solutions do not present basic answers. Change the viewpoint and the American public will take on a crusader spirit. Give the voters something to fight for and there won't be over 43,000,000 voters failing to go to the polls.

FACE THE FACTS

Let's face the facts and give the voter something to support or oppose. Ninety-three million voters were qualified to cast a ballot in 1948. More than 43,000,000 did not vote. Did these nonvoters have positive convictions? People busy with their own affairs want consideration of problems that affect their existence. Meet them on issues in an understanding way and no one will need to drag them to the polls.

Old empires grew to power on control of sea routes and the sea ports controlled the pattern of life. It was trade and commerce. To the Atlantic seaboard in the United States it was normal to think in these same terms. But America is not like Britain, France, Italy, Spain, Rome, Greece, Egypt, etc. More than three-fourths of America is not on the seaboard and from the very beginning of our development it was devoted to production. Attitudes on life, law, politics, what is important, varies where well-being depends on giving something for what you get—it is the code for production. Let the production areas make the slogan for so-called leaders. Let the consumers who pay the bills, say to the politician, "Earn it, not burn it."

The country's problems affect us all. As a practical matter about two-thirds of our voters the country over are traditionally members of the two major parties. They vote the candidates and the party platforms. The party in power has slightly over half of these traditional party men in its ranks. Another one-third of the voters are fence sitters and vote only when aroused to action. For them there must be issues that burn for solution; that calls for judgment and creates a willingness to do something.

In the last national election many Democrats, many Republicans, and very many independents failed to vote. In fact, about 47 percent of the qualified voters did not go to the polls. Now do you think people are not serious? They will follow the candidate with answers. Let the answer come from those who understand the production problem and are a part of it. Let the consumer understand what part of his dollar goes to the producer and what part goes to far away places and programs. We will then get what we are willing to pay for and the "Voice of America" will come from the heart of the people on whom our country's prosperity depends.

No Arab Ghettoes in Israel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I believe many Members of this House will be interested to know how Israel treats its minorities. Israel's population now numbers about 1,200,000, of whom 175,000 are non-Jewish. Most of this non-Jewish population are Moslem and Christian Arabs.

Here, then, is a state where for the first time in 2,000 years Jews constitute a majority of the inhabitants. What have Jews learned during their long exile when they were always and everywhere a minority, often suffering indescribable persecution and oppression? How are they applying this lesson in their own state today?

The article on this subject, which I am inserting in the RECORD, answers these questions. I trust all Members will take the few moments necessary to read this article and judge for themselves. It was published in the issue of June 10, 1949, of Israel Speaks.

The article follows:

NO GHETTOES FOR ARABS IN MINORITY-MINDED ISRAEL

(By Zvi Shiffrin)

TEL AVIV.—How Israel treats its minorities—especially the Arabs—is a matter of interest for the whole world. Almost every country has had a Jewish minority within its borders for some period during the past 2,000 years, and many people are curious to know just how the Jews have reacted now that the tables have at last been turned.

Right now it's too early for a detailed analysis. Security reasons prevented the complete normalization of the relationship between the Jewish state and her Arab minority. Even its harshest critics, however, have found little to criticize in Israel's treatment of the 70,000 Arabs who elected to remain within its borders.

CULTURAL RIGHTS

Probably the chief reason for Israel's success in this field is that so many of her leaders really understand the Palestine Arabs and their culture. Their policy toward the Arabs rejects the two extremes that hurt the Jews so much in the Diaspora; ghettoization on the one hand, and assimilation on the other. What they want to ensure for the Arab population is equal democratic rights for the individual, and community cultural rights for the Arabs as a group. To carry out a policy like this requires more than tolerance. It demands real understanding.

A minor but highly significant illustration of this occurred at the opening of the Knesset (Israeli Parliament) in Jerusalem. One of the Arab delegates rose to say a few words, in his native tongue, of course. When he was through, an official translator repeated his remarks in Hebrew. Then to the amusement of all, Foreign Minister Moshe Sharett, one of Israel's leading Arabic scholars, asked for the floor and pointed out that the translator had made a slight mistake. Sharett then proceeded to give the correct version while the Arab delegates beamed with satisfaction.

Thus far the Israel Government has undertaken rehabilitation measures for the Arabs extending into every sphere of life—religion, employment, education, health, even marriage and divorce. Whenever possible, Arabs themselves are entrusted with the administration of these activities. Each ministry has a special department to look after the Arabs. Thus the Department of Labor takes care of Arab employment, while the Department of Health is responsible for Arab health. It is felt that the problems are so complicated that this method works better than setting aside one ministry to cope with all Arab needs.

FILL MARRIAGE VACUUM

A good example of the work done by the Government is the record of the Ministry of Religion. The mass Arab exodus last summer left Israel's Moslems without religious leadership. (Most leaders of Christian Arab communities remained, however.) From the Mufti down, Moslem priests (imams) and judges (kadis) left their people to wait until the Arab forces would march triumphantly into Tel Aviv. While they waited, the Israel Government proceeded to fill the vacuum. They had to do something, because without the proper Moslem officials, there could be no Arab marriages. And how could a minority be happy without any marriages?

The Israeli authorities charged with dealing with this intricate subject had to start from scratch. With the assistance of special liaison officers appointed by the Army the Government authorities immediately took charge of the deserted mosques and religious courts. The mosques were repaired and, in many cases, again put into use. The destroyed archives of the religious courts were reassembled and the Ministry of Religions appointed a special committee to deal with Moslem holy places. This committee was headed by Prof. L. A. Meir, of the Hebrew University and its function was to advise the ministry on the conservation of Moslem religious sites.

A search was made and a few suitable candidates for the job of kadi were found. Their pay was raised substantially above what it was under mandatory rule and their courts are now operating in Jaffa, Haifa, Majdal, Tiberias, Nazareth, Acre, and other places. They have full authority to perform marriages and divorces. It is hoped that the second stage of Moslem jurisprudence—the appellate division—will soon be reestablished.

MOSLEM PROPERTY

How to hold religious services for the Moslems presented another difficult problem. So far, more than 35 religious dignitaries of various grades have been reinstated, but the number is woefully inadequate. What the Government plans to do is to reopen the Achmadi Seminary in Acre in order to provide enough functionaries to conduct Moslem rites.

The possessions of the Waqf—Moslem religious authority—are very extensive, and taking care of them has proved to be a complicated affair. Previously they were under the control of the now nonexistent Supreme Moslem Council. A detailed plan on how to manage and dispose of these lucrative holdings still has to be worked out by the Government. In the meantime, the limited income derived from the Waqf property is being spent on the maintenance of Moslem religious services and various welfare activities.

Eventually the Government wants to give the Moslem religious community complete responsibility for the direction of its own affairs, with only a liberal and discreet control from Tel Aviv.

LOCAL SELF-GOVERNMENT

The Jews hope to cement permanent friendship with the Arabs—not by buying

individual notables—but by fostering local self-government in every village and by giving them a share in the democratic rule of of the state. As one official puts it, "We're not satisfied merely to make the condition of Israel's Arabs better than that of the Arabs in Moslem countries. And, of course, we would never force the Arabs to live the way Jews in Arab countries do. What we do contemplate is raising the Arab standard of living to that enjoyed by the Jews in Israel."

There will be no second-class citizens in Israel.

Foes Seen as Aiding Fair Deal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the St. Paul Pioneer Press of January 8, 1950:

FOES SEEN AS AIDING FAIR DEAL

(By Gustaf A. Nordin)

WASHINGTON.—The conservatives of the American political scene may today be devising the very method for the Fair Dealers to extend the welfare-state program which they so bitterly attack as socialistic.

It may sound impossible that a conservative Republican President—Herbert Hoover—may have built the vehicle in which a Democratic President—Harry S. Truman—will ride to victory. But there is reason to believe it not only might happen—but that it already has.

Herbert Hoover was appointed by President Truman to head a commission which would find means of reducing Government expenditures, some way of getting more for every tax dollar spent.

The conservative Mr. Hoover accepted the task and named a flock of task forces to dig into every governmental closet. President Truman gave his full support. The doors of the agencies opened, the books were laid bare. No one dared object to such a bipartisan effort to save the taxpayers from a top-heavy Government.

Experts in the field of finance, accounting, and research gladly agreed to help a bipartisan legislative body do the job proposed.

They did their work so well and thoroughly over a 2-year period that detailed accounts on how the Government was wasting money quickly were provided. The President again gave his blessings and Congress, eager to appear economy-minded, set in motion the legislative machinery to carry out the Hoover Commission recommendations.

Billions of dollars are to be saved through the recommendations.

All factions of all parties agreed with the philosophy of thrift. But did they really? Did they all want economies for the same reason? It doesn't really appear to be the case.

Mr. Hoover soon will discover that he has been talking all the time about saving taxpayers' dollars. He thought he was recommending a way of cutting down on Government spending. He figured the outlay of dollars would be less if his plan was promptly carried out.

The Fair Dealers, who are supporting President Truman's welfare proposals, don't see it quite that way. Their program is condemned by Mr. Hoover and the Republicans generally, but it is to help finance the welfare program of the Fair Deal which prompts them to suspect wholeheartedly the work of the conservative Mr. Hoover.

The Fair Dealers want to make the Government efficient so that more money can be made available for extending the Fair Deal.

They are not talking about reducing spending, as Mr. Hoover and his followers. They are talking about economy through efficiency, so that the multi-billion-dollar Federal budget need not be increased and yet leave several buildings for the new programs.

If Herbert Hoover's plan could save $5,000,000,000 annually, for instance, this money could be used for the compulsory health insurance plan, extension of social security, Federal aid to education, and any other program which might cost money not now available.

* * * * *

So spending could go up if the people insisted upon the rest of the Fair Deal program.

A few days ago, Dewey Anderson, head of the Public Affairs Institute, a privately financed research group, quit the Hoover citizens' committee. His reason: The former President tried to commit us to a set of principles that is anathema to every New Dealer and Fair Dealer. He objected to a Hoover speech which Anderson said would establish a limited Government, a ceiling on public expenditures.

Perhaps before long the Republican conservatives and anti-Fair Dealers will discover they have helped provide the means by which the welfare state can be more easily financed.

McGregor Opposes Me-Too-ism and Gag Rule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss House Resolution 133 which was recently defeated by action of the House of Representatives. This resolution, if passed, would have given a majority of the Rules Committee, comprised of 12 members, veto power over every legislative committee in this Congress, and the Rules Committee would dictate to the Congress just what bills would be presented to us for our consideration. It should be remembered that before a bill reaches the Rules Committee it has already been considered by the appropriate legislative committee, after possibly many weeks of hearing, and has already been recommended by the majority of that standing legislative committee for House consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to dictatorship in any form, which certainly includes this legislative body. I do not believe in gag rule of any kind that prevents the membership of the House from expressing by their speeches and votes what they believe to be right. I have been sent to Congress by the people of the Seventeenth Ohio District to express their views, both by voice and vote, and they do not expect me to relinquish my powers or responsibilities to any small group of individuals. I am of the firm conviction that we have some in Congress who are fearful of taking sides or taking a definite stand on some of the issues confronting us. I recognize, had the resolution been passed, that a great many controversial issues would not be presented to us for our consideration. In other words, as stated on the floor of the House, by passing the resolution we would be "taken off the hot seat." But, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the membership of this body to be willing to go on record so that the people that elect us will know how we stand on various issues. Then, after we are recorded either by "yes" or "no" vote, the people will have the opportunity to determine whether or not we express their views, and they will so tell us at the next election. The argument has been put up that only by passing this resolution and giving the power to these 12 men will we be able to stop our enormous expenditures. This statement is in error because of this reason: Legislation covering our expenditures is considered by the Appropriations Committee and they report bills covering appropriations directly to the floor of Congress for our consideration and completely bypass the Rules Committee, in accordance with long-established legislative procedure. We, by our vote on the floor of this Congress, determine whether or not we are in accord with the expenditures, and, I reiterate, the people should know how we stand. We should be honest enough to come out in the open and put ourselves on record in voting on legislation before us for our consideration. It is time for all of us to be willing to stand up and be counted so that the people can decide by our record whether or not they want us to represent them in this legislative body.

Voters Ought To Begin Pinning Down Noncommittal Element in Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Mobile Press Register of January 23, 1950:

VOTERS OUGHT TO BEGIN PINNING DOWN NONCOMMITTAL ELEMENT IN CONGRESS

Representative J. HARRY MCGREGOR, of Ohio, is another Member of Congress who has served notice on the Truman administration that he cannot be counted on to support deficit spending, tax-raiding, and the concentration of more and more power in a bloated Federal bureaucracy.

He says:

"I definitely oppose the President's program of taking power from the people back home and placing it in the hands of Federal bureaus 'n Washington.

"I am not in accord with the President's socialized-medicine program and I will con-

tinue to strenuously oppose unnecessary Federal expenditures and the philosophy of spend and spend, tax and tax.

"I am not in accord with his demand for increased taxes nor do I believe in deficit spending.

"The time has arrived to cut down expenditures, reduce taxes, and apply a reasonable amount to our national debt."

Every Member of the House and Senate who does not voluntarily make known his position, should be pinned down by his constituents for an explicit statement of position on the raw-deal program devised by the Truman administration.

The people of the United States deserve to know who on Capitol Hill in Washington is and who is not a congressional puppet of the Truman administration where its raw-deal program is concerned.

It's time for the voters to begin calling the roll of those Members of Congress who have been vague or noncommittal as to where they stand.

H. R. 6769, To Amend the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as Amended

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, having been born and reared on a farm, and continuously keeping in close contact with the pulse of agriculture, I sincerely want my rural friends to know that I have always considered agriculture to be one of the very basic enterprises of our country. In fact, the prosperity and economy of our Nation, the success of our various industries, and the welfare, health, and happiness of our people are highly dependent upon the tillers of the soil and the products from the farms.

Let us be reminded that approximately all the wealth of our Nation comes from soil and toil, and those that toil in and on the soil are entitled to a fair share of the wealth they help to produce.

In recent years, through legislative enactments, we have been quite successful in providing the farmers of our Nation with conditions conducive to giving them a fair opportunity to dedicate their efforts in a constructive manner, exalt the dignity of their calling, and receive a reasonably fair share of the wealth to which they are entitled. Others just starting in the agriculture arena, and some with years of tenant farming experience, but sadly handicapped for want of capital to adequately equip a farm or rebuild impoverished soil, have now found a vehicle that makes it possible for them to become successful farm operators or owners of a family-size farm.

Since 1935 special aid has been given to low-income farmers by the Resettlement Administration, which was reorganized as the Farm Security Administration in 1937. The Bankhead Farm Tenant Act of 1937 authorized loans for tenant purchase and loans and emergency grants for rural rehabilitation. The Farm Security Administration was replaced in 1946 by the Farmers Home Administration, which gave permanent status to the production and subsistence loan program formerly carried on by FSA.

So we may rightfully say that the FHA program was given inception to assist worthy tenant farmers, potential farmers and GI's that were unable to obtain enough insured loans from banks to adequately establish themselves so they could become operators or subsequent owners of farms.

The FHA program has been a very meritorious one. It has met with success and pays incalculable dividends. In fact, it has been a godsend to those worthy and energetic farmers who avail themselves of the provisions incorporated therein. Checking many of the FHA farms in my congressional district, I was happy to find that the operators or purchasers of said farms had gained a new lease on life, were doing an excellent job of farming and were much in advance of required payments on interest and principal. Many of the farmers will clear their indebtedness within a span of 10 years.

Up to the present time the ownership loan under FHA, in most cases, has been limited to $12,000. Considering the present high cost of land, farm equipment, building materials, fencing, fertilizer, modern utilities, and so forth, so essential for successful and profitable farming, I am thoroughly convinced that the FHA farmer could well use a larger farm-ownership loan to a decided advantage.

So I have introduced H. R. 6769 in this second session of the Eighty-first Congress to amend the farm-ownership loan provisions of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act to increase the amount which may be loaned with respect to certain farms.

Said resolution provides that the second sentence of section 3 (a) of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, as amended, is hereby amended to read as follows:

Loans may not be made for the acquisition or enlargement of farms which have a value, as acquired, enlarged, or improved, in excess of whichever of the following is higher: (1) $15,000, or (2) the average value of efficient family-type farm-management units, as determined by the Secretary, in the county, parish, or locality where the farm is located.

In conclusion, I wish to say a loan of $15,000 on a farm cannot be considered exorbitant, considering the price one pays for a reasonably good house and lot in the average city.

If Jackson Only Knew

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of January 23, 1950:

IF JACKSON ONLY KNEW

All of these $25-a-plate banquets to be served by the Fair Dealers will be called a celebration of Jefferson and Jackson Day. And we suspect that it is a mighty good thing for the promoters that Old Hickory knows nothing at all about it. If he did, he might erupt from his grave with the pistols he once used so effectively against just anybody who had stirred his Hibernian wrath.

For Andrew Jackson was the sworn foe of the national debt. He was pledged to pay off that debt in the days of his Presidential candidacy. And when he became President he paid the national debt. For the first and only time in our history the National Treasury was debt free in the closing years of the Jackson tenure.

Now the party that has created the largest national debt in human history is on the eve of staging a series of political feasts, and the promoters of those feasts are pleased to call the day of the festivals Jackson Day. Men who have built up the largest national debt known on earth since time began and who are driving desperately to add billions to the sum of the indebtedness have the audacity to name the day of their banqueting after the only President in American history who paid the national debt and left the National Treasury debt-free.

It is a good thing that the shade of Andrew Jackson doesn't know what is going on. A good thing that is for the puny politicians who have swamped the Nation in debt and then boasted that they are Jacksonian Democrats.

Cooperative Banks Favor Tax Cuts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following resolution recently adopted by the executive committee of the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League:

MASSACHUSETTS COOPERATIVE
BANK LEAGUE,
Boston, Mass., January 24, 1950.

The Honorable ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE GOODWIN: At a recent meeting of the executive committee of this league, the following resolution was unanimously adopted, and I was instructed to so inform you:

"Whereas the cost of government, Federal, State, and local, has continued to increase until today more than 25 percent of the national income is taken in the form of taxes for the operation of government; and

"Whereas the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, like similar organizations throughout the United States, represents, through its members, thousands of substantial citizens who are either buying their homes on monthly payments or who by self-denial are endeavoring to accumulate by savings a down payment on a home which they hope someday to own, and yet another group who by small monthly savings are endeavoring to build a modest competence for their old age; and

"Whereas every dollar expended by the government, whether Federal, State, or local,

is a dollar taken from these thrifty citizens and handicaps them in their efforts toward personal security—a situation existing not only in Massachusetts, but in every State in the Union: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the executive committee of the Massachusetts Cooperative Bank League, on this its December meeting, calls upon our representatives and Federal, State, and local government officials to give heed to the excessive cost of government and bend every effort to reduce expenditures and particularly to eliminate unnecessary services."

Respectfully,

W. M. ALLEN, *Executive Secretary*.

The King Cannot Err

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT A. MEYER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Daily Oklahoman of January 23, 1950:

THE KING CANNOT ERR

In the ultrapartisan debate in the House of Representatives Friday, Speaker RAYBURN beat back the opposition right handsomely with his rhetorical question, "Who won the election in 1948, anyway?"

Of course, the answer was obvious. No Congressman could doubt and none would dare deny that Mr. Truman won that election. And no one could quarrel wtih the Speaker for asking such a question.

But the implication of that question is a different matter. In effect it was a categorical assertion by the Speaker that since Mr. Truman was returned the victor in the 1948 plebiscite, all opposition to the President and his policies should cease on every line. Whatever the President asks for should be granted meekly, even if the Congress is convinced that its acquiescence would be ruinous.

The question further implies that since the President won on a certain program in 1948, he has the absolute right to present an entirely different program in 1950 and that it is the duty of Congress to accept the change. Since the people declared that the 1948 program was right, nobody has any right to say that the 1950 program is wrong. In other words, when a President has carried one election, he has the full right forever thereafter to say how Congress shall vote, what the people shall think, and when his opponents shall cease to do any thinking at all.

It happens that the question before the House Friday was a proposed change in the House rules. Of course the House has the right to choose its own rules and to change them at will and no one else has any right to interfere. Certainly it is not the function of the President to write the rules of Congress. Nevertheless, the Speaker chose to imply that since the country went Democratic in 1948 the House is bound to adjust its rules to Mr. Truman's wishes.

The spirit that underlay the Rayburn interrogatory was at one time dominant in Great Britain. At that time the spirit was expressed in the formula, "the king can do no wrong." And for centuries the people of Great Britain agreed that the king could do no wrong. But finally they began to question it. And the more determinedly they questioned the principle of royal infallibility the faster their bill of liberties grew. Finally the American colonials reached a point where they seriously doubted if the king could do anything right.

Now by implication the Speaker of the House revives in a small way the old discredited formula that the king can do no wrong. The President was elected in 1948, wasn't he? Therefore no man born has any right to oppose him on any issue whatever. When he commands Congress to do something, Congress is guilty of a mild form of treason if it fails to do it. He was elected President, wasn't he?

This policy of blind recognition of executive infallibility may be good politics. It may help a partisan President to have his partisan way. But it is extremely questionable Americanism.

Terminal-Leave Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to state that on January 12, 1950, I appeared before the subcommittee of the Committee on Armed Services urging favorable action on legislation which would extend the date for veterans to file application for terminal-leave credits at which time I filed the following statement with the afore-mentioned committee:

On February 3, 1949, I introduced legislation H. R. 2335, which would extend the date for veterans filing application for terminal-leave credits to June 30, 1950. No action was taken by the Armed Services Committee on this legislation in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

I am happy to know that your subcommittee is now considering H. R. 3205, introduced by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. PHILBIN], which in effect is the same as my bill except for the date.

It is my understanding that the committee is being asked to extend the deadline to June or July of 1951. This meets with my complete approval.

It makes little difference to me whose name appears on the bill, since I believe we are concerned only that equity be done here by granting the veterans who have this money due them the right to apply for these credits, if by inadvertence they failed to meet the previous dead line of September 1, 1948.

I have no way of knowing how many veterans have been denied their justly-earned terminal-leave credits, but I would presume that several thousand are involved. I firmly believe that such veterans should be given an opportunity to file for their terminal-leave credits, and, therefore, respectfully urge that the subcommittee favorably act upon this legislation.

Address of Leonard W. Trester

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Leonard W. Trester, chairman of the committee on advertising, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, and director of public policy, General Outdoor Advertising Co., Inc., Washington, D. C., delivered before the Lions Club, Madison, Va., on December 13, 1949:

Things seem to change so gradually about us that we are all inclined to forget that we are living in a different world from the one we were born into.

In the lifetime of many of us in this room we have seen the airplane, the radio, the telephone, the automobile, and refrigerator, to mention only a few items, come into existence and be sold into mass consumption.

The accomplishments, the progress, in the period of our lifetimes, has been amazing. If you are 43 years old, you have lived one-fourth of our national history. Yes; think of it, the Declaration of Independence was signed only 173 years ago. How our progress has accelerated from the isolated agrarian economy of that day to the present time, particularly in the period of our own lifetime. The physical changes we have seen stagger the imagination.

But it is more of the subtler changes in our way of life that I want to speak. Sixty years ago 80 percent of our people lived on farms or in rural areas. Today, 90 percent of our people live on 1 percent of the land in the United States. Less than one person in five lives on a farm and this ratio is decreasing every year. One-third of our farms produce four-fifths of all of our agricultural production—all we will need after the world-feeding problem is solved by a few good European harvests.

In the past those living on farms were largely self-contained. Most owned their own property. They ate the fruits of their labors and they spun their own cloth and made their own raiment. The basic necessities of life, however meager, were assured by that kind of existence. In the trading areas business was largely local. Drugs and soap, two generations ago, were brought in from regional manufacturers to some extent. But most of what was sold locally was made in town.

Looking back across the years, consider also the problem of health. In those days we did not live so long. But that was before the day of the specialist. The poor were cared for by private agencies, supported by that out-moded individual whom the income tax has killed, the philanthropist, or by local governments. But the people of modest means had a family doctor who charged on the basis of ability to pay. Expensive specialists, hospital and diagnostic services were unknown. A bad disease was more likely to mean death in those days but not so likely to spell years of working off debt.

Wave upon wave of immigrants were only too glad to take the jobs at the bottom of the ladder, which represented such an improvement over their lot abroad. The immigrant saved and worked for the day when he or his sons might climb the ladder and open a small shop and, as the sociologists like to say, become assimilated to America.

The opportunities of yesterday have not disappeared by any means. The Congress of Industry of the National Association of Manufacturers saw only last week a skit of a displaced person who, coming to these shores 2 years ago, had borrowed $2,000 and set up a business which has already grossed $400,000.

But the fact that freedom of opportunity abounds here as it does nowhere else on earth—the fact that even the poor of our day enjoy luxuries unknown even to our grandfather and envied by the other peoples of the earth—all of this, I say, should not blind us to the climate in which we live.

We live in a time when half of the people of this country do not even own their own homes and one in five do not own their own furniture, even. Thanks to union restrictions, the interdependence of the economy, Government regulations, and all the rest, most are thrown out of work only when it is equally impossible for them to get jobs in the same line somwhere else. In two out of five homes mother goes to work along with dad and brings home at least 25 percent of the family income. In these very homes servants are out of the question because of the cost of human labor, so the children are left to roam the streets. Serious illness can throw the budget out of whack for years to come.

Well over one-third of the people who now populate this country cannot remember the period before the depression of 1929. They remember the long decade when it was not unusual for one out of every four breadwinners to be tramping the streets. They remember the period when NYA or CCC actually represented an opportunity for the youth trying to get a foothold. They have known the insecurity of the war that followed. They, like all the rest of us, know the insecurity of another threat of war, which may well be beyond our control to do anything about, and the fact that we may all be blown to smithereens at any moment, but they are too young to have developed a philosophical attitude toward these contingencies.

Another fact that we must face is that the day in which we live is not necessarily one in which enterprise, initiative, incentive, and perseverance are the royal road to success. Without capital, even the most outstanding, personable, and hard-working folks cannot hope to succeed, except over a very long pull. The hand lathe cannot compete with the electric one. Keeping accounts by hand cannot be done so quickly as with the adding machine. Longhand cannot keep up with a typewriter. Sometimes I wonder whether we do not have too much, rather than too little, rugged individualism in our great country, when I consider that one of every three businesses that opens in a normal year is bankrupt within the next two.

Less than 25 percent of all retail stores in this country have more than two employees. There is one retail store for every 25 families. Three out of five retail stores gross less than $33 a day. Forty percent of all stores are run by proprietors alone or with the unpaid help of their families.

Let us face the facts. There are insecurities in our day unknown in the times of our fathers. Acts of God could cause us in a simpler and earlier day to have to tighten our belts and work harder. But the individual was not at the mercy of man-made systems, union restrictions, and all the rest, over which he as one individual has little control and which can deny him not only a livelihood but also his birthright as a man—pride of accomplishment and the right to spend himself in his work.

If the best our generation can offer is to say that those who long for security can find it in prison, then perhaps it is we who belong there. It is for us, out of our years of business background, to provide some guidance, some constructive and positive leadership—if our philosophy is as sound as we proclaim it to be.

In spite of the longing for security, it should encourage us to know that a Nationwide survey of college graduating classes found these youngsters rate opportunity for advancement as the first prerequisite of a good job, although high-school kids listed it third. But surveys also show that most of those going to work for the first time are not so much interested in risking a connection which gives them a chance of cleaning up financially, early in the game, as they are in a steady job with gradual advancement. This is what they mean by opportunity to advance in business or the profession, not taking a roller-coaster ride.

Is security so bad, when it has raised the home-ownership figures from 35 percent 2 years ago to nearly 50 percent today? And most of the owners earn less than $300 a month and are under 35. Maybe security is to our sons pretty much what our fathers meant when they talked about thrift.

Is security so bad when it impels people to study for self-advancement? One out of every five adults is taking some sort of educational course—extension, night school, and the like. One-third of all loans made by personal finance companies under $500 are for training for self-improvement. That is what most of us have preached to our youngsters and younger employees, but we talk about it under the name of opportunity.

You and I, my friends, must find the answer to this great interest, longing, desire, or what have you, for stability, unless business is to lose not only its profits but its power and prerogatives for leadership.

Our youth are looking to the Government for solutions, because whatever else may be said of its panaceas, the Government's obsession with this problem, for political reasons, I grant you, has been apparent and it cannot be said that their proposed solutions, however much they lacked in practicality, have been short in imagination.

In our youth—yours or mine—nobody expected business, Government, or anyone else to look after people. As I have pointed out, conditions were different—there was no need for it on a widespread scale. The businessman philanthropist plus local governments could more than cope with the problems.

In those days it was the accepted function of business to make a profit. Nobody but crackpots questioned that. And the better profit the company made, provided it came by it ethically, the more respected and successful it was.

Today, however, business has no choice but to assume the responsibilities for increasing all the human satisfaction of the group with which it is associated, as Dean Donald David, of Harvard, puts it.

The reason is that business management as a group is just as much in competition for the loyalties of the public as the individual businessman is in competition with those in his same line.

We live in a day of big labor unions, big Government and big business—all competing for public favor. The Federal Government and the national labor unions are today primarily public relations agencies. In its national health programs, in its housing projects, its electric power developments, they are saying in effect that it can distribute human satisfactions more adequately to more people at less cost than private business. It is advertising its merits through every channel of communications. The national labor organizations recognize the magic of being in favor of the good ends of life and stress their ability to provide, with the aid of a friendly Government, more of the good things of life—a larger share of them—to their members. Labor and agricultural groups, depending on the individual dues of millions of members, have long realized the public relations secret of interpreting themselves, their motives and their objectives in terms of basic human aspirations. Business, on the other hand, has been the only factor so busy in producing the good things of life that it has not had time to win the battles of public opinion and so is gradually losing its right to distribute what it produces. As Government gains ever more control over the distribution of what it does not produce—housing, health benefits, food, electric power—business faces the prospect of becoming the contractor for a Government which will decide what shall be produced, by whom and in what quantities, for what price and how it shall be distributed.

As one industry or profession is taken over after another, the tax burden on the remainder—the shrinking free segment of our economy—becomes ever greater, not only because it is numerically reduced but also because it must pay the subsidies which allow Government to sustain the illusion of greater efficiency, increased distribution and lower costs in the nationalized industries.

We are far down the road to socialism already, so far along that some of my friends who have studied the problem doubt whether the tide can ever be completely turned. I am not that pessimistic, but it is going to take not only herculean efforts but sustained work on the part of us in business to reverse the trend, that I do recognize.

Today 14,000,000 persons, 1 family head in 6 receives Government checks regularly. One out of four aged people in this country are on the public-assistance rolls. The amount spent for Government relief, in payments to individuals in this country last year, was 250 percent of the aggregate amount of dividends paid by all United States corporations. The Government paid out $65,000,000 in Aroostok County, Maine, alone last year to hold up potato prices, as a result pickers' earnings averaged between $20 and $25 a day. Six out of every one hundred breadwinners in the United States work directly for the Federal Government. The Government will operate in the red next year to the tune of $7,500,000,000 assuming the most prosperous sort of conditions.

The Federal Government now costs $100,000,000 a day.

Here is the sort of thing it is doing with that money:

The Government owns 3½ typewriters for each stenographer or typist on its pay rolls.

If you apply to certain Federal agencies for a job, your application is processed through more than 100 different stages.

In Washington alone, the United States Government employs 1,485 press agents, 2,650 botanists, and 5,725 lawyers and legal assistants.

The United States Government has 45 separate Federal offices dealing with housing.

More than 530 Federal offices are located in Chicago alone.

Today the average person must put in 61 working days to pay his taxes. If the administration program carries, he will have to devote the earnings of 81 days' work to this purpose. The bill for taxes will absorb between 75 and 85 percent of all the savings of the people.

Our Federal debt is $250,000,000,000 or more than all the capital assets in the country, and equivalent to $6,297 per family.

The Federal budget itself is a document of 1,670 pages from which it is a practical impossibility to determine the real cost of any activities of Government. These pages are in fine type, almost impossible to read, let alone interpret. For instance, one item in the Veterans' Administration is a single line—salaries and expenses, $848,897,000. On another page in the same budget is a similar short item for carfare and bicycle allowance, $42.

The cost of the application of the so-called Brannan plan to milk alone is estimated at $2,000,000,000 by the American Farm Bureau Federation.

In addition to the 17,000,000 persons receiving payments direct from the Federal Treasury, there are millions benefiting indirectly from approximately $25,000,000,000 flowing annually from the Federal Government to business through subsidies, purchases, construction contracts and other expenditures.

Since the war there have been 23 programs for siphoning off American money, matériel,

and credit overseas and by last July the total value of our foreign assistance was already $35,000,000,000. To this figure should be added another $7,000,000,000 or $8,000,000,000 in usable military equipment left behind in Europe.

Eighteen cents out of every tax dollar you pay goes to foreign aid programs—35 cents for defense and 15 cents for interest on the debt.

Interest alone is now more than the total cost of the Federal Government in 1933.

Hiring of Government employees is increasing daily. One hundred and fifty thousand will be taken on for the census. Roughly 50,000 full-time permanent new employees were authorized by the last Congress.

Let's take a closer look at this subject of taxes. In 1914, when the income-tax bill was passed with a maximum rate of 1 percent, some cautious Nellies wanted to put a ceiling of 5 percent on by constitutional amendment. They were assured, however, that this was asinine since it was said no one in his right mind could even contemplate the tax rising that high.

Today one-third of the cost of the average item the consumer buys goes to taxes. More than 60 percent of the cost of cigarettes goes to taxes. Corporation taxes have increased 1,000 percent since 1932. Well over 100,000 units—Government-owned corporations, cooperatives and unions—included are escaping much more than $1,000,000,000 in tax liability, 522 hidden taxes take one-third of the cost of a $10,000 home, for which so many of our people are saving and scrimping. There are 116 tax items added to the average store-bought suit of clothing. But we can all take comfort in the thought that there is no Federal tax on coffins, unless the Government leaves us enough to buy one costing more than $100.

Seriously, the hour is late, the situation is alarming. But I, for one, do not expect it to be solved by merely reciting the facts and figures or by a long harangue on taxes. Our people want stability; our youth cannot, for the most part, because of their inexperience, see clearly the road down which we are traveling. Even though they can grasp perhaps the tangible, financial cost, but not the spiritual cost in terms of lost liberties, I believe, from my own observations, backed up by many researches, that there are great numbers of people in this country who would prefer to pay staggering taxes in exchange for a relatively stable existence without too many ups and downs over which they individually have no control. Who, indeed, would not rather bring his children up on a modest salary than in luxury one year and perhaps extreme poverty the next? Nineteen hundred and twenty-nine, when ruined fortunes, suicides, breadlines, and foreclosed mortgages went hand in hand, is an experience deeply etched into the consciousness of even the youngest.

The paradox of our situation is that even under a great tax load, business has demonstrated, with little help from many administration prophets of gloom and catastrophe, that it is the great economic stabilizing factor in our economy.

But business has failed to do a public relations job like its competitors in the arena of public opinion. Business has failed to sell itself. At the very time it has sold its tangible products and wares it has allowed its competition to steal a long march in the ultimate control of distribution of these good things of life.

The problem, oddly enough, is not one of business ability to produce the most human benefits or to produce them most efficiently nor even to stabilize the economy, although sorely harassed by Government and organized labor. That has already been accomplished.

Therefore, it is obviously not enough that we in business do an efficient job of reducing costs, providing jobs, improving quality, or expanding distribution.

Unless these benefits of business are interpreted and understood, it is clear that the public will favor those programs which the politicians promise, even though they as taxpayers must share the burden of paying for them.

National advertising can do a lot to educate the public about the economic benefits of business, just as it has made those benefits possible. But business management, unlike labor, agriculture and a Government administration, suffers from the handicap that it cannot speak with a united voice because the very system which it seeks to preserve is competitive. Nor would it help matters much if business could speak with one voice because people would still judge business in general by the actions and words of the individual businesses which they know. The problem, as we have seen, is not primarily a rational one which can be answered by rational arguments and demonstrated proof, or the problem would not continue to exist. The problem is emotional or psychological.

There just are not enough people in this country either who are enough interested in the viewpoint of business management per se to give it fair hearing or to support that viewpoint, merely because it would preserve power, prerogatives, or profits of business. Therefore, it becomes obvious that business can only win public support by identifying itself with the interest of people in general.

How to do this? The answer is that a lot of little things go to make a good sale. Public relations is looking after the details. The place to make the sale—the people we can influence most—are our employees whom we see every day.

In selling the principle of free enterprise, we should realize that in the past too many of us have been too autocratic and authoritarian in our management of people. We must more and more realize the importance of dealing with people as individuals rather than treating them as a mass. This means giving people an opportunity for advancement, a chance to ask questions about how the company's plans will affect their jobs, and giving them specific information about their work.

Specifically, we should not get into too much detail in trying to run our stores or businesses. We should give each employee broad latitude to use his own common sense and imagination in trying to develop the best techniques of selling, taking inventory, or whatever. Maybe he can teach us something if we don't sap his initiative.

All employees should have a chance to discuss policy with us individually and in a group meeting from time to time. We can then tell them why things are done as they are; and get the benefits of their observations as to how they might be done more efficiently and economically.

We should not go in for general pay raises where they can be avoided. People enjoy knowing they have earned a raise, rather than that it is something forced upon the employer or at any rate, automatically. Periodically, we should review with employees why they are or are not getting raises. And we should be specific about it.

We should try to treat all workers as equals not in proficiency at the job (that would be silly) but in basic privileges, such as vacations, sick leave, and so on.

Consider trying to keep rules down to a minimum. Instead of posting signs such as "Do not run up the stairs—J. C. Scrooge," why not get a cartoon drawn, with a comic figure saying "Don't be a dope, you may slip and fall."

Instead of prohibiting smoking on working hours altogether and having your people constantly slipping out the back door, why not suggest they come up with some practical rules as to how smoking can be handled without offending customers or slowing up the work. You'll probably find you have less smoking in the end that way and the rules will be stricter than your past enforcement of an outright ban.

Have chats with new employees frequently. Not only will this get them to pull on the team and feel the job is worth while but a fresh eye can see a lot of things about any of our businesses which we don't recognize.

Before you start telling your customers or suppliers about some new development in the business, be sure to cover your employees. They can help spread the word, and they will in a negative sort of way if they are confronted with such information by the wife who has heard it somewhere before they are "in the know."

Take them into your confidence, so far as possible, about earnings, the cost of your investment, and how much is needed to maintain your place of business in proper condition. If you don't do this, chances are they think you're taking a lot more out than you really get and that if you weren't such a skinflint you would give them a better Christmas bonus and substantial raise.

These are just a few hints on how to run a business on democratic principles. The reason for doing it is that it is the most satisfactory, ultimately the most profitable, and always the most human way of managing men.

As we learn this, we will be doing the most important job that business must learn to survive. Simple as it seems, difficult as it is, day by day, this is the great challenge facing all of us if we are to pull our oar in the race for understanding ahead. As H. G. Wells once said, "The situation in America is a race between understanding and catastrophe." May you and I do our part to advance understanding. Then and only then, can business move forward with a strong and active faith and devote its entire energies to realizing that higher standard of living for everyone which is nearly within our grasp.

Is the Coal Shortage Critical?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, is the coal shortage critical?

Does the threatened closure of schools and institutions because of the lack of fuel, the suffering which faces families without coal, the curtailing of work in shops and on railroads because of exhausted fuel supplies, constitute an emergency? Or are all of these things daily occurences?

Do these conditions warrant firm steps to get our coal mines in production? Or must we wait until there is a complete collapse, with its hardships, before we take action? I believe the situation is critical. There is a serious coal shortage. I believe that any informed person knows it.

The only reason the Nation has not been seriously hurt by the current coal shortage is because of the blessing of a mild winter. It has alleviated suffering

and made an intolerable situation bearable. That is obvious. Only the kindness and consideration of the weatherman has prevented a disaster.

But the President sees things differently. He seems to be as mired down in his prejudice against using the legislative tools to get coal mined, as the "Mighty Mo'" is stuck in the mud of Chesapeake Bay. He stubbornly refuses to act, regardless of what happens to the country.

If a hard blizzard should strike Colorado and the Nation, I fear the consequences.

I have received telegrams from three schools in my district, plainly pointing out the seriousness of the coal shortage. Their supplies are gone. The officials state they may have to close the schools. They are appealing for immediate relief. Action is necessary. We must get coal on its way. Further delay invites catastrophe.

Under unanimous consent, I include these three telegrams with my remarks:

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*
Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Have little over a ton of coal to run junior college. It will only last a few days at most. It will be necessary to have coal at once. Hope you will be able to get action to keep our schools running.

JUNIOR COLLEGE COMMITTEE.
Dr. J. H. JACKSON.

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*
Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Only a few days of coal supply left. If the weather gets bad that will be very few days. It is urgent that we have coal. We'll have to close all our schools unless we receive supply of coal at once.

STERLING PUBLIC SCHOOLS.
HAROLD R. WYMAN.

STERLING, COLO., *January 23, 1950.*
Representative WILLIAM S. HILL,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.:

Here is a shortage of coal. It will be necessary to close our high school unless we can receive some coal within the next few days. Because of State aid we must keep our schools open 172 days. If the schools have to close it would cost the district thousands of dollars. We urge immediate action on your part to get coal for Logan County.

LOGAN COUNTY HIGH SCHOOL COMMITTEE.
A. E. BEEDE, *Chairman.*

The Hiss Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, much is being said and written in condemnation of the treasonable machinations of Communists and fellow-travelers within our borders which were revealed in connection with the conviction of the traitorous Alger Hiss.

Mr. Frank C. Sands, editor of the Daily Reporter, of Independence, Kans., my home town, in a recent editorial discussing this nauseous Hiss case, concluded by stating:

It is indeed a sad case, far sadder than the deflation of Alger Hiss. The really sad part is what happened to the United States and what probably is continuing to happen through the efforts of persons of similar rathood who remain in positions where they can do great harm.

Because no more important verdict than the Hiss conviction has been reached in our day, and because Mr. Sands in his editorial drives home in telling fashion several factors underlying this case, I am, Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, quoting his editorial in full herewith:

HAS MORALITY CHANGED?

The name of Benedict Arnold still is the blackest one on the pages of history in the minds of average Americans. The Teapot Dome scandal brought to light during the Harding administration created an immense sensation among the American public and the name of Albert Fall, a Cabinet member, was blackened as a result of it.

The conviction of Alger Hiss on a perjury charge, based on the accusation that he lied when he said he had not given American secrets to the Russian Communists, brands Hiss as bad as Arnold and worse than Fall, who only stole money, but the public seems less excited than it was by Arnold or Fall.

Is this because there has been so much Communist treason in recent years that the moral sense of the people is blunted?

A formal charge of treason against Hiss was prevented by the statute of limitations, but he is morally guilty of that crime unless the jury was mistaken in its verdict of perjury.

How probable was it that the jury was wrong?

The former high standing of the accused in governmental circles gave him a presumption of innocence from the start. Compared with his accuser, Whittaker Chambers, he had infinitely greater prestige.

Two justices of the United States Supreme Court volunteered to appear as character witnesses in his first trial. The present Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, said, "Alger Hiss is my friend, and I do not give my friendship lightly."

Hiss was an adviser to President Roosevelt at Yalta and he was secretary general of the San Francisco conference in 1945 which drafted the United Nations Charter. Hiss held top ranking in the State Department under three Secretaries.

When he could be convicted in the face of all that, the evidence must surely have been compelling.

It becomes plain that talk of Communist influence in high places was not a "red herring" as it was described by President Truman in his last campaign.

According to Chambers there were a lot more "red herrings" in the school of fish with which Hiss swam.

Future activities of the administration will show whether the Truman government is more interested in seeing traitors cleaned out or in protecting the reputation of the FDR administration and his own.

A vigorous move to put only Americans on guard cannot be very confidently expected until there is a change in the high command in Washington.

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, who made the muddled comment that "I feel he [Hiss] may have perjured himself, but I don't feel he ever sold any secret papers," added "It's a very sad case."

It is indeed a sad case, far sadder than the deflation of Alger Hiss. The really sad part is what happened to the United States and what probably is continuing to happen through the efforts of persons of similar rathood who remain in positions where they can do great harm.

Voting on Appropriations

REMARKS
OF
HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to discuss a resolution I introduced which provides as follows:

Resolved, That rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

"5. No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays."

I do this, Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of letting us become appropriation-conscious. I have seen in this House not millions but billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money appropriated without even having a majority of the Members of the House present. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of this Nation, our constituents, to let them know how we stand on the appropriation of their money. I hope you will give consideration to this resolution.

Well, a Little More Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, it has been a very long time since I last had the pleasure of reading a worth while short story. My attention was directed to a short story published in Collier's for December 24, 1949, and written by Bob Considine, long-time columnist for International News Service. The article is entitled, "Well, a Little More Time."

With the tumult and confusion that is constantly present in our everyday lives, I enjoyed this article all the more, for in it I found a perfect veiled presentation, in a figurative story, of a meaning metaphorically implied but not expressly stated. This allegory should be read by

everyone, and I can assure you that you will enjoy it. Oftentimes, allegories are true to life.

The article follows:

WELL, A LITTLE MORE TIME

(By Bob Considine)

He had grown a bit older through the nearly 2,000 years. And He had been working too hard. The phones had been going night and day, for centuries, and there were millions of newcomers He hadn't been able to meet as yet.

His mother, of course, was the first to notice the few gray hairs around His temples. Quietly, but firmly, she suggested that He get away for a spell, and just before His birthday He decided it might be a pretty good suggestion, at that. He went to the window of His study one clear night and looked things over, trying to pick a vacation spot.

There were more than 30,000,000,000 worlds to tempt Him. All these, of the countless billions more, had passed through the trying years of war and want and had settled down to a point where peace had become an estate much more exciting to their peoples than war. He mulled over which of them He would visit, for He had not been to any of them for a time. But then a distant memory stirred itself and, searching the enormous oval of the littered sky, He found a tiny, luminous cinder amid an obscure constellation. And after a bit He remembered its name: Earth.

When He announced that He had chosen that forgotten place for His vacation, His mother was a bit vexed.

"The hotel situation is bad there," she reminded Him. "Don't You remember we had some trouble getting reservations?"

He laughed a little, in His kindly way, and assured her that nearly 2,000 years can make a lot of changes in man's hostility to man. She walked away, wondering, and pretty soon Michael, an enormous archangel, with a handsome face and the wingspread of a B–29, came up to Him and sat down.

"I heard You're going on a trip," Michael, the archangel, said. "I'll drive You down. And get you back in a jiffy."

"No, thanks, Michael," He said. "I'll get down all right. And besides, I've been wanting to try some of the transportation down there. Primitive, isn't it?"

And so, on the morning before Christmas, He arrived in New York City, bought some new clothes, took a look around the town, then caught an air liner. He got off at a fashionable winter resort and applied for a room at a nice hotel.

The man behind the desk looked Him over carefully and shook his head. "All booked," the man said. At the next hotel, the desk clerk said the same thing, and at the next and the next. But the doorman of the last place seemed to take a little pity on Him and suggested that He inquire at a place where a lot of young men, bachelors, mainly, seemed to stay.

They were nice to Him there, especially the lady in charge. She said that the town's hostesses and hosts had just about emptied her place looking for extra men to fill in at the numerous holiday parties being held. And would He please tidy up in a hurry? He did, and was happy when the lady in charge said He too had been invited to a party. It would give Him a chance, He felt, to get to know the descendants of those for whom He had undergone certain hardships.

It was a grand party, and He found it stimulating. Nobody caught His name, but He passed that off as one of the idiosyncrasies of this odd little planet. The talk was fine: certain political events had bestirred the men; certain fashion events, the women.

He joined in and found it rather easy to hold His own, for people had talked much like that when He was around the last time. Everybody at the party loved His fairness and easy wit.

Everything would have gone nicely, He supposed later, if the talk had not turned to, "Where are you from?"

They were from an interesting variety of places, He found; places that had sprung up during the split second of the last two or three centuries. He was charmed by the pride they held in their home towns, their schools, their clubs, and the like. Then just before the party was to move on to the exclusive Wampum Club for dinner, He realized that somebody was asking Him the question.

"I was born in Bethlehem," He said. "It's a small place."

"Bethlehem?" His host repeated. "Been there many times, when I was in steel. Fine town!"

"Then we moved on to a town named Nazareth, and finally to Jerusalem."

He didn't notice, for a moment, that a heavy silence had fallen on the room.

The host was the first to recover, boomed for another round of drinks for the other guests, and then took the Stranger by the arm and escorted Him to a quiet corner of the living room.

"Don't mean to be personal, old man," he said, "but You say You were born in Bethlehem * * * moved to Nazareth * * * then Jerusalem?"

"Yes," He said wonderingly.

"What's your profession?"

He thought a bit, then smiled. "I was a carpenter for a time. Then I sort of went on the road, as you say."

"Salesman?"

He thought that over for a time. "Yes, in a way."

"We thought You were a writer, from the beard * * *"

He shook His head. "No, I never got around to that. But I used to talk now and then."

The host thought things over for a long time. "Well," he said, finally, "I hope you won't be offended by this, but we've got to face facts here. Are you Jewish?"

"Yes." He smiled.

The host wheezed again. "Facts," he said, "have to be faced. We were counting on You being an extra man at the dinner at the Wampum. But, I'm sorry, it can't be done. There's a rule, see? Don't blame, me, I didn't make it. It's just a rule. If I bring You, and they find it out, I'll be asked to resign from the club. It's the oldest and best club around here, and we've got to live here, see? I hope You understand."

"Understand? Why, yes; I guess I do. You've already been quite kind to Me."

"Not at all. Not at all. You're interesting. I like your manner. But this is one of those things I can't buck."

The host's wife hovered behind them. "We're late, Horace," she reminded him. "You know how they are about holding tables, especially on Christmas eve."

The guests crowded out on the curb in happy confusion and piled into their convertibles and the chauffeur-driven cars. The sweet sound of racing motors filled the soft night. The host stayed behind, momentarily, and put his arm around the Visitor's shoulders.

"No hard feelings?" the man asked.

"No hard feelings," He answered warmly.

"Well, I got to get along. Nice of you to drop in." The host stepped into his own convertible and roared off.

The Stranger stood for a moment on the curb of the now darkened street. The air was tender in the palms, and it reminded Him vaguely of the palms He had known as a Child, and the palms He had known for one brief Sunday as a Man. He thought for a long time, reflectively. Well, a little more time. Then He chuckled a bit—or was it a laugh?—and clapped on His new hat.

Then He looked up at the star-studded night and cupped His hands around His sensitive mouth.

"Michael!" he shouted at the top of His lungs. "Oh, Michael!"

Will Congress Sell Out?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial by Mr. Jerry Keohen, one of the publishers of the Montgomery Messenger, of Montgomery, Minn., which appeared in that newspaper on January 13, 1950:

WILL CONGRESS SELL OUT?

The new session of Congress may do much to decide whether we are to continue down the road that ends in statism and dictatorial government, or whether we are to reaffirm the principles and the ideals that made us a great, free, and prosperous people.

A determined effort is being made to fasten the welfare state idea upon the country. Congress will be asked to appropriate billions for cradle-to-the-grave security measures—all of which, of course, would be compulsory. The only logical reasoning behind proposals of this character is that the American people are no longer capable of taking care of themselves, that independence, thrift, self-reliance, and pride are obsolete virtues, and that we must follow the sorry example of near-bankrupt England and dictator-ridden Russia.

An equally determined effort will be made to extend Government ownership and domination of industry and enterprise. This naturally goes hand in hand with the welfare state—the cloth is cut from the same bolt.

It is also possible that an effort will be made to increase the tax rates—despite the fact that they are excessively heavy now, cut deep into the purchasing power of every individual, and make it difficult and in some cases impossible for enterprises to obtain the investment capital they need. That is particularly true of new and smaller companies.

The basic issue was well put by General Eisenhower when he said, "Government ownership or control of property is not to be decried principally because of the historic inefficiency of governmental management * * *. Its real threat rests in the fact that, if carried to the logical extreme, the final concentration of ownership in the hands of government gives to it, in all practical effects, absolute power over our lives." That fine statement should be on every Congressman's desk. We have come nearer than we realize to giving government such power.

Federal Control of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURR P. HARRISON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include herein the following address which I delivered before the Rotary Club of Leesburg, Va., on January 26, 1950:

There is no doubt that the paramount difference of opinion today—the one that means most to the future of the United States and the lives of its people—is the controversy swirling around the welfare state idea.

The welfare state means many things. In general, though, it means that the Federal Government takes care of everything—health, education, conditions of employment, income. It's an all-encompassing system that has reached pathetically ludicrous proportions in England with such things as filing out a Government form to get a wig or a set of false teeth.

We have read in recent months of the curtailments the British have been forced to make in this brave scheme. The country has reached the brink of bankruptcy, and the Government, busy taking care of everybody, has been forced to pause and try to figure out how to take care of itself.

But these snags in the great experiment in Britain haven't dampened the enthusiasm of the "welfare staters" in the United States. The technique here is to offer a series of proposals which, from their surface aspect, can be expected to generate substantial public support.

Medical care for all the people, better education, increased interest in elections, adequate opportunity for employment—these, for example, form a group of objectives all of us can endorse. The "welfare staters" assure us they can be achieved painlessly and quickly through Federal legislation. The flaws are not discussed in the sales talk. We have to find them by looking closely at the merchandise now—before we buy it. It's not being sold with a money-back guaranty.

But let us see the effect of these proposals when you add them up and put them all together. The anti-poll-tax bill is a deceiving prelude to Federal control of all now free elections. The FEPC would place control of employment relationship in Washington; repeal of Taft-Hartley would subject the industrial production of the Nation and its workingmen to the caprice of a dozen labor bosses; compulsory public-health insurance would give control of public health to Washington bureaus; passage of the Brannan farm plan, devised by Henry A. Wallace and pledged in the 1948 platform of Wallace's Progressive Party and later adopted by Mr. Brannan without credit to its true author, would vest control of the Nation's food and raw materials in the hands of a Washington bureaucracy; Federal aid to education would place the training of American youth in the hands of an untrustworthy group; housing measures passed and proposed will destroy private business in a large field; continued deficit financing and high taxes will crush the middle classes and small business to extinction. What sort of an America does this add up to in your mind?

Many who are opposed to all other features of this program may protest the inclusion of Federal aid to education in this group.

Although always suspicious of the proposal, I confess that, at first, I was not convinced, as I am now, that the sort of Federal aid to education program pending in the Congress is the worst of all of these plans.

Because so many fine citizens—unfortunately including a number of experienced and respected legislators—have not looked under the veneer of this proposal to discover the stark structure of centralized socialistic control, I should like to tell you why I have come to regard the measure with such disapproval and concern.

The one argument that is advanced in its behalf is that some of the States are too poor to support an adequate public-school system. Did you ever stop to think that there is no State in the Union with a financial structure so unsound and demoralized as that of the Federal Government?

In Virginia, for example, we have relatively low taxes, whereas the tax structure of the Federal Government is inequitable and extremely high. Virginia has a surplus. Uncle Sam will wind up this fiscal year with a $5,000,000,000 deficit. Virginia owes no money, but the Federal Government owes $265,000,000,000.

Let us grant the need for additional money for schools. If that additional amount is to be raised by taxation, Virginia is in a better position than is the Federal Government with respect to increasing taxes. If it is to be financed by borrowing, the credit of Virginia is better than that of Uncle Sam. If more money is to come from surplus, Virginia has the surplus, whereas the United States Government is in real danger of bankruptcy as a result of heedless deficit spending.

Admit, for the sake of argument, that a few States, such as Mississippi, are so poor that they cannot finance adequate schools without outside help. Why should we include the great majority of States, such as Virginia, in such a program, which would take away more from Virginia citizens and give back less to its schools?

I challenge you to suggest a single reason other than a desire to force decisions on State and local school boards as a condition to receiving Federal grants.

Now, the sponsors of the Federal education subsidy program protest that there is no thought of Federal control over the Nation's public school systems. Those who believe that are misinformed. Those who are informed don't believe it.

Without entering into the delicate discussion of racial relations this quotation from a recent open letter to the Washington Post signed by a prominent group of educators, including John Dewey, is cited merely to show that leaders of education intend to exercise control:

"The existence of racially segregated schools is itself a blot upon the American public school system which must in time be eliminated. Any measure which forward-looking forces can support must provide effective means to prevent discriminatory application of Federal funds."

In addition, there is no form of Federal grant in aid that is not accompanied by conditions to be met before the money is paid. This has been true of Federal aid to roads; of aid to hospitals under the Hill-Burton Act; and of all similar proposals.

The power to withhold huge funds until conditions are met, of necessity, carries with it the power to impose the controls. Let the States accept the Federal aid for a few years, become accustomed to it—adjust their State financing to depend on the Federal contribution for school-program maintenance. Then, the educational planners will be ready for the next move—more controls, an approach to standardization of curricula—in short, a Federal system of public education, worked out in Washington and supervised by a corps of bureaucrats headquartered there.

What sort of educational system do they seek to impose upon us?

We can judge that when we have examined the efforts of leaders of the progressive education system and of bureaucrats up to now. Let us also consider the progress they have made up to now under State and local control which forces them to permeate the education departments of 48 States and thousands of localities.

It is my opinion that their intentions are very bad and their success very great.

Most of us have been puzzled, if not seriously concerned, at one time or another by evidence that our children aren't being taught the fundamentals that were drummed into our own heads years ago—an appreciation of the history of this country, for example, and a respect for its institutions of individual initiative and free enterprise.

We have noticed, too, that children who, either as a result of inadequate effort or insufficient ability, fail to master their subjects are nevertheless given a passing grade, but have we considered that when such a system is continued until a youth approaches maturity its effect must be to instill in him the thought that somehow he will get along in life regardless of ability or effort. We have noticed that the precocious or hard-working child is not permitted to enter the schools earlier or advance faster than the dull or indolent child, but have we considered that when such a system is continued until a youth approaches maturity its effect must be to instill in him the thought that there is no competition in life or reward for individual effort. We have noticed that public school curricula rarely includes the 3 R's, that rarely do children have courses in history, or spelling, or geography, but have we noticed that the high school graduate is untrained and uneducated? A survey made a few years ago by the New York Times showed shocking ignorance among the Nation's high school graduates, most of whom could not identify the Declaration of Independence or locate the Mississippi River.

Are we off the track in our thinking? Is this just our imagination? Or has there been a scrapping of the old teaching methods in favor of a new educational mysticism? I think it is the latter. I think, in fact, that we have permitted to grow within our system of public instruction a dangerous cancer. If we permit control of public education to become vested in one Washington bureaucracy that cancer may not be cured by our surgery.

John Dewey, a philosopher and educator, probably has been responsible to a larger extent than has any other individual for the new course set by this ivory-tower coterie in the teaching field. I say "ivory tower" because it is clear the thoughts of the average American parent as to the upbringing of his child is beneath the dignity of their notice. They believe they must educate the young in spite of, instead of in cooperation with, the parent.

Those who have deified Dewey want only to be left alone to teach in the manner in which they interpret the tenets of this new mysticism. And most of all, they resent any effort to insure that the teachers in our schools and colleges believe in our democratic system.

These shadowy schoolhouse rings have moved in our schools, under the noses of conscientious governors and other officials.

They are preaching dissension and outright subversion in subtle paragraphs sprinkled through dozens of textbooks which have been approved by State educational authorities for use in elementary and high schools.

In some of these texts, widely used in the United States, the founding fathers are dismissed as self-serving men; the Constitution is branded an outdated document; so-called social gains of the Soviet Union are discussed at length; there is overemphasis on poverty and distress in the United States. The claims of socialism usually are described in proximity to the description of the seamier side of American life; the idea of a class struggle is harped on, and it is suggested repeatedly that the capitalistic system serves only the moneyed, industrialist class, at the expense of the worker.

Let us look at a few illustrative statements contained in textbooks used in public school systems:

In Elementary Sociology, by Ross L. Finney, it is said:

"We often hear the old slogan that local self-government is the vital organ of democracy. But this slogan was coined before the invention of railroads and automobiles, telephones, telegrams, and radios; and no

longer applies to present conditions, except in part."

And here is another one from a book coauthored by the noted—or notorious—Dr. Rexford Guy Tugwell, who in saying that capitalism is a failure continues:

"Just as it was impossible for our Union to exist half slave and half free, so it may become impossible for the world to exist half socialistic and half capitalistic. And there are many who believe that capitalism in its nineteenth century present form would prove a weaker system than the system being developed by the Soviet Union."

Sneering reference is made to what is termed "the unreasoning, almost hysterical, attachment of certain Americans to the Constitution."

In another textbook used in American schools, Man's Worldly Goods, by Leo Huberman, is this choice gem:

"The break-down that came in 1929 is often referred to as a world crisis. * * * The crisis swept like a tidal wave over all countries but one; * * * the Russians were secure behind their dyke of a socialist planned economy."

Teachers' College at Columbia University in New York City is considered in the profession to be one of the outstanding institutions for the development of educators.

Many teachers who have studied there have been exposed to the influence of a Dr. George S. Counts. In addition to teaching at Columbia for a number of years as a professor of education, this Dr. Counts has been a leader in the American Federation of Teachers, a labor union for teachers.

He set forth his teaching philosophy very frankly back in the 1930's, when he wrote a number of papers on the general theme, "Does the School Dare Build a New Social Order?" These papers were delivered before audiences of educators.

Among many things, he said:

"That the teachers should deliberately reach for power and make the most of their conquest is my firm conviction. To the extent that they are permitted to fashion the curriculum and the procedures of the school, they will definitely and positively influence the social attitudes, ideals, and behavior of the coming generation."

Among the ideas that Dr. Counts offered teachers was this one, straight from Karl Marx:

"If property rights are to be diffused in industrial society, natural resources and all forms of capital will have to be collectively owned."

In preaching the class conflict, Dr. Counts said something must be done to overturn American capitalism in its existing form. "And according to the historical record," he commented ominously, "this process has commonly been attended by a bitter struggle and even bloodshed."

Such men, highly placed in the profession of education, are preaching conflict to our young teachers. And they are making substantial headway in many large cities in unionizing the teachers and promoting teacher strikes.

Dr. Harold O. Rugg is another educator who wants the teachers to emphasize struggle between classes in their teaching—to give the pupils to understand that a bitter fight must go on continually between classes.

In one of his Teachers' Guides, intended to tell teachers how to use a textbook series he prepared, Dr. Rugg points out how they should develop one central idea, the beginnings of the march toward democracy as a struggle between the so-called common people and the so-called upper classes.

"Thus we present political history as a conflict between groups desiring to control the Government," Dr. Rugg states. And he comments:

"For 300 years, this struggle has been revealed in America."

He goes on:

"This material raises the question of the distribution of the social incomes, the enormous inequality in the wealth of our people, and the share of each class in the national income."

In other words, the idea of class warfare is to be impressed on our children.

Similar advice to the teacher is found in a 1946 report by the National Council for Social Studies, an affiliate of the National Education Association, wherein the teacher is urged to point out, and I quote, "that Russia's suspicion of the world parallels the attitude of the young and insecure American Nation of the nineteenth century."

Admirers of Soviet Russia are legion among the educators. In 1935, a number of them went to Russia to attend a summer school at the University of Moscow. John Dewey was among the sponsors of the session. And, in 1937, the United States Office of Education, the Federal agency which will administer Federal controlled education, saw fit to issue a bulletin for public schools describing a series of public affairs pamphlets which included a number dealing with conditions in Russia. One of them was written by the Communist, Earl Browder. This was financed by taxes paid by you.

In a study of textbook trends made by the Sons of the American Revolution, a prime exhibit is a series of publications known as Building America, inaugurated in the 1930's with the financial assistance of the Rockefeller Foundation and widely used in public school systems. An analysis of this series revealed that more than 100 Communist front organizations were represented in the affiliations of persons whose writings were cited in the series as reference material.

Extensive support of socialistic housing and medical schemes, as well as inflammatory civil-rights agitation, could be found throughout the Building America material.

To what extent has this disturbing tide touched Virginia?

Until this year, the approved list of textbooks for our schools carried a book entitled, "The Story of Civilization." One of the authors of this book has permitted his name to be associated publicly with organizations officially adjudged subversive and Communist-controlled. This book referred to Karl Marx and Lenin in glowing terms; upheld the Spanish loyalists for their heroism; defended socialism and vilified capitalism.

It taught that Stalin had abandoned the principle of world revolution and was seeking only to win the good will of other nations and maintain friendly relations with them. This book stated:

"Many ministers and priests felt that the capitalistic system was un-Christian, since it imposed poverty on the masses of workers while the rich employers and capitalists lived in palaces."

Although the State board of education let this book slip by, it is to be commended for striking it from the approved list. But what would be the situation if books of this character were bought for use in our Virginia schools—not as the result of a slip, but through the deliberate policy of Federal bureaucrats exercising authority which local school authorities were powerless to oppose?

In his inaugural address last week, the Governor expressed his dissatisfaction with the lack of emphasis on fundamentals to be found in Virginia schools. Although the situation in this respect is much less serious here than in many other States, as a citizen of Virginia, I am in full agreement with the Governor's position.

So long as we retain control in the people of Virginia, you and I can back our Governor in his announced purpose to bring our Virginia schools to the forefront in training our youth to become informed and patriotic citizens. But once we surrender the management of our schools to the Federal bureaucracy and the parlor pinks of the progressive movement in education, neither you nor I, nor State and local school boards, nor even the Governor and the legislature will have any power over who teaches or what is taught to our children.

Instead of Federal control of education, what we need most at this time, it seems to me, is a firm resolve that the people shall recapture our schools from schoolhouse rings—to take back into the people's hands a careful supervision of the education of our children.

The school is the public institution closest to the family. It belongs to the people. It was contrived to serve the desires of the people as to the education of the young.

School authorities must be made to understand that it is the people's wishes which are paramount.

We may be stupid and uncouth in the eyes of the disciples of Dewey, who insist on their way of education and demand to be insulated from parents. But the children belong to the people and so does the money that pays the school bills.

If we want our youngsters trained as Godfearing, patriotic, industrious citizens rather than as soulless instruments of class struggle and social upheaval, that is our business.

And it looks as if we had better start doing a better job of minding our business.

More About the Katyn Massacre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, for some time I have been interested in unearthing the ghastly details of one of the greatest crimes of the century—one that should take its place in the halls of shame together with the Nazi gas chambers and concentration camps. I refer to the cold-blooded murder of 10,000 Polish officers at Katyn.

Charges have been made by responsible authorities that this horrible deed was perpetrated by the Soviet Red Army. Recently a committee of inquiry has been formed to find the true facts and this body is headed by the distinguished Arthur Bliss Lane, former United States Ambassador to Poland. To aid this inquiry I have several times sought to gain access to information in the hands of the Office of National Defense on the basis of investigations made by American Army officers. Each time my request has been refused on the ground that the information is classified. I am taking the liberty of appending herewith the full correspondence on this matter for the information of the American people.

It seems to me the American people should know why information as to this heinous crime against humanity is kept secret. What justification is there for classifying this information and smothering it in the files? I should like to know who is primarily responsible for the decision to withhold this information from the world and what is the motive behind it. At a time when the Soviet Government is conducting a ceaseless barrage of slander against the United

States, why should we not tell the truth about the Katyn affair, more than 4 years after the end of the war?

Is it possible that the fact that Donald Hiss, brother of Alger Hiss and a member of the law firm of Acheson, Burling, Rublee, and Shurb, who has been representing the government of the Soviet satellite state of Poland, for some time, has something to do with the suppression of this information? Is this one more example of Soviet appeasement?

The correspondence follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1949.

The DIRECTOR, MILITARY INTELLIGENCE,
Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: Some time ago I inserted an article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD regarding the murder of several thousand Polish officers, probably by the Russians.

It has recently come to my attention that certain British and American officers were taken to the scene of the execution of these men while such officers were prisoners of the Germans.

It has been rumored that at least two of the American officers were Lt. Col. John Van Vliet, Jr., now stationed at Fort Lewis, Wash., and a Captain Stewart, otherwise unidentified.

It is quite possible that a committee will be formed to investigate this matter officially, and the purpose of this letter is to inquire whether or not the above-named officers have made a report on this matter and, if so, whether such report is available. If so, I would be very much pleased to receive a copy of the same.

Thanking you in advance, I am,

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF,
UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., October 19, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Reference is made to your letter of October 6, 1949, in which you request information on a report of the Katyn massacre. The Intelligence Division has recently acquired a report on this subject, which was partially based on Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's observations of the German exhumation of the Polish graves at Katyn in 1943. The report is classified, and therefore cannot be released at this time.

In the event this report is declassified, it will be a pleasure to furnish you a copy.

Sincerely yours,
S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, GSC, Director of Intelligence.

ROYAL OAK, MICH., *October 31, 1949.*

Maj. Gen. S. LEROY IRWIN,
Director of Intelligence, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL IRWIN: For the life of me I cannot conceive why Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet's report on the Katyn affair should be classified.

Would you please explain what reasons impelled the Department to classify this document and why such classification is maintained at the present time, 6 years after the event?

Was the action taken as a result of instruction from the State Department? If so, I should like to know what the instructions were and who issued them.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
GENERAL STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY,
Washington, D. C., November 8, 1949.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. DONDERO: Your letter of October 31, 1949, concerning release of the Van Vliet report has been received and your interest in this matter is appreciated.

I should point out, however, that since the perpetrators of this crime have not been determined with finality and, since the report contains certain highly sensitive information the premature disclosure of which would be extremely unwise in view of the current international situation, the Department of the Army believes it inadvisable to release the report.

Sincerely yours,
S. LEROY IRWIN,
Major General, General Staff Corps, Director of Intelligence.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1950.

Hon. LOUIS JOHNSON,
The Secretary of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: For some time I have been interested in securing reports of the Katyn massacre.

I write to inquire if the report of Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet is now available and whether a copy may be provided for my study.

I am also advised that Mr. Stanislaw Mikolajczyk stated in his book, The Rape of Poland, that the official Russian records of the Katyn prisoners (together, I believe, with German translations) were carried into Germany when the German Army retreated from the Smolensk area, and that these documents were captured by American forces and brought to this country. The importance of such documents can hardly be exaggerated, and I should appreciate your advice as to their availability.

Very sincerely yours,
GEORGE A. DONDERO,
Member of Congress.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, January 18, 1950.

Hon. GEORGE A. DONDERO,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. DONDERO: I have received your letter of January 9 in which you express interest in obtaining documents concerning the Katyn massacre.

Of the two documents you mention, the only one which we have in the Department of Defense, is a report prepared in the Army General Staff. This report is an accumulation of information from various sources and, although its preparation has been commonly attributed to Lieutenant Colonel Van Vliet, he collaborated in its preparation only to the extent of reviewing its contents.

It is my understanding that you have previously requested the Army to release this report to you and you were informed that, since it contained highly sensitive information, its release by the Army was considered unwise. However, shortly before I received your letter, Secretary of the Army Gray raised with me the question of its release. No decision has been reached as yet concerning this matter but I hope to be able to give a definite answer to your request at an early date.

* * * * *

With kindest personal regards,
Sincerely yours,
LOUIS JOHNSON.

Communists on the Federal Pay Roll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial appearing in the Mount Vernon (Ohio) News. In my opinion, this editorial calls to the attention of all of us the lack of protection we have in our various departments of Government against Communists. I join with the writer of this editorial and insist we clean house of the Communists on our Federal pay roll and make a sincere endeavor to better protect our people in the future.

Elections will soon be here and the left-wingers and those who are friendly toward communism will support many candidates. The people should carefully analyze and scrutinize the various candidates to make certain they have not pledged themselves to those who would attempt to destroy our form of government.

During the last campaign, Mr. Speaker, the President as well as some candidates for Congress attempted to tell the people that communism was but a "red herring." Events since that time certainly prove that communism is still a menace to our freedoms and should be considered as such. Let us remember those who attempted to belittle this threat.

The editorial follows:

MAKING IT OFFICIAL

For years there have been rumors that the State Department—as well as some other Government departments—was pretty well sprinkled with Communists and Communist sympathizers.

And there have been rumors that these Communists and fellow-travelers have been active in feeding American secrets to agents for the Russian Government.

Just how much truth there is to these rumors has never been proven.

But it is now known that there is some basis for them.

This proof was contained in the verdict of the jury which convicted Alger Hiss on a charge of perjury for denying to a Senate committee that he had supplied State Department secrets to a Communist spy ring.

The outcome of this second Hiss trial—the jury in the first was unable to reach a verdict—makes one wonder about the present and the future.

Have all the Communists and sympathizers been cleared out of the departments and agencies in our Federal Government?

Or are there still some left in positions that enable them to inform Moscow on what is going on in the innermost circles of our Government?

And will the proper steps be taken to eliminate any Communist influence that still may remain in our Government?

For Alger Hiss was a trusted official. He was one of the brightest of the bright young men of the New Deal era. He held several important posts in the State Department. He was one of the late President Roosevelt's top advisers at the Yalta conference. He was secretary-general of the conference which drafted the outline for the United Nations Charter.

He had the utmost confidence of numerous persons high in public life during the time he was helping shape the policies of Government.

President Truman branded the Communist spy ring investigation by a Senate committee a "red herring."

Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt expressed the opinion, in her newspaper column, while the first Hiss trial was in progress, that Hiss was innocent.

And Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed were character witnesses for Hiss at his first trial.

Doesn't the Hiss case show the importance of exerting the utmost care in the selection of men and women to safeguard our national secrets and in taking every precaution to assure that those who now have access to secrets are to be trusted?

It is evident such precautions were not taken in the past. The American people should have the assurance of better protection in the future.

American Income, Its Sources, Distribution, and Continuation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES W. VURSELL
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. VURSELL. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks, I include an article by Justus Johnson, of Aurora, Ill., a political economist of distinction:

III. AMERICAN INCOME, ITS SOURCES, DISTRIBUTION, AND CONTINUATION

Sources of income and their distribution as reported by Dr. Claude Robinson, president of the Opinion Research Corp., and Father Edward A. Keller, director of economic research of Notre Dame University, have been presented the two previous Sundays.

These facts were pointed out neither to amuse nor to create prejudice. They helped understand what makes the wheels go around to produce a better living for all.

Let us give it further consideration. Why do we live better in America? Because there has been provided out of savings enough capital to better equip every worker. In Mongolia, lumber is sawed by hand. Here we have circular saws and electric or steam power. On the farms there are tractors—in the shops there are machines—everywhere the individual's effort is multiplied by implements and power energy. Back of each worker there is more than 100 horsepower of energy and over $6,000 of production equipment. Countries that do not make savings provide no capital. The production there is low and living is at a subsistence level.

European and Asiatic countries are much older than America. Many centuries of living together in groups provided answers ahead of us. The older civilization should have developed efficiency and know-how greater than ours. Their land area and undeveloped raw materials exceed ours.

DEVICES TO ENRICH

About the only things in which they surpass Americans is in devices that are now being promoted here on the patterns that made poverty there. Europeans especially have attained great experience in passing the buck and getting the other fellow to provide. These designs have been acquired in the extension of trading corporations and empire building. Their purpose is to get the fruits of the other fellow's toil. People long experienced in using their energy and ingenuity in this kind of effort, fail in providing better and more production among themselves. This type of operation has come down from the higher levels and now reaches into the worker groups. It is shouted from radio and press in America by the nonproducer class—those interested in making profits from handling the other fellow's goods. The eastern seaboard cities and the National Capital make 90 percent of the noise. Their faces are eastward across the ocean—not westward to production centers that supply 90 percent of the articles that give them an opportunity. The pattern of "get the money" stands out like a sore thumb.

America owes little of its success to this kind of leadership. The two most important groups in America are the consumers and the producers. A successful national policy must answer to their problems. A proper solution will get plenty of response at elections.

ADDED COSTS

Adding costs on the producer reduces the volume that could be utilized and lessens the amount of employment.

Production is absorbed by consumers and users. All added costs fall on these classes. The producer must add his overhead to the article and the consumer must pay the additional cost. Some may escape direct income taxes, but they will pay the load of added cost on everything purchased—food, clothes, housing, fuel, amusement, luxuries—everything carries the added production costs. One example which illustrates how it works: Politicians say "tax the corporations," so General Motors, which makes automobiles, is "socked." You buy their product. Their salesman without receiving Government pay collects from you, the buyer, $400 in taxes on every $1,500 of car price.

The consumer in America pays the bill. Strange how this has been camouflaged, how the people receiving less than $5,000 per year are kept from understanding that they are 90 percent of the consuming class and to them is passed the buck to provide the payment for making the world safe for democracy, according to the pattern of these good folks "who toil not, neither do they spin."

Is it not time that someone should arise and speak? Point out the groups that continue to make the little fellow the beast of burden for grandiose schemes and world-wide give-aways? These princes of power and politics stake the average man into camp and make him the goat to pay the freight. It is done by resorting to prejudicial name-calling as princes of privilege, selfish few, and similar cognomens.

LOCAL AND FEDERAL COSTS

Let's give thought to what we get from our Government revenues. From our local taxes we get the city service, police and fire protection, garbage collection, street cleaning and maintenance, public nursing, city health department, city hospital services, sanitary district, park system, township road and bridge expenditures, district organization, city, county, and circuit courts, county government, and State government. State government covers penal institutions, normal schools and State universities, State police department, many regulatory bodies, State aid, road systems, and many other services. Most of these can be visualized.

Now, recite what personal benefits you can visualize that comes because of the expenditures of the Federal Government. You name them and compare. Yes, sir; the Federal Government's take from the Nation's earnings is many times the cost paid for all these services enumerated as local.

America spends more per capita on education than any other country. Nearly every family can have provided for their children 8 years of grade school, 4 years of high school, some State university training, and special schools for those suffering from infirmities, and all this is provided at a fractional cost of what the Federal Government takes from the consumers.

TAKES ONE-FOURTH OF INCOME

The tax bill in the Nation is above $50,000,000,000 annually, 25 percent of the whole national income, $40,000,000,000 is taken by the Federal Government. Some escape income tax because of exemptions and low earnings. Do they escape paying? Everything carries that indirect burden—that package added to production. In many cases it far exceeds any direct tax load that might have been imposed on the individual. Certainly it is time for the consumers of the Nation, especially those with families to support, to get off the sucker list put together by these princes of power and politics.

Let us get our bearings and understand that the two important groups of people in our country are the producers and the consumers. If a healthy atmosphere exists for these two groups the remainder fare all right. When materials and goods are produced there is trade and commerce. Without production there will be disaster and it will fall first on business institutions. The American public has been distracted too long. Let's get on the beam—understand our problems. Give adherence to leaders who lead—voices that get their guidance from production centers and from the consumers. Ghost writers and propaganda-inspired solutions do not present basic answers. Change the viewpoint and the American public will take on a crusader spirit. Give the voters something to fight for and there won't be over 43,000,000 voters failing to go to the polls. In the Nation and in the State many granted leadership have surrounded themselves with "yes men." This has weakened our political virility. When the chief falls his captains do not have a capacity to make decisions because blind adherence over the years has eaten away any initiative.

FACE THE FACTS

Let's face the facts and give the voter something to support or oppose. Ninety-three million voters were qualified to cast a ballot in 1948. More than 43,000,000 did not vote. Did these nonvoters have positive convictions?

Ireland's Last Demand

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE P. MILLER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the present week has proven an outstanding week in the field of international affairs. Only yesterday a new government took office in India and that country became an independent republic, after early 200 years of British dominance and control. The new Republic of India, with a population of 330,000,000 people, becomes the third largest in the world. Only the United States and the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic exceed India in size.

Earlier in the week the United States signed the first treaty to be negotiated between this country and the Republic of Ireland. This treaty of amity, commerce, and navigation will prove an additional bond of union between ourselves and the Irish, who have always proven

their friendship through the centuries. On numerous instances the Irish have shown themselves to be our strongest supporters, especially in recent European matters where the Irish Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Sean MacBride, has repeatedly supported our position and taken the lead in urging European cooperation.

In addition to these events, President Truman has this week announced that the status of our representation in Ireland will be raised to that of an embassy. This change in diplomatic status is heralded both here and in Ireland as an appropriate recognition of the close ties that bind these two countries. Both the President and the State Department are to be congratulated on taking this step in advancing the international position of Ireland, by placing our mutual diplomatic representation on a par with that of other nations throughout the world.

Today but one step remains to bring about the complete realization of Ireland's hopes and dreams for freedom and independence. For 700 years the Irish have rebelled against British conquest and domination of their country. Today only a small portion of Ireland remains subject to that ancient imperialism. Only 6 counties in the north have not been granted the full independence, which has at last been achieved by the other 26 counties. It is inevitable that all Ireland must one day be free and united, and that no amount of foreign intrigue can long continue to hold sovereignty over this corner of the world.

Since our Government has now determined to give to Ireland the diplomatic recognition that is her due, why can we not also take the necessary steps to aid Ireland in abolishing the border in the north and reuniting the country into the natural unit, which it should be? One word from our Department of State or from the President to the Government of Britain could become the means of terminating this unjust aggression which continues in Ireland. To speak that word at this time would provide Britain the means of gracefully withdrawing from Ireland and would forever eliminate the possibility of riot and rebellion on the part of the Irish to regain their six lost counties.

While we hail the accomplishments of the present week in the international field, we yet realize that there is much more which can still be accomplished, and which must yet be undertaken. While the unification of all Ireland may appear to be a minor problem confronting the world, yet a peaceful solution of this matter is imperative, and only prompt action can assure that bloodshed will not occur in the effort to satisfy Ireland's last demand, namely, that all of Ireland be free and independent, that the border be eliminated and the nation united.

We have negotiated a treaty of friendship with Ireland and have raised the status of our diplomatic representation to that of ambassador. Now let us likewise assist in bringing about the satisfaction of this last wrong that afflicts Ireland, namely, the elimination of the border. Our influence can well be the deciding factor and should be made felt now. No more worthy achievement could be accomplished by our State Department than to bring about the end of partition in Ireland, thus ending the friction with Britain and satisfying Ireland's last demand.

Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith a résumé of the status of legislation based on recommendations of the Hoover Commission as of January 1, 1950. This was compiled by the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report:

The Reorganization Record—Status of legislation based on recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as of Jan. 1, 1950

Subject	House bill No., committee, and date received	Senate bill No., committee, and date received	Notes	Enacted into law
1. (*a*) Reorganization Act of 1949	Empowers President to submit plans for realinement of agencies. Either House can veto in 60 days.		6 of 7 plans effective; Aug. 20	Public Law 109, 81st Cong., June 20.
(*b*) General management	H. R. 2613, Expenditures, Feb. 10 H. R. 5520, passed Aug. 12	S. 942, Expenditures, Feb. 14 H. R. 5526, Expenditures, Aug. 15	Basically important to over-all program.	
	Reorganization Plan No. 4, transfer, to the Executive Office of the President the National Security Council and National Security Resources Board.			Effective Aug. 20.
2. Personnel management	H. R. 5181, Post Office and Civil Service, June 15.	S. 2111, Post Office and Civil Service, June 20.	No further hearings scheduled	
	H. R. 5931, passed Aug. 28	H. R. 5931, passed Sept. 30	To conference, Oct. 3	Public Law 429, Oct. 28.
	H. R. 1689, passed July 8	H. R. 1689, passed Sept. 29	do	Public Law 359, Oct. 15.
	Reorganization Plan No. 5, deals with office of "Chairman, U. S. Civil Service Commission," provides Deputy Director and outlines functions of Civil Service Commission.			Effective Aug. 20.
3. General services	Combines purchasing functions, records, building management, disposal of surplus property.		Can save $250,000,000 a year	Public Law 152, 81st Cong., June 30.
4. Post Office	H. R. 5177, Post Office and Civil Service, June 15. H. R. 5643, Post Office and Civil Service, July 14. H. R. 5775, Post Office and Civil Service, July 26.	S. 2062, Post Office and Civil Service, June 13. S. 2212, Post Office and Civil Service, July 7. S. 2213, Post Office and Civil Service, July 7. S. 1103, Post Office and Civil Service, out of committee September 30.	No further hearings scheduled	
	Reorganization Plan No. 3 transfers functions of subordinates to Postmaster General, subject to delegation, creates post of Deputy Postmaster General, abolishes Bureau of Accounts, creates Advisory Board on Post Office Matters.			Effective Aug. 20.
5. Foreign affairs	Strengthens staff of Secretary of State, paves way for amalgamation of Foreign Service and Washington Staff.		Partial realization of Commission Plan.	Public Law 73, 81st Cong., May 26.
6. Agriculture	H. R. 5179, Agriculture, June 15	S. 2055, Agriculture, June 13	No hearings scheduled	
7. Budgeting-accounting	H. R. 5823, Expenditures, August 1.	S. 2054, Expenditures, June 13. Amendment, expenditures, August 1.	No hearings scheduled	
8. National security: (*a*) Under Secretary of Defense.	Created much needed Deputy for Secretary of Defense		First step in better organization of armed services.	Public Law 36, 81st Cong. April 2.
(*b*) Tydings bill	Unifies armed services, centralizes operating controls, improves budgeting and accounting, creates Chairman of Joint Chiefs of Staff.		Savings of $500,000,000 annually announced.	Public Law 216, 81st Cong. Aug. 10.
9. Veterans' affairs	H. R. 5171, Veterans' Affairs, June 15. H. R. 5288, Veterans' Affairs, June 22.	S. 2019, Finance, June 8		
10. Commerce	H. R. 5180, Commerce, June 15	S. 2056, Commerce, June 13		
	Reorganization Plan No. 7 transfers the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Administration to Department of Commerce.			Effective Aug. 20.
11. Treasury	H. R. 5174, Ways and Means, June 15.	S. 2058, Finance, June 13		
12. Regulatory commissions	H. R. 5173, Expenditures, June 15	S. 2059, Expenditures, June 13 S. 2073, Expenditures, June 14. S. 2330, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, July 26. S. 2340, Banking and Currency, July 27.		
	Reorganization Plan No. 6 makes the Chairman of the U. S. Maritime Commission the Chief Executive and Administrative Officer of the Commission.			Effective Aug. 20.

The Reorganization Record—Status of legislation based on recommendations of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government as of Jan. 1, 1950—Continued

Subject	House bill No., committee, and date received	Senate bill No., committee, and date received	Notes	Enacted into law
13. Labor Department	Reorganization Plan No. 2 transfers into the Labor Department the Bureau of Employment Security and the Federal Advisory Council, and to the Secretary of Labor the functions of the Veteran's Placement Service Board.			Effective Aug. 20.
14. Interior	H. R. 5176, Public Lands, June 15. H. R. 5469, Expenditures, June 30.	S. 2057, Interior, June 13		
15. Social security, education, Indian affairs.	H. R. 5175, Expenditures, June 15.	S. 2060, Expenditures, June 13	Senate Expenditures Committee plans to hold hearings.	
16. Medical services	H. R. 5182, Expenditures, June 15.	S. 2008, Labor and Welfare, June 7.	No hearings scheduled	
17. Business enterprises	No bill prepared yet			
18. Overseas administration	H. R. 5172, Expenditures, June 15. S. 2072, Expenditures, Sept. 2 H. R. 6170, Foreign Affairs, Sept. 13.	S. 2072, passed Aug. 27 S. 2061, Expenditures, June 13	Provides for Overseas Study Commission.	
Federal-State relations	H. R. 4507, Expenditures, May 3	S. 1946, Expenditures, out of committee June 13.	No hearings scheduled	
Research	H. R. 4846, Commerce, out of committee June 13.	S. 247, passed Senate Mar. 18	Provide for Science Foundation	

Education in Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JESSE P. WOLCOTT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by John A. Hannah, president of the Michigan State College of Agriculture and Applied Science, which he delivered on January 26, 1950, at the annual banquet of the Michigan State Society of Washington:

The invitation to address the Michigan State Society of Washington was accepted with some diffidence. Only a foolhardy man would attempt to come into Washington and offer any comments on either domestic or international affairs. This is an unusual audience. Most of you have been called here from Michigan to serve your country because of special qualifications which set you somewhat apart from your fellow Michiganders.

It is a great comfort for one living in faraway Michigan to know that our State is represented here by such able people, and that problems of public importance will receive prompt and efficient attention. All of Michigan are in great debt to all of you.

I have decided to visit with you this evening for a little while about education—the one subject with which I can pretend to have any real familiarity, and the one subject about which I can presume to have any ideas of interest to you. Education is a proper subject to discuss with Michigan people because some of the most distinctive contributions of the Wolverine State to the development of this Nation have been in the field of education.

As you probably recall, John D. Pierce and his associates in the early years of our State devised and established a unique system of primary education, one much copied elsewhere, and one for which Horace Mann gets much of the credit. The University of Michigan was the first of the great universities and has long been the model and inspiration for State universities everywhere. It is to the eternal credit of the university that it was the first State university to admit women as students. We of Michigan can be proud of the fact that the State normal college at Ypsilanti was the first teachers' college west of the Alleghenies. We of Michigan can be equally proud of the fact that our legislature established the first agricultural college in the world nearly a century ago. From that modest beginning at what is now Michigan State College grew the great national complex of institutions known as the land-grant college system. It can be claimed with assurance that in general outline, the Michigan system of education has been used as a model for most of the Western States.

Such a remarkable record was not written by accident. You will remember that the Congress wrote into the Ordinance of 1787 which established the Northwest Territory these powerful words of injunction:

"Religion, morality, and knowledge being necessary to good government and the happiness of mankind, schools and the means of education shall forever be encouraged." So impressed were the founders of our State with that philosophy that they copied the enjoinder verbatim, into the first Constitution of Michigan.

Today the importance of education at all levels is recognized by everyone. But we must admire the intelligence and foresight of the pioneers who understood how important education was to be to the young State of Michigan in the years they would not live to see.

Understanding very well the nature of the democratic society that had been established on an experimental basis in this young country, they appreciated the importance of men and women being able to read and write and cipher. They understood perfectly that our system of government, dependent upon the intelligent decisions of its people as expressed by their votes, must for its own sake see to it that the people are sufficiently well educated to be well-informed.

They saw, too, that the State and Nation would benefit if there were opportunities to enhance native skills and aptitudes through education. Even in that distant day it was recognized that a skilled worker contributes more to the general economic well-being than an unskilled worker. For one thing, the skilled worker creates more real wealth because his capacity for production is greater than that of his unskilled brother. For another, in developing his skills and aptitudes, he develops taste and appreciation for things outside the narrow world of his own work. Basically, the wants and needs of the common laborer are easily supplied. Food, shelter, clothing, and simple recreation are his major interests. Not so the lawyer, or the engineer, or the teacher, or the good farmer, or the trained craftsman. He has a wider horizon and a broader vision. In addition to food, shelter, and clothing, he wants travel, and entertainment, and broader social experiences for himself and his family and for each of these he spends some of the extra money his higher skills have earned for him.

Even a hundred years or more ago, it was understood that dollars invested wisely in educational opportunity for able youths at whatever level return great dividends to society.

Succeeding generations of Michigan men and women have adhered to that philosophy. By and large, Michigan has always given strong support to its schools and colleges, in terms of both financial aid and the number of young men and women enrolled in its colleges and universities. Public education has paid the dividends the founders of our State prophesied when the system was established.

No thinking person will question that to a great extent America is what she is today because of our fundamental educational philosophy that makes educational opportunities available to all of our young people. Our preeminence in many fields, particularly industrial and agricultural production, can be attributed in large measure to the training given to our youth by our schools and colleges. We would be sore put to feed a great part of the world if scientific knowledge had not been applied decade after decade to the production of food. We would have been sore put to arm a great part of the world in wartime and support a great part of the world in this prolonged cold war if it were not for the engineers and production men, trained in the majority by the colleges and universities of America.

These are tremendous dividends on our investment in education to date. But I wonder whether our largest dividend has not been paid in a less tangible form—in the stability education has contributed to our democratic social structure.

To answer that question, one must realize that an outstanding feature of the American educational system is its emphasis on equality of opportunity. It was that emphasis which made the American system unique. The educational pioneers were determined that in this country, education was to be available to all, irrespective of economic status. They were determined that not just the sons and daughters of the well to do were to have the advantages of education, but that the sons and daughters of families of the industrial and agricultural classes as well were to have their chances in life, too. We can say with pride that the doors of educational opportunity have been and still are open to the vast majority of our youngsters who have the brains and the courage to take advantage of their opportunity.

I do not believe the importance of that condition can be overestimated. For decade upon decade in this country, youngsters of the poor and the rich alike have been required to attend primary and secondary schools together. For the more gifted, college educations have been available to a

more limited extent. The result has been that most of our young people have grown up with the certain knowledge that they need not remain in the economic classes in which they were born, but could climb upward as far as their intelligence and initiative could carry them. There has been no ceiling on opportunity. The transition from rags to riches is almost commonplace with us. By this means, we have come closer to achieving a classless society than those nations which have sought to create such a society by law and dictatorial decree.

Here we have democracy in action. Here we have examples by the million that our system does make it possible for the able to succeed; here we have examples by the million that caste and class are meaningless terms for those with intelligence and ambition. Here, I believe, we have one of the reasons why we Americans have continued to be so loyal to our unique system of government. Here we have a reason why our people listen to the charges and claims of envious foreign governments with amusement and with scorn, knowing as each of them does from personal experience that our system can and does work for the benefit of the greatest number.

I do not claim that more and more education is the cure for the ills of the world; we have too many crackpots among our intellectuals to enable any such theory to hold water. What I do claim is that by making a conscientious effort to insure equality of opportunity through education, we weave unequaled strength and stability into the fabric of our society.

Unhappily, there now is a serious question whether publicly supported education on the higher levels can continue to render this unique service to our Nation. Throughout the whole country, colleges and universities are face to face with a serious financial crisis not of their own making. There is the real danger that within a very few years, our colleges and universities will have to retrench—slip backward—for sheer lack of sufficient income.

The crisis was developing before World War II. The day of reckoning has been postponed thus far simply because the so-called GI bill of rights came to the rescue in the years immediately following the war. With the aid of income paid by the Federal Government for the education of veterans, colleges and universities have been able to carry on and even to improve their public services, despite the unprecedented burden of students piled upon them since the war. But the number of veterans on the campus is shrinking swiftly, and the colleges' income is shrinking at a corresponding rate. At my own institution, for example, our income from veterans' fees is due to drop by approximately $900,000 next year, while our enrollments promise to be about the same as they were this year. This year, the decrease in revenue from veterans' fees from the prior year is in excess of $770,000. Thus, in 2 years we will lose income at the rate of $1,670,000 per year.

Traditionally, support of higher education in America has been left to private, local, and State revenue sources. I do not have the exact figures at hand, but I know that private sources of support for higher education have been drying up in recent years. But as for State appropriations for higher education, I can tell you exactly what the situation is. State appropriations for the support of the land-grant colleges, for example, contributed only 40.3 percent of total income in 1948–49. More significantly, comparing this last school year, 1948–49, with the first postwar year of 1945–46, income from student fees increased by 147 percent, while State support decreased by 5.1 percent.

This trend is the same in both the land-grant colleges and the other State-supported colleges and universities as well. A recent study by the University of Michigan disclosed that while enrollments in State-supported colleges in 20 selected States increased by 154 percent in the 20 years since 1929. State appropriations per student in terms of 1948 dollars decreased by 14 percent. I am not proud of Michigan when I report that in our State, legislative appropriations per student have declined by 35 percent over that period, compared with the over-all average decrease in the Nation of 14 percent.

The significance is plain: The burden of paying for higher education is slowly being shifted from the States to the individual students and their families. The end result, if the trend is not halted or reversed, is equally plain: Fewer and fewer of our capable young men and women will be able to attend college in the years immediately ahead.

Those seeking an easy answer may say: "Too many young people go to college, anyhow." It is an easy answer, but not the correct one. The report of the President's Commission on Higher Education has made it painfully clear that we have not come anywhere near providing universal equality of educational opportunity. Every year, thousands upon thousands of our most talented and capable young men and women graduate from high school with the certain knowledge that college educations are beyond their reach, simply for lack of the necessary dollars.

Even more serious is the fact that we have regressed to the point at which the income of the family pretty much determines the course of study to be followed by even those so lucky as to go to college. This means, in plain language, that we are nearing the point at which the well-to-do parent can make a lawyer, a dentist, a doctor, or an engineer of his son, and his less-well-to-do neighbor will have to restrict his son's ambitions to the less-remunerative fields. It is almost impossible to earn ones way through college in 1950. Why? The high cost of room and board away from home.

These are matters of serious implication to our social system—the American way of living together. These are matters not reflecting great credit upon the richest country in the world, able to spend billions on the underprivileged abroad, billions on the physically, mentally, and morally deficient at home, and still more billions on nonessential pleasures and luxuries.

The danger signals have been observed by a great many thoughtful persons, both in and out of the educational field. That explains why, after surveying sources of income available to the States, they have begun to ask whether the time has come to ask the Federal Government for assistance. Federal aid for education has become a question of the day, and it is not news to you here in Washington that the question is debatable, to say the least.

I have no intention of espousing the cause of Federal aid to education here tonight nor of opposing the current proposals. I would, however, like to make a few general observations in the hope that they may be of some value in the months immediately ahead when this question is being debated in and out of the Congress.

My first observation, based on historical fact, is that it is possible to extend Federal aid to education without risking Federal dictation of educational policies within the States. The land-grant colleges have received subsidies from the Federal Treasury for more than 80 years, and I have yet to hear of one of them surrendering its proud independence to Washington.

Even so, my second observation is that the extension of Federal assistance to education would have to be done carefully to insure independence of action for the colleges. The current dispute between the land-grant universities and the Veterans' Administration is an excellent example of the danger of leaving important matters to the discretion of a Government official. As the Michigan Members of Congress know, the Veterans' Administration recently ruled that many of the land-grant colleges and universities, including Michigan State College, should repay to the Treasury comparatively large sums of money received in past years for the education of veterans. To our way of thinking, this is a capricious and arbitrary ruling, and we are looking with great confidence to the Congress for relief. The issue is too complicated to be discussed here tonight, but I recommend it to you for study and as a warning that the method of disbursement of Federal funds should always be carefully spelled out in statutory law.

My third observation is that it is extremely unfortunate that proposals for extending Federal support to education have already become embroiled in political and religious feuds. These proposals are of sufficient importance to the welfare of our Nation to be debated and decided on their own merits. There is every reason to insist that they should be so considered.

The issue is whether there are to be opportunities in the future for capable young men and women to acquire college educations so that they may contribute their full share to the continued development of this country.

Here is a question on which clear thinking is demanded, and for that reason it should be set apart from the arena of political and religious controversy. Either is enough to sway men's emotions to the point at which they do not think clearly and this is a question to be settled with our heads, and not our hearts.

Personally, my principal regret is that the proposal to extend Federal financial assistance to higher education is being made a part of the President's controversial social welfare program. As a result of that unfortunate entanglement I fear that those who debate this controversial program are almost certain to overlook a major distinction.

That distinction is, in my opinion, that most of the President's proposal is for social-welfare changes seeking to provide benefits for those who are unable, for one reason or another, to repay the sums to be invested in them. Federal assistance to students capable of doing college work could be a good investment. As a group, educated persons are better producers, better consumers, and better citizens.

Regardless of our individual opinions on some of the President's proposals, I am sure that we can all agree that there is a great and fundamental difference between an old-age pension to a retired worker and a scholarship payment to a gifted young man just on the threshold of his life's work. One is a payment to insure a decent minimum standard of existence; the other is a payment to lift the maximum standard of opportunity.

There is a difference between a slum-clearing project financed with Federal funds and a college building program financed with Federal funds. One is a program to do for others; the second is a program to enable others to do for themselves.

I would like to see proposals for Federal aid to higher education debated on their own merits without reference to partisan politics or religion, because I want the American people to be able to make an informed decision on a matter affecting most seriously their future and that of our Nation. Americans have always favored education, and every generation has been willing to sacrifice in order that the next generation might have greater educational opportunities. There is no evidence that they have lost faith in education. All the evidence is to

the contrary. All I ask is that the issues be set forth clearly, for I have the greatest confidence in the ability of Americans to make the right decision when all the facts are available to them.

It is probable that if they had an opportunity to study all the facts, they would decide to support education with Federal funds. If such were the decision, would it be naive to suggest that the Federal Government reliquish to the individual States one of its existing excise taxes, say on tobacco or liquor, with the specific requirement that such funds be spent exclusively on the education of our gifted youngsters? I do not pretend to be an authority on taxation or the Federal Government, but I venture to predict that such an arrangement would find universal favor with the people.

I hope you will forgive me if I have talked too long on a topic about which I am naturally seriously concerned. You who deal day to day with problems of world importance may not agree that the future of higher education in our own country is a matter of the great importance I consider it to be. It is my personal conviction that we soon will have to make a decision on a fundamental question touching on our deepest national interests—the decision whether we are to continue providing college educations at public expense for the most talented and ambitious among our young men and women, as we do now for our veterans of World War II.

It may be that we have reached the point in this country at which we turn away from our historic philosophy that there should be opportunities for every American to accomplish just as much as his own ability and ambition enable him to accomplish. Perhaps we are turning toward the philosophy that safety and security should be guaranteed to everyone by the Government, irrespective of individual ability and effort. Perhaps public investment in higher education will have to be whittled down in the years ahead because we as a people will have become more interested in security than in opportunity. I have no desire to debate the issues involved. I want to say only that before we take too many steps on the road leading away from the system of education we have used successfully for a century we should look at some of the probable consequences of such steps.

These are among the questions that must be answered:

Would the result of diminishing public investment in the education of qualified young people mean a return to the old days in which those without money and social advantages were barred from college as effectively as though barred by law?

Would this foreshadow a development of fixed class lines within this country? Do we want in America a pyramidal caste system with those caught helplessly below in constant revolt against their more privileged fellow citizens above them?

Do you believe for a moment that we could preserve our democratic traditions in America if we doomed each succeeding generation to the same levels of income and opportunity as the generation which came before?

The answers, I believe, suggest themselves. It is because they do suggest themselves that I would like to have the questions presented fairly to the American people. I would like to have the people told what education has done for this country, and what it is capable of doing in the future if given the support it deserves. I would like to have everyone know of the efforts of our colleges and universities to develop tough-minded young citizens, capable of making intelligent decisions on the great problems now before us, capable of making them on the basis of reason, and not emotion. I would like to have them understand that to a great degree, the kind of a nation we are to be in the latter half of this century will be determined by what is taught, and who are taught, on the campuses of America.

I would like to have them know that the great majority of the colleges and universities of the United States subscribe to the eloquent definition of the role of higher education recently written by the president of one of our oldest and greatest private universities. I quote from President Conant of Harvard:

"The primary concern of American education today is not the development of the appreciation of the 'good life' in young gentlemen born to the purple. Our purpose is to cultivate in the largest number of our future citizens an appreciation both of the responsibilities and the benefits which come to them because they are American and free."

Once our fellow citizens understand that to be the purpose of education, I have faith that they will not let our public colleges and universities languish and do less than the maximum of which they are capable in preserving the advantages and opportunities for all of our people that have made America the envy of all of the peoples of the world.

I would close with a couplet written by Edwin Markham:

"We are blind,
Unless we see that in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making
If it does not make the man.
Why build these States glorious
If man unbuilded goes.
In vain we build the Nation
Unless the builder also grows."

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, at this time when there is so much controversy over FEPC legislation and the remainder of the civil-rights program, I am proud and happy that the Board of Commissioners of the city of Newark, N. J., have passed the following forthright resolution in behalf of civil rights for all Americans:

Whereas the denial of any civil rights is unjust and undemocratic and contrary to the fundamentals upon which this Nation was founded; and

Whereas there is now pending before the Congress of the United States a civil-rights bill which would favorably affect many people in this Nation, who are now denied their civil rights because of their race, creed, or color; and

Whereas the FEPC bill, which prohibits discrimination in employment, will assure all Americans an equal opportunity to make a living on the basis of equality: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, That we hereby request and urge the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey to vote for and support legislation for (a) abolition of the poll tax as a voting requirement; (b) establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission; (c) enactment of antilynching legislation; (d) Prohibition of segregation in any transportation facilities; and be it further

Resolved, That we memorialize the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey, to give their full aid and support to the civil-rights program as outlined and requested by the President of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That a certified copy of this resolution be forwarded to each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from New Jersey.

STEPHEN J. MOREN,
M. ELLENSTEIN,
RALPH A. VILLANI,
JOHN KEENAN,
LEO P. CARLIN,
Board of Commissioners of the City of Newark, N. J.

Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson Keeps Ahead on His Pledge To Provide More for Less Money—Within 12 Months He Would Be Providing as Much or More Military Strength for $1,000,000,000 a Year Less, and by 18 Months for $1,500,000,000 a Year Less

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, every fair, impartial, and sincerely economy-minded Member of this Congress must have thrilled when Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense, was awarded a citation of merit just a few weeks ago for the magnificent work he is doing in the Department of Defense by the members of President Hoover's committee on the Hoover Report.

The story of that award was told in full in the extension of remarks made by my good friend, Congressman HAROLD PATTEN, of Arizona, as disclosed in the RECORD of Thursday last.

Having read the wonderful speech of Congressman PATTEN, I had hardly set aside the RECORD before I came upon the fourteenth in a series of articles in which Blair Moody and financial experts in Congress analyze the 1950–51 Federal budget.

Blair Moody is the well-known feature writer of the Detroit News and moderator of the program, Meet Your Congress. Upon this nationally known and popular NBC program many members of both houses have appeared during recent years.

The article was headed "Johnson keeps ahead on pledge to provide more for less money." The Members of this House are interested in all that Blair Moody either speaks or writes because of his terse, clear, lucid, and factual interrogations as well as his factual unbiased reporting of the news.

This article is written in a spirit of decency and fair play about one of the finest men and certainly one of the ablest officials that our Nation has ever

had. It needs no vocal embellishment by me.

Mr. Speaker, I know if our good friend, Louis Johnson, were here he would tell us all that "it is the team which he is heading that deserves all the credit for the tremendous savings effected," men like the Honorable Stu Symington, Secretary of the Air Force; Hon. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army; Hon. Francis Matthews, Secretary of the Navy; General Bradley; and the three grand Chiefs of Staff.

I commend this article by Blair Moody to the reading of every Member of this Congress, and on both sides of the Capitol.

All hail from this Congress to Louis Johnson on the coming of his first anniversary as Secretary of Defense.

The article reads as follows:

JOHNSON KEEPS AHEAD ON PLEDGE TO PROVIDE MORE FOR LESS MONEY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—This is the fourteenth in a series of articles in which Blair Moody and financial experts in Congress analyze the 1950–51 Federal budget and offer suggestions for cuts which, if adopted, should not only balance the budget but permit a moderate reduction in taxes. The final article will appear tomorrow.)

(By Blair Moody)

WASHINGTON, January 23.—The demand for economy in Government sweeping across Capitol Hill and the Nation has been emphatically answered by the Department of Defense.

In the first determined, intelligent, effective drive for really major savings in American political history, Secretary Louis A. Johnson is ahead of schedule on his pledge, made to Congress when it passed the Unification Act last August 10, that within 12 months he would be providing as much or more military strength for $1,000,000,000 a year less, and by 18 months for $1,500,000,000 a year less.

This is quite aside from the question of whether President Truman's budget program provides strength enough to meet present world conditions, a question bitterly disputed wherever military, naval, and air men meet in private.

But there can be no question that we are paying less for what we do get. Assistant Secretary Wilfred J. McNeil, right bower to the late Secretary Forrestal and now Johnson's chief ball-carrier in this field, reports that the Military Establishment is already reflecting a saving of $1,200,000,000 a year.

The most widely-publicized part of Johnson's crash dive for economy, of course, is the removal of 147,000 civilians from the pay rolls, a total expected to approach 160,000 by June. But underneath—and quite aside from the controversial reductions and shifts in Navy, Air Force, and Army strength—there has taken place a remarkable tightening up in many fields. Not least responsible for the results is the drive by Johnson to make officers at all levels realize that saving money is important.

A NEW APPROACH

Johnson's approach was different. Just 2 weeks after the unification law was enacted he faced in his office at 9 o'clock one morning more than 100 Senators and Congressmen, including many of Capitol Hill's most prominent battlers for economy, and told them that at 1 o'clock the same day he was announcing a drastic curtailment of Army posts, Navy yards, and Air Stations from coast to coast, making it possible to eliminate 135,000 civilian employees.

He had called them in, he said, because the reductions were taking place in their districts and he wanted them to know before they saw it in the newspapers.

When he read the list, angry protests came from some of the great economizers. But it quickly developed that Johnson was not asking them, he was telling them. They had been asking for economy and here it was.

"I'll have to give your Senator FERGUSON credit," Johnson says now. "He got up and backed us."

Obviously, Johnson had had the lists of spots that were to be hit nearly ready when Congress gave him the power to act. As Assistant Secretary of War in the late 1930's—and, incidentally, one who chafed noticeably at the lethargy of some colleagues and superiors—he had seen where the waste was.

He knew Army, Navy, and Air operated parallel systems of communications all over the world, at vast duplicated expense. He saw money draining away by millions through pro forma flying time for air officers, surplus civilian employees who would have to wait for another war to find enough to do.

FINDS ARMY FLEET

He found that the Army was operating a big fleet of ships, chiefly transports, bigger by tonnage than the entire Navy. He knew of old the feeling among the little "empire-building" minor executives that one way to make their jobs seem more important and raise their pay is to have more, not less, subordinates.

Forrestal already had ordered a survey by a committee of industrialists, headed by General Motors' Thomas C. Archer, McNeil had moved for a performance military budget in which all costs could be identified by activity, instead of having the budget of an air base or a navy yard obscured in 5 to 30 different long item lists under different labels.

This had brought a conference between Forrestal and Senator LODGE, Republican, Massachusetts, that broadened into the resolution creating the Hoover Commission. Now Johnson called in an industrial efficiency firm, Robert Heller and Associates.

Johnson used Heller as a spur, rather than a whip. He knew that if economy were imposed only from without it would not last. But when the proud Army, Navy, and Air officers saw Heller coming they moved on their own.

Sometime later, when Frank Elmandorf, Heller's top man, come in to superintend the crash, he told McNeil: "You two Scotsmen have left nothing to crash on."

The other Scotsman is Gen. Joseph T. McNarney, holder of many high fighting, staff, and administrative posts, who was named head of Johnson's management committee.

TASK FORCES MOVE

Each service set up task forces to move in on areas where cuts were possible. Heller pointed to places where money is always saved in an industrial reorganization—overuse of automobiles, motor maintenance—a score of ideas which would in no way affect the fighting structure of any service.

Meanwhile McNarney and McNeil reprogramed the plans of all operational services. They found hundreds of items like "new baskets for quartermaster's commissary, $60,000," which came out.

Services like printing in effect were made separate businesses and told if they could not sell their work to the National Military Establishment as cheaply as private concerns they would be wiped out. The result: 77 fewer employees in Washington alone and a sharp drop in costs. Passenger cars were cut 20 percent.

Staffs were cut all across the country, roughly 1,000 civilians being dropped in Michigan, including two-thirds of the personnel at the tiny air base of Oscoda.

"Better work and more defense for less money," says Johnson.

But enough defense to insure the safety of the United States? Economy aside, that is the real issue. It will be discussed tomorrow in the concluding article of this series.

General Eisenhower's Reputed Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I received from Longmont, Colo., the other day, a clipping taken from the editorial page of the Longmont Ledger published by George L. Bickel, which directs my attention to a recent speech claimed to have been made by General Eisenhower, which is so shocking, to put it mildly, that I feel that it should be given Nation-wide publicity at this time, even though the reactionary press of the Nation has carefully avoided making any reference whatsoever to it.

This editorial is as follows:

LET THEM EAT CAKE

Italy has the word for it—"stupidino"—and General Eisenhower coined the phrase to fit the word when he stated last week that "the common people ought to stop thinking about pensions and get back to a 'beer and hot dog' diet instead of looking to the Government for an illusory thing called security."

"If all Americans want is security," he said, "they can go to prison. They'll have enough to eat, a bed, and a roof over their heads," he added.

This arrogant attack on the natural longing of human beings for security in their old age will probably go down in history as the most stupid remark since Marie Antoinette's statement of "Let them eat cake" when she was informed that the peasants of France were without bread.

The general failed to tell his audience just one thing, that the Government, whose social-security programs he mistrusts, has guaranteed his own security for life with the very liberal pension of $18,000 a year.

Pensions for the aged and a sound social-security program are among the Nation's most important problems. Students of government and thinking citizens realize that contributory insurance is democratic and sound, that ultimately we will have replaced outright pensions with a sound insurance plan. These problems are real and close to the hearts of many millions of Americans. They can't be flippantly discarded, general.

CCC Food Bargains Listed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable John Flannagan, former chairman of the Committee on Agriculture, called the attention of the House in the Seventy-ninth Congress to

the fact that the world price, plus the import duty, was less than the support price of many agricultural products. The following is from the Sunday Washington Post:

CCC FOOD BARGAINS LISTED—EXPORT ONLY

(By John W. Ball)

The world's biggest dealer in food commodities last week advertised Irish potatoes for sale at 100 pounds for 1 cent.

Similar bargains in canned meat, eggs, edible beans, peanuts, flaxseed, etc., were made public by Ralph S. Trigg, President of the Commodity Credit Corporation, Uncle Sam's agency for operating the Government's farm price support program.

These prices, however, are only for export. The goods can't be bought for use in this country.

The sacks in which the potatoes will be sold cost from 10 to 15 cents apiece, or 10 to 15 times as much as the Government asks for them filled with the world's best potatoes.

NEW CCC POLICY

The low prices accompanied announcement of a new CCC policy to encourage export of surplus farm commodities bought by the Government to keep prices in this country high and farmers prosperous.

Americans will still be charged several hundred times the export price. Similar potatoes retailed in Washington this week at 3¼ to 4 cents a pound. In other words, the Government is selling potatoes at 100 pounds for 1 cent that are costing American housewives from $3.50 to $4. The potatoes cost the Government about $2.10 a bag.

The entire operation was ordered by Congress in its series of laws for the benefit of the Nation's twenty-odd million farmers.

In addition to the potato bargains, CCC is offering to sell to exporters:

1. Thirty million pounds of Mexican canned meat at 15 cents a can. This was bought from Mexico at about 30 cents a can. These purchases were made to reimburse Mexican cattle raisers whose markets were shut off when this country put an embargo on the importation of Mexican cattle, because of a hoof-and-mouth disease epidemic in Mexico. This meat is not permitted to be sold in this country under the pure food and drug laws because it comes from areas infected with the dreaded hoof-and-mouth disease.

2. Dried whole eggs, 73,000,000 pounds, at 40 cents a pound. These cost Uncle Sam about $1.20 a pound.

3. About 4,750,000 100-pound bags of beans. Pinto beans are offered at $7 a bag (cost about $9), red kidney at $8 (cost about $9.50) and great northern, $6 a bag (cost about $8).

4. Thirteen million bushels of flaxseed at $4.45 a bushel that cost the Government $6 a bushel in 1948.

5. About 50,000,000 pounds of shelled peanuts at 8⅛ cents a pound, or just half the 16¼ cents CCC paid for them.

OATS, BARLEY, AND CORN

Trigg also offered 13,579 bushels of oats, 20,000,000 bushels of barley, and 100,000,000 bushels of corn at not less than market price on date of sale.

Sales will not be made to buyers using ECA dollars or other Government funds. Other methods, such as subsidies, are provided for such sales. Sales of potatoes are restricted for export to areas not normally supplied by United States exporters.

Similar announcements will be made monthly, Trigg said. The prices named last week will prevail until March.

The announcement was met by a sharp break on the Nation's commodity exchanges. Most of the losses were regained later.

"From now on," Trigg said, "exporters will know in advance the commodities and quantities that are available, and the prices for a fixed period ahead. Thus, they will be in a better position to negotiate sales abroad."

LOSSES ABSORBED

The loss the Government takes on such sales is absorbed in several ways. Much is replaced from section 32 funds. Section 32 of Public Law 320 sets aside 30 percent of the Nation's customs receipts. Such sums the law states, shall be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to:

1. Encourage the export of agricultural commodities by benefits to the exporter, or payment of losses in connection with the exportation or by payments to producers to encourage production of commodities needed domestically.

2. Encourage domestic consumption of farm commodities by increasing their use through benefits, donations, etc., among persons in low-income groups.

Under the first provision, CCC is making the following subsidies available:

1. Four million dollars to exporters of fall and winter apples and winter pears. These may be shipped to ECA countries, and to any Western Hemisphere countries except Cuba, Canada, and Venezuela. They also may be exported to Israel, Egypt, and the Philippines.

These funds may be used to pay half the cost of the commodities.

2. Fifty thousand dollars, to permit payment of 10 cents a bale to exporters of cotton.

3. Seven and a half million dollars to exporters of surplus dried peaches, prunes, and raisins. These funds are to be used to reimburse the exporter up to 50 percent of the cost of the commodities.

4. One million dollars for dried-egg exports.

5. Two million dollars for flaxseed or linseed oil sold for export to any agency * * * furnishing relief to foreign countries.

6. Forty thousand dollars to encourage use of concentrated orange juice abroad.

7. Five million dollars to encourage use of peanuts abroad, to be paid to any Government agency administering relief to foreign countries.

8. Five million dollars to wheat exporters to meet the difference in price between the current domestic price and the International Wheat Agreement price of $1.80 a bushel.

9. Two million dollars for export sales of packed fresh oranges, and canned single-strength orange juice, to be used to meet half the cost of such exports.

Let us consider the above surplus foods:

First. The $4,000,000 worth of apples purchased by the ECA does not equal the $5,800,000 worth of apples imported the last fiscal year.

Second. The $50,000 for subsidizing cotton is small in comparison to the $36,319,000 worth of cotton imported. Over $30,000,000 of the cotton imports were on long-staple cotton as there is a near embargo on short-staple cotton imports.

Third. The $7,500,000 for subsidized fruit exported must be considered in the light imports of $52,644,000 worth of fruit and fruit preparations, not including the $50,657,000 worth of banana imports.

Fourth. The $1,000,000 for dried-egg imports is small in comparison to the $2,198,000 worth of eggs and egg products imported the last fiscal year. Eggs are only 39 percent of parity for the farmers in the Midwest today.

Fifth. The $2,000,000 for subsidized flaxseed and linseed-oil exports is questionable when we imported $3,493,000 worth of flaxseed the past fiscal year.

Sixth. The $40,000 for subsidizing orange juice covered by third paragraph above.

Seventh. The $5,000,000 to subsidize peanut exports when we imported $3,000 worth of peanuts and a total of $55,783,000 worth of nuts and nut preparations the past fiscal year, this does not make economic sense. No one seems to be able to figure out what the peanut subsidies are really costing the United States taxpayers.

Eighth. The $5,000,000 to subsidize wheat exports must be compared to the $2,924,000 worth of wheat imports not including the $6,740,000 worth of wheat milled in bond. The total imports of all grain and grain products was $55,126,000 in value, the past fiscal year.

Ninth. The $2,000,000 for subsidizing exports up to 50 percent in value of canned single-strength orange juice should be considered in connection with third paragraph above.

The total imports of competitive agricultural products was $1,532,000,000, without adding fur imports which are also a competitive agricultural product.

The above shows that the value of subsidized exports of competitive agricultural products does not equal the imports of competitive agricultural products. In other words, we are in pounds, bushels, and tons importing competitive agricultural products faster than we are exporting and giving them away. The CCC should not be held accountable for this situation. While we are subsidizing the exportation of millions upon millions of dollars worth of soil-depleting crops we imported a total of $497,163,000 worth of livestock and livestock products. While we imported millions of pounds of wool, we subsidized or gave away millions of pounds of cotton and then hear much conversation about soil conservation. Unless some kind of an agricultural agreement, like the international wheat agreement, is made these volumes of competitive agricultural imports are going to create a greater and greater loss to the CCC and the American taxpayer.

The Secretary of Agriculture stated before the Agricultural Subcommittee that the support program has cost $1,000,000,000. Assuredly one must realize that this cost has a direct relationship to the $1,532,000,000 of competitive agricultural imports.

Amending the Rules of the House

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY M. JACKSON

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, there appears to be a division of opinion among the supporters of House Resolution 133, as to why they

wish to restore to six members of the Rules Committee their dictatorial veto powers over the other 429 Members of the House.

One group continues to cling to the threadbare argument that the Rules Committee is the only single committee through which the flood of legislation pouring out of the standing committees must flow. As such, they say, it should act as a floodgate or a traffic cop. They cite the billions of dollars in authorization bills voted out of standing committees in the Eightieth Congress. They seem to claim that it was the Rules Committee and its veto power that prevented these billions from resulting in an enormous Federal deficit.

The hard facts of actual House procedure easily deflate this argument. Authorization does not mean expenditure. Every year billions of dollars in projects are authorized, but no appropriation is made for them. The expenditures are controlled by the Appropriations Committee—and appropriations bills do not go through the Rules Committee at all. They go directly from the Appropriations Committee to the floor of the House. The picture of the Rules Committee acting as a floodgate to check the flow of costly legislation looks pretty silly when you find out that the water really flows around the floodgate and never passes through it at all.

This group carries the argument one step further. It claims that the expected Federal deficit for this fiscal year is caused by the change in the rules voted by the House at the beginning of the last session. It is true that one-third of the increase over the deficit originally anticipated is due to higher expenditures than planned. But these were largely costs fixed by existing statutes—such as the GI education bill—which no one could anticipate. But the other two-thirds was caused by a decline in revenues as a result of last summer's recession. If the Rules Committee feels it has the power to anticipate and to prevent recessions, I shall be happy to reconsider my position in this matter, and I think the country will be happy to know that recessions can be avoided.

The members of the other group are, at least, honest in setting forth their reasons for favoring this rule change. They very frankly state that they want to use any device they can to block what they call a "socialistic" program, even if it means minority rule—a principle contrary to everything America stands for. What kind of people are these who are afraid to allow legislation to be debated by all the representatives of the people—who are afraid that a majority of those representatives might vote this legislation through? What kind of people are these who believe that a minority of six is wiser than a majority of the American voters?

I respect their right to oppose a bill—provided they do so by trying to convince a majority of the Representatives in open debate that their side has merit. That is the American way of deciding issues.

As I understand it, the Rules Committee was never meant to pass on the merits of legislation. That is the proper function of the standing committees, whose members and staffs are the experts in each of the many technical fields of legislation. I do not see how anyone can reasonably expect 12 men to consider intelligently the merits of hundreds of separate pieces of highly specialized and technical legislation.

Perhaps time and experience will tell us that the rule we passed last year needs to be modified in some minor respect. But I hope that time will never tell us that the decisions of a minority of six are better than the decisions of a majority of the whole House. If we are to make mistakes, let them be all our mistakes, and not the mistakes of a tiny few. That, in my opinion, is the basis of the American system.

Compulsory Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers has a membership of 120,000 members. This organization is a branch of the National Congress of Parents and Teachers, and is one of the outstanding organizations in Georgia.

The organization's executive committee, on January 11 in Macon, Ga., adopted a resolution opposing any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

I concur in the sentiments expressed in this resolution, and I attach a copy of it herewith for the information of Members:

Whereas the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers expresses sincere interest in the health of all of the people of Georgia as set forth in the Health Services Act of 1949 and urges enactment in 1950 of similar legislation; and

Whereas the United States has the highest standards of health, of medical care, and of scientific medical facilities of any country in the world, as a result of our system of free enterprise; and

Whereas compulsory health insurance, wherever tried, has caused a decline in national health and deterioration of medical standards and facilities; and

Whereas wherever the Government has assumed control of medical services, the result has been tremendous multiplication of costs over original estimates, extreme tax burdens and national deficits, and gradual extension of socialization into other activities of national life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Georgia Congress of Parents and Teachers does hereby go on record against any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of political medicine designed for national bureaucratic control.

That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, to each Senator and Representative from the State of Georgia, and that said Senators and Representatives be and are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

BLANCHE S. HOBBS,
President.
CORINNE L. DALLMUS,
Secretary.

Workers and Farmers Fight for CVA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in a well-illustrated, attractive, two-page story of the fight for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration, the Butcher Workman, publication of the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, attests once again to the widespread Pacific Northwest interest in the CVA. It follows:

WORKERS AND FARMERS FIGHT FOR CVA

(By Joe Miller)

The cynics who don't believe that the workers and farmers of America can work together to put across liberal issues had better think again. Out in the Pacific Northwest workers and farmers are pulling as one for the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration, the TVA-type agency which will develop the region's vast resources for the benefit of all its people.

The victory hasn't been recorded on the scoreboard yet, but the farm-labor team has pushed the ball down within the 20-yard line. They expect to run it across early in the 1950 sesssion of Congress, and the Northwest's people are rooting hard for them to do so.

The victory will be a terrific blow to the well-heeled private-power lobby, which has been fighting like crazy to stop the CVA. When President Truman sent a special message to Congress asking for CVA last April 13, the cries of rage that were sounded by the Nation's private utilities were as earth shattering as the major earthquake that rocked the region the same day. Howled Purcell Smith, the Nation's top-dog lobbyist at $65,000 per:

"We must do everything in our power to stop the CVA."

Purcell and his cohorts have been doing just that. Thousands and thousands of dollars have been poured into a campaign to smear the CVA throughout the vast region known as "America's last frontier." Private power interests have set up "front" organizations (borrowing a tactic from the Communists, incidentally) to attack the CVA. Modern-day carpetbaggers have been touring the region denouncing CVA as "communism," "fascism," "statism," and whatever other names they can think of.

Gov. Arthur Langlie, of Washington, continually attacks the CVA as "fascism," thereby branding almost 1,000,000 workers and farmers in his own State as fascistic.

(Langlie and the two other Republican Governors who oppose the CVA will not debate this pressing issue, however. Challenged to debate by leading Northwest liberals, they say they're "too busy" or "don't want to get involved in politics.")

Yet, despite the slanderous attack, the CVA forces march steadily closer to their goal, with every major farm-labor organization in the Northwest leading the way. Four years ago these groups organized the League

for CVA to promote a valley authority for the Northwest, and it has done a notable job.

The grass-roots support for CVA is so strong that Mr. Truman placed it No. 1 on his list of valley authority legislation—ahead of the better-known Missouri Valley Authority plan.

It is not only the workers and the farmers of the region who favor the CVA. Many businessmen noting what the TVA did for private enterprise in the Southland, have taken a stand for CVA—despite the cries of the power lobby.

One of these is the area's leading businessman, E. B. McNaughton, president of the Portland Oregonian and chairman of the board of Portland's First National Bank. A lifelong Republican, McNaughton told a luncheon of amazed Portland businessmen that CVA "has tremendous possibilities for our region." Admitting that he and practically every Northwest business leader had been against Grand Coulee and Bonneville Dams, McNaughton said:

"If Roosevelt hadn't given us these dams, where would we be today?"

It is a question that the enemies of CVA can't answer. The two massive structures, in addition to saving the region's economy, helped produce almost half the Nation's merchant marine and the aluminum for one-third of the wartime Air Force, among other things. They also proved the complete wisdom of Franklin D. Roosevelt's western development policy.

Now Harry S. Truman wants to follow in the footsteps of his former chief. And he has a mandate from the people of the West to do so. With CVA and public power as his prime issues, the President ran up an electoral vote majority of 59 in the Far West.

The reasons behind the region's demand for CVA are obvious, even to the tourist who visits the Pacific Northwest. The failure of the Eightieth Congress to go ahead with the region's resource development has helped create some of the worst problems it has faced since the days of "54-40 or Fight." Here's how they line up:

Floods: The 1948 disaster which struck from out of nowhere took 60 lives, cost $2,000,000,000 in soil losses and $75,000,000 in property damages. And every year the Northwest is hit by severe floods, which ruin homes and destroy crops. Oregon's Grange master, Morton Tompkins, tells the story when he says, "These floods are getting worse instead of better."

(But the present Government agencies have done nothing to halt future floods. The Army engineers-Bureau of Reclamation plan for the Columbia contains no provision for reforestation in the headwaters, where floods start.)

Power shortage: It is unfortunate but true that the Northwest, with 42 percent of America's total hydroelectric potential, is the only area in the Nation with a power shortage. Every winter the Northwest has to brown out, and the shortage has greatly hindered the region's needed industrial growth.

Unemployment: This has cost jobs too. Last winter 155,000 men were thrown out of work by the power shortage, and thousands of jobs have been lost because the Northwest didn't have the power required by industries that wanted to locate here.

With population up 36 percent since 1940, the region's unemployment rate is three times the national average. It hasn't been so bad since the depression.

Yet private power interests continue to curtail development of the region's mighty rivers by telling people the power isn't needed. The president of one company said, "We'll have kilowatts running out of our ears if we build these dams."

Erosion: The Northwest, with all its new soil, has the second worst erosion problem in America and loses 100,000,000 tons of topsoil yearly.

Sure, these are dull figures to many perhaps. But they mean a lot to the general welfare of the Pacific Northwest in particular and of the Nation in general. The crying need of the Pacific Northwest is for a CVA which will accomplish these tasks:

Fully develop the Northwest's vast source of hydroelectric power. This power not only is of mighty value to national defense, as seen by location of the atomic plant at Hanford, Wash.; it is the basis of the region's hope for a diversified industrial economy.

Prepare some 9,000,000 acres of sagebrush land for agricultural development. Reclamation of this land will provide hundreds of thousands of family size farms for new settlers.

Develop a river transportation system which will provide the region's hinterland with cheap and easy access to the sea.

Explore the area's untapped mineral wealth.

Protect and stabilize the Northwest's valuable fishing and lumbering resources, which have suffered from boom and bust exploitation.

Produce an adequate flood-control system like the TVA's.

This is the program the farm-labor groups have brought near reality, despite the opposition of the power lobby, the region's absentee-owned newspapers and eastern capital. The reason for their success is simple. Joseph D. Keenan, director of labor's league for political education, recently told western politicians that "they can no longer afford to do small favors for the land companies and private power lobby no matter how large their campaign contributions." Further Keenan said:

"The little people won't stand for it, and they are watching your voting records. And the little people have the votes."

Thus, the unity that the workers and farmers of the Pacific Northwest have shown in the CVA fight is a hopeful sign for the future. If the farm-labor organizations throughout America pull together as well as they have here, the resources of our Nation will be developed for the benefit of all and not just a selfish few.

Reveals Newsmen Knew of Alger Hiss' Communist Link 10 Years Ago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, a lot of shallow thinkers in this country, masquerading as liberals and progressives, aided and abetted by Communists and Communist sympathizers, were able to laugh off for a long time warnings given by sensible and well-informed people that our Government was being infiltrated by Communists and Communist sympathizers.

The truth has now been established by such overwhelming evidence, that this danger is obvious now to the most skeptical, whether the disbelief was occasioned by plain dumbness or by honest skepticism.

In the Atlanta Journal of January 25, 1950, there appears a very interesting and informative article by Victor Riesel. I believe it is worth while to place it in the RECORD, and under leave previously granted, I insert this article herewith:

REVEALS NEWSMEN KNEW OF ALGER HISS' COMMUNIST LINK 10 YEARS AGO

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—The same emotionless Communist lawyers who snared Alger Hiss out of a proud but rather impoverished and suicide-laden Baltimore family, and either for love or money got him to pass vital documents on to a Red courier ring, today are casually doing business as usual just a few streets from where this is being written. And they are whipping into shape a new network to help cripple the Nation if we go to war with—guess who?

How do I know? Well, it would be nice to pass on the vision of Riesel, the demon newsman, in Hollywood fashion climbing into dark places, filching files and planting microphones. It would be nice. But it's more mundane than fire-escape clambering at midnight.

There are many of us who know—and it goes back to the years when our crowd was a lonely hearts club and we belonged to each other because we knew the secrets of who was spying on what and who was keeping this country from putting guns and warplanes into the hands of young soldiers and kid pilots in trenches and in the air around Nazi Germany.

FEW WOULD LISTEN

But few in the Government listened to us, so we talked to ourselves.

Now that jury after jury comes in with verdicts confirming what we've been saying for almost 15 years, this little group of newsmen, magazine writers and former foreign correspondents can sit back and say the Nation's catching up—and hope the people will listen next time. What made us so all-wise? No great talents.

There's Hiss, for example. Some 10 years ago, our circle knew every detail of his activity. I ran into it at a small strategy session of newspapermen fed up with having their guild run by Communist-party members.

We met, I recall, in the home of a radio editor whose father had been a leading Communist himself, before he broke personally with Joseph Stalin. Someone introduced a chap named Whittaker Chambers, from Time magazine. And we listened carefully as he told us of Communist techniques and how to counter them.

Later we walked for hours along New York's East Side and slowly, sensitively he told the story of his break with the spy ring and about Hiss and other Government officials, some still living, some dead, who secretly had terrific impact on the writings and thinkings of the highest administration leaders. Chambers saw to it that we got on our way home and then disappeared into the crowds. Some of us tried to get action, but no one would listen.

Then, in 1945, at San Francisco, I saw Hiss with Secretary of State Stettinius and Truman—and knew whom the heavily guarded V. Molotov invited to his new fashionable soirees, all under surveillance of trigger-happy OGPU agents.

I knew, too, that I would be marked as nutty if I tried to tell Chambers' story about the slim young man on the platform of the gilded San Francisco Civic Opera House as the UN held its first sessions. So, I, like the few others who knew, had to watch this Nation get the oldest doublecross in the world.

There were literally hundreds of such cases. One day, early in the war, we learned the entire Communist section of CIO was whoop-

ing it up for a strike at the four-motored bomber plant in Inglewood, Calif.

AN ICY CORRUPTION

We knew that some pro-Communist Los Angeles CIO men worked closely with Hans Dieble of the German-American Bund there in distributing isolationist literature—and when we said this was the logical conclusion of the Russian-Nazi pact we were howled at. Then investigators proved we were right.

Each time we made charges, we did so on the basis of disclosures by men like Chambers, who could no longer stand the iciness of Stalinist corruption of their revolutionary sentiments. And so they broke and sought us out, told us what they knew, even as it happens today and every day.

Therefore, it's worth heeding the warning that the same Communist lawyers who first moved into the Government service back in 1934 and migrated in waves from department to department are now working on creation of a new labor network for industrial sabotage and espionage.

They've subtly approached Albert J. Fitzgerald, head of the United Electrical Workers (Independent) to lead it. But he won't fall for this secret maneuver. So they're looking for another innocent. And when they find him they'll be in business again.

Address by Senator Kefauver at Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address I delivered Saturday night before a meeting of Americans for Democratic Action, in the city of Louisville, in the home State of our distinguished Vice President.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, it is with particular pleasure that I come to Louisville to take part in this occasion. There is a peculiar kinship between us Tennesseans and the citizens of the great Commonwealth of Kentucky. This relationship with me has come to be a very personal one through long friendship with such of your distinguished citizens as Mark Etheridge, Wilson Wyatt, and Albert Kling who live here in Louisville.

And I have enjoyed, first in the House of Representatives, and having the chance of passing the time of day on happy occasions since then, with your distinguished Governor Earle Clements. I have high admiration and enjoy my service in the Senate with your capable Senators, VIRGIL CHAPMAN and GARRETT WITHERS. You know VIRGIL and I were in the House of Representatives together and moved over to the Senate at the same time. I sit next to him on the Armed Services Committee and when I go up to the Judiciary Committee, there by my side is GARRETT WITHERS.

And, of course, one of the big reasons all of us love and esteem the great State of Kentucky is that this State has given the Nation and the world a foremost gentleman, statesman, and friend of all mankind—our Vice President—ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

The history of Kentucky is replete with famous and well-known men such as Henry Clay and Irvin S. Cobb but none have more nearly fitted the hour and none have brought more joy and smiles to task-laden people than our own great Vice President. The democratic world, young children, and old people everywhere, are thankful for ALBEN W. BARKLEY.

I am glad to come here under the sponsorship of Americans for Democratic Action. The ADA has shown remarkable leadership and ability in carrying on effectively the cause of progressive government and sound world leadership. The ADA has shown much initiative in sponsoring this meeting. For ADA's substantial work for a great cause, we are all grateful.

This meeting—coming, as it does, at the outset of our midcentury year—assumes a special significance.

We meet tonight to honor the memory of a man who richly deserves the title of "Man of the Half Century."

It is well that we pause to measure the record of Franklin D. Roosevelt—to measure both the man and the time in which he lived and served. These past 50 years have been turbulent years, fruitful ones for mankind in many respects, but tragic years, too. The next 50 years of the twentieth century will be even more challenging and exciting; and as we approach them, it is appropriate that we examine the heritage which Franklin Roosevelt left us. His life and his faith will fortify us as we approach the grave problems which demand solution today, if mankind is to survive.

Numerous candidates have been advanced for the "man of the half century" distinction.

The editors of Time magazine named Winston Churchill.

No one will deny that this living symbol of British courage and determination is one of the heroic figures of this, or any age.

Some have suggested Lenin or Stalin, the founder of Russian communism, and his chosen disciple.

No one will deny that either of these masters of aggression and terror have influenced the world's destiny in the past 50 years.

The Wright Brothers, Henry Ford, Albert Einstein, and a score of others have changed our lives profoundly through their inventions and discoveries.

But no individual surpassed Franklin D. Roosevelt in his vast achievements for the happiness, well-being, security, and freedom of men everywhere. He symbolized, more than any public figure, the strength and vitality of democratic institutions. In the global combat between the forces of light and of darkness, Roosevelt brought inspiration, more than any other, to those who fought the battle for freedom. The death of no leader in modern history brought a keener sense of personal loss than that experienced by millions, the world over, one April afternoon 5 years ago.

We have only to recall crisis after crisis which Roosevelt met and mastered, to acknowledge the depth of his influence or the supremacy of his leadership.

Roosevelt entered the Presidency of the United States in the midst of our most crippling depression. Under his leadership we brought order from the chaos of that time. Although millions of our people were jobless and homeless, our industrial plant was at a standstill, and hunger and discontent were rampant throughout the Nation, our free-enterprise system later emerged stronger and more productive than ever before.

Long before most of us, Franklin Roosevelt foresaw the danger of aggression across the seas. He warned us and other freedom-loving nations to be prepared.

When war came, it was Roosevelt who guided us in the total mobilization of our manpower, industry, and resources. The production goals he set seemed fantastic then, but we met them. We soon challenged, on equal terms, great war machines unrivaled in world history. In 4 years, backed by our industrial might, the Allies brought Germany, Japan, and Italy to their knees.

Franklin Roosevelt did not live to witness the complete triumph to which he had contributed so much, but he had witnessed at first hand, the folly of our course in the aftermath of World War I. He had resolved that America would not again withdraw into its shell. Long before the end of the conflict we had laid the foundations of a world organization to preserve peace.

The most devoted follower of Franklin Roosevelt will concede that he made mistakes, that he was subject to the failings and foibles of any human being, but in the long-range perspective, against the background of magnificent accomplishment for good, the mistakes somehow become dim in their significance.

However, we are not met to eulogize him, nor do we need to do so.

A nation free from poverty and despair, a world saved from Nazi slavery, are eloquent testimony of his good works.

The crisis we face today presents the opportunity—and the necessity—for great accomplishment again. Within the next few years we shall learn if men can harness the mighty hidden powers of the universe to build the most abundant life ever known; or we shall learn if these powers will be utilized for the destruction of civilization as we know it. A Communist tyranny, more devastating and complete in its scope than its departed predecessors, has entered the equation of world politics to threaten our peace and freedom. The specter of atomic and biological warfare thus lends a terrible urgency to our thinking and action in this hour.

We are compelled to examine the qualities of mind and heart and spirit with which Franklin Roosevelt challenged the crises of his time.

We must demand those qualities of ourselves today.

One predominant characteristic of Roosevelt was courage.

Without courage, who could have conquered the tragic affliction which struck Roosevelt down in the prime of life?

Who can forget the moral and psychological "lift" a nation felt when this once helpless cripple dramatically asserted that "we have nothing to fear but fear itself"?

Too many of our people are troubled today by something approaching the blind, unreasoning, paralyzing fear which Franklin Roosevelt described in March, 1933.

While we must acknowledge the danger of an advancing communism abroad, we must not dissipate our total energy in conducting witch hunts at home.

And while we can foresee the terrible consequences of another depression, we must not permit a slight decline in economic activity to throw us into panic.

We cannot afford to approach any decision or crisis, in international affairs or domestic policy, with the idea that nothing can be done.

We cannot afford to throw up our hands in despair.

We cannot afford to be timid.

The times demand bold and resolute action, and the firm conviction that no problem is insoluble.

Franklin Roosevelt, in private and public life, demonstrated that high courage has its reward.

Roosevelt was blessed with vision too.

He once told a group of Young Democrats: "You ought to thank God tonight if * * * you are young enough in spirit to dream dreams and see visions—dreams and visions about a greater and finer America that is to

be; if you are young enough in spirit to believe that poverty can be greatly lessened; that the disgrace of unemployment can be wiped out; that class hatreds can be done away with; that peace at home and peace abroad can be maintained; and that one day a generation may possess this land, blessed beyond anything we now know, blessed with those things, material and spiritual, which make man's life abundant. If that is the fashion of your dreaming, then I say 'Hold fast to your dream.' America needs it."

These objectives were the fashion of Roosevelt's dreaming.

His vision of a prosperous and contented nation, and of a free, democratic, peaceful world set the sights for all America during the 12 years he led us.

We must not lose nor obscure that vision today. We must not become enmeshed in petty quarrels over details or methods if we thus forget the larger objectives we seek.

With courage and vision, Roosevelt had faith, faith in the supremacy of freemen and free institutions over all who would challenge them; faith in the ultimate triumph of righteousness; faith that man could achieve the dignity intended for him by his Creator.

We dare not falter in that faith, or all will be lost.

However, it was not through these qualities alone, nor through his ability to inspire them in millions of others, that Franklin Roosevelt left such an indelible mark upon his era.

His greatest contribution was that he gave new vitality to our concept of democratic government.

More clearly than any previous American political leader, Roosevelt saw the new role government must play as the guardian of the people's total interest.

The principles of democratic government have not changed since the time of Jefferson who first enunciated them.

We still believe, as Jefferson did, in equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

We still believe that governments are not the masters of the people but their servants.

We still believe that the interests of the majority must not be submerged to the greed of a minority.

We still believe that the protection of property in its legitimate rights is essential, but that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men come first.

These beliefs are embedded deeply in the faith of the party of both Jefferson and Roosevelt—the Democratic Party.

Yet through the years we found our political leadership attempting to reconcile these principles with another declared by Jefferson—"that government is best which governs least."

When Roosevelt approached political maturity, civilization had grown far more complex. New production techniques, new methods of communications and transportation had contributed to the growth of mammoth industrial organizations. The industrial society had grown so large under laissez faire that neither the society nor the individuals within it could be secure in their rights. Under the leadership of Harding, Coolidge, and Hoover, the laissez faire system of private enterprise reached its inevitable collapse. America stood at the crossroads. Either we had to revitalize our concept of democratic government or to cast it aside for totalitarianism of the left or the right.

Roosevelt saw that government could not give meaning to the basic theory of Jeffersonian democracy if we carried to the extreme the notion that the less government, the better.

He conceived of government as the one instrument through which our people could achieve a balance of the complex economic forces of modern society.

Thus the New Deal was born, and the New Deal put our Nation on the road to recovery because its fundamental philosophy was the only sound and workable one for our age. The New Deal provided our only hope, both for democratic government and preservation of the profit system.

Its theory was that the vitality of free enterprise depends primarily upon the welfare of those who produce and consume its goods and services, that is, workers and farmers; that through a wise use of its inherent powers, Government could effectively insure a steady flow of purchasing income.

There followed a coordinated program of public works, wages-and-hours regulation, unemployment insurance, soil conservation, crop controls, and farm subsidies to bulwark the worker and farmer against economic uncertainties. The social-security system was adopted to guarantee the worker an income when age would impair his usefulness. Restrictions on credit and security transactions were designed to prevent the wild speculation of the boom-and-bust era.

This program succeeded. Miraculously enough, it raised the income and standard of living of every group of our people without impairing the personal freedom of any group. Its cost was infinitely small when compared to the total expenditure we made for World War II. The money we have spent, in any two postwar years, to preserve the peace would be the approximate equal of all our domestic expenditures in the first 8 years of Franklin Roosevelt's administration.

Even if we should discount his world leadership in war, Franklin Roosevelt's triumphant effort to enlist Government in the people's service would stamp him as one of the great statesmen of history.

Roosevelt always insisted that government must be adapted to the needs of the time.

If bold action was necessary to make government responsive to the will of the people or to protect them in their basic rights, Roosevelt dared to take such action.

If new government techniques were essential to strengthen and preserve our free-enterprise system, Roosevelt dared to experiment.

Roosevelt never committed the cardinal political sin of repudiating imagination as a component of the art of government.

Today our Government is called upon for action, experimentation, and for service to the cause of human dignity on a scale beyond that of the wildest dreams of the founding fathers.

As never before, we need imaginative political leadership.

We are fortunate to have at the helm today a man in whom Franklin Roosevelt imposed utmost confidence—a man who has valiantly carried forward the Roosevelt program, who has given us imaginative leadership in foreign and domestic policy, and who is worthy of our confidence and trust—Harry S. Truman.

Always within the limits of realistic action, the Truman administration has sought to develop a broad strategy for winning the peace, and for establishing favorable conditions for the growth of democratic government throughout the world.

We have given full support to the United Nations, which provides a world forum for the foes of oppression—even though we have not seen it reach full effectiveness.

We halted the march of communism into the Balkans through timely aid to Greece and Turkey.

Through the Marshall plan we countered Communist infiltration in western Europe.

We entered the North Atlantic Pact, drawing ourselves closer into the fellowship of a freer Europe.

Honesty should compel us to admit that we have made mistakes in the conduct of foreign affairs in this postwar period—but the over-all record is one in which we may have pride and confidence.

Thus in our foreign policy we have seen significant examples of imaginative action by Government to meet the challenges imposed by new conditions and events.

No less imaginative decisions must be made in the field of domestic policy.

All Americans are properly concerned that, in fulfilling our world-wide obligations, we do not threaten the way of life we seek to preserve. We dare not wreck our own economy in order to sustain democracy overseas; and to strengthen our defenses. Simultaneously we must initiate necessary programs for the welfare and opportunity of our own people, many of whom are denied the benefits which they should rightfully enjoy.

Each of these objectives—foreign economic aid, military preparedness, and higher domestic living standards—is costly in its own right.

Our dilemma is to discover a satisfactory method for financing the biggest job our people have ever undertaken.

The only solution lies in the increasing productivity and vitality of our free-enterprise system, which is the keystone in the arch of world peace.

President Truman and the Democratic Party believes that the American people must have assurance against economic insecurity; that they must have adequate health, housing, and educational facilities; and greater protection of human rights to enlist our full moral and material resources in the cause of peace.

President Truman holds the attainment of these ends essential to the preservation of productive free enterprise.

The President believes it to be the Government's duty to maintain conditions which will permit us to reach these goals.

The Truman Fair Deal is the logical successor to the Roosevelt New Deal.

The Fair Deal is not a revolutionary concept.

It is not a radical departure from previously accepted techniques of Government action.

It seeks simply to provide what its name implies—a fair deal for every American, whether he or she be investor, businessman, worker, farmer, or housewife.

The Fair Deal was not devised in hostility to the interests of any of our people, but to advance the prosperity and security of all.

The Fair Deal concept is that the economic interests of all our people are interdependent—that the businessman cannot sell his product unless the consumer can buy at a reasonable price, that the farmer will suffer if the workingman's wages are cut, and that the social consequences of inadequate housing, health, and of failure to conserve our natural resources must be shared by all our people in equal measure.

The same forces which conspired to obstruct the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt are prepared today to fight the Truman Fair Deal to the last ditch.

The representatives of special-interest groups are no less militant today than 15 years ago; perhaps they are more confused, uncertain that they can thwart the desires of the great body of the people for a fuller, richer life.

But their tactics remain the same.

The opponents of Harry Truman advance no alternative program to assure an expanding economy and a higher standard of living for every citizen.

They resort solely to the bitter denunciations, hysterical attacks, and gloomy predictions which have fallen on deaf ears since 1932.

They are inventing a few new scare words to frighten the people and their representatives in Congress.

They are circulating the same brand of myths that were prevalent in Roosevelt's time.

There is the myth that a monstrous bureaucracy in Washington is enclosing its vast tentacles about the American economy and is squeezing the lifeblood therefrom. This frightening creature apparently was not spawned until 1933 when the Democratic Party moved into Washington. Yet after 17 years of Democratic administrations, the American enterprise system has reached record levels of production, income, and employment.

There is the myth that Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman have saddled the American people with an enormous debt either because they were spendthrifts, and knew no better, or because they harbored some insidious design to wreck the national economy. About 89 percent of the national debt directly reflects the cost of World Wars I and II—but it is difficult to acquaint some individuals with the truth.

It is easy to loose a flood of distorted propaganda about any legislative issue—a flood limited only by the imagination of the author, the slush funds at the disposal of the lobby which employs him, the durability of its mimeograph machines, and the receptiveness of the press to such hand-outs.

It is even easier to examine the facts.

There is no phase of the Fair Deal which has not been devised to provide a maximum amount of local governmental responsibility, a maximum amount of freedom for private enterprise, a minimum of Federal regulation in view of the task to be accomplished.

There is little danger that we will pay heed to these harbingers of doom who stanchly resist every item of liberal legislation which is placed before the Congress.

There is great danger, in this campaign year of 1950, that the people who do believe these impassioned warnings will outvote those of us who do not.

It happened in 1946, when the forward liberal march of the American people was interrupted for 2 years because more than two-thirds of the eligible voters in the Nation stayed home on election day.

This must not happen again. The consequences are too great to elect again a Republican Congress with a do-nothing leadership, which is sure to welsh on every obligation to improve the welfare of the people.

Those of us who believe in liberal action know that we will achieve it only through the Democratic Party.

Our task is to send more Democrats to Congress, and to seek greater unity of purpose among those Democrats who sit in the Congress.

We must press on ahead to implement, with imaginative action, the goals of progress and peace which have been charted for us by Franklin Roosevelt and Harry Truman.

We must work—and fight—for the liberal program of President Truman.

We must protect the millions of small-business men who form the backbone of our enterprise structure.

We must seek a fair labor-management relations act.

We must give the necessary protection to our farmers, through workable price-support legislation.

We must continue the gains we have made in improving the housing of our people, and erasing the Nation's slums.

We must vigorously fight those who would exploit our precious natural resources for private gain.

I do not want us to ever adopt socialized medicine but we must try in other ways to extend to more of our people the miraculous advances we are making in medical science.

We must work for immediate action to strengthen our educational system. What a heavy price the Nation pays for the tragic waste in human resources and talents which is fostered by inadequate schools.

In achieving all these objectives, our Government has a large responsibility. It has asserted this responsibility in the past, and will do so again, without restricting the personal freedom of any American.

If our Government moves ahead along these lines, it will certainly enlarge the liberty and well-being of every American.

Here is a program which is worthy of the man we honor tonight—the man who first dramatized and gave life to the principle that Government is a positive instrument to be utilized in the people's behalf.

Here is a program which is worthy of our best energies and talents. Its accomplishment demands of us the same courage and faith which Franklin Roosevelt summoned to lead our Nation in troubled times of depression and war. It requires of us something of the same tireless, devoted effort which broke Franklin Roosevelt's health and struck him down in his finest hour.

We cannot deny that the effort will be worth while.

Our Nation has the opportunity today to move into a new era of human well-being.

As President Truman pointed out, we have the resources and the manpower to increase our national production 400 percent in the next 50 years—to expand our average income 300 percent.

We have the opportunity to realize Franklin Roosevelt's vision of a "generation which will possess this land, blessed beyond anything we now know, blessed with those things, material and spiritual, which make man's life abundant."

In our ability to seize this opportunity—to move forward to the fulfillment of our national promise—lies the destiny of generations of men the world over. If we accept our responsibility, all mankind will find renewed faith that a strong and stable America is beside them yet in the eternal quest for freedom and peace.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address broadcast by me on January 30, under the headline "Happenings in Washington." This was program No. 17 in a series of broadcasts.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 17)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of happenings in Washington.

Today I want to direct your attention to the effect of the Government's present spending policies on the value of your money.

I want to show you how the high cost of big government, deficit financing, excessive taxation and increasing debt reduces the purchasing power of your dollars.

That means you are able to buy so much less with your salary or wages than you could only a few years ago.

At this time, when the administration in Washington is predicting that in the year 2000—50 years from now—the average family will be earning $12,000 a year, I think it behooves sensible, hard-headed people to sit down and analyze just what that means.

You see, it is mighty sweet bait. Everybody would like to earn $12,000 a year. Everybody thinks of $12,000 in terms of what it can buy today.

But years of deficit financing by this and previous administrations have brought—not stability—but inflation. The dollar buys less and less.

Inflation may sound like a dull word. But don't be fooled.

Inflation is like a thief robbing every one of you. Inflation makes your savings worth less and makes your money buy less. Inflation reaches into the pockets of every working man and woman in Pennsylvania to steal some of the real value of the dollars they work for.

Let me give you one example of what has happened over the years.

Fifty years ago, in 1900, you could buy 6½ dozen fresh country eggs in most cities for $1. Today you will get about 1 dozen and a quarter for $1. Fifty years ago, a quart of milk was a nickel and you could get a good suit of clothes for $10.

Today, in terms of food and clothing, a dollar buys only a fraction of what it bought then.

Now I'm not suggesting that the figures of 50 years ago have any real meaning today, but let us look 50 years ahead, to the times of wealth and luxury for everybody predicted by Mr. Truman.

If things keep going as they have been, the same dollar which now gets you about 15 eggs, should buy you two, or perhaps three eggs, in the year 2000.

And so on with the other items—meat, bread, milk, clothing, building materials, household furnishings, and all the rest.

That is what is happening. The high-taxing and loose-spending program in Washington, is mainly responsible.

Let me paint the picture for you another way.

Millions of Americans own Government savings bonds. Undoubtedly many of you listening to me now went to the bank or the post office in January 1940, and purchased a baby bond for $18.75. The Government promised that if you held your bond for 10 years it would pay you $25—a good, sound, investment.

This month you redeemed your bond and received the $25 in cash as promised. In other words, your money increased by $6.25.

But did your money really increase in value?

The answer, I regret to say, is "No."

It actually decreased.

You can buy less goods with $25 today then you could with $18.75 back in January 1940. You can buy fewer eggs, less butter, less meat, less clothing.

This means that you lent the money to the Government, did without it for 10 years, and what the Government gave you in return had less real purchasing value than the money you lent in the first place.

That is what comes from depreciating the value of the dollar—from inflation.

In our State of Pennsylvania, many elderly, retired people depend upon fixed incomes. They live on pensions or annuities purchased with dollars which had the real buying power of 10, 15, and 20 years ago.

Today those dollars buy only half as much as the aged expected when they invested their savings.

The devaluation of your money, coupled with high taxes and deficit spending in times of great prosperity, can have only one end. It can only weaken America at a time when our country needs to be strong.

The President tells you that it is necessary for the Government to go into the red in years of greatest prosperity when we should be reducing our debt. He says he is

doing it for national defense and to buy prosperity for the western European nations.

He says what he is doing will win the cold war for us and that it will prevent any shooting war.

On the contrary, we are not discouraging the Communists; we are doing exactly what they want us to do. Many of you remember that Lenin and other philosophers of communism predicted that the United States would spend itself into destruction.

The Russians work hard to create situations which stampede our Government into spending beyond its means. Thus, in years of prosperity and dollar income greater than anything we ever had before the war, we are going five, and five and one-half billions a year into the red.

This heavy drain on the resources and productivity of our people must make us progressively weaker.

Any businessman can understand this. Any businessman knows that in good years he must reduce his business debt and set aside a surplus to meet emergencies. He knows that if he operates in the red during the years of good business, he must surely go out of business in bad times.

Any housewife understands it. She knows she must save money when her husband has a good job at good wages.

That is elementary economics.

Everybody seems to know it but the administration in Washington.

This administration is merely building up new spending programs, which mean more deficit financing, more taxation, and further depreciation in the purchasing power of your dollar.

It is pushing forward more of what has been described as foot-in-the-door spending. That kind of spending program doesn't cost too much the first year. But thereafter, year after year, the bills mount sharply.

Let me call attention to just a few of these.

Mr. Truman calls for a National Science Foundation which would cost only $400,000 the first year. Very inexpensive. But the cost builds up so that eventually the annual outlays will exceed a hundred million dollars.

Another Truman proposal is for the St. Lawrence seaway which would be so destructive to the important port of Philadelphia and to much of Pennsylvania's business. This calls for a Government outlay of only $4,000,000 the first year. Then it shoots up to a minimum of eighty-two millions annually for the next 7 years.

There is the controversial Federal-aid-to-education bill, under which Pennsylvania would be taxed to support schools in other States. The first year it will cost you $290,000,000. But that is just a start. Experts estimate that the annual cost will mount to close to $2,000,000,000 in a relatively few years.

One fancy foot-in-the-door proposal is the Brannan plan of agricultural support. This one is the most dangerous of all. The administration does not even dare to estimate publicly what that will cost. But other official sources have figured that the bill will be several billion dollars a year.

These are all new programs. They are all inflationary. They will all affect the value of your dollars.

What shall we do to curb the policy of spending and spending which has lessened the value of your money and which threatens to make your dollars worth even less in the future?

A number of different approaches have been suggested here in Washington. I commend them for your consideration. I suggest that you let your Members of Congress know how you feel about them.

In my opinion, each of them will serve a useful purpose in getting the Nation's spending policy back to an even level, to the kind of stability which will make your dollars buy at least as much food and clothing next year and the year after as they can purchase now.

One suggestion has come from several Members of Congress. It is to have a single appropriation bill. This would enable Members of Congress who vote these appropriations to see the entire spending picture in detail and to make cuts intelligently and fairly.

I wonder how many people realize that now the administration departments send their spending requests to Congress one at a time. Thus, we have a situation where money for some departments is voted through before Congress has even seen what other departments need.

This is poor business policy. But that is the way we have been required to legislate in Washington.

Congressman JOSEPH W. MARTIN, the Republican leader of the House, has appointed a committee to put a price tag, as he expresses it, on all new spending proposals. This committee will study all bills providing for new spending. It will seek to determine what they will cost the taxpayers.

By pointing out that some things will cost more than believed, and much more than they are worth, the committee may halt such proposals.

Now let me call your attention to the suggestion of Mr. Daniel W. Bell. Mr. Bell was Budget Director under President Roosevelt for 5 years. Then for six more years he served under Mr. Roosevelt and then Mr. Truman as Under Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. Bell, let me add, was a career man in Government who started in the Treasury Department in 1911 as stenographer and then bookkeeper. From that humble beginning he worked himself up to the high positions he held in the Roosevelt and Truman administrations.

So I think you will realize that he talks with authority and with considerable friendliness toward the administration.

In a very recent speech he suggested that there should be no new Government spending for the next 2 years. He suggested that the Federal Government should not take on any new functions and that it should not expand any of its present functions.

During this period of moratorium, he added, Congress should look over what has been done. It should correct mistakes of the past and tighten up the machinery of Government.

Congress should, in a word, seek to create a condition of stability. It should halt the runaway spending which is causing inflation and is weakening the spending power of your dollars.

That is from Mr. Bell. It is one of the soundest proposals I have heard in a long time in Washington. It will protect your savings bonds, your bank accounts, your life insurance, and all forms of annuities and pensions.

It is a good thing to make yourself clear about that to your Congressmen.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

The All-American Conference Against Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, yesterday in New York City there was launched a significant movement against communism by the All-American Conference Against Communism. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this point, some remarks of my own relative to the conference, the resolutions adopted by it, and also the report about the conference appearing in today's issue of the New York Times.

There being no objection, the statement, resolutions, and article were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW ORGANIZATION DEVELOPING FOR ALL-OUT FIGHT AGAINST COMMUNISM AND ITS RELATED COLLECTIVISTIC CONCEPTS

STATEMENT BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Mr. President, communism cannot be curtailed by conversation. Since communism is an international conspiracy which advances its creed by tightly organized units forming the nucleus of a whole matrix of cooperating front organizations it follows that it requires equal effort and equal organizational genius and gumption if America is to defeat the program of communism. As a consequence of the 2-day sessions of the All-American Conference Against Communism concluding yesterday in New York City it appears that at long last this country is to have an all-American, pro-American organization solidly enough supported and with tight enough cohesion among its cooperating associations and groups so that an effective program can be devised and promoted at the grass-roots level on a community-by-community basis to defeat the pagan poisons of the godless Communist conspiracy.

The American Legion takes the lead

The All-American Conference Against Communism on Saturday featured addresses by Lt. Gen. W. Bedell Smith, former United States Ambassador to Russia; George Sokolsky, syndicated columnist and foreign correspondent; Frank H. Gordon, assistant in Communist conspiracy prosecution; James B. Carey, national vice president of the CIO; Matthew Woll, national vice president of the A. F. of L.; and Hon. Jack B. Tenney, State senator of California. The opening address of the conference was delivered by George N. Craig, of Indiana, the national commander of the American Legion, under whose sponsorship this first All-American Conference Against Communism was conducted. At the banquet Saturday night, addresses were delivered by Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen and Rev. Daniel A. Poling.

Sunday morning's session, Mr. President, began with an all-faiths' religious service lead by Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, of New York City, Rev. Daniel A. Poling, of New York City, and Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., national chaplain of the American Legion. The concluding addresses of the conference were delivered by Dr. Francis L. Bacon, of the University of California, and by the present speaker, the junior Senator from the State of South Dakota. A press release containing a digest of my remarks is being inserted in the RECORD at the conclusion of this statement.

Mr. President, I am greatly fortified in my conviction this morning that communism is going to be turned back in America and that our citizens are going to reject the centralized political controls which so frequently precede and which so invariably accompany communism by the fact that out of that conference this last week end came some constructive, concrete action. A 17-member committee was appointed in conformity with resolutions adopted at the conclusion of the conference calling for another meeting within 90 days and authorizing this committee to prepare an agenda for the next meeting and to do the spade work preliminary to the creation of a permanent anti-Communist

central organization with a definite and detailed program of action to be undertaken not only at the community level but also at the State and National levels.

The resolutions adopted and the identity of the members of the committee will appear following this statement as a part of these remarks. It should be noted, however, that this 17-member committee brings into focus on this problem such varying but important groups as the CIO, the A. F. of L., the Chamber of Commerce, Lions International, the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the Business and Professional Women's Clubs, the National American Legion Auxiliary, the State legislatures, the Congress of the United States, and religious, and fraternal orders of significant size.

Mr. President, we can win against communism if we work at it but we must work as a team and every community in the land must put into action a program to protect the integrity and the formula of freedom of its own area. If any of you have further thoughts on what can be done by this about-to-be-created permanent national anticommunism organization, I hope you will send them to Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion, care of Legion Headquarters, Indianapolis, Ind., so we can bring to bear on this problem the best constructive thinking of us all. America has no more important problem before it today than to curtail communism abroad and to defeat it at home.

RESOLUTIONS AND STATEMENT ADOPTED AT ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE, NEW YORK CITY, JANUARY 29, 1950

The following statement was adopted by the first All-American Conference at its closing session as expressing the determination of the 60 participating national organizations to pool their efforts to stamp out communism:

"We, the officially designated representatives of 60 major national patriotic, religious, labor, business, civic, service, professional, educational, fraternal, veteran, and social organizations representing the overwhelming majority of the American people, assembled in the first All-American Conference in New York City, January 28, 29, 1950, under sponsorship of the American Legion to form a united front against a common enemy—world communism.

"We assembled as free Americans. We have the right and do assert it, to hold our own and perchance differing views and opinions on problems involving economic, educational, political, religious, and social issues. But here in New York, as free Americans all, we find ourselves in complete accord and agreement that:

"1. World communism is the greatest present threat to domestic security and peace on earth and that its No. 1 targets are God and our American way of life in the United States, the last—a great stronghold of undiluted human freedom.

"2. The steady infiltration of communism into our schools and colleges, into our press, radio, and screen, into our labor and business and into our Government itself has reached a stage where it constitutes an immediate, serious, and growing menace to the very existence of the America that we know and love.

"3. Communism, as practiced in the United States, is not an economic or political philosophy, but it is in fact a deliberate revolutionary conspiracy inspired, directed, and financed by an alien power. It seeks to accomplish the overthrow of our constitutional form of government through force and violence. It seeks to achieve its unholy end through deceit and lies, to divide our people through vicious propaganda, to set class against class, race against race, and creed against creed. It denies the existence of God, seeks to extirpate all forms of religion, and aims to set up the police state as the supreme authority: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the chairman of this All-American Conference, George N. Craig, national commander of the American Legion, be, and hereby is, directed to designate a committee representative of a cross-section of the organizations in attendance at this conference to formulate plans to stimulate and coordinate the efforts of the organizations here represented and others of like mind, to encourage and enlist active public interest in combating the infiltration, influence, and activities of the Communists and all other subversive elements and to act as a clearing house and information center, through which the various organizations may be informed and advised of the activities and experiences of other organizations, all upon the understanding that such committee shall recognize the full independence of the various organizations and shall not attempt to control or supervise them; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That another meeting of the All-American Conference shall be called by the commander of the American Legion within 90 days to establish a permanent pro-American, anticommunism, unified and cohesive organization."

This resolution was submitted to the All-American Conference by a special committee of the delegates, named by National Commander Craig of the American Legion. Members of the committee which drafted the statement and signed it follow:

Harry Reed, CIO, Washington, D. C., chairman.

Dr. Francis L. Bacon, college of education, University of California, Los Angeles, Calif.

Senator Karl E. Mundt, of South Dakota.

Mr. Don Belding, president of Freedoms Foundation, Valley Forge, Pa.

Paul Wamsley, Buffalo, N. Y., representing the National Education Association.

Hon. Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles, Calif., State senator.

Alexander T. Wells, New York, N. Y., past international president of Lions International.

Miss Olive H. Huston, New York, N. Y., executive director, the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The All-American Conference at its closing session on January 29, approved a report of a drafting committee representing a cross-section of the meeting, which recommended that a permanent united front against communism be established.

Upon this authority, National Commander George N. Craig of the American Legion, who presided over the conference, appointed a committee of 17 members for forming a permanent organization and fixing the place of the next meeting to be held within 90 days.

THE COMMITTEE FOR PERMANENT ORGANIZATION

Harry Read, CIO, Washington, D. C., chairman.

Dr. Francis L. Bacon, Westwood, Calif., UCLA College of Education.

Mr. Paul Wamsley, Buffalo, N. Y., National Education Association.

Hon. Jack B. Tenney, Los Angeles, Calif., California State senator.

Alexander T. Wells, New York, N. Y., past International Lions president.

Hon. Karl E. Mundt, United States Senator from South Dakota.

Miss Olive H. Huston, New York, N. Y., executive director, National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs.

Mrs. Marie L. Sheehe, Rockford, Ill., national president of the American Legion Auxiliary.

Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, Washington, D. C., president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, New York, N. Y., executive director, American Jewish League Against Communism, Inc.

Lewis Hines, Washington, D. C., Philadelphia, American Federation of Labor.

Rev. Daniel A. Poling, New York, N. Y., editor, the Christian Herald.

Rev. John F. Cronin, Washington, D. C., assistant director, Department of Social Action, National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Dr. Louis H. Bauer, Hempstead, N. Y., chairman of the board of trustees, the American Medical Association.

Jackson D. Holtz, Boston, Mass., B'nai B'rith.

Donald Marcellus, Washington, D. C., manager, northeastern division, United States Chamber of Commerce.

A representative, to be named, of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Mr. President, I now call attention to the press release containing a digest of the address I delivered yesterday to the concluding session of this first All-American Conference Against Communism:

PRESS REVIEW OF ADDRESS GIVEN BY HON. KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA, BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION ALL-AMERICAN CONFERENCE

"Senator KARL E. MUNDT, Republican of South Dakota, in an address before the national All-American Conference sponsored by the American Legion, proposed that the 78 participating organizations form—under Legion leadership—a national phalanx-for-freedom.

"The Senator's address concluded the 2-day conference sponsored by the Legion's National Americanism Commission at the Hotel Astor which was called to develop a united national front against communism and subversion and to preserve the American way of life.

"Asked to appear on the program representing the viewpoint of Congress toward the challenge of communism and its related creeds, Senator MUNDT proposed the phalanx-for-freedom to coordinate the efforts of all groups desiring to do something practical and effective at the grass-roots level in helping to influence constructive State and National legislation.

"The Senator's talk was given before delegates from 78 national organizations who were invited to attend the conference by George N. Craig, national Legion commander.

"Senator MUNDT, who was a member of the House Committee on Un-American Activities under all four of the chairmen who have headed that group, told the conference that 'the battle to protect our Christian civilization, our American formula of freedom, and our established principles of private ownership and political independence calls for an all-out effort by God-fearing, loyal, and patriotic citizens of every race, class, and creed in this Republic.'

"The South Dakota solon, who served as acting chairman of the Un-American Committee at the discovery of the so-called pumpkin papers which led to the espionage activities of Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss, said to conference delegates that 'Victory in this fight against tyranny and the nationalization of both our economic and our political freedoms means as much to the farmer in his field, the workman in his shop, and the professional man in his office as it does to the big banker on the corner, the corporation president, or the very rich with their lush yachts and limousines.'

"He went on to say: 'In truth, this is a peoples' fight against a political plot to centralize our lives under the control of a few political overlords devoted to an alien creed and differing from the autocrats of ancient times only because they believe it is the Kremlin instead of the King that can do no wrong.

"'It is not alone the card-carrying Communist that we must guard against,' Senator MUNDT stated. He explained that 'we must be equally on the alert to restrain and defeat those who would give aid, comfort, and strength to the Communist cause by creating

political monopolies in the field of economic, social, and political controls.'

"He pointed out these monopolies 'can then be taken over by a Communist cabal and thus deny freedom to the people by a coup d'état or a storming of the power centers without even giving the people an opportunity to beat back their power-hungry attempts by rejecting their blandishments at the polls.'

"The South Dakota Senator outlined a step-by-step, community-by-community program which he recommended for consideration and active promotion by the phalanx-for-freedom which he urged the conference to sponsor.

"He recommended sponsorship on a basis to include all organizations 'willing to devote time, energy, money, or talent to the hallowed cause of freedom and to the practical task of educating ourselves and our children to the importance of maintaining in America the irreducible concepts of freedom and independence which are essential if liberty is to thrive and tyranny be turned back at our outer gates and stamped out of our own backyards.'

"Senator MUNDT suggested a local action committee in every American city, town, and county, and his list of recommendations for activities to be sponsored and promoted by this phalanx-for-freedom included the following items:

"Legislative action: Support and enactment of national legislation requiring the registration of all Communist organizations and members, annual financial reports to Congress by all Communist groups, and specific statutory provisions denying Communists the privilege of Federal employment and punishing equally those who deceptively obtain such employment and those Federal officials who knowingly appoint Communists to office.

"Legislation should also be enacted denying Communists American passports to travel abroad, compelling them to identify clearly all literature sent through the mail and all radio programs as to their Communist source, and extending to at least 10 years the statute of limitations on all crimes against the security and defenses of the Government.

"Senator MUNDT also recommended that similar legislation be enacted by each State legislature in order that both Federal and State law-enforcement agencies would have authority to 'keep from the public pay roll those who would use their official positions to deny freedom to others and to sabotage the functions of political and economic freedoms in this country.'

"Community-action programs: Senator MUNDT recommended that a special short course on What's Right With America be added to the curriculum of every high school of America so that 'each high school graduate will clearly know the basic principles of freedom which have so long and so well provided us with a success formula in America which has been unrivaled and unequaled anywhere else in the world in any era of history.'

"The South Dakota Senator also recommended that every community have 1 week each year set aside for a community-wide program and educational observance to be labeled 'Know Your America Week.' Senator MUNDT recommended that the week's observance start with sermons in every church praising the good features about America and 'to thank God that the United States—with all of its deficiencies and with all its never-ending need for continued improvement—still offers every church of every creed a better opportunity to render its great service than any other country in the world offers to any church in Christendom.'

"Senator MUNDT also urged that there be oratorical and essay contests for school children on the theme 'What Makes America Great'; that there be window displays in the stores; exhibits in the exposition halls and public auditoriums; radio broadcasts, editorials, cartoons and newspaper features stressing the values of private ownership, individual initiative, free enterprise, political independence and the cherished freedoms guaranteed in our American Bill of Rights.

"The Senator further recommended that 'special motion pictures be made and displayed during this commemorative week and that street parades, public programs, pageants, posters and all other publicity and educational media be mobilized to the end that by Saturday night every citizen, old and young, rich or poor, can go to bed with a full realization and appreciation of the great privilege that is his in living in America and with a clear knowledge of how well he lives and how richly he is rewarded by comparison with similar citizens under any other creed or living in any other country in the world.'

"A third community objective of the phalanx-for-freedom movement Senator MUNDT proposed as being a continuing effort in every locality to 'project the dividends of freedom in increasing amounts to steadily expanding circles of citizens so that every individual in every community will grow more enthusiastic in his Americanism and more sturdy in his opposition to false and alien creeds by virtue of the fact that freedom is meaning more and more to him in terms of better living, better health, more security, greater opportunity, and a richer and fuller life.'

"Finally, Senator MUNDT recommended that every community 'maintain an outpost to stand guard against tyranny or trickery to make certain its flank in the global battle against communism and national socialism in any form is well-manned, alertly staffed, and adequately prepared so that those who would deceive our youth, betray our freedoms, and destroy our American success formula do not weasel their way into our schools, our church groups, our business, farming, labor, or professional organizations.'

"The Senator warned against allowing these persons to 'supply "packaged thinking" and "pink pills for mental usage" by our women's clubs, our youth groups, or other organizations of any kind.'

"Senator MUNDT recommended exposure in the community itself by alert and active citizens as an effective way to defeat the Communist agitators and propagandists 'since I am convinced that 90 percent of all our Americans of every political party, race, creed, color, and locality would reject the pagan poisons of the Communist conspiracy and its odd asortment of fellow-travelers, witness dupes, and sentimental soulmates if once the true identity and purposes of this army of alien-minded organizations and individuals was exposed to the light of day and the relentless rejoinders of public opinion and patriotic citizens.'

"Included on the speaking program for the All-American Conference with Senator Mundt were: Gen. W. Bedell Smith, former United States Ambassador to Moscow; George Sokolsky, noted columnist and former Moscow correspondent of the New York Times; James B. Carey, of the CIO; Matthew Woll, of the A. F. of L.; Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen, Rev. Daniel A. Poling, and Frank R. Gordon, assistant Federal prosecutor in the successful trial resulting in conviction of 11 Communists in the United States."

Finally, Mr. President, I call the attention of the Senate to the news article in this morning's issue of the New York Times on this important conference. William R. Conklin of the New York Times covered the conference in detail and his news report appearing in today's issue summarizes its program and its purposes.

GROUPS WITH 50,000,000 MEMBERS UNITE TO COMBAT UNITED STATES COMMUNISM—PERMANENT BODY, SPONSORED BY THE LEGION, IS COMPOSED OF CIVIC, LABOR, BUSINESS, PROFESSIONAL, AND RELIGIOUS ELEMENTS

(By William R. Conklin)

Representatives of national organizations with a combined membership of 50,000,000 voted unanimously yesterday to establish a permanent organization to combat communism in the United States.

The action was taken on the closing day of a 2-day All-American Conference at the Astor Hotel sponsored by the American Legion. George N. Craig, national commander of the Legion, stressed the role of religion in the fight on communism and invited all loyal Americans to join in. He named a 17-member Nation-wide steering committee to direct the anti-Communist drive.

Before the conferees set up their permanent committee Senator KARL E. MUNDT, of South Dakota, told them that Russia could "knock out the United States in 90 seconds" with atomic bombs. Discussing Communist infiltration of the Federal Government, he said:

"Since Yalta, 151 Communists and fellow-travelers have been fired from the State Department, and the distressing thing is that not one of them ever spent a day in jail."

RESOLUTIONS BLASTS CONSPIRACY

In their resolution the 160 conferees said:

"World communism is the greatest present threat to domestic security and peace on earth, and its No. 1 target are God and our American way of life.

"The steady infiltration of communism into our schools and colleges, into our press, radio and screen, into our labor and business, and into our Government itself, constitutes an immediate, serious, and growing menace to the very existence of America.

"Communism as practiced in the United States is not an economic or a political philosophy, but is in fact a deliberate revolutionary conspiracy inspired, directed, and financed by an alien power.

"Communism seeks to overthrow our constitutional form of government through force and violence. It seeks to achieve its unholy end through deceit and lies, to divide our people through vicious propaganda, to set class against class, race against race, and creed against creed.

"It denies the existence of God, seeks to extirpate all forms of religion and aims to set up the police state as the supreme authority."

CIO MAN IN EXECUTIVE POST

Harry Read of the Congress of Industrial Organizations was chairman of the resolutions committee. Other members included Don Belding, president of Freedoms Foundation in Los Angeles; Dr. Francis L. Bacon of the University of California in Los Angeles; Paul Wamsley, of Buffalo, of the National Education Association; State Senator Jack B. Tenney, of California; Alexander T. Wells, of New York, past president of Lions International; and Miss Olive H. Huston, of New York, executive director of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc.

The permanent committee named by Commander Craig has Mr. Read as chairman, Mr. Craig appointed Dr. Bacon, Mr. Wamsley, Senator Tenney, Mr. Wells, and Miss Huston as members.

Other members are: Senator Mundt, Mrs. Marie Sheehe, national president of the American Legion Auxiliary; Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs; Rabbi Benjamin Schultz, director of the American Jewish League Against Communism; Lewis G. Hines of the American Federation of Labor; the Reverend Daniel A. Poling, the Reverend J. Francis Cronin of the National Catholic Welfare Federation; Dr. Louis H. Bauer, American Med-

ical Association; Donald Marcellus of the United States Chamber of Commerce, and Jackson Holtz of B'nai B'rith.

Another committee member is to be designated by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, which was not represented at the conference.

Under the resolution the committee recognizes the full independence of various organizations and will not attempt to control or supervise them.

MUNDT CALLS FOR ACTION

Senator MUNDT proposed a phalanx-for-freedom movement to coordinate the anti-Communist campaign.

"We live in a world where Russia is stockpiling atom bombs which, in effect, could be labeled 'Made for the U. S. A.'," he declared. "If dropped on 25 or 30 major cities, they could knock out the United States in 90 seconds. This country is blandly permitting Russia to build up its bomb stock piles, and we are doing nothing more than mildly deploring it."

As practical steps Mr. MUNDT recommended Federal legislation to compel Communists to register with the Attorney General and to identify their literature.

He said this legislation should deny Federal employment to Communists and should punish superiors who hired them knowingly. He urged the conferees to support the Mundt-Ferguson-Johnston bill now before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

"The bill will pass in the House, as it did in the Eightieth Congress" Senator MUNDT said. "Whether or not President Truman will sign it, I don't know. I suppose it depends on what he hears from Dean Acheson. But hiring a Communist in the Federal Government is like hiring a kidnaper as a baby-sitter."

Mr. MUNDT also recommended regular community programs to emphasize the benefits of American life and a special week each year devoted to Americanism.

"If a functional organization is developed here, this meeting may go down in history as one as important as the tea party given in Boston many years ago," he added.

Dr. Bacon, faculty member of College of Education in the University of California, discussed Communist infiltration of American colleges and universities. He said the country spent less than 3 percent of its national budget on education last year and called for increased appropriations in that field.

Assistance to Small Business Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] at the annual banquet of the Norwich (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce. In his address the Senator from Connecticut very ably discussed the problems of independent business enterprises, and made specific recommendations for necessary legislation which I think were very enlightening, and which should be very helpful to the Congress.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am told by my congressional colleague, Mrs. WOODHOUSE, that crossing the Connecticut River into eastern Connecticut is like scaling the Great Divide. On my side, the side where the sun sets, is a darkly mysterious civilization of commuters, station wagons, and advertising men. We have replanted our forests with factory chimneys and our land has been tilled into golf courses. Our sons go to Yale, our wives go to art school, and our towns go solidly Republican.

It goes without saying, of course, that none of this has been applied to me. Today I crossed the Rubicon at Hartford with no challenge whatsoever after I had paid my head tax of a dime. And as I rode into the clear air and broad meadows of your countryside I felt not unlike the returning prodigal son.

Not far from here, up in Tolland, are the gravestones of many generations of Bentons. These eastern Connecticut Bentons never were corrupted by money. My mother, who was not born a Benton, says it was because the Bentons couldn't find any in Connecticut that my father ended up in Minnesota. He didn't find much there, either.

The Bentons were Congregational ministers, school teachers, and farmers. I never see the rows and rows of stone fences that are so characteristic of Connecticut without marveling at these folks, and those like them, who scratched a living from this rugged farmland. The monuments of their determination, I often suspect, will outlast the Travelers' Tower or the Merritt Parkway.

They were little people and humble, too. They attached no importance or significance to their way of life. They had to work too hard just to live. But their lives, nevertheless, were eloquent expressions of independence.

This is a point worth recalling tonight before this audience of eastern Connecticut businessmen because the independent, small-business man today is a builder of stone walls in our modern economy. It is about him that I shall talk tonight. He represents the leadership and initiative which have helped this country survive the cold winters of depression and war. Independent small business is the core of our Connecticut community life.

It is a matter of record that over 90 percent of the 4,000,000 business enterprises in this country have fewer than 50 employees. It is also a matter of record that the thinking segment of this huge proportion of our business community feels itself in danger. The independent, small-business man in many respects is the "forgotten man" of this mid-century decade in our national history. He is in danger of a squeeze play that may deprive him of his independence as well as his profits.

On one side, the independent manufacturer, retailer, and serviceman must wage a continual battle for survival against his larger, more powerful competitors. It is true that the keen independent keeps bigger business on its toes by developing new products, improved designs, and advanced methods of sale and distribution. It is also true that as fast as some good independent demonstrates this kind of spunk all too often a bigger fellow comes along and gobbles him up.

The business which is independent and big is not a problem. Unhappily, there are all too few of these in the sense in which I use the word "independent." The real problem is how we can protect and promote the business which is independent and small. The independent business, big and small, is the business which supplies the yeast in our economy. It is the one which continues to provide the competition which gives to our economy the freedom of which we boast. It is the one which we should foster as a matter of national policy.

There is more than one way to collectivize an economy. It can be done by force from without, as we have seen with Czechoslovakia. It can be done by tyrants from within, as Hitler learned from Mussolini. But it can also come through business monopoly practices within any country or any economy. Such practices are the foe of enterprise and of new and independent business. They are a most important part of the problem today in England—and the Labor government can hardly be held responsible for the decline of competition in England and the steady growth of monopolistic business practices over the last several decades.

I believe the English economy again demonstrates the need for the strict and fair enforcement of our antitrust laws. They are the best friend we have of free competition in the United States. They are the best friend of new and independent business. They are the friend and supporter of those who foster enterprise in our economy. They would be a still better friend if they were still further strengthened.

The independent, small-business man has grown to feel, not without reason, that his National Government has not always treated his problems with the attention and sympathy they deserve. You may recall the statement contained in the recent report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. "The businessman believes," the Council says, "it is futile to influence public policy, because he is outnumbered by workers and farmers—and because he believes the Government counts, not thinks."

I recommend this report to your attention as well as the President's own economic message to Congress. They represent a significant, and encouraging, change of attitude toward the busness community at the highest level of national policy making. They are most cheering reports to those of us who have pioneered in the development of a more sympathetic understanding by Government of the problems of the business community in the preservation and strengthening of our free-enterprise system. The pioneering, I may say, has also included the development by business of some understanding of the problems and responsibilities of government; for our Government does, indeed, play a decisive role in the determination of the climate in which we as businessmen may thrive and prosper or wither and die. Some of us at least are more willing to admit this crucial and, indeed, indispensable role of business than we were a decade ago.

I like to think that I see in these two recent economic reports many of the ideas which Paul Hoffman, RALPH FLANDERS, and I helped to evolve when we helped organize the Committee for Economic Development, ideas with which many of you must be familiar. Here are a couple of samples contained in these most important documents which have just come from the administration. This is a new kind of language to encourage the independent businessman who believes in enterprise and competition. This isn't the language of the thirties. It is, gentlemen, the language of the fifties. I commend it to the business community. This is from the report of the Council of Economic Advisers:

1. "During the depression years a significant body of thought held that the forces of business expansion had spent themselves and that Government must provide the dynamic force for renewed growth * * * today the doctrine of secular stagnation has been replaced by the firm conviction that our business system, and with it our whole economy, can and should continue to grow."

And again:

"The new generation of Americans should always remember that the depression breakdown resulted from errors on the part of both Government and business; that both joined in forging some of the most practical measures for recovery; and that both must admit imperfection because the recovery was incomplete until the war restored maximum production and employment."

Quoting the President:

"This effective teamwork between free enterprise and Government confounded the enemies of freedom, who waited eagerly during 1949 for the collapse of the American economy. * * * Our economy can and must continue to grow. * * * The enterprise and imagination of private businessmen will be a crucial factor in achieving the upward growth of which our economy is capable."

As one Washington reporter put it, "The fire-eating, dragon-slaying approach to business of 10 years ago has been replaced by a concept of government in the role of facilitating and promoting business expansion and welfare."

I think you will agree with me that this is a most sound and healthy development. Further, it is one reason I am optimistic about that future. We have come a long ways, even though we still have much to learn about the proper role of government in our economy. (This is a subject to which I shall dedicate myself in some other speech.)

It is fair to say, I think, that there is usually far less proportional risk and boldness involved in operating our largest capital enterprises than, for example, in opening a new tavern, a new drugstore or laundry, or in launching a new product on the market. The risks to the men who strike out on their own, and how better to guard against some of them, are of vital concern not only to them but to the rest of us as well.

The President of one of our largest steel companies once told me of his experience with the most promising young man in the senior class of a great eastern university.

"Although they were all eager to work for us," he said, "we discovered that they were not so much interested in the steel business as in the security offered by a big company. They didn't mind starting at the bottom of the ladder, but they wanted someone else to hold the ladder."

In a recent issue of Life magazine (and I know you will not attach any political significance to the fact that I subscribe to a Luce publication) the young cartoonist Bill Mauldin cited a poll of 150,000 college graduates in the class of 1949. The poll showed that only 2 percent had any desire to go into business on their own.

"The fact is," says Mr. Mauldin, "that most people would rather work for a steady salary. They can depend on it, plan on it, and turn their attention to things that interest them more than their jobs."

Bill Mauldin may be right. But 5 years ago I wrote a short article for Reader's Digest called Young Man, Be Your Own Boss. After that article was published I received 5,000 letters and 400 telegrams. I have never written an article or made a speech which struck a chord anywhere nearly so responsive. And I continue to believe that there is no economic opportunity which offers such rewards in the form of personal growth and personal satisfaction as starting one's own independent business.

I do not mean to imply that there is anything ignoble about the aspirations of our young people to secure the protection for themselves and their families often offered by the big companies. All of us have always feared the economic hazards of old age and death. Young people have always wanted protection against these hazards. It is only recently, however, that they think they can get the protection. If I had thought I could get it 30 years ago, when I graduated from Yale, I am not one to claim that my own career might not have been quite different. Alas and alack, I might indeed have stayed with that $100-a-month job in the National City Bank.

You may guess from this that I firmly believe in the principle of what we loosely call social security. I believe that some form of assured security income is essential to the sustained welfare, freedom, and dignity of the American citizen.

How can we give the social security which our people want—and which our young people seek—without forcing them into the big companies in order to get it? It is in their interest to step out on their own—to provide enterprise and competition in our economy—to develop new products and new services. Yes, it is in their interest. Even more, it is in the interest of all of us.

I have reached the opinion that our small independent businessman is not only entitled as much as anyone else in our society to the protection offered by social-security laws, but that it is even more important to the rest of us that we have it.

In the last analysis, the security of every individual depends on the success of industry and agriculture in producing an increasing flow of goods and services. Without this increasing flow, an adequate social-security program would bankrupt us all. A system of security insurance for the small-business man will reinforce this drive toward greater production and maximum economic progress. It will encourage him to get going, and it will support him and keep him going in the inevitable days of discouragement. It should indeed cut down on the terrible mortality rate in the small business community.

There is now a bill before the Senate Finance Committee which would extend the Social Security Act to cover about 4,500,000 self-employed, independent, small-business men—storekeepers, retailers, garagemen, contractors, taxicab owners, and insurance brokers. I endorse the principle of extending this protection to the man who has the pride and the ambition to work for himself. By extending it, we shall get more such men.

Complete security, however—like happiness—is not to be had for the asking. More often than not, it is simply the byproduct of some other goal. We do not always find happiness just by searching for it. Similarly we rarely feel secure when we seek only to avoid taking risks.

The Yankee peddlers who trudged out of this State into the wilderness of the American backwoods were drawn by a sense of adventure as well as mere dollars and cents. It might be said they took what our military men would call a calculated risk when they left a sharpshooting, frontier housewife with a supply of wooden nutmegs.

In recent years, it seems to me, Government policy has overburdened small business with an unfair proportion of uncalculated risk in relation to the possibilities of profit. Social-security protection only goes part way toward converting the uncalculated into a reasonable calculation.

I do not think that it was either fair or prudent to retain in peacetime the high rate of excise taxes which were imposed during the war to curtail production in certain areas. These taxes have seriously reduced the volume of business in many lines of retail trade and have caused unemployment in several different kinds of New England industry—in many independent, small businesses of the kind I have been talking about tonight.

The President has now recommended reductions. I concur in this policy, and I look forward hopefully to the eventual elimination of all excise taxes except those on liquor, gasoline, and tobacco.

In his tax message this week the President also recommended the removal of the so-called notch tax on small-business income between twenty-five and fifty thousand dollars a year. The rate is now 53 percent, whereas on General Motors $500,000,000 profit it is only 38 percent. This is manifestly absurd as well as unjust.

The President has also proposed an increase from 2 to 5 years in which losses can be carried over and deducted from profits. I regard this as much more important than the removal of the notch tax. An enterprising new business very often loses money for several years and should have a better chance to get it back again before the taxes begin. Most new businesses are struggling, and it is a rare one which goes quickly into the black.

These two tax measures have been recommended by the Committee for Economic Development. Now the President has urged them on the Congress, they should be enacted promptly. I do not favor holding them up for a general tax review or for any other purpose.

In his economic message the President promised that he would recommend a program for encouraging private financial institutions to furnish small business with equity capital.

There are grave dangers inherent in direct loans and subsidies from Government to business. But I believe the powers of our Federal Reserve System can justly be used to stimulate and educate our commercial banks to better serve the needs of small business. This is a matter of highest importance. I know. I've been to the banks too many times.

The Senate is again studying the possibility of establishing a standing or a special committee on small business. Such a committee would study and investigate a sound program to foster and safeguard the place of independent, small business in the American economy.

Such a committee might study, for example, whether or not small business in obtaining its fair share of basic materials or if the prices it pays for these materials are equitable in comparison to those charged to large competitors. How can the morass of laws affecting business be consolidated and clarified and simplified so that a small-business man can understand them without wasting his substance on high-priced lawyers? What are the special labor problems of small business? What studies by Government or by universities can lead to better business methods in such areas as marketing or accounting? What can the Department of Commerce legitimately do? Should the development of State departments of commerce be encouraged? What about right here in Connecticut? Do our Government procurement agencies sufficiently include small business in their purchasing programs? Is American small business properly represented abroad by our consular services, and is it participating fully in our foreign-aid programs?

More important than the establishment of such a committee is the prompt action by present legislative committees on needed legislation. We don't need more propaganda. What we do need is more action. Congress through its present committees should also press for action from the laggard and reluctant executive departments.

When we talk about small business we are talking about the firms that employ 65 percent of all commercial and industrial wage earners and produce 45 percent of our entire industrial output.

As the CED's own report put it nearly 2 years ago:

When we talk about small business we are, in effect, talking about the American business system.

When we talk about small business we are, in effect, talking about the peace of the world, because this now depends on a strong and prosperous United States, which in turn

depends on our business system. When we talk about small business we are talking about our American goal of equality of opportunity for every individual and for every type and size of business.

Such equality of opportunity is vital in preserving a healthy, growing, and productive system of business enterprise, and, by the same token, in preserving the well-being of this country. More important, it is vital to remember that independent, small business produces men as well as goods. The fabric of American life is held together by the local businessman who knows his community, has a personal stake in it, and is eager to make that community a better place in which to work and live.

Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania, at Concert by the Army Band

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD remarks made by me at a concert given by the Army Band in honor of Pennsylvania, under the auspices of the Sesquicentennial Commission of the District of Columbia, on Wednesday, January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Boykin and my fellow Americans, I am deeply grateful for the honor conferred upon the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania in the splendid program we are enjoying so much tonight.

I welcome this opportunity to bring you most cordial and friendly greetings from the people of Pennsylvania. It is a real pleasure to express to you their sincere thanks and appreciation of this notable event.

In the magnificent structure of the States of the Union, Pennsylvania holds a place of pre-eminence. It has been rightfully called the keystone in the arch of the American Republic.

Pennsylvania is the birthplace of American independence. Its leadership for human rights, equal justice, and freedom of the individual had its beginnings 250 years ago—under the guidance of William Penn.

In establishing his holy experiment in government, the founder of Pennsylvania recognized social, political, and religious freedom as God's greatest blessing upon mankind.

Within the boundaries of Pennsylvania were framed and adopted two immortal documents of freedom—the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States.

Upon its soil patriots and heroes gave their lives in battle that men might be free. Fort Necessity—scene of Washington's first command—Brandywine, Germantown, and Valley Forge are shrines of patriotic inspiration.

Gettysburg—where the Union was preserved—is a monument to the valor of gallant men of the North and the South.

Pennsylvania is justly proud that three of its cities—Philadelphia, York, and Lancaster—have been Capitals of the United States.

Yes, Pennsylvania is rich in historic association with the glories of America.

Its tradition of faith in God, tolerance, and good will has been strengthened through the years by work, self-reliance, sacrifice, and loyalty to the principles of true Americanism.

Those qualities are so important today when evil forces work ceaselessly to undermine and corrupt our system of individual freedom.

Above all else we must be courageous and vigilant to protect and safeguard our precious heritage and all that we hold sacred.

Again I thank you on behalf of the people of Pennsylvania.

The Crisis in the Displaced-Persons Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the Honorable Harry N. Rosenfield, Commissioner of the Displaced Persons Commission, on January 15, 1950, at the Hotel Astor, New York City, at a gathering of the United Service for New Americans, Inc., a fine organization dedicated to the education and adjustment of immigrants to Americanism and to life in America. It is an extremely thoughtful and provocative address, and discusses the operation of the Displaced Persons Act and its inadequacies. I hope every Member of the Senate will have occasion to read this address prior to the consideration of H. R. 4567 and the amendments proposed by the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CRISIS IN THE DISPLACED-PERSONS PROGRAM

One of the obligations of public office is the duty to keep the people informed upon the progress of public programs. Having just returned from a 2 months' trip of inspection of the Commission's operations overseas, perhaps I can speak with some more intimate knowledge of developments which affect the success of the displaced-persons program.

There are three crises, not one, which jeopardize the successful completion of the job started by the people of the United States when the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was enacted:

Crisis 1: The brazen and deliberate effort being made in some quarters to besmirch the displaced persons and the displaced persons program, on the basis of alleged facts which an objective investigation would show either to be untruthful or completely warped out of significant proportions;

Crisis 2: The vicious and cruel effects which the present discriminatory and unfair law causes to innocent and helpless displaced persons who are caught by the law's spider web of arbitrary and capricious restrictions and limitations;

Crisis 3: The unhumane and callous disregard exhibited by some people toward the quarter million IRO displaced persons who will be left in the displaced-persons camps and areas on June 30, 1950, if the present law is not liberalized and extended.

The first crisis touches upon the very fundamentals of a democratic society, the right of the people to have the facts, unvarnished by personal prejudice. The Displaced Persons Commission has consistently sought to provide the people with full and accurate information, through the statutory method of its semiannual reports to the President and the Congress, through the normal and customary channels of appearing in public hearings before committees of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and through national and regional meetings with State commissions and voluntary agencies. It is perhaps well to point out that despite the majority vote in the full Committee on the Judiciary of the Senate for action last year, the Senate subcommittee which has been considering this program's operations for over 1 year and which has called people into hearings from all parts of the country, has never once given the Displaced Persons Commission the opportunity to state its side of the story in public hearings.

There have been reckless and false charges leveled against the displaced-persons operation which affect not only the Displaced Persons Commission, but a whole coordinated team of hard-working, loyal, and patriotic Americans in and out of Government. You must remember that the Displaced Persons Commission is only one part of the administration of the displaced-persons law; the Counter Intelligence of the United States Army, the Foreign Service of the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the Public Health Service, and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, on the Government side, as well as America's most distinguished voluntary agencies, which render so signal a role in our national life in war and in peace, are all part and parcel of the administration of this law. Charges of dishonesty, maladministration, and fraud affect all of these agencies as well as the Displaced Persons Commission.

One of the techniques employed by these crisis makers is to utter broad and unspecified charges of wholesale and willful corruption, maladministration—and even disloyalty to our country—which produce a prompt and categorical denial. Then a very few isolated cases are alleged though they are the exceptions and not the rule, to discredit the denial and presumably support the original broadsides. If the isolated cases had been presented along with the original charges it would be like saying everything stinks by pointing to an onion.

What are some of these unfounded charges? First, it is alleged that the gates are down for subversives to enter the United States under the program. There has been such loose talk before, and the Displaced Persons Commission has never been able to get specific cases. Take, for example, the most recent outbursts in this vein; did you see any cases mentioned? If there is anything to the claim, why cannot it be documented? The answer is simply that it is not true. Has the FBI complained that the program is bringing in subversives? No. Has the Attorney General made any such charge? No. Has the CIC of the United States Army (which is responsible for security screening overseas) made any such charge? No; and they know what they are talking about, since all these agencies are engaged in the actual process of security screening.

The fact is that the Displaced Persons Commission has instituted the most comprehensive and thorough security screening ever organized in any immigration program in American history, and that this program is in addition to the normal security screening by the consular service and the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which

prevails in this program as in normal immigration. In fact, informed and responsible observers overseas, including one of our veteran consul generals, complained to me in Europe that the Commission's security screening was too rigid and caused too much of a slow-down in the arrival of displaced persons in the United States.

Another phony charge is that the program has been riddled by false documents. This, too, is untrue. In any program of this size, and you must bear in mind that over 130,000 visas have already been issued, which means many more cases examined, since 30–35 percent of all cases are rejected or disqualified, there are bound to be some examples of false documents. But the fact is that we are catching such efforts. Apparently, the situation is something like this: if we catch some false documents, that proves that the whole program is riddled with them; if we don't catch them, that proves it too. Thus far some 10 cases of false documents have been alleged, in a program in which over 130,000 visas have been issued. Doesn't that sound like a pretty good batting average to you?

Still another trumped-up claim is that the coordinated team of Government and private agencies have been violating the law. This is merely another example of the loose talk in which some people have been indulging. Again you will look in vain for particulars, for details, for examples, for cases. It's talk, more talk, and more talk. Let me give you an example. At a public hearing in the Senate a claim was made on September 1, 1949, in this same general vein. I officially and respectfully demanded proof and documentation. Receiving none, I wrote to the Senate committee on September 7, reiterating my demand for proof. Today is January 15, 1950, 4½ months after the claim, and we have not yet received one iota of proof, or detail, or even an acknowledgment of my letter. I believe any reasonable jury would come to the conclusion that there is not one scintilla of evidence to substantiate the phony claim. I said then, and I repeat now, that any public official, whether he be in the legislative or the executive branch, commits a breach of public trust if he willfully conceals evidence which he believes would enable a Government agency to prevent or discontinue a violation of law. I can only come to the conclusion that the charge is as unfounded now as it was 4½ months ago. The Commission is always ready to rectify mistakes. We are not perfect. No human agency is. But the Commission always stands ready to investigate any alleged irregularity and cause swift correction if the allegation is proved to be true. Wouldn't you think it strange if people claim to have proof of such irregularities and deliberately conceal it, and thereby prevent corrections, for 4½ months, and—in a more recent incident—for 1 year? Is it not fair to assume that such people themselves do not trust the reliability of the alleged information?

Other similarly baseless charges have been made. I want to be understood quite clearly. I am not saying that the people who have made these charges are telling lies, but rather that in many cases they have been deceived by purported evidence which would have been proved groundless had they taken the trouble to investigate such claims. Perhaps, however, some people are so anxious for the wish to become the thought that they prefer not to check the reliability of so-called information conveyed to them.

I might add at this point that part of the campaign which seems to be building up against the Commission—as a means of discrediting displaced persons—is to seek to isolate one member of the Commission by engaging in a personal vendetta with him and exchanging recriminations. This is not a personal feud but a question of broad public policy. We on the Commission—all three of us—all hope that this discussion can be restored to the high level which the importance of the subject deserves. No one of us ever intended it should be otherwise.

CRISIS 2

Of a different character, but somewhat in the same tone is the second crisis, which arises out of the vicious and cruel results of the present discriminatory and unfair law which is causing thousands of people to wait needlessly for visas.

Under the law, 30 percent of all visas must be issued to people who not only are coming to farm jobs here but held such jobs previously. Unfortunately, the American people have not been asking for farmers in the proportion of 30 to 70 percent, at a time which would make it possible for the maintenance of an even operation. The major farm organizations have shown steadfast approval of the displaced-persons program, as such, and displaced persons have been making great contributions to our agricultural economy. But, as you know, farm labor is hired at given times in the year, varying with different areas of the country. The Commission informed the Congress that if this provision remained in the law, it would cause an almost catastrophic drop in our shipping, and a consequent serious decline in the number of people coming into the United States. Some Members of the Senate thought we were kidding them, but let the facts talk for themselves. Prior to the institution of controls to achieve the 30-percent ratio, the consuls were issuing visas at an average of between 3,000 to 3,500 per week with a high of 4,400 visas in 1 week. Last week it was only 879 visas. Prior to the institution of these arbitrary controls required by the law, we reached a shipping schedule of 15,000 and 16,000 persons per month. Now we shall have difficulty in maintaining an average of 6,000 per month for the next few months, and this we can do only because of an accumulated backlog developed prior to the arbitrary controls.

Today we are holding back almost 10,000 displaced persons, ready and anxious to be visaed, in order to achieve the 30-percent ratio. This number of people held back needlessly will increase by some 2,000 additional people each month. Why? Because the law says that 30 percent of all visas must go to farmers, and there aren't enough farmers being requested in the United States at this time of the year to reach that proportion. In other words, displaced persons who are being requested by Americans are being held back to await preferential treatment for displaced persons who have not yet been requested by Americans. As many as 20,000 displaced persons may be held up in this way.

This is a cruel effect of the law, and is completely inconsistent with the demands of the American people for the displaced persons being thus ruthlessly held back. I regret to have to tell you that if the present provision for 30 percent remains in the law there is a serious likelihood that, despite the availability of thousands upon thousands of fine assurances for fine displaced persons, the Displaced Persons Commission will not be able to comply with demands upon it to fill the full 205,000 authorized by the law.

CRISIS 3

One-quarter of a million International Refugee Organization displaced persons will remain stranded and deserted in Germany, Austria, and Italy on June 30, 1950—that is, if the present law is not extended and liberalized along the lines of H. R. 4567, which has already been passed by the House. We shall be sabotaging the task we started in the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, a solution of the IRO displaced-persons problem.

There are some people who will tell you that these people are hard-core cases and undesirable. That is not so. I just brought back with me from Geneva, IRO's headquarters, the most recent data. IRO estimates that on June 30, 1950, there will still be some 243,500 displaced persons in Germany, Austria, and Italy. And of this number, only 18,600 are expected to be hard-core cases. Apart from the human tragedy in this unfinished job, most of these displaced persons would still remain on our hands, since they will be the charges of the American occupation forces in Germany. Thus, we would be denying to Americans in the United States the opportunity to sponsor displaced persons whom they sorely need and still continuing a heavy and unnecessary financial burden to the American taxpayer by requiring these displaced persons to remain in these displaced-persons areas.

America hates a quitter. A job worth doing is worth finishing and doing well. This job finished will bring to the United States a larger number of highly desirable and useful persons. This job unfinished will only add fuel to the already serious crisis which exists in the displaced-persons areas.

The Displaced Persons Commission believes that the public should have all the facts. The three crises endanger the successful completion of one of the most magnificent international humanitarian ventures undertaken by this country. I heartily agree with the recent invitation issued to the American people by one of our distinguished Senators that the people express themselves on this problem. It is time now for the people who know the truth to speak their minds and make themselves heard in all parts of the land. If ever it were true that "knowledge is power," this is the time.

The people of the world are looking to the United States. Are we going to let them down? If we know the people of America, the answer will be: These crises are artificially created and must be stopped, and the displaced-persons program must be permitted to go on to a successful conclusion. I am convinced that the overwhelming sentiment of the people of the United States and of the Congress will not permit a small band of willful people, acting contrary to the best interests of the United States, to thwart the will of the American people to see this task completed in the noble American tradition which prompted its initiation.

Freedom Isn't Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very stirring and enlightening address delivered on January 20, 1950, at Knoxville, Tenn., by Mr. Maurice R. Franks, of Chicago. Mr. Franks is president of the National Labor-Management Foundation and editor of its official publication, Partners. His description of a Socialist is "one who has nothing, and is willing to divide it with everybody," or "a Communist with a haircut." The address is replete with many thought-provoking statements.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FREEDOM ISN'T FREE

Mr. Chairman, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen of Knoxville, I feel deeply honored to be with you tonight, and I am

grateful for this opportunity to speak to you on a subject of vital concern—vital to every man, woman, and child in these United States—yes, vital to our American way of life.

Now I wonder just what this audience would do were an abrupt announcement to be made over this same speaking system at this very moment that war No. 3 had just been declared. I venture to say that there wouldn't be many peaceful minds among us. Instinctively, our first thought would be as to the outcome. With stunned alarm we would wonder if our defenses were adequate to meet the onslaught. We would swiftly count the cost in men and money—and the greater cost of everything we would lose in the event of final defeat. For all of us would know very well that if we were to lose this war we would also lose at the final crack down all the liberties which presently belong to us as citizens of a free Nation. We would know that our very freedom was at stake.

All this would cross our minds in a single sickening flash if the news were suddenly to break in our ears that a new war had just been declared.

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that new war has been declared. We, the American people, are at war, and our present enemy is more ruthless, and I may add, more cunning than any other enemy we have yet encountered in our entire history. His weapons, by comparison, make the atomic bomb look like a cap pistol. For the atom bomb, when exploded, can destroy only a given area, a city, a certain spot of countryside—whereas our present enemy has devices which are capable of destroying our entire Nation overnight.

Now this may sound like a highly exaggerated statement, but I respectfully submit that it is nothing of the kind. For the target here is not a physical one. The target in our midst is the minds, not the bodies, nor the physical faculties of men—and a nation whose mind has been conquered will surely perish.

Who, then, are our opponents? Strange as it may seem, our immediate enemies are not the Communistic Russians, but a growing army of socialistically inclined Americans. These are the foes who are waging a dastardly war against the citizens of the United States and against everything our citizenship stands for. These are the enemies who are working day and night to wrest from us our most treasured possession—our freedom.

Indeed, the hour is one of great national crisis, and it is much later than many of us may think. The situation calls for some good hard knocks at our enemies, and I can think of no better group to do the job than this new organization, Fighters for Freedom. And, incidentally, I can think of no better place to get in some good hard knocks for our side than right here in Knoxville, Tenn.

We all in this country, especially we of the present generation, have become so accustomed to the American way of life that we make the easy assumption that the treasure of human freedom has always been ours to enjoy, and that it is by its very nature a permanent possession, one we don't have to fight to keep. To harbor such a notion is downright folly, for it is based upon anything but fact. The freedoms we enjoy today, and which are guaranteed us by the Bill of Rights of the Constitution of the United States, were not handed to our forefathers on a silver platter. A terrific price was paid for these freedoms. Our freedom was purchased by the blood of sacrifice, than which no greater price is possible. No, freedom isn't free. It didn't come to us as the result of a hand-out. Nor is it self-perpetuating. Let's keep that well in mind.

Freedom isn't free. It never was, and it never will be. It requires constant guardianship and a willingness to pay the price of eternal vigilance. This means that we of this generation must be awake to every threat and be prepared to fight off the array of forces which have arisen to deprive us of our most precious heritage—freedom.

THE ENEMY IS SOCIALISM

There is a great tendency these days to take the Socialist lightly, to set him down as a fair-haired child whose greatest sin is that he is simply badly mistaken. "Oh, the Socialists don't mean much," many of us are telling each other today. "They're just a bunch of silly idealists who don't quite know their way around. They're really good eggs at heart. Certainly, they don't mean to harm anybody"

To which I shout, "Baloney!" I've spent better than a quarter of a century in the labor movement. As a labor leader, I've bumped shoulders with Communists and I've bumped shoulders with Socialists. I've met plenty of both in every branch of organized labor, in union meetings and on the job, when the sailing was smooth and when the sailing was rough, and this much I say with the conviction born of experience: The only actual difference between a Socialist and a Communist is a hair-cut!

A Socialist, I have found, is no more than a slicked-up Communist, with a book instead of a bomb. He is just as vicious as his Communist pal, only somewhat more subtle and cunning. His social objective is precisely that of the Communist: In the holy name of the people to enslave the people; in the name of security to deprive them of all security; in the name of redistributing wealth to redistribute poverty; in the name of governmental operation to impose governmental domination; in the name of a planned democracy to inflict a damned autocracy; in the name of the New Utopia actually to create a new Siberia * * * In a word, the final aim and aspiration of the Socialist, like the final aim of the Communist, is to deprive you of your freedoms: your right to worship God in your own way; your right to own your own home; your right to live your own life in your own way, with due regard for the rights of your neighbor; your right to a job of your own choosing, and your further right to change that job when and as you yourself desire.

THE SOCIALIST WOULD DEPRIVE

The Socialist would deprive the farmer of his right to till his own soil in the manner he himself sees fit. The Socialist would deprive the teacher of the right to teach fact instead of fiction. The Socialist would deprive the doctor of the right to practice his profession in accordance with the dictates of his own conscience. The Socialist would deprive the union of its full right of collective bargaining. The Socialist would deprive the manager of the right to manage. In short, the Socialist would deprive. Period!

At the very outset, then, it should be obvious to all of us that the objectives of the Socialist are just about identical to those of the Communist, namely, the establishment on these shores of a government above the people, beyond the people, and against the people.

But what is more important is the fact that these Socialists—these Communists who have been to the barber shop—through their genteel appearance thus created have been able to gain full entrée into numerous segments of society, and are therefore in an excellent position to do a job of wrecking from within that cannot be done by their unkempt henchmen from without. * * * Which, may I suggest, accounts for the twinkle we detect in Uncle Stalin's eye. For Joe just wants a job done—and he doesn't give a hoot who does it, how it's done, or under what name it is perpetrated—whether the objective is reached via the road of communism, socialism, social planning, a planned economy, the welfare state, social democracy, or even perverted unionism. For Joe, too, knows that Bill Shakespeare was a pretty smart guy—and that communism, like the rose, by any other name is still his pet flower.

INVASION OF THE LABOR UNIONS

These Socialists of ours, in their war against Americanism, have mapped out some very clever strategy, and their generals are meeting with no small measure of success. They are particularly successful in their invasion of the labor unions of this country—many of which, knowingly or not, have practically surrendered to the Socialists.

Now far be it from me to stand upon this platform and accuse such men as Bill Green, Walter Reuther, Philip Murray, or John L. Lewis of being avowed enemies of our American form of government. And far be it from me to assert that any of these gentlemen would consciously lift a finger to aid or abet our national enemies, within or beyond our boundaries. In fact, it's a safe bet that all four of them would jump sky high if ever they were so accused. I can almost hear them shout in unison: "Certainly I'm not a Socialist. I'm an American. I hate socialism."

Well, if these big-time labor leaders, and dozens more in their class have not in fact surrendered to the Socialists, I wonder what they think they are doing when they seek to make of organized labor a political force? If they have not in fact put themselves in a position to serve a growing Socialist machine, I wonder what they think they are doing when they seek to solidify the labor vote and lend it without reservation to a political movement in every way contrived to foist the book of socialism—from A to Z—upon the people of this country? What do these gentlemen mean by "political action"? What is the political effect of the militant doctrines they preach day in and day out? What is the political significance of the class consciousness and class hatred which is their unwavering theme song? Are not the standardized antics of our big-time labor leaders but an accurate reflection of the antics of Britain's labor leaders, a few years back, when they surrendered lock, stock, and barrel to socialism and brought it into power in England?

ORGANIZED LABOR'S POLITICAL MESS

Certainly Messrs. Green, Reuther, Murray, and Lewis have pulled pretty far away from the teachings of Samuel Gompers, the patron saint of organized labor, who on many occasions warned the union men of this Nation against mixing up in party politics or selling out to any political faction which would use the labor movement as a stepping stone to political power. So long as Gompers was the leader of our Nation's union workers, he kept the unions out of politics and regarded collective bargaining as an economic and not a political issue. At every turn, Gompers applied the instrumentalities of collective bargaining, independent of governmental coddling.

Sam Gompers never forked over to any politician a half-million dollars of his union members' funds, as did John L. Lewis to Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Nor did Gompers on any occasion get his union into a mess by committing it to any political party, as Lewis endeavored to do on at least two important occasions. Gompers was smart enough to know that what the gods of politics create, the gods of politics can, and generally do, destroy. Had the labor leaders of Britain followed the example of Samuel Gompers, Great Britain today would still be the great economic force it was for centuries. When the British labor unions went political, they lost their souls to socialism and under governmental domination became nothing more than so many puppets on a string, and incidentally played a prominent part in reducing the British Empire to a condition of national and international poverty.

Walter Reuther, I have said, would be vociferous in his denial of any Socialist leanings. All right, Walter, let me ask you this: Where did you get the notion that the automobile manufacturers—such as General Motors, Ford, Nash, Studebaker, and the rest—can be operated by the Government except in a Socialist state? Whoever gave you the idea that the Government should build and operate steel plants? That the Government should erect and administer housing for workers? And whoever gave you the screwball notion that, if ever the Government did take over such industries as the automotive, steel, and housing, this economy of ours could possible hold together? Don't you know, Walter, that the moment such a situation comes to pass, the day of the investor will be a thing of the past—and that without stockholders, there can be little or no new enterprise? And with enterprise at a standstill, don't you also know, Walter, that you will have hordes of idle members, and that these present constituents of yours will of necessity degenerate into mere wards of an expanding Socialist government?

Where did you get this crackpot philosophy of yours, Walter? From the teachings of Samuel Gompers? Or did you pick it up over in Russia back in 1934, when you had a job in a Russian factory in Gorky?

No, Walter, you may not call your ideas socialism—you may have some fancier name for them, such as a "planned economy," or "the welfare state"—but no matter what you call them, they add up to nothing short of socialism. And, as such, they run counter to the best interests of this Nation—to say nothing of your own constituents whom you were elected to serve.

And now for you, Philip Murray. You don't look to me like a Socialist, or a Communist. But I'd be a coward if I didn't come right out and say that you do nevertheless look to me very much like a tool in their hands. Certainly the dogs of the collectivist program, both the long-haired and the short-haired breed, must be licking their chops as they study your maneuvers and manipulations which have repeatedly pushed the entire steel industry toward the brink of disaster—in the form of governmental control and eventual ownership. Probably you're not a Socialist, in either name or fancy, but for many a year you broke bread with gents of the Marxist stripe. Wasn't Lee Pressman, for example, an avowed Communist? And for several years didn't you accept his unholy guidance in matters economic as well as political? Possibly, then, some of the stain from those unwholesome contacts has remained with you. Possibly some of their foul teachings have stuck to your subconscious mind and, on important occasion, have influenced you to commit acts against the best interests of this Nation. Indeed, it appears that you have not always been content to let your unionism play second fiddle to your Americanism. Or am I wrong?

THE PRINCIPLE OF SAMUEL GOMPERS

As for me, I'll take a man of the Gompers type, a union leader who advanced the cause of organized labor immeasurably but always without sacrifice of a single iota of true Americanism—and with statutory odds against him. The principle of unionism as enunciated by Samuel Gompers was in its essence, "An honest day's pay for an honest day's work, and an honest day's work for an honest day's pay." And unless the labor movement gets back to this fundamental principle, the time is not far distant when unionism in this country will be as ineffectual as it is in Socialist Europe—where workers work on assigned jobs and where a change in job without specific permission from the powers that be may lead to a change in residence—behind bars, if you please—and where a strike is regarded as an act of treason punishable by death to the perpetrators.

And so—when the fancier ideas of governmental planning, welfarism, and more and greater securitism are dropped in our ears—by a labor leader, a college professor, or even a minister of the cloth—let's not stop to purr over the components. Let's consider the total package, which is, by accident or positive intention, communism pure and simple. Between us and the misty mirage of the Socialist utopia lie all the pitfalls of death to independence.

THE WEAPONS ARRAYED AGAINST US

Thus far, we have identified the enemy and spotted his main objective: the overthrow of our American form of government, our American way of life. Next, let's have a look at his weapons, the armament he is bringing to bear against the minds of our people:

First, there is his air force; the propaganda he drops to the effect that capitalism is outmoded and that the capitalist is the enemy of the people. His artillery is the falsehood he discharges to the effect that private enterprise creates business monopoly and human privation. The booby traps he lays before the unsuspecting are the enticements of a new security from the cradle to the grave: such as full employment, free pension, free medicine, and a long string of public welfare services. Finally, there is his big atomic bomb, which explodes upon the minds of the people and radiates the irresponsible doctrine that it is possible to loaf our way to prosperity.

All this is powerful ammunition in the war for the minds of our people. For who among us wouldn't desire the maximum standard of living for the minimum expenditure of effort? Who wouldn't love to live in the finest of homes, eat the finest of food, drive the slickest of cars, and wear the grandest of clothes; all with the greatest of ease? The promise of something for nothing makes a powerful emotional appeal, an appeal so strong that very frequently it cripples our better judgment.

But common sense should tell us that food doesn't fall like manna from heaven, that houses don't sprout from the ground, that cars don't grow on trees, and that clothes aren't the gift of the sun and the wind and the stars—that, in fact, nothing for man's use and enjoyment is in any way available to win without the expenditure of considerable effort both mental and physical—and that the most initiative we put forth, the more comforts and luxuries we can secure for ourselves. In a word, work is the basis of man's estate.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE OUR CAPITALISTS

Capitalism, free enterprise, the profit motive, these are but expressions of individual initiative striving for tangible incentives. And it was the free play granted by our form of government to this spirit of initiative which created this great capitalistic economy of ours and enabled it to progress to the point where our American standard of living has become the envy of the world. The philosophy upon which our dynamic economy is traditionally based is that he profits most who serves best.

Now this capitalism of ours, to be truly understood, certainly does not apply solely to the owners of industry, to our businessmen big or small, or to the financiers of Wall Street; it applies in comparative measure to every individual among us who has in his possession more than the bare necessities of life; it applies to the men and women who own their own homes, drive their own cars, can boast a change of raiment, and, if only moderately thrifty, have money in the bank, bonds, and insurance policies in the safe-deposit vault, and a personal plan of action in their minds.

Thus any attack upon capitalism here in the United States is not by any means an attack just upon Wall Street; it is no less an attack upon Main Street, and Home Street; yes, upon my street and your street, whoever we may be.

For we, the people of the United States, are the capitalists of this Nation, and it is against us that this war has been declared.

THE NATURE AND ORIGIN OF SECURITY

Curiously enough, the war cry of our enemies is "security." By hook or by crook, they would foist upon the minds of our people the erroneous belief that incentive and initiative are wrong; not only morally wrong, but also mathematically wrong in working out a formula for providing more and more things for more and more people. And this is the most insidious phase of their entire campaign against our way of life. For the principle of the free lunch—provided all citizens by the hand of a fond but costly bureaucracy—may be attractive to individuals not endowed by nature with gumption, but it is bum economics and a phony substitute for the authentic freedoms which render free lunches unnecessary.

Accepting the obvious fact that, by horizontal comparison, the standard of living of the American people under capitalism far exceeds the standard of living of any people under socialism, the fighters for a planned economy nevertheless invariably haul out their books of geography and triumphantly point to the fact that the North American Continent was blessed with an incomparable store of natural resources. Our magnificent standard of living, they argue, is due to those inexhaustible resources—and not to the dynamics of capitalism. But this is a phony of phonies, as we can see at a glance by making a vertical comparison.

For thousands of years, before the white men came to America, the red man held sway on this continent. For thousands of years before the white man arrived and set up his system of capitalism, the socialistic way of life was in full flower on these shores. But, although the American Indian had access to the iron ore of Minnesota, the oil of Pennsylvania and California and the great Southwest, the timber of limitless forests, prairie lands of stupendous fertility, together with the entire inventory of natural resources too numerous to mention, this socialistic-fed man of ours nevertheless lived out the total of his days ill-fed and ill-housed. Throughout the centuries, he was in practical effect a Socialist—without incentive, without the goads of personal ambition, without the rewards of initiative. He was and remained to the end a pauper in a treasure house, a beggar on the doorstep of paradise.

It took the capitalist, with his profit motive, to appreciate the significance of this abundance of natural resources. It took the capitalist, with the energy born of his ambition, to develop them fully—not only to the benefit of himself, but to the benefit of the multitudes as well. Yes, it took the capitalist to create for the first time on the North American Continent a platform for the ideal of real human security to rest upon.

SOCIALISM PARASITICAL

Socialism is therefore not a step forward, it is in reality a step backward into the unenlightened past. And in the event we lose this ideological war to the collectivists, I venture to say that it may not be too many years before the American people can just as well start painting their faces and sticking feathers in their hair—symbolically, at least—for their standard of living under the hand-to-mouth provisions of a planned economy will be rapidly collapsing to that of the redskins.

For socialism is not creative. It is not, as its promoters so loudly assert, paradisical—it is in its truest sense parasitical. It is not a system of give and take, it is a system of just plain take. Which suggests the true definition of a Socialist as a fellow who has nothing himself and is willing to share it with everybody.

Against the tide of progress, thus, the Socialists of this country would tear our system apart and give it back to the Indians. That is the nature of the war they are conducting against us. And that is why there is a job at hand for all fighters for freedom to perform.

If anyone were to step upon this platform tonight and right before our eyes were to attempt to tear this American flag of ours to shreds, it is doubtful he would leave this hall alive—for such an act would make every one of us fighting mad. But, ladies and gentlemen, this very thing is truly happening today—only not here in this particular hall, and not in a manner so crudely obvious. It isn't the American flag, as a piece of colored cloth, that the Socialist enemy would desecrate; the target of his sabotage is the main principle Old Glory stands for: Your freedom and mine.

I thank you.

Morocco Violates Treaty in War on American Traders

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Morocco Violates Treaty in War on American Traders," published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 28, 1950. The editorial deals with a matter which was under discussion when the ECA measure was before the Senate for consideration.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Editorial from Saturday Evening Post of January 28]

MOROCCO VIOLATES TREATY IN WAR ON AMERICAN TRADERS

It is a strange commentary on the strength of American diplomacy that an individual citizen should be forced to put on a one-man campaign to preserve the right of Americans to do business in a country in which this right is guaranteed by treaty.

Nevertheless this is what Robert E. Rodes, an American businessman and war veteran, has been doing for almost a year. He leads a group of thirty-odd veterans who set up export-import businesses in Casablanca, Morocco. Since 1836 Morocco has had a treaty with the United States according us unrestricted trading privileges equal to those of any other "Christian nations." Treaties signed in 1880 and 1906, countersigned by France, reaffirmed equal treatment of our trade in Morocco with that of France. Morocco looked like a good place for American businessmen to perform a useful function.

However, France has a protectorate arrangement in Morocco which seems to be interpreted in Paris as giving monopolistic commercial rights in Morocco to French businessmen. At any rate Mr. Rodes and his associates were soon subjected to various discriminations admitted by ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman to include "inequitable administration of certain exchange-control regulations, discriminatory valuation of imports for customs purposes, the application to Americans of a number of laws and regulations to which this Government has not given its assent," and to involve what Mr. Rodes calls an illegal embargo on many imports of American goods. The upshot of it all is that the Americans are being compelled to quit the field while their French competitors enjoy an unprecedented prosperity.

Inasmuch as France, which is thus acquiring economic monopoly in Morocco, is receiving a considerable sum from the United States under the European recovery program, it might be assumed that we had enough leverage to conduct a spirited defense of American commercial interests. The reality has been just the opposite. As Demaree Bess pointed out in the Post for June 18, 1949, the introduction of ECA money into the situation was taken to imply American support of French "exploitation" in Morocco, which we had opposed for many years.

Until ECA became a factor the State Department had protected American treaty rights, at least formally, and had protested Moroccan acts in defiance of them. But the fact that we had advanced money for French recovery apparently ended official concern for the right of American citizens to do business abroad. French authorities on December 30, 1948, issued a decree setting up embargoes and restrictions on our products, the result of which has been to turn over almost all our trade in Morocco to French cartels and other favored interests. The State Department first protested this action, then yielded to French pressure and accepted it for a 3-month period. After three other "temporary" periods the Department extended its assent indefinitely on December 31, 1949.

In continuing its approval of the French decree the State Department is ignoring repeated criticism in the Senate and is ignoring the evidence of discrimination to the State Department by Mr. Rodes and other businessmen and trade organizations at a public hearing. This hopeless attitude by a nation which is shelling out billions of dollars to promote the revival of trade among nations bodes ill for whatever success is to be expected from point 4—that is to say, the Truman plan for investment of American capital and know-how in undeveloped areas. If we can't protect the clear treaty rights of a small group of ambitious Americans to do business abroad, what is likely to happen to the billions we export under the chaperonage of bureaucrats and do-gooders?

Editorial Comment on Bill To Restrain Unreasonable Actions of Labor Monopolies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD three editorials—one from the Washington Evening Star, one from the New York World-Telegram and the Sun, and one from the Tampa Morning Tribune—commenting on Senate bill 2912, to restrain unreasonable actions of labor monopolies, which I introduced in the Senate on January 23.

[From the Washington Evening Star of January 25, 1950]

THE PEOPLE COME FIRST

The bill to amend the anti-trust law which has been introduced by Senator WILLIS ROBERTSON can be traced not to a desire to destroy unions, but to a growing realization that there must be some more effective legal protection of the public interest against abuse by the unions of their great power.

It seems to the Star that the introduction of this bill is a development of some importance. It may not have any immediate prospect of passage. Perhaps there is some better legislative approach to the problem. But here, at least, is a recommendation which has been carefully thought out, and which is based on a painstaking study of the facts and the present state of law as it applies to those facts. There will be some who will deny that there exists a need for such an amendment. But John L. Lewis is proving to be a persuasive witness on the other side of that proposition.

Senator ROBERTSON's proposal has to be appraised against the background of the immunity which labor has acquired by virtue of the laws and decisions of the Supreme Court.

The Sherman Act was passed in 1890. Congress did not intend in enacting that statute to sanction unreasonable restraint of trade by unions, and the Supreme Court so held. Then, in 1914, the Sherman Act was amended by adoption of the Clayton Act. In its pertinent sections, the Clayton act provided that labor organizations were lawful under the Sherman Act, and, further, that certain specific labor activities, such as peaceful picketing, could not be enjoined by the Federal courts. Neither of these enactments, however, gave unions immunity when they engaged in unreasonable restraints of trade or sought other illegitimate objectives.

The big departure came in 1932, when the Norris-LaGuardia Act was adopted. This act was an absolute prohibition, except in the narrowest circumstances, against any Federal injunction applicable to labor unions. Finally, in 1941, a five-man majority of the Supreme Court announced the decision in the Hutcheson case. The effect of this extraordinary decision was to go far beyond even the sweeping immunities extended by the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and to hold, for all practical purposes, that neither the criminal sections nor the treble-damage provisions of the Sherman Act could be invoked against any union activity arising out of any kind of labor dispute.

This was the green light. A period in which the injunctive power had often been flagrantly abused to the detriment of unions and reasonable union activity was succeeded by a period in which unions were put beyond the reach of any effective regulatory power. And it was not long before consequences which should have been foreseen began to be painfully evident. It soon became apparent that union leaders were not much different from industrial leaders. Given great and uncontrolled power, some of them would abuse it. And as the abuses grew it also became clear that all of the people, not just the big industrial bosses, were being made to suffer.

Senator ROBERTSON wants to bring this situation back into balance by amending the antitrust law. His amendment is not designed to interfere with the pursuit by unions of legitimate objectives. What it would do is best summed up in his own words: "The bill which I have offered would in plain and simple language remove the immunizing effect of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts from (union) conduct which up until 1941 had been almost universally branded as illegal and against the public interest, and which had always been regarded as outlawed by the Sherman Act. It would

leave the Government free to go into a court and it would leave the court free to put a stop to labor-union practices which are so detrimental to the national welfare that some remedy, beyond the temporary stopgap remedy of the Taft-Hartley Act, is essential to protect the people of this country. The Sherman Act would then again serve, as it originally served, as a brake on unions which seek to put their own activities ahead of the national welfare."

This, to many, will seem like a drastic proposal. It will seem increasingly less drastic, however, as the American people, whose welfare should come first, continue to suffer at the hands of irresponsible and uncontrolled unions and union leaders.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of January 25, 1950]

LABOR MONOPOLIES

Senator ROBERTSON, Virginia Democrat, sponsors a bill intended to protect the national economy, health, and safety against unreasonable use of monopoly power by labor unions. It merits earnest consideration by Congress.

In days when organized labor was weak, court interpretations of the Sherman antitrust law gave powerful employers an unfair advantage over unions. The Scripps-Howard newspapers were among labor's supporters in a long battle to correct that situation.

The 1914 Clayton Act, meant to serve that purpose, proved not fully effective. The 1932 Norris-LaGuardia Anti-Injunction Act went much further toward protection of unions. And, in 1941, a United States Supreme Court decision went too far.

It held that Congress, in the Norris-LaGuardia Act, intended union activities—licit or illicit, wise or unwise, right or wrong—to be exempt from antitrust prosecution if unions acted in self-interest and not in combination with nonunion groups.

By then, organized labor was no longer weak. Government, under President Roosevelt, had promoted vast growth of unionism in size and power. In many cases the power is monopolistic.

Union leaders can, and do, use it to restrain trade by restricting or stopping the national supply of commodities and services essential to public welfare, health, and safety. Because of it, John L. Lewis can decree that coal shall be mined only 3 days a week, or no days a week. And, because of that 1941 Supreme Court decision, Mr. Lewis and his rivals and imitators in the labor movement can do such things without fear of the antitrust laws which would crack down on employers if they dared to do them.

Senator ROBERTSON's bill proposes, in effect, to repeal the 1941 decision and to say that union activity undertaken for the purpose of restricting commerce to control production and prices is subject to, and can be punished by, the antitrust laws.

Legislating in this field is a difficult and delicate task. The need is to protect the public interest by curbing abuses of labor's monopolistic power while at the same time preserving labor's necessary rights.

The Robertson bill may not be the best possible approach to the problem. But the problem is real and pressing. Whether through the Robertson bill or otherwise, we believe, it is the duty of Congress to deal with it decisively and soon.

[From the Tampa (Fla.) Morning Tribune of January 24, 1950]

THE PINCH IS THE SAME

A new threat to John L. Lewis's iron-fisted control of the coal industry is contained in legislation proposed by Senator ROBERTSON, Democrat, Virginia, to make labor unions subject to antitrust action under certain conditions.

The bill would permit antitrust proceedings against unions when their actions constituted "unreasonable" restraint of trade affecting industries essential to the national economy, health or safety.

There is logic behind Senator ROBERTSON'S proposal. Under the autocratic rule of Lewis, the United Mine Workers are enforcing the tightest monopoly of a major industry whichever has afflicted this Nation's economy. Lewis lifts his hand and the mines shut down. He crooks a finger, and they open up again. He winks a cynical eye and the normal production of coal is cut 40 percent.

The recognized right of collective bargaining is not at issue here. The undisputed fact is that Lewis is deliberately restricting coal production—rationing the output of an essential product—in order to make coal scarce and thus force mine owners to grant higher pay.

Would the mine owners be permitted to create an artificial scarcity in this manner for the purpose of boosting prices? Certainly not. If they tried it, Government attorneys would slap an antitrust suit on their heads quicker than you could say Harry Truman.

Then are we as a Nation to have two kinds of justice—one for the union and another for the operators? Under present Federal laws, exempting unions from all monopoly restrictions, that is the situation. It doesn't follow the rules of fair play. It doesn't take into account the public welfare. It doesn't make any sense.

Senator ROBERTSON'S proposal may not get anywhere in an election-year Congress keenly conscious of labor's organized vote. It will, however, have the endorsement of a great part of the public. To the politicians, a monopoly operated by labor doesn't seem nearly so awful as a monopoly operated by capital, but to the consumer caught in the vise, the pinch is the same.

Depletion Allowances

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT McCARRAN
OF NEVADA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in view of the President's disturbing tax-message recommendations that depletion allowances for the mining industry be discontinued, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the National Minerals Advisory Council's report on tax revision, submitted to the Secretary of the Interior on December 7, 1949.

This heretofore unpublished report, prepared by an official advisory group representative of mineral producers and metal consumers, reasserts my previously expressed views that the mining industry if it is to survive and prosper must not have its tax burden increased as the President would suggest. Conversely, the tax load must be decreased, as the recommendations of the report set forth.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL MINERALS ADVISORY COUNCIL REPORT ON TAX REVISION OF DECEMBER 7, 1949

The exploration for and development of nonferrous and strategic metal and mineral deposits in the United States by individuals and smaller corporations has declined alarmingly. Work by larger corporations is principally in extending the initial enterprise of many individuals and small units. But even these corporations must consider the effect of their taxes and the taxes on their stockholders in determining whether the risk in new endeavor is worth while.

The members of the National Minerals Advisory Council have been selected by the Secretary of the Interior as representative of the industry and acquainted with its problems. It is their unqualified opinion that excessive taxation is a principal cause of the lack of interest in exploration for and development of new mineral reserves. Reduced tariffs and imports from depreciated-currency nations and other conditions have their effect, but our present taxation is such that the individual and the corporation qualified to carry on have little opportunity to recover their investments and still less possibility to realize a profit.

Incentive for mining exploration, development, and operation comes from hope of a gain sufficient to warrant the risk, the effort, and the investment involved. If gains are too greatly impaired by taxation, or if gains are taxed without full allowance for losses, there can be little incentive for new exploration, development, and investment.

The prospect of capital recovery free from tax will not in itself provide incentive. There must be the prospect of gain. But the taxation of capital recovery as if it were income, or the denial or limitation of losses as effective deductions from taxable income, greatly increase the risk and can virtually destroy incentive for finding and developing new mines. This is the situation under the tax provisions and high rates of our present laws.

To remedy these conditions the following changes in the tax structure as applied to mining must be made:

1. Allowance for depletion should be made to the stockholder as well as to the corporation.

Each distribution to stockholders should be considered to represent depletion to the same extent that depletion is allowed against income to the corporation.

2. Tax exemption should be granted to a mine for a period of at least 3 years after beginning of profitable operations.

Such an exemption would be most important in stimulating new development and discovery, as it has in Canada.

3. Development costs after discovery should be recognized as operating expenses.

Such development costs should not be treated as capital expenditures, recoverable through depletion. Their nature and purpose is for operation of and production from the known deposit. The taxpayer should have option to charge them off currently or to treat them as operating costs when the ore related to such expenditures shall be mined.

4. Adequate allowances for percentage depletion should be made.

The present percentage of gross income and the present limitation in reference to net income for mines should both be increased.

5. Losses from unprofitable ventures should be allowed corporations, partnerships, or individuals as ordinary deduction against current income.

When a mine is abandoned or becomes unprofitable or when exploration or development work has not proven the existence of a profitable mineral deposit, or when a shareholder sustains a loss on liquidation of the

corporation, the loss should be allowed in full as a deduction from income.

6. Income should not be taxed without full allowance for losses of loss years.

A carry-back for 2 years and a carry-forward of 5 years should be allowed. Depletion and other deductions and credits should be allowed as if the loss year and the income year were a single taxable period.

The Council recommends that Federal tax laws be modified to include the changes outlined in this report as approved at its meeting of December 7, 1949.

The Red Peril of the National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. KEM
OF MISSOURI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial recently published in the St. Louis Star-Times entitled "The Red Peril of the National Debt."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE RED PERIL OF THE NATIONAL DEBT

A study by the Brookings Institution proposes that the present patterns of old-age and survivors' insurance be replaced with a genuine pay-as-you-go system. Many people who have seen the deductions on their pay checks may be surprised to learn that the present system is not a genuine pay-as-you-go.

Well, it's not.

It started out on a sound actuarial basis in 1937. But since then Congress has been increasing the benefits and including more people, because this is popular. But it has not been raising the contributions at a rate equal to the obligations undertaken, because to do so would be unpopular. Congress is able to do this for a while, because at first the people who pay into the fund are more than those who take out of it. But eventually, and relatively soon now—1955, 1960, depending on management of the fund in the meantime—the pay-off will come. In view of that pay-off, the Social Security System's present deficit is more than $8,000,000,000, and it is growing every year.

A social-security system that prepared to meet future costs by adequate present contributions, the way a sound private insurance program does, would make sense.

A social-security system that paid for current costs out of current taxation, the way the Brookings' study proposes, would make sense.

But the present so-called Social Security System does neither. It is crazily backward. It is counting on future taxation to meet obligations assumed in the present.

The American people do not know how much the future costs will be. The Brookings study estimates that if the recommendations of Mr. Truman's administration are adopted, the total costs of old-age and survivors benefits, compulsory health insurance, public assistance, and veterans' benefits will range between $26,000,000,000 and $41,000,000,000 annually by 1970, and between $33,000,000,000 and $55,000,000,000 annually by 2000.

Will the productive people of those generations be able to pay for this?

Without adding up the costs of his program, President Truman assumes that they will. He is counting on a continually expanding national income.

If the increase in income merely expresses a decrease in the purchasing value of the dollar, then the dollars received by the aged and their survivors will buy less. If the increase in income expresses an increase in real income, it must be brought about by greater productivity. This can come about only by a sound economic system.

In a speech before the Economic Club of New York, Tuesday, Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, said that the soundness of our economic system is threatened by continued deficit financing.

In his tax message, President Truman vaguely promised that his present program would lead to a balanced budget, because, he said, a number of present expenditures could be reduced in the future.

Which ones?

The military? This item is likely to increase.

Foreign aid? This item also is likely to increase when the program of developing undeveloped areas is started.

Social-welfare programs? President Truman is urging that they be expanded.

And just over the horizon is looming the day of reckoning when the obligations of the present social-security program have to be met out of current taxation.

The American Government has no obligation to its citizens or to its allies that takes priority over the obligation to try to maintain a healthy economy. For the ability of fulfill all other obligations rests upon this.

The best way for the Government to promote the security both of the Nation and of the individual citizen is for it to adopt what Dr. Nourse calls for—a specific and hard-headed plan of getting back to black ink.

A Cut for Soldiers' Home

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Cut for Soldiers' Home," published in the Washington Times-Herald of today.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CUT FOR SOLDIERS' HOME

Harry Truman and his deficit-financing cronies are still wailing that they can't balance the national budget unless they boost taxes. They shrink with horror at the suggestion that Government expenses be cut.

That is, they do when their pets like foreign spending and farewell state projects are mentioned. But when they get down to something that ought to be none of their business, boy, can they cut.

MESS RATION SLASHED

For example, the Budget Bureau has ordered a 16-percent trim in the daily mess and dairy rations of the veterans of Soldiers' Home.

The present daily mess ration is 74 cents. The Budget Bureau wants to cut it to 61 cents next year.

The home is maintained by funds paid in fines and assessments by the men in the Regular Army, and a lot of the food is raised right on the big farm on which the home is situated.

Col. D. C. Cordiner, deputy governor of the home, points out that the Army's ration has been cut only 3 percent.

What kind of sense does this make, Harry? Let the old soldiers eat their own food.

Government Silver Purchases

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial published in the Deseret News, of Salt Lake City, Utah, on January 25. The article is entitled "Government Silver Purchases and Sound Hard Money Policy."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOVERNMENT SILVER PURCHASES AND SOUND HARD-MONEY POLICY

The Government's silver-purchase program is under attack by several Congressmen. Senator GREEN, Democrat, of Rhode Island, constant silver foe, has again introduced his perennial bill to repeal the Silver Purchase Act, and a Joint Subcommittee of the Committee on Economic Report has recommended abandonment of the program.

Admittedly, the silver-purchase program is far from perfect and it may not be wholly sound from a fiscal or monetary standpoint. Under it, silver is a sort of freak hybrid, neither quite all commodity nor wholly money, but having some of the characteristics of both.

Even so, neither the substance nor the motives of much of the attack on the silver program should go unchallenged. First, it seems only fair to mention that the perennial ringleader of the opposition, Senator GREEN, hails from New England, headquarters of most of the big silver manufacturers. Naturally, they would like to see silver wholly as a commodity and dirt cheap, so that they could make more profit on their articles.

But reports indicate that most of the big silver-manufacturing companies already are fabulously rich, and many of them are owned by families or groups that are so small they deem it unnecessary to issue annual reports.

Against their narrow interest of bigger profits is balanced, not just the interest, but the very survival of much of the country's nonferrous metal mining industry, one of the cornerstones of the entire western economy. On which side does the public interest rest?

These critics of the purchase program complain that it is a costly subsidy to silver producers. There are those who will debate that charge, but suppose for a moment that it is true. You don't hear these same Congressmen cry out against Government subsidies on farm products, air-mail haulage, public housing, education, etc., and the proposed subsidies on medicine and nearly everything else. So why is prostrate silver

mining and its thousands of dependents such a beam in their eye?

But is the silver-purchase program nothing but a costly subsidy? It is true the act directs the United States Treasury to purchase all newly mined domestic silver at the fixed price of 90.5 cents a fine ounce, a figure that is often, but not always, above the world price. But it must not be forgotten that Uncle Sam coins some of this silver and issues currency against most of the remainder at the rate of $1.29 cents per ounce. In other words, the Government makes a seigniorage profit of 38.5 cents on every ounce of domestic silver it purchases, and, in the aggregate, this profit exceeds the total profit made by the owners of the underground mines producing silver. How do the critics figure a loss out of that?

The opponents also complain that the silver program is continuously expansionary and that it is not needed because all the paper money necessary can be issued by the Federal Reserve banks without the silver backing. That argument is inconsistent. Surely silver-backed currency is less expansionary and inflationary than currency backed by nothing. Down through the years the production of silver, as well as gold, and the production of the two metals, has held to a fairly constant pattern. But there has been nothing dependable or constant about printing-press currency.

To be wholly consistent, silver's antagonists would have to attack gold purchases and the entire idea of backing paper money with precious metal. But the soundest economists on both sides of the political street today are thumping for a return to the gold standard as a means of taking currency manipulation away from Government and providing an automatic check on currency inflation.

After the present orgy of Government spending, currency inflation, the trend certainly should be back to, instead of away from, hard money.

Why Should American Soldiers Live Like Pigs?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, the Februrary 14, 1950, issue of Look magazine carries an article entitled "Why Should American Soldiers Live Like Pigs?" dealing with the housing conditions in our outposts in Alaska and in the southern Pacific. I ask unanimous consent to have the article published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY SHOULD AMERICAN SOLDIERS LIVE LIKE PIGS?—WITH THE THERMOMETER IN ALASKA AT 60 BELOW ZERO, SERVICEMEN AND THEIR FAMILIES ARE LIVING IN HOVELS. IT'S THE RESULT OF TOO LITTLE TOO LATE, AND IT IS A SERIOUS THREAT TO MORALE ON OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

(By Dr. Daniel A. Poling)

A few days ago I received the following letter from Alaska:

"DEAR DR. POLING: You probably won't remember me, any more than you remember any of us up here—but you visited our shack last May and said you were going to do something about it. My husband is a sergeant and we have a boy and girl. The four of us are still living in the one-room shack you visited. We are still carrying water in buckets across those muddy fields in all that slush that got your shoes and socks wet. We still use oil lamps and we still take turns emptying our toilet (a galvanized pail) in the ditch my husband dug out near the trees on the other side. And we are still paying $140 a month rent.

"Any day now the temperature will go to 60 degrees below zero. We've had a hundred visitors like you promise that something would be done before winter sets in, but now it's too late. I still believe that if Americans knew we are living like wharf rats up here, they would do something about it. Why haven't you told them?

"As far as I can see, the only money they raise in Washington is for Europeans. We Americans who are defending the frontier up here in Alaska should have been born in Italy or Germany. Then we would be eligible for the Marshall plan.

"Yours truly,

"——— ———."

This letter fills me with a deep sense of humiliation and personal condemnation. When I returned from my 6 weeks' flying trip through the Pacific, I made a lengthy and documented report. Then, speaking as a private citizen, I wrote letters, I talked to all who would listen—and still nothing was done. Now, so help me God, I shall cry to high heaven.

Comfortable living quarters for our armed forces and their families are a responsibility which we have failed to meet. The result has been broken homes, lowered moral standards and a general weakening in our defenses. In Alaska and Okinawa, particularly, we have failed. Living conditions in Anchorage and Fairbanks are worse than those in shack towns on city dumps. The barracks in Fairbanks at Ladd Air Force Base, originally constructed for 2 years' occupancy at the most, are powdery inflammables now. An engineer told me: "If an over-heated stove ever blows up in subzero weather, those boys wouldn't have time to roll out of their bunks."

Promises were made to these boys that living quarters would be provided with only reasonable delay. What is reasonable delay? It was September 2, 1945, when Japan signed the final surrender papers. Today, the families of servicemen in Alaska are still living in abandoned railway cars, in cellars, in plywood boxes without even the most rudimentary facilities.

A DANGEROUS SITUATION

Small wonder that morale is deteriorating and that a dangerous situation exists. Governor Ernest Gruening of Alaska states: "The high command in Alaska—Army, Navy, Air Force—is very seriously concerned. It is obvious that, in the event of war with Russia, Alaska would be the first point of attack. But it has been impossible to get Congress to make the appropriations urgently recommended by the military. As it is, Alaska could be taken tomorrow by even a minor scale airborne invasion. * * *"

The services themselves are doing all they can—with too little help from churches and agencies at home—to keep morale high. But without such minimum essentials as decent housing, they are severely handicapped.

True, Congress did finally pass a bill authorizing appropriations for Alaska. But it was an inadequate one, influenced by the hue and cry for economy, and it was not put through until just before adjournment of the last session of Congress. Then it was too late to get the work done. Meantime, winter closed down relentlessly and our boys—your boys—were still wretchedly housed.

Yes, I know what it costs to get a bag of cement to Alaska. But I also know that whatever the cost of cement, men, women, and children are even more costly. We cannot afford to waste and embitter these people.

However acute conditions are elsewhere—and they are acute in many places—Alaska is the No. 1 spot.

Last April, flying from Honolulu to Johnson Island, I met an Air Force captain who had just completed his year with the airlift in Germany. With his wife and two children, he was going to Johnson, a tiny thumb spot in the Pacific for 12 months' duty. He was looking forward to a very happy and profitable year. "Extra pay, no income tax and no chance for the kids to get lost," he said. "Now we'll really get acquainted." Johnson Island is remote, to be sure, but it has just about everything, including radio, movies, and climate. Compared to Alaska, Johnson is a little bit of heaven.

I spent Palm Sunday on Guam, where a truculent major said: "We've paid a thousand dollars for each coconut tree here. The per capita wealth of Guamanians is $7,000 against our $600. They don't need to produce copra any longer."

He was paying $120 a month rent for his house while the same quarters to a civilian were $45. Yet the civilian drew $2,000 a year more in salary. There was a 50 percent housing shortage on Guam. On Okinawa, it was a 70 percent shortage, with hurricanes to complete the picture. But Guam and Okinawa at their worst are definitely better than Alaska.

APPALLING COSTS

I know that overseas construction costs are appalling. The most primitive type of house on a Pacific island or in the Philippines represents an investment of $50,000 or even more.

Civilian construction workers are another problem. The turn-over is rapid; few of them stay more than 6 months. But considering the inadequate food and billeting provided for them by the construction companies, this is not surprising.

Still, if we could act with the speed and determination we showed in the early days of the war, we could keep faith with our servicemen in Alaska and elsewhere.

When I visited Alaska in May, the commanding officer expressed the opinion that if a civilian contractor in the United States were put on the job of building housing units immediately, there would be some hope of relieving the situation. But that was 9 months ago. Even the appropriation was not authorized until October.

Nine months ago in Anchorage, I saw skeleton steel that had been gathering rust for 2 years. I was told that more than $25,000 would be required to get rid of the rust before work could proceed on barracks to house 4,000 men. But that rust still accumulates and waste adds a staggering amount to the already great need. Only one of the proposed structures was ready before January 1.

GYMNASIUMS NEEDED

Not only living quarters are needed, but recreation buildings as well. Gymnasiums, swimming pools, bowling alleys, and the like are much more imperatively needed in places like Okinawa, Alaska, and the Philippines than they are in training camps in the States.

For it must be remembered that few American boys, removed from their communities in peacetime and assigned to duty in a pioneer area, are psychologically, culturally, or spiritually equipped for their new life. Without the dangers and diversions of a shooting war, they are at a loss to occupy their time. Without intending to, most American communities have developed a parasitic type of human who allows other people to provide his entertainment and diversion. We are radio-listening, game-at-

tending, movie-going, auto-riding, television-watching creatures. We are rarely called upon to operate under our own power.

Thus, when boys and young men are confined for 2 years or more within the tiny boundaries of Clark Field in the Philippines or on Okinawa or in Alaska, they simply don't know how to occupy their time. This leads to excessive drinking and other problems.

The problem of drinking is nothing new to the services. Yet in 6 weeks' traveling throughout the Pacific and the Far East, I did not see a single man in uniform under the influence of liquor on the street or in a public place. This does not, unfortunately, hold true for clubs and private parties. Certainly, the services should require that soft drinks be make available everywhere, including all social functions. General MacArthur insists upon this in all areas under GHQ jurisdiction. There is no stigma to soft drinks, and the nondrinker is not unpopular unless he is otherwise a bore. The major criticism regarding the handling of hard liquor overseas is its ready availability—to officers, at least—and its low cost. Too many young men assigned to overseas posts for 2 or 3 years have too much time on their hands. With bourbon at $1.50 a bottle, too many turn to liquor.

PEACETIME PROBLEMS

During wartime, we had millions of men overseas, but we were accustomed to a greatly reduced peacetime force. Thus when our armed forces began to expand in 1948, we were unprepared for the needs of these men who, free from war's stimulation of both fear and patriotism, still must stay abroad for an indefinite period of time.

On my trip, I found that practically all commands favored USO traveling shows or their equivalent. But they also wanted to make sure that such shows did not deteriorate in quality after leaving New York and become loose and bawdy by the time they reached the post. All were agreed that commanding officers should have direct and unquestioned control over these troupes.

Leadership of the USO in the field of hobbies and special interests is even more vital. But much is needed in the way of equipment and facilities—not to mention capable men and women to direct such activities. I talked with one sergeant in Hawaii who was so interested in his outfit's local theatrical program that he hadn't been to fabulous Honolulu for 2 months. He was too busy to go.

THEY DESERVE BETTER

Every command I visited spoke in the very highest terms of the service rendered overseas by the American Red Cross. In spite of this, there are occasional disappointments and even tragedies. Too often in the Pacific, men approved for emergency furloughs could not get planes to take them back. Operation "Vittles" in Germany was making heavy demands on our aircraft. But none of the men, no matter how tragically deprived of a last sight of a loved one, blamed the Red Cross. They suffered inconveniences and sorrows, but this was not the fault of the services. And it is precisely because the spirit of the men is so determined and so willing that I say they deserve better—far better—than we are giving them, particularly in housing.

I am only a civilian, and it would be impertinent for me to recommend how the services should be run. Our own failures right here at home shame me and I feel uncomfortable about offering suggestions to anyone. But I know what I saw in Alaska and elsewhere, and I must speak out.

The young wife and mother who wrote me that letter is making a desperate attempt to hold her family together in spite of terrible conditions. There are thousands like her. While the divorce rate in the United States remains disgracefully high, these young families on our military frontiers are fighting against enormous odds to maintain family life.

In spite of their courage and determination, some fine families have been broken as the indirect result of bad housing—or no housing at all. Character-guidance councils are doing fine work in the services, but they cannot win against squalor and constant discomfort.

Many marriages are broken, of course, when the wife and husband are separated by regulations barring wives—or when there is simply no place for them to live. When divorce becomes inevitable, the services do their best to protect the men.

Everywhere, I found the Army, Navy, and Air Force seriously concerned with promoting character guidance. Commanding officers and departmental chiefs are cooperating to step up information and education programs. Results today may be modest, but there has been far more progress than our home communities have shown. Character guidance is no longer merely VD control.

TOO FEW CHAPLAINS

Another powerful influence in keeping morale at a high level—in spite of separations and filthy living conditions—is the chaplain. He has assumed a place in military life which he never before enjoyed. But there are, alas, still too few chaplains and too many things for the few to do.

Chaplains at Clark Field in the Philippines, and the character-guidance council, suggested that an effort be made by local church councils in America to encourage young seminary graduates to prepare for a tour of duty in the chaplaincy. There would be no better way to give a clergyman a proper lifetime perspective. Living and working with troops for at least a year, preferably just at the conclusion of seminary training, would be helpful for all concerned.

What the services are doing in a spiritual way should make all of us at home ashamed of our own negligence. Home churches of all faiths seldom seem to show much interest in the spiritual and moral well-being of their young men overseas. A chaplain on Okinawa told me that 12 men of his command had been baptized and united with the church while under his guidance. In each instance, he wrote the home church and also the boy's parents. Only one clergyman acknowledged his letter.

Chaplains are deeply concerned with the problem of morals, particularly among teenage GI's. It is almost unanimously agreed that an 18-year-old boy is too young for overseas duty. I was told that 85 percent of the VD cases in Korea during 1947 and 1948 were among the 17- and 18-year-olds. If this is true, it is an indictment of community indifference at home and of the failure of the American people—the American churches, particularly—to support the moral safeguards and the religious guidance opportunities recommended by the Compton Commission.

THE CHURCHES' FAILURE

The religious press and religious leaders had much to say in opposition to what they called peacetime conscription. But they did little or nothing to support a program for safeguarding the morals of youth and for giving young servicemen comprehensive religious guidance. In these particulars, the armed services and commanding officers generally, with their chaplains, have done far more than our leaders at home.

Last summer, I wrote that civilization had pushed the legalized bawdy houses and the "line" back as far as Fairbanks, Alaska. But with the issuance of a new Army order declaring all houses of prostitution "off limits," the situation should improve. There was never any justifiable reason to allow a "line" of wide-open bawdy houses to operate 2 miles from a large military installation which is the principal support of Fairbanks itself. Hard-headed and realistic Gen. Dale Gaffney of Ladd Air Force Base had already made progress on the problem before the blanket order was issued. The churches had also made constructive efforts to meet the situation.

UNNECESSARY SHIFTING

While the services are doing fine work in maintaining morale, I feel that in one department a more realistic policy is needed. This is in job assignment. In an attempt to give every man a "well-rounded background," men are sometimes moved from positions to which they are suited to less compatible work. I an officer is a genius in automotive maintenance, I question the advisability of taking him from that job for 2 or 3 years to give him experience in personnel management, for which he may have not the slightest aptitude or inclination. We do not do it in civilian life. Why should we do it in the services?

One other problem remains for the services to solve. This is the problem of equalizing standards of treatment. Inequities exist, not only between civilian and military standards (as in the case of the major on Guam), but also among the services and the ranks within them. The balance does not always favor the civilian. A $6,000 civilian Army employee living in Tokyo without his family is entitled to a tiny, shabby room in a second-rate hotel. A full colonel gets a large and comfortable house, with three servants, free of charge. These standards and others comparable to them are established by Washington, not by theater commanders. An officer in Alaska gets 10 percent extra pay, a civilian 25 percent. An officer assigned to the University of Alaska gets additional pay allowances, while an officer living next door, but not assigned to the university, does not.

Cigarets are sold by the Navy for one price, and across the street by the Army for another. Navy movies are free, but soldiers and air men have to pay for theirs. An air man in Alaska must stay 15 months, a soldier 18. Some of these things are small, but they often add up to the difference between contented and discontented men and women.

There are great distinctions between the various units of the Army command on Okinawa, and even greater distinctions between Air Force and Army installations. Changes can't be made in a day, but they are needed. Some of them may be speeded by the unification program, and I believe unification is imperative.

BOLD EXPERIMENT

One experiment in unification is worth noting. Three services in Hawaii have combined their MP units. The MP's work in teams of two, one from each service. The sailor MP (shore patrol) can arrest soldiers, and the Army or Air Force MP can arrest sailors. Besides realizing a great saving in personnel, money, and vehicles, the experiment is significant psychologically. It seems to be paying off.

The services can, however, do just so much themselves. The rest is up to Congress and the American people. Unless decent living quarters are forthcoming, all the work of chaplains, Red Cross, post commanders, and all the others connected with remote bases will be largely in vain.

At its last session, Congress authorized $133,400,000 for Alaska, but much of this was for radio and radar installations. Now the summer is past, the harvest is ended, and I am not saved from a sense of personal failure with regard to my promises to the wrechedly housed families in Alaska.

"We thought you'd do something about it," said my letter from Alaska. Well, little lady up there under the Arctice Circle, with more courage and loyalty in your soul than I

have been able to find in mine, we don't deserve it, but forgive us if you can.

And to the gentlemen on Capitol Hill. God pity us all for not doing even the impossible—putting that young mother and hundreds like her in decent, safe quarters before the thermometer in Alaska dropped to 60 below.

Army Engineers Earn Praise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I set forth a splendid editorial entitled "Army Engineers Earn Praise," which appeared in the Shreveport Journal, of Shreveport, La., under date of February 1, 1950:

ARMY ENGINEERS EARN PRAISE

Reports from Washington convey the impression that the retention of flood control, inland waterway improvement and kindred projects and service as the privilege and responsibility of the United States Army engineers is being threatened. The threat, which appears dangerous, is contained in the Government reorganization plan of the national administration. The proposed divorcement of authority now held by the Army engineers would be unwise especially because it would place the work under a civilian agency, which obviously would have political handicap. Such handicap now is not in existence. The Army engineers do their work without regard to politics but with the idea of planning and accomplishing bank protection, flood control, and other such tasks from which the people will gain the largest measure of benefits. These engineers, as shown by their long period of successful performance of duty, meet their responsibilities as soldiers in combat against military foes. They accept their assignments, and loyally strive to fulfill them.

Recently we had the privilege of hearing an informal talk by one of the Army engineers of this district, during which he mentioned various projects developed, under way and planned for the territory including all of Louisiana. Millions have been expended on these projects, resulting in untold benefits to the public. The engineers have met their responsibility satisfactorily. There has been nothing political involved. Every citizen having the facts given in that talk would oppose plans to put others in charge.

Among the many groups protesting against the national administration's plan to transfer this service from the Army engineers to a civilian authority is the Red River Valley Improvement Association, through which much of the waterway improvements hereabouts have come about and been promised. Members of this organization, many of them Shreveport citizens, realize the potential hazards resulting from political authority in determining projects, how they are to be built and other operations now having the capable, unhampered attention of Army engineers, men of proved ability and reputation, who do their duty as they see it regardless of what this or that political representative may say or wish to say.

Had the plan now being urged at Washington been in effect some of the projects serving this territory would probably not have been authorized. The proposed transfer from the Army group to those under civilian direction would offer abundant reason for speculation and doubt. By all means, the existing setup, with the Army engineers continuing inland waterways service they have been in charge of for many decades, should go unchanged.

The Red River Valley Improvement Association and other protestants are doing a thoughtful service to this section and others in the great river valleys in trying to prevent the materialization of the national administration's plan to order cessation of the Army engineers' control.

Inconsistency of Government Planning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us known as the cotton bill is supposed to set up the machinery for establishing quotas to the various cotton growers throughout the United States. In other words, it is limiting the amount of cotton which can be grown. The Department of Agriculture has estimated that cotton growers of the United States will receive at least $750,000,000 from the Government this year, either as price-support payments or for export cotton purchased under the Marshall European-aid plan.

My purpose in speaking now is not to criticize that plan but to call to your attention the fact that we have a most serious threat of overproduction of farm crops staring us in the face. In view of these facts, we find the Department of Interior, and particularly the Bureau of Reclamation, advocating the authorization of a project known as the central Arizona project, a project which is not only not economically feasible but would supply water to an area which would raise more cotton and other farm products which are surpluses today, and they are doing this also in the face of facts wherein this Congress is attempting to cut down all new lands to 9 percent of previous quotas and, in fact, eliminating any new land.

Yes, the Bureau of Reclamation is advocating the central Arizona project which proposes to use water which it does not own, lift it nearly twice as high as the Washington Monument, convey it farther than from Washington to New York at a cost to the Federal Treasury of from three quarters of a billion dollars to a billion and a half dollars, to irrigate 200,000 acres of privately owned war-boom desert land which would not be required to repay any of the construction cost, for raising crops which are now surplus in this country.

I might go still further and say that not 1 cent of interest will be paid on this project and the cost of interest to the Government for the money for which it will have to borrow will be $465,000,000. Surely there should be some consistency between the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation.

Why Was Hiss Protected?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the January 26, 1950, issue of the Peoria Star, entitled:

WHY WAS HISS PROTECTED?

Alger Hiss, once a confidential adviser to a President of the United States, once an important personage in the Department of State, and secretary of the conference which wrote the United Nations Charter, stands convicted of perjury. Since the perjury involved matters pertaining to espionage, the conviction brands him also as a spy.

Whittaker Chambers' revelations which led to the conviction of Hiss are not new. They were given to high officials of the United States Government 11 or 12 years ago. A lot of powerful protection in higher places was necessary in those years to keep Hiss out of trouble. Why was he protected?

President Roosevelt knew the story. He either refused to believe it or didn't care.

Two Justices of the United States Supreme Court appeared at the first Hiss trial as character witnesses for Hiss. Justice Felix Frankfurter, who recommended Hiss as a law clerk to the late Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes; and Justice Stanley F. Reed, for whom Hiss worked in the Department of Justice, took the stand to praise Hiss' character.

Secretary of State Dean Acheson long ago knew the story but it is not recorded that he was influenced one way or another by it.

Gov. Adlai Stevenson, of Illinois, allowed his name and influence to be used to try to establish a good character for Hiss.

The Federal judge who conducted the first Hiss trial was assailed in Congress for showing partiality to Hiss, and impeachment proceedings were mentioned in the House.

Probably a long list of other influences which were brought to bear in Hiss' favor could be added. Certainly no spy ever had such an impressive group of powerful friends.

Even President Truman sneered that the trial of Hiss was nothing but a "red herring" being dragged across the trail of the mistakes of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

We think that many Americans, outraged by the spectacle of 11 or 12 years of official protection for Hiss, are going to be morbidly unhappy unless an effort is made by Congress to explain that protection.

The protection of Hiss is a worse scandal by far than the revelation of his crime. It is a gross offense against the American people. They are right in demanding that every individual who had a part in the protection of Hiss be called upon to explain. Let the whole sordid story be brought out in the open, just as the wartime graft and the 5 percenters stories were.

Let each citizen now ask the Members of Congress who represent him, "Why was Hiss protected?" And let him continue asking until the question is answered.

Cooperative Housing Projects Called Pattern of Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the House Banking and Currency Committee today commenced its public hearings on the Spence bill, H. R. 6618, to assist cooperative and other nonprofit corporations in the production of housing for families of moderate income.

The article which appeared in the Sunday, January 29, 1950, New York Herald Tribune by Joel W. Schenker could not have appeared at a more propitious time.

Mr. Schenker is an expert in the cooperative housing field. His building firm, the Roth-Schenker Corp., pioneered in the construction of the Bell Park Gardens mutual project for 800 families in Queens, N. Y.

His article follows:

COOPERATIVE HOUSING PROJECTS CALLED PATTERN OF FUTURE

(By Joel W. Schenker)

Broad lawns, trees, and shrubbery, spacious play areas. On the green expanse attractive garde· apartment buildings. In these apartments happy families enjoying a degree of living few of them dreamed of having—at carrying charges of only $14 a room.

This is not to wax lyrical. At the Roth-Schenker Corp. we believe this back drop is basic in any discussion of middle-income cooperative housing.

For when we discuss housing we discuss people. And when we discuss people in relation to housing there is this inescapable fact to be faced: that there are people earning from $3,000 to $5,000 a year for whom there is little or no housing. There are people who find themselves in the unhappy position of earning too much to be eligible for public housing projects, and of earning too little to permit them to buy or rent adequate and decent houses or apartments at present prices.

These are the people who obviously need cooperative housing. Housing that is decent, and is the kind they can afford.

BELL PARK GARDENS CITED

Bell Park Gardens, which has been called the pilot project in the 1949–50 era of cooperative housing, was erected by the Roth-Schenker Corp. As the builders, we were afforded the opportunity of studying mutual housing from the inside out, rather than from the outside in.

Without exploding any bombshell we can say frankly that this observation at first hand has convinced us of the need for cooperative housing as the only means of easing the situation in which the lower middle-income group finds itself.

From an academic viewpoint this so-called finding as it relates to the need, was not new to us, nor will it be to others in the industry. It always has been known. Over the years there always has been a shortage. Not in terms of units perhaps, but in terms of adequate and decent housing. Shortages in terms of housing at the right price.

From another viewpoint, however, the findings were startling. Working with these people we were struck with the cold, hard reality of their situation. It is one thing to know in an academic fashion that a need exists. It is quite another thing to experience it as something real.

PARADISE REGAINED

Individually and collectively the Bell Park cooperators are a testimonial to mutual housing—to its need and at the same time to its benefits. For these people came out of what might be called a housing hell where they were doubled up and tripled up, or living in substandard dwellings, and into a housing heaven where they can breathe their own air, live the good life, and realize the dream of Home, Sweet Home.

But these Bell Park families are only 800 families. There are hundreds, thousands more here, and North, South, and West. What about them?

The answer, of course, is mutual housing on a large scale, on a scale never before blueprinted. We know of no other way of solving or even coming close to solving the problem which besets America's lower middle-income families.

Mutual housing enables these families to enjoy better apartments priced at levels they can afford. Well planned mutual housing does not demand a disproportionate amount of their monthly income. Mutual housing takes these families out of the rut of old hand-me-down apartments. Mutual housing provides a healthier environment that aids not only the one family, but eventually accrues to the benefit of the community as a whole.

If there is any other way whereby the lower middle-income group can gain such advantages it has escaped us.

The builder and the industry as a whole have much to gain through cooperative housing. And again we can speak from experience. In agreeing to erect Bell Park we acceded to a contract limiting profits. This was an experiment for us. It has turned out to be eminently fair for all concerned. We received a fair return out of this arrangement, and the cooperators will share e.cess profits, adding them to their reserves and thereby reducing their charges.

This is one economy in mutual housing, but perhaps the greatest economy comes about through a centralization of effort in that builder who combines, as we did with Bell Park, "know-how," background, and experience with financial resources. Combined, these are the factors that take a mutual housing development over the humps in the many stages of putting one together.

Far from being socialized housing as some would tag it, cooperative housing symbolizes democracy in action. It gives a group of families what they so urgently require—at their price level, and it permits the industry to enjoy a continual flow of fair profit housing construction instead of a spasmodic risk pattern.

With tax exemption, where it is required, or without tax exemption, as it also can be achieved, cooperative housing is, we think, Amerca's new housing economy.

Tempest in the A. & P. Teapot

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very able analysis of the Government's case against the Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co., which has been the subject of widespread interest and debate in the country.

This article is written by Mr. A. G. Mezerik, the author of a number of important articles on economic subjects. Mr. Mezerik examines the evidence and defines the issues in this important litigation with the utmost impartiality.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEMPEST IN THE A. & P. TEAPOT

(By A. G. Mezerik)

The housewife, doing her shopping at A. & P., has never worried much about whether A. & P. is a monopoly or an economic force for good or evil. She has known only the end product of A. & P.'s bigness: comparatively efficient distribution and low prices. Together, these have been more effective in creating favorable public opinion than any propaganda which could have been invented by public relations experts. A. & P., in its tremendous advertising campaign, is presently using those low prices as its major line of defense against the Government's antitrust suit.

The Government, however, steadfastly maintains that it is after A. & P. neither because it sells food at low prices nor because it is big. The antitrust lawyers are going down another street. They are building their case around practices of which, they say, A. & P. has already been found guilty, practices which, in the main, do not directly penalize the A. & P. customer but which, since they spell injury and future danger to the rest of the businessmen in the food field, are against the public interest.

Behind the Government action against A. & P. is a theory which has been expressed in these words by the Supreme Court: "The material consideration in determining whether a monopoly exists is not that prices are raised and the competition is excluded, but that power exists to raises prices or to stifle competition when it is desired to do so." In this context the fact that A. & P. prices are low is relevant only when considered with its power and ability to up those prices at will or to sell products far below cost to kill off competition.

Whether or not the record contains proof that A. & P. has the power and ability to manipulate prices and stifle competition, it does show that A. & P. is truly big. Over its 90 years, since the first Hartford opened his little gas-lit tea store in downtown New York's Vesey Street, A. & P. has grown vertically and horizontally. It is a giant of giants. Its 6,000 stores are everywhere and 4,000,000 customers shop in them every day. One hundred and ten thousand A. & P. employees dispense enough canned goods, dairy products, and soap to supply a nation the size of Holland.

A. & P. is its own canner, packing much of the tinned goods it sells under labels such as Sultana, Iona, and Sunnybrook. A. & P.'s meats are purchased and assembled by one of its many subsidiaries, National Meats. Its national bakery division is the country's second largest baking operation, smaller only than Continental. One hundred and forty million dollars' worth of Jane Parker pie, cake, and bread is taken out of A. & P. ovens each year.

A. & P.'s American Coffee Corp. is the world's largest factor in the coffee business, roasting and selling 140,000 tons of Bokar, Red Circle, and Eight O'Clock coffee annually, bought by its own offices in Brazil and

Colombia. A. & P.'s Quaker Maid Co. is a huge producer of baking powder, mayonnaise, beans, puddings, and cereals. In turn, Quaker Maid's subsidiary packs White House evaporated milk. Ann Page preserves and jellies are still another A. & P. business of great size.

That this greatest of all food operations truly reaches from the Atlantic to the Pacific is easy to see. National Fish is a heavy buyer of fillets and whole fish on the Boston wharves. Seafood buyers in New Orleans comb the Gulf Coast. Nakat Packing cans salmon on the Pacific Ocean. The vast continental stretch in between is covered by a network which, in addition to those enumerated above, include A. & P.'s National Butter and the National Egg and Poultry agencies. Finally, the Atlantic Commission Co. (ACCO), a main objective in the Government's antitrust case, purchases, through its 70 field offices, over 2,000,000 tons of fresh fruit and vegetables each year. Connected with the New York headquarters by 9,300 miles of teletype, the ACCO men are in Maine for the potato crop, in Michigan when the cherries are ripe, in Texas when the onions are ready.

This bigness in production and purchasing backs up almost $3,000,000,000 in ultimate retail sales over A. & P.'s counters annually, which is more than twice that of its nearest competitor, Safeway ($1,200,000,000) and nearly three times as much as Kroger ($825,000,000), the third grocery chain in point of size. The entire operation, the Government maintains, makes the A. & P. the largest purchasers, manufacturers, processors, and retailers of food in the United States—which is not only self-evident but makes the total A. & P. operation bigger even than that of the Ford Motor Co. The A. & P. thereby wins another distinction, being the largest family controlled corporation in the world. Ninety-nine and ninety-seven one-hundredths percent of A. & P. is owned by John A. Hartford and his brother, George L. Hartford, 77 and 85 years old, respectively.

The Hartfords didn't talk when the Government, 7 years ago, started its successful action against A. & P. in Danville, Ill. The Hartfords still are not talking now, though the Government, acting on a complaint brought by the National Association of Retail Grocers, is seeking—on the basis of the Danville decision—to break up A. & P.'s subsidiary plants and agencies into individual holdings and to dissolve the retail outlets into six regional independently owned chains, along the lines of the seven divisions into which A. & P.'s operations are now separated.

But if the Hartfords aren't talking personally, A. & P. advised by public relations expert, Carl Byoir and his subsidiary, Business Associates, Inc., are very vocal indeed. In a campaign unprecedented in history of litigation, A. & P. has taken to the barricades of advertising. The familiar red store fronts are plastered with slogans and posters. Countermen stuff leaflets into 4,000,000 market baskets. More than 2,000 newspapers carry full-page advertisements setting forth the A. & P. position, which is that Government success in breaking up the A. & P. empire would mean the end of low-food prices for consumers.

The Government is bound to be on the defensive on this low-price issue. Its entire brief includes only one allegation that A. & P.'s prices to its own customers are not as low as they appear on the price tags. The simple charge reads: "The A. & P. officials, from Mr. John A. Hartford down to unit employes, admitted that their stock gains were abnormal in amount and the result of illegal practices. They recognized repeatedly that such gains were due to manipulative practices such as short weights and measures and overcharging of customers." Representative WRIGHT PATMAN, implacable congressional enemy of chain biggies, declared that the A. & P. gleaned, from these practices alone, nearly $2,000,000 in 1941 and that between 1935 and 1941, its take totaled $21,714,000.

DOES A. & P. USE COERCION?

However, neither the antitrust lawyers nor Representative PATMAN could believe for a moment that this alleged deception, of itself, is sufficient to up the whole range of A. & P. prices above that of competition. On the contrary, they admit that A. & P. prices are low. They come to the nub of their contention that A. & P. has the ability and power to stifle competition, when they state their reasons why A. & P. prices are low.

The Government says that A. & P., using its tremendous buying power as leverage, coerces its suppliers into maintaining a secret two-price system, that this system—because of special prices and concessions—is low for A. & P. and high for every other buyer. One example used by the Government is in the charge that the Bowman Dairy Co., Chicago, paid A. & P. a $50,000 rebate in 1942 and later agreed to pay A. & P. 11 percent of sales prices for the 1942–48 period, a total of $355,000. The Government contends that kick-backs of this type and other elements of the price system serve two purposes for A. & P. The first is obvious: It results in A. & P. obtaining the lowest possible price for itself. The second purpose, alleged by the Government, is to further the elimination of A. & P.'s competitors who when purchasing from the same supplier are thereby forced to pay two profits, one on the merchandise which the competitor buys for himself and one on the products sold by the supplier at a loss to A. & P.

Pursuing this same theory—that A. & P. is demonstrating its power and ability to restrict and eliminate competition—the Government points to the use to which A. & P. puts the profits of its far-flung subsidiary operations. These profits, which in 1941, amounted to 40 percent of A. & P.'s total earnings, are, the Government charges, used by A. & P.'s retail divisions to subsidize loss selling in whole territories where A. & P. is seeking to undercut all its competitors in the region.

A. & P.'s alleged use of its subsidiaries to damage competition becomes more complicated in the case of ACCO, A. & P.'s produce brokerage agency. ACCO was the target of emphatic rebuke by the trial judge at Danville. He castigated the double-barreled arrangement in which ACCO acts as buying agent for A. & P. at the same time that it is the selling agent for the farmer, not only in sales to A. & P. but to the general market. By using this special relationship to both A. & P. and the grower, ACCO is accused of diverting the best of the produce which it receives to A. & P., thereby forcing its competitor, who buys produce from ACCO in its capacity of agent for the grower, to accept inferior quality. ACCO is the target of another allegation, to the effect that, by bribery and other means and for its own ends, it has grabbed control of cooperatives, that are of course suppliers.

Throughout, these specific allegations do not question A. & P.'s low prices to customers. They all are directed to the point of proving that the practices which make them low are a danger to other businesses in the food industry and against the public interest. Legally, there cannot be much debate about whether or not A. & P. is involved in these practices. All were part of the allegations in the Danville suit in which the A. & P. was found guilty as charged, and fined $175,000. A. & P. without taking advantage of its right to appeal to the Supreme Court, paid the fine in July 1949, when the Court of Appeals upheld the Danville trial judge. In this new antitrust case the Government is seeking to enjoin A. & P. permanently from continuing these practices. To guarantee the discontinuance of these practices, the Government is asking the court—as a means of destroying A. & P. power and ability to control prices and stifle competition—to break the A. & P. into separated companies under separate ownerships as was done previously to Standard Oil, International Harvester, and other great combines.

Whatever the merits for breaking up A. & P., dissolution has not been a fate worse than death for those other companies. Single units of Standard Oil are now bigger by far than the original company. Since A. & P. is a holding company, the recent report of the Securities and Exchange Commission on the experience of the separate units into which utility-holding companies were broken, is pertinent. The total value of the securities of the separated units is today much more than the market price of the holding company securities were 14 years ago when the death sentence on holding companies became law.

The buyer of foods at retail, built up as the victim or beneficiary, depending on whether A. & P. or the Government is talking, is definitely not the main issue in all this. A Government victory, according to Attorney General McGrath, should "result in lower prices for over 90 percent of the public who buy from other grocers who, because of A. & P.'s practices, are required to buy their supplies at higher prices." The A. & P. counters this with a flat statement that a Government victory would put the A. & P. out of business and mean higher prices for you.

But underneath this and a tremendous volume of other language in this vein, all directed at the consumer, are other equally basic questions. If it seems to the Government that independent businessmen, farmers, middlemen, and other small operators are, or can be, forced to the wall by the actions of a large integrated operation, should it, in the public interest, step in? The Antitrust Division seems to be convinced that the Government has such a duty even when, as in the case of A. & P., the action is outside the classic pattern of trust busting. In the past, antitrust action has always been synonymous with trying to break up companies and combinations which, because they are monopolistic, limit production and keep prices high. Obviously, A. & P. policies do not fit that rule. Moreover, the traditional concept of a monopoly was a business which controlled more than 20 percent of an industry. A. & P.'s share of the Nation's food business is less than 7 percent. In none of these three ways does the case against A. & P. follow the accustomed path.

Nevertheless, the issue—the power and ability of large-scale integrated operations to affect the rest of the economy—has now been raised, and whether or not it follows orthodox antitrust patterns is not the most relevant point. More important is a quick determination as to whether the Government has, or should have, the right under the present law to undertake this type of action, and if so, where such issues should be decided. Up to now antitrust actions have been handled by lawyers and courts. Involved here may well be a question of national policy which ought to be decided by congressional policymakers.

One thing is clear: Business has stakes in the real issues behind the A. & P. case, stakes which are more vital than those held by the housewife to whom A. & P.'s tremendous advertising campaigns are now directed and to whom the Attorney General is speaking. The A. & P. case is opening up the fourth dimension of bigness. Modern technology, mass production, integration, and wide-area marketing—all the techniques which make for product quality at lower costs are in themselves the children of bigness. Since monopoly is only a matter of degree, these are also the attributes of monopoly.

Bigness and monopoly have given us automobiles, locomotives, telegraph, electric light bulbs, radios, steel, and many other products.

In some of these areas, the results show that bigness and monopoly are the more efficient modes of economic organization. How to achieve, preserve, and harness such bigness to promote the general welfare merits the most critical attention and it is in this field that the A. & P. case has opened the questions.

Perhaps, in untangling the threads of the A. & P. case, this country can find out for itself what it values most. It faces into the problem of creating a scale in which low prices and the other fruits of integrated operation are weighed against an ever-greater political centralization in Washington, forced into being to counteract economic centralization. The true effect of such concentrations as that of A. & P. on the independent businessman is also up for some research in which facts will take the place of opinions. The independent businessman is the heart of the American middle class which is in turn credited with being the backbone of democratic institutions.

All these are problems raised by the A. & P. case. They must be recognized as having importance at least equal to and probably far beyond the questions of low prices and size.

Let's hope, instead of vague talk about America being a wonderful country on the one hand and big speeches about trust busting on the other, the New Year brings light on the real issues underlying the A. & P. case.

Life Insurance a Favorite Target

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon, House Joint Resolution 371, relating to income taxes of life-insurance companies for 1948–49, will be the business of the House. A pertinent editorial referring to the subject matter of this resolution appeared in yesterday's Hartford (Conn.) Courant and I include this under extension of my remarks in order that it might be available to my colleagues in the House. The editorial follows:

LIFE INSURANCE A FAVORITE TARGET

The life insurance industry has been much in the news lately. Its top executives have been streaming to Washington to testify in separate congressional inquiries into monopoly and investment practices. Representative CELLER, of New York, heading the monopoly investigation, has been a particularly outspoken critic of the industry.

James G. Patton, president of the National Farmers Union, last week leaped into the fray. He urged Federal regulation of all interstate insurance business, the breaking up of all companies with more than $250,000,000 in assets, and an end to the control of insurance in New York and eastern financial centers.

In this week's tax message President Truman also singled out the life insurance companies for none-too-friendly attention. He referred to efforts by the House Ways and Means Committee to arrange now for retroactive taxes for the past 3 years, and urged Congress to pass a new tax law to remove the inequities of undertaxation in this field without impairing the ability of individuals to acquire life insurance protection.

All this hullabaloo, even if much of it comes to nothing, does the industry no good. Mr. CELLER's broadsides create no good will for life insurance, even though he has conspicuously failed to convince Congress of the need for a thorough investigation of the industry. Mr. Patton's gratuitous suggestions about breaking up the business are based on erroneous assumptions. Among them are that State regulation of insurance is slipshod and ineffective; that concentration of many home offices in the East necessarily makes the companies less than national institutions; and that credit for small businesses is less readily available now than it would be if the large companies were arbitrarily subdivided.

Even if the assumptions are false, the proposals will damage the reputation of a vital industry, unless they are effectively answered. The tax situation, too, lends itself to distortion. In 1947 and 1948 life insurance companies paid no Federal income tax, a fact that has given rise to a good deal of ill-informed criticism. The point is that a new formula for income taxation of life companies was adopted back in 1942, with the approval of the Treasury and of Congress. Implicit in that formula was the understanding that if the rate of investment earnings fell below a specified point, there would be no taxable income, and therefore no tax.

That was what happened in 1947 and in 1948. It was the low rate of return per dollar on investments, a direct result of Government fiscal policy, that caused it. If the 1942 formula was unrealistic, it should be revised. Whether it should be done retroactively is another question. Why should it be? In any case the attempt to imply that the insurance companies have somehow been cheating, or have hoodwinked the Government, is ridiculous. You might as well charge the Treasury and Congress with collusion in approving a tax formula that made the industry's virtual exemption possible. It's a pity that some people can't resist sniping at a big and inviting target, no matter what the facts are.

National Children's Dental Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Des Moines Register of January 29, 1950:

CONGRESS ACTS—FOR DENTAL DAY

WASHINGTON, D. C.—After 4 weeks, Congress has sent just one bill to the White House—a resolution authorizing President Truman to proclaim February 6 as National Children's Dental Day.

The Pressure Goes on Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial appearing in the January 26, 1950, issue of the Peoria Journal, entitled "The Pressure Goes on Again":

THE PRESSURE GOES ON AGAIN

Victorious in the Far East, where the Chinese Communists have consolidated their control of that sprawling country, Soviet Russia once again is turning her attention to the west—more particularly the sore spot at Berlin.

Once again she is setting up road blocks and blockades and hampering free access by American, British, and French soldiers and officials into the German capital. While the blockade hasn't been made very effective, it still is a nuisance and a hindrance and it has led to speculation as to whether or not it might be necessary to reinstitute the air lift that kept Berlin operating for so many months at so high a cost.

Our plans for an air lift to Berlin are still in existence. They could be put into operation again with little loss of time if it proves necessary. But renewal of the air lift would be a tremendous drain on the pocketbooks of the people of the United States.

There is considerable debate as to why Russia is putting the pressure on again now after letting the operations in Berlin continue unhampered for so long a time. One explanation seems more apt to be right than the others. The United States, under the ineffective leadership of Secretary of State Dean Acheson has just backed down in China and Formosa. Mr. Acheson has just justified our Nation's refusal to aid Formosa on the ground that such action might lead to war. The Russians might be feeling us out to see whether that same attitude pertains to Berlin and whether we can be made to back down there. When George Marshall was Secretary of State we showed them that we couldn't be bluffed by setting up the air lift. But a weaker man is now at the helm of our State Department and it might be possible, in Russian thinking, that we could be forced to step backward in order to avoid a conflict at Berlin.

The policy of the State Department ever since Acheson became Secretary has been one of softness and backing down. We have knuckled under to the Communists in China; we have feared to oppose them in Formosa; Acheson even proposes that we back down on the stand that we took against Francisco Franco in Spain. We are following a policy of appeasement and knuckling under that has always led to disaster in the past.

The reason is not hard to find. Our State Department is full of "brilliant, young men" like Alger Hiss, who stands convicted of treason in the eyes of his countrymen even though his trial actually was only for perjury. The State Department and other departments of our Government have been filled with just such "brilliant young men" as Hiss and Acheson ever since Franklin Roosevelt first was elected President. Their sympathies for the enemies of this Nation and their vacillating policies have betrayed us into the hands of our enemies.

The United States needs, as much as anything else, a complete housecleaning of the departments of Government, and the Department of State, the haven of Acheson and his good friend, Hiss, would be a good place to start.

Incongruous Conduct

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to place in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a very timely and

enlightening editorial written by a great, old-time, Democratic newspaperman, Mr. George Woodward, Sr., who is the editor of the Farm-Labor Press of Council Bluffs, Iowa.

Heretofore I have been very sympathetic to the plight of China, Formosa, and the other far eastern countries, but now I have great doubts about the wisdom of my former sentiment.

I am sure that everyone will be interested in reading this potent editorial and after reading the last eight paragraphs of same, they will begin to understand, perhaps, why many people outside of the Congress are now shedding crocodile tears, allegedly for humanity's sake, over the lost cause of Nationalist China and the recent decision of President Harry S. Truman not to lend our aid, of money and men, in the defense of Formosa.

It is now very apparent to me that many persons not in the Congress are in the fight as pressure groups to work on their Congressmen in an endeavor to secure aid to China and Formosa, et al., because American capital has made tremendous investments in China, Formosa, and other far eastern places, and most assuredly are now anxious to have American men and dollars save their investments for them.

I know that every Member of Congress has not heretofore and will never take up the legislative cudgel for any such group but will be motivated to act by better sources and for more proper reasons, and anything which I have to say will not be taken, I am sure, to apply to any of my colleagues.

I know that many people have wondered why so many of our citizens seem always to be continually living abroad mentally—at the present time in China and Formosa and the Far East.

The first intimation which I had that all was not real grief which crieth and sobbeth was when I read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at page A357, under date of January 18, 1950, where there appears certain data presented by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Hon. THOMAS J. LANE, entitled "Formosa." It was pointed out that Charles J. O'Malley had stated in the January 10 issue of the Boston Traveler of Boston, Mass., that Boston investors were part owners of Formosa, because the people of Boston and New England have greater ownership interest in Formosa than the Chinese or Japanese and that the real facts were that when Japan defeated China, China sold the Island of Formosa to the Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. for a sum equal to about $5,000,000 American. The Taiwan Electric Light & Power Co. was the most important industrial development in Japan. It owned and controlled the electric light and power all over the empire and the taking over of Formosa was one of its activities. When this was accomplished it was decided that America would pay for it, and bonds, equivalent to $22,800,000 were issued. These bonds were sold in Boston, New England, New York, and other parts of the United States. In order to accomplish this the company secured the services of J. P. Morgan & Co., Kuhn Loeb & Co., the National City Co., the First National Bank of the City of New York, and the Yokohama Specie Bank, Ltd. When this was accomplished, through the Yokohama Specie Bank, which was the interest involved in Japan, practically all the leading brokerage houses in this country were engaged in the sale of these bonds. Hayden Stone & Co. sold a great many of these bonds in Boston.

Is this why we are asked to help defend Formosa now?

The editorial which I have heretofore mentioned of my good friend, George Woodward, Sr., is as follows:

INCONGRUOUS

The incongruous attitude of the isolationists previous to and during the war, and their attitude of aggression against the administration's hands-off policy in Formosa is the most shameless exposé of political chicanery that could be conceived in the minds of so-called statesmen when the destiny of their country and the lives of their countrymen are at stake.

The isolationists were opposed to our preparation for war against Hitler. They stumped the Nation for Hitler and against the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of their own country. They lauded the infamous speech of Charles Lindbergh in which he made the seditious statement: "The only danger of war in the United States rests in the Jews and President Roosevelt." When war with Germany was imminent, the isolationists voted against lifting the embargo; against lend-lease; against the Selective Service Act; against war mobilization of industrial plants. In fact, they voted against every war measure proposed by the administration, and the treacherous Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor served only to drive the isolationists under ground to carry on in secret their obstruction to the progress of the war.

The isolationists did not want war then; were willing to compromise with Hitler upon Hitler's terms. When we became involved in war, they would not fight or support the Government's policies in the blackest hours of doubt and distress. Why?

Then there were no atomic bombs. Then, all we had to lose was life, property, resources, and time. Then, it was often suggested but never seriously contended that civilization was in peril. However, World War II was climaxed by the dropping of two atomic bombs, one on Hiroshima and the other on Nagasaki, capable of destroying all life and practically all property within a radius of 19,000 feet, and now scientists are awaiting the go-ahead signal to build a hydrogen bomb that could destroy all life—perhaps millions of people—and all property within a radius of 100 miles. We know that Russia our potential rival for world power, has the atomic bomb. We do not know how far behind, or that she is not ahead of us, in pursuit of building deadly weapons, or that she is not already at work building the incalculably more destructive, more devastating, and more dreadful hydrogen bomb.

In view of such possibilities, it would seem that no man whose power of reason rests securely upon its throne would risk fomenting the shallow stream that separates the cold war from boiling over into a shooting war by loudly criticizing the administration's hands-off policy in Formosa. And, who does? Nobody but the isolationists of World War No. 2!

They say we have betrayed China; that we have sold out to Stalin; that Dean Acheson should resign and that President Truman should be impeached, when all the world stands terrified in dread of the smouldering spark of contention that may ignite the explosion that will destroy all the hopes of mankind, all his achievements and the loftiest development of civilization to which man has ever attained.

There has never been the remotest hope of establishing a democracy in China; freedom, human or equal rights among man. Chinese destiny and doom was sealed in 1927 when Chiang Kai-shek sold the working class, the poor and the humanitarian intellectual people into slavery. When that great military leader accepted an initial loan of $25,000,000 from Shanghai bankers and industrialists, assisted by foreign capitalists (not excluding American vultures), to disarm and dissolve trade unions and peasant leagues; purge the Kuomintang of Communists, and establish a new government in Nanking as rival to the government in Hankow, and Chiang Kai-shek carried out his part of the agreement to the letter.

Thousands of factory workers and intellectuals were slaughtered in Shanghai and other cities, without trial or hearing. In the interior, military governors, army commanders and landlords began killing peasants. Rivers of blood divided the earth of China. Foreign powers called it good and recognized the government at Nanking as the only government in China.

No more despotic, savage, ruthless, murderous, and inhuman government ever existed than the Nationalist Government of China under the regime of Chiang Kai-shek and, the isolationists of World War II, are entitled to all the applause and glory they shall receive from the calloused hearts of big business for their criticism of the administration's attitude toward Formosa and deserve all the contempt organized labor and the common people of America can heap upon them.

The Chinese people, like all the peoples of the world, have always hoped to attain their God-given right to freedom of thought, individual liberty, equal opportunity, and the pursuit of happiness. The intellectuals of China are endowed with human sympathy and reason and capable of statesmanship. If some way could be found to curb the corruption of international bankers and the power of money to bribe the highest and the lowest officials, there is no reason to suppose that China would not establish a free government comparable to our own government.

"What's in a name? That which we call a rose would smell as sweet by any other name." If we laboring people of America demand moral legislation giving us a more equitable standard in social economy, we are called Communists by the arrogant rich, their big newspapers, their commentators, and their political parasites, knowing full well that freedom and liberty to us is worth fighting for, while the rich are content to sit back, rake in the profits of war and sick us on to victory or to death.

In China the war is between the poor down trodden people against the autocratic murderous rich—a subjugated people fighting and dying to throw off the yoke of despotism, and call them whatever name you choose. If the people have a voice in the establishment of a new government, it will not be communism, socialism, or any other than a government of, for, and by the people. The Nationalist Government in China is finished—is as dead as the the dodo bird, and whatever influence our country may have in support of a new government in China should be directed toward the people of that nation and against the rich.

The rich, everywhere, can be depended upon to get along quite well without suffering from want and destitution.

End Excise Taxes

REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, there is a buyer's strike on in America of tragic proportion. Inspired by an administration dangling a cut in excise taxes before the noses of the American people, the buyer's strike is affecting and economically damaging and bankrupting thoughts of small-business men in 48 States.

People are holding back from buying goods bearing heavy wartime-imposed taxes—and they are waiting for congressional action. Congress is waiting for a bill to vote upon.

I submit that virtually all wartime-imposed taxes can be eliminated without turning to new and dangerous levies on business to offset tax loss. I submit the removal of excise taxes will so inspire consumer demand and thereby production and employment and pay rolls that the income loss of excise levies will be more than offset by increased income from business and individuals during the year.

I also suggest that we refrain from thinking that every removal of tax depends upon the addition of new taxes. And especially should we refrain from the imposition of additional taxes until the time has come when we have exhausted every means of establishing a sound and economical operation of our Government.

It is a fact that if the measures recommended in the Hoover report were effected the Government could save enough to remove four billions of dollars in tax levies.

It is a fact that the reduction or ending of certain taxes would aid in bringing to our people a full enjoyment of a greater prosperity and at the same time not affect the efficiency or lessen the services of the Government.

More than 1,000 of my constituents have taken time in the past 10 days to write me personal letters protesting continuation of wartime-imposed excise taxes. They have also tied up their request with an urge to effect economies in Government operation which are obviously extravagant and admittedly ridiculous.

To add to that voice of impassioned protest of the public, I am urging businessmen throughout the country to let Congress know how seriously the excise taxes and the resulting buyers' strike is hurting them. I have suggested to businessmen everywhere that they protest further delay in congressional action in a telegram to the Ways and Means Committee on Thursday, February 2. That day, Mr. Speaker, is End War Tax Day, and it is a day when businessmen will take the only possible avenue of protest open to them.

Each business organization in the country should request its members to join this telegram "blitz" of the committee which has before it approximately 50 bills concerning excise taxes. Perhaps if such response is great enough the committee will appreciate that not only the public at large is against the excise tax imposition, but that business is solidly united in its knowledge that our economic structure is being damaged by war taxes continuation.

In my county of Onondaga, in upState New York, more than 20,000 persons are wearing lapel buttons protesting continuation of the war taxes and asking for an end of Government waste. They are not wearing buttons asking for more taxes on business. Because any thinking person knows that additional taxes on business will be relayed to consumers.

The mothers who deplore taxes on their baby's powder—know well that if corporation taxes are increased the baby powder will cost just as much as it does now but that all the new and old taxes on it will be hidden.

The politically remunerative policy of taxing the rich and levying heavily against business is the aim of the present administration. But we, in Congress, must be wise enough to see through this grim political devise and appreciate that every tax against industry is a tax against the public.

The people pay the taxes that industry is forced to assume. They pay it in every purchase and are told to blame high cost on industry. The laborer who is laid off because business is reduced by Government action, pays Government taxes with privation and denial and a loss of his hard earned benefits.

Wartime-imposed excise taxes were justified once when we were attempting to discourage consumption of goods deleterious to the war effort. They helped put business into war production—they helped channel dollars into Government bonds—they helped reduce demand for certain goods which it was felt weakened the Nation's strength of purpose needed for all-out war.

Now those same taxes have the same effect in peacetime. They reduce consumption of goods and reduce production. They deny each man the right to enjoy the fruits of his labor. They make a mockery of prosperity and high wages and labor's benefits.

I call upon this Congress to demand in a single voice that wartime-imposed excise taxes be removed immediately and that the Congress stand firmly against the imposition of additional taxes on the people.

When we have eliminated the tragic and costly waste in Government operation; and when we have removed the political pump-priming expenditures of the administration; and when we have tried sound economic programs of business encouragement to raise Government tax income through currently levied taxes, then we will find that new taxes are not necessary.

In fact we will find that even more old taxes can be reduced or ended.

Let's be the Congress which removed that tax—not the Congress that fell for the kindergarten philosophy of replacing a business deterent tax with another tax on the people.

This is the time to dedicate ourselves to ending the war—tax-wise.

Sabine River Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, there are two rivers which are partly in the Third Congressional District of Texas—the Sabine and Neches Rivers. When I first came to Congress, I contacted various authorities of our Government to ascertain what could be done to develop in practical ways these rivers. Too, as a member of the House Flood Control Committee several years ago, I constantly worked to direct attention to the feasible development of these two rivers. The late Senator Morris Sheppard, of Texas, did much work in connection with the prospective development of these streams.

More recently there has been evidence of renewed interest along the line mentioned. A forward step has been the formation of the Sabine Watershed Association, of which Mr. John Ben Shepperd, of Gladewater, Tex., is president. It is hoped the authorities of our Government will help us to complete in the near future the study or survey which currently is being conducted.

One of the most outstanding newspaper writers in Texas is Mr. Robert M. Hayes, who works with the Dallas Morning News; his office is in Tyler, Tex. Mr. Hayes recently wrote a series of articles on the Sabine River development possibilities. They are timely and to the point, in my opinion. Under unanimous consent, I include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD these articles, along with some communications:

A WATER SUPPLY FOR EAST TEXAS

(A series of articles on Sabine River development possibilities)

(By Robert M. Hayes)

I. TO AVERT WATER FAMINE

LONGVIEW, TEX., September 17.—All this talk about a threatened water famine—

Is it a real or imaginary danger? Can industry expand with its present source of supply? How long will cities be able to meet normal domestic demands? What is the solution?

Plagued by the fear of a water crisis, East Texans along the Sabine River watershed have organized to fight what alarmed geologists call "a creeping paralysis that threatens the entire Southwest."

East Texas already has felt the pinch. Bids for industries have been turned down because of inadequate water. Lawns and garden plots have become parched because of

the shortage. In a few instances even drinking water supplies dropped to dangerously low levels.

Ample potential supply

Yet water engineers say the potential supply of water in East Texas is ample. There's enough not only for present needs but for all demands of the foreseeable future.

Then why all the alarm? Because the major part of this area's fresh water supply is flowing unused down East Texas streams.

The Sabine River alone empties into the Gulf of Mexico an average of 5,800,000,000 gallons a day. That is enough for a thousand cities the size of Tyler.

Thus the threat in East Texas resolves itself into a problem of conservation and utilization. That's why the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has launched a crusade to arouse lethargic East Texans to the necessity of prompt action.

The watershed association is headed by John Ben Shepperd, energetic young Gladewater lawyer and past president of the United States Junior Chamber of Commerce. Its sphere of operations extends from Greenville to Orange and takes in an area of 9,703 square miles.

Shepperd's group will work hand-in-glove with the Sabine River Authority, a State agency headed by John W. Simmons, of Orange. In fact the watershed association expects to do much of the spade work for the long-range program and help finance the organizational activities.

The Sabine River Authority has received a State appropriation of $25,000. This, obviously, will not go very far in a program of such magnitude. Then, too, a restricted membership—nine directors appointed by the governor—tends to limit its functions.

It was largely to overcome these handicaps that the private group was formed. The watershed association has set a goal of 100,000 members and hopes to raise $100,000 a year.

How will the association funds be spent?

A statement from Shepperd's office gives the answer:

1. To organize an all-embracing development program for the river and its tributaries.

2. To sell the sprawling watershed area on the urgent need of water conservation.

3. To work with the Sabine River Authority and, if necessary, provide funds for investigation and surveys of practical development projects.

"If our program is to succeed," says Shepperd, "it will be necessary for the great majority of our people to throw their active support to the Sabine River Authority."

The association maintains offices in the East Texas Chamber of Commerce Building in Longview. There is only one paid employee—Byron Tinsley, of Greenville, the executive secretary.

The board of directors is made up of 45 civic leaders from throughout the watershed. There are three vice presidents representing the upper, central, and lower regions. They are Col. Hal Horton, Greenville; Judge Earl Sharp, Longview; and George S. Colburn, Orange. Hugh Sawyer, of Longview, is secretary-treasurer.

A fourth region, across the river in Louisiana, is in the process of organization. A little less than a third of the watershed area lies in Louisiana.

What are the objectives of the long-range program? Heading the list is water conservation. Scores of cities and towns have been warned they are drawing from their underground water supply faster than nature can replenish.

Then there's flood control. Periodical overflows take a heavy toll both in crops and property. Only a few years ago a Government engineer, in reporting on a survey, said: "Floods in the Sabine Basin cause damages principally to crops and, to a lesser extent, to oil properties, railroads, highways, and public utilities. These damages, both direct and indirect, are estimated to average $268,300 annually."

A third objective is the reclamation of overflow lands. By controlling the floods it would be possible to restore approximately 500,000 acres to agricultural production. This, it is estimated, would add $3,000,000 annually to the area's net revenue.

Still other aims include recreation, public health, reforestation, wildlife conservation, and river navigation.

Even though work has not yet begun in earnest, association officials have a tentative answer to the question: How much time will the program require?

If sufficient funds are raised the survey could be completed in 1951. The construction of dams and the straightening of channels should take about 8 years.

"It is highly possible," says Shepperd, "that the over-all project can be brought to a successful conclusion within the next 10 years."

That, engineers believe, would be long before the "creeping paralysis," now centered in the more arid States of California, Arizona, and Nevada, has time to reach east Texas.

II. FOR INDUSTRIAL GROWTH

GLADEWATER, TEX., September 18.—The man with the green eyeshade and a desk littered with funny-looking maps and charts put it this way:

"Suppose you own a small business and have a working capital of $100,000. With money in the bank you feel secure and are not worrying too much about building up a reserve.

"Your withdrawals have been greater than your deposits. But prospects appear rosy and you want to expand. Then you suddenly discover you can't swing the deal with the dwindling balance you have left.

"What are you going to do—go bankrupt or get out and rustle up more business? There's plenty of money in circulation but it won't come to you without an effort."

That's how the water engineer and the city planner eye the problem that confronts most of east Texas today. For the past decade industrial expansion in the area has been spectacular. The trend is gaining momentum and the future would look rosy if the threat of a water shortage could be thwarted.

As a solution to the problem the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has undertaken a long-range problem designed to harness and utilize the 6,000,000,000 gallons of water the stream is pouring into the Gulf daily. The association will coordinate its effort with those of the Sabine River Authority, a State agency.

Charts and statistics prepared by State and Federal engineers do not make pleasant reading. Water tables (levels at which ground water is found) are dropping fast. The surface water situation is not bad, but currently only a third of the domestic water supply comes from above ground. And less than 10 percent of the available surface water is impounded.

Prior to World War II, east Texas gave little thought to the water problem. True, it was known that water demands of the State at large had increased more than 7,000 percent from 1890 to 1940, though the population gain had been only 287 percent. But east Texas was not in the drought area and had plenty of live streams. So, why worry?

The Nation's unprecedented program jarred the area out of its complacency. There was a mad scramble for war plants. When applications poured into the War Department the first question asked was: Do you have plenty of water?

Deep wells helped many communities meet the war emergency. Contracts for material were spread relatively thin over the area, and despite handicaps, east Texas plants made a sizable contribution to the war effort.

When peace came, east Texas leaders, spurred by their success, trained their sights on a huge industrial expansion program. Figuratively speaking, their foot was in the door and they were determined to take full advantage of the situation.

During the past 5 years Gregg County has set the pace in its bid for heavy industries. Lake Cherokee, a 4,000-acre reservoir near Longview, has played a vital part in the city's spectacular industrial growth. Engineers say it will care for the needs not only of Longview but of neighboring cities and communities as well.

Tyler, too, has become a busy industrial center. Since 1940 its population has jumped from 28,279 to 42,500. A new water supply, Lake Tyler, will have an important bearing on the city's future growth. The lake covers 3,000 acres.

But how long will these reservoirs meet the demand? What about the demands of 1960? Of 1970?

Here again the water engineer, fortified with maps and charts, comes up with the answer.

During the next 20 years, according to his forecast, the population of the major centers in the Sabine River watershed will increase from 50 to more than 100 percent. The drain on the municipal water supplies will increase proportionately.

Smith County, for example, now has a population of about 57,000 persons who depend upon municipal water supplies. Consumption runs 5,100,000 gallons. In 1960 the population will be 74,704 and the water consumption 6,646,000 gallons. By 1970 the population will have reached 92,058 and the water consumption 8,165,000 gallons.

These figures were taken from tables prepared by J. M. Lloyd, Tyler water engineer, for the East Texas Water Conference.

Gregg County's growth, Lloyd predicts, will be even greater than Smith County's. He says Gregg's present urban population of approximately 49,000 likely will reach 90,200 by 1970 and the water consumption will jump from 4,079,000 to 12,273,000 gallons.

During the same period Wood County's population and its water consumption are expected to increase approximately 100 percent. Panola County, which takes in the world's largest natural-gas field, will show an even greater gain.

Lloyd called attention to the almost limitless possibilities for industrial expansion in east Texas if the water problem can be solved.

"In the east Texas oil field," he said, "there are approximately 27,000 oil wells. In Panola County there is a vast gas potential of 3,000,000,000,000 cubic feet of high B. t. u. gas. These natural resources make possible a huge industrial and manufacturing program. Gas is readily available as a fuel, replacing the more expensive coal.

"Several cities, deeply concerned about their future growth, have decided the only feasible solution to their water problem lies in the construction of reservoirs. It must be understood, however that these steps will only meet the needs for a few years and will not provide for many large industries which consume vast amounts of water."

The late Governor Beauford Jester sounded a similar warning in Tyler last year.

"Prior to 1940," he said, "many of our towns and cities were racking along with just enough water to meet current requirements. When the war came, with its urgent needs for quick action, many of these communities failed to obtain their share of war industries because they lacked the necessary water. They now may fail to obtain their quota of postwar industries for the same reason."

But the Governor's warning was tempered with optimism. East Texas, he said, is more fortunately situated than other parts of the State.

"Stream-flow records," he asserted, "show that the average annual run-off for each major stream of this region is sufficient to supply ample quantities of water for a greatly expanded population. But this future water demand cannot be supplied by the unregulated flow of our streams."

III. A FACTOR IN CONSERVATION

CARTHAGE, TEX., September 19.—Approximately 625 square miles of overflow lands in east Texas will be reclaimed and put into production if the Sabine River Watershed Association's long-range improvement program attains its goals.

That's the equivalent of more than four counties the size of Rockwall, or about three-fourths the area of Dallas County.

Crop production on the reclaimed land should yield a net revenue of $3,000,000. Pumped into the channels of commerce, the added income would mean a sharp rise in employment, increased sales, and the construction of new homes. It would also mean greater tax revenue to build new schools and highways.

These are the figures of John W. Simmons, 37-year-old president of the Sabine River Authority, a newly created State agency. The SRA and the watershed association have joined forces in an effort to harness and utilize the waters of the 578-mile stream.

"The future of east Texas," says Simmons, "depends on water conservation and flood control."

He estimates that agricultural benefits from the projected program would total $50,000,000 a year. This would include not only the revenues from reclaimed land but from irrigation and soil conservation.

Soil conservation and the control of water resources, engineers say, go hand in hand. Rains are not absorbed by barren, denuded lands. The water flows unchecked into the nearest streams and lakes, carrying with it any valuable topsoil that might remain.

Silting lakes and rivers, in turn, add to the flood dangers.

William A. Faught, agricultural economist for the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas, makes this observation:

"It is apparent that the improvement and conservation of the soil are closely related to the conservation and management of water supplies. It would be difficult to formulate a satisfactory program to provide a solution for either of these problems if the other were disregarded. Effective methods of conserving soil and water have been developed, and the public, including both farmers and business leaders, is aware of the importance of establishing these methods on the land."

Faught called attention to the steady deterioration of the soil because of unsound farming practices.

"Over large areas of the region," he continued, "the protective cover has been stripped away, exposing the land to the beating action of rain and increasing the rate of erosion. The run-off water into streams and rivers has been speeded up and flood damage has been intensified. Silting, which results from this erosive process, has partially filled many storage reservoirs, and reduced the productivity of lowland fields on which it was deposited."

But reclamation, erosion control, and water conservation are only part of the watershed association's broad improvement program.

Its most popular phase, perhaps, will be recreation. A series of reservoirs and lakes along the 578-mile stretch are of the Sabine would provide facilities for boating, swimming and fishing. It would enable east Texas to make a strong bid for tourist trade, now one of the Nation's largest sources of revenue.

For recreation cannot be written off as nonessential. It has moved into the ranks of big business. The tourist dollar is bolstering the sagging economy of many a drought-ridden State that has reached its limit in industrial expansion. East Texas leaders see no reason why this area, once an ample supply of water is assured, should not train its sights on the tourist trade and an expanding industrial program.

Lake Texoma, near Denison, is a typical close-to-home example of what recreational facilities can do for a community. It has become one of the most popular playgrounds of the Nation. All northeast Texas has reaped the benefits.

Lake Texoma was built by Army engineers for power, flood control, irrigation, and navigation. The recreational center was developed by the Department of the Interior and the National Park Service. The original cost was $54,000,000.

In asking for an appropriation recently for the expansion of its recreational facilities, Senator ROBERT S. KERR, of Oklahoma, said a million people visited Lake Texoma in 1948. Of all Federal projects, he added, only Yellowstone Park exceeded this record.

The indirect benefits from a recreational area often exceed the direct. Factory owners have long since learned that a contented worker is more apt to be an efficient worker. Consequently, in crowded industrial areas with inadequate provision for recreation, production is likely to suffer.

East Texas leaders believe the development of recreational areas not only would attract tourists but would be a definite inducement in bids for new industries.

There are two other important phases of the projected watershed development program. They are irrigation and navigation.

Near the mouth of the Sabine in Orange, Jefferson, and parts of Chambers and Liberty Counties, a network of canals and ditches feeds the principal agricultural crop—rice. Orange County alone has a 10,000-acre harvest that brings in $500,000 a year. There are at least 150 miles of canals in the area's irrigation systems.

Further inland, irrigation becomes somewhat of a rarity. A few farmers in Smith and Rusk Counties are using portable systems. Their success may start a trend.

The prospects for navigation in the upper reaches of the stream admittedly are remote, though Carl Estes, Longview publisher, insists that it is coming.

"Many of us," he told a Gladewater audience recently, "will live to see commercial steamers plying the Sabine in the east Texas oil-field area."

Currently, however, river shipping is confined to within a short distance of the mouth. But it has paid off. Water-compelled freight rates have effected great savings for shippers. The Interstate Commerce Commission requires railroads to meet the water rates on any rail shipments originating in the navigable area.

IV. ETEX CITY NEEDS

ORANGE, TEX., September 21.—This busy port's hue and cry about a threatened water shortage doesn't make sense to the average inlander.

Only a few miles from the Gulf of Mexico, the broad expanse of the Sabine River appears to offer ample assurance of a plentiful water supply. It is big enough to float a battleship—or a fleet.

Then why is Orange so vitally interested in the development of a water-conservation program along the entire length of the stream? How can a dam at Big Sandy, Longview, or Logansport possibly benefit the coastal area? Why did an Orange man, Edgar Brown, Jr., make the first pledge of $1,000 a year to the Sabine River Watershed Association to help find a solution to water problems hundreds of miles away?

The answer is found in two words that bob up frequently in engineering reports: regulated flow. The people of Orange know that unless the Sabine's flow is maintained at a reasonably consistent level their huge industrial plants will be in constant jeopardy, and that control measures, such as the construction of dams, must be taken on an area-wide, rather than local basis.

The Sabine dumps an average of nearly 6,000,000,000 gallons of water into the Gulf a day. But the actual run-off throughout the year may range from a mere trickle one day to a raging flood another day.

During the period of low flow, local industries face the constant threat that salt water from the Gulf will back up the stream, forcing a shut-down of factories representing an investment of millions of dollars. They must have fresh water to operate.

If they were unable to meet this threat thousands of employees would be idled and the impact would be felt throughout this section of the State.

The Orange Leader, commenting editorially on the projected watershed-improvement program, told how Orange County's irrigation systems had saved the rice crop during a dry spell last year, but added:

"At the same time, something a lot less subject to boastfulness was going on without publicity. Industrial concerns in the area were sweating blood because the supply of fresh water was inadequate. Tremendous quantities were required for irrigation, which seriously affected industrial usage.

"For a time it was nip and tuck with the industries whether they could stay in operation or be forced to close down until the rains came upstream and the river's flow increased.

"It is true that a lot of water flows down the Sabine River to the Gulf every year. But it also is distressingly true that most of this water comes down the stream during about 8 months of each year.

"So far as the fresh-water situation is concerned, the idea behind the present waterways movement is this: If a series of low-level dams can be constructed upstream on the Sabine, the water could be impounded during months when it is plentiful, then released as needed during periods of drought.

"Until this is done, there can be few more big industries requiring large quantities of fresh water built on the Sabine."

The unprecedented gains made by industry in the Beaumont-Port Arthur-Orange area during the last 10 years has attracted Nation-wide attention. Hundreds of millions of dollars have been invested in refineries, shipyards, chemical plants, and synthetic rubber factories.

Most of them take vast quantities of water. A nylon plant near Orange, for example, requires 30,000,000 gallons a day. There is not a major industrial installation in the entire Sabine Basin that does not impose a heavy drain on the current supply.

The threat to agriculture is equally menacing.

Orange County rice growers keep their fingers crossed when talking about their supply of fresh water. Their irrigation systems have served them well. During the dry spell last year irrigation canals and ditches remained free of salt water and not a grain of rice was lost.

But will their luck hold out? In some of the neighboring counties and in Louisiana parishes across the river, the loss was heavy. Rice is the principal cash crop in this area. A few failures would undermine the entire agricultural structure.

When the Sabine River Authority was created a few months ago, an Orange man, John W. Simmons, was chosen to direct its destinies. It was not only because of his qualifications but because he is in a position to realize the gravity of the water problems.

Other Orange leaders have thrown their strength behind the watershed-improvement program. They want dams built all up and down the Sabine to help maintain the flow at a consistent level and at the same time develop new industries that will strengthen the economy of all east Texas.

The late Beauford H. Jester, as Governor, addressing a water conference in Tyler last year, said:

"Texas has been as profligate in its usage and wastage and lack of conservation of its water as it has been in years past with its forests, oil, and gas. We have no more frontiers that we can move to, or more unexplored areas, so to speak, that warrant us in being wasteful of our natural resources. Our job is to conserve and better utilize that most basic of natural resources—water."

The Governor added that the picture is not too desperate in east Texas as this area has perhaps more available water than any other section of the State. But he cautioned that failure to make intelligent use of the existing supply would place a limit on future industrial expansion.

V. A SUMMARY OF ADVANTAGES

LONGVIEW, TEX., September 22.—Did you know that—

Texans are using water more than twice as fast as nature can replace it?

A shortage of water threatens to hamper the industrial expansion program in east Texas?

A single industrial plant near the coast uses as much water as Houston or Dallas?

Two-thirds of the domestic supply comes from underground, and 90 percent of the surface water flows into the Gulf?

In an effort to arouse east Texans to the gravity of the water problem, the newly organized Sabine River Watershed Association has launched an all-out crusade to pave the way for a long-range conservation program.

Volunteer speakers have been recruited to appear before luncheon clubs, schools, and civic groups. Each has been armed with statistics showing the urgent need for harnessing the water of the Sabine River.

Solution is simple

The figures about the diminishing supply were not gathered out of thin air. They came from Judge Guy C. Jackson, Anahuac, president of the Texas Water Conservation Association.

No alarmist, Judge Jackson says the solution of the problem is simple if everyone will pull together. Waters of the Sabine alone, according to the judge, will support four times the present population of the watershed area if proper control measures are taken.

What control measures are necessary? A series of dams, strategically located along the stream, would impound water for municipal and industrial use. It also would check floods that inundate hundreds of thousands of acres annually. It would help maintain a consistent flow so necessary to industry in the lower Sabine Valley.

And how will the program be carried out? The State legislature early this year created the Sabine River Authority, a nine-man agency empowered to map an all-embracing improvement program. Only $25,000, however, was appropriated for its use. So the private watershed group was organized to do much of the spade work and, if necessary, raise funds to take up the slack.

United States engineers are expected to start a routine survey of the project soon. But with a limited allotment of funds progress will be slow unless additional money can be raised to speed up operations.

Recreation centers

Once the project is given the official sanction of the Government, the next move would be actual construction of the dams. There probably would be three or four major reservoirs and from 15 to 20 smaller lakes that could serve not only as a water supply but recreation centers.

John Ben Shepperd, president of the watershed association, says, "under favorable conditions it should be possible to complete the entire project within 10 years."

Judge Jackson, who has studied the water situation throughout the Southwest, casts an apprehensive eye over California, Arizona, New Mexico, and other States that appear to be fighting a losing battle for more water.

"California," he says, "always brags about its sunshine. Los Angeles, so its boosters tell us, has only nine rainy days a year. But while they brag about the sunshine their water supply has cost the city and the Federal Government nearly a billion dollars.

"Newcomers are pouring into California at a rate of about 2,000 families a week. If that rate continues, California will have to close its gates to outsiders within 20 years because there won't be enough water for all.

Water means life

"In the Arizona country, water definitely means life. One of Arizona's driest counties is using water 18 times faster than nature is replacing it. And another, 11 times. How long can that last? Well, when the cistern goes dry the citizenry must move to a new source of supply.

"The water table (the depth at which underground water is found) has dropped in Arizona more than 55 feet in the last 6 years. In the area around Delano, Calif., it has dropped 220 feet in 20 years. What sort of promise does that hold for the future?"

Judge Jackson keeps records, taken from Government reports, that underscore the essential nature of water in industry.

"During the war," he says, "the Government picked tentative sites for more than 300 war plants, then had to pass them up because water supplies were inadequate.

"That, of course, was during the war. Nevertheless, it should serve as a yardstick. Industry wants to move to the Southwest where raw materials are more abundant and where the climate and labor conditions are better. But the thing that is stopping that movement is the lack of a stable supply of water."

To prove his point, the judge quoted a few figures:

The per capita consumption of water in the United States is 100 gallons a day. That is, a town of 5,000 needs 500,000 gallons daily. This is about four times the consumption in Europe.

It takes 65,000 gallons of water to produce a ton of steel.

To produce a gallon of gasoline, 10 gallons of water are required.

More than 3,000 gallons are required to process 100 cases of green beans.

A gallon of beer calls for 15 gallons of water.

One process of synthetic rubber production requires 85,000 gallons per ton of rubber.

It takes 100,000 barrels of water to raise an acre of oranges.

An iron smelter in east Texas uses about 17,000,000 gallons, and if a proposed steel mill is erected to operate in conjunction with the smelter the requirements will be raised to 70,000,000 gallons.

If the goals of the Sabine River Authority are attained, the huge water-conservation project likely will be operated under State supervision.

Warns of United States control

Ralph McAlister, of Nacogdoches, an active water conservationist whose interests lie in the lower Neches Valley, has warned that if we wait too long the Federal Government will take over our water project and a three-man board, unfamiliar with Texas problems, will control our destinies.

The Sabine River Authority is clothed with broad powers. Under the law it may issue bonds not to exceed $25,000,000. It may sell water for industrial, agricultural, or municipal uses and it may collect revenues from its recreation centers.

Whether the project will be self-supporting is questionable. There is little doubt that the over-all benefits will far exceed the cost.

"We hope," said President Shepperd of the watershed association, "to keep the management within the framework of our Texas government. That sort of policy is more in keeping with our ideas of free enterprise."

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION
Dallas, Tex., August 3, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated July 29, 1949, wherein you have expressed your interest in the completion of the survey of the Sabine-Neches River area, and your desire for information as to whether any request has been made for additional funds for those rivers.

In answer to your inquiry, you are informed that a request was made for additional funds to carry on the pertinent field investigations and office studies for the Sabine River report, in which you are interested. However, because of the limited funds appropriated by Congress for work of this character, and also because of the large number of other reports of major scope assigned to this division, it was found necessary to prorate the allotted funds to assure a reasonable rate of progress on as many reports as practicable.

For your further information, it is presently estimated that the Sabine River report will cost about $141,000, and of that total approximately $35,000 has been allocated to the continued prosecution of the necessary investigations and studies.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS W. PRENTISS,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers, Division Engineer.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
OFFICE OF THE DIVISION ENGINEER,
SOUTHWESTERN DIVISION,
Dallas, Tex., August 11, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your note of August 7, 1949, which was written on the bottom of my letter to you, dated August 3, 1949.

In reply to your inquiry as to the amount of funds required for the Sabine-Neches you are informed that the status of funds for the two separate survey (review) reports currently being prepared on the Sabine and Neches Rivers and their tributaries is as follows:

River	Estimated total cost of report	Available funds
Sabine	$141,000	$35,000
Neches	118,000	24,000
Total	259,000	59,000

In further compliance with your request I am returning herewith for your files my original letter to you with your note thereon.

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS W. PRENTISS,
Colonel, Corps of Engineers,
Division Engineer.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, August 26, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your note of August 15, 1949, which was

appended to a reply by Col. Louis W. Prentiss, division engineer of our southwestern division, relative to the allocation of funds for the review reports on the Sabine and Neches Rivers and their tributaries, Texas. Your note requests information as to whether all or part of the funds needed for these investigations was requested by the Corps of Engineers for the fiscal year 1950.

The Corps of Engineers in its budget request for funds to prosecute its survey program throughout the country during the fiscal year 1950 included the amount of $48,600 for the investigation of the Neches River and its tributaries and $58,700 for the investigation of the Sabine River and its tributaries. As you have been informed by Colonel Prentiss, the amounts currently available for those investigations total $59,000. Funds included for our survey program in the Civil Functions Appropriation Act for 1950 (H. R. 3734) were allocated to the Corps' field offices during July under the provisions of Public Law 154, Eighty-first Congress, which permitted the allotment of those funds contained in appropriation acts now before the Congress which are not in dispute between the House and Senate.

Your letters are being returned herewith as requested.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., September 2, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge receipt of your letter dated July 29, 1949, requesting information on the status of funds for a survey of the Sabine-Neches River area by the Corps of Engineers, and your letter dated August 12, 1949, requesting information on a source from which the recently established Sabine River Authority could receive or borrow funds to plan or complete a study of the area.

With respect to the survey of the Sabine-Neches River area, I might point out that river and harbor and flood control survey funds are contained in lump-sum appropriations from which allocations are made to projects at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. It is understood that allocations are made to as many of the highest priority surveys as may be carried forward within available funds consistent with reasonable and economic rates of progress. I am informed that the Corps has allocated $24,000 to the Sabine-Neches survey through fiscal year 1949, and has tentatively allocated an additional $11,000 for fiscal year 1950. No special budget request has been made for funds to complete this survey.

As to sources of financial assistance for the Sabine River Authority it may be possible that the Authority might qualify for a loan from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. I would suggest that inquiry be made at the Public Agency Loan Division of RFC to determine specifically the eligibility of the Sabine River Authority for financial aid through that agency. I am not aware of any other possible source of Federal funds for such purposes.

I hope that the above information meets your present needs.

Sincerely yours,

ELMER B. STAATS,
Acting Director.

GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, September 13, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives

My DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter of August 12, 1949, concerning the Sabine River Authority which was created by the Legislature of the State of Texas at its 1949 regular session (ch. 110, Laws of 1949). You inquired whether there was any source from which such authority could receive or borrow funds with which to plan or to complete a study.

The only funds available to this Administration at the present time for planning purposes consist of $200,000 appropriated by the Congress under Public Law 266, approved August 24, 1949, to carry out the provisions of section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act. Copies of the acts referred to herein are inclosed. You will note that section 8 (c) of the Water Pollution Control Act authorized an appropriation to the Federal Works Agency to enable the Federal Works Administrator to make grants to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies to aid in financing the cost of engineering, architectural and economic investigations and studies, surveys, designs, plans, working drawings, specifications, procedures, and other action preliminary to the construction of projects approved by the appropriate State water-pollution agency or agencies and by the Surgeon General.

Under section 5 of the Water Pollution Control Act, the Federal Works Administrator was authorized to make loans to States, municipalities, or interstate agencies for the construction of necessary treatment works to prevent the discharge by such State or municipality of untreated or inadequately treated sewage or other waste into interstate waters or into a tributary of such waters, and for the preparation of engineering reports, plans, and specifications in connection therewith. However, no funds have been appropriated by the Congress for the purpose of making loans under such section.

By virtue of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, Public Law 152—Eighty-first Congress, approved June 30, 1949, all the functions of the Federal Works Agency and of the Federal Works Administrator were transferred to the Administrator of General Services, and the Federal Works Agency and the Office of the Federal Works Administrator were abolished.

If the plan for which the Sabine River Authority is seeking funds pertains to water-pollution control, and if the Authority believes it can qualify for a grant under the Water Pollution Control Act, I suggest that you advise the Authority to correspond with Mr. W. H. Sindt, Division Engineer, Bureau of Community Facilities, General Services Administration, whose address is 1003 Texas and Pacific Building, Fort Worth 2, Tex.

Assistance that was made available, in recent years, in connection with the provision of public works was rendered through our advance-planning program whereby funds were advanced to States and political subdivisions thereof to assist in the preparation of drawings and specifications for public works proposed for construction with funds to be furnished by the applicant. However, our authorization to advance funds for plan preparation for such purposes expired on June 30, 1947.

In his midyear economic report, the President recommended to the Congress that it enact legislation at this session to assist States and localities to intensify their advance planning of public works. This is one of the recommendations considered by the President as of vital importance in the current economic situation. Such legislation would result in an adequate reserve of public works to be implemented as material and manpower become available, or accelerated if necessary to help stabilize the construction industry. Senate bill 2116 and House bill 5739, which have been approved by the respective Committees on Public Works, contemplate the extension of the advance-planning program, and it is hoped that the Congress will take favorable action on these measures.

Since the Sabine River Authority is a conservation and reclamation district, it may be that the authority will wish to communicate with the Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, to inquire whether that Bureau has any funds available for the purpose desired by the authority.

Sincerely yours,

JESS LARSON,
Administrator,
General Services Administration.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE,
Washington, D. C., October 6, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: A survey of the Sabine River watershed, concerning which Mr. John W. Simmons wrote to you recently, is scheduled to begin in fiscal year 1951 and is so indicated in our budget estimates recently discussed with the Bureau of the Budget. Previous commitments on other watersheds and carry-over of surveys started before the war have fully taken up the facilities available to us in the current fiscal year. The Sabine survey would be undertaken along with the Neches, the Calcasieu, and Mermentau. The survey of these watersheds is estimated to cost $162,000 and would require 2 years to complete, that is, fiscal years 1951 and 1952.

We have made a preliminary examination of the flood-damage problems in the Sabine watershed which indicated the seriousness of the flood damages in that area and the need for a comprehensive study, as suggested by Mr. Simmons, of the sources and what should be done in the way of watershed treatment to alleviate these damages.

When the survey is started, we shall keep in close touch with Mr. Simmons so that there may be the maximum possible coordination with the objectives of the Sabine River Authority.

Sincerely,

M. Y. NICHOLS,
Acting Chief.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
OFFICE OF THE CHIEF OF ENGINEERS,
Washington, October 10, 1949.

Hon. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your letter dated October 1, 1949, concerning additional funds for the survey of the Sabine-Neches River by the Corps of Engineers. With your letter you enclosed a communciation from the Acting Director of the Bureau of the Budget on this subject in which he states that no budget request has been made for funds to complete this investigation, and you inquire whether I could make a request to the Bureau of the Budget for additional funds for this purpose.

For a number of years, the funds provided by Congress for the prosecution of the authorized program of investigations has been insufficient to carry on that program at a desired rate. In the absence of specific information showing the necessity in the national interest of completing the investigation of the Sabine-Neches River at an accelerated rate over that provided for other invectigations throughout the country, this office would have no basis for submitting a special budget request for funds to complete this investigation nor would the Bureau of the Budget have any basis for favorable consideration of such a request. However, in the event that a larger appropriation is made in 1951 for carrying on the investigation program every consideration would be given to advancing the completion date of the Sabine-Neches survey consistent with the funds appropriated.

I trust that the information contained in the paragraphs above is sufficient for your present purposes.

The enclosure with your letter is returned as requested.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE
PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1949.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Receipt is acknowledged of your letter dated November 20, 1949, with respect to the survey by the Corps of Engineers of the Sabine-Neches River, Tex.

As Acting Director Staats pointed out to you in his letter dated September 2, 1949, in connection with this same survey, river and harbor and flood control survey funds are contained in lump-sum appropriations from which allocations are made for project studies at the discretion of the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers. If the Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Engineers determine that the Sabine-Neches River survey should be completed at an accelerated rate, increased allocations could be provided through their administrative action. It would appear that the schedule for completing this survey is a matter of negotiation between representatives of local interests and the Corps of Engineers.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Director.

DEPARTMENT OF ARMY,
January 4, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Reference is made to your note of December 18, 1949, appended to General Crawford's letter to you of November 23, 1949, relative to funds for the Sabine River survey. You ask if the Corps of Engineers would request funds for completion of this or any survey.

Based upon information presently available as to the urgency of the flood problem on the Sabine River this office is unable to justify a request for sufficient funds for completion of the survey in the immediate future. Accordingly, we cannot make a request for funds for early completion of the Sabine River survey. The Corps of Engineers does not make specific requests for funds for completion of any particular survey; however, numerous surveys are completed each year with funds provided in a lump sum for our authorized examination and survey program.

In the event your questions pertain to the use of General Services Administration funds, please refer to my letter of December 9, 1949, in reply to your note on a letter received by you from Mr. Pere F. Seward, Commissioner, Bureau of Communiy Facilities, General Services Administration, in which it is stated that it appears that General Services Administration funds cannot be used by the Corps of Engineers for prosecution of the Sabine River survey. This conclusion was based on the Commissioner's statement that planning funds appropriated to the General Services Administration under authority of Public Law 532, Eighty-first Congress, are to be advanced to local authorities for the planning of non-Federal public works. Accordingly. it is not proposed to request such funds for completion of the Sabine River survey.

Sincerely yours,

LEWIS A. PICK,
Major General, Chief of Engineers.

The Indeterminate Length the American Taxpayer Must Go To Make Good the Interest on British Bonds

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 6, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, with the help of the Bureau of Engraving and its billions of printing-press money made good as to purchasing power by the ingenuity and enterprise of American industry, and the brawn and productiveness of American labor, coupled with the utilization of oceans of petroleum energy applied in most every line of human endeavor, we have been able to service our huge national debt and at the same time contribute billions of dollars—American purchasing power—to help service the British national debt.

After all, the most important thing to our international financiers is to maintain the integrity of the bonds they hold of the European governments, the so-called Marshall-plan countries.

There seems to be no limit to the financial burden these financiers would induce our Government to place on the back of the American taxpayer in furthering their scheme to put money in the national treasuries of Great Britain and the Marshall-plan countries, so that when the interest coupons on the government bonds of these countries are presented, this money will be on hand to pay them.

Not satisfied with the huge cash contributions the American taxpayers have already made and are now making to the governments of these countries, these financiers want more

A condensation of an illuminating article by the able economist, Herbert Bratter, on the new plan for further financial contributions to Great Britain, taken from the Sunday Star of January 29, is presented here, together with extracts from an editorial appearing in the January 26 issue of the Washington Times-Herald:

[From the Washington Star]

The rumor markets of Washington, and perhaps of other world capitals, have encouraged speculation in the past week or two that the British Government will shortly submit a formal request for the equivalent of a United States loan of $8,000,000,000 for the liquidation of the so-called blocked sterling balances. These are the bank balances which have piled up in London as a result of goods and services which were supplied to the British during and after the war by India, Egypt, and many other countries.

To pay off those war debts, even though slowly, is today a great burden for the British. Whether or not Uncle Sam is now to be propositioned to take over this burden, the possibility does throw a spotlight on an important element in the whole problem of Britain's economic troubles—as well as those of her creditors.

CLOUD OVER ECONOMY

Ever since the war Britain in its financial relations with the rest of the world has been bankrupt in the sense that its obligations have exceeded its capacity to pay. Despite the assistance Britain has received through the Bretton Woods program, interim aid, the Anglo-American financial agreement of 1945, and the ERP, the country's reserves of foreign exchange are dangerously low. In part these reserves are low because of the rate at which London has permitted India and some of the other owners of the wartime-accumulated sterling funds to use them in the purchase of British goods, which otherwise might have been exported there or elsewhere against payment in foreign currencies. During the war the Indians and others gave up goods for London bank balances and got no goods in exchange; now the British in releasing those same balances, are giving goods and getting no other goods back in exchange. This the British call "unrequited exports." There has been strong pressure on the British Government from within the country to slow down the rate of honoring of the piled-up foreign bank balances, and a few weeks ago the Chancellor of the Exchequer announced that payments would be slowed down.

For years now the huge total of the blocked-sterling balances has hung like a cloud over the British economy, yet no solution has been found. When after World War I the British, like others, owed large war debts to the United States Treasury and found the annual payments burdensome, they simply stopped paying and, presumably, we have stopped dunning. But the more than $8,000,000,000 which Britain today reportedly owes to owners of the London bank balances and cannot pay off are not so readily to be canceled for political considerations. The Indians and others want to buy things with their money; in fact, want to buy things here, if possible. They would like to get dollars for their blocked sterling balances, so that they may buy American goods. But Britain has no dollars to give them.

Who owns those $8,000,000,000 or so of blocked balances? India and Pakistan, although they have been allowed to spend substantial portions of those sterling holdings since the war, still have to their credit more than $2,240,000,000 in London. Other members of the Commonwealth hold important amounts, notably Australia, whose balances in London have been growing rapidly in recent years, to a total last June of about $1,000,000,000. Eire, a non-Commonwealth country, owns a bit less than that in London banks. Egypt accounts for more than $300,000,000, it is believed.

PART OF DOLLAR TALKS

These balances have been the subject of Anglo-American official discussion ever since the war. Prior to Bretton Woods the United States Treasury Department recognized them as a potential troublemaker. During the Anglo-American loan negotiations in 1945 the sterling balances were exhaustively examined and in the loan agreement itself the British Government undertook to make settlements with the countries which owned those accumulations; yet settlements have not been made, due to the unwillingness of the owners of the balances to cancel any part of them. * * *

Because the greater part of the blocked-sterling problem is an Asian problem and because the United States of late has become very Asia-conscious, the British understandably are hoping for a way out of these bank-balance difficulties through American aid. Britain doubtless hopes that somehow in the extension of American aid to Asia Washington will persuade the eastern creditors of London to cancel part of the sterling in consideration of dollars supplied by the United States. In Colombo recently Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin stated that the United Kingdom will ask the United States to share the problem of non-Communist Asia. "The United States," he added, "is a very generous country." * * *

The Indians and other creditors would welcome Washington's replacement of the sterling with dollars only if no strings are at-

tached. Indian Finance (Calcutta weekly) sees as the most simple solution for this vexing problem—the taking over by the United States of the entire sterling obligations of Britain. * * *

We are now being told that this country is now helping India through the ERP aid to Britain; that with the diminution and final ending of ERP India will suffer and that, therefore, the Indian and British problems are really one. Americans are thinking more about India than ever before, but what is uppermost in their minds is Britain's inability to get on its feet and the fact that all the financial transfusions of the postwar years have failed to get the European deficits out of our budget. * * *

If history is a guide, therefore, some way will be found, eventually, to help Britain handle the sterling debts.

[From the Washington Times-Herald]

NEW SCHEME REVEALED

A move to give more billions to the British is gathering momentum. Representative WOLCOTT, of Michigan, one of the best-informed Members of Congress on financial matters and a delegate to the Bretton Woods Conference in 1944 by appointment of President Roosevelt, said in a statement last week that an attempt soon would be made to have the United States assume the debt of Britain to India, Egypt, and other foreign countries.

WOLCOTT was the first to describe the details of the new scheme. He said that the United States would pay these British debts by accepting sterling now frozen in London in payment, first, for agricultural products accumulated by the Commodity Credit Corporation, and then for machinery and other items.

All this ties up with the proposal made in December by a study group of United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce. The scheme released by that group was the first suggestion of using money obtained from the American taxpayers to pay old and stale debts of the British Government.

The study group limited the donation to 15 percent of the British debts. The idea now, according to Representative WOLCOTT, is to have the United States assume the entire debt.

The composition of the group in the International Chamber of Commerce which made the original proposal shows the motivating influence. The interests back of the new $8,000,000,000 donation to Britain are the same ones which put over the Marshall plan and then made huge profits out of it. They are also the same ones which backed every other donation of American funds to Britain.

MARSHALL-PLAN BUSINESS

One of the twenty-one named as authors of the scheme is Lamar Fleming, Jr. Mr. Fleming is president of Anderson, Clayton & Co., the principal business of William L. Clayton, former Under Secretary of State.

Mr. Clayton was the principal architect of the Marshall plan, directed negotiations with foreign countries in working out the plan, and directed the drive for the passage of the first ECA Act. Mr. Clayton's firm has supplied at least $100,000,000 worth of cotton paid for with ECA funds. ECA transactions with Anderson, Clayton & Co., tabulated by the Tribune, total $79,000,000, with no figures available since September nor between February 1, 1949, and April 30, 1949.

Another member of the International Chamber of Commerce group which suggested unloading British debts on the American taxpayer is S. Sloan Colt, president of the Bankers' Trust Co. of New York.

His bank has, from the first of ECA, had a large percentage of the letter of credit business. Through the end of the year, Mr. Colt's bank has had $281,000,000 worth of business from the Marshall plan. Two directors of the Bankers' Trust Co., Philip Reed and Ward Melville, were members of the Committee for the Marshall Plan—the propaganda group which agitated for passage of the act originally. Reed is also president of the International Chamber of Commerce.

The National City Bank of New York, which has had $310,000,000 worth of ECA business, was represented on the committee to put over the Marshall plan by two of its directors, Sosthenes Behn and Gerard Swope. Now we find two officers of the bank, W. Randolph Burgess, chairman of its executive committee, and Leo N. Shaw, a vice president, on the roster of the study group which brought out the new British aid plan.

BANKS GET THEIR SHARE

Two Irving Trust Co. directors, Henry P. Bristol and David L. Luke, worked hard to get the Marshall plan through Congress. The bank has cashed in on their efforts thus far with $220,000,000 worth of letter of credit business. A vice president of the bank, August Maffry, took a leading part in preparing the International Chamber of Commerce report.

J. P. Morgan & Co. has had $238,000,000 worth of business out of the ECA. I. C. Raymond Atkin, a Morgan vice president, was one of the study group which brought out the suggestion for a new lot of British aid. The Bank of America also can see the point that foreign aid is good for the country or at least the financiers' end of it, as its share of the ECA banking business so far has been $197,000,000. Russell G. Smith, an executive vice president, is on the international chamber's committee.

Those who had the misfortune to invest in foreign bonds which are not being paid or serviced would like to see their debtors helped; so the membership on the chamber's committee of James Grafton Rogers, president of the Foreign Bondholders Protective Council, is understandable. For like reasons, so is that of William S. Robertson, president of the American & Foreign Power Co.

The new plea for British aid at the expense of the American taxpayer is not being promoted by patriotic people who have only the welfare of all the people of the country in mind. It has been launched by persons who have their own private interests in mind. The influence of these people, when combined with that of the eastern Anglophiles, proved sufficient to put over the $3,750,000,000 loan to Britain in 1946 and the Marshall plan.

Unloading upon the United States old and stale debts of the British Government does seem a little more outrageous than the other schemes, but it will all look sweet and reasonable when the internationalists' propaganda has had a chance to dress it up.

Debacle in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Tribune correctly puts its finger on the situation in China. I include it as part of my remarks:

ENOUGH ROPE

Secretary of State Acheson has announced that Russia has absorbed or is in process of absorbing Manchuria, Outer Mongolia, Inner Mongolia, and Sinkiang from Communist China. He did not say whether this was being done with or without agreement of the leaders of the Chinese Communists. He implied, however, that the seizure will turn the Chinese people against Russia and against China's own Communists, and stated that it should be the policy of the United States to give the Soviet Union and Chinese Reds enough rope so that they may hang themselves.

We do not know how accurate Mr. Acheson's report is or whether it is a new development. There is some reason for approaching the matter with caution, for the Secretary has certain axes to grind. His cautionary word against foolish adventures by America is, of course, an oblique defense of the refusal of the administration to give further support to the Nationalist Chinese Government in Formosa or elsewhere. It is also a defense of the administration's orginal botched policy of intervention in China and of its present do-nothing policy.

Mr. Acheson also, it should never be forgotten, is a faithful stooge of British foreign policy. His parents were both born as British subjects. The British Government, in the hope of protecting its China investment, China trade, and its colony of Hong Kong, has hastened to recognize the new Communist government. Although we have refused to date to follow suit, there is good reason to believe that Mr. Acheson would like to do so in order to uphold the hand of His Majesty's Government.

He can now argue that, in view of the Soviet seizures, American recognition of the Red regime in Peiping might be accepted by the Chinese masses as moral support of Chinese integrity, and that to take this step would make the Chinese friendlier to us. Recognition, he might contend, would line us up with them against Russia, so that at a more opportune time they might side with us against Russia.

There is only one trouble with this position. Unfortunately, it is serious. The Chinese must have short memories, indeed, if they forget that it was Mr. Roosevelt, an American President, who first let Stalin in to rob and then possess himself of the Chinese orchard. At Yalta, in a snap decision, consummated, according to the late Secretary of State Stettinius, in a mere 13 minutes, Mr. Roosevelt gave Stalin the opening he is now exploiting.

As the price for Russia's entry into the last few days of the war with Japan—an action which Stalin had voluntarily pledged 15 months before with no price tag attached—Mr. Roosevelt, without consulting our ally, China, agreed that Russia should receive all the territory she had lost in the Russo-Japanese War of 1904, including special rights in Manchuria.

Thus Stalin was told he might Russianize the port of Dairen, lease the naval base of Port Arthur, take over joint operation of the Chinese eastern and south Manchurian railroads, and count upon Mr. Roosevelt to exact concurrence from Chiang Kai-shek, the leader of Nationalist China. When Japan surrendered, Russia was installed in Manchuria and disarmed the Japanese Kwangtung Army, turning over all of its arms to Chinese Communist forces, who employed them in the conquest of all China against Chiang's Nationalist forces.

Thus the Roosevelt-Truman administration stands as accessory in Russia's reported theft of vast areas of China, and if Mr. Acheson expects the Chinese people to direct their entire wrath against Russia, we fear that he will be disabused.

Something can be said for his doctrine of "enough rope." It is a doctrine which would have made great sense in 1941 when the United States had to appraise the world situation. Mr. Roosevelt refused to let events take their course with Germany and Japan, and, incidentally, with Russia. He had to plunge into war. As the British military

historian, Maj. Gen. Fuller, has noted, there was every chance that Germany and Russia, the two dictatorial powers, would have bled each other white if left to fight matters out between themselves. By intervening, Mr. Roosevelt built Russia into a menace compared to which Germany was of slight importance.

The doctrine of "enough rope," now advocated by Mr. Acheson in China, is not the doctrine which the administration he represents has followed. We have spent billions on economic and arms aid and have pushed ourselves to the front everywhere as a check upon Russia instead of adopting the patient and long view that, left to themselves, events supply their own counteractive. If enough rope will insure Stalin's downfall in China, it will insure his downfall everywhere. Yet Mr. Acheson regards it as a local remedy instead of a general therapy and continues the frantic program of rushing into every trouble spot everywhere, with the sole exception of China.

The Republican Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the folowing editorial from the New York Herald Tribune:

THE REPUBLICAN RECORD

Speaking at a Democratic conference on Saturday, where the illusion of unity was created by the ingenious device of keeping entirely silent on civil rights, Vice President BARKLEY departed from his prepared text to prophesy the approaching end of the Republican Party. It is a suggestion he has ventured before, and one that scarcely does credit to the Vice President's natural good sense or optimistic attitude toward life in general. On the same day, in New York, Representative FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR., was belaboring Republican skulduggery and talking as if the Democratic party was purely and undividedly in favor of civil rights reforms. That was a position, it seems to us, which did not do credit to his intelligence.

Not only logic and the record of history cried out against these Democratic orators. On the same day, by a fortunate coincidence, two outstanding Republicans spoke for their party. At a luncheon of the Women's National Republican Club Governor Driscoll and Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE, of Connecticut, had opportunity to prove that the Republican Party is very much alive and intends to remain so, and that on the crucial issue of civil rights it has acted effectively, rather than engaging in mere talk.

Representative LODGE, who is less well known in these parts than he should be, exhibited in his speech the combination of forward-looking zeal and realistic prudence which is characteristic of the Republican Party at its best. He insisted that the needs of men must find an effective response, and that neither timidity nor a fear of "me tooism" can justify the Republicans in ignoring them. But these needs, he insisted, also, can be met in other ways than by barren centralization and the withering of incentive. To maintain that the price of social improvement is the granting of illimitable powers to the state in the worst kind of defeatism. It is a defeatism in which Representative LODGE refused to indulge.

On civil rights he properly took the offensive, asserting that in this whole matter the Democrats have been "hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective." What he said was borne out in the speech of Governor Driscoll, whose record in New Jersey, like the record of Governor Dewey in New York, has shown that the Republicans really do believe in reform and do not hesitate to act. Even partisan oratory does not justify the interpretation that during recent weeks in Congress the Democrats have been sincerely anxious to pass civil rights legislation and that they have been thwarted by the opposition. The record needs to be kept straight before the voters, and Driscoll and LODGE have made a timely contribution to keeping it straight.

Cut Everything

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER E. BREHM
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, a familiar trick employed by advocates of deficit spending is to ask those of us who are attempting to economize just where we would make the cuts. Of course the objective back of this question is to try to embarrass those of us who are attempting to save our Nation from economic bankruptcy. They hope that our answer will serve to get us in bad with various groups or organizations who might have their appropriations reduced if our suggestions were followed.

I know that the Members of this House are loyal, patriotic servants of the people. I fear, however, that we may sometimes be influenced by some particular group. There are Members in this body who do not have a smokestack in their district and because of this they vote for each and every proposal which is advocated for the farmer. Other Members do not have a farm in their district but thousands of industrial workers so they vote for each and every proposal which is advocated for labor. Other individuals carry the torch for foreign countries, others for various pension groups, others for educational groups, others for veterans' organizations, and so it goes endlessly.

In my opinion there isn't one pressure group in a hundred who knows or cares what will be the over-all results to our Nation if their particular pet scheme is adopted.

Mr. Speaker, I started this speech in order to answer the question of where I would cut and my answer would be the following:

Cut everything. Cut the farm subsidies. Reduce all subsidies. Cut the rivers and harbors and highway and housing appropriations. Curb the lending powers of Government corporations. Reduce the amounts the Army and Navy and Air Force can spend. Pare down European aid. Cut the pay rolls, yes even our salary if necessary.

Put an economy and efficiency team to work in the Veterans' Administration to cut out the obvious wastes and abuses in administering the GI bill of rights. There are dozens of other activities where money could be saved without diminishing any really essential Government service, and without weakening the national defense.

There is excess fat in the Federal budget, from the Agriculture Department and Atomic Energy Commission all the way through the alphabet. The Government habitually hires at least three people to do what could be done better and at less cost by two. There are more Federal employees in Ohio than there are State employees.

We cannot do all this by saying, "We are for economy but—." What we must say is, "We are for economy, period." And that must mean cutting all the way down the line. We must stop spending money we have not got for things we cannot afford, regardless of their merit.

Now Mr. Speaker, these remarks may rise up to haunt me in the next election. Well so be it. My own personal fortunes in some future election are of small concern when contrasted with the solvency of America.

I refuse to support any peacetime budget unless it is a balanced budget brought about by economy in Government.

The Coal Crisis—What Is an Emergency?

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH P. O'HARA
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, the coal crisis which has been existing for weeks and weeks is reaching a climax. Coal-burning train service is being suspended, and I have received wires from my congressional district and from the fuel conservator of the State of Minnesota that some kinds of coal already are unavailable. Certain schools will also be closed in the matter of 3 or 4 days.

The Congress has provided a law for an emergency of this type and that law should be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, in our section of the country temperatures range from slightly above zero to as cold as 36° below zero.

The question which I ask is, How many people have to be frozen to death before it is determined that there is an emergency?

Our people are appealing for immediate relief. Action is necessary and coal must be delivered in these emergency conditions. Further delay invites nothing but catastrophe.

Mr. Speaker, I urge you to convene an extraordinary session of the House of Representatives for the purpose of taking emergency action in the present coal shortage crisis.

I include the following telegrams, letters, and newspaper accounts to show the serious conditions existing:

GLENCOE, MINN., *January 27, 1950.*
Congressman JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
Second Congressional District, Minnesota, Washington, D. C.:

Ordered carload stocker coal from Old Ben Coal Corp., 230 South Clark Street, Chicago, Ill., to be delivered December 27, 1949, or soon as possible. If not delivered in 7 days will have to close St. Peter and Paul School. Please try to expedite.

GLENCOE LUMBER & COAL CO.,
GORDON F. DAHL.

Congressman JOSEPH O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Investigation among coal dealers here reveals serious situation in coal for domestic use. Stoker coal for home-heating plants very low. Under present severe weather conditions supply gone in week to 10 days, domestic lump sizes soon after. Please do all possible to secure immediate relief in this area.

R. B. WILLARD,
Executive Secretary, South St. Paul Civic and Commerce Association.

ST. PAUL, MINN., *January 20, 1950.*
Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
United States Representative for Minnesota, Washington, D. C.:

Governor Youngdahl has just wired President Truman as follows, quote: A coal shortage in Minnesota now becoming critical. Industries threatened with closure. Lake-dock supplies running low. Some kinds coal already unavailable. Worst of winter season still ahead. Minnesota now dependent upon rail shipments difficult to secure because of reduced production. Imperative that action be taken to assure an increased supply in immediate future. Unquote. Your assistance in securing intervention of national Government in relieving situation is earnestly solicited.

J. W. CLARK,
Fuel Conservator, State Capitol.

COMFREY TRAIN TAKEN OFF AGAIN

On again, off again. That's the way Northwestern passenger train service to Comfrey and Darfur has been going in the last few months.

Since last Sunday the train is off again. The Northwestern withdrew it for the second time since late last October because of a shortage of coal. The suspension is for an indefinite period.

The suspended train was passenger 16, which leaves Sanborn at 3 p. m., travels through Comfrey and Darfur, and arrives at Belle Plaine, Iowa, at 11:10 p. m. daily except Sunday. The last trip was made last Saturday.

So Gil Iverson, star route carrier from the Springfield post office to Comfrey and Darfur, is back to carrying all classes of mail to these communities. The last time the train was suspended he made 19 round trips between October 29 and November 21. Carrier Iverson makes the circuit every day except Sunday and holidays.

WE'RE GETTING USED TO BELOW ZERO TEMPERATURES NOW

Frigid weather continues to prevail here, but it's the kind of weather Minnesotans expect at this time of year.

High winds kicked up a near blizzard Sunday. Fortunately only 1½ inches of snow were recorded, or this area would have had blocked roads and high drifts. The strong winds hit this area in the early morning hours Monday, but blew out of steam before noon.

Subzero readings have been regular this week; however, daytime temperatures have not been unusually low.

The following week's readings are furnished through the courtesy of Springfield's weather observer, Alex Peterson, United States volunteer official weatherman.

	High	*Low*
Thursday, Jan. 5	10	−15
Friday, Jan. 6	20	−5
Saturday, Jan. 7	14	−13
Sunday, Jan. 8	35	−1
Monday, Jan. 9	27	1
Tuesday, Jan. 10	17	0
Wednesday, Jan. 11	30	0

JANUARY 30, 1950.
Hon. JOSEPH P. O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

All available supply of stoker coal in Gaylord will be exhausted within a few days. None available from any source. Situation will be serious in a short time. Local school has 1 week's supply on hand. Urge immediate action.

H. A. KNOBEL,
Clerk, Independent School District No. 19.

MINNEAPOLIS, MINN., *January 23, 1950.*

On Friday, January 20, a check-up of dock coal figured against unfilled orders already placed indicated that our available stocks for dealers or industrial spot orders were exhausted and that we had already drawn heavily against reserves for contracts. Consequently, it was necessary to issue an order that we could not accept further orders for dock coal. This was a hard decision to make but limited working time at the mines last summer cut our lake shipments in half, causing this shortage. We expect to take care of contract commitments.

This fuel shortage can be relieved greatly by all-rail shipments if the mines are put back to work immediately on a 5-day work week basis. We earnestly suggest that all dealers and industries wire or write their representatives, Senators, or Governors, advising of coal needs and asking the necessary governmental orders to issure this much-needed coal production.

NORTH WESTERN-HANNA FUEL CO.

Foreign and Defense Policies of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by George Sokolsky, from the Washington Times-Herald of January 30, 1950:

THESE DAYS
(By George Sokolsky)

In the face of a potential enemy of the dimensions of the Russian universal state, a national carefully guards its own potentialities. The most serious problem in wartime that faces the United States is the supply of a few essentials, such as raw rubber, tin, and other metals, which are obtainable on the American continents and some of which must be imported.

Uranium, which is more important in war than in peace, is available in Canada; Bauxite in ample quantities is available in Surinam, British Guiana, Curacao, and Jamaica; tin from Bolivia and copper from Chile; antimony comes from Chile, Bolivia, Peru, Honduras, and Mexico; chrome comes from Cuba; cobalt from Canada.

In a word, war requires integration in a defensible area.

From that standpoint, after our frightful blunders in China for which the State Department is responsible, the 10,000-mile supply line from our west coast to southeastern Asia is too long and too difficult to maintain against a fleet of snorkel submarines operating out of the bays and harbors of Soviet China.

Because of our errors it will be difficult to protect either Japan or the Philippines or even Guam and Hawaii. Our first line of defense, in actual war, has been pushed back by Soviet Russia, to the west coast, to Los Angeles, San Francisco, and Seattle.

Taking for granted our favorable relations with Canada, the problem then is, what is our position in Latin America? To maintain more of a union than was achieved at Chapultepec in 1945, it is essential to cultivate not only the self interest but the respect of the Latin-American countries.

With the exception of Brazil, these countries are culturally related to Spain.

They are all Roman Catholic, and that term needs to be understood, for while to most Americans, the Roman Catholic Church is a religious sect, to Roman Catholics it is a culture, a way of life. For instance, a Mexican may be anticlerical, but he is not a Marxist, he remains a Catholic and his wife and children will be trained in the Catholic faith.

To refuse to recognize Spain and to be offensive to Spain, while recognizing Tito, can only strike a Latin as monstrously illogical, and seeking for logic, he reaches the conclusion that Spain has been rejected by the United States because in that country catholicism defeated Marxism.

As a matter of fact, Spain is the only country in Europe where Christianity and communism fought it out and Christianity was wholly victorious.

If the foreign and defense policies of the United States are to be integrated, Latin America is more important than Europe, and Spain is more important than any country in Europe because of its cultural influence upon Latin America.

A sound policy is an integrated one and this country is on dangerous grounds when its foreign and defense policies are operated in conflict.

During the Roosevelt administration, when the State department functioned with adoration for Soviet Russia, communism made tremendous inroads in Latin America, particularly in Cuba and Mexico.

Lombardo Toledano, the leader of Mexican communism, was a great factor in the development of a Marxist enclave. While such influences have become weakened in the Latin countries, they are by no means dead.

Peron represents our greatest error in Latin America. The United States opposed his rise to power which he has never quite forgotten.

Our opposition was based on the utterly false assumption that we could pick between good and bad dictators; that Stalin was a good dictator and Peron a bad one. But Peron turned out to be a very successful one, who not only established himself over the Argentine, but has also pursued an independent attitude, almost a competitive attitude, vis-à-vis American policy.

This country, in its defensive program, must make sure of the Argentine. It could prove to be an Achilles heel, the weak spot that imperils.

In fact, in a knockout war, it might prove necessary to bring wheat and meat from the Argentine to the United States, should our means of transportation be dislocated.

The so-called good-neighbor policy was so inadequately and amateurishly handled, that in spite of huge expenditures its lasting results are not visible. To win the next war, we need to be sure of both American continents.

Fair Employment Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the fair employment practices bill appears to be a reasonable piece of legislation. Members of Congress who have studied it quite carefully believe that if it is finally adopted that it will do more harm than good.

It calls for the establishment of another Federal agency which would have jurisdiction over all employers who employ 50 persons or more doing business in interstate commerce. This agency would be charged with the duty of preventing any discrimination in employment based on race, creed, or color. Further, the sole judge of such a charge would be the Federal agency set up under this measure. Any decree entered against an employer or a union would be enforceable in the courts. Obviously this tremendous power might be exercised for good or evil. One need not speculate very much to understand the strife and contention that might arise, especially in the South. It could easily start a class or race war and its sponsors know it.

A majority in the Congress, if provided with a secret ballot, would vote against it. Party leaders in both Houses know that is true. But both parties are committed to the legislation, solely for political purposes and not for the good of the country.

One week ago the Democratic leaders in the House shed crocodile tears in beating a move to restore previous power to the Rules Committee. The breast beaters cried that the effort to restore this power was designed to prevent the FEPC bill from getting to the floor for action. The effort was defeated decisively by a coalition of New Dealers and Republicans. There was no charge that this was a coalition of reactionaries, as the leftists have shouted before.

Now, 1 week later, and FEPC is still bottled up in committee with the help of President Truman and the Democratic leaders in the House. These Democrats do not want the bill to pass in its present form and they will have their way. Vote-hunting politicians have been paying lip service to the measure and a lot of unsuspecting people are being hoodwinked. Many fine colored people and a large group of labor leaders are being taken for a ride and they must be aware of it.

Emergency Situation on Montana Indian Reservations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WESLEY A. D'EWART
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. D'EWART. Mr. Speaker, the emergency situation on Montana Indian reservations, which I mentioned to this House on last Thursday, continues to cause great concern.

It is certain that many hundreds of Indians will have to be supported with food and fuel throughout the remaining months of this harsh winter, particularly on the Blackfeet, Rocky Boy's Fort Belknap, and Tongue River Reservations.

The President has now sent to the House a deficiency request for $800,000 for Indian welfare, and I hope that we will lose no time in making this money available so that further suffering from cold and hunger will be unnecessary.

Meanwhile I can report some improvements in the situation. The Indian Bureau reports that an additional $10,000 has been made available to the Blackfeet Reservation, and another $10,000 for the other reservations in Montana. Also, we have been able to secure release of part of the Blackfeet tribal oil royalty funds which have been tied up by another Government agency.

The various reservations have received or are receiving their shares of the 500 elk taken by Government hunters from the northern Yellowstone Park herd, and this meat will be very welcome.

Reports coming to me also indicate that an effort is now being made to use to the fullest extent the surplus commodities which are available from our agricultural supplies. I cannot understand why this source of food was not fully exploited long ago, and I hope that the potatoes, apples, dried eggs, and other supplies available will be distributed rapidly to the needy Indians.

The yearly repetition of emergency hunger and cold on our Indian reservations is something that is unnecessary and can be avoided.

Dead Animals on Our Highways Dangerous to Public Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am taking advantage of this oportunity of calling to the attention of the Congress, and the country, a condition that vitally affects the health of every person in every State in the Union, as well as in the District of Columbia.

On my return to Washington, I recently drove approximately 1,000 miles, through four States and the District of Columbia. On that trip I saw hundreds of dead animals, and parts of dead animals, on the highway. I saw dead dogs, dead cats, dead skunks, dead rats, dead squirrels, dead rabbits, dead possums, dead crows, dead buzzards, dead birds, and other dead animals, that had been run over by automobiles, and their bodies left to rot on the road.

In the summertime we see a large number of dead snakes on the road that have been run over by automobiles. Many of them are poisonous and extremely dangerous.

If any of these dead bodies are affected with contagious or infectious diseases, the germs are picked up by every car that rolls over them.

I am not a doctor, but I know that polio has been spread throughout the country in some mysterious manner that even the medical profession cannot explain.

I know that a great many wild animals are affected with rabies or hydrophobia, one of the most dangerous diseases known to man.

I know that in some States rabbits have become affected with some kind of disease that is not only destroying them but making it dangerous for anybody to eat their flesh.

I know that the body of any dead animal that is in a decaying condition is likely to be affected with disease germs that are dangerous for one to come in contact with.

I want to make two suggestions.

First, that any motorist who kills an animal of any kind on the highway should be required to stop his car and remove its body from the road.

Second, that the highway officials, as well as the public-health officials in every county in every State, and also in the District of Columbia, be required to have the bodies of dead animals removed from the highway as soon as they are discovered, and that every motorist who sees a dead animal on the highway be required to report it to the nearest authority.

In my opinion, this would prevent the spread of some very dangerous diseases and would probably save the lives of large numbers of men, women, and children throughout the country.

House Vote Should Decide

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial

from the Mt. Vernon (Ohio) News of January 28, 1950:

HOUSE VOTE SHOULD DECIDE

Whether you're for or against the Truman program, you should welcome the administration's victory over the House group that tried to scuttle the new system for bringing bills to the floor.

For many years the House Rules Committee had life-and-death control over legislation. It was like a traffic cop, steering some proposals to a floor vote, blocking others. It could smother any measure it disapproved.

Countless bills that would have passed the House never reached the floor. Some were bad, but some were good. The relatively unknown committee members struck down both kinds—without regard to popular sentiment or the views of the whole House.

Last year administration forces succeeded in breaking the committee's stranglehold on legislation. It rammed through the committee itself, and then the House, a new plan under which a measure could be brought to the floor 3 weeks after the committee turned thumbs down on it. In other words, the committee could be bypassed.

The change was generally hailed as a triumph for more broadly democratic methods over the autocratic impulses of the tiny group of men on the Rules Committee. The new 21-day rule meant that the full House could be assured of making the final decisions on controversial issues.

But as the 1949 session opened, a coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats on the Rules Committee took command and reversed the 1948 action. It decided to cast out the 21-day rule and restore to the committee its power to throttle any bill.

Republicans flatly said they hoped thus to block most of President Truman's social-welfare program. Southern Democrats made plain they wanted to stop civil-rights bills.

The administration was seriously concerned that it lose the advantage gained last year. Headed by Speaker RAYBURN, Texas Democrat, Mr. Truman's House chieftains marshaled all the strength they could to keep the 21-day rule. The fight looked close, but in the end the administration won by a surprising 236 to 183 when 64 Republicans came over to its side.

So, once more the old undemocratic system is out the window. That's where it ought to stay. Its supporters argue that legislative traffic runs wild without that check. But it's hard to believe that sensible lawmakers can't devise a way to steer bills wisely without giving the Rules Committee veto power over them.

The House floor is the place to decide the fate of major issues. All the Nation's representatives, not just a chosen few, should pass upon them. If they make a bad choice, the voters can reject them and put in other men who can correct the error. That's the sound democratic approach.

Truman's Spending Spree Based on Theory That Government Has the Right To Take Money From Peter and Give It to Paul

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a President who can outspend 32 other Presidents to date has established some kind of a record. Mr. Truman has outdistanced the others by more than eleven billions.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, in Newsweek for January 23, points out the fallacies in the President's argument for a perpetual spending spree. I commend it to the attention of all Members:

THE FORGOTTEN TAXPAYER

(By Henry Hazlitt)

"This financial program," insisted President Truman in presenting his annual budget, "provide a sound basis on which to proceed." He thought his spending policy one of prudence and restraint. "It provides for esesntial activities," he said, "on a minimum basis and no more." He spoke of it as if it were an abstemious, almost a niggardly budget. He had denied request after request for additional funds. In fact, he declared at one point: "The major question in my mind is not whether we are doing too much spending but * * * too little."

This budget that Mr. Truman considers to be so sound, prudent, restrained, a minimum and perhaps too little, happens to be in simple fact a continuation of the largest peacetime expenditure ever proposed by the head of this or any other government in the history of the world.

The requested 1951 expenditures of $42,440,000,000, would be greater than our total estimated national income in 1932. They would be more than 5 times the annual rate of spending in the peacetime years of the Roosevelt administrations. They would be more than 10 times the annual rate of spending in the Hoover administration.

This colossal rate of spending, Mr. Truman argues, is necessary to meet the demands which the foreign and domestic situations put upon the people. It contributes to the welfare of our people. It encourages prosperity. It maintains high employment. It promotes an expanding economy.

The real truth is the exact opposite. Mr. Truman's bouquet of fallacies stems from looking solely at what the expenditures do or appear to do for those to whom they are given. He forgets that a government cannot give anything to Paul without taking it from Peter. In brief, he completely forgets the American taxpayer.

Mr. Truman really does assume that we can eat our cake and have it too. He forgets that the Government cannot fill a single need without making it impossible for the individual taxpayers to satisfy other needs. He declares that many Federal expenditures constitute direct supports for important sectors of our economy. But he forgets that the taxes taken to make these expenditures must constitute at least equal depressants on other important sectors of our economy. He sincerely believes that he can pass economic miracles by seizing more and more from the American taxpayer and handing it over to someone else.

Yet you do not help the people to meet their needs by taking away from them the earnings on which they depend to meet those needs. You do not maintain high employment by putting further tax burdens on the industries that provide employment. You do not encourage production by burdening the productive to subsidize the unproductive. You do not create an expanding economy by killing incentives and draining industry of the very capital by which productivity is increased and an economy expanded.

Even with the present unparalleled burden of peacetime taxes the Government stands to raise only $37,300,000,000 in revenues. This means that it plans a deficit in the 1951 fiscal year of more than $5,000,000,000. This deficit alone would be greater than the entire expenditures of the Federal Government in any year in the Hoover administration. It would come on top of an estimated deficit of $5,500,000,000 in the current fiscal year, on top of 18 deficits in the 20 preceding fiscal years, and on top of a national debt of about $259,000,000,000.

What is most ominous is that the President no longer seems to consider deficits anything to worry about. He expects the country to be satisfied with the vague assurance that we are moving toward budgetary balance in the next few years. Mr. Truman and his advisers seem to believe that they can keep a perpetual boom going by perpetual deficit financing and perpetual inflation. And that belief, as experience shows, has always ended in disillusion and disaster.

Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. CARROLL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CARROLL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Christian Science Monitor carried an article titled "Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture." This article, written by Kimmis Hendrick, concerned the establishment of the new semimonthly magazine, Frontier, published by Gifford Phillips and edited by Phil Kerby.

I was very interested in Mr. Hendrick's account, as I have been a reader of Frontier since its first issue. As a magazine of opinion devoted particularly to the West, Frontier can play an important role in the future development of this great part of the Nation. The magazine is published in Beverly Hills, Calif., but it is printed in Colorado, and its interests include the entire West, from the Pacific seaboard through the Rocky Mountain area. In its first few issues, already it has published outstanding articles by such western writers as Carey McWilliams, Roscoe Fleming, Benton J. Stong, and Robert Stapp.

Every Member of Congress who is interested in trends of thought and action in the West will find Frontier well worth reading. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article "Liberal Magazine Pioneers in Western United States Venture," from the Christian Science Monitor for December 30, 1949, in the Appendix of the RECORD for the further information of Members:

LIBERAL MAGAZINE PIONEERS IN WESTERN UNITED STATES VENTURE

(By Kimmis Hendrick)

BEVERLY HILLS, CALIF.—Western liberals now have something they have been wanting for a long time—a review devoted to western affairs and similar in outlook to Nation and New Republic.

The appearance here of a modest-looking semimonthly called Frontier is noteworthy for two reasons:

1. It puts the liberal viewpoint on record for a region of tremendous, vital growth—a service that can be useful not only to liberals but to careful, conservative critics of the liberal position.

2. It helps, therefore, to draw the line between the genuine liberal viewpoint and that

wholly fallacious liberalism espoused by Communists—of which, it appears, the far West has too many and too much.

These two points become all the more emphatic in view of Frontier's definition of liberalism. Liberalism, says editor Phil Kerby, means that which a free people are evolving as their concept of society—provided, that is, they are adequately informed.

This proviso is Frontier's great opportunity. The West has liberal journalism, true. But in several western cities, notably Los Angeles, there has been virtually none at all, and it is Mr. Kerby's ambition to see Frontier help westerners get adequate appraisals—not necessarily political appraisals—of developments vital to their future.

This is an ambitious hope. When it is considered, however, that these States represent the newness of America, and that populationwise they represent the biggest migration to a new frontier of this time or of any time, it can be seen as an ambition irresistibly attractive to the liberal editor.

It is even more attractive to the editor who considers, as Mr. Kerby does, that the still-new West presents two fascinating extremes: the already entrenched conservatism of its founders and the unformed, liberal-tending hopes of the new generation of settlers that has poured in by the millions since Pearl Harbor.

Take Los Angeles. Today it can aptly be called the world in microcosm. A community shaped by hardy, enterprising pioneers whose successes have given it metropolitan status, Los Angeles is even more the camping ground of newcomers who have just two things in common—they are Americans and they like California.

Again, take Hollywood. Here is a place that is not a community so much as an influence. People think of it as the origination point for the neighborhood movie and the gossip column. But it has a bearing on the mores and manners of millions of moviegoers and an undoubted impact on the economic and political affairs of California.

Mr. Kerby believes that a magazine devoted to a review of what is happening in Los Angeles, in Hollywood, and throughout the West can help crystallize and support whatever genuineness there is—and, obviously, there must be much—in this evolving picture.

Such a review must rest on convictions. Frontier's convictions, as has been said, are the convictions of liberalism, belief in the individual's instinctive or deliberate quest for self-realization and a truer relationship to the rest of mankind. Such liberalism, of course, has nothing in common with communism, fascism, or clericalism, and Frontier regards these as having no part at all in its ideal.

It takes money to establish a magazine. Frontier has the money. A young Denver millionaire, Gifford Phillips, as publisher, is underwriting the cost for 2 years, anyway. But Mr. Phillips has indicated that the magazine must budget itself carefully and build enough circulation to become self-sustaining. He estimates that 10,000 subscribers will enable it, not to make money, but to pay its bills.

He is printing Frontier at the Golden Press, in Golden, Colo., a suburb of Denver, where he publishes a weekly newspaper. He owns a radio station in Pueblo, Colo. He has television interests in Hollywood. In Mr. Kerby he has an editor of broad experience as a western newspaperman—and he has given him what any editor would gladly call a free hand.

It is Mr. Phillips' good fortune, as a young publisher whose maturity is yet to be tested, to have the opportunity to give the far West something it can profit by, provided the job is carefully done.

The Ohio River Is the World's Most Beautiful River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the word "Ohio" means the beautiful river. Thus the Ohio River was named before the State of Ohio was named.

Besides being the world's most beautiful river, it is one of the world's greatest carriers of freight. The tonnage carried on the Ohio is gradually increasing and the increased usefulness of the Ohio justifies the great improvements which the Government has made on this river in the past 50 years. Greater improvements are yet to come, and with them will come usefulness.

The following newspaper clipping describes the beautiful Ohio in beautiful language:

OHIO: THE BEAUTIFUL RIVER

The Iroquois called the river "Ohio," and the name was later translated by the French as "the Beautiful"—La Belle Rivière. Not a beautiful river, mind you, but the beautiful, with no fear that it might be confused with any other.

The last moments of a sunset on a westering reach of the upper Ohio, smooth-flowing water the color of burnished copper between almost perpendicular stone banks already pitch black in shadow; or the jade green of low winter water on the middle river accented by a cold sun or bordering snowbanks; or a summer morning above its mouth where the broad stream makes a sweeping curve through rich black bottom lands, bound by yellow willows and gnarled white-limbed sycamores—those sights should convince even scholars of linguistics that "Ohio" must mean "the beautiful," no matter what the apparent connotation of the Iroquois noun.

But appreciation of the river's beauty was not limited to French and Iroquois. Charles Fenno Hoffman, urbane editor of the Knickerbocker Magazine, got his first view of the Ohio at Wheeling in 1833:

"The Ohio is beneath your feet. The clear majestic tide, the fertile islands on its bosom, the bold and towering heights opposite, with the green esplanade of alluvion in front, and the forest-crowned headlands above and below, 'round which the river sweeps away, to bless and gladden the fruitful regions that drink its limpid water—these, with the recollection of deeds done upon its banks—contrasted with all the luxuries of civilization that now float securely upon that peaceful current—these make a moral picture whose colors are laid in the heart, never to be effaced: no man will ever forget his first view of the Ohio."

One prosaic Englishman, Abner D. Jones, was prepared to find the Ohio wanting. But after he had viewed its length even Abner added his mite of commendation: "I had often heard the praise of this majestic river sung, and had curbed my expectations lest I should be disappointed. The Ohio is a beautiful river. There are points on the Hudson and Connecticut, and other rivers of the East, which equal anything I saw on the Ohio; but its peculiarity is that it is all beautiful. There are no points bare of beauty; but every mile is as rich in scenery as it was in verdure at the time of my passage down its winding way.

The Cost of Limited Wars

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an interesting item that appeared in The Reporter on the subject of the cost of limited wars:

THE COST OF LIMITED WARS

"Limited" has become a word to watch; world government with "limited" powers, "limited" assistance to Chiang Kai-shek, and so on.

For 4 years, a "limited" war was waged in Greece, in which Greek Government soldiers were armed with American weapons and paid with American money. It has also been called a budgeted war: The Greek Government's expenses had to stay within the budget that the United States Government had approved. Fighting against the Greek Army, which was advised, but not exactly led, by American officers—advice is of course "limited" leadership—were Greek guerrillas. Nobody knows their exact number, but it is generally assumed that at the height of the fighting there must have been around 20,000. The total cost of the Greek "limited" war for the American taxpayer was around $1,000,000,000, or $50,000 per Greek guerrilla (more than twice as much as The Reporter estimated while the war was still going on). A fairly well-fed Greek may weigh around 130 pounds. His weight in gold at the present legal rate of $35 an ounce would be worth $72,800. If the Greek guerrillas had been made of gold, we would have been getting them at a 33⅓-percent discount.

Intervention in Greece, no matter how necessary, was much more expensive to the American Government than to the Communists. A bridge built at the cost of $1,000,000 could easily be blown up, as many were, with a $25 Communist bomb. One wonders why the Communists have put a stop to this drain on American wealth.

Perhaps the reason is that they now see the prospect of another American experiment in "limited" assistance or "budgeted" war. If Chiang Kai-shek, thanks to United States help, were to hold Formosa and spring back to the mainland, he would face a Communist army of from 2,000,000 to 4,000,000 soldiers and guerrillas. At the Greek rate of expense—$50,000 per enemy—Chiang Kai-shek's victory would cost us between $100,000,000,000 and $200,000,000,000. The total national budget of this country, as even the Chiang advocates are supposed to know, is approximately $43,000,000,000.

All this, of course, is true only for a "limited" war, fought by a friendly army with the "limited" or "budgeted" assistance of the American Government.

Tom Shiras

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, Tom Shiras was one of the prime movers in the initiation of a program of progress

for the northwest section of Arkansas. I knew him well. He was my friend. He was a constant booster for the development of the water resources of the White River watershed. He was interested also in the development of the latent mineral resources in our section. He literally gave his life in the service of development of that great section. His name is indelibly imprinted upon the progress that has been made and the development which we hopefully expect in the years that lie ahead.

The following editorial from the Baxter Bulletin, published at Mountain Home, Baxter County, Ark., on January 26, 1950, discloses the effort which he lent to his community, his section, and his State. I desire to insert this editorial as a part of my remarks:

TOM SHIRAS, 1879–1947

Three years ago this month Tom Shiras, whose name was synonymous with progress in north Arkansas, left the Ozark hills and hill people who had accepted him as their spokesman for more than 40 years. The hundreds of feature articles he wrote about the Ozarks were published regularly in the magazine section of the Arkansas Gazette and many other newspapers and magazines, and he was at the forefront of every significant move for expansion of industry and agriculture and the utilization of the resources of nature. He collected, in the years he spent as co-publisher of the Bulletin, an unusual wealth of information about the people and the potentialities of north Arkansas, and transmitted this knowledge in glowing terms to thousands of readers.

It was not his capabilities or exceptional knowledge, however, which endeared Tom Shiras to his thousands of friends in the Ozarks; it was his incomparable personality and friendliness. In every hundred thousand men, perhaps, there is one who can talk at any man's level and who makes friends with every man he meets—that was Tom Shiras. In every country store in the 40 hill counties of north Arkansas he told his story, and men of every trade crowded to listen. It was a story of a day when the Ozarks would rival the sections of the North and East in industry and wealth, when the forces of nature would be coupled with the vast resources and local initiative to turn the wheels of industry. That this would eventually happen, he had not a doubt, and he transmitted his energy, enthusiasm, and optimism to all who heard him.

Before Tom Shiras died 3 years ago, he saw this new era begin to unfold. Now the series of dams which he urged so strongly are being built, and surfaced highways are being constructed into the former remote sections where he traveled. He was a man who rose to a high place of esteem in the hearts of the people of Arkansas because of his individual initiative and comradeship. His theory was that every man is entitled to independence and identity. At his passing, the Arkansas Gazette wrote: "Tom Shiras himself was a monolith of a man in character, personality, and accomplishment."

Automatic Control of Cotton

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, I have just read with interest an article that appeared recently in the Memphis Commercial Appeal commenting on a plan of cotton production control. This plan has been proposed by one of my constituents, Mr. E. L. Dean, of Jonesboro, Ark. Although I have not studied Mr. Dean's plan, I would like to place this article in the RECORD for the information and consideration of the Membership.

The text of the article follows:

AUTOMATIC CONTROL OF COTTON PROPOSED BY ARKANSAS PLANTER

(By W. Clarence Adams)

JONESBORO, ARK., January 22.—A Jonesboro planter and livestock grower believes he has a plan of cotton production control that would finally eliminate Federal Government participation in the industry.

He is E. L. Dean, who says he has been working for 20 years on a plan for adequate controls. Mr. Dean, a graduate of the agricultural economics department of the University of Chicago and a former county agent, believes it is high time a concrete plan be worked out to assure the cotton farmer a good living without so much uncertainty.

Because of the competition of rayon and other developed synthetics, it is doubly important now that leaders of the South unite in a demand that Congress draw up an act that is sound economics and which would provide an equitable profit to cotton growers and stabilize the industry, he declared.

PLAN OUTLINED

Mr. Dean's plan calls for Congress to—

1. Authorize a nonprofit corporation for the purpose of marketing all cotton grown in the United States and operate it in the interest of producer and consumer.

2. Provide for the purchase of sufficient stock of the corporation by the Federal Government to furnish necessary margins to handle all cotton grown in the United States. (Provision may or may not be made to retire this stock by the producer at a small rate per bale.)

3. Provide for a United States Cotton Board, appointed by the President of the United States from a list provided by farm organizations.

4. The instruction to the United States Cotton Board should be very definite and specific in the act, leaving nothing to the discretion of the members.

The full operation of the program would be as follows, says Mr. Dean:

"By using the margin provided, the United States Cotton Board should begin at once to buy cotton, starting at parity price. As soon as sufficient cotton has been accumulated, the Board would make known to consumers of raw cotton the kind and amounts of cotton on hand and offer to sell to them at a price 1 cent above parity, the 1 cent to be used to defray necessary expense of handling.

TEN-MILLION-BALE RESERVE

"When and if the Board shall accumulate more than 10,000,000 bales of cotton which shall be considered a normal reserve, the Board must lower the purchase price 1 cent per pound the following year. The selling price must be lowered the same amount and at all times stay 1 cent per pound above the purchase price.

"All price changes must be announced on January 1, of each year but no change shall take place except on July 1, following the announcement. The price shall remain unchanged thereafter for at least a year," Mr. Dean continued.

Mr. Dean asserted:

"If the reserve, or cotton pool, continued to get larger in spite of the reduced price and the increase is due to increased acreage, the same procedure should be followed each year until the increase is stopped. The gradual reduction of price, however, should decrease production and increase consumption to lower the cotton in the reserve.

"If it failed to do so, however, and the amount of cotton in the reserve reached 15,000,000 bales, then the Cotton Board should announce to the farmers that they would have the option of either voting acreage control or accepting a price in the future progressively reduced by an added cent each year until production was checked. Such an election should be sponsored and held by farm organizations," Mr. Dean said. "Farm organizations could influence farm voters to select the proper stopping point for price to pay the needed profit, yet get the desired consumption."

NO MORE GUESSWORK

Mr. Dean asserted that if the reserve should be below the normal mark, a price advance of 1 cent per pound should be announced each year to build up the reserve.

He said he believes the only time guesswork would have to be resorted to would be the first year in fixing the starting price. After the first year, the condition of the reserve would determine the price and the price in turn would determine the amount produced and the amount consumed, he said.

Thus, he contended, the program would become automatic with no further Federal attention needed.

If the Federal Government should choose to subsidize foreign shipped cotton to offset the penalties paid by farmers because of protective tariff, that would be another question but would in no way interfere with this stabilizing plan, Mr. Dean said.

Cecilia Wenz Welcomes American Legion Auxiliary Members to Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 18, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the American Legion Auxiliary is one of the great patriotic organizations in this country. Last week the national executive committee assembled at its national headquarters in Indianapolis to consider matters affecting the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, Cecilia Wenz is the national treasurer of that organization, and she was called upon to extend greetings to the women who were present from every State and our Territories. Her remarks were typically "Hoosier" and they should be preserved. I am pleased to extend them at this point in the RECORD:

Madam President, national officers, past national presidents, and members of this executive committee, unaccustomed as I am to public speaking, I've just realized that a great injustice has been done to you, as a result. In all the times that we've been meeting in Indianapolis, seldom has a bona fide native of the State welcomed you to Indiana. Now that's a great shame, because Hoosiers are very friendly people. In fact, it's been said we're so friendly that all you have to do is set your foot inside the State line and the Indianapolis newspapers will refer to you ever after as a native Hoosier. This is a kind of State pride that outrivals that of Texas or Brooklyn. We don't claim we can beat the rest of the country—we're

just trying to absorb it. And so, in addition to welcoming you to national headquarters this morning, I take great pride and personal pleasure in greeting all you former "Hoosiers" back home again in Indiana.

Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution:

Resolution on water pollution

Whereas the Buffalo Sewer Authority has developed a plan for reducing the effect of industrial wastes in the Buffalo River tributary to the Niagara River; and

Whereas the Niagara River has been described as one of the most seriously polluted streams in the United States; and

Whereas the construction of works essential to such pollution abatement would impose a tremendous burden upon this community; and

Whereas it is a public obligation on the part of municipalities in this area to take such action as may serve to reduce pollution reaching the Niagara River: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Common Council of the City of Buffalo hereby petitions the Congress of the United States to amend Public Law 845, known as Water Pollution Control Act, so as to provide for and allow loans of at least $5,000,000 at an interest rate of 1 percent to municipalities and public authorities for the purpose of constructing works essential to pollution abatement, and to further amend the act so as to include under the term "treatment works," all works directly contributing to the abatement of existing pollution in interstate or boundary waters, and that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation be instructed to loan money at the rate of 1 percent for that purpose; and be it further

Resolved, That the Representatives in Congress from western New York and the United States Senators from the State of New York be presented with copies of this resolution.

Do It Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, if each one of the 141,000,000 people in this country would speak to Congress with one voice, it would be "Repeal the burdensome excise taxes and do it now." The large executives have the facilities with which to express themselves on this question.

There is an upsurge from all classes of people demanding relief from excise taxation. The larger the family, the more the chief breadwinner has to pay in hidden taxes. There is another group who are suffering from the delay in repealing excise taxes, and that is the manufacturers who find that they are suffering from a buyers' strike as the result of President Truman's message to Congress. Labor is threatened with unemployment because of the delay in repealing excise taxes.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a petition to the Congress of the United States from 51 executives in American industry for the repeal of the wartime excise taxes:

A PETITION TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM 51 EXECUTIVES IN AMERICAN INDUSTRY

The wartime excise taxes were passed as wartime controls in 1941, 1942, 1943. They served their purpose well.

But the war is over. It has been over for more than 4 years.

Everyone agrees today that wartime excise taxes are unfair in peacetime.

They are discriminatory. They penalize selected industries, the men and women who work in them, the public which needs and buys their products.

They have created serious unemployment in certain industries and communities. They prevent fair and free competition.

Everyone agrees with this statement of the President in his tax message:

"There is need to reduce taxes which burden consumption and handicap particular business. * * * Some (excise taxes) are depressing certain lines of business. Some burden consumption and fall with particular weight on low-income groups. Still others add to the cost of living by increasing business costs."

And—this statement is just and statesmanlike.

We believe that the same sound reasoning applies not only to the 7 industries for which the President recommended some relief—but applies with equal force and equal justice to all of the wartime excise-tax levies of 1941, 1942, 1943[1] on all of the 27 industries affected.

These excise taxes were justified during wartime. They are unjust and discriminatory during peacetime. To repeal some of them now and allow others to remain is only to alter the shape of the discrimination.

We support the President in his concern for a balanced budget and debt reduction at high employment, and we are convinced, after careful study, that wartime excise taxes are today a dangerous obstacle to the achievement of these goals.

This is a matter of simple arithmetic.

1. How much revenue would the Federal Government lose if the wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943[1] were entirely repealed? The net loss will not exceed $1,500,000,000; it may well be less.

2. Can the Federal Government safely accept such a reduction of revenue? The budget now includes $1,920,000,000 to make loans and purchase certain assets, many of which are already guaranteed by Government agencies. Guaranteed mortgages and loans are a major part of this item. This $1,920,000,000 is not an expense; it is a recoverable asset. (See p. 1117 of the Federal Budget just published.)

3. This sum alone is greater than the maximum net loss of all wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943.[1]

American consumers have already registered their protest against these wartime levies.

They have done so by drastically cutting their spending in most of the 27 industries affected.

They are waiting for their Congress to act. Every passing week adds to the cut-back in buying, in production, in unemployment.

Every passing week adds to the crisis.

This committee has been organized for the sole purpose of presenting a just petition for the redress of a serious grievance.

We ask justice for the public which pays these unfair taxes. Justice for those of our employees who have been taxed onto the relief rolls through no fault of their own. Justice for communities disrupted by unemployment. And justice for the men and women who have invested in our companies.

In this spirit, we—active heads and executives of our businesses, Democrats and Republicans alike—solemnly exercise the American right of petition. We appeal to the conscience and the reason of the Congress:

Repeal the wartime excise taxes of 1941, 1942, 1943.[1]

Repeal these taxes completely.

Repeal these taxes now.

National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes: Chairman, Frank McConnell Mayfield, President, Scruggs-Vandervoort-Barney Co.; Vice Chairman, Arde Bulova, Chairman of the Board of Bulova Watch Co.; Vice Chairman, Eric A. Johnston, President of Motion Picture Producers and Distributors of America; Vice Chairman, Louis Ruthenburg, Chairman of the Board of Servel, Inc; Secretary, H. Leigh Whitelaw, Managing Director, Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association; Treasurer, James J. Newman, Vice President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; J. Carlton Bagnall, Sr., Executive Vice President, Swank, Inc.; Lester Baker, Treasurer, Dayton Rubber Co.; Robert F. Bensinger, President of Brunswick-Balke-Callender Co.; John M. Biggins, Vice President and Treasurer, Elgin National Watch Co.; H. C. Blakeslee, Vice President and General Manager, Cory Corp.; Harold Bozell, President of General Telephone Co.; Henry P. Bristol, President, Bristol-Myers Co.; Thomas A. Buckley, President, The Buxton Co.; J. H. Carmichael, President, Capital Airlines, Inc.; John S. Coleman, President, Burroughs Adding Machine Co.; John Collyer, President, B. F. Goodrich Co.; Robert Driscoll, Vice President, Greyhound Corp.; Samuel B. Edison, Vice President, Edison Bros. Stores, Inc.; Albert J. Feldman, A. Hollander & Son; Marion B. Folsom, Treasurer, Eastman Kodak Co.; John A. Fry, President, Detroit-Michigan Stove Co.; Leonard H. Goldenson, President, United Paramount Theaters Inc.; Julius Green, President, Julius Green Fur Co.; C. R. Harding, President of the Pullman Co.; Lyle C. Harvey, President, Affiliated Gas Equipment Corp.; J. V. Heffernan, Vice President, Radio Corporation of America; Oscar Heyman, President, Oscar Heyman & Bros., Inc.; Stanley H. Hobson, President, Geo. D. Roper Corp.; R. J. Irish, Executive Administrator, A. O. Smith Corp.; Stanley Klein, President, Mendel-Drucker, Inc.; R. A. Lumpkin, President, Illinois Consolidated Telephone Co.; L. R. Mendelson, President, Hotstream Heater Co.; John H. Moore, President of John Hudson Moore, Inc.; Dan J. O'Brien, President, Commodore Perry Hotel, Toledo; George F. Parton, President, Standard Safe Deposit Co.; Brock Pemberton, President, League of New York Theaters, Inc.; Warren Lee Pierson, Chairman of Board, Trans-

[1] Not including tobacco, gasoline, and alcoholic beverages which present problems of their own.

[1] Not including tobacco, gasoline, and alcoholic beverages which present problems of their own.

continental & Western Airlines, Inc.; B. Earl Puckett, President, Allied Stores Corp.; Milton R. Rackmil, President, Decca Records, Inc.; Carl P. Ray, Assistant to the President, Underwood Corp.; Vincent P. Ring, Treasurer, Knapp-Monarch Co.; Carl Rosenberger, Chairman of the Board of Coro, Inc.; Nicholas M. Schenck, President, Loew's, Inc.; Glenwood J. Sherrard, President of Parker House Hotel, Boston; Spyros P. Skouras, President, Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp.; C. R. Smith, President of American Airlines, Inc.; Edward Wallerstein, President, Columbia Records, Inc.; Harry M. Warner, President, Warner Bros. Pictures, Inc.; Howard V. Widdoes, Vice President, Remington Rand, Inc.; Edward T. T. Williams, President, The Lambert Co.

Senate Judiciary Changes in Celler DP Bill Unacceptable

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under the guise of liberalizing the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, the Senate Judiciary Committee has taken the Celler displaced-persons bill and unfortunately perverted it to the use of German expellees. Cleverly written to leave the impression that it accepts the principle of an increase in the admission of displaced persons in this country, it has completely departed from the principles of the Celler bill.

The Celler bill is designed to deal specifically with the problem of the displaced-persons camps—to look toward their quick dissolution, and to relieve the taxpayer of their burden of support for these camps. All facts point to the conclusion that the passage of the Celler bill will achieve that result. The changes to the Celler bill proposed by the Senate committee, despite their appearance to the contrary, would do no such thing. They leave untouched the central problem which is the elimination of the displaced-persons camps. The Senate committee bill does that primarily by including in its definition of the displaced person "persons of German ethnic origin who are expressly excluded under the Constitution of the International Refugee Organization."

That provision coupled with its other restrictive provision that 30 percent of the authorized visas shall be issued to persons who have been for at least 2 years at some previous time or times engaged principally in agricultural pursuits practically bars entry to those in the DP camps. The Displaced Persons Commission has testified that the agricultural restriction in and of itself has made the present act unworkable because of the difficulty in finding so high a percentage of eligible agricultural workers. There will be no difficulty in finding agricultural workers among the persons of German ethnic origin, but where does that leave the displaced person?

In addition thereto the proposed changes strengthen the provision that 50 percent of the German and Austrian quota shall be available exclusively to persons of German ethnic origin who were born in Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Rumania, Russia, or Yugoslavia, or areas under the control of any such countries.

Thus we see in effect a bill not for the persons in the displaced-persons camp, but for persons of German ethnic origin. In other words, the persons in the DP camps will have to compete with a heavy and overwhelming advantage in the law on the side of Germans for admission to the United States. This spells out a studied attempt to close our doors to the persons in the DP camp. It means that the American taxpayer will have to continue maintaining these camps for an indefinite period; it means that the DP problem will remain with us to be rehashed and rehashed over and over again; and it means that the hopes of dissolving the IRO on March 31, 1951, to which the United States is so heavy a contributor, will be dashed.

In addition to the expenses borne by the United States in maintaining these camps and in contributions to the IRO, the United States will be called upon to pay for all transportation costs of those persons of German ethnic origin since these persons do not come within the jurisdiction of the IRO. The constitution of the IRO forbids the organization from paying transportation costs for persons so excluded. Let me point out that the IRO bears the costs of transportation of displaced persons within their own definition. It will be noted, of course, that the Senate Judiciary Committee has changed the definition of a displaced person which heretofore has been the definition used by the International Organization. Acceptance of these provisions will mean a denial of our international obligations as well and a rift in the direction of international harmony.

I note, too, that the Senate Judiciary Committee proposes to include the word "Marxist" in addition to the word "Communist" already included in the Celler bill in its definition of excludible persons. It is hardly a legislative word since its definition is many things to many men. What is a Marxist and who is a Marxist is far from being settled and to use so vague a term legislatively is a grave error. Does a Marxist mean George Bernard Shaw, Clement Attlee, or Tito, or Molotov or any or all of them?

The Celler bill at best was a compromise bill, but it does have the merit of dealing directly and centrally with the problem of the displaced person. It has not departed radically from the core of the problem as has the Senate Judiciary version, which includes in its definition of displaced persons such people like the Greeks who reside within their country. That is the most curious of definitions. The purpose of a displaced-persons bill, I emphasize, is not to treat with all unhappy people everywhere.

It is most fervently to be hoped that the debate on the Senate floor will reveal the unhealthy structure of the proposed amendments to the Celler bill and that good statesmanship and good sense will prevail upon the Members of the Senate to reject the Senate Judiciary proposals and accept the House bill.

The Common Cold

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Dr. A. M. Washburn, from the Arkansas Health Bulletin of January 1950:

THE COMMON COLD

(By A. M. Washburn, M. D., director, division communicable disease control)

Winter is upon us with the cold in its period of greatest prevalence. The common cold is seldom a serious ailment but has a nuisance value of extensive proportions. Colds and their resulting complications—sinusitis, bronchitis, laryngitis, swollen glands, infection of the ears, and often pneumonia—are said to result in the loss of 60,000,000 work days and $400,000,000 in wages annually. More than half of all absences from school and work are caused by colds. Most persons have one or more colds a year. The incidence does not vary greatly according to age, sex, race, or occupation, but it appears to be highest in children under 5 years of age.

A cold is an acute catarrhal affection of the upper respiratory tract caused by one or more filterable viruses, usually accompanied by a slight rise in temperature on the first day and chilly sensations with coryza (cold in the head), and general lassitude lasting up to 7 days. Colds are highly communicable while the virus remains in the discharges from the nose and throat of the infected person, the source of all new colds. Transmission is brought about by coughing, sneezing, and explosive manner of speech by which droplets of infection are passed from the infected individual to susceptible persons within short range; and indirectly by handkerchiefs, eating utensils, etc. Susceptibility is universal, the cold developing within 72 hours after exposure, usually within 12 to 48 hours. A period of about a month or so of relative immunity follows an attack.

The common cold is largely preventable—preventive measures being of two groups—avoiding exposure and forming daily health habits to strengthen body resistance. The following rules may well be followed:

1. Stay away from crowds and ill persons during the cold season. An individual with a cold should remain at home in bed during the acute stage to protect others and to lessen the chance of complication.

2. Practice sanitary disposal of nasal and mouth discharges.

3. Avoid overheated rooms, too much clothing, and sudden changes in temperature.

4. Form proper habits of eating, sleeping, exercise, and recreation. Eat a varied diet, in moderation, consisting of meat, green vegetables, fruit, and milk, rather than rich pastries and sweets. Get plenty of rest.

5. Keep your hands scrupulously clean and away from nose, mouth, and eyes. Cover coughs and sneezes with handkerchief, or preferably, disposable tissues which should be burned or flushed out through the toilet.

6. If there is any doubt about the seriousness of the infection, see your doctor.

Various types of vaccine have been tried in the past but have not been proved as effective preventives of colds; however, they may prevent secondary infections, and thus complications. Recently the use of antihistaminic drugs under the direction of the private physician has been tried because the early signs of the cold are allergic in nature. Such drugs are not effective unless used in the very first stages of the cold.

California's Great Debt to Ed Hyatt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an editorial from the January 25, 1950, issue of the San Francisco News praising the services of Ed Hyatt, State engineer in California for 35 years, who is retiring this month. The imprint of Ed Hyatt's planning and effort in California will become even more distinct as time goes on, and I join in the sentiments of the editorial praising his work on the now nationally famous Central Valley project. The editorial is as follows:

CALIFORNIA'S GREAT DEBT TO ED HYATT

On February 1 the man who, more than any other living California citizen, has been responsible for long-range water conservation planning in this State will retire from public office. He is Ed Hyatt, State engineer for 35 years.

Ed Hyatt, together with Col. Robert B. Marshall, drew with daring strokes the picture of California's water needs back in the 1920's. Their long-range vision was shared by few other citizens. They saw that the State's very existence depended upon conserving the waters of the great Central Valley and using them economically for agriculture and industry. They drew up the original State water plan, which was the basis of the Central Valley project, now evolving. As State engineer, Hyatt started the work of putting the plan into execution and carried on until it became so big the Federal Government was asked to take it over.

The News is proud to have supported the plan from the beginning to date and proud also to have been associated with a far-seeing, devoted public official like Ed Hyatt in its development. He deserves public commendation and thanks for the contribution he has made to the fundamental welfare of the Commonwealth.

Our Civil and Human Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith the address delivered at the annual dinner of the Hudson County (N. J.) Bar Association at the Hotel Statler, New York, in December, by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States.

A distinguished audience of nearly 1,000 lawyers, including many eminent judges, listened with rapt attention to the Attorney General's address. The speech made a marked impression upon those present and commendations of the address were heard on every side.

The speech follows:

OUR CIVIL AND HUMAN RIGHTS

With the discovery of the New World, there came to this continent droves of colonists, seeking release from physical and spiritual oppression. Europe was just awakening from the slumber and nightmare of the Dark Ages; and from it went forth the oppressed, searching for freedom from tyranny and freedom to make the best of themselves in a fresh world. On this continent, in 1776, "our forefathers brought forth * * * a new nation, conceived in liberty, and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal." We have fought two world wars to defend our freedom so that we may live by that faith.

Now, on the continent where a light shone through the darkness to our colonists, America has herself become a light shining to all the world.

To millions of people everywhere, America is the source of new strength and new hope. We are giving our material aid through the European recovery program and in many other channels. We have given our promise of military support. We hold out to all the knowledge that America seeks no aggrandizement but rather the extension of human freedom everywhere.

Unfortunately, there are certain governments which hate the freedom we defend. They are dedicated to the proposition that a small ruling class knows what is best for all. They profess democracy, but in the lands they rule there is no freedom of speech, no freedom of thought, no freedom of religion, no security of the person, no freedom to meet with one's neighbors, no freedom to leave the country and exchange ideas with others of different belief. These governments seek to extend their rule by a world-wide conspiracy against the good order and the institutions of the other countries of the world. They proffer false promises of human freedom. With well-practiced lines, they are competing with us for the minds of men.

As lawyers, all of us here are sworn to defend our Constitution and the guaranties of liberty which it contains. It is, therefore, fitting that in this time of grave division in the world we should consider anew what our freedom means to us, how it has been preserved and some of the things we must do to preserve it for the future.

You will recall that when our Constitution emerged from the Constitutional Convention of 1787 it contained no bill of rights. It made no reference, for example, to freedom of religion, freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, or of the press.

The brilliant Hamilton, who was as much responsible for the adoption and ultimate ratification of the Constitution as any man, pointed out that the proposed Constitution guaranteed habeas corpus and trial by jury in criminal cases, and prohibited ex post facto laws, bills of attainder, and the grant of titles of nobility. A bill of rights, he went on to contend, was unnecessary, even dangerous. Said he, "Why, for instance, should it be said that the liberty of the press shall not be restrained, when no power is given by which restrictions may be imposed?" Such a provision on liberty of the press, he argued, could afford a pretext for implying power to regulate the press. Moreover, he wrote, "What signifies a declaration that the liberty of the press shall be inviolably preserved? What is liberty of the press? Who can give it any definition which would not leave the utmost latitude for evasion? I hold it to be impracticable; and from this I infer that its security, whatever fine declarations may be inserted in any constitution respecting it, must altogether depend on public opinion, and on the general spirit of the people and of the Government. And here, after all, as is intimated upon another occasion, must we seek for the only solid basis of all our rights."

Nevertheless the people were alarmed. Many feared that liberties won from the King by the Revolution would be lost to the new Government. Thomas Jefferson wrote from Paris to his friend Madison:

"A bill of rights is what the people are entitled to against every government on earth, general or particular; and what no just government should refuse or rest on inferences."

And again, on a later occasion:

"The declaration of rights is, like all other human blessings, alloyed with some inconveniences, and not accomplishing fully its objects. But the good in this instance vastly outweighs the evil."

This clash of views on an express bill of rights was to become a typical phenomenon in the struggle for liberty and equality. We should do well to remember this bit of history in viewing our present-day problems.

To achieve ratification of the Constitution its supporters promised the American people that the Congress at its first session would propose amendments for protecting the rights of the people against violation by the Government. This promise was carried out. The First Congress proposed what became the first 10 amendments to the Constitution, known ever since as our Bill of Rights. These amendments were promptly adopted by the people and became part of the Constitution on December 15, 1791—a day we have just commemorated, and which we mark each December 15 as Bill of Rights Day.

Thus we have guaranties that Congress shall make no law respecting the establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging freedom of speech or freedom of the press; or the right of the people peaceably to assemble and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances. So also we have detailed guaranties that criminal trials conducted by the Federal Government shall be carried on in accordance with basic standards—publicly, speedily, and fairly. There is affirmed the right of the people to be secure from unreasonable searches and seizures in their persons, houses, papers, and effects. These and other rights are guaranteed to all of us by the Bill of Rights against infringement by our Government. The Bill of Rights embodies not by indirection but in the explicit language of law our belief in freedom, our belief that there are some things that the Government may not do under any circumstances, our belief that an individual is an end in himself.

In the years that intervened after the establishment of the American Bill of Rights great changes took place. The original fears of tyranny from abroad and from monarchical tendencies within gradually disappeared. America settled down to an era of material growth, aided by the unprecedented advancement of science and invention, but complicated by such phenomena as slavery and emancipation, tremendous waves of free immigration and later restriction, unheard-of prosperity for many, economic misery for others in the shadow of plenty. The longing and striving for liberty did not change. Only the sources of potential oppression were different. Fear of private exploitation, backed by sometimes corrupt forces of law, replaced the early fear of our National Government. In fact, the National Government assumed the role of protector and mediator in the

struggle to arrive at a balance between property and human rights.

This was particularly evident in post-Civil War days when the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution were adopted. The thirteenth amendment abolished slavery and involuntary servitude. The fourteenth amendment, conferring citizenship on the former slaves, prohibited the several States from making or enforcing laws "which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States," from depriving "any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law," and from denying to any person "the equal protection of the law." The fifteenth amendment forbade abridging the right of citizens to vote on account of race, color, or previous condition of servitude. All three amendments empowered Congress to provide for enforcement by appropriate legislation. And Congress did. In a series of statutes known as the Civil Rights Acts, Congress in the years after 1865 sought to eliminate the practices and indicia of slavery which, if maintained, would defeat the purposes of the constitutional amendments. The statutes dealt with such things as peonage, and enticement into slavery; equality between blacks and whites in the right to own and transfer property, to make and enforce contracts, to sue, and to serve on juries; nondiscrimination in public accommodations, and, in general, equality in the rights and privileges which all citizens should enjoy. The bitterness of the Reconstruction, and the action of subsequent Congresses and courts, particularly prior to the First World War, reduced or nullified much of this legislation, leaving a residue of a few sections of the original laws. These provided dull and difficult weapons to wield when, in 1939, former Attorney General Frank Murphy, the late Mr. Justice Murphy of the Supreme Court, embarked a group of lawyers in the Department of Justice upon a regular program for enforcing civil rights, which incidentally has been continued by the succeeding Attorneys General in a unit of the Criminal Division known as the Civil Rights Section.

It remained for President Truman, in December 1946, to constitute the President's Committee on Civil Rights, a group of 15 distinguished citizens. The committee was asked to "determine whether and in what respect current law-enforcement measures and the authority and means possessed by Federal, State, and local governments may be strengthened and improved to safeguard the civil rights of the people." The committee engaged in extensive study and research. In October 1947 it handed up its report, containing findings and recommendations, now widely known under the title "To Secure These Rights." Out of further study of this report came the President's message to Congress of February 2, 1948, and his program for action.

I think it important to reiterate, as did the President and his committee, that although our basic human freedoms are better cared for and more vigilantly defended than ever before, there is a serious gap between our ideals and some of our practices. No thoughtful observer will deny that we have in practice achieved a great measure of the Bill of Rights. By the combined conduct of our legislative, executive, and judicial branches of government—local, State, and Federal—and by the vigilance of private citizens, watchful of their own rights and the rights of others, we have built up and defended constitutional liberty to a place where it is, in this country, the rule and not the exception.

Yet we would not, we need not, pretend we are perfect. The Civil Rights Committee report and the President's message afforded us a looking glass. It reflects the imperfections ranging from deficiencies in education and social attitudes to the needs of formalizing certain public policies in legislative and other acts. Perhaps our principal weaknesses and difficulties are in unevenness of application of civil liberties. We are in constant danger of dividing our people, of weakening our unity, if we fail to insure equality of treatment.

When I was a Member of the United States Senate, I had the privilege of studying the President's civil-rights program as a basis for proposed legislation. As a result, I introduced four bills, still pending, designed to carry out the major parts of his legislative program in this field. The factor common to each of these bills is the purpose to eliminate, with regard to the subject matter, discrimination based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

The first of these measures—the proposed "Civil Rights Act of 1949"—has a number of objectives. It would set up a permanent Civil Rights Commission in the executive branch of the Government continuously to survey the status of civil rights in this country and to advise the President of measures which might be taken to enhance the security of human rights. The bill would also set up a standing Joint Committee of Congress on Civil Rights, and a Civil Rights Division headed by an Assistant Attorney General in the Department of Justice. The bill would amend some of the few existing statutes in the civil-rights field in an effort to strengthen protection of the individual's rights to liberty and to the privileges of citizenship. Thus, in the case of the existing criminal statute protecting citizens in their rights under the Constitution and Federal laws, it would extend protection to all inhabitants of the United States, whether or not they are citizens, and this protection would be afforded against infringement by persons acting alone as well as in conspiracy. Another amendment makes an enumeration of the principal rights protected against the misconduct of public officers, in order to make more definite and certain the protection which the existing law seeks to afford.

The right to be free from intimidation and coercion in voting in an election for national offices would be extended to primary and special elections as well as to the general elections. The existing statutory protection of the right of citizens to vote at an election without distinction as to race, color, or previous condition of servitude, would be more carefully drawn to ensure against discrimination by public officers in the cases of qualified citizens. A greater use of civil remedies, as distinguished from criminal penalties, would be encouraged by the bill. The bill would also provide equal treatment in the enjoyment of accommodations of any public conveyance or facility operated by a common carrier in interstate or foreign commerce, without discrimination or segregation based on race, color, religion, or national origin.

The second of these bills is the proposed Federal Anti-lynching Act. It is designed to protect against and punish the lawless violence of mob action, which supplants the orderly processes of Government.

The third bill is the proposed Federal Anti-Poll-Tax Act. This bill would make unlawful the requirement of payment of a poll tax as a condition to voting in a primary, general, or other election for national offices. The right to vote—to take part in the selection of those who make and administer the laws—is basic in a democracy. The poll tax, where it is still used as a prerequisite to voting, stands between the citizen and that right. Experience has shown that when voting is conditioned upon paying a poll tax, the number of votes cast is cut drastically; but that when the poll tax is abolished, the number of voters increases very greatly. The poll tax is a way of saying: "The poor shall not vote. The rest of us will decide what is good for them." And so great numbers of citizens, both white and Negro, are barred from the polls where this condition prevails. The counterpart of the bill, which as I said would remedy the situation in elections for national offices, has already been passed by the House of Representatives.

The fourth of these measures is the proposed Federal Fair Employment Practice Act. It is designed to prevent discrimination in employment on grounds of race, color, religion, or national origin. It would apply to employers of 50 or more employees, or labor unions of 50 or more members, engaged in interstate commerce, as well as to the Federal Government and certain contractors with the Federal Government. It is important to note that the bill does not permit anyone to demand employment by a given employer. Except for the causes specifically condemned, the employer may hire or refuse to hire or discharge for any cause that seems proper to him.

In respect of the common purpose running through these bills, it is useful to observe the kind of right which is sought to be stated and preserved. In a sense, it is almost a negative right, expressive of the desire of all freemen to live unmolested—the right not to be treated differently from other men; the right not to be singled out for the special treatment which implies that there is more than one class of citizenship. The bills propose to reiterate and reinforce the guaranties of equality upon which our Government is based.

Some persons, with the earnestness and sincerity of Hamilton, others with less pure motives, will ask: What do we accomplish by declaring equality by law? Can we eliminate prejudice against minorities by legislation?

Statutes on nondiscrimination may not in themselves remove racial, national, or religious prejudices. Admitted. But they can create conditions favorable to the gradual disappearance of such prejudices. Already there are a number of years' experience in your State, New Jersey, with fair employment practice legislation. So, too, there is experience with similar laws in New York, Massachusetts, Washington, Oregon, New Mexico, Connecticut, and Rhode Island—all indicating that this kind of law can create a climate of opinion in which discrimination tends to disappear. And conversely, we know that statutes or public policies which support or condone Jim Crowism, and other forms of caste, simply solidify discrimination, giving it the gloss of respectability. The way to eradicate racial tension, wisely said the Supreme Court of California in a recent case, is not "through the perpetuation by law of prejudices that give rise to the tension."

What I have been speaking of principally, refers to the responsibility of government—the formal organization of our society—in the protection of individual liberties. But the responsibility cannot rest there alone. The individual, no less than his government, must share in serving the ideals of the democratic faith. Obviously, he has a duty to stand up for his own rights when they are invaded. An authority which threatens the rights of one citizen becomes all the stronger if it succeeds, and all the more dangerous to the rights of others. A citizen who asserts his own rights is therefore protecting not only himself but his fellow citizens as well.

But he has a further duty. This is to respect the rights of other persons. He must recognize each of his fellow men as a human being like himself, with wants, and the need for dignity, like his own. He must remember the words of the Declaration of Independence—"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." It was essentially for the protection

of these rights that the signers of the Declaration of Independence declared that—"We mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes and our sacred honor."

In the world today, this duty of each American citizen is more than a duty to the particular individual whose rights would otherwise be violated. It is a duty which each of us owes to every other citizen of the country. In one sense, it is a matter of national security.

Racial, religious, or national discrimination is a fearful thing for our country, both at home and in our international relations. At home, it divides us when we should be united. It leads to bitterness in its victims, and the rejection by some of the American creed.

In a brief filed recently in the United States Supreme Court, in a case involving alleged discrimination in interstate transportation (*Henderson* v. *United States*), the Department of Justice took occasion to call the Supreme Court's attention to testimony of a well-known Negro baseball player, who appeared before a congressional committee to answer statements which questioned the loyalty of large numbers of American Negroes. The witness said:

"Just because Communists kick up a big fuss over racial discrimination when it suits their purposes, a lot of people try to pretend that the whole issue is a creation of Communist imagination.

"But they are not fooling anyone with this kind of pretense, and talk about "Communists stirring up Negroes to protest,' only makes present misunderstanding worse than ever. Negroes were stirred up long before there was a Communist Party, and they'll stay stirred up long after the party has disappeared—unless Jim Crow has disappeared by then as well."

Abroad, discrimination embarrasses us in our international relations. It furnishes hostile propaganda to foreign critics. It raises doubt as to our sincerity among friendly peoples. Today, the United States enjoys a position of world leadership. Yet, the very existence of this country, and of the free nations associated with us, depends in considerable measure upon how well we live up to our own ideals at home. We must therefore do more than let the world know that we have the highest standard of living. We must prove to the world that our democracy works. Every one of us, by what he does or fails to do, in the daily business of living—in his contacts with neighbors, fellow workers and even strangers—inevitably affects the composite of our efforts to build a peaceful world.

Our concern, and the concern of all freedom-loving peoples, today, goes far beyond the domestic pattern. In many ways we have begun to make it clear that the protection of human rights is a matter of international concern.

Something akin to a constitutional convention of almost the whole world was held in San Francisco in 1945. I am referring, of course, to the San Francisco Conference which framed the Charter of the United Nations. In that Charter, universal interest in human rights is expressed more prominently and authoritatively than ever before. "To achieve international cooperation * * * in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language or religion," is stated to be one of the purposes of the United Nations. The General Assembly, the Economic and Social Council, and the Trusteeship Council, are given responsibility for promoting human rights within their fields of competence. The Economic and Social Council is specifically directed to set up a human rights commission—which it has done. And all members of the United Nations pledge themselves to take joint and separate action, in cooperation with the United Nations, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights.

There were some at the San Francisco conference who thought that the Charter did not go far enough in the protection of human rights. But there was no time at San Francisco to draft an international bill of human rights. Instead, it was decided that the question of framing one could be taken up by the United Nations organization itself after it got started. President Truman voiced his hope for such an international bill of rights in his speech at the closing session of the San Francisco conference. Under the Charter, he said, "We have good reason to expect the framing of an international bill of rights, acceptable to all the nations involved. That bill of rights will be as much a part of international life as our own bill of rights is a part of our Constitution." And so, just as our Bill of Rights was added to our Constitution after the Constitution was adopted, the United Nations has been taking steps to frame an international bill of rights which, in effect, would be added to the Charter of the United Nations.

A great preparatory step was taken just 1 year ago. On December 10, 1948, the General Assembly of the United Nations proclaimed the universal declaration of human rights. This declaration is not a treaty, as is the Charter of the United Nations. But it is, in its own words, "a common standard of achievement for all peoples and all nations." It declares many of the basic rights set forth in our Constitution and bill of rights, and some which are neither fully realized here nor elsewhere in the world, but which some day may be accorded to everyone.

Coordinately with the drafting of the universal declaration of human rights, the drafting of a proposed treaty was begun, to provide the basis from which to give legal effect to certain of the fundamental human rights. This proposed treaty is called the Covenant of Human Rights. It has been in preparation by the United Nations Commission on Human Rights since 1947 and is not yet finished. It is receiving most careful attention from our Government and the many governments participating in the drafting, as well as from hundreds of organizations in and out of the United States—bar associations prominently among them.

In this way, among others, the United States and other free countries are moving forward together, through the United Nations, in the noble enterprise of weaving their ideals into the fabric of international law.

But always there is the ordinary man and woman, and his and her duties and responsibilities as citizens in a democracy. Individually, at times, the contribution of each, the importance of each, may seem minute. Nevertheless, local governments, State governments, national government, international law, and international procedures cannot do the job without them. We know from experience that a great share of our liberties depends upon the vigilance, the wisdom, the tolerance, and the courage of our citizenry. Each of you, therefore, as a private citizen, has an unavoidable responsibility for the preservation of the American freedoms. As guardians of these freedoms, you are also guardians of the fair name of the United States and of its powers of moral leadership in the world. To this generation of Americans has come the greatest responsibility ever visited upon the citizenry of any nation. You are keepers of the light. Yours is the duty to make sure that it shines for all the world.

Government Favoritism With RFC Loans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, Henry Kaiser owes Uncle Sam $194,000,000. The Kaiser-Frazer Corp. recently secured from the RFC a new loan of $34,400,000 to pay the cost of retooling their plant in order to produce the new 1950 Kaiser-Frazer auto models; and another loan of $10,000,000 to establish a credit set-up for Kaiser-Frazer dealers in order to help them handle the output of the Kaiser-Frazer Corp.

Since the new Kaiser-Frazer car will be sold in competition with other lightweight cars—Ford, Chevrolet, and Plymouth—American tax-payers should wonder why Uncle Sam lends taxpayers' money to some big manufacturers on favorable, liberal, easy terms, while their competitors have to take their chances of borrowing from the banks on regular banking terms, covering interest charges and adequate collateral.

The Lustron Corp. of Columbus, Ohio, is another example of a favored RFC borrower. This corporation is supposed to manufacture prefabricated steel houses, but so far has turned out very few. The promoters of this company put up only $10,000 of their own money, but have already secured loans amounting to $37,500,000 from the RFC and have applied for $14,500,000 more.

When the Lustron Corp. applied to the RFC for their first loan in 1947, it is understood that the application was turned down by the RFC directors, but President Truman personally intervened in the case and forced the directors to reverse their position and grant the loan.

Has Uncle Sam decided to favor certain business friends but handicap, hinder, and punish certain other business concerns because they are not friendly toward the so-called Fair Deal? If the administration takes taxpayers' money and uses it to reward certain business friends and to punish certain business enemies, then we are headed down the road to national socialism.

THE A. & P. SUIT

It is axiomatic that bigness of any kind means power, and power unchecked means power abused. The Federal Government has brought suit against the A. & P. in an effort to break up that organization because the Government charges its very bigness makes it a monopoly, per se. What is a monopoly?

Webster says a monopoly is "(1) a conspiracy to limit production and maintain high prices; (2) an illegal combination in restraint of trade; (3) a combination having exclusive control of." Does the A. & P. limit production and maintain high prices? Of course not;

in fact, it does the exact opposite. Does the A. & P. restrain or restrict trade in any way? Of course not; it facilitates trade rather than restricts trade. Is the A. & P. a combination having exclusive control of? Of course not; it handles less than 6 percent of the Nation's groceries. Then, why the suit?

The Federal Government itself is the greatest economic monopoly on earth outside the iron curtain. The Federal Government not only restrains agricultural production by acreage control in order to maintain high prices, but it also corners the market by buying up millions of pound of butter and billions of eggs in order to control prices. One wonders, therefore, if the A. & P. suit is not a case of the pot calling the kettle black—our bureaucratic Government is a very dirty pot and the A. & P. is a clean, shiny pot. Which is more dangerous, a corporation regulated by Federal, State, and local governments, with its great power diffused by ownership distribution; or a bureaucratic monopoly exercising economic power that is not regulated but is in the hands of politicians of the Pendergast-machine type? This is a question that the voters must ponder over and try to answer in 1950.

Secretary Acheson's Policy For China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, January 30 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Policy Advanced by Acheson for China Declared 'So Extremely Comfortable'," written by Dorothy Thompson and published in a recent issue of the Washington Evening Star.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD as follows:

ON THE RECORD—POLICY ADVANCED BY ACHESON FOR CHINA DECLARED "SO EXTREMELY COMFORTABLE"

(By Dorothy Thompson)

The Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, speaking at the National Press Club last Thursday, advanced a policy for China (and we presume, for the rest of the world) which has all the charm of extreme novelty.

"The single, most important fact shaping American policy in the Far East," Mr. Acheson said, "was the attaching by the Soviet Union of the four northern areas of China." "The United States must not now do anything which might divert Chinese attention from Russia," he continued, for the division of China "must bring upon the Russians the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people."

PLANNED IT THAT WAY?

So we planned it that way? The reason for the secret treaty at Yalta, giving Russia special privileges in Manchuria, was just to encourage Russia to overreach herself? The reason for forcing the truce upon Chiang Kai-shek in November 1945, and allowing tens of thousands of Communist troops to escape; and for insisting in 1946 that the Kalgan Pass be opened to permit a million Communists to move into Manchuria and be armed by the Russians with the entire equipment of the Japanese Kwantung army, was to be sure that by Russian encroachment in China, the Chinese people would recognize their real enemy?

Do we, perhaps, have a secret agent in the Russian Politburo who directed the Soviet Union to annex the four northern provinces of China, since this is going to make the Chinese people awfully sore?

We don't like the Nationalist Government (runs the argument), so it is well for the Communists to defeat it. But communism being synonymous with Russian imperialism is hostile to the real interest of the people of China, and they will revolt. Ergo, the more successful Russian communism is, the less successful it will be.

No wonder George Kennan, author of the containment policy, resigned from the State Department. To contain communism is "putting the cart before the horse," said Secretary Acheson. "It is the United States' aim to develop within the people a resistance to communism based on the dignity and right of every people to develop their own way * * * any one who violates the integrity of China is the enemy of China and is acting contrary to our own interest."

But apparently, you can't develop a resistance to communism until you first have it, nor rise in righteous anger against the violation of territorial integrity until it is violated.

This is certainly a subtlety outsubtling the Kremlin.

ANOTHER TITO, OBVIOUSLY?

What we want to know, however, is just how the indignation of the Chinese (and other) peoples is going to express itself once the Russian noose is around their necks and all anti-Communist leaders assassinated or exiled?

There are at present some million Nationalist guerrillas on the Chinese mainland. There are 300,000 Chinese Nationalist troops (trained by the United States) in Formosa. There is a leadership, now very reduced, but still a leadership, and all these express the hatred and righteous anger of the Chinese people.

But we mustn't support them. No; we must wait for something more inspiring—obviously another Tito.

Maybe Secretary Acheson has one in mind. We suggest, however, that the Russians have thought of that possibility, and aren't going to let it happen twice.

At any rate, we have a new foreign policy, surely the most remarkable in our history—and so extremely comfortable. Under it we don't have to do a thing except "keep our own purposes perfectly straight, perfectly pure, perfectly aboveboard," and our enemies will do all the rest for us.

Stalin doesn't know it, but he's our ally. The more peoples he subjects, the more he will be hated and, conversely, the more we, sitting still in our perfect purity, will be loved.

Obviously, too, we were wrong about Hitler. If we had just let him take the world, people would have been plenty sore, and would have revolted—the Jews, for instance.

It is incredible. But it's true; it's the policy.

Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Simmons, from the Washington Times-Herald of today:

COMMUNISM

(By Walter Simmons)

In refusing to help the Chinese Nationalists hold Formosa, the United States has lost its last chance to fight world communism on an equal basis, according to Premier Yen Hsi-sham.

With Formosa gone, the aging marshal said, "communism will sweep like an avalanche through southeast Asia soon controlling half the earth and two-thirds of its population."

When that has happened. Yen said, "it will be too late for Americans and their allies.

"You cannot understand the difficulties of fighting communism militarily until you have tried it yourself," said the war lord, whose epic defense of his Shansi province home was the most prolonged battle of the civil war.

His soldiers built thousands of brick and concrete pillboxes, manufactured their own guns and ammunition, and withstood siege for 9 months until starved out last April.

"Americans do not yet understand that communism has developed an unprecedented and unmatched system of political military strategy," Marshal Yen warned. "The people are so controlled that they are made into a solid enemy body.

"When we entered Communist territory, it was like entering a sea of mud. The stronger our forces and the deeper they penetrated, the more they were hurt.

"No man, whatever his sympathies, dared be friendly or give us information. We were dead and blind. Yet the Communists, 100 or 200 miles away, knew every detail about us.

"You are already facing the same situation in regard to Russia and her satellites—but how many Americans realize it? How much chance do you have of getting reliable information out of the iron curtain countries?

"Yet it is common knowledge that some Americans steal top Government secrets, even those of the atom bomb, and pass them to Russia.

"This is exactly the same problem that confronted us in China. You will discover it for yourself someday. I hope it is not too late when you do."

Marshal Yen admitted incompetence and maladministration were partially responsible for the Chinese Government's failure. He has been among the Government's foremost critics for years, while waging his fight in Shansi Province.

"But it was easy for the Communists to raise troops, because families knew it meant death for all if their sons did not go with the Red army.

"The Government, defending the people, had difficulties in getting them to contribute 5 percent of their crops, because they were hungry. Yet the Communists collected two-thirds of the crops in their areas because the people dared not refuse."

Marshal Yen said American urgings of democracy on the Chinese in 1946 and 1947 crippled their fight against communism.

"At a time when everyone should have been sacrificing the most, democracy meant less burdens and more aid from the Government," he said.

Discontinuance of Passenger Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend and revise my remarks, I enclose herewith two letters, which I think cover a subject matter of great importance to the people of America.

In recent months, the railroads have begun to abandon passenger service, especially discontinuing the operation of passenger trains. In north Louisiana, which is the area which I represent in Congress, two major systems, namely, the Illinois Central and the Texas and Pacific, have abandoned passenger trains. The local people as a result of this abandonment are seriously inconvenienced in their transportation needs.

I have called upon the Post Office Department to make an over-all study of this abandonment, with a view of revamping the postal-delivery system in the localities affected. This may mean a considerable change on the part of the Post Office Department. It may mean the use of trucks, highway post offices, and other means of mail delivery. It may also mean that old routes will have to be abandoned and new routes put into use to meet a situation which has changed considerably because of the contraction of the passenger service by the railroads.

As these letters indicate, I have taken this matter up with the Interstate Commerce Commission, and I feel that a thorough investigation should be made to find out the reasons why the railroads, now operating at nice profits, should abandon needed service. If the railroads are not meeting their responsibility to the public, I think the Interstate Commerce Commission should say plainly that this is the case. Then, too, if the railroad companies are in effect abandoning their franchise, the Interstate Commerce Commission should proclaim this fact, and efforts should be made immediately to assist people in communities without proper transportation to regain the position which they had lost by the recent program of the railroads in discontinuing passenger service.

This is a most important matter, and, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the Interstate Commerce Commission will move vigorously and aggressively to find out what the situation may be in those communities and to advise us in Congress if legislation is needed to protect our people from any unwarranted and arbitrary action by common carriers.

The letters to which I refer are set forth, as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.
Hon. J. MONROE JOHNSON,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. JOHNSON: A number of passenger trains have been discontinued on the railroads in Louisiana, especially in north Louisiana, within the last few months. Two of the big systems, namely, the Illinois Central and the Texas & Pacific, have discontinued passenger trains, to the great inconvenience of the people of a large part of north Louisiana.

The action of these two roalroads in discontinuing passenger service has disrupted the mail service, and the Post Office Department has had to enter the field, put trucks in service and rearrange in general the system of the transportation of the mail. Certain communities are left without any railroad passenger service whatsoever, and since some of these communities do not have bus service, they are in a critical situation regarding transportation.

From the financial records I have been able to obtain, I find these two railroads to be in good shape financially. It may be that they have been losing money on the lines discontinued, but it seems to me some of the railroads are now reaching the point where the question is whether or not, by discontinuing service, they have abandoned their franchise. I understand from others that a similar situation prevails in other sections of the country.

I do not know what power the Interstate Commerce Commission may have. It should have power for investigation purposes. If this is the case, it seems to me very proper that some action ought to be taken by the ICC to investigate the situation developing throughout the country, caused by the great railroad systems: abandonment of service—especially passenger service—and whether or not the abandonment has reached the point that the ICC should act to protect the people of the country affected; or whether a new policy should be instituted for the purpose of guaranteeing communities proper transportation.

From day to day, I am in receipt of letters from communities which are now deprived of passenger service, and which are in great difficulty regarding transportation. I do not know what to tell these people, but I think as long as a railroad is making money, where necessary, it should be reqiured to give service in localities where, even though by doing so, it may lose money in it's operation in certain limited localities.

I will be glad to have an expression from you as to your views on a matter which has become critical in certain sections of the United States.

If you feel legislation may assist you in the performance of your necessary functions, I will be glad to have this expression from you as to what is needed.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 25, 1950.
Hon. JESSE M. DONALDSON,
Postmaster General,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR GENERAL DONALDSON: Several railroads have discontinued passenger service throughout Louisiana, especially in north Louisiana. This has brought about disruption, in certain instances, of mail service and has created hardship on local people. The Illinois Central Railroad and the Texas & Pacific, for instance, have both abandoned certain passenger service in north and central Louisiana within the last few months. I am receiving complaints from local people about the inadequacy of the mail service as a result of the action by these railroads and others.

It seems to me, therefore, that because of the failure of the Railway Mail Service a full investigation of the situation existing in Louisiana should be begun at once by the Post Office Department. In this investigation, it is my belief that an effort should be made to revamp the entire postal delivery system where inadequacies are found, and in all cases the Post Office Department should move, it occurs to me, to replace promptly the rail service which has been abandoned by speedy postal service.

I previously called this situation to your attention in the case of the Illinois Central Railroad, and you indicated that you would cause an investigation to be made of the matter. I am asking that this investigation go further and include other railroads which have recently abandoned passenger service, especially the Texas & Pacific, which has, I am told, abandoned all passenger service from Shreveport, south to Natchitoches, on what is commonly referred to as the Mansfield branch.

Please advise me what action I may expect to have out of your office at an early date.

Sincerely yours,

OVERTON BROOKS,
Member of Congress.

Lt. Jack Traub

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, it is with a mingled feeling of sorrow and pride that I announce to this distinguished body the funeral and interment of Lt. (jg) Jack Traub, of Pekin, Ill., which will take place on February 2, at 2 p. m., in the Arlington National Cemetery. Lieutent Traub was killed in action on Guadalcanal on June 2, 1945. As far as I have been able to ascertain, he is the only distinguished hero of World War II to be buried in the Arlington National Cemetery, who comes from Pekin, Ill., in the district I am honored to represent.

Lieutenant Traub was born in Pekin on January 18, 1921. He attended the Pekin Community High School and graduated with the class of 1939. After studying at the University of Illinois for 2 years his career was interrupted by the war in which he gave his life so heroically.

His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Orville Traub, of Pekin, Ill., as well as all the members of his family, are I know, proud of the lieutenant's distinguished service record. His parents, while deeply grieved, are, I am sure, proud of the brave and fighting spirit shown by their son. His friends and acquaintances will revere his memory more and more as time goes by.

May I, by this means, extend my deepest sympathy to his parents, relatives, and friends, as a token of my respect for the heroism displayed by this young man.

May we, as grateful Representatives, assure them we will work hand in hand in the interests of lasting world peace.

Federal-State Relations to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. James K. Pollock, late of the Hoover Commission and head of the department of political science of the University of Michigan:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS TO EDUCATION

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Before answering specific questions concerning the recommendations of the Hoover Commission, it is important to clarify the mandate under which the Commission operated.

It was not the task of the Commission to determine policy. Thus, in the field of education the Commission was not asked to determine the size of the budget or the extent to which the Federal Government should participate in this activity. This was deemed to be the task of Congress.

The only task of the Commission was to decide: assuming the present extent of educational activities on the part of the Federal Government, where and how can this activity be best administered within the organizational framework of that Government.

To this end the Hoover Commission applied to education the same standards of judgment which it applied to all other functions of the Federal Government which it investigated. These standards were applied with the following objectives in mind:

1. To consolidate departments, offices, and agencies so as to encourage in Government order, clear lines of responsibility and authority and effective organization.

2. To reduce to the minimum the number of agencies reporting to the President.

3. To set up consistent policies governing the administration, as far as possible, of all aspects of government.

4. To give status to Government functions in relation to the size of the budget it commands and the number of employees on the pay roll.

5. to give general discretion for determining the organizational and operating needs of departments to general administrators irrespective of the functions of their agency as they are best able to determine such decisions in line with the over-all needs of the agency as well as the Government.

Question. Why doesn't the Hoover report agree with the task force report?

Answer. In making its recommendations concerning education the Hoover Commission used the reports of the task force in the same manner that it used them to make recommendations regarding all other functions. In making its choices as to which recommendation of the task force to accept, to modify, or to reject, the commission took into consideration not only the needs and place of the specific Government agency under consideration but the needs and place of that agency in relation to all other Government agencies.

Upon study of the task force report on education, the Hoover Commission concluded that one of its major recommendations, that of the creation of a Federal Board of Education was not sound in relation to the organization of Government as a whole. The commission came to this conclusion on three counts:

1. Education is not a primary function of the Federal Government. It is a function of the States.

2. In comparison with other functions that the Federal Government performs, education is a very small part of the governmental picture both as to amount of money expended as well as number of employees.

3. The function of the Federal Government in education is one of service, advice, and professional leadership.

Th se conditions being true, the commission would have found itself unjustified in recommending the establishment of a separate agency for education, particularly as one of the chief aims of the commission was to reduce and consolidate the number of agencies and departments in Government.

Question. What are the dangers in a large agency administering a complex of many different services?

Answer. There are few dangers in a large agency administering different services so long as these services are related and well-integrated into the departmental structure.

Since the Commission was not in favor of creating a new and separate agency, education had to remain either in the Federal Security Agency (a "large" agency) or had to be transferred to another "large" agency. Education being closely related to the other functions handled by the Federal Security Agency, the recommendation to leave education there was in line with the general objective of the Commission to group-like functions, whenever possible, in one department or agency.

Moreover, it was felt that such an agency should be headed by a single, appointed, general administrator. Such a general administrator is in a better position than the "functional specialist" (as the educator) to pass upon the importance of each activity which the whole agency must perform in relation to the rest of all Government functions.

Page 44 of the Hoover Commission states: "It is the well-being of the individual, not control by the doctors, educators, or social worker, with which the Government's health, educational, and social-security functions are primarily concerned."

Question. What is the argument favoring including the United States Office of Education in a Department of Welfare (S. 2060), if it would give the Secretary of Welfare the right to determine completely by Executive order educational functions in the Federal agency for education?

Answer. The Commission established in its report concerning education, as well as all other functions, certain basic requirements for effective departmental organization:

1. The reduction of the number of departments reporting to the President.

2. The tightening up of organization, control, and integration of bureaus and agencies below the departmental level in order to do away with the freewheeling autonomous status these agencies have enjoyed to date. The autonomy of these bureaus has too often made them irresponsible and unresponsive to the over-all needs of the whole department under which they operate and even the whole of government.

As concerns the placement of education in a Department of Welfare of Cabinet rank, the justification for such a recommendation is the same as for placing it in the Federal Security Agency which such a Department of Welfare would absorb.

In such a Department of Welfare education would be accorded the importance which it deserves in relation to the sum total of all other Government functions.

If and when Congress decides to expand the budget and personnel of the Office of Education, then is the time to reappraise the need for placing this agency in a more prominent organizational position. But the expansion of the educational activities of the Federal Government is a political decision falling within the scope of Congress and not the scope of the Hoover Commission.

Question. Should the Government appropriate large sums of money for general education?

Answer. This is a question of policy which Congress must decide. As I indicated in my introductory remarks, the mandate under which the Commission operated defined its scope as limited to those questions related to the organization and management of Government.

Question. What about an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank?

Answer. The proposition of an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank was not laid before the Commission. Had such a proposal been submitted to it, it would, in my opinion, have opposed such a plan. Again, one of the basic aims of the Commission was to reduce the number of departments, not to multiply them. Moreover, as indicated before, the limited educational activities of the Federal Government do not warrant the creation of a separate department for their performance.

Question. What about S. 656: A Federal Board of Education as proposed by the American Council of School Administrators and supported by the NEA?

Answer. This is substantially the recommendation of the task force. Thus, the Commission would reject this proposal on the same grounds as it rejected the task-force recommendation. In addition, the Commission was particularly opposed to the type of board that this proposal contemplates. It is unsound to permit such a board to operate as an independent agency and to allow it to pick its own administrative officer. This would make the agency head almost completely independent of the President and, therefore, violates every sound principle of executive control and responsibility. It is the President, irrespective of whether he does or does not appoint the agency head, who ultimately must bear the responsibility for the performance of this activity. Moreover, independence of operation without reference to the other needs of government is unthinkable. In consideration of all of these factors, the Commission had no other alternative than to recommend that the Office of Education continue as a subordinate unit in one of the major agencies—the Federal Security Agency.

Question. In an agency with Cabinet rank, the political head obviously would be in authority over the whole hierarchy and determine the functions of even the Education Bureau. Would there not be the same danger in a Federal Board of Education?

Answer. As indicated, the Hoover Commission did not support the task-force recommendation for the creation of such a board. Neither would it have supported an agency with Cabinet rank.

In the case of a Federal Board of Education, I am all for keeping our educational system in consonance with the desires of the people. As one interested in improving the control of the people over their Government, whether education, health, welfare, or any other function, I cannot see any justification for making the process of control more difficult. The interjection of a board, such as the proposed board, between the people and the function to be administered is merely to place another obstacle in the way of effective control by the people.

In addition, in any solution as much care should be taken to avoid too much professional dominance of education as of too much political dominance of education.

Question. What are the possible weaknesses in a Federal board set up at the national level?

Answer. It would seem to me that I have indicated what these weaknesses are when I discussed the philosophy which governed the recommendations of the Commission.

Question. Is a National Board of Education analogous to a State board?

Answer. There is a serious fault in such an analogy. Education is a State function and not a national one. Therefore, if any comparison were to be made between the two, it must be based on two differing sets of assumptions which underlie the respective purpose of each in this activity.

Soil Conservation in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. OVERTON BROOKS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a most interesting and informative report, compiled by the Soil Conservation Service, in reference to its work in the State of Louisiana. This report shows the extent of soil-conservation work over the period of years and shows the results from this work. The increase in production of agricultural products as a result of soil conservation work is one of the interesting features of this report and highlights the importance of soil conservation work throughout the country. I think this report gives valuable information on the reason for the present remarkable production record which has been set by the farmers of not only the State of Louisiana, but of the entire United States.

Mr. Speaker, the report is as follows:

In the six soil-conservation districts which serve most of the area within the bounds of the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana there are 17,125 farms with a combined area of 1,396,848 acres.

The oldest of the six districts, the Dorcheat soil-conservation district, was organized late in 1938 and started receiving assistance from the Soil Conservation Service April 25, 1939—just 4 days ahead of the D'Arbonne district. The youngest district, Dugdemona, started operation only 2 months later than did the first. All of the districts have been in operation over 10 years.

There are 3,933 farmers in the six districts carrying out active soil-conservation plans on 639,237 acres of land. The number of conservation farmers, however, may not suggest accurately the interest in soil conservation in this congressional district. In addition to those who are actively engaged in a soil-conservation program, there are almost 2,000 others waiting for assistance from Soil Conservation Service technical personnel.

Any educational work or publicity pertaining to soil conservation immediately brings still other applicants to the soil-conservation district for assistance. Of the 3,933 farmers carrying out conservation plans, 687 have their plans on maintenance, which means that this number of farmers have already completed their initial conservation programs on their land and are now maintaining those programs.

A survey taken in 1943, in which detailed information was supplied by 610 Louisiana farmers who had conservation plans on 118,068 acres, revealed that conservation farming increased Louisiana crop and pasture production an average of 45 percent and also saved labor and equipment use on one farm in two.

These 610 farmers from all sections of the State said that both acre yields and total production had risen sharply after the application of planned practices. With 18 percent fewer acres in cotton, they grew 17 percent more pounds of lint. With 9 percent fewer acres in corn, they produced 42 percent more bushels of corn. And 284 of them said that the conservation program had brought about a total annual cash saving of $37,590 in labor and use of farm machinery.

The farmers reported that their average per-acre yields had increased from 13 to 20 bushels of corn since applying conservation practices, from 199 to 285 pounds of lint cotton, from 19 to 25 bushels of oats, from 13 to 17 bushels of peanuts, from 108 to 157 bushels of sweetpotatoes.

Similar increases were reported in yields of legume, hay, other hay, silage, cow peas, peaches, soybeans, and other crops. Land-use changes made as a necessary part of protecting farms from erosion added many new crops in a trend toward diversification. By putting 4,400 idle acres to work, the 610 farmers have increased grazing land 52 percent, with only a 5-percent decrease in cropland and a 16-percent decrease in farm woodland.

With the use of idle acres, the increased feed and hay yields, and the larger and better pastures, the conservation farmers have been able to start or expand livestock enterprises. The number of cattle has been increased 81.4 percent. The farmers have 42 percent more brood sows, 44 percent more pigs, 29 percent more ewes, 31 percent more chickens.

In spite of fewer acres in farm woodlands, harvest of pulpwood, sawlogs, rail ties, and piling poles has increased from 2 to more than 10 times.

Theo DeSoto, of Mansfield, in the upper West Red River soil-conservation district, was one of the 610 farmers interviewed. In 1937, DeSoto and technicians of the Soil Conservation Service at the CCC camp in Mansfield worked out a conservation plan for his 160-acre farm. At that time yields were low, and erosion was taking more soil every year. Seven acres were idle.

DeSoto had established every practice planned, and most of them had been in effect 5 years when the survey was made. He said that erosion had been controlled, rainfall conserved and soil fertility increased. No land was left idle. Lint-cotton production was 58 percent greater from 20 percent fewer acres. Acre yields of corn were increased 33 percent. Corn acreage declined 23 percent but total production was increased almost 4 percent.

DeSoto increased hay production by adding a new crop, lespedeza. With 7 acres of lespedeza and 6 acres of soybeans, he has 19.5 tons of hay a year as compared with 9 tons before. Livestock carrying capacity of pastures was increased 25 percent an acre, and DeSoto increased the size of his pasture from 11 to 69 acres.

With the greater amount of food and hay produced and the larger and better pastures, DeSoto added beef production as a major enterprise. At the time of the survey in 1943, he had 30 beef cows where he formerly had 2.

Two ponds were constructed on his farm to supply water for the cattle.

The experiences of Theo DeSoto are typical of conservation farmers in this district.

Timber and the other products of the forests are important to the economy of northwest Louisiana as well as to the State as a whole, and the need for intelligent conservation of these lands through reforestation, woodland management, and fire protection is readily apparent.

More than half of Louisiana's 30,000,000 acres of timberland is owned by individual farmers, and more and more of these farmers are learning, with the help of their soil-conservation districts and through aid of Soil Conservation Service field men, the importance of woodland management to their own economy.

Woodland management is a program for sane and efficient use of woodlands—of making it possible for woodland to produce trees at a maximum rate on an unending basis. The trees and other products are harvested much as any other crop, and the farmer is finding that his woodland can be one of the most profitable crops on his farm.

At the end of the last fiscal year there were 312,968 acres under woodland management in the State's 25 soil-conservation districts, which represents an increase of 186,184 acres in a 3-year period. Though progress is being made in woodland management in Louisiana, there are still thousands of acres of woodland in practically every district in the State which are not being properly managed. This includes the northwestern districts.

The biggest problem in timber management right now is getting farmers to select and cut only the trees that should be cut. A large portion of the farm woodland in Louisiana is now producing 50 to 100 board feet of lumber to the acre per year. Under intensive management production can be increased 5 to 10 times in 20 to 25 years, which isn't a very long time in the life of a tree.

Soil-conservation forestry technicians advise farmers to take certain land, put it to timber, and treat it as a farm crop. It takes no fertilizer and no cultivation. Foresters do not advise a farmer to plant pines on land best suited to row crops or grass.

Recent surveys made by technicians of the Soil Conservation Service reveal that about half of the approximately 3,000,000 acres in three soil-conservation districts in the northwest section of Louisiana should never have been considered for cultivation at all, due to soil, slope, erosion, poor drainage, or other factors. These acres should have been kept in permanent vegetation, such as pastures or trees, to insure their stability and producing power in the future.

Progress is being made in northwest Louisiana. The six districts in the Fourth Congressional District had 159,254 acres in improved pastures at the end of this fiscal year, the D'Arbonne district had 32,058 acres under proper woodland management—a substantial increase from the 8,534-acre figure in 1947—and the Saline district had 46,436 acres under woodland management, which is a like increase over what it was last year. Other districts have increased acres under woodland management accordingly.

With the advent of new-type mechanical tree planters, the job of tree planting is expected to increase rapidly in the soil conservation districts where this work presents a problem. The new Illinois Central Railroad tree planter has been ordered by the D'Arbonne, Dugdemona, and Saline districts with the intention of speeding up tree planting. The D'Arbonne district expects to plant 3,000,000 pine seedlings this year with the aid of the new tree planter.

The strides in farm drainage that Louisiana farmers have made in the last 2 years has been remarkable—more than 300,000 acres. The reported 54,675 acres of farm drainage accomplished in the six soil-conservation districts included in the Fourth Congressional District show that this area is doing a great deal to solve the problem of farm drainage. Drainage is a basic practice, one on which the other practices that make up a coordinated soil- and water-conservation program must wait. It is a practice that almost invariably has paid hand-

some dividends in increased production. For instance, T. P. Moore, Jr., farmer and supervisor of the Upper West Red River Soil Conservation District, says that drainage has increased his production at least 35 percent.

A part of this benefit, of course, comes from the use of soil improving and soil-building crops which is made possible to a large extent by drainage. Example: A portion of the 161,532 acres of cover crops planted by farmers in the six districts last fall.

Drainage and woodland management, however, are mentioned only as examples of how soil and water conservation measures assist in solving land problems for the farmer. In the case of every farm, it is the combination of the needed measures that must be relied on to bring the farm to a state of stability and continuing productivity.

The program of soil and water conservation in Louisiana is putting the State's agriculture on a sounder basis. Erosion is being controlled, idle acres have been put to productive use. The result has been a more secure and prosperous farm family, a more dependable source of raw materials for industry and a more stable foundation for a tax structure.

The program in Louisiana, as in other States, is well under way. Results and the rate of current progress are encouraging. An appropriation by the State of Louisiana has aided greatly in speeding up application of the program in recent years. The most recent appropriation was $80C,000 for the 1948-49 biennium, to be allotted to the soil-conservation districts at $390,000 a year. These funds made possible the employment of personnel and the purchase of needed equipment for the advancement of the soil-conservation program.

The rate of planning and application of soil conservation, however, is limited in a large measure to the number of trained technicians which can be placed, with available resources, at the disposal of the districts.

The following figures show the total achievements of the six soil-conservation districts in the Fourth Congressional District up to July 1, 1949:

	Planned	Applied
Contour farming.....acres..	173,731	108,026
Cover cropping.....do....	236,720	161,532
Crop residue management..do....	226,410	184,348
Strip cropping.....do....	148	112
Pasture improvement.....do....	199,869	159,254
Seeding of pasture.....do....	124,978	77,849
Wildlife area improvement..do....	1,783	1,507
Woodland management.....do....	162,662	79,423
Tree planting.....do....	13,215	7,220
Farm and ranch ponds..number..	821	691
Terraces.....miles..	12,692	5,901
Field diversions.....do....	87	38
Farm drainage.....acres..	89,548	54,675
Open drains.....miles..	1,003	660
Irrigation land preparation.acres..	30	3
Improved water application.do....	93	1
Water facilities.....number..	68	29
Woodland cutting.....acres..	128,806	44,581

Conservation needs for Louisiana are:

Contour planting, acres	2,344,862
Cover crops, acres	4,909,133
Crop residue management, acres	5,654,240
Strip cropping, acres	200,886
Range properly stocked, acres	4,449,766
Seeding range and pastures, acres	4,296,693
Farm and ranch ponds, number	14,377
Field and gully planting, acres	192,207
Woodland management, acres	6,274,818
Terracing, miles	199,176
Diversions, miles	4,649
Individual farm drains, acres	2,950,880
Farm irrigation land preparation, acres	150,944
Irrigation systems, installed or improved, number	1,892
Improved methods of irrigation, water application, acres	301,192
Shelter belts, windbreaks, acres	1,379

National Old-Age Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by William H. McMasters, of 448 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass., before the Senate Finance Committee on January 28, 1950. Mr. McMasters is president of National Old Age Pensions, Inc., and vice chairman of National Pension Committee. He advocates a straight national pension for qualified citizens.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my name is William H. McMasters, of 448 Broadway, Cambridge, Mass. I am president of National Old Age Pensions, Inc., and vice chairman of National Pension Committee.

I have long been an advocate of a straight national pension for qualified citizens reaching the age of 60 years. Despite the many legislative efforts that have been made to circumvent this basic idea, nationally and in the States, the ultimate trend toward that goal has never shifted. Little by little the old-age assistance title of the Social Security Act has been broadened until today the Federal contributions overmatch that of practically every State in the case loads. This is not so in Colorado, Washington, or in much-publicized California. Here we see the States outmatching the Federal Government.

I feel that it rests with this committee to suggest a simplification of the whole problem of old-age pensions by having it handled entirely by the Federal Government. If this step is taken, the present labor-management troubles with respect to pensions will be solved for all time. The democratic doctrine of equality will supplant the present inequality among the States which exists in the old-age assistance title of the Social Security Act and in no other pension statutes. I feel that it is now time for the elderly citizens of the Nation to be treated the same in Mississippi as in Massachusetts, just as soldiers, postal employees, civil-service employees and all others who benefit either from contributory or noncontributory systems designed to protect them against want in their old age.

The Aircraft Disaster at Washington National Airport on November 1, 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, under date of November 10, 1949, 16 Bolivian pilots and aviation instructors addressed a joint letter in Spanish to Eastern Airlines, Inc., at Washington National Airport. The letter of these Bolivian pilots makes serious charges of incompetency against Rios Bridoux. The letter alleges that he has been involved in numerous accidents and has an unsatisfactory flying record. These allegations, if true, cast serious doubts on his ability to fly an American aircraft safely, although he was authorized by the CAA to make noncommercial, that is, not for pay, flights in this country.

The Bureau of Safety Investigation of the Civil Aeronautics Board has received the letter but states that it has not been made a part of the November 1, 1949, accident-investigation record. The reason for not incorporating it in the record, according to a Board official, is that the letter is not in the form of a sworn statement, and the CAB thus far had been unable to obtain verification. The Board is stated to have endeavored to secure confirmation of the charges contained in this letter but so far has been unsuccessful, even though the subject matter of the letter is admittedly relevant to the inquiry. The present Bolivian Government authorities reportedly have been slow in replying to CAB requests for verification of these charges, and have not as yet even sent up the official flying record of Rios Bridoux.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUENOS AIRES, *November 10, 1949.*
EASTERN AIRLINES,
National Airport,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The terrific accident with the DC-4 that occurred the 1st of November at the airport has greatly disturbed the entire world as the major air tragedy in the history of the United States.

It has affected us doubly, for a Bolivian aviator was involved in that horrible tragedy, and so the reputation and the professional standing of Bolivian aviation is also concerned.

It has greatly surprised us that the press and the international news agencies have issued information that is so inaccurate and given to them by people that are interested in hiding the truth—presenting to the world wrong and misleading statements of the facts.

The mention in the news of the name of the Brazilian diplomat, Senor Guillermo Gutierrez Vea Murguia allows one to believe that he might have been the one who confused the press, for he was an associate of the pilot and so for that reason, his testimony might have been partial to him.

The two of them, Gutierrez and Rios Bridoux, staged a riot in Bolivia June 13, 1946, and received money for that riot, according to the general version. The financier was the industrialist, Carlos V. Armayo according to the information given at that time by the Secretary of State to the Bolivian Ambassador, Mr. Victor Andrade.

It is for this reason that the information of Mr. Murguia regarding Mr. Bridoux cannot be impartial because of their economic and political relations. Furthermore, he does not possess the technical and necessary knowledge to give an opinion on the matter.

The professional background of Rios Bridoux differs from that mentioned by the North American press. The laudatory qualifications and particularly the title, "Lindbergh of Latin America" are inconsistent

with the facts. And this affects the rating and the dignity of Bolivian aviation to which we belong.

Because of this, we are compelled to make the following statements—that we are ready to verify personally at any time to safeguard the prestige of Bolivian aviation, and of which Rios Bridoux is one of the least deserving of those qualified.

We do, therefore, make these statements as professional pilots with meritorious citations which are recognized throughout the world. We have done our utmost to do our duty with dignity and with a high sense of responsibility.

Mr. Bridoux has the following background:

A. Declared unsuitable as a pilot by Dr. Smith, colonel of the Aeronautical Service of Bolivia in 1946.

B. Accident in May 1946 in Bolivian town of Reyes—violated the ruling on minimum of time and disobeyed orders on flight control. The accident occurred when he attempted to land with an excess of speed, thus landing in the woods which surround the airport. The accident destroyed the Douglas C-47 of the FFAA of Bolivia.

C. Accident in June 1946 while trying to land in an AT-6 N186.

D. 1948: When attempting to land during a night flight mistook a public thoroughfare in the city of Santa Cruz for the airport and so placed in danger the lives of hundreds and caused panic in the town. He arrived at the airport of Santa Cruz without permission for a night landing since he had flown arbitrarily from the town of Yacuiba.

E. He was released from the Army in 1946 for offenses committed against the military regulations. One offense was the contraband of rubber in Army planes—ignoring the agreement between the American and Bolivian Governments, as is evident in the Rubber Reserve and its offices in the city of Reyes, the region of the rubber production. The contraband was taken from Reyes to La Paz and Rios Bridoux could do this as a military pilot because the Rubber Reserve had no guard over them.

F. The record of 5,000 hours flying time presented by him is false and there is proof that it has been raised more than 2,000 hours. The version given to the American press is entirely wrong in this matter.

None of these circumstances confirm the qualifying title of "Lindbergh of Latin America" that Senor G. V. M. has given him and that the news services have printed after the horrible accident in which by an unfortunate cause, Bolivian aviation is stained with blood due to the irresponsibility of Rios Bridoux.

He obtained his present position as Director of Civil Aeronautics as a result of his political work in Bolivia from June to September where he had to shoot at miners and bombard the cities of Cochabomba and Santa Cruz which caused much suffering. Rios Bridoux lacks moral authority as well as culture and sufficient knowledge to accomplish the task that the Bolivian Government has given to him, and so he has caused such disgrace as that which prompts this letter.

The officers who sign this letter have been military professors and aviation instructors in Bolivia and are ready to verify these statements if necessary.

Sincerely yours,

Armando Cortez, Walter Arce, Juan Moreira, majors; Walter Lehm, head of Lloyd Bolivian Pilots; Javier Cerruto, Raul Zumaran, captains; Reve Pinedo, Jaime Ayala, Walter Coronel, Louis Uriona, all stationed in the United States of America with Lloyd Bolivian Airways; Herbert Estremadoiro, Jorge Belmonte, Fernando Castrillo, Francisco Larres, lieutenants; Demetrio S nsetenea, with LLA. B.; Leon Kolle Cuelo, lieutenant stationed in Argentina.

Basing-Point Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL H. DOUGLAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter received by me, as well as other Senators, from 76 economists of the American Economics Association, urging the defeat of S. 1008, the basing-point bill. These men have given a great deal of study to this issue, and they have no personal ax to grind. For this reason I believe we should pay the greatest respect to their conclusions about S. 1008.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 13, 1950.

Hon. PAUL H. DOUGLAS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR DOUGLAS: We undersigned economists, fully sharing the conviction of the Congress that the traditional American policy of maintaining a free and competitive economy should be preserved, urge that legislation facilitating the use of basing-point or freight-equalization systems of pricing, in particular the bill S. 1008 now pending before the Senate, be rejected.

We are convinced that such systems have been employed as a means of effecting the sort of collusive price fixing that is condemned by the Sherman Act. We believe that they have promoted the suppression of competition and resulted in serious economic waste.

It has been said that the proposed bill would clarify the law. We do not believe this to be the case. Some of its supporters contend that it would legalize basing-point pricing; others insist that it would not. These interpretations of the bill's provisions are so inconsistent as to make it certain that its enactment would occasion far more confusion than may now exist. Another decade of litigation would be required to remove the uncertainties that these provisions would create. In the meantime, collusive pricing practices now outlawed by the court would be reinstituted, and others would go unchecked.

The bill would seriously weaken the antitrust laws and hinder their enforcement. It would impose upon the Government, in the case of industries long habituated to monopolistic systems of delivered pricing, a wellnigh impossible burden of proof. It would permit the issuance of an order terminating an agreement to employ a basing-point system, but it would prevent the issuance of an order enjoining the continued use of the system itself.

The bill would go far toward emasculating the Robinson-Patman Act by restoring the good-faith defense of the old Clayton Act, thus enabling a seller to justify any price discrimination, no matter how destructive of competition, by showing that his discriminatory price was adopted to meet the price of a competitor. This defense would serve to bolster the systematic matching of delivered prices under basing-point systems. But it would not be confined to such cases; it could be offered in justification of every form of price discrimination that is now prohibited by law.

Believing in the superiority of a system of free enterprise and fearing that freedom will be endangered as competition is restrained, we appeal to all members of the Senate to vote against the bill S. 1008 or any other bill which could be so interpreted as to legalize the basing-point system of pricing.

Respectfully yours,

(Signatures attached:)

Gardner Ackley, University of Michigan.
Edward L. Allen, American University.
Richard M. Alt, Johns Hopkins University.
James W. Angell, Columbia University.
George Leland Bach, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Edgar S. Bagley, Kansas State College.
Roland W. Bartlett, University of Illinois.
Roy Blough, University of Chicago.
Walter N. Breckenridge, Colby College.
Yale Brozen, Northwestern University.
John Buttrick, Northwestern University.
William A. Carter, Dartmouth College.
C. L. Christenson, Indiana University.
Philip H. Coombs, Amherst College.
James F. Corbett, New York City school system.
John M. Crawford, Carnegie Institute of Technology.
Kenneth J. Curran, Princeton University.
Charles R. Dean, Rutgers University.
Marshall E. Dimock, Bethel, Vt.
John F. Duffy, Jr., Denison University.
Durward H. Dyche, Wake Forest College.
Howard L. Ellis, University of California.
Frank Whitson Fetter, Northwestern University.
Milton Friedman, University of Chicago.
David L. Gass, Williams College.
Betti C. Goldwasser, Washington, D. C.
Bernard F. Haley, Stanford University.
Milton Hammer, Milton Hammer & Associates.
Albert G. Hart, Columbia University.
Edward R. Hawkins, Johns Hopkins University.
Charles H. Hession, Brooklyn College.
Henry G. Hilken, Washington, D. C.
Simeon Hutner, Princeton, N. J.
Martin V. Jones, Chicago, Ill.
Richard A. Kahn, University of Miami.
William F. Kennedy, University of California.
Robert R. Kibrick, New York Sun.
Frank J. Kottke, University of North Carolina.
Frank H. Knight, University of Chicago.
Ben W. Lewis, Oberlin College.
Clarence D. Long, Johns Hopkins University.
Arthur F. Lucas, Clark University.
Friedrich H. Lutz, Princeton University.
Fritz Machlup, Johns Hopkins University.
Edward S. Mason, Harvard University.
John W. May, Washington and Jefferson College.
John W. McBride, Washington, D. C.
S. Sterling McMillan, Western Reserve University.
John Perry Miller, Yale University.
Carey P. Modlin, Jr., Princeton University.
Julius L. Okun, Arlington, Va.
Alfred L. Oxenfeldt, Hofstra College.
Shorey Peterson, University of Michigan.
Roy A. Prewitt, Washington, D. C.
Lloyd G. Reynolds, Yale University.
I. Lyman Singer, S. J. Tilden High School.
Caleb A. Smith, Wilmington College.
Richard E. Speagle, New York State Banking Department.
Joseph J. Spengler, Duke University.
George A. Steiner, University of Illinois.
George J. Stigler, Columbia University.
George W. Stocking, Vanderbilt University.
Herbert E. Striner, Syracuse University.
Myrick H. Sublette, University of Virginia.
Carl F. Taeusch, St. Louis University.
Richard B. Tennant, Yale University.
Daniel C. Vandermeulen, Claremont Men's College.
Myron W. Watkins, New York University.
Clair Wilcox, Swarthmore College.

Edward R. Willett, Northeastern University.
John W. Wright, Washington, D. C.
Floyd A. Bond, Pomona College.
Miriam K. Chamberlair, Connecticut College.
A. G. Papandreou, University of Minnesota.
Floyd L. Vaughan, University of Oklahoma.
Jacob Viner, Princeton University.

Highway Construction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, the Joint Committee on the Economic Report has issued a study of highway needs throughout the Nation. The publication of this report has attracted great interest, and in the Washington Evening Star of last night there was an editorial based on the document. The title of the editorial is "No Time for Bickering." That is an admonition which can apply in many different fields, in addition to the field of highway planning. Irrespective of that, however, Mr. President, I feel that the Star editorial should appear in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I therefore ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO TIME FOR BICKERING

Against the background of the O'MAHONEY committee's long-view report on Washington's highway needs, current bickering among District and Federal highway and bridge planners becomes inexcusable. At a time when these officials should be working shoulder to shoulder toward realization of a $200,000,000 traffic-relief program of the nature described in the report, they are at an impasse over bridge sites. And the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, created by Congress to bring far-sighted leadership in building a better city, is even proposing a halt to further bridge construction until existing traffic bottlenecks are eliminated.

But the best relief for present bottlenecks is to be found in new channels for traffic—new bridges, freeways of the Whitehurst type, and similar bold, though costly, projects. Instead of abandoning plans for immediate construction of a fourth bridge across the Anacostia River, we should be going ahead with plans for more than one new bridge over that stream and for additional crossings along the Potomac from Alexandria to Great Falls. Meanwhile work should go ahead on interim relief measures, such as underpasses, street widening and relocation, corner cutting and the like, although it is absurd to consider these piecemeal undertakings as an adequate substitute for major relief projects.

No one proposes the launching at once of all phases of the far-reaching highway program envisioned in the report of the Joint Economic Committee. That is at least a 20-year program—longer than 20 years if the present rate of highway-fund allotment is adhered to. Today the District is spending only about 10 millions a year on highways and bridges, about equally divided between repairs and new construction.

Included in the long-range program are some projects which cannot fairly be considered as primarily District responsibilities. The proposed bridge between Alexandria and the Blue Plains area is a good example. That would be essentially a by-pass for the benefit of United States route 1 traffic. In a similar category is the proposed new bridge over the upper Anacostia to serve the uncompleted Washington-Baltimore Parkway. The Federal Government is financing and building this parkway as far as Fort Meade, because of its military value. It would be logical to assess the cost of the parkway bridge against the Federal Government, in view of the national aspect of the whole enterprise.

In fact, so many governmental interests are involved in the orderly development of a comprehensive highway system in the metropolitan area that, as the O'MAHONEY report suggests, an over-all coordinating agency may become necessary to effect joint action. This is a subject for exploration by a commission of inquiry of the type proposed in the pending Sasscer bill.

Neglect of Christian Refugees of Palestine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Whole of Christendom Neglecting Christian Refugees of Palestine," written by Dorothy Thompson.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ON THE RECORD—WHOLE OF CHRISTENDOM NEGLECTING CHRISTIAN REFUGEES OF PALESTINE

(By Dorothy Thompson)

An investigating mission under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee—composed of Protestant pastors and laymen—has returned from Palestine and reported against UN internationalization of Jerusalem as dangerous and unnecessary.

The group also opposes even the latest, much less inclusive scheme advanced by Roger Garreau, president of the United Nations' Trusteeship Council, to limit internationalization to a small area containing the chief holy places.

In short, it would appear that the mission wishes, as does Israel, to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether.

This column agrees with the mission that it would be dangerous to oppose or criticize the state of Israel in any way. It even is dangerous for an American publicist. Israel and its American supporters are claiming an absolutely unique immunity from criticism—as recently pointed out by pro-Israel Walter White.

STATE CREATED BY FORCE

Although Israel owes the legitimizing of its existence to United Nations partition, which was accepted by its agents, the state does not conform to that plan, but has been created by force—as what is left of the Arab world in Palestine is held by force. The ports of Jaffa and Haifa were not awarded to Israel, but Israel holds them. The internationalization of Jerusalem was included in the original plan, but is now refused. To protect a UN trusteeship would require force, for without it, force would certainly be used against it. Therefore, it is dangerous.

Whether a UN trusteeship anywhere in Palestine is unnecessary depends on one's viewpoint of necessity. The mission declares it is unnecessary as a means of protecting shrines, and that there is complete religious freedom in Palestine. Maybe there is freedom to worship, but how about the worshipers? Christian shrines remain undisturbed; how about the Christian community? Is it free, even to survive?

The United Nations never took one step to guarantee the lives or property of the indigenous Arab population in Jewish Palestine. Hundreds of thousands of them have been turned into refugees, living in the bitterest want, with all their possessions expropriated by Israel. And those refugees include most of the Palestinian Christians who constitute one of the oldest, most faithful Christian communities on earth.

Their story was told in part by Yusif El-Bandak, son of the mayor of Bethlehem (all Bethlehem is Christian), and in the November 30 issue of "The Christian Century." It apparently surprised Americans to learn that there were any Christians in Palestine. Yet they constitute a tenth of the Arab-speaking population. None of them are converts from Islam. All are either descendants from Christians, of the time of Christ (mostly Philistines or Canaanites), or of the Crusaders.

TIES TO WESTERN WORLD

Throughout history they have had ties to the western world. Their sons have been educated in Christian schools and colleges in the Middle East, and in the west. They have been among the most progressive and prosperous of the native population, and were concentrated chiefly in Jaffa, Haifa, and "new" Jerusalem, where they owned fully two-thirds of all the property, both in private and institutional holdings.

The members of this community are today refugees in the country wherein they have constituted a secure and highly respected community for centuries. Their properties have been confiscated without compensation. In the birthplace of Christ—which would have fallen except for a well-organized defense—40,000 of them have taken refuge, bursting the capacities of a town of 15,000. Although their fellow Christians have taken them into their homes with sacrificial generosity, thousands, like Mary, could "find no room in an inn," and, like Mary, their children are born in stalls, or in caves, or under trees, while over them "the silent stars go by."

All that reaches them is a trickle of totally inadequate relief. Great Christendom neglects them. The Moslems watch their plight with wonderment, asking, "if the United States, overwhelmingly a Christian country, lets these Christians perish in the birthplace of their Lord, whom will the United States protect anywhere?"

Russian agents jeer, "You call us atheists, but where is that Christian world?"

And a "Christian" mission reports about shrines, but not about Christians.

Who will protect this community? Israel, which created their plight? The Moslem world? Who, if not the UN?

Address by Russell W. Davenport in Presenting Award to Displaced Persons Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Let Us Keep the Faith," delivered by Russell W. Davenport at New York City on January 28, 1950, in presenting to the Displaced Persons Commission the annual award of the Association of Immigration Lawyers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET US KEEP THE FAITH

Mr. Chairman, Commissioners, and distinguished guests, it is a great pleasure for me to be here to help perform the little ceremony that is the object of this gathering.

The issues with which our guests of honor have had to deal, and with which most persons in this audience are almost daily concerned, are issues that involve not only the welfare of this country but of the entire world.

As you know, I am a Republican—a member of a party that has had some difficulty in recent years in winning its side of the argument. The Displaced Persons Commission is of course nonpartisan, and in that sense it makes no difference which party your speaker belongs to. Nevertheless, I welcome this opportunity to express my profound conviction that on matters such as we are discussing here, and indeed on all major decisions in foreign affairs, the two major parties must consistently join together to make common, bipartisan policies.

It is often said that the United States has emerged from the two world wars as the most powerful nation on earth. This fact cannot be questioned. But it will be well for us if we have a clear idea of what we mean by it.

Do we mean only that the United States has the most powerful Military Establishment? Potentially, at any rate, that statement might be true. Beyond our shores it is a statement that would be given much credit and much weight. But I do not believe that when Americans speak of the United States as the most powerful nation they have the thought of military power in mind. They mean something else.

One thing they mean, is that the United States is the most powerful nation in terms of industrial and economic productivity. Through our productivity and our industrial know-how we can show other people how to raise their standards of living and how to open for themselves new opportunities. That, for example, is the inner meaning of the European recovery program.

Yet how do we show other people these things? Not, certainly, by military force. Nor yet by economic force. It would not be consonant with any aspect of our doctrine of freedom to force our principles or our way of doing things upon anyone else.

Basically, American power is a moral power. It is that power which arises when an individual or a people is dedicated, for example, to the principle of justice. It is that power which arises when we assert that men are equal, irrespective of race, color, creed, or nationality. It is that power which arises when we insist upon government by law, rather than government for military, economic, or propagandistic advantage.

The power of America is that power that springs from the proposition that all men, not just Americans, of a right ought to be free.

We do not say that it is our task to make all men free. We do say that they ought to be free. We let the moral law speak for us. And insofar as we harness our military and economic resources to the service of that law, we shall be great and we shall grow greater as the future unrolls.

America the military power is just one more nation in the troubled history of man. But America the moral power is something new in human evolution, something of which we have yet seen only the beginning, something that awakens in all men that hope, that faith in the future, without which they cannot be free.

Now, among the moral propositions upon which our power was originally founded there was one that particularly concerns us tonight, the proposition that anyone on earth could become an American.

During more recent times it has become necessary for us to qualify this great proposition. It has become physically and economically impossible for us to accept everyone who wants to come here. Some of these limitations have economic causes and some political.

Let us be crystal clear, however, that the limitations we have placed upon free immigration do not cancel the principle. Americans may still be born anywhere on earth.

But now, just as the economic problems of our time caused us to limit the principle some decades ago, so the terrible problems created by the Second World War have required us to expand those limitations in order to save the principle.

Had we, after the Second World War, insisted upon the rigid application of our prewar immigration quotas, no one in the world would have believed that the United States was still dedicated to the proposition that all men ought to be free. They would have accused us of hypocrisy. It was absolutely essential for the survival of our principle that we set up machinery for the admission into this country of persons who had been uprooted by war and revolution and who literally had no home.

And it was from that necessity that there grew the Displaced Persons Commission, which we are gathered here to honor.

Now, my friends, as you see, I have come to this point in a very unsentimental way. I have not talked to you about the suffering of these displaced persons. I have not sought to make an appeal to what are commonly called the humanitarian instincts of the American people, though these instincts of mercy, of kindness, of generosity are very strong in our people.

I have rather sought to show, that when we properly understand the meaning of those words "American power," we find that the mere preservation of that power, which is a moral power, requires that we stand forth before the world as the defender and upholder of the principles of freedom—not just for Americans, but for everyone. And this means, in the present state of the world, that the admission of displaced persons is not merely a humanitarian act, but, literally, an act of self-preservation. It is an act to preserve the moral power upon which the destiny of the United States is founded.

In the light of this truth our course is clear. What we need is a Displaced Persons Act which will apply this principle in simple and unambiguous terms.

Every qualification that we add to the act raises an ambiguity of some kind. For example, to take the simplest qualification, it is generally recognized that the United States ought to take, as a minimum, 400,000 of these displaced persons. Why, then, do we keep qualifying this figure by writing it down to 330,000 or some other fraction of the minimum? Let us take 400,000 without haggling about it; the extra 70,000 is not going to ruin the United States.

But other and far more serious qualifications keep creeping into this vital legislation. The House bill that was passed last spring wisely and courageously eliminated many of them. But now we find that in the Senate they have crept back again.

We are again confronted with the old restriction that 40 percent of all who are admitted must come from countries annexed since the war by a foreign power—which weights the quota very heavily in favor of the Baltic states.

We are confronted with the restriction, that 30 percent of the quota must have practiced agriculture for 2 years.

Now everyone recognizes the desirability of allocating these new citizens to the farms, where they are much needed. But a rigid percentage requirement like that means that if enough agricultural workers cannot be found others cannot be admitted. The Commission's courageous policy during the past year, of deferring the allocations for these various categories to the last possible moment, is well known. Nevertheless, well over 100,000 able-bodied and desirable persons were excluded because of the impossibility of filling specific quotas.

Even more serious is the effect of such restrictions on the rest of the world, and particularly on the displaced persons themselves. Must they not be puzzled, that in a land which boasts that its citizens can choose their own occupations, a particular occupation is designated as the key that opens the magic door? And must they not be puzzled that a people who believe that all men are equal give an overwhelming priority to persons of Baltic stock?

I say that such restrictions do us more harm than good. Let us abandon them. Let us instruct the Commission to give preference to agricultural workers, and the like, but let us give it power to exercise its discretion.

And then there is the matter of caution. We have heard the charge repeated over and over again, that these displaced and homeless persons are infested with communism and other subversive doctrines. But anyone who will spend time in their camps with an open mind is bound to come out with practically the opposite impression. Owing to their terrible experiences with authoritarian regimes, an overwhelming proportion of these people are dedicated to the ideals of democracy—dedicated with an intensity that is capable of shaming many who already enjoy democracy and take it for granted.

Of course, it is true that there are communists and subversives among them. But the Displaced Persons Commission goes to almost fantastic lengths to screen such persons out. The security protections involved in the administration of the displaced persons law far exceed in severity and carefulness any rules that have ever been applied in the normal immigration law. There are at least seven special protections, as follows:

1. The Commission itself maintains the closest watch on security problems and has issued iron-bound instructions that no one who was ever a member of the Communist, Nazi, or Fascist Parties, or of related parties, for whatever reason, is admissible into the United States under the program.

2. An extensive field investigation is conducted overseas by the Counter-Intelligence Corps of the United States Army.

3. There is a special additional investigation for any displaced person whose country or origin has been overrun by the Communist terror.

4. Special laboratories have been set up for the examination of documents relating to eligibility.

5. The Immigration Service examines all displaced persons overseas, and then again examines them upon arrival in the United States.

6. There is an individual check on every displaced person by the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

7. And finally, there is a constant rechecking by the International Refugee Organization, so meticulous that Communist Russia has refused to be a member of the IRO.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, it is a very good thing to be cautious. But as everyone of us knows from experience in his personal life, caution can be carried too far. It can become a disease. The man who is afraid of all the things that might happen to him from the time he gets up in the morning until he goes to bed is a psychopathic case and usually ends up in a sanitarium. He can be healthy only if he counters his daily risks with reasonable care.

In the framing of this new Displaced Persons Act, let us abide by that good American principle. Let us take reasonable care. No less than that, certainly, but no more. And let the qualifications that we make also be reasonable qualifications. I urge that policy upon the Senate of the United States. And I especially urge those Senators who have hitherto obstructed this legislation to remember, that too much caution, and too many qualifications, can so undermine this legislation as to jeopardize the moral power, the good faith, of the United States.

Before I close I want to give you one specific example of how an excess of caution—a pathological excess of caution—is causing a shocking injustice beyond our shores, and is working to our own disadvantage.

Since the Second World War thousands of little children in Europe have been adopted by American citizens. They were orphans. Not only had they no homes, they had no parents. The circumstances of adoption were innumerably varied. Some have been adopted by Americans serving overseas; others by Americans in this country, because they wanted a child in their home or for some other reason.

One of the good provisions of the present Senate bill is that it provides for the admission of 5,000 of these adopted children. However, and here is this old business of qualification again—it imposes the restriction that they must be adopted by servicemen in Europe or by Government employees.

Now in the first place, 5,000 is not enough. The figure should be 25,000, as suggested by Senator TYDINGS.

But, secondly, since when have we so admired Government employees, or so exalted the armed services, that we should appoint them the sole guardians of our orphans? Why is it not possible for an ordinary American citizen, in responsible circumstances, to adopt one of these orphans in like manner and bring him into this country?

Most of these adopted orphans, let us note well, will come to this country some day, somehow—if in no other way, then on the immigration quota. It is manifestly to our interest that we bring them now rather than later; that we begin now to educate them in the American way of life; that we provide them with parents now, rather than permit them to develop all those faults and weaknesses which, psychologists tell us, are created by the lack of parental care.

I happened on this particular issue through some close personal friends, Mr. and Mrs. Rene Augay, of Scarsdale, N. Y. This couple was unhappy because they had no children. Through a friend they heard about a little boy named Peter who was born in Austria in 1946; whose father disappeared, and whose mother soon thereafter died of heartbreak and poverty. Peter had been taken by his maternal grandparents; but they were also poverty stricken and were too old to work. The Augays saw his photograph and were charmed. They journeyed to Europe, met him, fell in love with him, and with the greatest joy adopted him. That was going on 2 years ago.

But then the Augays had to return to America, because they are not rich and Mr. Augay has to work—all the harder now, since he has a third person in the family. Naturally they assumed that they would be able to take their child to this country. But every effort failed. There was nothing in the law to entitle Peter to a visa. He belonged nowhere. The Augays even tried to take him in through Canada; but the Canadian authorities refused him on a simple and logical ground. They said he was an American citizen.

So the Augays had to leave Peter behind. They put him in a children's home in Geneva, Switzerland, and said good-by. And there he is to this day. Peter worships Mrs. Augay, his new mother: whenever a visitor comes to the children's home, he runs out to the door crying, "Maman?" in the expectation that she has come to take him away. But he is always disappointed. When he is naughty, the lady who runs the home turns his mother's picture to the wall—and his father's picture, too. That is the worst punishment in the world for him: he at once behaves, and then begins asking where his mother and father are and why they can't come for him again. I ask that question, too. Why can't they?

Peter Augay is now 4 years old—in fact, I have told you this story because tomorrow, Sunday, January 29, is his birthday. And I would like to give him a birthday present and to have you give it with me. I would like to draw his case to the attention of the American public, in order that the Senate of the United States will at last recognize his right to be an American citizen.

I make no special plea for Peter—nor would he want me to. I appeal in his name, on his birthday, on behalf of the thousands of orphans whom responsible American citizens have adopted. I raise him as a symbol. Not the atom bomb, but this child of 4 is the true symbol of American power; the true symbol of the moral power that has made this country so great.

Let us, then, validate that symbol. Let us change that clause to permit any responsible American citizen—not just a special group—to bring into this country his or her adopted son or daughter. Let us recognize that when great and simple principles become cluttered with timid qualifications justice cannot be done.

Ladies and gentlemen, the business of the evening is to do honor to these distinguished guests, Ugo Carusi, Edward M. O'Connor, and Harry N. Rosenfield, who constitute the Displaced Persons Commission.

I need not tell you, who have struggled with the involutions of the present law, what heroic work these gentlemen have done, against what odds. They have been accused of just about everything in the book. But they have never lost their nerve. And they have never lost their faith in the great principles that it is their task to implement.

There has just been issued, as you know, the report of a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives. This subcommittee inquired into the work of these men in an exhaustive way. And here is what it says and I quote: "The studies and investigations undertaken in Europe have convinced this subcommittee that, on the whole, the administration of the 1948 act is being conducted in a diligent and satisfactory manner."

Well, that is a very fine vindication of your work, Mr. Commissioners. But I think that we here can do better than that. Of course, we do not carry the weight of a subcommittee of Congress. But there is in our hearts a great warmth and a great thankfulness, which, perhaps, official reports cannot properly supply.

There is warmth, because the going has been tough—and we, like all Americans, admire and love men who can do their jobs well under tough circumstances.

There is thankfulness, because you have been good public servants, loyal to principles upon which the power of America is founded.

And I know that there is a great, unseen audience, Mr. Commissioners, who join us tonight, in sprit, in expressing this warmth and thankfulness: the more than 120,000 displaced persons, who—case by careful case—have been admitted by you into this free land of ours; and not merely admitted, but settled into our American life.

And there is still another unseen audience woebegone and hungry, but clinging still to their hopes; those hundreds of thousands who wait in the DP camps of Europe for a chance to enter here.

The Association of Immigration and Nationality Lawyers, whose purposes center around the just and proper care of those who come to our shores, believes that you Mr. Commissioners, have set such a high standard of public service in the field of immigration, that it herewith presents you with its annual award for the year 1949.

It is my great privilege, gentlemen, to hand you this award. May the good work go on. Let us keep the faith.

Nondiscrimination in Immigration and Employment Practices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LANGER

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial on the subject of civil rights and nondiscrimination in immigration and employment practices, published in the January 1950 issue of the magazine known as Goodwill, a soundboard for democratic public opinion.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Among the presently hotly debated questions in the United States and in the United Nations is the question of civil rights and nondiscrimination in immigration and employment practices. Many of the problems arising in the UN, as well as in this country, basically stems from the afore-mentioned questions. Problems abroad between two nations arise from misunderstandings of their respective positions, and mutual distrusts toward each other. A protest is lodged in the UN because of the protesting

nation feels that another nation has transgressed or infringed upon her rights.

In a democratic nation all the inhabitants of that nation is supposed to enjoy equal rights and privileges under the laws of the country. The Declaration of Independence and the Bill of Rights have meant to give those democratic rights to all the peoples of America, without regard to race, creed, or color. There should be no discrimination in civil rights, employment, and immigration and naturalization policies.

Yet, today the United States Government is still practicing discriminatory laws and restrictive measures in immigration problems against orientals. The peoples who are being discriminated against are the Japanese, Indonesians, Malayans, Siamese, Burmese, and a few other smaller nations. They are mostly inhabitants of southeast Asia with an aggregate population of 250,000,000 people. All these peoples are now independent nations or, at least, autonomous, and have already become democratic-conscious and sensitive to social relationships outside their own countries. Most of these peoples look toward the United States for inspiration and leadership. Many of them have made more intensive studies of American history and such personalities as George Washington, Thomas Jefferson, and Abraham Lincoln, than the average American.

The Oriental Exclusion Act which was enacted by Congress in 1924, to prevent Asiatics from enjoying the same privileges in America in immigration matters is a slap in the face to all Asiatics. No respectable Asian will tolerate such an injustice and inequality to exist in an alleged democratic nation. There are reports in the papers to the effect that the United States intends to win over the rest of Asia, meaning southeast Asia, to the democratic cause. To a certain extent the United States Government has shown an increasing interest in the welfare of those countries, while President Truman has reiterated his point 4 program of economic and cultural aid to undeveloped countries. Those reiterations, although well-meaning, may sound attractive to radio listeners, but they will not suffice to calm the hearts of formerly suppressed Asiatic nations. To these peoples practical action in the application of democracy in this country and in United States foreign policy speak louder than words.

It stands to reason that the Oriental Exclusion Act is an overly outmoded law. Under that law no Asiatic could immigrate to the United States or receive equal treatment in naturalization matters. They didn't have any immigration quotas. Recently, this act had been modified in regards to nationals of China, the Philippines, and India. But, otherwise, its continued existence against the other half of Asiatics, is a paradox of American democracy. The speedy repeal of this Exclusion Act is much overdue. We hope that responsible Americans will urge their Senators and Congressmen to proceed with the liquidation of the last remnants of the colonial system. The close of World War II has already put an end to that colonial era abroad.

If America wants to retain its moral leadership in the world, it has to necessarily make certain adaptations to new conditions and attitudes of the people of the world. Laws in all countries have been modified just as fashions change from day to day. In an article in the New York Times magazine, April 3, 1949, Mr. Raymond B. Fosdick, former president of the Rockefeller Foundation, stated:

"Nothing is static in this world, least of all our ideas. Values change from age to age and the interpretation of one generation is seldom the interpretation of the next. Social conceptions must constantly be retranslated and reexpressed in contemporary conditions. Even our conceptions of freedom and democracy are not static principles. The Declaration of Independence was a broader definition of freedom than that which came out of the Revolution of 1688, just as 1688 widened the freedom of the Magna Carta."

Further up he said, "Democracy is another conception which must also be reinterpreted from generation to generation. It is government by the people and for the people, but its limits were not finally determined by the political concepts of the eighteenth century. Rather it is a growing, dynamic faith, a perpetually evolving adjustment between freedom and justice, between individual rights and the demands of society." This adjustment, however, is never perfectly and finally attained; it remains a problem which mankind must solve again and again. "It is provided in the very essence of things," said Walt Whitman, "that from any fruition of success, no matter what, shall come forth something to make a greater struggle necessary."

In conclusion Mr. Fosdick stated, "If democracy means anything at all, it means the promise of growth. Democracy is not a finished project; we are engaged in building it. There is no blueprint which covers all the contingencies that may arise, or the new ideas and patterns that may be developed in the future. There is no final and absolute form of democracy which has been handed down from some political Sinai. We have no Karl Marx in our past. Democracy is a method of evolution, a maturing way of living, a conception of human relations rooted in the worth and dignity of the individual and inspired by the developing idea of freedom."

We feel that America has matured in such a way so as to grant equal opportunities to all its inhabitants and residents regardless of race, creed, or color.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, January 31 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, an article published by Hon. Virgil M. McClintic, publisher, White County (Ind.) Democrat, outlines the experiences of two displaced persons who have been given refuge in White County, Ind.

I submit the article herewith and ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Two displaced persons from Europe are happily situated in two Big Creek township farm homesteads located across the road from each other at the homes of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell and O. C. Parks and family. The families sponsoring them in their new homes are just as happy as the two young women.

First to arrive in the county was Miss Troosh Agafia, native of the Ukraine, who is with the Parks family. She reached here on June 4. Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia arrived at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Shell on August 15.

After Congress passed the law June 15, 1949, permitting displaced persons from Europe to come to the United States, announcement was made that 205,000 DP's could come here. The Shells made application June 24 with the Church World Service, through which Protestant churches worked. They requested that they would like a girl 25 to 50, capable of assisting with the housework as Mrs. Shell was crippled with arthritis, and a Protestant. On March 3, this year, they received notice that the girl had been selected and would be ready to come soon. However, Mrs. Kiritschenko became ill with the flu and her voyage was slowed up for 3 months.

LAND AT BOSTON

Applicants who sponsor the DP, must furnish inland transportation from the ports of arrival, Boston, New York, or New Orleans. In June the Shells mailed the transportation. Mrs. Kiritschenko went to Bremen in June and sailed on July 19, on the *General Sturgis*, in which there were 885 DP's. It took them 9 days. The travel bureaus were responsible for taking care of them en route to their destinations over the country. Mrs. Kiritschenko was routed to Detroit, and from there took the Wabash to Lafayette, where the Shells met her.

Miss Agafia landed at Boston, and then came by train to Lafayette.

Mr. Parks put in their application in July 1948, a couple weeks later than the Shells. Their letter was sent to the Ukranian American Relief, and their application was acted upon quicker than through the other agency.

Born in 1913, near Moscow, Mrs. Kiritschenko was the daughter of a railroad engineer. When a little girl she went to live with her uncle and aunt, and they traveled quite extensively as the aunt was a Russian consular, comparable to an American Ambassador. They lived in Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Italy. When a little girl, she learned some English from an American lady. Mrs. Kiritschenko speaks fluent German and Russian and some French. She is a member of a family of six children, three boys and three girls. The family is well educated and hold responsible positions.

TRAINED NURSE

Mrs. Kiritschenko was married to an officer in the Russian Army, but had not heard from him since the war. She had 2 years' nurse's training and worked as a nurse in an X-ray laboratory for 4½ years in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Since liberation, she had been a nurse in a kindergarten for the last 4 years in Munich, Germany. She stated that first she was in charge of three infants, and then was responsible for seven children ages 2½ to 3, all war orphans.

In the hospital she became acquainted with modern appliances found today in the kitchens of American housewives. She did not hesitate to use the appliances found in the Shell home. She had no trouble in learning. Pat Doremire, a Chalmers High School pupil, assisted her in showing where the things were in the house. She can manage the household very well, and has prepared some fine meals.

Mrs. Kiritschenko is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, but has attended the Chalmers community church regularly since she came here.

She is an attractive blonde and has natural curly hair. The clothing brought with her is like American women wear. She brought several trunks full, which she described as "my house." She has worn her hair bobbed for a number of years, but when a girl it was long.

Shortly after her arrival at the Shell home, Mrs. Kiritschenko received a letter of welcome to the State of Indiana from Gov. Henry F. Schricker, which she prizes greatly.

Mrs. Kiritschenko enjoys reading the newspapers, but remarked that she has learned more about what is happening in Europe since she came to the States than during the time she was a resident.

Being able to speak some English, it was possible to secure considerable information from Mrs. Kiritschenko. However in the case of Miss Agafia, it was difficult. Both young women were at the Shell home the afternoon of the interview and when these pictures were

taken. While they both speak Russian, they are different. Miss Agafia is Ukraine Russian or Polish. Mrs. Kiritschenko assisted with the interview.

NATIVE OF UKRAINE

It was learned that Miss Agafia was a native of Ukraine, but she has no living relatives to her knowledge. She went to Poland, then Czechoslovakia and then to Germany, where she did field labor.

The clothing that she brought had been sent through missions to Germany. Before coming to the States, she worked in the Baptist mission in Munich.

Asked if she was happy in the United States, he replied, "Like it here," with a big broad smile.

She is an expert gardener and flower lover. No weeds grow in her garden. She likes to knit, and has some beautiful sweaters that she made which she brought with her.

The Parks family has a dairy and the cows are milked by machine. Miss Agafia took a delight in seeing the machine work. Afterwards she stripped some of the cows, and a member of the family is quoted as saying that "she stripped the cows so dry they had to prime them the next time to milk 'em." She also enjoys hunting eggs, in fact any kind of out-of-door work. Practically all of her 42 years has been spent on a farm.

Nine Members of the House of Representatives Add Names to List of Sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, To Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix, I include the following statement which my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. JUDD], and I have issued:

Nine Congressmen added their names today to the 102 original sponsors of House Concurrent Resolution 64, a resolution to strengthen the United Nations, thereby constituting the largest number of congressional sponsors of any foreign policy resolution in the history of the United States.

The new sponsors include Representatives CARL ALBERT, Democrat, of Oklahoma; WILLIAM P. BOLTON, Democrat, of Maryland; WILLIAM M. COLMER, Democrat, of Mississippi; WINFIELD K. DENTON, Democrat, of Indiana; EDWARD H. KRUSE, JR., Democrat, of Indiana; JOHN E. MILES, Democrat, of New Mexico; A. S. MIKE MONRONEY, Democrat, of Oklahoma; DONALD W. NICHOLSON, Republican, of Massachusetts; and MELVIN PRICE, Democrat, of Illinois.

The resolution, designed to put Congress on record in favor of strengthening and developing the United Nations, is as follows:

"Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

Congressman BROOKS HAYS, Democrat, of Arkansas, an original sponsor of House Concurrent Resolution 64, commented: "This increased bypartisan support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 is indicative of the growing belief in the House of Representatives that peace must be obtained through the establishment of world law.

"If we are to stand behind our pledge to support the United Nations, we must use all our moral and political strength to mold that organization into a body truly capable of preserving peace. House Concurrent Resolution 64 aims at establishing through the UN the minimum law necessary to maintain peace.

"In a world divided, we must seek to unite not to aggravate the schism. The sponsors of this resolution want the United States to make it clear that we are willing to sit down with all nations to establish a system of justice and enforceable law in the realm of world security.

"Although we must stay strong, our best resources for peace, as always, are not the arms of war but the strength of our dedication to the values of justice, order, and human dignity."

Congressman WALTER JUDD, Republican, of Minnesota, one of the initial sponsors said:

"In a world engulfed in a shadow of fear generated by the armaments race, we must achieve a positive moral base for our policy decisions. House Concurrent Resolution 64 shows the United States an important way to seize the moral initiative through the advocacy of a strengthened United Nations.

"This policy is not only consistent with the highest American tradition but is an urgent necessity in the present atmosphere of international tension. The establishment of law in the realm of world security is not an easily attainable goal, but should we fail the future is indeed foreboding.

"We must not shrink from what we believe is morally right because of the fear of possible frustration. We must stand firm in the strength of our convictions. We seek now to define our goal and indicate a method by which we shall strive to achieve this end. Failure to act along these positive lines would play into the hands of those who profit by deepening division and despair."

Senate Concurrent Resolution 56 which is identical to House Concurrent Resolution 64, has the support of 22 Members of the Senate. A subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee is expected to begin hearings on this and similar resolutions on Thursday, February 2.

Letter to Dr. Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

DEAR DR. MONTGOMERY: We shall sorely miss you in the House each noon. There was always great comfort and solace to hear your daily invocation. I shall always remember tenderly our friendship that has abided with us for many years. Wherever you may go, and whatever you may do, may health and happiness ever be with you and your dear wife.

You have left with all us Members many unforgettable lessons in religion and morality. They are as enduring as sermons on stones.

The name James Shera Montgomery will ever be a cherished name in our Halls. You recall what the psalmist said, "Better is the fragrance of a good name than the perfume of precious oils."

Not so long ago, I visited Israel and there the word spoken on meeting and on departure is Sholom (Hebrew for peace).

Till we meet again, Sholom.

EMANUEL CELLER

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, no section of this country has been more in the national spotlight recently than the Pacific Northwest, the drainage area of the mighty Columbia River.

In order to give all Members a brief general background of the Columbia region, its natural resources, its history, and its promise of the future, I wish to include in the RECORD a series of articles written by Mr. Leon Starmont, of Spokane, Wash., who for nearly 40 years has been reporting on that region. While Mr. Starmont's articles contain some statements not entirely in agreement with other versions of many of the happenings with which he treats, I think they deserve the attention of those who have been subjected more consistently to other points of view.

The Columbia is so tremendous in its importance to the people who live near it and the Nation as a whole that I believe those charged with planning its future should explore every idea advanced by those, such as Mr. Starmont, who will live with it.

The first article follows:

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 22, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Article 1)

(By Leon Starmont)

During the covered-wagon days of 1850, according to a story related at an off-the-record session of the Columbia Basin Commission the other day, a party of pioneers halted beside the old Oregon Trail, to take counsel, reorganize their ranks, and explore the immediate surroundings.

"We know where we're going," one leader insisted.

"But which is the right road?" asked another.

"We don't know just where we are," remarked a third.

"We're not sure just how we got here," added a fourth.

The point was supposed to be that the whole Columbia Basin comprehensive program is now at the stage reached by that more or less hypothetical wagon train 100 years ago.

Residents of the Pacific Northwest are fairly well agreed on the ultimate goal, which is to bring about in this corner of the continent the finest flowering of western civilization. In simple words, the plan is to make this the best spot on earth in which to live and raise a bunch of kids.

ALL WANT THE SAME THING

There is no important disagreement in the Columbia Basin as to what the people want. There are differences of opinion as to the best way of getting it.

There are even contradictory accounts of how the region reached this present stage of development. One task of this reporter will be to separate the facts from the fables, for the benefit of future historians.

The roads ahead wind into the future, somewhat as the Oregon Trail—a route of many detours, short cuts, and alternate choices—led into the Columbia Basin in covered-wagon days.

These are the main ideas as to how the goal may best be reached:

1. Continuation under the present set-up through the voluntary Columbia Basin Interagency Committee (CBIAC), formed in 1946 after the Spokesman-Review had published a series of articles disclosing the confusion that before then existed.

2. Continuation through CBIAC under the Hoover reorganization plan, in which the Federal agencies concerned with river projects are to be consolidated into one department instead of five.

3. Control by the Western States and financing through taxes or bond issues, in order to avoid the necessity of repeated calls on Congress for authorization of projects and appropriation of money.

4. An interstate compact, under Federal auspices, with a commission of one man each from Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and Montana, nominated by the governors, and a chairman selected by the President.

5. A Columbia Valley Authority or Administration, modeled to some extent after the Tennessee Valley Authority; several proposals along this line are grouped under the common name CVA.

6. An independent agency directly responsible to the President, operating with its own funds and controlling its own finances, like some of the Federal banking units.

HOW DOES IT WORK?

Before attempting analysis of the five plans offered as substitutes, it may be well to examine the present set-up. Does it click as hoped? Do its wheels mesh?

That is where these explorations start.

The opening articles will merely establish, in terms of that 1850 wagon train, where we are now, and in some cases how we got this far.

Many approaches are possible—chronological, historical, geographic political, industrial, governmental, administrative, engineering. This reporter will try the human angle, the story of who does what and why.

Commissions may be set up, new boundaries established, powers delegated to this group or that, but it takes human beings to keep the machinery running. Often the success of the project depends not on the technical skill or legal acumen of the operators but their ability to get along with their fellow men.

There has to be an order of procedure, a scheme of things, a realization that the whole basin cannot be developed at once, and that pay rolls cannot be equalized among all the counties all the time.

RIVALRIES MAY DELAY

The Columbia drains about 260,000 square miles. Its 1950 population is probably 3,000,000 people.

From the Gros Ventre's headwaters in Wyoming to Astoria, at the river's mouth, is 730 miles. From Valemount, British Columbia, where Canoe River turns southward, to Tuscarora, Nev., is 820 miles. All these areas have to be considered.

In past years, local fights over priorities have held back development. That difficulty continues into 1950.

A river does not have a single source. It has as many sources as there are springs and snow-fed rivulets.

It is usually said that the Columbia rises in Canada. So do the Kootenay, the Pend Oreille (Flathead), the Kettle, and the Okanogan.

Wyoming contributes the main stream of the Snake. Into it flow the Raft from Utah, the Bruneau and the Owyhee from Nevada, the many-forked Salmon and the Clearwater and Palouse from Idaho, the Grande Ronde from Oregon.

Other direct tributaries of the Columbia include the Spokane from Idaho, the Chelan, Wenatchee, and Yakima, from the eastern slopes of the Washington Cascades, the Walla Walla, Umatilla, John Day, and Deschutes from Oregon, and the Willamette and Cowlitz, whose problems are quite different from those of the upper reaches.

MANY CONFLICTS

The number of possible conflicts becomes immense when you start multiplying the number of states and nations involved by the number of counties, cities, and towns, and then again by the distinct industries, the possible uses, and the numerous local districts.

There are port districts, irrigation, drainage, soil conservation, and utility districts. There are national forests, parks, monuments, and wilderness areas.

There are Indian reservations.

And just outside the limits of the Columbia Basin, within the same political divisions, are other cities, such as Vancouver, Seattle, and Tacoma on the coast; Helena and Great Falls, Mont.; Klamath Falls, Oreg.; and Salt Lake City.

How to divide the water and arrange the priorities among all these political subdivisions, cities, towns, districts, and industries is one phase of the problem that now confronts the Pacific Northwest.

Add the clash of human ambitions and personalities.

Toss in deep-seated rivalries among 20 Federal agencies.

Stir the desires of a few hundred political leaders or would-be leaders.

Embellish with the free opinions of numerous regional, State, and local trade associations, development leagues, reclamation institutes, and chambers of commerce.

Is it any wonder that the number of possible conflicts, if stated in figures, would reach from Jasper Park to Crater Lake on a large-scale map?

Statehood for Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial which appeared in the Milwaukee Journal on January 29, 1950, entitled "Quit Stalling on Hawaii."

Mr. Speaker, the question of admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State is not a new one. It has been considered by successive administrations for many years now, with good reasons offered in support of such action.

The ties that link our Nation with Hawaii are more than a century old. Voyagers, traders, and missionaries from the United States were among the first occidental people who established lasting relations with the people of Hawaii, long before those islands began to play a role of importance in international affairs.

The history of Hawaii offers strong justification for the proposed admittance of that Territory to statehood. By 1854 Hawaii was already a civilized and Christianized country with constitutional government, highly creditable legislative, executive, and judicial branches, modern industries, personal and property rights secure, and the respect of other nations and independence assured.

Annexed to the United States on the eve of this century, the Hawaiian Islands became a Territory, and an integral part of our Nation on June 14, 1900. Ever since that time the people of Hawaii have been keenly interested in securing statehood. Through their elected representatives they have repeatedly petitioned Congress for statehood, and in a plebiscite in 1940 they voted in favor of statehood by majority of more than 2 to 1.

The people of Hawaii are capable of assuming the responsibility of statehood, and they have proven worthy of it. And our Nation has more than little to gain in admitting Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State. The following editorial enumerates few of those advantages, and it reflects my sentiment that H. R. 49 should be passed by Congress this year.

The editorial referred to follows:

QUIT STALLING ON HAWAII

What has the United States to gain by admitting Hawaii to the Union as the forty-ninth State?

A permanent military bastion in the Pacific, of course. A vacation paradise. An area greater than the States of Delaware, Connecticut, and Rhode Island. A sturdy economic unit that last year paid $90,000,000 in Federal taxes, more than each of 11 States. And a loyal, intelligent, democratic population of 527,000.

What else would Hawaiian statehood do for us? Read what a special committee of the House of Representatives, after visiting the islands, has reported to the Committee on Public Lands:

"Admission of Hawaii will be notice to the people of the Pacific and to the world that this country intends in no sense to retreat from its position of leadership in the Pacific. * * *

"It will be reassuring to the friends of democracy. The United States will give them a practical demonstration of its belief in the democratic system of government by admitting Hawaii to the Union as a State and its people, thereby, to the full privileges of American citizenship. This example will be of far-reaching influence. * * *

"It will provide an effective answer to Communist propaganda that is undertaking to persuade the people of the Pacific, and particularly of the Far East, that there are racial barriers in the American system of Government that militate against people of oriental origin.

"It will serve to bring the people of Hawaii into closer relationship to the people of the rest of the country and the latter to a fuller appreciation of our responsibilities in the Pacific."

This country has dallied too long with the affections of the Hawaiian people. Since 1920 they have been asking for the statehood that they have earned and the representation to which they are entitled. Thirty-six statehood bills have been introduced in the Congress. There have been

at least six congressional investigations in Hawaii. There has never been any serious opposition to statehood, yet the final step is never taken.

Another statehood bill is now before the House. It should be passed there and it should be passed in the Senate. This is not only a matter of party pledges or of keeping the promise long held out to the people of Hawaii. It is, as the House committee said tersely, "in the national interest."

Comparative Welfare Costs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent of the House to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following article from the Daily Times, published at Mamaroneck, N. Y., Friday, January 13, 1950, entitled "Comparative Welfare Costs":

COMPARATIVE WELFARE COSTS

Westchester County, which initiated nearly twoscore years ago much of the social reform which later was adopted at Albany for the State and tremendously amplified at Washington for the Nation, has rarely been accused of stinginess in relief for the unfortunate. And yet it is gratifying, in view of the knowledge that relief funds can easily be wasted, to learn that Westchester's welfare costs are low in comparison to those of the State and Nation.

Let's consider, for example, the three outstanding divisions of old-age assistance, dependent children, and general assistance:

Out of each 1,000 persons 65 years of age or more in Westchester, 70 receive old-age assistance. But the State average is 105.3 per 1,000 population, and the Federal average is 231.

In the matter of dependent children, out of each 1,000 children under 18 in Westchester, 14.7 receive aid. But the State average is 32.6 and the national average is 29.

Similarly, in general assistance, including that extended to veterans and home relief, the Westchester average is 5.5 per 1,000 population, the State average is 12.7, and the national average is 7.6.

In each of these three divisions, it will be noted, the Westchester costs are lower per 1,000 of population, in some cases markedly so. And since these three divisions represent the large bulk of welfare and relief recipients, it may be fairly surmised that Westchester's over-all welfare costs are lower per 1,000 than for either the State or Nation.

This gratifying factor, we are sure, is not due to niggardliness on the part of those responsible for the distribution of public welfare funds in the county. Rather, we like to believe, it is due to efficiency, elimination of waste, and a due regard for the interests of the taxpayer as well as of the applicants.

To some degree, we hasten to add, this fortunate condition may arise also from the fact that Westchester is an above-the-average county in its prosperity and per capita financial ability. But that alone would not be sufficient to bring about the pleasing comparisons enumerated above.

And, whatever the cause, we hope the results remain.

Korean Aid Bill Defeated

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. KUNKEL

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. KUNKEL. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the following radio broadcast I made recently on the subject of aid to Korea:

A week ago the House defeated the Korean aid bill by a vote of 193 to 191. Previously a motion to recommit the bill to the Foreign Affairs Committee for further study was defeated by a vote of 194 to 190. It is most unusual for a bill to be defeated after a motion to recommit that same bill has been defeated. I cannot remember offhand any instance of this during my service in the House. I voted against providing this money for Korea. I was surprised to learn, during the debate, that our executive officials have so far made no commitment whatever to Korea. The usual policy is for the administration to make some kind of a commitment and then urge Congress to supply the funds, whether the commitment was wise or foolish, on the ground that it was a pledge made by our executives of the United States.

In the white paper on China, issued last year, Secretary Acheson and the State Department definitely declared themselves out of China and, impliedly, out of surrounding sections of Asia. South Korea is a pin-point—half a peninsula—on the Asiatic Continent. Since the State Department has declared itself out of China, I do not see how they can expect us to hold onto a pin-point on the Asiatic Continent while releasing all the neighboring territory. I have a great deal of criticism to offer on the score of our Asiatic policy, and our China policy in particular, although I hold no brief for the Nationalist Government of Chiang Kai-shek. But our own vacillating, shifting methods were at least as much responsible for the loss of Asia as were the obvious shortcomings and corruption of the Nationalist Government. President Truman and Secretary Acheson have refused to take any steps to protect Formosa. I read Mr. Acheson's speech on this subject carefully. There is a good deal to be said in support of his contention about Formosa, in view of the policy adopted in the white paper. Some fog and doubt still surround the facts on this question, but I am perfectly willing to wait for that fog to clear before making any criticism of a decision which may be a sound and wise one.

Taking into account the Chinese white paper and the decision on Formosa, plus the fact that there is no commitment at all in connection with aid to Korea, it seemed to me that this would be money and goods thrown away, or placed where the Soviet Union could absorb it if the Soviet Union decided to do so. Furthermore, the program was a continuing one, lasting over a period of years and amounting to much more than the amount involved in this bill. South Korea is 7,000 miles from San Francisco. Freight charges would absorb 25 percent of the total appropriation—$1 out of every $4 would be used to carry the goods over there. This gives some idea of the impracticability of the whole proposition.

I was going to quote at length from the speech on the floor by Representative JACKSON of California. He is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee who opposed the bill. But after thinking it over, I decided to quote instead from Representative WALTER JUDD's speech, because he voted in favor of the bill, and hence his analysis of the objections would obviously be more impartial. Many of my friends in this area know and admire Mr. JUDD. He is also a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee. While he finally voted for the bill he stated about as clearly as anyone the objection to it:

"In the first place, Korea is not essential to our security. No military man says that it is, every military man before our committee said that it is not. Also the Secretary of State last week, in a speech he made before the Press Club, is reported to have said that Formosa is not essential to our security because it is beyond a line he drew from the Aleutians through Japan and Okinawa to the Philippines. Korea is also beyond that line. If Acheson's argument regarding Formosa's dispensability is sound, then he himself ought to be opposing aid for Korea too.

"In the second place, South Korea is not tenable whenever there is any effort by Russia or her satellites to take it. I would like to quote the expert opinion of General Marshall on this point from the hearings 2 years ago when he appeared before our committee:

" 'Representative JUDD. If north China and Manchuria should be taken over and organized by the Communists, do you think our position in Korea would long be tenable?'

" 'Secretary MARSHALL. I think it would not be tenable.'

"So you can properly argue, if you wish that it is a waste of money to pour millions into an area which cannot be defended because of the situation we have helped produce in Manchuria and China, and an area which we have no intention of making the slightest effort to help defend. Furthermore, it may well be against the interests of Korean security to build it up industrially, making it so much more desirable a prize for Russia's agents to seize and use for Russia's interests and against our own.

"There is no question but that there are people in the State Department who think South Korea is doomed as a result in no small degree of our own Government's blunders in this whole area which they want to cover up. They ask us to put up this money now so that if and when the day comes that Korea goes, they will have their alibi already prepared. They can then issue a white paper on Korea and say: 'Well we did everything we could and Congress appropriated plenty of money. But the Government of Korea was just so incompetent and inefficient and undemocratic and corrupt that it failed to hold the support of the people and so collapsed before the Communists.'

"To those people this bill never was a bona fide effort to save Korea. It is a phony—an attempt to shift blame from themselves for the Communist conquest of Korea which they expect. If we make the money available, they can blame the Koreans; if we were not to pass the bill they could blame the Congress. In any case the primary aim to them is to get themselves off the hook in Asia, to get an excuse for their failure to save Korea all fixed up in advance.

"There is a fourth argument against the bill. I myself feel our greatest need is for a positive, over-all consistent and defensible far-eastern policy. China was important to such a policy, in fact essential to it; Formosa is vital to it. The Philippines, Japan, southeast Asia are all vital to it. South Korea is not."

In the past, our Chinese policy changed every time the wind shifted, now no policy at all.

Representative JACKSON closed his speech dramatically:

"South Korea is a Bataan without a Corregidor, a Dunkerque without a flotilla, a

dead-end street without an escape. If the Congress wills it we shall invest in a gambit of pawns against an opponent whose major pieces are skillfully jockeyed against both South Korea and the United States on terrain chosen by our opponent and on terms which he alone will dictate. Let us be humanitarian, but let us not close our eyes to reality in a day when the fate of a world depends upon clear judgment and straight thinking."

American Program in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ISIDORE DOLLINGER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Speaker, we know now that our Nation has failed miserably in its German program. We promised the denazification, demilitarization, and decartelization of Germany, but the record shows that none of these has been accomplished. The truth is that we are further than ever from our goal of a democratic Germany. Our muddling, poor management, lack of foresight, and woeful mistakes have cost us our prestige in the eyes of the world.

The collapse of the denazification program was bad enough, and the return of Nazis to great power in Germany, lamentable, but now we come to the worst of all. Shocking and incredible is the news that John J. McCloy, the American high commissioner for Germany, still hesitates to order the hangman to execute the sentences which were passed some 26 months ago on the 16 most dangerous Nazis yet alive. We hear reports that he is considering an amnesty for some of them, and they may all escape the death penalty.

The following article by John Hohenberg which appeared in the New York Post on January 30, 1950, presents the facts very clearly. I agree with the author that more than American prestige is at stake, and that American justice is on trial before the world.

Remember, the condemned had a fair trial at Nuremberg. A few short years ago, stories of their unbelievable cruelties made our blood run cold. They were the masters of the Nazi furnaces, the gas chambers—inhuman planners of mass annihilation of millions of innocent victims. We dare not forget their terrible crimes against humanity. Certainly, the time has come when we must demand that the sentences imposed at Nuremberg be carried out—and at once.

SIXTEEN WORST NAZIS, PLEAS LOST, MAY STILL BEAT NOOSE

(By John Hohenberg)

This is the incredible and shameful story of Operation Nazi.

At Nuremberg, when the world's conscience revolted against the pitiless extermination of 6,000,000 Jews, it was designed as an act of supreme retribution.

Today it is in danger of being perverted into a bid for the political favor of the Germans who did nothing to halt the slaughter.

John J. McCloy, the American high commissioner for Germany, still hesitates to order the hangman to execute sentences which were passed up to 26 months ago on the 16 most dangerous Nazis yet alive.

There are well-founded reports that he is considering an amnesty for some of them—perhaps all.

McCloy has not forgotten that these 16 were the masters of the Nazi furnaces, the gas chambers, and the execution squads in which German, Polish, and Ukranian Jewry perished. He is reminded of it daily.

Yet, he waits. And in Washington not an official voice is raised in protest.

The State Department, preserving the diplomatic niceties, has adopted a hands-off attitude. It won't do anything for or against the most conscienceless killers of modern times. It helps to translate their appeals for clemency as a matter of convenience.

The Department of the Army, considering itself lucky to be out of Operation Nazi for the time being, acts as a transmittal agency for the writs which they shower on United States courts. Just messenger service, Army officials explain with a shrug.

Only Telford Taylor, the Army prosecutor who fought the case before the international military tribunal at Nuremberg, so far has demanded action from Commissioner McCloy.

"We have shown these Nazis far greater mercy than any convicted American murderer ever enjoyed," says Taylor. "It is time they were hanged."

But they are not.

Why?

First, the legal rights of condemned men had to be complied with. As a democratic demonstration, everybody agreed this was both just and necessary.

LONG DAY IN COURT

They were given every opportunity before the Nuremberg court to demonstrate their innocence and they failed.

Next, they waited while other Nuremberg defendants carried appeals direct to the United States Supreme Court, which refused to review the verdict of the international tribunal.

After that, still another Nuremberg defendant tried the other course of American judicial process—up the ladder through the Federal Court of the District of Columbia, the court of appeals and the Supreme Court. All three said "No."

Then a congressional investigation had to be made on whether there where irregularities in the trials. Now that is completed.

What now remains to deter McCloy?

HE REVIEWS THE REVIEWS

First of all, he has decided on his own responsibility that he must reaffirm the affimation of sentence passed by his predecessor, General Clay.

After that he believes he must wait for still a third appeal, just filed with the assistance of American authorities, with the District Court in Washington. He need not, as Taylor points out, since that avenue already has been closed.

Finally he says he has been deluged with appeals for clemency from a host of persons for the 16 Nazis.

There is some doubt about the size of that appeal, however. Inquiries in Washington showed that from 2 to 20 letters were received for each of the 16 defendants.

Extreme right wing German Nationalists, riding back into power, could increase that a hundredfold if they chose and the pleas still would be synthetic.

APPEALS MAGNIFIED

However, the disposition is to magnify the importance of the appeals for clemency. That is done for the very good reasons known to the American authorities concerned with Operation Nazi, the men who fix policy for the State Department in Germany.

McCloy's staff takes the trouble to point out that United States lawyers are concerned with the condemned men's fate—but the names aren't available except in Berlin or Frankfurt am Main. The American lawyers are keeping carefully under cover.

A final consideration in McCloy's mind is the length of time the 16 Nazis have been under sentence of death. "Cruel and inhuman punishment," so the legal phrase goes.

TESTIMONY RECALLED

"Cruel and inhuman" for such as Paul Blobel, the architect turned mass assassin who testified before the Nuremberg tribunal:

"When the men were ready for the execution one of my leaders gave the order to shoot. Since they were kneeling at the brink of the mass grave, the victims fell, as a rule, at once into the mass grave.

"I have always used rather large execution squads, since I declined to use men who were specialists for shots in the neck. Each squad shot for about 1 hour and was then replaced."

Such are the 16 who so far have cheated the noose and who now are being considered for amnesty. Such are the factors which are threatening to transform Operation Nazi from an act of retribution into a travesty of justice.

More than American prestige in Germany is at stake.

American justice itself is on trial before the world.

Resolutions of Monroe County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, on October 25, 1949, the members of the Farm Bureau of Monroe County, Iowa, met in annual meeting at Albia and adopted a set of comprehensive resolutions expressing the position of this great organization with respect to issues and problems that are before this country.

I desire to give to the Members of Congress the opportunity of knowing the position of the Farm Bureau of Monroe County, Iowa, at this time, and I include these resolutions in my extension of remarks:

MONROE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, 1949

The members of the resolutions committee recommend the following resolutions to the general membership as policies of the organization. These resolutions are based on questionnaires completed by members at township meetings and from other current problems facing the farm people of our county.

AGRICULTURAL POLICY

1. We believe some type of farm price-support program is necessary.

2. We favor a program of flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with minimum guaranties or floors and a minimum of controls. We believe this program should be developed through a bipartisan approach.

3. We believe satisfactory compliance with soil-conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

NATIONAL AND STATE HEALTH PROGRAM

1. We favor Federal aid to enlarge the capacity of medical schools and for construction of more hospitals and for medical research.

2. We oppose compulsory health insurance.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONSH P

1. We believe that the question of wages and working conditions, etc., are social, ethical, and economical in nature and can be settled through mediation supported by legal methods.

2. We believe in the principle of organization for self-betterment but feel that welfare of the public should be placed above the individual or group.

3. We approve some sort of extension service for the betterment of family living conditions for the urban workers.

GENERAL

1. We favor changing rural mail routes so that the principle of free mail delivery becomes an actuality to all rural families as road conditions will permit.

2. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives modeled after REA cooperative.

3. We request the American Farm Bureau Federation to institute a national advertising program to acquaint the general public with the final distribution of the consumers food dollar.

4. We believe Federal aid for farm-to-market roads should be increased.

President Truman's Budget Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES T. PATTERSON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE CONNECTICUT
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, INC.,
Hartford, Conn., January 24, 1950.

Hon. JAMES T. PATTERSON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATTERSON: President Truman's budget message reflects a commendable determination to carry out numerous recommendations made by the bipartisan Hoover Commission to improve administration efficiency.

The Connecticut Chamber of Commerce on the whole approves the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report. We understand that approximately 20 percent of the recommendations were enacted in the last session of Congress and that this will mean ultimate savings in Government operating costs of at least $1,250,000,000. The sweeping improvements in Federal purchasing, storage, records management, and other "housekeeping" functions, which are well under way in the General Services Administration, we understand, indicate a potential saving from this source of $250,000,000.

May I take the liberty at this time of calling your attention to important Hoover Commission proposals which apparently have been ignored? The Hoover Commission recommendations on business functions conducted by the Government sought to establish a clearer demarcation between the fields of taxpaying private enterprise and Government enterprise. This was particularly true with respect to commercial banking and lending activities, electric power utilities, and certain other forms of business enterprise. Many of the Hoover recommendations were aimed at restricting Federal expansion in these fields. Of direct Government lending, for instance, the Commission said: "It opens up dangerous possibilities of waste and favoritism. * * * It invites political and private pressure or even corruption. * * * Direct lending should be absolutely avoided except for emergencies."

The President's budget message, however, advocates large Federal expansion in these various fields. It seeks additional lending powers for the RFC, an agency whose operations the Hoover Commission roundly criticized. It calls for further expansion of Federal electric power activities, including the creation of a Columbia Valley Administration in the Northwest, and it suggests similar authorities in other parts of the country. Such a program adds up to nothing less than the eventual nationalization of the electric-power industry, an objective certainly not entertained by the Hoover Commission.

The message also backs legislation to enlarge the Government's part in the Nation's home-building industry by launching a program to provide housing for middle-income groups. Other proposals for new ventures into business fields are indicated in competition with taxpaying private enterprises—all adding up to more bureaucracies, more waste, and more tax demands upon the people's pocketbooks.

The Hoover task-force committee on Federal-State relations expressed concern about the trend toward National Government encroachment on the fields traditionally reserved for State and local governments. It called for Federal withdrawal from tax fields properly belonging to State and local governments and for an overhauling of the Federal grants-in-aid structure.

The budget message virtually ignores these proposals. Instead it asks Congress to approve grants-in-aid for 1951 totaling $2,999,000,000, an increase of $738,000,000 over 1950 outlays and an all-time high figure. This increase would include $290,000,000 to initiate the controversial Federal aid to education measure now before Congress, which is opposed by many Governors and State legislatures and by many leading educators as an unwarranted attempt by the Federal Government to intrude upon a public service which is constitutionally and traditionally a State responsibility.

It is the belief of the Connecticut chamber of commerce that one of the chief reasons why the proposed 1951 budget has swelled to the size it has is the increasing tendency of both Congress and the executive branch to resort to foot-in-the-door financing devices to speed approval of new spending legislation which would otherwise encounter rough sledding on Capitol Hill.

For instance, passage of new spending programs of a continuing nature is often made easy because the legislators are told that a very modest appropriation will suffice to get them under way the first year. The extent to which the annual cost will rise in succeeding years is a matter which is seldom explored or divulged. The 1951 budget is full of large expenditures for items which once began modestly enough but have grown steadily through the years. This should provide a warning to Congress, then, to look carefully at the price tags on the many new spending measures advocated by the President or initiated by congressional committees.

Three examples of projected programs bearing a low down-payment tag but destined ultimately to require huge annual appropriations include: (1) The bill creating a National Science Foundation which would spend only $400,000 the first year but would eventually entail annual outlays of $100,000,000 and up; (2) the St. Lawrence seaway which would involve the expenditure of only $4,000,000 the first year but would eventually shoot up to a maximum of $82,000,000 annually for the next 7 years; and (3) Federal aid to education, which contemplates a $290,000,000 expenditure at the start but would reach $2,000,000,000 or more annually as soon as possible, according to the commitments of its sponsors. So on down a long list.

Another foot-in-the-door device, we feel, to get new projects started is the contract authorization, which, as you know, is a grant of authority to a Federal agency to contract for construction or other services in a given amount. This is a sound and even necessary procedure when properly used, but in recent years it has been much abused. For instance, Congress has frequently replaced part or all of a requested appropriation with a grant of contract authority in order to show a budget cut. The taxpaying public, we believe, would rather see Congress make bona fide reductions in appropriations and put an end to such subterfuges as this.

The President's 1951 budget message asks Congress to approve $3,363,000,000 in contract authorizations, of which $1,280,000,000 is for programs requiring new legislation. These sums for the most part are not included in the $42,400,000,000 spending total proposed for 1951. They are in addition to this total, and their cost would be reflected in increased expenditures for 1952 and thereafter.

I know that your desk is piled high with many current proposals now before Congress and I apologize for this long dissertion, but deemed it necessary in order to acquaint you with our opinion. We trust that at the opportune time you will give the above your serious consideration.

Respectfully yours,

WAYNE R. DICKERSON,
Executive Vice President.

Deficit Financing Is Fraudulent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Peoria Star of January 28, 1950:

DEFICIT FINANCING IS FRAUDULENT

Extravagant spending by the Federal Government was made possible by the adoption of the sixteenth amendment to the Constitution in 1913. This amendment gave the Government the authority to seize any part or all of the income of its citizens. Government spending was limited only by the amount which the Government dared take from voters.

Unlimited spending by the Government was made possible by the abandonment of the gold standard early in the Franklin D. Roosevelt regime. When the Government had promised to repay loans in gold, the amount of such loans was limited by the amount of gold held by the Government. But now the Government promises to repay in currency which is unlimited. Thus, we have deficit financing, based on unlimited spending, based on unlimited borrowing.

President Truman's proposal to spend $5,000,000,000 more next year than will be collected in taxation is based upon the Government's privilege of printing unlimited bonds and money. Behind deficit-financing plans is the implied hope that next year or

5 years from now, by some means not now known, tax revenue will be greater than Government expenses, so that the current deficits may be repaid. In time of business depression, such a hope might not be unreasonable, but when employment figures are high and business is active it is absurd to look to the future for a time when the Government may be better able to pay its debts.

Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, the one conservative member of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, was forced to resign last fall because he sharply criticized deficit financing. Dr. Nourse said in New York this week that the 2-year deficit of $10,000,000,000 (and possibly $15,000,000,000) has stirred fears of inflation and possibly a rising uncertainty as to the stability of the dollar itself. He added:

"The first order of business in this country in 1950 is to turn from the easy acceptance of deficits as a way of life to the making of a specific and hard-headed plan of getting back to the black ink and a long-run program of sound debt management."

The alternative is certainly inflation. The Government cannot continue to spend money it does not have without inflating currency. Prices will go up as the value of money goes down. And for every cent the value of a dollar drops the Government will be defrauding its people of millions of dollars in savings. Inflation cuts down the value of life-insurance policies. It makes bonds worth less when they mature. Savings deposits shrink in value. Not even the money hoarded in a strong box can resist the destruction of inflation.

President Truman's deficit-financing proposal is a fraud upon all of the people, not only this generation but the next and the next.

President Truman's Tax Message

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES H. ELSTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Mr. Morris D. Ervin from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 25, 1950:

MESSAGE FOLLOWS FAMILIAR LINES—THE PRESIDENT ON A FISHING TRIP FOR VOTES

(By Morris D. Ervin)

WASHINGTON, January 25.—As a revenue measure President Truman's tax message to Congress Monday is not likely to prove of much value. As a political document it is of considerable interest.

The message may result in more votes for the Truman administration. It is not likely to result in any more dollars for the United States Treasury.

The message follows the lines of an old political device. It is designed to convince the taxpayers that the incumbent administration is intent on taking from the rich to take care of the poor.

In order to accomplish this purpose Mr. Truman's message proposes that certain excise taxes, such as those on transportation, communication, and such consumer goods as electric-light bulbs be abolished or reduced. The total of the reductions which he proposes along this line would amount to about $750,000,000 a year.

But at the same time he proposes that this loss of revenue be made up by increasing the taxes, principally the income taxes on corporations, to bring in additional revenue in the amount of $1,000,000,000.

Now this message makes it appear that if Congress follows the President's recommendations, the little taxpayer will have fewer taxes to pay and the big fellow will have more taxes to pay.

BUT WILL IT?

But will it actually work that way?

Mr. Truman himself, in the first paragraph of his message sort of lets the cat out of the bag. He says that "taxes are the means by which our people pay for the activities of the Government."

Now a truer statement was never made by a President of the United States, though Franklin Roosevelt put it in a little more literary way when he said that: "Taxes are paid in the sweat of every man's brow." (That was before he was President.)

Boiled down to its essentials, what the President proposed to Congress Monday was to repeal or reduce many of the direct taxes on such commodities as electric-light bulbs, cosmetics, luggage, telephone calls, and railroad tickets. He would reduce these taxes to the point where the Government would receive something like $750,000,000 less in revenue from these sources than it now does.

But at the same time he would increase the taxes on the corporations which produce electric-light bulbs, cosmetics, luggage, and furnish telephone service and transportation, to the point where they would pay to the Government $1,000,000,000 more every year than they now do.

THEY ALSO PAY

Well, who do you suppose is going to pay for this? The answer to that one is simple. The people who buy these products and use these services. The same people who are now paying $750,000,000 a year. Under the President's proposal they would pay $1,000,000,000 a year.

There is but one source from which the Government can get revenue and that is from the people. That's what Mr. Truman himself says. It may not collect taxes directly from the little taxpayer. But it collects it from him indirectly just the same. If the ultimate consumer didn't pay these taxes then they just wouldn't be paid. He is, as a matter of fact, the only guy who can pay them.

The Government may decide to repeal direct excise taxes on such things as electric-light bulbs, for instance. And then it may decide to collect an equal amount from the manufacturer who makes electric-light bulbs.

Well, who pays the bill? The fellow who buys the electric-light bulb. If the electric-bulb manufacturer tried to pay the additional bill himself he would go broke. So he passes the bill on to the purchaser in the form of higher prices and in the end the purchaser pays the bill. Only in this case instead of paying $750,000,000 he would pay $1,000,000,000.

HE KNOWS

Now, of course, Mr. Truman knows that Congress knows all about this. It knows who pays the bill. So it isn't likely that Congress will go along with the President on the scheme which the President has proposed, that is, to reduce direct taxes on the consumer and then hand him a still bigger bill in the form of high prices.

But Mr. Truman has set up a scheme to defend himself against that. He warned Congress in plain language that if it tried to reduce direct taxes on the consumer but failed to increase consumer prices by an even larger amount he would veto the bill. Then he would be in a position to say that he had tried to reduce taxes for the "little fellow" but Congress wouldn't pass the bill on to the "big fellow."

And in that case, unless, of course, Congress overrode his veto, the tax structure would remain exactly what it is now and Mr. Truman would get credit for a good try.

As stated before, the President's message is not likely to rank with Alexander Hamilton's famous reports on the fiscal affairs of the United States. But it is more than a little likely to rank as a political document of considerable interest.

Relations With Spain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, during the months of November and December 1949 my colleagues, the Honorable JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, the Honorable JACOB K. JAVITS, and I traveled in Europe as a study group designated by the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. All of us except Mr. JAVITS visited in Spain on December 9, 10, and 11.

At the request of certain Spanish newspapermen we prepared a statement to be issued to the Spanish press. Our statement, issued on behalf of the group by Mr. PFEIFER, was based upon questions raised by the newspapermen. In answering them, we sought to shed light on certain misimpressions which our conversations had indicated as prevalent in Spain. We had found a disposition to believe that any Congressman's view necessarily reflected the view of our Government, a misunderstanding of executive and legislative interrelationships in our constitutional process, an apparently overoptimistic assurance about the future of relations between our country and Spain, and a feeling that the resolution of issues between the two countries depended solely upon actions to be taken by the United States.

Our statement was an honest effort to bring these matters into proportion. This statement was the only one made by the Pfeifer subcommittee in Spain, notwithstanding any other attributions or quotations which may have appeared in the press here or abroad.

The Spanish press reacted in a manner that we had not anticipated. I see no point in reviewing here the editorial remarks made about us in the Madrid press. Apparently, however, the Spanish reaction has caused the belief among our colleagues that we issued a hostile statement in Spain. To clear up that misunderstanding, it is well to publish the text of the statement:

STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE JOSEPH L. PFEIFER, DEMOCRAT, NEW YORK, MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES, AT MADRID, SPAIN, DECEMBER 10, 1949

This statement has been prepared in consultation with my colleagues, the Honorable THOMAS S. GORDON, Democrat, of Illinois, and the Honorable CLEMENT L. ZABLOCKI, Democrat, of Wisconsin. It has their full concurrence.

We are three members of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the United States House

of Representatives. That committee exercises primary jurisdiction for the House in regard to legislative problems bearing on the conduct of American foreign policy. The committee includes 25 members. We do not speak for all of them. We speak only for ourselves.

It is always well for people of other countries to keep in mind the proportions and principles of American politics and constitutional traditions when they evaluate statements by visiting Congressmen. Any Member of the Congress speaks only for himself. He controls only his own vote. Our Congress has 531 Members—435 of them in the House and 96 in the Senate. Thus any Member can speak for only about one-fifth of 1 percent of the total membership. It is well that you avoid exaggeration of the importance of passing statements by American Congressmen.

Keep in mind this, also. We have an explicit and long-established constitutional system in the United States. Under that system the primary authority in foreign affairs is an executive function. It is not a congressional function. I do not mean to imply that our foreign affairs are carried on without responsibility. Far from it—our President, as well as our legislators, is responsible to our electorate. He derives his powers only through mandates developed in free elections which must be held periodically. So do not misinterpret what I say when I emphasize that foreign affairs are primarily an executive concern in our country.

Now that I have set the proportions of this statement, I shall go on to a few questions that I have been asked.

I have been asked about the attitude of the Americans toward Spain.

I trust there is no doubt in the minds of Spaniards that the attitude of Americans toward them is friendly. In America we have many jokes about the characteristics of the peoples of other nations. It is in point, however, that we have no stock jests about Spaniards. Spaniards as a people are always spoken of in terms of esteem. Furthermore, a large part of the United States was first influenced by European institutions through the agency of Spain. The institutions of Christianity and the culture of Europe first came to our West as a result of the endeavors of Spaniards.

Spain is a land of romance and heroism in the American mind. Spaniards are thought of in terms of friendship and respect. I think that will endure far beyond the passing difficulties of the moment. I am reassured in this thought by the fine hospitality—the genuine courtesy—that my colleagues and I have enjoyed during every moment of our stay in Madrid.

I have been asked what is the United States going to do about Spain? I think the order of the question is wrong. I do not mean to be harsh when I say that Spain is a secondary problem to the United States. The United States, however, is a primary problem to Spain. The real question is this: What is Spain going to do about the United States? Only the Spaniards themselves can answer that question.

I have been asked to comment on the question of a loan to Spain. Such loans in our country come under the authority of the Export-Import Bank. It is a public institution chartered by Congress and administered by our Executive. The decision ultimately would have to be an executive decision. It would be a presumption for me to attempt to give an answer to so complex a question after so brief a stay in Spain.

I trust, however, that an answer satisfactory to the aspirations of the Spanish people can be worked out. But let me say, again, that it is a matter not simply for the United States to settle. It is, in the last analysis, a question for Spain and the Spanish people to settle. So, I repeat: What is Spain going to do about the United States?

Mr. Speaker, further I would like to include and call attention to the following letter written by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, which appeared in the New York Times of January 13, 1950, and which reflects my personal sentiments for a revised policy for Spain:

A REVISED POLICY FOR SPAIN—CASE FOR ESTABLISHMENT OF RELATIONS WITH PRESENT REGIME PRESENTED

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES.

In the current discussion about friendship with Spain an important admission was made in the Times' editorial (Recognizing Franco, December 22, 1949). This reads as follows:

"It was wrong and short-sighted to withdraw the chiefs of diplomatic mission in the first place."

One could go further and acknowledge that the policy of attempted ostracism, adopted under an impression that the Soviets would be suitably appeased, has proved not only bad in principle but also a failure in practice.

It had exactly the opposite effect to that intended: it consolidated overwhelming popular sentiment behind the head of the Spanish state as the symbol of resistance against outside interference. Indeed, according to the Madrid correspondent of the New York Times, the present administration in Spain is stronger than ever. For that result, the constant drumfire of foreign dictation is largely responsible.

The Times is correct, and so was Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, in pointing out that the Spanish question should be considered in its "proper framework" and in the light of all pertinent resolutions of the United Nations General Assembly. But readers of the Times have a right to expect the whole record to be rehearsed and studied.

Although the so-called Franco Fascist regime, without any opportunity for self-defense, was denounced and a resolution was passed in 1946 recommending the withdrawal of chiefs of diplomatic mission from Madrid, it is untrue to assert that such a policy has been reaffirmed by the Assembly.

FAILED OF TWO-THIRDS VOTE

When the identical 1946 resolution was brought up again in 1947, according to the rules, by the Soviet-dominated Polish delegation, it failed to receive the necessary two-thirds vote and in the official minutes of the General Assembly reporter was recorded as rejected.

This is one reason why many experts on international law, including Dr. Edwin Borchard, of Yale University, and Dr. George Finch, former editor of the American Journal of International Law, judge the 1946 resolution to be invalid. Consequently, a number of nations, including some in the Western Hemisphere, considered themselves free to maintain, or to restore, a full complement of diplomatic officials in Spain.

More recently, in May 1949, a decisive majority (26 to 15, with 16 abstentions) supported the motion, proposed by Brazil, Bolivia, Colombia, and Peru, to leave all nations free to send, or not to send, ambassadors and ministers plenipotentiary to Madrid.

At the same time, and this is a point of genuine importance, the proposal of Sovietized Poland to repeat the 1945–46 denunciation of the present Spanish Government as Fascist and as having been imposed by the Axis was soundly beaten by a vote of 32 to 11. A similar fate, by more resounding majorities, was inflicted upon all other resolutions urged upon the UN by the iron curtain bloc in the General Assembly. With the defeat of these Soviet-inspired motions, the whole case against Spain fell to the ground.

REVIEW OF POLICY

In view of this historical sequence, it would appear to be reasonable to expect our country, democratically, to review its Spanish policy without delay. Since a mistake, admittedly, was made in 1946, the sooner we admit our error and try to repair the damage done, the more secure will be the people of the United States and the more advantageously we can provide for our national interests.

If we do what is right there is no solid ground for belief that the shock to public opinion in western Europe, and especially in France and Great Britain, would be enormous. Has not Winston Churchill called, repeatedly, for a revision of the bankrupt policy toward Spain? Did not the French Government, despite Leftist clamors, reopen its Pyrenees frontier and resume a lucrative trade with the Spanish people? Has it been forgotten that the Times of London, calling for an end to hypocrisy, in a powerful leading article (April 25, 1949), described the attempted ostracism of Spain a futile gesture?

The public, here and abroad, will recognize a policy of good will and fairness toward the people of Spain.

Dr. JOSEPH F. THORNING,
Associate Editor of World Affairs.
WASHINGTON, *January 10, 1950.*

Clear Channel in Radio Field

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. FRANK WILSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. WILSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

CLEAR CHANNEL IN RADIO FIELD

Come February 1, United States representatives will meet in Habana with Cuban spokesmen in an effort to reach an understanding on Cuba's demands for larger representation in the field of clear-channel broadcasting. If Cuba wins its point, necessarily will be involved impairment of improvement to present rural radio service in this country.

The recent Montreal conference on the same subject adjourned without agreement. Clearly some sort of treaty on the allocation of international radio frequency is a necessity to prevent interference. At the present time there is a high degree of voluntary cooperation. The persistent Cuban demand in the face of a lack of engineering standards and control in that republic is a good indication that the best solution will be treaty terms.

Our own clear-channel broadcasting is considerably perturbed by the situation. Affected principally are rural areas which can only be adequately served by clear-channel stations. Various farmer marketing groups have gone on record as to dependence on the service for price quotations. Consumers are interested in commodity prices and conditions. Weather reports are of extreme value.

Rural America is dead set against any agreement that will permit inroads on radio channels utilized by the United States. Broadcasting interests realize that the best basis for international dickering lies in complete utilization of clear-channel service now open to domestic service.

Few American observers believe that Cuba could possibly utilize now all of the stations which it asks. But Cuba may be using the familiar bargaining figure device as a means to an end.

The question of international distribution of frequencies has never been given the attention that it deserves. This country, the home of radio-broadcasting development, early set up its own national domestic regulation. But the question of power and frequency beyond the jurisdiction of the Federal Communications Commission will require all of the official skill we have to arbitrate. Certainly everything possible should be done to strengthen our position when we come to the bargaining table.

They Do as They Are Told

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, you own a 112-acre farm in Texas. You want to raise 75 acres of cotton in 1950, to meet your expenses. You thought you could decide what you ought to plant, did you? But, your Government at Washington tells you, you may not plant any cotton this year.

If this sounds like an episode from police state Russia, let me quote the full text of the farmer's letter, as I find it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 3, 1950, at page 19:

GRAND SALINE, TEX., *December 23, 1949.*
Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress.

DEAR SIR: I did not get any cotton acreage for the year 1950. I wonder just why. Seems to me like it was an unfair thing. They tell me it was because I did not have cotton in 1946-47-48.

I had truck crops, and seems they did not give me any credit for any war crops. Way things are going to be next year, we may not sell truck stuff, and we have a farm to pay for. I am expecting you to do all you can to help me get an allotment. I think each farm should have a few acres, don't you?

We have 112½ acres and 75 acres in cultivation, and are not allowed any cotton at all.

I appreciate whatever you can do to help me.

ARLIE E. HOLLOWELL.

A poor, helpless, frightened citizen feels the iron hand of remote bureaucracy. Maybe he has mortgage payments to meet. He wants to plant a money crop to meet his interest.

Here is what our Government—not Russia—wrote to a farmer in New York who wanted to raise his wheat allotment to 21 acres from the 13 acres assigned to him by the Government:

SEPTEMBER 1, 1949.

T. E. MILLIMAN,
Churchville, N. Y.

DEAR WHEAT GROWER: You have expressed a desire in writing for a reconsideration of your wheat allotment for 1950.

The county agricultural conservation committee have set aside Tuesday, September 6, from 1 to 5 p. m., to hear each farmer individually state his reasons for wanting his allotment increased.

You will be given 5 minutes to tell why your allotment is not satisfactory.

Stop at our office at 112 Federal Building for your number in line.

Failure to appear at this hearing may be considered a waiver of your right in connection with such appeal.

Sincerely yours,

ARTHUR G. ODELL,
Co-Assistant in Conservation.

Mr. Milliman wrote me saying that—

A farmer is helpless in his desire to escape Government controls and at the same time make his farm break even.

For the farm-support price makes the Government the only market possible for his crop. It is much higher than the open-market price which is greatly depressed by huge surpluses.

Yes, farmers may appeal.

But before their appeals are decided, in some far-away place, before some bureaucratic hearing to which they cannot even afford to travel, the time for planting will be gone.

If they do appeal, they have to go to the desk of a bureaucrat and get the number which tells their place in line. Then they are allowed the whole of 5 minutes to tell their story to the all-powerful judge who decides what they may do on their farms.

Will the Truman police state crush these poor farmers into insolvency in the boom of 1950?

If so, remember that this bankruptcy has been dictated from Washington, in the name of the Socialist state. It has claimed that it can build houses and manage crops and prices better from Washington than the people can manage for themselves.

These letters help us in America to see what every other country knows—that Central Government management must be measured in the end by what it does to individual citizens. To our far-away Federal Government they are the poor, helpless, faceless creatures of the States and the counties.

They have no choice but to do as they are told by our very own all-powerful, omnipotent, morally bankrupt Federal Socialist Government.

This is socialism—American variety, in action—here today.

Conciliation and Consultation, Not Coercion, Answer to FEPC Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, a logical and convincing argument for a moderate approach to the problem of discrimination in industry has been voiced by the Christian Science Monitor, one of the Nation's foremost newspapers. In an editorial appearing on January 27, the newspaper discussed proposed FEPC legislation and concluded, "The real reliance is on education and consultation."

Mr. Speaker, I am unalterably opposed in the use of force in advancing a policy of nondiscrimination in industry. However, I do believe that the Federal Government should concern itself with this problem. For that reason, I have introduced H. R. 6668, which would employ education and consultation as proposed in the editorial.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the editorial from the Christian Science Monitor:

WHEN RIGHTS CONFLICT

Are opponents of civil-rights legislation helping their cause by desperate maneuvers to stave off a debate and vote in Congress? We doubt it.

By obstructive tricks they not only risk damaging democratic legislative processes; they fail to put the emphasis clearly on sound reasons for their position—reasons which should be well weighed by the Nation.

Some of these reasons are based on rights which conflict with civil rights. One is the right of local self-government, usually expressed as States' rights. The Constitution expressly reserved to the people and the States powers not granted to the Federal Government. Such legal rights are supported by practical political wisdom and real questions of justice.

For instance, the civil-rights proposal now most hotly contested—the FEPC bill—would infringe the right of employers and union members to choose their associates. It may be argued that they should be willing to choose their associates without regard to race or religion. But there is a vital difference between should and must. When the State tells the individual how he must choose his associates it is interfering with a peculiarly intimate freedom. To correct one injustice it is committing another.

Quite possibly one injustice is greater than the other, and if the State's attempt at correction promised to be effective, it would be more nearly justified. But the State—happily—is not omnipotent. It cannot by law overnight change social customs and individual concepts of right. There is no question that a Federal FEPC act would be nullified, much as the Stamp Act was nullified before the American Revolution. Without defending nullification—although most Americans rejoice in the Boston Tea Party—we recall that Edmund Burke's statesmanship recognized the folly of indicting a whole people and of trying by coercion to achieve a result which demanded conciliation.

American constitutional practice recognizes that majority opinion is not always a safe basis for legislation. On some questions the intensity of minority opinion is so great as to make compulsion unwise. In the case of FEPC, the fact that divisions of opinion run along sectional lines makes it pertinent to ask if an attempt at coercion will not stir up dangerous bitterness and delay reform.

We can all agree that progress out of discrimination is urgently necessary. This newspaper feels so deeply on the subject that it has supported careful antilynching and anti-poll-tax legislation. Much southern opinion seeks actively to eradicate lynching and would open the polls to literate Negroes. Thus legislation on these subjects has the hope of local support. But FEPC is a different matter. Even in the Northern States which have adopted FEPC laws there have been only the most gingerly attempts at enforcement. The real reliance is on education and consultation.

This method should be extended and tested far more fully before any Federal coercion is attempted. Probably no one who has not experienced the injustices suffered by minorities can know how essential reforms have become. But a sound recipe would be 1 part coercion to 10 parts Christianity—a far greater effort to put ourselves in our brothers' place and love our neighbors as ourselves.

Central Arizona Project Will Cost Over $1,600 Per Acre

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arizona, my good friend Mr. MURDOCK, has made reference to certain remarks made by Congressman RICH appearing on pages 1130 and 1131 of the RECORD for January 30. The gentleman from Arizona took exception to the figures used by the gentleman from Pennsylvania in describing the cost of the proposed fantastic and unsound central Arizona irrigation project. Mr. Chairman, as proposed by this project water would be pumped a height of 1,000 feet into an aqueduct over 300 miles in length to take irrigation water to lands in central Arizona.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania referred to the fact that the cost would be $1,250,000,000 to $1,500,000,000 and equal $1,600 per acre for land in cultivation having a value of about $200 per acre. The gentleman from Arizona stated that the gentleman from Pennsylvania had his decimal point in the wrong place, inferring I presume that the cost would be nearer $160 per acre. Mr. Speaker, I rise in defense of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—he was too conservative in those figures he gave.

Here are the facts taken from the record of the hearings on the proposed bill, H. R. 934, which would authorize the proposed project.

The Bureau of Reclamation in its report and in the testimony of its engineers stated that if the project was not constructed 150,000 acres of land now in cultivation would go out of production and some 73,000 acres which had been in production at some time in the past but was not cultivated now would have to remain out of production. No witness for either the Bureau or Arizona could identify the 73,000 acres or tell where it was located—it is our belief it is new land which would be developed. Incidentally, the Bureau's figures show that about one-half of the water made available for delivery to the land would be required by this 73,000 acres. However, let us accept these figures and say that if the central Arizona project is not constructed, 225,000 acres of land will be out of production; and remember, Mr. Chairman, that is the end result which this irrigation project is supposed to avoid.

Now as to cost—and I again quote from the record—let us consider only the construction costs chargeable to irrigation—exclude power, flood control, recreation, and all other construction costs from the picture and here is what we find.

Without the 80-mile tunnel—which is included in the bill—the total irrigation construction cost is estimated at $399,424,000. Apply this against the 225,000 acres and you find it equals a cost of slightly more than $1,775 per acre—the gentleman from Pennsylvania stated the figure as $1,600 per acre.

Including the 80-mile tunnel and related features, as provided for in the bill, the total irrigation construction cost would be increased by another $550,000,000 making it $949,424,000 for the 225,000 acres this would amount to a cost of about $4,219. Is it any wonder, Mr. Chairman, that we call this project fantastic and unsound?

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make reference to the statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, who replied in part to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which appears on page 1131 of the RECORD. My colleague from Tennessee stated that power to be produced by this project will in time repay the total cost of the project to the Government. He did not tell you that it is proposed to write off as nonreimbursable around $80,000,000 of the cost. He did not tell you that the Government would never receive a cent of interest on this $1,250,000,000 used to build the project. As a matter of fact, after the power has repaid its own cost to the Government, without interest, most of what is left would be required to pay the annual irrigation, operation, and maintenance expenses.

The records show that the total charges the irrigators are able to pay for the water they receive, will equal only about 60 percent of the cost of the power used to pump the water the 1,000 feet of lift into the aqueduct. In other words, sale of commercial power will have to pay the entire construction cost of the pumping plants, aqueduct, and distribution and drainage systems as well as the operation and maintenance costs of such.

End War Tax Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. R. WALTER RIEHLMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. RIEHLMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform my esteemed colleagues in the House that Thursday, February 2, is a significant day. Thursday has been designated End War Tax Day.

On that day, businessmen from all parts of our country will be sending telegrams of protest to the House Ways and Means Committee and ask for immediate action to report on a bill ending excise taxes.

The reason is simple. The American people were given to understand by high ranking Government officials that excise taxes would be reduced. As a result the people stopping buying dozens and dozens of commodities bearing heavy, unfair, unrealistic, and unwarranted wartime imposed excise taxes.

As a result business has suffered from an administration-inspired buyer's strike which is bankrupting some businesses, severely damaging many others. The buyer's strike is causing widespread unemployment, reduction of production and pay rolls, and threatens to continue until we act to end the war taxes—not just threaten to end them.

Businessmen everywhere are being urged to wire the Ways and Means Committee on End War Tax Day to ask for action, and to point out to our economically naive administration that the end of war taxes does not call for new taxes on business. Such a step would continue to penalize consumers who pay all the taxes anyway.

The end of war taxes will boost consumption, increase production, aid employment, and return to the Government in increased corporation and personal income taxes more money than is now realized by the war taxes.

The day businessmen will tell that to Congress is this Thursday—End War Tax Day.

A Reporter Looks at Whittaker Chambers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, one of the most able of the many reporters who covered the trial of Alger Hiss for perjury was Victor Lasky of the New York World-Telegram and the Sun.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include an article by him which appeared on January 26 and which sets forth his observations on the conduct of Mr. Chambers during the course of the trial. The article follows:

Ever since Whittaker Chambers told Congress of Communist penetrations in high places he has been the target of a slander campaign which employed every smear and lie technique known to the Communists.

For 18 months Mr. Chambers was called a madman, a pathological liar, an unstable character, a stool pigeon. All because he told the truth. A Federal court jury decided Saturday that he had. That was that he had headed a Red spy network in Washington in which Alger Hiss was a productive cohort.

The story has made the rounds that Mr. Chambers was consumed by hate and a desire for vengeance in naming Alger Hiss. Why he should have felt this way was never explained by Mr. Hiss. But the facts show otherwise.

They show that Mr. Chambers first told his story in 1939 to the President's security officer. Mr. Chambers gave Adolf A. Berle, Jr., the names of Hiss and numerous other underground Communists. He urged Mr. Berle to ease them out of sensitive Government posts quietly in order to protect the Nation.

Apparently nothing was done. Alger Hiss rose to new heights in the State Department—traveling with Mr. Roosevelt to Yalta and directing the formation of the United Nations later in San Francisco.

Mr. Chambers also rose in the community. He thought he had done his duty in warning Mr. Berle. It was while he was earning $30,000 a year as senior editor of Time that he was subpenaed by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Hiss, caught in a web of lies before the House group, came up with the theory that his accuser was crazy. But he admitted having no knowledge. Nevetheless the smear, fed by the Communist propaganda machine, spread through the land.

As Hiss was soon forced to admit that he had known his accuser, the anti-Chambers campaign grew more vicious. Sex vilification was employed.

Whittaker Chambers and his courageous wife said nothing to strike back. They could only await the outcome of the Hiss trial. And a jury of eight women and four men finally vindicated him. They decided on the basis of a mountain of evidence that Mr. Chambers was telling the truth and that it was Hiss who had lived a fantastic lie.

And what did Mr. Chambers say of the verdict? "It would be inhuman to gloat over another man's misfortunes."

Here is a statement of dignity and kindliness which should move even the emotions of a defense psychiatrist.

The Patriotic Contribution of Our Jewish War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to include the address I recently delivered before a meeting of the members of Post No. 32, Jewish War Veterans of the United States. The assembly took place on January 22, 1950, at Worcester, Mass., and the proceedings were broadcast over Station WAAB, in Worcester.

The address follows:

Comrade Commander, officers and members of Worcester Post, No. 32, Jewish War Veterans of the United States, I was very happy to receive the cordial invitation to attend the installation exercises of this post tonight, and was very glad that my congressional schedule was such as to permit me to come here on this occasion, to be with you, the members of this great organization; an organization that was founded 53 years ago.

I think very few people know that it is the oldest organized group of American war veterans existing today, with the possible exception of the Grand Army of the Republic.

The founders of this great organization desires to insure that their descendants would carry on the principles that have made our country the freest in the world.

Most of us are descendants from immigrants, the sons and daughters of men and women who were forced to leave the countries of Europe because of persecutions, because of their race, color, or religious beliefs. Yes; your fathers and mothers fled from lands ruled by Czars and Kaisers, to this country where they could wear a badge of service, but never one of servitude.

That they were ever grateful for this haven where opportunities were so numerous, can never be questioned, whether in peace or war.

In all the wars in which our country has been engaged, the number of Jewish men and women of our armed forces has been larger than the ratio of the American Jewish people to the total population of our country.

They fought to preserve our freedoms and became war casualties in order that no American, whatever his religion, whatever his race, would ever become a victim of tyrannical dictatorship.

They met the first responsibility of good citizenship by defending our country and her philosophy of life in time of war.

You, and I, and all veterans seek for our country, in peace, nothing more than we sought for her in war. We want her to endure as the freest nation in the world. We want her major export always to be the ideals of human liberty and equal opportunity, upon which she has risen to become the great hope of mankind in this hour of world confusion.

You have demonstrated heroic patriotism as members of the armed forces of the United States. I know, and the people of this country know, that the Jewish War Veterans, as citizens, will continue to accept their full share of our cooperative responsibility in preserving America as the land of the free and the light of the world.

FEPC Rally

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the Emergency Civil Rights Mobilization, which was held recently in Washington, was conducted in good American spirit and in orderly fashion. Those who organized this rally in Washington should be commended for this accomplishment, no less than for rejecting the support of the Communists and fellow-travelers who made futile efforts to join in on the civil rights mobilization effort and to capitalize on it for their purposes.

The story about this rally in Washington written by Henry Lee Moon appeared in the New Republic, on January 30, 1950, as follows:

FEPC RALLY IN WASHINGTON

(By Henry Lee Moon)

Sponsored by 60 national organizations, the emergency civil-rights mobilization brought to Washington more than 4,000 delegates from 33 States for a 3-day conference and mass lobby, January 15–17. Their presence in Washington dramatized the mounting pressure among rank-and-file members of liberal organizations throughout America for early enactment of the civil-rights program to which both Republicans and Democrats pledged support in their party platforms of 1948.

Observers agreed that the gathering of so large and varied a group was significant in that it was composed of non-Communist, and in many instances strongly anti-Communist, supporters of civil rights. The mobilization, initiated by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, sought primarily the enactment of the fair-employment-practices bill in this session of Congress. Leaders of the movement believed that this objective would be impaired by the participation of Communist elements.

Shortly after the announcement of the mobilization, William L. Patterson, national executive secretary of the Civil Rights Congress, wrote a letter to Roy Wilkins, acting NAACP secretary and chairman of the mobilization, offering the support and cooperation of the CRC and suggesting that Ben Davis, Paul Robeson, Henry Wallace, and Vito Marcantonio be invited to address the Washington conference.

Citing past experience with Communist-dominated organizations and challenging the claim of Communists to be supporters of civil rights, Wilkins rejected Patterson's offer. "We want none of that unity today," he said. "We do not believe that it will contribute to the success of the campaign. On the contrary, we believe it will be a distinct handicap."

Nevertheless, units of the American Labor Party, the Progressive Party, the Young Progressives of America, the suspended CIO unions and other left-wing groups persisted in trying to crash the mobilization. To avert their infiltration, rigid accreditation requirements were set up and a credentials committee appointed under the chairmanship of Willard S. Townsend, veteran foe of the Communists, president of the United Transport Service Employees, CIO, and a vice president of the NAACP. Delegates who failed to present proper credentials on the stationery of an accredited organization and signed by a responsible officer thereof were denied registration. Known Communists were summarily turned back by the committee.

Among the delegates there was unanimity in giving priority to FEPC and other civil-rights measures. Labor delegates from AFL and CIO unions subordinated their demands for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. Delegates from the American Jewish Committee, the American Jewish Congress, and the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith sacrificed the opportunity to press for enactment of a nondiscriminatory DP bill.

More than half of the delegates were from local branches of the NAACP. While the majority were Negro, from a quarter to a third were white men, women, and youths from labor, church, Jewish, Catholic, fraternal, veteran, youth, and civic organizations. The presence at the conference of both Negro and white delegates from the Southern States belied the contention that the people of that region are solidly opposed to civil-rights legislation. Among the 291 delegates from the South was an all-white group of 35 from the University of North Carolina. There were also delegations from such institutions as the University of Chicago, Howard, Brooklyn College, and Sarah Lawrence.

For the most part, the delegates were courteously received by their Congressmen. However, there is the story of the 8-person delegation from Texas which visited the offices of 18 Texas Representatives and was received by only 2. The delegates, however, came armed. In each of the 18 offices they left a petition signed by more than 5,000 registered Negro voters in the Representative's district, expressing their desire for the enactment of civil-rights legislation and indicating that they would vote in the Democratic primaries only for candidates who supported the party's platform.

While making it clear that they intended to meet the congressional foes of civil rights at the polls, the delegates indulged in no threats, denunciations, or wrangling with Congressmen. They were serious, orderly, resolute. And on Capitol Hill they made a favorable impression.

The tone of the conference was set by Wilkins when he said in the keynote address at the Sunday night meeting:

"We come today as representatives of 60 national organizations who are interested in American legislation, for the rights of American citizens, in the interest of America and of no other state. We are not here for malicious heckling and embarrassment except as the citation of your shameless congressional record embarrasses. We are here to demand our rights. We are here to protest and to reason with our elected Representatives. We will be heard here and when we return to our homes."

The delegates sought commitments from Members of the House not only to vote for FEPC but also to vote against the dangerous backward step recently proposed by the

House Rules Committee. They buttonholed Senators in an effort to line up votes for cloture as well as for the bills. From President Truman they received assurance that the administration would seek a vote on civil-rights measures if it took all summer.

Psychiatry on Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, the appearance of two psychiatrists as defense witnesses at the recent trial of Alger Hiss for perjury has created a great deal of controversy in medical and legal circles.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article which appeared in the New Leader on January 14 by Ellen Johns and one which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun on January 24 by Victor Lasky.

[From the New Leader of January 14, 1950]

PSYCHIATRY SET BACK 50 YEARS BY TESTIMONY AT HISS TRIAL

(By Ellen Johns)

Psychiatric history was made in a Federal courtroom last week when Dr. Carl A. L. Binger, a practicing psychiatrist and editor of the American Journal of Psychosomatic Medicine, delivered his own profession a blow from which it may well take 50 years to recover.

Testifying in defense of Alger Hiss at his second perjury trial in an effort to discredit the testimony of Whittaker Chambers, the chief Government witness, Dr. Binger proposed to demonstrate a psychopathic motivation both for the appearance of Whittaker Chambers against Hiss and for the body of his evidence. In response to a droning 69-minute reading of a hypothetical question by stubby defense attorney Claude B. Cross, Dr. Binger delivered his considered opinion that Mr. Chambers is a psychopathic personality.

In a rich and rolling baritone which never hesitated and once or twice could not be stopped, he proceeded to demonstrate his enjoyment of the role of expert witness, as well as his shocking contempt for the responsibilities the position entails. He showed repeatedly a definite bias against the subject he was analyzing, in one instance drawing a severe reprimand from correct and courtly Judge Goddard, who reminded him, "Doctor, you are here as a witness and not as an advocate."

As Binger continued the earlier rigid tension of the courtroom was punctuated from time to time by whispered comments which soon deteriorated into laughter, quiet but unmistakable. By the absurdities he repeatedly accepted as a basis for his evidence, by his feeble documentation both of the judgment he delivered and the justification for delivering it at all, he handed skeptics and enemies of psychiatry—the doubters, the haters, and those who fear its implications—a better case against his fledgling science than they could ever assemble by themselves.

Assuming the truth of the defense "question"—a complex fabric of truth, hearsay, and downright falsity, to no part of which Binger offered any objection or qualification—the good doctor announced his diagnosis of "psychopathic personality." This "disease," he said, has been well known and accepted for all of 15 years. He failed to mention that among psychiatrists in general, there is serious doubt of the existence of any such "disease," and that it is a catch-all term which is constantly being redefined and reclassified. Yet he listed among the symptoms "omission of significant truth." He stated categorically, in elaborating on the symptoms that "anything is consistent with the diagnosis," and admitted that there are no statistics on its incidence.

For each of 5 of the 12 symptoms he claimed to find, he could demonstrate only one example of "characteristic" behavior in the 33 typed pages of assumptions which had guided his diagnosis. For 4 other of the 12 symptoms, the "pathological behavior" was something Mr. Chambers had described himself as doing under Communist Party orders or in his efforts to protect himself from the party's wrath after his break. Other bases for Dr. Binger's serious consideration were Chamber's admission that he had lied to the dean at college; that he had written an anti-religious playlet only 2 years after having been caught reading the Bible; that he failed to recall one pen-name he had used (although he did recall a long series of party aliases); and that a character, Sebastian, in Class Reunion, a novel Chambers translated from the German of Franz Werfel, had "certain abnormalities" and "no conscience, like Chambers."

Dr. Binger found it a pathological symptom that on the witness stand Chambers had admitted to perjury about the famous documents, "without apparent contrition, remorse, or shame." He implied thereby that psychiatrists do not expect a mature adult to be in control of his emotions in public. He took no consideration of Mr. Chambers' explanation that he had committed the perjuries deliberately and consciously in order to protect Alger Hiss.

Dr. Binger found Mr. Chambers extraordinarily indifferent to the feelings of others, in spite of public statements such as his reply to reporters' questions after Hiss was indicted: "I would be inhuman if I could take any pleasure in Mr. Hiss' personal troubles."

Not long after citing as a pathological symptom one instance of Chambers' inability to remember what day in April 1931 he had been married, Dr. Binger admitted to a 5-year error in his own recollection of a date. He called it pathological behavior that Mr. Chambers had often looked at the ceiling during his 5 days on the witness stand in the first trial (Judge Goddard was looking at the ceiling at this point in Binger's testimony) and undertook to add mind-reading to his own accomplishments. "He looked at the ceiling as if trying to recall what he had previously said," Binger explained.

In offering his qualifications as expert, Dr. Binger had described his medical career: medicine, epidemiology, researcher in physiology, and finally psychiatry. But he labeled Chambers' different jobs in and out of the Communist Party as clinical evidence of instability. This despite the fact that Mr. Chambers is enjoying the nineteenth year of his marriage and that he was an editor for Time for 10 years. Such trifles obviously, were not material to the analysis.

Dr. Binger found it very strange that Mr. Chambers recalled so commonplace an occurrence as a policeman directing traffic with an Easter lily in his hand. He declared that Chambers joined the Communist underground as a symbolic burial because of a sense of guilt over his brother's suicide—a tragedy which had taken place some 8 years previously. He stated that Chambers' reported claim to know more communism than Stalin and his remark that lying takes many forms, there are liars all about us were proof of paranoid thinking. Malcolm Cowley's unsupported assertion that Chambers accused Francis B. Sayre of heading an underground cell was proof that Chambers was given to pathological accusation. He declared flatly that Chambers was self-centered, and all but stated that when Chambers wrote an article subtitled "The Devil," he was necessarily referring to himself.

Dr. Binger thought it utterly outside the realm of rational explanation that when Chambers withheld the documents from the underground as hostage against possible kidnaping of himself or his family, he should have given them to his lawyer-nephew Nathan Levine rather than place them in a safety box to which he would have held the key.

Not content to stay within his own province of psychiatry, Dr. Binger offered to qualify as a literary expert as well by his judgments on some of Chambers' writings. Giving a resume of a story called The Dam Fool, Dr. Binger was outraged that although he tells the story of a mollycoddle he acts as though he were a hero. Significantly holding back part of the truth. Dr. Binger did not mention that Chambers had discovered and then translated Bambi, a classic of children's literature. Instead, he declared that "all of Chambers' writings and translations emphasized the witness' abnormal characteristics."

One spectator remarked at the end of Dr. Binger's testimony, "That doctor should have his head examined." Since no reputable psychiatrist will attempt analysis without long and repeated personal interviews and the cooperation of the patient, nor attempt clinical assessment of evidence out of context, it is unlikely that we will have a psychiatric explanation of Dr. Binger's motives in appearing as a voluntary witness in the Hiss case.

But the grudging respect that the psychiatric profession has won through the high seriousness of purpose and careful qualification of a majority of its members is worth fighting for. Perhaps its guardians will not be too dismayed by Dr. Binger's body blow to launch a counterattack.

[From the New York World-Telegram and the Sun of January 24, 1950]

HISS VERDICT STIRS CONTROVERSY: JURY VS. PSYCHIATRISTS

(By Victor Lasky)

The appearance of two mental specialists as defense witnesses at the Alger Hiss perjury trial has set off a storm of debate in legal and psychiatric circles.

Both Drs. Carl A. L. Binger and Henry Alexander Murray testified that Whittaker Chambers was a "pathological liar." A jury, after examining the evidence, decided that the former $30,000-a-year magazine editor was nothing of the sort.

NO PRECEDENT

But even before the jury decided it was Hiss who was the liar, the implications of such testimony had aroused considerable discussion. This newspaper learned of the controversy during the course of the trial. However, publication was withheld lest it affect the trial's outcome.

Vigorous opposition to the introduction of psychiatric testimony was expressed by Assistant United States Attorney Thomas F. Murphy. The prosecutor said it was without precedent in Federal jurisprudence and that there was nothing in the record to indicate Mr. Chambers suffered from mental illness.

BINGER'S BASIS

But Judge Goddard, one of the Nation's most highly regarded jurists, allowed it as the outcome of the trial was largely dependent upon Mr. Chambers' credibility.

Dr. Binger, who was certified a psychiatrist 3 years ago, testified that in his opinion Mr. Chambers was a "psychopathic personality."

Dr. Binger based his opinion on a hypothetical question detailing the worst aspects of Mr. Chambers' life, both true and mythical, a selected group of his writings and translations, and on observing Mr. Chambers on the witness stand.

ADVICE TO JURY

Dr. Murray, of Harvard, who never saw Mr. Chambers, agreed with Dr. Binger's evaluation.

In charging the jury, Judge Goddard declared that their opinions were purely advisory and could be rejected if the jurors found the hypothetical question to be incomplete or incorrect or if they believed their reasons to be unsound.

"You yourselves," Judge Goddard admonished, "have seen and heard Mr. Chambers while he was on the witness stand for several days and you have heard all the evidence. It is for you to say how much weight, if any, you will give to the (psychiatric) testimony."

CALLED DANGEROUS

It was learned that the jury did not even consider Dr. Binger's and Dr. Murray's testimony.

However, Judge Goddard's ruling was termed a "dangerous precedent" by at least two Philadelphia judges, both noted authorities on evidence. Judge Louis E. Levinthal, who was adviser on Jewish affairs in the American military government in Germany, declared:

"It could be a dangerous precedent that a litigant who is rich and can afford to employ a psychiatrist can always get some expert to attack the credibility of a prosecuting witness on the ground that he is a psychopathic personality."

JUDGE BOK'S OPINION

Judge Curtis Bok, presiding jurist in Philadelphia's Court of Common Pleas, declared:

"If the defense in every case could do the same thing, every prosecuting witness would be subject to such analyses. Psychiatry is still very young. For the present, I think, the credibility of witnesses can be left to the jury."

The appearance of Dr. Binger and Dr. Murray led several prominent psychiatrists to volunteer their services to Mr. Murphy. Mr. Murphy admits that much of the material he used during cross-examination came from them.

LIMITED VALUE

One psychiatrist, who said he had no direct interest in the Hiss-Chambers controversy, told this newspaper:

"Whether a man is a psychopathic personality can only be determined after weeks of intensive interviewing, and even then we can't be sure. It can't be done from carefully selected passages of freely admitted testimony, poetry, and translations."

Not since the Harry K. Thaw case in 1906 has psychiatry suffered such enormous damage in public opinion, a leading official of the American Psychiatric Association declared.

SUBSTITUTE FOR COURTS

At least one lawyer declared that if psychiatric opinions were accepted as absolutely accurate there would be no need for judges, juries, or lawyers.

"If we ever decide that a psychiatrist has some special knowledge or power enabling him unerringly to separate truth from falsehood," the lawyer said, "there will be no occasion for trials as we now know them.

"The process would be similar to that when an African medicine man performs his rites. The only difference would be that our process would be science, whereas the bushmen's rites are nothing more than superstition."

Uncle Sam's Untapped Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, today the most vexatious, incessant, and pressing problem that confronts each and every Member of Congress is our present confiscatory, oppressive, and merciless taxation. In spite of the enormous revenues collected by our Government, it continues to spend more than it accumulates. This is due to extravagance, refusal of the present administration to economize, and an alarming tendency on the part of many huge business enterprises to resort to subterfuge in order to evade their share of the cost of government. This later phase of our fiscal problem is admirably discussed and expounded in an illuminating article entitled "Uncle Sam's Untapped Millions," written by our distinguished colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], which appears in the February issue of the American magazine. Believing that this article will be of intense interest to all Members of Congress and especially to those of us in the House of Representatives where all legislation pertaining to revenue must originate, I include it herein, in its entirety, as an extension of my remarks:

UNCLE SAM'S UNTAPPED MILLIONS—WHILE OUR DEFICIT-RIDDEN GOVERNMENT SEARCHES FRANTICALLY FOR NEW SOURCES OF REVENUE, A BILLION-DOLLAR JACKPOT OF UNTAXED PROFITS LIES UNTOUCHED

(By NOAH M. MASON, United States Representative from Illinois)

Administration leaders today are frantically searching for new ways to raise revenue. I maintain we can raise at least $1,000,000,000 in new revenue simply by taxing the untaxed.

Today there is a great rush by United States businesses to hide behind tax-exempt fronts when tax time comes around—as it is coming right now. If we plug the loopholes in our present tax laws that permit such escapes, we can raise the $1,000,000,000 without adding a single cent to the bill of the regular taxpayers.

The fantastic, jet-propelled growth of these businesses now hiding behind tax-exempt fronts is a serious threat to America's economic health. By escaping the normal 38-percent tax on their business profits the tax avoiders not only legally outwit Uncle Sam, but they achieve an enormous advantage over competitors. They can, and are, forcing thousands of conscientious, taxpaying businessmen to the wall.

More serious, they are shrinking up the taxable pool of United States wealth. Last year alone, several thousand companies, with vast business profits, slipped beyond reach of the tax collector by joining the ranks of the tax exempt. Because of their escape you and I must shoulder an extra burden. And already, as ex-President Herbert Hoover has pointed out, the "average working citizen" works 61 days a year just to pay his taxes.

Our laws as now written exempt charitable, educational, religious organizations; cooperatives; labor unions; and many others. When these exemptions were granted, many years ago, our lawmakers never dreamed they would be used to shield vast corporate, profit-making enterprises. But that is precisely what has happened.

By various and often devious means business organizations are making deals with tax-exempt institutions so that both profit by having the institution take over title of the company. In other cases, the tax-exempt institution simply goes into business itself on a big scale, because our present tax laws are rigged so that the prospects of making a big profit are irresistible.

These arrangements are depriving the United States Treasury of badly needed revenue, since billions in business profits are now going untaxed. I am not criticizing the organizations that make these profits by taking advantage of the laws. Nobody wants to pay more taxes than the law requires. It is the law that needs changing.

A spectacular example of the way our tax laws permit business profits to go untaxed is illustrated by the California & Hawaii Sugar Refining Co. This gigantic company operates the biggest sugar refinery in the world, at Crockett, Calif. The plant stretches for a half-mile along the water front.

The C. & H. is dominated by businessmen who also operate plantations, department stores, etc., on Hawaii. Though C. & H. makes millions of dollars in profits, it hasn't paid a Federal income tax since 1927. In that year it stopped being a regular tax-paying corporation and, its tycoons announced, had become a farmer's cooperative, simply by changing somewhat its corporate structure. (It remained, however, a corporation, with many of the same stockholders.)

Two years ago a House investigating committee pried into this change-of-face. The committee asked William B. Tyler, general counsel of C. & H., why his corporation became a cooperative. Mr. Tyler made this frank reply: "To save taxes."

In my Illinois district there is a little macaroni factory. Its taxpaying owner complained bitterly to me that his business was being hurt by unfair competition from an enormous nontaxpaying macaroni manufacturer in New Jersey. I looked into this matter.

The nontaxpaying Goliath in New Jersey is the C. F. Mueller Co., one of America's largest producers of macaroni, noodles, and spaghetti. The Mueller company used to pay the United States Treasury about $300,000 in taxes each year, until it sold out to a nonprofit foundation acting in behalf of New York University. By taking itself under the protective wing of this NYU-affiliated foundation, Mueller declared it would pay no more taxes, even though it was operating as before. And by not paying taxes it has a tremendous advantage over its taxpaying competitors in the macaroni field.

New York University, I discovered, has blossomed out as quite a protector of tax-escaping factories. Its affiliated foundations now own and operate, in addition to the macaroni factory, a $3,000,000 piston ring factory in Missouri, a $3,300,000 pottery factory, and a vast $35,000,000 leather goods company.

These four companies, protected by NYU, earn many millions of dollars in profits each year. A spokesman for the university has admitted the companies would have to pay $1,500,000 in United States taxes each year if they had not come under the university's protective wing.

The great mushrooming growth of companies doing business behind tax-exempt fronts has occurred almost entirely in the past decade. You don't have to look far to find the explanation. It lies in the great increase in the Federal tax on business profits. In 1916, when the Federal tax was first

levied, the tax was only 1 percent. Today the Federal Government takes up to 38 percent of an ordinary company's business profits in taxes.

Taxes have become a major cost of doing business in America. If you can avoid the 38-percent levy you have an enormous advantage over your competitor.

Hundreds of lawyers and corporate manipulators today are busy trying to figure out ways to convert their companies into tax-exempt operations. Recently a Broadway columnist revealed that "Hollywood moguls are working out a plan to set up film companies as cooperatives to escape many taxes." How this will work is not yet clear.

A few months ago the Wall Street Journal carried an advertisement for a 2,000-acre citrus grove in Florida for $1,700,000. The ad pointed out, suggestively, that the huge orange grove would make a mighty fine investment for some tax-free institution.

I have just received a folder issued by a firm of so-called industrial financiers in Chicago. It is a legal but brazen document pointing out techniques by which private companies and "nonprofit" charitable foundations can get together to their mutual advantage. The beauty of the set-up, it points out, is "the tax-exempt status of the foundation."

The strategy these promoters outline is the same "sale-and-lease-back" method now sweeping America. Dozens of foundations and universities are using this legal strategy. The tax-free institution buys the land and buildings of a company. Being tax-free, the institution can afford to pay a very generous price. It then leases the property right back to the old owner on a long-term basis. He's happy because he now has an abundance of loose cash available for expanding his business. The foundation is happy because it has a good, tax-free, real-estate investment. Everybody wins but the Treasury—and the taxpayer.

Changing your company into a cooperative is another popular strategy to beat the 38-percent tax. Since the beginning of World War II, when regular business profits were taxed up to 90 percent, co-ops have had a heyday. They plowed their tax-free profits right back into the business and grew and grew and grew. Today they are still growing, and this year are doing an estimated $17,000,000,000 business. They manufacture cheese and cosmetics, dig oil wells, run supermarkets and funeral parlors, etc.

How enormous the tax-free advantage can be is painfully known to independent oil jobbers in the Midwest. They have had a desperate time surviving in the face of a great upsurge of tax-free co-ops, which are buying up hundreds of millions of dollars' worth of oil wells, pipe lines, and refineries. (One single co-op owns 805 wells.) They are also selling oil around the world.

For several years the independent jobbers in Iowa begged Congress to pass a law eliminating this tax inequality. Finally, last summer, their powers of resistance were near the collapsing point. Eight hundred of these independents sadly decided to form a tax-free co-op of their own as their only salvation. They began taking the necessary steps.

Since I have a bill before Congress to bring tax equality I went out to speak to these oil men. In essence I said: "I put it up to you—do you want to join the tax exempts, and thus join the opposition to my bill, which you have been pleading for, or do you want to try to hold off a few more months to see if the coming Congress will correct this inequality?"

After long debate they agreed to hold off a few more months. I shall never dare to face those hard-pressed men again if this Congress fails to plug the loopholes in our tax laws which permit such a situation to exist.

There are many ways under our present laws that a business can operate legally for profit while paying little or no Federal tax on their profits. Here I would like to describe the five devices most widely used:

The charity trust device. There are many conscientious trusts and foundations dedicated to public service. But thousands have sprung up in recent years that are little more than pawns in the game of outsmarting the tax collector. Recently a tax-free foundation bought up a skyscraper office building in Houston, Tex., for about $2,000,000. It then leased the building out to a large cotton firm. Since never again, under our present laws, will an income tax be paid on that building's rental profits, the cotton firm obviously gets the advantage of unusually low rental rates.

The Russell Sage Foundation, a conscientious organization, has made a study of some of the newscomers to the nonprofit trust and foundation field. Its report stated: "A disturbing number of such foundations * * * appear to have no headquarters other than the office of a law firm, to be modest to the point of complete silence about any program for social or public welfare, and indeed to be making no present contributions of any sort from their accumulated and accumulating wealth."

The fabulous 95,000-acre Montana wheat ranch of Tom Campbell, America's largest wheat farmer, has been sold to a charitable trust in Omaha for $2,000,000. Its earnings, which have been subject to a 38-percent tax, will now go tax-free. Mr. Campbell will continue to manage his farms at a very handsome income.

The purchase was engineered by an enterprising young Omaha lawyer named Gordon Diesing. He bought the ranch on behalf of the United States Wheat Corp., which Diesing set up last April exclusively for charitable purposes and thus tax-free. This corporation's profits, after paying Diesing's salary, expenses, etc., are to go to another charitable corporation, the Sacred Heart Foundation fund, which is capitalized at $10.

Who do you think runs this second outfit? Mr. Diesing is listed as president, secretary, treasurer, chairman of the trustees, general counsel, and resident agent. In effect, his second corporation, capitalized at $10, bought control of a $2,000,000 ranch. Evidently not much money changed hands.

The Campbell ranch, I found, is not the only purchase Mr. Diesing has made. He also has bought for $4,800,000 the 35,000 acres of cotton land in San Joaquin Valley run by California's cotton king, Russell Giffen. For this he set up another charitable, nonprofit corporation, which he heads. Giffen remains as manager.

One of the most significant aspects of these two deals is that the two ranches in the past year have drawn almost $5,000,000 in United States Government farm loans. Presumably they will continue to draw loans. Thus, in effect, the United States Government will be guaranteeing that they make a profit, while not being able to tax those profits.

Then there is Royal Little, president of Textron Corp., the $60,000,000 textile firm. Mr. Little and his aides set up six tax-exempt charitable trusts which were given title to much of the Textron empire. A Senate subcommittee, under Senator TOBEY of New Hampshire, which investigated this set-up has reported:

"The maze of negotiations, investments, loans, and leases between these trusts and Textron present a fantastic picture of fiscal manipulation. * * * Trustees (of the trusts) were at the beck and call of Textron in shuffling mill properties from one to the other. * * * Large manufacturing companies have been purchased (by the trusts). * * * Many millions of dollars have been received by the trusts and but an infinitesimal portion thereof has been paid to the beneficiaries of the trusts."

The committee report concluded: "It is clear that [Textron] has made wide use of so-called charitable trusts as a means of providing risk capital to itself. * * * These trusts have never paid a cent of income tax. Thus, by this system of using charitable trusts, Textron has gained an unfair competitive advantage over the orthodox textile manufacturers, and the burden of taxation has been thrown more heavily upon the shoulders of all other taxpayers."

Mr. Little, when questioned, acknowledged frankly that abuses had existed, and agreed that legislation is needed to remedy the situation.

The educational device: Our founding fathers decided, properly, that the facilities for education should not be burdened with taxes. But they had no notion that universities would go into business in direct competition with taxpaying companies. That is what several dozen schools have been doing in the past 5 years, largely because their tax-exempt status gives them such an advantage.

We find schools in some odd businesses. The University of Michigan now owns Willow Run Airport. * * * Morningside College, of Sioux City, Iowa, owns a streetcar and bus franchise. * * * Gonzaga College, of Spokane, Wash., owns a radio station in that town. * * * Wittenberg College, of Springfield, Ohio, has purchased a $200,000 supermarket. * * * Goucher College, in Baltimore, owns half interest in the shopping district of Towson, Md. * * * Oberlin College, in Oberlin, Ohio, owns some 5-and-10-cent stores. * * * Girard College, Philadelphia, Pa., through a trustee foundation, operates coal mines. * * * Washington University, in St. Louis, has money invested in 51 business buildings in St. Louis, a railroad freight station, and a switching yard.

In a sense, the University of Louisville is going into the horse-racing business. A tax-free foundation—which will have the university as one of its beneficiaries—has bought the famous Churchill Downs track. The profits of the track will no longer be taxable.

The biggest business deals now being put across by colleges (and their friends) are real-estate purchases employing the sale-and-lease-back gimmick.

Very recently tax-free Yale University (through a subsidiary called Connecticut Boola, Inc.) bought a brand-new department store building which the famed R. H. Macy & Co. had built for itself in San Francisco. The price was $4,500,000. Then Yale turned around and leased the now tax-free building back to Macy's for 31 years at an average annual rental of $240,000. Both sides win. The United States Treasury, of course, loses.

Likewise, the University of Pennsylvania has bought and leased back the huge Philadelphia department store, Lit Bros. The sale-and-lease-back technique was apparently first pioneered for schools by Union College, of Schenectady, N. Y., in 1945, when it paid $16,150,000 for the department-store chain of Allied Stores, Inc.

All of these operations, of course, are legal, but as a newspaper in my district, the Dekalb Chronicle, commented: "It seems somehow to be a blot on the educational system." This newspaper felt that our schools, along with our churches, have a responsibility for setting a high standard of ethics for our Nation.

The religious device. Like colleges, our churches have a tax-free status. Here, too, abuses of the privileged status are appearing, though not yet as flagrantly as with colleges.

Father Divine has purchased the third largest hotel in Newark, N. J., and given it a tax-exempt status. A company publishing a religious magazine in Kansas City is tax-exempt.

Some cities are finding this problem of increasing church property quite serious. Churches are taking millions of dollars' worth of property off the tax rolls. In Milwaukee it is estimated the city is losing $2,500,000 a year in revenue because churches and fraternal organizations have become such large property owners.

More and more church leaders have become disturbed by this trend. A few weeks ago The Christian Century warned its readers that "Tax reckoning is coming." It feared that churches would soon be facing public resentment.

"If the churches refuse to budge when the social implications of their untaxed profits and property are pointed out," it asked, "what will be the effect on their moral and spiritual influence?"

Other church leaders likewise are worried. Methodist officials are known to be disturbed over the untaxed profits some of their churches are making on properties which include on the premises such nonreligious tenants as taverns and pool halls.

Samuel Cardinal Stritch, the eminent Catholic leader of Chicago, has denied permission to the Catholic order that sought to purchase real estate in Lake County near the city. It is known that one factor he took into consideration in his decision was that the county already was seriously burdened by tax-exempt properties.

The Christian Century's stand is that churches should pay their own way on all their property. That, I think, is a bit extreme, but certainly churches should be taxed on all profits from their nonreligious enterprises. The Mormon Church engages in a great variety of commercial businesses. However, it has always set an example which other churches might, but rarely do, follow. It insists on paying its full share of taxes on profits from such business operations.

The cooperative device: Co-ops were given their privileged tax-exempt status in 1916. Then, it seemed like a nice thing to do. Co-ops then were merely small groups of neighboring farmers who formed associations to try to get a better return on their crops. Everyone then was inclined to pity the poor farmer. Furthermore, the Federal tax in 1916 was only 1 percent. Thus, only a minor concession was involved.

Today, however, the situation has changed vastly. The tax concession is not 1 percent but 38 percent. And many of the co-ops today are monster-sized corporations performing multi-million-dollar transactions in fierce competition with taxpaying businessmen. Today 80 percent of the co-ops are corporations. They run vast machine assembly factories, chemical plants, phosphate mines They sell oil around the world. They handle 75 percent of the Nation's fluid milk. They operate vast feed mills. A single mill in Buffalo is valued at $5,780,000. They operate the biggest grain elevators in America. One of them, in Enid, Okla., is about a quarter of a mile long.

Yet some of these co-ops still try to convince the public they're just a couple of little farmers struggling to make a living.

One of these so-called little farmer co-ops is the California Fruit Growers Exchange, which did a $300,000,000 business last year. It markets the famous Sunkist orange and 85 percent of America's lemons. The United States Department of Justice has prosecuted it as a monopoly. Yet this gigantic corporation is exempt from Federal income taxes.

Its operations are so far-flung that it has subsidiaries and subsidiaries. One subsidiary, the Fruit Growers Supply Co., in 1944, casually bought up the entire lumbering town of Westwood, Calif., for $11,000,000. The town has lumber mills, sawmills, veneer mills, box factories. Also included in the purchase was an estimated $11,000,000 stand of timber. Before the purchase, the town's enterprises paid the United States Treasury hundreds of thousands of dollars in taxes each year. Now they pay practically nothing.

In the United States today there are at least a dozen co-ops that would have to pay the Treasury an average of $1,000,000 each if they were taxed each year on the same basis as their competitors.

Yet they escape most taxes. Why? Because they claim to be nonprofit. When co-ops split a melon at the end of a year they don't call it a profit they're splitting. They say they are handing out a rebate or a refund or a final payment due.

The Bureau of Internal Revenue accepts this flimsy distinction. One reason the Federal Government accepts it is that cooperatives are very potent politically. President Truman himself has curried the favor of co-ops. A few months ago he told Iowa farmers, with whom co-ops are particularly strong: "This Congress will not listen to those who want to tax cooperatives out of existence."

No one wants to tax them out of existence. But they should be put on an equal basis with their taxpaying competitors. Otherwise, they will soon be driving our taxpaying businessmen out of existence at a rate that will cripple our economy. You just can't compete with someone who has a 38-percent edge on you.

The labor-union device: Unions, just like schools and co-ops, have long been on the income-tax-exempt list. When that exemption was granted I'm sure the lawmakers did not realize the unions would branch out into commercial enterprises having no relation to their union needs.

In many cities, unions receive rentals on buildings they own, and pay no tax on the income. The United Mine Workers Union in Springfield, Ill., has a big building with stores and offices which it rents out. In LaSalle, Ill., a local union is in the saloon-renting business.

Nor is that all. Both the CIO and the AFL are mapping plans to operate giant tax-free co-op supermarkets in union towns throughout America. These, of course, will be in direct competition with taxpaying grocers. The AFL has issued a bulletin urging its 7,500,000 members to set up co-ops to produce and distribute necessities on a gigantic scale.

CIO's United Automobile Workers is now backing a multi-million-dollar co-op store operation. It hopes to open a co-op supermarket in every town in America where there is a UAW local, which means any town that has an auto factory or airplane plant. A dozen UAW co-op stores are already open in the Detroit area. They sell groceries, appliances, clothing etc. Their announced aim is to capture 50 percent of all retail trade in the area. These stores, of course, pay little tax on their earnings.

We have seen, in this article, a half dozen of the favorite techniques profit-making enterprises have developed to avoid the tax collector. They have become so widespread that conscientious taxpayers are becoming indignant. Even the United States Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Sawyer, has acknowledged this indignation. Recently he made an extensive tour of the country consulting business groups. He has reported that one of the main gripes he encountered was this unfairness of our tax laws.

Our business leaders not only demand relief from tax-free competition from privately owned firms. They also believe that when a Government agency goes into an ordinary business venture—as agencies are doing increasingly—it should be required to pay a tax on its profits. Today the Federal Government operates a barge line on the Mississippi, it makes rum in the Virgin Islands, it runs tourist camps, and it manufactures fertilizer in competition with private companies. Likewise, State governments now own ferries and railroads, and have monopolies on liquor stores.

It is only fair, I believe, that Government profit makers face the income-tax collector just as any other businessman must do. By paying a 38-percent tax, our bureaucrats may come to realize that publicly owned enterprises are not so much cheaper to run, after all.

Some small progress is being made in getting the tax exempts to pay their fair share in taxes. Congress has finally prodded the Army's PX stores to pay taxes, just like anybody else.

As for the private tax avoiders, a little progress also is being made. The Treasury Department has finally forced a show-down with the Mueller macaroni people. It demands that the company pay taxes, even though its profits go to NYU. The Government contends that there is nothing charitable, scientific, literary, or educational in noodle making. The issue is now in the courts.

A few States also are taking action. Indiana has a law taxing business income of all churches, colleges, foundations, co-ops, etc. This law has produced no noticeable hardship.

Partly because of the public outcry, some of the farm co-ops are now voluntarily paying taxes on some of their profits. One of America's largest co-ops, the Cooperative Grange-League-Federation Exchange, of Ithaca, N. Y., has announced that it is going to pay voluntarily $928,000 (or about a 27 percent tax) on its profits of its past fiscal year. True enough, it ought to pay the full 38 percent (or $366,000 more), but the fact it is paying anything is a sign of the growing recognition that all business enterprises, regardless of their form, have a responsibility to help pay the cost of Government.

Isolated State laws and voluntary acts, however, are not enough. What is needed is an overhauling of our crazy patchwork of national tax laws to eliminate tax inequities. I am convinced that action can be gotten at this session of Congress. I would impose the regular profits tax on all commercial enterprises doing business for profit, regardless of who owns them.

Such a change would not in the least hinder schools, churches, unions, and charitable institutions in their primary functions. It would, however, cut the props out from under most of the legal tax dodging by commercial profit makers now going on in America.

Some such law, I believe, is urgently needed. We should tax the untaxed to ease the tax load upon the overtaxed, and provide much needed Government revenue. And we should do it before it is too late.

Extension of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a letter to Dean Acheson by Hamilton Fish, a former Member of Congress, who was among the first to point out the danger of Communist influence in our Federal Government and who now reminds us that this influence, if allowed to affect our present policy, will mean the loss of all Asia and a seri-

ous threat to Africa and to our own security.

The letter follows:

AUGUST 9, 1949.

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing, as one of the pioneers in Congress against the extension of world revolutionary communism, to protest the betrayal by the State Department of the anti-Communist cause in China and of the security and best interests of the United States.

The policy of the State Department since 1945 has aided and abetted the Chinese Communists by undermining Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek and the Nationalists by a continuous and ruinous policy of appeasement.

The Chinese Nationalist Government was deliberately stabbed in the back by President Roosevelt at Yalta, threatened and coerced by General Marshall into a disastrous appeasement policy in 1946 with the Communists, and deceived, thwarted, and maligned by a clique of near-Communists and fellow-travelers in the State Department for a number of years with unprecedented success.

I charge that the white paper is a studied plea to exonerate and whiten a series of frightful blunders committed by our State Department, and to incriminate and blacken Chiang Kai-shek and the anti-Communist forces in China.

I charge that the white paper is a distorted account of recent Chinese history, with the object of making Chiang Kai-shek (the arch enemy of Communists) the scapegoat for the incompetency and appeasement policies of the State Department. According to Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, "Nearly all the officials relieved by me in China because they were pro-Communists are now in the State Department presumably writing white papers."

I charge the white paper with being a contemptible character assassination of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek who was our valiant ally in World War II and a determined and fearless leader against the extension of world communism since 1927.

I charge the white paper with being an essentially negative and defeatist document consisting of a tissue of evasions, contradictions, sly insinuations, and half-truths to serve as a miserable alibi and whitewash for the consistently wrong-horse policy of the State Department.

I charge that the white paper is a monument of deceit and hypocrisy to cover up the tragic mistakes of F. D. R., General Marshall, and the pro-Communist group in the State Department in appeasing the Communists in China.

I accuse President Roosevelt of selling out the Chinese Nationalists by entering into secret and sordid agreements with Soviet Russia at Tehran and Yalta.

I accuse a determined group of Reds in the State Department with instigating the pro-Communist appeasement policy.

I accuse General Marshall of being the unwitting dupe of the pro-Communists in his Department in their plots and machinations to undermine Chiang Kai-shek by appeasing the Communists and stopping the shipment of arms to the Nationalists from 1946 to 1948.

I accuse the State Department of gross incompetency in our relations with Chiang Kai-shek, abandoning and deserting the Nationalists (who had all but driven the Communists out of Manchuria), of affording relief and arms on a basis of too little and too late, of being responsible for a cowardly and disastrous appeasement and do-nothing policy, and still adhering to the same do-nothing policy.

I accuse the State Department of willfully withholding the Wedemeyer report for 2 years until its effect was destroyed, because its recommendations were contrary to those of General Marshall.

I urge that the State Department stop whitewashing itself, cease its recriminations and attacks on Gen. Chiang Kai-shek, and throw all pro-Communists appeasers out of its offices.

I urge that we refuse to recognize the Communist government of China.

I urge that General MacArthur be recalled to testify before the proper committees of the Senate and the House regarding a definite plan to prevent the extension of world revolutionary communism in Asia.

I urge the establishment of a strong united pact of all anti-Communist nations and forces in Asia.

I urge that a truly bipartisan or nonpartisan plan be established to save the remaining nations of Asia from being engulfed by the military might of world communism.

I urge the immediate creation under Government auspices of an international organization to preserve freedom and to combat the propaganda, terrorism, and despotism of international communism.

It is public knowledge that as a result of Communist infiltration into the State Department that a number of its employees were arrested for conspiracy to violate the espionage law through theft of secret material in June 1945. Fifteen thousand confidential Government documents were recovered from the pro-Communist magazine Amerasia in New York by the FBI.

One Government employee, Emanuel Larsen, was fined $500 and assigned to a confidential mission in the Far East by the War Department. Philip Jaffe pleaded guilty and was fined $2,500. Alger Hiss is under indictment for perjury in connection with certain documents stolen from the State Department. Did he have a hand in formulating our pro-Communist appeasement policies in China?

Why has not Henry Julian Wadleigh (who declared in open court that he had stolen secret State Department documents for the Communists) been prosecuted?

How many more pro-Communist appeasers are there in the State Department? How many pro-Communists and traitors have been dismissed from the State Department since the disclosures in the Amerasia case in 1945?

Finally, I accuse the State Department of laxity and incompetency in failing to sustain, in every possible way, the anti-Communist forces in China during the last four critical years when their victory was almost assured. As a result of our State Department's bungling, China is entering an era of communistic terror and chaos.

If all the State Department has to offer is the white paper as a barrier to the conquest of Asia by world communism then I predict that, once China is fully communized, the Red hordes of Asia will sweep over the rest of the Far East, including Indochina, Burma, Korea, Japan, Malaya, Java, and India.

I further predict that within 10 years 4,000,000 well-trained and equipped Chinese soldiers will be on the march to Armageddon and the Suez Canal, fighting and killing American soldiers.

The American people have a right to know who is to blame among its officials for the catastrophic fiasco in China.

Already skilled Red agitators are fanning the flames of revolution throughout the Far East. Unrest, disorder, and civil war will follow as night the day.

We must have a definite and positive policy to stop world communism in Asia. We must not drift, by default, through the back door in the Far East into world war III.

Respectfully yours,

HAMILTON FISH.

What the ERP Has Done for Italy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Italy is today a better country all around, with more goods and more hope, as a result of the Marshall plan.

The Marshall plan has made three important contributions to Italy's recovery. First is the dollar program, namely, the allocation of dollars which buy very necessary imports such as coal, petroleum, and cotton which keep the Italian economy running, and machinery which remodernizes Italy's industry. Almost $1,000,000,000 have been allocated to Italy for this purpose under the Marshall plan thus far.

As a result of these dollars, Italy's production now surpasses that of before the war. Unemployment has decreased. The bread ration is gone, the black market has disappeared, the quality of bread has improved and the price has declined.

The second major contribution has come through the lira fund, or counterpart fund, which is made up of the lira receipts from the sale at fixed prices of the products that come into Italy free of charge under the dollar program. Approximately 200,000,000,000 lire, the equivalent of over $400,000, have already been deposited in this account.

This fund is being used to finance literally thousands of public works and other improvements all over Italy. These include bridges, roads, railroad improvements, railroad stations, better telegraph and telephone systems, dry docks, airports, thousands of workmen's houses, and the like. Some villages which have never had running water before are getting water as a result of aqueducts financed by the ERP lire funds. Some villages which never had electricity before are now finding magic current coming to them through ERP. Vast areas of land are being reclaimed through drainage and irrigation, farm roads are being run through them, buildings are being constructed, and machinery is being provided under the agricultural program of the lira program.

It is estimated that about 250,000 people will be given employment through this counterpart fund and that when the hundreds of projects in it are completed permanent employment will be given to many tens of thousands of men.

ERP is making its third major contribution to Italian recovery through the technical-assistance clause under the ERP Act. Under this clause ERP finances the sending of Italian experts to the United States or the bringing to Italy of American and other experts so that Italians will learn the latest methods of production, both agricultural and industrial.

Under this program Italian experts in as widely varying fields as electrical-power engineering and hybrid-corn development have gone to the United

States, and American experts in such widely different fields as hotel development and well drilling have gone to Italy.

The Italian experts who have returned to Italy have been eager to spread among their colleagues the many lessons they learned in the United States and the American experts who have gone there have been well received and their words of instruction listened to with real enthusiasm.

It is estimated that long after the end of the Marshall plan the effects of the plan will be felt in Italy through the application of additional knowledge acquired by these many experts.

The technical-assistance program will receive even greater development during the present year.

Italy's economy has felt the beneficial effects of the Marshall plan in many ways:

First, the dangerous inflation that followed the end of the war was checked by the arrival of goods under the previous American Aid Acts and then under ERP. Now Italy enjoys one of the most stable economies in Europe, as was shown by the strong position maintained by the Italian lire at the time of the devaluation of the British pound last September.

Secondly, Italy's national income has risen to the point where, despite all the destruction of the war, it is virtually at the prewar level.

Third, the Government is rapidly cutting down the deficit between income and expenditures.

Fourth, exports have increased to a point where they are well above those of prewar and the dollar deficit between exports and imports is narrowing.

The Italians are being kept closely informed of the progress of the Marshall plan in Italy through every medium of public relations possible. The ERP mission in Rome, assisted by the Italian Government, makes liberal use of press and radio, but also employs large and small exhibits, sound and projection trucks, motion pictures, and other devices to inform Italians of what the Marshall plan is doing for them and what it expects of them in the way of increased productivity and greater economic integration in Europe.

Americans working for the Marshall plan in Italy have been greatly encouraged by two facts. One is the keen will of the Italians to reconstruct. Inheriting from the ancient Romans the desire and ability to build, the Italians have effected a miracle of recovery from the devastation of the war. Towns like Cassino which were razed to the ground are now almost or entirely reconstructed and in many cases are better off than they were before.

The second item of encouragement is the universal desire of the Italian people to work on an economic basis with the other peoples of western Europe.

The Italian Government has lent the ERP mission in Rome every support. While naturally some differences of opinion arise from time to time the cooperation existing between the government and the mission has been cordial and fruitful.

Perhaps the most outstanding development since the arrival of ERP in Italy has been the weakening, although not the elimination, of the Communist menace there. The Communist-dominated union organization known as CGIL has been greatly hampered by the fact that 40 percent of its membership left it and formed two anti-Communist organizations. It is reliably estimated that the card-bearing membership of the Communist Party has dropped about 20 percent in the last 21 months. Now when the CGIL calls a general strike for political purposes it does not have anything near the response it used to meet with 2 years ago. Then the economic life of cities virtually died. Now that economic life goes on, though with some diminution which in some cases is so small as not to be noticed.

Everywhere in Italy there is greater confidence, largely as a result of the Marshall plan. There is confidence in Italy's ability to be able to walk on her own feet when the Marshall plan ends without the necessity for extraordinary outside aid. There is confidence that Italy is coming back as a helpful and useful member of the family of nations.

"All Recognize We Cannot Go on Spending at War Year Rates—That No Nation Can Go on With Expenditures of the Size We Have Been Putting Out and Still Remain Solvent—What Can We Do About It?—The Prescription Is Simple—Cut Expenses by Getting Down to Basic Essentials"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARENCE G. BURTON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. BURTON. Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure to be present at the Roanoke Chamber of Commerce annual dinner meeting on January 25, at which our Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, a native of Roanoke, Va., was the honored guest and made the principal address.

Roanoke has been the birthplace of a great many distinguished Americans but the memory of man runneth not to one who brought to public office greater drive, sincerity, and ability than Roanoke's first citizen of today, the Honorable Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense.

His distinguished, beloved, and respected mother and father, brothers and sister must have thrilled when they heard the remarkable address given by their son and brother to his friends and to his neighbors.

Mr. Speaker, somewhere was written "a prophet is not without honor save in his own country," but in the personality of Louis Johnson, America has a public official equally well and favorably known in both the Orient and the Occident, respected by his neighbors and kinfolk equally as he is respected by freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

The address made by Louis Johnson in Roanoke on Wednesday night last will never be forgotten by those who heard him speak. It was a statesmanlike presentation which had to do not alone with the history of his home city and State but which constituted a comprehensive statement wherein was crystalized all the issues with which the world is faced.

No statement of Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson would be complete if he failed to express himself fully as to the vexatious problems which he seemingly encounters every hour of every day in the administration of the great governmental department and particularly with respect to the expenditure of the huge sums that have been entrusted to his care.

Mr. Speaker, his speech made at Roanoke is so replete with factual data having to do with the economic, social, industrial, fiscal, tax, and foreign problems that I am including it in my extension of remarks. I feel that every Member of this House, as well as those who sit on the other end of the Capitol, would find tremendous interest in his discussion of the multiplicity of subjects covered in this remarkable statement made by our great Secretary of Defense.

That statement reads as follows:

It is always an inspiration for me to return to Roanoke and rekindle so many pleasant memories of my life in the happy surroundings of my youth. Roanoke was my first home and—

"The home we first knew on this beautiful earth,
The friends of our childhood, the place of our birth,
In the heart's inner chamber sung always will be,
As the shell ever sings of its home in the sea."

My roots are deep in the heart of Roanoke. My parents were married here. They still live here. All of their children were born here. When they first came here, there was no city of Roanoke. It was a little village, Big Lick. In the span of their lifetime, my father and my mother have seen it grow from a village crossroads into the magic city of today. May God spare them many more years in which to behold the realization of the even greater promise that destiny holds for this community.

Roanoke always was, and still is, an ideal place to bring up an American family. I am grateful, indeed, that it was my happy destiny to grow up here. It was in the homes and the churches of Roanoke, in its public schools and on its athletic fields, that we learned the true spirit of America. Here we were brought up on the pioneer tradition of self-reliance, courage, and democracy, a tradition that we trace back to the old frontier of the French and Indian wars when our forefathers fought forest, beast, and hostile man to make life worth while in their promised land.

It was characteristic of the frontier to measure man by his individual worth and by his readiness and willingness to cooperate with the other members of his community in a common cause. It is that same spirit that has come down traditionally to us through the ages. It serves as the business

spirit of the Chamber of Commerce of Roanoke today. It serves as the community spirit of our every-day life. It is a spirit that the sons and daughters of our latest immigrants share with the descendants of our earliest pioneers.

As children in Roanoke, we were taught the fundamentals of American living, of love of God and country, of duty and chivalry, of true neighborliness and mutual helpfulness, of free discussion and wholehearted cooperation, of the ideal of live and let live. These are the same fundamentals to which President Truman has been dedicating himself, to maintain them at home and to extend them abroad. And it is toward the preservation of these fundamentals that I, as a member of his Cabinet, am devoting my energies today. For it is my particular job, as Secretary of Defense, to help maintain the United States in an environment of security and peace, so that all can go forward toward the greater realization of our American ideals.

Thanks to these policies, foreign and domestic, of President Truman, and to the wholehearted support of the American people behind them, the United States is currently enjoying unparalleled prosperity at home and wholesome respect abroad.

At home, according to a recent sample survey made by the Federal Reserve Board, every other American family owns at least one automobile. Three out of four families hold life-insurance policies with premiums of more than $100 a year. Seven out of 10 have bank accounts or own Government savings bonds. Forty-five percent own a house or a farm. But why go on with cold, impersonal statistics when practically every one of us can look at himself and measure the strength of his own position? Everyone of us knows that his life is better protected, his opportunity for useful and productive work greater, and his standard of living higher than ever before in our history. And when compared with what the men and women of any other country in the world have today, each of us can well apply to himself the colloquial judgment of our service veterans in occupied territories, "We never had it so good."

Unfortunately, there are some people who refuse to be happy. They seem to be so constituted that they literally enjoy gloom. They are the pessimists who seem to get a sadistic pleasure out of punishing themselves. They are convinced that only tragedy will overtake us if we persist in following what they regard as new ways.

These dire prophets, however, are no novelty in American life. There always have been some Americans whose affection for the past was such an obsession that they wanted to go through tomorrow's life in yesterday's environment. For them the old way is the best way—the true way—forever. "Oh, for the good old days," is their incessant cry. Any attempt to utilize the inherent flexibility of our Constitution, our laws, our customs, and our manners, to enable us to meet the needs of life in an atomic age, they regard as heretical—as radical and dangerous. They act as if our splendid American civilization is already nearing its meridian when, in fact, "We are yet only at the cock-crowing and the morning star."

We will not listen to prophets of doom. We know that the promise of today and tomorrow for ourselves and our children is still as unlimited as it ever was. Yes; we have problems—fiscal, economic, political, and military; problems of management and of labor; of government and of business; national and international—tougher problems than we have ever had before. But we, the heirs to the tradition of the frontier, are honest enough to face the facts, and intelligent enough and resourceful enough to solve our problems, no matter how difficult they may seem.

It is in that spirit that we have approached our present fiscal problem. In the world of today national defense has a priority lien on the Federal budget. It is not a priority of our own choice. It is a priority imposed upon us by world conditions—by the threat of imperialistic communism and its sinister forces that stand ready and alert to take advantage of physical or spiritual weakness wherever they may find them. The only way to avoid their dangers is to be—

"Strong in will
To strive, to seek, to find, and not to yield."

National defense, important as it is, however, is but one of the functions of our Government. Our Constitution was adopted not only to "provide for the common defense," but to "establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity."

The priority on the Nation's pocketbook that national defense must have today is not one, therefore, that can wholly monopolize the Federal budget. No one recognizes that fact any more than we in the Department of Defense. We realize that successful government has many important functions to perform and they have a direct bearing on our ability to wage and win war. The President took all of these factors, of needs in their relative importance, into consideration when he made up his budget for the coming year. It is a well-balanced budget, balanced between the national economy and the necessary costs of government, and balanced within itself among the requirements to serve the relative needs of the American people at this time.

All of us recognize that we cannot go on spending at the rate of the war years. No nation can go on year after year, with governmental expenditures of the size we have been putting out in the last decade and still remain solvent.

What can we do about it? The prescription is simple—cut expenses. Get down to basic essentials. This medicine may be hard to take, but as intelligent, loyal Americans, we know we must take it. Gracefully, therefore, we shall swallow it and, instead of crying about it, we shall redouble our energies and strive to continue to give the American people what they have a right to expect of their Government—a sound and efficient administration.

That is the spirit that permeates the Department of Defense today. It is clearly manifested by our asking from our Government more than a billion less this year than Congress gave us last year; and we are doing so in full confidence that we retain our posture of defense, and our capability to wage war successfully, if necessary. We will get along on less because we are going to make every dollar do more.

Our military budget recognizes the dynamic nature of present-day security. It reflects development in the art and science of warfare. It takes into consideration the capabilities of possible aggressors. It promotes the development of the instruments best adapted to thwart his aggressive designs. It provides the men and the sinews calculated by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to meet the minimum requirements of a sudden emergency. It increases the number of men in combat units at the expense of desk jobs in administrative overhead. It buys more aircraft for our Air Force. It provides more money for research and procurement of new weapons for our Army. It meets the Navy demands for antisubmarine warfare. It keeps the strength of the Marine Corps in relation to its parent service, the United States Navy, in the ratio required by law. It calls for the procurement of more guns, guided missiles, tanks, and trucks than we ordered last year. It provides for a reduction from 865,000 man-years of civilian employment this year to 725,000 next year. It continues to wage war on duplication and waste and to promote efficiency and sound organization. In short, it is a budget that says security first, economy second—and provides a sufficiency of defense for the hour.

Even so, it is a budget of some compromises. No one service could possibly get all that it felt it needed. In its initial phases when the budget represented merely the total estimates of all the services, it ran to $20,000,000,000. By the time it was presented by the President to the Congress, and, in its present form, it is, not including strategic stock piling, approximately $13,000,000,000.

The difference between the original estimate and the final figure is not simply an arithmetic answer in subtraction. It is an achievement of unification made possible by military and civilian leaders who, thoroughly loyal to their own Army, Navy, and Air Force, thought, and worked, and planned in a spirit of team effort which placed the good of the defense program as a whole above the interests of their respective services. I am very proud to be a member of such a team.

We still have many problems in the Defense Department and we will continue to have them as long as we exist. Fundamentally they are human problems which human beings with good will toward each other can solve. We will solve these and any other defense problems that may arise, among ourselves in the American way—in the democratic way. We will gather facts. We will plan. We will consult. We will deliberate. We will listen. Finally, we will decide. We are determined not to suffer from the uncertainties that prevail of no decision when a definite decision is demanded. Always, we shall strive for decisions that are right, right on all the facts available, and after all sides have been given an opportunity to express their views. We shall make every effort to make our decisions right and to keep them right. Sometimes we will err, as all human beings must, but they will be honestly made, not errors resulting from undue haste or lack of study or deliberation. But in spite of these hazards, we shall not be deterred from making decisions when decisions are called for. I shall always remember the old maxims of the Field Service Regulations that were taught me in training camp at Fort Benjamin Harrison in 1917. They are still applicable:

"Vague or ambiguous orders indicate vacillation and the absence of any definite decision on the part of the officer responsible for them. Troops have a right to be told, in terms that are direct and unmistakable, exactly what it is their leader wants them to do."

We have made decisions in the unification of our armed forces—budgetary decisions, strategic decisions, personnel decisions—and never without giving all sides a hearing. They are honest decisions, the best possible decisions that such leaders as our Joint Chiefs of Staff and our Secretaries could help make. For these decisions we have assumed full responsibility to our Chief, the President of the United States, to the American people, and to their duly elected Members of the Congress.

On their own, the American people, too, have made certain far-reaching decisions in recent years in international matters. They have decided that our fate is linked with western Europe, that the chances of our survival and the survival of our American way of life depend on a climate favorable to democracy and unfavorable to communism; and we are proceeding accordingly. We are giving economic aid and military assistance to our friends to strengthen their financial structure and their ramparts, and to raise their confidence in their ability to resist communism.

These decisions were made in a series of positive actions taken in accordance with

the established procedures of our Government. They were not sudden decisions. Each took time in the making. Each was aimed to meet a crisis in world affairs. Each was inspired by the President who is keenly alert to the shifting tides of the cold war.

Each decision was preceded by painstaking study and research. We in the Departments studied them. We drew up preliminary plans. We presented them to the President. He approved them and made them part of his program. Congress in committee and in regular session discussed them. Hearings were thorough and complete. The State Department, the Department of National Defense and others had an opportunity to express their views. Risks involved were considered and weighed. Finally, there was the act of Congress and the approval of the President. Thus each decision became a national decision, arrived at in typical American fashion.

Each far-reaching decision—the Truman doctrine, the European recovery program, the North Atlantic Pact, the mutual-assistance program—each ran the gauntlet of the presentation of facts, discussion, deliberation, and decision. Each decision was clear-cut. Each decision was one that not only we in America but peoples everywhere could understand. And the implications of each decision are now clear to all friends and to all possible foes. Peace, I venture, is more secure today than at any time since VJ-day, and it is secure because the American people were not afraid to make decisions and to stand by them.

In the coming months Congress will be called upon to provide the necessary funds to continue to give effect to these far-reaching decisions in international matters we already have made. My full faith in the good judgment of the Congress leaves me no doubt of the action that will finally be taken. To paraphrase the words of President Truman in his recent message on the State of the Union, I am confident that our Nation will not fail "to put a roof on the house after building the foundation and the walls" in our program of European recovery and mutual security.

While the blaze of publicity has focused public interest primarily on our decisions affecting Europe, we have also gone ahead nearer home with equal zest to formulate policies to strengthen our hemisphere solidarity against possible war. We in the Americas, dedicated to the same ideals, have long been engaged in working together and striving together to keep our continent out of war and to promote the blessings of peace among ourselves. Before we in the United States had our North Atlantic Pact and the mutual defense assistance program with our European friends we already had established their counterpart with our American neighbors, for the regional defense of our continent, in the Rio Treaty of 1947 and the Inter-American System formalized in Bogota in 1948. So when the time came to draw up the North Atlantic Pact and the provisions for a mutual-aid program for Europe, we followed the model, in words and spirit, of these two monumental agreements with our American neighbors already in effect for the better defense of the Western Hemisphere.

Together the North Atlantic Treaty and the Rio Treaty are twin security measures conceived in the interests of peace and the preservation of civilization. Our decisions and the decisions of our partners on both sides of the Atlantic are the stabilizing factors in today's world of unrest. They have given faith to the weary and the oppressed and courage to the strong and free. Each decision freely reached and resolutely executed breeds additional confidence in us to face new problems without fear. It has been our heartening experience that any issue, no matter how complex, once honestly faced will be intelligently and equitably disposed of when nations of good will, such as our partners and ourselves, sit down to find a solution.

We have entered upon our New Year 1950 with a record of marked achievements but with some issues, national and international, yet to be met. The President has outlined them to the Congress. In the course of the next few months these issues before the American people will be met faithfully and definite decisions will be reached. I am confident the decisions will be sound, that the American people will support them. Under the leadership of President Truman, we will continue to point the way toward a prosperous, secure, and peaceful world.

Are We Headed Toward Collectivism?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH W. GWINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of all the Members of the House a very timely statement by Senator BYRD, of Virginia, warning us that "we are rushing headlong down the road to collectivism or socialism much in the manner of Great Britain."

The statement follows:

I would define collectivism as a system of government which subordinates individual freedom and initiative to an all-powerful state in which the government supports the people rather than the people the government. But for the sake of those who wish to be academic, the Library of Congress has supplied this definition of collectivism:

"A political or economic doctrine which maintains that the ownershp of property, especially land and capital, should reside in the community as a whole or in the state as the designated agent of the people. Collectivism is a broader term than communism in that revolutionary methods are not necessarily advocated. Moreover, the term is to be distinguished from socialism in its advocacy of broader controls over property rights."

It is my belief that we are rushing headlong down the road to collectivism or socialism much in the manner of Great Britain. The foundation stone of democracy, indeed of all our liberties, is the free-enterprise system; we cannot long enjoy political and religious liberty unless we likewise possess economic liberty. But the free-enterprise system is being dealt savage blows—and if the trend is too long continued will be destroyed—by (1) excessive Federal spending; (2) excessive taxation; (3) excessive government regulation; (4) excessive government competition with private business.

It is a very ominous sign that, in a period of peace and high prosperity, our Government has again embarked on deficit spending.

The American people never will knowingly and voluntarily give up their liberties, but the entire trend of government during the past 15 or more years has been gradually and definitely toward a highly regimented state with personal liberty subordinated to bureaucratic control. Those who have determined the course of government during these years have proceeded on the theory that the Government knows best, and that the Government should determine when its citizens should reap and when they should sow. Planned economy has been the fashion, and planned economy, in its ultimate form, is collectivism

An independent study recently transmitted to the Congressional Joint Committee on the Economic Report by President Truman's Council of Economic Advisers declared that the United States economy "is no longer a purely free and competitive economy." This study, carried through by Drs. Calvin B. Hoover and B. U. Ratchford of Duke University, examined the "impact of Federal policies on the economy of the South." While it was not endorsed by the Council, I am advised that it was sent by the Council of Economic Advisers to the Joint Congressional Committee "with great pleasure."

To my knowledge, this is the first federally sponsored study, originating in the executive branch and transmitted officially to Congress (or a congressional committee), in which it is stated that ours "is no longer a purely free and competitive economy." The authors, however, do go on to say that the economy of this Nation "is not consciously planned and directed by the National Government."

Presidential proposals this year included these:

Authority to control prices, wages, and employment practices; commodity control allocations; extended authority over consumer credit and bank reserve requirements; extended federalized power development through public works; expanded federalized insurance; socialization of agriculture (which turned out to be the Brannan plan); federalized urban redevelopment, housing and farm housing; federally aided education and socialized medicine, the latter being the most costly and far-reaching Federal program yet proposed. Adoption of a Fair Employment Practices Commission, recommended by the President, would empower the Federal Government to enter every private business and say who should be hired or promoted.

Such proposals, if adopted, would expand nearly 100 different programs already spreading out like tentacles from among the 60 principal Federal departments and agencies which extend Federal administration through financial aids, grants, subsidies, and benefits; pay rolls, pensions, payments, and virtually every other form of Government advance and contribution. It is my firm belief—and this is buttressed by history—that the people cannot surrender such vast power without eventually sacrificing basic individual freedoms.

Congress has so far defeated or resisted many of these new recommendations for extending Government control over individual citizens and embarking on new ventures of huge and unpredictable costs. But I say advisedly that if and when these proposals which the President is now urging upon Congress are enacted into law, then we shall have irrevocably committed ourselves to a socialistic state from which there can be no retreat.

Whether or not consciously planned and directed, the influence of these payments and programs of the National Government infiltrates the privacy of individuals, the policies of business, agriculture and labor, and the prerogatives of local, State, and foreign governments.

There are 17,000,000 people in the United States receiving monthly checks supplied by one or another program or payment pipe line from the Federal Treasury. That is the equivalent of 1 in each 9 of the total population, the equivalent of one-third of the total labor force. It should be noted, parenthetically, that when those receiving direct payments from State and local governments are added to the 17,000,000, the number of persons on public pay rolls becomes roughly 25,000,000. That is one-sixth of the population of the United States.

But it becomes impossible to arrive at the total number of persons affected by the programs and payments of the National Government when we include those receiving interest payments on war bonds and other Government securities; and when we add the mil-

lions more who benefit indirectly from approximately $25,000,000,000 flowing from the Federal Treasury into business through subsidies, purchases, construction contracts, and other expenditures, including those made in this country for the foreign-aid programs.

These vast spending programs lead directly to excessive taxation, which destroys the seed money necessary for industrial expansion, and on which increased employment depends. We are spending $15,250,000,000 for civilian domestic functions of the Federal Government, exclusive of $5,500,000,000 in interest on the national debt. To this add some $15,000,000,000 for national defense and about $7,000,000,000 for foreign aid—and you have the basis for an estimate that expenditures this fiscal year will come to between $42,000,000,000 and $45,000,000,000.

Against these three figures, the most authoritative estimate of revenue is approximately $37,200,000,000. Thus our deficit in the current year may be anticipated at between $5,000,000,000 and $8,000,000,000. Without retrenchment or new taxes it will be larger in the year beginning July 1, 1950. In the last fiscal year it was nearly $2,000,000,000.

And this chain of peacetime deficits is to be piled upon a postwar debt of a quarter of a trillion dollars. There are some self-styled Washington economists who say it is of no consequence so long as we owe it to ourselves. Stop and think of what that means: that debt means that each of us is responsible for nearly $2,000 of it. It is our debt to the extent that we own war bonds; to the extent that our bank savings are invested in it, and our life insurance for the protection of our families. It belongs to us to the extent that one dollar out of every seven we pay in Federal taxes goes to pay ourselves interest. And it will belong to us if the time ever arrives when the interest is not met or when it cannot be refinanced. It certainly will belong to us if it is not paid off.

There is documented evidence that business expansion is being discouraged. If the economy of this Nation is not consciously planned and directed by the Government, then our lack of consciousness can be traced to a total indifference to the warnings which have been flashing for some time along this economic primrose path.

I say there is literally nothing in the world today so important as to preserve the solvency of the American dollar and the American free-enterprise system.

This free-enterprise system supports the Government of this Nation in its present form and no other economic system can do that.

If the free-enterprise system falls, the Federal Government of the United States as it is known to the world also will fall.

If the American system and the American Government fall, so will the last hope for the preservation of freedom and democracy in the world.

To change our course, I would begin by eliminating the incompetence and extravagance that permeat virtually every branch of the Federal service. By this means, and notably by the dismissal of all unnecessary Government personnel, Federal spending could be drastically reduced. I would balance the budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, on a basis of sound fiscal policies. I would abolish functions of government that are too costly and infringe upon the economic freedoms of our people. The exhaustive Hoover Commission report shows—and my own careful and exhaustive research over a period of 15 years confirms—that the Federal budget could be drastically slashed without any decrease in essential services.

I would change the present trend to collectivism by eliminating from high council those who distrust the people and feel that the people are not capable of handling their own affairs with an absolute minimum of Government interference.

I would reverse our present trend by appointing to administrative positions persons who recognize that the free-enterprise system is the foundation stone upon which this Nation was built, and that its maintenance is essential to the preservation of individual liberty and to the advancement of economic, political, scientific, and human progress.

I would reverse the trend also by demanding that governmental administrators heed an economic truism: that excessive Federal spending necessarily must lead to excessive taxation or national bankruptcy; and that free enterprise cannot expand under long-continued oppressive taxation. Insolvency is the only alternative, but if insolvency comes in, freedom must go out.

An essential ingredient in reversing the trend toward collectivism is not new restrictive laws and oppressive regulations, but rather a desire and a determination on the part of those in authority to preserve our free enterprise system and the principles of government that have made us great.

Many civilizations which have entered the domain of history seem to present two evolutionary periods. The first period is that in which the individual seeks to safeguard himself against the excesses of arbitrary power by exacting guaranties from those trusted to rule. The second is that in which these guarantees are gradually surrendered to the collective power of the mass.

Let us always remember that human freedom is not a gift to man. It is an achievement by man, and, as it was gained by vigilance and struggle, so it may be lost by indifference and supineness.

What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I delivered on America's Town Meeting, Town Hall, New York, on January 24, 1950, on the subject What Is the Difference Between Socialism and Social Welfare?:

The policy of the administration of the Government of the United States falls squarely between those which are being advocated here by you, Mr. Thomas, and you, Mr. Steinkraus. I am in favor of the administration's policies and programs which, so far, have kept us moving forward on a sound democratic course—avoiding the rocks of reaction on the right and socialism on the left. The people of the United States obviously believe in, endorse, and support the policies of our constitutionally elected Government, since they have approved them in elections for 18 years, and will do so again next November.

Some have called what we have now a welfare state; some have called it a hand-out state—frequently by the same people. I do not know exactly what those terms mean as used by them and I do not propose wasting time by trying to define words and slogans. What we need to define are our objectives.

The best test of democratic government is the efficiency with which it serves the needs of all the people. The policy of our administration is to meet those needs under a system of free enterprise, and I submit that we are better free enterprisers than would be the kind of government which Mr. Steinkraus advocates.

What we seek is to meet the needs of our people in a complex society and at the same time maintain those essential freedoms of choice and action on which our Republic was founded to preserve.

We are striving to follow a policy of bolstering free enterprise in America by making it as really free as it can be in an industrial society.

No government which did not believe in free enterprise would have pushed private ownership of homes and farms as we have—would have made credit available to farmers and businessmen when they couldn't get it any place else, not only to save farms and businesses from failure, but to put families on land of their own and to help more people get a start in business, including many thousands of GIs.

We are really working for free enterprise when we seek to protect small businesses against the inroads of monopoly. We are really working for free enterprise when we seek to protect the bargaining rights of working men and women.

We are working for free enterprise when we help to build a healthy community, one in which people have decent homes, an opportunity for jobs, a right to get a good education. We are working for free enterprise when we preserve and develop our natural resources for the creation of new wealth, which in turn will create new industries and new jobs, for the benefit of all the people.

We are working for free enterprise when we work for economic stability on our farms, and for security during periods of unemployment and in old age.

These are some of the things we are doing. We do them because we do not believe that free enterprise is a privilege for just a few people at the top of the heap, but is the right of all the people.

Government is the means of coordinating our efforts so that we can work together to obtain goals which would be impossible to us as individuals. That may be socialism in the eyes of Mr. Steinkraus, but it is not socialism in the minds and hearts of the American people.

We all benefit when we work together and build a TVA or a Central Valley project.

We all benefit when we work together and devise a system of social security and unemployment insurance.

You can call that what you will. You can call it the New Deal, the Fair Deal, the square deal. You can call it the welfare state. Or you can call it hard times. But to me it is something which comes from the American genius. The ability to make things work. We are trying to make our economic system and our constitutionally elected and responsible Government work for us—for all of us. We intend to be neither the slaves of a system nor the slaves of a group of economically powerful masters. Call it whatever you want, but I call it the American way.

Mr. Lea Discusses the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. PERCY PRIEST
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to

include a statement by a former distinguished Member of the House of Representatives, Mr. Clarence F. Lea, of California.

Mr. Lea has for a number of years engaged in an intensive study of our system of electing a President and Vice President. As a result of that study he has from time to time urged that the Congress adopt a resolution calling for an amendment to the Constitution that would revise our present system.

In the following statement Mr. Lea sets forth what I consider to be some very pertinent arguments in favor of revision of our present system:

The outstanding question before Congress as to modernizing our presidential election is whether or not Congress will give the people of each State a chance to have their ballots for President credited to the candidates for whom they are voted.

Under the present method of electing the President only one man, the plurality candidate in the State, is given credit for all the votes of that State. All other votes are credited in the electoral college as if cast for that one man. The minority party in the State may be the Democratic or Republican Party, or a third party, but the votes for their candidates are alike ignored.

In the last 11 elections, from 1908 to 1948, the American people indirectly cast 372,546,637 votes for President. Of this total vote, 163,379,535 votes, or over 43 percent, were credited in the electoral college as if cast for the candidates other than those for whom they were voted.

In the last presidential election over 23,660,000 votes, or 48 percent of all cast, were credited to candidates for whom they were not voted.

The last presidential election is simply typical of the present method of crediting votes. In the States he carried, President Truman received 14,600,000 votes in his favor. In the same States his opponents received 13,030,000 votes, all of which were credited to Mr. Truman in the electoral college. In the States he carried he received only about 1,500,000 less votes on account of his opponents' votes than he did for his own votes.

In States Mr. Truman did not carry he was denied credit for over 9,000,000 votes cast in his favor.

Mr. Dewey, in the States he carried, received 9,927,000 votes. He also received credit in the electoral college for 10,309,000 votes cast for his opponents in the States he carried. In other words, he received more credit in the electoral college for the votes of his opponents than he did for his own votes in the States he carried.

In the election of 1912 Wilson, Taft, and Theodore Roosevelt each received more credit in the electoral college for the votes cast in favor of their opponents than they did for votes cast for themselves. (See House hearings, p. 42.)

Either the Republican or Democratic Party may be the minority party in one State and the majority party in another. Whether or not its members belong to either the minority or the majority party should not make a particle of difference as to whether or not the voter's ballot should be credited in every State. The present method is poor sportsmanship. It is necessary and desirable for the prevalence of our party system and for the country's welfare, that each party should have its proper credit in every State.

Every lawful vote is entitled to be credited in the ultimate count of the election, just as a simple matter of political integrity.

Our electoral system provides no logical method of compensating the minority candidate for the votes cast in his favor but denied him in the electoral college. The votes of the minority party are denied it, regardless of whether the plurality be 1 or 1,000,000.

The House hearings show the credit given the two leading candidates in the last election for the first eight States, selected alphabetically, and carried by each candidate. For every 100 votes for Mr. Truman in the States he carried he received credit in the electoral college ranging from 162 to 210, and Mr. Dewey received credit in the electoral college from 176 to 203.

These erratic results of popular voting are due to the fact that the present method of counting votes has no logical relation to the population of the State or to the relative strength of the candidates within the State.

HOW THE VOTES ARE COUNTED

Under our present method of electing a President, there are three fundamental ways of disposing of the States' electoral votes:

First, the only candidate in the State who gets credit in the electoral college for his votes in that State is the one candidate who has a plurality of the popular votes.

Second, the plurality candidate also gets credit in the electoral college for all votes in favor of his opponents in such State. That is true, regardless of the size of the plurality vote or the minority vote.

Third, every candidate in every State is denied credit in the electoral college for all the votes cast for him in every State in which he fails to secure a plurality.

This method of counting votes wholly ignores the real character of our Presidential election. The election is a national election to elect a President for the whole country. It is separately conducted in each of the 48 States, but the issues run crosswise over every State in the Nation. It is a contest to approve or oppose candidates and policies. The political party engaged in the contest seeks to ally all persons throughout the Nation to rally in support of its candidate and its cause.

A HOMELY ILLUSTRATION

The object of an election is somewhat like a census. Suppose the Bureau of the Census was called upon to take a census of sheep and goats. It counts two large groups in one State and finds there are 200,000 goats and 200,001 sheep. Then in its return it would report a total af 400,001 sheep and say nothing about the goats. The enumerator would go to the next State, and he might find there were 60,000 sheep and 100,000 goats. He would report that there were 160,000 goats. Such a method of enumeration would be so devoid of common sense that all would brand it as stupid.

Is it much less stupid when the same method is pursued by a great government in holding an election to determine the will of the people of the Nation under constitutional authority as to who shall be their President?

The election is held in New York. It is found that the candidate with 45 percent of the votes has more than any other, so the report to Congress gives credit for New York as 100-percent Democratic or 100-percent Republican. The election is held in another State in which one party carried by a majority of 600,000. No more credit is given than if it were carried by a majority of 1. Such a method is not only senseless, but it is unjust and vicious.

Now Congress has the chance to give the people of the Nation the opportunity to determine whether they want to continue such a stupid method of voting.

As clearly set forth on page 21 and the following pages of the House hearings, the original unit vote was imposed upon the country 12 years after the Constitution was adopted. In every case the unit vote was engrafted on the electoral system by the dominating leaders of either one or the other of the two political parties then existing. The sole purpose was to prevent the opposite party from sharing in the State electoral vote. That effort is now a matter of history. The unit voting system has acquired no additional virtue in the many decades it has been in operation. It lacks fairness, it is unjust in its operation, and is a constant barrier to the accurate and just operation of our electoral system.

PROPOSED PLAN BASED ON EXPERIENCE OF THE NATION

The plan proposed in the amendment is one mainly based upon the experience of our American political life. Our general method of election, approved by experience as applied to Senators, governors, and Representatives, and other important officials, is to give the final election to the plurality candidate. All lawful votes, wherever cast, are counted and credited to the candidate for whom they are cast. When the totals are added, the election is decided in favor of the plurality candidate.

That is in substance what is proposed here. The Constitution allots the voting power to each State according to its population. Under the plan proposed, the people of the State, by their votes, determine how their electoral vote shall be credited. The electoral votes of all candidates in all States are added up, and the election is settled.

THE ALLOTMENT OF ELECTORAL VOTES

House Joint Resolution 2 and Senate Joint Resolution 2, which are identical, do not propose to change the voting power of the State. That voting power is clearly defined by the Constitution. Each State has votes in Congress according to the number of their Senators and Representatives. Each State has electoral votes in the same number that it has votes in Congress. The Constitution provides "Electors of each State shall have the qualifications requisite for election of the most numerous branch of the State legislature." In substance, the Constitution says to each State, "You shall decide who your voters shall be. All the Constitution requires is that in qualifying voters for Federal offices you shall apply the same standards you apply for the election of your own officials."

Electoral votes are allotted to the States primarily on the basis of population. In substance each State has the same number of electors as it has Representatives in Congress on the basis of population—two electors for each State regardless of population or the number of voters.

As the apportionment now stands, 82 percent of the electoral votes are granted in proportion to the population of the States; 18 percent or 96 electoral votes are granted by allotment of two votes to each State regardless of population.

Under the pending proposal, the presidential elector would be eliminated, and the people of each State would vote directly for President. The State electoral votes would be retained and disposed of in exact proportion to the popular vote in each State. No fairer method of division of electoral votes can be devised so far as the State disposal of its electoral votes is concerned. When votes are allotted to the States on the basis of population, we have a common unit as between the States based on population for the allotment of 82 percent of the electoral votes.

So far as the votes are allotted in proportion to population, they represent a common unit between the States as to the number of people represented, even though the States may differ as to the number of popular votes.

The two-vote allotment is not a common unit either from the standpoint of population or voters. Under the proposed plan, as contrasted with the present, the criticism on the basis of discrimination is very largely eliminated.

In my judgment the best possible common unit between the States is based on equality

of population. The best available source of a common unit as to the two-vote allotment is under the plan proposed, which would very greatly minimize any objection that could be made to this grant to the small States regardless of population.

The people of each State determine who their voters shall be. Those selected, regardless of their proportionate number of the State population, represent the State. Those who vote, whether 40 out of 100 or 30 out of 100, represent 100 people in every State. The standard of the Constitution is representation according to population and not according to the number of voters. That is a basic fact we must recognize in appraising our electoral system. Our Senators, our Representatives, or electoral votes primarily represent population and not voters.

Last election only one-third of the Nation voted. The Congressman represents the whole people of his district; not merely the one-third who voted.

CHANGES PROPOSED

As pointed out in the House report on House Joint Resolution 2, it is fortunate that the outstanding defects of our present method of electing the President are comparatively easy to remedy. Each change proposed in our electoral system by House Joint Resolution 2 simply removes an archaic provision, and in every instance substitutes a means more like we use to elect Senators, Representatives in Congress, and State officials generally.

The President must now be elected by Presidential electors. Under the proposed plan he would be elected directly by the vote of the people. Electoral votes would be allotted by popular votes.

Under the present plan, voters by the millions at each election are disfranchised. Votes are counted by the millions contrary to the way they were cast. No minority candidates are given credit in the electoral college. Under the proposed plan every lawful vote would be counted as cast. No candidate, as now, would receive credit for votes cast for his opponent.

Under the present plan the possibility of election in the House of Representatives, except as provided in the twentieth amendment, would be eliminated. Under the proposed plan the plurality candidate would be elected. Under the present method a majority of the electoral votes is necessary to elect. However, the presidential electors are elected by plurality votes.

Fourteen of our Presidents have been elected by a minority of the popular votes. If the Constitution required a majority of the popular vote to elect, 14 of the Presidents would have been defeated unless elected by the House.

THE AMENDMENT PROPOSES AN IMPORTANT CHANGE AS TO THE TWO-VOTE ALLOTMENT

The allotment of two votes to each State regardless of population is manifestly not on a uniform basis either as to the number of voters or the population of a State. If the two electoral votes of the State were divided by a vote of its own people, there is no injustice to the State.

However, the two-vote allotment is of important concern in the apportionment of electoral votes between the different States. Ninety-six votes to be disposed of regardless of population is an important factor in our electoral system.

It may be conceded that the two-vote allotment is not a grant of electoral power on a uniform basis, as measured by either population or the number of voters involved. This grant of gratuitous voting power to each State regardless of population has been defended as one of the checks and balances of our Government. It has a similarlity to the Senate, whose Members are likewise not allotted on the basis of either voters or population. Nevertheless the Senate has served as a check and balance, and to the advantage of the country as a whole. It is highly improbable that the country would ever take away this two-vote allotment.

If we look upon it as an objectionable grant of power, the effect of the two-vote allotment is largely minimized by the geographic distribution of the small States which can use the two-vote allotment to their advantage. (See House hearings on House joint resolution, pp. 63–66.)

Those who object to the two-vote allotment regardless of population will find that the proposed constitutional amendment greatly reduces and minimizes any possible objection they may have.

At the present time all these 96 electoral votes are allotted to a plurality candidate. That means that no other party shares in the allotment of the two votes thus granted to each State.

For instance, in a State with four electoral votes, two votes are allotted to the plurality candidate and nothing to a minority candidate. Under the proposed plan, if one candidate, for instance, carried that State by a 10-percent plurality he would receive one and two-tenths electoral votes, while the minority candidate would receive eight-tenths of one electoral vote. So these two candidates would neutralize each other's vote to the extent of 90 percent and reduce the gratis vote from two to two-tenths of one vote.

This is better illustrated by the election of 1944. Mr. Roosevelt received 72 of the 2-vote allotment and Mr. Dewey 24. Had the proposed plan been in operation, the margin of Mr. Roosevelt on account of the 2-vote allotment would have been less than 14 instead of a margin of over 48 votes that he did receive. In other words, the present plan gives the two-vote allotment entirely to the plurality candidate. By the division of these votes between the candidates, the only gratis margin accruing to the benefit of the plurality candidate is confined to the percentage of his plurality.

In view of this change, the two-vote allotment when considered in connection with the geographical distribution of these votes (as explained on pp. 63–66 of the House hearings) would be of minor importance and would very largely remove any legitimate criticism that can be directed at the two-vote allotment.

A DANGEROUS IMPLICATION

Recently I was somewhat amazed to read a contention that the pending resolution to modify our electoral system carried a dangerous implication, because the proposed system would credit each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total votes. After 160 years of popular government we find an American citizen arguing that it is a dangerous thing for a lawful voter of the country to have the right to have his vote counted as he cast it. In my judgment, popular government and civilization itself will get a good deal further by counting lawful votes the way they are cast than it will by refusing to count them.

Where is the integrity and the fairness of elections if we insist on refusing to count votes lawfully cast?

Why invite people to vote if we do not intend to count their votes after they are cast?

If the people of the State do not have a right to control the disposal of the votes allotted them by the Constitution, who has such right?

Is there any fairer way that can be devised for dividing the State vote other than in accordance with the will of the voters of that State as expressed at the polls?

It has been suggested that the proposed method of election is by proportional representation. Clearly proportional representation has nothing to do with this proposed plan. Proportional representation applies only where there are two or more offices to be filled.

In the proposed plan we have a division of votes in the same way we have a proportional division of votes in the election of a Governor, a Senator, or a Representative. The popular votes are converted into electoral units to form a common voting unit as between the States. All the votes in every voting area are counted, the totals are established, and the candidate having the greatest number of votes is elected.

Among other things, it has been contended that permitting minority candidates to be credited with electoral votes in proportion to their popular votes would unduly encourage the formation of numerous political parties. The fact is that in 15 different presidential elections the electoral votes have been divided between three or more candidates, and no party has long remained a party of consequence unless it has established itself as one of the leading parties of the Nation. The answer against needless multiplicity of parties is not by suppression of lawful votes.

Whenever a group is able to control the plurality of the State vote, however small that plurality may be, it gets credit for the total vote of the State. It then dominates the State.

Under the proposed method the minority candidates will get credit for their votes, but for the number of their votes only—no more or no less. They will get the credit they deserve, but no fictitious credit.

One of the distinct advantages of the proposed amendment would be that it will minimize the illicit influence that small groups can now exert through claiming a balance of power controlling the whole vote of such States.

What is more important in our electoral system than to have the votes counted as cast? No suppression of lawful votes and no credit for votes for candidates for which they were not cast.

Every lawful voter in this country should go to the ballot booth with the consciousness that his ballot will be counted as cast and have its proper part in deciding who shall be President. Under the present plan an average of 44 percent of our people who vote have no influence whatever in the final count.

Suppression and misappropriation of votes is an offense of a monumental character against our popular form of government. The only remedy in sight is the adoption of Senate and House Joint Resolution 2.

Statement Reds Could Knock Out United States in 90 Seconds Unadulterated "Baloney"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial which appeared in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on January 30, 1950:

SENSE AND NONSENSE

Two well-known public officials have just made statements concerning the national defense of the United States. One sounds wholly sensible, the other wholly ridiculous.

Governor Gruening of Alaska says the Territory which he is responsible for could be captured "tomorrow" by one or two parachute divisions coming across the Bering Strait. That sounds sensible. Settlements in Alaska are relatively small and spread far apart. We know that the vast area as yet has little means for defense.

The statement which is wholly ridiculous comes from Senator MUNDT. The South Dakotan says that Russia "could knock out the United States in 90 seconds." This assumes that the United States would know even less about such an attack in advance than it knew about Japanese movements prior to Pearl Harbor. It assumes that atom bombs can be carried around in vest pockets and left in factory lockers. It assumes that our Air Force, Army and Navy, with the greatest defense budgets in our history, have no plans for the protection of the Nation.

Governor Gruening should be listened to, Senator MUNDT.

F. D. R.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert a very thoughtful statement made by Steve Walsh who writes under the column well known to newspaper readers in Massachusetts called the Bell Ringer, which appeared in the Lynn Telegram-News, Lynn, Mass., Monday, January 30, 1950:

They either held him in high respect or they hated the mention of his name. I'm referring, of course, to the thirty-second President of the United States because today is the sixty-eighth birthday of Franklin Delano Roosevelt. And in case it is of momentous interest to anyone, just count me as one who thought a lot of the man; the cripple in the White House, who gets bigger in name as time tolls the bell.

You got to have some form of infirmity to clearly understand what F. D. R. did for his race. Blind malice can always find a mark to shoot at, and in their madness of heart the venom of narrow souls poured out plenty of vituperation on Roosevelt. And to even think that there will be a discontinuance of this type of angry spite is like emulating Canute and telling onward waves to halt.

If you want to feel humble take a ride over through Poughkeepsie and then move along to Hyde Park, N. Y. Take a walk through the famed James R. Roosevelt estate, formerly the home of F. D. R.'s half-brother. Just beyond is the memorial building bequeathed by the late President to the people of the United States. Nearby is his grave marked by a simple marble slab; that and nothing more.

Around this plot is a 100-year old hemlock hedge, and though seemingly tens of people are always near you during your short visit, somehow you feel alone. That strange sensation will not live down as you meditate; the thought of what lies before you deep in the bowels of the earth. There are the remains of the man who at one time was the most powerful individual in the history of time.

But that has been changed, and the little mound and marker are all that remains. Unless you want to digress and point out what will be going on Tuesday, February 7, in many States of the Nation. Roosevelt's birthday has usually been the signal for an outpouring of the faithful to get ready for that date. Gayety is the watchword, not solemnity. A hundred-dollar ticket is the credential to a feast that is likened to ambrosia.

For this is the gathering of the boys and their better-halves; this is the long-awaited occasion to look each other over, to talk political shop, to make hay dipped in golddust, to laugh and cheer and applaud with high spirit, to try and emulate the bon vivants of yesteryear; in short, to keep up with the Joneses among whom Jesse Jones is one. But one voice will be missing: the mellifluent tone of the spellbinder, who always could say: "My frans."

Republicans will rave and rant about this sumptuous meal. They will call it undemocratic, and sulk like little children. But the delicious smells from the kitchen will be enjoyed, the tinkling of glasses will ring clear, the appetizing food will be consumed, and Democrats will still call this act "a division of the spoils."

The Challenge to Our Two-Party System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, Under leave to extend my remarks, I include an address by my able colleague from Connecticut, the Honorable JOHN DAVIS LODGE, delivered before the Women's National Republican Club of New York last Saturday.

In the usual vigorous and forthright manner which characterizes our distinguished colleague's words, as well as his deeds, Representative LODGE has made an important contribution to the public discussion surrounding the future of the Republican Party. His sincerity, his clarity, and his vision commend his remarks to the thoughtful consideration not alone of his colleagues, but of all voters regardless of their political affiliation.

The speech follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, for some time now I have been looking forward to the pleasure of meeting with you to discuss Republican plans and policies.

A discussion of the future of the Republican Party is, in a sense, like discussing the future of our country. I say this because, if the Republican Party should falter, there does not appear to be another party ready to take its place. And if we had but one party, then, in sober truth, America as we have known it would cease to exist.

In other words, the two-party system is probably the most important single factor in the preservation of American freedom.

If we had more than two major parties our political system would probably degenerate into a myriad of splinter parties reminiscent of Europe. We would then be a prey to the same sort of coalition governments, the same kind of cynical barters and trades which for so many years have been the curse of some of the European parliamentary systems. We would in all likelihood have a minority government which would be far too weak to preserve political stability. We would probably also forfeit the concept that a main purpose of government is to safeguard minority rights while protecting the majority from minority control. Indeed, in those circumstances we would have control by a minority.

On the other hand, if we had less than two parties, we would have a one-party system, and this would completely nullify our Constitution, neutralize our Bill of Rights, and invalidate all our free institutions. Our checks and balances would be but a nostalgic memory and there would be no separation of powers, since all power would be concentrated in one partisan instrumentality.

The two-party system is then an essential ingredient of the free system to which we owe most of our many blessings.

And yet we have a growing body of independent voters in America. More serious still, there were in the last presidential election some 45,000,000 people who failed to vote.

The independent voter represents the balance of power in our elections. To some extent this can be a healthy condition. It can put the major parties on their mettle. It can engender a fine spirit of political competition out of which the country can benefit. It can result in electing the best candidates to public office. It can produce sound policies and progressive programs.

But if independence of party is carried too far it can undermine our two-party system.

The increased independence of the American voter is in large part the fault of the parties themselves. It is due to an inability to make the parties attractive to a larger number of people. The Republican Party contains people of varying views, and this is natural since our party is a national party and since our country includes many races, creeds, occupations, and climates. Politics is in large part the art of conciliating varying and differing groups of people, of bringing them in and keeping them in under one partisan roof. The Republican Party must convince a majority of the people who vote that it has a constructive plan of action which will respond more effectively to the needs and aspirations of all the people than the tired clichés, the reckless promises, and the special interest appeals with which the Democrats have in recent years preyed upon the fears and apprehensions of the voters.

But this electoral independence is also, it seems to me, due to the fact that many people do not associate themselves with the political life of the Nation. It is due to the tendency of the independent voters to think that if the Republican Party should fall by the wayside, if it should succumb for lack of adherents, or because of an excess of independents, then that is tough luck for the Republicans. That is hard on the officeholders and on the party-workers. It is none of their affair. Yet it is, I fear, desperately true that the disappearance of the Republican Party would affect them as much as it would affect the Republicans. It would affect the Democrats. It would deeply affect the lives of all Americans. The American people have a great stake in the survival of the Republican Party. The independent voter depends for his independence upon the survival of the two-party system.

Narrow partisanship is, of course, deplorable. Partisanship which places party above patriotism, patronage above principle, and personalities above policies is highly reprehensible. Yet the best way to discourage such sordid attitudes and such demogogic practices is not to retire to the sidelines in derisive independence but rather to plunge into the political melee and endeavor to influence the party of one's choice in the direction of the people's real welfare. The best, the only way to be effective politically is through the medium of one of our two major parties. We cannot give a vigorous demonstration that we believe enthusiastically in our kind of government unless an increas-

ing number of Americans become increasingly active in politics.

In creating a broader basis of political participation, the women of America play a predominant part. For they have a dual role in politics. In the first place it is to them that we all look to maintain the home which is the most important political unit of all. Indeed, one of the first measures passed by the new Communist government in Russia some 30 years ago was an attempt to destroy the family. Nothing that we can do in Washington will matter if the American home disintegrates. The laws that we pass and the treaties that we sign will avail us little if America is destroyed from behind through our children, the men and women of the future. Certainly the burden of domesticity falls primarily on the women.

The second aspect of this duality is best illustrated by the great gathering here today. It is truly heartwarming to see such a large delegation from Connecticut and particularly from Fairfield County. In my first campaign for public office in 1946 I came to appreciate what a vital part the women of my district play in politics. They are patient in handling details; they are willing to undertake all manner of political chores which are as essential to victory as they are lacking in glamour; but above all, they bring into politics a much needed idealism. They bring it not only in their own status as politicians, but also through their influence with the men. The very qualities of sympathy and tenderness which make for a happy home make also for a more rounded and better balanced national political life.

And then, my friends, let me remind you that in the United States (as of the 1948 estimate of the Census Bureau) there are 1,669,000 more women of voting age than there are men. Accordingly, you not only hold the balance of voting power; you are the power. You are in a position to protect the great heritage of America not only in the home but with the ballot. You have wisely chosen as your instrumentality the Republican Party.

The Republican Party is the only political organism standing between the American people and one-party government.

Let us revive that old phrase which cub reporters used to practice on their typewriters: Now is the time for all good people to come to the aid of the Republican Party. Certainly now is the time. Now is the time for us to be imaginative, coherent, truly progressive.

Let us confront the real issues in an effort to discover how we can be of service to our country.

It has been the fashion in some quarters to think that our party is on the horns of the dilemma of choosing between a philosophy which some have called me-tooism and a point of view which others have labeled as reactionary. But this is not our choice. Certainly we must not follow and imitate where others lead and create. But neither must we be obstructionists. We must not disagree for the sake of disagreement. As I believe our distinguished guest Governor Driscoll has put it, we must not come out against the Ten Commandments just because the Democrats favor them. It is not sufficient for us merely to carp, to criticize, and to condemn. We must above all conserve, construct, and create. In its policies and in its actions our party must reflect the fundamental divisions of thought among the American people.

Now that does not mean that we must be horse-and-buggy die-hards. Nor does it mean that we should advocate the doctrine of laissez fairé. It does not mean that we must follow in the recent tradition of a small segment of the Republican Party who classify themselves as isolationists rather than in the far older, more wide-spread Republican tradition that what goes on outside our borders is of great concern to us. It does mean that we must produce feasible alternatives to the schemes of the Democrats which, if they were adopted, would destroy the very welfare of which the Democrats are the self-styled champions.

And, as a matter of fact, if one could believe Democrat oratory the Democrat Party would be the me-too party. A curious example of this attempt to be all things to all men is found in the President's recent message on the state of the Union which, I may say, contained a minimum amount of comment on the state of the Union and a maximum quantity of cynical political bait. The speech is interesting because the President, anxious to appease a growing body of aroused Americans, resorted to the very me-too philosophy which he has often attacked on those occasions when certain Republicans have agreed with him. In an effort to attract the support of those who are alarmed by the increasing cost of government, by deficit spending at a time of high national income, and by the growing might of the Washington bureaucrats, the President stated that "businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise."

Yet in the same breath he recommended a program which would go far toward eliminating these incentives, preclude the development of new enterprises, and concentrate more power in Washington.

The President also reiterated his desire for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law although the overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the House are opposed to repeal. Indeed, when repeal of the Taft-Hartley law came before the first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress only 30 Democrats out of 263 voted in favor of repeal. Furthermore, in spite of the President's request for repeal, the Democrat leadership has apparently decided to keep this issue for the 1950 campaign. I believe that this is a grave disservice to labor. I believe that labor is entitled to be influential in both parties. I believe that the welfare of the working men and women of America is entitled to the same bipartisan consideration as that which is accorded to the welfare of the Europeans. Labor and capital are component parts of what is essentially a cooperative effort. It should be the mission of the Republican Party to take labor legislation out of politics.

Furthermore, in order to provide more jobs and higher wages, in order to raise our standard of living, we must increase and improve our tools of production. This we cannot do if incentives are stifled, if risk investments are made so risky that people won't take a chance. This is the paramount interest of all of our citizens and in particular of labor. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to labor to discourage such investments.

The Republican Party should also point out to what degree the working men and women of our country are weighted down with taxes. Our Federal Government annually costs the average American between $275 and $300. It now owes the average American family of four somewhere between seven and eight thousand dollars. The average American citizen is plagued by dozens of invisible taxes. Yet the President talks of substantial tax increases.

A notable omission from the President's message is that it contains no reference to the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations which hitherto had been thought to have substantial bipartisan support. This is sad, indeed, particularly in view of the budgetary deficit because I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people, including those who want the Government to do so much, want it done without waste and with efficiency.

And while the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not a partisan matter; while they are supported by many citizens in both parties and by independent voters, certainly there is a tendency in some administration bureaucrats to prevent a proper streamlining of our Government. The Republicans should assert themselves to the utmost in order that the President and the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress should proceed with dispatch to the implementation of these recommendations.

With regard to what is often referred to as social legislation, there is no need to embrace the solutions offered by the Democrats. However, neither should we ignore these problems where they exist. It is up to us to demonstrate our imagination and our intellectual vigor by coming out with better solutions. Principally, however, the difference between our point of view and theirs is that for us it should be an effort to respond to a human need while for them it is usually part of a plot to concentrate additional power in Washington. Such centralization is, of course, pleasing to the Communists since it enables them more easily to undermine the morale of our people and to destroy the political fabric of our country.

Because the Government must be the servant of the people it must also be strong enough and wise enough to respond effectively to the problems of the day. While we provide incentives for the creation of new wealth, we must also intercede on behalf of those for whom life is particularly difficult in order that the people should retain their enthusiasm for the private-property system. While in order to raise our standard of living and buttress our economy we should reduce the national debt, effect large-scale economies in Government and return to sound fiscal policies, we must also assist those who have no more than a substandard on which to eke out a meager existence. But although the health of our Nation and the education of its citizens, old-age pensions and social security, minimum wages and unemployment compensation, large-scale production and full employment, rural electrification and flood control, adequate housing and soil conservation are all desirable objectives and all involve the people's welfare, we should burn into our brains the incontrovertible truth that the ultimate, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. Aid to the needy, to the unfortunate in our society, is right and just and feasible. But if every family receives housing, food, clothing, medical care, and education from Washington, we shall have embarked upon a course which will cause a break-down not only in the American economy but also in the American character. And when a government attempts to redistribute to the citizens more than the citizens can produce, inflation and eventual dictatorship are the inevitable result.

I believe most strongly that on the issue of civil rights, acting in the clear and vigorous tradition of Abraham Lincoln, we should take a forthright stand. This is in keeping with our platform.

On this matter the Democrats are hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective. We can and must be united and strong. The Democrats have with consummate hypocrisy attempted to use this great problem in human relations for partisan advantage. In the last few days the Democrats have had the chance to bring up legislation involving the right of equal opportunity to work, and they have resorted to every parliamentary trick to avoid the issue. We should take no part in such activities. We should carry the banner on the civil-rights program. This is not only right and just and in the best Republican tradition, but it will also be of great help to us in the battle for men's minds which we are waging throughout the world with the godless forces of Communist aggression.

And this brings me to the primary issue which faces our Nation—the issue of war and peace.

For it is relentlessly true that any social gains we make will melt like snow in the sun if we have war. And while this overriding issue should be met without regard to party advantage, it is more important to be right than to be bipartisan. And it must be increasingly clear to the people of America that it will be to their advantage to have in Washington a government which devotes its time not to a justification of its errors but to correcting them; not to covering up mistakes but to policies which will safeguard the peace. We have a right to demand of our officials that they place loyalty to America ahead of loyalty to their friends and cronies.

The most conspicuous and discouraging characteristic of Mr. Truman's message on the state of the Union is that it made no mention of the catastrophe in China and the Communist threat to Formosa and that it gave no indication as to how the state of the Union is affected by the dire events which in recent weeks have rung down the iron curtain on some 450,000,000 people in Asia. Communists all over the world cannot but applaud this dramatic absence.

While I do not feel that it is necessary or advisable for us to attempt to occupy the island of Formosa, I do believe that aid on the Greek pattern should be tried. It is undeniable that President Truman's statement on Formosa constitutes an abandonment of the Truman doctrine which is world-wide in scope. Formosa is the symbol of the failure of our entire Asiatic policy.

And so, in an effort to throw some light on this dangerous condition, I introduced a few days ago a resolution of inquiry in which I asked certain questions with regard to this entire lamentable affair. It seemed to me that the American people through their elected representatives were entitled to be informed.

It so happens that I have been a nonpartisan supporter of foreign-affairs legislation ever since I have been in Congress. But I do not feel that because I am a Republican, therefore I have no right to criticize or to disagree. I believe that the American people are entitled to a second voice on the great issue of life and death which is involved in our foreign affairs. And I believe that to attempt by cries of partisanship to deprive them of these criticisms in a matter of such grave importance is to subvert the great purpose of our political system at a time of increasing national peril.

If we Republicans abdicate our prerogatives, America may soon become an island of liberty in a sea of slavery.

In order to keep the light of freedom burning ever more brightly in a dangerous world, we in America must create a broader base of partisan political participation. More and more of our citizens must become politically active if we are to preserve the system which makes their political participation possible. Political duties are inevitable corollaries of political rights. Freedoms and responsibilities are inseparable. By discharging these precious responsibilities, we shall at the same time be exercising these cherished rights. We shall also in this way furnish the impetus which America needs in meeting the unprecedented opportunities for leadership which fate and fortune have visited upon us. We shall in this fashion provide America with the grass-roots spiritual and moral strength to safeguard our freedoms at home and to protect our freedoms aboard.

So will we breathe new life into our two-party system, and in so doing maintain the vigilance which we know is the price of liberty.

So will America go forward to new prosperities.

So will the contagion of our active faith in freedom spread to the dark recesses of this troubled planet where the forces of tyranny and oppression are still on the march.

So will we at long last lead the oppressed people of this harassed world out of the morass of suffering and slavery in which they are engulfed and onto the high, dry ground of liberty and peace.

The Republican Party is the best hope of America, and America is the last best hope of earth.

Boston Naval Shipyard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following letter that I have received together with a very enlightening statement written by John J. Carey concerning the Boston naval shipyard:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. THOMAS J. LANE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LANE: Enclosed please find a feature article which was in the Boston Post, Sunday, January 22, 1950.

This article, we like to feel, is what an impartial survey would find of our Boston yard. It clearly brings out the many things that we have pointed out to top naval officials in the last year.

We feel proud of this article and felt that you would, too; so that is why we are taking the liberty of sending it to you.

With best wishes, I remain,

Very truly yours,

EDWARD F. HINES,
Secretary,
Charlestown Metal Trades Council.

BOSTON'S PART IN WORLD WAR III

(By John J. Carey)

Recently a group of Boston newspaper men and women were invited to visit the Boston Naval Shipyard, at Charlestown, where, under the direction of shipyard commander Capt. Richard M. Watt, Jr., we would be able to get a comprehensive idea of what was being done currently in this important naval base; and the preparations that were being made for defense and offense in the event of world war III breaking out.

Probably few persons, even among those who daily pass by the Navy yard, realize that this is the second largest General Electric plant at Lynn. It is true, many of the buildings are antiquated and ill-adapted to modern ideas of manufacturing efficiency. But, inside the buildings, the machinery and equipment and the methods employed are up to the last minute.

FIVE BIG UNITS

In addition to the naval shipyard itself, at Charlestown, the First Naval District includes the big submerged oil tanks in East Boston near the Orient Heights section which were built for World War II, and from which, through a pipe line running along the path of the old narrow gage railroad to a point near the old Cunard docks, the Navy ships can be serviced with their fuel requirements.

Another most important adjunct of the naval district is the Commonwealth docks at South Boston wherein was built, in 1914, the largest drydock in the United States; and which is, in fact, only exceeded in size by one other in the world. Still, a third major unit of the naval facilities here are the shipyards at Hingham, which were built by the Government and operated by the Navy for the construction during the last war of destroyers and landing craft. A fifth unit is the big gear works at Lynn.

Assuming that our chief opponent in the event of a third world war would be Russia, Boston is regarded as the first base on what is called in naval circles Route 1 to Russia. This is Boston's position because Boston, among our major naval bases, is hundreds of miles nearest to Russia. Operations against Russia would necessarily be from the Atlantic seaboard as the nearest base to the heart of Russia. Operations in the Pacific would be largely of a defensive nature because of the vast distance to Siberia by water and the further thousands of miles across the Asiatic Continent to reach Moscow.

NEAREST TO "POINT CHARLEY"

Boston's importance, in the event of such a war, lies in the fact that as stated above, it is much nearer to what is known in naval circles as Point Charley, but also because deep water extends much closer to Boston than to the other major yards, at New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk, and Charleston, S. C. Point Charley is the point off the Canadian coast at which ships turn north to take the great circle route to Europe which, because of the earth's curvature, is a shorter route than if a ship sailed directly east.

From Point Charley to within about 40 miles of the Boston naval base there is deep water, which makes it impracticable for the laying of mines; whereas, in the case of the other major naval bases, this deep water ends several hundred miles out from the coast. Because of this advantage of comparative mine safety accruing to the Boston base, practically all ships injured or in need of replenished supplies would make for the Boston base. The need to keep this base in first-class shape physically, and well supplied with skilled workers under the conditions the world is facing, would seem most obvious.

SUPPLIES FOR OUR ENTIRE NAVY

The Boston shipyard at Charlestown manufactures all the rope and chains for the entire United States Navy, and the marvels of modern machinery employed there in this work are not excelled in any industrial plant in the country. Anyone who thinks that rope was for use only in the old sailing ships would be astonished to see the way it is turned out by the mile at Charlestown for our modern battleships and cruisers, and from small sizes that might be used on a rowboat to great hawsers, 6 inches in diameter. Besides the rope and chains, the forge and chain shops at the yard make practically all the other hardware, pipe fittings, hooks, plates, bolts, shackles, jaw-fitting wrenches, and tools of almost every conceivable kind.

The most modern method of anchor-chain manufacture—Dielock—was developed at the Boston naval shipyard in 1926, and it was developed, not by an MIT scientist, but by one of the workers at the yard. Since 1928 it has been recognized and adopted by the United States Navy as official standard.

NEED FOR DEFENSE PROGRAM

The very fact that the Boston naval district has so many advantages over the other major bases on this coast makes it all the more necessary that a comprehensive defense program for the Boston area should be mapped out. The enemy knows of these advantages and, therefore, would be alert to the need of putting the facilities at this base out of commission. Besides the defense measures being taken by the military authorities, there might well be especial need of such a civilian program as has been suggested by Congressman KENNEDY and Gov-

ernor Dever to supplement what the military chiefs are doing.

I might say in closing that we newspaper representatives were very much impressed by what we saw and heard during our visit to the yard. The naval officers and the personnel were evidently as well equipped and trained to operate the big establishment as any group trained in private industry.

A Report to the People of Kansas City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, this is a report to the people of Kansas City. If a Member of Congress is to do his job well, he must try to keep in personal touch with the thousands of people he serves as their representative in the National Legislature. As the representative of all of you, the people of the Fifth Missouri Congressional District, I have tried to keep you informed of my activities in many ways—through a weekly radio report on Monday nights at 10 over KCMO, by columns in weekly newspapers, through newsletters to those who have expressed a particular interest and, of course, through a large amount of personal correspondence. When the Congress is adjourned I join my staff at our Kansas City service office in the Federal Building at 811 Grand Avenue. This service office is open the year round.

This report is another way to keep in touch—and a chance to discuss with you some of the problems we face together.

DICTATORSHIP VERSUS DEMOCRACY

During 1949 the United States moved farther along the road to world peace. We continued our support of the United Nations. Our votes in favor of continuing the Marshall plan, providing adequate defense forces and giving military aid to our Atlantic Pact partners made clear that we meant to support and defend democracy in the world-wide struggle between dictatorship and democracy.

It seems to me that today, for the first time in history, our great country has a positive and well-rounded foreign policy. While we have not won every skirmish in the cold war, we have made a good beginning. Some of our victories have been spectacular—like breaking the Berlin blockade—other efforts have been less spectacular but just as important, such as plugging away, day after day, over the Voice of America, telling the world about our democracy and our efforts toward peace and world order. But the struggle between democracy and dictatorship will go on for a long time. The Communists will never, of their own accord, give up trying to destroy democracy as we know it. They and the other totalitarians will continue to try to develop fifth columns in democratic nations which is one of the reasons why my vote was cast for adequate appropriations for the House Committee on Un-American Activities. They will keep on exploiting misery, disease, poverty, and unrest wherever these conditions exist as a pretext for attacking the democratic way of life. What we have to do is to help plant the ideas and ideals of democracy firmly throughout the world and work to get rid of the conditions which give Communists their chance to spread their false doctrines among desperate and hungry people. The greatest ultimate security against communism will be found in the eventual elimination of the abject poverty and fearful insecurity in which so many of the world's people live. Peace will not come easily—we have to work at it constantly, with real determination and in cooperation with the other democracies.

ADVANCE OR RETREAT

Just as cooperation with other democracies is the key to the success of our foreign policy, so is cooperation by all the elements in our national community the answer to making our great domestic hopes come true. Our country enjoys the highest standard of living the world has ever known—yet, in 1948, a prosperity year, about one-third of all our families did not get the minimum goods and services they needed for their health and welfare. We cannot afford this.

There are many different ways in which this problem must be attacked if we are to solve it. First we all must recognize that ours can and must be an expanding economy. Despite our enormous production we have not approached our full possible development—there is no good reason why our gross national product 5 years from now should not be increased tens of billions of dollars to $300,000,000,000 a year. We have the means at hand, the resources, energy, and know-how. The achievement of this goal is in the interest of all groups in our national community. To achieve this goal we must all work together.

But if 5 years from now our over-all productivity is increased to $300,000,000,000 the problem of the lower economic third would not solve itself automatically. We must understand that we cannot afford to have millions of our citizens handicapped by low wages and poor working conditions, by the fear of insecurity in old age, by inadequate education and medical care or by opportunities restricted by senseless prejudices.

I believe we must have a program designed to help people to help themselves and develop into more productive workers in our communities and more confident citizens of our Nation. Some say we are trying to do too much—I say we cannot afford to do less. The challenge to us today is as great as those faced up to by the men who founded our great country, the pioneers who opened up our West and those Americans who on the battlefields have fought and died to preserve democracy.

WHAT HAS BEEN DONE

In the House, we voted last year to remove the unfair taxes on oleomargarine, and the Senate has recently followed suit. We passed a reasonably good rent-control law which protects the tenant from undue hardships and still assures the landlord a fair business return. A great program of housing and slum-clearance was enacted into law after a long fight in this and previous sessions of Congress. The House passed an expanded and improved social security bill, which the Senate is expected to act upon this year, extending coverage to 11,000,000 new people and increasing benefits on the average of 70 percent. Certain important benefits for disabled veterans and their dependents were also liberalized.

The minimum wage was raised to 75 cents an hour to help keep our laws in step with the times. I strongly supported this measure but was opposed to the amendment removing about 1,000,000 workers from coverage, which nevertheless was passed. An attempt was made to repeal the Taft-Hartley labor-management law and to write more constructive and effective labor-management legislation. I voted against the so-called Wood substitute bill, because it represented the substance of the present act under a different label. I did support the so-called Sims compromise, but when that failed, I joined with the majority in sending the Wood bill back to the committee. This important question remains before us.

Because of the vital need for cooperation among all our economic elements, it is very encouraging that a large number of Representatives from the cities showed an interest in the problems of the farmer. I was happy to have the chance to vote in favor of a bill to make telephones more readily available to rural areas. Part of the over-all housing program which we passed was devoted to the improvement of substandard rural housing. While I am in no way satisfied with the present farm price-support program—I voted for the final passage of the present bill because of the great importance to our economy of reasonably stable farm prices.

An amendment to the Antitrust Act was passed by the House in an important step to curb monopoly and unfair business practices. This bill, if passed by the Senate, would prohibit corporations from buying up the physical assets of their smaller competitors, which some groups had been doing because of a legal loophole in the old law. Individual initiative and healthy competition have helped to make us great, and we should make sure that our laws protect the small businessman from the encroachment of large corporations and great concentrations of economic power.

Despite the opposition of those of us who felt the legislation unfair to consumers, the House passed a bill which, should it become law, would result in greatly increased costs to the users of natural gas.

In my judgment it is not right in a democracy to make voting more difficult for one man than another so I voted in favor of the anti-poll-tax bill which passed the House.

A RIGHT WAY AND A WRONG WAY

A Congressman soon learns that there is more than one way for legislation to be defeated in either the House or the

Senate. One way is the way we all understand—honest disagreement over the merits of the legislation. One side says "we are for it," the other side "we are against it." That is a direct and honest approach. The other approach is less well known. It consists of killing a bill by parliamentary maneuver. On the first day of the first session in 1949, we passed an amendment to the rules of the House which made it impossible for a handful of Members of the House sitting on the Rules Committee to bottle up legislation they did not like and prevent it from coming to the floor for democratic decision by the majority of the Members. An attempt a few days ago to reimpose this gag rule was soundly defeated.

Just as there is a right way and a wrong way for the House to carry on its business, there is a right way and a wrong way to carry into effect the decisions of the Congress. The decisions of the Congress when signed by the President become the laws of the land and are then administered and enforced by the executive departments. Much progress has been made in the field of reorganization of the executive departments. Many of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on Reorganization have been carried into effect. I have strongly and consistently supported and worked for this program to streamline the functions of our Government and to assure the taxpayers the maximum benefit and service for every dollar spent.

THE ROAD AHEAD

We still face many problems. Our Nation's schools are in dire need of assistance from the Federal Government. Laws are needed to assure the unhampered use of the ballot, and the right for all our citizens to compete equally with others for employment for which they qualify. Some of our problems are financial. We are facing a deficit in a year of general prosperity. Our tax structure must be overhauled and modernized. Wartime excise taxes, for example, should be substantially reduced or, in some cases, eliminated, to assure a continued high level of business activity.

Some areas of the country have serious production and employment problems. We are fortunate that Kansas City is in an area which Secretary of Commerce Charles Sawyer described as "clearly the most prosperous of all the areas of the country."

As a Nation, we have learned our lessons the hard way. We have seen the totalitarian isms grow up and thrive in places where misery and poverty rule and people grasp for any false promise that seems to offer them a glimmer of hope. What we are doing—in the world and here at home—is taking out some insurance against the known hazards of bad economic and social conditions. In the heat of argument and debate your Representatives are trying to devise the ways that this can best be done.

In a democracy we can all share in building the future of our country and working for the communities that make up our Nation. No dictator can tell us what to do and when to do it. We use our democratic processes to tell ourselves what to do through the election of public officials who know us and respond to our needs. But the person who fails to use his democratic rights is not doing his share—he is letting somebody else do his thinking for him, and, more often than not, he is indirectly working against democracy and our way of life. I firmly believe that we cannot afford to let this happen because in these troubled times we face problems that everybody must help decide. We must all play our part. We must all work together. Only our enemies would divide us.

Once in a while, it is good to hear our goals restated. Here is what President Harry Truman said about our hopes in his recent State of the Union message to the Congress and the people:

We work for a better life for all, so that all men may put to good use the great gifts with which they have been endowed by their Creator. We seek to establish those material conditions of life, in which, without exception, men may live in dignity, perform useful work, serve their communities, and worship God as they see fit.

These may seem simple goals, but they are not little ones. They are worth a great deal more than all the empires and conquests of history. They are not to be achieved by military aggression or political fanaticism. They are to be achieved by humbler means—by hard work, by a spirit of self-restraint in our dealings with one another, and by a deep devotion to the principles of justice and equality.

It should make us truly thankful, as we look back to the beginnings of this country, that we have come so far along the road to a better life for all. It should make us humble to think, as we look ahead, how much farther we have to go to accomplish, at home and abroad, the objectives that were set out for us at the founding of this Nation.

As we approach the halfway mark in the twentieth century, we should ask for continued strength and guidance from that Almighty Power who has placed before us such great opportunities for the good of mankind in the years to come.

Textile Workers Union of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from Textile Labor, official publication of the Textile Workers Union of America, CIO, January 21, 1950:

JOBLESS INSURANCE FLOPS BADLY IN TIME OF SLUMP; IN DEPRESSION?

(By Irving Kahan)

Statistics now show what many jobless workers have known all along—that unemployment compensation is grossly inadequate even in States boasting the highest jobless insurance benefits. One-third of the Nation's unemployed workers already have exhausted benefits. The President's Council of Economic Advisers reports that in some areas the number of workers collecting UCC payments actually is smaller than those who have run out of benefits.

Congress has been told in the President's economic report that in a number of major labor markets, 60 to 75 percent of the unemployed have exhausted payments.

In the third quarter of 1949 alone, 500,000 workers exhausted their insurance, compared to 225,000 for the same period in 1948.

FIRST TEST

These are some of the products of the unemployment compensation system's first test since the war. By prewar depression standards, the test was not a major one. Some sources even described it as merely a period of healthy readjustment. They were not textile workers; for the latter, the test was severe.

But however it is labeled, statistics show that unemployment insurance not only fell far short of meeting workers' needs during a slump, but as it now stands, will fall even shorter in the event of a real depression.

UCC payments did prevent a major collapse in consumer purchasing power but they did not help tide over periods of idleness some 35 percent of the Nation's unemployed. These 1,500,000 workers were left completely without income between jobs in 1949.

SOME SHORTCOMINGS

Regardless of the size of benefits and they varied from a top of $25 plus dependents' allowances for 26 weeks, in some States, to $15 for 12 weeks in others, the same general shortcomings were evident everywhere:

1. Benefits were too low, didn't last long enough, especially in one-industry towns, where other jobs were not available. Nationally, the average payment was only $21.01 a week and the duration was 12 weeks even though based on the highest workers' income credits in the Nation's history.

2. Not enough workers were covered; more than 30 percent still are barred.

3. Payments represented only about 35 percent of a worker's average earnings. When UCC was established in 1935, payments averaged 44 percent with the goal set at 50 percent. In the passing years jobless benefits have lost ground in relation to living costs instead of increasing.

4. Seasonal workers, like those in many branches of textiles, who need jobless insurance most, drew the smallest and shortest benefits.

5. Merit-rating refunds to employers with the lowest lay-offs, may be good in theory; in practice, however, the system is completely cockeyed for it imposes a low tax on employers in good times, when they can afford a high tax, and raises the tax in bad times, when they can afford it least.

REFUND BAIT

The bait of refunds has stiffened employers' resistance to new or improved benefits for workers. It has encouraged employers' groups to keep alive the phony charge that workers prefer to loaf at home and collect jobless insurance rather than work.

The barrage of propaganda has been so great that the public often forgets that jobless insurance is not a hand-out but a right earned and paid for by workers from their wages.

In practice, merit rating actually robs unemployment compensation funds. If eliminated and the full 2.7-percent tax on employers were collected, most States could raise benefits and spread them over a longer period without imposing new taxes.

BOWLES' STUDY

A study recently completed in Connecticut under the direction of Gov. Chester Bowles underlines this point, although it studiedly avoids recommending an end to refunds for employers.

Figures reported by Bowles contend that employers' payments in 1949 were the lowest in the Nation—half of those in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, neighboring States with similar economies. Average payment was 0.07 percent, compared to 2.7 percent allowed by law. In 1950, it was hiked to 1.4 percent.

Bowles reports that 40,000 workers are now receiving unemployment benefits but 52,900

others who drew an average of only $19.60 a week—in a State with one of the highest benefit rates—exhausted their benefits.

Bowles says these people need help—now. He proposes that their benefits be extended to March 31; to do so would cost between $4,000,000 and $10,000,000. He proposes that the money be taken from the State UCC fund which now stands at $158,000,000.

MERIT RATING

But his report shows that in 1948 alone merit-rating refunds amounted to more than $7,000,000. It is obvious that if merit rating were ended, Connecticut could extend present unemployment payments at least 3 months more, or a total of 9 months a year. That would bridge many a gap between jobs and would cut relief rolls.

The situation is more serious in Massachusetts and Rhode Island.

The Bay State paid out in 1949 about $115,000,000, according to Antonio England, former TWUA cotton-rayon assistant director who now is director of the State's division of employment security. The fund now stands at around $107,000,000, lowest since 1941.

RHODE ISLAND

Rhode Island last year paid out $30,000,000 and its fund is around $26,000,000 today. In Connecticut, payment was $43,000,000, as against a $158,000,000 fund.

Eliminating merit rating would increase available funds, England concedes, but in Massachusetts it would not solve the basic problem.

On a $3,000,000,000 annual economy, a full 2.7 percent tax would bring in about $81,000,000, still far short of the $115,000,000 spent in 1949.

As far as England is concerned, the basic answer is more jobs. That's the direct way of dealing with a situation in which 127,000 are currently jobless and 160,000 will have exhausted benefits by April 1.

WORK PROJECTS

Massachusetts is thinking in terms of work projects like road construction and veterans' housing.

Rhode Island, where at one time last year 20 percent of all workers covered by the act were collecting jobless insurance, is thinking in terms of Federal aid, although its spokesmen are aware that what it needs basically is a diversified economy.

Seasonal industries like textiles and jewelry create crises by dumping thousands of workers on the unemployment rolls.

The State fund is slightly better off today for an ominous reason. So many workers already have exhausted benefits that the fund is now paying out less than is coming in.

BILL UP

But Rhode Island needs help. Its Senator THEODORE FRANCIS GREEN has introduced a bill in Congress to reinsure State UCC funds and provide Federal grants to States where funds have dropped to the danger point.

Chester Bowles' way seems to be a more lasting answer. By increasing benefits and stretching the period of payment, the cushion under the economy which unemployment insurance has provided in the past can be made far firmer than it now is.

But isolated action by each State also is inadequate. A Federal program is needed. The Forand bill is the best prospect of the moment.

It would preserve the present Federal-State relationship, but fix minimum UCC standards for all States.

It would pay workers at least 50 percent of weekly wages and up to 10 percent more for dependents for at least 26 weeks. It would end waiting periods and some of the disqualifications that bar jobless workers from benefits.

The bill is not up to CIO standards. CIO wants coverage for all workers 52 weeks a year with all disqualifications, including those involving strikers, removed. It also wants the UCC system federalized. It knows that if States are left to act for themselves, nothing will be accomplished. But it is supporting the Forand bill.

Not so most industrialists and businessmen. Despite the lift jobless insurance gave consumers' buying power at the height of unemployment, they're for "toughening up" UCC administration. This means giving fewer people less benefits for a shorter time.

CHOOSE NOTHING

Given the choice of making unemployment insurance fit today's bill or resorting to depression-type WPA programs, the business and industrial community chooses—nothing.

As John W. Edelman, TWUA Washington representative, once told a chamber of commerce institute on this subject, it may require the "equivalent of an economic atomic bomb to awaken employing groups in the country to the fact that our free-enterprise system will not survive unless we speedily enact and honestly apply a comprehensive Federal security system which fulfills in fact the promise that the name implies."

Until that happens, it's up to the Eighty-first Congress to make the choice for business and industry—much in the manner of a doctor forcing medicine down the throat of a sick but unwilling patient.

Veterans' Housing to Veterans' Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, following the war Congress made available by legislation surplus buildings throughout the country for veterans' housing. This program was known as temporary veterans' housing and was sponsored by communities and veterans' organizations throughout the country. In legislation passed during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress it was provided that the Housing and Home Finance Agency could relinquish such veterans temporary housing to municipalities and other entities sponsoring such housing locally. However, such legislation did not provide that the housing and Home Finance Agency could turn over such temporary veterans' housing to nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by Congress. In instances throughout the country nonprofit veterans' organizations have been carrying on, administering, and sponsoring such temporary veterans' housing. In order that war veterans might continue the use of such temporary veterans' housing I have introduced a joint resolution whereby the Administrator of Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer such temporary veterans' housing to nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress, as now being transferred to counties, cities, and other public bodies. This would permit the administration of such temporary housing to be carried on by the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Veterans, and other nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, there is included herewith the following copy of the joint resolution:

Joint resolution to amend the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, giving nonprofit veterans' organizations administration of temporary veterans' housing

Whereas public law provided that the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer title to temporary housing provided for certain veterans and their families under title V of the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to State, county, city, or other public body; and

Whereas in numerous cases such temporary housing has been sponsored by the veterans' organizations; and

Whereas said act of October 14, 1940, did not provide for relinquishment and transfer to such veterans' organizations: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the Administrator of the Housing and Home Finance Agency may relinquish and transfer, pursuant to the same general terms and conditions specified in subsections 505 (a) and (b) of the act of October 14, 1940, as added by the act of June 28, 1948, Public Law 796, title to temporary housing provided for certain veterans and their families under title V of said act of October 14, 1940, as amended, to any State, county, city, or other public body, including nonprofit veterans' organizations chartered by the acts of Congress: *Provided further*, That any application for such relinquishment and transfer shall be filed with the Administrator within 120 days after the approval of this act.

Removal of Racial Restrictions Now Prohibiting Admission to United States of Wives of World War II Veterans Asked To Meet Problem Arising in Japan and Other Pacific Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON
DELEGATE FROM HAWAII
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. FARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to incorporate the text of a statement issued to the press setting forth the reasons for the introduction today of 24 private bills to remove racial restrictions now barring wives and fiancées of World War II veterans and parents of American citizens to this country.

The statement follows:

The removal of racial restrictions now prohibiting admission to this country of wives, present and prospective, of World War II veterans because they are nationals of Japan or of other countries whose people are ineligible to citizenship, is proposed in a series of private bills introduced in the House today by JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii.

Delegate FARRINGTON proposes that the same policies that apply to brides of European races should apply to those of Oriental races who are ineligible to citizenship under present law.

He is requesting the House to act on 16 cases on an individual basis inasfar as the Senate has failed to act in a period of more than a year on H. R. 199 (the Judd bill)

under which the racial restrictions in our immigration and naturalization laws would be removed.

The action taken by Delegate FARRINGTON today follows extensive correspondence and study of this subject. While in Tokyo in December, Delegate FARRINGTON discussed the problem presented by the marriage, present and prospective, of American soldiers to Japanese nationals with both officials of Gen. Douglas MacArthur's staff and with a large number of individual Americans now serving in the United States Army and in civilian capacities with the American forces in Japan.

Precedent for action on such cases on an individual basis has already been provided by the enactment of individual bills under which financées of American veterans who are Japanese nationals have been admitted to this country in order to consummate their marriages.

The bills introduced by Delegate FARRINGTON include:

1. Twelve that provide approval of marriages of American veterans now in Japan to Japanese nationals;

2. Two that would permit the marriage of American veterans to Japanese nationals;

3. That would admit two Japanese fiancées to this country for purposes of marriage to American veterans.

Delegate FARRINGTON at the same time introduced eight bills that would permit the return to Hawaii of alien Japanese parents of American citizens. He pointed out that these for the most part involve parents who lived for many years in Hawaii and failed to maintain their reentry permits so as to allow them to return to Hawaii to live with their children in their declining years.

"The introduction of these private bills to cover individual cases constitutes a very laborious method for dealing with this problem," Delegate FARRINGTON said, "and I have resorted to it only because it seems to offer the only prospect now for bringing relief to people who are suffering discrimination as the result of the continuation of certain restrictions in our immigration laws."

Military authorities who require permits for military personnel before a marriage takes place have no choice but to deny permits to those who intend to marry women of races ineligible to citizenship.

The policy of the Departments of the Army and the Air Force covering marriage in oversea commands is set forth in Special Regulations No. 600-240-5 and Air Force Regulation No. 34-12, issued in Washington under date of February 11, 1949.

The regulations point out that the alien wife of any United States citizen may be approved for entry to the United States on a permanent-residence basis without regard to quota only after having met the statutory restrictions covering the admissibility of aliens.

These regulations set forth the standards that must be met with regard to physical, mental, and moral condition of the individual involved and the restrictions applying to races ineligible for citizenship.

Requirements covering the financial responsibility of the prospective husband are also pointed out.

The policy of the services is that careful consideration should be given to all aspects of the marriage, including the admissibility of stepchildren as well as wives before permission to marry is granted.

Military personnel are required to obtain written approval prior to marrying. The policy of the Departments is to grant approval where personnel have complied with local regulations and the alien fiancées are found on examination to meet all requirements for admission to the United States. The inadmissibility of a fiancée constitutes a reason for denying permission to marry.

In the cases of women of races ineligible to citizenship, such as Japanese, Korean, and certain people of the Polynesian and Micronesian races this is absolute. The latter are ineligible to admission to this country or to citizenship.

The problem this presents is a very serious one with respect to Japanese. A large number of American troops have been and still are stationed in Japan. Among these are a very substantial number of Americans of Japanese ancestry.

The military authorities cannot grant permission for marriages which might otherwise be completely in order, from the standpoint of the character of the individuals involved and their financial responsibility, because the fiancées are ineligible to citizenship and to admission to this country.

The resulting situation has been most unfortunate. It has resulted in marriages which have taken place without the consent of the military authorities, and in a number of instances, the birth of children who did not have proper legal status in this country even though the marriages and births have been in accordance with Japanese law.

It has emphasized in a most unfortunate way the racial barrier against the Japanese race which still remains in our immigration and naturalization laws.

Under date of September 24, 1949, General Headquarters, Far East Command, issued circular 51 containing the regulations covering the marriage of civilian and military personnel in that command.

These regulations contain in paragraph 3, subsection c, this statement:

"Except under very unusual circumstances, personnel listed in paragraph 2 who are United States citizens will not be granted permission to marry persons who are ineligible to enter the United States for permanent residence or naturalization. Approval of requests may be given by the commander in chief, Far East, only."

Shortly after the war, Congress adopted the so-called GI Brides Act and the Fiancées Act in order to facilitate the admission to this country of alien wives and fiancées of American soldiers.

The GI Brides Act permitted the admission of these wives up to the end of December 1948. The law as originally presented did not include wives of races ineligible to citizenship. This denied to many veterans who served in the Pacific permission to bring to this country wives of races living in Pacific countries such as the Polynesians, Koreans, and Japanese, who are ineligible to citizenship.

This law was finally amended but only to permit the entrance of wives where marriages had occurred before August 22, 1947. There still remain a considerable number of men who were unable to marry before that date. These, and others who have married since that time, are confronted with a problem which certainly merits special legislation.

Ground Hog Day

REMARKS
OF
HON. LEON H. GAVIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Chairman, Thursday next, February 2, is a great day—Ground Hog Day. And, again, I want to call to the attention of the House, to keep the record straight, that Punxsutawney, Jefferson County, Pa., Nineteenth District, is the home of the ground hog, that great prognosticator of the weather.

For more years than I care to remember—in fact ever since Punxsutawney was founded in 1849—this great meteorologist from his home at Gobbler's Knob, Punxsutawney, Pa., has been keeping the American people informed as to weather conditions for the 6 weeks following Ground Hog Day, February 2.

It is a matter of record that if the ground hog sees his shadow we are in for six additional weeks of cold wintry weather, and if his shadow fails to appear spring is around the corner.

Therefore, it is disconcerting to me and my many friends in Jefferson County, Pa., to see the bold attempts made by promoters of a lot of common alley cats, and so forth, trying to cut in on the ground hog's yearly prediction. This is a grave injustice to this great "seer" of the weather and it makes him very irritable. These brash attempts, which I deeply resent, by the run-of-the-mine fabricators and deceivers have given "his chuckship" in Punxsutawney a great deal of anguish. Last year, right here in Washington the local press tried to cut in on his annual irrefutable prediction with a common caged-up zoo cat posing as a ground hog. You all know the accuracy of weather prediction by this synthetic Washington ground hog. So, I want to impress upon the members that Punxsutawney, Pa., is the home of the ground hog—the originator of this unique and remarkable weather service, and that the Punxsutawney ground hog is the one and the only one that can make true, accurate, and unquestioned predictions on weather conditions for the next 6 weeks following February 2.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GAVIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I asked the gentleman to yield just to advise him that out in Ohio we honor Ground Hog Day each February 2 by the annual banquet of the Greenville Liars Club, for which I would be very happy to propose the gentleman for membership if he can spell that word "Punxsutawney" or whatever it was.

Mr. GAVIN. It is Punxsutawney.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. If the gentleman can spell the word, I should be glad to propose him for membership in the Greenville Liars Club and pay his initiation fees.

Mr. GAVIN. Well, I will be glad to do that now: P-u-n-x-s-u-t-a-w-n-e-y.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. The gentleman is very, very learned.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Cotton and Peanut Acreage Allotments and Marketing Quotas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE M. GRANT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. GRANT. Mr. Chairman, we are today confronted with a problem that is

not only of interest to the cotton growers of the Nation, but one that is paramount to the economy of the whole country. Days could be spent in arguing as to who is responsible for this condition, but, after all, where would that get us? Absolutely nowhere.

The important thing is that many cotton growers in this Nation are being unduly penalized through no fault of theirs. Please bear in mind that this bill is only 1-year legislation. It applies only for the year 1950. Just as soon as this legislation is disposed of, the Agriculture Committees of both the House and Senate are going to give careful study and consideration to the whole cotton program. You may ask why the present program is not working in an equitable manner. In the first place, no cotton quota program had been in effect since 1942. There was also the provision in prior laws that farmers who had diverted from cotton to the production of war crops should receive credit for such war crops in future cotton acreage allotments. This Congress should have, and did, keep faith with the farmer who voluntarily diverted his acreage from cotton to the production of some other crop that was in short supply. It now makes no difference what was the motive behind such a diversion. For my part, I believe that in the main, it was done to help the war effort. However, the law only provided that it be done, and since it was done in justice and in fair dealing, we must give credit where it was earned.

There was also a provision that there be an acreage reserve of 10 percent of the State allotment, and a reserve of 15 percent of the county allotment. There has been no uniform reservation of this reserve, either by the counties or by the States. Some counties have not reserved anything at all, while others made a very small reservation. I am not criticizing anyone, but only stating a fact. I am sure that both State and county committees have done the best that they could under the handicap that they have had to work under. This was something new to them and they were severely handicapped by the lack of accurate information. Remember, that there had been no quotas since 1942. There were no records, either on the individual farms or at the county or State level. Out of the nine counties in my congressional district, acreage reserves varied from minus 1 percent in one county to 2½ percent in another, and then all the way up to 15 percent. Out of the nine counties, five reserved over 7½ percent, and four under 7½ percent. However, one thing was done for which I do not believe there is any complaint, and that is the provision that the Secretary of Agriculture should allocate to each State its fair proporation or share of the national acreage. From there, it was the consensus of opinion in the Congress that the allotments to the respective counties and from the county level to the individual farm should be done locally—by those who were more familiar with local conditions than the Department of Agriculture here in Washington. This has not worked out satisfactorily because the law was new and there were many new committees who, on the whole, have done a good job under trying and difficult circumstances. However, in some instances, inequalities and injustices have developed. A condition that no one individual can be charged with, just an unfortunate situation that should and must be corrected.

The House Committee on Agriculture has been very diligent in an effort to correct this injustice, insofar as legislation is concerned. Early in December of last year when it developed that inequities were cropping up, the chairman of this committee requested those members of the committee who were interested to come to Washington for a special meeting. Many members of the committee immediately canceled engagements in their respective districts and came to Washington in an effort to attempt to do something to alleviate these hardship cases. Other Congressmen from the Cotton Belt met with the committee and after a thorough discussion and conference with the Secretary of Agriculture, and members of his staff, the chairman issued a statement to the effect that immediately upon the convening of Congress, that the committee would take prompt action to correct the injustices and inequalities as far as it could be done by legislation.

So, this is the reason we have this legislation before us today. The small increase that is requested will not unduly depress the market. Even with this modest increase, there will be a substantial reduction in cotton acreage this year, and it is estimated that after this increase is provided that we will have at least 5,000,000 fewer acres planted to cotton in 1950 than were planted in 1949. Some have estimated this as high as 6,000,000 fewer acres. We expect to have from year to year a constant and continuing decrease in the amount of cotton acreage until the carry-over is reduced to the point where the total supply of cotton will not exceed the normal supply as specified in the law. This legislation is fair and just.

There is a section in this bill which seeks to correct, for 1 year only, the mistake that was made in the 1949 peanut legislation. During the war, peanut acreage was 3,300,000 acres. In 1949, this was cut to 2,650,000 acres; and in 1950, this year, it has been cut to 2,100,000 acres. Without any hearings and in an effort to be helpful to one State, a provision was inserted in the cotton bill providing that no State shall receive less than 60 percent of the acreage of peanuts harvested for nuts in the calendar year 1948. It was thought and believed by the conference committee that any additional acreage given to this one State would be taken from each of the peanut-growing States. Certainly, those from this State who are interested in this legislation did not intend that one or two of the States should be made to unduly suffer. However, this was just what happened. Alabama and Texas were unjustly and unduly penalized because with a national allotment of 2,100,000 acres, the allotment to Alabama would be around 30 percent below the allotment to Alabama for 1949, whereas the national allotment would only be 19½ percent below the national allotment for 1949.

The farmers of my State know that there must be a cut in peanut acreage. In 1949, they took this cut without complaint and in 1950 were prepared to take another big cut in the national allotment. However, they were not prepared to take a cut in which all of the other peanut producing States did not participate. When farmers voted for marketing quotas on peanuts in 1949, they were assured that if a cut was made in the national allotment, it would apply prorata to all State allotments. After marketing quotas were established, it was unjust, unfair, and inequitable, and unconstitutional to change the law where it worked a decrease upon these farmers. We cannot change the rules in the middle of a game. I know that when the facts are known that no one will object to a clarification of this section.

Mathematical Truth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, in a little midwestern town, I know of a church of a small denomination that does not own the church building, but instead the congregation rent a meeting place for all of their church services and Sunday school and all general assembly purposes and activities. They pay $1,200 a year rent. Among the various church activities, the women's organization meets in the church parlor for an hour one Thursday afternoon each month for their program. According to one computation from the above facts, a queer and distorted arithmetic might claim that $100 was the cost per hour for the use of the church building by this group of members. To do this, of course, they would have to ignore all other church uses of the building. Such a claim would be distorted, foolish, and untrue. And yet, this is the kind of arithmetic that we have been treated to on the floor of this House and by the propagandists in their recent figuring concerning the central Arizona water project.

To be more specific, this is the arithmetic which the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] calls to our attention on page 1130 of the RECORD for January 30. He speaks of spending $1,600 per acre to put water on land in Arizona which would be worth only $200 per acre when reclaimed, and he asks, "Is not that asinine?" My reply is that that certainly would be asinine. I would never endorse such a proposal, and have never advocated such. I would not blame any public official for opposing the spending of $1,600 to reclaim an acre of land which would be worth

only $200 an acre when reclaimed. I know of no public official who is advocating any such thing, but apparently Mr. RICH thinks that I myself am advocating such, judging from the remarks as recorded in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I wonder where the gentleman from Pennsylvania got his information? He is wrong regarding the $1,600 cost and equally wrong regarding the $200 an acre final value. He gives us only one factor of the problem by saying that the cost is $1,600 per acre, without being too specific as to the total cost of the thing under consideration and the total number of acres involved. What does he divide into what to get this $1,600? There are three parts to any problem in division. There is the divisor, the dividend, and the quotient. In this case, $1,600 is the quotient. As he computes it is it right or wrong? Correct or incorrect? I say it is fantastically incorrect. Of course, if you pick out a number which is outlandishly distorted as a dividend and divide into that number an insignificantly small divisor, you might get 1,600 as a quotient. But surely we ought to use a correct divisor and a correct dividend, if we want to arrive at a correct quotient.

Not knowing where Mr. RICH gets his figures, but knowing full well the phony figures that have been spewed all over the country by the Los Angeles propaganda machine, I can well guess the actual source of these figures. In this three-part arithmetical problem, the cost of the project—that part being considered—ought logically to be called the dividend. The number of acres to be benefited ought logically to be called the divisor; and if the latter number is divided into the former, we might logically assume that the quotient obtained represents the per-acre cost. First, let us look at the dividend.

What is the cost for the irrigation part only of this central Arizona project? It is not one and a half billion dollars, regardless of who says so. No competent engineer has ever made any such computation. The cost of this project is not $1,000,000,000. It is certainly not even $700,000,000, which is the Bureau of Reclamation estimate of the total cost under the terms of the bill, S. 75, amended and reported by the Senate committee. Mind you, we are talking now about the reclamation phase only of this central Arizona project—diverting the water into Arizona. It is reliably estimated that the cost of bringing water from the Colorado River to the lands to be benefited is $267,000,000. Rightfully and correctly, Mr. RICH and every other person figuring on this project should regard $267,000,000 as the estimated cost of the reclamation part of this comprehensive multiple-purpose project. I want to make it very clear that we are talking about $267,000,000, and not properly $700,000,000 nor one billion nor one and a half billion to which the windy opponents have attempted to blow up these figures.

Well, what is the correct divisor to be used in this problem? We cannot get a correct answer for a quotient—meaning cost per acre of the improved land—until we know how many acres we are dealing with.

HERE IS THE MATHEMATICAL TRUTH

Seven hundred and twenty-five thousand acres call for a supplemental supply of water, and that is the number that should be our divisor. Two hundred and sixty-seven million dollars is the estimated cost for those facilities which will be used solely to bring water into central Arizona for these 725,000 acres of land. Let us divide 725,000—representing the acres to be benefited—into the $267,000,000 estimated cost of facilities to bring the water, and our quotient or answer is a $370 burden upon each acre instead of the fantastic $1,600 which the gentleman from Pennsylvania evidently borrowed from somebody in California.

We must not overlook the fact that the total cost of this multiple-purpose project, now approximately $700,000,000, is more than half chargeable to commercial power production and is highly desired by California opponents of this particular bill. They have repeatedly declared that they want to build the Bridge Canyon Dam for power production only, which power they hope to get into southern California. Arizona needs the commercial power that would be produced at the Bridge Canyon Dam and has offered to buy all of it, so that Arizona power users could and would bear the chief burden of cost in this total project, and all of the money spent would be returned to the Public Treasury.

If certain California interests could kill this legislation for Arizona, in order to take for themselves that water which rightfully belongs to Arizona, thereby dwarfing the future of the youngest State in the Union, I am confident that they would then come before you asking for an appropriation as great, or greater, to duplicate or enlarge upon the power features in this particular bill. The only difference would be that the power would be solely for California's benefit—and they would also have water which belongs to Arizona.

Address by Oscar L. Chapman Before the Nebraska Reclamation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, on behalf of the minority leader the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. WHERRY] who is absent on committee work, and at his request, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, before the Nebraska Reclamation Association, at Grand Island, Nebr., on January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I appreciate this opportunity to visit Grand Island on my first western trip since assuming my duties as Secretary of the Interior.

As you know, I am not exactly a stranger to Nebraska, and I think I could never be a stranger to people who have joined together to promote the reclamation of the natural resources around them. I congratulate the Nebraska Reclamation Association for its past achievements, and I am glad to meet with you to talk about the future. In many ways we of the Department of the Interior feel more at home out here than at our desks back East.

You are the people who are among the leaders in the battle to conserve our great natural resources in water, power, and land. You have provided magnificent demonstrations of what a people can do to turn these resources to the enrichment of their own lives. You are the people to talk with about the job yet to be done, and you can give us advice on the way to do it.

The West has a big part to play in the building of the country's future.

At this midpoint of the twentieth century, we are entering a period in which we shall have to develop our resources far more aggressively, depending increasingly upon those resources which have not been immediately accessible. Our new task will require thinking about broader areas, and imagining a newer and better kind of life. It will be a life to which Americans are entitled, and one which will come to them through their own efforts.

The resources we have failed to use fully up to now can provide us with an abundance greater than we have ever had in the past. They will give us a new frontier, a western frontier to lift again the living level of our Nation's people.

Reclamation is a word we all understand. It gives us access to the water, land, electric power, and other resources of our river basins. It controls our floods, it provides recreational facilities for better health and enjoyment of life. It provides power and light to help us in our homes, on our farms, and in our business.

It reclaims the material gifts of nature, and directs them toward the betterment of human life.

We are about to close the first half of the twentieth century with the job of reclamation far from finished. The development of irrigation is about half done, when we measure it by present methods, concepts, and legislation. Some 21,000,000 acres have been brought under the ditch by private and Federal action. About 19,000,000 still remain, waiting for water to bring them into productivity.

We have installed 3,000,000 kilowatts of electric generating capacity out of a potential 37,000,000 kilowatts that might be developed from our western streams under reclamation and allied programs.

We have been reaping benefits with over $500,000,000 per year in added crop values and more than $30,000,000 annually in direct revenues from power. Yet our total investment in project facilities has been under $2,000,000,000.

I don't have to ask you whether this has been a sound investment for the people's welfare. I know, and you know, that the people of this Nation are entitled to no less than this.

But what about the job to be done?

One of the best friends of all of us who believe in reclamation is Harry S. Truman.

In his recent message to the Congress, the President promised an economy that can and must continue to grow, an economy that will distribute the benefits of progress to all the

people. He foresaw, within 5 years, an annual national output of $300,000,000,000. He predicted that by the end of this century, family income in America would be three times what it is today. But he added something—that this growth would come only if we made an attempt to attain it, with "conscious effort and hard work."

The part that the West will play in this growth is already clear. Under the spur of a driving, thriving economy that quickly absorbs every acre-foot of water, every new farm, and every kilowatt we can wring from the rivers, we must build and settle this great territory from Nebraska to the sea.

Projects now authorized by the Congress for the 17 reclamation States will provide irrigation water for over 7,500,000 acres of new land and will expand power capacity by nearly 3,000,000 kilowatts.

An outstanding example of the work that lies ahead in the vast national plan is your own Missouri River Basin project. It is of the highest importance.

For too long the mighty Missouri has flooded you out periodically, has washed away billions of dollars in your property and your soil, and then has stranded you dry.

The Missouri Basin program grew out of the tragic drought of the 1930's, when billions of dollars were lost through crop failures, wrecked homes, and dislocated peoples. Most of the States of the basin, including Nebraska, came out of that period with decreased populations. Your State is still feeling the effects of the drought, and the census of 1950 may show that, in population, you have barely held your own during the past decade.

The whole Nation was shocked by your tremendous losses in money and in human assets during and following the great drought. Sectional lines were forgotten as the Congress approved a gigantic undertaking to rehabilitate the entire Missouri Basin—the first basin-wide multipurpose development program. During the intervening years work on this program has progressed slowly. We are only now getting properly under way, and the work is beginning to accelerate at a fast pace.

We are not planning on a small scale. The Missouri is not a small river. The Missouri River Basin project, as now envisioned, will cost more than $4,000,000,000. This is a measure of your Federal Government's faith in this region. It is a measure of our faith in ourselves and our future.

The basin-wide concept of this project is the product of the coordinated work of the Department of the Interior and the Army Corps of Engineers. The execution of the program is going forward with the active cooperation of the basin States, the Department of Agriculture, and the other Federal agencies operating through the Federal Interagency Committee.

There are many reasons why we are doing these things. We estimate that 53,000 new farms comprising 5,000,000 irrigated acres—an area the size of New Jersey—can be established among the millions of acres of lands now relatively unproductive for lack of water.

Even at prewar prices additional crops from these farms would be worth $130,000,000 per year. At current prices they would be worth much more. Stabilized feed supplies, produced in tributary valleys, will permit far more productive use of millions of acres of range lands.

The program as now conceived calls for about 2,366,000 kilowatts installed hydroelectric capacity. This power will be produced without any drain upon our exhaustible fuel supplies.

Low-cost power will encourage new industries in scores of communities. It will permit the local processing of local produce. It will encourage the development of the still untapped mineral resources of the basin.

The control of floods will be of major importance to the people of the entire region. The newly created reservoirs will provide recreation for the people of the basin and for thousands of tourists. Fish and wildlife resources will be improved. Adequate water supply will bring better living and better business to many cities and towns. Control of the headwaters will help provide a navigable channel from St. Louis to Sioux City, providing an opportunity for cheap water freight that can benefit the entire region. The benefits of silt detention and the abatement of water pollution will be felt increasingly as the program is developed.

You who live in this region will have more convenience in your homes and more leisure in your lives, as a result of improved power and water facilities and because of enhanced economic progress.

As we move forward in this planning and building, various segments of the Department of the Interior are working on ways to multiply the benefits from this development in conservation.

In addition to the work of the Bureau of Reclamation, about which you know, the Bureau of Mines and the Geological Survey are probing the earth's surface, and subsurface, to learn what minerals can be developed and new and economical ways to produce and use them. The Geological Survey is looking after the measurement of the waters that are available.

The National Park Service is developing plans for making the fullest recreational use of the new reservoirs that will be available to the people.

The Fish and Wildlife Service is attending to the enhancement of our fish and game life.

Our Office of Indian Affairs already is exploring the favorable effects of this program in changing beneficially the lives of our original Americans.

The Bureau of Land Management is surveying the problems of improved protection and use of our range and other public land, problems naturally arising in the development of such a broad resource program.

I could go on enumerating the benefits of this program, but I don't believe that I have to persuade the Nebraska Reclamation Association as to its value to the Nation. You were in the front ranks of those who helped to convince the rest of the country of the value of this basin development.

Here in Nebraska you know what irrigation and public power mean. Nebraska was among the pioneering States in public power development. Your North Platte project in the Scotts Bluff area was one of the first reclamation projects undertaken and is an outstanding example of what can be done with dry land through irrigation. You are now among the leaders of those who are working for more irrigation and your work has been rewarded.

The Republican River is being brought under control from its headwaters in Colorado to its confluence with the Kansas River in Kansas. This is being achieved by a series of flood-control and irrigation dams.

Work is under way preparatory to the development of the lower Platt River Basin, including areas up and down the river from Grand Island, and the Loup and Elkhorn areas. Potential irrigation undertaking that may cover more than a million acres along the Platte and its tributaries are now being investigated.

In Nebraska, you still need more flood control, and you still face other unsolved problems. There are certain water-division questions that you will have to settle among yourselves before current plans can go forward into construction. I need only point out that the people down on the Republican River, too, had a difficult water-diversion problem to work out before we could move effectively there. In some respects, their problem was even more difficult to solve for the project reached across State lines into Colorado and Kansas. But they solved it, as I am confident you can solve yours within the State.

The significance of the lower Platte irrigation and power development is dramatically shown by what has happened on the North Platte. Between 1910 and 1940, the population of Scotts Bluff County rose from 2,500 to 33,000 people. During the 1930–40 census period, while the rural population of Nebraska as a whole was declining by some 10 percent Scotts Bluff County gained about 18 percent.

Acre for acre, the consumption of goods in Scotts Bluff County is more than three times that in central Nebraska, and these goods come from all over the country. The seven-thousand-and-some-odd carloads of freight unloaded at Scotts Bluff station in 1942 came from 39 States.

Most of you have a good idea of the irrigation and power construction now going on in Nebraska, and I assume you have seen the President's budget proposals for the fiscal year 1951.

The Frenchman-Cambridge division again will receive more money than any other single element in the Missouri Basin program, and the Bostwick division also will be one of the major items in the budget. The Mirage Flats project is already complete except for finishing activities.

A sizable share of our proposed transmission-line expenditure will go into Nebraska. We expect to complete three lines and to begin on some of the smaller feeder lines. We also want to build a tie line between the garrison and Fort Randall power plant to the northward.

I will avoid statistical details, but I do want to say something about the rate and distribution problems that have delayed the marketing of public power in Nebraska. You cannot afford, nor can we afford, much more delay. We are actively negotiating and planning for definite contractual arrangements in every basin State except Nebraska.

We realize that you have an unusually difficult problem here. We know that it is a temporary by-product of your progressive public-power program—a program for which we have full sympathy. Nevertheless, we are obligated to proceed in accordance with the dictates of the Congress and the interest of the program as a whole.

One way or the other—through your transmission lines or through Federal lines—we must make it possible for thousands of Nebraskans to share the benefits of low-cost public power from these Federal power plants.

Ultimately the power plants included in the Missouri Basin program, as now conceived, will be linked into a single backbone grid, extending from western Montana into Iowa. We used to hear that we would be producing power for the jackrabbits. Yet, with the Missouri Basin program scarcely begun, it is already apparent that we have not planned for enough power to meet the demands of your region.

Your growing power needs illustrate the impossibility of setting any limits to the potentialities of an undertaking like the Missouri Basin program. Once the resources of a region are opened, there begins a process of economic expansion which is incalculable in size and inconceivable in extent. That has been the history of America. It will certainly be the history of your region.

When the Missouri River Basin program was planned, we contemplated developing only the more advantageous power sites. It appears now that we must consider the possibilities of expanding power from other sites, including installations at some of the smaller dams.

I cannot over-emphasize the importance of power to your economy, and to the successful development of the entire program. We must

have power to pump irrigation water, and we must have power revenues that can carry the financial repayment load which exceeds the water users' ability to repay.

Power production and transmission are being firmly and intelligently integrated, basin-wide, into the physical and financial structure of this program. The Department of the Interior adheres fully to this integration.

The possible power requirements of the basin are so great that we must develop the highest potentiality of power that can be produced from dams.

Your experience here in Nebraska will give you a good idea of the rough road ahead on public power development. Resolution No. 1, adopted by your association in 1948, showed that you are aware of the constant attempts of special-interest groups to block the public-power program or to divert it for selfish purposes.

So far, the legally established and approved public-power program has withstood all assaults. In the 1950 appropriations, the Congress gave the Bureau of Reclamation the funds necessary to make vigorous progress on power. The 1951 budget request contemplates more progress.

Attacks upon the public-power program will continue. They will be both direct and indirect, open and under cover. But as long as the people and their Government remain alert, and fully informed, these attacks will fail.

Our reclamation laws are still sound. They attest to the vision and the superb craftsmanship of the far-sighted men who have fashioned those laws over the past half century. But they need some modernization to help us do the everchanging job ahead.

We are also giving attention to the important question of sharpening our administrative and technical skills, in order that we can do a better, more efficient, and more economical job.

The Missouri River Basin program presents one of the biggest and most complex planning, construction, and operating jobs ever to challenge the American people in peacetime. Though we are making progress, there is still much room for improvement. We must be constantly alert for defects and inadequacies in legislation and policy, and in administrative machinery, and courageously take action to correct them. As the program develops, we must be prepared to make the changes that are necessary in the best interest of the region and the country.

To plan and build and operate this project requires the efforts of many Federal and State agencies, working together with the people who are in full partnership in this undertaking.

Out here, the 10 State governments are playing a vital role. Sometimes, I wonder how your own Governor Peterson can find the time and energy, away from the multiplicity of his other duties, to give this undertaking the prime and effective attention that he is devoting to it. All of the Missouri Basin States' Governors are demonstrating to the world how democracy, in the highest sense, can really serve the people.

Each of the Federal departments and agencies, and each of the States, has its own complex problem of adjusting and integrating conflicting interests. Just as we in Interior must thresh things out among ourselves and settle upon policies that best serve our mutual interests, so must the people within each State resolve their problems before they can participate fully and effectively in the Missouri Basin program.

This program is a tremendous undertaking in teamwork, and in reaching great common goals through the democratic process. Its results will be worth everything we put into it.

The Government's Social-Security System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The I O U Fraud," published in the Omaha World-Herald of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE I O U FRAUD

Some months ago this newspaper proposed that the Government's social-security system be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis.

It is pointed out that the present system of accumulating huge reserves is a fraud, because the money is invested in United States bonds and is used by the Government to finance its deficits. Those bonds eventually will have to be retired by the taxpayers. Thus the people will have to pay for their "benefits" twice—once when the pay-roll taxes are collected, and again when the bonds are retired.

The only way to prevent that fraud, this newspaper pointed out, would be to change the system—to collect each year, in pay-roll taxes, only enough to meet the expected requirements of that year.

That proposal was criticized rather vehemently at the time by Government officials and some of our public-pulse writers. But this week it received the full indorsement of the Brookings Institution, perhaps the most highly respected research organization in the land.

In a report made after long investigation and study, the Institution said:

"The present collection of (social security) taxes on all covered workers produces far more revenue than is immediately needed to pay benefits. The reserves thus created to take care of the heavy future benefits are borrowed and used by the Government for current expenses. Thus the assets of the reserve fund are simply promises that the Government at some future time will obtain the cash by one means or another and place it in the fund."

In discussing the same point, this newspaper said Uncle Sam was putting his I O U in the strong box in place of the people's cash. It amounts to the same thing.

The report continues:

"The so-called reserves will not reduce the taxes future generations will have to pay to meet the costs of social-security benefits coming due in their day. The reserves do not give financial security. Real security rests first on the capacity of the Nation to produce, and second on the use by the Government of its power to tax to compel workers of each generation to support the dependents of that generation."

In other words:

Social-security payments in 1950 necessarily will be paid by the workers and earners of that year. The same will be true in 1960 and the year 2000. Pay-roll taxes, above the amount needed for the current year, serve no purpose except to give the Government ready cash with which to pay its deficits.

Up to now the social-security bureaucrats have managed to keep Congress thoroughly confused. The unbiased, nonpartisan Brookings report should give new light and provide a new weapon for those Congressmen who are trying to put a stop to the I O U fraud.

Public Welfare Needs of North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE R. HOEY
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Hon. W. Kerr Scott, Governor of the State of North Carolina, and a statement by Ellen Winston, commissioner of the North Carolina State Board of Public Welfare, touching the public welfare needs of North Carolina.

There being no objection, the statements were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA,
GOVERNOR'S OFFICE,
Raleigh, January 20, 1950.

Senator CLYDE R. HOEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HOEY: North Carolina, as you know, is greatly interested in H. R. 6000 now before the Senate Finance Committee because of the need for expanded welfare services to the citizens of the State. The 1949 general assembly, with my full support, made increased efforts to help finance the public-welfare program through much larger State appropriations than in the past, but we are still unable to meet many pressing needs.

We are particularly concerned over the sharply rising case loads in aid to the aged and aid to dependent children due to the fact that farmers and farm workers are not covered by old-age and survivors insurance. We realize that the net result is a much heavier financial burden proportionately for this State in terms of helping pay the cost of public assistance than is borne by the industrial States where the great bulk of older workers and surviving children are taken care of through insurance. We are hopeful that the Senate Finance Committee will expand the coverage of old-age and survivors insurance to include agricultural groups.

At this time I am also particularly concerned over the fact that the Federal Government does not participate in the cost of care of needy persons who do not fall into one of the categories of aged, blind, or dependent children. The bill now before the Senate Finance Committee provides for only a limited additional group, namely, the totally and permanently disabled. The 1949 general assembly went on record with regard to the State's responsibility in this area by enacting a general-assistance statute and setting up State funds to be matched by Federal funds to take care of this group. Unless effective action is taken to modify H. R. 6000 in the Senate, we shall still have many economically unfortunate people who are entirely dependent upon the limited amount of assistance their individual counties can provide. This seems to me to be one of the most important next steps in the program for State and Federal participation in welfare activities.

I am greatly pleased over the new matching formula contained in H. R. 6000 which I

believe is known as the Mills formula. While not a variable grant formula in the strict sense, it will mean much needed additional money for this State and appears to be a sound approach to helping the low-income States care for their needy citizens.

I would like further to call your attention to the need for additional Federal funds for child-welfare services. In this State, I am informed, we now have counties spending at the rate of about twice our annual appropriation under the present provision for Federal funds for child welfare. In order to carry forward this important aspect of the child-welfare program, we urge careful consideration of not only doubling the present allocation for this work as provided for in H. R. 6000, but increasing that amount substantially. Certainly, we would all agree that more attention should be directed toward preventive and protective services for our boys and girls.

I greatly appreciate your own interest in an expanded social insurance and public-welfare program designed to meet more effectively the needs of this State. Please enter this expression of my deep concern for an expansion of our social security provisions in the official hearing record of the Senate Finance Committee.

Sincerely,

W. KERR SCOTT.

TESTIMONY ON H. R. 6000 BY ELLEN WINSTON, COMMISSIONER, NORTH CAROLINA STATE BOARD OF PUBLIC WELFARE, BEFORE COMMITTEE ON FINANCE, UNITED STATES SENATE, JANUARY 23, 1950

I appreciate the opportunity of presenting the public-welfare needs of North Carolina with particular emphasis upon major lacks in the present program and upon how the provisions of H. R. 6000 may be expected to affect the situation.

That North Carolina is a progressive but relatively poor State is well known. In spite of substantial increases in recent years the 1948 per capita income payment for the State was $930 in comparison with a per capita income payment of $1,410 for the Nation as a whole. There are many reasons for this, not the least of which is the high birth rate resulting in approximately 40 percent of the population of the State, July 1, 1948, being under 18 years of age, in comparison with approximately 30 percent for the United States as a whole.

In spite of the disproportionate burden upon the population of working age which results from the large number of children, tremendous effort is being made by the State to provide services commensurate with current needs. On both sales and income taxes, which provide the bulk of the State's general fund revenue, the rates are among the highest in the country. State appropriations for 1949–50 provide that 86.6 percent of the total general fund shall be spent for health, education, and welfare. Even so, not one of these areas of public service is being financed at an adequate minimum level.

The State has made steady progress in its efforts to provide more adequately for its needy people. The State appropriation for old-age assistance for 1949–50 represents slightly more than a 100-percent increase over the appropriation for 1944–45. The State appropriation for aid to dependent children for 1949–50 is almost three times the appropriation for 1944–45. The 100 counties of the State have made comparable increases in appropriations for these purposes. Even so, with present Federal matching formulae these increases make possible an average grant for January 1950 of only $22 per needy person 65 years of age and over and $43 per family of three children. In view of steadily rising case loads, some counties are already reducing these substandard average grants. Since the State appropriation is the same for 1950–51 as for this year the situation is critical. It is impossible to even approach the grants which the Congress has anticipated in providing for matching Federal funds up to a maximum of $50 per aged person and $63 for three children.

A partial approach to this situation of hungry children and needy aged in North Carolina, and to a comparable extent in other low-income States, appears to be variable grants on a formula basis, such as that included in H. R. 6000 which will take into account, more than the present law does, the differences in the fiscal ability of States. We cannot anticipate sufficient State and county appropriations to pay 50 percent of the cost of raising grants from the present inadequate State levels to minimum subsistence needs. The matching provisions in H. R. 6000 together with inclusion of the responsible relative in aid to dependent children families would make possible an increase in average monthly grants from the current $22 to $27 for the aged and from the current $43 for a family of mother and three childen receiving aid to dependent children to $64 or $16 per person. Thus even with increased Federal matching the State must obviously continue to increase its appropriation from biennium to biennium if we are to attain adequate grants.

The State has long accepted the principle of equalization. We know that aged persons and children can be just as much in need in one of the poorer counties as in one of the more well-to-do counties of the State and hence a larger proportionate share of the State appropriation is allocated to the poorer counties. We are convinced that the well-being of the State as a whole and the rights of our citizens wherever they may live demand an equalization procedure. We likewise believe that equalization of opportunity to have minimum subsistence needs met should be a primary concern of this Congress in revising social-security legislation. Are we to take the position that because a child happens to be born in a high-income State he shall have his basic needs met in full while a child who happens to be born in a low-income State must grow up as best he can with inadequate food, clothing, shelter, and medical care? It is well to remember also that many of these underprivileged and undernourished children will eventually migrate to large urban centers. For example, in spite of a high birth rate the population of North Carolina increased only about half as much proportionately as the population of the entire country from 1946 to 1948. We export young people to urban centers. Hence it becomes a matter of enlightened self-interest, as well as the essence of democracy, for the high-income States to join with the low-income States in the support of the variable grant principle for assistance programs.

It is unrealistic, however, to look only to increased aid to the aged and to dependent children through the variable grant principle to solve the problem of minimum security. We must also consider expansion of old-age and survivors insurance. We are greatly disturbed by the marked increase in recipients of aid to the aged in North Carolina from 45,000 in August 1948 to 53,800 in January 1950 and of aid to dependent children from 9,500 families to 14,000 families during the same period.

Farm leaders within the State are increasingly seeing the problems created by lack of coverage of agricultural workers by the old-age and survivors-insurance program. The large public-assistance loads in rural States as compared with highly industrialized States is a matter of record. The burden of helping care for a growing number of needy persons is becoming a more and more acute problem for agricultural States. It is the expectation of public welfare administrators that we can look forward over a period of years to a substantial reduction in the public-assistance load as a result of expansion of OASI coverage to include farmers, farm workers, and part-time domestics, and of increased benefits under the old-age and survivors-insurance program. We believe that probably 60 percent of the present old-age-assistance load in North Carolina consists of persons who would be receiving retirement benefits today if the OASI coverage had included these occupational categories when first enacted.

While expanded coverage and more liberal eligibility provisions under OASI and the matching formula for public-assistance categories included in House Resolution 6000 will materially aid in meeting the needs of the aged and dependent children, we will still be faced daily with the problem of children without adequate food, clothing, and shelter who are ineligible for either survivors benefits or an aid to dependent children grant. A liberalized definition for eligibility for ADC would make possible the same help for large numbers of needy children now ineligible that is made available to thousands of children otherwise in similar circumstances. Again, we are concerned not only about the handicaps from which children suffer but also about the inequities in meeting comparable needs of children.

We also want to stress the importance of Federal assumption of a share of responsibility for all needy persons, not just for the three categories of aged, blind, and dependent children. North Carolina is one of the few States which has traditionally left the entire burden of caring for needy persons not covered by the three public-assistance categories to the counties. The 1949 general assembly took account of this and enacted a comprehensive general-assistance law. It also set up a special new appropriation of $350,000 annually, a sizable appropriation in our State, to match any Federal funds which may become available for general assistance.

H. R. 6000 has recognized another group of needy persons in providing for a fourth category, namely, the permanent and totally disabled. It is too limited at present, however, to meet the problems which exist and, at the same time, would be exceedingly difficult to define for proper administration. We hope, therefore, that Senate revisions will provide for aid to the disabled in such a way that we can use this category for periods of temporary need in order that individuals and families may become self-supporting or return to self-support. The importance of an adequate fourth category is clearly revealed by a recent North Carolina study which showed that 70 percent of all recipients of general assistance from county funds, the only source at present, are unable to work and the 30 percent able to do some work are only marginally employable. One-third require physical care. Two out of three recipients are 45 years of age or older. Two-thirds are women. Major causes of need are illness or disablement or loss of the breadwinner. Yet we would probably only be able to certify 25 percent of these desperately needy people as totally and permanently disabled. Federal participation in aid to all needy persons will fill in the tremendous gaps in the present public-assistance program.

The data cited also reflect the need for medical care. The higher and higher costs of medical care and hospitalization are not only bringing people with otherwise adequate incomes into the classification of medically indigent; they are also far outdistancing the ability of local governmental units to provide needed care. Many of our counties have

already exhausted their funds for medical care and hospitalization for the entire fiscal year in the first half of the year. Thus, poverty prevents needed medical care and lack of medical care promotes poverty in the long-recognized vicious circle. In a far-reaching forward step, H. R. 6000 takes account of this by making special provision for medical care of the needy. However, the method of financing provided would be administratively difficult. In our State the recommendation of the advisory council on social security to this committee that financial aid for medical assistance outside the ceilings on payments under the $6 per adult and $3 per child formula would be more effective in meeting the need and more efficient from the point of view of administration.

It is also important to stress the need for Federal participation in the costs of welfare services. More and more emphasis should be placed upon prompt amelioration of individual and family problems and upon prevention whenever possible. North Carolina's public-welfare program has for a number of years devoted more time proportionately to social services not involving financial assistance than any other State program involving administration of two or three of the public-assistance categories. County departments of public welfare are asking for much-needed additional personnel. They see the value of preventive programs. They realize the need for more effective services to children in particular. Those of us close to the local scene can cite case after case of what happens to children deprived of needed services. If children are our most valuable resource, surely it is time to make the relatively small investments required for more effectively conserving this resource. Services in North Carolina to individual children have increased from 9,800 in October 1944 to 16,100 in October 1949. Under the present annual Federal appropriation of $3,500,000, North Carolina's annual share is just about half what we are spending this year. This is possible because of some accumulation of funds. If the allocation of $7,000,000 for child-welfare services provided for in H. R. 6000 is made it will only make possible maintenance of our present level of services to children. On every hand, we are being urged to provide greatly needed services and to give more children the benefit of social-service programs. The need exists and is clearly recognized in every local community. Counties are already carrying their fair share of the costs. Only by increasing the Federal appropriation for child-welfare services substantially above the $7,000,000 will we be able to continue to advance in this much-needed area.

In conclusion, we urge that this committee take the necessary steps to amend H. R. 6000 to provide for further extension of old-age and survivors insurance and for Federal participation in a more comprehensive public-welfare program.

Potatoes Without Gravy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, Potatoes Without Gravy, by Fern Thomas. This gives another side of the potato story.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Mars Hill (Maine) View of January 19, 1950]

POTATOES WITHOUT GRAVY

(By Fern Thomas)

As I read Vance Packard's article in the American magazine entitled "Potatoes and Gravy," I had a feeling of amusement and disgust. Evidently Mr. Packard contacted some tall-story tellers on his trip to Aroostook County, or some people thinking him very gullible and knowing he would swallow all they told him talked for his benefit.

I am not a writer but I would like to state a few truths in regard to Aroostook County.

I am past middle age and have lived in Aroostook County the greater part of my life. Yes, I was born and lived on a farm until I was 16 years of age. Let me tell you people who have read Potatoes and Gravy, which appeared in the November 1949 issue of the American magazine, that there were plenty of potatoes at times without any gravy. I have known years when Aroostook farmers sprouted their potatoes and sold them for 15 and 20 cents a barrel.

Some farmers lost their farms as they could not hold them when potatoes sold for that price. Many Aroostook farms were mortgaged and for years some farmers had all they could do to even pay the interest on the mortgage. Regardless of all these hardships they struggled on for Aroostook people are made of the stuff that is not easily licked. They have courage and perseverance and go on regardless of hardships.

Some of the farmers who lost their homes made a come-back through hard labor and shrewd management and left considerable property and money when they passed on.

It is courage and "guts" that has made Aroostook County prosperous. If outsiders are jealous of Aroostook farmers, cultivate some of the above.

I have known farmers and their wives to arise at 3 o'clock in the morning the year around and work until 10 or 11 o'clock at night. Especially through the farming season this seemed necessary as there was so much work to do.

Many farmers after harvesting their crops and plowing their ground for another year would hike to a lumber camp and earn the munificent sum of $1 a day through the winter in order to pay their bills and provide for their families.

The farmers kept sheep, and their wives, after the wool had been sent to the carding mills, spun it into yarn and knitted underclothing, stockings, and mittens for the family. They also wove woolen cloth and made garments for the men and boys. They knitted stockings and mittens and their husbands carried them to the lumber camps and sold them for a few cents a pair—to men employed there.

The wealthy farmers referred to in Mr. Packard's article made their money long before the Government guaranteed price of potatoes. I remember all those nice homes referred to, as a child, and as I mentioned at the beginning of this article, I'm no spring chicken. However, the size of some of those homes were exaggerated as there are very few 22-room houses in Aroostook County—maybe two or three. If people had been building homes since the Government guaranteed price of potatoes they would have constructed them according to modern types and not built the large houses which were built years ago.

Some of our so-called businessmen accused of not knowing a potato bug when it crawled down their nose would very quickly recognize a two-legged "louse" in the form of a newspaper reporter. Believe me, we have real men in Aroostook County and they would recognize potato bugs as well as other kinds of vermin.

A professional man who moved away from Aroostook County some years ago says he is always glad to return to Aroostook County for a visit in order to associate with he-men.

We have heard people who came here from small towns down State to make their living claim that Aroostook people are not cultured. Just why do people like that stay here? I notice they are glad to remain here and pull down a good fat salary.

People in Aroostook County do try to educate their children and some also travel abroad and to Florida and California winters, but not just since the Government guaranteed price of potatoes. People who had money always did those things. As a youngster some of the people I remember visited Europe and spent winters in Florida and California. In regard to education, I noticed last summer when attending college that nearly every county in Maine as well as Aroostook County was represented.

Many people in Aroostook County have money that was not made by raising potatoes. Some of the nice farms have been handed down from one generation to another. The farm I lived on was owned by my grandfather at one time and he did not make money by raising potatoes but by lumbering.

I can remember when Aroostook farmers raised cows and sold butter for 15 and 20 cents a pound. Eggs brought 12 cents a dozen. Is it any wonder they do not care to go back to those times? Would you?

Farmers are not getting as rich as Mr. Packard would lead people to believe. Farming is an expensive business and I'll venture to say the average farmer is just keeping his head above water.

If reporters for magazines are coming to Aroostook County to write about conditions, it would be a good idea to secure correct information and write up articles accordingly.

Why pick on the Aroostook farmer? Hasn't he as much right to some assistance as people in other walks of life in different sections of the country?

I'm for Aroostook 100 percent. Long may the farmers live and enjoy the fruits of their labor.

FERN L. THOMAS.

ROBINSON, MAINE.

Threat to Oil Exploration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Threat to Oil Exploration," published in the Oil City Derrick of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THREAT TO OIL EXPLORATION

The Treasury Department has taken its periodic dig at the oil and gas industry over

the question of depletion allowance, a tax adjustment permitted the industry for many years because of the risks involved and the intangible costs which enter into the continuing search for new reserves.

This time the dig came in President Truman's tax message to Congress. He termed the depletion allowance, or special tax deduction allowed oil, gas, and mining interests, the most inequitable "loophole" in the tax laws and urged that something be done about it. He made no specific recommendations, however.

There is nothing new in the President's stand on the matter of the depletion allowance. Over a period of years, the Treasury Department at regular intervals has attempted to whack the allowance but on each occasion Congress has stood firm and has refused to alter the tax-adjustment provision.

Briefly the provisions complained of by the President permit the owner of an oil or gas well to deduct from taxes 27½ percent of the gross income of his property up to a limit of half the net income from that property, and to deduct from his income expenditures for intangible drilling costs.

The President's recommendation is causing grave concern among oilmen in this area, as well as in all other producing areas of the Nation. And rightly so. For it is generally recognized that elimination or any serious reduction in the present tax adjustment allowed the industry will constitute an alarming threat to further oil exploration.

The oil industry is rated as the biggest gambling industry of them all. The continuing search for new reserves with its subsequent drilling of so many dry or unproductive holes makes it such. It was largely to provide the incentive and meet the risks involved in this extensive exploration work that oilmen were granted the benefit of the depletion allowance in filing income-tax returns.

Take the allowance away and there is grave danger that oil exploration will be seriously curtailed. Action such as that recommended by the President would mean an increase in income taxes for the industry and a cut into the working capital now employed to finance the search for new oil reserves.

Oilmen are particularly fearful of the consequences of any such action on the small independent producers such as make up, to a large degree, the Pennsylvania oil industry. For they, undoubtedly, would be less able to pay the proposed higher income rates without injury than would the larger concerns.

The importance of oil to the future of the Nation cannot be overlooked. The continuing search for new reserves must go on. Congress should not take any action that will hamper future oil exploration.

Senatorial Candidate in Indiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Confused as to Loyalties?" from the Palladium-Item and Sun-Telegram of Richmond, Ind.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONFUSED AS TO LOYALTIES?

Alex M. Campbell, Fort Wayne attorney, is a candidate for the Democratic New Deal Fair Deal nomination for United States Senator for Indiana.

He is the man who announced that if we Hoosiers would nominate and elect him he would, in substance, not represent us in the Senate. He said he would back President Truman in everything Truman wants. Some citizen to trust with our free institutions, isn't he?

The other night Campbell spoke at a Roosevelt Day dinner at Columbus, Ind. He told all about how that great Red baiter, Harry Truman, was succeeding in driving the Communists out of the Government in Washington, which Truman heads. Campbell did not, however, tell how those Communists happened to get into our Government. How could he at a dinner in honor of Franklin Roosevelt, the man who began giving China to the Reds under the guidance of Alger Hiss?

Campbell praised Truman to the skies for his loyalty campaign. He said Truman has the courage to issue a Presidential directive for an all-out fight on subversives.

Campbell, in case you have forgotten, is speaking about the Harry Truman who snarled at a House committee to investigate subversive activities 2 years ago for bringing out Whittaker Chambers' charges of espionage against Alger Hiss; the Harry Truman who snarled "red herring" at that committee for helping to show up that fair-haired favorite of Franklin Roosevelt and Dean Acheson in the State Department.

Rubber-stamp Alex, he is.

He is willing to back Harry Truman in anything that brainy and loyal American wants.

If Truman wants to protect Reds in the Government from detection, apparently rubber-stamp Alex, as Senator, would support him.

If Truman decides that trying to help the Reds in our Government is getting him in dutch with the ordinary people of the Nation and wants to start a purge of those Reds in order to gain public favor again, rubber-stamp Alex would support him in that.

He is for anything Red-Herring Harry wants.

Wouldn't you rather be represented in the Senate by a loyal American who will always be for what you want under our Constitution?

The National Debt

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The National Debt," published in the Christian Union Herald of January 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATIONAL DEBT

To most thoughtful Americans, one of the very alarming phenomena of the last quarter century has been the rising indebtedness of our Federal Government. Is it any exaggeration to say that an astronomer's measuring stick is needed to compute the accumulated Treasury deficits during the past two decades? In 1926—the year that I finished seminary and entered my profession—the country's financial obligation amounted to a modest $10,000,000,000 or $15,000,000,000. But with the descent of the depression in 1929, a mad spending spree began, which first meant huge outlays of cash to relieve the needy, then involved still greater expenditures to prosecute and win the war, and finally has required such lavish postwar assistance to Europe and Asia, that late reports show our indebtedness to creditors to be $253,000,000,000. No nation in history, to my knowledge, has ever contracted such a debt, and with the Government currently refusing to balance the budget, the end of the sobering spectacle is by no means in sight.

Some political observers make light of the tragedy. They tell us that we need have no concern, because the money is owed, not to any foreign state, but to our own American citizens, and if worse comes to worst, we may cancel the obligation, and small harm will be done. That easy answer to so serious a problem is both morally and economically unsound. Can a country preserve its self-respect and ignore the obligations it owes itself? And what is equally important, would the cancellation of this indebtedness, or even the repayment of the same indebtedness with inflated dollars, not involve the Nation in an immediate and very dangerous crisis? If and when Uncle Sam is unable to redeem with good money his promises to pay, then and there the Government in power will be out, and an emergency government with dictatorial authority would take its place. Such a critical situation could confront our country at any moment now. And you may be sure that no free and democratic society may be maintained if we repudiate our debt, or propose to pay it off with worthless currency.

A few men in Washington who still have a modicum of self-respect, consider the debt to be a moral obligation, but they want to liquidate it by means which would certainly destroy the people's freedom. They hope, through prohibitive taxation of corporations, to make it so miserable for businessmen, that the state may eventually take over all industry and use the considerable profits to clear our country of its staggering debt-load. That move, of course, would mean a socialistic state not unlike the one which obtains in England at the present time. Under such a scheme, free enterprise will flee America as surely as it has flown from the British Isles. And beyond any immediate tampering with business, I dare to think that one area of society after another would be seized by the Government until widespread liberty as we have always known and cherished it, would be cast into the limbo.

This article is written in the interest of American freedom, and is addressed especially to the younger generation. Better than their elders, youth understand the relation of liberty to a country's fiscal solvency, and at the same time have courage to deal drastically with any crisis which affects their future welfare. How may our boys and girls scale down the Nation's great indebtedness, and therefore register victory in a fight where their fathers have so unprotestingly accepted defeat? The answer to that question is anything but pleasant, because it involves both political responsibility and sobering self-denial. The youth of America must, for one thing, demand that the Federal budget be balanced immediately—deficit spending has to stop, even at the expense of dismissing hordes of bureaucrats from the Government pay roll. But they must, for another thing, demand that Federal revenue be increased, not by socialistic controls over industry and

business, to be sure, but by levying higher personal taxes—upon themselves and their offspring. These are stiff requirements, I know, but they are preferable to abandoning this country's freedom.

E. MARCELLUS NESBITT.

Policy of Appeasement of Communism in the East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Concord Monitor, January 6, 1950, entitled "By Default Again," which is a very good analysis of the Communist appeasement policy which we are following in the East.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BY DEFAULT AGAIN?

It goes without saying that the United States has an interest in what happens to the island of Formosa. National defense alone dictates such an interest, for to have any semblance of defense these days a nation must have far-flung outposts upon which it can depend. These may be possessions, or they may be owned by other, but friendly nations.

If the Chinese Communists take over Formosa, as our administration seems bent upon having them do, we have lost an outpost.

This country has access to the Japanese islands to the north, and to the Philippines to the south, and stepping stones to them in the broad Pacific. Formosa, in enemy hands, would breach the line of potential defenses at the far side of the Pacific.

It is proposed by the administration that we do absolutely nothing to help keep Formosa out of Communist hands. Yet, on the other bastion of communism, in Europe, we have given arms and other aid to such nations as Turkey, Greece, France, etc. Nor has such aid led to war. It has, all agree, helped to stem the advance of communism.

This Nation is spending about $15,000,000,000 a year on its armed services, and for that price they ought to be performing useful services. As a matter of fact our armed services believe that Formosa should be kept from Communist control, but the State Department, and now President Truman, say "No."

Our problem is to maintain peace in this world and to preserve the democratic way of life. To maintain peace we must prevent communism from gobbling up any more nations. Already we have in recent times helped the Communists to acquire a strangle hold upon two continents. In the East we virtually gave them Manchuria and part of Korea, though these lands were not ours to give away. We certainly didn't help the Chinese to keep them from overrunning that country, with weapons we had given the Communists.

In Europe we have said that the Communists must be stopped, and we have taken all manner of steps to accomplish that purpose. But in Asia we are lying down on the job, and the American people cannot understand why.

A show of force by us isn't going to precipitate war upon us by Russia, any more than the constant show of force by Russia. If Russia really wants to take us on she will use any excuse she pleases. To her a show of force is the only thing she understands and respects. She will holler bloody murder, but that she does all the time, even when we are acting like a scared little boy, which is a failing we too often have in our international relationships.

We have soldiers in Japan and Korea. We may as well have some more in Formosa, rather than keeping them in cozy quarters here at home. If we put our own soldiers on the island, to defend it and to protect the Chinese Nationalist Government and to help it, we would be doing more than we already are doing at numerous spots around the earth. We are protecting the Japanese from Communist absorption, and they were our enemy. The Chinese were an ally.

Once more the weaknesses and inconsistencies of this Nation's foreign policies, and their nonexistence in many respects, is forcefully demonstrated by the Formosa situation. Nothing has been anticipated. We have not been prepared for what obviously was bound to develop in time.

The State Department has been at loose ends for some years. It still seems to be, despite the rather rapid succession of Secretaries who have attempted to head the Department. Under Roosevelt the Department was not under its own steam. Under Truman it seems to be left to its own resources, but it still is at loose ends.

Congress may, and it probably should, seek to find out what the answers are. If it does, the Formosa situation will be the inspiration for efforts to end some of the confusion and contentions within the Government as to foreign policies.

Is Prejudice Poisoning Our Kids?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, it has long been the contention of child psychologists and sociologists that children are born without any sort of racial or religious prejudice, but quickly learn them from their elders. A study has recently been made showing how prejudices are acquired by children, and what an appallingly large percentage of our children are indoctrinated with such prejudices. This study, called the Philadelphia Early Childhood Project, brings out facts which are startling and appalling, and should be studied by all who sincerely believe that prejudices must be eliminated if we want to have a true democracy. I wish to insert in the RECORD an article from the November issue of the Woman's Home Companion entitled "Is Prejudice Poisoning Our Kids?"

IS PREJUDICE POISONING OUR KIDS?
(By Howard Whitman)

"What a shock to learn that my own child is prejudiced!" The speaker was a prominent educator, a good parent, a good American in every sense of the word. His 6-year-old daughter had said, "Let's cross the street, Daddy, here comes a nigger."

"If she had measles," he continued, "I'd know what to do. But this disease frightens me."

This disease may well frighten all America. When adult minds are corrupted with prejudice it is tragic. But when the minds of children are poisoned, it is more than a tragedy. It is a strident summons.

How dark is the record?

We never knew until now. This article has the necessary, if poignant, duty of bringing to light the first comprehensive investigation of prejudice in children. It is an unbeautiful report. Look:

"Catholic people are no good."

"Protestants go to hell."

"We don't like Jews on our street."

"I ain't playing with no more niggers."

These are not the statements of full-fledged bigots. They are the words of little children. They are taken verbatim from the record—out of the mouths of kindergartners, first and second graders, ages 5, 6, and 7.

The investigation was made in Philadelphia. Called the Philadelphia Early Childhood Project, it placed the calipers of scientific measurement upon the social perceptions and attitudes of children in six public schools from kindergarten to second grade. The work took three painstaking years. It was conducted jointly by the Bureau for Intercultural Education, of New York; the Research Center for Group Dynamics, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology; the Philadelphia Fellowship Commission and the Philadelphia public schools.

The findings will startle even experts, many of whom have assumed that children are not prejudiced.

"Actually," comments Helen G. Trager, director of the project, "we found many children saturated with prejudice. Nearly all were tainted in some degree."

What are children—little monsters?

Not at all.

They are little images. They are reflections of the adult world. No child was ever born a bigot, but he can become one incredibly early.

Every child is a blank page, as the Companion pointed out in a memorable article on children's thinking pattern, Your Town Can Do It Too (June 1944) and you can write practically what you will on that blank page. States the Philadelphia report: "The individual (child) not only follows the dictates of his environment concerning attitudes toward Negroes, Catholics, et cetera, but he comes to accept these attitude as his own (and) he uses them conveniently."

The Philadelphia project employed a special tool to measure child prejudice. It is called a social espisodes test. The children were shown simple drawings, nine in all, illustrating everyday situations which might evoke an expression of prejudice in a prejudiced person. Social scientists call this a projective technique. There's nothing significant in the picture itself; the significance is in what you project into it.

Thus, when one second-grader looked at a picture of white children playing handball with a Negro child, he commented, "The colored kid wants to steal the ball. That's why the white kids have to go somewhere else." There was nothing in the picture to indicate that anybody wanted to steal anything or that the white kids weren't perfectly happy.

The series of nine drawings deals with racial and religious differences, religious symbols and cultural observances. Nothing is said to the child about prejudice or group relations or anything else which might color his responses. He is merely asked such neutral questions as: "Tell me about this picture: Why isn't this little boy playing?" "Is this little boy glad he is colored?" "Is this little boy glad he is Protestant?" "What are these boys—they are watching children leaving a synagogue—going to do?" "Are

these children—leaving a Catholic church—glad they are Catholic?" "Are these children—white and colored—friends?"

The child who has not been tainted with prejudice will have none to project into the pictures. For example, one second-grader, looking at the picture of a colored boy left out of a game, says, "If the colored boy were white they would let him play. Even if he is colored they should let him play. What's different about him?"

Another second-grader remarks, "I like any kind—Catholic, Jewish, or any kind. Any kind of people except bad people."

But such attitudes appeared in only 7 percent of the children.

By contrast, the project report is swamped with attitudes like these:

Viewing the synagogue picture, one child says, "The Christian children laugh at the Jewish children because they go to synagogue." Another, when the tester asks what the four non-Jewish children are going to do, replies, "I think they're going to beat up the Jewish boys because the Catholics don't like the Jewish people * * * and the Jewish people don't like the Catholic people."

Responding to the Catholic church picture, one first-grader says, "Nobody will play with those children if they're not Protestant." Another child remarks, "I'm glad I'm not Catholic. They are bad."

When it came to the Negroes the children showed the saddest symptoms of all. They showed how deeply the adult world has infected them with racial hatred, fear, falsehood, and distrust. Here are the words of 5-, 6-, and 7-year-old Americans viewing the picture of the Negro boy on the sidelines of a game: "White people don't want to play with that colored boy because they know he cheats and is too tough." "All the other children will go away and leave the little colored boy alone. That's what always happens around my street."

Even when viewing a picture in which a Negro child and white children are playing together, one kindergartner, in answer to the tester's question—"What are these children going to do"—says:

"They are going to make a snowball and wash the colored boy's face with it."

There is abundant evidence throughout the study that children come by their prejudices by aping grown-ups. Not necessarily their parents; they ape grown-up culture as a whole. They take their cues from neighborhood incidents, the talk of a truck driver, a remark of a teacher, conversation of others. As Prof. Gordon W. Allport, of Harvard, remarks, "Children are not born with prejudices. They catch them."

What they catch mostly are the stereotypes of prejudice. These are the sweeping generalizations, the hate capsules. Professor Allport points out, "Some Europeans think all Americans are loud-mouthed spendthrifts. This stereotyped judgment is a prejudice."

We who know Americans can spike the stereotypes with ease. We know that some Americans are loud-mouthed spendthrifts. So are some Englishmen, some Frenchmen, and some Afghanistanians. But all Americans are not loud-mouthed spendthrifts.

Summing up the mountains of data, the Philadelphia researchers rated each child on his attitude of acceptance or rejection of various social groups. Toward Jews, 63 percent were neutral, noncommittal, or evasive; only 10 percent accepted Jews and 27 percent openly rejected them. Catholics were openly rejected by 9 percent and Protestants by 1 percent.

When it came to the white children's attitudes toward Negroes, 32 percent were neutral or had mixed feelings, 68 percent openly rejected Negroes, and none at all accepted them.

The report from Philadelphia—City of Brotherly Love—should do more than make adults shake their heads and say, "Imagine." It should evoke more than the bleats of the self-righteous—"Oh, that may be true of other children, but my children certainly aren't prejudiced." Plenty of parents in Philadelphia said that—until the probing tests showed that their children had the virus, too.

Prejudice hurts the prejudiced, psychiatrists tell us. They now know that prejudice is a personality disease.

And the antidote?

I sat over a child's play table in the experimental school for preschool children at St. Joseph College in Hartford, Conn. Across from me was Sister Mary de Lourdes, director of the school. She was explaining that Protestant, Jew, and Catholic, white and colored children, go to the school together.

"We don't want our children vulnerable to rickets, diphtheria, or typhoid," Sister Mary remarked. "And neither do we want them vulnerable to prejudice. We want to immunize them against it."

This is the new enlightened thinking on an age-old problem.

Sister Mary engaged a Negro teacher for the St. Joseph nursery school. Some of the Hartford parents had been raised in the South and were shocked. But they got over it. One mother, reared in Mississippi, said a few months later—to her credit—"It is a little hard on us, Sister Mary. But I'm extremely happy that my child will never have to get over what I'm having such trouble getting over myself."

How does prejudice harm the prejudiced?

"It restricts the development of personality," says Dr. Frances L. Ilg, assistant professor of child development at Yale.

But the most incisive diagnosis I heard came not from a psychologist or a doctor of medicine—but from a New Haven housewife, Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, mother of three. Mrs. Day—who has good reason to know about prejudice, as we shall see later—sat in her early American book-walled living room and said:

"The child infected with prejudice is doomed to live a confined life, to build walls around himself and be a prisoner of his own ill feelings. Such a child never can live at ease. He sends out hatred and thus creates enemies—real or imaginary. He must live in fear of these enemies and under the threat that his own hatred will rebound against him."

No one could wish upon his child a life like that. And so thousands of American parents already are doing all they can to bestow free and loving personalities upon their children and not the stingy pinch of prejudice. Many a parent can honestly say, "We've driven prejudice out of our own minds—our children can never catch it from us."

But what about the neighbors, the school, playmates, people on streetcars and street corners, restricted neighborhoods, Jim Crow, college quotas, fraternity exclusion—and all the many clouds of prejudice that hang in our American skies like sultry blots?

Children can catch prejudice on the outside as readily as they can at home.

Willard Johnson, of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, warns: "One family can poison a neighborhood. A few prejudiced children in the block can contaminate your child."

So we who are parents have a special job of protection to do. We must take positive steps to save our children from prejudice as we take positive steps to save them from other diseases. We must start early. Children's attitudes are formed from birth to the age of 6. These attitudes jell from 6 to 12. They solidify from 12 to 18. Thus the Philadelphia project advises us that the saving of children from prejudice cannot be postponed until adolescence, but must be begun in preschool and early school years.

It's the old story: you can stop it if you catch it early. Up to age 6 youngsters' attitudes can be changed with ease; from 6 to 12 the changing is more difficult—but they can be changed.

"We have learned to inoculate against physical disease at earlier and earlier ages. If we do a good job, sometimes we can give the child immunity for life. Immunity against prejudice works quite the same way," counsels Dr. Ilg.

Against the disease of prejudice we ourselves are the health-giving serum. If children catch prejudice from adults, so they catch free and loving attitudes from adults. They can catch from us not just bland and supine lack of prejudice, but powerful democratic attitudes which defy prejudice.

"We can intentionally sit next to a Negro on a bus," suggests Sister Mary de Lourdes.

"We can take our children to visit Catholic, Jewish, and Protestant houses of worship," suggests Willard Johnson.

"We can invite Jewish neighbors into Christian homes and Christian neighbors into Jewish homes," suggests Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day.

When my own daughter was 4 she came in one day and said, "I don't like black people. They're dirty." I felt like my educator friend—shocked that my own daughter was showing prejudice. My wife and I locked horns with the problem then and there. We explained to our little girl, not once but many times over the ensuing months, that God made many kinds of people in this world. He made them many colors, just as He made roses many colors. In color, people are like flowers. Some are red, some are yellow, some are dark, and some are light.

When our little girl is older and studies anthropology she will learn that there are no important differences between peoples of different colors. She will learn that there is actually more similarity between two fat men of different races than between a fat man and a thin man of the same race. She will learn that there is much more similarity between a colored and a white housemaid than between a colored housemaid and a colored schoolteacher.

The first virulent symptom of anti-Semitism often is a child's angry accusation to a Jewish playmate, "Jews are Christ-killers. You killed Christ."

Sister Mary de Lourdes suggests that to spike this stereotype, you give children as much history of the crucifixion as they're capable of understanding.

"Tell them first that Jesus was a great Jewish leader," she suggests. "Tell them that people who were in power at that time were afraid Jesus would come into power. Tell them that finally Jesus was sentenced to death by the Roman governor—who was not a Jew. Above all—help the children realize that all this was long, long ago and that it has nothing to do with the Jewish people of today."

Once at Christmastime Sister Mary sensed that the Jewish children in her school were feeling uncomfortable. She was standing near the Bethlehem scene that had been set up for the holiday. Calling the children's attention to the holy family, she said, "You know, children, Joseph was a Jew and Mary was a Jew and Baby Jesus was a Jew."

Given such attitudes as these, children later can appreciate that it was the hatred in mankind which killed Jesus.

Dr. Ilg, from her years with Dr. Arnold Gesell at Yale's clinic of child development, offers the following suggestions for inoculation against prejudice year by year:

"Age 3," she says, "is a good time to have your child play in mixed groups, if he hasn't already."

Ages 4 and 5, Dr. Ilg suggests, are the times to broaden the child. He should be told about the world and its people; he should learn that China is on the other side of the globe—that its people are yellow; he should know that there are red and black people, Eskimos, Indians, and orientals.

Six to eight is what Dr. Ilg calls the rhyming stage. Many clichés of prejudices are passed around in the rhymes and chants which 6- to 8-year-olds sing. We harm the child when we let them pass. We miss the chance to give him healthy attitudes instead of unhealthy ones.

Age 9, Dr. Ilg suggests, is a good time for concrete democratic action. "It is a good age to visit churches and temples," she says. Parents and children should go together, for the point is not merely to get acquainted with other religions. The point is to demonstrate to your children that you have a healthy attitude toward other religions. Let them catch it from you.

What Dr. Ilg calls the intellectual approach can come at age 10. The child is then ready for facts about minorities, about color lines, about scapegoating, about discrimination. Help him to understand prejudice—and be mighty glad he is free from it.

Is there anything more parents can do?

Mrs. Gertrude Hart Day, of New Haven, is an eighth-generation American. She was reared in a house built by her New England forebears in 1755. Today Mrs. Day heads the New Haven neighborhood project—one of the Nation's most effective antidotes to prejudice—because, as she says, "I've had a taste of prejudice. I know how poisonous it is."

During the war Mrs. Day's husband was in the Army Medical Corps and she, with her 3 children, followed him for 2 years through 14 cities from Maryland to Texas.

"I, who had always lived a comfortable life as a member of the accepted majority, suddenly found that I had no status," she relates. "Because I had three children, no one wanted to rent a house to me. The children and I were forced to live with other people who 'didn't belong.'

"Yes, I knew I'd be coming back to my comfortable niche after the war. But what about my wartime neighbors—all those minorities who had no niches to return to?"

So Mrs. Day came back to New Haven to her comfortable niche. She gathered a few other women around her. And in June 1946, the New Haven Neighborhood Project was launched. It first set up a playground. Then it started a nursery school. Then a summer play school. All three for all kinds of children, white and colored, Christian and Jew.

The New Haven parents didn't stop at that. They formed adult groups, they went to work on their own prejudices. "There was Mary, a second-generation American, mother of two children. She knew she didn't like Negroes, though she didn't know why," Mrs. Day relates.

"We who loved Mary were able to help her overcome her prejudice in a simple pleasant way.

"We invited a young Negro woman of Mary's own age and educational background to come to our afternoon teas. She and Mary had in common a rare love of music. Little by little they felt their common interest more strongly until one afternoon they sat side by side on the piano bench to play together."

The New Haven parents meet frequently at one another's homes. They don't have formal pep meetings about democracy. Groups with similar interests simply meet casually. People who like music come together for musical evenings—and it's just incidental that some are white and some are Negro and some are Christians and some are Jews.

"The most important thing," says Mrs. Day, "is that our children peek down the stairway and see us."

When they look in on an evening like that, the poison of prejudice can never touch them.

Attitude of the Secretary of State Toward Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Mississippi Legislature Rebukes Acheson," taken from the Washington Times-Herald of Saturday, January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MISSISSIPPI LEGISLATURE REBUKES ACHESON—SUPPORT OF HISS IS CALLED SHOCKING

JACKSON, MISS., January 27—Secretary of State Dean Acheson drew a sharp rebuke from the Mississippi House of Representatives today for his comment on the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss.

"I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," the Secretary said this week after the Hiss conviction.

The legislators unanimously adopted a resolution branding the statement as shocking and unprecedented.

"We have the spectacle in our country," shouted gray-haired delta planter Walter Sillers, "of a man proved of disloyalty, convicted after two trials, being defended by a man in the position of holding and guarding the secrets of his country, who stands by him (Hiss) instead of standing by the people of his country."

The resolution also slapped at the appearance of Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed as defense character witnesses in the first Hiss trial. It termed their appearance an unprecedented spectacle.

The resolution called for a congressional investigation of the State Department and other departments of the Federal Government, including the judiciary.

It asked that summary action be taken to rid these departments of all persons, from the highest to the lowest rank, who do not measure up to the strictest test of loyalty.

Preservation of Our National Forests

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WARREN G. MAGNUSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, January 26 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses, one delivered by Mr. Lyle F. Watts, Chief, United States Forest Service, at the dedication of Gifford Pinchot National Forest, on October 15, 1949, and the other, also a very able address by Mrs. Gifford Pinchot, on the same occasion.

I am informed that the cost of printing the two addresses will be $205, and that they will require 2½ pages of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GREATEST GOOD OF THE GREATEST NUMBER—ADDRESS BY LYLE F. WATTS, CHIEF, UNITED STATES FOREST SERVICE

In dedicating the Gifford Pinchot National Forest today, we honor one of America's great men.

It was Gifford Pinchot who gave conservation its first great impetus in the United States. It was largely through his tireless crusading efforts that conservation has become a part of our national policy. The ideas and forces that Gifford Pinchot set in motion may well determine the future security and prosperity and progress of this Nation. They may indeed determine the future welfare of the entire human race.

There are many here today who knew and worked with G. P., as Gifford Pinchot was familiarly and affectionately known to all his associates. They remember G. P. as a man of tremendous energy and enthusiasm, as an inspiring leader, as a zealous crusader. They knew him as a courageous, unflinching fighter in the public interest and for the public good. His cause did not need to be popular if it was right. He seemed at times to be fighting almost single-handed; but history has shown that the people were behind him.

Pinchot was the first Chief of the United States Forest Service. He was the first American to hang out his shingle as a consulting forester. He engineered the first conference of State Governors for the consideration of conservation policies. He promoted the North American Conservation Conference, the first conservation meeting on an international level. He was a cofounder of the Society of American Foresters, which is participating in these ceremonies today.

Pinchot was a man of many interests and many capabilities. But forest conservation was his first and greatest concern. Some of us here remember when Gifford Pinchot spoke to a group of foresters a few years ago. He said: "I have been a governor now and then, but I am a forester all the time—have been, and shall be to my dying day." He was indeed. At the time of his death in 1946, he was working over the management plan for the forests on his own land. In his last years, Pinchot suggested and promoted a world-wide conservation meeting—the initial impetus for the United Nations Scientific Conference on the Conservation of Natural Resources held at Lake Success just a few weeks ago.

The conservation movement, which Gifford Pinchot played such a big part in launching, has made much headway. Today we have a splendid system of national forests, making many important contributions to local communities and to national welfare. The timber and other resources of these national forests are managed for a sustained yield, for permanent and continuing production and use in the public interest. Our national forests are furnishing an increasingly significant portion of the country's timber supply; they are protecting vitally important sources of water; their grazing lands contribute to the Nation's supply of meat, wool, and leather; they afford recreational opportunities for millions of people. Their returns to the public in timber production, water supplies, flood control, livestock production, wildlife, recreation, and other services far exceed the costs of administration. It would indeed be difficult to place a dollars and cents value on many of their services and benefits.

We have in the various States, many strong, competent State forestry departments that

are doing notable work in forest protection and development. Fifty years ago, when Gifford Pinchot was beginning his crusade for forestry, only feeble beginnings had been made in systematic protection of the forests from fire. Today, State forestry agencies are heading up a cooperative program that provides organized protection for a total of some 340,000,000 acres of State and private forest land. State forests have been established and developed by many of the States, and in many other activities, State agencies are doing a good job for the advancement of forestry.

And so are many private owners of forest land. The forest-management programs of a number of lumber and pulp and paper companies are noteworthy. The forest industries have sponsored a tree-farm program in which hundreds of forest owners have signed up, pledging to manage their timber holdings for continuous production.

I have mentioned these advances in forestry particularly because they are the things with which I am most familiar and most directly concerned. There have been many other noteworthy advances in conservation. An aggressive program of soil conservation is under way. Wildlife management has made great strides. Deer and elk have made such a strong comeback that in some areas the problem is now to control excess populations instead of bringing back the vanished herds.

All of these things add up to an impressive total of achievement. Conservation is definitely on the move.

But we still have a long, long way to go. There is nothing in the record to justify any complacency. For the United States as a whole, we have yet to reverse the downward trend of our timber resources. The annual drain of saw-timber, though below a desirable goal for future production, still exceeds the rate of growth. Furthermore, much of the drain is of high-quality old-growth timber, and especially of the more valuable softwoods needed for construction lumber, plywood, and other important uses; whereas much of the growth is of inferior kinds of hardwoods and other poor-quality material. Millions of acres capable of producing high-grade timber now have only a scrubby, almost worthless growth. The general quality of our timber stands is steadily deteriorating.

Despite the excellent forestry programs of many forest owners, the fact remains that only 36 percent of all this country's operating private commercial forest land is being handled according to practices that assure the forest being kept in reasonably productive condition. Sixty-four percent of the cutting practice must be classed as poor or destructive.

The average grazing capacity of our western ranges is little more than half of what it was originally, or of what it should be now. Many ranges are badly deteriorated; in some areas nutritious perennial grasses have almost wholly disappeared; fertile top soil is being washed or blown away, increasing the difficulty of restoring range and watershed values.

Nearly all of our major rivers run muddy, much or all of the time. When you see a muddy river, you are seeing soil from farms and hillsides being carried off to the sea, or to be deposited along the way to clog stream channels or silt up the reservoirs. Every year, raging floods take a toll of human life and cause millions of dollars worth of property damage. A lot of this damage could be averted by more adequate attention to the watershed lands where the floods come from. Some watersheds have so deteriorated that a flash flood may start from less than an inch of rainfall.

And while too much water is wasted in floods, adequate, dependable water supplies for irrigation, industrial, and domestic use are becoming an increasingly acute problem in many parts of the West, and even in some parts of the more humid East. Many streams that are raging torrents during a rainy spell dry up soon after because not enough water gets into the ground to feed a steady flow. Many valley wells go dry for the same reason.

Such things as these indicate the big jobs ahead in conservation. If I sound like an alarmist at this moment, it is because I believe there is cause for alarm. In the face of a growing population our natural resources are declining. You cannot build an expanding economy on declining resources.

But I see no need for defeatism or despair. We know which way we should go. Gifford Pinchot and other early day conservationists long ago pointed the way. They were the pioneer pathfinders who first signposted what William Vogt, in his recent thought-provoking book, has called the Road to Survival. We can build up depleted resources. We can see that renewable resources are so managed that they will be continuously renewed. But it will take some aggressive, forthright action.

We need aggressive action to control unwise or destructive timber cutting—to establish certain basic rules of practice that will assure continued productivity of the forests. Some 14 States have already enacted legislation looking toward such regulation of forest practices. Their regulatory laws vary greatly in effectiveness and administration. We need Nation-wide standards and action on a Nation-wide scale to protect progressive owners from destructive competition, to stop further forest destruction and deterioration, and so help to maintain a reasonable growing stock as a basis for future timber production. This need was clearly foreseen by Gifford Pinchot. It has grown more urgent with the passing years.

We need also to tighten up still more our protection of the forests from fire. We need more protection work against destructive insects and diseases.

Along with such urgent defensive measures, we need positive action on a big scale to restore and build up resources. We need intensive education and other cooperative services to help forest owners improve their forests and practice real sustained yield management. We need to strengthen the public forests. We need to eliminate overgrazing and build up run-down ranges. We need to improve the condition of many watersheds. We need to replant or reseed millions of depleted acres to restore them to productivity.

And we need to get on with these things now. Time is marching on. For a century and more this country has been taking much from the land but putting little back. You can't keep on that way indefinitely. We have grown rich in worldly goods, but we are getting poorer in the natural resources that are the basis of those goods. And the longer we delay, the bigger and costlier will be the job of restoration that will have to be done if we are to maintain our high living standards and our strong place in the family of nations.

Ours is a Nation capable of doing things in a big way. We should aim high. Our goal should be continued abundance, not just to get by.

When Gifford Pinchot was Chief Forester, the guiding principle was laid down that our national forests should be managed for the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run. That principle has meaning not only within the boundaries of the national forests. It should motivate all public action. That the public has a stake in all natural resources was basic in Gifford Pinchot's thought. He strove to awaken realization of the fact that ownership of the land does not justify its abuse; that we of this generation hold the land in trust for the generations to follow; that it is our responsibility to see that it is used wisely, that it is kept productive.

One of Gifford Pinchot's achievements was in setting a high standard of public service. Under his leadership, the Forest Service gained a fine reputation for unselfish zeal and devotion. Power, prestige, or pay were not the dominant forces that motivated its actions—the public interest came first. Pinchot and his men did not stoop to subterfuge, special favors, nor secret agreements. Their fight was honest and aboveboard.

I think I am justified in saying—and I say it proudly—that the Forest Service still carries on in those traditions. Today we rededicate ourselves to those high standards. We shall not shrink from responsibility. We shall not be afraid of leadership in public policy. We cannot be content to drift with the tide. In the management of this national forest and of all other national forests, in our efforts to promote wise use of natural resources and sound conservation everywhere, our goal and guiding principle will continue to be the greatest good of the greatest number in the long run.

Our entire national forest system, embracing more than 180,000,000 acres in the United States and its Territories, is, in a large sense, a monument to Gifford Pinchot. But to this beautiful forest here in the Cascades of Washington has come the special honor of bearing his name. This national forest was established when he was Chief Forester. Its administration began under his direction. The basic principles for its management were set up under his guidance.

May the Gifford Pinchot National Forest help to keep forever alive and dynamic his conservation ideals. May it help point the way to wise use of all forests and all resources in the attainment of the good life for all men and all nations.

ADDRESS BY MRS. GIFFORD PINCHOT

You will understand how hard it is for me to speak on this occasion, even to thank you for the thoughts you have so beautifully expressed and the tributes you have so generously paid.

I know that every word has been heartfelt. Surely you realize how profoundly grateful I am.

Each one of you, the governor, the foresters, the soil conservationists, the engineers, have expressed, in your own separate fashions, something of the essence of what was Gifford Pinchot in the various fields in which you knew him. I can add nothing to what you have said.

But there is one point I am concerned to bring you which has not been stressed here.

That is the ideal of conservation that was so truly born of Gifford Pinchot's mind and spirit. The conservation philosophy from which he derives his temporal and earthly immortality.

Beyond the preservation of the forests, beyond the reclamation of the soil, beyond the various techniques of land use and flood control, over and above and back of all of these stands the philosophy itself, without which the former are without meaning.

Conservation to Gifford Pinchot was not a vague, fuzzy aspiration. It was something concrete, exact, dynamic. The very stuff of which democracy is made.

The conservation he preached dealt not only with trees but with the sheep herders, with homesteaders, whose means of livelihood in the forest depended upon the kind of protection that could be given them. It dealt not only with erosion and flood control, but with the wise use and development of great river valleys in terms of irrigation and power, such as you are so magnificently working out here.

To Pinchot, you see, man himself is a natural resource. The basic resource for whose material, moral, and spiritual welfare the conservation doctrine is invoked. Man, without whose energy, the energy of coal and oil, of electricity, yes, of atomic science itself, is inert and without meaning.

Believing, as Pinchot did, that the planned and orderly development of the earth and all it contains is indispensable to the permament prosperity of the human race, conservation in its widest sense became to him one of the guiding principles through which such prosperity might be achieved.

He was trained as a forester, thought as a forester, felt like a forester, but before he had practiced forestry long, he realized that there were questions to be answered that on the face of them might be said to have little to do with trees.

In his autobiography he writes about going out some 42 years ago "in the gathering gloom of an expiring day to ride in Rock Creek Park," and how he took with him on that ride the difficult problems upon which he was constantly at work.

Particularly he was thinking of the relations of the forests not only to streams and erosion, but to inland navigation, to water-power developments, to fish and game—he was thinking of the dangers of monopoly control of natural resources—about abuses in the exploitation of mineral deposits on public lands.

What had these to do with forestry, he asked himself, and what had forestry to do with them? What was the basic link between them?

Suddenly the idea flashed through his mind, Here were no longer a lot of different, independent, often antagonistic questions, each on its own separate little island—as he, a forester, had been in the habit of thinking. Instead there was one central question—many-sided, yes—but still a unit. All so closely connected as to make it imperative they be coordinated and treated as part of one coherent plan.

Seen in this new light, all these separate issues fitted into and made up one central problem—the use of the earth for the good of man.

To him it was like coming out of a dark tunnel. He had been seeing one spot of light ahead, and then of a sudden the whole landscape rushed into visibility.

It was a new policy that was needed. A policy not merely national—but world-wide in its scope. A policy that involved not only the welfare of man but his very existence on earth. An international policy in which all nations must cooperate for its fullest development.

In these terms conservation becomes a matter not primarily of techniques, as some moderns seem to think, but of policy, of Government policy on the highest level.

Possibly there are some of you old-timers—old-timers he loved so well—here who still remember the great meeting in 1908 called at the instigation of Pinchot by the then President Theodore Roosevelt. For the first time in history the idea of conservation was spelled out to the American people in terms so simple as to be understood by all.

First they were made to realize that our natural resources are not inexhaustible. That, on the contrary, they were being destroyed and wasted at a rate that was disastrous and might soon become fatal.

The point was then driven home that the natural resources of the country are a national heritage to be made use of in establishing and promoting the welfare, the prosperity, and the happiness of the American people.

Hitherto, said the President, our national policy has been one of almost unrestricted destruction of these natural resources. It was a policy that had led and was leading to exhaustion of many of them. Moreover, it was a policy that gave unequalled opportunity for private monopoly—he proclaimed over and over again.

"In the past," Roosevelt continued, "we have admitted the right of the individual to injure the future of the Republic for his own present profit. The time has come for a change."

Always the protection of the rights of the people marched side by side with the technology of forest management, with the development of water power, extraction of minerals, etc.

Always the emphasis was laid upon the social (humanistic we would call it today) purpose of conservation—the greatest good to the greatest number for the longest time.

Two years later Gifford Pinchot projected his insight into the conservation philosophy still further—this time into the international field—to the relationship between conservation and questions of peace and war.

Why, in the long role of history, had man so persistently gone out to do battle with his neighbors? Could one central issue be traced that underlay and explained such endless wars?

Obviously from time immemorial men had fought to grab from their neighbors or defend their own possession of the best hunting grounds, the most fertile plains, the protected harbors, the richest agricultural lands, the mineral deposits, etc. In early days the thinking was in terms of iron, copper, gold—later of coal and oil.

In our own day it is chrome, rubber, tin, manganese, molybdenum and bauxite, uranium. Natural resources all of them. Non-renewable at that.

No single nation is self-sufficient in essential raw materials. Pinchot pointed out the welfare of each is dependent upon access to those it lacks. Access without recourse to war. Moreover, the world is beginning to understand that, instead of its being in the interest of any one nation to see another depressed, it is to the interest of each and all to see the rest secure.

Could such access to raw materials be brought about by mutual consent on an international basis?

Well, Theodore Roosevelt, Franklin Roosevelt, President Truman all in their time believed that conservation on the international level could help to remove one of the most dangerous of all obstacles to a just and permanent world peace.

In 1909 a formal invitation was sent out by Theodore Roosevelt to 48 nations to join together in an international conference on the subject of natural resources and their inventory, conservation, and wise utilization.

Some 30 of these countries, including among them Great Britain, France, Germany, Canada, and Mexico, accepted. Most unfortunately, however, for the cause of peace, Roosevelt's successor, President Taft, whose failure to support domestic conservation precipitated a major political revolt, decided to recall the invitation and to kill the conference.

Wilson, Harding, and Hoover were in turn approached but each of them failed to act.

In 1944 we went to see Franklin Roosevelt. The story of that meeting is both exciting and dramatic. For F. D. R. with his broad and imaginative understanding of history, immediately grasped and welcomed the full implications of the idea; pledged himself to the calling of such an international conference and authorized Pinchot to draw up an agenda; and to draft whatever government officials he might want in the doing.

In a letter to Cordell Hull, dated October 24, 1944, F. D. R. wrote:

"In our meetings with other nations I have a feeling that too little attention is being paid to the subject of the conservation and use of natural resources.

"I am surprised that the world knows so little about itself.

"Conservation is a basis of permanent peace. Many different kinds of natural resources are being wasted; other kinds are being ignored; still other kinds can be put to more practical use for humanity if more is known about them. Some nations are deeply interested in the subject of conservation and use and other nations are not at all interested.

"It occurs to me, therefore, that even before the United Nations meet for the comprehensive program which has been proposed, it could do no harm—and it might do much good—for us to hold a meeting in the United States of all of the united and associated nations for what is really the first step toward conservation and use of natural resources—i. e., a gathering for the purpose of a world-wide study of the whole subject.

"The machinery at least could be put into effect to carry it through.

"I repeat again that I am more and more convinced that conservation is a basis of permanent peace.

"I think the time is ripe."

After F. D. R.'s death, President Truman, who had followed the matter with close personal attention, went ahead on it. In August 1946, he sent to the United Nations a formal proposal as the American plan for such a conference.

This conference, so conceived and so borne, took place last August at Lake Success. It was known as the Conservation and Scientific Conference.

Its story is too long to go into here. Suffice it to say that the humanistic and moral, the economic and political sides of conservation were ignored.

Even more tragic is the fact that mention of peace and war in relation to conservation were deliberately excluded from the agenda.

The sterile little mouse that emerged, while magnificent on the technical side and adequate on much of the scientific, could lay no claim to the name of conservation in which it was conceived.

Such a tragic sidestepping of a major opportunity was bitterly resented by many of the delegates who had looked forward to a great upsurge of sentiment from the people of the world.

However, to dwell too closely upon the details of the past, while it may be good history, is not necessarily sound conservation.

The problems of today differ in many respects from those of yesterday.

How could that not be? Many permanent victories have been won since conservation was first developed as an American policy.

And more than that, many new needs of the American people have come into being.

Much has been learned since that time. New and breathtaking techniques worked out. Scientific clues laid bare that were not even foreshadowed in the old days.

Basically, however, the central purposes of conservation remain the same, spelled out in the clear, simplified words of Gifford Pinchot, "that the greatest good, to the greatest number, for the longest time."

Conservation is central to the domestic and international objectives of the American people. It is still dynamic humanism. It is still a philosophy of government at the highest level.

That fact is what gives the philosophy of conservation its force; its central basic unity.

Gifford Pinchot was always the first to proclaim the principle of growth, of development, of renewal, as central to the conservation idea.

He welcomed, always, the rediscovery of conservation by successive Presidents and politicians. Conservationists always welcome the renewal of natural resources, you know. And the renewal of the Christopher Columbus of conservation is certainly a prolific resource.

Certainly Gifford Pinchot understood that the battlefields of the past would not be the battlefields of the future.

But he also understood that the victories of yesteryear are not to be conceived as an excuse for present-day inertia. The fight for conservation, exactly as the fight for democracy, must be reinvigorated, revived, remanned, revitalized by each succeeding generation.

Its implications, its urgencies, its logistics, translated in terms of their own day by each generation. In other words, conservation is never a static doctrine. It is a doctrine of growth and development, of science, and of insight.

Gifford Pinchot blazed the trail. A man who never turned his back but marched breast forward. He looked to the rest of us, the young men and the young women as they come along, to continue on the long march ahead.

Our Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the New Hampshire Morning Union, of January 13, 1950, entitled "Our Foreign Policy, Who Makes It and Accepts Responsibility?"

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OUR FOREIGN POLICY, WHO MAKES IT AND ACCEPTS RESPONSIBILITY?

(By Betty Knowles Hunt)

A friendly China is gone, lost to our side, written off, done with. As the key to all Asia, Communist China now menaces the freedom and independence of the whole Far East, to say nothing of our own American defense.

How did it happen? Who is to blame? Currently, the Saturday Evening Post is publishing a series of articles by Joseph Alsop, entitled: "Why We Lost China," which throws considerable light on the facts of the whole disaster. After conceding that the Nationalist regime was far from all-wise or good, Mr. Alsop writes:

"The question is whether we did our best to save China. The answer to this question is contained in the strange, still-secret inner history of our China policy. And this true history—for which the State Department could find no room in all the 1,054 pages of the white paper—may be simply, if grimly, summarized:

"Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the National Government. And in the end, they came close to offering up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, over 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph."

For the State Department now to insist that Chiang alone is to blame, that he lost the battle by the incompetence, corruption, and default of his administration, and to say not one single word about the pro-Communist aims and efforts of our own American authorities and advisers in China, is a shameful and disgusting low in American affairs.

Our first big authority in this sorry China story was Gen. Joseph Stilwell, who was anti-Chiang and pro-Communist when he accepted this important assignment in 1942. Almost from his arrival, he insulted, humiliated, and attempted to undermine Chiang in every way he could. He was aided and abetted by his chief political advisers, John Davies, John S. Service, and Raymond Ludden, all of whom favored the Communist side from the start. It was this group, our leading American representatives in China, who sold President Roosevelt on the idea of forcing Chiang into a "coalition government with the Communists." Did these advisers know this would mean a Communist China? The fact that they did is revealed clearly and unmistakably in their own writings.

All of which leads to the question: "Who makes our foreign policy, and accepts the responsibility for it?" Did the American people know that our own leaders were undermining Chiang, even while he was our wartime ally? They did not. Has the administration in Washington ever admitted any responsibility for appointing pro-Communist representatives in China? It has not. It does not even mention them.

Which brings us to Formosa. President Truman on December 27 called a special meeting of the National Security Council, for the avowed purpose of formulating a policy on Formosa. Press reports tell us that the Joint Chiefs of Staff urged an advisory military mission to the Nationalists, while Secretary of State Acheson argued against it. The President sided with Acheson, and that was that. But 6 days before this meeting, on December 23, the State Department had sent a secret dispatch to its officials in the Far East, writing off Formosa in advance to the Chinese Communists, and instructing our officials to play down the island's strategic importance. Why then, did President Truman call a policy meeting on December 29 when our policy had already been made and dispatched secretly 6 days earlier?

Who decided our Formosa policy? Apparently the Joint Chiefs of Staff were not consulted. Apparently our congressional leaders on foreign policy were not consulted. Who was consulted? Is our foreign policy now made solely by the Secretary of State? Or by him and the President?

This would seem to be a far cry from government of the people, for the people, and by the people. Not only are major decisions being made for all the American people by a person or persons unknown, without reference either to us or to our elected representatives in Congress—but the odds are heavy against anybody's taking any responsibility for any errors of judgment. About the most we can hope for is a series of whitewash papers, such as we have had to defend Yalta, Pottsdam, and now our China policy. But white papers don't pay the cost of tragic errors. The American people do.

It would seem advisable, therefore, that the major decisions of this crucial era be made by as wide and as representative a group of Americans as possible. The executive branch of our Government is assuming too much power, and accepting too little responsibility for its acts. This is highly dangerous in a land of the free.

Save Two Million

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, with the entire country and the Members of Congress demanding the stopping of waste and spending by the Government, everyone is amazed by the Government agreeing to give the D. & C. Navigation Co. $2,000,000 with interest at 4 percent from the time of taking of the land-locked passenger ship *Greater Buffalo* which operated on Lake Erie. The agreement for this was made in October 1949, after the D. & C. Navigation Co. said it would hold such an offer open for acceptance by the executive side of the Government to October 31, 1949.

Mr. Speaker, by agreement and not after trial on submission of evidence the executive side of the Government agreed to give away $2,000,000 with interest at 4 percent from the time of taking of this ship in face of the fact that the ship was built in August 1924, and had been depreciated at 5 percent per annum, and that the ship for 12 years previous to its taking by the Government earned nothing. In fact the earnings of the ship from 1931 to the date of taking are as follows:

Year	Earnings before depreciation	Earnings after depreciation
1931	−$8,714	−$161,771
1932	−86,139	−256,625
1933	−40,576	−211,032
1934	−70,151	−240,637
1935	−43,742	−214,228
1936	−1,923	−172,410
1937	13,411	−157,075
1938	−56,629	−227,115
1939	54,449	−116,037
1940	62,902	−73,486
1941	72,737	−63,651
Jan. 1, to Aug. 8, 1942	−33,348	−115,555

So that at the time of taking on August 8, 1942, the ship *Greater Buffalo* had an operating loss of $2,009,622 for the previous 12 years and was nothing more than a land-locked fresh-water white elephant with no place to go. The Maritime Commission determined its value as to what a prudent private person would pay at not more than $60,000 plus $35,000 for equipment making a total of $95,000 for the scrap value of the ship at the time of taking. The *Greater Buffalo* had no paying use, for passenger ships operated on the Great Lakes from 1920 to 1948 had gone down more than 50 percent. In 1920 there were 51 American flag passenger ships on the Great Lakes certified to carry 300 passengers or more and this had dwindled to a mere 21 ships by 1948. The fleet of passenger ships operating on Lake Erie from Cleveland, Buffalo, and Toledo had practically ceased to exist, including the large passenger ship *Seeandbee*, of the Cleveland-Buffalo Line, for which $129,000 was paid by the Government in 1941. And which the Maritime Commission says is the nearest instance of a sale of a ship with similar characteristics. And further, at the time of taking, the *Greater Buffalo*, as well as other such fresh-water ships, were worth scrap prices. They were charged off, they had no income, and they made no profit.

Yet, in the face of all this information which was available this agreed payment for the *Greater Buffalo* exceeds by 2,000 percent the administrative determination of just compensation for the taking of ships as previously carried on by the Government, and for which in other

instances criticism was leveled when agencies previously paid 169 percent of such administrative determination of just compensation.

The company carrying out its depreciation of 5 percent annually would leave undepreciated book value of approximately $300,000, and the fact is that it had no earning capacity. This was all done after a tender was made of the actual value of the ship at the time of taking which was set at no more than $95,000 by the Maritime Commission which has had all the Government experience with nonnaval ships.

Mr. Speaker, such offer to pay $2,000,000 of Government money seems to be less than lip service against wasteful spending and Treasury raiding. In view of all this I am asking that an investigation be made covering the cost, the value, and that everything be brought to light covering the agreement for the Government to give $2,000,000 with interest after the Maritime Commission has represented that the ship was worth no more than $95,000 at the time of taking.

I believe that the public is entitled to all of the facts, that the investigation should be held by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee so that the public might know and so that the Appropriations Committee will not be called upon to appropriate more than 20 times the claimed value of a ship that was nearly 20 years old, that earned no profit, and that did not earn its depreciation, and that in fact lost dollars like most American passenger ships on the Great Lakes.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that the whole matter be investigated by the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the House Committee on Expenditures so that the public might have all the facts and also that the Committee on Appropriations will not be called upon to appropriate for this raid on the Treasury.

Young Republicans Show Sound Judgment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STYLES BRIDGES
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 1 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Young Republicans Show Sound Judgment" which appeared in the New Hampshire Morning Union of January 25, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUNG REPUBLICANS SHOW SOUND JUDGMENT

The resolution adopted by the Manchester Young Republican Association denouncing American policy in the Far East and calling for defense of Formosa reflects sound judgment and a true appraisal of world affairs.

This resolution is given weight by the large number of veterans who shared in its adoption. These men fought the battle of freedom in the Pacific and they realize the dangerous implications of Soviet Russia's maneuvers there today. It is the supreme tragedy that the present administration in Washington has not shared this realization. Instead, as the Young Republicans say, it failed to appraise the intent of the Chinese Communists realistically, and then it tried to cover up its failure by charges of weakness and corruption on the part of Chiang Kai-shek's government. This over-all attitude was inspired by General Marshall's bitter opposition to Chiang because of his refusal to take Communists into his government.

The utter unreasonableness of the administration's position is set forth clearly by the Young Republicans in their statement that a friendly government in China, even if it had weaknesses, was surely better than a government devoted to promoting Soviet Russia's program of world domination. There has never been any doubt that Mao Tse-tung and his associates are the avowed disciples of Communist expansion under Soviet direction.

The administration's policy in the past has been exceedingly unfortunate, and it can only be made worse and our national security jeopardized to a greater degree by further appeasement and retreat in the Far East. The Young Republicans are absolutely correct in their decision that the time has come to make a definite stand against communism in the Far East—to draw the line against a further Communist advance in that part of the world. This means that Formosa should be kept out of Communist hands and that steps should be taken to forestall a Communist advance into Indochina, Siam, Burma, and Indonesia.

This is not a party issue. The Young Republicans speak as Americans. The issue involves the future security of all Americans. The American people generally should, therefore, get behind the proposal for decisive action in the Far East before it is too late, and our national defense and that of all democratic peoples is irreparably undermined.

The Reds March On

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial with respect to our Asiatic policy which appeared in the Washington Daily News of January 31, 1950:

THE REDS MARCH ON

There can be little doubt that the Chinese Communist forces and the Red Indochina insurrectionists headed by Ho Chi Minh have joined hands to drive the French out of Asia, as Chiang Kai-shek charges.

Both of these Communist forces get their orders from Moscow.

Now that they are in contact along the French Indochina border they would be expected to work together.

But what can be done about it?

China held the key to the situation on the Asiatic mainland, and when the United States abandoned Chiang Kai-shek's government, the door was opened for the Reds to move down upon the smaller countries on China's borders.

When the State Department issued its white paper, washing its hands of China, Secretary of State Acheson left himself an escape clause. He said: "Should the Communist regime lend itself to aggression against China's neighbors, we and the other members of the United Nations would be confronted by a situation violative of the principles of the United Nations Charter and threatening international peace and security."

But he didn't say what "we and the other members of the United Nations" would do when confronted by that inevitable situation.

Indochina is French territory—the last major foothold of European colonialism left on the Asiatic mainland.

Moreover, the French are backing Emperor Bao Dai in a war against the Communists who are hiding as usual behind the banners of democracy and nationalism.

Having denounced Chiang Kai-shek, the head of a constitutional government, as a dictator, and having accepted the Red cry that anyone supporting Chiang is an imperialist, the State Department couldn't very well go to the front now for a French-sponsored emperor.

The Communists know that, and are picking their spots.

This Red drive, in the opinion of many military men, could have been stopped at the Yangtze River 2 years ago.

Now it is rolling out of China in all directions and it will be difficult to stop anywhere because the anti-Communist forces are divided. They are in danger of being knocked off one at a time.

The New Chaplain of the House of Representatives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, I am highly pleased over the appointment of Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., as Chaplain of the House of Representatives, to succeed retiring Rev. Shera Montgomery. My home town of Alton, Iowa, is greatly honored to have one of its native sons selected for this distinguished position, for this little town of Alton, where I reside, is the place where Dr. Braskamp was born and grew to manhood.

Another lifelong friend of Dr. Braskamp and one who takes particular pleasure in his election as Chaplain is Claude S. Schekel, one of the Official Reporters of Debates in the House of Representatives. Dr. Braskamp, Mr. Scheckel, and I have known each other since childhood, all three being from Alton. It is a remarkable coincidence that the three of us meet again here in the great forum of the House of Representatives.

Dr. Braskamp, who has spent his entire ministry of 39 years in Washington, is the dean among the 42 pastors of the Washington City Presbytery in length of service. It is stated that among the several hundred clergy in Washington of the Protestant, Catholic, and Hebrew faiths there is only one in the active pastorate who exceeds him in the record of length of service. In 1951, when he completes his 40 years in his Washing-

ton pastorate, he plans to write a book entitled "Forty Years a Minister in the Nation's Capital."

The Gurley Memorial Presbyterian Church, which was his first church after being associated with Dr. Charles Wood in the Church of the Covenant, is in fact still his one and only church. It was named in memory of Dr. Phineas D. Gurley, Chaplain of the United States Senate and pastor of the historic New York Avenue Presbyterian Church where President Abraham Lincoln worshipped. Dr. Braskamp was the leader when the Gurley congregation built a new house of worship, and 7 years later he became the leader in merging the Gurley and Gunton-Temple Congregations and in the erection of their present church at Sixteenth and Newton Streets.

During the past 10 years he has officiated more than 175 times as Acting Chaplain in the House, substituting for Dr. Montgomery. During these past 10 years he has also been the Acting Chaplain in the Senate on more than 75 occasions and during the entire 1948 Special Session of the Congress and the vacation periods of Chaplain Dr. Frederick Brown Harris and the late Chaplain, Dr. Peter Marshall.

Dr. Braskamp pursued his education and received degrees from the following schools: Public school in Alton, Iowa; graduated from the Northwestern Classical Academy at Orange City, Iowa, in 1903; first 2 years of college study at Grinnell, Iowa; graduated from the University of Michigan with the degree of bachelor of arts in 1908; first year of theological training in Hartford, Conn.; last 2 years of theological training in Princeton Seminary, graduating in 1911; received the degree of master of arts from Princeton University in 1911, having taken his studies in the department of philosophy. In June 1930 Hanover College of Hanover, Ind., gave him the honorary degree of doctor of divinity.

In June 1947 he was made a Knight of the Order of Orange Nassau, the decoration being bestowed on him by Queen Wilhelmina at a ceremony conducted by Ambassador Loudon in the Netherlands Embassy.

In 1929 he was elected to the office of moderator of the Washington City Presbytery which is composed of 42 churches and in 1940 he was made the moderator of the Synod of Baltimore which is composed of the 153 Presbyterian Churches of Washington City, Baltimore, and New Castle.

Dr. Braskamp has for 15 years been the president of the Princeton Theological Seminary Alumni Association of Washington and is a member of the Washington Princeton University Club.

In September 1925 he married Anna C. Bull, of Milford, Pa. They have two children, a daughter, Anne Bernice, age 22, who graduated from Wilson College, Chambersburg, Pa., with a bachelor of arts degree in June 1949, and entered the law department of George Washington University in September 1949. Bernard, Jr., age 18, graduated from Calvin Coolidge High School in June 1949 and is preparing to enter West Point Military Academy in 1950.

Dr. Braskamp was born of humble, God-fearing Dutch parents in Alton, Iowa, a small town of 1,000 inhabitants in the northwestern part of the State where the temperature one winter, during his boyhood days, registered 42° below zero although on the 18th day of February 1887, when he was born, it was only 15 below.

His father and mother were childhood friends and schoolmates in Holland, both having been born in Appeldorn, where the queen has her summer home. His mother was 15 years of age when her parents and their nine children emigrated to America. His father, who was the same age, was a young tinsmith in Appeldorn and when he reached the age of 21 and had earned enough money at his trade to pay for his passage, he also went west to America, the "land of opportunity," where his boyhood sweetheart was living. A few years after his arrival they were married, the bride having been employed as a seamstress and the groom having found work as a tinsmith and clerk in the small hardware store in Alton.

Dr. Braskamp speaks the Dutch language fluently and keeps his command of that language by reading his mother's Bible which she brought with her from Holland.. He often calls to mind those pioneer days in the prairies of Iowa when life was a tremendous struggle and there were many hardships.

The house in which he was born was a small frame building with no heat in any room except in the kitchen where there was a cook stove in which corn cobs, purchased from farmers at 75 cents per wagonload, were the only fuel material. He and the other four children in the family slept on straw beds in rooms without heat. The mother, after kneeling with them in prayer, would tuck them in, the last in bed having the great thrill of blowing out the lamp which she carried.

Dr. Braskamp's parents made every possible sacrifice to give their five children a college education. After completing his grammar-school studies in Alton, he went to the Northwestern Classical Academy at Orange City, Iowa, which was 4 miles to the northwest. He usually walked this distance, leaving home at 6:45 in the morning, the starting time being determined by the weather. It was pretty tough going to face the cold northwest wind in the winter months. Like every normal boy he often wished that he could hear the news that the academy had burned to the ground and that there would not be any school.

On the evening of the academy commencement exercises the principal, in his introductory remarks, announced that the 16-year-old Braskamp boy in knee-length pants who was the next on the program to give an oration, had never during his 3 years been late for the 8 o'clock chapel services. Dr. Braskamp gives his mother all the credit for that record for she got up every morning at 5:30 to start the cook-stove fire and to melt enough water in the ice-covered basin so that he could wash his face and hands before sitting down to his breakfast which usually consisted of a large dish of oatmeal, toast, and a cup of hot chocolate. His mother would always put a few home-made cookies or doughnuts in his overcoat pocket which would tide him over until he returned from school at about 1:30 in the afternoon after walking the 4 miles.

After graduating from the academy he went to Grinnell College, Iowa, entering at the age of 16. In his freshman and sophomore years he was the shortstop on the varsity baseball team and the pitcher on his class team. There is one intercollege game whose memory haunts him. Grinnell was playing the University of Iowa and the game was a tie at the beginning of the ninth inning with Iowa University at bat. There was an Iowa runner on third base and two outs. The batter on the third pitch drove a sizzling grounder to the shortstop which he handled cleanly just as he had done with the seven other grounders but something happened and he threw the ball about 20 feet over the first baseman's head and into the grandstand. The game was over for Grinnell failed to score during the last half of the ninth inning. A heart-broken player went home in tears.

Dr. Braskamp completed his first 2 years at Grinnell College in a creditable manner but his parents were financially unable to assist him in continuing his studies. There was very little opportunity for a student to work his way through school at Grinnell. He consequently found it necessary to stay home and spent the year as a clerk in his father's hardware store. It was his job to open the store every morning at 7 o'clock, start the fire in the stove, sweep the floor, and dust the counter. After those chores he was ready to do a rushing business. The hardware business, however, was not a lucrative one, especially during the cold winter months. Frequently, when his father and he were getting ready to close the store at 9 o'clock in the evening, they would find, upon counting the money in the till, that they had sold less than $2 worth of merchandise.

Dr. Braskamp's parents, always ready to make every sacrifice for their children's education, sold their last small tract of farm land, which they had purchased for $8 an acre, in order that he might be privileged to pursue his education. He decided to go to the University of Michigan for those last 2 years. Realizing what tremendous sacrifices his parents were making, he immediately upon arriving at Ann Arbor, Mich., started out in search of work which would help pay expenses. He found work waiting on tables and cutting the lawn of one of the professors. In the wintertime he took care of the professor's furnace. He did not have time, however, for the practice and training that was required of a student who was trying out for the varsity baseball team and therefore gave up his boyhood dream of being a major-league player.

One week in the spring he made big money. He was given charge of the sale of the librettos for the May festival. He made $32 that week but his duties, as sales manager, deprived him of the inspiration and pleasure of hearing

Schumann-Heink who was on the program that year. It was a question of business before pleasure.

In the summertime, during his vacations, he sold maps and the Century Book of Facts. He also made an extra few dollars at the Fourth of July celebration in his home town and the nearby towns for he was quite a sprinter, usually winning first or second place in the 100-yard dash. The men who bet on him would always give him at least 50 cents or a dollar whenever he was the first to hit the tape.

Having been a shortstop on a college baseball team he also frequently made a few dollars by playing for neighboring towns.

At the beginning of his senior year at the University of Michigan he decided to enter the law department after receiving his bachelor of arts degree but a few months before graduation he felt the urge to enter the ministry. Then in September he went to Hartford Theological Seminary, Hartford, Conn., where he was given a scholarship.

While a first-year student in the Hartford Seminary he had the great privilege of hearing an address by Woodrow Wilson, president of Princeton University. He was so inspired by that message that he decided to go to Princeton for the remaining 2 years of seminary training where he could have an opportunity to hear Woodrow Wilson more frequently. It became his great ambition to obtain a master of arts degree from Princeton University. Consequently the following year he went from Hartford to Princeton. In addition to taking the regular studies in the theological seminary he went over to the university to enroll in the graduate department. At the end of the 2 years he not only graduated from the theological seminary but received the degree of master of arts in philosophy from Princeton University.

He was licensed and ordained to the ministry by the presbytery of Brooklyn, N. Y., in May 1911. In September 1911, he was invited to Washington to become the assistant pastor of the Church of the Covenant, now called the National Presbyterian Church, where Dr. Charles Wood was then the revered pastor.

Address of Hon. Kenneth B. Keating, of New York, Before the New York State Bar Association

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am inserting an address made by my good friend and distinguished colleague, the Hon. KENNETH B. KEATING, of New York, member of the New York bar, before the New York State Bar Association on January 27, 1950.

It will come as no surprise to those of us who know Representative KEATING that he deals with depth and understanding with the proposition that Supreme Court Justices should be prohibited from giving character or reputation evidence on behalf of a defendant charged with a crime in the Federal courts.

I hope that my colleagues will read his thoughtful and penetrating exposition of a very difficult subject. For Representative KEATING shows not only a judicial mind but a statesman's vision in analyzing the implications of this question. These implications are portentous for our entire judicial system. They bear also upon our ability to meet effectively the godless challenge of communism.

The subject selected by the association for discussion this afternoon is: "*Resolved*, That no judicial officer shall testify in any action or proceeding as to the reputation and character of any person or as to any matter of opinion."

As I told President Neil Harrison when he called me to ask me to participate in this discussion, I am not at all sure that I would advocate such a sweeping prohibition as is envisioned in this resolution. I do feel strongly, however, that a bill should be enacted along the general lines of the one which I introduced on July 18 last to prohibit Supreme Court Justices from giving character or reputation evidence on behalf of a defendant charged with a crime in the Federal courts. Whether this proscription should extend to opinion evidence is debatable. My inclination is to think that it should for some, though not all, of the reasons advanced for barring character evidence.

The universality of condemnation which greeted the appearance on the witness stand of two Justices of our highest court in the first Hiss trial to act as character witnesses for the accused, prompted my introduction of this legislation. The legal admissibility of this evidence is not open to challenge. It was the impropriety of their appearance which disturbed the American people, who look with awe and reverence upon our Supreme Court. In the cloistered shelter of our law offices, many of us may lose touch with the reactions of the general public. But I can assure you that one in public life, with his ear to the ground, soon becomes accustomed to catching the trends in thinking among our people. I can assure you that public sentiment, if it could be metered on this issue, would overwhelmingly support such legislation as I have offered. True, that is by no means the only test. Democracy itself would probably fail if every issue were determined by majority vote of the people. But orderly government does require that those charged with legislative responsibility give heed to the articulate wishes of the people.

I intended in the introduction of this measure, and intend now, no harsh criticism of Justices Frankfurter and Reed, both of whom are outstanding and able men. Nor do I imply in the slightest degree any impropriety in the action of the distinguished counsel for Mr. Hiss in his first trial, who happens to be my able adversary today. He conducted a brilliant defense of his client and properly employed every legitimate weapon at his command. Whether the more nearly successful result which he achieved than was reached in the second trial is attributable in part to the appearance on the witness stand of the Supreme Court Justices in the first trial, only the masters of surmise and conjecture would essay to state.

Supreme Court Justices should not, of course, be barred from giving evidence as to facts in any controversy of which they may have knowledge. In other words, if they have seen some actions done or heard words spoken which are material in pending litigation, there is no reason why they should not testify about them in the same manner as anyone else. Existing law would disqualify them from sitting in judgment on an appeal to their Court, so that no litigant would be injured through permitting such testimony.

On the other hand, character evidence or opinion evidence seems to me to be in an entirely different category. No case comes to mind where this type of testimony from such a source would be essential to promoting the ends of justice. A Supreme Court Justice could conceivably have been the only witness to an automobile accident or the only person who overheard a crucial conversation. To deprive him of the right to testify in such a case might defeat the ends of justice. It would always be possible, however, to secure other expert or character witnesses without reliance on the Supreme Court as an exclusive source of supply.

Although it is reported that this question has never arisen before, since no other Supreme Court Justice in all our history has sought to testify as a character witness in a criminal trial, it is important that a precedent for such action in the future be not established.

Alger Hiss has now been convicted. If his case reaches the nine Justices of the Supreme Court of the United States, I invite your thought about the embarrassing situation there presented. Justices Frankfurter and Reed, will, of course, be disqualified, leaving seven to make the decision. If a larger number of Justices, conceivably all nine, had elected to disqualify themselves, paralysis of our judicial system would have been the result. It seems to me the most extreme embarrassment will be caused the brother jurists of these two Justices in sustaining the conviction of one to whose high character their daily associates have attested. Indeed in the zeal of their brethren not to give undue weight to such testimony, it is conceivable that they may bend over backward to the prejudice of the accused. It is simply a situation which should never arise.

In addition, the very presence in one of our Federal courts of a Justice of the appellate tribunal, either as a witness for the prosecution or defense, results in an influence on the presiding judge and jury out of all proportion to the importance of his testimony, when he is there only to support someone's character. As we all know, those of previously spotless reputation often commit serious crimes. General character evidence is not of too great value at best. Its introduction should, therefore, be surrounded with the necessary safeguards to insure that its value and effect be not exaggerated.

I realize the serious implications surrounding the suggestion that anyone of high or low estate be deprived of the privilege of testifying in our courts. The extension of such prohibitions should be cautiously approached. Yet it is well established that physicians, lawyers, and clergymen are barred from disclosing confidential communications. The preservation of the sanctity of their relationship is considered of paramount importance. I can think of nothing more vital to the welfare and security of our Nation than the perpetuation of the position of eminence and respect which our highest tribunal has enjoyed throughout its history among our people. To permit the Justices of the Supreme Court to vouch for the character of defendants on trial in our Federal criminal courts represents a source of imperilment of the standing of that revered tribunal.

The contention has been advanced that barring Supreme Court Justices as witnesses might be an infringement of a defendant's

constitutional right to produce any relevant evidence to establish his innocence. It may be conceded that a person generally has a right to compel testimony. This right, however, is not absolute, but is subject to certain exceptions such as the well-settled exclusion of privileged communications. Thus it is universally conceded that communications between husband and wife, attorney and client, fellow jurors, Government and informer are barred. In most jurisdictions, the same applies to priest and penitent, and physician and patient. There can be no question but that these exemptions are not invalid under the Constitution, even though the exclusion of such testimony may be a great or fatal hindrance to a party or to the ascertainment of truth. Moreover, State legislatures are constantly adding new groups to these exemptions, as, for example, journalists barred from disclosing sources of information, accountants, as to communications made by a client, social workers, as to information given to them, confidential clerks or stenographers, licensed detectives, and others.

It may be highly relevant and material for a priest to disclose facts given to him in the confessional, or a lawyer, or a physician, facts elicited from a client or patient. Yet to seal their lips does not violate the constitutional protection. No more certainly does it infringe on constitutional guaranties to provide that nine men, while sitting as justices on the highest court in the land, shall not serve as character or reputation witnesses for a criminal defendant in a subordinate Federal tribunal from which an appeal may be taken to the very bench they occupy.

Another analogy may be found in the well-recognized doctrine that the President of the United States is not amenable to the service of process. Indeed, that goes far beyond any contention advanced here, since, as pointed out, it is here sought simply to prevent Supreme Court Justices from giving evidence of a certain narrowly defined character.

Thus Wiloughby in his learned work on the Constitution—second edition—at page 1498 says:

"In the trial of Aaron Burr for treason the amenability of the President to a judicial process was brought directly into issue. Marshall, who was conducting the examination, issued, at the request of the defense, a subpena duces tecum directing President Jefferson to appear and bring with him a certain letter to himself from General Wilkinson. Jefferson refused to appear or to bring the letter. That a compulsory process should be thereupon issued to the President does not appear to have been even considered, but upon a discussion as to whether the Attorney General should permit the defense to have the examination of a copy of the letter which had been put into his, the Attorney General's, possession, Marshall said: 'I suppose it will not be alleged in this case that the President ought to be considered as having offered a contempt to the Court in consequence of his not having attended; notwithstanding the subpena was awarded agreeably to the demand of the defendant, the Court would, indeed, not be asked to proceed as in the case of an ordinary individual.'"

Jefferson, likewise, was of the view that the President was beyond ordinary process. He wrote:

"Laying down the position generally, that all persons owe obedience to subpena, he admits no exception unless it can be produced in his lawbooks. But if the Constitution enjoins on a particular officer to be always engaged in a particular set of duties imposed on him, does not this supersede the general law, subjecting him to minor duties inconsistent with these? The Constitution enjoins his constant agency in the concerns of 6,000,000 people. Is the law paramount to this, which calls on him on behalf of a single one? * * * The leading principle of our Constitution is the independence of the legislature, executive, and judiciary of each other, and none are more jealous of this than the judiciary. But would the executive be independent of the judiciary, if he were subject to the commands of the latter, and to imprisonment for disobedience; if the several courts could bandy him from pillar to post, keep him constantly trudging from north to south and east and west, and withdraw him entirely from his constitutional duties?"

In the case of *Mississippi* v. *Johnson* ((1867) 71 U. S. 475), the question was raised whether the President could be restrained by writ of injunction from executing a law believed by Mississippi to be unconstitutional. The Supreme Court did not explore the subject at any length, but did hold that the writ would not issue on the ground mainly that if the President refused to obey the writ the Court was powerless to enforce it.

Commenting on this case, former President and Chief Justice Taft, in his work, Our Chief Magistrate and his powers, said:

"The Supreme Court has a number of times intimated that the President's office is of such high character that officially he is beyond the compulsory processes of the Court."

Despite occasional assertions to the contrary, the weight of judicial opinion and legal scholarship is to the effect that the President, so long as he remains unimpeached, is not subject to judicial process. If this is so, it follows that a defendant charged with a criminal offense would not be permitted to force the attendance in court of the President of the United States to act as a witness for him on any subject.

The bill which I have introduced in Congress does not render a Supreme Court Justice incompetent as a witness generally or prohibit compulsory process to force his attendance. It merely prohibits the giving of a certain type of testimony which concerns the interest of the witness in relation to the interests of the State and the proper administration of justice. Paramount considerations of policy always prevail over the purpose of judicial investigations and the interests of the parties involved in the litigation.

Regardless of the conclusions reached today by those who listen to this discussion, it is certainly a wholesome matter to discuss fully and freely anything which directly affects judicial officers, for whom all of us who practice at the bar are accustomed and desire to maintain at all times the utmost respect. I congratulate the bar association in the selection of this timely subject and express my gratitude for the invitation which you have extended to me to present my views and, no less, for the privilege which you accord me of hearing a statement of the position of those who may differ.

Post Mortem on China White Paper

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following pungent article on the incredible errors our State Department has made in dealing with Communist aggression in China and its alibis for its mistakes. The article is by Mr. Ross N. Young, editor of the Marion (Iowa) Sentinel. I did not think it proper to insert it prior to the conclusion of the trial of Alger Hiss:

FACING THE FACTS
(By Ross Young)

The State Department has issued a book of over 1,000 pages to explain its Chinese policy. St. Matthew required only a few words to describe the betrayal of Jesus. Give Judas credit for three things. He offered no alibis, he confessed his sin, and he hanged himself.

Secretary Acheson, whose principal contribution thus far is having his left profile photographed, does not add to his stature by this report. Serious omissions, alibis, and considerable double talk convict him of dishonest reporting.

If even half the criticisms of Chiang Kai-shek are true, nevertheless, he has been fighting the Japs and the Communists or both for 25 years. In doing so, he was in part fighting our battles.

The decline of Chiang increases the mathematical probability that your boy or his sons may some day be drafted to protect this land from world communism. Even at best, the necessary increases in defense appropriations will take a heavy toll from the standard of living.

We have been told that there is graft in China. There was graft in China when we forced Japan's hand to protect China. Those who make the loudest complaints about Chinese corruption have shown an amiable tolerance toward graft in this country.

The people are baffled by the conduct of their Government toward China, and millions of them are asking angry questions. Why was it necessary to betray China at Yalta? Why did they take to Yalta as an adviser Alger Hiss of all people?

Why didn't the State Department consult such authority and men of character as General MacArthur? Why was the State Department influenced so greatly by those of its employees who not only followed the Russian line but who also used almost the same words as the Communists propagandists?

This is no time to be cute or clever. We have had an expensive amount of that. This is the time for penitence, confession, and penance. Let the whole truth be told at whatever cost. Patriotism requires the protection of America rather than certain reputations.

Discontented Should Move Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 31, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, communism is a way of life in Russia, Yugoslavia, China, and other satellite countries.

Socialism is a way of life in Great Britain and other European countries.

Fascism is a way of life in Spain and Portugal.

Capitalism is a way of life in the United States.

Those people who do not like the American system can select the one under which they would like to live. They have a wide choice and their passage should be on a one-way ticket.

Those who are sabotaging our system are not asking for passports so they can live under communism, socialism, or fascism. Yet millions of people who live

under those foreign systems are begging to come to this country. How come?

The answer is a simple one: Only under capitalism does everyone have enough to eat. Only under capitalism is there opportunity to progress. Only under capitalism is there freedom to say and do as you believe. Only under capitalism is there the dignity of self-respect.

Let those who do not like eating nor opportunity, nor freedom, nor self-respect—let them remember there are plenty of places on earth where they can go and do without these great privileges.

China Grumbles, But Reds Push Relentlessly on With Their "Reforms"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an article from the Washington Post by William Lewisohn, the correspondent of the London Times in China, where he has lived 40 years. He was the last foreign correspondent to leave Peiping when the Communists, true to type, permit no observation by neutrals of the "democratic" utopia they install. The article demolishes several of the myths which have been so successfully cultivated for years by the Far Eastern Division of the State Department and pro-Communist and liberal writers: First, that nothing could be worse than the Kuomintang; second, that the Communists give land to peasants; third, that the Communists improve the lot of the people; fourth, that there is either democracy or freedom under the Reds; and, fifth, that the Communists cannot rule China because it is too big and the people too individualistic. What a problem our country faces in Asia because of these myths which were so largely believed by misled citizens of our land.

[From the Washington Post of December 18, 1949]

CHINA GRUMBLES, BUT REDS PUSH RUTHLESSLY ON WITH THEIR "REFORMS"

(By William Lewisohn)

In last Sunday's article, the foreign relations of the Communist Government of China were discussed. There remains to be described the effect of the recent upheaval on the domestic side.

The people of China have been between the devil and the deep blue sea. There is no need to enlarge on the misrule of the Kuomintang in recent years. This party had become extremely unpopular with all sections of the population or, as the Chinese say, had forfeited the mandate of Heaven. That is not to say, however, that the Chinese public looked forward to the rule of the Communists. When, in 1946, you asked a Chinese who was complaining about the Kuomintang whether he preferred the Communists, he would shrug his shoulders and reply, "Well, they can't be any worse."

When, therefore, the Communist armies entered Peking, Tientsin, and Shanghai, they were received by the mass of the population with only moderate enthusiasm. The attitude was one of indifference or, rather, one of curosity not unmixed with suspicion. Indeed, after a few weeks the old Chinese saying was much quoted: "The names on the menu are changed, but not the contents of the dishes."

A small section of the population, curiously enough, seeing that the Communists claimed to represent the proletariat, not among the poorer classes, was loud in its demonstrations of welcome. These enthusiasts included the students, among whom the Communists had long been carrying on secret propaganda, and who in recent years had got completely out of hand. Sit-down strikes in the colleges, and violent anti-government demonstrations and parades were the order of the day under the Kuomintang.

After a few months of Communist rule, however, there has been a certain revulsion of feeling among many of the students, and much grumbling, though it is no longer expressed openly. The reasons for this are that the quality of the meals, which are supplied free to students, has deteriorated, and that they are no longer allowed to express their opinions in public by parades and demonstrations. The only public demonstrations allowed are those planned by the new rulers for some political purpose of their own.

Actually, the number of the students at some of the universities has fallen off considerably, because many of them have been lured away by the special school set up to train administrators. They are promised a job after only 6 months, saving them the more strenuous university course, even though that has been cut to 2 years.

There is also a large body of university professors and disgruntled politicians, who had hitherto shown no particular enthusiasm for Communist principles, now climbing onto the Communist bandwagon.

The wealthy classes, needless to say, with few exceptions, are violent opponents of the new system, though they do not venture to air their opinions publicly.

REAL-ESTATE FIZZLE

Among the peasantry and the urban working class, there is also considerable discontent with the new government. These mostly uneducated and completely unpolitical groups had been led to expect a great and immediate improvement in their living conditions. The peasants are bitterly disappointed over the redistribution of the land. It seemed wonderful when they were given their acre—or whatever the amount was—to dispose of if they wanted to. Actually, it did not work out that way, for their were no buyers. Nobody was anxious to acquire land beyond his own holding, for fear he would then be regarded as one of the wealthy landowners and the extra land would be taken away from him in some fresh redistribution.

Moreover, the peasants are very heavily taxed, the government taking 40 percent of their produce for the army. The remaining 60 percent the peasant has to hand over to the farmers' union which controls the village or group of villages, and each family then receives a daily ration from this general store.

Then, too, the life of the peasants is strictly regimented. At the head of each district there is a Communist commissar, generally some young student, who even decides what crops are to be sown and what labor is to be commandeered for public works. The peasants have to attend political meetings several times a week, and the details of their life are interfered with in every way.

PRICES STILL CLIMBING

The urban workers are little better pleased with the new dispensation. After the extravagant promises made them by Communist propaganda, they are disappointed that the cost of living not only has not gone down, but has increased. Wages have not been increased, owing to the bad state of trade, while the quality of commodities has fallen off because of the lack of imported material.

Many workers had expected that when the Communists took over the cities, the capital and stocks of the big concerns would be divided up among them in the same way as had been done with the land in the countryside. Communists had considerable difficulty in explaining that such a division would ruin the businesses of which the workers were now the owners. The only advantage the workers appear to have reaped so far—if it is an advantage—is that in all factories, businesses, and public offices, workers' councils have been set up to fix wages, salaries, working hours, the distribution of profits and sometimes even the whole business policy.

Large numbers of workers have been thrown out of employment by the Communist campaign against the wealthy classes, part of which has been the suppression of all so-called unproductive trades, such as goldsmiths, silversmiths, and the production of luxury goods.

Undeterred by the undercurrent of grumbling, however, the doctrinaire Communist leaders are pursuing their Marxist economic policies. Their efforts to impose their theories on the people are supported by an intensive campaign of propaganda through the press, radio, and government bookshops selling only Marxist literature, and by complete control of all the arts, including theater and cinema. Privately owned newspapers have either been suppressed or taken over by the government. The official newspapers contain nothing but propaganda and are unutterably dull. There is no local gossip or general news about China, and the only foreign news is from the Russian news agency, Tass.

The old Chinese plays, which used to be so popular among the lower classes, have been forbidden, as tending to spread superstitious, feudal, or counter-revolutionary ideas. The propaganda plays which have taken their place bore the public, with disastrous results on the box office. Painting, sculpture, literature, and the other arts are permitted only if they draw their inspiration from the lives of the workers and peasants.

CHILDREN ARE INFORMERS

The Communists are making the most determined efforts to undermine the family, which was once such an important influence in Chinese life. Children are ordered to attend Communist schools for indoctrination, whether their parents like it or not. Marriage without parental consent is encouraged.

In general, it may be said that the Communist rulers pay little attention to that part of the population over 30. Their interest is concentrated on the generation now growing up. A widespread informer system has been introduced, in the countryside, in each village, and in the towns in each street; and children are encouraged to report criticisms of the regime by their parents or other relatives.

The argument that communism is opposed to the character and the whole tradition of the Chinese people, even if true, does not necessarily mean that it cannot be imposed on the country. The Chinese are a reasonable and practical-minded people with a strong strain of individualism. But the point to be remembered is that they have no democratic traditions, they are accustomed to being ruled from above and they have always accepted such rule with complete docility, provided it gave them peace and order and reasonable living conditions.

On the other hand, the new Communist rulers are a close-knit, well-disciplined body of fanatics, prepared to go to any extremes in order to introduce the Communist system. It would seem to be highly improbable that any revolt against the system from outside the Communist Party could ever succeed. If the Communist rule in China were overthrown, it could only be by an external war or by a split in the party itself, leading to fresh civil war.

Let's Get Together

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY J. LATHAM
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, under permission already granted to me, I wish to set forth in the Appendix a questionnaire, which I intend to send to my constituency:

LET'S GET TOGETHER

DEAR FRIENDS: Let's get together on how you, the people, feel on current legislative proposals.

If you will check off the following questionnaire, it will give me your detailed views, and aid me in deciding how to vote. This is the best way I know for an individual to help decide the legislative policies of his Government. These questions are intended to be unbiased, and not an indication of my own feelings.

I shall be grateful for your cooperation in this project.

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

1. Do you favor President Truman's European foreign policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
2. Do you agree with his Latin-American policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
3. Do you favor his policy in China and Asia? Yes ☐ No ☐
4. Do you favor continued aid under the Marshall plan? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, should this be substantially reduced? Yes ☐ No ☐
5. Do you favor recognition of the Communist regime in China? Yes ☐ No ☐
6. Do you favor use of American arms and men to keep Formosa from the Communists? Yes ☐ No ☐
7. Do you favor Truman's "point 4" program to use American money and know-how to build private business in foreign countries? Yes ☐ No ☐
8. Do you favor the present reciprocal trade agreements policy? Yes ☐ No ☐
9. Do you favor the United States joining a world government? Yes ☐ No ☐

NATIONAL ECONOMY

10. Is our present budget figure of $15,000,000,000 too much to spend on national defense? Yes ☐ No ☐
11. Do you favor Secretary Johnson's method of administering unification of the armed forces? Yes ☐ No ☐
12. Do you favor complete enactment of the Hoover plan of reorganization and economy? Yes ☐ No ☐
13. Do you approve of peacetime Government spending of more than its revenues—for any reason? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, for what? ——— ———
14. Would you impose additional taxes to meet a deficit or cut Government expenses to eliminate it? Raise taxes ☐ Cut expenses ☐
15. Do you favor increase of taxes on corporations? Yes ☐ No ☐
16. Do you favor elimination of overlapping and duplication of taxes by Federal Government and the States (i. e., gasoline, tobacco, income)? Yes ☐ No ☐
17. Would you eliminate wartime Federal luxury taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐
18. Do you favor continuation of Federal rent controls? Yes ☐ No ☐

SOCIAL SECURITY, HEALTH, AND WELFARE

19. Would you further expand social-security benefits and coverage? Yes ☐ No ☐
20. Do you favor socialized medicine? Yes ☐ No ☐
21. Do you favor a national health program which would not socialize health services but would supply Federal grants and aids to the States and communities for health purposes? Yes ☐ No ☐
22. Do you favor any Federal aid for education? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) If so, do you favor such aid to children attending nonpublic schools where the laws of the States of residence permit? Yes ☐ No ☐
23. Do you favor Federal old-age pensions of $100 per month for persons 65 years or over, the cost to be raised by taxation? Yes ☐ No ☐
24. Do you favor more subsidized public housing? Yes ☐ No ☐
25. Do you approve of subsidized slum clearance? Yes ☐ No ☐
26. Do you approve of the present system of Government guaranty on home mortgages? Yes ☐ No ☐
27. Do you approve of the Federal Government making mortgages directly to individuals? Yes ☐ No ☐

AGRICULTURE

28. Do you favor the Brannan plan to permit farm prices to seek their own level in the market place, resulting in low prices to consumers, and having the Government pay the difference between the farm price and parity out of higher taxes? Yes ☐ No ☐
29. Do you favor continuance of present high, rigid price supports to farmers? Yes ☐ No ☐

LABOR

30. Should the Taft-Hartley law be repealed? Yes ☐ No ☐
(a) Should it be amended? Yes ☐ No ☐
31. Do you favor increased minimum-wage laws? Yes ☐ No ☐

VETERANS

32. Should present veterans' benefits be further expanded? Yes ☐ No ☐

CIVIL RIGHTS

33. Do you favor Federal laws to prohibit discrimination in employment because of race, creed, or color? Yes ☐ No ☐
34. Do you favor Federal laws against lynching? Yes ☐ No ☐
35. Do you favor Federal laws against poll taxes imposed by certain States? Yes ☐ No ☐

GENERAL

36. Would you favor a national lottery to help defray Government expenses? Yes ☐ No ☐
37. Are you in favor of the move to enact uniform divorce laws throughout the States? Yes ☐ No ☐
38. Would you approve substantial Federal appropriations to help States and cities eliminate pollution of their beaches and harbors? Yes ☐ No ☐

Name ----------
Address ----------

Please return to Congressman HENRY J. LATHAM, 1118 House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

Feel free to use reverse side for comments and remarks.

An Effective International Organization or Anarchy and War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 17, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Minneapolis Tribune of January 1, 1950:

TURN OF THE CENTURY

This New Year's Day is widely celebrated as the beginning of a new half-century, the midpoint of mankind's journey through the twentieth millennium of the Christian era.

Those people are right, of course, who say it is nothing of the sort, and that the second half of the twentieth century won't begin until January 1, 1951. They have logic on their side; but they lose the argument. The world insists on celebrating the turning point of the twentieth century right now. And there is sense in that, if not logic, for it reflects the unquenchable human instinct to make a new start, and to invest that new start with a special significance and hope.

So this is a super-New Year's Day—one on which to study the entrails of the last half century in search of an omen for the next.

Where do we stand, we humans, at this turn of the century? What, in history's long view, has been the thing, in the last 50 years, which more than any other suggests the shape of the problem of the 50 years ahead?

It may well be that the first half of the twentieth century saw the end of nationalism as a sound basis for peace and world order.

If that is true, it is the most important happening of this century.

For almost four centuries the British Empire had been the stabilizing force in the world—fountainhead of liberal institutions, source and stimulator of economic development, world policeman through its navy. Like Rome and Spain before it, Britain had widened human horizons and fostered human progress; and no listing of its mistakes or tyrannies (and they were many) can outweigh the record of what it did to set men's energies and spirits free.

In this last half century, the world has outgrown the British political and economic framework. Two great world wars, a grievous economic depression, and now a cold war between two powers grown greater than Britain—these are symptoms of man's groping for a new basis of world order, something not only to take the place of the British system but to be the framework for a better way of life for all mankind.

That new framework of peace and order and progress cannot be imposed by any one nation. We in the Western World are determined that Soviet Russia shall not be the new Rome, the new Spain, the new Britain. The American people have no ambition to make Washington the capital of a new world imperialism. Even if there were less resistance to a Sovietized world than there is, even if there were a hot desire to set up American imperialism in the world, the chances are that neither would happen or could be brought about.

For it is not likely that any nation ever again can or will rule the world as Rome or Spain or Britain did.

Mankind has "grown up" to a point where every segment of it insists increasingly on a voice in determining its own destinies and conditions of life.

That, of course, is all to the good; it is progress toward government by the consent of the governed.

But it means international anarchy until nations join together in an effective international government with the powers that any government must have to be effective.

To create an effective international government is, therefore, the foremost problem of the next half century. We shall never again know peace, or military or economic security, or an end to "cold war," until we achieve it.

The arguments over what and how will be long and hard and hot. United Nations? North Atlantic Union? World federalism? Or something else? The Tribune has expressed its views on all of these, and will again—as have and will millions of other voices. But we need have no doubt of mankind's ability to work out the best answer, in such a great debate, if we keep our eye on one central fact.

That fact is that we must want and work toward international government not just because we think idealistically that it would be nice to have, but because we are convinced that it is the only answer to the problem of peace and security and progress in today's and tomorrow's world.

If we will carry that conviction, that lesson of the first half of the twentieth century, into the second half of the twentieth century, the travail of the last 50 years will not have been in vain.

Address by Hon. Herbert H. Lehman, of New York, at Roosevelt Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address delivered by the junior Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN] on the occasion of the Roosevelt Day dinner sponsored by Americans for Democratic Action, held at the Hotel Shoreham, Washington, D. C., on January 27, 1950. I commend the address to the reading of Members of the Senate and others who read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. It is a statesmanlike presentation of a great liberal philosophy by a great liberal.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am not making the usual perfunctory statement when I say that I am happy to be here tonight, to be sitting on this platform, in my capacity as a national cochairman of the Roosevelt Day dinners. Of course, this is my second year in that position. But this year I have a somewhat new distinction, of which I am very proud, that of being a Member of the United States Senate. I am not unmindful of the part played in that development by members of the ADA, the organization which is sponsoring these dinners, and by others not so affiliated who are here tonight in this common tribute to him who was my leader and yours, Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

I am happy to see here tonight many of the good, familiar faces of the members of that true Gideon's army which fought the mighty battles of the New Deal. Those faces are a little older now and not quite so eager as when I first saw them 17 years ago. But it is good to be reminded that there are so many who are still strong in the faith. This occasion, like the others on which we meet, is a glad reunion of the alumni of those days.

But I am happiest of all to see among us many young faces—faces strangely similar to those of 1933—full of hope and full of resolve to carry on the battles led so long, so valiantly, and so successfully by our honored and beloved Franklin Roosevelt.

Five years ago he died. Was it 5 years, or was it 50, or was it yesterday? Time has as little meaning for a figure as towering as his, as inches have for the measure of a mountain.

In those 5 years the world has turned a full circle. The great military victory which Roosevelt conceived and planned was won, but the laurels of that victory have faded and withered away. The world of peace and security which was almost within our grasp has eluded us. Again the heavy clouds of international conflict hover over us.

The outlook in the world and in our country is less dark, it is true, than a year ago, and even less so than 2 years ago. Nevertheless, while we have cause to rejoice, we still have great cause for concern. Sometimes I think we are much too blind to our present dangers, both from within our country and outside it: Like peoples who live at the foot of a smoking volcano or in the shadow of some great overhanging rock, we have become adjusted to our hazards, and accept them as commonplace, although they menace us at every moment.

Yet all this is quite natural. People cannot live forever in a state of passion and alarm. But we need to recall, on every possible occasion, that we do face great perils. We need also to hear the clear and ringing voice of the good cause and the moral principle, the call to arms—not for war, this time, but for peace and for justice. In such a situation it helps to focus our eyes on the heroic figure of Roosevelt and the example he gave us.

Yet it is not easy to guide our steps today by the light of Rooseveltian policies. President Roosevelt was not an inventor of new political principles, ready to be handed down to his disciples and apostles. Roosevelt was rather a translator and an adapter of already existing principles. He was above all a leader and an organizer.

Thus, we cannot easily guide ourselves, in our present predicament, by Rooseveltian aphorisms. We cannot determine from what Roosevelt said in the past what Roosevelt would do if he were alive today. All we can determine is how Roosevelt would have set about solving these present problems. The Rooseveltian method was to marshal the facts and then try by every possible means to solve the problem, using the tools, the materials, and the legal devices which were at hand. He was not interested in brands or labels. He was not interested in theories or in isms. He was interested only in the answers to the questions, "Will it work? Will it meet the need? Can it be done this way?"

That is why the program of the New Deal was neither static nor dogmatic. It was based on neither Marxism nor McKinleyism. Its strength was in its realism. It was designed to meet the needs of the people and the Nation, at the time, and to function within the frame of the American Constitution. How well it succeeded is now history.

Thus the one lesson we can learn from this recent and heroic past is a lesson of method. To solve our problems, today, we need to remember that method and that approach. We need also—and I mean you and I and all of us—to remember, as Roosevelt often said, that any problem was capable of solution. It was just a question of persisting until a solution was found. I think that this contains a profound truth, although it sounds too simple to be important.

The heart of the matter is this: We can succeed in solving our problems as long as we remain free to seek the solution and persist in that search. And that brings me to the subject which is the theme of the Roosevelt Day dinners this year—freedom of inquiry.

This freedom of inquiry is the promise to every man that he is at liberty to seek intellectual, religious, and spiritual fulfillment. Today that liberty is challenged not only by those who openly declare their allegiance to totalitarianism, but also by some who solemnly swear their devotion to democracy. Some of these latter individuals view democracy as a frail and frightened thing. They insist that we must suppress free inquiry in order to preserve our institutions and our way of life.

I judge this attitude to be heresy of the worst kind. I judge it to be, in fact, the denial of democracy. The very soul and spirit of democracy is the toleration of opinions different and even conflicting with those of the majority. The right of criticism of the prevailing government and the prevailing institutions is sacred in a true democracy.

This right of criticism—the right to hold and to preach opinion contrary to generally accepted doctrines—is the greatest guaranty of the vitality and the validity of our form of government. Thus we must even tolerate the holding of completely heretical beliefs, however much most of us might hate these heresies.

Today, in the year 1950, the world shudders under the impact of an aggressive force which calls itself communism. This force is international in form, although it is national in fact. It has found its home in Soviet Russia, and its partisans are now spread everywhere. Moscow is the Mecca of this new faith. Stalin is its prophet. The leaders and chief architects of this movement are cynical men who would use the freedom inherent in democracy to destroy both freedom and democracy. The problem is, How do we in America defend ourselves against this subversive force without at the same time sacrificing some of our democratic principles?

This is a real and ominous danger. Make no mistakes about it. For what will it profit us to fight the Communist conspiracy if, in order to do so we adopt police state methods and abandon the principles we live by?

I do not believe that this is necessary. I do not believe that democracy is so weak and brittle and so lacking in fibre and resource that it cannot handle this problem within a democratic framework. I believe that we can and must continue to protect individuals in their right to hold such beliefs as they choose. But we can and must prosecute vigorously any actual conspiracy against our form of government or against freedom or democracy. We can and must punish acts of subversion and treason and disloyalty. But we must not depart from our principles of democracy or our principles of Anglo-Saxon jurisprudence in so doing. The safeguards of our Constitution must be extended to all our citizens. In this, and in this alone, is the true strength of democracy.

I abhor communism, but we cannot afford to have our feelings or our fears color our actions. I am firm in my faith in democracy. I am firm in my faith that the American people or any freedom-loving people will never freely choose communism or follow Communists as long as the people have the alternative of a representative government, freely chosen, and fully responsive to their needs and desires. I want no defeatist faith. We need a vigorous and dynamic faith, which willingly accepts challenge in the free market place of ideas. Of course these are words and generalities. It is easy to say words. It is much harder to apply them to specific situations. One such specific situation is the Federal Government's loyalty program.

Certainly the Government has a right to expect and demand that persons holding what are defined as sensitive positions be fully loyal to the Government, and to its philosophy and principles. Any person holding views inconsistent with our present form of government or our philosophy of government seems to me to be obviously disqualified for any position with access to policy formation or confidential and restricted information.

This would certainly apply to Communists and to fellow travelers. But it should also apply, with equal strength, to Fascists and to believers in racial superiority and other equally un-American concepts. I think that anti-Negroism, and anti-Semitism, anti-Protestantism or anti-Catholicism should be as positive grounds for disqualifying individuals for sensitive Federal Government positions as membership in the Communist Party.

I have heard of a recent case in a foreign country—I will not name the country because I am in the process of making an inquiry into this case—where a responsible American official, when asked why he seemed to prefer individuals of a particular political party in that country, replied—and this was in an official conference—"Do you want me to pick Jews instead?"

If the facts are true this official is certainly no better a representative of America than a member or follower of the Communist Party.

But I have wandered a trifle. My general conclusion is that persons of alien or truly Un-American viewpoint have no place in representative or sensitive positions in the Federal Government. All such persons should be discharged, after the facts are established, as lacking the proper qualifications for the job. And any doubts must be resolved in favor of the Government. But I do not believe that the brand of disloyalty should be placed upon such individuals by any administrative body. These individuals should be discharged, yes. Or if applying for a job, they should not be hired. The integrity of the Government service must be protected. But the basis of this action should be disqualification, rather than disloyalty. Disloyalty stands hard by treason. No such finding should be made for any individual, except after a judicial proceeding, with all the safeguards for the accused which Anglo-Saxon and American law provides.

It deeply disturbs me to think of all the shame and suffering which has been needlessly visited on hundreds and thousands of Government employees over the past 2 years in the process of the loyalty program. Bookkeepers and file clerks, statisticians and messengers, without access or connection with any confidential or restricted material, have been, I have been told, exposed to great expense and suffering in being required to prove, affirmatively, their loyalty to their country. A chance association with a suspected Communist, or a family relationship with one so suspected, or even the holding of some unorthodox view in no way connected with politics has frequently been the basis for charges against some of these individuals.

I hope that some way can be found to bring the extreme and unfortunate aspects of this program to an end. I understand and endorse, as I have said, the objectives of the loyalty program. I also realize that there are those who have criticized this program as being far too lenient. Some reactionaries would be satisfied only if there were public executions, at dawn and at dusk, of every Government employee caught in the act of having a liberal thought. But I sincerely hope that the entire loyalty program may be reviewed, and a better system, more consistent with the American tradition, be developed and established.

This is one of the specific ways in which we must defend and preserve freedom in America. But there is still another way in which we must defend and enlarge the area of freedom and free inquiry. There is still another front on which the battle of freedom must be fought. That is the economic front.

There are those in our midst who would deny to the American people the full economic rights reserved to the people under the general-welfare clause of the Constitution. That clause provides for what has been called the welfare state. I would like to take a moment to explore the relationship between the welfare state and freedom.

The welfare state simply recognizes that government must accept its responsibilities to all the people, and must not merely serve the vested interests of industry and commerce. The people, as well as the privileged and the powerful, must be served.

The connection between freedom and the welfare state is simple. The welfare state provides the people with the means by which individual freedom may be secured and enjoyed. For we have long recognized that no man who is a slave to economic fear or insecurity can be politically or spiritually free.

How can a man who is scarcely able to nourish his body develop his full intellectual capacities and appreciate the full meaning of freedom in any form? Such a man is sometimes persuaded to exchange what appears to him an empty slogan for the promise of a crust of bread.

Freedom of inquiry can have no meaning either, for the uneducated and the unenlightened.

The welfare state must maintain a balance between freedom and security. Through the programs of the welfare state, we must bring to the people adequate housing. We must secure the aged against the degradation of pauperism. We must raise minimum wages, and develop and conserve our natural resources. Through these programs and the maintenance of full employment and purchasing power, we will enable our people to enjoy freedom of inquiry. When we secure jobs and health and education for our people, we remove the fetters of insecurity and ease the awful struggle for existence. Only then will people have the time and the strength and the incentive to nourish their souls and seek spiritual and intellectual fulfillment.

Nor do we intend to restrict the development of the welfare state and the assurance of freedom of inquiry to the United States alone. We have come to understand that only in a democratic world, where other peoples are also free and secure, can we hope to live in peace. We intend to bring to the depressed areas of the world the benefits of our technological skills and thus enable them to raise their living standards, so that they, too, can enjoy the blessings of freedom. Our intentions are made explicit in President Truman's point 4 program. I hope we will press forward with our efforts to make that program a reality for those people who look to us with so much hope.

The way is long. The way is hard. I have outlined a few of the qualities of democracy, a few of the dangers of freedom, and indicated a few of the directions we must travel to meet these dangers. But there are many other dangers which I do not have time to mention tonight. There are many problems to be solved and many tasks to be undertaken. But we are moving forward. We are fortunate in having as President of the United States a man who is in the tradition of Roosevelt, and whose advocacy of the people's cause, and of freedom's cause, is strong and sincere. But we need to give him the tools. We need to give him strength. This organization, the ADA, is one of those which can be counted on to support the President in the liberal programs which he has adovcated and to suggest and to urge other new programs which are vital and necessary. Carl Schurz, a refugee from Germany in his day, and a great American, said in a speech in the United States Senate in 1872, "Our country, right or wrong. When right, to be kept right; when wrong, to be put right." I think that is as fine a slogan for today, as it was in 1872.

Let us not for a moment relax our efforts. Let us not for a moment be satisfied with things as they are. Nor let us abandon hope, because things are no better than they are. We shall suffer some disappointments. We shall lose some battles. But if we know where we are going, and remain constantly on the march, we shall arrive at our goals.

Soak the Rich a Myth

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, recently I completed an analysis of the tax structure of this country with results so startling that I believe they should be called to the attention of the Congress as a whole. This analysis was made public through the medium of a news release issued from my office. The facts revealed speak for themselves and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I call the attention of the House to the statement issued from my office on January 9, 1950:

SOAK THE RICH A MYTH

It is very doubtful if the average person with a low or moderate income is impressed by the statement often made by advocates of reduction in taxes and Federal spending that 25 percent of peoples' income goes to support government.

The fact that Federal, State, and local taxes totaling $56,000,000,000 in the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, were almost exactly one-fourth of the estimated 1948 national income of $225,000,000,000—and yet not enough to pay the cost of government—doesn't make too much of an impression on the average wage-earning taxpayer.

The wage earner making $60 a week, the 1949 average for industrial States, is aware—but it doesn't hit him very hard as he doesn't see the money—that, if he has a wife and a dependent child, the Government takes $3 each week from his pay envelope for Federal income taxes. This amounts to $150 a year or about 5 percent of his gross income.

This same wage earner knows that he contributes 1 percent, $30 a year (this year it will be more) for social security. If he owns his own home or lives in a State where there is a sales tax, he is aware of State and local taxes. He knows he pays some excise taxes, particularly on tobacco, gasoline, liquor, and a host of so-called luxury items. He vaguely realizes that there are many taxes upon goods and services which are hidden in the sale price.

SKEPTICAL OF SHARE

Accordingly, he will believe that 25 percent of the national income is drawn off for support of government, but he assumes that high-income people and corporations pay the big share of it. He does not realize that he pays a share of corporate taxes in the price of the things he buys. And it would surprise him to learn that high income taxes by high-income people are a very small portion of the total taxes. Former President Herbert Hoover estimated that if all incomes of over $8,000 annually were confiscated it would cover less than 10 percent of the actual and proposed spending of the Federal Government.

From official figures obtained from Federal Government agencies and through reliable estimates, an analysis has been compiled which shows that a family of three with a $3,000 annual income contributes 23.56 percent of their income to the support of government. A family of four with a $5,000 income kicks in 24.75 percent of their annual gross salary. For a family of four with a $7,500 income, 18.98 percent goes to the Federal Government and their total share of State, local, and Federal taxes is 26.27 percent.

ACCURATE ANALYSIS MADE

The analysis was based on actual withholding taxes and upon the ratio of current consumption expenditures for each type family to national personal consumption expenditures in 1948 and application of percentage ratios obtained to fiscal 1949 tax collections as reported by the Commissioner of Internal Revenue in the case of manufacturers and retailers' excise and communication and transportation taxes. In computing the individual's share of corporate taxes, it must be realized that these taxes are usually figured in the selling price of goods or services and hence are borne by the consumer. Some, of course, are borne by the stockholders, but since they are also consumers, corporate taxes were charged in full to the consumer.

Manufacturers and retail excise taxes include the 5- to 25-percent tax on such items as automobiles, radios, gas, electric and oil appliances, photographic equipment, gasoline, jewelry, baby oils, cosmetics, luggage, soap, furs, etc.

Alcohol taxes of $2.25 per quart, cigarette taxes of 7.5 cents per pack and the 20-percent amusement taxes were based on average expenditures for the types of families as reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics for 1947. No charges of gift or estate taxes were made. State and local taxes were allotted on the assumption that these taxes were in the same ratio to Federal taxes (72.25 percent Federal) borne by them as the total State and local taxes were to Federal taxes.

Summary table

	Family of 3, $3,000 income	Family of 4, $5,000 income	Family of 4, $7,500 income
Individual income	$153.00	$351.00	$731.80
Social security	$30.00	$30.00	$30.00
Share of corporate taxes	$201.60	$316.80	$414.00
Alcohol taxes	$26.00	$40.00	$48.50
Tobacco taxes	$25.00	$28.00	$28.00
Amusement taxes	$19.00	$40.00	$55.60
Manufacturers' excise taxes	$27.90	$43.85	$57.30
Transportation and communication	$17.70	$27.85	$36.40
Retailers' excise taxes	$7.10	$11.10	14.50
All others	$3.45	$5.45	$7.10
Total Federal taxes	$510.75	$894.05	$1,423.20
Percent of income	17.02	17.88	18.98
State and local taxes	$196.15	$343.40	$546.60
Total taxes	$706.90	$1,237.45	$1,969.80
Percent of income	23.56	24.75	26.27

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address dealing with the subject of displaced persons, which I delivered over Station WSPR, Springfield, Mass., on Sunday, January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Today, as Congress goes forward in another important session, it faces numerous major problems upon whose solution depends the welfare of hundreds of thousands of men, women and children in our own and other countries.

Not the least of these problems involves displaced persons, the human aftermath of the most devastating war in our history, those victims of totalitarian cruelty and aggression.

Despite the great progress already made toward alleviating this human misery, much remains to be done, particularly by the United States. Even though we have done much, we in this country have yet to discharge more fully the responsibility which we accepted upon passage of the Displaced Persons Act of 1948.

It is true that of the 205,000 displaced persons which that measure authorized to be brought to this country, 110,909 had arrived here as of November 30, 1949, and 2,547 others were en route. It is also true that of the 122,556 visas issued as of November 15, 1949, more than 61,000 had been issued to displaced persons whose quota country is Poland.

Yet the very law under which these people are being admitted to the United States may prevent admission of the full authorized total of 205,000 displaced persons. The restrictions, limitations, preferences, and priorities as established in that law have been proved unworkable in many cases.

Furthermore, if the United States is to carry out its full responsibility in this great international problem, the authorized total should be raised so that additional deserving persons may be admitted.

Thus, it is imperative that Congress at this session pass legislation to amend this act to liberalize it and to make it more workable.

I had hoped, along with many other Members of Congress and such organizations as the Polish-American Congress, that the act would be liberalized in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. That was not accomplished.

We must not permit further delay. We are dealing with human beings—men, women, and children. Many of them have been without homes for years. To them time means everything.

H. R. 4567, the measure passed by the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, would accomplish considerable liberalization of the displaced persons law.

One of the last acts of the Senate during its first session was to send back to the Senate Judiciary Committee the DP bill with instructions to report it back to the Senate not later than January 25, 1950. So I hope that very early in this session favorable action will be taken to make the DP bill more workable and fairer to those persons the people of the United States are genuinely trying to help.

Time is rapidly running out with respect to making the desired changes. Human beings are waiting. Human hopes and aspirations are involved.

The proposed bill will make several important improvements if passed.

First, it would increase from 205,000 to 339,000 the number of displaced persons to be accepted by this country. Of the additional number, 18,000 would come from the Polish Army, which fought along with us in World War II, and who are now in England. Another 15,000 would be recent political refugees from behind the iron curtain. Refugees from Shanghai would account for 4,000 more, while another 5,000 would be orphans not now eligible.

Second. H. R. 4567 would advance the date line for eligibility from December 22, 1945, to January 1, 1949. This would eliminate one of the major provisions of the present law which has resulted in a pattern of discrimination. The December 22, 1945, date line arbitrarily cuts off 130,000 to 135,000 Jews and Catholics who would be eligible under the January 1, 1949, date line.

Third. This bill would eliminate other discriminatory restrictions. It would establish the basic principle that the selection of displaced persons "shall be made without discrimination in favor of or against a race, religion, or national origin." It deletes the 40-percent reference for de facto annexed areas, the so-called Baltic preference. It omits the 30-percent preference for agriculture but retains farming as preference. It eliminates priority for in-camp displaced persons over those not in such camps.

Fourth. The proposed changes broaden the definition of orphans as to permit admission of many children now barred.

Fifth. The bill would enable displaced persons who arrived in the United States prior to April 30, 1949, to receive benefits of the status of those who had been admitted under the 1948 act.

Sixth. H. R. 4567 would assist American sponsors of displaced persons by providing a $5,000,000 revolving loan fund to meet the expenses of transportation and reception of displaced persons in the United States. This would encourage the widest possible distribution of displaced persons throughout this country.

Seventh. This bill would double the number of ethnic Germans and expellees who may be admitted under the law. The number would thus be increased to approximately 52,000.

Eighth. The House-approved bill would provide additional safeguards to insure the internal security of the United States.

I need not tell you of the cruel sufferings and terrible deprivations of displaced persons, herded like cattle into concentration camps and fleeing into the night from Communist terror. You know and I know that they have no homes to which they can return and that they now live in displaced-persons camps situated for the most part in Germany and Austria who do not want them and whose economies cannot absorb them.

Some persons have questioned the need or the wisdom of increasing to 339,000 the number of displaced persons the United States will accept, arguing that there will be no displaced persons left on June 30, 1950.

Yet the Displaced Persons Commission, in its semiannual report released recently, states:

"The truth, perhaps, is better stated in a recent cable from the Director General of the International Refugee Organization that there will be some 200,000 resettleable displaced persons, plus some 100,000 to 160,000 persons of limited resettlement possibilities left on that date if the present law is not changed."

To me there is no doubt that the people of the United States want to do their part in providing opportunities and new life for a fair share of these displaced persons.

The best evidence of this is the fact that the Displaced Persons Commission, in its latest semiannual report, disclosed that the people of America have been requesting displaced persons on an average of 6,000 every week. The Commission is still receiving and accepting these assurances for jobs and housing.

Of course, the economic situation has changed somewhat in the United States since

the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was passed. But we have accepted responsibility in the solution of the displaced-persons problem, and we cannot shirk it.

You may rest assured that I shall continue to do what is in my power to have Congress improve this existing displaced-persons law. What this committee will report I do not at the moment know, but I am hopeful that it will be helpful, and I want to be one of those to help.

In closing I wish my many friends who may be listening on this Polish-American hour my best wishes for a happy new year.

The Truman Spending Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin:

THE TRUMAN SPENDING RECORD

Receipts, expenditures, and the public debt of the Federal Government by selected periods from the founding of the Republic through the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951

Period	Receipts	Expenditures	Debt at end of period
All Presidents, Washington to Roosevelt, 144½ years, 1789 to 1933	$91, 586, 076, 130	$112, 203, 367. 065	$22, 538, 672, 164
Administration of F. D. Roosevelt, 12 years, fiscal 1934 to 1945	165, 760, 825, 357	372, 235, 200, 271	258, 000, 000, 000
Administration of Harry S. Truman, 6 years, fiscal 1946 to end of fiscal 1951	248, 884, 679, 597	271, 461, 104, 992	263, 800, 000, 000

Details of the Truman spending record

Fiscal year	Receipts	Expenditures [1]	Public debt
1946	$43, 037, 798, 808	$63, 713, 969, 417	$269, 422, 099, 173
1947	43, 258, 833, 189	42, 505, 045, 529	258, 375, 903, 294
1948	44, 745, 542, 077	39, 326, 072, 233	252, 365, 707, 331
1949	42, 773, 505, 520	40, 057, 107, 857	252, 797, 635, 267
1950 [2]	37, 763, 000, 000	43, 297, 000, 000	258, 797, 000, 000
1951 [2]	37, 306, 000, 000	42, 439, 000, 000	263, 800, 000, 000
Total	248, 884, 679, 597	[3] 271, 338, 195, 036	

[1] Expenditures include statutory debt retirements (sinking funds, etc.)
[2] Estimates for fiscal 1950 and 1951 from the Budget.
[3] For the fiscal year 1949, actual expenditures were first reported at $40,057,107,857, but at one time they were reported $40,150,017,813. The figure used is the Treasury's figure of Jan. 3, 1950.

PAUL O. PETERS.

Liquor Advertising in Interstate Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LANGER
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the testimony of Rev. Gerald B. Winrod, a minister of the gospel, one of the most public-spirited citizens of the State of Kansas. It is a statement prepared by Dr. Winrod for presentation to a subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, dealing with the bill which I introduced to prevent liquor advertising in newspapers, by radio and television, and in interstate commerce. I may say that Dr. Winrod for years has been one of the outstanding men in the State of Kansas in the fight for high morals for the youth of Kansas and of the Nation.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Honorable Members of the United States Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce:

My appearance before your esteemed committee is dictated by a desire on the part of our organization, the Defenders of the Christian Faith, to serve the cause of national sobriety.

Others, better qualified than I, to give expert testimony on the important subject under consideration, will appear before you during the course of these hearings. The record when completed will be a reservoir of information, dealing with both sides of what many believe to be our country's most serious domestic problem.

With your permission, my testimony will be narrowed, first, to a discussion of fraudulent liquor advertising as a menace to national morality, and second, a personal statement regarding conditions in Kansas where we are feeling the effect of a wrong decision made in the election of November 1948, at which time our 69-year-old law against intoxicating beverages was repealed.

Enactment of the measure (S. 1847) proposed by Senator LANGER will go far in correcting evils which are bringing moral decay and death to western civilization. A vitalized conscience to lift the American people out of their alcoholic stupor is the supreme need of the hour.

The following summary of the bill, which appears in the first of its seven sections, will commend itself to all who understand the relation of national character to national security:

"Be it enacted, etc., That it shall be unlawful for any distiller, brewer, vintner, manufacturer, wholesaler, or retailer, or for the agent, broker, or factor of any of them, engaged in the sale of alcoholic beverages to cause to be transported in the mails or otherwise from any State or Territory or the District of Columbia to any other State or Territory or the District of Columbia any newspaper, periodical, newsreel, photographic film, or record for mechanical reproduction advertising alcoholic beverages or containing the solicitation of an order for alcoholic beverages."

I

Our theory of government presupposes sound national character. The final safeguard of a constitutional system lies in the right purpose of those who vote. There is an intimate connection between moral consciousness and safe government.

Roger Babson says: "Under the old system of centralized government, conditions depended only upon the character of the rulers and not upon the character of the masses. Once a government could prosper, whatever the condition of the churches, or even without any educational system for the people, but today, with every man a voter and with all votes counting the same, the stability of the government depends not upon wealth nor armies, but on the character of the electorate."

Anything that tends to loosen the foundations of national morality must be regarded as a foe of constitutional democracy. The liquor narcotic comes under this indictment because it deprives the user of his normal faculties, dulls the conscience, and when allowed to run its course, destroys the capacity for moral responsibility.

The story of Dr. Jekyll and Mr. Hyde has found tragic duplication in the lives of many people who started out as temperate drinkers. Robert Louis Stevenson describes Dr. Jekyll as an honorable man and discoverer of a potion by means of which he can change himself into Mr. Hyde, a loathsome creature who lives without restraint.

He uses another potion to retrieve his position as Dr. Jekyll. After changing character several times, he finds himself lapsing into Mr. Hyde without consuming the potion. Sinking into despair, he commits suicide.

Alcohol is a demoralizing agent, as deadly to society as Dr. Jekyll's fatal potion. We cannot afford to be indifferent to an evil that breeds mass immorality, wars against physical health, befuddles the mind and deadens moral sensibilities.

No prophet is needed to anticipate the future of the America we love, if present trends toward the Hyde level are not reversed. Rome maintained a democratic system until her moral structure sagged beyond repair. Thus weakened, the masses were incapable of governing themselves, and the long line of the Caesars began. Moral discipline must be regarded as a necessity in a democracy.

The conscience of a large segment of our population has become ossified, under a barrage of fraudulent liquor advertising reaching them through magazines, newspapers and by radio. A way needs to be found for arresting the torrent of propaganda, which is sweeping multitudes to destruction and weakening the moral base of the American social order.

Manufacturing and distributing agencies seem intoxicated with power. Standards of decency and ethics in the advertising field mean nothing to them. Integrity has been discarded. They appear willing to resort to any scheme or trick to intensify the appetite of potential patrons and produce wealth for their cankered coffers. The situation has become intolerable.

Logic would seem to demand that both the company engaged in the manufacture of alcoholic beverages, and the periodical which publicizes it, should share responsibility for suffering resulting from its consumption.

A friend of mine was recently killed on the outskirts of Wichita by a drunken driver who had been drinking heavily at a nearby night club. He left a widow and two small children. The victim was parked 6 feet off the highway, repairing a tire, when the tragedy occurred.

The woman companion of the murderer stated that she looked at the speedometer just before the crash, and it registered over 80 miles an hour. The driver, being out of his senses, did not know how fast he was going and had no knowledge of approaching danger.

My friend was murdered.

Who was responsible for the crime? Both the manufacturer and the advertiser.

The man who dished the poison over the counter was a mere incident between these two enemies of humanity.

II

The fall of 1943 witnessed a hard fought battle between friends and enemies of sobriety in Kansas. The struggle was regarded as pivotal because this State had been the first to adopt constitutional prohibition.

The law, enacted in 1880, stood the wear and tear of 69 years. It was repealed by a narrow vote. The liquor interests brought up their heaviest artillery. All the arts of wet propaganda were employed. The public was for weeks bombarded by the kind of falsehoods, with which we have become familiar, through magazine, newspaper, and radio advertising. Liquor groups were especially concerned to win because of Kansas, tradition as a citadel for sobriety.

Kansas has been called the moral battleground of the Nation. The first blood for the abolition of slavery was shed on its soil. John Brown was among the early immortals who helped make Kansas a reform State. His efforts kept the territory west of the Missouri river, including the Pacific Northwest, from yielding to the slave traffic.

When he died on the gallows, Victor Hugo exclaimed, "That ends slavery in the United States." Abraham Lincoln was elected President 11 months later on an antislavery platform. The Emancipation Proclamation was issued within 3 years from that date.

There stands in Ossowatomie, Kans., a log cabin, built by John Brown as a fort, from which to beat off armed ruffians who swarmed in to establish a slave-holding empire. This unpretentious structure was dedicated as a national shrine by Theodore Roosevelt.

The visitor reads these words inscribed on a marble shaft: "In commemoration of the heroism of John Brown, who died and conquered slavery on a scaffold at Charlestown, Va., August 10, 1856."

This man was a relentless foe of both slavery and liquor. Wendell Phillips said: "He feared God so much that he never feared the face of man."

Maj. J. B. Merwin, who was present when Lincion signed the Emancipation Proclamation, records the latter as saying: "Merwin, after reconstruction, the next great moral battle is to destroy the liquor traffic, and in that conflict I pledge you my heart, my head, and hand."

Kansas played an active part in both of these moral crusades. In fact, she was the State chosen by divine providence, to blaze the trails.

There was, however, an uprising against the white man's firewater among the Indians in Kansas Territory, which antedated both the John Brown crusade and enactment of the State's prohibition law. This occurred in 1836, when advance agents of slavery and the saloon sought to debauch red men by pouring poison down their throats.

The Otoe and Cherokee Indians are credited with having organized the first temperance society west of the Missouri River. Their chiefs forbade drinking in these tribes.

Mr. Clif Stratton, the well-known author and journalist of our Sunflower State, says: "Kansas' claim to greatness—or at least to attention, is not so much the production of material things as it is in its men and women with ideas and ideals. * * * The crusader spirit has persisted."

Members of the committee will recall Mr. Stratton as a long-time associate of the Honorable Arthur Capper, who recently retired voluntarily after 30 years' service in the United States Senate.

We are reminded that Senator Capper, reflecting the spirit of the Kansas tradition, introduced a bill before the Senate to prohibit fraudulent liquor advertising similar to, if not identical with, the one now under consideration. It is significant that the fight again both the Senator and our 69-year-old prohibition law, was led by newcomers into the State, namely, the Levand family, owners of the Wichita Daily Beacon.

The solemn promise to reject liquor advertising made by these editors in advance of repeal, and the violation of that promise immediately after the 1948 election, demonstrates the need of legislation anticipated by Senate bill 1847. The facts, briefly stated, are as follows:

The Levands were vociferous in promising that they "would not accept liquor advertising," but the votes were hardly counted before their pages began to drip with paid putrescence. It is estimated that they have realized between thirty and forty thousand dollars revenue, from this source, during these intervening months. Moreover, the public has since learned that they had made plans for going into the wholesale distributing business before the election.

Senator Capper probably never received a more insulting communication from a constituent than the telegram sent by Louis Levand on May 14, 1947, an abridgment of which reads:

"We always believe in cleaning off our own doorstep first. And we are wondering why you are taking up the important time of the United States Senators in discussing advertising of alcoholic beverages throughout the Nation in magazines, radio, and newspapers when in Kansas we have a prohibition situation that is a national disgrace. * * *

"How can you honestly defend a situation that you know loses this State millions of dollars in tax revenue while the bootleggers and the mobsters and the dishonest public officials line their pockets with money which should go to support our public schools, for higher teacher salaries and for good roads.

"Every decent citizen in this State is disgraced by this situation.

"Why don't you use your newspapers in Topeka and Kansas City and your radio station and your farm journals to fight this situation? We can't recall a single crusade you have ever carried on in this State in an endeavor to enforce the prohibitory law through your newspapers and your radio station—although we have conducted many such crusades.

"And make no mistake about this, Senator: The Wichita Beacon will not carry any liquor advertising even if this State does vote for repeal a year from next November. * * *

"Will you please have this telegram read before the Senate committee and have it placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?"

It is often amusing to see notorious wets, like members of the Levand family, use pious and hypocritical phrases to cloak their true purposes. The man who sent the foregoing telegram professed deep love for Kansas and a desire to save it from disgrace—but his real concern was to derive personal income from the liquor business.

This message was included as part of a front-page Beacon editorial, published May 14, 1947, under scare headlines. The promise was repeated in the body of the article as follows:

"The Beacon informed Senator Capper that even though this State might vote for repeal of its prohibition amendment a year from next November, it would not accept liquor advertising."

Not only did these editors willfully and flagrantly break their promise by accepting advertising, but they directed the formation of a company for engaging in the sale of liquor.

The name of the corporation under which the Levand family operates is the Standard Mercantile Co., central offices, 1104 Union National Bank Building, Wichita, Kans., Leonard A. Levand, resident agent, and the capital stock is recorded as being $150,000.

Legal papers filed with the State describe the nature of the corporation's business as being to "Engage in the distribution and wholesale of alcoholic liquor and beverages. To sell, purchase, and otherwise deal in alcoholic liquors and beverages and articles of a like or similar nature, etc."

When Kansas voted repeal, it became necessary for the State to set up a system of regulation. The head of the new department was given the title, "Director of Alcoholic Beverage Control."

Last week's press reports announced that the Standard Mercantile Co. had been caught violating laws which govern the sale and distribution of Kansas liquor. A directive was issued forbidding a certain firm outside the State from making future deliveries to the Levand organization.

This promises to be a hard blow—because it strikes the pocketbook.

I have tried to avoid being tedious in reciting the foregoing details. The case of the Wichita Beacon seems pertinent to the present hearings because it offers a clear illustration of the utter absence of integrity where the sale of liquor advertising is involved.

* * * * *

Only by a firm hand can American citizens be rescued from the sea of alcohol in which they are presently engulfed.

Under a democratic system, the people must look to elected representatives for deliverance from evils that threaten the moral foundation upon which their government rests. Our country cannot be considered safe as long as advertisers of alcoholic beverages, who put self above health and money above morals, are given ungoverned latitude to spread pernicious propaganda which can only weaken and contribute to the downfall of our Republic.

As a minister of the Gospel, editor of a religious and patriotic magazine with over 70,000 circulation, radio speaker on nightly and Sunday morning chain broadcasts and president of the Defenders of the Christian Faith—I beg you to report this bill out of committee for full and free debate on the floor of the United States Senate.

May I, in closing, remind us of the solemn admonition found in the book of Habakkuk, chapter 2 and verse 15:

"Woe unto him that giveth his neighbour drink, that puttest thy bottle to him, and makest him drunken."

Limit on Medical Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed

in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "College Heads Assail Doctors for Limit on Medical Students," written by Benjamin Fine, and published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of January 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COLLEGE HEADS ASSAIL DOCTORS FOR LIMIT ON MEDICAL STUDENTS

(By Benjamin Fine)

CINCINNATI, OHIO.—An unusually sharp attack on the medical profession of this country, rarely before heard in academic circles, was voiced here from a committee of prominent college leaders, studying preprofessional education.

The Nation's doctors were accused of using Petrillo and Fishbein economics in keeping down the number of students admitted to medical schools.

The reference was to James C. Petrillo, president of the AFL American Federation of Musicians, and Dr. Morris Fishbein, former editor of the Journal of the American Medical Association.

CLAIM THOUSANDS BARRED

Thousands of qualified premedical students are not admitted to these schools, even though the Nation needs more doctors, the committee maintained.

The charges were made before the American conference of academic deans, which met here in conjunction with the annual convention of the Association of American Colleges. One thousand college presidents, deans, and university administrators attended the 3-day sessions, considered among the most important in higher education.

A year ago the American conference of academic deans appointed a committee, consisting of the deans of Wayne, Ohio State, Northwestern, and Kentucky Universities to study the problems involved in admission to the medical colleges.

The report, presented here, assailed the medical profession for its short-sightedness in not keeping pace with the Nation's health needs.

When the committee presented its resolution, a number of college officials sprang to the defense of the doctors. Many delegates were upset over the effect the resolution would have upon the medical profession. The conference eliminated this portion of the resolution:

"Annually several thousand students fully qualified in training, personality, and temperament are denied admission to the professional training of their choice. This set of conditions constitutes a most serious threat to the continued health and well-being of the American people."

FEAR ANTAGONISMS

One of the delegates exclaimed: "A good many people in the medical profession do not believe this to be true. If we adopt the resolution we will create a lot of antagonisms."

According to Dr. William S. Guthrie, dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Ohio State University, college students face strict rationing of careers in medicine, dentistry, and veterinary medicine without respect for the country's need.

Dr. Guthrie urged the medical profession to utilize the medical colleges to full capacity, as was done during the war years. During 5 years the schools trained 7,214 extra doctors.

LAG BEHIND POPULATION

His report, presented to the conference, contrasted the number of medical students today with the number in 1905. In 1949, he brought out, 79 medical schools had an enrollment of 23,670 students, with a graduating class of 5,094.

In 1905, there were 160 medical schools in this country, with a student enrollment of 26,147 and a graduating class of 5,606. During this period the population has virtually doubled while the number of students in medical school has decreased, Dr. Guthrie pointed out.

Moreover, in 1905 college students totaled 150,000, contrasted to today's 2,500,000. In 1905, the ratio of medical students to college students was 1 to 5.

"U" DOCTOR STRESSES SCHOOL LIMITATIONS

"I think everybody would agree there should be some expansion of medical education," Dr. Howard L. Horns, assistant dean of medical sciences, commented at the University of Minnesota.

However, he added, two things should be pointed out:

1905's 160 medical schools included "many inferior schools," two or three in Minnesota alone. They have been consolidated into today's 79, mostly of high quality.

A medical school is limited by facilities and staff, and cannot add students beyond capacity without harm.

"Lab space and equipment limit us," Dr. Horns said. "In the final 2 years, furthermore, much of the teaching is in very small groups of four to eight students."

Enrollment in the university medical school is now some 430, and 89 seniors will be graduated in June. Subsequent graduating classes will be larger—there are now, for instance, some 120 freshmen.

During World War II instruction was on a 12-month schedule, but the teaching year has since been reduced to 10 months, a month longer than prewar.

Federal Aid to State and Local Governments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following news bulletin:

FEDERAL AID TO STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Federal aid to State and local governments will be more than 80 percent higher in fiscal 1951 than actual payments in fiscal 1949, according to the President's budget request. Greatest advance will be in payments to the States for social welfare, health, and security, which will increase $670,000,000, and funds for education and general research will increase $325,000,000.

A summary of the proposed spending for 1951 and the actual spending in fiscal 1949 follows:

Grants-in-aid	Expenditures, fiscal 1949	Budget request, fiscal 1951
Veterans' Administration, grants to States, etc.	$31, 587, 221	$11, 248, 185
Social welfare, health, and security	1, 091, 224, 052	1, 761, 635, 549
Housing and community facilities	8, 583, 830	27, 939, 403
Education and general research	36, 921, 631	354, 294, 823
Agriculture and agricultural resources	86, 630, 809	113, 039, 842
Natural resources not primarily agricultural	13, 996, 232	21, 143, 805
Transportation and communication	433, 640, 673	514, 493, 000
Labor, grants to States for unemployment compensation	140, 313, 590	183, 704, 500
Shared revenues	21, 242, 779	24, 556, 660
Loans and repayable advances	−73, 477, 454	240, 800, 275
District of Columbia, contribution in lieu of taxes	12, 000, 000	12, 000, 000
	1, 802, 703, 363	3, 264, 856, 042

PAUL O. PETERS.

The Federal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Cause for Worry," published in the St. Louis Globe-Democrat.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAUSE FOR WORRY

Edwin G. Nourse, ex-chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, is not an administration gadfly. Had he been averse to Fair Deal goals, he would never have joined Mr. Truman's official family. But he is a hard-headed economist. As such he interposes blunt, objective realism into the President's political concept of national economy.

Like many others with far less understanding of conditions, Dr. Nourse is deeply concerned over the prospect of a Federal deficit that promises to snowball above $10,000,000,000 in a 2-year period. He warns that such a deficit ballooning is a threat to the stability of the dollar, a harbinger of more and frightening inflation.

This man is not a gloom gabbler. It was he who, during the jittery slump early in 1949, told the Nation there was nothing to fear, that we were merely passing through a healthy disinflation. He was right. It was he who predicted a lower cost of living, without demoralizing business. We found out last year he was right. Living costs were scaled down a jot, and prosperity kept rolling.

There is reason for tacking confidence to his danger signs on the deficit highways. It is a rough row he seeks to hoe. The administration is dedicated to deficit spending, the Nation has become accustomed to vast national debt, and the average citizen hasn't the faintest notion of what the whole question means. Dr. Nourse says unless government gets back into black-ink financing, we are setting the stage for a new reveling inflation.

Maybe the average citizen is numb when confronted with the hazards of debt pyramiding. But we ought to have a pretty clear

idea of what inflation means. We struggled with it for a decade. The Government passed laws and made incessant patriotic appeals to stave off a gobbling inflation. Now Washington is casually hurtling down a fiscal road with inflationary perils lurking at every turn.

Dr. Nourse is alarmed because Government in an era of bulging prosperity is making no real effort to balance its budget. The administration—and Congress—has booted fiscal prudence out the window. Faced by a public refusal to accept more big taxes, the administration has listened to purveyors of economic fantasy and adopted deficit spending as a way of life.

The President's former adviser suggests that Government could get back to a sound fiscal condition within a year or two, and with production and employment kept at a high level. But that means retrenchment. It means, he thinks, Government economy and the reduction or deferment of Mr. Truman's pet schemes of social welfare.

Mr. Truman is an economic dilettante. Dr. Nourse was vice president of the Brookings Institution, a scientific research organization, and headed its institute of economics from the time it was established in 1922. He left there to head the economic advisers and make national studies of the economy.

But the President is a politician. He accepts the recommendations of deficit-spenders who, one suspects, whisper the advices they think he wants. He won't abandon a single social panacea. He makes genuflection to budget paring, then breezily whisks on down the path of high deficit piling.

Dr. Nourse is worried. There is plenty of cause for national anxiety.

The Genocide Treaty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD two letters addressed to me and one to the editor, Union-Leader, Manchester, N. H., in regard to the proposed Genocide Treaty, which is currently being considered by the Senate Judiciary Committee. These letters were written by one of New Hampshire's most prominent and thoughtful lawyers, and it is my belief they merit sincere and serious attention.

In its deliberations, I feel confident that the committee will ascertain the exact meaning of the measure. They will not fail to heed the warnings of the legal experts whose duty it is to point out to the American people and to their elected representatives the dangers that lurk in the written words of a legal document.

As for myself, I am anxiously awaiting the conclusion of the committee hearings before formulating my own judgment in this matter.

There being no objection, the letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WYMAN, STARR, BOOTH,
WADLEIGH & LANGDELL,
Manchester, N. H., September 21, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHARLES: I thank you for sending me the Christian Science Monitor editorial on genocide. It is precisely because of such editorials that I wrote to the Union a very brief review of the genocide situation which was published in both Union and Leader on the editorial page of the Friday, September 16 papers. Though I know it was inadequate, nevertheless I would like to have you read it if you have not already done so.

I may be presumptuous in saying that the editors who write such editorials do not fully understand what they are talking about, but I feel strongly that is so. It is by no means certain that individual human rights—involving such matters as discrimination against Negroes and Jews—are not in question under the proposed convention, as stated in the Monitor editorial. They surely would be if the Declaration of Human Rights and the Covenant of Human Rights were adopted in their present form. It seems to me that Negroes and Jews would be within the description of ethnical, racial, or religious groups under the genocide pact. The measure of mental harm or birth prevention is not given, and no one can know what might amount to conspiracy, incitement or attempt to commit or complicity in genocide.

I might refer for example to the declaration which asserts the right of miscegenation as a human right and ask what may become of those who favor or enact a State law against it—would they be guilty of mental harm to a racial group? And those who advocate birth control?

I am no isolationist. I believe we should take our responsibility as a strong Nation in world affairs, but I do not believe we should enter into a pact which obligates us to interfere with the internal affairs of other nations in times of peace and subjects us to their quite possible interference with our domestic affairs which to date we have handled pretty much to our own satisfaction and without any genocide or human rights violation as we understand those terms.

I put to you another question—having in mind that I understand that protest has already been made to United Nations against the Communist trials now going on in New York—if the Communists here follow Moscow direction, would our action against Communists be interpreted as an act of genocide against a national group for which individuals, officials, and our State or Federal Governments could be brought to the bar of an international tribunal?

The fact that reservations were suggested demonstrates that the pact should not be ratified as submitted, yet no one can be sure that those reservations as suggested would be fully sufficient to protect us against international litigation. It seems to me that such litigation would be a form of war and if after the pact was adopted we ourselves preferred charges against any in another country, we would be accused of warmongering.

I fear the use that might be made of such a pact as a sounding board for Communist attack on our institutions, and I fear the present assumption by us of an obligation to participate in the use of force to stop in other countries what we condemn and what we ourselves will never be guilty of.

I am sorry this is so long—but it might be longer.

Your humble constituent,
LOUIS E. WYMAN.

WYMAN, STARR, BOOTH,
WADLEIGH & LANGDELL,
Manchester, N. H., December 27, 1949.

Hon. CHARLES W. TOBEY,
Temple, N. H.

MY DEAR SENATOR: This acknowledges your letter of December 24 with enclosures which, as requested, I am returning to you herewith.

It may be presumptuous for me as a small-town country lawyer to place myself in opposition to the illustrious gentlemen whose names appear on the literature favoring the adoption of the genocide pact, but I am quite convinced that their propaganda is fully answered by the report of the American Bar Association committee on peace and law. You may have seen the brief summary of my ideas on this subject which was printed in the Manchester Union in September. My thought is, very briefly, that for us to adopt this pact as a treaty is not only dangerous to our institutions, but is also misleading the world. The little pamphlet entitled "Killing One Man Is Murder, Killing a Million Is Not," recites events which shock the conscience and states, "There was no law against it," and that the UN is forging a law against it, and that the United States should be foremost to ratify such a treaty. This sounds to me like nonsense. There is not the slightest possibility that under our form of government this Nation will ever be guilty of genocide as we interpret the pact, yet there is a danger that others might seek to bring us before an international court on some theory of their interpretation that we had violated the pact in seriously injuring the feelings of a minority group. However, if there is no danger of our being guilty of genocide, why must we undertake by treaty to legislate for other countries? If you assume that by the adoption of this treaty there will be a law against it, do we not thereby pledge ourselves to enforce that law? Written law does not seem to me to be particularly valuable unless it is to be enforced and I see no hope of enforcement of this pact under present world conditions unless we are prepared promptly to go to war. It seems to me far better that we should keep our own house in order rather than to enter a pact under which we must police the world.

It seems to me conceivable that under article II, defining genocide, it may be argued that a Communist is a part of a national group and when we undertake to pass laws to restrict and even to outlaw communism we may be charged with doing them serious mental harm or with undertaking to destroy them in whole or in part. If this convention passes we certainly can be charged with such conduct before some tribunal and the proceedings would then constitute a sounding board for further recriminations by persons who do not like our form of government.

I am not here referring to the legal effect of such a pact on our constitutional set-up. That is dealt with in the committee report above referred to, and that alone should be sufficient to warrant rejection by the Senate at this time. I am merely trying to say that no matter how well the proposed convention may sound, no matter how lofty may be the motives which prompted agreement between those who did agree upon its language, it is more likely than not to get this country into trouble. It is not an isolationistic point of view to assert that we cannot cure or eradicate all evil which exists anywhere. This country can no more feed the starving millions of India and China or undertake to bring their living standards up to ours than an individual traveler could undertake to meet the demands, in any degree, of individual beggars with whom in his travels he might come in contact. This is not intended to suggest that any national group should be compared with

a beggar. I know of no nation in any such position. I am merely undertaking to illustrate a financial comparison. I have seen beggars whose condition appeared to be heartrending, but so many that even a few pennies to each would have left me bankrupt, and that general situation of the impossibility of our assuming financial responsibility for the world to me also demonstrates that we cannot assume moral responsibility for the world. As I read the papers it seems to me that there are countries even now guilty of violating such a pact, and if one of the countries were Russia what would we do about it?

Sincerely yours,

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

MANCHESTER, N. H., *September 16, 1949.*

THIS EVENTFUL PRESENT—GENOCIDE—A CASE AGAINST TREATY RATIFICATION

EDITOR, UNION-LEADER:

With reference to your editorial of September 13, headed "Genocide Convention," I respectfully submit the following:

Genocide is a new word to denote race killing. The Genocide Convention or treaty as submitted to the Senate for ratification would make genocide a crime in peace or wartime which the parties to the treaty undertake to prevent and punish.

Genocide is defined as "any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy in whole or in part a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group as such." The following acts are described as "(a) Killing members of the group; (b) causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group; (c) deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part; (d) imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group; (e) forcibly transferring children of the group to another group." It is then provided that genocide or conspiracy, or direct and public incitement, or attempt to commit, or complicity in, genocide shall be punishable. Penalties are provided and persons shall be tried before a tribunal of the state or an international penal tribunal. Any contracting party may ask United Nations to take action and any dispute as to the meanings or fulfillment of the treaty obligation are to be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

MORE CENTRALIZED POWER

Under our own Constitution a treaty once ratified becomes the law of the land; hence this treaty would inevitably further concentrate authority in the Federal Government and deprive the States of their rights to suppress crime. That subject is beyond the scope of this paper, but the threat is serious.

Anyone who is inclined to think that the Genocide Convention should be ratified by the United States Senate, or that the American Bar Association should be criticized for opposing ratification ought to pause long enough to weigh a few simple facts. The historical background and the legal complications which may be involved are vital and complex beyond the limits of a brief review such as is here submitted. We now call attention to only a few basic facts.

The convention was transmitted to the Senate of the United States for ratification as a finished document. The President made no suggestion of any need for reservations or declarations of the understanding upon which the Senate should approve the treaty although the State Department, in submitting the convention to the President, did express its understanding of some of the phraseology with which other nations or the international court contemplated by the pact might or might not agree. A point which this survey makes is that this convention received careful consideration by (a) the American Bar Association special committee on peace and law, and by (b) the ABA section of international and comparable law. No member of the special committee and no member of the section recommended that the convention should be ratified in form as submitted to the Senate. In the debate which followed in the ABA house of delegates, no one argued that the convention should be approved as drafted. Even the Solicitor General of the United States, who is a member of the house of delegates and who came from Washington (presumably as the representative of the State Department) to speak to the house in favor of ratification, did not suggest ratification without reservations.

WHAT BUSINESS THIS?

We therefore ask what kind of a document is this which this country is asked to ratify as a treaty when all lawyers agree that it cannot be ascertained from the language used in it that it means what it says or says what it means. As a treaty under our Constitution it would become the law of the land. Lawyers are men especially trained in legal effect of language, and all agreed that as drawn this treaty should not be ratified. If the lawyers of this country and especially the able men of the ABA house of delegates do not know the meaning and effect of treaty phraseology, no one can know it.

Some of these lawyers of the section thought the convention might be saved by reservations, and it was argued to the house that the treaty ratified with reservations would not become effective as to this country until the reservations had beer accepted by the other ratifying countries.

To this writer, at least, this seems an unnecessary complication of the complicated. In the first place, it is impossible to be certain that the reservations, submitted at the last moment to the house, are sufficiently complete fully to protect the interests of the United States; and in the second place it would seem more desirable to know in advance whether or not the reservations are acceptable to other countries. If any committee brought in a draft proposal requiring such extensive amendments, as this convention clearly must have before it can be acceptable to this country, the proposal would be promptly sent back to the committee for further consideration. And that is precisely what the vote of the house suggests that the Senate of the United States ought to do.

SATISFACTORY TO RUSSIA

If we remember correctly, the representative of the United States on the committee which framed this convention at one time said in effect that concessions in language had been made to satisfy Russia and that she was not certain that they should have been made. There is today no way in which we can be sure that the reservations proposed are broad enough or definite enough to avoid our becoming involved in controversy through the challenge by some other country of acts or of treaty applicability.

As we understand the meaning of genocide, no lawyer or layman in America believes that there is the slightest chance that anyone in this country is likely to be guilty of that crime. The first reservation proposed undertakes to limit the crime by requiring that the acts enumerated must directly affect thousands of persons. It does not change the intent. The reservation further provides that criminality in the United States is to be determined only by the Federal court of the district wherein the act is alleged to have been committed. Passing what might be a protracted argument as to the meaning of language in the original convention and in the reservations, it is apparent that by the reservations the section on international comparative law has tried to avoid any possibility that a citizen of the United States might be summoned to trial before an international tribunal. Yet the reservations do not make it clear that our States shall retain jurisdiction of crimes committed within their borders if the acts which would otherwise constitute such crimes could be construed as coming within the definition of genocide, and there is nothing in the reservation that will prevent a foreign country or a citizen of a foreign country from filing a complaint that the conduct of some one or more citizens of this country constitutes the crime. Whereupon we would have an international episode.

We wonder if it is not true that some well-meaning citizens of this country believe that other countries may commit genocide. They want this country to be a party to a treaty that will make genocide punishable, and if this is done, then upon request of the United Nations this country would be obligated to step in and stop it. As we said, nobody in this country expects that this country will be guilty, but the proponents of this convention want the force of the United States back of tne general condemnation, and if other parties signatory, including Russia, become guilty—as many now think some countries are guilty—we would become involved in the effort to clean up the mess.

OF RUSSIA, CAN WE BE SURE?

It is said that Russia has signed the convention, but we all know that Russia permits no one to know what is going on within her borders. Nor can we tell what interpretation Russia may choose to ask to be placed upon the language of the convention. Inasmuch as the Declaration of Human Rights includes an approval of miscegenation, may it not be that someone will charge that laws against miscegenation in some way involve genocide.

Briefly, then, we have a proposal for a treaty which will make criminal and triable before an international court acts which no one in the United States has ever dreamed of committing, and which will not be committed so long as our form of government shall endure. Why, then, should we not continue our form of government and so govern ourselves as to furnish an example for the rest of the world without undertaking to bind ourselves to take action against the internal conduct of another nation. In the form in which this convention is submitted to the Senate for ratification, we would be subject to international tribunal decisions as to matters which we now consider of purely domestic concern while if we undertook to enforce the covenant against some other country we would certainly be again accused of warmongering.

LOUIS E. WYMAN.

MANCHESTER, *September 14.*

Alien Property

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Friday, January 27, 1950

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the following data pertaining to enemy property:

PART I. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (A)

Nullification and divesting orders

Order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
N. O. 1	German	Askania Regulator Co.	United States	Patents	(1)	Mar. 4, 1943	13	May 29, 1942
							151	Sept. 19, 1942
							201	Dec. 23, 1942
N. O. 2	do	Radio Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
N. O. 3	Dutch	Shell Development Co.	do	Patent applications	(1)	do	205	Oct. 2, 1942
N. O. 4	French	General Airplane Equipment, Inc.	do	Patent application	(1)	do	291	Nov. 2, 1942
							293	Do.
D. O. 1	Rumanian	Edgar Ausnit	Cuba	100 percent interest in 2 vested business enterprises.	$8,000.00	Apr. 19, 1943	46	July 2, 1942
D. O. 2	French	L. Gabrilavitch	United States	Patent	(1)	Apr. 27, 1943	306	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 3	German	American Lumber & Treating Co.	do	Patents	(1)	Apr. 30, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 4	do	Welding Research, Inc.	do	Patent application	(1)	June 3, 1943	293	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 5	Belgian	Lucien C. Sturbelle	do	do	(1)	June 21, 1943	292	Do.
D. O. 6	Danish	Bernhard Spur	do	do	(1)	Aug. 6, 1943	290	Do.
D. O. 7	German	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co.	do	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 8	do	William Kroll	do	Patent	(1)	Aug. 19, 1943	296	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 9	do	Walter Haendel	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 10	French	Joseph Blumenfeld	do	Patent application	(1)	do	293	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 11	German	The National Cash Register Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 12	Belgian	Leon Thiry	do	Patent	(1)	Aug. 25, 1943	675	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 13	German	Anaconda Wire & Cable Co.	do	do	(1)	Sept. 6, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 14	Rumanian	Byron Jackson Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 15	German	Elton H. Rimington	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 16	do	The International Nickel Co.	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 17	do	Scophony Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	Sept. 7, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 18	Japanese	General Electric Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 19	German	Karl Ludwig Schiff	do	Patent application	(1)	Sept. 10, 1943	68	July 30, 1942
D. O. 20	do	Paul E. Hawkinson Co.	do	Patent	(1)	Sept. 20, 1943	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 21	do	Remington Rand Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 22	French	Dewey & Almy Chemical Co.	do	do	(1)	do	293	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 23	Polish	Bronislaw Goldman	do	do	(1)	do	673	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 24	German	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 25	do	Allied Chemical & Dye Corp.	do	do	(1)	Sept. 22, 1943	201	Do.
D. O. 26	French	Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 27	German	Bagpak, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 28	do	do	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 29	do	W. F. and John Barnes Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 30	French	Bendix Aviation Corp.	do	Patent	(1)	do	1039	Mar. 8, 1943
D. O. 31	German	Edward G. Budd Manufacturing Co.	do	Patent application	(1)	do	68	July 30, 1942
D. O. 32	Dutch	De Directie van de Staatsmijnen (agency for the Dutch Government).	do	Patents	(1)	do	291	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 33	do	do	do	Patent	(1)	do	721	Jan. 23, 1943
D. O. 34	French	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 35	German	Bernhard Erben	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 36	do	Harold G. Henry	United States	do	(1)	do	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 37	Norwegian	Laboratory for raw materials of the Norwegian Government.	Norway	do	(1)	do	294	Nov. 2, 1942
D. O. 38	German	Montfort Investment Co.	Lichtenstein	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 39	do	National Cash Register Co.	United States	do	(1)	do	129	Aug. 28, 1942
D. O. 40	do	do	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 41	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 42	French	David Sciaky	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 43	Dutch	Shell Development Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	671	Do.
D. O. 44	German	Wallace R. Turnbull	Canada	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 45	do	Radio Corp. of America	United States	do	(1)	Sept. 30, 1943	141	Sept. 8, 1942
D. O. 46	do	Eugene Mittelmann	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 47	Japanese	I. F. Laucks, Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 48	Norwegian	Western Precipitation Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	672	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 49	German	The Anglo California National Bank of San Francisco.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 50	do	United States Metal Powders, Inc.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 51	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 52	do	do	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 53	Italian	E. I. du Pont de Nemours & Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 54	German	Link-Belt Co.	Greece	Patent and patent application.	(1)	do	13	May 29, 1942
D. O. 55	do	Walter Wisbrun	United States	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 56	do	General Electric Co.	do	Patent and patent application.	(1)	do	112	Aug. 25, 1942
D. O. 57	do	B.S.A. Tools, Ltd.	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 58	do	Davis & Co., Inc.	United States	do	(1)	Oct. 4, 1943	201	Do.
D. O. 59	do	The Fate-Root-Heath Co.	do	Patent and patent application.	(1)	Oct. 5, 1943	1	Mar. 25, 1942
D. O. 60	do	Radio Corp. of America	do	Patent	(1)	do	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 61	do	Imperial Knife Co., Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 62	do	General Electric Co.	do	Patent application	(1)	Oct. 9, 1943	205	Oct. 2, 1942
D. O. 63	Italian	Budd Wheel Co.	do	Patent	(1)	Oct. 23, 1943	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 64	German	Franz Puening	do	do	(1)	Nov. 6, 1943	201	Do.
D. O. 65	do	Walter Sobernheim	do	Securities	100,000.00	Nov. 17, 1943	435	Dec. 4, 1942
D. O. 66	Belgian	Leon Thiry	do	Patent	(1)	Feb. 17, 1944	675	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 67	French	Abel E. Chernack	do	do	(1)	Feb. 12, 1944	666	Do.
D. O. 68	do	David Bezborodko, Charles Zucker	do	Patent application	(1)	Feb. 17, 1944	1028	Mar. 4, 1943
D. O. 69	Dutch	Leonard Elion	do	Patent	(1)	Feb. 25, 1944	671	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 70 (not issued).								
D. O. 71	German	Alfred Marshutz	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 72	do	Aluminum Co. of America	do	do	(1)	May 9, 1944	1	Mar. 25, 1942
D. O. 73	do	American Diagrid Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 74	French	American Rolling Mill Corp.	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 75	Danish	Niels B. Bach	do	do	(1)	do	664	Do.
D. O. 76	Italian	Leon M. DeKanski	do	do	(1)	do	721	Jan. 23, 1943

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART I. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 9 (A)—Continued

Nullification and divesting orders—Continued

Order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
D. O. 77 (not issued)								
D. O. 78 (not issued)								
D. O. 79 (not issued)			United States					
D. O. 80	French	Wsevolode Grunberg		Patent application	(1)	May 9, 1944	1032	Mar. 4, 1943
D. O. 81	German	The Hoover Co	do	Patent	(1)	do	112	Aug. 25, 1942
D. O. 82	do	Lewis Larsen, trustee	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 83 (not issued)								
D. O. 84	German	Reynolds Metals Co	United States	Patent	(1)	May 9, 1944	16	June 4, 1942
D. O. 85	Dutch	Willem L. J. Spoor	do	Patents	(1)	do	671	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 86	French	United States Industrial Chemicals, Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Do.
D. O. 87	German	United States Radium Corp	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 88	Hungarian	George DeBecze	do	Patents	(1)	May 23, 1944	201	Do.
D. O. 89	Austrian	Robert Honigsberg	Canada	Patent	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 90	German	Leopold Lion	United States	do	(1)	do	2430	Oct. 20, 1943
D. O. 91	do	Bessie E. Steeves, Admix. of the Estate of Aubrey Steeves.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 92	do	Georg Szekely	Palestine	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 93	do	Leopold H. P. Klotz—North American Investing Co., Inc.	United States	Notes and Capital Stock of Luscombe Airplane Corp.	$624,000.00	June 6, 1944	3	Apr. 7, 1942
D. O. 94	do	Maurice Stern	do	Securities Stock of General Aniline Film Corp.	26,000.00 109,000.00	July 11, 1944	155	Sept. 19, 1942
D. O. 95	do	Chemipuls Process, Inc	do	Patents	(1)	Oct. 31, 1944	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 96	French	Coro, Inc	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 97	German	The Firestone Tire & Rubber Co.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 98	French	Freydberg Bros.—Strauss, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
D. O. 99	German	Mechanite Metal Corp	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
D. O. 100	do	Precise Products Corp	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
D. O. 101 (not issued)								
D. O. 102 (not issued)								
D. O. 103 (not issued)								
D. O. 104	Dutch	Eelco Nicolaas van Kleffens	Great Britain	Copyright	(1)	Dec. 23, 1944	4031	Aug. 16, 1944
D. O. 105 (not issued)								
D. O. 106 (not issued)								

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
1	Rumanian	E. A. M. Biering	Denmark	Cash	$67,066.55	July 26, 1946	2392	Oct. 11, 1943
2	Italian	Elizabeth P. King	Italy	Cash Interest in real property	9,058.12 2,941.88	Dec. 27, 1946	1971	Aug. 7, 1943
3	Hungarian	Harriot Daly Sigray	United States	Cash Interest in estates and trusts.	51,073.75 1,337,911.27	Jan. 9, 1947	1851, 1195	July 19, 1943 Apr. 2, 1943
4	German	Arnold Janowitz Paul Nickelsberg Franz Schatzky Arthur M. Seligman Delamere Co., Inc Norbert Bernheimer Max Jacoby Inter-Allied Patent Corp.	do	Patents	(1)	Feb. 24, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
5	French	Gaston Desagnat	do	do	(1)	Feb. 27, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
6	Philippine	Philippine Mfg. Co	Philippine Islands	Patent applications	(1)	Mar. 4, 1947	295	Nov. 2, 1942
	German	Arno Brasch	United States	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
7	Japanese	James P. Robinson	do	Patent	(1)	Mar. 12, 1947	1031	Mar. 4, 1943
8	German	Walter H. Lowston Hans Lewin Ingersoll-Rand Co	do	Patents	(1)	Mar. 17, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
9	do	California Spray-Chemical Corp.	do	Patent	(1)	Mar. 20, 1947	16	June 4, 1942
10	Belgian	Verne Hass	do	do	(1)	Mar. 25, 1947	675	Jan. 18, 1943
	German	International Shoe Co	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	Dutch	Bates Mfg. Co	do	do	(1)	April 14, 1947	671	Jan. 18, 1943
	Italian	Celanese Corp. of America	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	German	Petrolite Corp., Ltd	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
11	do	Rudolph Waldman	do	do	(1)	do	205	Oct. 2, 1942
	Czechoslovakian	Uneeda Notions Mfgs	do	do	(1)	do	676	Jan. 18, 1943
	French	Emil Zipper	do	Patents	(1)	do	201 666	Dec. 23, 1942 Jan. 18, 1943
12	German	Bagpak, Inc	do	do	(1)	Apr. 18, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	French	Jackson & Perkins Co	do	Patent applications	(1)	Apr. 30, 1947	1028	Mar. 4, 1943
13	German	The Celotex Corp	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	do	Christian Heinrich Hofess	do	Cash	128.40	do	5577	Jan. 8, 1946
	do	Walter M. Weis	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	do	Maywood Chemical	do	Patents	(1)	May 7, 1947	201	Do.
14	do	Singer Mfg Co	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Do.
	Danish	Clair L. Farrand	do	do	(1)	May 21, 1947	664	Jan. 18, 1943
15	German	Andrew A. Kramer	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	Italian	Walter R. Hearst	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
16	French	French National Railroad	France	Cash Bonds Copyrights	324,518.57 132,000.00 (1)	May 29, 1947 do do	817 817 500 A-9	Feb. 8, 1943 Do. Do.
17	Austrian	Albert H. Stronstorff	United States	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1943
18	Italian	Herbert Raymond Loder	do	Cash Interest in a trust	1,225.61 30,000.00	do	2423	Oct. 20, 1943
	French	Radio Corp. of America	do	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
	do	Kislyn Corp	do	Patents	(1)	do	666	Do.
	Italian	Charles N. Ehrlich	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
19	German	R. Hoe & Co., Inc	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
	Italian	The Light Conditioning Co. of America, Inc.	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.
	German	Pyrene Development Corp	do	do	(1)	do	201	Do.

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
20	German Belgian	Eastman Kodak Co. Rolf Bie	United States do	Patent application Patent	(1) (1)	June 16, 1947 do	68 292	July 30, 1942 Nov. 2, 1942
	German	Dr. August von Borosini	do	do	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
21	do do	Shell Development Co. Ottmar Loew	do do	Patent application Patent	(1) (1)	do do	68 2430	July 30, 1942 Oct. 20, 1943
	Belgian	Ellis Miller	do	Patents	(1)	do	675	Jan. 18, 1943
22	German	Builders Iron Foundry	do	Patent	(1)	June 19, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
	French	Antonina V. Luchaire	France	Cash Copyrights	$23,266.95 (1)	June 24, 1947	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
23	Norwegian German	Titan Co., Inc. Hansea Corp.	United States do	Patent Cash Patent contracts	(1) 16,149.61 (1)	do do	294 1239	Nov. 2, 1942 Apr. 15, 1943
	do	American Chain & Cable Co., Inc.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
24	do French	Standard Brands, Inc. Raymond Sauliner	do France	do Patents and patent applications.	(1) (1)	June 19, 1947 do	201 666 293	Do. Jan. 18, 1943 Nov. 2, 1942
25	do German	Francoise Seignobose The Sanoderm Co., Inc.	United States do	Cash Copyrights Patent	2,198.87 (1) (1)	June 24, 1947 do do	3430 3918 201	Apr. 12, 1944 July 11, 1944 Dec. 23, 1942
26	Czechoslovakian	Joseph Mahler	do	do	(1)	June 26, 1947	676	Jan. 18, 1943
27	French	Raoul R. R. Sarazin	France	Patents	(1)	June 30, 1947	1589	May 29, 1493
28	German do	Herman H. Frischer Karl W. Posnansky	United States do	do Patent	(1) (1)	July 11, 1947 do	201 201	Dec. 23, 1942 Do.
29	do	Emma Lochner	do	Cash	12,347.62	do	2197 6248	Sept. 18, 1945 May 6, 1946
30	do	Underwood Corp.	do	Patents and patent application.	(1)	Aug. 25, 1947	27 68 112 201	June 18, 1942 July 30, 1942 Aug. 25, 1942 Dec. 23, 1942
31	German	Henri W. Jonkhoff	do	Patents	(1)	July 24, 1947	201	Do
32	do do	Stephanie Schybilsky Posament. Josephine M. Lorsch	do do	Cash do	2,627.64 14,197.57	do do	3037 154 2903	Jan. 28, 1944 Sept. 17, 1942 Jan. 7, 1944
33	Italian	Rose Latino Agnes Latino Frank Latino Biagio Latino Carmela Armano	do	do	1,429.57	Aug. 7, 1947	2119	Sept. 7, 1943
34	German	Jochim Kolbe	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
35	do	Henry J. Beal	do	Cash	111.76	do	2371	Oct. 9, 1943
36	French Dutch	Clarence A. Hearley Lawrence Harbury	do do	Interest in a patent Patent	(1) (1)	do do	666 671	Jan. 18, 1943 Do.
37	German	Rudolf A. Sems	do	Cash	1,658.96	Aug. 12, 1947	6906	July 2, 1946
38	do	The First National Bank of Chicago, administrator, C. T. A. of Alfred Quensel.	do	do	30,623.04	Oct 20, 1947	3647	May 15, 1944
39 (not issued).								
40	French	Georges J. C. Simenon	do	do Copyrights	7,563.36 (1)	Sept. 30, 1947	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
41	German	Helene Zentgraf	do	Cash Interest in a trust	4,332.35 6,858.00	Jan. 12, 1948	3906	July 11, 1944
42	do	Fritz Hohenemser	Mexico	Cash	7,742.85	Feb. 11, 1948	1282	Apr. 20, 1943
43 (not issued)								
44	Italian	David Jona	United States	Interest in a patent	(1)	Feb. 9, 1948	2246	Sept. 21, 1943
45 (not issued)								
46	German	Enrique Kimmerfeldt	Guatemala	Cash Interest in a vested business enterprise.	26,426.00 1,250.00	Sept. 16, 1947	104	Aug. 17, 1942
47	do	Amalie Friese	United States	Cash	884.69	Sept. 30, 1947	5537	Jan. 3, 1946
48 (revoked Apr. 14, 1948).								
49	French	Julien Dungler	Switzerland	Cash Patents	12,036.27 (1)	Oct. 8, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
50	German	Anemostat Corp.	United States	Patent	(1)	Sept. 17, 1947	201	Dec. 23, 1942
51	Japanese	Nichibei Kinema Co.	do	Cash 70 motion picture film	15,000.00 (1)	Oct. 27, 1947	246 1639 1760 4626	Oct. 19, 1942 June 10, 1943 July 1, 1943 Feb. 20, 1945
52	Norwegian do	Erica Rotheim Hagbarth Rotheim	do Norway	Patents do Cash	(1) (1) 1.00	Oct. 21, 1947 do do	672 294 294	Jan. 18, 1943 Nov. 2, 1942 Do.
53	Hungarian	Aaron & Dautch Kremer & Leavitt	United States do	Cash do	266.50 237.32	Sept. 30, 1947 do	1842 1842	July 19, 1943 Do.
54 (property not vested).								
55	Polish	Barbara Gwiazdowski	do	Cash Copyright	251.52 (1)	Nov. 25, 1947 do	4034 4034	Aug. 16, 1944 Do.
56	Italian	Sophie C. Gordigiani	do	Cash Interest in a trust	8,597.79 19,920.00	Oct. 29, 1947 do	1191 2360	Apr. 2, 1943 Oct. 9, 1943
57	German	Babette Brehm	do	Cash	194.11	Oct. 30, 1947	5546	Jan. 7, 1946
58	Dutch	Staatsbedrijif der Posterijen Telegrafie and Telefonie.	The Netherlands	Patent	(1)	Nov. 17, 1947	671	Jan. 18, 1943
59	French	Alfred E. Lamarthe	France	Cash Patent contract	4,138.98 (1)	Nov. 19, 1947	4000	Aug. 8, 1944
60	do	Gaston Fleischel	United States	Patents	(1)	Nov. 26, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
61	German	Serge Koussevitzky	do	Cash Copyright	5,037.22 (1)	Dec. 9, 1947 do	2543 3430	Nov. 9, 1943 Apr. 12, 1944
62	Italian	Erminia Binda	do	Cash Real property	5,774.15 9,560.00	do do	2257 2257	Sept. 22, 1943 Do.
63	German	Leslie & Co.	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
64	do	Kurt M. Vogel, administrator of the estate of Max Vogel.	do	Patents	(1)	do	201	Do.
65	Italian	Carolyn Kent di Robilant	Italy	Cash Interest in estates and trusts.	23,875.58 29,223.00	Dec. 12, 1947 do	982 1922	Mar. 1, 1943 Aug. 3, 1943
66	German	Elizabeth Lewin	France	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
67	French	Societe Normande de Produits Chimiques.	do	Patents	(1)	do	666 1028	Jan. 18, 1943 Mar. 4, 1943
68	do	Isaac Frenkel	United States	Patent	(1)	Dec. 17, 1947	666	Jan. 18, 1943
69	German	Diedrich and Anna Burgdorff.	do	Cash	8,408.47	Dec. 18, 1947	1668	June 16, 1943

Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
70	German	Laura Gruenebarm-Oppenheim.	United States	Cash Interest in a trust	$7,800.81 8,800.00	Dec. 19, 1947 do	3456 3456	Apr. 17, 1944 Do.
71	do	Herberlein Patent Corp	do	Patents	(1)	Dec. 29, 1947	16 41	June 4, 1942 June 30, 1942
72	French	Puiseux, Boulanger et Cie, Societe en Commandite par Actions.	France	do	(1)	do	667	Jan. 18, 1943
73	German	Oesterreichische Magnesit, A. G.	Austria	Patents Shares in a vested business enterprise.	(1) 153,498.81	Jan. 2, 1948 do do	27 68 223	June 18, 1942 July 30, 1942 Oct. 9, 1942
74	Philippine	Rafael Gimenez Ruiz	Philippine Islands	Patent	(1)	do	295	Nov. 2, 1942
75	German	Walter C. Voss	United States	do	(1)	do	201 671 2430	Dec. 23, 1942 Jan. 18, 1943 Oct. 20, 1943
76	do	Ella Miller	do	do	(1)	Jan. 5, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
77	French	Anna Andreyev	do	Cash Copyright	740.56 (1)	Jan. 9, 1948 do	3430 3430	Apr. 12, 1944 Do.
78	do	Jeanne M. Badeire	France	Cash Copyright	501.68 (1)	do do	3430 3430	Do. Do.
79	do	Etinne Gilson	do	Cash Copyright	1,488.31 (1)	do do	3430 3430	Do. Do.
80	do	Marie Eugenie Decourbey Goguel.	do	Cash Copyright	818.98 (1)	do do	3430 3430	Do. Do.
81	German	Martha Loeb Banatz	United States	Cash Interest in a trust	2,327.71 13,600.00	Jan. 12, 1948 do	5283 5283	Oct. 23, 1945 Do.
82	do	Gisela Altschul	do	Cash	1,597.09	Jan. 20, 1948	2408	Oct. 20, 1943
83	Italian	Yettchen Behr	Italy	do Bond (U. S. Treasury)	1,913.44 1,500.00	do do	2655 2655	Nov. 30, 1943 Do.
84	German	Max Hoch	United States	Cash Interest in a vested business enterprise.	657.00 31.00	do do	2586 2586	Nov. 17, 1943 Do.
85	Italian	Era McMurtrie Licari	do	Cash Interest in a trust	1,711.98 1,500.00	do do	649 649	Jan. 9, 1943 Do.
86	German	Louis Marx & Co., Inc	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
87	Norwegian	Ludvik Rasch	Norway	Patents	(1)	do	672	Jan. 18, 1943
88	do	Nicolaus Per Mathiesen	do	Patent	(1)	Jan. 23, 1948	294	Nov. 2, 1942
89	Italian	Millicent Drake	United States	Cash Interest in an estate	15,467.67 1,593.00	Jan. 30, 1948 do	1165 1165	Mar. 29, 1943 Do.
90	Austrian	Franz Vasarhelyi	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
91	Japanese	Consolidated Amusement Co., Ltd.	Philippine Islands	Motion picture film	(1)	Feb. 6, 1948	1639 1760	June 10, 1943 July 1, 1943
92	Italian	Adelma Donnini	United States	Cash Real property	13,171.32 3,882.00	do do	1600 1600	June 3, 1943 Do.
93	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	do	Cash	103,814.24	Mar. 2, 1948	1501	May 18, 1945
94	German	Emma Meier	do	do	1,876.23	do	6542	June 12, 1946
95	French	Charles Henry Wilen	do	Patent Patent application	(1) (1)	Mar. 5, 1948 do	667 1028	Jan. 18, 1943 Mar. 4, 1943
96	German	Emil Zipper	do	Patent application	(1)	do	205	Oct. 2, 1942
97	French	Charles J. F. Lafeuille	France	Cash Patents	7,815.64 (1)	Mar. 10, 1948	666	Jan. 18, 1943
98	German	Robert Sommer	United States	Patent	(1)	Mar. 11, 1948	2439	Oct. 20, 1943
99	Japanese	Consolidated Amusement Co.	do	Cash	1,000.00	Mar. 19, 1948	1639 1760	June 10, 1943 July 1, 1943
100	do	Bishop National Bank of Hawaii.	Hawaii	do Interest in vested business enterprise.	18,294.94 1,920.73	Mar. 24, 1948	2865	Dec. 31, 1943
101	do	Haim Capelluto	United States	Cash	12,129.19	do	88 148 377	July 31, 1942 Sept. 17, 1942 Nov. 18, 1942
102 (property returned not vested).								
103	Hungarian	Margaret Brull	United States	Cash	11,860.34	Apr. 5, 1948	4721	Mar. 7, 1945
104	German	Emmy Carlotta Gertzberg	do	do Interest in real property	2,539.04 7,000.00	do	3860	June 28, 1944
105	do	Union Special Machine Co. and the Union Special Machine Corp. of America.	do	Patents	(1)	Apr. 6, 1948	27 68 201 4817	June 18, 1942 July 30, 1942 Dec. 23, 1942 Apr. 12, 1945
106	Italian	Albuquerque National Trust & Savings Bank, trustee—also Isola Bambini.	do	Cash Interest in a trust	491.00 60,200.00	Apr. 12, 1948	2496	Oct. 28, 1943
107	Norwegian	Johan Bojer	do	Cash Copyrights	405.24 (1)	Apr. 19, 1948	4034	Aug. 16, 1944
108	French	Marguerite Clement	France	Cash Copyrights	104.07 (1)	do	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
109	German	Eastman Kodak Co	United States	Patent application	(1)	do	68	July 30, 1942
110 (property returned not vested).								
111	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	49,169.26	Apr. 27, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
112	German	Auguste Lehmer Schultze William Lehmer Marie Lehmer Heerde	United States	do	2,167.14	do	2370 6853	Oct. 9, 1943 June 28, 1946
113	Polish	Standard Oil Co. of California.	do	Patent	(1)	do	673	Jan. 18, 1943
114	German	Felix Meyer	Belgium	Cash Patent contract	34,000.00 (1)	Apr. 29, 1948	2580	Nov. 10, 1943
115	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	24,834.53	May 5, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
116	Austrian	Nanhby Hormasji Moos	United States	Patents	(1)	May 11, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
117	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	38,481.18	do	1501	May 18, 1943
118	Italian	Leonello Biagiotti	United States	do	6,410.71	May 14, 1948	2303	Sept. 30, 1943
119	Hungarian	Anna Rosenfeld Klein	do	do	1,229.33	do	1931	Aug. 3, 1943
120	do	Bertalan Magyar	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
121	German	Ina Luisa Gurau	Uruguay	Cash	165,000.00	May 19, 1948	490	Dec. 11, 1942
122	French	Rene Francois Jules Paul	France	Patent	(1)	do	667	Jan. 18, 1943
123	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	56,198.34	do	1501	May 18, 1943
124	do	do	do	do	48,837.70	May 24, 1948	1501	Do.
125	French	Superflexit	France	Patent contract	(1)	do	1214	Apr. 2, 1943
126	German	Dr. Ernest Wittknberg	United States	Cash	5,154.41	do	5952	Feb. 20, 1946
127	French	Societe Rhodiaceta	France	Accrued royalties Patents	3,800,000.00	May 26, 1948	666 3420	Jan. 18, 1943 Apr. 4, 1944
128	Hungarian	Dorothea Neugebauer	Switzerland	Cash Interest in a trust	3,933.00 14,714.54	June 1, 1948	5657	Jan. 14, 1946

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
129	German	Edmund and Robert Abrahamson.	United States	Patent	(1)	June 15, 1948	2430	Oct. 20, 1943
130	French	Jean Albert Gregoire	France	do	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
131	Danish	United Aircraft Products, Inc.	United States	do	(1)	do	664	Do.
132	German	Martha Daniels, Hermann Schiff.	do	Cash	$1,400.00	do	6711	June 21, 1946
133	French	Jean Jobert	France	do	161,167.41	do	3502	Apr. 24, 1944
134	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	51,713.71	June 7, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
135	German	Hedwig Hermann	United States	do Interest in a trust	4,450.00 4,200.00	June 15, 1948	1628	June 7, 1943
136	French	Jacques Reinhardt	France	Cash	3,556.13	June 8, 1948	3957	July 17, 1944
137	German	Walter Bernhard	United States	do Securities	19,456.43 14,370.00	June 9, 1948 do	6309 7249	May 21, 1946 July 29, 1946
138	do	Maximillian Heller	Great Britain	Patents	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
139	do	Rene Loeb	United States	Cash	15,507.74	June 10, 1948	1282	Apr. 20, 1943
140	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	64,535.33	June 11, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
141	Italian	Louise Cooke Tamaro	United States	do	378.88	June 21, 1948	2595	Nov. 17, 1943
142	do	Carlos F. Saavedra	Cuba	do Interest in a trust	13,412.76 79,049.78	do	1148	Mar. 29, 1943
143	German	Board of foreign missions, Reformed Church in United States.	United States	Cash	1,984.55	June 15, 1948	5056	June 27, 1945
144	do	David E. Sapper	Guatemala	do Interest in vested business enterprise.	438.00 20.69	June 24, 1948	104	Aug. 17, 1942
145 (not issued)								
146	German	Lore Kahn	United States	Cash	1,220.98	June 30, 1948	4496	Jan. 3, 1945
147	do	Erich Hausdorf	Canada	Patents	(1)	June 28, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
148	do	Ernest and Alfred Hirsch	Great Britain	Cash	517.74	June 30, 1948	3601	May 3, 1944
149	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	139,205.16	June 24, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
150	German	Fischel Mokotoff	United States	do	407.41	June 28, 1948	878	Feb. 9, 1943
151	do	Bernard J. Becker, Executor of the estate of Frank Baumgartner.	do	do	500.00	July 8, 1948	8383	Mar. 5, 1947
152 (property returned, not vested).								
153	Belgian	Francois C. P. Henroteau	Belgium	Patents	(1)	July 19, 1948	675	Jan. 18, 1943
154	German	Edna S. Schmidt	United States	Interest in a vested business enterprise.	200,765.51	July 6, 1948	4727	Mar. 7, 1945
155	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	130,215.85	July 14, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
156	Italian	Adele V. Ferraresi	Italy	do Real property	1,088.15 17,983.00	July 29, 1948	2127	Sept. 7, 1943
157	Danish	Carl Emil Bartens	United States	Patent	(1)	do	664	Jan. 18, 1943
158	German	Heinz Krotoschiner	Great Britain	do	(1)	Aug. 11, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
159	Belgian	Simon Missotten	United States	do	(1)	do	675	Jan. 18, 1943
160	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	123,332.76	Aug. 3, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
161	French	Les Usines de Melle	France	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 1948	661 2491	Jan. 18, 1943 Oct. 26, 1943
162	German	Louise Schneider	do	Cash	2,642.66	Aug. 27, 1948	4075	Aug. 25, 1944
163	do	Otto Construction Corp	United States	Patents	(1)	Aug. 18, 9148	201 671 664	Dec. 23, 1942 Jan. 18, 1943 do
164	do	Ervin Otvos	do	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
165	Danish	Dines Christian Pedersen	do	Patents	(1)	do	664	Jan. 18, 1943
166	Italian	Marcel Del Drago	Italy	Cash Interest in a trust	36,610.86 98,088.05	Aug. 23, 1948	1999	Aug. 19, 1943
167	German	Dr. ing. Bertold Buxbaum	United States	Patent	(1)	Sept. 17, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
168	French	Georges Valensi	France	Patents	(1)	Sept. 14, 1948	293 666	Nov. 2, 1942 Jan. 18, 1943
169	German	Arthur Behrend	United States	Cash	481.16	Sept. 13, 1948	3901	July 11, 1944
170 (property returned, not vested).								
171	Danish	Danish Automatic Supply Co.	Denmark	Patent	(1)	Sept. 17, 1948	290	Nov. 2, 1942
172	German	William and Aloisia Freund	United States	Cash	1,619.29	Sept. 20, 1948	3125	Feb. 15, 1944
173	French	Compagnie Electro-Mecanique.	France	Patent	(1)	do	666	Jan. 18, 1943
174	German	Victor J. Schneider	United States	Cash Securities	20,781.76 1,161.00	Sept. 17, 1948	4615	Feb. 17, 1945
175	French	Etienne Augustin Henri Honore.	France	Patent	(1)	Sept. 10, 1948	666	Jan. 18, 1943
176 (not issued)								
177	Belgian	Arkady Fielder	Great Britain	Cash Copyright	552.74 (1)	Sept. 2, 1948	4031	Aug. 16, 1944
178	French	Raoul Blanchard	France	Cash Copyright	2,624.45 (1)	Sept. 13, 1948	3430	Apr. 12, 1944
179	do	Ateliers de Construction mecanique de Tirlemont.	Belgium	Cash	3,707.22	Nov. 29, 1948	666	Jan. 18, 1943
180	German	Max Hoxter	Argentina	do	4,261.70	Sept. 10, 1948	4033	Aug. 16, 1944
181 (information not available).								
182	Polish	Walery Rudnicki	Poland	Cash Copyright	921.08 (1)	Sept. 10, 1948	4033	Aug. 16, 1944
183	Hungarian	Emil A. Kann	United States	Cash	2,000.00	Sept. 7, 1948	5347	Nov. 20, 1945
184	German	Louise Hardy	do	do Interest in a trust	4,527.24 504.09	Sept. 10, 1948	2789	Dec. 16, 1943
185	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	57,972.31	Sept. 3, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
186	do	do	do	do	63,611.24	Sept. 2, 1948	1501	Do.
187	German	Oscar H. Webb Martin Behrens	United States Great Britain	Interest in a patent do	(1) (1)	Oct. 14, 1948	272	Oct. 29, 1942
188	do	Francois Pagis Paul Berche	France	Cash Copyright	3,739.70 (1)	Sept. 17, 1948	500 A-1	Dec. 12, 1942
189	French	Frantisek Kozik	Czechoslovakia	Cash Copyright	155.60 (1)	do	4034	Aug. 16, 1944
190	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	25,287.19	Sept. 18, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
191	German	Arthur Herman Manfred Herman Eric Herman Meta Mayer nee Herman	United States	Cash in equal shares of	3,379.80	Oct. 14, 1948	948	Feb. 24, 1943
192	do	Julius Fleischer	do	Cash	10,533.47	do	2575	Nov. 10, 194
193	Danish	Elias Feldmann	Denmark	Interest in a patent	(1)	Sept. 30, 1948	664	Jan. 18, 194

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

PART II. RETURNS PURSUANT TO SECTION 32—Continued

Return order No.	Nationality of owner at date of vesting	Claimant	Nationality and/or address at date of return	Description of property returned	Value	Date of return	Vesting order	Date of vesting order
194	German	Joseph W. Heiler	United States	Cash Real property	$253.13 2,500.00	Oct. 14, 1948	2725	Dec. 3, 1943
195	do	Hella Hilde Heyman	do	Cash	23,912.53	Oct. 15, 1948	6412	June 4, 1943
196	do	Alex Hirschberg	Great Britain	Patents	(1)	Oct. 14, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
197	Japanese	Kurt Rothschild	United States	Cash	6,352.39	Oct. 8, 1948	7295	July 30, 1946
198	do	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	do	13,721.39	Sept. 29, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
199	Hungarian	Irene Weser	United States	do	3,535.00	Oct. 14, 1948	3992	Apr. 4, 1944
200	Italian	Hope MacMichael Garibaldi	Italy	do Interest in a trust	33,170.10 16,829.90	Oct. 22, 1948	1204	Apr. 2, 1943
201 (not issued)								
202	French	Charles William Berthiez	United States	Patent	(1)	Nov. 12, 1948	293	Nov. 2, 1942
203	German	Societe Anonyme de Merbes-Sprimont	do	Cash	13,762.02	Nov. 3, 1948	809	Feb. 1, 1943
204	do	Arnold Schoenberg	do	do	2,700.00	Nov. 12, 1948	2096	Sept. 4, 1943
205 (not issued)								
206 (not issued)								
207	German	Mart Fryberg	United States	Cash Interest in copyright royalties.	675.10 (1)	Nov. 17, 1948	500 A-119	Sept. 26, 1944
208	do	Mandus Dammann	Canada	Cash	228.75	Nov. 24, 1948	4060 4071	Aug. 22, 1944 Aug. 25, 1944
209 (property returned not vested).								
210 (not issued)								
211	Italian	Louis Pieroni	United States	Cash Interest in a vested business enterprise.	170,269.00 36,985.16	Nov. 24, 1948	628 629 630	Jan. 6, 1943 Do. Do.
212	German	Karl Plach Christine Kaupar	do do	Cash do	5,719.17 5,719.16	Nov. 29, 1948 do	853 853	Feb. 8, 1943 Do.
213	Polish	Mieczyslaw Idzikowski	Poland	do Copyright	1,098.08 (1)	Nov. 26, 1948	4033	Aug. 16, 1944
214	do	M. Arct Zaklady Wydawnicae Spolka Akcyjna	do	Copyrights	(1)	do	4033	Do.
215	Belgian	Servo-Frein Dewandre Societe Anonyme. Paul Fourmarier, Jr	Belgium	Cash Patents and part interests in patents.	2,531.72 (1)	Dec. 1, 1948	675	Jan. 18, 1943
216	German	Frieda Heinen	United States	Cash	9,175.46	Dec. 6, 1848	1069	Mar. 12, 1943
217	do	Hedwig Fiebusch Meyer	China	do	3,706.57	Dec. 17, 1948	3181	Feb. 16, 1944
218	do	Siegmund Chambre Max Chambre	United States	do	1,518.39 1,518.39	Dec. 13, 1948	948	Feb. 24, 1943
219	do	Ernst Ludwig Ruppel	Great Britain	Patent	(1)	Dec. 15, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
220	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	22,072.84	Nov. 12, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
221	French	Societe des Auteurs, Compositeurs et Editeurs de Musique.	France	do	479,247.88	Nov. 8, 1948	2097 2171	Sept. 4, 1943 Sept. 10, 1943
222	German	Charles A. Buerk, trustee Max E. Bretschger, trustee Ansley W. Sawyer, trustee Jacob F. Schoellkopf, trustee Louis Wirth, trustee	Switzerland	do Interest in a vested business enterprise.	40,000.00 209,837.50	Dec. 15, 1948	42 191 247 405	July 1, 1942 Sept. 28, 1942 Oct. 19, 1942 Nov. 19, 1942
223	Italian	Beatrice Rappaport Emilia Castelbolognese	Italy	Cash	5,000.00 5,000.00	Dec. 21, 1948	1938	Aug. 3, 1943
224	Danish	Wilhelm Hansen Musik-Forlag	Denmark	Cash Copyrights	8,185.80 (1)	Dec. 17, 1948	3995	Aug. 8, 1944
225	Italian	Elizabeth Marion Tabasso	United States	Cash	2,000.45	Dec. 15, 1948	1675	June 19, 1943
226 (property returned not vested).								
227	Japanese	Various residents of Hawaii	Hawaii	Cash	38,200.78	Dec. 6, 1948	1501	May 18, 1943
228	German	Mrs. E. Locker Karl Locker	Switzerland	do	2,475.42	Dec. 15, 1948	8577	Mar. 27, 1947
229	Italian	Maria Clementina Fenoaltea	Italy	do	6,000.00	Dec. 31, 1948	1938	Aug. 3, 1943
230	do	Maria Scaramellini Prondini	do	do	9,496.79	Dec. 20, 1948	1595	June 3, 1943
231	French	Ateliers Neyret-Beylier et Piccard-Pictet	France	Patents	(1)	Dec. 17, 1948	666 667 201	Jan. 18, 1943 Do. Dec. 23, 1942
232	German	Fuel Refining Corp	United States	do	(1)	Dec. 20, 1948	671 664	Jan. 18, 1943 Do.
233	do	Arthur Fisch	Canada	Patent	(1)	do	201	Dec. 23, 1942
234 (not issued)								
235 (not issued)								
236 (not issued)								
237	German	Theodore Herbert Carter	United States	Cash	31,999.70	Dec. 21, 1948	4847	Apr. 18, 1945
238	do	Theodore W. Herbst Malvine Klausner	do do	Patents	(1)	Dec. 17, 1948	201	Dec. 23, 1942
(2)	do	George Yamaoka	do	Interest in a vested business enterprise.	53.86	Dec. 3, 1945	176	Sept. 28, 1942
(2)	do	Franz E. Loes	do	do	1,546.11	Mar. 6, 1946	110	Aug. 24, 1942
(2)	Italian	Wachovia Bank & Trust Co	do	Cash	4,854.84	Sept. 13, 1946	982	Mar. 1, 1943
(2)	German	Victor Chemical Works	do	Interest in a patent application.	(1)	June 17, 1944	68	July 30, 1942
(2)	Italian	Alfredo Cerutti, ward	do	Cash Mortgage Bank account Bonds	66,328.00 12,000.00 383.00 112,077.00	Sept. 30, 1946	1911	Aug. 3, 1943
(2)	German	Herman A. Brassert	do	Cash	92,648.99	Oct. 29, 1947	640	Jan. 6, 1943
(2)	do	Askania Regulator Co	do	do	32,611.53	do	640	Do.
(3)	Italian			9 ships	(3)	Mar. 16, 1948	52	July 22, 1942

[1] Because of the nature of patent, copyright, and trade-mark properties, it is impractical to attempt to value these properties.

[2] These are supplemental returns with no specific order number assigned. They consist of property returned through judicial proceedings and the return of property vested in error.

[3] This item pertains to the return of Italian ships which were still afloat at the end of the war. Originally 27 Italian ships were seized by the U. S. Government of which 18 were lost while being employed in the war effort. The return was authorized by Public Law 370, 80th Cong., 1st sess. No value was placed on these ships at date of vesting or date of return.

H. R. 87

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Rules Committee have presently recommended a rule on H. R. 87, relating to the promotion of veterans of World War II in the field service of the Post Office Department.

There has been some controversy of the cost of this bill. I have had the bill analyzed in the light of the report of the Postmaster General and submit these findings for the information of my colleagues:

In the report of the committee the cost of section 1 of the bill is estimated at $27,500,000 for the year 1950. This cost is based on an estimate of approximately 120,000 veterans being eligible for benefits under this section, indicating an average benefit of $229.16. The estimate of the number of employees eligible to benefits is at variance with the figures presented by the representative of the Post Office Department who appeared at the hearings, who testified that approximately 20 percent of the total of 503,000 employees would be affected. (See p. 107, House committee hearings.)

In the form in which H. R. 87 was reported, it would be applicable only to those employees who enter the service prior to July 1 of this year, while the Senate counterpart of this bill, S. 689, would be applicable to all employees who enter the service within a period of 3 years after its enactment. The estimated cost of section 1 of the Senate bill is only $22,000,000; notwithstanding that the Senate bill by its more liberal provisions for those who will enter the postal service at a subsequent date would apply to a larger number of people.

It would appear, therefore, that the estimate of the representative of the Post Office Department that the bill would affect approximately 100,000 veterans, is in line with the Senate figure. At an average benefit of $229.16, the cost of section 1 applied to 100,000 veterans would be $22,916,000.

Any estimate of the number of persons affected by this legislation can only be based on the annual reports of the Postmaster General which indicate an increase of 113,611 employees in the field and departmental services from June 30, 1944, to the last published figures. It appears that these figures are the basis of the cost estimate given in the committee report.

It should be noted, however, that while these figures are valid for most purposes, they do include departmental employees, post office inspectors, assistant postmasters, supervisors, and war service substitutes who are not eligible to the benefits of this legislation. While many of the war service substitutes have been replaced with veterans having civil service status, it is extremely doubtful that this section could under any circumstance be applicable to more than 100,000 employees.

Using the annual reports of the Postmaster General as a base, it is estimated that section 2 of the bill would be applicable to 67,000 veterans. This figure is arrived at taking the total number of employees added to the rolls between June 30, 1945, and June 30, 1948, the last published figures. There were 435,955 employees on the rolls on June 30, 1945, and 503,411 employees on the rolls on June 30, 1948, an increase of 67,546 employees. Of this increase, 206 employees are in the departmental service and are not covered by the proposed legislation; 8 are in the post office inspection service which has a requirement of a minimum of 5 years of service before an employee may even take the examination; 97 are postmasters who are not included in the definition of employee; an indeterminable number are supervisors who must have reached grade 9 before being eligible for promotion and, therefore, could not have entered the postal service from the military service within the prescribed dates; 663 are clerks in offices of the third-class who were not classified employees prior to July 1, 1945, and could not, therefore, be credited with service prior to that date; 1,740 are special delivery messengers who were not classified employees prior to July 1, 1945; and 15,296 are part-time employees, many of whom are not eligible for the benefits of this legislation. It seems certain, therefore, that not more than 50,000 employees are eligible for the benefits of section 2 of this bill, providing that all of them had been in the military service between September 16, 1940, and June 30, 1946. Actual experience demonstrates that only some 75 percent of those who have entered the postal service since July 1, 1945, are veterans and the cost of section 2 of this act should, therefore, be not in excess of $15,000,000 rather than the $26,400,000 given in the committee report.

The total first year cost of the bill H. R. 87 should not therefore, exceed $38,000,000 under any circumstances and will probably be a lot closer to $30,000,000 due to the fact that all employees in the groups eligible to benefits are not veterans and would not be affected by this legislation.

The attached table showing the increase in personnel for the years involved will indicate the maximum number of employees in each group that can receive benefits from this legislation.

Number of employees by groups	1944	1945	1948	Eligible to benefits	
				Sec. 1	Sec. 2
Departmental employees	1,483	1,526	1,732		
Post-office inspectors	1,134	1,153	1,161		
Postmasters	42,707	41,792	41,695		
Assistant postmasters	3,372	3,420	3,415		
Clerks and supervisors	90,116	93,941	124,087	[1] 33,971	[1] 30,146
Clerks, office of third class			663		
Village delivery carriers	298	188	71		
City delivery carriers	58,046	57,993	78,127	20,081	20,134
Special delivery messengers			1,740		
Rural letter carriers	32,035	32,031	32,342	307	311
Railway mail service	20,587	20,546	24,451	3,864	3,905
Motor vehicle service	3,596	3,631	4,264	668	633
Public buildings operating force	18,387	18,606	15,471		
All others	1,067	3,615	1,383	316	
Total number full-time employees	272,328	278,442	330,602	58,274	55,129
Total number part-time employees	117,472	157,513	172,809	[2] 55,337	[2] 15,296
Total of all employees	389,800	435,955	503,411	113,611	67,456

[1] Includes supervisors not eligible to benefits.
[2] Includes temporary and war-service employees not eligible to benefits.

Opinion by Marvin Jones, Chief Judge, United States Court of Claims, in Pedersen Against the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. CHARLES W. TOBEY

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the opinion rendered by Hon. Marvin Jones, chief judge, United States Court of Claims, in the case of Pedersen against the United States.

There being no objection, the opinion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPINION BY MARVIN JONES, CHIEF JUDGE, UNITED STATES COURT OF CLAIMS, IN THE CASE OF PEDERSEN AGAINST THE UNITED STATES

A dog and a cat may cause complications.

This is a suit by an employee of the State Department who claims per diem allowances for himself and wife, while delayed in Egypt en route from Turkey to the United States during the spring of 1945. Under the regulations plaintiff is entitled to a per diem for himself and his wife "during the time necessarily spent at ports awaiting sailing."

The issue turns on how much of the delay was necessarily spent in awaiting transportation, and how much of the delay, if any, was due to Mr. Pedersen's reluctance to travel without his wife and to Mrs. Pedersen's refusal to travel without being accompanied by her pets, two dogs and a cat, which she refused to leave behind.

The plaintiff claims that none of the delay was caused by the animals, while the defendant claims that all but a few days of the delay was thus caused.

We can well understand Mrs. Pedersen's anxiety about her pets and her reluctance to travel without them.

In our youth we always had dogs, mostly of the mongrel variety, but nevertheless dogs. We placed them just behind people, and when on rare occasions we fell out with any of our playmates, our hounds usually forged ahead.

We have very little respect and no affection for anyone who has not at some time in his life loved a dog. Throughout history the dog has been known for his loyalty and faithfulness. He has been celebrated in song and story. Even books have been written about the dog, his character, intelligence and attributes. The dog has been able to awaken affection in the hearts of every race of people. Wherever man has gone, on the frontier, in the great woods, in the frozen north, the faithful dog has been his constant companion, sharing his hardships and his poverty. When in trouble, humanity finds consolation in his company.

Alcibiades had a handsome dog. Senator Vest described the dog as man's best friend.

We meet him first in Homer's verse

"The dog by the Aegean seas."

Scott referred to him as the "companion of our pleasures and our toils," and Mark Twain said the difference between a dog and a man is that "if you pick up a starving dog

and make him prosperous he will not bite you."

It was a dog that licked the wounds of Lazarus in his rags. Rin Tin Tin was a movie star. Neither poverty nor riches, success nor failure, affects his loyalty. It was the dog that served as a test for the army of Gideon. He also performed heroic services in the most modern and greatest of all wars. The poet said that high in the courts of heaven the one sure welcome that awaited was a little dog angel that "sits alone at the gates" and would not play with the others until his master arrived.

The cat also has always been a favorite pet with many people.

But, coming back to the practical, the testimony of the respective witnesses is no more alike than the dispositions of the "gingham dog and the calico cat." It is difficult to determine from the conflicting testimony just what per diem should be allowed. The State Department regulations make no provision for the transportation of animals at any time. Whether or not they can be taken along even in ordinary times depends wholly upon the attitude of the captain of the ship on which passage is booked.

These were not ordinary times. The dogs of war had been unleashed and were running like mad over the face of the earth. In an effort to track them down whole families were separated for years. Our everyday wants, desires, and whims were in most cases sacrificed to the common cause. Anyone who couldn't willingly do this needed to kindle anew the altar fires. Any allowances must be measured in the light of these circumstances.

We must find from the evidence, if we can, the time necessarily spent at Cairo and Port Said awaiting sailing. The plaintiff was not required to travel by air. He was privileged to await sailing accommodations. He could probably have secured transportation for himself and his wife, without the pets, within approximately 30 days, or for himself alone by Army transport within about 15 days.

On May 9, 1945, the vice consul at Cairo informed plaintiff that he thought transportation by plane could be secured if plaintiff would consent to leave his wife in Cairo. This offer was accepted and plaintiff left by plane on May 14, 1945.

We find that plaintiff necessarily waited at Cairo for a period of 15 days. He is, therefore, entitled to a per diem allowance for 15 days.

It is more difficult to determine the allowance for Mrs. Pedersen. Because of wartime restrictions, she could not travel by plane. She was told by Mr. Miller, the American Consul at Cairo, that if she and Mr. Pedersen wished to travel together without the animals, he would obtain transportation as soon as possible, though it would mean a delay of a few weeks; but that if she insisted on carrying her pets, there would be an indefinite delay. She declined to travel without her pets. In giving her reasons for so declining she testified, "I [have] traveled my whole life with dogs and cats."

Mrs. Pedersen actually waited until July 6, 1945, before finally securing transportation that permitted her to take the dogs and the cat along. In the meantime she irritated the officials at both Cairo and Port Said. At the latter place the official stated the innkeeper wanted her to leave because she insisted upon bathing her two large dogs in the public bathrooms. She finally sailed on an American freighter. She had carried her point. The dogs and the cat went along.

The testimony does not disclose either the type or the names of the pets. For the record they must remain nameless. However, they must have been remarkable animals either in pedigree or disposition.

Mrs. Pedersen was certainly within her rights in refusing to travel without her pets. One can appreciate her unwillingness to leave them behind. On the other hand, she had no legal basis for charging the defendant $10 a day for the extra delay cause by her attitude, especially in a time of national peril, when family separations were the rule and not the exception, however appealing her sentiment may have been. We must apply the law as we find it.

Under the regulations Mrs. Pedersen was not justified in refusing to travel without the animals and charging the delay thus caused to the defendant.

The testimony is not quite clear as to the time Mrs. Pedersen would have been compelled to wait had she not refused to travel without her pets. From the record as a whole, we find that such period was 30 days.

Plaintiff sues for a total of $1,742, covering the entire period of delay for himself and his wife. He is entitled to recover for the 45 days which he and Mrs. Pedersen were necessarily delayed, or a total of $450.

It is so ordered.

Title to Submerged Lands

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, there was printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6 a statement of the Honorable A. A. Carmichael, attorney general of Alabama, in which he espoused the cause of the Federal Government, as opposed to the position taken by the various States, on the question of ownership of submerged lands within the State boundaries.

A letter from the Honorable Walter Johnson, of Nebraska, special counsel for the National Association of Attorneys General and formerly for five terms attorney general of that State takes issue with the Honorable Mr. Carmichael and presents the position of the States with regard to this vital question of submerged oil lands.

As a former President of the National Association of Attorneys General, and later as Chairman of the Governors' Conference and President of the Council of State Governments, I have been in close touch with the officials of the various States, in their resistance to the efforts of the Federal Government to take over title which in the century and a half of our country's existence, has never been questioned until the past few years.

In the interest of keeping the record complete and correct I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Johnson's letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 21, 1950.

Hon. A. A. CARMICHAEL,
Attorney General, State Capitol, Montgomery, Ala.

DEAR GENERAL CARMICHAEL: There has been called to my attention your statement printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 6, in which you opposed the States, including your own State of Alabama, and favored the Federal Government on the question of ownership of submerged lands within the State boundaries.

* * * * *

In your statement, you speak of "the weird assortment of State attorneys general." The National Association of Attorneys General has been in existence for 43 years and is made up of the attorneys general of each of the States. This group has considered the Federal attempt to seize submerged lands within State boundaries as the most serious threat ever made against our American system of constitutional government and have gone on record accordingly. General Carmichael, you have attended the last three meetings of the association and as you know, outside of yourself, there has been only one other States attorney general who has opposed the position of the association.

You and other Federal seizure advocates would give the impression that the issue is nothing more than "tidelands and oil" for a few coastal States. The truth is, the Federal claims cloud the rights of each State in the Union to its lands, harbors, improvements, waters, fish, mineral, and other resources in or under navigable waters and filled lands. The fact that the Governors' Conference (by unanimous vote of 44 Governors), the Council of State Government, the American Bar Association, the National Institute of Municipal Law Officers (representing 503 cities), the National Conference of Mayors, the American Association of Port Authorities, the American Title Association, National Reclamation Association, the National Water Conservation Association, and many other organizations which have no interests in oil, have joined together to fight the Federal seizure, should be evidence enough that the issue is broader than the tidelands oil of three or four States. Officials representing 46 States appeared before the recent Senate and House Judiciary Committees hearings in support of this legislation and not one State official appeared against the same.

The House of the Eightieth Congress passed a bill favorable to the States by a vote of 257 to 2. In other words, more than 89 percent, practically 90 percent of those voting were in favor of the bill. There was not a single vote cast against the measure by the Members from 35 States and in no States was there a majority against the bill. Surely, these elected Representatives of our people were moved by something more than propagandized "tidelands oil."

You and the other "Federal seizure advocates" would give the impression that confirming title in the States to the lands involved would constitute a gift or donation to the States. If a law enforcement officer returned a watch that had been taken from you, would that constitute a gift? The States now have, and from the beginning have had, full use and possession of the property involved.

* * * * *

You and other Federal seizure advocates would make it an unpardonable sin for State officials to express an opinion that the Supreme Court of the United States was wrong in its conclusions in the California case. The Supreme Court of the United States has repeatedly held—

"The shores of navigable waters and the soils under them were not granted by the Constitution to the United States, but were reserved to the States respectively."

Such was the holding in one of the leading cases on the subject, *Pollard* v. *Hagan* (3 How. 212), decided by the Court in 1845.

It is interesting to note that this case originated in your own State of Alabama, where the United States attempted to grant to private persons, lands which were covered

by the tidal waters of Mobile Bay. Mr. Justice McKinley, in speaking for the Court, stated as follows:

"When the Revolution took place, the people of each State themselves became sovereign; and in that character hold the absolute right to all their navigable waters, and the soils under them for their own use, subject only to the rights since surrendered by the Constitution."

* * * * *

"Then to Alabama belong the navigable waters and soils under them in controversy in this case, subject to the rights surrendered by the Constitution to the United States, and no compact that might be made between her and the United States could diminish or enlarge these rights."

This case has been cited with approval in 52 subsequent United States Supreme Court decisions and 244 State and Federal court decisions, and was considered the settled law of the land. Furthermore, all of the members of the Court were not in full accord in the California case as you would imply, and I would suggest that you read the dissenting opinions of Justices Frankfurter and Reed.

I would also like to call your attention to the following language in the majority opinion of the Court as reflecting an obvious hint that Congress should act. We find these words therein to arrest our attention:

"For article IV, paragraph 3, clause 2 of the Constitution vests in Congress 'Power to dispose of and make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territory or other property belonging to the United States.' We have said that the power of Congress in this respect is without limitation. * * * Thus, neither the courts nor the executive agencies could proceed contrary to an act of Congress in their congressional area of national power."

Another clear hint of the Court's thinking on this point is found in another portion of the decision in which it was said:

"But beyond all this we cannot and do not assume that Congress * * * will execute its powers in such ways as to bring about injustices to States, their subdivisions, or persons acting pursuant to their permission."

You and other Federal-seizure advocates would give the impression that continued State ownership of submerged lands would deprive the Federal Government of minerals necessary for national defense. The truth is that an examination of the record will show you that oil production under State control has been far more successful than similar operations. We maintain that in our system of government, socialized ownership of minerals and property would retard production and development of resources. This has been the history of national ownership of coal in England; oil in Mexico, and general nationalization of minerals in Russia. The National Petroleum Council, a group appointed by the former Secretary of Interior Krug, in its report last year, outlining a national oil policy for the United States, stated:

"7. The petroleum resources of the lands beneath the marginal seas extending to the outer edge of the Continental Shelf can best be explored and developed under State, rather than Federal, control."

* * * * *

You and other Federal-seizure advocates would give the impression that the States are claiming all the Continental Shelf, while the truth is that the total area within the original State boundaries is only 26,600 square miles or about one-tenth of the total area of the Continental Shelf which is approximately 262,500 square miles.

Your own State of Alabama has 159 square miles of tidelands. Even though you may be willing to surrender to the Federal Government Alabama's 100-year-old claim to these lands, I regret to see you condemn the attorneys general of all the other coastal States and most of the inland States for defending their State's ownership and opposing Federal claims.

General Carmichael, I ask that you make a real study of the history of this matter, and I feel strongly that when you have learned the true facts, you will join the other State officials in advocating confirmation of title in the States of the submerged lands within their boundaries.

Respectfully,

WALTER R. JOHNSON,
Special Counsel, National Association of Attorneys General.

A Cowboy's Views on Government Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, recently I had the opportunity to read a letter written to Mr. W. M. Rasmussen, secretary of the South Dakota Stock Growers Association. This letter was written by a cowboy named "Neckyoke Jones" and dealt with his opinions on Government spending. As editor of the South Dakota Stock Grower magazine, Mr. Rasmussen published this letter in the November 1949 issue of the magazine. In my opinion this letter expresses in an unusual and amusing style the thoughts of many citizens of the West regarding Government spending. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, at this point, a copy of this letter.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DERE SECERTARY RASMUSSEN: "I see where our Congrissman has come home to git busy with the post bar an' the wire stretcher to do a little fense mendin'," I sez to Greasewood, as we was drivin' over the chuck holes in the county road early this week. "Yep," sez Greasewood, who runs a few head of cows along with me here on Long Pine Crick, an' who is awful smart, "you know Congrissmen ain't like us stockmen. We got to patch fence up about twict a year—but a Congrissman don't do no fence repairin' exceptin' at long intervals—an' it began to look fer a while like Harry Trooman was not goin' to let the boys go home to shake hands with the constitchewints at all. He dog gone near had 'em roped an' picketed out down there on the Patowmick bottom. They wasn't too happy either." "I don't reckon that any Congrissman is a very happy feller anyway," I offers, "in fact he is ridin' the rough string most of the time—kinda whip-sawed between the White House an' the old home ranch, so to speak."

"Yessir," sez Greasewood, "an' he is allus tryin' to guess which way the dill pickel will squirt. The city folks wants low prices—an' the farmer, he wants high prices—labor wants to ramrod the outfit—an' industry is spurrin' the boys where the hair is short. I would guess that a Congrissman is a most unhappy feller."

"Wha do you make of this here Hoover idea of savin' some blue chips by reducin' the force of hired hands?" I requires, rollin' myself a smoke, "it sure sounds like horse sence to me—an' I hope they lay into it right off—an' I'm writin' our Congrissman tomorra tellin' him how we feel about it." "You an' about five millyun others," he sniggers. "Well if so many of the people wants this here economy—an' reduction of hands—why the blazes don't Congriss put the screws on. It seems to me its dog gone simple—an' they kin whack off a passel of these flunkeys an' let 'em go sheep herdin'. I hearn as how there ain't many herders these days—an' the sheepmen has to pay awful high wages to git a feller to go out an' rustycate with the woolies." I orates, gittin' kinda hot under the collar.

"You ain't got no more idea what's going' on than a Cree Injun," he sez, "the way the sign reads is this. Everyboddy wants that goviment help should be stopped—exceptin' help that they are gittin'. Out here in the West we are jest as bad as anyboddy. The chambers of commerces, an' plenty farm outfits wants irrigashun. They also want subsidizin'—which is killin' two birds with one stone, so to speak—business an' agerculture bein' the two stones. Either way the taxpayer plays it he loses.

"Now take this here joinin' the army an' navy an' the flyers, fer instunce. Like as not throwin' the 3 outfits together would probibly be a savin'—but who is goin' to run the outfit? The soldiers thinks a sailor is no good on land, an' the sailors thinks a soldier couldn't paddle a raft on Fryin' Pan Crick. The flyer he thinks neither the soldier nor the sailor could fly even iffen you fed 'em bird seed, an' each one wants to boss the rest of the crew.

"It looks to me like Presydent Trooman thinks along with the Army. What does he know about boats?" I ast, now bein' real intrusted. "He's been doin' a lot of sailin' recent like," sez Greasewood, "you know every time Congriss don't do what he wants he goes out for a boat ride on his yatch. They been turnin' him down so much recent like—that he's been doin' a lot of sailin'—which should make him as smart as a admirel—iffen he stick clost to bizness." "What about this here Demfield—this here admirel—who the Presydent jest fired? What about him?" "Well, I'll tell you," sez Greasewood, "as fer as I am concerned it looked like cold-deckin' a man to me. Now, me, I don't know nothin' about bein' a admirel, my only experience bein' a sea-farin' man was when I crossed the Yellerstone on a ferry in the ice—an' the cable broke an' we landed on a sand bar about 8 miles below. That was in 1906, an' I ain't had no hankerin' for water—either inside nor out since. Whatever this here admirel done or didden done don't make no difference. He was fired—an' didden know he was fired until he seen it in the newspapers. Ushully when you bounce a feller—you come up an' tell him so. When it come out in the papers—they said the boss of the Navy in Washinton sed it was done for the good of America—an' naval officers should ort to be Americans first. Them was kinda rugged words to use to a admirel who had won medals an' had done a top hand's job durin' the war. It don't set well with most folks who likes to have the cards dealt fair an' square. There was a lot of fellers like this here Hess, an' Whittiker Chamber, an' that feller Eisler who took a run-out powder an' jumped his bail an' run off to Rooshey with the only Oregon boot in Washington. Them boys had a finger in the Goviment pie in Washington. They was holdin' top jobs—an' noboddy, even the Presydent, didden call 'em much more than a red herring. To rope an' bust this here admirel an' tell folks he wasn't no American was like rubbin' salt into a saddle sore—an' as near as I could tell firin' him ain't savin' no money fer the taxpayer."

"Well what are we goin' to tell our Congrissman when we write him, or mebbe he

comes around to supper some night? That's what I'm waitin' fer you to tell me?" I demands to know. "You can't tell him nothin'," orates Greasewood, "you probibly want the goviment to fight grasshoppers for you. The cotton grower wants the goviment to fight weevils an' keep the price of cotton up. The wheat farmer he wants the price of wheat up. The chambers of commerces wants big dams built and plenty money spent in town. The old folks wants pensions—an' the young folks also wants 'em—so they don't have to keep paw an' maw—but have money to spend for cocktails, movies an' slot machines. The laborin' man wants unemployment inshurance—so he kin loaf fer a few weeks an' go duck huntin'. A lot of folks wants the goviment to buy 'em wigs, false teeth, wooden legs an' glass eyes with doctor's bills throwed in. Everyboddy wants somethin' but he also wants security—an' he wants that the goviment regulate everyone but him—an' the dog gone country is goin' Sochilist so fast you can't see the trees go by. The goviment is in the hole so fer you couldn't haul it out with a ten horse string team—an' noboddy gives a hoot. They don't want to think about it. Accordin' to some we owe the money to ourselves so it don't make no difference. All I kin say is that if we owe the money to ourselves we sure got a bum banker. So what kin a Congrissman do? Iffen he votes to cut here—he'll have a bunch of voters steppin' on his hocks—an' iffen he votes to cut spendin' there—he's got another tribe trampin' on his tail. Yessir—a Congrissman, I'll bet, is in a awful confusin' condition. It don't do no good to worry about it. I reckon the happiest man in the world would be like ol' Sam Yakey I met once down in the Ozarks when I went through there. He had a cupple acres of corn, a mule, a melon patch, an' a few razor back hogs. He had a jug of corn likker under the floor boards of the lean-to, some smoked side meat hangin' in the shed—an' spent most of his spare time coon huntin'. A city feller come along one day an' ast ol' Sam iffen he was contented. Ol' Sam sez, "I don't owe nothin', don't own nothin', never had nothin' an' don't expect nothing'—an' I don't know nothin' an' I don't give a darn no how!' Looks like to me Secertary Rasmussen that Greasewood's friend Sam Yakey was a awful happy man. Hopin' you are the same, I am

Yure fren,

NECKYOKE JONES.

P. S.—Sody Crick Smith wants to know iffen the goviment gives out subsidy—iffen he should take in a jug to get his'n!

Medical Economics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, the question of an adequate health program for all our people is uppermost in the minds of legislators and the public at this time. In this connection an address delivered by Dr. R. B. Robins of Camden, Ark.—who by the way, is Democratic national committeeman for Arkansas—presents a number of pertinent facts about medical economics and other phases of the health situation which enter very definitely into any consideration of an adequate program of medical care.

I ask unanimous consent that the attached excerpts from the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the excerpts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY MEDICAL ECONOMICS?

(By R. B. Robins, M. D., FACS, Camden, Ark., professor of medical economics, University of Arkansas School of Medicine; read before section on general practice, Southern Medical Association, November 15, 1949)

Mr. Chairman and fellow physicians: I have chosen today to develop my subject by posing five questions and then giving the best answers that I can. The five questions are these:

1. Why has medical economics come to forefront in the last few decades?

2. How much has the cost of medical care increased during he past 2 decades?

3. Since economics is the study of supply and demand, what about the alleged doctor shortage?

4. What do the people get for their medical expenditures? (Health progress chart.)

5. Can we ever have adequate medical care?

In answering my first question I shall try to explain the more important reasons why the problem of medical economics has come to the forefront in recent decades. It is certainly true that for centuries physicians were almost exclusively concerned with the problem of what we today choose to call the scientific side of medicine. We have always had poor people in our midst and I suppose we always will. Over the centuries the physician has treated the people who are truly medically indigent without charge and has made a lower charge for people with modest incomes. And that continues to be the situation where I practice. I think the explanation for the increasing importance of the economic aspects of medicine is not to be found in the traditional problems of medical indigency but, rather, in the great change in certain medical procedures. Medical care is expensive and some types are becoming more expensive. I particularly like the statement of Dr. Harrison H. Shoulder, in his presidential address to the house of delegates of the American Medical Association in June 1947 (JAMA, June 21, 1947, p. 703) in which he said:

"When appendicitis was treated largely by the administration of opium pills and the application of poultices to the abdomen, the cost of administering such treatment was low but the resulting mortality was high. When the physician acquired an understanding of the disease and perfected a technique for its proper treatment, the mortality from the disease went down to a low level but the cost of treatment went up. When diabetes was treated largely by diet and the administration of codeine, the cost of such treatment was low but the mortality was high. The diabetic patient lingered in discomfort for a relatively short while. But when the members of the profession acquired an understanding of the disease and developed a specific method for its treatment and management, diabetic patients were given an almost normal life expectancy in comfort and usefulness. Thus the problems in medical economics have been brought to the forefront."

So, one of the reasons why medical economics has been coming to the forefront recently is that our increasing knowledge of treating the sick has introduced some expensive and complicated procedures. The physicians must undergo longer and more expensive training; indeed, it is quite a task to keep abreast of these new developments.

In my own practice, however, I have observed certain contrary tendencies. As late as 1935 (?) a pneumonia case meant about three dozen calls for me. Today a pneumonia case means not more than five calls. The wonder drugs have brought about a sharp reduction in the medical cost of treating pneumonia. To the pneumonia patient a great gain has come in getting him back on his feet and back to work quickly, as well as in the sharp reduction of the number of fatal cases of pneumonia.

As another illustration of this contrary trend toward lower cost, I might mention the almost complete disappearance of mastoid operations, which were so common up to a decade or so ago. As one outstanding ear specialist in New York City said: "The general practitioner can administer penicillin just as efficiently as my nurse. If the penicillin is administered in time, mastoid surgery is almost always unnecessary."

Yet it seems to me that in the over-all picture of medical care there has been a trend toward more expensive procedures, despite these significant exceptions in the other direction of pneumonia and mastoid surgery.

My answer to the first of these five questions—"Why did medical economics come to the forefront in the past few decades?"—is that, with the exceptions noted, we have developed new procedures which cost more money but which reduce the mortality rate from certain outstanding diseases; secondly, the purchase of medical care is a negative expenditure by the consumer and can never be made as attractive as the advertisers make the purchase of cars, radios, refrigerators, and, I might add, alcoholic beverages.

Finally, how is organized medicine meeting these new problems of medical economics? I would not answer that question fully without making a separate speech. We have encouraged the development of voluntary insurance—Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans as well as coverage by insurance companies. Since the premium for a family membership of the Blue Cross-Blue Shield type costs about 20 cents a day, we have developed a new test for medical indigency for the millions of people to whom these plans are available. This new test of medical indigency for the broad benefits provided by Blue Cross-Blue Shield plans is the ability of a family to pay 20 cents a day—that is, the price of a package of cigarettes, a bottle of beer, or a gallon of gasoline a day. Prior to the 1940's the test of medical indigency for most people was the ability to postpay the cost of an illness which occasionally ran up to several hundred dollars. So, in brief, voluntary insurance has helped the people meet this new problem of medical economics by giving them an opportunity to prepay in small regular amounts instead of postpaying in very irregular amounts. Subscribing families can now choose between "budget and bludgeon" in the matter of medical-care costs.

II

The second of my five questions is: "How much has the cost of medical care increased during the last two decades of rapid advance in scientific medicine?"

According to the bureau of medical economic research of the American Medical Association, these expenditures by the people for medical care for physicians, dentists, hospitals, drugs, etc., have fluctuated closely around 4 percent of the amount spent by consumers for food, clothing, shelter, and all other goods and services (Bulletin 66, The Cost and Quantity of Medical Care in the United States, 20 pp., 1948.)

My statement that these expenditures have been about 4 percent of total personal consumer expenditures in each year since 1929 may seem to contradict the answer to my first question that certain improvements in medical science, which reduce mortality from certain diseases, have made medical care more expensive.

What I am trying to say is that although the number of dollars spent for medical care has increased from $3,000,000,000 in 1929 to $6,500,000,000 in 1947, total consumer expenditures for all goods and services have kept pace with this increase. The American people have chosen to spend about 96 percent of their family budgets on items other than medical care. This is not my decision, it is not your decision, it is not the decision of any offical in Washington; it is the decision of all the people. It represents their collective judgment and decision. It is not that they could not afford to spend more for medical care but that they have chosen to spend 96 percent on items other than medical care. The physicians' share of the medical-care dollar has decreased from 32 cents in 1929 to 26 cents; the hospital's share has risen from 13 to 21 cents; while the dentists' share has declined slightly from 16 to 14 cents. I consider the maintenance of this cost level at 4 percent one of the great accomplishments of American medicine.

Some of you may be more interested in the matter of unit prices than in the total dollars spent. Again quoting from the same source we find that, according to the United States Bureau of Labor Statistics, physicians' fees during the 1940's, hospital-room rates, dentists, drugs, and other basic items in medical care rose about 41 percent while the cost of living was rising 71 percent. Considering the two largest medical-care items separately we find that physicians' fees, according to this Government source, rose 36 percent but hospital-room rates soared 112 percent. Those of you who are familiar with hospital operations, whether you are laymen or physicians may appreciate that the hospital buys labor, food, and fuel, items which have risen very rapidly in price, and sells these soon after purchase in the form of food, shelter, and services to patients. The hospital is exposed to the full pressure of contemporary inflation and cannot dodge it. I do not mean to criticize hospital administrators. In summarizing this point I repeat that the prices of all medical-care items, even including hospital-room rates, have risen only slightly more than one-half as fast as the general cost of living, of which these medical-care items constitute about 4 percent. Secondly, for physicians' fees alone the increase is almost exactly one-half the increase in the cost of living.

We physicians are proud of our increasing ability to provide more and more medical care. We appreciate that among the major reasons for this increase in technological efficiency are the wonder drugs and the increasing number and efficiency of our technical assistants—for example, laboratory and X-ray technicians.

Therefore, my answer to this second question on what it costs is that the consumer still spends only 4 percent of his budget dollar on medical care; that the prices of medical-care items have gone up much more slowly than the cost of living, and that 1,000 doctors can deliver much more medical care today than they could 10 years ago.

III

My third question is, What about this alleged shortage of doctors? Is it real or imaginary? I believe it is real. I think that prosperity means shortage. I think that there is a shortage of doctors in exactly the same way that there is a shortage of household help, bricklayers, and school teachers. If there wasn't a shortage I don't think we would be enjoying this period of prosperity which has become somewhat less robust in recent months. But I do not think that this is what most of the advocates of compulsory sickness insurance are talking about when they discuss this alarming shortage of doctors. They often mention the deficit for 1960, placing it at something like 40,000 doctors and at other times as low as 25,000 doctors. What they really mean is that we have a permanent doctor shortage in the United States. While I agree that at first thought there does seem to be a temporary doctor shortage; certainly there is in the armed services—I absolutely deny that there is anything that may be called a permanent, alarming doctor shortage.

There was a real doctor shortage for civilians during World War II when about 40 percent of the physicians were in the armed services taking care of the 9 percent of the population in uniform. The civilians, however, did not die off like flies. The civilian doctors were badly overworked, I admit, but the health of civilians during World War II was very good. Aided by technical assistants who relieved them of routine tests, and by new drugs and methods, which are continuing to increase steadily, the civilian doctor was able to maintain the health of civilians at a high level.

And what of our present situation? The United States has more doctors per 100,000 people than any nation in the world except Palestine, where there is a temporary situation of a large number of refugee doctors who are doctors but are not in the medical practice. Secondly, the medical population of the United States has increased about 15 percent since 1940, whereas the total population has increased only 13 percent. Even the people who are talking about the alarming shortage of doctors predict that the number of doctors per 100,000 people will be greater in 1960 than it is now.

Is there a shortage of doctors in certain communities and areas in the United States? Before I consider that point, I want to tell you that there are 10 counties in South Dakota that do not have a doctor and yet the people of South Dakota are healthier than the people in any of the States that have a large number of doctors per 100,000 population. I do not think these facts regarding South Dakota belittle the medical profession; rather, these facts support the contention that there is more to health than the number of doctors in the county or State.

Now I turn to the supply situation in rural areas. Some small towns are not increasing their population and some are actually losing population. The system of hard roads and automobiles has made small towns a part of a larger trading area. This change in the trading habits of the people has affected the practice of medicine and the distribution of physicians. I doubt that we shall ever again have in the small towns in America the number of physicians that we did before World War II. After all, accessibility of a physician is not so much a question of distance as it is of time, and the time is being constantly reduced by more and better highways and better means of transportation.

Finally on this doctor shortage I should like to point out that an economic depression would reduce the demand for medical services less than it would for some other services, but the reduction would be sharp enough to warrant caution in reaching conclusions during this period of frenzied prosperity about a shortage of doctors in 1960.

The estimates which the advocates of compulsory sickness insurance have made about the doctor shortage in 1960 are based upon guesswork, mechanistic formulas, and an unrealistic approach to the problem of supply. When somebody tells you that there is an undue concentration of physicians in large teaching centers, you should ask him if he means an undue concentration of interns and residents.

IV

My fourth question is: "What do the people get for the 4 percent which they spend for medical care?" What medicine has done in this century, aided by better food, better sanitation, and better houses, is to reduce the fear of death.

V

My last question is "Can we ever have adequate medical care?" A physician may know, for a particular patient suffering a well-known ailment, what constitutes adequate care for that particular patient at that particular time but I doubt that the problem of adequate medical care for the entire American people is that simple. Federal Security Administrator Ewing has been claiming that with socialized medicine he could eliminate 325,000 deaths each year or, in other words, cut the annual number of deaths from the present figure of approximately 1,400,000 down to approximately 1,100,000. I want to say emphatically that he can do no such thing; nor can all the physicians of this country. Why, 1,100,000 deaths a year would be fewer deaths than we had in 1900 when we had only one-half as many people in the United States as we have now! It stands to reason that the number of deaths depends upon the number of people in the country and the death rate at each age. As we get more and older people in the United States, the number of deaths will increase from the present 1,400,000 to 1,600,000 or 1,700,000 in the next quarter century. Administrator Ewing doesn't understand that health progress is one idea and the annual number of deaths another idea.

Medical progress has been so rapid that fatal accidents rather than any of the great natural killers is the No. 1 death hazard of the working people of the United States. Heart disease kills four and one-half times as many persons as accidents, but many heart victims are retired persons, who have completed their working period of life. In 1945, the average age at death of persons dying from heart disease was 68; from accidents, 46. More unrealized working years of life—age 20 to 65—are cut off by fatal accidents than by deaths caused by diseases of the heart.

My answer to the fifth and final question can be summarized in a single sentence—as long as pain comes too often and death comes too soon to us mortals medical care can never be adequate. It can and will be better.

FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include an analysis and comparison of H. R. 4453, as reported in the House from the Committee on Education and Labor, of H. R. 6841, which has recently been introduced, and of the Massachusetts law enacted in 1946, prepared by the American Law Section of the Legislative Reference Service. I hope and believe that the analysis and comparison will be useful to my colleagues who are interested in developing the best legislation possible in this field, if and when the House is permitted to consider the problem.

FEPC, an analysis and comparison of H. R. 4453, H. R. 6841, Eightieth Congress, and the Massachusetts FEPC law, 1946 acts, chapter 368

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6841	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
A. Name of act (sec. 1).	A. Name of act (sec. 1).	A. Name of act.
1. Federal Fair Employment Practices Act.	1. Fair Employment Practices Act.	1. None.
B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2).	B. Findings and declaration of policy (sec. 2).	B. Declaration (sec. 1).
The rights of some persons to employment without discrimination because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin are being denied. It is essential to the general welfare that these rights be protected. Declares it to be the right of the individual to be free from such discrimination and that this act is necessary: (1) To remove obstructions to commerce. (2) To insure complete enjoyment of constitutional rights. (3) To promote observance of rights and freedoms undertaken by the United States under the United Nations charter and to further national policy with respect to the universa' declaration of human rights proclaimed by the General Assembly of the United Nations.	Declares that the denying of employment opportunities and discrimination against properly qualified persons by reason of race, creed, or color deprives the United States of the fullest utilization of its capacities for production and defense, and burdens, hinders, and obstructs commerce. Declares it to be the policy of the United States to eliminate discrimination because of race, creed, or color in employment relations.	Declares the right to work without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry to be a right and privilege of the inhabitants of the Commonwealth.
C. Definitions (sec. 3). Definitions include: "Employer"—a person engaged in commerce employing 50 or more, etc., except States or their municipal or political subdivisions or religious, charitable, fraternal, social, educational, or sectarian organizations not organized for private profit but includes a labor organization employing 50 or more individuals which is engaged in commerce. An exemption is made from the act of employers employing aliens outside the continental United States, its Territories, and possessions (sec. 4).	C. Definitions. None.	C. Definitions (sec. 4, ch. 151 B, sec. 1). Definitions include: "Employer" does not include employers of 5 or less persons, social clubs, fraternal, charitable, educational, or religious associations not organized for private profit but does include the State and all political subdivisions, etc.
D. Unlawful employment practices (sec. 5). It shall be an unlawful practice— (a) For an employer: (1) To refuse to hire, to discharge, or discriminate against a person with respect to terms, conditions, or privileges of employment because of race, color, religion, ancestry, or national origin. (2) To utilize in hiring any employment agency, placement service, or other source which discriminates. (b) For a labor organization: (1) To discriminate against any persons. (2) To limit, segregate, or classify its membership because of race, color, etc. (c) For either an employer or a labor organization: (1) To discharge, expel, or discriminate against a person because he has opposed such unlawful employment practice or participated in any proceeding under this act.	D. Unlawful employment practices. None.	D. Unlawful employment practices (sec. 4, ch. 151 B, sec. 4). Makes it an unlawful employment: (1) For an employer because of race, color, etc., to refuse to hire, to bar, or discharge an employee or to discriminate in compensation, or in terms, conditions, or privileges of employment unless based upon a bona fide occupational qualification. (2) For a labor organization, because of race, color, etc., to exclude from full membership rights, expel, or discriminate against any of its members or any employer or any individual employed by an employer unless based on a bona fide occupational qualification. (3) For an employer or employment agency to print or circulate or use any form of application for employment, make any record or inquiry which expresses any discrimination as to race, color, etc. (4) For any person, employer, labor organization or employment agency to discharge, expel, or discriminate against any person for participating in any proceeding under this act. (5) For any person to aid, abet, incite, etc., the doing of those forbidden acts.
E. Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 6). Creates a Fair Employment Practice Commission in the executive branch composed of five members appointed by the President with advice of the Senate for 5-year terms. The Commission shall have: (a) Powers: (1) To appoint officers and employees under civil-service rules. (2) To cooperate with regional, State, local, and other agencies. (3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts. (4) To furnish technical assistance to further compliance with the act.	E. Fair Employment Practice Commission (sec. 3). Creates a similar commission with: (a) Powers: (1) To appoint officers and employees. (2) To cooperate with and utilize regional, State, local, and other agencies and to use volunteer and uncompensated services. (3) To pay witnesses the same fees as in United States courts. (4) To make, amend, and rescind in such manner prescribed by the Administrative Procedure Act, rules and regulations to carry out the act.	E. Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission (sec. 3). Creates a Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission composed of three members appointed by the Governor with the advice of the council for 3-year terms. The commission shall have powers (sec. 4—ch. 151B, sec. 2 and 3): (1) To formulate policies to effectuate the purposes of the act, and to make recommendations to officers and agencies of the Commonwealth in aid thereof. (2) To function anywhere within the Commonwealth. (3) To appoint officers and employees within the limitations provided by law. (4) To obtain and utilize the services of all executive departments and agencies.

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6841	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
(5) To assist an employer acting in good faith whose employees refuse or threaten to refuse to cooperate in effectuating the provisions of the act. (6) To make technical studies to effectuate the act. (7) To appoint local, State, or regional advisory and conciliation councils to aid in effectuating the act and to make studies and recommendations for that purpose.	(5) To serve processes and other papers, etc. (6) To make technical studies to effectuate the purposes of the act.	(5) To adopt, amend, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act and the policies of the commission. (6) To receive, investigate, and pass upon complaints of discrimination in employment. (7) To conduct hearings, subpena witnesses, take testimony. (8) To create local, regional, or State-wide advisory and conciliation agencies and councils to aid in effectuating the purposes of the act. (9) To issue publications and studies to aid in effectuating the act. (10) To render an annual report to the Governor and general court.
(b) Investigatory power (sec. 9). (1) To issue subpenas. (2) To administer oaths, examine witnesses, and receive evidence. (3) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.	(b) Duties (sec. 4). (1) To make comprehensive studies of discrimination in various sections of the country and of the best methods of eliminating it. (2) To formulate plans in cooperation with interested public and private agencies for its elimination. (3) To publish reports relating to elimination of discrimination. (4) To cooperate with and furnish technical assistance to employers, labor unions, and other public and private agencies. (5) To receive and investigate complaints. (6) To make specific and detailed recommendations to interested parties for its elimination. c. Investigatory powers (sec. 5). (1) To examine and copy evidence. (2) To issue subpenas. (3) To administer oaths, examine witnesses, receive evidence, and conduct investigations. (4) To apply to United States district courts to enforce subpenas, etc., against contumacious persons.	
F. Self-incrimination (sec. 9 (e)). No person shall be excused from testifying or producing evidence in obedience to a subpena on the ground that the testimony or evidence may tend to incriminate him or subject him to a penalty or forfeiture but no such person shall be prosecuted or subjected to any penalty or forfeiture on account of such testimony or evidence except perjury in so testifying. Limited to natural persons only.	F. Self-incrimination (sec. 5 (f)). Same, except no express limitation to natural persons.	F. Self-incrimination (sec. 4—ch. 151 B, sec. 3, 7). Same, except no express limitation to natural persons.
G. Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 7). The Commission shall have exclusive powers to prevent unlawful employment practices under the act but may cede jurisdiction to State and local agencies where State and local acts are comparable to this act. The Commission on a written sworn charge shall investigate and endeavor to eliminate the unlawful practices through informal conference, conciliation, and persuasion. On failure to obtain voluntary compliance by informal methods, a formal hearing may be held before a member of the Commission or designated agent with the right to counsel and to cross-examine witnesses, etc. At conclusion of the formal hearing the record thereof shall be transferred to the Commission (or three designated members) for decision. The Commission shall then issue a cease-and-desist order or an order of dismissal. The whole proceedings hereunder shall conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.	G. None.	G. Prevention of unlawful employment practices (sec. 4–ch. 151B, sec. 5). The provisions here are, in general, similar to those of H. R. 4453, except that the formal hearing, after the informal methods have failed, is held before the commission itself and an order is issued thereafter.
H. Judicial review (sec. 8). Provides for a petition, by either the Commission or a party aggrieved by a final order of the Commission, to the United States court of appeals under the procedures established by the Administrative Procedure Act. Decision of the court of appeals is subject to a review by the United States Supreme Court.	H. None.	H. Judicial review (sec. 4, ch. 151B, sec. 6). Similar, in general, to H. R. 4453 with review by the superior courts of the Commonwealth in the counties with further review by supreme judicial court.

H. R. 4453 (as reported in House)	H. R. 6841	Massachusetts acts, 1946, chapter 368
I. Enforcement of orders directed to Government agencies and contractors (sec. 10). Authorizes the President to make Federal practice conform to the policies of the act and to prescribe administrative remedies by Executive order with no judicial review. The Commission may request the President to take such action as he deems appropriate to obtain compliance with the Commission's orders. Authorizes the President to make regulations to prevent Government contractors (contracts exceeding $10,000) from continuing unfair employment practices. The Commission shall enforce such regulations.	I. Discrimination in employment by the Federal Government (sec. 6). The Commission shall make a study of discrimination in the Federal Government and recommend to Congress a specific plan for its elimination together with the necessary legislation.	I. None.
J. Notices to be posted (sec. 11). Requires employers and labor organizations to keep a notice prepared by the Commission, with excerpts from the act, posted in conspicuous places on their premises under penalty of a $500 fine.	J. None.	J. Similar with fine of from $10 to $100.
K. Forcibly resisting the Commission or its representatives (sec. 14). To forcibly resist, oppose, impede, intimidate, or interfere with a member, agent, or employee of the Commission in the performance of duties under the act or because of the same is punishable by a $500 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.	K. Willful interference with Commission agents (sec. 7). Similar, in general, with $5,000 fine and/or imprisonment for not more than 1 year or both.	K. Willful interference with the Commission (sec. 4–ch. 151 B, sec. 8). Similar, in general.
L. Veterans' preference (sec. 12). This act shall not modify Federal, State, Territorial, or local veterans' preference.	L. None.	L. None.
M. Rules and regulations (sec. 13). The Commission shall make, modify, and rescind rules and regulations to carry out the act. The regulations must conform to the Administrative Procedure Act.	M. None.	M. None.
N. None.	N. None.	N. Construction of the act (sec. 4–ch. 151 B, sec. 9). The act is to be liberally construed.
O. Separability clause (sec. 15). The usual provision.	O. None.	O. Similar (sec. 4–ch. 151 B, sec. 10).

Freeman W. Sharp, American Law Section, January 30, 1950.

First Annual Report of Massachusetts Fair Employment Practices Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the major portion of first Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 10, 1946, to November 30, 1947.

So as to emphasize one of the most outstanding administrative principles adopted by the Massachusetts commission may I call your attention to the following sentence from the report of the commission to the Governor and the legislature in 1946 when the law was implemented by the creation of the commission:

It has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and workers alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law.

I think anyone familiar with administrative law and procedure realizes that the entire success of any such law depends upon the policies adopted by those charged with the administration of the law. If they are such as to turn the administration into a punitive expedition, this will bring violent criticism and justifiable resentment and the administrators alone will be responsible for the possible repeal of the law. If a Federal law in this field is enacted, those who are chosen to administer it will have much of value in the experience in Massachusetts and in other States where similar laws have been so successfully initiated and administered.

May I point out also that in this first report you will find another significant sentence, as follows:

The fact that the commission has not been obliged to proceed to a formal hearing with respect to any complaint of employment discrimination filed with it is, itself, a silent endorsement of the wisdom of the act and the manner in which it has been administered.

The following is from the report:

ADMINISTRATION OF THE FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICE ACT AND ITS EFFECTS

On August 21, 1946, the Massachusetts fair employment practice law became effective, thereby giving to inhabitants of the Commonwealth the right to work without discrimination because of race, color, religious creed, national origin or ancestry.

In the report of this commission to the Governor and to the legislature last year appeared the following paragraph:

"The commission has approached the administration of the law with a keen appreciation of the necessity of dealing fairly and peaceably with all persons who are subject to its provisions. It has not chosen to conduct a punitive expedition in Massachusetts but has preferred to steer a conservative course of educating employers and workers alike as to their responsibilities and obligations under this law. The commission has been continuously mindful of this policy in the formulation of its regulations, in the conduct of its educational program and in the investigation and conciliation of complaints."

During the past year the commission has administered the Fair Employment Practice Act with the same approach to the problem of eliminating employment discrimination in Massachusetts. The results have shown clearly the wisdom of that course of administration.

The processing of each complaint of employment discrimination where investigation showed that there was probable cause to credit the allegations of the complaint resulted in the elimination of the alleged discriminatory practice by conference, conciliation and persuasion. Not only did the respondent eliminate the discriminatory employment practice complained of, but also adjusted his entire employment policy to give equal opportunity to all people in the Commonwealth.

Investigations by the commission, subsequent to the conciliation of cases, has shown that changes in the personnel practices

agreed to in conference with the Commission have been faithfully carried out. In almost every case workers of hitherto excluded minority groups have proven to be satisfactory to the employers and have dispelled by their harmonious relationships with other employees the fears of employers that prejudice within would disrupt their organizations.

The fact that the commission has not been obliged to proceed to a formal hearing with respect to any complaint of employment discrimination filed with it is, itself, a silent endorsement of the wisdom of the act and the manner in which it has been administered. Yet the large number of complaints processed by this commission does not tell the whole story of the effect of the Fair Employment Practice Act on employment. The existence alone of the law has awakened many employers to their obligations to give equal opportunity in employment to all people and the evidence of the voluntary cooperation of these employers against whom no complaints whatsoever had been filed is very impressive.

Statistical report of the commission—Nov. 10, 1946–Nov. 30, 1947

Complaints:	
Complaints initiated and received	306
Complaints adjusted by conciliation	153
Complaints dismissed for lack of probable cause	41
Complaints dismissed for lack of jurisdiction	9
Cases withdrawn	1
Complaints in process of investigation	102
Investigations:	
Investigations initiated by the commission	35
Investigations adjusted by conciliation	15
Investigations dismissed for lack of probable cause	14
Investigations pending	6

NEWSPAPERS

In January and February 1947, members of the commission met with representatives of the papers of Boston and other cities and towns of Massachusetts and discussed with them the duty of these publications not to print help-wanted advertisements which specified or limited the race, color, religious creed, national origin, or ancestry of applicants for employment. At these meetings the newspapermen manifested complete willingness to cooperate with the commission.

A study of classified advertisements appearing in newspapers published throughout the State was commenced in December 1946. One hundred and four violations were noted during the first month. In November 1947 the number was 14, which is evidence of fine cooperation.

LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

The commission has undertaken a survey of employment discrimination in the A. F. of L. and CIO organizations with encouraging results, particularly because these branches of the organized-labor movement are apparently complying with the law and in most cases are showing a disposition to cooperate with the commission. A study of the policies of these unions has not been completed, but the majority of their constitutions and bylaws have been screened and no discriminatory clauses found.

The commission is at the present time investigating a number of complaints in which violations of the fair employment practice law by independent labor unions are involved.

EMPLOYMENT AGENCIES

The commission has had occasion to investigate discriminatory practices of some employment agencies. In addition, it has met with representatives of employment agencies with beneficial results. This includes the cooperation which the commission has received from the division of employment security, which operates the Massachusetts State Employment Service.

EMPLOYERS

The largest number of complaints filed with the commission has been against employers allegedly responsible for employment practices which are unlawful under the statute, particularly in the refusal to hire qualified applicants for employment because of considerations of race, color, religious creed, national origin or ancestry. In the processing of these complaints, the Commission has received good cooperation from employers in the following fields: insurance, retail marketing, manufacturing, restaurant and liquor sales, motion picture distribution and exhibiting, transportation, hotel management, packing, general distribution and sales.

EDUCATION

The statute empowers the fair employment practice commission to establish councils throughout Massachusetts.

"The commission may empower them to study the problems of discrimination in order to foster through community effort * * * good will, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of the Commonwealth * * * and make recommendations to the commission for the development of policies * * * and for programs of formal and informal education which the commission may recommend to the appropriate State agency."

Under this authority the first fair employment practice council was established in Springfield with an outstanding membership. Also under the authority of the law a State advisory council of the fair employment practice commission was appointed with an equally outstanding membership and constant efforts were made by all concerned to carry out a State-wide program of education and conferences with many civic, business, industrial, labor, and fraternal organizations.

Second Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the major portion of the second annual report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 30, 1947, to November 30, 1948.

May I emphasize two significant paragraphs from that report, as follows:

From the beginning, this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force. It has endeavored to deal fairly in every instance with complainants and respondents. It has appealed to the intelligence and sense of justice of employers and workers alike in each attempt to break down the barriers of racial and religious intolerance.

In short, the commission has not conceived of the fair employment practice law as an instrument of compulsion. Rather, it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out the ignorance and doubts and fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or natural origin. Thus in its whole work, it has attempted to substitute understanding for intolerance.

I am sure you will be interested also in the statement that from the beginning of its administration the Commission had handled a total of 445 complaints but had not had a single occasion to conduct a formal hearing, or have a matter which it had settled in conference brought into a court of law for further consideration.

The State advisory council in this period initiated a study of what the public school authorities were doing by way of developing democratic attitudes and behaviors. The findings of that study, as tabulated, revealed what the Commission describes as "an encouraging increase of interest on the part of Massachusetts educators in one of democracy's most pressing problems."

In addition to the Springfield council a greater Boston council was organized during this period again with a membership of outstanding citizens, and a local council was being organized in New Bedford.

The following is from the report:

INTRODUCTION

Two full years have now passed since the effective date of the fair employment practice law. The law declared that equal opportunity to work without discrimination because of race, religion, or origin is an express right and privilege of the people of Massachusetts. It authorized the establishment of a commission whose duties are to eliminate discriminatory employment practices and to foster good will and cooperation among all groups and elements of our population.

From the beginning this commission has recognized that the elimination of discriminatory employment practices based upon individual and group prejudices could be accomplished most effectively by reason instead of force. It has endeavored to deal fairly in every instance with complainants and respondents. It has appealed to the intelligence and sense of justice of employers and workers alike in each attempt to break down the barriers of racial and religious intolerance.

In short, the commission has not conceived of the fair employment practice law as an instrument of compulsion. Rather it has regarded the statute as presenting an opportunity to wipe out the ignorance and doubts and fears which men have of other men who are different with respect to color, religion, or national origin. Thus in its whole work it has attempted to substitute understanding for intolerance.

The question is often asked, "Is FEPC really working out?" It can be frankly stated that because of FEPC people of this Commonwealth of all races, creeds, and origins have today economic opportunities which they never had before. These people are sharing now the benefits of American citizenship along with its obligations. They have a growing faith in the American doctrine of equal opportunity.

Important are every single new job opportunity which is created by FEPC and each old barrier which is broken down among people of different races and religions. For every time that opportunity and recognition are granted to any individual for achievement regardless of race, color, or origin, the cause of our national ideal of equality of opportunity is advanced.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In 1948, the fair employment practice commission processed 142 complaints of economic discrimination and settled 135 of these after investigation and conference, indicating thereby that some discriminatory employment practice had been eliminated in each case. From the beginning of its administration in the fall of 1946, the commission has handled a total of 445 complaints, involving business organizations employing over 350,000 people, and has not yet had occasion to conduct a single formal hearing or have a matter which it has settled through conference brought into a court of law for further consideration.

In addition, it is true that the procedures which employers established to remove barriers against the employment of workers because of their color, religion, or national origin have had a marked effect in certain fields of employment. So it happens, that the settlement of one case in a given field has opened up scores of job opportunities to persons belonging to a group which has been the victim of racial or religious discrimination for years.

For example, employment opportunity in the railroad industry in Massachusetts, which gives work to over 75,000 people, has been shackled for years by the restrictive racial policies of the big brotherhoods. In 1948, the railroad carriers sat down with the Massachusetts FEPC and the New York State Commission Against Discrimination and effected an agreement in the matter of certain complaints whereby Negroes have been employed as stewards and machinists and have been placed in other categories of employment from which they had been barred hitherto because of their color.

Again in 1948, as a result of a complaint, the Massachusetts FEPC conferred with representatives of the automobile industry in an atmosphere of respect and cordiality and worked out an agreement which resulted in the hiring of Negro workers in that field on the same basis as white workers.

More and more, captains of industry are becoming convinced, when agreements like these prove of benefit to the employer as well as to the worker, that there need be no real reason to fear friction among qualified American workers of different colors or religions.

Then there is the retail merchandising field. Some employers in this industry had been extremely skeptical about the employment of any but white people in selling jobs. In 1948, FEPC can point to many stores where, as a result of complaints, Negro salesgirls are employed in good number and are no longer a novelty. In these same stores, as a result of the successful experience of employers with Negro salesgirls, equal opportunity is now being given to men and women regardless of their color, religion or origin, in clerical, operating, and supervisory positions. Some of the recent changes in this field have come about by agreement with FEPC, others have occurred through voluntary recognition of the spirit of equal opportunity before and after the fair employment practice law became effective.

In view of what is happening in Massachusetts, it is not at all surprising that the United States Department of Labor in 1948 pointed out that the cities which lead in the number of Negroes employed in white collar, technical and professional jobs in private enterprise are found in areas which have FEPC legislation.

Likewise, a recent Nation-wide survey by the National Community Relations Advisory Council disclosed that queries on religious affiliations by employers in Massachusetts (and in New York and New Jersey, which also have FEPC laws) have been occurring only one-sixth as often as in States not having FEPC laws.

Statistical report, Nov. 10, 1946, to Nov. 30, 1948

Complaints:	
Initiated and received	445
Closed after investigation and conference	288
Closed for lack of probable cause	89
Closed for lack of jurisdiction	13
Withdrawn	11
Pending investigation and conference	45
Investigations without formal complaint:	
Initiated by the Commission	60
Closed after investigations and conference	21
Closed for lack of probable cause	26
Transferred to complaint	3
Pending investigation and conference	10
Nature of complaints and investigations:	
Based upon alleged color discrimination	391
Based upon alleged religious discrimination	71
Based upon alleged discrimination because of national origin	39
Based upon alleged discrimination because of ancestry	4
Types of complaints:	
Against employers	313
Against employment agencies	30
Against labor unions	16
Against employees	2
Others	145

In noting the progress which has been made during the past 2 years in accomplishing the purposes of the fair-employment-practice law, attention should be called to the splendid cooperation which the commission has received from the daily and weekly newspapers which are published in the metropolitan areas of Massachusetts. Not only have they been fair and considerate in their reporting of the activities of this commission, but they also have been keenly alert to their own obligation under the law to eliminate help-wanted advertisements which specify or restrict color, religion, or ancestry of the applicant. For example, in December 1946, 104 violations of this type were noted in the help-wanted sections of Massachusetts newspapers. By November 1947 this figure had decreased to 14. A check of the newspapers in October 1948 revealed no advertisement at all of this sort.

In the summer of 1948, the staff of the commission conducted a survey of all cases which had been disposed of by May 1948 to ascertain the extent of and reaction to compliance with the fair employment practice law. This survey revealed: (1) That there had been a considerable increase in the employment of workers belonging to groups which had been discriminated against in the past because of color, religion, or national origin; and (2) that the policy of giving equal opportunity to all people regardless of color, religion, or national origin had proved to be no burden upon employers with respect to either management-employee relationships or employer-customer relationships.

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Investigations

Under the section of the statute which provides that the commission may study problems of discrimination in fields of human relationship outside of employment, 60 such investigations have been made in 2 years. Among these investigations, FEPC has looked into the matter of certain discriminatory practices which are alleged to exist in Massachusetts hospitals. Also, the commission was active in the summer of 1948 in eliminating discrimination against colored people by certain restaurants and other public places of recreation in the Cape Cod area. It has already taken the first steps to erase religious discrimination from the accommodation policies of certain inns and hotels in the resort areas of this Commonwealth. It should be noted with reference to these investigations that the commission has no power of enforcement but must rely solely upon educational methods.

Police departments

The executive secretary of the commission is contacting the various police departments in metropolitan Boston, which includes 39 cities and towns. A former member of the police force, he has done graduate work at Harvard in human relations. He is suggesting that any instances of tension between groups in the various communities be reported to the commission and is also available as a consultant in such matters. By invitation, he has addressed groups of policemen in different parts of the Commonwealth and has contacted the heads of police departments in many cities. As a result of this work, police officers and executive heads of police departments have taken steps to allay religious and racial tensions in certain areas and have assisted in enforcing the provisions of the act.

The report concludes as follows:

OTHER EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. A quarterly news letter Toward Racial and Religious Understanding was published containing contributions from 49 organizations, most of them private. Increasingly, this news letter is becoming a record of the various efforts to promote intergroup understanding, respect, and good will.

2. Among the educational materials distributed are a summary of the act and an explanatory pamphlet, entitled "What Is the Fair Employment Practice Law?," both of which have been widely read. The Associated Industries of Massachusetts, the Massachusetts Technical and Commercial Employment Association, the A. F. of L., the CIO, and many other groups have helped greatly in the distribution of these materials.

3. The Scrapbook for Teachers, a cooperative undertaking of the commission and the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews, contains book reviews and summaries of noteworthy magazine articles. It has been very popular with the general public as well as with teachers, for whom it was especially compiled.

4. Over 600 kits of material concerning the Fair Employment Practice Act have been sent to superintendents of public and parochial schools and to junior and senior high-school principals throughout the State, together with a letter offering the services of the commission in furnishing speakers for assembly programs. The response to the letter has been enthusiastic, and a schedule of speaking engagements has been arranged with the schools.

5. In an effort to extend the work of the commission throughout the State, plans have been made for members of the staff to be located during 1 day or more in some of the larger cities for consultation concerning the purpose and functioning of the law and the taking of complaints.

6. The commissioners have welcomed opportunities to explain the philosophy and provisions of the act. Over 200 addresses have been made by them, and about as many conferences have been held with widely varying groups in the offices of the commission.

The commission feels that its law-enforcing program, as well as its educational program, has been benefited by educational

work preceding the passing of the fair-employment-practice law, governmental groups and private organizations have worked hard, and are still working hard, to promote good will and fair play in Massachusetts. Their success has helped our commission, and their continued cooperation is earnestly desired.

Third Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the important portion of the Third Annual Report of the Massachusetts Fair Employment Practice Commission covering the period from November 30, 1948, to November 30, 1949.

It is most significant that in 1949 the commission could report that not once had a complaint required judicial review but rather each case had been settled through conference. I call your attention to this most important statement of policy and principle by the commission:

Once more the commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provision of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints be made through "conference, conciliation, and persuasion." This process invites cooperation and is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

The following is from the report:

INTRODUCTION

This is the third annual report of the administration of the fair-employment practice law.

During the years since 1946, when the law became effective, this Commission has processed several hundred complaints alleging unlawful discrimination in employment because of race, religion, or national origin. In addition to this quasi-judicial function, and through its educational activities, it has brought about solutions of other problems involving discrimination outside the field of employment and has endeavored with gratifying results to educate employers and employees to the realization that full and complete opportunity in employment on an equal basis is the best answer that Americans can give to the subversive doctrines that this kind of equality is not possible under our form of government.

Now, in 1949, the progress of the Commission may be evaluated in a preliminary way. It is certain that industry as a whole has taken a long step forward and many industrialists appreciate that racial and religious tensions are not heightened when fair-employment policies are practiced. Likewise it has been demonstrated that working men and women suffer no dire consequences from working side by side with persons of other races and religions; and that those individuals enjoying new job opportunities are better able to assume their obligations in our society.

While the accomplishments of these 3 years may be notable, the Commission realizes much work lies ahead. Benefits from anti-discrimination legislation can be more generally enjoyed than at present, especially in the populous areas outside Greater Boston.

Investigations made prior to 1946 indicated that economic discrimination against minorities was not confined to any particular section of the State. However, possibly because of the fiscal necessity of establishing the Commission's only full-time office in Boston, a distorted picture of the extensiveness of illegal discrimination may be developing. Only 5 percent of all complaints reaching the Commission have come from that area beyond 20 miles of the State House. Yet 46 percent of the State's inhabitants live outside the metropolitan district.

It is apparent to observers that an imbalance continues in the proportion of workers of minority groups who fill the menial jobs requiring little or no special abilities. Time alone can correct these inequities. Educational opportunities for minority groups must be enlarged, and the way must be kept clear of discriminatory obstructions for those members of the minorities who take full advantage of their educational opportunities.

ENFORCEMENT ACTIVITIES

In the past 12 months FEPC processed 117 complaints alleging employment discrimination. More significant, however, than the number of cases handled in the past year or the 562 complaints processed since the inception of the Commission is the fact that business organizations employing more than 350,000 have been concerned and have gained first-hand knowledge of the operation of the law. The Commission has settled each concluded case through conference. Not once has a complaint required judicial review.

Once more, the Commission acknowledges the wisdom of the provision of the law requiring that the first efforts to adjust complaints be made through conference, conciliation and persuasion. This process invites cooperation and, is the antithesis of swinging a big stick.

An illustration of how this works may be found in the following: A complaint charging religious discrimination was received against a company of moderate size. During a routine investigation, the investigating Commissioner came to the conclusion that the general policy of the company did not comply with the law, and on a friendly and cooperative basis the Commissioner and respondent sat down together and surveyed the employment pattern of the concern. When the Commissioner later recommended the employment of the complainant and a change in employment policy, the company readily complied. A review has shown the company has since employed many of the same religious persuasion as the complainant, and it has, for the first time, employed colored persons, the most recent example being a cashier.

During the past year FEPC conducted its first industry-wide investigation, involving 55 concerns and 10,700 employees. The study grew out of a series of complaints filed against labor organizations alleging unlawful discrimination in referrals for jobs on the basis of color. The situation reflected a pattern of apparent discrimination, manifested by the almost exclusive use of or segregation of workers according to their color and ancestry. Working in cooperation with the leaders in these concerns, the Commission is convinced that gradually complete and equal job opportunities will be opened to all in this field regardless of color and ancestry.

This year saw the first complaint adjusted by FEPC on the basis of compensatory damages to the complainant, in addition to a provision of employment.

Interstate cooperation among agencies of Government similiar to the Commission has proved successful, particularly in cases where the employees of a concern cross State lines in their regular duties.

Statistical report, Nov. 10, 1946–Nov. 30, 1949

Complaints:	
Initiated and received	562
Closed after investigation and conference	341
Closed for lack of probable cause	130
Closed for lack of jurisdiction	17
Withdrawn	19
Pending investigation and conference	55
Investigations without formal complaint:	
Initiated by the Commission	75
Closed after investigation and conference	34
Closed for lack of probable cause	35
Transferred to complaint	3
Pending investigation and conference	3
Nature of complaints and investigations:	
Based upon alleged color discrimination	481
Based upon alleged religious discrimination	88
Based upon alleged discrimination because of national origin	60
Based upon alleged discrimination because of ancestry	8
Types of complaints:	
Against employers	418
Against employment agencies	39
Against labor unions	20
Against employees	3
Others	157

EDUCATIONAL ACTIVITIES

Investigations

During 1949 the commission conducted investigations of problems of discrimination in fields of human relationships outside employment "for the purpose of promoting goodwill, cooperation and conciliation among the groups and elements of the population of Massachusetts." The subject matter of these investigations was discussed in a number of voluntary conferences with the organizations and associations concerned. For a time the Commission suspended this type of activity but will resume such discussions beginning January 1950.

It is of some significance to note the kind of progress which the Commission was able to accomplish in areas outside of employment. For example, as the result of voluntary conferences with key representatives of hotel and resort owner's associations, the Commission was able to effect an agreement that the matter of discriminatory policies with respect to the admission of guests would be brought to the attention of the proprietors concerned and that means would be adopted to change such undemocratic practices.

Similar voluntary conferences with the appropriate officials of the city of Boston, following an investigation of alleged discrimination against Negro doctors by the Boston City Hospital, resulted in the appointment this year of the first Negro doctor to the staff of that hospital in its history.

In the voluntary conferences on such subjects as have been mentioned, the Commission emphasized that its investigations and studies had been conducted as part of its general educational program. Furthermore, it was careful to point out in each instance that the Commission had no power of enforcement with respect to any suggestions or recommendations which it made to correct the situations under discussion.

Other educational activities

In cooperation with the commission, the Boston Public School Department has developed a unit of study based on the work of this body. This unit is to be taught in history and government classes. It is written for high-school seniors who shortly will find themselves either employees or employers. While other school systems have not developed such a detailed plan of study as Bos-

ton, many have used educational materials provided by the commission. In addition, members of the commission and field representatives have addressed school assemblies and pupils in social-study classes in both public and private schools. The commission stands ready to send its field representatives throughout the State to explain the operation of the law and to receive complaints.

The Scrapbook for Teachers, a joint project of the commission and the Massachusetts Committee of Catholics; Protestants, and Jews, is being revised once more for general distribution.

The commission has continued to publish a quarterly news letter, Toward Racial and Religious Understanding, containing contributions from 49 private and public organizations in the State. The news letter is considered a record of the efforts of these various organizations to promote intergroup understanding, respect, and good will. The commission wishes to express its indebtedness to these many agencies, private and public, that have helped in the success of its work.

Pamphlets and other material explaining the workings of FEPC have been printed and given wide distribution.

The police departments of the Commonwealth have been helpful in assisting in enforcing the law and have cooperated with the educational program of the commission. Conferences with the heads of 36 of the larger police departments have been held by the executive secretary, who came to the commission from the Boston Police Department where he worked on intergroup understanding. Several of the large communities hold training courses for their police officers and he has taken part in these courses. Assurances have been given that the commission will assist any police department in instances of tension between racial or religious groups.

Councils

Assisting the commission in its studies of the problems of discrimination have been the State advisory council and three regional FEP councils with headquarters in Springfield, Boston, and New Bedford. Another council is now being organized in Worcester. Mr. Philip M. Morgan, president of the Morgan Construction Co., will be its chairman.

The State council advises the commission on matters of general policy, and has helped greatly in promoting school activities. The three regional groups have spread knowledge of the operation of the Fair Employment Practice Act through addresses, radio broadcasts, conferences, and of especial significance, through surveys of industrial concerns, banks, insurance companies, and public utilities. These regional councils have been of assistance to the commission not only through educational activities, but by reporting to the commission on local conditions.

The Federal Trade Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement by former Senator James M. Mead, Commissioner of the Federal Commission:

THE FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Mr. MASON. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, the Commission has taken on a new look. Two newly appointed members of the Commission have insisted that they must know about what the Commission is doing and have insisted upon acting upon questions of policy themselves as Commissioners. This means that in order to carry out the mandate of the Commission, it is necessary that the work be divided among the Commissioners. When it came to considering who should represent us before this distinguished group, we felt if it was possible to get a Commissioner who had had 20 years' experience in this particular body, who had had two terms in the United States Senate, and who had had considerable experience in his legislative work with budget matters, that we would indeed be fortunate.

So it is with a great deal of pleasure that I have the distinguished honor of presenting to the committee, Senator, now Commissioner, Mead, who has been designated by the Acting Chairman as the Commissioner to make a special study of our budget problems and our budget requests. So I take a great deal of pleasure in turning over this particular part of the Commission's work to Senator Mead.

GENERAL STATEMENT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, as you know, I am a member of the Federal Trade Commission, and at the request of the Commission I am appearing before you today in support of the appropriation estimates for the Federal Trade Commission for the fiscal year 1951. As you also know, I was a Member of the House of Representatives and of the Senate for many years and, although in a different capacity, I am returning today to very familiar and pleasant surroundings. It is necessary to intelligent representative government that those persons charged with the execution of the laws periodically appear before the appropriate committees of the Legislature to give an account of their stewardship of the great public trust of public office.

REQUESTED APPROPRIATION FOR 1951

I have a long statement here; but, from my experience on the Committee on Appropriations, I realize that sometimes we might say too much and, as a result, receive too little. So I think I had better just proceed to get right down to the meat of the statement I have by telling you that the Federal Trade Commission is requesting for fiscal 1951 an appropriation of $4,225,000; that this represents an operational increase of $450,000 over the appropriations for 1950 plus a $43,000 estimated increase of the cost of the pay-raise bill. That makes a total of $493,000.

BREAK-DOWN OF INCREASES REQUESTED

This increase allowed by the President and the Bureau of the Budget, together with certain intra-agency transfers, contemplates, as reflected in our proposed method of operations, (1) an increase in the antimonopoly program of $476,200, (2) a reduction of expenditures in the unfair-, deceptive-, and fraudulent-practices program of $64,700, and (3) an increase in the administrative and general operating expenses of $38,500.

In terms of personnel and specifically the operating costs, the increase of $450,000 will provide $68,100 for 16 additional attorney-examiners for the antimonopoly work in the field offices; it will provide $214,300 for 6 employees to establish and maintan an index of concentration and 48 employees for the expansion of the corporation financial reports program to include the wholesale, retail, and mining corporation segments of the industry. It will provide $73,500 to meet the required automatic within-grade promotions and $94,100 for increased travel funds, the cost of work performed by other Government agencies for us, and general operating expenses.

INTEGRATION OF WORK PROGRAM

For the past 2 years, the Commission has been engaged in the execution of a planned, integrated program of work, placing major emphasis on restraint of trade in the basic industries. The Commission now has in the course of trial and/or decision cases in the steel, paper, plywood, furniture, food, clothing, and many other industries dealing with basic commodities, the cost of which affects the well-being and the pocketbook of every individual in the country. It is in the public interest for the Commission to investigate all those matters and, if restraints of trade or unfair practices are found to exist, to take prompt corrective action under the applicable statutes.

PRIMARY DUTY OF THE COMMISSION

While I have only been recently appointed to membership on the Commission, I am keenly aware of the vital importance of the Commission to our economic life and well-being. The President of the United States in his recent State of the Union message again emphasized that business in this country should maintain a spirit of initiative and operate in a competitive economic system. The primary duty of the Commission is to utilize all of the powers delegated to it by the Congress in order to keep our economic system competitive and free from those unfair restraints which injure competition. That is a large order, and the Commission must have adequate tools with which to do its job. These tools can only be made available by adequate appropriations from the Congress.

ACTS ADMINISTERED BY THE COMMISSION

The Commission was created in 1914 on the recommendation of President Woodrow Wilson. The Commission administers the Federal Trade Commission Act, certain sections of the Clayton Act, as amended by the Robinson-Patman Act, the Webb-Pomerene Export Trade Act, the Wool Products Labeling Act of 1939, and certain sections of the Lanham Trade Mark Act of 1946.

REQUESTED APPROPRIATION FOR 1951

The Bureau of the Budget has recommended that the Congress appropriate $4,225,000 for the Commission for the fiscal year 1951. This is an increase of $493,000 over the amount appropriated for the fiscal year 1950.

ANTIMONOPOLY PROGRAM

The greater part of this increase will be used on the Commission's antimonopoly program, which includes both the case work and the economic and financial reports. The Commission contemplates spending an additional $476,200 on its antimonopoly program, of which $64,700 will be transferred from its unfair- and deceptive-practices program. The Commission is fully cognizant of the importance of its work in the deceptive-practices field, but believes the significance of the antimonopoly program is of such fundamental importance to the economy of the country that this transfer of funds is necessary. The antimonopoly program includes legal investigations, economic studies, and formal proceedings in cases involving such practices as collusive price fixing, restriction of production, full-line forcing, exclusive dealing, tie-in sales, and unlawful geographic pricing practices. It also includes the very important compliance investigations, studies, and enforcement proceedings. After a cease-and-desist order has become effective, the Commission has a continuing policing job in order to insure observance of the terms of the order.

ELIMINATION OF FALSE ADVERTISING

The elimination of false or deceptive advertising of commodities sold in interstate commerce is also a responsibility of the Commission. The public interest in this field is great, because tens of millions of our people purchase goods relying upon the truth of the advertisements they hear on the radio or read in publications. Your constituent, the housewife, is entitled to protection against fraud or deception in these advertisements. In addition to the litigation method in this field, the Commission has developed informal and cooperative procedures designed for wider coverage of law enforcement at a lower unit cost. In the trade practice conference procedures, all members of an industry may meet with the Commission and, in a spirit of cooperation, agree not to use certain practices which may be violative of the laws administered by the Commission. Pursuant to the provisions of the Wool Products Labeling Act, the Commission makes frequent inspections of the goods represented to contain wool on the shelves of processors and distributors in order that the purchasing public may be assured that the wool products they purchased are correctly labeled as to fiber content.

GENERAL ECONOMIC INVESTIGATIONS

The Bureau of Industrial Economics of the Commission, in addition to assisting in the investigation of matters preparatory to the initiation of antimonopoly litigation, also makes general economic investigations and prepares reports to the Commission which are transmitted to the Congress. These reports include studies of the trends and concentrations of economic power, and in the past have served as factual background for very important legislation enacted by the Congress. The financial reports on corporations prepared by this Bureau have proved very helpful both to other agencies of the Government and to private parties. The Commission has other important functions which are described in the justification document presented to the subcommittee.

The Commission is constantly surveying its own procedures so that any duplication or waste may be avoided and that the Commission's business may be handled promptly and efficiently. The Commission has delegated to its secretary and executive director many of the routine duties that were formerly done by the Commission in order to free the Commission for its more important functions.

INCREASE IN JURISDICTION OF COMMISSION

To paraphrase the words of Daniel Webster in speaking of Dartmouth College, the Commission is only a small agency, but it has a great responsibility. The Commission has a smaller number of employees than it did in 1941 prior to World War II. The value of the goods sold in interstate commerce, over which the Commission has jurisdiction, however, has increased by billions of dollars, and the problems of monopoly and concentration of wealth have increased, due, in large part, to World War II. We respectfully ask your favorable consideration of our request for funds and assure you that we will do our best to prevent unfairness in interstate commerce and give the taxpayer a fair deal for his dollar.

So, Mr. Chairman, under the circumstances and by reason of the fact that the President and other authorities have pointed up the antimonopoly program, we are asking for certain increases that will fit the Commission to do that particular task without neglecting its other tasks.

CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER

There is no continuously available information, either in or outside Government sources, as to the trend of the concentration of economic power. Knowledge as to these facts is of major importance to the Congress in the formulation of legislative policy as well as for the Commission in developing its program for enforcement of the Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act. In a staff report of the Committee on Small Business of the House of Representatives on economic concentration and monopoly, it was recommended that an index of concentration be developed to meet the existing need and that investigation as to the extent and seriousness of such concentration be centered in the Federal Trade Commission. Approximately $46,000 is included in our budget request to establish this index in the fiscal year 1951.

FINANCIAL INFORMATION REGARDING BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

For many years, there has been a great demand, both in and out of Government, for a current continuing series of reports to provide accurate financial information regarding the operation of business enterprises. Section 6 of the Federal Trade Commission Act grants it the authority to require reports from corporations except those exempted by other acts of Congress, and prior to the war the Commission had exercised this authority and had prepared a large number of such special reports. There are many important demands for basic factual financial statistics about current business conditions which are not being met. The Bureau of the Budget, early in 1946, appointed an interagency committee on needs for financial data in Government, and this committee recommended that a continuing series of quarterly and annual business statistics be instituted as a part of the Federal statistical system.

SCOPE OF INITIAL REPORTS

The recommendation provided that the initial work be confined to manufacturing corporations and then expanded as rapidly as possible to cover wholesale, retail, and mining corporations. Ample safeguards have been provided to avoid duplication of Federal activities in this matter. The Bureau of the Budget designated the Federal Trade Commission and the Securities and Exchange Commission to operate this joint program because only these Commissions have clear-cut statutory authority and responsibility for mandatory collection of such data.

INFORMATION CONTAINED IN REPORTS

These reports provide information on a current quarterly basis as to aggregate assets, sales, and earnings of manufacturing corporations by industries. The use of approved sampling methods insures the highest degree of accuracy obtainable. The information made available through these financial reports enables the Commission to follow the changes in the relative importance of different industries and to compare the profits of large and small corporations.

SOURCE OF REQUESTS FOR REPORTS

Many requests for these reports are received from individual Members of the Congress. They are also regularly used by the Council of Economic Advisers, the Federal Reserve Board, the Department of Commerce, the Department of Agriculture, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, and the Securities and Exchange Commission, which cooperates with the Federal Trade Commission in the preparation of the reports. They are furnished only upon specific request. Presently there are about 8,000 active continuing requests and additional specific orders are received in substantial numbers for each quarterly report as it is released. The requests come primarily from banking, industrial, and labor groups.

EXTENSION OF PROGRAM

The Commission is now prepared to expand this program to cover the distributive trades and mining, as originally planned under the auspices of the Division of Statistical Standards of the Bureau of the Budget, and funds approximating $200,000 are included in our 1951 request to provide the necessary employees to effect the completion of the original plan of operation.

Although we have streamlined the other divisions and cut their appropriations in some instances as low as we deem advisable in order to minimize the request that is being made by our Commission to carry the work forward, that is necessary under present conditions, and that is in keeping with the recommendations of the President.

Very naturally, I am pleased to be here and happy to renew my old associations, and I hope I will be able to make a constructive contribution to the relationship between the agency I now have the honor to represent in part and the committee that has to do with our appropriations.

Mr. THOMAS. That is a good statement, Mr. Chairman. We appreciate it. It is very helpful.

Mr. MEAD. Thank you.

Freedom: How You Can Guarantee It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article by Dr. Norman Vincent Peale entitled "How To Guarantee Your Freedom." The original article appeared in Guideposts:

HOW TO GUARANTEE YOUR FREEDOM

(By Dr. Norman Vincent Peale, minister, Marble Collegiate Church, New York City)

What are the essential elements of our heritage which we would preserve? Two basic beliefs underlie the American structure of government—the sovereignty of God as the ruler of this land, and the sacredness of the individual human soul.

Broadly speaking, the American tradition flowed down two streams. One stream took its rise in the teachings of Socrates, Aristotle, and Plato. These great thinkers discovered that the human mind is sacred, that it is—and rightly ought to be forever—free, that no man has the right to make a slave of the mind of another man.

The other great stream took its rise in the teachings of Moses. Standing upon some great rock in the wilderness, he proclaimed that God had instructed him to tell men they were, in their own souls, utterly sacred, and as such no man had a right to enslave them. Said he: "You are created in the image of God."

Thus it went across the centuries until finally there came walking into the human story a great sun-crowned, radiant Soul who amplified this teaching, who told men they are brothers and sons of a common Father. He told men they should know the truth and the truth should make them free. He uttered wise sayings, all dealing with the greatness and dignity of the human soul touched by God. These sayings were gathered together in a Book.

Men put this Book under their arms and set forth in little ships across a stormy sea, driven by a mighty conviction that as sons of God nobody could make slaves of them. Thus, landing upon an immortal rock they

consecrated this new land to the ideal of the greatness and sacredness of the human soul and spiritual worth of men.

Never before had a nation been established upon a religious and philosophical base. It was revolutionary; it was unique. There was a strange power in it all. In a century and a half, out of this fertile soil was proclaimed more wealth, more freedom, more human happiness than ever in the history of mankind.

An Irish patriot, John Philpot Kern, back in 1790 declared: "The condition under which God hath given liberty to man is eternal vigilance: which condition, if you break, servitude is at once the consequence of your crime and the punishment of your guilt."

It has come about that today freedom is imperiled and our traditions are in jeopardy.

The solution of America's problem is not in terms of big government, nor big labor, but it is in big men over whom nobody stands in control but God.

Because we have encountered some difficulties, some among us seem to have concluded that we should go back to Europe for types of governmental philosophy which have failed whenever tried. They look to Russia, for example, which has never produced any abundance or creative values worth speaking of, and say with eager impetuosity: "Ah, there is what we want for America."

Foolish men who would barter away the priceless heritage for a mess of pottage. This free society has demonstrated its value. Never in all the history of the world have there been research laboratories where such wonders have been wrought. Never anywhere have men developed the genius to create astounding marvels out of the earth, even out of the air around them.

Samuel B. Pettingill says: "Socialism, fascism, and communism would not have a chance to outlive this generation if they were not financed and subsidized at home and abroad from the earnings, ideas, and inventions of individual competitive enterprise."

In this land of wealth with only 6 percent of the world's land area, we have 35 percent of the world's railroads, 60 percent of the world's telephones, 66 percent of the world's wealth. Too many of us think negatively of the American system. Let us think positively about it and see it for what it is—the greatest system ever devised in the history of mankind, with all its faults, and this system grew out of the philosophy of freedom.

What is wrong with it that they wish thus to change it? Is it because of racial and discriminatory matters for which we must find improvement? Is it because there have been and are selfish men and injustices? Is it possible that they see no discrimination in communism, no cruelties of class, no selfishness?

It is curious and sad the way much of the intellectual climate of this country has changed. Once we roared like lions for liberty, now we bleat like sheep for security.

Fear is lack of faith.

From the very beginning Americans have recognized Almighty God as their Supreme Ruler. He towers above state. The American Republic is predicated upon the Divine Will and the principles of Jesus Christ.

Long ago William Penn said: "Unless we are governed by God, we will be governed by tyrants." Man must have a god. If he abandons the God of the Old Testament and the New Testament, there is only one god left—the superstate. Piteously, then, freemen will quail before the colossal power of the state, their freedom gone.

Let us resolve that our prayers and our service be given to the perpetuity of these sacred principles which make for human freedom and the well-being of mankind. Let us again pledge ourselves to preserving the American tradition.

From the Frying Pan Into the Fire

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in my comments over Station WHFB, covering southwest Michigan and northern Indiana, from Benton Harbor, I endeavored to show how Republicans jump from the frying pan into the fire. That talk was as follows:

Fellow Americans, through the courtesy of WHFB of Benton Harbor, Mich., it is again my privilege to give you an idea of what is happening to the people's economy drive as spearheaded by the junior chambers of commerce.

As said last week, when bills are introduced by Members of Congress, they are referred to the appropriate legislative committee.

If deemed worthy of consideration and acted on favorably by that committee, its chairman then presents the bill to the Rules Committee for consideration.

If the Rules Committee considers the bill has merit, the bill is reported to the House. Otherwise, it is pigeonholed for the session unless, and this is important, a majority of the House membership signs a petition to discharge the committee.

If a majority of the House desire to bring a bill to the floor, nothing can stop it.

For many years, the Rules Committee has been screening proposed legislation. The result? Many a bill, unworkable or calling for ruinous appropriations, has never reached the House floor nor would a majority of the Members, aware of the situation, sign a petition to bring the bill before the House. Bills calling for $9,000,000,000 are now being held by the Rules Committee.

Last year, Mr. Truman and his political advisers changed the rules so that if the Rules Committee fails for 21 days to report a bill, the chairman of any committee can bring it to the House floor, if the Speaker will recognize him.

By that amendment the chairman of a committee and the Speaker, instead of the Rules Committee, program legislation.

A coalition of conservative (some call them reactionary) Republicans and southern Democrats sought to restore the power of the Rules Committee.

Although 85 Democrats voted with us, we lost that fight because 64 Republicans voted with the Democratic leadership, which was fighting for Mr. Truman's program.

Some Republicans who voted with Mr. Truman's forces do not favor his socialistic program, but were fearful of retaliation by powerful pressure groups which favor parts of that program. In this case, the group backing FEPC, consideration of which they thought the Speaker would permit on Monday, frightened them.

Perhaps a few Republicans voted with the Truman forces because bills in which they were interested had not been favorably reported by the Rules Committee.

Other Republicans argued that the Rules Committee was altogether too dictatorial; was acting as a czar.

Unfortunately, the House just jumped out of the frying pan into the fire. This was demonstrated Monday when Speaker RAYBURN refused to permit the FEPC bill to come to the floor.

As the rules stand now, it is up to the Speaker on the second and fourth Mondays of each month and on Wednesday of each week, unless there is a two-thirds vote to the contrary, to recognize or refuse recognition to the chairman of a standing committee.

The Speaker and the majority leadership go all out for Mr. Truman's program. Some Democrats on the Rules Committee—and Democrats outnumber Republicans eight to four—are inclined to apply the brakes on the President's proposals for increased taxation, social legislation—vote with nonspending Republicans.

Republicans who turned down their leaders just traded the more favorable Rules Committee boss for a Speaker boss, who is a dyed-in-the-wool Truman supporter.

So far as the Republican Party is concerned, that defeat last week makes it more difficult, if not impossible, to stop or even slow up during this session of Congress the President's spending campaign, his drive for dictatorial power.

It may be that another attempt will be made to change the rules. If so, those of you—and especially the junior chambers of commerce, who have been doing such effective work—who favor the adoption of the Hoover Commission's recommendations, the defeat of socialized medicine and similar measures, ask your friends and neighbors to urge their Congressman to oppose appropriations for desirable but unnecessary projects—to oppose socialistic measures.

If the issue has not been made clear in this brief time, will endeavor to be more explicit if you write me.

So thanks and good luck until I hear from you.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks this date, I include the second and third articles in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont, of Spokane, Wash., on the Columbia River region, its past, present, and future:

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 23, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 2)

(By Leon Starmont)

The news wires are carrying and will carry articles on the "coordinated, comprehensive plan of development" for the Columbia River Basin. The State Columbia Basin Commission has approved this program and has sent emissaries to Washington to help the Northwest Congressmen in getting it over the hurdle of the Budget Bureau, the House and Senate. One Senate committee has already stamped it "O. K."

Just what is this plan, how did it start, and how did it get this far?

It is, briefly, a program for the orderly development of 405 new Columbia River projects, of which only 93 are marked for immediate authorization.

ADVOCATED IN 1926

A plan, like a river, has not one source but many. A rough outline of basin planning was delivered in Seattle in 1926. The occasion was the annual meeting of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League. The speaker was Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce in the Cabinet of President Calvin Coolidge.

Hoover, of course, had many advisers. As these articles explore the files of the Army engineers, Bureau of Reclamation, Federal Power Commission, and interested private groups, it may be possible to date the origin of the "comprehensive plan" much earlier than 1926.

The plan today, however, as related by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation, involves a grand total of 405 projects, large and small, single-purpose and multiple-purpose. Of these projects, 93 are recommended for authorization at this time, under the interdepartmental agreement signed on April 11, 1949.

TWENTY-FOUR INVOLVE IRRIGATION

Of these 93 projects, 24 involve irrigation, 16 power, 34 water storage, 71 flood control, and 24 will contribute to improvement of navigation.

The irrigation projects will water 217,386 acres of new land and provide supplemental water for another 90,390 acres.

The power projects will generate 5,337,600 kilowatts.

The storage dams will hold back 21,663,800 acre-feet.

Thirteen projects are those of the Bureau of Reclamation. The others will be handled by the Army's Corps of Engineers.

Only six of the projects are costly enough to be considered big in 1950. Figured at construction costs of last December, they are:

Priest Rapids	$326,124,000
John Day	279,826,000
The Dalles	286,286,000
Libby (Jennings)	239,077,000
Hells Canyon	333,986,000
Payette division	253,234,000

Three of these are down the Columbia from Grand Coulee Dam, where construction is just starting at Chief Joseph (Foster Creek), and McNary Dam (Umatilla Rapids) is already well along.

Libby Dam is projected at Jennings, Mont., on Kootenay River. Hells Canyon is up the Snake above Lewiston, Idaho. The Payette division of the Mountain Home project involves both Boise and Payette Rivers in southern Idaho.

THE OTHER 312

The 312 projects covered in the comprehensive plan but placed in the deferred list for authorization includes 234 for which cost data are available based on December estimates. They run to $4,960,681,000. Call it $5,000,000,000.

Of these projects, 196 involve irrigation, 152 power, 295 storage, 180 flood control, 34 navigation, 2 drainage, and 7 domestic water supplies.

In this deferred list is an item of $17,920,000 for addition of irrigation features to the Chief Joseph Power Dam, now being started 52 miles down the Columbia from Grand Coulee.

Deferment of this conversion has caused much concern among residents of northern-central Washington. Working hard for its acceptance are the chambers of commerce from Wenatchee up the river, the Greater Wenatchee irrigation district, and the Chief Joseph Irrigation League, formed last fall at Bridgeport.

Kirby Billingsley, former managing editor of the Wenatchee World, now a part-time employee of the Columbia Basin Commission, has long been working for inclusion of the irrigation feature. The commission sent him to Washington 2 weeks ago, with instructions to work for the comprehensive plan, including the basin account provision.

[From the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., January 24, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 3)

(By Leon Starmont)

Thomas B. Hill, assistant secretary of Washington State Development Association, has started a movement for publication, perhaps by the State Columbia Basin Commission, of an authentic history of the Big Bend project, later called the Columbia Basin project.

Such a history has been written. It is in the files of the University of Washington.

Its author is E. K. Vande Vere, chairman of the department of social science at Emmanuel Missionary College, Berrien Springs, Mich. The article was his thesis for a university degree. It is actually a history of irrigation in Washington.

SPOKANE-TO-COULEE DITCH, 1903

The idea of using Grand Coulee as a reservoir for Big Bend irrigation dates at least to 1903, according to chapter V of Vande Vere's work, entitled "The Columbia Basin Project." He credits it to T. A. Noble, a Seattle civil engineer employed in 1902 to make an investigation of what was then called the Palouse project, for the Reclamation Service.

In 1909, the manuscript continues, Joseph Jacobs, a former consulting engineer of the Reclamation Service, in contract with the Quincy Valley Water Users' association, inaugurated a preliminary survey for watering about 300,000 acres in Grant County from Lake Wenatchee, under an earlier plan suggested by David R. McGinnis, agricultural agent of the Great Northern Railroad in 1906. Its cost estimate: $12,000,000.

The Jacobs survey report, the next year considered several possible water sources, one of which was from a dam, power plant and pumping station near Priest Rapids, cost of which he figured at $75,000,000. It appears that Jacobs also had access to the earlier reports by T. A. Noble.

GRAND COULEE DAM, 1909

Because of some contradictory accounts recently in circulation, the following passage from the Vande Vere manuscript, with its inside quotation from Jacobs, is given verbatim:

"In a second plan, one that was destined to assume great importance and the credit of which was to be claimed by others at a later date, he 'considered the possibility of a lower pump lift by going to some point higher up on the river, as for instance at the head of Grand Coulee, and thence by gravity canal to the irrigable lands, but this proved too inordinately expensive.'

"His third and fourth plans he thought feasible. In these he considered two water sources, namely, the Pend Oreille River in Idaho, and Wenatchee Lake, but favored a canal heading at the lake, where the water level could be raised 150 feet by a storage dam. The cost of this construction was placed as high as $40,000,000."

The Jacobs report resulted in passage of the Quincy Valley Irrigation Act, which, subject to referendum, called for a $40,000,000 State bond issue. The voters rejected the bond issue in the fall election of 1914.

NOBLE AID STILL ON JOB

The annual reports of the United States Reclamation Service (now Bureau of Reclamation) for 1902 to 1905 carry references to several plans for irrigating the Big Bend, Coeur d'Alene, and Spokane Rivers, as well as Pend Oreille and Palouse Rivers, Lake Chelan, and Lake Wenatchee were studied and considered.

Singularly little attention was given to the Noble plan for use of Grand Coulee as a storage reservoir for a gravity canal.

His detailed draft is now in the office of the Bureau of Reclamation at Coulee Dam, Wash.

Also on the Bureau staff at Coulee Dam is a veteran engineer, C. B. Cox, who was chief assistant to Noble on the Spokane-to-Coulee ditch survey.

"It was all very hush-hush," Cox remarked. "Members of the party were not taken into the confidence of the chief. I gathered the impression that about 3,000,000 acres could be irrigated if the project became a reality but exactly where these acres were I had only a faint idea."

SAW REPORT AFTER 47 YEARS

Just why this survey was not mentioned in later reclamation reports, or in the Army's first "308" report, or in the preliminary discussions after the Columbia Basin project was revived in 1918, it is difficult now to determine. This reporter, who started following Columbia Basin developments in 1918 and writing about them in 1920, did not know of the existence of the Noble survey until early in 1950.

"Maybe," said a Bureau executive at Coulee Dam, "you just didn't ask the right questions then."

Neither did anybody else.

C. B. Cox himself had not seen the Noble report until a few weeks ago, nearly 47 years after the survey was made and the report written.

The actual map started at Lake Coeur d'Alene, and comprised 20 separate sheets, which would make a map 30 feet long. At Coulee Dam last week he made up a map on a smaller scale, part of which is reproduced on the Spokesman-Review's back page of pictures today.

The survey was 160 miles, following the left bank of the Spokane River from the Monroe Street bridge to old Fort Spokane, thence down the Columbia's left bank. Tunnels cut the ditch total to about 130 miles.

Tennessee Walking Horse

REMARKS

OF

HON. PAT SUTTON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted today to advise the House that the United States Department of Agriculture in a letter to me dated February 1, 1950, has recognized the Tennessee walking horse as a distinct and standard breed.

Since 1935 the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeder's Association has been diligent in their efforts to establish this specific breed, the greatest of all pleasure and plantation horses, recognized in Farmers' Bulletin No. 952. The people of the great Volunteer State of Tennessee and the numerous breeders of the Tennessee walking horse in America, will welcome this news as a recognition that is long overdue.

For the benefit of those who are not familiar with the history of the Tennessee walking horse, I am inserting the material which will go into the farmers' bulletin above-mentioned.

To the horse lovers of America the Tennessee walking horse will be recognized as a strain of horse blue blood. He is not only noted for his easy and cradle-like gait, but likewise his gentleness, poise, confirmation, and loving disposition. The sire of the walking horse belongs to Tennessee. The dam of the walking horse belongs to Tennessee. Tennessee has given this useful and beautiful horse its name and Colonel Tennessee is now happy to share his equine with his neighbors and horsemen throughout the world.

[Farmers' Bulletin No. 952]

The Tennessee walking horse originated and was developed within the middle basin of Tennessee. Allan F-1 (7623 A. T. R.) is designated the foundation sire of the breed, and has been recognized as such by the Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association of America. These horses trace their blood lines back to the thoroughbred, and the standard bred, and the Morgan, and the American saddle horse.

Melted in the crucible of time the breed today has become distinct and is an entity of its own. It undoubtedly came about through a crossing of the thoroughbred with the sturdy stock of saddle horses which the Virginians brought across the mountains in early pioneer days, and through an admixture with the pacer. To this was added the blood of Morgan and the saddle breed.

Thus, throughout a century and more of meticulous breeding, the Tennessee walking horse has emerged as a distinct breed. The Tennessee walking horse averages around 15½ hands in height and will weigh from 1,000 to 1,200 pounds. In color they are sorrel, chestnut, black, roan, white, bay, brown, gray, and sometimes yellow.

In general conformation the Tennessee walking horse has an intelligent and neat head, well-shaped and pointed ears, good big bright eyes, and tapered muzzle. They are short in the back, deep in the body, and well ribbed. Full in the flanks and of good proportion and width in chest. Their necks are long and graceful and are set on well-muscled shoulders that are sloping. They have flat cordy legs and feet of ample size. Their hides are thin, hair is soft and silky, and their bone is smooth, dense, and hard.

The Tennessee walking horse, like all other breeds, has been bred pure for a purpose. This purpose in the beginning and in the early days of the Volunteer State was for utility.

Today, however, they have won recognition on the bridle path and in the show arenas of all sections of the country.

The three gaits of the Tennessee walking horse are all natural gifts. They are called the flat-foot walk, the running walk, and the canter. The running walk has a smooth and gentle spring of limbs, and is where the Tennessee walking horse does his famous nod of the head as he goes along. He sometimes swings his ears and snaps his teeth while in this rhythmatic movement.

Tennessee walking horses are now stabled and are being bred in practically every State in the Union.

The Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association records purebred animals of this breed. Nine volumes of the stud book have been issued and more than 40,000 have been recorded. Miss Syd Houston, Tennessee Walking Horse Breeders' Association of America Building, Lewisburg, Tenn., is secretary of the association.

Investigation of Texas Medical Association

REMARKS

OF

HON. KEN REGAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. REGAN. Mr. Speaker, our country rightfully points with pride to being the healthiest nation in the world.

Our medical profession has been outstanding in research and untiring in its efforts through the recent decades in bringing about this condition, which has relieved our people of many former fatal and frequent outbreaks of smallpox, yellow fever, influenza, typhoid fever, and the many other epidemics that once decimated our people, until today we are enjoying longevity of three score years and ten that was a rare exception 50 years ago.

For the past few years, Mr. Speaker, our entire medical profession have been faced with the increasing clamor of those in our midst who, while being fortunate in sharing the freedom of our country and the many benefits and blessings that our citizenship is privileged to enjoy, are now seeking an ever-increasing service from our Government without giving anything in return, including the so-called socialized-medicine proposal that would regiment our entire medical profession.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by the El Paso Medical Society of El Paso, Tex., through its president and secretary, that the Texas Medical Association is undergoing some type of investigation by the FBI for alleged antitrust violations, and it is the apparent belief of many highly respected members of the medical profession that a political effort is being made to beat down opposition by the Nation's physicians to the so-called socialized-medicine proposals, to which I am thoroughly opposed as being against the welfare of our people, un-American, and a step toward the socialization of our country, which has become the greatest Nation in the world through its safeguards of freedom of our people, who in addition to their rights of freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and the many other protective provisions of individual rights, have the further freedom of selecting their own doctors, dentists, or specialists without Government interference or dictation.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, the FBI who have earned, and continue to merit the respect of our people, would not lend themselves or their fine reputation to a cheap political program such as many good members of the deservedly honored medical profession have some reason to suspect.

I wish to include with these few remarks the full text of a resolution recently furnished me to which I referred to above.

The resolution:

Whereas El Paso newspaper stories report that the Texas Medical Association is currently under investigation by the FBI for antitrust violations; and

Whereas more than 20 such investigations of National and State medical societies have occurred in recent weeks; and

Whereas these investigations are no coincidence but rather a political effort to beat down opposition by the Nation's physicians to socialized medicine; and

Whereas such tactics are strongly opposed by El Paso County Medical Society as un-Texan, and un-American, and tending dangerously toward totalitarianism and police-state methods: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That El Paso County Medical Society herewith protests the current investigation of the Texas Medical Association and so informs the elected Senators of Texas and the Representative of the Sixteenth Congressional District of Texas.

RALPH H. HOMAN, M. D.,
President.
JOE R. FLOYD, M. D.,
Secretary.

World Health Organization

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JOSEPH L. PFEIFER. Mr. Speaker, permit me at this time to speak in behalf of the World Health Organization, commonly known as WHO. It is a young organization. It has only existed since September 1, 1948. It began with 50 nations, now its membership consists of 64 nations. In its short period of existence it has already showed good results, and therefore certainly worthy of continuation and expansion.

The forward-looking aspect of its program is and has been in the field of technical assistance the value of which has been firmly established by the League of Nations.

The President, in his inaugural address, visualized the importance of small expanded programs, and recommended a supplementary operating program to extend the phase of the WHO to a point that it can meet the most urgent demands particularly in the underdeveloped areas.

The first WHO assembly took place in Geneva in 1948. The second was held in the Palazzo Venezia in Rome on June 13 and lasted until July 3, 1949. I had the pleasure of being there as a congressional adviser. I was very much elated of the sincerity and the great ability that our delegation exercised and the high respect that was shown to them by the many other organizations. Our delegation was looked upon as the best assembled. It was headed by Dr. Leonard A. Scheele, our surgeon general. Dr. H. van Zile Hyde also played an important part. In fact every member of the United States delegation is a well-known technical expert with great administrative experience. They were just wonderful; they worked in unison and earned the respect of all present. Mr. Speaker, permit me at this time to congratulate them on their splendid work.

The WHO has a broad program which is divided into short and long terms. It realizes the necessity of establishing effective relations and close collaboration with the United Nations and other existing governmental organizations. It also realizes the advantages from cooperating with the existing health facilities of the countries in which help is to be given.

It strives to develop in those areas that are deficient in their health personnel, educational facilities that would tend to make them more efficient. This WHO tends to create a feeling among nations, of betterment to their citizenry, by not only making them a more healthful nation but indirectly a more productive one. In doing this, let us not forget, that by helping them we indirectly help ourselves. One only has to learn of the large sums of money that are expended at present to prevent disease from entering our shores, and how much easier and cheaper it is to eradicate it at its source.

This holds true for many of the communicable diseases, whether the carrier be flies, mosquitoes, insects, vermin, person, or poor hygienic and sanitary conditions. Certainly, personal contacts should be more easily eradicated and finally eliminated, provided there is full international cooperation. Let us, for example, consider syphilis, its relationship to industry, production, loss of manpower and costs. Do you know that according to the Beerman report of 1940, the cost of syphilis in labor lost in industry — man-hours alone — approaches $100,000,000 yearly in the United States of America. Also the cost of national curative program in the United States was estimated at from twelve to twenty-five million dollars per year and the cost of blindness from syphilis at $10,000,000 per year.

Only by international teamwork operating under international health regulations for venereal disease together with the ILO can one expect some degree of success, and only through stringent international controls can one expect results that would cause a reduction in the number of and perhaps eliminate reservoirs of venereal infections.

One only has to look at the report of Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Surgeon General of the United States Army, and in his address in June 1949, in which he stated:

The primary mission of any public health and welfare program in an occupied country is to improve medical, sanitary, and social conditions.

This, I may say, holds true as well as for unoccupied countries. The general then goes on and tell us what can be done to improve civilian public health by means of an aggressive and cooperative program. Let me quote from his recent address:

An organization to handle the anticipated public health and welfare problems in Japan was formulated tentatively in Washington, D. C., even before the Japanese surrender. Japanese standards of public health and sanitation, although better than in many underdeveloped countries, were far below those of some of the more modern progressive nations. Smallpox had been on the increase since 1938 and the existing immunization law had not been enforced by the Japanese Government. In 1946 there were 17,800 cases of smallpox. During the following year, the entire 75,000,000 inhabitants were vaccinated or revaccinated, with the result that only 29 cases of smallpox occurred in 1948.

An outbreak of cholera in 1946, when there were 1,229 cases, was cleared up effectively through cholera immunization of about 34,000,000 persons and through use of stringent measures for isolation, quarantine, and disinfection in areas where the outbreaks occurred. At present there is no cholera in Japan.

An epidemic of typhus fever in the fall of 1945 resulting in a total of 31,141 cases by the spring of 1946, was broken after about 48,000,000 persons were dusted with DDT and over 8,000,000 were vaccinated. From a mean morbidity rate of 41 cases per 100,000 of population for 1946 and a peak of nearly 147 cases per 100,000 in April of that year, typhus fever had dropped to a mean of less than one case per 100,000 during 1948.

A large-scale diphtheria-immunization program for children has resulted in marked reduction in the incidence of diphtheria, also, with a decrease of 73 percent below the average for the 1938–45 period and a decrease of 83 percent in the present morbidity rate as compared with 1945.

To control and prevent outbreaks of dysentery, typhoid fever, malaria, and other diseases, Nation-wide health education and sanitation programs have been conducted. Over 9,000 sanitary teams of 6 men per team, or a total of 54,000 persons, were trained and equipped in the spring of 1946 for environmental sanitation programs including insect and rodent control, education of the people to make them sanitation conscious, and so forth. The control program has involved improvement of water supplies, installation or repair of sanitary facilities and sewerage systems, and education of Japanese health officials as well as the general public in the importance of control measures.

Tuberculosis has always been prevalent in Japan and the leading cause of death there since 1934. A broad tuberculosis prevention and control program inaugurated in October 1946, resulted in a reduction in the tuberculosis death rate from 280 per 100,000 of population in 1945 to 180 per 100,000 in 1948. Mass chest X-raying of small school children, factory workers, and others; tuberculin testing and the vaccination of over 23,000,000 persons with BCG; education of the medical and nursing professions in diagnosis, treatment and care; return of active tuberculosis cases to hospitals under a reorganized program as well as inauguration of a school-lunch program with a more adequate diet for children as a means of resistance to infection have been integral parts of the tuberculosis program.

I may say that similar work was carried on in other countries of the world, particularly as to the detection and the checking of tuberculosis, the antimalarial program in Italy and Greece, and the cholera program in Egypt. From the results already obtained one cannot help to realize the importance of WHO.

Since we are a part of this world's civilization, it becomes the duty of all of us to do all we can, personally and collectively as a Nation, to help our fellowmen, yes, human civilization. Let us not forget that in helping them we help ourselves.

The authorization calling for the continuance of the WHO is small enough in comparison to the work required to obtain the desired results. Let us not forget that this authorization is a part of House Joint Resolution 334. It should pass unanimously for it attempts to make the world a better place to live in.

Poultry Raising $48,000,000 Connecticut Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, several days of Connecticut Poultry Week are still before us, the celebration having been set for January 30 to February 5. Poultry raising throughout Connecticut, my district, is an important industry, annually aggregating $48,000,000. Emphasizing its importance to the people of the Constitution State and to its neighbors everywhere, an article in the Bridgeport Sunday Post of January 29 gives more detail regarding this celebration, the industry and the programs for the week. Under leave to extend my remarks, I ask that the newspaper article be reprinted here, but before that, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that my colleagues will recall the centennial of the American poultry industry stamp which was issued at New Haven, Conn., in September 1948 as a result of Public Law 621 which I had sponsored. That stamp commemorated the devoted efforts for 100 years of men and women, poultry raisers to an agricultural industry that annually approaches $4,000,000,000 in the United States. Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, I am told, the total sale of this outstanding stamp exceeded all but one of the commemorative stamps issued in 1948.

POULTRY RAISING $48,000,000 CONNECTICUT INDUSTRY—CHICKENS, EGGS MAJOR PRODUCTS OF STATE FARMS

The $48,000,000 Connecticut poultry industry will celebrate Connecticut Poultry Week January 30 to February 5. According to Arthur Guzman of Vernon, vice president of the State poultry association, "poultry week is an effort on the part of the industry to acquaint the people of Connecticut with the importance of poultry in our State economy and with the superior quality of poultry and eggs raised right here in Connecticut."

PRODUCERS FOR NEW YORK

More than $26,000,000 worth of eggs and $20,000,000 of chickens are marketed each year by Connecticut farmers. Though much of it is consumed within the State, Connecticut is the largest shipper of live poultry to the New York market. About 2,000,000 pounds of fowl, broilers, fryers, and pullets are shipped each month to New York and usually command better prices than poultry from other areas.

New London and Windham Counties are known as the eastern Connecticut broiler area. As many as 226,000 baby chicks are placed on farms each week in that area alone. Most of these will be marketed in about 13 weeks as broilers or fryers. The tremendous growth of this business has rehabilitated certain areas unsuited for other types of agriculture.

The increased production of chickens and eggs in Connecticut as well as in other parts of the country has resulted in overproduction and below cost of production prices on the farm. Connecticut farmers through Connecticut Poultry Week bring to the attention of housewives everywhere that both poultry and eggs are selling at the lowest prices since before the war.

POULTRYMEN MEET TUESDAY

Several hundred poultry farmers will attend the annual meeting of the Connecticut Poultry Association at the Hotel Bond, Hartford, on Tuesday, according to George Wells of New Milford, president.

The program, starting at 10 a. m., will feature talks on many of the pressing problems that confront the Connecticut poultryman today. Walter Berger, president, American Feed Manufacturers Association, Chicago, will speak on Where Do We Go From Here on Poultry Feed Price and Supply? Poultry-disease problems will be thoroughly aired by Dr. Nelson Waters, East Lansing, Mich., Dr. Erwin Jungherr, Storrs, and Dr. R. K. Cole of Cornell University. Other speakers will be professor W. C. Skogland, University of Delaware, Dr. H. R. Bird, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., and Homer I. Huntington, Poultry and Egg National Board, Chicago.

A banquet, featuring Connecticut fried chicken, will be held in the evening. Dr. Earl Butz of Purdue University, Lafayette, Ind., nationally known speaker, will have as his subject Prince or Pauper. The 25 voice Beethoven Glee Club of Manchester will provide entertainment.

Hidden Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. HARRY McGREGOR
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am glad to bring to the attention of the membership of the House an example of how unfair excise taxes are. In my opinion, many articles covered by these taxes cannot be considered luxuries. I shall continue to exert every effort to bring about a more equitable classification of excise taxes. Below you will find an illustration showing the effect of hidden excise taxes on the price the consumer pays for gas and electric ranges:

Without excise tax:	
Manufacturer's selling price (average)	$100.00
Retail price (40-percent mark-up)	166.66
With excise tax:	
Manufacturer's selling price	100.00
Excise tax (10 percent)	10.00
Dealer cost	110.00
Retail price (40 percent mark-up)	183.33
Consumer cost with excise	183.33
Consumer cost without excise	166.66
Extra cost to consumer	16.67

Thus on production: 150,000 units per year, the consumer public pays ($16.67 times 150,000) $2,500,500 more than necessary, out of which the Federal Government receives $1,500,000 in excise taxes which are collected at no charge.

When expanded to national production (2,000,000 gas ranges plus 1,500,000 electric ranges total 3,500,000 units) the consuming public pay $58,335,000 extra for these products and the Government collects $35,000,000 in taxes.

John L. Lewis

REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, the village of Cedar Springs, Mich., is about 20 miles north of Grand Rapids. A fine weekly newspaper is published in that community by two very able journalists, Miss Nina Babcock and Miss Grace Hamilton. Recently Miss Babcock wrote a letter, a public editorial if you please, to John L. Lewis, and with your permission I will read it to the Members of the House. The letter is as follows:

AS THE WORLD WAGS
CEDAR SPRINGS, MICH.,
January 24, 1950.

DEAR JOHN L.: I ran afoul of the law recently. I disobeyed a traffic ordinance. The cop caught me at it. He gave me a ticket and I paid a fine. I tried to argue a little. (You know how that goes.) But even for too much lip we little folks often pay heavily. It was evident I had no leg to stand on. There was a law, you know—made for the general welfare, as all laws are supposed to be—and I was an offender. I knew I was wrong, and anyone familiar with the incident knew I was wrong.

It didn't take more than 30 minutes for me to be showed up as a law evader, and as a person who selfishly thought my own interests were more important than the general welfare.

No politics was involved. I had no pull. I'm only a country editor, running a weekly newspaper. I don't control the vote of the some 9,000 people who read my paper. (Some borrow it, some steal it, but they all read it.) The big boys don't even know I exist. Harry doesn't know me, even though we are both native Missourians and were born and reared only a few miles apart in the "Show Me" State. He doesn't know my newspaper, the Cedar Springs Clipper, but I wish he read it every week.

I've been reared and schooled to know that the laws of this land are the laws by which I must live, and that the welfare of the whole people is paramount to my own selfish desires. My more than 13 generations of forefathers in this land believed that, and it has seeped into my blood.

Now, Mr. Lewis, I'm in a mental quandary. And I find that many of my neighbors are in the same mental state. I am scared about this country of ours. I'm scared when the votes of men are more important than the welfare of the land. I'm not too bright about politics, but it is plain that getting votes is controlling Washington and the men elected to look after the welfare of all of us. You probably know more about this than anyone else, but you might not want to divulge political secrets. I've found that it's pretty hard to get dependable statements from politicians.

Here I've rambled on and on, and haven't come to the matter I intended to talk to you about. We haven't any coal in our newspaper plant. We've been cold here since last Thursday. We had to close our office over the week end. You see, we tried to conserve the little coal we had so we could get The Clipper out this week. Our folk expect The Clipper every Thursday, and we have an obligation to our community. We've worked in a cold shop all week. If it weren't for our red flannels we'd be frozen now.

Here I am again off the track, talking about red flannels.

The question is: How can you jeopardize the welfare of so many people? How can you break laws without punishment? How long is this great United States going to give you a free rein to trample on us? How long are you going to be able to evade the Taft-Hartley law? When are we going to get coal?

When are you going to get your ticket?

NINA E. BABCOCK.

Is the Kremlin's Aim Conquest of the U. S. A.?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address given on the Town Meeting of the Air program, January 17, 1950:

Ten years ago some of us who had lived under the Japanese conquest in China tried to convince our Government and the American people that Japan's real aim was a program of conquest which required the defeat of the United States. We failed, and Pearl Harbor became inevitable. My concern now is that we not make again the same tragic mistake we made 10 years ago. For I am convinced by both the declarations of Communist leaders and the unmistakable pattern of their actions that the ultimate aim of the masters of the Kremlin is—yes, must be—conquest of the United States.

The methods they use are not those of the past—like Hitler's legions marching openly across a nation's border. Their more clever and successful techniques seek to weaken a nation until their agents and followers can seize control from within. That, of course, is conquest.

Moreover, the Kremlin is already well on its way toward achieving this goal. It has gained control of half the land and one-third of the people of the world and their program is steam-rolling in high gear.

What would you do if you were a member of the Politburo, without moral principles, without conscience, without scruples, and embarked on a great program of expansion? Wouldn't you have to make your aim destruction of the one thing standing between you and complete victory—the free government of the United States of America?

How would you go about achieving that aim? Surely the same way the Kremlin has. You would try to soften up and isolate the United States by undermining its friends and shaking their confidence in its Government, cutting off our trade, and forcing us either, as Lenin put it, to spend ourselves into bankruptcy to help our allies stay free; or to let them be taken over, one by one, by this new type of aggression, internal conspiracy, and we thus be left standing alone. That is precisely the pattern the Soviets have followed.

When after the war they tried directly to get control of all of Germany and then western Europe, we were intelligent and forceful enough to prevent it. When they moved against the Middle East, Greece and the Mediterranean, we were vigilant enough to recognize that as a skillful attempt to turn the flank of our roadblock in Germany, and we stopped that move also.

But our State Department has not been alert enough to recognize Communist aggression in China and Asia as merely a wider flanking attack—aimed ultimately at Europe and then at ourselves.

The Chinese understood and resisted. But now, abandoned by us, free China is on the ropes. As a result the Communists feel strong enough to seize American consular property in Peking in order to eliminate all American and pro-western influence in China and completely pull the iron curtain down.

What reason is there to believe the Kremlin's next steps into southeast Asia will falter or fail? If deprived of access to the resources and markets of Asia, how can Europe recover? Where would that leave the United States?

Yes, the pattern of Soviet expansion in our direction is clear; the pronouncements of their leaders are equally clear.

A recent example is the message which Mao Tse-tung, head of the Chinese Communist regime, broadcast last October to Chairman William Z. Foster and other Communist officials in the United States. We have been led by the State Department and by pro-Communist propagandists in this country to believe that Communist aggression in China is merely a struggle to overthrow the allegedly feudalistic, landlord,

warlord government of China. But the Communists know better. Mr. Mao didn't even bother to mention Chiang Kai-shek. Rather, he said, "It is the present imperialistic government of the United States which * * * has met with decisive defeat."

How can conquest of China mean decisive defeat for us? Because it produces a drastic shift in the balance of power in the world—for the Soviets and against us.

For there are four main factors which determine power: Territory, resources, manpower, productive capacity.

If Asia falls under Communist control, the Kremlin will have gained preponderance in territory, resources, and manpower. The Russians have demonstrated by constructing the atomic bomb that they can gradually overtake us where we now lead—technical skills. But how can we ever overtake them where they will lead—in territory, resources, and manpower? Time is not on our side.

Yet, our Government still plays the diplomatic game of striped pants. We don't act—we just react. We are reduced to hoping that the Kremlin will make enough blunders in China and elsewhere to save us from our own blunders. That is too risky a policy—or no policy.

Unless there is a change of policy promptly, all Asia will be lost. Then the Middle East and Europe will be in mortal peril. Then we will have world war III—or lose the United States, or both.

Actually all this can still be prevented and we certainly need not have a shooting war, if only we will stir from our slumbers in time. We are in danger only if we fail, one, to understand the nature and the objectives of the enemy we face; and, two, to mobilize quickly and fully all the forces of freedom everywhere.

Fair Trade in Foreign Trade

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am pleased to include a most comprehensive letter from Mr. H. V. Simpson, executive vice president of the West Coast Lumbermen's Association.

As the chaos of recovery continues, it is well for us seriously to study the problems of our great industries. We want competition in commerce—domestic and world. We cannot have it if, by sins of omission or commission, we grant special concessions to anyone in any way.

WEST COAST LUMBERMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Portland, Oreg., January 25, 1950.

The Honorable WALT HORAN,
House of Representatives,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HORAN: The largest industry in western Washington and western Oregon is the forest products industry. The value of forest products from this area greatly exceeds that of any other industry and exceeds the value of the products of agriculture. In a large measure the economic welfare of the region depends on the welfare of its forest industries. Forest products provide the largest pay rolls, by far the largest inflow of money from other sections of the United States, the principal cargo for both rail and ocean carriers, and the principal source of taxation.

The welfare of the forest products industries should be the concern of every resident of the area. It directly or indirectly affects the lives of all who are residents of the territory and serious difficulty affecting the industry will seriously affect all those who reside in the territory.

The largest and most important segment of the forest products industry is lumber. This association represents the majority of the lumber production in this territory in many activities. It is one of the responsibilities of this association to represent the industry in foreign trade, both imports and exports.

We are presently concerned with the increasing volume of imports of lumber from western British Columbia, Canada. Lumber produced in that region is of the same species as that produced in western Oregon and western Washington, manufactured in similar plants under similar conditions. The one major difference is in the wage scale. The base wage (minimum) in Oregon and western Washington is $1.45 per hour. In western British Columbia the base wage is $1.07½ per hour. The American labor cost of lumber production is therefore about 35 percent greater than is the Canadian labor cost. In nearly all markets British Columbia lumber is in direct competition with Oregon and Washington lumber. On the basis of wage costs alone most Canadian mills can undersell most American mills and have frequently done so.

Last summer the Canadian Government fixed the exchange rate on the Canadian dollar at 90 cents. One Canadian dollar is now worth 90 cents in American money. To the lumber industry this means that Canadian sawmills can sell their product in the United States, or any other world market where American dollars are available, at the current market price in American dollars and receive a net return at the mill 10 percent greater than can an American mill selling at the same market price. As an example, when common lumber is selling in New York for $60 (freight charges eliminated) the Canadian receives $60 (American) plus 10 percent or $66 (Canadian) net to the mill. Competing American mills receive $60 only.

Large quantities of western British Columbia's lumber are shipped by water from their ports to American Atlantic coast ports, Boston, New York, Philadelphia, and others. Largely such shipments are made on tramp steamers of various foreign nationalities. Under the provisions of the Transportation Act of 1920 and amendments thereto shipments of lumber from Oregon and Washington ports to other American ports must be made in ships of American registry. Costs of operations of American ships are substantially higher than costs of operation of any foreign ships, principally due to the much higher wages paid by American shipowners. Freight rates on American ships are therefore nearly always higher than those applying on foreign ships. In recent months the rates on lumber on tramp steamers from British Columbia to the United States Atlantic coast have been $4 to $8 per thousand feet less than rates available from American ports to the same destinations. These freight savings accrue to the advantage of sawmills in British Columbia, giving them that much additional competitive advantage in that market.

Freight on shipments of lumber by rail and by water from Oregon and Washington to any point within the United States are subject to the 3-percent transportation tax. Lumber shipments from Canada are not subject to this tax. Under the terms of the Smoot-Hawley tariff of 1932 most lumber imports into the United States were subject to a $3 per thousand excise tax and a $1 per thousand duty. At the same time, under the Ottawa agreements most American lumber exports to the United Kingdom were subject to a 10-percent ad valorem duty, which duty did not apply on shipments into the United Kingdom from Canada. Other parts of the British Empire had varying duties on American lumber which likewise did not apply on Canadian shipments. Under provisions of the reciprocal trade treaties the duty and excise tax applicable to lumber imports into the United States have twice been reduced until it is now 75 cents per thousand excise tax and 25 cents per thousand duty.

At the same time reductions were made in the various duties on American lumber into the British Empire until under today's conditions, duties are not an influencing factor in much of our export business. And certainly the remaining duty and tax of $1 on Canadian imports is so small that its influence is negligible in view of the other substantial advantages enjoyed by British Columbia shippers. At the present time the American duty and excise tax gives not the slightest effective protection to American producers.

Fortunately, the American lumber market has recently been good. The effects of the Canadian advantage have not yet been fully felt. But no one in the industry doubts that the danger is present and the effects will eventually be sharply felt. At the first slackening of demand British Columbia shippers will drop prices until they can secure whatever business they need. Their total production will remain high even if it means that Oregon and Washington production will decline.

As an example in 1948 the lumber market was erratic. Oregon and Washington mills were just able to hold their shipments to the 1947 level; actually, three one-hundredths of 1 percent increase. During that year imports from western British Columbia into the United States increased 355,503,000 board measure or 255 percent. This 355,503,000 feet was valued at about $16,000,000 which was business lost to the American mills with $8,000,000 in direct pay rolls lost to American labor.

We now have another example of the Canadian mills' ability to underquote. Britain's purchase of lumber just completed went eighty-two million to British Columbia, five million to Oregon and Washington. British Columbia mills underquoted American mills on 95 percent of the business. Yet because of Canada's discounted dollar British Columbia mills will receive more in Canadian dollars per thousand feet board measure net than the American mills quoted in American dollars. This purchase was made with American dollars supplied by ECA. American mills got $200,000 in business of which American labor will get $100,000. Canadian mills got $3,800,000 of which Canadian labor will get $1,900,000.

Canadian mills, taking advantage of ocean freight savings, savings on transportation tax and their discounted dollar have sharply increased their shipments by water to the United States Atlantic Coast. Since the war the record is as follows:

Lumber shipment by water to United States Atlantic coast ports [1]

Year	From Oregon-Washington	From British Columbia
1945	16,673,759	
1946	317,261,046	
1947	478,274,306	
1948	552,724,033	96,071,921
1949—January	53,033,956	12,897,383
February	52,148,548	9,638,962
March	105,457,895	17,222,257
April	91,516,750	23,815,149
May	73,018,892	13,708,766
June	98,826,719	9,821,229
July	64,220,723	6,746,534
August	89,939,511	16,026,514
September	99,019,663	26,438,374
October	89,258,565	41,000,201
November	99,610,720	58,234,161
December (estimated)	105,328,887	67,925,929
Total 1949	1,021,381,829	303,525,459

[1] As compiled by the Pacific Lumber Inspection Bureau, Seattle, Wash.

It is our opinion that the United States Atlantic coast market will not continue to use the quantity of lumber currently moving and that British Columbia shippers will at the first drop in demand make every effort to hold their volume at the expense of the American mills. They will ship it on foreign ships at the expense of the American merchant marine.

Under present coditions British Columbia mills can drop their delivered price to the Atlantic coast about $10.60 per thousand and still net the same f. o. b. mill price in Canadian dollars that American mills are today netting in American dollars; that is, for example:

Freight savings	$6.00
Transportation tax	.60
Exchange	5.00
	11.60
Less duty	1.00
Total	10.60

American mills would have to drop their f. o. b. mill prices a disastrous $10.60 in order to compete. And Canadian mills, with their substantially lower wage costs, can in addition reduce f. o. b. prices to a level which would ruin the Oregon-Washington lumber industry.

In 1949 British Columbia mills received approximately US$14,000,000 on shipments to the Atlantic coast of which $7,000,000 went for direct labor. This is business lost to American mills and wages lost to American workmen. In addition approximately $2,500,000 was lost to American ship owners for freight of which $1,075,000 was for labor. This was business lost to American shipping and wages lost to American maritime workers.

We know nothing we can do as an industry about the Canadian wage rate. We doubt also that the Congress can do anything about it. We know of nothing we can do as an industry about the discount on the Canadian dollar and possibly the Congress is also unable to directly do anything about it. We know of nothing we can do as an industry about the transportation tax, the American duties, or the freight differentials. The Congress can take action on these.

These problems have been given much thought by members of our industry. Our concern over them is great. On our many discussions these suggestions have been made.

A limiting quota might be put on lumber imports into the United States of America. An equalizing tax on ocean freight might be placed on imports of lumber. Duties might be increased. Restrictive antidumping laws might be passed. FHA might require that all lumber used in FHA-financed houses be made in the United States. ECA lumber purchases might be restricted to American production. And certainly the transportation tax can be removed.

The lumber industry has so far as possible attempted to solve its own problems. These present difficulties seem however beyond our range of influence. Yet they are certain to endanger the well-being of our industry and with it the well-being of our labor and our communities. We therefore feel we should tell you of our great concern and ask for your suggestions as to possible remedies. We will gladly supply any additional information that may be required and the writer will if advisable proceed to Washington for a full discussion of the problem.

A similar letter is being written to each Member of Congress from Oregon and Washington.

Yours truly,

H. V. SIMPSON,
Executive Vice President.

Georgia Legislature Repudiates Resolution of 1946 Approving Principles of World Federation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it is a significant fact that the legislature in Georgia revoked and repudiated the action it took in 1946 approving the principles of world federation. This should be notice to all Members of this House to scrutinize the purposes behind Resolution 64 and others now pending.

Mr. Speaker, all the great patriotic organizations have spoken out against this resolution, and as part of my remarks, I am including a letter from the national society, Daughters of the American Revolution, on the subject of the resolution in question. It is opposed absolutely to any action by the Congress which might involve the United States in a world government.

Also, as part of my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I am including a copy of the resolution adopted by the Georgia Legislature:

NATIONAL SOCIETY, DAUGHTERS
OF THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION,
NATIONAL DEFENSE COMMITTEE,
Washington, D. C., January 28, 1950.

HONORABLE MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The action of the legislature of the great State of Georgia in rescinding its 1946 resolution favoring world government is indicative of the will of the people to follow the advice of our first great President, George Washington.

Entanglements proposed by any and all world government advocates will subordinate the sovereignty of the United States and will pull it down to the lowest common denominator of small nations who for ages have hated one another and who are not yet quite ready for a one world government.

Patriotically yours,

ESTELLA A. O'BYRNE,
President General, NSDAR.
LOLA LEE BRUINGTON,
Secretary, Defense Committee.

GEORGIA RESOLUTION

Whereas the General Assembly of Georgia passed a resolution at the 1946 session of the general assembly approving the principles of world federation; and

Whereas due to changing conditions it is best that Georgia be not considered as one of the 22 States seeking world government; and

Whereas the principles announced in the declaration of the federation of the world as set out in said 1946 resolution are not approved by the general assembly; and

Whereas a copy of said 1946 resolution was sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Georgia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That said resolution of 1946 be now repudiated and that the General Assembly of Georgia go on record as opposing the principles of world federation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Passed in Atlanta, Ga., January 1950: Georgia House of Representatives, unanimously; Georgia Senate, 34 to 8.

The Brooklyn Eagle on Mr. Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Brooklyn Eagle of Monday, January 30:

UNWISE TO DISCREDIT ACHESON FOR INDISCRETION ON HISS

The Republican Party has apparently found in the policies and the somewhat unfortunate utterances of Secretary of State Acheson acceptable material for political capital. Before they go far with their obvious purpose of trying to discredit Mr. Acheson in the eyes of the American people they should give thoughtful consideration to the political consequences of their attack, and also to its international implications. It is conceivable that the reaction in both instances may be harmful.

Regardless of the violence with which he is being assailed by Republicans in Congress, and the strange reluctance of Democrats to come to his defense, Secretary Acheson's policies with respect to China and Spain reflect practical wisdom and courage. It is significant that informed opinion generally is coming to recognize both the futility and the danger of our deepened involvement in the lost cause of the Chinese Nationalists. They have shown themselves through the years as unworthy of the confidence of their own people and of help from outside. The administration's willingness to restore diplomatic relations with Franco's Spain is a retreat from a policy which, Mr. Acheson frankly concedes, has failed. Nothing is to be gained and advantages may be lost by continuing it.

Unquestionably, Mr. Acheson has played into the hands of his political enemies by reiterating his support of Alger Hiss, the former official of the State Department who is under a sentence of 5 years for perjury. Although there is reason to admire his loyalty to a friend, his discretion must be questioned for taking a position which implicitly expresses lack of confidence in the Government which prosecuted Hiss and the court and jury which passed judgment upon him. There is good reason to criticize Mr. Acheson's utterance but not to make it a political issue.

The loyalty of Mr. Acheson is not open to question. His conduct of foreign relations and his general administration of his office have been marked consistently by sound judgment and fine ability. Yet Republicans in Congress are raising a cry for his resignation.

A logical consequence of this aggressive movement against Secretary of State Acheson is a partisan assault upon the administration's foreign policy. This possibility is cause for deep concern among the American people. It might well be the beginning of a national disunity which would give infinite comfort to the Kremlin and to Communists at home.

The Legislative Program of the Democratic Party in the New York State Legislature for 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDNA F. KELLY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished Democratic leaders of the New York State Legislature, the Honorable Irwin Steingut, of the assembly, and the Honorable Elmer F. Quinn, of the senate, on January 29, 1950, announced a most carefully thought out legislative program for the great Empire State. Because of its intelligent and enlightened approach to such pressing problems of government as civil rights, housing, rent control, education, agriculture, and other all-important subjects, I believe this statement to be worthy of the careful consideration of my colleagues in the House. I unhesitatingly commend it to you.

The text of the article follows:

THE LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY IN THE NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE FOR 1950

Following weeks of intensive study of recommendations made at the legislative hearings sponsored by the Democratic Party in December in New York City, Senator Elmer F. Quinn and Assemblyman Irwin Steingut, Democratic legislative leaders, announced today the party's full 1950 program.

Much of the program has already been implemented by legislation, including the proposal for a $200,000,000 bond issue for State aid for school construction. The remainder will be submitted to the legislature in the next few days.

"This is one of the most carefully thought out programs ever submitted to the legislature of this State for consideration. It is the fruit of considerable research, effort, and study on the part of hundreds of our citizens," the two legislative leaders declared.

"Paul E. Fitzpatrick, the State chairman, deserves the particular gratitude of all citizens of this State for initiating the nonpartisan public legislative hearings in December. More than 100 organizations representing the major social forces within our State proposed more than 1,000 recommendations at these hearings.

"The program that we are submitting to this legislature is the culmination of the recommendations made at these hearings. It expresses the wishes of the people of this State and should have the most careful consideration of this legislature."

The program includes recommendations on many matters of concern to the people, including problems of the aged, agriculture, child welfare, civil rights, education, hospitals, health, housing, labor, legislative reform, mental health, protection of small investors, rent control, social welfare, and veterans.

The program, in full, follows:

AGRICULTURE

We favor:

1. Endorsement and encouragement of cooperative associations among farmers.

2. An immediate report on the progress of the investigation of the milk price spread sponsored by the New York State Temporary Commission on Agriculture.

3. A more adequate milk weighing and butterfat testing program for dairymen. We suggest that activities with regard to weighing and testing in markets with Federal and State orders be delegated to the administrators of these orders, and that the State staff be used among producers not covered by minimum price orders.

4. The relaxation of agriculture and market law B258 relative to restricting the licensing of new milk enterprises.

5. Extension of the principles of the minimum price orders to include producers in upstate markets.

6. Immediate reestablishment of a full-scale agricultural and industrial fair at Syracuse.

7. Completion of rural electrification undertaken by the Federal Government under Democratic administration.

8. Increased State aid to rural schools.

9. Increased State aid for health and hospitalization in agricultural counties.

CIVIL RIGHTS

We favor:

1. Prohibition or forfeiture of any benefits to private housing developments with restrictions of occupancy because of race, color, or creed.

2. The outlawing of restrictive covenants on real estate.

3. A genuine end of segregation in the National Guard.

4. Outlawing of wire-tapping and the use of evidence obtained thereby except in cases affecting the national security, kidnapping, and murder.

5. Repeal of blue-ribbon juries in New York City.

6. State-wide personal registration.

CIVIL SERVICE

We favor:

1. Legislation to implement the veterans' preference system required by constitutional amendment in November 1949.

2. Revision upwards of salary standardization schedules and elimination of inequities in job classifications.

3. Establishment of sound grievance machinery for complaints by civil-service employees.

4. An investigation of working conditions of State employees.

5. Permissive retirement at age 55, with the employee and State sharing the cost of a pension.

6. Legislative investigation of working conditions and executive abuses of the State troopers.

7. Revision of the present 24-hour-per-day duty schedule of the division of State police to one which will allow members of the division to enjoy a reasonable home life.

8. Repeal of the Condon-Wadlin Act.

CONSERVATION AND PUBLIC UTILITIES

We favor:

1. A sound conservation program for all natural resources, including (1) flood control; (2) the improvement of the State's fish and game practices under a competent and active sportsmen's commission; and (3) reestablishment of the purchase of submarginal lands by the State, the removal of these lands from agriculture, and their development as State forests, parks, and game preserves.

2. Preservation of public ownership and control of water-power facilities of the State.

3. A legislative commission to make a thorough study of our water resources.

4. Regulation of utility companies to guarantee that consumers as a matter of right receive lowest prevailing rates. This should include the adoption of uniform accounting procedures by public-utility corporations and publication of rate schedules so that consumers are aware of cheapest rates.

5. Proper regulation of submetering companies.

6. Completion of rural electrification undertaken by the Federal Government under Democratic administration (also agriculture).

7. Protection of the Adirondack Preserve and opposition to any encroachment upon the forest preserve lands.

EDUCATION

We favor:

1. A $200,000,000 bond issue for school construction.

2. Elimination of the superior-merit rating provisions of the Feinberg teachers' salary law.

3. Broader benefits for all pensioned teachers to correspond with the retirement benefits enjoyed by employees of the city of New York under the New York City retirement law.

4. A permanent program of nonprofit school lunches.

5. State aid to public libraries.

6. Immediate appropriation for building of medical, dental, and nursing centers as part of a State university.

7. Community colleges to be paid for and initiated by the State.

8. Provisions that any increase in educational costs be borne by the State.

FOREIGN LANGUAGE

The Democratic State Committee, striving to serve the best interests of all citizens of this great State irrespective of their origin, color, race, or religion, recognizes fully the great contributions made by Americans of foreign descent in public affairs.

The growth and welfare of New York's citizens of foreign descent has always been of vital concern to the Democratic legislators of this State.

The Democratic Party of the State of New York urges upon the Congress a broadening of the present Displaced Persons Act.

HEALTH

We favor:

1. Establishment of a State hosiptal commission to exercise general supervision over both public and private hospitals.

2. Increased State aid for voluntary hospitals.

3. Immediate construction of mental hospitals to relieve overcrowding, and the setting up of clinics in urban areas for psychiatric examination and preventative treatment.

4. A State-rehabilitation program for alcoholics, including medical and psychiatric care, education and employment counsel and assistance.

5. A State program for drug and sex offenders, to include adequate facilities for examination, treatment, and rehabilitation.

6. Adequate care of cerebral palsy victims.

7. Construction of adequate facilities and the employment of qualified personnel to care for mental defectives under the age of 5 years.

8. We favor a State-wide health plan providing full medical care for all residents of the State on a cooperative basis among physicians, working people, farmers, and professional people.

HOUSING

We favor:

1. Implementing legislation to provide maximum benefits under the National Housing Act of 1949 in this State.

2. Stimulation of home building by private enterprise, giving the State as well as municipalities authorization to make loans to corporations regulated by law as to rent and profits.

3. Approval of a policy of providing for State loans to municipal housing authorities for construction of housing projects without cash subsidies for those families whose incomes are too high to render them eligible for cash subsidized public housing and too low to permit them to rent those private units which may be available at today's costs.

4. Deduction of veterans' and war widows' benefits from income computations in those housing projects limited to persons of a particular income group.

5. Prohibition of discrimination in any housing development projects which profit from tax exemption, condemnation of land, or other public assistance.

LABOR

We favor:

1. A State-wide minimum wage of $1 per hour.

2. Increase of workmen's compensation benefits: The injured employee to get 75 percent of pay, but no more than $40 a week; increased widow and survivor benefits.

3. Extension of unemployment-insurance coverage to employees and firms with one to four employees.

4. Provision of $3 per week for each dependent person and the increase of weekly unemployment-insurance benefits from the present minimum to $15, and from the present maximum to $30.

5. Enactment of legislation to repeal the so-called merit rating of employers and to prevent the raiding of the unemployment-insurance fund in order to assure its solvency and to assure payment of benefits to workers.

6. Immediate establishment of a system of genuine sickness-disability insurance for persons forced into unemployment through temporary illness. The present law is unworkable and unfair. An adequate and fair law should be under the administration of the Division of Placement and Unemployment Insurance, and not under the Workmen's Compensation Board, as provided by the present Mailler-Condon law. An adequate law should provide protection for a period of 26 weeks. An adequate law should be without discrimination. The present law discriminates against Negroes, against certain minority groups, against women, against the aged, and against those workers who, by nature of their jobs—for example, stevedores—are rarely employed by the same employer for four consecutive weeks. Furthermore, while under the present law the worker bears virtually all of the cost of the plan, he has no voice in its administration.

7. Encouragement of collective bargaining. We are opposed to any crippling amendments to the State Labor Relations Act or to any other legislation which will otherwise restrict or impair the right of collective bargaining.

8. Memorializing the Congress to repeal the Taft-Hartley law. We oppose any similar law in this State.

LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

We favor:

1. Creation of a "little Hoover commission" to study the relationship of Federal and State Governments, the relationship of the State and its political subdivisions, with a view to eliminating inefficiency, waste, and overlapping bureaus.

2. A split session of the legislature providing: (1) A 5- or 6-week period for introduction of bills; (2) a month for committee and public hearings and action; and (3) a month for debate and disposition by the senate and assembly.

MUNICIPALITIES

We favor:

1. Prohibiting the State from mandating expenditures upon cities and villages unless the State provides definite means of obtaining revenue to carry out the mandated projects.

2. Elimination of local and State laws requiring counties to reimburse towns for delinquent town taxes.

3. Amendment of State highway law revising the arterial highway formula to provide for payment by the State of a fair share of expenses of maintenance and snow removal.

4. Reimbursement by the State of certain administrative expenses such as rental of quarters, salaries of maintenance workers, postage, which are not now reimbursable by the State.

RENT CONTROL

We favor:

1. A comprehensive State-wide rent-control law to become effective immediately upon the expiration of Federal rent control, and the granting of permission to municipalities to enact local rent-control laws to supplement State law in areas where protection provided thereby is inadequate to extend to June 30, 1951.

2. Amendment of the present State rent-control law to provide protection of non-transients in hotels, apartment hotels, cooperatives, and other accommodations.

3. Amendment of the Civil Practice Act to make State-wide the provisions relating to stays of eviction in summary proceedings and extending such stays to 12 months.

4. Prohibition of excessive and unreasonable deposits and tie-in sales by landlords.

5. Extension of the commercial rent-control law for 1 year.

6. Amendment of the commercial rent-control law to include protection of persons who store automobiles in garages.

WELFARE

We favor:

1. Payment by the State to localities of 80 percent of expenses of indigent sick. At present, the State reimburses cities up to 80 percent of the amount cities pay to persons on relief; the State should pay 80 percent of its share for the indigent sick as it does for the indigent who are well.

2. Reimbursements by the State to the communities of certain welfare administrative expenses such as rental of quarters, salaries of maintenance workers, postage, which are not now reimbursable by the State.

(See child welfare and old age.)

CHILD WELFARE

We favor:

1. Adequate day care centers for children of working mothers.

2. Proper supervision of foster homes for permanent placement of dependent children.

3. Placement of children needing psychiatric care under the jurisdiction of the children's court.

4. Extension of the State youth commission.

5. Provision for adequate facilities to be provided by the State for diversified treatment of juvenile delinquents rather than mere custodial treatment. This should include: (1) A youth court to deal with 16-21 year old offenders; (2) specialized institutions for youthful offenders; and (3) establishment of a youth correction authority.

OLD AGE

We favor:

1. A permanent State commission on aged persons to study and to provide a complete program to combat the problems of the aging.

2. A counseling service division for the aged in the State employment service.

3. A State adult recreation council.

4. An adult hygiene and geriatric division in the State department of health.

5. Increased social-security benefits and widened coverage.

6. Proper incentive to employers and employees to work out old-age pension plans.

7. Reimbursement by the State to private individuals for taking care of aged in boarding homes rather than in county institutions.

8. Establishing the right of a welfare district to erect or supply, or establish homes for the aged who are able to pay a part or all of their maintenance without requiring residents of such homes to turn over all their possessions to the welfare district.

VETERANS

We favor:

1. Streamlining of the New York State Division of Veterans' Affairs by eliminating those efforts which duplicate the services of other State and Federal agencies; placing the division under the State department of education, and assuring the veterans of the best available professional service by putting the division's personnel under competitive civil service.

2. Enactment of legislation specifically granting to students enrolled at colleges or universities within the State, whose intention is that the State is their place of permanent abode, to vote at the seat of their college or university (extending court of appeals decision in Shanks Village case).

3. Provision of supplemental subsistence grants to veterans receiving Federal benefits under the GI bill of rights to equalize higher cost of living in New York as compared with the national average.

4. Extension of the State Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act for at least another year.

VEHICLE AND TRAFFIC

We favor compulsory inspection of automobiles every 6 months.

PROTECTION OF THE INVESTOR

We favor repeal of the Coudert-Mitchell law which imposes burdensome restrictions on small stockholders who seek to bring large corporations to account for their actions.

Relief of Americans Who Voted in Italy

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. ROONEY. Mr. Speaker, there is no more needed or more humane legislation than H. R. 6616, the bill introduced by my good friend and colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. WALTER] which provides for the expeditious naturalization of former citizens of the United States who have lost their American citizenship through voting in a political election or in a plebiscite held in Italy.

The Committee on the Judiciary has filed a very comprehensive report on this excellent measure and I want to congratulate them upon their painstaking and diligent work. As we all know, this bill was introduced after a thorough study and investigation of the situation by a special subcommittee of the Committee on the Judiciary which visited Italy last fall. The subcommittee subsequently submitted a report based on their investigation. It is simple justice to provide relief for American citizens who have lost their citizenship through voting in Italian elections or in a plebiscite held in Italy in 1946 and in 1948.

I am sure that most of us recall the Italian election held on April 18, 1948, in which the Italian people had to make a decision which could either tilt the scales toward democracy or totalitarianism in western Europe. People in the United States and throughout the free countries of the world for some time had been much concerned about the outcome of this election. There was much anxiety about it as communism was riding high in Italy. Soviet Russia was giving substantial support to her anti-Christian Communist agents through a skillful and unscrupulous propaganda campaign in an effort to bring the Italian people behind the iron curtain. Thank God,

the election was overwhelmingly in favor of a democratic government and the United States was one of the dominant forces in arresting the Communist tide. During the course of the campaign prior to the election of April 18, American citizens of Italian origin were induced to join a letter-writing campaign to their relatives and friends in Italy urging them to vote in favor of our American way of life as opposed to communism and the police state. I have a large number of citizens in my congressional district of Italian origin, all of whom are patriotic, law-abiding Americans. Thousands of them corresponded with their relatives and friends in Italy urging them to vote to put a stop to the Italian Communist campaign of chaos and terror. It is estimated that somewhere between 3,000 and 4,000 American citizens in Italy at that time voted in the Italian election through inducement and persuasion of their relatives and friends in the United States. Under the circumstances, when they went to the polls and voted they never for a moment realized that their vote against communism would result in the loss of their American citizenship.

These former American citizens are surely deserving of some measure of reward for the courageous stand they took in behalf of freedom and independence. In many instances, their anti-Communist vote has resulted in great personal hardship. Parents have become separated from their children. Many married couples have been broken up by virtue of the fact that one of them voted anti-Communist while visiting or temporarily residing in Italy.

The fact that these folks have been denied the privilege of returning to their United States, which in the majority of cases is their native country, has encouraged the Communist elements in Italy to take particular pains in publicizing the unfortunate position in which they have been placed by the terms of the present law.

As everyone can understand, these involuntary expatriates are perplexed about the uncertainty of their future. The adoption of this just and humane legislation will bring back to them peace of mind and reunite them with their loved ones.

May I therefore urge immediate favorable action on this bill. Such action would surely be an appropriate token of our appreciation for the contribution they have made in helping to establish a friendly democratic government in Italy.

Suction Socket Artificial Legs Now Available to Veteran Amputees

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, today the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs has issued a release to the newspapers informing the public that the Veterans' Administration is making the suction socket artificial leg available to eligible veterans who have suffered leg amputations above the knee of a character which makes its use medically feasible.

This is cheering news to many leg-amputee veterans. As a member of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs, I have been deeply interested for years in the experiments that have been made to determine the best possible artificial leg for veterans who suffered this type of disability. In the last Congress, when I was the chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, we had several very fine demonstrations of these prosthetic appliances, and the members of the committee were able to see for themselves the progress made under Public Law No. 729, Eightieth Congress, which authorized $1,000,000 annual appropriation to the Veterans' Administration for prosthetic appliance research. Many Members of Congress have remarked to me that they felt that this appropriation was one of the finest ever made by Congress for the disabled veterans. Today's announcement is further evidence of how well that money is being used. I hope every Member will take the time to read it. It follows:

After 3 years of scientifically controlled testing and development, Veterans' Administration is making the suction socket artificial leg available to eligible veterans who have suffered leg amputations above the knee of a character which makes its use medically feasible.

Veterans' Administration said that during the past 2 years, it had tested more than 500 amputee veterans in its experimental program on the suction socket leg. Successful results were obtained in a great majority of the cases, Veterans' Administration said.

This above-knee artificial leg differs from the conventional artificial leg in that it has no pelvic hinges or suspension harness. The leg is held to the stump by moderate suction created in the closed socket each time the leg is lifted from the ground in walking.

The suction socket leg is designed to give greater freedom of movement in all directions, appears more like part of the body and does away with the discomfort of the pelvic belt (a heavy belt with steel hinge fitted to the waist).

The earliest known reference to the suction socket is in a patent issued by the United States Patent Office in 1863 to Dubois D. Parmelee, of New York. The principle of the suction socket was the attachment of the socket to the amputee's stump by atmospheric pressure.

Others, both in this country and abroad, experimented with the suction socket principle of suspension, but it was only after the recent war that this country studied the suction socket leg in a cooperative program of limb makers, medical experts and scientists.

With the joint cooperation of the Advisory Committee on Artificial Limbs of the National Research Council, University of California, Orthopedic Appliance and Limb Manufacturers Association, the Army, Navy and other interested organizations, the Veterans' Administration sponsored an extensive program to determine the possibilities and limitations of the suction socket limb.

Besides the more than 500 veterans who were tested in the Veterans' Administration program, a much larger number of nonveteran amputees have been fitted with successful results by the artificial limb industry.

Also during the past 2 years, short courses have been conducted in various parts of the country to instruct over 300 orthopedic surgeons and limb fitters in the technical details of prescribing, fabricating, and fitting the suction socket leg.

Effective January 18, 1950, the suction socket leg was made available, upon request, to eligible disabled veterans through the established artificial limb program of the Veterans' Administration. When a new limb is required to replace an unserviceable limb previously issued to the veteran, the suction socket leg may be selected by the amputee upon medical prescription by a surgeon certified by the Veterans' Administration. A list of certified surgeons has been distributed to all Veterans' Administration regional offices, hospitals and centers.

Veterans' Administration emphasized that no suction socket legs will be furnished to veterans without prior examination of the stump by a surgeon on the Veterans' Administration certification list and a written prescription signed by the examining physician.

Amputee veterans who are eligible for a new artificial leg, may obtain complete information about the suction socket leg from the prosthetic and sensory aids unit of the nearest Veterans' Administration regional office.

Research on the suction socket leg was only part of a broad Veterans' Administration program in prosthetic devices and for the development and testing of all types of artificial limbs, aids for the blind, orthopedic braces and hearing aids. This research program, Veterans' Administration prosthetics experts said, will not only aid the disabled veteran, but will ultimately be of benefit to the civilian handicapped throughout the Nation.

Loans to Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, ever since I have been a Member of Congress, I have been very much concerned about the plight of the small-business man and what the Federal Government could do in order to encourage the growth of small business.

When I mention small business, I refer to the small machine-shop operator, the corner grocer, and delicatessen storekeeper, the butcher and the baker, and in general, the energetic small-business man who finds it difficult to obtain loans from banks for new enterprises because of restrictive banking regulations. I am also concerned about the small firms already in existence which have good business records but are in the class of borrowers whose legitimate credit demands are fulfilled with difficulty by usual sources of credit and who find it almost impossible to obtain long-term capital.

I know of the plight of the small-business man because I was associated with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in Buffalo, my home town, as an examiner, making loans to small firms after banks had refused them credit for one reason or another.

Big business, on the other hand, can take care of itself because it has the

wherewithal to do it or can obtain financial aid from banks when necessary.

I am most happy to join Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, in introducing a companion bill in the House, similar to the bill he introduced on Monday in the Senate, which will relax the regulations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and make it possible for thousands of small businesses to apply for small loans from that agency. The regulations governing loans must be liberalized so that small business can get greater consideration when applying to the RFC for loans.

In his recent state of the Union message, President Truman called attention to the necessity for a comprehensive program for the preservation and encouragement of small business in America and made recommendations for a revision of taxes in order to stimulate small business and to assist new enterprises.

The bill which I am introducing today would authorize the RFC to guaranty up to 90 percent loans made on the basis of demonstrated earnings, management skills, and prospective earnings. Under the present law, the RFC is authorized to take up only 70 percent of a loan when it is less than $100,000.

The bill provides that only in cases where loans cannot be made in cooperation with private lending institutions can the RFC make direct loans.

In most cases, the private institution will make the loan with the understanding that at a later date it may call upon the RFC to take up a certain percentage of the unpaid balance. However, in order to insure fuller cooperation and more active participation from the banks, this bill gives the lending institutions priority against the assets of the borrower for the satisfaction of any debt incurred through such a loan.

This bill also provides for relaxing the maturity date of such loans so that they may be extended for periods of longer than 10 years, which is the limitation set by existing regulations.

It is my understanding that there are approximately 1,500,000 small enterprises which require relatively small amounts of working capital, many of which are unable to secure funds from local lending institutions. In order to obtain funds, many of them must mortgage their entire assets or their accounts receivable at exorbitant interest rates.

Two of the most vital needs of small business at present are access to capital and tax relief. The bill which I am introducing may not be an answer to all the problems confronting small business, but I am convinced that it is a step in the right direction.

Small businesses are the backbone of the Nation and merit the consideration and assistance of the Congress. I am sure that most of the Members of this Congress realize the urgency of the situation and I feel confident that favorable congressional action on this legislation will be the saving of thousands of small enterprises throughout the country.

A bill to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, in order to provide more effective financial assistance for small business

Be it enacted, etc., That subsection (b) (1) of section 4 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That in order to encourage small business the Corporation is authorized to give management skills, past earnings, and prospective earnings consideration over security in the form of collateral, in the making of loans either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of this section for the purpose of establishing new business enterprises or for meeting the long-term capital requirements of existing small business enterprises. The Corporation shall make direct loans pursuant to the foregoing proviso only in those cases where loans cannot be consummated in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions."

SEC. 2. Subsection (b) (2) of section 4 is amended by adding before the period at the end of the first sentence thereof a colon and the following: "*Provided further*, That any loan made under section 4 (a) (1) for the purposes set forth in the proviso in paragraph (1) of this subsection as amended may be made for such period exceeding 10 years as the Corporation may deem proper for the encouragement of small business."

SEC. 3. Subsection (b) (3) of section 4 is amended by striking out the period at the end thereof and inserting a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That such participations by the Corporation may amount to 90 percent of the loan outstanding at the time of the disbursement, in the case of loans made for the benefit of small business enterprises in pursuance of the authority set forth in the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended. In order to encourage loans in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions under the proviso in subsection (b) (1) of this section as amended, priority shall be given to private lending institutions over the Corporation against the assets of borrowers for the satisfaction of such loans made thereunder."

Ten Years of Fisheries Activities Under the Fish and Wildlife Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Albert M. Day, Director of Fish and Wildlife Service of the Department of Interior, addressed the annual convention of the National Canners Association at Atlantic City on January 28, 1950. Mr. Day, during the several years that he has been Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, has made an outstanding record in the conservation and development of our fish and wildlife resources. I would like to commend to all Members of the Congress, for their thoughtful consideration, the following address by Mr. Day:

It is hardly proper for me as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, one of the agencies that is proposed for reorganization by the Hoover Commission, to discuss whether that Commission's recommendations are sound and should be adopted. Rather, I prefer to make some general observations about the background of the Hoover Commission Report on this particular subject and explain what the Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to do to aid in the broad development and utilization of the highly important fishery resources of this Nation.

In the first instance, it should be well understood that the final recommendations of the Hoover Commission resulted only after a great deal of conflicting and diverse testimony on this important subject had been given careful consideration. The whole problem is complex because fishery management is complex. It must always be woven into the intricate patterns of land and water uses and human needs in our expanding civilization. This fact is well emphasized when we recognize that the three different task forces studying the organization of the Government came out with three different recommendations when it came to fish and wildlife matters.

The report of one committee would have dispersed the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a transfer to Agriculture of all major public-land administration activities and functions including the Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force on Natural Resources proposed to abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, among which would have been a division of the present Fish and Wildlife Service into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service, each separately administered. The final recommendations of the entire Commission were that only the commercial fisheries activities of the Service should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. As evidence of the diversity of opinion among the members of the Commission, it should be noted that dissents to this proposal were expressed by Vice Chairman Dean Acheson and Commissioners James Forrestal, James K. Pollack, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

With this divergence of opinion among the members of the Hoover Commission and the various task forces as to the proper place in Government for the Federal responsibility for fishery activities, it is not surprising that the resultant reactions of the public also have been mixed. The American Fisheries Society, organized in 1872 and now the oldest scientific biological organization in the United States, at a meeting in Winnipeg, Canada, last September, passed a resolution endorsing the task-force recommendations of the Report on Natural Resources, with the exception that the Society opposed that portion of the report which recommends the separation of fisheries administration from wildlife administration.

Likewise, a meeting of the International Association of Game, Fish, and Conservation Commissioners, also meeting in Winnipeg, in September, passed a resolution endorsing the general purposes of the natural resources task force report, but also stated that they opposed the recommendation of the report which would separate fisheries from wildlife in the present Fish and Wildlife Service. Within the past few weeks, the executive officers and the legislative committee of the international association again reaffirmed to Secretary Chapman their strong opposition to this proposal. The international association is made up of representatives of all of the State conservation departments in the country, the great bulk of which administer both fisheries and wildlife in a single organization of the State. In fact, of the 48 States only 8 have separate departments devoted to commercial fisheries. In the other 40, commercial and sport fishery and wildlife management activities are all in the same department. The same, of course, is true in Alaska.

To the contrary, the Pacific Fisheries Conference, composed largely of members of industry operating on the west coast and in Alaska, by action taken at a recent meeting in California, adopted the following resolution, and I quote:

"Whereas the consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries; and

"Whereas the Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission, recommended that the administration of fisheries should be separated from the administration of wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the Conference heartily endorses the recommendation that such separation should be made and also urges that the re-established Division of Fisheries should be transferred in toto to the Department of Commerce or to a new Department of Natural Resources if such a Department should be created and now, in whichever Department placed, fisheries should be under direct charge of an officer of the rank of Assistant Secretary."

It is to the assertion of the Pacific Fisheries Conference that the present organization has been demonstrated as "unsound, illogical, ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries" that I wish to direct my remarks today. I challenge that statement as incorrect and I call upon the drafters of the resolution to furnish proof of their assertions. The present organization is sound, it is logical, and it is effective. In the 10 years it has been in effect, it has done more to futher the interests of fishery management, conservation, and utilization than was accomplished in the three or four decades previously.

Memories about public affairs and previous events are short, and I feel that the drafters of the resolution that I have just mentioned must have been unfamiliar with the background and did not know the original reasons for the consolidation of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey. Such moves are seldom made without good reasons, as was the case in this instance. At the time of the merger in 1940, both of these predecessor agencies were weak and to a considerable extent were discredited in the public mind. The Biological Survey, which I joined in 1918 and in which, together with the present Fish and Wildlife Service, I have served continuously ever since, had suffered from weak administration for several years prior to the merger. Waterfowl, coming under Federal regulation under a treaty with Canada, had been consistently declining over a period of years. The only remedy that the Bureau seemed to be able to prescribe was ever-shortened seasons and ever-smaller bag limits. Because of resultant public dissatisfaction and clamor, President Roosevelt appointed a special committee of citizens to study the problem and to recommend remedies. "Ding" Darling, the famous cartoonist, prominent in conservation circles in the Midwest, served on this special study committee. It recommended a positive action program—the acquisition and restoration of marshes along with severe restrictions on the take by hunters. Darling was induced to serve as Chief of the Biological Survey, an organization that had been virtually leaderless since the disability retirement of the previous bureau chief. He remained less than 2 years and was succeeded by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, an outstanding scientist and able administrator, but in 1940, when the merger came about, the public had not yet regained confidence in the efficiency of the administration of the Biological Survey.

A similar situation existed in the Bureau of Fisheries. It was a small organization and the morale of its employees, as well as the confidence of the public, suffered severely because of the quality of its leadership. Controversy raged, particularly in the Alaska fisheries field, where the Bureau then had, and still has as the Fish and Wildlife Service, sole regulatory authority over the extremely valuable salmon and herring fisheries. We are still trying to live down some of the things that happened in Alaska in those days.

Government reorganizers concluded that there might be a strengthening of the administration of both fisheries and wildlife programs if the two closely related small Bureaus were merged into one larger group. This has been the trend of Government for many years and, with the exception of the recommendations for the transfer of the commercial fishery activities to the Department of Commerce, was also the philosophy of the Hoover Commission.

When the merger of the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries came about in 1940, the Biological Survey was on its way back into public esteem under the leadership of Dr. Gabrielson. It was, therefore, logical that he should become the first Director of the new Fish and Wildlife Service. As a minor employee in Washington at the time of his "shotgun wedding" of the two Bureaus, with Secretary Ickes, incidentally, holding the old double-barreled gun on us, I can personally testify that it was an unpopular move with the employees of both Bureaus, particularly those who revere tradition and the "good old days" of the past. I also know that the proposal to return to those "good old days" does not fall upon completely unsympathetic ears with some of the present organization. It is difficult to understand their philosophy, because I cannot think of a single individual who has not personally benefited in rank and salary by the creation of a larger and more important agency. With some, tradition is truly a potent factor.

But, of more importance to you and the other people we are paid to serve, did the mandatory trip to the altar pay off? Let us merely check the records.

First, let's review the appropriations for fishery work for the past 20 years—the 10 years of operations under the present system and the 10 years immediately preceding. Granted that during recent years the costs of operations have risen and appropriations have been more liberal to take care of these factors, appropriation figures are probably still the best over-all yardstick to measure the services the Government gives its citizens in matters pertaining to the fisheries.

In 1930, Federal fishery appropriations amounted to $2,498,550; in 1940, $2,421,075. That represents a decrease during the 10-year period of almost $100,000. The average for that period was approximately $2,000,000 per year. The fishery appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 amount to $10,875,251. Of even greater significance, the budget which the President sent to the Congress within recent days and which Fish and Wildlife Service representatives justified before the Appropriations Committee a week ago carry proposed appropriations for fishery items amounting to aproximately $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. To be more specific as to items in which you are most interested, the work of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries received $229,540 in 1940; $668,500 in 1950. The Branch of Fishery Biology received $390,835 in 1940 as compared with $1,546,000 in 1950; Alaska Fisheries, including the Pribilofs, from $516,460 to $1,480,100 in those 10 years. And the wildlife appropriations have likewise increased at the same time. In 1940, they amounted to $6,149,343, almost 3 times the then appropriated sums for fishery activities. For 1950, they amounted to $16,502,049. This sum included duck stamp and Pittman-Robertson revenues. Not bad for an "unsound, illogical, and ineffective" organization.

At the time of the merger, not a single research or exploratory vessel was owned and operated by the Bureau of Fisheries. Now, the *Albatross III* is carrying on investigations extending from the Grand Banks to the Carolinas on the Atlantic Coast. Within recent months, two vessels, the *Oregon* and *Alaska*, have been acquired through special legislation and appropriations and are now stationed in the Gulf of Mexico. One will do exploratory fishing and the other will do biological research. A new vessel, the *John N. Cobb*, was commissioned at Astoria, Oreg., this month to carry out exploratory and experimental fishing in the North Pacific, reaching far into Arctic waters. The *Black Douglas* is carryiny on experimental and biological work in an effort to find answers to some of the perplexing problems surrounding the pilchard fishery off the coast of California and lower Mexico. The *Hugh M. Smith* is conducting biological and oceanographic research, while the *Henry O'Malley* and the *John R. Manning* are doing exploratory fishing in the waters of the South Pacific in a program that has been developed in close cooperation with the tuna fishing industry of the west coast. The *Spencer F. Baird*, the *Theodore N. Gill*, and the *David Starr Jordan*, three well-equipped research and exploratory vessels, are now completing a 5-year study of the South Pacific fisheries in connection with the rehabilitation of the Philippines. It is planned that the *Theodore N. Gill* will soon be stationed in the Great Lakes to undertake the difficult study of the decline in that great fishery, made possible by special legislation and appropriations passed during the present session of Congress. And that adds up to 11 large vessels compared with not a single one at the time of the merger. In the entire previous history of the Bureau of Fisheries, reaching back to 1671, in fact, there were never at one time more than three ships doing that sort of work and that occurred for only 2 years. None had been in service since 1932—8 years before the merger. Does that add up to the assertion that the present Fish and Wildlife Service is an unsound, illogical, and ineffective organization?

Ten years ago, the famous laboratory at Woods Hole, steeped in traditions of fishery research and oceanography since the days of Spencer Fullerton Baird, had been virtually abandoned. Within the past 2 years, we have rehabilitated the station, have transferred the scientific staff of the New England area there for headquarters, and the *Albatross III* is now berthed at Woods Hole. The laboratory at Beaufort, N. C., is being reconditioned and important studies in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission are being conducted at that point. A new laboratory is being constructed in Hawaii and the technology lab at Ketchikan, Alaska, has within recent months been enlarged and expanded. During that decade, a small laboratory was constructed in Puerto Rico, and fisheries research in the Caribbean area was carried on. In addition, the research stations at College Park, Md.; Milford, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; and Pensacola, Fla., have been expanded.

Never in the 80 years of Government participation in matters pertaining to the fisheries has there been such great activity in the international field as there has been during the past few years. That is perfectly logical because of the increasing influence of the United States in world affairs. I should like to cite some of the more recent developments, however, as proof that fishery matters are not suffering at the hands of the present organization.

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention concluded just a year ago and ratified by the President last September 1 brings 11 nations having common interests in the North Atlantic fishing grounds under treaty

arrangements for the first time in history. The fisheries of this great area have been the battleground for some exceedingly tough international problems that date back to days prior to American independence. A convention between the United States and Mexico for the establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna was signed at Mexico City in January 1949, and has been ratified by the President. A similar convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was signed at Washington in May 1949, and was ratified by the President on September 1, 1949. Three years ago 22 nations, including Canada and the United States, met in Washington and arrived at an international agreement which established the International Whaling Commission, empowered to conduct investigations and regulate whaling throughout all the marine waters of the globe. In 1946 a treaty was negotiated with Canada for the protection and management of the Great Lakes fisheries. This so far has been the least effective of the treaty programs because of opposition of one or two States surrounding the Great Lakes.

I have mentioned some of the more recent developments, but I should record also the continuing activities in connection with the Sockeye Salmon Commission which came into being in 1936, and which has now assumed regulatory powers after the first 10 years of investigation. This has included the construction of the $2,000,000 fishway at Hells Gate on the Fraser River. I serve as one of the American members of this Commission. Assistant Director James is a member of the Halibut Commission, established in 1937, which has done a remarkable job of restoring the stocks of halibut along the stretches of the North Pacific coast.

In the field of management of the fisheries of Alaska, I am proud of the progress that is being made. For the first time in history we are now developing a closely integrated program, using all available manpower and equipment for enforcing both the fishery and wildlife laws and regulations in a joint operation. Enforcement of the fishery regulations is now vastly improved because of the use of Alaska game agents as well as about a dozen transferred from the States each season. During the war years the fishing regulations were probably more liberal than they should have been. This was due to the pressure for food for our own people and our allies. Many of our trained personnel were in the Army and Navy and many Service ships were devoted to military uses. Inadequate observations and patrol, together with overfishing, created a serious depletion in the Alaska fishery. I am happy to say that it looks as though the situation is improving rapidly. Following severe restrictions during the past 3 years, the southeastern Alaska pack of pink salmon responded to the point where the pack last year not only returned to but also exceeded the previous normal 20-year average. Two large vessels have recently been secured by transfer from the Navy to augment our Alaskan fleet, and several smaller ships have been built as a result of new appropriations by the Congress. In the Service's combined Alaskan operations there are now owned and operated 18 vessels, ranging from 40 feet to 160 feet in size, with 11 additional patrol vessels, ranging from 30 to 40 feet. There are also about 100 speedboats used in fishery patrol. Within the past 3 months the Service has taken over from the Army one of the best equipped marine shops on the Pacific coast. It is located at Juneau, and is valued at least at $500,000. Surplus planes have been made available since the end of the war, and we now have a very excellent fleet of 20 planes which services both fishery and game agents in the Territory. Congress, last year, appropriated $250,000 for a new airplane hangar and shop at Anchorage, and as a result our facilities for observation and patrol will be much improved in future years. Moreover, Alaska regulations are now being made and enforced without fear or favor.

Ten years ago there were no effective means of correlating the needs of fish and wildlife with the construction programs of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. That is not the case today. The Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a river basin staff whose responsibility it is to review the plans of the construction agencies while the projects are in the making. We work in close coordination with these two bureaus. Much has been done to protect and increase the fishery potentials in the reservoirs because of this service.

The relations of the Fish and Wildlife Service with the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget are excellent. The needs of both fisheries and wildlife are given sympathetic attention both as to appropriations and as to legislation. This, in my opinion, is due in large part to the fact that practically every Member of the Congress has a personal interest in something that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. If he or his constituents are not particularly interested in the commercial fisheries, it is a pretty safe bet that he either likes to hunt ducks and geese or he enjoys fishing for trout or bass or blue-gills. Maybe he comes from the West and is more interested in the coyote and ground squirrel control program of the Service, or perhaps he wants to go to Alaska to hunt moose or brown bear. It is an assured certainty that if there is a Federal fish hatchery in his district, he is anxious to see that it produces as many fish for his sportsmen constituents as can possibly be done. I doubt that there is another single agency of Government that has such wide interest for so many people as do the varied activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Last year there were 15,500,000 people who bought fishing licenses and almost 13,000,000 who bought hunting licenses. Another 2,000,000 bought duck stamps to hunt ducks and geese. Many probably purchased all three kinds of licenses, but yet the fact remains that approximately one out of every five people in the United States is influenced in some degree by the activities of this Service. As such, the single organization known as the Fish and Wildlife Service wields much more power and influence than either the Bureau of Fisheries or the Biological Survey ever did before or would ever do again, if they were reconstituted separately.

I could continue this recitation for all day, but I fear that I have already used my allotted time. I shall close by inviting the members of the resolutions committee of the Pacific Fisheries Conference, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that the "consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective" to take a little more careful look at the record. I sincerely believe that if those members of industry who are not satisfied with the present accomplishments of the Fish and Wildlife Service would tell us, and the Congress, frankly, what in the way of accomplishments they want but are not now getting, they will come closer to seeing it done than if they were to depend upon a much smaller agency, with much less prestige. Remember the appropriation figures I gave you—$2,421,075 in 1940 as compared with $10,875,251 in 1950, and approximately $12,000,000 which President Truman has recommended to the Congress for next fiscal year. Again, I say, study the record.

Jewish Federation of Philanthropies Pays Tribute to Hon. Joseph T. Sharkey, Vice Chairman, City Council, New York City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS B. HELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Joseph T. Sharkey, majority leader of the City Council of the City of New York, is a Christian—a Catholic. On January 29, 1950, he was honored with a testimonial dinner sponsored by the Williamsburg division of the Federation of Jewish Philanthropies for his leadership in philanthropic affairs, and for the splendid example of brotherhood and neighborliness he has set in the community.

At this dinner which was held at the Knapp Mansion, 545 Bedford Avenue, Brooklyn, N. Y., the friends of the majority leader who foregathered to pay him tribute contributed in his honor the sum of approximately $30,000 toward the federation's building fund and maintenance campaign. Harvey L. Strelzin, a distinguished lawyer, as chairman of the Williamsburg campaign, presented Councilman Sharkey with a scroll in recognition of his untiring efforts on behalf of Jewry. I had the honor to address the gathering attending the dinner, and I wish to include my speech under my extension of remarks:

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I consider it an honor and privilege to share with all of you present this opportunity to pay tribute to a man whose life and accomplishments have made so profound an impression upon the people of this great borough. For me it is also a personal gratification to participate in this occasion because it is my first opportunity since my election to Congress, which took place almost a year ago, on February 15, 1949, to publicly acknowledge to the vice chairman of the city council my deep appreciation for his loyalty, cooperation, and support. I have stated on numerous occasions that Joe Sharkey is like the Rock of Gibraltar. He is a man of high principle, and once he has made a decision and a promise, nothing and nobody, no matter how powerful are the influences, can sway him from fulfilling his obligation.

The Jewish Federation of Charities in honoring him tonight honors itself and acknowledges that it has a friend all Jewry can be proud of. His magnificent record in public life is full of contributions to human welfare. "Joe," as he is affectionately called by his host of friends, is a leader in the field of tolerance and understanding and cooperation among all peoples. Particularly has he attained a high goal in the affection of Jewry. We have long recognized that he possesses sterling qualities—a strong will power, a strength of purpose, and faith in himself and in God. He is a quiet and unassuming man of simple dignity and he respects the dignity of others. He is a great single force in creating good and friendly human relations. That is why, in a district heavily populated by Jews—and I believe the most orthodox Jewish district in the United States—Joe Sharkey is the undisturbed and undisputed leader of the Democratic Party. If I might digress a moment to make an observation

of Joe's political philosophy, I will say he has an unvarying and unyielding rule—that loyalty, ability, service, and capacity are the only standards for recognition and promotion. Neither blood relations nor social relations are ever permitted to interfere with his yardstick. Above all is Joe's capacity for friendship. This I can say with literal accuracy and not as a gracious gesture at a testimonial dinner: No man in this great city is more admired, respected, and loved than our guest of honor, Joe Sharkey. Unconsciously, perhaps, he follows the credo: "Always forgive your enemy; remember, you made him one. Always appreciate your friend; remember, he made you one." Just as the light of phosphorus is more plainly seen when all is dark, so friendship can be best observed when the shadows fall. Any friend of Joe Sharkey's—and I speak from my own experience—who finds himself in gloom sees more plainly the phosphorescence of his friendship.

To those who know Joe Sharkey, the honor which comes to him tonight does not come as a surprise but as one richly deserved. Joe did not come here to gather honors. That is why we honor him. He came here to lend his name and prestige to a cause which he believes worthy. He believes in the great work of the Jewish Federation of Charities. He believes that if you take that cause to your heart, then in future years when you recite the twenty-third Psalm, which begins, "The Lord is my shepherd, I shall not want * * *," you may perhaps indulge yourself in the same inspired error the little child made when she said, "The Lord is my shepherd, that's all I want."

In the words of the old toast, "May the sun shine on both sides of the street, Joe, when you, your charming wife, and family pass by."

Tax Revision

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from the January 30 issue of the Kingston Daily Freeman, Kingston, N. Y.

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a great deal of merit in this editorial suggesting that we revise the entire tax framework. There is no question that on this issue of reducing the wartime-excise taxes, the administration is "me-tooing" the Republicans. The Republicans have been urging the reduction of these taxes for a long time and it is not surprising that the President, in this election year, bows on the issue most popular with the great majority. Our own tax history and more recently that of Canada proved definitely that business increases when taxes are held at a reasonable level. Let us hope that there will be no further delay in reducting the excise taxes and revising our tax laws so they will be on a sound basis.

REVISE ENTIRE TAX FRAMEWORK

President Truman's tax program has laudable aims, but it's a real question how close his specific proposals would come to realizing them.

The war saw the Government impose a whole host of excise taxes for the joint purpose of raising money and discouraging civilian consumption. They were declared to be emergency levies only, yet they're still with us 5 years after the war.

Mr. Truman proposes to cut seven of these including taxes on transportation of freight and passengers, long-distance telephone and telegraph, furs, jewelry, handbags, luggage, and toilet preparations. Except for a 3-percent levy on freight, the excises range from 15 to 25 percent.

But the President doesn't say how much the reduction should be nor what should be done about taxes on a wide group of other products.

In view of his past messages on the issue of tax reduction, his new program represents something of a reversal in attitude. Hence it may be expecting too much to imagine he would consider outright repeal of any or all wartime excises at this time. His recommendations nevertheless are disappointing.

There was nothing surprising in his suggestion that money lost through reduced excises be made up—and another $1,000,000,000 drawn in—through closing various tax loopholes and boosting corporate and certain estate and gift taxes.

Whether he may have thought also of advising higher income levies we can only guess. In any event, he bowed to election year realities on that score.

It is plain that if carried out his program would be popular with a majority of citizens and unpopular merely with limited groups affected by proposed increases and loophole-closings. One wonders how accidental that aspect of the President's plan is.

Aside from the excise changes most recommendations are offered as ways of correcting inequities in the tax structure. They may indeed have some value in that direction. But Mr. Truman's sketchy, piecemeal approach to the genuinely complex issue of tax inequity hardly looks sound.

Both Democrats and Republicans concede that the Federal tax set-up is a thing of shreds and patches that has long needed revision. The Republican Eightieth Congress made a stab at a general revision bill but it died after getting through the House late in the 1948 session. Since then nothing has happened.

Mr. Truman and his tax advisers are no help. The notion of revision is always pushed into the future.

We believe it would be a mistake to consider isolated tax inequities without reference to the whole body of tax law. Let Congress and the administration combine to chop expenditures enough to balance loss expected from lowered excises. Meantime, let's get on with at least the real preliminaries of the long-overdue revamping of the entire tax pattern.

International Frequency Allocations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Cincinnati Times-Star of January 16, 1950, regarding the matter of international frequency allocations.

The Clear Channel Broadcasting Service, composed of 15 independently owned and operated clear-channel stations, has reason to be greatly concerned over attempts by foreign nations to make inroads into United States radio channels.

The article is as follows:

RADIO GROUP SEEKS TO PROTECT CHANNELS IN UNITED STATES

"The Clear Channel Broadcasting Service will continue to fight any attempts by foreign nations to make inroads into United States radio channels," Ward L. Quaal, the Washington, D. C., director of the service, stated Monday at the Netherland Plaza, where the group is meeting to discuss matters of international frequency allocations.

Quaal explained that representatives of Canada, North America, the Dominican Republic, Cuba, and Haiti adjourned in Montreal last month following a similar discussion. Mexico, he said, did not participate. He added that there will be a meeting February 1 in Havana between the United States delegation and Cuba in an effort to work out a bilateral agreement. "All the North American nations will meet sometime between April 1 and August 1," Quaal said, at which time it is hoped that Mexico will join in a new attempt to get an international radio treaty.

"We vigorously protested the demands of the Cuban Government made in Montreal," Quaal said. "They would have caused tremendous interference with the stations in the United States known as regional channel stations as well as on clear channels."

Quaal explained that the organization is composed of 15 independently owned and operated clear-channel stations of which the Cincinnati member is WLW.

"Our stations," he added, "serve not only metropolitan communities but also large rural and small town areas which would be virtually without radio if it were not for interference-free clear channel service. All farm organizations in the United States have endorsed our efforts to provide better service for rural America."

Mr. E. W. Craig, chairman of the board of Station WSM, Nashville, and chairman of CCBS, presided at the meeting.

Gifts of Government Employees to Official Supervisors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that the law prohibiting the collection of money by employees of the Government for presents and gifts to supervisors and other employees is being increasingly violated.

It is a statute "more honored in the breach than the observance."

The law is specific and easy to read and interpret. It is designed to discourage favoritism and that undemocratic practice of fawning and placating the boss or people who are supposed to have an "in" with the boss.

I have written to the Civil Service Commission asking them to repromulgate

the law. My letter to Chairman Mitchell reads:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950.

Hon. HARRY B. MITCHELL,
Chairman, United States
Civil Service Commission,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CHAIRMAN MITCHELL: During the last few weeks more and more complaints have come to me concerning the vicious practice of collecting small sums of money from Government employees for gifts to superiors and other personnel. This is specifically prohibited by section 113 of title 5, United States Code. Such contributions are solicited for wedding presents, going-away gifts, birthday remembrances, and other tokens. While the sums have not been great, the demands made upon the employees, particularly those in the lower salary brackets, have caused embarrassment and, in many cases, hardships. People generally do not like to refuse such requests. It places them in an awkward position with relation to their fellow employees. Too frequently it destroys the harmony in an office, so essential to good morale.

May I suggest that the Commission publicize the provisions of section 113 above referred to, again calling it to the attention of Government employees.

The law as I read it is plain. It says:

"No officer, clerk, or employee in the United States Government employ shall at any time solicit contributions from other officers, clerks, or employees in the Government service for a gift or present to those in a superior official position; nor shall any such officials or clerical superiors receive any gift or present offered or presented to them as a contribution from persons in Government employ receiving a less salary themselves; nor shall any officer or clerk make any donation as a gift or present to any official superior."

I believe that such action by the Commission would have a tendency to discourage the abuses of which I complain.

If you feel the law is not sufficiently strong I would be glad to discuss with you changes to make it workable and effective.

Sincerely,

GEORGE P. MILLER.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, there is much talk but little apparent action being taken in regard to the removal or reduction of excise taxes. Even the President's message regarding taxes took notice of the harm these continued wartime burdens were having. The facts as I find them reveal to me further injury in lines of endeavor to which I had not readily attributed a serious detriment because of the excise taxes.

One of such has most vividly been called to my attention in a letter received from a manufacturer of hardware and sporting goods in my district, the State of Connecticut. The letter reproduced here almost in its entirety, by itself explains quite fully the urgency of immediate action regarding the war taxes and in particular, the necessity of including this item among those to be removed because of the damaging effect on the manufacture of various sporting goods or their discontinuance of manufacture because of the taxes thus causing unemployment and consequent hardship on the former workers and their families.

The letter follows:

The company closed its fiscal year June 30, 1949, with a disastrous loss, and for the first 6 months of its present fiscal year that loss is running at twice the rate of its previous year's loss.

Employment has been reduced from approximately 1,000 to approximately 275, which force is working but 32 hours per week, with operations in both the roller-skate and ice-skating departments suspended indefinitely.

The company manufactures sidewalk roller skates, rink roller skates, ice skates, bamboo fishing rods, steel fishing rods, and, through its subsidiaries, golf clubs, baseballs, and softballs, all of which are affected by the sporting-goods excise tax. For example, this company manufactures ice skates which they sell to shoe manufacturers, who in turn mount them on shoes and merchandise a complete skating outfit. Normally such shoe manufacturers purchase their ice skates in January and February and start manufacturing outfits for the next season during the months of February, March, April, May, June, etc. If the shoe manufacturers wait too long to start their production, they are unable to fulfill deliveries, and consequently a complete season is lost, both by them and the skate manufacturer. Yet because they have to buy skates now on which they must pay the 10-percent sporting-goods excise tax, which tax may be repealed before they sell their outfits in September, October, November, and December, they won't purchase. The same is true of all other sporting-goods items which are seasonable to the highest degree. If the season is missed, the business is lost for the year.

It is, therefore, urgent that the sporting-goods excise tax be removed and that such action be taken promptly, effective immediately, in order to preserve this spring's business.

I do not have the figures before me, but I am informed that the total amount received by the Treasury Department from the sporting-goods excise tax is comparatively small, and it is certain that, whatever it may be, it would be more than made up in income taxes if manufacturers of these items were placed in a position to reduce price to achieve volume, with consequent profits rather than present losses now being incurred.

To take but one illustration of the economic effect of such tax, consider sidewalk roller skates which are used by children up to 14 years of age whose wherewithal to expend for such items is limited. A 10-percent tax on the manufacturer's price means that the jobber adds one-third to that tax and the retailer two-thirds so that the child finally pays twice what the tax would apparently seem to be. In other words, on a roller skate sold by the manufacturer at $2 the child has to pay, in the final retail price, approximately 40 cents more than if there were no tax. Increased cost of manufacture has raised the price of roller skates to the point that any burden on the consumer's price effectively puts them out of the reach of the average child. We have endeavored to ascertain from the Department of Commerce, Government statistics pertaining to the sales of roller skates for the years 1948 and 1949. We were informed by the chief of the Sporting Goods Division of the Department of Commerce that the last figures that they have available, even in preliminary form, are for the year 1947. Such figures would not show what might be termed the disappearance of the sidewalk roller-skate industry from the current American scene, but from what we have ascertained from other sidewalk roller-skate manufacturers, they, too, have been practically out of production during the past year.

We are also confronted with a refusal on the part of the purchasers of our other sporting goods items who refuse to buy in normal fashion for this spring's business, because of the fact that they do not wish to be caught with an inventory of merchandise on which the excise tax situation is in doubt.

* * * * *

If there is any further information that we can furnish or any other way that we can be of assistance to repeal this unjust war-time levy, we shall be more than happy to cooperate.

Resolutions of Wayne County (Iowa) Farm Bureau

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL M. LeCOMPTE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, all of us are interested in a long-range farm program that will be satisfactory and fair to those who are engaged in producing food for our great Republic. I have a copy of the resolutions adopted by the farm bureau of my home county in Iowa, Wayne County, where I have lived all of my life, and I desire to have these resolutions printed in the RECORD so that all Members of Congress may have the opportunity of knowing the position that this great organization has taken with respect to national problems and issues confronting the country at this time. The resolutions were adopted at the annual meeting of the Wayne County Farm Bureau held at Corydon, Iowa, last fall and read as follows:

WAYNE COUNTY FARM BUREAU RESOLUTIONS, 1949

We, the members of the Wayne County resolutions committee, after due consideration, present the following resolutions for the approval of the members of the Wayne County Farm Bureau. These are based upon a summary of township resolutions and the work of the county committee after due consideration:

NATIONAL RESOLUTIONS

1. We believe that it is important to have the farm program developed through a bipartisan approach.

2. We believe guaranties of 100 percent of parity as compared with lower supports would result in more drastic controls.

3. We believe that it is important to keep controls at a minimum.

4. We believe there is danger of losing farm programs if the cost is too high.

5. We favor a minimum guaranty or floors under farm prices.

6. We favor flexible supports tied to the amount the commodity is in surplus with a minimum floor established by law and the Secretary of Agriculture having the authority to set support prices from this minimum up.

7. We do not believe that if production payments are used, the prices of commodities

to the consumer would drop enough to have a marked influence on consumption.

8. We believe that a cheap food philosophy established in the minds of the consumer would be dangerous to the long-time interests of farmers.

9. We believe that it is dangerous to have the income of farmers dependent to a large extent upon direct appropriations from Congress.

10. We believe satisfactory compliance with soil conservation practices should be a requisite to eligibility for price supports.

11. We do not favor abandoning the parity concept for the income support standard plan.

12. We favor increasing Federal aid to encourage more men and women to enter the medical profession.

13. We favor a voluntary prepayment health insurance plan rather than a compulsory health insurance program.

14. We favor increasing Federal aid for the construction of more hospitals and in such manner as to locate them in rural areas where they are needed.

15. We feel that labor-management problems that are questions of wages, working conditions, etc., are social, ethical, and economic in nature and can best be settled by the human approach of mediation rather than by legal methods (regular channels of our courts).

16. We favor the establishing of a Worker Extension Service similar to Agricultural Extension Service now in operation.

17. We favor the changing of mail routes so that free mail delivery becomes available to many more families.

18. We favor the establishment of a Federal agency for the purpose of setting up telephone cooperatives.

19. We recommend to the next Congress that they place a high priority on the coordination of agricultural agencies.

20. We believe Congress should provide Federal aid for public education in order that all children are guaranteed a minimum standard of education but with minimum of Federal control.

STATE RESOLUTIONS

21. We believe we should revise our health programs and adopt a county health unit program for Iowa.

22. We are in favor of keeping taxation on our REA co-ops in line with our municipal, light, and water organizations or systems.

23. We urge that Farm Bureau increase its attention in the legislative program.

24. We feel that Farm Bureau should put more emphasis on encouraging citizens to participate in the activities of the party of their choice.

COUNTY RESOLUTIONS

25. We urge greater cooperation between agricultural agencies for soil conservation in Wayne County.

26. We recommend that the county board of supervisors and the county board of education jointly plan for the construction and surfacing of school-bus routes and mail routes before other roads are considered for construction.

27. We commend the Wayne County newspapers, chamber of commerce, and the businessmen of Wayne County for their cooperation in Farm Bureau activities. We wish to thank those who have assisted in the program of work, membership drive, and this annual meeting.

28. We, the resolutions committee, submit the foregoing resolutions and recommend their adoption.

FOREST PERKINS, *Chairman.*
HENRY BERNER.
Mrs. ONNIE McKEE.
WAYNE EVANS.
WILLARD HALFHILL.

FEPC Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. COLMER
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, while the politicians are busy pressing for consideration of the ill-advised FEPC proposal under the assumption that the minority group support they will receive thereby will be politically beneficial, there are thinking people all over this country who are worried about the implications of this further proposal to regiment our people.

Because of my opposition to this proposal I receive many letters from people all over the country expressing their opposition. From time to time I have placed letters and other communications in the RECORD in order that my colleagues from the so-called North might understand that this is not a one-way political street.

In that connection I submit herewith a letter just received from the Reverend Joseph E. Gedra, of the Church of the Immaculate Conception, N Street at Eighth NW., Washington, D. C., which I am sure will be of benefit to my colleagues because of its concise language and convincing arguments.

Reverend Gedra's letter follows:

CHURCH OF THE
IMMACULATE CONCEPTION,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.

The Honorable WILLIAM M. COLMER,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COLMER: It is only because of the far-reaching, bewildering, and cataclysmic effect, I truthfully believe, the passage of the FEPC bill will have upon the fundamental structure of our society, that I write to ask you kindly to consider these few important facts before casting a favorable vote:

1. Cries of antiracial, anti-Semitic, anti-Catholic, etc., will skyrocket beyond calculation. Then, to prove all alleged charges will mean jamming our courts, with the resultant bedlamism.

2. Such a bill is contrary to the God-given gift of selectivity. For instance, we select our food, literature, forms of entertainment, friends, etc. People should exercise that right with regard to employees. There are abuses, of course. But the right which a person enjoys from above will be so smoke-screened if the FEPC bill is passed that one will lose sight of this right.

3. Forced consideration, by pressure groups, of one's race, religion, nationality rather than his qualifications will undermine our national set-up.

There appear to be some advantages in this bill. For instance, Catholics may see in this bill a way paved for a Catholic to become President of the United States. But apart from this, the bill can inflame the emotions of our people, making them supersensitive to their color, race, and religion. Herein lies the grave danger. That something should be done, everyone agrees; but, I believe the solution of this acute problem will not be found in the FEPC.

With every best wish, I am,
Very sincerely yours,
JOSEPH E. GEDRA.

Communist Thinking

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, since the Russian Communists are now laying claim to have been first in everything, it is not inappropriate to say that they lead the world with a first place as inventors of half-truths and untruths and as prime inventors of the propaganda of hate and the ideology of godlessness.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an editorial which appeared in the Kearny Observer of January 27, 1950, entitled "Communist Thinking":

COMMUNIST THINKING

Who invented the electric light? If you say Edison, you're wrong—it was a Russian named Yablochkov. Who invented the telegraph? If you say Morse, you're wrong again—it was another Russian named Yakobi. The radio? No, it wasn't Marconi—it was still another Russian named Popov. How about the first successful flying machine? If you answer "the Wright brothers" you'll have to go to the bottom of the class—a Russian called Mozhaisky flew like a bird near St. Petersburg 20 years before the Wrights took off at Kitty Hawk.

These, and similar revelations, are disclosed by Edmund Stevens in the Christian Science Monitor. He found them in a Soviet mazagine called the Literary Gazette. They show, he says, one of the ways the Soviet Party "woos Russian national pride. The move corresponds to a vital need of Russians to vindicate their self-respect and destroy the residue of an old sense of inferiority. It also increases the Russian's confidence in their capacity to catch up with and outstrip the rest of the world technically at the present time." It is, in other words, an example of the kind of morale-building propaganda the government is now feeding the Russian masses.

Moreover, it is an example of how the Soviet bosses will use any untruth or half-truth to serve their ends. A story has been going the rounds concerning a British Communist who went to a meeting of Russian Communist strategists in Moscow. He was perplexed as to how to argue some ideological point or other in England. The Russians gave him an answer, to which he objected that it wasn't true. The Russians looked at him with amazement—and then burst into gales of laughter over such naivete. It is said that the incident was described to the top Russians, including Stalin, and that they burst into laughter also.

Resolution Adopted Opposing the Proposed Legislation Taxing Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I addressed the House at some

length in opposition to a bill then under consideration seeking to retroactively tax insurance companies.

Since that time the Equitable field organization, connected with the Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, adopted resolutions supporting my view. A copy of those resolutions is as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EQUITABLE FIELD ORGANIZATION JANUARY 26, 1950

Whereas there is pending before the House of Representatives a joint resolution proposing a retroactive tax on the income of life-insurance companies for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949; and

Whereas the failure of the life-insurance companies to earn during those years sufficient income on their assets to warrant the payment of income taxes under existing law was due to the low yield on investments resulting from the easy-money policies of the Government; and

Whereas the investment earnings of the life-insurance companies during those years required to sustain their reserves, and to enable them to meet their obligations under outstanding policies, were, as the Ways and Means Committee report indicates, in excess of their interest earnings and therefore produced no taxable net income under existing law; and

Whereas we in the Equitable field organization do not oppose income taxes on the earnings of life-insurance companies in excess of their annual needs to accumulate reserves, but we resist the payment of so-called income taxes retroactively imposed after the income has either been distributed to the policyholders or has become a part of the accumulated property of the company: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we the agency officers and managers of the Equitable field organization throughout the country assembled in our midwinter convention hereby urge upon both Houses of Congress that they refuse to enact this retroactive raid on the funds of policyholders which will increase the cost of their insurance by reducing the capacity of their companies to pay annual dividends; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be sent to all Members of the House of Representatives and the Senate and be brought to the attention, through our agency organization, of our policyholders throughout the country.

Foreign Mines Developed With American Capital Will Not Help United States During War

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLAIR ENGLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. ENGLE of California. Mr. Speaker, I present an example of what disgusts and infuriates the American miner. The following item from the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 8, 1950, indicates that the American Government is spending millions of dollars opening up large-scale mining in Africa while our own mines are permitted to close down. The article states that the Marshall plan has put nearly $230,000,000 into French African territories alone in the last 2 years, and that an example is a recent $3,600,000 contract with an American firm to expand and develop lead and zinc mines of Algeria. This article explains a lot of things. It explains why this administration is bearing down upon the domestic-mining industry and has refused to rescue those mines so seriously in need of help. Obviously there must be a market for the lead, zinc, and other minerals produced with this investment of American capital abroad; that market will not be in the United States if American mines are producing. In addition, this article explains why some American mining firms are opposing help for the American mining industry—they have their hands in the honey pot and are getting immense benefits from this foreign expenditure. I am wondering, though, what will happen if we get into another war and need the copper, lead, zinc, and other strategic and critical minerals and metals here on our own shores where we can use them to keep our tanks, battle fleet, and airplanes fighting. The minerals and metals developed with American money in foreign lands will not help us, and without production of our own we will be easy victims of our own stupidity. The article follows:

[From the Chicago Sunday Tribune of January 8, 1950]

PARIS PARLEY TO PLAN AFRICAN PUMP PRIMING—ROAD-AND-POWER FUZZLE FIRST ON AGENDA

PARIS, January 7.—Ways of pumping Africa's untapped wealth into world trade streams come under study here next week.

Colonial officials from Britain, France, Belgium, and Portugal, who together control most of the continent, are to meet with African representatives Wednesday, Thursday, and Friday.

ROADS AND POWER FIRST

Their first job will be to decide on means of improving the roads, railways, bridges, and power supplies of the wilderness areas to speed development of mineral lodes, forest products, and plantations. Technical experts will aid them. Pest control, soil erosion, and public health are other problems.

Politically, the colonial officers are expected to discuss means of opposing a recent United Nations decision calling for a United Nations investigation of conditions in colonial possessions of member nations.

The Economic Cooperation Administration (ECA), which already has poured millions of Marshall plan dollars into African projects, will keep in touch with the meetings.

A. L. Moffat, ECA Deputy Commissioner, is in Nairobi, Kenya colony, studying a lengthening list of developments for east and central Africa. These include control of Nile waters, electric power production in Uganda, and opening up of large-scale mining and agricultural works in almost every territory from Uganda to northern Rhodesia.

TEN-YEAR BRITISH PLAN

Of the four nations to be represented here, Britain has approved a 10-year public works plan for its African territories.

France is developing a similar plan for French West Africa and equatorial Africa. The French program, still tentative pending parliamentary approval, calls for an expenditure of $300,000,000 a year for 10 years to make the territories more attractive to foreign investors. The money would be partly matched by allocations from territorial treasuries.

The Marshall plan has put nearly $230,000,000 into French African territories alone in the last 2 years. An example is a recent $3,600,000 contract with an American firm to expand and develop lead and zinc mines of Algeria.

Included in the mineral wealth that France's territories are expected to yield is manganese, lead and zinc from Morocco and other northern areas, and graphite from Madagascar.

A Life of Service

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, "a life of service." In my opinion no man could wish for finer words to be said or written of him after he has rounded out his span on God's earth.

Dr. John A. Kenney, who has now passed from this way of life, gave just that, "a life of service."

In a world half-bent on destruction, it is well that we pause for a moment and reflect on the life of one who, despite adversities, was so intent in his devotion to his fellow being that he served him well.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I desire to include the following editorial which appeared in the January 31, 1950, issue of the Newark Evening News:

A LIFE OF SERVICE

By any standard, Dr. John A. Kenney, dead at 75, must be accounted a notable figure. His outstanding services to the physical welfare of his race began at Tuskegee Institute, where he was resident physician and from 1902 to 1922 medical director and chief surgeon of the John A. Andrew Memorial Hospital and School for Nurses. He was also personal physician for Tuskegee's two great heads, Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

That was for Dr. Kenney not a wide enough service, so in 1912 he founded the John A. Andrew annual clinics, at which Negro and white doctors, working together, treated Negroes living within a 200-mile radius. Terrorism by the Ku Klux Klan drove him from Alabama for his insisting on the right of Negro doctors to practice at a Veterans' Administration hospital.

Alabama's loss was New Jersey's gain, for on learning that Negro doctors were not welcomed at hospitals here, Dr. Kenney established in this city the Kenney Institute, named for his parents. In 1935 it was turned over to the Booker T. Washington Hospital Association. This organization, representing the Negro population of the State, renamed it Community Hospital.

In a subsidence of Klan feeling Dr. Kenney returned in 1939 to Alabama to head for 5 years Tuskegee Institute Hospital. Subsequently he came back to this State and resumed private practice in Montclair. From earliest manhood he devoted himself to the health of his race, and it is entirely in keeping with the spirit and influence of the man that both of his surviving sons should be physicians. His reputation for service is national and deserved.

The Flood-Control Job

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. C. GATHINGS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of January 27, 1950:

THE FLOOD-CONTROL JOB

After disastrous floods in 1927 and 1937, an over-all program for controlling the Mississippi below Cairo was drawn up by the Army engineers. The program called for 1,500 miles of levees built to sufficient height to hold back a record flood. Also included in the design were reservoirs and floodways.

Brig. Gen. P. A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission, has now reminded a House Appropriation Subcommittee that the protective system is still not complete and another major flood may be due. General Feringa pointed out that 400 miles of project levees have yet to be built, and the vital Atchafalaya River Basin floodway is still under construction. Engineers hope to finish this project by January 1, 1953.

During recent high stages of some of the Mississippi's tributaries the retaining walls held and the lower river saw no serious damage. But, as the engineers told the Congressmen, the valley is "living on borrowed time." The day may come when all the tributaries are flooding at the same time. Then we don't want it said that we did too little too late.

What Ails the Shoe Industry?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Lynn (Mass.) Daily Item:

WHAT AILS THE SHOE INDUSTRY?—NEW ENGLAND NOW PRODUCES ONLY 32 PERCENT OF NATION'S TOTAL—BOSTON TRADE PUBLICATION BLAMES LABOR COSTS, LACK OF DIVERSITY

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—What's ailing the shoe industry in Lynn and other New England centers? New England once produced 62 percent of the country's shoes, but today it produces only 32 percent. It's main troubles are held to be labor costs, lack of diversified output, inadequate merchandizing, and nonidentification of its products on the national market, according to an article appearing in the current issue of Leather and Shoes, published in Boston. Since the preparation of the article, some relief has appeared on the horizon with the announcement that the Wage and Hour Division of the United States Department of Labor only this week denied a petition for industry-wide exemptions under the new 75-cents-an-hour minimum wage law and limited individual factory exemptions to 65 cents an hour for the first 6 weeks of a learner's employment and to 70 cents for the second 6 weeks. This is a decided boon to Lynn and other Massachusetts shoe factories since it will restrict the differential between the 75-cent minimum already contracted for in this State and the lower minimums sought in other States—some of them as low as 57½ cents an hour. Because of wide local interest in the topic, the Item has received permission to reproduce the Leather and Shoes article in full.)

For the past 50 years New England's shoe industry has been on the down grade. In this period it has consistently made fewer shoes, operated fewer factories, employed fewer workers. The only thing that has increased has been its mortalities, liquidations, and exodus of its former factories. According to all evidence available, the decline of New England's shoe industry will continue downward. It has apparently lost its once-famed virility and initiative; at least other shoe sectors in the country have superseded it.

The facts and statistics demonstrating this contention provide an impressive array of irrefutable evidence.

Fifty years ago, New England's shoe producing States (Massachusetts, New Hampshire, and Maine), produced 62 percent of the country's total footwear; today it is down to 32 percent, a fall of 50 percent. A half century past, Massachusetts produced 47.1 percent of the total as against about 17.5 percent today, a drop of about 70 percent. Significantly, these declines have been annually consistent over the 50-year period. The following table illustrates it more graphically:

Percent of shoe output

Year	Massachusetts	New Hampshire	Maine	Total New England
1899	47.1	4.9	9.7	61.7
1933	21.4	5.7	6.0	33.1
1948	17.4	5.3	7.7	30.4

The exodus of shoe-manufacturing firms and factories has also been impressive. Twenty-five years ago Massachusetts had 595 shoe plants, but today has only 245; New Hampshire in the same period fell from 65 to 54; while Maine just about held its own with approximately 46.

STEADY SHRINKAGE

New England's once celebrated shoe centers which were the core of the United States shoe industry—Lynn, Haverhill, Newburyport, Brockton, etc.—have shown steady shrinkage. Haverhill, which only 30 years ago accounted for 25 percent of the Nation's total shoe output, today accounts for a mere 3 percent. In 1905 Newburyport was a bustling shoe town with 28 factories, with approximately 6,000 workers. By 1924 the factories numbered only 18. Today there are only four shoe factories there, employing a total of about 1,500, and two of the firms accounting for 1,200 of the workers.

In the past year alone in the Lynn-Haverhill area, 33 of 61 shoe factories have liquidated or moved out. Charles J. Goldman, legal counsel for the Lynn Shoe Manufacturers Association, declares this 55-percent loss in this short period as "the greatest collapse of the shoe industry in history." He further states, "Lynn is the best place in the United States to make shoes. Historically it is the birthplace of the shoe industry. Yet, in spite of all these favorable conditions there has been an exodus of shoe manufacturers to such an alarming extent that recently I caused a bill to be introduced in the Massachusetts Legislature asking that a commission be appointed to ascertain the reasons for the exodus."

A recent and critical blow to New England's shoe industry was the migration of the W. L. Douglas Co. from Brockton to Scranton, Pa. For 76 years this firm has been located in Brockton, but after a 6-month labor-management quarrel, pulled up stakes and left. The firm once employed as many as 3,500 workers.

LABOR'S PART

Much of the plight of New England's waning shoe industry is blamed onto the labor unions. Most of the plants are under contract to one of two unions—the Brotherhood of Shoe & Allied Craftsmen, AFL, a New England local, and the United Shoe Workers of America, CIO.

In 1919 New England's shoe factories employed 114,000 workers. Today it has dwindled to 79,000. Except for Los Angeles and the New York-Brooklyn areas, both of which make mostly high-priced footwear requiring more detailed operations and hence higher rates, New England wage rates are higher than in any part of the country.

The relation of direct labor cost to the factory selling price per pair averages 23.18 percent for the Nation. In the Lynn-Haverhill area the direct labor cost averages between 24 to 40 cents. In this same area the union has negotiated contracts providing for a 75-cent minimum hourly, progressing to 80 cents in 4 months. But the same union contract provides for a 50-cent hourly minimum in Ohio and 60 cents in Maryland.

Walter Espovich, counsel for the Haverhill Shoe Manufacturers Board of Trade, stated: "Twenty years ago Haverhill had a differential in labor. Now it has disappeared. Conditions in New England are not favorable due to high labor costs. * * * Haverhill as a high labor cost area gets only the overflow of business."

Is New England's higher labor cost offset by a higher productivity? A Bureau of Labor Statistics study showed that from 1939 to 1945, for the country as a whole, there was an 8.8 percent reduction in labor time per pair of shoes, and that New England shoe plants increased output per man-hour more than producers located in other major centers.

On the other hand, Charles J. Goldman, counsel for Lynn shoe manufacturers, recently told Labor Secretary Maurice J. Tobin: "Not only has Massachusetts the highest labor cost in the country for workers on women's popular priced novelty shoes but also the lowest rate of production of shoes."

Address Before the Washington-Lewis Chapter of DAR, Fredericksburg, Va., Explaining House Concurrent Resolution To Strengthen United Nations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following text of an address I delivered on House Concurrent Resolution 64, before the Washington-Lewis chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, at Fredericksburg, Va., recently:

I appreciate very much the invitation to meet with you tonight, to discuss House Concurrent Resolution 64—what it is, what it proposes to do, and how advocates of this form of international cooperation for peace hope to achieve this worthy objective. I

also hope that I can correct some of the misconceptions of the program. I am highly honored that you have invited me here to present, so to speak, my side of the question. Your national organization has publicly expressed disapproval of the idea of world federation, and by asking me here tonight you have demonstrated once again one of the principles which has made our democracy distinctive—a desire to hear both sides of a question.

Federation is no new or revolutionary concept of government. World federation proposes an extension of the idea which binds governments into programs of service, and in this case the proposed service is a truly effective attack upon the war system. It is not, as some of the critics charged, a superworld government with unlimited powers to assume all of the functions of the individual states. The federation I contemplate could not interfere with the internal affairs of the member states; it would not deal with currency or trade problems, nor have authority to consider any matter not related to the world's peace.

The power of a federation such as I envision would be carefully defined and strictly limited. For example, House Concurrent Resolution 64, which I had the honor to introduce and which is sponsored by more than 100 Members of the House, refers specifically to "defined and limited powers," and only in one field—that of preservation of peace. The language is so clear and direct that there cannot be any misinterpretation of the objective of world federation under this measure.

All of us will agree, I am sure, that another war, releasing upon the world terrible weapons of destruction, would threaten modern civilization. All of us are searching for the means whereby peace can be made secure and future aggression prevented. That burning desire, not only on the part of the people of the United States but of other peoples, as well, was responsible for the warm welcome the United Nations received when it was organized in San Francisco in 1945. Since that time millions of freedom-loving people everywhere have placed their faith in the United Nations. We have come to accept it as the world's best hope for enduring peace. But, at the same time, we would be indulging in a dangerous deception to assume that with the creation of the United Nations the fight for world order based upon law has been won. We have made a beginning with the United Nations; the more difficult task lies ahead. The sense of imperfection must not cause us to abandon the United Nations. Those of us who are supporting the idea of federation are careful to point out that we must work through the United Nations and develop that organization into an international agency capable of maintaining the peace.

House Resolution 64 is definite on this score. It states: "It is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of the United State to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited power to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation and enforcement of world law." A reading of this statment is proof enough of our devotion to the United Nations. We want to give to the United Nations the one thing it lacks—the authority to decide questions of aggression through a judicial system and enforce the decisions so reached. We must recognize that it is still possible for aggression to take place, and this great organization finds itself without power to check potential aggressions.

A system of law, based upon justice, is the only answer. That is the meaning of Resolution 64. We are saying to the world, "What we want is a world governed by law and the principles of justice, not a world of violence and disorder." We are proposing that the principles which have united the people of the United States be extended in this limited sense to the whole world. If we do this, we will have peace and we will have something we love even more than peace itself—we will have justice.

Not many years ago, the State of Tennessee and the State of Arkansas had a sharp clash over the ownership of certain islands in the Mississippi River. Suits and counter suits were filed, and eventually the Supreme Court of the United States was called upon to make the final decision. Both States accepted, without equivocation, the judgment of the Court. Why? Because we have grown accustomed to accepting the rule of law.

The United States marshal of the district which I represent is one of the least violent men I know. He does not often carry a pistol, and yet, he is charged with enforcing mandates of the Supreme Court. No matter how many millions of dollars are involved or how many lives affected, the judgment is enforced and violence is never done. But one day that was not the case. It required force to carry out the mandate of the Supreme Court. In that period we had not, as a people, developed the respect for law and order which governs our life today.

Our goal in international relations is the same universal respect for law but with force sufficient to back up the decisions against aggression if necessary. Certainly that does not call for a world government which would destroy the sovereignty of the member nations.

The world has initiated movements in the past to achieve this ideal but the efforts have ended in failure because we had not developed a system of international justice, nor did we have power to back up decisions. The Kellogg Pact, negotiated by our own Secretary of State, outlawed war, but that treaty was immediately and consistently violated. The League of Nations could only protest, it could not act against the aggressors.

We all realize now that the occupation of the Rhineland by Hitler's troops was an act of aggression. That proved to Hitler that by acting boldly in violation of international agreements he could gain his ends in the face of indecision and timid action on the part of law-abiding Nations who had failed to build a system for unified protection of the peace. We can see now that German militarism could have been stopped then if we had had an international rule of law to brand his actions as violation of world law. Had Hitler persisted, in the face of such a ruling, he would have been confronted by world opinion and then by world police.

Chairman Kee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee had something like this in mind when he declared, during hearings on HCR 64: "If we could have had a world marshal to go in and arrest Hitler and Hitler recognized that the world marshal was backed by a Federation with sufficient power to enforce the orders of the marshal, we would not have had any trouble."

I shall not attempt to outline in great detail the organization of such a federation. I am more interested in having the Congress adopt HCR 64 as a policy statement. Such a clear policy declaration by the Congress would have a great moral effect upon the world. It would demonstrate once again to the world that we in the United States are interested primarily in establishing an enduring peace. We have fought two world wars for the ideals of freedom and justice. We are now in a position of world leadership. By adopting such a policy declaration, supported by the people of all political faiths in this country, we would point the way toward fulfillment of age-old dreams of peace.

Cost Against Saving

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. E. C. GATHINGS

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. GATHINGS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Gazette of January 24, 1950:

COST AGAINST SAVING

As flood crests on the Mississippi and Ohio Rivers have receded, the Army engineers have calculated that works erected since 1937 averted $15,000,000 in losses in the Wabash and lower Ohio Valleys this year. Levees and flood walls on the Mississippi below Cairo, Ill., are credited with saving $100,000,000 more.

These figures, however, give only a part of the picture. It is certain that the Nation-wide flood-control program which Congress set in motion in 1937 prevented loss of human life. While savings in life are not calculable, the engineers point out that hurricane-driven floods on Florida's Lake Okeechobee drowned 2,000 people in 1928. Flood-control works there were finished in 1943, and last year, when the same type of hurricane struck, no lives were lost. In no other year since the Government undertook flood control as a Federal responsibility has the death toll from river floods matched the 423 lives claimed by the Mississippi in 1927. Since 1938, when flood deaths totaled 180, the toll has exceeded 100 only once. In 1943, when the Missouri broke loose, the national toll was 107.

The national flood-control program by the middle of 1948, had prevented losses totaling $5,000,000,000 in the lower Mississippi Basin alone, according to the engineers' estimate. This was accomplished at a cost one-eighth as great. Elsewhere in the Nation the estimated savings on newer works was $500,000,000. This was slightly more than the amount of money spent for completed projects.

When we look at this balance sheet, with lives and property saved listed in one column and the funds spent for flood control in another, the figures are impressive enough. But can losses from floods really be measured in dollars and cents? To people who have known the menace of the advancing water, to people who have lost loved ones to the river, levees, and other protective works mean more than entries on a ledger. They represent guardians against disaster that need not occur again.

Israel's Labor Starts Modern Medical Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following item which appeared in this morning's New York Herald Tribune is a very interesting commentary on how

the State of Israel is treating its medical problem:

ISRAEL'S LABOR STARTS MODERN MEDICAL CENTER—HISTADRUT PLANS $5,000,000 HOSPITAL AND SCHOOLS FOR PHYSICIANS AND NURSES

(By Paul Tobenkin)

A $5,000,000 medical center, including a 400-bed hospital and medical and nursing schools, has been started 6 miles east of Tel Aviv, Israel, it was learned yesterday. When completed it will be the largest and most modern institution of its kind in the new state.

Dr. Noah Feler, chief surgeon and medical director of the Beilinson Hospital in Petach Tikvah, Israel, said the institution will be part of Kupat Holim, the medical service of Histadrut, the Israel labor federation.

Dr. Feler, sent to the United States by Kupat Holim to study American surgical methods, said that mass immigration, coupled with a serious shortage of doctors, nurses, and hospital facilites, has resulted in an increase of 25 to 30 percent in the civilian death rate since Israel became a state in May 1948.

The new 6-story hospital will be staffed by 100 doctors and 250 nurses. Each year the medical school will graduate from 20 to 30 doctors and the nursing school 60 nurses.

"We have about 1,600 practicing physicians in a land that must have a minimum of 2,500 doctors," Dr. Feler said. "There is a great need for graduate nurses. Kupat Holim alone needs an additional 400 nurses. Half of our present nursing staff consists of nongraduates. Israel vitally needs 6,000 hospital beds, but we must do the best we can with only 3,000 at present."

"In addition to training doctors," Dr. Feler said, "the new medical center will offer refresher and post-graduate courses to physicians already in practice. At present Kupat Holim sends a number of its physicians to the United States for such work."

"Israel plans to establish 400 new settlements within the next 2 years," Dr. Feler said, "and each must have a clinic staffed by at least one doctor and one nurse." He emphasized that Israel will welcome American physicians and nurses who wish to settle there.

A Secretary of State Is Also an Individual

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of January 27, 1950:

A SECRETARY OF STATE IS ALSO AN INDIVIDUAL

"I do not intend," said Dean Acheson, "to turn my back on Alger Hiss." Immediately hue and cry arises to condemn him.

It would be gratuitous to comment that the criticism comes from expected sources, from political partisans of known hostility. For many another, in swift judgment, seeing Mr. Acheson as Secretary of State, recalling Alger Hiss as a former employee of the Department of State, would likely join the chorus of condemnation.

Mr. Acheson, however, is not speaking as Secretary of State. He is speaking as a man in whose personal code friendship is impervious to weather changes, fair or foul. He makes an indelible case for the right of individual conscience.

The questions addressed to Mr. Acheson on this subject indeed came as result of public statements of obviously political inspiration. It is to his high credit that he did not evade them, as another might have done, by raising this point. Here I am, he seemed to say, and this is what I believe, and you will have to take me or leave me on the strength of it. Of course, he might have added that he expected the questions and was ready for them, because his answer and its Scriptural reference was, however admirable, quite well assembled. This, however, does not detract from its value, which is that of solid precept, useful as a guide to principled behavior.

It is seldom that an official occupied with high public policy, responsible to political considerations and impersonal routine, has an opportunity to relate conduct to personal conscience. Perhaps we would all be better off if this sort of interpretation of motive and action were called forth more frequently from public men. It is not a question of leniency for improper official conduct or its extenuation in betrayal of the public interest. It is a question whether adherence to conscience, wherever it leads one, is not properly a thing for a single standard, in private or public life.

Tulsa Tribune Suggests They Be Impeached

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include at this point in the RECORD the following editorial by Mr. Richard Lloyd Jones, editor of the Tulsa Tribune, Tulsa, Okla.:

"No wise man ever thought a traitor could be trusted."—Cicero.

THEY MUST BE IMPEACHED

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's happened to our country? This Hiss conviction has revealed something more than an individual traitor. It has revealed men in offices of high public trust who are defenders of treason.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of Harvard's collection of cultural curiosities, should resign from the highest court in our country. And if he hasn't the decency to do that, he should be impeached.

Frankfurter is only one of our high officials who has indicted his own intellect and integrity by sponsoring and repeatedly publicly professing his warm personal friendship for a traitor.

Justice Stanley Reed, also of our highest court, is another friend of traitor Hiss. He should resign, or be thrown out of his judicial robes by impeachment. Our courts and our Congress should be above suspicion.

Frankfurter was the exalted scholar whom the late President Franklin Roosevelt picked as his adviser.

It was Frankfurter who picked Hiss as the prodigy of the Roosevelt administration. It was Frankfurter and Roosevelt who made this traitor Hiss the closest adviser of the President of the United States at a time when not only the security of the American people was imperiled but the peace of the whole world. Roosevelt put the fate of nations in the hands of Hiss.

Added to all this our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, after the traitor is convicted, reiterates that he is the traitor's friend. If he is the traitor's friend he is not fit to be our Secretary of State.

The people's representatives in their Congress should lose no time to impeach and remove this man who could be a friend to a traitor.

This Hiss who helped our enemy was authorized by our Secretary of State and our President to shape the tragic policies that have brought China into communism, and an ally of Russia.

For 10 years, through the interest of the late President Roosevelt, Frankfurter, and others, this fellow Hiss has gone from one position of power to a new position of greater power. For 10 years this intrigue against our Government has been going on and for 10 years high officials in Washington, with full knowledge of these infamous operations, have protected and covered all these trails of treason. The treason story does not end with Hiss. It begins with Hiss. Washington is now filled with frightened public officials.

Even the President of the United States so far forgot his obligations to the American people that when the facts of treason began to be talked he assured the people that it was nothing but a political trick to distract their attention by dragging "red herrings" before them.

The President should have been the first to authorize and insist upon full investigation. He should have been the first to ferret out the truth. But instead of that our President, and his lieutenants, did everything they could to hide the truth and to keep the people in ignorance of their betrayal.

What is the matter with the Democratic Party that it, professing to be a political champion of the American people, should lend itself to the suppression of the truth and make every effort to smear and ridicule those who, in the defense of our country, have sought to establish the truth?

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, to his disgrace, is just one of the Democratic Senators who have tried to ridicule those who have brought the truths of the Hiss infamies to light.

On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a dying man. He had just been reelected without the strength to go through an exhaustive hard political campaign. Yet there at Yalta, this sick man, the choice of his party, was to determine the fate of nations. Of all the able men in America not one was chosen to be his adviser. He chose Hiss and Hiss alone. And it was at Yalta, under the influence of Hiss, that millions upon millions of people were flippantly handled over into slavery under Stalin.

It was this Hiss who, given the power by a Democratic Party and a Democratic President, gave to Russia three votes to our one in the newly formed United Nations. Everything that Hiss did was done to strengthen communism and to weaken America. And he is still the dear friend of our Secretary of State. And to two of the judges on our Supreme Court. And he is just a piece of "red herring" to the President.

Where are the Americans that they witness this with flippant disinterest? Where is our Congress, every Member of which has taken his solemn oath to defend the interests and protect the integrities of our Republic?

Every loyal citizen of this Republic should write every Congressman he knows or who represents him, Senate and House, and demand the impeachment of Frankfurter and Reed and Acheson. Command every Representative and Senator to command the President of the United States to reveal the names of those who have concealed this Hiss, and

his associates, in the betrayal of this Republic for the last 10 years.

Already, from the floor of the United States Senate, President Truman has been challenged to reveal the identity of those in our Government who, for 10 years, have engineered the concealment of the espionage evidence that convicted Hiss.

But a challenge is not enough. The whole country is now alerted to the fact that our State Department is honeycombed with trusted and confidential workers who have the funny idea that it is intellectually smart to betray America to the communistic forces.

The Senate should do more than challenge. It should command President Truman to come clean with everything, and himself clean out the traitors and the near-traitors and the friends of traitors in all the departments of our Government.

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has demanded the resignation of Acheson and Frankfurter. We would like to see one of Oklahoma's Senators lead the fight for a clean and honest national administration that is above suspicion. It is time that ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR became articulate with righteous indignation at the "red herring" hypocrisy of Truman.

Cheap and shallow are the gentlemen who sit in the Senate of the United States more concerned with their reelection than they are with the security of the American people. Shallow and sad, are the American voters who think betrayal of a public trust is a clever political trick that merits political award.

Our Congress is what we voters make it. This Hiss trial has proven many things. Chief of which is that we, the voters, have failed to do our duty. We have elected a President and a Congress that have tried to shield a traitor to the Republic.

The Hiss trial has put ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR on the spot. This Hiss story will reveal them. Do we expect statesmanship performance? Or are we to listen, as do the Texans, to a Senator who said that those who brought this Hiss to trial and those who convicted him are just trying to make a burlesque out of this.

Betraying your country is not burlesque, Mr. CONNALLY. Oklahoma waits for her Senators to speak.

How the Phrase "In God We Trust" Came To Be on the Coins of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article published by the Chase National Bank:

HOW THE PHRASE "IN GOD WE TRUST" CAME TO BE ON THE COINS OF THE UNITED STATES

The Reverend Watkinson was troubled. In his small parish at the Ridleyville, Pa., he brooded over the low ebb of Union fortunes after Fort Sumter and Bull Run. He deplored the godlessness of a Nation 7 months in civil war.

One cheerless November day in 1861 he sat down at the antique desk in his rectory and wrote a letter of singular eloquence to the Secretary of the Treasury.

"One fact touching our currency has hitherto been seriously overlooked," he wrote. "I mean the recognition of the Almighty God in some form on our coins.

"You are probably a Christian. What if our Republic were now shattered beyond reconstruction? Would not the antiquaries of succeeding centuries rightly reason from our past that we were a heathen Nation?"

Proposing a motto on the theme of God, liberty, law, he concluded, "This would relieve us from the ignominy of heathenism. This would place us openly under the divine protection we have personally claimed. From my heart I have felt our national shame in disowning God as not the least of our present national disasters."

The Secretary of the Treasury was Salmon P. Chase, certainly a Christian and one of Lincoln's ablest Cabinet members. Later he was to become Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, and it was in his honor that the Chase National Bank of the City of New York was named in 1877.

The Secretary, deep in problems of war financing, read this letter from the Reverend M. R. Watkinson and promptly recognized the merit of his plea. Within a week he had dispatched a note to the Director of the Mint in Philadelphia, James Pollock.

"No nation can be strong except in the strength of God," the note read, echoing the sentiments of the clergyman, "or safe except in His defense. The trust of our people in God should be declared on our national coins.

"You will cause a device to be prepared without unnecessary delay with a motto expressing in the fewest and tersest words possible this national recognition."

The Director of the Mint acted quickly on the Secretary's order. Before the year was out a bronze pattern for a $10-gold piece with the motto "God, our trust" had been submitted. Shortly thereafter, "Our country, our God" was suggested. But it was not until 1864, that "In God we trust" first appeared on a United States coin, a 2-cent piece. Salmon P. Chase himself had proposed this inscription.

Today this motto has the ring of timelessness, as though it had been given on tablets of stone to the founding fathers of a Republic conceived in a deep religious spirit. Yet until 1864 our country's moneys bore only practical and mundane Yankee slogans. The terse injunction "Mind your business" on the Fugio cent, first coin issued by the United States, illustrates the tempo of those times.

Since then many issues of all our coins have borne this simple affirmation of a Nation's faith, "In God we trust."

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting the text of a recent address made by Prof. Carlton Wells, of the University of Michigan, on the Justice for Poland radio program of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress.

In his introductory remarks, Attorney Joseph F. Furtek paid tribute to Professor Wells for his interest and work in the Polish cause. For many years, Professor Wells has kept in close touch with Polish affairs and during the war, he headed a Michigan committee of Americans for Poland.

The western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress is to be complimented for its fine work in stimulating interest in and making the average American aware of the tragic fate that is Poland's through its regular series of radio programs. We must not give up the fight for this worthy cause. Let all those who believe in freedom, independence, and self-determination join in the fight for the liberation of Poland.

Poland must be free. Let all true Americans rally to the noble cause of the Polish people.

The address of Professor Wells follows:

WHAT CAN AN AVERAGE AMERICAN DO ABOUT THE FATE OF POLAND?

(By Carlton F. Wells)

Let me begin by rephrasing my subject as an average American of Chicopee, Mass., or of Ann Arbor, Mich., might phrase it: How can an average American do anything about Poland? And why should he concern himself about this far-away country behind the iron curtain? To be sure, this average American may sympathize with Poland's present tragedy—her terrible human losses in the war, her devastated territory, her capital reduced to rubble, her political enslavement by Communists taking orders from Moscow.

But an average American is also bound to feel that Poland is, after all, only a small and distant part of a much-troubled world. Our 1950 headlines play up Communist China, Formosa, General MacArthur; Indonesia, India, Yugoslavia; the East-West struggle for Germany; Russia, the atomic bomb, and the cold war; the forthcoming British elections and the welfare state. * * * But Poland? The average American almost never hears of it any more.

And because most of us Americans are practical people and because we usually refuse to worry about problems beyond our power to remedy, we are likely to sum it up by asking the obvious and difficult question: Why should I—how can I—do anything about Poland?

To that question, with all that it implies of hopelessness—I want to give a clear and practical answer. For I believe profoundly that we average Americans have a stake in—and a responsibility for—what is happening today to 25,000,000 Polish people in Poland and to hundreds of thousands of exiled Poles in western Germany, France, Britain, and Italy. I believe that we as Americans ought not to act as though Poland's fate is none of our business, or that we have no responsibilities in the matter.

For we do owe a debt to the Polish people—a debt that I can only summarize here—a debt based on Poland's unique record to the common cause in World War II.

Even the most average of average Americans knows that back in 1939 Poland was first to fight Hitler—and that her bitter, heroic resistance to Germany marked the end of appeasement and the beginning of Germany's ultimate defeat. We average Americans know, too, that subsequently Poland was ruthlessly dismembered by its two totalitarian partners in plunder, Germany and Russia. In the fateful, bloody years that followed, Polish resistance went on—a great army-in-exile stationed in France and later in England, an air corps that played a key part in the battle of Britain, and naval units cooperating with the British Navy. As for Russia's treatment of Poland after 1939—the Communists sent more than 1,500,000 Poles into Siberian mines and into slave-labor camps, and almost certainly murdered at Katyn 10,000 Polish officers. Meanwhile,

in German-occupied Poland, the Polish underground—the most effective in all Europe—fought unceasingly. Then, after Hitler invaded Russia in 1941 and Stalin hastened to enlist Poland's aid, a Polish Army formed in Russia under General Anders moved to the Middle East, and in the final years of the war fought skillfully and bravely in Italy (Monte Casino, Ancona, Bologna). A like record was made by Polish troops in the Normandy invasion and after. In short, the Polish record in the war was magnificent—hailed again and again by Churchill, Roosevelt, Eisenhower, by dozens of other spokesmen for the Allies.

And yet—as average Americans are finally coming to realize—Poland was betrayed—progressively and utterly—into the hands of the Russians: at Tehran, in 1943, where the British and Americans gave Stalin half of Poland's territory without so much as informing Poland's loyal coalition government-in-exile; at Yalta, in 1945, in a capitulation to Russian demands that can only be called appeasement; and in our repudiation of the legal Polish Government for the Communist puppet regime, imposed on the Polish people by the Red Army and kept in power by a totalitarian-style election.

No sensitive American can look at our treatment of our wartime Polish ally without a sense of shame—without realizing that an irreparable wrong has been done a valiant and loyal nation. One cannot read our repeated assurances and pledges given to the Polish people by Britain and America—and by Russia too—without realizing that a flagrant injustice without parallel in modern history has been perpetrated.

No American can, I suppose, fully comprehend the tragic plight of Poland, or realize how bitterly betrayed the Polish exiles feel. Let me urge my listeners to look at one book—a graphic, restrained, heroic story recently published: General Anders' An Army in Exile—a book that makes crystal clear why no American can fairly say that Poland's fate is not also, in some measure, America's responsibility.

What, then, can an average American do on Poland's behalf? I have two suggestions to make, which I can only outline briefly. Here they are:

1. In America we can help to keep in living memory the great history and the great cultural tradition of Poland. Here, in free America, the Polish traditions of liberty, of patriotism, of liberal western culture, can be kept in remembrance—can be studied in our colleges and recorded in our libraries and represented in our art galleries and concert halls. This tradition of the Polish nation is, as a recent writer has said, a great spiritual tradition, possessed of such "inner virtue and strength that it can survive ordinary human trials and vicissitudes. But today Poland has on her back a cynical enemy operating with all the modern means of extermination and repression. A good tradition cannot die but it can be killed. Let the cold war last another 20 or 30 years and there will be no Poland." (But see all of this admirable address on Polish Studies—A New Task for Polish Americans by Helen S. Zand, September 11, 1949.)

We can and we should use Polish scholars-in-exile in our schools and colleges to expand our too meager knowledge of Poland's distinctive literature, her unique national history, her contributions to art and music and science and scholarship and religion. We average Americans can do our small part in making certain that our local libraries have the best Polish books and the best books about Poland—Jan Karski's Story of a Secret State, General Anders' An Army in Exile, Arthur Bliss Lane's I Saw Poland Betrayed, the United Nations series volume on Poland, and The Cambridge History of Poland; also, such books as The Art of Poland by Irena Piotrowska and translations of Poland's older writers from Mickiewicz to Sienkiewicz and Reymont. By such small but practical efforts as these, can we help to keep alive the spiritual heritage of the Polish people.

Now—and finally—my second suggestion:

2. The average American must remember, always, that Poland means people—means individual, human, knowable people. And toward some of these Poles we can extend help of incalcuable value. I have known a fairly large number of them—exiled Poles who got to America during or after the war—and I count it my rare good fortune to have known them: a Polish-Jewish artist, selflessly patriotic, ardently devoted to Poland's culture, tirelessly anti-Communist; a Polish soldier, whose wartime record included Siberian prison, military service in Italy, and at long last adjustment at Ann Arbor to American education; a Polish woman from the Polish underground, who fought in the Warsaw uprising in 1944 and who endured incredible conditions as a German slave laborer but who, in spite of all, got to America and into scientific work * * * and I could list a dozen others illustrative of Poland's sterling people who have reached our shores.

There are, however, many, many thousands who have not got to America but who want desperately to come——DP's who deserve a welcome and a haven in the United States.

How can an average American help to bring these Poles-in-exile to America? A word or two must suffice. The present DP law, passed in 1948, is "overly complicated, unjust, unfair, and discriminatory"—and a better law can be got, now, if enough average Americans urge it on their Senators and Representatives. You can help here, by getting in touch with the Nation-wide Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, located at 303 Lexington Avenue, New York City, or by working through your local church or civic organization. Again, as an individual or through a local organization, you can help to bring displaced Polish or other DP's to your home community—an opportunity and a challenge of such human importance that many more Americans should participate. At Ann Arbor a 14-organization DP committee is functioning and effective. In our university six DP students (including three splendid Polish DP's) have been brought this last year by American students. For further information on how you or your community can bring DP's to America and to your community, please write me or write the Polish-American Congress in care of this station.

My modest suggestions, then, boil down to these: We average Americans must not forget Poland's fate. We as a Nation must do all we can as individuals or in organizations, to maintain ties with Poland's great traditions and culture, and to maintain ties with the Polish people—especially at this time by bringing Polish DP's from Europe. We Americans must maintain in the long dark days ahead, an unswerving resolution that Poland's honored dead in World War II should not have died in vain—that by our American efforts, the Polish people shall be brought nearer to the ultimate attainment of Poland's freedom.

The Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

The fact still remains that all of us have a widespread and sincere desire for peace and although the decision of the President to continue work on the hydrogen bomb seems logical under existing conditions with no apparent cooperation from the Soviet Union to eliminate war, we seem to be forgetting United Nations and what its real function was. What can we do to make this group become something other than a name, when its real function was to break down the tensions between the nations of the world and be an effective instrument of peace? Presently the United States spends over $15,000,000,000 annually for its military defense and approximately $24,000,000 annually for the United Nations. How long can we or any other nation afford to continue this armament race? We should take the lead in an effort to relieve the world of the burden of armaments and pray that by making mutual concessions we might achieve the goal of international security.

The editorial follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S DECISION

On Friday the President simply stated what, under all the circumstances, was no more than simple fact: that the responsibility for decision as to whether or not to proceed with the hydrogen bomb was his and his alone. It is a subject which cannot be submitted to public debate, on which the President alone has access to all relevant sources of information and in regard to which he bears, as Chief Executive, as Commander in Chief, and as director of foreign relations, the direct constitutional responsibility. His decision has now been announced: "I have directed the Atomic Energy Commission to continue its work on all forms of atomic weapons, including the so-called hydrogen or superbomb." This work "will be carried forward on a basis consistent with the over-all objectives of our program for peace and security."

This newspaper has already indicated its belief that this is the only sound decision; that if the bomb can be made, it now must be made. It is not a moral issue and cannot be so regarded. Mr. Lilienthal, in a difficult and embarrassed interview on Monday, intimated that the secret high-level discussions of recent weeks have not turned on ethical scruples. Such hideous weapons as burning phosphorus—which Mr. Lilienthal himself earnestly promoted during the war—or napalm incendiary jelly are just as terrible for the individual victim as an atomic explosion. The issue has been one in military and political strategy, in the proper allocation of the national effort, in evaluation of the weapon as a weapon.

Conceivably the moral problem might arise if American action could in any way determine Soviet action. But then there would be no problem, for no one would attempt to construct this superhorror if there were any assurance that by refraining from doing so the Soviet Union would be prevented from building such a bomb of its own. There is no such assurance. Dr. Urey's informed guess that, given the raw materials, the development of the hydrogen bomb could not well cost more than around a hundred million dollars is sufficient indication that the technical and scientific problems foreseen are not particularly difficult for any nation which has already achieved atomic fission.

The knowledge and materials are now available. The United States really has no choice save to go forward, to acquaint itself with the possibilities and to be ready with

a hydrogen bomb as soon as any other power may be—just as it had no choice during the war save to go forward with the study of such horrible things as modern superpoisonous gases and bacteriological warfare. A moral question can only arise, if it ever does, in connection with the use of the superbomb. We must be very careful how we pin our faith on this thing, assuming that it is successfully developed; we must be wary of the idea that a superweapon can give us a superpower in the world or relieve us of the hard obligations of intelligent policy and diplomacy, of consistency, integrity, and foresight on the basic plane of human relationships. If the bomb can be made, we must make it. The manner of its use is the difficult question, but that cannot arise until we know the results of the directive which has now publicly been given to the Atomic Energy Commission.

Let There Be Laughter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in a world which is deploring the fate of mankind, the words of His Holiness Pope Pius XII contained in the following editorial which appeared in the Newark Star-Ledger of February 2, 1950, are indeed worth noting.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include therein the editorial entitled "Let There Be Laughter":

LET THERE BE LAUGHTER

When Pope Pius XII says there should be more laughter in this world of many long faces, he is deserving of an amen from every American. Introduced to Chick Johnson and Ole Olson with the explanation that they are not Catholics, His Holiness responded:

"Laughter has no religion; there should be more of it in the world."

Those two American comedians have done much to bring laughter to all. Their irrepressible good humor, and their zany antics have lightened many heavy hearts.

With his appeal for more laughter, the Pontiff also calls attention, if only by contrast, to a curious lapse among professional world-savers to the left. It has long been noted that most do-gooders seem to lack the gift of laughter. Perhaps they are too busy decrying the woes of society to laugh either with or at Olson and Johnson.

Civil-Rights Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the reading of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York Times magazine section on January 22, 1950:

TO SECURE THESE RIGHTS EDUCATION HELPS, BUT LEGISLATION IS NECESSARY TO BRING ALL OUR CITIZENS THEIR CIVIL RIGHTS

(By Robert K. Carr, professor of government at Dartmouth, and formerly executive secretary of the President's Committee on Civil Rights)

In the 2-year period since the members of the President's Committee on Civil Rights went to the White House to submit its final report to Mr. Truman the civil-rights problem has become one of the most bitterly fought political issues in American history. While much of the attack upon the President's civil-rights program has been raucous and emotional, some of its critics have been reasonably calm and intellectual and accordingly their arguments are entitled to careful consideration.

These critics specifically have challenged two findings of the Civil Rights Committee which underlie the specific recommendations which the President has submitted to Congress. These are (1) a call for positive governmental action, much of it Federal in character, in support of civil liberty in America, and (2) a conclusion that segregation of people along racial, religious, or nationality lines must be eliminated from American life.

In the face of the renewal of the civil-rights conflict in the final session of the Eighty-first Congress, it is appropriate to reexamine these two findings, to note the nature of the attack upon them, and to restate some of the arguments in their favor which the President's Committee found persuasive.

The idea that civil rights can be strengthened and supported by Government is suggested in the very title to the Report of the President's Committee—"To Secure These Rights"—a title taken from the Declaration of Independence, where it is followed by the words "governments are instituted among men." Thus, the notion that government can be a friend as well as an enemy of basic human liberties finds firm support in our earliest political traditions.

In spite of this fact, opponents of civil-rights legislation argue that the only sound and successful way of strengthening civil rights is through private, voluntary action—through the education of each man to an understanding of the value of the free way of life, of the folly of prejudice, intolerance, and bigotry, of the need to respect his neighbor's rights if his own are to be secure. The more liberal of the opponents also emphasize the need to shore up the social and economic underpinning of our Nation so that civil liberty may have favorable conditions in which to thrive.

Let it be made clear at once that the President's committee by no means urged the use of laws as an exclusive means of safeguarding civil rights. It saw clearly the important roles which education, and economic measures in such fields as employment, housing, and health must play if our freedoms are to be made secure. But it saw no need to choose between these approaches as though they were rival and mutually exclusive means of reaching the goal. All are necessary.

Because legislation in support of civil rights is the most controversial of the means, the committee devoted much of its report to the development of the case in its favor. The argument may be restated as follows:

A careful reading of American history since 1789 shows that private individuals and organizations have been responsible for many of the most serious encroachments upon civil liberties. This assertion is borne out by the treatment we have given the largest of our minorities, the Negro. There is no denying that the Negro's civil rights have frequently been encroached upon by government. But for every Negro who, for example, has been kept from voting by legal restraints there is at least one other who has been kept away from the ballot box through intimidation by private persons. And while there are 17 States that segregate the Negro by law, can anyone doubt that in many of the other 31 States private action still prevents the Negro from associating freely with other men in the place of business, the labor union, the church, the school, the theater?

Traditionally a democracy copes with the antisocial acts of individuals through criminal laws, such as those dealing with murder, arson, and burglary. Why should we not deal with interferences with civil rights the same way? If one man willfully and deliberately interferes with another man's right to vote, why should that not be regarded as criminal conduct and punished accordingly?

Objection is promptly heard to such a proposal. It is said that civil-rights violations have their roots in prejudice and bigotry and that unfortunately prejudice and bigotry cannot be eliminated by passing laws. And it is commonly asserted: "You cannot change human nature by passing a law; you cannot legislate morality."

These assertions, while at first thought seemingly persuasive, are shown by history to be something less than true. It may be impossible to eliminate prejudice and bigotry or to change human nature by passing laws. But human behavior is often controlled by law. Laws against murder cannot be expected to eliminate all murderous hatreds and drives from men. But there can be no doubt that such laws do prevent many potential murderers from putting their hatreds and drives into practice.

The opponents of civil-rights legislation also refer to the practical difficulties of administering such laws and warn us that they will prove as unenforceable as were the prohibition laws, or that it will take a standing army to back them up. Admittedly, civil-rights laws—particularly those carrying criminal sanctions—are not always easy to enforce.

But the difficulties can be exaggerated. For example, the record of the Civil Rights Section of the Department of Justice shows that civil-rights laws carrying criminal sanctions can be enforced, at least to the extent that they are responsible for improvement in the condition of our rights. The work of this agency is clearly one of the forces responsible for the drastic decline in lynchings and the increase in Negro voting during the last decade.

The recent experience of New York State under its Fair Employment Practices Act demonstrates that racial and religious discrimination in employment can be ameliorated by a law which, although containing criminal sanctions, has never taken offenders to court. Much has been accomplished by an administrative commission through negotiation and conciliation without using even its cease and desist order provided by the law.

Actually the choice is not between law and no law. Much tolerance and discrimination are today encouraged by law. This is particularly true of the many States in which Negroes are denied the right of first-class citizenship through segregation laws. Thus, it is not true that those who advocate protection of civil rights through legislation are necessarily trying to force people to abandon private voluntary practices—to interfere with "folkways." Those who are opposed to civil-rights laws on the ground you cannot legislate morality should ponder the possibility that we have been legislating immorality.

If it be admitted that laws may be helpful as a means of safeguarding civil rights, there is still the issue whether such laws should be local or national, with the critics of the Truman civil-rights program insisting that only the local community, or at most the

State, should so use the legislative power. Here, too, it should be made absolutely clear that the Civil Rights Committee believed the battle for civil rights must always be fought in good part on the local front. Accordingly, it directed many of its specific recommendations for legislative action to the States and local communities.

And yet there are certain compelling reasons why Federal action is necessary. Let us consider three:

First, the record shows that insofar as civil liberty has been encroached upon by public officers, rather than by private persons, the threat from State and local officials has been greater than that from Federal officials. This is a difficult assertion to prove statistically, but there are certain reasons why it is so.

For example, against the threat offered to freedom of the press by a Federal sedition act, the threat resulting from a local ordinance restricting the distribution of handbills is minor indeed. But analysis of Supreme Court decisions shows that in the collective sense State and local statutes have encroached upon freedom of the press far more than have Federal statutes.

Where a State or a community is either unable or unwilling to prevent its officers from encroaching upon fundamental freedoms, the Federal Government has a responsibility to step in and take action. Indeed, the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments to the Constitution place an express obligation upon Congress to see that the rights protected by these amendments against State action are safeguarded.

Second, logic suggests that the high moral principles of the whole society be used to check the lapses of wayward parts. The many and varied components of the moral fiber of the larger area give it a strength and resiliency that cannot be matched in many of its parts. It is a fact that in our Nation at large we have shown a deeper understanding of the free way of life and a higher regard for civil rights than has been true in certain of our States and communities. Should we not put that greater national sense of moral responsibility to work in protecting our rights?

Third, whether we like it or not, our civil-rights difficulties have become an international issue which the Federal Government must meet. The Civil Rights Committee saw evidence that whenever a lynching has occurred in this country in recent years the word has echoed from one end of the world to the other within a matter of hours. People everywhere, and particularly colored people—who make up two-thirds of the world's population—have looked to the National Government of the United States for an explanation as to how such a shocking event can occur in a democratic country, and for the taking of remedial steps to prevent the recurrence of such outrages.

Recently the Supreme Court has called our attention to the damage which can be done to our interests internationally through irresponsible action by one State. In 1913 California passed an alien land law which made it impossible for Japanese aliens to own or occupy agricultural land in the State. In taking this step California rejected the protests of three Presidents of the United States that such a law would almost certainly cause an adverse reaction inside Japan. In 1948 the Supreme Court declared this statute unconstitutional and in one of the opinions in the case it is stated:

"The passage of the law was an international incident. The Japanese Government made an immediate protest on the ground that the statute was an indication of unfriendliness toward its people. Indeed, the resentment was so strong inside Japan that demands were made that war be declared against the United States. Anti-American agitation grew rapidly."

Who can doubt today that the passage of this State law was one of the things that finally led the Japanese people to feel such hatred toward the United States, or that it made it easier for militarists and extremists to guide Japan down a road that brought ruin to that nation and the ravages of war to this Nation? Or who can be certain that similar action by American States or communities today may not give similar offense to foreign peoples that will one day bring suffering and death to many Americans? Irresponsible action by some of our people can well do grave damage to all of us.

In other words, as a Nation in a troubled world we cannot wait for our slowest State or our most backward community to catch up and see to it that all freedoms are guaranteed to all of its people. The international situation creates a sense of urgency with respect to our civil-rights problem which only the National Government can meet.

Two considerations persuaded the President's Committee that segregation must go. The first was a belief that we must narrow the gap between our principles and practices. Perhaps the most basic principle of the American way of life is a belief that each individual should be judged by his fellowmen strictly on the basis of his own personality, his industry, his achievements.

Recently Gen. C. W. Lawrence reported on the experience of the Air Force which has abandoned segregation at its Lackland Base in Texas, where 26,000 men go through 13 weeks of basic training. He said: "The integration of the base was accomplished with complete harmony. Orders went through to completely end segregation among the trainees on a certain date and when that date arrived the segregation was ended. No unpleasant incidents resulted and the white boys and the Negro boys in the training camp are getting along well together." This and other recent interracial experiments seem to show that where men do live and work together regardless of race and religion, prejudice and intolerance begin to decline and awareness of the importance of the individual as against his membership in a racial group begins to grow.

Secondly, the Committee was convinced that the so-called separate but equal solution to the race problem is a failure. The separate but equal policy is the best rationalization which supporters of segregation have advanced. The argument runs that it is desirable to segregate people solely because of the color of their skin, but they are to be provided absolutely equal facilities to those available to the rest of the population, particularly as to services supplied by the Government.

The evidence shows that, after long years of effort, the facilities supplied the segregated races, while indeed separate, are far from equal and are not likely to become so in the foreseeable future. For example, statistics recently released by the United States Office of Education show that as late as 1946 separate Negro schools, by whatever test employed, were shockingly inferior to white schools. Value of school property per student was $250 for white and $48 for Negroes. School expenditures per student were $104 for whites and $57 for Negroes.

No responsible person can demand the elimination of segregation from American life overnight. The social patterns of segregation have been rigidly set over a long period of years, and it would be folly to attempt to alter them quickly or without careful preparation. Yet here, too, time is a very serious factor. We have made progress in the 80 years the problem has been with us in integrating our racial minorities into the national life. But much remains to be done. And who can doubt that we have far less than 80 years in which to travel the rest of the way to the goal of a truly democratic society?

In his address at Columbia University during his recent visit to this country, India's great statesman, Nehru, warned: "The West has too often despised the Asian and the African and still in many places denies them not only equality of rights but even common humanity and kindliness. This is one of the great danger points of our modern world; and now that Asia and Africa are shaking off their torpor and arousing themselves, out of the evil may come a conflagration of which no man can see the range of consequences."

We must heed the warning before it is too late.

Our Fiscal Crisis—What Can We Do About It?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 30, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under authority granted me I am very glad to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the address made by Hon. John W. Hanes, chairman of Tax Foundation, Inc., before the three hundred and tenth regular meeting of the National Industrial Conference Board at the Hotel Astor on January 26, 1950.

His subject Our Fiscal Crisis—What Can We Do About It? is most apropos at this time. The American people are more conscious than ever of the heavy burden of taxation upon their shoulders and there can be no dispute that if our country is to go forward and prosper and if our industries are to expand, the cost of Government must be decreased and the weight of this burden lifted from the people's shoulders.

Mr. Hanes is well qualified to speak on this subject because he is not only a man of affairs and highly considered in the world of business, but he has also served his Government as Assistant Secretary and Under Secretary of the Treasury from July 1, 1938, until December 31, 1939; therefore, he has a wide vision and broad experience in fiscal matters. I hope the Members of Congress may read this clear and factual presentation of the serious fiscal situation which confronts us, and I am sure our country will be benefited by his analysis and recommendations.

The address follows:

The subject assigned to me is The Tax Burden. I should like to divide my remarks into several sections: first, taxes and spending in relation to a sound over-all fiscal policy second, some desirable reforms in tax policy; and third, incentives and socialism.

To some, fiscal policy has a forbidding sound. The very words bring to mind visions of statistics by the pound, complicated formulas, the higher reaches of economics and public finance—in short, a subject to be avoided at all costs and at all times.

Nothing could be further from the truth. Although the techniques for carrying out fiscal policies may be complex, the basic policies themselves are determined—or should be determined—by common-sense principles understandable to any layman.

For instance in drawing up a Federal fiscal policy for the next year beginning June 30, 1950, there are two possible approaches. On the first basic decisions resulting from these approaches, rests the entire fiscal program.

One is the businesslike approach. The fiscal planner looks first at the estimated revenues for fiscal 1951. He finds they have been estimated at $37,300,000,000. And he says, in effect: "We are going to get that much money—a tremendous sum, and what can we afford? How can we fit our many wants to the funds available?"

That is one approach. A second is to draw up a national budget based on what one would like to spend, what is desirable or considered necessary by one voting group or another. This fiscal planner, after finding that the total adds up to $42,000,000,000 for fiscal 1951, goes on to say, in effect: "Let's see what new taxes can be added to reach that total. How much of it can we add to the national debt?"

There is the choice: what we can afford, or what we would like, whether we can afford it or not. A decision in this basic area, understandable to any taxpayer, can determine—has determined—fiscal policy for the most powerful country in the world.

I have begun with this illustration to demonstrate simply that tax policies do not exist in a vacuum; they are dependent on the level of expenditures. And both taxes and spending depend on an over-all fiscal policy developed at the top. It is difficult, if not impossible, for Congress to cut spending without strong leadership from the executive department.

Today the No. 1 fiscal problem of the Federal Government is this: We are living above our income; we are spending more than we are taking in.

There are three ways to meet this problem: First, we can reduce spending; second, we can increase taxes; third, we can increase the national debt through deficit financing.

During the present fiscal year we are spending over $80,000 a minute, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, for 52 weeks. As a result of this spending pace, nearly $6,000,000,000 will be added to the national debt by next June 30.

Proposals for reducing Government spending are as numerous as they are unsuccessful. You will remember the situation in Congress last year. A strong effort at economy gathered momentum through June, then aborted in the tangle caused by the out-of-date appropriation procedure. It finally ended with failure of even a somewhat plaintive appeal from Congress to the President to cut down expenditures after the money was appropriated. When it finished work, the first session of the Eighty-first Congress had the distinction of appropriating a larger sum than any other peacetime session in our history.

One ray of hope has been the work of the Hoover Commission. About 20 percent of its recommendations are already in effect with potential savings so far listed at about a billion and a quarter dollars.

But this large sum is dwarfed by the anticipated deficit for this year alone.

There is a solution to the problem of reducing Government expenditures. But it doesn't lie in halfway measures. The Director of the Budget, Mr. Frank Pace, hit the nail on the head, and I quote him:

"A realistic appraisal of the budget outlook must begin with the realization that if there is to be any significant reduction in Federal expenditures, it must be obtained through the curtailment or elimination of programs."

Mr. Pace, unfortunately, was not arguing for the elimination of any programs. But one of his predecessors in office did offer recently a concrete proposal for immediate action. Mr. Daniel Bell, formerly Under Secretary of the Treasury and Director of the Budget, now president of the American Security & Trust Co. in Washington, proposes a 2-year moratorium on new legislation creating any new Government function or the expansion of any function already assumed. He adds, and I quote:

"During this 2-year period, the Congress should devote itself almost exclusively to a restudy of all functions taken on during the past quarter of a century to ascertain whether they were soundly conceived and soundly financed, and whether our economy can afford them. After this study has been completed, Congress should devote the next period to a correction of our past mistakes."

This is an ambitious plan. But, in my judgment it indicates one good method of cutting Government spending enough to lick our basic fiscal problem. The road back to sanity in public spending is going to be a long one, in any case. Trimming Federal personnel rolls and sniping at individual items of Federal expenditure, however desirable, are not enough. Some day we will have to come down to the crux of the matter, which is reducing Government functions.

Alternative No. 2 is to increase taxes to meet budget demands.

It will not be necessary to demonstrate that taxes are a burden. But it is a startling fact that in each of the last two fiscal years, the American economy furnished all Government with more revenues than the greatest amount collected in any year of World War II.

Despite the postwar decline in the individual income-tax burden, American taxpayers as a whole have been called on to pay more in taxes to Federal, State, and local government than they did when we were fighting and trying to pay for history's most destructive war.

Total tax receipts for the three levels of government reached a wartime peak in 1945, when $50,148,000,000 was paid in. In fiscal 1948, this figure was up to $51,042,000,000 and in fiscal 1949 it was an estimated $50,271,000,000. And, Mr. Truman has just proposed additional taxes.

I have bunched Federal, State, and local taxes together for this example. But despite a postwar trend showing increases in State and local taxes, our principal tax problem is at the Federal level. Back in 1939, less than 40 percent of total tax receipts went to the Federal Government. Today, almost three-quarters of all taxes go to Washington, and this makes the problem a Federal one.

It has been said, and I believe it, "there is a point in taxation beyond which Government cannot go without draining away the lifeblood of the economy."

Moreover, with total taxes already at about 25 percent of our national income, that point I believe has been reached. In England, where taxes have risen to 40 percent of the national income, industries have reached the point of stagnation. In the United States, about 700,000 new jobs must be created each and every year for the young people just starting their careers. Consequently, constant expansion of private business must be encouraged. More taxation does just the opposite. It destroys all incentive to expand.

Increased taxation, as a solution to our primary fiscal problem has nothing to offer but a direct threat to the continued health of the economy on which our very existence depends.

The third alternative is deficit spending.

I am convinced that prolonged deficit spending, as we have seen it in 18 of the last 20 years, holds more immediate danger for us than any other domestic problem.

A single year's deficit does not make a crisis. Even a business or a family can have a bad year financially. But it was President Roosevelt who said in 1932 that if a government like a spendthrift, throws discretion to the winds, and is willing to make no sacrifice at all in spending; if it extends its taxing to the limit of the people's power to pay and continues to pile up deficits, then it is on the road to bankruptcy."

The tragedy in a six-billion deficit this fiscal year and the anticipated deficit of 4 or 5 billions next year is that deficits are becoming, as Dr. Nourse has said, a way of life."

And part and parcel of the fiction that deficits are not important is the idea that the debt and the deficits somehow will take care of themselves. The President in a recent message to Congress implied that the country will some day grow up to the budget, that the national income will increase enough to raise tax yields and bring receipts into balance with expenditures.

Expansion through a policy based on deficits is not growth; it's monetary inflation. And inflation, as has been demonstrated since the war, blows up the Federal budget as fast as it blows up tax yields. On that basis, there never will be a balanced budget.

Even more ominous, however, is the present admission that inflation has been adopted as a fiscal policy by the Federal Government. The latest group of planners in Washington call it a managed inflation, which is somewhat like speaking of a managed atomic bomb.

The adoption of inflation as a fiscal policy has been accompanied by a complete reversal of the administration position in the past year. At this time a year ago Congress was weighing Mr. Truman's demands for great powers to fight inflation. Although deflation was already pecking at the economy, the signs had not yet been read—especially by Government experts. Instead, the President appealed in his budget message for authoritarian power, unprecedented in peacetime, to combat the demon inflation. He also urged a tremendous tax increase of $4,000,000,000.

Six months later, the situation altered drastically. In the interim, our capitalistic system had been demonstrating its resiliency. The inflation was halted before it reached a disastrous peak—not by the Government but by operation of classic economic laws.

Then, in the face of political pressure and coming elections, the administration did a complete turn-about and asked for more powers to combat deflation, simultaneously calling for an orgy of spending which is still developing.

The Government is, in effect, trying to put a floor under the highest point to which inflation has ever driven the Nation. Because of political commitments and promises, the administration can't afford an adjustment of prices to the point where they could do the wage earner some real good. It can't afford to permit a temporary halt in the upward wage spiral until the economy can support a real wage increase in terms of purchasing power.

I am reminded of what Dr. Vannevar Bush said—and I quote—"a people bent on a soft security, surrendering their birthright of individual self-reliance for favors, voting themselves into Eden from a supposedly inexhaustible public purse, supporting everyone by soaking a fast-disappearing rich, scrambling for subsidy, learning the arts of political logrolling and forgetting the rugged virtues of the pioneer."

Under the circumstances, it is a measure of our national strength that so many Americans today turn with disgust from government by hand-out financed by managed inflation.

It should be evident that neither increased taxes nor deficit financing will solve our fiscal problem. The solution is reduced spending, through reduced Government functions. And it must be accompanied by a changed fiscal outlook at the top—a resumption of the idea that Federal fiscal policies should be designed to permit the American economy

to grow, to add to the unprecedented standard of living we have already achieved. This definitely does not include replenishing an enervating inflation with what Dr. Nourse has called "monetary and fiscal tricks" that have no power of magic but are a slippery road to misery."

With understanding that the ultimate key to the tax problem also unlocks our entire fiscal problem, we can go on to consider several individual tax policies which impair proper functioning of the enterprise system. I shall discuss only depreciation and the double taxation of dividends, two of the most important of all suggested tax reforms.

Liberalization of the depreciation allowance is a completely desirable reform in tax policy. In the tremendous expansion during and after the war, corporations have had to acquire and pay for new plants and equipment at prices far above prewar costs. At the same time they have had to depreciate old equipment at low rates on a prewar base. To accomplish this they have been forced to retain an ever larger share of current earnings, to dip into their reserves and surpluses, and in many cases to borrow heavily from banks and insurance companies.

There is general agreement that the present method of dealing with depreciation is unsatisfactory. Treasury policies on depreciation are a direct handicap to new risk capital. The tools of industry are wearing out at a greater rate than they are being replaced because corporations must follow archaic and restrictive depreciation schedules. Corporations tend to keep their older facilities in operation instead of modernizing them, since they cannot afford to discard older tools till they are completely depreciated.

I believe there is a simple solution: corporations should be permitted to set their own depreciation rates, with two limitations: First, the rates should be no higher than 20 percent, and second, corporations should stick to their schedules once these are established. If such a farsighted policy is adopted, I will guarantee that the building expansion and renovation of plant in this country will be on a scale never before equaled—and the simple fact of the matter is that it will not cost the Treasury one penny in revenue.

The one drawback to such a policy would be its immediate cost. Every billion dollars of extra depreciation means a temporary loss of $380,000,000 in revenues. This could be overcome by adopting the policy gradually over a period of years. But depreciation reform should be high on the list in any sound program of tax revision.

Even higher on the list should be the elimination of the double tax on corporate dividends. Perhaps because it is so basic, the problem of double dividend taxation is more difficult than most. Three bills designed to mitigate double taxation were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. One would allow a credit against income tax of 20 percent of the amount received as dividends from a domestic corporation, subject to certain limitations. Another would exclude dividends from the definition of gross income. The third would allow a credit of 10 percent of dividends received.

No action has been taken thus far on any of these bills.

Obviously it is unfair that corporation earnings distributed in dividends be taxed once to the corporation that earns the money and then to the individual stockholders who receive distributions.

But as in the case of depreciation allowances, the cost of such a reform is held to be a handicap. For instance, one of the proposals to mitigate double taxation of dividends would cost about $1,000,000,000 in fiscal 1950. This is a sizable sum, in view of present budget deficits.

Nevertheless, the first steps toward removal of the double taxation on dividends should be taken without further delay. The initial loss in revenues would be made up many times over because of the great impetus such a change would give to business. More risk capital would become available at once. Many corporations would be freed of the necessity of financing their expansion in the banks. The morale of individual investors would receive a wonderful boost.

In other words, incentive would be returning to the economy, and incentive, so important in the formation of risk capital, must be restored to our economy or we will go the way England has gone.

I have already mentioned the economic stagnation resulting in Britain from a tax burden of 40 percent of the national income. There is no magic in a specific figure of 40 percent, or 25 or 50. I am sure we would have maintained the strength of our economy during World War II even if the tax burden had risen to 70 or even 80 percent, because our incentive was a combination of patriotism and self-preservation.

When it is said that England is stagnating under a tax burden of 40 percent, the background of that tax burden is an all-important consideration. Hand in hand with its huge tax burden, Britain has been subjected to a steady undermining of incentive, which is another way of saying individual freedom to make one's own way.

My major objection to socialism aside from the fact that it has never succeeded in any country that tried it, is its failure to preserve individual liberty which is our most cherished possession. The foundation of socialism in Britain is that government knows best. As the British Labor Party platform puts it: "Government must accept responsibility for economic planning for the nation as a whole." Government, however, is composed of men, and men do not become infallable by joining up with government.

But the planners of Downing Street frequently discount the individual completely. Serious inroads have been made in what Prof. John Jewkes calls, in his book "Ordeal by planning," the three economic freedoms. These are freedom in the choice of occupation, freedom in the disposal of income, and freedom to acquire and to hold property. All three of these relate directly to incentive.

Freedom in the choice of occupation means the right to make the financial sacrifices necessary to order one's working life as one wishes. It means the right to choose between work and leisure, the right to choose what work shall be done, when, where, and for whom.

Unfortunately, for the British people, the plan of the British Government does not have room for individual decisions about occupation. During the war, the British had conscription of labor—we almost had it here. After the war, in the British democratic tradition, labor conscription was abruptly ended. But after the Labor Party won the first postwar elections and took control of the government, here is what happened to the workingman.

In February 1946, Sir Stafford Cripps said: "Our objective is to carry through a planned economy without compulsion of labor."

But he was talking before the plan was in action. A year later he was less sure, and more long-winded; I quote:

"We are attempting to make a success of democratic planning and, save for emergency measures such as are necessitated by war, or may be necessitated by some urgent economic crisis, we have not decided to employ, as a normal matter, methods of direction or compulsion of manpower outside the necessities of defense."

On August 7, 1947, the turnabout was complete, and Sir Stafford told the House of Commons, weakly:

"It has been decided to stop, by negative control, further people from going into the less necessary industries."

It became the law of Britain that, with minor exceptions, no man between the ages of 18 and 50 years and no woman between the ages of 18 and 40 years could change his or her occupation at will. Every such change had to be registered at the Employment Exchange, and the Minister of Labor had the power to direct workers changing their jobs to the employment he considered best in the national interest.

Attempts were made to minimize the significance of what had happened. The power was to be employed "to a limited extent." The control was to be negative and marginal.

But the barriers were down. Although the original understanding was that workers would not be moved from their own districts, it was soon announced that single men and women and married men in special cases could be sent away from home.

That is what socialism in Great Britain is doing to the freedom of the individual—freedom which in itself is the greatest incentive that ever lifted mankind.

As Professor Jewkes points out: "The modern planning movement sets out, with good will and noble intentions, to control things and invariably ends up by controlling men."

The sum total of all these controls—these limitations on the incentive of the individual to live his own life in his own way, far beyond what we here consider the public interest—this is the most important failure of socialism as it is practiced in Britain, and as it would be practiced here if some people had their way.

Is there, then, a direct threat to the American economy which has turned over $75,000,000,000 since the end of the war to help Britain and other foreign nations?

It is my conviction that there is a direct threat. Not in the economic philosophy of communism or socialism as a whole. It needs no Gallup poll to demonstrate that most Americans are against socialism and communism as such; they would never accept it—as so named.

But we do accept—we are accepting—the equally fallacious notion that the Government must spoon-feed every citizen in conformance to a distorted interpretation of our Constitution's general welfare clause. Many Americans accept big government, its handouts, and the planned life that are some of the ingredients of socialism, without realizing what they are getting into.

I believe that a new tide may be rising. Actually, it is scarcely more than a ripple as yet. Recently there was a change in the current in New Zealand. Another in Australia. We shall see next month whether the fears of the Labor Party in Britain are justified.

I would not have said this 6 months ago, but now I am convinced that Americans also are beginning to see that a hand-out state financed by inflation and deficits can lead only to complete regimentation and bankruptcy. We are beginning to realize that we shall not preserve our individual freedom by transferring to Government decisions which we should be making ourselves. We should invite and encourage this happy development with our every resource.

If it is true, as I believe, that the "wave of the future" need not be socialism or some other negation of the individual spirit—

If it is true, as I believe, that the desire to live one's own life and make one's own decisions is still an integral part of the American personality—

If it is true, as I believe, that Americans stand ready to reinvigorate our economy by the application of sound principles—

If these things are true, then it is up to businessmen to carry out the difficult task of public education that they are so ably equipped to do—to demonstrate by so doing their faith in our Republic and their confidence in the essential thrift, integrity, and intelligence of the American people.

On decisions made by Americans in the next few months rests the future of our Nation for generations. And what those decisions are may be determined by the action—or lack of it—in the business community.

I'd like to sum up these remarks with words attributed to that noble, but underprivileged railsplitter, Abraham Lincoln. Whether Lincoln spoke these words or not, I am enough of a believer in him to think that were he here tonight he would say:

"You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

My daily prayer is that I may live to see our America again guided by those simple but honest motives which once came to our rescue in the person of Lincoln.

Should Rent Control Be Decontrolled?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, in Huntington, W. Va., there lives a lady, Mrs. E. Wyatt Payne, who takes a great interest in public questions. Recently she debated the question of rent control. The following is a copy of her address on that subject:

Mr. Moderator, tragic opponents, and defenders of the Republic, I am surprised that the opponents would mention the founders with the inference that they always felt the Government should help the schools. This statement proves the point we are discussing tonight, namely, the distorted concept of the American way as warped and practiced by Government agencies. The fact is, that the founders never intended that government should pay for and thus exercise control over the schools. You will note they named them free schools. Our opponents lost another point when they proudly said the Government had always managed the post offices. So they have. And that's the reason it costs 2½ cents to mail a penny post card.

Why control? After World War I a survey was made in Huntington which showed a lack of housing units. Contractors were called in and asked to meet this need and it was met without aid of government or controls. After World War II a similar condition existed here—as elsewhere—but Government regulations, priorities, and red tape kept free enterprise from building the necessary units, causing endless trouble for tenants and landlords alike. The Federal Reserve Board figures show that average rents over the country are only 12 percent. The Government and other agencies recognize 25 percent as the normal figure for that budget item. Although the tenant averages 12 percent for rent the landlord must pay excessive prices for the goods and services needed to keep up the property. The whole situation is untenable from every standpoint and forces many people to buy homes they cannot afford who could, and would pay a fair and equitable rent where they are.

Considering problems the opponents did not anticipate I should like to turn to other important factors in this problem. In logic, we learn that if the premise is correct, the conclusion will be. In successful experiments the principle and practice are one, and so it was in this great Republic when the founders established a government by law instead of directives. I am in favor of rent decontrol because it is type and symbol of the plan to destroy this Nation. It violates every concept, right, and principle of the freedom and initiative that carved out of the wilderness the reality of the dignity of man, under God.

There is no point in discussing this one phase of our destruction without naming it as part of the whole scheme of regimentation and socialization, because it is germane to it. Having failed to control and freeze capital and labor at the beginning of the war, thus preventing the chaotic conditions which developed, they set up the machinery to control everybody and everything all along the line. When Americans are free to think and act, we are a going concern, but when Government puts restrictions and penalties on these important functions, we are concerned about where we are going. Most writers and commentators—and certainly the Government—miss the most tragic and dangerous point in the control dilemma, namely, human relations. Although they prime the pump with our money to make a false economy look real, who and what is priming the spirit of the American people? The great middle class of thrifty, hard-working, dependable, patriotic Americans are beginning to crack up; they are beginning to wonder if they can survive, and if there is reason to hope for the opportunity to live and move and have their being as freemen. Under such mental and physical tensions we are prone to lose our sense of values and also the will to do and to be. The much publicized melting pot, which fused varied races, creeds, and colors into the beautiful experiment in human liberty, called the American way, was made possible only because their very survival depended on faith, work, understanding, and kindly human relations. Let's look at the latter—human relations—through controls for a minute. Control over free people changes human relations. The faith and understanding gives way to fear, doubt, and suspicion between all groups. To be specific, have you noticed that unfamiliar look between tenant and landlord?

A personal experience proves the point. My family represents the average American family; being a school teacher nobody would accuse me of being a capitalist, but, I believe in the system and want to keep the bid open. We have owned a few small houses for rent, but most of our lives we were renters ourselves, looking toward the day when we could own our own home. During those years, as renters we were grateful that others had provided homes for our need. We met our landlord with that attitude, looked after his property as if it were our own and, therefore, he could afford to keep up the repairs and make some money on his investment, which was the reward for thrift and wisdom and his right as our benefactor. The human relations involved between tenant and landlord were typically American, and produced no frustrations, bad feelings, or instability, which lead to discontent and disloyalty, both in people and nations. May I repeat—the loss of kindly human relations inherent in controls superimposed on a free people by a so-called benevolent Government, is the greatest tragedy in our life today.

In the case of rent control we must ask ourselves this question: How can anybody in the judicial, executive, or legislative branch of Government, either in high or low places, construe the Constitution on property rights to be property wrongs? Stripped of all the excuses, red-tape, and verbiage of high-sounding words found in the directives and files of the OPA, the Constitution is crying above the confusion to "We, the people" to remind us that the real issue involved in the control of property is that it belongs to us. If I work and save and buy the house it is mine, and, unless I infringe the property rights of others, I can rent it, let it stand idle, or tear it down. When this property right, guaranteed to me by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights, is abrogated or usurped by any source whatsoever, I am not living in a free America. I am existing in a dictatorship, and, I don't like it, and neither do you.

Americans, working—note the word working—on their individual problems and successes, toward the goal of real security, not built on pensions, subsidies, and doles, but rather, on the dual miracle of history, free enterprise, and the American know-how, can build again a fortress for all right ideas for themselves and the world. It is later than we think in this beloved country of ours and unless the human spirit is released from its present bondage of controls—forced on us by the Communist-Socialist planners under the guise of "social progress"—to hitch its wagon to the star of opportunity, we will not have to wait for that new and terrible word genocide to destroy us. The spirit of a free people will have weakened and died and the suicides and a decadent morality will lose for us the last great hope of earth.

Let us, therefore, move quickly to decontrol all Americans, including the tenants and landlords; let us unite to decrease the pressures and tensions on our daily lives that tend to keep us mad instead of glad; let us remind the Government that it derives its just powers from the consent of the governed and that we no longer will acquiesce in this infringement of our rights as free citizens; let us work together to stop the "divide and conquer" campaigns designed to confuse us and weaken our faith in our form of government. Let us reinstate the faith, freedom, and fundamentals that made and kept us "One Nation, indivisible." Only a free America can provide the example, the production, and the incentive for a free world.

Wake up, America, and live.

Antitrust Suit Against A. & P.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I am inserting the following letter and an address referred to in it:

JANUARY 28, 1950.

Hon. RALPH E. CHURCH,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHURCH: I wrote you some weeks ago about the antitrust suit against A. & P. and I want to thank you for your very nice reply and promise to investigate. Today I was given the privilege to read the enclosed talk by Dwight B. Austin, president middle western division of A. & P. It cleared up several points for me and I thought you should have it. I know you are a busy man but if possible will you look it over and return to me unless you wish to use it further. It pretty well states their side of the story and I believe it is a true picture.

Strange things are happening in this country today and it is good to know that we have a true supporter of our American way of life as our Representative in Congress. I do hope that the recent uncoverings have not come too late to save our United States.

With best wishes for your continued good work for us all.

I am,

Sincerely,

RUTH COPE.
(Mrs. Walter.)

TALK BY DWIGHT B. AUSTIN, PRESIDENT, MIDDLE WESTERN DIVISION, THE GREAT ATLANTIC & PACIFIC TEA CO., BEFORE THE NEWSPAPER ADVERTISING EXECUTIVES ASSOCIATION, INC., EDGEWATER BEACH HOTEL, CHICAGO, ILL., JANUARY 23, 1950

Gentlemen, it's good to be with you today. I really appreciate this opportunity to talk to you men, who, I'm sure, are already quite familiar with the antitrust suit that has been brought against our company. I am sure you have heard all the Government's allegations repeated over and over again on the radio and printed over and over again in the newspapers. You have read our ads, too—I hope.

Even if you have kept abreast of these things, I'm afraid that you—like millions of other Americans—must still be somewhat confused about the whole case. I don't blame you. I'm confused, too.

All this confusion rises out of several things: the vagueness of the antitrust laws; the legal double-talk in which the antitrust lawyers' allegations and statements are couched; the feeling we all have that if an arm of our Government—and particularly the Department of Justice—makes a charge, there should be a sound basis for it.

I hope I shall be able to clarify this whole situation for you a bit. I don't pretend to be a lawyer or a student of economics. But I do know the food industry, and I do know the A. & P.—even better, I think, than the antitrust lawyers say they do.

I need hardly warn you that I am a somewhat prejudiced observer. The antitrust lawyers say that we in A. & P. have adopted a pose of outraged innocence. They are right—all except the pose.

We do have a consciousness of innocence, and we do feel outraged. We don't pretend to be saints or philanthropists; but we do know that we have tried all through the years to run a good, clean, decent business; that our sole objective has been to operate so efficiently and so economically that we could give our customers more good food for their money. We did this not to satisfy any spiritual yearning, but simply because the founder of this business, and his sons who have managed it since his death, felt this to be the best way to attract and hold customers.

If you knew George Hartford and John Hartford, as it has been my privilege to know them for many years, you would realize that they would never dream of running a business the way the antitrust lawyers allege A. & P. has been run. It has often been pointed out that the only real reason that anyone would intentionally violate the antitrust laws is greed—and there just isn't any of that in the make-up of these men. Both men are well along in years; both are widowers, and neither has any children. They have more money than they could ever spend. Their sole interest in life is running this business which their father left in trust with them. They work at their job 5 days a week, all day. When I go to New York every 3 months to meet with these men and the presidents of the other divisions, I never hear them harangue us about getting higher profits. But, if they think we are underpaying our employees, or not keeping our expenses down, or letting our prices to our customers get too high—we do hear about that.

So, when the antitrust lawyers say that these men are criminals, and that they encourage us to crush our suppliers and fool our customers and destroy our competitors, we are outraged because we know it just isn't so.

I admit that I am prejudiced, and you may be inclined to discount something of what I say. I must warn you, however, that you'd better be careful how much discount you take or you'll have the antitrust lawyers after you, too.

First, let's take up the causes of confusion I referred to.

I need hardly dwell at great length on the vagueness of the antitrust laws. The newspapers you gentlemen represent have been talking about that for a long time. During the last session of Congress, four committees held hearings that touched on this whole broad problem. Only recently the President announced the appointment of an executive committee, headed by Secretary of Commerce Sawyer, whose job it will be to educate businessmen as to the meaning of the antitrust laws and how they can comply with them. In announcing the committee, Secretary Sawyer said that most businessmen want to obey the law but just don't know how.

After all, gentlemen, most of the things that constitute offenses in this complicated society of ours are fairly specific. You know that if you drive a car while you're drunk, or exceed the speed limit, or go through a red light, you're violating the law.

But how can you know what constitutes a violation of the antitrust laws? What is undue restraint of trade? Where does competition end and restraint of trade begin?

Every time I step up my sales program and take a customer away from a competitor, I am restraining his trade. Every time a newspaper puts on a circulation drive it does so at the expense of a competitor. At what point do we step over the line and violate the law? The answer is—at any point that a particular judge decides we do.

Now, it will do you no good to act on the advice of legal counsel, because that doesn't mean a thing when you get into court. Nor will it do you any good to base your behavior on the decision of one judge, because another judge might take a different view of the whole matter.

You have noticed in our ads—I hope—that the antitrust lawyers filed suits against us before. When the cases came to trial, the courts said there wasn't any basis for them at all.

You will recall that they obtained an indictment in Dallas, Tex., making the identical charges they are making now. The Dallas judge sustained our demurrer, saying that the Government's charges did not constitute, in his mind, an offense. And yet when they dropped that suit and brought an identical suit in Danville, Ill., that judge decided in their favor.

I would like to point out that he didn't find us guilty of each of the alleged charges; and that he did say that violation of the antitrust laws was not a crime in the ordinary sense of the word; and that he took occasion to congratulate us on the job we had done in distributing a billion and a half dollars worth of food at less than 1½ cents per dollar profit.

But he took exception to the dual role played by our fresh fruit and vegetable buying affiliate, the Atlantic Commission Co., whereby they acted as buying agents for us and selling agents to the trade for farmers. And he said that that dual role pushed us over the legal line.

It pushed us over the legal line as far as the Sherman Act was concerned, although there is no law on the books that prevents any agency from functioning as the Atlantic Commission Co. had functioned.

Now, that is the terrible thing about the vagueness of these antitrust laws. A businessman may engage in various operations, each of which, in itself, is entirely legal. And yet some judge, when he looks at them all tied together, may decide that, somehow, they constitute this vague thing known as restraint of trade.

Let's consider for a moment the ways in which the antitrust lawyers allege we violate the Sherman Act.

First, they say that we force our suppliers to give us special discriminatory price concessions.

Now, if we did that, it would be illegal; and it is the only allegation they make which in and of itself would be illegal. If we knowingly got special price concessions from our suppliers, that would be a violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. But the antitrust lawyers have said we are not being prosecuted for violating the Robinson-Patman Act. And the judge in Danville said we were not being tried for violation of the Robinson-Patman Act. And in the entire 15 years in which the Robinson-Patman Act has been law, we have never been charged with, nor convicted of, any such violation of the Robinson-Patman Act.

Gentlemen, as I said before, I am confused too. If we did violate the Robinson-Patman Act in this manner, why weren't we charged with it and tried for it? And if we didn't violate the Robinson-Patman Act, why is the Government making it the very heart of its case against us now. I just can't understand it.

As a matter of fact, I know that we have never had any such policy. Of course, our buyers are skilled at their trade and they're certainly going to try to get the best deal to which they are legally entitled. But I know that it has been the company's policy to obey the Robinson-Patman Act, and for that matter, every other law governing business. And if there is any doubt about that in your minds, all you have to do is look at the record of the Danville trial and see the great effort we made to comply with the law. Or you might try to remember back to the days of World War II, when we went out of the coffee and meat business, and many other lines, simply because we wouldn't go in the black market, regardless of how many others did.

Well, I guess you would expect me to protest that we didn't engage in any such activity. But I think the more convincing answer is the fact that, down through the years, many, many thousands of suppliers have voluntarily sought our business; and today they're coming to our defense. I don't think they would be doing that if we had been crushing them, or if they hadn't found our business profitable.

But the point I wanted to make is that of all the Government's allegations, that's the only one that carries with it any inference of illegality. Everything else they charge us with is perfectly legal, in itself. And what's more, the antitrust lawyers themselves admit it.

The second major allegation they make is, that we went into certain areas and engaged in price wars designed to drive competitors out of business; and operated at a loss there in order to do that. And they charge that we made up those losses with profits realized from areas in which we had no competition and where we could charge the consuming public any price we wanted to.

That, of course, is nonsense. You know and I know that there are no areas in which we don't have competition. And if there is any town anywhere in which our prices aren't competitive, we'd like to know about it.

We know that we didn't engage in any such price wars. Of course, we try to keep our

prices competitive everywhere and we try to get a fair share of the business everywhere. We admit that we are pretty tough competition for other grocers. We'd be ashamed of ourselves if we weren't. But they're pretty tough competition for us, too.

Everybody knows the grocery business is just about the most competitive business in the country. There are almost a thousand food chains operating more than 25,000 stores. There are almost 400,000 individual merchants, more than 100,000 of whom are banded together in voluntary chains. All these stores are competing vigorously for the consumer's dollar. All you have to do is look at the food ads in your paper each week to realize just how vigorous that competition is.

And, of course, the public has benefited from this. That's why your grocer—I don't care whether he's a chain or independent—is the most efficient merchant with whom you deal. That's why only 15 cents of your food dollar goes to pay distribution costs, as compared with 35 cents or more in other fields.

Monopoly? It just isn't possible here. It's too easy to open a grocery store. Nobody controls, or can control, the source of supply. And nobody controls a single customer. The minute we fail to satisfy her she's going to move right over to one of our many competitors

It's inevitable in such a competitive business that there should be areas in which our business is not as profitable as it is in other areas. I don't think there's any business in the country that isn't making more money on one item or one department or in one place than another. Even in the case of a newspaper, its suburban circulation would be less profitable on an actuarial basis than its city circulation. And any business takes care of its weak areas with the earnings from its stronger areas.

Of course, we have stores that operate at a loss from time to time for any one of a variety of reasons—competition, poor management, poor location. But I'll let you in on a secret. Contrary to what the antitrust lawyers would have you believe, we are not in business for the purpose of operating stores in the red. Just as fast as they get that way, we try to get them out. And if we can't get them out of the red, we close them up.

Now, the third thing about us the antitrust lawyers say they don't like is that we manufacture some foods we sell and that we use profits from these manufacturing operations to subsidize our retail operations.

That's nonsense, too. We admit that we are in the manufacturing business not to make big manufacturing profits, but to enable us to give our customers better food at lower cost. What's wrong with that? Not a thing, legally. And it certainly gives the consumer a break.

This is the thing that the antitrust lawyers call "vertical integration." And it exists all through the food business. Of course, if you said "vertical integration" to the average delicatessen operator, he wouldn't know what you were talking about. But when he mixes up a batch of potato salad in the back room and sells it in the front room—that's vertical integration. The same thing applies to the bakery that sells at retail, or the farmer who owns his herd of cows, processes the milk, and runs a wagon route. All those things are customary in our field, as well as many others, and they're entirely legal.

In any such set-up, there is no such thing as a true manufacturing profit. You can't make a profit from selling something to yourself. That's just like saying that our warehouses operate at a loss. All of the operations in A. & P. are geared to the retail end. We are food merchants. There is only one profit in our business, and that is when we sell food to our customers.

It's just as if the antitrust lawyers came up to a newspaper and said, "Look, you fellows are violating the antitrust law because you lose money on the papers you sell, and you are subsidizing the sale of your papers with your advertising revenues." Maybe they'll get around to that idea yet.

But the point I'm making is that here are all these activities, admittedly legal in themselves, and yet the antitrust lawyers put them together, throw in a few nasty-sounding adjectives and nouns like "predatory," "vicious," "blacklist," "boycott," and "price war," stir the mixture well and come up with a crime.

You gentlemen are experts in words. You know what "boycott" means, as applied to this case? It means that we refused to buy from a manufacturer who was charging us with what we knew to be too high a price. It means that we allegedly said to him, "If you can't get your price down to a reasonable figure, we'll make this food ourselves, because we know we can."

So if your wife goes into a delicatessen store and says, "Mr. Schultz, $1.50 a pound is too much for baked ham. Unless you lower your price, I'm going to start baking ham at home." If your wife does that, it's boycott.

Now, gentlemen, I tell you this is actually the way in which normal trade practices and innocent business transactions are distorted to make them sound illegal.

It can happen to anybody. I'll admit that it's much more likely, today, to happen to you if you're big and successful. But under the present vagueness of the antitrust laws, and the present policy of the antitrust division, it can happen to anybody.

As a matter of fact, it is this use, or perhaps I should say "abuse," of the meaning of words that causes much of the confusion in antitrust suits.

Just look at the legal doubletalk employed by the antitrust lawyers in our own case, for instance.

They say that A. & P. is not being attacked because it is big.

They have to say this because there is no law on the books that makes bigness illegal. Actually, do you think we would be under this attack if we were not big? The whole purpose of this suit is to break up A. & P. into small pieces and destroy its size.

They say they are not opposed to A. & P.'s low prices.

They have to say this because there is no Federal law that says low prices are illegal. But, do you think we would be under attack if our prices were not low? Yet, the effect of the suit would be to destroy many of the efficiencies which make these low prices possible.

They say they are not opposed to the fact that we manufacture many of the foods we sell.

They have to say this because there is no law on the books that says it is illegal for a food retailer to manufacture food, too. And yet, they ask the court to order us to get rid of all our manufacturing operations.

They say that this suit is not punitive.

They have to say this, for this is a civil suit, and if they admitted it was punitive, it would be thrown out of court. Actually, what could be more punitive than breaking up this company into small pieces and forcing the present owners to sell off the pieces to someone else?

They say the sole purpose of this suit is to keep A. & P. from violating the antitrust laws.

They have to say this because it is the only legal basis on which such a suit could be brought. Actually, they are not simply trying to enjoin us from violating the law. They ask the court to put us out of business.

They say this suit will not close a single A. & P. store.

Actually, if they win this suit there will be no such thing as an A. & P. store, as you know it, left.

They say that this suit will lower food prices instead of raising them, when any high-school economic student, or any housewife could tell them differently.

Now, the third element that contributes to the confusion about this whole case is the respect that you and I and every other good American has for the courts of this country, for our Government, and particularly the Department of Justice.

Many people feel that if the Department of Justice makes a charge against you, that charge must be true. Believe me, gentlemen, that is a very powerful weapon the antitrust lawyers have. And believe me, they are using it.

You've heard their speeches and you've read their releases. There are undoubtedly people who have done business with us, either as customers or suppliers, and who like us and believe in us, but who are honestly troubled and confused when they hear or read these charges.

That is why we have had to take our story to the people. We had to do it to protect our business. If everybody believed what the antitrust lawyers are saying, our suppliers wouldn't want to sell to us, our customers wouldn't want to buy from us, our employees wouldn't want to work for us, and we wouldn't blame them.

The antitrust lawyers, as you know, have taken violent exception to our advertisements. They say we have no right to buy space to give the public our side of the case. They imply that somehow we are trying to influence the court's decision.

Of course, that's silly. We don't believe for a minute that anything we are saying in our ads, or anything that the antitrust lawyers are saying in their speeches, is going to have any effect on the judge who eventually hears this case. If that were our plan, we would never have to run these ads in any papers outside of New York City, where the case is going to be tried. Certainly, no judge in New York is going to even know about an ad we run in the Hoopeston (Ill.) Chronicle-Herald.

The real reason we're running these ads in 2,500 newspapers is because when you get in a fight like this, actually you are being tried in two courts—the court of law and the court of public opinion. Eventually, after long and expensive litigation, you may win free in the court of law, but in the meantime, your reputation is damaged and your business jeopardized in the court of public opinion. We say that we have not only the right, but the responsibility to defend ourselves through advertising or any other legitimate means in the court of public opinion, just as we propose to defend ourselves in the law courts.

You and I know that no business such as ours could earn and hold public patronage over a period of 90 years except on a policy of fair dealing.

I tell you that every executive in the A. & P. Tea Co. knows that this is, and always has been, our company's policy. We want the millions of American citizens who have a stake in our operations to know it, too. And we are using the best medium we know of to tell it to them.

We've been heartened by the fact that this suit against us has brought a great wave of public support. We undoubtedly have made some enemies. But obviously we have made many millions of friends. We are hopeful that we will be permitted to continue to serve these friends for many years to come.

Amendment of Federal Home Loan Bank Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENDERSON LANHAM
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 1, 1950

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to go on record in support of H. R. 6743, because it is intended to strengthen and make more effective the work of the building and loan associations of the Nation.

It is impossible to estimate the good that has been done in furthering the purchase and building of homes by the people, by these associations.

There can be no question but that a nation of home owners is a stable and freedom-loving nation. Home ownership stimulates the self-respect and pride of every family so fortunate as to own its own home. The home owner is not an easy prey of the proponents of the many strange isms that appeal to some portions of our population.

Of course, it is true that in the large cities, and to some extent even in the smaller cities, it is not possible for every person or every family to own a home. In the large cities the high cost of real estate makes individual home ownership impossible. So I do not mean to say that the great number of our people in the large cities, who are forced by circumstances to forego the benefits and the pleasure of home ownership are unstable and unpatriotic. It is true that where home ownership is possible it strengthens social and patriotic ties and makes a real contribution to the stability and welfare of this great country of ours.

In the Seventh District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent, there are several of these building and loan associations, and all of them have made a distinct contribution to the welfare of the community in which they exist. So firm a believer am I in these organizations that I have made from time to time small deposits and investments in several of them. All of these institutions in my district are thriving and are rendering a distinct service to persons and families, who are anxious to own their own homes. Many of them have made loans to veterans when the veterans could not obtain a loan from other lending institutions. All of this has resulted in a great increase in the number of individually owned homes in the district.

For all of these reasons, it is truly a pleasure for me to support and vote for H. R. 6743, which will make investment in these associations more attractive and secure. This in turn will enable these associations to extend their benefits to countless more individuals and families.

In passing I would like to say that the building and loan associations in many of the cities in my district have made most remarkable records during the past year. Never before in history have they been so prosperous and of such service to home owners and the private building industries. The private building industry is to be congratulated also on the remarkable record it has made in the past few years in supplying our people with homes, which have been so badly needed since the war.

I am a great believer in private industry and our free-enterprise system. At the same time I realize that, especially in the large cities, there are housing problems which private industry has not to date been able to solve. It was for this reason that I voted at the last session of Congress for the bill providing for public housing in slum areas. The prosperity of the private building industry and of the building and loan associations and other members of the Federal home loan banks seems proof to me that the undertaking by the Federal Government to eliminate slums and provide decent housing accommodations for those areas where private industry has not succeeded in solving the problem, has not in any way affected free enterprise as represented by these associations and those engaged in the private building industry.

Again let me say I am happy that I have the opportunity of voting for and speaking on behalf of H. R. 6743. I congratulate the great Committee on Banking and Currency for its wisdom in bringing this bill before the House, and guiding it to what I am sure will be its prompt adoption in the House.

The Example of the Patriots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun:

THE EXAMPLE OF THE PATRIOTS

Today is one of the most important anniversaries in the long and proud history of the United States, for it was 172 years ago that the embattled farmers of Middlesex County, with little other than their dogged determination to shake off the yoke of the oppressor, fired the shot heard round the world.

They gave notice to the world that a new nation, dedicated to the principle of freedom, was in the making. They carried on under the most grueling conditions to achieve their goal.

They were united in their purpose; had there been bickering and dissension with factions working at cross-purposes, the outcome might have been different and this great country might never have succeeded in asserting its independence.

The lesson of Patriots' Day should be studied with greater zeal than ever before by all who call themselves true Americans. There were no Communists among the patriots who stood their ground against the redcoats at Concord and Lexington—they were all loyal and steadfast, working together in a common cause.

There was no fifth column operating among the pioneers, and there were no quislings working furtively to give aid to the enemy.

The sentiments of the Massachusetts patriots, their ideas and ideals have been expressed many times since the country was founded, particularly in the Bill of Rights, and, more recently, in the Atlantic Charter.

These are the men who established the American way of life. Are the principles for which they fought and which are now held up to ridicule by some of the subversive elements that are now working in all parts of the country going to be sacrificed?

The Revolutionary War brought about the creation of a new land, governed in a way that recognized individual freedoms. The pattern was made by the patriots of 1775—are we now going to stand by and see them renounced in favor of radical poppycock?

The Nation, from coast to coast, should rededicate itself to the democratic principles that were first expounded during and immediately after the Revolution; it should make short work of any and all elements that are yammering for a change in the American way of life.

Our Asiatic Foreign Policy With Especial Reference to the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech made recently by Emmet O'Neal, a former Member of the House of Representatives, who recently retired from the Ambassadorship to the Philippines:

Gentlemen, the population of the world is 2,278,000,000.

Over one-half—1,194,300,000—live in Asia, not including Asiatic Russia.

Passenger planes fly to Asia on regular schedule in less than 48 hours. The flying time is being reduced each year. Rocket planes are even now able to fly that distance between daylight and dark.

Yet most of our thinking, planning, and assistance has been given to Europe. No doubt it was necessary, because of the dangerous emergencies existing there. It is a short-range program and it is hoped that Europe can be put on its feet in a comparatively short time.

America, apparently, has never been engaged in long-range planning in its foreign affairs. Years fly quickly, and it is wise to think in terms of 5, 10, and 20 years, as well as to plan only for 2 or 3.

Our peace has not been greatly affected by Asia, except when an Asiatic nation attacked us at Pearl Harbor. Our foreign wars were nearly entirely of European origin. In the future, and particularly in the more distant future, Asia may be the chief breeding place of threats to our peace and to world peace. Now is the time for a well thought out American foreign policy as to the half of the world population in Asia. It must project its thinking further than 1, 2, and 3 years and try to plan intelligently for a much longer time.

We need now a far-reaching, long-range program to enlighten that part of the world as to the democratic way of life. It should not be a part-time job of a department of our Government. It should be a major activity, planned and executed by the best brains America has at its command. We know that a police state, totalitarianism in

communistic form or otherwise, encourages wars and human hate and destruction. We believe devoutly that our democratic way of life, if adopted sincerely by all nations, would almost be a guarantee of world peace. Nations which have a democratic form of government are far less likely to plan or initiate wars of aggression.

Europe is set in its ideologies as far as the individual nations are concerned. It is very difficult to affect the thinking of their leaders. The vast Orient where live one-half of the world population, is now awakening. The countries in that area are seeking freedom and a better way of life. Their minds are more open. They are impressed by what they see.

Is there anything more important to America and to the world's future peace than to make a major effort to show those nations that a democratic form of government is the best way to bring the greatest good to the greatest number. The stake is so great we should attack the problem as one of our greatest objectives. We should start a program now and any plan should immediately recognize the importance of the Philippines in such an effort. There is no spot on earth more potentially important to the cause of future world peace and human freedom than the Philippines.

A successful Philippines can affect the thinking of the Eastern World more than propaganda from any source. The Philippines are a part of Asia, and a world cross roads. Ships from everywhere, going to all places on the globe anchor there in one of the finest of all harbors, Manila Bay. What is seen there is talked about by the thousands of travelers when they return home. The Philippines are on the doorstep of China, Malaya, Indonesia, Japan, Siam, and other populous countries. The Asiatic mainland is closer than Chicago is to Washington. It is a matter of a very few hours by plane from the Philippines to all parts of Asia and Australia. Passenger planes daily carry large numbers of people to and from the Philippines to other countries.

The leadership of all those awakening nearby countries are watching with extreme interest the progress of democracy in the Philippines. To them it is a demonstration of the democratic way of life in the Orient, and it carries with it implications as to the value of American friendship and cooperation. They are watching to see if a democracy can succeed in Asia. Its influence now on the future of the governments of Asia cannot be overestimated. If the Philippines succeed in demonstrating that its democracy is bringing all the freedoms to all its people, and a better life to its citizens than any Asiatic country ever saw, it could lead countless millions to demand a true democratic form of government. In this way the chances of peace in the decades to come would be enhanced greatly.

If there were no iron curtain in Russia and Russians could see a democracy in action, they, themselves, would soon end communism for communism in action is totalitarian and tyrannical.

There is no iron curtain in China or in Asia. The Philippines experiment will be seen and studied. Nations may work out their own destinies according to convictions based upon observation and investigation of the Philippines. It could bring results more satisfactory than those obtained by the expenditure of millions by this country in other ways.

The Philippines have done a remarkable job since becoming an independent nation in 1946. Our assistance has been helpful and kindly given.

America should give the greatest consideration to the Philippines as a matter of duty and enlightened self-interest.

The Philippines are the only Christian nation in that part of the world.

It is the only democracy there.

It is the only country in the Orient which is openly and avowedly our friend, and unequivocally on our side.

It has a higher percent of literacy than any far-eastern country with the possible exception of Japan.

It has lived under a democratic form of government for over 50 years.

Perhaps at least 85 percent of its people were born under the American flag.

It has a public-school system something unique in Asia, and it is a counterpart of the American public-school system. American educators planned it and directed it.

The Philippines are as free as we are, and they will protect with their lives their heritage, from America, their liberty. In the Philippines, you feel as though you are in one of the States of our Union. The people still feel that they are part of the United States and there remains an almost unbreakable tie between us.

They respect and love the flag under which they were born, and they appreciate what was done for them by the benevolent rule of the United States.

The governing of the United States was not perfect; there were mistakes of omission and commission; there was even some selfishness, but the Filipino knows that no other country in the history of the world, ruled a dependent nation, with so much kindness, unselfishness, and benevolence. They are grateful, and their loyalty to America during World War II was proof of their feelings toward us. Large numbers of Filipinos were in the American Army, attached to it or fighting independently on the side of America. This was the case with most of the men of fighting age, and their families at home were loyal and true to the United States.

The aftermath of war is there in like proportions of families which lost their fathers and brothers, and every city and village has its maimed and sick. There can be no question but what America has a friend in the Orient, the Philippines.

The two Presidents of the Philippines have each said, in effect, that should America again be forced into war, the Philippines would take up arms on America's side without delay or question.

To the thinking people of Asia, the Philippines are the product of America, and an example of American democracy.

It must succeed, to be a beacon that will lead the oriental countries to adopt for themselves a democratic form of government. If that is accomplished, the cause of world peace has been greatly advanced.

We should and must adopt a plan extending over a period of years to see that the Philippines pass successfully this, the most critical period in its history. The most critical period in American history followed for 10 or 15 years after independence. The Philippines have some of the same problems and others which our forefathers did not have.

In July 1946 they received their independence. It came immediately after World War II, during which a brutal and vandalistic enemy occupied and denuded their country. In the closing months of Japanese occupation, the Japanese destroyed in vicious resentment hundreds of millions of dollars of property. In order to dislodge the fanatical soldiery of the enemy, the Americans had to do equal or more damage to Philippine property. It is difficult to believe, but Manila's destruction was exceeded only by Warsaw and Stalingrad. The Philippines, it is said, was the most devastated country in the war. The estimates of the damage have ranged from 2 to 4 billion dollars, and even higher. It is regretted that much of it was done by American military might. It is not possible to estimate in dollars and cents the loss to the Philippines caused by the slaughter of its civilians and soldiers in large numbers. Those who died were representative of the best-trained citizenship.

With these impossible handicaps, Philippine independence was launched, and it is remarkable that such an unseaworthy and battered vessel could survive. It has survived, prospered, and made a remarkable record. The Philippines have had the support of the United States, and that has been a material factor in their success. But it is not the sole reason, for the Filipinos have shown intelligence and wisdom in the solution of their problems. The main cause of their success so far is that they believe in and have established a government which guarantees to their citizens the exercise of all the freedom we enjoy. No doubt many mistakes have been made, many things have happened which should not have occurred, but the Philippine citizen today is as free as an American citizen, and the Filipino is living on a higher and better plane than in most parts of the world. These things are observed and known throughout the Far East.

In spite of the successes since independence day, the war damage was so great that industry, agriculture, and other fundamentals have not come back to a point which will insure survival. We have been generous since the war in providing appropriations and other aid for the Philippines, but what values we have provided are far less than the values our valiant armies destroyed. It is not argued that these amounts should be equalized. The purport of this article is to urge in our own self-interest, that we recognize the burdens of this small country, and through all types of intelligent cooperation, stand by the Philippines until they have passed through this critical period of their history.

The Philippines can be one of the two or three most important nations in the Orient.

They are far ahead of most countries in that area in their knowledge and understanding of government.

Their educational system is years ahead of any neighbor, except Japan.

They have a population of 18,000,000 people, which is larger than that of any European country, with the exception of three or four. Its population is greater than most of the countries in North and South America.

The Philippines are very rich in known natural resources, and much of it has not been fully studied and explored.

The Filipinos generally have adequate housing, food, and clothing.

It has every chance for success, if it can be wisely assisted over this its most critical period.

What will it mean to America in the future and to world peace, to have the Philippines a powerful, successful, happy, and free democracy showing the way in Asia to a better life through a democratic process?

If our foreign policy is to bring results, we must think in terms of decades rather than years. In our Asiatic foreign policy if we recognize the importance of the Philippines and think in terms of 5 and 10 years, we will advance the cause of democracy beyond our present power to evaluate.

Bouquet for State Department

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RAY J. MADDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, there have been so many speeches made on the floor of the House criticizing the

State Department, I think it would be well for the Members to read the following letter from Saul Cohen, of Gary, Ind., who throws a verbal bouquet to the State Department.

He extends special commendation to Elvin Seibert, the American Consul at Mexico.

The letter follows:

GARY, IND., *January 30, 1950.*

SECRETARY OF STATE,
Department of Foreign Service,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On January 7, 1950, my family and I were driving home from a vacation in Mexico when we were unfortunately involved in a rather serious automobile accident in Cuidad Mante, Tamps, Mexico. My wife was seriously injured as well as my son and myself.

Needless to say, being in a foreign country with only a slight command of the language, I was immediately confronted with many problems.

My first and foremost obstacle was to get my wife and son to the States as quickly as possible where proper medical care could be given her. The American Consulate at Tampico, under the direction of Mr. Elvin Seibert, American Consul, was in truth a lifesaver.

I am entirely satisfied in my own mind that had it not been for their prompt and intelligent efforts, in spite of the fact that the accident took place on a week end when Mexican officials were difficult to reach, we would have been in a much more serious condition when we finally reached the States.

I have been an American taxpayer for many years as well as a native-born citizen, but I never knew until that week end of the accident, what it meant to be able to call for help on one of our consular offices and how truly invaluable such an office could be in a time of stress.

I want to go on record that we who remain at home in the United States and those who grumble at taxation would do well to bear in mind that the type of service that was rendered to me and my family by the Foreign Service cannot be measured in dollars, and furthermore, every attempt should be made at all times to properly support this Department as well as many others who render service to the citizens of the United States, so that they can continue to safeguard their interests, both personal and financial, outside the borders of our country.

I wish to commend this particular office of the Foreign Service, Mr. Secretary, and whatever I can do as a citizen of this country to further support its efforts, I most certainly will make every effort to do so.

Very truly yours,

SAUL COHEN.

Truth and Other Things

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, there are numbers of Members of this House who remember with affection the Honorable Edgar Howard, who served so ably in this body for 12 years. Mr. Howard is an outstanding Nebraskan and an outstanding member of the Democratic Party. He is editor of the Columbus Daily Telegram, and although he has passed the age of 90, he continues active and his editorials are quoted in many newspapers and magazines of our land. In spite of his age, Mr. Howard keeps in close touch with the activities of his former colleagues in the United States Congress. One of his recent editorials entitled "Truth and Other Things" should be of special interest to the Members of this body at this time when the memberships of the various subcommittees on appropriations are holding hearings and listening to the officials of various departments justifying gigantic appropriations for the next fiscal year. By leave previously granted me by the Speaker, I include this editorial with my remarks:

TRUTH AND OTHER THINGS

How much Federal tax did the people of Nebraska pay for 1949? The usually excellent authority—the Scottsbluff Star-Herald—says the Federal levy upon the modest commonwealth of Nebraska was $523,000,000. That's awful. But let's forget what has happened, and try to avoid something worse. Let's forgive every one of our representatives in either branch of the Congress—7 Republicans and 1 Democrat—for their bad voting records which aided the great spender's administration to carry the country to the very brink of insolvency. But let's keep wide-open eyes on the voting record of our Senators and House Members during the present session of the Congress. Let's tell our Nebraska boys in the Congress that we want the enormous burden of Federal taxation lifted—not increased—and it will be increased if the Congress shall meekly comply with the demands of the great spender. Watch out, all you Nebraska boys in the Congress. Your personalities are good. Some of your voting records have not been the best. A government with an empty treasury is no more competent to work the welfare of the country than a farm horse tied to an empty manger is competent to work the welfare of the farmer who owns him. The picture is not overdrawn. Nebraska farmers will vote this year for congressional candidates who during the present session have voted to lift this greatest republic of all the world out of the shameful ditch of financial depression.

The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. CHURCH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor and privilege to deliver the address of welcome to the thirty-fourth annual convention of the Speech Association of America which met in Chicago, Ill., last December.

At the opening session on December 28, James H. McBurney, dean of the school of speech, at Northwestern University, delivered an excellent speech, The Plight of the Conservative in Public Discussion.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

THE PLIGHT OF THE CONSERVATIVE IN PUBLIC DISCUSSION

(Address by James H. McBurney, dean of the school of speech, Northwestern University, and president of the Speech Association of America, presented on December 28, 1949, at the opening general session of the Thirty-fourth annual convention of the Speech Association of America, Stevens Hotel, Chicago)

The plight of the conservative in American public life is a fact which hardly needs documentation. An analysis of this plight was presented in a recent issue of the Chicago Daily News in which opinions from grassroot voters to political and educational leaders were reported. Says the News: "Whether it was called a 'welfare state,' 'creeping socialism,' 'fascism,' 'a regimented state,' or something else, it boiled down to a belief that individual freedom and initiative are being threatened by the Government." When queried by the News, Franklyn B. Snyder, president-emeritus of Northwestern University, added this: "Complacency today is the greatest foe of the conservative."

I think this hits the nail on the head. Complacency it is! And this complacency affects public discussion in America in ways which are good for no one, least of all the conservatives.

I have the temerity to argue that the conservatives in America have become inarticulate to a point where their voice does not do credit to their ideas and often does their cause a positive disservice. I think my analysis is not a partisan one. I confess to a conservative bias, but my concern here is a professional interest in public discussion and debate. In a very real sense, discussion is the essence of the democratic process. Whatever weakens discussion in America, weakens America. A monolithic society is not conducive to vigorous discussion of public questions. We need differing points of view, and we need articulate spokesmen for these points of view.

For the past 8 years, I have had charge of the Northwestern University Reviewing Stand, a national radio forum originating in radio station WGN, Chicago, and carried by the Mutual network. We are on the air each week with discussions of contemporary problems, mainly social, economic, and political questions. Our speakers are members of the university faculty and distinguished guests from business, industry, labor, government, and the press. As moderator of these discussions, I am the recipient of an amazing volume of letters and comments from all over America. One of the most persistent criticisms is the charge that we are radicals, Reds, and even Communists. To be sure, we are often labeled radicals and reactionaries on the same program, but the charge of radicalism far outruns any other single criticism.

Why this persistent charge of radicalism? I am sure the answer does not lie in the sponsorship and management of our radio forum. Even our critics express surprise that we should be the ones to commit this indiscretion. What is more, precisely the same charge is directed against the other leading radio forums. The answer must be sought in the discussions themselves.

In the first place, we usually discuss changes in the status quo—questions of public policy. That is an important function of discussion. All kinds of social, economic, and political changes are analyzed in the interest of better understanding. The conservative, by definition, opposes change; he supports the status quo; he usually takes the traditional position. The very fact that discussion concerns itself with change may suggest that discussion supports such

change. Actually, of course, it does not. Properly conceived, discussion is a method for analyzing problems and considering solutions to those problems. It is not even a good vehicle for propaganda.

More important are the persons who take part in these programs. In organizing discussions of controversial questions, we naturally try to secure the most competent spokesmen available for all points of view. We have little trouble getting the advocates of change, the liberals, the radicals. These people invariably accept our invitations with pleasure and alacrity; but not so with the gentlemen on the right, the representatives of business and industry, the conservatives. More often than not, they are too busy, have other commitments, or refuse to appear on the same platform with other speakers we have invited. Sometimes they say quite frankly that they are afraid of give-and-take discussion.

As moderator of these discussions, I frequently find myself wanting to come to the aid of the conservative spokesmen. Often they are nervous and inarticulate. Especially is this true when their basic assumptions are challenged. They lack facility in verbal analysis and synthesis, in give-and-take argument, in rebuttal and refutation. More often than not they are no match for rhetorically seasoned liberals, with long experience on every kind of platform from a cracker barrel to a radio microphone. There are notable exceptions, but my description is faithful to the rule.

I think this is the reason why our radio forum is charged with radicalism—the conservative spokesmen do not come through. It is either this or the less charitable explanation that the conservative position in America today is not tenable in public discussion. Whether or not the conservative position, or any other position, is tenable is precisely what public discussion is designed to test. Given spokesmen of high competence and reasonably equal competence, it provides one of the best tests democracy has been able to devise. Unless these conditions are met, we run the risk of serious distortions in public policy.

If this problem were confined to radio forums, I would not take your time with it. It most emphatically is not so confined. These forums are just a small sample of the kind of discussion that goes on all over America—in homes, schools, churches, places of business, legislative assemblies, and deliberative bodies of all kinds. In this larger arena, we can witness the full measure of the rhetorical bankruptcy of the conservative.

For many years past in America, the conservative has been in the saddle. The industrialist, the banker, the businessman have been the backbone of America—respected, accepted, and looked to for leadership. Whether this reputation was deserved is neither here nor there. It is a fact. But this long, unchallenged tenure has not been an unmixed blessing. The conservative grew soft under it. He came to take his position for granted. He became complacent. And he lost his voice, except for occasional ceremonial chants and cries of distress. In the meantime, the little fellow on the outside grew in strength and lung power, until one day there appeared on the scene a great spokesman for the ill-fed, the ill-housed, and the ill-clothed. Since that time we have lived under New Deals and Fair Deals.

How have the conservatives responded to this rude unseating? Not too well, I fear. The National Association of Manufacturers invited a number of students to attend their annual convention in New York this month. Time magazine reports some of the reactions of these young observers:

"Too many of the NAMsters, the students felt, talked in such platitudes and generalities about the drift toward socialism, the welfare state, taxes, that what they had to say lost its effect. What was needed, said one student, was a clear, fresh exposition to the man in the street in terms of the simple why and wherefore of the price of his bread."

"A further student criticism was that, in panel discussions, the NAMsters were often unqualified to answer our questions."

"One student, put his finger on NAM's biggest trouble: its failure to capitalize on opportunities to catch the public's ear."

Quite obviously the answer to this problem is not a simple one. Indeed, there may be no answer which the conservatives will like. Whether or not an intransigent liberalism is good for America must be ground out in countless discussions and debates all over America. My hope is that the conservatives will find the means of developing an effective voice in these discussions and debates. I think they are lost unless they do. And I think America stands to lose without their best counsel. I would say exactly the same of the liberals were the situation reversed.

I realize that this thesis comes easily from a teacher of discussion and debate and a moderator of public forums. Some will say the plight of the conservative is dictated by economic, social, and cultural realities in the American scene which have little or nothing to do with talk about these realities. I do not propose to assess these realities in this paper, but I do profess to know something about the influence of talk in building attitudes and shaping events. Talk influences men, and men influence events. The case for making good sense and good taste articulate is a familiar one to most teachers of speech. We have substantial experimental data to support this thesis.

In the first place, we know that attitudes toward social problems do change significantly as a result of discussion. In other words, something is accomplished in discussion; people do change their positions on public questions as a result of listening to discussions and participating in them. Secondly, we know that the initial or prediscussion dispersion of attitudes is significantly reduced as a result of discussion. People get closer together. There is a significant tendency toward concensus. Thirdly, we know that people develop superior attitudes toward public questions through discussion, as measured by the opinions of experts. In other words, discussion has the effect of developing sound positions on social questions. Finally, we know the greatest influence in discussion is exerted by the more competent people, as measured by standard tests of personal competence, such as personality inventories, intelligence tests, social-maturity scales, and the like.

I cite these data to make the point that public discussion is a democratic tool which no segment of American society interested in social attitudes can afford to neglect; and by the same token, it is a matter of great importance to American society that all social groups be competently represented in public discussion.

Several suggestions for developing effective spokesmen in deliberative councils are implicit in what I have already said. I should like to spell these out in greater detail.

In the first place, men in executive positions in business and industry must be willing to participate in public discussion. As the president of the United States Rubber Co. put it last June:

"The eleventh hour is here for business to speak for itself. Now, and from now on, the men who run American business must devote as much—if not more—time and effort to the public relations of their business as they spend on finance, production, and distribution. Unless they do, they will not need to worry about the latter problems. Government will be glad to handle them all."

In the second place, the paid spokesmen of the conservatives, the public-relations officers of business and industry, must be selected with careful attention to their qualifications for serious intellectual discussion and vigorous public debate. The main job of such officers is developing relations with the public rather than with their brothers in the bond. This requires social, political, and economic literacy of a high order and top-notch dialectical ability.

Thirdly, the conservatives urgently need to develop greater sensitivity to the changing pattern of communication in America. This pattern is characterized by a growing emphasis on logical values in place of high pressure mumbo-jumbo; by simple, direct statement rather than verbal obfuscation; and by a sense of relativity in language usage in place of arbitrary, dogmatic assertion. These changes are inevitable in a democratic society which is becoming more conscious of the processes of communication and more sophisticated in their use. Any speaker ignores them at his own peril.

Fourthly, the conservatives must rid themselves of some unfortunate stereotypes. In this so-called era of the common man, the conservative is depicted as the foe of the common man. Unfortunately, this role can easily be given specious plausibility because the conservative does have vested interests in the status quo. In a society in which men are living longer and specialized economic functions tend to draw class lines, it is easy to think of the conservative as an old man who has lost the common touch. Actually, the interests of the common man on any given issue at any given time and place may be just as completely identified with the conservatives as with the liberals. Most certainly it begs the question to assume otherwise. The lines between conservatives and liberals in America need not, and should not, be drawn on the basis of age or class. They should be determined in free and widespread discussion, and the conservatives must learn how to conduct themselves in such discussions in ways which will enlist the sympathy and understanding of common men.

The conservatives have also succeeded in alienating many of the intellectuals in America. Witch hunts in the colleges and universities, journalistic caricatures of the mortar board, and frantic name calling are hardly designed to win the understanding of men who place a high premium on objectivity in discourse. Moreover, there are echelons in the intellectual hierarchy in which there are fashions in ideas just as there are in goods. In some of these quarters, I fear, the conservative position has lost caste for reasons which have very little or nothing to do with its merit.

A minimum program of education and training for the kind of public discussion I am talking about should include: (1) a broad understanding of social, political, and economic issues in American life and culture; (2) clear insight into personal and social values as they affect these issues; and (3) specific training in the philosophy and method of democratic participation.

On this last point may I add with some feeling that such training is not to be secured in classes in after-dinner speaking and polite elocution. What is needed is sound education in discussion, debate, persuasion, and semantics under conditions which provide opportunities for realistic experiences in participation and leadership under the direction of competent teachers.

In conclusion, I wish again to make it clear that I do not present this analysis to plead the cause of the conservative, nor do I mean to question the ability and integrity of the conservative. It is my purpose rather to point out that conservatives generally are not doing their cause justice in public discussion and debate, explain

why this is the case, and suggest some of the ways in which this weakness can be corrected. I believe this to be a problem of more than ordinary importance in American public life, and certainly one of great significance to students and teachers of speech.

As Aristotle put it, over 2,000 years ago, "Truth and justice are by nature more powerful than their opposites; when decisions are not made as they should be, the speakers with the right on their side have only themselves to thank for the outcome."

Ground Hog Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to enter into this controversy but I received a telegram from the renowned lawyer, Mr. Charles Margiotti, which very emphatically backs up the assertions made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. GAVIN]. I will now read the telegram:

PITTSBURGH, PA., *February 1, 1950.*

Hon. HARRY J. DAVENPORT,

House Office Building:

Each February second the land is deluged with pretenders to the throne of the Punxsutawney groundhog who for nearly a century has ruled supreme as the lord high prognosticator of Gobbler's Knob and points east, north, west, and south. Disregard particularly the pretentions of striped kitties whose promoters wear long gowns to protect their clothes, high hats to cover their low brows, gas masks to enable them to breath while pretending polecats prate about the weather, shadows, and the like.

CHARLES J. MARGIOTTI.

Thoughts at Income-Tax Time

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter written by one of my constituents to the Cleveland Press:

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

THOUGHTS AT INCOME-TAX TIME

Today I sent in my income-tax papers and I hope I am straight with the collector. I find I worked for Uncle Sam from Thanksgiving to the end of the year.

Years ago, when I began paying income tax, I always felt proud to think that I was carrying my share of a reasonable expense to run the best Government on the earth. Today I feel that perhaps somebody is taking advantage of me.

It seems to me if a fellow has to kick into the kitty the least he should be able to do is send along a statement on how he does or does not want his money spent. I think my statement would be predominantly negative.

None of my money should go for tax-free entertainment funds. Nothing for Government buying of eggs, butter, peanuts, potatoes, etc., ad nauseam, so that when I go to buy such articles at the store, I won't find my own money competing with me and creating an artificially high price.

Nothing for bureau employees who spend their time and my money planning my future. Nothing for bureau employees who think $600 exemption is enough today but want to give me a $100 pension when I am 65.

I'd settle for firing the planners and take the $100-a-month exemption now and worry about my sixty-fifth birthday when it comes.

None of my money for dreamers on a world-wide scale who think 150,000,000 people can make millionaires of themselves and the other several billion people throughout the world. None of my money to support the people who have the laws and refuse to use them to curb selfish individuals who put their own interests above those of the majority of our people.

Last, but most important of all I want none of my money used to support anyone in Washington or elsewhere who feels that a government's chief purpose is to do my thinking for me; who feels they have to save me from myself; who has to keep me from being exploited; who feels they have to take care of me in my old age; who thinks they can persuade me they are going to give me something for nothing; who thinks they can slowly and insidiously, by diverse means, take from me my birthright of free, independent thought and the right to take care of myself and my family and substitute, therefore, dependence on a benevolent, paternal Great White Father whose interest in me is so all-consuming that before long I lose my identity and end up a mere social-security number.

I paid my taxes because I had to. Under the present system of profligate spending and even more profligate promises, I wonder if my money is not helping subsidize a system whose subtle purpose is my dissolution as an independent individual.

GEORGE F. HOUCK.

Bureaucratic Nonsense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a letter from a man from Montana and two of his poems:

After reading your remarks of October 10, 1949—Financial situation of the Government—I believe you are thinking along the same lines that I have been for several years past. If any of these New Deal spenders should ever try to stump you with their stock question of just which of their pet projects you would cut down on, please show them my enclosed Bureaucratic Nonsense, and ask them to explain the sense of spending millions of the taxpayers' dollars on the irrigation of more land at a time when there is such a surplus of land under cultivation in America that we have to subsidize the farmers on that land.

BUREAUCRATIC NONSENSE

Our bureaucrats in Washington;
Now, aren't they wondrous wise;
They're forcing prices up, until
They almost reach the skies!

They killed off lots of little pigs,
Not many years ago;
The price of pork went up and up;
It had been nice and low.

And now, they're buying 'taters, too;
The price was low, they found;
They're dumping them around, to spoil
And rot upon the ground.

And still they are not satisfied
With what we now can grow;
They want more 'taters, and more pigs,
To be destroyed, and so

They're building irrigation works,
To irrigate more land,
And raise more spuds and little pigs
Upon the desert sand.

And you and I, who taxes pay,
Can watch those taxes rise;
And bless the men in Washington
Who are so wondrous wise!

—*G. H. E.*

AUGUST 6, 1947.

My New Deal Blues is a statement of my own personal predicament at the present time. I did not ask to be retired; I would a great deal rather have continued working at my old job and my old salary than to be loafing on $53.67 pension and $45.20 social security. It seems to be a crime to reach one's sixty-fifth birthday; that's why I was fired. I have found a part-time job, but if I earn more than $14.99 in any one month, I lose my social security for that month.

MY NEW DEAL BLUES

We skimped and saved for many years
Out of my wages, slim,
So we could have an income, when
My eyes were old and dim.

And then the New Deal came along,
With spending, big and grand,
Which forced both tax and prices up
All over this fair land.

And then, when I was sixty-five,
They took my job away;
And left me with a pension, small,
To use from day to day.

And now, our lifetime savings,
Which now we have to use,
Have only half their former worth;
So, hence My New Deal Blues!

Now it seems to me we are trying to regulate the people of this country, especially those who have the will to work, and I say it is about time to put a stop to it.

Listen to what William R. Williamson, former actuary for the Social Security Administration, told the Senate Finance Committee. He said the social-security program is a flop. He urged the rejection of the social-security revision bill (H. R. 6000) saying, "Let's have no more tampering with an intrinsically bad law, until a thorough study outlines the logic of a sound program." Furthermore, he recommended that social security be replaced by a program giving everyone $30 a month, a sum lower than the subsistence level. He said the present program involves muddy bookkeeping and insults American citizens by assuming incapacity and a lack of will power.

Observance of One Hundred and Seventy-fifth Anniversary of Patriots' Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following bill I have introduced:

Joint resolution to provide for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775

Whereas the 19th day of April 1775 witnessed the first military engagement between the American colonists and British troops, and the fighting that then occurred at Concord and Lexington, in Massachusetts, formed the prologue to the mighty drama of the Revolution and determined the character of its first campaign; and

Whereas the significance of April 19 in the history of our country is not to be measured by the extent of the military forces that engaged in local battle in 1775, but by the direction and strength of the intangible forces then set in motion which in due course established the United States of America; and

Whereas a frequent recurrence to the events out of which this Nation rose, and a better understanding of the principles upon which our forefathers grounded their independence cannot fail to stimulate and renew that high sense of patriotism which has ever been the glory of our country;

Whereas each such dramatic struggle onward in the process of world civilization has been marked by a ceremonial indicating the formal and official conclusion thereof, the first Commander in Chief and General of the Continental Army purposely selected the 19th of April as the date for a peace proclamation which he read to assembled troops on April 19, 1783.

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established a commission to be known as the Patriots' Day Celebration Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") and to be composed of eight commissioners, as follows: The President of the United States; two Members of the Senate, one from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the Vice President; two Members of the House of Representatives, one from each of the two major parties, to be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives; and three individuals from private life, to be appointed by the President of the United States. The commissioners shall serve without compensation and shall select a chairman from among their number.

SEC. 2. It shall be the duty of the Commission to prepare and carry out a comprehensive plan for the observance and celebration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of Patriots' Day for the commemoration of the events that took place on April 19, 1775. In the preparation of such plan, the Commission shall cooperate with the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and its cities and towns in order that there may be proper coordination and correlation of plans for such observance and celebration.

SEC. 3. (a) Without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the Commission is authorized to appoint and prescribe the duties and fix the compensation of a director and such other employees as are necessary in the execution of its functions.

(b) The Commission may make such expenditures as are necessary to carry out the purposes of this point resolution, including all necessary traveling expenses and subsistence expenses incurred by the commissioners. All expenditures of the Commission shall be allowed and paid upon presentation of itemized vouchers therefor, approved by the chairman of the commission.

(c) The Commission shall cease to exist within 6 months after the date of the expiration of the celebration.

Percentage Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, in his tax message to the Congress, President Truman recommended an ending of certain abuses that have developed in connection with percentage depletion.

The special benefits of percentage depletion and the option to expense intangible developments costs should be limited to the oil industry and not remain available as a means of tax avoidance to movie actors, manufacturers engaged in businesses unrelated to the oil industry and private investing interests.

It is a notorious fact that during the war years, ordnance companies, paint companies, and almost every other kind of manufacturing company recklessly speculated in the oil industry with excess profits dollars. Their operations were notoriously unsuccessful and they were risking and largely wasting tax dollars which would otherwise have come into Uncle Sam's coffers. The new oil reserves which they developed were inconsequential.

It is an equally notorious fact that private investing interests and wealthy individuals are using these special benefits, designed to encourage the oil industry itself to the maximum development of oil reserves, to offset their large incomes from other sources and thus avoid the payment of income taxes which would otherwise be payable by them on such unrelated incomes.

This was not the intended purpose of these special tax benefits and represents an illegitimate use of them. I favor appropriate legislation continuing but limiting the availability of these benefits to the oil industry for which they were originally designed.

As to percentage depletion, I favor limiting the availability of that deduction to those owners of oil wells who originally took the drilling risks or who are generally engaged in the risk part of the oil business. The deduction should not be available to those outside of the oil industry who buy developed oil properties as investments free from drilling risks.

Issuance of Paper Money of Different Hues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lowell (Mass.) Sun of February 1, 1950:

NO SERIOUS OBJECTIONS

Congresswoman EDITH NOURSE ROGERS has revived her campaign to have the Treasury Department issue paper money of different hues. Last year the Department adopted a sleepy view of the proposal and it was finally pigeonholed.

But there are new and more pressing reasons for the change now. In the first place, it could conceivably have a powerful effect upon bringing some of the stolen Brink money to light, or else cause the loot to be practically worthless.

It would also cause many billions that have been hoarded by big-time professional gamblers into the open, so as to be exposed in part to the Department of Internal Revenue.

And again, as was argued last year, it would speed up all business transactions if bills of varying denominations were printed in uniform colors.

The arguments in favor of the measure far outweigh the objections and it is time that the Treasury Department should stifle its yawn and accept this constructive idea.

Mercy Killing Is First-Degree Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following from a sermon delivered by Rev. Thomas F. Coakley, Sacred Heart Church, Pittsburgh, Pa., entitled "Mercy Killing Is First-Degree Murder":

Those favoring mercy killing are not the forward, progressive thinkers of the day. They are the reactionaries, the group that would push us back again into the law of the jungle, proclaiming the survival of the fittest, and setting up the barnyard ethics of dog eat dog. It was the savage and the barbarian who killed the old and the sick lest they become a burden to him. It was Christianity that took the power of life and death out of the hands of despots and arbitrary tribal lords and taught the world the beauty of compassion for the sick and suffering. The hospital is an invention of Christian charity.

Euthanasia, mercy killing, sterilization, contraception, planned parenthood, birth control, abortion, all hang together. These foul practices should not be given fancy names to cloak over their monstrousness. They touch the very wellsprings of our civilization for they deal with the gravest fundamental problems of life and death. You can

no more have mercy killing than you can have mercy robbery or mercy extortion. It is a vile attempt to couple the Christian virtues of mercy and compassion with the ugly concept of homicide. It is another effort to legalize the doctrine that the end justifies the means, however immoral the means may be.

There is absolutely no convincing argument against mercy killing unless one believes in God, in the divinity of Christ, in the immortality of the soul, in the reality of heaven and hell, and a final judgment in the next life to render an account of our doings on this planet. For those who believe in God's moral law, the commandment "Thou shalt not kill," binds their consciences. No exception was made for physicians, who have a special responsibility for preserving human life. But euthanasia will make executioners of physicians. Are we going to classify the medical profession as a gang of salaried murderers? Are doctors willing to be thus cataloged? Mercy killing defiles a noble profession that mankind has reverenced through all ages. The doctor has always been looked upon as a friend, a helper in our trouble. It has been difficult always to find a hangman because their trade was revolting. If euthanasia prevails every physician will be despised and labeled as a first-degree murderer, and we will replace our hospitals by death cells for condemned patients.

Who will be the judge as to when and how a patient is to be murdered? Are we now starting to copy the horrors of Hitler and his Nazi gas chambers at Buchenwald, and those other hucksters of death, the German doctors and scientists, who were tried at Nuremberg and held up to the execration of the world? Is it not significant that Dr. Sander who is about to go on trial for mercy killing studied medicine in Nazi Germany, where the German doctors practiced mass killing? Does this not make us stand aghast at the shamelessness with which presumably reputable doctors and even ministers of religion give impetus to the gathering movement of revived nazism and its mass killings?

The ministers who defend and even applaud Dr. Sander cannot avoid the accusation that they share with Lenin the doctrine that religion is the opiate of the people; that mass murder is justified in the interests of the state, and that a human being and a block of stone are on the same level. Such are the prophets of defeat and despair, led either by their moral illiteracy or their diabolical cynicism to espouse voluntary murder and suicide, practices as loathsome as any in the history of degeneracy.

For a Christian one would suppose that the agonizing death of Christ on the cross gave suffering a supernatural value; that pain patiently endured in imitation of Christ had a high spiritual quality. Surely Christian ministers should boldly proclaim these truths instead of denying them, or advocating their surrender or repeal, or proposing instead an atheistic doctrine that man is ultimately destined for this world only, not for the next.

A Harvard professor and the officials of the Euthanasia Society tell us that mercy killing is going on all the time secretly. If this is true, what effect will it have on the patients in our public or private hospitals? What guaranty will they have that they will not be murdered in their sleep? Will not the vast majority of the sick avoid hospitals as they would the plague?

What about the rich uncles and aunts and relatives, whose wealth is desired by their greedy heirs? Would any of them ever enter a hospital if murder was the prospect? What about life-insurance companies who would face bankruptcy if they were confronted with the mass murder of their policyholders who were insured for large sums? What about the small minorities, racial and religious, if the Government sanctions the extermination of any individual or group who displease the momentary majority in the country? All will remember how Jews, Catholics, and Protestants were put to death by the millions in Soviet Russia and Nazi Germany because the law of force which they instituted authorized mass killing.

Euthanasia will spell the death of all progress in medical science. A disease will remain incurable as long as doctors do not try to cure it. The problems of disease and pain will never be solved by killing the patients. Such an evil law would put a premium on lazy, incompetent, unscrupulous physicians who would solve a difficulty by denying that it exists. The medical profession has made marvelous and spectacular advances by laboring with unwearied patience and skill to cure sick people, not by killing them. Mercy killing is marching to the rear; it is progress backwards.

Euthanasia would not long be restricted to the sick and incurable. It would shortly be extended to the culturally unfit, the crippled, the mentally sick, the socially undesirable, to those who are not in agreement with the dominant political power, to the unpleasant elements in the community, to those who annoy their fellow men by their way of life, however saintly. Who knows but what, if mercy killing is condoned that Pope Pius XII or President Truman may be murdered by their enemies, who may think them a nuisance to society.

Against all this stands the law of God: "Thou shalt not kill," and this applies to physicians and to all others.

Brooklyn Honors Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, Commanding General, New York Port of Embarkation, as Man of the Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, I am extending my remarks at this time to include an article from the Brooklyn Eagle of Sunday, December 18, 1949, honoring Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount, commanding general, New York Port of Embarkation, as Brooklyn's "man of the week." It is a deserving tribute to the general who is doing such a splendid job as head of the Army base in Brooklyn—the Army's largest single transportation installation:

BROOKLYN'S MAN OF THE WEEK—ARMY BASE CHIEF ENJOYS KEEPING THINGS MOVING

(By Richard J. Roth)

The Brooklyn Army Base, sprawling hub of the Army Transportation Corps on the Bay Ridge waterfront, is bustling. And, as far as Brig. Gen. Paul F. Yount is concerned, that's exactly the way it should be.

"I like anything that's moving—either people or things," explained the youthful commanding general of the New York port of embarkation, which, with the Brooklyn base and four giant piers across the Narrows on Staten Island, is the Army's largest single transportation installation. "It doesn't make any difference whether it has wheels or wings or if it floats."

With such leanings, it's hardly surprising that the 41-year-old general is enjoying his present assignment. Tons of cargo and hundreds of passengers move in and out of New York through the NYPE every day as the United States discharges its occupation and foreign-aid obligations overseas.

Glancing out of his office window the other day at a loading operation being performed three floors below by a few of the 10,000 civilian employees at the 100-acre base, through which half of the passengers and cargo entering New York City pass, he said.

PLACE TO SEE PROGRESS

"This is a place where you can always see progress, in terms of people and tonnage. That's why I like it here in Brooklyn. I inherited a fine operating installation, and my only hope is that I may leave one just as good."

General Yount received his "inheritance" from Maj. Gen. Ewart G. Plank, when the latter retired 6 months ago, and since then he's been busy learning his way about the NYPE. Not that he had a great deal to learn about the transportation business; in his 20 years of military activity, he has packed in a lifetime full of experience in moving people and things.

Born in Alliance, Ohio, near the Pennsylvania border, September 9, 1908, the blond officer was one of four children of William C. Yount, "the only maverick of the Yount family that went west" from the Yount farm in western Pennsylvania. The elder Yount was connected with the Ohio Telephone Co.

ACHIEVES TWO AMBITIONS

"I had two ideas when I was a boy," General Yount confessed. "One was to become an engineer and the other was to become an Army officer."

Unlike many youngsters, he achieved both ambitions. Following his graduation from West Point in 1930 as a second lieutenant and an initial assignment to river and harbor work in Buffalo, he was sent to Cornell University for a postgraduate course in engineering.

While at Buffalo he met and married Elizabeth Reybold, the daughter of Lt. Gen. Eugene Reybold, now retired, who was chief of the Army engineers in World War II. Elizabeth, as an "Army brat," had no problems of becoming adjusted to the frequent moving of military families. They have one daughter, Margaret, 16, who is attending Packer Collegiate Institute on Brooklyn Heights.

"Moving around is no problem for us," General Yount smiled. "As a matter of fact, when my 'infant' is in a place for about 2 years she gets restless. She sees other 'pappies' moving around and begins to wonder what's wrong with us. During the year we've become pretty expert at picking up our gear and moving on."

TAUGHT AT WEST POINT

The Younts picked up their gear in 1934 and returned to West Point, where the general served as an instructor for 4 years. Following several assignments in various Corps of Engineers posts, he was serving on the United States-Iranian Mission when the war broke out. His first war mission was the command of a supply base in the China-Burma-India theater, center of the early battle against the onrushing Japs, and he won the Legion of Merit for this duty.

Moving on again back to Persia, he became general manager of the military railway service in the Persian Gulf command, supervising the supply line to Russia. "Strictly a transportation operation" is the way he describes it, and it was a vital one. For his outstanding achievements here, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Medal.

In 1944 he returned to India to head a similar operation on the Stilwell Road, gaining an oak-leaf cluster on his original Legion of Merit. Following the war he was assigned to the Office of the Chief of Transportation in the Pentagon Building, and before he came to Brooklyn he was assistant to the chief.

BROOKLYN IMPRESSES HIM

Brooklyn has impressed General Yount. "I don't know of any city in the country that's more proud of its heritage than Brooklyn," he said seriously. Then he grinned as he added: "Between Brooklynites and Texans we have quite a time. They're certainly two proud areas. I've learned one thing—you call them Brooklynites, not New Yorkers."

Particularly impressive for the general was the way Brooklyn mobilized to bring the State freedom train to the borough. He played an important part in this undertaking, too, by providing an Army base siding free of charge for the train, which concludes its 3-week Brooklyn visit today. General Yount was honorary cochairman of the Brooklyn Heritage Fund Committee, which sponsored the stop here.

There are 13 miles of rails extending around the Army base, and freight cars moved ceaselessly about the installation, picking up and depositing cargo. After a busy day at the base, it would be understandable if the general were completely happy about getting away from the railroad business which has occupied much of his time for two decades. But, as General Yount points out, "it's a hard business to get away from."

He ought to know: In the attic of his Fort Hamilton home, Paul Yount spends much of his spare time fixing up his authentic model railroad system. He has 2 scale miles of track set up already, as he pursues this self-styled busmen's holiday.

In Honor of an "Old-Timer," Roger S. Erdman, Panama Canal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. H. LICHTENWALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. LICHTENWALTER. Mr. Speaker, in this city, on the evening of the 21st of January 1950, the Panama Canal Society of Washington, at its midwinter dinner paid special tribute to a constituent of mine, a fellow Pennsylvanian, Mr. Roger S. Erdman, who was employed for 40 years in consecutive service in the construction and maintenance of the Panama Canal. The principal speaker on this occasion was Hon. Maurice H. Thatcher, formerly a member of this body from Kentucky, and who, during the construction of the great Isthmian enterprise, served as a member of the Isthmian Canal Commission, in charge of the work; and as Governor of the Canal Zone. He paid high tribute to Mr. Erdman, and under leave granted, I am extending my remarks in the RECORD, with inclusion of Governor Thatcher's address:

ADDRESS OF HON. MAURICE H. THATCHER

Mr. President, members of the society, ladies, and gentlemen: This evening it is our purpose to do honor to one of the most faithful and loyal members of the society, and one who has served his country and the Panama Canal for a great many years with the utmost efficiency and fidelity. The man to whom we strive to pay our tribute is a native of Macungie, Pa., a town located in the eastern part of the State. After leaving the public schools of Macungie, he attended Keystone Normal School at Kutztown, Pa., completing his junior year there, after which he took the commercial and stenographic courses in the American Business College at Allentown, Pa., graduating in 1895. Thereupon he left Macungie to make his home in Allentown; and his first employment was with the Lehigh Portland Cement Co., at its manufacturing plant at Ormrod, near Egypt, Pa., serving as one of its first employees, as clerk and timekeeper.

About the year 1899 he entered the employ of the Lehigh Valley Railroad Co. at Bethlehem, Pa., as stenographer and clerk; and later was transferred to its offices in New York City as a rate clerk. After that he went with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co. in Philadelphia as stenographer in its passenger department, which at that time was in charge of George W. Boyd, as passenger agent.

While in New York City, in an effort to become an expert stenographer, he practiced his art on various speeches made by Bourke Cochran and William Jennings Bryan to such an excess that he sustained what is known as writer's cramp. This compelled him to terminate in 1904 his service with the Pennsylvania Railroad Co.; and after great efforts to overcome the indicated handicap, he decided to seek employment in the construction of the Panama Canal; and accordingly, sailed for the Isthmus in October 1906, hoping that with an entire change of climate and conditions he might obtain relief. On arrival on the Isthmus he was rated as a rodman in the Canal work and he was therefore given outside employment rather than indoors.

It turned out that climatic and other conditions of the Isthmus did effect the cure he sought; and thereupon he went back to clerical work, and was transferred from the field to the office of the Chief Engineer, in charge of Colonel Goethals, in 1910: this in connection with personnel activities. He was made Chief of the Personnel Bureau in July, 1916, and remained as its chief until May, 1921, when he was transferred to the Washington office of the Panama Canal, for duties in connection with personnel activities and the gathering of wage statistics for use in computing wages and salaries of employees on the Isthmus. In May, 1927, he was promoted to the post of Chief of the Appointment Division of the Washington Office; and in November, 1941, was made Appointment and Transportation Officer.

During his life on the Isthmus he entered upon the most important adventure of his life. In January, 1915, a very charming young lady, Miss Ann R. Young, a graduate nurse of Mercy Hospital, in Baltimore, came to the Canal Zone, and served as nurse in Ancon Hospital; and, according to the judgment of those then and there in charge of the hospital, proved herself to be one of the most capable nurses ever to serve in that great institution. In Isthmia's romantic setting they met, and met again, with the result that they were married, on the Isthmus, on July 5, 1917; and ever since have lived most happily in marital companionship.

He whom we honor has always taken pride in the fact that he served a single branch of the Government throughout, and for such a long and continuous period; although, as he believes, he might have bettered his financial situation by transferring to some other Government activity, or else gone into private business. His loyalty to the Canal work was such, however, that he remained with it, and finally retired, on October 31, 1946, upon completion of 40 years of service. At the time of his retirement he could have served another year before the compulsory age limit of 70 years would have affected him. I can bear special testimony touching his faithful and efficient work for the Panama Canal after I left Congress in 1933. My law office in Washington was near his official quarters, and I saw much of him, and was impressed with his untiring and effective labors for the Canal, and by his unfailing loyalty to the cause he had served so long and so well. During this period, until his retirement, his work was very burdensome, but he was on the job for as many hours of the day, and for as many days in the week, as the exactions required.

Also, I know something of his tireless and effective efforts in behalf of the legislation which broadened the scope of the act of May 29, 1944, enacted for the benefit of old-timers—those who had been engaged, on the Isthmus, in the actual building of the Canal. During the pendency of the legislation he often conferred with me about it, and I am sure that he did much to bring about the enactment.

Hence, practically all of his active working career has been bound up in the service of the Panama Canal, in one or another form; and there are few officials or employees of the great Isthmian enterprise who may have a comparable period of service.

Such has been the life work of Roger S. Erdman. Not only are we glad to pay him our tribute on this occasion for what he has done through the years; but, as well, because he stands as a symbol for thousands of other American citizens who participated in the work of construction of the Panama Canal, and in its maintenance and operation after construction. Not many can claim the long tenure of service that has been his, nor the lengthened period of his connection with the Canal. However, others in varying periods of service and in like positions of responsibility have discharged their duties well and faithfully, and what we now say of Roger Erdman in these connections may be applied also to these others. All of them deserve the highest credit for what they have done. As American citizens, most of them civilians, in a strange land, under the fierce glare and torrential rains of the tropics, those whom we call old timers wrote an imperishable record of efficient and patriotic service, not only in behalf of their own country and flag, but as well, for the the good of the entire world; and the United States and all lands and peoples owe them an everlasting debt of gratitude. In like manner should that gratitude extend to those who, since the last lone yard of the link was done, have operated and maintained the Canal. Most of these never crept into the headlines of the daily press, but they did the jobs to which they were assigned, and without their effective services there would have been no headlines for anybody or for the Canal. Surely the recording angel has made note of all of this; and, thus, we are pleased to believe that all these have wrought far better than they have ever known.

And to Roger and his faithful spouse—who also lived and worked on the Isthmus, and who shared with him the Isthmian life—let us all join in wishing them many more years together: years of health, happiness, and prosperity.

Defeat for 5 Years

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an article which I believe to be highly important to the American people and which appeared in

the February 1950 issue of the magazine The Sign. This article was written by Richard L. Stokes, reporter and war correspondent for many years, who covered the State Department for the St. Louis Post-Dispatch. This item deals with incidents vitally affecting our foreign policy and the men entrusted with the safety and well-being of our country.

The article follows:

DEFEAT FOR 5 YEARS

(By Richard L. Stokes)

Three anecdotes, never before published, rear like milestones along the pathway of American diplomacy since 1941—a thoroughfare of disaster and enormity which has led Catholics to wonder whether Satan has not fixed his lodging in the State Department, having chosen that heart of the democratic and Christian world as his throne room and capital seat.

The date of the first incident was September 4, 1939. According to habit, President Roosevelt was breakfasting in bed at the White House. Morning papers were scattered about the coverlet. Their banner lines almost cracked the forms with epic news. On the day before, England and France had declared war against Germany. Nazi tanks were 3 days beyond the Polish frontier. Less than 2 weeks had passed since Joseph Stalin rang up the curtain on World War II by signing a nonaggression treaty with Adolf Hitler.

Visiting the President and wearing an anxious look was Adolf A. Berle, Jr., an intellectual prodigy of renown, an arch New Dealer, and Assistant Secretary of State. He stammered that Hitler's accomplice and America's foe, Joseph Stalin, had set up an espionage apparatus in this country with pipe lines into its most treasured secrets.

His informant, said Berle, was Whittaker Chambers, Communist go-between, whose "contact," a protégé of Associate Justice Felix Frankfurter, was assistant to the State Department's adviser on political relations. The name was Alger Hiss.

President Roosevelt was far from diverted. As soon as he caught the drift of the warning, he broke in upon it with his iciest accents of dismissal.

"Adolf," he grated, "it's a beautiful, sunshiny morning. Take a walk around the block, and you'll feel better."

The White House was also the scene of the next episode, but the time was January, 1945. Roosevelt was on the eve of his black-omened flight to Yalta. There, among other iniquities, Catholic Poland was to be surrendered to armed atheism, and dikes were to be opened for sabotage of the United Nations through the Russian veto and for Communist domination of eastern Europe and the Orient.

A chief of mission from one of the continental states sought an interview with Mr. Roosevelt for the purpose of imploring him to be on guard against Stalin's cunning and malice. The President's smile was one of Olympian amusement.

"Mr. Ambassador," he drawled, "I see you haven't much confidence in my famous charm."

The diplomat was appalled. "Mr. President," he gasped, "I hope you won't have too much confidence in it yourself."

For the third anecdote the locale shifts to China and the hour to the spring of 1946. Gen. George C. Marshall was absorbed in a mission to implement policies drafted by the State Department's left-wing cell. His fated victim, Chiang Kai-shek, had submitted to injury after injury.

At Marshall's command he accepted an armistice on the brink of triumph over the Communist enemy. He laid down his most potent weapon, the Nationalist Air Force. He unlocked the Kalgan Pass for Red Star troops, who thronged into Manchuria and were armed by Russia with material from Japanese arsenals.

But the generalissimo, for 20 years the Orient's pillar of flame against communism, mutinied when he was ordered to invite Chinese Marxists into his cabinet. For the one-time chief of staff, such disobedience was an outrage of military insubordination. It was punished with an embargo, which lasted 18 months, upon shipments of munitions from the United States to Nationalist China. With that mandate it became positive that sooner or later China would be engulfed by the Soviet police empire. But President Truman's ambassador, at the moment, was proud of his ukase.

"During the war," General Marshall said to a friend, "I armed more than 30 Chinese divisions." He added with satisfaction: "Today I disarmed them."

Incidents like these are telltale flashes upon the landscape of foreign affairs under the Roosevelt and Truman administrations. The general survey which follows will impugn no motives and assess no judgments—though it appears manifest that the statesmen concerned have wrought harm to their country, wittingly or unwittingly, beyond the most traitorous dreams of Benedict Arnold.

West Point's renegade could not have imagined an overturn comparable to that suffered by the United States during the last 5 years. In 1945 it enjoyed throughout the world a supremacy in arms, a moral prestige, and a repute for statecraft probably unique in history. That hegemony, spiritual as well as military, lies at the outset of 1950 in ruins equivalent to those of shattered Berlin. The American people have been maneuvered into a degree of isolation which bids fair to condemn them to fight world war III, if or when it comes, without one strong and trustworthy ally.

In an effort to prove its innocence, the State Department has flooded the land with a vast confusion of remonstrances and denials, explanations, white papers, and pronunciamentos. But, when the eye turns from special pleadings to assured, notorious facts, there starts into view a line of conduct as distinct and unswerving as a traffic band on a motor highway. It is as if Vyacheslav M. Molotov or Andrei Vishinski had been Secretary of State since June 1941 and had ordained this directive, to be pursued at all costs:

"The settled policy of the United States shall be to aid and abet the Soviet Union in creating vacuums of power for occupation by communism."

With American help, acquiescence, or feeble opposition, such voids have been dredged on a fantastic scale in Europe and Asia, to be overflowed by Stalinist seas. Bodily annexed by Russia since the war have been 122,000 square miles, with a population of more than 22,000,000, in Poland, Rumania, northeast Prussia, the Kuriles, Sakhalin, and Tanu Tuva in China. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, proper, today boasts an area of 8,473,444 square miles and a census of 221,384,985.

Above and beyond these figures, the Soviet system, as a result of the war, has swept into its orbit regions of Europe and Asia which total 4,861,860 square miles, with a population of 570,000,000. Thus, 14 men in the Politburo exercise more or less absolute sway over a grand aggregate of 13,335,304 square miles and about 791,384,000 human beings—that is to say, one-fifth of the globe's land surface and one-third of all mankind.

Not yet occupied, but at various stages of readiness for the process, are further tracts and multitudes in southeast Asia, India, Japan, the Philippines, Korea, the Levant, and western Europe.

Gulfs scooped away and then filled by communism had their genesis in the Roosevelt doctrine of unconditional surrender. It overthrew German and Japanese militarism, but also blasted the dams of armed strength which theretofore had held back Muscovite imperialism in Occident and Orient.

The headlong dismantling of America's fighting machine after the war and the homeward stampede of its troops, ships, and planes, by Atlantic and Pacific, left the Red army as the only surviving military power in the Eastern Hemisphere. The giant Eurasian land mass was prostrate at the Kremlin's feet.

A backstage glimpse of the mechanism at work was afforded in testimony given by Adolf Berle on August 30, 1948, before the House Un-American Activities Committee.

It was common knowledge in the State Department, he said, that by the fall of 1944 there had arisen a contest between two cliques regarding policy. A pro-Russian group was captained by Dean G. Acheson, then Assistant Secretary of State, with Alger Hiss, Deputy Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs, as his chief lieutenant.

The opposing faction, led by Berle, was not at all hostile to the Soviet Union but ventured to hint at doubts as to whether its spirit of cooperation was not a trifle below all-out friendliness.

The opposition was strong enough, Berle continued in effect, and sufficiently ardent in the Soviet cause, to brush him out of diplomatic life by way of demotion to the ambassadorship in Brazil. That was his penalty for having dared even to question the attitude of Moscow.

Light on attacks against Berle's veracity is thrown by published records of the State Department. They present evidence of something like a clean sweep of his adherents and a singular upsurge of fortune in the case of Acheson's disciples.

In August 1945 Acheson himself found reward in his advancement to the office of Under Secretary of State, which he held until July 1947. Because of frequent overseas journeys by Secretaries James F. Byrnes and Marshall, Acheson during much of this period served as Acting Secretary, administering policy, attending Cabinet meetings, and representing the Department in other top-level functions. After 18 months of private law practice, he became Secretary of State on January 21, 1949.

Compensation for Alger Hiss was rapid. In January 1945 he was promoted to full Director of the Office of Special Political Affairs. General Marshall's top adviser during the Chinese mission was W. Walton Butterworth, Minister-Counsellor at Nanking. By way of recognition of his services in helping deliver China to communism, he was appointed Director and then Assistant Secretary for Far Eastern Affairs.

Among Foreign Service officers sent home by Ambassador Patrick J. Hurley, who accused them of leaking information to the Chinese Communists, were John S. Service, second secretary in Chunking; and John P. Davies, Jr., political adviser to Gen. Joseph W. "Vinegar Joe" Stilwell, the evil genius of China.

Service is now Director of Far East Placements in the Division of Foreign Service Personnel. If a candidate fails to hew closely to the orthodox line, Service is in a position to shunt him away to Zanzibar or Patagonia. Davies is Far Eastern expert of the Department's Policy Planning Staff, where his views must have clashed bitterly with those of its Director, George F. Kennan.

In that case Service had power enough to defeat his boss, though Kennan is recognized as the most brilliant star of the Foreign Service. On January 1 he was relieved of two key jobs—Director of the Policy Planning Staff and counselor of the Department. With elaborate and dubious explanations he was sent on a tour of South America and Africa and announced that he would retire in June. He is known to have been shocked

by the Department's abject failure in China and had no reticence about saying so.

Another Foreign Service man of whom Hurley disapproved was Raymond P. Ludden, a staff officer of the rival embassy which State Department career men set up on behalf of General Stilwell. When John Leighton Stuart was made Ambassador to China in 1946, Ludden emerged as counselor and first secretary. He came to be rated as actual chief of Mission, with Stuart, now in his seventy-fourth year, as a figurehead. Today, Ludden is Counselor of Legation in Dublin.

Alleged to have been the Department's spy on Lt. Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer was another Foreign Service officer, Philip D. Sprouse. Wedemeyer, who replaced Stilwell, was suspected of being less than fiery in his admiration for the Communist leader, Mao Tse-tung. Sprouse's job was to sit in and report on all the general's conversations. He was summoned to Washington in 1947 and recently became Director of the Office of Chinese Affairs.

As Under Secretary, Acheson was responsible for instructions which guided Marshall's Chinese errand, but which undoubtedly had the general's personal approval. Drafting of the actual papers is attributed to John Carter Vincent, then Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs. His recompense was advancement to the class of career minister. He was slated to be Ambassador to China. But it proved impossible to obtain Senate confirmation without a solemn pledge that Vincent would not be assigned to any post in the Far East. He was sent as Minister to Switzerland.

Casualties on the other side, in addition to Berle himself, are listed as including Ambassador Hurley, a former Secretary of War; Joseph C. Grew, wartime Ambassador to Japan and later Under Secretary of State; Dr. Stanley K. Hornbeck, special assistant to the Secretary, who was disposed of with an appointment as Ambassador to the Netherlands; Joseph W. Ballantine, Director of the Office of Far Eastern Affairs, who was eased into another unit of the Department and escaped to the Brookings Institution; Everett F. Drumright, consul at Nanking; and Grew's first assistant, Eugene H. Dooman.

To Loy W. Henderson belongs the distinction of having twice been exiled for independence of character. As assistant chief of the Europe Affairs Division, he was found lacking in reverence for the Roosevelt-Stalin idyl and was packed off to be Minister in Iraq. Brought home to direct the Office of Near Eastern and African Affairs, he took the unpopular side of the Palestine issue and was banished to Pakistan.

Three men outside the Department are credited with having given notable succor to the Acheson thesis. The most conspicuous is Owen Lattimore, former political adviser to Chiang Kai-shek and deputy director of Pacific operations for the Office of War Information. An early champion of Red China, he has consistently supported its interests and is charged with front-rank liability for the Chinese debacle. He is director of the Page School of International Relations at Johns Hopkins and one of the Department's most valued consultants.

Dimmer to the public eye are Edward C. Carter, secretary-general of the left-wing Institute of Pacific Relations; and Mortimer Graves, administrative secretary of the Council of Learned Societies. The Institute of Pacific Relations is Acheson's recruiting ground for ace personnel. A directory of individuals with far-eastern experience has been kept for years by the Council of Learned Societies, which has become the Department's principal recourse in screening applicants for jobs in that region. This service is maintained with Rockefeller funds.

In 1940 Graves promoted a concert at the stadium in Washington, nominally for Chinese relief, with Paul Robeson as soloist. Among the patrons, until they withdrew, were Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt, the Chinese Ambassador, and Mrs. Gifford Pinchot. There was a scandal when Mrs. Pinchot charged publicly that half the proceeds were earmarked for a Communist organization, the National Negro Congress.

A Red Cross worker by profession, Carter was president of Russian Relief in 1941–45 and was decorated by the USSR with the Order of the Red Banner. From the Institute of Pacific Relations, Acheson mustered two of his committee of three for drafting a new Chinese policy—its former chairman, Prof. Philip C. Jessup, and its quondam treasurer, Everett N. Case, president of Colgate University.

Besides acting until recently as ambassador-at-large to the United Nations, Dr. Jessup compiled the white paper with which dying China was stabbed in the back. His committee, as it was selected to do, reported that the betrayal of China was actually a high-minded extension of the open door and that choice of their form of government should be left to the Chinese people—signifying, under present circumstances, the Chinese Communists.

Over a period of years the Rockefeller Foundation has contributed more than a million dollars to the Institute of Pacific Relations and has given important backing to the Council of Learned Societies. Raymond D. Fosdick, president of the Foundation, was the third member of Acheson's China policy committee.

History, of course, will seek to adjudge responsibility for measures which have brought not only the United States, but democratic and Christian civilization, thus far on the road to disaster.

Absent from the roster of defendants can scarcely be Franklin D. Roosevelt, who for more than 12 years was his own Secretary of State; and Dean Acheson, who for 9 years—except for 18 months—has been a continuing and ascendant luminary in the firmament of state.

Russia's immense gains could not have been achieved without Roosevelt's great gamble—as he himself termed it—that trust could be reposed in Joseph Stalin's good faith, though the past record was scarlet with his crimes of duplicity and malevolence.

With Acheson in charge, Spain was outlawed from the household of peoples and is being forced deliberately into bankruptcy and collapse. The Nationalist regime is the only power to have met communism face to face, in arms, and to have defeated it. That, possibly, is Franco's unpardonable offense.

Under the leadership of Roosevelt and Acheson, the American people have been persuaded to put all the eggs of their destiny in a pair of highly fragile baskets—western Europe and the United Nations. Disarmed, demoralized, impoverished, and honeycombed by Marxism, western Europe cannot be relied upon, either now or in the calculable future, to stand up in war against the Soviet Union.

Like the Maginot line of France, the United Nations may serve to lull the United States into a passive psychology and false sense of security. Already this proposed rampart of defense has been riddled again and again by the Soviet veto. It is so wanting in realistic strength that it has been defied with impunity by the small Union of South Africa and was challenged lately to a show-down of force by the Israeli Republic, a nonviable colony of American Jewry which would perish without subsidies wrung from earnings in the United States.

There are signs that Stalin has construed the surrender of the Western Powers in China as another Munch, flashing the green light for his long-revolving plan to hurl a communist German Army from the east upon west Germany in a campaign of national liberation. With Marxism on the Rhine, France would be expected to collapse and with it all that remains of free Europe.

Then, like mists before a hurricane, would vanish those gossamer walls of security which the United States has constructed at such expense and which are particularly associated with Acheson's name—the Marshall plan, the Atlantic Treaty, the arms assistance program, the western European union.

Since Roosevelt's death, Acheson, for good or evil, has had things largely his own way, though serving under three Secretaries of State and a new President. Edward R. Stettinius, Jr., was only a stop-gap. Byrnes, a small-town politician, knew nothing about foreign affairs and troubled himself still less. Believing in his heart, as a West Pointer, that war alone can settle anything, Marshall despised diplomacy.

Foreign policy is several stratospheres over Harry S. Truman's head. Commonly he does as he is told, unless, as in Palestine, matters chance to touch upon the single trade he knows—winning elections and influencing ballots.

Before what he fancied to be Marshall's soldierly grandeur, Truman groveled in awe. He is impressed to the point of terror by Acheson's Harvard intonation, his air of patrician insolence, and a fluency of rhetoric which must seem, for an artless boy of Independence, Mo., to partake of the supernatural.

It is possible that Alger Hiss has the makings of a Robespierre. Like him, at the Harvard Law School, Acheson enjoyed the privilege of being indoctrinated by Professor Frankfurter. But Acheson strikes one as an astute careerist, with the ethics of a lawyer and the morals of a sophist. As Assistant Secretary of State, with Roosevelt for client, he cheerfully followed the Moscow line. On his own, under Truman, he is anti-Communist in Europe and Russophile in Asia. Like a sophist, he is prepared at a moment's notice to improvise an ingenious discourse on either side of the same question or on both sides at once.

There is temptation now and then to wonder whether he is ever haunted by ghosts—for example, the specters of James V. Forrestal, Secretary of Defense; John G. Winant, Ambassador to England; Lawrence Duggan, for 9 years Chief of the Division of American Republics; and Sumner Welles, for 6 years markworthy and puissant as Under Secretary of State.

At least Acheson is suspected, on one occasion, of having known a twitch of remorse. Perhaps that also has never been published. Shortly after becoming Secretary of State, he made a confession to an American who is prophetic in his zeal against communism.

"You know," the Secretary murmured ruefully from the depths of a chair, as he stretched his legs toward the fireplace, "I was 100 percent wrong about Russia."

But a lone swallow of repentance does not make a summer of conversion. And there is a popular pleasantry which is attaching itself more and more to Dean G. Acheson. Justly or unjustly, it labels him as the Red Dean of the State Department.

Nebraska Farm Bureau Resolutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave previously granted me, I include with my remarks part of the resolutions

adopted at the thirty-first annual convention of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation, November 30, 1949:

AGRICULTURE

7. We urge continuance of the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation policy of flexible price supports of 75 to 90 percent of parity in the six basic farm commodities. We oppose the price-support policy of the so-called Brannan plan or any other plan whereby we depend upon congressional appropriation for a substantial part of our farm income. We would also oppose the principles of the Brannan plan if they were applied to labor or industry.

8. Resolved that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record favoring the use of surplus crops industrially and favoring further chemurgic research.

9. Resolved that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record opposing livestock-production controls.

10. We commend the hatcheries of Nebraska for the progress made in their voluntary program of pullorum control and urge them to continue their efforts toward pullorum-clean ratings.

11. The Nebraska Farm Bureau is cognizant of the overlapping functions in the Department of Agriculture. We believe that it is for the best interests of the public and the farmers that the dual administration of soil conservation in the United States be modified. We feel that the existing administration of soil conservation which permits the Production and Marketing Administration and the Soil Conservation Service equal rights as to performance of technical services but with only the Production and Marketing Administration having authority to approve or disapprove soil-conservation payments, increases the cost of administration, creates friction between the agencies, obstructs conservation, and, in the final analysis, the individual farmer suffers the loss.

We recommend that the Secretary of Agriculture delegate to the soil-conservation district boards of supervisors the authority to approve or disapprove soil-conservation payments in those areas where a soil-conservation district has been organized. In the event the Secretary of Agriculture does not now have such authority by law, we recommend that legislation be enacted to give him such authority.

12. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation recognizes and heartily commends the great contribution the Farm Credit Administration has made through the years in providing a dependable source of credit for agriculture, in establishing favorable terms for agricultural credit.

Especially to be commended is the ideal of complete farmer-ownership which the Farm Credit Administration has always encouraged the cooperative lending institutions in the Farm Credit System to achieve. The Federal land banks and the national farm loan associations are now entirely owned by the farmers and stockmen who borrow from them. Many of the production credit associations have also reached this goal, and many others are nearing it.

The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation believes that the cause of agricultural credit will be served best when all the cooperative lending institutions sponsored by the Farm Credit Administration are fully owned by the farmers and stockmen and farm cooperatives that do business with them.

13. We firmly believe that a substantial appropriation is necessary to encourage agricultural producers to carry out necessary erosion, flood-control, and water-conservation practices. We feel, however, that the appropriation should be used solely for the carrying out of the soil-conservation practices. When counties have unexpended funds, we believe a reallocation of such funds should be made to other deficit counties.

14. We recommend a continuation of the present legislation which permits the Commodity Credit Corporation to provide for supplemental storage of farm commodities which are in surplus supply to the extent for which terminal storage is not available. Any program for the extension of storage facilities should first emphasize increased storage on the individual farm for the commodities which store successfully.

15. In order to increase consumption of surpluses, we urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to expand the present research programs in the use and distribution of agricultural commodities.

16. We recommend a continuance of the present legislation authorizing use of the International Wheat Agreement. This agreement serves as a protective measure to the current price support program in years when we experience production over and above the amount required for domestic use.

17. We recommend a continuance of the present policy of administering agricultural programs at the local level by elected community and county farmer committeemen; and further, we insist that the policy of elected personnel be expanded to include the administration of the program at the State and National levels.

18. We feel that present Government crop forecasts are unrealistic and generally in error by overestimation. We urge that efforts be made to devise a more accurate method of crop forecasting.

19. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation highly resents the abuse of the franking privilege and the use of public-tax moneys by the United States Department of Agriculture to promulgate and propagandize any program which has its conception entirely within its framework, but which is not law.

We feel that the primary purpose of the United States Department of Agriculture is to administer agricultural legislation enacted by Congress and is completely outside its jurisdiction when it seeks to influence public opinion or establish policies regarding any so-called farm program.

20. We recommend that legislation be enacted enabling a tax not to exceed one-half cent a bushel on wheat and one-quarter cent a bushel on corn at the producers' market; the moneys raised to be used to develop new markets and uses for these commodities. We recommend that such fund be administered by a committee appointed by the Governor of the State from a list furnished by the general farm organizations and the dean of the College of Agriculture; a majority of whom must be producers of the commodities. We further recommend that this program be coordinated with States having similar programs.

21. We believe in a more rigid control of infectious and contagious diseases in livestock sold through community sale barns.

22. It is evident that there is a great deal of sentiment for some regulation in the farm program which will give credit for the summer fallow practice in those areas of Nebraska where it is a good farm practice. We hesitate to recommend that the amendment to the cotton bill in regard to the establishment of 1950 wheat allotments be reenacted because of inequities which resulted from its application between farms and between areas. As a substitute, we recommend very strongly that production controls for wheat be changed from an acreage to a bushel basis. We believe this change will have two principal advantages over the present program:

A. It would place upon the farmer who produces the surplus the responsibility of financing its carry-over.

B. It would result in a more equitable adjustment of production between farms and between areas.

Under this plan, county marketing allotments would be established by giving equal weight to the average production of the most recent 10 years and the most recent 3 years.

23. The farm program has become a major factor in our agricultural economy. Therefore, we recommend that a Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation farm-program committee be inaugurated. This committee shall be a 12-man committee appointed by the President, with the approval of the board of directors. A chairman shall be elected by the committee. The personnel of this committee shall be three farm-bureau members from each farm-bureau district. They shall hold a minimum of four meetings annually. Membership of this committee, being representatives of all areas of the State, will represent all major farm commodities produced in the State. The duties of this committee shall be to discuss all phases of agricultural farm programs and make recommendations to the board of directors for legislative action. This committee should return to farmers in their own areas a better understanding of the problems of other areas with different crop practices as well as legislative needs.

ROADS

24. We recommend to the 1951 session of the Nebraska Legislature a bill which will provide for the appointment of a proven efficient business manager, other than the State engineer, to head the State highway department; said man to be appointed by the Governor and subject to the approval of the unicameral legislature.

We recommend that all records of the department of roads and irrigation be kept in a simple and comprehensive manner and subject to a detailed audit by the State auditor's office and available for inspection and publication.

SCHOOLS

27. We wish to reaffirm resolution XV of the 1948 Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation resolution which reads: "We do not favor the principle of Federal aid for schools." In the event that such legislation should be enacted, we strongly believe that such disbursements should be made on grant-in-aid basis through State and county governments to insure a maximum retention of local control.

TAXES

28. We favor a reallocation of the gas-tax funds so that they will be more equitably distributed to meet rural needs.

29. We urge the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation support the campaign to repeal by referendum vote the gas-tax increase and the license-fee increase laws. We urge that steps be taken to insure more efficient operation of the highway department. We do not favor an increase of these taxes until a sufficient need has been demonstrated, following more efficient use of highway funds.

30. We recommend that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation go on record in favor of a sales and/or income tax; this tax to be a replacement tax for personal-property tax and real-estate tax.

31. Since under the present Nebraska constitution, farmers who reseal 1948 commodities are suffering a double taxation, we request a revision of Nebraska's constitution, and we further request a comprehensive study of Nebraska's tax system, toward a more fair tax for all citizens of our State. If a legislative committee of the Nebraska unicameral does not make this study, we authorize the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation to do so, since we believe this is the first step essential to the relief of an intolerable tax situation.

32. We urge that the taxes on farm buildings, except the dwelling, be removed so as to encourage land owners to leave buildings stand; to encourage and not discourage farm owners to improve and maintain their farmsteads. The tax income lost to the county, exempting farm-building taxation, would be added to the over-all land valuation because it would still be to the farm community's advantage by requiring the outside investor and farmer to pay his fair share of county taxes.

33. We request the repeal of the transportation tax, communication tax, and all excise taxes, except so-called luxury goods including alcoholic liquors and tobacco.

Nebraska paid well over $10,000,000 in excise taxes to the Federal Government last year; much of which was levied on necessary equipment and supplies used in regular farm operations.

We strongly urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to take steps to follow this through in the next session of Congress; as the retaining of this amount within the State (and comparable amounts in other States) would relieve the necessity of a large amount of Federal and State matching.

34. We go on record in favor of the present refund law on agriculture gasoline.

35. We recommend that the American Farm Bureau Federation through its Washington office do everything in its power to get Congress to control deficit spending and start reducing the national debt.

HEALTH

36. We do not favor socialized medicine and we urge the American Farm Bureau Federation to continue opposing any bill introduced in Congress that favors socialized medicine.

37. We are opposed to the extension of social security to farm people.

38. We commend the fine work being done by the tuberculosis and blood bank mobile units and suggest that more units be made available to the public. We urge more universal use of units when available.

39. We urge more intensified research on cancer, polio, diabetes, and undulant fever, and all diseases with a high degree of morbidity.

40. We recommend adequate funds be appropriated for a continuation of the Nebraska brucellosis control program. The Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation feels that present legislation is adequate but that the department of animal industry has been handicapped by insufficient funds.

MISCELLANEOUS

41. We commend the Nebraska Legislature for retaining the use of dairy products in our State institutions.

42. We feel that present noxious weed laws are adequate but should be more rigidly enforced.

43. We oppose any increase in postage rates until the abuse of the franking privilege is rectified.

44. We request the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation be authorized to represent its members and oppose any unjustified rates or curtailment of services of public utilities.

45. We urge the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation to investigate and use their influence in obtaining extension and improvement in rural telephone service.

46. There is need for additional facilities to assist farm people of Nebraska and their organizations in presenting agriculture's point of view to the general public; and there is need to bring to the farm population of Nebraska additional facts and information on agricultural markets, taxes, schools, roads, and many other problems; therefore, we recommend that the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation make the farmer-owned radio plan one of its major projects of 1950.

Two Congressmen With a Mission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES P. RICHARDS
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICHARDS. Mr. Speaker, much has been said pro and con about American Congressmen making investigation trips overseas. It is my personal opinion that, without these studies, Congress would not have the benefit of a first-hand picture of what we have to contend with in our battle against communism. How can a Member of Congress intelligently evaluate the Marshall plan, ECA, the United Nations, reciprocal trade treaties, our military aid program, and a dozen other subjects involving the welfare of this country without seeing first-hand conditions in foreign countries and the results of our economic and military efforts to insure a just and lasting peace.

In this connection I wish to insert in the RECORD an article by Mr. John Reynolds, in the Houston Post, concerning a joint trip and study made overseas by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CHATHAM] and the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. RIBICOFF]. Our colleagues, Mr. CHATHAM and Mr. RIBICOFF, are two of the most able and hard working members of the Foreign Affairs Committee and the information that they brought back to us has been invaluable. The article mentioned follows:

LETTER FROM LONDON—EUROPE IMPRESSED BY UNTIRING MOBILITY AND GENEROSITY OF CONGRESSMEN ON ECA CHECK

(By John Reynolds)

LONDON, November 12.—Just what does an American Congressman do when he trips through Europe on one of those ever-more-frequent investigating junkets? Does he take his work seriously, or is he more interested in looking into Paris night clubs than into the effects of Marshall plan aid or the possibility of a western European union? What impressions of Europe does he take back with him, and what effect does he himself have on Europeans?

We cannot answer for all of them. But we have just spent a good deal of time with two, and are happy to report that, if they are at all typical, America is well served by the Congressmen she sends abroad.

They are ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, Democratic representative of Hartford, Conn., and THURMOND CHATHAM, from Winston-Salem, N. C., also a Democrat; both sent over here by the Foreign Affairs Committee to make a study of the workings of ECA; both keen, intelligent and workmanlike.

We met them first on their way to Europe, on the Nieuw Amsterdam, and it was obvious from the beginning that their trip was to be no joyride. Several hours a day were spent going through economic pamphlets and reading European history books for background. The rest of the time they "investigated" the passengers, most of whom were Dutch and French.

They were indegatigable in their questions. Why was not more being done to further Western Union? What did the Dutch and Belgians think of Benelux? What industrialists, what labor leaders, what politicians might help them most in their European education? Wherever one went on the ship one was sure to see either CHATHAM or RIBICOFF or both surrounded by a little group of well-chosen people, intently discussing everything from the price of food in London to the threat of communism in France.

After we left the ship at Southampton, we did not see them again till they turned up in London after a hectic 3-week trip that took in Belgium, France, Germany, Italy and Switzerland, and included long sessions with Count Sforza, Ambassador Bruce and the pope ("one of the best brains in Europe").

In London they showed the same extraordinary mobility. In their 2 days here they saw high embassy and ECA officials, they interviewed Ernest Bevin and many other cabinet and civil service members, they sat in on a House of Commons debate, they talked to taxi drivers, shopkeepers, and chambermaids, and in between times "ABE" RIBICOFF managed to broadcast a report to constituents back in Hartford.

With it all, they managed to get a pretty sensible view of English life and English problems.

Though they saw most of the same people and the same scenes—RIBICOFF, however, concentrated more on politicians, CHATHAM on businessmen—they will take back with them by no means the same impressions.

RIBICOFF, a young New England lawyer, has taken great pains to understand rather than judge the European situation. He has been particularly impressed by England. He likes the British people's cheerful ability to do without a lot of the comforts of life in order to pay their way honestly in the future. He admires their integrity and their courage; and when he returns to Hartford he hopes to be able to explain to his constituents that England's present troubles are not all caused by its Socialist Government, but by two wars, an adverse trade position, and other forces in large measure outside its control.

CHATHAM, a southern industrialist, mildly unreconstructed, has on the contrary seen nothing in England to modify his strong distrust of socialism, in any form, though he joins forces with RIBICOFF in his friendly feeling toward the individual Briton.

He found himself much more attracted toward France and would like America to bend all its reconstruction efforts to strengthening France, preferably under the leadership of de Gaulle, and making it the economic and political leader of Europe. As for England, he considers its economic situation so bad that trying to save it is simply a waste of American money.

CHATHAM is not to be budged from this position even by the argument that in a crisis America is likely to find Britain a far more reliable ally than France.

Both men had as their trip's main purpose the investigation of the all-too-slow progress toward western union. They will return as convinced of its necessity as ever but far more aware of the enormous difficulties to be overcome. They know now it cannot be accomplished by simple fiat. They are also sure that ECA aid must continue, in some form or other.

Our two Congressmen learned about Europe not only through interviews with the higher diplomatic brass. They managed, too, to get around on sightseeing and shopping trips much like the average tourist. We took RIBICOFF on a shopping tour one day and realized ourselves for the first time just what a wealth of goods London still has to offer the customer. And, for the foreigner, all at a remarkably low price, what with the devalued pound and the avoidance of the purchase tax (66 to 100 percent on luxury items).

Europeans were pretty taken with RIBICOFF and CHATHAM, too. For one thing they

were in themselves almost perfect examples of that American generosity that has made ECA possible; they brought with them dozens of nylons, cartons of cigarettes, crates of bacon and eggs, which they distributed with a lavish (but not patronizing) hand to their most casual acquaintances.

But more than that they were intelligent and friendly, obviously men of good will who could meet on common ground with men of good will of any country. They could not have been more different from the noisy, conspicuous American abroad, which European caricaturists have so long delighted to draw—often from life. America could do with more ambassadors like these two Congressmen of ours.

Pensions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, January 30, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, all of us here on the House side are following with eager interest the hearings now proceeding before the Senate Finance Committee on H. R. 6000, the bill we passed last year by the overwhelming vote of 333 to 14 to strengthen the social-security system and especially to strengthen the contributory social-insurance program on which organized labor and all working people pin their hopes for a retirement consistent with American concepts of dignity and decency. Many of us sincerely hope that the Senate will, after studying the problem, go further in the direction of a comprehensive program paying adequate benefits, as a matter of earned right, in their years of retirement to all workers not now covered by satisfactory public retirement systems, including farmers and farm workers.

I was, therefore, much amazed and dismayed to learn that a witness from my own State of California, Mr. George McLain, appeared before the Senate Finance Committee on January 28 to denounce retirement benefits paid as a matter of right and to advocate their replacement by a universal means test program making benefits contingent on poverty. He stated that, to use his own words:

> I have never held to the philosophy of granting a pension as a matter of right.

He then proceeded to castigate as "a special privileged group of pensioners reminiscent of class legislation of the most inequitable kind" all those who, by years of patient struggle, and by their own contributions have won for themselves retirement systems. Who are these privileged groups to whom he would deny the very benefits for which they have paid week after week, month after month, with their own pay-roll deductions? His list includes and I quote:

> Federal, State, county, and city civil-service employees—judges, school teachers, policemen, firemen, etc., employees of quasi governmental institutions, public utility and railroad employees, semiprivate and private corporate personnel—members of our State and National legislative bodies—and those now covered by the Federal Social Security Act.

To these people already protected by retirement systems and all others who have petitioned this Congress for recognition of their desire for a dignified retirement system Mr. McLain proposes the indignity of a means test investigation, "a single standard uniform pension system that will embrace all our citizens and that will recognize but one requirement. That requirement to be—need." Are people after a useful life and after paying from their own wages for retirement benefits to be harried by an army of investigators? Are they to be denied benefits for which they have paid unless they take a pauper's oath?

To these people, now enjoying or seeking the dignity of a contributory program of old-age and survivors insurance, Mr. McLain offers the cold comfort, if they can pass a means test investigation, of California's present payments under its old-age assistance program. This they are already entitled to if they can show need, so what do they gain for the rights they have lost? Mr. McLain states in his testimony:

> It is my considered opinion that the Federal Government should today be paying a pension of $75 per month to those who can prove they need it. Such recipients should be allowed an outside income, in addition, of a value of $30 a month.

Thus, one must assume, a worker who, through his industry, thrift, and foresight has managed to provide for himself more than $30 a month in retirement income or has income from other sources such as veterans' benefits must forfeit his social security benefit or have it reduced proportionately.

Most amazing of all in the fact of this poor-law approach to social security is Mr. McLain's proposal that the employer be relieved of his present responsibility to share equally with his employees, through a pay-roll tax, the cost of financing social-insurance benefits. Instead the worker is to continue to pay a pay-roll tax for benefits which he has no assurance of receiving, and the Government is to take over the employer's share. This ill-begotten concept of financing has neither the advantages of assuring the equity rights implicit in individual pay-roll deductions or of universal payments based on a progressive ability-to-pay tax system. The worker is first deprived of the very rights his pay-roll taxes are assumed to assure and then asked to pay the bill all over again through his income and excise taxes.

I wish to assure the Congress that these are not the views of Californians who value human dignity and the rights of labor. I wish to assure the organized workers of California that their hard-won battles for retirement benefits based on right rather than the whim of a means test investigator will be respected whether under the Social Security Act, the Railroad Retirement Act, State or local retirement plans, or private agreement. I wish to assure all workers that our efforts will be for more adequate, more dignified, more universal insurance programs in which a means test has no place.

I wish also to assure those who have already retired and therefore cannot hope to benefit from insurance programs based solely on years of employment in covered occupations that their interests are not forgotten. I personally have long advocated that the Government purchase social insurance coverage for all those who have passed retirement age without acquiring insured status at a benefit level consistent with present living costs. This would then become the minimum benefit level for everyone under the social-insurance system with proportionate increases above this amount related to the previous earnings of insured workers.

I expect shortly to introduce a bill which would assure every man over 65 and every woman over 60 a minimum social-security benefit of $75 a month with an additional 15 percent of their previous average earnings plus dependents' benefits. I do not quarrel either with the State of California or Mr. McLain on the necessity of a $75 floor under old-age retirement.

I would, however, like to see this paid to all as a matter of right and not to a few as charity.

I would like to see the Government bear the whole cost for those who, through the historical accident of their birth date rather than any choice or fault of their own, reached retirement age before a universal social-security system could become effective. The cost to the Government would be temporary, would be offset by reduced assistance costs, and would be a good investment if it brought to an end these unscrupulous demagogic appeals to those already retired to join with reactionary efforts to destroy the retirement systems so painfully sought and won by working people. I am for old-age security for everyone and I am opposed to all efforts to turn social security into a political football for the private purposes of Mr. McLain or his associates.

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by the Vice President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner address delivered by our distinguished Vice President at Raleigh, N. C., January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster and friends, I was greatly complimented by the invitation to address

this great gathering in the capital of North Carolina, and am happy over my ability to accept it.

I am not in strange territory nor on strange ground in North Carolina. In this great State my grandfather and my ancestors, running back beyond the American Revolution, were born, reared, and fought for the liberties of their country, and there are many descendants of the Barkleys, the Stevensons, and the McKenzies still in North Carolina, all of whom contributed to the blood that flows through my veins.

During my service in the two Houses of Congress, extending for a generation back to the beginnings of Woodrow Wilson's administration, I have enjoyed the friendship and the fellowship of many great North Carolinians, whose names are too numerous for me to catalog here, and I still enjoy the great privilege of serving and cooperating with North Carolinians who are members of both Houses of Congress and of the executive branches of our Government.

North Carolina has been for more than a generation a leader among all the States of the Union, and, particularly, the States of the South, in adopting progressive measures of government looking to the greater enjoyment of the benefits conferred by government, when that government is kept close to the people and serves them with single-minded devotion.

I am proud of my North Carolina antecedents, and of my North Carolina friends, and I am happy to be here in the company of my two colleagues now in the Senate, and many others in the House of Representatives, and many others who have served in one capacity and another in maintaining the high traditions of this great Tar Heel State.

I express the hope that the organization of Democratic forces in the Nation will not fall apart merely because a victory has been won in a single election. The battle for democracy is like the battle for liberty. It requires eternal vigilance. The Democratic Party, through its long and glorious history, has represented and achieved enough for the welfare of the American people to justify continuous and coordinated labor on behalf of all Democrats, in and out of office, to keep the light forever burning which points the way to progress and to solid achievement in behalf of America and everything for which she stands.

In all of its history, the Democratic Party has been the liberal party of America. Practically every legislative act for the protection of the people and the advancement of their welfare has been brought about through the advocacy and the insistence and the intelligent foresight of the Democratic Party.

The first act to regulate commerce, passed in 1887, 100 years after Congress was given the power to regulate commerce by the Constitution, was passed in the Democratic administration of Grover Cleveland.

The initiation of rural delivery of mail to the four corners of this land came about under a Democratic President.

It was Grover Cleveland, the first Democrat to occupy the White House after the War Between the States, who said that "Public office is a public trust."

It was the far-sighted advocacy of many reforms on the part of William Jennings Bryan that gave us the income tax, the election of Senators by direct vote of the people, and many other legislative achievements, for which the Democratic Party stood, even in the days of its defeat.

It was under the great liberal administration of Woodrow Wilson, one of the South's great sons, that the Federal Trade Commission was established, the Clayton antitrust law enacted, the Federal Reserve System inaugurated, Federal aid in the construction of highways was initiated, and both farmers and laboringmen given a charter of liberty by an enactment that relieved them of prosecution as violators of the antitrust law, merely because they belonged to a farmers' or laborers' organization.

It was under the Democratic Party that the Department of Labor was established, in all of its power, to seek the advancement of the welfare of laboring men, and that the Department of Agriculture became the greatest agency in history of America for the advancement of the welfare of farmers and their families throughout the Nation.

It was under the Democratic administration of Franklin D. Roosevelt that the Communications Commission, the Civil Aeronautics Board, and the Securities Exchange Commission, were established to protect the people in the enjoyment of their rights in modern and complex age of transportation and communication, and the sale of securities in interstate commerce, in which the people needed the agency of the Government for their protection.

It was under the Democratic Party that flood-control legislation was enacted, protecting the inhabitants of our great river valleys from the wholesale destruction of life and property.

It was under the Democratic Party that the soil-conservation program was inaugurated, seeking not only to protect the fertility of what soil there is left, but seeking to reclaim that which has been wasted by improvidence and wasteful negligence.

It was under the Democratic Party that our Nation recognized its obligation to the aged, the infirm and the unemployed, by providing a system of social security, the extension of which President Truman has repeatedly recommended, which recommendation was carried out in the last session of the Congress in the House of Representatives by the passage of a bill extending social security and increasing its benefits.

It was under the Democratic administration that rural electrification was inaugurated, not by gifts to the people, but by financial aid to cooperative organizations seeking to install electric lights and equipment upon the farms of the Nation, by reason of which 5,000,000 farm homes today enjoy the benefits of electricity. The loans which have been made by the Government, without which this great advancement could not have been made, are being repaid on schedule.

There are many other enactments which might be cited as evidence that the Democratic Party is and has been the forward-looking, progressive, liberal party of the Nation, seeking always to make the Government the agent of the people in their protection and in their advancement.

There have been unavoidable controversies among our people, and among some members of the Democratic Party, with reference to the speed and degree of these advancements on the part of our Government. But, regardless of any technical differences of opinion as to speed or degree, I think we are all prepared to admit that in this modern, complex age in which we live, government must assume its responsibility in the field of economics, of industry, of labor, of agriculture, of health, of education, and of social advancement, because in many such fields there is no other agency upon which the people may depend, that has both the power and the authority to administer to their needs.

We are celebrating tonight the lives and the achievements of two great Americans—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson.

If there are controversies now among honest men and women concerning the questions of government, there were likewise controversies in the day of Jefferson and in the day of Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was the most advanced statesman of his day. He was the most accomplished statesman of his day. He was not only a great political philosopher, a great administrator, a great preacher of democracy, but he was a great musician, a great agriculturist, a great botanist, a great historian, a great founder of institutions in America. He was one of the greatest political organizers in the history of America. He did not organize the forces of democracy by speeches. He organized them through the power of his logic, through letters and pamphlets so numerous that even yet they are being discovered and collected in various parts of the country.

Thomas Jefferson believed in the people. He believed in their education. All through his writings can be found his constant belief in, and his constant effort in behalf of, the education of the masses of the people.

He believed in the right of the people to change their government if they saw fit, and in his Declaration of Independence, that eternal doctrine is announced as part of the fundamental doctrine upon which our independence was founded. Thomas Jefferson believed that when constitutions or laws became out of date, the people had a right to change them, and he went so far as to advocate that every 20 years the Constitution ought to be revised, because, he said, "No dead generation had a right to bind a live generation."

Thomas Jefferson was such an advanced advocate of liberty, freedom, and the rights of the people, that he was denounced as a demagog, but each recurring year brings fresh evidence of his political soundness and his true devotion to the principles of democratic government.

When he wrote his epitaph, he forgot he had ever been a member of the Virginia House of Burgesses, Governor of Virginia, Member of the Continental Congress, Minister to France, Secretary of State, Vice President or President of the United States. He did not want to be remembered by the things the people had done for him, but only by what he had done for them. So he gave himself credit for three things—the Declaration of Independence, the Virginia statutes for religious liberty, and the University of Virginia.

What man in our history could claim authorship for that trinity of achievements—political liberty, religious liberty, and intellectual liberty?

There may be speculation over what Jefferson would do today if alive and confronted with the complex problems of our civilization. He has been many times quoted as having said that "That government is best that governs least." I have never been able to find where he said that, but undoubtedly, in an uncomplicated age where every man desired to do justice by his neighbor and not encroach upon his rights anywhere, it would be a beautiful theory, if it could be truthfully said that that government governs best that governs least. But, if that aphorism should be true, it would be only another step to say that that government is best that governs not at all, and surely Jefferson did not mean to create any such impression. Out of our experience as a great democracy, not absolute but relative, we have learned that each year each one of us grows more dependent upon others; each community more dependent on other communities; each State more dependent on other States; and each nation more dependent upon other nations in the world, for the advancement of civilization and the protection of human rights.

The liberalism and progressive outlook of the Democratic Party stems directly from Thomas Jefferson. It comes almost in an unbroken line of descent from Jefferson to Jackson, who on the battlefield and in legislative halls and in the executive chambers, stood for and fought for the rights of the

people against all and sundry who would encroach upon them or seek to destroy them. Thomas Jefferson became the moral and philosophical founder of democracy. Andrew Jackson became its fighting advocate and preserver. Down through the years, whether under the leadership of Samuel J. Tilden, Grover Cleveland, William Jennings Bryan, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin D. Roosevelt, or Harry S. Truman, the golden thread of loyalty to the people, to the rights and privileges of the common man in America, has indicated the continuity of our service to the people of the Nation.

In the advocacy of these immortal principles, we are not afraid of controversy, we are not even afraid of friction. We do not shun discussion or disagreement. We welcome it. Because, out of the friction of intellectual processes, there finally comes a consensus of public opinion which has a right to control the deliberations of those who represent, or claim to represent, the people of our country.

No political party in the history of the Nation ever consummated so comprehensive a program as the Democratic Party has consummated, and as evidence of its soundness, no organized political opposition, by whatever name it went, has dared to threaten to destroy it.

We are now faced with tremendous problems at home and throughout the world. The enemies of democracy are seeking to batter down the ramparts of true liberalism and of popular government throughout the world. Not only are they seeking to batter down ramparts of political liberty, but they are seeking to destroy the foundations of religious faith and belief in the religion which has helped to make America the great stronghold of democracy and of righteousness.

During the past generation we have fought two world wars. We have expended in them more than $350,000,000,000 and we have accumulated a national debt of more than $250,000,000,000. We have been compelled to maintain a military establishment far beyond our desires because of our inability to induce another nation to engage, in good faith, in the effort to make and preserve the peace.

As a result of these expenditures of treasure and precious human lives we have asked nothing in territory, nothing in reparations, nothing in selfish advantage, except the advantage of living in peace with the nations of the world. In spite of discouragements, in spite of draw-backs, in spite of handicaps, in spite of the intransigent attitude of the enemies of democracy, I believe it is but the truth to say that the prospects of success are brighter today than they were a year ago, and it may be they are brighter than they have been since the end of actual fighting in 1945.

In order that we may be able to accomplish what seems to be our mission as the leader of the nations of the world, it is necessary for us to maintain not only a strong military defense but to maintain a strong and sound economic structure which will give force and validity to all our proclamations and all our efforts.

If, out of the travail through which the world is going today; if, out of the expenditure of treasure and out of the loss of life which is involved in every conflict, there can come peace—not only in our generation but in all generations—not only for our Nation but for all nations—it will be worth the price we have to pay. And the democracy which Jefferson proclaimed, which Jackson fortified, and which millions of Americans have given their lives to preserve, shall be established throughout the earth, as Jefferson himself would have established it, and as Jackson would have defended it. We shall be able to rejoice beyond the limits of any political party. America's rendezvous with destiny has been fulfilled.

Moderate-Priced Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, the housing commissioner of the State of New York, Mr. Herman T. Stichman, recently made a public statement in which he criticized certain provisions of S. 2246, the middle-income housing bill now pending before the Senate Committee on Banking and Currency. Commissioner Stichman took exception to the low interest and long-term amortization features of this legislation which, in my opinion, are essential to the success of the whole program. I, therefore, wrote a letter to my colleague the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK], in his capacity as chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee, advising him of my views on this legislation and urging most strongly that his committee approve the provisions of S. 2246, providing for 3-percent interest rate on loans to housing cooperatives and a 50-year-amortization period.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the text of my letter to the distinguished chairman of the Banking and Currency Committee printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I have followed with great interest the work of the Banking and Currency Committee on S. 2246, the housing bill, and have taken special interest in the amendments which you introduced on January 6 of this year. I should like to say that I am in full accord with the objectives of these amendments. They seem to me to initiate a vigorous program which will help cooperatives and other nonprofit corporations provide housing at monthly costs which families of middle income can afford. I feel that such a program is urgently needed now in order to fill the major gap in our present housing plans.

You may have noted in the press that on January 26 the housing commissioner of my own State, in an address to the building and construction department of the American Federation of Labor, made some criticisms of your amendments. I thought you would be interested to know that in my judgment these criticisms do not reflect the feeling of the people of New York State. They surely do not accord with the facts as presented in the course of the hearings. Certainly the two features which Mr. Stichman criticized—a low rate of interest and the long amortization period—are essential to the success of the entire program which S. 2246 seeks to carry forward.

There is certainly no other feasible way in which sound and suitable housing can be made available to middle-income families at monthly costs which such families can afford. To deny these two essential parts of the program would be to make a wagon without wheels. I was very glad to learn, therefore, that the American Federation of Labor, the Congress of Industrial Organizations, the major veterans' organizations, and many other public-interest groups have declared themselves in strong support of your amendments, particularly those provisions relating to the low rate of interest and the 50-year amortization period.

The New York housing commissioner stated in his speech that the interest rate on loans to cooperatives, as proposed in your amendments, was unsound and undesirable because it was too low. He said that this interest rate, which is expected to be about 3 percent, was too far below what savings banks need to get on their deposits and below the return life-insurance companies calculate on their investments in determining premiums. This argument, it seems to me entirely overlooks the fact that under your amendments, the National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives would obtain the funds to make its loans by selling its debentures in the private investment market. As I understand it, these debentures would be fully guaranteed by the United States Government, both as to principal and interest. Securities of this type, of course, involve no servicing costs to the purchaser. The rate of interest on such securities is therefore a net rate. The rate on mortgage loans is a gross rate. As I recall, figures were presented at the American Life Insurance Convention in Chicago in the fall of 1945 which indicated that mortgage loans bearing interest at 4½ percent represent a net rate of about 3 percent, after deducting the costs of procuring and servicing the loans, together with a pro rata share of administrative expenses. Since these figures were those of the large life-insurance companies, who have the advantage of geographical diversification and a better balanced loan portfolio than most banks, the net return for these insurance companies would certainly be more favorable than the return for many lenders for whom a 4½-percent gross rate on the mortgage loan represents a net return of less than 3 percent. Hence I would consider the provision in your amendments of an interest rate of approximately 3 percent a fair one.

The securities issued under your amendments would certainly represent a sound and profitable investment for life-insurance companies, trust accounts in banks, investment portfolios, and similar types of investors. Far from decreasing the amount of interest for saving banks' depositors, or decreasing premiums which life-insurance policyholders might receive, these securities would actually be one of the soundest sources of a steady rate of return for savings banks or for life-insurance policyholders.

The New York State housing commissioner was also critical of these provisions of your amendments which would provide a long-term amortization period of 50 years. He said that, with such a long period of amortization, 99 out of 100 members of the cooperative would never pay off their mortgages in their lifetime but would die in debt. The theory that a dwelling unit must be paid for in 25 or 30 years has no real basis except in a traditional practice. This practice was based not on the life expectancy of the building, but on the life expectancy of the owner of the building. It was designed not for the benefit of the purchaser, but for the benefit of the seller, and has worked, over the years, to prevent families with modest incomes from being adequately housed.

I feel that the longer period of amortization, in combination with the lower rate of interest, will be very beneficial to the cooperatives, without being at all detrimental to the lenders of the money.

It seems to me that under your amendments, the individual cooperators do not contract a fixed debt. They contract to pay monthly charges for their houses, as long as

they are members of the cooperative and live in the housing. Unlike the ordinary renter, however, they accumulate an equity or ownership of interest in their housing by paying the monthly charges. If a cooperator should find it necessary to move, his equity or interest would be repurchased by the cooperative. If he dies, his equity would be an asset in his estate. It has a cash value. It is not a liability. This is certainly not true in the case of rents.

I understand that it was thoroughly brought out, in the course of the hearings on S. 2246 and on your amendments, that the middle-income families, whom this measure proposes to assist, would be able to save 10 to 12 dollars a month because of the longer period of amortization. The cooperative provisions eliminating profit and the savings made possible by cooperative management would cut the cost to the middle-income families by another $13 monthly, making an average saving to these families of $25 a month. I would therefore judge the low rate of interest and the long amortization period to be essential provisions of the entire proposal.

The third and final point made by the New York housing commissioner was that your amendment would prove to be a boon to speculators rather than a benefit to labor and to middle-income families, unless the profits of the contractors are specifically limited by law. Naturally, I would be deeply concerned and disturbed if there were such a possibility. It was for this reason that I made direct inquiry of you regarding this matter. I was pleased to be assured, as I expected, that there is a specific provision in your amendments that the benefits of this program will not be dissipated through speculative devices. I would assume that the officials administering this program must, among other things, insure that no contractor is allowed to make a speculative profit. I agree that speculation may sometimes develop in unforeseen manners. Only vigilant administration can prevent this. I assume that vigilant administration will be forthcoming. I certainly expect that the legislative history of the consideration of this measure will give full assurance that it is the intent of Congress that speculative profits be prevented. In general it has always seemed to me extremely undesirable to inject into legislation the minutiae of regulations which would, in the long run, only result in hampering sensible and efficient administration.

In closing, I want to take this opportunity to express my high admiration for your able and energetic leadership in developing this housing legislation. This country will derive years of life and benefit from the Housing Act of 1949. I hope your committee will approve your pending amendments and that they will be brought to the Senate floor where, I am confident, they will receive overwhelming support.

Very sincerely yours,

HERBERT H. LEHMAN.

Senator Capehart's Record

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Businessman Senator," from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 28, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUSINESSMAN SENATOR

The political arm of the American Federation of Labor, which calls itself Labor's League for Political Education, has put out what it calls a scorecard to direct people with no minds of their own how to vote in this year's congressional election. The AFL hatchet enterprise, which is dedicated to the purge of 8 Senators and more than 100 Members of the House, marks its intended victims on right votes and wrong votes.

It is hardly accidental that almost all of the alleged wrong votes are chalked up against Republicans who have resisted the New Deal rush toward state socialism and the demands of the labor bosses that they be freed of all restraints and given their way in everything.

As a good example, the voting record of Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, Republican, may be cited. On nine issues, the AFL marks him wrong eight times. He voted to defeat the anti-injunction amendment to the Taft-Hartley Act, introduced by Senator LUCAS. He voted to support Senator TAFT'S amendments to the same act—a measure which passed the Senate but was sidetracked in the House.

Senator CAPEHART, among other issues, voted against installation of a steam plant by the TVA and thus against the further socialization of power; against the extension of public loans for housing on farms, and against confirmation of the left-winger, John Carson, as a member of the Federal Trade Commission.

Mr. CAPEHART was able to approach these questions with a particular qualification, in that, unlike most of his colleagues, who are lawyers and professional politicians, he is a businessman who never ran for office before he attained the senatorship. The business judgment he brings to debate and roll call provide valuable balance to the judgment of the Senate as a whole.

Mr. CAPEHART has refused to fall for socialist mirages and has consistently striven to keep enterprise free, as the best means of assuring prosperity for everybody, which means, primarily, for wage earners and farmers. In his proposal last year to trim $3,000,000,000 from the Marshall plan, he showed a commendable interest in preserving the Nation's fiscal solvency.

It is to be doubted that such attacks as that made by the AFL are going to damage Mr. CAPEHART'S standing in Indiana. Hoosiers in general being marked by the same sort of good sense as their Senator. The AFL's campaign to buy a Congress of yes men can only be considered presumptuous.

Control of Floodwaters in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement issued by the United States Army engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority regarding the operation of flood-storage reservoirs in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

United States Army engineers and the Tennessee Valley Authority issued a joint statement today revealing that operation of flood storage reservoirs in the Tennessee, Cumberland, and Ohio River Basins, including Kentucky Reservoir, master-valve control of the vast TVA system, had lowered the Mississippi River crest at Cairo, Ill., by about 2½ feet during the still-continuing flood crisis.

This operation, effected through close coordination among all agencies and offices involved, prevented the flood crest at Cairo from rising above a stage of 55.3 feet, making it unnecessary to legally blast open the fuse-plug levee of the Birds Point-New Madrid floodway in southern Missouri—as contemplated under the so-called Jadwin plan of Mississippi River flood control. Many people had been evacuated as a precautionary measure, but even so, millions of dollars in flood damages in that area were prevented.

"It should be pointed out however, that high water still exists for many miles along the Ohio and Mississippi. Until stages are perceptibly lower and until flood storage within some of the reservoirs can be released, the situation will still be critical.

"Efficacy of the flood-control reservoirs has been proved. Had it not been for the vast storage provided by these structures, a crest at Cairo of 58 feet or more would have resulted instead of 55.3 feet."

The record crest at Cairo is 59.51 feet, recorded at the height of the 1937 Ohio River flood.

So far as the Mississippi River is concerned, the greatest and most widespread damage was wrought by the 1927 flood—before authorization of the so-called Jadwin plan and construction of the present vast system of levees and floodways. During that flood, the gage at Cairo went to 56.4 feet.

"Since early in January, Army and TVA engineers have been carefully watching the increasing flood in the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers. As the flood rose to near the flood stage of 40 feet at Cairo, these engineers, in cooperation with the United States Weather Bureau, began exchanging flood data on the Tennessee, Mississippi, and Ohio Rivers by phone and wire daily as has been the custom for 10 years or more so as to be informed at all times as to flood conditions and to be ready to operate the reservoirs in case of necessity. At the same time TVA began to discharge water from Kentucky Reservoir at relatively high rates in order to pass the excess water down the Ohio and Mississippi Rivers ahead of the flood crest at Cairo, and this was continued until it became desirable to reduce the discharge and lower the crest at Cairo. When this time arrived on January 14, the release from the Tennessee River at Kentucky Dam was reduced from 325,000 cubic feet per second to 150,000 cubic feet per second and again on January 16 it was further reduced to 100,000 cubic feet per second and held at this rate until the crest had passed and the flood began to recede. This discharge was about 170,000 cubic feet per second less than that which would have been flowing in the river if there had been no dams there to regulate the flow."

Meanwhile, discharge from all Corps of Engineers reservoirs had been shut off except for a small amount necessary to produce power at Dale Hollow Dam in Tennessee in order that they might produce the maximum effect possible on the flood.

Private Capital for Small Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, widespread interest was exhibited in the press yesterday and today in the bill which I introduced yesterday to authorize the establishment of a private system of capital banks to provide both debt and equity capital for independent business. I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Associated Press story from the New York World-Telegram of February 2, the New York Times story of February 3, and the Wall Street Journal story of the same date.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York World-Telegram of February 2, 1950]

NEW 36-BANK SYSTEM URGED TO FINANCE SMALL FIRMS—SENATOR O'MAHONEY WOULD PUT THEM UNDER RESERVE

WASHINGTON, February 2.—A plan to set up 36 banks under Federal Reserve supervision to provide loans and capital funds for small business was proposed today by Senator O'MAHONEY, Democrat, Wyoming.

"This is machinery by which our free-enterprise system may work," Senator O'MAHONEY told a news conference in announcing he will introduce the necessary legislation.

Although the plan appeared to be similar to those previously advanced by some Federal Reserve spokesmen, Senator O'MAHONEY said he is introducing the bill without consulting or committing other Government agencies or officials.

PROPOSES THREE FUNCTIONS

He said the proposed 36 new banks, each with a minimum initial capital of $1,000,000 would have three functions:

1. To make loans to small business for terms up to 12 years at interest rates determined by the banks under supervision of the Federal Reserve.

2. To buy shares or stock in small business, up to 20 percent of the bank's assets or lending authority.

3. To insure loans made by commercial banks up to $10,000 for any small business for periods up to 5 years.

Senator O'MAHONEY said his plan grew out of hearings by the Joint Congressional Economic Committee on the problems of small business in attracting investments. He is chairman of that group.

WOULD AFFECT RFC

If the new bank plan works, Senator O'MAHONEY said it should eliminate lending functions of the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation. It has lent billions of dollars, especially during the war, to what Senator O'MAHONEY termed chiefly big business.

The Senator said the 36 regional banks could be set up by use of up to 1 percent of the capital and reserves of Federal Reserve banks. He said this would be about $72,000,000.

The bank's stocks then could be bought by other banks, including members and nonmembers of the Federal Reserve System, other financial institutions, corporations, or individuals.

Chief incentive for investments in these banks, the Senator explained, would be exempting the earnings of the banks from taxation for 15 years.

[From the New York Times of February 3, 1950]

SENATE BILL PLANS SMALL LINE BANKS—O'MAHONEY MEASURE PROVIDES FOR SYSTEM OF 36 SET UP WITHIN FEDERAL RESERVE—HEARING DUE AFTER FEBRUARY 15—MAYBANK COMMITTEE TO HOLD INQUIRY—WOULD BE STRICTLY PRIVATELY OWNED

WASHINGTON, February 2.—Creation of a country-wide system of private banking corporations devoted exclusively to meeting the financial needs of small or independent businesses was proposed in a bill introduced today by Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, Democrat, of Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on the Economic Report, presented the measure to the Senate as possible solution to the growing problem of providing sufficient venture capital to fill the demands of an expanding national economy.

With some existing financial institutions unable and others unwilling to provide needed capital to small business, he noted, the private enterprise system "is starving for a lack of debt and equity capital" despite record private savings throughout the country.

PURPOSES ARE OUTLINED

The bill is designed to provide the machinery for channeling private savings "to the place where capital is most needed," the Senator said.

It would authorize establishment within the Federal Reserve System of 36 regional banking corporations with power to aid small or independent businesses by stock purchases, loans, and loan insurance.

As incentives to the formation of such corporations, the bill would exempt them from corporate income taxes for 15 years and permit Federal Reserve banks and members of the Federal Reserve System to invest in them, up to specified limits. Stock of the corporations would also be available to any other private financial institution or individual.

The new corporations would be required to have minimum initial capital of $1,000,000 each.

The bill was the outgrowth of recent hearings on investment problems by a joint economic subcommittee which Senator O'MAHONEY conducted. It stemmed directly from a proposal by A. D. H. Kaplan of the Brookings Institution, who testified at the hearings.

Senator BURNET R. MAYBANK, Democrat, of South Carolina, chairman of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, which will have jurisdiction, said his committee was prepared to start hearings on the measure any time after February 15.

While declining to commit himself to the bill pending further study of its terms, Mr. MAYBANK told a reporter that it was "about time we did something to help the little business man."

Senator O'MAHONEY emphasized that the proposed banking corporations would be "strictly privately owned." Although they would be subject to supervision of the Federal Reserve Board, they would receive no grants in aid or other Government support.

SEEN BANK SYSTEM AID

"Through the authority to insure small loans they would provide cooperation and support for the existing banking system," he said. "Through the authority to make term loans they would be able to finance sound little and local enterprises which cannot now obtain working capital because so many local banks do not have sufficient capital to meet the demand.

"Through the authority to purchase equity stocks they would be enabled to provide the venture capital now so necessary to bring about development of existing business opportunities."

While he acted independently in introducing the bill, Senator O'MAHONEY told questioners that he believed its enactment would help to answer President Truman's call for congressional action to stimulate investment.

One effect, he said, would be to relieve the pressure for use of Government funds to aid business including demands on the RFC for loans.

Business eligible for aid by the 36 proposed corporations would be defined by the Federal Reserve Board in cooperation with the Secretary of Commerce. But none would be eligible that "is affiliated through stock ownership or otherwise with any other enterprise in the same trade or industry which is determined to be dominant in the trade or business in which it is engaged," the bill stipulates.

Each of the new corporations would have nine directors, three appointed from the public by the Federal Reserve bank in the district and six elected by the stockholders.

[From the Wall Street Journal of February 3, 1950]

PRIVATE SYSTEM OF CAPITAL BANKS TO HELP SMALL BUSINESS PROPOSED BY O'MAHONEY—UNITED STATES AID EXCLUDED

WASHINGTON.—A new system of privately owned capital banks to help finance small and independent business without Government loans or insurance was proposed yesterday by Senator O'MAHONEY (Democrat, Wyoming), chairman of the House-Senate Economic Committee.

Senator O'MAHONEY told newsmen that if his scheme is enacted and if it works, there will be no further need for the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in the business loan field. He declared that unless the owners of private capital devise some method of channeling funds into small business, the reliance on Government will continue to grow.

To stimulate investment in the capital banks they would be exempt for a period of 15 years from all Federal, State, or local taxation, except that any real property held by the corporations would be subject to local levies. Individuals or institutions investing in the corporation, however, would pay taxes on any dividends they received.

The O'Mahoney proposal was developed at recent hearings by the Investment Subcommittee of the Economic Committee. The subcommittee is expected to issue a report within the next few days endorsing the capital bank idea. The proposal was first laid before lawmakers by Dr. A. D. H. Kaplan, Brookings Institution economist.

WOULD SET UP 36 CORPORATIONS

The O'Mahoney measure would authorize a capital banking corporation for each Federal Reserve bank and each Federal Reserve branch district. Thus 36 such banking corporations could be organized.

The banks would be empowered to make loans to small and independent firms, by their equity securities, or insure or buy loans made to eligible borrowers by existing commercial banks. The Federal Reserve Board, advised by the Secretary of Commerce, would define small and independent business firms eligible for financial aid under the O'Mahoney measure.

The O'Mahoney bill was proposed as an amendment to the Federal Reserve Act. It would repeal the present section 13 (B) under which Federal Reserve banks are authorized to make 5-year industrial loans.

The new capital banks would get their funds from a variety of sources. First, each Federal Reserve bank would be permitted to invest in the corporation for its district

up to 1 percent of the aggregate of the capital and surplus of all its member banks. Each member bank could invest 1 percent of its capital and surplus in the new corporation.

SHARE OWNERSHIP LIMITED

Stock in each corporation could also be purchased by any nonmember bank, any financial institution or by individuals. However, no one individual or institution could own shares in more than one of the capital banks, nor more than 10 percent of the total outstanding shares of any one of the banks.

Each corporation could borrow money and sell debentures or bonds under general conditions laid down by the Federal Reserve Board. At no time, however, could one of the corporations have liabilities outstanding in excess of the sum of its paid-in capital stock and surplus.

The Federal Reserve Board could not permit one of the proposed capital banks to begin business until its paid-in capital and surplus had reached $1,000,000.

Under the O'Mahoney measure, the banking corporations could not insure more than 10 percent of the amount of loans made by any one insured bank, nor more than 95 percent of any individual loan. An insured loan could not be for more than $10,000, nor have a maturity of more than 5 years. The rate of insurance premium and the interest rate on insured loans would be fixed by the Federal Reserve Board.

COULD JOIN OTHER BANKS IN LOANS

In making loans the banking corporations could make advances either directly or in cooperation with banks or other lending institutions. However, obligations acquired by the corporation under this provision could not run for more than 12 years.

The corporation also would have power to buy common or preferred stocks, income bonds or other capital shares of small and independent firms. The amount invested by any one of the corporations in such securities could not exceed 20 percent of the combined capital and surplus and authorized indebtedness of the corporation.

While there would be no limit on the size of a loan the corporations could make, no corporation could invest more than 25 percent of its funds in loans or security purchases in the sum of $250,000 for any single enterprise.

Each corporation would be run by a board of nine directors. Three of them would be appointed by the Federal Reserve bank of the district in which the corporation is located. These three would be subject to Federal Reserve Board approval. The other six directors would be elected by holders of the capital shares of the corporation and would not be subject to Federal Reserve approval.

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address by Benjamin V. Cohen

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, Hon. Benjamin V. Cohen, one of the most distinguished Americans, who has been in recent years delegate to the General Assembly of the United Nations and counselor of the State Department, made a speech at Chicago before the Americans for Democratic Action which I believe to be deserving of study and attention by all of us. Mr. Cohen is a man of great intellect and great insight. In this speech he sets forth his understanding of the principles and meaning of the life of Franklin D. Roosevelt. No man has a greater right to speak of these matters than Mr. Cohen. He also discusses the legal and ethical implications of the Federal loyalty program. I ask unanimous consent that this fine and thoughtful speech be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are assembled here to express our respect and homage to the man who had the greatest influence for good on American life in the first half of the twentieth century—Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

It is particularly fitting that this and other dinners in his memory throughout the country should be held under the auspices of Americans for Democratic Action and affiliated organizations like the Independent Voters of Illinois. For the ADA groups, by their courageous sponsorship of progressive measures, are helping mightily to maintain the Roosevelt tradition as a vital factor in American political thought and action.

I am particularly happy to speak in Chicago tonight. Chicago was once my home and it was here that I received my first schooling in political thought and action.

The people of Chicago and the people of the State of Illinois have already demonstrated to the Nation their devotion to the Roosevelt tradition. Those who would belittle the Roosevelt tradition would like to think that it sprang only from the charm of a magnetic personality and that it could not long survive the mortal life that inspired it. But United States Senator PAUL DOUGLAS and Gov. Adlai Stevenson of this State are living proof that the seeds which Roosevelt planted have struck roots deep into the American soil and that properly nurtured, they can and will bring forth rich and perennial crops.

It would be a mistake, I think, to consider that the greatest contribution of the late President Roosevelt to our political life and thought lay in any one or more of the great programs which he encouraged, supported, or carried through. It seems to me that his greatest contribution lay in the understanding he gave us of the nature of the twentieth-century world and the realistic approach he taught us to the problems of our times.

He sensed intuitively as well as intelligently the growing interdependence of men and nations in an age which has witnessed and is witnessing marvelous but frightening advances in science and technology. These advances have not only enormously increased man's control over nature and his capacity to produce but have almost obliterated barriers of time and distance. These advances have brought in the last century greater changes in the economic habits and living of men than occurred in the preceding 19 centuries. The paradox is that so many of Roosevelt's opponents regarded him as an advocate of dangerous change. In fact he was primarily concerned to find the means by which men could adjust themselves to the truly revolutionary changes which had already occurred in industry and agriculture, in finance, commerce and communications. His concern was how men could adjust to these changes in time without losing the great ideals of freedom and tolerance which he considered the most precious heritage of western civilization.

He was suspicious of all theories or magic formulae. Certainly he had no liking for totalitarianism. Nor did he believe that in a highly developed industrial state things would run smoothly if nature were allowed to take its course and the devil take the hindmost. Like Lincoln, Roosevelt believed that there are things that the state can and should do which individuals cannot do as well if at all. But he saw no virtue in the state doing what free enterprise can and should be able to do as effectively or more effectively than the state. With Brandeis, Roosevelt believed that if we would guide by the light of reason we must let our minds be bold. And with Brandeis he thought it more important to understand the facts of life than the theories of life.

Roosevelt felt deeply that individual freedom was threatened by the insecurity of man in an increasingly interdependent and potentially richer world. As a realist he could not believe in the inevitability of poverty amid plenty. Nor could he understand why the unavoidable—and I emphasize unavoidable—hazards of old age, sickness, and unemployment, of the loss of crops and of markets, should fall most heavily upon those least able to bear them or to protect themselves from them. Roosevelt believed as an English judge said some centuries ago that "necessitous men are not free men." He fought to make life in America and throughout the world more secure not because he loved freedom less but because he loved freedom more—freedom to live and to venture, not only for the strong and powerful, but for all mankind.

To Roosevelt freedom and security were simply two sides of one coin. Men could not long enjoy one without the other. To deny men the security necessary to their freedom in this interdependent world would, Roosevelt believed, discredit not only the principle of security but the principle of freedom itself. But security without freedom was, he thought, wholly illusory. He could not conceive of man really being secure in a totalitarian society in which no one could be free of fear in his own home or even in his own mind.

He was the master and not the slave of words. He looked behind words to realities. He thought in terms of people and resources. When he saw idle men and idle factories, and unused materials and unused crops, he inquired how they could be put to work and how they could be used to enrich the lives of individual men and women and to husband their farms and factories, their forests and their waterways.

He encouraged his advisers and coworkers to develop their own ideas, at times encouraging them to develop competing or even conflicting proposals. When it became necessary for him to approve or disapprove a proposal, he did not ask is this statism or even is this the welfare state. In fact, Roosevelt was very little concerned about the labels which either his friends or his enemies attached to a proposal he had to consider. But he was very much concerned to ascertain whether and how the proposal would work and what effect it would have on the lives of people, their jobs, their homes, their future.

When men were unemployed and factories idle and materials and crops were unused he was impatient with those who said nothing could be done about it, that the Nation must wait until deflation runs its course and confidence somehow or other returns. But when the war came and our factories and manpower were fully employed and new proposals were put before him requiring the use of more men and more materials, he was the very opposite of the character of Santa Claus or Lady Bountiful which some have ascribed to him. Then he would ask where are the men and where are the materials to come from and why are the new proposals entitled to priority over the work that is already absorbing the full energy of our people and the full use of our resources?

Some detractors of the New Deal like to say that Roosevelt changed during the war years and forgot the New Deal. But there was no

change in Roosevelt's realistic approach to the problems which confronted him, no change in his practice of judging in terms of men and resources, free from any ideological bias, what could and should be done to safeguard the freedom and welfare of the people. And that to my mind is the essence of the Roosevelt tradition and the basis of the New Deal.

When my friend and former chief, Mr. James F. Byrnes, then Secretary of State, returned from the Paris Peace Conference in October 1946, he stated:

"America stands for social and economic democracy at home and abroad. The principles embodied in the social and economic reforms of recent years are a part of the American heritage.

"It would be strange indeed if in this imperfect world our social and economic democracy were perfect, but it might help our Soviet friends to understand us better if they realized that today our social and economic democracy is further away from the devil-take-the-hindmost philosophy of bygone days than Soviet Russia is from Czarist Russia.

"Whatever political differences there may be among us, we are firmly and irrevocably committed to the principle that it is our right and the right of every people to organize their economic and political destiny through the freest possible expression of their collective will. We oppose privilege at home and abroad. We defend freedom everywhere, and in our view human freedom and human progress are inseparable."

If, as I think nearly all Americans believe, human freedom and human progress are inseparable, we need full, fair, and free discussion of our vitally important problems. The Roosevelt tradition demands inquiring minds, not minds that blindly accept or blindly oppose every new proposal. We believe in a two-party system and if that system is to function properly the opposition party ought not to be either a me-too or a view-with-alarm party. It should seek out the vulnerable points in the position of the majority party. Its concrete and intelligent criticisms should keep the majority party alive and alert and on its toes.

But unfortunately we do not get that sort of constructive opposition from a party that couches its criticisms in fatuous words breathing sound and fury and signifying nothing.

The absence of an opposition party willing to face up to the facts of American life and destiny in the twentieth century world threatens the effective functioning of the two-party system. It is bad for the country because it deprives the party in power of the intelligent criticism and effective competition that it needs. It is bad for the country because if the country should tire of the party in power, it brings into power another party which is ill prepared to assume the responsibilities of government or to give the people the sort of government that they really want. Until we do have an opposition party that can keep step with the times, ADA will have to serve as the independent conscience of American liberalism.

The truth is that America has been a welfare state for many years. The truth is that in this mass-production society of ours practically no one produces, with his own labor, the food, clothing, shelter, and transportation he consumes or uses. In this interdependent society we are all dependent upon the state doing the things necessary to keep our economic machine from being stalled at dead center. The modern community may be compared, as Roosevelt compared it, to a modern factory where none of us can work or be free or secure at our chosen tasks when the conveyor belts stop moving.

The real issues are in deciding just what tasks the modern state should undertake and how the tasks should be executed to make certain that the conveyor belts keep moving. The real issues center and should center about problems of effective administration and democratic control and most importantly upon the practical effects of particular state actions on the lives of our people.

Take, for example, the Federal labor-management legislation. The opponents of the Wagner Act used to attack it as socialism. But today not even the NAM attacks the Taft-Hartley Act as socialism. But that does not make the Taft-Hartley Act a good law. Few today, however, would seriously propose that the Federal Government remove itself entirely from the labor-management field. But we do recognize that the issue is not a simple choice between socialism or laissez faire. And so it is with most of the great current issues like medical care, pensions, housing, aid to education, aid to agriculture, and even our relations with the Soviet Union, China, and Britain.

To all these problems we should apply the Roosevelt approach. This will give us no simple, automatic answer. This will require us to think through our problems fearlessly and boldly and avoid rubber-stamping our prejudices. The Roosevelt approach obliges us to inquire just how state action and private action affect the freedom and welfare not of the few but of the many. It requires us to think through just how necessary governmental functions can be administered, financed, and controlled so as not to discredit the great objectives they are intended to serve. But the Roosevelt approach requires confidence in ourselves and in our futures, and the potentialities of a nation of 150,000,000 people, free, enterprising, healthy in body, mind, and soul.

But in recognizing the great increase in the necessary functions of government in our interdependent society we must take heed that government remains the servant and does not become the master of the people. All power is subject to abuse. Public power no less than private power may be misused. Public power no less than private power may be influenced by the pressure of selfish groups. Public power no less than private power may bog down in the quagmire of administrative confusion and inertia. The wielders of public power no less than the wielders of private power may be more intent on holding their power than on doing their duty.

Safeguards against the arbitrary exercise of public power affecting the lives and liberties of millions is certainly no less essential than safeguards against the arbitrary exercise of private power affecting the lives and liberties of thousands. It used to be said that no person had a right to a particular job and that a private employer could hire and fire at will. As industry grew and one employer came to control tens of thousands of workers, it soon became evident that the right to hire and fire had to be subject to some safeguards. Thus also when government was small it used to be said that no man had a right to a Government job and he could be discharged at any time for any or no reason. But today Government is not small. Millions of people work for the Government. Some are specially trained for Government service and opportunities for the use of their special training outside Government are limited.

Roosevelt saw clearly the dangers of expanding the functions of the modern state without a Government service qualified to administer them. Roosevelt believed that the public was entitled to quality in the Government service. But he also believed that quality in the Government service could not be had unless the public respected and protected quality in that service.

It shocks me to hear it said today that such safeguards as protect the public servant in his job are only a matter of grace and not of right. And this is particularly true when the good name and repute of a public servant is involved. While the Government has a responsibility to protect the security of the United States, it also has a duty to protect its employees from being branded as disloyal or unworthy of public trust by star-chamber proceedings.

Of course, the situation confronting the Government is not simple. It is not a situation where we can say that in order to avoid any danger of individual injustice the Government must ignore any danger to the state.

The use by the Soviet Union in this and other countries of the Communist Party as an instrument of Soviet foreign policy does create dangers which no independent state can ignore. The dangers may be exaggerated at times but they are real and must be guarded against. Yet it is one thing to take reasonable measures to protect the national security and quite another thing publicly to accuse or to adjudge citizens as guilty of disloyalty without observing traditional judicial safeguards. The branding of an individual as disloyal or even as a poor security risk may affect his life and livelihood no less seriously than his conviction for an infamous crime. Persons known to have been dismissed or refused Government employment on loyalty or security grounds are not likely to find it easy to secure private employment.

The loyalty procedures of the Government may be an improvement over the ill-defined and indefinite procedures which they supplanted. But in my judgment the current loyalty procedures still have grave shortcomings and present grave dangers to individual rights.

Generally speaking acts of disloyalty should be defined by the Congress and punished by the courts in accordance with our century-old traditions. It is extremely difficult to see the need for individual loyalty investigations for the myriads of Government employees who are not in strategic positions in which they may acquire knowledge, the divulgence of which would really threaten the security of the United States. The blanket annulment of civil service rule I adopted in 1884 forbidding inquiry into the political opinions or affiliations of the applicant is entirely unwarranted. Every Government employee is now required by law to take an oath of loyalty. If he swears falsely he can and should be subject to prosecution for perjury. But dragnet efforts to determine by administrative process the individual loyalty of all Government employees offends the spirit and the letter of the Bill of Rights.

On the other hand individual investigations of the background, judgment, and trustworthiness of Government employees in security-sensitive positions is not only warranted but necessary. But the question should be considered as a question of the fitness and qualification of the individual for a particular position rather than a question of eligibility for the Government service generally. The duty of responsible administrative officials is to protect the security of the United States not to punish guilt or to proclaim suspicion.

Reasonable doubt as to the qualifications of an applicant for a security-sensitive position must be resolved against the applicant. But no person should be branded as disloyal and disqualified for service in non-security-sensitive positions unless, in accordance with our common-law traditions, he has been given the benefit of a jury trial and of every reasonable doubt.

The present loyalty procedures are not restricted to security-sensitive positions. Charges for which no one is obliged to vouch are now made against individuals who are obliged to prove the charges false beyond a reasonable doubt without even seeing the reports on which the charges are based. The FBI makes the initial investigations but the FBI denies any responsibility for making any evaluation or appraisal of the results of its investigations. Most loy-

alty boards, fearful of making their own evaluations and without staff assistance to aid them, file charges on the basis of a few unchecked derogatory statements which may crop into an FBI report and leave it to the accused to prove his innocence.

It is not necessary for me to labor the anxiety, bewilderment and heartbreak caused to an innocent persan and his family by charges reflecting upon his integrity and loyalty. Of course the proceedings are supposed to be secret. But the accused cannot keep the secret from his wife and his friend or even from relative strangers from whom he must seek affidavits or supporting testimony. He usually is so worried and troubled that he feels that he must take a leave of absence to prepare his case even if he is not involuntarily suspended from his job. He must get a lawyer and sometimes that costs money. Of course, after months of anxiety he is usually cleared—but that rarely stops the rumors that he is under suspicion.

On January 4, 1939, President Roosevelt listed among the costs of dictatorship "the cost of being afraid to walk down the street with the wrong neighbor." We have no dictatorship in America. But today a Government employee may well be afraid to walk down the street with someone whom some undisclosed and unknown observer may consider the wrong neighbor.

The statistics published on the loyalty program as of November 1949 seem in a sense reassuring. Of the millions of employees affected less than 10,000 have had to go to the loyalty boards for adjudication. So far the loyalty boards have adjudicated 6,694 cases. In only 413 of these cases has the accused been found ineligible for employment. Of these adjudications, however, 107 or one-fourth have been reversed on appeal. One hundred sixty-one or more than a third are pending appeal or further consideration. Only 152 persons have in fact been dismissed as a result of the loyalty program. But 939 persons resigned while charges against them were pending adjudication by the loyalty boards. And I should hesitate to assume that all of these were in fact disloyal or questionable security risks. Some of them may have preferred to give up Government service rather than to submit to trial because they have been denounced by undisclosed informers.

If we assume that all the adjudications so far made and not reversed will stand and that all resignations pending adjudication were cases of ineligibility, we would have only 1,245 cases (306 adjudications and 939 resignations) of ineligibility determined by adjudication or resignation out of 7,633 cases (6,694 adjudications and 939 resignations).

It is reassuring to know that so few of our Government employees are found to be ineligible for employment on loyalty or security grounds. But it is difficult to understand why it is necessary for the loyalty boards to file charges requiring formal adjudication in so many cases where the charges cannot be sustained. In less than 1 out of every 6 cases in which persons are requested to answer formal charges before the loyalty boards is there found by adjudication or resignation to be a reasonable doubt as to the accused loyalty or security risk. Indeed excluding the cases of resignation and considering only the cases actually adjudicated the charges are sustained in less than 1 out of 20 cases.

It is interesting to contrast these figures with the figures of the criminal cases adjudicated in the Federal courts. Of the persons formally accused of offenses in the Federal courts, more than 80 percent are usually convicted or plead guilty before trial. In other words, in more than four cases out of five in which persons are required by the Federal Government to answer formal charges of law violation, the persons accused plead guilty or are found to be guilty beyond a reasonable doubt. Most of these plead guilty before trial, but if we eliminate convictions obtained before trial and cases dismissed by the Government before trial we find that of those actually tried in the Federal courts more than 3 out of 5 are convicted.

Various reasons may undoubtedly be offered to explain these figures, and the situations are not exactly comparable. Yet I am convinced that a principal explanation is that a Federal prosecutor would not think of going before a grand jury or court without making some effort to evaluate the available evidence and to assure himself that he had some sort of a case, while as a general rule no comparable effort is made by any responsible official before formal charges are made in loyalty or security cases.

Let me give you just one example of the harassment to which an innocent Government employee was inexcusably subjected. Miss A, a woman secretary, was requested to answer formal charges because of her alleged association with Mr. X. Witnesses before the Un-American Activities Committee had charged Mr. X with being a part of the Communist apparatus while he was in the Government. Miss A is said to have served as Mr. X's secretary. The facts at the hearing revealed that Miss A had worked in a Government office some time before Mr. X, whom she had not previously known, was assigned to the office as her acting chief. She continued at her usual work under the chief her Government had assigned to her. She remained at the same job after Mr. X was assigned elsewhere, and she had no further contact with Mr. X. Of course she was cleared by the loyalty board, but only after she had been obliged to employ counsel and had for months wondered what she could have possibly been thought to have done to be under such grave suspicion. Certainly in cases like this a little checking and evaluation of the evidence before the filing of charges could avoid needless anxiety and heartbreak.

I know one small law firm in Washington which has felt obliged to handle, with little or no compensation, 20 cases involving formal loyalty or security charges. In all 20 cases the accused was exonerated but not until after months of tension and hardship, and in some cases nervous break-down, and in one case a wife's miscarriage. The two members of this firm are very able lawyers, having held responsible positions in Government, but it is their view that every one of these cases could have been disposed of without formal charges, and with full protection to the Government's interest, by a reasonable effort to evaluate the evidence before the filing of formal charges.

Big government brings its problems, no less than big business, and we must not flinch in meeting the problems that both present. These are days fraught with great events. Dangers must be faced and met; opportunities must be seized and realized. But those of us who do not believe that dangers can be avoided and opportunities gained by seeking refuge in isolation and laissez faire must prove to those of little faith that we do not seek security at the expense of freedom.

We must stand firm against those who, in the name of security, would walk roughshod over our Bill of Rights. Only at our own peril can we allow Government service to become unattractive to those with inquiring nonconforming minds. In these critical days we need in Government men and women who are not only loyal and trustworthy but who are also alert and resourceful.

Roosevelt was always fearful of a regimented Government service. Some even called him a poor administrator because he would not always logically delegate responsibility or rigidly impose a line of command to eliminate conflict within his administration. He usually liked to test his own ideas with many and varied minds and to feel that the ideas he accepted from others had also been subject to similar testing. He was always wary of his administration falling too completely into the hands of one school of thought. It was no accident that he wanted the counsel of James F. Byrnes, Bernard Baruch, Cordell Hull, Henry Stimson, and Will Clayton, as well as of Harry Hopkins, Harold Ickes, Robert Jackson, William Douglas, and Thomas Corcoran. He knew how to get the best out of all of these. And don't forget that he was among the first to discover and appreciate the very unusual qualities of Harry S. Truman. But what was even more important he had the knack of making those in the Government service who seldom had direct contact with him feel that he valued initiative and imagination and was not afraid of new ideas. He inspired into all echelons of Government a new spirit of intelligence and devotion.

We must see to it that new spirit is not transformed into a dull conformity that forbids the mind to inquire or to venture. We must never forget that "where there is no vision, the people perish."

Ministry Outweighs the Law for Him

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have published in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting and well-written article entitled "Ministry Outweighs the Law for Him," by Richard L. Neuberger, special writer for the Oregonian.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINISTRY OUTWEIGHS THE LAW FOR HIM—PORTLAND ATTORNEY GIVES UP PRACTICE FOR CHURCH PULPIT

(By Richard L. Neuberger)

I remembered Corwin Calavan as one of the most brilliant students at University of Oregon law school.

In Portland, before the war, I heard occasionally of his steady progress up the staircase of the legal profession. His success as a lawyer seemed assured. Indeed, in large measure, it already had been achieved.

Then I lost touch with him, except to know that he was in the Navy while I was serving in the Army.

A few weeks ago he called on the telephone, asking me to speak at his church. To me, at the time, his church merely meant the parish to which Corwin Calavan belonged. It was St. Matthew's Episcopal Church.

But my friend of college days more than belonged to this church in Maywood Park, on the eastern fringe of Portland. He was its rector, a fact made obvious by the cassock and clerical collar he was wearing.

In 1946, when he was 36 years old, Corwin Calavan had abandoned the practice of law and gone to the Church Divinity School of the Pacific to study for the ministry. After 3 years of theological preparation in Berkeley, Calif., he now was commencing a totally new and different career at the age of 39.

That night we talked long and earnestly in his basement study at 9934 Northeast Mason Street.

"My income is about 25 percent of what it was when I was an attorney," began Corwin Calavan, "and I'm happier and more at peace with myself than ever before in my adult life."

Because contentment is the most universal of goals, Calavan's decision fascinated me. What was the specific appeal of the church which had lured a man with two children and another on the way from a prospering law practice?

C. Corwin Calavan was born in Portland February 11, 1910, the son of a dentist. He attended Jefferson high school and got his law degree at University of Oregon in 1935. His campus career was orthodox and he was a member of the Kappa Sigma fraternity.

After embryonic legal work, he formed a partnership with Milton R. Klepper, an older attorney. Calavan undertook a good deal of civil trial work. He also drafted wills, contracts, and similar documents. In the summer of 1942 he entered the United States Navy and served until the end of 1945.

He emerged from uniform with the two and a half stripes of a lieutenant-commander. His principal duty was that of staff legal officer for the aircraft arm of the Seventh Fleet, assigned to the South Pacific amphitheater of war.

In 1942 Calavan had met a girl with a peaches-and-cream complexion named Frances Krumenacher at a Sunday afternoon garden party and married her. Today there are two children—bespectacled Sharon, aged 6, and Charles Corwin, Jr., 4. A third offspring is expected by spring.

These are the bare biographical facts of a career which was altered so drastically in mid-passage.

Was there one, incisive moment which, above all others, influenced Calavan's decision?

If so, he believes it occurred on the island of Manus, in the Admiralty Archipelago off the New Guinea coast. In the darkness of a Christmas eve, Lieutenant Calavan trudged over the brow of a tropical hill and heard hymns coming from a chapel. Beside the chapel, in the naked glare of arc lights, men bare to the waist were digging graves. Coffins lay promiscuously among the brown mounds of earth. Out in the harbor bulked dimly the superstructures of a convoy about to start for Lingayen Gulf in the Philippines.

"I stood there," said Calavan, "while the incongruity of it all sank into my consciousness. In the chapel men were celebrating the birth of the Saviour of mankind, the Prince of Peace. On the other side of the walls, men who had fallen in war were being buried. Soon our ships would leave to kill other men, or themselves be destroyed in the attempt."

Calavan continued: "Many terrible questions seemed unanswered. I wondered what I, in my profession, was doing to help unravel them."

Calavan moved on to the Philippines with the Seventh Fleet. With his natural inquisitiveness, he shared frugal meals with native families which owned nothing except a few cotton rags. These families had been bereaved by the war that the great powers of earth were conducting all around them. "Yet these simple men and women," recalled Calavan, "appeared to be contented and happy."

He went on, "I began to see that the important things were within a person. Genuine peace of soul was of far greater value than those external trivialities—transitory luxuries, expensive cars, fine clothes."

The lieutenant commander came home to Portland and resumed his torts and contract work. "All about me," he said, "I met people who had become rich during the war. Some of them were my clients. Their bank books bulged with impressive digits. But these people were not happy. Money was the only thing of tangible reality to them."

Calavan said he thought hard and stubbornly about his own fleeting role on earth.

"While practice of the law unquestionably was useful," said he, "it did not appear to be solving the problems which I had come to regard as basic. I realized I was not contributing what I wanted, in my heart, to contribute. As a lawyer, I was skimming the surface of mankind's troubles. As a minister, I might probe them to the depths."

Calavan had been raised a Presbyterian. He was a Presbyterian on the day he decided to sell his case reports and other legal references. But the religion which suited him the most, personally, was the Episcopalian.

"I liked the formalism of the Episcopal Church," he explained. "To me worship is not an intellectual process. It needs symbolism and ritual. These things make people feel their religion, and I believe religion should heavily involve the emotions. A person should worship God with all his senses, not merely the intellect. For these reasons, the formal nature of Episcopal services appealed greatly to me."

The attorney went to see Rt. Rev. Benjamin D. Dagwell, bishop of the Portland diocese. They never had met before, but to the older man Calavan poured out his soul. He was through with the law. He wanted to be an Episcopal minister.

Dagwell made it possible for Calavan to enroll in divinity school of the Episcopal Church at Berkeley. He graduated in June of 1949 with the degree of bachelor of divinity, the GI bill of rights having helped to finance the Calavan family during the 3-year course.

The new rector asked the bishop for a pulpit which would be a challenge. He feels that Dagwell satisfied this request.

Not only is Calavan a new rector, but St. Matthew's is a new church. The ex-lawyer is its first clergyman. The church began with only 15 or 20 parishioners. Today its membership is 130, and still growing. Does Calavan find being a minister a profound difference from being a lawyer?

He does, indeed.

In the first place, he has far less free time. Four or five nights a week he is occupied with the men's club of his church, with the various women's activities, with arranging day nursery programs, with visiting individual homes.

Calavan regards personal counseling as extremely important. During the summer of 1948 he attended the Massachusetts General Hospital in Boston to observe the work of psychiatrists and the general staff of the institution. Other clergymen joined him in this project.

"We learned a great deal about human behavior and human psychology," revealed Calavan. "Perhaps most fundamental of all, we learned to be good listeners. Some ministers may do too much talking themselves. I found out that distressed men and women can relieve their tensions and anxieties if they can tell what is disturbing them. I believe I have trained myself to be an intent and patient listener."

The rector of St. Matthew's deprecates the fact that his present income is only about a fourth of what it totaled as a lawyer. "So what?" sums up his attitude.

"We've dropped a few private clubs, curtailed my insurance program, and drive a smaller car," he added. "But what do these things amount to? They entail no real sacrifice. We eat all we want, and my wife and children are perfectly satisfied."

Pretty Frances Calavan corroborates this opinion. She enjoys being a clergyman's wife. "Our phone rings a lot more," she continued, "and I have a good deal more extensive social duties. But my relationships with the families of the church seem extremely worth while, and I share Corwin's pride in our new way of life."

Calavan believes he is not unique. He thinks the dislocations of the war induced many men to revaluate their careers. In one Wisconsin diocese of the Episcopal Church, for example, he explains that no fewer than 13 men who were in business or trade are preparing themselves for the cloth. "A time of great upheaval," said he, "tends to make us get down to fundamentals in our thinking."

The former barrister looks the part of his new profession. He has a long, serious face and a prominent, aquiline nose. A heavy mat of black hair, now heavily threaded with gray, surmounts a scholar's high forehead. His voice is pleasant but capable of a burning intensity. This tone comes into it when he says, "Religion to me is the channel by which people arrive at a better relationship with God. It gives men and women a sense of true fulfillment."

Calavan never has regretted his epic decision.

During his divinity studies at Berkeley, a long-distance call came through from Portland. A prominent lawyer wanted Calavan to take over his practice. It might yield a $20,000 annual income the first year. This would be five or six times the pay of a fledgling rector. Calavan did not hesitate in turning down the offer.

"I never gave the matter a second thought," he added.

We walked out on the level lawn in front of the parish house. A few flakes of snow were falling desultorily in the December night. They mingled with the fir needles on the frozen ground and were lost. "The basic thing," maintained Calavan, "is that I wasn't contributing as a lawyer what I was best equipped by temperament and conviction to contribute."

And he concluded: "Be sure to make people understand that."

I looked back at him. In the bright doorway of the little rectory he waved a hand in farewell. I thought then that his thick shock of hair stood up like a plume.

Proposed Change in Counting Electors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Proposed Change in Counting Electors," written by Arthur Krock and published in the New York Times of February 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—THE PROPOSED CHANGE IN COUNTING ELECTORS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 2.—The amendment to the Constitution which more than the required two-thirds of the Senate agreed yesterday to submit to the States has taken only the first step on the long road to ratification. If the State delegations in the House of Representatives, which has yet to act, align themselves proportionately as the Senators did on this proposal to divide presidential electors on the basis of the popular vote in each State it will attract more than the two-thirds majority needed there also.

But this will not assure that the legislatures of three-fourths of the States will give the majorities of both branches that must be forthcoming before the Constitution can be amended.

The President hazarded a guess today that the process will still be incomplete when the voters of the United States go to the polls in the next general election, in 1952. Since the terms of the submission allow 7 years in which the States may consider the change, and it may well encounter local opposition which was not indicated in the Senate debate, that seems a good guess. But if the Senate vote truly represents mass opinion, and not chiefly that of politicians, toward a new method of choosing Presidents and Vice Presidents, the amendment may be added in far less time.

The majority in the Senate was made possible by the favoring vote of 16 southern Democrats who, with 30 northern and border State Democrats, joined 18 Republicans to make an approving total of 3 more than the essential two-thirds—61—of those "present and voting." If any 4 of these southerners had followed the 2 Virginians—Senators BYRD and ROBERTSON—in opposition, the Lodge-Gossett resolution, in which Senator KEFAUVER and former Representative Lea of California, also pioneered, would not have been submitted to the States.

The debate made very clear the reasoning by which these 16 Democrats were attracted to the proposal. They are at odds with the President's larger party group over the so-called program of civil-rights legislation. They believe that its genesis as the national party platform rests in the balance-of-power strength which is attributed to the Negro voters in non-Southern States with large blocs of presidential electors. If hereafter electoral votes are allocated in proportion to the popular vote in each State, these southern Democrats believe that balance-of-power groups, actual or claimant, will lose the power to dictate national Democratic policies because they will no longer be able to deliver a complete State electoral bloc by their affiliation.

The southerners are confident also that they will lose few electors in their own States by the change, unless that is the strategy of the Democratic organization; and that it will not stimulate in the South the rise of a two-party system, though this is one of the virtues asserted for the amendment by its advocates from all sections of the country. Convinced of these two things, the southern Democrats see in the amendment a sure way to reestablish their ancient power in the national councils of the party. They can, they foresee, deliver their electors substantially en bloc, or they can let some or all go by default to the opposition national ticket.

Others, apparently including Senator BYRD, regard these expectations as fallacious. They see situations in Northern States where splinter groups, unable to apply their present pressure on the major parties, will combine on independent tickets and get the bulk of the electors with a minority of the popular vote, then being able to wield a mightier balance of power. They see in the amendment also a bar to an independent Democratic movement in the South, as in 1948, because under the electoral change the political control of the State would then go, with most of its electors, to the Republicans.

But what probably troubled the Virginians most about the Lodge-Gossett amendment is an aspect which got no notice in the Senate debate but is sure to get it during the process toward ratification. This is its effect toward further dissolving States as units, thus amounting, as some see it, to another move toward a wholly Federal Government structure and away from the original Union of sovereign States.

When the Colonies which became States created the Federal Union they reserved all powers not otherwise delegated by them to the central Government in the Constitution, and in every other way the unit character of each State was stressed and protected. Hence, for example, the expressed will of a majority of Virginians was always to be registered in the Nation as the decision of Virginia. And this was true of all the other States, a concept maintained in the system whereby—with very slight deviations—all a State's presidential electors are allotted to the candidate who gets a popular majority vote.

Under the Lodge-Gossett amendment the will of a State in national elections is disunified. The voting majority gets some electors, the minorities above a certain fraction get the others, and both groups melt into a broad national alignment. Opponents of this result find it as unacceptable as they would a law prescribing that only 51 percent of a statute was enforceable because that was the size of the majority which approved it. And they are the more convinced that the amendment is an opening wedge for the direct election of Presidents because Senator LODGE announced that he introduced this amendment only because he never could get three-fourths of the States to ratify the Nation-wide method.

Displaced-Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial in this morning's Washington Post entitled "Closed Door." We will soon be considering various amendments to the Displaced-Persons Act, and this fine editorial clarifies one of the proposed amendments which would bar so-called Marxists from obtaining visas under the act. Such a prohibition raises some serious questions not only for the effective administration of the legislation, but also for cherished American principles of free expression and peaceful change.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CLOSED DOOR

Senator MCCARRAN has added, let us presume in the interest of national security, an interesting new gimmick to the Displaced Persons Act. The amendments reported after so much delay by the Senate Judiciary Committee supplement the safeguards of the existing law against admission of undesirable persons by providing that "no visas shall be issued under the provisions of this act, as amended, to any person who is or has been a member of the Communist Party or a Marxist, or of any organization which has been designated by the Attorney General of the United States as a Communist organization * * *."

What interests us most in this catalog is the prohibition against any person who is or has been a Marxist. This means, of course, any person who is or has been a supporter of the present government of England. It means the entire body of Social Democrats who provided the most effective resistance to Hitler before the war and are now the most vigorous opponents of communism in many European countries. It means persons like Leon Blum and George Bernard Shaw and Pietro Nenni. In short, it probably means anyone to the left of Friedrich von Hayek or Ludwig von Mises. If Senator MCCARRAN had only thought to bar, in addition, any person who is or has been a Keynesian, he could have double-locked the door against anyone critical in any degree of the economic status quo ante bellum.

The ban on Marxists poses an obvious administrative impossibility. The term is too vague to convey any meaning, and individual political sympathies are too inscrutable to be determined by any consular examination. We hope the Senate will strike out this stipulation, however, not merely because it is absurd but even more because it is extremely dangerous. The punishment of unorthodox opinion is usually begun in relation to some helpless group such as aliens seeking admission to the United States. But once accepted, it is liable to be applied at home, say, to persons seeking employment in the Government. Marxists (or non-Marxists) who want to overthrow the Government of the United States by force can properly be excluded from this country, as they are under existing law. Marxists who believe in a peaceful change of the economic system can be excluded only at peril of imposing a sterile conformity.

Capehart Versus Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Capehart Versus Acheson," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAPEHART VERSUS ACHESON

It was a bold thing to do when Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART stood on the floor of the United States Senate a week ago and demanded that President Truman request the resignation of Secretary of State Dean Acheson on the basis of revelations brought out in the Hiss trial. It was a bold thing to do but when Senator CAPEHART had finished documenting his case there could be no doubt in the mind of any reasonable person but that he had right and justice on his side.

Senator CAPEHART pointed out that it was in 1938 that Whittaker Chambers first came to Washington to lay the information he had about Communist activities in the Government before President Roosevelt. Presidential Secretary Marvin McIntyre referred Chambers to Adolph Berle, who then was in charge of intelligence matters in the State Department.

Berle listened to Chambers' story, including the part concerning Hiss, who was then employed in the State Department. Mr. Berle testified before the House Un-American Activities Committee that he discussed the matter with Dean Acheson, who then held a top post in the State Department. Nothing came of it. In fact, only a few months after the Chambers information concerning Hiss was developed to Acheson, Hiss received a promotion.

For the past 12 years Acheson has had full knowledge of Hiss' activities during a 2-year period, 1936–38, in filching top-secret documents from the State Department and delivering them to Russian spies. He had this knowledge but he did nothing about it. On the contrary, he participated in promoting Hiss to positions of increasing responsibility, even to the post of confidential adviser to President Roosevelt at the Yalta Conference.

And after the second Hiss trial when Hiss was convicted of perjury; after a jury had said that Hiss was guilty of filching secret papers from the State Department and passing them to Russian spies; after Hiss had been proved to be a traitor; after all that, Mr. Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States, is quoted as having said, "I will not turn my back on Alger Hiss."

What other course could Senator CAPEHART have taken and still retained his self-respect as an American citizen and as a Member of the United States Senate? What other course was available to him but to stand on the floor of the Senate and request that President Truman demand the resignation of Dean Acheson?

We know not and care less what the "long hairs" in Washington may think, but to the good people of Indiana such straight talk and two-fisted action makes sense. We want no part of any person or group of persons who are disloyal to the United States.

The Potato Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Philadelphia Inquirer of February 3, 1950, entitled "Potatoes: Shocking Example of Wasteful Program."

This article emphasizes the need for an immediate lowering of our farm support price level, and point out how such action will benefit both the farmer and consumer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATOES: SHOCKING EXAMPLE OF WASTEFUL PROGRAM

Federal support of farm prices at unreasonably high levels has, in the case of potatoes, led inexorably to the shocking situation in which the Government is faced with the necessity of destroying some 50,000,000 bushels which cost the taxpayers about $1.25 a bushel.

In the face of such flagrant proof of the waste involved in the present farm-price program it would be reasonable to expect demands for a prompt review of Federal policy. Instead, a move is under way to give the Commodity Credit Corporation some $2,000,000,000 more with which to buy up additional agricultural surpluses.

The housewife paying unnecessarily high prices for potatoes will be the first to recognize the need for lowering the price-support level to such a point that production will once again be geared to the level of consumption. Until this has been done the outlook is for a continued piling up of foodstuffs, many of them perishable, in Government warehouses at a constantly mounting cost to taxpayers.

Potatoes became the first crop to embarrass the Federal planners, but the situation with respect to wheat, corn, eggs, butter and other products differs only in degree.

Secretary of Agriculture Charles F. Brannan acted properly in going to the Senate Agriculture Committee for advice concerning what disposal should be made of the Government-owned potatoes, for his dilemma stems directly from the failure of Congress to lay aside political considerations and enact realistic farm legislation.

The committee's refusal to make any suggestion should deceive no one. In this instance Secretary Brannan has simply carried out a program laid down by Congress—a program with which he has been in disagreement.

The crisis in potatoes provides a most convincing demonstration of the necessity of a general lowering of farm-support price levels to a point where, without depriving producers of protection against sudden fluctuations of the market, food will be raised for the dinner table and not to be stored for a time in bulging Government warehouses—and then thrown away.

Proposed National Board of Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE MORSE
OF OREGON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a letter which Dr. Hollis P. Allen, professor of education at Claremont College, California, and the compiler of the Task Force Report on Education for the Hoover Commission, recently sent to Pres. James B. Conant, of Harvard University.

The letter, in my opinion, presents a cogent argument in favor of establishing a National Board of Education, such as is proposed in the substitute measure, S. 656, which I introduced on October 19, 1949.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 6, 1950.

President JAMES B. CONANT,
Harvard University,
Cambridge, Mass.

DEAR PRESIDENT CONANT: As compiler of the Hoover Commission Task Force Report on Education (pt. 3 of appendix P of the Commission publications) I am particularly pleased to note your selection as chairman of the schools and university committee of the citizens committee on the Hoover report. I recall your generous assistance to me in presenting data concerning the effect of the various Federal activities in education as they concerned Harvard.

There is so much good in the Hoover Commission findings and recommendations in general that I am extremely sorry to find it necessary to take issue with it in respect to its particular report concerning education. I do hope that you may see your way clear to approach these problems in the constructive manner which has been so typical of your past valued service to education throughout the country.

With many others who have the best interests of education at heart I am greatly concerned over the failure of the Hoover Commission to give serious consideration to any of the proposals and recommendations of this task force report concerning education. I suspect that this may have been due to the very brief time which the Commission was able to devote to its final deliberations. I trust that I am not imposing on you to present a few considerations:

1. As pointed out in the task force report, our difficulties concerning education at the Federal level has been largely due to lack of any consistent policy. Both the Brookings Institution, which prepared this and other welfare task force reports, and I had understandings with the Commission that policy consideration was an essential prerequisite to determination of organizational matters in education. In reports of progress to the Commission staff I stressed that evaluation and development of Federal policy in education must precede and to a considerable extent determine Federal organization for education, a point which was mutually agreeable.

In spite of this the Commission stated in its Report on Social Security and Education—Indian Affairs (p. 4) that "it is not the province of this Commission to pass upon policies." Again on page 12 it stated "this Commission is not dealing with policies." Under the same cover, however, in dealing with Indian affairs (p. 63) it first considered policy and stated "this policy should be the keystone of the organization and of the activities of the Federal Government in the field of Indian Affairs." If policy is the keystone in Indian Affairs it is many times more so in respect to education. Apparently the Commission could consider policy when it so desired.

2. The act of Congress which established the Commission specifically charged it with the following:

(1) Limiting expenditures to the lowest amount consistent with the efficient performance of essential services.

(2) Eliminating duplication and overlapping of services.

(3) Consolidating services of a similar nature.

(4) Abolishing services not necessary.

(5) Defining and limiting executive functions.

Our task force report makes specific recommendations in respect to each of these functions of the Commission, yet all have been ignored. For instance, the school-lunch program of the Department of Agriculture overlaps and duplicates similar activities of the Office of Education. Thus we recommended that this program—$92,000,000 in fiscal 1949—be consolidated in the Office of Education. In spite of the fact that the task force on agriculture made a similar strong recommendation, these two task force recommendations, in complete harmony, were entirely ignored. There is extensive overlapping and sometimes conflict between the Agriculture Extension Service and the program for vocational education in agriculture, particularly on the local level. This was treated both in the Agriculture and Education task force reports, and suggestions made for improvement, but these suggestions were ignored by the Commission. We felt it highly desirable to limit executive functions, in order to eliminate a partisan type of thought control which could easily permeate present programs of education, yet this has been ignored by the Commission. Many other illustrations could be given.

3. Our task force report took the position that educational activities on the Federal level should be evaluated in terms of the effect on States and local institutions where the basic responsibility for education rests. Both policy and organization should be developed in terms of similar criteria. At the one place where we most fear control

or an authoritarian approach to education we have given it the fewest safeguards. We have made recommendations to overcome this and to strengthen educational responsibility and leadership in States and in local institutions, yet they have been ignored by the Commission. The Commission has taken the point of view that what looks neat and streamlined in an organization chart, where partisan influence can be exerted, is of more importance than keeping education democratic and close to the interests of the places where basic responsibility should rest.

Out in the open I have little fear of undue Federal control of education. But with hidden and totally uncoordinated and highly specialized educational activities tucked hither and yon over most of the Federal departments and agencies, with no central or over-all plan or policy, I greatly fear a more subtle type of control which we now have and which is constantly increasing. The Commission would have this continue. Neither it nor I want a large and powerful Federal educational agency. But it is essential that we have an agency which is sufficiently effective to bring some semblance of order out of this chaos; sufficiently out in the open and unsubordinated to partisan considerations to be an adequate influence in coordinating these activities and keeping the American public informed of educational trends on the Federal level.

4. Frankly, when I started my study for the Commission, I held the hypothesis that a Federal Department of Health, Welfare, and Education was appropriate. As my evidence accumulated, however, I reluctantly had to desert this position as unsound and damaging to the best interests of education. After reviewing arguments for and against the various proposals, I firmly came to the conclusion that an independent agency for education, with a National Board of Education, holds by far the greatest promise for overcoming the present and potential dangers and the current chaos in educational activities of the Federal Government. Under our proposals I believe we can develop much highly effective teamwork between Federal, State, and institutional agencies in education which can be of material benefit in increasing the potentialities of education in the national welfare.

If you have not already done so I hope you can at least take time to read chapter V (pages 361 to 378 of Appendix P) of our task-force report. Unfortunately, this report was rather hurriedly condensed from more voluminous materials, and I consider it quite unsatisfactory in many respects. However, McGraw-Hill is publishing my complete manuscript in February of this year under the title "The Federal Government and Education." I hope the latter may have a desired effect in acquainting the public with the important issues and possible solutions to the many problems involved.

Sincerely,

HOLLIS P. ALLEN,
Chairman, Committee on Teacher Education.

Development of the Columbia River Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that two letters and appendices, dated February 1, 1950, and written by Frank Pace, Jr., Director of the Budget, to the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Interior, respectively, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. These letters which discuss the Pacific Northwest will be of interest to every Member of Congress and to all citizens of the area in question.

There being no objection, the letters and appendixes were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE ARMY.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On July 15, 1949, you transmitted to the President your report on a plan for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. This report has been considered along with the related report of the Secretary of the Interior, and in connection with the provisions of H. R. 5472, now pending in the Senate.

Because of the close relationships between the reports and the bill, particularly if H. R. 5472 is amended to include authorization of projects for the Bureau of Reclamation, it was felt that in the main, the President's views should be set forth in one letter. Accordingly, I have transmitted to the Secretary of the Interior a letter which, together with its appendices A, B, and C, and this letter, set forth the conditions attached to the President's approval of the two reports, and contain his views respecting amendment of H. R. 5472. A copy of the letter to the Secretary of the Interior is enclosed.

In summary, your report is approved for submission to the Congress, and the President recommends authorization by the Congress at an early date of the projects which are listed in appendix B, with the limitations indicated therein. This approved list omits certain navigation and flood control projects, listed in appendix A, and certain flood protection works for which sufficient data are not at present available to provide justification. These limitations and omissions are made without prejudice to their later reconsideration at such time as sufficient data are available to permit final determination concerning the need and economic justification for them.

You are requested to seek amendment of H. R. 5472, so far as the Department of the Army is concerned, to eliminate the Columbia Basin projects now included in it which are not listed in appendix B, and to include those projects listed in appendix B which are not at present in the bill.

The President has asked me to express his appreciation to you and to the Secretary of the Interior for the cooperative efforts made by the two Departments to present their respective plans in a complementary and coordinated framework.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of the Interior for his information, and it will be appreciated if you will transmit a copy of it to the Congress along with your report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director.

EXECUTIVE OFFICE
OF THE PRESIDENT,
BUREAU OF THE BUDGET,
February 1, 1950.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: This letter sets forth the conditions under which your report on plans for the development of the Columbia River Basin is approved by the President for submission to the Congress, and replies to your letters of January 6, 1950, concerning amendment of H. R. 5472, now pending in the Senate.

Columbia River Basin report: On June 20, 1949, you transmitted to the President a supplemental report on a plan for the development of the water resources of the Columbia River Basin. This report, together with the related report of the Secretary of the Army, sets forth a plan of engineering works for the physical development of the basin's water resources, which, subject to certain qualifications noted below, is approved by the President for submission to the Congress.

The works projected by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers represent a construction program which will extend over a period of about 20 years. When completed, they will make the Columbia River system the greatest source of hydroelectric power in the world and will yield additional benefits in terms of flood control, navigation, reclamation, and other beneficial uses of water. The President recommends the authorization by the Congress at an early date of the projects herein approved, so that orderly plans for construction and budgeting may be laid out.

At the same time, as you pointed out in your letter of June 20, 1949, an engineering program for the construction of physical works falls far short of meeting the need for truly comprehensive and coordinated development of the water and other resources of the Pacific Northwest. First, the program, concerned with one river system, is planned for construction and operation by two departments of the Government. Further, the program is confined to river projects and does not extend to such equally important aspects of resource conservation and development as soil conservation and land management, reforestation and forest management, and mineral exploration and development. For these reasons the President strongly endorses your view that authorization of this program by the Congress will make it more important than ever to establish a better organizational framework and a more uniform statutory basis for the conservation and development of all natural resources in the Pacific Northwest, such as would be provided by the Columbia Valley Administration he has already recommended.

We are only at the beginning of a tremendous development program in the Pacific Northwest. If the Federal Government is to carry out its part in this program effectively, in proper coordination with State and local governments and private activities, there must be unified Federal responsibility for scheduling, designing, constructing, and operating multiple purpose water control projects, and for assuring wise planning and integration of the contemporaneous activities of all the Federal agencies concerned with the land, forest, and mineral resources of the region.

In the meantime, it is obvious that the coordination of their respective programs which has been effected by the Departments of the Interior and the Army is essential. The agreements which they have reached on certain policies concerning the interrelationship of their programs in the Pacific Northwest appear to represent a practicable plan under which the two Departments can work together within the shortcomings of the present Federal pattern of piecemeal legislation and divided administrative responsibility. The President expects that the two Departments will continue to operate in conformity with agreements of this general character. However, such agreements, by their very nature, should be considered only as operating agreements, to be changed and brought up to date from time to time. Their form and content should not be frozen by statutory enactment.

To meet one outstanding deficiency in present laws the two Departments have recommended the establishment of a so-called basin account to permit a more intelligent accounting for power revenues from the

various Federal plants in the Pacific Northwest and for the various costs which are to be returned from those revenues. Such an accounting method is obviously necessary to permit efficient management of the Government's power operations in the Columbia Basin and a proper assignment of power revenues to return the costs of irrigation facilities which are beyond the ability of the water users to repay. Subject to specific detailed changes in the proposed legislative provisions authorizing its establishment referred to in subsequent paragraphs, the President approves the establishment of a Columbia Basin account and recommends its enactment by the Congress.

The following numbered paragraphs set forth certain detailed comments on your report and that of the Secretary of the Army which reflect the position of the President concerning them.

1. Authorization for construction of the power-generating facilities proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers would be in accord with the program of the President except for the power features of the Garden Valley Dam and Power Plant of the Mountain Home project, which are not approved at this time because of their relationship to the irrigation features of the project.

2. Authorization for construction of flood control and navigation facilities by the Corps of Engineers would be in accord with the program of the President except for the specific items set forth in appendix A, which should be used as a basis for recommending such amendments as may be necessary in H. R. 5472.

3. Authorization of all irrigation projects would be in accord with the program of the President with the exception of the Mountain Home project. Objection to authorization of the irrigation features of Mountain Home project at this time is without prejudice to its reconsideration after the report of the President's Water Resources Policy Commission has been received. That report will deal with a number of the major policy issues involved, including the maximum length of time for repayment of irrigation costs, the levels of subsidy justifiable for irrigation projects, the source of such subsidies, and related considerations.

Two reservations are made with respect to irrigation projects. First, it is understood that in connection with the Crooked River project, investigation of an alternative dam site (Post Reservoir) is about to be concluded and that the alternative site may be preferred by reason of being more economical. A final report and justification of the site decided upon is to be submitted for approval in the usual manner before any request for funds is made. Second, in the case of the Canby project, while it would appear that the works proposed are economically justified and can be paid for in full in a 40-year interest-free period, it is noted that the project is located in an area of 42 inches of annual rainfall. This fact raises questions of national policy as to irrigation of lands in humid areas and even in the Eastern States where there are occasional shortages of rainfall. Approval of the project at this time does not constitute a precedent for general endorsement of similar projects on a Nation-wide basis.

4. A consolidated list of all projects approved by the President for authorization is attached as appendix B. This should be used as a basis for recommending amendment of H. R. 5472.

5. Allocations of construction costs to pollution abatement, salinity control, recreation, and sediment control are not approved at this time. The handling of recreation and sediment control as approved by the President in my letter to you dated January 27, 1950, concerning amendment of H. R. 1770, would be without objection.

6. Reallocations of cost are approved subject to the limitations set forth in the amendments to H. R. 1770 proposed in my letter of January 27, 1950.

7. Further discussion of the basin account and the use of the interest component on the power investment to the return of nonpower costs will be found in a subsequent paragraph dealing with specific amendments to H. R. 5472.

Amendment of H. R. 5472: There is no objection to the submission of your proposed report to the Vice President as attached to your letters to me dated January 6, 1950. The relationship to the President's program of specific amendments to the bill (as suggested in attachments to your proposed report) is discussed in subsequent paragraphs.

8. Section — (a) (as drafted for inclusion at the appropriate place in the bill), if enacted, would approve the reports of the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Chief of Engineers; would authorize construction of the projects, works, and improvements recommended in the reports as coordinated by the agreement of April 11, 1949; and would, in effect, provide statutory ratification of the responsibilities of the two agencies as set forth in the agreement.

As has already been pointed out, approval of the reports as submitted will not meet the requirements of the President. Authorization of projects is approved only to the extent indicated in appendices A and B. Statutory enactment of the interagency agreement is both unwise and unnecessary for reasons already indicated. Since the present bill already authorizes the projects of the Corps of Engineers, only textual changes are needed to bring its provisions in accord with the positions set forth in preceding paragraphs. New language, however, is needed to authorize the projects of the Bureau of Reclamation and to authorize appropriations for them. Proposed text for these purposes is attached in appendix C in the form of a new section for insertion in H. R. 5472. The President requests that you confer with the Senate committees in working out the details concerning the list of projects to be inserted in the section. He has authorized me to suggest that the aggregate total authorization for appropriations for projects for the Bureau of Reclamation be held at this time to $200,000,000, about half of the total required for the projects approved.

9. Section — (b) of your amendments would authorize the basin account. Since receipt of your letters of January 6, staff discussions have resulted in agreement as to the exact form of authorizing provisions to be recommended for enactment by the Congress. The text of these provisions will be found in appendix C in the form of a new section for insertion in H. R. 5472. I believe that the underlying concepts of the basin account, the revenues to be included in it, the charges to be made against it, and the other terms and conditions surrounding it are largely self-explanatory.

Four points are worthy of special mention. First, the basin account will provide a better method of accounting than is now the case, but it will in no way affect the flow of funds to and from the Treasury. Present law will continue to control the processes of making appropriations for constructing and operating projects, and of paying receipts into the Treasury. The basin account, in short, is for accounting but not for funding purposes. Second, projects will be included in the basin account only upon specific approval by the Congress. Third, the provisions concerning power rates require interest to be charged on the outstanding Federal investment in power facilities; that is, the amount of the investment less amounts for depreciation and amortization which have been repaid to the Treasury. Fourth, in setting rates for the sale of power, the Secretary may consider the application of interest on the power investment, from the various projects covered by the account, to the return of nonpower costs, only to the extent that he can do so under reclamation law—existing or as hereafter amended. As you know, this is one of the matters on which recommendations are expected from the President's Water Resources Policy Commission.

10. The provisions proposed in your amendments as subsections (c), (d), (e), (f), and (g) have been replaced in the proposed provisions in appendix C, or eliminated as unnecessary.

11. Elimination of section 208 of the bill (Alaska) would be in accord with the program of the President for the reasons set forth in your statement. The amendments which you suggest with respect to Grand Prairie-Bayou Meto, the study commission for the Arkansas-White and Red River Basins, and the study commission for the New England river basins would be in accord with the program of the President. It is believed, however, that provisions should be made to extend the jurisdiction of the New England Commission in such manner as to insure that it is authorized to consider the Passamaquoddy project and to take into account the interrelationships between development of power in New England and development of power in New York State and internationally along the St. Lawrence River.

A copy of this letter is being sent to the Secretary of the Army for his information and guidance, and I am enclosing a copy of my letter to him.

It will be appreciated if you will transmit a copy of this letter to the Congress along with your report.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK PACE, JR.,
Director.

APPENDIX A

COLUMBIA BASIN RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NAVIGATION AND FLOOD CONTROL HELD NOT IN ACCORD WITH THE PROGRAM OF THE PRESIDENT

Project: Snake River navigation channel and harbors on Snake River.

Comment: The benefits developed in the report are based entirely on a speculative demand for limestone for agricultural and industrial uses in the lower Columbia Basin. Use of the facilities is also contingent on completion of lower Snake and Columbia River dams, upon which construction may be under way for a decade or more. The navigation features may be determined feasible upon development of a firm demand for limestone products and upon completion of necessary downstream control units.

Project: Harbors on Columbia River.

Comment: Data sufficient to permit final determination of the size and location of necessary harbor facilities are not available. Local needs may be more accurately predicted when construction is advanced on The Dalles, John Day, and McNary Dams.

Project: Kootenai River at Bonners Ferry, Oreg.

Comment: Benefits to be realized through raising of levees at Bonners Ferry would be of an interim nature, since the protection would not be required after regulation of the stream by Libby Dam. There appears to be a lack of local interest in provision of additional levee protection at Bonners Ferry. Relative infrequency of flood stages sufficient to overtop existing levees appears to render an interim protection at this location inadvisable at this time. In case construction of Libby Dam is not undertaken within a reasonable period of years, this project might be resubmitted for consideration.

Project: Willow Creek at Heppner, Oreg.

Comments: The economic ratio of the project based on valuable benefits is less than unity because of the infrequency of excessive flows. The project would contribute little, if any, toward elimination of flood damages along the main stem of the Columbia. A more modest proposal for protection

at this locality may prove economically justified.

Projects: Cascadia Dam, Lewisville Dam, Gate Creek Dam, Wiley Creek Dam, modification of Fern Ridge Dam.

Comments: These projects or project modifications, in Willamette subbasin, having economic ratios of unit or less are held not in accord with the program of the President at this time.

Project: Supplemental levees, Willamette subbasin.

Comments: The report indicates that to prevent damage through overtopping, construction of the levees must be held in abeyance pending completion of all upstream storage units. Since the present economic ratio of the recommended work is considerably less than unity, this item is considered not in accord at this time. It is possible that the agency may wish to resubmit the proposal for authorization if and when a decline in construction costs may result in a more favorable economic ratio.

Project: Overflow channel closures, Willamette subbasin.

Comments: The report contains insufficient data to permit determination of location or design of necessary closures. It would appear that the effects of several reservoir evacuations would have to be observed to ascertain need for these structures. This fact, combined with the present economic ratio, indicates the advisability of delaying authorization of the feature.

Project: Engineering research and experimental laboratory.

Comments: The value of working models in solution of design problems is recognized, and their use in connection with advance planning on units of the proposed Columbia Basin project should be encouraged. A $15,000,000 laboratory to accomplish the experimental program, does not, however, appear necessary as an adjunct to the Columbia Basin plan. Construction of elements of the project will be prosecuted over several decades. The magnitude of the program will not in itself justify the laboratory since planning and design should conform generally with the anticipated construction program. The existing laboratories of the Corps of Engineers and Bureau of Reclamation available for this work can be expanded without additional authorization if necessary.

APPENDIX B

COLUMBIA BASIN RECOMMENDATIONS CLEARED FOR AUTHORIZATION WITHOUT OBJECTION

Corps of Engineers

Main control plan: Libby Dam, Albeni Falls Dam, Priest Rapids Dam, John Day Dam, The Dalles Dam. Lower Columbia River levees and bank protection works: The necessity for levees and bank protection on the lower Columbia River will diminish progressively with completion of upstream reservoirs. The recommendation for authorization is cleared without objection, subject, however, to the condition that requests for construction funds for this purpose should be subject to annual review to insure conformity with local requirements.

Willamette subbasin plan: Hills Creek Dam, Fall Creek Dam, Holley Dam, Tumtum Dam, Cougar Dam, Blue River Dam, Green Peter Dam, Waldo Lake storage development, White Bridge Dam, Meridian Dam power features, Dexter Dam. Although these projects or project modifications have economic ratios of unity or less the need for meeting anticipated power requirements in this shortage area together with the greater cost involved in building transmission facilities to meet the shortage from alternate sources justifies clearance without objection.

Willamette Falls fish ladder, channel improvements for flood control and major drainage, bank protection works, channel clearing and snagging.

Subbasin plans:

Jackson Hole levees, Snake River, Wyo.

Umatilla River at Pendleton, Oreg.

Local flood-protection projects, Columbia Basin: The report indicates that data sufficient to determine final design and justification of all proposed local flood-protection works are not available. Pending completion of current investigations which may indicate possibility of some additional items, the following features are cleared for authorization, subject to a limitation of $15,000,000:

Clark Fork: Missoula, Mont.; St. Regis River, Mont.; Lightning Creek, Idaho.

Yakima River at Ellensburg, Wash.

Okanogan River, Wash.

Methow River, Wash.

Entiat River, Wash.

Wenatchee River, Wash.

Crab and Wilson Creek, Wash.

Upper Snake River: Heise-Roberts area, Idaho; Shalley area, Idaho; Blackfoot area, Idaho; Teton River, Idaho; Blackfoot River, Idaho; Portneuf River and Marsh Creek, Idaho; Mud Lake area, Idaho; Little Wood River, Idaho; Camas Creek area, Idaho.

Central Snake River: Malheur River, Oreg.; Boise Valley, Idaho; Payette Valley, Idaho; Weiser River, Idaho.

Middle and Lower Snake Rivers: Whitebird, Idaho; south fork of Clearwater River, Idaho; Kendrick, Idaho; Palouse River, Oreg.; Grande Ronde River, Oreg.

Minor tributaries below the Yakima River: Lower Walla Walla River, Wash.; Mill Creek, Wash.; Touchet River, Oreg.; Umatilla River, Oreg.; John Day River, Oreg.; Prineville, Oreg.; Randle, Wash.; Lower Cowlitz River, Wash.; Umatilla Harbor, Oreg.; Columbia slough channel; Baker Bay channel, Washington; Westport slough channel, Oregon.

Other: Hydrometeorological reporting network for Columbia Basin and hydrologic reporting network for Willamette subbasin. Any requests for funds for these purposes should contain information relative to the plan of operation and should indicate the manner and extent of anticipated participation by cooperating Federal agencies and affected States.

Bureau of Reclamation

Mountain Home project, Idaho, following features only: Upper Scriver Creek power plant, Lower Scriver Creek power plant, Smiths Ferry Dam, Smiths Ferry-Scriver Creek tunnel, Scriver Creek Dam and Reservoir.

Cambridge Bench project, Idaho: Council project, Idaho; Hells Canyon project, Idaho. This item is cleared without objection, subject to elimination of transmission facilities ($120,000,000). These facilities, if and when required, would come more approximately under another Federal agency.

Bitterroot Valley project (including Woodside unit), Montana.

Canby project, Oregon.

Crooked River project, Oregon. Cleared subject to understanding that final report and justification of site decided upon will be submitted for approval before any request for funds is made.

Vale project, Oregon, Bully Creek extension.

The Dalles project, Oregon, west unit.

Grand Coulee Dam, Wash., modifications for flood control.

Upper Star Valley project, Wyoming, and the following projects, previous authorized under the Water Conservation and Utilization Act: Mann Creek poject, Idaho; Missoula Valley project, Montana, north side unit.

APPENDIX C

DRAFT OF CERTAIN AMENDMENTS TO H. R. 5472

(For insertion at appropriate place in bill)

SEC. — (a). The following projects are authorized to be constructed, substantially in accordance with the report of the Commissioner of Reclamation dated May 2, 1949, by the Department of the Interior under the supervision and direction of the Secretary of the Interior, who in prosecuting his activities under this section, and in operating and maintaining such projects, shall be governed by the Federal reclamation laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof and supplementary thereto):

(List to be inserted here)

(b) The sum of $200,000,000 is hereby authorized to be appropriated for the partial accomplishment of the projects authorized in this section.

SEC. —. (a) In order to provide a method of accounting which reflects the interrelationship of certain projects in the Pacific Northwest, the Secretary of the Interior shall establish a Columbia basin account. The account shall be credited with all power and miscellaneous revenues, including revenues on account of benefits to downstream power plants which result from upstream Federal improvements, derived from or incidental to the operation of Federal power plants now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, including all transmission lines and other facilities incident to the marketing of power from such plants. The account shall be charged with all operation and maintenance costs of such power plants, transmission lines, and other facilities, with all construction costs of such plants, lines, and facilities that are allocated to power purposes, and with interest as provided in subsection (c). The account shall also be charged with all reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but which are assigned for return from power revenues, in connection with all projects now existing, or authorized heretofore or in this act, within the Pacific Northwest, whether or not such projects include power features: *Provided,* That assignment of such costs of existing or heretofore authorized projects in excess of amounts which are so assignable under the Federal Reclamation Laws (act of June 17, 1902, 32 Stat. 388, and acts amendatory thereof or supplementary thereto) shall be made only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. Revenues and costs in connection with projects hereafter authorized to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest shall be included in the Columbia Basin account only upon specific authorization by act of Congress. For the purposes of this section, the Pacific Northwest shall be defined as the area, within the United States, comprising the Columbia River Basin, the basins of other streams entering the Pacific Ocean between the Canadian boundary and the California-Oregon boundary, and the closed drainage areas of Oregon.

(b) As of the close of each fiscal year, beginning with the fiscal year 1951, the Secretary of the Interior shall report to the Congress on the status of the Columbia Basin account, and on the revenues from and cost of constructing and operating Federal facilities in the Pacific Northwest for the supply of water for irrigation, municipal water supply, or other reimbursable purposes. The Secretary's report shall be prepared in such a manner as accurately to reflect the Federal investment in power plants and facilities, and in water-supply facilities, and the progress of return and repayment thereon.

(c) The revenues and costs credited and charged to the Columbia Basin account, together with estimated future costs and revenues, shall be taken into account in fixing

rates for the sale of power and energy from Federal plants and facilities in the Pacific Northwest. Such rates shall be fixed from time to time by the Secretary of the Interior, after consultation with the Federal Power Commission, at levels which in the aggregate will be at least sufficient to cover (1) the operation, maintenance, and all other costs of generating, transmitting, and disposing of such power and energy, including among such costs depreciation on the depreciable properties included in the construction costs allocated to such generation, transmission, and disposition, plus amortization, over a reasonable period of years, of the nondepreciable properties included in the construction costs so allocated, and including interest on the balances of such construction costs remaining after the deduction of depreciation and amortization, at rates not less than those specified in existing applicable laws or, where no rates are so specified, at such rates as may be determined from time to time by the Secretary of the Treasury to be appropriate, having regard to the probable term of the power investment and the rates payable on outstanding marketable obligations of the United States; and (2) any additional amounts which may be required to return the reimbursable costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues. In setting rates for the sale of power and energy, the Secretary of the Interior may take into consideration, for all properties covered by the Columbia Basin account, the application of interest on the power investment to the return of costs properly allocable to purposes other than power, but assigned for return from power revenues, to the same extent that application of interest on power investment to the return of such costs may be taken into consideration under the Federal reclamation laws.

(d) Allocations of construction costs for projects authorized in this act to be constructed in the Pacific Northwest, and for other projects included in the Columbia Basin account as to which allocations have not heretofore been made, shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Interior in the case of the projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Interior, after consultation with the Secretary of the Army as to allocations to flood control and navigation and with the Federal Power Commission as to allocations to power. Such allocations shall be the responsibility of the Secretary of the Army in the case of projects constructed or to be constructed by the Department of the Army, after consultation with the Secretary of the Interior in the case of allocations to irrigation and the preservation and propagation of fish and wildlife, and with the Federal Power Commission and the Secretary of the Interior with respect to allocations to power.

(e) The Secretary of the Interior shall contract for appropriate repayment to the United States, in accordance with the Federal reclamation laws, for all irrigation services provided by or obtained from all projects in the Pacific Northwest constructed pursuant to the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods.

(f) Except as specifically provided in this section, nothing herein shall be construed as repealing, modifying or affecting in any way the Federal reclamation laws, the laws affecting the prosecution of works for the improvement of navigation and the control of floods, the act of August 20, 1937 (50 Stat. 731), as amended, the act of June 5, 1944 (58 Stat. 270), the act of December 22, 1944 (58 Stat. 887), or the act of March 2, 1945 (59 Stat. 22). Nothing in this section shall be construed to apply to projects of the Bureau of Indian Affairs or to supersede existing provisions of law relating to the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife.

Germany's Relations With Eastern and Western Europe

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "Made in Germany" appearing in the No. 32 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MADE IN GERMANY

"UNTIL THESE PLANS ARE CHECKED, THEY WILL PRESENT A CONSTANT MENACE TO POSTWAR PEACE AND SECURITY"

"We long for a sword, but no God can give us one now." This was the fateful verdict of the Versailles Treaty, according to Gustav Stresemann, Germany's Foreign Minister from 1923 to 1929. God had failed the Germans. The time had passed when the Germans could count on some supernatural force to restore their power and glory.

Stresemann's judgment pointed the way out. The Germans must dispense with the guidance and help of God and take matters in their own hands. God had not only failed them, but was apparently on the side of their "mortal enemies." To discard illusions of a democratic peace, to exploit to the fullest the weaknesses of her adversaries, to disarm them morally and materially, to break up their solidarity, and to pit them against each other—this would be the German way.

In a brilliant analysis of Germany's relations with eastern and western Europe, Prof. Gordon A. Craig, of Princeton University, quoted Herr Stresemann's exposition of the strategy that German foreign policy must pursue:

"The question of a choice between east and west does not follow from our entrance into the League of Nations. One can make such a choice only if he has military power at his disposal. In our case, unfortunately, that is lacking. We can neither become a continual dagger for England, as some desire, nor can we trust ourselves to a German-Russian alliance. I warn against the utopia of flirting with Russia. Once the Russians are in Berlin, the red flag will fly from the castle; and in Russia they will be satisfied with having bolshevized Europe to the Elbe and will allow the rest of Germany to be gobbled up by the French. On the other hand, we are perfectly ready to deal with the Russians on another basis in order to prevent selling ourselves to the west. * * * The most important task of Germany foreign policy is the liberation of German soil from any occupying force. We must get the stranglehold off our neck. On that account German policy will be one of finassieren (of finesse), and of avoiding the great decisions."

Out of this policy of finesse and the avoidance of the great decisions Germany was able to forge a new and more potent sword.

During the Weimar Republic, when the world—shortsighted then as it is today—hailed the advent of democracy in Germany, the Germans began their steady march along the new path outlined by Stresemann. The Germans bargained with the Russians and when the western powers became alarmed, they turned around and made deals with them. They posed as friends of the Bolsheviks against the plutocratic west and then promised to defend western civilization against the communist menace.

By keeping Europe in a turmoil and blinding her conquerors, Germany was able to mask her true designs. Thus the Germans succeeded in preventing the consolidation of the peace after Versailles. But this was only the beginning. The next step was to smash the solidarity of the western allies. They were out to disarm the victorious entente and succeeded by offering assurances of security to the victors.

In 1925, Stresemann said: "Our policy of offering the entente powers a security pact was undoubtedly correct * * * It broke up the entente."

Having split their opponents, the "democratic" Germans had reached a point where they could extract a maximum advantage for themselves and destroy all other security provisions of the Versailles Treaty. The sensational victories of the Stresemann plan paved the way for Hitler's Third Reich.

Hitler was a leading apostle of the Stresemann strategy. He never forgot the childish statement of Britain's Foreign Minister Austin Chamberlain to Stresemann, "Whenever we make a concession to you, instead of acknowledging it, you ask for more." Hitler had to deal with the half-brother of this British statesman, Sir Neville Chamberlain, who bent the knee each time the Fuehrer raised his voice.

The peoples of the west were told that a strong Reich would guarantee peace and stability in Europe and ward off the Communist threat. This was Hitler talking through the mouths of the western politicians. The peoples of the west were told that the Germans needed room and space; that German economic power was the sine qua non for a prosperous Europe. This, too, was Hitler talking through the voice of western statesmen and business leaders.

But as soon as these words were spoken and as soon as concessions were made, Hitler bellowed for more. And when the time came for the pay-off, Hitler turned around and made his pact with the Russians, while the western powers were trapped and blitzkrieged into submission.

This was to have been the grand climax of the Stresemann plan. But the horrors and devastations inflicted by the Germans, both east and west, unmasked for a moment the real intentions of the Germans. The lesson was clear. Only by joint military efforts could the Germans be defeated. The victims of the Stresemann plan were further taught that the future peace could only be preserved and maintained by thwarting the schemes of the Germans to evade their responsibilities for the war which they brought upon a trusting but deceived mankind. These lessons were embodied in numerous agreements made by the victorious Allied Powers. They solemnly pledged to one another that they would eliminate Germany's capacity to wage war, break up the German cartel network, rid the world of the war criminals, and force the Germans to compensate, at least in part, for their looting and spoliation.

To the common man who honestly believed that a new day was dawning, it was inconceivable that the ghost of Stresemann would so soon emerge from the ruins of World War II. Yet, as early as April 1945 the State Department made the following announcement which we, for reasons of space, can only quote in part:

"The Department of State announced today that reliable information collected by allied governments clearly indicates that the Nazi regime in Germany has developed well-

arranged postwar plans for the perpetuation of Nazi doctrines and domination. Some of these plans have already been put into operation and others are ready to be launched on a widespread scale immediately upon termination of hostilities in Europe.

"Nazi Party members, German industrialists, and the German military, realizing that victory can no longer be attained, are now developing postwar commercial projects, are endeavoring to renew and cement friendships in foreign commercial circles and are planning for renewals of prewar cartel agreements.

"An appeal to the courts of various countries will be made early in the postwar period through dummies for unlawful seizure of industrial plants and other properties taken over by Allied governments at the outbreak of war. In cases where this method fails, German repurchase will be attempted through cloaks who meet the necessary citizenship requirements.

"German technicians, cultural experts and undercover agents have well-laid plans to infiltrate foreign countries with the object of developing economic, cultural and political ties."

In connection with this announcement, Julius C. Holmes, who was then Assistant Secretary of State, revealed:

"In August of 1943, von Papen, the German Ambassador in Turkey—and he's the self-same von Papen who violated all the rules when we were neutral before we entered the first World War and whom we deported in 1915—von Papen told a close friend of his in 1943 that Germany could no longer hope to win the war, and that every possible move should be made to save German industry and military power for the future."

In disclosing these documents, the State Department admitted "Until these plans are checked, they will present a constant menace to postwar peace and security."

Look around—look at the state of the world today. Is it not clear that the ghost of Stresemann still stalks the earth? Is it not clear that our State Department and, for that matter, the foreign offices of Soviet Russia and England, have failed miserably in checking these plans?

Where is that much heralded Allied policy which announced to the world that Germany was through as a spawning ground of aggression? In truth, the policies which are now followed by Washington, Moscow, and London correspond to the German plans. They fit in so neatly with German strategy that one might be justified in saying that they were actually made in Germany.

The Germans knew that the only way they could obtain advantage and new power was by pursuing a conscious and well-thought-out program that would undermine the unity of their military opponents. Only in a climate of political and economic unrest, in an atmosphere of war fever, could the Germans begin to operate as they did after World War I.

The developments of the past 4 years since the defeat of the Germans militarily, show that this strategy is working and making alarming headway. They have been able to capitalize on and, yes, encourage the differences between Russia and the United States. They have graciously allotted part of their energy to making deals with the Russians but simultaneously they flatter and cultivate western sympathies. They encourage every move on the part of the Russians that could challenge the security of the west, but at the same time they egg on the western powers with assurances that only the Germans can be relied upon as a bulwark against Soviet Russia.

To these attractive guarantees the Germans have attached their price. They called for the destruction of denazification, and both Russia and the west raced for the honors to comply. They demanded a halt to the reparations program and again their opponents trampled over each other in order to meet the German diktat.

As matters stand, there seems to be no end to this disgraceful retreat from victory on the part of the west and east. The mad bid for the bloody hand of the former enemy continues. Illusion has become the soil out of which foreign policies grow. Thus the New York Times rushes in with a new plea to the Germans: "It should be clear to all informed Germans that the west is offering them a free and decent future." The informed Germans know exactly what they are gaining from the west, as they know what they are extracting from the Russians who have taken over the German slogans of unity. Both sides are dancing to the Pied Piper. Both sides are being drawn into the web which has been woven so artfully by the German spider. And as they become more enmeshed in this web, they prate about their success with the Germans.

We have no intention of oversimplifying the basic causes of enmity between Russia and the western powers today. But it is certainly no oversimplification to state that German hopes for the future are based on the continuation of this breach even if it means a new and more terrible war. If any such eventuality should arise, the Germans will be in the position where they can choose and make decisions and play their usual role of blackmail, deceit, and treachery.

The break-down of the Allied occupation with its dangers to world security no longer seems to be of account to those who make policy. These Allied officials have either been hypnotized or have become the willing mouthpieces of the renewed Stresemann plan. Each of the occupying powers visualize a rearmed Germany fighting by its side against the others. For only this can explain the deliberate sabotage of their agreed aims to eliminate Germany's capacity to wage war. This sabotage, however, is a double-edged sword and the Germans are carefully sharpening both ends. The Germans are experienced hands at creating tensions and turmoil. They know how to fan the flames of war which broaden the scope of their own operations.

The Herrenvolk carefully cultivate the illusion that a strong and powerful Germany will ever be grateful to the west. But the Germans show only one part of their face—for the other part looks toward the east. Thus, the rebuilding of German war power can really become a one-way ticket to disaster.

It is an illusion to say that the alternative is—whether the west or the east will dominate Germany. The Stresemann plan does not contemplate such a finale, nor do the schemes of the present German political leaders of all parties. On the contrary, the real question is how west and east can prevent their own subjugation to German designs. This is not fantastic as the State Department documentation demonstrates. It is the aim of the Germans today, whether they live in the eastern zone or the western zone. It is expressed privately and even publicly by their politicians, their military and their industrial war lords.

It is for this reason that of all the nations in Europe, it is precisely Germany which finds the danger of war to be her own salvation. Through blackmail to victory—that is the latest edition of the Stresemann plan.

This is the reality of today which is ignored by the occupying powers who thereby fail to discharge their great responsibility to mankind.

When will the statesmen wake up?

When will they throw off the hypnotic spell of German slogans?

When will they discard the influence of the German cartel partners and other special interests?

When will they get down to the serious task of unmasking the war plots of the former enemy and hammer out a peace of the victors?

If they will fail to act in time, war will also be "Made in Germany."

Catholic Schools Become a British Election Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville Courier-Journal of February 1, 1950:

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS BECOME A BRITISH ELECTION ISSUE

State support for sectarian schools is certain to become an issue in the British election. The Catholic Church is leading the fight to force candidates of all parties to state their views. The question now is not whether church schools shall receive state aid; they do receive it in fairly large amounts. What the church is attempting to force, and to enlist the aid of all denominational schools in forcing, is a pledge that the government will actually take over parochial schools, leaving the church the right to decide who will be employed as teachers, and, presumably, to conduct some sort of religious observance on school premises.

This goes, of course, far beyond anything American Catholics have asked of government. But in its beginning the British Catholic problem was not very different from the one now confronting Americans. The seeds of today's trouble in England lie in the methods proposed by the Education Act of 1924 to remedy the often marked disparity between parochial and State schools. The British law proposed to grant denominational schools sums of money designed to bring their buildings, curricular and general facilities up to a par with the State's schools. But the parishes and foundations themselves had to promise to meet minimum standards in order to become eligible for this aid.

The bill was eagerly welcomed when it was first passed by schools of all denominations. Since then, the gap between existing church schools, many of them old and entirely inadequate for modern educational methods, and the Government's minimum standards has become increasingly obvious. Scores of parochial schools, unable to meet the minimum, find themselves ineligible for aid and see their pupils attracted by the undeniably better facilities of State schools.

Efforts to force the Government to provide still larger sums for modernization of church schools have not succeeded. The Government cannot very well divert funds from its own huge schools program which is already far behind expectation. And neither major party is likely to welcome the proposal that scores of small, inadequate school buildings, many of them in locations already well served by State schools, be taken over as is, improved at tremendous cost, but left free to maintain their status as a unit of parish life, subject to clerical control.

The Catholic drive is not aimed wholly at the Labor Government. The Education Act was a creation of Winston Churchill's wartime coalition. It is an excellent law and

has had full support from the Socialist Party, but neither party is likely now to commit itself to a blanket expenditure which would make church schools everywhere a part of the state system in everything but control of educational policy. There may and probably will be some concession to present pleas, but it will by no means satisfy Catholic demands, or solve all future problems for the worried sponsors of church schools.

Republican Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, an editorial entitled, "A True Orthodoxy," which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, together with the preamble, the section entitled "Foreign Affairs," and the section entitled "Human Rights," from a policy statement framed by the New York Young Republican Club—Blueprint for a Better America, to which the editorial refers.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 2, 1950]

A TRUE ORTHODOXY

The widespread and growing realization that the Republican Party must reshape its program in the light of current problems has led many groups and individuals to try their hand at a blueprint. Few have gone about the task with more care and imaginative good sense than the Young Republican Club of New York. The Republican policy statement framed by this group is printed, unfortunately in a much abbreviated form, on another part of this page. It deserves a sympathetic reading in high quarters.

The Young Republicans are orthodox in the basic and original sense of that much-abused word. They do not follow blindly any particular leader, but they adhere to the undenying principles and ideals of their party. Thus on civil rights they are at the same time traditionalists and infinitely more progressive than the Democratic Party as a whole can afford to be. On social issues like old-age insurance, education, and health they show in new forms the concern for human values, and the adaptability to new needs, which their party has revealed in its best days. Yet they hold fast to an insistence that the individual must be kept free of centralized authority, oppressive debt, and paralyzing controls. They are convinced that the individual can be kept free and at the same time provided with safeguards against insecurity.

Not everyone will agree with all the details in this document; this newspaper could criticize it at several points. But we believe that the spirit in which it is drawn is the right spirit, and that it bodes well for the Republican Party.

PREAMBLE

The goal: At home—an opportunity society that offers each individual a maximum chance for achievement, well-being and security.

Abroad—a world at peace working out the common problems of mankind through effective international organization in a spirit of mutual trust and cooperation and with an increasing regard for the dignity of every man.

The promise: At home—increasing economic prosperity with a renewed faith in moral values. New energy sources, new products and new production techniques can greatly improve the material well-being of each citizen in our time. But the pursuit of material wealth must be accompanied by a renewal of spiritual and moral values on the part of the individual, the family and the Nation.

Abroad—a community of free nations living at peace. The free exchange of goods and ideas among nations affords the best hope for maintaining the peace and raising the standard of living in all countries.

The threat: At home—gradual surrender of individual freedom. In our country, the danger to our democratic way of life lies chiefly in our adopting schemes for attaining economic security which compel or result in the surrender of individual freedom.

Abroad—breakdown in international relations. Failure of the United States to develop a sound affirmative foreign policy to meet the threat of Soviet imperialism and the revival of fascism, and to assume its responsibilities of world leadership, may lead to a breakdown in international relations resulting in economic or military warfare between nations.

Our position: The present administration is neither realizing the promise nor warding off the threat. Instead, it is creating a hand-out state which slowly destroys individual initiative and enterprise, limits the right of the individual to make personal decisions, and compels a surrender of individual decision and action to a bureaucratic central government.

Our own position can be summed up in two main principles: "Individual freedom with security" at home and "international responsibility" abroad.

INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM WITH SECURITY

Individual freedom has always been the cornerstone of our Constitution, of liberal thought, and of Republican Party action. It includes civil liberties such as freedom of speech and freedom of religion. It means freedom to choose a home, a job, and a way of life. But it also means freedom for the individual to exercise his initiative, ability, and judgment, to develop his own personality, and to realize his dreams and aspirations. These aspects of individual freedom are being threatened by bigness and bureaucracy in Government.

Individual security is also one of our common aims. The complexity of our modern society requires that the individual be assisted when his economic security is imperiled by physical or economic disaster, such as unemployment, sickness, disability, old age, or death, over which he has no control and against which he is unable adequately to protect himself. The need is for an intelligent balance between the extremes of selfish individualism, on the one hand, and the irresponsible hand-out state, on the other. The socialist governments in Australia and New Zealand were ousted neither by a reactionary nor a radical movement but by parties which combined a belief in economic security with a recognition of the roles of individual initiative and efficient government.

The ultimate purpose of our society is to preserve the freedom of action of the individual. We should be especially watchful, therefore, that we do not confer upon our governmental institutions powers beyond those required to attain our common goals, for the ultimate and fatal curse of big government is the regimentation of the individual.

INTERNATIONAL RESPONSIBILITY

As a nation, we must never forget that this is one world. We must live up to our responsibility of active leadership in the world community. While we do not seek to impose our form of government on other countries, we must contribute to world-wide economic health and political security so that all peoples will have the opportunity to establish and maintain free governments of their own choosing.

Further, we recognize that the United States, as the leader of the democratic forces in the world, must do more than adopt a merely negative policy of containing totalitarian aggression. Our foreign policies must be directed toward rekindling the love for freedom in the hearts of all men throughout the world, and toward enlisting their enthusiastic support for the establishment of free governments everywhere. We believe that such a policy must be founded upon the active practice of democratic principles here at home. Only by practicing these principles can we demonstrate to the world that men who are free can best provide for their common material security, and that a free society is the only means for achieving moral advancement and spiritual freedom.

We approach the second half of the twentieth century with an abiding faith in the ability of our democratic system to meet and conquer each new problem as it arises. We are confident that our common goals and ideals can be achieved so long as we keep open the channels of free expression. In this spirit of optimism, we present, from the young Republican point of view, a blueprint for a better America.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

WORLD ORGANIZATION

Problem: If world war III becomes a reality, it could well mean the paralysis of freedom, if not the end of civilization. With the monstrous weapons of mass destruction man has developed—atomic and hydrogen bombs, rockets and biological warfare—wars can no longer be won by any nation. The present armament race consumes billions of dollars which might otherwise be devoted to education, medical facilities, housing and other basic human needs. Moreover, the cost of past wars and the burden of preparedness for future wars threatens to tax and regulate individual freedom and private enterprise out of existence.

Proposal: A fundamental objective of our foreign policy should be to support and strengthen the United Nations through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law. The United States should take the initiative in calling a convention, in accordance with the provisions of the UN Charter, for the purpose of making the UN the means to achieve this end. The abolition of the veto is a major element in such a program.

RUSSIA

Problem: The central problem in the field of foreign affairs is the relationship between Soviet and non-Soviet nations.

The foreign policy of Soviet Russia is primarily a reflection of its internal political structure. With the ruling Communist Party a minority in Russia itself, a dictatorship has been established in which all opposition and dissent have been effectively eliminated. The party leaders exploit the Marxist-Leninist concept that capitalism abroad is a menace to Russia, and use capitalist encirclement as justification for continuing to deprive the Russian people both of their freedom and of the material benefits which have been promised them.

Externally, claiming that it requires friendly nations on its borders, Russia has either annexed outright or, through fifth-column activity and the pressure of her armed forces, converted into puppet states the now-familiar list of formerly independent countries. China is the latest and most significant acquisition.

In 1947 a policy of "containment" of world Communist aggression was enunciated by the administration. While that policy has been adhered to in Europe, it has never been effectively applied in the Far East. A policy of containment can be effective only if we are steadfast in our determination that the area of freedom shall not be further reduced. Moreover, containment by means of United States efforts alone is not enough. If civilization is to be saved, a coordinated plan for the defense of all free nations must be devised.

Proposals: 1. The Atlantic Pact, in which the United States and 11 European countries are associated, should be supplemented by a "Pacific Pact," which all non-Communist Pacific nations may join for the purpose of mutual protection in case of aggression.

2. Economic aid, within the limits of our resources, must be extended to nations which demonstrate their willingness to resist Soviet aggression and to maintain basic freedoms, as well as their need for such aid.

3. The freedom of movement of Soviet diplomats and their large staffs in the United States represents a startling contrast to the prisoner-like status of the few American representatives in Russia and her satellites. Reciprocity should be required. Conditions under which Russian and American envoys carry out their missions should be equalized.

4. The forum provided by the United Nations should be used to full advantage by American spokesmen to reveal the differences between Soviet theory and practice. No charge should remain unanswered, no lie should pass unexposed. Only mobilized world opinion can convince the Soviet Union that its aggressive and subversive designs will not be permitted to succeed.

WESTERN EUROPE

Problem: The tremendous sums devoted to postwar European relief and recovery by American taxpayers indicate continuing interest in the protection of this area against Soviet expansion, and in a healthy European economy. But such a financial burden cannot be borne indefinitely. The best hope for a self-sustaining Europe lies in the elimination of trade and monetary barriers, the continuation of the reciprocal trade policy, and the development of new non-European markets.

A related European question is the political and economic—but not the military—rehabilitation of Germany, so that Germany can contribute to the stability and prosperity of western Europe.

Proposals: 1. Continuation of our commitments under the European recovery program, with a view to termination by 1952.

2. Encouragement of a western European union.

3. Admission of western Germany into the European community and gradually greater delegation of responsibility to the west German government, but with continued Allied control over German foreign relations and military affairs.

4. The German economy should be dovetailed as far as possible into that of western Europe, to promote interdependence.

5. Maintenance of Allied military occupation of Germany as long as the East-West division continues.

THE FAR EAST

Problem: The recent loss of China to the Communists requires reexamination of our entire far-eastern policy.

In Europe our program of helping war-devastated countries to help themselves, and of aiding legally constituted governments in their resistance to Soviet-directed revolts has met with partial success. Not so in Asia.

Indecision on our part, the withholding of aid at a critical period, and secret concessions to Soviet imperialism made by the administration at Yalta have all contributed to the Communist victories.

What happened to China must not happen to other nations of the Far East.

Proposals: 1. Recognition should be withheld from the Chinese Communist Government as long as that Government remains an instrument of Soviet policy.

2. The Japanese economy should be utilized in raising the standard of living of non-Communist Asia.

3. Technical and economic assistance to aid agricultural and industrial development in non-Communist Asia should be offered. Where local conditions are favorable, American private investment should be encouraged. Above all, we must demonstrate to the newly independent Asiatic nations that in offering help and advice we respect their right to control the development of their own resources.

4. A "Pacific Pact" (see discussion on Russia) should be concluded as part of a coordinated plan for the mutual protection of all free nations.

BIPARTISANSHIP

Problem: A bipartisan foreign policy can help the United States to fulfill its responsibilities for world leadership. However, it is essential that the principle of bipartisanship be thoroughly understood. Bipartisanship should not be used as a means of cutting off free and open debate. The basic concept of bipartisanship is that foreign policy will be formulated by joint consultation and that neither party will seek partisan advantage therefrom. This principle has not been accepted by the administration in good faith.

Proposal: The initiative in establishing true bipartisanship lies with the President and the Secretary of State—not with the Republicans in Congress. The disastrous failure of American foreign policy in those areas where Republican advice was not sought requires that the administration demonstrate its intention either to seek full bipartisan assistance and to consult in advance with Republican leaders, or to abandon the pretense of favoring a bipartisan policy.

HUMAN RIGHTS

Problem: Discrimination because of race, color, or religion condemns a large segment of our population to limited opportunity for useful employment, to substandard housing, to inadequate educational institutions, to denial of full voting rights, and at times to outbursts of violence. Moreover, when the entire world looks to the United States for encouragement and leadership in the constant battle of ideas between the forces of freedom and slavery, it is more important than ever that we practice the principles that we preach.

The Republican Party was formed and first brought to power on its opposition to the spread of Negro slavery. The thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth amendments and eight of the nine civil-rights statutes enacted by Congress were passed during Republican administrations. In contrast to the inherent division within the Democratic Party, the Republican Party has no large and solid bloc of votes which consistently opposes any civil-rights legislation. The Republican Party can meet one of the great challenges of our times by acting in adherence to its own traditional principles and the principles of the Constitution.

Proposals: We believe that voluntary recognition and acceptance of the principle of equal opportunity for all men regardless of race, color, or creed offers the most desirable and permanent solution to the human-rights question. The efforts of social and religious groups directed to this end are therefore to be commended and encouraged. However, in view of the plight of our minority groups and our responsibility for world leadership in preserving the rights of man, we recognize that more immediate action to eliminate the evils of discrimination is required. We therefore propose the following:

1. A Federal fair employment practice act should be enacted which will declare that the opportunity for employment without discrimination because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry is a civil right of all the people of the United States. A Federal commission should be set up to carry out the policies and provisions of this act, and this commission should be given power to use effective sanctions against any offenders.

2. The Taft-Hartley Act should be amended to prohibit the National Labor Relations Board from certifying as bargaining representative any labor organization which denies full membership rights and privileges to, or which segregates or otherwise discriminates against, any employee because of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

3. Segregation or any other form of discrimination on the basis of race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry in any of the armed forces of the United States should be prohibited.

4. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit segregation and other forms of discrimination in public places and on public conveyances in the District of Columbia.

5. The Interstate Commerce Act should be amended to prohibit segregation of passengers on interstate carriers because of their race, religion, color, national origin, or ancestry.

6. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit the payment of a poll tax as a prerequisite to voting in any Federal election.

7. A Federal antilynching law should be enacted to provide for criminal penalties and also to authorize civil suits in the Federal courts by lynch victims against individual offenders.

8. The displaced-persons law should be amended to eliminate occupational, religious, and nationality discriminations.

9. Legislation should be enacted to prohibit discrimination on account of race, creed, or color in the expenditure of Federal funds for housing, health, or education.

10. A permanent congressional committee on civil rights should be established to study and recommend further ways of promoting individual civil rights in the United States.

11. The Senate cloture rule should be amended so that two-thirds of the Senators voting can invoke cloture on any measure or motion to take up a measure, including a motion to change the Senate rules. If it is necessary to face a filibuster in order to bring this proposed amendment to a vote, we recommend that the Senate remain in session until such vote be taken.

Coddling of Communist Agents

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHAN GURNEY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in

the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Coddling Communist Agents," published in the Washington (Ind.) Herald of January 30, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CODDLING COMMUNIST AGENTS

The revelations of the Hiss trial and the revealed actions of Government officials, before, during, and since the trial serve to spotlight a situation which has received little, if any, publicity.

At the time President Roosevelt agreed to recognize the Communist regime in Russia in 1933, one of the conditions was that Russia would cease and desist from any efforts to spread its propaganda and extend its system to the United States.

It is a fact well known that Russia has paid no attention to that stipulation. It is a fact well known that the Russian propaganda machine has worked at top speed in the United States and that Communist agents have been working at top speed to build up the Communist organization in the United States.

All that has been going on for years but this is the first time that such facts have been brought out in a formal trial and made a matter of Federal court record.

Now that the facts are established as a matter of court record, what does the administration propose to do? Will it ignore the facts and go ahead playing footie-under-the-table with Communist Russia? Or will it bring the situation forcibly to the attention of the Russian Government and demand the immediate withdrawal of the Communist agents (the FBI knows who they are) and sever diplomatic relations with Russia if they do not do it?

To go ahead as we are only makes us a laughing stock for those Russian officials who know of the 1933 agreement and how it has been completely ignored.

The Alger Hiss Conviction

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Liar and a Spy," which appeared on Monday, January 23, 1950, in the Journal-Every Evening, Wilmington, Del.

I agree completely with the editor that the country owes a deep debt of gratitude to Representative NIXON and other members of the Committee on Un-American Activities for their persistence in uncovering this situation.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LIAR AND A SPY

Unless the verdict is reversed on appeal, Alger Hiss will stand before his fellow citizens as a liar, a spy, and as one who was willing to hand over his country's secrets to the agents of a foreign power. For a man like that, whatever his gifts in other directions, Americans may have pity but not the slightest sympathy. He was the enemy of all of us.

And this is what President Truman called "a red herring," an effort by the Republicans to draw attention away from their own shortcomings in the days when they had control of Congress. It is now plain that the only red herring in the case was the one which was dragged across the trail by Mr. Truman himself and which, if Representative NIXON is to be believed, is involved in the furious campaign which was waged by high-ranking officials of the administration to keep the affair from ever seeing the light of day.

As a result of this verdict there should be on the part of many Americans a new attitude toward the Committee on Un-American Activities. It will now be an indifferent citizen who will dare to say that this committee is not needed or that it should be shorn of its authority.

Sordid as the whole story may be, there is one cause for pride. Mr. Hiss had as fair a trial as it was possible for any man to receive and there were times when the court actually leaned over backward in its consideration of the interests of the defense. And whatever happens, Mr. Hiss will still be alive. He can thank his lucky stars that it was America and not the Soviet which he sought to betray.

Why Not an Anti-Cominform?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, all over the world, and significantly inside Russia and in her satellites, there is widespread unorganized opposition to the Cominform. The problem is to unite behind one banner this deep-seated antagonism. A resident of my State, Siegfried Wagener, writing in the January 1950 edition of Plain Talk, has come up with a provocative suggestion. At least he has a plan which should challenge the thinking of every anti-Communist in the world. I ask unanimous consent to insert his article on Why Not an Anti-Cominform? in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY NOT AN ANTI-COMINFORM?

(By Siegfried Wagener)

In the heartland of the Cominform Tito is visible evidence of what is going on in the minds of millions of outwardly loyal subjects of the Kremlin. In the Russian zone in Germany morale is so low that soldiers not on duty are confined behind barbed wire, and 20 minutes' absence without leave is treated as desertion. How can we exploit this state of affairs to win tactical advantage in the cold war?

The best defense being attack, why not strike now by organizing an Anti-Cominform and watering the seeds of democratic rebellion which are germinating behind the iron curtain? Why not advance at the hostile Cominform with its own weapons on its home ground?

Military defense measures are costing us $15,000,000,000 annually in direct expenditures, not counting the billions for ECA, aid to the North Atlantic Pact nations, private relief work, etc. This drain on our national resources is so heavy that the Kremlin and many Americans are, for once, unanimous in considering it only a matter of time before we shall be exhausted.

An Anti-Cominform, on the other hand, would cost us little. One hundred million dollars for a starter would carry it a long way. Even if its maintenance would cost us annually several times that much it would be comparable only to a minor item in the military budget. Should it succeed, it would have prevented the nation from bleeding itself white before the first A-bomb was dropped.

The Anti-Cominform would not rely on educational propaganda of the type of the Voice of America, nor on economic and military aid to countries threatened by communism. It would supplement these measures by forming revolutionary action committees staffed by the rank and file of refugees from the iron-curtain countries. Modeled somewhat along the lines of its Russian counterpart, it would set up these revolutionaries, give them the means to proselytize the Russian and vassal peoples by radio, pamphlet, direct underground contact, and furnish the arms they will ultimately need. It would pursue its objective on all fronts in Asia and Europe, wherever the spark of rebellion can be fanned into overthrowing Soviet tyranny.

Uncounted DP's, refugees and deserters would rally, including many old hands experienced in the business of revolution; the Anti-Cominform would give these people, for the first time since their exodus from home, a hard-fisted cause to live, fight, and if need be, die for. There are so many of them that great care must be taken in screening them, weeding out Cominform infiltrators, unreliables, and adherents of fascism and reaction.

The Anti-Cominform would work under strictly American control and direction. We have men like Col. Heber Blankenhorn, who helped foment the German revolution of 1918 and who was prevented from repeating the performance in 1944; Maj. Gen. William J. Donovan, of the erstwhile Office of Strategic Services; his associate, Allen Welsh Dulles, who kept his finger on the pulse of the abortive anti-Hitler rebellion in 1944; and a number of others in whose judgment of, and sympathy with, revolution as a means of democratic survival we can trust.

The American conspirators could work right out in the open as there is no ethical or practical need to keep the Anti-Cominform under cover. Nor would there be any sense in hiding the fact that it is, as the case may be, either an agency of the United States Government or a private organization with Government approval. The Cominform against which it operates is a direct part of the Soviet Government and the Red Army, overtly aiming at the overthrow of self-government in the United States.

Hence, if the Anti-Cominform constitutes an unfriendly act in our relations, with the U. S. S. R., let Cominform propaganda make the most of it. Every single mention the Kremlin would make of our organization would be a boost for millions of silently suffering, praying, hopeful Russians. They who have been so often and so excruciatingly disappointed by their own and outside governments would at last feel reassured if they knew that the Anti-Cominform agent who contacts them is backed by the United States.

What are the chances for success?

First of all, we could not lose, no matter what the future holds in store. If war came our psycho-political warfare would be organized down to the last detail if it had not already succeeded in laying the groundwork for internal Russian combustion. Conversely, should the Kremlin mend its ways and meet us on sensible terms, we would recall our Anti-Cominform simultaneously with Russia's dissolution of the Cominform;

among realists there need be no hard feelings, although the very existence of the Anti-Cominform might have assisted in bringing this desirable turn of events.

However, neither of these possibilities being immediately feasible, we are faced with long protraction of the present stalemate whose peaceful termination the Anti-Cominform is seeking. For this the prospects are substantially brighter than is generally conceded.

Nobody knows how many millions of Russian dissenters rot in slave-labor camps and prisons, or are liquidated. Estimates range all the way up to 1 out of every 10 Russians. Western Europe harbors millions of displaced persons with more coming every day. And how many thousands of Red Army deserters are quietly cared for by American-British forces is a military secret.

This indicates a far better precondition to revolution than existed in Nazi Germany where we had a good chance and threw it away—a catastrophical mistake which we cannot afford to repeat.

The evidence is now in and well documented that German labor and underground leaders were right when they assured me in London that Germany was ripe for revolution during World War II. They pleaded for American help. Mainly due to our politically unwise unconditional-surrender policy this was refused. Thus we probably missed shortening the war by many months, sparing ourselves long-term occupation and reeducation of Germany, and we missed the chance to keep Russia out of central Europe.

By now it should be clear to all that we have already crossed the Rubicon. For the Anti-Cominform would only invigorate and bring to climactic effect existing agencies and organizations working in precisely the same direction.

At present these movements and efforts are extremely minor, widely scattered, and uncoordinated. At best, they affect only pinpricks in Moscow but, uncontrolled as they are, they could also cause the kind of irritation which in a tense situation might lead to a premature incident.

The Anti-Cominform would give them unity of purpose, discipline, wherewithal, and efficiency. Moreover, it would be controlled. Behind its task force of freedom-loving legions would stand in solid ranks the anti-Communists of this country and the world—churches, industry, labor, the arts and sciences, the professions, and last but foremost, the Government of the United States.

"Help From America"—in the form of Wilson's Fourteen Points—was the magic slogan of the German revolutionaries of 1918, of whom I was one. It could have been the key to Germany in 1944. We can start a subterranean rumbling throughout Russia and shake her rulers either to their senses or have them overthrown by her own oppressed masses. In this role America would emerge as the true champion of freedom in the world.

Wards of the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an address entitled "Wards of the Government" delivered by Dean Russell at the convention on individual liberty held at Billings, Mont., on January 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WARDS OF THE GOVERNMENT

(By Dean Russell)

(This is the text of a speech delivered before the convention on individual liberty at Billings, Mont., January 20, 1950. The convention was sponsored by the Montana Chamber of Commerce. Dean Russell is a member of the foundation staff.)

The constitutions of former American slave States generally specified that the masters must provide their slaves with adequate housing, food, medical care, and old-age benefits. The Mississippi Constitution contained this additional sentence:

"The legislature shall have no power to pass laws for the emancipation of slaves * * * [except] where the slave shall have rendered the State some distinguished service."

The highest honor that Mississippi could offer a man for distinguished service to his country was personal responsibility for his own welfare. His reward was freedom to find his own job and to have his own earnings, freedom to be responsible for his own housing, freedom to arrange for his own medical care, freedom to save for his own old age. In short, his reward was the individual opportunities—and the personal responsibilities—that have always distinguished a free man from a dependent.

What higher honor can any government offer?

THE RIGHTS OF A SLAVE

But many present-day Americans are trying to avoid this personal responsibility that is freedom. They are voting for men who promise to install a system of compulsory, Government-guaranteed security—a partial return to the old slave laws of Georgia that guaranteed to all slaves "the right to food and raiment, to kind attention when sick, to maintenance in old age." And the arguments used to defend this present-day trend toward the bondage of a welfare state are essentially the same arguments that were formerly used to defend the bondage of outright slavery.

For example, many of the slaveholders claimed that they knew what was "best for the slaves." After all, hadn't the masters "rescued" the slaves from a life of savagery? The advocates of Government-guaranteed security also claim that they know what is best for the people. Many of them argue in this fashion: "After all, haven't the American people conclusively shown that they are incapable of handling the responsibility for their own welfare?"

Many of the slaveholders sincerely believed that the dumb, ignorant slaves would starve to death unless their welfare was guaranteed by the masters. And the advocates of compulsory security frequently say: "Are you in favor of letting people starve?"

MOST PRECIOUS OF ALL

But as proof of the fact that personal responsibility for one's own welfare brings increased material well-being, consider the emancipated slaves. Among them, there were old and crippled and sick people. They had no homes, no jobs, and little education. But—most precious of all—the former slaves were responsible for their own welfare. They were free. They had the privilege of finding their own security.

Now compare the remarkable progress of those former slaves to the lack of progress of the American Indians who were made wards of the Government; who were given State-guaranteed "security" instead of freedom with responsibility. In 1862, most American Negroes were slaves. Today they are about as self-supporting and responsible as other American citizens. Meanwhile, the Indians as a group have become less self-supporting and more dependent on Government aid. It has been claimed that many thousands of Indians will actually die of starvation unless the Government feeds them. If this is true, why is it so?

CARETAKERS

There seems to be no scientific basis for calling the Indians an innately inferior race. As has been proved by the success of many individual Indians, they have just as much capacity for understanding and advancement as the Negroes and the so-called Nordics. But today there are more than 12,000 Federal employees directly taking care of the 233,000 reservation Indians who are still classified as wards of the Government. The number of Government caretakers for the Indians has been steadily increasing over the years. As a result, the reservation Indian is becoming less self-sufficient and more dependent upon what he calls "the Great White Father in Washington."

Instead of freedom, the Indian has Government-guaranteed security. Instead of individual responsibility, he has a Government bureau to handle his personal affairs. There are special laws governing his right to own land and to spend tribal money. Under that system of bondage it should surprise no one to find that many thousands of Indians have remained uneducated, hungry, diseased, and mismanaged.

THE ONLY SOLUTION

The only lasting solution is for the Indians themselves to handle their own affairs on the basis of individual freedom and personal responsibility. If this is not true, then the blessings of freedom would appear to be fanciful myths. But for some queer reason, we Americans seem to believe that just because our pioneer fathers once subjugated the Indians, we in turn are obligated to keep them in the bondage of Government security. As a result, the Indian has the status of a ward instead of a citizen. Instead of being a responsible person, he is a dependent.

And in a like manner, if we free Americans continue to turn to Government for our security, we, too, will surely become dependent wards instead of responsible citizens. There will be a commissioner to control our personal affairs and our individual responsibilities. Instead of calico and blankets, we may be promised a hundred dollars every month. But since the principle is the same in both cases, the results will also eventually be the same.

A RETURN TO BONDAGE

The advocates of this compulsory security honestly seem to believe that most Americans—including the Indians—are too ignorant, or lazy, or worthless to be trusted with their own destiny; that they will literally starve in the streets unless their welfare is guaranteed by a benevolent Government. However good their intentions may be, these disciples of a relief state are demanding that they be given the power to force mankind to follow their plans. In the name of liberty they advocate bondage.

This is true because the persons who receive support from the state are thereby led to expect—and then to demand—more support from the state. They become dependents. Thus they enter into a form of bondage. They lose their individual freedom of choice to whatever extent the state assumes responsibility for their personal welfare. In time, as is now the case in the welfare state of Russia, the people become completely subservient to the state. In effect, they become slaves of the benevolent government that has promised to solve all of their personal problems for them.

Admittedly, this is not the intent of the planners. Apparently, most of the advocates of government paternalism really believe

that they are able to know and to do what is best for all of the people. Most of them may honestly desire to help the people. But their efforts always result in some form of bondage. For example, the leaders of the Labor government of Britain probably never even dreamed of bringing compulsory labor to its supporters. Yet that is what they did. In England today the democratically elected leaders can—and do—force persons to work where the Government decrees they are most needed. And if the person objects to his Government's decision, force is used to make him conform.

THE ROAD TO HELL

In Russia we find another example of the fact that good intentions are no guarantee of freedom. For instance, in the beginning Lenin and Stalin probably had no desire whatever to bring slavery to Russia. Their announced plan was to free the Russian people from the slavery of an all-powerful government. But look what happened.

We Americans of today are following this same path toward the bondage of a welfare or slave state. Just as the law once guaranteed adequate medical care for American slaves, so a law to guarantee adequate medical care for all Americans is being demanded today. And who will determine what is adequate medical care for a person? Not the person, but the Government official who has the authority.

And jobs? Of course the Government can guarantee every man a job—just as every slave was guaranteed a job; just as every Russian is guaranteed a job. But it is impossible, of course, for the Government to guarantee everyone a job of his own choosing. Some persons must be guaranteed the scavenger jobs. They may not like it, but dependents have little choice.

THE ONLY HOPE

It is true that many citizens in this country are old and crippled and sick and homeless. Possibly some of them are jobless through no fault of their own. The same conditions existed during our Revolutionary War. But our ancestors knew that their only hope for permanent security lay in their own individual efforts. They knew that the main purpose of Government should be to protect whatever security the people were able to attain individually or in voluntary cooperation. They knew that electing or appointing a man to public office cannot endow him with wisdom; it can endow him only with power. Thus they took no chances on this power of government being used to encroach upon their individual liberties and their personal responsibilities. In advance, they put positive restrictions on all office-holders. And as a final guarantee of freedom, they specified that any powers not expressly given to the Federal officials were to remain with the individual citizens and their local governments.

THE USE OF FORCE

The American Constitution naturally did not list virtues—such as compassion, charity, and respect for one's fellow man—as functions of government. The statesmen who founded our Government knew that all virtues are purely personal and voluntary. It is utter nonsense to imagine that a person can be forced to be good. Government can and should use force to punish a person who commits a crime. But this same force cannot be used to create kindness and compassion within the mind and heart of any person.

Thus the authors of our Constitution left compassion and charity—aid to the unfortunate—on a strictly voluntary basis. They designed a form of government based on individual freedom, personal responsibility, and equality before the law for all citizens. Wisely, they made no attempt whatever to separate freedom of choice from the resulting reward or punishment, success or failure. Since they recognized the absurdity of passing laws to protect a person from himself, they left all citizens free to make their own decisions concerning their own personal welfare. From all viewpoints, including that of material security for the so-called common man, those decisions concerning the proper functions of government proved to be the most effective that the world has ever known in this field.

BREAD AND CIRCUS

If this state-guaranteed security idea were new, it might help explain why so many people insist on trying it. But it is not new. It was written into the Code of Hammurabi over 4,000 years ago. In one form or another, it has been tried time and again throughout history—always with the same result. In the Roman Empire it was called "bread and circus." More recently, Karl Marx called it socialism. He believed that the state should take "from each according to his abilities" and give "to each according to his needs."

Marx said that it was the duty of government to provide all people with adequate housing, medical care, jobs, and social security. Word for word, the advocates of government security in this country are saying the same thing today.

And just as the Russians are enslaved to a welfare state, so this country is being carried into bondage by accepting the same false principle. Just as force is used in Russia to make the people conform to the security laws designed "for their own good," so we also are now forced to submit to American security laws designed "for our own good." And just as the Russian state punishes any objector, so the American state will now imprison us if we refuse to conform.

ENEMY OF THE STATE

If you doubt that compulsory socialism has gone to that extreme in this country, just test it, for instance, by refusing to pay the social-security tax that is taken from your salary. The Government will do the same thing to you that it did to the owner of a small battery shop in Pennsylvania who balked at the idea of compulsory social security. First, the state confiscated his property. Still he refused to obey. Then the state preferred criminal charges against him. And in January of 1943, the Government gave him the choice of conforming or going to prison as a criminal—an enemy of the state because he refused to pay social security. He paid. And his 6-month prison sentence was suspended.

Next may come total Government housing—for our own good, of course. Then the state will assign us so many square feet of adequate living space. This is true because, under complete state ownership of housing, there is no other way that Government can do. We may ask for more space, a different location, better service, or a choice of neighbors. But we already know the Government's answer. Even today, a person has no real choice when he lives in Government housing.

Next may come full employment with Government-guaranteed jobs for everyone. A person will say: "I don't want this job." And as happened under England's program of Government-guaranteed full employment, the American welfare state will also answer: "We will put you in jail as a criminal unless you work at your assigned task."

Along about then, the advocates of Government-guaranteed security may begin to understand the inevitable result of their ideas. They may realize that it is power that makes a dictator, and not what he's called or how he's elected. When that fact has become obvious to everyone, the advocates of compulsory security will then exclaim: "But we didn't mean this!" It will be too late to turn back at that point. Just as the night follows the day, so Government aid to the individual is followed by Government control of the individual, which necessarily means Government force against the individual.

NO EASY WAY

Fortunately, it is not yet too late for America to turn away from the evil that is a welfare state; a slave state. But, unfortunately, there is no simple or easy way to do it. Both major political parties—along with the smaller ones—seem to be trying to outbid each other by promising more Government housing, more social security, more "free" medical care, more Government "welfare" projects, and more special privileges to various groups and interests.

Most of our movies, magazines, newspapers, and radio programs generally endorse—directly or indirectly—the idea of some form of Government-guaranteed security. Even the few objections seem to be aimed mostly at poor administration instead of a recognition that the theory is wrong in principle.

And, whether we like it or not, many of the instructors in our schools and colleges are teaching the desirability of the relief state, the planned economy, and Government ownership in general.

GOLDEN RULE REJECTED

Finally, even some of our church leaders are teaching that the force of government should be used to make people charitable and good. Some of these Christian leaders seem to have forgotten that the principles of the Good Samaritan and each individual doing unto others as he would have others do unto him are voluntary principles. In many cases these principles have now been discarded for this evil slogan: "It is the duty of government to care for the sick, to feed the hungry, to aid the unfortunate, and to build houses for those who need them." Probably one of the main reasons for the declining influence of the church is that the church is defaulting on many of its own responsibilities by turning them over to government. Many of our church leaders are rendering unto Caesar that which does not belong to Caesar.

But the politicians, periodicals, schools, and churches generally reflect the opinions of the persons who support them. Thus the final decision rests on the attitude of each individual American. If enough of us accept the degrading idea of a welfare state—a relief state, a slave state—the process will soon be completed. But if enough individual Americans desire a return to the personal responsibility that is freedom, we can have that too.

THE CHOICE IS OURS

Before choosing, however, consider this: When one chooses freedom—that is, personal responsibility—he should understand that his decision will not meet with popular approval. It is almost certain that he will be called vile names when he tries to explain that compulsory Government security—jobs, medicine, housing, and all the rest—is bad in principle and in its total effect; it saps character and strength by encouraging greed and weakness; it destroys the individual's God-given responsibility for self-help, respect, compassion, and charity: in some degree, it automatically turns all who accept it into wards of the Government; it will eventually turn a proud and responsible people into cringing dependence upon the whims of an all-powerful state; it is the primrose path to serfdom.

No, the choice is not an easy one. But, then, the choice of freedom never has been easy. It never will be easy. Since this capacity for personal responsibility—freedom—is God's most precious gift to mankind, it requires the highest form of understanding and courage.

The Global Challenge to the GOP

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Global Challenge to the GOP," written by the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE] and published in the United Nations World magazine for February 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE GLOBAL CHALLENGE TO THE GOP

(By WAYNE MORSE, United States Senator from Oregon)

(In this hour of decision when the battle for Asia moves toward a climax, a far-sighted Republican statesman warns that for the United States to give up its bipartisan foreign policy is to play politics with peace.)

Is the Republican Party about to abandon the principle of a bipartisan foreign policy, a policy which Senator VANDENBERG—one of its chief architects—has rightly described as "our best available insurance for peace"? I don't believe it. For this would mean that the United States is on the verge of another postwar era of perilous nationalism.

It would mean that the forces which would have America embark on a course of imperialism, which is the partner of isolationism, have staged a comeback. It would mean a return of dollar diplomacy. It would mean that certain harsh preconditions would be imposed on countries now receiving Marshall-plan aid on the ground that they must conduct their domestic affairs in a way that meets our entire approval—or else. Fortunately, at the Philadelphia convention in 1948, the Republican Party firmly backed the bipartisan precept. Its platform officially pledged the party to continue that kind of policy. In its plank No. 5, written in anticipation of a Republican victory, the GOP declared that the minority party (i. e., the to-be-defeated Democrats) would be invited to join "in stopping partisan politics at the water's edge." That kind of plank is still the core of official foreign policy for the Republican Party. Those within the party who deride the bipartisan program perhaps need to be reminded that to differ over the practices of a united American position in international affairs does not in any way justify the scuttling of the bipartisan principle. On the contrary. the shortcomings which have developed merely dramatize the urgent need to perfect the mechanics of cooperation. Surely the reasons for a bipartisan foreign policy are plain enough. What we Americans want is to achieve and maintain international peace and security in a world of free men and of free nations. We want a world where human rights are not merely an exercise in verbal piety, but a living embodiment of human dignity and individual opportunity. To fulfill our obligations as a leader among free nations, we must have a foreign policy clear in its aims and consistent in execution.

National security itself demands that our foreign commitments can weather changes in the political direction of our Government. Any Member of the Congress who searches his heart must agree that a strong effective and dynamic American policy in foreign affairs is to be preferred to a strictly Democratic policy or Republican policy—even in the heat of an election year.

What, then, are the indispensable ingredients for a workable bipartisan foreign policy? They would seem to be obvious enough and yet they need to be restated in view of the charge that to support bipartisanship signifies "me tooism" and GOP addiction to the dubious virtues of the rubber stamp.

First of all, Republicans and Democrats must agree that bipartisanship means that "both parties are committed to working together" for world peace. In the second place, the responsible party leaders must achieve and display both mutual tolerance and common readiness to strive together in the common cause. They have to agree that all pertinent information will be shared and that ample time be spent in advance consultation and scrutiny of every issue.

During the past decade, very earnest efforts have been made to attain a functional interparty cooperation in coping with foreign affairs. Soon after Hitler attacked Poland, the late President Roosevelt invited key figures of both parties to the White House for some extremely candid discussion. And the next day he told the joint session of Congress that "these perilous days demand cooperation between us without a trace of partisanship." There have been many heartening examples of constructive and fruitful interparty teamwork as exemplified by lend-lease, the establishment of the UN conference and the drafting of its Charter, the Marshall plan and the Atlantic Pact. Despite the strains and tempers which accompanied three national election campaigns, bipartisanship has survived. Sometimes its workings have been very far from perfect. But its imperfections hardly warrant the palpitant yearnings to go back to an isolationist past that can never be recaptured. Our only sane and sensible course is to summon forth our most creative and constructive efforts to tool up the machinery of bipartisanship and make it run more smoothly than ever before. Only thus can America really present a united front whether to eager foes, reluctant friends, or enthusiastic co-opters.

Perhaps today's heaviest obligation for both Republican and Democratic Parties is to foster and further a bipartisan foreign policy and to carry it out in a spirit of good faith. By this means the long-range stake of the American people in winning the peace will be placed above and beyond any short-range partisan advantage. The leaders of neither party can justify playing politics with peace.

A genuine bipartisan foreign policy contains within it the obligation upon the party in the White House—whether Democratic or Republican—to consult in advance with the leaders of the minority party before entering into any international understanding which would commit the United States to a definite course of action. Nobody can be permitted to forget that it is a two-way street between the White House and Capitol.

It is true, of course, that under our Constitution, the primary responsibility for formulating foreign policy rests with the President of the United States. But it is equally true that whenever foreign policy questions generate friction between the White House and the Congress our country is greatly embarrassed in its overseas concerns. This is particularly important whenever the President makes an international pledge or agreement which later may require implementation by the Congress. Much of the confusion which now surrounds American foreign policy at the moment derives from the regrettable fact that in recent years Presidents and Secretaries of State too often have entered into understandings with the heads of foreign governments without prior consultation with Democratic and Republican leaders in the Congress. The latter indeed were kept in ignorance until discord and misunderstandings of potentially serious propositions had developed.

It is not too wise to discard entirely the use of hindsight when charting a course for future action. The defects of our bipartisan foreign policy as they have been revealed over recent years can be appraised in calmer perspective by a realistic analysis of some of the errors which have resulted from this very failure of Presidents and Secretaries of State to take into their confidence and to consult with congressional leaders from both parties. For it is upon these men that the administration must in the last analysis lean heavily to gain and to preserve congressional support for any international commitment. The Cairo understanding, the Yalta agreements, the Potsdam pledges, the administration's improvisations in China during and particularly since the war, all exemplify flaws and faults in applying the spirit of a bipartisan foreign policy. Nobody can for a moment think that the entente reached by the President with representatives of foreign powers at Cairo and Yalta would have been acceptable, even at the time they were made, to the bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee.

The Cairo and Yalta decisions involve not only the prosecution of the war but also the building of the peace. Historians will undoubtedly record that these international conferences of the Roosevelt administration represented, in a very real sense, an attempt to write peace treaties on the installment plan. It is difficult to answer the charge put forth by many Republican spokesmen, that in these conferences the treaty-making clause of the Constitution was circumvented by the President of the United States. In any case the conduct of the executive branch was not consonant with the essential aim and purposes of a bipartisan foreign policy. Even the Potsdam agreement cannot escape its need of criticism on this score.

If bipartisan leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee had been given an opportunity to present the Potsdam proposal to their committee, they would have raised some pertinent and pointed questions about America's prerogatives in Berlin. Certainly the failure of the agreement to clarify America's ability to enter and leave a city in which she was to have joint occupational rights and obligations with Russia would have been avoided.

The administration's handling of our policy in China, particularly since the war, cannot be fitted into a traffic design of two-way coordination and communication between the White House and the Congress. For many months the State Department failed to discuss with the bipartisan leaders of the Senate's Foreign Relations Committee its plans for China, if any. Warning signals of dissension and criticism were raised in debate in the Senate many times during this period. On one occasion during the Eightieth Congress, the Republican chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee—and the man who is perhaps more responsible than any other living American for a willing acceptance on the part of Republicans, and for that matter Americans generally, of the need for national unity in support of a bipartisan foreign policy—admitted under questioning on the floor of the Senate that the State Department had not consulted with the Foreign Relations Committee for many months on any phase of the China problem. He declared in the course of that debate, that the contents of the Wedemeyer report had not been made known to the bipartisan leaders of the Foreign Relations Committee.

At that time, which was the fall of 1947, a series of cracks and fissures developed in

the seams of America's bipartisan foreign policy. It should have been cemented very quickly by a mutual exchange of points of view and information between the State Department and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. Instead, the misunderstandings and criticisms in respect to American policy in China became greater throughout 1947, 1948, and 1949. True, the predominant tendency in the Congress was to favor any administration proposal offered in the name of a bipartisan policy. Nevertheless, those of us in the Senate who strongly supported the idea of maintaining a bipartisan foreign policy were both grieved and handicapped on many occasions when the State Department neglected to inform the bipartisan leaders of the Congress about what America intended to do in Asia.

A great deal of the dissension which marked debates over the European recovery program, both in 1948 and 1949, was rooted in the dissatisfaction of some Senators with the administration's lone-hand action in Asia. In the closing weeks of the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, Senators who were battled and displeased with the administration's seeming unwillingness to make clear its position on China, gained considerable support not only in the upper Chamber but also from public opinion.

THE CHINA INCIDENT

When the second session of the Eighty-first Congress convened on January 3, it was from the outset obvious that the administration would be confronted with a serious attack upon some aspects of its foreign policy, particularly those relating to China.

It is not too late to arrest and reverse the trend toward partisanship in the field of American foreign policy. It is not too late to replace with a spirit of confidence and participation, the distrust which some Senators have of the adminstration's foreign policy. If the administration will hasten to assure the people of the United States that the leaders of both the Democratic and Republican Parties in the Congress will be consulted before major policy on any international issue is formulated by the State Department and the White House, the breach can be healed before irreparable damage is done.

This today is the acid test as to whether a bipartisan foreign policy actually prevails. No other course on the part of the administration will ever satisfy those who are questioning not only the existence, but the worth, of a bipartisan foreign policy. No other kind of cooperation will sufficiently strengthen the hand of the great VANDENBERG. Nothing else can place him in the powerful position he deserves to have within the Republican Party when he is faced with laying an administration foreign policy request before the Republicans in the Senate for approval.

A bipartisan foreign policy does not mean that Members of the Congress should refrain from criticizing any proposed course of action contemplated by the administration in the name of a bipartisan foreign policy. Rather, it is the duty of the Congressman to voice doubt and disagreement whenever, in his honest judgment, these are due. However, experience shows that mutual cooperation and mutual exchange of ideas and viewpoints between the administration and the leaders of Congress, in advance of an international commitment, usually remove any basis for fair and just criticism.

What is more, the greatest guaranty the administration has for maintaining a united American people behind the foreign policy of our country is to keep it bipartisan from conception to delivery. The American people can be counted upon to endorse and help effectuate a foreign policy which results from the cooperative efforts of the leaders in both the Democratic and the Republican Parties. Whenever a split occurs between those leaders, then division of a perilous nature is likely to develop.

American foreign policy cannot be separated from the cause of peace. The destiny of the American people depends upon winning that peace. Hence, they have the right to look to the party in the White House, Democratic or Republican, in the years immediately ahead to raise the issue of foreign policy above the level of partisan politics. They have the right to expect that the leaders of the minority party in the Congress will cooperate in good faith with the majority party and the Executive in formulating a foreign policy bipartisan in blueprint and in building.

A Factual Digest Detailing the Background and Significance of the Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, under permission granted me by the Senate, I call attention to the following copy of a letter I have just sent to the editor of the largest and most widely read daily newspaper in South Dakota. It includes a condensed summary prepared at his request of some of the most significant factors in the Alger Hiss case as they were brought out in my speech on the Senate floor during the afternoon of Wednesday, January 25.

Due to the unusually wide interest which is developing in the background and significance of the conviction of Alger Hiss, I am taking this means of calling this digest to the attention of the Congress and the country.

UNITED STATES SENATE,
Washington, D. C., February 3, 1950.

Mr. FRED C. CHRISTOPHERSON,
Editor, the Daily Argus-Leader,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak.

DEAR FRED: It was indeed good of you to write and let me know that you had come across my address on the Senate floor entitled "What the Hiss Trial Actually Means," and telling me you had read the address in its entirety.

I certainly agree with you, fully, that the Hiss case is destined to go down in the annals of history as one of the strangest—and perhaps one of the most significant—chapters in our American history. Surprisingly enough, a great many of our otherwise very well informed citizens have never gone far enough into the actual evidence and ramifications of the Hiss case to realize its full importance and its far-flung significance.

I think your suggestion is therefore most timely and valuable; it is certainly true that editors, commentators, public officials, and most of our active private citizens are all very busy these days, and so your proposal that I prepare a condensed summary of the more important factors in the background and significance of the Alger Hiss case is entirely sound. I am grateful for it.

Enclosed with this letter is the digest high lighting some of the major points of the case, and more careful students can of course have access to the full text of my address starting on page 889 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 25 or the address covering the same record which was recently made by Congressman NIXON on the floor of the House and which appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30. As you know, DICK NIXON and I devoted many weeks almost exclusively to the congressional investigation which revealed the evidence on the basis of which Hiss was convicted.

Due to the many requests which have come in for the full text of my analysis of what the Hiss case actually means, I have had a limited number of reprints made of my address of January 25. I am enclosing one herewith.

Again thanking you for your constructive and helpful suggestions and with best wishes and kindest regards, I am,

Cordially yours,

KARL E. MUNDT,
United States Senator, South Dakota.

P. S.—If any of your friends desire a copy of the complete address for historic reference or to acquaint themselves fully with its full significance I shall be glad to send them a copy direct if they will write me here in suite 432 of the Senate Office Building in Washington.

A FACTUAL DIGEST DETAILING THE BACKGROUND AND SIGNIFICANCE OF THE CONVICTION OF ALGER HISS

(Prepared by request by Senator KARL E. MUNDT who, as a Member of the House of Representatives in the Eightieth Congress, was chairman of the subcommittee handling the investigations leading to the conviction of Alger Hiss)

1. Whittaker Chambers, at that time a $30,000-a-year member of the editorial staff of Time magazine, was not a voluntary witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He came in response to a subpena served on him by the committee after it had been learned from independent sources that Chambers was a former member of the Communist Party. Chambers was not motivated by dislike or personal enmity for Hiss—in fact, if anything, throughout the hearings Chambers tended to protect Hiss by refusing to volunteer incriminating evidence against him.

2. Since it is an established fact that Chambers for years was a functionary of the Communist Party operating both as a transmission belt ferrying secret information out of Washington to the Communists and as a Communist agent seeking to influence the thinking and attitudes of top policy makers in high Government officialdom, the vital aspects of his relationships with Alger Hiss do not rest upon the court trials leading to his conviction but in the admissions which Hiss himself made while testifying under oath before the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

3. As a witness before the House Committee on Un-American Activities, Hiss first denied knowing Whittaker Chambers or anybody resembling his likeness. Later, when confronted with a vast body of testimony from Chambers demonstrating that Chambers knew many intimate details of the home surroundings, and the personal habits of Alger and Priscilla Hiss, Alger Hiss admitted that he did know Chambers under the name of "Crosley." He, in fact, admitted he knew Chambers so well that the Hiss and Chambers families had lived together under the same roof, that Hiss had loaned Chambers his furnished apartment for a period of several months without pay, that he had "loaned or given" Chambers the Hiss family automobile, and that he had loaned Chambers money. Incredible as it may sound, Hiss finally disclosed that he knew Chambers so intimately and well that it was only after an inspection of his teeth that he was willing to identify him positively!

4. At the time of the associations which Alger Hiss told the committee under oath he had with Chambers, Whittaker Chambers

was a paid Communist agent assigned to the Washington Communist apparatus in the dual role as an espionage agent and a man planted here to contact high American officials for the purpose of influencing their thinking and their policy decisions. At this period of history, Alger Hiss was an important figure in the State Department in Washington serving here as an assistant to the Assistant Secretary of State.

5. The court case in New York City dealt only with the question of the specific date that Hiss last associated with Chambers—in the trial, Hiss did not deny his past close associations with Whittaker Chambers. The trial also dealt with the truthfulness of Hiss when he denied smuggling State Department security documents from their official files and giving them to Chambers to photostat and relay to his Communist employers.

6. The conviction of Alger Hiss for perjury because he was accused of lying when he denied continuing his associations with Chambers down to a specific date—was made certain on the testimony of Mr. and Mrs. Chambers, supported by the corroborative testimony of a maid who worked in the Chambers household at that time and other evidence.

7. The conviction of Alger Hiss on the second count of his perjury indictment, however—the charge that he stole and delivered State Department security documents to Chambers—was based on a vast amount of documentary and tangible evidence in support of the testimony of Whittaker Chambers. For example, there was the unchallenged evidence that Chambers had these highly secret and important security documents in his possession. There was the evidence that the contents of many of these security documents had been typed on a Woodstock typewriter which Alger Hiss admitted belonged to him. No denial was made that the Hiss typewriter was the one used in transcribing the documents. There was the evidence that Chambers had several photostats of documents made in the handwriting of Alger Hiss; no denial was made that this was the handwriting of the accused. There was the admitted fact that Alger Hiss in the State Department had access to the documents the contents of which were found in the possession of Communist agent Chambers. Thus those who through lack of information suggest that no jury should take the word of an ex-Communist like Chambers either speak without knowledge of the documentary evidence in support of the perjury charge or else deliberately for reasons best known to themselves refuse to face up to the fact that it was the documentary evidence against Alger Hiss which resulted in his conviction in New York City.

8. Now that the country knows—or has available to it—the evidence showing that Alger Hiss was (by his own admission) a close associate of the Communist, Chambers, and since tangible and documentary evidence has convicted Hiss of lying when he denied supplying Chambers with State Department secret documents, it becomes highly important to know just what part Alger Hiss may have played in the history-shaping decisions which were made during the time that he served as a high-ranking State Department official. It is important as well to know how many close associates of Alger Hiss, whose present employment in Government may have been made possible by his intercession in their behalf, are still in position to sabotage our policies and to serve the cause of Soviet Russia and communism.

9. What, then, are the positions of vast influence held by Alger Hiss during his long career in Government?

Overlooking for the purposes of this digest, his other positions in Government, there were at least four strategic positions which Alger Hiss held in which he was in an ideal position (1) to influence high-policy decisions in the field of international relations, and (2) to seek, secure, and smuggle out vital secrets essential to our national security and the success of our foreign policy.

These four strategic positions were as follows:

(1) Hiss was a high functionary in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department, where recommendations originate concerning our foreign policy toward China.

(2) Hiss was the executive secretary of the Dumbarton Oaks Conference—one of the forerunners of the San Francisco Conference.

(3) Hiss was the Secretary General of the San Francisco Conference, where Time magazine reported he was in an ideal position to "have a lot to say behind the scenes about who gets the breaks."

(4) Hiss was one of a very small group of personal and confidential advisers to President Franklin D. Roosevelt and Secretary of State Edward R. Stettinius both before and during the entire Yalta conference.

10. This digest will not permit detailing the specific functions of Alger Hiss in each of these important posts. Those seeking more complete information will find it in my address on the Senate floor delivered on January 25.

At Yalta, however, the books written by Stettinius, James F. Byrnes, James A. Farley, Arthur Bliss Lane, and Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson (all quoted literally in my address) provide ample testimony of the important part that Alger Hiss played at the Yalta conference.

In addition, Hiss was one of the very small coterie of advisers taken by Stettinius to Yalta prior to their meeting with President Roosevelt there, and at which meeting the State Department advisers were briefing and counseling Stettinius on what he was to urge President Roosevelt to do, to say, and to decide at Yalta. It is hard to conjecture a more vital spot in the entire Government for rendering a permanent disservice to this country than the succession of offices held by Alger Hiss and by the part he had in determining the decisions at Yalta.

11. Up to now, no committee of Congress has had made available to it a list of the State Department employees or other Government officials who may owe their appointments to Alger Hiss or whose promotions to positions of enhanced influence may have resulted from recommendations by Hiss. President Truman, unfortunately, has issued a "freeze order" denying all committees of the Congress access to these employment records.

12. It is now common knowledge that President Truman, Dean Acheson, and others high in Government endeavored to discredit the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities in conducting the investigation and hearings leading to the indictment and conviction of Alger Hiss. President Truman—not once, but at least twice—publicly denounced it as dealing only with a "red herring." The President said it was simply a political attempt to draw attention from his special session of the Eightieth Congress.

13. Even after the discovery that Chambers had in his possession the security documents from the State Department, a United Press news dispatch issued on December 1, 1948, stated, "The Department of Justice is about ready to drop its investigation of the celebrated Alger Hiss-Whittaker Chambers controversy, it was learned today * * * officials said privately that unless additional evidence is forthcoming, they are inclined to forget the whole thing." (Entire text of news story was inserted with my address in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 25, beginning on p. 889.)

14. Against the opposition of the White House and overcoming the lethargy of the Department of Justice, the House Committee on Un-American Activities stuck doggedly to its task until the documentary evidence was discovered which resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss.

It stands today as an uncontrovertible fact that had it not been for the House Committee on Un-American Activities, this country would never have learned about the activities of Whittaker Chambers and Alger Hiss and the celebrated "pumpkin papers" would never have been located or disclosed.

15. Observers endeavoring to analyze the scope of activity engaged in by the particular Communist apparatus in the Federal Government which was operated by Whittaker Chambers should bear in mind that Alger Hiss was not the only member of this apparatus. Henry Julian Wadleigh, also of the State Department and also named by Chambers, has confessed to his important part in this espionage and policy-fixing apparatus. In fact, every important member of the apparatus named by Chambers has by this time either confessed, been convicted in court, fled from the country, or is dead.

16. In evaluating Yalta, and the importance to Communist sympathizers that policies agreed to there should be favorable to the Soviet and detrimental to the forces of freedom everywhere, we should bear in mind that it was at Yalta that (1) Poland was divided and its eastern portion given to the U. S. S. R.; (2) China was doomed as an autonomous country under its own government because at Yalta the United States of America yielded to the demands of the U. S. S. R. that the power spots in Manchuria—"The Ruhr of China"—should be turned over to the Communists; (3) the weird arrangements, which were later confirmed at Potsdam by President Truman, were devised whereby the American occupation forces in Berlin were to be entirely surrounded by the unfriendly Red armies of Russia; (4) the fate of the Balkans was sealed; and (5) the extra votes for the Soviet and the veto in the United Nations Charter were agreed upon which have done so much to enable the U. S. S. R. to sabotage the peace-preserving efforts of that great international organization.

17. There are other serious and important consequences disclosed by the trial, the activities, and the conviction of Alger Hiss, but those wishing to pursue the subject exhaustively can find this material in the printed hearings of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, in my address on the Senate floor on January 25, in the report of Congressman NIXON'S analysis of the same subject as it appears in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 30, and from the files of the Library of Congress and the House Committee on Un-American Activities. More careful students can find much information also in the printed transcripts of the two trials in New York City which resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss. This digest simply chronicles some of the more significant and obvious factors involved in this epochal case.

18. Out of this experience the United States should learn some lessons and take some action which will tend to strengthen its security and to protect more adequately this last great bastion of human freedom on this earth. Among these lessons are the following:

(A) Since the statute of limitations necessitates crimes of this type being disclosed within 3 years, or grants the offenders complete immunity from punishment, Wadleigh, Chambers, Hiss, and others will go scot free, insofar as punishment for their espionage activities is concerned. Hiss has been sentenced to 5 years in the Federal penitentiary solely because the jury found him guilty of perjury for lying about the part he played in this great conspiracy. Therefore, the statute of limitations for crimes of this type against the security of our Government should be promptly extended to at least 10 years.

(B) Strangely enough, this free Republic has no law of any kind which prevents the employment of Communists on the Federal pay roll or which punishes these traitorous agents when they work their way into such employment and are caught in the act. There is real need for the early passage of some such law as the Mundt-Nixon bill which passed the House in the Eightieth Congress by a vote of 319 to 56 but which was never acted upon in the Senate. This bill has been modified and rewritten and is again before Congress having been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress by Senators MUNDT, FERGUSON, and JOHNSON of South Carolina. It should be passed despite the Communists' boast that they have spent over a million dollars in a successful effort to block its passage in the Eighty-first Congress.

The aggressive and adroit propaganda and campaigning of the Communists and their fellow-travelers has entirely misrepresented the contents and purposes of this legislation until many who have never even read the bill have lent their good name to those desperately opposing its passage. Unless this country acts to protect its public offices against disloyal elements who desire to take them over and infiltrate them we are apt to so weaken our nternal defenses against communism that it will be impossible to defeat it successfully by military might and by expenditures of time and effort on our external defenses alone.

(C) Appropriate committees of Congress should make a thorough check to determine to what extent our State Department and our other Government offices are still permeated and peopled by Communists and their sympathizers and coworkers. All disloyal elements should be summarily weeded out without further apology or appeasement—the time is amply here when once again we should "place only Americans on guard."

(D) A complete reappraisal should be made of the so-called loyalty checks now being conducted by the administration at great expense but with highly inadequate results insofar as protecting the public interest is concerned. What we are actually getting is simply a name check and not a loyalty check at all. Only those who openly affiliate with some obviously Communist group are now detected and removed. At least in the more important posts in public office we need a security check rather than a name check to determine merely whether a person has openly indicated disloyalty by joining a Communist group. There is still inexcusable laxity in high places in the matter of preventing the employment on the Federal pay roll of disloyal individuals.

(E) The House Committee on Un-American Activities should be strengthened and it should be encouraged to continue the great work it has done in the past. Carping critics and chronic accusers of this hard-working committee should not be permitted to drive it into ineffective idleness. It should be adequately staffed and courageously manned. No political party should be permitted by the public to stifle its work or to soft pedal its disclosures.

(F) As a consequence of the currently sorry situation which has developed in our foreign policy and the disturbing disclosures of policies detrimental to American interests as well as the revelations that atomic secrets, information on the new H-bomb, and diplomatic security matters have been freely funneled out of this country to Russia, a careful, candid, and complete reappraisal should be made of the entire international situation. A positive, constructive, freedom-serving, and peace-preserving foreign policy should be developed as the result of the best efforts and thinking of both of our major political parties rather than by either one of them.

The Republican Party should begin measuring up to its responsibilities as a great and independent political party. "Me-tooism" in foreign policy should be stopped. A political party which is too timid or too tired to make constructive, positive, and realistic foreign-policy proposals of its own and to match them in debate and discussion with the suggestions of the White House and the Secretary of State can scarcely expect the public to entrust it with their future and their fate. We Republicans have not for several years met our full obligation in this regard as a great political party.

To preserve America and to protect the peace, we must do so now. Once a foreign policy is established by merging the best ideas of both political parties and all good American minds into a common pattern, it should have complete support by both political parties and by all good citizens. That is true bipartisanship in foreign affairs. Our foreign policy of the future must not be isolationism, it must not be narrow nationalism, it must be global in its thinking and realistic in its operation and it must serve the best interests of the United States; because in so doing it best serves the interests of permanent peace and of the entire world.

The foregoing is a sketchy digest only of the 3-hour discussion of the ramifications and background of the Alger Hiss case which I delivered on the Senate floor on January 25. The full account begins on page 889 of the RECORD for that day. In limited numbers I have some extra copies of that detailed discussion available to those who care to request them by post card or letter addressed to me here in my office, No. 432, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

The Road to Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 3 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article entitled "The Road to Peace" appearing in the January-February 1950 issue of the magazine Prevent World War III, published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, 515 Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ROAD TO PEACE

It will be recalled that after each concession granted to Adolf Hitler, the Nazi propaganda machine would announce to the world that there were new "problems" which demanded immediate solution. This would invariably cause western diplomats to put on an expression of pained surprise—sometimes indignation.

The shock quickly wore off and again concessions were made to Hitler. Again demands by Hitler. Again surprise. Yet, these diplomats were filled with optimism. In his book, Defense of the Peace, Georges Bonnet, the French Foreign Minister, during the late 1930's relates that "Mr. Neville Chamberlain furthermore wondered whether the European situation was as black as Daladier believed. He doubted very much that Hitler desired the destruction of the Czechoslovak state or of a refashioned Czechoslovak state; he did not believe the Fuehrer wanted an anschluss."

As we now know, Mr. Chamberlain's hopes were unfounded. Hitler obtained new concessions—made new demands—then caused Mr. Chamberlain to express astonishment again.

This routine continued right up to and including the fateful Munich sell-out. During all those years, peoples in western Europe and the United States were fed the delusion that there was no real connection between old concessions and new demands. Their failing to perceive the underlying strategy of the Nazis enabled Hitler to grab a good part of Europe without risk or opposition.

When the people awoke to the fact that appeasement had its own deadly logic, the bombs were already falling on Rotterdam, Coventry, and Warsaw. Must we pay the same price again? Shall we allow ourselves to be taken down the road to disaster step by step?

Since the day that the Allied Powers declared as their common objective "the complete disarmament and demilitarization of Germany and the elimination or control of all German industry that could be used for military production," this war-torn world has witnessed ever-increasing violations of this sacred pledge.

The Germans demanded that denazification cease. The Allied Powers hastily acceded to their wish. Even the members of the German general staff have been spared.

The Germans demanded that the war criminals be spared, and the Allied Powers forgave these criminal elements, with few exceptions.

The Germans demanded that their cartel empires be preserved, and the Allied Powers have acceded.

The Germans demanded that there be a halt to the reparations program and the Allies scaled down reparations deliveries to an insignificant level.

The Germans demanded the retention of prohibited industries which are the basis of a war potential, and the Allied Powers complied.

The list of concessions, demands, concessions, demands, is by no means complete. But is it not clear that there is an organic connection between the concessions granted and the new demands made? Is it not plain that the logic of this steady retreat from victory points to the rebirth of the German army? The authoritative London Economist naively declares: "The problem of the part that Germany should play in its own defense has suddenly sprung to the surface of thought and discussion." There is nothing sudden about this development. It is merely the end result of the steady deterioration of our original policies and position in Germany.

Shall we rearm Germany? The question is unreal and when it comes from the lips of the German-Firsters who have such thorough control over the occupation, it is downright dishonest. For the bitter truth is that Germany is being rearmed. You do not build up a modern army without first building up the steel plants, the ball-bearing plants, the synthetic oil plants, the machine-tool plants, the chemical plants—and these are going full blast again.

In addition, the tradition of militarism and pan-Germanism has also been preserved. Pensions are paid to former members of the German general staff. Even the little children are being groomed for their future role. Military toys are reappearing this Christmas season in Germany.

As the Society for the Prevention of World War III has revealed in previous issues, the east German police are being attuned for new tasks of a more portentous nature. According to western military intelligence sources, the police forces are the precursors

for a new German people's army. Presumably this army will have to save the Germans from the imperialist plots of the Anglo-Saxons. But what about the West? Are our statesmen Simon-pure? The answer by this time is obvious, we believe. It does not make military sense to preserve a war potential far in excess of Germany's peacetime needs and yet piously assure peace-loving peoples that there is no intention to organize a German army.

For weeks, official denials have been crossed up by weasel-worded qualifications. You can pick up magazine after magazine, newspaper after newspaper and you will find reports and rumors about a new west-German army. For example, in the November 25, 1949, issue of the United News and World Report we read the following:

"Dean Acheson, Secretary of State, signaled a vital turn in United States policy when he traveled to Germany to promise things to the Germans instead of having German officials representing a defeated nation travel to a meeting with United States officials to ask for favors, hat in hand. Original United States plan to turn Germany into a sheep pasture is revised into a secret plan to rearm the Germans into a powerful nation."

It has been said that General Bradley has spoken off-the-record on the practicability of a west-German army.

General Lucius D. Clay, who shares in the responsibility for the decline of American prestige and authority in Germany, is openly lobbying for a German army. Some Americans have expressed surprise because 10 months ago General Clay told American correspondents that if the United States allowed the creation of a new German army "We should never have come over here in the first place." His change of mind stems from the very policies he pursued which laid the groundwork for the rebuilding of Germany's industrial war potential.

According to newspaper columnists, Viscount Field Marshal Montgomery, a recent visitor to this country, has adopted the same line as General Clay.

And what about the Germans? There has been no official denial that Chancellor Adenauer has requested war equipment for 25 German divisions. As a matter of fact. Adenauer has recently said that he would, under certain conditions, be ready and willing to organize a new Wehrmacht.

Adenauer seems to have a short memory because in the agreement of November 24, 1949, Adenauer's government pledged as follows: "The Federal Government further declares its earnest determination to maintain the demilitarization of the Federal territory and to endeavor by all means in its power to prevent the re-creation of armed forces of any kind. To this end the Federal Government will cooperate fully with the High Commission in the work of the military security board."

Adenauer did not wait very long to shatter the illusions of some naive politicians about the new Germany. When Dean Acheson visited the German leaders on November 13, he expressed his aim to establish a relationship of trust and confidence and feelings of personal regard with the Germans. (New York Times, November 14, 1949.)

The Germans are playing their cards carefully. They do not want to make any premature promises until their economic power has been fully revitalized. The Germans do not want to open all their cards until they are in the position where they can dictate the terms and conditions upon which they would agree toward the reestablishment of German armed forces.

The London Economist, in discussing the question of an army for Germany, recently admitted that an independent German Army would be on every score politically disastrous. But it then urges a practical plan to integrate such an army under the control of the Western Allies. The London Economist apparently believes that the Germans will consent to play the role of European Gurkhas. On the other hand, the President of the Bonn Government, Mr. Heuss, told newsmen "Frankly, I cannot see the people's police waging a Socialist Unity Party crusade to conquer and subdue democratic west Germany, just as I cannot see the west fighting the men from the Soviet zone. This would not be the German way of handling internal political matters."

The London Economist should ponder the words of Herr Heuss. And while it does so, it should recollect the fateful September days of 1940 when Goering's Luftwaffe poured tons of bombs on London. Indeed, the Germans will not accept an inferior position. They regard the creation of a German army as an internal political matter, for such an army must first and only be at the service of the Germans.

What does this all mean? First, let it be said that our society is dedicated to the prevention of a new holocaust. It does not believe that war is inevitable. Yet the Germans have been able to extract concession after concession on the assumption of the inevitability of a new war. It is therefore understandable that the Germans should have a vested interest in keeping the pot boiling.

Only by maintaining a war-charged atmosphere can the German plan for resurgence succeed. There are people who believe it far more practical to allow the Germans rather than Americans to do the fighting and the dying in a new war. But is it not far more prudent to put an end to German intrigue which thrives on the mounting tensions and cultivates the propaganda of the inevitability of a new war between east and west?

If the Germans were deprived of their ability to pit east against west as they are succeeding in doing today, then the inevitability thesis would not be as plausible as it seems. The German strategy can be checked by an honest and determined effort on the part of the four occupying powers to neutralize Germany. Our concept of neutralization calls for a four power agreement to deprive Germany of those instruments of economic, political, and military power which have enabled her to blackmail east and west. (As can be seen, our concept of neutralization has nothing in common with similar projects advocated by the so-called Nauheimer circle of Prof. Ulrich Noack, whose background we have on various occasions exposed in these pages.)

The American Friends Service Committee prepared a report last summer in which it discussed ways and means of reducing tensions between Russia and the west and thereby decreasing the chances of a new war. It, too, advocated the neutralization of Germany "for the United States and the Soviet Union to continue the competition for Germany will almost certainly lead to disaster."

It is encouraging to note that responsible groups dedicated to the brotherhood of man are aware of the fundamental importance of Germany with regard to the future peace and security of the world. We have said this on frequent occasions: "For so long as Germany remains a potential asset to one or more of the Allied Nations she will be used for ulterior, selfish, political, military, and economic purposes. And so long will the world remain insecure. So long as Germany is available for one of these marriages, she will be in a good position to recapture her military strength. Only when we have conclusive proof, supported by acts, that the big powers will not establish any liaison with Germany to use her as an eventual ally in any extra national activity, will there be a reasonable chance of destroying mutual suspicions and of establishing a genuine world collaboration for peace."

This statement was published in our magazine, Prevent World War III, in April 1946, long before there was any apparent sign that the Germans were climbing back to positions where they could embroil the world in a new war.

We refused to live in Mr. Chamberlain's dream world of the 1930's, because we were already aware of the violation of common agreements made by the Allies to eliminate Germany's war potential. Thus all the talk and noise today about new German armies in the east and in the west is not surprising to us.

It must be said that German armies will inevitably be created again if the present policies which are repeating the same blunders made by the Allies after World War I, are continued.

The neutralization of Germany can be a major step toward the prevention of new conflicts. Such a neutralization requires the following steps:

A. The establishment of a four-power disarmament committee to prevent the remilitarization of any of the zones in Germany.

B. Four-power agreement to hold the level of German steel production to peacetime needs—not exceeding present permitted levels.

C. Prompt fulfillment of the original reparations program under four-power control.

D. Four-power agreement on the elimination from key positions of former Nazis and Hitler supporters.

E. Four-power action to break up the German cartel empire.

F. Genuine international control of the Ruhr to prevent the reestablishment of German economic domination of her neighbors, and, at the same time, give Germany a viable economy for peace.

The carrying out of these measures and subsidiary steps would take Germany out of the international arena as a major bone of contention between east and west.

The hour is late, but it is up to us, the living, to make our final decision. We must bear in mind that a German army is inevitable if the people consent to policies which preserve a dangerous war potential in her heavy industries. It would be wishful thinking to believe that the creation of German armies, east or west, would be a boon to either side or to mankind in general.

President Heuss has told the truth: An east German army will not fight a west German army or vice versa. They will unite and when they unite, the betrayal of the peace and the security of the United States and her friends abroad will be complete.

Does the Republican Party Want the Negro Vote?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been an increasing attempt by the Republican Party to avoid the blame for the failure of Congress to pass FEPC legislation.

With permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include excerpts from a singularly clear explanation of Republican political strategy. It is an article by Arnold Aronson and Samuel Spiegler published in the Crisis, official magazine of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

It points out that the Republican Party has been responsible for every major defeat of civil-rights legislation in the last year. Beginning with the fact that President Truman campaigned courageously on the civil-rights issue while Dewey was silent, these writers find the Republican Party record consistently against civil rights.

They cite the revealing fact that in last year's civil-rights filibuster fight five of the Republicans' nine-member Senate policy committee voted with the Dixiecrats.

They quoted Mary McLeod Bethune, famed educator, as remarking on that same fight closed by the atrocious Wherry resolution:

The loss of the battle, while disappointing in itself, was not so piercing a blow as the way the Republicans appear to have insulted our intelligence.

These writers recite the same stories in California, Ohio, Illinois, and Pennsylvania Legislatures where Democrats went down the line for FEPC, but Republicans used parliamentary jockeying and direct votes against the measure when necessary to prevent enactment into law.

DOES THE REPUBLICAN PARTY WANT THE NEGRO VOTE?

(By Arnold Aronson and Samuel Spiegler)

Once again a congressional session has come to a close without enacting any civil-rights measure. FEPC was fought through committee in both Houses in the last session and is on the calendar in both the Senate and the House of Representatives ready for floor action when Congress reconvenes in January. Thus, while poll tax, antilynch, antisegregation, Army Jim Crow, and other civil-rights bills rest in committee pigeonholes, the most important of all civil-rights measures is in a position to be taken up forthwith when the legislators resume their seats.

There is no doubt about the crucial character of FEPC in the whole civil-rights struggle. It is this measure to which virtually every Negro assigns first priority. As one Negro spokesman has put it, FEPC means bread and butter, rent and fuel, shoes for the baby, and clothing for millions of colored people. Moreover, not only Negroes, but Jews and other minority groups, religious and labor organizations, and liberal bodies of all sorts, have called for enactment of FEPC as the real test of congressional sincerity on civil rights.

Next year, 1950, is an election year. One-third of the Senate and the entire House of Representatives goes before the electorate. Not only will the strategy of the major parties in dealing with FEPC quickly reveal where they really stand on civil rights when the chips are down, but the way Senators and Representatives vote in crucial tests on this issue may determine how they, and their parties, will fare at the polls in 1950 and 1952.

* * * * *

Traditionally the Negro used to be a Republican. Until 1932, when Franklin Delano Roosevelt swept the country, including the Negroes, into the Democratic fold, the Republican Party, the party of Abraham Lincoln, the adversary of southern white oppression, commanded the Negro's support. Since that time, the Negro vote in every national election has gone Democratic. Only Wendell Willkie, with his unequivocal stand against racial discrimination, recaptured any significant part of this vote.

* * * * *

Republican strategy has seemed to many Negroes deliberately designed to alienate rather than to attract their support. During the Presidential campaign, Dewey made no move to exploit his excellent record on civil rights as Governor of New York. At no time did he or any of his major supporters make any reference to the pioneer laws against employment discrimination or discrimination in educational institutions which New York State had adopted during his administration. While Truman made capital of his civil-rights proposals, Dewey kept silent about his civil-rights accomplishments. While Truman made a major campaign speech in Harlem, New York's Negro Metropolis—the first Presidential candidate ever to do so—Dewey, Taft, Stassen, and other Republican bigwigs campaigned in the solid South. While Truman defied and denounced the Dixiecrats, Republican spokesmen all but openly invited the dissident Southern Democrats into the Republican Party. While the Republican platform pledges on civil rights in 1948 represented a retreat from the position taken by the party in 1944, the Democratic civil-rights plank was the most far reaching ever to be adopted by a national party convention.

While Congressman DAWSON of Illinois was named assistant to the chairman of the Democratic National Committee and secretary of the Democratic Congressional Committee the Republicans failed to give any Negro a position of prominence or importance in the party organization.

NEGRO REPUBLICANS DISMAYED

Influential Negro Republicans were confounded and dismayed. The Republican American Committee, comprising Republican Negro leadership in 38 States, as early as August 1947 felt impelled to warn the party leadership of the dangers which lie ahead if it continues its policy of inaction in respect to these issues (i. e., civil rights). Negro leaders both inside and outside the party became steadily more and more convinced that they were being offered lip-service and political double-talk.

One of them, a life-long Republican, said: "In 1944 our party pledged itself to the enactment of FEPC, in 1946 it had the opportunity to make good on that promise. It did not do so. You cannot say it failed. The plain, sad, regrettable truth is that it did not try."

A writer in the Republican, the national party magazine, for October 1947, took up the warning. Apparently addressing the white leadership, he wrote:

"If the Republicans don't wake up to the factor behind the Negro vote, it will soon be too late. * * * If the shoe were on the other foot and you were the Negro seeking political affiliations, would you be honest in considering the Republican Party as your party today? Wouldn't you demand better treatment and more recognition from the Republican Party than you, as a Negro, have been receiving?"

VOTE WRITTEN OFF

This cursory review of Republican campaign behavior suggests that the party leadership may have decided, quite deliberately and as a matter of long-range political policy, to write off the Negro vote. If such is the case, the decision must have been taken with a view to attracting some larger or at least off-setting advantage. What might have been?

Perhaps Senator TAFT offered a clew in his speech at Nashville, Tenn., when he told a southern States' rights audience, "There is a basic agreement between the southern Democrats and the Republican Party." It is not necessary to interpret this as a reference to a deal in order to support the conjecture that the Republican Party may have been making a genuine bid for a basic realinement of political forces. The endorsement of Dewey and Warren by Jesse Jones, of Texas, Secretary of Commerce in the Roosevelt administration, and the apparent willingness of the Byrd machine to see the Virginia electoral votes go Republican lend credence to this conjecture. Also supporting such speculation is TAFT'S prediction that the Republicans might carry Virginia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Georgia. Most of the Republican votes in those States, he said, would come from conservative Democrats.

After all, a Republican victory was expected by virtually everyone. The Republicans may have been convinced that they did not need the Negro vote to win, and that the occasion was ripe for breaking the solid South once and for all. If this was, indeed, their objective, the prize was a tremendous one; perhaps tempting enough to induce the Republicans to gamble the election on it.

Having lost the election, and having failed to win any southern electoral votes, the Republicans might have been expected to seek to regain some of the Negro vote which had been such a major factor in their defeat.

REPUBLICAN BEHAVIOR

Does their behavior in the present Congress suggest any such basic change in strategy on their part?

Following the defeat of the antipoll-tax bill by a filibuster during the special session of Congress in the summer of 1948, Republican leaders pledged a change in the Senate rules governing cloture as the first order of business in what they confidently expected would be a Republican-controlled Eighty-first Congress.

Rule XXII of the Senate, the point at issue, was adopted in 1917 to "terminate successful filibustering." It provided that debate on a "pending measure" would be brought to a close by a favorable vote of two-thirds of those Senators present and voting. However, the rule proved largely ineffective. Only four times in the 32 years during which it was in force had cloture been invoked successfully—and never on a civil-rights bill. Despite repeated passage of civil-rights measures by the House they were always filibustered to death in the Senate; and all efforts to invoke cloture failed for want of the necessary two-thirds majority. It was abundantly clear, therefore, that a more liberal cloture rule, which would permit limitation on debate by something less than two-thirds of those present and voting, was basic to the enactment of civil-rights legislation.

* * * * *

CRUCIAL TEST

The crucial test came on a ruling by Vice President BARKLEY which in substance declared that rule XXII applied to any business before the Senate whether technically a motion or a measure. Had this interpretation been upheld the filibuster on Senator LUCAS' motion to take up the cloture change would have been brought to a close and the Senate enabled to debate the issue itself. A reversal of the Vice President's ruling left the road open for endless filibustering subject only to the limitations of lung power. By a vote of 46 to 41 the Senate overruled the Vice President. A shift of but three votes would have changed the result.

The 46 Senators who voted to override Mr. BARKLEY were divided equally among Democrats and Republicans. Of the 23 Democratic Senators who voted against the Vice President's ruling, 18 were from the South; the remaining 5 from the border States of Arizona, Oklahoma, Kentucky, and Nevada. Southern opposition to any anti-filibuster resolution was to be expected, however. It was much more difficult for Republican leaders to square the 23 negative Republican votes with the party's professed zeal for civil rights legislation, and it was probably not pure coincidence that a majority of the 23 were from such States as the Dakotas, Maine, Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska, Minnesota, Oregon, Washington, and Wisconsin, States where there is no appreciable Negro vote. The top-level character of the

Republican back-turning on its civil rights platform pledges may be gleaned from the fact that 5 of the GOP's 9-man policy committee voted with the southern Democrats as did 15 of the very Republican Senators who originally had challenged Senator LUCAS to take up the cloture rule.

The same coalition of Republicans and southern Democrats then pushed through a new cloture rule bearing the name of Republican floor leader KENNETH WHERRY and the blessing of Dixiecrat strategist, Senator RUSSELL, of Georgia. The new rule extends the application of cloture to any "measure, motion, or other matter pending before the Senate," and to that extent is an improvement on the 1917 rule. More fundamentally, however, instead of lowering the hitherto unattainable two-thirds present and voting requirement, the Wherry substitute ups the number necessary for cloture to two-thirds of the entire Senate; that is, to 64 votes. In addition, any future attempt to liberalize the rule is specifically exempted from any limitation on debate. This 64-vote requirement for cloture has, perhaps, scuttled civil-rights legislation for many years to come.

NEGRO REACTION

Negro reaction was immediate and violent. The NAACP called the Republican role in the Senate rules maneuver a sell-out. In a special message to its branches throughout the country, the association adjured its members "to fix firmly in your minds for 1950, and following election years, the names of those who tried to stop the clock so far as civil rights are concerned."

The chairman of the politically important Negro Republican American Committee in a letter to WAYNE MORSE expressed his heartfelt thanks for the Oregon Republican's speech against the transparent sham of the Wherry compromise. The writer of the letter, remarking that he had "been a delegate to as many Republican national conventions as any man alive today," called the debate on the rules change a cream puff farce, and the amendment "an absolute and complete surrender to the ideas and policies of the Ku Klux Klan. The defeats of 1932, 1936, 1940, 1944, and 1948," he wrote, "have not taught the Republican leadership anything about the wishes, hopes, and aspirations of colored Republicans to become full-fledged citizens of this great America."

Efforts of Republican leaders to justify the Wherry resolution on the ground that it closes the loopholes in the old rule have therefore merely aggravated the resentment of Negro voters. As famed educator Mary McLeod Bethune put it: "The loss of the battle while disappointing in itself was not so piercing a blow as the way the Republicans appear to have insulted our intelligence."

This recital scarcely supports the conjecture that the Republican strategy was designed to appeal to the Negro voter. What might its objective have been? Some observers have suggested that it was the achievement of the same practical result through coalition with the southern Democrats which had been denied the Republicans in the election, namely, control of Congress. If this was so the Republican strategy, it must be conceded, paid off. Not much has been done by the present Congress over Republican opposition.

It is possible thus to explain Republican congressional tactics. But it is not possible on the same grounds to explain the actions of Republicans in state legislatures during the sessions just ended. In the States there are no southern Democratic blocs with which to seek coalitions, and there are no bases for fundamental reorganizations of party lines. Yet in legislature after legislature, Republicans have voted against bills which had been given the highest priority by Negro citizens.

Let us look first at the Republican record in the three key States of California, Illinois, and Ohio, where, as we have seen, the Negro vote may well have determined the outcome of the last presidential election.

In California, where the Republicans will be contesting in 1950 for the United States Senate seat now held by Democrat SHERIDAN DOWNEY, Governor Warren's administration has a moderate but firm majority in both houses of the State legislature. Democratic sponsors fought desperately to get an FEPC bill through the Assembly, California's lower chamber. The bill would have created a State commission modeled closely on New York's successful State commission against discrimination. It was voted on unfavorably in a Republican-dominated committee, the vote being 11 to 8 on straight party lines. However, three record votes on the measure were forced on the floor.

A motion to discharge the bill from committee first carried 41–34; but the Republican leadership swung into action, and a few days later the body voted 46 to 28 to reverse itself. The bill's sponsor charged that the Republican speaker of the assembly had threatened committee chairman with loss of their jobs if they did not vote for the reversal. Four committee chairmen did in fact change their votes, and a fifth absented himself from voting. A further and final attempt to get the bill out of committee was defeated 35 to 31. An analysis of the voting reveals that only one of the 35 Democrats in the assembly voted against FEPC on all three tests; whereas 28 of the 45 Republicans did so.

Illinois, for the first time in many years, emerged from the 1948 election with a Democratic Governor, Adlai Stevenson, and a lower legislative house under Democratic control. In the senate the Republicans retained an almost two to one majority. The United States Senate seat, now occupied by majority leader SCOTT W. LUCAS, will be in contest in 1950, and a Republican victory would represent a major set-back for the Truman administration.

With both party platforms pledging enactment of FEPC, passage of a fair employment act in Illinois seemed almost assured. But the succession of events paralleled that in California. The Democratic-controlled house passed a bipartisan FEPC bill sponsored by no less than 57 members, by a vote of 81 to 53. Sixty-nine Democrats and only 12 Republicans voted for it; 40 Republicans and but 3 Democrats opposed it.

But it was in the senate that the crucial test came. Here the 32 Republicans comprise a clear majority of the 50 members. The Democrats lined up early in support of the measure; by early June, 16 of the 18 Democratic senators were committed to vote for it. Although the Republican caucus publicly announced that it was taking no party position on the issue, it was reported that a secret caucus committed the Republican members to oppose the measure. Whether this is true or not, the Republican leadership, in debate, did demand that Republican senators vote against the bill as a matter of party regularity. One Republican stated on the floor, in explaining why he was voting against the bill, that he was doing so against his convictions; that not only had political and economic pressures been applied to him, but his wife and his children had been threatened with social ostracism if he supported the measure.

FORGET NEGRO VOTE

* * * * *

On the final test, FEPC lost, 25–23. Twenty-four of the 25 adverse votes were cast by Republicans. Only 7 Republicans joined 16 Democrats in support of the legislation.

Although the final vote was three short of the necessary constitutional majority, actually the bill would have passed had one more Republican been for it. The lone Democrat who voted against the measure, and one Republican answered "no" only when and because it was evident that enough votes could not be mustered for enactment. Had one more Republican come forward and committed himself to vote for FEPC before the roll call, Illinois would today be among the States which have prohibited discrimination in employment because of race, color, or creed.

* * * * *

OHIO STORY

The story was the same in Ohio. Senator TAFT's present term expires in 1951, and it is generally agreed that, with labor grimly determined to accomplish his political demise, and liberal sentiment generally opposed to him, he will face the toughest campaign of his long career in 1950. The Republicans slipped badly in 1947 in Ohio. The State legislature went Democratic for the first time in history, but by a small majority, so that the Republicans hold the balance of power on many controversial issues. In the circumstances, one might expect the Republicans to be even more than ordinarily solicitous of the interests of so influential a group of voters as the Negroes.

The Republican State platform in 1948 had promised to enact an FEPC law, and early in the session a bipartisan bill was introduced. But Republicans promptly introduced a substitute bill, establishing a purely educational commission, generally considered worthless by FEPC advocates. This was defeated in the house by one vote, 67 to 66. The support for this emasculated measure was almost wholly Republican, the opposition almost wholly Democratic. The house then passed, 70 to 61, the original, effective bill, 62 Democrats and only 8 Republicans comprising the majority, with 55 Republicans and 6 Democrats opposing.

The senate, however, by a vote of 17 to 15, passed the same ineffective bill which the house had rejected. The vote in the senate on this measure was crucial. Favoring the innocuous bill were 13 Republicans and 4 Democrats. The 15 votes in opposition were solidly Democratic. If a single Republican had voted against the measure it would have been defeated. Friends of FEPC exerted every form of persuasion to obtain that critically needed Republican vote. George Bender, chairman of the Cuyahoga County Republican Committee, warned Republican legislators: "Our party's platform pledge will be a crucial issue in our 1950 campaign," he telegraphed. "The political implications of this question may be of decisive importance in determining the outcome of these elections." TAFT was importuned to use his influence, but to no avail.

A conference committee of senate and house which was appointed to iron out differences between the strong house measure and the weak senate bill agreed upon a compromise. The Republican Cleveland News said editorially that this seemed "fair and cautious." It urged its adoption, resting its advice, it stated, on political considerations: "We want to see Republicans get credit among the sympathy groups in the large Ohio cities so these more or less dissident groups can be wooed to the Republican cause in the 1950 and 1952 elections." But even this compromise was rejected by the senate, 17 to 13. Not a single Republican voted in favor of the conference report.

MICHIGAN STORY

Other case histories could be recounted. They would all fall into the same pattern. Take Michigan for example. A Democrat introduced a bill for an effective FEPC. Bipartisan sponsorship was sought but rejected by Republicans. The bill was bottled up in

committee. An alternative bill was introduced under Republican sponsorship late in the session. This lacked features which FEPC advocates considered essential. Amendments to strengthen it were added in committee, and Democratic members of the legislature announced that they would support this measure as amended, even though it was known by the names of its Republican sponsors. The committee failed to report it out. A motion to discharge the committee from further consideration, which would have had the effect of bringing the bill to the floor of the House, was defeated by a straight party vote: 57 Republicans voting no, 39 Democrats voting yes.

PENNSYLVANIA

Somewhat more labyrinthine is the history of FEPC defeat in Pennsylvania. Several bills were introduced by Republicans in both senate and house. Pledged to enactment of fair employment practices legislation, Governor Duff publicly declared that the Republican Party had an unmistakable obligation to pass an FEPC act. One bill, specifically supported by the Governor, became known as an administration measure. The Pennsylvania Manufacturers Association opposed the bill. Its president, Republican National Committeeman G. Mason Owlett, after an interview with the Governor, told newspaper reporters that the Pennsylvania Republican Party was united (referring to the deep differences between the Governor and the Grundy-Owlett machine), that the administration's legislative program would go through, but that passage of FEPC seemed unlikely. Both senate and house committees kept FEPC bills bottled up. In an effort to obscure responsibility for the action, the senate committee on judiciary finally voted by secret ballot to kill FEPC. A Democratic motion to discharge the bill from a house committee lost, 107 to 89; every Democrat in the house and one sole Republican voted for discharge. An effort to discharge a senate committee met a similar fate, the motion losing 35 to 15 on a straight party vote. An example of newspaper comment was a front-page Philadelphia Inquirer article headlined, "Death of FEPC looms as big '50 issue."

At a meeting of the executive committee of the State council for a Pennsylvania FEPC, coordinating body for groups backing the legislation, following defeat of the bill, it was recommended that FEPC should be exploited as a political issue by using education to induce voters to change their political affiliations, if necessary, especially in areas where the Republican representatives were against FEPC.

In Minnesota, Republican Governor Youngdahl's efforts to redeem his campaign pledges by getting an FEPC bill through the legislature were thwarted by members of his own party. In Colorado, FEPC passed the Democratic-controlled house; the Republican-dominated senate passed an emasculated measure and blocked all efforts at compromise on an acceptable bill. In Indiana, young Philip Willkie, son of the late Wendell Willkie, was the only Republican member of the assembly to vote for FEPC.

* * * * *

In the Northern States, FEPC has become a touchstone not only for Negro voters, but for large blocs of others as well—church bodies, labor groups, members of non-Negro minority groups, and great numbers of independent voters who merely want to see legislation enacted against racial repression and discrimination.

On the evidence of the past year, the Republican Party, by seeming design, appears to have cut itself off from any reasonable hope of support by precisely that crucially pivotal segment of the electorate which it once could rely upon, whose defection played a major role in costing the Republican Party the last national election, and which now appears alienated beyond any possibility of reconciliation short of a drastic turn-about in the Republican approach to civil rights. Republican performance on FEPC in the coming session of Congress will provide the test.

Address by Hon. William Benton, of Connecticut, Before Connecticut Editorial Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BRIEN McMAHON
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON] before the Connecticut Editorial Association, at Waterbury, Conn., on February 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I shall start with a confession. I admit frankly that I am a rarity in gatherings such as this—a man who doesn't claim that he used to be a newspaperman himself.

I am sorry about it, too; I wish I had been one—note that past tense—because I suspect I might be a better Senator if I had been a newspaperman. I've always had a special weakness for newspaper people, in part because they've enjoyed one of the few types of experience in the field of human communications that I admit I have missed.

I've spent all of my adult life in the field of communications. I started in it—as I suspect many of you did—because somebody once told me I could write.

For example, I have been in every branch of broadcasting except television: In commercial broadcasting, in boiler-plate broadcasting, in educational broadcasting, in international short-wave broadcasting. I spent half of my time or more for 9 years in university work—in education—surely the most serious of all forms of communication. I have published books. I have produced classroom motion pictures and now I find that part of my job is this lower (or perhaps even lowest) form of communication—making speeches.

The moral from the foregoing may be the danger of telling a young man he can write.

The conclusion I draw, however, is that a principal motif of my existence is this: My deep belief that human communication is the most important—potentially the noblest—certainly the most characteristically human—of all human activities and pursuits.

Let me assert this as dramatically as I can. I do not believe that communism as such, or the USSR as such, or the Red Army as such, constitute public danger No. 1. I do not believe that the atomb bomb, or even the hydrogen bomb when the Russians learn how to make it—is public danger No. 2. I do not believe that any of the familiar dangers, such as depression and disease, can compete for the No. 3 position. Public enemies Nos. 1, 2, and 3 are ignorance, the willful effort anywhere in the world to preserve ignorance, and the fear and suspicion and hatred that ignorance engenders.

Ignorance cannot be cured except through communication. Surely the hydrogen bomb is no cure. And if I can, as a United States Senator, advance the cause of better human communication, even in the smallest degree, I shall count myself a success. Parenthetically—I shall be a greater success if I can also help advance the cause of communication in Connecticut.

There are two sides of the problem of communication. They are equally important; one I shall call a negative side, and the other positive. The first is merely the freedom to communicate—which means simply that no one may dictate to you what you can or cannot say. This is indeed a negative freedom. It forbids interference with an inalienable right. You will find me an ardent champion of this freedom. You will find me fighting all man-made barriers against this freedom. Freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of information in any medium—these are the beginning and the foundation of good human communications. They are the father and the protector of all other freedoms, and of all human rights.

The other side of human communications, the positive side, is the substance of what is communicated—the copy, if you will. It is the use we make of our freedom of speech. It is the integrity of the information that flows among men. It is its constructive quality. About this positive side I am also deeply concerned. On this, we have a very great deal to learn. Perhaps you will agree with me that even newspaper publishers and editors have a very great deal to learn about improving the quality of the information which flows among men.

No country in the world has a press more free than ours. The first amendment to our Constitution is a classical—and classically brief—guaranty: "Congress shall make no law abridging the freedom of speech or of the press." The amendment was born out of a long history of attempts by strong rulers to interfere with the press; and indeed you will find that the only successful bills of rights in past centuries have been cast in this negative form—as curbs on tyrants or strong governments. Our newspapers are properly vigilant to every threat against freedom of speech and the press, however minor.

Our first amendment was drafted on the solid premise that out of the free conflict of fact and opinion the truth would emerge; and on the hope that out of this competition would emerge not only diversity but adequacy—and an ever-increasing quality and responsibility in the press. This hope needs constant rekindling.

As far as the press is concerned, one present ground for concern is the decline in the number of American newspapers, and the tendency toward standardization of content and centralization of control. This applies to the weekly field, as we know, as well as to the great urban centers. The New Yorker magazine made the appropriate comment on the recent death of the New York Sun. It mourned the passing of the Sun not because of any special attachment to the Sun, or out of nostalgia for its colorful past, but because one more newspaper had disappeared.

No one knows better than you men here who are editing and publishing Connecticut's home-town weeklies the struggle involved in putting out a paper which is both independent and profitable.

It is not enough just to be free. You must be able also to exercise that freedom.

The small weekly—the small, independent weekly—is as traditional to our New England way of life as the village green. And as our village greens are being carved away by bus terminals and superhighways—so the spark and spirit of our community newspapers are also threatened by boiler plate and chain operation.

We cannot afford this kind of progress, any more than we can afford to trade our conscience for vitamin pills.

But what I want to stress in the balance of this talk is not the problem of our Connecticut press or even our domestic American press. I want to direct your thought today toward the international flow of information—between peoples everywhere throughout the world. This is a field in which I have really had intensive experience, perhaps more of it than anybody here today. And let me assert my position as dramatically as I can.

If we could achieve international freedom of information, and extend it to all the peoples of the world—and this would indeed be a colossal achievement—and if we could find means positively to stimulate the integrity, the responsibility, and the constructive quality of this freely flowing information—then we would, in my judgment, reduce the danger of war by a factor of 90 percent. Is that a goal worth pursuing or isn't it? Is there any other such goal—anywhere in the world today? This goal, my friends, holds the real answer to the hydrogen bomb. It is the only real answer.

Now what progress are we making toward this goal?

The hard fact is that, on a world-wide basis, freedom of the press and freedom of communication are in worse shape today than they have been for decades. Four years ago International News Service made a study which showed that more than half of the member states of the United Nations practiced some form of censorship. Last month the Associated Press in its semiannual survey on the subject reported that the world situation on press freedom has declined still further. Mr. Robert Brown, of Editor and Publisher, wrote me 2 weeks ago that progress has been backward instead of forward. "Around the world," he wrote, "more barriers to freedom have been set up in the last year, and none have been torn down."

Now if I thought this were an irreversible trend then I should indeed despair. We cannot despair. We must not concede that this trend is irreversible. The instinct for freedom—including freedom to communicate—is one of the deepest of all human drives. It is only in the last two or three centuries that men of the western world have learned how to build freedom of communication into their political and economic institutions; but the lesson has been deeply learned. The fact that there has been retrogression and reaction in major areas of the world in the past 30 years does not prove that the great historical movement toward freedom has been permanently reversed. The task of statesmanship is now to restore that great movement before the reaction causes a cataclysm.

I had the privilege, 2 years ago, of serving as chairman of the United States delegation to the United Nations conference on freedom of the press at Geneva, Switzerland. It was the first international conference of its kind. Every one of the 54 nations present professed its devotion to the free-press ideal. So powerful is this ideal that even the Russians pay lip service to it. But the Communist version of a free press, is, in effect, a press free to advance the truth as laid down by the Kremlin. It is a press free from what the Kremlin regards as error. It is a press free to say that war is peace, slavery is freedom, depression is prosperity—and black is white.

I went to Geneva fully realizing that there is no hope at the present time of converting the Russians to real freedom of the press and determined that the United States would not compromise on the basic principle. Our strategy was to rally the forces of freedom, and to strengthen the will of the waverers. The measure of our immediate success was that on almost all important issues the Russians and their satellites found themselves voting as a lonely bloc of six.

The United States delegation brought to Geneva a draft convention which proposed, for the first time, to give the protection of international law to the free movement of foreign correspondents, and to the movement of their copy, with military secrets the only legitimate subject for censorship. After we had staved off a number of dangerous proposed amendments, this convention was finally approved by the Geneva conference, with only the Soviet bloc in opposition. Since the conference, this convention has run the gantlet of the Economic and Social Council and the United Nations General Assembly. It is now scheduled to be opened for signatures this coming autumn. It has been somewhat weakened in the gantlet process but in my judgment it still represents—without compromise on principles—a major advance for the cause of world-wide freedom of information.

I have been disappointed that this convention has been subjected to so little analysis in the United States newspapers. Our newspapermen are usually ready to editorialize on the subject of a free press and I can only conclude that they are discouraged at the tedious pace of international agreement, and at the fact that a proposition which seems so self-evident to us should require so much debate. (Let me give you, parenthetically, just one example of why the danger of censorship over the press is not always self-evident to others. (The Indian spokesman at Geneva illustrated the need for press "censorship" by stating that a single false rumor appearing in a Hindu or Pakistani newspaper at that time of tension might have ignited riots, before the rumor could be corrected, that would cost thousands of lives.)

The point I am trying to make here is that we must keep everlastingly at the job of freedom—internationally as well as domestically. If I am right that freedom of information at the international level is necessary for peace, then the lives of all of us are at stake—in keeping everlastingly at it.

The most important development now to watch is the action to be taken on article 19 of the Universal Declaration on Human Rights, as approved by the United Nations General Assembly 14 months ago. It could scarcely be more sweeping: "Everyone has the right to freedom of opinion without interference and to seek, receive, and impart information and ideas through any media and regardless of frontiers." I invite you to watch the efforts of the Commission on Human Rights over the coming months to translate this article 19 into a legally binding treaty, applicable to every citizen of every nation that signs it. This is important to the United States press as it is to every United States citizen.

The objective of this treaty is to tear down the man-made barrier to international freedom of information. The theme of the treaty is the negative theme of no interference. The first task is to work incessantly to lower the political barriers represented by censorship. The second is the reproduction of other types of obstacles to the free flow of information—chiefly economic—for example the shortage of newsprint and modern communication equipment in many parts of the world. You can't use radio without microphones or a printing press without paper.

Now what about the positive side of the freedom of information issue? Let me begin by citing China as an example.

Chiang's army in 1945 was stronger than the Communist army. The Russian army was not involved. But Chiang could not produce or project a program that appealed to the masses of the Chinese people, and the Communists, with incessant and skillful propaganda, could and did.

I listened to General Marshall speak at the Press Club in Washington when he was back from his mission to China in 1946. He spoke off the record, but since he spoke to 500 newspapermen, perhaps I can paraphrase a few sentences.

General Marshall described the great problem of communication in China. He couldn't get around fast enough. He couldn't communicate with the various conflicting groups and their constituencies. They couldn't communicate with each other. He called for the use of radio and the motion picture on a scale hitherto undreamed of.

The implication of his remarks seemed clear to me then and now, though nothing was done about them or has been done. The Marshall plan in the field of ideas still awaits development and leadership.

With adequate communication, the history of General Marshall's mission to China could be a very different one. The history of China could be very different. I shall go further. It would be very different. How important would that be to us? How much might it be worth to us in cash? We shipped billions of dollars in arms to China and vast quantities are now in the hands of the very Communists for whose destruction they were given. Would we not have been wise to have invested a few tens of millions in radio broadcasting and in motion pictures? I omit newspapers, not only because General Marshall omitted them but because, as I once said in a congressional hearing, if you pasted the Associated Press dispatches on every tree in China this could not be wholly effective because 80 percent of the Chinese can't read and far more than 80 percent in some areas. The impact of these on the minds of the Chinese could be of benefit to us still—even though the Communists are in power. The impact could change the history of China in the future, even if the Communist wave could not have been turned in the past. Here is an investment in peace and our security which is still largely neglected by our media of communications in the United States and by our political leaders.

The inventions of this century in the field of communications are as outstanding technically as those in any other field of human activity. They are potentially far more important to the future of mankind than any others. I contend they are far more important to the future of mankind than any others. I contend they are far more important to our future than the development of atomic power. They, too, are a matter of life and death. No other problem rivals the enormity of the international misunderstanding we now face.

We are not yet using the radio and the motion picture and the printing press in the international field. Their impact today, in our interests, is that of a midget. They have the potential strength of a giant. Let us give them a chance. They are our best chance. Fortunately, we now have two new agencies which can stimulate their constructive use. One is the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization, which has not yet begun even to realize its own potential. It needs real support and nourishment from our national leaders. This it has not yet received.

The second is the program of our State Department in international information and educational exchange. For 2 years in the State Department I read daily reports of the distortion of American life and American policy presented to foreign peoples, and saw their effects on our international relations. Much of this distortion was traceable to Communist propaganda. Make no mistake, the Communists are professionals. We are in comparison amateurs. They are skillful, determined, and successful. The Red Army is merely a reserve force; the front line troops are propagandists and political agitators.

We cannot and should not copy tactics. But we must tell our story straight, and see that the story of the free world is told straight. In many areas, and in some media, our private agencies cannot operate profitably across the globe.

The United States Advisory Commission on Information headed by Mark Ethridge, has just issued its semiannual report to Congress. This report criticizes the State Department and the Budget Bureau for slashing the program of the Department's overseas information division. We are spending on this program today less than the Procter & Gamble Co. spends in advertising its soaps. At the same time we are spending twenty billions a year for defense, including the foreign-aid programs. Much of this twenty billions is indirectly psychological in purpose—to deter aggressors, and in the belief that hungry and hopeless people are easy victims of Communist propaganda.

I propose now that we start at once to spend 1 percent of these twenty billions for programs that have a direct and constructive psychological impact on world opinion and world peace. Specifically, let us begin, immediately, to plan for a true world radio network, capable of laying a signal into every radio receiver in the world, even if it costs as much to build and operate as the battleship Missouri, including hauling it off the shoals of the Chesapeake. The American people are prepared and ready for such a program. They want to hear it discussed. They want to read about it. They fix their eyes on Washington seeking leadership. Senator MCMAHON won a warm response, as you may have noticed if you read the right papers, for his efforts along this line in his eloquent speech on the floor of the Senate on Thursday.

Now my talk today may seem remote from the problems of a Connecticut daily or a Connecticut weekly. I hope it does not for believe me it is not. The world would be a far happier place if we could lay a copy of a good Connecticut paper, or its counterpart, regularly on every doorstep in the world. They are editorially free papers, and what we seek is freedom. They build the sense of community, and I do not see how a better world order can develop without a growing sense of world community.

It is to this task, building a world community of free men, that freedom's past inspires us. It is to this task that freedom's future calls free men everywhere in the world today.

Career of Fulton Lewis, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 2 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, the New York Post performed a valuable service to the American people a few weeks ago when it published a series of articles by its Washington correspondent, Mr. Charles Van Devander, analyzing the career of Mr. Fulton Lewis, Jr.

It is because I share many of the conclusions arrived at by Mr. Van Devander and because I consider the articles to be a public service that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the first two installments in the series appearing in the New York Post for December 5 and 6, 1949.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be published in the RECORD as follows:

INSTALLMENT 1

(By Charles Van Devander)

WASHINGTON, December 5.—Nightly at 7 o'clock, Monday through Friday, somewhere between five and ten million Americans religiously dial their radios to local stations of the Mutual Broadcasting System to have their prejudices massaged.

Last Friday, this multitude was regaled with a fresh assault on the long-dead Harry Hopkins.

Mostly, Lewis' listeners are the irreconcilables—the people who have never ceased to regard all phases of the New Deal and the Fair Deal with profound distrust and suspicion.

The high priest of this 7 p. m. radio cult is Fulton Lewis, Jr., an exuberant, robustly self-assured, full-throated broadcaster, who, under the guise of news, reports his own peculiar version of the daily Washington scene. It is a scene unrecognizable to most of the Capital's residents.

Lewis cannot be explained or understood except in conjunction with his specialized audience. Nightly he confirms and gratifies his regular listeners in their conviction that the Government is being run by fools and knaves. They, in return, provide him with a devout support which makes him a potent minority force in public affairs and, incidentally, enables him to earn about $5,000 a week as radio's golden voice of reaction.

For 12 years—right through the war no less than in times of uneasy peace—Lewis has spread the seeds of confusion, doubt, and distrust of Government over the stations of the Mutual chain.

He has assailed and misrepresented with destructive effect such vitally important national endeavors as wartime rationing, price control, the veterans' housing program, and the present work of the Atomic Energy Commission.

The Government officials in charge of these programs have been singled out for personal abuse and attacks on their characters, against which his victims have no adequate defense.

His bitter and long-continued campaign of harassment against David E. Lilienthal almost certainly contributed to the final decision of the Atomic Energy Commission chairman to surrender the doubtful privilege of public office.

Others who have known the frustration that accompanies an all-out Lewis attack are Chester Bowles, Wilson Wyatt, Leland Olds, John Carson, and dozens of lesser Government officials.

His heroes make up an equally significant list. They include the Un-American Activities Committee, Senator Bridges, Republican, New Hampshire, and assorted right-wing Republicans, Senator Byrd, Democrat, Virginia, John L. Lewis, and almost anyone else who is willing to assail the motives or practices of the national administration.

Lewis' methods are unvarying. His prejudices parade usually as facts, seldom as opinion. His voice is superb. Its calculated stumbling, the deprecatory chuckle, convey an impression of sincerity. He repeatedly professes his own impartiality. A casual innocent listener, open-minded for an interpretation of the kaleidoscopic and confusing Washington scene, may be taken in for months.

Lewis' Washington, which he recreates nightly on the air, is peopled almost entirely by left-wing radicals and their well-meaning but inexperienced colleagues in Government, all pursuing crackpot or hair-brained schemes, and by Fulton Lewis and a few stalwart legislators on guard to expose them and protect the public.

Lewis is no sour-visaged, pinch-faced misanthrope, as many of his enemies assume. On the contrary, he is robust, blustery, and completely self-confident. He is blond and blue-eyed, walks with a strut, and is as positive in private conversation as he is on the air.

He strides determinedly through the welter of Washington news, contemptuously brushing aside everything which does not fit into his preconceived pattern and gleefully grabbing every scrap of news or opinion which can be made to serve his purpose.

He has been described by one biographer as being as innocent of guilt as a collie.

Lewis is a member of an old and vaguely aristocratic Washington family. He was born here April 30, 1903. He was graduated from Western High School and then attended the University of Virginia, where his academic record was less than distinguished.

In college he gave most of his interest to music and drama. He won a $25 prize for composing the Cavalier song, which is still played at Virginia football games, conducted his own orchestra, and picked up spending money by playing the organ in a movie house. His music nowadays is confined to the piano, which he is said to play somewhat better than does President Truman.

THREE HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FOUR ADVERTISERS SPONSOR HIS PROGRAM

Lewis solidified his place in Washington society in 1930 when he married Alice Huston, daughter of the then chairman of the Republican National Committee. It was a big June wedding, and President Hoover sent a gift. They now have two children, Betsy, 17, and Fulton III, 14, and live on a farm in Maryland, outside of Washington.

Lewis started work in 1924 as a cub reporter for the Washington Herald (since absorbed in the Times-Herald). From 1928 to 1937, he was a reporter in the Washington office of the Hearst news services. Meanwhile, he made a few radio broadcasts and attracted the attention of William Dolph, then owner of WOL, the Mutual station. The present 7 p. m. program was inaugurated on WOL November 27, 1937.

The Lewis program is now carried by 440 Mutual stations, although he is sponsored on only 249 of them. His 325 sponsors, who pay for an advertising spot on a single station one or more nights a week, are all local concerns in the various cities.

This multiple sponsorship makes Lewis virtually immune to the pressure of public indignation, since if one sponsor is persuaded to drop him, there are 324 left, and some other admirer may pick up the open spot.

In Washington, where the listening public has the best opportunity to recognize the distortions and falsities in his nightly program, his sponsors have tended to become discouraged rapidly in recent years.

MERCHANT SWITCHES TO ELMER DAVIS

Mazor Masterpieces, a Washington retail furniture store which sponsored Lewis on WOL for 5 years, dropped him after his anti-OPA campaign of 1946 and switched to Elmer Davis on another network station. Meyer Mazor, the owner, told this writer that the change was made as a result of widespread protests by customers, who not illogically assumed that the store would not sponsor Lewis unless its management was sympathetic to his peculiar viewpoint.

"Elmer Davis just gives the straight facts," Mazor added.

Since then Lewis has had a long succession of sponsors in the city from which he operates and with whose affairs he is chiefly concerned and at times has gone unsponsored for weeks. At present his program is sponsored here on a part-time basis by a stock-brokerage house and a motor-sales company.

Throughout the country Lewis' request and flagrant distortion of the facts has grad-

ually built up an opposition which, while it has no ready means of expression, is as fervent and possibly as numerous as his admiring audience.

FIGHT ON CO-OPS SHOCKED FARMERS

Thousands of farmers—perhaps the most susceptible victims of Lewis' antigovernment propaganda—were shocked and disillusioned when he conducted a virulent campaign against cooperatives, to which about 5,000,000 farmers belong with satisfaction and profit.

Other thousands of essentially nonpolitical citizens who gave their time and effort to voluntary work in rationing and price control, were outraged by Lewis' barefaced misrepresentation of that endeavor, of which they had first-hand knowledge.

More recently he received the doubtful distinction of having his postwar broadcasts selected for a case study of "Irresponsibility on the Air." This study, by Giraud Chester, former assistant professor of speech at Cornell University, resulted in a scholarly and documented exposure of some of his most flagrant distortions of fact and outright misstatements. It was publised in the spring, 1949, issue of Princeton University's Public Opinion Quarterly.

INSTALLMENT 2

WASHINGTON, December 6.—Among the many harassments to which a liberal-minded servant in present-day Washington may be subjected, nothing quite equals the frustration that accompanies a concentrated attack by Fulton Lewis, Jr., Mutual's 7 p. m. news commentator.

Night after night the hapless individual singled out for Lewis' attention will hear himself ridiculed and maligned over the air, his efforts misrepresented, his work hampered, his accomplishments undermined.

There is little that he can do to defend himself. Lewis usually stays just inside the laws dealing with libel and defamation of character. Even when he may have wandered outside those legal bounds, most public officials have figured they had more to lose than to gain by court action.

Several high-ranking public servants who attempted to fight back in Lewis' own medium have forced the Mutual Broadcasting System to grant them the opportunity to reply over the air. In such cases, Lewis blandly, and incorrectly, assures his audience that he has given up his time voluntarily and in the interest of fair play. And with that, he returns to the attack with even more deadly venom.

The experience of David E. Lilienthal, Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission and one of Lewis' major targets, proved that silence under the radio broadcaster's attacks is an equally futile defense. Far from tiring of his subject, Lewis kept up a steady drumfire of misrepresentation and distortion against Lilienthal and the atomic energy program for 2 years. He was largely responsible for Senator HICKENLOOPER's charges of incredible mismanagement, which led to a formal congressional investigation of the AEC last summer. While the charges fizzled out into nothing, the investigation tied up top officials of the AEC for months.

Lewis opened up on Lilienthal immediately after President Truman nominated him for the AEC chairmanship in 1947.

He took the position that no one who had run the Tennessee Valley Authority—whether he had run it well and successsfully was beside the point—should be named to head the AEC.

"The thinking behind it (TVA) is the same thinking and the same philosophy that rules the Soviet Russian Government and the economic structure," Lewis declaimed on his news program.

In a period of slightly more than 2 years, the Mutual broadcaster devoted all or part of 52 broadcasts to attacks on Lilienthal, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the left-wingers, whom he pictured as running the Nation's atomic-energy program. These broadcasts were, as usual, completely one-sided. Under the thin mask of an objective Washington radio reporter, Lewis was actively creating distrust of the atomic-energy program and the men in charge of it.

His own attitude toward atomic energy and the underlying dispute over military or civilian control was revealed February 2 of this year when he suggested that it would be a good idea to say how many ready-to-drop atom bombs this country had, in order to induce what he thought might be a much more respectful attitude on the part of Soviet Russia. Lewis airily assured his listeners that this would be entirely safe since there was complete agreement that Russia did not have the secret of the atomic bomb and wouldn't have it for considerable time yet.

The implied confidence that information as the number ready-to-drop United States bombs would be gratifying to this country and terrifying to the Kremlin apparently didn't strike Lewis as incongruous with his criticisms of the inefficient AEC management.

His sporadic attack on Lilienthal turned into an incessant daily drumfire early in January 1949 when Lewis discovered that the AEC had overridden its supercautious Security Advisory Board to grant an atomic energy security clearance to Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM, then president of the University of North Carolina, and now a member of the United States Senate.

Dr. GRAHAM is a distinguished educator and scientist, and a public-spirited citizen who earlier had served on the War Labor Board. Using some of the less reliable data of the House Un-American Activities Committee, Lewis smeared him as a supporter of Communist fronts and implied that he was an outright party-liner or fellow-traveler.

To fit this incident into the pattern of his attack on Lilienthal, Lewis blurred the fact that the five members of the AEC had unanimously approved Dr. GRAHAM for access to classified and secret atomic energy data. He reported that Lilienthal had maneuvered through the Commission, the clearance for his friend and fellow left-winger, Dr. GRAHAM.

Lewis was at the height of his campaign against GRAHAM (as a means of hitting at Lilienthal) when Senator Broughton, of North Carolina died unexpectedly in March and Gov. Kerr Scott—no Communist sympathizer even by the weird standards of Fulton Lewis and the Un-American Activities Committee—appointed Dr. GRAHAM to fill the vacancy in the Senate.

With his carefully built-up case against GRAHAM and Lilienthal in dust, Lewis breezily told his somewhat shaken listeners:

"Administration Democrats persuaded the Governor to appoint Dr. GRAHAM as a means of getting Mr. David E. Lilienthal, the Chairman of the Atomic Energy Commission, off the hook. * * *"

Following this fiasco, Lewis dropped the subject of Lilienthal and the AEC for more than a month. Then, on May 10—a historic date in the Lewis saga—he was back with an even bigger sensation.

Hans Friestadt, one of hundreds of students to whom an AEC agency had granted fellowships for scientific study, had turned out to be a known and admitted Communist. Moreover, he was a student at the University of North Carolina, "the same university, ladies and gentlemen, of which Dr. FRANK P. GRAHAM was until recently the president," and so on.

Apparently convinced that this time he had the AEC cold, he went through the unaccustomed procedure of telephoning that agency and actually reported, in his broadcasts, its viewpoint.

"They said," he told his radio audience that night, "that they did not go into the loyalty background of any individual until the time comes for that individual to be placed in a position in which he will have access to confidential and secret information."

PERHAPS PART OF A PLAN?

Lewis concluded:

"Now is it a fair question to ask, ladies and gentlemen, whether this could be just a matter of stupidity, or does this perhaps pass stupidity and become perhaps part of a plan? What do you think?"

When Lilienthal issued a statement on the Friestadt case, Fulton Lewis reported that "it's too long to go into details about tonight * * * (but) * * * it's as full of holes as Swiss cheese."

Hammering away nightly on the subject, Lewis said it was preposterous to be using tax money to provide a free education for Communists, whatever the purpose or ultimate objective may be—a view which would suggest the need for a loyalty check of every grammar- or high-school student.

The argument that intellectual freedom was involved, he observed, was sheer sophistry, of the first water. Don't swallow it for a single moment.

When noted scientists voluntarily came to the defense of Lilienthal and the AEC, Lewis promptly questioned their loyalty and good sense.

"It was an amazing performance," he said. "Sitting there listening to them you wondered whether you were hearing correctly. For example, one witness said that among the reasons it is dangerous for any loyalty tests to be required of scholarship students is that it is worrying to the older scientists for fear they, too, may be investigated for loyalty. can you imagine that statement?"

Not content with giving his own radio audience a completely biased and one-sided account of the alleged theft of uranium 235 frorr a Chicago atomic laboratory, Lewis reproved the Associated Press for sending out a clarifying statement by the AEC, "as though it (the AEC statement) was gospel fact."

On July 6, when Lilienthal testified before the congressional committee, Lewis gave less than 30 seconds (about 50 words) of his broadcast to a summary of his testimony, and then went back to the attack with this prelude: "It would seem to be a fair question to ask how that is an explanation of the lax security conditions, the squandering of untold millions of dollars unnecessarily."

The following day, he was back with this account of "the top of the news as it looks from here:"

"Mr. David E. Lilienthal, head of the Atomic Energy Commission, presented a further array of his scientists and contractors and assistants before the AEC investigating committee of Congress today in defense of his administration * * * and once again there was nothing specific in what he said; no specific explanation of the evidence against the Lilienthal administration which has been brought out to date. It was as yesterday merely a continuing series of general personal opinion on the part of the individuals who testified and after all they are unprejudiced witnesses, being part of Mr. Lilienthal's organization."

The hearing on the HICKENLOOPER charges finally petered out completely for lack of any further evidence, and Lilienthal soon afterward submitted his resignation.

Lewis asserted that this action would "leave forever moot" the question of whether the HICKENLOOPER charges had forced Lilienthal out of office.

The story ends, for the present, with one of the biggest of all Lewis whoppers.

It arose from a Presidential order to Attorney General McGrath to see that laws dealing with military security were strictly enforced. The order was occasioned by some loose-mouthed talk by Senator ED JOHNSON, Democrat of Colorado, about the development of an atomic bomb 1,000 times more powerful than any so far known.

Lewis, ignorantly or deliberately confusing military security with atomic secrecy, asserted on his news program that the President's position was diametrically opposite to that of Lilienthal, when, in fact, the two were in complete agreement.

This theory was not merely in some quarters, Lewis said, "that the President made his security views known to Lilienthal some time back and Lilienthal declined to go along with them and the President gave Mr. Lilienthal the opportunity of resigning before putting them into effect."

This theory was not merely unfounded; it was so obviously false and at variance with the known facts that no capable and conscientious reporter could ever have entertained it for a moment, much less broadcast it with his approval.

Price Survey Comparison

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a study made by the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, of New York, on the subject of fair-trade laws.

There being no objection, the study was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIRST COMPARISON PRICE SURVEY SHOWS FAIR-TRADE STORES FAVOR CONSUMER—COMPANION STUDY INDICATES RETAILER EFFICIENCY HIGHER IN FAIR-TRADE STATES THAN IN NON-FAIR-TRADE AREA

HARTFORD, CONN., February 1.—A price survey of 18 of the country's best-known nationally advertised brands of drug products reveals the American consumer pays slightly less for 12 of these products in States with fair-trade laws than in those without fair trade, and slightly more for only 6.

These findings were disclosed here today by Maurice Mermey, director of the Bureau of Education on Fair Trade for which the survey—the first of its kind—was made, in an address before the Connecticut Pharmaceutical Association at its midwinter convention at the Hotel Bond.

At the same time, Mr. Mermey also made public the results of a companion study on retailer efficiency "which shows that drug stores in the 45 fair-trade States—in the aggregate—have a lower operating cost than do those in the non-fair-trade area (Missouri, Texas, Vermont, and the District of Columbia)."

"Since all products in the price survey are typically used as loss-leaders by predatory price cutters in the non-fair-trade area," Mr. Mermey said, "the scant price differential noted in the price survey proves that fair-trade prices are, indeed, the lowest at which a retailer can sell these products and earn an honest profit. They also show conclusively that the protection of trade-marks, manufacturers, distributors, and consumers, the objective of the fair-trade laws, is achieved at no cost to the American people."

The cost of operations study, Mr. Mermey said, showed that operating expenses in 1948 of drug stores in the fair-trade States averaged 26.17 percent of sales while comparable figures for stores in the non-fair-trade area was 27.57 percent of sales. "Thus, in terms of retailer efficiency, there is an absolute difference of 1.4 percent in favor of fair-trade stores," Mr. Mermey explained, "but expressed as a percentage of the lower operating cost figure, stores under fair trade show 5.35 percent greater operating efficiency."

This study on operating costs was made for the Bureau by William R. Spurlock, director of the economic research division of Eli Lilly & Co., from data which the company compiles for its annual Lilly Digest.

PRICE PICTURE FAVORS FAIR TRADE

Covering leading national brands of dentifrices, laxatives, and headache remedies, the comparative price survey was conducted by a well-known independent research agency for the Bureau's research advisory committee, according to Mr. Mermey.

The data were gathered from 700 stores in the 45 fair-trade States and 70 stores in the non-fair-trade area, thus maintaining the proportion between fair-trade and non-fair-trade areas. Included in the sample were independent and chain stores in both rural and urban areas. Similar types of stores were compared, and prices were weighted according to sales volume, Mr. Mermey pointed out.

The figures on prices were collected over a 2-month period (July 15 to September 15, 1949), with the September 1, 1949, price representing the average for the period—the average being weighted to reflect volume. Mr. Mermey presented the following detailed break-down of the price survey:

Consumer prices in fair trade—Non-fair-trade areas

Brands	Fair trade minimum price	Consumer prices—all stores	
		Fair-trade States	Non-fair-trade States
Dentifrices:			
1	$0.43	$0.432	$0.416
2	.59	.590	.586
3	.43	.472	.438
4	.43	.439	.435
5	.53	.540	.534
6	.57	.589	.590
Laxatives:			
7	.23	.237	.238
8	.29	.303	.322
9	.31	.317	.322
10	.36	.392	.421
11	.39	.411	.439
12	.39	.419	.455
Headache remedies:			
13	.57	.574	.567
14	.49	.503	.528
15	.24	.256	.274
16	.19	.216	.235
17	.59	.609	.622
18	.19	.209	.229

STUDY ON RETAILING EFFICIENCY

In addition to showing that retail efficiency in the drug field, with respect to keeping operating expenses down, is greater under fair trade, the Lilly survey, Mr. Mermey disclosed, reveals that the cost of sales in fair-trade areas is 67.46 percent of the stores' total sales volume in 1948 as compared with 67.26 percent in the non-fair-trade area.

"The slightly higher cost of sales in fair-trade areas obviously reflects the slightly lower consumer prices in those areas," Mr. Mermey noted. He added that net profit for fair-trade stores is found to average 6.37 percent of sales while net profits for non-fair-trade stores averages 5.17 percent of sales.

In the Lilly survey, a sample of 1,051 stores in the 45 fair-trade States was used, plus 71 stores in the 3 non-fair-trade States and the District of Columbia, Mr. Mermey pointed out. Stores were broken down by size, in terms of dollar sales volume in 1948, ranging from under $50,000 to $100,000 and over. The sample was also analyzed with respect to community size, ranging from a population of under 5,000 to 500,000 and over.

Mr. Mermey presented the following summary of comparative figures from the study on retail efficiency:

Summary comparison of average operating data of drug stores in fair-trade and non-fair-trade classification

[In thousands of dollars

	Fair-trade classification		Non-fair-trade classification		Combined	
Number of stores	1,051		71		1,122	
	Amount	Percent of sales	Amount	Percent of sales	Amount	Percent of sales
Average sales volume per store	86.4	100.00	81.4	100.00	86.1	100.00
Consisting of:						
Cost of sales	58.3	67.46	54.8	67.26	58.1	67.44
Operating expenses	22.6	26.17	22.4	27.57	22.6	26.25
Net profit (pretax)	5.5	6.37	4.2	5.17	5.4	6.31

Government Financing and Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY FLOOD BYRD
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me before the National Industrial Conference Board, in New York, on January 26 last.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOCK AND ALARM

If this Nation is not shocked by the President's recommendations to the current session of Congress it is because we are stupefied by overindulgence in debt and deficit spending.

The Federal Government has been in the red 18 of the last 20 years. We had surpluses in fiscal years 1947 and 1948. We then started deficit spending again in fiscal year 1949.

Against this background, it is alarming enough that the President would launch us into a third deficit decade by his admitted incapacity—for the third consecutive postwar year—to hold expenditures to the level of revenue. But the President three times in the first 3 weeks of the session has, in effect, deliberately recommended that Congress refrain from balancing his budget for the coming year.

The ominous part of this postwar deficit spending is that we are unable to balance the budget in time of greatest prosperity. If we cannot balance the budget now, I ask you, when can we?

ADVERSITY AND PROSPERITY

There are a few businessmen, or heads of families, who have not experienced the necessity of borrowing in times of adversity, but there are no successful men of integrity who have not hastened in periods of prosperity to liquidate their lean-year debts.

From their own experience, there may be many men who could sympathize with some of the deficit financing in periods of depression and war, and even in periods of prewar emergencies and postwar foreign aid. But, no domestic emergency confronts us now. The President himself recommends

reductions in war-related expenditures for foreign recovery and veterans. And he says we are in a position where we can look forward to early reduction in defense costs. No recession in business is on the present horizon. National income is at or near its all-time peak, and so is employment, with the exception of those who choose the idleness of strikes precipitated by the distorted ego of labor czars.

The country is admittedly prosperous, but the prosperity is suspended dangerously from the unpredictable economics of a Federal debt already more than a quarter of a trillion dollars. The sound course is obvious to every prudent person. Yet, the President proposes that we pile up more debt with the continuation of deficit spending at the rate of nearly a half billion dollars a month.

SOLVENCY AT STAKE

The influence of the President of the United States and the prestige of his office must not be underestimated in consideration of the fact that the sound fiscal course under existing conditions is not obvious to him at a time when the solvency of the Nation may be at stake.

The President first brought in an expenditure budget and urged Congress not to cut it to meet revenue. Then he brought in his tax proposals which admittedly were not even designed to meet expenditures.

If we followed this advice we would nullify one of the fundamental tenets which have safeguarded this Government from its beginning. In their infinite wisdom, the founding fathers tied all the fiscal procedure of our Government to what they believed was a fool-proof system of checks and balances. They believed excessive spending would be checked by excessive taxation; that the hardships of taxation would act as an irritant to compel the Congress to reduce spending and thereby keep the budget in balance on a basis of taxation within the ability of the people to pay.

This official embrace of chronic deficit financing, written into Presidential messages, in time of peace and prosperity poses the question: How long can we continue to add to our debt and remain solvent?

VIOLENCE BY SPENDERS

One fundamental reason this Nation is greater than others in all respects, including living standards, individual security, civil rights, and personal privileges, is the productive capacity of our private-enterprise system, operating under a democratic form of government. Neither can exist in insolvency. Solvency requires balanced budgets.

You may be sure that under a balanced budget, within our ability to finance it, the havoc irresponsible spenders could wreak upon our system and form of government would be limited to misdemeanors. But an unjustifiable policy of indefinite deficit spending such as the President proposes would invite violence by the spenders to our system, our form of government, and our way of life.

Thus, nothing at this time is more important to democracy and freedom in the world, than for Congress to balance the Federal budget for the year beginning July 1, and then while keeping it in balance start gradual reduction of the public debt.

A balance can and must be achieved by reduction in expenditures. It cannot wait until deficit financing inflates income up to $300,000,000,000 to make the revenue available, as the President suggests. Insolvency would inflate money far more than that, and sooner. It should be noted in passing that inflation is always reflected in the cost of all the Government buys just as it is in the pocketbooks of all of us as individuals.

TAXES

If the President thought the Nation could take the taxes to pay for his expenditure proposals, he would have asked for them. He did last year. When he forecast a deficit of only $800,000,000 he asked for $4,000,000,000 in new taxes, and a recession in business followed.

In the present volatile state of our economy new taxes could easily accelerate a minor business decline into a major business recession. Federal revenue from taxes on corporation income now totals more than $11,000,000,000. If we attempted to cover the President's expenditure requests with additional taxes on corporation income it would require an increase of 50 percent on this source. And if the deficit were erased by increased taxes on individuals, it would mean an average increase of nearly 30 percent in our personal income taxes.

This would be in addition to a 24-percent increase in postage rates and a 43-percent increase in pay-roll taxes which the President already had proposed.

Indisputable calculations confirm my estimate that such increases in individual, corporate, and pay-roll taxes would raise the total tax take—Federal, State, and local—dangerously close to the confiscatory level.

Even the existing tax rates are drying up the Nation's venture capital, and this is the lifeblood of production expansion required to produce more of what people need at prices they can pay.

EXPENDITURES

Thus, it is clearly seen that reduction in Federal expenditures to balance with revenue is the only sound course open to us. To say that this cannot be done is not only fatalistic. It is inaccurate. It can be done if there is the will to do it. It can be done if the President and the Congress believe that a solvent Government should be preserved. As proof I submit that in the 18 months of peace and prosperity since the end of fiscal year 1948 we will increase Federal expenditures by $8,250,000,000 if we enact the President's recommendations.

I have proposed an over-all expenditure budget totaling $36,000,000,000. This is four times as much as we expended the year before the war and nine times as much as we spent when I came to the Senate in 1933.

I give you the Byrd budget in contrast with the Truman budget:

A $36,000,000,000 budget for progress, in tabular form with comparisons

[In billions of dollars]

Expenditure categories	Fiscal year 1948 (which ended June 30, 1948), actual	Fiscal year 1950 (which will end next June 30), estimated; Jan. 9, 1950, revision	Fiscal year 1951 (which begins next July 1)	
			Byrd $36,000,000,000 budget	President's Jan. 9 proposals
I. Domestic-civilian (exclusive of veterans and interest)	$6.9	$11.4	$8.9	$12.2
Social welfare, health, and security	$1.9	$2.3	$1.4	$2.7
Housing and community facilities (including RFC secondary mortgages)	.1	1.0	1.0	1.3
Education and general research	.1	.1	.1	.4
Agriculture and agricultural resources (including CCC)	.6	2.7	2.2	2.2
Natural resources	1.1	1.8	1.2	2.2
Transportation and communication (including postal deficit)	1.3	1.9	1.2	1.7
Finance, commerce, and industry	.1	.2	.1	.2
Labor	.2	.2	.2	.2
General government	1.5	1.2	1.0	1.3
II. National defense	11.0	13.1	11.3	13.5
III. Veterans	6.6	6.9	5.3	6.1
IV. Foreign	4.8	6.0	4.8	4.7
V. Interest on the Federal debt	5.2	5.7	5.7	5.6
Grand total expenditure budget (see below)	34.2	43.3	36.0	42.4
Revenue	[1] 42.2	[2] 37.5	[3] 37.5	[2] 37.5
Deficit surplus	[1] +8.0	[2] −5.8	[3] +2.0	[2] −5.1

[1] Actual.
[2] Maximum estimate.
[3] Minimum estimate.

NOTE.—Detailed figures may not add precisely to totals due to rounding and omission of reserves.

AT THE END OF THE RAINBOW

It is in the domestic civilian programs detailed in the table that the spenders are having their field day. And, it is in these programs that we are chasing a mirage of easy money in the form of deficit dollars flowing through expanding Federal programs which are undermining the will of individuals, regimenting the production of agriculture and labor, controlling the practices of business, curtailing the sovereignty of States and reducing the self-determination privileges traditional in our local government.

Make no mistake. It is socialism which lies at the end of this rainbow and the predominating color in the spectrum before us is the red of 19 Federal deficits in 21 years, including the one now proposed by the President in this time of highest prosperity.

When debt destroys confidence, insolvency sets in. Our private-enterprise system cannot survive in an insolvent nation. The private-enterprise system is fundamental to our form of government, and without it democracy, as we know it, cannot exist. The alternative is socialism.

THE FOUNDATION

The foundation for socialism in this country has been well laid by legislation enacted over the past 20 years usually in the name of temporary expedients to meet emergencies. But almost invariably it has been this type of legislation which opened the gate leading to the socialistic destination now looming ahead. A few of these Government programs—not many—have been repealed but their objectives almost without exception have been picked up and reincarnated in the legislation for the next emergency.

AS WE STAND

As we stand today there are 100 different programs spreading out from among 60 principal Federal departments and agencies (with a thousand units), and the President has just announced that payments to the public through these programs this year will total $46,500,000,000.

These payments are being made in Federal aids, grants, subsidies, pay rolls, pensions, and virtually every other form of government advance, contribution, and expenditure.

Too many of us regard this deluge as easy money overlooking the facts that a great

part of it is in deficit dollars from borrowed billions, and that binding strings are attached.

It is through these give-away programs that Federal plans, administration, control and regimentation are extended over individuals, their private lives, their agriculture, their labor, their business, their State and local governments, and their general welfare.

The extent to which we have gorged ourselves is indicated by the fact that 17,000,000 individuals are now receiving regular direct payments from the Federal Government, and Government payments to business are equal to more than half of corporate profits after taxes are paid. The number of people receiving regular public payments increases to 25,000,000 when State and local employees and other recipients are included.

A LOOK IN THE BRITISH MIRROR

Those who think they are benefiting from Federal payments and expanding federalized programs should take a look at England. In all that great country there are 70 Britons with net incomes of $16,800 after taxes. The so-called well-to-do in England have already been liquidated. But the worst of the British situation is that the liquidation of the middle-income group has extended to an alarming degree. There remain only 320,000 Britons with income of $2,800 to $5,600.

If we like what we see in English socialism, we are justified in stuffing ourselves with gratuities from a paternal Central Government until we bankrupt the greatest nation in all history.

If socialism is what we want, there are three more Federal programs pending in Congress at this moment which, if enacted, will irrevocably commit us to a state of socialism from which there is no retreat.

The first of these clincher programs is for more socialized housing. Part of this vast public-housing program has already passed, and exclusive of the new proposals, the program as it stands is estimated to cost $20,000,000,000.

The second clincher program is socialized medicine, which within 10 years will cost $20,000,000,000 annually.

The third and crowning program is the Brannan plan. The most accurate thing Mr. Brannan has said about this plan is that he cannot estimate the cost. The American Farm Bureau estimates that its application to milk alone would cost $2,000,000,000, and both of the great farm organizations—the American Farm Bureau and the National Grange—are opposed to it. Despite this, politicians are exerting their most powerful effort to force this highly socialistic plan upon farmers and consumers as sop to labor leaders.

EVIL COMPANIONS

While insolvency resulting from deficit-financed Federal programs which stifle individual initiative and private enterprise will be the overpowering force behind our capitulation to socialism, if that is to be our fate, evil loves company.

The evil companions of this unbridled deficit ogre are: (1) Confiscatory taxation; (2) Government competition with private enterprise and business; (3) Federal usurpation of State and local prerogatives; (4) Government invasion of private privileges; and (5) disregard of constitutional processes.

Continuous deficits and growing public debt in company with these natural sidekicks are virtually synonymous with socialism.

GOVERNMENT COMPETITION

We have already discussed confiscatory taxes as such, but they should be considered in conjunction with the fact that along with higher and higher taxes goes more and more Government competition such as that which results from the development of huge valley projects and tremendous so-called business loans such as those to Lustron and Kaiser.

The spenders make capital of this type of expenditure, and have been influential in having a whole section set up in the Federal budget to list them. They claim they are capital investments in the form of loans. The Government is not in business for profit and therefore it has no reason for capital investments. If they are sound loans they are in competition with private business, and if they are not sound loans, they are expenditures and must be regarded as such on the Federal books.

As if this were not enough Government meddling in business there is also the continuing threat of Government controls such as those requested at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress on prices, wages, commodity allocation, consumer credit, bank requirements, and employment practices.

STATE, LOCAL, AND PERSONAL PREROGATIVES

If you think these threats are dormant, your attention is invited to the pressurized maneuvers for the so-called civil-rights program which in its entirety would be the greatest mass invasion of States' rights, local prerogatives and the privileges of individual self-determination ever perpetrated on this Nation.

I am a southerner but I think my record will clearly show that I have never been guilty of any public act or attitude persuaded by racial intolerance. I think also the fact that as Governor of Virginia I was instrumental in the enactment of the tightest anti-lynching law of all time, along with my public advocacy of poll-tax repeal by State action, demonstrates that I speak without bias on this subject. Following this preface, I assert that the civil-rights program as proposed by the President and his Committee of Advisers, would invade the States' prerogatives with respect to the franchise and invade local prerogatives with respect to police power.

As to invasion of personal privileges, the FEPC would establish another costly powerful and inquisitorial Federal bureau to extend the strong arm of the National Government from Washington into the daily transactions of virtually every man's private business, dictating to employers as to whom to hire, whom to fire, and whom to promote.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROCESSES

Government regimentation of individuals and Government control of business is socialism, whether you choose to call it welfare state, collectivism, or give it some other meaningless name.

There is no retreat from socialism once it is entrenched, primarily because the state usurps not only the machinery of agricultural, mineral, and industrial production but also the sources of wealth and capital which would be required by private enterprise to recapture its vitality.

And with socialism goes frequent disregard for our constitutional processes which have made ours a Government of laws and not of men.

We have just experienced a foretaste of this byproduct of our socialistic tendencies when prompt invocation of the law in the case of the coal strike would have averted an unnecessary assault on the general welfare.

THE KEY IS SOLVENCY

I do not believe the people of the United States want socialism. Despite the fact that we are moving rapidly toward this end, I hope the American people, as always in the past, will awaken to their danger, and when they do they will smite down all Government programs and actions which can lead only to socialism.

This will take a lot of doing at this late date, and I realize that it cannot be done suddenly. But I am convinced by my own careful study of the whole Federal fiscal situation and all of the Government's programs that a start on Federal retrenchment can be accomplished now with neither harm nor great inconvenience to anyone involved, and the plan I have submitted with great detail would achieve this immediate objective. The plan requires only that Members of Congress be encouraged by their constituents to retrench within existing Federal policies and programs and to allow no unnecessary new ones.

This is not all that I desire and it is not all that is required to put this Nation on a long-term program of sound prosperity and constructive achievement, but it would balance the budget in the coming fiscal year, break the strangle hold of chronic deficit financing, and snatch the Nation from the clutches of the irresponsible spenders who would stifle us into socialism.

THE FOLLOW-THROUGH

To follow through from this beginning we must search every Federal program and policy and throw out all of those which were not soundly conceived and all those which our economy cannot afford.

It is true that more than $27,500,000,000 of the President's $42,500,000,000 expenditure budget for the coming fiscal year is for items tied to long-term commitments or other obligations carried over from prior years. Relatively few people regard all these programs as sacrosanct; but millions of people regard one or more of these programs (those affecting them) as sacrosanct.

To accomplish the job which has to be done to make this Nation sound for the future will require some personal unselfishness on the part of the vast majority of us.

For example, businessmen must withdraw from the easy money of some of the Federal subsidies, nonessential Federal contracts, and their advocacy of useless expansion of Federal activities to their localities.

States and localities must withdraw from Federal aid which has been increased from little over $1,500,000,000 in 1947 to nearly $3,500,000,000 proposed by the President for the year beginning in July.

Farmers must withdraw from some of the lucrative Federal payments which are not required as insurance against price decline that would precipitate depression.

Young and able-bodied veterans must withdraw from political pap programs having no connection with the bona fide obligation the Nation owes them for war-connected sacrifices.

Government employees must withdraw from nonessential public jobs and we must see to it that they are not refilled.

And the Government itself must withdraw from competition with private enterprise in the name of housing, banking, development of natural resources, etc.

A NEW GENERATION

These are the things required to make this country financially sound, to guarantee our permanent solvency, and to provide the true democratic progress of which this country is capable.

But it cannot be overlooked that in the coming fiscal year a whole new generation will have reached its majority under a deficit-financed Federal Government, and while children have been growing up young men have been growing old. Two decades of Federal hand-outs by a paternalistic Government are bound to influence the philosophy of all of us.

To change this philosophy, now so deeply rooted, may require some individual sacrifice during the period of readjustment, and it certainly will require complete and continuous devotion to the objectives, and the constant dissemination of facts presented in a manner which may be universally understood.

I know we do not want to go the way of England and I believe that so long as we can

keep this country financially sound the door will not be closed to recovery of the freedoms of private enterprise in democracy.

We must keep constantly before us the fact that the last hope of freedom-loving people in the world hangs upon maintaining the integrity of American money. The key to our fiscal solvency is balanced budgets when there are no domestic emergencies.

Thus, balancing the Federal budget is the first and vital requirement for the preservation of our own security and the security of democracy throughout the world.

The Coal Situation and 1952 Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no matter how hot a man may get under the collar, it will not warm his family hearth or keep the fire burning in his shop or factory.

But millions of Americans are hot under the collar because of the temporizing with the coal situation, which continues in almost every interest—except the public interest.

The editor of the Omaha World-Herald, in my opinion, has stated the situation most pungently, and I ask unanimous consent to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD his editorial appearing in the February 1 issue of the Omaha World-Herald under the title, "Into 1952 Politics."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO 1952 POLITICS

Following the precedent set in the steel strike, President Truman is seeking to settle the coal strike by unofficial persuasion.

He has asked the miners to go back to work and the operators to reopen the mines for a period of 70 days while a Presidential fact-finding board studies the problem. After the fact-finders make their report, according to this proposal, the miners and operators will sit down with Cyrus Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and decide what to do about it.

"The parties or either of them," said the President, "would be free to accept or reject the recommendations of the board as they see fit."

That is about the same thing he said in the steel strike. In that case the union quickly accepted the recommendations of the fact-finders, and the operators, under considerable pressure, capitulated one by one. They were free to accept or reject—provided they accepted.

In his letter offering the fact-finding plan, the President stressed that this would be "voluntary action, not compulsion," in accordance with "not only my personal conviction but the national policy."

That is not quite an accurate statement of the case. National policy is defined by laws passed by Congress, and there is no law which provides for a fact-finding board.

There is a law—the Taft-Hartley Act—which provides how the President shall proceed to end a strike which jeopardizes the Nation's well-being. That law provides that the President may obtain a court order requiring the strikers to go back to work for a period of 80 days.

As in the case of the steel strike, the President chose to ignore that law. He did so, not because of national policy, but because it is Harry Truman's policy to ignore and try to discredit the Taft-Hartley Act.

Yet that act is the only real weapon. If it were not on the books, if the President did not have that club in reserve, the fact-finding proposal would be only a scrap of paper.

Whether it will prove to be more than that, even under present circumstances, remains to be seen. At this writing neither the union nor the operators have replied to the Presidential letter.

But whatever their replies may be, it is clear that the coal strike has been thrown all the way into 1952 Presidential politics.

John L. Lewis has no more liking for Mr. Truman than Mr. Truman has for John L. Lewis. But their mutual and aggravated dislike is complicated by an equally mutual disapproval of the Taft-Hartley Act.

So:

How can the President get as much as possible for the miners, and thereby prove himself a stout friend of labor, without allowing credit for the victory to go to Lewis?

And how can Lewis now win a famous victory for his men, and thereby reinstate himself in their graces, without permitting Harry Truman to reap political benefits?

A large-sized dilemma. And if it is to be solved it must be done without recourse to the despised Taft-Hartley Act.

The fact-finders, if they are appointed, will have their work cut out for them. And that work will be enormously complicated by the fact that nobody but John L. Lewis himself knows precisely what the miners are demanding. In the protracted negotiations with the operators, he has talked about almost everything except the issues.

The seams of fact, in this case, are overlaid with hard strata of political rock. Whoever tries to dig them out will be engaged in hazardous work.

Value of High Dams

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Value of High Dams," published in the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer, of January 18, 1950, which, I submit, supports my bill, S. 338.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

VALUE OF HIGH DAMS

The mighty Mississippi River has reached the highest mark since 1937, but there is no cause for alarm as it is still several feet below the crest of that flood year.

What would be happening along the lower reaches of the Ohio and the Mississippi if the Tennessee were not harnessed with a series of high dams running its full length is anybody's guess.

The Tennessee development was not completed in 1937 and it poured all its floodwaters into the Ohio at Paducah, including the swollen current of the Cumberland. We all remember the consequences.

Opponents of TVA have accused the Government of tricky bookkeeping by charging a part of construction costs of dams and locks along the river to flood control.

It takes an emergency such as the present one to remind us flood control is actually one of the major functions of TVA. Cheap power is only a side line.

When we think of folks living in Paducah and Cairo we are reminded of something we heard a young woman say during the war.

The American Army started to cross the Rhine River into Germany and the papers said it was costing the Army something like $5,000,000 a mile to lay down an effective smoke screen to permit soldiers to cross the river in safety.

This report was causing the usual criticizm of Government waste when the young lady spoke and said she thought the smoke screen was cheap.

Being questioned as to the basis for her opinion it was disclosed her husband was among the soldiers crossing the Rhine.

We suspect folks in Paducah and Cairo think about like she did so far as the Government's investments in locks and dams is concerned.

Editorial Comment on the Hiss Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Acheson Should Resign," from the Indianapolis Star, January 27, 1950; another editorial entitled "They Must Be Impeached," from the Tulsa Tribune, January 28, 1950; another editorial entitled "A Dramatic Scene From the 'Inside' at Yalta," from the Wheeling Intelligencer, January 27, 1950; and another editorial entitled "How Naive Can You Be?", from the Indianapolis Star, January 29, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 27, 1950]

ACHESON SHOULD RESIGN

The depth to which morality and principle in Government have sunk was strikingly revealed by the position taken by Secretary of State Dean Acheson in regard to Alger Hiss. Acheson publicly defends Hiss as his friend, he publicly casts doubt on the court that convicted him, and the judge that sentenced him. He states unequivocably that he will not turn his back on a man convicted of lying, exposed as a traitor to his country. Thus he either condones Hiss' actions in stealing State Department secrets on the grounds of friendship in case Hiss' conviction is upheld, or he is using his high office to influence the decisions of higher courts before those decisions have been made.

Men in public office owe a higher loyalty than mere friendship. They owe their first loyalty to the institutions and to the people they serve. Does friendship with a murderer justify the murder? Does friendship with a traitor justify treason? This is what Acheson implies. He is saying clearly that he either believes Hiss innocent despite the decision of the courts, or else he is saying that

his friendship with Hiss condones Hiss' perjury and his treason. By what moral standard can he justify this stand? His invocation of the Sermon on the Mount borders on blasphemy.

Precedent for Acheson's defense of his friend has been well established in Washington by an even higher public official. The President of the United States publicly defended a convicted tax dodger, a vote stealer, a cynical and dangerous political boss, Pendergast of Kansas City. Out of friendship or loyalty to the boss he even punished the man who sent that criminal to prison. The morals of those in highest positions sink down through to the lowest and we are not surprised at the low state of morality and principle in the administration which now governs the American people.

The first loyalty of the President and the Secretary of State should be to the people of the United States, regardless of friendship, regardless of their political beliefs, regardless of what they think of the courts, or of the people, or of themselves. Hiss has been convicted, as Pendergast was convicted. If that conviction is upheld he is a traitor to his country. Dean Acheson has no right to use his high office to influence the coming decisions of the higher courts. He has no right to cast doubt on the decision of the jury that convicted Hiss, nor on the sentence of the judge. He has no right to put his friendship for Hiss above his responsibility to his Government and the people of the United States.

Acheson has disqualified himself for service to the American people, not only because he defends Hiss, but because he contributed to the campaign of secrecy and protection of Hiss while Hiss was in the Department of State. Henceforth every action of his will be suspect by the American people. He should resign.

[From the Tulsa Tribune of January 28, 1950]

THEY MUST BE IMPEACHED

(By Richard Lloyd Jones)

What's happened to our country? The Hiss conviction has revealed something more than an individual traitor. It has revealed men in offices of high public trust who are defenders of treason.

Justice Felix Frankfurter, one of Harvard's collection of cultural curiosities, should resign from the highest court in our country. And if he hasn't the decency to do that he should be impeached.

Frankfurter is only one of our high officials who has indicated his own intellect and integrity by sponsoring and repeatedly publicly professing his warm personal friendship for a traitor.

Justice Stanley Reed, also of our highest court, is another friend of traitor Hiss. He should resign, or be thrown out of his judicial robes by impeachment. Our courts and our Congress should be above suspicion.

Frankfurter was the exalted scholar whom the late President Franklin Roosevelt picked as his adviser.

It was Frankfurter who picked Hiss as the prodigy of the Roosevelt administration. It was Frankfurter and Roosevelt who made this traitor Hiss the closest adviser of the President of the United States at a time when not only the security of the American people was imperiled, but the peace of the whole world. Roosevelt put the fate of nations in the hands of Hiss.

Added to all this our Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, after the traitor is convicted, reiterates that he is the traitor's friend. If he is the traitor's friend, he is not fit to be our Secretary of State.

The people's Representatives in their Congress should lose no time to impeach and remove this man who could be a friend to a traitor.

This Hiss who helped our enemy was authorized by our Secretary of State and our President to shape the tragic policies that have brought China into communism, and an ally of Russia.

For 10 years, through the interest of the late President Roosevelt, Frankfurter and others, this fellow Hiss has gone from one position of power to a new position of greater power. For 10 years this intrigue against our Government has been going on and for 10 years high officials in Washington, with full knowledge of these infamous operations, have protected and covered all these trails of treason. The treason story does not end with Hiss. It begins with Hiss. Washington is now filled with frightened public officials.

Even the President of the United States so far forgot his obligations to the American people that when the facts of treason began to be talked about he assured the people that it was nothing but a political trick to distract their attention by dragging "red herrings" before them.

The President should have been the first to authorize and insist upon full investigation. He should have been the first to ferret out the truth. But instead of that, our President, and his lieutenants, did everything they could to hide the truth and to keep the people in ignorance of their betrayal.

What is the matter with the Democratic Party that it, professing to be a political champion of the American people, should lend itself to the suppression of the truth and make every effort to smear and ridicule those who, in the defense of our country, have sought to establish the truth?

Senator CONNALLY, of Texas, to his disgrace, is just one of the Democratic Senators who have tried to ridicule those who have brought the truths of the Hiss infamies to light.

On February 11, 1945, at Yalta, Franklin D. Roosevelt was a dying man. He had just been reelected without the strength to go through an exhaustive hard political campaign. Yet there at Yalta, this sick man, the choice of his party, was to determine the fate of nations. Of all the able men in America not one was chosen to be his adviser. He chose Hiss and Hiss alone. And it was at Yalta, under the influence of Hiss, that millions upon millions of people were flippantly handed over into slavery under Stalin.

It was this Hiss who, given the power by a Democratic Party and a Democratic President, gave to Russia three votes to our one in the newly formed United Nations. Everything that Hiss did was done to strengthen communism and to weaken America. And he is still the dear friend of our Secretary of State. And to two of the judges on our Supreme Court. And he is just a piece of "red herring" to the President.

Where are the Americans that they witness this with flippant disinterest? Where is our Congress, every Member of which has taken his solemn oath to defend the interests and protect the integrities of our Republic?

Every loyal citizen of this Republic should write every Congressman he knows or who represents him, Senate and House, and demand the impeachment of Frankfurter and Reed and Acheson. Command every Representative and Senator to command the President of the United States to reveal the names of those who have concealed this Hiss, and his associates, in the betrayal of this Republic for the last 10 years.

Already, from the floor of the United States Senate, President Truman has been challenged to reveal the identity of those in our Government who, for 10 years, have engineered the concealment of the espionage evidence that convicted Hiss.

But a challenge is not enough. The whole country is now alerted to the fact that our State Department is honeycombed with trusted and confidential workers who have the funny idea that it is intellectually smart to betray America to the communistic forces.

The Senate should do more than challenge. It should command President Truman to come clean with everything, and himself clean out the traitors and the near-traitors and the friends of traitors in all the departments of our Government.

Senator CAPEHART, of Indiana, has demanded the resignation of Acheson and Frankfurter. We would like to see one of Oklahoma's Senators lead the fight for a clean and honest national administration that is above suspicion. It is time that ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR became articulate with righteous indignation at the red-herring hypocrisy of Truman.

Cheap and shallow are the gentlemen who sit in the Senate of the United States more concerned with their reelection than they are with the security of the American people. Shallow and sad are the American voters who think betrayal of a public trust is a clever political trick that merits political award.

Our Congress is what we voters make it. This Hiss trial has proven many things. Chief of which is that we, the voters, have failed to do our duty. We have elected a President and a Congress that have tried to shield a traitor to the Republic.

The Hiss trial has put ELMER THOMAS and BOB KERR on the spot. This Hiss story will reveal them. Do we expect statesmanship performance? Or are we to listen, as do the Texans, to a Senator who said that those who brought this Hiss to trial and those who convicted him are just "trying to make a burlesque out of this."

Betraying your country is not burlesque, Mr. CONNALLY. Oklahoma waits for her Senators to speak.

[From the Wheeling (W. Va.) Intelligencer of January 27, 1950]

A DRAMATIC SCENE FROM THE INSIDE AT YALTA

A challenging and dramatic inside picture of the scenes at Yalta has just been given by United States Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, in relation to the part allegedly played there by Alger Hiss, who has just been convicted by a jury on two counts of perjury to conceal his turning over to a Communist espionage apparatus certain documents of the United States Department of State. For the traitorous offense of which he was convicted, Hiss, former aide of the late President Roosevelt at Yalta, has been sentenced to 5 years in prison. Senator CAPEHART says:

"At one meeting, Stalin, President Roosevelt, Alger Hiss, and a Russian interpreter were the only ones in the conference room. When Mr. Roosevelt and Alger Hiss came out of that room, they advised those waiting outside that an agreement had been reached to give Russia three votes against one for the United States in the United Nations organization."

Can you not call up this picture in your own mind? How Generalissimo Stalin appeared in his new uniform, with the sleeves too long, and the bottoms of his trousers flopping somewhat about his ankles for the same reason? And Alger Hiss with his confident, audacious, and even infectious grin? And the late F. D. R. with his long, tragic-looking cape of Navy blue, his wan and emaciated face, betokening the strain of the war years, and possibly the imminence of the malady which was to end his life a few months later? Mr. Roosevelt was in full possession of his mental faculties, however, according to his biographer, Robert Sherwood, in the voluminous book, Roosevelt and Hopkins.

Were there some knowing looks and glances exchanged between Presidential Aide Hiss and Generalissimo Stalin behind the back of F. D. R. while the best interests of the United States and China were being sacrificed at these Yalta conferences? We believe this a fair question in view of all the circumstances. Mr. Roosevelt, according to Mr. Sherwood's biography, was a tired man when he consented to turn over to Soviet Russia dominance in Manchuria, all of Saghalin, the Kuriles, Outer Mongolia—yielding to Moscow unnecessarily, and without General Chiang's knowledge, what virtually amounted to handing China to the Soviets on a silver platter. We believe it no more than right and just to the American people to be given the full part played by Alger Hiss at the Yalta parley, which did so much to aggrandize Soviet Russia, increasing its total dominion over the nations to 750,000,000 people. We should know, in full if possible what part Alger Hiss played in influencing Mr. Roosevelt, when the latter trusted Hiss implicitly, and apparently had no idea that Hiss had been betraying United States State Department secrets to the Soviet Government of Russia.

It is not too often that we find ourselves in agreement with the Chicago Tribune, but the following editorial from the Tribune, relating to the admitted friendship between Hiss and United States Secretary of State Dean Acheson, we believe will be of profound interest to the American people. Twice, in recent months under the same heading "Acheson must go," we have contended in the Intelligencer that Mr. Acheson has demonstrated his unfitness for the vital post he holds. The Tribune bases its demand for his removal on somewhat different grounds, as follows:

"ACHESON MUST GO

"The dismissal of Dean Acheson from his post as Secretary of State should follow automatically on the conviction of Alger Hiss.

"The relations between the two men were and are intimate. Mr. Acheson has described Hiss as his friend and, in this connection, has noted that he does not give his friendship lightly. The Secretary found in the traitor not only a sympathetic personality but also a helpful collaborator whose views on foreign policy he shared. We know this from the testimony of Adolf Berle who said that when there was division in the State Department in 1944 on a policy toward Russia, Acheson favored the soft line and Hiss was Acheson's principal assistant in promoting it.

"In the circumstances, the best that can be said for Acheson is that he has shown himself to be so poor a judge of men and events as to be disqualified for the management of this country's foreign relations. He misread Russia and Hiss. Or did he?

"Either way, Acheson's continuance in office is a danger to the Nation and an affront to every loyal American."

Notwithstanding the above editorial, Mr. Acheson persists in avowing his friendship for Hiss, even after Hiss has been convicted by a jury and before a judge who was scrupulously fair to give the defendant every resource to attempt to prove his innocence. Mr. Acheson now goes even further than he did in the interview quoted yesterday from the New York Times. A later United Press dispatch quotes Mr. Acheson as saying:

"Whatever the outcome of the appeal, I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss. I think every person who has known him has on his conscience the serious task of deciding what his attitude will be. Each must decide according to his own standards and principles. For me there is no doubt as to these standards and principles. They were stated a long time ago on the Mount of Olives."

It seems rather strange that Mr. Acheson would say that he feels constrained by Christian principles to stand by a man who has been convicted of aiding the espionage of Communists, who if they had their way, and are permitted to triumph by treason in our own State Department, would crush all religion, including the Christian religion in the United States. Does Mr. Acheson have no awareness whatever of such dangers to our traditional religious freedoms here in America? It would seem to us that the normal man, confronted by the evidence of such treachery in his own household would wax exceedingly wroth and indignant, especially when the convicted traitor was found in alliance with Communists and as a cog in the top Communist apparatus would be required to subscribe to the tenets of militant atheism.

It raises a series of questions: If Mr. Acheson is so quick to deal lightly with Communist aides in his own Department, and turn the other cheek, is he himself a proper person to be entrusted with policies that could mean the life and death of our Republic? The people also have a right to ask, in view of Mr. Acheson's tolerance of the author of Communist machinations in his own Department, does he know more about Alger Hiss than he has revealed? What is the reason for this strange friendship, in which some will see a perilous mesalliance?

The long delays before the sinister role of Alger Hiss was recognized by Washington officialdom have justifiably aroused the suspicions of the United States people. They will not be content now until the full glare of research is turned into every nook of the United States Department of State.

[From the Indianapolis Star of January 29, 1950]

HOW NAIVE CAN YOU BE?

Like addle-headed Dean Acheson, Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt now throws up her hands in horror that such a nice boy as Alger Hiss should have been convicted as a liar and a traitor to his country. "I just don't like it at all," she says. "It seems rather horrible to condemn someone on the testimony of another person who by his own admission is a perjurer and a former Communist." Whittaker Chambers is the one who is guilty in her mind, for doing dirt to Alger Hiss.

Let's keep the record clear. Whittaker Chambers' testimony wasn't what convicted Alger Hiss. The facts convicted him. There were documents in his own handwriting. There was his typewriter which had been used to type other secret papers. There was the testimony of Hede Massing and of Edith Murray. There were facts aplenty, facts which Hiss tried to deny, but which kept coming back to haunt him.

As prosecutor Robert Murphy said to the jury, "I told you * * * that the facts would be proven by immutable documents. * * * What do they prove? Treason."

The jury of 12 honest American men and women decided after careful deliberation that that was exactly what they did prove. Treason. And Mrs. Roosevelt says that people are overhysterical because they attack Dean Acheson for publicly defending this convicted liar.

Who's overhysterical? If anybody is emotionally tangled up it is Eleanor Roosevelt and Dean Acheson. They have allowed their feelings to blind them to the simple fact that a jury of his peers convicted Alger Hiss of lying, stealing state secrets, and treachery to his country. There is nothing hysterical about the conviction. And there is nothing hysterical about scorn for a traitor. That is the normal reaction of Americans since the time of Benedict Arnold. If Mrs. Roosevelt and Mr. Acheson don't feel it there is something wrong with their heads.

Proposed Fair Employment Practices Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a splendid editorial entitled "A Problem for the States," which appeared in the February 2, 1950, issue of the New York Journal American. This editorial is in reference to the so-called Fair Employment Practices Commission bill. It is so clear and logical and so soundly states a fundamental principle of American Government that I believe it will be of value, and will command itself to the thinking of the Members of the Congress. I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A PROBLEM FOR THE STATES

I would be a sensible action if both parties in Congress should agree to drop the controversial legislative proposal for a Federal Fair Employment Practices Commission, and return the issue to the States where it belongs.

Of course, there should be be no discrimination between citizens in such matters as employment and wages, just as there should be no such thing as prejudices because of differences of race, color, or religion.

But if these faults occur, they are faults of the mind and of the heart, or of social inheritance, which can be eradicated only by education and example.

They are not faults that can be corrected by compulsion.

Furthermore, no law can be effective if it is not acceptable to the people affected, and a national FEPC law would be unenforceable in a very large section of the country.

Such a law would provoke resentment and lawlessness, and be worse than no law at all.

Even assuming, however, that legislation of this nature is practicable it is extremely doubtful if Congress has jurisdiction.

Under the Constitution, Congress has no powers not delegated to it, and it would seem clear that the States—which alone may determine the qualifications of voters— have also reserved to themselves jurisdiction in the field of social relationships.

And, since these relationships are necessarily local to every community and various as among the States, the legislatures and the local councils would be the proper agencies to act.

If legislation, is desirable, therefore, the place in which to strive for it is in the self-governing areas that would be affected.

The persistent effort to obtain congressional legislation, uniformly applying to every area of this diverse country, is essentially demagogic and rabble-rousing.

One of its most vociferous advocates is the Communist Party.

The loudest supporters must realize this truth, although it would be politically inconvenient for them to say so.

As regards Congress itself, it is quite intolerable that its important business should be continually roiled and frustrated over an issue that does not arise in Congress under the doctrine of States' rights.

Relations Between Coal Operators and Coal Miners

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter from the negotiating representatives of the United Mine Workers of America, by John L. Lewis, to the President of the United States, regarding conditions in the coal mines.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
Washington, D. C., February 4, 1950.
Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We represent great numbers of men. They are citizens and taxpayers. They are men with family responsibilities. They perform an essential service. They serve a harsh and brutal industry. Its toll of broken men and its usage of human flesh are without parallel in modern industry. Their employers are, in a controlling sense, greedy, grasping, and devoid of ordinary compassion.

The mine workers have the same ideals and dreams as other Americans. They wish to provide for their families, and serve their God and their country without reserve. To do so, they must eat and have shelter to face the menace of the years and to retain the courage to combat the terrifying vicissitudes of their toil.

The industry contract expired June 30, 1949. For 8 months, the organized coal operators have refused to execute a successor agreement. For 8 months, the operators have gloried in the protection given them by an oppressive Federal statute. For 8 months, Mr. President, they have boasted that the abomination, known as the Taft-Hartley Act, rendered it unnecessary to concede anything, and that in the end your high office, wielding TAFT'S club, would beat the mine workers into submission.

So now it comes to pass, Mr. President, that as a penalty for refusing the coal operators' dictated terms your office offers arbitration by three strangers, who know not of the industry nor the human beings who delve in it.

With due respect, Mr. President, the mine workers do not wish three strangers, however well-intentioned but necessarily ill-informed, to fix their wages, decree their working conditions, define their living standards, and limit the educational opportunities of their children. Such strangers cannot see into a mine worker's home, nor peer into the hearts of his loved ones. The mine workers believe that as free citizens in a free country they have an inherent right to pass upon these vital considerations themselves, and that no stranger, however situate, should be given such power over their lives.

It is no answer, Mr. President, to suggest that your plan, as set forth in your telegram of January 31, permits acceptance or rejection by either party, after rendition of judgment by your agents. The mine workers know that any rejection of your agents' findings, after issuance, would cause them to face the oppressive legal sanctions of TAFT'S bill of attainder against labor unions. The mine workers know also, Mr. President, that the heavy hand of Government would not be laid concurrently on the shoulders of the coal operators as they make wassail in the privacy of their exclusive clubs.

For 7 months since the expiration of the agreement, the mine workers have made personal sacrifices to insure the country sufficient coal. It is a travesty upon justice that they should now be slugged by a legal blackjack to satisfy the overweening avarice of their reactionary employers.

To use the power of the state to drive men into the mines, on the terms and for the profit of private employers, is involuntary servitude, violative of the spirit, and perhaps of the literal text, of the thirteenth amendment. It is questionable whether one could postulate that such mass coercion would insure enthusiastic service from grateful men.

Respectfully submitted.

NEGOTIATING REPRESENTATIVES, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,
JOHN L. LEWIS.

Tribute to Lt. Col. Albert L. Vreeland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an announcement of a presentation of the Army's commendation to Mr. Albert L. Vreeland, an ex-Congressman from New Jersey, and a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserve Corps. I am making this insertion at the request of the Bronx County Disabled American Veterans and ANU.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Albert L. Vreeland, ex-Congressman from New Jersey, and a lieutenant colonel in the Organized Reserve Corps, received the Army's Commendation Medal at a ceremony held January 23, at 11 a. m., in the office of Col. H. A. Cooney, chief, New York military district, 90 Church Street. The presentation was made by Colonel Cooney.

Colonel Vreeland, who is vice president of the Celanese Corp. of America, as well as general counsel for the same firm, receives the decoration for his wartime service.

A Member of Congress at the time of the United States entry into war, Colonel Vreeland first served with the Military Intelligence Division of the War Department, then was recalled to Congress to finish out his legislative term.

When returned to duty with the Army, Colonel Vreeland became commanding officer of the Counter Intelligence Corps of the Southwest Pacific area.

Colonel Vreeland is currently assigned to the One Thousand Five Hundred and Sixty-Eighth JAGC Training Center, New York City, and lives at 415 Prospect Street, East Orange, N. J.

Minnesota Welcomes the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD some remarks of mine at the time of the President's visit to the State of Minnesota.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINNESOTA WELCOMES THE PRESIDENT

Mr. President, the people of Minnesota welcome you to their great and progressive North Star State. You have honored us by your visit on this historic occasion.

Tonight we celebrate two great events in the history of a growing and expanding American democracy—the Minnesota Centennial and your miraculous victory in November 1948.

One hundred years ago America was in the midst of a great internal controversy over the issue of slavery versus freedom. The establishment of Minnesota as a Territory and her subsequent admission as a State gave strength to the forces of liberty and emancipation in the tragic conflict which later on convulsed our Nation. Then, as now, there was a struggle for the minds of men. Then, as now, the principles of democracy were being challenged within and without.

In the year 1948 we saw a world in the midst of a great controversy. The issue now, as a century ago, was whether or not a people can live half slave and half free. To be sure, the stage for the great human drama was in the dimensions of a world and not merely a nation, but the principle in our generation is the same as that of a hundred years past. And as if history would repeat itself, the people of Minnesota again made a great contribution to the cause of human freedom. That contribution, Mr. President, was their confidence and faith in you. That contribution was made real and tangible by the overwhelming vote you received from the people of Minnesota in that crucial election of 1948. Our people now, as 100 years ago, place their faith and hope in the principles of the dignity of the individual, freedom of conscience, and a brotherhood of man.

These are not merely idealistic pronouncements or comforting phrases of a democratic ritual. The dignity of the individual has real meaning in the social, economic, and political fabric of our State. We jealously guard and protect as inviolate that sacred principle of freedom of conscience. We not only preach and proclaim the brotherhood of man, but as a State of almost 3,000,000 people we tirelessly work toward its realization.

Yes, Mr. President, if ever one State could justifiably claim that it represented the dynamic spirit of America, our State of Minnesota feels justified in making that claim. Permit me to indulge myself in a recitation of our case for this honor.

Here in Minnesota people from all sections of the world have learned how to live, to build, and to work together. Our people represent the finest qualities of every race, creed, and nationality. Our standard of honor and respect is not that of birth or

race. Our standard of honor and respect is that of achievement and of individual ability.

We have placed our faith, Mr. President, in the people. That faith has been justified by the accomplishments of our people in a free America. Here before you tonight you see living testimony to the virtues and truth of the democratic way of life.

Less than a century ago this vast expanse of land which now is known as Minnesota was an undeveloped and almost unknown region. Today it stands out as one of the most progressive and prosperous areas of a strong and mighty Nation.

The pioneers, the immigrants, the sons and daughters of those who came from many lands, have applied their minds and bodies to creating a prosperous and democratic society. Our people have taken the iron ore from the earth to supply the steel furnaces of the industrial East. Our woodsmen have cut the forests to produce the timber and the lumber required by growing America.

Our seamen have sailed the ships from the great harbor of Duluth, Minn., to carry the iron ore, the grain, and the lumber to the processing and manufacturing plants in other areas of our Nation.

Our farmers have tilled the soil and produced the food that was needed by a growing population.

Yes, Mr. President, there is no place in all the world where one will find a more industrious, a more enlightened, a more devoted, and a more patriotic people than here in middle America.

We have created new industries. We are rich with a supply of skilled labor. Our workmen take justifiable pride in their productive skill and ability.

Our industry and business community have demonstrated unusual initiative and ingenuity.

Minnesota points with pride to its hospitals, its clinics, its programs of public health and recreation, its great State university and its many colleges, its splendid system of public and parochial schools.

We have emphasized the human values. We have believed, and will continue to believe, that the richness of America is in its people. It is because of this faith of the people in themselves that we have placed particular emphasis upon the health and the welfare and the education of our people.

Like you, Mr. President, we believe in human welfare and we have dedicated much of our efforts and a sizable portion of our resources to the creation of a social, economic, and political environment that is conducive to the betterment of the people.

We in this State know that a deep concern for human welfare yields dividends. This emphasis upon the welfare of people has given us a rich and productive economy. It has given us an enlightened citizenry that is capable of conserving and improving the great storehouse of natural resources in land, water, forests, and mines with which God so generously blessed us.

We in Minnesota in this generation have repudiated not only the exploitation of human and physical resources—we have likewise repudiated for once and for all the false doctrine of isolationism.

We are of the people—yes, of the people of all the world. Therefore we are interested in people no matter where they may be or who they may be.

We do not need to ask ourselves the question, "Am I my brother's keeper?" We already know the answer. Our political and social convictions are deeply rooted in a religious faith. We gratefully acknowledge our humility before one God. We know that man does not live by bread alone. Our strength is not merely that of material blessings. Our strength and faith are guarded and protected by a sense of religious and spiritual obligations and principles.

It is in this spirit, Mr. President, that we welcome you. What has been said of our State typifies your character, your philosophy and your program.

You, too, are of the people. You have placed your confidence in the people. Your great victory in 1948 was made possible because you went to the people with your message. They received you and gave you inspiration to carry on.

You, too, Mr. President, are known for those sterling qualities of honor, integrity, industry and a man of deep faith.

You are in the midst of many friends—friends not only in the social sense, but friends in spirit and mind.

There is a bond of fellowship between our people and their President.

I have the honor and the privilege of presenting to you the President of the United States, the Honorable Harry S. Truman.

Tribute to Harry Hopkins by Winston Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BRIEN McMAHON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a tribute by Hon. Winston Churchill to Mr. Harry Hopkins, appearing in the New York Times under date of January 26, 1950.

There being no objection, the tribute was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On January 10 a gentleman arrived to see me at Downing Street with the highest credentials. Telegrams had been received from Washington stating that he was the closest confidant and personal agent of the President. I therefore arranged that he should be met by Mr. Brendan Bracken on his arrival at Poole Airport, and that we should lunch together alone the next day. Thus I met Harry Hopkins, that extraordinary man, who played, and was to play, a sometimes decisive part in the whole movement of the war. His was a soul that flamed out of a frail and failing body. He was a crumbling lighthouse from which there shone the beams that led great fleets to harbor. He had also a gift of sardonic humor. I always enjoyed his company, especially when things went ill. He could also be very disagreeable and say hard and sour things. My experiences were teaching me to be able to do this too, if need be.

At our first meeting we were about 3 hours together, and I soon comprehended his personal dynamism and the outstanding importance of his mission. This was the height of the London bombing, and many local worries imposed themselves upon us. But it was evident to me that here was an envoy from the President of supreme importance to our life. With gleaming eye and quiet, constrained passion he said:

"The President is determined that we shall win the war together. Make no mistake about it.

"He has sent me here to tell you that at all costs and by all means he will carry you through, no matter what happens to him—there is nothing that he will not do so far as he has human power."

Everyone who came in contact with Harry Hopkins in the long struggle will confirm what I have set down about his remarkable personality. And from this hour began a friendship between us which sailed serenely over all earthquakes and convulsions. He was the most faithful and perfect channel of communication between the President and me. But far more than that, he was for several years the main prop and animator of Roosevelt himself. Together these two men, the one a subordinate without public office, the other commanding the mighty Republic, were capable of making decisions of the highest consequence over the whole area of the English-speaking world. Hopkins was, of course, jealous about his personal influence with his Chief and did not encourage American competitors. He therefore, in some ways, bore out the poet Gray's line, "A favorite has no friend." But this was not my affair. There he sat, slim, frail, ill, but absolutely glowing with refined comprehension of the cause. It was to be the defeat, ruin, and slaughter of Hitler, to the exclusion of all other purposes, loyalties, or aims. In the history of the United States few brighter flames have burned.

Harry Hopkins always went to the root of the matter. I have been present at several great conferences, where 20 or more of the most important executive personages were gathered together. When the discussion flagged and all seemed baffled, it was on these occasions he would rap out the deadly question, "Surely, Mr. President, here is the point we have got to settle. Are we going to face it or not?" Faced it always was, and, being faced, was conquered. He was a true leader of men, and alike in ardor and in wisdom in times of crisis he has rarely been excelled. His love for the causes of the weak and poor was matched by his passion against tyranny, especially when tyranny was, for the time, triumphant.

Federal Employees in Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUBERT H. HUMPHREY

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post of February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EMPLOYEES IN POLITICS

With some reservations, this newspaper has supported the broadening of the Hatch Act to permit nearby Federal employees to participate in local partisan political campaigns. Understandably, leaders of the nonpartisan movement in Arlington view this extension as a device whereby the Democratic machine can renew its hold on local offices. Their discomfiture is increased by the apparent glee of the machine over the amendment. Our feeling is, however, that legislation cannot be particularistic. It would be unfair to Federal workers living in areas where the nonpartisan movement does not prevail to deny them participation in local Government because of the possible bad effects in Arlington. The answer is to strengthen the nonpartisan movement.

Now, however, serious questions have been raised about both the workability of the Senate amendment as now phrased and the means by which it was accomplished. Apparently public hearings were not held on this particular section of the amendment (which was not even considered in the House) and many groups which have sought an opportunity to be heard have not been given the chance. This is an unhealthy situation which should be remedied, and the best way is for conferees to remand the entire amendment for full discussion. Certainly nothing could discredit the Hatch Act more than to have it distorted by sneak amendment.

Welcome to White County

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the White County Democrat, of Monticello, Ind.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WELCOME TO WHITE COUNTY

The White County Democrat takes pleasure in introducing two new residents of White County, two young women, displaced persons from Europe, who recently arrived to make their home with two Chalmers farm families. Both are very pleasant and are anxious to do things the American way.

Miss Troosh Agafia, native of Ukraine, is right at home with the O. C. Parks family, neighbors of the Shells. She likes farm life, and did field labor in Germany. No weeds grow in her garden. Troosh is fond of knitting. She has a number of articles she brought with her. Before coming to the States, she worked in a Baptist mission.

Meet Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia, who is at the home of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell, just a mile north of Chalmers. She has a fine education, and has lived in a number of European countries. She speaks understandable English, but very fluent in German and Russian, and knows some French.

Two displaced persons from Europe are happily situated in two Big Creek township farm homesteads located, across the road from each other, at the homes of Mr. and Mrs. B. C. Shell and O. C. Parks and family. The families sponsoring them in their new homes are just as happy as the two young women.

First to arrive in the county was Miss Troosh Agafia, native of the Ukraine, who is with the Parks family. She reached here on June 4. Mrs. Alexandra Kiritschenko from Yugoslavia arrived at the home of Mr. and Mrs. Shell on August 15.

After Congress passed the law June 15, 1949, permitting displaced persons from Europe to come to the United States, announcement was made that 205,000 DP's could come here. The Shells made application June 24 with the Church World Service, through which Protestant churches worked. They requested that they would like a girl 25 to 50, capable of assisting with the housework as Mrs. Shell was crippled with arthritis, and a Protestant. On March 3, this year, they received notice that the girl had been selected and would be ready to come soon. However Mrs. Kiritschenko became ill with the flu and her voyage was slowed up for 3 months.

LAND AT BOSTON

Applicants who sponsor the DP, must furnish inland transportation from the ports of arrival, Boston, New York, or New Orleans. In June the Shells mailed the transportation. Mrs. Kiritschenko went to Bremen in June and sailed on July 19, on the *General Sturgis*, in which there were 885 DP's. It took them 9 days. The travel bureaus were responsible for taking care of them en route to their destinations over the country. Mrs. Kiritschenko was routed to Detroit, and from there took the Wabash to Lafayette, where the Shells met her.

Miss Agafia landed at Boston, and then came by train to Lafayette.

Mr. Parks put in their application in July 1948, a couple weeks later than the Shells. Their letter was sent to the Ukranian-American Relief, and their application was acted upon quicker than through the other agency.

Born in 1913, near Moscow, Mrs. Kiritschenko was the daughter of a railroad engineer. When a little girl she went to live with her uncle and aunt, and they traveled quite extensively as the aunt was a Russian consular, comparable to an American ambassador. They lived in Turkey, Greece, Yugoslavia, and Italy. When a little girl she learned some English from an American lady. Mrs. Kiritschenko speaks fluent German and Russian and some French. She is a member of a family of six children, three boys and three girls. The family is well educated and holds responsible positions.

TRAINED NURSE

Mrs. Kiritschenko was married to an officer in the Russian Army, but had not heard from him since the war. She had 2 years' nurses' training and worked as a nurse in an X-ray laboratory for 4½ years in Belgrade, Yugoslavia. Since liberation she had been a nurse in a kindergarten for the last 4 years in Munich, Germany. She stated that first she was in charge of three infants, and then was responsible for seven children, ages 2½ to 3, all war orphans.

In the hospital she became acquainted with modern appliances found today in the kitchens of American housewives. She did not hesitate to use the appliances found in the Shell home. She had no trouble in learning. Pat Doremire, a Chalmers High School pupil, assisted her in showing where the things were in the house. She can manage the household very well, and has prepared some fine meals.

Mrs. Kiritschenko is a member of the Greek Orthodox Church, but has attended the Chalmers Community Church regularly since she came here.

She is an attractive blonde and has natural curly hair. The clothing brought with her is like American women wear. She brought several trunks full, which she described as "my house." She has worn her hair bobbed for a number of years, but when a girl it was long.

Shortly after her arrival at the Shell home, Mrs. Kiritschenko received a letter of welcome to the State of Indiana from Gov. Henry F. Schricker, which she prizes greatly.

Mrs. Kiritschenko enjoys reading the newspapers, but remarked that she has learned more about what is happening in Europe since she came to the States than during the time she was a resident.

Being able to speak some English, it was possible to secure considerable information from Mrs. Kiritschenko. However, in the case of Miss Agafia, it was difficult. Both young women were at the Shell home the afternoon of the interview. While they both speak Russian, they are different. Miss Agafia is Ukraine Russian or Polish. Mrs. Kiritschenko assisted with the interview.

NATIVE OF UKRAINE

It was learned that Miss Agafia was a native of Ukraine, but she has no living relatives to her knowledge. She went to Poland, then Czechoslovakia, and then to Germany, where she did field labor.

The clothing that she brought had been sent through missions to Germany. Before coming to the States, she worked in the Baptist mission in Munich.

Asked if she was happy in the United States, she replied, "Like it here," with a big broad smile.

She is an expert gardener and flower lover. No weeds grow in her garden. She likes to knit, and has some beautiful sweaters that she made which she brought with her.

The Parks family has a dairy and the cows are milked by machine. Miss Agafia took a delight in seeing the machine work. Afterwards she stripped some of the cows, and a member of the family is quoted as saying that "she stripped the cows so dry they had to prime them the next time to milk 'em." She also enjoys hunting eggs, in fact any kind of out of door work. Practically all of her 42 years has been spent on a farm.

Roosevelt's Promise to Churchill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROBERT F. RICH

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Times-Herald:

ROOSEVELT'S PROMISE TO CHURCHILL

Winston Churchill's war memoirs have reached the year 1941. This was the period in which Mr. Roosevelt took the final steps to push the United States into a war to which the overwhelming majority were opposed.

HOPKINS CARRIES THE "FIRE HOSE"

On January 10, 1941, Mr. Churchill recalls, Harry Hopkins arrived in London as the emissary of Roosevelt to Churchill. Hopkins bore a personal message from the President. It was that Roosevelt would aid Britain at all costs. There was nothing he would not do.

This, almost to the day, coincided with Roosevelt's successful campaign to get the lend-lease bill through Congress. That, he told the American people, was to be regarded as the lending of a fire hose to a neighbor to keep the fire from spreading to our own house. Lend-lease was going to keep America out of war.

The Roosevelt deception went farther back than that. Churchill discloses that the mission of Vice Adm. Robert L. Ghormley, sent to London in July 1940, as American naval observer, was not merely to coordinate with the British Admiralty all American aid short of war. Ghormley was also to consult with the British on American participation as a belligerent.

This was 4 months before candidate Roosevelt, speaking at Boston, assured the mothers of America "again and again and again" that he was not going to send their sons into any foreign war.

MATSUOKA'S MANEUVERS

Perhaps, the most important of Churchill's current disclosures, however, concern the former Japanese foreign minister, Yosuke Matsuoka, and his unsuccessful effort to get Japan into the war 6 months before Pearl Harbor. The incident is vital because Churchill's account plainly demonstrates the means by which the United States could

have remained at peace had not Roosevelt been so avid for war.

Matsuoka was one of the real warmongers. It was he who negotiated the treaty that put Japan into the Axis. In March 1941, he set out on a journey to Moscow and Berlin. Hitler and his aids besought him to get Japan into the war against Britain. At the same time they disclosed that their relations with Russia were uncertain, and that they wanted at all costs to avoid war with the United States.

Matsuoka stopped in Moscow long enough to negotiate a nonaggression pact. Like Stalin, he had no taste for two-front war. According to Churchill, he assumed Roosevelt would have the same sensible aversion, therefore saw no reason to conciliate America, which Roosevelt was pushing toward war with Germany.

On his return to Tokyo, however, he found the remainder of the cabinet of Prince Konoye arrayed against him. Instead of seeking war with this country, Konoye and his government were at that very moment seeking a general Pacific settlement, which they hoped would be started by American mediation between Japan and China.

Matsuoka not only lost his argument for war, he lost his job. He lost prestige tremendously when Hitler attacked Russia 7 weeks later.

AXIS EFFORTS TO DUCK WAR

Thus, in Churchill's view, confirmed by the documents we found after the occupation of Tokyo, the Konoye government was genuinely anxious to avoid war with the United States. It was unable to do so because Roosevelt was beginning to realize about that time that neither lend-lease nor the active participation of the American Navy in the battle of the Atlantic was going to goad Hitler into attack.

Lend-lease was followed by Roosevelt's proclamation of an American security zone in the Atlantic. He informed Churchill, the latter says, that the American Atlantic Fleet would actively seek out German submarines and surface raiders in the area so that the British could attack them. Following the occupation of Iceland, American ships were assigned to actual convoy duty. Some of them were placed under British command.

These were acts of war under any possible interpretation of international law, but Hitler refused to rise to the bait. Instead, he ordered his submarines not to fight back against American destroyers.

Roosevelt did not have to be particularly bright, after a few months of this, to recognize that if he was going to fulfill his pledge that there was nothing he would not do to aid Churchill, he would have to find his war somewhere else than with Hitler directly. The Japanese negotiations gave him his opportunity.

Churchill notes that the great obstacle to Japanese-American understanding was the American demand that, as a preliminary to any peace discussions, Japan should withdraw from China.

Complete withdrawal would have caused the immediate fall of any cabinet that proposed it. Yet Roosevelt and Secretary Hull stuck to that demand in all the negotiations through the summer and fall of 1941, and incorporated it in the ultimatum by Secretary Hull on November 26, 1941, that started the Jap Fleet for Pearl Harbor.

If our mission in the Pacific was the protection of China, as the Roosevelt idolators say, it is incumbent upon them to explain why Roosevelt's aides and his successor, having got their war and crushed Japan, have now abandoned China to the Communists. Was that, also, the intended fruit of his far-seeing foreign policy?

Report to the People of the Fifth District of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I set forth herewith a report to the people of the Fifth Congressional District of Michigan of my voting and attendance record during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The purpose of this report is to make available, in concise form, information which is scattered over thousands of pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, information which, from a practical point of view, would not be available to the majority of the voters of the district which I am honored to represent here in the House.

It is my hope that this report, which includes all roll calls in the covered period, will enable my constituents to be intelligently informed of the voting record of their Representative in Congress.

If more complete information on any measure considered, or an explanation of any particular vote, is desired, I shall be glad to furnish that information to those who may so request:

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
1	Jan. 3	Quorum call	Present.
2	...do	Selection of Speaker of the House (Rayburn, 255 to 160)	Martin.
3	...do	H. Res. 5: Amendment to House Rules, permitting committee chairmen to bring to floor any measure not reported by Rules Committee within 21 days (adopted 275 to 142).	Yea.
4	Feb. 7	H. Con. Res. 22: Postponed date of submission of legislative budget from Feb. 15, as required by 1946 Reorganization Act, to May 1 (passed 230 to 142).	Nay.
5	...do	H. R. 2361: To provide for reorganization of Government agencies (passed 356 to 9)	Yea.
6	Feb. 9	H. Res. 78: To provide $200,000 for investigations by House Committee on Un-American Activities (passed 353 to 29)	Do.
7	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1211: Reciprocal trade agreements bill, to committee with instructions to retain peril-point provision in law (motion lost, 151 to 241).	Do.
8	...do	H. R. 1211: Extending authority to President to enter into reciprocal trade agreements (passed 319 to 69)	Do.
9	Feb. 15	Quorum call	Present.
10	...do	H. Res. 99: Waiving all points of order against H. R. 2632, first deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 242 to 121)	Nay.
11	...do	Quorum call	Present.
12	...do	...do	Do.
13	Feb. 16	...do	Do.
14	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill to committee with instructions to insert $9,000,000 to handle State backlog of unemployment claims (lost 148 to 237).	Yea.
15	...do	H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill (passed 367 to 19)	Do.
16	Feb. 17	Quorum call	Present.
17	...do	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports, instructing committee to report bill deleting such authority for agricultural commodities, supply of which certified to be in excess of domestic needs (motion lost 139 to 222).	Yea.
18	...do	H. R. 1661: Continuing Presidential authority for control of exports (passed 259 to 102)	Nay.
19	Feb. 21	Quorum call	Present.
20	...do	H. Res. 75: Authorizing Committee on Education and Labor to conduct studies and investigations (passed 331 to 4)	Yea.
21	Feb. 22	Quorum call	Present.
22	Mar. 1	Motion to recommit H. R. 199: To provide immigration quotas to Asian and Pacific peoples (defeated 39 to 336)	Nay.
23	Mar. 7	H. R. 2663: To provide for administration of Central Intelligence Agency (passed 348 to 4)	Yea.
24	Mar. 10	Quorum call	Present.
25	Mar. 11	...do	Do.
26	Mar. 14	...do	Do.
27	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 163 to 181)	Yea.
28	...do	H. R. 3347: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (defeated 166 to 176)	Nay.
29	Mar. 15	Quorum call	Present.
30	...do	Williams "home rule" amendment to H. R. 1731: To extend rent control (adopted 227 to 188)	Yea.
31	...do	Rains amendment to delete authority to recontrol hotels which had been decontrolled (adopted 237 to 175)	Do.
32	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 1731. Rent control bill, instructing committee to extend existing law 3 months (defeated 154 to 260)	Do.
33	...do	H. R. 1731: Extending time and scope of Federal rent control (passed 261 to 153)	Nay.
34	Mar. 16	H. Res. 148: Providing for consideration of H. R. 1437, authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (adopted 368 to 1)	Yea.
35	...do	Quorum call	Present.
36	Mar. 21	...do	Do.
37	...do	H. R. 1757: Extension of District of Columbia rent control (passed 247 to 117)	Nay.
38	Mar. 22	Quorum call	Present.
39	...do	H. R. 1437: Authorizing composition of Army and Air Force (passed 395 to 4)	Yea.
40	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee (failed, 187 to 223)	Do.
41	...do	Motion to strike out the enacting clause of H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (failed 120 to 291)	Do.
42	Mar. 23	Quorum call	Present.
43	Mar. 24	...do	Do.
44	...do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2681: To provide pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II, to committee for further study (carried, 208 to 207).	Yea.
45	Mar. 25	Quorum call	Present.
46	Mar. 28	...do	Do.
47	...do	S. 135: To authorize Board of Commissioners of District of Columbia to establish summer daylight saving time (passed, 223 to 130)	Nay.

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
48	Mar. 28	Quorum call	Present.
49	Mar. 29	do	Do.
50	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, to prevent acquisition of lands at Garrison Dam, N. Dak. (failed 194 to 203).	Yea.
51	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, providing funds for project at Clinton River, Mich. (adopted 256 to 138)	Do.
52	do	Amendment to H. R. 3734: Appropriations for civil functions of Army, adding $6,000,000 amount for lower Mississippi flood control (adopted 277 to 117).	Do.
53	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for District of Columbia (lost 177 to 218)	Nay.
54	do	H. R. 3704: To provide additional revenue for the District of Columbia (passed 216 to 180)	Yea.
55	do	Conference report on H. R. 1731: Extension of Federal rent control (adopted 263 to 143)	Nay.
56	Mar. 30	Quorum call	Present.
57	do	do	Do.
58	Mar. 31	do	Do.
59	do	H. Res. 168: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2023, to regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 383 to 9)	Yea.
60	do	Quorum call	Present.
61	Apr. 1	do	Do.
62	do	Poage substitute amendment to H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (adopted 242 to 137)	Nay.
63	do	H. R. 2023: To regulate oleomargarine and repeal certain taxes (passed 287 to 89)	Yea.
64	Apr. 4	Nonsegregation amendment to H. R. 1823: To establish Women's Reserve of Coast Guard Reserve (adopted 193 to 153)	Do.
65	do	H. R. 3830: To amend China Aid Act of 1948 (passed 279 to 70)	Do.
66	Apr. 7	H. Res. 180: Providing for consideration of H. R. 4016, appropriations bill for State, Justice, and Commerce Departments, and waiving all points of order (adopted 246 to 137).	Nay.
67	do	Quorum call	Present.
68	do	Motion to adjourn (rejected 145 to 212)	Yea.
69	Apr. 8	Quorum call	Present.
70	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4046: Deficiency appropriation bill, with instructions to include funds for War Claims Commission (lost 149 to 190)	Yea.
71	Apr. 9	Quorum call	Present.
72	do	do	Do.
73	Apr. 11	do	Do.
74	Apr. 12	do	Do.
75	do	H. R. 3748: Extension and amendment of Economic Cooperation Act of 1948, Marshall plan (passed 354 to 49)	Yea.
76	Apr. 13	Quorum call	Present.
77	Apr. 14	do	Do.
78	Apr. 26	do	Do.
79	do	H. Res. 191: To provide for consideration of H. R. 2032, to revise the Labor Relations Act of 1947 (adopted 369 to 6)	Yea.
80	Apr. 27	Quorum call	Present.
81	Apr. 28	do	Do.
82	Apr. 29	do	Do.
83	May 3	do	Do.
84	do	Wood amendment to H. R. 2032: National labor relations law revision (adopted 217 to 203)	Yea.
85	May 4	Quorum call	Present.
86	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 2032: National labor relations law revision (agreed to 212 to 209)	Nay.
87	do	Quorum call	Present.
88	May 5	H. R. 2989: To incorporate the Virgin Islands Corporation (passed 273 to 62)	Yea.
89	May 9	H. R. 2203: To provide for a decennial census of housing (passed 223 to 51)	Do.
90	do	Quorum call	Present.
91	May 10	Amendment to H. R. 4392 Swiss war damage claims bill, to prevent payment of interest on claims (rejected 172 to 191)	Yea.
92	do	Quorum call	Present.
93	May 11	do	Do.
94	do	H. R. 2682: To amend Commodity Credit Charter Act, and the Strategic and Critical Materials Stock-Piling Act (passed 326 to 52)	Nay.
95	May 16	Quorum call	Present.
96	do	Conference report on H. R. 2632: First deficiency appropriation bill of 1949 (adopted 292 to 17)	Yea.
97	May 17	Quorum call	Present.
98	do	H. Res. 190: Providing for consideration of H. R. 195, to assist the States in collecting sales and use taxes on cigarettes (agreed to 322 to 24)	Yea.
99	May 18	Overriding Presidential veto of H. R. 1036: Claims bill for destroyed internal revenue stamps (overridden 318 to 49)	Do.
100	May 19	Quorum call	Present.
101	do	do	Do.
102	May 20	do	Do.
103	May 24	do	Do.
104	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4591: Armed services pay bill (agreed to 227 to 163)	Nay.
105	May 26	Conference report on H. R. 3704: District of Columbia revenue bill (adopted 184 to 152)	Yea.
106	June 1	Quorum call	Present.
107	do	H. R. 4617: To liberalize the requirement for pensions for veterans of World Wars I and II (passed 365 to 27)	Yea.
108	June 15	Quorum call	Present.
109	June 16	Motion to recommit H. R. 4963: To provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges (lost 135 to 195)	Yea.
110	June 21	H. R. 4332: To amend National Bank Act and Bretton Woods Agreement Act, so as to permit national banks to deal in securities of World Bank (passed 293 to 55).	Do.
111	June 22	Quorum call	Present.
112	June 23	do	Do.
113	June 24	do	Do.
114	June 27	do	Do.
115	June 28	do	Do.
116	June 29	do	Do.
117	do	Amendment to H. R. 4009: Public-housing and slum-clearance bill, to strike out public-housing section (rejected 204 to 209)	Yea.
118	do	Amendment to H. R. 4009; Housing bill of 1949, barring payment of salaries to employees who fail to sign antisubversive affidavit (adopted 283 to 129).	Do.
119	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4009: Housing bill of 1949 (lost 170 to 241)	Do.
120	do	H. R. 4009: To provide Federal aid for public housing and slum clearance (passed 228 to 185)	Do.
121	July 6	Quorum call	Present
122	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 4406: Yugoslav claims bill (lost 151 to 177)	Yea.
123	do	H. Res. 277: To provide for consideration of S. 1008, to define application of Federal Trade Commission Act and the Clayton Act to certain pricing practices (basing-point price bill) (adopted 305 to 22).	Do.
124	July 11	Quorum call	Present.
125	do	Amendment to S. 937: Authorizing payment of certain claims, to reduce amount to be paid (adopted 167 to 142)	Yea.
126	July 13	H. R. 2960: To amend the Rural Electrification Act to provide for rural telephones (passed 282 to 109)	Nay.
127	July 14	Quorum call	Present.
128	do	do	Do.
129	July 20	do	Do.
130	do	do	Do.
131	July 21	do	Do.
132	do	Gore amendment to H. R. 5345: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) to continue present program for 1 year (adopted 239 to 170).	Yea.
133	do	H. R. 5345: To amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938 (farm-price support) (passed 383 to 25)	Do.
134	July 25	Motion to adjourn (defeated 102 to 243)	Nay.
135	do	Previous question on approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 (carried 259 to 88)	Yea.
136	do	Approval of Journal of proceedings for July 22 (approved 285 to 54)	Do.
137	do	Motion to adjourn (defeated 113 to 243)	Nay.
138	do	Previous question on adoption of H. Res. 276: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (ordered 262 to 100)	Yea.
139	do	Motion to adjourn (defeated 110 to 252)	Nay.
140	do	H. Res. 276: To consider H. R. 3199, Federal anti-poll-tax bill (adopted 265 to 100)	Yea.
141	do	Quorum call	Present.
142	July 26	do	Do.
143	do	Motion to recommit H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (lost 123 to 267)	Nay.
144	do	H. R. 3199: Federal anti-poll-tax bill (passed 273 to 116)	Yea.

Roll Call No.	Date (1949)	Identification and result of vote	My vote
145	July 27	Motion to recommit conference report on S. 1184, to encourage construction of rental housing in areas adjacent to military installations (lost 52 to 289).	Not voting.
146	---do----	Quorum call	Absent.
147	Aug. 1	----do----	Present.
148	---do----	H. R. 3282: To repeal Indian liquor laws in certain parts of Minnesota and Wisconsin (defeated 131 to 168)	Yea.
149	---do----	H. R. 5602: Authorizing the Secretary of State to provide for the relief of Chinese students in United States (passed 254 to 46)	Do.
150	Aug. 2	H. R. 5598: To increase disability and death-compensation rates, and liberalize dependency allowances for veterans with service-connected disabilities and their dependents (passed 356 to 0).	Do.
151	---do----	Conference report on H. R. 5632: To promote efficiency and economy in National Military Establishment (adopted 356 to 7)	Do.
152	---do----	H. Res. 289: To provide for consideration of H. R. 29, to provide parity for tung nuts (adopted 335 to 21)	Do.
153	Aug. 2	Quorum call	Present.
154	Aug. 3	----do----	Do.
155	---do----	----do----	Do.
156	Aug. 4	----do----	Do.
157	---do----	----do----	Do.
158	---do----	H. Res. 310: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 1758, to amend the Natural Gas Act (adopted 233 to 113)	Yea.
159	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
160	---do----	----do----	Do.
161	Aug. 5	----do----	Absent.
162	---do----	----do----	Do.
163	---do----	Motion to recommit H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (lost 124 to 187)	(1).
164	---do----	H. R. 1758: To amend the Natural Gas Act (passed 183 to 131)	(2).
165	Aug. 8	Quorum call	Present.
166	---do----	Amendments to H. Res. 183: To provide for consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 249 to 124)	Nay.
167	---do----	H. Res. 183: Providing for the consideration of H. R. 5856, amendment of Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 351 to 17)	Yea.
168	Aug. 9	Quorum call	Present.
169	---do----	----do----	Do.
170	---do----	Motion to instruct conferees to insist upon disagreement to Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid, which amendment restored "watchdog committee" (carried 210 to 164).	Nay.
171	Aug. 10	Quorum call	Present.
172	---do----	Lucas amendment to H. R. 5856: Amending the Fair Labor Standards Act (adopted 225 to 181)	Yea.
173	Aug. 11	Quorum call	Present.
174	---do----	H. R. 5856: Amending Fair Labor Standards Act (wage and hour law) (passed 361 to 35)	Yea.
175	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
176	Aug. 12	----do----	Do.
177	---do----	----do----	Do.
178	---do----	Amendment to H. R. 5526: To authorize the President to delegate executive powers to other officers, which amendment would confine the delegation to "routine administrative duties" (failed 114 to 162).	Yea.
179	Aug. 15	Quorum call	Present.
180	---do----	H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations through Aug. 15, 1949 (failed two-thirds vote for suspension of rules 176 to 145)	Nay.
181	---do----	H. R. 2734: Amending Clayton Antitrust Act to control purchase of assets of one company by another (passed 223 to 92)	Yea.
182	Aug. 16	Quorum call	Present.
183	---do----	----do----	Do.
184	Aug. 17	----do----	Do.
185	---do----	Amendment to H. J. Res. 339: Making temporary appropriations (amendment set Sept. 15, rather than indefinite continuance of appropriations) (adopted 213 to 114).	Yea.
186	---do----	H. Res. 327: Providing for consideration of H. R. 5895, military assistance program (agreed to 275 to 47)	Do.
187	Aug. 18	Quorum call	Present.
188	---do----	Amendment to H. R. 5895: Bill providing for military-assistance program, reducing appropriation from 2 years to 1, and halving amount (adopted 209 to 151).	Yea.
189	---do----	H. R. 5895: Providing for military assistance to European countries (passed 238 to 122)	Do.
190	Aug. 19	Quorum call	Absent.
191	---do----	----do----	Do.
192	---do----	Amendment to H. R. 6008: Supplemental appropriations bill, amendment eliminated $3,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (adopted 150 to 129).	(2).
193	Aug. 23	Quorum call	Present.
194	---do----	----do----	Do.
195	---do----	----do----	Do.
196	Aug. 24	----do----	Do.
197	---do----	Motion to adjourn (carried 186 to 132)	Nay.
198	Aug. 25	Quorum call	Present.
199	---do----	H. Res. 342, making suspensions of the rules in order for 1 day only (adopted 270 to 1)	Yea.
200	Sept. 27	Quorum call	Present.
201	---do----	----do----	Do.
202	---do----	H. R. 4495: Postal pay raise, leave, longevity, and promotion bill (passed 332 to 2)	Yea.
203	Sept. 28	Quorum call	Present.
204	---do----	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (lost 113 to 213)	Yea.
205	---do----	Conference report on H. R. 5895: Military assistance program for foreign nations (approved 224 to 109)	Do.
206	Sept. 29	Quorum call	Present.
207	---do----	Motion to instruct conferees to recede and concur in Senate amendment to H. R. 4830, making appropriations for foreign aid (amendment provided $150,000,000 additional loan authorization) (motion prevailed 177 to 124).	Nay.
208	Oct. 3	Quorum call	Present.
209	---do----	H. R. 5903: To amend Hospital Survey and Construction Act (passed 236 to 43)	Yea.
210	---do----	S. 2116: To provide for advance planning of non-Federal public works (passed 210 to 69)	Do.
211	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
212	---do----	Motion to instruct conferees on H. R. 3734, civil functions appropriation bill, to disagree to any funds for flood-control project at Gavins Point, S. Dak. (rejected 101 to 153).	Nay.
213	Oct. 4	Quorum call	Present.
214	---do----	Previous question on H. Res. 372, providing for consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act, under a closed rule with no amendments in order (ordered 175 to 154).	Nay.
215	---do----	H. Res. 372, providing a closed rule for the consideration of H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (adopted 189 to 135)	Do.
216	Oct. 5	Quorum call	Present.
217	---do----	Motion to recommit H. R. 6000, social-security bill, with instructions to substitute Kean bill, H. R. 6297 (lost 112 to 232)	Yea.
218	---do----	H. R. 6000, amending the Social Security Act (passed 333 to 14)	Do.
219	Oct. 6	Conference report on H. R. 5300, third deficiency appropriation bill (adopted 269 to 18)	Do.
220	Oct. 10	Quorum call	Present.
221	---do----	----do----	Do.
222	---do----	Motion that House insist on its disagreements to Senate amendment to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (58 versus 48 air groups) (motion prevailed 305 to 1).	Yea.
223	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
224	---do----	Motion that House insist on its disagreement to Senate amendments to H. R. 4146; National Military Establishment appropriation bill (retaining appropriation for stock piling of strategic materials) (motion prevailed 305 to 0).	Yea.
225	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
226	Oct. 11	----do----	Do.
227	---do----	Motion to recommit conference report on H. R. 6008; supplemental appropriation bill, to strike out $3,000,000 for Sesquicentennial Commission of District of Columbia (defeated 159 to 163).	Yea.
228	Oct. 13	Motion to recommit to committee, H. R. 1370: A bill authorizing three new municipal judgeships for District of Columbia (lost 30 to 286)	Do.
229	---do----	Adoption of rule for consideration of S. J. Res. 134, extending certain provisions of National Housing Act (adopted 290 to 34)	Nay.
230	Oct. 14	Quorum call	Present.
231	---do----	Motion to recommit S. 1008: A bill to define and permit basing-point pricing (motion failed, 138 to 178)	Nay.
232	---do----	Adoption of conference report on S. 1008: To permit basing-point pricing (adopted 200 to 104)	Yea.
233	Oct. 17	Quorum call	Present.
234	---do----	S. 2105: To stimulate exploration for and conservation of, strategic minerals (failed necessary two-thirds vote for suspension of rules, 176 to 118)	Yea.
235	---do----	Quorum call	Present.
236	Oct. 18	----do----	Do.

[1] Not voting, paired against.

[2] Not voting, paired for.

Republican Principles and Objectives

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement of principles and objectives adopted by the Republican Members of the House of Representatives and the Republican Members of the Senate, and concurred in by the members of the Republican National Committee on February 6, 1950:

To win lasting peace, to build a country in which every citizen may make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, and to hold aloft the inspiring torch of American freedom, opportunity, and justice, assuring better and happier life for all our people, we dedicate our efforts and issue this statement of principles and objectives supplementing the Republican platform of 1948.

We shall not passively defend the principles stated here, but shall fight for them with all the vigor with which our forefathers fought to establish what we now seek to advance and perpetuate—human liberty and individual dignity.

We pledge that in all we will advocate and in all that we will perform the first test shall be: Does this conduct enlarge and strengthen or does it undermine and lessen human liberty and individual dignity.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The American people face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago they have not yet won the peace. We offer them leadership in new efforts to achieve this vital end.

We favor a foreign policy in which all Americans, regardless of party, will join to assure peace with justice in a free world while maintaining the independence and the rights of the American people.

We insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We oppose secret commitments, and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

Under our indispensable two-party system, we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. We favor consultation between executive and members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy; and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and new dangers throughout the world.

We favor full support of the United Nations and the improvement of its Charter so that it may be an effective international organization of independent states prepared to mobilize public opinion and the armed forces of the world against aggression. We favor full support of the inter-American system as an integral part of the international organization, and of our treaty obligations in the North Atlantic community.

We advocate a strong policy against the spread of Communism or Fascism at home and abroad, and we insist that America's efforts toward this end be directed by those who have no sympathy either with communism or fascism.

We support aid to those states resisting communism but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, if it is beyond the ability of the aided nation to supply for itself, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

The Republican Party has always believed in a strong national defense. We must maintain our armed forces at a strength completely adequate for the security of our people.

We favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition and we assert that this can be done within the Republican principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry. A strong American economy is a vital factor for our security.

DOMESTIC AFFAIRS

The major domestic issue today is liberty agains socialism: whether we shall remain in this country a free people in constant control of our governments, or whether we shall delegate to an all-powerful Federal Government with unlimited power to tax and spend, the rights to direct and operate our agriculture, industry, labor, and local communities and the daily lives of our citizens. We believe there is no frontier beyond which devotion to the American system may not increase our knowledge, character, and material welfare; but we believe these goals can only be secured in a framework of liberty, equality, and justice, with adequate incentive and rewards to workmen and to industry for ability, knowledge, character, hard work, daring, and genius.

Basic American principles are threatened by the administration's program for a planned economy modeled on the Socialist governments of Europe, including price and wage control, rationing, socialized medicine, regional authorities, and the Brannan plan with its controls, penalties, fines, and jail sentences. This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

As the iron curtain descends on half the globe, and as nation after nation samples the drug of totalitarianism, the Republican Party is the champion of human liberty and the essential dignity of the individual. To it falls the task of offering not only its opposition but of proposing a program to restore faith in free institutions, and bring about stability, opportunity, and progress.

We hold that government can use its just powers to foster national health, promote real security for the aged, develop sound agricultural and labor-management policies, and advance civil rights. These ideas are in keeping with the earliest and finest Republican traditions, and can be achieved without establishing socialism or discipline or dependence. The Democrats have also professed these ideals, but the stark truth is that after 18 years of Democratic control and endless talk, they have reduced this whole field to confusion and futility. The administration is seeking to make demagogic appeals rather than enact sound legislation. It seeks to keep glittering goals intact to lure votes in anticipation of favors to come. Such a cynical procedure raises the naked issue of sincerity, of responsibility, and of achievement.

To achieve our objectives, we offer certain fundamental proposals, and constructive undertakings to rebuild a prosperous and progressive America:

I. The economy

Liberty cannot breathe the air of bankruptcy and live.

Reckless and extravagant spending by the Federal Government, as now advocated by the Democratic administration, with recurring annual deficits or continually increasing taxes, can result only in disaster and ruin for our country. It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance, and investments of millions of people. Therefore we urge:

A. An end of deficit spending and a return to a balanced budget.

B. That Federal spending be materially reduced.

C. The achievement of efficiency and economy in Government especially by adoption of measures along the lines of the Hoover report.

D. A policy of general tax reduction to be accomplished as rapidly as reduction in Federal expenditures will permit. We favor immediate repeal of oppressive wartime excises and reduction of taxes on small business to stimulate new industry and growth. This will create new jobs, new wealth, and eventually greater tax revenue. It will provide opportunity for youth, furnish incentives for stable employment and retention of older employees and encourage lower prices.

E. Strict enforcement of the laws against monopoly and unfair competition.

F. Establishment of a nonpartisan commission to study and recommend a sensible redistribution of governmental functions and sources of revenue between the Federal, State and local entities, to secure the sovereignty of the several States with as much decentralization as is compatible with the national welfare.

II. Agriculture

A prosperous agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America. We join farm organizations in condemning the Brannan plan which would regiment our farmers, cost untold billions of the taxpayers' money, and would mean the ultimate nationalization of agriculture. Its inefficiency and increased costs would adversely affect both the producer and the consumer. It would place every farmer in a state of complete dependency on Government for a large part of his income from uncertain annual congressional appropriations. We deplore the maladministration for political purposes of the present agricultural law by the Department of Agriculture.

We will continue to work with the farmers, farm organizations, and all friends of agriculture to bring about a sound solution of the many problems confronting the farmers of this country. Such farm policies must be developed in the interest of the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy. Agriculture is a growing and dynamic industry undergoing constant change and improvement. No farm program can succeed which is not in harmony with this concept. Specifically we propose the following:

A. A program to provide a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by a system of price supports and by protection against the dumping of competitive commodities produced by underpaid foreign labor, to the end that the farmer's standard of living will be in line with the contribution he makes to the national economy.

B. Continue and enlarge programs of research and education, both in production and marketing, with particular attention to cheaper and more effective production, a better and more effective marketing system, especially for perishable commodities, sound cooperative marketing, and the development and expansion of industrial uses for agricultural products and byproducts.

C. Continued development and restoration of our soil and water resources through soil conservation and reclamation.

D. Expansion of animal agriculture as a means of reducing surpluses, rebuilding the soil, and providing a better diet for our people.

E. Special encouragement for the development and ownership of family-sized farms, improvement of rural living conditions, and completion of the rural electrification program.

F. Development of export markets for the surplus crops which can be efficiently produced in this country.

III. Labor-management relations

Industrial haromy and justice are essential to the country's well-being. To that end, government should encourage and promote free collective bargaining. On management and unions falls an equal responsibility to act in good faith toward each other and toward the country. We favor:

A. Continuation of the Taft-Hartley law because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members. Under this law union membership has increased to new highs, wages have risen to record levels, and strikes have decreased.

B. Continuation of our efforts to enact such improvements in the law as have been shown to be necessary to accomplish its purposes more effectively and achieve more complete equality. We deplore the action of the administration in playing politics in this vital area of human relations, thereby blocking the enactment of necessary amendments to the law.

IV. Civil rights

The right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. Therefore, we shall continue to sponsor legislation to protect the rights of minorities.

V. Social responsibility

The obligation of Government to those in need has long been recognized. Recognizing the inequities and injustices of the present program of social security, we urge:

A. The extension of the coverage of the Federal old-age and survivors insurance program, reduction of eligibility requirements, and increase of benefits to a more generous level, with due regard to the tax burden on those who labor.

B. A thoroughgoing study of a program of more nearly universal coverage including the principle of pay as you go.

C. Federal aid, where the need is clearly demonstrated, to States and through States to their subdivisions, to assist them in affording subsistence, shelter, and medical care to their citizens who are unable to provide for themselves. Such aid, including unemployment compensation, must be based on State and local initiative, operation, contribution, and responsibility without Federal bureaucratic interference. It must avoid socialization of the medical profession or of any other activity. Federal aid must be in amounts which do not impose an unreasonable burden of taxation on the American people who pay the bills.

VI. Veterans

A grateful nation demands that those who fought in its defense, their widows and orphans, must never be forgotten. We urge:

A. Continuing and sympathetic consideration of the rights and deserts of the veterans and their dependents.

B. Prompt and efficient handling of claims and other problems of veterans.

VII. Loyalty

Communism is an international conspiracy aiming at world-wide dictatorship and the suppression of religious, political, and economic freedoms throughout the world. It corrupts ideals, corrodes basic religious teachings, destroys the fiber of man, and denies the existence of God. It is imperative that the nations of the world develop new methods to offset this frontal attack on civilization.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists and their fellow-travelers have been employed in important Government posts and the fact that information vital to our security has been made available to alien agents and persons of questionable loyalty. We denounce the soft attitude of this administration toward Government employees and officials who hold or support Communist attitudes. We pledge immediate action to bring about:

A. A complete overhaul of the so-called loyalty and security checks of Federal personnel.

B. The prompt elimination of all Communists, fellow-travelers, and Communist sympathizers from our Federal pay roll.

C. Closer coordination between our intelligence agencies, with full use of the facilities of the FBI for protecting our security.

CONCLUSION

To this program we subscribe, confident that the overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

Our people must arouse themselves to preserve our precious liberties and freedoms—the right to worship God in our own way; to speak freely our minds without fear; to conduct our lives and our affairs without officious meddling by too-powerful government. We must revivify those qualities of diligence, economy, courage, initiative, and patriotism which enabled our forefathers to make this Nation great.

This Republic is the custodian of human liberty. The Republican Party will endeavor to see to it that we are worthy of this guardianship.

President Truman and the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE MAGEE
OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received a letter from a business executive at St. Louis, Mo., wherein he discussed President Truman and the budget. Under permission to extend my remarks, I include his letter and my reply:

AMERICAN REFRIGERATOR TRANSIT CO.,
St. Louis, Mo., February 2, 1950.

Hon. ELMER MAGEE,
Representative in Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CONGRESSMAN: If there is any financial responsibility whatever in the present Congress as a whole, something which, reluctantly, I am beginning to doubt, it will certainly tell our financially irresponsible psuedo President what to do with his nightmare budget.

May I hope, as one of your constitutents but more as an American, that you will display financial responsbility when Congress comes to pass upon the fearful spending so blithely proposed by this shallow executive.

Won't you tell him by your vote that it is his job to trim that budget by not less than $7,000,000,000 and that it is his job, not that of the Congress, to do the trimming. Won't you do your part to pin this President to his responsibility for being specific and not vague about the taxes he asks the Congress to eliminate and about those he wants increased to support his intolerable spending. Won't you tell him by your vote that in this peace year, 5 years after war ended, when production is at high level, the Nation's budget not only must be balanced but that, besides, substantial reduction must be made in the national debt.

Above all, won't you, by your vote, tell this President that if he is honest—as of course he is not—in blaming the tax reduction of the Eightieth Congress for the deficit he now proposes, that he should be equally honest to propose restoration of the taxes that responsible Congress eliminated.

People generally, Mr. Congressman, even fuzzy-minded neoliberals, the get-something-for-nothing people who applaud spending, are beginning to wake up to the fact that Government can spend no money it does not first take in taxes from the people. They are beginning to see also that they are "the people." In my opinion, a rude surprise is rapidly building up for the planners, promisers, and spenders—a surprise package which they will dislike opening come next election.

I would be pleased and proud to hear that you stand for fiscal sanity.

Yours truly,

O. M. STEVENS.

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. O. M. STEVENS,
President and Manager, American Refrigerator Transit Co.,
St. Louis, Mo.

DEAR SIR: Your letter addressed to Hon. Elmer Magee has been received at my office. My first name is not Elmer, but maybe you had a purpose in mind by so addressing me. I recall that at Legion conventions the boys would go around saying: "Where's Elmer?" It appears he was always an elusive character who was lost. Perhaps you have considered my record in Congress and think I'm lost.

Yours was quite an interesting letter; but I just wonder if you haven't been in the refrigeration business so long that it's chilled your heart. You refer to our "financially irresponsible pseudo President." You mention the "nightmare budget," and then proceed: "May I hope, as one of your constituents but more as an American, that you will display financial responsibility when Congress comes to pass upon the fearful spending so blithely proposed by this shallow Executive."

You then suggest that by my vote I tell him that the budget should be trimmed by $7,000,000,000. In a later reference you question the honesty of the President.

Most legislators appreciate getting helpful, constructive letters and suggestions. We desire the viewpoints of people, even though they may not coincide with our own. All this is democracy in action. However, your letter was none such. It was mean and hateful, full of venom and calculated to reflect dishonor on our fellow Missourian who holds the high office of President.

My inclination was to reply in like vein and call you a factious facsimile Fascist, attempting to play the role of a modern Fafnir. However, I will be kinder than that. No doubt, you have just paid some income tax and it has made you ill. I'll just say that you are a pained paleface in need of paregoric because you can't have your pie and eat it, too.

Of course, I never met you, never heard of you before, and if I never meet you it will be soon enough; but to you, the American who refers to Mr. Truman as "shallow" and "dishonest" and a "pseudo" or sham and fake President, I address these questions: Where

were you when Harry Truman was leading his troops in the Vosges operations, in bloody combat at St. Mihiel, or the offensive in the Meuse-Argonne? Where were you when Harry Truman was trying to get in active service in the Second World War? Where were you when Harry Truman headed a Senate investigation committee and worked his heart out to save the taxpayers a few billions?

Oh, I've heard this song of hate before. I've heard Harry Truman called "the small man from Missouri." Let me say to you and ilk that this small man stays with his own class. He's for the small people all over the world. The late mother of the President once said: "Harry could always plow the straightest furrow of any farmer in our community." Harry Truman is still plowing a straight furrow—a straight furrow for the American people, a straight furrow for democratic ideals everywhere.

Of course, we all want a balanced budget when we can safely have it, and we are working with that goal in mind. We are attempting to correct some tax inequities. We want to restore some agents in the Department of Revenue so that we can check up on some tax evaders. You may recall that your friend, the Eightieth Congress, was responsible for our not having the men to do this. We expect to effect substantial savings by passage of the Hoover Commission recommendations.

There is one thing you may have overlooked. The Government's system of bookkeeping is different from what it was a few years back. It now lists as expenditures all loans made by such lending agencies as the RFC, Commodity Credit Corporation, etc. There are some $4,000,000,000 of such loans now listed as expenditures. We hope that most of these will be repaid. For example, you might be interested in knowing that in our State of Missouri no electric cooperative is in default one cent, and the REA loans will probably total about one-half billion this year. Actually, the deficit spending is nearer $1,000,000,000 than $5,000,000,000.

It would be interesting to know just where you would cut off $7,000,000,000 of the present budget. Out of every budget dollar, 31.9 cents will go directly for national defense. How much would you cut this? The interest on the national debt is 13.2 cents. Of course, no cut can be made here. Veterans' benefits account for 14.3 cents. How much would you take from the defenders of our country? Security grants to foreign nations take 11.1 cents. How much would you reduce that? There is earmarked for atomic energy development 1.9 cents. Is communism a threat? Is national defense necessary? If not, we can beat your suggestion for a savings. We can quadruple the amount you suggest.

You will note that the above accounts for 72.4 cents out of every dollar of Federal spending.

In a subsequent paragraph of your letter you speak of "fuzzy-minded neoliberals, the get-something-for-nothing people." I assume you refer to the aged, the blind, and otherwise handicapped who get 3.6 cents out of every budget dollar. The average payment made to the aged who draw assistance is something over $40 per month. Just how much do you think these payments should be reduced? Or would you take something off of other social and health services which account for 2.8 cents? Purchase of housing mortgages is 2.3 cents; housing and slum clearance is 1 cent; aid to agriculture is 3.6 cents; REA and rural housing is 1.6 cents; and subsidies to business is 3.9 cents. The items total 13.8 cents of the budget dollar, and include the loans which we trust will be mostly repaid.

What do we have left? If I figure correctly, this leaves only 8.8 cents for the ordinary costs of Government. You have the figures. Now, Mr. Stevens, you can take pencil in hand and start lopping off that $7,000,000,000.

I wonder if you have ever thought that even though taxes are high the average businessman or property owner could pay the present tax rate for two or three decades and it wouldn't cost him as much as one good old depression would cost. You probably recall a depression such as we had when your friends were running this Government under the old theory of "free enterprise" and "individual initiative."

You close your exhortative epistle with the statement that "a rude surprise is rapidly building up for the planners, promisers, and spenders—a surprise package which they will dislike opening come next election." I haven't gone and won't go 100 percent with this administration; but I believe in a planned economy within our democratic framework, so I might be labeled a "planner." I made certain promises to my folks back home on how I would vote, so no doubt I am a "promiser." I believe that in a great country such as ours, with its vast wealth and resources, no one should be in want. I believe in opposing communism. I believe in national defense. Therefore, I am a "spender." So I come in the category you mention. Now, Mr. Stevens, I'll take back what I said about not wanting to meet you. I've decided it would be a pleasure. It would be nice to meet you in public debate in my district in the next campaign, and certainly I want you present when I open that "surprise package come next election."

I believe it was Lord Beaconsfield who said, "The man who does not look up will look down, and the spirit which does not dare to soar is destined to grovel." I think Harry Truman is looking upward. I think the spirit of America is looking upward as it seeks to lead the way to a fuller life and to portray to all the world a type of government that grants the greatest good to the greatest number.

Sincerely yours,

CLARE MAGEE,
Member of Congress.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES B. HOEVEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOEVEN. Mr. Speaker, Successful Farming, the magazine of farm business and farm homes, is published in Des Moines, Iowa. In the January 1950, issue of that popular and well-known magazine appeared a most interesting and thought-provoking article entitled "We're Not Through With the Brannan Plan." Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit the article herewith:

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—For almost 30 years Congress and farm organizations have debated solutions for farm problems, chiefly surpluses. Intervention of World War II absorbed surpluses which had been steadily mounting in spite of crop controls, marketing quotas, and other expedients calling for heavy outlay of tax money (yours). Again there is growing concern that farm production may exceed our effective needs. Like all other business, farming must make adjustments.

(Has experience taught us anything? Must farmers surrender their freedom of action and decision? Will free market price no longer perform its function of guiding production? And from the taxpayer must we draw increasing sums of money to cover up the errors of judgment of the planners? We may escape the short-time adjustment that way. In the long run we will have achieved growing inefficiency and frustration.)

Guaranteed high income to farmers and low-cost food to consumers. That's the basis of the farm-price-support plan Secretary of Agriculture Charles Brannan proposed to Congress. And that's probably what 148,000,000 of us Americans would want if that were all there were to it. Certainly no one could ask for anything more.

The question is, How would it work? Is the plan in your long-time interest as a farmer? What about the rest of the people and the national economy as a whole? How much will the Brannan plan really help the low-income farmers? Or just how will it fill the Nation's bread basket with cheap food? What about the cost to the Government (which means tax costs to you)? And would you want to put up with all the Government controls you are certain to run into under such a plan?

These are some of the questions you should answer before definitely deciding whether the Brannan plan is or is not the long-time answer to the problem of maintaining your farm income at a satisfactory level.

Frankly the Brannan plan promises to be the most marvelous program to strike this or any other country—that is, if it could be made to work and if Congress could or would tax enough money away from you, your neighbors, and city people to keep it going.

First, let's take a look at this farm income support proposal Secretary Brannan recommended to Congress last summer. Let's remember, too, that despite set-backs, the present administration in Washington hopes to hammer away in an attempt to have the plan or some version of it passed by the Eighty-second Congress.

Briefly, here's how the plan would have applied in 1950: It would be an attempt to support your farm income at a figure that would buy as much as your average annual income did during the period 1939–48.

To do this, you and the other 6,000,000 people classified as farmers in the United States, need a total cash farm income of around $26,000,000,000 next year. In order to achieve this national income figure, support prices on commodities next year would need to be 25 percent higher than the average price received by farmers during the last 10 years, 1940–49.

As examples, wheat support prices would be around $1.88 a bushel; corn, $1.46; potatoes, $1.59; milk, $4 a hundred; eggs, 46 cents a dozen; beef cattle, $16.90 a hundred; and hogs, at $19. Anyone who wants to know the detailed plan which Brannan used to figure the income support standard, may turn to page 94.

The big problem in any price-support program has been to find a way to support prices to farmers at the guaranteed level. Brannan proposes to continue the use of commodity loans and purchase agreements for storable commodities such as wheat, corn, and cotton. Prices for your nonstorable commodities such as hogs, eggs, and milk, on the other hand, would be permitted to seek the open-market level determined by supply and demand. Then you would receive a Government check for the difference between the market price and the price-support standard determined by the plan.

As an illustration, the price of hogs would be left free to rise or fall on a free market. But Mr. Brannan is thinking of a farm price-support standard of $19 on hogs. Under his plan, if you sold hogs for only $17, the Government would dig down and pay you the $2 a hundred difference between the standard and the market price.

To be eligible for price supports you would need to meet certain demands. First, Bran-

nan believes farmers should be required to follow certain soil-conservation practices as determined by Government officials. Second, they would have to comply with whatever control programs are found necessary, such as acreage allotments, marketing quotas, and marketing agreements. And third, he would limit all farms to a certain specified volume of production on which price supports would apply.

That's the Brannan plan conjured up in Washington's agricultural bureaucracy. That's the plan they're trying to sell to the Nation's millions as the panacea for most of this country's economic ills. "An effective farm-production and price-stabilization program to serve the interests of all the people."

In his plan, Brannan first recommended that not more than 1,800 comparative units of production per farm be made eligible for price supports. Production beyond 1,800 units on any farm, regardless of acres or type of farm, would not be supported.

Here are several farm commodities and the pounds, bushels, or dozens equivalent to Mr. Brannan's unit of production:

Corn	bushels	10
Wheat	do	7.77
Soybeans	do	5.75
Potatoes	do	9.18
Flaxseed	do	3.40
Oats	do	17.70
Butterfat	pounds	21.82
Hogs	do	76.00
Cattle	do	86.00
Whole milk	do	346.00
Lambs	do	79.00
Chickens	do	50.34
Cotton	do	52.16
Eggs	dozens	31.88

In other words, supports on any farm would be limited to 18,000 bushels of corn, 13,986 bushels of wheat, or a combination of any commodities whose unit-of-production values don't go over the 1,800 limit. This 1,800-unit idea was worked out in such a way that price supports on any farm would be limited to a total production with a cash value around $26,000.

Mr. Brannan figures the 1,800-unit top would be reached by only about 2 percent of the Nation's farms. But let's remember that these farms account for nearly 25 percent of all the agricultural products marketed.

As you think over Brannan's ideas, there are many other things to consider. And those things will have far-reaching effects outside the strictly farm field.

Remember, for one thing, that it was only last year that city consumers were howling that price supports were responsible for 90-cent steaks and 70-cent pork chops. Actually, your hog market prices were far above the support level and you had no support on cattle. But pressure for repeal of farm price supports neared the danger mark.

In the face of all that, Secretary Brannan comes along with a plan that not only would support your farm prices at levels considerably above the old 90 percent of parity but also pegs farm prices to the highest support level on record.

The Brannan plan proposes to abandon the old parity formula which has been used for the last 20 years in measuring farm prices. It substitutes a new formula tied to an abnormal wartime-postwar period of distorted prices, incomes, and price controls. Thus, the plan sets up a goal of wartime purchasing power for farmers. And it allows little or no way for farm prices to adjust along with other prices in our country. A farm-income standard is the objective of the plan, but even so, the same old type of price supports and production controls are the means of reaching this goal.

Aside from the fact that the plan defies simple and basic economics that must accompany a good farm program, farmers are beginning to realize little could be worse than turning the problem into a political football. That is exactly what Brannan has done. They fear it means that any farm program in this country is destined to be picked up and cut up at every opportunity by opposing parties. Obviously if this happens, there will be little to which farmers can look forward with certainty. Already, this has been apparent in Congress.

The board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation are unanimous in their opposition to Brannan's plan. They have said, "The philosophy of the Brannan plan is so dangerous to agriculture that we vigorously oppose * * *

"Under this proposal, the farmer's only hope for a fair income would depend on Government hand-outs from annual appropriations by Congress. We maintain that it's unreasonable to stake the welfare of agriculture upon such a hazardous possibility.

"Cost of the program would be staggering. There is no good reason why the Government should pay part of the grocery bill for every citizen.

"Price goals of the plan are so high that farmers constantly would be under rigid controls in production and marketing.

"Whenever Government undertakes to make the decisions on which volume and quality of production must depend, the result is inefficient and costly production with continuously increasing Government subsidies."

Of course, labor-union spokesmen have been loud in their support of the Brannan proposal. They welcome the idea of cheap food at the expense of the Government Treasury. More than that, they served notice on farmers that labor expects and demands farmer support in the fight for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act—a sharp political swap.

But after all, there is only just so much production and national income each year. What income there is results from the labor, capital, and the brains of all the people. The Government, itself, doesn't produce the wealth it has to spend. Every dollar that goes into any support program has to be taken away from the people in taxes.

Mr. Brannan proposes to guarantee prices to farmers which are high enough to yield around 100 percent of parity in 1950. Under his formula, supports would rise still further in the years ahead. That would happen as the relatively low prewar years are dropped from the computations and higher years following the war are added. This means that the Government would be called upon to support your farm products and farm income far above the free-market level. There would be little or no drop in the farm-income standard until there would be an appreciable drop in prices paid by farmers. And that's regardless of the general economic conditions, unemployment, and hard times outside the farm field. Even arm-chair economists know it is nonsense not to provide for adjustments to weaker demands or a supply that is too great.

Although Mr. Brannan himself failed to venture a guess as to cost, several agricultural economists have estimated the cost of the Brannan plan could run well over $5,000,000,000 in 1950—maybe 7 to 15 times the average cost of the entire farm program each year from 1935–1939. And taxes, we don't have to remind you, are pretty high already. Also, during last year, the most prosperous year on record, the Federal Government spent nearly $2,000,000,000 more than it was able to take in from taxes.

Another argument against Charlie Brannan: Price supports before the war were never higher than 75 percent of parity. Even so, by the time the war came along, huge stocks of Government-owned corn, wheat, and cotton were becoming a real headache. The big question in the Department of Agriculture was fast becoming one of what to do with all the surpluses. So, can anyone doubt the necessity of regimentation and control of every farmer under such high supports? How long would Mr. Brannan's promise of $19 for hogs continue without limiting farmers on the number of pigs they could farrow or sell?

Also, if you think you can operate outside any Government program of controlling agricultural prices and products, you had better think again. Once marketing quotas are approved by two-thirds of the producers voting, all farmers producing that crop must go along or pay a stiff penalty. In the case of wheat, the fine is 50 percent of the support price for any production in excess of the allotment. The Brannan plan would expand the penalty provisions under present laws. For example, it would make farmers liable for fines up to $500 for failure to keep and furnish records as requested by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Nor can we overlook what these artificially high support-price levels would do to our foreign-trade policy of encouraging more and freer trade among nations. The world dollar shortage already has been cutting in on American exports. Flax, which has been obtained by our Government through price-support operations, is finding no market abroad right now. Other countries are able to get it at a cheaper price than this country is asking for it. And whenever we sell food or fiber such as this abroad at less than cost, we actually are subsidizing foreign consumers at the expense of American taxpayers, which means all of us.

Our tremendous export-market demand for wheat is not expected to continue, either. When wheat prices in this country are supported at around $1.90 a bushel and the world price is less, the only way we can expect to export wheat is to dump it abroad. In a dumping operation, the Government takes the loss between the prices here at home and the world market. Other countries don't like this and neither do we.

Brannan bases the need for his own particular plan on a comparison of income of farm and nonfarm people. He says the per capita, average, net farm income in this country last year amounted to $909. The average, per capita, net nonfarm income was $1,569. And the plan, of course, would work to bring them together.

But the average, net farm income for all farmers is far from a fair basis for comparison. The last United States census taken in 1944 reported more than 2,500,000, or more than 40 percent, of the Nation's 5,858,889 farmers were small or part-time farmers. (Anything more than 3 acres in the country is considered a farm.) Really not farmers at all, this group reported an average gross production of $544.

The same census reported more than 3,200,000 family-sized farms with an average, gross farm production of $3,966. In 1948, subscribers to Successful Farming had an average, gross farm income of around $10,000. Mr. Brannan's shotgun approach of $909 includes all kinds of farmers and people who live on acreages. It includes the very largest operators as well as hundreds of thousands of acreages that produce only a few dollars of food for market.

Isn't it apparent that real market prices for farm products are important to only about half of the people classified as farmers? The other half raises only about 10 percent of our total agricultural production, and they consume at home most of what they grow. In point of view of workers there are more consumers of agricultural products than there are producers. Actually they stand to lose more than they gain from high support prices through taxes and controls, as does everyone else. You see, this is a fine example of taxing ourselves in order to pay ourselves. And that's not good business.

So, in the end, we are beginning to realize more and more that real, permanent, long-range aid to farmers could better be brought about through greater stability in the general price level than through tinkering with

individual commodities. This calls for intelligent management of the public debt, of the tax, credit, and fiscal policies of our National Government.

Finally, it was only a few years ago that Joseph S. Davis, director of the Food Research Institute at Stanford University, Calif., asked the question: "What kind of an agriculture does America want?" His answer was then and would be now: "America wants an agriculture that earns its way, instead of being continually and increasingly dependent on Government props, vulnerable to political shifts, and forced to accept the accompanying regimentation. It wants an agriculture that, proud of its strength, competes in domestic and foreign markets on the basis of efficiency and fair play, independent of import restrictions and export subsidies. America wants well-tested programs continued and improved, and ill-starred and dangerous programs abandoned or replaced by better ones. America wants genuine, nonpolitical soil conservation, economically achieved. America wants redress of flagrant inequities, wherever they appear, but no truck with guaranties of equality for any individuals, groups, or occupations.

Acheson Speaks Unwisely

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the editorial which appeared in my own daily newspaper, the Racine Journal Times, at Racine, Wis., reflects my own views on Mr. Acheson's attitude toward Alger Hiss. I am including it at this point in the RECORD:

As an individual Dean Acheson had a perfect right to his own opinions on the conviction and sentencing of Alger Hiss. But because he is Secretary of State, and, as such, a shaper of American policy against the expansion of communism, his public defense of Hiss was unwise and unfortunate.

Acheson's remarks can only confuse the American people and foreign governments with whom he must deal. Hiss was convicted of perjury by an American jury after a fair trial. In effect, the decision meant that he was guilty of treason back in 1938, though he could not be tried on that charge because of the 3-year statute of limitations.

It is not appropriate for the head of the State Department to defend a man who committed the acts of a traitor while working in that same Department—a man who was branded by the Government prosecutor as an aide of spies for the Soviet Union and found by a jury to have been guilty of lying about it.

The Hiss case is being appealed and may be heard by the United States Supreme Court before it is finished. But it would have been much better if Secretary Acheson had refrained from comment as an official, instead of throwing suspicion and casting aspersions on the judicial system. He has placed himself in the untenable position of defending a perjurer duly convicted according to the law of the land.

This Nation today faces a problem of revising its foreign policy because of communistic expansion in the Far East. This policy must be worked out by the State Department in cooperation with the Senate. Secretary Acheson's remarks about the Hiss case certainly will not contribute toward the harmony and understanding in his relations with the Senators. Dissension and distrust already voiced in the upper House may imperil this Nation's foreign policy. If a Secretary of State does not have the confidence and respect of the Senate, he loses his usefulness to the Nation.

What Is Kansas?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, on January 29, 1950, the great State of Kansas celebrated her eighty-ninth birthday. In the years following her admission to statehood she has in her high type of citizenry met and fulfilled the challenge of her proud motto—"Ad astra per aspera"—"To the stars through difficulties."

One of her devoted and loyal sons, Gordon P. Martin, a young newspaperman of Topeka, in commemoration of this birthday event, has painted a word picture that so beautifully portrays the true meaning and substance of Kansas. I feel it should have the widest dissemination possible. To that end, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I quote it herewith:

WHAT IS KANSAS?

You ask me: What is Kansas?

And I reply: Kansas is all things to her sons and daughters.

Kansas is the lilting call of the meadowlark wafted across a meadow where a rock-cradled creek beckons sheep to water; the shrill whistle of the bobwhite, a bird dog frozen on point, and the silence-shattering explosion of a shotgun.

Kansas is the smell of moist earth in springtime, the puffing labor of a farmer's tractor, and the cheery call of a driver to his willing horses.

Kansas is the redbud of the Elk River Valley, the rocky glens of Atchison, and the silent wildness of Scott County.

Kansas is the mass of wheat that rolls for miles like a golden ocean under the driving, growing rays of a summer sun, the sweat-soaked shirt of a harvest hand who pauses for a cooling drink from the water barrel.

Kansas is the frosty morning when frisky animals welcome the bite of the late October air, the swirl of snow which beats against windows while a family gathers 'round the hearth.

Kansas is appreciation for the public schoolhouse as the first great hope of a living democracy, the swelling roar of Rock Chalk Jayhawk K. U. booming down from Mount Oread.

Kansas is the stubborn belief in moderation and the reluctance to depart from innate conservatism, but having chosen new ways, seizes upon them with a zest to know the truth.

Kansas is the guts to fight drought and pestilence and all adversity with a will to win.

Kansas is the political fight that asks no quarter and gives none, the reason why the mayor of the town declares that on his main street are the most solid citizens of the Nation, the reason why the weatherman says his elements demand and breed a vigorous people.

Kansas is the return of the native who has wandered far and comes home with full heart to the earthly strength of his forebears.

You ask me: What is Kansas?

Why, Kansas is all these things, and more, as she goes onward, sometimes inching, sometimes marching, sometimes rushing, but moving, always moving, toward a greater dawn tomorrow.

GORDON P. MARTIN.

Future of Rehabilitation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of December 26, 1949, under the title of "Future of Rehabilitation."

The editorial is timely, dealing as it does with a problem now under consideration by the Congress. That problem in my opinion is not that of a reorganization of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation—OVR—for such an effort, unless thoroughly and advisedly considered, might well result in disorganization. And, as the editorial aptly says, neither is the problem that of whether the OVR shall be maintained in action. All persons everywhere who know of the accomplishments of this organization are agreed that its great work should not only be continued, but it should be expanded.

During the last fiscal year alone, 2,400 disabled persons were processed by this service in the District of Columbia. The work load of the agency in the District is steadily increasing, and it is extremely doubtful whether or not the agency can meet this increased work load without an increase in its appropriation. It is hoped that the Congress presently in session will give to this matter its sympathetic consideration.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

FUTURE OF REHABILITATION

When the Congress meets again in January, one of the problems which it will be asked to consider will be that of the expansion of the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation. This useful and helpful agency now is a part of the Federal security establishment. It serves handicapped men and women seeking to improve their opportunities to live normal lives through the exercise of their own capacities. Naturally, its major objective is to make these citizens self-supporting. There are economic reasons, social reasons, spiritual reasons why it is desirable that they should not be dependent upon others. They themselves want self-sufficiency. The OVR program from its inception in 1920 has operated in the direction of promoting wage-earning abilities. Its success has been noteworthy.

During the fiscal year 1949, 58,000 persons were rehabilitated. Seventy-four percent were unemployed at the time rehabilitation was started, 100 percent had jobs when it was completed. The wages paid to these people reached $94,000,000, or almost five times the previous earnings of the entire

group. More than 400 disabled residents of the District of Columbia were included in the roster. The cost of the services rendered to them was $202,346, of which amount $177,346 came from the Federal Treasury, $25,000 from District funds.

In this connection, it should be remembered that the expense of vocational rehabilitation is not a continuing burden upon taxpayers. Once it is paid, the cost becomes merely a matter of history. What continues is the increasing economic worth, the improved wage- and salary-earning power of the beneficiaries. A blind man who is taught how to operate a vending stand has to be instructed during only a few weeks or months. Thereafter he is on his own—a productive worker. The same rule applies to handicapped fellow Americans who are taught the techniques necessary for employment in sheltered workshops and at home. Any investment of public funds which adds to their ability to earn a living yields abundant dividends in the form of taxes which they themselves soon are able to meet.

The gain in morale, of course, cannot be measured or computed. It goes beyond statistical tables and charts and is best appreciated when it is witnessed in process of development—as it easily may be in many neighborhoods. The problem which Congress must face is not that of whether the OVR shall be maintained in action. Rather, it is whether it shall be reorganized. Several proposals to that effect have been offered. Before Congress decides upon any revolutionary change, it should be demonstrated that it is desired and will be justified, not simply in political advantages but in larger benefits to the handicapped and the Nation as a whole. Change for the sake of change might disorganize the OVR in such fashion as to require years for the correction of the mistake.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES S. GOLDEN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. GOLDEN. Mr. Speaker, we learned from members of the great Committee on Education and Labor that this committee has heretofore passed a resolution to go into executive session on tomorrow and stay in session from day to day endeavoring to agree upon, and report, a bill providing for Federal aid to our public schools.

I believe that this committee will work diligently and faithfully to accomplish this great purpose. There is no bill pending before the Congress from a domestic standpoint that will confer greater benefits upon the American people and go further in strengthening the moral, intellectual, and economic fiber of our Nation than this bill. No state or nation can rise above the intellectual and educational standards of its people.

Because of economic conditions prevailing in this great Nation of ours, educational opportunity for the children of the various States are not equally distributed. If we are to have one united nation with equal opportunity for all of its citizens, we must have Federal aid to our public schools. It has been heretofore demonstrated and it is a fact that many States of this great Nation do not have and cannot obtain sufficient economic strength within the borders of the States to properly and equally support their public schools. If we could elevate and equalize the educational opportunities of the youth of this entire Nation, it would bring into society many young men and young women able to earn more and contribute a much larger share to the economic welfare of the entire Nation.

Because of the lack of educational opportunities in many of the States, many thousands of physically fit young men were excluded from the draft during World War II and the extra burden thus caused was thrown onto the youth of the more-favored States that possessed a better primary and secondary education. This is a national problem from every viewpoint.

In my own good State of Kentucky a much greater effort has been and is being made by the citizens and taxpayers than the national average to provide our children with an adequate education. Our economic wealth and our yearly income are not sufficient without Federal aid to public schools to accomplish this.

Many other States of this great Nation are in the same situation that Kentucky finds itself in. There is a direct effect upon the wealthier States by permitting the youth of the poorer States to grow up in ignorance and without an adequate education. A very large percent of the young men and young women from Kentucky and many other States situated as she is migrate into other States where opportunities for work and employment are better. Most of them spend their adult life in and become citizens of other States.

Kentucky, like many other border and Southern and some Western States, has many more children to educate per thousand of the total population than the richer, more prosperous Northern and Eastern States. There are approximately 260 children of school age in Kentucky per thousand population as compared to approximately 200 children per thousand population on a national average. While our per capita income in Kentucky is less than $900 per year and less than $4,000 per school child, the national average income for the entire United States is much higher and in some of our great wealthy States there is an income in excess of $10,000 per school child, yet Kentucky spends a greater percent of her average income upon the education of her children than does the average State of the Union. This condition has prevailed for many years in Kentucky and in other less fortunate States. Although these things are true, it has been demonstrated throughout the history of this great Nation when some few of the Kentucky young men and young women do obtain proper training, equipment, and education the product is most satisfying and they have contributed a great deal to the leadership and welfare of this entire Nation and to many of her sister States by Kentuckians going to the very top in our national life and in the affairs of other States where native-born Kentuckians migrate and live in other States.

Our people have the native ability, the intellectual strength, and the moral fiber to become great contributors to the American way of life if they can obtain a fair and equal education. There is now a great shortage of qualified teachers in Kentucky. Other fields of endeavor that pay more have been a constant drain upon the teaching profession, yet many loyal qualified teachers have remained in the teaching profession at great personal sacrifice to themselves.

We should turn our attention as a Nation to the lost generation of youth that is growing up among us. Additional strains are being placed upon the education systems of many States because of the tremendous increase in the birth rate over the past several years. The condition, in the absence of Federal aid, is growing worse instead of better. We have lost, in the Eighty-first Congress, much valuable time. I believe this great committee that has jurisdiction over this vital subject is aware of their tremendous responsibilities. Every friend of the public schools of this Nation should unite together to encourage this committee to allow nothing to divert them from their determination to bring out a good bill to public education as soon as reasonably possible. Of course, we are all agreed that in such a bill there should be no Federal interference.

What the school systems of the various States of the Union need is Federal money to supplement the money raised by taxes on the local level. This great Nation of ours takes in taxes approximately $800,000,000 per year from the citizens of my great State. Yet, in contributions back to the State of Kentucky, our great Nation furnishes less than $150,000,000 per year.

Considering our great need, the good that can be accomplished to all the Nation, there is no reason why there should not be passed at the present session of this Congress a Federal-aid-to-public-schools bill that would furnish to the school teachers and children of Kentucky the small comparative sum of approximately $16,000,000.

This Nation has been generous with other nations throughout the world. I think it should be our first consideration to look after and improve the young people of America.

American Small Business, Constituting the Warp and Woof of Our Nation's Economy, Is the Very Keystone of Private Enterprise; 90 Percent of All RFC Loans Go to Such Small Business and Industrial Enterprises, Thereby Saving More Than 30 Small Concerns From Financial Disaster Every Working Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, who is there among us brash enough to say,

"Let us repeal the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, do away with the Coast Guard Service, abate all safety laws in these United States, take down the lightning rod from off the Washington Monument, or terminate the wonderful work being done by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation"?

Mr. Speaker, I have just received a letter from one of our leading, most representative, public-minded, and contemplative citizens in the State of Alabama. It was written with respect to and in appreciation of the wonderful work that is being carried on today by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

It is a short, terse communication. It puts down, ink on paper, the opinion held by millions of our citizens, businessmen, and labor leaders concerning the need not alone for continuing but for perpetuating the operation of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Originally published in Forbes Magazine of Business under date of November 15, 1949, a copy was sent to me by my good and lifelong friend, Howard Scott. Mr. Scott is a member of the law firm of Scott & Porter in the town of Chatom, Washington County, Ala.

His letter reads in part as follows:

Now, Congressman FRANK, as you so well know, here in the Southland we are desperate in our need for credit. One of the reasons we have such low wages in the South is that we have to do much of all labor by hand, inasmuch as we do not have available capital with which to buy machinery. We need sound term credit. Our complaint, if we have any to make, is that RFC is too conservative.

I live, as you well know, in a small town and consequently my perspective is necessarily limited. The few bankers with whom I have been associated recognize only the salvage value of the security. They exclude entirely the going concern value of the business in question. This evidences an entire lack of confidence in the American spirit of business success and capital venture.

Were RFC to be eliminated, it would mean the immediate closing down of many small businesses here in the South, with the net effect of considerable additional unemployment. Some of the larger companies would gobble up the assets of the smaller ones for little or nothing. Particularly would this be true as applied to the lumber industry, inasmuch as 65 percent of the lumber manufactured in the South is by small concerns, many of which, though basically sound, cannot possibly get a loan from a bank. This is entirely due to the enactment of both Federal and State banking laws which narrowly limit available banking facilities.

In order to comply with the new 75-cent-minimum-wage law it is going to be necessary here in Washington County for the smaller mills to immediately get new, labor-saving equipment. I know personally of several concerns who simply cannot buy this much-needed equipment without the assistance of the RFC.

We certainly agree witn your general philosophy that the Government should not engage in business activities, but if private business does not choose to, or for some reason beyond its control, cannot assume the privilege and duty of financing fundamentally and factually worth-while undertakings at reasonable rates * * * then it should not complain if the Government recognizes this absolute need for credit and does something about it.

Yours very sincerely,

SCOTT & PORTER,
HOWARD SCOTT.

CHATOM, ALA.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you believe with me that Mr. Scott expresses the sentiments held by the little-business men throughout the entire cotton-producing South inasmuch as our small-business enterprises have in general long depended upon the facilities of the congressionally established RFC to prosper them in their business activities.

Conceived during the dark days of the world-wide depression in 1932, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has long since proved itself to be of inestimable value to all business—large or small—in the First District of Alabama.

Time, and time again, when the merchants, manufacturers, and agricultural processors in my district, due to restrictive banking laws, were not able to avail themselves of the credit facilities of local banking institutions, the facilities of the RFC saved their employees from unemployment and the borrowing business concern from receivership, if not from insolvency.

It is because of these facts that every citizen in every town and village throughout the land, be he employer or employee, has a vital stake in its continued existence. In the brief time I have allotted myself for this discussion I am not going even to attempt to trace back, through the 18 years that the RFC has been engaged in its beneficent work, the benefits that have accrued to small-business concerns that have availed themselves of the unique and peculiar credit facilities provided by this Congress to help them in times of financial difficulties. Any fiscal agency that merely accomplished this task would have done a good job. Certainly a financial agent of Government, the policies of which have proven so factually, economicaly, and financially sound as to do the job at no cost to the taxpayers or to the Federal Treasury, is deserving of recognition and merit. Charging but low interest rates on their loans, the RFC, because of the enormous volume of business done, actually made a profit of more than $573,000,000, of which $308,000,000 profit has been paid into the United States Treasury as a dividend on the investment made by the Government which holds the preferred stock of that Corporation.

In accordance with good business practices, ample reserve had been established and been provided even before that huge sum was covered into the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, I will grant that at times it is seemingly difficult for business to negotiate a loan with the RFC and, moreover, that sometimes those who have made application become disheartened by the demands made upon them—income, expense, sales, and other statements—in order to obtain the credit.

That, Mr. Speaker, is because those historically charged with its operations and loan approvals have lived within both the letter and the spirit of laws as we here in Congress laid them down—and the further fact that its every function has been administered in accordance with the rules and practices—of good, sound fiscal policies established, ardently adhered to, in negotiation of its every last loan.

Mr. Speaker, this Congress placed the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on a peacetime basis beginning July 1, 1947. In the short 2½ years that have elapsed, the RFC as now constituted has already made a total of 10,770 loans, aggregating $1,022,000,000.

Of that sum $884,000,000 were advanced by the RFC while local banks participated to the extent of $138,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, now hear me well on this. In order to more fully inform my own mind with respect to the facts in the case, I took time to make inquiry as to just what number of the total loans approved had been made to small-business houses and came upon the following:

Out of the total of 10,770 loans, a total of 9,695, or more than 90 percent of all were loans of less than $100,000 and of that number 10,646 or 98.9 percent of all were under the $1,000,000 mark.

Thus it becomes clear that by far the greatest number of loans effected by RFC even in those last 2½ years were made to the small-business men whose enterprise constitutes the warp and the woof of a national economy fabric which reflects every shade of its colorful occupation design.

I seriously doubt if in the history of our Nation any department agency ever established in Government has made a more enviable record of public service than that which distinguishes the operations of the RFC and its subsidiary organizations.

A study of the high character of every man who has served on its board—or participated in the direction of its fiscal policies—from the time of its establishment is reflected in each succeeding financial report of its successful administration and operation.

Marked as have been the successes of his predecessors, this great governmental Corporation was never chaired by one more capable than by the good friend of every Member of this House, the Honorable Harley Hise, now Chairman of the Board of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, there are very few public officials that have ever brought to their office the demonstrated resourcefulness, ability, skill, and tact that characterize the present chairman, Mr. Harley Hise.

When President Truman nominated Harley Hise to be the Chairman of the RFC, he knew he was no hereditary banker. He did know however that he was schooled in law and a highly skilled accountant. He knew that the honors and successes which are his were earned by him in the hard school of long experience and, I would have you know with me, that there is no type or phase of the banking business—as we know that great profession—in which Harley Hise has not acquitted himself with distinction.

He is well and thoroughly acquainted with the financial needs of agriculture, mining, industry, banking, long-term as well as short-term loans, home-owners loans, farm land banks, small homes and business properties, and construction loans.

These are but a few of the many, many banking experiences which enrich Harley Hise's abilities and make him one

of the most valued men holding public office in these United States today.

As it is with Harley Hise, so it is also with all members of the Board of Directors of the RFC. The membership of both Houses of Congress know these estimable gentlemen—Mr. Walter L. Dunham, Mr. Harvey J. Gunderson, Mr. Henry A. Mulligan, and Mr. William E. Willett. They know them to be men of exceedingly rare abilities, experience, and talents. Individually and collectively you will find no group of directors in the field of banking—possessed of superior qualifications—either in or out of government.

Not alone do I know of no other agency which has more carefully and successfully carried out the fiscal principles and policies declared by the Congress, but I know of no other agency that was called upon to engage in such a multiplicity of diverse activities carried on by its subsidiaries, in peace as well as in war. Its every congressionally imposed function has been discharged, not alone with dispatch, economy, and efficiency, but with great distinction and credit to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

The problem of quickly, economically, and efficiently expanding the tremendous armament, war plant, and production necessary to the successful conclusion of World War II is not alone a tribute to the work accomplished by RFC and its skilled personnel—but, the fact that the industries of this country were able by and with its fiscal aid, technical advices, and financial help—to reconvert to peacetime affairs from wartime activities constitutes a record of industrial banking by the RFC of which this Congress and Nation is justly proud.

Mr. Speaker, one frequently hears it said that "the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not make small loans." That impression, however, is far from fact. Established in the dark days of 1932, one of the principal banking activities carried on by that organization has been the making of loans to small-business enterprises—despite the fact that only the few larger advances to banks, railroads, and huge industrial enterprises are the ones that always get the headlines in the press.

Mr. Speaker, there are those among us who are inclined to feel that the need for the activities which have engaged the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the last 18 years no longer exists. To them I would say that the activities carried on by the RFC are in a manner more or less comparable to the lightning rod that protects the Washington Monument or all other great structures throughout these United States. The Washington Monument is capped by an apex of metal to which is welded a stout cable, the other end of the cable being buried deep in the wet bowels of the earth.

Thousands of lightning and electrical storms of greater or lesser magnitude assail that great structure, and have during its long life. Any single bolt was possessed of power enough to crack it asunder and cause it to come tumbling to the ground. But there, silently functioning, doing its work throughout every night and day of the year is the "lightning rod" to attract and absorb enormous currents that accumulate and dart through the heavens. These charges were absorbed. They were silently and imperceptibly conducted into the earth without any injury whatever to the great structure itself.

Every great electric-generating station in these United States, as well as the huge high lines, are likewise equipped with lightning rods or as they are sometimes called, lightning arrestors. Silently, they also keep the electrical energy continually flowing out of the generators over the wires into the mines, the mills, the factories, and the farms of our Nation, despite the great electrical surcharges of lightning which constantly assail them from the heavens. It is only when they fail to do their allotted work that we begin to appreciate the great service which they render in caring for our normal operations and normal life.

Mr. Speaker, as it is with the lightning rods that protect our monumental structures and the lines that power this Nation from the sources of nature, so it is with the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, an agency that protects the financial economy and stability of the Nation and, particularly its small business concerns when they find themselves confronted with financial problems, which although based upon sound credit, cannot be handled by local banking institutions and facilities. Moreover, the RFC, like the lightning rod does its allotted task, silently and without ballyhoo or fanfare.

Mr. Speaker, hear me well on this point. The great volume of the financial assistance handled by the RFC does not in any way mean that the loans which it has made have been granted indiscriminately. The fact is that more than 50 percent of the loans which are applied for are either withdrawn or declined.

Out of the years of experience in this highly specialized and technical field of credit, the RFC set up a group of expert analysts or examiners charged with determining whether an applicant should be given financial assistance. Often a business loan would prove a great disservice to a borrower. This would be particularly true where the examination discloses that despite the fact that a loan was granted to the business, for one of many reasons, it could not hope to succeed.

Conversely, there are thousands of instances where the applicant had figured his financial needs too closely and had not allowed himself sufficient capital for various requirements and aspects of his business. Here again the RFC is helpful and may, as is sometimes the case, recommend that the application be increased by an amount sufficient to provide the margin of safety that will definitely insure success of the venture and the consequent repayment of the loan.

But whatever the action on any application, it receives consideration only because the financial aid requested was not otherwise locally available and at reasonable rates.

Local banking facilities must participate in making the loans to the full measure of their legal and fiscal abilities.

The Congress recognized the importance of protecting the established lending institutions as the foundation of our national economic structure and has wisely made provision that only after a bank or other lending institution had determined that it could not make the loan could the businessman expect assistance from the RFC.

There are, as all well know, many, many reasons why a bank cannot or will not make a loan. Among them are statutory loan limitations enacted by both the Federal and State governments, the local requirements of a diversified portfolio and the type of loan requested. One of the most common problems arises from the fact that most banks today as never before desire to be liquid in order to meet any contingency. As a consequence thereof, there is little money available locally for loans running for more than 180 days. Whether the borrowers realize it or not, experience has long since proved that a loan for such a short time is of little or no value to most businesses.

Concomitant with the drying up of the main well springs of long-term credit is the distressing fact that the principal sources of venture capital are also being exhausted. It is in this field—the furnishing of venture capital and as a source of long-term loans—that the RFC can and is proving of inestimable value. So long as there is a lack of ready funds in either of these fiscal areas, there is a needful place in our national financial structure for an agency like the RFC in all of the foreseeable future.

Mr. Speaker, all of the foregoing is representative of the feeling of the business people of not alone my district in Alabama, but throughout the country. It is, indeed, fortunate in this connection that we have available in the RFC a highly qualified personnel whose years of experience is backed and complemented by an able Board of Directors, each of whom, after great study, was appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Three of the Board members have come up through the ranks of the Corporation they so well serve. They are, therefore, well acquainted through first-hand knowledge with its purposes, policies, and aims, past, present, and prospective. Their long experiences and day-by-day contact with the difficulties reflected in the thousands of cases that have come to their notice make them most sympathetic and understanding of the problems of the little fellow diligently trying to operate a small business so as to support himself and his family.

It is an incontrovertible fact that the economic stability of the country can best be fostered and maintained if the small fires of business adversity which dot our economic landscape are promptly extinguished. Unfortunately some, however, feel that the ends of our economy would be served if small business or the small flickering flames of private enterprise were allowed to burn themselves out of existence. They who belong to that school hold that the RFC should be called only to the five-alarm financial conflagrations, and to where a real and readily recognizable financial crisis already exists. The latter view, more often

than not, means that we arrive with too little too late, padlocking the barn as it were when the horses are gone.

The question has been asked: Should the RFC concentrate on helping new enterprises or should it extend assistance only to old-established ventures? Here again the question cannot be answered categorically. Important as new activities might prove to our well-being, newness alone does not warrant financial assistance. The RFC extends aid to a business which has a reasonable possibility of being successful and of contributing to the national welfare. On the other hand, when an established business finding itself in financial straits makes application for a loan merely for that reason, it cannot be dismissed lightly. If this course of reasoning were to prevail and become the accepted policy, much valuable experience and know-how would be irretrievably lost. An old business, even though in financial distress, might well be essentially sound but harassed with easily corrected weaknesses and poor management, overproduction or lax collections could be readily relieved of its financial distress. In any event, whether the business be old or new, RFC has one steadfast policy: a policy of deciding each case individually and on its own merits.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard more or less furor over loans made for the national defense in World War II and which, under a law passed by the Congress, were not required to be as fully secured as reasonable to assure payment. The lack of understanding as to these transactions has given rise to a din which drowns the purring hum of the vast array of smooth-running machines in thousands of factories, which together with their operators would be idle but for RFC.

Mr. Speaker, and you, my colleagues, hear me now well on this.

When the Board of Directors of the RFC tells me that "the Kaiser-Frazer loans are well secured and will be repaid," that "they will insure a level of production which will insure a profitable operation," that "they will provide employment for thousands of workers," that "they will assist and encourage many small businesses and will increase production in a number of fields," who am I, in all fairness, to say that such is not the case?

None but one other with the same fund of factual information, knowledge, and experience as possessed by the Board could speak authoritatively on that subject. What we hear to the contrary is but one man's opinion. It is entitled to be given that much weight, not one grain more.

Whatever problems yet remain to be solved, it is a noteworthy fact that direct attempts are being made to meet issues squarely. One fact stands out above all others—that is that the RFC is the sole certain source of venture capital available to American small-business establishment, development, and the security of private enterprise today, without putting the United States Government itself into the management of business.

It is in the best American tradition and in accordance with the history of our democracy. It is essential to the future of that democracy that the trust and faith imposed in our public servants be truly warranted and zealously guarded to the end that we may work and walk together toward the goal of world leadership which is our destiny.

Mr. Speaker, on February 2 the great RFC celebrated its eighteenth birthday. I know I speak the sentiments of this House when I extend to that great financial organization the congratulations and best wishes from the people in general and small-business men of these United States in particular.

Mr. Speaker, it is only in part because of the foregoing that I want to see the RFC made a permanent institution in the forward and progressive march toward preserving private initiative in these United States.

Percentage Depletion Not Tax Loophole as Applied to Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I must vigorously criticize any portion of the administration's viewpoint on taxes which calls percentage depletion a loophole in the tax laws.

One would think the mining industry was taking advantage of some slick technicality in the tax regulations, barely legal and certainly immoral. This is plain nonsense. The 15-percent depletion allowance was specifically granted the mining industry by law after long study by the Ways and Means Committee. It is a legitimate way for a mining enterprise to recover its capital, ore being a wasting asset. Mr. Chapman's industry advisory committee on mining has pointed this out clearly, calling not only for adequate depletion allowances but insisting further that such allowances should be made to the stockholder as well as to the corporation. In fact, the committee advises increases in allowances by a change increasing the present percentage of gross income and the limitation in reference to net income.

I wonder why the agencies have these industry advisory committees, spending good time in Washington several times a year and giving the benefit of their brains and experience free to the Government, if their recommendations are to be so blatantly ignored.

It is certain that all Members of the House who understand these matters will stand up valiantly against this new onslaught against the mining industry—an onslought calculated to sap away its very lifeblood. I have pointed out many times the disadvantages our domestic mining industry is laboring under. It is, outside of the very substantial operators, dying out. We need encouragement, not abuse. We need more aid, not less.

When the mining industry is taxed out of business, priced out of business by rising costs, and put out of business by low prices, an attack on such a fundamental point as percentage depletion may well be the blow which will render it impotent to supply our commercial needs, let alone those of war.

I, for one, will never rest until the foes of domestic mining within the administration—an administration of which I am in general an ardent supporter—are ejected from their high places or at least told bluntly by the Congress that they are wasting their time in these abominable attacks upon the industry most vital to our basic economy and security.

Court Picketing Should Be Outlawed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New Orleans States:

COURT PICKETING SHOULD BE OUTLAWED

We understand that the bill outlawing picketing of Federal courts has not yet been placed upon the Senate Calendar.

It certainly should be.

And it ought to be enacted, as soon as possible.

It is a matter of record that this measure, which was conceived and drafted by Cuthbert Baldwin of New Orleans, passed the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress by unanimous vote. It was introduced by Representative BOGGS.

Introduced by Senator ELLENDER in the upper Chamber, the bill was blocked by Senator LANGER of North Dakota when the Louisianian asked that it be brought up to a vote on unanimous consent.

One man and one man alone, Senator LANGER, defeated the measure last year.

Most Federal judges and most lawyers are for this bill. It was approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States and the American Bar Association. What it does is to prevent the picketing of Federal courts where a trial is in progress, and where picketing might tend to influence the judge, the jury, or officers of the court. The practice of court picketing is only a recent development; it has occurred at least twice on the west coast, but it reached its peak in the picketing of Judge Medina's court in New York during the trial of the 11 Communists.

Pictures printed at the time showed proponents of the defendants massed shoulder to shoulder on the sidewalk completely surrounding the front entrances of the Federal building. All bore signs, some very inflammatory.

What will be the ultimate of this sort of pressure to sway the path of justice?

What is to prevent these goons from picketing the homes of jurors? Or their places of business, or the schools of their children? Or their wives going to market?

Those who believe that this picketing ought to be allowed will point to the conviction of the Communists and say: "You see, no harm was done. Nobody was swayed by these tactics."

That is quite true.

But it is true only because Judge Medina was the sort of judge and man he proved to

be. He was patient, he wouldn't be badgered into a situation which might cause a mistrial or a reversal; and all of this was bound to become reflected in the jury's actions. But Judge Medina is a rather unusual man. There is no guaranty that just because the Red tactics failed to pay off in the picketing of his court that they won't pay off by influencing a jury trying a case before a hesitant or a hot-tempered jurist.

This picketing bill ought to become law. And it is up to the United States Senate to enact it. The House already has. The Senate shouldn't let Senator LANGER hold up this necessary legislation. Majority Leader Senator LUCAS ought to place it on the calendar.

Choosing a President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the RECORD an exceedingly interesting and enlightening letter in the Sunday New York Times by a distinguished Princeton professor of history and constitutional law, Dr. Edward S. Corwin, concerning reform of the electoral college system.

CHOOSING A PRESIDENT—SHORTCOMINGS SEEN IN PROPOSAL TO REFORM ELECTORAL SYSTEM

(The writer of the following letter is McCormick, professor of jurisprudence, emeritus, at Princeton University. He is at present an editor in the Legislative Reference Bureau of the Library of Congress, directing a project in international law.)

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

Congress is at last seriously considering the Lodge-Gossett joint resolution to reform the present constitutional machinery for choosing a President. There are some commendable features to the proposal, but there are some which, in the opinion of this writer, might lead to undesirable results.

The word "elector" means one who has the power to elect; that is, one who exercises a choice. Save for two or three instances when their doing so made not the least difference in the world even to themselves, no presidential elector has ever exercised the smallest conceivable particle of independent judgment in the casting of his vote for a President of the United States.

In the first two elections George Washington was the universal choice of the American citizenry. Since that time electors have been party stooges taking their orders from the party higher-ups. The proposal to abolish the college, so-called, which is one feature of the pending joint resolution is, therefore, considered for itself alone, not open to serious criticism. By the same token, the adoption of this feature of the proposal would of itself make no practical difference.

PRESENT METHOD

Nor, on the other hand, is the effort to get rid of the present method for determining a presidential contest in which no candidate has received a majority in the electoral college open to important challenge. In that event the House of Representatives, voting by States, today chooses from among the three top contestants in the college.

For its negative features alone the Lodge-Gossett proposal—which, in the main, only repeats several previous ones—is not open to important adverse criticism. But how about its positive features? These are three in number: First, while the electoral college is abolished, each State remains an electoral unit; and, as such, is entitled to the same electoral vote as before in the choice of a President; secondly, this electoral vote is to be divided in each State among the political parties which are recognized by it, in proportion to their popular vote for President; thirdly, a plurality of electoral votes suffices to choose a President.

What the proposal does, therefore, is to apply the principle of proportional representation in the election of President; and this, it is objected, favors the rise of splinter parties, a tendency which the provision that a President may be chosen by a mere plurality of electoral votes will further encourage.

TENDENCY TO INSTABILITY

What is more, it is argued, once introduced into our system, the proportional representation principle may be adapted to the choice of Representatives, which could easily be done by requiring that Representatives be chosen, not by districts, as at present, but as they once were in some of the States, on State-wide tickets. And, the argument proceeds, splinter parties, being pressure-group parties, are inveterate foes both of political moderation and—since their tendency is to regroup—of political stability, lessons with which the annals of parliamentary government on the Continent of Europe are replete.

This argument certainly has some force. At the same time, it must be recollected that splinter parties are by no means beyond the realm of possibility under the present system, as was shown in the last election.

What, however, are the chief advantages that the sponsors of the Lodge-Gossett proposal urge for it? Aside from the fact that it would eliminate the participation of the House of Representatives in the choice of a President when no candidate has an electoral majority, there appear to be two. The first is that under the proposed amendment electoral strength would directly reflect popular strength, whereas under the present system the successful candidate in the electoral college may have been the choice of a minority of the voters.

The argument seems to me to have little weight. It is true that when a strong third party has appeared on the scene a majority in the electoral college has been backed by only a plurality of the voters. But this fact hardly constitutes an argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal, which provides in terms for plurality Presidents.

EFFECT OF STATE-WIDE TICKETS

The other argument for the Lodge-Gossett proposal is weightier, although the fact that makes it so is probably an illegitimate feature of the present system. Owing to the now well-established practice of choosing presidential electors on State-wide tickets, the entire electoral vote of say New York may be swung for the Republican candidate by a few hundred votes, while the heavy Democratic vote in New York would count as nothing toward the choice of President.

One consequence of this is that in the so-called one-party States no effort is made by the other parties to educate the electorate in their various points of view, whereas under the Lodge-Gossett proposal there would be every inducement for minority parties in a State to roll up as big a vote as possible, since this would be converted automatically into electoral strength. But this desirable result could, it seems to me, be achieved, or at least approximated, much more simply, namely, by doing away with the State-wide ticket system and instituting in its place the choice of electors by districts, which—if we are to believe Madison—was the system the framers had in mind, and which was in fact employed in several of the States in early days.

CHOICE BY DISTRICTS

It is my own belief regarding reform of the electoral system, first, that, ridiculous as it is in some aspects, the electoral college, so-called, should be retained, but that its members should be chosen in districts, to be laid out by Congress every 10 years; secondly, that the requirement that the President receive a majority of electoral votes should be retained; thirdly, that when any candidate fails to receive such a majority, the House of Representatives should choose, as at present, except for the important change that it vote per capita and not per State.

A President thus chosen would come near at least to being the people's choice and, moreover, would probably be guaranteed at the outset of his term a House of the same political complexion as himself.

Presidential influence has become the most prominent, the most dominant, element of our constitutional system, and this fact of itself forbids the idea of our instituting a system of presidential election which might make plurality Presidents the rule rather than the exception. It also forbids the idea of supplanting geographical parties with pressure-group parties which a President can at any time wheel into action to do battle for his pet schemes provided he concedes them theirs. The proposal is careless of both these dangers.

EDWARD S. CORWIN.
PRINCETON, N. J., *January 31, 1950.*

Honor for Dr. Montgomery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS E. GRAHAM
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Evening Star of February 3, 1950:

HONOR FOR DR. MONTGOMERY

The House of Representatives honored itself when it made the Reverend Dr. James Shera Montgomery its Chaplain Emeritus at the regular salary of the position. He came to the service of the lower branch of Congress in 1921 and has grown old in his ministry to it. Eighty-seven now, he merits as much rest as he may desire. But the House very properly does not wish to let him go in the sense of parting with him definitely, finally, and altogether. It has told him in effect to stay around. And the whole community of Washington is glad to hear of its decision.

Dr. Montgomery arrived here in 1911 to be pastor of Metropolitan Memorial Church. Later he preached at Calvary. Then he returned to Metropolitan. The summons to the chaplaincy of the House resulted from popular response to his work as a missionary. He was known as a gifted pulpit orator whom ordinary people could understand—and did. A keen sense of humor was one of the qualities for which he was appreciated. He still loves a joke even when it happens to be at his own expense.

But Dr. Montgomery is serious enough where his vocation is concerned. No man of his time has cared more deeply for religion as such. He has been a Bible Christian, striving to accomplish the great spiritual objectives of the Gospels in a world rife with confusion and turmoil. If the prospect of achievement generally has been bleak, he has been undiscouraged. A friend who

knows him well and values him devotedly says of him that he personifies fellowship and the capacity of the human soul to press on to an ideal goal. When the House rose in tribute to him, it gave expression to its realization of the worth of the example he has set.

Dr. Montgomery's successor, the Reverend Dr. Bernard Braskamp, of Gunton-Temple Church, will carry on the chaplain's duties in the same spirit.

Cut in Tax Leeway for Oil Wildcatters Seen as Death Blow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK A. BARRETT
OF WYOMING
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARRETT of Wyoming. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the appendix of the RECORD a statement by Col. C. H. Reimerth, on the question of the reduction of depletion allowances presently in force for oil and gas operators, as published in the Casper Tribune, of Casper, Wyo., on January 30 last. Casper is the center of the oil and gas industry in the Rocky Mountain area. Colonel Reimerth is an authority on the matter, and I am sure that his statement will be of great interest to Members of Congress.

The Secretary of the Treasury appeared before the Ways and Means Committee on Friday last and appeared again before the committee today. The Secretary proposes to make two cuts in the depletion deduction presently allowed to oil and gas operators. In the first instance, the Secretary proposes to reduce the depletion allowance from 27½ percent to 15 percent and, secondly, he proposes legislation requiring the deduction of intangibles from the gross income and then applying the depletion exemption of 15 percent to the balance.

There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that thousands of small independent oil operators throughout the country will be forced out of business if this legislation is enacted.

It is very unfortunate that the Ways and Means Committee has determined to hear oil and gas representatives on Tuesday, February 7, and I have requested the distinguished chairman of that committee to give these small operators of my State at least 2 weeks to prepare their case and present it to the committee. The following statement of Colonel Reimerth is ample proof of the devastating effect of this proposed legislation on a vital industry of my State:

CUT IN TAX LEEWAY FOR OIL WILDCATTERS SEEN AS DEATH BLOW

"Reduction or removal of depletion allowances for the oil industry will spell the death of wildcatting for new oil fields in Wyoming and the Rocky Mountain Region," Col. C. H. Reimerth, prominent Casper income-tax expert, told the Tribune-Herald today.

He referred to President Truman's recent reference to excessive depletion exemptions now enjoyed by the oil and mining interests.

Loss or whittling down of this 27½-percent exemption from payment of income taxes, which was set up to compensate for the hazards of wildcat drilling, will dry up most of the risk capital coming into Wyoming for drilling, exploration, and other costs, the accountant declared.

RISKS TOO GREAT

"No sensible person will invest money in a wildcat promotion in the belief that it is a safe or conservative investment," Mr. Reimerth said. "It takes venture or speculative capital to do this and the reward must be commensurate with the risk involved. This depletion allowance is, and has been, the inducement for all of this venture capital which has brought outside money into the search for new oil fields in Wyoming. It has also brought all of these small, independent operators, drilling contractors, supply houses, and thousands of technical and field workers into the State."

He went on to say that the allowance has also made it possible for landowners to realize returns on previously undeveloped lands, through oil royalties, and has brought millions of dollars to the people of the State through additional royalties for schools, the universities, and roads.

"Without the depletion allowance," he asserted, "the hazards of wildcatting would be so great that only the major companies could survive and even they would have to curtail any wildcatting and limit themselves to known and proven structures. That's a conjecture but I believe a very reasonable one, for the reason of the high cost of labor and materials in operating even producing fields.

NOT SELF-SUFFICIENT

"If it were President Truman's idea to curtail new oil-field discoveries for some reason of his own, the elimination or reduction of the depletion allowance will surely accomplish this purpose. It is not any military secret that this country is not self-sufficient in oil reserves in the event of war and now in peace it resolves on us as a Nation to develop to the maximum degree all of our potential oil reserves."

Mr. Reimerth pointed out that Canada, with a higher tax structure than the United States, gives oil operators a depletion allowance of 30 percent to develop large new oil reserves in Alberta.

Removal of the exemption, coupled with heavy foreign imports of oil, would cripple independent producers in this country, Mr. Reimerth added. Many would be forced out of business.

The accountant recommended that the President, in seeking additional tax revenues, turn his attention to the recommendations of the Hoover committee for reorganization of the Government. So far, he said, only 20 percent of the Hoover committee's recommendation has been adopted. Enactment of the other 80 percent will save more than $1,000,000,000, he declared.

The speaker urged all civic groups and individuals in the State to contact Wyoming's Senators and Representatives protesting any change in the income-tax laws which would alter the present depletion provisions.

Needed Reform of Our Electoral System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an exceedingly valuable contribution to the debate about proposed changes in the method of electing Presidents. It is by a distinguished Princeton scholar, Lucius Wilmerding, Jr. It will well repay the reading by Members of the House and others vitally interested in this question. It follows:

NEEDED REFORM OF OUR ELECTORAL SYSTEM

FOREWORD

One of the most important reforms is in the method of electing a President and Vice President of the United States. Section 1 of article II of the Federal Constitution provides that—

"Each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors, equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress."

In all of the States today the method of choosing electors is by general ticket. It is also the practice for the electoral vote of a State to be cast as a unit. As a result, even though the plurality for a Presidential candidate in a State should be only one, that State's entire electoral vote would be cast for that candidate. In the case of the State of New York this would mean 47 votes, which is about 10 percent of the total of 531 votes in the electoral college. The harmful results of such a system are obvious.

Two methods of remedying this defect are proposed in resolutions now pending in Congress. The first is a system of proportional voting contained in a joint resolution introduced in the Senate by Senator LODGE and in the House by Representative GOSSETT. The second is contained in a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 192) introduced in the House by Representative COUDERT, providing for the election of each Presidential elector in the same manner as his counterpart Member of the Congress. With the exception of a few Congressmen elected at large, the Representatives are elected by districts.

Lucius Wilmerding, Jr., has written an excellent article on this subject under the title "Reform of the Electoral System," which has been published in the March 1949 issue of the Political Science Quarterly.

In this article Mr. Wilmerding argues very convincingly that the district system of election is to be preferred to both the system of proportional voting prescribed by the Lodge-Gossett amendment and the present system of election by general ticket.

In his article he says:

"I would suggest that the system of proportional voting be dropped from the Lodge amendment and the district system substituted. This, I repeat, is the mode which was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted. It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others."

ROBERT B. DRESSER.

PROVIDENCE, R. I., *June 2, 1949.*

REFORM OF THE ELECTORAL SYSTEM

INTRODUCTION

It is my purpose in this article to examine those features of our electoral system which have been singled out for reform in the amendment to the Constitution recently proposed by Senator LODGE and now under public debate.[1] I must begin, however, by pointing out and commenting upon two things which the Lodge amendment does not do, but in respect of which there has been much popular misconception.

In the first place the Lodge amendment does not provide for a direct election of the President of the United States by the people at large. The intermediate electors are

[1] 81st Cong., 1st sess., S. J. Res. 2 (Jan. 5, 1949).

abolished, but the electoral vote is retained. This means that it would still be possible for a candidate receiving a minority of the popular vote to receive a majority of the electoral vote. Take two States each having 24 electoral votes, and assume that 4,000,000 popular votes are cast in one, 2,400,000 in the other. In State A the Republican receives three-fourths of the popular vote, the Democrat one-fourth; in State B the Republican receives one-eighth, the Democrat seven-eighths. The popular vote in the two States together is 3,300,000 for the Republican, 3,100,000 for the Democrat. But under the Lodge amendment—which provides for prorating the electoral votes of each State between the candidates in proportion to their popular votes therein—the Democrat is credited with 27 electoral votes to the Republican's 21. The proportional voting system may therefore reflect the Nation-wide popular vote even less accurately than the currently used general ticket—winner-take-all—system, under which in the given case the two candidates would be credited with 24 electoral votes apiece.

In the second place the Lodge amendment does not get rid of the present unequal weighting of the electoral vote in favor of the small States. Each State will continue to have the number of electoral votes to which its population entitles it, plus 2. Vermont, entitled to 1 vote, will still have 3; New York, entitled to 45 votes, will still have 47. This means that, other things being equal, a voter in Vermont will still have the weight of almost 3 voters in New York.

These facts being understood, it may be asked why Senator LODGE'S amendment should not be criticized on the ground that it does not sweep away the whole system of electoral voting and substitute a system of Nation-wide popular voting. The answer is complex but will probably satisfy most minds.

To begin with, a good case can be made for the proposition that each equal mass of persons (comprising voters and nonvoters alike) is entitled to an equal voice in the choice of a President. If the qualifications requisite for voting are higher in one mass than in another; [2] if, in order to express their disapproval of their party's policy, the voters in one mass stay away from the polls while those in another cast their ballots for opposition candidates; if local issues vary the proportions of the electorate voting in different masses; if stormy weather keeps more voters at home in rural areas than in urban areas—none of these is a valid reason for reducing the weight of the masses casting the fewer votes. The electoral vote may reflect the will of the people—of all the people not merely of the active voters—more correctly than the popular vote.

This argument, it is true, does not go to prove the propriety of allowing masses in small States a greater weight than equal masses in large States; and I, for one, regard it as a constitutional solecism that one mass in Delaware should count for as much as three in New York. It is frequently asserted, indeed, that the two extra votes allotted to each State are given to it on the Federal principle and reflect the equality of the States as corporate entities. But the alleged equality is a figment of the legal imagination, invented to justify what was in its origin a mere act of force. When the Thirteen States first associated themselves in the Continental Congress, each was given a single vote. The arrangement was intended to be temporary, however. As was pointed out by Benjamin Franklin in the Federal Convention, the method of voting by States "was submitted to originally by Congress, under a conviction of its impropriety, inequality, and injustice. This appears in the words of their resolution. It is of September 6, 1774. The words are: *'Resolved*, That in determining questions in this Congress each colony or province shall have one vote: the Congress not being possessed of or at present able to procure materials for ascertaining the importance of each colony.' " [3]

That force, not principle, was the controlling factor in the allotment of two Senators and two additional electors to each State will be plain to anyone who will bother to read the debates.

Hamilton said:

"The truth is it is a contest for power, not for liberty. Will the men composing the small States be less free than those composing the larger? The State of Delaware, having 40,000 souls, will lose power, if she has [in the Senate] one-tenth only of the votes allotted to Pennsylvania, having 400,000; but will the people of Delaware be less free, if each citizen has an equal vote with each citizen of Pennsylvania? [4]

Paterson, of New Jersey, speaking for the small States, admitted the charge:

"It was observed (by Mr. Wilson) that the larger State gave up the point (in the Continental Congress), not because it was right, but because the circumstances of the moment urged the concession. Be it so. Are they for that reason at liberty to take it back? Can the donor resume his gift without the consent of the donee?" [5]

The retention in the Lodge amendment of the unequal weighting of the electoral vote in favor of the small States cannot therefore be justified on grounds of justice. The reason for retaining it is expediency: no proposition could at the present time pass the Senate which would deprive the small States of their privileged position.

This same consideration, it is plain, also makes it useless to propose any scheme for electing the President by direct Nation-wide popular vote; for the continuance of the small States' privilege depends on the continuance of an electoral voting system. Senator LODGE is entirely right when he says that "to eliminate the credit given for Senators (that is, the two extra electoral votes), or to eliminate any electoral allotment to e ch State, would destroy any possibility at all of electoral reform." [6]

So much for what the Lodge amendment does not do. Its positive proposals may be arranged under three heads. If adopted it would (1) require the electoral votes of each State to be divided between the several candidates for President in proportion to the popular votes cast for each within the State; (2) discontinue the use of intermediate electors; (3) discontinue the umpirage of the House of Representatives in all cases where no candidate has received a majority of the whole number of electoral votes, leaving a plurality sufficient to elect. Mutatis mutandis, it would do the same things in respect of the Vice President.

THE MODE OF VOTING

Let us begin with a bit of history. The Constitution of the United States provides that each State shall appoint, in such manner as the legislature thereof may direct, a number of electors equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which the State may be entitled in the Congress; these electors are to meet in their respective States and vote for President and Vice President; and so on. In the early elections no uniform mode of appointing electors was followed. The three most usual modes were: (1) election by the legislatures; (2) election by the people in districts; (3) election by the people on a general ticket. Of these only the third is at present practiced. According to Madison the district mode—which "was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted"—was "exchanged for the general ticket and the legislative election, as the only expedient for baffling the policy of the particular States which had set the example." [7] The legislative election—under attack from the beginning as violating the spirit and perhaps the letter of the Constitution—gave way to the general ticket in Jackson's time.

That the general ticket is an improper mode of election is not to be denied. Its evils were never better set out than by Senator Benton in 1824:

"The general ticket system, now existing in 10 States was the offspring of policy, and not of any disposition to give fair play to the will of the people. It was adopted by the leading men of those States, to enable them to consolidate the vote of the State. * * * It contributes to give power and consequence to the leaders who manage the elections, but it is a departure from the intention of the Constitution; violates the rights of minorities, and is attended with many other evils. The intention of the Constitution is violated, because it was the intention of that instrument, to give to each mass of persons, entitled to one elector, the power of giving that electoral vote to any candidate they preferred. The rights of minorities are violated, because a majority of one will carry the vote of the whole State. * * * In New York 36 electors are chosen; 19 is a majority, and the candidate receiving this majority is fairly entitled to count 19 votes; but he counts, in reality, 36; because the minority of 17 are added to the majority. These 17 votes belong to 17 masses of people, of 40,000 souls each, in all 680,000 people, whose votes are seized upon, taken away and presented to whom the majority pleases. * * * To lose their votes, is the fate of all minorities, and it is their duty to submit; but this is not a case of votes lost, but of votes taken away, added to those of the majority, and given to a person to whom the minority is opposed." [8]

Jefferson, it is true, may be quoted to the countrary. Defending in 1800 the action of Virginia in exchanging the district system for the general ticket, he declared that it was

[2] On July 25, 1787, in the Federal Convention, Madison, arguing that a choice of the President by the people, or rather by the qualified part of them, was the best mode of appointment that could be devised, noticed the difficulty which arose from the disproportion of qualified voters in the Northern and Southern States, and the disadvantages which this mode would throw on the latter. In replying to this objection he remarked, "(1) that this disproportion would be continually decreasing under the influence of the republican laws introduced in the Southern States, and the more rapid increase of their population; (2) that local considerations must give way to the general interest. As an individual from the Southern States he was willing to make the sacrifice." Max Farrand, editor, Records of the Federal Convention, II, 111. The acceptance of electoral voting made the sacrifice unnecessary.

[3] Farrand, I, 200 (Franklin). For the remarks of Wilson, Gerry, Gouverneur Morris and Madison condemning the equal vote of unequal States as improper and founded on coercion, see ibid., I, 166, 467, 522; II, 8.

[4] Ibid., I, 466.

[5] Farrand, I, 250.

[6] See his letter of January 12, 1949, in the New York Times of January 18. In a letter to the author dated November 4, 1948, Senator LODGE indicated that he was personally in favor of a direct popular election of the President and Vice President, but he knew that such proposals had never made any headway in the past and he thought that they would make no headway in the future.

[7] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823. Gaillard Hunt, editor, The Writings of James Madison (New York and London, 1910), IX, 151–152.

[8] 41 Annals of Congress, 169–170.

"merely a question whether we will divide the United States into 16 or 137 districts." [9] The reasoning is, however, fallacious. It would be valid only if the States were roughly equal in population and had each an equal number of electoral votes. Besides, as Jefferson himself knew, the number of districts is much more than a mere question. Madison, writing in 1823, pointed out:

"The States when voting for President by general tickets or by their legislatures, are a string of beads; when they make their elections by districts, some of these differing in sentiment from others, and sympathizing with that of districts in other States, they are so knit together as to break the force of those geographical and other noxious parties which might render the repulsive too strong for the cohesive tendencies within the political system." [10]

Senator LODGE proposes to get rid of the evils of the general ticket by a mode which has often been advocated before: proportional voting, that is to say, the division of each State's electoral votes between the candidates in proportion to their popular votes. In 1912, for example, New York's 45 electoral votes, instead of all going to Wilson, would have been cast (to the nearest whole number) 19 for Wilson, 13 for Taft, 11 for Roosevelt, and 2 for Debs.

At first blush this might seem an eminently fair arrangement, and indeed there are probably few today who would not sympathize with the complaint of the Federalist minority of Virginia when the legislature of that State changed in 1800 from the district mode to the general ticket: "We are apt to fancy ourselves called, as citizens of the United States, to vote for the highest officers of the Government. But the late assembly has separated us from our fellow citizens of the Union, and compels us to speak the voice of Virginia only." [11] Second thoughts, however, may lead us to believe that, though the object of the Lodge amendment is sound, its method is faulty.

I would point out, to begin with, that the principle upon which this amendment would divide a State's votes is the same as that which underlies the system of proportional representation—PR as it is briefly called. Carried to its logical extreme it would require the creation of a plural executive (as recommended by Benjamin Franklin and others in the Federal Convention) in order that the several parties might share in it in proportion to their numbers. The reasoning is simple. If it is unfair for a candidate who has received 54 percent of the Nation-wide popular vote to receive 84 percent of the Nation-wide electoral vote, why is it not even more unfair for him to receive 100 percent of the prize?

It is, to be sure, unlikely that the adoption of the Lodge amendment would actually lead to the creation of a plural Executive. There is more danger that it might give countenance to a move for some form of proportional representation in our legislative bodies, National, State, and local. If the electoral vote of a State should be divided between the several parties in the same proportions as its popular vote, why not its representation in Congress also? Why should the votes of minorities in geographical constituencies be lost instead of combined with the votes of like minorities in other districts to make up mathematical constituencies or quotas? The answer I think is this: If a legislative body is to work, its mass must be men of moderate sentiments; for, without compromise between like-minded men of unlike parties, nothing but violent legislation would result. A Member whose constituency is geographic must almost perforce be a moderate man; he must have regard for the opinions of the minorities within his district or risk defeat at the next election. But a Member whose constituency is mathematical—all Democrats, all Republicans, all antivivisectionists or what have you—must almost necessarily be immoderate; he must be wholly subservient to the wishes of his party managers, or of the splinter ism which elects him, or risk being replaced at the next constituency making by someone who is.[12]

The connection between electoral voting and representation in Congress is very close. The electoral body has often been likened to Congress in joint convention.[13] Senator Baldwin, of Georgia, who had been a member of the Federal Convention, once remarked that the electors were a constitutional branch of the Government as respectable as Congress, and in whom the Constitution in the business of electing a President, had more confidence than in Congress.[14] Many of the early amendments, proposing the establishment of a uniform mode of appointing electors by the people in districts, suggested the same mode for choosing representatives. Many of the plans introduced in the 1870's, similar in principle to Senator LODGE's, but continuing the electors, would have worked equally well for Representatives; Senator LODGE's own plan could be adapted to Representatives by giving the odd congressional seats remaining after each party's integral quota had been filled to the parties having the largest fractions.

I submit, therefore, that the danger to be apprehended from the adoption of proportional voting for the Presidency is real. It ought not to be ignored merely because the mode of choosing representatives is not dealt with in the amendment. We must remember the remark with which Senator Hillhouse, in 1808, introduced the set of constitutional amendments which some have supposed were meant as the framework for a new confederacy: "All (partial amendments) are aimed at particular detached parts; which, without examining or regarding the bearing on other parts, like partial alterations in a curious complicated machine, may, instead of benefiting, destroy its utility." [15]

What then should be done? I would suggest that the system of proportional voting be dropped from the Lodge amendment and the district system substituted. This, I repeat, is the mode which "was mostly, if not exclusively, in view when the Constitution was framed and adopted." It is also the mode which was advocated after some experience with the Constitution by Hamilton, Jefferson, Madison, Gallatin, James A. Bayard, J. Q. Adams, Van Buren, Benton, Webster, Story, and many others. Senator Benton explained it very well in 1824:

"It would divide every State into districts, equal to the whole number of votes to be given, and the people of each district would be governed by its own majority, and not by a majority existing in some remote part of the State. This would be agreeable to the rights of individuals: for, in entering into society, and submitting to be bound by the decision of the majority, each individual retained the right of voting for himself wherever it was practicable, and of being governed by a majority of the vicinage, and not by majorities brought from remote sections to overwhelm him with their accumulated numbers. It would be agreeable to the interests of all parts of the States; for each State may have different interests in different parts; one part may be agricultural, another manufacturing, another commercial; and it would be unjust that the strongest should govern, or that two should combine and sacrifice the third. The district system would be agreeable to the intention of our present Constitution, which, in giving to each elector a separate vote, instead of giving to each State a consolidated vote, composed of all its electoral suffrages, clearly intended that each mass of persons entitled to one elector, should have the right of giving one vote, according to their own sense of their own interest." [16]

All the objects of the Lodge amendment would be attained equally well by the district system as by the proportional voting system. It is correct to say with Senator Dickerson, author of what used to be called the New Jersey plan of districting, that "upon a calculation of chances, the probabilities of a fair expression of the public will are increased by dividing the States into districts, and in the ratio of the number of districts to the number of States." [17] But the district system is preferable to proportional voting because it maintains the geographical constituencies and gives an equal voice to equal units of population rather than to equal aggregations of actual voters.

The significance of this last consideration in the distribution of a State's electoral votes should not be overlooked. Under the district system each group of, say, 300,000 persons residing in contiguous territory would be entitled to cast one electoral vote, and it would cast this vote regardless of how many of its citizens actually went to the polls. Under the proportional voting system the weight of these equal groups would vary with the turnout. Bad weather, for instance, might give the urban communities a fortuitous advantage over rural communities, as it does today under the general ticket system. Or an unusual interest in some local issue might lead to a community's exercising a disproportionate influence in the choice of a President. In fact, all the arguments which I have brought together in my introduction to justify the principle of electoral voting as against Nation-wide popular voting apply with equal force to the system of voting within a State—excepting only that which is based on the disproportion of the qualifications requisite for voting.

The manner of dividing a State into districts should present no special difficulties. Most of the early district system amendments provided for the establishment of as many districts in each State as that State was entitled to electors—the qualifications requisite for voting to be the same as those prescribed for congressional elections. The mode is inconvenient only insofar as it prevents the States from using the congressional district as the unit of voting. It might be better, therefore, if each State were divided by the legislature thereof into as many districts as will equal the number of representatives to which such State may be entitled in Congress. This would enable though it would not compel a State to use its congressional districts as its voting units. The two extra electoral votes to which each State is entitled under the Constitution might be given as a sort of game-winning bonus to the candidate carrying the State as

[9] Jefferson to Monroe, January 12, 1800, P. L. Ford, editor, The Works of Thomas Jefferson (New York and London, 1905), IX, 90–91. Jefferson's point was that it would be better for all the States to use the general ticket than for some to use it and others the district system: "All agree that an election by districts would be best, if it could be general; but while 10 States choose either by their legislatures or by a general ticket, it is folly and worse than folly for the other 6 not to do it."

[10] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[11] Daily Advertiser, June 6, 1800. Quoted from C. A. O'Neil, The American Electoral System (New York and London, 1887), p. 75—an invaluable work.

[12] The fallacies of PR are ably set forth in Bagehot's English Constitution, ch. vi.

[13] E. g., 33 Annals, 142.

[14] 10 Annals, 30 (1800).

[15] 17 Annals, 333.

[16] 41 Annals, 169.

[17] 33 Annals, 142.

a whole, or the State might be divided into two superdistricts, each to cast one vote. In this connection I would point out that in Michigan in 1892 the election was by the people in districts, with the exception of two electors, one of whom was chosen by the eastern, the other by the western part of the State. Such an arrangement has the advantage of bringing into a clear view the principle of equal masses, equal votes. It also exhibits the compromise in the electoral system between the popular and Federal principles.

One objection to the district system ought not to pass unnoticed. It is possible, indeed probable, that in districting a State for presidential elections the legislature thereof might resort to the iniquitous practice of gerrymandering.

"What is to become," asked Edward Everett in 1826, "of the minorities on the district system? I could here tell the gentleman something about that arrangement in my own State, to which he alluded by a name—which, out of respect to a venerable patriot and statesman of the Revolution, now no more, and who had nothing to do with the transaction, I shall not repeat. At a time when the parties in the State were nearly balanced, there was a small majority on the Federal side; 51,000, perhaps, on one side, and 49,000 on the other. In that state of public feeling, by virtue of a system of districts, consisting of adjacent territory, and the same amount of population (for in all these details, I believe the division was perfectly fair). It was so contrived that the minority chose 29 State senators, and the majority chose 11; and more votes were given for these 11 than were given for the 29. This is, indeed, an effectual protection afforded by the district system to the minority."[18]

The solution would be, in the first place, to provide in the Constitution that the districts should be compact and contiguous territories containing, as nearly as practicable, equal numbers of inhabitants—language which appears in the act of 1911 prescribing a single-member district system for Representatives. In the second place, it would be to entrust to Congress the same power to make and alter the State regulations regarding presidential elections that it now has in respect to the election of Representatives.

Every argument advanced by Hamilton in Nos. 59, 60, and 61 of the Federalist to justify the power of Congress to regulate the election of Members applies with equal force to the appointment of electors or, in the event of their abolition, to the casting of electoral votes. The same may be said of the arguments of Madison in the Federal Convention:

"The policy of referring the appointment of the House of Representatives to the people and not to the legislatures of the States, supposes that the result will be somewhat influenced by the mode. This view of the question seems to decide that the legislatures of the State ought not to have the uncontrolled right of regulating the times, places, and manner of holding elections. These were words of great latitude. It was impossible to foresee all the abuses that might be made of the discretionary power. Whether the electors (that is, the voters) should vote by ballot or viva voce; should assemble at this place or that place; should be divided into districts or all meet at one place; should all vote for all the Representatives; or all in a district vote for a number allotted to the district; these and many other points would depend on the legislatures, and might materially affect the appointments. Whenever the State legislatures had a favorite measure to carry, they would take care so to mold their regulations as to favor the candidates they wished to succeed. * * * It seemed as improper in principle—though it might be less inconvenient in practice—to give the State legislatures this great authority over the election of Representatives of the people in the General Legislature, as it would be to give to the latter a like power over the election of their representatives in the State legislature." [19]

Against this it ought to be said that Congress has not been very successful in preventing the gerrymandering of congressional districts and would probably be no more successful in respect of electoral districts. Perhaps so. But the evil would be less. Congressional gerrymandering affects measures; presidential gerrymandering could affect but a single individual. At the very worst it could result in the choice of a man who was considered by the second largest group of persons in the country as the best fitted for the office. And even here it might have a countervailing merit. If the electoral districts were gerrymandered on the same plan as the congressional districts (as they probably would be), the result of the election would be to produce a President in political sympathy with the majority of the House of Representatives.

I would conclude, therefore, that, on a relative view of the merits and demerits of the district system and the proportional-voting system, respectively, the palm must be awarded to the former. The district system is clearly to be preferred to the present general-ticket system. Of the proportional-voting system we must speak more doubtfully.

THE INTERMEDIATE ELECTORS

The idea of abolishing the intermediate electors and committing the choice of the President and Vice President to the people voting in districts, in States, or in the United States at large, is an old one. First advanced in the shape of a constitutional amendment by Senator Benton, of Missouri, in 1823,[20] it had long been hinted at. In 1801 Jefferson wrote to Gallatin of an "amendment which I know will be proposed, to wit, to have no electors, but let the people vote directly, and the ticket which has the plurality of the votes of any State to be considered as receiving the whole vote of the State." [21] And in 1803 Representative Holland declared that he would "have preferred an immediate suffrage to this indirect mode of electing by electors." [22]

The argument which is usually brought forward to support the proposal is very plausible, if not altogether sound. I give it in the words of the report of a select committee of the Senate made January 19, 1826:

"It was the intention of the Constitution that these electors should be an independent body of men, chosen by the people from among themselves, on account of their superior discernment, virtue, and information; and that this select body should be left to make the election according to their own will, without the slightest control from the body of the people. That this intention has failed of its object in every election, is a fact of such universal notoriety, that no one can dispute it. * * * Electors, therefore, have not answered the design of their institution. They are not the independent body and superior characters which they were intended to be. They are not left to the exercise of their own judgment; on the contrary, they give their vote, or bind themselves to give it, according to the will of their constituents. They have degenerated into mere agents in a case which requires no agency, and where the agent is useless if he is faithful, and dangerous if he is not. Instead of being chosen for their noble qualities set forth in the Federalist, candidates for electors are now most usually selected for their devotion to a party, their popular manners, and a supposed talent at electioneering, which the framers of the Constitution would have been ashamed to possess." [23]

There are some things about this argument which call for comment. While it is doubtless true that the character of the electors has sunk from the standard of perfection visualized by the framers of the Constitution, it is very doubtful that these electors were ever intended to act a part wholly independent of the people. The electoral system was not the invention of that part of the Federal Convention which distrusted the people [24] but of that part which trusted them. First proposed by James Wilson, it seems to have been regarded by him as an equivalent to an election by the people.[25] In the debates it was advocated not so much as a means of correcting the judgment of the people (and never as a means of ignoring or superseding it) but as a device for getting over the difficulties of disproportionate voting qualifications and Negro representation.[26] And when it was finally adopted, Madison had no hesitancy in saying that "the President is now to be elected by the people." [27]

However this may be, it cannot be denied that the electors at the present time exercise much less discretion than was originally expected of them. The founding fathers regarded the electors as analogous to representatives. Hamilton called them "a special body of representatives, deputed by the society for the single purpose of making the important choice." [28] Abraham Baldwin, as we have

[18] 2 Register of Debates, 1583–1584.

[19] Farrand, II, 240–241.

[20] H. V. Ames, Proposed Amendments to the Constitution of the United States (Washington, 1897), p. 89. Benton himself asserted the novelty of his proposal, 41 Annals, 168.

[21] Jefferson to Gallatin, September 18, 1801. Such an amendment would have fixed the general ticket system on the States. The Norris amendment of 1934, as finally voted on by the Senate, was of the same type.

[22] 13 Annals, 735.

[23] 2 Register of Debates, Appendix, p. 121. Nowadays, in States using the Australian (or short) ballot, the names of the candidates for electors are not printed, so that the people have no idea for what agents they are voting.

[24] When George Mason declared "that it would be as unnatural to refer the choice of a proper character for chief magistrate to the people, as it would to refer a trial of colors to a blind man," he spoke for the minority.

[25] Wilson's plan, seldom or never correctly explained in secondary works, was to divide the United States as a whole into a certain number of districts, each to consist of one or more States, and each to elect a certain number of persons who, meeting as a single body, would choose the Executive. This plan, submitted June 2, 1787, was an elaboration of his proposal of the preceding day that the Executive be chosen by the people at large. Nowadays, to be sure, an election by the people at large means a direct vote by Nation-wide referendum, but it was not necessarily so in the eighteenth century. Madison, in the Virginia convention, declared that under the scheme actually adopted the President would be "the choice of the people at large" (Elliott's Debates, III, 487). And in the First Congress he spoke of the President as being "appointed at present by the suffrages of 3,000,000 people" (1 Annals, 461).

[26] "There was one difficulty, however, of a serious nature attending an immediate choice by the people. The right of suffrage was much more diffusive in the Northern than the Southern States; and the latter could have no influence in the election on the score of the Negroes. The substitution of electors obviated this difficulty" (Madison, July 19, 1787; Farrand, II, 57).

[27] Farrand, II, 587.

[28] Federalist, No. 68.

already seen, referred to them as a constitutional branch of the government "as respectable as Congress and in whom the Constitution on this business has more confidence than in Congress." [29] And representatives were regarded by the founding fathers, not as State ambassadors to be "the mere agents and advocates of State interests and views," but as "the impartial umpires and guardians of justice and general good." [30] "We stand not here," said Thomas Sedgwick in the First Congress, "as the representatives of the State legislatures * * * but as the representatives of the great body of the people." [31] Nothing of this idea remains today as regards the electors. An elector is viewed as an automaton, a mere organ for conveying the wishes of his constituents to the electoral college. A notable proof of this fact was given in 1876 when James Russell Lowell, being asked to cast his vote for Tilden in order to prevent the success of a gigantic electoral swindle, replied that he was a mere delegate of his constituents, a trustee to carry out definite instructions, and that to refuse to comply with his mandate would be "treacherous, dishonorable, and immoral." To the founding fathers it is the countenancing of a fraud that would have seemed "treacherous, dishonorable, and immoral."

In the light of these considerations the proposal to abolish the intermediate electors is a reform which must appear very reasonable. If the electors are automata, merely registering the will of their constituents, why not ascertain that will directly? The case is not so simple, however. Madison, first consulted on this subject in 1823, later made a very pertinent remark:

"One advantage of electors is, that altho' generally the mere mouths of their constituents, they may be intentionally left sometimes to their own judgment, guided by further information that may be acquired by them: and finally, what is of material importance, they will be able, when ascertaining, which may not be till a late hour, that the first choice of their constituents is utterly hopeless, to substitute in the electoral vote the name known to be their second choice." [32]

There have been cases where exactly this course has been followed. In 1824, for example, the electors of North Carolina were pledged both to Jackson and Adams with the understanding that they would vote for the one who had the best chance of success.[33] And as recently as 1912 the Roosevelt ticket of electors declared before election that, if Theodore Roosevelt could not be elected and it should become a contest between Taft and Wilson, they would vote for Taft.[34]

Under the present arrangements this advantage of electors may be thought a small one. The operation of the general-ticket system has been such as invariably to give some candidate a majority of the electoral vote. No combination of minority parties could affect the result. But if the general ticket were to be broken up—either by the district system or by proportional voting—occasions might frequently arise when a majority opposition to a plurality candidate might make itself felt. On such occasions the advantage mentioned by Madison would be very considerable.

A second advantage of electors is that they act as a connecting link between the Presidency and Vice Presidency. Being pledged to support the candidates of their parties for both offices, it can seldom happen that the popular election will result in the choice of a President of one party and a Vice President of another. It is conceivable, however, that in a close election under the Lodge amendment a popular Vice Presidential candidate of a minority party might succeed where his principal failed. The twelfth amendment to the Constitution, it will be remembered, was adopted precisely to prevent such a result.

Against these advantages there are, to be sure, disadvantages. Perhaps the most serious is this. The use of intermediate electors limits the choice of voters in each State to those candidates who have electoral tickets, and, more particularly, to those candidates whose electoral tickets appear on the printed ballots. In 1856, for example, it proved impossible for the voters in most of the Southern States to cast a single vote for Fremont and Dayton. In 1912 a Californian could vote for Taft and his unnamed colleague [35] only by writing in the names of 13 electors. In 1948 the Alabama voters were precluded from voting for Truman and Barkley.

It would appear then that the desirability of abolishing the intermediate electors is not quite so self-evident as it seemed at first glance. What should be done depends mainly on what changes are made in other parts of the electoral system. Principally, as we shall see in the next section, it depends on whether or not some proper mode is introduced of taking the sense of the Nation in cases where no candidate for President or Vice President has obtained a majority of the electoral vote. With such a mode most of the advantages of electors would disappear. Without it, the case might be different.

THE UMPIRAGE OF CONGRESS

The twelfth amendment to the Constitution provides that the person having the greatest number of electoral votes shall be the President, if such number be a majority of the whole number of electors appointed; but if no person have such majority, then the Houes of Representatives, voting by States and not by heads, shall immediately, by ballot, elect the President from the persons having the highest numbers not exceeding three on the list of those voted for as President.[36] A majority of all the States is necessary to a choice. The same rule controls the election of the Vice President, except that the Senate, voting by heads, makes the choice from the two highest numbers on the list, a majority of the whole number of Senators being necessary to a choice.

The impropriety of this mode of determining the eventual choice of the Executive has long been noticed. Jefferson, writing to George Hay in 1823, had no hesitation in saying that he had "ever considered the constitutional mode of election ultimately by the legislature voting by States as the most dangerous blot in our Constitution, and one which some unlucky chance will someday hit and give us a pope and antipope." [37] Madison was of the same opinion:

"The present rule of voting for President by the House of Representatives is so great a departure from the republican principle of numerical equality, and even from the Federal rule which qualifies the numerical by a State equality, and is so pregnant also with a mischievous tendency in practice, that an amendment of the Constitution on this point is justly called for by all its considerate and best friends." [38]

Senator LODGE has proposed precisely such an amendment. He would provide simply that the person having the greater number of electoral votes for President shall be President. In the event of a tie (an impossible case under the decimal system of computing the electoral vote [39] but quite possible if the electors were to be continued), then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes was cast shall be President. A similar rule would control the election of the Vice President.

High authority can be quoted for the idea of making a plurality sufficient to elect. James Wilson, perhaps the leading member of the Federal Convention, when the subject was under debate, once declared that the concurrence of a majority of people is not a necessary principle of election, nor required as such in any of our States.[40] Mason and Williamson preferred making the highest though not having a majority of the votes, President, to a reference of the matter to the Senate.[41] Madison and Williamson moved to strike out the word "majority" and insert "one-third" so that the eventual power might not be exercised if so many as one-third of the electors should vote for the same person.[42]

High authority and strong arguments, however, can likewise be brought forward to sustain a different view. The members of the Federal Convention as a body decided that a majority vote would be necessary for the choice of a President both in the first election by electors and in the contingent election by the House of Representatives. The Eighth Congress and the States, in passing the twelfth amendment, extended the majority principal to the case of the Vice

---

[29] Annals, 30. On the other hand, the Supreme Court in *Fitzgerald* v. *Green* (134 U. S. 379 (1890)) has said that "Presidential electors, although they are appointed and act under and pursuant to the Constitution, are no more officers or agents of the United States than are the members of State legislatures when acting as electors of Federal Senators, or the people of the States when acting as electors of Representatives in Congress." The founding fathers would have denied the analogy; for they likened the electoral body to the persons chosen (Senators and Representatives) rather than to the persons choosing them (State legislatures and the people).

[30] Farrand, I, 428.

[31] I Annals, 743.

[32] Madison to Robert Taylor, January 30, 1826.

[33] C. O. Paullin, Atlas of Historical Geography of the United States (Washington and New York, 1932), p. 96.

[34] Ibid., p. 103.

[35] The Republican candidate for Vice President died before election day. It was not until after the election that the Republican National Committee determined that the Republican electors should vote for Nicholas Murray Butler.

[36] The quoted language is very obscure. "I will venture to say that three-fourths of the people who shall read it, will think it is intended to confine the election to three persons; and yet, I understand, it is the intention of the Senate only to confine it to three classes. * * * The three highest numbers may refer to 40 persons, if they should be equal." (Representative Griswold, December 7, 1803; 13 Annals, 677, 678.) It has also been suggested that the words "not exceeding three" imply that the House might, if it chose, confine the election to the persons having the two highest numbers on the list or to the persons tied with the highest number. (Representative Baldwin, December 7, 1803; ibid., p. 679.)

[37] Jefferson to Hay, August 17, 1823. Works, XII, 303.

[38] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823. Similar sentiments may be found in the debates of Congress on the twelfth amendment, notably in the remarks of Senator Taylor, of Virginia (John Taylor, of Caroline).

[39] In prorating the electoral vote of each State the calculations are to be carried to three decimal places, "unless a more detailed calculation would change the result of the election." The probability of two candidates receiving an equal vote to an infinite number of decimal places is virtually nil.

[40] July 17, 1787.

[41] September 5, 1787.

[42] September 5, 1787.

President.[43] Madison, commenting in 1823 on a proposal identical with that of Senator LODGE, remarked:

"The mode which you seem to approve, of making a plurality of electoral votes a definitive appointment would have the merit of avoiding the legislative agency in appointing the Executive; but might it not, by multiplying hopes and chances, stimulate intrigue and exertion, as well as incur too great a risk of success to a very inferior candidate? Next to the propriety of having a President the real choice of a majority of his constituents, it is desirable that he should inspire respect and acquiescence by qualifications not suffering too much by comparison." [44]

It is worth observing that these arguments would gain in force by the introduction of a system of proportional voting and the abolition of the intermediate electors; for the former would tend to multiply the number of candidates and the latter would make impossible the subsequent reduction of that number by the device of electors voting their constituents' second choices. It might happen that the leading candidate might have a very small proportion indeed of the popular or electoral vote. He might even be totally obnoxious to a great majority of the Nation. As Madison stated to Henry Lee:

"In what degree a plurality of votes is evidence of the will of the majority of voters, must depend on circumstances more easily estimated in a given case than susceptible of general definition. The greater the number of candidates among whom the votes are divided, the more uncertain must, of course, be the inference from the plurality with respect to the majority." [45]

This consideration alone may be thought sufficient to decide the issue. We must also take into account, however, the certainty that it will not be debated solely on its merits. The present mode of voting in the contingent election is advantageous to the small States. The present mode of appointing electors is advantageous to the large States. The abolition or modification of the one may therefore be regarded as a political equivalent for the abolition or modification of the other. The connection has long been noticed. As early as 1826 Representative McDuffe declared that "the small States will never consent to give up their eventual equality in voting for the President, in this House, unless the large States will consent to break their power of concentration and combination" in the initial electoral voting.[46]

If then, we accept the desirability, or even the political necessity, of retaining some mechanism of taking the final sense of the majority of the Nation, we may briefly review the modes which might reasonably be adopted.

A mode first recommended by Representative McDuffie in 1826 deserves consideration: "In case the primary vote of the electoral colleges shall fail to decide the election, I propose that the two highest candidates, respectively, shall be referred back to the people, voting directly for the President and Vice President by districts." [47] Such a scheme could be operated without the intervention of electors at all, and the obstacles to it, being chiefly temporal, could easily be overcome.

An amendment introduced by Senator Van Buren in 1823 proposed that, in like circumstances, the electors should meet again and choose the President from the two persons receiving the highest number of votes at the first election.[48] Such a scheme would transfer the umpirage of elections from the Congress to the electoral college. In view of the present character of electors, it has not perhaps much to commend it.

Assuming that the umpirage is retained by Congress, the most proper mode of deciding presidential contests is that which Representative Tucker is said to have suggested in 1819—that in electing a President the House of Representatives should vote by heads and not by States.[49] The overriding advantage of this mode is that the President and House of Representatives would surely be of the same political sympathies. It would, however, utterly deprive the small States of the over-representation to which they have become accustomed in the choice of a President.

Perhaps then the mode which has the best chance of success is that which was voted by the Federal Convention when it contemplated allowing the national legislature to choose the President in the first instance—an election by joint ballot of the two Houses, each Member to have one vote. Such an arrangement would preserve to the small States the advantage which they now have in the electoral college but would deprive them of any additional advantage.

As regards the Vice President, we need only say that his appointment should depend on the same body that appoints the President. Under the present system, the House might choose a President of one party and the Senate a Vice President of another.

One point remains: From how many persons should the eventual selection be made? In effect, the question is between 3 and 2, for none, I suppose, will wish to restore the number, 5, prescribed in the original Constitution, or advocate 7 or 13, as did Sherman, Spaight, and Rutledge in the Federal Convention. Here again Madison has supplied the answer:

"It might be a question, whether the three instead of the two highest names might not be put within the choice of Congress, inasmuch as it not unfrequently happens, that the candidate third on the list of votes would in a question with either of the two first outvote him, and consequently be the real preference of the voters. But this advantage of opening a wider door and better chance to merit may be outweighed by an increased difficulty in obtaining a prompt and quiet decision by Congress with three candidates before them, supported by three parties, no one of them making a majority of the whole." [50]

Whether any provision should be made for the case where there is an equality of votes among several highest on the list is a moot question. The original Constitution made none, and John Taylor, of Caroline, thought that none was necessary.[51] Others have thought otherwise.

LUCIUS WILMERDING, Jr.

PRINCETON, N. J.

[43] The Constitution, as originally adopted, never notices a vote for Vice President, and no vote was in fact given for such an office. Each elector wrote the names of two persons on a piece of paper called a ballot: these were his alternative choices for President; either of them might become President. The Vice President was, in effect, the runner-up in the Presidential contest. He might or might not be the choice of a majority of the electors, depending on whether his vote was or was not in excess of one-fourth of the electoral vote.

[44] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[45] Madison to Lee, January 14, 1825.

[46] 2 Register of Debates, 1376.

[47] 2 Register of Debates, 1366.

[48] 41 Annals 74, 866.

[49] 34 Annals, 1420.

[50] Madison to Hay, August 23, 1823.

[51] 13 Annals, 93.

Restoration of Citizenship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to comment upon the passage by the House of H. R. 6616, a bill which restores citizenship to persons who, while citizens of the United States lost their citizenship solely by having voted in a political election in Italy after October 13, 1943, and before January 1, 1949.

I am truly delighted that the House took this action.

As you may recall, during the months immediately preceding the Italian election of April 18, 1948, I did everything in my power to assist those millions of Italians who were attempting to resist the godless tide of Communist oppression. It was my privilege to speak on short wave to Italy on a number of occasions. My wife also gave much of her time to this effort. All right thinking Americans recognized that the Italian election of 1948 was of tremendous consequence to the people of the United States. If Italy had succumbed to the Communist tyranny at that time the national security of the United States would have been vitally impaired.

Several thousand American citizens, including many from Connecticut, native born and naturalized, in Italy on either business or travel, cast their votes in the Italian elections thereby losing their American citizenship. All were urged to participate in the elections by friends in the United States and by various authorities. Many cast their votes because of their conviction that by so doing they were acting in the common interest of all freedom-loving peoples. The pressure on these American citizens in Italy to vote was very great indeed. That they did so is a credit to them. Yet by so doing they have lost their citizenship.

In an effort to remedy this situation, I introduced H. R. 6777, which is similar to H. R. 6616, the bill which passed the House.

I did so in order to unite American families which have been cruelly separated by virtue of their participation in this historic election.

I did so in an effort to reward those who understood the grim necessities of the hour and who acted to preserve all that we hold dear.

The letter killeth and the spirit giveth life.

This favorable action on this legislation by the House of Representatives corresponds with the relentless realities of the world in which we live. It is in the true spirit of the heritage and culture

which in such large measure is shared by the American and Italian people.

I believe that just as the United States and Italy have many common traditions so shall we partake of a common destiny.

It is my hope that the Senate will soon consider and pass this bill, thereby enabling these expatriated Americans to return to their homes in America and rejoin their families here.

Formosa Folly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin from the New Leader of January 21, 1950. I do not agree with Mr. Chamberlin's suggestion that the United States should establish American bases on Formosa—such action would be neither wise nor necessary. But it is of vital importance to our security that we give effective assistance to those defending the island in order to deny it to the Communists and the Kremlin—our avowed enemies:

FORMOSA FOLLY

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The decision to take no action calculated to keep the island of Formosa out of the hands of the Chinese Communists is the biggest political, moral, and strategic blunder the American Government has committed since the days when appeasement of Soviet communism dominated our foreign policy. Everything about this decision was wrong: the substance, the manner and the timing.

The opinion of the military experts, of whom General MacArthur was the most prominent, that Formosa is essential to America security in the Far East was brushed aside. There was no sounding of Congressional opinion through consultation with the Senate and House Committees on Foreign Relations. A heavy blow was struck at the basis of bipartisan foreign policy.

Senator VANDENBERG, who has always taken a national, not a party view in this field, and who has come under the heavy fire of some of his fellow-Republicans for that reason, was fully justified in the measured criticism which he offered:

"Like Yalta and Potsdam, and many other unhappy chapters in China policy, Congressional advice is precluded. I regret that these conclusions precede the factual reports which have been anticipated from the Jessup mission and particularly from the Far East conference between our Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur."

This last point was certainly worth emphasizing. The President gave the abandonship signal in regard to Formosa without waiting for the results of the military conference between the Joint Chiefs of Staff and General MacArthur.

What serious reason was there for this haste to announce a decision certainly calculated to excite joy in Moscow and in every Communist satellite capital in the world? Secretary Acheson's lame explanation is that "there was a good deal of confusion in the minds of our people." But this confusion was rather intensified by a curious statement emanating from Mr. Jessup in Tokyo. He asserted that we do not intend to abandon China (could it be that the China of Mao Tse-tung has abandoned us?) and that the United States opposes Communist practices of overthrowing governments by subversion.

But at the very moment Mr. Jessup was announcing this opposition, Truman and Acheson were declaring a policy which can only help the Communists to consolidate their grip on China and to extend that grip to Formosa.

These two issues, China and Formosa, should be kept strictly separate. It would probably be beyond our power, and would certainly be an unwarranted commitment of American military strength to try to reconquer China for Chiang Kai-shek.

Formosa, on the other hand, as an island a hundred miles off the China coast, could easily be held with a very moderate display of American naval and air power. Suggestions that this would mean war, even a third world war, are ridiculous. How could the Chinese Reds capture Formosa when they have neither a navy nor an air force worthy of the name? Far from promoting war, the establishment on Formosa of American naval and air bases would be the surest means of preventing the extension of war to the island. It would be an obvious, practical, and bloodless means of containing communism in Asia.

But, so the apologists for the administration's do-nothing policy argue, this would be imperialism and violation of the supposed right of China to rule Formosa. However, this right, from any moral standpoint, is nonexistent. The decision of Roosevelt and Churchill at Cairo to hand over Formosa to China was one of the many blunders of the war and was a cruel injustice to the 6,000,000 inhabitants of the island.

* * * * *

An independent Formosa, secured by American naval and air power, bolstered in its formative period by American technical advice and economic aid, would be the best solution of the problem posed by this rich and beautiful island. Economically there are natural links between Japan, with its surplus manufactures, and Formosa, with its surplus of sugar, rice and citrus fruits, all of which find a ready market in Japan.

From the strategic standpoint, it is an act of grave irresponsibility to let Formosa pass in to the hands of a hostile power. And Communist China must be considered a hostile power until there has been a drastic change in its policies and methods. A submarine base in Formosa could endanger all our communications with Japan. An air base could be a constant threat to the Philippines. From the southernmost promontory of Formosa one can see the northernmost islands of the Philippine archipelago.

The Chinese Communists, of course, have neither airplanes nor submarines at the present time. But there is nothing in their record to suggest that, once they are in possession of the island, they would refuse a fraternal offer from Moscow to build such bases—and stock them with the necessary weapons.

The passive abandonment of Formosa to Mao Tse-tung's dictatorship is defended on the ground that Mao is a potential Tito. But Titoism is something that must first be proved by deeds. If and when Mao breaks with Moscow, there will be other means of rewarding and supporting him, without handing over to his rule an island which there are the strongest political, economic and strategic reasons for keeping outside the Asiatic iron curtain.

Secretary of State Acheson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FOSTER FURCOLO
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. FURCOLO. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is entitled to a detailed statement by Dean Acheson making crystal clear that he recognizes all the ramifications of the dual capacity in which he says he finds himself by virtue of his position a Secretary of State.

His right to some private life as an individual has not been questioned. But he also has certain duties and obligations as an official of the Government.

As an individual, Dean Acheson may be granted the right to choose his personal friends. However, as Secretary of State, he has no personal choice of either friends or enemies—the United States selects those for him and he must abide by that selection.

Probably not many people would object if Acheson said that—as far as his private life as an individual is concerned—he would not "turn his back" on any friend. That, for example, if his friend's children had no food, clothing, or shelter, he would help them as one friend helps another. But—and Acheson should make this emphatic—that as Secretary of State he cannot regard Alger Hiss as a loyal citizen unless and until Hiss is able to satisfy the people of the Nation that he—Hiss—is a loyal citizen of this country. That must be established to the satisfaction of the people of the Nation, not simply to the satisfaction of Dean Acheson.

Whether we accept the best or the worst that can be said of Hiss at the present time, we arrive at the same conclusion. At worst, he is a traitor who has betrayed his country; at best, his loyalty to this Nation is in grave doubt. By either viewpoint, Secretary of State Acheson must not now regard Hiss as a loyal citizen.

I have been told that the above is exactly the position of Acheson. If so, Acheson should make that clear to the country.

General Romulo Honored

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished gathering of military and civilian personnel participated in an unusual ceremony on January 31 at 9:30 a. m. in room 3E912, Pentagon Building, Washington, D. C. The occasion was the presentation of the Legion of Merit (degree

of commander) to His Excellency Carlos P. Romulo, president of the General Assembly, United Nations. General Romulo, who served in this body as a resident commissioner from the Philippine Islands, is known to most Members of this House. I feel that it is fitting that the statement in connection with this ceremony and the citation itself be made a part of the official CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and by leave granted me by the Speaker, I include it herewith as part of my remarks:

GEN. CARLOS P. ROMULO AWARDED LEGION OF MERIT

Gen. Carlos P. Romulo, President of the General Assembly, United Nations, today received the Legion of Merit (Degree of Commander) from Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson, who made the presentation on behalf of President Truman.

General Romulo was discharged yesterday from Walter Reed General Hospital, where he had been under treatment for a throat ailment.

The award to General Romulo was accompanied by a citation that it was made because of his exceptionally meritorious military services to the United States during World War II.

Called to active duty as a major in the Philippine Army Reserve in 1941, General Romulo became press aide to Gen. Douglas MacArthur. In 1942 he served on Bataan and Corregidor and from January to April 1942 operated the Voice of Freedom.

General Romulo continued to serve as General MacArthur's aide in Australia after the general ordered him out of Bataan in April 1942.

In September 1944, while serving as Resident Commissioner in Washington, D. C., he was appointed brigadier general. He was chairman of the Philippine delegation to the San Francisco Conference on International Organization in 1945.

General Romulo was appointed chairman of the Philippine delegation to UNRRA in 1946, and later became permanent delegate from the Philippines to the United Nations and to the United Nations General Assembly.

Born in Manila January 14, 1899, General Romulo received a bachelor of arts degree at the University of the Philippines, a master of arts degree at Columbia University, and doctor of laws (honoris causa) at Notre Dame University. He has been a newspaper editor, publisher, and a professor of English. Articles which he wrote while on a tour of the Orient addressing Rotary Clubs won for him the Pulitzer prize.

The Legion of Merit citation follows:

"Brigadier General Romulo, Philippine Armed Forces (Reserve), formerly Philippine Army, performed exceptionally meritorious services to the United States as an officer on the staffs of the commanding general, United States Army Forces in the Far East, and of the commanding general, United States forces in the Philippines from December 12, 1941, until April 12, 1942. As press aide to the respective commanding generals of the United States Army Forces in the Far East from early December 1941 until he was ordered to escape from Bataan on April 12, 1942, Brigadier General Romulo (then lieutenant colonel) was in charge of the Public Relations Section for the United States forces in the Philippines. He was responsible for radio broadcasts, censorship of news, propaganda material, and all matters dealing with the press. He displayed remarkable skill and unusual judgment in all matters connected with those responsibilities. His daily articles, which were broadcast over the local radio station on the Voice of Freedom programs, contributed immensely to the maintenance of a high state of morale among all of the troops in the Philippine Islands. His work was so outstandingly thorough and his judgment so unfailingly sound that the commanding general frequently consulted him on matters pertaining to the Philippine Army. His work in all branches connected with his office contributed greatly to the defense of the Philippines."

Facts and Figures on Lobbying Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, I would like to call the attention of Members of Congress to the section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of Tuesday, January 31, devoted to reports filed under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946.

This section, which runs to about 47 pages of fine print in the RECORD, contains 870 quarterly reports on Form C filed by active registered lobbyists for the fourth quarter of 1949. Also included in Tuesday's RECORD were 68 new registration statements on Form B received by the Clerk of the House and the Secretary of the Senate in the preceding 3 months, up to and including January 20 of this year.

As the Members know, Mr. Speaker, the registrations on Form B are in the nature merely of notices of intent to engage in lobbying activities "for pay or for any other consideration," while the quarterly reports, on the other hand, on Form C, are the periodic disclosures of income and expenditures, and so forth, of those who have previously registered and who acknowledged engaging during the particular calendar quarter in actual lobbying activities or in activities which might be regarded as constituting lobbying.

A TOTAL OF 2,074 REGISTERED LOBBYISTS

As of January 20, when the list of registrations contained in Tuesday's RECORD was made up, a total of 2,045 persons, mostly individuals, but including also law firms, public-relations firms, corporations, and some pressure-group organizations, had registered since the act went into effect in 1946, complying with section 308, which requires that—

Any person who shall engage himself for pay or for any other consideration for the purpose of attempting to influence the passage or defeat of any legislation by the Congress of the United States shall, before doing anything in furtherance of such object, register with the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Secretary of the Senate and shall give to those officers in writing and under oath, his name and business address, the name and address of the person by whom he is employed, and in whose interest he appears or works, the duration of such employment, how much he is paid and is to receive, by whom he is paid or is to be paid, how much he is to be paid for expenses, and what expenses are to be included.

The number of such persons who had registered stood at 1,999 as of December 31, 1949, but went over the 2,000 mark on January 2. By January 20, when the current list of 68 new registrations appearing in the RECORD of January 31 was sent to the printers, the number stood at 2,045. I checked this morning, and the number is now 2,074.

NO MACHINERY FOR WITHDRAWAL

These figures by themselves are a little misleading, for the simple reason that some registrants have registered two, three or even more different times for separate accounts or employer interests. Some have died, others have retired or changed jobs or are otherwise no longer subject to the act. A few of these have withdrawn their registrations, but there is no official machinery provided for that purpose and so they are still carried in the total number of registrants.

Our committee staff is now in the process of cataloging these various registrations for the purpose of arriving at more definitive figures.

In any event, however, it is obvious that less than half of the approximately 2,000 registrants now on the books have acknowledged engaging in actual lobbying activities, or in activities which might be regarded as coming within the scope of the act, during the calendar quarter recently ended, since the RECORD of January 31, as I said, contains only 870 quarterly reports, and some of those are multiple reports from the same registrants for the same employer interests but covering different calendar quarters. And, of course, the multiple purpose registrants who represent a number of different interests filed separate quarterly reports for each. Those who did not file for this past quarter presumably were not active as lobbyists during that period.

Nevertheless the reports contained in the RECORD of January 31 reflect a significant picture of tremendous amounts of time and money being expended by pressure groups and pressure interests throughout the country in seeking to influence actions by the Congress of the United States. For that reason the 47-page section of that RECORD is of great importance and warrants study by each Member of Congress.

EACH MEMBER OF CONGRESS SHOULD SAVE THE LOBBY REPORTS PRINTED IN THE RECORD OF JANUARY 31, 1950

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that each Member clip out of Tuesday's RECORD the section containing the lobbying reports and keep those pages on his desk for future—and I hope frequent—reference. This is about the only handy reference material readily available to us and to the public on the activities of individual lobbyists who have registered under the act—their employer interests, their salaries and expenses, and, where this fact is included, the legislation which

they are engaged in promoting or retarding or otherwise influencing in the Congress.

Although the information contained in many of these reports is extremely sketchy, they can still be helpful to us and should be utilized constantly by the Members.

We are all fairly well acquainted with the citizens in our own districts who take more than a casual interest in pending legislation and who inform us of their views or speak on behalf of organized groups or for various social, economic, or political interests in our own districts. But each of us, in our capacities as national legislators and as members of committees dealing with important national issues, are subject at all times to constant pressures from a multitude of other sources. The lobby registration statements and quarterly reports provide us with one of the few instruments we have for assessing the representations made to us in regard to legislation by the various spokesmen—official, unofficial, self-appointed, or pretended spokesmen—for this or that pressure group or economic interest.

So, limited as some of these reports might be in the information they provide, they are still a useful guide and should be used by the Members in checking the claims of lobbyists and lobbying groups against the statements they have filed under oath.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON PRESSURE GROUPS FILED WITH CLERK OF THE HOUSE

In addition to the material printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, however, there is a wealth of additional information on lobbying and lobbying activities on file with the Clerk of the House, submitted by organizations, associations, and other pressure groups which solicit or spend money for the purpose of influencing legislative action by Congress, and which have decided to report under section 305 of the act. These reports, made on Form A—as distinct from the Form C reports made by registered agents and which are printed each quarter in the RECORD—are not printed but are available to the public for inspection in the Clerk's office.

They show the amounts of money collected by these organizations, during each quarter and cumulatively for each calendar year, the names of all contributors of $500 or more, and usually a complete break-down of all expenditures of $10 or more, showing to whom the money was paid and for what purpose.

These Form A reports tell a whole lot more about lobbying activities on the larger scale than do the individual Form C quarterly reports filed by those who file as paid agents of these various pressure groups. It is my hope that our committee can devise some practical method for making the information contained in these organizational reports more generally available to the Congress and to the public. In their present form, many of these reports are quite voluminous, and printing them in full would probably be impractical and uneconomic. But I believe we can devise a form for pressure groups to file which we could then print in the RECORD along with the others.

REPORTS SHOW FIFTY-FIVE MILLION COLLECTED—TWENTY-SEVEN MILLION SPENT IN 3½-YEAR PERIOD

I have had some preliminary studies made in connection with these Form A—pressure group—reports and the data we have accumulated so far is most interesting. A few significant facts emerge:

First. A total of 490 organizations, associations, corporations, firms, or other groups which acknowledge receiving and expending money for purposes of influencing legislation under the terms of the Lobbying Act, and which, in most cases, employ one or more paid lobbyists, have filed quarterly reports on Form A at one time or another in the past 3½ years. Actually, however, no more than 291 of them had filed for any single quarter, and that was for the second quarter of 1949. For the fourth quarter, only 249 such pressure groups had reported. The rest have not indicated whether they were operating in that quarter. Presumbably they were not.

Second. These various pressure groups—and it will be noted that not all of them file for every quarter of every year—have reported collecting more than $55,000,000 since this act went into effect in 1946 and of spending $27,304,952.10. In many cases receipts and expenditures of all kinds, whether bearing on legislative activities or not, are reported in the total, but in a great many other cases, and particularly those of many of the big lobby groups, the receipts and expenditures reported are carefully segregated to include only those regarded as dealing with legislative matters. The figures, in any event, are startling in reflecting the size of America's pressure-group industry operating on the Congress of the United States.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, and I believe it is shared by Representatives LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, the other members of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, that before we finish our work we will be able to give the Congress a more complete and a more definitive picture of this so-called Third House of Congress—the lobbyists—than is presently ascertainable.

LOBBYING LAW REQUIRES ONLY THAT ACTIVITIES BE OUT IN THE OPEN

I personally believe, as do a lot of other Members, that lobbying is necessary and essential. Most lobbyists, I believe, perform a real service, not only to their own employer groups but to the Congress in keeping the Congress informed, with informed facts and informed opinion, on pending legislative issues in which those groups are not only interested but on which they are expert.

Nevertheless, the Congress has decreed that this activity designed to influence legislative action by Congress be carried on out in the open where we can all see it and assess it and recognize the special interest aspects of it. That is all that the Lobbying Act requires. It will be the purpose of my committee, I feel safe in saying, to make sure that the principle of full disclosure and open and aboveboard activity be adhered to.

Lost Tribe of Indians in North Carolina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today which, in effect, will recognize what might be called a lost tribe of Indians in North Carolina. The story of these Indians is both interesting and tragic. James Evan Alexander has written me a letter telling this story and, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting it in the RECORD:

WILMINGTON, N. C., *February 5, 1950.*
Hon. NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. POULSON: Attached to this letter you will find a draft of a bill designed to transfer certain lands into a Federal trust status and grant a small group of Indian people the privileges and benefits of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1934. I am taking the liberty of asking you to introduce this bill because I am one of your constituents, although the people to be benefited by the proposed legislation are located in the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina.

My first knowledge of these Indians was acquired while visiting my wife's family who have a farm within 40 miles of the Indian village. Hoping to find a saleable story or article, I contacted the chief of the tribe and after hearing a brief account of their troubled existence, I offered to assist them in any way I could in exchange for their cooperation in my writing project. To accomplish this purpose my wife and I moved into the Indian village where we have been residing with one of the families for the past 4½ months. Thus the project, on which we had originally intended to spend 30 days, stretched out over this long period of time. As our investigation revealed the conditions of oppression, prejudice, fear, and actual want, our interests were gradually transposed from an ordinary business deal to an association full of warm human understanding and a strong feeling of kinship.

Our research has proved to our own satisfaction that these people are descendants of a tribe known as the Waccamaw, and a member of the eastern Siouan Nation. I will not burden you with an attempt to prove the rights of these people to Federal recognition, but rather the need for recognition and the protection and aid such recognition would afford.

The present members of the tribe reside on approximately 2,000 acres of land in one of the swampiest regions of the coastal plain, 4 miles north of Bolton in southeastern North Carolina. This land straddles the county line of Columbus and Bladen and lies in the swamps of Buckhead, Doehead, and Ricefield. Of the 2,000 acres, less than one-fifth is arable land. This arable land being a series of islands that dot the swamp which surrounds them. Not to be misled by the word "island," it must be stated that these so-called islands are merely patches of higher ground which rise a foot or two above the water level of the swamp. The excessive amount of moisture keeps the production of crops far below that which would be considered economically profitable. Inasmuch as this area has an average of 40 inches of rainfall per year, it is not unusual for the waters of the swamps to rise and inundate the islands, thus destroying the

entire season's crop. These crops consist chiefly of field peas, corn, sweet potatoes, and collards, which are raised for the sustenance of the tribe and not as a market crop. Little tobacco is grown due to the nature of the soil and extremely small tobacco allotments. Some hogs are raised, but these too are mostly for tribal consumption.

Hunting, which at one time provided much of their food, is now extremely limited. This limitation is due to the fact that the woodland surrounding the Indian land has been acquired by several large paper companies, and hunting privileges are granted only to recognized hunting clubs upon application and payment of fees of several hundred dollars per year. Hunting was further restricted by the setting aside of a large tract of land as a game refuge of the State of North Carolina where no hunting is permitted.

The principal source of cash income for the tribe is from logging and pulpwood. Due to the lack of nearby markets, the Indians are, for the most part, dependent upon truckers who scour the swampland regions and buy the timber products at the side of the road. My investigation reveals that the Indians are paid approximately $3.50 per cord for pulpwood decked and ready for delivery.

The unproductivity of the land, plus the extremely low prices paid for their labor, presents a dismal economic picture. These factors are translated into a condition the result of which is malnutrition, frequent epidemics of diseases, high infant-mortality rate, and a short life expectancy. Though these conditions are the result of the Indians' economic condition, the economic condition itself is not a cause but rather an effect. The cause can be attributed to the social environment in which they exist.

This social problem is a complex one in which these Indians are caught between the color lines of a South which is predominately and almost equally divided, white and black. Exhibiting the fierce racial pride which is the trait of Indians generally, the Waccamaws have consistently resisted all efforts of their white neighbors to designate them as Negroes. This resistance brought further indignities upon them. I should like to note that from my experiences with these people I am sure that they would have resisted with equal determination any effort to designate them as white.

Instead of generalizing on the social problem of these Indians, I will cite some specific cases for the purpose of acquainting you with the social conditions under which these people live.

The first remembered attempt to institute a system of education in the Indian settlement was made by tribal members in 1891. A school committee was formed and a one-room, 16-by-20-foot building was constructed to serve as a schoolhouse. Tribal members furnished the material and labor for this structure. Each family, having children of school age, were assessed the sum of $40 per school year to create a fund for payment of a teacher's wages. Many of the families were unable to contribute this amount, so the school operated sporadically, more frequently closed than open. At a later date, now unobtainable, aid toward paying the teacher was granted by the State. In 1921, at the beginning of the school year, a new teacher arrived prepared to take up her duties. She was a Negro. Joe Patrick, then head of the school committee, ordered the teacher to leave the community and nailed up the schoolhouse door. This was the first knowledge the Indian people had that, under the State-aid program, their school was classified as Negro. Following this, the parents threatened armed resistance to the attempts on the part of white school officials to force the Indian children to attend colored schools.

The church served as a school from the year 1924 to the year 1930. Indian teachers were procured from Robeson County. They were boarded in turn by members of the community and paid, when the school committee had money to pay them, the sum of $40 per month.

Early in the thirties a collection was taken from the tribe members, and the money pooled to sue the county of Columbus. The Indians, having no educated people in their group, hired a white attorney and suit was filed, naming the county school board as defendants in the action, and praying that the county would provide the Indian settlement with a school. On the day of the court hearing, the attorney, for reasons known only to himself, arose in court and asked for a nonsuit in the case of the Indian inhabitants of the *Ricefield-Buckhead Section* v. *the County of Columbus.*

Not to be daunted by such a set-back, they again collected a sum of money and hired another attorney who proposed taking their case directly to the State capital, Raleigh. This attorney, with a delegation of four members of the tribe, proceeded to Raleigh and registered at a hotel. Their case was to be heard the following morning. During the evening the attorney received a telephone call. He informed the delegation that it was imperative that he go to Lumberton at once, but he would return to present their case at the designated time. Exit attorney, period.

Though the plight of these people is a pathetic one, there are certain incidents not without their humorous side. A vivid imagination is not required to visualize rotund Robert Jacobs firmly wedged by the tail of his coat in the hotel's revolving door, or lanky Joe Patrick standing outside in his frozen oilskin raincoat, refusing to attempt to negotiate its frightful circle of travel. As one of the delegates, R. T. Freeman, so aptly expressed it, "Ole Mr. Joe jes' stood out there in the wind rattlin' like a mess 'o corn shuks."

There was no humor in the situation that existed the following morning. The attorney failed to return, and the Indians had no idea where the alleged hearing was to be held, so they started their long trek home in a blinding snowstorm. Their mode of travel was a battered and ancient model T Ford touring car. The Indians took turns in running along side of the car to keep from freezing to death. It was only after they had reached familiar territory near home that they dared stop, find wood, and build a fire to warm themselves.

Inasmuch as a portion of the Indian land lies in Bladen County, Alex Patrick picked up the fight with the Bladen County school officials. He was granted the privilege of tearing down an old condemned "white" school building in the town of Council for the purpose of building a school in the Indian settlement. The Bladen County Board of Education agreed to furnish teachers if the community would construct the school building.

The task of wrecking the building was accomplished by volunteer Indian labor, and the material transferred to the new school site by mule and wagon. The project took 15 months to complete. The building consisted of two rooms. A community with a cooperative spirit is evidenced by the fact that much of the labor was contributed by the fathers of the Columbus County children who would not be eligible to attend this school. In 1941, Bladen County agreed to accept the students from the Columbus County side of the line, provided additional land and rooms were added to the existing school. The tribal members again dug into their scanty resources to purchase material for an additional two rooms. This, too, was built with volunteer labor from the community.

The school was put into full operation in 1942, and consisted of four rooms, four teachers, and an enrollment of 208 students. It included grades through the eighth. There is no means of acquiring an education above this grade except by establishing residence in one of the counties that provide Indian schools and defraying all of the costs attached thereto. This is an effective barrier to a higher education for the Waccamaw Indians.

The present school is inadequate. It is poorly constructed, drafty, overcrowded, lacking in books and desks, and portions of it have never been ceiled on the inside. Bare studs in the rooms add to the general dismal appearance. There are no cloak rooms; no entry halls. Access to certain rooms are only through another. No playground or playground equipment. Three of the rooms have an ordinary tin, wood heater. The fourth is provided with no heat at all. Its construction, as well as lack of exits, create an extremely dangerous fire hazard. There is no fire-fighting equipment or extinguishers. The only source of water is a hand-pumped well which requires priming.

There are presently enrolled in the school a total of 117 students. An additional 20 students, who have completed the eighth grade, have no place to go.

Even though the Indians took a certain amount of pride in finally having acquired an Indian school, they fully realized its inadequacy and know that it falls far short of being equal to the other schools in the nearby territories.

One blow to their pride happened very recently. They found that the Wide Awake Indian School in Bladen County (their own school), was listed on the State rolls as being a white school. At the same time Columbus County officials sit back and declare that if they get any school at all it will be colored.

Additional current problems are roads and drainage. The majority of the families live on roads that transverse the community. Others live off the main roads, deeper in the swamp. These families are frequently marooned several days at a time during storms when the swamps are in flood stages. The land is fertile, but the excessive amount of water frequently destroys the crops. The WPA drained most of the land in the vicinity of the Indian settlement, but did not include their area. Due to this excessive moisture, Robert Jacobs harvested less than 20 bushels of corn per acre this year on deep rich topsoil that, properly drained, could have produced in excess of 100 bushels per acre.

Medicine and hospitalization is another problem of long standing. Due to the nature of the roads and distances to travel, it is extremely difficult to get doctors to attend the sick or injured in the settlement. Infant mortality rate is high, and many of the adults meet an untimely end due to the lack of proper medical attendance. The following case occurred in August of 1949 and is set forth as a typical example.

Penny, the aging wife of Robert Jacobs, had been under the care of a doctor at Lake Waccamaw for a liver complaint. During one of the longest and hardest storms of the rainy season, her condition took a turn for the worse. The land of Robert Jacobs is on an island in the swamp and off the main road. In order to reach this main road it is necessary to cross the Ricefield Branch. Unable to get a doctor to call on the patient, and the roads being impassable to automobiles, Mrs. Jacobs was loaded into a wagon drawn by a mule. The swamp was forded as the patient lay on boards across the wagon sides to keep her out of the water that came up into the bed of the wagon. Upon reaching the road, she was transferred to a car and driven by her sons to Lake Waccamaw. The doctor prescribed some medicine; advised rest, and told

the young men to take their mother home. They explained the road conditions and pleaded that she be hospitalized. The doctor declared that it was unnecessary, inasmuch as she would be all right in a day or two. The patient was returned to her home in the same manner she was taken from it.

Three days later the storm had not abated. It was obvious to the family in attendance that Mrs. Jacobs was, not only critically ill, but on the verge of death. An Indian was sent to Clarkton in an attempt to reach a doctor there and ask his assistance, but the doctor was out on a baby case. Another went for the doctor at Lake Waccamaw. This doctor assured them that he would come except for the fact he suffered from an asthmatic condition that prevented him going out in the wet night air.

Someone waded out from the island to the residence of W. J. Freeman (this was late in the evening) and W. J. returned to the island to offer his assistance. As he waded back through the swamp the water rose over the top of his hip boots. Another person was sent to Chadbourn to get the ambulance from the Peacock Funeral Home. The men of the community rallied around W. J. and they all began a futile attempt to build a bridge across the black, waist-deep waters.

At 11 p. m. death came.

At 7 a. m. the following morning the ambulance crossed the rickety structure and took away the last remains of Penny Jacobs.

Early in 1943, six Indians from the settlement were drafted. They appeared on the specified day and learned they were classified as Negroes. They advised the head of the draft board that they would not be inducted as Negroes but sought the privilege of being inducted as Indians. When refused this privilege they returned home. In the subsequent trial in which these six young men were charged with violation of the Selective Service Act, Judge I. M. Meekins summarily dismissed the charges against them. M. Butler Prescott, who was the probation officer for the Federal court, in a recent letter to R. T. Freeman, summed it up as follows:

"My presentence investigation led me to conclude as a fact, that these young men, members of the group of Indians living in the vicinity of Bolton, N. C., were Indians, and that the efforts to designate and induct them as Negroes was due primarily to the prejudice of the white people in that vicinity."

The ultimate solution of the local draft board's problem of disposing of the Indians was a simple device. All subsequent Indian draftees were classified as 4–F.

On November 21, 1949, my wife and I brought a delegation from the tribe to Washington, D. C. There we met with John Provinse and D'Arcy McNickle of the Office of Indian Affairs, and presented them with the compiled history of their right to be recognized and aided by the Federal Government. Mr. Provinse advised us that in the absence of a treaty with the Waccamaws it would be impossible to render any assistance without legislation in their behalf. He further advised we contact other people including Representative F. ERTEL CARLYLE from the Seventh Congressional District of North Carolina and Senators CLYDE R. HOEY and FRANK P. GRAHAM also of North Carolina. This we did and received prompt assurance of their interest and willingness to assist in the case of the Waccamaw Indians. On December 9, 1949, Senator Hoey forwarded to me a copy of a letter from John H. Provinse of the Office of Indian Affairs. I am setting forth the last paragraph here inasmuch as the course of action suggested by Mr. Provinse is the procedure I have attempted to follow:

"Congress, of course, has authority to provide for the welfare of the people in question by legislating in their behalf. I should be happy to discuss the problems of these Indians with you, if you desire. It is my impression that the group is in need of educational facilities, and perhaps some assistance in making better use of the resources they now possess.

"I appreciate you bringing this matter to my attention.

"JOHN H. PROVINSE,
"Assistant Commissioner."

Just before Christmas my wife and I went to New York and secured the promise of assistance from several organizations, including the Civil Liberties Union, the Home Missions Council of North America, and the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc. The board of directors of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., met on December 19, 1949, and agreed to support and sponsor the necessary legislation in behalf of the Waccamaw Indians. Dr. Alexander Lesser of the association, directed Felix Cohen, their Washington counsel to prepare a draft of a bill to accomplish this purpose.

I discussed the matter of introducing this proposed legislation with Senator HOEY on January 12, 1950, and he advised that he would not introduce the bill unless he could be assured that it was the desire of the entire tribe to have this legislation enacted. I returned to North Carolina and procured the following resolution:

"The Council of the Waccamaw Tribe, having met on January 15, 1950, to consider the attached bill to grant Federal recognition and help to our tribe, respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to enact this bill.

"We have submitted this bill to the referendum vote of our tribe. Of 157 adult members, 157 voted. Of the votes cast, 157 were in favor of the bill and none were opposed.

"We are attaching to this resolution the papers showing all votes cast on this proposition. The marks of those who could not write were witnessed by this Council."

This was signed by the Council of Waccamaw Indians and certified by Chief Freeman.

The original resolution and petition was delivered to Senator HOEY on January 18, 1950, and typed copies were delivered to Senator FRANK P. GRAHAM and Representative F. ERTEL CARLYLE.

I have discussed this matter with Dr. Alexander Lesser of the Association on American Indian Affairs, Inc., and Felix Cohen, counsel for the association. We feel that this bill should be introduced in order that the claims of these Indian people can be investigated by the proper authorities and Federal legislation enacted in their behalf.

Mr. POULSON, 340 people, including babies and children, are anxiously awaiting the outcome of this activity in their behalf. My wife and I know that these people's problems seem insignificant in a world concerned with H-bombs, Marshall plans, and Atlantic pacts, but when your world only encompasses a small area of poverty-ridden green swamp, these problems assume gigantic proportions. They become the opponents in the battle for survival against the all-to-frequent winners: malnutrition, exposure, and disease.

We have nothing to offer in the way of recompense other than our thanks and the gratitude of an humble and industrious band of people—the Waccamaw Indians.

Very truly yours,

JAMES EVAN ALEXANDER.

Policy Statement by New York Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 6 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, the sections on labor, health, old-age pensions, education, and housing from a policy statement by the New York Young Republican Club entitled "Blueprint for a Better America."

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LABOR

LABOR-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS

Problem: Young Republicans believe that the free collective-bargaining process offers the best means by which employers and employees can meet and resolve their mutual problems. Constant and direct participation by the National Government in the settlement of industrial disputes is inconsistent with our system of private enterprise and is rejected both by labor and by Government as a solution to the problem. The role of Government should be limited to enacting legislation which will foster and encourage free collective bargaining, and will remove, whenever possible, existing causes of friction.

There have been two major legislative attempts to achieve these ends—the Wagner Act and the Taft-Hartley Act. Both have proved inadequate. The Wagner Act of 1935 was hailed as labor's "bill of rights." This act guaranteed to the individual worker and his union, for the first time, many of the rights which are now regarded as fundamental in a free society. There are few, if any, who today mourn the departure under the Wagner Act of the yellow-dog contract and the blacklist. However, the legislators who enacted the Wagner Act failed to impose responsibilities correlative with the rights granted. The period of unprecedented industrial conflict which followed was coupled in many instances with union irresponsibility that made a mockery of the collective-bargaining process and the integrity of contract. The Taft-Hartley Act sought to impose certain responsibilities upon unions and union leaders, equated to the rights which they had enjoyed and continued to enjoy. The act was designed to be a bill of rights and responsibilities.

However, the experience of the last year and a half has revealed that the American economy is still being subjected to frequent and wasteful industrial conflict and that many of the problems of labor-management relations are not met, or are improperly dealt with, under the later act. Several of the provisions of the act have proved to be unnecessarily restrictive and in some cases superfluous.

WORKER-UNION RELATIONS

In view of the economic pressure which unions can bring to bear upon employers to discourage the use of nonunion labor, the ability of an individual worker to join a union is in some cases tantamount to his ability to get a job. Yet many workers today find that union membership, and con-

sequently job opportunities, are closed to them by reason of the discriminatory and exclusionary practices employed by some unions.

There are at least 32 unions, with a total membership of 2,500,000, which exclude Negroes.

Over 70 unions deny the right to join either because of citizenship, sex, religious creed, or closed membership policies.

The constitutions of 17 unions require that all members be white and Christian.

Particularly in the craft unions there has developed a complex but effective pattern of exclusion from union membership through apprenticeship requirements, competency tests, work permits, licensing requirements, and prohibitive entrance fees. As a result of such exclusionary techniques, many workers are denied the opportunity of pursuing a vocation of their own choosing and the Nation is confronted with a shortage of skilled craftsmen.

While the collective action of unions should be protected against the inroads of an unorganized labor market, the denial of job opportunity through the denial of union membership is inconsistent with an opportunity society. The right of another to work must be respected by those who have already gained that right for themselves.

Even after union membership is attained, the individual worker is frequently denied any voice in the affairs of his own organization. In some unions the rank and file is subject to disciplinary action, including expulsion, for such vague offenses as undermining the union and creating dissension. In these unions the official hierarchy usually has the last word on what constitutes a punishable offense under the union's constitution.

Many unions which have clearly defined and narrow grounds for punishment of their members lack adequate procedural safeguards against arbitrary conviction. In a few unions the union leadership acts as grand jury, prosecutor, and judge, denying to the accused member any semblance of an impartial hearing.

In some cases financial accountability to the members has been either skimpy or nonexistent. A financial report by the national office of one union at a recent convention purported to cover a period of 30 years, in just three lines.

Member participation in national policy making is almost completely foreclosed by the concentration of power in the hands of a few top officials of certain national unions. Moreover, reports of convention proceedings indicate that the top officials of many unions do not hesitate to depart from parliamentary rules where an important issue is involved or their own power is threatened. One union constitution gives the president absolute power to abrogate both the constitution and the bylaws whenever he sees fit.

This lack of internal democracy in the unions leads inevitably to irresponsibility on the part of union leaders and exploitation of the individual union member. Regardless of the frequency or infrequency of actual abuses, the importance of the individual rights at stake demands all possible safeguards.

While the Taft-Hartley Act attempted to meet some of the problems of worker-union relations, it failed to provide adequate protection for the rights of the individual worker. Moreover, since the act as a whole does not have the support of the worker himself, a new legislative approach to the problem is required.

THE PUBLIC INTEREST

We firmly believe that the United States cannot enjoy increasing prosperity so long as our economy is subjected to frequent and wasteful industrial conflict. In 1946, the peak year for strikes in the United States, there were 4,985 work stoppages, involving 4,600,000 workers and resulting in a loss of 116,000,000 man-days of production. The gravity of frequent and prolonged work stoppages, in terms of lost wages and lost goods and services, cannot be over-emphasized. The cost of strikes runs into millions of dollars annually and results in a lower standard of living for the entire country.

The interests of the general public have also been adversely affected by the recent development of large national or international unions representing for collective bargaining purposes the employees of many competing employers. In most of our basic industries a single national or international union and its locals represents all or nearly all of the workers in the industry.

This centralization of function and concentration of power in a few national unions has led to the developmet of "pattern bargaining" and "industry-wide bargaining," both of which have hurt the American consumer. When the industry-wide demands of national unions are resisted by the competing members of an industry, the strikes which occasionally follow are national in scope and catastrophic in effect. In the case of basic industries, the national health and safety may be immediatel endangered. On the other hand, when these demands are not resisted but are willingly accepted, competition is stifled and prices become fixed at the expense of the consumer.

Proposals: 1. A bipartisan nonlegislative commission, similar to the Hoover Commission, should be established to investigate all phases of labor relations, to conduct public hearings, and to make specific recommendations to the President and to Congress for the enactment of a new comprehensive labor law.

This recommendation is made in recognition of the fact that many of the problems in the labor field today urgently require resolution if our private-enterprise system is to survive; and in further recognition of the fact that the labor issue has now become so hopelessly complicated by political issues that clear and dispassionate legislative action is practically impossible.

2. As an interim measure, pending the return of the commission's report, the Taft-Hartley Act should be amended immediately to resolve more pressing problems now arising out of labor-management relations and worker-union relations.

HEALTH

Problem: The level of health in the United States is superior to that of almost every other country in the world. There are at present 6,335 hospitals of which 1,900 are operated by Federal or State agencies. The United States has 140 doctors per 100,000 population, one of the highest per capita ratios in the world. The life expectancy of the American male has increased from 48 years in 1900 to 70 years in 1950. In the last 33 years, the rate of infant mortality has been cut by about two-thirds.

However, the health in certain economic groups and geographic areas continues to be substandard. While this condition is due in part to poor diet, overcrowding, and lack of health education, it is also due to inadequate medical care. In certain areas, there is a severe shortage of medical personnel and hospital facilities. Indeed, the country as a whole does not now have facilities to furnish complete medical care to the entire population.

More important, however, is the inability of large segments of the population to pay for adequate medical attention. It has been shown that families with an annual income of $3,000 or less are not medically self-sustaining. Two groups in particular require financial assistance. One group, while able to pay routine medical expenses, is unable to provide against the catastrophe of serious illness or accident. The second group, composed principally of the aged and incapacitated, and those with many dependents, is unable to afford the cost of even minimum medical care.

The public medical facilities of the Federal Government currently serve about 24,000,000 people free of charge. However, this includes about 18,500,000 veterans, most of whom receive such assistance only to the extent that facilities are available. In view of this, more and more people are turning to private health insurance.

The highest estimate of membership in some kind of voluntary health insurance plan in 1949 was 61,000,000 persons. Nineteen forty-eight saw an increase of 8,500,000 persons, or 16 percent, in the number covered with regard to hospital expense. However, most voluntary health insurance plans provide only limited protection. The average monthly cost of voluntary health insurance is estimated to be $2.50 per individual and $5.50 per family.

Estimates regarding the initial yearly cost of proposed compulsory health insurance legislation vary from the administration's figure of between four and six billion dollars to the American Medical Association estimate of $18,000,000,000. Both predict subsequent increases in cost. In Great Britain, it was originally estimated that the health program would cost about $620,000,000 for the first year. Yet expenditures for the first 9 months exceeded estimates by $234,000,000.

Proposals: 1. Sufficient tax sources should be returned to the States to enable them to supplement the contributions of their citizens to voluntary non-profit-health-insurance plans. Where local tax sources are insufficient, Federal funds should be made available to the States. This would result in increased coverage and expanded benefits.

2. Dental education and examination at the primary school level and the expansion of facilities for the treatment of chronic and mental illnesses (which should not be included within the coverage of health-insurance plans at the present time) should be encouraged by Federal grants-in-aid to the States.

3. Federal funds should be made available to the States to enable them to maintain and expand medical facilities for those unable to afford voluntary health insurance.

4. Any shortage or maldistribution of medical personnel or facilities can best be corrected by proper administration at the State and local level. A reallocation of public-health personnel should be effected to supplement available medical service in substandard areas.

These recommendations assure a program which will preserve to the patient his right of privacy and free choice of physician, and will preserve to the medical profession the valuable incentive of private practice free from political control.

OLD-AGE PENSIONS

Problem: Today 11,000,000 persons are over 65. By 1980 this figure may rise to 22,000,000. How can we assure a living standard consistent with human dignity to our aged population?

At present old-age pensions do not afford even a minimum level of subsistence. The average pension payment for a retired worker is less than $26 a month and for a retired worker and his wife only $41 a month. Many persons who are eligible and might otherwise desire to retire are forced to stay at work. Nearly 25 percent of those who do retire are

compelled, with great damage to their morale, to seek old-age relief from local authorities to avoid destitution. The problem is even more alarming since over 25,000,000 employed and self-employed are not covered by any old-age law at all. The largest groups now excluded are farmers, farm workers and the self-employed.

Industry pension plans also leave much to be desired. A depression might destroy many such plans. Workers are covered only so long as they remain with a particular employer. If they change jobs, their pension rights are lost. This discourages a fluid labor force and reduces opportunity for young people. A great percentage of workers go unprotected because their companies cannot afford pension plans for them.

No American feels that the aged should be left to destitution in their nonproductive years. Yet, while provision for the aged is a responsibility of the community, no plan to date has proved adequate. None will prove adequate until it is apparent that (1) the national productivity is sufficient to provide for the needs of the retired aged without unduly burdening the productive members of our society, and (2) we as a Nation accept the responsibility of maintaining an equitable balance between the needs of the productive and the nonproductive members of our society.

If each aged man or woman were to be paid $100 per month, the cost would be $13,500,000,000 in 1950.

If such pensions were financed entirely by employer-employee contributions it would be necessary to establish reserves far out of proportion to our present national wealth.

If pensions were financed entirely out of current Government funds, the burden would fall more and more heavily on the younger person. There are today 8 young people for every individual over 65; by 2000 this ratio will be reduced to about 4.9 to 1 if the life span continues to lengthen.

Proposals:

1. The Federal old-age pension system should be geared to our rising national income so that our society can quickly guarantee at least a subsistence income to every person who reaches the age of retirement.

2. Twenty-five million employed and self-employed, who are not presently covered, should be brought immediately into the existing program. But, thereafter, no further implementation of the present system should be undertaken until a sound workable program has been achieved.

3. We propose that Federal funds now granted to States on a matching basis for old-age relief be devoted to increasing Federal old-age pension payments.

4. We urge a comprehensive investigation and analysis by qualified technicians of old-age pensions, provisions for full employment, and other social security measures.

EDUCATION

Problem: A good education is the birthright of every American child. To this end education has traditionally been the responsibility of the entire community. The strongest assurance we have that our free society shall endure is education for all its members in an atmosphere free from governmental control.

The initial problem is at the primary and secondary school levels. In this field the educational facilities provided by local communities have not kept pace with the Nation's need. The demand for qualified teachers exceeds the supply; rising birth rates require more new teachers; because of low salaries many teachers have been lost to higher-paid jobs outside the teaching profession; the rising cost of living has nullified past pay increases; many school facilities are inadequate.

Although the problem varies in intensity from one area of the country to another, the lack of adequate educational facilities can be attributed in large part to the insufficiency of State tax sources. The virtual monopoly of the Federal Government on present tax sources has accentuated the problem for all States.

Today, at least 2,000,000 children are suffering a major impairment in their education due to inadequate teaching facilities.

In 1947 about 5,000,000 children between the ages of 5 and 17 attended no school whatsoever.

A teacher's average annual salary was $900 in 1920, $1,515 in 1930, $1,565 in 1940 and $2,375 in 1947.

The States are spending $3,000,000,000, or almost one-third of their total revenues, for education, but this is less than 2 percent of our national income.

On a national basis the average sum spent to educate one child for 1 year is $148. Most southern States fall below this average; North Carolina, which spends $89 per child, tops the southern States.

Proposal: Federal funds should be made available to States unable to raise sufficient funds from their own revenue sources to provide for the expenditure of an amount per child at least equal to the present national educational average. Each State receiving a share of these funds should have complete control over the administration, personnel, curriculum, instruction, and methods and materials of instruction, but subject to the following conditions:

1. It must expend such funds for education at the primary and secondary school levels.

2. It must continue to utilize at least the same proportion of its taxable resources for education as at the present time.

3. It must expend such funds without discrimination as to race, creed or color.

HOUSING

Problem: There are two major aspects of the housing problem, each of which needs solution in order properly to attack the fundamental question of adequate, decent shelter for all of the American people. These are (a) subsidy of low cost housing and (b) fostering of private building.

It is regarded as axiomatic that inadequate, unsanitary, congested housing is a breeding ground for crime and disease. Somewhat less dire in its results, but none the less serious, is the effect on young families having to double up with in-laws, or else devote a disproportionate share of their income to housing.

About 1,500,000, families in this country are doubled up against their wishes.

There are over 5,000,000 housing units in this country so badly in need of repair as to be considered substandard.

Twenty-two percent of nonfarm families in this country have incomes of $2,000 or less and cannot afford more than a very small rental. For example, approximately 4,000,000 housing units rent for $20 per month or less—a return so inadequate that private landlords cannot afford to make even essential repairs to existing buildings, much less build new housing units for this income group. The result is further deterioration of already substandard housing, and no new building by private industry for low income groups.

At present it costs between $6,000 and $7,000, in most parts of this country to build even a simple four-room house, making new housing prohibitive in cost to families whose incomes are less than $3,000.

We feel that there is a way completely consonant with the private-enterprise system, by which those problems can be successfully met.

Proposals: 1. We recommend Federal fiscal aid to State governments in their handling of the problem of subsidizing low-cost housing for low-income groups. While the 1949 Housing Act provides, in general, an adequate working basis for a comprehensive program in this field, the research provisions of this legislation should be more adequately utilized than has been true to date. And in no event should the Federal Government go into the housing business. It should encourage private action primarily, not provide a substitute therefor.

2. We favor a continuation of Federal insurance for home mortgages.

3. We submit that a substantial reduction of building costs could be effected by:

(a) modifying antiquated local building codes to conform to present technological development;

(b) breaking up monopolies in the building-material industry;

(c) eliminating restrictive practices in building-trade unions;

(d) eliminating many of the hidden taxes on construction materials which at present are passed on to the consumer.

For a New Approach to the Labor Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, without question, one of the serious problems before the American people is to find a solution as to how to obtain better relationship between management and labor. I do not wish to state that one group is more responsible than the other. I think that Mr. Eric Johnston, president of the Motion Picture Association of America, has ably introduced a new approach to this problem. I am inserting his statement in the RECORD:

FOR A NEW APPROACH TO THE LABOR ISSUE

ERIC JOHNSTON PROPOSES THAT MANAGEMENT AND LABOR, NOT POLITICIANS, REVISE THE LAW

(By Eric Johnston)

I would like to see management and labor jointly draft new labor legislation to present to Congress. This suggestion would have been ridiculous a few years back. Today there are powerful stabilizing forces in industry which make it possible and desirable. Labor and management are closer together in their basic thinking than they ever were.

The ridiculous thing today is to leave labor-legislation drafting to the politicians. They gave us the Wagner Act, which business didn't like, and the Taft-Hartley Act, which labor doesn't like. Neither act gave us what everybody in this country wants, and that's peace in industry. Rightly or wrongly, both were dubbed punitive measures, and peace never results when one party believes it has been unjustly treated.

When it's left to Congress, the kind of labor law we get depends on which side can influence Congress with the promise of the most votes—the friends of labor or the friends of management. If labor legislation continues to be the outgrowth of a political

power struggle, we can despair of ever achieving industrial peace.

In this article I want to make three points:

1. I want to amplify the reasons why I think there's no chance of industrial peace if it is left to the maneuvering of political parties.

2. I want to discuss the surprising new stabilizing forces which have been evolving in the last 5 years.

3. I want to outline my ideas of how labor and management can draft their own rules as a basis for a labor law acceptable to both that would provide a reasonable assurance of more peace in industry.

It is the practice of politicians to exploit controversial issues. Among the most hotly disputed is the kind of labor law we're going to have. The Taft-Hartley Act will be made an issue by both sides in the 1950 elections. Left to politics, there is no knowing what kind of act we will have in 1952. If the past is any guide to the future, it will not be one to inspire industrial peace.

Left to politics, we will continue to get labor legislation inclined toward labor one year and management the next; first a Wagner Act, then a Taft-Hartley Act. Every time this happens, either labor or management is affronted and basic issues are not resolved.

True enough, labor has exaggerated the effect of the Taft-Hartley Act. Labor said the law would smash unions. It has not. But management exaggerated the virtues of the law. Management said it would stop strikes, bring industrial peace. It has not. Labor exaggerated the virtues of the Wagner Act. Labor thought it was a Magna Carta for the working man. It was not. Management exaggerated its flaws. Management said it would wreck business. It did not.

Extremist legislation either way meets no real need in our sensitive economy. It perpetuates ill will between management and labor, when greater cooperation is necessary. Extremist legislation is a contradiction of the democratic principle of compromise and accommodation.

All of us—not just labor and management alone—are acutely affected by labor legislation today. The livelihood of everyone depends increasingly on uninterrupted production in industry. So do our commitments to the democratic world. Our industrial disputes look bad in the eyes of the world we are supposed to be leading; they look good in the eyes of those who think that our type of capitalism is doomed to collapse.

Our people are aware of how acutely they are hit by industrial feuding. Major work stoppages in industry affect all levels of our system. Public opinion polls place strikes as the Nation's most alarming problem for 1950—ahead of the cost of living; ahead of how to handle Russia; ahead of war.

What the people want is a law that is neither prolabor nor probusiness. They know you cannot operate efficiently under rules slanted in favor of one side or the other.

The kind of impartial labor legislation we are all hoping for can be drawn only on the basis of rules agreed to by management and labor in advance of congressional action. The only men who can write impartial rules for labor and management are the rational leaders of both groups, acting in concert and determined above all else that henceforth politics shall not make a football out of industry disputes.

This has been tried before, but it failed because the timing was wrong. I am utterly convinced it is time to try again.

That brings me to my second point: that fresh stabilizing factors now exist in industry. They have evolved. They were unplanned. They were unintentional. But they are brand-new indicators of the American capitalistic system's ability to work toward the answers to its own problems. Three of these stabilizing forces stand out:

Stabilizer 1 is that high wage levels and a high standard of living for the American worker are proving deterrents to the use of the strike as a weapon for labor advantage. If living standards continue to rise, the strike may yield to more civilized methods as trial by combat in the feudal days yielded to the courts of law and the judgment of juries.

It would be naive to suggest that the high-wage theory so commonly accepted by industry today as good business will work around to an assurance of peace in industry. As a stabilizing force, it should not be exaggerated. In all candor, the strike has been the weapon that enabled the worker to achieve much of his present fortune. We can never delude ourselves that labor will grow soft on the subject of strikes until a more civilized way of settling industrial disputes has been developed.

Just why are workers becoming more reluctant to strike? The answer lies in terms of people and not in terms of statistics or theories. Suppose we visit, in fancy, the home of a typical industrial worker in the year 1900—a half century ago. What kind of living standard did he have?

His home was probably more of a shack than a house. Undoubtedly it was rented. Kerosene lamps did the lighting, and the heating was in charge of a rickety stove or two. The plumbing was rudimentary. If the man of the house had a "Sunday suit," he was among the lucky ones. A clean apron was sufficient dress-up costume for his wife—and probably all she had.

Refrigerators, electric irons, vacuum cleaners, and other household work-savers were unknown. People other than industrial workers did not have them either, but they probably had their 1900 equivalents—an ice box, a carpet sweeper. The industrial worker lacked these conveniences.

His children left school as soon as the law allowed. If they could earn a few pennies, the earlier the better. By and large, the industrial worker lived on a shoestring. To paraphrase the sometimes useful Karl Marx, he had nothing to lose by striking except that shoestring. In many cases, it was only a question of keeping fed while a strike was in progress, and soup kitchens, like as not, supplied that need.

Now suppose we visit an industrial worker's home today. It may not be utterly typical; it may not be absolutely average, but we would not need to hunt long to find one like it. This union man, let us assume, is a steel worker. In the last steel strike, he found it immensely difficult to keep going after the strike had lasted only a few weeks.

Why? Because he could not keep up his overhead. He had had a long stretch of prosperity—good wages and steady work—and his living standard had hit a new top. Ten years of good times—a long pull in our economic history—had changed his habits and his circumstances. Very much like a businessman, his credit had expanded and he had been using it. He was buying his home, and there were payments to be met. He was buying—on time—an electric refrigerator and other labor-saving devices. There was a telephone bill, an electric bill, and a gas bill.

One of his sons was in college. The wages of a skilled worker in steel could afford that now. There were some medical bills—for illnesses for which the worker of 1900 would never have dreamed of calling in a doctor.

This is the story of so many industrial workers that it accounts for their growing dislike of the strike. Their long stretch of good times has found them giving hostages to fortune. The bosses' luxuries of yesterday have become the workers' necessities of today.

Stabilizer 2 is management's growing social consciousness.

Let's visit, in fancy, the front office of a corporation in 1900. We won't need to stay long to learn that its workers are so many ciphers on the pay roll; that labor, in management's eyes, is a commodity. Get it as cheaply as possible, spend as little as possible on the working environment; if the man gets sick, that's his bad luck; when he's too old to work, pitch the old guy out on the ash heap of the community. That's the mood of the scene. It allowed for obsolescence of machines—but not of men. A strike brewing? Have the Governor call out the National Guard.

By contrast, suppose we visit the front office of a big corporation in the year 1950. It could be the Ford Motor Co. Here is an atmosphere utterly at variance with that of 1900. The high-wage principle is actively at work. Collective bargaining is an established institution. Pensions go to the retired worker. He has health insurance. Above everything else, he is a respected person, virtually a colleague, never a commodity.

It could be General Motors, where the pay scale is geared not only to the cost of living, but to benefits from increased production. It could be any one of scores of concerns where justice has been enthroned in the factory as it has in the courthouse. It could be any concern where the worker has been given a direct sense of participation in the operation—and in our whole system—by sharing in the benefits of new techniques, in the new wealth made possible by better machines, and in the fruits of increased production.

The high-wage level has forced management to more efficiency; but the worker must accept, along with his new high wages, the higher productivity theory. More and more he does. Sound labor leadership knows that high wages which necessitate high prices are self-defeating, and so said Labor's Monthly Survey, that excellent publication of the AFL, not long ago.

Stabilizer 3 is the growing acceptance by management that social progress must keep in step with technical progress. The welfare fund is the natural corollary.

What high wages will do for industrial stability will be repeated by the welfare fund. The United Mine Workers are finding that out. When no coal is mined, funds stop flowing. No coal, no welfare fund. I think it is safe to predict that union leaders will not tend to jeopardize welfare funds as they become more and more a part of the workers' standard of living.

That, at least, has been the experience in the ladies' garment industry. Unions get a vested interest in the continuity of production. In the form of pensions, workers earn a franchise in the plants which employ them. The security of the individual is tied to the security of the institution, and it becomes viewed in that light.

The welfare fund cannot be advocated without some caution. These funds can't operate as stabilizers long unless they are actuarilly sound; they must be free from domination by either management or labor; they must be wisely administered, with impartiality assured by a third party on the board, jointly chosen by labor and management.

These stabilizing forces—a high living standard, social justice, and the welfare fund—are combining to change the character of our industrial society from one of constant warfare to a higher pitch of civilized living together. Their emergence means that many things which fomented dispute in industry are behind us: the recognition of unions, the acceptance of the principle of collective bargaining, and the acceptance of the principle

that wages must keep pace with profits out of increased productivity.

We have come further than we sometimes are aware. We are sometimes unaware of how strong is our present base from which to move even further. What we need to do now is to translate the changed conditions into a smoother working arrangement, exploiting our new advantages into positive factors for industrial progress and peace.

That brings me to point 3: How labor and management can write their own rules as a basis for new labor legislation. Knowing what we do—that the American people are insistent on industrial peace, that a Nation-wide strike might paralyze our country, and that industrial peace through politics is hopeless—labor and management have no reasonable excuse today not to convene once again to write their own rules. When I say rules, I mean a set of general principles of agreement between labor and management which would then be written into the draft of a law for the House and Senate Labor Committees.

Past failures in reaching a lasting accord between management and labor need not deter us. I am naturally thinking back to the time when the last attempt was made. It was just about 5 years ago that the President of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, with the presidents of the CIO and the AFL, worked out a simple declaration of accord and signed their names to it. It was labeled a management-labor charter for industrial peace. The president of the CIO, then as now, was Philip Murray; the president of the AFL, then as now, was William Green. I was president of the National Chamber at the time.

The effort was a failure. The accord was short-lived. We failed because labor and management were simply not ready for a step as big as this. The war was still on. Both sides were timorous about the post-war years. The bugaboo of a depression after the victory hovered over the deliberations. Each side was maneuvering for advantage in the uncertain years ahead. More importantly, there were no stabilizing forces in evidence then as they so clearly show themselves today. In five brief years the whole atmosphere has changed in tone.

Men from management and men from labor can meet at a conference table this time with new faith in our system and with new faith in each other. And when they meet, what rules should they draft for industrial peace?

I believe the rules should encompass these points:

1. That increased prosperity for all involves the highest degree of production at wages assuring a steady advancement in the standard of living.

2. That the rights of private property and free choice of action are the foundations of our Nation's expanding economy.

3. That management has an inherent right to direct the operations of an enterprise.

4. That labor has fundamental rights to organize and engage in collective bargaining.

5. That we must cooperate in building an economic system which will protect the individual against the hazards of unemployment, old age, and physical impairments beyond his control.

Agreed to and spelled out in law, there is room within those broad principles of accord for labor and management to work together better than they ever have in the past.

These principles are not new. They were encompassed in the labor-management charter of 5 years ago, but in the perspective of today the thought and the language itself were in advance of the times. They could well be the core of the labor legislation we need now, for they are the antithesis of the principle of punitive legislation.

As an ally to the law, I suggest that at the same meeting at which the rules are written, a permanent council of management and labor be formed. This council would not be a substitute for collective bargaining. It would concern itself only with the broader aspects of management-labor relations. It would make public its reports, and most importantly, it would meet often. It would be reassuring to the public. It would be another great stabilizing force.

Who would take the leadership in a call to draft such rules? It is obvious that it will not be done at all if it is left to everybody. The simplest procedure, it seems to me, would be a joint invitation to the representatives of labor by the two leading business organizations, the National Association of Manufacturers and the National Chamber of Commerce. It should be done promptly.

Now, while the hour is propitious, in advance of the political campaigns if possible, but during them, if need be, is our great chance to take labor legislation out of the area of politics and lift it into the realm of business and labor statesmanship. Now is the time to exercise a new kind of patriotism, demonstrating to the world the versatility of the American system.

Msgr. Maurice W. Chawke: "His Boys" Mourn His Loss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOUIS C. RABAUT
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include an article from the Detroit News of Monday, January 30. This article is a tribute to a saintly priest whose death on January 29 was a great tragedy to the people of Michigan who knew him so well, to the generations of boys who were the objects of his inspiration and guidance, and a deep personal loss to those who, like myself, valued his friendship so highly.

The lives of few men have been so filled with that thought and action which springs from a self-less devotion to youth. His was a devotion that did not know the boundaries of race, religion, or color.

Father Chawke as he was known to so many, even after the church saw fit to bestow an ecclesiastical rank upon him, burned with an ardor and spirit of self-sacrifice which was the inspiration for the youth organizations which now reach into every part of our country. Although his interest lay chiefly in providing athletic recreation for his boys, the guidance he gave them did not stop there. Many of his protégés have joined him in the priestly ranks, and success in other fields and walks of life has visited nearly all of them.

Following the example of him to whose service his whole life was dedicated, and taking to his big and sympathetic heart the words of his Master, "Suffer the little children to come unto Me," Father Chawke gave himself to the boys of Detroit and the youth of the Nation. Knowing him as I did, I can say that few men have ever given so much.

It was a singular blessing to have known him and I am sure that his greeting will be "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

The article follows:

AN ORIGINAL WORKER IN YOUTH MOVEMENT PASSES WITH A PRIEST'S DEATH

(By Harry Leduc)

"Father Chawke is dead."

Dozens of Detroiters passed that word Sunday and are repeating it today as they pause in prayer and reverence for the memory of the Catholic priest who was the first spirit of the boys' movement in Detroit and Michigan, as well as an inspiration undoubtedly to the founding of Boys Town in Nebraska and other movements in the world of youth.

Details of the 79 years of his life and death are recorded in another part of the News, but the sport section obtains the privilege of reporting his contributions to the phase of life of which sport pages treat.

"Firsts" marked his career from the time he entered old Detroit College, precursor of the present University of Detroit.

He played on the first football team Detroit College ever had.

He organized and played on the first great sandlot baseball team in the city's history, the Avon Tigers.

He built the first parish athletic club in the city's history, the St. Louis YMC. Membership was a quarter and dues a nickel a month and no boys were barred.

From his work and inspiration developed the present Catholic Youth Organization, with its boys' clubs on the West and East Sides, its full city-wide program of athletic activity, and with one of his own St. Vincent boys (Father Harold J. Markey) wearing his mantle as head of the CYO.

In a broader sense, Father Chawke 50 years ago understood the boy and worked and fought for him until today city government is spending millions to provide facilities for baseball, football, boxing, tennis, handball, skating, and all the other myriad activities once nonexistent for youth.

His protégés would fill a column. He organized the Avon Tigers at the turn of the century, after his 1897 Detroit College graduation, in the summers between his studies for the priesthood at Baltimore and Cincinnati. "Wish" Egan, chief scout of the Detroit ball club today, was one of his Avon pitchers. Others of that team were Claude (Blink) Stark (brother of the News' George W. Stark), "Nig" Clarke, Jerry Utley, Ed Killian, all of whom went into organized baseball successfully. Bill Hayes, Randolph Duchene, and Joe Schiappacasse were others.

The Avons played the best ball clubs in Michigan and met the famous DAC teams annually. They were just kids but they always gave the star-studded DAC club a battle.

After his ordination, Father Chawke was assigned to St. Vincent's and he quickly erected a building that still stands. It had a court where basketball and handball both were played, wrestling mats, billiard tables, and a room for checkers and other games.

In the light of present recreation centers, it does not pale—and to what he called the St. Louis Young Men's Club Father Chawke welcomed all boys regardless of creed.

As were the Avons, the St. Louis YMCA ball club was one of the city's best. Mike Maurer, a lefthander, was its great pitcher, Wobbles McLaughlin the catcher, and in the line-up were such as Burt (Birdie) Herzog, Al O'Driscoll, Jack Cronin, Joe Marshke, Pete LeFebvre, Bull Drean, Joe Scribner, and Tony

Dugray. His basketball teams were equally well-known and hard to beat. Maurer starred in basketball, too, along with Frank and Walter Hardy, Charley Faber, Ray Elster, and Bob Bowerman.

Marshke, LeFebvre, and the Hardy brothers all entered the priesthood. Cronin today is head of Fisher Body, Fabor is the DSR's chief accountant, Herzog is a prosperous businessman, and success in one form or another came to all the others.

Later, out of the St. Louis YMCA, came the boy Markey who today is the priest who organized and heads the CYO.

Father Chawke was a big man but his heart was bigger than his tall and athletic figure. He could put his hand on the head of a tike and the youngster felt not only the kindliness of the pat but the sense of being next to greatness.

Yes, he had a church title at his death (monsignor), but he'll always be "Father Chawke" to all of "Father Chawke's boys."

Admiral Blandy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PORTER HARDY, JR.
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Speaker, Admiral Blandy's retirement on February 1, 1950, is a great loss to the Navy which he has served so magnificently for over a third of a century. He is one of the finest officers, one of the ablest, one of the best grounded in the art of naval warfare in the great history of the Navy. Throughout the naval service he was recognized as not only an outstanding leader but one whose remarkable grasp of the strategy, techniques, and tactics of naval warfare made him a truly Navy great, a fitting compatriot of the greatest Navy leaders of the past.

I regret keenly that Admiral Blandy has terminated his active naval service. His departure from the active list will be felt throughout the fleet, and will have an impact on all of the Nation's defense planning. From my personal associations with him, from the associations of my friends in the Navy who have served many years in the Navy with him, I can say with the deepest conviction that the retirement of Admiral Blandy takes from the active list of the fleet one of the finest combat officers I ever expect to know.

I know all my colleagues in the House join me in a rousing "well done" to Admiral Blandy, and will enjoy reading the remarks he made when he turned over command of the Atlantic Fleet to Admiral Fechteler. His statement follows:

REMARKS OF ADMIRAL BLANDY UPON BEING RELIEVED

I wish to take advantage of this final opportunity to thank and congratulate the Atlantic Fleet upon the progress made in the past 3 years.

In spite of two large turn-overs of enlisted personnel since the war, during one of which one-third of the fleet was immobilized by lack of men, you were able to meet all your essential commitments. Those commitments took you from the pleasant waters of the Caribbean to the cold mists and stormy seas of the Davis Strait, and from the Atlantic seaboard to the eastern Mediterranean. I am sure many statesmen will agree with me when I say that the presence of our ships and planes and men in Mediterranean waters and ports has played a major part in strengthening the resolution of countries along Europe's southern coast to reject the slavery of communism.

The Atlantic Fleet today is manned by the finest men it has ever had. Your combat efficiency, already high, is rapidly progressing toward the higher level which your country expects of you. I am pleased with your progress in all forms of training, and I am particularly gratified by the advances made in the past year in all phases of antisubmarine warfare.

I naturally have some regrets at giving up command of the greatest fleet in the world today, which my superiors have entrusted me to hold for 3 years. But that is long enough for any man to hold it; and my regret is tempered by the satisfying knowledge that I am delivering it into the capable hands of my distinguished successor, Admiral William Fechteler.

You can be sure I will always follow the progress of the Navy, and especially the Atlantic Fleet, with the keenest interest. What the future will bring in sea warfare and the air warfare which will always accompany it, cannot now be accurately forecast. Perhaps before I die, warfare on, under, and over the sea will again change as radically as it has during my active service. In any event, I can say with confidence that the Navy's mission of controlling the sea, in order that we may use it as a highway, and keep the enemy's traffic off it, will remain for a great many years a major role in war, involving a wide variety of tasks, and requiring a multiplicity of talents. I fervently hope that our highest leaders responsible for the national defense will always have the wisdom to give the Navy the tools needed to do its complex job.

Certainly at the present time our best hope of peace lies in a strong national defense team, adequately equipped and adequately trained.

In conclusion, I wish to think the American people for the honor and privilege they have accorded me, in permitting me to serve them for the past 40 years. And I thank all of you here, and all others in the Navy and the other armed forces, who have made my 40 years of service such a thoroughly enjoyable and soul-satisfying experience.

Address of Lawrence M. Kocinski

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include the following speech delivered by Lawrence M. Kocinski, national commander of the Polish Legion of American Veterans of the United States, at the grave of Gen. W. Krzyzanowski, at Arlington Cemetery, Virginia:

Comrades, we are gathered here today to honor the memory of Gen. Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski, who died 63 years ago.

But the glory of his deeds lived on beyond him.

Like his compatriots, the immortal Thadeusz Kosciuszko and Kazimierz Pulaski, he was in the forefront of the struggle for our fundamental and basic liberties, for the right of every man to live in freedom, and to live in peace.

Like them, he hated tyranny.

Like them, he was always on the side of justice, democracy, and equal opportunity for all.

These great patriots were the sons of Poland.

And following in their footsteps, and inspired by their noble sacrifice, countless other sons of Poland, countless Americans of Polish parentage, have rallied to the defense of our American ideals whenever these were threatened by a foreign or domestic foe, and have gone forward into battle, to fight for freedom.

They fought in one world war against the oppression of the Kaiser, and they fought in the Second World War to wipe off the face of the world the blot of Hitler butchery, brutality, and crime.

In that titanic struggle for our very civilization, Poland lost 6,028,000 men, women, and children of her population (half of the entire population of the Dominion of Canada).

Of every 1,000 inhabitants, Poland lost 170 at Hitler's hand.

And, in addition, the destruction and ravages of war cost Poland $58,000,000,000.

These losses were greater than those suffered by any nation of the world during the last war.

And because the democratic nations of the world took cognizance of these tremendous losses, and to help Poland rehabilitate herself, they returned to Poland lands which had been a part of Poland in 963.

Today the government of western Germany asks that this land be once more taken away from Poland, and there are some among the statesmen of the democracies who have failed to cry out against this new iniquity, and who are not averse to having these new losses inflicted upon Poland.

We, of the Polish Legion of American Veterans, maintain that because it was Poland that suffered the most tremendous losses of all nations in the last war, because iniquity and injustice must not be rewarded through further injury to their victims it would be a denial of justice—it would be a grievous wrong—to grant our enemies of not very long ago that which they seek.

On these hallowed grounds we affirm our determination: To do everything within our power, as citizens of this greatest democracy in the world, to resist the campaign of vicious propaganda aimed at depriving the Polish people of this land. During the past 5 years Poland has expanded a tremendous effort in that area, and has struggled valiantly to reestablish its economy.

Five million people, brought from other parts of Poland, were resettled on the land.

Today, as we place this tribute upon the grave of Gen. Wlodzimierz Krzyzanowski, as we recall all that he had done to help establish freedom and justice in our own beloved Republic, let us remember, too, the great nation of which he came, a nation that today also pleads for justice.

As veterans of America's own battles, as Americans of Polish descent, it is our sacred duty to continue fighting for the preservation of those principles of equity and justice for which we had battled in two world wars, to preserve that heritage of freedom which our patriots entrusted to us.

We shall ever be on the alert to preserve Poland's western frontier—the frontier of peace itself.

Georgia Legislature Rescinds Humber Resolution for World Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. DAVIS
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on January 24, Mrs. Lola Lee Bruington, executive secretary of the defense committee of the National Society of the Daughters of the American Revolution, issued a news release in Washington regarding the action of the Georgia State Legislature in rescinding its 1946 action in passing the Humber resolution for world government.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this news release herewith, and also a copy of the resolution passed by the Georgia Legislature repudiating the resolution adopted in 1946:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 24.—Action of the Georgia State Legislature rescinding its 1946 action in passing the Humber resolution for world government, was hailed today by the Daughters of the American Revolution as the first victory against world federalist advocates since their drive for a constitutional convention on the subject.

Mrs. Lola Lee Bruington, executive secretary, national defense committee, praised the action of the Georgia House of Representatives for its unanimous vote to rescind the measure, while the Senate voted 34–8.

The new bill called upon the legislators to rescind the action taken by the 1946 legislature in adopting the Humber resolution which called for declaration of a federation of the world.

Mrs. T. Earle Stribling, DAR State chairman for national defense, Atlanta, Ga., led the fight for adoption of the new bill. She was aided by veterans and other patriotic groups.

Mrs. Iris Blitch, only woman member of the Georgia Legislature, declared her stand against world government, and she was supported by Lt. Gov. Marvin Griffin and Speaker of the House Fred Hand. Senator Frank Gross, who introduced the Humber resolution in 1946 and succeeded in having it passed, worked strenuously for its repeal, stating that from additional information gathered, he did not believe that the State of Georgia was ready to back an attempt at federation.

Mrs. Bruington, in issuing this information from DAR national headquarters here, said that her Georgia committee has the full assurance that Gov. Herman Talmadge will sign the new measure.

Whereas the General Assembly of Georgia passed a resolution at the 1946 session of the general assembly approving the principles of world federation; and

Whereas due to changing conditions it is best that Georgia be not considered as one of the 22 States seeking world government; and

Whereas the principles announced in the declaration of the federation of the world as set out in said 1946 resolution are not approved by the general assembly; and

Whereas a copy of said 1946 resolution was sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives in Congress from the State of Georgia: Now therefore, be it

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That said resolution of 1946 be now repudiated and that the General Assembly of Georgia go on record as opposing the principles of world federation; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each of the Senators and Members of the House of Representatives from the State of Georgia.

Passed in Atlanta, Ga., January 1950. Georgia House of Representatives, unanimously; Georgia Senate, 34 to 8.

Effect of Taxation on Our National Economic Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHARLES A. EATON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. EATON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a very important and instructive statement by Mr. George K. Batt on our national economic situation with special emphasis upon the effect of taxation:

STATEMENT BY GEORGE K. BATT, VICE PRESIDENT, DUGAN BROS. OF NEW JERSEY, INC., AND VICE PRESIDENT, NEW JERSEY STATE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, THIRTEENTH ANNUAL CONGRESSIONAL DINNER, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 2, 1950, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C.

We know that you of the New Jersey delegation in Congress are dealing with many issues which gravely affect the fortunes of our country and its people. I doubt whether any previous Congress ever had so large a work load as that which confronts you. And as more laws are enacted which take the Government into new fields, your work load grows rather than diminishes. I would imagine that it has already become physically impossible for any Member of Congress to acquire a comprehensive knowledge of all the important measures that come up for debate and decision.

Doubtless it would help you greatly if more of the folks back home would write you, giving you the facts as they see them about the effect which specific proposals would have upon their daily living and upon the life and development of their communities. It has been my experience that all of you have welcomed such letters; you have often found them helpful. Some of you have, in a friendly way, criticized our New Jersey business men at times for not availing themselves of this opportunity to inform and advise you regarding legislation which will affect them. I hope tonight's meeting will be a step toward correcting this situation.

We are informed that Capitol Hill swarms these days with a bewildering convergence of pressure groups and counter-pressure groups, many of them presuming to speak for people and interests back home. The spenders—those having vested interest in the spending of public funds—are said to be especially active these days. If it is at all reassuring to you, may I say that we of the New Jersey State Chamber come here seeking nothing that will help New Jersey at the expense of Uncle Sam. We have for some years refrained from being a party to any demands for Federal funds for any local purpose. We have urged chambers of commerce and other business groups in New Jersey to do likewise. You will not find us in the pork-barrel parade. On the contrary, we have considered it much more important to all the people of New Jersey that the Federal Government reduce its spending burdens so that we in New Jersey may have more funds to perform those public services which can be best administered at the State and local levels. We are convinced that, all in all, we get more service value for our tax dollars spent at Trenton or in our city halls than we get from those spent in Washington, D. C.

We also believe it vitally important that our Federal budget be balanced without further delay, so as to protect the value of the dollars we spend in our local governments, in our households, and in our business.

The $42,500,000,000 Federal budget proposed for the next fiscal year will cost the people of New Jersey $1,400,000,000 in Federal taxes, plus interest on whatever deficit is incurred.

This $1,400,000,000 Federal-tax burden is nearly three times the total amount of taxes which will be collected in New Jersey this year to finance our State government, all our county and municipal governments, and all our public-school systems combined.

The total amount of all Federal, State, and local taxes collected in New Jersey last year very nearly equaled the total amount of wages and salaries paid by all New Jersey industries.

The Federal Government expects to wind up this year with a $5,500,000,000 deficit, and next year with another about as large. This means an eleven-billion-dollar increase in the Federal debt. The interest on this deficit alone will add some $270,000,000 to the Government's yearly spending burdens. Do you know that New Jersey's share of this increased interest charge will be about $8,500,000? Do you know that $8,500,000 is three times the amount now needed to meet the interest charges on our entire State government debt?

While New Jersey collected $14,767,000 in alcoholic beverage taxes last year, the Federal Government collected $92,574,000 from New Jersey in the same kind of taxes. And our State and local governments do most of the policing of the alcohol industry.

The State government of New Jersey last year collected $9,106,000 in inheritance taxes, while the Federal Government extracted $39,737,000 from New Jersey out of the same tax sources.

Don't you think it's about time we began to take stock of this situation?

We would offer three constructive proposals for consideration by you and your colleagues on Capitol Hill:

First, the answer obviously is not to be found in imposing new Federal taxes. If wartime excises are to be reduced, the reduction should be made on the merits of the case. It should not be conditioned upon increasing other Federal taxes. What is needed is a gradual leveling off of Federal spending, so that the over-all Federal tax burden may be reduced. The President's budget for 1951 includes nearly a billion dollars to initiate 34 new spending programs. We estimate that when these new programs are fully under way, they will add about four billion dollars to the Federal spending budget. This is simply traveling in the wrong direction.

Second, get behind the Federal-State fiscal program of the Conference of Governors, which calls for two things: (1) A step-by-step withdrawal by the Federal Government from tax fields properly belonging to the States; and (2) a gradual curbing of the Federal grants-in-aid evil. This would be done by rejecting proposed new aid measures and by an intelligent cutting of present grants of doubtful necessity. Governor

Driscoll, as you know, has been spearheading the fight for this program, which has won the support not only of most of the governors and legislatures, but of the Hoover Commission and of many thoughtful leaders, including General Eisenhower.

Our third proposal is this: Insist upon and work for congressional approval of the economy proposals of the Hoover Commission. Many of these proposals are being resisted by bureaucratic and other spending lobbies, which, for their own selfish reasons, prefer to see our Government continue to blunder along in the thick morass of inefficiency, duplication, and wasteful spending. We particularly call to your attention those Hoover Commission recommendations which point toward the adoption of the Governor's Conference tax program to which I just referred, and those which would draw the line upon further Government intrusion into public power, banking, medicine, and other fields in direct competition with taxpaying private enterprise.

The time has come for congressional leaders in Washington to recognize the fact that the States and their local governments are still principal component parts of our American system of government. We have confidence in the ability of people at the local level to conduct their public affairs adequately and competently. We have local problems, to be sure. We presently have a State revenue problem. But I repeat this assurance in your presence, that our State chamber is intent upon working with the governor, the legislature, and others interested to bring about a constructive solution to New Jersey's tax problems, to the end that full responsibility for education, police protection, highway development, and the other essential services within the State and local domain may be fully met.

In short, we of New Jersey enterprise cannot help but find ourselves becoming increasingly alarmed at the whole picture of a Central Government growing larger every year—draining an ever-increasing tax income away from our citizens, and competing in more and more ways not only with private enterprise but also with State and local governments.

The concept of a huge Federal Government inevitably clashes with the generally accepted characteristics of our American opportunity system. Business spokesmen groups, such as the New Jersey State Chamber of Commerce, are of one mind in feeling that governmental units should be only as large as they need to be, and not as large as they can contrive to be. And they are of one mind also in feeling that there must be sufficient legitimate freedom for every enterprise and every individual to work and contribute to the fullest for the common good.

To put our economic house in order, and, more fundamentally, to demonstrate that genuinely American principles are to prevail over the monopolistic principle of a large Central Government, three major objectives must be given topmost importance in the efforts of both private citizens and public officials. These three major objectives are:

First, we must bring the cost of government—and this means predominantly the cost of Federal Government—down to a level commensurate with the real cost of performing essential governmental services, and proportionate as well to the ability of both individuals and enterprise to pay the bill without imperiling the flow of money so vital to the continued growth of our system.

Second, we should refrain from enacting and imposing laws and regulations which by every reasonable measure would do nothing but hamper productive enterprise.

And finally, basic to all of our actions, both as citizens or as lawmakers, we should alert ourselves to the lengthening shadow of a socialistic trend in government. This threat places upon each of us a personal responsibility to resist those seemingly worthy legislative proposals and actions of government which cannot help but lead us further down the road to socialism.

Cold Won't Stop Budworm

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the East Oregonian of January 21, 1950:

COLD WON'T STOP BUDWORM

(Western Pine Association Service)

Any hopes that cold weather might freeze out the 2,000,000-acre tree-killing budworm epidemic in Pacific Northwest timberlands were dashed today by the scientific record.

Ernest L. Kolbe, chief forester of the Western Pine Association, said the vast insect horde that menaces billions of feet of fir timber in Oregon and Washington, is "just about frostproof."

"When it comes to cold, the budworms can sure take it," said Kolbe. "In Quebec and Maine they have weathered 40 below zero many times. In eastern Oregon last winter temperatures dropped to 30 below without decimating the budworms. Chances are they could get along fine at the North Pole if they only had some of our nice, juicy needles to eat.

"Reason they are more or less immune to cold is that during hibernation they are well insulated by a silken nest, or cocoon that they spin around themselves. Also, they are protected by bark behind which they hole up for the winter."

"But there's one thing they can't take, and that's DDT," said Forester Kolbe, who heads a private-State-Federal joint action committee formed here a year ago to fight the record-breaking insect outbreak. The group has mapped an aerial-spraying project for this coming spring to cover about 1,000,000 acres of the worst infested areas in the two States. It will be the largest single aerial-spraying job ever undertaken," Kolbe said.

Listed for treatment are various areas in the Blue Mountains, near Walla Walla, Pendleton, Kinzua, La Grande, Enterprise, Wallowa, Heppner, John Day, and elsewhere; also south of Mount Hood, out of The Dalles; the Sisters region, and numerous danger spots west of the Cascades, including several near Roseburg. Last year 270,000 acres, chiefly near Eugene and Oakridge and east of Mount Hood, were sprayed with near-perfect results.

"The budworm," said Forester Kolbe, "is vulnerable only during a period of about 2 weeks in the spring. That's when you have to hit the caterpillars, or not at all. It is a tremendous job to get such a huge spray project ready. We must stock pile a trainload of DDT and line up a veritable armada of specially equipped spray planes, build some roads and airstrips, spot stray storage tanks at strategic points, and have everything ready to go by nature's deadline in May or June."

He said preparatory work is marking time now pending action by Congress on a requested $880,000 emergency appropriation to cover the Federal share of costs. Already the two State governments and private owners of lands to be sprayed have underwritten their shares, totaling $314,000. More than two-thirds of the infested areas to be sprayed are Federal lands.

"We can't even hope to proceed on this huge project without Federal participation," said Kolbe, "and if we don't spray, heavy losses in timber are inevitable. It has to be a three-way cooperative job—private, State, and Federal, as these properties are intermingled. If the United States Government keeps us on tenterhooks on the financing matter beyond mid-February, it will be too late to get ready."

Box Suppers Offer Less Political Nourishment Than Bender's Advice

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an excellent column by Lowell Mellett. I invite particular attention to the wisdom of the advice offered by a former Republican Member of the House, George H. Bender, of Ohio, to those to whom his counsel applies:

ON THE OTHER HAND—BOX SUPPERS OFFER LESS POLITICAL NOURISHMENT THAN BENDER'S ADVICE

(By Lowell Mellett)

This you wouldn't believe if you didn't see it but there it is right in the paper, a two-column paid ad for that Lincoln Day celebration the Republicans have planned as an offset to the annual Jefferson-Jackson Day shindig of the Democrats.

You remember the original announcement concerning this affair. It was to be a dramatic demonstration that the GOP is still the party of Lincoln, the poor man's party. The Democrats might throw $100-a-plate dinners in the name of their twin patron saints, but a more fitting tribute to the founder of republicanism would be a simple dollar dinner. That's what it was to be, a spontaneous, inexpensive expression of the party's loyalty to its original principles. The country would see who are the political plutocrats and who are the plain people.

IDEA DIDN'T TAKE HOLD

But apparently the idea didn't take hold in the manner hoped for and it has become necessary to advertise for customers. So, look what you'll get for your dollar: Fred Waring and his Pennsylvanians. Square dancing and round dancing. Entertainment, with George Murphy and Robert Montgomery, all the way from Hollywood, acting as masters of ceremonies. The dinner? Well, you don't even have to eat that; you can have dinner at home, but there will be complete chicken dinner for an extra dollar if you want it.

Nothing is said in the ad about speeches, but if there are not to be any it surely would say so, since that would help draw a crowd. However, even if they have speeches, it's a good guess that the big hall will be filled and that everybody will have a good time. Presumably they will all go home filled with a new appreciation of the greatness of Lincoln and the fidelity of his party to his principles.

The Jackson-Jefferson Day meal won't draw any more customers—the estimate for each

affair is about 5,000—but there the similarity ends. The Democrats attending will have paid $100 per plate in advance and they will have to listen to speeches. No big name band. No square and round dancing. No Hollywood entertainers. Just a good, wholesome dinner on a red, white, and blue tablecloth. For this and for the love of Harry Truman, Thomas Jefferson, and Andrew Jackson they will pungle up $100 each. At least that's part of the idea, the other part being the profit on the proceedings, which goes into the party's campaign fund.

And presumably the elegant eaters will all go home resolved to be more like Jefferson and Jackson and Truman.

GOP LEADERS IN FIX

Which is enough of nonsense. Seriously the Republican Party leaders should be doing something about the ridiculous fix they are in, as exemplified by these two contrasting celebrations. The answer won't be found in silly box suppers. It will be found in an improved course of action.

"As matters stand now, the Republican Party is in the most difficult position in its history," said George H. Bender, former Ohio Congressman-at-large, writing last May in the National Republican, which he publishes. "It may receive little or no credit for any assistance it may render in the passage of legislation. It will be blamed justifiably for any stand it may take in conjunction with reactionary elements of the Democratic Party. But this dilemma must be faced resolutely.

"It will profit the Republican Party nothing if it chooses the path of obstructionism in the Eighty-first Congress. The political consequences of any conduct which can be interpreted as an unholy alliance with nonprogressive elements must prove catastrophic."

The first half of the Eighty-first Congress has passed into history with little to indicate that many of the party leaders believe Mr. Bender. The second half is under way and the indications haven't greatly changed. But there is still time—unless the Republican leaders really prefer box suppers.

The Church Federation of Greater Chicago Commits Itself Wholeheartedly to the Christian Principles of FEPC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, that my distinguished colleagues in the House may understand the depth and the universality of the public sentiment of the great metropolis of the inland, Chicago, supportive of H. R. 4453, I am extending my remarks, by unanimous leave graciously granted, to include the following letter from the Church Federation of Greater Chicago, which includes Protestant churches of all denominations:

JANUARY 30, 1950.

The Honorable BARRATT O'HARA,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has declared that discrimination in employment because of race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry is unjust; and a denial of Christianity and brotherhood; and that it is favorable to the principle of legislation which would prohibit such discrimination, such as the present House bill H. R. 4453.

We urge you to do everything in your power to bring this legislation to the floor of the House as soon as possible, and to keep it on the floor until a final vote has been taken.

Your party pledged support of a Fair Employment Practices Commission in its 1948 platform. We trust that you will not fail now in securing the passage of adequate FEP legislation.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER R. MINION,
JOSEPH L. ROBERTS,
Cochairmen, Commission on Race Relations.

P. S.—Please sign discharge petition No. 20.

Following is my reply to the above letter:

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. LESTER R. MINION and Mr. JOSEPH L. ROBERTS,
Cochairmen, Commission on Race Relations, The Church Federation of Greater Chicago, Chicago, Ill.

DEAR SIRS: This is to acknowledge receipt of your form letter concerning H. R. 4453. I am happy to note the position taken by the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago in support of legislation aimed at removing discrimination in the opportunity to obtain and hold employment.

Such legislation, reflecting as it does the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God, could not fail to inspire deep sympathetic interest among the men and women whose spiritual strength is maintained and augmented by attendance and worship at the many Protestant churches of all denominations comprising the membership of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago.

It is heartening that your board of trustees has responded to this universal sentiment among Christian people in our community by officially declaring the support of H. R. 4453 by your federation, truly representative of and the spokesman for the United Protestant Churches of Greater Chicago.

You request me to sign discharge petition 20. I am happy to inform you that I was one of the first to sign this petition and that I also signed discharge petition 21, which is of a similar nature. Discharge petition 20 was filed by Representative FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT and discharge petition 21 by Representative ADAM CLAYTON POWELL. It is significant to note as indicating no division among those supporting FEPC that ROOSEVELT signed POWELL'S petition, as well as his own, and POWELL signed both his own and ROOSEVELT'S petition.

As the 1948 national platforms of both major parties pledged support of a Federal Fair Employment Practices Act I see no good reason why any individual Member of the House should not feel free to sign any or all discharge petitions, the objective of which is to bring an early vote on proposed legislation redeeming the pledge of both parties. Certainly if each individual Member applied to his own actions the test of his fidelity to campaign pledges of his own party it is inconceivable that a discharge petition for H. R. 4453 would fail of the required 218 signatures.

Regardless of the fate of the discharge petitions now on the Clerk's desk, I can assure you with the utmost confidence that H. R. 4453 will reach the floor of the House early in this session and be passed by a substantial majority. The sincerity and determination of the President and of the House leadership is beyond question, and I am sure there is equal sincerity and determination that the FEPC bill shall be passed among sufficient numbers of the opposition party.

The action of the board of trustees of the Church Federation of Greater Chicago has been a stimulating contribution, of real value, to a good fight for the good cause of a functioning democracy geared to the conception of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God.

Cordially and sincerely,

BARRATT O'HARA,
Member of Congress.

Relocation of Defense Industries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, California has had the greatest population increase since the war of any State in the Union. The question of employment, therefore, is of first importance. The possibility that a factory may close or a shipyard shut down in a given area is of grave concern not only to the people who live there but to the people of all California.

A number of proposals have been made and continue to be made as to the dispersal of vital industries from both the east and west coasts because of the possibility of eventual air attack upon the continental United States.

Mr. A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., tried to ascertain from Mr. Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, what the policy of the Munitions Board was to be with respect to vital industries on the west coast.

A press release issued by the Chairman of the Munitions Board making public Mr. Howard's letter to Mr. Hayes clearly states the position of the Munitions Board in this matter.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the abovementioned press release; together with Mr. Hayes' letter in acknowledgment of the letter from the Munitions Board:

Hubert E. Howard, Chairman of the Munitions Board, today made public a letter to A. J. Hayes, international president, International Association of Machinists, Washington, D. C., which states that the Department of Defense is not advocating the relocation of defense industries from one area to another.

The Department of Defense program for dispersion of industries, Mr. Howard pointed out, is to encourage separation of vital facilities by at least a few miles.

This reiterates a statement made by Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson before the New England Council, at a meeting in Boston, November 18, 1949, when he said:

"I have been told by three or four of those sitting on this platform as we were in in the ante-room, that you governors and you members of the council have been distressed by publicity and rumor that we of the Department of Defense favor the moving of factories from New England. There isn't and there never has been a word of truth in those rumors. Our job in the Department of Defense is the defense of all America. I do beg of you in accepting that statement of mine, when you build the new plants, don't put them too close together. Put them a few miles apart."

Mr. Howard's letter to Mr. Hayes is made public as a statement of the Department of Defense policy:

"DEAR MR. HAYES: The resolution of December 7, 1949, expressing the position of the International Association of Machinists in regard to the dispersal of defense industries, which was forwarded to the President and the Secretary of Defense, has been received This matter was referred to me as Chairman of the Munitions Board for reply because of our interest and responsibility in the security of vital defense industries.

"The Department of Defense program for dispersion of United States industries is to encourage vital facilities to separate major industrial plants by at least a few miles. For your information a copy of a booklet entitled, 'National Security Factors in Industrial Location,' published by the National Security Resources Board in September 1948, is attached. The general guidance on dispersion to be found in this booklet is being followed by the Department of Defense. Particular attention is invited to the fact that industry is spending 12 to 14 billion dollars annually for new plants and equipment. A substantial portion of these plants are being located in highly industrial areas, thereby increasing such areas' susceptibility to attack. As pointed out in the booklet, the separation of major industrial plants by only a few miles is sufficient to give any single installation considerable protection. When private industry expands existing plants or locates new plants, the benefits to be gained by this comparatively small space can be had without any marked effect on the local economy, dislocation of experienced craftsmen or additional cost to the taxpayers.

"Although modern strategy is based on the fact that any area of the United States can be attacked, the staggering cost in material and energy of such an extensive attack would require that it be planned so as to accomplish the maximum damage to our production facilities. The area of major destruction from an atomic blast generally can be enclosed within a circle of 3 miles radius. The fewer vital plants located within any given 3-mile radius, the less desirable it is as an atomic target.

"The Department of Defense program is to disperse within areas and not to disperse from one area to another. We do not advocate dispersion by the relocation of industries from one area of the United States to another because of the serious social and economic factors involved, such as those pointed out in the resolution. In addition, under our form of government, no executive authority exists to direct private industry to move its plants or its production from one location to another. The transfer of the aircraft plant from Connecticut to Texas, referred to in the resolution, was based on reasons quite apart from security considerations and was financed in its entirety by the company concerned.

"I would like to assure you that the Department of Defense is planning the protection and defense of the entire United States and is not planning the defense of any one area to the detriment of another. Our program for dispersion is designed to make all areas less desirable for an atomic target by advocating that the location of new plants or the expansion of existing plants be made in areas outside of a 3-mile radius from other vital facilities.

"Sincerely,

"HUBERT E. HOWARD, *Chairman.*"

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION
OF MACHINISTS,
Washington, D. C., January 17, 1950.

Mr. HUBERT E. HOWARD,
Chairman, Munitions Board,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HOWARD: This will acknowledge your letter of January 13 which was sent as a result of and in reply to a resolution regarding the dispersal of defense industries, recently adopted by the executive counsel of the International Association of Machinists.

We are greatly pleased to learn that the Department of Defense is not presently contemplating the relocation of industries from one area of the United States to another. The International Association of Machinists is highly in favor of defense plans or a defense program which will adequately protect our people, our industries, and our form of government. It is our considered judgment that this type of protection can be afforded only by the building of adequate defenses to protect all of the vital section of the United States and its Territories.

We are principally concerned with defense because we want to protect our way of life. This, of course, includes our free-enterprise system. We are not in favor of cutting the main arteries of our economic system on the basis of the unilateral judgment of experts in one field. If, in the final analysis this is necessary we favor it, but if possible we prefer adequate defense of all of our country, including our industrial and economic systems.

Respectfully yours,

A. J. HAYES,
International President.

Situation of the Jews in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD today a very interesting study on the Jews in Russia. It was prepared by an able and outstanding scholar, Dr. Sergius Yakobson, who is Chief of the Foreign Affairs Section of the Legislative Reference Service, in the Library of Congress.

This excellent study should help in clearing up a good deal of the misinformation and the many untruths about the Jews in Russia, which have been spread these past few years by individuals and groups who are interested merely in keeping alive the flames of hatred and prejudice. Dr. Yakobson discusses in his study such factors as the number of Jews in Russia, their social composition, their legal position, and the factual situation of Jewish life under the Communist regime. He delves into the causes of the failure of the colonization project at Biro-Bidjan, in the Soviet Far East, which are not generally known.

Most important, however, is the last part of his study which he devotes to an analysis of anti-Semitism in present-day Russia and the Soviet attitude to the State of Israel. He reaches the conclusion, on the one hand, that "the current attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Jews has many of the characteristics of traditional anti-Semitism," and on the other hand, he concludes that "although it has recognized and entered into diplomatic relations with Israel, the Kremlin is determined not only to prevent the Jews in the Soviet Union from emigrating to the new state but even from supporting or manifesting their sympathy with their friends in Tel Aviv."

Mr. Speaker, I commend this brief study to the attention of the Members of this House:

THE JEWS IN THE U. S. S. R.

(By Sergius Yakobson, Chief, Foreign Affairs Section, Legislative Reference Service, Library of Congress)

1. NUMBER OF JEWS

The last Soviet census of January 17, 1939, registered 3,020,141 Jews in the U. S. S. R., establishing them as the seventh most numerous national group after the Russians, the Ukrainians, Belorussians, Uzbeks, Tatars, and Kazakhs. The question of nationality in the 1939 census was given a purely psychological-cultural definition indicating the group with which each individual felt that he and his children were most closely identified.

With the incorporation of the Baltic republic, eastern Poland, and Bessarabia, into the Soviet Union in 1941, about 2,200,000 persons were added to the Soviet Jewish population. Allowing for a slight natural increase, the grand total of Soviet Jews prior to Hitler's attack on Russia in June 1941 amounted to about 5,300,000.

At present, after Hitler's mass extermination of Jews, the numerical strength of the Jewry in Russia is estimated at from two to two and one-half million people.

2. SOCIAL COMPOSITION

The social composition of the Russian Jewry has undergone remarkable changes. It consisted at the turn of the century when the last prerevolutionary census was taken in 1897, of—

	Percent
Merchants, entrepreneurs, and indefinite professions	54.4
Handicraft workers and artisans	29.4
Employees	10
Industrial workers	4
Agricultural workers	2.2

In 1939, prior to the outbreak of the war, the main groups of the Jewish population were:

	Percent
Employees and professionals	48.2
Industrial workers	23
Handicraft workers and artisans	20.8
Collective farmers and individual peasants	5.8
Others	2.2

3. LEGAL POSITION

After the downfall of the monarchy in Russia, the Provisional Democratic Government at St. Petersburg promulgated on April 2, 1917, a decree finally repealing all restrictions and discriminations against Russian citizens of Jewish faith, as well as other minorities. Thus, the end of anti-Jewish legislation in Russia has to be credited to the victory of democratic and liberal forces in the March revolution of 1917. The political freedom which the Provisional Government gave the Jews delighted them to such an extent that they were not interested in deriving any further benefit from the revolution.

The Communist Government of Russia in power since November 1917, proclaimed in one of its first decrees issued on November 15 of the same year, equality and sovereignty of the peoples of Russia and abolition of each and every privilege or restriction based on nationality or religion. Later on, in August 1918, a special statute called upon the Soviet people to fight anti-Semitism by all possible means. The Council of People's Commissars instructed "all Soviet deputies to take uncompromising measures to tear out the anti-Semitic movement by the roots. Pogromists and pogrom agitators were to be placed outside the law." Any kind of hatred against any nation was declared "inadmissible and shameful."

In 1926, the Russian Criminal Code made anti-Semitism a criminal offense. This law stated that incitement to discrimination of any kind was punishable by a jail sentence of up to 2 years; during times of stress, incitement to discrimination was punishable by even longer terms of imprisonment and also by death.

Finally anti-Semitism was outlawed by the Soviet 1936 Constitution. According to article 123 of the Constitution "equality of rights of citizens of the U. S. S. R. irrespective of their nationality or race, in all spheres of economic, state, cultural, social, and political life is an indefeasible law. Any direct or indirect restriction of the right of, or conversely, any establishment of direct or indirect privileges for citizens on account of their race or nationality, as well as any advocacy of racial or national exclusiveness or hatred and contempt, is punishable by law."

Thus, by law, the Soviet Jewry is put on an equal footing with all the other ethnic groups inhabiting Soviet territory. However, neither Judaism nor the Hebrew language is encouraged by the Soviet government. In the words of Dr. Morgenstern, former president of the Hebrew Union College at Cincinnati, "The great Jewish community of Russia is lost to Judaism and perhaps to the Jewish people. Judaism cannot survive in Russia, any more than can any other religion."

Article 124 of the present Soviet Constitution guarantees to all Soviet citizens freedom of religious worship and freedom of antireligious propaganda, but significantly, not the freedom of religious propaganda. As before, organized religious teaching is not permitted in the Soviet Union. Religious instruction, including Hebrew, may be taught children under 18 only privately within the confines of the home.

Like all other Soviet citizens, the Soviet Jews are not permitted, with very rare exceptions, to leave the Soviet Union and migrate to foreign countries. The Soviet Government has also for a long time been violently opposed to Zionism as a "bourgeois movement bound up with foreign imperialism." Lenin himself was the first to suppress the Zionist movement in Soviet Russia.

The attitude of the present Soviet leaders to zionism was best summarized in a talk which Bartley Crum, a member of the Anglo-American Committee on Palestine, had with the powerful Ukrainian Foreign Minister Dmitri Manuiliski in London early in 1946. "He, Manuiliski, in his own city of Kiev, had seen the sufferings of the Jews, he told me," writes Crum. "He knew what they had gone through. He was proud that anti-Semitism was not tolerated in Russia. But he would be less than honest, he added, if he didn't tell me also that there is a large Mohammedan population in the Soviet Union. 'Does Moscow still believe that Zionists are the tools of British imperialism?' I asked. He smiled again. 'They are not active tools of British imperialism, Mr. Crum, but Dr. Weizman and his group have such confidence in the integrity of the British that Russia feels sometimes they are the unconscious tools of British imperialism.'"

4. FACTUAL SITUATION

(a) Jewish life in Russia after the revolution:

The revolution of 1917 put an end to the Jewish ghetto in Russia. But Russian Jewry had to pay dearly for the Communist revolution. The downfall of the Romanov dynasty gave the Russian Jew political equality, but the establishment of the Soviet regime destroyed the foundations of the social and economic life of the Jewish masses in Russia. The so-called Jewish question, which, in 1917, had been solved in the political sphere, now reappeared on the economic plane.

One of the first aims of the Moscow Communist government was the destruction of bourgeois society in Russia. Its economic policy was directed primarily against all forms of private ownership in industry and trade. Russian Jewry became one of the main victims of the Bolshevist experiment. It was estimated that before the revolution 50 percent of the Jews were tradesmen, 40 percent small artisans, 6 to 7 percent belonged to liberal professions, and only 3 to 4 percent were working in the factories or on the land. The Soviet policy led to the pauperization of the Jewish masses. It deprived them of their savings, their means of production, and of hope of employment in the near future. The Russian Jew became a "declassé." Neither Soviet industry, which itself underwent a severe crisis; nor the bureaucracy, which could take only the best-equipped; nor the party, whose numbers were artificially kept very low; nor the black market, condemned in Soviet Russia as "economic prostitution," could absorb the very large number of the unemployed Jewish population. The unemployed Jewish worker tried to become an artisan or to open a little shop. But the ranks of Jewish artisans were soon depleted due to shrunken markets, the lack of tools, and heavy taxation. The Jewish tradesmen, even under the New Economic Policy, were badly handicapped by the lack of goods, prohibitive taxes, and hopeless competition with state and state-protected cooperative trade. Besides, the position of the Jew as a middleman between the town and countryside made him a special suspect in the eyes of the Soviet government. It also endangered his position and nourished anti-Semitism. Particularly hopeless seemed to be the situation of the Jewish youths, who, unless they were members of the Young Communist League, could hardly find a place in the new Soviet society.

How was a solution to be found of this problem of the Jewish masses, which threatened to affect the whole social organism of Communist Russia? As all doors to other occupations seemed to be shut, the settlement on the land and agricultural activities seemed to offer the only logical chance for the regeneration of the Jewish ethnic groups in Russia. This exodus to the land began quite spontaneously, first entirely unorganized and on a purely voluntary basis. The Jews turned first to places close to the towns in which they lived and obtained land as individuals. But soon the land around the towns was no longer free for settling. Many Jews therefore now had to emigrate to new districts farther away from home in order to seek work on the land. They were particularly attracted by the free steppes in the Ukraine, and in 1922 Jews began to migrate thither.

Only as the economic situation became more acute and the number of Jews ready to migrate increased steadily the Soviet government decided to assume control of this colonization. The Committee for Land Colonization of Jewish Toiling Masses (Komzet in Russian, Komerd in Yiddish) was organized in August 1924 with the idea of establishing through migration 100,000 Jewish families in the course of 10 years. But only 10,000 families were settled on the land during 1925 to 1927. During these 3 years only a small part of the expenses was borne by the Government, the greater portion being provided by the foreign Jewish organizations. An official report of the Komzet states that the Jewish organizations from abroad brought in 9,500,000 rubles of the total sum of 14,500,000 rubles.

As a result of this Jewish agricultural colonization in the U. S. S. R. during 1922–27 large Jewish settlements could be formed as nuclei of a series of national Jewish regions. In fact, the Jewish Communist press spoke already of a Jewish republic in the Crimea. However, in 1928, all these plans had been abandoned. The reasons for this change of policy were never explained in the Soviet press. At that time the region of Birobidzhan, in the Soviet Asia was suggested as a substitute. Through an investigating committee sent to the Far East the Komzet discovered that in respect to climate, territorial size, and natural resources Birobidzhan was suitable for Jewish mass immigration and was capable of absorbing economically in compact groups tens of thousands of families. In 1928, the Komzet requested the All-Union Executive Committee of the U. S. S. R. that Birobidzhan be set aside for Jewish colonization as a means of alleviating the plight of the economically and socially uprooted Jewish populace.

Many factors appeared to favor the success of Birobidzhan project. The settlement of Jews was to be carried out in a territory connected by land with the motherland. True enough, it was situated thousands of miles from the original homes of the Jews but these need not face the difficulties of an overseas migration. Further, the two contracting parties usually responsible for the operating of different settlement projects—vis, the government of the territory selected for settlement and the agency responsible for the project—were here identical, to wit, the Soviet Government. This eliminated a good deal of friction, facilitated the planning of the project, and its execution. Besides, the Soviet State was prepared to take upon itself the bulk of the expenses for melioration work, extensive drainage, clearing of forests, etc., without exacting the repayment of the allotted funds.[1] Birobidzahn—unlike the ordinary settlement projects—was an economically diversified entity. Agricultural and industrial colonization went hand in hand. The natural features of the region favored such a development. Birobidzhan had both plenty of fertile land and an abundance of timber and mineral resources. Finally, the settlement of Jews in Birobidzhan took place in an almost uninhabited country upon which no local populations had claims.

There is no doubt that some degree of economic progress was achieved in Birobidzhan. However, in spite of economic achievements, Jewish mass settlement in Birobadzhan resulted in a threefold failure.

1. Birobidzhan did not become a sanctuary or a spiritual center for the entire toiling Jewish population. In fact, only a small number of non-Soviet Jews, altogether 784 persons (101 from Lithuania, 83 from Latvia, 116 from Argentina, and the rest from Poland and Palestine) were reported to have come to Birobidzhan. The agreement signed in 1936 by the American Committee for the Settlement of Foreign Jews in Birobidzhan (Ambidzhan) with the Soviet Government for the admission of an initial quota of 1,000 Jewish families from Poland has never been put in force, and nothing came of the promise made by the Soviet Government in the spring of 1938 that in the course of the year 4,500 foreign Jews would be settled in Birobidzhan.

2. Birobidzhan did not become the national home for Soviet Jewry; it also did not become a Soviet Jewish state. At least until 1939—and this is still the case today—the Jews remained a minority in the Jewish autonomous region. Thus, the results, in spite of the steadily increasing total number of Jews in Birobidzhan, in no way measure up to the high expectations for mass migration to this country. The goal was the settling in the first 10 years of approximately 150,000 to 200,000 Jews. But in 1939, 11 years after the beginning of the Birobidzhan project, only 40,000 Jews, according to pro-Soviet figures

[1] Between 1928 and 1932, government appropriations for Birobidzhan amounted to 9,250,000 rubles. The Ozet (a society to assist Jewish colonization) furnished 2,400,000 rubles. Later both the government appropriations for Birobidzhan as well as contributions of voluntary organizations (labor unions, factories, etc.) showed substantial increases.

(23,000 according to conservative estimates), were present in the Jewish autonomous region.

Due to the lack of accurate and complete Soviet official statistics the figures given by private investigators on the population movement in Birobidzhan differ in detail but all of them agree as to the tremendous turnover in Jewish settlers. An extremely high number of Jews who migrated to Birobidzhan came as immigrants but turned out to be only visitors. About a half, or at the best 75 percent of the Jews who migrated to Birobidzhan in the years 1928–36, became permanent settlers in the region, while the others either returned home or left Birobidzhan for the neighboring provinces.

3. The problem of reconciling simultaneous agricultural and industrial colonization with an establishment of an organic and sound relationship between the city and the countryside was not solved in Birobidzhan. We are here faced with the same phenomenon of flight from the land familiar to us from other settlement enterprises and the economies of nonsocialist countries. Only a part of the Jewish settlers in Birobidzhan remained on the land; the greatest majority settled in, or moved at the first opportunity to, the towns of Birobidzhan, preferably to the largest city, that is Birobidzhan—where, in 1939, about one-half of the population of 40,000 was Jewish. The Jewish agriculturists in Birobidzhan were also attracted by the glamor of the neighboring towns of Khabarovsk and Vladivostok, the rapid growth of which can at least partly be traced back to the infiltration of the Jewish element.

"What do we desire?" complained the chairman of the Presidium of the Central Executive Committee of the Soviet Union, Kalinin, at a meeting on August 8, 1936. "Do we desire to create a new western region, a Jewish population in the cities and a non-Jewish one in the villages? What kind of a national Jewish state will this become?"

Furthermore, physical hardships and psychological hurdles handicapped the colonizing effort. The conquest of this virgin land proved to be more than a match for quite a number of Jewish settlers with very little or no previous farming experiences. The Jews who came to Birobidzhan—but for a few exceptions—were no pioneers, but average, everyday Soviet citizens. No pioneering urge or spirit of adventure but sheer necessity, unemployment, social dislocation put the poverty-stricken Russian Jew on the way to Birobidzhan. Therefore, it is hardly surprising that, as soon as changes for the better occurred at home, the chief incentive for moving to Birobidzhan instantly disappeared. The chances of making a living in the old country or, preferably, in Moscow and other large Russian industrial centers, mainly accounted for the Jewish reemigration from Birobidzhan, as well as for the set-back to Jewish eastward migration.

In order to overcome the crisis in the Jewish migration to Birobidzhan it was proposed that the Commissariat for Internal Affairs and the secret police aid in recruiting, selecting, and transporting settlers. This introduced an element of forced migration but was officially justified by the need for special precautions in settling border districts.

The Jewish mass migration to Birobidzhan was a failure. It is still an undeveloped, underpopulated "backward" country. There is still a huge reservoir of almost untapped natural resources, of fertile land, water power, timber, and minerals. There still remains the unique geopolitical and geoeconomic position of this region on the confines of the Soviet Far East and Manchuria. The proximity of iron and coal reserves can make Birobidzhan into a powerful metallurgical base of the Soviet Union, even overshadowing the Donets Basin and the Kuzbass, and the configuration of the three rivers—Amur, Ussuri, and Sungari—makes Birobidzhan a land of great promise. But it is hardly to be expected that future settlers of Birobidzhan will be Jewish. Much speaks against it.

(b) Anti-Semitism in present-day Russia.

The legal and social segregation of the Jews in Russia disappeared after 1917 and a high percentage of Soviet Jews were absorbed into the ranks of ordinary Soviet citizens through frequent intermarriage with the Russians and through voluntary assimilation. Anti-Semitism and the primitive rather emotional anti-Semitic prejudices among the different nationalities of the U. S. S. R. are, however, still in existence in the Soviet Union of today.

They continued in the first years after the revolution in spite of the official policy of the Communist government. Remnants of the anti-Jewish feeling persisted and while it was not widespread, sporadic outbursts of anti-Semitism occurred.

The survival of anti-Jewish prejudices even became a part of the general picture. As early as 1921, on his visit to Georgia, Stalin, for instance, was astonished at the lack of the former solidarity among the workers of the various trans-Caucasian nationalities. "Among the workers and peasants," he complained, "nationalism has developed; suspicion against their own comrades of other races has strengthened; there are far too many — anti-Armenian, anti-Tatar, anti-Georgian, anti-Russian and other such nationalistic expressions to be heard."

The new wave of anti-Semitism was even reflected in the proletarian literature of the period: a number of articles by Maxim Gorky and other noted writers deploring the anti-Semitic tendencies of some of their colleagues were published.

Anti-Semitic excesses continued to occur, however, and the Government was compelled to enforce the law vigorously. Conductors were required to stop trolley cars and have militia men arrest passengers, sober or drunk, who uttered anti-Semitic invectives or cast aspersions upon the Jews or other minorities of the multinational Soviet state. In 1928 the press denounced anti-Semitic manifestations. All cases were thoroughly investigated and offenders severely punished. Schools, factories, farms, offices, and trade unions were instructed to expel members guilty of such action. In March 1932, two anti-Semitic judges at Krasnoyarsk were dismissed; 1 month later a Kharkov court passed a death sentence on five Ukrainian peasants found guilty of raiding a Jewish colony and killing several Jews. Anti-Semitism was particularly rampant among the Crimean Tatars.

Later in the thirties, when Hitler's accession to power in Germany and the expansion of the Japanese to the Asiatic mainland promoted the rise of nationalism in the Soviet Union, anti-Semitic feeling in Russia received an additional impetus. A Jew became now identified as a Trotskyist. By repeated actions and purges of Trotskyists, the left international wing of the Communist Party was completely decimated in Soviet Russia and simultaneously the radical Jewish element with a few exceptions disappeared from the Moscow government. By the end of 1938, all the outstanding leaders, up to 100, of the Jewish Communist group in Soviet Russia were liquidated. The Jewish press was suppressed. Russification of Jewish cultural life progressed rapidly. At the same time all contact with Jewish foreign organizations interestd in Birobidzhan was interrupted, and even some of their representatives were imprisoned. "You Jews," said Stalin to the German writer, Feuchtwanger, in 1937, speaking of Radek, "have created one eternally true legend—that of Judas." Jews who formerly played a conspicuous role in the Soviet bureaucracy were dropped now en masse from the neo-Nationalistic Soviet Government, the Soviet Diplomatic Corps, and the high offices in the various agencies of the Soviet administration. Even during the recent war, the United Press correspondent in Moscow, Harrison Salisbury, never saw at the Soviet Foreign Office a young Jewish attaché around the place, and he had a feeling that blond Nordic types were preferred. And in the late thirties it was a popular Soviet joke to compare Stalin with Moses for having achieved the exodus of Jews from the central executive committee of the Soviets.

The recent war years, the time of terrible hardships in Russia, strengthened furthermore the anti-Semitic sentiment in various Soviet quarters. They even revived the old accusation of Jews dodging active military service in spite of the fact that the Soviet Jewry ranked fourth among the national groups receiving Soviet military decorations. A total of 123,822 Jewish Red Army fighters and war workers received the Order of Lenin, the Order of the Red Banner, the Medal of the Patriotic War, and other Soviet medals and orders.

The growth of anti-Jewish feeling in wartime Russia forced even Ilia Ehrenburg to speak openly against this dangerous development at a meeting of the Jewish anti-Fascist Committee in Moscow in March 1943. And it is remarkable that in view of the strength of anti-Semitism in Russia, in none of the Soviet war slogans or posters has there been particular reference made to the plight of the Jewish people under the Nazi regime. The Soviet leaders avoided scrupulously any chance of being accused of waging a Jewish war. After the end of hostilities, the anti-Semitic sentiment in Russia seemed to have subsided to some extent. However, new anti-Jewish excesses were caused by the return of the Jewish evacuees from their evacuation places in Russia to their old homes in the war-devastated regions of the Soviet Union with their terrible housing conditions. And a new and significant turn in Stalin's national policy is finally indicated in his address of May 24, 1945. Here Stalin spoke openly for the first time of the Russian people as the most outstanding nation of all the other nations forming the Soviet Union and as the leading force of the Soviet Union. Thus, the Soviet dictator is inclined now to put the Russian people in the same privileged position with regard to other Soviet peoples as the one which the Communist Party enjoys as the "vanguard and the leading core of all organizations of the working people" with regard to the proletariat of the Soviet Union.

As early as 1903 Lenin attacked the Jewish Bund, which was a Jewish socialist organization founded in 1897, on the ground that the Jews were not a nation and that their destiny lay in being assimilated by the people of the area where they resided. Lenin condemned the bund for trying to combine Zionist views with those of socialism, insisting that "the idea of a Jewish nationality is contrary to the interests of the Jewish workers and engenders in them a feeling of hostility toward assimilation."

Stalin has also attacked the Bund in an article republished in 1946, but actually written much earlier. Stalin contended that the Jews were not a nation because they "did not have a broad stable section tied to the land which naturally consolidates a nation." Only 3 or 4 percent of the several million Russian Jews were engaged in agriculture, Stalin pointed out, and he implied that for this reason they would be assimilated. He considered the Bund to be contrary to the purposes of the proletarian revolution and was, therefore, to be opposed.

With the advent and establishment of a Jewish state in the Near East, Soviet warnings against Zionism became strong and explicit. During 1948 articles began to appear in the Soviet press warning Soviet Jews that

their future lay in the Soviet Union and not in Israel. The famous journalist Ilya Ehrenburg, himself a Jew, repeated in the Communist Pravda of September 21, 1948, the old Communist concept that the fate of the Jews lay in their being assimilated in the countries in which they were living and that the idea of an international Jewish culture was mystical. And a month later the Jewish newspaper Einikeit reminded the Jews that while their sympathy should be with the Israeli proletarians struggling against capitalism, they should not "consider Israel their homeland." In short, although it has recognized and entered into diplomatic relations with Israel, the Kremlin is determined not only to prevent the Jews in the Soviet Union from emigrating to the new state but even from supporting or manifesting their sympathy with their friends in Tel Aviv.

Coincident with this opposition to Zionism within the Soviet Union has appeared a chauvinistic prejudice against "international bourgeois culture" or "cosmopolitanism" which is, to a large degree, identified with Jewry.

During 1949 the campaign of the Soviet Government against "antipatriotism" and against other deviations and "errors" in the realms of art, literature, the theater, and other cultural activities assumed to a great extent an anti-Semitic coloring. In a very prominent position among those thus attacked were persons with Jewish names. In numerous instances Russian names were followed by the original Jewish names in parentheses. "Cosmopolitanism," which was largely identified with Jewish international culture, was harshly castigated. In particular Jewish literary critics in the Soviet Union were pictured as living corpses, renegades, men wearing traitor's masks, and they were accused of playing up the "cosmopolitan idea of the existence a world-wide Jewish literature and of putting Soviet writers on a par with burned-out businessmen of America and Palestine."

These officially inspired press attacks did also assault the Jewish religion. The novel, Years of Life, by Alexander Isbakh, was, for instance, taken to task for propagandizing in favor of and describing in detail the services in a synagog.

Thus it may be said that the current attitude of the Soviet Union toward the Jews has many of the characteristics of traditional anti-Semitism which hardly can encourage or terrify the Russian Jews into "resigning themselves to spend the rest of their days in the Soviet Union under a dictatorship," as pointed out by Joseph Newman in his recent series of articles on Soviet Russia which were published in the New York Herald Tribune.

VA "Fight's On" Over Hoover Commission Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, there is printed herewith a radio talk made by me during the past week:

Friends and fellow Americans, an evening broadcast is opened with the statement, "Soup's on." Let me open this report with the statement, "Fight's on."

Over WHFB, local chambers of commerce have been urging the folks to write their Congressman to support the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They did.

The writers wanted economy and efficiency in the Federal Government. So do I, and, unless we get it—and that right soon—everyone is going to pay—as the old expression has it—through the nose—whatever that may mean.

Through the generosity of WHFB, I was given opportunity to reply to those requests, and then stated what I thought everyone knew—that I, too, was for more economy, greater efficiency, in the Federal Government.

The home folks were advised that, as the various bills designed to put the Hoover Commission's recommendations into operation came before the Congress, those who thought they would be adversely affected would vigorously oppose them.

The expected has happened. Today the battle is on. The Hoover Commission recommended changes in the Veterans' Administration. From veterans, from veterans' organizations, the letters are now pouring in, opposing the recommended changes.

Typical of the American Legion's position is a letter dated January 12, 1950, from R. Gerald Barr, commander of the American Legion, department of Michigan.

I quote Mr. Barr:

"The American Legion, as you will recall, carried on a great fight for many, many years to see that veterans' rights were placed under a single, central agency so that there might be greater efficiency in the management and coordination of veterans' benefits. This fight, which was carried on for many years, finally resulted in 1929 in the creation of the Veterans' Administration under which all veterans' benefits and their coordination and management were placed. The Veterans' Administration has continuously operated for some 20 years since that date.

"Although there is constantly room for increased efficiency in the Veterans' Administration, we believe that its record since 1929 has been a creditable one; certainly greater efficiency has been promoted by having all phases of the veterans' program under the same roof where immediate reference can be made to master indexes and master files for many phases of the veterans' program. We in the American Legion are wholeheartedly in favor of seeing the veterans' program administered under a central agency where greater efficiency can at all times be realized.

"However, we do not oppose the recommendations of the so-called Hoover Commission as a whole or in their entirety. We are very much opposed to those recommendations as they pertain to veterans."

On the other hand, the Washington branch of the Citizens Committee for the Adoption of the Hoover Report, on the 25th, last, announced that it was only trying to improve service to the veterans by reorganizing the veterans' agency, which has been attacked even by professional veterans organizations' leaders for slowness and inefficiency in handling claims.

It issued the following statement—and I quote:

"Those leaders of veterans' organizations who are maintaining that the Veterans' Administration does not need a major reshuffling must be creating considerable surprise among their members who have had to wait 6 weeks for a letter to be answered, or who know a veteran's widow who has had to wait four times as long to collect on her husband's National Service life insurance policy as is required to collect from an insurance company.

"We are sure that most members of veterans' organizations will greet some claims of their leaders with healthy skepticism. The Hoover report would definitely speed up and improve the service to veterans—and the veterans know there is plenty of room for improvement."

The Hoover Commission Task Force which investigated the VA was headed by a former Legion national commander, Col. Franklin Dolier, of Newark, N. J.

The Task Force found, for example, that, in the handling of veterans' insurance, the Government agency employed four times as many clerks per policyholder as do commercial companies.

That Task Force also recommended merging veterans' hospitals in a general Medical Administration; recommended transferring the GI home loan programs to the regular Federal Housing Agency; giving the Interior Department the responsibility for construction of veterans' hospitals.

On January 25, George M. Craig, national Legion commander, held a conference with President Truman. Then, on the 26th, he talked the situation over with former President Herbert Hoover. It is understood that he told both gentlemen that the Legion would fight the proposed changes at the polls.

So here in Washington, Congressmen are on the spot.

Junior chambers of commerce no doubt many of their members Legionnaires—millions of citizens throughout the country, insist they want economy and that we'll get it if we adopt the Hoover Commission's recommendations.

Present officials of the Legion and no doubt all other veterans' organizations and individual veterans say, "Yes, we, too, are for economy, but"—as Department Commander Barr wrote me—and again I quote—"we are very much opposed to those recommendations as they pertain to veterans."

If the former national commander of the Legion who recommended the changes is all for them, and if the present commander of the Legion is all against them, what is a dumb Congressman to do?

One thing this dumb Congressman does know—and no one is going to argue him out of it—and that is that a lot of veterans, veterans' widows, veterans' dependents, are writing him for help in adjusting their differences with the Veterans' Administration, and he'll sure be glad of a procedure which will give the veteran better service, people generally less expense in connection with the administration of veterans' affairs.

Prayer To Make Democracy Worth Defending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, a real old-timer of the desert is Alice Salisbury, of Barstow, Calif., a fine and growing city of the Mojave Desert region. No longer young, Alice Salisbury still has the vigor and forthrightness, the optimism and belief in the future of the pioneer woman. She has composed a prayer which in this day of struggle echoes the aspirations of millions of Americans. I place this prayer in the RECORD where it may be read by many:

PRAYER TO MAKE DEMOCRACY WORTH DEFENDING

God of our Fathers, we thank Thee for America, her fertile plains, her majestic

mountains, her age-old forests, and the treasures that lie in her bosom.

We thank Thee for the heritage of faith and courage and fortitude that our Nation-building forefathers entrusted to our keeping.

We thank Thee for the pattern that they wrought for our guidance—crusade against tyranny, defense of the rights of the individual, preservation of the institutions of democracy.

Now, O Lord, when the forces of greed and untruth are again threatening the citadels of civilization, we, the wives and mothers of America, pray that we may come to know the true meaning of democracy, the democracy born of the agony of Valley Forge and nurtured in the heart of martyred Lincoln.

O God, make us large enough in word and thought and deed to face valiantly the problems besetting our Nation, and at the same time help us to bring unprejudiced minds to an understanding of the problems of other people struggling today to emerge from war ruin into strong and sustaining national life. To that end, O God, guard us against racial intolerance and denial of world brotherhood.

Above all else, help us to make our homes strongholds of true democracy; help us to fortify those homes against false and misleading doctrines; help us to teach the children those homes shelter, to face clear-eyed the hideous aspects of war, without weakening their belief that liberty is worth dying for.

Help us to convince these children of ours that the very existence of civilization is at stake today, and that we are calling upon them to become guardians of that civilization. Help us to teach them by precept and example that the patriotism of today calls for a courage, fortitude, and honesty, a capacity for labor, self-sacrifice, and self-discipline such as America and the world may never need more urgently.

Help us, O Lord, to make democracy here in our United States worth defending against the onslaughts of tyranny, greed, intolerance, and unbelief.

ALICE SALISBURY.

Some of the Meanderings of Nebraska's Reactionary Republicans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, comes now David Martin, of Kearney, Nebr., attorney and counselor at law, and proctor in admiralty, and also Republican State chairman from Nebraska, a man whose forebears were shrewd enough to elude, some people say, the mountain feudings of the Coys, and with high hope and stout voice starteth to maketh by caravan, of either one or two automobiles, an extensive trip through now prosperous rural Nebraska, with the avowed, fell purpose and intent of recapturing the farm vote lost by the Republican Party in Nebraska at the last election.

This election blow delivered by the Nebraska farmers to the very pit of the elephant's stomach seems by coincidence to have been as identically severe as an 80-day cool-off period of the Taft-Hartley law to labor after the issuance of a "yellow-dog injunction" because the caravan comes creeping about 80 days after the blow.

The old fear plays of what will happen to you if you do not vote Republican and the old squeeze plays of the banks and holders of the mortgages and the dispensers of the credits, are all things of the past. The farmers of Nebraska have not only grown to be ultra courageous but also exceedingly smart since the awful, suffering days of President Hoover.

The Nebraska farmers have paid up their mortgages and notes, now pay cash as they go, and have money in the bank, and sometimes own the blamed old bank since the Democrats took over the reins of National Government, and the Democratic Party put its kindly, sheltering arms about the shoulders of the troubled Nebraska farmers.

I am sure that Mr. Martin by this time realizes that all of the farmers of today "can see above the grass in the summertime and the snow banks in the wintertime." Although the soil of Nebraska is most fertile, even the river-bottom slough grass does not grow that tall anymore, and when the blizzards come the Democrats, if need be, under the able direction of that great Democratic engineer from Alabama, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, can dig them out if need there be.

I am sure that Mr. Martin will have his ingenuity taxed to the utmost in trying to figure out some plausible recapture conversational methods, for that is the only method left for reactionary, greedy, and selfish Republicanism to pursue in Nebraska or elsewhere.

I wonder if Mr. Martin will tell the farmers and other Nebraskans that the Republican Party in the Eightieth Congress made the wartime excise taxes permanent so as to give the big boys a big income tax cut, that that same Congress cut off all money for grain storage bins in an effort to force grain storage into the private grain elevators and if need be force the grain which they could not store on their farms, on the market at less than could be secured from a Government loan; that that same Congress was against a 90-percent parity for basic farm crops, and passed a sliding scale parity law providing for a base 75 percent and a high of 90 percent of parity so as to tumble the prices of basic farm crops and make the farmer again the legitimate financial prey of the now financially lean middlemen who were wont to farm the farmers; and many other unfriendly legislative gestures which time will not permit me now to call my readers attention to.

I do not suppose that Mr. Martin will call the farmers' attention to any of these wrongdoings, but I feel sure that the farmers will remind him of them and hereafter steer their future political courses far, far away from the Republican help which blighteth and destroyeth farmers and those who are dependent upon farmer's incomes for their own livelihood.

In conclusion I want to direct your attention to the following news story which appeared in the Lincoln (Nebr.) Star, a liberal Democratic newspaper, on January 31, last, and written by Ray Hansen, one of its staff members:

DENNEY HITS ACTIONS OF GOP LEADERS—"PARTY OF OLD PEOPLE" POLICY IS UNDER ATTACK

(By Ray Hansen)

FAIRBURY, NEBR.—The dilemma facing the Republican Party was exemplified in Fairbury Tuesday.

The party wants—and needs—votes, but it doesn't want to sacrifice the cherished principles that made America great to get them.

That is well pointed out in two observations of a young Fairbury attorney when the GOP caravan held its second meeting of the second week of its cross-State tour here Tuesday. He exorcised the leaders for making the GOP a party of old people, and reprimanded State leaders for getting radio commentator Fulton Lewis as a speaker for Founders Day.

The attorney was Max Denney, unsuccessful candidate for the State chairmanship last November.

Denney, who is chairman for the legislative district in Jefferson County, set forth his views in a brief talk to party leaders who are conducting the tour. He said Republicans should answer affirmatively every issue they face. "Unless there are constructive answers to all questions," he declared, "the party will continue to lose votes."

In particular need of all the answers are county precinct workers, Denney said. "And it is the job of State headquarters to provide the answers," he added.

URGES RENEWED VIGOR

Sixteen farmers, workers, businessmen, and housewives turned out to hear State Chairman David Martin, of Kearney, plead for renewed vigor of party workers. Accompanying Martin were National Committeewoman Edna Batson Donald, of Grand Island, and John Binning, Lincoln attorney representing Young Republicans.

Vice Chairman Eve Bowring, of Merriam, and Finance Chairman Joseph Wishart, of Lincoln, who were with the caravan on the first week of its tour, returned to their homes over the week end when hit by flu.

The ostensible purpose of the meeting is to get the feeling of what the common people want from the Republican Party.

But that does not seem to be followed. For instance, Chairman Martin tells the handful who gather for each meeting that the party leaders are here to get your ideas on what the party should do.

But he then proceeds to tell the workers what should be done, by stressing the evils of the Democratic administration, the dangers of socialism, and why the party should make deficit spending the main issue of their attack. Declared Martin, "It seems to me you're more concerned with the money being spent than anything else."

The minor leaders who follow Martin then echo his assertions.

Binning emphasizes the importance of interesting young people in party work. He urges county leaders to give young men and women offices of responsibility.

Following the meetings, Martin meets with the county chairmen and they revise the list of precinct workers—in some cases cutting away deadwood and injecting new blood.

The one-car caravan left Fairbury at noon and went to Beatrice, where they will meet with Gage County leaders late Tuesday. On Wednesday they go to Pawnee City, Thursday to Auburn, and late Friday to Lincoln.

Alaska and Hawaii Statehood Vital to National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following statement made recently by Hon. FRED L. CRAWFORD, of Michigan, on Alaska and Hawaii statehood which appeared in the Hearst papers throughout the Nation:

ALASKA, HAWAII STATEHOOD VITAL TO DEFENSE OF UNITED STATES—ADMISSION WOULD BE LETHAL BLOW TO RED COLD WAR

(By FRED L. CRAWFORD, Representative in Congress from Michigan)

WASHINGTON, January 21.—Congress must grant Hawaii and Alaska statehood—now.

The reasons are imperative.

They are key areas of our strategic defense against Russia.

They are key areas in our cold war against the world spread of communism.

As Territories they are weak.

As States they would be strong.

Japan struck at both Territories in World War II.

Hawaii and Alaska today are the prime targets under the American flag of the most powerful enemy that has ever threatened the United States.

Statehood would strengthen them internally.

And statehood would vastly strengthen America's position in the ideological and economic conflict now being waged by Russia throughout the Pacific.

Proof that was given me on my recent tour of all our island possessions in the Pacific, Japan, the Philippines, Okinawa, Hong Kong, and other parts of the Orient.

It substantiated completely earlier impressions I had gained on visits to Alaska and other territorial possessions.

The actions of our Government toward its territories speak louder to the peoples of the Orient and the Pacific than all the flossy double talk emanating from our State Department.

We will be on the losing end of the cold war in the Pacific as long as we limit the peoples of Hawaii and Alaska to a mere territorial status.

Today Communists everywhere can and do make capital of these admittedly unfortunate facts:

1. Hawaii, an area with a population greater than that of 11 of our sovereign States, has no vote in Congress and no voice in the Senate of the United States.

2. Alaska, with an area one-third as large as our entire continental United States, likewise has no vote in Congress or voice in the Senate.

3. They are excluded from even discussions of foreign relations within the appropriate committees of the House and Senate.

4. Their citizens contribute richly in taxes to the Federal Treasury—without representation.

5. Their people, their business enterprises and their investments in recent years have been denied even Federal protection.

As territories, both Hawaii and Alaska have been powerless to deal with paralyzing strikes which Harry Bridges' Pacific longshoremen's union either engineered or in which his union has been actively involved.

Bridges is now on trial in the United States District Court in San Francisco on perjury charges that he swore falsely at a naturalization hearing in 1945 that he never was a Communist.

There is voluminous testimony before that trial that he is or was a Communist and a leader among Communists.

As Territories, Hawaii and Alaska are helpless to deal with such types.

CRUCIAL ROLE

As States they could protect the interests of their citizens and their economy at least to a greater degree than they can now or have been able to during recent strangling strikes.

Statehood is more important to Hawaii and Alaska.

It is even more important to the United States that Hawaii and Alaska become States.

Theirs is a crucial role in our national destiny.

They are our western bastions of defense.

They represent to the peoples of Asia, the Orient, and the Pacific the one example of unity and equality among the three great Pacific racial groups.

In their Territorial activities Hawaiians and Alaskans have long demonstrated the highest qualities of citizenship and abilities for self-government under the free American system.

Hawaii and Alaska are entitled to statehood and statehood will enable them to more effectively fill their vital roles.

Consider these roles separately.

Alaska as a vast Territory of very great, yet unmeasured, resources.

We are spending money up there as if we intended to use Alaska as a buffer between the United States and Russia, which lies only across a narrow strip of water where the two countries almost touch.

CANNOT CONTINUE

The United States has set itself up as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

Unless Alaska does serve as a strong buffer between Russia and ourselves, the United States cannot continue indefinitely as a buffer between Russia and the rest of the world.

It is as simple as that.

The United States needs Alaska as a State.

It needs Alaska much more than Alaska needs the United States.

It needs Alaska's space, her strategic geographic position, her industry, her resources, and her potential products.

We need everything Alaska has—fish, timber, minerals, oil—and everything that Alaska can develop and produce.

We need them in relation to our industrial and economic position, and in relation to the international obligations we have assumed throughout the world.

NEEDS PEOPLE

Alaska needs people, lots of people, in addition to its present population which today is larger than that of a third of our States when they were admitted to the Union.

She needs people to develop her vast resources.

Alaska needs transportation so that tonnage to build industries and defenses can move to Alaska, and the products and raw materials of Alaska can move to us.

To Alaskans this means a railroad, and it should mean the same thing to us.

A railroad is the only safe and economic method of transportation that can be provided.

Ocean transportation to Alaska has been shut off repeatedly by maritime union strikes.

POWERFUL INFLUENCE

Every strike has impaired our defense program in Alaska.

Russian submarines would menace our sea lanes in event of war.

The Alcan Highway is a dusty road that starts far north of Edmonton and is connected with closer highways only by an unimproved dirt road constantly in bad condition.

This is because Canada's railroads exert powerful influence in Canada and they want it that way.

What is needed is a railroad east of the coastal range where it could be defended and where it would supply both Alaska and Canada with transportation for their goods and people, and transportation of goods and people from Alaska and Canada to the United States.

In the face of Russia's huge submarine program and her vast construction program across the Bering Straits from Alaska, a railway to Alaska is a must.

What does this have to do with statehood? This:

Alaska needs—and we need—two Alaskans in the United States Senate who can inform us about Alaska and her needs, both economic and for defense. We need their voice, their action, and their vote.

Alaska needs—and we need—a Representative in the House who has a vote.

BENEFIT TO ALASKA

Alaska would benefit—the United States would benefit—and, I believe, our international relations in view of the obligations we have assumed to help most of the world, would benefit as well.

Hawaii is in a somewhat different position, but is just as much entitled to statehood as Alaska, although for somewhat different reasons.

Militarily, Hawaii stands at one corner of our inner Pacific defense triangle that extends from Alaska's mainland down to Hawaii and across to our Pacific Coast.

Hawaii also is a pivot for our outer Pacific defense triangle that extends southward to encompass the Pacific islands now under our trusteeship, Samoa and Guam; extends westward to Okinawa, and extends north to the tip of the Aleutians.

Hawaii has almost reached the zenith of her agricultural development and resources.

LOYAL POPULATION

Her population is large and relatively stable. Her people are industrious and loyal. Hawaii is American. In every way Hawaii is the equivalent of States with similar populations—except that she is not a State.

Hawaii has met all qualifications of statehood ordinarily required by Congress and definitely should be a State.

Statehood for Hawaii would have priceless value to the United States in the Pacific and in our international relations with the world.

Only in Hawaii have the cultures of the Orient, of Micronesia and Polynesia, become completely absorbed within the American concept of human dignity and government under law.

The mere knowledge that Hawaii has been granted statehood would have dynamic effect throughout Oceania and the Orient.

It would be the greatest blow to Stalin and communism in the Orient that America could deliver, for it would prove this:

Where Russia can only offer slavery, starvation and loss of face, the United States has offered to a population that includes their racial strains full partnership as a State.

Let us achieve this victory in the cold war in the Pacific now.

Make Hawaii a State.

United States Neglects Own Defense While Bolstering Allies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 5, 1950:

UNITED STATES NEGLECTS OWN DEFENSE WHILE BOLSTERING ALLIES—ANALYST SAYS OUR 48-GROUP AIR FORCE IS LARGELY ON PAPER AND THE GATES ARE OPEN FOR POSSIBLE ATTACK

(By Constantine Brown)

No nation which is not fully prepared—arms in hand—to fight for its freedom can survive. This has been amply demonstrated throughout history, from the decline of the Roman Empire to the fall of France of 1940 and of China of 1949.

Whatever wishful thinkers may say, the United States is in a more critical situation than ever in its history. We are the direct target of a ruthless, oriental despotism which has at its disposal an enormous mass of manpower and almost limitless raw materials.

The U. S. S. R., which we pampered during World War II and the years immediately following, has succeeded through exploitation of our mistakes in becoming the world's foremost military power. When after VJ-day we pulverized the most formidable military force the world has ever seen under the impact of almost hysterical propaganda, the Russians proceeded to a thorough reorganization of their armed forces.

While we were reducing our air, ground, and naval power to a mere token, the Soviet military establishments were modernized and improved. During the war Russia had masses of manpower, which it used with utter recklessness. But it lacked completely the know-how to develop technical weapons, which mean as much as manpower these days.

We hid nothing from them. What was not given Moscow officially was handed over surreptitiously by the legion of ideological agents who filled our Government departments.

REDS KEEP BUILDING

The possession of important military secrets was not of much help, however, since Russia was known to lack the technicians who could turn blueprints into actual weapons for destruction. But Russia obtained the needed technicians from Germany. Highly skilled men who had worked a lifetime in laboratories where V-missiles, snorkel submarines, and the A-bomb were studied either were impressed or cajoled into Russia's service.

Today, according to reports which are considered correct by the most authoritative services in America and England, there are upward of 10,000 scientists and skilled technicians working in Russian arsenals and navy yards.

Never in modern history before World War II was Russia able to develop a single prototype for a naval vessel, and in 1939 Soviet authorities pleaded to be permitted to buy a couple of modern American battleships. But today Soviet arsenals have produced improved snorkel submarines, with greater speed and longer underwater endurance than the originals she received from Germany. Russia has many more such undersea vessels than all the other powers combined.

The same thing applies to Russia's air force, which not too long ago was lamentably weak. During World War II the Russians had to rely exclusively on American lend-lease planes, but they did not use them extensively. Russian aviation was limited principally to ground support and its pilots flew at tree-top elevation.

Russian authorities confiscated American long-range bombers which made forced landings in Siberia and obtained secrets which were not communicated officially to Moscow. Today the Soviet has 14,000 first-line planes, including the latest jet fighters and long-range bombers, which probably are not inferior to our B–36's, the pride of the United States Air Force.

PROBABLY HAVE H-BOMB

For a while we appeared to have a monopoly on the atomic bomb. While the Russians were not expected to produce such a bomb for several years yet, there was a howl from Russian sympathizers that we either do away with that destructive weapon or that we share our secret with the U. S. S. R.

No such howl is being heard any longer. The Russians, according to President Truman's unequivocal statement of last September, have produced and tested the atom bomb, which now is in production in the many plants in Central Russia, Siberia, and Outer Mongolia.

The German technicians, who have been working on atomic energy longer than our own scientists, are likely to have produced both the atomic and hydrogen bombs. The fact that we have not yet received an ultimatum from Moscow to cease our effort to frustrate Russian expansion is an indication, in the minds of our military leaders, that the Soviet has not yet produced the number of bombs needed to create a real threat to this country. It is only a matter of time, however, until enough have been produced.

This is not a race, however. When we have the hydrogen bomb in production we shall stow it away for use only in retaliation. When the Russians have a sufficient number they probably will use them in a blitz, hoping to catch us by surprise in the same way as the Japanese caught us at Pearl Harbor.

The Russians are concentrating their power on targets which they have selected as vital for the day. We are dispersing our weak forces to the four corners of the earth. After possessing a formidable ground force at the end of the war, we now have some 11 divisions, less than 7 percent of the Russian ground strength. These are divided between Japan, Germany, Austria, and Trieste. Only two divisions are available within the United States for the defense of our territory.

Strategic Alaska is completely lacking in any ground force. The maintenance crews of the three air groups stationed there are being trained in their spare time to handle machine guns and rifles for defense against a potential enemy airborne force of three divisions which is known to be located in eastern Siberia.

FEARS OF STRATEGISTS

Congress last year approved 70 air groups as a minimum for the security of the United States. Today we have only 48 air groups, and those are largely on paper. The necessity for stringent economy to reduce the deficit of $5,500,000,000 prompted the administration to cut military expenditures drastically. But the administration is still spending cheerfully this year an amount equal to the budget deficit to help western European countries.

We are now in the process of sending $1,000,000,000 worth of military equipment to the Atlantic Pact nations. The administration will require at least twice that amount for the military-aid program next year and will put up a real fight to maintain the European recovery program appropriation at $3,000,000,000. But there is not enough money in the Treasury, we are told, to permit the expenditure of about $200,000,000 to house at least one ground division in Alaska where most military men expect the blow to fall.

The spending on western European rearmament is predicated, strategically, on the conception that if Russia decides to change the cold war into a shooting war, its troops will march either toward the Rhine or into the Balkans, the Middle East, and the Near East.

NOT TOO LATE

But nobody seems to have told the American people the nightmarish fears of some top American strategists. What, it is asked, if Russia decides to bypass Europe and the still unconquered countries of the east and moves quickly on the strategic bases from which it can ruthlessly bomb American industrial centers? What if Russia, instead of following the classic pattern ascribed to its strategists, decides to rush its paratroopers—of which the Soviet is reported to have about 13 divisions—into Alaska, Greenland, and Iceland, all totally undefended territories?

Are we really ready, as Defense Secretary Johnson so frequently states, to meet a Soviet attack on those territories? The composition of American forces is no military secret any longer. And there is no indication that those particularly strategic bases are in any way ready to repel an attack by Soviet airborne forces which will try to establish and hold air bases for the Russian long-range bombers and fighters. The area between Los Angeles and Buffalo is only 5 or 6 hours from Alaska, Greenland, or Iceland.

Yet, while many billions have been found available every year since 1941 for all kinds of schemes in Europe, there is not sufficient money in the Treasury to close the gates of the United States to any enemy force.

Moscow has left nothing to the imagination as to how it feels toward the United States. All our diplomatic efforts to cajol, appease, and, more recently, to adopt a semi-firm attitude toward the Kremlin have brought no improvement. The men in the Kremlin continue to regard us as the only obstacle to their ambitions to dominate the world.

The tragic part of our spending money on foreign nations without substantially strengthening our own military forces is that if Russia decides to move against the United States directly from the polar bases none of the countries which we are now supporting can or will come to our aid. The one exception is Canada, which from the strategic point of view is integrated with American territory.

Those countries cannot create a diversion by threatening western Russia because even if the full military-aid program is fulfilled they will still be far weaker than the Russian forces which are guarding the approaches of the iron curtain countries. But what is even more likely is that as soon as the reports of a successful Soviet air attack on the United States have reached Europe the present governments will disappear and the Communists will take over. The new regimes immediately will place their respective countries under the protecting wing of the U. S. S. R.

REARMAMENT URGED

There is still time to offset these great dangers to our own security. But nothing can be done diplomatically at this time. If Russia were to learn that we have decided to build a very powerful American air force and at the same time that we are proceeding with the organization of strong defensive positions backed by full-strength divisions in the "polar areas," she might think twice before acting rashly.

The answer to the present concrete threat to our own territory is to be found in our immediate rearmament, regardless of what other international or domestic commitments we may have to ignore, or how much larger the deficit may be this year or next. If the administration were to take the American people really into its confidence and tell them bluntly what could happen if we continue in the present state of unpreparedness, there would be few, regardless of political party and beliefs, who would not be willing to buckle their belts and even forego some necessities in order to hand out some more cash to pay for insurance for the Nation's freedom—an adequate military force at home.

The whole program for welfare of the people as understood and contained in the platform of the Democratic Party may be important. But it will only be money wasted if the country is not in a position to defend itself if attacked. And today we are not capable of warding off the first deadly blows of a potential enemy, regardless of what the politicians say.

We are alone. We can help those across the Atlantic after we mobilize our forces, even if large sections of Europe are invaded by the Russians. The reverse is not true. The war-weary Europeans have neither the ability nor the will to come to the rescue if we ever need their help. We are alone, 160,000,000 Americans (including the Canadians) against an oriental mass four times as great, which has learned to produce and use the most modern scientific inventions for destruction.

Well-prepared in advance we can weather any storm. But today we are neither psychologically nor physically prepared to meet what many describe as an inevitable danger.

Colorado River Controversy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

COLORADO RIVER BOARD
OF CALIFORNIA,
Los Angeles, January 24, 1950.

Hon. HARRY R. SHEPPARD,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: During the past year, as the Colorado River controversy between California and Arizona intensified, a great deal of misleading propaganda has been disseminated by proponents of the central Arizona project.

Arizona supporters, both in and out of Congress and others, publicize two major subjects which have the effect of confusing and deluding the public and the Congress into believing that California does not need its legal share of Colorado River water. These subjects are: (1) Conversion of salt water into fresh water; (2) importation of water into southern California from the Columbia River.

Through published stories, speeches, and testimony the opponents of California have succeeded in deceiving the unwary and the uninformed into believing that these panaceas are available just around the corner. I hardly need tell you that the opposite is the truth.

I wish to be most emphatic in stating that California is not opposed to any scientific experiment which might result in relieving the water problems of the Nation, and desires to support bona fide research for the purpose.

Meanwhile, the Colorado River controversy is real, and it must be settled in the interest of an economic security that cannot be obtained with mere faith in experiments. The people of California have invested more than half a billion dollars in projects to bring Colorado River water and power to their farms, homes, and factories. This great investment, which must be paid for regardless of future events, was made years ago to assure us adequate water and power in days ahead. Those days have now arrived. Every increase in water needs from now on must be met with water from the Colorado River.

The highest scientific authorities are agreed that it may be years, if ever, before conversion of sea water can be accomplished cheaply enough to be used in industry and agriculture.

Southern California does not need water from the Columbia or any other distant river, if the Colorado River water awarded to California years ago in Federal Government contracts can be retained.

I appeal to you to help in defeating the propaganda of the Arizona proponents which may deceive those unfamiliar with the facts into believing that California might soon be supplied with water from the sea or some other unproven source.

The fight we now face is a fight to determine whether 5,000,000 people will be assured of an adequate water supply, or whether a few large landholders in Arizona will get water to grow more crops that are already surplus and subsidized.

California must win this fight. This is a fight for southern California's economic life. A proven and dependable water supply cannot be abandoned.

With kindest personal regards.

FRANKLIN THOMAS,
Chairman.

The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit the following article entitled "The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy," which appeared in the New York World-Telegram and the Sun on February 4, 1950, and which was written by Gabriel Pressman.

Mr. Pressman covered the Mindszenty trial while in Europe on a Pulitzer traveling scholarship. His application for a visa to Hungary first was denied but finally was issued—apparently by mistake—to "Grabriel Stanley, American pressman." Stanley is his middle name. He gives here an eye-witness account and his impressions on the first anniversary of the infamous trial, as follows:

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL: A CHAPTER IN INFAMY—PROSECUTION OF CARDINAL CONVICTED RED JUDGES IN EYES OF FREE WORLD

(By Gabriel Pressman)

A year ago today, I saw brought to trial a brave man who acted like a coward. I saw a people's court from which the people were barred. I saw an ex-Nazi sitting as a Communist chief judge. I saw a defense attorney out-prosecute a prosecutor.

On February 4, 1949, second day of the trial, I was admitted to a dimly lit courtroom in Budapest, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty and six co-defendants sat before the bar of Communist justice. Edward Korry, of the United Press, and I were the only American correspondents representing American publications admitted to the trial.

There was one catch: I could not choose an interpreter, I was told by Ivan Boldizar, pudgy, nervous-eyed government press chief.

The government would supply me a bright young Communist to translate for me.

GUNS GUARD COURT

The courtroom was two flights up—with six checkpoints of submachine gunners from the door of the dirty, red-brick courthouse on Marko Street, to the door of the trial room itself.

It was a small, dark room. Not much light pierced the huge windows. On the dais sat the people's court president and four associate judges. On the first bench beneath were the seven defendants, charged with a royalist conspiracy to overthrow the government.

Their faces were drawn. Their attitudes ranged from indifference to resignation. Alongside each sat a militiaman. Throughout the courtroom, militiamen stood or sat among the carefully screened spectators. Only seven relatives of defendants were present.

FROM NAZI TO RED JUDGE

Through an American's eyes, it was a trial of paradoxes. There was Vilmos Olti, before and during the war one of Hungary's foremost Nazis, now playing Communist chief judge.

Olti fired an endless stream of questions at the defendants, methodically building up the case against them with "Yes" and "No" answers. He allowed seven prosecution witnesses, no defense witnesses. As he carried the case through in a lightning 3 days, the hard-faced prosecutor-juror seldom looked up from the papers he read.

The trial seemed a little academic. The defendants had confessed everything days before at the headquarters of the dread secret police, 60 Andrassy Street. And the government had the confessions bound neatly into a yellow book for the convenience of Red propagandists.

EAGER TO CONFESS

The defendants vied constantly to confess. Once it was even too much for the court. The cardinal tried to read a repudiation of his prearrest warning against any future confession, but Olti silenced him: "You don't want to read that now." So the cardinal sat down and read it when directed.

Young Andreas Zakar, the cardinal's secretary, was once his stubborn, good right arm. Now pathetically trying to follow wherever Olti led. And the judge coached him benignly, like a teacher with a backward child.

Zakar used the word "democratic" in the Western sense. "Liberal, bourgeois democratic, or people's democratic?" Olti demanded.

Zakar (searchingly): "Er * * * liberal."

Olti (with fatherly severity): "That means against progress."

Zakar: "Yes, sir."

ROLE FOR CARDINAL

The Cardinal, an excellent orator before his arrest, spoke monotonously, reading from prepared papers. Under prodding from the rasp-voiced director, the Cardinal said: "I'm very sorry" about everything—the book he had written, letters, money manipulations.

The script called for a Mindszenty of repudiation, confession, and apology. And this, the Communists wanted the world to believe, was the same man who in a last interview said stanchly: "I will never take

back anything I have said against the Communist government. * * * Hungary has degenerated into a gigantic chamber of horrors, a den of robbers and thieves."

Crudest of the crudities was the attitude of the so-called defense attorneys. They spent most of the trial twiddling their mustaches or gazing into space. I didn't see them take a single note, nor consult each other once.

Kalman Kiczko, a Communist of 30 years' standing, defended the cardinal. Joseph Groh, prominent Catholic lawyer, had been jailed for offering to serve.

Kiczko pleaded well * * * for Kiczko. Most of his final speech told how much he, Kiczko, loved the people's democracy.

Then, removing his spectacles, he denounced Western newspapers: "The foreign press has written numerous calumnies against Hungary." He disputed that the trial was unfair: "Nobody either at home or abroad can accuse us of restricting freedom." He cringingly thanked the prosecution for bringing up the charges against his client. And, when he sat down, even Olti smiled.

A year has passed and the world still wonders what made the defendants act as they did. Was the cardinal tortured, drugged, or hypnotized?

Pro-Communist correspondents reported the cardinal seemed perfectly normal in every respect. It was hard to agree when you saw a man weak and cowardly, whose actions for 4 years had spoken strength and courage.

CHANGED MAN AT TRIAL

Was he in his right mind when he offered to resign if the charges against him were dropped? Only the Pope could accept such a resignation. Before his arrest, he could deliver a perfect sermon from a few notes. At the trial he forgot frequently and—the interpreters did not hide it—had to be prodded by the court.

The key to what happened is, of course, the 38 days the cardinal spent with the secret police before the trial. I did not speak to the cardinal—the government forbade it—but I have spoken to others educated to confess at 60 Andrassy Street. The Communists have a standard curriculum: questioning for days on end under bright lights, standing with arms overhead until faint, repeated blows with blunt instruments on the kidney, electric shock treatments.

It is possible that all the standard methods and perhaps more were used on the defendants. Perhaps Zakar was tortured to arouse the cardinal's pity. Zakar's white face and trembling impatience to please marked him a likely graduate of the torture chamber.

Not all the clues were outside the court. In the cardinal's final speech, he spoke with some feeling for the first time:

"I stand here with half a century of basic principles * * * principles that guide us as railway tracks guide trains. * * * I was not and am not an enemy of the Hungarian people * * * worker or peasant."

Perhaps the cardinal here revealed his true thoughts—that he believed as he always did, that he still loved the people but not the Communist government.

REFUSE TO BOW TO REDS

Significantly, the Hungarian press and radio did not carry the statement. For weeks before the trial, these government-controlled media trumpeted the cardinal's guilt. "A pitiable worm, a scared scoundrel, a bloodthirsty beast of prey," they called him.

Meanwhile, the government had nightly press briefings to tell correspondents what to write. Boldizar, the press czar said: "Tell your readers that the cardinal is not a brave hero of freedom but a weakling and a coward." The second night Mr. Korry and I refused to sign a Communist-sponsored resolution, signed by the others, affirming there was no censorship and translations were accurate.

A Hungarian journalist secretly applauded our stand: "There are two kinds of censorship: one where the censor's pencil scratches out the words, the other where the fear in your heart scratches them out." He told me how every Hungarian-speaking person in that courtroom had been intimidated.

After my refusal to sign, the government pretended I did not exist, withdrew even its slanted help. I had to scrape together at least the official version of what was happening—and that was damning enough.

FINAL COURT SCENE

Time will never dim that last, sad scene of February 8. The defendants stood for more than an hour while Olti issued an anti-Western political tirade and their sentences.

The cardinal's head was slightly bowed, his hands clasped before him. As he was sentenced to life imprisonment, his cheek twitched. Princess Esterhazy knelt in prayer. A government camera's flashbulb exploded.

There was a weird moment when Laszlo Toth, almost deaf Catholic editor, stepped forward to hear Olti shout his fate—10 years.

Then it was over. The heavily guarded defendants filed out. In the corridor I stopped gray-haired Hildegarde Zaker, the defendant's sister. Glancing nervously at detectives, her eyes moist, she said in French:

"My brother is a good boy. He has always served God. If God wills it, then this must be."

The reaction of the people in the streets and coffee houses was bitter. Through a Hungarian-speaking American, they told me: "They were afraid to give him the death sentence because they know his hold on the people is too great."

HAS PLACE IN HISTORY

The cardinal, says the Hungarian underground, languishes today in Gyujtofoghaz jail, 10 miles north of Budapest.

Whatever happens, Cardinal Mindszenty's place in history is assured. A Hungarian student friend expressed it well that last night in Budapest as we strolled along the banks of the Danube. I had just come from a final press conference at which Boldizar said: "The trial is over, but the trial of you correspondents has just begun. You must tell the world the truth about this traitor."

My friends looked up at the sky. "You know, for once Boldizar is right," he said. "This was more than the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In the court of world public opinion, a cardinal has convicted his judges and communism stands condemned."

Implementation of Hoover Commission Reports and Recommendations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN
OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, the staff of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has prepared a staff memorandum, which is a brief summary or analysis of the progress which Congress has made thus far toward the implementation of the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations. I believe this will be of interest to Members and others. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SENATE COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS,
February 3, 1950.

STAFF MEMORANDUM NO. 81-2-12

Subject: Why hasn't the Congress taken action upon the Hoover Commission Report?[1]

The public appears confused over three important phases of the Hoover reports: (1) Action taken to date by the Congress to implement the reports; (2) possible economies in Federal expenditures expected to result; and, (3) the distinctly different methods of effectuation required.

The facts are:

1. ACTION BY THE CONGRESS

Half (9 of 18) of the Hoover reports have been acted upon favorably—in whole or in part. They are:

No. 1, General Management of Executive Branch.
No. 2, Personnel Management.
No. 3, General Services (Supply Activities).
No. 4, The Post Office.
No. 5, Foreign Affairs (Department of State).
No. 8, National Security (Department of Defense).
No. 10, Department of Commerce.
No. 12, Regulatory Commissions.
No. 13, Department of Labor.

(For details see S. Rept. 1158, October 12, 1949, and Senate Committee Rept. No. 7, February 1, 1950.)

Legislation is pending to effectuate in varying degrees every report not already approved.[2]

A recapitulation of congressional action on the Hoover reports reveals that 12 major statutes were enacted, 6 (of 7) reorganization plans submitted by the President were approved, and some 20 other measures were processed toward enactment (passed Senate or House, reported favorably by committees, or hearings held) during the first session, Eighty-first Congress. As a result, significant reorganization has been effectuated or authorized in these broad executive areas: (1) Personnel, (2) Federal Supply, Buildings Management and Records, (3) the Department of Defense (including revision of budgeting and accounting methods) (4) the Department of State, and, (5) the Department of Labor.

(In October, the Citizens Committee for the Hoover Report, a research organization founded with Mr. Hoover's approval to further the adoption of the Commission's report, estimated that approximately 20 percent of the entire report had been effectuated. "More reorganization has been accomplished than at any previous time in the Nation's history," the committee stated.)

2. HOOVER REPORT "DOLLAR SAVINGS"

No hard and fast figure upon Hoover report dollar savings exists, or likely will. At best, the estimates which have been made are of necessity a "guess." Their chronology follows:

In December 1948, Mr. Hoover stated in a press release that if the whole of the Commission's recommendations were adopted "there should be a saving of about $3,000,000,000 a year."

In January 1949, the Hoover Commission conducted a "staff study" of its task forces'

[1] A question repeatedly asked Members of Congress. This is a summary of action taken by the Congress. It supplements S. Rept. 1158, October 12, 1949; and Senate Committee Rept. 7, February 1, 1950, which present more detailed analyses of action taken, legislation pending, and areas awaiting action.

[2] Where legislative action is required. See Methods of Effectuation.

estimates of savings in their respective areas. Fourteen of the 24 task forces made no estimates. The estimates of 10 totaled $3,234,850,000.

In June 1949, the Citizens Committee estimated savings at $3,000,000,000 a year; in October 1949, "of approximately $4,000,000,000 a year," and in December 1949, "three to four billions, possibly more." Various speakers, the source of whose information is unknown, since have raised the estimate to as high as $5,000,000,000 a year. The variance of such estimates indicates the difficulty of accurately forecasting economies.

The citizens committee estimates savings in fiscal 1951, as a result of reorganization effectuated to date, will total $1,250,000,000—$1,000,000,000 from reorganization of the National Military Establishment; $250,000,000 from consolidation in General Services Administration of supply, buildings management, etc. These estimates stem from the Hoover Commission staff study which a year ago predicted military savings at "from one to two billion per year" within "a reasonable period" of time, and savings through consolidation of supply activities at $245,200,000 per year.

Many students of reorganization believe Hoover Report economies have been oversold. They point out that the primary objective of the Hoover Commission was not to achieve immediate economies, but greater efficiency through better rearrangement of the executive branch, which could be expected to effect improved administration and produce long-range economies. Emphasis, therefore, should be placed on increased efficiency of government and improvements in the Federal service, to insure a greater return for the tax dollar expended. It is extremely difficult to pin point future economies in reorganizations without a broad margin for error, and often, even more difficult to prove them once reorganization is accomplished. Two-thirds of the Hoover task forces declined to estimate economies, probably for these and other reasons. It remains reasonable to expect economy from some of the Hoover Commission reorganizations, particularly consolidations and eliminations of functions. Just what the amount will be cannot be reckoned accurately until operations have been conducted under such readjustments over a definite period of time.

It is doubtful that any accurate evaluation of Hoover report "dollar economies" could be made until that has been done.

3. METHODS OF EFFECTUATION

Many Senators report this inquiry from constituents: "Why can't all the Hoover Commission recommendations be sent through Congress in a 'single package'—one bill?" On the other hand, some organizations have expressed the fear that all the commission's recommendations will be considered in an omnibus bill—thus precluding "individual treatment" of their special interests.

Aside from the obvious legislative infeasibility of attempting to embrace the some 288 Hoover recommendations in one bill, the more important factor is that the Congress actually is responsible for initiation of only slightly more than one-third of the recommendations made.

Few appear to realize that the Hoover recommendations require three distinct types of effectuation: (1) Administrative action by the agencies concerned; (2) Reorganization plans submitted by the President; and (3) Substantive or appropriation legislation by the Congress. The Bureau of the Budget has classified the 331 individual actions necessary to effectuate the 288 recommendations as follows:

Actions and methods of effectuation:

One hundred and twenty-two (or 36.9 percent): Administrative action by executive branch.

One hundred and five (or 31.7 percent): Substantive legislation by the Congress.

Eighty-two (or 24.8 percent): Reorganization plans (initiated by the President).

Twenty-two (or 6.6 percent): Appropriation legislation by the Congress.

Total, 331 (100 percent).

Thus, according to the Bureau of the Budget, of the 331 actions necessary to implement the Hoover Commission's recommendations, 61.7 percent require initiation by the Executive Branch (through administrative action or reorganization plan) and 38.3 percent require initiation by the Congress, through legislation.

Beyond that fact, such matters as committee jurisdiction, coordination with other interrelated legislation and the necessity of conducting extensive public hearings upon many of the reorganization proposals, would preclude, from a time factor if none other, single-package processing.

PUBLIC LAWS ENACTED

A tabulation of public statutes enacted and reorganization plans approved by the Eighty-first Congress, first session, to effectuate the Hoover Commission Reports, with a terse description of each, and reference to related Hoover reports, follows.

(Status of other pending legislation is available in detail in Senate Report No. 1158, Progress on Hoover Commission Recommendations, October 12, 1949; and in condensed form, in committee print No. 7, Legislative Action on Hoover Commission reports, February 1, 1950, prepared by the Senate Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.)

PUBLIC LAWS

Public Law 109 (Reorganization Act of 1949), June 20, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 1): Empowers President to submit reorganization plans to the Congress. (Expires April 1, 1953.) The President transmitted seven plans in 1949, six of which were approved.

Public Law 92 (Travel Expense Act of 1949), June 9, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 1): This act increased the Federal travel per diem from $6 to a maximum of $9 per day, in accordance with recommendations of the Commission's task force on Federal field services, filed with Report No. 1.

Public Law 429 (the Classification Revision Act of 1949), October 28, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act revised the civil-service classification system to promote simplicity, efficiency, and economy. It would correct distortions among present pay schedules; provide additional classifications for top management, professional, and scientific positions; provide incentives for employee contributions toward more economical administration; require each agency to establish a performance rating plan; and require the Civil Service Commission to submit its recommendations for improvement of the efficiency rating system to the Congress by February 1, 1950. (Report referred to Senate Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, February 2, 1950.)

Public Law 359 (the Executive Pay Raise Act), October 15, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act increased compensation of Cabinet officers, heads of departments, and other administrative officers, establishing pay schedules for Cabinet officers at $22,500; and for Under Secretaries, Assistant Secretaries, and heads of agencies, commissions, bureaus, and boards, at rates ranging from $14,000 to $20,000 based upon relative importance of the respective positions.

Public Law 180 (Civil Service Retirement Act), July 24, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 2): This act consolidated various Government retirement programs; repealed the Alaska Railroad Retirement Act and the Canal Zone Retirement Act, to bring subject employees under the Civil Service Retirement Act.

Public Law 167 (10 professional and scientific positions in NACA), July 13, 1949 (Hoover Rept. Nos. 2 and 8): This act authorized the establishment of 10 positions at salaries from $10,000 to $15,000 per year to provide for scientific research relating to national defense by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Public Law 152 (Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949), June 30, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 3): This act established the General Services Administration. Transferred Federal Bureau of Supply, Federal Works Agency (including Public Buildings Administration, and Bureau of Community Facilities) and National Archives to GSA, thus consolidating in one general service agency all housekeeping functions, including Government procurement, buildings management, records management, transportation supervision, and surplus-property disposal.

Public Law 231 (to improve operations of Post Office Department), October 16, 1949 (Hoover Rept. No. 4): This act provided for a long-range development program for improvement in methods, procedures, equipment, and supplies used in the postal service.

Public Law 73 (reorganization of Department of State), May 26, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 5): This act vested authority, previously administered by subordinates, in the Secretary of State for the conduct of foreign affairs; authority to promulgate regulations necessary to the execution of such functions, authority to delegate certain responsibilities to subordinates under his immediate direction; and, in general, provided for a thorough reorganization of the Department.

Public Law 216 (Reorganization of the National Military Establishment), August 10, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act converted the National Military Establishment into a Department of Defense, centralized management, improved fiscal reorganization upon basis of performance budget, created a Chairman for the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and, in general, provided for further unification of the armed services.

Public Law 110 (Central Intelligence Agency), June 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act granted the CIA the necessary authority to improve its internal operations. It clarifies functions relating to procurement, expenditures of appropriated funds, protection of confidential operations, and other administrative activities.

Public Law 36 (to amend the National Security Act of 1947), April 2, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 8): This act created an Under Secretary of Defense to exercise the power of Secretary of Defense during the Secretary's official absence.

REORGANIZATION PLANS

Reorganization Plan No. 2 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 13): Transferred the Bureau of Employment Security from the Federal Security Agency to the Department of Labor.

Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 4): Increased authority of the Postmaster General by transferring to him functions of each Assistant Postmaster General, the Purchasing Agent, the Comptroller, and the Bureau of Accounts. Authorized Postmaster General to delegate functions.

Reorganization Plan No. 4 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 1): Transferred National Security Council and National Security Resources Board to the Executive Office of the President.

Reorganization Plan No. 5 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 2): Provided for executive direction by the Chairman of administration of the United States Civil Service Commission, but maintained advantages of bipartisan membership.

Reorganization Plan No. 6 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 12): Strengthened administration of the United States Maritime Commission by vesting in the Chairman responsibility for (a) administration, (b) appointment of personnel, and (c) supervision of personnel.

Reorganization Plan No. 7 of 1949, August 20, 1949 (Hoover Report No. 10): Transferred the Public Roads Administration from the General Services Agency to the Department of Commerce.

MILES SCULL, Jr.,
Staff Member.

Approved:

WALTER L. REYNOLDS,
Staff Director.

The Story of Boston

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an interesting and thought-provoking editorial entitled "Only the Big Ones," from the Boston Post of February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONLY THE BIG ONES

The lifetime comments on men and modes which G. K. Chesterton, brilliant British writer, penned in his day, outlive him. One was the immortal essay on why people laugh when somebody slips and falls down. He attributed it to a subconscious memory of man's fall from grace in the Garden of Eden.

It would take a bearded philosopher many years and many volumes perhaps to prove it. But Bostonians know why their city becomes the immediate target for guffaws, at home and abroad, when it stubs its toe. No one bothers to chortle when a pee wee topples. It's when the big fellow goes down that the big laugh comes.

Boston was where America began on King Street, now State Street, when five citizens fell under the withering fire of the Redcoats for freedom's sake. It was Boston money and Boston pioneers who developed much of America, building far-flung cities and sowing the western plain. It was Boston men who sent clipper ships roving the earth to bring back the spices which Columbus sought.

But Boston did not rest on those laurels. Today it is the cultural center, the history center, the educational center, the medical center, and the religious center—big, busy, and seeking to be better. As such there is bound to be envy, satire born of little minds, and laughter which indirectly adds up to flattery. If Boston did not count—did not amount to anything—it would be ignored.

If Boston was morally unctuous, instead of right, it would accept rowdy lines in plays that would not be used in the living room; it would overlook the purple passages in books that are put in purposely to sell them and gloss over motion pictures it feels, in some parts, are not fit for children.

Such an attitude makes Boston free game for pseudo-liberals and phony intellectuals who at heart are nihilists in public conduct. When there is an incident like that involving the visiting Japs, which is contrary to everything Boston and which all thinking Bostonians deplore, we are scandalized. When Brink's is robbed, the comedians in a city not so far away, where jewel thieves steal half as much in a night, have a holiday.

However, Boston is not dismayed. There will be a great jubilee here in May. A new city hall will rise on the traditional School Street site. Futuristic ramps and circles to relieve traffic problems will soon be started. Mayor Hynes lops $50,000 from the refuse contracts in his economy drive. There are other happy, progressive steps being taken which spell the important thing—prosperity—the kilowatt that spins the flywheel.

Out of error will come good. Public and private safeguards on money and life will be increased here and Nation-wide because of Brink's. The Jap incident, which the State legislature in Boston rectified yesterday, will only hasten the demise of the 22-man council. But Boston should create, and at once, a citizens group to combat the censure, libel, and half truths. We cannot afford to be complacent or indifferent. Some mud might stick. By telling the Boston story, the real story, we can fight back.

Open Primary System

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., February 7, 1950.

Hon. WILLIAM H. HILL,
Chairman, Broome County Republican Committee, Binghamton, N. Y.

DEAR BILLY: According to the Binghamton Press, you are still determined, despite terrific pressure, to maintain the open primary system which your worthy leadership has always advocated as the fairest possible method of selecting Republican nominees.

You are deserving of the greatest praise for your courage in the face of the most vicious plot to wreck the Republican Party in Broome County in the twentieth century.

This gang would never dare challenge your will in this matter were you not confined to a hospital bed.

This underground wrecking crew has just about ruined representative government hereabouts and is dedicated to a rule-or-ruin policy, come what may.

They advocate the closed primary for two reasons, and I will describe them in detail, as follows:

1. They are afraid of facing the voters in a free primary, because they know only by strong-arming a so-called party endorsement can they survive the natural dislike which Republican committee people and party members alike have for their overbearing arbitrary methods.

2. They have for years been pointing to ganging up on me in the party primary, because they realize that is the only place they can even begin to accomplish their sordid scheme.

Whatever few differences you and I may have had since I have served this district in Congress, I have always recognized in you a champion of the Republican Party of Abraham Lincoln. It is shameful and tragic to think that this great organization should now be honeycombed by a myriad of termites boring from within, having but one objective, complete sabotage of the lofty principles of the Great Emancipator.

A public official should be unafraid of primary competition. Your policy has made a fair fight out of what could have been a below-the-belt, one-sided battle.

On the basis of the open primary, I have always welcomed other candidates. The more the merrier, I say. Those who are appearing most desirous of the opposite view seem to be afraid of equal competition.

While I have never been a power in the little circle of trouble-makers who for the most part are self-appointed apostles of this un-American brand of lousy politics, you have, nevertheless, my pledge of unqualified support in your brave and gallant struggle to keep our Republican Party free in Broome County.

I join with you in trying to preserve the American electoral system against these modern Huey Longs, these Bosses Pendergast, these Henrich Himlers, who want to turn our party's primary into a Nazi plebiscite.

Most sincerely, I remain,
Your Congressman,
EDWIN ARTHUR HALL.

The President and the Taft-Hartley Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DONALD L. JACKSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my own remarks in the Appendix, I include the following remarks delivered on Monday, February 6, over the Mutual network by our colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. WERDEL] a member of the Committee on Education and Labor:

At long last President Truman has decided to invoke the Taft-Hartley law in the coal dispute.

For weeks we have pleaded with Mr. Truman to do what he finally did today.

Had he taken this action 6 weeks ago, the Nation's coal supply would not now be at its present dangerous low.

But that is what might have been.

Now the President has decided to use the very law that he has condemned so often * * * the same law his party expects to use as a political issue during the coming congressional elections.

Well, the people will remember that it was the only instrument available to the President of the United States to protect the Nation's health and safety.

Even Democratic politicians should now be thankful for the Taft-Hartley law.

Even they must now admit that when the President took his oath to enforce the laws of the United States, he had his tongue in his cheek with regard to Taft-Hartley.

That his actions and statements since then have bred disrespect for the law, that may have a vital bearing on its enforcement.

Federal-State Relations to Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the

RECORD, I include the following statement by Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers, Washington, D. C.:

FEDERAL-STATE RELATIONS TO EDUCATION

(By Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary, National Council of Chief State School Officers)

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT

Assuming that only the present educational activities of the Federal Government are being considered, most educators favor a Federal board of education to replace the appointed politicians now in charge of the United States Office of Education. This board would determine internal policies of the Office relating to educational appropriations by Congress, publications, staff assignments, library, research, and advisory services.

As the task-force writer in education for the Hoover Commission has said, the Commission's recommendations for education were "innocuous and reactionary." Educators desire to remove education, somewhat as the judiciary has been removed, from control by partisan politicians and to reduce the possibility that any politician will ever be in a position to control education in the United States as Hitler and Stalin have controlled the educational systems of Germany and Russia. Control of education by partisan political officials is fundamentally out of harmony with American experience. Our colleges, universities, and public-school systems are universally governed by boards of education and operate most effectively where they have best protection against partisan politicians. The Federal agency for education requires the same protection if it is to operate efficiently and economically.

It is absurd for the Hoover Commission to say there must be a huge educational bureaucracy in Washington before the Office of Education can attain status worthy of education.

The major functions of the Office involve services to education in the States without Federal control of State programs of education, not services to other Federal agencies.

Question. Why doesn't the Hoover Report agree with the task-force report?

Answer. Since education is primarily a State and not a Federal function, the Hoover Commission erred fundamentally in treating the Federal agency for education exactly as it treated Federal agencies exercising functions primarily Federal. The services of the Office of Education cannot be effective under the personal control of a hierarchy of noneducational politicians.

The Commission recommended retention of some independent Federal agencies and a new independent agency for health services. The reasons for an independent agency for education are far more compelling than the reasons for a new independent agency for health. Neither can the independent agencies recommended for retention, with few exceptions, present a case for autonomy comparable to that of education.

Question. What are the dangers in a large agency administering a complex of many different services?

Answer. Any of the services in the agency favored by its political head could use the Office of Education for political ends, thus ending its usefulness to educators throughout the country. Under the Hoover Commission recommendations, education would be dominated by a huge welfare organization devoted to crusades for such programs as compulsory health insurance. Education must be nonpartisan, and must not be placed where it can be used to promote partisan political programs of this kind. To place a small professional Office of Education far down in a neat organizational chart of political hierarchy is to invite Federal control of education in its worst form.

The statement of the Hoover Commission that "It is the well-being of the individual, not control by the doctors, educators, or social worker, with which the Government's health, educational, and social-security functions are primarily concerned" is irrelevant and a gratuitous insult to our profession. We ask for control of the Office of Education by a nonpartisan board of laymen and the Congress of the United States, not by either professional educators or appointed politicians only remotely responsible to the people.

Question. What is the argument favoring inclusion of the United States Office of Education in a Department of Welfare (S. 2060), if it would give the Secretary of Welfare the right to determine completely by executive order educational functions in the Federal agency for education?

Answer. The arguments are (a) that the Secretary of Welfare should have power to assign educational responsibilities as he desires anywhere within his agency to assure coordination and integration, (b) that the Secretary of Welfare will speak more effectively for education in the Federal Government than will a Federal Board of Education.

The present small amount of autonomy in the Office of Education, which the Commission would have abolished, has prevented its complete emasculation and subordination to welfare. The process of coordination and integration has been going on for several years, and has reduced both the prestige of the Office of Education and the value of its services to education.

The Office of Education would not be adequately represented in the Federal Government by a Secretary of Welfare. His would be a partisan, welfare-dominated voice and it would interfere with the hearing of the real voice of education. A nonpartisan board of laymen could speak for education within a statutory framework established by the Congress in a manner which would command the respect of all the people.

Question. Should the Government appropriate large sums of money for general education?

Answer. Congress must decide. Political scientists who worship streamlined charts need to study the precedents for State financing of local schools without control of their programs of education and the history of Federal aid to education.

Should general Federal aid for elementary and secondary education be appropriated by the Congress, all our experience in education indicates that a nonpartisan board of laymen would provide more protection against Federal control of the State education programs aided than could possibly be provided under the administration by political officers recommended by the Hoover Commission.

Question. What about an independent Department of Education with Cabinet rank?

Answer. We do not favor it. We don't want Federal control of educational programs. A Cabinet official is always a politician and we can't afford to make education political. It might easily lead to a Federal educational agency too large for safety, especially if the recommendation of the Hoover Commission that all Federal agencies be given status according to the size of their pay rolls should be accepted. The temptation to build up his department is next to irresistible for a political officer sitting in the Cabinet.

Question. What about S. 656: A Federal Board of Education as proposed by the National Council of Chief State School Officers and supported by the NEA? (Other organizations which passed resolutions in support S. 656 are the County and Rural Area Superintendents, the Southern Work Conference, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, the American Association of School Administrators, the New York State School Boards Association, etc.)

Answer. Within its appropriation and statutory authority, the Federal Board would determine the policies of operation of the United States Office of Education and administer the Office through its professional executive, the Commissioner of Education.

This organization for education has been most successful in colleges, universities, and all levels of public education. Educators merely desire to substitute a board of citizens for a single politician wtih personal political power over educational policies. Dealings by teachers, administrators, and State officials with Federal agencies on educational matters is most effective when such dealings are on a nonpartisan basis.

Question. In an agency with Cabinet rank, the political head obviously would be in authority over the whole hierarchy and determine the functions of even the Education Bureau. Would there not be the same danger in a Federal Board of Education?

Answer. No. The effect of a nonpartisan Federal Board of Education would be just the opposite. Educators and citizens generally are willing to trust a nonpartisan board of laymen to represent the public, but not a partisan politician. In any event, the argument that education must be turned over to the politicians in order to keep it close to the people is fallacious. The entire history of our public schools and our colleges and universities demonstrates otherwise.

The notion that education must be protected in behalf of the general public against both professional educators and politicians accords with the views of educators but not with those of the Hoover Commission. Educators do not seek such control, but favor the exercise of such control by a board of laymen broadly representative of the general public. They would protect education against both educators and politicians. The Hoover Commission on the contrary, would apparently turn the entire educational enterprise over to politicians.

Question. What are the possible weaknesses in a Federal board set up at the national level?

Answer. It has been contended that persons who do not give full time to paid jobs do not serve efficiently, although volunteer services of citizens to the Federal Government in the past have failed to prove this. Some college, university, and public-school boards have been wiser than others, but it should be possible to rely on the President to appoint a board of high quality, of whom no more than 6 of the 11 members may be of one political party, under the provisions of S. 656.

Question. Is a National Board of Education analogous to a State board?

Answer. Education at the Federal level is not a duplicate of education at the State level, but there is much resemblance so far as the relationships of the Board of Education and its professional staff to educational policies are concerned. The special requirements of Federal relations to education due to the fact that education is a State function and not a Federal function have often been grossly violated by politically administered Federal agencies of the type proposed for the Office of Education by the Hoover Commission. Such special requirements for the Office of Education, due to the differences in functions, would be more likely to be observed by a nonpartisan board of citizens than by a politician. The Federal Board would confine its functions to the legal scope of the Office of Education, just as State or local school boards or university boards of education would act within their respective areas of statutory authority.

Flood Wall at Vincennes, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. NOLAND
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. NOLAND. Mr. Speaker, several days ago Mr. Curtis Kimmell, the city attorney of Vincennes; Mr. R. S. Robertson, secretary of the Indiana State Flood Control Commission; Mr. Joseph Perrey, engineer of the Indiana State Flood Commission and I appeared before a House Appropriations Subcommittee requesting an initial appropriation of $500,000 to start construction of a floodwall at Vincennes, Ind.

This project constitutes the greatest emergency in the State of Indiana today. The following newspaper article from the Indianapolis News demonstrates beyond all doubt how seriously this new floodwall is neded:

VINCENNES WAS NEARER DISASTER THAN IT KNEW—MINOR SLIP WHICH MIGHT HAVE FLOODED MOST OF CITY REVEALED

VINCENNES, IND., January 25.—James White, flood coordinator, today revealed how a minor slip a week ago Sunday night came near causing inundation of four-fifths of Vincennes.

White said following the heavy rain, a leak was detected in Niblack Boulevard along Kelso Creek, and men were pulled from other sections of the city's levee to avert a flooding of North Vincennes.

After the danger had been averted, a patrol passing along the section of secondary sandbag levee near the Ebner Ice and Storage Co. discovered water running over the top tier of sandbags, threatening to wash out this bulwark.

Soldiers and volunteers were rushed to the spot and worked frantically to avert the mishap that would have brought flooding of 80 percent of Vincennes, and most of southern Knox County.

This incident was not revealed publicly until after the flood crisis had passed.

"Some of these floods," White said, "are going to sweep over Vincennes, just because of a minor slip, if the Government doesn't awaken to the peril here and appropriate money with which to construct an adequate floodwall."

Representative JAMES E. NOLAND, Democrat, of Indiana, is taking a plea for the proposed $3,000,000 floodwall directly to President Truman tomorrow. He will ask Truman to support spending of $500,000 next year to start work on the wall, already planned by Army engineers.

Franklin Roosevelt, Jr., Being Groomed for Albany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DEWEY SHORT
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Frank R. Kent:

FRANKLIN ROOSEVELT, JR., BEING GROOMED FOR ALBANY—COLUMNIST DISCUSSES PREPARATIONS FOR GAINING NOMINATION FOR GOVERNOR

(By Frank R. Kent)

The efforts to build young Franklin Roosevelt up to a size where he must be nominated by the Democrats for Governor of New York next November is not going so well. For this there are several reasons.

The chief of these seems to be the source and character of his publicity. Most of this comes from interested persons so close to him personally as to make the fulsomeness of their praise slightly sickening. A second trouble is their technique. Their notion of an argument is to assert that the mere suggestion of either James or Franklin Roosevelt achieving success in politics is enough to cause all the rich old reactionaries in the country to tear their hair in a rage or swoon with fright. This is considered not only effective politically but screamingly funny. It is, of course, pretty silly stuff but it does give an idea of the caliber of the new gubernatorial aspirant and his journalistic masseurs.

It is interesting to note that in none of the printed grease in which young Franklin is now being drenched is there any reference to his qualifications for the governorship. Great emphasis is placed on his personal charm, his extraordinary victory in the district last year and the vote-getting asset of his name. Not a word is said about either his character or his ability. No mention is made of his public record. Of course, as yet, he has no public record. Nor has he ever been in position where his ability could be judged. As to his views, his speeches have merely mouthed the word of the welfare state administrationists and he has carefully echoed the Americans for Democratic action propaganda. If since he came to Congress—or before—he has done any thinking for himself about issues or measures or men, there has been no sign of it.

Notwithstanding the spoiled child characteristics which protrude, when he first came to Congress the disposition of his colleagues was rather to like him personally. He has done a good deal to change this recently. Among the incidents which do not reflect credit on him may be mentioned his slightly degrading controversy with Clayton Powell, Negro Congressman from New York, who accused him of discourteously usurping Mr. POWELL'S prerogative to present the petition to bring the FEPC bill out of committee in order to glorify himself and promote his gubernatorial ambitions. Another was his attack upon Congressman Clarence Brown, of Ohio, who, in replying, gave the rather startling figures of the number of important roll calls Junior had missed since he took his seat and suggested that he could not learn House procedure in New York night clubs nor by nocturnal meditations on Fifty-second Street. A third was his inexcusable use of the word "chicanery" in referring to the greatly beloved and respected Congressman JAMES W. WADSWORTH. He also indicated his belief that Senator TAFT and ex-President Hoover were somewhat hypocritical. And, finally, there was the typically bumptious reply to the question of why he refused to debate with Wendell Willkie's son Philip over the radio. "Why," he asked, "should I make that fellow a big shot?"

All this has combined to create the impression of an unpleasantly immature and self-assertive playboy, chiefly interested in promoting himself politically as fast as possible, but not to be regarded as raising either the mental or moral level of the House. Of course, he may correct this idea in the present session and make a record that will commend him generally. But no one will claim that he has yet made a start in that direction. His publicity promoters have practically drawn a blueprint of how, with the aid of his friend, Ed Flynn, of Belgian-paving-block fame, he can get the gubernatorial prize through the old labor union-Negro combination. It is to be worked for him by his political aides and agents. He is to stay in Washington (mostly) and "stick to his knitting," pretending not to be interested in anything except his seat in the House, while his friends "sew the nomination up for him."

Perhaps, it will work out the way they have it planned. However, there are a good many hurdles to take and quite a few persons to push out of the way. Also, there is the question of being elected after being nominated. Junior's boosters insist the name alone will carry him. "Junior," they say, "is just the boy to do the trick." But that is not necessarily so. For 10 years now, the Democrats have not had a real majority in New York State. In that time they have carried the State for President and for Senator by the grace of the so-called Liberal Party bossed by David Dubinsky, the labor leader, and the American Labor Party, admittedly dominated by the Communists.

Combined, the two parties poll upward of 700,000 votes. Without their support, President Roosevelt would not have carried the State in either 1940 or 1944. With their support, President Truman failed to carry it in 1948 and Senator LEHMAN would have been overwhelmingly beaten last year but for them. The indisputable truth is that for its success in the greatest State in the Union, the Democratic Party is completely dependent upon these two splinter parties. It isn't a savory situation. If the people of New York ever really grasp the character of the men who control their State and what a shabby, subservient instrument the Democratic Party has become there, it will take a good deal more than Junior has to do the trick.

The American Legion and the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER D. ANGELL
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, the following interesting and factual radio address was recently delivered in my district by Mr. Don Eva, legislative chairman of the American Legion for the State of Oregon, relative to the American Legion and the Hoover report. It is worthy of consideration by all persons interested in the Hoover report and the welfare of the veterans. All of my colleagues will find time to read it:

My fellow Americans, the American Legion, as you know, is dedicated to God and country.

Probably never before in our long and proud history have we of the Legion been put to a more severe test in living up to that sacred dedication than we are today.

Do not believe those who would tell you that the American Legion is a pressure group, interested only in putting all veterans on a gravy train. That is either a

vicious lie or an accusation based upon ignorance of the true ideals of the American Legion.

True, the American Legion's obligation is to fight for the rights and proper privileges of our disabled and needy veterans. It always has been and it always will be.

But the American Legion today stands in the forefront among all patriotic organizations in the United States in the cause of Americanism. It is in the interest of Americanism—Americanism and true national economy that I have the pleasure of appearing before you today.

First of all, permit me to state that the American Legion is not opposed to the Hoover Commission Report in its entirety.

The American Legion from its national commander down to its more than 3,000,000 post members is wholeheartedly in favor of economy in Government, good, sound, common sense economy. After all, American Legionnaires are citizens and just as much taxpayers as any other good American citizens.

The conception that the American Legion is opposed to the complete Hoover Commission Report is wholly erroneous. Much of it may prove of real assistance in bringing about economy. Some of it already has.

The American Legion does however oppose most strenuously that section of the Hoover report which would dismember the Veterans Administration, which has proven itself for more than 20 years to be the most efficient of all large Government agencies into five or more separate bureaus, some of them purely experimental and certainly more costly to the taxpayers of the United States.

Many people seem either not to know or to have forgotten that the Veterans Administration was created by recommendation of Herbert Hoover himself when he was President of the United States.

Mr. Hoover, then President, said to the Nation in 1929 that in the interest of efficiency, economy, more uniform administration and better definition of national policies, the Veterans Bureau, the Pension Bureau and the National Home for Volunteer Soldiers should be brought together into a single agency.

So the Veterans' Administration was created by act of Congress on July 3, 1930, as the last word in streamlined service to veterans.

The Veterans' Administration today is exactly what its name implies. It administers all laws relative to benefits or services to former members of the armed forces and their dependents. These include disability and death compensation, disability and death pensions, medical and hospital services, domiciliary care, United States Government and national service life insurance, vocational rehabilitation and education, guaranty of loans for purchase of homes, farms, business properties, everything applying to veterans.

The wisdom and the economy of creating the Veterans' Administration as the one agency to administer all veterans benefits has been proven to the complete satisfaction of the Government and the people of the United States.

During 30 years of careful scrutiny by and cooperation of the American Legion, the Veterans' Administration has been developed and so operated that in spite of some existing imperfections it stands alone today among all large Government agencies as the one not subject to political pressure and free from pork-barrel raids.

That economies even now may be effected in the Veterans' Administration we do not for one moment deny. But from years and years of experience and close cooperation with this great one-stop agency, the American Legion, which itself fought alongside then President Hoover for consolidation of a number of bureaus into one agency, both in the name of economy and efficiency. The American Legion maintains that further economies can best be brought about within the present set-up of the Veterans' Administration.

But what has the Hoover Commission suggested? It proposes that the major functions of the Veterans' Administration be split up into five or more agencies.

It recommends that hospital and medical attention be turned over to a new experimental bureau—a United Medical Administration—that hospital construction be transferred to the Department of the Interior, that all insurance matters be handled by another new and experimental agency, a Veterans Insurance Corporation, that home loans be taken care of by a Housing and Home Finance Agency, and that only the lesser veteran benefits remain under the charge of the Veterans' Administration.

Ladies and gentlemen, such dismemberment of our Veterans' Administration is unthinkable.

Emasculation of this most efficient of all large Government agencies into five separate Federal bureaus, as proposed, would not only be a stunning blow to our veterans, particularly the disabled, it also would entail an additional drain on America's already overburdened taxpayers.

I ask you, ladies and gentlemen, where could economy be effected in such a set-up?

As I have stated, the American Legion has proven itself for more than 30 years the most experienced group in the world on veteran affairs. The American Legion's rehabilitation experts, its National, State, and post officers and members have labored through these three decades in building up a most efficient Veterans' Administration.

But the suggestion that the Veterans' Administration be vivisected was made without any consultation with either the American Legion or any other recognized veterans' organization.

Four times the American Legion asked the Hoover Commission for permission to present the Legion's side of the case. But no such permission ever was granted.

The very fact that all members of the Hoover Commission itself were not in accord, and that neither the group of insurance executives nor a big engineering firm called in by the Hoover task force would recommend such changes as have been proposed, is evidence in itself of the folly of the portion of the reorganization plan that would dismember the Veterans' Administration.

Permit me to read the following from the report of the Trundle Engineering Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, to the Hoover Commission:

"From the very beginning the Veterans' Administration has been the beneficiary of the advice and constructive criticism of organized veterans' groups—of which the American Legion is by far the largest, with a membership of more than 3,000,000—who have acted as spokesmen and representatives of ex-servicemen and their dependents. Formal recognition was extended to these groups by congressional enactment in 1936, naming several national organizations, and authorizing the Administrator to add others at his discretion.

"The full-time representatives of these accredited organizations do valuable work in connection with cases that otherwise would have to be done by Veterans' Administration personnel. As intermediary counsel and later as advocate, they save time for the contact officers, the rating boards, and adjudicators.

"Examination of this program indicates that it is sound both in intent and operation. * * * The Veterans' Administration, representing the Government, acts as a judge in determining a veteran's entitlement to benefit. As a claimant he is entitled to the assistance of an advocate fully familiar with the laws governing his rights. This need is met by these accredited representatives of recognized service organizations, who render this aid free of charge and with a minimum of self-interest.

"This policy of recognition offers a corollary benefit to the Veterans' Administration as well as to the veterans themselves. The close working of its personnel with well-informed but independent groups serves to provide a source of constructive criticism of procedures, rulings, and possibly activities that is most wholesome. Service organizations through their executive offices in Washington and elsewhere maintain a vigilant watch over its activities and are not hesitant to express pertinent comment when it seems desirable. A number of the service organizations contribute materially to the operation of veterans affairs by appearing by invitation before congressional committees. They either advocate or oppose proposed measures and thus permit examination by the public as to the merit of such proposals."

Thus the Trundle firm, in its report, lauded the American Legion and other veterans' organizations for the priceless service rendered by their rehabilitation experts to the Veterans' Administration.

Would the United Medical Association, the Department of the Interior, the Veterans Insurance Corporation, the Housing and Home Finance Agency, and the Veterans' Administration all continue to utilize most beneficially this invaluable service?

Or would the taxpayer be saddled with the cost of such service?

We have mentioned the five bureaus into which it is suggested we experiment with veteran affairs, now handled efficiently by one established agency. Then what would we have?

The Hoover Commission proposes that the hospital care and medical treatment presently available to veterans, under the direction of the Veterans' Administration, be taken over by a new colossal Federal agency. It is to be known as the United Medical Administration and contains a cruel joker.

This experimental bureau would not render service exclusively to veterans.

Instead of the wise and efficient course demonstrated by the Veterans' Administration through the years, the new agency would administer hospital care also for the merchant mariner, civil-service employee, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps personnel and their dependents. This is definitely the beginning of an attempt to divorce the veteran from his identity as a veteran.

That's how this one change would affect the veteran. Now how will it affect you and me as taxpayers.

The creation of any new governmental agency, such as the proposed United Medical Association, inevitably would mean the creation of thousands of new jobs.

It would mean the training of many inexperienced new officials. This would require both time and money.

It would involve many duplicating functions, such as existed in the dark 1920's, with faint hope that any good would result.

In such a program there can be no economy.

Veterans, active servicemen, merchant mariners, civil-service and other Government employees are hospitalized under completely dissimilar authorizations. A veteran no longer must be accounted for on a morning report, a sick book, a clothing report and a pay record, but for the active serviceman in the United Medical Administration hospital all these records must be accurately kept.

The handling of some five or six classes of patients would make the paper work in United Medical Administration hospitals chaotic.

Such ramifications would not work for economy.

They would be stupendous and costly to the taxpayer.

Of all Government agencies, only one is familiar with the needs of veteran hospital construction and experienced in this highly technical work—the Veterans' Administration. If recommendations of the Hoover Commission were followed, this all-important and specialized work would be transferred to the Department of the Interior.

Veterans' Administration hospitals have been and are being built for less money per cubic foot than those constructed by the Army and Navy and compare favorably with private hospital construction. Certainly the taxpayer could not benefit by the transfer of this work to the Department of the Interior.

The Hoover Commission states that the Insurance Division of the Veterans' Administration is inefficient. Yet, it proposes to correct this alleged inefficiency by creating an additional experimental corporation to handle this tremendous job—a new Veterans' Insurance Corporation.

The Hoover Commission wants to take from the Veterans' Administration the handling of all home loans made possible under the GI bill of rights, which the American Legion fought so tirelessly to enact into law. The Commission would give this part of the Veterans' Administration's responsibility to yet another Federal outfit—the Housing and Home Finance Agency. The Commission's failure to make mention of administration of farm and business loans remain unexplained. The natural inference is that additional complications may result from a further division of veteran loans into still other agencies.

Should the recommendations of the Hoover Commission be adopted, there would remain in the hollow shell of the Veterans' Administration only a relatively small part of its present services, including:

A Veterans' Benefit Service, charged with administration of pensions, retirement benefits, disability compensation, and guardianships.

A Readjustment Service, to administer the vocational rehabilitation, education, and readjustment allowance programs, as well as the certification of veterans for loan guaranties.

The Office of Legislation would be consolidated with that of the General Counsel.

If such an emasculation should conceivably be adopted by the Congress, the pushing around plight of our veterans in 1920 would be only a circumstance to the bewildering chaos into which our veterans of today and tomorrow would again be plunged.

The American Legion will fight to the last ditch to prevent a recurrence of the infamous Economy Act of 1933. That part of the Hoover report dealing with veterans proposes to repeat the Economy Act on an even greater scale. It would divorce all veterans from their identity as veterans, dismember the Veterans' Administration, take their hospitals from bed-ridden veterans, deprive all veterans of preference in Government employment, leave the 19,000,000 veterans of the Nation without a unified service agency, and all centralized Government responsibility for the welfare and rights of veterans, and leave the dependents of those who fell in battle at the mercy of bureaucratic red tape.

The American Legion contends that the cost of rehabilitating the human wreckage of war is as much a part of the cost of waging war as is the building of battleships, tanks, planes, and guns. Those weapons are paid for in cash on the barrel head. The Government leans over backward to see that every wartime contractor gets a square deal. But the human costs of war are put on the cuff. They constitute a sacred obligation of the Nation. This debt cannot be honorably discounted or evaded by simply writing it off as a so-called economy measure.

A so-called economy measure that cannot conceivably mean economy.

How many of you recall the plight of our veterans immediately following World War I?

Back in 1920 the American Legion discovered that the veteran was far from receiving the services a grateful American people had voted for him. Then a labyrinth of agencies was going through the motions of trying to serve the veteran. The result was overlapping, inefficiencies, and tremendous expense. For his various rights the veteran was pushed around from the Pension Bureau to the Public Health Service, to the War Risk Insurance Corporation, to the Federal Board for Vocational Education, and back again.

Because of this chaos, President Harding appointed a committee of 10 prominent Americans to study this deplorable situation and recommend action. This committee, headed by Brig. Gen. Charles G. Dawes, himself later Vice President of the United States, recommended that all services to veterans be placed in one agency. From this report came the Veterans' Bureau, established by law in 1921. The Dawes committee said in part:

"It cannot be too strongly emphasized that the present deplorable failure on the part of the Government to properly care for the disabled veterans is due in large part to an imperfect organization of governmental effort. There is no one in control of the whole situation. Independent agencies by mutual agreement now endeavor to coordinate their action, but in such efforts the joint action is too often modified by minor considerations, and there is always lacking that complete cooperation which is incident to a powerful superimposed authority. No emergency of war itself was greater than is the emergency which confronts the Nation in its duty to care for those disabled in its service and now neglected."

Then, upon the recommendation of President Hoover, came the further consolidation resulting in the creation of the Veterans' Administration in 1930.

Now comes the recommendation by Mr. Hoover's Commission that this great institution, the Veterans' Administration, the magnificent monument to the American Legion and other veterans, be torn limb from limb.

Mr. Hoover's task force must have failed to study, and it certainly failed to heed, the bitter experience of the past. The Hoover recommendation of dismemberment, which would return veteran affairs to the chaotic conditions of 1920, is not consistent with the usual sound thinking of this great American.

Just suppose General Motors was told: "You may retain your administrative functions, but you will have to divorce yourself from the other operations of your corporation. Ford will take over your production. Engineering will go to Studebaker. Your distribution will be conducted by Chrysler. And your sales can be handled by Kaiser-Fraser."

That is substantially what the Hoover Commission recommends so far as the Veterans' Administration is concerned.

In such a situation, could you possibly expect more efficiency, more economy?

As we have tried to make clear, the American Legion does not oppose the Hoover report verbatim.

The America Legion, as much as any other patriotic group, insists upon economy.

But we do maintain and most sincerely trust you will agree that that part of the Hoover report dealing with veteran affairs does not mean economy. It will not reduce taxes.

It means a house divided—five experiments to replace one success.

It means more agencies and more taxes.

And that is what nobody wants.

Budget Pruning

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "Budget Pruning," published in the Washington Post of February 7, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BUDGET PRUNING

Section 138 of the Reorganization Act providing for a legislative budget is a dead letter, and should be replaced by a workable substitute providing congressional appropriations committees with the information required to do an intelligent job of budget pruning. The joint congressional committee set up under this act includes all the members of the four appropriating and taxing committees of both Houses. It is handicapped by sheer size. Furthermore, the committee is required to report its estimates of over-all receipts and expenditures, with accompanying recommendations, much too early in the session. Senator McCLELLAN proposes to correct these defects by replacing this unwieldy committee by a small body consisting of five members of the House Committee on Appropriations and an equal number of members of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. The budget committee's work would be continuous; it would be assisted by an adequate technical staff; and it could call on Government agencies to transmit duplicates of all requests for funds submitted to the Budget Bureau.

This procedure would enable the budget committee to assemble detailed information on all the items contained in the executive budget, and the utilization of such data by the committees on appropriations would speed up legislative processes, now delayed by long and tedious hearings.

As Senator McCLELLAN notes, the need for the services of a really effective legislative budget committee has been accentuated by the decision to combine all appropriation measures in a single bill. For it will be late in the session before the House will act on the omnibus bill, and the Senate Appropriations Committee will have little time to consider it before the end of the fiscal year. However, if both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees were supplied in advance with detailed, up-to-date information on the budget and given time to study the recommendations of the budget committee, an omnibus bill could be disposed of without undue delay.

Wisely, in our opinion, the McClellan bill does not authorize the reconstituted budget committee to report directly to Congress. It would be a strictly service committee, making reports to the appropriations committees and, in some cases, to other standing committees of both Houses. The effectiveness of the plan would depend very largely upon the caliber of the experts employed to assist the budget committee, and on the size of the staff. It would cost a good deal to build up an organization equipped to do a good job of screening executive budgetary requests, but the money spent for such

purposes would undoubtedly yield rich dividends by cutting down wasteful and discouraging excessive expenditures.

There is some danger that the authorization given the budget committee under the bill to examine the records of Government agencies and request them to furnish estimates of their budget requirements might bring it into conflict with the Budget Bureau. However, Senator McCLELLAN stresses the fact that the purpose of the proposed legislation is not to hamper the Budget Bureau, but simply to enable Congress to discharge its responsibility for fiscal policies more intelligently. If Congress keeps that implied admonition in mind, we believe that adoption of the McClellan proposal would result in better working relationships between the legislative and executive branches of Government, which are jointly responsible for the formulation of taxing and spending programs.

The Nation's Capital and the Man Who Planned It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The Nation's Capital and the Man Who Planned It," published in the Freedom Fair News, issued by the National Capital Sesquicentennial Commission. This being the sesquicentennial of the Capital, I believe the article will be of interest to everyone.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATION'S CAPITAL AND THE MAN WHO PLANNED IT

Few Americans realize that their Nation's Capital, Washington, is the only Capital City in the world that was hewn out of a wilderness and based on a government that was created on paper before it was created in brick and stone.

This city, which is celebrating its sesquicentennial year as the Nation's Capital, was George Washington's last great legacy to the American people. Today it has become, as Lafayette prophesied in 1824, "the central star of the constellation which enlightens the whole world."

The debate on the permanent Nation's Capital began in the Continental Congress even while the last shots of the American Revolution were still echoing. Definite action was not taken until the year 1787 when a provision was inserted in the new Constitution for a federally controlled District where the permanent Capital of the Nation was to be established.

The design for the new permanent Capital became a pressing consideration immediately after General Washington was inaugurated first President of the United States on April 30, 1789. The residence bill, which located the Nation's Capital on the Potomac, passed the Congress in July 1790. President Washington was thus faced with producing a plan for the new Federal city and he made it clear that the Nation should provide for a magnificent seat of government commensurate with the expected growth of the Nation. In his instructions to the first three Commissioners of the District, President Washington said it should be remembered that, if a city such as Philadelphia, capital of one State, occupied two or three square miles, the Capital of the then 13 States of the Union should require a city of due proportions.

To plan this ideal city, this permanent home of the best Government the world has ever seen, President Washington selected Maj. Pierre L'Enfant, a talented French artist and engineer, who had come across the Atlantic in 1777 to fight for America's independence. L'Enfant had served at Valley Forge and was severely wounded at Savannah. He was known as the Artist of the Revolution.

The fact is, soon after Washington took office, Pierre L'Enfant applied for the task of designing a future permanent Capital of the Nation. In his formal application, L'Enfant said, "The plan should be drawn on such a scale as to leave room for the aggrandizement and embellishment which the increase in the wealth of the Nation will permit it to pursue at any period however remote."

L'Enfant's dream was of a Capital City for a nation of 50 States and 500,000,000 people.

Soon after President Washington had picked the actual site of the future city he and Pierre L'Enfant rode together across the fields and swamps that are now the heart of downtown Washington, and on to the crest of what was then Jenkins Hill, now Capitol Hill. This was March 29, 1791. The next day, March 30, 1791, President Washington met the 19 original landowners, mostly farmers, in a tavern in Georgetown and there made his celebrated agreement by which these farmers turned over their land to the United States for its future permanent Capital.

Quickly, L'Enfant produced his historic plan for the permanent Capital of the Nation, a plan in which he envisioned a city of great parks, spacious circles, broad avenues, beautiful vistas, imposing public monuments and buildings, as well as a thousand and one features that delight the eye of the American people.

L'Enfant was both draftsman and artist. He produced a city plan of great beauty and reality. The plan was approved by both President Washington and Secretary of State Thomas Jefferson. President Washington then directed Major L'Enfant to proceed with the execution of this plan. It was in the execution of his own plan that L'Enfant's artistic temperament collided with the practical views of the first three District Commissioners, a collision that brought his dismissal within 1 year after he had undertaken the task.

Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected Jenkins Hill as the site of the Capitol. He referred to it in these words: "Jenkins Heights stands ready as a pedestal waiting for a superstructure." Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected the site of the President's house, the hallowed mansion, home of our first citizens, which we today know as the White House. Pierre L'Enfant it was who selected the locations of the Capitol and the White House as the focal points of his masterly plan, thereby creating the famous axis of the Nation's Capital. Pierre L'Enfant today lies buried at Arlington, on the brow of the hill just in front of that historic mansion. Above him is a table of white marble on which is carved his original plan for the Nation's Capital.

There is no monument today in the city of Washington to Pierre L'Enfant, and certainly the Sesquicentennial of the Nation's Capital is an opportune time to erect one. However, in 1909, when L'Enfant's remains were taken from an obscure grave in Maryland and brought to lie in state in the Capitol, on his way to Arlington, a great Frenchman, Monsieur Jusserand, the French Ambassador, and a great friend of the American people, voiced the sentiment of the Nation when he said to those assembled: "Major L'Enfant's monument is your beautiful city of Washington."

But L'Enfant's dream has come true. The exquisite development of the Nation's Capital in the last half century is but the unfoldment of what Pierre L'Enfant envisioned way back in 1791. So also has the dream of President Washington come true. Shortly before his death, Washington made this remarkable prophecy: "A century hence, if this country keeps united (and surely it is its policy and interest to do it), will produce, on the banks of the Potomac, a city, though not as large as London, yet of a magnitude inferior to few others in Europe."

Where Are We Going?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. E. COX
OF GEORGIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. Donald R. Richberg at the dinner of the Albany Chamber of Commerce, Albany, Ga., on February 2, 1950:

WHERE ARE WE GOING?

On January 4 the President explained the state of the Union today by predicting that 50 years from now, in A. D. 2000, national production would be about $1,000,000,000,000 and "the real income of the average family would be about three times what it is today." This was an extraordinary flight of fancy even in a political manifesto.

The President cheerfully omitted any reference to the gloomy fact that 10 years ago, in peacetime, the average family was taxed only one-fourteenth of its income by the National Government, but today, in peacetime, it is paying one-fifth of its income for national taxes and one-fourth of its income for the total of State, local, and national taxes.

He also cheerfully avoided any estimate of the increased taxes which would be required in the coming years to pay for the prodigal spending which he recommended. But, it is quite evident that long before A. D. 2000 an unreformed, prodigal, parental government will be taxing away the greater part of every man's income, and spending it for the declaimed purpose of doing him good. Indeed, the submissive citizen can be quite sure that, in doing a lot for him and to him—and all at his expense—the tax-eaters of Washington will, in common language, really "do him good."

The prognostication of the President somehow reminded me of the boy who learned his figures quicker than his alphabet. After a few weeks in school he reported his progress to his mother in these words: "Ma, when I comes to a crossroad sign, I can always tell how far, but I can't ever tell where to."

It's easy today to prophesy how far we are going, if we keep on going at our present pace. But, where we are going is a much harder question.

Our industrial progress is terrific. Every year we make more and more machines to give more and more people more and more leisure to enjoy life less and less.

Our financial progress is amazing. Every year we make more and more dollars for more and more people to spend in buying less and less for a dollar.

Our political progress is wonderful. Every year we enact more and more laws to restrict the freedom of businessmen, in order to preserve free enterprise. We socialize

more and more industries in order to avoid socialism. We write more and more laws to equalize the spendthrift and the thrifty, the incompetent and the skillful, the dullard and the wise man, in order to save ourselves from communistic equalizers. We promote more and more monopolies by labor managers in order to protect ourselves from monopolies by business managers. We authorize more and more tyrannical regulation by a remote National Government, in order to escape from the lesser evils of more lenient regulation by neighborly local governments.

In a word, we create more and more instruments of despotic power to rule our lives, for the proclaimed purpose of setting us free from the risks and burdens of a self-reliant, democratic control of our own lives and fortunes. We have made amazing progress in a few years in transforming the United States of America into the "Benighted States of Demagogia."

Of course this political progress has been made possible by a great intellectual advance. In the early days of our Republic, we were essentially a humble, God-fearing people. Confessing our ignorance of the great design of human existence, we believed that it was the simple obligation of every man to work hard for a livelihood which would permit him to take care of himself and his dependents, and to develop a personal security against the inevitable hardships and misfortunes of living.

In this spirit men and women of many races and creeds found the ways and means to work together for individual and common gains, with such success that the most powerful and prosperous nation ever known was built up by the mighty energies of a free people. Not only the material power but also the intellectual power of the American people steadily increased. The level of ordinary education and higher education rose rapidly under universal encouragement of schools which were open to all who had the capacity and patient determination to deepen their minds and improve their ability to realize their ambitions.

The scientist, the inventor and the philosopher became honored even more than the managers of business and finance. Our respect for learning grew so great that millions of people began to feel that a political or economic creed, founded upon the dogmas of the learned, was of greater importance than a religious creed founded upon a faith which could not be proved by a test tube or by a heavy volume of statistical facts.

Millions of people lost sight of the elemental ignorance of great scientists. They did not realize that the masters of electrical science did not even know what electricity was. They did not realize that the mystery of the atom remained a mystery, even after the atomic scientists split the atom. They did not realize that consciousness, the supreme fact of lift, was still a mystery to the greatest of biologists—or philosophers.

One of the outstanding modern scientists, Dr. Robert A. Millikan, wrote 20 years ago that "fullness of knowledge always and necessarily means some understanding of the depths of our ignorance."

He also wrote down his judgment that "if the influence of American churches in the furtherance of socially wholesome and forward-looking movements, in the spread of conscientious and unselfish living of all sorts, were to be eliminated, our democracy would in a few years become so corrupt that it could not endure."

Unhappily there have been many lesser scientists, and a multitude of those who have assumed to assert a small or large intellectual leadership, who have not retained the humility appropriate to their fundamental ignorance. We see great numbers of fanatic reformers and noisy politicians who are now undertaking to play God and to hurl the lightning of political compulsion against all who will not submit to laws written to enforce their concepts of morality.

A man-made government may wisely and safely establish rules to maintain an orderly society which will provide security for the individual from violence, theft and fraud. Only in such security can men and women enjoy the benefits of community life, and work together in enterprises of common gain. Government also offers a practical means through which the more capable or more fortunate members of society can fulfill their humane obligations to alleviate the sorrows of their less capable or more unfortunate neighbors.

But this does not prove that government offers a desirable or practical means of guaranteeing economic security to all persons within its domain. On the contrary, let the free man go on guard whenever government moves into any project of restricting individual freedom of action for the purpose of creating a pattern of living or working which is supposed to be for the benefit of society as a whole, or for the purpose of redistributing the rewards of labor, or determining where and when and under what conditions men shall or shall not be permitted to work, individually or in cooperative enterprises.

Let the free man, and his would-be guide or master, remember that the dominant characteristics of human beings, have persisted for thousands and thousands of years during the long slow rise of man from the jungles into the refinements and complexities of modern civilization. Among these are self-preservation, love of liberty, individuality in likes and dislikes and ambitions, a customary energy in free labor and a customary apathy in compulsory labor.

These enduring characteristics of human nature are not going to be changed by law. Men and women, forced into a planned economy, regimented into socialized industries, will not remain the docile servants of a fictitious master called the State. They will soon learn that their real master is a human being, a political tyrant who is trying to usurp the throne of the God who created them—who created them free.

Why do we seem to be going in the direction of national socialism, which is just a way-station on the road to communism? Why are millions of unhappy people in many lands subject to a communistic tyranny? Why is the shadow of such tyranny spreading over other lands? Why do notable political leaders in our own prosperous land dare to advocate more and more socialism for our free people?

The answer to this last question is that too many of our intellectuals, and too many of their swarming pupils, have inflated themselves in two or three generations from the humility of conscious ignorance to the arrogance of half-educated egotism.

They have not learned enough to know how ignorant they still are. They have not retained the humility of a truly learned man. They have learned just enough to discard childish fears of a finite God, but not enough to gain a mature devotion to the infinite God. They have not learned enough to know that, although their animal eyes will never see God, He is visible through the eyes of a faithful soul. They have not learned enough to know that there are divine laws that overrule all human laws; and that, when God created a world of free men and women, the divine law of self-preservation was established, not a law that human life must be preserved, but that human freedom must be preserved, even at the cost of human life.

You must forgive me for preaching this short sermon, but I am convinced that, whether we are going to make America eventually a heaven or a hell on earth, depends upon whether we continue to pursue happiness as free men and women, which appears to be the divine plan, or whether we shift to a socialistic slavery, planned by half-educated politicians and godless fanatics.

One of the essential steps in persuading a free people to accept the rule of Socialists is to establish the moral conviction that all men are created equal (which is a biological falsehood) and that in a democracy they should enjoy economic and social equality, although the fundamental virtue of a free and democratic society is that it offers the opportunity to enjoy a better living and better associations to those who have better abilities. In truth, the leveling down of citizens to the same income and the same privileges, regardless of the value of their services to others, would destroy all the values, purposes, and objectives of political freedom and democracy.

So the Socialist morality must be based on the assertion and repetitious reassertion of an outright falsehood which is that a Democrat must believe in the equality and equal rights of all human beings. This is supported by another falsehood which is that men are not free unless they are legally free to go where they please, to do what they please, and to associate with whom they please. But even a child can see that every freedom legally granted to one person to do anything means that other people must be denied freedom. If I am free to go into your home, or your place of business, or to use your property in any other way, then your freedom to use your own property as you please is denied. If I am free to force my company upon you, then your freedom to choose your own company is denied.

What the Socialist moralizers are in fact demanding is not equal freedom for all but a special privilege for a favored few to violate the long-accepted freedoms of all the rest of the people. Even as a demand for a special privilege the alleged moral issue is a crafty fraud because no one will be really free in a state of national socialism. The use of moral slogans to accomplish an immoral end is a favorite device of every hypocritical political schemer. A moral purpose is an essential shield for hideous deeds. The lie is an ever-useful weapon of the politician; and the Socialist lies are the seeds of tyranny which bear fruit in vainglorious cruelties of a Mussolini, the inhuman cruelties of a Hitler, the calculated cruelties of a Stalin, and the apologetic cruelties of a Labor government in England—or America.

We can obtain complete social security only in a Government prison. We can attain social equality only in the cold rigidity of death. Neither of these are the avowed goals of our Socialist equalizers, but they are beckoning us to follow them into a national penitentiary and into the death agonies of a free people.

So, let the free man also go on guard the instant the Government undertakes to establish and enforce by law any moral doctrine that has not been sanctioned by the customs and habits of millions of human beings from time immemorial. The cardinal sins have been similarly defined and identified by many races and creeds for thousands of years. The cardinal sinner is a confirmed enemy of society, whom the Government has the right and duty to prosecute and punish.

But the greatest moral precepts ever uttered, which are found in the Sermon on the Mount, cannot be written into law and their observance enforced by a policeman's club. How utterly muddle-headed and wicked are the petty moralists of today who would enact their dubious dogmas of right and wrong into law, and have a Federal police force pound them into the heads of a protesting people, or ram them down their throats with bayonets.

Communists, supported by a host of zealous socializers, are advocating compulsory Federal laws to compel men to associate in work or play with persons with whom they are

unwilling to work or to play. The Communists would enjoy enforcing such laws, because they thrive on disorder and renounce all religious moralities. But, how many of the non-Communist socializers, how many misguided churchmen, for example, would be willing, or would dare personally, to attempt to force other men to employ persons or to associate intimately with persons with whom they are unwilling to associate. The moral right of any free man to choose his compansions is so clear, his moral right to a free-will choice, based on reason or whim, based on like or dislike for race, color, or religion, if you please, that moral right is so clear, and the moral wrong of compelling him to accept an offensive association is also so clear, that no one who sincerely believes in human freedom could have the moral courage to face the righteous wrath of a deliberate violator of his oppressive law. No, he would leave law enforcement to men paid to do the dirty work of enforcing the vicious law he made.

This need to employ men to do unto others what you would not do unto them yourself might well be used as a test of the morality of any law. Would you be willing or able to enforce it yourself? Could you face the noble rage of a law violator who was ready to defend at any cost his freedom from your arrogant assumption of a moral dictatorship? Would you dare to try to enforce your law in a community which refused to obey? Or would you order the hired help in brass buttons to do the dirty work for you? A genuine moral leader is usually found facing the guns—not crawling along behind them.

It is particularly difficult to see where we are going today because so many of our misguiders are sincerely trying to achieve good ends by leading us into evil ways. They are trying to help their fellow men by depriving them of the power to help themselves. They are trying to find peace and security by fostering tyrannies that make more wars and greater insecurity inevitable.

They are clamoring for enforcement of what they call the civil rights of minorities, without calling for a corresponding enforcement of the civil obligations of minorities, and with no regard for the necessity of preserving our constitutional protections of the rights and liberties of all the people.

Let me make this misguidance clear by reviewing briefly three major items in the original Communist program that have been adopted by Democratic and Republican socializers.

First, is an anti-poll-tax Federal law. Although payment of taxes by all citizens might well be made a qualification for voting, it can be persuasively argued that it is unfair to deprive only the citizens of a few States of the right to vote unless they pay taxes. However, the Constitution of the United States definitely leaves the right to vote subject to State laws, with only the requirements that the right shall not be denied because of race, color, or previous condition of servitude or because of sex.

It is a far more serious wrong for the Congress to attempt to exercise a power denied to it by the Constitution than for a State to exercise perhaps unfairly a power which it undoubtedly has under the Constitution. As a matter of personal opinion, I think it might be well for every State to enact a law making the right to vote dependent on the filing of a tax return—not on the payment of a tax, but on the making of a tax return. In this way a multitude of tax-dodgers who are now insisting on their right to vote, but evading their obligation to pay taxes, would have the exercise of their civil right made dependent, as it should be, on the fulfillment of their civil obligation to support the government they wish to control. If taxation without representation be tyranny then representation without willingness to pay taxes is also tyranny.

Second, is an antilynching Federal law. No one can morally defend mob rule when there is an orderly, impartial administration of justice provided for the punishment of crimes. But, here again the Constitution definitely leaves authority in the States to prevent and punish all ordinary crimes, and it is an offense of more far-reaching evil consequences for Members of Congress, who are sworn to support the Constitution, to violate the Constitution than for an individual to violate the rights of another individual. To write and enforce a law which you have no authority to make is a form of lawlessness for which there is no emotional excuse.

If there were a widespread campaign against the failure of State governments to enforce their criminal laws, or to protect the victims of crime, or to protect the rights of those accused of crime, we might well consider the wisdom of supplementing State powers with Federal powers in the field of criminal justice. This would, of course, require an amendment to the Federal Constitution.

But, on the contrary, there is not today even a widespread demand to have the National Government exercise the power which it has under the Constitution to prevent and punish crimes that seriously obstruct interstate commerce. The punishment of criminals who, in a labor dispute subject to Federal law, slug and maim and kill their opponents, and often disinterested people, is left to local police who are frequently helpless to resist the numbers of deliberate law breakers who establish mob rule. Only the development of an effective counter mob brings demands for Federal intervention to protect the alleged civil rights of those whose criminal conspiracies are immunized by Federal law.

What justification is offered for an unconstitutional antilynching law? There was one lynching in the entire United States in 1947, according to the Tuskegee records. In that same year there were recorded by the FBI over 7,700 murders and over 17,000 cases of rape in the United States. There were only 6,571 persons arrested for criminal homicide and only 9,742 for rape. Obviously a very large number of murderers and rapists were not apprehended or punished. We know from many newspaper reports and other investigations that a shameful number of the murders were committed by gangsters and other organized criminals. We know from official reports that there were in Detroit 112 murders, in Chicago 209, in New York 333, which are three notorious hotbeds of gangsterism and labor warfare.

Is there a strong demand from the crime-ridden cities of the North for a Federal law to protect the lives of their citizens? There is no such demand. On the contrary we find the Representatives in Congress from these cities and States generally yielding to the demand of pressure groups that they violate their oaths of office and enact a Federal law to prevent and punish mob lawlessness of one kind only, through which only one man in the United States lost his life in 1947. From the graves of 7,700 others murdered in 1947 might well arise an echo of that divine protest: "Woe unto you, Scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are as graves which appear not, and the men who walk over them are not aware of them."

Time will permit me to add only a short comment on the third item on the pseudo liberal program, that is the proposal of a Federal law to undermine the private management of private business. This proposal is piously called a Fair Employment Practice Act. It would grant power to a Federal commission to review every act of every sizable employer in the Nation in order to decide whether in hiring, or firing, or promoting, or otherwise dealing with an employee, or an applicant for work, he had given any consideration to his race, color, or religion.

Under this act, as similar laws have been administered, no employer could exercise his freedom of speech or freedom of the press, or exercise his religious freedom, even to inquire as to the race, color, or religion of applicants for work or of his employees. Under this act Federal bureaucrats could override an employer's judgment as to whom he should hire or promote, on the basis of their opinion as to whether he was influenced by any preference for or against a person because of his race, color, or religion. The employer would be forced to accept this outside, arbitrary judgment, or else engage in an expensive lawsuit—not to vindicate his freedom of choice but to demonstrate that his motives were free from any taint of a politically created immorality. He must demonstrate that he has acted free from the prejudices against or in favor of race, color, or religion which have influenced the opinions of mankind since the dawn of history and still influence the opinions of almost every human being, including the half-educated, intolerant Communists who originally gave birth to this new moral doctrine—and devised the new political program of thought control by forced education.

I get easily wound up on the subject of the viciousness of the FEPC program. I must stop myself before I exhaust both the subject and my audience. So, I will leave you to draw your own conclusions as to your respect for the intelligence, or the loyalty to his oath, of any Member of the Congress who supports such legislation. I fear that if I continued you might apply to me the comment of a man who was told that an ancient clock would run 8 days without winding, and who said: "I wonder how long it would run if it was wound up."

In conclusion let me attempt a brief answer to my question: Where are we going?

Our destination, and our destiny, depend on whether a dominating number of the American people will turn away from the allurements of the devil, who offers to all fear-ridden mortals a mythical world of security and plenty, if they will only surrender to him their God-given love of liberty. That was once the political religion of America, burgeoning out of the reverent faith of Americans in the divine origin and purpose of human life.

Surely a majority of Americans will not join those who are willing to put all their faith in Government, because they have lost faith in themselves. We have not lost faith in ourselves. We have not lost faith in our God—who made us to be free.

Fair Deal Mathematics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL E. MUNDT

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 7 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, mathematics used to be considered an exact science, and the multiplication table was recognized for years as a fixed pattern of consequences. Comes now the Fair Deal, however, with an endeavor to twist the science of mathematics to suit its own purposes and to justify its political conjectures. Tampering with the

mathematical formula is a very interesting pastime for pundits and professors, but from the standpoint of a man owning a Government bond or trying to finance his old age by a pension program the consequences are both serious and tragic.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Magazine of Wall Street which deals with the intriguing subject of Fair Deal mathematics.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TWO TIMES TWO EQUAL SIX

(By Vermont Royster)

The economic experts of the new school are promulgating a new kind of arithmetic in which things equal to the same things aren't equal to each other. It's already being used in arguments to prove that inflation won't rob the people of any benefits from their social security and pension plans.

Inflation, say the modern mathmaticians, will not milk these planned savings programs for financial security because the programs can be enlarged and expanded to keep pace with the depreciation of the dollar just as wages and prices can adjust themselves to inflated money values.

Even the most liberal economist admits that inflation equals a depreciation in the value of all other forms of dollar savings, as for example, bank deposits. But the Government's security programs and the new industrial pension plans are to escape this erstwhile inflexible rule by the abracadabra of the new arithmetic.

This advance in mathematics comes as a great boon to the planners, who have long advocated inflation as a means of raising dollar wages. Now they have an argument, to allay fears that inflation will rob the worker of his retirement savings funds.

The new view can be discerned in President Truman's economic message to Congress. There he forecast a steadily rising wage-price level (a $12,000 annual average wage) implemented by Government spending; he also simultaneously praised the growth of social-security programs, public and private, which he said were thrift-wise preparations for our old age. There was no suggestion in his message that the one development might adversely affect the other.

There was much more than a hint of the new logic in the report of the Council of Economic Advisers, which endorsed inflation so long as it does not proceed too rapidly. And this philosophy is explicit in the economic programs of the labor unions.

The arithmetic of the argument takes many forms. One of the simplest runs as follows:

A company establishes a pension plan. Let us say that this year it sets aside $100 for employee Smith's retirement 25 or 30 years hence. Now if next year it develops that the dollar's purchasing power has depreciated, the plan is inflated too. If the dollar's depreciation is about 10 percent, the union will demand—and get—$110 put in his pension account that year. The third year this is again increased by whatever is necessary to match the decrease in the dollar's buying power.

Naturally the number of dollars in the pension Mr. Smith is to draw on that happy future day is likewise increased. And so on, and on.

Now how is inflation going to hurt him? As the years roll by he will pay more dollars for his butter and eggs, but he will also find more dollars in his pay envelope. And even his enforced savings in the pension plan are going to be safeguarded by this expansible economics.

It is a neat and plausible argument, and it is obviously politically effective since people seem to be accepting both inflation and the pension plans without much cavil.

Of course what is lost sight of in this little logical progression is what will happen during this inflation to the $100 Mr. Smith has now, in 1950, to his credit. With inflation that $100 is as hard to keep track of as the evanescent queen in the old game of three-card monte.

To see what will happen to that $100, look back at the hours it took the average worker to earn $100 in 1940. Consider the quantity of food and clothes and other goods he had to do without to set it aside. And consider now what he could buy with it if he were drawing on it for retirement income. The deferred payment for his 1940 labor has been sliced in half.

The same thing will happen to Mr. Smith's pension plan if inflation continues. This year he has $100 of savings put aside. Whether he pays it directly or whether his employer contributes it doesn't alter the fact that it is his kitty for the future. That $100 represents a measurable quantity of wealth; today it's equivalent to about 50 bushels of wheat. Those dollars are to Smith the personal equivalent of food stored away for the day he can no longer toil.

Now, it is quite true that as inflation comes his escalating pension plan will credit him with more dollars in succeeding years. In the above example he would get $110 in 1951, and if everything were properly adjusted to the new price level this would again let him save the equivalent of 50 bushels of wheat. He seems to be keeping up with inflation.

But, in the meantime, what has happened to his little hoard put away in 1950? It is still $100, but that $100 is no longer the equivalent of 50 bushels of wheat. With the cheapening of the dollar by inflation, that sum will buy only about 45 bushels of wheat. Mr. Smith, in 1951, has been robbed of 5 bushels that he had in 1950.

At the end of 2 years without inflation he would have $200 in his retirement fund—the equivalent in goods of 100 bushels of wheat. With inflation and his elastic pension plan, he will, at the end of 2 years, have $210 to his credit. But in terms of goods he has the equivalent of only 95 bushels of wheat—and it's goods, not pieces of paper, he needs to live on when he retires.

And so it goes. Further inflation in 1952 robs the 1950 kitty further. It also robs the 1951 investment. Each succeeding year quietly steals from all the hopes of each preceding year.

Until recently no one denied this. It was too obvious that inflation robbed savings. Politicians who advocated inflation and economists who justified it simply ignored the fact, arguing that at worst it only robbed the well-to-do. Indeed, inflation was oftentimes urged precisely because it robbed a minority of savers for the benefit of a majority of nonsavers.

Now, it has become necessary to alter the argument. With the growth of pension plans, union welfare funds, and Government social security, it would not longer do politically to urge inflation through deficit financing and to concede still that it would rob the people's savings, and so the new arithmetic.

Henceforth the pedagogs of the new school will have to teach that inflation is a means of dividing the value of money savings—except where those savings are in a Government or union pension plan. In that case a different set of rules will be taught. Then inflation will be called a means of multiplying the worker's thrifty hoard against a rainy day.

The Point 4 Proposal

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

STATEMENT BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS ON IMPORTANCE OF THE POINT 4 PROPOSAL BY J. T. SANDERS, LEGISLATIVE COUNSEL, THE NATIONAL GRANGE, JANUARY 12, 1950

Point 4 involves one of the most important national problems our Nation will be called on to consider during the current postwar period. It involves the question of whether or not we will fit our position wisely and soundly into the present troubled world.

The point 4 proposal is a part and parcel, a continuation of our effort to adjust ourselves into the new world which began with UNRRA, then moved over into our efforts to supplant a failing UNRRA by the ECA. We now realize that ECA was a transitional agency that merely took over where UNRRA was rapidly failing, and now as we pass the midpoint of the contemplated life of ECA we are faced with the realization also that with the second try we have not set our feet as a nation on the path that leads to the proper assumption of our inevitable position as the world's wealthiest, most productive, most admired, and most feared nation.

Until we realize that we occupy this position in the world, and that it cries mightily for a quick, long-time adjustment to a position of real world leadership, we fear that we will continue to grope through other temporary UNRRA's and ECA's, and thus fail to move directly and surely into a better world. Both UNRRA and ECA were great and serviceable agents and undoubtedly led us toward a better world; but as a worker in UNRRA it is my judgment that it lacked both the means and the will to move from a position as a relief agency to a permanent international policy agency, while ECA lacks the former.

As we view the point 4 proposal, and if it is to become truly an instrument of long-time value in solving the world's present economic difficulties and uncertainties, we must be guided by what seems to us the main objectives we as a nation seek. The objectives appear to us to be as follows:

(a) Our immediate and urgent objective is to close the five to six billion gap in our export-import balance and to stop at the earliest possible moment wholesale international charity, that has been just as necessary for us as for the recipients.

(b) Another and dominant objective, it seems to me, is for our Nation to assume a sensible, sound, and inevitable position as the world's main investor nation, and thus to help us in the coming intermediate years to balance and help stabilize the world's exchange situation.

(c) To develop and conserve presently wasted natural and human resources, and thus expand the economy of other nations, and, with their expansion, expand our own economy.

(d) To create a sound, economic base for a peaceful world.

(e) To strengthen the UN as an instrument of world government and hence world peace.

It will be noted that I have not listed humanitarian aims as one of our motives. This does not mean that we think that this

is not, and should not be, one of the all-pervading motives we have in helping to set up and taking the necessary initiative in setting up a sound point 4 program. But the less this can be said to be one of our direct aims, the more practical it seems to me will be our approach. What the world is seeking earnestly, what we should strive for, is an abandonment of wholesale charity at the earliest time.

This point 4 proposition must be approached with the maximum realism. This Nation must of necessity be even a greater proportionate financial contributor to a world-wide or international point 4 program than we were with UNRRA—over two-thirds of all its financial support. The main difference is that UNRRA was a one-way street; point 4 must truly be mutually profitable to the suppliers of financial support and to the recipients. As long as we believe implicitly in the superiority of the capitalistic system and in democracy, practical politics tells us that point 4 cannot be set up so as to stimulate the growth of a totalitarian economy in any country. That, to my way of thinking, was the basic reason the United States abandoned support of UNRRA. Yet any point 4 program will miserably fail if it incorporates means whereby investing nations can and do interfere with the liberty and freedom of the recipient nation.

The faith of the National Grange in the point 4 program rests mainly on our belief in the fundamental soundness and the ultimate triumph in the world of the principles incorporated in the Grange Guide Posts as follows:

1. All prosperity springs from the production of wealth; or anything which retards the production of wealth is unsound.

2. The compensation of each should be based on what he contributes to the general welfare.

3. The prime purpose of government is to protect its citizens from aggression—both physical and economic.

We as a farm organization are deeply interested in the development of an internationally and nationally sound point 4 program. We know that the underdeveloped nature of the nations which a point 4 program will directly help, is due to an unsound balance between their agriculture and their nonagricultural industry. A rough estimate of the occupational distribution in these countries would probably be 80-percent agricultural and 20-percent nonagricultural—the opposite of the situation in our country. Essentially, therefore, a sound point 4 program would work constantly toward a shift from agriculture to industry, and this is indeed a slow, long-time laborious task.

We also cannot support any point 4 proposal that does not coordinate integrally with and enhance the functions of the UN. Our official pronouncement on this score is forceful and unmistakable as follows:

"We are convinced that our policy should be one of wholehearted support of the United Nations and that we should do everything in our power to build it and strengthen it as an instrument of peace. A strengthened United Nations undoubtedly should provide a legislative body to enact laws related to world peace, with some practical and equitable system of weighted representation, a world court to interpret the law, and a world police force to enforce it."

In view of our emphasis on production as the basis of a peaceful world we favor the approach to increased world production, both agricultural and industrial, which is contemplated as the goal of point 4. We feel that the bill, H. R. 5615, represents a farsighted step toward the exercise of United States leadership in improving the productive resources and the conditions of life and labor for those vast populations of the world now far below the standard of economic life which our modern technology can make possible.

The implications of the point 4 program are great. The Grange is not expert in all phases of the contemplated program. But we have studied the two bills before your committee, and studied the official explanations of the program made available to us. We would like to set forth certain general, basic principles which we feel should guide the Congress in writing the point 4 concept into law. These principles are:

1. Since we favor maximum use of the UN, we believe that through the point 4 program nations must act in concert for common ends in the present world, where even a powerful nation as the United States cannot afford to stand alone. If we support the principle of cooperative action with other nations, we must do everything possible to effectuate that principle. Having set up the UN, we must use it so that it can mature in capacity and effectiveness as a world government and consequently as an agency of world peace.

2. Even though we know that our motives toward the under-developed areas are not those of the exploiter, we must realize that real fears of this exist—and can be fanned into flame—against the United States and her alleged imperialist schemes. The way to counteract this is to retain our program as it is contemplated in the Kee bill, but to lean over backwards in our every word and deed to make our intentions incapable of misinterpretation. Use of the UN is one of the best ways we can show our genuine intent to give assistance, not dictation.

3. We must not forget that other countries have technical resources which will be as valuable to under-developed areas as is our technology. Especially can better pooling of technical assistance be achieved through UN, and channelling the major part of the technical-assistance program through UN will also insure that other countries contribute their share of costs. Therefore we approve of the plans laid out in the Kee bill for providing a broad technical-assistance program through which the scientific advances of the industrialized nations can be shared with nonindustrialized areas whose methods of producing the necessities of life are still at a relatively primitive level.

4. It is important to recognize, however, that method must be supplemented with financial aid or investments if productive capacity is to be measurably increased. It is highly desirable that one phase of the technical assistance offered to under-developed areas be that of fiscal advice to the governments, so that every possible step can be pointed out to them for channelling their own available wealth into productive investment. Further, it is apparent that a substantial flow of foreign investment must be directed to these areas. It is hoped that additional study will be given by the United States Government to determining how best to stimulate private investment. It may be that a considerable volume of public investment is needed in the initial stages of a region's economic development, especially in the matter of development of such natural resources as water power, before the area will attract equity capital. We are not prepared to make recommendations on this question, but we do feel strongly that the program should not be limited to technical assistance. Technical assistance is an ingredient in economic development, but technical assistance alone cannot yield the results we want from this program. Intensive study should be given to ways of insuring that economically under-developed areas increasingly gain access to domestic or foreign sources of investment capital.

5. Since United States help to under-developed areas is a program which should involve all segments of the Nation's economy, it appears that an advisory board should be established by law, composed of representatives of agriculture, business, labor, and the professions. This board should be a real advisory body to the administrator, and should be composed of informed men and women of experience in matters affecting public policy. It would serve the purpose of keeping the program as close to the citizen as possible so that the honest humanitarianism and good practical sense of the average American can be incorporated into the missions of assistance which we send abroad. For the spirit in which this program is undertaken will determine its success as much as anything else.

Is the West Against Itself?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS at Stanford University, California, November 11, 1949:

IS THE WEST AGAINST ITSELF?

I appreciate greatly the opportunity that you are giving me to speak at Stanford University on a question of public policy. Your university is well known throughout the length and breadth of the land as a center for thought and reflection, for investigation and teaching. In creating this occasion you are saying, if I interpret your invitation correctly, that a university may also offer itself, upon appropriate occasion, as a place where the university community may gather with members of the public to hear discussion of great public questions—even by a person who is active in the political life of the State. I appreciate this occasion and I respect its high character.

Your institution has been playing a role in the life of the West, now for some 60 years. In those two generations you have identified yourselves as contributors to its cultural and material growth. It has seemed proper to me, therefore, that I have chosen the West itself, as my topic of the evening. I should like to tell you some of my thoughts about the West—its past and its future, but especially its future. Also I want to tell you some of the questions that come into my mind as I contemplate the programs and forces that are shaping our future. They are serious questions, they demand answers, and I ask your help in finding the right answers.

Last May a great Californian was asking Congress a question, "Is the West against itself?"

A few weeks after he asked it Richard J. Welch, of San Francisco, died, leaving the question behind him to be answered.

Dick Welch's long consistent fight to develop western waters will place him, in the history of Congress, among the men who for a hundred years have understood how to realize the full benefits from our land and water resources, for all the people. His name will stand alongside the defenders of the Homestead Act—Andrew Johnson, of Tennessee; Galusha Grow, of Pennsylvania; George Julian, of Indiana—and beside those

Members who fought, or are now fighting, in defense of reclamation—Newlands of Nevada; Hansbrough of North Dakota; Mondell of Wyoming; Norris of Nebraska; Hayden and Murdock of Arizona; Murray of Montana—and others with a similar sense of the future.

There are men in Congress, today as always, who do not see the need of solving problems until the problems press so hard that all can see them; they are the men who arrive after the house has caught fire.

Then there are those others—the Norrises and the Welches—who look ahead, seeking to prevent the social and economic tragedies that men of the first type recognize only after they run into them face to face.

There are still others who are indifferent, and there are some who, for one reason or another, create obstructions.

Dick Welch is remembered now by the people of San Francisco with affection. He will be remembered in the years to come by the people of the entire West with gratitude and respect.

Is the West against itself?

Dick Welch asked this question on May 4. He was defending the unity of Central Valley development against those others who, for reasons of their own, were willing to see it destroyed on the American River.

Is the West against itself?

It is a seaching question and a fair one.

Fifty years ago the West was not divided against itself. Western men were united by a common purpose. They wanted fuller development of western waters. They wanted actual settlers to get the water so they could make homes on the land. They wanted them to get the water without having to pay anything to speculators. They wanted no monopoly.

In 1891 western citizens began to meet annually, first in one city then in another, to see how the costs of what they wanted could be met. They examined very possibility and came to an agreement. They agreed that if left to private corporations alone, only the less expensive river diversions would be made, because corporations could not afford the costs of the great reservoirs that are the backbone of full development. They agreed—and the records of Congress are explicit on this point—that even if, like the railroads, corporations were to receive great blocks of land out of which to recoup themselves, they did not want the monopoly and speculation in water and land that that method would create. They agreed, somewhat reluctantly, that the States were not able to pay the costs. They agreed that the Federal Government alone could finance this job.

It was necessary to convince the Federal taxpayers, most of them in the East, that they ought to help the West to develop. A formula fair to all had to be found. It was found, and in 1902 Congress wrote it into the statutes, and called it the national reclamation law.

By its terms the beneficiaries were to repay the capital cost of irrigation in installments spread over many years. The Federal Government would grant the money interest-free, a simple formula that cut the cost to irrigators to less than half. Since 1902 still other ways to increase the amount of Federal assistance to western irrigators have been added to the law.

When the reclamation bill was in debate prior to passage, the representatives of the entire country, West and East alike, agreed that the expenditure of public money could not be justified if it was to result in private monopolies of water.

So they wrote into the law, with care and pride, a provision that if any private lands should receive the benefits of reclamation law no individual landholders could receive more water than sufficient for 160 acres. Remember that no landholder was obliged to ask for the benefits of reclamation law, but if he chose to do so, he had to comply with its terms. As a citizen he could not receive more than this—his share.

The congressional delegations of all the Western States were solid in their support of the reclamation bill. When President Theodore Roosevelt signed it on June 17, 1902, it became law.

I am telling you about a great episode in western history. Sometimes I think there are those who would like us to forget it, or at least to forget the part of it that records a determination that western waters developed by public money shall not be turned to the uses of monopoly. A determination that our society shall be molded in forms that benefit the many, not the few.

I think there are those who would like us to forget that in 1902 Theodore Roosevelt said the purpose of reclamation is to make homes on the land.

I think there are some who would like us to forget the western Congressman who said: "The policy of the Government is—not to encourage the prosecution of agriculture by large corporations."

Sometimes I think that in these days when corporations and individuals with tracts of 1,000, 5,000, 10,000, and more acres wait hopefully to have their great holdings watered and their land values increased at public expense, there are some who would like to have us forget Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson knew what makes a good society and a just one. In 1776 he brought before the legislature of the colony of Virginia his famous bill to abolish entailed estates. "In the earlier times of the colony," he said, "when lands were to be had for little or nothing, some provident individuals procured large grants; * * * desirous of founding great families for themselves. * * * the transmission of this property from generation to generation in the same name, raised up a distinct set of families * * * privileged by law in the perpetuation of their wealth, (and) thus formed into a patrician order * * * to annul this privilege, and instead of an aristocracy of wealth, more harm and danger than benefit to society, to make an opening for the aristocracy of virtue and talent, which nature has wisely provided for in the direction of the interests of society, and scattered with equal hand through all its conditions, was deemed essential to a well-ordered Republic." The colonial legislature deliberated, then under the leadership of Jefferson struck down the legal device of entail by which large landed estates then were perpetuated. Primogeniture went out the same way, and Americans of a former day felt secure that monopoly of the land, and of the power over the lives of other men which it confers, never would survive in America.

There are men today who seek repeal of the 160-acre water limitation. Whether these men understand that by doing so they are strengthening the pillars of monopoly and weakening the supports of democracy, I do not know. But I have faith that the people can understand.

No one had to ask the question in 1902: Is the West against itself? For the West knew its own best interest, and no voice from within was raised against it.

This is the centennial year of our State. We are telling again the old story that gold was the cornerstone of California. True, when this State was not yet 10 years old. The 1850's had not run their course, however, before man were saying that gold was only one of our resources. They had already turned to the rivers in the foothills to bring water to the land.

Today we have a new technology they did not have. We can use the power of the falling waters to create industries and jobs as well as to irrigate the land.

The future of California depends on how we use our natural resources—our forests and soils, our oil and natural gas, but above all our water.

Water is the perpetual self-renewing resource. By its proper use we can turn the deserts into farms, and make electric power—like food and fiber—into a crop that will spring into life anew each year with the rhythm of the seasons.

Our generation has this chance—to lay a foundation for the perpetual sustenance and well-being of the generations to follow. That is why the use of water is the highest issue of public policy within our Commonwealth today.

When Dick Welch asked the question, "Is the West against itself?" He was asking whether the people understood the foundation of their own future.

I, for one, believe that if Californians do understand it, they will not work against themselves. They will defend their heritage and protect their future.

This evening I want to discuss the Central Valley.

When I speak of Central Valley I am talking about a vast valley that stretches from Mount Shasta in the north to the Techachapis in the south. From the crest of the Sierra on the east to the hills of the coast range on the west—one-third of California. I am talking about an area as large as the State of Massachusetts, the State of Connecticut, the State of Rhode Island, and one-half the State of New Jersey.

I am talking about a project in that valley that will extend over the next 50 years. I am talking about a project in which the ultimate Federal investment will be perhaps three times the Federal investment in the Tennessee Valley.

The President of the United States recently authorized the Secretary of the Interior to transmit a report to Congress on full development of the Central Valley Basin. Congress has received the report. It is being printed now. I suggest that you obtain a copy when you can, and study it.

This Central Valley Basin report proposes a unified system under reclamation of 38 major reservoirs, 3 enormous pumping plants, 15 major canals covering almost 1,500 miles, together with thousands of miles of laterals and drains, 28 hydroelectric power plants, supplementary steam plants, and power transmission lines to carry the power generated at the dams to the giant pumps that form links in the canal systems, as well as to factories in the cities, to the irrigation pumps and milking machines on the farms, and to homes everywhere.

It proposes to protect 360,000 acres in the Sacramento-Sarr Joaquin Delta from the intrusion of salt from San Francisco Bay. It provides for bird refuges, for fish ladders and hatcheries, and for recreation on a chain of lakes within easy reach of the floor of the valley.

Construction started on the first part of this great program in 1935. More than $300,000,000 has been spent on Shasta, Keswick, and Friant Dams, on the Delta cross-channel, Delta-Mendota and Friant-Kern canals, and on power generators, transmission lines, and pumping machinery. This construction could not have begun until men conceived and accepted the idea that the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys are parts of the same watershed that man can make into an effective unit.

Nature has distributed water and land unevenly in the Central Valley—about two-thirds of the water in the Sacramento, and about two-thirds of the irrigable land in the San Joaquin. The present construction will impound most of the floodwaters of the San

Joaquin River behind Friant Dam, then release them north to thirsty land through Madera canal, and south for 150 miles through the Friant-Kern.

The flow of the San Joaquin River, diverted in this way from its natural course, will be replaced and augmented by water from the Sacramento River, carried through channels across the delta, hoisted 200 feet up, through huge steel and concrete tubes, by a battery of pumps, then let flow for 120 miles, down a concrete-lined canal that slopes gently—to Mendota where it will refill the channel of the San Joaquin and replace the waters diverted above at Friant Dam.

There would be no present project without unity between the Sacramento and San Joaquin. We never will get the fullest possible use of the waters of Central Valley without unity throughout the basin. Without unity we cannot coordinate the various streams within the various parts of the basin.

Flood control demands empty reservoir-space at some seasons. Irrigation requires that as much water as possible be held back in winter, for release months later. Power generation requires that water be released in a flow through the turbines coordinated carefully to the fluctuating power load. These requirements of flood control, irrigation, and power are partly in conflict with each other. Therefore, only the most skilled operation in control of the entire system, can strike the essential balances that will wring the maximum benefit from every drop and snowflake that falls on the 500-mile watershed. California cannot afford to waste one drop.

Yet there are some, who for whatever reasons, have not hesitated to work for the destruction of unity in the Central Valley.

The Central Valley Basin report now in the hands of Congress proposes to make water available for nearly 2,000,000 acres of land now irrigated inadequately, and for about 3,000,000 acres not now irrigated at all. It proposes to generate 8,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of electricity every year. With unity this can be done. Without it, some water will waste to the sea every year, some land needing water that could have it will not get it, and some electricity that might have done work will never be generated.

I suggest, if you want to see this spelled out, that you get from your library a copy of the recent report by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Federal Government. Ask for the volume that contains the Task Force Report on Natural Resources, and read the special study that tells part of the price of destroying Central Valley unity on the Kings River.

The program for unified development of the Central Valley Basin is a program to enable our sons and grandsons to employ their skills and ingenuity to the greatest advantage, and to dig their roots deep into the soils that nourish our democracy.

I believe that the people of California will defend and support a fair and full and unified development of water. Why do I believe it? For many established localities, this kind of development is not a theoretical issue. It is a matter of survival.

A few weeks ago the people of Orange Cove celebrated the first bringing of project water to that community and the surrounding farms. Out of a man-made river—the giant Friant-Kern canal—came water to a community where the citrus and olive groves, the vineyards and the truck-farms were threatened because the underground water on which they depended had practically disappeared. On July 10 water came to Orange Cove, it had been carried 45 miles from the man-made lake behind Friant Dam to the people of Orange Cove. Because men have vision water had been stored for the day of use, instead of wasting to the sea. Little wonder the people celebrated.

They could not wait for a permanent distribution system to be built. When water released at Friant, the day before, came to Orange Cove on July 10, 1949 they siphoned it out by all manner of crude but ingenious devices. The Central Valley project was placing a firm foundation under their community. They had signed a water contract with the United States: "Stabilized the community" is the way one of the founders of Orange Cove put it. He proudly gave me a copy of a letter he had sent to the newspaper to express his feelings toward the whole reclamation program. This is what he had to say:

" 'Young men dream dreams, old men see visions.' Thirty years ago the Central Valley project was a young man's dream, and for many years remained only a dream, and to this day would have remained so, and a faded dream at that, had it not been for the Bureau of Reclamation, coming to our rescue in transforming these dreams into visions and the visions into vivid reality.

"While the picture of the 30 years ago situation is now happily turned to the wall, it may be impressive to take a parting look at what it 'might have been' had it not been for the saving grace of the Reclamation Bureau and its quota of able men to do the job. We of Orange Cove and other communities of similar situation could be walking down the road with packs on our backs talking to ourselves about 'what it might have been,' instead of the happy event of celebrating the coming of the water."

I think I know how this "young" man of 86 years felt. I stood on a citrus farm in his district that canal water had not yet reached. I watched the farmer's pump suck air instead of water on three strokes out of every four. I saw the withered leaves on his citrus trees and the stunted oranges the size of walnuts.

In another place I met a man who had helped to organize his neighbors into an irrigation district for the purpose of signing a contract for water from the Friant-Kern Canal.

He was in the field picking his last squash of the season. He told me the wells there, too, were being pumped dry. Unless the district can get emergency water, its farmers face the prospect of having to turn wholly to dry farming. He pointed and said, "These fields were once planted in vineyards and orchards. You can see there are only a few left, and there is hardly enough water for them."

The soil was rich. He told me that in his opinion a family could make a good living on 20 acres if they had water.

It may not occur immediately to some that labor and industry and the cities have as big a stake in full water development as these farmers in their fields. But they have. And as recently as last year during the power shortage many laborers and industrialists had good reason to learn it. I have talked with some of them.

Around the bay there are industrial plants that know what it means to curtail operations and even to shut down for lack of power. More than 5,000 factory workers have had to count the dollars cut from their pay checks for the same reason. The State of California found that in 39 factories the average weekly earnings had dropped from $62.04 in February 1948 to $53.17 in March because of power shortages. Every electric clock in northern California ran slow, the entire State went on daylight-saving time, and stayed there in the winter, because power was short. Little children went to school in the dark because power was short.

Some people said power was short because rainfall was short. It was not so much the lack of rain as it was that some men lacked foresight and were willing to retard the public-power building program in Central Valley for their own purposes at the hazard of other men's incomes and other men's earnings and other men's jobs.

That shortage of power in 1948 is a warning of the price this State may have to pay again and again. We need not expect that new industries will be established here unless we face this fact and get ample supplies of low-cost power.

The issue of water and power in our State neither can nor should be kept out of politics. For under our Constitution politics is the arena where the principles to guide public policy are decided upon.

In the highest sense, this issue rises above partisanship.

Its proper solution affects every segment of our population—industry, labor, agriculture, commerce. On its material side it will determine our standard of living in the future. On the cultural side it will go far to determine the quality of our society.

For these reasons the Republican, Richard Welch, could press for the unity of the Central Valley under reclamation law, and the commission of ex-President Hoover could point to the placing of the Army engineers in charge of Pine Flat Dam on the Kings River as a sacrifice of the public interest.

And Democratic Congressman CECIL WHITE can lead the movement to bring the Kings River into the great Central Valley project and introduce legislation to transfer the functions of the Army engineers to the Department of the Interior as recommended by the Hoover Commission.

As a practitioner in politics, I wish to pay tribute to the contributions that universities make to the solution of the problems that I and my colleagues must grapple with. It has not escaped me that the Hoover Commission study of the Kings River was made by a Harvard professor, Arthur A. Maass, and that the most illuminating and objective book on the Central Valley, The Thirsty Land, by Robert de Roos, bears the imprint of Stanford University Press.

I hope that universities generally will support this kind of study and that they will carry their public education even further on great questions. I invite them to investigate, for example, into why some men work for ends that destroy the unity of Central Valley, and inquire, What will be its results?

Why were the Army engineers injected into the vitals of the Central Valley project area on the American and Kings Rivers? What can we expect the results to be of the fact that Congress has not united the American River with Central Valley project, but has left the Kings outside?

When efforts are made from within the legislative branch of Government to control individuals in the executive branch, does it promote or injure good public administration? Does it make the public service more attractive or less attractive to young men choosing their career?

How will it affect the Central Valley and the State of California if Congress should not sustain the 160-acre water limitation?

These are the kind of problems that press, and I assure you that many of us in political life will welcome the results of your investigations.

This is the Armistice Day of World War I, the war men fought, in the words of Woodrow Wilson, "for democracy." In coming to your university this evening, it has been in my thoughts that to discover the truth about the issues I have laid before you and to decide them rightly, will be a real contribution to the perpetuation of the democratic faith for which they—regardless of party, race, or creed—fought through that war to its end.

Address of the National Commander, the American Legion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I present the address of National Commander George N. Craig before the twenty-seventh annual national rehabilitation conference banquet of the American Legion at the Statler Hotel, Washington, D. C., Monday night, February 6, 1950.

Commander Craig made a most forceful speech, in which he called upon the membership of his organization to fight against the recommendations of the Hoover Commission as they pertain to the Veterans' Administration.

When Commander Craig appeared before our Committee on Veterans' Affairs on January 17, I assured him of my wholehearted opposition to the Hoover Commission VA proposals. On January 31, I spoke at length here upon the matter. I hope every Member will read Commander Craig's address. It follows:

My fellow Americans, I am grateful for this opportunity to discuss with you certain problems that not only face the veterans of this Nation but the general public as well.

All citizens are affected by certain proposals of legislation now pending before the Congress and certain proposed legislation that is being authorized by certain sponsors.

Throughout our 31 years of existence, the American Legion has attempted to preserve in time of peace the principles of Government and human conduct for which we fought in time of war.

Realizing as we do the tremendous cost in health, welfare, and life by which these principles were purchased upon the battlefields and seas, our Nation, based upon a system of free enterprise, has paid heavily for the burden of war. The tools of war were paid for in cash. The human cost of war was charged—charged because amounts could not be calculated and only future events and circumstances could determine the requirements. Because of the human cost of war, veterans' legislation, since the inception of our Nation, has been enacted not with the view of giving to the veteran of wars a bonus or a premium, but with the sole purpose of rendering him more capable of competing in a highly competitive society.

All of the displaced persons are not in Europe. A man or woman who gives valuable years of his or her life, who gives of health, who gives of mind is less able to take his place in society and to maintain a standard of living comparable to that of his fellow who has not been compelled to make these sacrifices and, too, he will die younger. Therefore, a wise Congress, speaking for a grateful people, has from time to time placed upon the statute books certain laws in an attempt to give the veteran equal opportunity.

Marked efforts in this field came succeeding World War I, but our Nation found itself without experience. As a result, much money was wasted and a slight degree of proficiency was achieved. Separate and distinct bureaus and commissions were formed, each attempting to carry out the responsibilities of their office and each failing because of a duplication of effort, because of the lack of central authority, because of the lack of experience in handling such an emergency.

You formed the American Legion to act as counsel to the Government in carrying out rehabilitation. You were most fitted for this purpose because you yourselves had experienced war, you knew at first hand the problems confronting the individual, you knew the toll that war takes in the life of any man who engages in it. You knew of the lessened opportunities, the hardships; you knew what it was to see the fine sentiments borne of our society blunted and blurred in the minds of persons who were required to destroy life so that our Nation, our homes, and our families might remain free; this, even though an individual may be sound of limb and mind.

You knew the great difficulty experienced in the attempt of an individual to reorient himself, to try hard to retake his place in society and to contribute the maximum which is the duty of every law-abiding citizen.

Finally, after bitter experiences, after much suffering and hardship, and 11 years after the cessation of the first war, the Veterans' Administration, at the suggestion of President Hoover, was formed. Here, for the first time, was created a bureau whose responsibility was fixed to carry out its purpose. Here for the first time was unified under one roof and within four walls an agency whose sole purpose was to care for those who had served in war.

To be sure, the Veterans' Administration has not at all times performed without error duties imposed upon it. But basically it has impartially and without political interference performed its intended function. To be sure, its operation is expensive to the taxpayer. Wars are expensive, the care of the disabled veterans of this Nation is still a cost of war.

In 1947, the Congress of the United States thought it wise to inquire into the executive branch of our Government with the view of making a study to determine whether or not economies could be exacted and efficiency improved. Upon the recommendation of the Congress, the President of the United States appointed a Commission to give study and make report. Heading this Commission was the Nation's only living ex-President, Mr. Herbert Hoover, who has a record of public service second to none. His very name rightfully has become a synonym of integrity in Government because of his civic virtues and his unassailable loyalty to American principles.

Four million members of the American Legion and its Auxiliary bear good will, affection, and respect toward him. Would that there were more men of his caliber in our public life.

However, this small Commission could not in itself delve into the details of each department of our executive branch of Government, and so 24 task forces were appointed to serve under the over-all Commission to report to it. And tonight, I wish to speak of that portion of the report that deals with the matter of veteran affairs. In so doing, I do not for one second criticize any other portion of the report. As a matter of fact, the American Legion commends those savings in Government that have been made in the Department of Defense under Secretary Johnson, the unification of the armed forces that has stemmed from the study made by this Commission, and I am confident that within the remaining 18 volumes of information there is much good and many wholesome axioms that would be wise for the American people to follow. After all, the American Legion is for economy in government. It is for the maximum efficiency in the discharge of governmental functions. In the expending of taxpayers' money for the disabled and needy veterans of this Nation, we are more interested than anyone else to see that each tax dollar is devoted to a maximum of service with a minimum of administration burden.

For many months, the veterans' task force deliberated. It met only four doors from our headquarters here in the District of Columbia. On four separate and distinct occasions, your representatives asked the privilege of placing before this group the experience of 31 years gained and upon four separate and distinct occasions they were refused that opportunity. The excuse given was that the task force was not interested in the experience of the past, and it was seeking an objective view devoid of interference.

It is also interesting to note at this point that the Veterans' Committee of the House of Congress was not called upon to give its views and versions, even though it had for 25 years been charged with the responsibility and study of this great social problem.

It was with shock, chagrin, and manifold disappointment that we learned when the report was made it called for the American people to destroy and dismember the handiwork of Government born of time, study, and experience. It was with equal amazement and concern that we learned that there has been formed throughout this Nation a committee of varied interests known as the citizens' committee, subsidized by powerful interests, whose sole purpose was and is to ask the American people to adopt these 19 volumes of reports without consideration or study. They stated then and they state now, either you take the entire package or you are against the recommendations.

Now, we Americans gained proficiency in government by careful consideration of laws and modes of human conduct. We have a free, God-fearing democracy only because we have looked to the experiences of the past and weighed them heavily in our considerations for the future.

The people of the United States don't buy "pigs in a poke," and other nations have disintegrated and vanished because of blind acceptances. So we of the American Legion and its auxiliary, joined by the other veterans' organizations chartered by Congress, ask the American people and their representatives to weigh carefully the facts placed upon the scales of economy and efficiency.

The first dismemberment that the citizens committee would ask you to approve is to take from the Veterans' Administration its medical facilities. Those facilities that have made such great strides in the advancement of medicine, those facilities that have been the recipient of the services of the finest medical minds in the world, those facilities that have made such great progress in curing the minds and health of those of your citizenry who can no longer speak for themselves, and who must rest their case in your hands.

They would place it in the hands of a governmental gargantua known as the United Medical Administration, and combined with it would be military and naval medicine, the medicine of your Federal penitentiary, the medicine of the merchant marine, and with this galaxy of patients, the veteran would be required to stand in line. What chance would he have? There are already 20,000 veterans awaiting beds in Veterans' Administration hospitals. But the proponents of the citizens committee say, "We are not going to destroy the Veterans' Administration." Let us see.

What do they secondly consider? The matter of Government insurance. Do you know what they propose to do with that? In the name of economy and efficiency, they

have decided to form a new Government corporation, a corporation that must of necessity bear administration costs in itself. Our experience has been, and I am confident it is true of all people, that Government corporations are expensive. And so they would divest the Veterans' Administration of this particular function, but they still say, "You will have a Veterans' Administration."

The next matter they consider is the building of hospitals, and who do you suppose they would place this responsibility with? The Department of the Interior—the branch of our executive department that is charged with rivers and harbors, public grazing lands, and reclamation. A department that is, of course, necessary in function, but whose history is replete with political government and pork-barrel raids. And here there would be injected politics in hospital construction, a matter that for some time has been divorced from veterans' affairs. But the citizens committee says, "There will still be a Veterans' Administration."

Next, they consider the matter of loans and guaranty, and do you know what they propose to do with that? Why, bless you, they insist that it be placed with the Housing and Home Finance Agency. Federal housing, if you please. Under the GI bill of rights, loans for the building of homes were obtained from local banks. To be sure, the Government guaranteed repayment, but private capital was given the privilege to invest, and it has to the extent that 1,746,000 veterans have obtained homes by this medium. Only seven-tenths of 1 percent have defaulted, establishing the veterans of your last war as the highest and finest credit risk your Government has, and they want to put it in the class and category of Federal housing. When the GI bill of rights was written, Federal housing did its utmost to obtain jurisdiction over veterans' housing, and I say that the proponents of this recommendation now are more interested in expanding and making larger Federal housing than they are in administering to the needs of their former defenders. But they still say, "You will have a Veterans' Administration."

I imagine the building will still be standing over here on the corner, but I am confident it will be unoccupied.

The Veterans' Administration is granted the right to handle pensions, retirement benefits, disability compensation, and guardianships, but where in the world would the records be? United medical would have to have some; the insurance corporation would have to have some; Housing and Home Financing would have to have some; the armed forces, of course, must retain some; and by the time a poor claim would have run the gauntlet and passed through the maze of bureaucratic machinery and red tape, the claimant would have either passed to his reward or given up in disgust. All of this in the name of economy and efficiency, in the name of trying to help the veteran.

I indict the authors and proponents of these suggested changes as men without experience in the matter of veterans' affairs. I indict them for asking the American people to not look, to not study, to not consider suggested changes relative to a sacred duty. The American Legion, its auxiliary, and the 16,000,000 persons for whom it may speak indict the paid hirelings of the citizens committee for its attempt to flood this Nation with propaganda composed of half-truths and falsehoods. I am confident in my mind that the majority of the members of the citizens committee is not familiar with the conduct of some of its paid agents. I am confident that the great majority of the committee members wish to see economy in government, wish to see efficiency and desire fervently to see those cared for who can neither care nor speak for themselves.

As I have previously suggested, I am not one who says that the Veterans' Administration is perfect. I am confident in my own mind from the studies made that savings can be effected, administration simplified—matters that should be corrected within the structure. It is an old saying that you need not tear down the house to fix the chimney.

The attack of the American Legion upon legislative suggestions trickling from the report does not lessen our desire to cooperate with all who seek good government. Nor would we for one moment wish that anyone would lessen their action to assist in the passage of such laws because of our attack upon this portion. We, of the American Legion, are only doing what we know to be right and proper.

To combat the noxious propaganda flowing from the heavily subsidized citizens committee, you have but one weapon—the truth.

The truth consists of facts and figures which the American Legion has gathered so that you can meet hostile and misleading propaganda with statements of actual conditions, problems, and needs. This factual information was compiled by our national staffs in Indianapolis and in Washington, by our national rehabilitation, legislation and economic commission, and by a great many well-informed and experienced Legionnaires. To all of them I am very grateful for a fine job.

There is no more loyal task force in the American Legion than that made of the thousands of our department and post service officers. They are the ones who have made the name of the American Legion the greatest name of rehabilitation. They too have rallied to repel this attack upon the welfare of the Nation's veterans. We are proud of our service officers. They exemplify the finest ideals on which the American Legion was created.

We face a tough fight. The American Legion alone cannot defeat these ill-advised proposals of legislation spawned by the citizens committee. But I am confident that when you have carried your message of truth to the American people that they and their representatives will place the stamp of disapproval upon the advocacies of the citizens committee.

The majority leader of the House of Representatives, JOHN W. MCCORMACK, correctly states:

"In its recommendation on veteran affairs, the Hoover Commission failed to recognize that the Veterans' Administration was already set up on the one basis on which veterans' affairs could be handled with the greatest dispatch and the least cost. The lesson of the past is most emphatic that there must be no division of authority in the vast operation of administering the affairs of 19,000,000 veterans. Yet the Commission proposes such a division of authority. It is uneconomic because divided authority means divided responsibility. Divided responsibility means no responsibility.

"If the Hoover proposal to split up the Veterans' Administration into five separate Federal agencies should be adopted, it would wreck the principle of unified service and of single responsibility in the handling of veteran affairs. It would require more time, more labor and more money to administer the affairs of veterans.

"I do not think it is in the interest of the veteran or of economy to divide the Veterans' Administration as presently constituted and in particular to take away from this agency the control and operation of veteran hospitals and transfer them to a new or another agency."

I regret to say that the campaign that has been conducted by the citizens committee has attempted to bring into disrepute the veteran. And while it has only been a few short years since the last shots were fired, which terminated the slaughter of our friends, an attempt is being made to vilify the veteran, to charge him with being a Treasury raider. Why even in the press if a crime is committed it's not a lawyer who committed assault; if he has had service it is as a veteran that he is charged. If civil suit is brought against a person, it isn't a truck driver who is being sued, it is a veteran who is being sued, an attempt to defile the status. For those who did their best in time of emergency, to preserve our Government, I ask the American people in your name, not for special privilege, not for premium, I only ask them for that which is equitable, right, and just. So as we go down through the years together meeting the common problems to us all, each contributing in his own way to carry out the responsibilities and duties of citizenship, working together with all lawful interests, having confidence in ourselves and in one another, believing in America and having faith in divine guidance, we will permanently preserve the principles of America and bring to the world enduring peace.

Unification and Integration

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, while reading the Infantry Journal magazine for February 1950, my attention was directed to an article written by Commodore Dudley W. Knox, United States Navy, entitled "Unification and Integration." My curiosity was aroused. What is an article on naval aviation doing in an Infantry Journal?

The central theme of Commodore Knox's essay is found in the following two quotations:

After World War I, naval aviation pursued a policy of becoming more and more closely integrated with the general body of the Navy until by World War II it was an inseparable part of naval bone, sinew, and flesh.

Army aviation, on the other hand, followed the Army tradition of semi-independent corps and departments until it became a completely separated and independent Air Force.

My own conclusion, after reading this article, is that the Army and the Air Force should bear in mind that unification does not mean jealousy, suspicion, and hostility, but rather a cooperative spirit of sane and sensible men working hand in hand to accomplish a job in the most efficient and proficient manner that is possible.

The article follows:

UNIFICATION AND INTEGRATION

(By Commodore Dudley W. Knox)

Those with the welfare of our country and its armed forces at heart have naturally felt great concern over the constant bickering that has become associated with processes leading toward the unification, now prescribed by law. The admirable degree of harmony that prevailed in wartime seems to have deteriorated and become transformed into a predatory spirit of jealousy,

suspicion, and even hostility. Such a spirit could surely defeat genuine unification, regardless of the organizational and administrative measures that may outwardly seem to give it effective form and substance. The intangibles of conviction must be resolved first. Otherwise unification can only be a deceptive sham.

As I view the matter, the respective service prides and loyalties commonly assumed to be the principal obstacles are usually secondary. The real trouble is much deeper and more basic. In War College terms it is conflicting conceptions of war. We think differently of the ways war should be organized for and conducted. In a word we are indoctrinated differently.

A great part of this conflict lies in the traditional differences between Army and Navy in their organizational and administrative concepts. And these are in turn a product of operating conditions. Of necessity a ship must be a tightly integrated unit. A fleet of such units needs to be, and is instinctively, itself well knit. But an army has no such basic need. Ours has always been a loosely woven aggregation of corps or branches, each one semi-independent. A corps complex still prevails in our Army's conception of unification, whereas to the Navy a much more intimate integration is implied. In these basic respects the two services think in different terms, and the Air Force has inherited the Army viewpoint. The Marines cling to the Navy concept.

I may be in a better position than most officers to understand these basic differences. Having been born a yellow leg and become a deserter to the Navy at a tender age, I have an ingrained sympathetic interest in both the Army and Navy. And this extends to the Air Force through a long friendship with the late Billy Mitchell. In the days when Billy, as a Signal Corps officer, was learning to fly, he and I collaborated in undercover publicity for preparedness. We could not write under our own names because of President Wilson's ban against it during the long period of American neutrality in World War I. So Billy sought my naval advice and used it in his articles, and I was similarly guided by him on military questions.

After the Allied victory in Europe, and Billy's brilliant part in the air operations that led to it, we had frank and friendly talks on the future of aviation, including its organizational relation to other branches of the services. He was sold on the British solution of an independent Royal Air Force. But I had served most of the war in London and talked to British officers of all services, and I favored the integration rather than the separation of aviation * * * more especially for the Navy.

Since then Billy Mitchell's way has become the gospel for the Army. The cleavage between aviation and ground forces grew wider and wider until the Air Corps became a completely independent Air Force after the British pattern. To our Navy this was a mystifying evolution, for during the same era, which included World War II, development of naval aviation took an opposite course, the wisdom of which was proven by a wealth of experience. Starting in 1919, the top-level naval policy was to integrate naval aviation more and more closely with the general body of the Navy. And by now naval aviation is so intimate a part of naval bone, sinew, and flesh as to be inseparable.

How could such diametrically opposite developments come about—in the same era and the same war—in American sister services? The conflicting causes are even yet so vigorous and uncompromising that they actually give impetus to the deplorable feuding between Air Force and Navy, within the unified national defense organization created to gain harmony and cooperation.

And in this situation how can the Army seemingly stand supinely aside with but a flabby interest in providing for its ground forces the tactical aviation they so sorely need? It seems possible to explain this paradox and seek a remedy for it only by examining the enduring habits and customs of the different services—what psychologists or sociologists might call their "mores."

Since its very origin the Army has been split up into corps, each a semi-independent empire. The cleavage between Cavalry, Infantry, and Artillery was for long very great. More recently these branches have been merged at top level into the Army Field Forces. But even yet they do not seem to be well integrated at the lower levels. In addition, there have been the Corps of Engineers and the Quartermasters, Adjutants, Inspectors, Judge Advocates, and so on. And each of these has been largely sufficient unto itself, though perhaps only less so today than in the past. And as the art of land warfare grew in complexity and armies increased in size there was ever a strong tendency to create additional corps. Within recent decades Artillery was split into two corps (Field and Coast) and new corps included Signal, Ordnance, Chemical, Transportation, Finance, and Air.

With different service conditions, the naval tendencies have been just the opposite. Early in the present century the Navy's Engineer Corps was amalgamated with the line, and later the same was done with its Construction Corps. And much consideration has been given to similarly amalgamating the Supply Corps, whose officers and men have battle stations when afloat. The same strong trend to integration has ever characterized the Marine Corps within itself.

And so the coming of aviation as a major element of combat and reconnaissance naturally reacted upon the Army as a reason to add one more to its large assortment of greatly independent corps. Whereas the Navy chose instinctively the oposite path of closely integrating its aviation. And so did the Marines. Thus, for the Navy and Marines aviation developed into a vital organ, not merely an appendage as in the Army—an appendage easily separable.

This profound difference largely accounts for the heated controversy that developed between the Navy and the Army Air Corps. The latter looked upon naval aviation as something almost apart from the Navy, as loosely knit to it as the Air Corps was to the Army. It saw it more as an extra leg or arm than as a circulatory or nervous system. It saw it as something which could readily be severed from the Navy and attached to itself. But from the Navy's viewpoint, to have a circulatory system dissected out of its general body clearly meant a fatal operation.

The late war seemed to demonstrate amply the soundness of our Navy's solution of air organization. The armies and navies that employed planes closely integrated with surface forces were conspicuously successful, so long as their total means permitted success. Illustrations could be multiplied. The spectacular successes of the German Army offer sufficient examples on land, though Russian practices are also worth noting. Afloat, only the American and Japanese navies had well integrated aviation with which to start the war, and their performances clearly prove the point.

On the other hand, the want of adequate air support resulted in trouble and even disaster almost without exception, even when surface forces were otherwise in superior strength. A striking illustration is the early British experience in North Africa, where at first the Royal Air Force planes operated independently of the troops. Whenever the commanding general needed air support from planes close by his forces, he could only get it by communicating with London, and the air authorities there might or might not meet his request. The result was a series of disasters on the ground. The tide turned toward victory only when the local aviation was placed under the direct control of the ground commander.

Both ashore and afloat the independence of the Royal Air Force worked badly for the British. In theory, due air support was to be given as needed to military and naval forces. But in practice such support proved very inadequate. The aviators lacked proper understanding of surface problems. And surface forces were unable to appreciate air problems. In short, the Air Force was so engrossed in strategic bombing that it neglected what it regarded as secondary missions—those of close cooperation with the Army and Navy.

A great wealth of experience in the late war has made it axiomatic that adequate air support is essential to success in surface warfare. The better the support from aloft, the more certain and more complete becomes the victory below. It does not require close reasoning to conclude that the value of air support depends not merely upon its quantity but even more upon its quality; nor that its quality is first of all a product of proficiency of the men in the air.

However good an aviator may be as a flyer, and however good the combat characteristics of his plane, he cannot be proficient enough in supporting surface forces unless he understands how they fight and what their combat problems are. And it is similarly important for surface personnel to have a due comprehension of the capabilities and needs of aviation. The two arms must work together as a well-coordinated team. They must be thoroughly integrated if the full value of air support is to be realized.

And there lies the basic difference between the thinking of Navy and Marine Corps, on the one hand, and Army and Air Force on the other. And this difference offers the main explanation for the superlative effectiveness of the Navy and Marine Corps aviation in the close support of surface forces. However good the Air Force may be in strategic bombing—however greatly we admire its superb contribution to victory by paralyzing German communications during and after the Normandy invasion—hundreds of cases can be cited to reveal its substantially lower efficiency in the combat role of close tactical support, compared with naval and marine performance in this role.

The fundamental reasons for this naval-marine superiority are clearly put by Admiral C. M. Cooke in a recent article in Foreign Affairs, entitled "Soldiers Need Wings." He points out that since 1920 "a naval aviator was a qualified naval officer, and naval officers, many of them aviators, became increasingly indoctrinated in aviation. Naval officers were air-minded, and, no less important, air officers were surface-minded; without this general understanding of naval principles, and experience and proficiency in surface operation, the air officer could not understand the possibilities of his own arm." Neither could the surface officer otherwise appreciate the tremendous potentialities of a truly integrated air-surface force.

Admiral Cooke goes on to argue for applying the same principles and practices to our Army. He believes that "years will be required to create an experienced body of ground-indoctrinated air personnel and air-indoctrinated ground personnel and to develop special equipment and methods. This growth will be accompanied by continuously changing tactical concepts, and even changes in strategic concepts, to fit in with the increased mobility and offensive power that

our ground-air force will acquire." He feels that "the integration of our ground forces, which are first rank in quality, with an expanding ground-air element, is today the most pressing task of our military leaders."

These views find strong corroboration in the example of the Marine Corps. The Marines are the only proficient ground-air and air-ground organization in the country. There are many potent reasons against the half-baked suggestions that have been made to abolish this splendid corps d'élite, or to abolish its aviation element. Among the strongest of them is simply that the art of close aviation support to ground troops would be lost in this country, and many years would be required to regain it. It is paradoxical that such abolitions are advocated at the very time the Army is urging the Air Force to begin providing almost nonexistent suitable Air Force planes, and to begin appropriate training of personnel to give our ground forces a sorely needed, adequate tactical air support.

There is room for misunderstanding of what constitutes close tactical air support to troops. As I am using this term, it refers to what the marines call "close-in" air support. They define it as: "Attack by aircraft of hostile ground targets which are at such close range to friendly front lines as to require detailed integration of each air mission with the fire and movement of the ground forces, in order to insure safety, prevent interference with other elements of the combined arms, and permit prompt exploitation of the shock, casualty, and neutralization effect of the air attack."

The marines consider that their aviators should be competent to make such attacks effectively on targets as close as 200 yards from their front-line troops. This accurate and extremely helpful performance was not uncommon for them in the late war, not only in support of Marine infantry units but also Army infantry. On Okinawa they gave support as close to troops as 50 yards with great success. It is obvious that an aviator should be a well-trained soldier first, before he can clearly understand what is expected of him and how best to do it. And before he is entrusted with such difficult tasks as these.

Perhaps less of the soldier is required in an airman for interdictory attack at greater ranges. Yet the better his military understanding and training, the better will he succeed in supporting ground forces at any range. Besides, interdictory attacks and "close-in" attacks are likely to merge in the course of battle. For both of them, general direction and complete general control of air operations must necessarily rest with the ground commander, if satisfactory results are to be expected below. And certainly the ground commander must also be proficient in this vital part of his authority and responsibility.

Whether the present defense organization will be able to properly develop and integrate ground tactical air with the ground forces is a question that Admiral Cooke thinks "remains to be seen." "It certainly will not do so," he says, "unless the top command in both Army and Air Force place greater emphasis upon its importance," and effect necessary changes in organization "worked out by the two services in close collaboration, aided and prodded by the Secretary of Defense."

The most favorable factor for a happy solution is the availability of the Marine Corps pattern for imitation. The greatest obstacle appears to be the Army's traditional "corps complex," resulting now in insufficient mutual understanding between air and ground personnel of each other's techniques and problems, with a corresponding want of interest and sympathy. Had there been a warm sense of an important common need of unity, the Air Force never would have driven so hard to separate itself from the Army. Nor would the Army have consented to that separation with such seeming indifference.

One of Billy Mitchell's strongest early complaints was the Army's lukewarmness toward the importance of aviation. In this he was probably well justified at the time. The same criticism can be leveled at the Navy before 1919. Until then, pioneer naval enthusiasts were met principally by skepticism from the Navy at large. But being themselves naval (or marine) officers, their vision looked toward ways in which aviation would enhance naval power, and accordingly they made and won that fight within the Navy itself on those grounds.

On the other hand, Mitchell's similar frustrations from the Army turned him against it. Having had no considerable line training or experience, with correspondingly little understanding of line problems and techniques, his natural impulse was toward the development of air functions quite independent of the combat ground forces—thoroughly believing in fact that aviation would supersede them, or render them quite secondary in warfare. Merely as one of many examples of this attitude, he strongly contended that the principal future role of ground armies would be to occupy territories conquered by air forces. This general doctrine was ardently seconded by his followers. And so persistently was it supported that we have now witnessed the actual severance of the Air Force from the Army. And this, paradoxically, under the guise of unification.

Such a background seems a rather sterile one in which now to begin cultivating the true integration between combat ground forces and the tactical aviation which is so indispensable to military success on land. Certainly British experience after creating their independent Royal Air Force at the end of World War I is not reassuring. In theory their Army and Navy were to receive from the RAF such air support as they might require. In practice their naval aviation and ground tactical aviation became mere stepchildren. Neither the proper types of planes nor good specialized equipment were developed. These grave deficiencies in World War II cost many lives and nearly cost the war.

I understand that some such arrangement as the British tried out after World War I, to their great sorrow, is now proposed for our Army's tactical air support. The Air Force is to supply the planes, equipment, and aviators. What degree of control the Air Force will retain over them, I do not know. Presumably it will at least have control over the all-important funds. Let us pray, sincerely, for the sake of future blood and victory that whatever arrangement is made will work out with pronounced success. Personally I cannot help but be skeptical and fearful unless true integration is achieved.

The potency of the lessons from naval and Marine Corps experience in this regard are beyond doubt. The integrated forces must be under single control and command. And this not merely for combat operations but also during the needful years of preliminary training and indoctrination. Neither the aviation nor the ground elements in such an integrated force can serve two masters well and stay a hard-hitting team.

Obviously, in the final analysis this may well mean that the Army must have complete control of its own aviation as an integral part of itself, and graduate out of the corps complex.

Economic Problems of the Year Ahead

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY M. JACKSON
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JACKSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the following article, entitled "Economic Problems of the Year Ahead" appeared in the New York Times Sunday magazine of February 5, 1950. Its author, Sumner H. Slichter, holder of the highest professorship in economics at Harvard University, is well known and respected as an economist throughout the country. I think it is fair to say that he generally is regarded as a conservative, rather than a liberal thinker, if those labels have retained any meaning at all.

Because of Professor Slichter's reputation and his position in the field of economics, I think it is noteworthy that he advocates, under certain circumstances, a permanent, or at least a very long-range Federal deficit as an intentional part of a fiscal policy designed to maintain prosperity and high employment. He says:

> Many people believe that anyone who does not advocate that the budget be balanced over the period of the business cycle or that the debt be gradually reduced is indifferent to sound fiscal policy. This is far from true. It is just as important that the Government deficit be not too small as not too large.

I am not an economist myself, and so I cannot presume to pass expert judgment on this argument. But at a time when deficit financing is almost universally deplored, I think it is important to note that another side to this problem can be supported by an economist as highly regarded as Professor Slichter.

ECONOMIC PROBLEMS OF THE YEAR AHEAD
(By Sumner H. Slichter)

"As 1950 opens," said President Truman, in his economic report to Congress, "renewed confidence prevails in the American economy. This confidence is in itself an element of strength; and it is justified by the facts." Mr. Truman goes on to give the country the goal of reducing unemployment from 3,500,000 to 2,500,000, or possibly to 2,000,000, during the next 12 months. Since the normal yearly increase in the labor force is about 600,000, this would mean a total increase of 1,600,000 to 2,100,000 in the number of people at work—a fairly substantial expansion.

Although Mr. Truman has reason to be well satisfied with the present state of business, difficult problems are raised by the fact that the cash budget of the Federal Government for the present fiscal year shows a deficit of about $5,000,000,000. At a time of high employment such as the present, ordinarily the budget ought to be in balance or perhaps show a surplus. But increases in taxes might produce a contraction in business, and cuts in Government disbursements would reduce the incomes of many individuals and enterprises, which would also be depressing. And yet many persons fear that failure to cut or eliminate the deficit would lay the foundation for inflation.

What is the business outlook for 1950? Is the President unduly optimistic in suggesting that unemployment can be reduced to 2,500,000 or even 2,000,000 in the next 12 months? What should be done about the budget? Should taxes be increased? Should expenditures be cut? Should taxes be cut?

I. THE GENERAL OUTLOOK

In judging the outlook for 1950 one should distinguish between the first half and the second half of the year. The outlook for the first half is bright. In this period business will receive important stimulus from the large special insurance dividend paid to veterans. The outlook for the second half is quite uncertain. After the middle of the year a moderate decline in business is more than likely. The prospect that a decline can be averted is good, but far from certain. Underlying conditions are strong and give reason to believe that the economy will be responsive to efforts on the part of business concerns and Government to stimulate demand. The great question is whether business enterprises and Government will make the necessary efforts and whether action will come soon enough and be vigorous enough.

Even since the end of 1948, gross private investment (outlays on plant, equipment, housing, and inventories) has been slowly dropping. Only prompt and well-planned policies by business and Government will bring the slow drop in private investment to an early halt and will cause consumer expenditures to rise sufficiently to offset the gradual weakening stimulus from the insurance dividend to veterans.

II. THE FIRST HALF YEAR

What are the reasons for being optimistic about the first half of 1950? It is true that the drop in private investment which has been going on since the last quarter of 1948 will probably continue at least throughout the first half of 1950. Present estimates are that the outlays of nonagricultural business concerns on plant and equipment during the first quarter of 1950 will be about 14 percent below the corresponding quarter of 1949. A moderate further drop in business expenditures on plant and equipment during the second quarter of 1950 would not be surprising because more and more enterprises are catching up on investment needs which accumulated during the war.

Despite the prospect that gross private investment will be slowly decreasing, the level of business during the first half of 1950 will continue to be high and will possibly continue to rise. There are three principal reasons for this belief.

One is the prospective high demand for consumer goods for which the special life-insurance dividend of approximately $2,800,000,000 to veterans will be partly responsible.

A second is the large volume of construction contract awards and of new housing starts during the late months of 1949. Both contract awards and housing starts were substantially above the corresponding months of 1948. This assures an abnormally high level of construction during the early part of 1950.

Finally, the cash deficit of $5,000,000,000 in the budget for the fiscal year 1949–50 means that the Government is adding to people's incomes more than it is taking from them. All in all, a very satisfactory level of activity for the first half of the year is in prospect.

III. THE SECOND HALF YEAR

The outlook for the second half of 1950 is much less favorable. Even Mr. Truman does not appear to believe that he will achieve his goal of reducing unemployment during the next 12 months to two and one-half million or two million. In estimating the Government's revenues he assumes virtually no change in incomes, and that means, at fairly steady prices, little change in employment.

There are three principal conditions that make a decline in business likely in the second half of 1950. One of these is that the level of private investment is likely to be lower than it is at the present time, and may be continuing to drop. By the middle of 1950 outlays on private plant and equipment, and possibly housing as well, will probably have dropped to normal levels. There is a possibility, it is true, that private investment may not fall below normal because the backlog of deferred demand has not been entirely met. Furthermore, as I shall point out, prompt steps to stimulate private investment would probably bring about a rise by the middle of the year. Nevertheless, one is not justified in counting on such a rise until steps to stimulate investment appear imminent.

A second reason for expecting a decline in business during the second half of the year is that much of the effect of the large life-insurance dividend payments to veterans during the first part of 1950 will have worn off by then. Of course, the effect of the payment will not have entirely died out because a large part of the incomes generated by the payments will continue to be spent.

A third reason for expecting some decline is the prospect that expenditures by government will be less. The States and cities will probably be spending more in 1950 than in 1949, but it looks as if the Federal Government will be spending less. The expenditures of the Federal Government were boosted to an abnormal high in the fiscal year 1949–50 by the dividend payment to veterans of $2,800,000,000. There will also be a drop of about $1,000,000,000 of Marshall-plan aid. President Truman is asking for some cuts in expenditures, and there is powerful support in Congress for reductions. Increases in certain items asked by the President will not be granted. Consequently it is likely that the cash outlays of the Federal Government for the next fiscal year will be at least $4,000,000,000 less than in the present one. This would more than offset any rise in expenditures by State and local governments.

The tendency for a drop in investment expenditures to reduce the demand for goods will be mitigated to some extent by a drop in the rate of saving. Corporations have recently been doing about half of the saving of the community. As outlays on plant and equipment drop, corporations will pay out a larger proportion of profits to stockholders. The proportion of personal incomes saved also will drop. The large rise in personal savings during 1948 was caused in the main by large purchases of houses by individuals and of plant and equipment by owners of unincorporated enterprises. If these expenditures of individuals and unincorporated enterprises decrease, the proportion of incomes spent on consumer goods will rise.

Unfortunately, the shift into the buying of consumer goods cannot be counted upon to prevent a drop in total demand for goods. The reason is that, as corporations and individuals reduce their expenditures on plant, equipment, and housing, they will use a larger part of their incomes to repay their debts. Hence a drop in investment expenditures will mean some decrease in the total demand for goods.

IV. STEPS TO AVERT DECLINE

Can the prospective drop in business during the second half of 1950 be prevented? Fundamental conditions are favorable to a high level of business. For example, expenditures on consumers' goods are small in relation to personal holdings of cash and demand deposits. At the present time the annual rate of personal expenditures for consumer goods is only three and six-tenths times the average personal holdings of cash and demand deposits, as against five and nine-tenths times the average in 1939. Under such favorable conditions it ought to be possible to maintain a high level of sales. President Truman, in his economic message, indicated he might have some real interest in encouraging investment. Such a change in Government policy under present favorable conditions would have important effects.

The steps which might be taken to avert a business contraction during the second half of 1950 may be divided into three groups—those relating to private investment; those relating to consumer expenditures; and those relating to Government spending and tax policies.

1. Steps to encourage private investment: Since the amount of private investment depends immediately upon the decisions of business concerns, managements have the best opportunity to influence its volume. The opportunities of enterprises to spend a dollar in order to save or make a dollar are enormous. Some managements are more cautious than others, and managements as a whole are more cautious at some times than others. There is danger that caution will be overdone, and that an undue proportion of capital expenditures will be held in abeyance pending political and economic developments. An economy which is too cautious will not be very progressive. In particular, there is little prospect that the postponement of investment expenditures will enable business concerns to buy plant or equipment at substantially lower prices.

Several useful steps might be taken by the Government to encourage investment. One would be to permit losses to be carried forward against income for 5 years instead of 2 years, as at present. This change in the tax laws would be particularly helpful to new concerns, which frequently do business at a loss for a year or two. Such enterprises should have a good chance to earn enough to offset their initial losses before becoming subject to the full corporate income taxes.

The present corporate income tax makes corporations with incomes of less than $50,000 pay a 53-percent tax on all income between $25,000 and $50,000. The standard corporate income-tax rate is 38 percent. Thus the corporate income tax makes it harder for small corporations to grow to moderate size. Such a provision in the tax law is preposterous and should have been eliminated long ago.

Still another way in which the Government might stimulate investment is by permitting enterprises to charge off new equipment in a 5-year period rather than over the life of the equipment. This change would permit depreciation allowances to be adjusted to the state of economic visibility. In the long run the change would undoubtedly yield the Government an increase in revenue because it would stimulate business activity. More important, by encouraging earlier replacement of equipment which is not ready for scrapping it would raise the productivity of industry.

2. Steps to increase consumer expenditures: Persuading individuals to buy consumer goods is primarily the job of business concerns. If a good proportion of enterprises are aggressively attempting to increase their share of sales and willing to give better quality or lower prices in order to take business away from competitors, the total volume of sales will expand. Unfortunately, much business planning is done on the assumption that the concern can expect to get only its present share of the sales in the industry.

This kind of planning does not lead to general expansion of business. Expansion is produced by aggressive driving for a larger share of the sales and by willingness to give better quality or lower prices in order to take business away from competitors. During the sellers' markets that have existed most of the time since 1946, there was not much occasion for price cutting. At the present time the economy needs plenty of price cutters.

The worst offender in keeping up prices is the Government. The competition between Democrats and Republicans for the votes of the farmers has led to legislation which is causing the Government to spend $1,400,000,000 during the present fiscal year supporting the prices on farm products. (Incidentally, the British are spending almost an equal amount in subsidies to keep the price of food down.) Support prices for agricultural products made sense as a device to encourage agricultural output during and immediately following the war. Likewise, some support to agricultural prices is desirable during periods of more or less severe unemployment because prices of farm products are unusually sensitive to drops in demand.

The present, however, is a time of high employment. At such periods farm products should be permitted to sell for what the market will bring. At the same time that the Government is spending $1,400,000,000 on the support of agricultural prices, it is putting into effect acreage-restriction schemes. Such procedures belong in Alice in Wonderland.

Congress would be wise to modify the price-support program so that it would come into operation only after prices are well below "parity." This would save the Government over $1,000,000,000 which it would otherwise spend during the coming fiscal year on keeping up the prices of farm products. This saving might well be promptly passed on to the community as a whole by reductions in excise taxes, thus also stimulating the sale of various nonfarm products.

3. Adjustments in Government spending and tax policies: The fact that the cash budget shows a deficit of about $5,000,000,000 at a period of high employment leads many people to believe that an immediate effort should be made to balance the budget. If the budget cannot be balanced during a period of high employment, will it ever be balanced?

Some of the proposals to balance the budget would greatly increase the likelihood that business might contract during the latter half of 1950. Certainly tax advances now would greatly increase the danger of a decline in business because they would reduce the ability of individuals and business concerns to buy goods. Consequently, President Truman's proposal of even moderate tax increases is ill-timed. The demand for reductions in Government expenditures is widespread and has much merit. Such reductions would stimulate business to the extent that they created the hope of eventual cuts in taxes—provided that they were not made by reducing the productive services furnished by the Government. Cuts in disbursements by the Government, however, would have the immediate effect of reducing the incomes of individuals and enterprises and, to that extent, of inducing contraction in business. Consequently, the Government should not cut its disbursement without passing on most of the saving to individuals and enterprises in the form of reductions in taxes.

If cuts in expenditures are offset in large measure by reductions in taxes, how and when will the budget be balanced? As a matter of fact, the condition of the budget is not as bad as the figures suggest. A substantial part of the deficit of $5,000,000,000 is caused by the dividend disbursement of $2,800,000,000 to veterans—a nonrecurring expenditure. Furthermore, the Federal Government is spending about $1,300,000,000 during this fiscal year in purchasing guaranteed mortgages. These mortgages may properly be regarded as an investment.

The best way to reduce the deficit in the budget is to let the normal growth of the national output raise the revenue of the Government. Under present tax rates the normal growth of output and incomes will increase the revenue of the Government by over a billion dollars a year. If increases in expenditures are avoided, the normal growth of the economy will eliminate the deficit within several years.

V. A BALANCED BUDGET?

Is it clear that the Federal Government should aim at least to balance its budget over the period of the business cycle, or even to achieve a net surplus in the budget over the period of the business cycle, so that the national debt can gradually be reduced? Most people undoubtedly believe that the Government should avoid a long-run increase in the public debt and should gradually pay off the debt. And yet an attempt to balance the budget over the period of the business cycle, and even more to reduce the national debt, might prevent the supply of money (cash and bank deposits) from increasing rapidly enough to prevent a decline in prices and the development of chronic unemployment.

Little attention has thus far been paid to how rapidly the country needs to expand its supply of money and what is the best way for it to get the needed increase in money. Unless there is a rise in the rate at which money is spent (and the rate has been decreasing for many years), the country will need to increase its money supply during the next 30 years by about $120,000,000,000, or approximately 75 percent. This is merely the growth in money supply that will be needed to avert a drop in prices. Such a rise in the money supply would be the slowest in the history of the country. During the last 20 years the money supply of the United States trebled; in the 30 years between 1900 and 1929 it increased about sixfold.

How can the country increase its money supply by about $120,000,000,000 in the next 30 years? Part of the increase may be expected to come from the growth in short-term borrowing by business enterprises from commercial banks. It would be undesirable for the short-term borrowing of business to rise faster than the dollar volume of production because a high ratio of short-term business debts to output makes the economy unstable. If short-term business borrowing rises no faster than production, and if the price level is stable, an increase of about $30,000,000,000 in the money supply might be obtained during the next 30 years from short-term business borrowing.

Perhaps another $30,000,000,000 increase in the money supply might be obtained by purchases of mortgages and other long-term private, municipal, and State securities by commercial banks. Such an increase would mean a very rapid rise in the buying of such securities by commercial banks. Still another increase of $30,000,000,000 in money might be produced by imports of gold of about $1,000,000,000 a year. Gold imports will be large because the United States levies no duty on gold and is always willing to buy it in unlimited quantities at a fixed price. If gold imports are about a billion a year the stock of gold at Fort Knox would be somewhat more than doubled in 30 years.

There would remain about $30,000,000,000 of money supply to be obtained from some source. It might be provided through the banks' buying up part of the public debt, but concentration of the public debt in the hands of the banks is not desirable. Hence an increase in the public debt would probably be the best way to obtain the remaining $30,000,000,000 of new money. This would mean that during a 30-year period the budget would need to be in the red, on the average, about $1,000,000,000 a year.

If the debt of the Federal Government rose from $257,000,000,000, the present level, to about $287,000,000,000, while the net national product was rising from about $247,000,000,000 to over $400,000,000,000, the burden of the debt in relation to the net national product would substantially drop.

Many people believe that anyone who does not advocate that the budget be balanced over the period of the business cycle or that the debt be gradually reduced is indifferent to sound fiscal policy. This is far from true. It is just as important that the Government deficit be not too small as that it be not too large. Once a judgment has been reached as to the rate at which the money supply needs to increase and as to the extent to which the rise in the money supply should be made possible by growth in the public debt, it becomes important to insist that the average size of the deficit correspond to these judgments—that it be no larger and no smaller.

Allowance must be made for the possibility that the operation of collective bargaining will require a slow rise in the price level of the country. If unions push up wages faster than engineers and managers are able to raise output per man-hour, prices must rise in order to prevent the growth of chronic unemployment. In that case the increase in the money supply must be large enough to make possible the needed rise in prices. If the community does not like a rise in prices, it must insist that employers do a good enough job of bargaining to prevent wages from outrunning output per man-hour.

VI. THE NEED FOR WELL-PLANNED AND VIGOROUS POLICIES

What conclusion does one reach about the outlook for business in the second half of the year? The sound underlying condition of the economy indicates that efforts to stimulate demand have a good chance of being successful. It is uncertain, however, whether business and Government will act soon enough and vigorously enough. Only prompt and well-planned policies will halt the slow drop in private investment, will offset the gradual weakening stimulus from the insurance dividend to veterans and will prevent the prospective drop in Government expenditures from reducing the demand for goods.

Surpluses

REMARKS

OF

CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California [Mrs. DOUGLAS] said that we had a surplus of potatoes. She intimated that they were rotten, and that the Congress was to blame for that situation. I deny that the Republican Members of Congress are responsible for the potato, the egg, or the milk situation. Nor is the Congress to blame for the rotten Communists who are in this Government of ours.

If my recollection is correct, the potato and other similar legislation came down here with the blessing of the administration, and the Congress, with the Democrats in the majority, put that through. The House, on the other hand, did its utmost to get rid of the Communists, just as smelly as any potato that ever rotted, but the Congress was not successful. The Congress was opposed all along down the line from the time the committee to expose subversive activities was first created, from the time that Mr. Dies had charge of it and was finally driven out of Congress, right down to and since the President accused that House committee, or more accu-

rately the Republicans on it, of drawing a "red herring" across his political trail. The House opposed by the administration then in power from the day that committee was born until after Hiss was convicted.

If we have too many potatoes now, sound or rotten, and if we have too many Communists now, all rotten, the fault lies right on the doorstep of the present administration.

You Can't Compromise With Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the article entitled "You Can't Compromise With Communism," written by Hon. Charles Solomon, appeared in the January 1950 issue of the American Federationist. I am happy to commend this article to the attention of my colleagues. I have known Judge Solomon for many years, during all of which time he has been an ardent foe of totalitarianism in all its forms and in all its disguises.

The article follows:

YOU CAN'T COMPROMISE WITH COMMUNISM

(By Charles Solomon)

Between communism and the democratic way of life there is a basic and irreconcilable divergence. Contrary to Winston Churchill's characterization of Communist Russia as "a riddle wrapped in an enigma," the literature of communism is unequivocally clear as to its objectives and methods.

The spokesmen for communism have taken pains to leave no possible doubt as to their purpose and the means by which they propose to achieve it. One is reminded of Hitler's full disclosure of his aims in Mein Kampf, which was generally available and as generally either unread or not taken seriously.

We can be thankful for the fact that circumstances have finally compelled our own national leaders to take to these sources for this indispensable information in dealing with Communists. The result has been a somewhat belated disillusionment and awakening, which explains our stiffened attitude and such policies as the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the North Atlantic Defense Pact.

Certain basic facts must be faced if we are to understand why our relations with Communist Russia are as they are; why, in fact, it is impossible to have with Russia the kind of relations we enjoy with other countries, such as Britain, France, Italy, Canada, and Australia. These facts are so foreign to the democratic orientation they are at first difficult to grasp. Furthermore, they have implications the significance of which is not always readily apparent, especially to the uninitiated.

To begin with, communism represents a fundamental and unbridgeable break with the ethics, morality, and way of life of the democratic world. What we regard as decent, honorable, fair—these and similar concepts are contemptuously rejected by communism as so many bourgeois prejudices and bourgeois superstitions by which Communists in pursuit of their revolutionary objections will not permit themselves to be encumbered or deterred.

This primary Communist postulate controls regardless of where the particular Communist finds himself—in a labor organization, a cultural group, a religious group, a fraternal organization or in public office or employment.

Lenin gave positive expression to this article of Communist faith in the following language:

"It is necessary * * * to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of truth" in the pursuit of Communist ends.

On another occasion Lenin enunciated the Communist doctrine of the ends justifying the means in these words addressed to a young Communist group:

"In our own opinion, morality is entirely subordinate to the class war. Everything is moral which is necessary for the annihilation of the old exploiting social order. * * * We do not believe in external principles of morality. * * * Communist morality is identical with strengthening the dictatorship of the proletariat."

We can trace this revolutionary morality back to the anarchism of Bakunin who many years ago, in the Catechism of a Revolutionist, wrote:

"Everything which promotes the success of the revolution is moral; everything which hinders it is immoral."

The principle followed by the Communists is that if lying, deceit, duplicity, and misrepresentation will promote the achievement of Communist objectives, they are thereby sanctioned. If the democratic world chooses to believe in fair, decent, and honorable dealing, so much the worse for it. That is the Communist code.

I have referred to the significance of the implications of this position. No kind of agreement can be permitted to stand in the way of what the occasion may require from the Communist point of view. Signatures are affixed to otherwise solemn documents with the reservations herein recited. And this goes for high and solemn compacts between Communist Russia and other non-Communist states.

Words frequently cease to have what we regard as their commonly accepted meaning when used by Communists. This is outstandingly so when we talk of democracy. When we use this word we mean, among other things, freedom of speech, press, and assembly; the right to petition for a redress of grievances; the right of habeas corpus; the existence of multiple political parties, free labor, and other free organizations. Yet Soviet Russia, where none of the foregoing exists, is denominated by Communists as the only true—the new—democracy.

Notwithstanding statements made for public consumption by Communist spokesmen in high positions, including Stalin himself, to the effect that the Communist and democratic systems can live together in the same world, the accepted literature of communism reveals a completely contrary belief.

Communism is committed to total war on our way of life, in which they can find not a single saving grace and which they hold must be exterminated, root and branch, by any means effective under the circumstances. Here we have an intriguing resemblance to fascism, between which and communism ideologically there are deep and striking similarities. In fact, communism, which preceded fascism, can be said to have been its schoolmaster. Stalin, who has on several occasions publicly stated—speaking as the head of the Russian state—that Communist Russia and we can live alongside each other in peaceful competition, has in his capacity as Bolshevik theoretician taken his position squarely on Lenin's pronouncement:

"It is inconceivable that the Soviet republic shall continue to exist for a long period of time side by side with the imperialist states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet republic and the bourgeois states are inevitable."

Here we have the ideological background of the bitter and concentrated attack on the United States, strongest of the bourgeois states and bulwark of the democratic way of life. We are to the Communist world the principal barrier to what it regards as the certain, ultimate triumph of bolshevism. Only in the light of this teaching does the vicious attack on the Truman doctrine, the Marshall plan, and the Atlantic Pact become intelligible.

Unless our Nation understands the unvarying ideological motivations of the leaders of communism, from Stalin down, we shall flounder in a morass of confusion and futility. It shall ever be a case of too little and too late.

Communist Parties the world over are essentially identical. This goes for the Communist Party of the United States. Note I do not say the American Communist Party because there can be no American Communist Party. The concepts of Americanism and communism are completely antithetical.

For the true Communist there is one exclusive loyalty—to Soviet Russia—which is regarded as "the workers' fatherland" which can do no wrong.

Communism is more than a political philosophy. It is for many millions tantamount to a religion, evoking fanatical and unquestioning dedication. If this spells betrayal of country, friends, those whom we would regard as loved ones, fellow trade unionists, this would only apear as "revolutionary virtue" in the eyes of a true Communist.

In a now almost unavailable Communist publication entitled "The Communist Party, a Manual on Organization," by J. Peters, it is stated:

"The conditions for membership in our party are contained in the following pledge read by Comrade Browder to 2,000 workers who were initiated into the party in the New York district in 1935."

The heart of this pledge is contained in the following excerpt therefrom:

"I pledge myself to rally the masses to defend the Soviet Union, the land of victorious socialism. I pledge myself to remain at all times a vigilant and firm defender of the Leninist line of the party, the only line that insures the triumph of Soviet power in the United States."

Not a single word in the entire pledge indicating loyalty to the United States and its democratic institutions and way of life. Communist leaders throughout the world, including William Z. Foster, in our own country, have made it clear that in the event of war between their own countries and Soviet Russia they would refuse to defend the former against the latter.

That our own Communists fall completely into this category is revealed with blunt forthrightness by Foster in his book entitled "Toward a Soviet America." The title should be sufficient to indicate the thesis of the author. If you would know what a Soviet America would be like, if you are not already apprised, you need only contemplate Soviet Russia, with its brutal dictatorship, with its totalitarianism, which extends into every walk of human life—literature, art, science, poetry, architecture, the theater, philosophy. All must rigidly toe the ideological mark.

Communist parties cannot be compared to political parties as we know them in the western democratic sense. There is a basic divergence in the purpose of political organization and activity. This is strikingly revealed by Stalin himself. In his Foundations of Leninism he has written as follows:

"The revolutionary will accept a reform in order to use it as an aid in combining legal with illegal work; to intensify under its cover the illegal work for the revolutionary preparation of the masses for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie."

This "overthrow of the bourgeoisie" can only be accomplished through civil war and by resort to violence. We have Lenin's own authoritative statement in this respect.

"The replacement of the bourgeoisie by the proletarian state is impossible without a violent revolution," wrote Lenin in State and Revolution. The proletarian state is only another way of saying dictatorship of the proletariat and the latter is defined by Stalin himself in Foundations of Leninism as "the rule * * * unrestricted by law and based on force * * * of the proletariat."

William Z. Foster has set forth what a Communist dictatorship would mean in our own country.

"Under the dictatorship," he says in his book, "all the capitalist parties—Republican, Democratic, Progressive, Socialist, etc.—will be liquidated, the Communist Party functioning alone as the party of the toiling masses. Likewise will be dissolved all other organizations that are political props of the bourgeois rule, including chambers of commerce, employers' associations, Rotary clubs, American Legion, YMCA, and such fraternal orders as the Masons, Odd Fellows, Elks, Knights of Columbus, etc." And, adds Foster, all this "will mark the birth of real democracy in the United States."

Winston Churchill, in a message a year ago to the Alfred E. Smith Memorial Foundation dinner, said:

"We are a socialist government—you may have heard of that." He did not say, although he could have done so, "There is a socialist government in Britain," or "They have a Socialist Government in Britain." Churchill employed "we" and thereby hangs a tale. Churchill was saying, in effect, that there had been a democratic parliamentary election in his country; that the Labor Party and the Conservatives had been the chief antagonists in that campaign; that each had had a full and democratic opportunity to present its side to the people; that under these circumstances the people had gone to the polls and overwhelmingly chosen Labor.

Therefore we have a Socialist Government in Britain.

This is the democratic concept. Such a concept is utterly foreign to communism. This kind of give-and-take, this kind of compromise rests on the mutual acceptance of certain common basic postulates. These are the basic postulates of our democratic way of life. Such give-and-take, such compromise has no place in the Communist lexicon. To Communists "we" in the sense that Churchill employed the term, does not exist. No government is that of the Communist unless it is a Communist Government and that government is his, commanding his subservient loyalty, regardless of where it happens to be. For Communists, every other government, no matter how arrived at, exists only to be overthrown.

What does all this mean? One of the things it certainly does mean is that there can be no agreement in our sense of the word between Communist Russia and ourselves; no genuine compromise or give and take. To compromise sincerely and genuinely with the bourgeois world is, in the minds of Communists, to betray the revolution.

If we will only look these facts squarely in the face, the rest is comparatively simple.

We must make and keep strong increasingly all the agencies and institutions of democracy.

We must be strong economically, politically, morally.

We must confront the Communist world with superior power, the one thing the Bolshevik understands and respects.

We must do all this and more. We must do social justice by eliminating economic, social, and political injustice.

Here the trade union movement is contributing valiantly. The democratic way of life has no firmer pillar.

Rivers and Valleys

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WILL M. WHITTINGTON

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following address which I delivered at the Thirty-first Annual Convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 6, 1950, to wit:

RIVERS AND VALLEYS

There are two statues at the entrance to the National Archives Building in the city of Washington. On the pedestal to the right is the figure of an old man in a thoughtful mood, and beneath the statue is the arresting phrase: "Study the past." On the left is the statue of an attractive woman with an open book in her hands. There is an appropriate inscription below the figure: "What Is Past is Prologue." The study of the past of countries and nations is useful as we plan in the present for the future.

PURPOSE

The study of the neglect of soils and waste of waters in the civilizations of the past is most helpful as we plan to improve our natural resources. Water gives life and must be conserved. Where it is scarce it must not be wasted. Where it floods it must be curbed. The purpose in all plans is most important. The Spaniards came to the New World in search of gold. They sought and they won gold, but they lost their empire. The Pilgrim Fathers came to Plymouth Rock in search of freedom. They won their freedom, and their descendants won their independence.

Civilizations must promote the welfare of all the people. The dynasties of Egypt, the golden age of Greece and Rome, the Renaissance in Europe were great eras; art, science, literature, and philosophy flourished, but the civilization promoted wealth and fame for the fortunate few. It was founded on slavery.

The basic concept of free enterprise is the dignity of the individual. Today modern machines and inventions have given to every man, woman, and child in this country the equivalent of the power and services of 50 slaves.

The rise and fall of civilizations through the centuries have been largely determined by the conservation and the utilization of the bounties of nature. The misuse of land is a warning that the resources of nature are not inexhaustible, and that once lost, it is difficult to replace. The pioneers of America may have had both land and water to misuse and waste, but their descendants are not so fortunate. The natural resources of the United States enhanced by science and invention are the foundation of the unparalleled production in World War II that made our country the most powerful in history.

The United States is determined in the programs for reforestation, soil conservation, flood control, and river and harbor improvements, to profit by the experiences of other countries. An inescapable conclusion from the study of the past is that the problems of soil erosion and overpopulation go hand in hand.

There is today a connection between the peasant revolt in Italy and soil erosion, for the lands of Sicily are constantly eroded as overpopulation obtains. The Carthaginians used elephants when they invaded Sicily. The people of Sicily used a scorched-earth policy against the elephants of Hannibal. They burned the forests. For 2,000 years forests have been burned. The problem of erosion is tremendous. There is overpopulation in Sicily today.

STREAMS AND LAKES

Nothing in nature is more interesting to me than streams and lakes. They appeal to poets. They are the inspiration of artists. They are useful to the historian. They are the delight of sportsmen. They invite lovers. They are attractive to the writers of fiction as well as verse. They appeal to the engineer as he dreams of building and ministering unto man.

Above the streams and lakes are the sources of both; there are the brooks, there are the forests that have aptly been termed the cradles of rivers. Walking by the side of the still waters of lakes appeals to me, and nothing is more delightful than to roam through the green pastures of valleys. As I linger along streams, my thoughts as I have dreamed for years always turn to the improvement of rivers and to the protection of valleys. Nothing intrigues me more than "the journey of the raindrop to the sea."

WONDERS

The Pyramids, Karnak, Persepolis, and other wonders of the ancient world, are not to be compared to the bridges, dams, skyscrapers, highways, and great cities of our country. The flood control works and the river and harbor improvements of the United States surpass those of this or any other age and of any other country. No nation has ever made more or comparable progress in production and construction than the United States.

As we go forward at present and plan for the future, we recall the lines from Longfellow:

"Build on and make the castle high and fair,
Rising and reaching upward to the skies."

SPIRIT

We must carry on in the spirit of the founders and the defenders of the Republic and in the spirit of those who fought in World War II on all continents, in all skies, and in all oceans to preserve freedom. That spirit is embodied in the following lines:

"From dream to deed, and from that deed again,
To further dream, and deed more mighty yet."

FOUNDATION

The Corps of Engineers was organized by George Washington, and it has functioned in river and harbor improvements authorized by Congress since 1824. Flood-control improvements beginning with the organization of the Mississippi River Commission 70 years ago and culminating in the declaration in the Flood Control Acts of 1928 and 1936 that flood control is a national problem rests upon the solid rock of a sound national policy. The foundation is that in all improvements the benefits must exceed the costs.

RIVERS AND HARBORS

There have been authorized some 1,300 river and harbor projects in the United States and Territories. They provide 28,000 miles of improved waterways, 490 locks and dams, and 270 harbors. One billion six hundred sixteen million one hundred forty-five thousand six hundred and ninety dollars have been appropriated. The vast inland waterway, coastal, and Great Lakes networks are without a peer. An all-time record high total of 791,541,717 tons of water-borne traffic was reached in 1948, which is more than double the tonnage of 15 years ago. There are many more harbors to be constructed and waterways to be improved.

FLOOD CONTROL

Some 1,000 projects for flood control have been authorized; $2,434,092,400 have been appropriated. At the close of the 1948 fis-

cal year 56 dam and reservoir projects and 170 local protection projects had been completed at a total cost of $483,000,000. The engineers estimate that the amount of damages already prevented is in excess of $500,000,000. The project for the lower Mississippi River and tributaries, including projects in the valley authorized as a part of the project is substantially 60 percent complete. Already the project is preventing damages that aggregate $5,000,000,000, or about eight times its cost to date.

The improvements of the rivers include dams for the generation of power and for navigation. They save the lives and property of river basins and increase the supply of power for industry, for homes, and for production to keep America invincible. The accomplishments of flood control under the sound program that constitutes its basis are outstanding. The people of all river basins are anxious to have the construction extended from the basins where the improvements have been made to the basins where they live. There are 160 separate river basins, and there are valleys of more numerous small streams. Most of these valleys are subject to flooding of various degrees of destructiveness. The works planned will prevent 75 percent of this flood damage. The policy is realistic. The program contemplates that it is not practical to prevent all damage. To be authorized the benefits, I repeat to emphasize, must exceed the costs. Flood control pays for itself. All improvements are capable of being expanded. The works are among the more valuable assets of the Nation.

RECLAMATION

Another national policy was adopted in 1902. Reclamation was authorized. The progress has been notable. The desert is being made to blossom as the rose. Waters are being conserved. Lands are being preserved. The program is sound.

APPROPRIATIONS AND ESTIMATES

The appropriations for flood control, rivers and harbors, and reclamation for the current fiscal year, while the largest ever made, were not finally approved until late in the first session of the present Congress. The civil-functions bill for the current year was approved October 13, 1949, although the fiscal year began on July 1, 1949. Valuable time was lost. Good weather was not utilized. Such weather is essential for river improvements. The budget estimates for the next fiscal year provide for $354,119,100 for reclamation, including $321,000,000 for construction. The budget estimates for national flood control for the next fiscal year are $478,477,000, which is an increase over the estimate of the current year of approximately $110,000,000. The estimate for rivers and harbors is $240,714,000 against the estimate for the present year of $197,985,790. The budget estimate for the Mississippi River and tributaries is $72,000,000, whereas the estimate for the current year was $70,000,000. I repeat that while the full amount of the estimates for the current year was not appropriated, the largest amount ever appropriated was made available by the Congress. It was most unfortunate that many months elapsed at the beginning of the fiscal year before the appropriation was finally made. This delay should not occur during the present year. The program will be promoted by funds being made available at the beginning of the fiscal year.

DEPARTURE

Formerly appropriations for rivers and harbors were contained in the appropriations for military affairs. Some years ago separate bills were considered. The bill for flood control and rivers and harbors is now called the civil-functions appropriation. For the first time the Committee on Appropriations in the House of Representatives during the present session has determined to submit one over-all appropriation bill for all of the departments of the Government. Hearings will be conducted by the subcommittees, but it is planned to report one bill. It is an experiment. A one-package bill should be of benefit with respect to balancing the budget. Departments can be more familiar with appropriations for other departments. I trust the policy will be successful. Such a policy obtains in the English Parliament. It is an experiment in the United States. I am apprehensive of delay. This association is always on guard. I am sure that it will spare no effort to urge that the appropriations be promptly made.

PENDING BILL

There is a second matter that is vital and of importance to the country. The House Committee on Public Works, after comprehensive hearings, reported probably the most constructive flood-control and river-and-harbor bill ever submitted to Congress. It provides for increased authorizations in river basins. It provides for new projects in both flood control and rivers and harbors. All projects were carefully screened. The bill was unanimously reported by the committee. Meantime, appropriations for all purposes increased. They were at an all-time high. The committee was diligent in applying for a rule. The leadership was cooperative. However, a rule for the passage of the bill was not granted. Finally, under the amendment adopted to the rules of the House at the beginning of the Eighty-first Congress, the bill was brought up for consideration on August 22, 1949, and after much opposition and over many difficulties, the bill was finally passed by the House by the overwhelming vote of 202 to 1. It was a great victory, but this association and other advocates of river and harbor improvements cannot rest upon their laurels. The bill is pending in the Senate. It was there for 2 months before the session adjourned. It has not been taken up on the floor as yet. The Senate has always been cooperative. I trust that the bill will be promptly passed and approved by the President. It is a prior objective with this association, and I am sure that the leadership of the association will continue to cooperate for its prompt passage.

MISSISSIPPI VALLEY

The Mississippi River is one of the world's greatest rivers. None holds more interest. None wields more influence upon the country through which it flows than does the Mississippi. No river has so vast a drainage basin. Its supply is drawn from the vicinity of the Delaware on the Atlantic seaboard and to the State of Idaho in the Rockies and near the Pacific. Mark Twain said that the basin of the Mississippi is the body of the Nation. All other parts are but members, important in themselves, yet more important in their relationship to the body. The basin contains 1,200,000 square miles. One-half of the people of the United States live in the basin. One-third of the total population of the country resides within a 50-mile radius of the Mississippi River and its tributaries. This basin is the bread basket and the storehouse of the Nation.

As has been well said, "As a dwelling place for civilized man, it is by far the first upon the globe." It is the second great valley of the world. It is exceeded only by that of the Amazon. "Ol' Man River" starts to rolling at the Twin Cities, and it flows as it just keeps rolling along to the Gulf, where it discharges 3 times as much water as the St. Lawrence, 25 times as much water as the Rhine, and 338 times as much water as the Thames. With the Missouri, it is the longest. In some places the Mississippi is the most crooked river in the world. In one section the distance as the crow flies is 675 miles, but as the river flows it is 1,300 miles.

The flood-control project of the Mississippi River and tributaries is the most gigantic ever adopted by any nation. The lower or alluvial valley consists of 30,000 square miles. The improvement of that river and the protection of that valley was never more important than it is today. As the valley grows so will the Nation grow. Progress is rolling through the basin today as new industries are being established in the valley. The opportunity with soil, oil, and rivers is unparalleled. The eyes of the Nation are turned toward the Mississippi Basin today as never before in the history of the Republic. Progress rolls just as "Ol' Man River" rolls in the Mississippi Valley.

COOPERATION

A great flood is passing down the Mississippi River today. It reached a maximum height at Cairo. In the beginning of the TVA, essentially a power project, and in former maximum floods, there was general complaint of lack of cooperation, as was in the case of the flood in 1937. The country knows that the TVA will not prevent floods along the lower Mississippi River, but the country also knows that, especially with the recent Kentucky Dam and with the two dams under the supervision of the Corps of Engineers along the Cumberland, flood heights at Cairo can be reduced. It is estimated conservatively that reduction in the present flood crest at Cairo was 2½ feet. There was cooperation. Government agencies, like individuals, as they grow older become more sensible. I commend to the Corps of Engineers and to the Bureau of Reclamation the very sensible example of cooperation that has obtained during the flood that is now in progress on the Mississippi River as the kind of cooperation that the country expects in the Missouri, Columbia, and California adopted projects.

WARNING

There is a campaign for Government reorganization. Such reorganization is greatly needed. To be sound it should eliminate waste and extravagance. It should prevent duplication. The program is generally sound. Personally, I have sponsored it in the past. I support it at present. Often, however, reformers, without supporting reason, advocate under the guise of reorganization the crippling, if not the destruction, of existing agencies that have proved their worth, of agencies that have been tested, and of agencies whose construction has been approved and whose plans are sound.

For years theorists or selfish individuals have advocated stripping the Corps of Engineers of their civil functions and have urged that their civil functions be removed from the Department of the Army. We should make no mistake. The enemies of the Corps of Engineers are still active. Their supporters should be on guard. Many fallacies are urged. Coordination is emphasized.

I have answered that contention by showing the coordination between the Corps of Engineers and the TVA in the flood of 1950. Again it is fallaciously urged that there would be better coordination in reclamation and flood control. The answer is that a new agency to supplant a successful and an established agency may result in disorganization and inefficiency. There should be coordination, and such coordination obtains today in the Missouri Valley where there is both reclamation and flood control. It will obtain in the Columbia River Valley. The remedy is to promote coordination and not to provide for the experiment of a new construction agency to supplant the Corps of Engineers whose experience in peace is most valuable for war. It is unthinkable that the Corps of Engineers should be deprived of their civil functions when their achievements are without parallel. We say to the advocates of reorganization that the public welfare in the

future as in the past will be promoted by continuing the civil functions of the Corps of Engineers under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Army, and by continuing to authorize the construction of flood control and river and harbor improvements by the Corps of Engineers of the United States Army.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS

No agency of the Government has ever wrought better than the Corps of Engineers. George Washington appreciated their worth. A great administrator, he provided for the construction of non-military works by them 175 years ago. They are the servants of the Congress, the elected representatives of the people. They are selected and appointed to West Point by Senators and Representatives. The corps is selected from the high men of the class. They take postgraduate courses after graduating at West Point. No engineers are better trained. They are prepared to meet the challenges of peace as well as war, of emergency, and of disaster. They respond when there is an explosion such as occurred at Texas City. They are on the job when cities, states, and regions are snowbound. They respond to rehabilitation from hurricanes and storms along the Gulf and the ocean where disaster strikes, and where emergency calls. They serve the American people in rain, and in sunshine, in prosperity, and in adversity. They should be encouraged. I believe in flowers for the living as well as flowers for the dead. The civil functions of the Corps of Engineers must be preserved and strengthened.

The services of the Corps of Engineers are essential to the protection of our valleys and the improvement of our rivers. The dams prevent erosion below them as they prevent floods. They also prevent silt below as they prevent floods. They promote reforestation as they store the waters above the dams. The flood dams raise the low-water flow, and they lower the high-water flow. While the Corps of Engineers needs no eulogy or defense at my hands, when I think of their achievements, and their opponents, the lines of Wordsworth come to me:

"Him, only him, the shield of Jove defends,
Whose means are fair and spotless as his ends."

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION

I would like to say that there is no more occasion for depriving the Bureau of Reclamation of its functions than there is in destroying the Corps of Engineers. It is an established agency. It is doing an outstanding job. It should be strengthened and encouraged. It would be most unwise to supplant the achievements of this organization for almost 50 years by an untried agency.

COLUMBIA RIVER BASIN

There is pending in Congress today a coordinated plan for the Columbia River Basin with the projects named and with careful studies covering the economic and engineering problems involved. That coordinated report with division of authority between the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation should be adopted. It should not be supplanted by the creation of an administration that would duplicate in the very beginning the years of studies and investigations made by the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. The two existing agencies would be destroyed. Their works would be duplicated at the expense of the taxpayers under the guise of coordination, but in reality for lump-sum appropriations and for supplanting the way of life in the region.

DISCRIMINATIONS IN LAWS

I am not saying that our flood-control and reclamation laws are perfect. I emphasize that they are on a sound foundation. Much of the criticism that now obtains, however, can be eliminated by the Congress of the United States. I like to be constructive. I want to help my friends. I always want to be fair to my enemies. I want to help the agencies of the Government that control our rivers and reclaim our lands. The remedy is not the creation of administrations, but the forward step is legislation eliminating differences in laws by the Congress of the United States. I believe that such legislation will do much to defeat the authorization of expensive and spending administrations.

I assert that in evaluating benefits the same rate of interest should obtain; the same charge for the disposal of power and the same system of costs and benefits with allowance for the essential differences that may be involved should obtain in both reclamation and flood control. The discriminations in existing laws between flood control authorizations and reclamation authorizations should be abolished. The two agencies have grown older, and with age they have grown more sensible. Dissension will be eliminated, expansion will be promoted, and new agencies will be defeated by the passage of a statute that would prevent and eliminate the fundamental differences in the laws that now obtain between reclamation and flood control authorizations.

WATER, RAIN, AND DISTILLATION

The attention of the country is being focused on waters today. The mismanagement of waters gives rise to fears that we are running out of water. The fact is that we have ample water. The demand with increasing populations and increasing needs, however, is increasing. Formerly there was ample water in the East. The lack of water for domestic purposes in New York City has appeared constantly in the headlines in recent months. When I visit the Great Salt Lake in Utah and the Salton Sea in California, and when I am on the Atlantic and on the Pacific, and whether near New York or Los Angeles, I am reminded that the water problem is most important, and it brings to mind the lines of Samuel Coleridge in the "Rime of the Ancient Mariner," written 150 years ago:

"Water, water everywhere, nor any drop to drink."

Experts tell us that the supply of water is ample and that if we conserve the supply there will be ample water. Research will be of aid. Here again science will play an important part. Today artificial rain is being studied by private and public agencies. They have not yet perfected plans to obtain water, but there is hope that the clouds as they are sprinkled with dry ice may provide rain. If the process is developed, it can be applied to arid regions where the need is greatest and to other regions where water is sometimes more precious than gold.

The methods of salt-water distillation used for stranded airplanes especially during World War II is being further explored. If scientists can produce the hydrogen bomb, they can surely eliminate the salt from the waters of the gulf and ocean. It is particularly important at the mouths of the rivers. Salt water distillation will result in the supplying of water that will make the deserts of the west more productive than most of the fertile valleys in other parts of the country.

ENGINEERING AND RESEARCH

Engineering and research have made possible the spanning of our rivers, the reclamation of our deserts, the construction of transcontinental highways, the building of transcontinental railways, the harnessing of mighty waterfalls, and the bringing of pure water through mountains, under gorges, and across lands to supply the teeming millions of cities. With the advance in engineering discoveries, science, and invention, there is the opportunity for free America to extend and maintain the highest standards of living ever attained by man.

GREAT OPPORTUNITY

Following war, and even in the uncertain days of peace, and with hope of a permanent peace, with unparalleled natural resources promoted by invention and science, the United States has the greatest opportunity in human history to provide for the well-being of man. In the Republic all are equal. There are no classes. The door of opportunity is open to all. If we keep faith with the lads who went out in World War II never to come back, and if we put first things first, there will be a new era of progress in the United States. There is opportunity for peace and for progress in the United States that has never been afforded to any people of any other country. Our plans must be sound. Our Government must be stable, and our faith must be abiding in man, country, and God.

DANGERS

After the stress of war, there is always danger. The tendency is to be soft. The temptation is complacency. We think more and more of our rights. We overlook our responsibilities. We think more of security than sacrifice. We confuse the meaning of public welfare. We must take advantage of our opportunity for progress, but unless America is strong, the opportunity may be lost. The Government must be stable. Public expenditures must not exceed public revenues. A paternal state must be avoided. Emphasis must be more on the responsibilities than on the rights of citizens. There are always dangers, and there are many dangers to the freedom of democracy in the United States today. I mention a few. There is confusion of the meaning of welfare. The private welfare and public welfare must not be confused. Those who advocate the so-called welfare state point out that Jefferson's program to purchase Louisiana was opposed by the conservatives of his day. There is a difference between the public welfare as promoted by the extension of our national domain and the private welfare of those who expect the Government to do for them what they should do for themselves. An unbalanced budget is a danger. The government that cannot live within its income in prosperity is in great danger of being destroyed in the event of either war or widespread inflation. It is time to think clearly and to speak frankly. Measures for the general public health are in order, but socialized medicine is a national danger. Home-owning is to be encouraged, but socialized Federal housing will result in the socialistic if not the communistic state advocated by those who first proposed public housing. Socialized farming will result in the regimentation and control of the farms and food of the Nation.

The plan of subsidizing agriculture has been tried, and it has failed. No course can more fully lead down the path to state socialism than the socialized programs that lead to a soft citizenship that deprives the country of the initiative and the independence of patriots. I cannot help but believe that the appropriations for the Army, Navy, and Air Force, while adequate defense is imperative, can be reduced, and I believe that we can reduce the appropriations that we have been making for the past 2 years for the recovery and the rehabilitation of the countries of Europe. A sound America, and a strong America is the best assistance that can be rendered to the oppressed peoples of the earth today.

ATOM BOMB

The strength of America does not consist in the atom bomb nor in any other source of power, but the strength of America consists in the faith and spirit of the people of America. The splitting and utilization of the atom should be applied for the benefit

and not for the destruction of man. I am a lot more afraid of other bombs than the atom bomb. For the want of a better name, I am apprehensive of the spending bomb that is likely to explode in unbridled inflation and national bankruptcy to the destruction of the American economy unless checked and checked now.

We must be prepared for war, for there is still both chance and change in the world, but there is no occasion for fear of the destruction of the world in the event of another war. I do not underestimate the effect of the atom bomb, but it takes something more than the bomb to make the bomb effective in war. Only the rich nations can produce the atom bomb, and only the rich nations can transport it to the enemy country when it is produced. I repeat, I do not underestimate the importance of the atom or the hydrogen bomb, but it is well to keep in mind that Japan was really begging for peace with the destruction of her air force and her navy when Nagasaki and Hiroshima were bombed.

It would be most unfortunate if America were dependent upon the atom bomb or any other weapon. We would relax and become soft. We would not be vigilant. America will only lose its liberty when it abandons it. I do not underestimate the force of the atom bomb, but I believe that the scientists who split the atom will provide for a defense against the atom bomb. Our weakness is in the selfishness of minority groups, in high taxes, and in unsound spending rather than in providing for permanent measures in the public benefit. When we encourage paternalism, when we encourage the Treasury raids of the minorities, we are destroying the freedom of the individual. It is time today in America to stop, look, and listen. If we do not watch our steps, it may be most difficult to retrace them. The strength of America is in the faith and courage of the people.

BULWARKS

I spoke of the prologue as I began. I come now to my epilogue. "It is time to steady the national ship of state." It is not an accident that the United States is the leading democracy of the world today. Those who founded our Nation were sturdy souls. They suffered persecution. They sought to exchange the oppression of the Old World for the freedom of the New. They endured sacrifices. They paid the price for freedom. We must be willing to pay the price for continued freedom. We must be realistic. We must convert our dreams into realities. We must take advantage of our opportunity as a nation. We must be "guided by the stars and not by the lights of each passing ship."

MAN MAKING AND NATION BUILDING

I am anxious for the security of America. I know that security can only come with the strength of America. I am ambitious that America may grow and prosper. I would like for our generation to be constructive. The individual, like the government, that does not grow will die. Democracy is not only a growing but a dynamic faith. Over the gate of a city in the interior of ancient China is found an inscription which, when translated, reads, "It is later than you think." What was true centuries ago is true in the world today. Only in the United States today is there peace. Only in North America today is there security. Time is running out. It is later than we think. It is time for all citizens to take their places in the front lines of citizenship as we plan and build for the future.

A lad in the invasion in World War II wrote to his father as the American forces were landing on the Normandy beaches: "I am not in the grandstand nor on the sidelines, but in the front line of the invading forces." There was no place for the summer or sunshine patriot in that invasion. It tried men's souls. There is a place today in the front lines of citizenship for the patriotic American as humanity advances toward a better day.

No man or nation was ever great whose primary concern was security. The men who engaged in great adventures and the nations that took the risks have made the greatest contribution to the world. George Washington was a wealthy man. He did not seek a soft or an easy place. He was not satisfied with mere personal security. If he had lost, he would probably have died a traitor's death and forfeited all of his property. He took the risk. He is among the immortals.

Jesus of Nazareth did not seek mere security for Himself. He said that the man who loses his life in service shall save it. He dared to bring to the world a new appreciation of values and a new way of thinking. He gave His life for humanity. He dignified and loved man. Citizens must have faith in themselves and in their country. They must prefer sacrifice to security. The old-fashioned virtues of honesty, industry, thrift, and self-reliance are essential to a better man and a greater nation.

I close with these lines of Edward Markham:

"We are all blind until we see
That in the human plan
Nothing is worth the making if
It does not make the man.

"Why build these cities glorious
If man unbuilded goes?
In vain we build the world unless
The builder also grows."

Franklin Delano Roosevelt: A Tribute

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have been glad and proud to identify myself as a Roosevelt Democrat for so long that I can scarcely remember any other badge of political devotion that I have worn.

My admiration for and devotion to the late Franklin Delano Roosevelt has been made a matter of record in many ways. I was not slow to recognize him as one of the greatest of all Americans, and one of the greatest men of all time, worthy to walk with the great leaders of history, a man who shaped his own destiny and the destiny of the world about him.

However, the hatred he evoked from a powerful and vocal minority in America is equally green in my memory; I can still see in my mind's eye some of the scurrilous and slanderous cartoons, lampoons, editorials, and articles published in derogation of that great man by lesser men.

You can understand, therefore, with what pleasure I read a full-page editorial in the Wichita (Kans.) Beacon eulogizing the late great wartime President. Under leave, I am inserting the text of the editorial in the RECORD. Since the rules do not permit its reproduction in its original format, I want to make special mention of the fact that the page is set up in very large type so that truly "he who runs may read".

This, Mr. Speaker, is recognition indeed, from the rock-ribbed Republican plains of Kansas, of a great man; and the display given by the Wichita Beacon is a gracious gesture from a newspaper which seldom agreed with his domestic policies in his lifetime.

It gave me pleasure to read this tribute and it gives me pleasure to place it in the RECORD.

FRANKLIN DELANO ROOSEVELT—"MAN OF THE HALF CENTURY"

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, the thirty-second President of the United States, who served 14 years as this Nation's Chief Executive after having previously played a major role in American history, is the choice of a vast majority of the world's peoples as "man of the half century."

Certainly no other man ever did so much for so many in a lifetime of public service. The tradition-shattering presidential career of Mr. Roosevelt spanned turbulent years of peace in which he worked to lift the Nation out of its deepest depression and tumultuous years of war when he played a dominant role in charting an Allied victory.

Mr. Roosevelt, without whose able leadership the Second World War, greatest conflict known to man, might have been lost, had attained a substantial international stature in the years when he was concerned primarily with applying revolutionary remedies to an economic blight rooted in World War I.

And after the flames of a second global conflict were kindled, he became the pivotal statesman of more than 30 united nations which pooled their might to smash a German-Italian-Japanese Axis.

Kings and queens, presidents and prime ministers traveled to the White House to consult him. International conferences on a scale never before seen in history resulted from Mr. Roosevelt's tremendous driving energy during the trying years immediately preceding and during the great conflict.

The military strategy of nations representing 75 percent of the earth's surface and 60 percent of its population—a strategy that sent American fighting men, American war weapons, American food, and American dollars to combat the Axis—was mapped at conferences in which he took the leading role.

A big man physically as well as mentally, Mr. Roosevelt shouldered burdens heavier than any ever before carried by a chief executive of any nation. When he went into the Presidency at the age of 51, the United States had an estimated 12,000,000 persons unemployed, prices were depressed to new low levels, foreign trade shrunken, and the national banking system on the brink of collapse as the result of widespread bank failures.

War was far from the thoughts of most Americans when Mr. Roosevelt declared in his inaugural address of March 4, 1933, that the only thing America had to fear was fear itself. Those words did much to relieve the minds of the masses who were faced with starvation. The drastic economic changes he offered to Congress were accepted and a new feeling of security was born. Faith and dignity returned to the common man. Security was just beginning to be felt by the American people when the rise of totalitarianism swept some parts of the world.

Mr. Roosevelt saw the threat as something more significant than a mere change of government in western European nations. He warned the world that dictators were threatening the very existence of democracy. He piloted this Nation through its greatest preparedness program. He told the rest of the world that America was ready to fight to preserve the rights of free men everywhere. It was up to the American people to do the rest. Pearl Harbor cemented American opinion behind the President and his stewardship led us successfully through the greatest war in world history.

Thirty days after Pearl Harbor, Congress gasped when he proposed a 2-year production of 185,000 planes, 120,000 tanks, 55,000 antiaircraft guns, and 18,000,000 tons of shipping. He told the world that the militarists of Berlin and Tokyo started this war, adding that the massed, angered forces of common humanity will finish it. Production goals, mammoth though they were, were met and surpassed and the Allies achieved a crushing superiority of arms over their foes. Four years after the United States entered the war, it had 11,000,000 men under arms, with more than 7,000,000 overseas fighting in all parts of the world.

By every standard by which global renown is measured Franklin Delano Roosevelt is head and shoulders above any other man on the world scene during the first 50 years of the twentieth century. In every standard of measurement—as a leader, as a statesman, as a man, as a power in world politics—he tops all others during the 50-year period.

Mr. Roosevelt was more widely loved and respected, the world around, than any other person in the past half century.

Yalta Agreement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, 5 years ago on February 7, 1945, at Yalta, a secret agreement was made which doomed the gallant Poles to Communist slavery and which condemned the anti-Communist Chinese to the reign of oppression to which they are now subjected.

I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a challenging statement by Charles Rozmarek, president of the Polish-American Congress, regarding the sad and unbecoming actions which occurred at Yalta. Many of the difficulties with which we are now faced in the international field stem from this original sin. Much of the threat to American national security for which we are now desperately seeking an escape are the result of the ignominious betrayals of Poland and China at Yalta. No one can foretell when or by what means Poland and China will be liberated from their subjugation by these godless despots. But this we know: That aside from the fact that our own national interest was heavily involved and was badly served on this occasion, we have a great moral commitment to the freedom-loving peoples in both these nations.

It is time that we returned to the policy of open covenants openly arrived at. It is time indeed that we launched a great moral crusade. There can be no better beginning than by recognizing our moral commitments to the people of Poland and to the people of China. Let us not allow the high moral tone which we should assume at this time to be in any way diminished by the shameful and cynical expediencies to which we resorted at Yalta.

The statement follows:

DEAR EDITOR: The abandonment of Nationalist China by Britain and the United States, brings to mind the forsaking of another loyal and valiant ally, Poland. The fate of both these allies was sealed at the same time and at one and the same place, at Yalta, 5 years ago, on February 7, 1945.

Today, no penetrating analysis or any deep study is needed to properly evaluate what Yalta was or is. A mere glance at the map of Europe and Asia is all that is needed to see the results of the shameful bartering of loyal nations that took place in that obscure Crimean town.

Yalta, was that single moment at the tragic crossroads of history that decided the life and death of millions of people, the fate of many nations and the outcome of the Second World War. There it was where we lost the peace while winning the war.

As long as the apparition of Yalta is upon us, so long will our hopes for peace remain but idle dreams. We must break away from Yalta so that history's course can again find its proper channel.

The Yalta decisions were not only politically pernicious but what is more, they bore the seeds of future conflict. The evil seeds sown at Yalta are now bearing evil fruit.

It was always the opinion of the six million Americans of Polish descent united in the Polish American Congress that the Yalta agreements would bring nothing but trouble. We knew that the course of American foreign policy which led to Yalta was not charted with the knowledge or consent of the American people and their Representatives in the United States Congress.

The Yalta agreement was never ratified by the United States Senate and is, therefore, null and void.

Speaking of Poland, which lost the most at Yalta, half her territory and what was left made into a puppet of Communist Russia—freedom and democracy can be restored to her people only if and when America repudiates all Yalta decisions regarding that country.

CHARLES ROZMAREK,
President, Polish American Congress, Inc.
CHICAGO, ILL.

"Pie in the Sky" Tariff Slashes—Third Round Coming Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, the phoney "pie in the sky" philosophies of the administration and the Democratic Party should now be crystal clear to the midwestern farmer. While his alleged friend, the Secretary of Agriculture, attempts to talk up a farm depression and further depress farm prices, the administration's policy is to preach fear—fear of surpluses. The same spokesmen who stated that they favored a broader price-support program with higher price-support levels are, in practice, curtailing the price-support program and threatening more and more control. The Secretary of Agriculture, who is so concerned about the farmer's income, gleefully slashes production and reduces the farmer's income through acreage allotments and marketing controls.

Fact is that the Secretary of Agriculture is not attempting to move our food surpluses. Fact is that he apparently is trying to build them up. The free-trade tariff-slashing policy is hitting right at home, at our own farmers, and directly forcing further curtailed production and lower price-support levels. The Secretary of Agriculture has the power and the authority to stop the flooding of our markets with foreign food products that we have in surplus supply or under price-support programs. The fact is he is not. There is a case on record in the Department of Agriculture that dates back to the fall of 1948. The nut growers protested the reduced tariffs and heavy imports of foreign nuts into the American market. They have petitioned and protested, but Secretary Brannan has failed even as yet to take any action.

In progress is the third round of tariff slashes since the end of the war. The lists are being prepared and the final meetings are scheduled to get under way next September. This, in spite of the recent report by the Department of Agriculture that many countries are beginning to be faced with surplus and marketing problems for their own agricultural products. During the period July-November 1949, we imported approximately $45,000,000 in value of food commodities that we had in surplus supply—Commodity Credit Corporation loans and inventories. Certainly our losses on these same commodities would have been reduced by this amount. But the flood of imports is but starting. Our exports meantime are being curtailed.

From July to November we imported 795,000 bushels of wheat—Government stocks on November 30 were over 375,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 288,000 bushels of corn—Government stocks on November 30 were over 400,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 18,500,000 bushels of barley—Government stocks were on November 30 over 58,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported over 12,000,000 bushels of oats—Government stocks on November 30 were over 40,000,000 bushels.

From July to November, we imported 45,480 bags of dried beans—Government stocks on November 30 were over 9,000,000 bags.

From July to November, we imported the equivalent of 90,000,000 shell eggs in shell, frozen, and dried form—imported most of them from Red China, where the industry is being expanded and shipments increased. Farm wives were getting 20 cents a dozen for their eggs, which were then dried and added to the over 70,000,000 pounds now owned by the Government. From July to November, while hog prices skidded badly throughout the Midwest, we imported over 1,500,000 pounds of pork and pork products.

How long can this give-away last? When is the Secretary of Agriculture going to act to protect our farm markets?

Should the American People Finance the Puerto Rican Rum Campaign?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, public funds are now being used to advertise and promote the sale of liquor and whether they know it or not, the American people today are lending their direct support to the subsidization of a $1,500,000-a-year Government campaign of advertising and publicizing of Puerto Rican rum.

This campaign has now reached such proportions that its promoters are seeking to entice our teen-agers to sample this Puerto Rican product.

The clever way in which this propaganda is being packaged prevents the average citizen from realizing what is involved.

Here is how it works. The government of Puerto Rico, whose officials have publicly announced that that government is a partner in the rum business, have realized annual revenues ranging from $5,000,000 to $60,000,000 per year from Puerto Rican rum sold in the United States. Out of these funds last year the Puerto Rican government appropriated $1,500,000 for an advertising and publicity campaign directed at American consumers of that Puerto Rican product. In other words, the Puerto Rican government is taking $1,500,000 out of its treasury to spend on this campaign. It is just the same as the Congress of the United States appropriating from United States Treasury funds several million dollars a year to propagandize Kentucky whisky or any of the other alcoholic beverages manufactured in this country.

Now, how is this Puerto Rican campaign being designed to entice our young boys and girls to sample that island's demon rum? Well, one of the first endeavors of the propagandists working on this campaign was to get someone to dream up what they at least hoped would become a popular song hit in the United States. And they called it Rum and Soda. They had recordings made of the song and sent it, together with samples of Puerto Rican rum, to practically every disc jockey in the United States, obviously hoping that the samples would put the disc jockeys in such shape that they would push the tune over the air right into your home and mine. Naturally—and the Puerto Rican rum campaign propagandists know this as well as you and I—it is the teen-agers who follow these novel tunes on the air, so there can be no doubt that these rum salesmen were setting their sights on our children as the best target for their rum sales.

It would appear that this government-sponsored and supported Puerto Rican rum campaign is a new low in a business that has already done enough to bring suffering, misery, and wrecked homes and lives to the people of the United States.

Puerto Rico is a part of the United States. Its citizens are citizens of the United States.

The Federal taxes collected on tobacco grown in South Carolina goes to the United States Treasury. So do Federal taxes collected on products made in other States. Why then should Federal taxes collected on rum be returned to Puerto Rico just because it happened to be made there? It is clear they have abused the use of this money. Therefore, I propose that the law be amended to require that this money go to the United States Treasury.

A typical example of the brazen efforts of the Puerto Rican rum interests to promote the sale of Puerto Rico rum in the United States is the following advertisement of the Puerto Rico Industrial Development Co. of San Juan, P. R.:

HERE'S SWEET MUSIC FOR YOUR CASH REGISTER

Newly released by MGM records, Rum and Soda is a sparkling song hit. It's written and played by Noro Morales, the rhumba king. It's dedicated to the Governor of Puerto Rico. And it's being promoted by a great campaign.

All of that promotion for Rum and Soda promotes your business. National advertising—bar and record shop streamers—cooperative displays by Canada Dry at retail club-soda outlets—newspaper publicity—it all adds up to a hard-hitting campaign that shouts rum and soda to millions of people, including your customers.

So the smart thing to do is to get on the bandwagon. Help promote Rum and Soda—not just the song but the drink. Suggest it to customers. Put your Puerto Rican rums where they can be seen—at eye level on a center shelf, and a few bottles right out there on the counter.

As the old Puerto Rican proverb says: Sweeter than the guitar is the rustle and jingle of cash. Or, in other words, sell, brother, sell.

This is another concrete illustration why favorable action should be taken by Congress on the Langer and Bryson bills prohibiting all liquor advertising in Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Role of Farm Co-ops

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following article from the Wisconsin Rapids Tribune of February 2, 1950:

ROLE OF FARM CO-OPS DISCUSSED AT JOINT MEETING OF CLUBMEN, FARMERS

"Farm cooperatives have operated in the United States for over 100 years—they want to be recognized for what they are, a small but vital force in American life."

That was the opinion expressed by C. L. Jackson, assistant secretary of the Wisconsin Council of Agriculture, speaking Wednesday evening at a joint meeting of the Wisconsin Rapids Kiwanis Club and Wood County Farm Supply Cooperative held at the Congregational Church in Vesper.

Jackson, who substituted on the program for Milo Swanton, council secretary, originally scheduled to speak at the meeting, charged that while farmers have always done an excellent job of production, they have fallen down in their public relations with other groups.

"There has been too much pitting of one group against another. The policies of farmers affect those of businessmen and labor, and we must get together to learn what the other fellow is doing," he urged.

Concerning farm problems, Jackson said that the average American must look beyond the daily newspapers and radio programs for sufficient information to form sound opinions. He declared that the general public too often takes a portrait of a single farmer, as presented in a national magazine, as representative of the general situation.

Three problems were listed by the speaker as the most urgent now facing Wisconsin farmers: (1) The decline in prices paid for farm products, (2) the oleo producers' attempts to escape restrictions in marketing their commodity in competition with butter, and (3) the attack on the cooperative movement by various groups.

Jackson stated that farm income in Wisconsin has decreased 30 percent in the last year without "a comparable drop in the cost of operations. Instead, freight charges have increased 52 percent, and costs of labor and equipment have remained at high levels," he said.

He added that consumer services, including such things as distribution and delivery of farm products, are one of the biggest items in the cost of food, remarking that the price of a 16-cent loaf of bread would decrease only to 14.7 cents if the farmer donated the wheat for it. Jackson listed comparable figures for several other commodities, and urged that the probable solution to the problem was for the farmers to organize selling cooperatives in the same manner in which they have organized supply cooperatives.

As for the oleo battle, the speaker asserted that 29 huge corporations have fought the battle for repeal of Federal taxes, and that success on their part would be the beginning of the marketing of filled milk products of all sorts. He added that repeal of the tax will allow movement of yellow oleo in 32 States, pointing out that 75 percent of the butter produced in Wisconsin is marketed outside of the State in just such areas.

Turning to the problem of the cooperatives, Jackson said that the farmer has two alternatives: To ask the Federal Government to completely underwrite agriculture, or to build their own organizations. He expressed the opinion that the latter solution is the much more effective one, but hastened to add that he did not therefore envision a "co-op commonwealth."

Jackson explained that farm co-ops are taxed in the same manner as private business owned individually or in partnership, and denied that they are monopolistic. Of all the businesses in the United States, 86.4 percent are owned either by individuals or in partnership, 13 percent are corporations, and only 5 percent are cooperatives, Jackson said. He further stated that cooperative growth has not been relative to the growth of farm business in the past 10 years, and ridiculed the charge that cooperatives are communistic, pointing out that they depend upon the same set of values as other business organizations.

A. P. Bean, president of the Wood County Farm Supply Co-op, which was host to the Kiwanians at a 6:30 dinner, briefly outlined the history of the organization. He said that the first step was taken on July 28, 1907, when a cranberry co-op was formed that was in existence for about 10 years. The present organization came into being later when three Farm Bureau groups at Arpin, Pittsville, and Vesper were merged with a total capital of $150,000, he said.

Max Leopold, of Arpin, manager of the farm organization, and Martin Hoeneveld,

president of the village of Vesper, also extended welcomes to the visiting Kiwanians. Jackson was introduced by W. W. Clark, of Vesper, Wood County assemblyman.

Prior to the dinner, a tour of the cooperative building at Vesper was taken.

Any Extension of the Selective Service Act Should Prohibit Discrimination and Segregation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement which I submitted to the Armed Services Committee today. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, a little more than a year ago I introduced a bill in the House, H. R. 1403, which was referred to this committee. Specifically I sought to amend the National Defense Act by adding a paragraph which provided that Federal aid is to be withheld from National Guard organizations which practice discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed.

The exact wording of that paragraph was as follows:

"Whenever any unit of the National Guard practices discrimination or segregation on account of race, color, or creed with respect to members of, or applicants for membership in, such unit, the National Guard of the State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, as the case may be, of which such unit is a part shall be debarred from receiving from the United States any pecuniary or other aid, benefit, or privilege authorized or provided by this act or any other law."

Now, you have under consideration a bill to extend the Selective Service Act, which is due to expire in June of this year. In the event your committee decides to recommend to Congress a further extension of this act I hope and trust that it will at the same time make an earnest effort to correct some of the abuses still rampant in our armed services whereby some of our citizens are reduced to the status of second-class citizenship.

I am referring specifically to the treatment of Negroes in our armed services. How can we truly and honestly expect the Negro to fight for democracy, when he himself is a victim of racial prejudice and is not given the opportunity to enjoy the benefits of democracy? How can we ever expect the Negro to enter our armed forces and not grow increasingly resentful and distrustful, when he discovers that he is faced with the same limitations and Jim Crow treatment he had to endure in civilian life?

It is, therefore, imperative that your committee should amend the Selective Service Act along the following lines:

(a) Prohibit discrimination and segregation in the entire selective-service program. Persons subjected to such treatment should have the right of injunctive relief and writs of habeas corpus in Federal courts.

(b) Discrimination and segregation should be prohibited in interstate travel on busses, trains, planes, and boats for all military people; where practiced or enforced, such act should be a Federal offense.

(c) Any attacks upon or lynching of a person in military uniform shall be a Federal offense and severely punished.

(d) Prohibit discrimination against members of the armed forces by public authorities or in places of public accommodation, recreation, or other public service.

(e) Private contractors or commercial firms, as a condition of getting Government contracts under the Selective Service Act should be required to use fair-employment practices in their hiring of labor.

(f) Segregation in the National Guard must be forbidden, and no one should be exempted from selective service by virtue of service in a segregated National Guard unit.

Mr. Chairman, I want to emphasize particularly the last section where I refer to the National Guard organizations. By incorporating my suggestions concerning the National Guard, you will include some of the purposes I had in mind when I introduced my bill last year. My original suggestion to withhold Federal aid from National Guard units which practice discrimination still stands, and I am as much in favor of it today as I was a year ago.

I hope the committee will give serious consideration to the amendments suggested above and will incorporate these in any Selective Service Act you may recommend.

In conclusion, permit me to extend my sincere thanks to your committee for the opportunity to present this statement to you.

Development of California's Electric Power Potential

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, nothing is more vital to the continued growth of California than a full development of its electric power potential. The people of California know this and are fighting for such a development for both present and future needs. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring your attention to two editorials on this subject from leading newspapers in the State. The first of these is "Governor Warren's Answer Is Vital" from the San Francisco News, and the second is "CVP Steam Plant Should Be Started This Year" from the Sacramento Bee.

The editorials follow:

[From the San Francisco News]

GOVERNOR WARREN'S ANSWER IS VITAL

The question of public versus private development of hydroelectric power on the North Fork of the Kings River will have to be answered by Governor Earl Warren (through his representative, Public Works Director Charles Purcell) by the middle of next week. His decision might settle the controversy between the United States Bureau of Reclamation and the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. over rights to build power plants on the river.

Last fall the Bureau recommended a program of development that would exclude the Pacific Gas & Electric Co. from the river entirely. Under provisions of the 1944 Flood Control Act the recommendation was referred to the United States Army engineers and Governor Warren. The act provides that they must approve or disapprove the recommendation within 90 days. That would be by January 25. If they approve, the project becomes automatically allocated to the Bureau. If both ignore it, their action is construed by the law as tacit approval. If they disapprove, the matter goes to Congress for special legislation.

Several weeks ago the P. G. & E. won approval of the Federal Power Commission for a project to enlarge its present power developments on the river. A rehearing on that decision has been granted for March 20 to enable the Reclamation Bureau to present its further claims. However, it is the contention of bureau lawyers that approval by the governor and the Army engineers would settle the matter finally regardless of the FPC decision.

The outcome is important in connection with a Central Valley project plan to bring water to the dry west side of the San Joaquin Valley, now rapidly becoming California's dust bowl. That plan involves building a reservoir on San Luis Creek into which water would be pumped from the Delta-Mendota Canal in period of heavy winter run-off and stored for irrigation use in the rainless summer months. Some 250,000 acres would be brought under irrigation thereby.

To pump water from the canal to the reservoir would require an abundance of cheap power. That's where the Kings River power project comes in. It would be the source for the west side project pumps. Private power would be too expensive.

The question thus posed to Governor Warren and the Army engineers, therefore, is whether to encourage with their approval this plan to put water into the western dust bowl, or to reject the plan and thus subject it to the uncertainties of the Congress.

Anticipating that eventuality, Congressman CECIL WHITE, of California, has introduced a bill authorizing the Reclamation Bureau to acquire the P. G. & E. power works and rights on the river, and to build additional power facilities, as well as to operate the power features of the Pine Flat Dam the Army engineers have been authorized to build.

It is likely Governor Warren would be asked to express his approval or disapproval of that legislation when and if it reaches the voting stage in Washington. Inasmuch as the proposed development is entirely within the State of California, the Governor's attitude is important and should be influential in Congress' final decision.

What does Governor Warren say?

[From the Sacramento Bee]

CVP STEAM PLANT SHOULD BE STARTED THIS YEAR

Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman is urging Congress to approve funds to begin construction during the next fiscal year of the Central Valley's project steam plant. President Truman's budget recommendations include $2,000,000 for this purpose.

The case for the steam plant and for the immediate start of construction is a strong one.

The Federal Government definitely is committed to the policy of public transmission lines from Shasta Dam. It would be folly of the first water to haul the kilowatts to the central California market areas and then virtually abandon them to the privately owned power utilities.

Shasta power can be of benefit to the public only if it is firmed up by the adjunct of a steam plant.

Secretary Chapman told the House Appropriations Committee this week that Government power is necessary to pump the Sacramento River water into the San Joaquin Valley irrigation canals, and to supply Government installations and other users in central California.

The need for haste in getting the steam plant built is underscored by the fact the irrigation operation is scheduled to begin in the summer of 1951.

There should be congressional agreement with Secretary Chapman's statement that "it is most important the steam plant be placed under construction at once."

The private power lobby, of course, will be on hand in force to try to kill the CVP steam-plant appropriation.

This lobby fought for years to block the construction of transmission lines, in order to make it necessary for the Government to sell the power at the generating plants to a private utility.

But, having lost the transmission-line battle, the lobby now will concentrate on blocking the steam plant in an attempt to keep the transmission lines from being of practical benefit to the people.

In many respects this is a crucial contest, and Congress should deal with the power lobby in the steam-plant controversy as it did in the transmission-line fight—only it should not take so long.

How Federal Funds Are Wasted on the Apple Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the following letters show the complicated, costly trade program:

UNITED STATES TARIFF COMMISSION,
Washington, D. C., December 23, 1949.
Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: I have your letter of December 16, 1949, requesting information concerning the quantity and value of United States apple imports and exports during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949.

United States imports of apples for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, amounted to 1,900,000 bushels, valued at $5,800,000; exports during the same period amounted to 1,300,000 bushels, valued at $5,500,000.

To furnish you with basic information on the trade in apples we are enclosing a copy of a reprint from our Summaries of Tariff Information with statistics brought down to date.

If we can be of further service, please do not hesitate to call upon us.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR B. RYDER,
Chairman.

JANUARY 9, 1950.

Hon. REID F. MURRAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. MURRAY: This is in reply to your letter of December 16, 1949, asking the number of bushels of apples purchased for the school-lunch program this year, and their value.

Through December 17, 1949, the Department had purchased a total of 1,673,931 bushels of apples from the 1949 crop. These apples are purchased under authority of section 32, Public Law No. 321, Seventy-fourth Congress, as amended, and are delivered to agencies authorized to receive such commodity for distribution to nonprofit school-lunch agencies, and to other agencies and institutions eligible to receive them. The estimated total delivered cost of these purchases is $4,373,820. Approximately 85 percent of the total purchases are used by the school-lunch agencies.

The total quantity to be purchased will depend largely upon market conditions for apples. For this reason we have not yet established an absolute quantity to be purchased.

Sincerely yours,

K. T. HUTCHINSON,
Acting Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, the above official letters show, first, that we imported 1,900,000 bushels of apples valued at $5,800,000 and exported 1,300,000 bushels valued at $5,500,000; second, that we used section 32 funds to dispose of surplus apples that represented 1,673,931 bushels valued at $4,373,820 for the school-lunch program.

The facts are that more apples were imported than were given away and $4,373,820 of the taxpayers' money was spent on the program. This is just a sample of the other programs being followed wherein we imported over $1,532,000,000 worth of competitive agricultural products at the same time other millions are spent to subsidize exports of other agricultural products. Is this not another argument in favor of an international agricultural agreement similar to the international wheat agreement, as proposed by Mr. Albert Goss, of the National Grange, and the FAO?

Yalta: Crime Will Out

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONI N. SADLAK
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SADLAK. Mr. Speaker, 5 years have passed but the passage of time has not diminished the lingering stench of the foulest, the stealthiest, and the most shameless diplomatic maneuver of all time.

The Yalta agreement dangles over our heads like the sword of Damocles and history will forever point to our glaring repudiation of moral standards. The United States will not be able to forget that disgraceful retreat when a friend, a faithful ally, was left in the lurch. The world will continue to remind that we were partners in crime with Churchill and Stalin in a tragic betrayal of Poland. At Yalta the United States agreed to the fixing of the Curzon line as the western border of the Soviet Union, thereby incorporating a sizable area of prewar Polish territory. What hypocrisy. The Atlantic Charter specified that there would be no territorial changes that could not accord with the freely expressed wishes of the people concerned. But, apparently in our great haste to appease Stalin these considerations were left by the wayside, for little imagination is needed to realize that earlier in this game of betrayal the State Department with its horde of pro-Soviet advisors prepared the terms of the Yalta Agreement and upon arrival in Yalta when notes were compared there was scarcely anything to pick up for disagreement between the Western Powers and the Russians. Alger Hiss had masterminded and engineered the terms to the satisfaction of the Soviets.

The administration in power at the time of the Yalta agreement and currently holding the reins of Government and messing up not only our foreign policy but everything in general should be held to account for the reckless trampling of the principles of humanity and liberty. The blame for the dismemberment of Poland comes to rest squarely upon the shoulders of the Democratic Party, for the Yalta agreement is undoubtedly the most monstrous and grievous diplomatic faux pas of our time.

When it is remembered that Poland was deliberately forgotten and abandoned and 40 percent of her territory turned over to Russia it is amazing that the blush of guilt does not continually cover the faces of the members of the Democratic Party. We demanded unconditional surrender from our enemies and then with one stroke at Yalta President Roosevelt surrendered ignominiously and unconditionally to Stalin, thereby setting in motion the gigantic totalitarian expansion in eastern Europe and the present debacle in the Near East.

In the light of what we have learned to date there certainly was no need for the meeting at Yalta. We were winning the war—supplying the needs of a worldwide struggle and yet we were appeasing Stalin. We were giving early indication of fearing Russia. Our dealings with her indicate a continuing parade of concessions. The State Department and the administration just simply neglected to remember that the honor of the United States as a protector of free peoples is an important factor in our relations with other countries and should be upheld at any cost. But what is worse is the fact that the American people and the Congress were left completely in the dark as to the deals at Yalta which shoved Poland, our valiant ally, behind the iron curtain, and set off a chain of similar tragedies in eastern Europe.

The administration is responsible for Alger Hiss and his ilk that clutter the State Department with their Soviet-slanted advice and assist in formulating the cock-eyed foreign policy which has been causing the United States such discomfort and loss of prestige throughout the world that the possibility of graceful extrication from this dilemma appears remote for some time to come.

We have all been given ample proof that the pledges made at Yalta were utterly disregarded by Stalin.

The decisions of Yalta no longer bind us. We have every right to repudiate that ill-conceived venture that is steering us into another conflagration. Nothing is to be lost by throwing away something that was worthless to begin with.

After 5 years of keeping the Yalta document under wraps is it not high time to bring out into the light of day, for all to see, the details of that infamous cabal.

Since the Yalta agreement is presumably long overdue in the Senate of the United States there should be no further delay and it should now be sent to the Senate for consideration.

Our stand at this point in our history should be expressed by a firm and convincing action aimed at restoring to

Poland and other nations swallowed up by the Communists, the freedom that has virtually disappeared from their midst.

There has been no ratification of the Yalta Agreement by the Senate of the United States and there is no earthly reason why we should continue to honor a piece of paper that has no meaning except to further the Soviet expansion in Europe and the world. We have gone far enough along that road. It is time to call a halt.

More on the Jews in Russia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, only yesterday I brought to the attention of this House the very interesting study of the situation of the Jews in Russia, which was made by Dr. Sergius Yakobson of the Library of Congress. I hope many of the Members found the opportunity to read this study which I placed in the RECORD.

Entirely by coincidence, the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor, at its meeting in Miami, Fla., issued a statement urging quick ratification of the genocide convention and in it the charge is made that Russia is trying to wipe out the Jews behind the iron curtain. The A. F. of L. council says: "The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism."

At the same time, we still hear the ridiculous charges made by anti-Semitic elements of a Zionist-Communist global plot" and the illogical reasoning that every Jew is a Zionist and every Zionist is a Communist. It should be clear by this time to anyone who is honest with himself and with his fellowmen that, in the light of Russia's attitude to the Jewish religion and its treatment of its Jewish nationals, there is no future and no hope for Jewish survival in Communist Russia.

Mr. Speaker, I am placing in the RECORD two items which deal with this subject. One is from the Washington Star, February 5, 1950, entitled "AFL Charges Russia Is Trying To Wipe Out Jews as Hitler Did"; the other is from the New York World-Telegram and Sun, February 3, 1950, "Red-Hater Don Levine Swings at Right, Hits Hart as Anti-Semite" by Frederick Wiltman. They are as follows:

[From the Washington Evening Star of February 5, 1950]

AFL CHARGES RUSSIA IS TRYING TO WIPE OUT JEWS AS HITLER DID

MIAMI BEACH, FLA., February 4.—Leaders of the American Federation of Labor charged today that Stalin is trying to wipe out Jews behind the iron curtain.

The AFL's executive council said Russia is imitating Hitler by making life miserable for Jews as a class in a way that means virtually sentencing these human beings to death.

These charges were included in a council statement urging the Senate to ratify quickly the pending international treaty against genocide. This is the term that has been given to the international destruction of racial, national, or religious groups.

BASED ON CULTURAL GROUNDS

The AFL council said what Stalin is doing to the Jews is a tragic extension and frightening innovation in this crime of mass murder.

The American Federation of Labor keeps a force of trained observers in Europe operating closely with underground movements in Russia-dominated territory.

The council's statement said:

"Behind the iron curtain—and particularly in Soviet Russia—governmental authorities have developed a fiendish plan based on cultural grounds and have launched a terrific campaign to wipe out entire groups of their population.

"The new drive to make impossible the continued existence of Jews in Russia and in its satellite areas is going on under the flag of a savage war against so-called cosmopolitanism.

"Their crime is that they have, or might develop, a culture different from the ultranationalist and imperialistic brand supported by the ruling party, by the totalitarianism dictatorship in Russia.

"VICIOUS CAMPAIGN

"A vicious campaign is afoot to chase out all Jews from employment in occupations entailing contact with the mass of people in the U. S. S. R. or with the people of other countries.

"All citizens of Jewish origin have been eliminated from the Soviet occupation administrations in Austria and Germany. Jews are no longer permitted to be members of Soviet delegations and foreign missions or to undergo training for diplomatic service.

"The door to employment in the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Trade has been slammed hard in the face of Russia's Jews—on cultural grounds. The same process of elimination of Jews continues ruthlessly in the ranks of the ruling Communist Party and its government apparatus."

What is happening in Russia, the council said, means that prompt international action to check the spread and stop the perpetration of this heinous crime is most urgent.

The council said the genocide treaty would mean international sanctions could be applied against this treatment of the Jews and against the destruction of life through slave labor.

[From the New York World-Telegram and Sun of February 3, 1950]

RED-HATER DON LEVINE SWINGS AT RIGHT, HITS HART AS ANTI-SEMITE—SAYS NATIONAL ECONOMIC COUNCIL BREWS ZIONIST-COMMUNIST MYTH

(By Frederick Woltman)

Plain Talk, the monthly magazine which specializes in exposing the Communists, today delivered a blast in another direction.

The leading article of its February issue, signed by Isaac Don Levine, editor, attacked Merwin K. Hart, founder and president of the National Economic Council, Inc., Empire State Building.

It charged that the head of the council, which lists prominent industrialists and businessmen among its backers, is in the business of merchandising anti-Semitism.

QUOTES HART ON ZIONISTS

"And," continued the article, "he wraps his contraband in packages bearing the labels of free enterprise, anticommunism and Christian love."

His Economic Council Letter of December 15, according to Plain Talk, "leaps to the startling conclusion that 'the controlling influence in the world is not the United States, nor the UN, which the United States did so much to set up, but the Zionists'."

This was part of a 2-year design by Mr. Hart to create the myth of a Zionist-Communist global plot to destroy the Christian religion, wrote the editor. It ignores, he added, the fact that Communist Russia was the first modern power to outlaw Zionism as far back as 1920 and that thousands of Zionists have been sent to Soviet slave-labor camps, many of them to perish.

CITES EXHORTATION TO ARM

That every Jew is a Zionist and every Zionist is a Communist is an integral part of the Hart myth, according to Mr. Levine.

To show he is in dead earnest, Mr. Hart wrote in his January 15, 1948, council letter:

"We have one concrete suggestion to make to every citizen who is impressed by the potential danger.

"Let him possess himself of one or more guns, making sure that they are in good condition, that he and other members of his family know how to use them, and that he has a reasonable supply of ammunition."

CONCERNING JEWISH NAMES

The letter went on to advise its readers to acquire the weapons in accordance with the statutes of their particular States.

Like the press of Nazi Germany and the Communist press of Russia, according to Mr. Levine, "Mr. Hart knows how to underscore Jewish-sounding names and to put in quotation marks non-Jewish-sounding names when it is common knowledge that their bearers are of Jewish origin."

Among the council's supporters or deluded followers, Mr. Levine pointed out, are captains of industry, prominent members of the bar, politicians, clergymen, and educators.

SEES COMMON ENEMY SERVED

"The tragedy is that Mr. Hart brings to the noble cause of freedom the disease-carrying elements of hate and civil strife," declared Plain Talk.

"He unwittingly serves the common enemy and furthers the divisive and wrecking operations of Stalin's fifth column."

Isaac Don Levine for decades has written against Soviet totalitarianism and the Red underground in this country.

A Necessary Amendment to the Electoral College Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLIFFORD P. CASE
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. CASE of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Judiciary has approved House Joint Resolution 2, commonly known as the Lodge-Gossett Resolution. This resolution proposes certain changes in the provisions of the Constitution for the election of the President and Vice President.

I am strongly opposed to House Joint Resolution 2 in its present form for the reasons presented in my minority views which are appended to the report of the Judiciary Committee.

Among my reasons for opposing the resolution is my conviction that its provision for the division of each State's

electoral votes in proportion to the popular votes in that State would result in further restrictions upon the franchise in the safe or solid States.

In my minority views I stated that when the resolution reached the floor I would offer an amendment to prevent this most undesirable result.

By my amendment each State's electoral votes in any particular election would be reduced in the proportion that the number of persons actually voting is less than the total number of citizens of voting age in that State.

The text of House Joint Resolution 2, showing my proposed amendment, is set out below. My amendment would eliminate the language printed in brackets and would add the language in italics, which appears immediately thereafter.

Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That an amendment is hereby proposed to the Constitution of the United States which shall be valid to all intents and purposes as part of the Constitution when ratified by three-fourths of the legislatures of the several States. Said amendment shall be as follows:

"ARTICLE—

"SECTION 1. The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America. He shall hold his office during the term of 4 years, and together with the Vice President, chosen for the same term, be elected as herein provided.

"The electoral-college system for electing the President and Vice President of the United States is hereby abolished. The President and Vice President shall be elected by the people of the several States. The electors in each State shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the State legislature. Congress shall determine the time of such election, which shall be the same throughout the United States. Until otherwise determined by the Congress, such election shall be held on the Tuesday next after the first Monday in November of the year preceding the year in which the regular term of the President is to begin. [Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes equal to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress.] *Each State shall be entitled to a number of electoral votes in any election for the Presidency which bears the same ratio to the whole number of Senators and Representatives to which such State may be entitled in the Congress as the total number of votes cast in such State at such election for all candidates for the Presidency bears to the total number of citizens of voting age in such State according to the last preceding decennial census.*

"Within 45 days after such election, or at such time as the Congress shall direct, the official custodian of the election returns of each State shall make distinct lists of all persons for whom votes were cast for President and the number of votes for each, and the total vote of the electors of the State for all persons for President, which lists he shall sign and certify and transmit sealed to the seat of the Government of the United States, directed to the President of the Senate. The President of the Senate shall in the presence of the Senate and House of Representatives open all certificates and the votes shall then be counted. Each person for whom votes were cast for President in each State shall be credited with such proportion of the electoral votes thereof as he received of the total vote of the electors therein for President. In making the computations, fractional numbers less than one one-thousandth shall be disregarded. The person having the greatest number of electoral votes for President shall be President. If two or more persons shall have an equal and the highest number of such votes, then the one for whom the greatest number of popular votes were cast shall be President.

"The Vice President shall be likewise elected, at the same time and in the same manner and subject to the same provisions, as the President, but no person constitutionally ineligible for the office of President shall be eligible to that of Vice President of the United States.

"SEC. 2. Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 of section 1, article II, of the Constitution and the twelfth article of amendment to the Constitution are hereby repealed.

"SEC. 3. This article shall take effect on the tenth day of February following its ratification.

"SEC. 4. This article shall be inoperative unless it shall have been ratified as an amendment to the Constitution by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States within 7 years from the date of the submission hereof to the States by the Congress."

Percentage Depletion

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me by the House, I am including an editorial that appeared in a recent issue of the Oil and Gas Journal. The article is entitled "Percentage Depletion."

This statement, in my judgment, sets forth quite concisely the position of the independent oil operators with respect to the proposed legislation to reduce the depletion allowance presently in effect.

PERCENTAGE DEPLETION

The President's attack on percentage depletion in the oil and mining industries as a tax loophole is in character for an administration which knows that it can perpetuate itself only by continued reckless spending, and which is desperately seeking new sources of revenue which will not have unwanted political repercussions in an election year.

Nothing new has developed indicating that the present oil and gas depletion provisions should be ended or reduced as to percentage. In fact, if a fair and complete investigation results, the weight of the evidence will be on the side of liberalization.

The Depletion Act became effective in 1926, after long investigation by Congress. It was a practical application of a taxing principle previously recognized by Congress and which in turn had a background of English mining law going back more than three centuries.

Briefly reiterated, the 27½ percent depletion allowance isn't a "tax gift," a "tax avoidance," or anything of the kind, but represents a return of capital to those engaged in the hazardous pursuit of finding and producing oil. In principle, applied to an irreplaceable asset, it is exactly the same as depreciation allowance for manufacturing enterprises and other replaceable business operations in arriving at taxable income.

The 27½ percent depletion figure originally was a compromise figure of the two branches of Congress, arrived at after an investigation had shown that the allowance should be in excess of 30 percent in an industry-wide application. Actually, because of the statutory limitation based on net income, operators as a group do not receive the full 27½ percent.

So much for the position of the oil and gas industry. What about the depletion provisions in relation to public policy?

A practical objective of the depletion allowance is to encourage operators to find plenty of oil. This they have done—too much at times for their own good. These supplies have not only been large enough to take care of the steadily expanding needs of a peacetime economy but have been adequate for two major war emergencies.

Then there is the matter of petroleum's cheapness. The latest Government report shows the all-commodity index to be 152.2, that of petroleum 110.1. This means yearly savings to users of petroleum many times greater than the total depletion allowances.

Outstanding efficiency in production, refining, and transportation are factors in the low index of petroleum extending over many years, but it starts with the fact that the capital protection that depletion affords producers has supplied in part the wherewithal needed to find sufficient oil. Without that incentive oil prices most assuredly would be more in line with the commodity levels.

The oil industry has much at stake in defending this latest attack on its tax position, but that of tens of millions of consumers is much greater.

A Plea for Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH J. ADDONIZIO
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. ADDONIZIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following editorial from the East Orange (N. J.) Record of February 2, 1950. I think this fine and thoughtful editorial is deserving of the attention of all Members, particularly at this time when the legislative proposals to implement the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God are under such violent attack. As the writer of the editorial observes, our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when the Republic was founded. If we are to survive as a Nation, we must give unreserved allegiance to the credo upon which our great country was established and wipe out the breach between ideals and practice so that all Americans can enjoy full civil and political rights.

A PLEA FOR BROTHERHOOD

"Almighty God, we make our earnest prayer that Thou will keep the United States in Thy holy protection; that Thou will incline the hearts of the citizens to cultivate a spirit of subordination and obedience to government; to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large."

It is fitting that Washington's prayer after his inauguration should be the prayer with which we celebrate Brotherhood Week. Our Nation was founded upon the principle which is the foundation of all monotheistic religions—the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. We gave allegiance to this credo when we accepted as the cornerstone of this Republic, the declaration that all men are created equal.

Consider the prayer of our first President. He prayed first for divine protection for the United States. Next for the willingness of Americans to submit themselves to the laws which they themselves should make, to the will of the majority, and lastly he prayed that they have brotherly affection and love for one another as fellow citizens. By submission to law, Washington did not mean blind subservience. His formula left room for laws to be tested, to be subject to repeal, to be put to a high and supreme authority to establish their justice. Those rights come under our procedures as Washington understood them.

Here was no mention of creed, race, or color. Here were drawn none of the differentiating lines of the Old World. He prayed to the Father of all mankind that His children might recognize their kinship and display the spirit of brotherhood.

Our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when the Republic was founded. If we are to survive as a Nation, if we are to take our proper place in the world of nations, we must have brotherhood—not a condescending charity toward those whose ancestry, faith, or work is different than ours, but a wholehearted acceptance of the kinship of all right-thinking men, of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God. America is made up of all races and creeds, but Americans to be true Americans, must respect individuals for what they are individually, regardless of color or creed.

The strength of brotherhood is the strength of love. If we as individuals cannot get along with our neighbors, how can we ever hope to live peaceably with other nations. Prejudice and bigotry are the subterfuge and the foundation of all wars.

The full expression of brotherhood is the Golden Rule which has never been surpassed as the most practical rule of life and as the only basis for peace on earth. As we celebrate the birthday of the father of our country during Brotherhood Week, let us pause to pledge ourselves again to that golden rule of life—"Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that man should do to you, do ye even so to them; for this is the law and the prophets."

It Is Vitally Important That We Work Out a Plan Whereby Every American Citizen, in All Areas of Our Country, Have Medical, Surgical, and Nursing Services Adequate to His or Her Needs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, subsequent to adjournment of this House on January 20, our colleague, FRANCES P. BOLTON, flew back to her congressional district in Cleveland. She made that journey in order to discuss with the Cleveland Medical Library Association, holding its annual meeting on that evening, various phases of a national health program as comprehended in the many bills that have been introduced into the hoppers of the House and the Senate, by Republicans and Democrats alike.

Mr. Speaker, there is probably no Member of Congress who has given more time, thought, substance, and study to the problems of public and private medicine, nursing, and child care, to the field of preventive and curative medicine and related fields, than has our distinguished colleague from the Twenty-second District of Ohio.

We in this House who know Congresswoman BOLTON, for years have listened while, with knowledge and logic, she has urged the passage of bills that looked to the welfare of the Nation's children, its mothers, its sick, its indigent, and blind.

Mr. Speaker, I know of no one in this body who can speak from a greater personal experience and with a more sympathetic understanding on any question involving the mental, physical, and spiritual health of the American people than can FRANCES BOLTON.

Rich in its quotable parts, the Congresswoman's address to the Cleveland Medical Library Association discloses in large measure the important changes that have taken place here in these United States which give rise to the questior as to the adequacy of existing medical and hospital services available to our people, regardless of their age group or economic status.

It is because of the factual and practical manner in which Mrs. BOLTON addresses herself to this problem that I am asking the unanimous consent of the Members of this House to insert into the records of our proceedings today the address which Congresswoman BOLTON made on January 20. I commend its reading and study to every Member, with the assurance that if and whenever such a bill comes to this floor for passage, the House will have the benefit of the perception and experience of this great humanitarian.

Congresswoman BOLTON'S address to the Cleveland Medical Library Association follows:

Mr. President, members of the Cleveland Medical Library Association, ladies and gentlemen, I am greatly honored to be the first woman to address this distinguished group of Cleveland physicians and surgeons and those interested in various fields of care for the sick and prevention of disease.

No old Clevelander like myself could come to this Allen Memorial Library and not be flooded with memories of the many consecrated physicians who have influenced the life of this great community. This beautiful building in itself is evidence of a certain capacity they had for bringing the layman to recognition of the part he should play in making medical and nursing care available to all the sick. It is a monument to the constructive altruism of those responsible for great wealth.

Cleveland has become known everywhere for its social conscience and for its community spirit, a spirit that makes one both proud and humble to be a Clevelander.

This library has on its shelves and in its archives priceless material for those who search out historic backgrounds, as well as for those who reach out with eager and never-ceasing curiosity into the realms just beyond the proven wonders, into the areas still to be proved.

Who knows, friends, what new life may not be stirring at this moment within the hearts and minds of those who come and go in this building? Who can say what the membership of this medical library will bring to birth at the appointed time?

There are many matters I should like to talk over with you—all of them far reaching—all of them having to do with the one great problem with which we must come to grips—the protection of freedom here in these United States.

I am particularly appreciative of the opportunity to come here tonight and participate in your proceedings because one of the most vital matters before us all is that of the physical and mental well-being of our people—not parts of them, but all of them.

I am referring to the so-called national health plan and program which, as advanced by the Federal Security Administration under Mr. Oscar Ewing, is, in fact, a proposal to inaugurate a new Federal pay-roll tax to be superimposed upon the pay-roll deductions and other taxes already being collected from the workers in these United States.

The compulsory plan as proposed would, by law, compel the employer to take out of the pay envelopes of the employees an additional 3 to 4 percent on every dollar earned, in order to create annually in the Federal Treasury a fund of from three to six billion dollars, to be redistributed by some newly created Federal agency employing an estimated fifty to eighty thousand new Federal pay-rollers.

But more about this later.

I feel it altogether unnecessary for me to point out to this audience of Cleveland physicians and surgeons the all-consuming interest I have maintained for some 40 years in matters affecting the health and welfare of our people. The record of that service began more than a quarter of a century before I went to Congress—in the field of health and hygiene, as well as in the field of public-health nursing. It began in the early days of the Visiting Nurse Association with what was known as the Brownie Club. This little group became the surgical dressings committee of the Visiting Nurse Association. We were given the task of making the dressings used by the nurses. We went out eagerly with the visiting nurses into the homes, carrying their bags, tidying up the houses, washing anything that needed washing, helping the nurse at every turn. As I look back upon a full life I know that no experience I have had was more vital to my understanding of life as it really is rather than as we hope that it will be.

I shall not spend my short time with you elaborating upon the accomplishments made by the medical profession which have come within my personal experience since the turn of the century. The over-all accomplishments of medicine have opened up vistas of well-being beyond those of any other science.

Humanity will ever affirm that the work of Louis Pasteur in his researches with respect to germs, of Drs. Norton and Long in their discovery of anesthesia, of Koch in isolating the tuberculosis germ, of Madame Curie in radium, and many others have not alone brought greater comforts to mankind, mental as well as physical, but also were the early waymarks that have brought us into new areas of scientific knowledge.

For we stand today at the end of a momentous half century. We are at the gateway that opens into an area awesome to contemplate. One prays that those who deal with nuclear fission, who dare to propose upsetting the balance of disposition of so volatile and terrible a force as hydrogen—in essence the central spark of light and

fire—that those who deal with it will be constrained by sheer love of humanity from bringing upon the earth a destruction beyond the imagination of man to conceive.

Because health is so vital to sound judgment, at a moment in time when not only judgment but great wisdom are imperative if freedom is to survive, I could not come to you tonight without discussing some of the problems awaiting solution in this field and in the field of adequate care of the sick.

The solution of this problem, sought and found within the American formula for freedom, as I believe it can be, will indicate the direction in which we, as a Nation, will go in the second half of this century.

The questions uppermost in our minds are: Shall we accept the suggestions that are being poured out upon us that Americans can no longer do for themselves, or shall we gird up our loins, alert our minds, face the facts, and solve the problem?

Do we want the Federal Government to reach down into every department of our lives? Granted that there are many things which we as individuals, as communities, and as States can no longer do without Federal help, but surely we can find methods by which freedom from an all-encompassing central authority can be maintained.

It is in the light of this fundamental need to protect our basic freedom that I want to discuss for a few minutes the principles involved in a national health program, for just as it is on your minds every day, so is it a matter of constant argument and discussion in the cloakrooms of the Congress.

May I say to you that more than a million words, on every issue and on every side of this question, have already been written into the records of committee hearings during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

It is definitely incumbent upon all of us to have a clear understanding as to what constitutes the national health problem. Once the question is clearly posed, and not until then, can we formulate principles and policies which, when enacted into law, will retain all of the benefits and eliminate as much of the error as can be discovered in the free-enterprise system that we have historically enjoyed in the practice of medicine as part of our way of life here in America.

We can well be proud of what has been done for the health of our people. Nowhere on earth are so many of the results of scientific research available to such numbers. We cannot close our eyes, however, to the fact that there are still areas in our country—there are still groups of our people—unable to secure the medical care they need. It is of utmost importance that we work out a way by which every last one can have a plentitude of medical, surgical, and nursing services commensurate with and adequate to his or her needs.

Now, as never before, there is a patent and a particular need for some national health program, and that need, of which we hear vocal expression on every hand, makes it the more necessary that we take the formulation of such a program out of the hands of the economic crackpots and political "do-gooders" scattered throughout every bureau in the National Government in Washington.

If we are to maintain the American way, such a plan cannot be laid down along lines which will regiment the medical, surgical, and nursing professions and the technicians serving with them, giving society services rendered under a compulsory system, supported by taxes taken out of the pay envelopes of the workers, and later dispensed by a federalized medical bureaucracy—by doctors employed by the Government.

"Economic crackpots" are nothing new! Years ago when congressional enactment of a compulsory medical system was first discussed, I was talking with the editor of a nationally known publication about the program advanced at that time to establish a cabinet post—with a Secretary presiding over a newly created Department of Health. The proposal, then as now, was that any man appointed to administer such a post should by no means be a medical man!

When one fully appreciates the tremendous economic, social and financial changes that have taken place in Government during these last 20 years, one can more clearly understand and weigh the demands being made by the electorate that something be done by the Federal Government in the field of medical care.

First and foremost of the factors which give rise to these demands is the fact that the national system of taxation as administered during the past 2 decades, has in a large measure dried up the sources of private funds which long gave philanthropic support to extended and never-ending research in the field of both preventive and curative medicine.

I have quite recently done some interesting research on the subject of "Foundations" and our "Public Trusts" * * * their effect upon our society at the turn of the century and what, generally, is happening in regard to them today. I would like to give you some of my findings.

A study of the larger "Foundations," "Trusts," and other types of "Endowments" as reported in the World Almanac of 1949, reveals most important and significant facts that have to do with the present problem of health and nursing care. Statistic-wise, they set forth the year the trusts were founded * * * the amount of the original endowment * * * other assets, and the amount expended between the years 1902 and 1941.

During the 10-year period 1939–49, there was expended by our foundations listed in that decade the small sum of $2,500,000, of which $821,443 was spent right here in the city of Cleveland, by our own Elizabeth Severance Prentiss (Allen) Foundation.

In the preceding 10 years, the expenditures of these foundations amounted to the sum of $65,000,000 * * * while in the previous 20-year period they averaged $56,000,000 annually, or a grand total expended by the trusts and foundations established by our wealthier class of the stupendous sum of $1,127,000,000.

The over-all purpose for which these bequests were made was to promote the well-being of mankind throughout the world. Particular emphasis in many instances was placed upon certain specific fields: medical sciences (psychiatry); natural sciences (experimental biology); public health (development of general public-health activities and study and control of certain diseases); social sciences (projects contributing to the understanding of important social problems and to the development of personnel and methods); the humanities (efforts to raise the general cultural level and to promote cultural interchange between countries).

Millions were annually donated for public health, to the support of other agencies, and for training, through post doctoral fellowship, of competent personnel in the various fields of medicine and surgery.

Instead of enjoying the benefits of similar bequests and gifts, we today see similar contributions restricted to drives, and popular appeal made for the bestowal of small contributions in order to fight polio, cancer, heart, tuberculosis, and other diseases.

It becomes more evident each day that the inroads made upon private initiative by Federal legislation and tax policies are drying up the past sources and subjecting the people to an even greater overburden of taxation than meets the eye.

The decline in the number and amounts of the philanthropies enjoyed by the medical and educational professions during these last 18 years, is in direct ratio with and clearly traceable to the confiscatory high rates of taxation imposed upon income by both the Federal and State Governments, whether that income is derived from gainful employment, capital gains, inheritance, gift, or other sources.

Is it any wonder, therefore, that with what seemed an inexhaustible supply of endowed capital cut off by our newly applied tax system, these "do-gooders" now propose to levy additional taxes upon those less able to pay them in order to replace the funds which used to flow as freely into medical channels as rivers flow to the sea.

There is no gainsaying the fact that there are certain areas, and even certain income groups in these United States, whose requirements are not now serviced with adequate medical, surgical, and nursing service.

I remember well a statement made by Mr. Harvey W. Brown, long-time president of the International Associaion of Machinists, a man well and favorably known to the people of Cleveland—a man of vision, of deep convictions—when he testified before the House Committee on Labor and Public Welfare June 2, 1949. This was just a few days before his voluntary retirement as president of the great International Association of Machinists, an organization with a membership of more than 600,000 workers. Mr. Brown told of the long researches conducted by his organization in the field of medical and nursing services. Let me quote him, because his words must be listened to.

"After careful study, and recognizing the needs of our 625,000 members and their families * * * our conviction is that we need Federal health insurance * * * Our conviction is not alone based on technical and scientific charts or figures. To a great extent it comes from the first-hand knowledge that our families live under a constant fear of costly medical expenses which they cannot at present guard against * * * The well-to-do and the charity patients are for the most part adequately cared for. Present voluntary plans at best can only supply part of the in-between group with partial financial assistance."

This is a statement made by a leader of organized labor * * * a labor statesman * * * one who after serving his people in our country for nearly 40 years, was chosen by our Government to serve abroad. He is at the moment doing an outstanding job as director of labor affairs in the office of John J. McCloy, United States High Commissioner for Germany.

One reason I have made such a supreme effort to be with you tonight is because I believe that in this great city where I was born and grew up, there is no group more able to address themselves to this whole broad question of adequate medical care for all our people * * * in the American way * * * than you of the Cleveland Medical Library Association.

As for me, I am not this evening speaking in behalf of any particular bill that has been introduced, either in the House or in the Senate.

I am well acquainted with the provisions of (S. 1679) the Health Act sponsored by Senators THOMAS of Utah, WAGNER, PEPPER, CHAVEZ, TAYLOR, HUMPHREY, and MURRAY.

I am cognizant of all the discussion there has been with respect to S. 1581, the National Health Act of 1949 as sponsored by Senators TAFT, DONNELL, and SMITH of New Jersey.

I have studied with deep interest the Voluntary Health Insurance Act (S. 1456) as sponsored by Senators HILL, O'CONOR, WITHERS, AIKEN, and MORSE.

I have likewise studied S. 1106, the Medical Aid Act of 1949 as proposed by Senator LODGE, together with H. R. 4918, cosponsored by my colleagues in the House, Representatives HERTER, AUCHINCLOSS, CASE, FULTON, HALE, JAVITS, MORTON, and NIXON; and by Senators FLANDERS and IVES in the Senate.

My desire is to emphasize the fundamentals that must be taken into consideration in whatever action results, if we are to retain our heritage of freedom.

Somewhere I once saw a little verse which, as I remember, read something like this:

"So many Gods, so many creeds,
So many roads that wind and wind,
When just the art of being kind,
Is all this old world needs."

I am reminded of that verse because when I had completed my study of these bills as they were introduced at both ends of the Capitol, and had read the long pages of testimony given by the endless number of witnesses who appeared before the respective committees of both the House and Senate, it became evident that all were aiming at the self-same goal; to insure the physical and mental well-being of all the people of this great country of ours.

I believe that we must find ways to insure sick care and a better chance for health to all of our people. That whatever method we decide upon, provision should be made that the Federal Government provide moneys with which to make a totally disinterested national survey to ascertain in exactly what geographical areas, income groups, and other criteria our people stand in need of additional medical services.

That survey should include the regional and local evaluation of all hospital facilities available, of the additional medical educational facilities needed to keep a flow of young, virile professional personnel in sufficient numbers to fill the existing deficiency.

In addition thereto, the plan should make provision that all aged and indigents shall be afforded the same high character of medical, surgical, nursing assistance that is afforded to the most fortunate among us.

We should also institute a general health-education program more intimately to inform our citizens on a Nation-wide scale of the benefits that would accrue to them by their voluntary association with one of the many hospitalization and surgical groups now existent, or the formation of new insurance groups in special areas.

But above all else, it is my studied conviction that what is to be done should be done on a basis of some form of medical insurance, not to be made compulsory by the legal collection of taxes to be taken out of the pay envelopes of the wage earners of these United States by their employers.

In other words, the over-all improvement in medical service throughout the country to be attained by some one of the programs advanced in both Houses of Congress to date, can be accomplished by the extension of the voluntary groups now common to our life in these United States.

In his appearance before the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare on May 23 last, J. Donald Kingsley, Acting Federal Administrator, and speaking for Mr. Oscar Ewing, the Administrator, made this significant statement: "Health insurance has made gigantic strides and now affords protection to 52,000,000 Americans, or a third of the Nation."

It is true that Mr. Kingsley questions the amount of protection this health insurance affords, granted it covers as yet only one-third of our people. Well, if voluntary health insurance does not afford sufficient protection, let us extend the coverage so that it will afford what in Mr. Kingsley's and Mr. Ewing's opinion is a coverage needful and necessary to insure the health and comfort of our people.

"Most voluntary insurance policies," Mr. Kingsley continued, "are issued by Blue Cross hospitalization plans. * * * About 60 percent of these policies are held by citizens of six rich industrial States, which contain approximately 36 percent of the total people of the United States. * * * Only about 17 percent of the Blue Cross members," Mr. Kingsley went on, "live in Southern and Western States, representing 43 percent of our total population. Less than 3 percent," he said, "of the rural population now belong."

Therein lies a great deal of the confusion that gives rise to the demand for a compulsory national health plan.

These regional variations will readily be made known by point No. 1 of the program which I have outlined.

The above figures, indicate the need for an extensive educational program conducted on a Nation-wide basis to make the people who live in our rural areas aware of benefits that would accrue to them by affiliation with medical, surgical, and hospitalization groups such as Mr. Kingsley advises now serve the 52,000,000 people in the more affluent areas of the Nation.

More highly significant than the foregoing is the fact disclosed by Mr. Ewing that more than two-thirds of our people have not availed themselves of protection of any kind. Thus the more reason for the Federal Government to lend assistance to an educational program looking to the extension of the growing voluntary services.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have said that there is a particular need that the aged, the indigent, and others not able to afford adequate medical care should find it available to their requirement. I do not propose, however, that any program to which I shall lend assistance shall comprehend the so-called means test (ability to pay), if that test will result in any delay whatsoever in extending needed services.

If there is to be any one determination as to ability to pay, the means test should be applied only after the person has received the assistance requisite to their needs. I know full well from the nursing services which I rendered years ago, that I personally could never withhold food, coal, or wood from a needy mother and her brood until after I found out why she was needy. Rather, first we provided the necessities and then made our determinations as to why the needs arose.

In conclusion, friends, may I say that to me the strength of these United States lies fundamentally in the courage, the integrity, and the vision of each individual. This is a land where men and women have recognized their individual responsibility toward each other and toward the Nation whose formula for freedom has protected them from the domination of a centralized government. We feel we have the right to freedom, but if we are not to lose it we must assume the full responsibility for it. There is no country in the world where the people have enjoyed more opportunity, where they have more comfort and economic security, more chance for happiness than here in the United States.

The strength, the honor, and the integrity of our country must be maintained both at home and abroad. This cannot be done just on Capitol Hill. Every one of you, every citizen of this country, must carry a share of this responsibility.

So I would say to you in the immortal words of Abraham Lincoln: "With firmness in the right as God gives us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in."

The Housing Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT L. RAMSAY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RAMSAY. Mr. Speaker, daily, Members of Congress are bombarded with propaganda from the real-estate lobby opposing further housing legislation and rent-control extension.

Briefly we are told that such measures constitute either the "welfare state" or "statism."

These things, according to the lobbyists and propagandists of special privileges, are threats to our American way of life.

Mr. Speaker a far greater threat to our American way of life is the undermining of the institution of marriage and the American home. Our housing situation is still sufficiently acute as to retard marriages by young people; so as to retard the establishment of homes and families. This, Mr. Speaker, is a far greater threat to our American way of life than all the phony issues the high-priced propagandists can think up in a hundred years.

To illustrate the acuteness of the housing situation, and to illustrate the problems faced by young people, I include as a part of my remarks a letter received by me from a constituent together with my reply thereto:

WASHINGTON, D. C., *January 31, 1950.*

Hon. ROBERT L. RAMSAY,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. RAMSAY: I am writing you with regard to a problem with which I am confronted—that of housing. It seems that here in the District of Columbia and vicinity, apartments are not to be had unless you happen to be a friend of the owner, resident manager, rental agent, etc. Also, the new apartments being built are so far out so that an automobile is an absolute necessity. Not only that, but a one-bedroom apartment rents on the average of $80 per month so that a Government clerk earning $2,650 per annum is not in a position to rent one of these apartments in view of the fact that his weekly earnings do not equal the monthly rental.

My fiancé, Mr. Darwin H. Lalk, of Hermann, Mo., and I plan to be married on June 13. Mr. Lalk is a veteran, employed with the Department of Defense with a salary of $2,650 per annum, and starting February 15, will begin a course in accounting at Benjamin Franklin School of Accountancy. I plan to continue working as long as possible.

My question is, what good earthly reason is there as to why apartments cannot be built and rent for prices we can afford? I am certain that there are hundreds upon hundreds of couples facing this same problem.

What do you suggest, Mr. Congressman?

An early reply will be deeply appreciated.

Very truly yours,

MISS ELENA C. FORMIS.

(Daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John Formis, 672 Virginia Avenue, Follansbee, W. Va.)

FEBRUARY 2, 1950.

Miss ELENA C. FORMIS,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MISS FORMIS: Reference is made to your letter of January 31 advising of your forthcoming marriage and relating the problems you face in obtaining housing.

You have my every wish for a long life of happiness. Mr. Lalk is a very fortunate young man.

As far as housing is concerned, I can only suggest you have patience. Your personal problem merely highlights the need for continued rent control and additional housing legislation. If you have followed the papers, you know what a fight the real-estate lobby has made against rent control—and they have been successful to the extent of whittling away at safeguards to a great extent. You recall the very great difficulty we had passing the low-income housing measure, and the opposition, spearheaded again

by the real-estate lobby, to the present middle-income housing bill.

I firmly believe, however, we shall eventually get these programs in operation. Of course, in the meantime, young couples have pretty hard lines, and I venture to say many marriages are delayed and postponed. In time, I feel sure, we can convince the opposition that preventing the establishment of homes is a far greater danger to our American way of life than the phony danger of statism.

Sincerely,

ROBERT L. RAMSAY.

As the Twig Is Bent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. H. CARL ANDERSEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Fay George Child, who is now editor of the Maynard News, Maynard, Minn., is well known to many Members of the House through his service as secretary to Hon. HAROLD HAGEN. Mr. Child has been crusading against infiltration of Communists into our Government service, and under leave previously granted, I wish to include in the RECORD an editorial he has written which is well worth the attention of every Member of Congress:

AS THE TWIG IS BENT

This editorial is being written after much deliberation, research, consultations with cooperative local school authorities and conferences with officials of the State department of education in St. Paul.

A copy will be sent to the superintendent of each public school in Minnesota.

The editorial will concern itself with what this writer considers to be subversive propaganda in publications widely used by the students in the public schools of Minnesota—and the Nation.

I am fully aware that the subject matter of the editorial is taboo with many of the intelligentsia, and to dare to write about it poses the possibility of being subjected to vituperative denunciation ranging from book burner to Red baiter.

Most schools in Minnesota have subscribed to the Public Affairs Pamphlet Series, published in New York City, and issued on the average of one a month for the nominal price of 10 cents apiece. These pamphlets, 143 in number, are intended for school libraries, to be used for research and supplemental reading by the students in connection with their various classes.

Many of the pamphlets are written by competent authorities, but in most cases the material is compiled by the editor of the series from many sources. In some instances, the pamphlets are written after consultation with reputable organizations such as the United States Chamber of Commerce, American Jewish Committee, the Boy Scouts, etc. In justice to schoolmen who order the series for their classrooms, we must state that it is almost impossible to detect the sly, subtle propaganda so carefully and sparingly injected into the pamphlets. Probably only 3 or 4 percent of the series can be identified as obnoxious propaganda, designed to give the students of the Nation a leftist slant in their thinking. Many of the pamphlets are excellent, and are not objectionable.

It was by sheer accident that this writer stumbled across one of the pamphlets that contained leftist propaganda, and because my curiosity was aroused, I contacted a friend in Washington, D. C., who at one time was an investigator for the Committee on Un-American Activities of the United States House of Representatives. This was his reply:

"Relative to the Public Affairs Pamphlet Series, published in New York. Please let me know who is behind the series. I think that Maxwell Stewart is one of the sponsors—if that is true it is strictly left-wing. Stewart is one of the foremost Communist-fronters in the United States."

The editor of the entire Public Affairs Pamphlet Series is Maxwell S. Stewart. He has editorial privileges as to selection of sources and material that go to make up the pamphlets. His is the guiding hand. He is the key man.

Further inquiries have resulted in a compilation of documented history about Editor Maxwell S. Stewart; and a strange history it is for a man who is working tirelessly to shape the thinking of our young people.

After I had accumulated and assayed the information which came to my desk about Mr. Stewart, I forwarded most of it to the commissioner of education of the State of Minnesota, with a letter requesting information as to whether or not the State department of education has any jurisdiction over books and pamphlets used in Minnesota public schools.

With Commissioner Dean Schweickhard's permission, I am quoting his reply:

"The series of pamphlets with which you are immediately concerned has been deposited here, but so far as can be ascertained has never been made a part of any traveling library or reading list in connection with any course of study issued by the department.

"Power to adopt or prescribe textbooks and other instructional materials is placed under the authority of local boards of education in Minnesota Statutes, section 125.06, subdivision 9."

On being informed that the Maynard News would publish an editorial on the pamphlet series and send a copy of the editorial to superintendents in Minnesota, Mr. Schweickhard commented as follows:

"I am sending you also a copy of the Minnesota Educational Directory. On page 28 there appears a list of all superintendents of graded elementary and secondary school systems. Any information which you can supply to these superintendents along the line of material you now have here under consideration or any other one of equal importance will assist them in their selection of instructional materials for use in their schools."

The following testimony will be of interest to school authorities and readers of the Maynard News.

State Senator Jack B. Tenney, chairman of the legislative committee in California investigating un-American activities, gave the following testimony before a congressional committee in Washington, D. C., March 26, 1947:

"We found a book in the public schools in California called Land of the Soviets. The book is prepared for the use of seventh- and eighth-grade children, and is written by Marguerite N. Stewart and edited by Maxwell Stewart. * * * Both Margureite Stewart and her husband, Maxwell, taught at that institute at Moscow (Russia). Mr. Stewart is a correspondent and has been correspondent for the Moscow News and is connected with practically every (Communist) front organization of any consequence on a national scale in the United States for the past 7 or 8 years." (Hearings and reports, vol. 1, p. 247.)

As long ago as November 22, 1938, Mr. Stuart Lillico of New York City, newspaper and magazine correspondent in the Orient for several years, testified before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities in Washington, as follows:

"Mr. LILLICO. Let us take up the case of the American Friends of the Chinese People. I have here a letterhead from this organization, including the names of the officers and members of the national advisory board.

"Maxwell S. Stewart, the chairman, appears also as a member of the editorial board of China Today, the official organ of the American Friends. He is widely known as either a secret member of the Communist Party or as what might be called a fellow-traveler. At one time he was an associate editor of the Moscow Daily News, and taught in the Moscow Institute. He is also connected with the organization known as the Friends of the Soviet Union, and is an associate editor of the Nation." (Public hearings, vol. 4, p. 2512.)

The organization, American Friends of the Chinese People, was cited as a Communist front by the Special Committee on Un-American Activities (U. S. Cong.) on March 29, 1944.

If this editorial serves to further alert schoolmen and school boards in Minnesota to the dangers that beset our democracy, I will be adequately compensated for the expenditure of my time, effort, and money, to say nothing of braving the inevitable repercussions from the "left" when this editorial hits home.

The fight to preserve true democracy and free enterprise in America will not be easily won. We cannot engage in battle at our own convenience. The welfare-state planners and the Socialists and Communists have set the pace.

We have been challenged.

We cannot afford the terrible consequences of not meeting this challenge head-on.

What do you intend to do about it?

Korea Is a Must

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EARL T. WAGNER
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I incude the following editorial from the Cincinnati Enquirer:

KOREA IS A MUST

When the House of Representatives voted by a margin of just one vote to withhold economic aid from South Korea, it was clear that a foolish and somewhat partisan action had been taken. Undeniably, there is always a risk in giving assistance to a country which is under Soviet pressure and might conceivably be taken over in the future. But there is even greater risk in suddenly cutting off aid to a country which our military forces liberated and then started on the road to self-government.

To abandon South Korea now is to sacrifice what we already have spent there in an honest and reasonably skillful attempt to build a bulwark and to establish democracy in a long-neglected country. Furthermore, abandonment of South Korea would be taken by other countries, even in Europe, as proof that the United States cannot be relied upon for consistent support.

Korea is far more important to our strategic position in the Far East than Formosa. It faces squarely up to Soviet-controlled territory. It is on the front line of Russian-Western rivalry. It juts out into the Pacific

in such a way as to command the flank of vital positions in south Manchuria. More important still, Korea in hostile hands would be a real threat to Japan, which is the northern anchor of our entire position in the Far East.

On this basis, we have every right to expect the House to reconsider its precipitate action on the $60,000,000 Korean aid bill. Everyone knows that we must draw the line somewhere. We cannot give assistance to every country under threat. But Korea surely is not the place at which to draw the line. We have too much already invested there. It is too vital to other positions we now hold and intend to keep. And there is a moral commitment to south Koreans that we cannot ignore without losing the confidence of many other peoples who have put their trust in us.

Letter from Hon. Hamilton Fish

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include a letter from Hon. Hamilton Fish, of New York, to President Truman:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 23, 1950.*
Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: On December 23, 1948, more than a year ago I wrote you as follows: "You have persisted in attacking the un-American Activities Committee, duly appointed by the House of Representatives, and denouncing its recent startling exposures of spies and traitors in our midst as 'red herrings.' I sincerely respect you, Mr. President, because you were a tough combat officer in World War I, and on account of your Missouri mulishness, but there is such a thing as carrying stubbornness too far. You must know by this time that you were wrong in raising the 'red herring' issue."

Mr. President, I now repeat, who appointed Alger Hiss to the State Department, recently convicted virtually of spying for Soviet Russia?

Who appointed him as adviser to F. D. R. at the Yalta Conference?

Who appointed him as Executive Secretary at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference in 1944?

Who appointed him as Secretary-General of the San Francisco Conference for the Organization of the United Nations in 1945?

Mr. President, you wrote me on January 6, 1949, that: "I read your letter of December 23 with a lot of interest and sometime or other I shall explain just exactly the situation to which you refer."

In all fairness, I think you will agree that the time has come, and the American people are entitled to an answer to the forthright questions that I asked of you more than a year ago.

Mr. President, the American people are also entitled to know how many other spies may be lurking within the State Department, transmitting secret information and documents to the agents of Soviet Russia.

Why not dismiss Secretary of State Dean Acheson (the acknowledged and proclaimed friend of Alger Hiss) who has outlived his usefulness? Isn't he responsible for the continuation of the tragic and ghastly appeasement policy in China? This deplorable and cowardly policy has resulted in the seizure of that nation by the Communists, the most disastrous diplomatic defeat in our history, which will plague us and our children's children.

With high esteem,
Respectfully yours,
HAMILTON FISH,
Chairman of the House Committee To Investigate Communist Propaganda and Activities in the United States, 1930–31.

The Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, a few days ago I indicated my approval of the President's order to the Atomic Energy Commission to develop the hydrogen bomb. I did this because I feel that in order to insure peace in the world, the United States must be ready to defend itself at any time against any aggressor and further, according to recent developments, it seems apparent that Soviet Russia will have the H-bomb available to it within a few years' time. Accordingly, I feel that the United States must keep pace with the rest of the world in scientific development, even though it be in such weapons of destruction as the H-bomb.

I have received the following letter and petition from a group of 84 Protestant clergymen from 12 denominations whose churches encompass greater Buffalo, which I have the honor to represent.

While my views with regard to development of the H-bomb do not coincide with theirs, I think this petition is important enough to bring to the attention of the United States Congress so that the Members may be given the benefit of the thoughts of this distinguished group on world peace.

While I do not agree with their position regarding development of the H-bomb, I do heartily subscribe to the suggestion contained in their resolution that a disarmament conference be called immediately under the auspices of the United Nations, at which should be discussed the control or abolition of such viciously destructive weapons of war as the H-bomb, the A-bomb, and bacterial warfare.

In order that all peoples may live in harmony with each other, we must solve the problems which imperil the peace of the world and the efforts of all nations must be directed unceasingly toward that goal.

RIVERSIDE SALEM CHURCH,
Buffalo, N. Y., February 4, 1950.
Hon. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. TAURIELLO: As the one designated to release it, I am enclosing a copy of a public statement on the "H" bomb signed by 84 Protestant clergymen from 12 denominations who serve churches in greater Buffalo.

You will, without doubt, be hearing from several of the men who reside in your district as they express their profound concern and distress over the course which the Nation is now following.

I am sure that all of those signing are anxious to see some change in American policy commensurate with the high moral principles which the Nation avows.

Sincerely yours,
ALAN B. PEABODY, *Pastor.*

PUBLIC STATEMENT ON H-BOMB BY CLERGY OF BUFFALO, N. Y., AND VICINITY

We, the undersigned ministers of the Niagara frontier, regret the decision of President Truman to proceed with the development of the H-bomb. As a nation, the United States is morally bound to use its position and power to promote peace in the world.

The period during which the United States was the sole possessor of the A-bomb was marked by the greatest expansion of communism throughout the world. Therefore, the H-bomb is no guaranty that communism can be contained by military power.

We are of the mind that use of money, natural resources, and human energy, intelligence, and ingenuity in development of destructive power cannot be morally justified in a world where millions of God's children are ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed.

As citizens and as followers of the Prince of Peace, we repent for our share in the growing militarization of America and for our failure to bind up the wounds among the nations. The growing nationalism and militarism of the world make us mindful that it is "not by might, nor by power," but by the Spirit of God incarnate in human life which will bring fulfillment to the peaceful aspirations of all men.

The Christian faith affirms that war is not inevitable and that peace on earth will come through good will toward all men.

We would, therefore, urge the calling of a disarmament conference under the auspices of the United Nations. H-bombs, A-bombs, bacteria, gases, and poisons should be included in the list of weapons forever abolished.

Rev. Renato G. Alden; Rev. Glenn B. Alty; Rev. Albert W. Asquith, Rev. Robert M. Atkins; Rev. Charles O. Bayard; Rev. Carl Berges; Rev. Derrick M. Bird; Rev. Herbert A. Bosch; Rev. Gary Bousman; Rev. J. J. Braun; Rev. Herbert A. Brethauer; Rev. Osmond H. Brown; Rev. Nicholas H. A. Bruinix; Rev. Earl R. Burdick; Rev. Merideth H. Dallman; Rev. Erford W. Daniels; Rev. Richard J. Davey; Rev. J. Ralph Davie; Rev. Merritt Dietterich; Rev. William H. Dudley; Rev. Elijah Echols, Sr.; Rev. Leo J. Engler; Rev. Herman A. Fenske; Rev. Carl Fiscus; Rev. John Fleck; Rev. Paul G. Frankenfield; Rev. Forrest Freeman; Rev. Edward P. Gill; Rev. Artemas P. Goodwin; Rev. John W. Guyer; Rev. Rodney Heckman; Rev. J. Erlek Holmer; Rev. William H. Norner; Rev. E. Franklin Jackson; Rev. Mitchell Johnson; Rev. Paul Jordan; Rev. Peter M. Kemper; Rev. John Kochner; Rev. Irvin F. Kracke; Rev. Julius Kuck; Rev. Franklin B. Laundry; Rev. Theodore T. Lehmann; Rev. Marshall P. Lucas; Rev. John O. Mabuce; Rev. Burnie C. McCarley; Rev. Walter Meisenheimer; Rev. William Melberg; Rev. Richard A. Mikolon; Rev. Clytus F. Mowry; Rev. John R. Neubert; Rev. Urban L. Ogden; Rev. Roland L. Osgood; Rev. Alan B. Peabody; Rev. Oscar C. Plumb; Rev. J. J. Post; Rev. Emory Proctor; Rev. S. Leslie Reid; Rev. Dean Richardson; Rev. Roland Roehner; Rev. Ralph R. Rott; Rev. Michael Salmen; Rev. Robert O. Smith; Rev. Paul

G. Smithson; Rev. Harold J. Snitker; Rev. Edwin E. Staudt; Rev. John F. Steve; Rev. Alexander Stewart, Jr.; Rev. Alexander Stewart, Jr.; Rev. Paul E. Strauch; Rev. Benton S. Swartz; Rev. William H. Tempest; Rev. Harold Thiedt; Rev. Shirley L. Travis; Rev. Gordon L. Tritchler; Rev. Donald N. Tubbs; Rev. Alfred L. Underhill; Rev. Harry W. Vere; Rev. Carl G. Voglemann; Rev. William R. Walch; Rev. George W. Walker; Rev. Bradford G. Webster; Rev. Charles A. Williams; Rev. Gilbert W. Wieting; Rev. Arthur S. Wright; Rev. Robert N. Zearfoss.

(The 84 signatories represent 12 denominations.)

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the following excerpts from a letter from a constituent, whose name I am omitting for the reason that I did not ask her permission to mention it. Her letter, however, is of such timely interest that I feel it my duty to share it with others:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RICH: Though Drew Pearson took occasion to call you a "broken record" I know many of us are so glad to have someone reiterate and reiterate certain things such as "Where are we going to get the money?"

As you know I come from a great farming district, I would like to tell Mr. Keyserling to learn how the Amish farmers get so prosperous without being subsidized. I believe it is against the religion and rules of the Amish to accept such checks and yet there are no better farmers anywhere, nor more prosperous ones.

Let Mr. Keyserling also take note when he says "We had to find ways to keep production and demand in balance." Does he not know that not one middle-aged woman and many younger ones would think of eating potatoes and bread at the same meal? In fact most of the women I know just do not eat potatoes more than two or three times a week, if that often. I do not.

We destroy millions of pounds of potatoes and lower the tariff and import millions of pounds. Sensible?

The Fair Deal bought up over $450,000,000 worth of wheat and at the same time imported over $3,000,000 worth. Sensible?

We imported $8,000,000 worth of barley and bought up $40,000,000 worth at the same time. Sensible?

We imported over $90,000,000 worth of wool and bought up $76,000,000 worth of domestic surplus. Sensible?

With as many pounds of dried eggs in a Kentucky cave as we have gold we import 2,500,000 dozen "fresh" eggs and hundreds of thousands of pounds of dried ones. Sensible?

Why are we paying 85 cents for butter with 100,000,000 pounds of surplus butter in storage?

And yet Mr. Keyserling talks about the necessity of keeping supply and demand balanced.

My grandma used to quote, "Put a beggar on horseback and he will ride to the devil." Haven't we done just that?

My objection to that is, that I have to pay for his horse.

Mr. Keyserling surprised me by even mentioning the word balanced. I was not aware it was in the New or Fair Deal dictionary.

Miss Sara Ann Stauffer, who heads our juniors, wrote a one-act play which I wish could be seen by all the women in this country; it might go far toward presenting a clearer picture of where our tax-dollar does go.

Please keep right after Mr. Keyserling and his ilk.

There just isn't enough money to make the American women eat more potatoes or bread, even with the present budget, so please try to persuade Mr. Brannan not to support them any longer.

May I be broken-record like and repeat—please keep after them.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the fourth and fifth in a series of articles on the Columbia River region by Mr. Leon Starmont.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN
(Art. 4)
(By Leon Starmont)

Just to keep the record straight, let's fix another "first" from official records in connection with the Columbia Basin project and the comprehensive plan into which it has developed.

The Bureau of Reclamation demonstrates that the use of Grand Coulee as a reservoir was proposed by a Reclamation Service engineer in 1903. Files of the Quincy project, which became the Quincy-Columbia or West Columbia unit of the three-district project in central Washington, show that Grand Coulee Reservoir was coupled with a dam at the site as early as 1909. But before either of those dates there had been numerous suggestions for watering the Big Bend or for developing water power on the Columbia.

CANAL STARTED IN 1892

The unpublished history by E. K. Vande Vere, printing of which has been suggested at State expense, relates that wells were sunk in Douglas County at State expense in 1889, and that an irrigation canal was started in 1892 for 20 miles from Palouse River through Washtucna. This venture was stopped by the panic of 1893.

The Army's Corps of Engineers, according to records in its Seattle district office, conducted both power and navigation surveys along Columbia River, from the Canadian line to its mouth, as long ago as 1881. In one of them, Lt. Thomas W. Symons, chief engineer of the department of the Columbia, suggested a power dam at Priest Rapids or in that vicinity. Priest Rapids is now part of the comprehensive plan.

Who first suggested a power dam at the present site of Coulee Dam has not been determined, but Symons called attention both to this site and to Foster Creek, where Chief Joseph Dam is now being started. Other reports, all by congressional authority, were made by the Corps of Engineers in 1884, 1888, 1892, 1895, 1905, 1908, 1911, 1914, and 1917.

SERIES OF DAMS PROJECTED

Up to that time all plans for a dam at the head of Grand Coulee had assumed it would be a power dam with navigation locks. The next dam below would be at Foster Creek; the next dam above, at Kettle Falls. These and many others are discussed in the first 308 report of the Army engineers, ordered by Congress in 1927, and printed in 1934.

Before taking up later developments, and starting a tour of the projects now under construction, let's return to that survey made in 1903 of an irrigation canal from Spokane to the head of Grand Coulee, 130 miles.

Charles B. Cox, second in charge of the party, now on the USBR staff at Coulee Dam, tells about it thus:

"The cost of the project was estimated at around $100,000,000 and as the Reclamation Service could not hope to have more than $4,000,000 allotted to Washington from its limited funds, the Big Bend project was impracticable at that time. In fact, I never expected to live long enough to see it developed.

WOULD HAVE SAVED MILLIONS

"Today, the development of the entire project will probably cost close to $750,000,000. We would have saved a little money could we have built it in 1903.

"I recall that we worked a 60-hour week, slept four men in an 8 by 10 tent, ate prodigious meals, and helped ourselves to a gunnysack full of peaches every night—after dark, of course—while camped near the little town of Peach, now inundated by the waters of Roosevelt Reservoir.

"Rattlesnakes along the survey route were so numerous that hardly a day passed without encountering one or more.

"Time was the essence of our survey, and the hike to and from camp was made at the rate of 4½ to 5 miles per hour, with a similar pace maintained between stations during the day. After supper at night, we turned in promptly, and after a few tall tales were soon asleep. Once a month, however, our level man sat up all night relieving the cook of his $40 monthly pay check at poker. Both thought they were good players, but the level man had the advantage of being a good player—at least he always won the money.

TIP FOR WASHLADIES

"Surveys didn't cost much in those days. The entire monthly pay roll of seven men was less than $500, and we really turned out the work. I was paid $60 a month and "found." At a good restaurant today, my "found" would amount to well over $5 a day.

"Saturday nights we washed our own clothes by tying them firmly on the end of a rope and letting them swing back and forth in the swift current of Spokane River all night. I still maintain that this method has marked merit, and the results were surprisingly bright with absolutely no "Duz" whatever.

"Our musical education was not neglected on the survey. I had my violin along, and the chief of party wrestled many evenings with strictly classical music, horribly off the pitch. He was particularly pertinacious after a couple of slugs of whisky, which he kept in his tent and never passed to the crew.

"Our level man was a fiddler, and while not overly fussy about playing strictly in tune, his style and rhythm were marvelous. The cook was a steady singer of salacious songs, and always ready to oblige."

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN
(Art. 5)
(By Leon Starmont)

This is an "iffy" article, but no understanding of the Columbia Basin plan is possible without recognition of the numerous unrelated events that led to the present stage of accomplishment.

Jim Rowan, in 1917, would have gone goggle-eyed in amazement if anybody had told him a call for a general strike in Northwest

fields and lumber woods would result in construction of great multipurpose dams at Grand Coulee and Bonneville, Umatilla Rapids and Foster Creek, Hungry Horse, Priest Rapids and maybe Albeni Falls, Ice Harbor, and Hells Canyon.

Jim Rowan was regional secretary of the Industrial Workers of the World, a radical labor organization which had its head office in Cleveland and its Inland Empire headquarters in Spokane. His strike, called for August 20, 1917, was a flop.

BLAINE SEES PEND OREILLE

Ernest Lister was then governor. World War I was on. E. F. Blaine, a well-to-do irrigationist of Grandview, in Yakima Valley, had been named State railroad commissioner, but with the war he became Governor Lister's trouble-shooter, or as some others have put it, "the Colonel House of the Lister administration."

Violence had followed the efforts of IWW organizers for 10 years, and they had been arrested and tried in many localities on charges of impeding the war effort, or outright sabotage or treason. Spokane was a hotbed of radical agitation, and among the strike-threatened areas were Newport, Ione, and Metaline Falls, on Pend Oreille River.

Several Spokane businessmen wired Governor Lister asking for troops to quell expected outbreaks. The Governor sent E. F. Blaine to see how bad the situation really was.

"You can have martial law if you insist, but I don't think you'll like it," he told the businessmen. They did not insist. Federal and local authorities handled the situation. Blaine went on to Newport and the Pend Oreille.

BLAINE INTERESTS MILLER

Sight of that great river fascinated Blaine. He had earlier envisioned the Sunnyside project in his own Yakima Valley, and had seen the Yakima, Wenatchee, and Okanogan convert veritable deserts of sagebrush into bountiful gardens of Eden.

He knew that power projects were already scheduled for Z Canyon on the Pend Oreille, and for Kettle Falls, Priest Rapids, and other locations down the Columbia below the Pend Oreille's mouth. He knew that hundreds of dreamers and scores of engineers had worked on the problem of reclaiming the Big Bend, meaning roughly that portion of central Washington half encircled by Columbia River between the mouth of the Spokane and the mouth of the Snake.

A year later, on a Great Northern train east-bound, he expounded his theories to his friend, H. Lloyd Miller, of Sunnyside, and tried to get Miller to "front" as spokesman for the idea then forming.

"It's your baby," said Miller. "You spring it yourself. I'll help all I can."

Miller is now a member of the State Columbia Basin commission, doubtless the oldest member of that group in years of service to the project. Antecedents, make-up, and workings of that oddly formed State body will be discussed in a later article.

OTHER HAPPENSTANCES

There are half a dozen other points in Columbia Basin history where apparently unrelated occurrences had a hand in shaping destiny. One need not dwell too much on their relative importance.

If the Kansas Legislature in 1912 had not passed the first State blue-sky law there might not have been a panic in 1929, and in that case President Hoover would have been reelected in 1932.

If Senator Miles Poindexter had not depended too much on the longer life of a deal he made with a Washington correspondent in 1916, he would not have gone down to defeat by C. C. Dill in 1922.

If Dill had not been in the United States Senate in 1933, the chances are that President Franklin D. Roosevelt would not have started Grand Coulee Dam on the basis of the Army engineers' report made to Congress in 1932.

If Gordon C. Corbaley, a Seattle chamber of commerce employee, had not ridiculed the name "Big Bend" in 1919 it is unlikely that the name "Columbia Basin" would have been substituted. (Who actually suggested the name is still in doubt.)

STARTED REGIONAL THINKING

If the name "Columbia Basin" had not been attached to a comparatively small part of the Columbia Basin the chances are the possibilities of region-wide planning would not have occurred to Secretary of Commerce (later President) Herbert Hoover and his numerous advisers.

If several hundred engineers, officials, journalists, civic leaders, and politicians had made different choices at any of twoscore decision points between 1918 and 1932, history might be quite different. There is no necessity for going into events of those 14 years in these articles, except as they bear on the present situation at projects or in institutions not yet examined.

The story of how E. F. Blaine returned from Washington, after his trip with H. Lloyd Miller, and electrified the whole Northwest with his revival of the Big Bend's dream has been told too frequently of late to need repetition.

Americans All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following editorial from the Chelsea Record, Chelsea, Mass., under date of January 10, 1950.

It is brief but timely. It high lights a fact which confounds those who hope to divide our unity by promoting racial and religious tensions.

It proves that our way of life opens the door of opportunity to all and will recognize merit regardless of race, color, or creed.

It illustrates the one great hope of humanity.

The United States would not be the great Nation of free men and free women that it is if it did not recognize, and welcome, the talent and the character implicit in those of our citizens who point with pride to their Polish heritage.

Sturdy, industrious, neighborly, and God-fearing; these, and their passionate faith in democracy, are virtues which we believe in, admire, and share. We are happy to note the increasing participation of our Polish friends in the public life of our United States because it brings strength to our common cause.

Here follows the editorial:

DESERVED RECOGNITION

The banquet tendered by the Polish residents of our community to Alderman Alexander W. Dzengelewski, the first citizen of Polish-American descent to be elected to a position on that board, was truly deserved.

The Polish people are rapidly becoming a more important factor in our community life than ever before. They deserve recognition in the events, in the civic life, and in our municipal government. Some of outstanding, most loyal, efficient and faithful employees in the various departments of the city are the Polish young men and women.

We extend a hearty welcome to them into the broader aspects of the American way of life and judging by their past records, they will make capable leaders and fine citizens.

How To Kill an Oilman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. REES
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. REES. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous permission granted me by the membership of the House, I am including an editorial that appeared in the Tulsa Tribune under date of January 24, 1950.

The article is entitled, "How To Kill an Oilman." This statement is particularly interesting at the present moment for the reason that the problem involved is presently under consideration by the Ways and Means Committee of the House.

The article follows:

HOW TO KILL AN OILMAN

If President Truman had set out deliberately to destroy the independent oil-producing industry in the United States, he could not have picked a better way than to urge elimination of the depletion clause of the Revenue Act, or a more opportune time, when producers are harassed by other serious problems.

Crude-oil production in the United States has been curtailed substantially because of increasing imports of foreign oil. A large part of the export market for American oils was lost through the British ban on imports of American-dollar oil into sterling areas. More will be lost, in fact, our oil export trade may be wiped out, when Europe completes its vast program of expansion of oil-refining facilities, partially financed by American taxpayers' dollars through contributions by the Economic Cooperation Administration.

Elimination of the depletion clause would wreck the independent producing business in the United States. It would prevent producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves to an extent which would menace the security of this Nation. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be shut off in case of war.

President Truman's references to the oil-depletion clause, in his tax message to Congress Monday, are most misleading. He evidently was given information on a few abnormal cases and based his statements on them rather than on actual conditions which obtain for the oil-producing industry as a whole.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of the oil producer. During last year 82 percent of all wildcat wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent found oil and 3 percent were gas wells. Even in an area where oil already has been found, drilling is a big gamble. Of all such wells drilled last year, called development wells, 25 percent were dry, 66 percent produced oil, and 9 percent produced gas. Of the total number of wells drilled in the United States last year—wildcats and development wells—37 percent

were dry, 56 percent produced oil, and 7 percent produced gas.

Congress realized this situation and the necessity, if exploratory work were to be continued, of returning to producers, tax-free, capital invested in finding and producing oil. Capital is not taxed. Only income from capital is taxable.

So Congress, in 1916, adopted the cost-depletion method of returning capital to producers. It was difficult to figure depletion on that basis and in 1918, Congress passed the recovery-depletion method. This involved endless engineering, legal, and accounting work so Government made a survey of oil production operation for the years from 1918 to 1925 to determine a fair and simple depletion law.

That survey by Government showed that during those years the annual average depletion of capital invested by producers in finding oil and producing it was between 32 and 33 percent of the gross income of producers. So the House of Representatives in 1926 passed a bill providing for a percentage-depletion allowance on gross income from a producing property of 30 percent in figuring taxes. The Senate passed a bill permitting a depletion allowance of 25 percent. In conference, the present percentage-depletion allowance of 27½ percent of gross income from a property (but in no event more than 50 percent of the net income from the property) was adopted and enacted into law.

When oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. The depletion allowance is designed not only to permit the producer a return of that amount of capital, tax-free, but also a return of capital invested in finding that oil or gas.

That is a point Mr. Truman failed to mention. He stated, "In the case of oil * * * the depletion exemption goes on and on, year after year, even though the original capital investment in the property has already been recovered tax-free, not once, but many times over."

Each individual producing property, or lease, is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers have drilled 20 wells before finding oil. Their capital investment in finding oil is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well.

So, while the depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one property, it still falls short, in most instances, of returning to the producer all the capital he has invested in various properties in search for production. As the Government survey showed, the depletion allowance for the producing industry as a whole should be 32½ percent instead of the present 27½ percent.

Independent oil producers constitute only a part of the number of persons who would be harmed by elimination of the depletion clause. In 1948, the oil industry paid out $1,200,000,000 in oil royalties and lease bonuses and rentals. This money was expended in 37 States, 28 of which are oil-producing. Farmers, merchants, and others in all lines of business benefited from these payments. More than 200,000,000 acres, or 10 percent of the area of the United States, is under lease for oil and gas exploration and development by oil and gas companies.

Government says this Nation is running out of oil. The Department of the Interior is urging the oil industry to construct costly plants to manufacture synthetic fuels from oil shale, gas, and coal. Producers are investing vast sums in exploratory and development work in an effort to find new oil reserves. The discovery well in the Elk City field of Oklahoma cost $750,000 to drill and that cost did not include $750,000 to $1,000,000 spent previously in exploration and preliminary development work.

Does anyone believe Shell Oil Co. would have spent that amount of money, and many millions more in developing the field, if it had not felt it would get back at least part of its capital investment through the depletion allowance?

A policy which would eliminate the depletion clause in the revenue act and still permit large imports of foreign oil would be more than the domestic oil industry in the United States could bear.

If Congress wishes to hasten the end of this great industry, so vital to the welfare of the Nation, to business, and the American standard of living, let it go ahead and adopt this twin policy of destruction. If it wants to foster this vital industry, it will continue the present depletion clause in the revenue act, and restrict imports to a figure which would supplement, not supplant, domestically produced crude oil.

Ernest Lynn Kurth—Man of the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on December 14, 1949, Mr. Ernest Lynn Kurth was honored in Lufkin, Tex., by two awards presented to him on that date. One was a certificate from Dixie Business Magazine, published at Atlanta, Ga., certifying that he was chosen as the South's man of the year for 1949 in a poll of editors, industrialists, bankers, and other leaders of the South. This award was delivered by Col. Hubert Lee, editor and publisher of Dixie Business magazine.

The Houston Post in its issue of December 14, 1949, carried an interesting article regarding the exercises at which the awards were made. Under leave previously granted, I am inserting this article herewith:

HIGH TRIBUTE PAID TO KURTH AS "MAN OF THE SOUTH"

(By Brian Spinks)

LUFKIN, December 14.—Ernest Lynn Kurth, a 64-year-old industrial giant of the East Texas piney woods, a native son hailed as a living example of what free enterprise can accomplish, officially became the "man of the South for 1949" Wednesday night.

He was formally notified of his selection for the honor at a testimonial dinner here as the culminating event of what had been planned as an all-day program in which a grateful community, State, and region accorded him an impressive accolade. It was a tribute such as few men receive in their lifetime.

High governmental officials, headed by Gov. Allan Shivers and United States Senator TOM CONNALLY, joined with leaders of business, industry, and finance, and with residents of Angelina County in showing their appreciation for what he has done to bring industrial progress and prosperity to Texas, the South, and his part of the State in particular.

Two awards were presented Mr. Kurth at the dinner. One was a certificate from Dixie Business magazine, published at Atlanta, Ga., certifying that he was chosen as the South's man of the year for 1949 in a poll of editors, industrialists, bankers, and other leaders of the South. He received it from the hands of Hubert Lee, editor and publisher of the magazine.

The other was a certificate from the Texas Manufacturers Association naming him the industrialist of the year. It was presented by Ed C. Burris, vice president of TMA.

At the dinner in the Lufkin High School gymnasium, attended by hundreds of visitors from over the State, including a large group from Houston, Mr. Kurth heard himself lauded for his vision, for his business courage, for his humanitarianism for what he has done to open new vistas of opportunity for the entire South, for his sense of civic responsibility, and for his contribution to the economic growth of the State.

A cold rain which fell throughout the day interfered with what had been planned as a full day's program of activity. The bitter, unpleasant weather cut down substantially the number of visitors expected for the event.

A parade of Angelina County industry scheduled for the afternoon was called off, although some of the floats drove through the streets in the rain. It had been planned for Governor Shivers to lead the procession, but he was delayed in arriving from Austin.

The 200-piece band of Texas A. & M. College showed up despite the weather, but there was no parade for it to march in.

A reception for the notable visitors was held late in the afternoon at the Lufkin Country Club, just preceding the dinner.

A. E. Cudlipp, Sr., chairman of the local committee for the observance and vice president of the Lufkin Foundry, presided as master of ceremonies for the banquet, which was high lighted by the two presentations to Mr. Kurth.

The keynote address was given by Senator CONNALLY. The other speakers were Governor Shivers, former Governor W. P. Hobby, president of the Houston Post; Judge Ireland Graves, of Austin, Mr. Kurth's roommate at Southwestern University; Dr. C. C. Cody of Houston, Mr. Kurth's physician; Morris Frank, of Houston, and Don G. Mitchell, of New York, president of Sylvania Electric Products Co.

Miss Mona Paulee, mezzo-soprano star of the Metropolitan Opera Co., who flew here for the event, sang, accompanied by Dr. Leonard Grimmett of Houston. Doctor Grimmett is with the M. D. Anderson Foundation and formerly was a concert pianist in England. There also was music by a string quartet.

Melvin Kurth, of Houston, brother of the honored industrialist, responded to the presentation of the Dixie Business Award by Editor Lee, while Mr. Kurth himself accepted the TMA certificate.

Cal C. Chambers, president of Texas Foundries, Inc., gave a eulogy of Mr. Kurth in behalf of the citizens of Angelina County. The invocation was by Dr. William F. Finch, trustee of Southwestern University, Georgetown.

Jesse H. Jones, of Houston, was scheduled to introduce Senator CONNALLY, but was unable to attend. The Reverend James Savoy, Episcopal rector of Lufkin, gave the invocation.

Mr. Kurth, in his acceptance speech, said:

"In our community we have a partnership, no so-called leaders, but a partnership of people with honest regard for one another * * * a partnership of people with an eye to progress and the well-being of their neighbors.

"To me, this partnership reflects the highest ideals and traditions upon which our country was founded. It graphically represents, with all its glistening qualities, the ability of men working, dreaming, envisioning new horizons together to accomplish good and lasting things."

That is why, he said, he accepted the honor also for the men and women of Angelina County, for his friends, and for the future generations who will chart new paths to progress.

Governor Hobby, in his tribute to Mr. Kurth, described him as a country boy who

went to town in a big way and took his town along with him.

"God never made a better man, and the eyes of the South never looked upon a nobler son," he said.

He had begun his speech by saying that although Mr. Kurth was being called the Man of the South for 1949, people in Texas know that he is the man of the South for all time.

"Mr. Kurth is more than the pioneer of the newsprint paper industry in the South," Governor Hobby went on to say. "When we say 'free enterprise' we think of him as the kingfish," he said. He pointed out that Mr. Kurth, who heads 16 east Texas firms and advises dozens more, is the son of one of the earliest lumber men in the State, and was one of the first to advocate and practice forest conservation.

Nor has Mr. Kurth overlooked the humanitarian side of human needs, Governor Hobby said. He pointed to the fact that Mr. Kurth is president of the first and only hospital in the United States built by an employer expressly for the use of his workers.

After reviewing Mr. Kurth's youth and early business career, Governor Hobby remarked:

"It has always been a policy of the Kurths to share their good fortune with the community that has made their prosperity possible."

He mentioned that Mr. Kurth's mother, Mrs. Hattie Martin Kurth, built the first church home for the Keltys Methodist Church, and that his father, Joseph H. Kurth, Sr., gave Lufkin its beautiful Kurth Memorial Library in her memory and endowed the Kurth student loan fund.

It was only natural for Mr. Kurth to put a large part of his profits as a businessman back into Angelina County and the South.

The way he chose to do this, Governor Hobby said, was to help young enterprises to get started, to lead the South in saving its forests and to open a whole new industry—"one that has meant more to the South than any development of this decade."

Mr. Hobby called the testimonial to Mr. Kurth an epochal expression of esteem for a great citizen.

Earlier, Governor Shivers, in paying his tribute to Mr. Kurth, saluted him as "Mister East Texas." Wednesday was, the Governor said, not only a great day for Lufkin, Angelina County, and east Texas, but also for the entire State. He commended Mr. Kurth as a man interested in seeing that freedom is cherished in the future as in the past.

United States Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, who was added to the program to introduce Senator CONNALLY, because of the inability of Mr. Jones to attend, told the large audience that filled the gymnasium that Mr. Kurth's career offered a lesson.

Recalling how Mr. Kurth helped his employees to help themselves during the depression years, Senator JOHNSON said:

"If all businessmen had been what Ernest Kurth sincerely tried to be, there would have been no WPA for the jobless. There would have been no NYA for the youths who needed help so badly, and there would have been no soup kitchens in our metropolitan areas.

"Through all his years of leadership, Ernest Kurth has never permitted any government to take over the duties of his conscience and his heart," the Senator said. "He has not allowed the state to be a better neighbor than he is."

Harry M. Seaman of Houston, president of the Southern Pine Association, a position which Mr. Kurth once held, presented Mr. Kurth with a token of appreciation from the lumber industry. It was a Swiss clock cased in pine.

Mr. Mitchell, whose subject was "Let Us Not Sell Our Birthright Short," pointed to the basic conflict between security and freedom and held out the trend toward industrial decentralization as offering an opportunity for young men and women of the South to find opportunity close to home.

Senator CONNALLY, in his keynote address at the dinner, praised Mr. Kurth as a businessman, as a citizen, as a civic leader and above all as a great pioneer in the American tradition.

He said that he took a personal interest in the Southland Paper Mills project and assisted Mr. Kurth in getting favorable action on his plans by the War Production Board and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Senator CONNALLY said that Texans do not want a State that is wholly industrialized.

"We want a State balanced in its economy. We want industry and we want agriculture and ranching and the other enterprises which we have had in the past," he said. "We do not, however, want to pay unnecessary tribute to the manufacturing industries of other sections. We want to utilize our own resources and contribute to the economy of our own people."

In his praise of Mr. Kurth as a pioneer, the Senator said that he is the type that built America and Texas.

"He pushed out into untried and unknown industrial development, in which there was hazard; in which there was risk; in which it took courage to achieve," the Senator said. "He went into new fields and has reaped rich rewards."

Despite all of his achievements, the Senator went on to say, Mr. Kurth has remained democratic in his attitude and devoted to the well-being of all people.

The certificate presented to Mr. Kurth by the Texas Manufacturers Association designating him as "industrialist of the year" was signed by Mr. Burris and Robert E. Clements of Amarillo, president of TMA.

Mr. Lee, in presenting the certificate for Dixie Business magazine, said that although many publishers have dreamed of developing an American newsprint supply, Mr. Kurth was the first to do it.

Mr. Lee explained the manner in which Mr. Kurth was selected for the honor. His nomination, incidentally, was seconded by Oveta Culp Hobby, executive vice president of the Houston Post, he said.

Mr. Kurth received 5,000 votes out of more than 50,000 cost. Many of those who voted were not readers of his magazine, Mr. Lee said, and some are in foreign countries. The selection of Mr. Kurth was made from a list of 50 of the South's foremost business leaders.

Scores of congratulatory telegrams were received by Mr. Kurth, some of which were read at the dinner. One was from Mr. Jones.

Mrs. Connally, wife of the Senator, and Mrs. Hobby were among the women who were introduced at the dinner.

Ruhr Authority Farce—I. G. Farben Still the Boss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE G. SADOWSKI

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. SADOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include two editorials that appeared in a recent issue of the magazine Prevent World War III issue of November-December 1949. published by the Society for the Prevention of World War III, Inc. These editorials are entitled "Ruhr Authority Farce" and "I. G. Farben Still the Boss:"

RUHR AUTHORITY FARCE

With front-page headlines in the press and pompous speeches by top officials, the Allies announced to the world last year that Germany's war arsenal, the Ruhr, would be a thing of the past. In accordance with the deepest desire of all peoples, so these announcements read, the Allied powers had set up an International Control Authority for the Ruhr. This so-called international authority was supposed to be the last word in the development of super safeguards that would prevent the Ruhr from being employed again as an aggressive instrument. In addition, the Allied representatives in Germany boasted that this international authority would take all steps to insure that the Ruhr would work for all of Europe.

Most people reading the contents of this agreement applauded the decision as evidence of the good faith and intentions of the occupying powers. Those of us, however, who read between the lines of the agreement, found little comfort.

In its press release of January 1949, the Society for the Prevention of World War III called a spade a spade. We said that those who were responsible for the new plan to "internationalize" Germany's war arsenal, the Ruhr, achieved a notable victory in public relations. Though the agreement served to placate those who feared a resurgent Germany, in reality it was mere window dressing, hiding the fact that the control of the Ruhr was not international, nor did it meet the security and economic requirements of Germany's victims.

The reemergence of the Ruhr magnates who served Hitler with enthusiasm should have been a broad enough hint to all peoples concerned that the international control authority for the Ruhr could only be nominal, because it lacked the power to truly prevent the Ruhr from becoming a new base for German aggression and economic domination. Yet there were many sincere people who, while in accord with our analysis of the agreement, suggested that we give it a chance before making a final judgment. Well, almost a year has passed, and as the saying goes, "By their fruits ye shall judge them."

We challenge anyone to tell us just what this International Ruhr Authority has accomplished since its inception. As recently as September of this year the press reported that members of the International Ruhr Authority complained that they received no authority to implement the powers allegedly granted to them. They made a further revelation. It was disclosed that the German coal and steel trustees "were in a position to receive more information and to carry out more authority than the International Ruhr Board itself."

The Ruhr Authority has not only been twiddling its thumbs all these months, but it has been grossly understaffed and many of its top officials are either glorified office boys or men who have not the slightest understanding of the Ruhr and its role in German history.

Matters have recently reached such a point that the French representative on the Authority, Ambassador Maurice de Jean, threw up his hands in disgust and despair at a meeting, realizing that it is just a paper organization which acts as a front for the real control which is vested in the Germans themselves.

In spite of all its shortcomings, the International Ruhr Authority could have played a significant part in controlling the resources of the Ruhr with a view toward facilitating economic recovery and independence of Germany's neighbors. This could have been

achieved providing that there was a genuine desire on the part of the Allied authorities in Germany to infuse the Ruhr Authority with real powers. But nothing of the sort has occurred as yet. On the contrary, there seems to be a deliberate plan to discredit the International Ruhr Authority, to limit its scope of activities, and thus paralyze its usefulness. This is the German hope and was expressed in a speech made in January 1949 by one of the top politicians of Chancellor Adenauer's party, Dr. Walter Strauss. He told his fellow Germans that the powers of the International Ruhr Authority must be abolished for "it should be appreciated that the German claim is for priority to be given to the requirements of the German economy * * *."

Strauss was not talking through his hat when he said that the International Ruhr Authority must be subordinated to the interests of the new Germany. This became clear when the French recently urged that the International Ruhr Authority investigate Germany's deliberate price discrimination on the export of Ruhr coal. It is a decisive issue in the economic recovery of Europe today.

The general practice of the Germans is to sell Ruhr coal abroad at a higher price than that which it obtains in Germany itself, which means that it is far more expensive, for example, for the French to produce a ton of steel than for the Germans. This, in turn, enables the German steel industry to keep down the steel industries of other nations and rise again to its former power when German steel dictated the politics of the Continent.

In reply to the French request that the International Ruhr Authority investigate this situation, the New York Times reported that United States officials opposed "this use of the organization." Here was a concrete instance where the Ruhr Authority could have made an invaluable contribution toward making a more equitable economic relationship among the nations of western Europe, but the United States representatives vetoed the suggestion. Which leads us to the question: What is the International Ruhr Authority supposed to do? If it cannot exercise prerogatives which, according to the agreement, were given to it, why should the taxpayers of this country and our allies support it?

It would have been far more helpful if the United States officials, who are protecting the interests of Hitler's industrial warlords, announced to the world that in reality their aim is to curtail the powers of the International Ruhr Authority. Such an admission, at least, would dispel the illusions which have confused the people as to the character of this organization. On the other hand, the continuation of this farce can only serve the purposes of the Germans and their American Charlie McCarthys. This, of course, is precisely what the Germans want.

It should be remembered that when the International Ruhr Authority was organized, the Allies assured the world that it would never become an instrument of German interests. It was supposed to work for all of western Europe and was intended to be recognized as an independent power whose recommendations and activities were to be respected by all those who joined in establishing it.

The refusal of the United States and British representatives to allow the International Ruhr Authority a semblance of its potential powers exposes another of the postwar tragic comedies to which the people have been subjected since the end of the war.

I. G. FARBEN STILL THE BOSS

In the last issue of Prevent World War III we published a short editorial in which the notorious record of Herr Herman Buecher, I. G. Farben "trust buster" was disclosed.

We pointed out that Buecher is the chairman of the I. G. Farben Dispersal Panel (Fardip) which is charged with the administration of the Farben assets. This organization is supposed to play a key role in "breaking up" the Farben empire. We indicated, however, that Buecher was one of Hitler's staunch supporters, a friend of the German banker, Von Schroeder, who was the midwife of nazism. Buecher was also a director of Hermann Goering's 12-man Armament Council.

Taking advantage of these powers, Herr Buecher was able to expedite the delivery of efficient electrical devices to the Siemens Trust which were used in the gas chambers of Auschwitz and Buchenwald. On the basis of our findings concerning Herr Buecher, intuition told us that with a little research we could uncover similar facts with regard to some of his associates on Fardip. We were right! There was ample documentation published by the United States Government and its agencies which reveal the character of some of his German cronies in the Farben Dispersal Panel.

For example, take the case of Gustav Brecht, a member of Fardip. Brecht was a key director of the Deutsche Bank which, in cooperation with the Nazis, played a decisive part in the looting of Europe. Furthermore, Brecht had long been associated with the German coal cartel. He was an active operator in many of Germany's war industries and participated in the aryanization of companies which did not conform to Hitler's racial theories. Because of his "selfless sacrifices" for the Nazi cause, Brecht was rewarded by Hitler and received the title of "Wehrwirtschaftsfuehrer" (war economy leader).

According to a report on the Deutsche Bank made by members of the American Military Government, "the phenomenal upswing in Brecht's career after March 1933, shows that he was a participant and beneficiary in the nazification of Germany." Though he denied direct affiliation with the Nazi Party, the report discloses that Baron Von Schroeder "has repeatedly characterized Herman Brecht as a Nazi." If anyone was in the position to know who was a Nazi among Germany's industrialists—Baron Von Schroeder was certainly the man.

One of Brecht's companies, "Rheinbraun," and its sister companies and subsidiaries, were notorious employers of slave labor. It has been estimated that up to 30 percent of their working forces consisted of peoples from all parts of Europe who were thrown into the Nazi slave pens. Like a hungry vulture, Brecht followed the Nazi machine in Europe, despoiling property and stealing it from its legitimate owners, under the protection of Nazi bayonets.

The American investigators of Brecht's activities characterized him as "a reluctant, inconsistent, and evasive prisoner." (Who freed him and why?) They concluded that within the meaning of Paragraph 1A of Article II of the Control Council Law No. X dealing with the prosecution of German war criminals, Brecht had committed "a crime against the peace." So much for the war criminal Brecht.

Another Hitler supporter on Fardip is Dr. Eugene von Ritter. Von Ritter is a partner in the German bank Merck Fink & Co. American investigators in Germany reveal that his bank participated with the Deutsche Bank in the creation of a special German bank for Japan that would facilitate the opening of a "new and potentially important channel for expansion in the Far East." This new bank underwrote the alliance between German and Japanese imperialism in the Far East and was guided by Hellmuth Pollems, the right-hand man of Herman Abs, one of Hitler's most dependable henchmen.

The War Department in its study of Germany's industrial war lords, classified Von Ritter as one "who in an outstanding way thrived under National Socialism, who welcomed it in the beginning, aided the Nazis to obtain power, supported them in office, shared the spoils of expropriation and conquest or otherwise markedly benefited in their careers or fortunes under the Nazis."

The Farben rogues gallery, however, is by no means complete. True, there was a trial which had as its ostensible purpose the prosecution of some of Farben's top officials. But this trial now turns out to be a mere formality, for it is now clear to those who have closely followed the Farben story that most of the old gang is back in power again.

This is especially true in the British zone where a flock of Farben officials have returned to power. At Leverkusen, for example, one of Farben's chief officials, Ulrich Haberland, is the general director. He was involved in the slave labor traffic up to his neck. When American prosecutors tried to take him into custody for interrogation, the British refused to let him go.

Another gentleman who has returned to the scene of his crime at Leverkusen is Wilhelm Mann. Mann is in charge of pharmaceutical sales. This is his specialty, for he ran the Bayer agency of I. G. Farben abroad prior to the war. He was a faithful servant of the Nazi program. As early as 1933, he directed a purge of his organization to insure that "only those representing the National Socialist point of view and acceptable to the Nazis" would be employed in the Farben outlets throughout the world. His pro-Nazi activities were so clear-cut that he was actually placed on the docket at Nuremberg, but he escaped punishment.

Gajewski, another Farben criminal and former defendant at the Nuremberg trial, is also free and is running the Elberfeld plant in the British zone. To a lesser extent, the same situation is found in the French zone of occupation.

The characters mentioned above are only a sampling of the many Farben empire builders who are back at their jobs.

Here is a tragic picture which hardly needs comment, for it clearly reveals the degree of moral bankruptcy which is undermining the original aims of the occupation of Germany.

How can one explain the growth of this nest of Farben war criminals and their accomplices, when all the facts about their crimes have been documented by the occupation authorities themselves? How can one dare to justify the retention of the three German war criminals, members of Fardip, who have been entrusted to break up I. G. Farben?

The Garland-Ferguson Committee which made an admirable report on the deliberate failure of American officials to decartelize Germany, declared that Farben was an exception. We believe that they would have never reached that conclusion had they been presented with the above-mentioned facts and additional material which is kept under lock and key. General Clay, as Military Governor, was in the position to know the facts which we have cited. If he was unaware of them then he was indeed a poor representative of the people's interests in Germany. On the assumption that he knew the character of these men and that they were entrenching themselves again in the Farben set-up, why did he fail to act?

The facts must also be known to his successor, Mr. John J. McCloy. But apparently he is too busy these days discrediting the dismantling program.

It is true that these disgraceful conditions are, to a large extent, the immediate responsibility of the British. They have always been reluctant to upset the sacred status quo in their zone of Germany. Their record is black indeed as far as decartelization and the prosecution of German war criminals is concerned.

There was a time when the United States could do little about the goings-on in the British zone, because it was solely British responsibility. But that day has passed.

When Germany-firsters, in and out of the military government, wanted to curtail the delivery of reparations, they found the means to make the British comply.

It is obvious that if Mr. McCloy had the desire to clean up the Farben scandal, he could very easily do so.

In the first place, the American set-up to control Farben in the United States zone is grossly overworked and understaffed. There are hard-working Americans in the organization, but how can a few watch over a vast empire which stretches from Berlin to Buenos Aires? McCloy is fully conversant with this situation but has failed to take remedial action thus far.

In the second place, Mr. McCloy's past connections with the Farben empire should also be taken into consideration. In our judgment, Mr. McCloy will move only when the pressure of public opinion can no longer be ignored.

No Emergency

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial entitled "No Emergency," from the Altoona (Pa.) Tribune of Wednesday, January 18, 1950:

NO EMERGENCY

It must stand as a very dark blot indeed on President Truman's record that he has insisted upon playing politics with the coal situation and Mr. Lewis.

Mr. Truman has placed politics ahead of his country's welfare.

A certain bigness of character is expected of the President of the United States. It is not to be expected that the President would permit an economic weak spot to endure in the country if he had the power to do something about it.

The miners have not worked full time since last June. That is fair neither to the miners, who need the work, nor to the Nation, which needs the coal they could produce.

The miners were granted good wages and certain other demands by their employers last year, but they have not had the opportunity to enjoy what they have been given. They have not had a full year's work in a long time because of Mr. Lewis and his desire to display his power once a year.

There are generally two sides to every question. Yet, the plain facts appear to be that the chief of the United Mine Workers will not let his men work a full year or a full week.

It is not to his credit that he has stalled for months in his demands nor that he has adopted the attitude of "I'll win this fight if it breaks every coal miner in America."

In neighboring Pennsylvania communities to our west, miners are facing difficult times. Some company stores have ceased to extend credit. Miners' bills have been mounting. Their families and their children are beginning, even, to want for food.

Over in Pittsburgh, a steel company has cut production and laid off 1,000 men. The city's biggest electric utility company warns that it must shut off industrial electric power Friday for want of coal. If that occurs, many industries will be forced to close, many will be out of work.

Coal dealers have wired the President that "the emergency in coal has become a crisis."

If cold weather seizes the district many persons may suffer, the dealers warn.

Generally those who suffer most in such instances are the poor, who cannot lay in sufficient reserves of coal to see them through the winter.

We do not know, of course, how Mr. Truman views an emergency.

He and the New Deal have developed one emergency after the other in this country in the last 15 years or so. Perhaps the coal crisis does not now threaten the very fabric of our Nation, if that is what Mr. Truman now means by "emergency."

But certainly an emergency exists in the lives of many thousands of Americans due to Mr. Lewis and his enforced coal shortage.

There is one means at hand provided for just such an occasion as this long coal crisis. It is the Taft-Hartley Act.

Mr. Truman has used it several times. But he campaigned on a prominent plank calling for repeal of the Taft-Hartley Act. It would weaken his political ammunition if he were forced to use the Taft-Hartley Act now even if it would solve the problem, as it is generally believed would be the case.

The miners themselves are rebelling. Mr. Lewis' suggestion that they go back to their 3-day week Monday was refused by some 81,000 up until Tuesday night. They said they are disgusted, sick of the 3-day week. They need the work. It is "5 days or nothing" they are saying.

Union officials deny it is a revolt. But, put it how you will, the men are not doing as John L. says this time.

Despite this pressure from the public, Mr. Truman said Tuesday again, for the third or fourth time, that he plans to do nothing, since no national emergency exists. "The time has not yet arrived," Mr. Truman told Senator Brewster.

Is Mr. Truman waiting for national catastrophe? For economic collapse, for riots, joblessness, stalled industry, cold and hungry people?

Is that an emergency? Or does an emergency exist when such dire things are threatened.

It seems ridiculous, tragic, even, to quibble thus in the face of such an important national need, a need to which the President consistently has refused to rise.

It is time Mr. Truman stops playing politics, and acts for the real welfare of the people instead of talking vaguely about a welfare state, which would mean only their ultimate ruin.

Mr. Speaker, events have transpired, and the President is now invoking the Taft-Hartley Act. It is a good, workable piece of legislation, for the best interest of labor, management, and the country. But the Taft-Hartley Act will not work unless the President of the United States, whose duty and responsibility it is to see that it is executed, is sincere in his desire that it work. Remember the old saying: "You can drive a horse to water, but you cannot make him drink." You can force the coal miners into the pits but you cannot make them work.

It seems to me we as a Nation are getting in pretty bad shape when arrogant, radical labor leaders are able to tie this country up to the point of strangulation. When we reach such a point, watch out labor; watch out capital; watch out, Mr. President, that Joe Stalin does not take us over. History proves this is the way he operates.

This warning is meant as much for the President of the United States as it is for the worker, the Member of Congress, or any good sound-thinking American citizen.

A Parable on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I bring to your attention the following parable by Mr. Karl Baarslag, the able and energetic research expert of the Americanism division of the American Legion, which I present for the enlightenment of the American people. It should be read carefully and the proper moral should be drawn from it:

THE PARABLE OF THE VANISHED VILLAGE

Once upon a time, long, long ago, there was a peaceful and contented village hard by a rocky and desolate ravine. In a cave in the ravine lived a wild and ferocious beast. For many years the villagers ignored the existence of the animal because village elders and wise men had decided that it would speedily succumb to its own suicidal tendencies and lack of common sense. When the beast began to raid the flocks of the village grazing in the upper stretches of the ravine, the herdsmen prudently withdrew their animals to an area closer to the village where they could be better guarded. Nevertheless, the emboldened beast ranged farther and farther in its nocturnal depredations, finally destroying and running off with cattle and sheep close to the village limits. It also had killed a hunter returning from the forest and had seized and devoured a small child which had strayed from the safety of the village confines.

Badly alarmed and deeply concerned, some of the villagers now began to hold numerous emergency meetings on what to do about the beast. Debates raged far into the night but they found themselves badly divided in opinion. Some argued that the beast was really not carnivorous or destructive but had become so accidentally and that it would undoubtedly return to a vegetarian diet later when it found meat unavailable. Learned men and philosophers, none of whom had ever seen the beast or studied its ways, speculated at great length and with profound wisdom on its nature, origin, and destiny. Others, obviously the victims of hysteria, described it as a most frightful monster which bore no resemblance to any other form of animal either they or their ancestors had ever encountered. Some of the more practical and solid citizens argued sagely that the beast had already received too much hysterical publicity and that it should be ignored out of existence. One of the most respected of the village elders even thought that it should be laughed out of existence.

That night two more children were horribly killed by the prowling beast. Several fine beef cattle also were destroyed, substantially cutting down the village's food supply. This led some of the village witch doctors and medicine men to the belief that only positive means should be adopted and that they should breed cattle and sheep able to outrun the beast and with improved breeding methods they might be able to develop herds whose flesh and hides would be practically resistant to the wild animal's fangs and claws. That night 16 sheep and several more beef cattle were destroyed.

The villagers thereupon tried every conceivable countermeasure advised by their medicine men and witch doctors. A stockade was built across the upper ravine. The beast simply outflanked this by coming over the mountain and descending on the village from

another direction. It ran off with a small boy after killing a woman gathering berries. After this berry picking was banned and all children were confined to their huts. The infuriated and apparently mad beast trampled down their crops and harried a number of sheep and cattle to death, apparently for the sheer lust of senseless destruction. Fires were built and tom-toms beaten all night long to frighten it away. The village's best orators held forth in long declamations against the animal which had now become the scourge of their existence. Medicine men and witch doctors exhausted their ancient arts by brewing every known form of magical potion and casting every known and secret form of incantation and spell. The beast fell upon several of these tom-tom drummers and mumbo-jumbo men at the edge of the forest, harrying them to death. That night the destruction of their stock was the heaviest in years, with the already drastically curbed food supply dwindling day by day.

It was now plain that the beast or monster, whatever it was, had whelped, as there were smaller-size tracks in evidence after this most disastrous foray. The village debates now became embittered and furious. Everyone agreed that something must and should be done but they were unable to agree upon any recourse or remedy. The local chapter of the Society of the Prevention of Cruelty to Anmals, for example, argued that the beast and its young had to eat in order to live, and that it had, under their basic law and constitution, the very selfsame rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of its own admittedly peculiar form of happiness as they claimed for themselves. Destroying the beast would be but a step to destroying their own cherished freedoms. This humane principle won wide support among the more intelligent and liberal element of the villagers. And those who had no children and no cattle to lose and who lived safely near the center of the village and who had never seen even the track of the animal seemed to be full of far more advice and knowledge on what not to do than the direct victims of the beast's marauding.

By this time the villagers were panic-stricken. All normal village pursuits and means of making a living had become impossible, as the emboldened beast and its whelps ranged far and wide, raiding and destroying by day as well as by night. The village elders were in practically continuous session trying to find ways and means of ending this frightful incubus which was poisoning their very existence.

At this point a few of the village's hunters came forward with an altogether unique and revolutionary proposal. They had tracked and studied the beast from hiding places in the trees near its cave. They reported that while the animal was of enormous size and far better equipped with saber-like teeth and destructive claws than any other animal previously encountered in their past, it definitely was not supernatural or invincible. Why not simply organize a mass hunting party of the most fearless and trained fighters of the village, proceed to the cave and destroy the evil animal and its young thus ending for all time the horrible nightmare. This extraordinary proposal was promptly rejected by the village elders and wise men as entirely impractical and "a purely negative approach to the problem." It was further intimated that these "beast-baiters" as they came to be known really suffered from hallucinations and that they probably thought they saw the beast under every bed. That night three of the medicine men engaged in casting spells in the direction of the cave were pounced upon at the outskirts of the village and horribly mangled to pieces. Their few remaining cattle were also nearly decimated.

The villagers now sat frightened and huddled in their huts never knowing where the dread animal would strike next. They no longer dared to forage abroad for food for their hungry children many of whom died of malnutrition. With time on their hands the village wise men and elders debated endlessly and futilely on the nature of the beast and what, if anything, they should attempt to do about it. They were never able to reach any agreement, each villager having different ideas and suggestions. The beast-baiters had been locked up in a strong hut set aside for the feeble-minded. It was perfectly plain to the rest of the more level-headed villagers that their perfectly idiotic idea of proceeding to the cave and destroying the beast and its young was not worthy of serious consideration as it was entirely negative and impractical and dangerous besides. Strongly worded resolutions and fiery denunciatory speeches were deemed far more efficacious. Others insisted that emphasizing the undeniable benefits of their communal life and their cultural advances as compared with the horrible, dank lair of the monster were the only correct and positive approaches to the problem.

Centuries later archaeologists stumbled upon the ruins of the village. The few remaining inhabitants had apparently died of starvation while debating on the village green despite the fact that their valley was a particularly fertile and sheltered one. The scattered skeletons of other villagers indicated that they had been destroyed by some extremely ferocious and powerful animals. No other trace of their culture or cause of their extinction was apparent. They appeared to have been a people with a high order of intelligence, well equipped with weapons and otherwise perfectly capable of defending themselves.

United States Withdrawal Policy in Asia Encourages Reds on All Fronts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER H. JUDD

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, the following article by the distinguished foreign-policy analyst, Edgar Ansel Mowrer, is the first public statement I have seen that the Truman administration is prepared, if necessary, not only to let the mainland of Asia go to the Reds, but also to abandon Japan and the Philippines, too, if the Communists make a determined move in their direction. This has actually been the policy for a long time. The dust for whose settling the State Department is waiting was thrown in the air by itself to keep our people from seeing the stark bankruptcy of American foreign policy in Asia. Many people have known the truth for months but I for one had hoped that before it became public knowledge, to the Kremlin as well as to us and its victims, the administration would come to its senses, forget about its face, and start thinking about our security enough to change the policy—adopting for Asia the policy of helping free peoples resist Communist subjugation which it has followed successfully thus far in Europe.

However, the President's fateful announcement on January 5, 1950, that the United States would not give any assistance in the form of military advisers and supplies or even moral support or encouragement to our beleaguered ally, the free Republic of China with headquarters on Formosa, has tossed the fat into the fire. The Kremlin now knows it has practically a green light on the Asiatic mainland as far as we are concerned, and its prompt stepping up of aggressive pressures in both Asia and Europe is the inevitable result. The peoples of Asia know that without strong American support they are almost certainly doomed. The American people are the only ones who do not know the score. I can see nothing to gain by trying to keep them longer in ignorance of what the rest of the world already understands fairly clearly. Hence, under permission to extend my remarks, I include the article.

The only statement in it with which I disagree is in the first sentence. It is not quite accurate to say that the Truman doctrine has been abandoned as far as Asia is concerned; the stark fact is that it never was extended to Asia. What has happened is that that fact is now admitted and its ominous implications—including its probable failure now in Europe—ought to be recognized by all.

UNITED STATES WITHDRAWAL POLICY IN ASIA ENCOURAGES REDS ON ALL FRONTS

(By Edgar Ansel Mowrer)

The United States has abandoned the Truman doctrine so far as Asia is concerned. As a result, not only Formosa but Japan, the Philippines and the entire Pacific area as far back as Hawaii and Alaska are considered by the American armed forces as expendable.

This is not the fault of the armed forces. Our generals and admirals would have liked nothing better than to save China and to stop Soviet expansion everywhere. It is the fault of the administration when it discovered that the cost of implementing the Truman doctrine everywhere in the world would have limited the social gains promised to the American people.

The natural trend of any democracy to put butter ahead of cannon was strengthened by the claims of the American Air Force to win any war by intercontinental bombing. It was further strengthened by the State Department's acceptance of the theory that to use American force anywhere in Asia to stop communism would mean to drive the awakening Asiatic masses into the arms of the Kremlin.

The result was that the United States is retreating—has perhaps already retreated—from those areas which we conquered from the Japs by years of bloody fighting.

ATLANTIC PRIORITY

At a certain time, as can be ascertained by reading between the lines of statements by the Secretary of Defense and the badly embarrassed chiefs of staff, the administration decided that the cost of world-wide containment of a communism was prohibitive. The military chiefs had to draw up a priority list of areas. Those in the Atlantic, perhaps quite properly, came first.

Therefore, we signed the Atlantic Security Pact with the west-European countries. We are sending them arms though not enough. We would presumably fight to defend a bridgehead in Europe, the Atlantic islands of Iceland and Greenland, the Caribbean, the coast of Central and South America and the northern border of Canada.

The military leaders would be ready to do the same in the Pacific. They are forced to tailor their suit to their cloth. The administration is not asking for, and Congress is

not voting, enough money to contain communism in Europe, the Middle East, and Asia. Therefore, American forces may not defend badly threatened, Indochina or Hainan Island or Formosa. If these places hold, so much the better. If not, as matters now stand, they will have to go.

DEFENSES MEAGER

Just as before Pearl Harbor, the American forces available to defend Japan and the Philippines are small. If seriously attacked, these places may well be abandoned. So with the Pacific islands for a long way west. There is also talk of withdrawing from the Mediterranean those American naval forces that have for the last 4 years stopped Soviet expansion in that area by their mere presence.

So long as this policy of restricting the Truman doctrine was not public, its harmfulness was limited. Now, however, that the debate over holding or not holding Formosa has revealed the limited nature of American strategic intentions, the Communist world is becoming increasingly bold. Chinese and Soviet radios are already announcing the coming liberation, meaning conquest, of Tibet and of Indochina. Pressure on India is increasing.

For if these regions can expect no military help from the United States, why should the Soviet Empire cease expanding? Once Senator TOM CONNALLY had told the world that the United States would not risk getting into a war to defend Formosa, why stop anywhere in Asia?

GO-AHEAD SIGNAL

The American policy of disavowing Chiang Kai-shek and of withdrawal from Asia has, of course, been an invitation to the Soviets to take those countries over. Now that Moscow knows that the United States will not fight for Formosa, it will quite obviously push forward into other areas. Perhaps the partial revival of the Berlin blockade was an attempt to test out our will to fight for that city. Certainly, the hasty withdrawal of American forces from the Railway Administration building in our zone which we had legitimately occupied would seem to confirm the Soviet suspicion that the United States was bluffing.

Quite obviously, should such a suspicion become general, it would cost us our already none too confident European allies just as it is already costing us the confidence of our friends in the Pacific. It could be that the public decision not to defend Formosa marked the end of a successful policy that had lasted since we saved the Dardanelles and Iran in 1946.

Whittaker Chambers Spikes Malicious Rumors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I include in my remarks the following transcript of a Nation-wide radio broadcast by Bert Andrews, of the Washington bureau of the New York Herald Tribune, in an interview with Whittaker Chambers, Saturday, January 28, 1950:

Good evening, this is Bert Andrews, reporting from Washington. With me tonight is one of the most controversial figures in America. He is Whittaker Chambers, the former Communist courier, whose disclosures led to the perjury conviction of Alger Hiss, former State Department official. Mr. Hiss' conviction and his sentence to 5 years in prison is being appealed. Meanwhile, it has stirred intense interest and widely contrasting reactions in Washington and throughout the country. Secretary of State Acheson, as you know, has stated that he will not turn his back on Alger Hiss even if the highest Court in the land upholds the verdict of the trial jury. Mrs. Franklin D. Roosevelt has said that she thinks it was "rather horrible" of the jury to condemn someone on the word of someone else who admits to guilt. The Mississippi State Legislature has passed a resolution assailing Secretary Acheson for his defense of Mr. Hiss. Because of the continuing conflict in the minds of so many people, I am going to ask Whittaker Chambers some of the questions I believe our listeners would like to ask him. First, Mr. Chambers, what do you think of Mrs. Roosevelt's recent comments on the outcome of the trial?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I think that Mrs. Roosevelt, like some other people, is too inclined to consider this as a contest between Alger Hiss and Whittaker Chambers. This is a line which the defense has been urging to distract attention from the bigger conflict. She overlooks the fact that the jury did not reach its verdict merely on the basis of the stories of two men. She overlooks the fact that the jury decided there was corroboration from many witnesses and from other forms of evidence of the charges against Mr. Hiss. I believe the American people still accept the verdicts of their duly selected juries rather than the personal opinion of any well-meaning individual, no matter how highly placed that individual may be.

Mr. ANDREWS. Now, Mr. Chambers, since you agreed to answer tough questions as well as easy ones, I'd like to ask this: What about all the stories that have attained national circulation in scuttlebutt fashion? I mean the rumors that you were once in a mental institution, that you were a heavy drinker, that there was something in your relationship with Hiss that has not come to light?

Mr. CHAMBERS. These stories were assiduously spread by Mr. Hiss's sympathizers. I have never been in a sanitarium of any sort. Period. I almost never touch hard liquor. I may have five or six glasses of wine a year. The whole truth about my friendship with Alger Hiss was placed before the jury. Right here I'd like to ask a question of you: Do you imagine that the defense would have failed to bring out evidence relating to all those rumors if they had been able to find an iota of evidence about them?

Mr. ANDREWS. I can't answer for the defense in the case, Mr. Chambers, although I must admit it would be logical to think they produced all the evidence they could on all points. Now how about another rumor—that you acted from a motive of revenge. I might tell you that I received a letter only yesterday containing that rumor in a new form. It said that a man who claimed to know the lowdown argued that you were and still are a Communist. He argued that Alger Hiss was once a Communist but broke with the party. And that the Kremlin ordered you to become an apparent renegade so that you could set out and get Hiss.

Mr. CHAMBERS. I know all of those stories, Mr. Andrews. Usually they say that I am working out some old grudge or some old hatred. I do not hate Mr. Hiss. We were close friends but we are caught in a tragedy of history. Mr. Hiss represents the concealed enemy against which we are all fighting. If I had been trying to destroy him personally, why would I have waited 10 or 11 years? I tried to persuade him to change his mind when I abandoned the Communist movement.

Mr. ANDREWS. Another question that bothers many people is this, Mr. Chambers. I'll quote from the language of one of the Congressmen who heard you testify before the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He raised this point: Why should an American who has prospered under the American system and who is assured of security and a worth-while future—why should such a man join the Communist Party in this country and try to overthrow the American system?

Mr. CHAMBERS. To answer that question, it is necessary to think for a moment about the world in which Mr. Hiss and I came of age. It was a world racked by global wars and social struggle. Like me, Mr. Hiss came of age from a proud but impoverished middle-class family. As a young man—a thoughtful young man—he must have asked himself what caused the world's wars, what caused the global depression, and what should he do about it. Like me, he thought he had found the answer. Like me, I believe he saw in the decline of his family the image of a society in decline.

Mr. ANDREWS. That's not quite responsive, Mr. Chambers. Mr. Hiss's personal financial future seemed assured. Why should he or anyone else want to kick such a future aside, or endanger it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. That mere fact that a man is making a good living does not necessarily blind him to the troubles of others and the world. They find the world full of moral confusion. Some of them think that Marxism and Leninism offer a simple explanation of the causes and a program for action. The very vigor of the project appeals to some of the sheltered middle-class intellectuals who feel a sense of guilt because others do not have as much as they have. And so some of them turn to communism without realizing that communism destroys the very rights they would like to see granted to the underprivileged.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chambers, most of the reporters who attended the second trial agreed that a witness who may have been the one witness to sway the jury in the direction of a guilty verdict was Mrs. Edith Murray, who once worked as a maid in your home. She did not testify at the first trial. She appeared at the second trial and identified Mr. and Mrs. Hiss as persons who had called on you and Mrs. Chambers at your home. Can you tell me why she didn't testify in the first trial?

Mr. CHAMBERS. The FBI had not been able to find her for the first trial. My wife and I remembered her only as Edith. We gave the FBI that name but they could not trace her. Between the first trial and the second trial my wife found an oil painting she had done of Edith back at the time in question. She turned it over to the FBI. It was a good likeness. They took it through various neighborhoods in Baltimore.

Mr. ANDREWS. And someone recognized it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Yes. Finally they found a woman who said, "Why, that looks like Edith Murray." Once the FBI had the last name they were able to find Mrs. Murray without difficulty. She appeared as a surprise witness. She corroborated another phase of the story.

Mr. ANDREWS. Another thing that has puzzled many Americans is this, Mr. Chambers: How could people know each other only by so-called cover names—or first names?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Unlike Europeans, Americans do not have a long history of conspiracy. Therefore, they find it difficult to understand the true nature of a conspiracy. But history teaches that just such methods have been used by conspirators since time immemorial.

Mr. ANDREWS. As I told you at the outset, Mr. Chambers, I have some tough questions. You know that you have been assailed by

many as a self-confessed Communist agent, a self-confessed traitor, and a self-confessed perjurer. You know that many people have argued and still argue that nothing you have said should be believed because of your past. What is your answer to that?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I am particularly glad that you asked that question. It goes to the heart of what I have tried to do. In exposing the conspiracy, the problem was to find a man who had first-hand knowledge of the facts—who was willing to testify to them publicly. This had to be an ex-Communist who was willing to tell all the facts about his own activities as a Communist as well as the activities of others. In short a man who would sit in the witness chair and accept all of the criticism that could be thrown at him. But again, Mr. Andrews, let me say that it was not merely a matter of my word against another's word. There was other evidence. If there had been no other evidence, it is possible that my word alone would not have satisfied a single juror. But there was other evidence. And it was accepted as sufficient by 8 out of 12 jurors at the first trial—and by all 12 jurors at the second trial.

Mr. ANDREWS. But I was talking about your past, Mr. Chambers. You were a Communist courier. What made you change?

Mr. CHAMBERS. My own experience and the record of events made me change. They taught me that communism is a form of totalitarianism—that its triumph means slavery to men wherever they fall under its sway, and spiritual night to the human mind and soul. I think we have only to look at the situation in countries behind the iron curtain to realize that that is true. I realized it back in 1937 and I broke with the party.

Mr. ANDREWS. A great many people ask just why did you wait until August 1948 to volunteer your information to the House committee?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I did not wait—and I did not volunteer it to the committee, Mr. Andrews. I gave the information to Government officials in 1939, 2 days after the Hitler-Stalin pact was signed. Nobody gave it any credence, and nothing was done about it. When the House committee took up the case in 1948, I was subpenaed without any advance notice.

Mr. ANDREWS. On another phase, Mr. Chambers, I remember that the House committee once asked you if you would be willing to take a lie-detector test. You said you would. They did not ask you to take such a test because Mr. Hiss, in writing, had declined to take one on the advice of friends who informed him the test was not reliable. Now that the trial is over, are you still willing to take such a test?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I am not only willing to take one, Mr. Andrews, I am eager to do so. I am eager to take this test under the proper auspices.

Mr. ANDREWS. What do you mean by proper auspices, Mr. Chambers?

Mr. CHAMBERS. I mean that the person or persons administering the test must be free of any suspicion of complicity with Communists or close ties with Alger Hiss and his sympathizers.

Mr. ANDREWS. Do you mean that you alone, Mr. Chambers, would want to decide who would give the test and assess it?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Not at all, Mr. Andrews. I would stipulate that the Federal Bureau of Investigation be satisfied as to the character of the person or persons giving the test.

Mr. ANDREWS. Would you demand that you be furnished in advance with the list of questions?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Certainly not. I should merely insist that one question be included—was there ever anything peculiar in your relationship with Alger Hiss or any member of his family?

Mr. ANDREWS. I take it that that goes back to some of the scuttlebutt rumors I asked you about before?

Mr. CHAMBERS. It does. I particularly want to spike the rumor that Alger Hiss is shielding someone. He is shielding nobody but himself.

Mr. ANDREWS. Let's go back to another phase we were discussing, Mr. Chambers. I'd like to get a more definite answer on it. A lot of people find it hard to understand why you testified against Mr. Hiss, on the one hand, while, on the other, you insist you have no personal resentment against him. Can you explain it a little more fully?

Mr. CHAMBERS. Point 1, Alger Hiss was, of course, only one of a numerous group against whom I testified. Point 2, I assume that Alger Hiss is a man of intense convictions—convictions which I once shared. I believe that I also am a man of intense convictions. Due to the social struggle which is the dominant theme of our age, Hiss' faith and mine are now diametrically opposed. But I cannot fail to respect even an enemy who shares with me the feeling that only that life is worth living for which a man is prepared to dare all and die at any moment.

Kuomintang May Be Disbanded To Bring Liberals to the Fore

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN DAVIS LODGE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the February 6 issue of the Washington Daily News relative to the possible disbandment of the Kuomintang:

KUOMINTANG MAY BE DISBANDED TO BRING LIBERALS TO THE FORE

(By Clyde Farnsworth)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA, February 6.—Formal disbandment of the Kuomintang (Government party) and its rebirth as the Democratic Revolutionary Party—Minchukemintang—under the leadership of Chiang Kai-shek is reliably reported to be in the planning stage.

And a separate organization of Nationalist liberals under the leadership of Dr. Hu Shih, one of China's prominent scholars, is expected to emerge under the name of the League of Liberal China—Chungkuotzeyutungmen.

Dr. Hu, now in the United States, is expected either to return and give the league its official send-off or remain there and in collaboration with such learned Chinese as T. F. Tsiang seek to advance its recognition as the main repository of Kuomintang liberalism.

It is understood Generalissimo Chiang has given his blessing both to the projected League of Liberal China and the reorganization of the Kuomintang into the Democratic Revolutionary Party. For years he has generally refrained from taking sides in intra-Kuomintang politics.

Much of the support for the league is said to originate among the Generalissimo's own advisers. It appears that the two reformative ideas are closely linked through overlapping sponsorship.

TO CONVINCE UNITED STATES

The principal objective of the two moves, though it may never be enunciated in so many words, would be to convince the United States Government that the Kuomintang contains elements of sound liberal and democratic thinking and is capable of its own reform.

Kuomintang liberals believe that if the Chinese are to show any middle-of-the-road tendencies which the United States State Department has said it is looking for in China they must come from the anti-Communist side.

If there are any liberals with the Communists, they must be a hamstrung lot, it is reasoned here, and reform of the Kuomintang and the emergence of the League of Liberal China might offer attractive rally points for them—if they can ever get out from under the Reds.

It is reported from Peiping that the so-called "democratic personages" are not even permitted to leave the Red capital.

SEVERAL NAME CHANGES

The Kuomintang has gone through several name changes since Dr. Sun Yat-sen organized the Hsing Chung-hui (Regenerate China Society) in Macao in 1892. The Hsing Chung-hui was the Kuomintang in its earliest form.

Dr. Sun's Three Principles of the People—nationalism, democracy, and the people's livelihood—would continue as the central and historic inspiration of the Democratic Revolutionary Party, but the League of Liberal China would embody most liberal Chinese thought on how to insure their fulfilment.

WEEDING OUT LIKELY

It is likely the party would weed out much of the old Kuomintang membership and subordinate leadership—especially that which, right or wrong, has given the party a reactionary reputation. The time for that was never more pressing.

The bulk of membership has always lain with Government employees. The Kuomintang reached its peak membership of 400,000 mostly civil servants, at the end of 1939. Now, Nationalist civil servants number only a few hundred and active leadership has been pared to a core.

But this core contains conservatives and liberals. It seems the League of Liberal China would include liberal elements within the larger framework of the Democratic Revolutionary Party. Whether the league would function independently as a party is doubtful.

No. 1 Issue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Brighton-Pittsford Post is not a paper of wide circulation. It serves, primarily, two suburban communities on the edge of the great city of Rochester, N. Y. But from the pen of the editor of this paper, Mr. Leroy Percy, comes some of the clearest thinking and most convincing common sense brought to my attention. Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following recent editorial on Government spending, which is very much to the point:

NO. 1 ISSUE

As the second session of this Congress got under way, news reports emphasized that the domestic issue of the greatest concern to many Senators and Representatives of both parties was the cost of the Federal Government, taxes, and deficits.

The news reports said further that congressional leaders, on either side of the aisle which divides Republicans and Democrats, were determined to do everything possible to cut appropriations, to abstain from raising

taxes, and to make the next budget show a surplus instead of a deficit at the end of the fiscal year.

These are splendid aims but it must be recorded that they are usually honored more in the breach than in the observance. Practically everyone is for rigorous economy—for the other fellow, and for ample spending when the money will benefit him.

That is why enormous pressure is exerted on Congress by groups of all kinds for bigger and better appropriations. And that is why Congress must have the courage to resist this pressure if the Nation is to avoid financial disaster. Government, like individuals, can spend beyond their incomes and dissipate their resources only so long. The only difference is that Government can stave off the day of reckoning longer. But when that day does come, the repercussions are felt everywhere.

The Hoover Commission, for one, has shown us how we can heavily cut the cost of Government without undermining any necessary function. Let this Congress do it—and if it does, let it be given the thanks of a grateful union.

Is Joint Chiefs of Staff Tour in Asia Merely Smoke Screen?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington News of December 31, 1949. When I read it almost 6 weeks ago it was hard to believe our Joint Chiefs of Staff would go all the way to Asia supposedly on a survey tour and not go near the most critical area there—Formosa. Apparently, the editorial's predictions were correct. If so, it can only confirm the fear that this Government makes its diagnosis and prescribes treatment—or no treatment—first, and then makes its examination—but not of the patient, only the patient's neighbors. Are we or are we not concerned about Communist-expansion in Asia?

SMOKE SCREEN

The Joint Chiefs of Staff will make a personal tour of inspection to Hawaii and Japan early in February for a first-hand check of the critical situation in China, it has been announced.

Formosa, the immediate trouble spot in the Pacific, will not be visited.

This is akin to going to London and Paris for a first-hand check on Marshal Tito and the Balkan situation.

Why don't the Joint Chiefs dispense with air travel altogether and conduct their survey from Palm Springs? The California climate yields nothing to Hawaii's at this season.

The explanation that the Joint Chiefs are going to Japan to discuss the Chinese crisis with Gen. Douglas MacArthur makes little sense. General MacArthur's views with respect to the Chinese situation are known to the Department of Defense, and if his recommendations need to be brought up to date that could be accomplished by an exchange of cables within 24 hours.

President Truman's meeting with the Security Council on the Formosa problem, the sending of an aircraft carrier and two destroyers to reinforce our Pacific Fleet, and now this projected tour of the Joint Chiefs of Staff all seem to be parts of one pattern. But the whole pattern has little relation to reality, and as a smoke screen it won't cover the State Department's colossal blundering in the Pacific.

The President faces a storm in Congress on this issue, for Congress has been hearing from the people. But something more than face-saving gestures will be needed to convince the public that a sincere effort is being made to protect American interests in the Pacific.

Maintaining Our National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, in the light of the most recent developments concerning the American watch manufacturing industry in general, and the Waltham Watch Co. in particular, I am again urging the Members of this House to take action to preserve an essential contribution to our national defense system.

It is indisputable that the watchmaking industry involves the preservation of irreplaceable skilled craftsmanship in the manufacturing of precision instruments that are vital to the sound defense of this entire Nation. Great Britain recognized the terrible mistake they made in permitting the disintegration of their watchmaking industry and are today, through direct government action, taking corrective steps. In time of emergency they are wise enough not to be left again, as they were in the recent war, without a domestic source for supply of the timing devices which are of paramount importance in modern atomic warfare.

Although, in the past, I have repeatedly presented the testimony of qualified experts on the essentiality of protecting the people of this country through the preservation of our domestic watch-manufacturing industry, I regret to say that no substantial effort toward this objective has been demonstrated. Today I, and our distinguished majority leader, have formally requested the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee to appoint a subcommittee to make a survey or inquiry as to the contributions of the American watch business during World War II and its importance as a part of our national defense in the event of any future emergency.

We are doing that with the intense conviction that an official committee report will show the desperate urgency and obligation of this House and this Government to take immediate action for insurance of the lives and safety of the American people. I earnestly hope that the chairman of the Armed Services Committee and the committee members, despite their pressing burdens, will promptly act so that full information and details on this vital subject will be available to you at the earliest possible moment.

We have been and we are now generously concerned with helping and protecting the citizens of almost every country in the world. Let us not forget our own people. Our first obligation, under our Constitution, is to the citizens of the United States.

The agencies of our Government have been created for the purpose, primarily, of serving and aiding the citizens of this country. We must make certain that our people do not lose their faith, trust and confidence in the institutions and divisions of Government whose only reason for being in existence is to assist them. It appears, in some communities, that this is exactly what is happening and I deeply feel the Members of this House will appreciate knowing it. I am, therefore, calling to your attention a pertinent editorial, titled "Untimely Desertion" which appeared on the front page of the Waltham, Mass., News Tribune in its daily issue of February 4, 1950. I earnestly ask that each and every Member of this Congress read it.

The editorial follows:

UNTIMELY DESERTION

Just at a time when the Waltham Watch Co. appears to have its finest opportunity in years to reestablish itself, the stopper is pulled from the drain. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is both short-sighted and lacking in faith when it refuses to make available the working capital so vitally needed.

The fate of the 100-year-old industry hinged upon RFC willingness to set aside an original restriction of $2,000,000 of its $6,000,000 loan to machinery and research. RFC, in denying the company's request, automatically condemns it to receivership and liquidation.

The Government's lending agency is being pound wise and penny foolish. The firm couldn't possibly place itself in a position to utilize new machinery until the ambitious sales program just launched had a chance to prove its worth. This chance has been spiked.

On the initial grant of $4,000,000, the RFC wasn't doing the Waltham Watch Co. much of a favor. Three-quarters of the sum was designated to wipe out debts owed Boston banks, leaving less than a million dollars for working capital. So small was this amount, in relation to the total problem, that circumstances dictated the half-price inventory sale which stirred a controversy in many places.

It looks to us as though the Waltham Watch Co. is being made the scapegoat by the RFC to cover up its embarrassment over the sorry Lustron affair. Under congressional fire for its advancing of money to the metal housing pioneer outfit, RFC turns a hard-fisted policy on a firm which has proved itself a vital link in national defense. It may well be sounding the death knell to a concern it provided only token assistance to in the first place.

The original watch-factory need was established at $9,000,000. If granted, the allocation to banks and reserve for machinery could have been set up and a reasonable amount of working capital made available.

If the RFC really believed Waltham Watch was essential to national defense and endowed with long-range value as a going concern—as the Government officials stated in their approving statement—it was supporting the belief with a trivial gesture.

The domestic watch industry is being dealt a crippling blow. Once there were nearly 60 American manufacturers. Until yesterday only three existed. The number may well be reduced to two, and the strangling process is condoned by President Truman and the State

Department because of failure to do something about the import situation.

Attorney Lyne, one of the original reorganization trustees, phrased it aptly when he said the firm is being sold down the river.

Nobody is quitting on the Waltham Watch Co. hereabouts. Walter W. Cenerazzo, union president, who has been in the forefront of the struggle all the way, intends to carry the fight on. We feel that at the very least it can be readily established that the RFC's policy of too little help has been a tragic delusion to thousands of employees.

How Harmful Are Cigarettes?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALTER K. GRANGER

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the Appendix of the RECORD a reprint of an article appearing in the January 1950 Reader's Digest entitled "How Harmful Are Cigarettes?" The increase in the use of cigarettes by the American people is phenomenal, and the ill effects from the use of tobacco are alarming, as this author so ably points out.

The article follows:

HOW HARMFUL ARE CIGARETTES?

(By Roger William Riis)

In all the history of human habit, there have been few changes so remarkable as the tidal-wave increase of cigarette smoking in the United States. Within a single generation, a new habit has laid hold upon an entire people to an extent which we do not begin to realize, and with effects which we certainly do not understand.

Last year 60,000,000 Americans consumed 400,000,000,000 cigarettes. Every year, some 800,000 nonsmokers join smoking ranks. Two out of every three men, two out of every five women, one out of every seven boys of 14 smoke cigarettes. The average consumption is 19 a day. We spend some $4,000,000,000 a year on tobacco products and supplies—twice as much as we pay all the public-school teachers in the United States.

Up and up runs the graph at a towering angle, with no sign of leveling off. We are, at a lively pace, engulfing ourselves in one giant Nation-wide cloud of cigarette smoke.

What is this substance which we breathe into our mouths and lungs in such stupendous clouds? It contains a number of ominous-sounding chemicals.

Two of the chemicals are under grave suspicion: benzopyrene, which chiefly affects the respiratory tract, and nicotine.

Nicotine is the essential ingredient of tobacco. It is what makes tobacco tobacco and not just another weed.

When one smokes, most of the nicotine escapes into the air. About a third gets into the mouth, where a little is absorbed. Of what goes into the lungs, perhaps a fifth is absorbed. The effect of smoking a cigar is equal to that of four or five cigarettes. A pipe gives one a trifle more nicotine than does a cigar.

The hotter the burning surface, the more nicotine is taken into the system. Thus, the faster one smokes, the more nicotine one gets; smoking twice as fast results in 10 times as much nicotine. And the closer to the end of a cigarette one smokes, the more nicotine also, because the butt, having filtered the first part of the cigarette, has more than its share of nicotine.

In pure form nicotine is a violent poison. One drop on a rabbit's skin throws the rabbit into instant shock. The nicotine content of a trifle more than two cigarettes, if injected into the blood stream, would kill a smoker swiftly. If you smoke a pack a day, you inhale 400 milligrams of nicotine a week, which, in a single injection, would kill you quick as a bullet.

In factories which make nicotine insecticides, cases of acute poisoning occur now and then. One worker sat on a stool the concave seat of which held a little spilled nicotine. In less than 2 minutes he fell to the floor, blue in the face, apparently dead. Rushed to the hospital, he recovered quickly, as one does from light nicotine poisoning. But when he returned to the shop and put on those nicotine-soaked trousers again, again he fell headlong on the ground, and had to be revived a second time.

Aware that nicotine is a killer, men have tried for years to keep it out of their systems while still enjoying the smoke. All types of artificial filters take out some nicotine. The kind which uses another cigarette as a filter is said to remove 70 percent; the kind which uses a silica-gel cartridge removes 60 percent, according to claims of the manufacturers confirmed by the American Medical Association. But with a filter one is likely to smoke a cigarette until it is shorter than if a filter had not been used—usually 20 percent shorter—and that extra length is the nicotine-filled butt.

Tests of various popular brands show that the average nicotine content of Virginia-blend cigarettes is around 6 percent; of Turkish cigarettes, 1½ percent; of the so-called denicotinized cigarettes, just over 1 percent; and, strangely enough, of the strong-looking West Indian cigarettes, least of all—.86 percent.

In the 400,000,000,000 cigarettes we smoke each year there are nearly 23,000,000 gallons of nicotine. Administered with precision, this is enough to kill a thousand times the population of the United States—a wild idea, of course, but nevertheless suggestive of nicotine's lethal power.

If nicotine is such a poison then why doesn't smoking kill us? Partly because the remarkably adjustable human body can gradually build up a tolerance for larger and larger doses of poison; partly because, in smoke, it is not accumulated in sufficient quantities. Just what the harmful effects of smoking are the reader will judge for himself from the following evidence.

Do cigarettes irritate the throat? Yes, say some physicians. But other physicians say they don't. This conflict of expert opinion matters a great deal to smokers. Let us weigh various opinions and the factual experience back of them.

First, no doctor claims that smoking soothes the throat. The argument, as an editorial in the Journal of the American Medical Association puts it, hinges on "the extent to which cigarettes irritate the throat."

If you smoke a pack a day you take in 840 cubic centimeters of tobacco tar in a year. That means that you have drenched your throat and lungs with 27 fluid ounces, or 15 full cocktail glasses, of tobacco tar containing benzopyrene.

The brown stain in filters or on your handkerchiefs when you blow smoke through it is not nicotine, for nicotine is colorless, it is incompletely burned tar products, like the soot in a chimney. Many physicians suspect that its main constituent, benzopyrene, though an irritant rather than a poison, is a greater threat to heavy smokers than nicotine.

In 100 smokers who average 28 cigarettes a day, Dr. Frederick B. Flinn, of New York, found 73 with congestion of the throat, 66 with coughs, 7 with irritation of the tongue. In the AMA Journal Dr. Emil Bogen reported on 100 smokers; 80 complained of mouth irritation, and 30—not necessarily the same—complained of coughing. Said Dr. J. L. Myers, of Kansas City, "Nicotine irritates the mucous membranes of the respiratory tract. Tobacco tar injures those membranes."

It matters far more how you smoke than what you smoke, stated Dr. Arthur W. Proetz, nose and throat specialist of Washington University and editor of The Annals of Otology, Rhinology, and Laryngology: whether you puff briskly or gently, how far down the butt you smoke, how long you hold the smoke in the mouth and lungs. Rapid smoking, reports Maj. C. W. Crampton in the Military Surgeon, "greatly increases the irritation" because it brings the smoke into the mouth at temperatures up to 135° Fahrenheit.

There is probably no steady smoker who is not convinced that smoking does irritate his throat. Doctors familiar with this field comment on the persistent way smokers have of changing brands every so often in an incessant search for a less irritating cigarette.

Do cigarettes affect the stomach and digestion? Every smoker has noticed that a cigarette seems able to still the pangs of hunger for a while. This is not a delusion. The sensation of hunger is caused by contractions of the stomach walls and smoking can suppress these contractions.

By the same process, smoking interferes with the appetite and thereby with good nutrition. "We all have friends who have quit smoking and have promptly gained in weight and look like new persons," says Dr. Walter C. Alvarez, editor of Gastroenterology and specialist at the Mayo Clinic. "When a man smokes excessively he is not likely to eat well."

Excessive smoking may cause gastritis. By favoring an accumulation of acid secretions, it brings about heartburn. Relief comes in a matter of hours after the smoking stops.

Excess acidity of the stomach provides the kind of climate ulcers like. The most recent work in this field, done by New York University, showed that patients who continued to smoke during treatment for their peptic ulcers had more relapses than those who did not, or those who had never smoked at all.

At the great American clinics ulcer patients are told not to smoke. The Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans refuses to treat an individual unless he totally abstains from smoking. In Boston doctors had an interesting case some years ago, a man who had all the symptoms of duodenal ulcer. Even the X-ray showed it. But an operation found no ulcer at all. The patient stopped smoking, under orders, and his "ulcer" left him. Three months later, feeling quite well, he took up smoking again, and back came the "ulcer." This time, however, the doctors ordered him off cigarettes completely. Since he stopped smoking, he has had no more "ulcers."

Nonsmokers, in 4 years at Yale and at Amherst, grew more in height and weight and lung capacity than did their smoking colleagues. At Yale the increase in chest development of the abstainers was 77 percent better, their increase in height 24 percent greater.

At Wisconsin students were asked to hold a small metal point in a small hole, trying not to let it touch the sides. Electrical connections registered the number of times it did touch. Regular smokers were 60 percent more unsteady than nonsmokers.

Coaches are almost unanimous in saying that muscular power is lowered and fatigue begins earlier in smokers. Knute Rockne was definite: "Tobacco slows the reflexes, and any advertising which says it helps an athlete is falsehood and fraud."

Which raises the question of change in the sugar content of the blood, due to smoking—that famous "lift" which cigarettes are supposed to give the weary mortal.

Like many other claims of cigarette advertising, this one was destroyed by research. Studies at the Harvard Fatigue Laboratory concluded that there was no significant change in blood sugar in connection with smoking, hence there was no lift.

Nowhere is there any medical evidence—despite the advertisements—that smoking improves an athlete's abilities.

What does tobacco do to the heart? As to the long-run effects, medical opinions differ. As to the immediate effects of cigarette smoking upon the mechanism of the heart and upon the arteries and veins, there is no difference of opinion, for these effects are easy to observe and measure.

Smoking speeds the pulse by as much as 28 beats per minute. In this respect individuals vary, and the same individual varies at different times. The average increase in pulse due to smoking is 10 beats.

Smoking can produce arrhythmia, an irregular stop and jump of the heart which often thoroughly frightens its owner. The pulse of an unborn baby is raised when the mother smokes. Habitual smokers have a 50 percent higher incidence of palpitation of the heart than nonsmokers.

Smoking raises the blood pressure, markedly and quickly. The higher your blood pressure is, the more sharply does tobacco lift it. Apparently the blood pressure does not develop any tolerance for tobacco, as does the digestive system. Nevertheless, smoking does not cause permanent high blood pressure. When the smoking stops, the pressure falls slowly to normal.

Smoking constricts the blood vessels, especially those of the feet and hands. The smaller the blood vessel the tighter is it constricted, and often smoking closes the tiny vessels under the fingernails entirely. As soon as one starts a cigarette, the rate of blood flow in the hands decreases to less than half normal, and it stays down for about an hour.

The effect of this constriction is curious. The temperature of hands and feet drops. "Practically all the subjects who inhale show a definite drop in surface temperature at the fingertips," reported Drs. Irving Wright and Dean Moffat at New York Post Graduate Hospital. The drop averaged 5.3 degrees, was frequently more than 10 degrees, and occasionally as much as 15.5.

Nicotine constricts the veins; alcohol dilates them. When we drink and smoke at the same time, we are in effect prodding ourselves with a pitchfork to get a lift and beating ourselves on the head with a club to offset it. Hence the popular belief that taking a highball offsets the effect of taking a cigarette. Drs. Roth and Sheard at Rochester, Minn., went into this interesting possibility, making 121 tests on 65 persons. The winner was nicotine; it was more potent than alcohol; "the constricting effects of smoking cannot be prevented by alcohol."

Buerger's disease—fortunately rather uncommon—is characterized by loss of circulation in hands and feet, sometimes so serious that gangrene may form and amputation be necessary. Doctors are cautious souls and do not say that smoking causes Buerger's disease. But in a study of 1,000 sufferers from Buerger's disease 1,000 turned out to to be smokers; and of another 1,400 cases checked at Mount Sinai Hospital, New York, 1,400 were smokers. A group of 100 cases were studied for more than 10 years; in all of them the disease was arrested when smoking stopped. Dr. Irving Wright reports that in 100 consecutive cases amputation was avoided in 97 cases, but was necessary in 3—the only 3 who would not stop smoking. Only a few isolated cases have ever been reported among nonsmokers.

No more vivid and dismaying comment on the strength of habit could be imagined than the reaction of one Buerger's patient, who was told repeatedly that he must choose between smoking and progressive amputation of feet and hands. Some years later one of the doctors was hailed on the streets of Chicago by an armless, legless beggar on a little wheeled platform.

"Hey, Doc, remember me? Say, be a good scout, light a cigarette for me and stick it in my mouth; will you?"

There is no proof that smoking causes heart disease. But there is evidence that heart disease is more prevalent among smokers than among nonsmokers, and that smoking may intensify existing heart disease.

Doctors selected 1,000 men over 40 who smoked and 1,000 who did not smoke. Of the nonsmokers under 50, 1 percent had coronary disease, of the smokers 4.8 percent. Of the nonsmokers in age group 50–60, 2.6 percent had coronary disease, of the smokers 6.2 percent.

Virginia doctors, in an article on angina pectoris, point out that "coronary disease develops before the seventh decade significantly more often in smokers than in nonsmokers."

It would be difficult to select a better-qualified group of heart specialists than Dr. Paul D. White, of Boston, Dr. Robert Levy of New York, Dr. Edwin P. Maynard, of Brooklyn, and Dr. Samuel Levine, of Harvard. In brief, these four men testify as follows:

Dr. White: "Tobacco causes no actual heart disease, but may produce irregular pulse, precipitate or aggravate the angina pectoris of coronary heart disease."

Dr. Levy: "Smoking does not increase significantly the work of the heart. The more important cardiac conditions for which smoking should be prohibited are congestive heart failure, acute stages of cardiac infraction, active rheumatic carditis, and peripheral vascular disorders (disorders of the blood supply of hands and feet)."

Dr. Maynard: "In certain individuals smoking is harmful to the heart. We do not know how to tell which patient should smoke and which should not."

Dr. Levine: "In former years I used to tell patients with angina pectoris or coronary artery disease to smoke not more than two cigars or eight cigarettes a day. Now I am more inclined to urge them to omit smoking entirely."

What does all this add up to? The chief difference of opinion is as to how much damage smoking does to the heart. All doctors agree it can damage sick hearts. It is, in short, never a help and often a menace.

This probably refers to the most extensive and reliable research yet made in this field, which is now being completed by Dr. Evarts Graham and Ernest Wynder, one of his senior medical students at Washington University, St. Louis. Dr. Graham's studies will cover close to 2,000 persons in St. Louis, New York, Chicago, and Salt Lake City—the last because orthodox mormons do not smoke and therefore offer an excellent control. It is expected to show that over 95 percent of patients with lung cancer smoke a pack of cigarettes a day or more, and have done so for many years.

"Will you be able to say clearly that smoking causes lung cancer?" I asked. Dr. Graham shook his head.

"No," he replied, "but we will say that it is curious how very few nonsmokers develop lung cancer."

"Very few" is one-half of 1 percent of the victims of this disease. This contrasts with the 95 percent who are steady smokers.

Cancer of the lung, Dr. Graham stresses, has shown a shocking increase in the last 35 years. "As a possible cause," he says, "we must look for some factor in our civilization which has shown a similar increase. We eliminated carbon monoxide after examining traffic policemen who breathe it in large quantities."

While all other types of cancer were declining in frequency, the age-adjusted death rate for respiratory cancer rose steadily from 3.7 per 100,000 in 1930 to three times that in 1947. In Georgia mortality from this cause rose from 23 per 100,000 to 200 in 10 years. Dr. Alton Ochsner of the Ochsner Clinic in New Orleans says: "25 years ago I saw only one cancer of the lung in 4 years. In the last 15 years I have seen thousands. I am convinced that there is a definite relationship between smoking and cancer of the lung."

It is generally agreed that cancer of the mouth, tongue, and lips is unduly prevalent among smokers. Researchers in Michigan, Illinois, and Pennsylvania have come independently to the same conclusion: that the majority of victims of cancer of the tongue are excessive users of tobacco, that pipe smokers who develop lip cancer get it at the spot where the pipe has always rested, and that tobacco chewers, if they develop cancer, develop it at the place where the tobacco has been held.

Can smoking shorten your life? Some 10 years ago the late Dr. Raymond Pearl of Johns Hopkins studied the life span and smoking habits of 6,813 white American males. His carefully tabulated statistics tell us that if you take 300 people at the age of 30—100 of them nonsmokers, 100 light smokers and 100 heavy smokers—

Of the 100 nonsmokers, 66 will reach 60 years.

Of the 100 light smokers, 61 will reach 60.

Of the 100 heavy smokers, 46 will reach 60.

"The conclusion is clear," said Pearl, "that smoking was statistically associated with impairment of life duration. The amount of impairment increased as the amount of smoking increased."

If tobacco is so deadly, ask the doubters, why don't insurance companies consider this in their rates? Perhaps they will before long, for they have been thinking about it. Harry Dingman, in the book Risk Appraisal, published by the National Underwriter Co., says: "Use of tobacco entails extra mortality. In assessment of risk, why ignore it?" And a company medical director at an insurance meeting said, "We don't give standard insurance to excessive drinkers. I think we shouldn't give it to excessive smokers."

Higher mortality among smokers was noted in a study made by Dr. Robert A. Godell of the Phoenix Mutual Life Insurance Co. This covered 5,000 smokers and 5,000 nonsmokers.

To sum up, we can do no better than quote other figures in Mr. Dingman's insurance book: Habitual smokers have 62 percent higher incidence of gas on the stomach, 65 percent higher incidence of colds, 76 percent higher incidence of nervousness, 100 percent higher incidence of heartburn, 140 percent higher incidence of labored breathing after exertion, 167 percent higher incidence of nose and throat irritation, and 300 percent higher incidence of cough.

What does it all come down to? Think over the many theoretical and actual kinds of damage which smoking causes. Discount them all you want. Then look in vain for any evidence of any measurable good effect. Then speculate with incredulity as to why we go right on smoking.

Every day, of course, people stop smoking, and stay stopped. Given a good enough reason, almost every confirmed smoker will stop. The trouble is that the good reason usually only comes when (and because) it is too late for the smoker's health.

All this being so, why do not physicians warn their patients more helpfully about smoking? Because doctors are human, too, and many of them smoke, because many of them therefore hesitate to believe the worst

about the cigarette; and, as one physician noted sadly, "because forbidding tobacco makes the doctor unpopular."

The physicians most concerned about the dangerous effects of smoking are those who have had greatest personal experience with research into those effects.

America's Expanding Economy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MATTHEW M. NEELY

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the address which the able senior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] delivered before the congressional district meeting of the West Virginia Petroleum Association in Charleston, W. Va., on Thursday, February 2, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA'S EXPANDING ECONOMY

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, it is a great pleasure to attend this meeting and talk with you leaders in the oil industry and the truck and bus associations in this congressional district. I feel a great kinship for everyone engaged in the oil industry. As many of you know, I grew up in the oil fields of northern West Virginia. My father was a wildcatter, and I spent a great deal of my boyhood with him in the oil fields. The days were long and the work was tough, but I enjoyed it very much. Most of the old-timers I knew as a boy are gone, but one sturdy soul—Mike Benedum—still carries on in Pittsburgh. He is a grand old man—old in years, but young in spirit.

The oil industry has come a long way since those days when I worked as a boy around my father's rigs. I think it has achieved its present-day greatness because it has combined a competitive spirit of hard work and vision. The history of the oil industry is a story of great progress, a story of Americans at work eager to find new sources of oil and to develop more and better products to make our living easier and more comfortable. It is the story of an industry that has grown with the times.

When I received your kind invitation to attend this dinner, I thought I would confine my remarks to the growth of the oil industry and its role in America's present-day economy. But sitting in my office late one night last week reading a huge stack of letters from constituents I changed my mind. I decided to tackle a more difficult subject—the Nation's budget for the new fiscal year and its relationship to America's economy.

It is customary for many Americans, especially businessmen, to speak of the economy of the country in terms of how many tax dollars they give the Government. But actually that is not a true yardstick. The economy of the country can only be measured in terms of the economic status of all the people of the Nation.

The true measure of prosperity is the amount of goods and services produced by our country and the distribution of these among all the people. It is important for us to remember that our production of goods and services today is just double the level it was in 1935. Our national income today is just about 4 times the 1935 level.

This is the only true yardstick for measuring the national economy. We must examine Federal spending not in terms of some oversimplified bookkeeping approach but in terms of our basic objective of keeping our industrial plant going at full blast, keeping it growing and producing the maximum of goods and services for all our people.

If we measured our national budget on the same basis as many private businesses measure theirs, we would carry a good part of our expenses as investment. A good portion of the budget represents investment in physical facilities like roads, improvement of rivers and harbors, public works, and such physical assets—all of which contribute directly to the expansion of our productive capacity. The improvement of the Nation's health and educational opportunities directly increases the productivity of our citizens and this increased productivity means, of course, greater prosperity for the Nation as a whole. The development of our natural resources is an expense that can only be viewed as an investment.

Any fair-minded person will have to agree that conditions are better today for the great majority of Americans than at any other period of our history. Nevertheless, we still have many parents who do not earn enough money to properly care for their families. We still have too many people who live in slums, whose diet is poor. We still have too many children attending overcrowded schools with inadequate teaching facilities. We still have too many people unable to pay their doctor bills or unable to find adequate medical facilities in their community even if they can pay.

The charge is often made that many of these people are shiftless, that they are unwilling to exert the effort required to earn a better life for themselves. This may be true in a few cases, but it is not true of a large majority of that group aptly described as underprivileged. There are numerous examples of the great strides made by these so-called shiftless people when they received the opportunity to improve their living conditions and become more productive members of our society.

We have not yet achieved our goal of a decent life for all Americans, but tremendous progress has been made as we continue a program that considers the welfare of the human being and no some economic statistic as the real measure of our success.

The charge is often made that the Government, by helping its citizens, is bringing on a welfare state. The charge is also made that the Government, by helping its citizens, is threatening their liberties. I believe these charges are sheer nonsense. Such charges have been made thousands of times since 1933 and yet not one thoughtful person can show that the Government has deprived any person of any essential freedom. We have not and we shall not sacrifice any essential freedom by continuing to raise our economic goals. On the contrary, we are adding two new freedoms to those cherished by all Americans—freedom from fear and freedom from want. These are essential, almost as essential as freedom of religion and freedom of speech, if we are to preserve our democratic form of government and our system of free enterprise.

Many people say that social security is good, that Federal aid to education, slum clearance, and low-cost housing are good, that it would be a fine thing to have more medical schools and more doctors and nurses, but they also say: "We cannot afford them."

I believe that no community, no state or nation can realize its full potential if it follows an attitude of "We just cannot afford it." No nation could have become as wealthy and powerful as ours if it had not set its goals high and then encouraged the people to achieve them.

America has never been a country that was penny-wise and pound-foolish. We have always been capable of great thoughts and great actions. Any man who claims that America cannot afford to wipe out its slums, to eliminate malnutrition, to educate its children properly, and to take care of its aged or disabled citizens who cannot take care of themselves—I believe any man who claims this lacks the faith that has made our country great.

We have seen in wartime how gigantic is our ability to produce material wealth. We must continue to devote our great productive capacity to the maintenance of peace, to the elimination of unnecessary social evils, and to a more abundant life for ourselves and our children. Actually, this is the only way we can assure the survival of free enterprise. We know that in the last analysis our prosperity depends on the ability of the people to purchase the goods produced. Free enterprise can survive only if a great majority of Americans are prosperous.

I have mentioned the importance of programs like social security, improving the Nation's health, providing better educational opportunities, and substituting decent homes for slums. These are the basic programs for improving the national welfare. And yet it is interesting to note what a very small part of the Federal budget goes for these purposes. In the 1951 budget, only 6 percent of the total budget is proposed for all our social welfare, health, and security programs—and barely 4 percent for slum clearance, housing, and education.

Those who claim that welfare is the reason for our budget deficit should take a close look at the budget dollar and how it is allocated. Thirty-two cents of that dollar is going to national defense; 15 cents to veterans, 11 cents for international items, and 13 cents for interest on the debt. In other words, defense, foreign aid, veterans' programs, and debt interest account for almost $30,000,000,000 out of a total estimated expenditure for 1950–51 of $42,500,000,000. This accounts for 71 percent of the budget.

The rest of the proposed budget, about $12,500,000,000, goes for all other Government functions. This includes Federal aid to education, housing, agriculture, health; for the development of communications, power, and natural resources; for the promotion and regulation of trade and industry, and for the hundreds of other activities which the people have indicated they wanted and needed over the years.

This is the picture—and it ha. to be viewed in its entirety to be seen in true perspective. I am not any more enthusiastic than anybody else about deficit financing in a period of full employment. But the point to remember is that if we try to achieve a balanced budget by the meat-ax method, we could very easily bring about a downturn in our whole economy which would cause a severe drop in employment and the production of goods.

It has been estimated that the last brief and not-too-severe downturn in 1949 cost us $13,000,000,000, which represents the difference between what we could have produced and what we actually did produce in 1949.

A drastic cut in our budget right now could have disastrous results not just for our own economy but for the world-wide effort toward peace and economic security. That is the danger the administration had uppermost in mind in formulating the budget.

The administration has pointed out that we are moving toward a balanced budget within the next few years. Decreases in foreign aid, in our commitments to veterans, and perhaps in our military needs will make this possible. Our program of an expanding economy will bring us to that desired goal of a balanced budget in a much shorter time than many of the critics are prophesying today.

The administration hopes through the implementation of the Hoover Commission recommendations to bring about better administrative policies, eliminating duplication, and thus saving on administrative expenses. Through such Government reorganization, through an expanding economy, and through the eventual decrease in foreign aid and the cost of our military establishment, we can look forward to both a balanced budget and healthy prosperity as well.

We must keep uppermost in our minds that an expanding economy is necessary not only to maintain domestic prosperity but in order that we can carry out our commitments in the struggle for world peace. I do not believe President Truman was overstating the case when, in his economic report to the Congress, he said: ". . . our programs for national security and international peace . . . are the defense of the world against disaster. Upon them, our whole future depends."

Our foreign-assistance program is one that has been given the most careful study by various executive agencies, by the President, and by the Congress. The funds that have been allocated to the European economic-recovery program and the funds which have been allocated to the military-assistance program, as well as every other sum loaned or given for foreign aid, have all been studied in the light of American interests, as well as the wider interests that indirectly affect us.

Our primary objective is a peaceful and prosperous world, because peace and prosperity for America alone cannot be insured in a vacuum. We cannot afford to lull ourselves into the complacent theory that our only concern is our own immediate welfare. The twentieth century has turned the word "welfare" into an international concept instead of an individual concept. If 150,000,000 Americans fare well, this cannot fail to influence the economy of other nations. By the same token, if the other peoples of the world fare badly, their political and economic despair cannot fail to affect our own economy. In the words of a famous poet, "There are no islands any more." There is no escape from the impact of external events on our own affairs.

That will be the dominating thought in my mind when I am called upon, as a member of the Appropriations Committee, to go over foreign-assistance appropriations. As a member of that committee, I can assure you that every item, both domestic and foreign, in the budget will be carefully scrutinized. Wherever possible, items will be cut. I think it may be possible to make some reductions in foreign-assistance items, but, at the same time, speaking for myself, I am going to look at each proposed cut from two carefully balanced viewpoints: What will it mean to the budget now, and what will it mean in terms of prosperity and world peace tomorrow?

This country has been struggling toward big goals and big ideals for many years now—in fact, ever since this Nation was formed. Would anybody have believed 170 years ago that we would become the richest and most powerful country in the world? With the same courage and common sense that brought us this far, we can achieve the goal we are presently striving for—peace and security for ourselves and for the whole closely knit world. We can do it by keeping our own economy expanding and healthy and by giving other countries the opportunity to find peace and security for themselves.

Award of Poor Richard Medal of Achievement to Paul G. Hoffman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on January 17, 1950, Mr. Paul G. Hoffman, our very able ECA administrator, was awarded the Poor Richard Medal of Achievement at the annual Franklin Day celebration held in Philadelphia under the auspices of the Poor Richard Club of Philadelphia. I believe that no one could more richly deserve an award that is given with the ideals of Benjamin Franklin in mind. In Paul Hoffman can once again be seen the imagination, optimism, and faith of Ben Franklin. And in him we see a man who, like Ben Franklin, is ever ready to meet the challenge of the times in a courageous and confident manner. Mr. Hoffman, an American businessman, is, in his role as Chief Administrator of the ECA, handling a job that embodies every American principle of integrity, a job that is worldwide in its scope, a job that is of the utmost importance if we are to gain world peace and security.

At the Franklin Day celebration Mr. Hoffman delivered a speech which I think should be of interest to all of us. That speech not only explained what ECA has done and is continuing to do but it also paid high tribute to the American spirit—a spirit of freedom and integrity—which has played a tremendous role in the shaping of world affairs and which must and will continue to do so.

At the same celebration I was also given the privilege of addressing the audience. However, my duties here in the Senate prevented me from arriving in time to deliver the address myself. The speech was delivered on my behalf by Mr. William Berry, past president of the Poor Richard Club.

I ask unanimous consent to have both Mr. Hoffman's address and mine at the Franklin Day celebration printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BENJAMIN FRANKLIN MEMORIAL BUILDING

(This speech was delivered by William Berry, past president of Poor Richard Club, in behalf of Senator MYERS, who was unable to attend)

We are paying tribute today to a distinguished American whose interests, like Franklin's, are not confined to one field.

We are honoring a man who has proved that he is not afraid of new ideas; who has shown that he is capable, as Franklin was, of adapting himself to change. A man who has something of Franklin's bold imagination and optimism and faith, who like Franklin courageously and confidently has met the challenge of hi

Paul Gray Hoffman fits the description of world statesman in the finest meaning of the words. For the job that he has done in a difficult assignment and at a critical period in our history, he has earned the gratitude of his countrymen and has carved for himself a place of prominence and importance in the annals of this century.

I think it is most fitting at this particular moment in world history that the Poor Richard Club should award its gold medal of achievement to a businessman. Business has a tremendous role to play in the rehabilitation and development of the world economy, in the securing of human freedom and dignity to all people who desire it, and are willing to pay the price for it. Particularly will this be true when someday, in the not far distant future, our Government's large-scale aid to nations, now struggling for their living against Communist aggression, must be reduced or ended. Not this year or next year—because, as Paul Hoffman will tell you, the weak are not yet strong, the fires are not all out. But when the day does come, when ECA has completed its unprecedented and supremely essential mission, then will American business assume a role of heroic proportions as it is called upon to revitalize and expand the world's economy.

Many Americans and people of other countries are coming to realize that there is an economic base which supports political and religious freedom. Religious and political liberty walk hand in hand with a free economy and with the free exchange of goods and ideas. We have seen in totalitarian countries a pattern which tragically demonstrates this truth. Where private enterprise has been destroyed, political and religious freedom have fallen too.

That is why, at this time, I feel your choice of a business leader as your gold medal recipient for 1950 is a singularly appropriate one. Paul Hoffman represents a new kind of businessman, a type of businessman who has developed out of the needs of our times. He deserves to be called an enlightened businessman, if you please, an industrial statesman. He has none of the provincialism that has characterized so many American businessmen in the past. He has a wider vision, a truly global outlook. An acute realization of the necessity for American business to recognize its social and world responsibilities, and particularly its obligation to provide industrial and financial leadership and "know how" for the world, a leadership that only it can provide.

You know, there is no reason why a businessman should be provincial or concerned only with business affairs. Benjamin Franklin demonstrated that. Perhaps we don't often think of Franklin as a businessman, but he was one of the most successful businessmen of his day. He made a great deal of money, so much that he once offered to pay for the tea that some hot-headed patriots dumped into Boston Harbor, although it would have cost him $75,000. He was the most successful newspaper and magazine publisher of his generation. He built so well that one of his publications, the Pennsylvania Gazette, still is being published under the name of our own city's Saturday Evening Post. Another, Poor Richard's Almanack, was born again as the official publication of the Poor Richard Club.

The catalog of Franklin's amazing accomplishments is a familiar one. Writer, publisher, inventor, educator, scientist, diplomat—one of the two or three most versatile geniuses the world has ever known. Yet despite all this enormous activity, he found time—as Paul Hoffman has—to serve his country—and how brilliantly, every school child knows.

But Franklin was a great businessman. He bargained with his neighbors and with nations. He believed devoutly in the im-

portance of trade. He took the lead in helping to develop new enterprises and profitable investments in the then undeveloped colonies which became with the passage of years the great industrial heart of these United States. Franklin was willing to invest his capital, to take the risk, of backing new enterprises throughout the American Colonies and even in the West Indies in the establishment of their own businesses, taking for himself a return from earnings.

I call your attention to this phase of Franklin's business activities because I feel the times demand the same kind of faith and enterprise from American businessmen and investors on a world-wide scale.

In his inaugural address in January of 1949, President Truman listed as point four of his program for world peace and prosperity the investment of American dollars and "know how" in the development of the still undeveloped areas of the earth in order to raise standards of living for the people of other nations and to make it possible for them to enjoy some of the material benefits which we in America enjoy. Such a program would be in our own self interest, as well, because only in a world where other peoples can enjoy prosperity can we in America live in prosperity and peace.

It seems to me that the only logical and eventual successor or substitute for the European recovery program and for aid to the Far East, which is, after all, a temporary expedient, is the development of the underdeveloped areas of the earth, the building of new businesses and industries and customers, on a really gigantic scale by American private enterprise. This is the challenge which faces American business and the American investor today.

To meet this challenge will require the daring imagination, the faith, and confidence which Franklin so well exemplified. With American businessmen of the caliber of Paul Hoffman to lead us, I am confident that it is a challenge that will be met successfully.

I know of no one who so richly deserves the honor you are about to bestow upon him. Paul Hoffman, by his achievements, has reflected credit upon his country and upon the whole of American business.

Thank you.

ADDRESS BY PAUL G. HOFFMAN, ECONOMIC COOPERATION ADMINISTRATOR

It was with some initial misgiving that I heard I was to receive the Poor Richard Award. I wondered what Poor Richard himself would have thought of any award being made to me in his name. Here I am, a man administering a program involving billions of dollars, the greater part being distributed as gifts. True, I think those billions will bring us great returns, but even in the case of the loans I cannot point to excellent security or a high-interest rate. The returns on both the loans and gifts must be measured largely in terms of intangibles. But those intangibles are such that, as I have studied the life of Benjamin Franklin, I felt much easier in my mind and I decided I could accept the award with a reasonably clear conscience.

Benjamin Franklin was many sorts of a man. He was a scientist, inventor, statesman, philosopher, editor, and, may I proundly add, a businessman. Now he wasn't all of these things separatively, he was all of them at once and together. One of the reasons, I think, for his notable serenity was the fact that the many parts of his life were brought together into an integrated whole. Perhaps that integration also accounts for the fact that, though a businessman, he lived to enjoy an ulcer-free old age. At any rate, it was this breadth of integrated interest that gave soundness to Franklin's life and soundness to his contributions.

Benjamin Franklin's first reaction to this $15,000,000,000 program of ECA's would undoubtedly be one of great shock. But after that initial shock, he would, I am sure, in order to get perspective, want to look around and see how this project would fit into the current world scene. And then, from the vantage point of that knowledge, he would direct his inquiring and penetrating mind toward the objectives of ECA, and the manner in which we were going about achieving them.

The initial shock of a $15,000,000,000 figure on Franklin would undoubtedly be softened once he learned that our annual gross income today had reached the astounding figure of $250,000,000,000. He might be distressed, but would unquestionably be impressed, by the cost of the wars we have fought. You can guess for yourself what he would think when told that the out-of-pocket cost of World War II to the United States of America alone was between three hundred and forty and three hundred and eighty billion dollars, and that the ultimate cost, according to Mr. Gordon Gray, Secretary of the Army, will be in the neighborhood of $1,400,000,000,000. If you want my guess, Franklin would think, in view of these costs, that a way must be found to insure future peace. He would, of course, marvel at the telephone, radio, television, the steamships, automobiles, airplanes, and the atomic bomb. He would be astounded by, but understand, some of the great developments in the field of electronics far better than most of us here understand them. I rather think the modern development which would impress him most is the speed of travel, and the manner in which that has shrunk the world. With his quick mind, he would not need to be told that a shattered European economy is a liability to the United States, to every family in this vast and once isolated land of ours; and the further fact that a prosperous and thriving European economy is a vital asset to the United States and to every American. He would, I am sure, approve what we are doing to help get Europe back on its feet. To him, that would make economic sense. It would appeal to his common sense too, because he knew that the most useful charity is that charity which raises people above the need of charity.

Benjamin Franklin would also, I believe, agree that the job we are trying to do in Europe makes political sense. We are trying to help the Europeans to create those conditions under which free institutions can flourish and free men live in decency and dignity. The Europeans, with our help, are going about that job in a hard and practical way. They have devoted themselves to increasing production in the plants and on the farms, to freeing markets, and to facilitating convertibility, one with the other, of the various national currencies.

Yes, I believe that Benjamin Franklin would heartily approve of the economic and political objectives of ECA. But that doesn't necessarily mean that he would approve the very large expenditures called for by the program, some of which have been made, some only planned for. He would have to be shown and it would be up to us to show him.

In seeking his approval, we would, first of all, want to impress him with the scope of the undertaking and the conditions under which we were laboring.

The first broad principles which led to ECA were laid down by General Marshall, then Secretary of State, in his historic speech at Harvard University on June 5, 1947. In that speech, General Marshall called upon the nations of Europe to join in a vast, cooperative effort to repair their shattered economic health as the only means whereby political stability could be restored, progress resumed, and freedom once more set firmly on its feet. For our part in that undertaking General Marshall declared that the Government of the United States stood ready to "do whatever it is able to do to assist." There were no ideological strings attached to that offer. It was an offer made in good faith. It was backed by good will. Its sole objective was a more prosperous world in which peace and freedom would be more secure. And when that offer was made, we believed—or at least we hoped—that that was an objective which every government shared, and that that was a task in which every government would be not merely willing but eager to join.

The nations of Europe quickly accepted our challenge. In Paris, hardly a week after General Marshall's speech, the representatives of most European nations—east and west—met to accept our offer and begin to turn that challenge into practical achievement. That meeting was attended by the representative of the Soviet Union in the person of Mr. Molotov, its foreign minister. It looked for the moment as though, on this technical and desperately urgent level of economic recovery, something close to joint cooperative action for the common good was about to be achieved. For 3 days, Molotov attended that Paris meeting and for those 3 days the hopes of freedom-loving, peace-seeking nations ran high. Then on the third day, Molotov, with his entourage of satellites in tow, walked out of the meeting and enplaned for Moscow.

That departure, as we now know, was not merely another uncouth Communist gesture. We know now as Walter Lippmann so trenchantly said, that it was a declaration of a "cold war..' It was a declaration of war by world communism against recovery in the free world. And the issues brought into conflict by that declaration were no less momentous for us because the tactics employed were those of a cold war rather than a hot war.

Thus it appears that ECA today is not what it started out to be. It is much more than that. It is true that through ECA America's dollars are being used for foreign aid; but it is not true—in fact, it is dangerously untrue—to describe ECA any longer merely as foreign aid or to regard it any longer as merely a foreign-aid program. The truth is that ECA has become not only a first line of defense for western civilization, but an instrumentality for advancing the cause of freedom—not only America's freedoms and America's free institutions, but freedoms and free institutions everywhere. To regard ECA as any less than that is to reveal a perilous lack of knowledge about the menacing facts of our world. It is to reveal a perilous lack of understanding of what is required of us if we are to help establish a world in which the children of free men can live in peace.

Once Benjamin Franklin knew the scope of ECA's activities, and the conditions under which it has been endeavoring to carry out its mandate to help the Europeans get Europe back on its feet, he would be all the more eager to know how the battle was going. Instead of reporting myself, I would call his attention to the report of a fellow Philadelphian, because he had infinite faith in his neighbors. The Philadelphian is Moreley Cassidy of the Philadelphia Bulletin, and here is what he wrote after a tour of the Marshall-plan countries:

"With American help, Europe has suddenly come alive. The stumbling, be..ildered, sickly Europe that cringed with fear at every Communist frown is gone.

"In its place is a Europe that feels blood in its veins again.

"Its people are better fed and better dressed. Their houses are warmer. They

are working hard, with better tools, and producing more of everything from electric power and coal to wheat, butter, and baby buggies.

"Because they are stronger, they get angry instead of cringing when Communists try to smash their efforts to rebuild. They have begun to fight back."

If that report of Mr. Cassidy's did not persuade Benjamin Franklin that we are getting on with our task, nothing could. Unlike a few of his fellow Americans, I don't believe that Franklin would need any persuading that this program of ours should be carried through for its full 4 years. In all his long life he never quit a job half done. He would not only approve our finishing it, but I feel certain we would have his enthusiastic support. That certainty of mine stems from my belief that there is a further aspect to soundness—the kind of soundness Franklin believed in. When I was thinking about this talk someone very thoughtfully brought in a copy of Poor Richard's Almanac. When I opened it, I saw—somewhat to my surprise—that the first maxim was this: "The noblest question in the world is this: What good may I do in it?" That, I like to think, would still be Franklin's first maxim; just as, I believe it is America's first maxim. After we have judged the economic and the political soundness of the enterprise we are engaged in, there is still a more basic test to pass. That is the test of moral soundness. The test of finding out—not merely whether it is economically or politically sound—but whether it is right.

That is a test that has always been—and still is—soundly American. For America is more than the sum total of all its resources. It is more than the accumulation of all its political experiences and institutions. America, basically, is a moral achievement. As a Nation, we are what we are because of what we believe, and because—with all our failings—of our success in living up to our beliefs. As Americans, we have had a way, in our history, of doing the right thing for no other reason than that it was the right thing.

And this desire on our part has been above selfishness and above self-interest. From the very beginning Americans had a sense of mission about America. They believed that the great and good society which they were founding here was not for their own good, only, but for the good of all mankind.

Let me quote you a few sentences from Abraham Lincoln. This was in February 1861. Lincoln was on his way from Springfield to Washington for his first inaugural. Secession had already begun. The Union was torn. America was passing under an ominous cloud. On the way to Washington Lincoln stopped here in Philadelphia. A crowd gathered at Independence Hall to hear him. There, speaking informally, Lincoln said: "I have never had a feeling politically that did not spring from the Declaration of Independence * * * I have often inquired of myself what great principle it was that kept this confederacy so long together. It was something in that declaration giving liberty, not alone to the people of this country, but hope for the world for all future time. It was that which gave promise that in due time the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men, and that all should have an equal chance. This is the sentiment embodied in the Declaration of Independence * * * I would rather be assassinated on this spot than surrender."

That was the authentic voice of America—of an America, conscious and proud that its mission involved a better life for all men everywhere. And because of that high concept of what America was, because of the fires of hope which America lighted in men's hearts, millions of people came here and found what they had dreamed of, but scarcely dared to hope for. America has been what its founding fathers deeply believed it could be.

Perhaps—as some people sometimes say—there is very little political sex appeal in idealism. But I don't believe it. I am proud of the fact—and every American should be proud of it—that this great enterprise, the Marshall plan, is economically and politically sound. But I am even prouder—and every American will share that pride—that it is morally sound. I believe that ECA is America being American, as Benjamin Franklin intended America to be.

Fifty Million Bushels of Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH E. FLANDERS
OF VERMONT
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FLANDERS. Mr. President, I have in my hand a letter from a constituent, Mr. Harold K. Burt, and signed by a considerable number of fellow constituents, in which they call attention to the fact that as citizens they have bought 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. They humbly petition that each of them may receive his proportionate share of the potatoes which they have bought. I ask unanimous consent that this letter be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I should like to point out to the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS] that 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes amount to 200,000,000 pecks, which would entitle each citizen to 1 peck.

Mr. FLANDERS. To a peck and a third.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WINDSOR, VT., *February 3, 1950.*

Hon. RALPH E. FLANDERS,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR FLANDERS: It is currently reported in the newspapers that the Secretary of Agriculture has 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes that he does not have the business ability to dispose of at anywhere near cost price to the Government, and that he threatens to sell these at a loss or to destroy them.

We understand there is a population of approximately 150,000,000 people. By arithmetic, my share of this surplus of potatoes would be one-third of a bushel. Having been unable to purchase anything but second-grade potatoes during the past winter because the Department bought up all of the good potatoes, will you kindly transmit this request to the Secretary of Agriculture, and ask him to send me, parcel post forthwith, my one-third bushel share of the potatoes which the collector of internal revenue can certify that I have paid for through my tax bills. My wife is also entitled to her one-third bushel. Please have them sent at the same time.

I believe, sir, that it would be a crime against this country and its taxpayers, and an everlasting insult to God Almighty if this portion of our food should be wantonly destroyed to satisfy some political whim or ulterior motive on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture.

I am joined in these sentiments, and in this request, by certain other fellow citizens who are likewise married people and entitled to potatoes for themselves and their wives, and their names and addresses appear below.

You will understand, of course, that I am not holding you personally responsible for this outrageous situation, and I trust that you are doing everything possible to bring back a little sanity into the operation of our Government in Washington.

Very truly yours,

HAROLD K. BURT.

We, the undersigned, join in the foregoing request to have our share of the surplus potatoes sent to us for our own use.

John E. Rockstrom, H. H. Weld, G. H. Pratt, C. P. Audette, W. H. Washburn, C. E. Miller, Windsor, Vt.; Leon Cleveland, Ascutney, Vt.; Wm. Fierne, Windsor, Vt.; George Northrop, Plainfield, N. H.; R. S. Lombard, N. L. Nichols, Gordon F. Cushing, Wm. C. Farrell, Windsor, Vt.

National Security Resources Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the column entitled "Washington Scene," by George Dixon, which appeared in the Times-Herald this morning, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD. Mr. Dixon is a difficult person to either startle or shock. What has caused him concern may arouse a similar interest in others.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON SCENE
(By George Dixon)

Eleven months ago the Senate turned down Mon Wallgren for Chairman of the National Security Resources Board, one of the four most important positions in the world, on the ground that the job was too big for him.

Wallgren, in addition to being a renowned poker player, had been a Member of the House of Representatives, Governor of the State of Washington, and a United States Senator. Yet his former colleagues decided the National Security Resources Board required a man of wider economic and industrial experience and competency as Chairman.

Wallgren was handed the final thumbs down on March 15, 1949. The job hasn't been filled with a permanent Chairman yet.

Ho! ho! and haw! haw! Who do you think has been doing the actual work of running one of the four most important positions in the world since the former Representative-Governor-Senator was rejected as not having the stature?

Wallgren's former clerk.

To top the irony—pardon me a moment while I giggle some more in unholy glee—President Truman has since nominated Wallgren to the Federal Power Commission,

and the Senators agreed he was competent enough for a job like that.

But the work that was considered far beyond his capabilities has been handled by the man he brought with him to Washington to run his errands.

The disclosure that Wallgren's former minion, Jack O. Gorrie, is running the works came about at a hearing before the House Subcommittee on Appropriations for the Armed Services and caused not a ripple. The committee members heard it without apparently recognizing its significance.

But the appropriations come over to the Senate in a couple of weeks and you can look for squawks that will shake the Chamber. Senator HARRY P. CAIN, of Washington, who led the fight to bar Wallgren, will probably give vent to conniptions.

CAIN, who made the battle almost a personal one (he abhors Wallgren with devoted abhoration), will cry for blood when he gets the full pitch on Gorrie.

In theory, and on paper, Assistant to the President, John R. Steelman is Acting Chairman of the National Resources Security Board, but he can't give much of his time to it. The redoubtable Dr. Steelman has too many other things to do.

The House subcommittee did not crowd Gorrie on who is running Security Resources, but the Senate will. In the report of the House hearings the testimony as to the time devoted to the Board by the Acting Chairman was confined to three short paragraphs.

Representative GEORGE H. MAHON, of Texas, chairman, asked Gorrie: "How much time does Dr. Steelman, the Acting Chairman, give to the work of the Board?"

Gorrie: "He is in the office almost every day. He comes over to the office and spends from an hour to sometimes almost a full day. Most of the time I would say he was there on an average of possibly 2 to 2½ or 3 hours. Usually it is in the afternoon of each day.

"We are in contact with him on the telephone, of course, on questions which arise when he is not there physically."

Don't you love that "almost every day"; "sometimes almost a full day"; "an average of possibly," etc., etc.?

How many of you, my gentle readers, have jobs that take up an average of possibly, approximately, almost, well nigh, pretty near, some of almost, approximately, possibly, every day on an average?

Roosevelt Day Dinner Address by Hon. Hubert H. Humphrey, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Roosevelt Day dinner address by the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], national chairman of Americans for Democratic Action, at Pittsburgh, Pa., on January 24, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Throughout the land, speakers at ADA-sponsored dinners in memory of Franklin D. Roosevelt are discussing freedom of inquiry in a democratic society. In this age of anxiety, of tensions, and of great changes, few subjects are more worthy of discussion. Franklin Roosevelt, with his great insight, knew this well. "Freedom to learn," he said, "is the first necessity of guaranteeing that man himself shall be self-reliant enough to be free."

Why is it necessary to stress freedom of inquiry today? Does not everyone agree with Thomas Jefferson's observation that inquiry leads to truth? Certainly no one who ever went to second-year high-school science class can dispute it. When we wanted to see what a microbe looked like, we put it under a miscroscope. We inquired, and we found the truth.

No, you can't deny that inquiry leads to truth. But there are many who regret that it does, because they don't want the truth to be known.

This, I think, is why it is important that we discuss freedom of inquiry tonight. In this country and in the world there are powerful forces who would close the channels of inquiry, require a strict conformity from all the people, and keep our society right and unchanging. Regardless of the specific names they are known by in their own land, they all stand for the unquestioning acceptance of things as they are. They equate inquiry with subversion and conformity with patriotism.

But this has never been the way the American people have wanted it. From the early days of the New England town meetings our country has always stood for free discussion—freedom to question, freedom to examine, freedom to inquire. If I may quote President Roosevelt again, in one of those perceptive remarks we learned to expect from him: "You will never have a completely stable world without freedom of knowledge."

There are two ways of reporting history. The first is in terms of battles won and lost and the fall and rise of government; the other is in terms of the discoveries of the mind. In every generation the mind of man reaches out to new length and never shrinks back to its former dimensions. Fortunately, though man is mortal, his thoughts and ideas are immortal. Each generation salvages the immortality of the preceding ones to create a steady progression of civilization.

The creative ideas of man have developed fast in recent years. It was only 300 years ago that man began to seriously question himself about the nature of the physical world in which he lived.

The seventeenth century was characterized by the great intellectual revolution, the age of science. Men became possessed with the idea that the physical universe was their concern—that they could ask questions about natural phenomena without incurring the wrath of God. They became possessed with the idea that there were physical laws they could fathom. Here, indeed, was the triumph of Copernicus, Galileo, Newton—men of ideas, men fearlessly inquiring into the unknown.

The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries were characterized by new inquiries, by new ideas that possessed men—the idea that if there were physical laws of the universe that men could fathom and ask questions about, then why not inquire about the nature of man-made society.

With this inquiring, the ideology of democracy came into being.

Until the First World War this ideology of democracy was on the offensive. The action against it was rear guard, defensive, and uncertain. Democracy was the concept of today and tomorrow. Men everywhere heard of it and spoke of it and acted to achieve it.

But, in this generation democracy has been challenged by another ideology. In Italy, Germany, and Russia the leaders talked of what they said was a "new order"—something new and streamlined.

But what did we see when we examined this "new order"? We have found it wasn't new at all. It was the old, old doctrine of authoritarianism, pushed with the force of guns and marching feet—yes, nothing more than the ancient curse of "divine right" of the strong to rule the weak.

Democracy met and conquered this old concept years ago in nearly every civilized nation of the world. Today, if we fully understand the power of inquiry, the power of our idea and its full meaning, we can easily maintain the eminence of the democratic faith that only yesterday spread from mind to mind and heart to heart throughout the world.

Of all people who should understand the strength of freedom of inquiry, the power of democracy, the American people should be the first. Our idea of democracy was embodied in the Preamble to the Declaration of Independence, and in the words of our Constitution. It has as its philosophers Samuel Adams, Thomas Jefferson, James Madison, Tom Paine, Abraham Lincoln, Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt. These men all spoke of the same ideology; all were possessed of the same idea. They sought to free men from fear; to free them from poverty; to free them from social and economic injustice, and from insecurity, they sought freedom of inquiry.

Strange as it may seem, America has let loose upon this world the most powerful and dynamic political and social force in the history of man. It has its roots deep in the spiritual substance of Judeo-Christianity. It receives its political inspiration from the logic of the stoics, the compassion of the martyrs, the faith of the philosophers of natural law. We are of the first to present to the modern world a coherent political faith based upon the dignity of the individual, the equality and fraternity of mankind. We are of the first to pattern a structure of government and a form of society in which the liberties of a people were guaranteed and opportunity was to be assured.

This was an idea—or better to say—an ideology more powerful than the armies of the conquerors. History proves this fact. It was our call to freedom in 1776 and our realization of a government of the people, by the people, and for the people that let loose in this world a social and political revolution. This revolution upset the thrones of Europe and convulsed the continent. It put into the hearts and breasts of the colonial people, the under-privileged, and the subjected, the consuming desire of individual liberty, a desire which today is manifested by such rebellions as we see in Indochina, in Indonesia, and in the fact of India's freedom. We never moved a battalion or a regiment on the continent of Europe in the 1800's, yet the idea of the Declaration of Independence produced the doctrine of the rights of man and broke the back of oppression and the power of kings.

Today, too, the vital force in the world is the search for freedom. We see many manifestations of it: the rise of nationalism of the colonial peoples; the oppressed and the poverty stricken following the leadership of those who use the symbols of freedom, even though their purpose may be otherwise. We find economists and political philosophers talking in terms of abundance within the framework of individual freedom. Men are no longer just content to talk of their security. They want security and liberty. The humanitarian of this generation is one who understands the interdependence of these two principles—freedom and security.

There are those who today feel we have moved away from this idea, when in fact it is but maturing. It is growing strong in its own sense of competence and rich in its experience. The great political and social experiments taking place in Europe—in the free countries of Europe—are but another expression of this idea of democracy. Our groping and experimentation in the hall of

Congress, evolving such programs as the new freedom and the New Deal are but further expressions of a people with the desire to emancipate themselves from fear, from insecurity, and from oppression.

No better example of our maturing democracy can be found than the ever-growing demand that all people, regardless of race, color, or creed, be guaranteed full and equal civil rights. The morality of our democratic faith compels us to cleanse our body politic of the guilt that arises from our distortion of democratic principles through discrimination and bigotry. The American people are acting to redeem their honor. In city after city—in State after State—human rights are being reaffirmed and protected by law. The democratic spirit of the people now calls upon our National Government to destroy the last vestige of intolerance.

Our maturing democracy calls for the recognition that all must be free from insecurity. All must be privileged to enjoy the opportunity of good health, of productive work, of education, of adequate housing, and of decent living conditions.

This is democracy's answer to the challenge of totalitarianism.

One of the finest examples of the spirit of freedom and free inquiry in a democratic society was the investigation and report 2 years ago of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights. Its report added immeasurably to America's store of knowledge about itself: 44 lynchings in 11 years, with not a single person given the death penalty for these crimes. The poll tax and other ballot restrictions, denying the vote to literally millions of Americans. Newspaper help-wanted ads offering jobs for which only whites or gentiles need apply, and job seekers required to list their religion on application blanks. The demonstrable fraud of separate but equal schools for whites and Negroes. Job discrimination keeping minority groups in relative poverty.

On the basis of these findings, President Truman formulated his civil-rights program and sent it to Congress. These proposals have languished there for 2 years, kept in the shadows of inaction by the combined power of Republicans and Dixiecrats. But the test is approaching. I'm sure many of you heard about the national emergency civil rights mobilization which took place in Washington earlier this month. Fifty-three national organizations took part in it, including ADA. The 4,000 people who attended the mobilization were earnest, devoted, non-Communist liberals. They buttonholed practically every Member of the Senate and talked frankly to them on the civil-rights bills, and particularly FEPC. Many of my colleagues were deeply impressed. Given this kind of encouragement, we who are committed to the civil-rights proposals can make a much better fight when the issue comes up. It will come up shortly, and I promise you that the fight for fundamental decency in human relations will be made.

The reactionaries, the racists, the monopolists—all of them are loudly protesting their love of freedom these days. They profess to see danger to freedom in the minimum standards of security which the people are seeking to set up through their Government. But the conservatives' devotion to freedom hardly ever embraces protection of basic civil liberties against the peril of contemporary hysterias and the intolerant demand for unquestioning acquiescense in things as they are.

That is why this country so desperately needed ♣ Franklin D. Roosevelt. That is why it needs today the vigor of the liberal movement that honors him on this day. That is why America needs an ADA.

Today we are a country incomparably the strongest, the richest, the best protected in the globe. Our Nation and our Constitution have withstood the vicissitudes of 160 years. Our people are intelligent and they are moral, they are devoted to freedom.

The real danger we face is that a fear of free inquiry will produce an atmosphere of suspicion and timidity that will discourage independence of thought, original investigation, and association. The real danger we face is that a program of suppression will seriously endanger effective operation of our democracy.

The real danger we face is that a spirit of hysteria will endanger the morale of American science by putting a premium on mediocrity in a field requiring independence, originality and full freedom of inquiry and communication.

The real danger we face is that a society gripped by fear strengthens the hand of the military in areas traditionally and wisely entrusted to civilian control.

The real danger we face is that freedom of teaching will be imperiled by requiring conformity to standards, by introducing the grave peril of censorship in textbooks and ideas and drive away from the teaching profession men and women of independent minds. We must guard lest it create an atmosphere in which teachers find safety not in orthodox ideas, for they will never know fully which ideas are orthodox, but safety in no ideas.

Yes, the real danger we face is that the right and necessity of criticism is threatened. No government can operate successfully without criticism and no government which censors its critics can get the criticism that it needs.

Finally, the real danger we face is that the hysteria we are confronted with, strikes at one of the most precious of all rights, one essential to the effective operation of democracy, the right of association. As Professor Commager recently pointed out, the practice of voluntary association is a peculiarly English and American practice. The Pilgrim Fathers associated themselves into a compact and since that time Americans have customarily operated around hundreds of voluntary associations: Political parties, parent-teacher, Federal, business, fraternity, philanthropic, recreational, learned and others. It is in these associations that the average American has found the training for government and real democracy to take the place of the town meeting. Any policy which discourages or crushes voluntary associations will totally dry up the very roots of American democracy.

Our security lies not in secrecy but in the preservation of peace and in the encouragement of free inquiry; our real long-term security lies in perfecting our own democracy. Even as our society now exists, it is the freest in the world and confers the most benefits on the humblest of citizens. We must make sure that it is kept free and flexible.

National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem Hebron Yeshivah

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a dedication to the National Youth Rehabilitation Center of Jerusalem Hebron Yeshivah. The statement is a foreword to the journal of this organization which will be published in connection with its benefit dinner on March 19, 1950. The journal will depict 50 centuries of Jewish history and will be dedicated to the common brotherhood of all men of good will.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Yeshivah Hebron is a landmark in the Eternal City where every site is a pageant, featuring centuries of awe-inspiring history; where every cave is a labyrinth and her every alley reflecting the immortality of her heroes and prophets, rebels and saints, kings and princes shrouded in timeless majesty.

Her harness, studded with Biblical jewels, Jerusalem discovered in Yeshivah Hebron, yet another shield. Though soft and pilpulistic, the voices that emanate from the great yeshivah set the music to Jerusalem's ornamental lyrics and open the vaults to her Torah treasures.

The voice of the melodious shepherd sounds yet in prophetic rhapsody—"from Zion shall come forth Torah and the word of God from Jerusalem."

Yeshivah Hebron cannot be estimated as the exclusive property of any one region or populace, because of her territorial periphery she is a panoramic to which every Jew may lay claim. Nothing circumvallates her edifice; her influence and authority is not restricted to her seat in Jerusalem. On the contrary, her very structure and concept makes Yeshivah Hebron the common responsibility of all Jews as is, indeed, the Eternal City.

To understand fully the function of Yeshivah Hebron it is imperative that we give here the origin of yeshivahs and a brief but concise history of their relation to world Jewry.

The term "yeshivah" and the Aramaic equivalent, "mesivtah," both found in the Talmud, originally meant a session, a council, or a meeting of scholars, over which presided the elder. The patriarchs were all elders of a yeshivah (Yuma 28b).

During the Talmudic period, the principal Eretz Yisrael Yeshivahs were at Sephoris, Tiberias, and Caesarea, while those of Babylon were at Mahuza, Nehavdea, Sura, and Pumbedisa.

In Babylon and Levant during the fourth century, the yeshivahs assumed the functions of rabbinical colleges, where young men were prepared for the rabbinate. Until the beginning of the ninth century, the Jews in European countries and elsewhere depended entirely on, and abided by, the decisions of the authorities in the yeshivahs of Babylon which they supported liberally. It was largely due to the encouragement of Charlemagne—who jointly with his brother Carloman, ruled over France, Germany, Spain, and Italy—that the learned men of Babylon emigrated and established yeshivahs in France and Germany.

With the beginning of the eleventh century, the seat of the yeshivahs was firmly established in France, Spain, Germany, Italy, Holland, and Poland.

Not until the sixteenth century did yeshivahs again begin to flourish in Eretz Yisrael—in Safed under Berab; in Caro—and in Jerusalem under Levi ibn Haviv.

During the rise of the Hasidic and Reform movements, which the yeshivahs regarded as a threat to the method and style of study augmented by Reb Elijah, the Gaon of Wilna, Reb Hayyim of Volozhin, a pupil of the Gaon, organized in 1803 the celebrated Yeshivah of Volozhin, a small town in the state of Wilna, and his own birthplace.

When God decreed the death of Moses, the prophet's primary request was "Let the Lord, the God of the spirits of all flesh, set a man * * * that the congregation of the Lord be not as sheep which have no shepherd." Reb Hayyam Volozhin lived to see the new shepherds whose destinies were shaped by their very tenacity to uphold the yeshivah traditions. They were Reb Moshe Mordechai Epstein and Reb Noson Zvi Finkel.

In 1883 these renowned Talmudists founded a yeshivah in Slabodka (Lithuania) which was inconspicuously transferred in 1924 to Hebron, Palestine, and thence became known as the Hebron Yeshivah. Following the Arab riots of 1929, the yeshivah moved to Jerusalem.

Now, that great edifice stands as a tribute to the sainted memory of its founders, engendering a steadfast faith, unabated by sorrow, and a loyalty unmitigated by serfdom.

The students of the yeshivah have, for more than a half a century, withstood the challenge of anti-Semitism in Russia, and outlived the Nazi holocaust in Europe. These men of every generation and decade treasure neither gold nor silver; they favor neither steel nor blade; they are dedicated to the justice of their divine principles—ancient and hollow. They feed on faith uncorrupted and, like the cedars of Lebanon, stand undaunted against the stridulous and subrosa evils of the secular world.

"And the sun stood still and the moon stayed, until the people had avenged themselves upon their enemies" (Joshua 10:13). Indeed, time stands still for these men who observe the ancient traditions and rituals as on the day God commanded their ancestors to do. Such is the caliber of the man who aspires to leadership in the great yeshivah; such is the caliber of the yeshivah-ordained rabbi who tutors and guides Jews throughout the world; teachers who are the link between God and the Jew at large in a bond unbroken by the cavalcade of disaster.

Hundreds of rabbis who serve the spiritual needs of Jews all over the world received their training and ordination at the great Yeshivah Hebron. Two-thirds of Israel's rabbis were graduated from this, the greatest institution of learning.

In addition, the Yeshivah Hebron inspired and sponsored the growth of yeshivahs throughout Israel. Six such institutions are drawing on the renaissance of Yeshivah Hebron.

With the independence of Israel, Yeshivah Hebron expanded and received her share of the new influx of immigrants. The yeshivah's new dormitory, which will be known as the national youth rehabilitation center, equipped to house and care for thousands of young men, is now nearing completion—making your contribution a pillar upon which this edifice will stand and endure.

Why the Difference?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER E. BREHM

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, the widow of a veteran who had been declared totally and permanently disabled has asked me the following question: "Why does the widow of a veteran who died as a direct result of his service-connected disability receive more pension than the widow of a veteran who was adjudged totally and permanently disabled, service-connected, but whose death could not be directly attributed to his service-connected disability?"

Mr. Speaker, I can readily understand why a veteran with a service-connected disability should receive a greater degree of compensation than one with a nonservice-connected disability. However, I cannot understand why any widow of a veteran should receive a greater degree of compensation simply because the husband of one died as the direct result of his service-connected disability while the other one did not—remember, both veterans' disability being service-connected.

The price of all necessities of life cost the same for the widow in either case and it seems to me, in all fairness, that if a veteran has been declared totally and permanently disabled, service-connected, that all widows of veterans with this type of disability should be compensated equally, regardless of the cause of death.

Jackson-Jefferson Day Dinner Address by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the Jackson-Jefferson Day dinner address by Hon. Oscar L. Chapman, Secretary of the Interior, in Los Angeles, Calif., January 23, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JEFFERSON-JACKSON IDEALS STILL LIVE

I am happy to be among you tonight to pay a tribute, at once humble and proud, to those two great protectors of the general welfare of the people, President Thomas Jefferson and President Andrew Jackson. The Democratic Party is reinvigorated on occasions like this when the liberal Jefferson and the rugged and popular Jackson can walk again in spirit among their friends.

We of the Democratic Party are the heirs to their great tradition, and it is we who stand among the people as the guardian of their democratic ideals.

Thomas Jefferson was the philosopher of our democratic state, and he played a masterful part in its creation. It was his hand that so often guided his contemporaries from the paths of error and unwise compromise. It was his voice that appealed repeatedly to the people and to their Congress for undivided support of the Constitution for which he had, in his own words, "a zealous attachment."

His insistence on the inclusion of a Bill of Rights in the Constitution is a matter of history well known to us all. To him, this was a guarantee against the invasion of men's lives by habits accepted in an old world grown weary from congestion and conflict.

But Jefferson's legacy to us is far more dynamic than this. In a world where those about him were subject to the will of monarchs and masters, he recognized in men themselves an essential dignity, and a power to determine their own destinies and make them free.

This belief in the common man—an abiding faith in man's ability to govern himself—was the eternal spring of Jefferson's philosophy. In his first inaugural address, he stated it simply: "Sometimes it is said that man cannot be trusted with the government of himself. Can he, then, be trusted with the government of others? Or have we found angels in the form of kings to govern him? Let history answer this question."

For President Jefferson, we can say that while tyranny still lives in the world, his question has been answered. The Government of this Nation has been kept, as he hoped, "close to the people."

We of the Democratic Party are proud to state that we have followed his admonition for "the preservation of the general government in its whole constitutional vigor, as the sheet anchor of our peace at home and safety abroad." We as a people can affirm his own claims for us as "the strongest Government on earth." We still believe, with Jefferson, that our Constitution is unquestionably the wisest ever presented to men.

To Andrew Jackson we pay tribute for the renewed application of practical democratic principles to a national life growing ever more complex as our frontiers pushed onward to the West. The movement toward the West had all begun by Jackson's time, and the spirit of the West was beginning to be felt.

These pioneers were the people whose voices were heard in the White House, asking from Andrew Jackson, of Tennessee, a square deal in national administration. This Jackson proceeded to give them, and the Nation assumed new vigor and new hope. He was the leader of the rising democracy of our Nation, and like the Democrats of today, a firm believer in our Constitution.

We who are joined here tonight do not have to be told how the Democratic Party has carried out the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson. It is proper, however, to review the progress we have made, for in the review we dedicate ourselves again to the principle of government for all the people. It is right that we examine what the Democratic Party has done for their welfare.

The people have always benefited during Democratic administration. This has been particularly true since 1932. In that year, the people of the Nation took back unto themselves the control of their Government, and handed the legacy of Jefferson and Jackson to Franklin Delano Roosevelt.

In 1948, the people knew with certainty all of the things they wanted done for their own welfare. This was the year when they handed their Government to a man who possessed an unfaltering faith in the people of this Nation to choose what was best for their own welfare, to the man whom nobody wanted but the people, Harry S. Truman.

Franklin D. Roosevelt knew and understood, and Harry Truman knows and understands the meaning of the West to this Nation.

This is the territory that Jefferson felt would serve the needs of the Nation's people for a thousand generations, not only to make the Nation great, but also to strengthen the Democratic ideals to which he devoted his life.

It is also, I am proud to say, the land which has claimed rightly a great share of attention from the Government department over which the people now permit me to preside.

The national income during the year 1849, when the Department of Interior was established, and when our population was about 23,000,000, amounted to little over $2,000,000,000. In 1948, this income reached a high of $226,000,000,000.

The role now played by your Government in the development of the West during those hundred years is recorded for all to see. I think we can be justly proud of that role. With you, we have looked with wonder at your vast, fertile, and productive land. We have seen your growing industry. We have joined you in exploring for the wealthy minerals hidden in your mountains and valleys.

We have imagined with you the possibility of watering your dry acres. We have come with you as you made plans to give your electric power to your Nation, to provide water for your people, and to grant to all the people of this Nation an opportunity to recreate themselves in your forests and your parks. And, then, under Democratic leadership, we have moved ahead with you.

The vast resources which the West has held in custody for the Nation are far richer than Jefferson or Jackson could have imagined. The social pattern for the protection of this precious possession of all the people was set long ago. In his plans for the government of the Louisiana Territory, Jefferson made certain that monopoly in land could never be established.

Andrew Jackson, in his successful fight against the Bank of the United States, settled the question as to whether the Government could protect its citizens against a small minority who had achieved wealth and power through the monopoly of a vital instrument of the Nation's economy.

The Democratic Party has continued to follow the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson in holding the interests of all the people of this country as paramount to the desires of special interests or particular groups. We are unlike many people who speak of our great Abraham Lincoln loudly and in awed tones while privately serving the interest of those who oppose most strongly the liberal ideals for which Lincoln lived and died.

We believe that the vast resources of the West—water, land, and minerals—constitute a national wealth which should be used for the enrichment of life for all our people. In the last 17 years, we have made greater strides in the use and control of these national resources than have been made in all the years of our history.

You know well the value of your water. The world wars have brought to the Western States a new industrial economy and people to swell your population. The demands on your water supply, for irrigation, for power, and for your civic needs, have been increased. The way in which these demands are met will determine the soundness of your new economic foundation.

Only too recently, you have seen shortages in electric power for lighting your homes and for operating the utility and industrial requirements of your cities, your factories, and your farms.

You know now that problems involved in maintaining adequate water supplies are too large and too complex for individuals and groups to handle without help. They transcend State lines, and they affect the welfare of the entire Nation. You have asked your Government for help in planning. Under Democratic leadership, it has provided that help, and it intends to continue to do so.

The Grand Coulee, Bonneville, Central Valley, Boulder Canyon, and smaller projects, multipurpose in design, are now mighty servants of the people. It is important to your lives and to the Nation that public projects like these be multiplied.

Our Bureau of Reclamation has been able to report that water has now been made available to 90,000 farms, totaling 4,600,000 acres. Crops on reclamation land alone were valued last year at about $500,000,000. Installed capacity on western Federal power projects alone totaled 3,000,000 kilowatts by 1949.

This is the way in which the Democratic Party has planned with you for your own control over your water and your power and for your own right to build your mighty power plants and your transmission lines. These are your heritage in the West, and they must remain yours, never to become the instrument of profit and special privilege to some few among you.

Yes; under Democratic leadership your Government has led the way in stopping "water, the destroyer," as it flooded your valleys, eroded your soils, and poured wasting into the sea. It has redirected "water, the builder" into activity which promotes life, provides it with leisure, and lights its way.

If this kind of Government service to the people is the welfare state, I am for it, and I think you are for it.

The conservation of mineral resources is of the highest importance to the West and to the Nation. In the face of rapid depletion of some of these resources, the Government under Democratic leadership is moving steadily to find out exactly what your mineral resources are, and to develop methods of lower-cost extraction and processing. The maintenance of a sound mining and mineral industry is of vital importance to the Truman administration.

The land of the West has always been its richest physical resource. We now know that our resources in forest and grazing land must be protected to serve all of our people. This the Democratic Party is doing.

I believe that you want these rich resources to be conserved for your children and their children. I believe you want to use them to make a better life for our people as well as in the future. If you do, and if this is the welfare state, I am for it, and I think you are for it.

Now look with me at yourselves, as the reason for all of these things. Resources and their development are not ends in themselves.

You, the people of this Nation, are its greatest natural resource. In your example of democratic living and government, you are one of the rich resources of the world.

You knew your power as a people when you placed your faith in one of the noblest of our citizens, Woodrow Wilson, and enthusiastically welcomed his "new freedom." It was not of your making that a handful of shortsighted and willful men thwarted your wishes and his ideals for an America assuming its place in the councils of the world to secure a lasting peace.

You knew your power in 1932 when you asked Franklin D. Roosevelt to make your voices heard in the land, in your factories, your homes, and your schools.

You knew your strength as a people when you told Harry S. Truman to guard again your rights to a Fair Deal.

The Democratic Party has been your voice, and your general welfare has never ceased to be its goal. Let us look at what has happened to us under its leadership:

The people are secure in employment and income. Our factories are busy. Our commerce is moving. We are educating our children, and we continue to maintain the highest standard of living in the world. We are helping our neighbors who bore the brunt of war, and we are sharing the responsibilities of nations for maintaining the peace.

Vast numbers of our people can look forward to old-age assistance under our social-security program. Workers are protected against want during periods of forced unemployment.

There has been progress in many directions under the Democratic administration, and most of it has touched your lives. Cash income of farmers in 1932 was less than $2,000,000,000. In 1948 it reached more than $30,000,000,000. Here in California your farmers' income rose from about $404,000,000 in 1932 to over $2,000,000,000 in 1948.

Nearly 95 percent of California's farmers had electricity at the end of June 1949. When REA was established in 1935 only 50 percent of these farms had electric lights.

This, however, is the almost unbelievable accomplishment. Only 11 percent of the Nation's farms had electric lights in 1935. Under these years of the Democratic administration, over 78 percent of all farms are electrified.

Like the people of the rest of our Nation, you have needed houses, and you have asked for help to get them. Here is what has been happening, and the State of California has been typical. At the end of 1948 the Federal Housing Administration had outstanding in this State over 908,000 insured loans on small homes for property improvement, with insurance totaling over $342,000,000. It had underwritten the construction of over 13,000 units in large apartment projects, and had insured 342,000 mortgages on 1 to 4-family homes.

The Home Owners' Loan Corporation had aided over 57,000 families by refinancing home loans totaling over $148,000,000. By June 30, 1949, all but about $5,000,000 of these loans had been repaid.

If all of these things are the welfare state, the Democratic Party is for the welfare state, and it proclaims it to the people proudly.

The Republican Eightieth Congress set out to destroy many of the progressive benefits which you as a people had chosen for yourselves. You are all too familiar with the way in which special interests made inroads into your rights under the Constitution.

The Democratic Eighty-First Congress reversed this trend, and many things have already been done to serve the people of the Nation. Funds for continuing important reclamation and power projects have been restored. Provision has been made for a Nation-wide program of low-cost housing and slum clearance. Rural electrification has been strengthened and extended. Minimum wages for working people are higher than ever before.

The Economic Cooperation Administration has been authorized to carry on for us its great work in resisting the advances of communism by strengthening the democracies of Europe.

We cannot be content, of course, with these accomplishments. The dynamic philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson which took them through new frontiers of thinking and planning still means for us a never-ending crusade to better the life of our Nation and the lives of its people.

President Truman has told us that we can soon achieve a national income of $300,000,000,000 annually. He has predicted that the average family can receive, by the year 2000, a real income about three times what they receive today.

To do these things, we must maintain a stable economy, avoiding the economic boom and bust cycles too frequent in our past history.

Under Democratic leadership, your Government intends to stimulate increasing returns of capital into new productive investment. It will curb monopoly and provide incentives to new and independent enterprise.

It will take all steps necessary to see to it that the benefits of economic growth extend to all groups.

Farmers will be protected against economic and physical forces over which they have no control. The products of their land and their work must be made available to consumers in increasing quantities and at reasonable prices. Farmers themselves must be guaranteed a fair return for their services to the Nation.

Labor must have lifted from its back the weight of one-sided labor legislation which now stifles its efforts to express its needs in the democratic way.

The social-security laws must be extended until almost all of our people are covered by their benefits.

The health of our people is the well-being of our Nation. With a vast segment of the population lacking medical care, some form of national insurance must be enacted to provide this care. Our doctors must increase in number, and the number of our hospitals must be multiplied greatly.

Thomas Jefferson held as a fundamental tenet of democracy, equal and exact justice to all men, of whatever state or persuasion, religious, or political. In our time, our concept of democratic rights has extended with the development of our Nation. The recognition of the civil rights of all men and women has been long since accepted as a tenet of the Democratic Party.

All citizens have equal rights to gainful employment and economic advancement; to security of their persons; and to the right of franchise. We intend to support legislation which will establish these rights within the law of our land forever for all our citizens.

We shall continue, under Democratic leadership, to work actively in the council of nations to maintain peace in the world. More than this—your Government intends to give example to the world in the use of resources for the people's welfare. The President's point 4 program will be accelerated, that less advanced nations may come to know the vast benefits of their resources, just as the west has done. We shall help these nations to direct their resources to lift the standard of living for their citizens.

You know that, if these things are to be done—and you have to count on Democrats to do them—the President needs a Congress overwhelmingly Democratic.

The elections in 1950 will return a Democratic Congress, but there must be even greater numbers to support the President as he moves on to the goals I have mentioned.

Here is a challenge to you who join me here tonight. Your administration and your party need you, and they count on your help in this election that is coming. The people must be told the story of what we are trying to do, and they must come to the polls. California helped to elect Harry Truman. Now it must strengthen his hand as he works for the interests of its people.

We are the people of a great Nation. We stand as a symbol to the world of man's faith in himself, and in the thoughts, abilities, and motives of those around him. This, my friends, is the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. The magnificent determination of President Harry S. Truman and Vice President ALBEN W. BARKLEY to rest upon the decision of the people in 1948 proved that this was their philosophy. It is your land and my land. We have kept it secure under our Constitution, and the Democratic Party proposes to keep it secure for us, the people of America. Yes, Jefferson's questions have been answered. This Government is "close to the people." If this be the welfare state, I am joined by the millions of our people in seeking to maintain it for our children and our children's children.

What Is a Reactionary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an interesting article by former President Herbert Hoover, which appeared in the February issue of Coronet:

WHAT IS A REACTIONARY?

(By Herbert Hoover)

The new era of today seems united in the notion that they have just discovered real liberalism and that all previous eras are reactionary. Well, there is something to be said for the old reactionary notions which held to basic freedoms of mind and spirit.

In the years since the founding fathers, a God-fearing people under these reactionary blessings have built quite a plant and equipment on this continent. It teems with millions of comfortable farms and homes, cattle, and hogs. It is well equipped with railroads, power plants, factories, highways, automobiles, and death warnings. It is studded with magnificent cities and traffic jams.

The terrible reactionaries have filled the land with legislatures, town councils, free presses, orchestras, bands, radios, juke boxes, and other noises. It has a full complement of stadiums, ball players, and college yells.

Furthermore they have sprinkled the country with churches and laboratories, have built 10,000 schools and 1,000 institutions of higher learning. And somehow these reactionary minded taxpayers are squeezing out the resources to maintain 1,000,000 devoted teachers and 100,000 able professors, and to keep more than 2,000,000 students in colleges and universities.

Possibly another ideology could do better in the next 174 years. But I suggest that we continue to suffer certain evils of free men and the ideal of equal opportunity rather than die of nostalgia.

Increased Sugar Production in United States Areas in 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, between thirty and thirty-five million acres of good farm land in the United States will be taken out of customary production of corn, wheat, cotton, peanuts, and tobacco in the crop year of 1950. Approximately one-half of this acreage is taken from wheat and corn areas. The farmers in the wheat and corn section are looking around for other crops to plant on the idle acres. But they find it exceedingly difficult to locate another farm crop for large-scale planting without adding to existing surpluses.

Sugar is a deficiency crop in the United States. Sugar beets can be grown in most wheat and corn sections, and sugarcane production can be increased in Louisiana, Florida, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. We annually import 2,504,000 short tons of sugar from Cuba. A very substantial portion of this sugar could be raised in United States areas.

While the economy of Cuba is largely dependent on the production of sugar for consumption in the United States, certain developments have taken place in Cuba, which I feel warrant a reexamination of our sugar policy by Congress.

For the past 50 years Cuba has purchased most of its wheat flour from United States flour mills. In fact, Cuba has been our best foreign customer for flour. Flour imports by Cuba from United States mills for five calendar years—in hundredweights—are shown as follows:

1945	4,611,000
1946	3,453,000
1947	3,701,000
1948	2,583,000
1949 (estimated)	3,064,000

American wheat farmers and flour mills are about to lose the Cuban market for wheat flour to a newly established flour-mill company in Havana, which is known as Molinos de Harina Burrus, S. A. The new flour-mill company, which eventually expects to produce all of the flour required for Cuba, is being constructed and financed by a Mr. Jack Burrus, a prominent American miller from Texas, under the most extraordinary concessions from the Cuban Government. Under the concessions, which I will outline, it is anticipated that the Burrus Cuban flour mill will import most of its wheat for flour production from Canada, Argentina, and other foreign countries, instead of the United States, because of the lower prices for wheat in those countries. The wheat farmers and flour mills in Texas, Oklahoma, Missouri, Minnesota, Indiana, New York, and other sections will be the losers. Eventually, when the Burrus mill gets into full production to fill all Cuban requirements, the outlet for wheat produced on 530,000 acres in the United States will be gone.

Amongst the concessions given by the Cuban Government to Mr. Burrus are:

First. Import of wheat into Cuba for the mill, cancellation of import duty and tax.

Second. Complete exemption from all taxes on machinery and materials imported for construction of the mill.

Third. Complete exemption from all taxes on the export of currency necessary to pay for imported construction material and machinery.

Fourth. Exemption from all taxes on the export of currency necessary to pay for wheat and other raw materials imported for the operation of the mill.

Fifth. Exemption from taxes on capital and capital stock.

Sixth. Exemption on all tariffs, consular fees and other types of excises and supercharges now being levied for the importation of raw materials necessary to the operation of industries located in Cuba.

Seventh. Exemption from general Cuban utilities taxes.

I understand that the State Department has given its approval to the concessions awarded to Mr. Burrus in his Cuban venture. Possibly it was done to advance President Truman's dynamic point 4 program to assist undeveloped countries to become self-sustaining. It is difficult to understand the reasons for the action taken by the Cuban Government against the interest of its neighbor country and its best customer for sugar and other commodities.

In view of the fact that the Cuban Government has undertaken a policy to

curtail and finally stop imports of American wheat flour, and since United States areas are curtailing production of sugar in order to provide a market in this country for Cuban sugar, I will ask the Committee on Agriculture to review the sugar quota law. There will be at least 10,000,000 idle acres of corn and wheat land upon which sugar beets can be grown, and I am positive that sugarcane production can also be increased in Florida, Louisiana, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico. This matter should be promptly investigated so additional production of sugar can be made available from the 1950 crop.

Freedom Through the Marshall Plan and the Truman Doctrine

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, on January 26, 1950, it was my pleasure and privilege to address the mass meeting of the Ahepa chapters at the Pythian Temple in the city of New York. These people know only too well how important it is that we never, for one moment, relax in our efforts to gain freedom for all peoples of the world. They have seen their Greek countrymen continually threatened by oppression during recent years. They have seen the peoples of neighboring countries suffer under the stranglehold of oppression for centuries, with the flame and hope of freedom flaring forth time and time again, only to be smothered by some new enemy. They know what a very real fight the fight for freedom must be.

The Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine, Mr. President, have been our weapons in recent years in the fight for freedom for all peoples. They have been effective weapons. We have seen the tide turn again and again in countries which feared the oppression of communism. We have seen the Greek people succeed in their efforts to retain their ideals of freedom. We have seen Europe once again on the road to freedom and security. The Marshall plan and the Truman doctrine have done a tremendous job, but their job is not completed. America must continue to strive for the freedom of all peoples by every means possible, for only through freedom can the world obtain peace.

I ask unanimous consent that my address before the Ahepa chapters be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For millions of people, the ideals of freedom for which the world fought the bitterest war in history are ideals which have not yet become realities.

It was, I believe, Winston Churchill who gave the world a suitable name for what has happened in eastern Europe in the years which have followed the end of World War II. In a speech given in the spring of 1946, Mr. Churchill remarked that an iron curtain had been drawn across the continent of Europe. He went on to say that behind that curtain lay the ancient, great capitals of eastern Europe: Berlin and Warsaw, Prague and Budapest, Belgrade and Bucharest, and Sofia.

For centuries the people of eastern Europe have seen their homelands turned into bloody battlegrounds. For centuries, the efforts of the eastern European peoples to achieve peace with their neighbors, and freedom from oppression by their rulers, have been efforts thwarted by the countless and merciless forces of history. Great states with free governments, with free elections, and with free people, have risen only to fall when some new vanguard of oppression overwhelmed them.

The people of eastern Europe have lived with tragedy for centuries. They have seen fortune turn against them again and again. To me, however, the most hopeful note of all lies in the fact that the desire for freedom has survived in the hearts of these people despite the tragic history of their efforts to obtain liberty.

While I realize that in the minds of most of us the events of recent years are remembered with a painful clarity, I would like tonight to look back briefly over some of the things which have happened since the close of World War II; I would like to review for you some of the things which have been done constructively to rekindle the hope for peace and freedom in the future; and, in short, to sum up for you where I think matters stand now, and to outline for you, as I see them, some of the steps which remain to be taken.

I think it is fitting to illustrate this unhappy period for the people of eastern Europe by directing our attention to what has taken place in Greece since 1946. I say this for several reasons. Perhaps the most important is the fact that the Greek people have shared with the Estonians, the Latvians, the Lithuanians, the Poles, the Czechs, the Slavs, the Ukrainians, the Hungarians, the Rumanians, the Bulgars, the Serbs, the Croats, and the Albanians, the threat of oppression by a single philosophy of totalitarian control. Another reason, obviously, is the fact that this control has been imposed upon all these peoples from without—imposed upon them by a system which seeks the domination of the entire world—imposed upon them with such an overwhelming threat of force that they have been reduced to pawns in the gigantic game for mastery of the planet.

Let us look at Greece by the end of World War II. Her people were starving. Her agricultural economy was so badly broken that it could not conceivably undertake the job of feeding her people. What industry had existed in Greece prior to World War II was so badly crippled that only 40 percent of it was in operation.

Yet, in 1946 there were two free elections held in Greece. On the last day of March in that year, general elections were held to select representatives to the Greek Parliament. In September of the same year, a majority of the Greek people decided, again in a free election, that it wished to see the restoration of its monarchy. Both of these elections were held under the watchful eyes of international observers, whose duty it was to assure the Greek people of an opportunity to vote as they wished to vote—to vote without fear of retaliation for speaking their minds.

Trouble followed. Defeated at the polls, a handful of hardened Communist revolutionaries, backed with assistance furnished them across the borders of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, sought to achieve through violence what they had failed to accomplish through democratic processes. They sought to destroy every vestige of democracy in Greece, and they were backed in these efforts by the Cominform, a body I scarcely need identify for you.

The Greek Government was in a poor position to ward off an organized, systematic attack upon it—an attack made possible through arms furnished by the Soviet Government. As I have already said, the Greek economy was close to collapse, thanks to the merciless treatment it had received in the hands of the occupying Nazi forces during World War II.

The Greek Government appealed to the Security Council of the United Nations, and as a result of that appeal, a special commission was appointed to investigate the charges alleged by the Greek Government. That commission reported back to the Security Council, saying in effect, that the charges alleged were, in fact, true. Efforts were made immediately by the American and British delegates of the Security Council to act in Greece and put an end to this threat. The Russian veto killed off any hope that the Security Council might act.

It was in this setting that the Truman doctrine was born. In March of 1947, President Truman urged the Congress to undertake a vast obligation in southeastern Europe. He did so because certain facts were absolutely clear. First, it was clear that without help the Government of Greece would fall, and the country would become a Soviet satellite. Turkey needed help. It was also clear that the Russian veto would stop any effective action by the Security Council of the UN.

We had a fight, of course, in the Congress, as you might have expected, for there is still a noisy handful of Senators and Representatives who believe that America is round—of those who still believed that America could be kept strong and free even if we let the rest of the world go hang. I think all of you know that this group does not truly reflect the sentiments of an overwhelming number of American people, and thus it was that the Congress endorsed President Truman's proposal a short time after it was made.

The flow of American assistance into Greece and Turkey gave birth to a new hope that the fate of Communist oppression could be avoided. I think we must be realistic, however, in admitting that the year which passed between the spring of 1947 and the spring of 1948 was a year of fear for those who believed in democracy and freedom. It was in this period that the outcome of Communist efforts in Greece and Turkey was gravely uncertain. It was in this same year that the economy of all of Europe staggered so badly that it seemed virtually impossible to avoid a complete collapse, and it was in this same year that the Communists secured their positions in eastern Germany, in Poland, in Czechoslovakia, in Hungary, and in the Balkan countries to the south. The winter of 1947 and 1948, as all of us recall, was the winter the veterans cast anxious eyes at the uniforms they had laid aside, wondering whether, in a matter of weeks, they would be called on once more to save democracy through the merciless and inhuman mechanism of war. A Communist-inspired general strike threatened calamity in France. The general elections due in Italy in the spring of 1948 gave rise to the real fear that the Communists would gain control of the Italian Government. This was, in truth, a year of paralyzing terror for millions of the world's people.

I have a deep and humble pride, however, in the fact that the American people rose to the challenge of the cold war. We were not paralyzed; we were thinking, and we were thinking constructively. In June of 1947 our great soldier-statesman, George C. Marshall, had thrown out the suggestion of the plan which later was to bear his name. It is true, of course, that 10 months passed between the birth of the Marshall plan idea and the day that the Congress of the United States created the European recovery pro-

gram. While we did not hear much about it at the time, a tremendous amount of planning and blueprinting was accomplished in the dark months which followed General Marshall's statement at Harvard in June of 1947. The blueprints for the Marshall plan were drawn up, not by Americans alone, but by the true believers in democracy that were still to be found in the free countries of Europe. Without that planning there never could have been a European recovery program, and, despite the fact that it took us 10 long months to complete the blueprints, the job was done in time.

I have often felt that one phase of the Marshall plan has not been clearly understood. In General Marshall's original outline of his program he invited every government of Europe to participate in the joint and necessary enterprise of rebuilding the European economy. He added, however, one proviso. He made it equally clear that American assistance would not be given to foster antidemocratic developments. There had been initial requests made by representatives of many governments behind the iron curtain to participate in Marshall plan assistance. Pressure from Moscow forced these countries to withdraw their requests. I can scarcely tell you what a bitter disappointment it was to all of us that the countries behind the iron curtain were powerless to participate in the Marshall plan.

Less than 2 years have passed since the ECA was born. We, of course, continued throughout this period to furnish military assistance to the governments of Greece and Turkey, in order to make the Truman doctrine effective. In these 2 years we have passed the turning point in the cold war. The combination of the Truman doctrine and the Marshall plan is paying off.

By the 1st of September 1949 the Government of Greece was able to announce that the Communist guerrillas had been driven past their borders, and that civil order had been restored. Turkey was secure. In country after country that had participated in the Marshall plan, the Communist group had been resoundingly turned down at the polls, and there was new life and new hope in all of the free countries of Europe.

The job isn't done. I think, however, we can say, without being smug or complacent, that tremendous progress has been made in these 2 years—progress which I am confident will lead us ultimately to a free and democratic world which will live in peace.

We have a great deal of work yet to do. For example, the Marshall plan was drawn up on the assumption that economic recovery in Europe could be achieved by 1952. Thus we are at the half-way point in that program. Those who know most about Europe and its problems are united in their belief that we must continue the recovery program until its job is done. These same experts agree that all our good work in Europe would be undone in a matter of months if we were to discontinue the recovery program before its task is completed.

Returning for a moment to Greece, her troubles are not yet over. Civil order has, as I've said, been restored. American assistance in the economic recovery of Greece has brought back her agricultural production to a level which is now higher than prewar. Industrial production in Greece has been doubled since the end of the war. These accomplishments are not enough. We can be deeply grateful that there is no longer famine in Greece, that there is enough to eat now. The road ahead for the Greek people, however, must lead them in the direction of far greater industrial development, in order to be self-sufficient and independent of foreign charity, and that is the problem which the Greek Government and Marshall-plan representatives are devoting most of their attention to at the present time.

There is a further problem for the Greek people. During the guerrilla warfare, during the days that arms and food and support for the guerrillas flowed across the borders of Albania, Bulgaria, and Yugoslavia, there was another kind of traffic moving in the opposite direction. Thousands and thousands of Greek children crossed those borders and are, today, held captive in these surrounding countries. The disappearance of those children poses a problem which is above politics. In appealing for the return of those children to their families, we must appeal in the name of humanity. There is no deeper human emotion than the emotion with which we regard the ties of family and the importance of home in the development of our children into responsible, sensitive, and peace-loving citizens. World public opinion decries the retention of these children in foreign lands, away from their families and away from their homes. On two separate occasions the General Assembly of the United Nations has endorsed strongly worded resolutions in protest of this. In addition, I can assure you that President Truman, the State Department, and the Congress are fully informed of these facts. I am sure all of you here know of the recent exchange of messages between President Truman and His Grace, Michael, orthodox archbishop of North and South America.

President Truman assured Archbishop Michael that this Government intended to continue to give the utmost support to the efforts of the United Nations and the international Red Cross organizations in seeing to it that the children removed from Greece during the guerrilla warfare will be returned to their homes and families.

Then, a week ago today, Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, of Florida, introduced what is now known as Senate Resolution 212. This is a short resolution that, I think you will agree with me, is effective in what it says, and I shall read it to you now.

"*Resolved*, That the Senate profoundly condemns the action of the Communist guerrilla forces in Greece in abducting thousands of Greek children and carrying them off into servitude in countries of eastern Europe during the course of the recent Communist guerrilla warfare in Greece, and request the President to exert all of his powers, acting through the United Nations and other international organizations and directly with the governments of the countries where these children are confined, to the end that these thousands of children shall be speedily returned to their homes and homeland."

This resolution is now before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and I give you my pledge that I shall support it with every effort when it is brought before the Senate for a vote.

I have tried in a brief way to summarize in general terms a great deal of history, but I do not believe this summary could be complete without some brief discussion of the displaced-persons program. The DP law which was passed by the Congress in 1948, despite the fact that it has been of material assistance to thousands and thousands of refugees driven from their countries as a consequence of World War II, is, as it now stands, an inadequate law. I firmly believe that within a matter of weeks we will have cured most of the defects of the present act. I have fought for a decent DP law in every way possible, and I am now absolutely certain that my efforts and the efforts of those who have also fought for a good law will be successful. One of the major things that we intend to do in amending the 1948 act is to change a date. Let we explain what this means. Under the existing law, no person is eligible for admission to America under that program unless he was driven from his own country prior to December 22, 1945. We intend to advance this date to January 1949. This means that thousands and thousands who, because they opposed the Communist regimes of eastern Europe, were forced to flee, will soon find it possible to enter America where they may live in freedom. Just as I left Washington today, I learned that the Displaced Persons Commission has recommended that the Senate alter the DP bill which has already passed the House of Representatives to provide for a total of 10,000 people of Greek descent who had been forced into exile from their homeland between 1940 and January 1, 1949, as a result either of the Nazi occupation or of the Communist guerrilla warfare. I intend to give this amendment my full support.

Ahead of us, as I have already indicated, lie grave responsibilities if we are to achieve the desired peace and freedom in the world which is so deeply hoped for everywhere. I can tell you that I sincerely believe we are headed in the right direction. Our efforts to contain the spread of communism are unquestionably proving successful. What remains to be done is to peel back the borders which now represent the extent to which communism has spread. We in the democracies are armed with the truth; our institutions, because they exist in an atmosphere of liberty, are enduring institutions, and the truth about them is penetrating the "iron curtain" every day. We in the democracies are tremendously assisted by the longing for freedom that is in the souls of all the people who today exist under the ruthless totalitarian dictatorships which the Communists have thrust upon the countries of eastern Europe. This longing for liberty in the hearts of the people behind the "iron curtain" has not been killed, and it will not be killed by any efforts the Communists may attempt. A faith in freedom is an abiding faith that no amount of empty promises can do away with.

The Communists have charged that America has world-wide aims. I will accept that charge. We do have a world-wide aim, and it is this: It is our goal that all peoples in the world shall have the opportunity to choose their own Government through democratic processes. It is our goal that the people shall be masters of their governments, and not that the governments shall master the people. It is our goal that every man shall achieve for himself the right to worship as he chooses to worship, the right to speak as he wishes to speak, the right to think as he wishes to think, and the right to live secure in a job of his own choosing in a world of peace. This is America's world-wide aim, and if we work hard enough at the job, as I believe we intend to, I am sure that we will succeed.

Taxes Set to Verse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks a poem on taxes by C. H. Foster, Fairbanks Morse & Co., Beloit, Wis. I commend it to all Members of the House.

If we want to know how England
Will continue to exist,
If we're worried 'bout the Germans
And their late financial twists.

If we wonder just how China
Could endure another war,
And we feel that money matters
Cause the Japs to feel quite sore.

We can pack away our troubles
In that little old kit bag,
And just settle down to working
Day and night without a lag.

For the politicians, many
Feeling sorry for the Axis,
Will eliminate their troubles
Just by boosting all our taxes.

And as soon as they have gathered
All the money that's in sight,
They will pose as peace defenders
And our sons will have to fight.

There is only one more action
That remains to rate a tax,
And we feel that soon 'twill happen
If we get the least bit lax.

For a small machine could easily
Be made for installation,
On those of us who labor hard
To keep away starvation.

'Twould let us breathe quite freely
For a given length of time,
After which, 'twould shut our breath off
'Til we plugged it with a dime.

But there is a way to settle
And avoid a lot of trouble,
If the country will stop spending
Foolish dough on paltry rubble.

For respect from other nations
That is bought with U. S. dough,
Will not last a minute longer
When donations cease to go.

The Victim of the New Deal Character-Assassination Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial entitled "Dr. Wirt, of Gary, and the Hiss Liberals," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of February 3, 1950:

DR. WIRT, OF GARY, AND THE HISS LIBERALS

The evidence proving Alger Hiss a Communist spy proved also that Dr. Wirt, the Gary schoolmaster, knew what he was talking about back in March 1934, only a year after the New Deal came to power.

The substance of Dr. Wirt's testimony was that many young Communists had found influential places in the New Deal administration and were promoting revolution from the inside.

Dr. Wirt's charges were explosive because he was the first to state publicly what many had come to suspect but couldn't prove. The accusation came out almost by accident. James H. Rand, testifying before the House Committee on Interstate Commerce at the end of February 1934 gave Dr. Wirt as authority for the allegation of treachery within the administration.

The Roosevelt idolators were outraged at this attack on their hero and demanded vengeance on the schoolman.

Dr. Wirt had been present at a dinner party attended, as he said, by some of the brain trusters. They had told him that by retarding recovery and by the use of propaganda to undermine the people's confidence in the free economy and representative government, they could gain their end. Among the words Dr. Wirt quoted were these which he attributed to Laurence Todd, correspondent in Washington of the Soviets' Tass news agency:

"We believe that we have Mr. Roosevelt in the middle of a swift stream and that the current is so strong that he cannot turn back or escape from it. We believe that we can keep Mr. Roosevelt there until we are ready to supplant him with a Stalin. We all think that Mr. Roosevelt is only the Kerensky of this revolution."

THE DIRTY ART OF MUD SLINGING

Dr. Wirt was summoned to appear before a congressional inquiry. He became one of the first Americans to receive the smear treatment. Representative BULWINKLE, the chairman of the investigating committee, said in a speech in Congress that Dr. Wirt had served a term in jail during the First World War for pro-German activities.

This was wholly false, as Mr. BULWINKLE later confessed. He said that the information had come to him from what anyone would consider reliable sources. He did not name them but acknowledged that "the report is not true and therefore as a man and as a Member of this House, I tender my apologies to Dr. Wirt."

A few days later, however, Mr. BULWINKLE said that, though his committee itself did not intend to press charges of perjury against Dr. Wirt, "there is no reason why the district attorney and the grand jury shouldn't be able to take notice of the case."

Fifteen years later another grand jury did take notice of the case, but with a very different purpose and result.

Harold Ickes was another of the mud slingers. Mr. Ickes said that Dr. Wirt had sought unsuccessfully to obtain Public Works Administration funds to develop a section of beach along the Indiana dunes. Dr. Wirt had paid several visits to PWA headquarters, said Mr. Ickes, and was quite willing to use communistic money for his private enrichment.

Dr. Wirt replied as promptly as he could that "I have not been interested and no one else connected with Dune Acres, Inc., referred to by Secretary Ickes, has been interested in securing any money from any Federal, State, or local government for any sort of project."

Dr. Wirt supplied a quantity of detail in support of his assertion, but Mr. Ickes had the louder voice and it may be doubted that the denial ever caught up with the accusation.

A pretty good measure of a citizen's political sagacity is the credence he gave at the time to Dr. Wirt's accusation. Those who believed the man from Gary was telling the truth were politically intelligent.

Several other touchstones to political acumen and integrity at that period are available. Those self-styled liberals who didn't recognize the Republic Steel massacre in South Chicago for what it was—a Communist promotion—were not very bright. The same must be said of those who wasted sympathy on the bonus marchers, another Communist promotion.

TESTS OF INTEGRITY

The most serviceable index of all, of course, is the attitude of an individual toward the House Committee on Un-American Activities. The best that can be said of anyone who at any time sought to disband the committee is that he is a jackass. The worst is that he is a traitor.

To the everlasting credit of the Members of successive Houses of Representatives is the fact that the great majority of them never yielded to the propaganda, the smears, and the threats of the jackasses and traitors, but kept the committee in being to perform its great service in the defense of the American Republic against the traitors in the New Deal administration.

Sponsoring Farmers All Praise DP's—Virginia's DP's Fast Taking Root

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS E. WALTER
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 8, 1950

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Walter Dushnyck, from the Washington Post of February 5, 1950:

SPONSORING FARMERS ALL PRAISE DP'S—VIRGINIA'S DP'S FAST TAKING ROOT

(By Walter Dushnyck)

The great majority of Virginia's new Americans—as displaced persons are affectionately called—are well on the road to readjustment and resettlement, according to a survey in Orange and Madison Counties.

More than 1,000 DP's have been resettled in Virginia. Of these, some 880 came to this country under the auspices of War Relief Services-National Catholic Welfare Conference, while the remainder had the help of other American volunteer agencies. These include the National Lutheran Council, the Hebrew Immigrant Aid Society and the United Ukrainian American Relief Committee of Philadelphia.

The national backgrounds of the Virginia displaced persons are chiefly Polish, Ukrainian, Lithuanian and Latvian (in that order). There are smaller groups of Estonians, Hungarians, Czechs, and Jews.

The overwhelming majority of Virginia's new Americans work on dairy and beef cattle farms.

In the course of our survey, we talked to both farmers and DP's, to representatives of religious organizations and social-welfare groups, and to State farm authorities. What we heard is encouraging. American farmers and European DP's are endeavoring to help each other with the least friction possible.

GOD-FEARING PEOPLE

The Reverend Andrew Taillieu, I. H. M., a Belgian missionary priest who serves two Roman Catholic parishes in Orange and Culpeper, Va., spent one evening and an entire day taking us to various farms where his DP families are working.

"All the farmers I know who accepted European displaced persons are well pleased with them. With the spring they might take some more," said Father Taillieu. "As a general rule, these DP's are God-fearing and law-abiding people, and they are worthy of any help Americans can give them."

Father Taillieu added that if the DP is a genuine farmer, there is usually only the initial difficulty that comes from lack of English and unfamiliarity with American farm machinery. When the European is also a carpenter, his additional aptitude comes in handy on any farm.

"One encouraging thing," said Father Taillieu, "is that farmers who have DP families often send for the DP's farmer relatives or neighbors."

There are 13 DP families in Orange County and 12 in Culpeper County. All 25 families are Catholic, and the largest number is Polish. There are 8 Ukrainian, 3 Lithuanian, 3 Latvian, and 2 Hungarian families.

"Only one family left our neighborhood," said Father Taillieu, "and we think they were not farmers, although they worked hard and in every respect seemed to be decent people. When the opportunity arose, the family, with two boys of 21 and 22 years of age, took off for Youngstown, Ohio, where they had some distant relatives."

THE LANGUAGE BARRIER

What sometimes causes misunderstanding between farmers and DP's is the lack of a common tongue. It takes time before the sponsor and the DP can understand each other even in sign language.

"There are psychological reasons that add to the initial misunderstanding," said Father Taillieu. "For instance, the DP's despite their harsh treatment in Nazi or Russian concentration or slave-labor camps, are terribly disappointed when the houses in which they have to live here are quite dilapidated. After these are repaired, they take their initial difficulties with a light heart."

The DP's on farms usually work 10 hours a day, 6 days a week, with every other Sunday free except for the regular chores. Their wage is usually $60 to $80 a month, plus some groceries, meat, milk, butter, wood for fuel and, of course, a free tenant house.

The Rev. T. A. Graves, minister of the Hebron Lutheran Church at Madison, Va., has helped Luthern DP's, mainly Latvians and Estonians, to settle in his county.

"In my experience with the DP's, I have found nothing but complete satisfaction," he said.

"They are gradually overcoming the language and custom difficulties, and so are being slowly integrated into American life. Of course, we had one or two cases that 'did not work,' but these were exceptions."

FARM LABOR NEEDED

"There is plenty of room here for honest people willing to work," said John C. Estes, county agent of Orange County. "Sponsors in our area are generally well satisfied with their DP families. The demand for farm workers is above normal.

"Any dissatisfaction with the DP's can be attributed to a variety of causes. Among them are the following:

"1. Some sponsors who need DP's most badly are those who have always had trouble with local help and cannot keep any help very long.

"2. It has been proved that placement of persons on a farm who had better conditons in their home countries before the war is not the best way of helping them or of giving satisfaction to the sponsor. When these people have not been farmers, even if they try their best, a feeling remains that they are not making any progress.

"3. Finally, in cases where the DP-sponsor combination does not work, it may be that the DP's are getting unfair treatment."

Estes was full of praise for the Lutheran and Catholic organizations which work to resettle DP's on farms.

"We county agents," he said, "could place our applications directly through the United States Displaced Persons Commission in Washington, but in my county we prefer that any application for DP's be approved also by the pastor or the priest of the church to which the applicant belongs. It works much better."

Estes said that the DP's were quickly adapting themselves to the American way of life. The men and children are doing this more rapidly than the DP women, because of their everyday contacts with American people.

ALWAYS DOING GOOD

Estes spoke of his own Lithuanian DP family, named Paleckis:

"The man is an excellent worker and a good human being, always wanting to do something beneficial.

"I don't pamper my DP family," Estes said. "I treat them just as I would treat any American family, and the same way I would like to be treated if I were in their place."

Asked about the behavior of the DP's, Estes said:

"The DP's in Orange County have had no tangles with the law. There is no indication whatsoever that they might be engaged in any subversive activities.

"If you hear occasional complaints about DP's by American sponsors, you should not be surprised. The good cases as a rule don't make the news, and in our country the DP cases are overwhelmingly successful in every respect."

Estes said complaints that DP's are slower workers than Americans, and that they are not used to American farm machinery, are to be expected, but that these things do not prevent successful resettlement.

YOUNG TEACHERS

Douglas Hill owns a large dairy farm at Orange, Va. He has accepted the Marian Dudzik family, a Polish couple and five children. The family had worked on a farm in Poland, and Hill said that he could not wish for any better family to work on his farm.

While the 18-year-old son, Czeslaw, helps his father, three other children, Joseph, 15; Genevieve, 13; and Tadeusz, 12, attend public school at Radiant, Va. These children come home from school and teach their parents English, thus helping them to overcome the language barrier.

Robert Sisk, manager of Mayhurst Farm, Orange, owned by Frank E. Daniel, said there is an excellent relationship between him and his wife on one hand and the Polish DP farmer, Roman Wajler, on the other. The Sisks often visit the DP family, which lives in a good tenant house a few hundred yards from the manager's home.

Here we found something rather unusual. Daniel, the owner, is building a new house for Wajler's parents and sister, who are still in Europe. That is something concrete to demonstrate the usefulness of DP's to American farmers.

PRAISED BY ANOTHER

Hartzell Spence, the writer (One Foot in Heaven; Happily Ever After), and his wife have a Latvian family on their place at Somerset, Va. They were warm in their praise of Philip and Antonino Skapars, but Spence added:

"I made my position clear at the beginning of their stay with me. I told them that I do not expect them to stay with me forever. As soon as they get on their feet, they may leave for something better. I would never hold them back if they could do better somewhere else."

Spence, however, would like to have them remain and eventually become coowners of the farm.

Skapars is running the farm, with some supervision, and is repairing and painting all the outbuildings on his own volition. He also has proved to be an experienced veterinarian; he saved Spence's horse while Spence was away.

"My DP's certainly are not bashful about asking questions," said Spence. "At the beginning, it was sign language and pantomine. Then the children became a great help. When we are tired of gesticulating at one another, we wait until Antonina comes home from school. She translates our conversation.

"The children are doing very well in school. They have already been advanced one grade."

J. T. Walker, principal of the public school at Orange, said that the 16 DP children in his classes are fully accepted by the other children.

"After the first day in class," he recalled, "a DP boy was invited to a drug store by some of the older boys for a chocolate soda.

"On the whole, the DP children are extremely diligent workers. The only difficulty is that of the language and that, too, is overcome rapidly."

SOME "CASUALTIES"

We discussed the over-all DP picture with the Rev. F. Harold Nott, vice chairman of the Richmond Diocesan Resettlement Committee for Displaced Persons. He pronounced the program a success and said that, in the case of Catholic DPs, the success was due mainly to the work of the local parish priests.

He, too, spoke of the inevitable "casualties," i. e., DPs who could not stay on farms. But those casualties are rather insignificant in comparison with the overwhelming successes in Virginia.

From the moral viewpoint, the DP's in Virginia are excellent people. There has not been one crime committed by a DP.

These people also remember what happened when their homelands were taken over by the Russians. They are overwhelmingly anti-Communist and do not hide their feelings about Russia.

Father Nott believes that for continued successful resettlement of DP's in Virginia, the following points should be stressed:

1. The DP's who are going to farms should be genuine farmers—a first condition of success.

2. Nationalities should not be mixed on one farm, for not all of them get along well together. It is always better when two or more DP families of the same nationality are put together.

3. The sponsor and the DP's should not live in the same house, for several reasons. One is the difference in language; another, the difference in customs and habits.

4. The sponsor should see that the DP's have the opportunity to attend mass on Sunday. This is generally observed, and here interreligious cooperation has met all difficulties. The Lutheran sponsor takes his Catholic DP's to the nearest Catholic church.

LAW NEEDS TEETH

When asked about the possibility of further settlement of DP's in Virginia, Father Nott said there is still a need for genuine farmers and domestics. He believes that some sort of State board should be set up to intervene in difficulties arising between sponsors and DP's.

He also believes that the DP law should have "teeth" in it; that DP farmers who sign an agreement to work on farms should be obligated to stay there a certain time, to give the sponsor a chance to get back the money he invested in rebuilding the tenant house or in paying the DP's overland transportation.

This survey of the DP situation in Virginia was made possible through the cooperation this writer received from Father Nott; Miss Joan Midkiff, secretary of the Richmond Diocesan resettlement committee; Jack McGann, of Washington, area director of war relief services-NCWC, and the sponsors and DP's who provided information.

Our Irresponsible Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including an article by Mr. Henry Hazlitt which appeared in Newsweek for February 6. This is a timely editorial and should be read by all members of this House, as we shall soon be considering the new budget.

Whatever may be thought of the President's tax message to Congress as a 1950 campaign document, there is only one possible

judgment of it as a statement of fiscal policy. It is irresponsible.

In his budget message, for peacetime, for a year expected to record one of the three highest national incomes of our history, Mr. Truman planned a deficit of $5,100,000,000. He now joins the popular clamor for reducing excise taxes. He asks Congress to impose compensating taxes, most of which would be even more harmful than the taxes he asks it to reduce. In order to reduce taxes which burden consumption he proposes to increase taxes which burden production. But even if all his proposals were carried out, and if the resulting yields came up to his expectations, he would still be recommending a deficit of more than $4,000,000,000.

If there is any fiscal responsibility in Congress itself, its course is clear. It should return his proposed 1951 budget to Mr. Truman without approval, and request him to submit a responsible, balanced budget, with provision for a minimum debt reduction of $600,000,000.

If it agrees that it is desirable to cut excise taxes by, say, $700,000,000, and to allow not less than $600,000,000 for debt reduction, and if it agrees that other taxes are already at if not far beyond the highest levels that our economy can tolerate, Congress should become even more explicit. It should point out to the President that his present proposed expenditures of $42,440,000,000 for 1951 must be slashed by a minimum of $6,440,000,000 to make a responsible, balanced budget possible. The total expenditures under such a responsible budget, in other words, could not exceed $36,000,000,000.

A responsible Congress would further inform the President that he ought not to place upon it the impossible burden of trying to find where all the wastes, inefficiencies, and nonessential items in his budget are; and that if he wishes to avoid what he calls "foolish budget slashes" it is his job to make the cuts himself. Congress should tell the President, in other words, that he will have to learn to get along on a mere $36,000,000,000 in the next fiscal year, even if this is only four or five times the rate at which the Roosevelt administration spent in peacetime and nine times the rate of spending under the Hoover administration.

A responsible Congress would go on to demand executive responsibility. The proposals in the President's tax message are extremely vague. Congress should insist that the administration spell these out in detail; tell exactly what excise rates it wants on what; exactly what new corporate rates it wants; and exactly what new provisions for oil and mine depletion. Congress should ask the administration, in brief, to draft and submit the complete text of its proposed tax-law changes. Congress is under no obligation to adopt these administration proposals; but Congress and the country should insist on knowing precisely what they are. That is the only way to get executive responsibility.

Mr. Truman's tax message is honeycombed with contradictions. He persists in declaring, for instance, that the deficit of more than $4,000,000,000 which he plans for the fiscal year 1951 "will be due largely to the short-sighted tax reduction enacted by the Eightieth Congress." If Mr. Truman really believes what he says, his only consistent course is to recommend immediate restoration of the higher tax rates prevailing before the cut. He actually declares, on the contrary, that "nothing could be more foolhardy than to attempt to bring about a balanced budget in 1951" by "drastic increases in tax rates" or "drastic cuts in essential expenditures." So he denounces the Eightieth Congress for bringing about a deficit that he insists upon maintaining.

The country is in grave financial peril unless the administration can be brought to end this political double-talk and recognize its responsibilities.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, one of the important measures that will be considered shortly by the Senate is the so-called middle-income housing bill. The passage of this bill will mean that thousands of people who have hitherto been unable to finance new homes will be able to do so. In a recent news letter to the people of Pennsylvania, I have explained various provisions of the bill, and I ask unanimous consent to have this news letter printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the news letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JANUARY 26, 1950.

WASHINGTON NEWS LETTER—A PERSONAL REPORT TO THE PEOPLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Even if you aren't planning to build a new home, you may be affected by the middle-income housing bill due for consideration shortly by the Senate, having passed the House—because our home-building industry is a cornerstone of our whole economic life.

Our economy prospers when home-building flourishes, and we head for a slump when building falls off.

One-fifth of our domestic private investment goes into residential construction.

Our mines, farms, and thousands of businesses depend on a steady flow of their products into home construction in order to stay profitable.

And new homes provide markets for thousands more producers, distributors, and retailers of household furnishings and materials for home maintenance.

So, whatever your plans, you should be familiar with the new housing proposals, because the well-being of our economy affects you.

Increased production of privately owned homes is a major purpose of the pending bill. The Housing Act of 1949, as you recall, provides for publicly owned, low-rent housing for those in the bottom-income brackets who simply could not otherwise afford decent shelter. The new bill is designed to assist those who could afford to buy a home, but are unable to find adequate financing arrangements under today's prices.

Homes costing less than $10,000 will be encouraged, because the need is greatest among families who can afford to buy in that price range; the market for higher-priced homes is starting to dry up—either because those who can pay above $10,000 have bought recently, or are satisfied where they are; home construction will drop, and the industry sicken, unless new markets develop.

Smaller down payments will be required on FHA-approved loans—and FHA mortgage insurance will be easier to obtain for soundly constructed homes costing up to $9,000. By liberalizing mortgage insurance provisions, private investment in smaller homes will be encouraged—and such investment will be encouraged still further by enlarging the secondary mortgage market.

Cooperative housing will be developed under title III of the proposed bill. Co-op housing is a development of this century in America, but it has a long history in many other countries. Members of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee has made glowing reports on the co-op developments they saw during their European visit last fall.

Co-ops work thus: A group of families buys some land together, forms a cooperative to purchase materials, to hire a building contractor, and to maintain the homes after their completion. The bill proposes a new Government service to furnish technical advice to those who wish to form cooperatives—and provides short-term planning loans to assist in getting things started. The co-op would be financed by private investment in debentures that are Government-insured. A 2½ percent down payment in the co-op is proposed, and the interest rate is expected to be about 3 percent—much lower than in ordinary home financing. Nonprofit rental housing projects will be aided in the same fashion.

Veterans will find home loans easier to obtain. The bill proposes to do away with the confusion of separate FHA and GI loans by combining them into a single loan running up to $10,000 at an interest rate of 4 percent. The GI home loan hasn't worked out as expected 5 years ago. The bill will make the GI loan work by permitting veterans unable to obtain a loan through private sources to borrow direct from the Government. And, as a result of the Myers-McMahon amendment I introduced, widows of veterans who died from service-connected injuries will also be able to obtain GI home loans.

I support the middle-income housing bill. It will be a big help in ending the housing shortage, and thus ultimately ending the need for rent control. It will encourage private ownership of homes. And by increasing the output of new homes, it will keep one of the basic industries in our free-enterprise system expanding and healthy.

FRANCIS J. MYERS.

Harmony in the Armed Services

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH R. McCARTHY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Harmony in the Armed Services—An Exclusive Interview With General Eisenhower," from United States News and World Report. I am informed by the Public Printer that the article is estimated to make two and a half pages in the RECORD, at a cost of $205.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HARMONY IN THE ARMED SERVICES—AN EXCLUSIVE INTERVIEW WITH GENERAL EISENHOWER

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—No man in the world today can speak with such authority as Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower on the value of coordination where different military services are concerned. His experience covers not only the coordination of Army, Navy, and Air Force of our own in Europe but also the bringing together of the forces of Allied countries. The general responded to an invitation to come to the conference rooms of United States News and World Report and answer the questions of its editors on some

of the basic principles of interservice harmony.

(In accordance with our usual practice, the full text of this interview is being released this week to the press and radio.)

Question. The popular conception, General Eisenhower, is that in Europe you had a more effective coordination of the three armed services than existed in other theaters. What lesson can be derived from that experience?

Answer. There were not present with us some of the causes that might have led to friction in other places. For example: The second the soldier went ashore in Europe a general started commanding. There is another system under which the Navy stays in charge of men going ashore until, as it is said, the Army can take feasible command. This difference grows out of differences in experience, and, under some circumstances, the second arrangement is good. But because it introduces a determination by two men to be based upon judgment as to feasibility, friction can easily develop.

BASIS FOR COOPERATION IN EUROPE

Also, in other theaters, operating forces often were a long, long way from their top commander. I, on the other hand, could always be right next to my command. There was no chance for an argument to build up—they could call over to me and say: "What do you want us to do now?" And hence there were absent, I think, some of the causes of friction.

Also, from the beginning in the Pacific there were two separate theaters of operation—one from Australia and one from Hawaii. We did not have that to contend with in Europe. So I should certainly be the last to maintain that there was any special qualification or any special genius in directing this problem in Europe. We probably did not have as difficult a situation.

Question. Did the Navy cooperate freely with you?

Answer. At the beginning of the war, when I was designated as the European commander, Admiral [Ernest J.] King [Chief of Naval Operations, 1942–45] called me in. We sat in his office and he said, "Now, look—this is the first attempt in American history to operate combined forces under the principle of single command. We have talked about some meaningless words called paramount interest. He said, "I want you to understand, General, as far as the United States Navy is concerned, you're in command as long as you're in command."

It was then that he invited me to wire him directly if I ever saw any trouble with any part of the Navy. Once, I think it was just a slip of a pen somewhere, we were suddenly to lose all of our naval staff officers except three. I wired Admiral King and the order was countermanded in 20 minutes.

Our operations, except for landings, were chiefly ground and air. Naval losses and day-by-day functioning were not an intimate part of our activities. But the naval role was clear and vital, and naval failure would have meant failure for all.

BUILDING A WORKABLE COMMAND

Question. Doesn't the real difficulty arise in understanding of the word "unification"? Isn't "coordination" of the armed forces what really happened in your operation?

Answer. Except, of course, if you have people working together as partners and in the proper atmosphere, there are a few questions that have to be referred elsewhere for decision.

I think there is one principle that applies with any combined command. I am sure it applies with an allied command. The principle is that you really must build your way into command. When you start in you've got to do a lot of urging and cajoling. But finally there comes a time when everybody suddenly realizes that this machine is working pretty well.

There is built gradually for the allied team that same kind of loyalty that you have for your own division or your own battalion. Governments get confidence in the headquarters and its personnel, and once that confidence is built up, your recognized right to issue orders, which you could not possibly have issued a few months before, becomes quite clear.

For example, the highest British officials told me several times in the early days of our plan to invade Normandy: "General, please remember that any officer of the British forces serving under you is there because you want him. Any expression of dissatisfaction on your part will be instant cause for his removal."

You could not have imagined such a statement being made to any Allied commander on the first day we started off to war. At the beginning we are all imbued with the thought: "My duty is to protect my country against this ally here and that ally there." Since I saw that attitude disappear in war, I think that finally there is going to disappear a man's belief that his primary duty is to protect his service against the decisions of the whole security establishment.

STEPS TOWARD EFFICIENCY

Question. Would that be helped if we made the three services divisions of one service?

Answer. I do not think so. I think that in arguing these details of organization we are just setting up straw men to whip. It is not for me to preach, but I say this: Anyone who is really interested in our country's security can help a lot by beginning to express confidence in the theory and say: "We've had all sorts of trouble and we do not for a minute believe that any single person has been to blame. We take back nothing we've urged in the past, but the time has come to hammer on the constructive side for the future."

That is what I believe, and I believe it so thoroughly that I did not want to go before the House Armed Services Committee last autumn. The authorities insisted, so I came down. I said, "I won't talk about this quarrel. There has been enough name calling and I think this committee as well as everybody else has got to start looking toward the future."

For that is all we're really concerned about. Why are we spending this defense money? It is for the future. It is not to make applicable somebody's concept of how I should have used the Navy at Salerno, or how someone else should have used the Army at Okinawa, or somewhere else.

We ought to be turning our eyes to the future with an approach that will help our service staffs to get together. Because, like the rest of us, they are all human. They have their little prejudices, their stumbling blocks. But I have tremendous confidence in their capacity to do work together.

Question. Isn't it true that the feeling within the services is that they get along better outside of Washington than they do in Washington?

Answer. Yes. Several times I have observed that efficiency in unification grows in proportion to the distance you get away from Washington. Of course, there is a reason—because here in the National Capital is that one great basic problem—the division of the dollar. Once you get away from that problem, there is less friction.

LAWS OF STRATEGY AND LIFE

Question. A great many laymen have advanced the idea of a single service in one uniform. What do you think about that?

Answer. I have often said how nice it would be if we were all in the same uniform with just differing tabs to distinguish us. I was only trying, in somewhat exaggerated form, to illustrate the spirit that we ought to have. I certainly believe in the benefits of competition—the benefits of specialization. But what we must do is never carry those things too far and not be arbitrary about them. So we should keep our traditional uniforms.

Remember this: When you get high enough up in command, you cannot have a mind that is technically trained in all the specialties you must employ. For example, the highest command in this last war consisted of Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Churchill. Mr. Roosevelt may have read some naval history and Mr. Churchill was once a young cavalry officer, but that was the extent of their professional military training. Yet in the final analysis they made the highest military decisions.

As long as your viewpoint is broad enough you do not have to worry too much about professional or technical training in top commands—such as theater of operation. It did not make any difference, for example, that I didn't know how to shoot the latest artillery piece in order to be able to use artillery.

The broad laws of strategy are roughly the broad laws of life, you might say. When you begin to talk about cooperation and surprise, concentration, and maneuver, really you are talking about the way you handle the affairs of your life. You merely are following certain common-sense rules that somebody who called himself a scholar codified and called "principles of war." They sometimes make me chuckle—because you break at least one of those principles every time you fight a battle.

Question. Do you think the public is conscious of the enormous increase in costs of everything the armed services have to have?

Answer. No. When we begin to compare costs these days with those of the past, we make the mistake of just comparing moneybags. I sometimes wonder whether we shouldn't stop calling them dollars and call them dollarettes—so as to convey the idea we are not talking about the same thing we did in 1939.

But I do believe that something could be done toward educating the public by just carrying the price tag of some things. When we talk about a great big B-36 or a P-85 or 86, or whatever it is, or an aircraft carrier, or anything else, or the cost of keeping a regiment through a year, we should just put the price tag on what it now costs compared with a comparable thing in prewar.

Question. There are only so many dollars to spend in any event, and those dollars must be divided between three services, must they not?

Answer. That's right. I feel that in our services we have today the best-educated group of military people that this world has seen. There is something a little bit haywire that makes it difficult for them to work together. I am quite sure that they themselves, in the end, are going to discover that they are not quite doing their very best to work together. When they do it will be fine.

I think that all argument must retreat from the extremes if it is to be valid. A way will finally be found down the big, broad middle of common-sense, logic and conciliation that will be effective. I do not mean to say we are ever going to end all arguments.

Question. You mean arguments within the services?

Answer. Oh, yes; within each of them. We are always going to be dealing in deficits.

Question. What do you mean by deficits?

Answer. Deficits under a professionally calculated force or strength. I am not speaking of strength to assure absolute safety, because all of us are smart enough to realize that there is no such thing as absolute safety in weapons. But there is a very definite relative security that you can calculate.

Professional calculation as to the total that prudence requires for relative security will never be matched, in its aggregate total, by

the dollars that we can reasonably make available in time of peace, year after year. Therefore, you have to do the best you can. There must be a compromise between endurable cost and what you would really like to have.

Question. How much weight has ever been given in councils of that sort to the principle of a nucleus from which you can expand in wartime, and how much has been given to the idea that you must be ready at all times?

Answer. The more nearly that the unit about which you are speaking becomes a machine, merely operated by men, instead of men carrying the battle directly to the enemy—in that ratio you become committed to the force in being. You cannot build a warship in a month, and you can't build an airplane in a month.

For example, there wasn't a single airplane used by the American forces in combat in World War II that had not been designed before the war started. The design was on the drawing board before the war started. Therefore, both navies and air forces stress very much this business of force in being—because of the danger of a sudden, paralyzing shock by the initial blows of an enemy.

The skeleton force has always been uppermost in the Army's calculations. Get a small nucleus that can multiply itself—like the amoeba, you know. They go in for that more in the Army than they do in the other two services, for the reason that the other fellows' services have more ready at the moment of attack.

Question. In recent discussions of military organization hasn't there been rather a lack of interest in tactical air for support of ground troops?

Answer. In public discussions there may have been, but it is a matter that has been important to all of us, certainly since 1941, at which time we thought there was a very grave lack of concern.

You realize that in Europe the Army with its supporting Air Force became the predominating factor in victory. Indispensable as was the naval role, the campaign was a continental one, and the chief battle assets were ground forces, air forces, and supply. So we were peculiarly sensitive to this business of tactical air support.

During the war and since the war I've heard no lack of discussion about this vital matter. But again, there is this matter of compromise. In the measure that you believe a paralyzing shock delivered, let's say, against the industrial centers of a potential enemy may be a really grave deterrent and hold him up while you're doing some other thing, you may finally have to curtail construction of a smaller, fighting kind of aircraft in favor of the big ones. So, you are always struggling to get what you think you will need on D-day and with the least possible damage to things that, though necessary, will not be vital.

NEED FOR SPECIAL PLANES

Question. We have been told that aircraft were not interchangeable as between strategic and tactical air—that is, special types would have to be developed for tactical air. Is that true?

Answer. I think that is true only within limits. I know that we found the very finest ship you could put on the front lines was the pursuit ship especially equipped for support. You could put a bomb under each wing and turn 51's and 47's into attack ships. I do think as they go more and more to terrific speeds in jet-powered fighter planes that probably we are going to have to have special planes for ground support—which would be too bad, but there it is.

Question. Special planes for the use of ground operations?

Answer. Yes; unless they find some way of developing a flexibility in speeds and maneuverability needed in ground operations.

Question. Some people feel that your book did not deal adequately with the work of the Navy in Europe. How do you feel about that?

Answer. If that is true, it is something I regret, but it was certainly never meant. I have looked up people who had been present at a number of my press conferences during the war and I think there was not a single press conference in which I did not go out of my way to stress that we were a triumvirate. I emphasized the three services all the way through—and I meant to do it in the book.

Question. What do you think was the importance of naval power in your ground operations?

Answer. When we started planning what turned out later to be the invasion of Europe, it was in January, February, and early March of 1942. I would like you to remember how we then were looking at the world situation. We were losing ships by the score every week coming up from South America. We had graveyards of ships along the Florida coast and all across the Atlantic, so all of the plans were up against the utter necessity, first, of gaining control of those Atlantic lanes. The first thing that entered into our calculations was naval power and the assurance that it would be adequate in strength.

When you start an operation of the kind we were calculating—which eventually was going to consume some millions of men—you cannot have interrupted sea lanes, with convoys being chased and scattered as they were being chased and scattered in the spring of 1942.

There was a very, very great belief that the Atlantic wall the Germans were supposed to be constructing could not be breached tactically, so at the same time that we were counting on the Navy to control the Atlantic we also had to count on smashing of the areas back of the beachheads by means of air. This became a basic thought or idea of the plan. Yet the airplanes to do the job did not exist. A start was just being made to build them.

So the plan had to be constructed with complete faith in two things: The certainty that the United States would have great naval power and the certainty of great air power.

Question. In the North African landing was naval power essential?

Answer. Absolutely.

Question. To make sure there was no opposition from an enemy fleet?

Answer. Not only that. I think that the feat of the Navy in bringing the African operating forces ashore with the loss only of one ship was one of the most amazing things in naval annals—almost a miracle. The German submarines at that time were everywhere. The Allied navies brought this force of General [George S.] Patton's all the way from the United States. They brought the others from England and took these forces through that bottleneck in the Mediterranean, most of them through Gibraltar, the others down to Casablanca. Yet before landing we lost only one ship. We lost a lot afterwards because the enemy could gang up around the entrances to these ports.

DEPENDENCE ON NAVAL GUNFIRE

Question. You used naval forces in the landings in the south of France, of course?

Answer. Everywhere.

Question. When you went up to the Normandy landing you had several battleships, didn't you?

Answer. Oh, yes, both United States and British.

Question. What function did they perform?

Answer. One, of course, was bombardment. We knew we weren't going to be able to search out and break up all of the coastal batteries by air-bombing attacks alone. The Navy, all the way through the war, had been gaining for itself an increased respect for its gunfire. With spotter planes they can do a lot—at Gela, in Sicily, for instance, they broke up a tank attack with their gunfire. They're good—they're very good. So we had come, by the time of Normandy, to depend very seriously upon naval gunfire in getting ashore, so much so that I was asking all the time for more than they could give.

Question. Were those naval long-range guns helpful?

Answer. Oh, indeed, yes. As a matter of fact, I was just reading a report made by two German commanders in Cherbourg. Along about the 23d or 24th of June 1944, they wanted to surrender. They were really taking punishment because we were dumping everything we had on them and pushing them very hard on the ground, and in the air. Finally, about the morning of the 24th, these two admirals sent a radio begging permission to surrender because they said, "The Navy's opened up on us too." So it was coming from everywhere.

RISKS OF AMPHIBIOUS WARFARE

Question. All through the operation in Europe we controlled the sea. Was this vital?

Answer. Yes, and the Navy supported the landings. You know an amphibious landing is not a particularly difficult thing, but it's a touchy and delicate thing, and anything can go wrong. In some ways, from the land fellow's viewpoint, it is one of the simplest operations. You put your men in boats and as long as you get well-trained crews to take the boats in, it is the simplest deployment in the world—the men can go nowhere else except to the beach. But, nevertheless, it is a very, very delicate thing and you need all the gun power you can get. We faced a number of enemy batteries along the Normandy beaches that annoyed us for several days after the landings and the Navy kept pounding on them until we captured them.

Question. Was the Navy in charge?

Answer. It was in charge of putting men ashore. Admiral [Chester W.] Nimitz [Commander in Chief, Pacific Fleet, 1941–45] and I used to talk about this point of "changing command." The Navy's experience in the Pacific was hopping from island to island. You knew what was there—you could, in other words, calculate your battle plan down to a more minute detail than you can in a continental land mass, where a landing is nothing but a prelude to a campaign. You know that if you can get ashore firmly on an island you can stay there, because you know approximately what is ashore, how much you've got and what you can do.

In Normandy when we got ashore we didn't know what was going to happen; no one did. And the Navy had to stay right there and do its part all the way through—Admiral [Alan G.] Kirk [commanding United States naval task forces, invasion of Normandy, 1944] was just as much a part of my planning staff as was my chief of staff. He allotted his gunfire down to include particular batteries—and the Navy even helped to break up counterattacks.

What I constantly try to make people see is that there are all kinds of warfare. No one ought to draw arbitrary lessons from the European campaigns alone, because always, except where we went into Africa—where we were invading a neutral country to make an ally—we always had air bases that were close by.

Now, of course, this has its disadvantages. That's the reason the Germans could figure we would land at Salerno. We had one British aircraft carrier in the Mediterranean but we depended upon the fighters that were based in eastern Sicily. The reason we had to pick Salerno was that it was within effective range of our fighter craft. The Germans knew we weren't going to land out of fire range, so Salerno was indicated clearly.

Question. What if we had been able to develop large air-borne forces that could be landed inland?

Answer. There are all sorts of difficulties yet in the way of air landings, unless you can do so undisturbed and have pretty good airfields; you need them for true mobility on the land. An air-borne force is a very immobile thing because it doesn't have the trucks and tanks and self-propelled guns and all the other heavy equipment that a mobile force needs.

What it really amounts to is that with an air landing you establish a blocking force, under present conditions. We will get better and we will develop better and lighter equipment; we will progress. We are not yet at the point, in my opinion, where you can establish an inland air head and then from that, as a base, start a real campaign that would be in the nature of the one on the Normandy beaches where we brought boxcars ashore.

Some genius thought of putting rails on the bottom of an LST (landing ship, tank) and of bringing across boxcars and running them across a makeshift connection up to the French railroads. We would have a boxcar out of England and operating in France in 24 hours. Now you cannot do that with an airplane—not yet. I don't know what we will do if they some day put wings on the *Queen Mary*, but that's where we are now.

ADVANTAGES OF CARRIER FORCE

Question. Do you feel that amphibious warfare will be a part of warfare for a long time to come?

Answer. My first remark is that I hope there will be no more warfare. But I could not give an unqualified answer, for the simple reason that it is very hard to figure where any war is going to be fought and under what conditions it is going to be fought.

I would say this: We would be foolish today to allow to die in our services the very great knowledge we have of that type of operation. We are ahead of everybody in amphibious operations. We are certainly equal with the British in doctrine and we've got more and better equipment. We are better equipped to produce that equipment. It would be foolish for us to drop back. We should keep pushing ahead. I would be very much against letting that type of warfare be neglected.

It's the same way with aircraft carriers—in the peacetime calculations. One great thing about war is that, if and when such a tragedy visits us again, it is always going to happen under circumstances, at places and under conditions different from those you expect or plan for.

The one great thing about a sizable aircraft-carrier task force is its great flexibility. Suppose a war should start in the Mediterranean. Suppose it should start on the west coast of Africa, or Siberia, or the Persian Gulf. Aircraft carriers can operate in those areas. I cannot tell what are going to be the scientific discoveries of the future and therefore what is going to be the increasing vulnerability and the increasing efficiency of these weapons. But I do know that you can calculate in detail only with what you can see with some certainty for today and tomorrow. We establish staffs which are thinking in hazier future terms. But now we are speaking of current plans. A flexible carrier task force has a high place in my own personal priorities. This same observation applies also to a sizable bombing fleet.

To revert for just a moment to the question concerning the Navy and its part in the European war—when we were preparing for the final assault across the Rhine, we brought the Navy into it. We had had wonderful experience with the Navy in going ashore. We just said to the Navy, "Come on, take us across the Rhine." We had these LCVP's (landing craft, vehicle, personnel)—they were maybe 40 feet long—mounted on truck trailers. They were taken right across France, dumped in the water and the Navy took us over.

HOW THREE SERVICES WORKED TOGETHER

Question. That certainly was a unified operation, wasn't it?

Answer. Yes. One of the things—one of the reasons that I've shied so definitely away from any public participation in the arguments between services was my complete respect for the three services and the way they operated with and for me. I have no complaint whatsoever, I assure you. The two or three times when I thought, for example, that the Navy didn't understand, I sent direct cables to Admiral King and he just answered, "Yes." I couldn't have been supported in the field more definitely or completely by anyone than by Admiral King. Admiral King was not of the back-slapping type. I never had anything but the utmost respect and liking for him.

All this applies also to the Army; I have merely mentioned the naval support because, after all, I wore the OD uniform and therefore expected perfect Army support.

It's a difficult business, you know, planning the forces you need for relative security. You make a generalization and say, "We must have a given number of tanks." This might be first priority, but when you get those tanks, what then is the priority on the next hundred tanks as compared with something of another kind? That is the job that has to be done each year, and it's one of those things that create heat because each fellow in this business will become very, very confident of his own forces. He has had experience with them.

Take a paratrooper, with his very, very high morale. A paratrooper really thinks that if you give him two bazookas and a jeep, he'll go anywhere and whip the world. Of course, it's a fine spirit. But the fact is that each service gets this almost cocky confidence in its own forces and then the heat of argument starts as all come to realize that there is not enough money for everything.

PROBLEMS IN COMBINED COMMAND

Question. Is the idea of a combined command still accepted by other countries?

Answer. I think at least to this extent—when (Viscount) Montgomery was over we had a long talk, and certainly with him single field command is completely accepted as a must. Now I think that all of the people with whom I've talked—people like (Baron) Tedder of the Royal Air Force and most of my naval friends are going out of the picture over there—they all believe in it.

But I don't think that countries other than ours will ever use it in time of peace because for them it introduces new problems of a kind that are not encountered so much in our service. In Britain their chiefs of staff are almost part of the cabinet. They fit in with the defense cabinet, which is part of the big cabinet. Professional commanders are always present when military decisions are rendered. Military problems are not neglected and allowed to pile up. One of the reasons I have always believed we needed a Defense Department over here was so that these questions, when they could not be settled by strictly professional cooperation, would have some civilian part of Government instantly familiar with them and solving them. Whether or not it's always done perfectly is sometimes not quite as important as the fact that it's done satisfactorily.

The British are not likely to accept, in peacetime, a unified method for the control of British forces along with the forces of other countries. But they have accepted it, I am sure, as a necessary type of command in war.

Question. Of course, some people have been hoping that we would get an international police force—if we ever got the principle of combined command——

A. Well, yes—but that is a question of highest international policy.

National Security and Individual Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM BENTON

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix a summary of a penetrating statement on national policy issued by the Research and Policy Committee of the Committee for Economic Development, on December 14, 1949, entitled "National Security and Our Individual Freedom."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL SECURITY AND OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

1. THE THREATS TO OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

We live in a world of insecurity, in a critical period which may last a generation. We are now faced with entirely new problems. Changes in the world distribution of power, added to revolutionary developments in military weapons, have fundamentally changed the character of our security problem. For the first time in our history, we, in effect, share a common border with powerful potential enemies.

Today's conditions make a major security program necessary. In this new situation we Americans are painfully learning that our security program cannot be kept to a minor budget nor to an incidental effect on our peacetime lives. While we continuously exert every effort to prevent war, at the same time we must be prepared to fight at a moment's notice.

Our security program is only partly a matter of rearmament. The European recovery program, atomic energy, our foreign broadcasts, and the conduct of our diplomacy and incoming intelligence are also in large part security measures.

During the next few years, the annual cost of rearmament and other forms of security expenditure, at home and abroad, is expected to amount to $20,000,000,000 or more as an annual minimum. This is nearly a tenth of our national production. It is truly a tremendous expenditure of national resources.

The security program is a necessary and, at the same time, a dangerous force in our society.

Our security program threatens our individual freedoms. Under it there has been a great increase in the role of the military in our Government, a great increase in bureaucracy, an expanding dominance of government over industry and in increasing interference with individual freedoms. When we increase the share of our resources devoted to security, we unavoidably enlarge the scope of government in every sphere of life.

Security measures, uncurbed by the requirements of freedom, can undermine our free institutions. Public apathy and the pressure for security can lead us down the road that ends in the garrison-police state.

We must seek both national security and individual freedom. Some measures can serve both objectives. But other measures

to increase one can operate to decrease the other. Where there is such conflict, the problem is to work out an acceptable balance. In time of war, security takes temporary precedence over individual freedom. At the present time, the balance must be weighed in the direction of freedom.

Freedom itself, and the self-discipline necessary to true freedom, contribute to security. The maintenance of individual freedoms creates the greatest bulwark of our security—the energy and intelligence of freemen working together to build and to save their own and their country's freedom. Even more important, freedom and the dignity of the individual are the very foundation of our society, and the ends for which we are striving. Without them security loses its purpose.

II. ON WHAT DOES OUR FREEDOM DEPEND?

The security program threatens two major institutions on which our freedom depends: the traditional supremacy of the civilian over the military and our system of individual liberties. At the same time, freedom depends on an adequate security program. Herein lies the dilemma.

Civilian supremacy is essential to freedom: The men who drafted our Constitution provided that a civilian, the President, should be commander in chief of the armed forces. They also insisted on the civilian control represented by the authority of Congress, and, beyond this, by the power of citizens to elect the Congress and the President. Appointment of civilian secretaries of the defense departments, civilian control of the War Production Board in World War II, and civilian control of the Atomic Energy Commission have also advanced this principle.

The purpose of civilian control of the military is clear: (1) To protect free institutions; (2) to insure that military measures fit into the larger programs of national security and national policy of which the military is only a part; and (3) to promote efficiency in the Military Establishment itself.

There is today no direct challenge to the principle of civilian supremacy nor to the legal chain through which it can be exercised. But the magnitude and character of our security program make the effective exercise of civilian supremacy increasingly difficult and all the more necessary.

The President faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. He is the constitutional manager of our security system. In the discharge of his responsibilities, he must work through many agencies. To assist in coordinating the work of these agencies, the President relies on his Cabinet, upon a few immediate advisers, and upon several staff agencies.

The complexity of our security organization suggests the magnitude of the burdens placed upon the President. He urgently needs an effective staff to provide him with a comprehensive and balanced review of the security program. For such a review the President requires the efficient operation of the two top-level Cabinet committees created in 1947: the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board.

The National Security Council was established to advise the President on the integration of domestic, foreign, and military policy. Its members are the President, the Vice President, the Secretaries of State and Defense, and the Chairman of the National Security Resources Board. The President may add additional members. So far the National Security Council has not fully lived up to its high potential, though it has made important recent progress. It does not appear that it has yet drawn up a comprehensive set of current and long-range security policies. As a result, the President is handicapped in carrying out his responsibility to recommend a balanced security program to the Congress and to the people.

The National Security Resources Board consists of a civilian chairman and the Secretaries of State, Treasury, Defense, Agriculture, Commerce, Interior, and Labor. It was created to advise the President on the coordination of military, industrial, and civilian mobilization. It, too, has not fully lived up to its potential. Despite recent progress, it has been characterized by a lack of clarity of purpose and by inability to establish satisfactory working relationships with other security agencies. This handicaps the National Security Council and further weakens the hands of the President.

The Congress, like the President, faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. At least two-thirds of the committees of both Houses are concerned in one way or another with security policy. Problems come before Congress in piecemeal fashion. Neither House has a committee structure designed to secure a balanced, comprehensive view of security policy as a whole. Congress is not yet organized to deal with security problems on a broad and balanced basis.

The citizen also faces difficulties in exercising civilian supremacy. He suffers in carrying out his responsibilities from the faults in the present organization of the legislative and executive branches of Government. The citizen also needs much basic information he now lacks. While certain specific information must be withheld in order to keep it from potential enemies, our Government is now leaning more heavily toward secrecy than in any previous peacetime period.

Great danger is inherent in a poorly informed public. Even more important is the public apathy toward security policies due to lack of adequate and reliable information necessary for responsible discussion and judgment. An alert and well-informed citizenry is essential to the effective working of civilian supremacy on which our democratic processes depend.

Maintenance of our system of individual liberties is essential to freedom. The requirements of security and the fear and hysteria generated by the threats to our security require constant vigilance to preserve our individual liberties.

One threat to individual liberties comes when the loyalty of individual citizens is called into question. Loyalty investigations can degenerate into witch hunts.

A more indirect threat comes when the security program endangers the free economy which underlies so much of our individual freedom. A security program of the present size threatens the free economy in three major ways: (1) by the burden of taxes on economic incentives; (2) by the control of business activity through Government contracts; and (3) by the likelihood of recurrent proposals to impose direct controls over economic activity in the name of security.

Security bought at the cost of destroying our system of individual liberties of our free economy would be self-defeating.

An adequate and balanced security program is essential to freedom. Though our freedom is threatened by our security program it would be threatened even more gravely without it. Freedom cannot survive in today's world without reasonably adequate security. An adequate security program obviously requires a large military establishment. But it must also include such nonmilitary weapons as diplomacy, world information, economic aid and an effective intelligence service.

At the present time, there is reason to believe that our security program is neither efficient nor in balance. There are serious instances of disregard of civilian authority. There are evidences of low efficiency in the Nation's defense forces. A balance must be kept between the various parts of the security program and programs serving other objectives of national policy.

Proposals need to be made by the executive branch after balanced consideration of all aspects of national policy. Our lawmakers must keep America solvent as to both ideals and resources. An informed public needs to remain alert to the dangers to both security and freedom.

III. RECOMMENDATIONS TOWARD IMPROVING OUR NATIONAL SECURITY AND PRESERVING OUR INDIVIDUAL FREEDOM

There can be no simple solution to the problems of security and freedom. We must look to time and the wisdom of public discussion to find the answers. But public wisdom cannot be brought to bear if the chain of civilian control is ineffective, if the basis for informed judgment is lacking, or if policy is approached in a piecemeal fashion.

The recommendations which follow are only a step toward bringing public discussion to bear on these continuing problems. They are not the only possible steps. They are concerned almost entirely with organization and procedure. Their aim is to strengthen the machinery by which adequate and balanced discussion of security policy and its relation to freedom can be carried out at all levels. It is our belief that these recommendations, if put into effect, will lead to a powerful strengthening of both freedom and security.

Toward more effective exercise of civilian supremacy

The strengthening of civilian control requires action at each level to aid the President, the Congress, and the individual citizen in the exercise of their respective responsibilities.

At the executive level: To aid the President in developing a balanced policy with respect to security and freedom, we recommend:

1. That the National Security Council be developed as the principal executive agency on which the President relies for formulating and reviewing comprehensive and balanced security policies.

2. That there be added to the Council three full-time civilian members without other governmental responsibilities.

3. That the role of the National Security Resources Board be further clarified and developed.

4. That a full-time chairman of the Board be promptly appointed.

5. That within the Department of Defense there be a strong civilian staff independent of control by the military services to aid in developng and evaluating defense policy.

At the congressional level: To strengthen the hand of Congress in achieving a proper balance of security and freedom the Congress should take positive steps to coordinate the various aspects of security policy. To this end we recommend:

1. That a Committee on National Security be established in each House of Congress, representing all committees of each House whose jurisdiction covers a significant part of the field.

2. That as far as possible these Committees on National Security act together in the manner of a joint committee.

At the public level: To encourage and assist the citizen in exercising his responsibility for security policy we recommend:

1. That one full-time member of the National Security Council be made responsible for a more effective flow to the public of information relating to national security.

2. That the President devote a part of his annual message to the Congress and to the public on the state of the Union to a discussion of the problems involved in the national security program and their relation to freedom.

3. That vigorous effort be made to stimulate discussion throughout the Nation on the problems of national security and their relation to freedom.

Toward preserving our system of individual liberties

To strengthen the forces which operate to preserve our individual liberties we recommend:

1. That one full-time member of the National Security Council be made responsible for reviewing the effect of security measures on individual liberties and advising the President thereon.

2. That the section of the President's annual state of the Union message devoted to the national security program (recommended above) include a review of the relation of the security program to individual liberties.

3. That the National Security Council, in reviewing the security program, give particular attention to the danger of undermining the free economy.

Toward a more balanced and efficient security program

The recommendations made for preserving our freedom will also help to produce better balance and reduce waste in the security program. In addition we recommend that both the executive and legislative branches of the Government conduct a continuing review of the security program to see:

1. That waste and inefficiency in security expenditure is kept at a minimum.

2. That the security program itself is kept in internal balance, both as among the various types of military expenditure and as between military and other forms of security expenditures.

3. That measures to further the security objective and measures to further other important objectives of national policy are kept in balance. An over-all review of all national policies, their timing and their economic cost is needed to appraise their effects on both security and freedom.

Vigilance is the price of freedom

In the last analysis, the economic strength and the freedom and security of this country rest on the moral and spiritual vigor of its people. A free society can be preserved only by responsible citizenship. The new requirements of national security threaten our freedom. Only an alert and responsible citizenry can insure that adequate security is obtained without the loss of essential freedoms. We are confident that the American people can and will solve this problem.

Beware of German Propaganda

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YCRK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial from the January–February issue, No. 33, of Prevent World War III, the official publication of the Society for the Prevention cf World War III, Inc., of 515 Madison Avenue, New York 22, called "Auction for Germany."

I am including a second article from the same source headed "Revealing documents."

Needless to say, I fully endorse the position taken in each editorial; America, and the civilized world, must be on constant guard against the ruthless, cynical, and effective propaganda of Germany, in strength or in weakness, if civilization is to survive.

AUCTION FOR GERMANY

The confusion of the German situation, which has been growing steadily in the past year, recently reached a new peak. It is almost unbelievable that the situation should have touched the point where even the question of German remilitarization and of a German army is strongly advocated by certain powerful circles.

Tempora mutantur—times change—but the naivete, if not the stupidity of the period following the First World War prevails again. Or are we witnessing the unfolding of a well-calculated plan preferred by the powers that be? It is true that there are other factors in the German problem today which were not present after the First World War. But the hysterical arguments in favor of a strong, rearmed Germany, as advocated at present by wishful thinkers and political opportunists, so soon after the end of hostilities, are fantastic and outrageous.

It is no secret, and the fact has been stated in these pages many times previously, that both Soviet Russia and the Western Powers are frantically bidding for Germany. The London Economist recently called this bidding an auction for Germany. The imbecility of this auction, unfortunately, has not been fully realized by those responsible for shaping German policy. Every intelligent political observer knows that Soviet policy in Germany, to quote the Economist, "has been one of long-sighted and realistic conspiracy for power," while American policy—we still quote the Economist—"had gone through 180-degree revolution since 1945." It should have been clear for a long time that in a continuous bidding for Germany's favor, Moscow definitely has more advantages to offer. It also should have been made clear for a long time that in an open bidding the Western Powers, for very obvious reasons, could only be the losers. It is mathematically certain that the Western Powers, being democracies, would never be able to outbid totalitarian Soviet Russia for the good will, friendship, and alliance of totalitarian-minded Germany.

There is still time, perhaps, for those of our policy makers who are under the delusion that we can win Germany to our side against Soviet Russia to awake from their wishful dream.

An editorial in a recent issue of the New York Post—a paper which consistently opposes Soviet policy of expansion—has given an excellent analysis of this situation.

"Have we finally been deluded into the belief," the editorial states, "that we can compete effectively with Soviet expansionism only by embracing the old Nazi cabal?"

And it adds:

"Unquestionably, the Russians are holding hands with their former Nazi adversaries. There is powerful evidence that the Nazi come-back is just as swift or even more phenomenal in the Soviet zone than in the western realm. This is no justification for American policy or lack of policy. It proves nothing about the nature of the problem concerning us in Germany. It proves only that the old Nazi contingent is doing quite well on both sides of the German fence. The Nazis were always remarkably flexible fellows; they will play 'footsie' with anyone who takes care of their immediate needs. They can love or hate Bolsheviks, as they proved in August 1939, and June 1941. But they can never make real peace with democracy."

The editorial furthermore emphasizes that it is nonsense to think that a strong Germany would prove an efficient bulwark against communism. It should not be forgotten that it was a strong Germany that signed the Nazi-Soviet pact.

Needless to say, we most heartily endorse the viewpoints expressed in this editorial, especially the following:

"(The Germans) will sing anti-Soviet songs in the western zone even while their counterparts in the Soviet-ruled territory dream of a grand new alliance with the Soviets. They will profess their devotion to 'free enterprise'—even as they endeavor to rebuild the cartel system. They will bring neither peace nor security to the world."

Many times in the past we have pointed out in these pages that it would be criminal for the western powers to rely on the Germans. To think seriously that if we were to remilitarize and build up western Germany—even if we were to recreate the German Army—the Germans would become our partners and friends and not those of Soviet Russia, is plain nonsense. In this connection it should be pointed out that even extreme conservatives, to say nothing of right-wing elements in western Germany, openly play with the idea of a new Russo-German alliance.

It is true that some of their colleagues occasionally show a strong anti-Communist attitude. But is this not done to fool us and to throw sand in our eyes? We need only to mention the strange activities of people like ex-Ambassador Rudolf Nadolny, university Prof. Ulrich Noack, etc., men who despite their conservative backgrounds are strong protagonists of a German deal with Soviet Russia.

Even a man like Pastor Martin Niemoeller recently tore off his mask of nationalistic double-talk and openly stated that if unification is not granted he would rather see Germany become Communist than continue to live in its present divided condition.

The question put to Niemoeller after his return from a 3-month visit to Australia was, "Do you think that, in order to reunify east and west Germany, most Germans would be prepared to pay the price of having a Communist regime?"

"Yes," Niemoeller answered without hesitation. "Given the alternative of a continual split in Germany or the prospect of reuniting the country under a fallen dictatorship—that of Russia—the Germans would prefer to take the risks of communism."

Such a statement, coming from the mouth of a man generally considered one of the most outspoken of the conservative German nationalists, speaks for itself. No comment is necessary. But we think this significant statement of Pastor Niemoeller should help clarify the situation.

It is our firm belief that Niemoeller's pro-Soviet pronouncement should destroy, once and for all, the myth that if we give them everything they want, the Germans will be a bulwark against communism.

They never will be a bulwark against communism because the totalitarian and autocratic features of communism are much dearer to the hearts of the Germans than the features of democracy. It should be kept in mind—and history will undoubtedly confirm it—that far from being a bulwark against communism, it was Adolf Hitler and his Nazi Germans who opened the door of central and western Europe to communism.

REVEALING DOCUMENTS

The politics of war is a subject which received the closest attention of the German General Staff. During the crucial period of World War II, the General Staff sought to influence the outcome of the military struggle by every possible political means. This explains the secret instructions of Admiral Walter Wilhelm Canaris, chief of the secret service of the German High Command to his agents which were found in the files of the German Foreign Office.

In this connection, it is interesting to note that Allen Welsh Dulles, former head of the OSS in Switzerland, makes frequent mention

of Canaris in his book about Germany's so-called underground. He tells about negotiations he conducted with some of Canaris' agents in Switzerland who were supposed to be anti-Nazi. Whether these agents were anti-Nazis or not is a moot question. But we do know that Admiral Canaris was the "brain" of the German espionage service and a ruthless agent of the German General Staff. He fully understood the importance of the political factor in warfare.

As disclosed in the Canaris documents, the Germans knew that they could not win the war unless they succeeded in dividing their enemies by heightening political tensions and suspicions among them.

If this were merely wartime strategy on the part of the Germans, these documents would only serve as an historical curiosity. But we know that the Germans today have a vested interest in holding tensions between East and West at war pitch. As in war, so the Germans today are fanning the flames of mutual suspicions among their former adversaries. By intensifying the divisions among the victorious powers and pitting East against West, the Germans were evading the responsibilities of their crimes and aggressions. Thus, the Canaris strategy, which was frustrated during the war itself, has reemerged with greater success in this period of peace. It is the context of present day developments that the Canaris documents assume a sinister significance.

Following is the verbatim translation of two of these documents containing Admiral Canaris' instructions for top German agents abroad.

"OKW—ABWEHR, SECRET STATE MATTER, MARCH 15, 1944

"At a meeting of the representatives of the A. S., S. D. and the department of defense, the following resolutions were adopted for unified action of all the leaders in foreign countries:

"1. Utilize to the fullest extent all available possibilities in neutral and enemy countries, in order to strengthen our military effort with political and propaganda campaigns.

"2. Our goal is to crush the enemy's plan whose object it is to destroy forever Germany militarily, economically, and culturally.

"3. The new regulations put into effect by the political leaders for the dissolution and disintegration of the enemy bloc should be carried out more intensively. We must do our utmost to create a state of confusion among our enemies. Such a state of disunity would enable us to sue for a quick separate peace with either side. While it is true that the efforts made in that direction have failed so far due to the implacable hate policy of Roosevelt and Churchill, it does not mean that someday under different conditions, the unnatural front of our enemies could not be broken. Roosevelt's electoral defeat this year could have immeasurable political consequences.

"The political and military leaders are of the opinion that Germany has nothing to expect from the Russians; on the contrary, should the war take a turn for the worse, the Slavs may retaliate the harsh treatment we inflicted upon them. Nevertheless, every alley should be explored in order to create a political state of mind which will induce the Russians to negotiate a separate peace with us.

"In the event of a negotiated peace, or should we be defeated—on a long-range plan Germany has everything to gain by cooperating with the east.

"Right now, the chances for a separate peace with the west are a little better, especially if we succeed, through our propaganda campaign and our 'confidential' channels, to convince the enemy that Roosevelt's policy of unconditional surrender drives the German people toward communism.

"The opposition against Roosevelt's alliance with Stalin grows constantly. Our chances for success are good, if we succeed, to stir up influential circles against Roosevelt's policy. This can be done through clever pieces of information, or by references to unsuspicious neutral ecclesiastical contact men.

"We have at our command in the United States efficient contacts, which have been carefully kept up during the war. The campaign of hatred stirred up by Roosevelt and the Jews against everything German has temporarily silenced the pro-German bloc in the United States of America. However, there is every hope that this situation will be completely changed in a few months.

"If the Republicans succeed in defeating Roosevelt in the coming Presidential election, it would greatly influence the American war policy toward us.

"The KO-leaders abroad and their staff have innumerable opportunities of constantly referring to Roosevelt's hate policy.

"They can at the same time hint to the danger that Germany may thereby be forced to cooperate with Russia. The greatest caution has to be observed in all conversations and meetings by those who as 'anti-Nazis' maintain contact with the enemy. When fulfilling missions, they have to comply strictly with instructions.

"CANARIS."

"BERLIN, *June 28, 1943.*

"Strictly confidential.

"To KO-DIRECTOR, Bern (Switzerland).

"We informed the chief of the Swiss Espionage Defense, in a friendly way, not to disturb the connections between certain enemy posts in Switzerland, and our agents, who are camouflaged as anti-Nazis. If there should be any difficulties please inform OKW and SD at once.

"CANARIS.

"Copy to Foreign Office, Commissioner for Defense, and SD."

This statement was published in our magazine, Prevent World War III, in April 1946, long before there was any apparent sign that the Germans were climbing back to positions where they could embroil the world in a new war.

We refused to live in Mr. Chamberlain's dream world of the 1930's, because we were already aware of the violation of common agreements made by the Allies to eliminate Germany's war potential. Thus all the talk and noise today about new German armies in the east and in the west is not surprising to us.

It must be said that German armies will inevitably be created again if the present policies which are repeating the same blunders made by the Allies after World War I, are continued.

The neutralization of Germany can be a major step toward the prevention of new conflicts. Such a neutralization requires the following steps:

A. The establishment of a four-power disarmament committee to prevent the remilitarization of any of the zones in Germany.

B. Four-power agreement to hold the level of German steel production to peacetime needs—not exceeding present permitted levels.

C. Prompt fulfillment of the original reparations program under four-power control.

D. Four-power agreement on the elimination from key positions of former Nazis and Hitler supporters.

E. Four-power action to break up the German cartel empire.

F. Genuine international control of the Ruhr to prevent the reestablishment of German economic domination of her neighbors, and, at the same time, give Germany a viable economy for peace.

The carrying out of these measures and subsidiary steps would take Germany out of the international arena as a major bone of contention between east and west.

The hour is late, but it is up to us, the living, to make our final decision. We must bear in mind that a German army is inevitable if the people consent to policies which preserve a dangerous war potential in her heavy industries. It would be wishful thinking to believe that the creation of German armies, east or west, would be a boon to either side or to mankind in general.

President Heuss has told the truth: An east German army will not fight a west German army or vice versa. They will unite and when they unite, the betrayal of the peace and the security of the United States and her friends abroad will be complete.

War on Russia's Side

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask that an exceptionally newsworthy and revealing article published in the December 1949 edition of the United Nations World, entitled "New German Blueprint: War on Russia's Side," written by T. H. Tetens, be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. Tetens is an authority on pan-Germanism and geopolitics. In this article he has put his finger on the greatest single danger facing America in Europe: the danger that a rebuilt, rearmed supernationalist Germany will unite in totalitarian brotherhood with the Soviet Union in a third attempt in this century to conquer the world.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW GERMAN BLUEPRINT: WAR ON RUSSIA'S SIDE

(By T. H. Tetens)

From a secure base in Argentina, a group of top German political and intellectual leaders, all brought up on Prof. Karl Haushofer's geopolitical bible, are engaged in shaping a German policy which could threaten the safety of the United States even more than Hitler's drive for world dominion.

Although still lacking authority or official position, these men are the potential leaders of an unreconstructed Germany, rather than Presidents Heuss or Pieck. They are on the way to laying the foundations of the German political thinking of tomorrow. But already their influence upon their fellow Germans has assumed an importance difficult for Americans to understand.

What makes the activities of this clandestine political general staff so dangerous to the basic interests of the United States and the whole free world is their decision that, in the event of a Third World War, the German people must side with Soviet Russia.

The organ of the group is a monthly called Der Weg (The Way). It is the new testament of Realpolitik. It is the bible of nationalist Germans everywhere. It is also the progeny of Dr. Karl Haushofer's famous Zeitschrift fuer Geopolitik—Journal of Geopoli-

tics, source book for the Nazi drive toward world dominion.

* * * * *

Der Weg is printed in Buenos Aires in the Duerer House at Sarmiento 532. An attractive monthly on coated stock, its 80 pages contain many columns of advertising. Its editors are Eberhardt Fritsch and Gustav Friedl. The magazine attracts a galaxy of significant writers and thinkers of strong nationalistic convictions, whether residing abroad, or in Germany and Austria. Der Weg was started in July 1947, and became an immediate success among embittered Germans to whom it held out hope for a better—even a grandiose future. Although occupation authorities banned the publication from the American zones of Germany and Austria, it is smuggled into the fatherland by the thousands.

The chief editorial writer of Der Weg hides under the pseudonym "Observator." His articles sum up and express with forceful logic the political decisions which Der Weg accepts and promotes. Among the visible pundits of the Buenos Aires group are such stalwarts of German nationalism and aggressive expansionism as the notorious Dr. Colin Ross, one-time head of the Nazi propaganda machinery in the United States, Dr. Anton Zischka, Hans Grimm, Dr. Walter Pahl, Prof. Dr. Ferdinand Fried, and others. These intellectuals, however, are far from being an isolated assortment of thinkers. In their mansions, hotel suites, and clubs, in Buenos Aires, a large and influential clique of South American Germans are engaged in financing and developing the activities of the planners. Among them are the great financiers and industrialists of German extraction who are the big wheels of Argentina's economic life; theoretical economists like Ludwig Freude, Peron's personal adviser; former high ranking Wehrmacht officers now occuying important positions in the Argentine Army; scientists like Prof. Dr. Wilhelm Westphal, outstanding German authority on atomic energy; or ex-Luftwaffe flyers who had escaped from the allied armies. Prominent among the latter are General Baumbach, who used to be a top man in the Luftwaffe's training division; Gen. Adolph Galland, a fighter-pilot with 102 planes to his credit; Col. Thieben and Col. Hans U. Rudel.

* * * * *

When Der Weg started in 1947, its program called for collecting data on the comparative strength and weakness of the Western allies on the one hand, and of the Eastern bloc on the other. The group took the position that Germany must remain free from definite commitments to either side, and reserve its allegiance until such time as the distribution of power in the postwar world is clearly revealed. Through their emissaries, the planners warned political leaders active in Germany that it was their duty to follow the same line.

The reversal of that policy came in the summer of 1948. It was at that time that Haushofer's heirs in Argentina, on the basis of their carefully collected evidence, deduced that from a show-down between East-West Russia would emerge as the undisputed victor. On this premise they saw only one possible course of action: Germany must throw her lot in with Russia.

The exiles are convinced that as soon as the military occupation of Germany is ended, they will be able to return to the fatherland and transplant their organization. They are sure that they will be able to take over the signs and seals of power and put their plans into official operation with popular consent. Meantime, over and above the visible activity of Der Weg, Argentina is also the conspiratorial cellar where from the Rio de la Plata to Patagonia even more extreme groups hatch plots for the come-back of a more successful nazism.

Lest the confidence of Der Weg's circle be dismissed as an exercise in collective megalomania, it should be recalled that Lenin and a similar band of exiles prepared the blueprints for the Bolshevik administration far from their homeland, and then transformed their plans into world-shaking reality.

The background for this latest historic conspiracy centered in Argentina is furnished by the ardent wooing of Germany by Washington and Moscow.

The long-term occupation of Germany agreed on at Potsdam has been abandoned by both east and west. Neither fears Germany longer—except as an ally of the other. On both sides the men who make the policy are apparently convinced that the trend has turned in their favor.

An objective appraisal of the facts unhappily discloses that on this score the Russians are right and the Americans are wrong. Russia is right because its economy has already profited from the Soviet occupation, and because it has gained German military allegiance of the first magnitude.

America is wrong because its military men and financiers are both sponsors and victims of what Walter Lippmann has called the official mythology of the United States. Briefly, their credo runs something like this:

"Germany is the heart of Europe. To prevent Europe from going Communist, we must restore Germany's industry in the west, acquaint her with our democratic way of life, and slowly change German mass thinking, aggressiveness and authoritarian behavior to resemble our individualistic, friendly and democratic behavior. Meanwhile, the increased output of the gigantic Ruhr industries will help to bring the other nations of Europe back onto a sound basis and enable Europe as a whole to resist communism."

In line with this view, America's economic policy in Germany has been to restore "peaceful" industries, providing management guidance and other incentives where necessary.

On the other hand, Russia's economic policy has been to take as reparations, in the form of either goods or transplanted factories, all the German industrial production its soldiers and diplomats could lay hands on.

Russia has already benefited measurably by its control of eastern Germany and by obtaining goods and machinery from western Germany.

If the United States has failed to forge for itself a dependable German allegiance, and there is nothing to prove that it has, it follows that Russia will eventually benefit by every American dollar, every American machine, every Germany factory restored or saved from dismantling by American aid. For the chances are that those dollars, machines, and factories would be turned against the west in any third world war.

United States military men have been no more successful in Germany than their financial counterparts. It is no secret that their primary concern has been the establishment of a body of hard-fighting German troops, armed and equipped by America to stand between the aggressive Russians and the Rhine.

But the vision of a German army that will fight Russia out of German fondness for America is one of the saddest illusions fostered by the official myth. To date no group of staff officers, no army of German fighting men have gone over to the United States. Contrast this with the roster of German military personnel who have lined up with the Russians.

Among the Soviet's outstanding converts are such military notables as Field Marshal Friedrich Paulus, the defeated hero of Stalingrad; Gen. Walter von Seydlitz, who organized the Committee of German Officers in Moscow; Gen. Vincenz Muller, commander of the east German police force of some 100,000 former Nazi soldiers and officers; Colonel Markgraf, chief of the force in Russian Berlin. Another former colonel, Walter Lehwess-Litzman, who served on Goering's General Staff, is a Communist lecturer and editorial writer, while Dr. Otto Korfes, a former major general, today is the chief of the central archives in the Soviet zone. Where among the friendly Germans of the west can one match this evidence of Germans who have chosen sides so unequivocally?

Walter Lippmann has not been alone in seeing through the flimsy, wishful mythology of United States administrators in Germany. Ex-Secretary of State Sumner Welles, ex-Secretary of the Treasury Henry Morgenthau, Jr., William Shirer, Edgar Mowrer, Delbert Clark, Drew Middleton have also understood clearly that Germany can still exploit a potential alliance with Russia as a potent diplomatic weapon.

After the Allies had won Germany's unconditional surrender, a new and violent rephrasing of prophecies on eventual Russo-German accord appeared in the United States. Heinrich Hauser, a German newspaperman and refugee anti-Nazi, wrote and Henry Holt published an angry book, The German Talks Back.

The book, which became a best seller in the German neighborhoods of New York, Chicago, Cleveland, and St. Paul, explained at length why Hauser and other Germans had only contempt for western democracy and scorn for capitalism—particularly as both were exemplified in the United States.

* * * * *

Hauser's explanation is that the Germans "must be provided with a dream powerful enough to justify the sacrifice of eight or ten million lives," and he adds:

"There is only one great ideology left which as a nation we have not yet tried, which therefore has not yet failed—communism. If the Germans accept communism for their new dream and ideology and do it quickly, they will be lifted almost overnight from the status of outcast lepers to the status of allies of the biggest land power on earth. * * * If one has to embrace communism in order to get lebensraum, what of it?"

This is the voice of German Realpolitik speaking through the lips of an anti-Nazi German, and is by no means an isolated case. The temptation of playing both ends against the middle induced even such a stanch anti-Communist as Friedrich Stampfer into using the threat of German-Russian rapprochement. In December 1944 he published an article in the Neue Volkszeitung, New York. He severely criticized the western Allies for planning a long-term occupation, demilitarization of Germany, and eradication of its war potential.

Stampfer warned the west that, unless leniency was shown, the Germans would turn to the east. He wrote:

"There is a way out for Germany from total defeat and—we have to say it openly—the Western Powers are pushing Germany systematically toward that way. Germany can change this situation (of defeat) decisively and at once by lining up with the only real power on the Eurasian Continent, with Russia. * * *

"Germany (even in defeat) can give many things to Russia—the open way to Hamburg and the Rhine, trained general staff officers, technicians, skilled workers, soldiers, warships, tanks, bombers, and the most modern weapons of destruction. * * * [It can] bring about the final destruction of the French-British barrier, the liquidation of the British Empire, and the end of west European colonial rule. This would mean the establishment of German domination over Africa."

* * * * *

Today the proponents of partnership with the east have on their side the German, or

Prussian, national memories that go back through two recent world wars and the Napoleonic conquests to the Seven Years' War. In every case these memories summon forth success for German arms when allied with Russia, but defeat and failure when fighting against Russia.

* * * * *

As a consequence, therefore, the group of Haushofer geopoliticians operating in Argentina represents, in German eyes, a source of irrefutable logic and guidance. Dr. Colin Ross, Professor Fried, Messrs. Grimm, Mahler, Zischka, and the others are accepted throughout Germany as a body of policy shapers who are weighing the evidence of the past and present with scientific objectivity, and are building up a fool-proof national action program for the triumphant Fourth Reich of the future.

Long before the war in Europe ended, military intelligence knew that the brains of Germany was in flight—by air or submarine—often by way of Spain, to South America. There, in Argentina, and to a lesser extent in Brazil, the Haushofer School now flourishes, well-financed with funds shipped out of Germany before VE-day, and also getting generous donations from the pan-Germans who have prospered under General Peron.

The plan evolved by Haushofer's heirs and assigns in geopolitics features elaborate courses of action in case of both peace and war. For peacetime, the basic policy is economic cooperation with Russia. For wartime, the prescription is full-fledged military alliance with Russia.

Germany's cartel-minded industrialists see their western markets taken over by the Atlantic states, chiefly by the United States.

They therefore endorse the aim of the Argentine geopoliticians to end the occupation by whatever means, then to restore a united Germany and throw in their lot with Russia. Since they prospered under the totalitarian regime of Hitler, they think they can prosper under the totalitarian regime of Stalin. Their immediate goal in peace is to capture the vast, hungry markets that lie between Riga and Vladivostok—and southward now to Canton.

Every move made by Hitler's former Ambassador to Moscow, Rudolf Nadolny, all the unpublicized conversations he conducted with political, military, and industrial figures in both west and east Germany, have had as their purpose not merely restoration of a united Germany but, even more, the restoration of a strong Germany which will be able to deal with Russia on a basis of comparative equality.

Thus there is developing in Germany an unbelievable national front. The Communists in the east and the ultranationalists in the west are jointly orienting the dynamic militaristic instincts of the German people toward an alliance with Russia against the west.

The men who are blueprinting Germany's economic future, based on business with Russia and her communist neighbor states, know that their program appeals as much to conservative manufacturers anxious about profits as to beaten militarists yearning for revenge.

* * * * *

Again and again in their blueprints, the German planners make clear that, once freedom of action is assured, Germany will begin a furious drive to funnel the necessary goods eastward and to siphon back the grains and metals, the timber, furs, oil, and other raw materials from Russia.

* * * * *

They are convinced that Russia can gain full command over Europe and the Middle East within a few weeks after the outbreak of hostilities. In any such event, they point out, the eastern allies would acquire a tremendous advantage in the war potential of resources and manpower. They stress the point that Russia is not inferior in modern weapons—about which they may well know much more than any non-Russian general staff. Readers of Der Weg were told that Russia had an atom bomb long before President Truman reported it to the world.

Der Weg's editors also know a great deal about Russia's bacteriological warfare, because German scientists collaborated in designing the laboratories in the secret-understanding days of the Black Reichswher and the Rapallo Treaty. They refer guardedly to other, new unproved weapons which the Russians are developing with the aid of German scientists. There are references to submarines, rockets, and even rays, as well as to atom bombs. The final conclusion of the German planners is that the free west is riding for a fall.

* * * * *

Meanwhile the planners—and the German people—await Der Tag. If it comes soon, only the paramilitary police force of the East will be equipped and trained to fight side by side with the U. S. S. R. The thin lines of Allied occupation troops can only retreat—in good order, if possible.

* * * * *

If Der Tag is delayed long enough for the "sovereign" western state of Germany to acquire an Allied-approved, trained, and equipped Panzer force, the planners foresee that it will not long continue to fight on the side of the west. Where, how, and when it will surrender to the Russians and turn on the fleeing American, British, and French is a tactical question. The answers will remain military secrets—only the strategy is discussed openly.

There is no doubt that the blueprint has been sold to the German people, pro-Communist and anti-Communist, neo-Nazi and Roman Catholic. This, of course, is not a question of Communist sympathies. Rather, many conservative leaders are fully convinced that Russia's need for Germany will persuade the men in the Kremlin to leave Germans as masters of their destiny as far as their internal political and economic system is concerned.

* * * * *

Franklin Roosevelt's nightmare of a Russian-American split over Germany, followed by a German-Russian combination against the United States, has all but come true. The blueprint has been drawn, the plans are set. On the evidence, whatever America does, Germany will become a partner of Russia. And if it comes to war, Germany will fight on Russia's side.

Policy Statement of New York Young Republican Club

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 8 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the sections on rent control, agriculture, wasteful big government, private enterprise, public regulation of business, taxation, and the citizen and politics—from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America" by the New York Young Republican Club.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RENT CONTROL

Problem: Rent controls are still necessary and desirable in many areas where there is a shortage of low and medium cost housing to prevent landlords from exploiting tenants who have nowhere else to live. On the other hand, the evils which accompany rent controls must not be disregarded. They create an artificial demand by holding prices too low. They discourage new building. They discourage proper maintenance and repairs. They deprive the landlord of a fair return on his investment. They add another unit to the vast Federal bureaucracy.

Rent controls began as a wartime measure. They are the only important wartime controls still remaining and should be removed just as soon as the war-created housing shortage is over. It would be tragic if, for purely political reasons, they were allowed to continue indefinitely, and if, as in France, they were permitted to throttle construction of new housing units.

The problem, therefore, is to provide adequate rent controls wherever and whenever there is a shortage of housing, and at the same time to set up machinery that will remove rent controls as soon as the shortage is over in any area.

The present Federal rent-control law became effective April 1, 1949, and expires June 30, 1950. It represents an improvement over earlier legislation in at least two important respects: (1) A State legislature, with the approval of the governor, is given the power to remove the State from Federal rent control, or to substitute State control, and (2) landlords are allowed rentals sufficient to provide a fair net operating income.

Seventeen million housing units were under rent control at the peak in April 1947; 14,500,000 units were under control when the present act went into effect in April 1949; and 12,000,000 units were under control in January 1950.

Proposals: 1. Rent-control legislation in substantially its present form should be renewed when it expires on June 30, 1950.

2. More rapid decontrol in areas where a housing shortage does not exist should be provided for under the new legislation. If controls are removed in some areas and rents rise too sharply, controls may be reimposed.

3. High-rental residential units should be decontrolled. There is much less of a shortage in this price range than in low-rental housing, and the tenants are usually not hardship cases.

AGRICULTURE

Problem: The problem of farm income is primarily a problem of farm prices. The instability of farm prices results chiefly from general business fluctuations over which the farmer has little control. Thus, the basic causes for the farm problem do not lie within agriculture; rather they lie in the economic and political relations between agriculture and the rest of the economy.

The problem of surpluses is parallel to the problem of price and 1950 finds American agriculture with dangerous surpluses mounting in virtually all of the grains and cotton. Surpluses give rise to proposals for crop quotas, acreage restrictions, and other forms of governmental control. The farmer, as America's most rugged individualist, intensely opposes such measures since he, more than anyone else, believes that personal prosperity springs from one's own production. Because of this basic philosophy of the farmer, agricultural production remains fairly constant despite the effects of business

fluctuations, area weather conditions, or governmental efforts to curtail production.

The farm population comprises one-fifth of our total population.

During the two decades of 1920–39, the net migration from farms was 10,000,000 persons; yet the supply of food produced increased.

Under the AAA, wheat acreage was reduced 13 percent; yet production increased 21 percent—acreage allotments not proving satisfactory for regulating production.

Ten cotton States have 43 percent of the United States farm population, but only 25 percent of the farm income (due in part to smaller farms, lack of fertile soil, smaller capital investment, inadequate farm management, risk from weather and insects, and dependence on exports).

For the individual, parity prices have meant higher taxes and high consumer prices and, for the Nation, a collision between our domestic and foreign policies. The Government subsidizes to produce, stores the excess, then subsidizes to get rid of it as exports. At present, the Government has over $3,000,000,000 tied up in farm commodities and is faced by a declining export market. In addition high subsidies tend to encourage an artificial diversion of capital resources into agriculture, thereby increasing production and ultimately causing surpluses. They keep the inefficient high-cost producer in business.

Chronic overproduction, whether caused by inability or unwillingness of producers to adjust output to demand, by price supports or by controls, indicates that we are not making the best alternative use of our human and land resources. Nobody gains if everybody is subsidized equally—yet no single group can or should expect to gain at the expense of the rest of the population.

The Brannan plan is a political rather than a grassroots program. It leaves the farmer dependent upon annual appropriations by Congress. As one farmer put it at the Sioux City conference:

"The Brannan plan reminds me of a friend of mine in Shiawassee County, who went fishing in a leaky rowboat. He couldn't bail fast enough, so he rowed it back to shore and instead of patching the leak, he merely got a bigger pail to bail with."

Proposals:

1. We favor continuing the present price-support program during 1950. A sudden end to these supports would substantially impair the farmers' financial stability. Moreover, the present state of international relations demands that we carry moderate surpluses.

2. We propose, on the other hand, that serious consideration be given to reducing gradually the support-price levels in 1951 and to substituting a price floor below which farm prices will not be allowed to fall. Such a floor price should be low and should be announced a year in advance so that farmers can make their plans accordingly. Since a low floor price would result in taking some marginal land out of production, those leaving unproductive lands should be assisted in securing jobs elsewhere.

3. Curtailment of production is inconsistent with the incentive system of an opportunity society and, moreover, ignores the fact that many people throughout the world are hungry. Accordingly, we favor a stock of emergency remedies to meet critical surplus situations and long-range measures to stimulate consumption as follows:

(a) Temporary food-stamp plans to meet specific surplus problems.

(b) Cooperation with community efforts to improve the diet of children through dietary education and school-lunch programs.

(c) Greater exports to needy areas to meet specific surplus problems.

(d) Increased on-the-spot industrialization of farm products and expansion of industrial and byproduct use.

(e) Encouraging production of livestock and livestock products to utilize grain surpluses.

(f) Further streamlining of the processing and distributive systems for farm products.

(g) Charitable and community feeding of underprivileged families.

(h) Better on-the-farm storage facilities.

4. We favor an amalgamation of the flood control, navigation, reclamation, and irrigation functions of the Army Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation as proposed by the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch. Hundreds of thousands of dollars have been wasted in the Columbia and Missouri Valleys and Central Valley of California due to the competition in water resource development between these agencies.

WASTEFUL BIG GOVERNMENT

Problem: The Federal Government is today the biggest single organization in the free world. Some 2,000,000 people are employed in 9 departments, 104 bureaus, 12 sections, 108 services, 51 branches, 460 offices, 631 divisions, 19 administrations, 6 agencies, 16 areas, 40 boards, 6 commands, 20 commissions, 19 corporations, 5 groups, 10 headquarters, 20 units, 3 authorities, and 263 miscellaneous and functionally designed parts. Without reducing essential services, $3,000,000,000 a year might be saved by introducing efficient management into the Federal Government.

Veterans' Administration insurance death claims take four times as long to be paid as private insurance claims; yet the Veterans' Administration employs four times as many insurance workers per policy as do private companies.

There are 30 agencies in the Federal Government actively engaged in lending, guaranteeing, and insuring loans.

There are 390,000 Indians under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau employs over 12,000 persons to administer its work—one employee for every 32 Indians.

Many Government business agencies invest their idle Government surplus funds in Government securities. Result: the Government pays interest on its own money.

Construction cost of Government hospitals runs from $20,000 to $51,000 per bed, compared with an estimated $16,000 per bed for voluntary hospitals.

About half of the 3,000,000 Government purchase orders issued each year are for $10 or less. The average cost of paper work involved in each order exceeds $10.

Proposal: We propose adoption of the remaining suggestions for economy contained in the report of the Hoover Commission, a bipartisan task force created by the Eightieth Congress in 1947 to examine and report on the Federal Government. Adoption of these suggestions would be a long step toward helping the Federal Government balance its budget without reducing essential services.

PRIVATE ENTERPRISE

Problem: Private enterprise has given this country the highest standard of living ever known in the world and enables the United States to stand today as the great bulwark of freedom-loving people against the forces of oppression and totalitarianism.

The United States possesses more than half of the world's telephones, telegraph and radio networks, more than a third of the railways, more than three-quarters of the world's automobiles, almost all of the world's radios, and consumes more than half the world's coffee and rubber, two-thirds of the silk, a quarter of the coal, and nearly two-thirds of the crude oil.

But today the vigor, flexibility, and capacity of our private-enterprise society are seriously threatened by constant and haphazard governmental interference and control.

Proposals: Recognition and support by the Republican Party of the following basic principles:

1. That insistence on preservation of private enterprise clearly distinguishes the Republican from the Democratic Party.

2. That under our economic system there is today, as in the past, the opportunity to rise from the humblest beginning to the top of one's calling; and that the drift to socialism in many countries of Europe has resulted from the old stratification of society and the inability to make such a rise except over many generations.

3. That private competitive enterprise offers the only incentives for production that are consistent with individual freedom.

4. That a plentiful supply of venture capital is indispensable to the ample production of goods and the creation of job opportunities. Encouragement of private investment should be emphasized in the formulation of future legislation and in the administration of existing laws.

5. That continued deficit spending creates inflation, progressively reduces real income and destroys the savings of the thrifty. Deficit spending is justified, therefore, only in time of war or major depression.

6. That an unchecked "laissez-faire" economy, as opposed to responsible private enterprise, is no longer compatible with the general welfare of our people.

PUBLIC REGULATION OF BUSINESS

Problem: During the past few years, the antitrust laws, through judicial review and administrative interpretation, have become a source of utter confusion to businessmen, both large and small. This confusion has spread to the Justice Department, the Federal Trade Commission, and even the Federal courts. Consequently, the antitrust laws require immediate reexamination, revision, and amendment. In addition, too many unlawful trade practices, which are extremely harmful to small-business men and consumers, escape prosecution.

Proposals: 1. The antitrust laws should be reexamined by Congress and should be redrafted or amended to make them more definite and consistent. If Congress, after its investigation, considers it feasible, it should enact legislation which specifically sets forth those practices which are lawful and those which are unlawful. In any case, the standards to be applied should be clarified by comprehensive regulations.

2. Serious consideration should be given to the economic utility and social desirability of the giant corporation in our competitive economy. For the curse of bigness, in business as well as in government, is the regimentation of the individual and the curtailment of his freedom.

TAXATION

Problem: Taxation imposed by the Federal, State, and local governments during the past year will take from private individuals and businesses over $50,000,000,000 or almost one-quarter of the national income. Just 10 years ago the take in taxes of these three governments was under $13,000,000,000 or less than one-fifth of the national income. The Federal Government's share of these taxes has increased during that period from under 40 percent to over 70 percent of the total.

During the same period the general Federal tax structure has remained approximately what it was in 1939—a haphazard system of taxes falling unequally on persons and businesses in like circumstances, unnecessarily restricting the expansion of production and employment, and raising insufficient revenue to pay for Government expenditures. Furthermore, the existing laws fail to offer sufficient incentive for foreign investment.

Proposals:

1. While an over-all reduction in taxes represents a desirable objective, any substantial reduction must be geared to a corresponding reduction in Federal expenditures.

2. The present Federal tax structure should be completely overhauled for the purpose of stimulating the flow of risk capital into new enterprises and thereby creating additional job opportunities.

3. Pending an over-all revision of the Federal-tax structure, the following inequities of the existing law should be remedied immediately:

(a) More liberal provision should be made for the averaging of income by individuals over a period of years and for the offsetting over a period of years of losses in prior or subsequent years. The present Federal income tax based primarily on an annual accounting period discriminates unfairly against individuals with fluctuating incomes such as wage earners subject to irregular employment, actors, authors, and small-business proprietors.

(b) The sale of residential property occupied by the taxpayer as a home should be treated as a tax-free exchange if the proceeds are used to purchase another residence for occupancy by the taxpayer.

(c) The provisions imposing high surtax rates on corporate income between $25,000 and $50,000, which discriminate unfairly against small corporations, should be modified.

(d) The provisions restricting the deductibility of nonbusiness bad debts by personal lenders tend to discourage investment in speculative enterprises and should be eliminated.

(e) Since most new businesses operate initially at a loss, business operating loss carry-overs should be extended to 4 years in the case of new businesses.

(f) Wartime Federal excise taxes, such as those on cosmetics, telephone service, transportation, and baby products, should be eliminated.

4. Those provisions in the Federal tax laws which affect income received from foreign sources should be thoroughly integrated with a negotiation of new treaties with foreign countries where investment is to be stimulated. Subject to modification by an overall revision of the Federal tax structure and to the terms of treaties negotiated with foreign government, the following specific changes should be made:

(a) Expand the provisions in the Federal income-tax law granting exemption from surtaxes in the case of Western Hemisphere trade corporations to corporations doing business in other parts of the world.

(b) Remove the present requirement that a domestic corporation must own a majority of the stock of a foreign corporation to be eligible for a tax credit based on foreign taxes paid.

THE CITIZEN AND POLITICS

Problem: The ill health of American politics was strikingly revealed in the 1948 presidential election when almost one-half of those eligible to vote failed to cast their ballots. This indifference and apathy to participation in elections constitutes a real threat to effective representative government. It is also a serious indictment of the major political parties which have the responsibility for providing the link between the citizen and his government.

Too many Americans feel that the individual ballot does not have any real importance, that politicians and political parties are basically dishonest, and that all politicians make promises which they never intend to keep. This explains in part why so many Americans refuse to interest themselves in the practical workings of democracy.

As our Government has become more impersonal and centralized, the individual citizen has felt increasingly unable to participate in the making of important public decisions. The Government no longer is Councilman Jones up the street, but rather a vast and disturbing hierarchy of nameless Federal officials.

Proposals:

1. More careful selection of able Republican candidates who will support sound programs reflecting economic, social, and political realities.

2. Bold and sincere efforts by Republicans at all levels of party organization to broaden the base of party support among all economic, racial, and religious groups.

3. Weeding out of political deadwood and paper organizations at all levels and supplanting them with younger and more aggressive party workers.

Social Security Act Amendments

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I would like to include comments on the statement of George H. McLain, chairman, National Pension Committee, and chairman, board of trustees of the California Institute of Social Welfare, Los Angeles, Calif., presented to the Senate Finance Committee in the course of hearings on H. R. 6000, Saturday, January 28, 1950, as prepared by Mr. Nelson H. Cruikshank, director of social insurance activities, American Federation of Labor:

I

Mr. McLain's statement reveals that he completely fails to grasp the concept of social insurance. The working people of America have repeatedly demonstrated that what they want is to be able to insure their wage incomes against the hazards that are a part of our modern economy. They do not want an economy that is static and limited in opportunity. They want an economy that is free both for the employer and the worker. They realize that such freedom entails certain risks. Among these risks are unemployment, sickness, and dependent old age. They want to insure their incomes against these risks just as businessmen want to insure their capital investments and farmers want to insure their crops.

The wage earner in unions affiliated with the American Federation of Labor have expressed again and again through resolutions by local unions, State federations, national and international unions and in conventions of the American Federation of Labor that they are perfectly willing to pay through regular pay-roll contributions their share of the cost of such insurance.

The Advisory Council on Social Security to the Senate Finance Committee, which consisted of 17 members, wrote on page 1 of their report their views in regard to the principle of social insurance. This statement of policy was adopted unanimously by the council, which included not only representatives of labor, but also some of the leading economists of our outstanding universities as well as business leaders. Included in the last group is Mr. Adrien J. Falk of California, president of the S & W Fine Foods, Inc.

"THE METHOD OF SOCIAL INSURANCE

"The council favors as the foundation of the social-security system the method of contributory social insurance with benefits related to prior earnings and awarded without a needs test. Differential benefits based on a work record are a reward for productive effort and are consistent with general economic incentives, while the knowledge that benefits will be paid—irrespective of whether the individual is in need—supports and stimulates his drive to add his personal savings to the basic security he has acquired through the insurance system. Under such a social-insurance system, the individual earns a right to a benefit that is related to his contribution to production. This earned right is his best guaranty that he will receive the benefits promised and that they will not be conditioned on his accepting either scrutiny of his personal affairs or restrictions from which others are free."

The workers of America are in wholehearted agreement with that position. They regard this approach to the problem of security in old age as the one which is most sound and practical. They want benefits as a right—a right which derives from their having made regular contributions from their wages. They want this right established in a manner to remove the question of their old-age security from the uncertainties of political fortunes. They are aware that there can be no genuine security which rests only on a vague promise that their future will be taken care of if need should arise. They remember too well the uncertainties of the relief handed out from month to month during the depression. Workers want benefits as a right because they want not only security, but they want security with dignity. Too many of them know too well the indignity of the means test.

There is no indication anywhere in Mr. McLain's statement that he understands the nature of the American worker's desire for security or that he understands the principles upon which our program of social insurance was established.

II

In his statement, Mr. McLain speaks of the groups who are presently under one of the social insurance programs as "special privilege" group. We agree that the coverage today is far from adequate; that there are entirely too many people deprived of this protection, but to use the term "special privilege" is completely inaccurate. This is proven by an analysis of the groups which for the last 10 years have been asking for a broadening of the coverage, as opposed to those groups which wanted to limit and restrict it. The very groups which have enjoyed what Mr. McLain calls special privileges have pressed hardest for the broadening of the program. When was it ever known that a special privilege group sought to extend that privilege to others? The industrial wage earners of America have constantly sought to extend the protection of social insurance to those outside the system, while certain segments of business (but certainly not all business leaders) have been responsible for keeping the coverage limited. It is easy to point to the deficiencies of the present social-security system and Mr. McLain has correctly pointed out some of its major limitations. The American Federation of Labor wants to correct these deficiencies. We want to correct them constructively, not by wiping out the entire system as Mr. McLain proposes.

When Mr. McLain speaks of special privilege groups, he includes those under the civil service retirement system and the railroad employees who are under the Railroad Retirement Act. Does he mean to wipe out the civil service retirement system and the railroad retirement system? While he does not say so in so many words, clearly the plan

which he suggests would supersede these programs. Mr. McLain should say in so many words whether he means to destroy or supplant these two outstanding social-insurance programs which have proven their acceptability to millions of workers in these fields and in which billions of dollars of their own contributions are now invested. The proposals contained in H. R. 6000 would leave these plans intact.

The general position taken by Mr. McLain is in harmony with the new line which is now being taken up by the conservatives on all sides, including Senator TAFT and Congressman CURTIS. The current confusion in the pension and retirement field could have been avoided if the Eightieth Congress had undertaken its responsibilities constructively, rather than approaching the problems with a meat ax. The time to have made the basic changes in the social-security program was from 1946 to 1948. They could not have been made earlier, as the program was just getting started when this country went into a war economy. The need for constructive change was clearly brought out in the report of the House Ways and Means Committee prepared in 1945 and 1946, but men like TAFT and CURTIS who, during the time they were in control of Congress did nothing to repair the deficiencies of the program, now point to its admitted inadequacies as a reason for discarding the entire system. The workers of America are too well acquainted with the intentions of such men to trust their future security to any schemes that they propose. Mr. McLain's testimony indicates that he has joined their ranks.

III

The failure to grasp or understand the basic needs and desires of working people revealed in Mr. McLain's statement leads to some glaring inconsistencies:

1. In the opening paragraph he describes his plan as a "pension." In the same paragraph he states that payments should be made only in case of need. What is it that he proposes? Is it a pension or a dole? The two are radically different and if Mr. McLain is aware of the difference, his statement fails to resolve it;

2. Mr. McLain proposes that the payments are to be made in case of need, but he fails to indicate at any point as to how this need is to be determined. No one has ever found a way to provide a public relief or Government charity without some kind of a means test.

At one point he states that a flat $75 per month should be paid to "those who can prove they need it," and at another point indicates that an additional $30 a month should be paid to those who need medical care or service. The suggested flat payments are in contradiction to his proposal to pay in cases of proven need. If payments are to be made to meet need, some will need less than $75, and some will need more. Certainly most elderly people will need more than the $30 which he suggests for medical aid if they need medical aid at all.

3. It is interesting to note that with regard to financing, Mr. McLain states frankly that he has no idea what his plan would cost. He is clear on one point: he wants to relieve the employer of any direct cost, suggesting that Government contributions take the place of the present employer contributions. However, he thinks employees should continue their contributions. Under his proposal, the employee would pay twice: once through direct pay-roll contributions and again as taxpayers—unless, of course, Mr. McLain is among those who believe that workers don't pay taxes. In fact, Senator MILLIKEN pointed out this weakness in the plan and asked Mr. McLain directly if that presented any difficulty to him. Mr. McLain replied that it did not, that it only seemed to him that his proposal spread the tax base—a nice phrase for asking the employee to pay double.

4. Mr. McLain refers to "the keen observer" of the problem of security and apparently means to identify himself as such. When he states his belief, however, that the administrative costs of the program that he proposes would be less than that of the present plan, it is quite plain that his observations have not been very keen. For the Federal Government to undertake to make payments to all elderly persons on the basis of proved need, an army of investigators and snoopers the like of which has never been seen would have to be employed. To say that that kind of program could be operated as efficiently and as economically as a social-insurance program is fantastic. The present old-age and survivors program has 80,000,000 current wage accounts, and the entire cost of administration is only 3 percent of the contributions. This is the largest insurance system in the world, and it operates at the lowest per capita cost.

We in the American Federation of Labor believe that our system of contributory social insurance has proved its worth, even on the limited basis on which the reactionaries in Congress have forced it to operate over the last 10 years. It should be broadened and brought up to date and not destroyed, as Mr. McLain proposes. We have no fear that the workers will be deceived by any such impractical and uncertain promise of security as that which Mr. McLain offered in his statement to the Senate Finance Committee last Saturday.

Undermining the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, if the Hearst papers had never published any other constructive thought nor advocated any other patriotic action, the editorial which they carried Tuesday, February 7, 1950, more than justifies their publication.

That editorial calls attention to the several proposals now pending before the Senate to surrender our sovereignty, commit our youth to fight in every war anywhere in the world which the representatives of contentious, ambitious, quarrelsome, bankrupt nations may decide will advance their collective or individual interests.

The editorial is as follows:

THE NEW BOOTLEGGER

(By Burris Jenkins, Jr.)

UNDERMINING THE REPUBLIC

Do the American people want to betray the founders and the defenders of the Republic?

Do they want to renounce the principles confided to them by their patriots?

Do they want to defile the civilization instituted by their worthy ancestors?

Do they want to desert the noble flag for which their sons and brothers have shed devoted blood and enroll themselves as a fragment of a nondescript horde under an ensign of universal subjection?

Do they want to repeal their Declaration of Independence?

Do they want to annul the Constitution of the United States?

Do they want to submerge their nationality in a welter of world government which will have steadily encroaching power to dictate their laws, to alter their currency, to tax their incomes and property, to adulterate their citizenship, to decree their wages, to confiscate their goods, to expropriate their savings, to control their industries and agriculture, to punish them for vague and undefined crimes, and to establish over them for all these purposes an alien police?

Do the American people realize that all this may be—and in fact is being—inflicted upon them through the servile agency of their own State legislatures, which they themselves elected?

On January 19 of this year a resolution was introduced in the New York Legislature requiring Congress to assemble a national convention—"for the sole purpose of proposing amendment of the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government."

This extraordinary proposal in the legislature of one of the Thirteen Original States was not devised there.

It came from one of the several visionary internationalist groups which are promoting world government in America.

And, while the public at large has been uninformed and indifferent, similar resolutions have been adopted by the lethargic legislatures of 23 States—and recently recanted by one, the State of Georgia.

New York, with its commanding wealth and prestige, would thus be the twenty-third State on record.

An additional 9 States—32 in all—would compel the Congress to act affirmatively.

The movement has been astutely and covertly conducted.

The world-government propagandists have disclosed to their own followers, in their own restricted literature, their design as summarized in this editorial.

Yet in no State has any decent public notice been given of legislative intentions.

In no State have representative committee hearings been held, nor have any adequate inquiries or reports been made.

The world-government project is being bootlegged through the State houses and into the Capitol at Washington.

Once again, since they cannot rely upon their trusted lawmakers, it looks as if the American people must depend upon themselves to defend their institutions, their national integrity, and their freedom.

In legislatures where the world-government proposal has not been approved, it must be defeated.

In legislatures where the un-American resolution has been adopted, it must be repealed.

Well do I recall that, when, in January of 1942, I made two speeches on the floor of the House condemning the proposal to haul down the Stars and Stripes, I was hailed before a grand jury which the Washington Post and the administration was then attempting to use through its henchman, William Power Maloney.

Apparently I was summoned to appear before that grand jury because the Washington Post and its stooge, William Power Maloney—who was characterized in more polite language by the United States Suprem Court as a shyster and who was later convicted of a drunken assault on a representative of the Chinese Government—wanted to learn by whom and in what quantities copies of my speeches had been circulated.

If more publications had the conviction and the courage of the Hearst publications, the danger to the Republic would not be so great. The people, once aware of the present attempts of some well-meaning but misguided citizens to overthrow our Government by the creation of one world or whatever they call it, would receive less support.

If our youth must continue to fight in world wars, let them at least fight under our own flag, our own officers—not as mercenary or puppet soldiers of an international group of ambitious, power-hungry world politicians.

What Should the United States Policy in China Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech delivered by me in Constitution Hall, Washington, D. C., January 30, 1950:

The time is rapidly approaching when it will no longer be of much use to discuss United States policy in China. If the last stronghold of the Chinese Government, Formosa, is overwhelmed by the Communists, it will not make much difference whether we get a China policy or not. Should the Nationalist Government finally be overcome by the blows rained upon it both by its Communist enemies and its supposed friend and ally, the Government of the United States, then the followers of the Kremlin will have power in China that cannot be challenged in any foreseeable future, no matter how unhappy or angry the Chinese people may be. American influence in that vast area will be almost a thing of the past. We will have suffered the greatest defeat in our history.

But as long as Formosa stands as the final bastion of the free Chinese, there is still a chance for the United States to play a decisive role in preventing such a catastrophe to our own security and interests. It should be our policy to help the free Chinese maintain on Formosa the legitimate government of the Republic of China—first, to maintain a symbol of hope and encouragement to the hundreds of millions of our wartime allies now rapidly disappearing behind the Asian iron curtain; second, to strengthen resistance to Communist seizure of Formosa which would give Russia use of a perfect air and submarine base in the heart of our western Pacific security system; and third, to encourage Chinese to work toward eventually removing China from the Soviet side of the balance and returning her to the side of free nations in the gigantic cold war in which we are engaged throughout the world.

The first requirement of a policy is that we wake up to the real nature of the Communist movement in China and to the fact that its real target is ourselves. The State Department and many writers on China for years followed the line that there was some hope in the Communists in China, and none in the Chinese Government. On the other hand, many of us maintained that there was some hope in the Chinese Government, and none in the Communists, because they are committed to dictatorship and to world conquest. The policy of supporting the Chinese Government and those who are resisting Communist subjugation will not require a large expenditure of effort, money, or materials on the part of the American Government and people. It will, however, require positive action and a genuine determination really to help the free Chinese resist those who would enslave them. Until there is such a will on our part, there can, of course, be no way.

Second, we should not grant diplomatic recognition to the Communist regime at Peking. Such recognition would bring us no benefits, and would greatly weaken the will-to-resist of the Chinese already under the Communists on the mainland, the free Chinese in Formosa, and the strong communities of Chinese in all the countries of southeast Asia. It would shake the confidence in us of the peoples in Asia still on the fence. Our greatest immediate stake in Asia is to keep them on our side. If they were to witness official abandonment by the powerful United States of an ally which stood by us during the nightmare period following Pearl Harbor, could they then be expected to have any faith in our present declaration that we will resist the spread of Communist aggression beyond China and help them against Communist threats to their own independence? Would not they rather decide that in view of our debacle in China, it would be foolish to put their faith in us? Would not it be the part of wisdom for them to seek the best terms they could get from the Communists, rather than depend on American support with no assurance it would ever come?

Furthermore, to recognize the Communist regime would put an avowed enemy instead of a proved friend in the Chinese seat on the United Nations Security Council. We would have enemies instead of friends in all Chinese embassies, legations, and consulates all over the world, carrying on espionage conspiracy and propaganda against ourselves in the very midst of the countries which we hope to keep out of their control. Surely that would not be in our interest.

Third, we should make a forthright statement of support to the Chinese Government and all other anti-Communist forces, in their struggle to remain free. More than anything else the Chinese—exhausted from 12 years of war and invasion, discouraged because of betrayals and abandonment by their allies—need moral support, the same sort of support we have given to the Greeks, Italians, Turks, and others in Europe engaged in exactly similar fights to prevent being taken over by Communists and made Soviet satellites. The governments of some of them do not come up to our standards either.

Fourth, we should extend effective military aid to the defenders of Formosa. By effective military aid I mean the same sort of military-assistance program we have carried out successfully in Greece, but have not tried in China since the recall of General Wedemeyer in early 1946.

Effective military aid includes first of all, putting in charge of America's security in that part of the world, the most experienced and successful man we have in dealing with East Asia. That man, of course, is General MacArthur.

It includes some top-flight American military sparkplugs, like General Wedemeyer, Admiral Cooke, or Admiral Badger, with adequate American staffs to train and advise the Chinese armed forces at all levels—and in strategy, tactics, and operations—which our previous mission in China was not permitted by our Government to do.

It includes a relatively small amount of munitions, equipment and supplies carefully planned for the particular type of operation needed. It includes spare parts and fuel for the Chinese air force and navy. It might include about 50,000 World War I type rifles and ammunition therefor, in addition to the 130,000 rifles we have sent under the program the Congress voted in 1948.

A military aid program does not include American combat troops. I do not know anyone who has ever suggested that we should send American combat troops to Formosa, or that we should occupy it with American forces, even though the State Department is busily engaged in shooting down that straw man set up by itself. Such a policy is unnecessary and would be most ill-advised. It would be neither justifiable nor advantageous for the United States to occupy or seize Formosa for herself; it is extremely important to our security that it be denied to our enemies. The way to accomplish that end, and at the same time to strengthen the spirit of resistance among all Chinese and other free peoples in Asia, is to help the Chinese and Formosans hold their island, as many of our best military students of the problem believe they can do with such aid, and with the natural advantages Formosa has as a result of the hundred-mile barrier of water between it and the mainland, and the fact the Communists do not have either a substantial navy or air force.

In short, what China has most needed all along and most needs now is not more aid but proper aid, which is what we have not given since 1945. Munitions without American advice and assistance in their use cannot succeed any more than advice without munitions could succeed.

If we had tried in China the sort of policy we have followed in Greece, or if we had followed the recommendations made by General Wedemeyer 2½ years ago, and still failed, then neither I nor any other person could say a word of criticism. But we have not tried. How does anyone know whether we can succeed or not, until we do try?

Fifth, we should continue to give economic assistance to the Chinese Government on Formosa. One of the reasons the economy of the island is sorely strained is because it is having to export materials needed for home consumption, in order to get foreign exchange to buy commodities like cotton and oil which must be obtained from abroad. If we help with such commodities, exactly as we are helping Korea and Japan and helping western Europe, under the European recovery program, and in Korea and Japan, the economy of Formosa can be made reasonably stable. Ordinarily it has a favorable balance of trade, in sharp contrast to that of England, for example, which we are helping even though it almost certainly can never again become self-supporting.

Sixth, we should give every possible assistance and even leadership in encouraging the free peoples of Southeast Asia to get together in a mutual assistance defense pact, such as we have sponsored in the North Atlantic. Without some such cooperative effort to defend the whole area, there is every reason to expect that the Communists will be able to pick the countries off, one by one. Without access to the resources and markets of Southeast Asia on a mutually beneficial basis, what chance is there for England, France, Holland, and western Europe to become self-supporting? If we are compelled to continue beyond 1952 the heavy burden of supporting these free countries of western Europe, how long can we ourselves remain solvent and safe?

That brings me to the compelling reason why I believe we should adopt some such positive policy in place of the pro-Communist wait-and-see do-nothing-effective policy our Government has followed with such disastrous results these last 4 years. That reason is the basic instinct of self-preservation.

I am not and never have been interested in any persons, groups, or parties in China. I am interested in the security of the United States of America, and in freedom, world order, and peace. It is the job of responsible American officials to find means of achieving those goals; not reasons for not achieving them. If they think nothing effective can be done in China, then they should step aside or be removed to make way for those who believe something effective can be done and must be done.

The primary objective of an intelligent nation's foreign policy must always be one thing—the nation's security. How can we attain that objective? There are two main methods. We must seek by all legitimate means to prevent the development or expansion of any power or powers hostile to ourselves to the point where they might be able to attack us with chance of success;

we must seek by all legitimate means to keep as many nations as possible free and strong and on our side.

In a jungle world such as ours, survival depends to no small degree on the capacity to distinguish friend from enemy. Whatever the weaknesses and shortcomings of the Chinese Government, it is a friend whose loyalty to us, even in the darkest days after Pearl Harbor, has never been questioned. Whatever the strengths or alleged virtues of the Communists, they are our avowed enemy.

In such a situation it has always seemed to me the decision as to what we ought to do should be extremely simple: We should oppose whatever assists our mortal enemy; we should assist whatever opposes that mortal enemy. However great the risks and difficulties of such a positive policy may be, the risks of a policy of doing nothing effective are even greater.

It is not enough just to recite the weaknesses of China—the five adjectives which the apologists of our Government's negative policies always use as their excuse for not giving effective aid, namely, that the Government of China is "inept, incompetent, inefficient, undemocratic, and corrupt." Those conditions exist in China, just as they do in every Asian country and everywhere else in greater or less degree, especially after long exhausting wars. They are the problems it is the business of responsible statesmanship to solve; not the alibi for failure to solve them.

I am fully aware of all the myths which have been so successfully propagated regarding the Communists in China: for example, that they are not really Communists but just agrarian reformers, patriotic peasants leading spontaneous revolutionary forces against warlordism, landlordism, and feudalism; that they are not connected with or subservient to the Soviet Union; that they won't be able to organize and administer a government in China without our help, which will make them susceptible to our influence; that they will not be able to convert the Chinese to communism; that they will not be able to solve China's economic problems; that they will probably develop Titoism; that they will have to cooperate with the West. All of these myths have proved or are being proved cruel hoaxes. They were designed to lull us to sleep while the Communists were getting control of China. They have been exceedingly successful.

If we cannot decide what is best in China, because we think neither side, Nationalist or Communist, is good, then let us decide what is worst, as a physician does when confronted with no good alternatives. What is the worst thing that can happen to China? There can be no question about that. The worst thing from the standpoint of our own interests, those of the Chinese people, and of world peace is for China to come wholly under the Communists and become another satellite of Russia. Therefore, that is the thing which we must, if possible, prevent.

The first requirement of our security in the Pacific is not a democratic Chinese Government or even a better Chinese Government; but an independent Chinese Government. The present disaster began when we abandoned in 1945, starting at Yalta, our historic policy of supporting resolutely "the sovereignty, the independence, the territorial and administrative integrity of China."

We got off the track because some officials high in our Government failed for some unexplained reason to realize the nature of the Communist movement in China as an instrument of Soviet aggression, and allowed themselves to be beguiled into thinking or hoping that it was just one faction in an internal conflict that was none of our business. Now it is plain to all that the Communists have all of Asia and ourselves, not just China, as their aim.

Unless immediately—and I have warned for 2 years it may already be too late—there is a drastic reversal of our policy in Asia similar to that we executed 3 years ago in Europe, namely, a shift from appease Communist aggression to oppose Communist aggression—then history can only record that we defeated Japan but Russia won the war in the Pacific. We and the free world lost it.

However late it is today, it will be still later tomorrow. However much it will cost—about $26,000,000—to make the effort now, our choice is not between that and something less; it is between that and something more. Which do we want?

There are two lessons we could still learn from our experience in Europe if we would. The first is that when Communist expansion is stopped, it begins to fall apart, because it cannot deliver on its fancy promises. The second is that it cannot be stopped except by resistance all along the line of its advance. That requires assistance to all in its path, even though some of the governments involved do not meet with our full approval. If we will apply those lessons with imagination and resolution in Asia, the situation may still be retrieved. There is hope if we try; there is none if we don't try.

We have learned that to keep western Europe free there must be a regional effort—assistance to all in the given area. If we would keep Asia free, there must be a program of regional defense there also.

Ultimately, and soon, there must be global defense against the strong, cruel enemy we and the free peoples of the world face; or all of us, not just weakened and exhausted China, will fall before its ruthless and skillful onslaughts from within and without. Must we once more dawdle and daydream until after the blow actually falls, and then have to fight for our own survival under the most difficult circumstances possible?

A Fruit Grower's Views

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, from Les Boyd, an outstanding citizen of southwestern Berrien County, in the State of Michigan, comes the following article, as published in the January 7, 1950, edition of the Herald-Press of St. Joseph, Mich.:

POLITICS ARE FELT IN FRUIT DEAL, TOO, BOYD DECLARES

(By L. A. Boyd)

Politicians receive a lot of criticism, but did you ever stop to think that this American democracy was founded on politics?

A group of early settlers objected to King George's rule, and the American Revolution started us on our freedom.

As I see it, our elected officials for the most part are a fine class of men. There are some who fall by the wayside, but the majority try to do the right thing for the masses of people.

Our main trouble is with the appointive officers who get jobs because they helped elect someone to office.

They get into Federal and State offices, Department of Agriculture, Secretary of State's office and colleges and schools. Some of them who are supposed to help the growers with better packing think more of the convictions they can get.

We have some good men who try to do a good job, and then we have some who forget the people who furnish the tax dollar that pays them.

These appointed officials are all well paid, and hold their jobs through civil service and pensions.

Then comes the politics played by different departments from the USDA down through the State of Michigan.

One of the main items is the lobbying to get all the funds possible for their promotions, whether good or bad. It's a merry scramble.

Then comes the commissions appointed by the different groups, generally five men, and, with a change of governors, it is a "party man," whether he is fitted or not.

The different departments work to get their man on the commission. If there is a group known as radicals, those that do not agree with them, they may concede appointment of two from the radical group to satisfy them, but there is always "three ag'in them."

Take with agriculture. It is always a fight and lots of hard feelings. The growers have nothing to do with it; they take what they get.

This does not help the growers much. Seventy-five percent of the money spent goes to stir the "political pot." Time and effort is wasted that should have been spent on the advancement of the growers' interests.

If anything comes up about trucking, grades, or things close to the Benton Harbor fruit market, these boys want a delegation to come to Lansing for a hearing.

Generally, things are all settled before the hearing, and the growers' time, money, and effort is wasted just to appease the psychology of your officials.

They have an expense account. They are supposed to be your servants. Why not have meetings with the growers and save this needless waste of time and energy? Who gets the benefits?

Then there is the jealousy among departments. If one group does an outstanding job in which another does not have a part, they are in the dog house.

Our county politics are in good shape, and one receives courteous treatment from our elected officials. You know them.

Sheriff Erwin Kubath and his deputies have done a good job in protecting farmers' crops and in handling labor trouble that always comes up with "floating labor."

Our board of supervisors and township boards give us better service for less money than any branch of Government. We can always vote them out. We know them, and the majority of them help their people.

What are we heading for?

There is a movement under way to centralize your county and township governments. This means that your assessor and treasurer will come from St. Joseph. You will pay your taxes there, and I know that a lot of farmers do not have the time nor means of transportation to go to the county seat for all the little things that come up.

This all ends for a bigger political machine, and I am sure that we have had all the rationing, reports to Government agencies, plus rent controls, that we want. Let's remember this deal.

Times have changed in Michigan.

There have been a lot of people from the large cities, workers in steel mills, and other factories, who have bought 5, 10, and 20 acres of land to insure their future security with a farm. That's their dream.

They build a home. They plant grapes, peaches, plums, and apples on low ground when they should be on high ground. They plant blueberries on sweet soil when they should be on sour soil. They plant berries anywhere.

We have had some outstanding county agents in the past, notably Frank Simanton and Harry Lurkins. They spent their days calling on the larger growers, and at night held meetings in the school houses and in the homes in the various communities.

These new growers, as a class, knew nothing about soil testing, fertilizers, elevation, and air drainage, or spraying.

When the crops came in they knew nothing about packing.

They had roadside stands, and still have them, and these, with the other roadside stands, are a problem.

We had three men in this country—Bill Esslinger, Sid Smith, and Al Hastings—who used to spend some time with any grower and show him how to put up an honest pack, and that helped a lot. They always had a smile.

Things have changed a lot in a great many ways, and in our mad rush through the war years we forgot the roadside stands and the grocery stores. They all handle locally grown produce; the farmer is their customer.

How about the tourists who flock to Michigan each summer, stop at the roadside stands, and buy some fruit that is swell on the top of the basket, with marbles and inferior fruit on the bottom?

The grocery stores have the advantage. They weigh it out and know where they bought it, but they still have their losses.

This tourist customer will not have a nice taste left in his mouth for more Michigan fruit.

Here are some of the things which our farmers cannot understand, and which show the national trend and what happens.

Quote: "Apple growers hold meeting at Quincy, Ill., and decide to pull out their apple trees." This means the famous Senator Scarborough orchards. How do they feel?

Quoting from a recent newspaper: "United States Gives Spuds Away"—17,800,000 bushels, bought through the Commodity Credit Corporation; part went to schools; the balance was offered for sale at 1 cent a bushel. They cost an average of $2.10 per bushel.

The next items mentioned to go the same way are dried eggs, dried milk, cheese, and butter.

Now they want to remove the tax from oleo, just to help the solid South. We have been helping them since the Civil War.

To top it off, with floods throughout the Middle West, and cold weather, they quibble in Washington over the coal strike. Just why is it necessary to play politics with the things that are so vital to our American way of life?

These things are vital to the factory worker, the farmer, the manufacturer. Why pick on the people who produce your very existence?

It will be well to let our politicians know that America comes first; that internationalists are a thorn in our side; they want to police the world.

I don't think we can properly police ourselves, much more try to police the world.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 6, 7, and 8 in the series on the Columbia River region written by Mr. Leon Starmont. Since these articles contain much information about the history of Columbia water-resource development not generally known to Members of Congress who today are considering important legislation affecting that river, I commend them to all. It should be remembered, however, that all statements in them are Mr. Starmont's own and that many of the actions taken over a period of the last 50 years are subject to varying interpretation.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 27, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 6)

(By Leon Starmont)

Early Spokane papers, including the rival Spokesman and Review, the original Times and the Chronicle, campaign for irrigation of the Yakima, Wenatchee, and Okanogan Valleys and the Big Ben country long before the railroad reached the present sites of Yakima, Ellensburg, Ephrata, Wenatchee, and Kennewick, and before Pasco became a city.

Numerous laymen, too, had elaborate schemes for developing the Columbia and for putting water on the Columbia plains, which is a title long used for the area now generally called the Big Bend. The name Big Bend at one time was confined to the area around Delrio, Mansfield, and Waterville, west of Grand Coulee, and in some instances even west of Moses Coulee.

LAUGHLIN M'LEAN'S IDEA

Nobody can now say with certainty who first thought of diverting Columbia River into its ice-age channel, Grand Coulee, or what paper first publicized the idea.

One proposal that attracted wide attention was made in 1892 by Laughlin McLean, a dealer in farm land in the Big Bend and Grand Coulee areas.

Yellowed clippings from the Spokane Daily Spokesman indicate that his vision included a dam so high it would back the Columbia well up the valleys of the San Poil, Spokane, Colville, Pend Oreille, and Kootenay.

It would also bare the present course of the Columbia for gold mining at some seasons of the year, and would provide a supplementary channel capable of carrying barges through Grand Coulee from the upper Columbia to the lower end of the locks, somewhere around Priest Rapids.

Many newspaper articles in Spokane and other cities played with the idea of running river steamers to Spokane, of connecting mid-Columbia navigation with the busy lines on the Arrow Lakes, and even of connecting the Spokane and Pend Oreille by means of a canal at Newport, Wash., where the Little Spokane rises within a few hundred feet of the Pend Oreille.

"BILLY" CLAPP'S IDEA

Laughlin McLean's plan was revived in the summer of 1917 by William E. (Billy) Clapp, an Ephrata attorney, now counsel for the Quincy-Columbia irrigation district. He took it up with three friends, W. Gale Matthews, head of the Grant County Abstract Co.; Paul D. Donaldson, also of Ephrata, still active in basin planning; and A. A. Goldsmith, who then lived at Soap Lake but later moved to Grandview. They discussed the idea several times and mulled over it for a year.

Then, in July 1918, Rufus Woods, editor of the Wenatchee World, stopped in Ephrata and called on Matthews. Matthews took him to see Clapp, and the resulting story of Clapp's revival of the McLean River diversion plan was carried, as an entertaining feature, on an inside page of the Wenatchee World.

"Billy" Clapp, much to his own embarrassment, has been labeled "father of Grand Coulee Dam," an honor he smilingly and modestly disclaims. For, as Clapp and his friends explain, Grand Coulee had then been long considered both as a reservoir and a dam site, and the scheme of diverting the river into the coulee has little resemblance to the plan finally agreed upon by the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation some 13 years later.

SOUTHARD PLAN, TOO

Another Ephrata resident, W. E. Southard, followed Clapp shortly with a modified idea. He would build a Columbia River dam only high enough to divert water by tunnel into lower Grand Coulee, below Dry Falls, at what is now Sun Lakes State Park. Southard got quite a bit of front-page display in Spokane and other newspapers, and his plan was later mentioned seriously in official documents, as the McLean and Clapp projects never were.

There was some official notice of the Clapp proposal, however, after E. F. Blaine had revived interest in the Big Bend development after visiting Washington in its behalf and delivering his now famous address to the Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

On November 27, 1918, C. W. Duncan, then county engineer at Ephrata, wrote the county commissioners that he had scouted the area looking for a possible dam site for the river diversion plan and recommended "exploring the valley of Columbia River in the vicinity of the head of Grand Coulee and Box Canyon * * * to bring the river to the level of the floor of Grand Coulee."

Hugh Cooper, who had a dam site at Z Canyon on Pend Oreille River, told members of the Spokane Columbia Basin group late in 1919 that the best way to irrigate was by a low dam at Grand Coulee, which could supply power to pump irrigation water into the bed of the coulee. They discounted his ideas, believing he was motivated by fear that diverting part of the Pend Oreille at Albeni Falls would endanger his Z Canyon project.

Cooper later expounded in Spokane, Wenatchee, and elsewhere his ideas he had picked up from reading the Noble, McGinnis, and Jacobs reports and from examination of the site.

James O'Sullivan, whose name is now preserved in the dam at the south end of the projected Potholes Reservoir, became interested about this time, and wrote a number of articles about the Army engineers' proposals for dams at Priest Rapids, Rock Island, Box Canyon, Grand Coulee, Hell Gate, and Kettle Falls.

Late in 1920 O'Sullivan wrote in the Wenatchee World a proposal that 500,000 acres be irrigated by a 100-foot dam at Grand Coulee and the rest of the project, then 1,850,000 acres, by gravity from Albeni Falls on the Pend Oreille.

The 1920's brought construction of Rock Island Dam on Columbia River below Wenatchee. Rufus Woods first opposed the Rock Island project, maintaining the site should be preserved for the city of Wenatchee and neighboring irrigation districts. His opposition was later withdrawn.

These matters are significant now only because Woods is a member of the State Columbia Basin commission.

Private capital then had plans for dams at Priest Rapids and Kettle Falls, and Army engineers had plans for several localities, including Grand Coulee and Hell Gate, which lies between Grand Coulee and the mouth of Spokane River. The Army also had started to improve a navigation channel through Rickey Rapids, permitting boats to run up the Columbia to the international boundary.

While engineering studies were still going on, Woods undertook a campaign for a high dam at Grand Coulee, which was to eliminate two upper dam sites, wipe out all possibility of continuous navigation, and reduce the irrigable land of the Columbia Basin project by nearly 45 percent.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 28, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 7)

(By Leon Starmont)

Eastern Washington now faces the sobering fact that the great Big Bend irrigation

project, renamed the Columbia Basin project, on which thousands of earnest citizens expended much time and money and great effort beginning in 1918, has been reduced from its original 1,850,000 acres, in round figures, to a scant half million.

Three principal factors in this shrinkage are substitution of the dam-and-pumping plan for the gravity plan of irrigation, withdrawal of wheat land that was to be watered from the East High canal, and removal of most of the rich Wahluke slope, taken over for security by the Atomic Energy Commission in connection with the Hanford plutonium plants.

SOME CAN BE RECOVERED

Some of this loss can be recovered.

Spokesman for the Columbia Basin Commission at Ephrata, and the Bureau of Reclamation at Coulee Dam, still speak of a "million-acre project." They assume the Wahluke slope will ultimately be released by the AEC, and the East High canal, which takes off above the new Long Lake Dam north of Stratford, will eventually be built.

They are not so optimistic about the acres that would have been irrigated under the gravity plan, but are too high to be reached with water from Grand Coulee Reservoir.

Ralph D. Nichols, a former Seattle State senator, has an elaborate plan, however, for using Kootenay, Pend Oreille, Spokane, and Palouse River water in a great high interconnecting reservoir that would inundate several townships in eastern Washington and northern Idaho, and let water out down either the Pend Oreille, the Kootenay, the Spokane or Little Spokane, the Palouse, Hangman Creek, or Rock Creek, wherever it might be needed or required.

ENGINEERS IGNORED PLAN

Army engineers, during last year's public hearings on the revised 308 report, listened to Nichols' explanation of his scheme, but gave it little or no serious consideration.

Many of the areas to be inundated had already made their protests known at hearings on the Springston and Boundary Dam projects and the three-dam plan once considered for a greatly expanded Pend Oreille lake.

Nichols, one of the original municipal ownership advocates in Seattle, has been plugging for the seven-valley dam since 1946, and has made numerous attempts to interest members of the legislature.

ACRES VERSUS KILOWATTS

The Nichols proposals are physically possible, from an engineering point of view. There are several other spots in the upper Columbia Basin where exchange of waters between tributaries is possible. One of them now being studied would create a high lake from which water could be directed down either the Columbia or Kootenay from Canal Flat, British Columbia.

Balancing the gains and losses caused by the gravity-to-pumping switch is a task that makes experienced engineers quail. A layman should therefore attempt it with extreme caution.

Stated simply, perhaps oversimply, for every acre lost a kilowatt was gained.

One engineer indicated that 400,000 acres may have been irrevocably lost to irrigation by abandonment of the gravity canal. To compensate for this, he said, the river would have lost enough water at Albeni Falls to reduce by 400,000 kilowatts the possible power output at Z Canyon, Kettle Falls, Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, and the other dams down the Columbia.

This reporter lets it go at that.

You can drive out past Cheney and see the 400,000 acres, representing some of the best land tributary to Ritzville, Lind, Connell, Washtucna, Kahlotus, and Pasco.

At no place can you see the kilowatts.

The ultimate basin-wide goal is 8,500,000 acres and 30,000,000,000 kilowatts.

The rate of exchange, therefore, was 4¾ percent of the acreage for 1¼ percent of the kilowatts.

NAVIGATION ADVOCATED

Early in the 1920's, it now appears, the Army engineers gave up their idea of developing the upper Columbia and the middle Snake for navigation.

Bargemen on the lower river still insist a mistake was made. This came out during hearings on the 308 revised report in connection with Hell's Canyon Dam on Snake River.

"Let's not repeat at Hell's Canyon the mistake made at Grand Coulee," cried Capt. Arvid Leppaluoto. "Let's make it possible to run barges up to Boise."

Idaho Power Co. spokesmen also protested Hell's Canyon, saying power could be delivered much earlier by a series of low dams, including the company's Oxbow and other sites, which could include navigation locks.

Nevertheless, the revised "308" plan includes Hell's canyon, with its bar to upriver navigation and its much delayed power development.

Most residents are inclined to concede that abandonment of the international navigation channel on the Columbia, and delay of several years in power delivery, are more than outweighed by the advantages the high dam brought.

IRRIGATION SUBSIDY

There is another consideration, also, which induces all but a few of the original irrigation group to accept the pumping plan and its lower acreage.

That is the subsidy paid by power users to water users.

In some cases, of course, this is the same as moving pennies from one pocket to the other. Most users of irrigation water also use power.

But many power users and prospective power users do not use irrigation water, and question a policy that makes them pay part of the bills of those who do.

True, all power users buy groceries, and if the lower water rates are reflected in lower grocery bills they haven't much to kick about—except the principle of the thing.

It may become a definite part of western or national policy to have farming subsidized by industry. There have been no loud protests so far.

But a number of people in high official circles have indicated some concern as to how far this policy can or should be carried.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 29, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 8)

(By Leon Starmont)

It may be news to many that the original 308 report, on which the present comprehensive Columbia Basin program is based, did not recommend Bonneville or McNary Dam and did not recommend immediate construction of Grand Coulee.

It was, however, the deciding factor in abandonment of the gravity plan for irrigating 1,850,000 acres and substitution of the pumping plan, with its subsidy feature, for a much smaller acreage.

Maj. John S. Butler was district engineer at Seattle when the study was made. This is what he said in his summary about Grand Coulee Dam in 1932:

"Under proper conditions it would be capable of returning the investment with interest. * * * It doesn't necessarily follow that the proper conditions exist at the present time."

WARRENDALE ADVOCATED

District engineer for the Army at Portland was Maj. Oscar O. Kuentz. His report covered the Columbia below the mouth of the Snake. It listed 17 possible dam sites, but eliminated 12 of them "because of not economically fitting into the general scheme of developing power * * * or on account of foundation difficulties."

Five received closer study "in order to determine the best plan of development." These were, reading down river, Umatilla, Arlington, John Day, The Dalles, and Warrendale.

The final recommendation was: "A power dam at The Dalles with its pool at elevation 330, a power dam at Warrendale with its pool at elevation 54, the navigation features for passing craft through these dams, and the irrigation, at such time in the future when it may become economically justified, of 378,000 acres by pumping from the pool created by The Dalles power dam."

Warrendale is 3 miles below Bonneville. The dam recommended in the first 308 report would have had its north abutment against Beacon Rock, now a State park.

ROOSEVELT TO THE RESCUE

This is what the original "308" report did recommend for the upper Columbia:

1. That the comprehensive plan be adopted as Federal policy.

2. That future dams require provision for navigation locks.

3. That permits be denied for power dams at Kettle Falls on the Columbia and the Narrows and Fishhawk sites on Spokane River below Little Falls.

4. That priority of irrigation over power be established.

Senator C. C. Dill, realizing there was little chance of getting money from Congress in a depression year on the strength of the Butler report, went directly to President Roosevelt. A. S. Goss, master of the National Grange, went along. They sold Roosevelt on the idea of using $60,000,000 PWA funds to start a low dam at the head of Grand Coulee, with the understanding it might later be built to the level indicated by Butler.

But Senator Charles L. McNary insisted Oregon share in the program, so the President ordered another dam built down the river first. The site was changed in the early 1930's from Warrendale to Bonneville.

LOCAL PRESSURES COUNT

It is interesting to watch the play of local pressures as the comprehensive plan takes tangible form and its units come into existence.

Cities in the center of their States, such as Wenatchee, Bend, Butte, and Bailey, tend to emphasize the "rights" of these States as opposed to their neighboring States. Seattle has much the same attitude, although it is outside the Columbia Basin.

Cities close to State lines, like Portland, Pasco, Walla Walla, Lewiston, Spokane, and to some extent Boise, seem to see more clearly, through their spokesmen, the necessity for interstate cooperation and a common front.

McNary Dam was substituted for The Dalles as the second project on the lower Columbia. This reporter does not attempt to say whether local pressures had a part.

Efforts were made to have Foster Creek (Chief Joseph) placed ahead of McNary, and similar efforts succeeded in getting it started ahead of either Ice Harbor or Albeni Falls—the latter not yet authorized. These efforts make the southern directors of the State Columbia Basin commission, who come from the Pasco area, unhappy.

They also create antagonisms in the Walla Walla country, in Whitman County, and in the sovereign State of Idaho.

DWORSHAK VOICES OBJECTION

Idaho's Senator HENRY C. DWORSHAK, former publisher of the Burley Bulletin, expressed it in a recent letter to Marshall Dana, an editor of the Portland (Oreg.) Journal, one of the early directors of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League, and former president of National Reclamation Association. Wrote DWORSHAK to Dana:

"Idaho makes a valuable contribution to our basin resources with the Snake, Salmon,

Clearwater, and other tributaries, providing valuable water for the Columbia River. In exchange for this cooperation * * * Portland should give our State realistic cooperation in addition to the verbal greetings of good will. They should, likewise, enlist the active support of their congressional representatives.

"During the last year obstacles have sidetracked essential upper basin projects.

"Two years ago the Army Engineer Corps recommended the construction of Ice Harbor Dam, one of the important elements of developing navigation on lower Snake River. Funds were requested to initiate this project, but during the recent session of Congress appropriations were diverted from this project to the Chief Joseph Dam, which has recently been given priority over the Snake River dams.

"'ONE REGION' SIDETRACKED

"This means that once more preference has been given to the detriment of dams which for many years have been approved as essential, in providing not only navigation, but flood control and electric power.

"If we are to have 'one region,' it is time to equalize the benefits of Northwestern development. Idaho does not want more than its share, but it wants equity.

"There are powerful political influences which have militated against Idaho's full development. I appeal for a realistic approach with genuine cooperation in preventing further delay and to insure Idaho's place in this regional development."

Address by Hon. Frances P. Bolton, of Ohio, Before the Women's Club of Richmond, Va.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, during my service in the House of Representatives it was my privilege to enjoy a warm friendship with two able and outstanding Representatives of the Twenty-second District of the great State of Ohio—the late Honorable Chester C. Bolton and his public-spirited and talented wife, Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON, who succeeded him in the House. The Commonwealth of Virginia, our capital city, and the members of the Women's Club were signally honored on the night of January 9, 1950, when Representative BOLTON was the guest speaker at the Club's annual dinner meeting.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the news item of January 5 from the Richmond Times-Dispatch announcing the address to be made in Richmond on the ninth by Mrs. BOLTON and a copy of her remarks on that occasion.

There being no objection, the news item and the address were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch of January 5, 1950]

MRS. BOLTON WILL ADDRESS WOMAN'S CLUB—CONGRESSWOMAN TO SPEAK MONDAY

FRANCES PAYNE BOLTON, Congresswoman from Ohio, will address the membership of the Woman's Club of Richmond as guest speaker on the president's program here Monday, according to an announcement made at the club's meeting yesterday.

Miss Frances Leigh Williams, president of the club, will preside at the Monday session.

Mrs. BOLTON was Ohio's first woman elected to Congress, and is now serving her tenth year in the House of Representatives from Ohio's Twenty-second District. A native of Cleveland, Mrs. BOLTON entered the political field after more than 30 years of homemaking.

An honorary alumna of Colgate University, Mrs. BOLTON was awarded an honorary degree of doctor of laws by Colgate in 1940, and was awarded a similar degree by Ohio Wesleyan University in 1942. She received her education at Hathaway-Brown School, Cleveland, Miss Spence's School for Girls in New York, and in a school in France.

Before she entered public life, Mrs. BOLTON was an active worker for higher standards of nursing education and service. She spoke in Richmond at the commencement exercises of St. Philip's School of Nursing in May 1941.

Before his death, Mrs. BOLTON's husband, Chester C. Bolton, was a State senator in Ohio, and later served in the United States Congress. He died in October 1939, in the midst of his fifth term.

ADDRESS OF HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON, OF OHIO

Madam Chairman, members of the Woman's Club of Richmond, as I drove down from Washington this morning I thought of many matters about which I wanted to speak with you, matters of great moment, for these are days when the fate of our civilization hangs in the balance.

With each mile I found the challenge of your invitation beckoning me more and more, and I wondered increasingly how I could tell you my deep appreciation of the privilege you have given me.

To come to Richmond is always a particular pleasure, for Richmond has a peculiar flavor, an atmosphere all its own, and Richmond women have a well-earned reputation for culture, intelligence, and charm. To come under these auspices is a rare and treasured opportunity.

To all Americans Virginia has a special meaning, for is she not the mother of the man whose dream, whose vision and whose indomitable courage made us a nation?

To me, the Ohio vice regent on the Mount Vernon Ladies Association, Virginia has come to mean much, to symbolize even more. I could not be a member of that board, living right there during council where Washington lived, without feeling closer each year to the Virginia of his day, to the Virginia he served and loved deeply all the days of his life, the Virginia that has given so much to America.

I know there is no need for me to recall to you that here in beautiful Virginia for three quarters of a century before the Declaration of Independence was signed, your people were stump speaking on Virginia court days for the expansion of liberty, of justice, and of freedom. Yet I would like to remind you that here in your Commonwealth there was a deep-seated antagonism to government from across the sea. And that antagonism constituted an excellent schooling for those who later led in the fight for the eventual freedom of the colonies and the birth of the United States of America.

Unlike the northern colonies, the Virginia system of government concentrated the administration of all local affairs in the hands of a few well-born county families who in those times were eminently fitted for the development of skill in leadership. This so-called aristocratic selection developed within your government a people trained to a remarkable degree in political economy. Hence it is not strange that this habit of parliamentary discussion enabled Virginia in those early days to give us men like Washington, Jefferson, Mason, Madison, and Marshall, and of a certainty this was a group of well-born leadership that has seldom if ever been equaled in all of history.

Moreover, it is indeed no happenstance that the Eighth Congressional District of Virginia—now and long represented by my good friend, the Honorable Judge HOWARD SMITH—not alone produced five men who later became Presidents of these United States—Washington, Jefferson, Madison, Monroe, and Taylor—but also the most distinguished and preeminent of all gentlemen, statesmen, soldiers, and patriots, your own beloved and revered Robert E. Lee.

Virginians have never had to apologize for the fact that their forebears brought from their mother country strong aristocratic prejudices and marked distinctions as to rank.

Here in Virginia the word "gentleman" had a very distinct meaning, and carried with it not only an ease of life but also a definite responsibility. Your many beautiful plantation homes are monuments to a way of life and of an economy very different from the severe, puritanical methods of my own forebears in old New England.

How different the life in these two sections of colonial America. In the North the elements themselves forced the already dour Pilgrims into a life dependent upon staple products and stable employment in which one must be assured gainful work as hired or purchased labor.

Here in Virginia the plantation needs were filled by the labor of imported indentured servants and slaves.

Life on the plantations of the Virginia Commonwealth was a life of isolation. Here each man settled where he found a convenient unoccupied plot of land. The parish churches, the county courts, and the election of your burgesses, bringing the Virginians together, kept up a fairly high degree of adult education. The parishes were extensive, and as there were but few schools, parochial and political rights of the minorities were in some measure—and rather unavoidably—curtailed.

The culture of tobacco was then, and in a large degree still is in some sections, the main source of cash income, though there were those who had little success with their tobacco. Oddly enough, Mr. Washington was among those who put himself through some difficult times in his attempt to make this one of his main crops.

As a matter of fact, the low price at which tobacco then sold afforded but scanty resources to the free planter obliged to rely on their own labor. Hence the management of local affairs fell under the control of but a few wealthy men possessed of large tracts of land which they cultivated partly with slave and largely with indentured white labor.

Thus it was that the Commonwealth of Virginia, through its landed gentry, inciting all of its people to clamor for liberation from the yoke of foreign government, liberated not only the Virginians themselves, but nurtured the seed for all mankind in the New World to develop what in this day and age has come to be known as the American way of life.

When at long last liberty had been wrested and the separation from the British throne had been completed, the strong arm that led the Nation on the field of battle lifted its pen at Mount Vernon to point out the path that lay ahead.

In writing the Governors of all States subsequent to the time he disbanded the Continental Army, George Washington said in part:

"According to the system of policy the States shall adopt at this moment, they will stand or fall; and, by their confirmation or lapse, it is yet to be decided whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse—a blessing or a curse not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be in-

volved. There are four things which I humbly conceive are essential to the well-being, I may even venture to say to the existence, of the United States as an independent power:

"(1) An indissoluble union of the States under one Federal head;

"(2) A sacred regard to public justice;

"(3) The adoption of a proper peace establishment; and

"(4) The prevalence of that pacific and friendly disposition among the people of the United States which will induce them to forget their local prejudices and policies; to make those mutual concessions which are requisite to the general prosperity; and, in some instances, to sacrifice their individual advantages to the interest of the community."

The names of Virginia's Washington and Jefferson are as much a part of the Constitution of the United States as the Bill of Rights itself. This was so eloquently stated by your own Edmond Randolph who, in writing to General Washington and urging that he should accept the Presidency, said in part:

"The Constitution would never have been adopted but for a knowledge that you had once sanctioned it, and moreover, the expectation that you would execute it."

Thus it was that Washington, son of Virginia, became the first of the great galaxy of its sons whose names, having reached stardom, will be held in perpetual honor by the people of these United States.

High in your firmament—part of the great contribution Virginia has made to the inherent strength of this great country of ours—are the Pages, the Nelsons, the Tuckers, and the Lewises; the Douglases, Stuarts, Spottswoods, Howards, and Beverleys, few of whom are now left; the Blakeleys, the Fairfaxes, the Williamses, the Harrisons, Carters, Welfords, and Careys; and last but not least, that eminent and distinguished Virginian who now serves as the senior Senator from your great Commonwealth, the Honorable HARRY F. BYRD.

I say to you with deep sincerity that no man who ever served his State and his Nation in the Congress of these United States has given more of himself to his country than does HARRY BYRD. He stands as a pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, pointing the way whereby in economy and in truth we must all unite in the common cause of saving this Nation from the pitfalls which lie ahead, pitfalls indicated by President Washington when he said: "It is yet to be decided whether the revolution must ultimately be considered as a blessing or a curse—a blessing or a curse not to the present age alone, for with our fate will the destiny of unborn millions be involved."

Virginia was proud of HARRY BYRD when he was Governor. She had reason to be, and the Nation looked to Virginia as an example of administration second to none. Virginia then sent this strong son of her loins to the Senate of the United States where he stands out as one of the few men whose eye sees clearly, whose hand points the way, and whose heart holds a courage, a loyalty, and a passion for truth and for freedom that is as a light on a dark road.

Surely it is no happenstance that once again Virginia, through one of her sons, is playing a strong role in the country she started on its way.

It cannot be by chance that it is another great Virginian who stands in the Senate of the United States and points out the dangers that lie ahead under the guise of the welfare state, proposed by the Chief Executive, who is the titular head of the left wing of the Democratic Party.

America is fortunate that this distinguished son of Virginia with whose opinions on matters of bureaucracy and of economy I am in complete accord, should be pointing out daily that literally billions of dollars can be saved annually by the simple expedient of honest determination to do away with the duplications, the extravagance, and the waste now inherent in the administration of our national and Federal affairs.

Any thinking American today, especially such women as you who come out of the free soil of Virginia, cannot but see that Federal powers are reaching out from Washington into every hamlet and home in this great free land, largely under the guise of beneficence under implied powers of the Constitution insidiously destroying the sovereign rights and freedom of the States.

I need not remind you that Federal taxation is already overburdening. Nor do women need to be told that the man—or the nation—that lives on borrowed funds eventually exhausts them at the source and goes bankrupt.

But I do urge you to face up to the facts of our fiscal situation with a determination to know the truth, that with the high courage that runs in your blood you can take hold of your share of responsibility to the oncoming generations.

Never was there a time in history, friends, when we as women had so heavy a responsibility, we who have been full citizens of this last stand of freedom, lo, these many years.

So many have asked me:

What can a woman do as a full citizen in a free land? Let me quote from an editorial of 1946 in the Christian Science Monitor:

"She can start quite basically and simply within her domestic sphere, remembering that politics, like charity, begins at home. She can teach her children that the word 'responsibility' is a companion word to freedom; she can teach them to play and work happily with children of other races, creeds, and colors, and that difference in cultures are to be appreciated and enjoyed—not to be sneered or laughed at. She can lay aside her soap operas, bridge parties, and 'escape' reading along with the other toys of her childhood and do a little home work in the problems that confront her in the grown-up world. She can learn to base her opinions on something firmer than hysterical headlines. She can watch the voting record of her Representatives in Congress and reject or accept them on the basis of that record. She will go to the polls with a bow of gratitude to the men who plowed through abuse and ridicule to give her the suffrage, and exercise her vote."

Let me remind you that a nation is not a tangible thing, not a building of bricks and mortar that will crash to ruins at the first strong blow. It is an echo of the past and a whisper from the future, the whole bound together with the lives, the hopes, and the endeavors of millions of men and women.

I have stressed the splendid efforts of Senator BYRD in the whole matter of our national economy and fiscal policy. I would be amiss if I led you to believe that in my opinion the current dangerous trends here in these United States are primarily economic in character.

Liberty is a thing of the spirit, and freedom is lost when the spirit falters. Liberty as we have known it in this country is the greatest privilege man has achieved. America is the land of liberty, a land built on the certainty that the individual is a part of the very essence of the living God, and on the belief in the right of that individual to build his own home, to live his own life, to worship in his own way—a land built upon the recognition by each individual of his responsibility to protect his freedoms and to render full stewardship to the God from whom he received a riches transcending all imagination.

We who are women citizens of this great Republic must make ourselves more intelligent in all matters pertaining to government, and we must assume responsibility for the future with a keenness and a courage which we are peculiarly able to give.

Is it not our job to protect our children? Is it not ours to see that every man (and woman) accepts his part of the burden right in the home community for the health, the living conditions, and the education of the children.

We who are mothers and teachers should be keenly aware that children for whom too much is made easy do not grow into strong men or capable women. We should therefore recognize the dangers of the welfare state which turns private citizens into public charges. What strength there is in those two words: "private citizen." How they emphasize the proud independence of the individual in the kind of America George Washington envisioned and millions of Americans have been trying to build for 3½ centuries.

Surely all of us wish passionately to remain private citizens, but we must do something about it every chance we get.

We have a wonderful formula of government that divides the very power of power in order to assure to the individual protection from Government itself. Underlying the whole plan, in Madison's memorable words, is "that honorable determination * * * to vest all our political experiments on the capacity of mankind for self-government."

Said William Penn: "We have put the power in the people."

We have a two-party political pattern which in itself is an anchor to windward in these stormy days when free institutions are being swept by tides of strange forces of centralized power.

This system is so fundamental to our political structure and of such protection to the rights of the sovereign States that we cannot give too much thought to it.

When we turned over many of the sovereign powers of our separate States to the Federal Government during the war, we were doing what must always be done in like emergencies. But we have not recognized the implications of our failure to reassume at the State and local levels many of these responsibilities.

It is imperative that we recognize the inevitable results of continuing wartime measures in peacetime—even though peace be but a mirage on the face of the earth.

If there is to be freedom, then we who have a formula, we who have been made stewards of liberty, we must accept the burden of our privilege.

Now, what does that mean in concrete terms?

I have already given you a glimpse of what each individual woman, no matter what her state in life, no matter where or how she lives, must assume if she values her citizenship.

But there is more for each of us to do because American citizenship is twofold in character. We are citizens of sovereign States with aims and purposes not only to protect personal freedom but to protect the individuality and the sovereignty of the States themselves, and we are citizens of that great Union of States, the United States of America.

We are faced today, as our Nation has always been faced since its very inception, with problems that are both national and local in scope.

The answers to these problems must be sought with infinite wisdom—yes; and with infinite patience—if they are to be solved within the framework of a system that has as its goal the preservation of individual freedom from the hands of centralized power, and preservation of the identity of a nation that can take its place of leadership in the great family of nations.

There are many questions before us daily which we must relate to this basic formula for freedom which made us a nation and upon which we have built prosperity and strength. Often we do not stop to do this.

We look at the immediate moment only, failing to recognize the implications for the future.

Let me give you instances.

At what level does the local responsibility for proper teachers' salaries and school buildings fall? Where does the State's responsibility begin and end?

Is our State citizenship, our State and local pride, so weak that we must turn to the Federal Government at every corner?

If so, are we ready to accept the dictation, the control, that is the inevitable result?

One of the inevitable results of turning to the Federal Government—or of expecting the State to do something which, with some effort and a bit of common sacrifice the local community can do—is that the further away we get from the actual need at the community level, the more complicated and expensive the solution becomes.

You mothers and grandmothers, you wives and sisters, look ahead and think twice before you ask for outside help. Get together with your own families, with your neighbors, and tap the unmeasured strength of your own possibilities. Face the cold fact that no matter how beneficent the outward form of government help may be, there are strings to it that grow rapidly into chains that will ultimately bind not only your activities but your hopes and dreams.

There are other questions about which you, in your double citizenship, must concern yourselves.

What of the tidewaters of the States? To whom belong the minerals, the oils, that may be under them—to the States or to the Federal Government?

Who shall own the water sources and the water that flows from them? Who shall own and dispense the grazing rights? Who shall say that forests must be kept if we are to sustain our rainfall and prevent encroachments of deserts upon our fertile land?

These and many more are questions to which each American should be giving consideration, for upon the answers depend more than we know.

These United States of ours that joined together in order that freedom might be protected and extended, were given a formula elastic enough to meet every changing demand—for I remind you that freedom is the manifestation of that liberty which is of the spirit. We are charged with the responsibility to preserve this that was given into our hands. None of us is free of the responsibility that rests upon us as citizens of this great country.

We women who know all too well the irksomeness of restriction must at this moment awaken to a full sense of what stewardship means, remembering vividly that none of this is ours. For the "Earth is the Lord's, and the fullness thereof."

All too long have we left our talents buried under the ground; all too long has our candle been under a bushel. No longer may we sit by the roadside. Rather must we gather ourselves together and with our eyes fixed upon the stars, our feet solidly upon firm ground, our hearts in God's keeping, humbly but with shining faith in the ultimate victory of liberty under law, go out into our own land, strengthening her every sinew that he in her own destined hour may indeed prove herself to be the light set in darkness that shall bring all men to peace.

Where are we going, you ask? I will tell you.

"Towards happiness that is beyond dreams;
Towards truth that surpasses thought;
Towards realization of something that is
both within and beyond you;
Towards freedom, peace, and love."

—*Townshend* (Earth).

During 1949 and From Every State in the Union, as Well as From Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, to the RFC Came 11,127 Applications for Business Loans—4,559 Applications Totaling $592,647,000 Were Approved—Pending as of December 30 Were 1,686 Further Loans Aggregating $433,866,000

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, on Monday last I addressed this House with respect to the wisdom of continuing, if not perpetuating, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation in behalf of small business and other industries of these United States.

I, at that time, pointed out what the record of the RFC discloses as to the beneficent effects upon the national financial economy as well as labor that have continuously flowed out of the activities carried on by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation from its inception in 1932.

Additionally thereto, I pointed out to this House that the RFC, a federally owned corporation, had covered into the Treasury of the United States in excess of $308,000,000, as profits on its preferred stock, all of which is held by the Government of the United States.

Moreover, I pointed out that these were not so-called paper profits but were profits taken in the coin of the realm.

Mr. Speaker, since I made that talk some 72 hours ago, I have been in receipt of many letters, telegrams, and telephone calls. These came not alone from Members of both Houses of Congress, but from lawyers, manufacturers, bankers, industrialists, the heads of public utilities, lumber and mining companies.

Without exception, all commended the stand I had taken in advancing the splendid work now being done by the RFC, and that it should be continued.

The writers pointed out that not alone would it be false economy to abate or in any manner curtail RFC activities at this time, but that to do so now would be to doom thousands of business concerns that are now attempting or will in the next few months attempt to avail themselves of RFC lending facilities.

Several of the letters stated that the writers are as of this very hour negotiating for RFC loans. One writer said that whether or not the RFC was curtailed and if for that or any reason they failed to receive the temporary financial help now needed, and which is not available to them through their local banks, they would be compelled to—

First. Scrap their plans for increasing production by virtue of an inadequacy of working capital.

Second. Curtail their credits and shrink their inventory to a point that would eventually and adversely effect their probable operations.

Third. Continue production as in the past, with high-priced hand labor, pay increased wages under the new minimum-wage law instead of meeting competitive prices by availing themselves of decreased production costs through the acquisition of costly automatic machinery, or else

Fourth. In order to save what they could of their present invested capital, to liquidate their affairs, shut down operations, sell the plant and equipment, take their loss now, and discontinue business.

Mr. Speaker, that is but a typical case of the difficulties that face many small business enterprises throughout the country.

The general tenor of these letters so disturbed me that I called upon the RFC to make specific inquiry as to how many loans were now subject to negotiation; the total volume of money involved in these applications, the nature of the applicant's business and exactly what number, and from what types of business, and general areas from which they expected to receive applications for processing loans in the next 12 months.

In response to my telephone inquiry, I learned that during the calendar year of 1949, 11,127 applications for business loans were filed with RFC. Of that number, 4,559 applications aggregating $592,647,000 were approved, and that at the close of business December 30, 1949, there were pending and undisposed 1,686 applications with an aggregate amount of $433,866,000. The applications were received from every State in the Union and, in addition, from Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Mr. Speaker, there was one telephone call that I received from a Member of this House about which I would particularly like to speak. I want to do so in order to clarify the minds of all with respect to just how the expense of running the RFC is met each year.

The good friend who called me is a new Member of this body. He was laboring under the impression that because the RFC appeared in the annual appropriation bills, as passed each year by this House, the Congress was annually making appropriations to the RFC for meeting their expenses.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that that is far from the fact. I want not only to reiterate but to elaborate on what I said last Monday with respect to the RFC being a self-supporting organization. As we all know, it is a governmentally owned private Corporation. The capital with which it operates and loans out was made available to it by this Congress from the Treasury of the United States. The Corporation charges a reasonable rate of interest, comparable to that charged by private banks, and certain other expenses on all moneys loaned to borrowers.

Rather than having cost the Government of the country any taxpayer's money, the fact is that the RFC has earned the taxpayers of the Nation, as of this hour, a net total of $573,000,000—$265,000,000 of that sum being retained by the Corporation to set up, as do all

safe and sane banking institutions and other commercial concerns, a reserve for bad accounts. The reserve for bad accounts that has been established was likewise set up solely out of the profits earned by the RFC.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hear me well on this. The difference between the net total of $573,000,000 that has been earned by the RFC and the $265,000,000 which has been set aside as a reserve amounts to the $308,000,000 that have been covered into the Treasury of the United States.

The deposit of this huge sum into the Treasury of the United States, and in behalf of the American taxpayers, has decreased the cost of operating the Government by just that much money—which would otherwise have to be raised by taxing our people.

Mr. Speaker, now let me continue and point out just why it is that the financial costs of operating the Reconstruction Finance Corporation do appear in the President's budget as sent here to Congress.

While the moneys which the RFC expends for operation do appear in the appropriation bills as they come to the floor of this House, there is this significant difference between the sums voted for RFC and the sums appropriated for other agencies and departments.

All other agencies and departments are voted appropriations to pay for their operations directly from the Treasury of the United States, whereas in the case of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and some several similar organizations, what the Appropriations Committee recommends to the Committee of the Whole House actually is the maximum amount which, in our judgment and findings, the RFC can spend out of their profits in carrying on their operations.

The Government Corporation Control Act of 1945 placed practically all Government corporations under the annual review of the Appropriations Committee of the Congress. What profit they earn goes to the United States Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, I repeat: We in this Congress do not make an appropriation from the general fund of the Treasury to the RFC. We merely authorize or, more precisely, limit the amount they might use of the corporate funds or earnings for administrative and all other purposes.

Mr. Speaker, the wonderful economic and financial accomplishments of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation are too well known to the Members of this House for me to dwell on that subject at greater length. I am, however, in receipt of one letter which has to do with their modus operandi that so clearly exhibits and pictorializes the splendid work an RFC loan accomplished in behalf of one borrower that I am going to place that letter, together with the comments of its writer, into the records of our proceedings today.

That communication comes from a man not alone well and favorably known to the Members of this House but well and favorably known to business and financial interests throughout the United States.

There is no man in all of our great South country more intimately respected, more conservative, more righteous, or is there another who in the last two decades has done more to raise the standards of life and living of all of our people in the cotton South than has Jim Allen, executive vice president of the St. Regis Paper Co.

Mr. Speaker, from first-hand knowledge I can testify that lumbermen and forest farmers everywhere throughout the South recognize in Jim Allen the greatest living force in forest conservation and utilization that has ever lived.

One of the pioneers in the manufacture of kraft paper from slash pine trees, he was responsible for the establishment of the Mobile mill of the International Paper Co. It has been said that he has done the most inconceivable things with a pine tree—"practically everything except to fix it in some manner that would make it edible."

From country boy to empire builder, he has interested and concerned himself in dozens of successful enterprises in some 18 States.

At the time that this letter was written in May of 1945, Jim Allen was president of the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. with its main interests in Pensacola, Fla. He was active in the development of the great Southern Kraft Corp. which now operates mills in Mississippi, Louisiana, Alabama, Florida and South Carolina.

In the years 1934 and 1935, while associated with the Union Bag & Paper Corp., he planned, organized and built the first pulp and paper mill at Savannah, Ga., and that, Mr. Speaker, was a development that was made possible only through the aid of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. Today the Union Bag & Paper Corp. plant at Savannah is the largest and by far the greatest pulp and paper mill in the whole world.

The people of Savannah willingly acknowledge that it was this development, by and with the participation, and the sympathetic understanding of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation that made Savannah the prosperous community which it is today. This is but one of the communities and one of the many developments that our cotton South can point to with pride and a feeling of gratitude to the RFC.

There are innumerable projects in my own First District of Alabama as well as elsewhere in the State that were successfully financed by the RFC, the loans of which have been completely amortized as of today. The great Bankhead tunnel was financed by the RFC. The Cochrane Bridge was constructed with an RFC loan. This is another which has long since been paid in full. In my opinion, the great development and growth in trade and commerce between the cities of Mobile, Ala., and Pensacola, Fla., is in a very large measure directly traceable to the helpfulness and services extended to our people by this fiscal governmental agency.

Mr. Speaker, for more than a decade past and while representing my district in the Congress of the United States, I have had innumerable opportunities to know of many small business groups which made their application for financial assistance to the Birmingham office of the RFC. I would be remiss in my duty and wholly unappreciative of work well done if I failed to tell this House of the great help, courtesy, consideration and aid that the men who represent the RFC in my State have extended to my own constituency in the discharge of their duty.

I am proud to stand here in the well of this House and express to you, Mr. Speaker, and to all of my colleagues, that I have the utmost respect for and confidence in the abilities of men like Fred Foy, RFC agency administrator in Birmingham, Jack Holliday, his assistant, and all of the rest of the personnel of that district office who work so ardently and unstintingly in the discharge of their official duties.

Mr. Speaker, it is true that the Birmingham office has probably turned down more requests for loans than they have approved, but I assure you that, to my personal knowledge, not one penny of the money that they ever loaned on any security was not absolutely necessary and at the same time absolutely essential to save small business from distress, from foreclosure and bankruptcy to the end that our people could earn a living and at the same time continue to serve the trade and productivity of our great Nation.

In my Washington connections I am more than gratified to have found men with the ability of Frank Prince working on the staff of the RFC. I knew Frank Prince when he was a banker in the South, and I have first-hand knowledge that he could today be president of one of our greatest banks in Alabama were it not for his devotion to the aims and principles of the RFC, where he is now serving as Chief of the Loan Operations Division. I know that it is at great personal sacrifice that he continues with untiring willingness to serve the large as well as the small enterprises seeking their aid. Frank Prince gives unselfishly of himself through every hour of the day and night in discharging with honor and dignity the job entrusted to his care.

Mr. Speaker, if there is anything that I can say that is derogatory to the RFC organization, insofar as my experience with it is concerned, is that they are far too conservative, too careful; yes, far too careful in the handling of their funds.

The letter from Jim Allen, which I have heretofore said I would insert as part of my remarks, is dated May 17, 1945. It was written to the Hon. John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, who then had in turn succeeded the Hon. Jesse H. Jones and the Hon. Fred M. Vinson as the Loan Administrator, charged with the handling of all Federal lending agencies, including the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

I wish that every Member of this House would take time to read that letter from Jim Allen to John Snyder. I wish that they would take time to trace this single loan made by the Reconstruction

Finance Corporation to a business organization which, after having discharged with interest every penny of the $1,878,000 loaned to them, wrote in grateful appreciation of the splendid service afforded to them by the RFC.

Trace with me the temporary financing of what is now a huge enterprise, step by step. Note the care with which the equity security was scrutinized, evaluated, and checked.

Note, also, the way the RFC invoked the so-called matching dollar formula, and the serious consideration given to the postwar program of creating new jobs by the examiners and other officials of the RFC.

Mr. Speaker, note the care with which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation persuaded every party financially interested in this transaction to participate to the limit of their abilities to the end that each would have an acual cash stake in the risk that the RFC was assuming. This participation by interested individuals and concerns was from as little as $1,700 by one equipment company to as much as $245,000 by the principles.

Study the income, the operation, and the expense statements gratuitously given by the beneficiary of the loan after the entire sum of $1,878,000 that had been advanced had been repaid.

Note the profits which that concern has derived from its successful operations. Mark well the great benefits which have been added to the natural forest reserves of these United States, and above all else, note the one significant paragraph from the letter Jim Allen wrote:

> We simply could not have gotten started, in the beginning, without help from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We just weren't eligible for private bank financing.

Mr. Speaker, that project is wholly typical of the hundreds of millions of dollars of loans now pending with the RFC and it is for these reasons that I repeat what I said to this body last Monday:

> Let us not alone continue the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, let us in behalf of small enterprise throughout the Nation and in behalf of our national economy, make the RFC a permanent institution of Government.

Mr. Speaker, I now hand to the reporter a copy of the communication written by Mr. J. H. Allen, addressed to the Honorable John W. Snyder, Secretary of the Treasury, on May 17, 1945, at which time he was serving as Federal Loan Administrator of the RFC.

That letter is preceded by the self-explanatory cover letter written to me by Mr. Allen under date of February 1, 1950.

ST. REGIS PAPER CO.,
New York, N. Y., February 1, 1950.

Congressman FRANK BOYKIN,
House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRANK: I note from the press that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been under criticism by some who certainly must not know of the creative work the Corporation has done.

We had a great experience here in the Pensacola area with the use of funds of the Corporation. On May 17, 1945, I wrote the directors and officers of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, telling them of our appreciation of the services they had rendered the commerce of this area. I am attaching to this letter a copy of the letter I wrote at that time. All of the directors acknowledged receipt of this letter. I am also attaching a copy of the acknowledgement of the letter from Mr. John W. Snyder.

My letter points out clearly the value of this Corporation to those seeking equity capital. If the Reconstruction Finance Corporation were destroyed or limited, I would hate to contemplate just what the result would be to commerce generally. This sort of contraction at this time would bring on a stoppage of expansion, caused by new projects that would stifle commerce.

I hope you will do all you can for those who need capital to keep this great enterprise as a part of our public facilities.

Sincerely,

J. H. ALLEN.

MAY 17, 1945.

Mr. JOHN W. SNYDER,
Federal Loan Administrator,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. SNYDER: On May 14 we paid our entire indebtedness to your Corporation, which amounted to $869,308.51. This is the balance due on a loan we received from you on June 17, 1940, amounting to $1,878,000. We have met all interest payments and all monthly payments, in every case, on the due day.

As we are now closing a 5-year association with you, we want to express our appreciation for the very splendid advice and financial service we received from Mr. Ribenack and the courteous attention from the Jacksonville agency, not only in the promotion and operation of our business, but particularly in the service rendered in helping us make our business a permanent business, which shall prove to be, we feel, one of the most complete, unique, and permanent forest project developments in the South.

We simply could not have gotten started without help from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. We just weren't eligible, in the beginning, for private bank financing.

The story, we believe, is worth recording.

NINETY-TWO THOUSAND ACRES OF LAND AND $2,700,000 IN CASH TO GO

In the beginning, Mr. James G. Pace and his family owned 92,000 acres of land which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation valued at $800,000. That was the only asset the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. fell heir to in the beginning. The Pace family took the most distant junior securities for their stock. That is, they took the last place in equity.

The lands were fine, but we needed $2,700,000 in cash, with which to build a mill and operate the project.

The Reconstruction Finance Corporation used the formula of matching dollars with us, for the cash and/or any fair asset value we put in. This meant, of course, that we had to raise, out of equity securities, approximately $1,078,000, in addition to the $800,000 in land referred to above.

(The matching-dollar formula, when applied to new projects, is most difficult, and we feel that, in your postwar job-creation plan, you should give serious consideration to liberalizing this formula. It might become necessary for you to do, for new job-creating industries, what you did when you saved the banks, namely, buy preferred stock and let the management place the senior securities. This is simply a suggestion.)

HOW WE RAISED THIS EQUITY MONEY

Messrs, Hilton-Green, Finlay, and Ed Leigh McMillan agreed to sell to the Florida Pulp & Paper Co. 35,000 acres of very fine timberland for $245,000, and agreed to accept, in payment for same, 4 percent in the common stock of the company, and 96 percent in the 15-year debenture notes of the company. This accounted for $245,000.

Mr. and Mrs. John C. Pace subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $62,000, and common stock in the amount of $6,000.

Mr. Ben Mintz, of the Trinity Bag & Paper Co., subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $96,300, and to common stock in the amount of $8,000.

Mr. S. A. Allen, of Savannah, Ga., subscribed for 15-year debenture notes in the amount of $48,300, and to common stock in the amount of $4,000.

The purveyors of equipment agreed to take part pay for their equipment in our 15-year debentures. These fine concerns and the amount they subscribed are listed below:

Babcock & Wilcox Co., New York, N. Y	$41,200
The Black-Clawson Co., Hamilton Ohio	126,700
Chicago Bridge & Iron Co., Chicago, Ill	18,300
The Dorr Co., Inc., New York, N. Y	5,100
Improved Paper Machinery Co., Nashua, N. H	23,700
International Pulp & Equipment Co., Bee Bee, Quebec	1,700
Layne-Central Co., Memphis, Tenn	14,200
Lockport Felt Co., Newfane, N. Y	10,200
Pittsburgh Piping & Equipment Co., Pittsburgh, Pa	74,400
Swenson Evaporator Co., New York, N. Y	5,200
Warren Steam Pump Co., Warren, Mass	6,000
Westinghouse Electric & Manufacturing Co., Pittsburgh, Pa	160,100

The city of Pensacola purchased our mill site and improved it partially, for $50,000, and gave the company a 99-year lease on same. We pay 1-percent interest on this money.

The Frisco Railroad Co. built our sidetracks for $25,000.

All of these items are considered as part of the asset value management had to raise.

As stated above. you then stood ready at any time after we had spent our equity money, to make available to us $1,878,000. This you did, and without a hitch.

The Citizens & Southern National Bank, through Mr. William Murphey, advanced us the promotional money necessary to arrange for timber surveys, engineering, legal expenses and, in fact, all promotional expense.

Mr. Ed. Lane, of the Atlantic National Bank of Jacksonville, along with the Citizens & Southern National Bank, agreed to handle some early financing of the subscriptions made to junior securities of the company by some of the companies above listed.

The local banks in Pensacola loaned some money to Mr. John Pace to be used for the purchase of junior securities of the company.

You can see from the story that the city and county governments, the Federal Government, the railroads, private banks, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, and private industry all had a hand in the creation of this development. As far as we know, there has not been a disgruntled purchaser of any of our securities.

OPERATION

I shall give you herewith summary of the performance of this mill from the date it started in 1941, up to and through the year 1944. We do this just to show you what an investment of $3,700,000 can do.

Comparative profits, taxes, sales, expenses—Years 1941 to 1944, inclusive

	Profit before interest and depreciation	Interest	Depreciation	Income tax	Net to surplus
1941	$366,699.13	$47,592.93	$42,675.35	$32,925.94	$243,504.91
1942	632,925.52	131,917.67	102,975.04	8,432.75	389,600.06
1943	893,024.69	121,899.42	117,286.59	124,450.27	529,388.41
1944	1,256,466.56	105,092.26	159,060.72	449,680.41	542,633.17
Total	3,149,115.90	406,502.28	421,997.70	615,489.37	1,705,126.55

	Gross sales	Discount and commission	Freight	Net sales	Tons shipped
1941	$1,128,586.95	$77,221.39	$91,522.21	$959,843.35	9,875
1942	2,742,137.63	183,154.06	255,848.53	2,303,135.04	26,257
1943	3,945,324.07	215,283.78	376,206.79	3,353,833.50	36,059
1944	4,773,705.38	249,770.25	410,760.95	4,113,174.18	38,374
Total	12,589,754.03	725,429.48	1,134,338.48	10,729,986.07	110,565

The first 4 months of this year, 1945, we have added approximately $190,000 to surplus:

Current assets	$1,234,735.25
Other assets	437,298.24
Fixed assets	3,998,478.47
Total	5,670,511.96
Current liabilities	678,731.53
Deferred liabilities	2,003,034.61
Net worth	2,988,745.82
Total	5,670,511.96

(NOTE.—Not included in the above: Our timber holdings have appreciated approximately $1,000,000 since purchase.)

Today we are working in the woods and in the mill better than 1,000 men. Our pay roll and wood costs are running, currently, at the rate of:

	Yearly
Pay roll	$1,250,000
Wood	900,000

Approximately 60 percent of the wood cost is labor.

We own, in fee simple, 172,000 acres of land. We are raising better than 86,000 cords of wood yearly, which is about the volume of wood our present plant is consuming. We know that our timber farms are sufficiently productive to keep this mill running forever. Therefore, the jobs referred to above are permanent jobs.

As soon as we became eligible for private financing, two very fine banks, the Citizens and Southern National Bank of Savannah, and the Bank of the Manhattan Co. of New York, agreed to purchase our two notes of $900,000 each, dated May 5, 1945, due in 5 years, with interest at 3 percent.

Believing that it was the intent of Congress for a concern to pay up the Reconstruction Finance Corporation when its own securities became seasoned and salable, we issued the notes and made the loan, and, as stated in the beginning of this letter, we took up all of your indebtedness, as well as all of our 15-year debenture notes.

WHAT HAVE WE PROVEN TOGETHER?

We have proven that, in forestry, through the medium of pulp and paper making, permanent jobs can be created, and that, in your postwar planning, if you are able to secure experienced managements in forest projects, thousands of permanent jobs may be created.

We have been able to select capable executives to manage this enterprise. The writer was attracted to this development when he was vice president and director and in charge of an expansion program for the Union Bag & Paper Corp., and resigned his connection with that very fine company the fall of 1939, to undertake this promotion, construction, and operation; and, together with A. D. and J. C. Pace, entered into a long-term contract for the management of this business.

The whole enterprise has been pleasant and constructive and full of cooperation by all parties in interest.

In the beginning the company was assured of a market for all the trees it might raise, and cut from its forest farms, by the Trinity Bag & Paper Co. of New York, who are large and wise distributors of pulp and paper throughout the United States.

In closing let us say again that we are grateful to you for making this very fine project successful and permanent, for you can take it from us, the forest-project development here shall not be "gone with the wind," but, quite to the contrary, it is here to stay.

Yours very sincerely,

FLORIDA PULP & PAPER CO.,
J. H. ALLEN, *President.*

FEDERAL LOAN AGENCY,
Washington, D. C., May 24, 1945.

Mr. J. H. ALLEN,
President, Florida Pulp & Paper Co.,
Pensacola, Fla.

DEAR MR. ALLEN: Please let me thank you for you nice letter of May 17.

Expressions of appreciation such as this help make this job of ours here in Washington seem tremendously worth while.

I hope you come in to see me the first time you are in Washington.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN W. SNYDER.

Statement by Hon. Margaret Chase Smith, of Maine, on Social Security and Old-Age Assistance Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement on the subject of social security and the old-age assistance program, which I made on February 3 before the Senate Finance Committee in connection with House bill 6000.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I am pleased to be here at this part of the committee's hearings.

The highlight has been the testimony of Dr. Francis Townsend. Certainly no one has done more on the problem of old-age assistance than Dr. Townsend, and he deserves the thanks of every American citizen.

The legislation which you are now considering is probably the most important domestic problem now confronting our people. From the cradle to the grave—from the first cry of the baby until the last beat of the heart—each and every one of us strive for the same things—happiness and security.

Individual independence and the capture of security through sacrifice, hard work, and saving should be the goal of all of us before we first turn to the Government as the dispenser of security to us. But not all of us are endowed with the tools and ability to achieve security through individual effort.

Circumstances, or "breaks" if you want to call it that, have granted some of us greater ability to achieve happiness and capture security. We have been endowed with greater productive or creative ability or with greater financial resources or with the rare and admirable ability to be happy with less of the material things than what the next fellow has.

Others of us are not so lucky. Our mental or physical capabilities have been limited from birth or have not been developed because of lack of means of development or have been impaired by misfortune. Depression, war, and inflation in unbroken succession have shaken the faith in the belief that man is the master of his own destiny. These conditions have proved beyond question that our Government must cope with the problem of social security and old-age assistance.

I think most everyone today readily agrees that our present social-security and old-age assistance program is woefully inadequate both in coverage and amounts of payments. It has been for a long time and this legislation is long overdue in the interest of a happy and stabilized America.

Only one out of every five of our senior citizens over 65 years of age receive any old-age assistance, and the average payment is less than $45 a month or less than $1.50 a day. This is not even bare subsistence in the face of today's cost of living.

If we possess the genius to build an atomic bomb, a hydrogen bomb that can threaten the very existence of the world, surely we must possess the will to provide the means of security for ourselves and our fellow Americans in our old age after we have given the best years of our lives to the development of our country.

Insecurity breeds war. A happy and secure people are the best guaranty against war. Adequate social security can make a great contribution to the realization of permanent peace. And the best place to start is right here at home in America—right here before this committee—right here in Congress.

Need for Veteran Hospitals in California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the acute shortage of well-staffed hospital facilities in California for care of dis-

abled veterans was discussed by the California congressional delegation and representatives of the American Legion Department of California at a meeting held February 7.

The serious problem which confronts us is not new. Decisions making its solution possible have been postponed many months. On Monday, December 12, Congressman CECIL KING and I called together the southern California members of our State's congressional delegation in Los Angeles to meet with representatives of the veterans organizations and the Veterans' Administration to gather up-to-date evidence and coordinate our efforts to obtain adequate hospital facilities. Veterans organizations represented at the meeting were: American Legion by Messrs. Sloneker, Merryfield, and Dunn; Veterans of Foreign Wars by Mr. Hendricks; Disabled American Veterans by Mr. Lucas; and Military Order of the Purple Heart by Mr. Sutro.

Those attending the meeting, congressmen, veterans representatives, and the local Veterans' Administration officials unanimously agreed upon the need and the kind of action we must take.

At the meeting on February 7, after hearing further testimony from the American Legion, Department of California, we determined to proceed as a delegation on this problem. A resolution was drafted by the veterans committee of the California congressional delegation recommending that the Veterans' Administration acquire the military facilities including the McCornack General Hospital in Pasadena, Calif., the naval hospital at Corona, Calif., and the Long Beach Navy and Mare Island Navy Hospitals. The motion was adopted unanimously and our veterans committee was instructed to transmit the delegation resolution to General Gray, Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, and Mr. Frank Pace, Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that the action of the California delegation will hasten decisive action by the executive departments to meet California's critical need of hospital beds for veterans.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I insert factual material supplied by the American Legion in the Appendix of the RECORD, as follows:

[The American Legion, Department of California, Lewis K. Gough, commander. Rehabilitation commission: Stanley S. Coffey, chairman; John C. Dunn, vice chairman; Lewis S. Sloneker, director. Department service officers: Charles R. Farrington, J. Earl Merifield, Frederick Fish]

FEBRUARY 1, 1950.

HOSPITAL BED SITUATION FOR VETERANS IN CALIFORNIA

(Compiled by rehabilitation commission, through the office of the director, 1380 Sepulveda Boulevard, Los Angeles, Calif.)

It is well to again review what progress has been made on approved construction for additional Veterans' Administration hospitals, and additions to existing Veterans' Administration hospitals in California. For this purpose we will list them as to their intended types of treatment in this order: Neuropsychiatric, tuberculosis, and general medical and surgical.

Hospital	Type	Date approved	Approximate date of maximum use for patients	Number of additional beds
San Francisco area	Neuropsychiatric	Oct. 19, 1946	No construction started; no bids called; site selected only.	1,000
Los Angeles area	do	do	Not even a site selected	1,000
Livermore	Tubercular	Dec. 17, 1943	Undetermined	119
San Fernando	do	Oct. 16, 1945	do	130
Fresno	General medical and surgical.	Sept. 12, 1944	July 1950; dedication March 1950	250
San Diego	do	Oct. 19, 1946	Site obtained; bids called for; low bidder announced then entire project canceled.	200

The slow and unexplained progress made toward completing the construction already approved is very discouraging and believed inexcusable. Added to this delay the canceling of one of the hospitals approved for California by the executive branch of the Government is further disheartening to the sick and disabled veteran.

The Veterans' Administration being fully aware of not having enough beds to meet their requirements in California, entered into contracts with the Army and Navy, to hospitalize veteran patients in several of the armed services hospitals. The peak of such contracts, including 50 beds at the United States Public Health Hospital at San Francisco, reached 1,750 beds as follows:

	Peak contract	Closed, announced closed, and reduced	Contracts expected to remain
United States naval hospital, Mare Island	150	150	0
Letterman General Hospital, San Francisco	175	0	175
United States Public Health Hospital, San Francisco	50	0	50
United States naval hospital:			
Oakland	400	0	400
Long Beach	400	400	0
San Diego	250	50	200
Corona	225	225	0
McCornack General Army Hospital, Pasadena	100	100	0
Total	1,750	925	825

There is no assurance that the Veterans' Administration will maintain the present contracts for hospitalizing veterans in Army and Navy hospitals. In fact, it is evident that they may soon lose all such contracts. According to the Army Times Vet-Letter of November 19, 1949, Maj. Gen. Raymond W. Bliss, Army Surgeon General, confirmed to the Vet-Letter, the Department of Defense has under consideration the feasibility of terminating 5,500 beds in Army and Navy hospitals now at the disposal of the Veterans' Administration. The Vet-Letter goes on further to quote Dr. Paul B. Magnuson, Chief Medical Director of the Department of Medicine and Surgery, Veterans' Administration, when asked about this, said: "That's the way the wind is blowing."

The trend of doing away with hospital beds for Veterans' Administration patients in Army and Navy hospitals is further indicated in the Army and Navy Journal of November 19, 1949, on page 326, third column, under the caption "Medical service cut." The article infers that Brig. Gen. Richard L. Meiling, USAFR, OSD, Director of Medical Services, stated that the service to nonmilitary patients may be cut at service hospitals and that it includes beds being used for veterans' care. With the already existing shortage of hospital beds for veterans in California, we understand that by the stroke of a pen in Washington, D. C. would eliminate the remaining beds for veterans in Army and Navy hospitals in California.

Another possibility of losing these beds for veterans has been demonstrated by the Army closing its McCornack General Hospital in Pasadena, Calif., the Navy closing its hospital at Corona, Calif., and the announcement by the Department of Defense of the closing of Long Beach Navy and Mare Island Navy Hospitals. By the closing of those 4 hospitals, 875 belds are lost for veterans' care. The Veterans' Administration records will show that aproximately 1,200 veteran patients per month were admitted to these 4 hospitals. This is another clear indication of the mistake in canceling the new 200-bed general medical and surgical hospital for San Diego, the site for which had been selected, bids had been called for and the low bidder had been announced. It should be built without further delay.

Further evidence as a sound reason why additional hospital beds are needed for veterans in our State is the waiting lists at the various Veterans' Administration hospitals. The waiting lists are made up of veterans who have made applications for hospitalization, have been found to be legally and medically eligible, and have been placed on the waiting list because no beds are available. Included in this list is the approximate number of veterans with active tuberculosis who have been hospitalized outside of Veterans' Administration hospitals and outside of our State because of the shortage of Veterans' Administration tuberculosis beds.

To further point out the need for additional beds for psychoneurotic patients, the figures below will show the crowded, overcapacity conditions, in addition to the existing waiting lists:

Neuropsychiatric hospitals

	Number on waiting list
Palo Alto (Jan. 23, 1950)	503
Standard bed capacity, 1,161.	
Patient population, 1,430.	
Over capacity, 269.	
Brentwood, Los Angeles (Feb. 1, 1950)	1,000
Standard bed capacity, 1,842.	
Patient population, 2,053.	
Over capacity, 211.	
Other Veterans' Administration hospitals	18
Present waiting list	1,521
Veterans patients in State mental institutions, 2,965, of which 1,111 show on Veterans' Administration waiting list, leaving balance of 1,854 who, too, should be hospitalized by the Veterans' Administration	1,854
Present neuropsychiatric beds needed	3,375

Of the 1,521 on the waiting list for mental and nervous conditions, it is interesting to know just where these veterans, who have been declared legally and medically eligible

for Veterans' Administration hospitalization, are located:

At home without proper supervision or care	311
In understaffed, overcrowded State hospitals	1,111
In private and other Government hospitals	99
Present total	1,521

It does not require very much imagination to see the menace to society and the unfairness to the veterans caused by the failure of these men to be hospitalized by the Federal Government.

Tuberculosis hospitals

	Number on waiting list
Livermore (Jan. 23, 1950)	125
San Fernando (Feb. 1, 1950)	128
Birmingham (Van Nuys) (Feb. 1, 1950)	31
Present tuberculosis waiting list	284
Service-connected patients in county and private hospitals	152

Tuberculosis hospitals—Continued

	Number on waiting list
California veterans patients sent out of State for hospitalization due to bed shortage in our State	150
California men in service with active tuberculosis who would be transferred to Veterans' Administration hospitals and discharged from the service, were Veterans' Administration beds available	100
Present tuberculosis beds needed	686

Relief to the extent of the 249 beds for tubercular patients is expected sometime in the future by the additional construction at Livermore and San Fernando hospitals. The additional construction is completed, patients and the administrative offices have been transferred from the old building to the new construction. Renovation, repair, and some construction in the old buildings prevent full utilization. While this renovation, repair, and construction has been approved by the Veterans' Administration, the work is being held up due to lack of funds.

General medical and surgical hospitals

Hospitals	Beds lost	Further need for general medical and surgical beds	Number on waiting list	Total
Fort Miley, San Francisco			42	
Oakland			44	
Birmingham, Van Nuys			34	
Wadsworth, Los Angeles			139	
			259	
Mare Island Navy	[1] 150			
Long Beach Navy	[1] 400			
Corona Navy	[2] 225			
McCornack General Army	[2] 100			
	875			
Occupying domiciliary beds, Los Angeles		400		
Probable loss of remaining contract beds in service hospitals		825		
	875	1,275	259	
Total				2,359
Gained by opening Veterans' Administration Hospital, Fresno				250
Present general medical and surgical beds needed				2,109
Domiciliary waiting list:				
Veterans' Administration Center, Los Angeles			501	
Veterans' Home of California, Yountville			205	706
Grand total of all waiting lists				2,770

[1] Announced closing.
[2] Closed.

Due to the shortage of general medical and surgical beds, the Veterans' Administration for the most part are rejecting hundreds of veterans badly in need of hospitalization for disabilities and diseases coming under this category, because they have had to make a more restrictive determination as to need for hospitalization. If true waiting lists were kept at these general medical and surgical hospitals is is safe to say it would be four or five time larger than is shown. This is partially explained by them giving appointments to hundreds of veterans instead of placing them on waiting lists when no beds are available. Added to this are the poor unfortunate victims classed as medically ineligible that would be hospitalized if beds were available.

In estimating the need for additional Veterans' Administration hospital beds for general medical and surgical cases in California, consideration should be given to the continued large influx of disabled veterans to our State, many of whom are chronic cases who will require long periods of hospitalization. Several hundred beds in general medical and surgical hospitals are frozen with chronic cases that require mostly nursing, attendant and dietetic care. It is safe to say that California has a higher percentage of these types of cases than any other State in the Union.

The only chance we see for immediate relief is for the Veterans' Administration to take over the Army's former McCornack general 500-bed hospital in Pasadena, and the Navy's 1,350-plu-bed tuberculosis and general medical and surgical hospital in Corona. The closing of these two service hospitals and the announced closing of the Mare Island Navy and Long Beach Navy Hospitals should be seriously considered as a solution for the shortage of general medical and surgical, and tuberculosis beds for veterans in California.

It is apparent from the information coming out of the White House, the Bureau of the Budget and the Veterans' Administration that if California is to receive adequate hospitals and domiciliary facilities for its veteran population of 1,750,000 veterans, favorable action on the part of the Congress itself will be necessary.

Additional important facts for consideration are:

1. A high percentage of Veterans' Administration hospital and domiciliary beds in California are used by veteran patients from out of the State.

(a) The Veterans' Administration Tumor Clinic for the western part of the United States is at Los Angeles.

(b) Their paraplegic center for the western part of the United States is at Van Nuys.

(c) Their psychoneurotic patients from Arizona, Nevada, and other Western States for the most part are hospitalized in California.

(d) The large influx of veterans to California consists of a high percentage of sick and disabled veterans.

2. Veterans' Administration records will show that California has a higher percentage of veterans drawing compensation and pension than any other State in the Union.

(a) Of the Nation's 77,569 100-percent service-connected total and permanent disabled World War II veterans, California has 9,800, or 12.63 percent.

(b) California has the highest number—38,023 service-connected World War I veterans. New York is second, with 32,840.

(c) California has the highest number—5,619 service-connected regular establishment. New York is second, with 2,603.

(d) California has the highest number—13,827 Spanish-American War veterans drawing compensation or pension. New York is second, with 8,402.

While there has been a curtailment in the number of hospital beds for veterans in California, the number of applications for hospitalization continues to show a steady increase of approximately 18.5 percent. For the fiscal year 1948–49, 96,503 applications were received.

The number of veteran case folders transferred into California Veterans' Administration offices over a 30-month period show 227,497 as compared with 194,223 transferred out, indicating that 33,274, or 1,109 per month new veterans with active cases took up permanent residence in California.

It is clearly indicated therefore, from actual facts and figures that regardless of the Veterans' Administration's estimate on veteran population in California, that California must have a higher ratio of hospital beds per veteran population than any State in the Union, if the veterans from our State and those coming from all other States to California are to be cared for.

The Great Lakes Waterway Must Be Completed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I send to the desk a statement which I have prepared on the subject of the vital necessity of completion of the Great Lakes waterway. I ask unanimous consent that the text be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, Mr. WILEY's statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY—A NECESSITY IN THE ATOMIC AGE

Mr. President, I have in my hand one of the many fine issues of the splendid magazine published by the Great Lakes Harbors Association entitled "Great Lakes Outlook." This periodical, as usual, in its January 1950

issue, contains a wealth of vital statistics on Great Lakes shipping in relation to our entire economy.

LAKE-OCEAN SAILINGS

It, for example, reports that an all-time record was established in the number of ships operated directly between the Great Lakes and foreign ports in the 1949 navigation season. Twenty-five ships in the direct service last season ran up a total of 71 sailings from the Lakes, compared with 56 sailings in the previous year when 22 ships plied the route.

Mr. President, these and other statistics belie the base and foul charges which enemies of the Great Lakes waterway have hurled at the proponents of this vital project. These and other facts point up the truth that the opponents of the seaway are as backward looking yes, as reactionary if you please, as those blind souls who opposed the Panama Canal in 1900 on the ground that it would not be used. Let me point out, Mr. President, that the Soo locks alone last year passed some 96,000,000 tons of freight, of which over 71,000,000 tons were iron ore, 8,000,000 tons wheat, other grain 3,000,000 tons, and soft coal 8,500,000 tons, and so forth. Vessel passage through the Soo locks totaled 22,157.

These facts underline the vital shipping role that a deepened 27-foot Great Lakes seaway could play in the future, not to mention, of course, the vital role it could play in connection with the generation of 2,200,000 horsepower of needed electricity through the power project that would be associated with it.

TOO MANY SURVEYS, TOO LITTLE ACTION

In other words, Mr. President, the Great Lakes waterway project will not down, it cannot down and be defeated. Why? Because it is so fundamentally right and its enemies are so fundamentally wrong. On February 27, hearings are scheduled to be opened in the House Public Works Committee on this issue on which there has unfortunately been so much talk, talk, talk, investigation, double investigation and triple investigation, but so little conclusive action unfortunately in the last quarter century.

The facts emphasize the necessity for action now in this critical technological age.

According to the statistics which were secured by the Foreign Relations Subcommittee, which I headed in the Eightieth Congress, the waterway would have a potential traffic of between 56,000,000 and 84,000,000 tons per year. Let us note, Mr. President, that these estimates were made prior to the tremendous information now available on the subject of crucial iron ore that will be brought down from Labrador, now that the Mesabi Range is being depleted. How can we possibly safeguard our defense if we deny ourselves the elementary materials for United States armament?

NOMINAL SEAWAY COSTS

The Great Lakes seaway would be entirely self-liquidating. The latest estimates fix over-all costs at $966,768,000 for a 27-foot channel. Of that sum, $802,566,000 would be for new construction, $229,105,000 would be allocated to Canada, and $573,461,000 would be allocated to the United States.

These sums are admittedly large, but not when one considers the enormous sums which are appropriated for projects elsewhere that (a) would not be self-liquidating, (b) would not contribute to the welfare of so large a number of people as the 50,000,000 people in the valley of the Great Lakes, (c) would not contribute to national defense, (d) have not been endorsed by outstanding leaders of both parties and by every President of the United States in the last quarter century.

Mr. President, we serve notice on the enemies of the waterway that we intend to battle through until we achieve victory. Recently President Truman indicated once more his personal fervent approval of the dual-purpose project. We only wish that certain members of his party were equally zealous in abiding with his position.

MIDWEST IS ORGANIZING FOR SELF-INTEREST

We of the Midwest will not always take this throttling of our legitimate rights lying down. Already there are rumblings of grassroots organization action to come, so that the Midwest will not always be a stepchild of this Nation and so that Midwestern legislators will receive effective support for their efforts on a bipartisan basis.

We have been short-changed far too many times while other sections have been deluged with Federal funds. We are not asking for hand-outs. We are not asking for pork barrels. We are simply asking for our rights.

We have not been allocated any maritime surplus vessels out of the 5,000 ships available for disposal. Our package-freight service on the Lakes has never been reinforced to make up for war losses. Milwaukee alone lost 500,000 tons in annual package-freight service. These and other instances of Washington neglect of the Lakes could be cited ad infinitum.

It is not only we who have suffered, but the whole Nation as a result.

CONCLUSION

Mr. President, referring again to the Great Lakes Harbor Outlook, I should like to have printed at this point one of the particularly fine articles which summarizes the great job being done by the Milwaukee municipal port. We of Wisconsin are proud of that port just as we are proud of all the other great ports which the Badger State possesses on the Lakes. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this summary be printed at this point.

The matter referred to is as follows:

"MILWAUKEE MUNICIPAL PORT BREAKS ALL RECORDS IN 1949

"In a year-end review prepared by Mr. Frank H. Ranney, president of the Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners, he describes 1949 "as one of the significant years in Milwaukee's history as a port." He outlined some of the high lights of the year at Milwaukee Harbor as the following:

"Water-borne commerce through the municipal outer harbor reached an all-time high.

"Operating revenues from municipal port operations reached an all-time high, crossing the quarter-million-dollar mark for the first time.

"The number of ocean vessel sailings was at an all-time high in 1949.

"Petroleum traffic through the port of Milwaukee again broke all records, exceeding a million tons during the past year.

"Use of river-type barges for Lake Michigan operation was firmly established during the past year and may be the forerunner of future regular water service between Milwaukee, Mississippi River points, and the Gulf of Mexico.

"The outlook for the St. Lawrence seaway project was greatly improved as the result of developments in 1949.

"Water-borne grain traffic was at the highest level in recent years and general port commerce flourished, although the coal strike resulted in a large reduction in water-borne coal receipts and considerably reduced the over-all water-borne commerce through the port.

"The port of Milwaukee has set its sights on becoming the principal heavy-lift port of the Great Lakes. The Milwaukee port authority, which, in 1949, contracted for a new 70-ton capacity electric gantry crane, is confident that the crane will attract large tonnages of export freight through the Milwaukee gateway. Although intended to serve the export needs of heavy machinery manufacturers in the Milwaukee area, the new crane will be publicized throughout the Middle West to persuade exporters in the area to consign heavy-lift traffic via Milwaukee.

"Illinois exporters have been using Milwaukee's present 25- and 30-ton cranes to transfer heavy freight from railroad cars to lake and ocean ships for several years past, due to the lack of crane facilities in the port of Chicago.

"The new Milwaukee crane will cost about $125,000, including the expense of reinforcing a section of the municipal open dock terminal to take the heavy weight of the equipment. The crane itself will weigh 225 tons. Its rated capacity will be 70 tons at a 45-foot radius, but its potential capacity is considerably greater at shorter radii and by use of its overload capacity. Without unduly straining the equipment, the Milwaukee board is confident that 90-ton lifts can be handled on occasion, making the Milwaukee crane comparable to practically the finest equipment in any salt-water port.

"THE 1950 IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

"The Milwaukee Board of Harbor Commissioners has scheduled a large improvement program for 1950, entirely at municipal expense, which will set the pace for all lake ports. Improvements scheduled for the Milwaukee water front this year include the building of a new outer harbor pier 1,026 feet long, exclusively for petroleum tankers, at an estimated cost of $350,000; construction of a modern dock office building, $60,000; 9,250 feet of new water mains for harbor fire protection and industrial water supply, $115,000; lake-front airport improvements, $150,000; railroad trackage and sewers, $25,000. In addition, the new heavy-lift crane and dock reconstruction will entail another $130,000 as noted. The total estimated cost of the 1950 construction program is $830,000.

"Petroleum traffic through Milwaukee public docks in 1949 exceeded 1,100,000 tons, an all-time record, and about 350,000 tons higher than the 1948 volume. Milwaukee is fast becoming one of the major petroleum ports of the Great Lakes. About 350-tanker cargoes of gasoline and fuel oil were received at that port in 1949. Another innovation at Milwaukee has been the establishment of barge traffic on Lake Michigan, between the Illinois River and the Chicago refining district for movement of petroleum products to Milwaukee by barge. Scores of barge movements have been made during 1948-49 on Lake Michigan between the two ports without incident or accident.

"Although traffic through Milwaukee's municipal wharves reached an all-time high in 1949, the total commerce of the port will probably show some decline as a result of the coal strike and the 3-day week in the coal mines. According to Mr. Ranney, coal receipts at the port were at the lowest ebb in the modern history of Milwaukee, with receipts of only 2,600,000 tons compared to 4,000,000 tons in 1948.

"Grain receipts and shipments by lake were at the highest level in years, totaling 14,416,000 bushels. While a substantial boost from the 8,700,000 bushels handled in 1948, the grain increase was far from sufficient to offset an estimated 1,400,000-ton loss in coal traffic."

Proposed Extension of Federal Social Security Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, in view of the great concern of our pub-

lic employees at State and local levels over the possible effect of H. R. 6000, the Members of the Senate cannot be urged too strongly to consider carefully an amendment to that measure whereunder all public employees in positions covered by a retirement system would be excluded.

I hold in my hand a statement by John J. Goff, chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6000 in its present form, which merits the study of the entire Senate.

To the end that this statement may be properly before the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD, together with a resolution on the same general subject, sponsored by me as a State senator and adopted by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey on March 23, 1942.

There being no objection, the statement and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF JOHN J. GOFF, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE OF ASSOCIATED PENSION FUNDS OF NEW JERSEY, IN OPPOSITION TO THE ENACTMENT OF H. R. 6000 IN ITS PRESENT FORM

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee, my name is John J. Goff. I am chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, embracing the pension and retirement organizations which are listed immediately hereafter:

Board of Health Employees, Newark, N. J.
Board of Health Employees, Paterson, N. J.
Board of Education Employees of Essex County, N. J.
Essex Council No. 1, New Jersey Civil Service Association.
Employees' Retirement System of County of Essex, N. J.
Employees' Retirement System of County of Passaic, N. J.
Newark, N. J., Board of Works Pension Fund.
Newark, N. J., Municipal Employees' Pension Fund.
Newark Firemen's Pension Fund.
Newark Policemen's Pension Fund.
New Jersey Civil Service Association.
New Jersey Education Association.
New Jersey State Health Officers' Association.
State, County, and Municipal Employees' Retirement System of New Jersey.
State Prison Officers' Pension Fund.

There are approximately 50,000 employees throughout New Jersey represented who are members of existing public employees' pension and retirement systems.

Many of these funds are affiliated with the National Conference on Public Employees' Retirement Systems, of which I had the honor of serving as chairman for 4 years. At the present time the pension and annuity organizations affiliated with the national conference have a total membership of approximately 1,000,000.

I am an active participating member of a pension fund. As such, I am well aware of the concern which my fellow members have pertaining to the question of the possible extension of social security to public employees and I can speak from personal knowledge of their feeling toward such extension which would include public employees who are now members of, or who may become members of, these legally constituted pension and retirement systems.

The membership of these State and local systems have a vested interest in the continuation of their own retirement plans, without impairment by Federal legislation.

For many years, public employees such as policemen, firemen, teachers, civil-service employees of all classes have devoted themselves to public service as a career, in considerable degree only because of the large measure of security in old age assured by their membership in various pension and retirement systems.

In most intances, one of the compelling reasons which led to acceptance of a State, county, or municipal position was reasonable assurance that after the stipulated number of years of service had been rendered, the employee would receive a retirement benefit that would at least enable him to live free of the fear of want.

Most public employees in New Jersey are now covered by retirement funds established by State authority. In all instances these funds provide a retirement annuity which is more adequate for the career employee than that now provided or proposed under social security. And they make it possible for public employees, many in hazardous occupations, to retire at an earlier age than under social security.

Consider what might have happened during the recent war, when private industry began to bid for manpower by raising salaries higher and higher. Had there not been this picture of lack of fear and want which had been assured them for their old age, many public employees undoubtedly would have left public employment and accepted jobs in industry, with their promise of large immediate financial gain. The fact that public employees, members of existing pension and retirement systems, did not in any large degree shift to industry dispels the statement that shifting in and out of State and municipal employment is similar to that in other employments.

Not at this time, nor since the Committee of Associated Pension Funds was organized some 9 years ago, have we ever expressed any opposition to the extension of social-security benefits to those public employees who at present have no protection from want in their old age. As a matter of fact, we concur in the resolution adopted by the National Conference on Public Employees Retirement Systems on April 2, 1942, which reads in part, as follows:

"It is the sense of this conference that it takes no position on any pending legislation in the Congress of the United States, except insofar as the same may tend to diminish, defeat, or impair the interests, present or future, of any public employee in any existing pension system."

Although we do not oppose the extension of social security to those public employees who are not members of public pension funds, we are unalterably opposed to the extension of social security to public employees who are members of, and eligible for membership in, any State, county, or municipal pension or retirement system. To include such public employees would inevitably lead to the destruction of their own local systems, because the local taxpayer will not support both, nor is it reasonable to expect him to do so. Also, the superimposing of social security upon existing retirement plans would impose a double burden of contributions upon the underpaid public employee.

A technical staff for a previous Ways and Means Committee, in a painstaking report, made reference to the problem of the lack of coverage for so-called migratory public employees. This question was answered during the war. The records will reveal that very few public employees who were members of existing systems left public employment for the higher salaries that were offered. However, any loss sustained by migratory public employees could be negligible in comparison with the loss which career public employees now covered by their own retirement systems would sustain, were they embraced within social security, or if a Federal-State voluntary agreement, or pact, were provided, which loss would be the ultimate destruction of their own retirement systems.

As this committee well knows, there was no coverage of State and local employees under social security at the time the act was passed in 1935, because at that time there was no thought of taxing State and local employees, let alone the taxing of States and political subdivisions.

The first suggestion for covering State and local employees under social security was contained in the original Wagner bill introduced in August 1940. Such coverage under that bill would have been compulsory, and public employees challenged the right of the Federal Government to collect social-security taxes from States and their political subdivisions. They also protested against the policy of covering State and local employees, since many were already protected against the hazards of old age through State and local retirement systems.

This committee may remember the political repercussions in the fall of 1940 leading Senator Wagner to announce (1) that he had no intention of jeopardizing State and local retirement systems, and (2) that he would amend his original bill to exclude members of State and local retirement systems from the proposed coverage. That bill, of course, did not pass.

Then came the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills, of the Seventy-sixth Congress. Then the Kean bill of the last Congress, which was objectionable; however, Mr. KEAN agreed to amend his bill to meet the objections of public employees, members of existing funds. Then the Ways and Means Committee of the first session of this Congress drew and passed H. R. 6000 under the gag or no amendment rule.

Mr. KEAN, of New Jersey, tried to have his bill H. R. 6297 which amply protected public employees who are members of existing pension or retirement systems, substituted for H. R. 6000. However, sufficient votes were not available to recommit H. R. 6000.

It may be said that the referendum in case of retirement systems which is found on page 82, line 10 of the bill is ample protection. To this we say "No"—because it will place existing systems in constant jeopardy. There could be one referendum after another. It will permit the Social Security Board with its unlimited funds to deluge the persons concerned with well-planned propaganda. Speakers from Washington will appear before every group of employes that can be persuaded to welcome them.

The referendum permits voting by persons already retired. In many instances these will not understand the issue involved. They may even believe that if they vote in the affirmative they would receive both their pension and social security even though they never were in covered employment as required by the social-security statute. Similar attitude may be taken by many employees believing also they would receive both. But as before stated, it is hard to conceive that the taxpayers would pay for both or is it reasonable to expect them to do so.

The referendum requires a two-thirds affirmative vote, but does not state two-thirds of what. Is it two-thirds of those voting? Two-thirds of all eligible to vote? The possibility is that we may have a compact approved by a number far less than a majority of all existing members of a system.

The dangers inherent in the referendum section become apparent only after one studies what will happen to the members of existing systms if a referendum is decreed in any State.

The public employees, members of existing pension systems, are not asking for anything, just to be left alone, with security

after our own State's ideas, security to continue in the enjoyment of our existing systems, where most of us have benefits superior to those offered by social security.

In closing we ask that the proposed amendment to section 106 of H. R. 6000, as follows, be included in the bill before it is reported by the Senate Finance Committee.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO SECTION 106 OF H. R. 6000

Strike out section 218 (d) (1) (beginning with line 10, page 82, to and including line 17, page 83) and substitute therefor the following paragraph:

"(7) Such agreement shall exclude all public employees in positions covered by a retirement system, as previously defined in subsection (b) (4) of this section."

Which amendment was submitted by the National Conference on Public Employees Retirement Systems and is supported by the Municipal Finance Officers' Association of the United States and Canada as well as all public employees who are members of existing pension funds.

This, gentlemen, we believe to be a most fair and reasonable request and I wish to thank each member of the committee in behalf of the more than 50,000 public employees in New Jersey, now enjoying the benefits of their local retirement systems.

Present here today are Frank Walker and Charles I. Levine, whom with myself were directed by the New Jersey Civil Service Association to oppose H. R. 6000 unless it is amended to provide total exclusion of public employees, members of existing pension and retirement systems. They concur in my statement and remarks.

Attached hereto and made a part of this statement, please find a resolution which was adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 23 and was signed by the Governor of New Jersey on March 25. It is known as Joint Resolution No. 4, laws of 1942.

To the Members of the United States Congress, Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was adopted by the Legislature of New Jersey on March 23, and was signed by the Governor of New Jersey on March 25. It is known as Joint Resolution No. 4, Laws of 1942.

(State of New Jersey, introduced February 9, 1942, by Senator HENDRICKSON)

"Joint resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which would impair the rights of public employees of the State of New Jersey and its political subdivisions

"Whereas the Federal Social Security Act as enacted by Congress in the year 1935 and as subsequently amended, excludes from its provisions employees of the United States Government and of any State or political subdivision thereof; and

"Whereas under the provisions of the Federal Social Security Act, each State and its political subdivisions are immune from the tax imposed upon employers by the act aforesaid; and

"Whereas the employees of each State and political subdivision thereof are immune from the tax imposed upon employees by the act aforesaid; and

"Whereas there are one or more bills now pending in the Congress of the United States which would have the effect of extending coverage of the Social Security Act to all States and their political subdivisions and the employees thereof; and

"Whereas the President of the United States has said that the objectives of the Social Security Act should not and need not be attained at the sacrifice of protection now available to some municipal workers through existing pension and retirement systems; and

"Whereas there are approximately 50,000 public employees in the State of New Jersey who have contributed to and are members of approximately 150 statutory pension funds; and

"Whereas the extension of the provisions of the Social Security Act would not only impose additional taxation upon the State of New Jersey and many of its political subdivisions and the employees thereof, but would likewise tend to impair the benefits and protection which have been gained by public employees now members of existing pension funds: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate and General Assembly of the State of New Jersey:

"1. The Legislature of the State of New Jersey looks with concern upon any proposal to extend the present Federal Social Security Act to the State of New Jersey, its political subdivisions and the employees thereof who are now members of existing legally created pension and retirement systems and, therefore, respecfully urges and petitions the Congress of the United States to refuse to enact any legislation which would extend the provisions of the Social Security Act to those public employees now members of legally constituted State or local pension, retirement or annuity systems.

"2. The Secretary of State be and he is hereby directed to transmit copies of this joint resolution to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives, the Senators and Representatives of the State of New Jersey in the Congress, the Federal Security Administrator, and the Federal Social Security Board.

"3. This joint resolution shall take effect immediately."

Although the resolution by its own terms provides that certified copies be sent to certain Members of Congress, serving on the Ways and Means Committee, this resolution is sent to you together with all other Members of Congress, for your information, through the courtesy of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey.

JOHN J. GOFF, *Chairman.*

NEWARK, N. J., *April 10, 1942.*

Nation Was Economical When the People Insisted

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a very timely article entitled "Nation Was Economical When the People Insisted," written by Herman Lowe and published in the Philadelphia Inquirer of January 21, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATION WAS ECONOMICAL WHEN THE PEOPLE INSISTED

(By Herman A. Lowe)

WASHINGTON, January 20.—This is a capsule course in escapism for you who get jitters over the growing national debt, continued deficit financing, and the descent into the soothing quicksand of statism. It turns back the calendar to the good old days when the Nation paid as it went, and when Federal fiscal statistics ruffled nobody.

So, if you get heebie-jeebies over "whither are we drifting"—and, brother, your number is legion—a good dose of these statistics will soothe you more than mother's cooking.

Do you have a roaring in your ears when you hear of our $257,000,000,000 national debt which is still climbing? Astronomical debt figures are a thing of the past 15 years. Relax and turn back the pages to the beginning of the Republic. In 1791 the year opened with a national debt of $75,000,000, mostly taken over from the Colonies which had become the Original Thirteen States. By 1812 it had been worked down to $45,000,000. The war which broke out with Britain that year sent the debt soaring back to $127,000,000 by 1816. Then the Nation really buckled down to economy. By 1835 the national debt was an almost invisible $38,000—yes, thousands.

That is the closest the United States Government ever came to being completely debt free—wonderful memory for those who live under the $257,000,000,000 debt. It was not until 1863, in the middle of the great Civil War, that our debt crossed the $1,000,000,000 mark for the first time. It fluctuated up and down and dropped below $1,000,000,000 during 1892 and 1893.

Do you have nightmares at the thought of the $5,500,000,000 deficit the President announced for the current fiscal year and the $5,100,000,000 he predicts for the next fiscal year?

Relax with this. In the period 1789–91, the National Government took in $4,418,913. It not only ran for 3 years on that but actually wound up with a surplus of $150,000. There have been lots of surplus years in our history. However, the only two since 1930 were during the much-damned Republican Eightieth Congress.

Lots of folks don't sleep nights when they think of a peacetime appropriation of $13,500,000,000 for national defense. It was better in 1792. The Navy Department, exclusive of civil functions, got an appropriation of $53 (yep, 53 bucks). The War Department, including rivers and harbors, cost $1,100,000.

The great pork barrel of public spending continues to be public works. For the current fiscal year it is costing just short of $3,000,000,000. President Truman has asked Congress for $3,500,000,000 for the coming year.

Turn back the clock to 1791. The Government spent $23,000 on public works. Most of it seems to have been to build lighthouses.

Another current source of irritation is the postal deficit amounting to several hundred million dollars a year. Earlier administrations and earlier Congresses saw to it that the Post Office Department paid its way. Year after year there was a surplus to turn into the Treasury. Up to 1820 there had been a deficit during only 1 year—a deficit of $2,246. Not until 1841 was money voted to cover a post-office deficiency.

Once we used to make ends meet in the National Government, because the American people insisted upon it. If the people should insist upon it now, there is no doubt the Government could and would make ends meet again.

Shubert Theater Monopoly

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have made a check on the Shubert strangle-

hold of the theater in this country and I find a very malodorous picture.

The Shuberts control over 60 percent of the theaters presently operating in New York, and approximately 90 percent of the theaters throughout the country. They dominate the League of New York Theaters, arrange for the allocation of tickets to their own pet brokers, using kick-backs of all kinds. In Boston, the sister of the Shuberts has control of the brokerage agencies, and on "hit" shows it is almost impossible to get tickets unless one gets them through an agency. If the agencies are unable to sell them, the tickets are returned to the box office just before curtain time and many of the theaters are empty as a result. In Chicago and in Philadelphia, this is true only to a minor extent. There, they control only the box offices of the theaters they rent, through the distribution of tickets and affiliation with the ticket brokers.

I ask this question: What happens to the amusement tax on the mark-up of their tickets? The answer is that the Government is cheated out of its rightful revenue. You can bet all the tea in China, no income tax is paid on South Pacific tickets which sell for $25 plus.

Theater people hesitate to testify. They are afraid of being put out of business, for they don't know where they could house their productions either on the road or in New York, if they were to speak out.

The Shuberts have kept even the critics out of certain of their theaters if they disapprove of their reviews. Wolcott Gibbs and Louis Kronenberger are two examples of this practice.

This Shubert monopoly and its baneful practices are drawing the public away from the legitimate theater.

Gordon Gray, an Enlightened Public Servant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning, entitled "North Carolina's Gain," expresses the sentiments of most of the Members of Congress, on both sides of the aisle, with reference to the Secretary of the Army, Gordon Gray. We regret losing the services to the Federal Government of such a capable and conscientious public servant. We know, however, that as president of the University of North Carolina he will continue to make a great contribution to the Nation. The South needs the leadership of such men as Gordon Gray, and we know that more understanding and progress will come to the Southland as a result of his presidency at the University of North Carolina.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial from the Washington Post be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NORTH CAROLINA'S GAIN

The University of North Carolina will gain a public servant of truly exceptional ability and stature in its new president, Gordon Gray. Mr. Gray has progressed through the Army ranks from private and captain to Assistant Secretary, Under Secretary, and finally Secretary. He has profited from the experience. In actuality he has been the first civilian executive since Henry L. Stimson who has really run the Army. His firmness, however, has been accompanied by an almost inexhaustible patience and a North Carolina charm that have won him the stanch admiration not only of the other services but also of the generals.

It was he who engineered the unanimous Gray Board report on the National Guard, a project that took both persuasion and courage, and it is by no means to Mr. Gray's discredit that political pressures resulted in the selving of the report. As Assistant Secretary he did valiant work in helping to place the procurement work of the Munitions Board on a sound basis. As Secretary he has approached the ticklish problem of race relations in the Army with both principle and realism, a realism he has carried over in his advocacy of the continued need for the foot soldier as against the slick claims of the pushbutton and aerial blitz addicts. In short, he has been an Army Secretary of extraordinary merit who will be extremely difficult to replace. The one consolation is the knowledge that he will be in a position to continue his public service in his home State.

The Boy Scouts of America Conclude 40 Years of Service to American Youth and American Institutions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, we hear a great deal these days about the mid-century. Many writers have looked back at the past 50 years while comparatively few have looked ahead to the next half century.

America's future lies in its youth. We have heard that expression many times. It gives me pleasure to bring to the attention of the House the fortieth birthday anniversary of the Boy Scouts of America which is being celebrated by Boy Scout Week, February 6 to 12. Here in Washington just 40 years ago yesterday, February 8, 1910, the organization was incorporated, and in 1916 the Congress of the United States granted the Boy Scouts a Federal charter.

The purpose of Scouting, reads the Federal charter, "shall be to promote, through organization and cooperation with other agencies, the ability of boys to do things for themselves and others, to train them in Scout craft, and to teach them patriotism, courage, self-reliance, and kindred virtues."

Scouting has become so woven into the American way of life it is difficult to recall when our Nation did not have this character-building, leisure-time program for its youth.

Today there are 2,579,515 boys and adult leaders enrolled—the highest active enrollment at any time. Since 1910, more than 16,500,000 American boys and men have had the benefits of the training, fellowship, handicraft skills, and high adventure of Scouting. America is all the richer for it. Many men in high places in American affairs today proudly credit Scouting's influence in their lives.

The year-in, year-out civic and emergency service to the Nation by the Boy Scouts needs no recital here. Scouting brings to boys at an important time in their lives a program of worth-while activities, under high-grade, volunteer leadership.

Simply stated in the words of their chief Scout executive, Dr. Arthur A. Schuck, "the Boy Scouts of America is dedicated to the high purpose of enriching the Nation by helping its boys and young men grow physically, mentally, morally, and spiritually so that our heritage of freedom will be strengthened in the citizens of tomorrow."

Many of us will have the opportunity this summer of seeing for ourselves what makes Scouting grow.

At historic Valley Forge next June 30 to July 6, some 40,000 Scouts and leaders, from every part of the Nation and a few hundred guest Scouts from overseas, will live together in their own tent city at the Second National Jamboree. There will be boys of every race and creed, and of every economic level, sharing in a great adventure that will be the climax of the Scouts' 2-year "crusade to strengthen the arm of liberty."

If you get out to the hallowed ground of George Washington and his heroic Continental Army, and mingle with the Scouts, you will be assured that our Nation in the years ahead will be in strong and dependable hands.

Newsprint Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the Subcommittee on Study of Monopoly Power, of which I am chairman, has received complaints that the price of newsprint is excessive. Accordingly I have announced that hearings will be held on the question of monopoly in newsprint.

In a preliminary way I would say that we want to know whether the prices on imported newsprint are excessive. We want to know whether American producers are following the import prices,

and if so, whether they are operating at capacity. If American mills are operating below capacity, why do they not lower their prices enough to get full capacity? Has anyone recently considered setting up new paper mills in American territory, including Alaska, and if so, what happened to these projects?

Other questions will appear as the investigation proceeds, and I hope that persons having authentic information on this problem will offer their aid to this subcommittee.

Arming Our Future Adversaries by Shipping Arms to the Middle East

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave, I am inserting in the RECORD a very able letter to the editor from the New York Times of February 1, 1950, signed by Dr. Manfred Sakel. The letter discusses the curious State Department pattern of action and inaction in the Middle East, not exhaustively, but capably. I feel, personally, that the present Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson, has gone far toward correcting the startling imbalance of the middle echelons of State Department officials; but I agree with Dr. Sakel in this essay:

SHIPPING ARMS QUERIED—SECRETARY ACHESON IS CRITICIZED FOR STATEMENT CONDONING THIS TRAFFIC

To the EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

The statement made recently by Secretary of State Dean Acheson, condoning the shipment of arms to the Middle East, in answer to Congressman JAVITS' question, as reported in the New York Times of January 16, should be of grave concern to every citizen of our great Nation.

Two points seem particularly distressing and contradictory. The condoning of such traffic of arms is directly counter to our inherent and oft-stated policy of nonsupport to aggressors, even latent ones. But their own declarations, several of the middle-eastern countries who have been supplied with arms have recently stated that they have suffered a loss of their military prowess of aggression. They frankly give as their reason for their present need of arms their wish to recapture their lost military aggressive pride. We, as a nation, by nature and officially, deplore aggression and we do not knowingly encourage the aggressor. The Secretary's statement, however, seems to weaken this position of ours and, at the very least, undermines our pronounced stand on these principles.

REPEATING EXPERIENCE

The second and more important point is our apparent reluctance to help one of our closest allies avoid repeating our painful and costly experience in the Far East. It is clear that our State Department, that of the greatest nation on earth, is somehow unable to free itself of the influence of the permanent officials of the colonial office of our ally, the once-powerful Britain. We seem disinclined to try, at least, to point out to them the very bitter lessons, at the expense of several billions of dollars, which we learned from our far eastern experience: that, by supplying arms to those unwilling or incapable of using them, we are actually supporting those groups whom we did not intend to, for these very weapons find their way into exactly those hands opposed to those we originally wished to help. Consequently, our actions indirectly and inadvertently helped subvert our aims and defeated our chosen friends. In turn, it alienated all of them from us.

If the strategic planning of the Government of the United States has decided that the Middle East is so vital to our defense, how can we abet the colonial office in repeating these very same miscalculations? If these officials continue, with our acquiescence, to practically give their armaments (at the ultimate dollar expense of our taxpayers and at the expense of the blood of our citizens) to those who are not in a frame of mind or who are not capable of using them effectively, and will lose them eventually to a potential adversary of our Nation, as was demonstrated in the most recent historical events in th Middle East, are we not again driving our more capable friends into the opposite camp and so helping to defeat the purposes to which we are dedicated? Will not their present acts tend to alienate the only people in this strategic area who so recently have proved themselves both willing and able to use arms effectively in defense of the very principles of democracy and peace to which we subscribe?

WEAKENING LINK

It would be reassuring to the citizen to know that the State Department is aware of the fact that any chain is as strong as its weakest link, and that goes for the chain of defenses too. Against the background of this fact, it seems the State Department is weakening the potentially strongest link in the chain.

This letter is written by one who does not claim to be too well versed in politics, and, therefore, does not wish to give political advice, but who, choosing the science of logic as his field, wishes merely to point out the contradictions in the policy devised by the State Department.

MANFRED SAKEL, M. D.
NEW YORK, *January 25, 1950.*

The Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 9 and 10 in the series written by Mr. Leon Starmont on the Columbia River region:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 30, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 9)

(By Leon Starmont)

Potholes Dam having been officially renamed O'Sullivan Dam, Foster Creek rechristened Chief Joseph, and Umatilla Rapids changed to McNary, State and Federal officials connected with the Columbia Basin irrigation project point to three other opportunities to honor men identified with basin development or Northwest history.

South Dam at Coulee City is virtually complete. It holds water in the reservoir in Grand Coulee. U S 2 runs along its top. A bill was introduced in Congress to attach the name O'Sullivan to South Dam, thus honoring a pioneer worker for the project and long-time secretary of the State Columbia Basin commission.

For some reason James O'Sullivan's friends wanted his name attached to Potholes rather than South Dam. This leaves South Dam open for another name.

LONG LAKE CONFUSING

North Dam, now under construction on the outskirts of the city of Grand Coulee, is the north end of the 27-mile equalizing reservoir.

Long Lake Dam, overlooking Stratford, also needs a new name, as it is duplicated in the largest dam on Spokane River. It is part of the main canal, and has no separate power or storage function.

Of these four dams only North Dam was provided for in the original 308 report at its present location. South Dam was first planned for a location 3 to 5 miles north of Coulee City, and Long Lake and O'Sullivan (Potholes) Dams were not in the original scheme of things at all.

The original plan called for a bifurcation works at Bacon siphon, a few miles south of Coulee City, with the west main canal running down the east side of lower Grand Coulee to Soap Lake, around its north end and on past Ephrata and Quincy. There is no change in the present design south of the Soap Lake siphon.

CONSTRUCTION DEFERRED

The main east canal, in the original 308 report, was to follow roughly the line of what is now mapped as the east high canal, with construction deferred indefinitely. It reversed, at a somewhat lower level, the first-planned north canal under the gravity ditch as projected in 1920.

Towns or railroad stations which were below the main canal in the original report, but are now above the main canal, include Stratford, Ruff, Warden, and Cunningham.

Lind, which was within the gravity irrigation area, was about 5 miles from the area reached under the original pumping plan, and is now 15 miles from the district to be reached by the east low canal.

The easterly limits have been moved a dozen miles west by the dropping of the east high canal.

HAD THREE MAIN LATERALS

Most of the area reached by the Potholes east canal and its Wahluke lateral was to be reached by a long ditch from Ruff, under the original plan. The southern part, however, was to be served by a lateral leaving the main canal just north of Cunningham and running west of Hatton to the present location of the Pasco pumping unit.

Another lateral from near Sulphur, on the Connell branch of the Union Pacific, was to serve the section east and south of Eltopia.

These numerous changes in design have complicated the problem of locating highways, particularly in the east and south Columbia districts. Where to put the roads, and how to finance them is one of the main problems before the State Columbia Basin commission, which has scheduled a session on this subject at Ephrata today.

As a general rule, the Bureau of Reclamation bears the expense of bridging the major canals wherever there is an existing road. But when a new road is put through the expense falls on the counties, which already are bothered by growing pains in school finances.

MINOR CHANGES

Other changes made since the pumping plan was adopted involve town locations, wasteways, and supplementary reservoirs.

When O'Sullivan Dam was first planned, about 1944, it was to create a reservoir including Moses Lake, which was to be raised

a few feet and the whole developed as a recreational area.

Announcement last year that the reservoir would not include Moses Lake created consternation at the city of Moses Lake, formerly Neppel. Many residents had bought business and residential property there in expectation of placing boats on the 22-mile waterway that would extend from O'Sullivan Dam to the mouth of Rocky Ford Creek. This change is still being protested.

One change then announced has been canceled. This is the decision not to run fresh water from wasteways into Moses Lake.

The latest is that Winchester and Rocky Coulee wasteways will not be extended to the lake, but a new supply of fresh water will be directed into its southeast corner, near the creeping Barcan dunes and the proposed bypass that will take U S 10 south of the town.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of January 31, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 10)

(By Leon Starmont)

If there is anything these days that makes residents of the Columbia Basin irrigation districts fighting mad, it is the question of what road will be built first, and where it will go.

This was illustrated at yesterday's meeting of the State Columbia Basin commission at Ephrata, which only three of the seven members were able to attend. Chairman Jack Rogers, ex officio member as director of conservation and development, was present, with Frank T. Bell, Ephrata hotel operator, representing the Quincy-Columbia district, and Leon L. Baillie, of the south Columbia district, who also is president of the Washington State Reclamation Association.

ROAD ARGUMENT BITTER

It was away below zero in most of central Washington, and many roads were blocked, but 125 residents of the districts, and others from Yakima valley and Seattle, were on hand. So were W. A. Bugge, State director of highways, and James Travis, assistant manager of the Atomic Energy Commission's Hanford works, which is involved because of its closing of the Connell-Yakima cut-off via Wahluke ferry.

Rogers emphasized that no subject was to come before the meeting except roads. Later meetings, he indicated, might take up schools and domestic water. The meeting was held in the Ephrata community hall.

Principal disputants were the advocates of the Warden and Othello routes for the projected north-south highway through the district, from Pasco to Coulee Dam.

In 1945 a route was proposed by the Bureau of Reclamation, based on a joint State and Federal investigation, which left U S 395 at Eltopia and ran 2 miles east of Othello and 3 miles west of Warden, veering westward and following the Connell Northern branch of the Northern Pacific almost to Adrian. At that point one branch turned west to Soap Lake and another east to Stratford.

ANOTHER ROUTE BUILT

Another road has been improved, however, running straight north and south through Warden, about 3 miles east of the route recommended in 1945. It starts on U S 10, 12 miles east of Moses Lake, and ends on an east-west road about 6 miles east of Othello. If continued north it would reach Coulee Dam without going near Grand Coulee reservoir at all. If continued south it would hit U S 395 about Eltopia.

Othello objects strenuously to this road, and wants a more westerly route selected for the ultimate improvement. Its route is about 3 miles west of the 1945 proposal, and generally 6 miles west of the Warden route.

Othello is without a good highway now, although it is on a direct line between Pasco, metropolis of the South Columbia district, and Moses Lake, largest town in the presently irrigated district crossed by U S 10.

Advocates of these routes made it clear that the 1945 compromise satisfied neither side. Debate grew bitter at the morning session, but Chairman Rogers calmed the waters with assurance that no snap judgment would be taken.

Another dispute raged over the projected Burke cut-off, which would create a beeline from Ephrata on State Highway 7 to Burke Junction on U S 10, west of Moses Lake. This projected route bypasses Quincy.

Result of the discussion was passage of a resolution, addressed to Gov. Arthur B. Langlie, asking that he declare a state of emergency on Columbia Basin road problems, and that the legislature be petitioned to give priority to county and farm-to-market roads in the irrigation districts, instead of to the State highways.

The resolution makes it clear that the suggestion comes from an informal public meeting, called by the State Columbia Basin Commission, but not from that body.

Advocates of the various routes are expected to prepare the strongest cases they can make, for their respective routes. Decisions probably will be made by the State Highway Department and the Bureau of Reclamation, although either agency would like to rid itself of the necessity.

OTHER ROADS IN BASIN

Bids were to be opened today for a bridge across Lind Coulee near O'Sullivan Dam, but because of the deep snow in the area the opening was postponed to February 14, the Bureau of Reclamation announced. It has been impossible for prospective bidders to examine the area, the Ephrata office of the bureau explained. The same contract would call for relocating of about 6½ miles of county roads wiped out by construction of O'Sullivan Dam, near the south end of Potholes Reservoir.

Meanwhile work is being rushed on the new speed-ball highway along the east edge of Grand Coulee Reservoir, between Coulee City and Coulee Dam.

Also undergoing extensive improvement is the middle route (W. 7) between Davenport and Ephrata, which when linked to Spokane via the proposed Four Lakes cut-off east of Harrington will be the shortest route to a good share of the East Columbia and Quincy districts.

Blueprint for a Better America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. IRVING M. IVES

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the conclusion from a policy statement entitled "Blueprint for a Better America" by the New York Young Republican Club.

There being no objection, the matter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CONCLUSION

We believe that the basic difference between the Republican Party and the Democratic Party is clearly defined. It is not a difference in goals. It is a basic difference in the necessary consequences of the policies pursued in attaining our goals. This difference is reflected in the completely dissimilar political and social philosophies prevailing within each party. The choice between these two philosophies lies with the American people—a choice between:

1. SELF-HELP VERSUS HAND-OUT

The leaders of the Democratic Party pursue a policy of unlimited Federal spending for the purpose of appeasing pressure groups which command large blocs of votes. Their program is not one of prudently conceived assistance to the individual in need, but it is rather a program of creating a reliance upon government, from the cradle to the grave. The result has been the slow destruction of self-reliance and of individual incentive to provide for a rainy day. By appealing to the something-for-nothing instinct, the Democrats have endeavored to obtain widespread support of their program.

We firmly believe that the American people are a self-reliant, independence-loving people, and that they will grow to resent being made the involuntary objects of permanent charity. The American people prefer to rely primarily upon their own industry, ability, and decision to provide not only the necessities, but also the luxuries of life, rather than to rely upon the uncertain benevolence of Government. Assistance to those who, through no fault of their own, are either consistently unable to obtain the necessities of life or unable to cope with sudden physical or economic misfortune is accepted as the responsibility of a humanitarian society; it should not be made a substitute for individual enterprise.

2. PAY-AS-YOU-GO VERSUS EXTRAVAGANCE

The Democratic administration has pursued a policy of spending each year billions of dollars more than the annual Federal income in order to effect more and more Government hand-outs. The result has been a meteoric rise in the national debt—which today is equivalent to a mortgage of $7,000 on every American family. Lenin once boasted: "We shall force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

We believe that the American people will not continue to support such spendthrift policies and that they will demand strict adherence to a pay-as-you-go Government program. The Republicans must refuse to out-bid the Democratic administration, and must develop a program which is geared to what we can afford. Our immediate goal should be a balanced budget and a gradual but substantial reduction of the national debt. Within these strict limits, we favor expenditures for health, housing, old-age security, and other services and benefits as previously proposed in this blueprint. We are confident that our human, technological, and natural resources can provide a rising standard of living for our people far superior to that offered by a permanent Government dole.

3. HOME RULE VERSUS BIG GOVERNMENT

Under the Democratic administration, the Federal Government has preempted many areas of taxation, economic regulation, and social welfare formerly reserved to State and local governments. The result has been the development of a gigantic Central Government, with an alarming concentration of powers in the executive branch. The theory that the Central National Government should and must be given all major powers and functions is diametrically opposed to our concept of a system of sovereign State with a Federal Government of enumerated powers. Concentration of power is but one step removed from abuse of power.

We feel that the present concentration of power in the National Government is dangerous and inefficient. State and municipal governments must be permitted and encouraged to perform those functions which relate to matters of local concern. We firmly believe that a minimum of governmental interference with the individual's decision and action is alone consistent with an opportunity society.

Under the Old Pricing System Farm Products Were Worth No More Per Unit of Measure Than the Value Placed Upon the Needless Surplus Products—Every Panic, Depression, or Recession Marked by Industrial Unemployment Can Be Directly Traced to the Archaic, Unjust Pricing of Agricultural Products

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK W. BOYKIN

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOYKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of one of the finest talks on agriculture that I have ever read. It was directed to my attention by Col. C. C. Hanson, secretary of the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture.

I need not remind my colleagues that the Association of Southern Commissioners of Agriculture is an association made up exclusively of the duly elected public officials of the 14 cotton-producing States, who have been charged by their electorate with the care and the well-being of the agricultural industry within their respective States.

The speaker was the Honorable FRANCES P. BOLTON, of the Twenty-second District of Ohio, and the address was delivered before a State-wide meeting of the Ohio Farm Bureau Federation in Columbus, Ohio, November 28, 1949.

In transmitting this talk, Colonel Hanson told me that he regarded it as one of the "clearest expositions he had ever read of the agricultural problem facing this Nation today and the need for full parity prices to be paid the farmer for his products."

Complimenting Congresswoman BOLTON upon her depth of understanding of this problem facing the American farmer, to say nothing of repercussions upon the American industrial workers, Colonel Hanson commends its consideration to Members of Congress and others who are interested in the Nation's welfare problems. In his letter of transmittal he said:

> If the Congress had more Representatives like Mrs. BOLTON from the great metropolitan areas who could grasp the problem of the farmer with the understanding and the wisdom exhibited in her Columbus talk * * * the American farmer would achieve a parity of price for that portion of the fat, food, and fiber consumed within these United States, and without either the purchase of a single dollar's worth of farm commodities by the Federal Government or appropriation by Congress of a single dollar of taxpayers' money * * * to support agricultural prices in this or any other year.

The address follows:

PARITY PRICE IS AN ECONOMIC, NOT A POLITICAL PRINCIPLE

You have done me a signal honor in inviting me to address you, the representatives of the Ohio farmers, gathered here in annual convention tonight.

My anticipation has been keen, and I want you to know that there is a deep measure of satisfaction in having opportunity to talk with this great audience of Ohio farmers here tonight because I come of solid farm stock and count myself very much as one of you.

My brother owns the rocky little farm in Connecticut that my father's people worked for more than 150 years. My father's father left three fingers of his left hand in the mill there to which he took the grain of one fall's harvest to be ground into the winter's supply of flour.

My mother's people came west and farmed both in Geauga and Cuyahoga Counties. Payne's pastures are only memories today and Nathan Perry on his pony riding across his farm seems like a dream—for a great city has swallowed most of it up. But next time you come to Cleveland go past Euclid Avenue and Twenty-first and Twenty-second Streets where the Perry pastures once were. You'll see a sign "Perry Parking" and in the middle, raised above the cars a yellow house. The central section was built in 1824—there my mother and my grandmother grew up—and there I spent many years of my own youth.

How I used to love the excitement of crawling under the barn and finding the eggs. I think it was such memories that made me rather resent the all-too-organized life of the modern hen when my own sons came along. There is no better foundation for living life than a farm youth—and I am deeply happy that at least one of my sons has kept up the tradition not only of my family, but of his father's as well. Franchester Farms and its golden Guernsey milk, its strong strains of useful animals is no doubt known to many of you. Just as the old farm down town was crowded out, Franchester Farms in Cuyahoga County has begun to make way—and most of the animals and all of the real farming has moved down to beautiful Wayne County. Even my chickens have gone.

Although my life has been devoted in the main to widely diversified interests quite apart from agriculture, the roots of it go deep into the soil—nor can I imagine losing my interest in diversified farming. Some day—when I have served my tour of active duty I shall find myself a tiny farm where my hens can lay their eggs in exciting places and there will be a cow that won't mind yielding her milk to my fingers rather than to the machines.

You see, to me farming has been and will always be more a matter of a principle of life—a mode of living—than just a means of livelihood. To me you who till the soil, who plant and harvest, who contend with nature, whose understanding of God's law is a part of your very being, are the rock upon which this Nation stands. Yes—farmers—dwellers on the land, producers of the food man must have to live all over the world, know the deeper meaning of life as no city dweller can ever know it. Even as you know the bitter cost of labor you know the sweet, the indescribable joy of planting that new life may come from the seemingly dead earth. You know, as none but farmers know, the deep gratitude that wells up when the harvest time is successfully over and your bins are full, and your surplus sold. To you the Thanksgiving season is one when you have often gone out alone perhaps at dawn or at sunset-time and raised your heart to the God whose tool you know yourself to be, under whose great laws you have known freedom. You know that a man must sow, he must care for his fields, his orchards, his stock with his own hard labor if he is to reap. You know also the joy that such living gives.

Men follow many lines of endeavor—their vocations are increasingly diversified—but there is none that gives greater dignity than that which agriculture affords. It is the most basic of all industries. When I say basic I mean that of all the tens of thousands of commodities known to man—of goods that satisfy our senses—that afford us all the comforts of life—physical, intellectual, spiritual—the farmer alone is the producer of that commodity without which all life would in the last analysis perish.

In reality there are just two classes or kinds of goods in this world: Those which are dispensable to human life and those which are indispensable. The farmer produces the indispensables—the fat, the food, and the fiber. It is the farmer who produces those things which feed and clothe and house us. Oh, I am not saying that there are not scores of other commodities which to a modern civilization may seem necessitous to human life, but again I repeat, it is only the farmer who produces those things which are indispensable to all life.

There is not time for me to go into detail in the matter of the well-being of the farmer. Suffice it for me to say quite categorically that the thoughtful people in this country know that when American agriculture is prosperous all America is prosperous. When agriculture slows down, unemployment is present in every mine, every mill, and every factory in the land.

Nor is it only that those who live in cities are dependent upon the farmer for their food and all other of life's indispensables, but they are exceedingly dependent upon him for his purchasing power.

As a Representative of the Congress of the United States, I find it difficult to understand some of my colleagues who seem to feel there is no justification for paying our farmers for the products their toil wrings from an often reluctant earth. I have contended with them that if, through some unjust system of agricultural economics our farmers are paid too little for the products of their labor they, in turn, cannot buy the products of American manufacture. That if the farmers are paid justly; yes, generously for the products of the farms, they then in turn can buy generously of the thousand and one gadgets and other things that are processed in the great cities of the land, and in that wise afford gainful employment to the industrial workers who run our great American industries.

Read history and you will find that every human crisis, upheaval, panic, depression, recession, or what not that has ever temporarily stopped or caused marked distress to the financial structure and the progress of our country, has been directly traced to unjust pricing of agricultural products in these United States.

This unjust system of pricing decreed that the annual crop was worth no more per unit than the value placed upon a needless surplus.

The farm parity of price formula is a keystone upon which the economic security of these United States today can be dependent. That security must not rest upon the possible direction of political winds, it must rest quite simply upon basic economic principles. When I use the term "parity of price" I do not mean any laws in which are written formulas or even provisions to pay 60 or 70 or 80 or even 90 percent of parity. Parity to me would mean par, justice, equality. When made applicable to agricultural income in this year of 1949 in these United States, parity to me means that we should pay to the American farmers a price commensurate with—or shall I say, in parity with—the prices which, under the modern system of pricing, the farmer is compelled to pay for the industrial goods which he finds necessary to his enjoyment of the American way of life.

It is certainly not economically unsound or unjust to fix the price of basic crops in behalf of the agricultural producer, when society in general and Government in particular has practically fixed the prices on everything the farmer has to buy.

Are not taxation rates, railroad freight and passenger rates fixed by law? Isn't the price of electric current and gas per thousand feet also fixed by law? Aren't you fixing the price of the industrial products the farmer must buy when you regulate hours of labor and minimum wages paid? It would seem rather clear that society as a whole cannot continue with all the price fixing that has been done to bolster industry, transportation, communications, public utilities, insurance, et cetera, without doing something to insure the farmer a parity of price for the products of his toil, his risk, his faith, without which we would all die.

I rejoice today with American farmers everywhere, with those who farm their little tracts to cotton, or to peanuts or to tobacco in the forks of the creek in the great Southland. I rejoice with those who cultivate their broad acres on the plains of Kansas and in the Dakotas, and with those who practice the diversified type of farming which we follow here in the great Buckeye State.

I rejoice that the day has dawned when the American people at long last are learning to pay their just debt to their agricultural producers, cattle and dairy men, for the endless toil and privation spent in producing the fats, the foods, and the fibers without which this Nation would perish in a single crop year.

American agriculture has not alone built America great, but for more than a hundred long years our exportable surpluses of farm crops—whether beef, pork and pork products, lard, tobacco or cotton—have maintained the balance of our foreign trade against the world.

Yet, my friends, in spite of these things there are those today who say our farmers constitute a pressure-lobby group—that parity formula is a species of political relief.

To them I would say that the principle of parity of price is an economic principle, grounded in equity and justice, and that we should never permit it to be traduced and made use of as a political football by any political party at any time.

How many people in our country realize that they are eating a greater variety of food of a better quality than ever before in the history of this Nation?

When I was a girl in Cleveland, oranges were a rarity except at Christmastime, and grapefruit was unknown. Figs and dates were something a few of which one might find in a Christmas stocking. Lettuce, radishes, string beans, green onions were garden vegetables which we then enjoyed on our tables but a few weeks in the year, in the late springtime season.

Strawberries were something that we knew in strawberry time. Peaches, in peach time. Raspberries, blackberries, and blueberries, in berry time. Today strawberries are available in the market places of America when winter snow is 2 feet deep outside the food shops in our cities.

Lettuce and string beans, radishes, celery, fresh fruits and green vegetables of every variety are today available to the American people the year around, from the rock-bound coasts of Maine to where the Pacific Ocean laps our shores on the west, and from Canada to the Gulf of Mexico.

The American consumption of citrus fruit and juices has increased more than 382 percent in the last decade alone, that of canned fruits and vegetables has likewise increased by more than 20 percent, while frozen vegetables and fruits—a thing unknown to the American people as short a time back as 1935—have made the prodigious increase of 725 percent.

As it has been with fruits and vegetables, so it has been with meats; the annual per capita consumption of which now stands at an all-time high.

There is no scarcity now, nor has there ever been a scarcity, of meat for the American table. Americans everywhere are eating more meat than ever before. I am especially glad to say that this is particularly true among the low-income groups. Moreover, they are eating better cuts of meat and eating more of them.

The limited supply of choice cuts of pork and beef, steaks, chops, hams, bacon, and what not, is in no wise due to any shortage of cattle or swine, or any decrease in the production or slaughter of the same. The cattle and beef slaughter is heavier than ever. It is merely that there is now a sharper competition between all income groups for the better grades and better cuts of all meats and meat products, that prices are high, and the better cuts are in short supply.

And here is an even more amazing fact. This great superabundance of food consumed by the American people (which in 1935 required 31,000,000 people, working on 6,600,000 farms, to feed 140,000,000 people) now is being produced by 28,000,000 farmers working on 5,900,000 farms, and feeding more than 149,000,000 people—our population as of today.

Somewhere in the Scriptures it is written: "By their fruits ye shall know them." And so I say to you, the members of the American Farm Bureau Federation, that it is by the fruit of the things that the American farmer has produced that we do know him, and the work that he has done and is doing among us.

My friends, some several weeks ago I had occasion to make inquiry of the Fats and Oils Division of the United States Department of Commerce, with respect to the declining prices on hog lard. The decline in prices had been more or less reflected by the increased importation of competing coconut, cotton, and other vegetable oils and fats used for cooking and shortening purposes.

Complaint had reached my desk that hog lard, a product upon which America had from the inception of the Nation built its brain and brawn, was destined to be thrown into the soap kettles. My problem was to find out why. You can imagine the economic shock I received when facts and figures were presented for my consideration to show that America was eating higher up on the hog today than ever before in all our history.

And because of that change in eating habits, the packers of pork and pork products have no longer found it profitable to pack, ship, expose, and offer for sale such things as pigs feet, pigs knuckles, backbone, chitlings, and other secondary cuts of pork and pork products which for decades past have been enjoyed on the tables of the great masses of American people. Now, for want of profitable markets, these valuable food products are actually being dumped into soap kettles, there to be boiled into soap.

It grows more and more apparent that people in the cities are no longer content to eat the end chops off a loin. I have seen the end chops or loin butts sell at a discount of 10 cents a pound below the price of the center cuts. And despite this—shall I say a standard of high living—we are still paying the American farmer a less percent of the average industrial income for food than we had previously paid for the smaller quantities, lower qualities, and a far less diverse diet. If I had not investigated, I would not have believed that the people in the cities, when they buy such breakfast cereals as corn or wheat flakes in the individual 1-ounce packages—which retail at about 4 cents apiece—are compelled to pay at the rate of $38.40 per bushel for the corn or the wheat which they contain.

Let me remind you that Saturday on the Chicago commodity market corn sold at a price of $1.29½ per bushel and wheat at $2.16⅜ per bushel.

When you buy a cereal in a hotel such as this—at 15 cents per individual package—you pay for the corn or wheat which the cereal contains at the rate of more than $100 per bushel.

These facts prove beyond all doubt that the high retail prices in the food shops of America today are not the fault of the farmer.

I have no complaint whatsoever to make with the attractive, sanitary, and hygienic methods that now characterize the packaging and the marketing of our food products, for while they are tremendously costly and add to the cost of living, nevertheless they do guarantee us standards of cleanliness and quality heretofore unheard of.

Certainly I would rather buy and pay for a package of Uneeda Biscuits wrapped in waxed paper, with both moisture-proof wrappers and moisture barriers covering the same, than go back to the day when at the corner grocery the clerk would stir a broomstick in the cracker barrel to chase out the rats before reaching down to take up and weigh out a pound of ofttimes stale, damp soda crackers to be carried home in a paper bag.

But by the same token this standard of high living represents the difference roughly between $1 and $38.40 per bushel of corn and can be laid at the door of our modern system of packaging, distribution, and marketing.

In conclusion, my friends, let me repeat what I have heretofore stated: that if the American people pay the farm producers of this Nation too little for the fat and the food and the fiber necessary to sustain their lives, that our farmers can in return spend but little to buy the products of the mines and mills and factories of America.

So long as the American people pay our farmers in equity and in justice a parity of price for the products of their soil and toil, then can the American farmers buy generously and maintain the millions of factory workers at gainful employment in the industries throughout America.

It is not, perhaps, as simple as I am making it sound—for the moment is upon us when we must reevaluate existing methods and conditions. We must find ways to put these basically important matters clearly into the field of sound economic principle, where they belong. We must take them definitely out of politics.

We know that when agriculture declines, America declines. We know that when the American farmer is prosperous, America is prosperous. We know also that at this critical moment in the life of man on this earth America's prosperity is the key to world peace. Unless we are prosperous there will be nothing with which we can express that curiously deep desire that is in the heart of every American to help those who need help, to protect others from bondage, and to see freedom under law the lot of all men.

Great as are the problems facing the farmer today, difficult as are those facing the workers in the mines, the factories, the shops, the stores, and the offices, they are but parts of the whole great future of America, and we must face them and solve them as such.

The strength of the United States, of this wonderful Nation of ours, must be increased—the honor and integrity of our America must be maintained—we must give constant proof that here in this land of ours men and women recognize their individual responsibilities toward each other and to the Nation whose formula for freedom has given more comfort, more opportunity, more joy to more people than any formula in known history.

If we, as farmers, seek our own particular solutions with no thought of America as a whole, if industry or labor or the white-collar worker looks after himself only, we shall find ourselves in a dead-end street instead of on that great road to freedom upon which destiny placed this Nation of ours.

True as it is that America prospers in proportion to prosperity on the farms, it is no less true that unless America as a whole swings along with everything in balance, with all the instruments of her great symphony of freedom synchronized and in harmony, not only the people of America, but the people across the world will find themselves lost in an intolerable darkness.

You, who contend with nature—who are close to the earth and her seasons, to the beauty of twilights and dawns, to the wonder of silence, the miracles of life, you know that a nation is not a tangible thing, not a building built with bricks and mortar—you know a nation is not its laws, its customs, its behavior, even its history. It is its people. You know, too, with a deep certainty of experienced knowledge, that the earth is the Lord's and the fullness thereof, the world and they that dwell therein and that it is to Him that we are responsible.

We can carry this responsibility with worthiness and abiding joy if we remember that to Him all people matter—not just one or two groups. Remembering this we can find the right method of application of the principle of parity of price for the farmer, of the principle of just recompense for the men and women in industry, and all its ramifications for teachers and preachers, for scientists, for those who care for the sick.

Remembering our responsibility to the Infinite Father of all mankind we can and must solve the many problems we have made for ourselves that America may be strong in freedom, in justice, in humility, and in peace.

United Ireland Urged by Knights of Columbus

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, recently the supreme board of the Knights of Columbus met in Washington for their regular midwinter meeting to arrange the forthcoming program for the Knights during the current year. Among the various resolutions adopted was one of particular interest to the Congress, since it recommends the passage of the Fogarty resolution, now pending before the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. John E. Swift, of Boston, supreme director of the order, was chairman of the committee which drafted the resolution, which urges the complete unification of all Ireland unless a majority of all the voters in Ireland should by a plebiscite determine otherwise. No fairer means of solving this very controversial issue could be employed than the holding of a free plebiscite of all the people in Ireland, who alone have the right to determine whether any part of that small island country should be cut off and attached to the dominions of a foreign nation. Certainly the foreign parliament of that foreign nation does not have that right, even though they presumed to accomplish just that by an act of the London Parliament.

I trust that the recommendation of the Knights of Columbus will be given full consideration. The text of the resolution unanimously adopted by the Knights of Columbus reads as follows:

Whereas the Honorable JOHN E. FOGARTY, Representative in Congress of the Second Rhode Island District, submitted to the House of Representatives, June 28, 1949, the following resolution (H. Res. 270):

"Whereas the House of Representatives, Sixty-fifth Congress (1919), third session, by House Joint Resolution 357, duly passed a resolution declaring that the people of Ireland should have the right to determine the form of government under which they desired to live; and

"Whereas in the intervening 30 years, the people of Ireland have so determined but the effect of their determination has been thwarted, and they have in fact been deprived of the right to the form of government under which they desire to live; and

"Whereas 26 of the 32 counties of Ireland have been successful in obtaining international recognition for the Republic of Ireland which has, as its basic law, a constitution modeled upon our own American Constitution: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That it is the sense of this House of Representatives that the Republic of Ireland should embrace the entire territory of Ireland unless the clear majority of all the people of Ireland, in a free plebiscite, determine and declare to the contrary"; therefore be it

Resolved, That the supreme board of directors of the Knights of Columbus endorses the sentiment and purpose of House Resolution 270; and be it further

Resolved, That copies of this action of the supreme board of directors be forwarded to Congressman FOGARTY and to the members of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Point Four

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS S. GORDON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the recent announcement of our decision to make the hydrogen bomb has now forced us all to think seriously and realistically about the foreign policies of this country. There are many who feel that all hope for the preservation of civilization is gone. I do not shut my eyes to the terrible facts that confront us; and I commend the President for his forthright decision of a few days ago. But I suggest that we should not lose sight of the genuinely constructive leadership of the President and his advisers, clearly manifested in his recommendations for a point 4 program. This program, embodied in proposed legislation, is now under active consideration by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member. The point 4 program is an effort to make permanent and lasting improvements in the world by assisting the stable development in areas of the world that are at present economically underdeveloped. One aspect of this program is the development of a favorable climate for private investment.

Americans generally, and Chicagoans in particular, are deeply interested in the various problems that affect the successful accomplishment of the point 4 program. On February 1, 1950, the Chicago Council on Foreign Relations, with the cooperation of the Inter-American Council of Commerce and Production, sponsored a luncheon at which the principal speaker was the Honorable Edward G. Miller, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs. Mr. Miller's address was an important contribution to our thinking on this subject, and I feel that it should be read by all of us. The address follows:

A FAVORABLE CLIMATE FOR PRIVATE INVESTMENT

I

I feel honored that you have asked me to be with you today here in the heart of our country. I was last in Illinois a little over a year ago, when I came to attend the inauguration of your Governor, Adlai Stevenson, whom I am proud to count as one of my dearest friends. The record he is making should be an inspiration to men of talent and high purpose, attracting them to the public service. Illinois is also fortunate in the two Senators who represent it in Washington. Senator LUCAS, as majority leader, set a high standard of performance during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Senator DOUGLAS has in 1 year established himself as one of the most respected Members of the Senate. No State is better represented in that great body than is yours.

This audience of leaders in the business and professional world affords an excellent occasion to deal with a subject now under intense discussion in financial circles. That is the question of creating favorable conditions for private investment in Latin America. This question, in turn, raises further questions as to how the economic development of the Latin American countries can best be achieved.

The basic position of the United States is clear. We want to support the efforts of our sister American Republics to achieve economic maturity. No nation in the world's history has ever embarked so deliberately upon a policy of helping other nations to strengthen themselves. The point 4 program is the true expression of a national ideal, an ideal that is shared by business and labor and is reflected by our Government. Accordingly, we are prepared to extend loans of public funds to other American countries to help them build basic projects essential to their development. The two great lending agencies in Washington, the Export-Import Bank, and the International Bank, have made many loans for undertakings such as highways, agricultural development, railroad improvements, hydroelectric power, and other projects suitable for public financing. These banks have between them more than enough capital to take care of the requirements of the underdeveloped areas, in terms of feasible projects, for some time to come.

Loans of public funds, however, cannot of themselves bring about economic development. They may help to create the basic structure, but the main job must be done by private capital. Now, the plain fact of the picture in Latin America as we confront it today is that, large as United States private investments are, the rate of new investment is slow, much slower than it need be or should be.

Why is the rate of private investment in this area so slow? What can be done to attract new capital? What do we mean when we talk about a favorable climate for private investment?

The first thing we mean is confidence—and confidence involves personal considerations. It is no accident that the first article of the Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Economic Development recently signed with Uruguay is entitled "Entry and Basic Personal Rights," and that the second is entitled "Protection of Persons." Unless management can

follow capital in reasonable numbers, there will be no investment. Unless the managerial staff receives personal protection, there can be no stability of investment. I am talking about basic concepts—the inviolability of the home; the right to pursue one's own religious beliefs; the right to a prompt and fair trial in case of accusation of crime. If one of our nationals is the victim of a personal crime, it is reasonable to expect that effective police and judicial measures will be taken against the criminals. Where criminals go unpunished, as in some cases in which managerial personnel have been murdered, the result is necessarily a lessening of confidence.

The basic factor of confidence is thus inseparable from a second factor, namely, the kind of government that exists in the country which seeks foreign investment. Our people cherish the ideal of stable, representative, democratic institutions. They have fought and died for this ideal throughout our history. Though we have deep emotional and sentimental feelings about this ideal, it is based on sound practical considerations. Our people know that stable democracy provides the best governmental structure under which private enterprise can operate. And let us not forget that, though there is much governmental regulation today, this is still a land of free enterprise. Indeed, much of the regulation—such as the antitrust and fair trade laws—is specifically designed to insure the survival of free enterprise.

The great economic development of this country could not have taken place if stable, democratic government had not functioned here since the earliest days of the Republic. It could not have taken place if investors had lacked confidence in the stability and continuity of the National Government, if they had lived in fear from week to week of abrupt changes in the Presidency, with all the attendant uncertainties. It could not have taken place if the security of their persons and their businesses had been subject to the whims of a dictator with arrogated powers to tax and to destroy. Secretary Acheson was referring to this basic concept in his speech on Latin American policy last September, when he said:

"In countries where [favorable] conditions are provided, it will follow that we can collaborate more effectively in working out development programs. Public and private capital will be attracted more readily to such countries. While this is dictated by logic rather than emotion, it has been our experience that these conditions are generally found in countries where constitutional and political democracy exists."

The third basic factor essential for the attraction of foreign investment is local investment. Our Nation has always been open to foreign capital, but one of the circumstances which encouraged foreign investors to come in was the fact that our own capital would be working side by side with theirs. In countries where foreign investment is the only investment, foreign investment is an oddity and its managers are intruders. The foreign enterprise, by its conspicuousness, is exposed to dangers which would not arise in a setting that included domestic as well as foreign investment. Moreover, an active and healthy degree of local investment activity is bound to insure a richer market for the products of foreign investment whatever they may be. Investors are not ordinarily attracted to areas that are stagnant economically. Finally, many businesses operating abroad want local partners. They want guidance in local affairs. Many of the most successful foreign ventures of American business are carried on in collaboration with local capital, and some of our companies have even been satisfied to take minority stock positions.

The inadequacy of local capital is, in fact, one of the substantial deterrents to new investment in Latin America. Age-old habits of investment in real estate—the epitome of a stagnant economy—cannot be easily broken. In many countries you find, among the peoples themselves, symptoms of an essential lack of confidence. The most obvious symptom is the flight of capital. So long as a great part of private Latin-American capital is invested in the more developed countries there is bound to be a shortage of locally available capital. Another symptom of lack of confidence is the tendency to amortize an investment in the least possible time. A return of 10 percent per annum on an equity investment is often regarded as too small. Twenty percent or more is not regarded as excessive in some countries. This kind of thinking about the function of capital investment is obviously different from our own.

It is not only private investment from abroad that is inhibited by the shortage of local capital. Loans of public funds are also held back. It has not generally been the policy of our public lending institutions to provide for local currency expenditures. In an irrigation or hydroelectric project, however, local expenditures may represent a great part of the total enterprise. One of the major impediments to the making of loans in such cases has been the difficulty that confronts local sources, including governments, in providing for the local currency costs without causing inflation.

A fourth requirement for a favorable climate is absence of discrimination against foreign investment. A foreign company may be an attractive target, especially if it is big. Discrimination may take the form of direct action, such as expropriation or exclusion from certain types of normal business activity; or especially onerous taxes may be imposed upon foreign enterprises. It is our policy to eliminate the threat of discrimination by negotiating treaties of friendship, commerce, and economic development with our fellow American republics. Such treaties are designed to provide a set of rules under which foreign investment activities may be carried on. I have already mentioned the signing of one such treaty, with Uruguay. Negotiations for others are now impending. These treaties will go far toward establishing confidence by reducing the threat of discrimination. Furthermore, they will furnish a basis for discussing a broad range of problems relating to foreign investments with the governments concerned. Finally, being reciprocal, they will constitute a reaffirmation of this country's age-old policy of freedom of opportunity to capital from anywhere in the world.

A fifth factor essential to United States foreign investment is confidence on the part of the investor that if he earns money abroad there will be dollars available for the transfer of his earnings. There are only six or seven countries in the Hemisphere that do not have dollar shortage difficulties. Some of the others have, nevertheless, assigned a high priority under their exchange-control systems to the transfer of current earnings on foreign investment. What is more, the standard form of the treaty of economic development contains general assurances on this point. The stark fact, however, is that any assurances of this nature—regardless of their sincerity—are subject to the availability of foreign exchange at any particular time. That dependence on the supply of foreign exchange cannot be completely eliminated by any written document. This situation has no counterpart in the field of domestic investment.

To deal with this problem of convertibility we have asked Congress to authorize the Export-Import Bank, on the basis of funds already available to it, to extend certain limited guaranties to foreign private investments with respect to risks pecular to such investment. The most important risk is that to which I have just referred, which arises out of foreign-exchange shortages, although other risks, such as those of expropriation and war damage, could be included. A similar guaranty provision has been included in the ERP legislation. The present proposal has substantial backing in business circles. It also has opposition in business circles. Part of the opposition is based on a fear that the proposal threatens established American enterprises abroad. I do not, myself, find this fear well founded. The proposal involves only an extension of the Export-Import Bank's present authority. The Bank already has ample power to purchase many types of securities and notes of American companies or their subsidiaries abroad. It has always administered this authority with due regard for established American businesses. Since it has not misused the authority which it already possesses, there is no reason to suppose that it would misuse its extended authority. Furthermore, the Bank proposes to make it clear that guaranteed investments rank in all respects with all the other United States investments in the country involved and that the nature of the treatment accorded them will reflect this equality. Any local currency received by the bank in connection with a guaranteed investment will rank with local-currency proceeds of other United States investments in regard to priority of claims upon the exchange resources of the country concerned.

Some critics have objected to the guaranty program because they believe that our Government should not associate itself with private business in such a way. These critics have overlooked the extent to which our Government has, throughout our history, helped private industry right here at home. Where would Chicago be if railroads had not been helped through land grants and subsidies? What of the activities of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, which does not merely incur contingent obligations with respect to private businesses but actually advances funds for their support? Our aviation and shipping industries receive direct subsidies from the Government. Our agriculture is based on various types of subsidy to which both political parties are committed to different degrees. The guaranty program is much more limited and indirect than any of these examples. It involves no present appropriation of funds. In the long run it may involve no outlay whatever by our Government.

A sixth factor in attracting foreign investment is that of a fair and rational system of taxation. Prospective foreign investors pause before the prospect of double taxation. They are even more hesitant to involve their funds in the uncertainty that characterizes the administration of the tax laws of some foreign countries. Our Treasury Department is now negotiating tax conventions with a number of American republics. These should provide incentives to investment through real concessions on both sides. Such treaties will lay down the rules of the game in the tax field. They will prescribe mutual formulae for such unglamorous but vital questions as the determination of income and of allowable deductions. They will also prescribe methods of consultation between the administering agencies of both governments. They should, consequently, go far toward improving the climate for foreign investment.

A seventh element in attracting foreign capital is the technical competence and know-how to make the capital productive. The absence of technical competence in underdeveloped areas—and that absence is a prime characteristic of such areas—raises a

problem akin to that of the chicken and the egg. Technical skills attract capital and capital is accompanied by technical skills. Through the Institute of Inter-American Affairs and other agencies of our Government we have been actively helping the peoples of the Americas to improve their basic skills in agriculture, public health, and industrial arts. We have asked Congress under the point 4 program for an increase and expansion of such cooperative activities. But help of this sort must come in very large part from private enterprise in conjunction with private investment. That is the only way through which to produce, eventually, a managerial class competent in modern methods of plant management, cost accounting, inventory controls, and the distribution of finished products. It is the only way to produce, eventually, skilled industrial labor. The necessary skills cannot be exported by themselves. They are inseparable from the going enterprises with which they have been developed.

I might add a word about the role of labor in all of this. Nothing could be more conducive to a rapid rate of investment than an increased recognition of the important role of responsible and progressive trade-union movements. By this we mean unions dedicated to increased productivity and improved working and living conditions and not those serving the political ends of a foreign country.

II

I have outlined some of the major factors affecting the rate of private investment in the other American Republics. I have also mentioned some of the things that we are doing about it.

What more should we be doing?

I must say to you, first, that the job is not ours alone, and it is not even primarily ours. It is not, in the first instance, the job of our Government or of private enterprise in this country.

Our 20 fellow republics in this hemisphere are juridically our equals. Like us, they have their own sovereignty and enjoy the dignity of their own independence. Like us, they assume responsibility for themselves. Each carries its own destiny in its own hands. Each regulates its own affairs with no less authority than that which we exercise over our affairs in this country. Each must decide for itself what it will do about its own economic development. Each must decide for itself whether it wants foreign private investment and, if so, whether it is prepared to establish the conditions necessary to such investment. It would be an impertinence on our part to presume that we could make these decisions for our neighbors in the hemisphere. We come into the picture only when they come to us, as a source of capital and technical knowledge, and request our support of the efforts they are prepared to make for the strengthening of their own economies.

There is a basic principle involved here that we must all keep in mind—we in this country and our friends in the other American Republics. Secretary Acheson expressed it effectively when he said on January 12 before the National Press Club that American assistance can be effective when it is the missing component in a situation otherwise favorable with respect to economic and political progress. Most of the components in the situation we have been contemplating must be furnished by the other American Republics. They must furnish all seven of the components I have discussed, though we can help with some of them. Only they can furnish other components, tangible and intangible, that bear upon the possibility of conducting business under fair conditions. For example, the rate of exchange fixed by a government may, without being discriminatory, be so arbitrary in its operation as to make it impossible to conduct business in the country. Again, even though an exchange rate is realistic, the operation of an exchange control may obstruct progress. The system of justice in a country may be such as to create doubts as to contractual rights. We have all seen how nationalistic tendencies, when they affect fiscal and governmental policy, may stultify the possibilities of foreign investment. Finally, I shall allow myself to depart from diplomatic practice just long enough to say to you that there are cases, as we all know, in which administrative venality is a major impediment to investment and to the economic development of a country. These things are not wholly unknown anywhere, our own country included, but wherever they exist they are a local responsibility.

The creation of favorable conditions for private investment depends fundamentally upon the will of the country concerned. In the absence of that will, nothing we could do would create those conditions. The treaties I have talked about would be of little use. Public loans would not lead to the private initiatives on which economic development depends.

This, then, is the setting in which our State Department must perform the role which falls to it. This role, as I see it, is through good will and mutual effort to help, first, to bring about a clear understanding of the factors that affect investment, of the need for programs of positive action by the governments that want investment, and of the things that can be done by governments to attract investment. By and large, this process resolves itself into tedious and unspectacular efforts in specific situations.

The suggestion has been made that we withhold all economic cooperation except on condition that the other country enter into a treaty of friendship, commerce, and economic development with us. I respect the thinking of those who make it. Nevertheless, I think it confuses the form with the substance. It substitutes the device of a treaty for the objective of a treaty which may be attained by a variety of other and in some cases better means. It substitutes indirect compulsion for the willing reciprocity that must exist in the long run between cooperating nations. For 20 years we have been trying in our Latin-American policy to erase the old notion that we would not scruple to throw our weight around, to use our economic power in order to force concessions from other nations. Though we have made great progress, the notion still has some currency in Latin America. The fact is that we are cooperating on a voluntary basis with the other American republics in our common interest because the health of our entire community depends on the development of each one of us. The common good, which is the objective of our policy, must not be confused with petty bargaining advantages. The spirit of reciprocity is not a bargaining matter. A bargaining attitude on our part would, in fact, destroy it.

At the same time, it should not be thought that the State Department is disposed to favor large loans of public funds to countries which do not welcome our private capital. In some countries so many difficulties have been erected in the way of private investment, local as well as foreign, that private productive investment is infinitesimal. In such circumstances it is difficult to see how United States financial assistance could be fruitful from the standpoint of achieving sound economic development. We do not intend through public lending to compensate for the failure to make the most of natural resources through vigorous economic activity on all fronts. Our Government will naturally favor making public loans to countries where the broader objectives of our program can be accomplished. We will, in general, select situations where public loans will be accompanied by private activity, local or foreign. If our record of public lending is scrutinized, it will be seen that the recipient nations have generally been those where our loans can do most good in terms of these objectives. It will also be seen that they have been those with the highest development of stable democratic government. This is because our public-lending agencies, like private investors, must have confidence in the investment climate. And for them, as for the private investor, confidence in general is synonymous with democracy and all that democracy stands for.

While there are obviously hard problems ahead, we find that some countries have made encouraging progress. In these cases the adoption of a few additional measures of self-help and mutual aid should complete the necessary basic framework for rapid and continuing economic expansion.

The fact is that the Latin American republics are more keen today than ever before to do something positive for the achievement of their economic development. In many countries it has become the principal preoccupation of their governments. I have an impression, moreover, that they are increasingly aware of what it takes to achieve economic development. They are learning to think about the heavy disadvantages of a narrow economic nationalism. They are learning the importance of making themselves attractive to capital.

That brings me, finally, to what we can all do in a positive fashion to improve the climate for foreign investment in the other American republics. Our foreign enterprise must so conduct itself as to justify a welcome reception abroad. It must act in good faith. It must understand the essential principle of mutuality, that both parties must profit. Just as the investor must be assured of fair and sympathetic conditions, so the country receiving the investment must be assured that its own vital interests will be honored. We must be willing to justify such assurance by our conduct.

It is only fair that, having referred so undiplomatically to some failings among our neighbors, I should also state that some American businesses have, on occasion, behaved in a fashion that has tended to make all American business enterprise unpopular. Such behavior has always been exceptional and it is rare today. I assure you, however, that our Government, if only in the interests of American business as a whole, is not going to encourage this kind of foreign investment. One of the most encouraging elements in the whole situation today is the statesmanship that most United States enterprises are displaying abroad and their growing regard for public opinion in the countries concerned. This is the kind of thing that will in time contribute more than anything else to a favorable climate of investment.

I am glad that I am not alone in the point of view that I have expressed today. After I had prepared this speech, a bill was introduced in the House of Representatives by Chairman KEE of the Foreign Affairs Committee and Republican Congressman HERTER, under the name of "International Economic Development Act of 1950." This bill—which is the proposed legislation implementing point 4—has bipartisan support. You will be interested in the following excerpt from the statement of policy in the bill:

"International investment can make its maximum contribution to economic development only where there is understanding of the mutual advantages of such investment and where there is confidence of fair and reasonable treatment and due respect for the legitimate interests both of the people of the country in which the investment is made and of those who make the investment. This involves confidence on the part of the people of the underdeveloped areas that investors will conserve as well as develop local resources, will bear a fair share of local

taxes and observe local laws, and will provide adequate wages and working conditions for local labor. It involves confidence on the part of investors, through intergovernmental agreements or otherwise, that they will not be deprived of their property without prompt, adequate, and effective compensation; that they will be given reasonable opportunity to remit their earnings and withdraw their capital; that they will have reasonable freedom to manage, operate, and control their enterprises; that they will enjoy security in the protection of their persons and property, both industrial and intellectual, and nondiscriminatory treatment in taxation and in the conduct of their business affairs."

If we in our country and the peoples and governments of our fellow American republics proceed along these lines, confidence will grow and over the years a vast development of the American republics will occur through wholesome private enterprise.

Economic Aid to Korea and Non-Communist China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, it is my intention to vote for the bill S. 2319, which provides for limited economic assistance to the Republic of Korea and to areas of non-Communist China. I do not care to do so, however, without making the following clarifying statements.

Last month I was one of those who voted against the bill to provide certain economic aid to Korea. I voted in that manner at that time not because of any failure to understand the Korean need, and not because of any lack of desire to help the freedom-loving people of Korea. I voted against the other bill because it was piecemeal legislation and because I sincerely hoped that it would force those formulating our foreign policy for the Far East to draft a more complete, more coordinated program of a realistic nature, having a greater opportunity to be effective.

The present bill before the House falls far short of reaching those goals. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, I consider it to be progress in that direction, and, therefore, as I have said, I expect to give it my support.

In voting for this bill today, I wish to direct attention at this time, however, to the following facts. The committee has stated in its report that the major portion of the funds needed to carry out the provisions of this bill have already been appropriated. It is therefore assumed that these funds for aiding non-Communist China, which have been available for many months, will now actually be used in the most effective manner possible. Furthermore, the committee in its report has stated that this bill makes it explicit that the authorizations contained in the bill are limited to the fiscal year 1950 and that subsequent authorizations must be considered on their merits; in other words, that this bill contains no pledge of continued assistance.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, my vote for the pending bill should be interpreted to reflect my interest in establishing world stability and peace through American foreign economic assistance, but it must not be construed as any pledge or any commitment for additional foreign economic aid. In other words, as the committee itself has stated, requests for subsequent authorizations are to be considered solely on their merits and with full regard for their effect upon our own American economy and stability.

It must be remembered that it is vitally important to free people throughout the whole world that the credit and leadership of the United States remain strong. We must ask ourselves how long the credit, security, and economic stability of the United States can endure under a continuing policy of deficit financing and tremendous burdensome national debt. It is my firm opinion that under this administration policy of operating in the red, our Government is seriously impairing its ability to provide help and leadership in the great struggle for freedom and world peace. By continuing this destructive policy we are weakening our ability to meet even our obligations to our own people. If we are to continue to make enormous assistance grants to other nations, then those who formulate such a policy should also accept the responsibility for advocating additional revenue sources to offset these additional expenditures. It is only in that manner that our people here in the United States will realize and feel today the full impact of this policy.

Americans have always been known for their generosity and their humanitarianism. Coupled with these splendid American characteristics there must be, however, a full evaluation of the facts and a practical realism so that we will not unduly weaken ourselves in our efforts to strengthen others.

Democracy in Northern Ireland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. SHELLEY
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just received a copy of a news release from the Irish Legation in Washington which clearly shows that the Special Powers Act of 1922 is still being enforced in Northern Ireland. Recently the world had been informed that provisions of the act had been repealed and the inference was made that this undemocratic piece of legislation had been abandoned.

The Special Powers Act in Northern Ireland established the pattern for similar legislation under Hitler and Stalin in their forced control of occupied areas. Under that act, trial by jury has been denied, imprisonment for prolonged periods without filing of any charge is authorized and has been employed frequently and numerous other recognized civil rights have been abrogated. That such legislation should continue to exist and be employed in a country which claims to be democratic seems unthinkable. Little wonder that Stalin belittles democratic nations and their avowal of democratic principles.

In the instance cited in the news release it is evident that the display of any flag is permitted, even the Soviet flag, with the sole exception of the flag of Ireland. Yet, Great Britain recognizes Ireland as an independent republic, and hence her flag should be given the same recognition as granted to that of any other nation. Or is it that Northern Ireland, realizing that those six counties are rightly a part of the Republic of Ireland, so fears the display of the true flag of the area that, their consciences quaking at the sight, the puppet administrators of the government must resort to tyranny to preserve the usurpation of power in that area.

Interesting is the fact that Mr. MacEntegart, who carried the Irish flag and was thereupon arrested, had served during the recent war with the British forces. His arrest is part of his reward for his wartime services. During World War II it is estimated that between 150,000 and 180,000 men from the 26 counties volunteered for military services. While no official figures on this have ever been released, this estimate is considered to be quite conservative, according to the article appearing in the January 1946 issue of the Foreign Affairs Quarterly. In addition no less than seven Victoria Crosses were awarded to citizens of the Republic of Ireland during the war. This award is Britain's highest military award and is granted in very limited numbers, even in wartime. I am sure that the record for service in the six counties will not outshine that of the rest of Ireland, in spite of the so-called neutrality of Eire.

Perhaps the real reason behind this arrest was the fact that the incident occurred during the welcome-home ceremonies held in honor of Senator J. G. Lennon and Mr. Malachy Conlon, M. P., members of the Belfast Parliament, who had just returned from a speaking tour in the United States, during which they repeatedly decried the continuance of the partition of Ireland and urged a prompt elimination of that unnatural border which divides the country. The only answer available to the demand for an end of partition is this unwarranted exercise of the Special Powers Act and the continued denial of civil rights under its undemocratic provisions.

The full text of the release from the Irish legation reads as follows:

IRISH FLAG FORBIDDEN IN OCCUPIED IRELAND BUT SOVIET FLAG ALLOWED

Prosecuted by the six-county government for displaying a tricolor consisting of three vertical stripes, green, white, and yellow, purporting to be a flag of the Irish Republic, on the occasion of the return from America of Senator J. G. Lennon and Mr. Malachy Conlon, M. P., to Armagh on the 4th of December last, a former member of the British forces, James MacEntegart, appeared in Court Armagh on January 26. With another defendant, Anthony Smith, he was further

charged with obstructing a police officer in the course of duty. In court, witnesses described the procession welcoming the two northern leaders on their return.

Giving evidence, a Royal Ulster constabulary policeman said that MacEntegart was told by police "Take down the flag" and that he would not be allowed to carry it on the street. MacEntegart replied, "It is the flag of Ireland—you have no authority here—I fought for the freedom of small nations for 6 years under the Union Jack and was proud to do so. I am now fighting for the freedom of Ireland and I shall continue to fight under its tricolor." Defending Counsel MacSparran asked, "Supposing that it had been the Soviet flag—would you have interfered with it?" The policeman replied he would not have interfered with the Soviet flag. MacSparran continued, saying, "This case has been brought under the Special Powers Act of 1922; an act recognized not merely by the present British Government but by members of the present Northern Ireland administration as a repressive act. It has now endured for 28 years. Most people are under the impression that the regulations under it had ceased to exist by virtue of the statement made last year and many would be surprised to learn that one of the most obnoxious regulations of the act is still valid. Surely it is an absurdity that Britain should recognize the validity of the Irish Republic Army and national emblem and yet in part of the British Commonwealth there should be a situation whereby a person displaying the flag of a recognized state within the community of nations should be prosecuted."

The prosecution was brought under regulation 25 (c) Special Powers Act of 1922.

Trade With Soviet Satellites

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RALPH W. GWINN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GWINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I should like to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD the following report from the Scarsdale Inquirer of a timely warning on trade with Soviet satellites by J. Anthony Marcus, president of the Institute of Foreign Trade of New York:

POLITICAL FORCES ABROAD THREATEN SALES EXECUTIVE

"What Becomes of the Sales Executive When Stalin Takes Over?" was the title of an address given this winter by J. Anthony Marcus, of 35 Church Lane, president of the Institute of Foreign Trade of New York and a former international trade adviser in Washington. The occasion was a meeting of the Association of Commerce of South Bend, Ind. Says Mr. Marcus of his talk, "It is not pleasant, but we are not ostriches. We must face facts no matter how discouraging they may be. We can still master the situation if we act before it is too late." The Inquirer prints excerpts of Mr. Marcus' speech which many of the community will find it worthwhile reading.

In a number of countries in recent years freedom has been liquidated; the free enterprise system murdered, and with all that the sales executive has vanished. Being the product of a free society, he dies when freedom perishes. In Russia and the satellite countries freedom, even the most elementary forms of freedom and liberty, are a thing of the past.

The evil forces that have brought this about have been on a rampage since 1917. They have brought death and suffering to untold millions. Thus far very little has been done to assure the ultimate defeat of the Red plague. We have a North Atlantic Pact, to be sure, we have been pouring out billions first through the mismanaged UNRRA. Now, through the superbly administered ECA by your illustrious citizen, Paul G. Hoffman, we are pumping new billions of dollars into the rehabilitation of the economic and industrial power of the free nations of Europe, but that is not enough. Money alone will not do the job; wishful thinking, a pastime of many of our so-called liberals and religious groups, will do even less. Unless all of us recognize pretty soon that Red fascism is an irreconcilable force which will continue to wage war against civilization of one form or another until either "we" or "they" survive, as Lenin had proclaimed, it might be too late to save civilization from inevitable doom.

There is much that our Government can and should do to help eradicate this plague that is not being done. But there is much that the free citizens of the world must do and should do, but are not doing. Since history has decreed that ours shall be the leader in this struggle, what should be some of the first steps our Government should take?

INSIGNIFICANT MARKET

Sever trade relations with the Soviet Government at once. In 1913 President Wilson, outraged by the Tsarist's government persecution of a Russian Jew named Mendel Bailis on a trumped-up charge of the ritual murder, abrogated our trade treaty with that government. Since 1945, numerous American citizens, military and civilian, have been arrested without cause, kept in prison incommunicado for months and subjected to uncivilized treatment. All this after we had poured out billions of our treasure and rivers of blood of our young boys to help liberate Russia from the Hitler tyranny. And what did we do? We engaged in a diplomatic word battle.

The Russian market is the most insignificant of all in the world to us. It will never amount to anything as long as there is a Soviet Government in Russia. During the 20 years preceding the last war Russia's average purchases in this country amounted to about $60,000,000, while during that time she stole from us technological know-how worth billions of dollars. Severing trade relations and a complete stoppage of sales to Russia will do great injury to the Soviet economy, despite the lying claims of their government that practically every invention known to man has been created by their people.

But most of all, such severance of trade relations will serve as a tonic for the tens of millions of Russians who hate their government with an ever-burning hatred; it will hearten them to carry on the struggle against their tyrants. The mere fact that there are from nine to twelve millions of men and women in slave-labor camps in Russia, with many more millions in concentration camps and jails is conclusive evidence that the people are resisting the Communist regime. Had it not been for the stupid agreement with Stalin in Yalta, there would have been today several million Russian enemies of Stalin in Europe, men and women who preferred hardships in a strange land rather than return to the so-called paradise of the workers.

Many a time top-ranking Russian officials in Moscow and other cities have said to me: "Why do you Americans come here to trade with our Government? You are only enhancing their prestige; you are helping tighten the noose around our necks." Those remarks came from their wounded hearts; they were brave men, for they knew that they could have been liquidated without trial if overheard or if I chose to report them to the police.

TREATY VIOLATIONS

Insist upon scrupulous observance by Russia of our treaty which was a condition of recognition by us in 1933. They have been violating it almost since the day it was signed, according to the statement of our former Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. Our leniency is being interpreted by them as cowardice and stupidity on our part. For 2 years, since 1946, the Soviet-owned Amtorg Trading Corp. had been flouting the alien registration law and only after my testimony before the Senate Judiciary Committee on July 28, 1949, did the authorities wake up to act and arrested the top officials of that agency which has been the center of economic espionage in this country.

And unless they live up to the very letter of treaty obligations, diplomatic relations should be broken completely. They are not and never will be friends with us. No pretty diplomatic verbiage will ever change matters.

If Vishinsky and company want to take a walk out of the UN, let us wish them "Skotyertyoo doroga"—a smooth journey like on a table cloth, the Russian version of our good riddance of bad rubbish. According to Stalin's own teaching, they are in the UN and any other international body of nations merely for propaganda purposes, to bore from within and to destroy the institution, just as the parliamentary struggle is a school and an aid in organizing the battles outside the parliament, according to Stalin.

There can never be a silver lining to the Soviet horizon in its relations at home or abroad. If from time to time they do change their tone, it would be well to remember the Biblical passage: "The voice is the voice of Jacob but the hands are the hands of Esau." Don't trust them; treat them as they do us—enemies.

The next time an American civilian or military person is molested by them, don't use diplomatic niceties. It is futile. Act. Arrest 10 for 1. That is precisely what should have been done in the recent incident in Prague. When two of our embassy personnel were expelled from Czechoslovakia on 24-hour notice, four of theirs should have been hustled out of this country and instead of giving them 24 hours, it should have been 12 hours. This is the only language Communists understand and respect.

It is high time for our UN delegation to have at least one member who can speak Russian perfectly, who knows the true nature of the poisoned men of the Kremlin better than anyone now in our Government. Such men are available; they could be used with effect in dealing with the tricky Vishinsky and company—men whose culture is that of the head hunter and the manners of cavemen.

The Soviet diplomatic and business personnel in this country should be held down to the exact number of Americans allowed in Russia. Stalin's government must be taught the lesson reciprocity. A Russian Communist explained to me their meaning of the term: "You give us everything and we give you nothing." And a second official present added: "And we will repay you by helping bring about a Soviet Government in your country through a revolution."

ASSERT OURSELVES

What should the citizens of this and other freedom-loving countries do? For 32 years the Soviet Government has been fomenting uprisings, creating fifth-columns here and everywhere to bring about the destruction of our way of life by means of force and violence. Only gullibles like Henry Wallace and some of our ignorant university professors and parlor Bolsheviks refuse to recognize the underground work of the Soviet tyrants. The time has therefore come for our citizens, as distinct from our Government, to assert themselves. We must not leave everything to Washington. The best

brains, the most courageous ones are still in civilian life.

With the zeal and courage of the founding fathers we must begin to take certain steps which would help the Russian people overthrow their tyranny. They can and will do it themselves, if we get behind them to encourage them and help them directly and indirectly. Our Revolution in 1776 did not secure liberty to us for all time without our doing something to keep it secure. A new force, an evil force the like of which has never existed before, and certainly one of which Washington, Jefferson, and the other statesmen could not have imagined would ever arise, is working with all its might and main to destroy freedom here and elsewhere.

I am not advocating a new organization. America is overorganized as it is. But let the thousands of clubs, trade organizations, labor unions, church organizations, etc., discontinue many of their unnecessary activities and devote their time, money, and energy to this goal—the ridding of the world of the Red plague.

For this purpose we have in Russia at least 90 percent of the population as our allies. The mere news of the formation of such a movement will hearten them and steel them to the supreme effort to liquidate their liquidators. They have done it before; they will do it again. But they need our encouragement. We can and must give it to them.

A coordinating committee to guide the thousands of citizens' organizations in this work will soon be formed. I have been working on this plan since 1927. Our people have yet to realize that we are living in an emergency, that the war is not over. We have downed two adversaries and have helped rear a third—the Soviet power. The incompetent men who helped guide our late President to his dealings with Stalin and Molotov are much to blame for the situation which is now plaguing us.

The hundreds of thousands of Russian DP's in Europe and now being scattered all over the world have a story to tell that must be heard. Our press, unfortunately, has hardly scratched the surface in this connection. But first of all the story must be told in telling terms in Europe. American ingenuity is needed badly in this work in Europe. Stalin has too many ideological brothers in Italy and France. The European countries have done a miserable job about exposing the true physiognomy of the Soviet state. Let this be our task No. 1.

We have failed thus far because we are not accustomed to dealing with arch-conspirators such as the Communists are. We must outdo them in their tactics. They have already hurt so many tens of millions of people in Russia and the newly annexed countries that we would be unworthy of the freedom we still enjoy if we did not take full advantage of their eagerness to join with us in this undertaking.

Let us keep before us at all times the following basic philosophy of Stalin as published in volume 8 of his collected works:

"What is this country of ours which is building socialism if not the base for the world revolution?"

This fundamental goal will never be changed regardless of who is on the Kremlin throne—Stalin, Molotov, Malenkov, or anyone else. And as long as that is the case, there can never be lasting peace for us, and we will have to tax ourselves to the limit to prevent this scourge from consuming us as it has already consumed hundreds of millions in other lands. With a little effort by comparison with the billions we are now spending and might have to spend in the future, without sending our boys abroad to die on alien lands, we can encourage the discontented tens of millions in Russia and the satellite states to do the job and do it promptly. Five or 10 years from now it might be too late.

Supersonic Ram-Jet Engines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 9 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I desire to have inserted into the RECORD a story appearing in the New York Herald Tribune on February 2, 1950, about the supersonic ram-jet engines for intercontinental guided missiles, which are being developed at the new jet engine laboratory at Wood-Ridge, N. J. These engines simulate flight speeds of 2,600 miles an hour at altitude conditions up to 80,000 feet.

The story is written by Mr. Ansel E. Talbert, the aviation editor of the New York Herald Tribune, also president of the Aviation Writers' Association. Mr. Talbert is recognized as one of America's leading aviation writers.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY LABORATORY BUILDS JETS FOR GUIDED MISSILES—AIR FORCE PLANT SIMULATES SUPERSONIC SPEEDS AND ALTITUDES OF 80,000 FEET

(By Ansel E. Talbert)

WOOD-RIDGE, N. J., February 2.—Supersonic ram-jet engines for intercontinental guided missiles are being developed here at a new jet engine laboratory which simulates flight speeds of 2,600 miles an hour and altitude conditions up to 80,000 feet.

The laboratory opened today for the first time to nonmilitary observers. It was constructed by the Wright Aeronautical Corp. for the Air Force, which, together with Navy and the Army Field Forces, is pushing "a national guided missile program."

This program includes investigation of the best methods and techniques for conducting intercontinental warfare, and already has progressed from subsonic to supersonic missile speeds.

DEFENSIVE SAFEGUARDED

On the defensive side, United States strategists expect the introduction of surface-to-air guided missiles to bring extensive improvements in the ability to defend local areas from intruding planes and missiles.

The ram-jet engine, most effective at speeds in excess of 760 miles an hour—the approximate speed of sound at sea level—is favored by many missile designers as the ideal power plant for high-speed, long-distance propulsion. Although proposals for ram-jet missiles were made in Europe during the war, the engine was largely in the drawing-board stage at war's end and has been developed mostly in the United States since then.

A ram-jet can be compared to a flying stovepipe with no moving parts, or to a giant milk bottle with the large end sawed off to make an exhaust for the high-temperature gases created by combustion of fuel in the engine's interior. When a ram-jet engine moves at high speed, small end forward, and fuel ignites inside under pressure created by the air flow the resulting exhaust gases give the engine tremendous power.

PERFORMANCE STILL SECRET

The faster the engine goes the more efficient it becomes. In the new Wright Aeronautical laboratory here, ram jets up to 20 inches in diameter may be operated in the new test chamber and future modifications of the chamber will make it capable of testing units twice this size.

Although the output of ram-jet engines to be tested here is classified as secret, the laboratory's capacities give a good indication of the power which can be obtained from this engine type.

Fuel pumps supplying engines undergoing tests are capable of delivering more than 6,000 gallons of fuel an hour—or the contents of 14 railroad tank cars a day. A series of steam jets, which can produce steam at the rate of 150 tons an hour, are pointed into the exhaust system to aid or retard the escape of exhaust gas.

By varying the air pressure for the test chamber, which is supplied at the rate of 140 tons an hour from the turbine compressors at a nearby $3,500,000 gas turbine development laboratory, it is possible to starve or overfeed an engine and create the effects of altitude or speed.

UP TO 4,000°

In parts of the ram-jet test chambers near the exhaust end the temperature of the gases reaches 4,000° Fahrenheit. Because this heat causes the test chamber to expand more than 1 inch over its entire length, the designers of the chamber put it on rollers. To muffle roaring of the ram-jet exhaust gases and steam jets, three silencers, each 45 feet high, have been installed at the end of the exhaust line.

The central test cell of the new Wright ram-jet laboratory is a steel tank 12 feet in diameter and 96 feet long. The ram jet to be tested is mounted in a platform in the center of the test chamber and connected to electronic thrust measuring instruments.

In 1948 the first facilities contract for the present ram-jet laboratory was awarded to Wright Aeronautical. Ground for the laboratory was broken in December of the same year and the main testing chamber was installed last fall. The first check runs on the laboratory as a complete unit were run last winter.

Equal Rights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an article referring to a rider attached to the equal rights amendment. This comment was written by Florence C. Kitchelt, chairman, Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment, and which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune on February 3, 1950. It follows:

EQUAL RIGHTS—AMENDMENT RIDER CRITICIZED AS MISPLACING THE ISSUE

To the NEW YORK HERALD TRIBUNE:

There is no doubt of the good intentions of the Senate in voting a rider to the equal rights amendment, last week, guaranteeing women benefits and exemptions.

It was done because some Senators interpreted the amendment as menacing protective legislation, laws providing seats for women in factories, etc.

The amendment does not mention either men or women. It says: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex." We logically conclude that

if it menaces protective legislation for women it does the same for men. Are laws safeguarding sailors on the high seas, miners in coalpits, soldiers ready to give their lives in war to be endangered, but stools for factory women guaranteed? This puts the self-seeking of women in a very unlovely light.

The rider misplaces the issue. Legislation in regard to health and welfare comes under statutory law, the work of State and national legislatures. The amendment is a constitutional principle like that in the Charter of the United Nations.

Women are now inferior and adolescent under the law. The amendment would give them full adult citizenship. This legal inferiority has been stated clearly in a speech by Attorney Helen Elizabeth Brown before the Lawyers Civic Association of Maryland:

"Men, aliens and corporations are persons entitled to the equal protection of the laws in this country; American women are not.

"It is unconstitutional to try a Negro man with a jury from which Negro men have been excluded; it is not unconstitutional to try a woman, black or white, with a jury from which women have been excluded.

"It is unconstitutional to place restrictions on men's liberty to contract; it is not unconstitutional to restrict women's liberty of contract.

"It is constitutional to bar women from any lawful means of earning a living; such laws as to men are unconstitutional and void.

"Women may be subjected to labor restrictions; men may not.

"Women may be excluded from business and the professions; men may not.

"Women in business and the professions may be discriminated against; men may not.

"Women may be deprived of their property without due process of law; men may not."

Miss Brown quoted the cases before the Supreme Court which decided that a woman was not a "person" and entitled to equal protection of the laws. She recalled the statement of Bishop Hoadley that whoever interprets the laws is the lawgiver. As Justice Holmes said, the Constitution is what the courts say it is.

The dean of Barnard College, Mrs. Millicent McIntosh, is reported as saying that civilization still tries to thwart woman's intellectual development by imprisoning it within mid-Victorian concepts.

We submit that the Senate rider, with its reference to "the female sex," is mid-Victorian as well as misplaced. The issue is not seats in factories for women. We rely upon the common sense of our legislators for that. The issue is the full humanity and dignity of all the citizens of the United States.

FLORENCE L. C. KITCHELT,
Chairman, Connecticut Committee for the Equal Rights Amendment.
NEW HAVEN, CONN., *January 31, 1950.*

Address of Robert P. Boylan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Robert P. Boylan, chairman of the board of governors and president pro tempore of the New York Stock Exchange, at a dinner meeting of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms at the Shoreham Hotel, Washington, D. C., on Tuesday evening, February 7, 1950:

This dinner of the Association of Stock Exchange Firms, held so fittingly in the Nation's Capital, is of special importance because it brings together representatives of Government and business. We are accustomed to being on the receiving side in listening to Government. This time the position is reversed and Government is going to listen to business. I hope that all of you enjoy the experience. We are happy indeed to have so many distinguished Members of both Houses of Congress and of the executive branch of Government with us tonight.

This year, 1950, marks the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the moving of the seat of government from Philadelphia to Washington. As many of you know, plans are under way to hold a Freedom Fair here next year to celebrate 150 years under a free economy. It is being sponsored by the Government. Congress has approved it. All sections of our national life have been invited to participate. Such an exposition has great possibilities in dramatizing the progress of our country under our American system—way of life—call it what you will—which has brought us so far in the last century and a half.

The New York Stock Exchange, formed not long after the Revolutionary War, and now but 3 months from its one hundred and fifty-eighth anniversary, is proud of the historic parallel between it and the Republic. To me, the significance of this parallel lies in the fact that free markets and a free economy—you cannot have one without the other—have existed in the United States for a century and a half, drawing their strength from increasing consumption and from thrift and investment.

During those 150 years, the well-being of the Nation has been at all times dependent upon a proper balance between consumption and investment. Imbalance is always upsetting to the American economy. To cite an example: In the twenties, consumption was neglected. Income was not well distributed. There was too much at the top—not enough at the bottom. A condition of underconsumption developed. Today, investment is neglected. Underinvestment is evident on the part of individuals and of business. This is an alarming trend, particularly when we consider that it takes about $5,000,000,000 annually in new investment to create some 700,000 new jobs for young people entering the labor force each year.

Industry cannot provide these new jobs unless it can raise ownership capital. Ownership capital is not now available on favorable terms. Last year, as measured by Moody's, the average yield was 2.96 percent for corporate bonds and 6.63 percent for common stocks. Thus, it theoretically costs a company two and one-fourth times as much to obtain ownership capital as to go into debt.

Faced with the necessity of going into debt to finance improvements and expansion, or of drawing on current earnings, a company, unless exceptionally situated, usually will undertake only the essential. It will not invest the large sums needed for growth and development. Thus, it cannot utilize research and productive efficiency to create the new and better products at lower prices needed to improve the living standards of the lower income groups.

Permit me to review for a moment the reasons why underinvestment is putting a cloud on the economic horizon. During the depression preceding the war, in an effort to stimulate consumption, the Government taxed and spent freely. This tax philosophy still underlies our Federal tax policies. It has not been changed, although during the war and afterward consumption rose to levels that were undreamed of at the time this tax theory was accepted. Meanwhile the equally vital problem of investment continues to be neglected.

In a sense, I speak for the American investor. I do not pretend to do so with his authority. Certainly, however, from my vantage point as the chairman of the board of governors of the New York Stock Exchange, I am in a position to appraise the attitudes of investors. I know what the investor, the former investor, and even the potential investor are thinking about in terms of their willingness or unwillingness to supply capital. The New York Stock Exchange has some 600 member firms with more than 1,500 offices located throughout the country. We are constantly in contact with these firms. They, in turn, are in contact with those who own the securities of American industry. Our member firm organization, far flung as it is, is acutely aware of the fact that an extremely large number of people would like to employ their surplus funds. These people would form the habit of investment if conditions were made attractive for them.

A free economy, under which we have prospered for more than 150 years, cannot continue to expand and meet the needs of a rapidly growing country without an increasingly larger number of investors. It has been truly said that the American investor is the forgotten person in this country. Yet, the millions of men and women who invest in American industry and whose numbers would greatly increase if given reasonable assurance that they and their invested dollars would receive fair treatment, are among our most useful citizens. I am speaking of them not only as the suppliers of capital, without which our system would perish; but I have in mind also their qualities of thrift, their faith in American industry, their devotion to our free economy and our free institutions, and their rejection of the forces and influences that endanger our country.

May I tell you, briefly, what causes the fears that are uppermost in the minds of these millions of people:

1. Restrictive taxes (and this is the factor of most immediate concern). I am referring to taxes that diminish the incentives of both the stockholders and the managers of business.

2. The enormous growth of the Federal establishment, together with the indifferent attitude of large numbers of people with respect to the necessity of shrinking the size and the cost of government.

3. Tax-free organizations that are now doing an estimated $10,000,000,000 business annually, resulting not only in unfair competition, but in a substantial loss of tax revenue to the Government.

4. The taking over by Government of lending functions which properly belong to our private capital markets, except when emergency conditions exist.

I would like to take this opportunity to mention another factor which is disturbing to investors and to business. This is a very widespread impression that Government and business are unfriendly—that some deep-seated antagonism divides them. I doubt whether this will stand up under analysis. Congress fully recognizes the urgent necessity of keeping our economic system strong and in this it is in complete agreement with business. Congress is an able, hard-working body, both vigilant and courageous with respect to the best interests of the country. I am sure that those who are acquainted with the complex problems with which it has to deal and with the pressure under which it works share my sympathy and respect for our Senators and Representatives.

A friendly relationship between business and Government is highly desirable, and never more so than at this juncture in our national life. The need for harmony among

all segments of our population has never been greater than at this time. I earnestly appeal to all for restraint in the interest of internal strength and solidarity.

Whatever weakens business confidence, retards the country's economic progress. All of us can remember the time when it seemed to be popular in one breath to praise the genius of American business and in the next breath to denounce the creators and guardians of our prosperity as men engaged in exploiting an unsuspecting public. Of course, this doesn't make sense.

As to the necessity of keeping our economic system strong, I would like to remind you that the rewards for achievement are taxed so steeply that they reduce the incentive of those who operate business and the incentive of those who would otherwise supply its capital. Such taxation is eating away the forces that have given America its strength—a strength that grew out of incentive and a strength that is unique among the nations of the world.

What we call the good life, for all of our people, can only be provided by a dynamic and expanding economy stimulated by incentive. Only the Government, through wise monetary, tax, and debt-management policies, can give full scope to the dormant energies of American industry.

I commend to all of you, as preferred reading, a study by Prof. W. L. Crum, of the University of California, who shows that incomes of stockholders—especially small incomes—bear a much heavier tax burden than those of citizens not owning stock. Considering the importance of the stockholder in our economy, can there be any excuse for this discrimination? The answer is "No."

Now as to the measures that would remove the fears of investors and of businessmen. The steps that should be taken to substitute confidence for anxiety are indicated in the four principal causes which I have outlined. A variety of remedies are, of course, necessary, but what we need above everything else are national policies and attitudes that recognize the investor as indispensable in the processes by which jobs and opportunities are created.

I am amazed, in my contacts in different parts of the country, to discover how few people realize the extent to which incentive has been destroyed in this country. I have never understood this. Given proper encouragement, our economic machine will operate at such a rate as to assure not only progress and prosperity for the Nation, but adequate revenue for the needs of government. The effectiveness of policies shaped around incentive has been demonstrated in the past. Our policies, particularly our tax policies, should be so shaped again. Why not try incentive?

I say restore the incentives needed to activate the businessman, the enterpriser. Thus, a dynamic economy can be developed in which the country certainly can attain a national income of $300,000,000,000 or larger. Such an income certainly cannot be attained soundly without incentives. With a national income of that size, the cost of carrying the war debt and its relation to the economy will assume proper proportions. The obstructions to the investment of equity capital have prevented our capital markets from reflecting the true value of private wealth. The present Government debt of $257,000,000,000, not to mention many other forms of debt, is compared in the public mind with a national wealth of $310,000,000,000 figured at prewar prices. As a result, many people have reached the conclusion that the country is near bankruptcy. It is not, of course.

The restoration of confidence will require, however, a change in tax philosophy which was based on the false assumption that the United States had reached a position of economic maturity. These policies are retarding investment ownership. They are eliminating the able, the competent, from the fields of enterprise.

Our tax problem is really not as complex as it appears. It is a matter of choosing those taxes which retard enterprise the least. Let us take a familiar symbol—the man with a pack on his back. It is true that the heavier the pack, the greater the handicap. But, it is also perfectly clear that a pack skillfully adjusted can be carried more readily than one which is badly arranged. Because of our heavy obligations, there are limits to the reduction which can be made in the over-all tax burden. But, we can redistribute the tax load in such a way as to stimulate equity investment and spark the economic machine.

Canada is showing the way by demonstrating that the gradual elimination of double taxation on dividends is both basic and possible in a modern nation. I would like to quote Canadian Finance Minister Douglas Abbott. He said, in announcing a sweeping tax cut last spring, and I quote: "It seems to me that, under a system of private enterprise, which depends for its existence on a steady flow of venture capital, we cannot afford to neglect the implication of this defect of double taxation in our tax system. * * * It is a matter of concern for the future under a system where we depend, and must depend, for full employment and the creation of new wealth on the willingness of our people to risk their money in constructive enterprises." End of quotation.

Our Canadian neighbor has put his finger on one of the most indefensible features of our tax structure, and that is the double taxation of dividends. I have yet to hear any logical justification for this particular tax policy. It is unjust, it is unsound and it outrages the investor's sense of fairness. It has been proposed to allow individuals to take a credit equal to 10 percent of their dividends in computing their tax liability. This would be an encouraging first step toward a long overdue correction of an injustice which crept into our tax system as long ago as 1913.

Another serious inequity in the tax structure which has very damaging consequences is the capital-gains tax. There is an easy remedy for this tax which, to be realistic, is not a tax but a form of confiscation. It has been in our tax structure so long, however, that its complete elimination is too much to expect at this time. An approach to a solution which is widely favored would be to reduce the rate to 10 percent, to increase to $5,000 the amount of capital losses which could be offset against ordinary income each year, and to reduce the holding period to not more than 3 months.

Originally, the objective of the capital-gains tax was revenue. Later on, it was regarded as a means of soaking the rich. This was and is an absurd idea. By making the acceptance of capital gains optional, you cannot levy on the rich through a capital-gains tax. All you can do is to deter the taxpayer from selling an old capital asset and from putting money into a new one. You can stop him from using his own best judgment and thereby needlessly interfere with the functioning of a free market. The investor who finds that he cannot use his own judgment because of an arbitrary time factor becomes apathetic in regard to risk-bearing and finds shelter in tax-exempt securities.

I have merely attempted to point out a list of alarming conditions and trends that are endangering a Nation grown great through the magic of incentive. Unless these trends are checked, much that we have today will disintegrate, and once the light of a great, free, industrial economy is extinguished here it may be a long time before it is relighted anywhere.

Our enterprise system will continue to grow if national economic policies in general are directed to release its potentials. I believe that people everywhere can be most effective in reversing dangerous trends by constantly drawing attention to every tax, every attitude, and every action that is suspect, as regards their effect upon incentive, enterprise, and initiative. In doing this, they are contributing to the common welfare. National policies must be modernized to fulfill the needs of a dynamic America.

I thank you.

The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following sermon by Rev. Clarence R. Haden, Jr., rector of St. Philip's Episcopal Church, Durham, N. C.:

THE ELEVENTH HOUR

(Septuagesima, February 2, 1950)

We are in the throes of a social, political, and economic revolution. So far the changes have been effected gradually and through legislative processes. There is always a lag between what people want and believe in and legislative enactment. Our legislators, because of self-interest as well as their purpose of representing their people endeavor to keep in touch with the desires of their constituents. That this is a difficult task, no one will deny, for lobbyists and pressure groups often confuse the issue by the exertion of influence beyond their importance. Reconstruction is bound to come, however, for the ferment of unrest throughout the world makes it certain. This ferment itself may in part be due to an awakened conscience to the needs of man.

The standard of the market place is contractual in nature, but a more basic standard is what is best for man. His welfare is of greater importance than monetary considerations. As a business executive stated to me recently, "Beginning wages are much higher proportionately than ever before. After a level of around $60 weekly is reached, and it is soon reached, it is slower and more difficult to advance." This it seems to me is sound principle. A man is given more than he is worth, economically speaking, to begin with because of his basic needs, and then advancement is dependent on manifested skill and talent. This present status has been reached because of society's conviction, implemented by minimum wage laws, organized pressure, etc., that man has a basic need which must be met. Such other boons as old age pensions and unemployment insurance are also based on this consideration for the welfare of human beings.

The standards of the Kingdom of God are those of family life wherein each member is of significance and worth. Toward the achievement of these standards society is moving, and great gains have been made, though much still remains to be done. There are times, no doubt, when we feel that democracy is so slow, inefficient and unwieldy, that it should be abandoned. But when we compare the status of social consciousness in the United States with that in the other countries in the world, we know that it is our most valuable asset and must be preserved so that even greater progress may be made. The development of a social conscience was possible because of the democratic way of life.

The world situation wherein rival systems are warring for supremacy should awaken us to the great danger that is confronting society. With the advent of first the atom bomb and now the hydrogen bomb, the future of civilization, even civilization itself, is in question. No one has any right to be complacent in the face of what will inevitably happen if we get in another war. Dr. Harold Urey, the great scientist and expert on nuclear fission, has said that if the hydrogen bomb is used, it will render whole countries uninhabitable for thousands of years. Dr. Clifford Morehouse, editor of the Living Church in an open letter to the President of our country, points out that no weapon of war has ever been developed and not used. This is the most sobering of facts in view of the estimated destructiveness of the hydrogen bomb. We cannot afford to use, we cannot allow, the hydrogen bomb to be used.

It is all very well to recognize the awfulness, the horror, of the hydrogen bomb, but we are faced with doing more than saying it must not be used.

No nation can have a monopoly on the hydrogen bomb, just as no monopoly on the atomic bomb was possible. It will take two years for us to manufacture the hydrogen bomb, and it is estimated our potential enemy, Russia, will have it in four years. We are already in an armaments race, the end of which is sure and certain—war and destruction—unless. Civilization hangs in the balance—we are at the eleventh hour, so this "unless" is of infinite importance to you and to me and to all mankind.

Unless international control of the atomic and hydrogen bombs is effected in the very near future, we shall be destroyed. I am aware that the United States has proposed a plan of international control which Russia has consistently refused to accept. I am also aware that Russia will claim that our possession of the hydrogen bomb is a threat to world peace. Through vitriolic denunciation she will accuse us of all manner of imperialistic designs. But we must now allow the world or ourselves to be confused or deluded by the motives she imputes to us. Russia does not want war with us within the next 4 or 5 years. She is trying to keep us fearful of her until she thinks she is strong enough to withstand the world. It is sad but true that each passing month she intrenches herself more strongly behind the so-called "iron curtain."

We blindly watched the Nazis take more and more territory and get stronger and stronger and thought they would finally stop before we were sucked into the maelstrom. Our residence in this fool's paradise was abruptly terminated. We refused to take a stand for justice, for our principles while we could have done so without resort to war, and then inevitably we were drawn into war. We are making the same old mistakes of thinking we can work with Russia on the basis of right and wrong. They have no standard of right or wrong. Their policy is openly and avowedly one of expediency and opportunism. They will do whatever is best for Russia. Lying, double-dealing, inhumanity, brutality, fear and oppression are basic to their political philosophy. They will never rest until they achieve world domination. This goal is plainly stated in their writings, just as Hitler's plan was clearly presented in Mein Kampf.

So what can we do now to help avert war?

Firstly, this is one world under one God. Nations must surrender their sovereignty to a larger organization, such as the United Nations. The United Nations must change itself by the five leading nations giving up their veto power. The United Nations needs a police force to carry out by power if necessary its rulings. If Russia will not give up her veto power, then let her withdraw from the United Nations. We can show our good faith by proposing that the five nations relinquish this veto power.

Secondly, we as a nation must carry forward our desire to effect an adequate international control of the atomic and the hydrogen bombs. No longer can Russia and her satellites be allowed to sit in the council of the nations of the world when she consistently refuses to cooperate with the others. This will have the effect, no doubt, of lining the world up into two camps, but I submit that that is just what exists today—only we stumble along, hoping that despite all the evidence we shall somehow avoid war. When the differences are clear-cut, we shall know, and the world will know, just where we stand.

Thirdly, we of the Christian Church have the spiritual resources to help change the world. We of the Episcopal Church at this moment of history are endeavoring to send more missionaries throughout the world to proclaim the gospel of Jesus Christ which essentially is the Fatherhood of God and its corollary the brotherhood of all men. Human dignity and freedom rest on the foundation of God. When we work to implement such beliefs, we are on God's side and He will bless and further our efforts. We must give generously in this eleventh hour of mankind to missions at home and abroad.

To demonstrate our desire to avoid world destruction from the use of atomic energy, I urge you to write our two Senators, the Honorable FRANK GRAHAM and the Honorable CLYDE HOEY, and our Representative, the Honorable CARL DURHAM, and advise them of your personal belief that the Congress of the United States should vote for us to relinquish our veto power in the United Nations in conjunction with a majority of the five nations now holding same, and that the United States push with all the influence and power at our command the establishment of adequate international control of atomic energy including its newest development—the hydrogen bomb.

Operation of Television Stations in Chicago

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the great city of Chicago by the City Council of Chicago, passed a resolution on January 20, 1950, requesting the Congress to take necessary steps in order to provide the city of Chicago with adequate facilities for the operation of seven television stations. Seven television stations were allotted to Chicago by the Federal Communications Commission; but only four authorizations were issued for operation in the Chicago metropolitan district.

The New York metropolitan district and the Los Angeles metropolitan district were each allotted seven television stations and they were respectively issued seven authorizations. Certainly this discrimination should not continue, particularly in view of the fact that the importance of Chicago as a center of commerce and industry is further evidenced by the fact that it was selected as the site of the first United States International Trade Fair to be held in August 1950. Chicago should have its full quota of television stations.

The resolution as adopted by the City Council of Chicago follows:

REQUEST FOR CHICAGO FACILITIES FOR OPERATION OF SEVEN TELEVISION STATIONS

Whereas Chicago has always been a leader and pioneer in radio broadcasting and manufacturing and the many allied industries; and

Whereas many Chicago residents are gainfully employed in said vocations and rely thereon for their livelihood, including technicians, actors, musicians, scientists, and advertising, management, and research personnel; and

Whereas in the production and origination of programs for Nation-wide distribution by networks or otherwise, Chicago has been and remains in strong competition with the cities of New York and Los Angeles; and

Whereas television is a new and recent development in this general field of broadcasting that promises to attain dominance thereof in the very near future; and

Whereas the importance of Chicago as a center of commerce and industry is evidenced by the selection of Chicago as the site for the first United States International Trade Fair to be held in August 1950; and Chicago should have its full quota of television broadcasting stations; and

Whereas adequate television broadcasting facilities are a basic essential to the growth and progress of all industries related to and dependent upon broadcasting; and

Whereas the Federal Communications Commission by regulation has allotted seven television stations to New York metropolitan district, seven to the Los Angeles metropolitan district, and seven to the Chicago metropolitan district; and

Whereas a sufficient number of applications were filed in each city to provide for the assignment of all allocated facilities; and the Commission did issue authorizations to seven applicants in New York and seven in Los Angeles for the operation of said stations, but has issued only four authorizations for operation in the Chicago metropolitan district; and

Whereas the failure of the Commission to issue authorization for all seven television stations in Chicago is attributed to a suspension of the processing of applications by said Commission pending a review of Commission regulations concerning television; and

Whereas in September 1948, when the Commission suspended its processing of applications, there had been pending for many months applications for all the facilities allocated to Chicago; and

Whereas the Commission's review of its regulations has developed into a complex and time-consuming procedure which will delay the commencement of further operations in Chicago for at least 18 months and perhaps for another 3 or 4 years; and

Whereas it appears that the authorization of the three additional television stations already allocated to Chicago need not hinder a satisfactory solution of the issues the Commission is currently considering in review of its regulations; and

Whereas a delay of 18 months to 4 years in the establishment of such additional facilities will grievously injure Chicago industries and residents and will seriously, if not permanently, impair the ability of Chicago to compete with its principal rivals in this field, and all of this without countervailing benefit to the Nation as a whole: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the mayor of the city of Chicago be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the delegation of the State of Illinois to the Eighty-first Congress that it is the sense of the city council that all necessary and appropriate steps be taken to the end that authorizations for the operation of additional television facilities in the city of Chicago, allocated by the Federal Communica-

tions Commission, may be issued forthwith; be it further

Resolved, That the city clerk be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this resolution to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, to each Representative from the State of Illinois in the Eighty-first Congress, and to the Chairman and members of the Federal Communications Commission in Washington.

STATE OF ILLINOIS,
County of Cook, ss:

I, Ludwig D. Schreiber, city clerk of the city of Chicago, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct copy of the certain resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Chicago at a regular meeting held Friday, the 20th day of January A. D. 1950.

Witness my hand and the corporate seal of the said city of Chicago this 2d day of February A. D. 1950.

LUDWIG D. SCHREIBER,
City Clerk.

What Should the United States Policy in China Be?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I am inserting in the RECORD the following speech, delivered by me at the Washington Town Meeting, January 30, 1950. The other participants were Senator Paul Douglas, Congressman Walter Judd, and Barnet Nover, of the Denver Post:

In any discussion of China policy two premises ought to be agreed upon at the outset. Unless they are, we will end by obscuring the very issues which we are supposed to clarify.

First of all, China is not merely a group of political and military chieftains on the island of Formosa. Nor is it a few Chinese Marxist theoreticians in Peking, or—as they are at present—in Moscow. We mean or should mean when we speak of China the 475,000,000 Chinese people who possess a very ancient and distinct culture and who, during the past half century, have come to develop an increasing awareness of their national unity. They constitute the China toward which the friendly hand of the United States traditionally has been extended. They are the China we have long sought to encourage in the direction of democracy and freedom from foreign control.

In the second place, we ought to agree that China policy is not solely the question of "to aid or not to aid" Chiang Kai-shek, but rather the whole course of action and inaction in our relations with that country. The question we must ask ourselves is whether the course we have set is the best that can be pursued under existing circumstances. Does it serve all the interests of the United States? Not merely our commercial interests in China, although they are of some importance; not merely our strategic interests in the Far East, although obviously those, too, are important—but the entire range of American concern with China, the Far East, and the rest of the world.

If we keep these two fundamental facts in mind, we shall find, I believe, that the policy followed in turn by General Marshall and Secretary Acheson during the administration of President Truman has been on the same bipartisan track pursued by administration after administration—Republican and Democratic—during the past half century. It should be kept on that track despite the efforts of those, who for reasons of sentimentality or politics, would derail it.

So much heat and so little light has been shed on this policy by the debate of the past few years that I should like to review briefly just what we have done and what we have not done with respect to China.

During the war and immediate postwar period the United States extended both economic and military assistance to the Chinese. The amount of that assistance was not large enough to satisfy some people. It was much smaller than that which went to Russia or Great Britain. At the time, however, most of us were concerned not with dividing the American inheritance equally among our allies, but with using available resources in a manner best calculated to defeat our enemies. The fact that we are meeting here tonight seems to indicate that the decisions of our wartime leaders in this respect were at least reasonably correct.

Assistance given to China during the war, limited though it may have been, was the critical factor in saving a valued ally from collapse and I think it is about time we stopped being ashamed of it. American interests were served by this aid in that we were able to share the terrible human sacrifices demanded by the war. China's interests also were served since that country emerged from the conflict in a stronger and more independent position than it had ever before occupied in the modern world.

Partly to complete our wartime commitments and partly to equip China for its greatly enhanced and important international role, the United States continued aid to China during the months following the end of the war. The Chinese people wanted the removal of the 3,000,000 Japanese remaining in China. They wanted internal stability and rapid economic and political reconstruction. And above all they wanted an end to civil war.

The intention of our postwar aid was to assist them in realizing these objectives; we were not concerned with furthering the interests of any particular group of Chinese officials. If we extended our assistance through the National Government, it was because the available evidence indicated that, at the time, most of the Chinese people still looked to the generalissimo, who had led them in war, to continue to supply them with leadership in peace.

General Marshall's mission similarly was in accord with the wishes of the Chinese people. The general did not go to China to force Chiang Kai-shek to accept Communists into his government as has been so recklessly charged by some in this country. He went to help achieve what the Chinese people clearly and desperately desired—what the generalissimo and the National Government had repeatedly proclaimed as their official policy—a settlement of the internal problem of unity by peaceful means.

When it proved impossible to achieve such a settlement, President Truman reiterated the traditional policy of the United States—that we would not become directly involved in a Chinese civil war. That decision was applauded by the people of China, who were overwhelmingly opposed to the suicidal conflict being precipitated among them. As the civil war spread, we sought ways to alleviate the suffering it caused and to prevent China from collapsing into utter anarchy.

The cost of these American efforts to help the Chinese people has been great. An official calculation placed the total amount in excess of $2,000,000,000 in loans and grants since VJ-day. It is possible to argue about the exact amount and millions of words have been wasted in proving that it was closer to one billion or to three billion.

The significant facts, however, are these: During the first few weeks after the defeat of Japan the United States transported by sea and air 400,000 to 500,000 National Government troops over and around the Communist forces to key sectors of East and North China. The purpose of this undertaking was to insure an orderly surrender, disarmament, and repatriation of the Japanese. Fifty thousand American marines held such vital cities as Peiping, Tientsin, and Tsingtao for months, thus preventing their seizure by the Chinese Communists. By the end of 1945 we had delivered sufficient tonnage to equip 39 divisions of National Government ground forces and an eight and one-third group air force. Whatever Japanese equipment the Chinese Communists obtained with the facilitation of the Russians in Manchuria was offset by the Japanese equipment surrendered to the Nationalist forces in North, Central, and South China.

In December 1945 Chiang Kai-shek held a numerical superiority in combat forces over the Communists of five to one. He had a monopoly of heavy equipment and mechanical transportation and an unopposed air arm. Yet by December 1948, exactly 3 years later, this preponderance of strength had been so dissipated that General Barr, head of our advisory mission in China, was forced to conclude that without direct American involvement with its combat forces the complete defeat of the Nationalist armies was inevitable.

What lies behind this colossal failure? We have the answer from General Marshall, General Wedemeyer, General Barr, and practically every other competent observer who has had the opportunity to view the situation in China first hand. The failure was due not to any lack of arms and ammunition. The failure was due to the incredible ineptitude of the Nationalist Army command. It was due to the inability or unwillingness of the Chinese Government to take the necessary and repeatedly advised measures of social, economic, political, and military reform which alone could have retained for it the support of the soldiers and the common people of China. It was due to the downright corruption in official circles.

In the face of the mass of evidence, there are still people who cling to the theory that the Yalta agreement is at the root of all of China's difficulties. It follows, then, that since we participated in this dark and wicked conspiracy we are guilty of some sort of gross betrayal.

Let us see what this much-maligned agreement actually provided. Under its most pertinent clause, the United States committed itself to intercede with the Chinese Government in order to obtain the return to the Soviet Union of certain limited port and naval concessions in Manchuria. They were substantially the same as had been lost by Russia to Japan in 1904. In return the Russians agreed to enter the war against Japan. They also reaffirmed their recognition of China's sovereignty over all Manchuria, and consented to give assistance and support to China exclusively through the National Government.

Military considerations were largely responsible for the American decisions at Yalta. It is all very well, with the wisdom of hindsight, to ridicule these considerations. But at the time, the war with Japan was still of uncertain duration. Without the unforeseeable impact of the atomic bomb on the outcome, hundreds of thousands of additional casualties might have been the price of the defeat of Japan. The administration wanted to share that toll as far as possible with other countries. No one, it seems to me, is justified in talking glibly of such a consideration.

The fact is that we could not have prevented, by any method short of war, the penetration of Manchuria by Russian imperialism, so we tried to limit it. The American people have never indicated a willingness to go to war for the ejection of non-Chinese control from Manchuria. Our traditional China policy has never countenanced such a step. We did not go to war when the Russians originally penetrated the area toward the close of the nineteenth century. We did not go to war when the Japanese replaced them in 1904. It was, as a matter of fact, President Theodore Roosevelt, who arranged that first "Yalta" agreement. And in 1931, another Republican administration refused to lead us into war over this issue when the Japanese expanded economic concessions into political domination of all Manchuria.

We have placed on record in the past our conviction that Manchuria is Chinese territory. At Yalta we did so again. And we still believe Manchuria remains Chinese territory, regardless of the advantages taken by predatory neighbors in this time of China's weakness. But the task of restoring Manchuria to China in fact as well as in name is primarily the task of Chinese nationalism. It is not now and it has never been the responsibility of the United States armed forces.

Rather than speak of Yalta as a gross and iniquitous betrayal, I think it is time to recognize it for what it was—the best possible chance, at the time, of preserving the long-term interests of both the United States and China.

Another bogey has now made its appearance in connection with the island of Formosa. This time the administration is accused, not of betraying the Chinese, but of betraying the Formosans who, incidentally, are about 98 percent Chinese.

At the Cairo Conference in 1943, the United States pledged the restoration of Formosa to China. There was practically unanimous approval of that decision both in this country and in the allied world. When the war ended, the Formosan Chinese welcomed the return of the National Government as a liberator. Chen Yi, an old friend of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek was appointed the first governor. Chen Yi found living standards on the island better than on the mainland. He found a populace both industrious and law-abiding. And he found no Communists. After a little more than 1 year of Chen Yi's carpetbagging maladministration, the island was rocked by a fierce uprising against the mainlanders. Chen Yi crushed the revolt with a ruthlessness that claimed several thousand lives. It is not surprising that many Formosans believe their lot—bad as it might have been under the Japanese—was preferable to what they have suffered under the National Government. Successive and more enlightened governors, Wei Tao-ming, Chen Cheng, and K. C. Wu have not been able to wipe out the bitterness and hatred which the Formosan Chinese feel for their oppressors.

It is into this ugly situation that we are now invited to project ourselves. Since a peace treaty with Japan has not yet been signed, a legal loophole exists whereby we might assume some sort of protectorate over Formosa. In this manner we might conveniently avoid or postpone in Chiang Kai-shek's interest the pledge given to the Chinese people at Cairo. This ignores the fact, however, that for 3 years we have not questioned Chinese control over the island and to do so now would be unabashed interference in internal Chinese affairs.

The "gunboat" policy for Formosa currently being advocated in some quarters is not a new one. It was first proposed a hundred years ago by Admiral Perry and decisively rejected by the American people then. If we were to follow it now, we might be able with superior force to discourage the present Communist masters of China from seeking to take the island. But in doing so, we would give credence to the anti-American propaganda in the Orient that charges us with using our power for imperialistic purposes. We would build, in the final analysis, a lasting heritage of hatred just as the Russians are now busily doing in Manchuria, Sinkiang and Mongolia.

The situation in Formosa points up the key difficulty involved in keeping our China policy on the right track. We must discriminate between what we can do and what we cannot do both in a material and an ethical sense. There is no virtue in doing in foreign affairs just to be doing, and there are times when inaction is more effective from the point of view of American interests than action.

The cardinal principle of United States China policy must remain what it always has been—recognition of the fact that the internal problems of the Chinese people, whether on the mainland or on Formosa, must be solved primarily by the Chinese people themselves. They do not want and they will not acquiesce indefinitely in solutions forced upon them by foreign intervention.

We cannot make ourselves responsible—militarily or otherwise—for a regime which has been abandoned by the Chinese people. To do so would be the certain way of diverting attention from the real threat to their nation arising in the north.

We cannot continue to supply armaments to a government which the Communist leader Mao Tze-tung has callously, but unfortunately with much accuracy, labeled his supply service for the delivery of American equipment.

We cannot, by conducting naval exercises in the path of an impending engagement in the Chinese civil war find a cheap and involvement-free solution to the complex problem of China policy. It is irresponsible and dangerous to threaten force unless you are prepared to use it. And I doubt that even those who advocate such a policy are ready to go to war over Formosa.

We cannot, on the other hand, give recognition to a Chinese Communist government which shows little regard for the rights of our citizens and little respect for even the most elementary international usages. There would appear to be little point, moreover, in our association with a regime which claims to speak with the authentic voice of China but which has the accent of the Soviet Union. At the conclusion of the present and unexpectedly long talks in Moscow we may know better whether that regime has abandoned the accent or China's fundamental interests.

What we can do in the present circumstances is to maintain our faith in China—not in a handful of exalted figures but in the Chinese people themselves. We can continue to help those people with the limited means at our disposal—through public and private channels—in whatever regions remain open to us. The Chinese people will not forget acts of genuine friendship in their hour of trial.

We can, moreover, through the Voice of America, the United Nations, and other feasible ways, keep the attention of the Chinese and the world focused on the Soviet exploitation that is now going on in China's remote provinces. Through the United Nations, we can also seek to prevent the present Communist masters from pushing the peaceful Chinese people into aggressive campaigns beyond China's borders.

By lending encouragement to legitimate Nationalist aspirations and by extending practical economic assistance under point 4 to the countries surrounding China, we can demonstrate our genuine interest in the progress of all Asia.

Finally, we can keep our thinking on general foreign policy flexible. Only in this way will we be able to act appropriately in any given circumstances. Above all, we must avoid the fallacy of believing that consistency in foreign policy lies in acting precisely in the same manner in every part of the globe. It is, for example, fantastic to suggest that what we have done in Greece we must also do in China, which has 58 times as many people, 60 times as great an area, and a vastly different set of political and strategic problems.

The only consistency we need be concerned with is the consistency with which we devote ourselves to the protection of the security and all the legitimate interests of the United States. That is the basic ingredient of a nonpartisan, nonpolitical approach. Beyond it let us exercise a little imagination and a lot of discretion.

The Secretary of State and the Man

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Arthur Krock, from the New York Times of January 27, 1950:

IN THE NATION—THE SECRETARY OF STATE AND THE MAN

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, January 26.—To comment as Mr. Acheson did on the conviction and sentencing of Alger Hiss was politically explosive, and in his capacity as Secretary of State he was fully aware of that. Also, experience and observation must have shown him that an officeholder, especially of his eminence, cannot divest himself of official status and speak or act as a private person when the matter concerned touches a public issue and the setting is the place in which he conducts the public business.

These circumstances of Mr. Acheson's comment, combined with the fact that he deliberately expanded it beyond the remark that it would be "highly improper" for him to discuss the legal aspects of the Hiss case while it was still before the courts, led this correspondent to a certain conclusion. It is that Mr. Acheson expected the question and determined that when it was asked his conscience as a man and his ethical concept as a Christian required him to reply as he did despite the obvious consequences—at any rate the immediate ones—and the inseparability of Dean G. Acheson from the Secretary of State in the premises.

A minority among the many in Washington who were heard to discuss the incident today approved the decision he reached as Mr. Acheson, and some of these held that the compulsions of conscience entitled his comment to be weighed as that of an individual only. In this opinion, any who believed in his right as a man to say what he did have no grounds for criticizing him for doing so because of the office he occupies and the world importance of the popular estimation of its occupant.

That opinion may become general as the event is discussed and rehashed not only in the political community of the capital but in countless gatherings of the American peo-

ple. Personal, deliberate courage, loyalty to friends in dire trouble and professions of the Christian ethic of compassion are admired and respected in Western and other civilizations. And all these were displayed by Mr. Acheson.

VIEWS OF THE CRITICS

Nevertheless, among those whose opinions were heard today the critics outnumbered the defenders, and on these grounds:

In two jury trials 20 of 24 jurors decided that Hiss was guilty of perjury as charged. In the second of these trials, though the attitude and rulings of the court were more satisfactory to the prosecution, it allowed the defense to present evidence excluded from the first trial and urged by the defense as vital demonstrations of the innocence of the defendant.

Trial by jury is basic among democratic institutions, and Mr. Acheson's citation of the Last Judgment of Jesus against the background of Hiss' conviction was bound to leave a critical implication toward the operation of that system in this instance with the verdict still before the courts. If Mr. Acheson had waited to cite the doctrine of compassion for all sinners until the verdict was affirmed, which he could have buttressed with another quotation from St. Matthew (12: 31), this implication would not have touched a pending case. For the present, Hiss has been found guilty of perjury in relation to accusations of disloyalty to his country and breach of official duty for which he could not be tried under the statute of limitations. As a lawyer, Mr. Acheson should merely have observed that the case is still in court.

As Secretary of State he should have confined his comment to the remark about propriety. He should have done so because (1) it is his duty to keep his office out of unnecessary controversy, and this was unnecessary; because (2) the former connection of Hiss and certain others with the Department of State has already hampered its effective operation by arousing the distrust and resentment of many worthy Members of Congress and the public, and yesterday's comment was sure to stimulate these at the expense of the general welfare, and (3) because Mr. Acheson's personal and business relations with Mr. Hiss and his brother make him a biased observer in the minds of many.

A POLITICAL JUDGMENT

Those who evaluated Mr. Acheson's comment wholly on the scales of politics and foreign policy found the heart of the matter in its possible effect on these. Some who support the domestic and foreign policy of the administration were disposed to criticize the Secretary, though in private, as having committed an irresponsible act in the circumstances which no prompting of conscience or religious doctrine could excuse. They agreed with the others that Mr. Acheson should have awaited the final judgment of the courts before he amplified his refusal to discuss the legal issues that remain, adding it is plain that, if the jury's verdict does not stand, the reason can only be a legal technicality.

Even then, said these critics, whether the case goes back to the courts on a technicality or the verdict is sustained, Mr. Acheson should weigh the effects of what his conscience as a man might prompt him to say or do against the consequences of these on the great public duty he has accepted. Then, since he knows the obligations of his office and the nature and sources of his opposition, he should resign as Secretary of State if to follow his conscience required him to do so in the interests of his country. And, in this opinion, Mr. Acheson is a practical enough judge of consequences to know when resignation would serve those interests best.

Place Names in West Virginia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN KEE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEE. Mr. Speaker, the place names of West Virginia have been studied by the State's industrial and publicity commission, and many quaint and curious pieces of lore have been uncovered. They smack of the early pioneer life of Americans in a rough mountain region. I find in the Monroe Watchman, of Union, W. Va., a reproduction of the commission's report, and it is with pleasure that I commend it to my colleagues, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD:

PLACE NAMES IN WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia place names do more than merely designate locations. They give us a graphic picture of the life and times in the State's early development. In fact, a study of West Virginia's names is a study of its history.

Take Mohawk and Mohegan, Mingo, Seneca, and Guyandot—names of the great Indian tribes that inhabited or hunted this region. Wyoming, Shawnee, Potomac, and Watoga are places and rivers that recall the rich beginning of our recorded history. Even before the Indian there lived the Moundbuilder, hence Moundsville.

Many streams in West Virginia still carry descriptive titles of the colorful Indian language. Monongahela was known to the Delawareans as the "river of falling banks." Pocatalico was the "river of fat doe." Ohio means "river of many whitecaps." The Great Kanawha pays tribute, not to the river, but to the once great tribe of Canoys.

The little town of Pickaway, in Monroe County, is a rough pronunciation of the tribal name, Piqua.

Names give us a true insight on the life of the early pioneers. Moreover, in names like Little Italy, Ireland, Polandale, Welsh Glade, and Germany Valley, we discover the origins of these people. Helvetia, in Randolph county, is the Swiss name for its settler's native country. Ronceverte, meaning Greenbrier, shows the French influence in the southeastern area.

Many of West Virginia's commonplace names depict the environmental conditions of those early days. Names like Elelber Run, Ramp, Spice, Sang, and Seng Runs reveal the pioneer dependence on root and herb medicines. Panther Fork, Elk River, Copperhead Branch, and Wild Cat Knob emphasize the wild unsettled conditions. Pigeonroost, Cow Creek, Bull Run, Goose Lick, and Turkey Wallow Branch indicate agricultural pursuits. Names like Tunder Hill Run, Mount Storm, Hurricane, and Tornado show the settler's deep awareness of natural forces.

Perhaps it was the pioneer women who gave us such names as Cupboard Run, Kitchen Creek, Kettle Run, Pot Branch, Skillet Run, and Tub Run. Tearcoat Hill, Mitten Ridge, Scissorsville Branch, Wash Hill Fork, and Suds Run can be credited to them, too. What stories lie behind names like Peddler Run and Gunbarrel Hollow?

Even foods are immortalized in names like Apple Pie Ridge, and Potato Hole Knob. An early day humorist probably gave us Pickles Fork. And to show that the frontiersman was of sturdy stuff, there is Grogg Run, Mash Fork, Rum Creek, and Still Run.

Religion played an important part in the lives of the pioneers. Such names as Canaan Valley, Eden, Herods Creek, Pharaoh Run, and Pisgah are taken from the Bible. There is a Job Knob, a Moses Creek, also a Christmas Ridge. Names like Paradise, Purgatory Knob, Devil's Tollgate, and Hell For Certain Branch mirrored the moral fiber of these places. Desolate Branch, Shades of Death Creek, and Troublesome Valley reveal more somber aspects of frontier life.

Feelings and emotions are betrayed in names like Big Ugly Creek, Hardscrabble, Desolate Branch, Stinking Creek, and Hateful Run. Soak Creek and Lissie's Roost connote humorous incidents of long ago.

Proving that the pioneers also explored the great world of literature, Avoca, from Moore's Irish Melodies, and Ravenswood, from Sir Walter Scott, are added to the list. A knowledge of Greek and Roman literature is hinted in Caesar Mountain, Socrates Mountain, Eureka Island, Polemic Run, and Styx River, Geography is evidenced by the Congo, Nile, and Rhine Rivers.

The building of railroads resulted in such names as Rose Siding, Engle's Switch, Switchback, Jones' Crossing, Vivian Yard, Tunnelton, and others. Combo evolved from the Cumberland Valley and Baltimore & Ohio Railroads.

Wars are responsible for such names as Brandywine and Bunker Hill. Dunmore and Cornwallis were named for famous generals. Jefferson, Washington, and Lafayette are names of districts; counties are named for Lincoln and Grant. Civil War heroes are recognized by the districts of Stonewall, Lee, Sheridan, and Sherman. Scott and Winfield were named for the hero of the Mexican War of 1847.

Nearly all the Presidents are represented in some way. There is both a Woodrow and a Wilson in West Virginia. Women, too, have been honored by place names. Both Belva and Lockwood were named for the famous women's rights advocate of 1877. More recently, the little Putnam County community of Eleanor was named for the wife of the late President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

Excise Taxes Should Be Immediately Repealed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the Nation is clamoring for repeal of the wartime excise taxes, which have served their purpose long ago.

I present an editorial from the Washington Daily News for January 30, which gives added reasons why these excise taxes should be repealed immediately. If not, thousands of small firms may go out of business because buyers are waiting for Congress to repeal these taxes.

The editorial will be of interest to Members of the Congress and readers of the RECORD.

It follows:

PARALYZING BUSINESS

Wartime excise taxes, still in effect 4½ years after the war ended, are depressing certain lines of business.

President Truman says so, and everybody else knows it to be true.

The original chief purpose of most of these taxes was to discourage travel and business-as-usual, thus releasing transportation facilities, manpower, and materials for war work.

They continue to serve that purpose when all lines of business need every possible encouragement to produce and sell, thus providing more jobs and more Government revenue from individual and corporate income taxes.

They serve that purpose, as Mr. Truman says, with particular detriment to low-income groups.

And now, since Mr. Truman has advocated reducing many of these excise taxes, they serve that purpose more effectively than ever.

For customers are putting off buying excise-taxed goods in the belief that the taxes will soon come off or come down.

The effect on some lines of business has become worse than depressing. It's paralyzing.

But Mr. Truman tied a string to his recommendation for cutting such taxes. He said that Congress must replace the revenue lost by closing tax-law loopholes which now permit some groups to escape their fair share of taxation. Otherwise, no excise-tax cuts.

Closing the loopholes is a difficult, time-consuming job, which Congress apparently intends to study for several months before acting.

A few months of stagnation in the market for excise-taxed goods could put a lot of employers out of business and a lot of employees out of jobs.

We believe that Congress should do quickly whatever it means to do about reducing or repealing excise taxes, and should firmly commit itself to offset any consequent loss of Government revenue by cutting down Government spending.

Report on European Visit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LEON H. GAVIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following report of my visit to military headquarters, units, and installations in Germany and Austria, and certain other points in Europe, November 9 to December 9, 1949, made to the Honorable CARL VINSON, chairman of the Committee on Armed Services:

This report of the trip made by the undersigned to Europe commencing November 9 and concluding December 9, 1949, is designed to make available to the members and staff of the committee essential information gathered and the views and impressions gained on such trip. While the main mission of my tour was to inspect American military installations and American troops in the occupied zones—Germany and Austria—nevertheless because our overseas military missions are largely determined by social, economic, and political conditions abroad, I spent considerable time investigating those conditions. And although certain of the matters coming to my attention are not directly within the jurisdiction of the Armed Services Committee, it is believed that they may be of general interest to the other Members, particularly those whose schedules did not permit them to visit Europe during the past year.

ITINERARY

During this trip stops were made at Westover Air Force Base, Massachusetts; Lagens, Azores; Frankfurt, Heidelberg, Weisbaden, Berlin, Munich, Germany; Vienna, Austria; Rome, Paris, Iceland, and Newfoundland. The major portion of the time overseas was devoted to the study of installations in Germany, with 2 days in Austria and 4 days each in Italy and France.

The following items and conditions with respect to our troops in Europe were noted during this trip:

The number of American troops in Europe today represents merely a token force whose mission is that of maintaining law and order. Nevertheless the mere presence of American troops very obviously means much to reassure the peoples of the occupied zones that the United States is vitally concerned with their welfare and their problems.

PERSONNEL

The health, appearance, and discipline of our forces in Europe were uniformly good. American military leaders in Europe, under General Huebner, and more recently under General Handy, have made substantial strides in these fields; and our military personnel by their appearance and conduct reflect credit upon the United States.

The strength of the United States forces in Germany has been gradually reduced since the close of hostilities, and today our troops constitute a very small number particularly in comparison with their missions, or the number of troops maintained by certain other powers. Under such conditions, it is doubly important that the highest quality personnel be recruited and trained, and that the maximum combat strength be organized from the personnel available. I am not convinced that these objectives are being fully attained. Due to the requirements of the Selective Service Act of 1948, and the shortage of voluntary enlistments, the Army lowered its personnel standards to a degree. Furthermore, there are still substantial numbers of military personnel in Germany assigned to more or less nonmilitary duties, such as the operation of hotels, service stations, restaurants, etc. The fact that such activities are necessary for the maintenance and convenience of our occupation forces does not, in my opinion, require that, in the stabilized conditions now prevailing, military personnel be directly assigned to such activities. The State Department, through the High Commissioner for Germany, Mr. John M. McCloy, has taken over the responsibility for civil government, economic affairs, and most policy matters affecting the German population. It would appear that they should also take over, or make suitable arrangements, for the support and maintenance of their personnel, and that our armed forces should be reorganized to emphasize their strategic and tactical combat missions. Furthermore, it may be noted that among the personnel assigned to nonmilitary duties a substantial number have been engaged on such activities for 2, 3, or 4 years. While such specializations may contribute to technical efficiency in the particular job concerned, it does not advance over-all training or develop maximum potential combat strength.

Some units and headquarters appear to be overstaffed with officers as compared to actual needs. This condition, I understand, has come about principally because during the period following the seizure of Czechoslovakia by Communist forces, and enactment of the Selective Service Act of 1948, the Army anticipated an increase in its effective strength from 550,000 to over 800,000, and encouraged a large number of emergency and Reserve officers to volunteer for 3-year tours of duty. Subsequently, the President determined not to increase the armed forces to the extent authorized by the Congress; but the Army and Air Force still had a substantial number of officers in excess of actual requirements. This problem is clearly understood, and I understand efforts are being made to solve it, by relieving Reserve officers on their own application and by limiting the recall to extended active duty of others. However, some forced attrition has become necessary, resulting in the involuntary separation of certain Reserve officers. Needless to say, such a program, no matter how fairly and efficiently carried out, creates uncertainty and injures morale among those who have gone overseas expecting a 3-year tour of duty and now find themselves subject to possible involuntary separation. It would appear to be in the best interests of all that the policies to be followed in this matter be promptly disseminated, and that the program be carried through as expeditiously as possible.

TRAINING

One infantry battalion of the First Division is stationed in Berlin, where, together with a battalion of the constabulary and one battalion of military police, it constitutes our tactical force. This infantry battalion has not been afforded opportunity to rotate with other similar units of the First Division; consequently, while the individual training and discipline are at a high level, it scarcely can be considered fully trained as a divisional unit. It would appear possible, now that the Berlin blockade has been lifted, to replace the battalion concerned with another similar unit in order to provide the personnel better opportunities for combined-arms training.

With respect to the Air Force units in Germany, it may be noted that current directives authorize a maximum of 4 hours flying time per month for combat pilots, and limit the operation of aircraft to those of the type to which the officer is regularly assigned. While the need for economy and efficiency in our military affairs is recognized, I do not believe that 4 hours flying time per month is sufficient to maintain the proficiency of air crews, particularly on high performance or combat-type craft such as fighters. As a temporary measure, such limitations on training may produce economies, but by reducing the readiness of our combat squadrons and pilots they weaken our defenses, and subject the personnel concerned to undue hazards. I recommend that the committee take up with the Secretary of Defense and the Secretary of the Air Force the matter of maintaining real flying proficiency, particularly by those air crews assigned to duties with tactical units in Europe.

EQUIPMENT AND QUARTERS

The equipment of our ground force elements in Europe is generally satisfactory. The standards are those of 1944 or 1945, and the problems of maintenance and repair have required great ingenuity and resourcefulness on the part of the leaders concerned. In general, though, our Army forces have sufficient weapons, transportation, and other equipment to meet their needs. In an effort to maintain in serviceable condition the maximum amount of motor equipment, the Army has taken over and is now operating in the vicinity of Munich a major industrial plant constructed by the Bavarian Motor Works for the manufacture of aircraft engines. There, unserviceable trucks, cars, and jeeps are completely dismantled, inspected, and rebuilt, by the labor of several thousand German workers. Due to the efficient organization of the plant, the skill of the workmen, and the low rates of pay (in comparison to United States industry), as well as the saving of transportation costs, the operations of this plant and others in the United States zone have achieved very substantial economies. Of course, the process of rebuilding and repairing used motor vehicles cannot go on indefinitely, but the Army and particular-

ly the Ordnance Department, deserve the sincere commendation of this committee for the resourcefulness and initiative shown by this operation, and the efficient results obtained.

So far as aircraft equipment was concerned, the only deficiency noted appeared to be at Neubiberg Air Force Base where our most advanced fighter units were still equipped with World War II planes. The reasons for delay in equipping these units with modern jet fighters are not known, unless it be the need for extended runways which are now under construction; but every effort should, in my opinion, be made to provide such units with the newest and best equipment available. This Air Force base is approximately 20 minutes from the Czech frontier and 1 hour from Berlin by air. If they are to perform their mission in combat, the units stationed there should have the very best that American industry can provide in the way of weapons and equipment.

The problem of quarters for officers and enlisted men of our services stationed in Europe is one of unusual gravity. During the last months of the war in Europe, and the first year following, the United States Army took over, by requisition, large numbers of dwellings as billets and quarters. Subsequently, General Clay, in an effort to stabilize the situation and to avoid unnecessary drain on the German economy, discontinued requisitioning and in many areas turned back substantial numbers of quarters to the Germans. The transfer of several staff functions from Berlin to Frankfurt, and more recently to Heidelberg, has produced a severe shortage of family quarters in those areas. Another factor has been the increasing tendency since conditions became more stable for officers and enlisted men to bring their families to Germany. In any event, there is now a serious shortage of family quarters for assignment to Army and Air Force personnel of all grades, with the possible exception of senior general officers. I did not, during this trip, have time or facilities to determine what solution should be reached, but I am convinced that the problem urgently requires more thought and effort on the part of the responsible commanders than it has heretofore received. One minor aspect of the problem is that, due to the interpretation placed upon the definition of dependent parents (under sec. 102g, Public Law 351, 81st Cong.) some officers and enlisted personnel are encouraged to transport overseas parents who could be better cared for in the United States. Such interpretation appears unnecessary and the results are entirely wasteful and injurious. It appears that our Army and Air Force should be required in Germany for a very substantial period in the future. As will be noted in a subsequent paragraph, the Germans have already regained a major portion of their spirit, and if our troops are to be effective they must maintain the dignity and prestige of the United States. In order to do so, and to maintain reasonable morale, those officers and men with families must be provided quarters in the areas where they are stationed. Their presence constitutes a very major addition in the valuable form of the dollar exchange to the German economy; and I believe that economy is now sufficiently recovered to provide shelter for the personnel concerned by means of leases, requisitions, or otherwise, as may be best adapted to each particular location.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY AND ECA

While matters in these fields are more clearly within the purview of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, I believe that the other members of this committee are, like myself, interested in the results which our numerous and very substantial programs of aid have obtained. Since the end of hostilities in Europe, Congress by means of UNNRA, Interim Aid, United Nations Welfare and Relief organizations, funds for the government and relief of occupied areas, loans and credits to Britain, and the Economic Cooperation Act have made available very large sums for the relief, rehabilitation, and recovery of the European economy. According to a Commerce Department report carried in the press on January 3, the United States has laid out nearly $30,000,000,000 in postwar aid to foreign nations, including $3,385,000,000 subscribed to the World Bank and Monetary Fund and $24,802,000,000 in aid furnished directly to foreign countries. I will mention certain specific situations in the various localities in an appendix; but, in general, the following are my impressions and conclusions:

With the exception of Berlin and other industrial cities of Germany, the war damage in western Europe has been largely repaired. Railroads, highways, electric power systems and many industrial plants are back in production.

ECA and similar programs have largely filled the pipe lines and restored inventories. Shipments of foodstuffs, textile fibers, and other raw materials have resulted in a marked increase in business activities; and today the stores in Europe are well stocked with a wide variety of goods and foodstuffs.

Problems of markets for restored western European economy have not been solved. Export business is very limited on most items to other European countries. The amount of imports which this country can absorb is limited.

The problem of payment for food and raw materials imports likewise remains unsolved. Significant amounts of imported foodstuffs are necessary in order to maintain the populations of western Germany, Austria, and Italy. Thus far, the United States Government has shipped large quantities of food and raw materials, some of which were surplus under the domestic-support program to Europe. Whether such programs should be continued without reimbursement is the question for the American people, and the extent to which such activities can be carried out without impairing the solvency and credit of the United States and weakening our economy is a matter which must be determined by the Congress.

It is my own opinion that the economies of western Europe are not, in general, now self-supporting, although the recovery has been amazing. They are well on the mend. And it is also my opinion that the necessary arrangements to achieve that end will not, as anticipated, be effective by 1952. Large-scale efforts to achieve balanced economies in those countries will take the form of future industrialization, leading inevitably to increased competition with our domestic industry and producers, either in the United States market or in overseas areas such as South America. I believe that we must recognize and face the fact that some aid will be required long after 1952; but the amount of such aid should be drastically reduced, starting with the fiscal year beginning July 1, 1950, as it is questionable how long the economy of our country can continue to stand the terrific strain on our finances and resources without finding ourselves in difficulties.

Finally, it must be noted that maintenance of sizable United States military forces in Europe, and the assistance to be furnished, under the military-aid program, will both result in substantial economic benefits to Europe.

CONCLUSIONS

The United States is committed, as a result of the policies and decisions reached during World War II to the maintenance of forces in Europe for a number of years. We likewise find ourselves committed to the economic support of numerous areas where the population exceeds the means of subsistence, until a new European economic system is evolved or export markets become available. Under such conditions, it is imperative that all possible measures be taken to maintain and increase the morale, efficiency, and prestige of our limited military forces. It is likewise essential that the programs for European aid, whether in the form of loans, economic aid, or otherwise, be scaled down to a level which the United States can support.

DETAILED NOTES AND OBSERVATIONS BY PARTICULAR LOCALITIES

Westover Air Force Base, Mass.

This base, located near Chicopee Falls, Mass., is the United States terminal for MATS Atlantic flights, and serves as a general port of aerial embarkation. The strength at this base is almost 6,000, including some 670 Navy personnel. There are very few permanent buildings on the base—a few hangars, a photo laboratory, four sets of officers' quarters, and four sets of noncommissioned officers' quarters. There are projected, and under way, 750 sets of family quarters to be constructed under the provision of Public Law 211, Eighty-first Congress (Wherry housing bill). While this amount of construction will assist in developing the base, additional permanent construction is urgently needed. Maintenance and operation of temporary wartime-type buildings, particularly in the climatic conditions prevailing, is neither economical nor efficient.

Lagens, Azores

This base is an important installation in our military air-transportation service for any ferrying operations between the United States and Europe. However, quarters and buildings are still of a very temporary nature, inadequate for permanent use, particularly at this important station. If the United States is to maintain an air base at this location, appropriate steps should be taken immediately to provide permanent quarters and, so far as possible, a dependable water supply.

Frankfurt

Maj. Gen. George W. Hayes, deputy to Mr. John J. McCloy, concerning the economic problems of Germany, pointed out that west Germany would be in a favorable position if markets for its products could be made available. Western Germany faces two major difficulties: The first is markets for manufactured goods, and the second, sources of food and raw materials, within western Europe, or otherwise available to them. Concerning the problem of refugees from Russian-dominated areas of Europe, General Hayes estimated that these persons are still arriving from East Germany and Communist-dominated countries at the rate of approximately 100,000 per month. While General Hayes regarded this matter as a German problem, it is apparent that the addition of such large numbers of persons in an area already overcrowded and short of housing and employment, constitutes a serious economic burden.

So far as the ECA counterpart funds are concerned, Germany has been relatively slow to develop plans for submission concerning their use. However, this delay is being overcome and will in the future diminish.

Berlin

As a result of conference with Maj. Gen. Maxwell D. Taylor, and inspection of various areas and units the following was developed:

(a) The situation with Russia is less tense than it was a year ago.

(b) Berlin is suffering a severe depression, due to the fact that sales from western zones of that city to the surrounding Russian area are almost impossible so long as the west German mark is worth approximately 6 east marks. Furthermore, the dismantling and stripping of industrial plants by Russia, immediately following the termination of hostilities, has required the use of improvised

or old equipment which is less efficient than the relatively modern machines in the west zone. As a consequence, there are now unemployed in Berlin some 250,000 workers, constituting 25 percent of the employable populace.

(c) A visit to a battalion of the Sixteenth Infantry located in Berlin and commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Barker, indicated that individual training is now carried out in Grunewald. There is no rotation with similar units in the United States zone. Most of the battalion's enlisted personnel are very young soldiers, only 10 percent having served during World War II. The barracks and quarters in this unit were very good.

(d) The Seven Hundred and Fifty-ninth Military Police Battalion in Berlin is commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Lancer. This unit is responsible for supervising the police in the United States sector of Berlin, and for negotiating with the Russians concerning incidents and arrests involving United States personnel. Within this military police battalion, there is always available one alert company with a minimum strength of 100 men, capable of being mobilized and ready to move within 20 minutes. Lieutenant Colonel Lancer stated that the number of incidents with Russian forces has decreased during the past several months, but they still picked up quite a few Americans for interrogation or information if found within their zone. This battalion and its equipment made an excellent appearance, but there are too many young, inexperienced soldiers assigned for duties requiring mature judgment.

(e) A constabulary battalion, commanded by Lieutenant Colonel Prunty, is the other major United States tactical force in Berlin. This unit is equipped with light reconnaissance vehicles and guns, and make a very good appearance.

(f) A visit to the refugee reception center at Anhalter Bunker, where political refugees from the eastern zone and Communist countries are received, showed that the Germans are endeavoring to meet this problem with their limited facilities and resources. The refugees themselves present a pitiable sight, having mostly only ragged clothing on their backs and giving every evidence of having been terrified before or during their flight to the western zone.

(g) In general, the western sectors of Berlin present a hopeless economic picture. People there are definitely less prosperous than those in the western zones of Germany. There has been some reconstruction, mostly minor repairs, but the future of this area is far from clear. The municipal government is unable to meet the problems of mass unemployment and depression by any means available to it; and no solution was suggested other than continued United States aid. We cannot abandon 2,250,000 people—a considerable number of whom would be marked for liquidation—to Russia; but there is no early termination to the need for United States assistance; i. e., support.

Vienna, Austria

The briefing at this headquarters, conducted by Mr. Ashenese, was very informative and excellently handled.

There is more consciousness in the military headquarters in Austria of the need of efficiency and economy than in many other places. Careful studies have been made as to the most economical methods of carrying out our missions in that country, and those responsible deserve great credit.

With the United States aid, including that under ECA, the Austrian economy has made considerable recovery, and production has increased markedly from 1946 levels. Nevertheless, the requisitions by Russians in the eastern zone of the country constitute a heavy burden.

At conferences with Chaplain (Rabbi) Lipschutz and General Woods of the IRO concerning displaced persons and refugees, it was manifest that very few potential immigrants eligible for admission in the United States remain in Austria. Only the hard core who would not be eligible for admission, even if vacancies were available, are left.

Despite the spirited and efficient efforts of the Army and the Department of State, in the rehabilitation of Austria and the recovery thus far achieved, the future of that country as an independent nation, it would seem, depends on continued United States subsidies. Austria lost her empire in World War I, and is now located within the Russian orbit. While United States funds for economic recovery will alleviate distress, they can scarcely alter the basic situation. The Russians have taken over the Danube River shipping, and control the only oil field in that country, which they are exploiting in a manner which is certain to reduce its life. From the oil production, they take a significant proportion prior to refining and a large output from the refineries. They also requisition substantial amounts of wheat and beet sugar. In addition, they claim an extraterritorial status for a number of industries and plants as German assets. The relative amounts of Russian acquisitions as compared to United States aid is not known; but I fail to see how we can ever place that country on its feet, no matter how much money we pour in, so long as the present drain continues.

Munich

This city is being rebuilt at a rapid rate and with great energy. Construction work is in progress in every quarter and significant results are being achieved. The countryside around Munich appears to be prosperous and the farms look in excellent condition with well-tilled fields and buildings in a good state of maintenance.

So far as military units are concerned, there are several important Army and Air Force installations in this vicinity. There is an acute shortage of quarters for families, as discussed in the main body of this report and immediate action should be taken to alleviate the housing shortage.

At Garmish, Partinkurken, the Army operates a large recreational center with a capacity of 200 officers and 750 enlisted men. This worth-while activity is a self-supporting establishment, the cost being provided from nonappropriated funds or assessed against those participating in the use of the facilities.

While in Munich, the undersigned at regional headquarters of the United States Displaced Persons Commission talked with Mr. Main, formerly of Immigration and Naturalization Service, and Mr. Taylor and Mr. Young, who work in that office. This agency is charged with screening and processing prospective immigrants under special legislation enacted for the relief of displaced persons. According to information gained, the general administration of this law has been markedly improved during the past few months, following the visit of Commissioner Carrusi, but there still remain a significant number of eligible refugees. The requirements of the Displaced Persons Act concerning the proportion of farmers and farm laborers pose some difficulties; and it is hard to find sponsors for potential employment for professional men, such as doctors, lawyers, etc., many of whom are of high type and would make valuable citizens of the United States, even if they are required to accept employment in less-skilled fields.

Rome

Conference with Mr. Dayton, acting ECA chief in Italy concerning the program in that country developed that to date progress has been largely in the fields of agricultural aid and reclamation. The United States has assisted Italy by approximately $2,000,000,000 of aid, since the war, of which ECA has spent $700,000,000. In addition, that agency has a program for approximately $500,000,000 more. Real progress has been made in agricultural rehabilitation and reclamation, but industrial equipment has been slow to arrive. So far as the rehabilitation or recovery from war damages is concerned, the ECA program in Italy is about concluded. If further improvement is to be made in fostering Italian economic plans, it must be through broadened and expanded markets in other European countries, or overseas. Mr. Dayton has an excellent grasp of the economic and political difficulties involved and realizes the obstacles in the way of European integration. He is of the opinion that such unification should be carried out now while the United States economic aid is available. There are now some 2,000,000 unemployed persons in Italy out of a labor force of twenty to twenty-five million, and, in addition, industries are carrying a million more without real need or justification. The result is, of course, high costs of production resulting in high prices and limited export markets. On the other hand, Italy has a chronic food deficiency which can only be met by imports.

While visiting the office of the military attaché of the United States Embassy, the undersigned had a very interesting conference with Lt. Col. John F. Franklin, member of the survey team outlining the military-assistance program for several European countries. While plans were just getting under way, Lieutenant Colonel Franklin advised they contemplated an Army, Navy, and Air Force team in each country under command of a general or colonel who will be responsible to the chief of the mission (generally a State Department employee). Each military staff will have sections for training and logistics. The State Department chief of mission handling this program in each country will work with the ECA representatives and political advisers to the Ambassador.

The highest organization of the military-assistance program is extremely complicated; and I entertain serious doubts whether such a complex organization can be sufficiently flexible to meet changing requirements in time of peace, let alone tactical problems in event of an emergency.

Paris

During the few days available in Paris the undersigned had the privilege of an extended conference with Gen. deLattre de Tassigny, formerly chief of staff of the French Army and now commander of the ground forces, under Field Marshal Montgomery, for the western European powers. In response to questions concerning the status of the French Army and plans for a unified force, General deLattre outlined the history of reconstruction of French forces during the postwar period. At the end of World War II, French forces comprised some 12 divisions, largely deriving logistical support from United States and British sources. Following the end of hostilities, the French Army command was faced with the difficult problem of integrating various diverse and hostile groups—prewar French forces who had largely been taken prisoners in 1940—the resistance group or maquis who had carried on guerrilla warfare against the Germans, and the colonial forces from Africa who had participated in the liberation of France. It was necessary to allay the suspicions and hostilities of these various groups, meet minimum needs without adequate financial support, and improve the general caliber of the officers' corps.

In this conference General deLattre stressed the problem of French Indochina which he described as a key spot. It appears that the best French officers and troops have been sent to that area in an effort to hold it against native occupancy and Communist infiltration. According to the general, there

is a shortage of new and serviceable equipment, particularly tanks and motor vehicles.

With regard to the western European army, General deLattre stressed that it would require work, strength, and confidence. He stated that the French will have an army which, together with the available British and Belgium forces, will provide the basis for a strong ground force. He expressed his personal pleasure at the participation of the Italians in such force, and stated that he would also like to have the Spanish infantry, which he described as very good. As for equipment, he emphasized the need for United States supplies, which he says should be strictly modern and ready for employment. Otherwise the delays and costs involved in the conversion would negate the anticipated benefits. In regard to the staff organization under the military-assistance program, my conclusions from talking with General deLattre were that there were too many large international committees of political, military, and fiscal experts to permit rapid and decisive action.

It was a distinct pleasure to talk with an experienced military leader who clearly recognized the difficulties facing the Western Powers, but who is determined to carry out the job of organizing and equipping a modern ground army. Whether the United States can or should assist Indochina is beyond my knowledge. I do agree with the general that whatever military equipment is furnished western Europe should be of the most modern type and fully serviceable. Any other course will involve a waste of money for processing, and shipment, and a loss of confidence on the part of those furnished such material.

The undersigned also had the pleasure of a conference with Mr. Averell Harriman, American Ambassador in charge of ECA affairs in Europe. Mr. Harriman feels that the ECA has fulfilled its essential objectives, and that the major problem now remaining is the integration of the separate and conflicting European economies into a single system. It is further his opinion that an essential element of such European integration is the incorporation of Germany into the western European economy. Regardless of my personal views on other aspects of European economic matters, I am in thorough accord with this last statement.

L. H. GAVIN.

Federal Housing Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered over Station WHAM, Rochester, N. Y., on February 6, 1950:

Yes, I believe that Congress should pass an enlarged Federal housing program.

We Americans like to think of the typical home as a vine-clad cottage, with roses growing on trellises, and trees and grass in the yard; and with all this we associate the pleasing and lively sounds of healthy children at play. It is one of the glories of America that so many of our homes are of that kind—or, at least, equally attractive.

But it is one of our moral, political, and economic responsibilities to do something to lift more homes at least to the minimum level for satisfactory living. The 15,000,000 or more Americans who live in blighted areas are not inferior to the rest of us. They are only less fortunate. Imagine how you would feel if you and your family were housed as they are. Trouble does not come from men who are living agreeable lives. It breeds among men who are frustrated, ashamed, and envious.

Congress is at last recognizing one of the most crying needs of the American people. In both the House and Senate the best brains of both parties are combining to push through a housing measure which, in its broad outlines, will represent one of the most solid achievements of the Eighty-first Congress.

The impressive cost of the low-rent housing program loses much of its impact when one considers what the measure offers in the way of results. Some 810,000 dwelling units will be built by local housing authorities in the next 6 years with the aid of Government subsidies.

Equally important the measure provides for a 5-year plan to raze some of the Nations disgraceful slums and a broad farm-housing program, an aspect of the housing program or problem that frequently has been overlooked in the emphasis on urban needs.

To applaud the passage of the housing bills does not necessarily mean that one feels the problem has now been solved and all that remains is to sit back and watch slums tumble down and edifices rise up in the wake of an avalanche of Federal dollars. Indeed, the Senate has demonstrated its desire to solidify an extended housing program by passing additional legislation designed to stimulate the construction of privately owned homes. This it plans to do by increasing the amount of money that may be used by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to advance on secondary real-estate mortgages.

It is a victory for the people who have long been demanding better roofs over their heads and now seem likely to get it.

Federal aid in providing decent housing is not an issue of Big Republicanism versus Big Democracy. It is an issue on which the two parties should have got together long ago.

Housing is an issue that both Houses of Congress should be interested in. Senator TAFT, one of the administration's arch foes on other measures, is in complete agreement with the housing program. In fact, Senator TAFT got a similar bill through the Senate in the Eightieth Congress, but the House refused to pass it. The fact that thoughtful legislators favor this program and have helped to shape it on the basis of a careful study of the situation may be taken as evidence that its critics have exaggerated its potential weaknesses and overlooked the strong points in its favor. The strongest of these points is the simple fact that during the past decades blighted areas have grown more blighted and the construction of new low-cost housing has lagged far behind our population increase of 17,000,000 since 1940.

Proposed housing bills and those already passed will have an economically and socially wholesome effect on the future life of the Nation. A large number of builders and real-estate men have bitterly opposed housing but their arguments have been based on false premises.

Housing programs as authorized by the Federal Government will result in a good deal of healthy progress, during the next few decades, in a field where there is certainly a very clear need for construction on an extensive scale.

Critics of the bill hold that it will lead to far-reaching Federal intervention in local affairs; that private industry can meet the current demand without Government help; that the program will endanger free enterprise in the field, and that it is not only economically unsound but also socialistic. Rather the law carefully assigns the dominant role to the localities; that private industry is definitely unable to do the job all by itself; and the whole undertaking, far from being socialistic or a menace to free enterprise, represents a wise long-range investment promising to pay rich dividends in terms of contracts for independent builders and enduring social betterment for a large segment of the population. It will provide Americans with good homes at prices they can afford, that will give builders a fair but not an exorbitant profit, that will keep things on an even keel so that there will be work for those employed in the forests, in the mines, in the mills, in the factories, on freight trains and trucks that produce and bring the materials that go into the final product of the home.

Housing, may I repeat, is a long-range policy under which the Government will help local communities. It is a policy that is sound and practical even though it may have to be inaugurated on a small scale compared to the need.

Socialism is not the issue though this may be the cry of housing opponents. Americans have never regarded it as socialism to aid families who, by reason of misfortune or low income are forced to live in squalor or unhealthful environment. Housing is predicated on the belief that private enterprise should provide housing for all the families that it can possibly serve. Beyond its reach, however, are vast slum areas that must be wiped out by governmental effort to save our cities from an incredible burden of crime, delinquency, disease, and social malaise. Our highly integrated society cannot neglect this problem without risking its own health and stability.

I would favor solving the housing problem by private effort if it could be done that way. But since it cannot, I think the National Government must do it. When the soil resources of this Nation were threatened by erosion, the National Government properly set to work to save them. It must act similarly when human resources are threatened. The situation is badly out of control and will speedily grow worse if all building is left to private enterprise or capital. Only a major operation can handle this problem and only the National Government can perform that operation.

We have seen some wonderful illustrations of private enterprise at work. But, to assure a reasonable profit, homes had to be so high as to create other problems of congestion. This must be recognized and must be solved through and with the assistance of the Government.

The apparent cost of an enlarged housing program will run into millions, but the benefits will be inestimable. It is not an investment in the narrow sense. It is an investment in American ways of living, and in ever-rising American aspirations. It is an investment in social and political stability. It is an investment in the fundamental resource of this free country—the people.

I feel that our Government has been dangerously slow in recognizing that decent housing is a basic necessity for the public welfare. There is no sense in waiting longer, because it is now plain that only governmental aid can solve this national problem.

The Creeping Shadow of Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I am glad to insert an address made recently by Mr. George E. Stringfellow, vice president of the Edison Industries and a prominent citizen of New Jersey, before the young-man-of-the-year award dinner given by the Camden County Chamber of Commerce, on the subject, The Creeping Shadow of Socialism.

This is a timely address and I hope that every Member of Congress will take the opportunity to read it.

THE CREEPING SHADOW OF SOCIALISM

"Cherish public credit and avoid the accumulation of debt," said George Washington in his Farewell Address. Let's see how well we have followed this advice.

The total debt of this Nation 18 years ago was less than $20,000,000,000. By June 30, 1951, the President tells us it will have reached $264,000,000,000. The annual cost of running the Government has increased from $5,000,000,000, 18 years ago, to approximately $50,000,000,000 today. The President has consistently underestimated Government expenditures. For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1950, the President budgeted a deficit of $900,000,000. This deficit will probably exceed $6,000,000,000. He has budgeted a deficit of $5,500,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1951. This deficit can conceivably reach $10,000,000,000. The debt, therefore, may appreciably exceed $264,000,000,000 by June of next year.

The budget of this Nation has been balanced but once in 20 years. It was balanced by the Eightieth Congress, which the President said was the second worst in the Nation's history. Its successor, the Eighty-first, which the President has characterized as the best, has authorized the expenditure of more money than any other peacetime Congress in our history. President Truman gives us no assurance when we will stop the accumulation of debt or when the budget will be balanced. He predicts it will be balanced when the income of the Nation is greatly increased over what it is today.

If our business were in the red and we told our directors we couldn't do anything about it until sales increased, they would likely say, "Cut your costs or we will find new management." I think that is exactly what we must tell our Government through our elected representatives.

"Any government, like any family, can for a year spend a little more than it earns," said Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1932 when the Government was spending a little more than it was earning. "But," he continued, "you and I know that a continuation of that habit means the poorhouse."

Poorhouse for a government means inflation. Inflation means dictatorship. When a corporation gets into financial difficulties, the courts appoint a receiver and either it is liquidated, or, if there are enough assets left, the corporation is reorganized, new officers are elected, and the corporation often becomes a going concern again.

When a government gets into financial difficulty, there is no court to appoint a receiver. A self-appointed dictator usually arises and takes over. The people lose their liberties, their savings, and their property. Their way of life is prescribed by the dictator. History shows that this has always happened when a government habitually spends more than it takes in. Uncontrollable inflation has always followed and it always will.

It was inflation that produced Mussolini; it was inflation that produced Hitler; it was inflation that produced Stalin and if continued is certain to produce a similar dictator in America.

When leaving Independence Hall in the late afternoon of September 17, 1787, following the signing of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin was asked by an unknown woman, "Dr. Franklin, what have we got?" The wise old man replied, "We have a republic—if we can keep it!"

If we are to keep our republic, we must avoid inflation; if we are to avoid inflation, I repeat that we must tell our governments—State and National—through our elected Representatives, to stop spending more than they take in. That is your responsibility and it is mine. If we do not discharge it, we will be derelict in our duties as citizens and should not complain about the consequences.

The cash-in value of all the life-insurance policies in this country is $44,000,000,000. This would run the Federal Government, at its present rate of expenditures, for 10½ months.

Twenty years ago the total cost of the Federal Government was about two-thirds of the total income of the citizens of the State of California. Today the cost of Federal Government is equal to the total income of the citizens of every State west of the Mississippi except Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri, Iowa and 11 percent of Minnesota; and as long as it continues to increase, it will continue, like a creeping shadow, until it reaches Maine; our entire Republic will then have been engulfed by state socialism. This creeping shadow of socialism should concern every American citizen who values his liberty and his way of life.

The difference between capitalism and socialism is one of principle. The difference between socialism and communism is one of degree. Capitalism produces things for people to divide; socialism divides the products of capitalism, and when there is nothing left to divide, chaos reigns and communism takes over.

One of the things which is spreading the socialistic shadow consists of the large grants we have made and are making to foreign countries. For example, since World War I we have given Britain $44,000,000,000. Since World War II we have given other foreign countries $33,000,000,000; yet the outpour continues. Much of this money, we are told, was given to fight communism. Since World War II we have given Communist Russia $440,000,000 and her satellite Poland, $480,000,000. This, of course, has had a tendency to strengthen communism at its base at the expense of the American taxpayer. At the time we were aiding Russia and Poland with grants, we gave Greece over $600,000,000 with which to fight communism. We recently purchased rye from Poland thus aiding her economy. We have in this country a great surplus of rye which we don't know what to do with.

In a recent radio broadcast, Sir David Maxwell Fyfe, a conservative and former attorney general told British working men that without American financial aid, there would be 1,500,000 unemployed in Britain.

Our State Department, with the President's approval, appears to have advanced the interests of the Communists in China more rapidly than Molotov or Stalin could have done had they been left alone. General Marshall, a great general but anything but a diplomat, did much to undermine Chiang Kai-shek and help communism to engulf China and weaken our prestige and influence in Asia.

In speaking over the radio the other day, Clement Attlee, Prime Minister of Britain's Socialist Government, said that in general his Government was doing nothing in a social manner or in an economic manner that the Truman government is not doing in this country. The difference is, of course, that Truman calls his socialistic activities Fair Deal while in England they call theirs socialism. It's a distinction without a difference. Winston Churchill recently said that the difference between Truman and Attlee is that Truman has a Florida tan and is smooth shaven while Attlee is anemic and has a little moustache.

The drive for socialized medicine continues in this country despite the fact that we have the best hospital system in the world, despite the fact that our health is better than ever before, despite the fact that the lives of our people have increased about 20 percent over the last quarter of a century, and despite the fact that all of this has been accomplished on a voluntary, private-charity basis.

Sixty years ago, someone asked James Russell Lowell, United States Minister to the Court of St. James's, "Dr. Lowell, how long will the American Republic endure?" Lowell responded, "As long as the ideals of the men who made it continue dominant."

Those who would socialize our people, destroy their initiative, and confiscate their wealth through taxes, are not imbued with the ideals of the men who made America.

"Our representatives in Trenton and Washington will not save us from socialism unless we can stimulate our citizens to understand, to act, and demand that our representatives throw overboard all socialized principles and return to those of our founding fathers," said former United States Senator from New Jersey, Albert W. Hawkes.

Our representatives in our National and State capitols want to hold their jobs. They will be responsive to the will of the majority. Have you registered your will with them?

"It is not the duty of the Government to support the people," said Grover Cleveland. "It is the duty of the people to support the Government."

There are so many large groups of people receiving benefits from the Government today in one way or another that it is extremely difficult for them to vote on the merits of the issues presented at the polls. Many of them fear that they run the risk of losing, directly or indirectly, their grants or subsidies. Then, too, the Federal pay roll has grown so large that in many States it has a tremendous influence on the outcome of elections.

Twenty years ago there were approximately 600,000 employees on the Federal pay rolls. Today there are more than 2,000,000.

The administration did everything it could to bring about the election of LEHMAN as United States Senator from New York and to defeat Dulles, who opposed socialism. There is little doubt that a large majority of the 183,000 Federal employees in New York voted for LEHMAN, the "welfare stater," who defeated Dulles by about 183,000 votes.

* * * * *

The pay roll of Federal employees is continually growing. If we reduce the cost of Government, these pay rolls will be reduced, thus correspondingly reducing their influence on elections, especially their use to elect men who, unlike our founding fathers, are less interested in the public welfare than in perpetuating themselves in office at the taxpayers' expense.

Our form of government, as conceived by our founding fathers, was something to live under. It was motivated and controlled by the citizens. It was a servant of the citizens. Millions today seem to think it is something to live on—a vehicle intended for a free ride.

May I cite an example of free rides in two directions at the same time. The United States Department of Agriculture is engaged in two expensive programs which are basically contradictory. It employed $3,148,500,000 of the taxpayers' money during the first 10 months of last year on a program to take foodstuffs off the market and store them in warehouses and caves, where they are rotting or being given away. This program did three things:

1. Kept the cost of living fictitiously high;
2. Increased national debt; and
3. Exhausted national wealth.

The purpose of this program is to get the farmers' votes.

On the other hand, the Agriculture Department is spending hundreds of millions of dollars a year to increase the farmer's yield per acre, thus tending to aggravate the very problem which the first-mentioned program was designed to correct.

The Brannan farm plan would let the price of farm products fall to their natural competitive levels. This is intended to appease the consumers and get their votes. The Brannan plan would tax you and me to provide the funds to make up the difference between what the farmers receive for their produce in the market and what the politician determines they should receive for it. It has been suggested that the housewife would pay the market price and the husband would pay in hidden taxes the difference between the market price and that determined by the politician. This plan is designed to please the consumer and the farmer and hoodwink the taxpayer.

No one knows what the Brannan Plan would cost, not even Brannan. That appears not to interest the Fair Dealers. They are interested in the farmers' votes, much more than in what it may cost you and me and future generations in dollars or in the fact that it gives further impetus to the creeping cloud of socialism.

The politicians have not cherished public credit nor have they avoided the accumulation of debt as urged by the Father of our Country.

It is the duty of the individual citizen to lift his voice above the self-serving, conniving politicians and force them to cut extravagances, force them to balance budgets, stop further inflation before it is too late, and thus preserve our way of life.

"Duty," said Robert E. Lee, "is the sublimest word in our language. Do your duty in all things," charged this great patriot. "You cannot do more, you should never wish to do less."

The times call for men in public office of:

"Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and willing hands;
Men whom the lust of office does not kill;
Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy;
Men who possess opinions and a will;
Men who have honor, men who will not lie;
Men who will stand before a demagogue and damn his treacherous flatteries without winking;
Tall men, suncrowned, who live above the fog
In public duty and in private thinking."

It is your duty and it is my duty to ferret out such men, urge them to seek office and, once they are in office, to support them. In no other way can we serve America, and thus roll back the creeping cloud of socialism.

Lutheran Day Schools in Western New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, a great deal has been said of the tremendous influence for good which has been made by religious groups of all denominations in connection with the education of our young Americans.

Among the foremost in New York State is the Lutheran School Association of Erie County, the territory of which encompasses my hometown, Buffalo. This association occupies a respected and unique place in our community and has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the church and schools groups of various denominations in western New York.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Courier-Express of January 30, 1950, which discusses the possibility of expanding the Lutheran day schools in western New York:

SCHOOLS' LACK OF RELIGION POINTED OUT—LUTHERAN EDUCATION DISCUSSED AT RALLY

To discuss possible expansion of Lutheran day schools here, a rally sponsored by the Lutheran School Association of Erie County was conducted yesterday in the First Lutheran School, 427 Goodyear Avenue. About 275 persons, representing 20 churches, attended the affair.

The principal speaker was Vernon H. Koehler, principal of the east end Lutheran school in Pittsburgh, who said, "Democracy cannot function without religion * * * but democracy at the present time is not making adequate provisions for religion in education."

Discussing the purpose of Lutheran schools, he stressed the fact they "inculcate a Christian philosophy of life and since Christianity is not a mere acquisition of knowledge but is a way of thinking, living, and interpreting all life, therefore there can be no such thing as a secular subject."

The speaker said the curriculum of Lutheran schools is of the best available, comparable to that in any school system anywhere.

He maintained the curriculum of Lutheran schools "is patterned after, although not identical with, the curriculum used in Buffalo public schools. The difference in the curriculum of Lutheran schools is that it is Bible and Christ-centered."

"The Lutheran day school is an agency of the Lutheran Church to promote the heritage of the Reformation," he said. "The great reformer, Martin Luther, wrote a language, advocated schools and penned textbooks for the propagation of the divine truths he rediscovered.

"Luther's educational conclusions were a natural outgrowth of his knowledge, faith, and gratitude to God. Luther was truly a steward of the truth he found. The Lutheran churches in Buffalo are endeavoring to carry out their stewardship responsibilities through the establishment of the Christian day school."

Speakers during the afternoon session included Orville W. Richter, principal, First Lutheran School, who discussed phases of school management and control; the Reverend Oswald A. Waech, pastor of Gethsemane Lutheran Church; Dr. William J. Weinbach, school board member, and Robert J. Schutrum, school board member and church legal counsel.

HIGH SCHOOL DISCUSSED

During the evening meeting, the Reverend Bertwin L. Frey, pastor of Bethany Lutheran Church, declared the time is not ripe for the establishment of a Lutheran high school.

He pointed out that before a high school is created there should be an elementary school enrollment of about 700 pupils "which would give us a potential high-school enrollment of about 200 pupils." Present elementary school enrollment totals about 300 for the area, he added.

Other evening speakers included the Reverend Ernest E. Heuer, secretary of parish education, eastern district, Missouri synod, and Arthur E. Will, school board chairman. The Reverend Walter E. Succop, pastor of St. Andrew's Lutheran Church, was moderator.

Keep America Free

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD T. MILLER
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the address of Hon. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., minority leader of the United States House of Representatives, before the Advertising Club of Baltimore, at the Emerson Hotel, Baltimore, Wednesday, February 1, 1950:

I am honored by your invitation to review with you today the state of the deficit.

I am delighted to come here with my good friend and your able Congressman, TED MILLER. Congressmen BEALL and FALLON are detained because of an important committee meeting affecting Maryland.

As a newspaper publisher, it is always a pleasure for me to get together with advertising people. Nobody realizes better than a publisher how much the advertising fraternity contributes to the general welfare.

How many times I have wished in my reflections in Washington that we might somehow harness all the wonderful skills, energy, and genius of the advertising clubs throughout the country in the great battle that is now being waged for solvency and constructive order in Federal administration.

This battle being fought in Congress may well determine the future, not only of our own country, but the free world as well. The importance of this struggle is why we must have the united support of all people—Republicans, Democrats, and Independents alike.

This country must continue to be free; it must continue to function under the constitutional requirements of three separate and independent branches of government. It must continue as a nation with an honest dollar and a people who will continue to pay their debts and obligations with an honest dollar.

A new session of Congress is under way.

Although these grave issues confront the country, both in the realm of domestic affairs and foreign relations, this new session thus far has not indicated a firm sense of direction. Beyond the fact that we face another deficit of more than five billions for the new fiscal year there is not much to be said with certainty of the Eighty-first Congress.

There is the annual demand for more taxes, and yet more taxes.

But there is also a growing determination in Congress to put the brakes on Government spending. We on the Republican side—and many fine, patriotic Democrats in both the House and Senate—insist that the American people and American business are already heavily overburdened with taxes. We contend that economies in Government—through elimination of waste, extravagance, and duplicating functions—is the true American way to a balanced budget at this time.

There are limits to how much the Government may spend. There are limits to the amount of taxes which safely may be extracted from the national economy. There

are limits to the percentage of personal incomes which can be diverted to government for new ventures in state socialism.

This year of 1950 affords a challenging turning point in history. The first half of the fabulous and war-torn twentieth century leaves the whole world with a staggering legacy of debt. We have seen two world wars in a single generation. Some Democrats say we shall all be paying the bill for at least another hundred years. Some say it will never be paid as the future generations will be frustrated in their better aspirations through the yoke of this big debt.

As we look forward to this hundred years or more of debt, let us also look back the same span of years and renew our vision of the America that was—the America which was the light of the world before the present era of bureaucratic domination.

Just 100 years ago, in 1850, President Zack Taylor reported the total national debt at the very modest figure of $63,500,000.

That was a debt of $2.85 for every man, woman, and child in the United States.

But today our national debt is $258,000,000,000, which means $1,800 for every man, woman, and child.

Today the average American family of four owes $7,200 as its share of the Federal debt.

In 1850 there were 33,000 Federal employees in the entire civil service. Today there are more than 2,000,000 Federal workers, not counting the Army, Navy, or Air Force. And worst of all, we are still trying to think of new ways to add to the burdens the people must carry.

In 1850 the Post Office Department reported a surplus of $370,000. Today we face a postal deficit of more than $500,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

Big government is the real challenge before us today.

Big government takes more than 27 cents from every dollar of income we can earn.

Big government saddles upon the people a gigantic bureaucracy of regulations and controls, and these new instruments of public power are the stepping stones to the police state, the state which governs by the old creed of tax and tax, spend and spend.

Such is the real significance of our new Federal budget—a budget which calls for more than $42,000,000,000 of Government spending in Washington in the 1951 fiscal year.

During the last 21 years, there have been only two balanced budgets reported out of Washington. They were for the fiscal years 1947 and 1948—the 2 years in which Republican majorities were in control of the House and Senate.

It was a Republican Congress—the Eightieth—which passed the last income-tax reduction—the bill which was vetoed three times before it became law.

I make the prediction today that that tax reduction will stand for many years as the last income-tax reduction enacted by an American Congress.

The planners are now off on another wild-spending spree. In the three fiscal years 1949 1950, and 1951, by their own figures, they will run up a combined deficit of more than $13,000,000,000. And this at a time when tax collections are the highest in the peacetime history of the Nation.

If we cannot live within our income now, what will happen if the tragedy of a depression should hit us.

More than a year ago we presented in the House a bill to repeal and reduce many of the wartime excise and nuisance taxes. These rates were imposed to retard sales and to drive manufacturing into essential wartime production. The principal argument for these excessive rates vanished with the end of hostilities. They should be repealed without delay.

This bill would have taken $700,000,000 a year from the Washington spenders and returned it to the people to spend for themselves.

There is a curious theory developing these days in Washington. The thinkers and planners tell us that if the Government spends one of your dollars, that's good, but if you spend the same dollar yourself, that's bad. If you spend your own dollar, that helps make inflation. But if the Government spends the same dollar from your pay envelope before you ever see it, that's not inflation.

Let me remind you that Canada, our good neighbor to the north, already has cut back her wartime excise taxes.

Canada already has repealed the wartime tax on transportation. We still pay 15 percent.

Canada already has repealed the tax on amusements and admissions. We still pay 20 percent.

Canada also has repealed the wartime taxes on telephone charges; reduced the taxes on jewelry by more than half; cut back the taxes on cosmetics by more than half; reduced the tax on luggage, hand bags, fountain pens, and many other items.

And all of this is on top of three different reductions in the Canadian income taxes since the end of the war.

The personal exemption from income taxes in Canada today is $1,000 per person, against $600 in this country. Yet Canada, in spite of its tax reductions, reported a surplus of $87,000,000 at the end of its last fiscal year.

We could do the same. The removal of these excises would not cost the Treasury a single penny. They would stimulate business, put millions of people to work. Through income taxes from happy, prosperous, busy workers, we would gain revenue and at the same time, reduce spending for unemployment.

The serious budget problem is one far beyond the recriminations of narrow partisanship.

There are many influential Democrats all over the country who support the Republican demand for an honestly balanced Federal budget—a budget to give the American people the kind of government they want at a cost they can afford to pay.

Let me quote just one of these Democrats—Chairman CLARENCE CANNON, of Missouri, the chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. In the House on January 9 this year Chairman CANNON reviewed the budget submitted by his fellow Missourian in these grave terms—

"From every technical and statistical point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

And Senator WALTER F. GEORGE, of Georgia, the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, has said—

"Canada is moving in the right direction. We can and must follow a similar path."

There is obviously a broad common ground upon which men and women of all parties can meet to enforce policies of prudence and common sense in the administration of the Federal business. That broad common ground is the ground of old-fashioned American patriotism—a sense of loyalty and devotion to America and her cherished institutions of freedom.

We must not permit reckless men and irresponsible policies to drag America into the treacherous paths of stateism.

One reason for our confused financial situation in Washington is that there is division and conflict in the highest councils of Government. The President's advisers are at war with themselves. The Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Nourse, resigned several months ago because, as he stated publicly, he could not go along on another round of deficit financing, higher prices, more taxes, and more governmental controls.

Let no one be deceived that he stands to gain by the inflation program now clearly mapped out for this mighty Nation.

It is true that we are promised an income of $12,000 for each family by the year 2000—50 years forward.

But did President Truman mention what the dollar would be worth in buying power by the year 2000?

He did not.

Maybe he doesn't know.

But he does know that today's dollar buys only 60 cents worth of goods as measured in 1939 purchasing power, and less than 30 cents worth of goods as measured in the purchasing power of the year 1900.

If the purchasing power of the American dollar falls off as much in the next 50 years as it has in the last 50, it will be worth about 18 cents. Then the $12,000 income for each family will represent $2,160 in 1939 purchasing power.

We must beware of the economic narcotic of inflation.

So much for the problem of red ink in Washington.

Let us now explore, in our friendly, informal way, the problem of the red herring.

The red herring is a special White House dish—served up by press and radio whenever a protected Communist or fellow traveler unexpectedly falls into the hands of the law.

When a committee of the House reported in the summer of 1948 that vital State Department documents had been stolen, microfilmed, and delivered to couriers for transmission to Moscow—that was a red herring.

When some of the microfilmed documents were discovered on a Maryland farm, in a hollow pumpkin shell—several weeks after the 1948 election—that was more red herring.

When the FBI reported to Congress in 1943 that there were more than 2,600 persons on the Federal pay roll whose loyalty was open to question, that was the beginning of the red-herring era.

Nevertheless I feel that there is a real sentiment in America in support of the proposition that we should root out the Communists and fellow travelers who now frustrate and sabotage operations within the very structure of the Federal Government itself.

The Eightieth Congress set down the principles that Communists have no place in the Government of the United States. In that Congress, in 1947–48, we appropriated more than $17,000,000 for a loyalty check of suspected subversives in the Federal departments and agencies.

It is now a solid fact of history that the first conviction of a Communist within the Government structure—the first conviction since 1933—did not come until 1947, when the Eightieth Congress had been in session almost 4 months. That was the Marzani conviction, a State Department employee, who had been in charge of secret maps and war plans during the African campaign in 1942 and 1943.

It is also a solid fact for history that the Eighty-first Congress—the one now in session—did not renew the appropriation for the loyalty check of Government workers challenged by the preliminary inquiries of the FBI and the Civil Service Commission.

This is the one point at which economy in Government became a virtue—for the first time since Pearl Harbor.

The exact point where red ink and red herring meet is where money is requested to weed out subversives, spies, and saboteurs in government.

But I insist there is no place in our Government for these Communist traitors.

Communists despise our American system of private enterprise and ordered liberty under law.

Communists have only contempt for our cherished American ideal of justice and equal opportunity for all.

Communists mock and jeer our aspirations for peace and order in the world. They veto every effort toward world accord. They can govern only with the tools of tyranny and oppression.

It is a matter of official record that the secrets of the pumpkin papers were revealed to an Assistant Secretary of State in 1939.

But the American people did not hear of these stolen documents until 1948.

Where were these vital secrets during those ten long years?

Who bottled them up in the cloisters of the State Department?

Certainly the American people are entitled to some explanation. They deserve something better than to hear their Secretary of State rush to the defense of his friend, Alger Hiss, after being convicted of treachery to his country.

The American people gave unnumbered thousands of dead and wounded on the fields of battle, and poured out billions of their wealth during those 10 years to save China from the cruel fate of aggression.

And now China has been abandoned to the Communist aggressor.

What will the secret, hidden documents impounded for 10 years by the State Department tell us of this amazing posture of American policy in the Far East?

I say it is high time that we open the sheltered cloisters of the State Department to fresh air of American public opinion.

The American people are entitled to know what our real policies are abroad; and they are entitled to ask frankly if those policies are being applied by men and women who are in full sympathy and accord with our traditional American ideals of freedom, justice, and fair dealing all around.

Woodrow Wilson stirred the hearts and minds of Americans when he pronounced the doctrine of open covenants openly arrived at. He thought, as many of us do today, that the people who suffer, sacrifice, and die have a right to know the facts. No man in America should be powerful enough to defy the people of America, and through the use of high office, prevent the people from getting the truth. The truth should be known in time, and not years afterward, or after we have been plunged into a bloody war.

Let me remind you the United States is a republic, we must maintain the Republic and in maintaining it we must demand with Woodrow Wilson that no one shall conceal the truth about the acts of our Government officials either at home or abroad.

I am aware that your Maryland traditions of freedom and resolute independence trace as far back into American history as do the traditions of my own Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

There is a kinship here which I am certain transcends all considerations of faction or party.

As Americans we are the guardians and custodians of a precious heritage. We must all be true to the faith that is in us. We must all resist the tides of passion and hate which would rip us from our stout spiritual moorings and set us blindly adrift in a boundless sea of Socialist experiment and irresponsible public finance.

Common sense tells us all that we can take no more out of Government than we put into it—whether we measure our contributions in spirit, energy, work, or dollars.

It is not mere partisanship which condemns the hollow promise that holds out to the people the lure of something for nothing.

We hold it humiliating to the true spirit of America to see ambitious men conniving in a persistent and calculated effort to aline our people in bitter classes of race, creed, or economic station.

The great work of constitutional restoration is a call and a challenge to men and women of all parties. A crusade of patriotism is forming to redeem mighty America from bungling bureaucrats and spendthrift party-liners. We must stop this growth of bureaucracy and meddling by Washington into all the details of our daily lives.

The power to determine taxes and to appropriate money was vested by our wise forefathers in the Congress. Yes, so anxious were they to keep this power in the hands of the people that they further required that such bills originate in the House of Representatives, which was popularly termed "The People's House."

When we see the executive branch usurping this power, this great Republic is in danger.

Congress must fight to be independent, and you must support that fight. This is not a minor issue. It is one upon which hangs the fate of popular government. We must not fail to uphold this precious heritage.

Maryland will have her traditional part in that crusade.

Resolution Against Reds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY CAVALCANTE
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CAVALCANTE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the Knights of Columbus, Uniontown Council No. 1275, Uniontown, Pa., on December 13, 1949. This resolution against Reds was later adopted by Bishop O'Connor, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Connellsville, Pa.:

RESOLUTION AGAINST REDS

Uniontown Council No. 1275, Knights of Columbus, is the first religious fraternal group in the United States to take a positive stand supporting J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI against attacks launched by the National Lawyers Guild, an alleged Communist-front organization.

A resolution, presented at a regular meeting, December 13, 1949, was approved by the council, and it was adopted later last month by Bishop O'Connor, fourth degree, Knights of Columbus, Connelsville, Pa.

The resolution:

"Whereas the Lawyers Guild, an organization with principal place of activities situated in the city of New York, has been listed as subversive to our national security and our way of life by the Un-American Activities Committee of the Congress of these United States; and

"Whereas the Federal Bureau of Investigation is maintained and entrusted by the people of these United States with the delicate and arduous duty of detecting and bringing to justice the enemies of our security and our American way of life; and

"Whereas it is indispensable for the Federal Bureau of Investigation to operate in secret and to keep the results of its investigations in secret until such time as the enemies of our security and our way of life are brought before our courts of justice to be tried in accordance with the laws of our democracy; and

"Whereas the aforementioned Lawyers Guild has taken action to petition the President of these United States to appoint a commission for the purpose and with power to subpena the files and agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for examination and inspection; and

"Whereas the uncovering of the operations and files of the Federal Bureau of Investigation has long been sought after by the enemies of our security and our American way of life; and

"Whereas the action of the Lawyers Guild in so petitioning the President of these United States is indicative of aid and comfort to these enemies of our security and our American way of life; Now, be it

"Resolved by Council No. 1275, Knights of Columbus, at Uniontown, Pa.—

"1. That the action of the Lawyers Guild is subversive to our American security and our American way of life.

"2. That the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its agents deserve the protection and gratitude of the American people for the courageous and vigilant manner in which they have so far guarded our security and our way of life against subversive elements, domestic and foreign.

"3. That it is indispensable to the security and way of life of these United States that the Federal Bureau of Investigation, its agents and files, should operate and remain in secrecy until such time as the results of their operations, files, and investigations are subpenaed by proper courts of justice against the enemies of our security and our way of life.

"4. That a copy of these resolves shall be sent to the President of these United States, to J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; the Supreme Council of the Knights of Columbus; Congressman Anthony Cavalcante; Walter Winchell because of his untiring efforts to quash communism and to any other party of which the grand knight shall be advised.

"RALPH CAVALCANTE,
"Grand Knight."

Foreign Trade Agreements—One Year Later

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, exactly 1 year ago today I stood before this House to speak for the first time. At that time I was discussing the Reciprocal Trade Act, which was then up for renewal. I warned of the disaster which would strike my district in northern California and many other parts of the country if the act were renewed without adequate checks and safety valves.

Today I am sorry to have to tell you that many of my predictions have come true. Thousands of Americans are jobless, factories are closed, and our farmers have been forced to take tragic losses because of the cheap goods from abroad that are flooding this country.

The administration's chickens are coming home to roost.

When the Reciprocal Trade Act was being considered by Congress 1 year ago, I said that I favored its principle. I still do. I still believe that we should do everything within our power to expand world trade on a sound basis.

But I also said that I opposed importing unemployment and starvation wages and a miserable standard of living, and bankruptcy. The way to avoid these tragedies was through a peril-point clause and an escape clause. These clauses are simply common sense.

The peril-point clause would say that the President could not reduce tariffs on foreign goods below a figure that would damage United States producers without first telling Congress why he was doing it. And the escape clause would say that if a tariff-cutting agreement with a foreign country caused great injury to United States producers, the United States could ask to change or repeal the tariff cuts.

These two provisions had been placed in the reciprocal-trade law by the Republican Eightieth Congress, and they had done much good. They had protected the American farmer, workingman, businessman, from the unfair competition of countries with wages far below ours.

With a number of other Congressmen, I fought against taking out the peril-point clause and the escape clause, but we were defeated. Congress last year renewed the Reciprocal Trade Act for 2 more years without any such safeguards for the American economy.

Today we can see the results all around us. To understand how the reciprocal-trade treaties are menacing American producers, we need only look at my district in California—at the lumber industry and the fishing industry and at the hop, walnut, olive, almond, prune, grape, cherry, and many other industries.

The hop industry is a good example. Two years ago the United States and Czechoslovakia negotiated a treaty under the reciprocal-trade program. The treaty reduced the tariff on hop imports from Czechoslovakia from 24 cents a pound to 12 cents. This was done in spite of the protests of California hop growers, who pointed out that even with a 24-cent tariff, the American market was being swamped with cheap Czech hops.

Before the treaty went into effect on April 21, 1948, Czechoslovakia became a Russian satellite, with semislave labor and nationalized industries. In view of this development, American hop growers asked our State Department to cancel the tariff cuts, but the State Department refused. It said that if it turned out that American hop growers were being injured badly, something might be done under the escape clause.

So the tariff cut went into effect. Czech hops immediately began pouring into this country at an even faster rate. Imports increased by 40 percent. As a result, the bottom dropped out of the American market. Prices dropped from 75 cents a pound to 30 cents, while it was costing American producers as much as 50 cents a pound to grow hops.

Our California growers, who had invested millions of dollars in land and equipment, faced ruin. We appealed to President Truman, Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and the Tariff Commission to investigate their plight and cancel the tariff reduction. But we were turned down. We were told, in effect, that it was just too bad about our hop growers. We were told, in effect, that it was too bad if our California people were thrown out of work.

This is not an isolated case. The same thing is happening daily throughout the country. On October 15, 1949, the California Farm Bureau Federation telegraphed to ask for my help in obtaining price supports for the olive industry to compensate "for the serious loss they will sustain through the recent drastic lowering of tariffs on olives, olive oil, and other olive products."

Foreign competition was forcing United States olive oil prices down to disastrous levels. This was possible because the average worker in the Mediterranean area is paid $1 a day, while the average wage in the California industry is $1 an hour. You can see what this means to my district when I tell you the olive industry is highly important to California as a source of employment during December, January, and February, when other work is scarce in our agricultural valleys. Most of the olives are grown in modest family-size farms averaging 9 acres by people who are in no position to stand heavy losses from cheap imports.

Up in Massachusetts we see the same forces at work. Last Friday the Waltham Watch Co., a 100-year-old firm, closed its doors, throwing 1,231 employees out of work on 1 day's notice. Walter W. Cenerazzo, president of the American Watch Workers Union, told why the plant had been forced to the wall. It happened, he said, because of a flood of cheap Swiss watches that came into the United States under the reciprocal-trade program. These Swiss watches, he said, were made "under conditions which we would not permit in the United States."

Waltham was one of only three watch companies remaining in this country. The Federal Government, through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, had previously loaned Waltham $4,000,000 in an attempt to keep it going, but now even the Government has given up in the face of the Swiss watches which are still flooding the country under our tariff system.

Just yesterday we read how Canadian potatoes are being permitted to come into this country under the reciprocal trade program and compete with our own potatoes. In New Orleans 1,000,000 pounds of imports from Canada were being unloaded from a single ship, while we are trying to support the price of our homegrown potatoes. How can our American farmers obtain decent prices when they are being undercut by foreign producers with far lower wages and living standards? How can our American farmers obtain the benefits of price supports when cheap foreign goods are pouring in by the shipload?

I see nothing "reciprocal" about our tariff system when all the benefits flow in only one direction—to foreign producers. Last October, after Congress passed the administration's bill for extending the so-called reciprocal program, the State Department signed tariff-cutting agreements with ten foreign countries for no less than 350 items. Most of the reductions in United States tariffs were up to 50 percent.

This was the second time in 2 years that the administration had lowered its tariffs. The reduction covered such items as wrapping paper, paperboard, and plywood from Finland; olives and olive oil from Greece; olive oil from Italy; matches from Sweden; and butter and cheese from Denmark. These are the type of tariff cuts that mean jobs and bread and butter in my district.

What did the United States obtain in return for these favors? Almost nothing. Even the State Department admitted there will be no benefits for a considerable time. Most foreign nations still restrict the imports of goods from the United States, as the people in my district know only too well when they try to export their fruit and many other products.

It is easy to see where all this is taking us. Only yesterday the Federal Government admitted that unemployment is now up to 4,480,000. We have more people walking the streets for jobs than at any time since the war, and the number is still going up.

Fortunately, more and more people are joining the fight to defend American agriculture, American labor, and American business against cheap foreign goods. Last month more than 100 representatives of labor and management met here in Washington to form a permanent organization to protect American wages and living standards from attack from abroad. The meeting was called by the Wage Earners Protective Conference of the American Federation of Labor, and 16 AFL unions were represented.

As for myself, I will continue my efforts to help American producers before it is too late. I have introduced a bill—H. R. 6902—to restore the peril point and escape clauses in the Reciprocal Trade Act, and I am going to press for action on the bill. I hope that all who are sincerely interested in the welfare of our country will join me. We must defeat all attacks upon American jobs. The American producer must be permitted to sell in his own market.

Saving Jobs and Preventing Suffering

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the President has this week decided to use the tools furnished him by the Congress to deal with strikes imperiling the national health and safety. Although he has said he does not want this power, it is a fortunate thing that he had it. It affords some protection at least to the

general public, most important of all, the working people of this country.

The only question is whether he waited too long to invoke the powers which he has. We must all hope that he has stepped into this critical situation in time.

It was 2 weeks before he acted that his Director of the Bureau of Mines, who had been studying the effects of the partial strike on the economy, reported to him that a crisis was in the offing. His words were "unless there is an immediate resumption of substantially increased coal production the national economy, health, and welfare is now, or soon will be, impaired."

Even though the machinery has at last been set in motion to restore full production in coal, nothing tangible can result, at the earliest, before the middle of next week. The fact-finding board which has been appointed must report to the President, which, we have been told, will be done next Monday. After that he must review their report and ask the Attorney General to take appropriate action if he feels it is warranted by the facts.

These are 10 days that can certainly be ill-spared in the middle of winter when coal stocks are at the lowest level in many years. Then, there is, of course, still the question whether anything further will be done and, if so, what it is.

It certainly must be apparent to everyone, however, that without some law to deal with this situation, we would now face a complete chaos in our economy. Even now, I am told that there is serious doubt in the community which I represent whether it may not be necessary to put into effect some kind of a rationing system on gas and possibly steam and electricity before relief can be afforded. If that is done, the curtailment is likely to come first in industrial plants, which means no jobs or, at least, short work. We have read that railroad service will be drastically reduced tomorrow.

Just today I have received a telegram from a small plant in my community in which they say:

> We wish to register our protest against the long delay in handling the coal strike. Our plant will close February 14, throwing 125 men out of work and will cause shortage of material critically required in building program.

In this case, apparently relief has come too late. Unemployment in midwinter with all its attendant suffering and disruption of normal family life cannot be prevented. No doubt all over the country such situations are being repeated manyfold.

Laws are of no value on the statute books unless they are enforced. Everyone who works for a living should be grateful that there was in existence a law to cope with the catastrophe which faced our Nation when the supply of coal stopped. Despite the belated action of the President, we can only hope and pray that his delay will not entail the loss of too many jobs and cause too great hardship.

The Root of All Evil

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to present to the House of Representatives an unusually interesting and timely address by a great statesman, the Honorable C. A. Christopherson, of Sioux Falls, S. Dak. Mr. Christopherson for a long time was a Member of this distinguished body, serving the people of South Dakota ably and well. He is now chairman of the board of the Union Savings Bank of Sioux Falls, S. Dak., and has continued his intense interest in State, national, and international affairs. I am sure the senior Members of both parties will long remember the outstanding service of Representative Christopherson. The following address, appropriately called The Root of All Evil, was presented by Mr. Christopherson over radio station KISD, Sioux Falls, on January 22, and clearly reflects the clear thinking of an able and alert senior statesman, a man of whom every South Dakotan can be proud, and to whose eminence and prominence I, who now represent them in Congress, can only humbly aspire:

Have had in mind for some time a discussion of that which has frequently been termed "the root of all evil," viz: money, of which commodity everyone strives to get all they can. To designate money as the root of evil is a misnomer, a statement without any basis of fact to support same.

The brief and generally understood meaning of money is that it is a medium of exchange, which is a correct definition. People in the remote past did not have money. In the period of early recorded history there was no generally recognized medium of exchange. It was barter and trade. This answered the purpose, when people lived in what might be termed "community groups," and there was no interchange of commodities with people in other areas. If one person raised more potatoes than he needed for his own family, he would trade the surplus to someone who had a surplus of wheat, corn, or something which the potato grower did not have. So down the line; a general exchange of whatever one had he did not need, for something of which someone else had a surplus.

But as the human family developed, began to pay visits to neighboring groups, the exchange business grew and was carried on to an ever-increasing extent. This created a problem. It became difficult for the potato grower to find people who had what he wanted, who were in need of his potatoes. So, with all commodities. To make the deal it was necessary for the one who had a surplus of anything, to find someone who was in need of his particular commodity, and who also had a surplus of the very things of which he himself was in need. It can readily be understood that as the human family developed and expanded in its activities, trade and barter between the different groups became a factor in the daily life of each one.

It has been said, "Necessity is the mother of inventions." So with money. As the problem of barter and trade became more difficult, someone sought an article that would command a trade value at any place. That commodity was readily at hand, viz: Gold. This rare mineral had been discovered. People had learned how to find same in streams of water, placer mining; to excavate ore which carried a small percentage of the precious metal, and how to separate the gold from the slag.

Gold held a fascination for people from the very earliest days. It was scarce and precious; it could be hammered or pressed into any shape desired. As a consequence, people sought gold, which they fashioned into trinkets, finger and ear rings. These they wore with pride. As civilization progressed, and the houses of worship came into being, gold was used to adorn their altars. All of which gave gold a value wherever human beings lived, in community life or illiterate tribes. It could be exchanged for something else; it had a universal value.

Gold was therefore especially adapted to the use as a medium of exchange, in that it was plastic and could be pressed or molded into any form desired. It could be buried in the ground, or exposed to the elements without any deterioration. At first, and even as late as our time, in the mining areas, it was exchanged by weight. But many years ago, it was discovered that it could be pressed into disks, of certain size and weight, on which could be stamped its value, thereby greatly facilitating exchange. In fact, that was money; a medium of exchange which everyone recognized.

Money is often termed wealth, which is not a fact. The phrase "Rich as Croesus" is often heard. Though he was the last King of Lydia he was the first to press gold into the form of coins and use same as an exchange medium—money in fact. Money in itself has no especial value. It was created for convenience and as such has become a very effective part of the complex system of trade and commerce. Gold itself, which is recognized as a valuable mineral by all people, is at times of greater value as a material which the dentist uses to repair decayed teeth. Therefore, we should recognize that money, as such, does not have the value frequently ascribed to it. If on a desert island, money in any form would be to its possessor of no value. In such circumstances, food and garments would be of use, but not so any money the lonely occupant might have. We have, however, come to think of money as wealth. In this appraisal, we should ever be mindful of the fact that money has been tampered with, to the loss of the people in the years that have gone by.

It has been said that the two outstanding inventions are money and printing. Each one of these has played an important part in the progress of civilization. Printing, in the dissemination of news, information, exchange of ideas—in truth, learning, and education. Money, the medium which has facilitated business, trade, and commerce to a degree it could not have achieved without its use. But money has no definite, constant, and fixed value. In normal times gold has a fairly stable value, but the kings of ancient days found methods by which they enriched themselves through tampering with the gold coins of the people.

When a monarch found himself in financial distress, he called in the coins of the realm, melted them down, recast them with only one-half as much gold. Thereby he doubled his wealth. That method has been frequently resorted to in the past.

We, here in the United States, indulged in some high finance, some years ago, when we, without either rhyme or reason, raised the price of gold nearly 60 percent. That, of course, increased the price of the gold our

Government had in reserve; its money. But it also, stimulated the mining for gold. In Africa, mines which had not operated for 50 years because of the low-grade ore, with the higher price, resumed operation and sent millions of dollars worth of gold to our Treasury which we readily purchased at the increased price, thereby incurring further indebtedness, and now we have the gold stored in Kentucky.

When this increased valuation of gold was announced, I made an effort to learn just what was back of it all and what benefit we could possibly derive from this surprising move in finance. I contacted people in Washington, but failed to get any understandable explanation. Some years later I had the opportunity to attend a meeting where there were to be four financial experts from Washington. Some were from the United States Treasury and some were from other departments. Notices were sent out that they would answer any questions which anyone wished to propound. The question was to be sent in on or before a certain date. Here, I thought, is the opportunity to find out about this high price of gold, set by our Government, so far as known, on its own motion. I, therefore, prepared a question, asking the real cause for this increased price and what if any advantage had we derived from the purchase of foreign and other gold at this above-market price. At the meeting in question, the four financial experts (all Government officials) were there. They devoted some two hours to answering questions, relating largely to banking, credits, exchange, etc. My question was ignored. I then concluded that that is the answer—there is no logical reason for our Government raising the price of gold near 60 percent, and buying all gold offered at this premium value. We, thereby, gave to foreign miners, profits running into the millions. The only reason appears to be that some bright genius thought this a good idea; our officials approved, and in the experiment we incurred added billions to our national debt.

Oh, yes, we have the gold, to be sure. Already foreigners are looking upon this pile of gold in Kentucky as world wealth to be distributed. You will recall last fall an official in Europe suggested this very procedure, viz, that the United States should make a distribution of this gold in order to bolster the financial status of Europe. A very thoughtful suggestion, to give to Europe gold which we had purchased from their miners at a price 60 percent over its market value. I am surprised that our officials, who have shown such deep interest for the welfare of Europe did not fall for this gentle hint from abroad. Though we did not take this hint seriously, the day is coming when we will, in all probability, take a loss running into the billions, on our gold stock. It will come about in this way. The time will come when it will be expedient to again return to the gold standard. To this all will agree, but the statesmen from abroad will say to Uncle Sam, "You have all the gold; we cannot come in, etc." Then there will be some haggling over price, which will ultimately end in our selling other nations gold, for reserve against their circulating medium; no, not at the high price we paid, but at a figure of less than 25 percent of the cost to us. Loss—billions more swept into the European game in which we are holding a hand. What would George Washington and his conferees say if they could view our foreign attempts to regulate civilization? Shocked, to say the least. As said, "A great game if you do not weaken," but can we continue the present pace without weakening to a marked and dangerous degree? Time to think.

We like to refer to the kings and monarchs of the Old World for examples of juggling the money of the realm. But we have one example in our own land which points a lesson to what can happen to the medium of exchange.

Many articles have been used as money, among others, what became known as wampum. This is a type of beads which the noble red man of the West made. It consisted of beads—white ones made from the shell of the periwinkle and black ones made from the black part of clam shells. These were attractive, were made into belts, necklaces and other articles for personal adornment. This "wampum" was so attractive that it was used as money. It came to be recognized by the Americans, and in some of the colonies, was by legislative act made legal tender. But soon the red men learned a lesson. The shrewd white man developed a method by which they could make these in competition with the Indian. The white man found it an easy matter to dye the white beads black thereby adding to their value. Also found beads somewhat similar, but of less value; fixed them to imitate the real ones; thus, flooding the market and making the real wampum worthless. That was, so far as I know, the first inflation in this country. And that is just what it was, so far as the Indian was concerned, an inflation. His money suddenly lost its buying power, and the legal-tender privilege soon was repealed.

We have had several inflationary periods. You have frequently heard the expression, "Not worth a continental." That refers to the continental currency which, of course, became worthless as a consequence of the revolution. Then, there was the pronounced inflation, following World War I. A definitely pronounced inflation which had set in before World War II, and has been spiraling upwards ever since. War always brings about such conditions. Inflation is simply a recurrence of the wampum money. To meet war expenditures, our Government was obliged to borrow in sums running into the billions. This was in turn paid out to meet expenses; in short, distributed throughout the land, adding greatly to the circulating medium, thereby reducing its buying power. Our dollar is now down to about one-half of its former value.

The war is over, so far as actual combat is concerned, but we are still engaged in war expenditures, beyond our income. That tends toward more inflation, which if not checked may break loose some day in an uncontrolable wave which will overwhelm us, as it has other nations in the past. I mention this, because so many with whom I have discussed money, and its present value, do not seem the least concerned about that phase of the matter. In truth, it is of vital concern to each one. That great reservoir of savings of the American people, life insurance, amounting to billions of dollars has been cut in two by the depreciation of our dollars. The same depreciation in all securities, to be sure. This, through no fault of the insurance companies; solely by reason of inflation brought about by deficit financing on the part of the Government. In war this is necessary; in times of peace it is the height of Government mismanagement. It endangers our status as a Nation, and the security of every individual.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Daily Tribune of January 27, 1950:

REWRITING THE HISS VERDICT

Alger Hiss has been convicted by a jury and sentenced to 5 years in the penitentiary for lying when he said he did not steal secret Government documents for Russia's spies. To read a good many editorial pages, however, it might seem that Hiss either deserved a medal or was a much maligned traitor.

Mr. Willard Edwards, who reported both Hiss trials for this newspaper, has discussed the "loaded" presentation of the trial offered their readers by the New York Herald Tribune and Washington Post. We were not particularly surprised to learn that pro-Hiss treatment of the news was pronounced on the eastern seaboard, for both Communist inclinations and internationalism are most marked in that area, and Hiss typified both.

In sentencing Hiss, Federal District Judge Goddard stated, "This should be a warning that a crime of this character may not be committed with impunity." It might be thought that among patriotic citizens there would be no dissent from the view that it is not praiseworthy conduct to be a traitor, or that a man who had been found out in his double dealing deserved neither admiration nor sympathy.

But loyal Americans would be underestimating the extent to which fluffy communism has spread through the ranks of editorial writers and columnists if they were to believe that this was the unanimous position of the American press. Newspaper after newspaper playing the New Deal line, the internationalist line, and the State Department line found it possible to reserve sympathy for Hiss, condemnation for Whittaker Chambers, his accuser, and doubt for the wisdom of a jury which received all of the facts, knew how to appraise them, and had the courage to act on its conviction.

The Louisville Courier-Journal, as was to be expected, wept over the ruined life of Hiss and bemoaned the truth still hidden. The St. Louis Post-Dispatch thinks that, despite the evidence and the conviction, the citizen still cannot be sure, and tosses in the thought that the Government should have a sound basis for such serious charges, as if there were no evidence in the 40 days of courtroom presentation.

The late E. P. Adler's Davenport Times, also in character, expresses relief that Hiss was found guilty of something. It says he could never quite completely sweep aside the evidence of the stolen papers and his own typewriter, upon which the papers were copied for Russia. This publication achieves a far-fetched parallel to the Dreyfus case and finds the Hiss case worked up emotions which had little to do with the national welfare. It might be thought that it was no service to the Nation to expose public officials working in the service of a foreign state.

Marquis Childs, the columnist, would suggest that, if some Americans served Russia, others, with a like "failure of faith," used to look up to Hitler and Mussolini. We never heard of a fascist or a bundist who got into the bureaucracy and sent secret papers to Berlin or Rome, whereas the Communist network, existing by New Deal tolerance in Roosevelt's Washington, was widespread, effective, damaging, and has been thoroughly proved to have had a real, not a fanciful, existence.

Mrs. Roosevelt, who during the first trial of Hiss used her daily column to whip up sentiment in his behalf, has issued two statements since the verdict was reached. The first: "I have never heard anything that I could think would approximate the idea that Alger Hiss was a Communist. It is difficult for me to accept what Whittaker Chambers has to say." The second, "It's a very difficult case to know what to think. I never

once heard him say anything that would approach the idea that he was a Communist. I feel he may have perjured himself, but I don't feel he ever sold any secret papers."

This is the same columnist who, on August 17, 1948, wrote, "Smearing good people like Lauchlin Currie, Alger Hiss, and others is, I think, unforgivable. * * * Anyone knowing either Mr. Currie or Mr. Hiss, who are the two people whom I happen to know fairly well, would not need any denial on their part to know that they are not Communists."

A review of post-trial comment ought to warn readers of a good many "liberal" newspapers that they are justified in greeting the pap served out to them with the utmost reservation. Some of these organs are so steeped in propaganda attitudes that they are even ready to take the side of traitors against the United States.

The Hiss Verdict

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. ASPINALL. Mr. Speaker, with no intent of attempting to minimize the importance of the personal and public reaction to the finding of Alger Hiss guilty of perjury in the recent trial, but with the thought that there has been far too much politics in the thinking of the people who have made public utterances, I insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the Daily Sentinel of Grand Junction, Colo., published by former United States Senator from Colorado, Walter Walker, which quotes an editorial from the New York Herald Tribune. I wish to state that the editorial specifically expresses my personal thoughts in this matter.

GUILTY

Because it is, in our opinion, fair, sound in its reasoning, and entirely justified, we are reprinting the editorial comment from Monday's edition of the New York Herald Tribune on the verdict of guilty in the case of Alger Hiss. We give the sentiments expressed in this editorial our full endorsement. It follows:

"There can be no sense of vindictiveness, now that the long proceedings against Alger Hiss have ended in a verdict of guilty. The personal tragedy is great; the evidence of fine talents perverted, of promising careers wrecked, of prolonged mental suffering, made the trials painful to observe. And the national tragedy is even greater. No judicial action, no penalty, can wipe out the hard facts that stand on the records of the court, of disloyalty at the heart of the Government and the knowledge that trusted men were unworthy of their trust.

"What redeems this sorry picture, and does give cause for solemn satisfaction, is the painstaking manner in which the American judicial system operated to safeguard the interests of both the defendant and the community, to seek the truth through the mazes of a tangled jungle of evidence and allegation. Alger Hiss was given every opportunity—expert counsel, a judge who was learned in the law and administered it without favor, an intelligent jury which approached its duties conscientiously, and performed them decisively. Indeed, the protection which the law affords an accused person does not end with conviction; the right of appeal to higher courts is still open to Mr. Hiss, and his lawyer has announced that he will take advantage of it.

"Many recent instances have served to heighten the contrast between the workings of American processes of justice and those prevailing in Communist-dominated lands. It is a very real source of pride and strength in this country that in a matter of this kind involving complex human relationships, intricate problems of personality and motive, and capable of stirring strong passions, the courts move deliberately and the juries apply themselves diligently to the question at issue. Whatever private moral judgments may be delivered on the case, whatever heart-searching may be applied to discover how, in our society, a man like Alger Hiss could come to his present pass, it is good to know that 12 men and women, representing the American people, after hearing the fullest and fairest possible basis for a verdict reached, without haste, a decisive result."

Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Indianapolis Times of January 24, 1950:

Marquis Childs, a writer whose sincerity we respect, sets forth on this page today an opinion with which we wholly disagree.

It is on this page at all only because we believe it expresses a point of view that is going to be heard quite often as the apologists for Alger Hiss go into action—and one that appears already to be widely held among his associates in our Government.

Mr. Childs portrays Alger Hiss as a naive, innocent, sincere young seeker after truth who was somehow forced by the great depression into a hard choice between communism and fascism—and maybe chose the better of the two.

Poppycock.

Alger Hiss was a sophisticated, informed Government official. He had been educated in the best universities in this country. He held a confidential post in the innermost circle of our State Department. He had access to the facts. Not one American in a million had his chance to know the score.

No American had to choose between communism and fascism—if, indeed, there is any difference between them.

Alger Hiss had already sworn loyalty to the United States and to the principles of this Republic. He chose to betray that oath, and the trust placed in him, in behalf of another nation and contrary principles, and he lied about it when he got caught.

That's what he was convicted of doing.

He was not on trial for the ideas he held. He was on trial for the direct and overt violation of laws he had solemnly pledged himself to uphold.

And he was found guilty.

The suggestion that those who turned to communism in this country did so to save the soul of America from fascism could hold no validity for any convert above the grade of a retarded moron.

Where were they when Hitler and Stalin and Mussolini were allies, hurling their armies together for the destruction of democracy and liberty and human decency?

We heard no protest from them.

They still served communism—and fascism—together.

Waste no tears on Alger Hiss.

He knew what he was doing.

Back to Reality

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, because I think it is worthy of the attention of the membership, I enclose an editorial appearing in the Bridgeton Evening News of January 28. The theme is Back to Reality. It helps us to reappraise some of the fantastic paths we are now treading.

BACK TO REALITY

In 1946 a New England editor coined the phrase "Have had enough" and urged its adoption as the Republican slogan in the congressional election of that year. The suggestion was generally taken up, with the result that the people responded to it by giving the Republicans control of both Houses of Congress, much to their surprise so far as the Senate was concerned.

We are now face to face with another congressional election. The people in the intervening 4 years have had more than enough of the New Deal administration and are ready for a bold leadership and sound, forward-looking governmental program to lead them out of the financial, economic, and foreign policy morass in which the country has become involved; but the program to achieve its purpose, that of again conferring control of Congress on Republicans, must be bold, not only strongly attacking the present administration for its misdeeds, but promising the people a return to a conduct of Government on a sound basis, a high level of living, adequate returns for their labor, whether in industry, cultivation of the soil, professional life, or investment, and full and free opportunity to carve out their own destinies, free from Government control or interference, through a Government economically administered for the equal benefit of all, and such a policy made so clear and explicit that there can be no misunderstanding of its purpose and assurance.

During a conversation with a lady a few days since, she surprised us by suddenly digressing and asserting with vigor that she didn't know what the future of the country was, but she thought it was high time that the thinking people organize themselves into clubs or leagues to rescue the Nation from the administration and policies now in control in Washington and adopt a slogan under which to move forward. Continuing, she said the women of the Nation should take the lead in such a move and throw their every effort into the work, and she suggested "Back to reality" as a good slogan for the crusade—"for crusade," she said, "it should be."

Back to reality.

On second thought it must be plain to anyone that that is the prime need of the Nation today, to get back to reality.

We are not living in a real world in this country. We are living on a bubble that is liable to burst any day involving the country in a vortex of disaster that will take us years from which to recover, and that bubble is as sure to burst as that the sun will rise tomorrow morning unless we speedily retrace

our steps. We cannot live on false promises, borrowed money, and inflation forever.

Yes, we want to get back to reality.

Here are some realities we want to get back to—

A foreign policy that is the same in Asia and the isles of the Pacific as in Europe, but is first, last, and all the time in the interest of the United States.

A State Department whose first objective in its diplomatic dealings with other nations of the world is the protection of the interests of the United States, and staffed by men and women from the head of the Department to the scrub women all 100-percent loyal Americans.

A financial policy based on the gold standard, which will give the people a 100-cent dollar instead of the 51-cent dollar we now have, and will put us back on a solid financial basis, wipe out the inflation we are now living under and again put in circulation the hundreds of millions of gold now buried in Kentucky hills.

A Federal Government conducted on a strictly efficient economic peace basis and not one conducted, as at present, to provide sinecures for thousands of employees of useless bureaus and agencies, all for political purposes and to spy on the people.

A Federal judiciary manned in all branches and learned in the law, instead of one largely filled by men in payment of their political services and usefulness, as is now the case.

An economic domestic policy assuring to every citizen the opportunity not only to earn a high standard of living but to carve out his future by his own energy and initiative, in accordance with his ability, but not try to boost one class of citizens at the expense of another, as has been done for the past 15 years at a terrible cost to the people.

Restore the old, proud feeling of every American citizen that he was as good as any of his fellows and free to carve out his standing by his own efforts and knew no class distinctions and hatreds until unleashed by the New Deal Party, which lives on class and race hatreds.

Restore the moral standard of all business, industrial, and agricultural life, which has been sadly lowered as a result of the broken and unfulfilled promises of the New Deal and which has affected the entire social fabric.

Make real effort to live within our income instead of loading down the taxpayers with a back-breaking burden of taxation, the proceeds of which are spent on wasteful socialistic schemes and profligate conduct of the Government.

W. E. M.

Tribute to War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, following is the text of the inspirational message delivered by National Chaplain Edward J. Carney, of the American Legion, before the special conference of department commanders and other representatives assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., January 7 and 8, 1950, for briefing on the recommendations of the Hoover Commission on veteran affairs.

My fellow Legionnaires, "It is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead that they may be loosed from their sins."

Those words are taken from the Old Testament, the Book of Maccabees. After some of the soldiers, who probably had the taint of sin upon their souls, were killed in battle, Massabeus brought some money to the temple to ask that the priest therein would spend some time in praying for the repose of the souls of those who had not paid the last farthing.

With those words in mind, this morning I am going to tell you one of the most beautiful things ever written by Sir Walter Scott was of a character called Old Mortality. Old Mortality was a Scotsman who day after day, week after week, and year after year, felt it his duty to go to the graves of his fellow countrymen and make sure that the moss didn't gather too deeply on their gravestones, and that the emblems that marked the Divisions to which they belonged were not erased. Sir Walter Scott says of him that he was probably as wonderful a character as one would know because he remembered with his notices of devotion the old men who had gone before him, who had fought for a cause of their country and their God. He wanted all generations behind him to remember these things, and therefore he brushed these things up from time to time, that they might read the inscriptions, and that they might know that "it is a holy and wholesome thought to pray for those dead," lest they be forgotten and in order that they might be relieved of their punishment should any have befallen them.

Whenever veterans get together, I know too in their hearts they always have a feeling of their fellow veterans who have gone before them, fellows with whom they walked and talked and laughed and smiled and had the social amenities of life. When we pay them tribute, our heroic dead, we certainly know that we are giving tribute to men who lived a life and died a life in sacrifice that these great American institutions might endure. Some way in our life we try to emulate them.

What is true of all veterans as we pay this tribute is often too rare. Once a year we have a memorial service, but this should be constantly in our mind because "it is a holy and a wholesome thought to pray for the dead." We should, especially Legionnaires, pray for the men who have done so much for this great organization. Forever enshrined in our minds should be the names of Teddy Roosevelt, Galbraith, Bill Doyle, Jerry Twomey, and the rest of those countless men who have given their all to this great organization's cause.

We who are of World War II stand in awe and admiration for your accomplishments, gentlemen. We want you to know it is with deference and respect that we approach you and we ask you to be kind to us if we haven't the full understanding of the many sacrifices you have undergone in order that the cause of the veteran might be furthered.

If you ask any one of the men who have gone before—men who have given of their last drop of blood for God and country in this great organization—what their greatest request is, what their last will and testament is, it was the same as the fellows who were left on the battlefields, who as they breathed their last breath said: "Don't bother with me. Take care of our sick buddies who can make it and those who are wounded."

We are gathered together at a time like this, and you know that you have a great cause on your hands. You know that you have a principle to fight for. Most of all we should measure this principle in a spiritual value.

You know they say of a man who doesn't catch on very fast and who can't see through things, that he is dumb. But I say to you that two of the principal things that should be indelibly impressed on the memories of each and every one of us here today, is a divine sense of humor. Not a sense of humor just to make somebody laugh, but a divine sense of humor—that is, to see through things. See in the snowflake the purity of God; see in the mountain the power of God, and see in the rainbows and in the heavens the beauty of God.

That divine sense of humor is most essential for us, for when we go about our work of rehabilitation, when we go about our work of preserving the good things and carrying out the last testaments of our dying comrades, we shall see to it that when we take care of a fellow in room 262, we are not only taking care of a fellow in room 262, but we are taking care of somebody in the name of Christ, somebody that He died for, somebody that He loves. And as a reward for that, we have a promise some day in store for us: "Well done, thou good and faithful servant."

I didn't do anything. I'm sorry. I didn't. But, you gave a cup of cold water, you fought for a cause in the Legion's program to help one of those lads to see to it that they weren't thrown out in the streets, out of the hospitals, because of some false economy. You saw to it that these, our heroes, were enshrined and never to be forgotten in our hearts. That cup of cold water that you gave took on a spiritual investment in the bank of heaven where the rust and the moss cannot destroy, nor thieves break in and steal. You placed these things in spiritual value and every effort that you extend to that end will pay great dividends.

I said that you needed two things, not only a divine sense of humor, but you have to have the knowledge of the pain of an incision. Not necessarily a physical incision, but an understanding of pain.

You know, these lads who left the classrooms became history's graduates. Left at home they were to be probably the greatest statesmen this country has ever known. They grabbed the rifles and marched off to war. They might have been the scientist who would discover the cure for cancer, they might have been a captain of industry, they might have been a rabbi, a minister, or a priest who would bring spiritual consolation to future generations. They might have been an artist, or a painter, or a sculptor.

But today many grope with the blindness inflicted upon them by battle. They are warped in mind because they still scream in the psychopathic wards, hearing the ghost-guns of battle. They clutch with stumps of hands. They are carried around in wheel chairs, and you who are here today must know and have an understanding of pain in order to give them your all.

These are the things that I would like you to make a part of your mental make-up. Leave on the indelible tablets thereon these impressions.

What you do, you do well before the throne of the most high God.

Two thoughts, therefore, in conclusion.

Remember your dead who have done so well for you in days gone by. Remember them where remembrance counts—at the altar of God. And don't forget their last wish and will and testament. Take care, at all costs, take care of the sick and the wounded and those who are suffering on beds of pain.

Achievement in Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. FERNÓS-ISERN

RESIDENT COMMISSIONER FROM PUERTO RICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. FERNÓS-ISERN. Mr. Speaker, on February 6, the honorable ambassa-

dor, Warren R. Austin, representative of the United States at the United Nations, addressed a joint session of the Legislative Assembly of Puerto Rico. The legislature assembled at the special call of Gov. Louis Muñoz-Marin.

I regret I was not able to be in San Juan at the time. I would have been thrilled to participate in this grand occasion, close both in flesh and in spirit to my people in the island. Unfortunately, I was able to participate in spirit only, because the pressure of urgent duties here entailed by representing in Congress 2,000,000 Puerto Rico Americans who toil and struggle up hill, confident and courageous along the roads of democracy and the "four freedoms."

Mr. Speaker, Ambassador Austin has delivered a message of great significance for the people of Puerto Rico. He made before our legislature, an informal report on the work of the United Nations, on our participation in that work, and on the prospects for peace.

He did this, I am sure, because he knows the American citizens of Puerto Rico are as much represented in the United Nations by him as are the citizens of any of the great sisterhood of States. And he realizes that we Puerto Rico Americans know it, too.

So we feel and know that Ambassador Austin speaks there for our ideals of peace and fair play, for freedom for all, for respect to the dignity of man, for the security of the democratic way of life in this shrinking world—in short, for the ideals which have made this Nation great, and which are as much loved and upheld in San Juan, Ponce, and Mayaguez as in any other community within continental United States.

There is additional significance in Ambassador Austin's words. As he put it, he went to Puerto Rico to report, and after doing that he could come back and report further. He found in Puerto Rico, a self-respecting people trying to help themselves and making themselves deserving of outside assistance. He saw the people of Puerto Rico, even within their meager and limited resources, not only striving to help themselves, but to help others help themselves. He observed what contributions Puerto Rico could make toward our common goals and he saw that Puerto Rico is making them.

As the Representative of Puerto Rico, I should like here to express my profound thanks to our honored Ambassador at the United Nations for his illuminating and inspiring words delivered before the joint session of Puerto Rico's Legislature. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the distinguished membership of this Congress should be acquainted with what Ambassador Austin had to say at San Juan.

ACHIEVEMENT IN GOVERNMENT

Your excellencies, Gov. Muñoz-Marín, Mr. Speaker of the House, Mr. President of the Senate, it is good to be here again in a sunny corner of the United States which holds pleasant memories for Mrs. Austin and me. The time we spent with you in 1937, on a mission of the United States Senate, gave me an opportunity to become acquainted with your problems, and to meet and know your people.

Our special objective was to ascertain what, if anything, Puerto Rico needed from the Congress with respect to her judicial system.

During that study we had an extremely pleasant welcome from agriculturists, manufacturers, and educators. I believe that the most vivid impression given us was at the university. There we were shown research projects respecting possibilities of diversification in crops, and the development of parasites to eliminate certain pests that attack agricultural and horticultural products. We were entertained beautifully at social events in different parts of the island. Mrs. Austin and I have often recalled many an enchanted evening when we danced out under the stars in your salubrious climate. The warmth of personal generosity and friendliness that was lavished upon us enriched our lives.

This time we are in Puerto Rico as your representative, as the representative of the United States at the seat of the United Nations. As such, I feel that I owe you an informal report on the work of the United Nations, on our participation in that work, and on the prospects for peace.

Before commencing that report, I must express congratulations to Gov. Muñoz Marín for the progress of this part of the United States under his gallant leadership in his Operation Bootstrap. This great progress which has occurred since our visit and to which, I am sure all Puerto Ricans have contributed, is positively helpful—not only in the Caribbean, but the world—because of its proof that under the inspired leadership, and by diligent application to the welfare of a state, its inhabitants can speedily raise the standard of living and increase the moral power of the community.

We who work at Lake Success are acutely aware of certain public misgivings and the reasons for them. We are poignantly conscious of the fact that our negotiators have not reached agreement on effective means of international control of atomic energy. Now, the walk-out of the Soviet Union has frustrated continuing efforts among the sponsoring powers. We know only too well the widespread uneasiness that has resulted from inability to reach agreement on the setting up of the peace forces contemplated by the United Nations Charter. We are aware of the public's concern over the abuse of the veto and over all Soviet walk-outs.

It is a function of my office, not only to consult the other 58 states in the United Nations, but also to inform our own people of our policies and transactions, to aid them to arrive at sound opinions, which are necessary for the strength of American policy. Therefore, I bring to you an accounting for the conduct of our mission.

In my opinion, United States policy in the United Nations is an open-minded policy. On the question of atomic energy, for example, an overwhelming majority of the nations have expressed satisfaction with a control plan worked out by the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. We support that plan. It is the only plan we know of that would maintain safeguards effective and enforceable against use for destructive purposes. At the same time, we have repeatedly expressed our willingness to consider any other effective and enforceable control plan.

This is typical of our attitude on every controversy within the United Nations. The reasonableness and the fairness of our approach is attested, in my opinion, by the great majority of member nations that have reached conclusions similar to ours.

The troublesome question is always, "Why is it so difficult to reach agreement with the Soviet Union?" In answer, I will not go into the possible motives of the Soviet Union. I need not discuss questions of Soviet aggression and interference in the political affairs of other countries, for it will be enough if I simply assert that the Soviets are an intensely isolationist country—far more isolationist than the United States ever was—and that reason is enough to make agreement exceedingly difficult. Here is an illustration:

In Geneva, Switzerland, last summer the Economic and Social Council had up for discussion a question relating to narcotics. Narcotic experts had decided that if the United Nations had a laboratory in which its experts could conduct a scientific analysis of opium seized in illicit traffic they would be better able to trace its source and track down the illegal operators. The United States offered laboratory facilities to the United Nations without charge. The question before the Economic and Social Council was merely whether this offer should be accepted. The Soviet Union voted against acceptance.

The representative of the United States was astonished, and said so, asking the reason for the negative vote. The Soviet representative merely stated that his Government preferred national action to suppress the illicit opium traffic.

It is not surprising, then, that a country which refuses to cooperate in a sphere so universally established as the international control of the narcotic-drugs traffic declines to accept effective international control of atomic energy.

This illustrates not only the narrowness of the internationalism currently apparent in Soviet foreign policy. It illustrates that international cooperation through the United Nations requires two steps, not just one. It requires first participation in the making of the decision. This the Soviet Union usually does. But it requires in adition that the country carry out what the United Nations decides to do. This the Soviet Union usually does not do.

To illustrate I will not repeat the well-known political examples, such as the Soviet boycott of United Nations peace efforts in Greece and Korea. I cite instead what the International Children's Emergency Fund has accomplished and the noncooperation of the Soviet Union.

The International Children's Emergency Fund is not solely a collecting agency; it is an operating agency. It has not been a relief program solely; it requires an equal effort on behalf of the recipient countries—a matching system is in practice by which the equivalent value in supplies or services has been added either by the Government, the locality, or some voluntary organization. The matching food supplies—bread, vegetables and other indigenous products—were made available out of limited stores, but, with what the International Children's Emergency Fund was able to add, an extra meal was made possible for millions of Europe's children in time of dire need. During the peak period in 1949, 6,000,000 children, including Arab and Jewish refugees in the Middle East, received daily lunches; the vaccination of millions of children for tuberculosis has been accomplished; several million children received one or more garments, for which the emergency fund supplied the raw cotton, or the raw wool. Another several millions of younsters were given shoes for which the fund provided the leather. The fund was able to produce, at a generously reduced price, more than 100,000,000 pounds of dried milk from the United States stores. This milk, when reconstituted, will fill 1,000,000,000 cups, and, because the fund is available, it can now extend its child feeding this winter to many more children, including those in countries in Asia and Latin America that have not so far had feeding assistance.

The expansion of the program has brought the total number of countries and territories aided, or shortly to be aided, by the International Children's Emergency Fund, to more than fifty. The Soviet Union had a representative on the executive board which made the policy and operational decisions. Yet, while small nations like Iceland and Norway and New Zealand gave cod-liver oil and hides for shoes when they couldn't give dollars, and while the United States

gave $72 for every $28 contributed by all other countries combined, the Soviet Government made no contribution.

Of such are the difficulties in the way of universal cooperation in the United Nations. Even so there is a more positive side.

When the United Nations Charter was created in San Francisco in 1945, the public received the impression that an instrument had been forged with teeth in it. In those days, we were accustomed to thinking in terms of armies and navies and air forces, in terms of military force. Thus when the peace forces of the United Nations were not set up at once, a certain amount of public disappointment resulted.

But in 4 years of extensive experience the United Nations has discovered and developed new forces behind its decisions. I refer principally to the moral force of world opinion. The discussions of the United Nations General Assembly, and of the Security Council, and of other United Nations bodies, is picked up and radiated throughout the world by modern means of transmission and communication. The result is a body of opinion world-wide in scope. That opinion is a force for any nation to conjure with. It is an immense power in support of United Nations activities.

We first became aware of the tremendous effectiveness of this force early in the history of the United Nations when the little country of Iran complained that the big Soviet Union, in violation of a treaty commitment, had refused to withdraw its military forces. The issue came to dramatic focus in the Security Council. The Secretary of State of the United States himself came to New York to speak on behalf of this country. The Soviets found themselves unable to defy the world censure aroused by the case. The Soviet troops were withdrawn from Iran.

The case of Indonesia is also in point. In 1948 there was a disturbance there involving the use of military forces on both sides. The issue was brought to the Security Council of the United Nations. Without peace forces, and without the threat of sanctions of any kind, but through the aid of a Good Offices Commission of the United Nations, the Netherlands and Indonesia were brought to pacific settlement. Peace, order, and freedom were established for the 77,000,000 of people in Indonesia. Within a year a new and independent republic had been formed—public opinion had demanded it—and the good will and sense of justice of the parties, aided by the United Nations, triumphed.

But the development and utilization of world opinion requires increased vigilance and understanding on the part of citizens of the world. It takes form through independent personal judgments becoming composite.

It is vital, therefore, that we protect the processes by which we are able to make these decisions. We must guard those human rights, such as freedom of the press, freedom of speech, free assembly, freedom of movement, which permit each one of us to obtain essential facts. For without the facts our judgment becomes warped. Only well-informed judgments aid the cause of peace.

Another force we discovered in the United Nations is the force of technical assistance to under-developed countries. Here by pooling our brain power in the interest of others, we help them to help themselves.

This is a field in which the people of Puerto Rico have provided me with a liberal education. I came hoping to report certain progress to you. But it is I who am receiving from you knowledge that I can apply positively in the discharge of my responsibilities when I return to Lake Success. When I see what you are doing here, I am tempted to declare that if all the peoples of the world will face their problems in the spirit in which you are facing yours, the solution of the problems of the world will be in sight.

You in Puerto Rico are today demonstrating a cardinal principle in the achievement of a better life. This principle is that of looking to oneself first and to others second for the solution of one's own problems. I refer, of course, to your adoption of Gov. Muñoz Marin's "operation bootstrap" as an alternative to "operation lament." You have not rejected Federal assistance—you have, in fact invited it—but you are demonstrating here that such assistance as comes to you from outside is effective in direct proportion to the effectiveness of what you do for yourselves by yourselves. What you do for yourselves and by yourselves is what justifies you, as self-respecting people, in asking for cooperation from outside. I have in mind the important bearing of this principle, and your demonstration of it, on the whole concept of assistance as set forth in point 4 of President Truman's inaugural address a year ago. Assistance to a country that is doing nothing for itself is assistance wasted. But assistance that supplements the all-out efforts of the people who receive it, is assistance rendered under conditions that are bound to make it effective. That is one lesson I presume to read into what you have shown me here.

This kind of initiative already has come to my attention in United Nations affairs. Not long after President Truman delivered his inaugural address, your honorable Governor, Muñoz Marin, was in the State Department offering a number of scholarships at the University of Puerto Rico to train experts under the point 4 program. More recently, at the invitation of your government, Assistant Secretary of State Willard Thorp and a team of experts came here to study technical assistance in Puerto Rico. They returned vastly impressed by what they saw and learned, and I can readily understand that from what I have seen since I arrived.

The initiative taken by your insular government to contribute what this island has to offer for the constructive development of the point four program gives hope that your experience here will have a salutary impact on the problems of areas in the world at large. At this stage, of course, I can only speculate. It does seem to me, however, that you might well provide procedures and an organization that would make it highly desirable to bring individuals from other countries here for technical and administrative training. You are overcoming, here, problems that are in many respects similar to the problems of a number of other agricultural countries in the tropics. You offer here the example of an effective democracy in action in a rural community of predominantly Latin speech, and you offer an illuminating picture of the successful coexistence of the two cultural streams—the Anglo-Saxon and the Spanish—each tolerant of and helpful to the other, preserving and developing a national life according to the wishes of the inhabitants.

I also envisage the possibility that this island, perhaps through the University of Puerto Rico, might provide some preliminary guidance to technicians from the continental United States who are on their way, for the first time, to work in the countries of Latin America. That would depend, I suppose, on what facilities were developed here. Given the right circumstances, the point four program of the United Nations and the point four activities conducted by our Federal Government might well profit from the intelligence and generosity of your whole approach to the problem of cooperating in the development of underdeveloped countries.

Indeed, examples of Puerto Rico's contribution to the training of technicians from other countries are already well known. To mention one, I need only refer to the arrangement with the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, by which a score of experts from Haiti have been brought to Puerto Rico over a 4-year period for advanced training in agricultural matters.

I hope that something of this sort proves feasible. I know that a number of your citizens already have given distinguished service to the United Nations and its specialized agencies. Your treasurer, Señor Descartes, has performed valuable service for the International Trade Organization. Chancelor Jaime Benitez, of the University of Puerto Rico, similarly has contributed to the development of the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and Cultural Organization. Your Commissioner of Labor, Señor Sierra Berdecia, recently attended the International Labor Conference in Montevideo.

It is clear that Puerto Ricans, drawing from both their valuable experience and their youth and vigor, can contribute increasingly to the United States effort toward peace in the United Nations. We are observing your efforts with interest and expectation.

The moral of what you and the insular government of your own choosing exemplify, however, has still wider and more significant application. Up in the United Nations, at Lake Success, we use a good many technical terms with which you people are familiar from your newspapers. One of them is the term "dependent peoples." Another is the term "non-self-governing territory." Whatever the technical meaning of these terms may be, it is apparent to me that they have little application in a literal sense to Puerto Rico and to the people of Puerto Rico. I find among you Puerto Rican Americans an independence of spirit no less than that which characterizes us Americans from the continental States. This does not fit in with any literal conception of a dependent people. What strikes me most forcibly, however, is that it is your own doing, it is what you have made of yourselves, that makes the term "dependent" so incongruous in its application to you as Americans. The lesson you have to teach in this respect is that true independence is not something that is conferred from without; it grows from within, and that is where it must always reside.

The term "non-self-governing" is also subject to qualifications in its literal implications as applied to this island, which is a part of our Federal association. It is true that the progressive development of your position with respect to our whole Federal Union has not given you yet the opportunity to vote for the constitutional instrument under which you are developing yourselves. I understand that you are working on this fundamental principle, and I am confident that you will have cooperation in your high purpose. I see here self-respecting adult Americans with their destiny in their own hands. Is it not a significant fact that the United States Department of the Interior, which has Puerto Rican affairs in its jurisdiction, is unrepresented by any commissioner or commissar or resident official of any sort in San Juan? Is it not a significant fact that the statesman who does exercise the executive powers of your insular government is not designated by Washington, but freely chosen by yourselves from among yourselves, that he is the servant of the Puerto Rican people and not the servant of Washington?

The world may well take note of this dignity that the Puerto Rican people have achieved; and it may also take note that they have achieved it within the terms of their relationship to the metropolitan United States. Just as we would not ourselves be bondsmen, so we would not have others in bondage to us. That is why we have welcomed and, indeed, supported the development that makes you today our associate under an insular government of your own creation. The friendly nature of our association is a tribute to our common democracy.

Let us all throughout the United States of America join your distinguished governor in his inspiring slogan "jalda arriba." [1]

[1] "Uphill" in a rather dynamic sense.

The Conviction of Alger Hiss

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by William Henry Chamberlin, from the New Leader of February 4, 1950:

THE CONVICTION OF ALGER HISS

(By William Henry Chamberlin)

The verdict of guilty on two counts of perjury brought in by the jury after the second trial of Alger Hiss is an event of profound significance. It should be regarded not as an end, but as a beginning. Hiss the individual is unimportant. Hiss the symbol of Soviet and Communist infiltration into high Government circles is alarmingly important.

The best means of insuring that there need never again be an Alger Hiss trial is to open up a long overdue painstaking investigation of indications of treasonable and espionage activities which have been coming to light in piecemeal fashion of late. There are many questions on which the American people are entitled to an answer.

Why, for example, were there so many notorious fellow travelers, if not card-carrying Communists, in the OWI? Three of the most influential individuals in the Polish section of that organization, Herz, Arsky, and a woman named Balinska, subsequently turned up in Stalin's satellite Poland, blackguarding the United States as hard as they could. Annabelle Bucar, the amorous lady who changed sides in Moscow, left her post in the American Embassy and wrote, or signed her name to, a scurrilous book about State Department and Embassy personnel, was an OWI alumna.

For some time after the war it became second nature for me, when reading a magazine article attacking the United States and apologizing for Soviet communism, to see whether the author was not formerly connected with a Government institution. Often this proved to be the case.

Why our chief agency of psychological warfare was so vulnerable would be a subject of rewarding inquiry. Did it just happen that way in the general wartime excitement, with the many accompanying illusions and delusions? Or did some person or persons plan it that way?

Another subject on which intensive research might yield interesting results is the origin of the Morgenthau plan. Most people think of this as a wild scheme of economic revenge which was fortunately not put into full effect. But there is food for thought in the last part of the plan which has been generally overlooked. Here is the precise wording of this provision:

"The primary responsibility for the policing of Germany and for civil administration in Germany should be assumed by the military forces of Germany's continental neighbors. Specifically these should include Russian, French, Polish, Czech, Greek, Yugoslav, Norwegian, Dutch, and Belgian soldiers.

"Under this program United States troops could be withdrawn within a relatively short time."

It is easy now to understand that military control of Germany by its continental neighbors, to the exclusion of the United States and Great Britain, would have meant turning over Germany, and Europe, to Stalin.

Does this reflect political illiteracy, or the blindness which often afflicts schemes of revenge, or a more deliberate purpose? The late Harry Dexter White was one of the principal authors of the Morgenthau plan. He was named by Whittaker Chambers as a source of information to Communist spy rings. Was there any connection—unbeknownst to Mr. Morgenthau—between these two facts? Or can the whole thing be laid to the wartime innocence and/or stupidity of some of our leaders?

These are only a few samples of scores of questions which arise in connection with Soviet and Communist infiltration and espionage before, during, and after the war. An authoritative investigation that would make a more coherent picture of the fragments of information which we possess might be of great service, in exposing the guilty and in clearing the innocent, and in showing conclusively what America is up against.

As for the Hiss trial, both its conduct and the final decision of the jury should redden the faces of those whose standard practice is to shout "Red baiting," "lynching," "hysteria," whenever anyone is accused of pro-Soviet or pro-Communist activity. Anything less hysterical than the proceedings against Hiss can hardly be imagined.

He was indicted only when the pumpkin papers furnished clear evidence that Chambers was not inventing stories of espionage. In the two trials he enjoyed every opportunity to prove his innocence. Indeed, the rulings of the court in the first trial seemed definitely favorable to Hiss, notably in the exclusion of the very important testimony of Hede Massing. And Judge Goddard may be considered to have stretched a point in favor of the defense when he admitted the dubious "psychiatric" testimony. The psychiatrists, incidentally, were handled very effectively by Prosecutor Thomas Murphy.

The jury evidently felt that the main exhibit in the case of the prosecution, the typewriter, the memoranda in Hiss' handwriting, the corroborative testimony of Hede Massing, the confession of Wadleigh, the effective confrontation of the Hisses with the former maid of Chambers, heavily outweighed the psychiatrists and the parade of the character witnesses.

Some of the latter may indeed be well advised to be more reticent in the future, especially when they are considering their attitude toward a man against whom there is strong prima facie evidence. The idea that Hiss "could not" have committed the acts laid to his charge because he was well educated and possessed a "proper" social background, is fantastic and could easily be refuted by dozens of examples in history and in Communist undergrounds in other countries. This is apparently what the jury thought also.

Court of Current Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FREDERIC R. COUDERT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. COUDERT. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday evening, February 7, it was my good fortune to appear on the well-known television program, Court of Current Issues, which emanates from New York City, and which on this occasion marked its second anniversary of continuous presentations. I say it was my good fortune to appear on this program, for I welcome every opportunity to bring my views on certain subjects to the American people.

Television in recent months, with the expansion of coaxial cables, is a new media with which the great American public can be reached with a variety of subjects, keeping them informed of the trends of the times, and allowing them, in normal democratic processes, to decide what is good or bad for America.

It is then with a great deal of personal satisfaction that I pay my respects to Irvin Paul Sulds, the originator of the Court of Current Issues. It was he who conceived this plan to have leading citizens of the Nation, representatives of schools, scientists, lawyers, and others skilled in their professions but differing in their opinions, to come before the public through this exciting new media.

Visual education has long been acknowledged as a great form of impressionism. This was greatly developed during the years of World War II in training our soldiers, sailors, and marines. Today programs such as the Court of Current Issues can bring this visual education into the living room of virtually thousands of homes, and give the public information on a variety of subjects. Once the facts are presented, the public is left to draw its own conclusions and make its own decisions.

It was gratifying to me that Mr. Sulds' efforts during the past 2 years were recognized last night by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, who through their senior vice commander-in-chief, Charles C. Ralls, of Seattle, Wash., presented him an official citation, signed by Commander-in-Chief Clyde A. Lewis, which said:

TO IRVIN PAUL SULDS:

In recognition of the second anniversary of the initiation of the Court of Current Issues, of which program he is the originator, and in commendation of the outstanding service of the program to America's service personnel and veterans in furthering public understanding and evaluation of important national and international issues pertinent to their interest and to the interest of our Nation, whose proud American tradition they fought to uphold.

So long as we have forward-looking citizens such as Mr. Sulds, whose ambition it is to bring information and the light of day in a very interesting and entertaining manner to the people of the Nation, I am sure that we can reasonably expect our people to make basic decisions in the best interests of all of us.

I hope that the Court of Current Issues will continue the splendid work which it has carried on for the past 2 years, and it is my further opinion that should like programs be developed and presented through the media of television, we can look forward to a period in our immediate future when we will have the best informed public of any nation in the world.

Philippine Surplus Storage

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about war surplus property in

the Philippines. Charges have been made of considerable waste and many erroneous stories have been printed in the press.

Today I had a discussion on this subject with Mr. John A. O'Donnell, one of the Commissioners of the Philippine War Damage Commission, who is presently in Washington. Mr. O'Donnell called my attention to an article written in the Christian Science Monitor, Friday, January 27, 1950, entitled "Basic Aims Won Despite Manila War Surplus Waste." I have read this article carefully and Mr. O'Donnell assures me that, based on his 3 years' experience in the island, including travel throughout the archipelago, that this article clearly and succinctly states the facts. In order that the membership of the House may have these facts because there is now much discussion on this subject, I include same as part of my remarks:

BASIC AIMS WON DESPITE MANILA WAR SURPLUS WASTE—VAST STOCK FOILED ORDERLY SELLING

(By David T. Sternberg)

MANILA.—When the Philippine Government closed its books in October on the surplus property deal, many felt this had affected the body social almost or profoundly as did the 3 years of enemy occupation.

The deal was that in which the United States Government turned over to the Filipinos a quantity of military surplus material ranging in diversity from bulldozers to beans and having an estimated procurement value of more than 2,000,000,000 pesos.

When the Philippine Government finally dissolved the Surplus Property Commission, its estimated total receipts in liquidation were about $17,500,000, plus perhaps another $9,000,000 pesos worth of goods allotted to government agencies.

There was little excitement here over that announcement.

MORAL LIABILITY

There was a feeling almost of relief, for thoughtful Filipinos came to regard the stock piles of war goods as something of a Pandora's box. Most of the government's scandals have stemmed from surplus, and much of the nation's lawlessness has bred in its temptingly vulnerable piles.

Morally, the gift was undoubtedly more of a liability than otherwise.

Looking at the record, American critics are inclined to charge bitterly that the Filipinos have wasted and dissipated a great treasure trove which could have gone far toward restoring their war-damaged nation. Filipino critics, with equal bitterness, are hinting darkly that they were short-changed. Neither comes very close to the truth.

Army surplus has gone far toward restoring the Philippines to a stage of well-being which compares more than favorably with that of any other war-torn country in the world today. And the task has been accomplished with material which originally may have had a procurement value of more than $1,000,000,000, but which, when turned over, was estimated by the donors at only $100,000,000.

To understand the story of military surplus, it is necessary to visualize the stores and their disposition physically.

COMBAT EXPENDABILITY

In 1944 the Philippine Islands were to be the staging area of the final all-out offensive against Japan. Along their shores were poured millions of tons of military supplies to support the offensive—supplies of high procurement value because they were produced under pressure of time, without regard for cost, and because built into them were certain military virtues absent from their civilian prototypes.

Custodians of these stores were men schooled to a concept of combat expendability, men who, even when well behind combat areas, could grin and shrug their shoulders when a barge tipped and sent three crated trucks and a Sherman tank to the bottom of the Pasig River.

Military logistics, logically enough, had made no provision for permanent storage and warehousing of these supplies. They were dispersed wherever space and strategic requirements permitted over the length and breadth of the archipelago, sheltered only by flimsy temporary roofs and tarpaulins.

VJ-day in 1945 found the bulk of the stores unexpended, and thoughts turned to the problem of surplus. But before much could be done the enthusiastic "bring the boys back home" had swept across the Pacific even to the service echelons which had seen no combat and relatively short terms of service.

COSTLY WASTE

The pace of subsequent demobilization and green replacements created a labor turn-over which would have sent the management of any private industry screaming into the streets, but the more philosophical military merely shrugged, murmured something about "citizen army," and started to nibble at the gargantuan task.

Nibbling, however, was no match for the elements. By late 1945, when the United States Foreign Liquidation Commission here first started limited sales of surplus, typhoon rains and tropic sun—plus GI handling—had reduced such surplus items as heavy trucks to rusty, stripped hulks with rotting tires. By the time the Philippine Rehabilitation (Tydings) Act finally was passed in 1946 by the Seventy-ninth Congress, more than $1,000,000,000 in procurement value was needed to make up an estimated fair value of $100,000,000, the amount granted by the act.

Both valuations could be little more than estimates, because the skeletonized military could barely cope with the minimum demands of maintenance and security, let alone the preparation of inventories.

Both under America's FLC and the Philippines' SPC, not the least deterrent to swift and economical disposal of surplus was a mass of well-intentioned official red tape. Restrictions intended to thwart favoritism and speculation in surplus goods served only to breed greater evils.

CORRUPT SALESMANSHIP

Corruption in the sale of surplus started when the first lieutenant discovered that his strategic position between the impatient buyer and the next desk in a long line leading to official approval could mean easy money at no greater effort than leaving some documents to gather dust in his outgoing basket. And it has continued to the present.

There is a bright side to the picture, however. What the United States may see as a billion-dollar tragedy of waste, and what the Philippine Government sees as a disappointing financial transaction can be regarded as such only in terms of bookkeeping.

It is true that useful equipment was rendered valueless by stripping and looting at the sprawling, vulnerable depots dotting the islands. It is true that fraud and corruption permitted vast quantities to slip out at a fraction of actual worth. It is true that years of costly adminstration and security have eaten deeply into the proceeds of sale and left the Philippine Government with perhaps a third of expected revenue. But it also is true that private enterprise has performed the minor miracle of reassembling, reconditioning, and converting the original contents of those depots into a well-rounded basic national economy.

INGENUITY PAYS OFF

In many areas the Filipino still eats surplus food, wears surplus clothing, and derives his livelihood from the use or sale of surplus materials. Twice as many vehicles are registered as before the war, and the vast majority are surplus trucks, jeeps, and trailers. Surplus sawmills are cutting timber which is being hauled to cities and piers by surplus trucks and trailers. Agricultural lands are being cleared and cultivated with surplus bulldozers and tractors to the extent that rice production this year will exceed prewar levels. Interisland shipping is almost back to normal with surplus bottoms.

Surplus cranes, cement mixers, road graders, and rollers in numbers and type unknown to the Philippines before the war, are speeding public and private reconstruction. From the uncounted jeeps, igeniously converted to carry six or eight passengers, which offer cheap mass transportation, to the pots and pans fashioned from aircraft fuselages, there is scarcely a phase of Filipino life today which does not derive benefit from surplus.

An additional factor which the Philippines must use in appraising its surplus treasure may be illustrated by the history of a surplus crane. Turned over by the Army at a fair value of $2,500 because of a battered cab and missing parts, Filipino manpower alone served to restore it so that it performed, and continues to perform, the functions of a civilian unit costing $12,000—and not until recently available.

Un-American Probe Should Be Continued

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash., for January 30, 1950:

UN-AMERICAN PROBE SHOULD BE CONTINUED

The manner in which President Truman dodged the questioning of White House correspondents last week on the Alger Hiss case indicates the degree of embarrassment with which the administration is now confronted as a result of Secretary Acheson's strange defense of Hiss.

It was President Truman who months ago termed the congressional probing of the Hiss record as a red herring. This earlier effort to stand by Hiss and other possible fellow travelers in high Government office did not prevent the House Un-American Activities Committee from pursuing the case, but it did hamper the work considerably.

The Hiss case eventually found its way into the Federal courts, and thanks to the cooperation of the Department of Justice, particularly the Federal Bureau of Investigation, the once-high State Department official was given an imminently fair trial and convicted of perjury.

This type of cooperation was not forthcoming, however, on the release to the congressional committee of a list of Government officials suspected of belonging to Communist-front organizations. Mr. Truman suppressed the loyalty report months ago and continues to do so.

It is hoped that the present House Un-American Activities Committee will continue to ferret out the facts on Communist infiltration into Government offices, and that Secretary Acheson, particularly, be called upon to explain why he continues to defend Alger Hiss.

Alice Morrison Nash and the Vineland Training School

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. MILLET HAND
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HAND. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Alice Morrison Nash, of Vineland, was the guest of honor at a dinner in New York, at which some of the most distinguished citizens of the Nation joined in paying tribute to her half century of selfless humanitarian work at the famous Vineland (N. J.) Training School, which is located in my district.

In Time of January 23, 1950, there appeared a brief sketch of the work done by this outstanding woman, which I herewith include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FIFTY YEARS OF SMALL VICTORIES

When 20-year-old Alice Morrison unpacked her Saratoga trunk in her tiny room at the Vineland (N. J.) Training School in 1900, she had a sinking sensation. The silent, halting students she had just seen were far different from the kind she had been taught to cope with at the New Hampton (N. H.) Literary and Biblical Institution.

In 1900, when Alice Morrison came to Vineland, it was one of three pioneer institutions for the mentally deficient, had been going just 12 years. The rest of the United States knew precious little about retarded children (i. e., those with an intelligence fixed below the 12-year level) or what could be done for them. Horrified and grief-stricken parents hid the uphappy children in back rooms or sent them to be cared for in inadequately equipped asylums.

A STAMMERED GRACE

When Alice Morrison arrived, the school owned 6 buildings and had 200 students. She spent a long day looking around her and sizing up her job. As she surveyed the children's bowed heads at the evening meal and listened to one youngster repeat a stammered grace, she made up her mind to stay.

She stayed. She married one of the school officials, Charles Emerson Nash, set up housekeeping in the administration building. To many of the children whose parents never visited them, the Nashes became "mother" and "pop."

As director of studies, Alice Nash was continually exploring new possibilities for her limited boys and girls; music, dramatics, dancing, and a variety of handicrafts as well as slow-motion versions of the three R's. Vineland became known as one of the foremost schools for mental deficients in the United States.

PLACES IN THE WORLD

Most of her victories were small ones: Teaching a mongoloid boy (with a 3-year-old's intelligence) to plow a straight furrow; coaxing a few words from a 6-year-old who had never spoken; teaching a girl to sew a straight hem or weave a towel. But she also fought for places in the outside world for students she felt were ready, every year sent 15 or 20 out to earn their own way. During World War II she had the satisfaction of seeing a hundred of her boys accepted for service.

Last week, as Alice Nash completed her fiftieth year there, Vineland's 93 buildings spread over a broad 1,100-acre campus. A hundred Vineland boys ran a 400-acre farm which helped feed the school's 550 students. The school had already fostered five other New Jersey institutions for the mentally retarded, served as the model for such schools as far away as Australia. The next step was a $1,000,000 fund-raising drive to build a new research center and expand the school's facilities.

As the drive got under way, 70-year-old Alice Morrison Nash sat in the crowded ballroom of Manhattan's Statler Hotel one night last week and listened to tributes from Nobel prize winner Pearl Buck, stateswoman Ruth Bryan Rohde, and New Jersey Gov. Alfred E. Driscoll. She nodded happily at the applause of friends, former students, and parents who had gathered to honor her, then prepared to return to her boys and girls at Vineland.

There Are Times When Damon's Bound To Unload Pythias

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Robert C. Ruark from the Washington Daily News of January 27, 1950:

THERE ARE TIMES WHEN DAMON'S BOUND TO UNLOAD PYTHIAS

(By Robert C. Ruark)

NEW YORK, January 27.—I believe friendship, along with respect for motherhood and other abiding institutions, has long been on the editorial free list as an unassailable commodity. So I do not propose to knock friendship as a whole, but would merely like to speculate on some rather odd aspects of it.

Dean Acheson's stanch and Biblical backstopping of the convicted Alger Hiss seemed rather brave and admirable in a man, rather silly as a diplomat, and downright shocking as a Secretary of State. Mr. Truman's sterling advocacy of his old pals, such as the Pendergast mob, and his stubborn protection of that great buffoon, Harry Vaughan, also has been a fine example of butt-headed loyalty.

I am now beginning to wonder just how far you can carry this friendship operation if you hold public office and the respect and welfare of your country weighs upon your back. I am prone to challenge the nobility quotient of friendship if it leads an Alger Hiss, a high and trusted public servant, to snitch vital state papers for delivery to his Communist bosom buddy, Whit Chambers. I even knock love a little bit, too, if it moves a Judith Coplon to swipe the FBI's private files for her Russian boy friend.

Somewhere along the way, it seems to me, Damon is morally bound to unload Pythias, if Pythias gets completely out of hand, and Cupid may even be shot as a spy if he starts pegging his arrows at the wrong people. In some cases this friendship assumes the proportions of the distraught dame who is standing over her lover with a smoking gat and proclaiming that she loved him. This is of short comfort to the chilled gent on the deck.

I believe that friendship should endure until death, that friendship is a perfect blendship if indulged in privately, but when somebody else's friendship is inflicted on the public time then it is strictly friendship, "schmendship," in my book. Nobody is ever criticized for continuing an amiable relationship with some old, sodden bum you played ball with as a kid, but you don't have to put him in charge of foreign relations or appoint him to run the FBI or sit in the Supreme Court.

Mr. Acheson's Bible quotations and jut-jawed loyalty to his old pal therefore leave me a touch cold and I begin to wonder about Mr. Acheson's own standards and qualifications to steer us safely through the moment's emergencies.

After what happened to China, under State Department hands, the unpleasant thought strikes me that maybe the joint is leaping with Hiss admirers, and for all I know a big business in hot documents to the Russians is flourishing there. I seem to remember an old saw about man being known by the company he keeps.

I lack Mr. Acheson's nobility of mind. Even if Hiss had been my best chum, fraternity brother, and steady bankroller, I would be inclined today to regard him as a lavatory rat, and dump him, fast.

Lincoln Day Celebration Speeches, Washington, D. C., February 6, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I offer for the RECORD the speeches made by the Republican Members of Congress and the Senate on the occasion of the annual Lincoln Republican celebration in the form of a box supper held February 6 at Uline Arena, Washington, D. C., where at least 12,000 people were in attendance and 3,000 were turned away because space was not available to accommodate them:

CONGRESSMAN GEORGE A. DONDERO, OF MICHIGAN, CONGRESSIONAL EXECUTIVE CHAIRMAN

May the day never come when we can no longer stand up, as a free people, and sing "My Country 'tis of Thee." May all Americans who still believe in our country and its Republican form of government join with the Republican Party tonight, in celebrating the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, who still stands as the greatest symbol of freedom the world has ever known.

Lincoln knew that any man worthy of the name would rather be free than safe; because when freedom is lost, all is lost.

We dedicate ourselves tonight and join together to stop the creeping socialism being forced upon our country by the present administration. We pledge ourselves to fight for the preservation of our free institutions—for the freedom and self-respect of the individual—to the end that this Nation of free men shall continue to be free.

GUY GEORGE GABRIELSON, CHAIRMAN, REPUBLICAN NATIONAL COMMITTEE

Thank you, fellow Republicans.

As your national chairman, there are many things that I would like to say to you tonight, but I feel that since we have now issued a statement of principles of the Republican Party, the time for talking is past and the time for action is here.

However, I wish to make one brief pronouncement. From this night on, the Republican Party is going to be the strongest, most active and vigorous opposition party that has ever been known in the history of our country. We are at present the minority party but we have no intention of remaining so—and we mean to become the majority

party in 1950 and, with the help of all patriotic Americans who believe in constitutional government, to elect a Republican President and Vice President in 1952.

TAXES—CONGRESSMAN CHARLES A. HALLECK, OF INDIANA

The Republican Party is the party of low taxes and economy in government.

It was the Republican Eightieth Congress which reduced taxes for the first time in over a generation. This was done over the opposition and veto of the Democratic administration.

The Republican Eightieth Congress forced a Democratic administration to balance the budget for the first time in many long years.

Today, under a Democratic Congress and a Democratic administration, the budget is again out of balance—hopelessly in the red. "Mr. Spender-in-Chief" has again sounded the call. He wants more taxes.

To that the Republican Party says—

"Let's cut the cost of government and reduce taxes—not increase them. Let's balance the budget. Let's be sure we have a sound economy."

DEFICIT SPENDING—SENATOR KENNETH S. WHERRY, OF NEBRASKA, SENATE MINORITY LEADER

Fellow Americans, deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy.

The reckless and extravagant spending by this administration can result only in disaster and ruin for our country.

It will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, insurance, and investments of millions of people.

Why, the only, sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government, balance the budget, get on a pay-as-you-go basis, cut the debt, and cut taxes.

Carry this issue to the country, and we will elect a Republican majority in both Houses of Congress in 1950, and a Republican President in 1952.

SENATOR MARGARET CHASE SMITH, OF MAINE

I am glad to be here tonight because I honestly hope that this event will start not only Republicans, but more important, Americans on the road to something that is far more important than any one of us—you and me—the Republican Party, or any other political party—to a truly free America with free people—to a land of free opportunity—away from government paternalism—away from government by hand-out—away from government by deception, that promises something for nothing—in which individual freedom is bartered away for the mental drug of politically-promised security.

Yes, all summed up, away from a government that daily dictates our life, that tells us what we can and can't do on matters that we used to decide for ourselves.

I hope with all my heart that tonight the Republican Party will be starting America, you and me, back to that most basic of all freedoms that we used to cherish and enjoy—the freedom to be let alone.

FARM PROGRAM—CONGRESSMAN AUGUST H. ANDRESEN, OF MINNESOTA

The Brannan farm plan is a fraud upon both farmers and consumers.

For the farmer it means full Government control of all his operations and the ultimate nationalization of American agriculture as has occurred in Socialist Britain. It means that every farmer will become completely dependent upon Congress and the Government for a large part of his annual income. It means inefficiency and increased costs in agricultural production, which in the end results in scarcities and high food prices to consumers.

It makes the Secretary of Agriculture an economic czar over American farmers, and in the end, due to the inability of the taxpayers to finance this multimillion-dollar Utopia, the farmers will wind up in bankruptcy and without any farm program whatsoever.

American farmers are justly entitled to an American farm program that will assure them an income and standard of living on equality with other segments of our American economy as against the ruinous political scheme proposed by the Truman administration.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE—SENATOR HOMER E. CAPEHART, OF INDIANA

The people of the United States have achieved the highest standard of national health the world has ever known under our system of private medicine, aided by Public Health Service.

The Democratic administration now seeks to Trumanize and socialize the practice of medicine.

They ignore the failure of the British experiment.

The power-drunk dreamers want to herd the American people into regimented groups and assign them to doctors and dentists who are identified by number as if they were in prison—well, maybe that is more than a descriptive thought.

The idea, of course, is to make a stomachache a Federal offense.

Seriously, folks, we feel the Government's job is to make possible the education and training of more doctors and nurses.

It is to help provide funds for the erection of more hospitals and research laboratories.

It is to aid in the spread of medical facilities in the areas where they do not now exist.

Socializing medicine will not do these things.

We Republicans would rather place our confidence in a practice we know to be successful than in a theory which so far has failed to work.

MRS. JOSEPH R. FARRINGTON, NATIONAL PRESIDENT, WOMEN'S REPUBLICAN CLUBS, PAST PRESIDENT, LEAGUE OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Thank you, Mr. Murphy.

As president of the National Federation of Women's Republican Clubs, I wish to address this appeal to all women within the range of the sound of my voice.

In the last general election, 45,000,000 eligible voters failed to use their ballot. This is a situation that must not continue. Let us—all of us women—everywhere—here and now dedicate ourselves to the proposition of persuading those of voting age of the importance of being alert to the present-day issues: the necessity of finding out who the candidates are and what they stand for—the need for women to be active in politics—then, by all means, last but most important—to cast their votes for those candidates who best exemplify human freedom and American liberty.

If we succeed in achieving this goal—and I know with woman force we shall succeed—the year 1950 will go down in history as the year of the second emancipation.

JOHN TOPE, PRESIDENT, YOUNG REPUBLICAN NATIONAL FEDERATION

This opportunity for Young Republicans to honor our ideal among statesmen is a privilege. As chairman of the Young Republican National Federation, we support the dynamic principles of the Republican Party. The utilization of our ideas, our ideals and our energies in this year's congressional and senatorial campaigns will do much to insure victory.

Lincoln opposed a country half free and half slave. We oppose a country half free and half Socialist. We unite in the fight for a Republican victory. In the fight for freedom, we invite other like-minded people to join us.

MRS. THOMAS, ASSISTANT SECRETARY TO THE NATIONAL CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY, NIECE OF THE FIRST GENERAL OF HER RACE TO SERVE IN THE ARMED FORCES, THE ILLUSTRIOUS GEN. F. O. DAVIS

I am very happy to have this opportunity to honor the man who did so much for my people—the great Abraham Lincoln.

We in the Republican Party honor his memory and intend to carry forward the principles of government and humanity that he believed in so firmly.

Thank you.

BIG GOVERNMENT—CONGRESSMAN LEONARD W. HALL, OF NEW YORK, CHAIRMAN, CONGRESSIONAL CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Section 4, article 4, of the Constitution, says "the United States shall guarantee to every State in this union a republican form of government."

Today we are plagued by a monster known as big government, a monster which has not only gobbled up the rights and privileges of the States but also many of the rights of labor, management, and the individual citizen. It is a thing of unlimited appetite.

The time has come to do away with this monster. We subscribe to the belief that the founding fathers knew what they were doing when they formed this Government of ours. We are certain that for 150 years it has been the finest type of government known to man.

The time has come to return to this republican form of government, a government of the people, by the people, and, particularly, for the people.

CHINA POLICY—SENATOR WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, OF CALIFORNIA

Our bankrupt China policy stems from Yalta. In a secret deal, the Democratic administration—without the knowledge or consent of the Chinese Republic—gave vital Manchurian rights to the Soviet Union.

The action was taken without the consent of the American Congress or the American people.

More recently, a State Department leadership that is reluctant to turn its back on Alger Hiss has turned its back on effective aid to non-Communist China.

In that area of the world they appear more interested in saving face than in saving freedom.

HISS-ACHESON—SENATOR KARL E. MUNDT, OF SOUTH DAKOTA

Tonight we are gathered together to honor Abraham Lincoln. On the bill of fare we have old-fashioned American fried chicken, but there are some people in this town tonight who are attempting to eat their own words—and they are finding those words hard to swallow and highly unpalatable.

Today one Alger Hiss stands convicted and sentenced. His crime? He sold his country down the river—a Russian river. The Democratic administration was first told of Alger Hiss 11 years ago—in 1939; then again in 1943; then again in 1948. Again and again and again.

When questioned about this, one important executive's answer was: "No comment." Another man high in the Government reaffirmed his affection for his former associate.

Yes, indeed there are folks in this town tonight who are eating "red herring," but they are not Republicans. This red herring can only cause us to end up with a horrible case of national indigestion. And how can this indigestion be cured? By substituting a government by intelligent Americans who can very easily distinguish foreign "red herring" from American fried chicken.

THE ATOM BOMB—SENATOR OWEN BREWSTER, OF MAINE

Russia has the atom bomb. The free world trembles. How did she get the atom bomb? The story is now unfolding.

We have exposed our Coplons, our Hisses, our Wadleighs—and now Britain's Dr. Fuchs. When will this parade of traitors end?

Russia got the atom bomb not by independent research—but through traitors within our ranks. The present administration, through stupidity or by design, has coddled Communists, shielded traitors, and aided and protected enemies of our Republic. All of this being treason, let us make the most of it.

We Republicans believe that spies should be arrested and dealt with as spies, that traitors should be treated as traitors, and that the uppermost concern of all elected representatives of Government should be the preservation of our national security, and the safety and protection of our Republic—from enemies within and without.

FBI—CONGRESSMAN FRANK B. KEEFE, OF WISCONSIN

In years past there have been many attempts made to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its great leader, J. Edgar Hoover.

I wish to state here and now that the Republican Party has complete faith and confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Mr. Hoover and his men have done a magnificent job under the most difficult circumstances. They have earned the confidence, the praise and the esteem of the American people.

The Republican Party intends to see to it that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is allowed to continue its good work. We will not stand by and allow the left-wingers and the pinkos to discredit the Federal Bureau of Investigation with a campaign of lies and deceit.

We are certain that the Federal Bureau of Investigation is an important cog in the preservation of the American way of life, and we intend to see that it is allowed to function and continue its important work unhampered.

VETERANS—CONGRESSMAN JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA

In the past, as in the present, the Republican Party has always championed the cause of the veterans.

We feel the men who fought our wars are entitled to a decent break from their Government—the disabled, the sick, their widows, and their orphans.

Most of the benefits enjoyed by veterans today were enacted by Republican administrations or passed over the vetoes of Democrats.

As all veterans know, the Economy Act of 1933—written by a Democratic President and jammed through a Democratic Congress—took away many benefits from our comrades of the Civil War, the Spanish-American War and World War I.

Today the veteran is getting a curious kind of deal from the so-called Fair Deal. While he is being given a refund for passed overcharges on his insurance premiums, he is being deliberately overcharged on his current payments. Then one of these days, when an election is in the offing, he may be given another refund.

The Republican Party wants no part of this kind of political shell game. We want a square deal for the veterans.

DECENTRALIZATION OF GOVERNMENT—SENATOR CHARLES W. TOBEY, OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

Stop the trend to centralized government in Washington. It was Jefferson who warned: "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap, we should soon want bread. * * * When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington, as the center of all power, it will become venal and oppressive."

And our own Abraham Lincoln confirmed this when he said: "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society."

Wake up, America. Understand how far your individual liberties have been encroached upon; and then, as we celebrate Lincoln's Birthday, join with me in hurling his warning to the Democrats: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time."

Wake up, America, cast the scales from your eyes, rebuke the greed and lust for power, so rampant in Washington today.

How? Vote Republican.

FOREIGN POLICY—SENATOR HARRY P. CAIN, OF WASHINGTON

Ladies and gentlemen, I'm supposed to speak tonight on foreign policy. I find it a very difficult subject, and honestly and truly I don't know what our foreign policy is.

All sorts of secret agreements have come to light from time to time, and there is no way of telling how many more we'll discover as time goes on. To my way of thinking, if we have a policy, it is the most confused conglomeration of inconsistencies that has ever been contrived to plague a nation. It has no definite form and definitely is not the result of bipartisan cooperation. It is more probably the complete work of the Democratic administration—ably assisted by Acheson, Hiss, and company.

I propose that we must have a definite foreign policy, discussed and agreed upon by the elected representatives of the people—and most important—I insist that the Congress and the people have a right to know what our commitments are, where our Government is leading us—and most important of all—our foreign policy must be designed for the welfare and protection of the United States of America.

LABOR—SENATOR ROBERT A. TAFT, OF OHIO

The Republican Party has restored equality between employer and employee; outlawed secondary boycotts, jurisdictional strikes, and other unfair labor practices; and guaranteed to every workman the right to work, the right to have his union recognized, the right to strike after a proper waiting period. It has given the President power to protect the public against threats to its safety and health. Under Republican legislation, union membership has increased to new highs. Wages, working conditions, and services and pensions are at their highest point in history. The number of strikes has been reduced. The Republican Party will be vigilant always to protect the rights of the workmen against unfair employers and also against arbitrary union bosses.

THE HONORABLE JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR., OF MASSACHUSETTS, HOUSE MINORITY LEADER

Ladies and gentlemen, we are nearing the close of this magnificent tribute to Abraham Lincoln. You have heard Republican Members of the Senate and the House tell you where the Republican Party stands on taxes, deficit spending, communism, the Brannan plan, socialized medicine, foreign policy, the atom bomb, our veterans, and labor.

Late today the Republican Members of the Senate and House adopted, and the Republican National Committee concurred in, a new statement of party policy which I consider a great document. On foreign affairs it contains eight specific and positive proposals. On domestic affairs it makes 23 more fundamental and constructive recommendations. Even more important, it sets forth the great issue of today: liberty against socialism.

America as we know it and love it is the last outpost of freedom. We in the Republican Party are dedicated to the proposition that the America of free men, free competition, and free speech shall never die, and we will take this issue to the voters next November, convinced that every thinking American will join us in this crusade to save our country.

Why Does Acheson Defend Alger Hiss?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. NIXON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Spokesman-Review, Spokane, Wash.:

WHY DOES ACHESON DEFEND ALGER HISS?

One of the strangest statements to come out of Washington in recent political history is the affirmation by Secretary of State Acheson that "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss."

To create an aura of martyrdom over the perjury conviction of his former associate, Mr. Acheson refers to the Sermon on the Mount. In so doing he is using a powerful weapon to try to repudiate the decision of the Hiss jury and to assure the Hiss sympathizers within his own Department of State that he will stand by and protect them from a fate similar to that which has befallen their comrade.

Secretary Acheson is granted to be a devoutly religious man and he gives every indication of having been deeply moved by the Hiss conviction. Only time and revelations yet to come will show whether he expressed a sincere concern for a victim he believes to be innocent or whether he has utilized a sacred mechanism to cover up what might be a conspiracy even greater than that openly revealed before congressional committees and at the two Hiss trials.

Mr. Acheson declined specific comment on the legal aspects of the celebrated case, but what he said in support of Hiss had a far more damaging effect upon his own reputation as a lawyer, a scholar, and as America's leading foreign policy spokesman than any discussion he could have advanced on the purely legal phases of the trial and conviction.

That trial and conviction was in the American tradition and was carried through with finite regard to the principles of due process of law. For a high official of the Truman administration to question the verdict in the manner in which he did and to utilize an emotional-religious lever to appeal to public opinion to overrule that verdict is strange conduct indeed for our Secretary of State.

Mr. Acheson's pretrial and posttrial defense of Alger Hiss calls for further probing by those agencies and those men who are attempting to ferret out the forces that have been trying to undermine our Government and destroy our democracy.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL STEFAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by me for Lincoln's birthday, 1950:

It has been a matter of lasting regret to me that I was not personally acquainted with the midwestern Member of the House of Representatives who declared on the floor of the House: "* * * The President is in nowise satisfied with his own positions. First he takes up one, and in attempting to argue us into it he argues himself out of it, then seizes another and goes through the same process, and then, confused at being able to think of nothing new, he snatches up the old one again, which he some time before cast off. His mind taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which he can settle down and be at ease.

"He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

I should like to have known the man who said these words.

That man was Abraham Lincoln.

He said these words on January 12, 1848, while a Member of the House of Representatives from Illinois.

All Americans pay particular homage to Abraham Lincoln on February 12, 1950—the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of his birth. The America into which he was born, and in which he spent his youth and his manhood, has changed in a material way. Spiritually, our America and Lincoln's America are one and the same. The great principles for which he lived and died have not changed.

Let us search those enduring principles for clues as to what we twentieth century Americans must do to bulwark the very survival of our republican form of government.

One of Lincoln's own favorite quotations was Thomas Jefferson's profound statement that "Were we directed from Washington when to sow and when to reap we should soon want bread. * * * When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of power, it will become venal and oppressive."

When Lincoln was born (1809) the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $13,056,000. In that same year—after all expenses of Government were paid—the Treasury books showed a surplus of $3,970,000.

When Lincoln was a Member of the House of Representatives (1847–48)—when Lincoln was at odds with then-President Polk for engaging in the Mexican War—the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $28,545,000. In that same year the Treasury books showed a deficit of $5,553,000.

When Lincoln was President (1861–65), during the great Civil War, the total Federal Government income from all sources was approximately $160,907,000 per year. The average yearly deficit for this period was $522,878,000.

Compare these figures with those of President Truman in his 1950 budget message. President Truman said that the Federal Government took in $38,246,000,000 in the fiscal year 1949 while spending $40,057,000,000. This is a deficit of $1,811,000,000. President Truman went on from there to estimate the 1950 deficit at $5,100,000,000 and the 1951 deficit at $5,500,000,000.

These boxcar figures bring us back with a jolt to the aptness of Abraham Lincoln's reasoning when—at the age of 34—he stated: "As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next, no one left to borrow from, so must it be with the Government."

Keeping his Government solvent was one of the major motivating forces in the life of the Great Emancipator. His devotion to the American system of free enterprise was another motivating force, of equal stature.

On July 1, 1854, almost 7 years before he became President, Lincoln declared: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere." This was a powerful restatement of what he had already said on the floor of the House of Representatives on July 27, 1848: "We see it, and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing people to do as they please with their own business."

How vividly Lincoln's wisdom applies to American old people today who, living lives of thrift and obedience to law, find, in their old age, that their livelihood is being taxed and regulated out of existence.

"Tax, tax, tax, to spend, spend, spend"—the current battle cry—keeps down the pioneer vitality of American youth whose promise of the future Lincoln underlined in his Cincinnati speech of 1859: "The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all."

The restoration of the right of old age to enjoy the fruits of the labors of a lifetime; the restoration of the right of youth to a tomorrow of unimpaired opportunity—these should be the rallying points of all Americans today. These things have not changed.

Still another motivating factor in Lincoln's triumphant career has remained the same—the Lincoln concept of the place of State and local government as against Federal Government.

Speaking in Columbus, Ohio, in 1858, Lincoln declared: "I believe there is a genuine popular sovereignty. I think a definition of genuine popular sovereignty, in the abstract, would be about this: That each man shall do precisely as he pleases with himself, and with all things which exclusively concern him. Applied to government, this principle would be, that a general government shall do all those things which pertain to it, and all the local governments shall do precisely as they please in respect to those matters which exclusively concern them. I understand that this Government of the United States, under which we live, is based upon this principle; and I am misunderstood if it is supposed that I have any war to make upon that principle."

These words which I have just finished quoting are a guidepost back to the road to national sanity for which the American people have been devotely searching. The American people need seek no further. Lincoln found the way. His way is still the way.

Lincoln never envisioned farmers being dictated to by Washington bureaucrats.

Lincoln did not approve of teachers being told what to teach by Washington.

Lincoln did not advocate telling the people of Nebraska how to run their State, county, and community governments.

Lincoln did not propose the enslavement of physicians.

Lincoln did not stand for the binding of merchants by coils of red-tape regulations.

Lincoln did not support the idea of sending snoopers to pry into the private lives of law-abiding citizens.

He believed—and he repeated over and over—that the best Federal Government was the least necessary Federal Government.

Because of what Lincoln believed—because of the beliefs for which he lived and died—I am proud that his name will forever be associated with the State of Nebraska. I am cheered by the thought that on July 29, 1867—3 months and 28 days after Nebraska became a State—the Capital was removed to a new site. I am further encouraged by remembering that on the very day the site became the State Capital its name was changed from Lancaster to Lincoln. This act was a public acknowledgement that the State of Nebraska had chosen to take the principles of Abraham Lincoln as the principles of our State.

It is my firm opinion that the people of Nebraska have nothing to fear from the future so long as they cling to the ideals of Lincoln—under whose banner this State was born.

Where then should Nebraskans look for possible threats to their way of life? Lincoln said in his Cooper Union speech, "At what point is the danger to be expected? I answer, if it ever reaches us, it must spring up among us. It cannot come from abroad. If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be its author and finisher. As a nation of freemen, we must live through all time or die by suicide."

What should we do when we feel that this land, this great Republic our ours, is menaced by internal dissent, by the setting of race against race, and occupation against occupation? Lincoln said: "I am driven to my knees over and over again because I have nowhere else to go." Let us follow Lincoln's example. Let us get down on our knees—and pray. When we have finished praying, let us rise to new courage, new determination.

Lincoln is gone from us in body. But what he said and what he did are still here to lead us in the right way—his way. On Lincoln's birthday, 1950, the American people must—and, I believe, will, dedicate themselves to their Nation. They will say, as one, so that all enemies of this Republic—both those without and those within—will hear and tremble: "We will follow Lincoln's road. We will not let him down. We will not fail the eternal spirit of the man who never failed his people."

That spirit we will long remember.

Stealing the Savings of the Thrifty

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following excerpt

from an address by Hon. Samuel B. Pettengill, former Member of the House of Representatives, entitled "Stealing the Savings of the Thrifty":

STEALING THE SAVINGS OF THE THRIFTY

At a dinner party in New York City some 15 years ago I was urging the responsibility of bankers to do all they could to prevent rot in the dollar. In reply, a vice president of one of the country's biggest banks said to me, "The responsibility for money rests on the Government. If the Government pays off its bonds in cigar coupons, we will have the cigar coupons to give to our depositors."

I will never forget this complete abdication of trusteeship as a banker, and as a citizen. Under our system who is the government anyway?

I was one of the few men in Congress who voted against the repudiation of the gold clause. Under the circumstances then prevailing I knew the Government could not meet all demands in gold. But I knew we had suspended specie payments once before—and resumed them. To me it was one thing for a debtor to say: I regret that I cannot pay now. It was a different thing to say: I will never perform my promise. I ventured to say at the time that this act of national dishonor would sow dragon's teeth to grow into bitter fruit in the years to come.

Having cast my vote, I was, of course, gratified when the United States Supreme Court later held unanimously that Congress had acted unlawfully with "all the wrong and reproach," to use Chief Justice Hughes' words, that repudiation carries when done by a private citizen. But, as the case was presented by the holder of Government bonds, the Court held that while he had been wronged, he had not proved his damage. Four of the judges said, even with respect to the gold clause in private contracts, that "the impending legal and moral chaos is appalling." When the people were denied the right to demand gold for Government paper, their hands were taken off the brake of profligate public spending.

The dragon's teeth thus sown, in 1933, have now sprouted everywhere. The abdication of moral responsibility for the welfare of the thrifty and industrious and therefore the most useful members of society has permeated governmental action. The devaluation we excused in 1933 is now a world-wide example of moral and financial decadence. A United States Government bond for $100 bought in 1939 has lost 40 percent of its then value. A French Government bond bought that same year has lost 98 percent of its value. A French worker gets 15,000 francs a month. What trash will be in the American's pay envelope a few years from now?

Unless public opinion is changed, the following facts prove to me that the trend, not over the next few months, but over the years is toward more inflation—more repudiation, more stealing.

What do I mean by inflation? Assuming that money continues to circulate, the guts of inflation is simply this: More dollars for no more goods or services. That makes money cheap. That makes prices rise and steals the wages and savings of the thrifty.

What proves that the trend is toward more dollars for no more goods?

Most important of all, perhaps, is the politically promoted mass hallucination that people can vote themselves rich, the witchcraft that government can create wealth, that politicians have a magic cornucopia filled with the more abundant life, that "we owe us"—and therefore debt is harmless.

Even some business editors have fallen for the witchcraft that Government spending sustains the Nation's economy. But we have been prosperous when spending was negligible. It ought to be plain to a school child that the Government can't make you rich by spending your own money.

Next, unbalanced budgets during 17 of the past 19 years have poured into the economic bloodstream more dollars than the Government has taken out in taxes. This has developed the habit.

Next in order is that evil sleight-of-hand by which the Government converts its debt into money. This is removed from outright greenbacks or printing-press money only by the fact that debt still carries some interest.

The political need of appearing to tax the people as little as possible to pay interest on the debt leads the borrowing government to force interest rates down, which makes money cheap, and thus dilutes all savings payable in a fixed number of dollars. At the same time the political spendthrifts have the need to cheapen money in order to force wage payments up into higher dollar brackets so they can collect more through the withholding tax.

The loss of the peace—the substitution of Russia as a threat to the world in place of Germany and Japan—has resulted in enormous armament spending, which, however necessary, pours billions of dollars into the economy without the offset of consumable or commercially useful goods.

The next big inflationary factor are Federal politicians paying for votes by putting pressure on employers to force more dollar signs to be written on pay checks or pension checks—more dollars for no more goods.

Labor monopolies and industry-wide bargaining, granted by politicians for votes, permits ruthless men, competing with each other for place and power, to force the Nation to pay more dollars for no more goods. The repeal of the Taft-Hartley law would tighten their grip on our throats.

Price supports for farmers—again more dollars for no more goods. Billions of dollars worth of eggs, potatoes, cotton, wheat, meat, etc., are taken out of the market by the Government and put in vast caves and warehouses under lock and key until they rot and are fed to hogs, or are shipped abroad.

Then we have the prevailing rage of State governments, which had no direct responsibility for the war, to vote bonuses to veterans wholly irrespective of need or injury in the country's service—again more dollars for no more goods.

Next is the boost to minimum wages—more unemployment compensation and longer periods to enjoy it—the increase of pay of civil-service workers—more dollars for no more goods.

Such are some of the powerful long-range forces at work to make money constantly cheaper. But there is more to the story.

Those of you who have read Andrew D. White's classic on inflation in France in the 1790's will recall how one issue of assignats so cheapened money that the politicians printed more assignats to offset the evil effects of the previous issues, thus causing a chain reaction which was not stopped short of total collapse. That same chain reaction is at work in America today as workers demand more and more wages to offset the rising cost of living, or as Congress votes bigger social-security payments because present payments buy so few goods. With a few exceptions, such as HARRY BYRD, of Virginia, or BOB TAFT, of Ohio, politicians have no cure for the evils of inflation except more inflation—more dollars for no more goods.

This chain reaction is also at work as floors under farm-commodity prices cause city workers to demand more wages, which increases the cost of shoes and clothing and machinery to the farmer who then demands that his parity price be raised still higher. And so the music goes round and round.

Another chain reaction is this. The Federal vampire sucks so much tax money out of the pockets of the people and the cities and States in which they live, that they feel poor and so demand Federal aid for housing, doctor bills, education, and all the rest. So Federal power grows on what it feeds on and Marx goes marching on. If the politicians on the Potomac let the people and States keep what they make, they could pay their own bills. There would be just as much purchasing power in the country and a lot more freedom.

Taxes and especially progressive income taxes discourage production and reduce the output of goods which might otherwise keep dollars and goods in balance. The blight of taxes is seen in the steady drying up of risk capital. It is a startling fact that the securities of 9 of the 15 largest American companies are selling today on the exchanges for less than the bock value of their assets. And this in a year of record prosperity. This means that if these companies were not in existence, the money could not be found to create them.

The graduated income tax—borrowed from the Communist Manifesto of 1848—lays its heaviest hand on the most dynamic and productive members of our society—the managers, risk takers, and job creators. States and cities are now adding their own graduated income taxes to those imposed by the Federal Government. This penalty against efficient men slows down the production of goods. As Cal Coolidge said, "When the Government takes 30 percent of what a man makes on Monday, 40 on Tuesday, 50 on Wednesday, and 60 on Thursday, he won't show up for work the rest of the week."

Last, we have the blight of socialism and the so-called welfare state. Socialism has an incurable disease. It is that men generally will not work as hard or produce as much for the Government as they will for their own wives and children. Socialism produces less goods per dollar paid out. It encourages shirkers and discourages workers. It lures men away from doing their best by its promises of shorter hours, longer vacations, and more dollars for less work. Socialism is parasitical—by its very nature. The private-property system must be productive—by its very nature. The hope of profits sees to that, whereas crushing taxes and strangling red tape produce fewer goods per dollar spent.

The popular appeal of the welfare state is that it promises to pay the masses more than they pay the government. The very nature of this promise creates greater and greater pressures on those who made the promise to make more promises. After taking all they can from those who are above the average in income, the promise will finally be paid only in rotting money, as the workers of Europe are finding out. The immutable law of socialism demands that their politicians plunder the savings of the thrifty, first by taxation—and then by inflation and confiscation. The money of any socialist government must be sold short for the long pull.

There is, of course, no need for America to breathe any more of this contagion of rotting money. With our marvelous productive capacity—with science, invention, research, and technology anxious to work their miracles, we can produce such a flood of goods as to keep goods and money in balance. We can start prices downward again and bring integrity back to the dollar.

But under the prevailing political climate, despite our almost unlimited capacity to produce, the price of the basic needs of life is being pushed upward by this chain reaction of cheap dollars—food, shelter, clothing, coal,

steel, freight and passenger rates, wages, hospital and medical care, education, life insurance—most of these are higher in price today than in 150 years. No one can produce goods as fast as politicians can print money.

Historically, due to constantly better tools, production per man-hour has increased 2 to 3 percent a year, or from 20 to 30 percent per decade. But the Cleveland Trust Co. reports that the gain in the past 10 years has only been 8 percent. And in some cases, it has been zero, or less. But hourly wages have gone up 118 percent. This is inflation in every language. One hundred and eighteen percent more dollars for 8 percent more goods. Despite our huge investment in new tools and the harnessing of mechanical energy, which should bring all prices down for everyone, we are largely denied the benefits of our technology by feather-bedding practices, and the narcotic of the promise of security without work.

Before turning to the remedy for our ills, note how the moral chaos predicted in the gold-clause case is spreading. Leaving the war and cold war out of consideration, I refer to the immorality of those actions of the Federal Government which cause more dollars to be issued for no more goods—for example, monetizing the debt, or putting pressure on employers to write more dollar signs on pay checks.

This adulterates all dollar savings, just as a dishonest farmer pours water into milk. But there are five groups of voters numbering millions who have an even stronger case than some of us against the pickpocket or Robin Hood state. These five groups hold the direct contracts of the Government itself.

First are those who loaned the Government their money; that is, bought its bonds. At one time these totaled 80,000,000. What right has the Government to take any action, not forced on it, to cheapen the dollar in which its contracts are payable?

Next, some 40,000,000 men and women are compelled to deposit some of their wages with the Government to be redeemed years hence in what is called "social security." The Government has become the banker for millions.

Third, are 2,000,000 Federal civil-service employees—including your postman—who have also been forced to surrender part of their wages for retirement pensions.

Fourth, are millions of ex-GI's who are paying premiums on life-insurance policies issued by the Federal Government.

Fifth, are the veterans who lost limbs and eyes and health in protecting their country, and who now hold the sacred promise of Government to ease their loss to some degree. These millions hold contracts against the Federal Government as borrower, banker, and life-insurance company.

Who thinks of these millions today whose contracts are being stealthily repudiated as politicians cheapen money by swapping public funds for votes? What right has any government—Federal, State or local—to take any action not forced on it that will cause the price to rise of food and coal and clothing for the blinded veteran and his little family? A government that promises social security when it is continually adulterating money is not only a hypocrite, but morally a thief.

The remedy I propose is votes. The time has come again, as in 1896, to campaign for sound money.

It is said that the tide toward socialism cannot be turned for want of a mass base. That base exists. It is these millions of thrifty Americans.

Their nest eggs are being sucked dry by the vampires of taxes and inflation which is only another form of taxation and the cruelest of all, for it lays its hand not only on those in the prime of life, but on the widow's mite, and the little hoard of the aged.

For some years many efforts have been made to inform voters that they get nothing from the Government that they do not first pay to the Government. In fact, they get less, for the political brokerage is always deducted. We are familiar with these programs of tax education. They are all good.

But hidden as some of these taxes are, nothing so stealthily steals the savings of the thrifty as inflation. This vampire has not been really exposed. No one mentioned it at the last Presidential campaign. All we heard was talk about rent and price controls to conceal inflation—not expose it. Inflation is like the giant squid that squirts ink into the sea so it can hide. Inflation surrounds itself with an air of fictitious prosperity—$2 jingling in our pockets where $1 previously made no noise. So inflation needs to be explained. "Old age and want, thou ill-matched pair" is a legitimate political appeal. It proved itself in the recent Australian elections. Sound Democrats and sound Republicans can use it in every district and State. It worked in 1896. Nothing has a better chance of working now. It beats the sterile cry of "statism" a hundred times over.

The stage is being set by events. Up to now the great labor organizations have campaigned for one wage increase after another. They will continue to do so. But they now want something else—pensions, millions of pensions, to be paid not next week but years hence. For the first time, they are ripe for a discussion on the future value of their dollars. Every labor union that has signed up for pensions should warn its members of the vampire of inflation. A company that warns its employees of the danger of accidents, but not of the danger of rotting money to the pension plan, to which it is a party, is defaulting in its duty to its men and itself.

Life-insurance executives are beginning to publicly assert their moral responsibility to their policyholders. An insurance president has recently pointed out the blight of cheap money and high taxes on insurance. A paid-up policy for $10,000 in 1940 is now worth only $6,000 to the widow. Tell that to the women. A typical policyholder now needs 70 percent more insurance to provide the same protection as in 1929.

Mrs. Asa V. Call, of Los Angeles, president of the Life Insurance Association of America, has just said, "We must now frankly face the fact that our Government has become predatory." In short, it is stealing the savings of the thrifty. Tell that to our 80,000,000 policyholders—30,000,000 more voters than those who cast ballots for President last time.

A Government bond costing $750 in 1939 has shrunk in true worth to $594. In short, there is a 20-percent loss in principal and a 100-percent loss in the accrued interest. Much of the loss of course represents the waste of war. But a $6,000,000,000 deficit this year, and more next year, rubs it in. Except in depression, deficit spending increases the demand for goods. It makes prices high and dollars cheap. The people pay twice—in prices today, and in taxes tomorrow.

This is the reverse side of the welfare state. As Mr. Francis Truslow, president of the New York Curb Exchange says, "The same policies which whet the thirst for security debase the money in which that security is measured." A government that is always borrowing is morally insolvent and moral bankrupts become financial bankrupts.

Then you have the millions of depositors in savings banks and building and loan institutions who used to get 4 percent on their life's savings and now 1½ percent—a loss of income on savings of 62 percent. Isn't this a fine commentary on the Government guaranty of bank deposits?

Then you have the social-security-card holders—35,000,000 of them—and the retired firemen, policemen, school ma'rms, ministers, and other pensioners trying to exist as cheap money drives up their cost of living in old age. Then you have the tens of thousands of loyal alumni of our hundreds of fine private colleges which are facing slow starvation as cheap money reduces income on their portfolios and crushing taxation liquidates their benefactors.

In words that bounce along the sidewalk, we must tell what makes money cheap and who is hurt, and how.

Make an appeal, also, to the moral sense of our people—the conscience of Americans. Ask our well-meaning but leftist clergymen why it is a crime for a candidate for office to use his own money to bribe A to vote for him, but right for the candidate to promise that if elected, he will take from B who has worked hard all his life and give to A, who has been a loafer.

"Thar's votes in them thar hills." Far more is involved than saving the savings of the thrifty. You save also our private property system, which can live and grow only in the savings of the thrifty. It is plain that the vampire of socialism lives only on political spending. Cut off the spending and you stop it in its tracks.

Whatever other arguments are used, we must unite on one point, easily understood, which touches the pocketbook nerve of millions of voters. This is the grand strategy of freedom.

Rotting money and a rotting republic go together. Lenin told us that—"debauch their money." As Jefferson said, we must make our choice "between economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." Give us sound money and a free country! You cannot resign from this struggle.

Emery A. Odell: A Great Newspaper Career

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the people of this country will never fully appreciate the work that has been done by pioneer newspapermen. One such outstanding individual is the owner and publisher of the Monroe Evening Times, Monroe, Wis. This distinguished citizen and newspaperman started to work in his father's shop at the early age of 10, and for 67 years he has been actively engaged in bringing vital news to his section of the State of Wisconsin.

Mr. Speaker, I am including as part of my remarks an article which was recently devoted to his career:

Sixty-seven years of newspapering have dulled none of the early enthusiasm of Emery A. Odell for his calling and for his community.

Monroe has grown considerably in those 67 years, and the Evening Times has paced progress for the last half century while its

founder and publisher kept a vigilant interest in both.

Mr. Odell was born in Janesville, October 25, 1871, son of John W. and Mary Christina Lincks Odell. He was only 10 when his father moved his printing plant to Monroe, in 1881, and founded the Weekly Gazette. The shop upstairs was in the Corson Building, on the east side of the square.

It was only natural that the son should take his place at the type case in his father's shop after a proper period of seasoning as a broom wielder. He swept the shop and once a week, on press day, turned the roller which distributed ink for the Washington hand press, shoving the inked roller across the type.

When he turned to setting type by hand it was necessary for him to place a thick Ayer's Newspaper Directory on a high printer's stool to reach the case. That directory years later was to show his Evening Times to be one of the outstanding small dailies of the Nation.

His pay as a novice typesetter was 50 cents a week, finally moving up to about $2 a week. He was learning a trade and he was learning the things which people found interesting to read.

At 17, he was ready to go out into the world to prove himself as a journeyman printer. First stop was Janesville, where he pegged away by kerosene lamplight through long nights setting type for the Janesville Recorder. A hand-set paper, it also used stereotyped plates received by express early each morning. Press time was daylight with a water-driven drum cylinder furnishing the power.

Part of the drudgery of every printer of that day was redistributing the type after printing. The faster type was put back into the case the sooner the printer could start setting his string for the night. Printers were paid by the combined length of proofs on completed composition. This method was a challenge to the ambitious and it developed Emery Odell into a "swift" at early age.

From Janesville he went to Madison, where in 1891 he saw the first Mergenthaler linotype machine in Wisconsin go into service. Printers were skeptical of the line caster, but it spelled the doom of hand-setting.

Mr. Odell moved on to Milwaukee in 1893 to the Morning Times started in opposition to the Sentinel. Milwaukee papers were still hand set. He was recognized as a top man in his trade by that time, having served as chairman of the typographical union chapel while at Madison.

A business depression folded the Morning Times summarily and the young printer took a trip to Chicago to the Columbian exposition, returning afterward to Monroe.

His father's weekly had become a daily and the son, after mulling over the changing outlook for typesetters, turned to the news side. In November 1893, he succeeded his father as editor.

From his study of big-town papers, he introduced lively headlines, enlarged on the local briefs of the weekly style and "made the home news whistle."

"People liked the signs of new life," he recalls.

It still was an age of merger, however, and with the advent of consolidations—recounted elsewhere in this edition—he eventually found himself editor of the Daily Journal and no longer associated with his father's enterprise.

When his new employer refused to do anything about the weekly wage, Emery Odell left the editor's helm. After sounding out public reaction to his idea, he revived the Monroe Evening Times, dropped in the recent merger, on October 13, 1898.

Capital of the new paper was 99 percent ambition and optimism. Subsequent success indicates there was a generous reserve of integrity, character, and ability.

Knowledge of news interests of Monroe and Green County folk was coupled with a keen business sense which took the Times through its struggling days.

"The Times learned early that it had to have news, income, and business management. It went on a cash basis, has never made exchange agreements, and at the outset discontinued subscriptions on expiration. To this day it does not take due bills," Mr. Odell emphasizes.

Mr. Odell's marriage to Miss Amelia Burgy, daughter of Jacob and Barbara Luchsinger Burgy, took place December 14, 1898. Her father was a native of Switzerland and a pioneer Washington township stock raiser.

The publisher and editor of the Times during the lean years was no chair warmer.

"I was reporter, make-up man, manager, and collector," he recalls. "Daily I rattled around the boardwalk on courthouse square, climbed stairways to offices, legged it to the railroad depots, a half mile away in opposite directions, taking down notes, writing copy by pencil."

The few telephones were no help since no one involved in regular news beats had one.

He solicited the ads, prepared the copy, and generally kept the daily ticking by constant application. The Evening Times was a very personal enterprise.

But better days were ahead. Launching into the political battlefields, the Times supported the La Follette cause and gained attention by the strong role played on the local scene.

In 1910 came an unsought honor, appointment as postmaster. After 12 years of one-man journalism, Mr. Odell welcomed a change which stretched into 15 years of service. During much of that period he continued in charge of the paper's daily production, but there were other hands to write some of the news and other legs to climb the stairs for daily items.

Each progressive step in development of the Evening Times however, was planned and initiated by Mr. Odell. On the eve of the paper's twenty-fifth anniversary, he moved it into the present modern building.

The Lincoln Memorial, Washington, D. C.: An Inspiring and Perpetual Refreshment to American Ideals

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, so few folks seem to visit the inspiring Lincoln Memorial right here in the midst of our beloved Capital and so few folks residing away from the District of Columbia seem to know much about its creation and what is inside of it—and since it is admittedly such a famous and everlasting inspiration to those who do have the pleasure of visiting it—that I am pleased to use this unanimous consent to give you who have not had the privilege of seeing the inside of the memorial or of reading the detail about it the following.

On the interior of the north wall of the memorial, engraved on the marble wall, appears Lincoln's second inaugural address, as follows:

Fellow countrymen, at this second appearing to take the oath of the Presidential office, there is less occasion for an extended address than there was at the first. Then a statement somewhat in detail of a course to be pursued seemed fitting and proper. Now, at the expiration of 4 years during which public declarations have been constantly called forth on every point and phase of the great contest which still absorbs the attention and engrosses the energies of the Nation, little that is new could be presented. The progress of our arms upon which all else chiefly depends is as well known to the public as to myself, and it is, I trust, reasonably satisfactory and encouraging to all. With high hope for the future, no prediction in regard to it is ventured.

On the occasion corresponding to this, 4 years ago, all thoughts were anxiously directed to an impending civil war. All dreaded it; all sought to avert it. While the inaugural address was being delivered from this place, devoted altogether to saving the Union without war, insurgent agents were in the city seeking to destroy it without war—seeking to dissolve the Union and divide effects by negotiation. Both parties deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came.

One-eighth of the whole population were colored slaves, not distributed generally over the Union but localized in the southern part of it. These slaves constituted a peculiar and powerful interest. All knew that this interest was somehow the cause of the war. To strengthen, perpetuate, and extend this interest was the object for which the insurgents would rend the Union, even by war, while the Government claimed no right to do more than to restrict the territorial enlargement of it. Neither party expected for the war the magnitude or the duration which it has already attained. Neither anticipated that the cause of the conflict might cease with or even before the conflict itself should cease. Each looked for an easier triumph and a result less fundamental and astounding. Both read the same Bible and pray to the same God and each invokes His aid against the other. It may seem strange that any men should dare to ask a just God's assistance in wringing their bread from the sweat of other men's faces, but let us judge not that we be not judged. The prayers of both could not be answered—that of neither has been answered fully. The Almighty has His own purposes. "Woe unto the world because of offenses, for it must needs be that offenses come, but woe to that man by whom the offense cometh."

If we shall suppose that American slavery is one of those offenses which in the providence of God must needs come, but which, having continued through His appointed time, He now wills to remove that He gives to both North and South this terrible war as the woe due to those by whom the offense came, shall we discern therein any departure from those Divine attributes which the believers in a living God always ascribe to Him. Fondly do we hope, fervently do we pray that this mighty scourge of war may speedily pass away. Yet if God wills that it continue until all the wealth piled by the bondsman's 250 years of unrequited toil shall be sunk and until every drop of blood drawn with the lash shall be paid by another drawn with the swords, as was said 3,000 years ago, so still it must be said, "The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous altogether."

With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right as God gives

us to see the right, let us strive on to finish the work we are in, to bind up the Nation's wounds, to care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan—to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations.

And on the south wall of the memorial appears Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as follows:

Fourscore and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal.

Now we are engaged in a great Civil War testing whether that nation or any nation so conceived and so dedicated can long endure. We are met on a great battlefield of that war. We have come to dedicate a portion of that field as a final resting place for those who here gave their lives that that nation might live. It is altogether fitting and proper that we should do this. But in a larger sense we cannot dedicate—we cannot consecrate—we cannot hallow—this ground. The brave men living and dead who struggled here have consecrated it far above our poor power to add or detract. The world will little note nor long remember what we say here but it can never forget what they did here. It is for us the living rather to be dedicated here to the unfinished work which they who fought here have thus far so nobly advanced. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these honored dead we take increased devotion to that cause for which they gave the last full measure of devotion—that we here highly resolve that these dead shall not have died in vain—that this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth.

Then there has been, appropriately published by the United States Department of the Interior, National Park Service, Newton B. Drury, Director, National Capital Parks, the following comments about the memorial:

Had Lincoln been an ordinary ruler—even an ordinary hero—an ordinary monument would have sufficed and doubtless would have been built quickly. More than half a century elapsed before a fitting memorial was dedicated to this simple, heroic man whose name has penetrated to the ends of the earth and universally called to mind with reverence and hope wherever aspiration kindles the heart of youth, or tyranny oppresses mankind. The memorial, neither palace nor temple nor tomb but partaking of the nature of all, seems to gather within its marble walls the very essence of his upright character, steeped in tolerance and the belief that all people should be free—free to think, free to express themselves, and free to apply themselves to various enterprises.

INCEPTION AND HISTORY

The first concerted effort looking to the erection in Washington of a monument in honor of Abraham Lincoln appears to have been made about 2 years after his death by an act of Congress, approved March 29, 1867, which incorporated the Lincoln Monument Association. An appeal for subscriptions was sent out. Plans were submitted, but no practical results appear to have been accomplished from this legislation.

The next effort to secure authority from Congress for such a monument, or memorial, was made in December 1901. Numerous additional efforts were made in the following years, but it was not until February 1911, with the passage of a bill "To provide a commission to secure plans and designs for a monument or memorial to the memory of Abraham Lincoln," that these efforts were crowned with success.

The Commission created by the act held its first meeting on March 4, 1911. At its tenth meeting on February 3, 1912, the Commission decided to locate the memorial in Potomac Park on the axis of the Capitol and the Washington Monument, as recommended by the Commission of Fine Arts. After viewing designs prepared at its invitation by Henry Bacon and John Russell Pope, architects, of New York, the Commission at its fourteenth meeting selected Henry Bacon to prepare a final design, which Congress approved January 29, 1913. Ground was broken for the foundations of the memorial on February 12, 1914, and the cornerstone was laid February 12, 1915. At subsequent meetings, Daniel Chester French was selected as sculptor for the Lincoln statue, and Jules Guerin as architect to design and execute the murals for the end walls and the ornamentation on the bronze ceiling beams. The memorial was dedicated on Memorial Day, May 30, 1922.

THE ARCHITECTURE

The exterior of the Memorial symbolizes the Union of the United States of America. Surrounding the walls of the Memorial hall is a colonnade of the States of the Union, the frieze above it bearing the names of the 36 States existing at the time of Lincoln's death. On the attic walls above the colonnade are inscribed the names of the 48 States existing today. These walls and columns enclose the sanctuary containing three memorials to Abraham Lincoln. The place of honor is occupied by a colossal marble statue of the man himself, facing the Washington Monument and the Capitol. On the north wall to the right of the central space where the statue is placed, and separated from it by a row of columns, is inscribed Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address. Similarly, on the south wall the Gettysburg Speech is memorialized.

There are some architectural refinements not common in modern buildings. The columns are not vertical, but are slightly tilted inward toward the building, and the tilt of the corner columns is even more exaggerated. The outside face above the columns is also inclined inward, but less than the columns. The wall of the Memorial Hall inclines inward least of all. This was done to avoid the optical illusion of bulging at the top.

THE BUILDING

The foundations of the memorial rest upon bedrock from 44 to 65 feet below the original grade. The superstructure of white Colorado-Yule marble is approximately 80 feet high and rests on a base composed of three immense marble steps. Masonry approaches from the direction of the Washington Monument and the Capitol ascend a terrace retained by a 14-foot granite wall. This wall on the east and west sides is 256 feet 10 inches long and 187 feet long on the north and south sides. The walls of the memorial are enclosed by a continuous colonnade 188 feet 4 inches long and 118 feet 6 inches wide. The 38 columns in the colonnade, including the 2 standing in the entrance, are 44 feet high, 7 feet 5 inches in diameter at the base, and the shafts are composed of 11 drums each.

Greek ionic columns 50 feet high and 5 feet 6 inches in diameter at the base divide the interior of the memorial into three chambers. The walls of the interior are Indiana limestone, and the ceiling, which is 60 feet above the finished floor, is designed with bronze girders ornamented with laurel and pine leaves. The panels between the girders are of Alabama marble saturated with melted beeswax to produce translucency. The interior floor and the wall base are of pink Tennessee marble. The central chamber, containing the Lincoln statue, is 60 feet wide and 74 feet deep. The side chambers are each 63 feet wide and 38 feet deep.

The two tripods on the two buttresses flanking the steps leading up to the entrance to the memorial are each 11 feet high. Each is cut from a single block of pink Tennessee marble. The carving upon them was done by Piccirrilli Bros., of New York. The decorative carving on the stonework of the building was executed by Ernest C. Bairstow, of Washington.

THE STATUE

The outstanding feature of the memorial is the statue of Abraham Lincoln designed and modeled by Daniel Chester French. It is placed in the central hall of the memorial where, by virtue of its imposing position in the place of honor, it predominates. The statue represents Lincoln as the war President seated in a great armchair 12½ feet high, over the back of which a flag has been draped. The gentleness, power, and determination of the man have been wonderfully expressed by the sculptor, not only in the face but also in the hands which grip the arms of the massive seat. Twenty-eight large blocks of Georgia white marble compose the statue, which is 19 feet high from head to foot. The extreme width, including the drapery over the chair, is 19 feet.

The carving of the statue was done by Piccirrilli Bros. in their shops at New York, where it was also worked on by Mr. French personally. Some 6 years were devoted to the creation and execution of this work. The statue rests upon an oblong pedestal of Tennessee marble 10 feet high, 16 feet wide, and 17 feet deep, which in turn rests upon a platform of Tennessee marble. On the wall above the statue is the inscription: "In this temple as in the hearts of the people for whom he saved the Union the memory of Abraham Lincoln is enshrined forever."

THE MURALS

The two murals by Jules Guerin typify allegorically the principles which were evident in the life of Lincoln. They are affixed to the north and south walls above the memorial addresses and are each 60 feet long and 12 feet high. The piece of canvas upon which each was painted weighed 600 pounds, and about 300 pounds of paint were used. The mural above the Gettysburg Address (south wall) centers around a group portraying Emancipation. An Angel of Truth is freeing a slave. To the left and right are groups typifying justice and immortality. Above the second inaugural address (north wall) the mural has for its central theme, unity. An Angel of Truth is joining the hands of the laurel-crowned figures of North and South and is flanked by Fraternity (left group) and Charity.

ADMINISTRATION AND VISITOR SERVICE

The Lincoln Memorial is administered by the National Capital Parks for the National Park Service, Department of the Interior. All inquiries should be addressed to Irving C. Root, Superintendent, National Capital Parks, Washington 25, D. C. This national memorial is open daily from 9 a. m. to 9 p. m., closing only on Christmas Day.

Again, I respectfully urge each one of the Members of Congress to take the privilege and to receive the inspiration of personally visiting the Abraham Lincoln National Historical Park at Hodgenville, Ky. But, my colleagues, before you do that, be sure to go and personally pause amply in the presence of the great statue of Abraham Lincoln majestically resting in the interior of the Lincoln Memorial itself here within just a few minutes of where you and I have the privilege of working daily on the Hill.

I am here privileged to present to you an outline furnished me, at my request, by the Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. I know it contains much important and interesting data which may be known to some, but is not known to most of us:

SELECTED DETAILS CONCERNING ABRAHAM LINCOLN AS CONGRESSMAN

Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress, March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849, from the Seventh Illinois District, comprising the counties of Putnam, Marshall, Woodford, Tazewell, Mason, Menard, Cass, Morgan, Scott, Logan, and Sangamon.[1] The combined population of these counties in 1840 was 61,424, and in 1850 it was 93,428.[2] At the time of Lincoln's election to Congress, the population of the district might therefore be estimated as approximately 85,500.

Lincoln first came to Washington to serve in the Thirtieth Congress, arriving December 2, 1847.[3] The session opened December 6. Various conflicting accounts of the trip from Springfield, Ill., to Washington, D. C., have been published, and we are still dependent upon conjecture for part of the trip.

John W. Starr, Jr., Lincoln and the Railroads, imagines the trip thus:

"When he left his home in Springfield, in October 1847, to take his seat in the House of Representatives at Washington, Lincoln was eagerly looking forward to the journey, for it would be the first time in his life that he had been east of Ohio and Kentucky. He went by way of his native State, desiring to stop at Louisville to see his erstwhile Springfield friend, Joshua Speed.

"At that period of American history his passage from Springfield to Washington would necessarily have been made chiefly by other means than rail transportation. He would have gone by stage as far as Louisville, by way of Terre Haute and Vincennes, Ind. After leaving Speed the stage would again be made use of into Frankfort, where a short rail line operating between Frankfort and Lexington could have been used to the latter point. * * *

"From Lexington to Covington, Va., over what is known as the Boone Trail, the stage would again be used, as also from the latter point into Winchester, Va., by way of Staunton. Thence to Washington he must have gone by rail over what is now known as the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, but which then followed a more roundabout route than that of today.

"When Lincoln went over it, the line running from Winchester to Harper's Ferry was called the Winchester & Potomac Railroad. Thence to Relay Station it was known as the Baltimore & Ohio; and from Relay Station into Washington, it was known as the Washington branch of the Baltimore & Ohio, having been built under a separate charter.

"Lincoln reached Washington * * * on December 2. We find his name registered on that day, at Brown's Hotel. As he had left his home in October, the trip, counting his visit with his friend, Speed, must have taken over 6 weeks."[4]

Some points in the foregoing account are clearly erroneous. Lincoln did not reach Kentucky by stage through Indiana, but went from Springfield to St. Louis and up the Ohio by boat. If he did not stop to visit his friend Joshua Speed near Louisville it may have been because he knew Speed to be in St. Louis. Speed was registered at the same hotel as the Lincolns in St. Louis when they were there.[5]

[1] Congressional Directory, 30th Cong.
[2] De Bowe, Compendium of the Seventh Congress, pp. 218–224.
[3] Clark, p. 3.
[4] Starr, pp. 47–48.
[5] Thomas, p. 44.

The journey from Lexington to Washington is conjectural and may or may not have been as outlined by Starr.

Another account is given by William H. Townsend, Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town:

"By the middle of October, he had completed plans for the journey to Washington. It was arranged that Mrs. Lincoln and the two children should accompany him, and that they should stop off at Lexington for a leisurely visit with the Todd relatives. * * * So, early Monday morning, October 25, Congressman Lincoln with his wife and two small boys, Bob, four, and Eddie, a year and a half old, climbed into the stage that carried them overland to St. Louis, where they boarded a steamboat for Louisville.

"The little party did not stop in Louisville, although Lincoln's intimate friend, Joshua Speed, lived nearby, but caught the first train east, and as the poky little locomotive puffed up the winding grades toward the Blue Grass, Lincoln could not help marking the contrast between his first visit to Lexington and the present journey.

"For the next 3 weeks, Abraham Lincoln enjoyed immensely the first real vacation of his life. * * *

"November days were drawing to a close. Senator Crittenden and other members of the Kentucky delegation were starting to Washington for the opening of Congress. On Thanksgiving Day * * * on the afternoon of that day, the Lincolns said goodby to Lexington and with their two little boys boarded the stage for Maysville, where they would take a steamboat up the Ohio on their journey to Washington."[6]

This account is also inaccurate. The Lincolns could not have "caught the first train east" out of Louisville, because the railroad between Louisville and Frankfort was not completed until 1851.[7] And no source is cited for the statement that they went from Lexington to Maysville by stage and thence up the Ohio by steamboat; this statement may be conjectural.

Beveridge also tells the story inaccurately:

"Then came the time for Lincoln to go to Washington and take his seat as Representative in Congress of the Seventh District of Illinois. Mrs. Lincoln and their son, Robert, now in his sixth year, accompanied him. They went by way of St. Louis, up the Ohio on a steamboat to Pittsburgh, and thence by rail to Baltimore and Washington."

A footnote adds:

"A regular stage carried passengers from Springfield to St. Louis (Sangamo Journal, December 13, 1848). The other route to Washington was by the Lakes to Buffalo, thence by rail to New York and Washington; but Mrs. Lincoln says that they did not take that route."[8]

Regarding this account it may be noted that Robert Lincoln would have been in his fifth year instead of his sixth;[9] there was no railroad from Pittsburgh east to Baltimore in 1847.[10] That this was the route taken may be an assumption arrived at by elimination of the route via Buffalo, referred to as "the other route to Washington." But Starr, quoted above, suggests a still different route, overland by stage to Winchester, Va., and this alternative is favored as probable by Benjamin P. Thomas, who was familiar with these variant suggestions."[11]

However, the route by Pittsburgh should not be ruled out too hastily. For "by 1829, with the opening of the Pennsylvania Canal, Philadelphia was brought within 3 days' travel of Pittsburgh at a passenger rate of 2 cents a mile."[12]

It seems likely that the Pittsburgh route by boat and train would be more desirable in point of comfort in the wintertime for a family with small children than the long stage trip through Virginia. If the Lincolns traveled by Pittsburgh they may have experienced the interesting complexities of travel described thus, only proceeding in the opposite direction.

"When the State-owned project was completed in 1834, Philadelphia was linked with Pittsburgh by an extraordinary combination of transportation facilities. Coaches fitted with flanged wheels were drawn by horses from various points in Philadelphia to the railroad in Fairmount Park. There they were hauled by a stationary engine to the top of what is now Belmont Plateau, and there hooked together for the trip to Columbia [by steam railroad]. After a 10-hour journey, passengers were transferred to a packet boat on the central division of the Pennsylvania Canal, traveling 172 miles up the Susquehanna and Juniata Rivers to Hollidaysburg, passing through 108 locks on the way. At Hollidaysburg they changed to coaches of the Portage Railroad, which were pulled up five inclined planes to the crest of the Alleghenies, almost 2,500 feet above sea level. * * * Five inclined planes on the western slopes of the mountain provided the descent to Johnstown, where the trip was resumed by canal to Pittsburgh. The entire journey from Philadelphia to Pittsburgh, over a route of 394 miles, required 4 days."[13]

In view of the conflicting accounts, about all we can be sure of is that the Lincoln family must have had an interesting trip, and traveled by stage, by steamboat, and by railroad, somewhere on the way.

Sources:

Beveridge, Albert J., Abraham Lincoln, 1809–1858, volume I. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1928. E457.3.B57, volume 1.

Clark, Allen C., Abraham Lincoln in the National Capital. Washington, D. C.: 1925. E457.C58.

Congressional Directory, Thirtieth Congress.

DeBow, J. D. B., Compendium of the Seventh Census. Washington: Beverley Tucker, Senate Printer, 1854. HA201. 1850.C.

Dictionary of American Biography, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1933, volume XI. E176.D56.

Division of Maps, Library of Congress, Railroad Maps of Pennsylvania for 1848.

History of the Ohio Falls Cities and their counties, volume I. Cleveland, Ohio: L. A. Williams & Co., 1882. F459.L8H6.

Johnston, J. Stoddard, Memorial History of Louisville, volume I. Chicago and New York: American Biographical Publishing Co. (1896 or 1897). F459.L8J7.

Starr, John W., Lincoln and the Railroads, New York: Dodd Mead & Co., 1927. E457.S78.

Thomas, Benjamin P., Lincoln, 1847–1857, Being the Day-by-Day Activities, etc. Springfield, Ill.: The Abraham Lincoln Association, 1936. E457.4. T43.

Townsend, William H. Lincoln and His Wife's Home Town. Indianapolis: The Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1929. E457.T84.

Writers' Program, WPA, Pennsylvania: A Guide to the Keystone State. New York: Oxford University Press, 1946. F154.W94.

Mr. Speaker, in closing these remarks, may I say: I know that we, as Members of the present Eighty-first Congress, cannot sit between these walls on any occasion without realizing that Abraham Lincoln also worked here. This

[6] Townsend, pp. 140, 141, 144, 161.
[7] History of the Ohio Falls Cities, p. 58; Johnston, vol. I, p. 320.
[8] Beveridge, vol. I, p. 398.
[9] Dictionary of American Biography, vol. XI, p. 266.
[10] Railroad Maps of Pennsylvania for 1848, Maps Division, Library of Congress.
[11] Thomas, p. 48.
[12] Writers' Program, WPA, Pennsylvania, p. 298.
[13] Ibid., p. 90.

fact must, of necessity, renew our determination to make it literally true that we assume the great task remaining before us and that the honored dead of our wars for democracy shall know that we dedicate an increased devotion to the cause for which they gave their lives and that, in like manner, we, at this birthday season, do again highly resolve that they shall not have died in vain and that we, as Members of the same Congress of the same great Nation which Abraham Lincoln served as a Member of Congress, shall daily dedicate our lives to the proposition that, because of our unselfish service to our Nation, that Nation shall have a new birth of freedom and that we shall make it truer than ever that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Democracy's Traitors

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL HINSHAW
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. HINSHAW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Los Angeles Daily News of January 26, 1950, by Victor Riesel:

NEW YORK.—The same emotionless Communist lawyers who snared Alger Hiss out of a proud by rather impoverished and suicide-laden Baltimore family, and either for love or money got him to pass vital documents on to a Red courier ring, today are casually doing business as usual just a few streets from where this is being written. And they are whipping into shape a new network to help cripple the Nation if we go to war with—guess who?

How do I know? Well, it would be nice to pass on the vision of Riesel, the demon newsman in Hollywood fashion climbing into dark places, filching files and planting microphones. It would be nice. But it's more mundane than fire-escape clambering at midnight.

There are many of us who know—and it goes back to the years when our crowd was a lonely-hearts club and we belonged to one another because we knew the secrets of who was spying on what and who was keeping this country from putting guns and warplanes in the hands of young soldiers and kid pilots in trenches and in the air around Nazi Germany.

But few in the Government listened to us, so we talked to ourselves.

Now that jury after jury comes in with verdicts confirming what we've been saying for almost 15 years, this little group of newsmen, magazine writers and former foreign correspondents can sit back and say the Nation's catching up—and hope the people will listen next time. What made us so allwise? No great talents.

There's Hiss, for example. Some 10 years ago, our circle knew every detail of his activity. I ran into it at a small strategy session of newspapermen fed up with having their guild run by Communist party members.

We met, I recall, in the home of a radio editor whose father had been a leading Communist himself, before he broke personally with Joseph Stalin. Someone introduced a chap named Whittaker Chambers, from Time magazine. And we listened carefully as he told us of Communist techniques and how to counter them.

Later we walked for hours along New York's East Side and slowly, sensitively he told the story of his break with the spy ring and about Hiss and other Government officials, some still living, some dead, who secretly had terrific impact on the writings and thinking of the highest administration leaders. Chambers saw to it that we got on our way home and then disappeared into the crowd. Some of us tried to get action but no one would listen.

Then, in 1945, at San Francisco, I saw Hiss with Secretary of State Stettinius, and Truman—and knew whom the heavily-guarded V. Molotov invited to his new fashionable soirees, all under surveillance of trigger-happy OGPU agents.

I knew, too, that I would be marked as nutty if I tried to tell Chambers' story about the slim young man on the platform of the gilded San Francisco Civic Opera House as the UN held its first sessions. So, I, like the few others who knew, had to watch this Nation get the oldest double-cross in the world.

There were literally hundreds of such cases. One day, early in the war, we learned the entire Communist section of CIO was whooping it up for a strike at the four-motored bomber plant in Inglewood, Calif. We knew a Lew Michener, then a CIO Auto Workers' Union official, was a Communist and with others, back of the stoppage at the critical moment when we were trying to put bombers in the British skies.

So we screamed—and we were smeared. But, only a few weeks ago, Michener got on the witness stand during the Harry Bridges trial and admitted he was a Communist then.

We knew some pro-Communist Los Angeles CIO men worked closely with Hans Diebel of the German-American Bund there in distributing isolationist literature—and when we said this was the logical conclusion of the Russian-Nazi pact we were howled at. Then investigators proved we were right.

Each time we made charges, we did so on the basis of disclosures by men like Chambers, who could no longer stand the iciness of Stalinist corruption of their revoluntionary sentiments. And so they broke and sought us out, told us what they knew.

Therefore, it's worth heeding the warning that the same Communist lawyers who first moved into the Government service back in 1934 and migrated in waves from department to department are now working on creation of a new labor network for industrial sabotage and espionage.

They've subtly approached Albert J. Fitzgerald, head of the United Electrical Workers (independent) to lead it. But he won't fall for this secret maneuver. So they're looking for another innocent.

When they find him, they'll be in business again.

No More Cheese After the Trap Is Sprung—Workers Beware the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the Warner & Swasey Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, have made a pertinent observation on the welfare state in an ad that appears in Newsweek for February 6, 1950. The admonition contained in it should be clearly understood by every worker in this great Nation. The ad referred to follows:

THEY DON'T KEEP FEEDING YOU CHEESE AFTER THE TRAP IS SPRUNG

All welfare states are alike. They promise you anything and everything if you'll vote them into power—security, more money for less work, sharing the wealth, soaking the rich.

So you vote them the power—and then find you have voted away your freedom. You find that all such promises of something for nothing were false—as such promises must always be. For example:

One welfare state government (England) recently used troops to break a strike. Another (Russia) destroyed the importance of the very unions which had helped it to power, and, boasting of its love for the common man, cut the value of his money by nine-tenths, without warning.

Look out for all those promises of something for nothing. They don't put that cheese in the trap just because somebody loves mice.

No government, no individual, can give you anything worth having for long. The only thing you'll ever have and keep is what you yourself produce. And then you have your self-respect, too.

Whose Way on Rivers?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN B. SULLIVAN
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith an editorial from the St. Louis Star-Times of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, entitled "Whose Way on Rivers?" which is a discussion of the Hoover Commission recommendation concerning rivers and harbors and flood-control work. It is a very thoughtful editorial, and I am making it available to my colleagues:

WHOSE WAY ON RIVERS?

The Mississippi Valley Association's annual meeting here runs true to the form of the last several years. The speeches and reports are carefully integrated into a blanket defense of the Army engineers' role in Federal river work.

That this again takes the form of all-out criticism of the idea of regional valley authorities is a matter of course. The Mississippi Valley Association took its position years ago against the socialism, the totalitarianism, and the superstate that its leaders see in the Tennessee Valley Authority. It doesn't want anything like a TVA to be imposed on the Missouri Valley or any other valley.

But since the last meeting of the association there has come a new threat to the Army engineers' way of building dams and levees. This was the Hoover Commission recommendation that the Army turn its flood-control and rivers and harbors functions over to a reorganized Department of the Interior.

And so some of the big guns of the Mississippi Valley Association now are trained on the Hoover Commission's effort to reorganize and streamline the executive branch of the Federal Government. An association committee has reported that removal of the Army engineers from river work would de-

stroy one of the most valuable and efficient operating agencies of the Federal Government. And Representative WILL M. WHITTINGTON, of Mississippi, came here to tell the meeting that he is for Government reorganization in general but against any meddling with the Corps of Engineers. "Often," he said "reformers, without supporting reasons, advocate the crippling if not the destruction of existing agencies that have proved their worth."

The best answer to the committee, to Representative WHITTINGTON and to the Mississippi Valley Association is in the words of the Hoover Commission. In its summary of reasons for transferring river work from the Army to Interior, the Commission gave these:

1. To secure coordinate policies in these fields.
2. Elimination of disastrous conflicts and overlaps which cost the taxpayer enormous sums annually.
3. Provision of a center for more energetic development in water resources.
4. Provision of a center for coordination of State and Federal action in these fields.
5. Elimination of competition for construction labor and materials.

Members of the Hoover Commission were not starry-eyed reformers, as Representative WHITTINGTON implies. They were asked to look for ways to improve Government and save money. They found glaring defects and inherent conflict in the present agencies concerned with river development.

In the end it is the taxpayer who is most concerned with this conflict. He must foot the bill for the projected multibillion-dollar river program. Whom should he believe—the Hoover Commission or the Mississippi Valley Association?

The choice should be easy.

Our Nation, the World Needs the Philosophy of Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLYDE DOYLE
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is to be observed as the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the coming to birth of Abraham Lincoln.

Ever since I was a small child, I have had an increasingly vigorous awareness of the fact that the birth, life, and death of Abraham Lincoln has been a definite blessing to my own humble experience. I can clearly remember that when I was an elementary-school boy the public-school teacher not infrequently came and cracked my knuckles with a ruler because she found me drawing pictures of the birthplace cabin of Abraham Lincoln instead of studying.

During the recent congressional recess my wife and I deliberately drove to Hodgenville, Ky., en route to Long Beach, Calif., in order that we might have the inspiration of being in the presence of that birthplace cabin of which I began to draw pictures on scratch paper when I was about 10 years of age.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the inspiration of being president of the Abraham Lincoln Club of my home city; and, being a Member of this great Congress during the Seventy-ninth and Eighty-first sessions, has made it possible for me to have the privilege and inspiration of serving as one of the directors of the Abraham Lincoln group of Washington, D. C. And this is an invitation to you, one and all, to attend the Abraham Lincoln anniversary program at the Lincoln Museum, 511 Tenth Street NW., Sunday, February 12, at 2:30 p. m. The outlined program is as follows:

Chairman, Hon. CLYDE DOYLE, Member of Congress, California.

Address: The Washington That Lincoln Knew, by Edward Boykin, director, National Capital Sesquicentennial Celebration.

Vocal concert: United States Army Band chorus.

Presentation of bust of Abraham Lincoln: Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

Presentation of Lincoln Memorabilia: Washington Lincoln Group.

Benediction: Dr. Frederick Brown Harris, Chaplain of the United States Senate.

Under the unanimous consent approval extended me, I herewith call to your attention a portion of a very worthy editorial in the National Tribune—The Stars and Stripes, "the voice of the veterans of the United States," dated February 9, 1950. It should be significant, Mr. Speaker, that the masthead of this veterans' paper carries the following quotation on every one of its issues: "To care for him who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan." The following is the portion of the editorial to which I refer:

On next Sunday there will be observed the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, a man of humble beginnings who served as this Nation's Chief Executive during a period of its greatest trial. Having faith that right would create the strength to overcome immorality and defeat evil intentions, Lincoln furnished the inspiration needed to keep our country truly united. He was an inspired foe of injustice and malice. He was possessed of a charitable mind, and, resultantly, he forged the America of 85 years ago into a single whole after a long civil conflict that threatened to tear it asunder. In the clash of opposing ideals, he chose to support those that promised clearly the preservation of national solidarity as the only single means of defending the priceless liberties that had been won at frightful cost by our founding fathers. Indeed, Abraham Lincoln was in his day the savior of our country.

Every year, as we pause to learn anew the ageless lessons taught by Lincoln and his predecessors, we derive fresh courage from them. A glance around the troubled world of today brings home as never before the need for that union to which our sixteenth President devoted himself and for which he gave his life. If ever there was required the sensible and solid thinking of his time, it is wanted now, because other forces are intent upon dividing the house that has long been united on the solid foundation of freedom. Nation-wide organizations, led by astute and self-seeking spokesmen and supported by millions whose fervent desire for peace has blinded them to the wrongs which attend the movements they have joined, are directed toward objectives that would destroy forever the liberties they now enjoy. Too many, instead of fighting to hold what they have, would give up essential freedom to buy a little temporary safety, and in doing it, are threatened with the loss of both. * * *

Veterans also remember Lincoln as a short-time soldier, but as one who was so close to the servicemen of the great Civil War that he knew and understood their needs. Far from believing that war veterans should be classed with all others under a system of social equality, he recognized their special service to the country and many times voiced his concern about their security as a class and about the welfare of the dependents of their honored dead. We have moved ahead far as a nation during the past nine decades, and our thinking has had to be adjusted to new developments as they have occurred, but we believe that Lincoln would have protested in horror at advocates of social planning and world freebooting who would spend untold billions for impractical and liberty-destroying projects but practice penury when it comes to protecting those "who shall have borne the battle and for his widow and his orphan."

On this, another anniversay of the birth of Abraham Lincoln, the veterans of America think the time has come for a lot of people to unscramble their confused thinking and to dedicate themselves once more to the homely philosophy of Lincoln and others like him. Also attributed to the savior of our country is this remark: "You can fool some of the people all of the time, and all of the people some of the time, but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time."

Republic of Lithuania Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, on Thursday, February 16, of this week, all Americans who believe in liberty and self-government will commemorate the Lithuanian nation for the outstanding fight its patriotic people are making to restore its former freedoms and self-government.

Gov. Henry F. Schricker, of Indiana, has issued a proclamation proclaiming February 16, 1950, as the Republic of Lithuania Day in the State of Indiana.

Mayor Frank J. Migas, of East Chicago, Ind., has also issued a proclamation setting aside February 16, 1950, as Lithuania Day in the city of East Chicago. There will also be held in the city of East Chicago commemorating services at St. Francis Church Hall, wherein prominent citizens will pay tribute to the fighting spirit of the Lithuanian people who will continue the battle against the communistic tyranny in an effort to save their country from slavery. The minds and hearts of all true Americans beat in unison for the Lithuanian people in their noble battle for freedom and independence.

I herewith present to the Members of Congress a radio address delivered by Petras Dauzvardis, consul of Lithuania at Chicago:

It gives me very great pleasure to express my official and personal gratitude to His Excellency Henry F. Schricker, Governor of the State of Indiana, for the proclamation of Republic of Lithuania Day in Indiana, Thursday, February 16, 1950, and for the

sentiments and wishes expressed in said proclamation.

In his proclamation the Governor recounts the historical facts and present appalling plight of Lithuania, and urges the citizens of Indiana to give serious thought to the sufferings the Lithuanians are undergoing, and to hope that all freedom-loving people will raise their voices to end the extermination of the gallant nation of Lithuania.

In conjunction with this proclamation and commemoration of the Independence Day of Lithuania, it is proper to make a few reflections upon Lithuania's past, and to glance at its present state. Lithuania is a many centuries old state; she was first occupied by Russia in 1795. That occupation and enslavement of the Lithuanian nation lasted for 123 years, and was terminated by the nation's constant fight for freedom and determination to be free and independent, and the resultant declaration of independence of Lithuania on February 16, 1918. Soviet Russia took cognizance of this declaration, renounced for all time all rights to the territory of Lithuania, and recognized Lithuania as a sovereign and independent state. The United States of America and other nations also recognized, and continue to recognize Lithuania's rightful independence and sovereignty.

The free and independent Republic of Lithuania made remarkable progress in every phase of its life, and was acknowledged as one of most cultured, progressive, industrious countries of the post World War I period.

Lithuania's independence was suspended and achievements destroyed when it was occupied by Russia for the second time in 1940. The Nazis wrested the occupation of Lithuania from the Soviets in 1941, continuing it until 1944, when the Soviets reoccupied the country, and continue to occupy and rule it by force to this day. The Nazi-Soviet occupations have deprived Lithuania of approximately one million people. Unremitting and aforethought genocidal acts by the Soviets threaten to annihilate the Lithuanian nation. Recent reports state that the 1941 Soviet plan to exterminate 700,000 (25 percent) of the Lithuanian nation has been amended so that 85 percent of the indigenous population of Lithuania is subject to elimination and liquidation.

Up to now the liquidation of Lithuanians was carried out by arrests, tortures, and deportations to the Soviet slave-labor camps of Lithuanians thus doomed to a lingering death. Mass purges and executions are now imminent, since capital punishment has been reimposed in the Soviet Empire.

Because of these ominous signs of a speeding up of the annihilation of the Lithuanian nation, Lithuanians throughout the world are joining Governor Schricker in the hope that freedom-loving people will raise their voices against the Soviets by protesting against the impending destruction of the Lithuanian nation and in demanding that the Soviet Union: (1) Halt the deportation and murder of Lithuanians; (2) return Lithuanian deportees from Russia to Lithuania, to their homes; (3) withdraw the Soviet army, police, officials, agents, and colonists from Lithuania; and (4) restore sovereign rights and self-government to the people of Lithuania. These demands are based upon international law, the Soviet-Lithuanian peace treaty, the Atlantic and United Nations Charters, and various wartime pledges and undertakings.

Should the Soviet Union disregard these demands and continue violating the law of nations, she should be proclaimed an outlaw aggressor and a perpetrator of the crime of genocide.

The tenets of man's inalienable rights, of law, and of the United Nations Charter must be given meaning and effect lest they become meaningless and subservient to totalitaristic might and brutality. Lithuania and the other Soviet-occupied and tyrannized countries afford a case for the test of right and democracy against might and slavery. May right prevail over might and thereby bring freedom, peace and security to all peace-loving countries, including Lithuania and the other two Baltic states.

Kosciusko, Like Lincoln, an Emancipator

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, yesterday in Lafayette Park, here in Washington, wreaths were placed at the inspiring statue of Tadeuz Kosciusko and in the memory of that great son of Poland and of liberty a magnificent audience gathered on the greensward facing the monument to listen to the tributes to the life and works of Kosciusko voiced by the Honorable SCOTT LUCAS, majority leader of the Senate, and three Members of the House, the Honorable CHESTER A. CHESNEY, the Honorable ALVIN O'KONSKI, and myself. Under leave granted, I am extending my remarks to include my address on that occasion:

Much has Poland given to the enrichment of mankind and the betterment of the world. Great has been the contribution of men and women of Polish blood to our own United States of America.

The story of the life of Tadeuz (Thaddeus) Kosciusko has been an inspiration to brave deeds and noble thoughts to the generations that have come and gone since, as is so well said in the marble lettering in the monument in Lafayette Park here in the Nation's Capital: "Freedom shrieked when Kosciusko fell." The influence of his life will be reflected in all the generations to come. His name is high on the roll of the heroes of immortal fame.

Today, which also is the birthday of Abraham Lincoln, I would dwell on a quality in character which the great son of Poland shared with the rail splitter from Illinois whose name with Kosciusko's is on that roll of immortals.

Kosciusko came to America on borrowed money. He remained here for 7 years of service, sacrifice, and danger. An engineering genius and perhaps the greatest master of the use and tactics of artillery of his day, no officer under Washington was a more vital part in the winning of the victory for independence. To him is attributed the triumph of American arms at Saratoga, the turning point in the long, painful struggle of the Colonies and the victory that decided the action of France in coming to the side of the American patriots. He directed the building of the defenses at Philadelphia and at West Point on the Hudson, guarding our line from an English advance which could have come from either the east or the north. Then, fighting as a guerrilla, the uniform and insignia of rank he discarded, the pride in his brilliant reputation he forgot, as well as all sense of danger and desire for personal security, and in the most hazardous situations battled as a private side by side with the most daring of the American guerrillas.

Thomas Jefferson said of him: "He is as pure a son of liberty as I have ever known, and of that liberty which is to go to all, and not to the few and rich alone."

And from the great Washington came this tribute: "To his care and sedulous appreciation, the American people are indebted for the defenses of West Point."

In recognition of his service of incalcuable value the Congress voted him a large tract of land in what is now the site of the city of Columbus, Ohio.

Here was the test of the character of Kosciusko. There is not in all of history a better example of self-abnegation nor a more stinging rebuke to those who question the sincerity and the lack of self-interest motivation in the heroes of action and of idealism who serve for country, freedom, and humanity.

Plutarch was his favorite author and his favorite character in the writings of the great Greek biographer was Timoleon who yearned to liberate his country, taking nothing in return.

Having spent seven hard and hazardous years of his life in aiding the liberation of the country to which later hundreds of thousands of Polish men and women were to come, he returned to Europe, taking nothing in return for his glorious and priceless service. He returned, still penniless, the money that he had borrowed to come to America remaining to be repaid from his labors after the 7-year intermission during which he aided so brilliantly in the liberation of the country now become the strength of the world. He took nothing from America for the much that he had given to America. Like that of Timoleon the name of Kosciusko will stand throughout the ages for pure unselfishness in the doing of great public works.

I return now to the lands on the present site of the city of Columbus, Ohio—lands given him by a grateful Congress and which well might have lifted his poverty and assured the security of his later years. This is the disposition he made of these lands; I read from his will:

"I, Tadeuz Kosciusko, being just on my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that, should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States, I hereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own slaves, or any others, and giving them liberty in my name; in giving them an education in trade or otherwise; in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality, which may make them good neighbors, good fathers and mothers, husbands and wives, in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, of the good order of society, and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful; and I make the said Thomas Jefferson executor of this. 5th of May 1798."

Two centuries have passed, and many mighty events have shaken the nations of the earth and the destiny of mankind, since a mother in Poland gave to the world the son who was to give his all for liberty and accept for himself nothing. Nothing except the glory which forever will attach to his name as an inspiration to noble deeds and one who is outstanding among the great characters in the world's history as a practitioner of the gospel of self-abnegation.

That which was given him for his service to the young American Republic he returned to purchase freedom for other Americans, of another race and another color and then slaves, and to provide for their education and training that they might be good neighbors, good fathers, and mothers, and sons, and daughters, and happy in their families and communities would be defenders of liberty and of their country.

He who loves liberty as did Kosciusko will not rest on his oars when liberty for himself and his own people has been attained but there are still peoples of other

races and of other nations remaining in bondage and lashed by the cruel whip of discrimination. Liberty like virtue to Kosciusko was priceless in itself and for itself—liberty, as the air itself, the common heritage of all men.

Two centuries or so after his birth—the exact date of which is not definitely established—I am thrilled to be an humble member of this magnificent gathering in the Capital of the world's mightiest Nation, the powerhouse of liberty, honoring his memory.

Ugly Spy Disclosures Indicate Administration Covered Up Dr. Fuchs—Information Available 5 Years Ago—Who Blocked FBI Investigation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting as part of my remarks an outstanding article by Felix Morley which appears in the current issue of Human Events. The information Mr. Morley sets forth is grounds for impeachment of the President, in my opinion. I commend it to all Members who are interested in learning some of the hidden facts underlying the recent spy disclosures.

A chain reaction operates in the journalistic estimation of news value. The belated arrest in London of Dr. Klaus Fuchs on charges of atomic espionage did not of itself warrant the explosion of press and radio publicity that erupted over here. In the English newspapers a less-excited editorial judgment played the incident down.

It was much the same last September when President Truman announced portentously that a trial atomic bomb had been exploded in Soviet Russia. I happened to be in London at the time, and the universal reaction was "Why not?" In western Europe all well-informed people have long been aware of the subtlety of the Russian spy system and of the skill with which Communists are infiltrated into governmental posts where they can be most useful to the Soviet fatherland. It is different here, where this infiltration has gone very deep.

One of the charges against Dr. Fuchs is that in this country 5 years ago—in February 1945—he transmitted atomic-research information "useful to an enemy." That news is certainly not surprising.

An English Communist colleague of Dr. Fuchs, the physicist Allan Nunn May, was caught that same year in the Canadian atomic espionage disclosures and is now serving a 10-year jail sentence. The report of the special Canadian Royal Commission then pointed out that there were many connections between the Canadian spy ring, revealed by Cipher Clerk Igor Gouzenko, and the larger ring operating in the United States. All the Canadian information was made available to our Government by the personal orders of Prime Minister Mackenzie King. The subject was discussed when Mr. King came to Washington in November 1945 to consider atomic-energy problems with President Truman and Prime Minister Attlee.

So the mystery in the Fuchs case is not how secret atomic information could have been passed on to the ubiquitous Soviet agents. The detailed Canadian revelations long since disclosed the manner in which this business was handled, in this country as well as in the less-important Canadian cases.

The mystery is why it has taken years for the Truman administration to make even a tentative start on disclosures that the alert Canadians cleaned up at their end in a few months. And the unresolved question is why our responsible officials failed to follow the Canadian leads.

Evidence justifying the arrest of Dr. Fuchs has been available for exactly 5 years. But the FBI was not allowed to investigate atomic espionage until 1947 and is said to have been working on the Fuchs case for less than a year.

Why, and by whom, was the FBI blocked off from this and similar cases? That is the unrevealed story behind the story, justifying the headlines appropriate to a mystery affecting the safety of us all.

II

We know now that the Soviet spy ring in Canada was operating full blast, and very successfully, at least as early as June 1943. There is very good reason to suspect that an even larger and more efficient apparatus was then well established in the United States. Certainly the unknown person to whom Dr. Fuchs is accused of passing top-secret data in February 1945 was no casual stranger.

All Americans familiar with Communist techniques were at that time aware of the general outline of what was going on. But it was impossible to make the truth prevail over the strong pro-Soviet attitude of the Roosevelt administration. Indeed any attempt to do so, on the basis of definite evidence, was immediately countered as isolationist, or even as pro-Nazi. Human Events was greatly daring when it ventured to say, on March 8, 1944, that: "The administration seems to be the prisoner of the Communist Party."

And it was not merely the administration. Mr. Wendell Willkie, Republican candidate for President in 1940, made a hurried trip to Russia in the summer of 1942 and on his return told all, in a slap-happy compilation entitled "One World." In this he advised Americans (p. 86) not to be mistrustful of Communists. "Russia is neither going to eat us nor seduce us. * * * No, we do not need to fear Russia."

About a year later, Mr. Sumner Welles, Under Secretary of State until his split with Mr. Roosevelt in 1943, wrote the Time for Decision, appropriately chosen as the book-of-the-month for July 1944. It stood up for just about that length of time.

This book was in some respects critical of Mr. Roosevelt's leadership. But not where the President's faith in Soviet Russia was concerned. To call Stalin's Russia a dictatorship, said Mr. Welles (p. 309) is only "superficially true." Actually: "The Russian people today are satisfied that their government is devoted to the popular interest. * * * The Soviet Government today is guided by the popular will. * * * Certainly in the immediate future the foreign policy of the Soviet Government will continue to represent what the people want." It would be pleasant if we could say as much for the United States.

These samples of the stuff Americans were fed go far to explain why honest efforts to unmask Soviet espionage during its most active period were unavailing. Yet the attempt was conscientiously made, for instance by a small group of Congressmen headed by Representative Busbey, of Illinois, shortly before the election of 1944. To this President Roosevelt, in a speech on October 5, replied:

"It is a source of regret to all decent Americans that some political propagandists are now dragging red herrings across the trail of this national election."

III

This red-herring phrase, like much else in the Roosevelt bag of tricks, was used more lately, and less successfully, by President Truman. The revelations before the House Un-American Activities Committee which led to the indictment of Alger Hiss were also called a red herring, to keep the public from considering the bad record of the Eightieth Congress. Now that Mr. Hiss has been found guilty it is no longer possible to write off the effort to expose Communist infiltration as political propaganda. But it would not have become an issue, even in an election year, except for the strange behavior of Secretary Acheson, and perhaps not then except for the even more strangely retarded development of the Fuchs case.

Americans are a generous as well as a politically unsophisticated people. Throughout the country there has been much sympathy for Alger Hiss, wholly aside from the realization that a verdict in the court of first instance is subject to appeal.

Many were therefore willing to reserve their final personal judgment on Alger Hiss, and additionally were anxious to see the case kept out of politics. Come what may, this former high official of the State Department is now a broken man; his career is ruined and his fall is harder because his earlier pretensions were so great. The general desire, as one could see in editorials and private conversation, was to forget the whole miserable business.

And then Dean Acheson, with that strange ineptitude which so often afflicts clever men, suddenly made it impossible to drop this case. The Secretary of State, speaking in that capacity at an official press conference, made prepared remarks which, however guarded, could only be interpreted as an aspersion on the judicial process. Coming from a Cabinet officer, after the verdict, Secretary Acheson's defense of Hiss was actually executive infringement on the independence of the judiciary, and was promptly resented as such.

Before the echoes of this blunder had subsided—while the legislatures of Southern States were still voting resolutions demanding the resignation of Secretary Acheson—came the arrest of Dr. Fuchs in London. And thus was set off the chain reaction referred to at the outset of this analysis. This is big news primarily because of the growing realization that all these ugly disclosures fit together, and are part of a pattern of which much—perhaps by far the greater part—is still to be disclosed.

IV

The significance of the case of Alger Hiss might well have been forgotten. Now it will not be.

Simple people who have not given the matter much thought heretofore will now realize more fully that Hiss was convicted, in effect, of passing confidential State papers of the highest importance to active Communist agents. It will be recalled that he was subsequently at the center of activities which in the upshot have proved extremely helpful to Soviet Russia; extremely detrimental to the United States. Mr. Hiss gets much credit for the Yalta Agreement, which led directly and swiftly to the Communist conquest of China. He also gets much credit for securing approval of the Charter of the United Nations in a form that has made it easy for Russia to use that organization as a base for continued espionage, while insuring its worthlessness as an agency for the maintenance of peace.

There was at first no widespread suspicion over the alacrity with which high officials of the administration rushed to the defense of Alger Hiss. There is such suspicion now. And it is strengthened because there is as yet no explanation of why it has taken over 4 years to open up the case of Dr. Fuchs. A

lot of pieces in the jigsaw puzzle are still missing. Some of them seem to have been carefully swept under the carpet. But enough are being belatedly fitted together to give the pattern a certain shape. It is not a pleasant shape.

If a nation cannot clean its house of corruption, not even hydrogen bombs will give it security—the less so if the formulas have already been handed to the Kremlin. And that is why Communist infiltration is bound to become a political issue of the first magnitude—this year—in spite of popular reluctance to have it so.

St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently, St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church in Buffalo, N. Y., celebrated the one hundred and fifteenth anniversary of its founding.

This thriving parish, which is located in my home town, has had a brilliant history of over a century of splendid service to its country, its community, and its parishioners.

Since the establishment of this church, its ministers have labored diligently, competently, and fruitfully in giving of their faculties to advance the spiritual morale of their charges.

St. Peter's has attained an aura of venerability in the past century, but it is youthful in its ebullience and vigor. It occupies a respected and unique place in Buffalo and has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the churches of various denominations in western New York.

The seeds sown by its pastors have been productive of an abundant harvest, and its parishioners today carry with them the priceless inheritance bequeathed them by the founders of the parish over 115 years ago.

I want to join heartily with the people of Buffalo in offering to St. Peter's Church my heartiest congratulations on its anniversary and my sincerest wishes for many more years of good work for God and community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in connection with this historic event:

FAITH OF MAN HELD EFFECTIVE ACROSS WORLD

St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, the oldest church of its denomination in Buffalo, observed its one hundred and fifteenth annversary yesterday.

A keynote sermon was delivered at the morning service by the Reverend Willard A. Kratz, minister of Salem Church at Catasauqua, Pa., and vice chairman of the commission on Christian social action.

Referring to the Apostles' Creed, which was recited by the congregation, the Reverend Mr. Kratz said it is an ancient statement of man's conviction in the power of God to help him, as opposed to the destructive powers of what man called evil.

"The character of man has been affected by this conviction of his," he declared. "He has discovered that he is capable of imitating evil, which we call the devil, as well as being noble by the power of good, which is God in us."

The Reverend Mr. Kratz continued:

"The character of man as an individual affects his relationship to a community of individuals which we call the congregation and, when joined with people of like convictions, he is able to exert an influence beyond his own individual character. This witness of his faith is not only individual and local but it is world-reaching."

The Reverend Mr. Kratz paid tribute to the church's minister, the Reverend William H. Tempest; former pastors; and to Henry Eisenberger, superintendent emeritus of the Sunday school of the church, at Genesee and Hickory.

To Promote the General Welfare

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, from the pen of a distinguished clergyman, Rev. William H. Hudnut, D. D., pastor of the Third Presbyterian Church in Rochester, N. Y., comes one of the clearest expressions I have seen on the much-discussed subject of the general welfare.

Under leave to extend my remarks, it follows:

TO PROMOTE THE GENERAL WELFARE

The Constitution has a phrase that is an apt description of one of the necessary functions of government "to promote the general welfare." No responsible government can ever be insensitive to that, and most citizens believe in the welfare state in that sense.

Recently, however, a school of thought has arisen that would rewrite the Constitution at this point and make it read "to guarantee the general welfare." This is something that no democratic government can undertake without in the process impoverishing its citizens and becoming a dictatorship. It is one thing to promote the general welfare, it is quite another thing to guarantee it.

The moment government guarantees my job, food, clothing, and shelter, that moment it both pauperizes and enslaves me. If one employer is not free to fire me, another is not free to hire me. If I am not free to quit one job and seek another, I am bound indeed. But things like that are what guaranteeing the general welfare would involve. The necessary prelude to this kind of welfare state is a police state. All that freedom guarantees is change, insecurity, and choice; but those are priceless.

Remember that guaranteeing our welfare is something that God himself has never tried to do. God gives every bird its food, but He does not throw it into a nest. The bird must work for it and so must man. And as a man works, without every contingency foreseen, without every corner cushioned, and without his physical well-being from cradle to grave a guaranteed conclusion, a strange thing happens to him—he develops independence and character.

Representative WALTER JUDD, of Minnesota, is right when he observes that freedom from want, if interpreted as freedom from the necessity to struggle, would be a calamity if ever realized. This is not to say that there should be no planning by government for the good of all, but it is quite different from saying that there should be total planning. No nation can remain free whose citizens transfer to government the initiatives that are rightfully their own responsibilities.

The attempt to promote the general welfare makes men, the attempt to guarantee it makes masters—and puppets.

Was Lincoln a Reactionary?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Altoona Tribune of February 11, 1950:

WAS LINCOLN A REACTIONARY?

One of the visible hallmarks of American institutions comes in pairs—a pair of portraits. They are to be found in all American public schools. They are to be found in public libraries, colleges, organizational meeting places, and, in fact, at every place where Americans gather, at home and abroad.

These portraits are of Abraham Lincoln and George Washington, whose birthdays are observed this month.

Abraham Lincoln was famous, among other things, for his clear understanding of his country's basic precepts, for his appreciation of the things for which his country stood. This understanding he was able to use to the benefit of posterity because of his rich gift of expression.

Observe some of the statements which have been the acme of American wisdom since the Civil War:

"You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money."

"You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich."

"You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and his independence."

"You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer."

"You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred."

"You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Last year the President of the United States, replying to criticism of his spending policies and his point 4 to spread American resources around the world, referred to his critics as reactionaries.

The criticism aimed at Mr. Truman was based upon just such Americanisms as those we have quoted from the wisdom of President Abraham Lincoln.

Perhaps that also would make the Great Emancipator a reactionary.

But if that is so, then we need more reactionaries in America.

If we are to accept the word with relation to Lincoln and in the meaning accorded it by the Communists, reactionaries are those who oppose communism and who stand for the American system.

Sadly, our American institutions and our American wisdom seem to mean less to us than they did two decades ago. Our statesmen pay lip service, but their acts belie their words.

What is government for except to preserve the freedom of the people? Beyond any doubt that is the primary purpose of government.

Big government ultimately serves only one major purpose: to build up a clique of big government officials, a class of government Mr. Bigs.

We see them arise wherever big government flourishes. They start out by promising every man a job, a pension, perpetual Federal care. Remember Hitler's speech of 1935, in which he promised every German one of the new people's cars?

Generally, we can see by the record, that political pledges of security and government care develop into realization only for the politicians who make the promises.

In this respect, notice our Government trend toward providing tax-free salaries, or expense accounts, for the President, and other top officials.

Our President now has a staff of 3 secretaries, a special counsel, 5 administration assistants, 3 armed service aides, and numerous persons of mere menial category, for a total of 225, exclusive of the aides, the Secret Service, and the police. The President also has at his service, a yacht, two other craft, including a cabin cruiser, a palatial airplane, the *Independence*, and a fleet of autos, soon to be supplemented by leased armored, bulletproof-glassed limousines.

Most of his staff also have their own Government-owned limousines.

All of this seems to be a world apart from Mr. Truman's socialistic programs to take away man's initiative and independence.

Americans never will have any real security that they haven't earned for themselves unless they are willing to accept servitude to a central government as a condition of security; and, as General Eisenhower said not long ago, the only real economic security available is that "enjoyed" by the inmates of penitentiaries. They don't need to worry about tomorrow, either.

With all this in mind, one more warning from Lincoln offers food for thought:

"If destruction be our lot, we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of free men we must live through all time or die by suicide."

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD,
Michigan Representative,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. FORD: Sunday night, February 5, Walter Winchell made a plea to his radio audience in behalf of J. Edgar Hoover. It seems the FBI have been tapping Communist telephone lines which has brought about the request for the removal of Mr. Hoover from the Department. I hope I am just one of many thousands that heard this broadcast.

This sort of action, as Mr. Winchell stated, would be as stupid a reflection against our American people as the criticism made against our armed forces commanders in using flame throwers against the Japanese during World War II. What can our American people be thinking of by tearing down our means of protection against forces attempting to disrupt our country?

I am a veteran of World War II with 4½ years' service, 33 months of which were spent fighting the Japanese. It is my understanding the Thirty-second Division had more combat experience than our other fighting units so my basis in criticizing these people is not unfounded.

During the years 1941 to 1945, it seems to me the American public heard enough of the treatment of our boys in service that were unfortunate enough to be captured by the Japs alive. Do these very people ever stop to realize our boys also faced such things as flame throwers and other weapons of destruction that we alone were not guilty of using? Who is it that answers for the captured enemy equipment that was stamped "made in U. S. A."?

Those people not facing these things in reality and continually criticize our country's means of protection from aggression have much to learn.

Any method our FBI uses to stop this aggression inside our own country should be commended not condemned. Above all, we should not lose the one man who has headed this Department so intelligently in the past and most capable, in my opinion, to handle any future activities of our FBI. I must be wrong in thinking any American would think of taking such action for the protection we get from the FBI. These actions must have backings from only communistic organizations.

In such times as these, and with the crisis that faces our freedom today, our country should be protected at all costs be what they may.

Very truly yours,

JAMES W. WELLS.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH.

Our Nation's Prayer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER A. CHESNEY
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CHESNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, may I offer a patriotic prayer that was originated by one of my constituents, Rev. Francis C. Young, known as the poet priest, pastor of St. Juliana's Church in Chicago. This patriotic prayer was first presented by him 25 years ago at an installation of Portage Park Post of the American Legion at Chicago in my congressional district.

It has received the formal approval of Presidents Harding, Coolidge, Hoover, and Roosevelt and has been accepted by all patriotic Americans as indicative of our confidence in our country and in the Almighty. The prayer is as follows:

OUR NATION'S PRAYER

O Lord, a sacred peace we crave.
For this, with all our leaders brave
We pray that Thy almighty hand
Will guard and guide our wondrous land.
We'll melt with love the swords of men
To make of them the noblest pen.
With this, dear God, our hope and aim,
Let us enshrine Old Glory's fame.

For us our fathers died by sword
And loved ones spent their lives, O Lord.
Give us unselfish hearts like theirs
To prove our worth as loyal heirs.
Direct our thoughts to holy deeds,
Let love abide among all creeds;
Pray, keep us in Thy watchful care,
We seek, dear Lord, Thy help in prayer.
Amen.

The people of America, regardless of creed, in these days of national and international distress should raise united voices asking for His divine protection, guidance, and assistance.

The spirit expressed in Our Nation's Prayer has moved our national leaders and the people of America since the founding of our Republic.

Legislation From the Committee on Education and Labor Enacted at the First Session of the Eighty-first Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN LESINSKI
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. LESINSKI. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me over Station WJR, Detroit, Mich., on February 10, 1950:

Ladies and gentlemen of the radio audience, I want to give you a brief resumé of some of the important legislation that has been reported out of the House Committee on Education and Labor, of which I am the chairman, and was passed by the Congress in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress.

First, let's talk about the amendments to the Fair Labor Standards Act which went into effect January 25, 1950. A million and a half workers are now getting higher pay because this law provides that a worker must be paid not less than 75 cents an hour if he is employed in commerce or in the production of goods for commerce. No oppressive child labor can now be employed in commerce or the production of goods for commerce, and no children may be employed in agriculture during school hours. For the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act the 75-cent minimum wage means that they once more have real protection for their own living standard even though they may be getting much more than 75 cents an hour because they are now protected from the unfair competition of employers who were paying as low as 40 cents an hour and thus were undercutting all wages in the industry. The business health of the whole country is strengthened, and the children of this country are given greater protection. The entire country benefits from this advance in the improvement of the Federal law establishing minimum fair-labor standards.

The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 was made the law of the land by the Democratic Party under President Roosevelt and has been expanded and modernized in line with our changed economic conditions by the Democratic Party under President Truman. The Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 has proved itself an effective instrument for carrying out its liberal aims and its beneficial economic purposes. It has been a good law for the worker and a good law for the employer. It went far to correct substandard labor conditions. It went far toward removing from the great majority of employers of this country who are fair-minded and who want to maintain decent labor standards the fear and the pressure of unfair competition from those who would seek to gain a market at the expense of their own employees. But conditions have changed greatly since 1938. We have moved to a $250,000,000,000 economy, and the 40-cent minimum wage had become out of date. It was

time to reexamine the law. This the Congress has now done under the leadership of a Democratic administration. The new minimum-wage rate of 75 cents an hour directly benefits a million and a half workers whose pay had lagged behind the times. Indirectly, it affords protection to the 22,000,000 workers who are covered by the law. And it is an additional protection of the Nation's economy. Under the Fair Labor Standards Act as it stands today there is vastly greater protection for the children of our country. For the first time oppressive child labor is prohibited in interstate commerce. This will prevent the exploitation of child labor in such fields as transportation and communication. The act now provides clearly and directly the authority needed to deal with the vicious aspects of industrial homework. The fair-labor standards amendments of 1949, is a great achievement and another step forward in our unceasing efforts to promote the general welfare of all the people.

However, I want to point out that in spite of the improvements in the wage-and-hour standards which were made in the past session, I do not believe that the duty of Congress was fully discharged in the field of fair-labor standards with the passage of the 1949 amendments. During the whole session in 1949 I fought for a minimum wage of at least $1 per hour with greatly expanded coverage which would have granted the benefits of this law to millions of additional workers. To this end I introduced H. R. 2033. I was not able to get these provisions in the bill which finally was passed but I am determined to continue the fight and I will not be satisfied until every worker covered by the wage-and-hour law is paid a wage of at least $1 an hour.

Another important bill which was reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and was passed by the Congress in the last session is a law to provide for the education of children residing on nonsupporting, federally owned property, and children residing in localities overburdened with increased school enrollments resulting from Federal activities in the area. This law provides that assistance should be given only to those school districts that showed a deficit in their maintenance and operation program for this school year—that the total amount of funds available to the school district from all sources was not sufficient to provide a normal school program and that the deficit was caused by defense-incurred school enrollments or reduction in school revenue resulting from the acquisition or ownership of land by the Federal Government. The bill authorized an appropriation of $7,500,000, although the Congress actually appropriated only $7,250,000. Under this law eight school districts in this great State of ours applied to the General Services Administration for assistance. They are:

1. Warren Consolidated school district No. 1, fractional, Warren, and Sterling Townships, Macomb, Mich. Applied for assistance in the amount of $30,980 for the current school year.

2. Lavonia Township school district, Wayne County, Plymouth, Mich. Applied for $85,549.

3. School district No. 7, Nankin Township, Inkster, Mich. Applied for $73,185.

4. Ypsilanti township school district No. 1, fractional, Willow Run Village, Washtenaw County, Mich. Applied for $73,178.

5. School district of the village of Wayne, Wayne County, Mich. Applied for $99,151.

6. School district No. 2, fractional, Erin and Warren Townships, East Detroit, Macomb County, Mich. Applied for $132,959.

7. Romulus school district, Romulus Township, Wayne County, Mich. Applied for $85,295.

8. School district No. 6, Erin Township, Roseville, Macomb County, Mich. Applied for $16,944.

The final determination as to eligibility and approval of the amount of allotments has not yet been made. The General Services Administration must determine the total amounts needed by those eligible school districts that have been recommended for allotment and compare this to the $7,250,000 appropriated. It is the hope of the House Committee on Education and Labor, and my personal hope, that we can devise legislation at this session of Congress that will meet this problem on a permanent and uniform basis whenever and wherever it occurs. Such permanent legislation will permit local school authorities to make their plans in advance without waiting each year for the Congress to pass temporary relief legislation.

And now let me tell you about the Federal employees' compensation amendments of 1949. This bill was also reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor and passed by Congress in the last session. It is a law to provide for Federal employees who get injured as a result of their work. Who are these workers? Many of them are your neighbors and friends—the man who delivers your letters or from whom you buy your stamps at the post office is a Government employee. So is the food and drug inspector who protects you as a consumer against filthy food and impure drugs. So is the mechanic who works on airplane motors at a Government air base. So is the weatherman and the typist at the Census Bureau. Every year about 11,000 of these people have an accident on the job. They can't work while they are injured. They or their families would suffer if we didn't provide for their loss of wages. If you were laid up, could your family survive very long without help? Under the old law a permanently and totally disabled man could never receive more than $116 a month for himself and family. Many injured workers received much less. The first thing we did in the new law was to increase the benefits for injured workers and for their families in case of death. A man with a wife and children now can receive up to 75 percent of his former wages if he is completely and permanently disabled. If he is killed on the job his family has similar protection. Here's an actual case: A few months ago a postal employee picked up a parcel-post package. The package exploded in his hands. The employee, a 29-year-old veteran, lost both arms up to the elbows and the sight of both eyes. He will never work again but his wife and several young children will be protected under the new law. The second thing we did in this new law was to include postmasters and other groups of Government workers not covered under the old law. By the way, the old law hadn't been revised for 22 years, in spite of great increases in wages and living costs during that time. The third important thing in the new law is a schedule of payments for permanent disabilities such as injury to the face or head, loss of hearing, loss of a hand, a leg, or a thumb. It goes all the way from a 15-week benefit for loss of a fourth finger to a 312-week benefit for loss of an arm. This new law has been in operation for only several months. The first case decided under it was that of a 77-year-old disabled man who suffered complete loss of his right eye from a flying nail while working as a carpenter for an Army general depot in 1944. Under the amended law, his present benefit check will be doubled for the next 160 weeks, and he will continue on the Federal workmen's compensation rolls as long as he has a loss of wage-earning capacity due to his injury.

Another important piece of legislation which has been reported out of the Committee on Education and Labor is the FEPC bill. This prohibits discrimination in employment because of race, religion, color, national origin or ancestry and creates a Fair Employment Practices Commission to prevent discrimination. A great deal has been said about the efforts of southern Members of Congress to delay or prevent consideration of this bill. I would like to say now that it is my firm conviction that in spite of everything our opponents may do I will be able to force a vote on the FEPC bill at this session of the Congress and that it will pass the House.

Before closing I want to mention that since February 7 the Committee on Education and Labor has been in executive session considering a bill to authorize an appropriation of funds to assist the States and Territories in financing a minimum foundation education program of public elementary and secondary schools, and in reducing the inequalities of educational opportunities through public elementary and secondary schools and for the general welfare. This bill is better known as Federal aid to education. I believe that this bill will be reported out of the committee at this session.

Let's Deliver Two Blows for Democracy in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States of America have taken their stand at the head of the forces of freedom in the world's war of ideas. They look to us here in Congress—their spokesmen and representatives—to make the thrusts and lay home the blows which will win the fight for men's minds.

It occurs to me that some of us here in Congress are overlooking one of the most effective weapons we could use in the ideological war in the Pacific. It is a weapon which will cost us practically nothing yet will win us the good will of all of the people whose home shores border on or lie wholly within the vast Pacific Basin. I refer to statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

The peoples of the Pacific know of Hawaii and Alaska. They know that they are parts of the United States. They know, too, that for many years the United States has held Hawaii and Alaska at arm's length and has denied them full fellowship in the great Republic of which they are a part.

We are in an all-out struggle with imperialistic Russian communism. The burden is on the United States to defend the democratic way of life. We must convince the world that freedom and democracy, not communism, is the road to a better future for the individual.

What good is it that we talk of equality under law while we continue to deny the full measure of democracy to many of our own people—the people of Hawaii and Alaska?

The Fifty-sixth Congress, which in its infinite wisdom, enacted legislation to annex Hawaii to the United States, saw the picture in the Pacific through the eyes of prophecy. The Fifty-seventh Congress, which in 1900 enacted Hawaii's

Organic Act, made Hawaii an integral part of the United States. Thus, the great Americans who occupied the seats of Congress at the turn of the century envisioned the future of democracy in the Pacific. They gave Hawaii a government of law after the pattern of the governments of the States and the Territories of the American Union. They incorporated Hawaii into the Union as a Territory—a State in being. They made the citizens of Hawaii American citizens.

The annexation of Hawaii occurred in 1898. The United States was then engaged in a war with Spain. We needed the islands as a forward base for operations against our then enemy. Spain was lodged in the Philippines and the small islands of the central Pacific. Hawaii was vital to our young Nation in its war with Spain.

Almost 50 years later, in World War II, the Territory of Hawaii again was vital to our survival in the Pacific. The attack on Pearl Harbor brought home to the people of the United States the knowledge that Hawaii is America. Without Hawaii our survival as a free Nation is threatened.

When the bombs fell on Pearl Harbor the American people cried:

"We have been attacked."

There was no one in America to say:

"Wait. Hawaii is not yet a State."

The 45 United States who welcomed Hawaii into their Union at the turn of the twentieth century have now increased to 48. Arizona, New Mexico, and Oklahoma, then Territories, have since been admitted to the Union.

The American flag has flown over Alaska since 1867. In 1912, the same year that Arizona and New Mexico came into the Union as States, Congress enacted Alaska's Organic Act.

In World War II when the Japs threatened the Aleutian Islands, they threatened the United States. Americans did not draw back and say, "Oh, no. The Japs haven't attacked the United States. They have merely attacked an organized territory."

Today, as we start the second half of the twentieth century, Hawaii and Alaska are far more vital to the United States than at any time in our history. Our only potential enemy is already strongly entrenched on the shores of the western Pacific and is making ominous movements into southeast Asia.

The great Americans who purchased the vast Territory of Alaska and who annexed the Hawaiian Islands saw the future of our great country better than many of us do today. They viewed democracy as an ever-expanding force always moving forward to greater horizons.

As we sit here in this, the Eighty-first Congress, and debate and discuss the admission of Hawaii and Alaska to statehood, more and more of the people on the shores of the Pacific are forsaking—involuntarily—the ways of freedom. While we look with hesitancy at the aspirations of our fellow Americans in Hawaii and Alaska, Russia through its satellites and puppets is taking the millions of Asia to its bosom.

Is it not logical, therefore, that these parts of the United States—Alaska and Hawaii—be taken to our bosom? Is it not logical at this juncture of history that we should bind our own people into our Union with all of the ties at our disposal?

Those who are joining up with the new Russian imperialism are the unwitting victims of a false ideology. They are succumbing to a new superweapon—a monstrously false philosophy which destroys the faith of men in the free way of life.

It is our job to fight this false ideology with the true ideology of democracy. There is no better weapon than truth and ever-recurring professions of faith in the things we stand for.

We must be careful, however, to see to it that what we do matches up to what we profess and what we say. And it is therein that I derive my zeal for immediate action on statehood for Hawaii and Alaska.

To my way of thinking, the time has come for Americans to make a profession of faith in democracy in language the world will understand. The time has come for us to get on the street corners of the world and announce that Hawaii and Alaska, at their own request, have been admitted into the American Union of sovereign States as equals. They have both earned this right.

Prayer at Lincoln Day Banquet at Lock Haven, Pa.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include one of the most beautiful and inspirational prayers I have ever had the pleasure of listening to. It was offered by Rev. Burleigh Peters, pastor of St. Johns Lutheran Church, Lock Haven, Pa., at the Lincoln Day banquet sponsored by the Clinton County Republican Committee, Friday, February 10, at which our own beloved GEORGE A. DONDERO, of Michigan, was guest speaker:

Ever blessed God, our heavenly Father, through whose righteous will everyone of us is sustained and whose goodness is evident upon every hand, we truly call upon Thee at the beginning of this meeting. Let it not be in a perfunctory manner but rather with a deep sense of our great need of Thee and Thy wisdom and counsel as colaborers with Thee in the execution of Thy divine plan for good, sound government in our beloved land. Help us as instruments in Thy hand to raise up honest, God-fearing men as aspirants for public office. Endow those in office with a new clarity of comprehension to see, e'er the night time comes upon them and us, the exceedingly dangerous road we are traveling toward the socialistic welfare state. Teach us again, O God, to lift up our eyes unto the hills, for from whence shall our help come but from Thee? May our Nation truly turn from the materialistic gods of our day unto Thee, the true God, the God of our fathers, who can and will give again unto our people the good grain rather than the empty husks of glorified promises. As our forefathers trusted so implicitly in Thee in the forests primeval and in that faith so wisely laid the foundations of our great Nation and whose labors have been abundantly blessed with high honor, great integrity, and immense wealth among the nations of the earth, so give use now the wisdom, determination, and vision to arrest this tragic descent e'er we slip entirely from off that foundation into utter ruin. Be pleased, O our Gracious God, that never shalt Thou see nor history record, the collapse of the United States of America because she lost her faith in Thee.

May this meeting and all similar ones in this campaign be animated by the spirit of true statesmanship rather than just politics. The hour our Father, has arrived in our history when all true, wholehearted, God-fearing, Americans must stand up and be counted that this Government perish not from the earth. May all be done here tonight in the interest of good government.

Even the food of which we shall soon partake came from Thee. For it we are truly thankful, and may the deep interest in our good American heritage prevail now and henceforth. We pray in Jesus' name. Amen.

Roles of Alaska and Canada in National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, I call attention to the following editorial, under leave to extend my remarks, which appeared in the Norwich (Conn.) Bulletin:

JOINT DEFENSE WORK

Alaska is so close to Siberia that it is impossible to ignore the possibility of a drive into the North American continent at that point, and it is folly to set up a first line of defense in Europe without giving thought to what might happen if Alaska should be left unguarded or poorly so.

While Alaska is American territory, Canada adjoins it and cannot fail to recognize that any invasion of Alaska would, or could, mean the overrunning of Canada unless there are adequate means established to prevent it. The logical defense therefore lies in strengthening Alaska, but it is impossible for Canada to overlook the need of looking carefully to its defense plans in that direction.

Through the cooperative efforts of the two countries which have maintained peace for more than a century, and which have worked together loyally when they have had to face emergencies created by others, the means of preventing war through defense sufficiently strong to discourage an aggressor must be recognized on this continent as well as across the Atlantic. Much dependence will naturally be placed on the United States but there is a part which Canada should and doubtless will take. The joint maneuvers which have been arranged in Alaska indicate that the Dominion is giving thought to its responsibility.

Valley Authorities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRIS ELLSWORTH
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. ELLSWORTH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a statement on valley authorities from the Government Affairs Legislative Daily of the Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America for January 10, 1950, as follows:

A little cofferdam was thrown across the Tennessee River in Alabama before the close of the First World War.

Later—30 years and hundreds of millions of dollars later—it develops that the little dam was the start of the now controversial valley authority idea.

What happened?

In 1933 President Roosevelt told Congress that something must be done to protect what had become a great national investment in the Muscle Shoals area. He asked Congress to create a Tennessee Valley Authority which would have the "broadest duty of planning for the proper use, conservation, and development of the natural resources of the Tennessee River drainage basin and its adjoining territory for the general social and economic welfare of the Nation."

"If we are successful here," he concluded, "we can march on, step by step, in a like development of other great natural territorial units within our borders."

Congress, a little later that year, did create the TVA, avowedly for primary purposes of flood control and navigation.

In 1934, the President said that the valley authorities were going to be copied in every State in the Union before we get through.

Today, the Tennessee Valley Authority has developed into an octopus whose tentacles have spread over seven southeastern States.

Taxpayers in every State of the Union have contributed to a Government corporation which has fixed assets, before depreciation, of $811,300,000 as of June 30, 1948.

Most people are well acquainted with the activities of the TVA, the one existing valley authority. They know, for example, that TVA generates and sells power to consumers and industries in the valley; that the Authority administers flood control, navigation, and soil-conservation programs which in other parts of the country are administered by the Army engineers and the Department of Agriculture; and that the Authority subsidizes the production of fertilizer in competion with an established fertilizer industry.

The average person also knows that the economic function of generating electrical energy in the valley is performed by the Federal Government and not by people through their self-supporting business institutions, and that power is sold at about half its cost.

The earliest proponents spoke of the valley authority idea as an expression of the need for a body politic intermediate between the State and the Nation, as an expression of the inappropriateness of existing State boundaries, and as an outgrowth of the federalizing tendency which requires closer articulation between State and national activity.

The planners, however, saw no chance that State boundaries could be changed or that a regional body politic could be superimposed upon these States. They needed a way around these difficulties and the valley authority idea provided a method.

In 15 years, there has been no fundamental change in the thinking that lies behind the valley authority idea. The idea now, as then, is Federal-regional planning with the plans administered by a single agency directed by three men. Furthermore, those selected to direct this enterprise must start free from loyalties to competing Federal bureaus, and then, as now, it was considered imperative that the three men have a public, rather than a private point of view.

Fifteen years ago, the planners called for national control of all the running waters of the United States, from the desert trickle * * * to the rushing flood waters of the Mississippi. This is still a number one objective.

Thirteen years ago these planners were united in their opposition to the Corps of Engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. "Neither the Corps of Engineers nor the Bureau of Reclamation," they wrote, "should be assigned to this new regional operating service." They believed that the idea that people and existing agencies could work together for the common good was an out-moded, tradition-bound, and static concept. Instead, the unique character of the task and its key importance called for the creation of a new and special Federal operating agency.

If the essence of the valley authority idea is three Federal appointees controlling a region, then there is a pattern for the future under which 48 States with their governors and legislative bodies are to be forced into the background to make way for government by 27 men to be appointed—and thereby controlled—by one man.

The question for all citizens to decide is whether under the pattern of the valley authority idea this Nation would still be the United States of America.

OMNIBUS LEGISLATION

The valley authority idea was incorporated in two different types of bills in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress—bills which are still pending, of course. The first is an omnibus measure which would create nine valley authorities to blanket the Nation.

Representative RANKIN, Democrat of Mississippi, introduced a bill (H. R. 894) which would create these regional operations:

Atlantic Seaboard Authority.
Great Lakes-Ohio Valley Authority.
Tennessee Valley Authority.
Missouri Valley Authority.
Arkansas Valley Authority.
Southwestern Authority.
Columbia Valley Authority.
California Valley Authority.
Colorado Valley Authority.

This omnibus bill is designed to (1) "develop, integrate and coordinate plans, projects and activities for or incidental to" navigation, flood control, reclamation, and generation, sale and distribution of electric power; (2) improve living conditions; (3) aid commerce among the States; (4) strengthen the national defense; (5) conserve water, soil and forest resources; (6) stabilize employment and relieve unemployment, and (7) otherwise protect and promote the national interest.

Under H. R. 894, the President would appoint an administrator for each authority, except TVA which would continue in its present form. The Authority could acquire by purchase, lease or condemnation any property it deems necessary. Regional policies would be made to conform to national policies with due regard for regional and local requirements. Each authority would consult and cooperate with the States insofar as practicable.

Should Congress approve any such project, the Authority could at once proceed with its construction and operation. To encourage wide use of power and water, the authority could acquire or build or maintain such canals and transmission lines as it deems necessary. Priority in purchase of the power would be given to States, districts, counties and municipalities.

Although each authority could determine how it kept its accounts, the United States Comptroller would be required to audit the accounts at least once a year. All receipts of the authorities would go into the United States Treasury.

One of the most important of the provisions appears near the end of the bill. It reads: "There are hereby authorized to be appropriated from time to time such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act."

THE CVA BILL

The second type of enabling legislation that has been introduced is the actual bill for creation of one of these valley authorities.

It is S. 1645 which was introduced last spring by Senator Magnuson, Democrat, of Washington, for himself and Senators Kefauver, Democrat, of Tennessee; Humphrey, Democrat, of Minnesota; Chavez, Democrat, of New Mexico; Murray, Democrat, of Montana; Langer, Republican, of North Dakota; Douglas, Democrat, of Illinois; McGrath, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Pepper, Democrat, of Florida; Sparkman, Democrat, of Alabama; Hill, Democrat, of Alabama; Green, Democrat, of Rhode Island; Wagner, Democrat of New York; Taylor, Democrat, of Idaho; Gillette, Democrat, of Iowa; Johnston, Democrat, of South Carolina; and Johnson, Democrat, of Texas.

An examination of S. 1645 is appropriate because it could serve as a pattern for authorities for other sections of the Nation. It provides the basic legal structure for regional authority control, but leaves much to the uncertainties of administrative ruling and interpretation.

1. Declaration of policy: The Government's policy in the CVA would be to use the area's water, land, forest, and other natural resources for fostering commerce among the States, strengthening the national defense, developing the lands of the United States, and for promoting the general welfare. The area to be included would be the United States portions of the Columbia River, its tributaries and watershed areas, plus major portions of Washington and Oregon not in the watersheds.

2. Creation of a Government corporation: A Columbia Valley Administration would be created under the general supervision of the President of the United States. It would have all authority of the Federal Government and would me managed by a 3-man board of directors appointed by the President, who would name the chairman. Two of the three directors would have to be bona fide residents of the region and all members would have to profess a belief in the feasibility and wisdom of the act. The board would be responsible directly to the President—not to Congress.

3. State and local participation: The Valley Administration would seek the advice, assistance and participation of the people to the fullest practicable extent. There would be consultation with appropriate representatives of the people; advisory boards could be set up as may be necessary or appropriate and their comments shall be included in the annual report.

The Administration would be free from any State or local control even from the jurisdiction of State courts, for any proceedings brought against it in a State court could be transferred at once to a Federal district court. That provision is especially important where water rights are involved.

4. General powers: The Administration would construct, operate, and maintain projects for navigation, flood control, conservation of land, development of resources, and generation, transmission, and disposition of power and for the execution of such other

responsibilities as are vested in the Administration pursuant to this act. To the extent found necessary or appropriate, the Administration could acquire real and personal property.

The Administration would undertake experiments and practical demonstrations. It would determine the necessity for the character and amount of its expenditures and how they should be paid. It could work with other agencies.

Construction work would be carried out by contract so far as practicable, but the Authority could do the work itself in emergencies or unusual circumstances, when no reasonable bids are received or where necessary to provide certain employment for maintenance crews.

5. Coordination of plans: The administration would prepare plans and projects and programs for consideration of the President and Congress. Such operations would provide for water use and conservation, improvements by irrigation and drainage, conservation of wildlife, recreational facilities, and for the use of the mineral, forest, land, water, fish, and other resources of the region as a balanced and stable economic development. The CVA directors would decide whether proposed projects are economically sound and in the public interest. All programs, projects, and activities would have to be effectively coordinated with related national policies and programs.

6. Sale of power: The Administration would sell electric energy so as to encourage its wide use at low rates, with preference to Federal agencies, States, and their political subdivisions, and to cooperatives. The CVA directors would build or acquire transmission lines. Sale of power to private utilities would be under contract, which contract could be canceled by CVA upon written notice (not more than 5 years) and which could contain such terms and conditions as the Administration may deem appropriate for carrying out the purposes of the act. Thus it would be possible to starve many existing companies.

7. Reclamation provisions: The Administration, the bill says, would proceed in conformity with State laws relating to the control, appropriation, use, or distribution of water used for domestic, irrigation, mining, or industrial purposes, and in the acquisition of land incident to the construction of dams, reservoirs, etc. But, nevertheless, it could condemn water rights appurtenant to such land. And the reclamation activities would have to be consistent with national agriculture policies.

The Administration would establish the maximum size of farm units within each project for the reclamation of lands * * * but no farm unit shall contain more than 160 or less than 10 acres of irrigable land. No benefits from such projects could be made available to owners of lands whose individual holdings exceed the maximum area unless the owners agreed to sell acreage in excess of maximum.

8. Financing: A Columbia Valley Administration fund, of unspecified size, would be created in the Federal Treasury with funds Congress would appropriate. The CVA could then tap those funds in such amounts as the Administration may deem necessary. The money would be repaid over a reasonable period of years, receipts from projects and activities may be used to repay project costs. No major project could be undertaken unless it was included in the CVA's annual budget program which Congress must approve, but need do nothing more.

9. Tax payments: The CVA would attempt to avoid impairment of the finances of a State because of removal of property from its tax rolls. In fact, the CVA could be required to make tax payments to States but under certain conditions which CVA directors would determine. CVA would be guided by, among other things, the amount of increase in taxable values and other benefits arising from the activities of the Administration. The CVA property franchises and income would be expressly exempted from any taxation. Here is a case where the taxpayer decides how much taxes are due, if any.

10. Personnel: The Administration would be required to employ and fix compensation of officers, employees, attorneys, agents, and consultants without regard to the civil-service laws.

11. Legal interpretations: This act shall be liberally construed to carry out the purposes of Congress to provide for the disposition of and make needful rules and regulations respecting Government properties entrusted to the Administration, provide for the national defense, improve navigation, control destructive floods and promote interstate commerce and the general welfare.

THE ISSUES

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is strongly opposed to regional authorities.

It believes that if the Columbia Valley Authority were to be established, it could lead to creation of a network of authorities blanketing the country.

The valley-authority idea should be rejected for the following principal reasons:

1. The carefully developed and coordinated planning for resource development that has aided the Pacific Northwest over the years would be abandoned in favor of a three-man board of political appointees, responsible only to the President.

Eighty-six major power dams already operate in the Columbia Basin. There are 32 major irrigation dams. And there are 12 major multipurpose dams. More than 500 miles of flood-control levees protect the land. About 8,800,000 acres are under irrigation.

Seventy percent of the basin's forests are maintained on a scientific perpetual-yield basis. Sixty percent of all farms are in soil-conservation districts. A much higher percentage of farms are electrified than in the TVA. The average use of electricity is higher and the average price is lower.

Four years ago Federal and State agencies formed the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee to coordinate development of the area.

It is understandable, therefore, that the idea of creating valley authorities comes not from the people, except from some locals of the CIO and the Farmers' Union, but from the Federal Government. The Governors of Oregon, Idaho, Washington, Nevada, and Wyoming—five of the States that would be affected—have expressed opposition to CVA.

2. The Supreme Court has interpreted broadly the powers of the Federal Government involving water rights and reclamation development. It has decided (a) that the Federal Government has full power and authority over all navigable streams; (b) that Federal control of navigable streams extends to the entire basin of the streams; and (c) that if State laws conflict with Federal control over local waters, the State law need not be complied with and may be ignored. Thus, State rights could be obliterated. Directors of a valley authority could determine upon a course, consulting only as much as they deemed necessary with States, regional groups, and local communities. The value of interstate compacts could be wiped out.

Language in the various valley-authority bills is vague. So until the identities of the three board members became known and they had a chance to put their own interpretations on that language, it is difficult to appraise precisely the extent of the problems that would be created. As former Chairman David Lilienthal of the TVA once said publicly: "TVA, if it were politically managed, could become a curse to this valley."

3. Former Interior Secretary Harold L. Ickes, while favoring valley authorities under certain conditions, frankly told a Senate committee during hearings in 1945 on a Missouri Valley Authority bill: "There is before you a major step in the basic reorganization of the Government of the United Stat as we have known it for the 150 years. * * * It is a theory that strikes at the very roots of present Government organization."

4. An authority, in the form of a Federal corporation, having substantial autonomy, would be free of many of the legal and congressional checks and restraints.

Projects probably could be initiated at the will of the authority directors. Their purpose could be that of the directors only. Accounting methods would be determined by the directors. They could deal with whom they pleased. They would have broad powers of eminent domain and condemnation. They would not be subject to regulation by any State or Federal commission.

Usually Congress authorizes the construction of separate projects in an area. Subsequently it has to appropriate the actual money for them. The valley-authority idea would give Congress only one chance to gage the merit and cost of new construction. And Congress would be asked to set up a general authority found in the Treasury which CVA directors could tap at will.

5. Untold new billions of dollars in taxes would have to be raised. Estimates are that CVA would cost at least $3,000,000,000 for water projects only and the Missouri Valley Authority about $6,000,000,000 for water and agricultural projects. The valley-authority idea contemplates nine authorities to blanket the country.

6. Flood control versus power development: Anyone who can build dams can control floods. One of the first, if not the first, jobs of an authority is to supply power. The fuller the reservoir behind a dam, the more power. The emptier the reservoir when floods come, the more flood control. There's a major conflict—unless a dam is large enough to adequately serve both purposes.

NATIONAL CHAMBER POLICY

The Chamber of Commerce of the United States believes that the Federal Government has a responsibility for the development and use of water resources for navigation. So have the States and so has private enterprise. The chamber has repeatedly reaffirmed its advocacy of national legislative policies which recognize the interests and rights of the States in water utilization and control and afford full opportunity for States and their communities and private enterprise to participate in the development and operation of water-resource projects.

The national chamber holds that the Congress is responsible for the wise management of this Federal interest in water and that it should establish, and adhere to, a consistent and progressive water-resource policy for the United States, defining the scope of the duties and obligations which the Federal Government legally can and should assume. Only the Congress should authorize the projects and assign their construction and operation to the appropriate Federal agency.

The national chamber advocates such development only upon sound engineering and economical principles and in aid of well-defined purposes. Complete cost analyses should be maintained for all beneficial uses. Commercial uses, such as power, should provide for taxes, interest, and other cost factors common to business enterprise.

The Comptroller General should be vested with jurisdiction over the application of all

revenues for multipurpose projects, with authority to require the devotion of such revenues to the purposes prescribed by Congress.

All local agencies, both public and private, should, by participating in a regional power pool, have opportunity to distribute and sell surplus power at Government dams.

The national chamber believes that under the foregoing principles applicable to water-resource development, there is no place for regional authorities. Therefore, it has declared repeatedly that:

"Federal regional authorities are opposed. They substitute Federal controls over natural resources by encroaching upon or displacing State jurisdiction. The extension of the regional idea to the entire country would mean the eventual disregarding of State lines and a new subdividing of the United States on a regional basis. Local and State government would be subordinated to centralized Federal control, not only of the waters, but also, in large degree, of the national economy. The Federal Government should continue to use its regularly established agencies, operating on a national basis, for activities properly belonging to the Federal Government in relation to natural resources."

The Progress of Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to enclose the following article from the Exeter News-Letter, Exeter, N. H., Thursday, February 2, 1950, by Mr. James P. Lynch:

THERE IS NO ROOM FOR INTOLERANCE

(By James P. Lynch)

If we were to tell some people that they were supporters of certain communistic doctrines they would be provoked. Yet in their everyday life, they unconsciously, by word and deed, embrace, to a certain extent, the progress of communism. The number is relatively small but, nevertheless, there are such contributors.

If these people would only realize that when they carry the torch of intolerance the only one who gains satisfaction is the master of the Kremlin. We have seen in the past several months many cases of intolerance among the wealthy and also among the poor. Internal friction in America is of grave concern to each and every one of us. Some have forgotten that we all are created equal.

The United States has been going forward and we cannot afford to allow intolerance to creep in and halt such progress. Our forefathers came here because they knew it was a land of freedom—a land of love and brotherhood. Regardless of what kind of blood ran in their veins—Irish, English, Scotch, French, Polish, Spanish, Swedish, or the many other nationalities—they left behind a land that could in no way compare with the freedom-loving United States. Here they were given opportunities. They were interested in tolerance. They had seen the pitfall of a Europe where the peoples from one nation were set against another. In fact, within the borders of their own states they were accustomed to disunity. Love thy neighbor was just three words to many of them.

The big gap between the words "hate" and "love" was quite descriptive of some of their homeland. When they arrived in this country they did not want the word "hate" accompanying them, they were interested only in the word "love."

When hate creeps in, regardless of the methods used, division follows. Harmony is in good company when it goes along with the word "freedom." However, when hate and fear step into the picture harmony steps out. Also the government weakens and as a result the future problems are similar to those that confronted the Old World.

Every American, whether he speaks in a small private group or in a large public gathering, should be denounced vigorously if he is guilty of committing the crime of intolerance. Race and creed hatred shall never be a substitute for love and respect.

Many months ago a young Jewish lad from Lynn, Mass., was the victim of assault by some of his little neighbors. The boy was beaten because he was a Jew. It was very unfortunate that such a deplorable incident occurred. To put the entire blame on these youngsters would be wrong inasmuch as the parents of these children were more to blame.

This case created considerable comment not only within the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but also throughout the country. People denounced the tactics. The remarks made by Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts department commander of the Jewish War Veterans, were of an exceptional nature and they are a great contribution toward the much-needed promotion of tolerance in America. Toye sent a letter to the little Jewish boy, Laurence Goldstein, and gave him some real good American advice. In part of the letter he stated: "Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who do not understand America do not get hold of it and spoil it."

That was advice from a prominent person to a little youngster. It was advice that each and every American should follow during his everyday life. We need not be reminded that during recent years there are certain radicals that have been doing their utmost to get in top positions throughout the Nation. One bad apple can spoil a bushel. This youngster's severe beating because he was a Jew should be a challenge to the people to stop the spread of the deplorable tactics used by those that have no love or affection for their fellow man.

No man or woman cares to have his religion or his ancestry torn to shreds. It is regrettable when people stoop so low that they are able to instill such debauchery into the hearts and minds of their little youngsters. This was the case in Lynn. We all realize children must be taught, and the youngsters that beat up this little boy because he was a Jew would never have acted as they did if they were not subjected to such slander in their own homes.

Commander Toye proved that instead of being intolerant, the best way to win your case is through love and affection. In discussing the uncalled-for assault he pointed out that the youngster received an undeserved beating at the hands of ill-bred and misinformed youngsters who were brought up in an unwholesome atmosphere.

Unwholesome atmosphere and ill-breeding is not necessarily confined to any certain section of a city or town. The rich and the poor sections alike can produce the condition.

It should not be necessary to remind those bigots that under the American way of life people make no distinction between Christian or Jew, white or colored. Also, we in America have the right to pray to God as we wish and to express our minds as freely as we want.

Toye tried to persuade the youngster of the dire need for love and kindness in winning the battles throughout life and to use force only when forced to do so. As he stated: "I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you 'Jew,' you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like the Jewish religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christians."

This could be so aptly put in referring to a portion of the adults that go around, day after day, ridiculing people because of their religious beliefs. The time they spend on such a deplorable cause could be used to much greater advantage in attending to their business of bringing up their children in the spirit of love and respect for other human beings, regardless of race, creed, or color.

These religious and racial agitators more recently have used a form of approach that is below gutter level. It has been brought out by commentators and newsmen during the past few days. In all cases it has been denounced because of its filthy falsifications, and use of false signatures. It is a letter supposedly signed by a Catholic attacking some Protestant missionaries. However, the Official Catholic Directory has no record of a Catholic priest by the name employed. The directory lists every recognized Catholic ecclesiastical organization, as well as every Catholic priest in the Nation. The attempt to denounce the Catholic Church and to make use of such a vicious and false letter, the object of which is to foment bigotry and discord, has little place in the American scheme of things.

Unfortunate, too, for the promoters of tolerance, is the bickering of certain lecturers and preachers. We heartily agree that it is much wiser and much more beneficial to be for something than against everything.

Those that are willing to participate in spreading bigotry and the false teachings of hate are un-American. They belong to that small poisonous group of people who live in America but who are very definitely our real enemies.

Many people probably feel that these intolerant disciples will sooner or later quiet down and the threat will be just a memory. It would be far better to be assured that intolerance could be erased for the well-being of ourselves and the children of America. Check it before it is too late. The elimination of hatred in America will be a severe blow to those that desire to spread the communistic doctrine in our land. We could write a thousand laws to combat the infiltration of such wicked tactics but the greatest contribution to the cause is for the freedom-loving people to denounce such radicalism right in their own section, before it starts to spread.

Pottery Industry Faces Collapse

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM S. HILL

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, a serious condition exists in one of the important segments of our vast and diversified field of industrial enterprise. It has developed as a result of the reciprocal trade agreements negotiated by the State Department at Annecy, France, last summer. It brings to our attention another example of the lack of vision and incom-

petence of the Department in handling economic affairs. As I will show you, the continuation of such policies will lead to a wider rupture of the industrial life of the Nation, with increasing unemployment and other economic distress.

The situation I particularly wish to emphasize and call to your attention concerns pottery and glassware. Factories manufacturing these products in Ohio are closing down. Many workers who have grown up and are skilled in this type of work are being forced out of their jobs. It is time for the Government to arouse itself. Japan and Europe are copying the designs and manufacturing pottery and glassware items, and sending them to this country. Because of the low tariff rates agreed to by the State Department, an unfair competitive situation has arisen which is putting our workers and factories out of business.

As you know, it also has been reported that 80 percent of the reciprocal-trade agreements made at Annecy affected farm commodities. When the farmers wake up to this, I am sure you will hear a roar of protests and demands for a quick reversal of this policy.

With this section of our industry already hard hit, it is the start of a trend which will grow from these ill-considered trade agreements.

Figures from the United States Tariff Commission of December 1949 clearly show what is happening. Total imports of table and art glassware for the first 11 months of 1948 amounted to $2,121,-305; for the corresponding period of 1949 they amounted to $2,665,692.

Is it any wonder the domestic glass business is folding up?

Before this snowballs into greater proportions and rolls into other fields of industrial activity, let us take action. And at the same time do something to help the workers and the glass and pottery industry.

I also wish to include with my remarks a copy of the letter I have written to my colleague, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN, chairman of the House Select Committee on Small Business, of which I am privileged to be a member, urging that the committee take the lead in investigating the reasons for the economic plight of the pottery business and initiate efforts to help all small business to assure us a strong, expanding economy.

The letter follows:

FEBRUARY 7, 1950.

Hon. WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman, Select Committee on Small Business, Washington, D. C.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: In this letter, I wish to express two things: First, my disappointment over the statements made in the release on Small Business Organizations.

I have two reasons for objecting to this: First, I never understood that the committee was authorized to release such a report. The copy of the minutes I have show that it was not authorized. The report also is superficial and makes unwarranted insinuations in regard to the firms investigated.

My second purpose in writing is: I believe the committee should take constructive steps to solve the problems of small business. For instance, the pottery and glassware industry in Ohio is closing down. Men are losing their jobs. I feel that part of the economic problems of this industrial enterprise can be laid at the door of the State Department as a result of reciprocal trade agreements entered into without knowledge, consent, or advice of Congress. When small business like this is being hurt, I think it is our duty to investigate the causes, and to help find a solution, if it is at all within our power. I contend that the committee's efforts should be along this line, rather than trying to pin a tag on some group of alleged business representatives. Our job is to help small business, and to see that legislative action is taken to assist this important part of our economy. Small business—no matter in what field it functions—is the backbone of our great economic heritage.

Because of the serious economic plight of the pottery and glassware industry, I am making a statement on the floor of the House bringing it to the attention of the Members. I believe that the Small Business Committee could be of great assistance by cooperating and taking the lead in starting an investigation to dig out the facts and, if possible, get this small-business enterprise back on its feet.

Thanking you for your interest and consideration, with kindest regards, I am,

Sincerely yours.

(Copy to Hon. CHARLES HALLECK.)

What Mr. Truman's Yearly Expenditures Mean to Each County in Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. CURTIS
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, in the tables listed below there are three columns that show each Nebraska county's share in this year's Federal expenditures, in the total national debt, and the 1948 assessed valuation of the land in each county.

Mr. Truman's budget calls for $42,439,-000,000. The proportionate cost of this spending budget for each county is based on the 1948 consumer-income figures.

The President estimated the Federal debt will be $263,300,000,000 at the end of the coming year. Each county's share of the national debt is based on population estimates of January 1, 1949, and a per capita debt of $1,759.

The assessed valuation for the farm lands shown in the third column is taken from State reports in the Library of Congress based on 1948 appraisals.

To illustrate what is involved in these tables let us take the case of my home county, Kearney. Based on that county's income they will have to pay $1,251,900 as their share of the coming year's spending of the Truman administration.

Kearney County's share of the national debt, on a per capita basis, is $11,081,700, while the value of all their farm land, and it is distinctly a farm community, is $9,890,745.

It is estimated that Lancaster County, with the greatest assessed land worth in my congressional district, will have to pay $38,220,200 as its share of 1 year of spending by the Truman administration. The value of the farm lands in Lancaster County—and they are very fine lands—is only $28,038,235. Lancaster County's share of the national debt, based on a per capita estimate, is $189,972,000.

It will be interesting for the citizens of Nebraska to inquire of their county treasurer how much tax he collects for schools, roads, townships, counties, and State governments in 1 year.

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,439,-000,000	Share of Federal debt of $263,800,-000,000 at end of fiscal 1951	1948 assessed land valuation
FIRST, NEBRASKA			
Adams	$9,708,300	$54,880,800	$12,942,320
Chase	1,233,600	8,443,200	5,028,125
Clay	1,956,300	18,293,600	12,593,505
Dundy	861,300	7,739,600	4,753,230
Fillmore	2,080,400	18,293,600	14,299,105
Franklin	1,879,600	11,961,200	6,897,840
Frontier	1,204,400	9,498,600	6,279,270
Furnas	2,401,500	14,951,500	7,630,525
Gage	7,284,900	51,714,600	27,816,025
Gosper	657,000	5,101,100	5,909,725
Harlan	894,200	10,554,000	7,113,590
Hayes	368,600	4,573,400	4,035,540
Hitchcock	1,124,100	10,026,300	6,274,315
Jefferson	3,934,400	24,626,000	14,020,290
Johnson	1,529,200	13,368,400	11,587,305
Kearney	1,251,900	11,081,700	9,890,745
Lancaster	38,220,200	189,972,000	28,038,235
Nemaha	2,762,900	17,414,100	15,240,150
Nuckolls	2,036,600	15,831,000	12,024,420
Pawnee	1,365,000	12,137,100	12,082,480
Phelps	2,405,200	13,720,200	8,884,215
Redwillow	3,814,000	21,283,900	6,484,660
Richardson	4,003,800	29,727,100	20,266,185
Saline	2,992,800	24,450,100	19,182,480
Thayer	2,299,300	19,876,700	12,954,455
Webster	1,594,900	12,137,100	7,940,995
Total	99,864,400	631,656,900	
SECOND, NEBRASKA			
Cass	2,959,900	28,144,000	22,875,270
Douglas	113,120,500	510,110,000	16,495,285
Otoe	4,029,300	29,199,400	25,043,945
Sarpy	1,616,800	21,283,900	9,833,165
Washington	2,065,800	18,293,600	16,477,557
Total	123,792,300	607,030,900	
THIRD, NEBRASKA			
Antelope	2,288,400	20,228,500	14,073,195
Boone	2,262,800	18,997,200	13,373,510
Burt	2,522,000	20,404,400	17,077,190
Butler	2,087,700	20,404,400	21,469,440
Cedar	2,518,300	24,801,900	21,092,520
Colfax	2,620,500	17,414,100	15,614,220
Cuming	3,259,200	21,811,600	24,568,660
Dakota	1,379,600	15,831,000	8,468,000
Dixon	1,934,400	16,886,400	12,386,360
Dodge	7,109,700	46,437,600	22,496,075
Hamilton	1,689,800	15,479,200	14,476,505
Knox	2,361,400	26,033,200	15,691,625
Madison	5,708,200	42,040,100	18,448,365
Merrick	2,036,600	15,303,300	10,494,616
Nance	1,339,500	11,433,500	8,709,565
Pierce	1,704,400	15,655,100	14,932,540
Platte	4,233,700	35,707,700	20,643,605
Polk	1,306,600	13,368,400	14,380,456
Saunders	3,894,300	31,662,000	28,764,015
Seward	2,762,900	21,987,500	20,283,495
Stanton	938,000	10,729,900	15,055,115
Thurston	1,584,000	14,775,600	9,348,155
Wayne	2,014,700	15,831,000	17,977,370
York	3,616,900	24,098,300	18,169,645
Total	63,173,600	517,321,900	
FOURTH, NEBRASKA			
Arthur	171,500	1,407,200	1,674,983
Banner	255,500	2,286,700	2,458,100
Blaine	208,000	2,286,700	1,462,345
Box Butte	3,595,000	22,691,100	6,267,155
Boyd	1,175,200	9,498,600	4,393,240
Brown	1,262,800	9,146,800	3,550,560
Buffalo	5,441,800	45,734,000	15,725,710
Cherry	1,959,900	12,840,700	12,972,634
Cheyenne	3,040,200	18,117,700	11,503,877
Custer	4,956,400	32,717,400	18,348,605
Dawes	3,142,400	18,293,600	5,240,030
Dawson	4,792,100	29,903,000	16,644,810
Deuel	733,600	5,980,600	4,419,196
Garden	996,400	6,860,100	6,813,782
Garfield	591,300	5,277,000	2,117,690
Grant	244,500	2,286,700	1,852,815
Greeley	1,204,400	9,850,400	6,363,660

County	Share of fiscal 1951 Federal expenditures of $42,439,000,000	Share of Federal debt of $263,800,000,000 at end of fiscal 1951	1948 assessed land valuation
FOURTH, NEBRASKA—con.			
Hall	$10,281,400	$55,936,200	$12,330,405
Holt	2,668,000	24,977,800	11,064,760
Hooker	226,300	2,286,700	1,317,775
Howard	1,270,100	13,016,600	8,703,310
Keith	1,416,100	11,433,500	6,961,505
Keya Paha	408,800	4,397,500	2,325,600
Kimball	934,300	6,684,200	5,258,991
Lincoln	6,376,100	48,900,200	11,054,929
Logan	357,700	2,462,600	1,996,665
Loup	226,300	2,814,400	1,676,940
McPherson	175,200	1,759,000	1,397,055
Morrill	1,748,200	14,599,700	7,035,175
Perkins	1,160,600	8,443,200	6,966,378
Rock	810,200	5,804,700	3,340,120
Scotts Bluff	10,613,500	65,434,800	17,192,095
Sheridan	2,270,100	16,534,600	8,089,750
Sherman	1,124,100	11,081,700	6,685,200
Sioux	430,700	5,804,700	5,288,805
Thomas	288,300	2,286,700	891,410
Valley	1,390,600	12,840,700	7,175,535
Wheeler	186,100	2,990,300	2,269,465
Total	78,133,700	555,668,100	

A Plea for Our Domestic Mining Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 19, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, a most critical situation exists in our domestic mining industry, and for the information of my colleagues I am appending hereto the statement of a representative of the small-mine operators of Idaho before the Committee on Ways and Means, House of Representatives, on February 9, 1950:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM R. NEW BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, FEBRUARY 9, 1950

My name is William R. New, of Hailey, Idaho. I am secretary of the Idaho Small-Mine Operators Association and director of the bureau of public relations of the western division of mining activities.

Our entire national economy is based on the production of raw materials, the products of our farms, mines, and forests.

The combined income of agriculture and mining is always one-fifth of our national income; and every time there is a reduction of $1,000,000,000 in mining or agriculture, our national income must drop $5,000,000,000.

No segment of our society can escape the effect of this economic law. It affects the retailer, the wholesaler, the manufacturer, and wage earner alike.

Labor may think it can escape this law by keeping wages high, but the percentage of reduction in our national income will be reflected in unemployment.

The farmer may think he can escape it by subsidies, but unemployment will bring reduction in consumption and continue to pile up huge surpluses.

Seventy percent of our metal mines are now closed and this will adversely affect employment and every line of business.

While our own mines are being closed, we are importing foreign metals which will not be available to us in the event of war; and I want to say very frankly to you that unless something is done to put our mines in operation, we are going to lose the next war.

In closing, let me emphasize that rather than reducing the present depletion allowance of 15 percent, I believe it should be increased to at least 25 percent to compensate the mines for the exhaustion of their mineral resources.

Let me emphasize again the fact that unless legislation is enacted, making it possible for our mines to go into full production, we cannot hope to win the next war because we cannot depend on the importation of foreign metals.

Surrendering Just a Little

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the one worlders, those who would commit us to some form of a united states of the world, are out in the open.

Here are excerpts from the testimony of Justice Roberts which would seem to indicate that, to him at least, the writers of the Constitution, those who have fought so hard to preserve us a Nation, have just been mistaken.

The testimony was given before a committee of the other body last week and is as follows:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE OWEN J. ROBERTS, FORMER JUSTICE OF THE SUPREME COURT, PRESIDENT OF THE ATLANTIC UNION COMMITTEE, ON THE ATLANTIC UNION CHARTER RESOLUTION BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE UNITED STATES SENATE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS, WASHINGTON, D. C., SENATOR ELBERT D. THOMAS, CHAIRMAN OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Justice Roberts.

Justice ROBERTS. I have proposed this statement more or less as a lawyer would prepare a brief. * * *

Senator WILEY. You are sure it is not a judicial decision, instead of a lawyer's brief. * * *

Justice ROBERTS. No, sir. It's an advocate's presentation. * * *

This resolution requests the President to appoint citizens delegates to such a convention and invites the other six nations who joined with us in the Atlantic Pact to send similar delegates. In other words, it is the old pact of the Convention 1787, when the States sent their citizens to discuss the thing and report back.

They are wondering when the Marshall plan runs out what is going to happen to them. They are wondering if we are going to be a little too late with military aid to them; in fact, I don't see how military aid to western Europe will prevent Russian overflow of the whole country, but, be that as it may, they are none too happy, and I think this sort of a great gesture would give moral courage all over the world.

Senator WILEY. You make yourself very clear. However, while your argument is persuasive in that regard, we had, of course, to fight the Civil War to determine whether we were a Union or not. South Carolina and other States made up their minds they had a right to step out, and do otherwise what we asked them to do. Now, you run into a situation that is apparent in Europe today, and I think it goes to the will and desire, and what you might call the faith of these people, who have been pounded through the centuries.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I have only one question, Mr. Justice; it embraces all the others. Assume that you and I are appointed delegates to the conference, assume we have drawn up a constitution, or whatever you want to call it, and we have come back to report to our country. Will you dare come back with me if I go on the floor of the Senate and say that we have made arrangements whereby I have got to admit that the flag is removed from the Capitol?

Justice ROBERTS. I don't see why you should say that.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. I shall explain more, because it is the most important point of everything. The fact that the veto was put in the United Nations was made very, very emphatic by a speech in Congress that the flag remains on the dome of the Capitol. Now does it remain?

It remains because we have the power to veto any action suggested. Now, are you and I brave enough without that veto power? [Laughter.]

Justice ROBERTS. I am; come on. [Laughter.]

My goodness, now, listen Senator, if we are in the trenches on that——

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is your whole point.

Justice ROBERTS. All right; if we are in the trenches on that, then God help you for finding the funds to support our national economy. Go to it, if you can. I don't think it can be done. Just because that flag means, you can't tell us what to do, ever, then we have got to play a lone hand in the world, we can't do it.

I come from a little country county called Chester County, Pa., and we have a slogan out in Chester County, and it is this: "The United States against the world, Pennsylvania against the Union, Chester County against the Commonwealth." We are still flying the flag of Chester County there. It isn't down off the courthouse, but we like the United States flag pretty well, too. We are liable to hang them both out of the same window.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. That is the point I want to make, Mr. Justice, that these ideas about a flag, and about the loss of sovereignty, about the inability to say "No" to something are purely fictional.

Justice ROBERTS. Absolutely.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. And they have been fictional ever since the concept or the naming of the concept of sovereignty came into existence but, at the same time they have occupied the minds of men to such an extent that we have been able to go forward.

Justice ROBERTS. Absolutely. Take another fictional thing: Suppose you and I come back from this convention and present a plan, a frame, think of the debate which will go on in this country—all the way down to the cracker barrel in the country store; my Senator is for it; mine is against it; mine is for it for this reason; mine is against it for that reason. We will have the greatest political debate, since the debate in the States when the Constitution of the United States was ratified, and we will have some real education and people will forget what you are talking about, that this flag is all-important, and nobody must ever tell us where to get off. It is fictional and they have got to learn and they don't know.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. Can anyone help me from this situation I got myself into. [Laughter.] I am exceedingly glad to have brought out the point.

Justice ROBERTS. Yes; I am glad you did.

Senator THOMAS of Utah. The objections of any union, whether it is under the auspices of this resolution or any other resolution, are objectives to prevent war, and the techniques which we will use will not be absolutely necessary in a practical way,

although they may be very new in a fictional way, and the world that you are trying to make a survey of is a world to find out if men are willing to give that much of their own which they have always given to bring about a better world.

Justice ROBERTS. That is right.

Senator SMITH of New Jersey. I may say, Mr. Justice, there is one problem you will have, of course, in getting the people convinced of the wisdom of this and that, and that Uncle Sam still might be paying the bill for the group instead of for himself.

Justice ROBERTS. That is a false position.

Senator WILEY. I just want to ask one question along the line that Senator SMITH brought out, because I am very much interested in this flag incident. To me, instead of "taking down the flag," if you bring about peace and security, you are raising the only flag in the world that stands for that.

Justice ROBERTS. Right.

Senator WILEY. Now, then, I assume that when you and Senator come back from that international pow-wow with the other folks, then you will come back with the rather restricted notions as to how you start out this big show with the idea that you could amend it, as we have amended our Constitution.

Justice ROBERTS. Certainly.

I don't know what strange poison there is in this nationalism, but even in military things you know how difficult it is to get the defense forces to agree on command, on policy, and material. The British have one idea, we have another, and they fight as they battle about it; in the meantime Rome burns, and when you get to economic things it is even worse. What is there in nationalism that so poisons the ability to be broad and to see the other fellow's point of view?

Senator MCMAHON. Mr. Justice, if you would have sat with me on the hearings on the Genocide Pact for 4 days—I am afraid that you might think that the difficulties in the way of bringing this proposal into being were superhuman in character, that is you need superhuman strength to overcome it.

Justice ROBERTS. As I said to Senator THOMAS, the chairman, I do not know what the poison is that is in nationalism, etc. I would be glad to have any Senator suggest any alliance that has worked satisfactorily for any length of time. They fall apart.

Senator KEFAUVER. I believe Dr. Urey is the witness. Before he proceeds may I say, Mr. Chairman, Senator GILLETTE is not on the committee but one of the sponsors. Senator GEORGE is expected to comment.

Justice ROBERTS. How long is our economy going to stand this—What will we do? I think that we will have to become a Fascist state with a Fuehrer, we will have to be regimented, and we will have to stop eating well. We will have to be rationed. In other words the Russian system is the perfect system for keeping your feet under you for military purposes, because you can starve the proletariat.

I question the propriety of Congress stating what is the foreign policy of the United States.

Mr. Speaker, there is also printed herewith a letter received by me, which refers to this same testimony:

NATIONAL SOCIETY OF NEW ENGLAND WOMEN,
Washington, D. C., February 8, 1950.

Hon. CLARE HOFFMAN,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HOFFMAN: At last the true aims of the one-worlders has come to light as predicted by you in your able address of 1942, Don't Haul Down the Stars and Stripes.

On February 8, former Justice Owen J. Roberts, president of the Atlantic Union Committee, which advocates eventual world government and partial world government now, in testifying before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that he would be willing to take the flag down from the Capitol. Chairman THOMAS asked him if he would be brave enough to return with him as delegates from such a proposed "Federal convention" without the veto power and prepared to take the flag down from the Capitol. Justice Roberts replied, "I would. People will forget this flag is all important, they've got to learn. I am completely puzzled by this poisonous nationalism."

This Owen Roberts and Joe Stalin are working toward the same goals. Both would take down the flag from the Capitol of the United States.

Once the American people understand that the aims of the one-worlders parallel the concurrent lines of the Communists and that it means unconditional surrender by the stroke of a pen, they will have no part of the scheme to sell America down the river.

There are many kinds of traitors. To work to break down the Constitution of the United States is treason. Benedict Arnold was a piker—he only betrayed West Point. This is a betrayal of the United States Government from within.

An investigation should be begun at once as to who these people are who want to haul down the Stars and Stripes millions of past and present patriots have given their lives and their sacred honor to raise and keep flying. Let our veterans' organizations know the true aims of the one-worlders and we predict the feeling of inspired nationalism and patriotism, the same spirit to which we owe the very existence of this great Nation, will overwhelm the poisonous traitors in our midst.

Very sincerely,
MADALEN DINGLEY LEETCH
(Mrs. William Dougal).

Socialism in Action Proves Disastrous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the administration's farm program, better known as the Anderson plan, is nothing in the world but socialism in action. It is the result of the Government interfering with the free market and the attempts of a few men to substitute their planning for the workings of a free market.

Everybody — literally everybody — is losing by such a stupid course on the part of our Government. Let us remember that the New Deal started these various "plans" to cut down acreage and, in effect, to kill little pigs and plough under cotton and corn. It was economically absurd then and everytime the so-called "farm program" is "improved upon," the whole thing becomes more and more absurd.

The taxpayer loses because he is taxed heavily, whether he is a city man or a farmer, to pay for support prices, and all this other foolishness. He also loses because he has to pay higher prices for the products he consumes. By running the price of food up, or holding it up, the Government is unjust both to the farmer and to the consumer in the city. Because laborers have to pay more for their food, they strike for higher wages. These higher wages are reflected in the cost of the manufactured articles which the farmer must buy. Hence, nobody wins in the long run, on the average. It is true that certain individual farmers and certain extremely fortunate union members, and labor leaders, win by all the confusion, and because of factors not here examined, but by and large everybody loses by the Government intervening in the free market.

Right now, we are witnessing a most amazing spectacle. The United States Department of Agriculture is engaged in a subtle campaign to make people angry at the present stupid farm program so that it can sell its even more stupid program—the Brannan plan. The Brannan plan is not a farm plan, but a plan further to socialize the farmer. Let's call it what it is.

The Republicans, instead of defending the present economic miasma, ought to use the Department of Agriculture statistics to sell a better way to the American people. That better way would consist of lowering support prices, or doing away with them in most instances, particularly on cotton, and to work toward a free market again in agriculture. That better way would consist of promoting the Department of Agriculture as a service institution, to carry on research to help farmers grow and market produce, not administer plans to rule the farmer and drive him into economic slavery. The Republicans should stand for freedom of price at every possible stage in the economy, for only by working back toward the free movement of goods and services can we get away from the present course, which is toward more and more control over every segment of the economy, and, of course, over every action of a man's life.

We are faced with a perfectly ridiculous situation today, because of the operations of the Fair Deal in the farm field. With close to 3¾ billions of dollars tied up in supporting crops—and more supporting to be done yet—the Government surplus problem continues to grow.

The plans to destroy up to 40,000,000 bushels of potatoes, while our tariff policies encourage the import of Canadian potatoes, simply serve to dramatize the troubles a policy of socialism in action brings about. At the same time, we learn that Uncle Sam will continue to buy eggs, to support the price, although the Government already has more than $100,000,000 worth of eggs.

Then we come to the problem of storage. This can be seen by looking at the situation in grains. The Commodity Credit Corporation is building still more of the huge storage bins which already dot the country. When the new wheat harvest starts, farmers will dump surplus grain grown in 1949 on the Government. The CCC, with 375,000,000 bushels of storage capacity, has all but 40,000,000 bushels of the space filled. So it will have to buy space for another 100,000,000 bushels.

All of these facts merely high light the utterly ridiculous economic position into which the Fair Deal has worked us. Mr. Brannan might think that he can sell

more socialism by peddling these facts to the newspapers, but the facts really indicate that Uncle Sam should be finding ways of getting out of the farm field, instead of getting deeper and deeper into the mess he has created. The object of a Federal program—if one ever is inaugurated by emergency or necessity—should be to restore some degree of normalcy and then to withdraw. As the New Deal and Fair Deal programs have worked through the years, they have pulled the Government more and more into the farm business until today the Federal Government has the greatest stake of any organization in the farm field. It has more employees than ever, more money invested than ever, and more problems than ever, because none of its programs ever has solved a problem, but merely have created new problems to compound the evils we face.

The Republicans ought to spend a great deal of time on a specific farm program that will assure farmers a fair income for a transition period, during which both the people and the Government will work to get the Government out of the farm business and to keep it out.

The Rest of This Century Belongs to the Mississippi Valley

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, Lloyd J. Cobb, president of New Orleans world-wide famous International House, recently made an address in St. Louis, which commends itself for consideration of the entire American people.

I commend it to you:

We are met today, here on the banks of the Mississippi, at one of its oldest ports, in a conference predestined to stand in history when the greatness of this gigantic valley is discussed. We are on the threshold of another half century of life on the Mississippi, reflecting on its past, considering its future, and planning actively for its continued present development.

With a sense of awe, I pause to consider with you the majesty, the vastness, the limitless wealth and indescribable power of this, the world's largest and richest river valley. Its potential is beyond the comprehension of mere man, and yet we are the trustees of its development and of its ultimate destiny.

Today, Old Man River is on the march in world affairs, from its headwaters in Minnesota to the bayous of the Louisiana Delta, with trains, trucks, and tows carrying the goods of the valley and the products of foreign lands up and down the Mississippi and its tributaries. New industries are locating on the banks of these same rivers, and river towns of a hundred years ago are rubbing the sandman's harvest from their eyes and stirring anew in the rebirth of river activity.

At the southern end of this great valley, the port of New Orleans is busy handling its foreign trade with the nations of the world, wharves loaded with five times the amount of cargo of 10 years ago.

This valley consists of two component parts, the Middle West, as you here call it, and the South, or as we call it, the "world of opportunity."

Your own intimate knowledge of the Middle West constrains me to pretermit a discussion of this vibrant area, but I do want to talk to you a little about the South. No true son of Dixie could or would pass up an opportunity to tell you with swelling pride and ringing voice about what is going on here today.

Many Americans unfortunately think of the South as too many of our national magazine editors picture it—a backward, unreconstructed and involuntary appendage to the Union. Without delving into conditions as they existed not so many years ago, I should like to tell you briefly about our new South.

First and foremost, we have dismissed our detractors and apologists and we have gone to work. Our people, both white and black, are on the march toward lofty horizons of desire and accomplishment. Together, under God's canopy of mutual understanding and good will, they are moving with reasoning and courage toward new goals of achievement not even imagined only a few years ago.

In agriculture, some of the greatest progress in this Nation is being recorded in an unspectacular but solid manner. At Louisiana State University is the world's greatest plant breeder, a horticultural genius surpassing Luther Burbank in the benefits he already has contributed to mankind. He is destined soon to be recognized as the most accomplished botanist the world has ever known. His influence has created hundreds of millions of dollars of new agricultural wealth throughout the South. Great scientist that he is, his work has been little publicized, but any southern planter, white or Negro, knows about Dr. Julian Miller and acknowledges almost with reverence the things already done to improve his standard of living.

The nostalgic, lackadaisical days of yesterday are fast being forgotten all over the Southland. Natchez was a catchword in a song for southern dreaminess a few years ago. Today it is a booming metropolis, and one of the South's future great industrial cities. The same holds true for Baton Rouge. Memphis will be as big as St. Louis now is within 20 years. Dallas, Atlanta, Birmingham, New Orleans, and Houston will pass a million population with a decade or two, and several will be as large, or larger, than the Chicago we know today long before the century is over. On the Gulf, Beaumont, Pensacola, Mobile, Corpus Christi, Lake Charles, Port Arthur, Tampa are all great cities and expanding fast.

There is more undeveloped rich farmland in Louisiana than in the entire United States, outside the South. Water—now scarce in many agricultural areas—is one of Louisiana's problems, too. But her problem is too much water—not a lack of it. When adequate drainage projects are fully established, millions of acres of rich delta soil, washed down from the Middle West, will flower into profitable agricultural production.

There is probably enough water daily flowing by New Orleans' door to irrigate all of the United States needing irrigation. Someday we will find the answer to this problem of too much water here and not enough there, and the South's water system will carry supplies by pipe line to areas now on the verge of exhaustion.

The forests of the South are being restored through intelligent reforestation, developed by our own people. Our universities are on the march, nurturing and training the leadership we so long lacked. Our natural and mineral wealth exceeds any other like area on the face of the earth.

The South is God's chosen land. It is on the threshold of its greatest years. Only an area so rich could have withstood the exploitation it has undergone, and yet Southern resources are practically untapped. In a large sense the South is still virgin country. We have the climate, the resources, the people, the energy, and now we have found the initiative to forge ahead intelligently.

We are doing so. Throughout Dixie the whistle of the donkey engine on the peckerwood sawmill has given way to the whistle of factories which have sprung up everywhere. There is an upsurge of industry in the South that will amaze you all when the 1950 census statistics have been analyzed.

Today we have virtually solved our greatest problem in the South—the Negro problem—but the solution has come without gratitude for many unwise, radical Northern influences. Unlike a decade ago we have Negro schools today, many of them new, which are just as fine and up-to-date as any white school, and infinitely superior to many white schools of a few years ago.

In New Orleans, or in any other large Southern city, you will find equal opportunities and impartial justice for both races. Age-old prejudices, fanned by intolerance, are being abolished. There are 25,000 registered Negro voters in New Orleans today, and in a recent city election, in which 90 percent of the city's registered voters, including these Negroes, went to the polls, there was not a single instance of molestation or interference. Here is a practical demonstration of tolerance and mutual understanding.

Our very progressive mayor did not spurn the Negro vote, nor did the other major candidate. Both spoke openly before Negro rallies and solicited this vote just as actively and intelligently as they did any vote. We still have as many problems as anyone else, and some of them are very hard ones, but we know or are working out the answers, and rapidly we are moving to set at rest our most vexing difficulties. We need patience, time, and tolerance, and we have it in 95 percent of our Southland.

All over Dixie today I can show you farm land that can be bought for thirty to fifty dollars an acre and which is just as rich and just as productive as the finest corn lands of Iowa.

The cattle population of the Nation is about 80,000,000 for approximately 150,000,000 people. Argentina has 40,000,000 cattle, or half as many, for only 16,000,000 people, or about one-tenth of our population. A benign climate, improved pasture, and solution of our traditional feed-deficiency problem today make the South the great cattle frontier of the future. No area on earth can produce better cattle or produce them as economically.

Cheap land in the South will not last long. The South is filling up rapidly with people who are finding out about these opportunities, are wondering why someone didn't tell them about these things a quarter or half century ago. In defense, if for no other reason, the southerners are digging in to take advantage of their opportunities.

Stop anywhere in the South today and you will find that city or town is on the march. Stop in any coastal town or city and you will learn that if it has no port, one is being planned. I know at least half a dozen Louisiana and Texas cities well in from the sea that are planning ports. The same is true in Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida.

Our South, and the Middle West, with which it is interdependent, form the world's greatest, richest valley—the true land of opportunity. This last half of the twentieth century belongs to us. Before it passes, the Gulf of Mexico will be our new frontier and Latin America our greatest market.

The Gulf coast is the real gold coast of America, the golden horseshoe cutting up from Mexico and running around to the Florida beaches. Within a few miles of its shoreline are sufficient resources, energy, and op-

portunity to enrich all of present-day America. Another few years and we will find a hundred million persons living adjacent to this coast and looking to it as their outlet to the sea.

Foreign trade to them is a reality today just as it will be for everyone in this Nation within a few years.

New Orleans calls itself the international city and has always had an international outlook. It is that viewpoint that I want to explain and pursue now to the conclusion of this talk. I will not be too long.

It is as the gateway to the rich Mississippi Valley—the link between that valley and the world—that New Orleans has thrived and prospered through more than two centuries. It was the Nation's leading port a century ago when the whole valley was piling its docks with cargoes of furs, grain, and cotton. It suffered with the rest of the South during and after reconstruction. It was only within the last decade that a reorganization of its administration along businesslike, nonpolitical lines, and a new awareness by its leading citizens of the importance of foreign trade combined to put into motion the international trade-development program which today serves the Mississippi Valley with New Orleans, the second port in the Nation.

You are all familiar with what we have been doing along these lines, but let me tell you about two results of this work which are of far-reaching consequence and importance throughout the valley.

The first has been to bring producers of this great heartland of ours closer to foreign markets and the producers of other lands. Time was when our Mississippi Valley was considered the home of isolationism, and our merchants and producers thought along jingoistic lines of "buy American" and let the world shift for itself. A great war and an atomic age have changed isolationist thinking. We thank our own efforts in bringing together men of good will and business desire from all over the world have had some part in changing the thinking of those who believed foreign trade meant nothing to them.

St. Louis, Minneapolis, St. Paul, Chicago, Little Rock, Kansas City, Louisville, Pittsburgh, Cincinnati, and the rest today are all just next door to cities all over the world.

It was my good fortune 3 weeks ago to lead a party of 40 fine midwestern and southern newspapermen to Panama and Peru on the occasion of new nonstop flight service from New Orleans to Panama. Returning, we had supper in Lima and 12 hours later, after only one stop, this regular service put us in New Orleans in time for breakfast. We could have lunched in St. Louis, Indianapolis, or Chicago. Today, a 3,000-mile flight is an overnight journey, like a pullman trip of a decade ago.

Within another decade every major city in the Mississippi Valley will be an international city, with an international airport or seaport. Using jet-propelled machines, flights will leave St. Louis with the first stop Brazil or Honolulu or take off from Minneapolis-St. Paul nonstop for Calcutta or Tokyo. Chicago will have direct nonstop service with Europe and Africa, and we will call the whole world neighbor.

This is not fantastic dreaming. These things are coming very soon, and it is well to consider them now. This shortening of distance and tightening up of the world is of greatest significance to our once isolationist Mississippi Valley area, especially in transportation and air-borne cargo.

International airports open all kinds of possibilities for our big cities, with international houses and trade marts similar, in their way, to our own twin organizations in New Orleans. Foreign trade zones also then become a possibility, where goods from abroad may enter and be stored, processed, or handled in any way short of manufacture without paying duty until taken out to enter, technically, the United States.

Our international development program at New Orleans is based entirely upon the productivity and buying capacity of the Mississippi Valley—not on our port itself. New Orleans is but a service station on the highway of international trade—a gateway, receiver, forwarder and handler. We are trustees for the great valley with our port, but without products of the valley to handle, or markets of the valley for goods from abroad, our foreign trade would wither like grapes on the autumn vine.

This land between the mountains which we call the Mississippi Valley is the future of America. This is our land, our valley, now coming into its own in development. Here is the last frontier of American industry—raw materials, labor and power. Here, too, lies the richest agricultural land under cultivation in the world. This is the heart, the backbone, the future of America. The east dominated the first half century. This second half belongs to us. This fact we accept with confidence and pride. We must lay our plans now for the next 50 years and the transcendental development which they will bring.

In the South we have great confidence in our Mississippi Valley as a trade area and area which will make our gulf ports the world's greatest. It is this confidence which has delineated our actions in New Orleans over the last few years and which has sent us on missionary trips through the valley selling world markets and foreign trade in the cities and towns of 24 States. As a result, thousands of firms, large and small, which had never thought of trade in anything but terms domestic, are now inquiring about foreign markets, channeling part of their production abroad and imparting noncompetitive goods. We are balancing the world's trade picture and bringing about a true and lasting peace based on mutually profitable world commerce and international understanding at both a business and cultural level.

The second result of our efforts is that this new interest is not all one-sided. The nations of Europe, Asia and Latin America are, in turn, taking a second look today at the great Mississippi Valley and realining their trade plans, both export and import to include this area. Habitually through the years they have thought too much of America in terms of the Atlantic seaboard and New York. This great interior of ours was an unknown quantity which they felt was little interested in them and in which they, in turn, were little interested.

But the Mississippi Valley today is very much in the minds of foreign nations as a market place for their goods and source of supply for products they need. The valley, in its great industrial cities, produces everything these nations are seeking—farm machinery, heavy equipment, automobiles, appliances, textiles and a host of other products eagerly sought in the markets of the world. At the same time, these nations' industry is underway again and they are eager to place their goods in our rich valley markets.

Trade commissions which had comfortably established themselves in New York are awaking to the tremendous trade potential of this valley. Numerous consulates—Sweden, Belgium, Italy, Great Britain, Norway, Switzerland, to name only a few—have opened trade offices in connection with their consulates in New Orleans and are sending men up the valley to study and develop new markets in our towns and cities. Harold Wilson, president of Great Britain's Board of Trade, recently made a swing through the valley, and in speeches in England now urges his nation's exporters to "go West" when they seek to sell in the United States.

Belgium is a graphic example of this new interest in the valley and how it is paying off. A year ago its exhibit opened at the International Trade Mart. So successful were Belgian exhibitors that this year the exhibit's size doubled, additional exhibits were opened in Chicago, Kansas City, and Dallas, a new consulate was established in Kansas City, and a band of twelve trade prospectors has been hired to comb the valley from north to south to develop additional markets.

Too long the world has considered the United States as one market, rather than a series of markets with different likes and dislikes. Now it is awakening to this thriving and prosperous valley of ours, and we are awakening to foreign trade. You need only look about at the international clubs, trade organizations, language classes and other manifestations of this interest in your own cities to sense the new international feeling. The Mississippi Valley World Trade Conference, now in its sixth year, brings hundreds of foreign traders from all over the valley to New Orleans annually, when a decade ago such an organization probably could not have mustered a hundred, or even be organized.

Here again, it has been the great Mississippi system of inland arteries which has enabled us to carry out this program of an awakening of international trade. Millions of tons of foreign trade move down the Mississippi and its tributaries annually to the wharves of New Orleans, and other millions of tons move up river to new industries along its banks, using the rubber from Africa, copper from Chile, tin from Bolivia, bauxite from Guiana, mahogany from Central America and Africa, and numerous other raw products.

A network of transportation services at favorable freight rates prevails in the valley basin and gives this area an added advantage in developing trade with foreign nations.

Four ideas that have enriched the life of this valley in the past quarter century came out of New Orleans, spawning ground of ideas. Now I seize upon this opportunity to suggest another.

Three of these ideas are realities. I refer to this very association, born and nurtured through infancy in New Orleans, then transferred to St. Louis. The same is true of the great National Cotton Council, the most successful venture in public relations for greater consumption of a crop that the world has seen. It, too, came out of New Orleans and is now domiciled in Memphis.

The third was International House, permanently located in New Orleans. Only 5 years old, it is the South's most famous civic institution, known and respected throughout the world, a vibrant new business voice of the South and the envy I assure you, of a great many cities in our own and other nations.

The fourth great idea has yet to flower. It is as great as the rest and it affects all of us. I refer to the Alexander seaway at New Orleans—the Tidewater Channel to the sea which this association has endorsed and which everyone has been busily engaged in promoting for nearly a decade. It is still on the drawing boards, unfortunately, desperately as it is needed. The Corps of Engineers has approved and recommended its construction but it has been put in deep freeze by the Bureau of the Budget. The Director of the Bureau of the Budget has taken such action in direct opposition to the recommendations of all the engineers involved in the study of the construction and, apparently, the needs of commerce in the area which is served by the port of New Orleans, and the requirements for national defense have also been given very little consideration. But I sincerely believe that we have the intelligence, the initiative, and the drive to bring this plan to reality within a few years. We then will see ships of any

draft moving out of the port of New Orleans through a man-made canal not subject to the power and vagaries of the great Mississippi River. This channel, when finished, will unlock the greatest port of this Nation, the port of New Orleans, your port and the great natural port of the Middle West and valley.

I come now to the fifth idea, which I shall preface by quoting briefly from a description I read recently by E. L. Corthell on the Mississippi River region, which was originally published in 1881. Corthell said:

"That giant stream (the Mississippi River), with its head shrouded in Arctic snows, and embracing half a continent in the hundred thousand miles of its curious network, and coursing its majestic way to the southern Gulf, through lands so fertile that human ingenuity is overtaxed to harvest their productiveness, has been given by its immortal architect into the jealous keeping of this Republic. The garden which it beautifies and enriches, contains 768,000,000 acres of the finest lands on the face of the globe; enough to make more than 150 States as large as Massachusetts. * * *

"This great valley lies between those parallels of latitude that are known to be most conducive to health and to the development of the mental and physical energies of man. In its capacity to produce the cereals, grasses, cotton, sugar, tobacco, hemp, vegetables, and fruits of every kind; in the richness and variety of its mineral wealth, the grandeur and value of its forests, its inexhaustible quarries; in a word, in all the natural resources which conspire to increase the wealth and power of a people, the bounty of providence has been most wonderfully manifested.

"The stream which in every direction penetrates this favored region, and is the grandest natural feature of North America, holds in its embrace the destinies of the American people. Sooner or later it must give to the dwellers within this valley, power and dominion over this whole immense continent. * * *

"The commerce of this great empire will, in time, certainly exceed that of any other in Christendom."

In our very early history the Mississippi River was recognized as the heart of America and most dominant trade artery within the Nation. It seems to me it is high time we commemorated and honored this great stream which has played such a vital part in our history, and I know of no better way to do so than for the forward-looking businessmen of St. Louis and New Orleans to get together and work out a plan.

Over half this great valley was acquired 147 years ago through the foresight of one of our great Americans, a man who constantly thought beyond his time or even the time of his children's children. I refer to Thomas Jefferson, who purchased the Louisiana Territory in 1803.

It seems fitting that we should begin to consider now some sort of celebration or observance of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of this act in 1953, and I have in mind an international-Mississippi Valley-trade fair linking St. Louis and New Orleans, two great cities which have grown from that purchase and from the river—the one with its industry and as the gateway to the West; the other with its foreign trade and as the financial center of the South and gateway to the world.

This is a project to which all of us in the valley might well give serious consideration. It would be the opportunity to show, alike, the wealth and progress and future greatness of our valley, and exhibit the products of the world which flow in foreign trade into this great area. St. Louis, now a seaport with steamships coming up the river to load and discharge cargo, could open the fair in the spring and summer, and it could close in New Orleans in the fall and winter, with the actual ceremony reenacted in Jackson Square on the same flagpole which bore aloft the Stars and Stripes in 1803 when the French Tricolor was hauled down.

It would be a time for a rededication of ourselves and efforts to a greater Mississippi Valley, and for proclaiming to the world that the Mississippi Valley has come into its own. The rest of this century belongs to us.

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article from the Denver Post of January 16, 1950, by Secretary of the Interior Oscar L. Chapman, on the timely subject of statehood for Alaska and Hawaii:

Statehood for Alaska and Hawaii has been urged and reiterated until now the question is clearly posed before the United States. The addition of two new States is important everywhere but the expansion of the West through the addition of Alaska and Hawaii is of utmost importance to the Rocky Mountain empire and the Pacific Coast States.

The distance between Washington and Juneau or Washington and Honolulu might have been considered a barrier at one time, but today with our rapid communications it cannot seriously be considered an argument against statehood for either of our two great Territories. News travels in a flash. Messages can be delivered in an hour. A man can make the trip by regularly scheduled airplanes to either of the Territorial capitals in less than 24 hours. When Oregon and California were admitted to the Union and for scores of years thereafter, Sacramento and Salem were days and even weeks of travel farther away from Washington.

The populations of Alaska and Hawaii are thoroughly American. Alaska has been United States territory for more than 80 years and Hawaii for more than half a century. The English language is used throughout both Territories and each has a fine record in two world wars. The population of Alaska is about 100,000, which is twice as many as some of the States had at the time they entered the Union. Hawaii has more than half a million.

Both the islands and the northern territory are important to the United States. They have resources that enhance our economy. They hold promise of further development and, without question, can play a mature role in the family of States that make up our Federal Union.

In the West, the bestowal of statehood on a territory has deep significance. It has not been so long since 1912 when Arizona and New Mexico were admitted. The thrill that the people of a territory feel when this milestone in American progress is reached can still be remembered here. Reaching statehood, the bringing of responsible local government home to the people to be operated by them is an essential to the maturing of any part of our country.

In the Interior Department, which traditionally has been the sponsor of our Territories before the country, evidence crosses my desk nearly every day that shows the disadvantages of the territorial form of government to the people living there. Too many things have to be done by extremely long arms reaching out of Washington when the responsibilities of statehood have not been imposed. This deters the economic development of a region and it restrains the political development of the people. In a democracy, both of these results are bad.

The community of interest which binds Hawaii and Alaska to the West and to western attitudes is an established fact. For this reason, the Western States should take strong positions in support of the ambitions of the "little brother" Territories.

The southern terminus of the Alaska Highway is at Great Falls, Mont. The principal airlines operating to Alaska use the Seattle-Tacoma airport and the Minneapolis-St. Paul airport as points of departure. The shortest routes to the Orient are along these lines and through Alaska. In the future there will be air routes over the short route across the pole, again through Alaska. All of the new developments of the twentieth century have bound Alaska and Hawaii closer and closer to the States. There will be no reversal of this trend.

For all of these reasons, the slogan is "50 States in 1950."

Woodland Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY O. TALLE
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following testimony by me before the Agricultural Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, Friday afternoon, February 10, 1950:

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate this opportunity to appear out of turn in behalf of the forestry activities of the Department of Agriculture.

On other occasions I have stressed the importance of forests and forest products to the well-being and prosperity of our Nation. I know you are pressed for time, and I will go direct to the forestry measures which I consider of paramount importance today. I want to refer specifically to the items listed on page 448 in the budget for the fiscal year 1951, under the heading "Farm and other private forestry cooperation." I note that the Budget Bureau allowed an increase of about $850,000 for cooperation with the States in the procurement, production, and distribution of forest-tree and shrub seeds and plants. In Iowa we have one State-operated nursery at Ames cooperating in this program. There are similar State-operated nurseries in 40 other States growing trees for distribution to farmers and other private woodland owners. The tree-planting needs are tremendous—over 62,000,000 acres on private lands nationally and 650,000 acres in my State, Iowa. We are just now beginning to assume a fair share of the responsibility on behalf of the Federal Government. This increase, if allowed, will give added stimulus to a program which must be vigorously pursued each year if we are ever to plant the millions of idle and unproductive acres now found on our farms, ranches, and other privately owned properties that are suitable only for the growing of trees.

My State, Mr. Chairman, through the land-grant college at Ames—Iowa State College—is cooperating with the Department of Agriculture in an educational program which consists of demonstrating to the farmers the

advantages of wise management and careful protection of their woodland acres. We have two extension foresters now cooperatively employed. I heartily endorse this kind of educational effort and am most pleased to note that the Budget Bureau allowed an increase of some $150,000 for expansion of the work nationally.

I am disappointed, however, to see that the Budget Bureau did not allow an increase for farm foresters to work with the small woodland owners and thus make this educational work more effective. This cooperation with States and private forest owners in forest-management service work is essential if we are ever to secure good forest-management practices on the 261,000,000 acres of small, privately owned woodlands throughout the Nation. In my own State, we now have three farm foresters that go direct to the woods and advise the woodland owner in the proper husbandry of his tree crops. We have almost 80,000 small woodland owners in need of this direct service type of assistance.

Last year I introduced H. R. 2952 which gave special attention to the work of the farm foresters. A similar bill, H. R. 2296, was enacted and is now known as Public Law 392 of the Eighty-first Congress. The legislation provides increased authorizations for tree planting, extension educational work, and cooperative fire protection; but I regret to report that the section dealing with farm forestry which was approved by the House was dropped by the Senate. Fortunately, there is existing authority under the Norris-Doxey Act to provide additional farm foresters, and it is my considered judgment that any action this distinguished committee might take to increase the appropriation for farm foresters would be a step in the right direction. The in-the-woods type of service provided by the farm foresters appeals to me as the practical way of helping millions of woodland owners throughout the Nation to learn good forest-management practices.

Mr. Chairman, many people think of Iowa as being a prairie State with only fringe woodlands bordering the streams. But this is by no means the case. The value of Iowa's standing timber alone is over $75,000,000. Each year the woodland owners harvest more than $20,000,000 worth of forest products. Recreation, much of which centers in Iowa's wooded areas, is a $35,000,000 business annually. Moreover, the protection that Iowa woodlands afford the watershed of the Mississippi and other rivers is inestimable. Fire protection of a resource so valuable is only good common sense. Some 2,000,000 acres of the woodland in my State are now receiving organized protection under the provisions of the Clarke-McNary Act, but much of the timberland needs more intensive protection. Many forested areas in other States likewise have inadequate protection or none at all. Consequently, I am pleased to note that the Budget Bureau has allowed a $1,000,000 increase in cooperative forest-fire protection. I heartily endorse this cooperative effort by the States and the Federal Government. Our woodlands serve all of our people. Their products are found in every corner of the Nation. Protecting this great resource is an obligation we cannot afford to take lightly.

At this point I should like to read some brief excerpts concerning the need for increased funds for forest research and farm forestry which I have taken from a recent letter addressed to me by a distinguished conservationist, Mr. Don C. Kern, chairman of the forestry committee, Iowa division of the Izaak Walton League of America, as follows:

"The President's budget provided increases for some forestry activities, but it largely overlooked the needs for expanding forestry research and farm forestry. This is hard for us to understand since research must lead the way in all improvements in forestry practices. Also because farm forestry is the means for getting good forestry practices applied on over 50 percent of our country's commercial timberland which is a part of farms or in small forest properties mainly intermingled with farm lands. * * * Surely, if we are to undertake, with private and public funds, the restocking of our denuded lands with trees and grasses—the rehabilitation and maximum utilization of our forests and woodlands—we must first acquire the best possible knowledge of the most practical methods for doing the enormous tasks discussed above. Such knowledge can be secured only through intensive research—research that precedes and keeps ahead of the actual application of technological advancements in the woods and on the range. * * * The farmer and the man-on-the-street are talking economy and reduction of Government spending; but their thinking does not consider or imply that false economies in funds for restoration and conservation of such natural resources as our forests, lands, and waters should be imposed upon the people of America."

There is one other forestry item, Mr. Chairman, to which I wish to direct attention at this time. I refer to the deadly disease known as oak wilt which is spreading unchecked through the upper Mississippi River Valley. Cities as well as undeveloped regions are threatened with the extinction of their oaks. For example, in Cedar Rapids, Iowa, the city arborist estimates that 500 oak trees are dying annually—since 1941 this community has lost 40 percent of its oaks. The disease is destroying all species of oaks in Iowa, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Missouri. Michigan's valuable timberland as well as the Ozark Mountain forests will be next to suffer from this devastating blight unless forceful steps are taken promptly to check it.

It is known that the disease is caused by a fungus which grows in the sapwood of the trees, but it is not known how the disease spreads. Insects, animals, and birds, or the wind may be the carriers; possibly it is spread through root contacts, or perhaps a combination of all these. In any event, for lack of funds the Department of Agriculture is unable to conduct the necessary research. Some work has been carried on in Iowa State College at Ames and in the University of Wisconsin at Madison. Also, the Iowa State Conservation Commission and other State conservation agencies have subsidized oak wilt studies. But the problem is so large and complex that individual organizations cannot set up a program of sufficient scope to meet the challenge. Furthermore, much valuable time can be conserved, and thousands of trees thereby saved, if duplication of research is avoided and if the Department of Agriculture and the various State conservation agencies are enabled to coordinate their efforts. The following extract from a letter addressed to me by Mr. R. K. Alman, city arborist, Cedar Rapids, Iowa, several months ago, offers a logical solution:

"The National Shade Tree Conference, the Illinois Association of Nurserymen, the American Association of Nurserymen, the Illinois Academy of Science, and the State Foresters of all the States where oak wilt disease is found are deeply concerned with this problem. We feel that an appropriation for research work on the control of oak wilt disease is of vital necessity, both to protect our shade trees and our forest resources in the upper Mississippi Valley. We feel that the appropriation should amount to $60,000, one-half of which would be used by the Division of Forest Pathology and one-half by the Division of Forest Insect Investigation of the Department of Agriculture. Your interest and assistance in obtaining these funds will be appreciated, both personally and by the associations mentioned above."

In line with this suggestion, I propose that your committee make the following increases in the Budget Bureau's recommendations: On page 423 of the Budget, under the item "Forest diseases," there is ample authority for the Forest Pathology Division of the Bureau of Plant Industry to make an investigation of oak wilt. I urge, therefore, that the committee provide $30,000 to be used by the Forest Pathology in studying the problem. On page 427 of the Budget, under the item "Insect investigations," there is ample authority for the Bureau of Entomology and Plant Quarantine to conduct oak-wilt research. I urge, therefore, that the committee provide an additional $30,000 for this Bureau to carry on similar studies in its field.

I want to impress upon the committee that the oak is extremely important as a lumber-producing tree, to say nothing of its value as an ornamental tree. As just one example of its importance, I may say that a friend of mine who recently visited the naval shipyards at Bremerton, Wash., in Puget Sound, informs me that the oak is still the chief material used in the construction of the superstructure of our small naval craft. I mention this merely to call attention to the importance of the oak in one of our national-defense items. It is used, of course, in thousands of other products with which we come in daily contact.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I want to express again my appreciation for this opportunity to testify on the forest items which are of most urgent importance to Iowa and the other Central States. I speak for the people of the great agricultural Midwest in urging your thoughtful consideration of these problems. By taking adequate steps to preserve our forest resources we will not only insure an abundant supply of timber for future generations but we will also help to promote the conservation of our soil, our water, and our wildlife.

Abraham Lincoln's Philosophy of Government Should Guide Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THURMAN C. CROOK
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD pertinent to what the birthday of Abraham Lincoln should mean to every Member of this Congress and every citizen of the United States.

Abraham Lincoln said:

The strongest bond of human sympathy outside of the family relation should be one uniting all working people of all nations and tongues and kindreds.

Abraham Lincoln was born of humble parentage; his log-cabin homes in Kentucky, Indiana, and Illinois were open-faced to partake of the invigorating elements of the wilderness and out of his arena of poverty his body, mind, and soul grew saturated with the essence of modesty, freedom, democracy, and an indefinable love for the integrity of the human soul and the sterling brotherhood of all mankind.

On this birthday of Lincoln, few statesmen, but many politicians, have extolled the virtues of Mr. Lincoln in their orations and have conspicuously

expanded their chests in claiming him as the pioneer of their philosophy, political policies, and their way of living.

Words are yet to be designed that would permit me to adequately describe the incalculable contribution that Abe, the orator, statesman, humanitarian, and emancipator made to our beloved Nation as he unconsciously groomed himself to die a martyr for the cause of liberty and humanity.

So, to the politicians that find such a revered character to eulogize, I extend my profound respect for your appraisal of Mr. Lincoln, just trusting that you will be fully stimulated to practice Mr. Lincoln's philosophy down the pathway of life in every day of living, be you Republicans or Democrats. If you will only follow Abe's doctrines, selfishness, greed, exploitation, deception, prejudice, and human slavery will fast vanish from our land to make way for honesty, righteous living, contentment of the minds, enhanced standards of living for all, respect for the integrity of the human soul, reenforcement for democracy and the economy of our Nation, conditions conducive to promoting a just and lasting peace for the troubled world and a brotherhood of man the like of which our Creator intended. Surely we should be willing to practice what we preach about Mr. Lincoln on February 12 of each year. Ladies and gentlemen, Abe, obsessed with unimpeachable ideals, pioneered the trail of unselfish and righteous living. May we, in our humble wisdom, follow his well designed concepts of government dedicated to the general welfare of all classes of citizens, regardless of race, color or creed, and continue to build our bulwark of democracy more grand and stately.

Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson Would Turn Over in Their Graves—FEPC in New York—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson could come back here today and see what is going on, and what misrepresentations are being made in their names; see the attempts to destroy America by insidious communistic movements which they attempt to justify by misapplying quotations made by them, what a shock it would be to those great leaders.

You have just heard one Member speak here and quote Jefferson, whose words Lincoln used in his Gettysburg address, to the effect that all men are created equal. Jefferson was a slaveholder, and his words would not have been construed at that time to mean that there is no difference between the races.

I received an invitation to attend a Jackson Day banquet by paying the small amount of $100. If Andrew Jackson could come back here today and see the attempts being made in his name to further the cause of communism through the so-called civil-rights bill, or FEPC—the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened—he would be shocked beyond measure.

If Abraham Lincoln could come back and read that communistic monstrosity, which certain individuals are trying to force upon the American people, and hear his name used in their arguments for its support, he would spurn such a proposition with utter contempt.

YIDDISH COMMUNISM VERSUS CHRISTIAN CIVILIZATION

These individuals who prate about slavery do not hesitate to join in this communistic movement to enslave the white people of America, to destroy the American way of life and to wreck everything for which the great mass of the American people stand.

You have an illustration now. Our Yiddish Solicitor General has taken it upon himself to go into the Supreme Court and misrepresent the American people by filing a brief in the Henderson case, for the purpose of trying to wipe out all segregation, and destroy our separate schools throughout the country. He pretends to be doing this for the benefit of the Negroes. He and his gang do not give a tinker's dam about the Negroes. They are doing the Negroes infinitely more harm than good. This is a part of the communistic program, laid down by Stalin approximately 30 years ago. Remember, communism is Yiddish. I understand that every member of the Politburo around Stalin is either Yiddish or married to one, and that includes Stalin himself.

They have murdered more white Christians in the Ukraine in the last 30 years than have been killed in all the rest of the world since the crucifixion.

Washington has just read the disgusting report of a little Yiddish woman lawyer here by the name of Ruth Weyand. A Negro woman sued her for alienating her husband's affections. She comes back now and says she has been married to this Negro for years.

This same Ruth Weyand has filed a brief in the Supreme Court of the United States in the Henderson case, trying to tell the decent white people of America what to do. I wonder if the Supreme Court of the United States is going to be misled by this element.

I was glad to note that my friend, Lloyd Benford, of Memphis, has banned the showing of any pictures of Ingrid Bergman. I hope the Christian people of America will all join in protecting their children from having her loathesome pictures paraded before their eyes now and hereafter.

Mr. Speaker, it is ridiculous for Members of this House to use the names of Lincoln, Jackson, and Jefferson in their argument for the passage of this infamous FEPC—as I said, the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

In my speech to the House on February 13, 1947, I called attention to the fact that they had put this measure on the ticket in California and let the people vote on it. They beat it by a clear majority in every single individual county in California. The majority against it throughout the entire State was more than a million.

In that speech I said:

You simply destroy business with a measure like this. That is what the FEPC did here. Men have gone out of business all over the country in the last few years because of the persecution that was carried on by this outfit here in Washington, the personnel of which I shall insert later on.

A few people are going around urging us to pass it as a national law, to put everybody else in the same predicament. These people who are carrying on this racial agitation are using the Negro as a smoke screen. They do not give a tinker's dam about the Negro. They are not trying to help the Negro. They are doing them more harm than anybody has in the last 50 years, and the decent law-abiding Negroes know it.

But let me show you what they have done in New York, and let me give you some of the regulations or rulings, as they are called, and ask you if you would like to have them in your State. I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, how he would like to have them in Illinois, or how you would like to have them in Ohio, Indiana, Pennsylvania, or in Missouri, or in any other State in the Union.

Here are the regulations, or rulings, issued by the State of New York. They are headed:

"State of New York Executive Department. State commission against discrimination. Rulings."

Here are the rulings:

I want to show you some things you cannot ask in the State of New York when you go to employ a man.

Remember that State has no gas, coal, or oil, and very little water power. The rest of the country does not have to go to New York, or to any other State to get what it needs in the years to come. The American people in every section of this country are in a position now to take care of themselves. You put this measure on in one State after another and you will simply penalize those States beyond reason, and when they ask you to pass it for the whole United States and put it on the entire American people, after the fiasco they have made of it here in Washington in the last few years, it is simply unthinkable to a man who knows what he is doing and has the interest of the people of the country at heart.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

UNLAWFUL EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES BEFORE HIRING ANYBODY

Those words are written in capitals. Here is the first unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know

you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Here is the next "unlawful practice":

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make—

"Inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"Applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature, you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Dirksen, now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and the Fourth of July, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "Inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department in order to grant a visa requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly; and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Another unlawful practice in New York is to—

"Inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co., in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

It is an unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is. It is an unlawful practice to make—

"Inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, that is, during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Masachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was

here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would 'screw his courage to the sticking place' and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, we wrested the South from such domination 'when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic.'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not one out of ten on these rolls is a white Gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., Office of the Chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchell, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and Analysis Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Golightly, Cornelius	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this Legal Division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and ex-servicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred.	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer.	----------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, 'We have no Negro members on our board of directors.' Then the question came back 'Why haven't you?' This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this

group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

"St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office, New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic, revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

Poland Will Rise and Live Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is most fitting and proper that on this day we honor the memory of Abraham Lincoln. February 12, however, is the birthday of another apostle of freedom, Thaddeus Kosciusko. Providence works in strange and devious ways. It is more than coincidence that Lincoln and Kosciusko—two outstanding champions of freedom from two different continents, and from two different generations—should be born on the same dates.

Hence, while honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln on this day, let us also honor the memory of Thaddeus Kosciusko—the heart, the blood, the spirit, and the inspiration of millions of Poles scattered throughout the globe. Today, more than ever, the name of Kosciusko is dear to the hearts of freedom-loving people the world over. Because today, like during the days of Kosciusko, Poland is the sad victim of betrayal by its friends—the memory of Kosciusko is heavy on all the hearts of Poland.

Providence directed that Lincoln and Kosciusko be born on the same date, even though more than a generation apart. Providence must have directed this because the two had everything in common. To both—freedom was their life work.

Lincoln emancipated the enslaved in America. Yet, long before that time Kosciusko gave of his possessions to buy freedom for the enslaved. It was with funds from Kosciusko's will that there was built the first trade school in America at Newark for Negroes.

Kosciusko came from Poland to America and for 6 years fought to create our Union. Lincoln more than a generation later fought to preserve that Union.

Whenever any nation anywhere in the world was threatened by dismemberment by bigger and corrupt neighbors—Kosciusko was always ready to help the unfortunate victims. Lincoln, as our President, by his force for good had always used his offices to protect the weak and small nations from their greedy and corrupt neighbors. To Lincoln and Kosciusko appeasement was the lowest form of betrayal.

Lincoln is known the world over for his philosophy that "a house divided against itself cannot stand." Kosciusko's philosophy went beyond that. His was the belief that a world divided against itself cannot stand. Lincoln believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of our Union, it was in danger all over the Union. Kosciusko believed that if freedom was in danger in one part of the world, it was in danger all over the world.

A close examination of the lives and works of Kosciusko and Lincoln will reveal their likeness and greatness in almost every respect. It is easy to see the hand of providence in that their birthdays come on the same date.

Mr. Speaker, I beg your indulgence in order that I might briefly review Kosciusko's contribution to the cause of freedom—freedom not only for Poland but our own freedom—and freedom for the world.

When our Union was engaged in the struggle that gave it birth in 1776, there came from a strange and far-away land a young man who gave his fortune and life to our cause. Then, like now, Poland was always a champion of freedom. Polish land, way back at that time, already was drenched with blood in its traditional fight for freedom. When the people of Poland heard of our struggle in 1776 they became gravely concerned. Every heart and every breast of Poland prayed for the Union's success. It was this universal wish among all of the people of Poland that sent Thaddeus Kosciusko to America to help us gain the freedom for which Poland on many occasions bled and died.

In the beginning things did not go so well in our Union's struggle for freedom. With justified pride Poles regard the role played by Kosciusko in the victory at Saratoga, a victory which won for America not only a battle but France's recognition of our independence. This was one of the turning points of the War for Independence.

In our Union's fight for freedom, the question of the defense of the Hudson had been of paramount importance. Kosciusko was assigned that responsibility. He choose West Point for its commanding position. Little is now left of the fortifications, but the monument erected to his memory by American youth will remain a grateful tribute forever. That America today can regard West Point with pride is, in large measure, due to Kosciusko, who first suggested for a national military school the spot where it now stands.

In the summer of 1780, Kosciusko was transferred to the South. Here he saw the Negroes at close quarters and was brought face to face with the Negroes in slavery. It was then that, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, he acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later was to dictate his parting testament to the New World.

Kosciusko was present through the whole campaign of the Carolinas and was regarded with strong affection and admiration by General Greene. When the campaign changed to one of guerrilla warfare, he fought as a soldier, not as an engineer. At length Charleston fell, and on December 14, 1782, the American Army entered the town in a triumphal procession, in which Kosciusko rode with his fellow officers, greeted by the populace with flowers and cries of "Welcome."

Peace soon followed. Our Union was born. Kosciusko helped give our Union its birth. The prayers of the people of Poland were answered. America was free. Poland, a country to whom freedom means more than life, helped make our Nation free.

Kosciusko had fought for 6 years in the American Army. Nathaniel Greene best sums up what the Pole had done for America and what he had been to his brother soldiers:

Colonel Kosciusko belonged—

Wrote Greene—

to the number of my most useful and dearest comrades in arms. I can liken to nothing his zeal in the public service, and in the solution of important problems nothing could have been more helpful than his judgment, vigilance, and diligence. He was fearless of every danger. He never manifested desires or claims to himself, and never let the opportunity pass of calling attention to and recommending the merits of others.

Congress, in 1783, belatedly conferred upon Kosciusko the rank of brigadier general with an acknowledgment of its high sense of his long, faithful, and meritorious service.

In the fall of 1784, Kosciusko returned in his native country. For the next 12 years he remained in Europe—through the infamous partitions of Poland and the many battles fought in connection therewith. It was in 1794 that Kosciusko was seriously wounded in battle and was taken prisoner by Russia, not to be released until 2 years later. Then, like now, Poland became the prey of the Muscovite Bear—while the rest of the world looked the other way. Then, like now, Poland was the pawn of hyprocrites and betrayers.

Wounded, sick at heart and body, on the 19th of December 1796, Kosciuski left St. Petersburg to go back to America. In good time he arrived in Stockholm, where he was greeted with enthusiasm. Later, Kosciusko embarked and after a 3 weeks' passage landed in London.

The Gentlemen's magazine announced: "Kosciusko, the hero of freedom, is here."

The whole of London made haste to visit him. Politicians, men of letters, and the rules of fashion, all alike thronged to his rooms. To Walter Savage Landor, then a mere youth, the sight of Kosciusko awakened a sympathy for Poland that he never lost, and to which English literature owes one of his Imaginary Conversations. More than half a century later he looked back to the moment in which he spoke to Kosciusko as the happiest of his life. The Whig Club presented Kosciusko with a sword of honor; the Duchess of Devonshire pressed upon him a costly ring, which went the way of most of the gifts that Kosciusko received—he passed them on to his friends. Tokens of admiration had counted for nought in Kosciusko's life. They were the merest baubles to him who had seen his own country fall. In the portrait that without his knowledge Cosway painted, we see him lie with bandaged head in an attitude of deep and sorrowful musing—for his native Poland.

Bristol was at that time the English port for sailing to America and it was there that, after a fortnight's stay in London, Kosciusko betook himself. He found in Bristol old friends of American days, and now was the guest of one of them, at that time United States consul. A guard of honor received him, processions of the townsfolk flocked to catch a glimpse of the hero, a military band played every evening before the consulate, and he received as the gift of the city a handsome silver service. One who visited him here records his impression of a soul unbroken by misfortune, by wounds, poverty, and exile.

The journey down the Avon to where Kosciusko's ship lay at anchor was a triumphal progress. He was accompanied by English officers in full dress, by the American consul, and hosts of well-wishers. All heads were bared as he was carried on board. The whole length of the river handkerchiefs were waved from the banks. Farewell resounded from every rock and promontory, where spectators had crowded to see the last of the Polish hero. Boats shot out from the private dwellings on the waterside, laden with flowers and fruits for the departing guest. Not a few men and women boarded the ship and accompanied Kosciusko for some distance before they could bring themselves to part with him.

The ship had sailed on June 18, 1797. For 2 months Kosciusko and his Polish companions tossed on the Atlantic, on one occasion near shipwreck. Philadelphia, their destination, they reached on August 18, 1797. Claypole's Advertiser for August 19, 1797, reported:

In the ship *Adriana*, Captain Lee, arrived here last evening, from Bristol, came passenger, that illustrious defender of the rights of mankind, the brave but unfortunate Kosciusko, the Polish general. On his landing he was received with three cheers. And, as a further mark of popular respect for this great character, the citizens insisted upon drawing him to his lodgings. The general appears to be in good spirits, but has suffered very materially from his wounds and inhuman imprisonment. We trust, however, he will long live to enjoy in these peaceful shores, that liberty and happiness which he assisted in fighting for, but which he fought in vain to obtain for his native land.

Eight days later Washington, from Mount Vernon, congratulated Kosciusko on his safe arrival and welcomed him to the land whose liberties he had been instrumental in establishing.

No one—

Said Washington—

has a higher respect and veneration for your character than I have, and no one more sincerely wished, during your arduous struggle in the cause of liberty in your country, that it might be crowned with success. But the ways of providence are inscrutable and mortals must submit. I pray you to believe that at all times, and under all circumstances, it would make me happy to see you at my last retreat, from which I never expect to be more than 20 miles.

Kosciusko was, however, never able to visit his commander at Mount Vernon.

At this time Kosciusko drew into great intimacy with Thomas Jefferson, at that time Secretary of State. Jefferson wrote to Gates:

I see Kosciusko often. He is the purest son of liberty among you all that I have ever known.

Sometime in March 1798 a packet of letters from Europe was handed to Kosciusko. His emotion on reading the contents was so strong that, despite his crippled condition, he sprang from his couch and stepped without a helping hand to the middle of the room. "I must return at once to Europe," he said. At that time he received news that Poland was again being massacred. Before leaving America he gave Jefferson his power of attorney and wrote out the will in which more than half a century before the Civil War the Polish patriot advanced the cause of emancipation:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that my friend Thomas Jefferson employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country, and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

T. KOSCIUSKO,
5th Day of May 1798.

By the end of June or early in July 1798, Kosciusko reached Paris. His arrival centered upon him the gaze of the whole world. Sympathy with himself and the Polish cause he heard expressed upon all sides. He negotiated at length with the Government of France for France's help in the restoration of Polish independence. This was promised him many times, but his cautious request for guaranties was never complied with. Then, like now, Poland was betrayed by its friends and used as a pawn to gain temporary peace, expediency, and advantage.

But Kosciusko's intercourse with his American friends did not slacken. In 1800, at Paris, at the request of Gen. William R. Davies, then envoy from the United States to France, Kosciusko prepared in French his Manoeuvres of Horse Artillery, and it was published. General Davies requested the United States Military Philosophical Society at West Point to have the manual translated and published. This was done in the same year, and Colonel Williams, the translator, presented President Jefferson with a copy of this work, the first upon its subject to be published in America and used for many years as a basic text in our country.

Napoleon was now big man of Europe. In 1806, from Berlin, he summoned Kosciusko to assume the leadership of the revolting Poles. But the former Polish commander in chief had little faith in the fortune of the Emperor and none in his promises. He declined to obey the call and remained in Paris. He refused to use Poland as a pawn to promote a dictator. He refused to bargain his honor and the honor of his native Poland. Appeasement hypocrisy was not part of his life.

In May 1815 Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement for a new partition of Poland, just like they did at Yalta. An autonomous Kingdom of Poland was to be formed with the Czar as King, but it would be but a small part of the true Poland. Kosciusko heard these things. In dismay, he wrote to the Czar. In vain he waited for an answer. Kosciusko refused all offers of office and honor in the newly partitioned Poland—now a puppet of the Czar. He felt that his very presence, even, would lend sanction to the new partition. He despised puppets and quislings. He chose, therefore, a voluntary exile among the Swiss.

In serene communion with nature, among eternal mountains, in unceasing meditation upon the future of Poland, he spent the two last years of his life. And here, on the sad autumn evening of October 15, 1817, far from his fatherland, though close in spirit, among strangers, with not a Polish face nor a Polish word to gladden his heart, Kosciusko died. Even in his loneliness he was faithful to Poland—her purest soul and the greatest of Poles. And his greatness in that it was not his own personal greatness; merely, it was the greatness of Poland.

Mr. Speaker, the greatness of Kosciusko is the greatness of Poland. The spirit of Kosciusko has always been the spirit of Poland. Wherever freedom needs a friend there you will always find Poland the first to bleed and suffer. No soil of any nation the world over is so saturated with blood gashed for freedom as it is in Poland. There in that land at all times freedom had a loyal and trusting friend. Kosciusko is dead—but his spirit still guides Poland and its people.

Let us go back just a few years to 1938 and 1939. The whole world was afraid of a little paperhanger from Austria, then the big man of Europe. I remember at that time even in our own country when I denounced the leader of the "master race" I was told I should temper my words because Adolf might get mad at us. Among all the nations of the world there was no voice courageous enough to even call Adolf Schickelgruber a bad name. The leaders of the world licked the boots of the tyrant. They went to Munich. Chamberlain even took an umbrella with him, hoping that he might get the privilege and high honor of protecting the paperhanger from the rain. Shaking in their boots the powers of Europe appeased and fought for the favors of the big man of Europe. Even the mighty Red Bear of Russia embraced the madman of Europe and plotted with him the murder of small and helpless people of small and helpless nations.

In all the world during these tragic years, 1938 and 1939, there was only one nation and one people courageous enough to call the paperhanger's bluff. True to the spirit of Kosciusko, the people of Poland said, "We care not what course other nations take, but as for us we shall stand up and fight. The cause of freedom is at stake. We would rather fight and die for that freedom than lick the boots of any tyrant."

How courageously the people of Poland fought is written in the records of the past 7 years. To the last man, woman, and child they stood up. In the long struggle ahead—6 years—there could not be found in Poland a single quisling. The spirit of Kosciusko was prevalent in the hearts, minds, and breasts of every single Pole—fighting and dying for their freedom, as well as ours.

Meeting the mightiest military power in all history, they fought on. Alone they bore the brunt of the killers of Europe. After 19 days of glorious resistance, they were stabbed in the back by one of Hitler's pals—the bear of Russia. The bank robber of Georgia—not a Russian—and the paperhanger of Austria—not a German—were now butchering and dividing the spoils and carcass of prostrate Poland. Now Poland was attacked from both sides by two of the mightiest powers the world had ever known. Still they fought on. Still the spirit of Kosciusko urged them on. Never in the history of mankind has there been such an exhibition of glorious courage and resistance. Poland did not get lend-lease to spur on their courage. The spirit of Kosciusko was all the inspiration these people needed.

As Members of Congress we know the story full well. Poland was not a warring nation. All they had to offer was courage, life, and blood. But that was not enough to stop the bank robber of Georgia and the paperhanger from Austria. Poland was overrun and destroyed. The paperhanger enslaved the Poles in the west in labor and concentration camps and the bank robber from Georgia took the Poles from the east and sent them to Siberia.

But it takes more than murder to destroy the spirit of Poland which is the spirit of Kosciusko. Enslaved and betrayed by the rest of the world Poland still fought on. They fought harder and longer than any of the Allies of this war. A few months after Poland fell, a Polish Army was fighting in France in the Maginot line. When mighty France folded up, the Poles were the last to lay down their arms in the Maginot line. From there the Poles went to England. Six months after Poland fell 12,000 Polish boys were flying in the British Royal Air Force. They shot down one out of every five planes during the London blitz. One of the Polish squadrons was named the Kosciusko Squadron.

The only help the Allies sent Norway was a small contingent of Polish boys and what was left of the Polish Navy. All this after Poland was destroyed and overtaken by the Red and Brown Fascists of Europe. By now Hitler was running wild in Africa. It was a group of Polish boys that gave Hitler his first defeat at Tobruk. This after Poland had been overrun. This Polish Air Force helped in the evacuation at Dunkerque. So did what was left of the Polish Navy. The spirit of Kosciusko will never be destroyed, nor will the spirit of Poland.

What American is there who does not remember the deadly battle of Monte Cassino Hill? It was a Polish general and a Polish Army that captured that murderous fortification and paved the road for the Allies on their march to Rome. Nor did Poland refuse to play a part in the invasion of Normandy. Side

by side with the Allies Polish forces marched through France, Holland, Belgium into Germany. Never in the annals of history have so few done so much for the cause of freedom and humanity. Wherever there was a fight there you found Poland. The first to resist—the first to be destroyed—yet out of the ashes of that destruction Poland contributed manpower for the air forces exceeded only by the United States and England. The first to resist and the first to be destroyed—yet Poland provided fighting troops in an amount larger than all the nations combined outside the United States, the British Empire, and Russia.

If all this were all it would be more than enough. But the people who stayed in Poland—what part did they play? True to the spirit of Kosciusko the people of Poland organized the largest and most effective underground in Europe. Every Polish man, woman, and child was a part of that underground. The Polish underground was the most effective weapon the Allies had in their march through Europe. In one uprising—the Warsaw uprising—alone, in August of 1944, 250,000 Polish men, women, and children laid down their lives. Even though betrayed by its own allies, the underground fought on. With true Kosciusko spirit they had faith in Almighty God.

The courage and the sacrifice by Poland in this last war has no parallel in the annals of history. More than 8,000,000 of her people gave their lives. That comprises almost one-fourth of her population. When in the annals of man has any nation paid so high a price for freedom? If Kosciusko were alive today he would be proud of his native land and its people; to whom freedom means more than life, and to whom freedom is so priceless that it can never be compromised.

But I am sad to say that there is one thing Kosciusko would not be proud of. I might also say that there is one thing Lincoln would not be proud of. I might add that there is one thing that decent people the world over are not proud of. It is the shameful and unprecedented betrayal of a brave and a gallant people by its own allies.

Poland has had a sad history. It was dismembered time and again. Three times before the nineteenth century—the fourth time by a bank robber and a paperhanger in fateful September 1939. But these partitions were by enemies. That is to be expected and endured. If you, as a person, are robbed by your enemies, it is sad but understandable. However, when you get robbed by your own brother or sister, that is hard to understand, let alone endure. Yet that is what happened to Poland. It was partitioned by its brothers and enslaved by its brothers, as a result of the crime of Yalta. What a shameful reward to a brave and gallant people—a people that gave us a Kosciusko and a people who gave 8,000,000 dead for the same cause for which we gave more than 300,000 dead:

O feeble statesmen,
O ignominious times
That lick the tyrants' feet,
And smile upon his crimes.

Shame on us. Shame on Britain. Shame upon the world for such cowardly appeasement. Shades of Munich. Shades of Chamberlain. But Munich is a Sunday-school picnic compared to Yalta, and Chamberlain a Sunday-school teacher compared to the big men of Yalta. I say Yalta will go down in history as worse than Munich and its conspirators worse than Chamberlains.

What did Poland ask for its sacrifice? Did they ask for four or seven billion dollars from American taxpayers? No. Did they ask for the atom bomb? No. Did they ask for us to ever bail them out and rebuild Poland? No. Poland did not even ask for bread.

Then what did Poland ask? They merely asked for their own land and their own government. In the name of truth, mercy, and freedom Poland had a right to expect that simple and honorable request to be fulfilled. But the answer Poland received from one of the White House palace guards was, "You Poles are just like the Irish; you are never satisfied."

So lo and behold—all this gallant blood of Poland was gashed in vain—because Poland by the acts of greedy and power-hungry men of Yalta—lies prostrate again. But mark you, fellow countrymen—Poland is not this sad drama's closing act. Its tragic curtain will rise anew again and again. On Poland's gashed breast today the beast of Red fascism plants his hunger and consults what nation's breast shall next be gored. This is just the beginning. There will be more and more stupendous slaughters of the free.

To gallant Poland we can well say—as other nations fall one by one—then and only then will they know what it means to be betrayed like Poland was betrayed. When these nations fall one by one they will miss Poland. As they fall one by one and plead for mercy on bended knee—then and only then will they understand the glory that belongs to Poland.

To you Members of Congress—the elected custodians of America—I wish to warn that the fall of the Polish eagle, caused by betrayal, is big with fate to man. If the New World is to begin by a broken word, it would be better not to be born. Our own strife is coming. You cannot sell out the freedom of your friends and neighbors and keep your own secure. The beast of Red fascism from the ashes and blood-soaked soil of betrayed Poland shall forge the fetters and fate of our sons yet unborn. It will not be a kind fate. It will be a hideous, murderous, and shrieking fate. Today its Poland—tomorrow it will be another—after that another, one by one, and us, too. It is nearer than you think. Someday and soon the world will understand the words, "Poland's setting star is the world's disaster-rising morn."

In conclusion, Poland, the world will someday mind how you bore the brunt of fate and how you bled for humankind. Poland, so hallowedly have you played your part that freedom-loving people everywhere have your name written on their heart. Poland, your sorrow in nobility transcends. Your conquerors' and betrayers' joy make their own cheeks blush. But shame never has and never will tinge the cheeks of Poland. Thank God that Poland never has and never will change her conscience, cause, and name for all the wealth and all that goes with a felon fame.

Poland might be dead for a while. Poland has died before. But the spirit of Poland has never died and never will die. Because Poland is the spirit of Kosciusko—even after suffering defeat in victory—the spirit of Kosciusko shall make Poland rise again and live again as it has before. Why do I say that?

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people have a patriot's spirit, an unconquerable spirit. Just a few days ago, for instance, 50 young Polish orphans left India for the United States to seek haven in various convents in America. When they boarded the ship in India, in unison they sang, "Jescie Polska nie Zginela," which means Poland is not yet lost. All the orphans of Poland, morning, noon, and night sing in their hearts "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 250,000 Polish troops who bled all over the world for their freedom and ours. They are now in the beet fields of Canada and in the mines of England, but morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 12,000 gallant Polish airmen scattered over the four corners of the world without a country and without a home, and morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 6,000,000 Poles in America, proud and happy citizens of our own native land, yet morning, noon, and night they sing "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." There are 25,000,000 Polish people being tortured under the heel of Red fascism in Europe, but morning, noon, and night in their hearts and minds are the words of the immortal Polish song "Jescie Polska nie Zginela." That is the spirit of Poland; that is the spirit of Kosciusko. It is an unconquerable spirit that will never die.

I say that Poland will arise and live again, because they have a profound affection for their native land. I might mention that it is an old custom in Poland that when a citizen leaves that country, his last deed is to pick up a bit of Polish soil to take with him so that it can be buried with him in case he never returns to Poland. Such profound affection for a native land is unique among all people of the world.

I say Poland will arise and live again, because the Polish people everywhere have an abounding faith in Almighty God. You can steal their country and the Poles will be sad, but they will sing and pray "There is a God." You can murder their loved ones, but the Poles will sing and pray "There is a God." You can destroy every last segment of their nation, and the Poles will pray and sing "There is a God."

With the immortal spirit of Kosciusko, with profound and everlasting love for their country, and with an abounding faith in Almighty God, Poland will arise again, and live again, and be forever free.

Tragically, but with no surprise, honest Americans now learn the sad truth that the architect who at Yalta was largely responsible for the selling out of Poland to Communist Russia, was none other than

the convicted traitor in America, Alger Hiss. Tragically, we now learn that he was the planner appointed by President Roosevelt and our State Department who had the most to say regarding the future of Poland at Yalta. Poland today is a sad victim and lies prostrate because of the work of an American traitor and spy by the name of Alger Hiss.

We Members of Congress, in commemorating Lincoln and Kosciusko today, would do well to repudiate the work of this convicted spy and traitor and declare ourselves openly and loudly for a free and independent Poland.

This Is Murder

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans, comprising the minority on the Ways and Means Committee, on the first day that it opened hearings on taxes, moved that the first order of business should be the reduction of excise taxes. The motion was voted down, every Republican voting for the motion and every Democrat voting against it. The buyers' strike swept over the country as soon as the President's message was delivered to the Congress, in which he suggested an elimination of excise taxes covering a few—a very few—excise taxes. In the first session of the Eighty-first Congress 50 bills were introduced by Republicans asking for the reduction of excise taxes, and yet here we are well along in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress and the delay still continues. This refusal to meet the tax situation promptly and forthrightly is doing irreparable damage to the economy of the country. The only subject in which the administration seems to be interested is how to increase taxes and spend the people's money.

Under leave to extend, I am inserting as a part of my remarks an article by Sylvia F. Porter which appeared in the New York Post under date of February 7, 1950:

THIS IS MURDER

(By Sylvia F. Porter)

This is murder. All this publicity out of the White House, the Treasury, and Congress about near-term cuts in the wartime excise taxes—but no action.

Every day, more would-be buyers of jewelry, cosmetics, luggage, furs, etc., are deciding to postpone their purchases until the taxes are reduced or eliminated.

Every day, as a result, more workers in the industries involved are being thrown out of jobs.

Every day, more of the manufacturers and stores are caught in the squeeze and are going broke.

This is slow murder—via Washington befuddlement and red tape. It simply must be stopped and stopped at once.

It was bad enough when President Truman decided to drop the hint (just before Christmas, mind you) that he wouldn't be opposed to cuts in the 15 to 25 percent excise taxes if other means were found to offset the revenue loss.

That was an open invitation to the buying public to hold off on all except essential purchases until the cuts became effective. They held off—in droves. Truman's few casual words did million-dollar damage.

It got worse after Truman sent his official tax message, mentioning only seven excise taxes he thought might be cut. For he didn't specify any figures, he didn't leave the list open and he didn't close it, either, and he did hint strongly at a Presidential veto if Congress did not vote offsetting increases.

Now with Congress taking its time on debating a tax bill and discussing revenue increases before it gets to excise taxes, it's a 100-percent mess. The customers have all but disappeared.

Either Congress should cut the excise taxes quickly or it should dispense with the question. It should cut them.

Either Congress should slash the taxes enough to stimulate activity in the industries and thereby permit the Treasury to pick up some extra cash from taxes on profits and incomes or it shouldn't bother going through the motions. It should slash them.

What's happening now is not only cruel to the businessmen and workers involved. It's also a shameful financial waste.

In St. Louis, a big jewelry store sold three important pieces right before Christmas. All three have since been returned with a request for credit. The explanation? The buyers frankly admit "We're waiting for the tax to go off."

In Denver, a large department store revealed it didn't make a single fur sale in January. (Denver has had freezing weather.) The store's executives had just about decided to close the department and fire all the clerks; then, last week, they agreed to try once more. They're now running ads promising buyers "your tax will be refunded if a reduction is voted before April 1." A few customers have returned.

In New York, the major fur sellers have been advertising this tax refund angle to pull in the reluctant buyers. "Otherwise, we'd be flat on our backs," said one of the best-known furriers.

Fur sales were down 32 percent in December from 1949. Currently, they're running 50 percent below, it's estimated.

Jewelry sales were down 17 percent in December. Currently, they're running 20 to 25 percent below.

"The spring season already is being ruined by this uncertainty," a luggage manufacturer told me. "Distress merchandise in the jewelry industry is fantastic," a watch company official disclosed.

"Excise tax collections are reclining at a rate of $450,000,000 a year because of this," a tax expert reported. "The Treasury is losing out on this too."

What's occurring is easy to grasp. The tax-cutting publicity is encouraging buyers to strike, pending a decision.

But while their attitude is certainly understandable, it's murder for the businesses and workers concerned.

What's the answer? As far as the individual sellers go, I'd suggest they all investigate the fur trade's angle during this difficult twilight period. The "fair-trade" laws in the various States may be an obstacle. But many stores are making under-the-counter tax deals with their customers anyway.

As for Congress, it should—and must—stop this dawdling, put through the cuts, make them sufficiently broad to matter and settle the question. Every day's delay is cruel, unintelligent and wasteful.

Destroying Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I am including several editorials on the order of Secretary Brannan to destroy surplus potatoes.

I wish it were possible to include cartoons in the RECORD since the one in today's issue of the Washington Daily News by Talburt so effectively depicts what is going on in this instance with poor old John Q. Taxpayer pictured as a dazed goat with a tin can tied to his tail, standing on the top of a mountain of 65,000,000 bushels of potatoes, with two other mountains in the background of 219,000,000 dozens of eggs and 96,000,000 pounds of butter.

The first editorial is from the Boston Post, which is the leading Democratic paper in New England. It is as follows:

POTATO DUMPING

Secretary of Agriculture Brannan appears intent on dumping the 1949 potato crop, in one way or another. Balked in his plan to destroy some 40,000,000 bushels outright, by an outraged public opinion, he has finally decided to sell them back to the farmers at the give-away price of 1 cent per 100 pounds, after first dyeing them so they can't be sold for human consumption. Once again the emphasis is on not allowing them to be eaten, although it is all right to use them as fertilizer or livestock feed.

With so much starvation in the world and poverty in our own country, such a plan seems almost criminal. There are so many people, in so many places, that would welcome these surplus potatoes that to literally throw them away seems a travesty on good sense. Mr. Brannan says he can't use them in school-lunch or relief programs without spending additional money, but with all the millions already wasted on them, it would certainly seem wiser to spend a little more now to allow the human race to get the benefit of them, than to have them turned into fertilizer. Also, a more determined effort might have been made to get industrial users to buy them at bargain rates.

Mr. Brannan seems more intent on showing that the farm price-support program, which he wants ditched in favor of a plan of his own, is not working out than in getting the maximum value for the millions invested.

The second is from the Boston Herald and is as follows:

SOME COLD POTATOES

May we put a few 2's and 2's together, and then see what 4's we get on the interesting matter of potatoes.

1. Some time before the 1948 election the Commodity Credit Corporation sold a lot of grain-storage facilities. This had gone on over a period of years, so that storage capacity was reduced from 292,000,000 bushels to slightly over 41,000,000, but it continued even while President Truman, campaigning in the West was denouncing the Republican-dominated Eightieth Congress for failing to provide on-the-farm storage for surplus grain.

2. Also shortly before the election the Department of Agriculture not only failed to apply the support program on corn, but also withheld purchases for export, with the result that the price dropped to $1 a bushel on the farm. But during the 8 weeks immediately following the election, over 80,000,000 bushels of corn alone was handled under the support program. Low farm prices at election time were useful in persuading farmers that their salvation lay in President Truman and a Democratic Congress.

3. The Department of Agriculture is making a great show now of dumping 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. The spuds are to be allowed to rot on the ground as fertilizer. This is the first time since the national scandal of potato burning some years ago that the Department has resorted to dumping. It handled a surplus of 134,000,000 bushels last year in other ways. For an additional expenditure of $15,000,000 extra, the Department could put all this year's surplus to industrial uses. But though it spent $25,000,000 shipping last year's surplus, it won't spend $15,000,000 this year.

4. The political league of the American Federation of Labor has just reported that a growing farm revolt against Republican policies will help elect a Congress next fall to insure Taft-Hartley law repeal. The league's director says farmers have grown increasingly fearful of GOP price support in view of falling farm prices and prospects for more farm surpluses.

5. The Brannan plan for income support for producers of perishable goods is advanced by the administration as a way in which the potato farmers could have their support without surpluses.

You add all these things up, and you get an inkling of why Secretary Brannan is inviting the Nation to witness a mass destruction of good food, why he is courting another public scandal. He wants it that way because it will help in the congressional campaigns this fall. The Democratic candidates can offer the Brannan plan as a way to avoid the surpluses that result from the old price-support plans that have been advanced by such Republicans as Senator AIKEN.

No less an authority than Professor Black of Harvard has pointed out that the Brannan plan simply wouldn't work for potatoes. The 1949 crop, which supported at 60 percent of parity, would have cost the taxpayers $400,000,000 under the Brannan plan, instead of the eighty to one hundred million dollars it is now costing. And under the Brannan plan the farmers would have the incentive of full parity, not 60 percent of parity.

But whether the Brannan plan is practical or not, the administration is going to make the present system as unpalatable as possible. It is said that an offer by Spain for some of our surplus potatoes has been turned down, and there are reports that the Government has not been buying as many for school-lunch programs and welfare institutions as in the past. To make the thing look even more threatening, the majority leader in the Senate, LUCAS, has suggested scuttling the potato support program.

All this evidence of political manipulation of the farm program by the administration is pretty damning. It suggests that the party which makes so much of its solicitude for the farmer, is really simply using the farmer for its political ends. Not merely by promises it cannot fulfill, which is bad enough, but by the actual perversion of administrative functions.

The third is a portion of an editorial from the Springfield (Mass.) Union, as follows:

MORE ABOUT POTATOES

We didn't know whether to laugh or cry over the loss by fire of 50,000 barrels of Government-owned potatoes stored in a Worthington warehouse. We hope the warehouse was insured, as it doubtless was.

While the dispatch was very revealing, it left us rather confused, if not actually dazed. For example, the potato loss is estimated at $70,000 though the Department of Agriculture, which has already destroyed 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes, was preparing to bag the Worthington potatoes "for use as required by the United States."

We think the Government could learn something from this incident. Charles Lamb depicted a character who got roast pig following a fire which burnt his house down. Thereafter there was a veritable epidemic of house burnings and roast-pig feasts in the neighborhood.

Instead of hauling away for destruction in one way or another the stored surpluses, why not set fire to the warehouses in which they are being made ready to use "as required by the United States"? It might be cheaper to pay for the burned warehouses.

Of course, no tears are being shed over this incident by Agriculture Secretary Brannan, who is being accused of playing politics with federally owned farm products, acquired to prop prices. All this publicity about dumping excess foods is playing directly into his hands. The public doesn't like this terrible waste. If it can be aroused sufficiently it might create a public demand for a trial for his own scheme.

But the Brannan plan has been so thoroughly discredited that it will take more than aroused public sentiment against waste under the present program to demand a trial for the Brannan "production payment" idea. Particularly when it is suspected that the Department of Agriculture is actually putting obstacles in the way of distributing the surpluses.

Each of these editorials express a unanimous opinion as to the real reasons for this destruction order. It is my hope that someone in the Department of Agriculture will make these editorials available to the Secretary.

Navy Language

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, ever since the Navy Department issued its rather amusing instructions directed at controlling the very speech of sailor men, I have wanted to say something about it.

The editor of the New Orleans States, generally recognized as the most accurate and reliable afternoon newspaper in New Orleans at this time, has said in an editorial what I would like to have said when I first read the press releases on the subject. Since what he said could not be said better I have asked the privilege of directing the following editorial to the attention of the House:

NAVY LANGUAGE

The Navy seems to have hit rough seas. First there was the Denfeld incident. Then the *"Mighty Mo"* was stuck in the mud. Now comes another blow. Colorful terms, such as "brass hats" to designate high-ranking officers, have been declared verboten under the new Navy regime.

We like to think of our sea arm as a hairy-chested institution that sparkles with color, tradition, and individuality. That has been the concept down through the years of the men who went to sea. They lived and spoke strongly and to the point.

In the Navy, as in other branches of the service, use of a humanized, workable language in lieu of the formal phraseology of the manuals and orders was a natural development. It was the practical thing to do.

Now the policying of thought in the new unification plan, on orders of the civilian Secretary of the Navy, is extending even to the use of common terms. No longer can the Naval Academy graduates be referred to as "trade-school boys." No longer can the naval aviators be dubbed "airedales." Navy personnel must avoid the use of "black-shoe Navy," "mustangs," "gyrenes," and other similar terms.

It seems to us that the vigorous old Navy is becoming just too, too divine—simply out of this world.

Alaska Statehood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article by Mr. Louis R. Huber, which appeared in the Christian Science Monitor of January 19, 1950.

Mr. Huber, a well-known writer of Seattle, Wash., is thoroughly conversant on Alaska matters, and I especially commend the following article as reflecting the feelings of the vast majority of Alaskans who are seeking statehood now:

PLEA ACCENTS MUTUAL HELP, 83-YEAR WAIT

(By Louis R. Huber)

WASHINGTON.—"Please, Uncle Sam, give us statehood. We need two Senators and a Representative in Congress to help us develop as the other 48 States have developed. Statehood for us will be good for you, too—both to bolster national defense and to prove to the world that you mean what you say about democracy."

That is what Alaskans are saying to Congress, and they have American tradition on their side. Alaska has waited long for statehood—83 years, if you count from the 1867 purchase from Russia, or 38 years, if you count from the year the District of Alaska became a Territory (in 1912)—with explicitly implied future statehood.

A cornerstone of American political structure, the question of statehood is one that nobody ever answers with "No." Alaskans have been repeatedly told "Not yet—later," or "Wait until you can afford it."

TRUMAN SUPPORT

In fairness it must be said that President Truman has advocated statehood for Alaska and Hawaii, too, in recent messages to Congress. The bills for statehood that were introduced in the first session of the Eighty-first Congress, however, became hopelessly stuck in the Rules Committee.

It should be said also that Alaska, though long in weak financial condition and even now with a deficit of $221,645, last year enacted in its nineteenth biennial legislature

measures which will more than balance its budget, and prepare the way for statehood.

If matters had taken their traditional way, however, Alaska would have become a State about 1910. Each of the Western States, upon acquiring a population and some degree of economic promise, was promptly made a State—and Alaska had all that in 1910.

ICEBOX MYTH MELTS

The northland's swiftest development immediately followed the gold rushes of '98 (the Klondike) and '99 (Nome). The flood of prospectors—perhaps 50,000, at the peak—that came to the north found not only gold but extensive copper and coal deposits, and agricultural land. The icebox myth of former years melted and the newcomers set about developing the new land.

But President Theodore Roosevelt withdrew the Alaska coal lands from entry in 1906; and, of roughly 1,000 coal claims, all but a handful were declared in 1911 to have been fraudulently filed.

It is generally believed today that the fraud charges of 1911 were groundless; be that as it may, the coal-claim action pulled the props out from beneath Alaska's boom. Four railroads had been planned and construction was under way; it was promptly halted, and an estimated 20,000 would-have-been Alaskans went south.

DELEGATE LAW PASSED

While the coal fight was going on, Alaskans also were struggling to secure self-government at home and representation in Congress. In 1906 the delegate law was passed, giving them one voteless representative in Congress—which is all they have today.

The 1911 coal-claims ruling told them in certain terms that economic development of the northland was not welcome; and it was cold comfort for them to receive home rule in 1942 through the organic act. It gave them a Territorial legislature of very limited powers. The real government was vested in fifty-odd bureaus 5,000 miles away—in Washington, D. C.

"Your Delegate occupies a very minor position in Washington," said Delegate James Wickersham, about this time, "despite the fact that he represents more coal than the 2 Senators and 36 Representatives from Pennsylvania, more gold than the 2 Senators and 13 Representatives from California, more fisheries than all the Atlantic-coast Senators and Representatives combined, and more copper than Montana's entire delegation."

Alaska's political circumstances have not changed one bit since the day Mr. Wickersham made his statement. It is not astonishing that Alaskans should have voted nearly two to one in 1946 in favor of immediate statehood.

"We want only the simple justice that is guaranteed all Americans in the Constitution—self-government, the right to vote in national elections, and representation in Congress," say the Alaskans. "But there are even more powerful reasons why you should give us statehood."

SOVIET ACTIVITY CITED

They point to the statements of military authorities who have visited Alaska and repeatedly urged statehood as a strong corollary to effective defense in the northland. The contention of the military men is that a vigorous economy alongside national-defense installations makes those installations immeasurably easier to service and maintain.

Alaskans also cite the Russian promotion of communism in the southwest Pacific that they believe is made easier by withholding statehood from Alaska and Hawaii. The Russians point out to the Asiatic peoples, say the Alaskans, that the United States is not sincere about democracy—how could it be, while denying sovereignty to Alaskans and Hawaiians?

"Alaska has, in fact, convinced nearly everybody it has earned the right to become a State," says Alaska's Gov. Ernest Gruening. "Nearly all the large national organizations—business, labor, patriotic, fraternal, State legislatures, and the past three conferences of governors—have gone on record unanimously favoring statehood for Alaska.

"The Nation's press is almost unanimous in urging Alaska statehood, editorially. We have on our side such diverse papers as the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the New York Herald Tribune, the Washington Post, the Cleveland Plain Dealer, the Washington Times-Herald, the Hearst newspapers, and the Chicago Tribune."

What To Do About the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an outstanding address, revealing high statesmanship, and characteristic common sense, delivered by the distinguished minority leader of the House before the sixty-first annual dinner of the Builders' Exchange of Rochester, N. Y.

The address follows:

It is an honor to be here tonight to help celebrate your sixty-first anniversary. In these days of crumbling institutions you are to be congratulated not only for being 61 years young, but for the fact that it looks like you will be around for quite awhile yet. In fact, Rochester has a number of reasons to be proud of the high-type organizations it has, such as yours, and the character of the men it produces. It happens to be my privilege to work with one of them in Congress, a man young in years but wise and prudent in his judgments. I refer to your Congressman, KENNETH B. KEATING. KENNETH KEATING is a Congressman who is going far in public life, and I am confident that the people of his congressional district have the same faith in him that we all do in Washington, and I would like to pay tribute to another great Congressman who shares the privilege of representing Rochester. I refer to JAMES W. WADSWORTH. He is an outstanding statesman and one of the great Americans of our day. I regret absence from the city prevents my old and valued friend of many years, your patriotic and philanthropic citizen, Frank Gannett, from being with us.

I want to talk to you tonight about the biggest problem that faces the American people—what to do about the Federal Government. It is a problem that is on the minds of everyone—builders, real estate men, labor leaders, housewives, businessmen, and farmers alike. There are three sound reasons for this growing anxiety. First, the American people are genuinely concerned about the trend toward socialism in Washington. Second, the American people are aroused, as never before, over the ever-increasing cost of government and the ever-increasing burden of taxes they bear. Third, there is great uneasiness over the high cost of living.

I hope to show you that the first is causing the second, and the second is causing the third. I think I can demonstrate that the way to cut the cost of Government and to reduce taxes is first to ged rid of the socialist schemers and planners in Washington; and the way to cut the cost of living is to reduce the cost of Government and the burden of taxation that we all bear.

It is almost impossible to discuss what is going on in Washington today without taking a look at what has been going on in the world for the past century. The root of our trouble today goes back in a large measure to the philosophy of one man, a man named Karl Marx. Marx wrote thick books about his theories and published lengthy papers and manifestos about a revolutionary doctrine which he called socialism. If you examine the thousands upon thousands of words that he wrote and uttered, you will find that he was preaching one thing—that the stomach deserved more attention than the soul; that the physical necessities of life were more important than religion, liberty, or spirit.

Since the beginning of time, man had been struggling against oppressive government in all forms. Essentially, he has struggled for freedom of spirit, and for his own dignity as an individual. And he had made enormous gains, he had prospered and he had become more productive than ever. But the history of man is that when he gains something after a long struggle, his children and his children's children too often forget how he won it.

Marx, because he proclaimed that the state could give shelter, food, and clothing to all, began having an increasing appeal to those who enjoyed freedom but had not been forced to fight for it. As the followers of Marx made headway, they divided into two groups. One group called themselves Communists and advocated infiltration, violence, and revolution as a means of gaining power. The second group was more tricky. Calling themselves Socialists, they contended the way to achieve power was to do it on a piecemeal basis.

Both groups were amazingly frank and outspoken—but people simply did not believe them. It did not seem possible, for example, that 2 percent of a population could seize control of the remaining 98 percent. But the Communists in Russia finally proved it could happen.

In Great Britain, before the turn of the century, the Socialists banded together in a group which called itself the Fabian Society. And where do you think the name "Fabian" came from? They took the name from Quintas Fabius, a Roman general who believed that the best way to fight a battle was to fight it piecemeal—by quick thrusts and quick withdrawals. Slowly, the Socialists in Britain made headway. They won one minor skirmish after another, getting approval of this radical law and that radical law as time went on.

Although the Communists and Socialists differed in method of attaining power, they agreed on most everything else. They agreed, for example, that the more you taxed the people, the less they would be able to help themselves, and the more they would have to depend on government. If they were taxed long enough and high enough, they would soon be helpless and socialism would take over.

During most of these years, the spread of socialism was confined to Europe. It made no headway in the United States, but one European country after another was falling prey to the Socialist concepts. Russia went Communist in 1917; Italy went Fascist in 1922; Germany embraced nazism in 1933; Britain finally fell into the grip of the Socialists in 1945. In every one of these nations—Russia, Italy, Germany, and Great Britain—taxation was raised to almost confiscation levels, the tools of production were nationalized, and the people fell under the yoke of statism. Government drained off their savings and their capital and cut more deeply into their income—all in the name of providing them with the needs of life.

In America, the advent of the New Deal flung wide open the doors that had long been shut to the Communists and Socialists. They poured into Washington by the hundreds. They took modest jobs and worked like beavers. They hatched schemes by the score and they saw a few of them actually enacted into law. The Wadleighs, the Chamberses, and the Hisses went even further. They secretly joined the Communist spy apparatus. Those of us who, back in the thirties, tried to tell the Nation that this was going on were laughed at and ridiculed. We were called reactionaries, Lord Macaulays, and Tories. This abuse was heaped upon us because we still believed that the cherished freedom of Americans should not be traded for empty promises—promises that Government could provide shelter, food, and clothing if the people would only let Government manage their affairs. I am proud of the record we made. The American way of life was worth fighting for then and it is worth fighting for today.

It is noteworthy that during all this period Federal taxes rose steadily. From soaking the rich, the Government turned to soaking the poor, and there was scarcely a man or woman who did not feel the ever-increasing pinch of taxes as rates went up and the tax base spread.

The Second World War completed the job. Because every American willingly undergoes heavy taxation in time of war, no one could rightly complain as taxes went up. But war has always been favorable to the disciples of socialism and communism. War always tends to make people helpless—either by oppressive taxation or by outright destruction. Scarcely had the war ended than the proof of this was upon us. The iron curtain descended on a dozen European countries; Britain went Socialist; France and Italy teetered in the balance; China felt the pangs of a Communist revolution.

In the United States at the end of the war, most people breathed a sigh of relief, reached out their arms to those who had returned alive, and looked forward to some years of peace, happiness, and prosperity. But the breeze that had been sowed in the thirties was to be reaped as a whirlwind in the late forties. The planners and socialistic schemers were firmly entrenched in Washington. In the White House was an Executive willing to listen to their schemes and to advocate them. Taxes instead of going down went up. Total Federal, State and local tax collections in the years that followed the end of the war were actually higher than at any wartime peak.

Now, as a great political leader in this State used to say, "Let's take a look at the record." In 1933 total tax collections amounted to roughly $2,000,000,000. By 1941 the Federal taxes imposed almost three times that burden, and by 1948 the increase was 22 times what it had been in 1933. Of course, war was responsible for a great deal of this enormous leap in the tax burden. But the war has been over for nearly 5 years and the burden is still with us. The only tax reduction the American people have had in all that time was voted by the Republican Eightieth Congress when we relieved 7,000,000 people in the lowest income brackets of having to pay any Federal income tax at all, and we spread the benefits of that tax reduction in such a fashion that 71 percent of the total cut was given to people making less than $5,000 a year. By this tax cut, if nothing else, the Eightieth Congress enacted the first real road block in the path of socialism.

And what happened? With almost 45,000,000 people remaining at home in November 1948, the United States for the first time in this century elected a President who didn't have a majority of the popular vote. President Truman, with less than 50 percent of those voting behind him, was back at the old stand, advocating socialism and contending he had a mandate.

To those 45,000,000 people who did not vote in 1948, this much should be obvious: Complacency will never stop socialism.

The 1948 election proved one thing for certain—if the American people want socialism, they can have it by staying away from the polls.

But if the American people cherish their liberty and love their country, as I am convinced they do, there is one way they can stop socialism in its tracks—they can stop it by the greatest out-pouring of voters next November that this country has ever seen. They can stop it, as our founding fathers intended such alien philosophies should be stopped, by registering and voting their will.

At this moment in Washington, there are bills in Congress that paint a dire picture of the future for America if this administration stays in power. There are proposals in legislative form to socialize agriculture, to socialize medicine, to socialize credit, and to socialize the natural resources. These proposals have one thing in common—they require huge outlays of money and the most rigid controls.

It has been estimated that if the administration's entire program, as outlined in the President's state of the Union message, were to be enacted tomorrow, the cost of Government would double. At the present moment, the American people are paying almost 27 percent of all they earn simply to support government, Federal, State, and local. If the administration's program went into effect, government would soon be taking almost 50 percent of what the people earn.

Let the man on the tractor, the worker at the lathe, the bookkeeper at his ledgers, the businessman in his store or factory, and the housewife in her home, ask themselves this question: If half of their income were taken away from them, could they support themselves?

The answer in almost every case would be "No."

Yet this is the prospect we face, and the President makes no mystery of it. In his first three messages to Congress this year, he made it plain that taxes must go ever upward, and he asked for $1,000,000,000 more in revenue this year as a down payment on future increases.

Yes; the prospects have been made abundantly clear. The President in his messages used such words as "foolhardy," "foolish," and "unwise" in discussing possible cuts in the cost of Government and reductions in taxation. The President drew a picture of the future extending to the year 2000, and, in all the words employed to describe that vision, he could not find room in a single place to mention reduced cost of Government or relief from the tax burden. I think he has greatly underestimated the American people's patience. They are in no mood, if I am any judge, to wait 50 years for another tax cut.

There is a great awakening occurring in America. The people are discovering at last that whether they pay a Federal income tax or a State income tax or pay neither, they are still paying plenty of taxes in hidden levies.

This awakening is one of the greatest things that has happened to the American people since the Boston Tea Party. They are on the march. They are beginning to ask merchants and businessmen about the taxes that are passed on to them, the consumers. They are beginning to look at their phone bills, at their railroad tickets, and their theater admissions, with a practiced eye for the tax bite.

It is beginning to occur to people that the consumer in the long run is the great American taxpayer. They are discovering that duties, excises, and corporate levies are being passed on to them to pay in full. They are startled to find that practically everybody can pass on some or all of their taxes except the last purchaser, and that means it is Mr. and Mrs. Consumer who get stuck—everyone of them.

It is no longer a mystery that if the Government imposes more taxes at any level, it is the consumer who eventually pays. In short, it is at least dawning on the American people that high cost of Government means high cost of living.

Let's take a look at some these taxes, hidden and otherwise.

If you buy a new car in the $2,000 price category, you pay approximately $511 in taxes. Why, only a few years ago, you could buy an automobile for a few hundred dollars more than the tax itself today. Every time you buy gasoline, every time you buy a quart of oil, every time you buy a tire, you are paying Federal taxes, which, together with State and local taxes, add another $81 a year just for the privilege of operating your automobile.

I repeat, high cost of government means high cost of living.

Did you buy a refrigerator after the war for, say, $200? You paid a Federal tax of $20 on that refrigerator. When you paid your $6 phone bill the other day, $1 of it went to the Federal tax collector. If you got a new handbag for your wife, one-fifth of the price went to the Federal tax collector. If she bought a box of face powder, one-fifth of the price went to the Federal tax collector. If you recently took a rail, plane, or bus trip, one-seventh of the fare went to the Federal tax collector. If you attended the theater, and bought a $3 ticket, 60 cents went to the Federal tax collector.

Do you have a baby in the family? Well, for every dollar's worth of baby oil or baby powder you have bought, 20 cents went to the Federal tax collector.

I repeat, high cost of government means high cost of living.

Now, someone may say that things aren't so bad—at least food isn't taxed. Let's take a look at that proposition. There is a national organization devoted to studying taxes, known as the Tax Foundation. It recently made a study of a loaf of bread baked and sold in Indianapolis by a commercial bakery. The foundation study showed that by the time the single loaf of bread had been bought by the housewife, it bore 151 hidden taxes. Now, who paid those 151 hidden taxes on that single loaf of bread? You know the answer—the housewife.

Let's not fool ourselves. In the final analysis, it's not the farmer, it's not labor, it's not the businessman who is to blame for the high cost of living—the blame rests squarely on reckless Federal spending and exorbitant taxation.

Yes; high cost of government means high cost of living, and it means a lot of other things, too. It means that you have little hope of affording many things you want as long as the present administration is in power.

I pointed out earlier that a $2,000 automobile bore $511 in taxes. A lot of folks have been wondering when we are going to have low-cost automobiles again. Mr. James D. Mooney, who recently retired as president of Willys Overland, and who knows as much as anybody in America about building a low-cost automobile, has said: "The present tax rates make it impossible to get back to a real $1,000 car—a car that just is not a motor scooter."

A low-cost automobile would mean jobs for a lot of people who would be needed to make the cars. A low-cost automobile would mean cars for a lot of people who do not have an automobile. It should be clear to anyone that high cost of government means not only high cost of living, but it means we do without a lot of things we want and a lot of production that would mean jobs.

Exactly 1 year ago today I introduced a bill in Congress to repeal the wartime excise taxes. So while you and your organization

are celebrating your sixty-first anniversary tonight, my bill and I are celebrating our first. But I must say that you are doing better than my bill. Mr. Truman doesn't like it. He is looking for tax increases, not tax decreases.

My 1-year-old bill, which is a pretty popular baby in Congress, has been bottled up in the House Ways and Means Committee by the administration for 12 long months. From the present temper of the Congress I would not be a bit surprised if we took it off the bottle within a few weeks. President Truman has at last grudgingly admitted that perhaps there should be "reductions" in excise taxes, but he says that he will veto any bill containing such reductions unless it is accompanied by companion increases amounting to an additional billion dollars.

The probability is that he will get to exercise his veto, because most Members of Congress know what the American people are thinking, even if the administration doesn't. The Members of Congress know that excise taxes were enacted during the war to discourage sales of goods made out of materials needed in the war, and they know that those same excise taxes are still discouraging sales today and costing people jobs. They also know that this country cannot stand another billion-dollar tax increase. They know that if these excise taxes were repealed, the general stimulating effect on business and jobs would more than make up the relatively small amount of revenue these levies now bring. So Congress is not likely to vote a tax increase this year.

But Congress cannot stem the tide forever, nor can Congress stem it if the American people do not express themselves in one great voice at the polls next November. We are at the midpoint of the century in this year of 1950. We are also at the midpoint in a crisis threatening our form of government. Given one small shove in a forward direction and socialism will be upon us, with the Brannan plan, the compulsory health plan, the regional planning authorities, and all the trimmings, including bigger and bigger taxes for everybody.

The issue has been clearly cast. The American people, having watched the British debacle under socialism, know what is in store for them if we continue down the dead-end road the administration has chosen.

I have always contended that if the American citizen is given a clean-cut choice, he will make a clean-cut decision. His self-reliance is known around the world. His fear of big government is the product of 175 years of freedom and individual dignity. I am convinced that in this crusade to save America, that there are untold millions ready to join the fight. We cannot and must not fail them.

Military Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. E. L. BARTLETT
DELEGATE FROM ALASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to call to the attention of all Members the following article, which appeared in the February 8 issue of the New York Times, on military living conditions in Alaska and other areas. The conditions described in the article based on the recent visit of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to Pacific bases were high lighted in an excellent article which appears in the February 14 issue of Look, containing a report by Dr. Daniel A. Poling on similar conditions as found by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. I also commend that issue of Look to the Members' attention. Dr. Poling, editor of Christian Herald magazine, made an extensive trip to visit Alaska and Pacific installations of the Military Establishment early in 1949 as a member of the President's Committee on Religion and Welfare in the Armed Forces.

The article from the New York Times follows:

MILITARY HOUSING IN PACIFIC IS LABELED SLUMS BY BRADLEY; VANDENBERG HORRIFIED

HONOLULU, February 7.—Military housing in the Pacific was sharply criticized today by the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who arrived here on their return trip to Washington following conferences in the Far East.

Gen. Omar N. Bradley told a press conference that shabby service housing in Alaska, Guam, Okinawa, Kwajalein, and even Japan constituted "military slums."

Gen. Hoyt S. Vandenberg, Air Force Chief of Staff, said that he was "horrified" by some of these housing conditions, and that "we talk about slum clearance at home, but find conditions for troops in Alaska and elsewhere much worse."

The Staff Chiefs said that they were impressed by the combat readiness of the Pacific military forces despite these adverse circumstances.

Admiral Forrest P. Sherman, Chief of Naval Operations, said that Russia's submarine strength in the Pacific was a matter of concern. He added that he had no knowledge of how close to Hawaii these submarines were operating, but that their presence in the Pacific pointed up the need "for strong naval forces" in this ocean.

The Admiral reported that American destroyers were being modified for Pacific anti-submarine duty. Asked if the strength of the Navy in the Pacific was sufficient to guarantee the security of the scheduled atomic tests on Eniwetok, he replied that it was.

Admiral Sherman said that the poor housing criticized by his colleagues was preventing shore installations from properly servicing the fleet, and that the problem of mere existence took too much of the men's energies. He noted that some Quonset huts on Guam and Okinawa were in use after surviving 8 years and several typhoons.

General Bradley said that "it is quite common for families to wait 6 to 10 months before joining husbands, and then they find they must use quarters which would be classed as slums back home."

The length of the Hawaiian stopover of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the fourth member of which is Gen. J. Lawton Collins, Army Chief of Staff, is indefinite, but they are expected to stay 2 or 3 days. During that time, they will inspect military installations in the Hawaiian area.

Changing the Color of Money

REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, late yesterday afternoon a representative of the United Press said that a Phoenix, Ariz., newspaper had requested my views regarding a hold-up there involving $130,000. They wanted to know how the colored money bill which I have been trying to get passed for 3 years would have affected that. Of course, I feel that if that bill were enacted it would be very easy to apprehend the robbers. I hope the Secretary of the Treasury, without legislation, will request a change in color of the money every 5 years, and that these robbers may be apprehended.

Faker Einstein

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN E. RANKIN
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr Speaker, one of the greatest fakers the world ever knew is Albert Einstein, who should have been deported for his communistic activities years ago.

Ever since he published his book on relativity to try to convince the world that light had weight, he has capitalized upon his alleged reputation as a scientist.

According to the Committee on Un-American Activities, he has been engaged in communistic activities in this country for a long time. At this point I am inserting some excerpts from the report of the Committee on Un-American Activities received by me today showing what some of those subversive activities were.

Every time the word "Daily Worker" is used in this report it means the Communist Daily Worker—that is, a Communist newspaper published in New York by the Communist Party and dedicated to the overthrow of this Government.

He had no more to do with the development of the atomic bomb than if there had not been such a thing. American scientists developed the atomic bomb, as General Groves will tell you, and old Faker Einstein had nothing to do with it.

The "bunk" that he is now spreading to try to get this country into a world government, for the American people to assume the responsibilities of all the other nations of the earth, to fight their battles, and to pay their debts, is simply carrying out the Communist line.

At this point I am inserting excerpts from the report which I have received from the Committee on Un-American Activities today relative to Mr. Einstein. It reads as follows:

INFORMATION FROM THE FILES OF THE COMMITTEE ON UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES, UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1950.

For: Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN.
Subject: Albert Einstein.

A check of the public files, records, and publications of the committee has revealed the following information concerning the individual listed above:

According to a letterhead, dated October 27, 1942, Prof. Albert Einstein was one of the

patrons of the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship. He was a sponsor of the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown on Call to the Congress of American-Soviet Friendship, November 6–8, 1943 (p. 4); and a memorandum issued by the Council on March 18, 1946. He signed an open letter to the American people, sponsored by the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship, as shown in the New York Times of May 18, 1943, page 17C.

The Congress of American-Soviet Friendship was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944; the same report shows that "in recent months, the Communist Party's principal front for all things Russian has been known as the National Council for American-Soviet Friendship." Attorney General Clark cited the National Council of American-Soviet Friendship as subversive and Communist in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

The Daily Worker of February 26, 1942, page 4, named Albert Einstein as one of the sponsors of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born.

The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as "one of the oldest auxiliaries of the Communist Party in the United States" in Report No. 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944. The organization had previously been cited in Report No. 2277 of the committee, dated June 25, 1942. The American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein was an endorser of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 16, 1937, page 2; he was named as a sponsor of the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy, Medical Bureau, in New Masses of May 18, 1937, page 25. In Reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1940, and March 29, 1944, the North American Committee To Aid Spanish Democracy was cited as a Communist-front organization. In a list furnished the Loyalty Review Board by Attorney General Clark, which was released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, April 25, 1949, the organization was cited as Communist.

Albert Einstein was a national sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Appeal of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, according to letterheads of that group dated February 26, 1946, and February 3, 1948; he signed a petition in defense of the Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee, as shown in the Daily Worker of April 28, 1948, page 4; and was cochairman of the national reception committee for Madame Irene Joliot-Curie, whose speaking tour was sponsored by the joint anti-Fascist refugee committee (invitation to dinner, New York City, March 31, 1948).

The Joint Anti-Fascist Refugee Committee was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948; it was cited as a Communist-front organization in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

Attorney General Clark cited the American Council for a Democratic Greece as a subversive and Communist organization formerly known as the Greek-American Council in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, which were released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948. Albert Einstein sponsored a petition of the American Council for a Democratic Greece, as shown in the Daily People's World of August 23, 1948, page 2; he signed a statement of the council condemning the Greek Government, according to the Daily Worker of September 2, 1948, page 7.

Dr. Einstein was a sponsor of the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign, as shown on a letterhead of that group, dated at New Haven, Conn., November 16, 1939, and a pamphlet entitled "Children in Concentration Camps." The Special Committee on Un-American Activities cited the Spanish Refugee Relief Campaign as a Communist-front organization in Report 1476 of January 3, 1940.

Albert Einstein contributed a manuscript for Spanish aid to the League of American Writers, according to the Daily Worker of February 18, 1939, page 7.

Both Attorney General Francis Biddle and Attorney General Tom Clark have cited the League of American Writers as a Communist-front organization (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, September 24, 1942, pages 7685 and 7686; letters to Loyalty Review Board, released June 1, 1948, and September 21, 1948). The organization was cited as a Communist front in Reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated January 3, 1940; June 25, 1942; and March 29, 1944.

Albert Einstein signed a letter pledging support to China, which was issued by the American Friends of the Chinese People, as shown in the Daily Worker of July 16, 1940, page 4. He was an endorser of the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation, according to the Daily Worker of April 2, 1938, page 4. Both American Friends of the Chinese People and the Committee for Peace through World Cooperation were cited as Communist-front organizations in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

Albert Einstein was a sponsor of the Freedom Crusade of the Civil Rights Congress, according to the Daily Worker, issues of December 15, 1948, page 2, and December 31, 1948, page 3.

In Report 1115 of the Committee on Un-American Activities, entitled "Civil Rights Congress as a Communist Front Organization," dated September 2, 1947, the Civil Rights Congress was cited as being dedicated "not to the broader issues of civil liberties, but specifically to the defense of individual Communists and the Communist Party" and "Controlled by individuals who are either members of the Communist Party or openly loyal to it." The Civil Rights Congress was cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein was a signer of a declaration honoring Georgi Dimitrov, former head of the Communist International, as shown in the New York Times of December 22, 1943, page 40. The declaration was sponsored by the Reichstag Fire Trial Anniversary Committee, cited as a Communist front in Report 1311 of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated March 29, 1944.

As shown in the Daily Worker of April 22, 1947, page 4, Albert Einstein was a speaker under auspices of the Council on African Affairs, an organization cited as subversive and Communist by Attorney General Clark in lists furnished the Loyalty Review Board, released to the press by the United States Civil Service Commission, December 4, 1947, and September 21, 1948.

Albert Einstein has been a contributor to the publication Soviet Russia Today (issue of June 1942, p. 6); he was a sponsor of the Soviet Russia Today dinner celebrating the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Red Army (Soviet Russia Today, February 1943, p. 34).

Soviet Russia Today was cited as a Communist front in reports of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, dated June 25, 1942, and March 29, 1944.

Albert Einstein is named as a member at large of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions on an undated letterhead of the organization (received January 1949). He was a sponsor of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace held in New York City, March 25–27, 1949, under auspices of the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions, according to the conference program, page 14.

Both the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace and the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions were cited as Communist-front organizations in the Report of the Committee on Un-American Activities, dated April 19, 1949, which is entitled "Review of the Scientific and Cultural Conference for World Peace Arranged by the National Council of the Arts, Sciences, and Professions."

I do not see how any man can read this record and not realize that this man Einstein is not interested in the welfare of the United States.

Defense of Alaska and the Nation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. E. L. BARTLETT

DELEGATE FROM ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to have included the following speech delivered by Hon. Ernest Gruening, Governor of Alaska, at the meeting of the All-America Defense Association on January 12 in Washington, D. C., relative to the importance of Alaska's defense to the whole Nation:

"Through to this day, Alaska has never received the attention in national defense planning that it deserves."

This moderate factual statement is not mine. It is found on page 204 of that very excellent book entitled "Global Mission," published within the year by our only General of the Air Force and great war leader, Hap Arnold. I doubt whether there is any better authority. And further on he says, after stressing the great strategic importance of Alaska:

"But we were never able to get the money or allocations for the Air Force that we really needed there to give us the kind of bases we required then—and need more than ever now."

Those of us who have been closely associated with Alaskan affairs for years—in my own case for over 15 years—realize the stark truth of this presentation. Alaska was virtually defenseless on the eve of World War II. For years previous to Pearl Harbor our Delegate in Congress—our voteless Delegate, for a Territory can be represented in the Congress only by a voteless representative in the House of Representatives—had pled for the defense of Alaska. From the floor of the House he had warned repeatedly that Alaska was undefended and vulnerable. Indeed, he prophesied exactly what would happen in the event of war with Japan. He foretold that Alaska would be invaded and occupied. And Alaska was invaded and was the only part of the American Continent that for a time was

held by the enemy. And while it is true that after over a year of occupation the invader was driven out and defeated in that theater of operations as in every other theater, the entire campaign was unnecessary. With adequate Alaskan defense it need never have taken place. It was needlessly costly of American lives, of shipping, of material. But for the success of the American forces at the Battle of Midway, which stopped the Japanese advance in the Pacific, the occupation of Alaska would have progressed further.

Now, 4½ years after the termination of World War II, Alaska is similarly defenseless. Alaska is similarly defenseless in the face of a far greater and more imminent danger of invasion than existed from the Japanese enemy.

Let me state briefly the obvious facts—known to everyone—but by a strange paradox not acted upon.

There is today only one potential enemy of the United States in the world. That is the totalitarian police state which stretches from the Baltic to the Bering Sea. During World War II Russia and America were allies in a war against totalitarianism and ruthless aggression. In the 4 years since the termination of that war the American people have hoped for an era of peace and self-rule on the part of the peoples of the world. Those high hopes have been bitterly disappointed. Instead of their fulfillment we have seen that police state extend its power and tyranny first over the Baltic and Balkan states. We have seen it roll over Hungary. We have seen it overrun and crush the most democratically minded people of central Europe, the Czechoslovaks. We have seen it attempt to carry that penetration throughout the continent of Europe, where its further advance has been stopped, fortunately, because of the economic aid given the peoples that were still not under the Soviet boot. We have seen how the Marshall plan and the Truman plan together have thus far managed to contain the advance of the iron curtain beyond these frontiers.

That is very gratifying, and, with the economic aid thus rendered and to be rendered, plus the military aid voted by the last Congress, it is to be hoped that a further advance of totalitarian tyranny on what might be considered the eastern front of freedom has been halted.

But in the meanwhile, what has happened on the western front? Within the last 2 years the Communist hordes have overrun China. Except for the southern extensions and peninsulas of that continent, they now hold all Asia.

No broad ocean such as the Atlantic separates the Asiatic mainland from the American mainland. The shores of Soviet Siberia are visible to the naked eye from the shore of Alaska. The distance across Bering Strait is only 54 miles. American and Soviet islands are actually closer to each other than that. It is a shorter distance from St. Lawrence Island, belonging to Alaska, where dwell American citizens, to the nearest Siberian headlands. Between American Little Diomede and Russian Big Diomede there are only 2½ miles.

Under these circumstances it would seem logical and proper that the defense undertakings of Alaska on our western front should bear a relation comparable to those on our eastern front. But, as General Arnold has indicated and as we all know, no such thing has happened.

After the close of World War II most of our Alaskan bases were abandoned either wholly or in part, and decommissioned. Practically all of these were, of course, constructed on the eve of or during the war with Japan for purposes solely related to that war and in many cases not appropriate to or adequate for the type of war that we now must guard against in the second half of the twentieth century.

But in these 4½ years when it has been increasingly and tragically evident that we cannot count on an era of peace and international friendship with our neighbor across Bering Strait, next to nothing has been done to defend our western frontier. We do not have to go back, although we may well do so, to the warning of Billy Mitchell, that great prophet and pioneer of military air power, that "he who holds Alaska holds the world," to realize that Alaska should be, and can be made the great bulwark of defense not merely for the United States but for the entire Western Hemisphere. And that means for the entire world or part of the world where rests the hope of peace, civilization, and freedom for all mankind.

Consider that Alaska, with an area of 586,000 square miles, an area one-fifth as large as the United States, is the only portion of our North American continent under the American flag which fronts on the Arctic Ocean, one of the great airways of the future and one that obviously should be protected against attack.

Consider, likewise, that Alaska is the only portion of the American continent within naked-eye view of our totalitarian neighbor.

Consider, finally, that Alaska is the only portion of the American continent which, with its island extensions, reaches well into the Eastern Hemisphere.

Elementary common sense would require making Alaska as nearly impregnable as possible. Common consistency with our wise policy in Europe would require that the United States do the equivalent in the matter of economic and military aid to our own fellow citizens on our northern and western boundaries—frontier in the Arctic and in the Pacific of freedom, and democracy. But no such thing has happened. During the 4 years from 1945 after VJ-day, till the summer of 1949 next to nothing was done for the building up of Alaskan defenses. Congress, which so generously voted funds to check the advance of imperial communism in Europe, voted next to nothing to prepare against a similar advance to Alaska and the American continent. Finally, in August of 1949, less than 6 months ago, we in Alaska were stupefied to learn that the extremely modest request of our military for an authorization of $137,000,000 for defense housing and public works in Alaska would be shelved and not acted upon during that session of Congress. At almost the same time, we received definite indications that some of these same military authorities were deeming that the northwest portion of the United States, the Puget Sound area, was vulnerable and were proposing and, indeed, had begun to transfer some of the airplane production located there since the beginning of aviation to what was deemed a safer point in the Prairie States on the other side of the Rockies.

I need not rehearse this episode which is now fairly familiar to most of us. Suffice it to say that as a result of the most emphatic protests from Alaska and great efforts on the part of the military, the first session of the Eightieth Congress in its closing days reconsidered in part its decision to postpone the beginning of adequate defense for Alaska. In almost the final hours Congress authorized an expenditure of some $96,000,000. And for that we are grateful, and all those who believe that permanent peace is made more likely by adequate defense, as we in Alaska firmly believe, are and should be grateful for that action of the Congress.

But note that the requested authorization of $137,000,000 was slashed drastically. The $96,000,000 reduced from $137,000,000, a cut of nearly one-third, contrasts with the almost unhesitating authorizations and appropriations for what was asked by the administration for the defense of our western front in Europe. Earlier, the same first session of the Eighty-first Congress had voted $5,700,000,000 for economic aid, plus $1,300,000,000 for military aid, a total of $7,000,000,000 on top of previous vast sums previously voted by the Eightieth Congress. Contrast this with the piddling $96,000,000—less than 2 percent of the amount readily appropriated for defense of European countries a few months earlier.

Now, the point is that these requests for Alaskan defense are minimal requests. They represent what, in the opinion of the military authorities in Alaska—in whom, incidentally, those of us who know them have the greatest faith and confidence—consider the absolute minimum required in the event of a sneak attack. Until these defenses are established, and they will not be for at least a year or more, because of the 4-year interval since VJ-day in which little or nothing has been done—until these defenses are established, Alaska continues defenseless and can be, as I have stated publicly before, taken by a minor scale airborne invasion.

What is needed for the minimal defense of Alaska is a complete radar screen, work on which has now been authorized, and sufficient housing to take care of the necessary ground troops to hold our airports in the event of a parachute attack and, finally, enough planes and air personnel to intercept and destroy any air attack directed at the northwest coast of the United States and passing over Alaska. It seems incredible that we should have to plead and fight and beg for such minimum requirements.

In this connection, let me pay a warm tribute to the Secretary of the Air Force, Mr. Stewart Symington, who not only is fully aware of and alerted to the paramount importance of Alaska defense and its needs but has been working unceasingly to bring this about. Coming to Alaska in the late summer to survey the situation, he subsequently gave up his Christmas vacation to return to Alaska for further investigation in order to be able to give to the congressional committees the first-hand information which they will undoubtedly require.

It is very unusual for Government officials inspecting Alaska to come up there in winter. But here we have the case of a top-level official foregoing the pleasures and comforts of the Christmas holidays at home, traveling about Alaska in the closing week of December for that purpose in order to see for himself how our soldiers had been forced to live under winter conditions in the Arctic and sub-Arctic. I desire to express the deep appreciation of Alaskans and my own gratitude to Secretary Symington. I hope that his efforts will be successful and will bear early fruit in this session of the Eighty-first Congress.

Hopeful as I am that Secretary Symington's efforts and those of the rest of us will be successful, I cannot forbear to terminate with the conclusion that Alaska will never be adequately defended unless and until we get statehood. This is perhaps not the place or time to elaborate fully the overwhelming evidence that leads to that conclusion. Moreover, adequate defense is only one of many compelling reasons why the Congress should grant statehood to Alaska at this session. But the history of our Nation during recent years demonstrates overwhelmingly that the development of Alaska, the defense of Alaska, the realization of Alaska's current mission and destiny, and statehood are inseparable.

That current mission and destiny, incidentally, are worth stressing. I have talked this evening about the need of defending Alaska for the sake of national security and as a preventive against enemy attack and the catastrophe of a third world war.

While we are all struggling, as all sane people must, to avert such a third world war, we are engaged in another form of conflict, the so-called cold war. This is a contest of ideologies. It is a competitive effort to demonstrate to all of mankind that a free society is better than a fettered one; that democracy is better than dictatorship;

and that government by consent of the governed, majority rule, and protection for the minorities, the basic tenets of our American faith, are more productive of happiness and therefore more enduring than the converse policies practiced wherever the Soviet idea dominates. If we are to win this war of ideas, if we are to gain adherence among the neutral and wavering peoples of the earth, it is essential that we live up to our professions, that we demonstrate by deeds rather than by declamations that we mean what we say.

And that means, among other such acts to prove our good faith, granting statehood to our Pacific Territories which, after a long period of semicitizenship and colonial rule, have requested statehood, have requested self-government on the established American pattern, have requested the full equality of citizenship which is their right.

The majority of the press of the Nation, public opinion, and every major national organization have endorsed this aspiration.

The Governors of the 48 States at three successive annual meetings have by unanimous vote endorsed statehood.

In both the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses the House committee which investigated statehood reported favorably—by a unanimous vote in the Eightieth Congress, with but one dissenting vote in the Eighty-first.

Can we continue to be the torch bearers of democracy in a darkened world if we deny statehood?

To win the cold war as well as to avert the calamity of a third world war, Alaska, above all else, needs statehood, and needs statehood now.

Mark of a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950:

MARK OF A STATESMAN
(By Bruce Barton)

In 1937 Fiorello LaGuardia, Senator Copeland, and Judge Mahoney were candidates in the primaries for mayor of New York.

There was hardly any talk about local issues. That might have been dangerous; it might have lost votes.

Senator Copeland's theme song was: "Vote for me. I am brave. I denounced Hitler in the Senate."

Judge Mahoney boasted: "I made Hitler mad by keeping our American boys away from the Olympic games in Berlin."

LaGuardia screamed: "I called Hitler a so-and-so."

Mr. Mahoney beat Copeland, and Mr. LaGuardia beat Mr. Mahoney.

Most of our political campaigns are like that. Most politicians are like the one in Sam Kiser's poem, who practiced his speeches before the mirror. Shaking his fist, he would shout that—

"White is white and black is black.
And he swore that even torture would not
make him take it back."

Lincoln had a different kind of courage. In the closing days of the Civil War a delegation visited him in the White House—men so powerful that they could swing the votes of Illinois, and Illinois could swing the national election. They demanded a reduction in the draft quota of Illinois; her fathers and mothers, they said, had suffered enough.

Joseph Medill, owner of the most feared newspaper in the Middle West, was their spokesman. Quoting his own words, Ida M. Tarbell tells the story.

"I shall never forget," said Mr. Medill, "how he (Lincoln) suddenly lifted his head and turned on us a black and frowning face.

"'Gentlemen,' he said, in a voice full of bitterness, 'you called for war until we had it. Now you come here begging to be let off from the call for men which I have made to carry on the war you demanded. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves. I have a right to expect better things of you. And you, Medill, you are acting like a coward. You can influence great masses, and yet you cry to be spared at the moment when your cause is suffering. Go home, and send us those men.'

"I couldn't say anything," Mr. Medill continued. "It was the first time I ever was whipped. We all got up and went out, and when the door closed, one of my colleagues said:

"'Well, gentlemen, the old man is right. We ought to be ashamed of ourselves. Let us * * * go home and raise the men.'"

Lincoln had won his point, but he had risked powerful support to do so. That was real political courage—the hallmark of a statesman.

The Movement for Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HALE BOGGS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the growing movement for a union of Atlantic democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact is less than 1 year old. It announced its formation on March 15, 1949, and then embarked upon all-out support for the pact. On July 26, 5 days after the pact was ratified, the Atlantic Union resolution—H. R. 107–111 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 57—was introduced into the House and Senate.

This resolution, as former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts has said, "offers a minimum of commitment with a maximum of hope." It provides in its resolving clause:

That the President is requested to invite the democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Treaty to name delegates, representing their principal political parties, to meet this year with delegates of the United States in a federal convention to explore how far their peoples, and the peoples of such other democracies as the convention may invite to send delegates, can apply among them, within the framework of the United Nations, the principle of free federal union.

This resolution is now before the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Hearings on it by a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee are scheduled for early February.

Since the introduction of this resolution the Atlantic Union Committee has grown both in size and importance. Headed by Justice Roberts, former Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson, and former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, it now includes more than 270 distinguished Americans from all sections of the country on its national council and has active chapters or community leaders in every State. More and more thinking Americans are beginning to realize that its proposal offers the broadest and safest road to peace and prosperity.

The Atlantic Union Committee is endeavoring, as the resolution indicates, to bring about early exploration of the possibilities of federating the Atlantic democracies. It seeks no commitment other than to explore; any proposals for action which might develop from such exploration would be submitted to the Congress and the American people for full discussion and consideration. Any actual steps in federating with other democracies would require amendment of the Constitution.

The practicality of this procedure has been underlined by two developments which occurred during 1949. The first of these was the adoption of the North Atlantic Pact, which furnishes a springboard for efforts by its parties to form an Atlantic Union. Article 2 of the pact pledges them to contribute toward the further development of peaceful and friendly international relations by strengthening their free institutions, by bringing about a better understanding of the principles upon which those institutions are founded, and by promoting conditions of stability and well-being and to encourage economic collaboration between any or all of them.

The second development was the discovery that Russia can make atomic bombs. When American cities have become exposed to atomic attack, the American people cannot afford to be content with small measures in their search for peace and security. They cannot afford to indulge in the tragic tendency of democracies to do too little and to do it too late.

How far the Atlantic democracies will be willing to go in federating cannot be foreseen now, since that can be determined only when their leaders and experts in government meet to consider together the complex problems involved. At this stage, we can do no more than point to the experience of existing federal unions, the greatest of which is our United States. They have been built upon a division of powers, certain specified powers being granted to the Federal Government and the rest reserved to the local governments. Among those granted to the Federal Government have been the conduct of foreign relations and defense, regulation of trade and communications, and powers to issue currency, raise revenue, and grant citizenship.

We can, furthermore, even at this stage, survey some of the consequences of successful creation of an Atlantic Union loosely comparable to the federal unions which have been established in the past. These are so far reaching as to indicate that the birth of the Atlantic Union would mark a turning point in history and make the second half of this

century an era of peace and unprecedented prosperity.

Peace and security are foremost in all our minds today. The Atlantic Union at its creation would possess 80 percent of the world's industrial capacity. Endowed with so vast a war potential and wide dispersion of territories, it would be too strong to be defeated in war. With or without atomic bombs, no aggressive government, and certainly not the cold-blooded Kremlin dictatorship, will undertake a world war unless it believes it can win.

The Union would possess at its birth a world predominance of power. This predominance, moreover, would grow progressively as a result of two developments. The first would be the rapid increase in the productive capacity of all the Union's people resulting from economic integration. The second would be the expansion of the Union resulting from the voluntary accession of additional free peoples. Thus the security of the union would grow year by year and decade by decade, affording to all its peoples a prospect of enduring peace which does not appear attainable by the methods we have pursued thus far.

The Union could be expected to establish a stable currency, and to create, at a relatively early date, one great economic area comprising more than 300,000,000 consumers. Such a stable currency and decreasing fear of war would stimulate private investment by both Americans and Europeans on an unprecedented scale. Its huge economic area, free from barriers to trade, would permit within a market twice as large as the United States the full development of the mass production and specialization which have made our American standard of living so high.

All the expected benefits of European integration would be multiplied many times in Atlantic integration covering a region which, unlike western Europe, would possess a balanced economy. These results would soon become evident in increasing productive capacity, rising standards of living, better business, more income, and more wealth.

These economic advances, moreover, would make the burden of defense progressively easier to bear. For Union would decrease defense costs not only in relation to income, but also in actual size. The inherent strength of the Union would enable it to maintain security with a smaller military establishment than the total of those the democracies would need separately. To take one example, its navy would not need to be as large as the combined navies of the United States and Great Britain. At the same time unification of forces and command, standardization of weapons and equipment, and specialization of functions and of production would make its forces far more efficient than the combined national forces of the democracies could be.

Such savings in defense costs, plus those resulting from elimination of United States Government aid to western Europe and of many thousands of officials engaged in functions which Union would render unnecessary, could be expected to reduce the burden on the American taxpayer by billions of dollars.

There is something else which Americans have proved that they prize more than either peace or prosperity. That is freedom. In the last 20 years the frontiers of freedom have drastically receded. In the last few months we have seen Communist despotism overrun the whole of China.

Creation of the Atlantic Union would reverse this process and set in motion a progressive expansion of freedom. It would not only bring victory in the "cold war," it would also wrest the initiative from Russia in the war of ideas and show up communism as the reactionary autocratic movement which it actually is.

Due to the magnetic attraction of the union's security and prosperity, many peoples who had not maintained free institutions would hasten to establish them in order to become eligible for inclusion. Once these peoples were included, those institutions would presumably be guaranteed by the union government, as a republican form of government is guaranteed the States in our own country. Meanwhile the peoples of the dependent territories of the Atlantic democracies within the union would be developing self-government and evolving toward the status of states or nations.

To appreciate the importance of these developments, we must remember that about two-thirds of the peoples of the world now have close ties with the Atlantic democracies. Atlantic Union would strengthen these ties, not weaken them, since these peoples would rely more on the union for security, markets, and industrial products than they do now on the democracies separately. Many of these peoples, notably those in South America, could be expected to seek to join the union at an early date. Others, hoping to join it eventually, would establish in the meantime some special relationship with the union government. In all of them and over the greater part of the earth, creation of the union would stimulate the expansion of freedom and the development of free institutions.

Supposing that we Americans prove to have wisdom and vision as our forefathers did, sufficient wisdom and vision to take this great forward step, what can we expect the world to look like a few years from now? There will be a union of free peoples, too strong to be crushed in war and growing progressively in strength, extent, and prosperity. There will be hundreds of millions of other peoples associated with the union and aspiring toward eventual inclusion in it. Freedom will be on the march. Communism will be on the defensive, compelled to concentrate on a task at which autocracy has always failed in the end, the maintenance of its grip upon subject peoples. Mankind will be advancing by a road which is broad and direct, even though it is long, toward an eventual free world.

How Do You Like Your Potatoes, if Any?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 2, 1950:

HOW DO YOU LIKE YOUR POTATOES, IF ANY?

And so the Government is getting ready to destroy 50,000,000 bushels of potatoes. It may let them rot in the fields or burn them or spray them with dye so they can't be dumped on the market. Under the law, you see, prices can't be suffered to go down, either for the consumer or the taxpayer.

It sounds terrible. And it is terrible, when you think of potatoes in terms of mouths to be fed and stomachs to be filled by this most filling of food. It sounds just as bad when you think that at $1.25 a bushel the Government has put out $62,500,000 of the taxpayers' money for these same potatoes.

However, nobody wants to buy them—and a lot of people can't buy them at the retail price which is kept high by the program of guaranty. Nobody seems to want them even for free, if this calls for paying the freight from fields or storage warehouses.

We have to begin at the beginning of the Government's sad experience with potatoes to find the villain in the case. And even then we can't be quite sure. Some signs point to the potato producer himself. Some point to the farmers' political friends. Some point to the whole system of price supports and particularly to the method of supporting prices by purchase which takes food off the market to keep the price up.

Early in the war, it was found that potato requirements for military, civilian, and lend-lease were about 50,000,000 bushels greater than the peacetime production. The Secretary of Agriculture asked for increased production. Under the law, this brought potatoes under the support plan at 90 percent of parity until 2 years after the end of hostilities.

Nobody was troubled much at the time. Wasn't the Government, to get war production, subsidizing the construction of huge plants, subsidizing profits, granting tax recovery in a postwar pinch, and taking huge losses in sale of surplus plants? But in potatoes, and other food crops, the production was bigger and better than expected, and the surpluses began to accumulate, and the guarantees began to work.

The Government tried to cut down losses by curtailing acreage. But the farmers were pretty good. As they were assured of a price for all they could grow, they set about to make the fewer acres produce more. They increased the yield as the acres decreased. In 1943 acres harvested totaled 3,239,000; the average yield, 141.7 bushels an acre. Last year, with only 1,900,000 acres harvested, the production was 401,000,000 bushels. This was 2 percent over the 1938–47 average—on little more than half the 1943 acreage. It was no skin off the potato grower's nose if his product never got to market, though it was cash in his pocket.

The supports did not end at the specified time, because the farm politicians in Congress extended them. Potatoes, like almost everything else, are under the support provisions of the present law. The pressure

from constituents and logrolling farm lobbyists worked well. It is a commentary on the system that even as Secretary Brannan announced the plan to destroy unwanted potatoes, Congress was yielding to the pressure of cotton growers and increasing the acreage allotments for that crop—with the certainty of more cotton to come, more drains on the loan funds, more surpluses.

At this rate, if the American Farm Bureau and the other pressure groups don't look out, they will find themselves hard put to stave off something like Secretary Brannan's plan to end supports, let prices fall in the market place, and pay the farmers a production subsidy to keep their income stable. Certainly they are likely to find public revulsion for the plan of support by Government purchase (and destruction) of surpluses. They may find production controls substituted for acreage controls. We have an idea that any or all of these things won't make the consuming public a bit mad. At any rate, the consumer couldn't be madder than he is at news like the potato shocker.

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include my speech on the Lincoln's Day broadcast, National Broadcasting Co., New York City, February 11, 1950:

Throughout history the words of great men have been used by other men to justify their own thinking on important issues.

In our own country the words of Washington, of Jefferson, of Jackson are often used in an effort to prove some point or other. We argue endlessly about what these great figures would do if they were faced today with this or that problem.

No American has been more quoted, not only in our own country, but in every land, than Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday we will be celebrating tomorrow.

Lincoln is quoted by many men for their own purposes and their own ends. He is held up for veneration by many men whose actions show that they do not believe what he believed, but who use his words to lend to themselves some of the coloring of his deep humanity, something of the greatness which attaches to one of the most beloved of all the men born in the Western World.

That is so. Some people seek to employ the words and the memory of Lincoln for small purposes. But it is also true that he cannot be truly quoted on both sides of a question. With his simplicity of mind and spirit, with his steadfastness of heart, Lincoln kept a straight clear line in this love and respect for all the people. And the people know it, and that is why their devotion to this man's memory is so profound.

Lincoln cannot be quoted on both sides of any question touching humanity, since we know so clearly where he stood. We know as well as if he were speaking to us today what he would have said about some of the problems which confront us now.

Before our Nation is the grave problem of civil rights, the granting of the benefits and opportunities, as well as the obligations of our democracy, to all our citizens with no regard to race or creed or color.

Congress has before it today a program to assure full civil rights for all of our people. As a part of that program it has before it a bill to establish a Commission whose purpose would be to see that race and creed were not used as bars to equal opportunity to earn a living.

Where would Lincoln stand on the question of an FEPC?

Lincoln said that the leading object of our Government—and these are his exact words—is "to elevate the condition of men; to lift artificial weights from all shoulders; to clear the paths of laudable pursuits for all; to afford all an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race for life."

Can anyone doubt where he would have stood?

Listen to what Lincoln says to us today:

"What constitutes the bulwark of our liberty and independence?" he asks us. And then he replies, "It is not our frowning battlements, our bristling seacoast, our Army and our Navy. These are not our reliance against tyranny. All of those may be turned against us without making us weaker for the struggle. Our reliance is in the love of liberty, which God has planted in us. Our defense is in the spirit which prized liberty as the heritage of all men, in all lands everywhere. Destroy this spirit and you have planted the seeds of despotism at your own doors. Familiarize yourself with bondage and you prepare your own limbs to wear them. Accustomed to trample the rights of others, you have lost the genius of your own independence and become the fit subjects of the first cunning tyrant who rises among you."

Where would Lincoln have stood? We know, how well we know.

The question is, Where do we stand?

Do we measure up to his great, long dream of us, of an America great because it was free, and free for the very least among us?

Where do you stand?

Abraham Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, in honoring Abraham Lincoln on this one hundred and forty-third anniversary of his birth it is befitting that I recall to this distinguished body a brief history of his service as a Representative of the Seventh District of Illinois.

Abraham Lincoln was elected as a Whig to the Thirtieth Congress on March 4, 1847, to March 3, 1849, after having been nominated at a convention held at Pekin, Ill., which I am proud to say is my home town. The Seventh District of Illinois was, at that time, comprised of the counties of Putnam, Marshall, Woodford, Tazewell, Menard, Mason, Cass, Morgan, Scott, Logan, and Sangamon. While Lincoln's service as a Member of Congress was not spectacular, he began evidencing at that time some of the courage of personal conviction that made him one of the outstanding leaders in world history.

Some of the words which he uttered at the time of his service, and afterward, are well worth repeating here, especially at this time when we are being carried in this headlong rush toward socialism. Lincoln said:

1. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift.
2. You cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong.
3. You cannot help strong men by tearing down big men.
4. You cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer.
5. You cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred.
6. You cannot help the poor by destroying the rich.
7. You cannot establish sound security on borrowed money.
8. You cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn.
9. You cannot build character and courage by taking away man's initiative and independence.
10. You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves.

The Lonely Lincoln

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Sunday Star of February 12, 1950:

THE LONELY LINCOLN

All of his biographers speak of how lonely Lincoln was. Gamaliel Bradford says: "He lived in a solitude which neither man nor woman ever perfectly penetrated. * * * He ruled over millions of men and women who loved him; yet he was enormously alone." The words here quoted were written 25 years ago. They confirm the declaration of R. H. Dana in March 1863: "He has no admirers, no enthusiastic supporters, none to bet on his head." To multitudes who cared about him were far from him, distant as the poles, inarticulate, perhaps dismayed by their instinctive apprehension of the tragedy they sensed coming.

Doubtless it generally is so. Shakespeare's divinity that "doth hedge a king" extends to presidents. The elevation of a man to leadership removes him from the people, Lincoln felt that; "thought of it," as Mr. Bradford remarks, "all the time." The melancholy of the uncommon commoner traced back to his isolation, and he mourned the fact. Yet nothing could be done about it. Lincoln was above, beyond human fellowship. There are many theories intended to explain this, but they are not adequate; they remain mere guesses as the years go by.

What matters most, however, is that Lincoln still is magnetic, still dynamic. He is one of the half dozen great world figures of the nineteenth century who continue to possess power to stir men's thoughts, to influence their actions. If he be the symbol of America as Whitman, Vachel Lindsay, James Oppenheim, and other poets have believed, then he represents all of us in the experiences, the ordeals of our lives. Our ways are cast in bitter times as his way was. We, too, are lonely. Moving in millions,

closer in terms of improved facilities of communication than our fathers ever were, we yet are like Lincoln in our insularity, one from another.

But it would be an error to fail to note the automatic, inescapable bonds by which humanity is identified with its best exemplars. Their destiny is that of the least of their fellows in the shifting kaleidoscope of history. If we are affected by the enemies of mankind, we just as truly are advantaged by those who are our friends. Lenin in his mausoleum in the Red Square at Moscow is dead, despite the Soviets, while Lincoln—even though he still is lonely in his shrine by the quiet Potomac—never has died. The difference is an affair of the enlightened spirit. Read again the familiar lines from the second inaugural, cut on the wall of his temple: "With malice toward none, with charity for all, with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right, let us * * * do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

These words remain a compelling affirmation. America is noblest in the ratio of its approach to the ideal which they represent. The same observation applies to the world at large.

There's Some Fine Print in Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Louisville (Ky.) Courier-Journal of February 4, 1950:

THERE'S SOME FINE PRINT IN FARM PRICE SUPPORTS

Potatoes are eye-deep in politics today. It is a shocker that 50,000,000 bushels of them may have to be destroyed—and by the Government, at that—though potato prices keep high in the stores and people are hungry in this land of surpluses. It is no wonder that there is more than the usual amount of buck-passing in Washington.

The highly dramatized situation seems about to open the eyes of Congress as well as the public to the inconsistencies of the farm program, to the evils of Government purchases that create scarcity and high prices. If Members are aroused to action it will be worth all the $62,500,000 the potato-dumping is likely to cost.

There are signs that eyes are being opened and political consciences stirred. There are signs also many a Member of Congress is ignorant of much of the fine print in the Agricultural Act that was passed last fall. All that many of them seemed to see at the time was the headlined fact that price supports would be kept high—90 percent of parity—and that on the surface this would mean that farmers would stay happy, and vote to keep their faithful Representatives.

However, blinded by the dazzling thought that they were voting themselves political credit, and brushing off several more practical alternatives, they fairly outsmarted themselves. This was certainly the case as to the potato politicians. By dint of logrolling here and there, helping the champions of other groups in consideration of help for their own crop, they held potatoes in the bill as subject to mandatory price supports.

Previously it was possible for the Government to help clear potato surpluses by sending large quantities for school lunches and welfare institutions. The law permitted the Government to pay transportation and handling costs, so that the whole transaction was free, potatoes and incidental charges as well. But it applied only to "perishable nonbasic agricultural commodities," which were not under mandatory supports. Once the friends of potato-growing constituents got their product on the mandatory-support list, they were stopped by section 411 of the act from most of the benefits of free distribution.

The curious law permits the Government to pay freight and handling only if price-supported perishable foods are to be used to feed livestock. Potatoes might come under this head. But if the same perishables are to go to school lunches, welfare groups, or commercial processors, it must be f. o. b. at the shipping point. Secretary Brannan told the Senate committee this week:

"The paradox of a situation in which we would pay transportation costs on potatoes going for livestock feed, but would be forced to assess such charges to those who wanted them for human food, is so obvious that we feel obligated to discontinue paid-freight distribution for livestock feed."

And so the country is beguiled by the prospect of destruction of food for no other reason than that the law says its price must be supported; and that, being supported, the food is over-produced by farmers who know a good thing when they see it.

The potato situation is but one item, and a comparatively small one, in the price-support picture. This newspaper hopes to discuss shortly the broader aspects of the law and to point out what it considers to be follies and dangers. If Members of Congress, aroused by the potato scandal in which they have abetted the big commercial growers, don't move swiftly to mend matters, where will be the end?

Memorandum on the Proposed Bill To Provide for Certain Exemptions From the Federal Admissions Tax

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the Internal Revenue Code be amended so as to provide that admissions to a limited number of political facilities be exempted from the tax levied on admissions by section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code. The proposed amended Code seeks to have admisssions to swimming pools, bathing beaches, public parks and other similar facilities, operated and maintained by the United States, or any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or any political subdivision of a State or Territory, declared exempt from the so-called Federal admissions tax. The proposed amendment also provides that no penalties shall be assessed in respect to past offenses relating to taxes on admissions to such facilities enumerated and specified in the proposed exemption.

The revenue cost to the Federal Government from this proposed exemption is almost nil. The consequences to the public health and juvenile delinquency programs of cities will be great.

The impetus to propose this amendment was precipitated by the decision of the Supreme Court of the United States in Wilmette Park District against Campbell, Collector of Internal Revenue, on December 12, 1949. In that case the Court held that the Wilmette Park district, a political subdivision of the State of Illinois, was liable for penalties for failure to collect, return, and pay taxes which were due and owing on admissions charged to enter the park and bathing facilities operated and maintained by the park district. The Court held that the charge made by the park district for use of its swimming beach were in fact admissions within the purview of section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code and that the park district had the duty to collect and remit the Federal tax levied on such admissions. It was also emphasized in the Wilmette decision that under the present provisions of the Internal Revenue Code, Congress did not intend to exempt any admissions to activities like those here involved, that is, not conducted for gain, although Congress might readily have done so.

Many governmental units, and particularly those at the local level, have maintained and operated for many years swimming pools, bathing beaches, and public parks for the benefit of their citizens. Problems of local finance have, in many instances, required that nominal admission charges be levied in order to operate and maintain such facilities. These facilities are designed to fill an important public need by affording wholesome and beneficial recreation and relaxation chiefly to children, and in some instances to adults, who are unable to afford similar facilities operated by private organizations. The health value of such programs and their tremendous value in combating juvenile delinquency are obvious, as these facilities give children something wholesome to do during summer months when schools are closed. The public welfare requires that any admission charges to such facilities be kept at a minimum as children have only a few cents to spend. While the Federal admissions tax is not a large levy, it increases the charge to be paid by those who can ill afford anything but a token charge for recreation and relaxation, and imposes difficult duties upon the cities operating these facilities—duties all out of proportion to the small amount of revenue to the Federal Government derived from this source.

Some cities, counties and other political subdivisions have in the past collected, returned and remitted taxes on admissions to swimming pools, bathing beaches and public parks. Unfortunately, however, many other local governments have not collected, returned or remitted such taxes in the sincere belief that section 1700 of the Internal Revenue Code levying a tax on admissions did not apply to such public facilities. The impact of the Wilmette decision on such communities will be of considerable magnitude for the decision allows United States collectors of internal revenue to

assess penalties against local governmental units in the amount of the taxes which should have been collected. The assessment of such penalties would add immeasurably to the already staggering burdens of local finance and the serious ramifications of local taxation.

This memorandum in support of the proposed amendment to the Internal Revenue Code, to exempt admission charges to swimming pools, bathing beaches and public parks operated by governmental units and to provide that penalties shall not be assessed for past offenses relating to the taxes now levied on such admission charges, has been prepared in summary form, but it is believed it covers the great problem from which cities need the proposed legislation. Realizing the importance of such facilities to local communities, the dire and pressing fiscal problems of all governmental units, and the importance of sound local government to the welfare of the Nation, it is hoped that the Congress of the United States will enact the proposed amendment providing for the aforesaid limited exemptions from the Federal admissions tax.

Four Hopeful Movements in the World Today

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DWIGHT L. ROGERS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an address by Rev. E. Stanley Jones, which I had the pleasure of hearing delivered at the Calvary Methodist Church of Washington, D. C.

Dr. Jones has been and is an outstanding religious leader of the world.

FOUR HOPEFUL MOVEMENTS IN THE WORLD TODAY

(By E. Stanley Jones)

There are four hopeful movements in the world today. Amid the encircling gloom, four things stand out as stars of hope: (1) The movement for world government. (2) The Christian missions movement. (3) The movement to win the 70,000,000 Americans who are members of no church—Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant. (4) The movement to unite the churches of America.

The movement for world government is a growing pressure from beneath, pressing on governments for action—a people's movement. It will probably go through the United Nations, or if this is impossible, then around the United Nations through a peoples' convention to the establishment of a world security for everybody. Under this security of world law, Russia would have a chance to carry out her way of life, within Russia; America would have a chance to carry out her way of life, within America. All other nations the same. Then the one with the best order would win. I am not afraid of that test, for underlying our civilization we have something lacking in Russia, a Christian basis. In the long run that will be the deciding factor. If this collective security were honestly set up for everybody, I am persuaded that the satellites of Russia would desert her and take world collective security instead of Russian security.

While this is a peoples' movement, yet the political leaders are in it too—over 100 in the House of Representatives of the United States, and over a hundred members of the British Parliament are committed to world government now. Twenty-four State legislatures have already voted for world federal union. Sixty-five percent of the people of America voted in a poll for America to delegate sovereignty to a world federal union. It is a rising tide as the half-answers are proving incapable of bringing peace and security for all.

The second hopeful movement is the movement of Christian missions, especially in relation to Japan. When I landed on the airport at Tokio a newspaperman ran up and said, "Sir, all Japan is talking about Christianity, what have you to say in regard to it?" An exaggeration, of course, but Christianity, from being a marginal sect, had moved to the center of the life of Japan as the subject of a national choice. With the disastrous defeat of Japan the bottom dropped out of the inner life of that people. They had been taught that they were a divine people, with a divine emperor, with a divine destiny to rule. That whole concept went down in blood and ruin and left a moral vacuum in the soul of Japan. Shintoism and Buddhism are too feeble to reorganize the inner life of Japan. Two virile forces are rushing into that vacuum—communism and Christianity. The life of Japan will be organized around one or another of these systems and that perhaps in 10 years. For the time being Christianity has the inside track I have done evangelistic work around the world for 42 years but never have I seen such spiritual responsiveness and hunger as Japan. They hang on your words wanting some sure word from God to fill the awful inner vacuum. In some places they charged admission, 10 yen, to get into evangelistic meetings and everyone was given a decision card when he went in and his name registered. They packed the buildings. In two meetings in Matsuyama 930 people signed cards saying they wanted to follow Christ, be baptised and come into the Christian church. In Tokio in one meeting 715 signed cards. We begged them not to do it through mere politeness, but only if it meant a real decision to go through the whole meaning of being a Christian. Even with these brakes on over 8,000 people signed cards within a month. Cut it in half and say only half really meant it, though for the life of me I don't see why they all didn't mean it, and yet the opportunity is amazing.

General MacArthur, whom I consider the author of the most outstanding piece of constructive work since the war, said to me: "The church has not faced a situation like this in 500 years anywhere. Where you have sent one missionary send a hundred and lay the foundations broad and deep to make this a Christian nation, for Japan will never become a democracy until it becomes Christian."

We have prayed for an open door in Japan and now the whole half side of the house is out. We must give Japan our best without any strings attached. For if the Japanese become Christian they can be the natural evangelists to the whole of the Far East. The old dream of national conquest has gone down in blood and ruin and a new dream of being the agents of a new order, the Kingdom of God, is beginning to take shape. They are virile people and will go far.

The third hopeful thing on the horizon is the fact that in America 38 denominations representing 38,000,000 Christians have united to make this mid-century year the year of evangelism in a concerted effort to win the other half of America to Christ. A vast mission field of 70,000,000 is at our doors. And the church is beginning to realize that if it can't convert it has lost its right to be called Christian. For the Christian faith is a contagion or it is not Christian. The laity are being mobilized to go out two by two and win people to a double allegiance to Christ and the church. This is putting evangelism where it should be—in the soul of the laymen. This will help individuals to a new life and will strengthen the moral and spiritual foundations of this country for the half century ahead.

The fourth hopeful movement is the movement toward an ecumenical church. This means that the Christians are beginning to feel the sense of solidarity of being Christians, that if we belong to Christ we automatically belong to each other. We may betray that brotherhood, but we cannot deny it.

The ecumenical movement will be precipitated into some form of union. There are four proposals for union before the American people: (1) That union be organized around the existing councils of churches on the local, State, National, and international level. (2) That the churches federate to do certain things together. Both these two proposals are good but not good enough, for they are this side of union leaving the denominations sovereign and intact, surrendered to nothing beyond themselves. (3) Merger. Where denominations have sufficient affinity with each other to merge, without splitting, then I'm in favor of it. But, if merger is taken as an over-all strategy for union, then it will result in a minority merging, leaving the majority outside, which would not be church union, but a union of some churches. We must have church union. (4) Federal union offers the possibility of church union now. The principle of Federal union would mean that the denominations would come together on the same basis as the Colonies came together—a Federal union but with local self-government or States' rights in the constituent branches. There would be one church: The Church of Christ in America," or "The United Church of America," but under it there would be branches, no longer separate, sovereign churches, but branches of the one church—the Episcopal branch of the Church of Christ in America, the Lutheran branch, the Baptist branch, etc. Within those branches there could be local self-government. If any branch wanted bishops or adult baptism by immersion it could keep such distinguishing characteristics but it wouldn't compel the rest to take them as the price of union. Then would be a union of diversity and not a union of uniformity.

Federal union puts together two urges—the desire for union with the whole, and the desire for local self-government. Applied to these States it has made us the most united people on earth—united in difference. Applied to the churches it could mean a union of rich diversity, for God has raised up these different denominations to emphasize forgotten or neglected truth. Now the same spirit of God that raised them up is moving on them to bring together these emphases and share them with the rest, not by compromise but by comprehension.

There is a peoples' movement on. In the 125 cities where we have gone with this crusade for a united church the most that have ever voted against federal union were 11 people out of an audience of 4,500 in San Antonio, Tex. The Christians, with the largest single allegiance, hold the balance of power in this country. United they could go anywhere and do anything—anything that's right. Christians of America, unite; you have nothing to lose except your dividing walls.

Oil-Depletion Allowance and National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to include in the RECORD a statement I made to the Committee on Ways and Means in regard to the necessity for continuing the 27½ percent depletion allowance for the oil industry.

I hope the Members will read this statement, since the reasons for this allowance have become so confused to those who do not have an intimate working knowledge of the Nation's oil industry. I strongly feel that we will endanger our national defense by crippling this vital industry if this depletion allowance is eliminated or reduced, since it is almost entirely true that the present healthy oil-development program in the United States is created by this allowance.

The statement follows:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I ask this opportunity to place before you my views on the proposed oil tax depletion clause because of the great harm I am sure will result from eliminating or reducing this allowance.

I presently represent one of the largest oil-producing districts in America. My district is of particular significance because of the fact that a large part of the oil activity in my district is carried on entirely by small independent operators. This is the group which does the most in the field of oil exploration and development and which is now receiving the greatest benefit from the oil-depletion clause. If this allowance is cut, this part of our oil industry will be driven out of business. Any person who has an intimate knowledge of the oil industry knows that we must maintain our independent operators if we want to maintain a growing industry.

This is true because in the field of "wildcatting" it is the independents who will spend the time and money required to find new oil reserves. This activity is such a great financial risk that few of the major companies are willing to engage in this field.

Elimination of the depletion clause would wreck the independent producing business in the United States because it would prevent these producers from getting back capital invested which is necessary if they are to continue in business. It would reduce exploratory work and the finding of new oil reserves to an extent which would menace the security of this Nation. It would make us, within a few years, dependent on foreign oil which might be shut off in case of war.

References made in the President's tax message to Congress are most misleading. These evidently were based on information from a few abnormal cases rather than on actual conditions which obtain for the oil-producing industry as a whole.

No other industry is as hazardous as that of the oil producer. During the last year, 82 percent of all "wildcat" wells drilled in the United States were dry. Only 15 percent were producers and 3 percent were gas wells. This so-called wildcatting deals with the problem in areas where no oil has been previously produced and is the way in which all new oil reserves are discovered.

After an area has been proved by such a "wildcat," drilling still remains a big gamble. Of all the wells drilled in the United States last year in these so-called proved areas, 25 percent were dry, 66 percent produced oil and 9 percent produced gas. Since oil was first discovered in America to the present day total drilling shows that only one well out of each seven wells drilled has produced oil or gas in paying quantities. Congress realized this situation long ago. Efforts made to provide the oil industry with sufficient help culminated in 1926 with what we now have as the 27½-percent depletion allowance. This figure was reached by compromise after a survey of the industry from 1918 to 1925 disclosed that actually the depletion figure was between 32 and 33 percent.

When oil or gas is produced from a property, there is a reduction in the capital represented by that oil or gas in place. The depletion allowance is designed not only to permit the producer a return of that amount of capital tax free, but also a return of capital invested in finding that oil or gas.

That is a point Mr. Truman failed to mention. He stated, "In the case of oil * * * the depletion exemption goes on and on, year after year, even though the original capital investment in the property has already been recovered tax free, not once, but many times over."

Each individual producing property or lease is considered separately in figuring the depletion allowance. Some producers have drilled as many as 20 wells before finding oil. Their capital investment in finding oil is far greater than the capital invested in that twenty-first well.

So, while depletion allowance for one producing property may, over a period of years, total more than the investment in that one property, it still falls short, in most instances, of returning to the producer all the capital he has invested in various properties in search for production. As the Government survey showed, the depletion allowance for the producing industry as a whole should be 32½ percent instead of the present 27½ percent.

Independent oil producers constitute only a part of the number of persons who would be harmed by elimination of the depletion clause. In 1948, the oil industry paid $1,200,000,000 in oil royalties, and lease bonuses and rentals. This money was expended in 37 States, 28 of which are oil-producing. Farmers, merchants, and others in all lines of businesses benefited from these payments. More than 200,000,000 acres, or 10 percent of the area of the United States, is under lease for oil and gas exploration and development by oil and gas companies.

I estimate as a conservative figure that at least 95 percent of the total population of my congressional district will be directly or indirectly affected to a harmful extent, if this depletion allowance is cut or taken away. It will be a general hardship that my communities cannot withstand.

Another illustration of why the depletion clause is important to the continued success of the American oil industry can be found in a recent development in western Oklahoma. The discovery well in the new oil field at Elk City, Okla., cost $750,000 to drill and that cost did not include $750,000 to $1,000,000 spent previously in exploration and preliminary development work. This new source of oil for our Nation is now available because independents were willing to gamble and risk such huge sums. They took this risk because the depletion allowance gave them a minimum hope of recovering their capital. Acreage in this same area was held by major oil companies for more than 20 years without a single cent being spent by them in wildcatting.

If this depletion clause is cut or eliminated, the time will not be long before foreign oil imports will have to supplant, not supplement, American production because no new fields will be discovered. This is a historical fact proven by a study of the entire search for new oil reserves. You must have the wildcatting independents if this phase of the industry continues.

Loss of revenue to the States by reason of a declining oil production will upset fiscal programs in virtually every oil-producing State. Unemployment will become widespread throughout all oil-producing areas. The ultimate cost to the Government in relief and other means of absorbing this impact on our economy will far offset any immediate tax-revenue benefits the Government can hope to gain by taking away this tax exemption of the oil industry.

Mr. Chairman, I cannot emphasize too strongly the point that all is not black gold that glitters in the oil industry. We must not, for the sake of the Nation's economy and for national defense, make the mistake of thinking that a few isolated cases of immense riches that an oil strike brings is any more typical of the oil industry than could be said of any other industry.

Strange as it may seem, the fact still remains that more money has been invested in the search for oil and oil producing in the United States than has ever been earned from such investments or gambles. This is true only because the oil-depletion clause constitutes an invitation for risk capital in the most risky of all industries that otherwise will not be available.

Increase this already terrific gamble and risk, and you will stop the balanced and continuing search for new oil reserves that this Nation needs and must have.

Federal Aid for Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL D. PERKINS
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

CONFERENCE OF PRESIDENTS OF
NEGRO LAND GRANT COLLEGES,
KENTUCKY STATE COLLEGE,
Frankfort, Ky., February 6, 1950.

Hon. CARL D. PERKINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I am authorized by above-named organization to communicate to you its prayers and hopes that your Education and Labor Committee will report favorably on S. 246.

Our organization has a long record in support of legislation to provide financial assistance to the States for education because we know such aid is necessary for promoting the type of education which the people need and which our democratic society requires.

It is requested that this communication be made a part of any records, reports, or proceedings that the committee might issue.

May we hear from you?

Very sincerely yours,

R. B. ATWOOD,
Secretary.

Address by Secretary of the Air Force Before the Graduating Class of Baylor University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a most inspiring address by the Honorable W. Stuart Symington, Secretary of the Air Force, which was delivered before the graduating class of Baylor University, Waco, Tex., on February 1, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

For some years now I have been a member of your national defense structure, America's team of land, sea, and air; and certain observations might be of interest to you today in connection with problems incident to the future security of the United States.

In his recent message to Congress on the state of the Union, our great President outlined the position and responsibilities of our country at this turn of the mid-century. In that challenging address he said in part:

"The human race has reached a turning point. Man has opened the secrets of nature and mastered new powers. If he uses them wisely, he can reach new heights of civilization. If he uses them foolishly, they may destroy him.

"In the world today we are confronted with the danger that the rising demand of people everywhere for freedom and a better life may be corrupted and betrayed by the false promises of communism.

"While the world remains unsettled * * * and as long as our own security and the security of the free world require, we will maintain a strong and well-balanced organization."

It is common knowledge that the source of the unsettled conditions to which our Commander in Chief referred is the threat of communistic aggression. Four years ago World War II ended. In 1922, 4 years after the close of World War I, the major powers were able to sit around the conference table in Washington, in a conciliatory atmosphere, and arrive at an agreement for the reduction of armaments. This they accomplished because no major power threatened the peace.

Ever since the end of the last war, however, America has become increasingly aware there can be no true peace while there is this threat of Communist aggression.

Indeed we may have already lived so long in this postwar cold-war atmosphere that unrest and instability are now being taken for granted and, therefore, disregarded.

If so, that is a very serious matter, because such lack of interest might result in loss of our freedom.

Such disregard may be natural for normal, healthy, peace-loving people. In this air-atomic age, however, it is dangerous, because the cause for this unrest—Communist aggression—is a threat not only to the preservation of the peace but also to our existence as a nation.

Never in the history of the United States has it been more important to recognize the truth about the world we live in; to recognize that truth, and then to follow the proper course necessary for America's preservation, no matter what the sacrifices required.

As our President said, "We know now that this is not an easy task or a short one." Prof. Arnold Toynbee, famed historian, recently predicted that these secrifices might be required for the next 50 years. Toynbee assumed, of course, there would be no successful world conquest by the Communists.

Some 12½ years ago, in the summer of 1937, I went to the seat of a great world empire, a gay and busy city. It was the end of the London season. There were the usual number of parties. Some of the wealthy were watching their horses race; others were taking off for the Continent. With the exception of very few men, always and primarily Winston Churchill, foreign affairs were viewed with but normal apprehension. Many were sympathetic with Hitler. There was fear of Communist Russia, and fear of the growth of communism in the French Army, which was considered the greatest army in the world. As against these two fears, many favored Hitler's Germany as providing a balance of power and a bulwark state.

Douglas Reed, of the London Times, sounded consistent warnings from his post in Berlin. Churchill pleaded with the good people of his country, in epochal speeches which later composed a famous book, While England Slept.

Appeasement, however, was the order of the day. World trade and the stock dividends from it were important. Some were trying to buy security through appeasement—as if any nation can ever buy security through compromise with evil.

Fourteen months later came Munich. Some countries, particularly Czechoslovakia, felt they had been sold down the river. By then, however, there was no alternative, because the wolf had taken off his sheep's clothing. Hitler and his gangsters had revealed their true intent, and neither England, nor any other democracy, had adequate armament with which to trade against the war now sure to come.

In all free countries men stirred uneasily. They realized that soon they might be called upon to fight and die. They asked one another: "How did we ever get into this position so soon after having won before?"

How did they? That is the point of such critical importance to us today.

Less than 4 years later I again visited London, in early 1941. We sneaked up the coast of Portugal by air, praying for bad weather, hoping to avoid Hitler's dominant Focke-Wulf, long-range bombers, as they returned over the Atlantic from their attacks on Allied shipping.

Times had changed in London. Nobody took off for the continent of Europe except in battle planes, because the Nazis controlled that continent, just 20 miles away. Horses were being eaten instead of raced, and most of the entertainment was deep in the shelter of basements, comparatively safe from the bombs raining down overhead.

One of Britain's greatest battleships, the *Hood*, had been sunk. Worse to them, a large island, Crete, had just been conquered from the air.

The British people stood up with indomitable courage. Their leaders knew, nevertheless, that all which stood between them and slavery was the potential production, wealth, and manpower, of the United States.

At this point let me ask you—in case our country in turn is caught with its defense guard down, what nation has the strength to stand behind us as we stood behind England?

At present the people on this earth are, in effect, split in two main political groups. One group is headed by an aggression dictatorship, ruling some 285,000,000 people directly, plus many millions indirectly through puppet or satellite regimes. This central Communist dictatorship has reiterated many times to its own people and to the rest of the world that it is conducting the modern equivalent of a holy war against all nonbelievers.

In every issue of Communist dogma, under the title "Problems of Leninism," published over the signature of Stalin, appears this basic Communist tenet:

"We are living not merely in a state, but in a system of states; and it is inconceivable that the Soviet Republic should continue for a long period side by side with imperialistic states. Ultimately one or the other must conquer. Meanwhile, a number of terrible clashes between the Soviet Republic and the bourgeois states will be inevitable."

The above statement of Communist policy has been reiterated many times, and as recently as after the close of World War II in 1945.

Furthermore, Communist leaders denounce all spiritual faiths, dictating as a substitute the cynical and materialistic doctrine of communism. As we all know, but sometimes are prone to forget, the Communist does not believe in God. That is part of the foundation of his philosophy. He has always fought to destroy religion.

The leaders of Russia have not only constantly reiterated their goal of world domination; they have also predicted the doom of all other political systems, especially capitalism. They have inflamed all Communists against all non-Communists, wherever the latter may be. They have sealed off their own people behind an "iron curtain," while taking advantage of free access in other countries to create constant distress and confusion from within.

Theirs has been a ceaseless campaign of aggression; ideological political and economic; and wherever expedient, that campaign has been supported by guns and marching men.

In the middle thirties it was important to know what the people of France and England and Holland and Denmark and Belgium and Norway were doing. It was far more important, however, to know what the Nazis were doing. Were they really rearming? Did they really believe their marching slogan, "Today we rule Germany, tomorrow the world"?

I believe that in these United States, at this midcentury mark, the most important question for all of us today is, "What are the Russians doing?" Not what we are doing in the way of rearming, at some slight expense to our standard of living, but what are those other people doing—those people who say they cannot live in the same world with our way of life? What is their weapons program, and why?

Surely we Americans do not want to be caught at any future time the way the democracies were caught by Hitler in the thirties.

This we know. Those who reiterate America must be destroyed now have—

1. A ground army greater in numbers than the combined armies of the United States and its allies;

2. An Air Force whose strength in nearly all categories is now the largest in the world and growing relatively larger month by month; and

3. The world's largest submarine fleet; and an intensive submarine development and construction program.

It is our belief that if any democracy attempted to maintain in peacetime a comparable regular armed force, the free economy of that democracy would be wrecked. In Communist countries, however, the will of the rulers, and not the economy of the nation, is the controlling factor. People under a dictatorship do not know when great

streams of national wealth which could be used to raise their standard of living, are diverted instead to further the aggressive ambitions of their rulers.

The Communist government dictators have no problems of money, because all money is owned by the state. The coin of the realm is the order of the dictator.

Nor have these bosses any problem of labor, because they have millions of slaves, captive prisoners from other countries, as well as their own political slaves. From our standpoint, every citizen of their state is but a slave to the handful of rulers at the top.

All men in such positions of dictatorial power, uncontrolled by the checks and balances of representative government, disdainful of the dignity and rights of the individual, and dedicated to the belief that the end justifies the means, are, and always will be, a threat to the freedom-loving peoples of the world.

Here are three facts which every American should know, because this is the world in which we live:

1. Behind the iron curtain there has been an atomic explosion.

2. Behind that curtain is the air equipment capable of delivering a surprise atomic attack against any part of the United States.

3. We have no sure defense against such an attack.

The bleak picture is that today we have a group of dictators dedicated to destroy our way of life. They are capable now of unleashing, without warning, the world's largest ground army, air force, and undersea fleet. The gravity of this situation is multiplied many times by our knowledge of achievements being made by Russian scientists in the field of atomic energy.

I ask you, if these leaders want peace, why are they building their armed strength to such staggering proportions?

Today America holds the position of world economic, moral, intellectual, and in some respects, material leadership, in a struggle as bitter and fundamental as that in the Middle Ages between Islam and Christianity. In that ancient conflict the battleground was religious belief. It is with difficulty that we now understand the intensity of feelings which led to those holy wars. Many feel those dedicated to communism are, in effect, now waging a new religious war, with the dialectic materialism of communism the basis of a godless faith.

In the past the United States has been relatively safe, because our allies have given us the time necessary to build our defense against attack. Then we were at relatively safe distances from our enemies. That is no longer true. Distance is no longer any protection from the long arm and smashing fist of modern military air power. In this air-atomic age the oceans and polar wastes are not barriers against attack. Remember Russian soil is but 5 minutes flying time from the American soil of Alaska; and but a few hours away from our great cities. Waco is but an 18-hours flight from Moscow for the bombers we know Russia is now producing in quantity.

Based on these facts, are there any who would question the importance of this country maintaining as much military strength as will provide what George Washington called a respectable posture of defense? Would any of us like to forfeit either (1) the capacity to defend ourselves as best possible against sudden atomic air attack, or (2) the strategic air capacity necessary for instant effective retaliation against those who would make a surprise move against this country?

America is reconciled to the necessity for a peacetime defense program greater than ever required in the past. We must remain steadfast and alert until that day—God hasten it—when we can have complete assurance that any power, or combination of powers, which threatens peace will abandon their aggressive schemes and participate effectively in the community of nations to advance, and not destroy, civilization.

History teaches that mere races for armed might do not prevent wars. History also teaches, however, that weakness invites aggression.

Our patience in seeking peaceful solutions must not be interpreted as weakness. Rather it constitutes evidence of our own lack of aggressive designs, a manifestation of our sincere hope that as one member of a world organization, we may help to realize the aspirations of mankind for a permanent and responsible peace.

It is a basic dilemma of our time that those who menace our way of life may force arms expenditures of a magnitude that could cripple our economy and thus imperil our free institutions. I submit, however, that those who are critical of this administration for not bringing the national budget into balance may be guilty of ignoring the grim realities of the world in which we live.

I share the businessman's traditional dislike for deficitis and am not unaware of the desires of the American taxpayer to have his burden made lighter. But under the circumstances of today, I am convinced that no loyal and informed American would knowingly consent to dangerous concessions in our security program in order to achieve some otherwise desirable fiscal objective. The risks involved are too great—the stakes too high, for any such false economies.

The arithmetic of the distribution of your tax dollars and mine establishes that during the current and coming fiscal year one-third of that dollar, or 33 cents, is being allocated to the Army, Navy, and Air Force. This figure does not include foreign aid, part of our payment for security, which averages 14 cents.

Those who say they would destroy the United States are thus forcing us to spend heavily from our resources, not only for our national defense but also for the rehabilitation and strengthening of our Allies. They hope to force us into economic collapse.

This danger is always present—consequently efficiency and quality assume transcendent importance in all our preparations; and selectivity in the building of our defense structure grows increasingly vital to our solvency.

If it is more important to balance the budget than to guarantee our security, it would be a relatively simple matter for our President to do so by recommending still further reductions in appropriations for national defense.

Based on the facts presented to you above, however, I ask again, is there any American who wants to see our defense budget reduced further?

We have made the mistake more than once. Let us consider what a single mistake of this kind cost us in money alone—not to mention hundreds of thousands of American lives.

In 1913, at the start of the First World War, the national debt was a little over $1,000,000,000. That war heavily taxed our resources; and a few years later we went through the greatest depression of them all.

A new President came in. He helped those people who wanted work but couldn't find a job. He did so because he believed that human dignity was better for the Nation than poverty and want.

At the time we started, somewhat leisurely, rearming for the Second World War, the national debt was around $40,000,000,000.

Today this debt is about $257,000,000,000.

Could there ever be clearer proof of the cost of unpreparedness?

If reports received from behind the iron curtain are correct, in a short time Russia will be at its strongest position in armaments; and under their present program that position will increase steadily year by year. So, I say today that further reduction in our payment for national security is unthinkable.

Our able and conscientious Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, is doing everything possible to promote true unification of the services which will guarantee the taxpayer maximum security at minimum cost. He is doing a fine job. But, it was Mr. Johnson himself who said recently that our "watchword should be military security first, economy second."

Both he and our President were front-line fighters in one war waged to preserve our way of life. They know that peace can be lost—but they know also, and you know, that the current price to America of losing any modern war is slavery.

I remind you that there is little, if any, peace in the world today. We don't have peace just because the guns are silent. Tragically, we do have fronts where the shooting could begin at any time; and no one knows when or where.

The history of Texas is the history of a battle for independence. May you in this great State, and in all our other States, remember the cost of such battles. When those who want to represent us in the halls of our Government consistently close their request for votes with the stressing of two words—peace and prosperity—let us remember the long rows of those who have passed on to us another heritage, and who believed that we in turn would pass that heritage on to our children, and our children's children. Let us ask our statesmen to add a third word to the appeal of peace and prosperity. From Sam Houston to SAM RAYBURN one word is engraved on the heart of every Texan, every true American. That word is "freedom."

Second-Class Mail Rates Have Been Increased Many Times Since 1879

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the information was given out during the recent consideration of H. R. 2945, that the second-class mail rates have never been increased since they were first established in 1879.

This is contrary to the truth and fact as the rates have been revised several times, both downward and upward, and more often increased. The rates have been changed in the following years: 1885, 1917, 1925, 1928, and 1932.

I am glad to insert in the RECORD a brief history of the various changes, revisions, and increases in second-class mail rates since the Congressional Act of March 3, 1879, which established the second-class mail privilege and rates. My source of information is the report on second-class mail to the Postmaster General, submitted by Charles E. Hiss, special consultant, on May 21, 1946, pages 17, 18, and 19.

It follows:

PRINCIPAL CHANGES IN SECOND-CLASS POSTAGE RATES SINCE 1879

The act of March 3, 1879, established a flat rate for second-class matter of 2 cents per

pound or fraction thereof for other than (a) free-in-country service; and (b) for newspapers—other than weeklies—and periodicals deposited in a letter-carrier office for delivery by its carriers: 1 cent per copy except for copies exceeding 2 ounces in weight for which the rate was 2 cents per copy.

The act of March 3, 1885, reduced the 2-cents-per-pound rate to 1 cent.

The act of October 3, 1917, established a flat rate for reading matter portion and zone rates on advertising portion as follows:

(a) Reading matter:

1. On and after July 1, 1918, and until July 1, 1919, 1¼ cents per pound.

2. On and after July 1, 1919, 1½ cents per pound.

(b) Advertising portion:

	Date effective			
	July 1, 1918	July 1, 1919	July 1, 1920	July 1, 1921
	Cents per pound	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*	*Cents per pound*
Zones 1 to 2	1¼	1½	1¾	2
Zone 3	1½	2	2½	3
Zone 4	2	3	4	5
Zone 5	2¼	3½	4¾	6
Zone 6	2½	4	5½	7
Zone 7	3	5	7	9
Zone 8	3¼	5½	7¾	10

The act of February 28, 1925, reduced, effective April 15, 1925, the rates of postage on the advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	2
Zone 3	3
Zones 4, 5, and 6	6
Zones 7 and 8	9

This act also increased the rate of postage on nonprofit religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, and fraternal organizations from 1¼ cents per pound to 1½ cents per pound.

The act of May 29, 1928, reduced the rates per pound on advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	1½
Zone 3	2
Zone 4	3
Zone 5	4
Zone 6	5
Zone 7	6
Zone 8	7

The act of June 6, 1932, increased for a 2-year period, effective July 1, 1932, the rates on advertising portion, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	2
Zone 3	3
Zone 4	5
Zone 5	6
Zone 6	7
Zone 7	9
Zone 8	10

During fiscal years 1932–34 the volume decreased: These rates were lapsed, effective July 1, 1934, and the rates in effect prior to July 1, 1932, were restored, as follows:

Zones and amount per pound

	Cents
Zones 1 and 2	1½
Zone 3	2
Zone 4	3
Zone 5	4
Zone 6	5
Zone 7	6
Zone 8	7

These are the zone rates now in effect.

Cooperative Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement of William Green, president, American Federation of Labor, on the cooperative housing bill, H. R. 6618, before the House Banking and Currency Committee, February 14, 1950:

I am very glad to appear before your committee today to discuss a subject that has always been close to my heart, the problem of providing decent, comfortable housing for America's workers.

I consider this appearance in behalf of the American Federation of Labor of the highest importance. I have just returned from the winter meeting of the A. F. of L. executive council, at which the cooperative housing bill, H. R. 6618, introduced by Congressman SPENCE, was thoroughly considered. I bring to you this message: The American Federation of Labor pledges its full support for this middle-income cooperative housing program because we believe that, more than any previous housing legislation, it will really meet the needs of workers and their families. I am attaching a copy of that statement as an appendix to my testimony.

At our sixty-eighth convention, which met last October in St. Paul, Minn., a resolution was adopted unanimously urging enactment of the cooperative housing bill then before the Congress. The resolution pointed out that our postwar housing legislation has thus far failed to meet the needs of workers in the so-called middle-income group. It is because this new program is designed especially to meet the needs of the middle-income group that the convention unanimously urged that the cooperative housing bill be enacted at the earliest possible moment.

We in the American Federation of Labor have never supported any social or economic program unless we were convinced that the proposed program would meet a genuine and a specific need. We certainly apply that criterion to the subject of housing. It is because we believe that the cooperative housing program will meet a genuine and specific need which is not now being met that we are vigorously urging its immediate enactment.

I want to present our views regarding the present status of home building in this country before I discuss the specific points of the bill itself. I know that opponents of this legislation who have come before you during the past few days have argued that the private building industry which has just completed a record year can meet all of the housing requirements of the American people. If this were true, certainly there would be little need for the program you are now considering. Let us, therefore, examine the actual record of the private building industry to see if it is really meeting the housing needs of the American people and particularly of our moderate-income families.

An examination of the actual record will show that private builders have failed to pass two simple housing tests: quantity and quality. First, a word about quantity. The private builders are congratulating themselves on the fact that 1949 was a record home-building year with about 1,020,000 units constructed, as compared with the previous record of 937,000 units in 1925. Yet when we consider the growth in the Nation's population, the facts show that the 1949 record actually falls considerably below 1925, for in the latter year our population was smaller than it is today by more than 35,000,000.

Impartial sources agree that in order to meet our over-all housing requirements we need, not 1,000,000 homes a year, but a minimum of 1,500,000. Thus the 1949 record construction is only two-thirds of what is required to meet our minimum housing needs.

Nor does this 1949 record compare favorably with the output of other major industries. Compared with the 1920–29 decade, production of housing has increased much less than output of other commodities. Thus, in 1949, when industrial production was more than double our Nation's annual output during the twenties, housing construction had risen only 45 percent.

Not only is our housing woefully lacking in quantity, but in addition its quality is far below our standards for decent family living.

Gentlemen, I want you to find out about this quality for yourself. Last year a group of Senators and Congressmen, including, I believe, some from this committee, made housing history by visiting the District of Columbia slums within the shadow of the Capitol Building.

Now I am asking you to make housing history once more. I want you to make a visit to a number of private housing projects in the metropolitan Washington area to see for yourself whether private builders are meeting the housing needs of the American people.

You can get some idea of what you would find by studying a recent report of the United States Department of Labor analyzing housing units started in the Washington metropolitan area during the third quarter of 1949. According to this report, only 12 percent of the more than 11,000 apartment units built during that period had four and one-half or 5 rooms, and not one had more than five rooms. This means that only 12 percent of the units had two bedrooms, none had three bedrooms, and the remainder had one bedroom or none.

In the construction of one-family houses for sale, the report indicates that 60 percent of the homes started in the Washington area during this period contained only one bedroom, or no bedroom at all.

More detailed data concerning the survey are attached as appendix B.

To my mind, these figures are really shocking. They are a clear indication that private builders are forcing American families into housing units far too small for adequate family living.

Why has this been allowed to happen?

Let me call this to your attention. All of these apartments have been built with help from the Federal Government through the device of a Government-guaranteed mortgage approved by the Federal Housing Administration. I say that a chief reason for this shameful condition is the absurdly low standards which FHA uses to pass upon an application for an FHA guaranty. Let me point out one example of what I mean.

FHA sets a certain minimum size of space for rooms in a dwelling unit which builders of houses and apartments have to meet before they can get approval for FHA guaranteed loans. These standards simply do not provide enough space for decent family living.

Of course, in many cases builders do not construct apartments as small as they are allowed to by FHA, but in the Washington metropolitan area during the past few months, the situation with regard to size of apartments has definitely been getting worse.

Recently, our A. F. of L. housing committee noticed that some two-bedroom apartments now being made available in the Washington area were renting at $75 to $80 a

month instead of $85 to $95. Encouraged by this apparent trend, we asked a member of our research staff to inspect these apartments. He found that although the rents in these apartments were indeed somewhat lower than in most new apartment developments in this area, the living space had been reduced more than proportionately. In fact, the living space in these apartments is actually at or near the absolute minimum required by the FHA. For example, a typical two-bedroom apartment which our staff member inspected had the following measurements:

Living room: 10 feet 2 inches by 15 feet.

Bedroom: 10 feet 6 inches by 10 feet 2 inches.

Second bedroom: 8 feet 3 inches by 10 feet 8 inches.

Kitchen-dining space: 15 feet by 6 feet 2 inches.

This is an over-all area of about 440 square feet, which means that the total area of the apartment is about 525 square feet. These are apartments which are being rented to veterans in the Washington area with one, two, and sometimes even more children.

These are the housing units which private builders are constructing, and FHA is approving, for middle-income families. These facts by themselves are startling enough but they become even more vivid when we realize that the housing units the Federal Government is approving for middle-income families would not meet the standards set for low-income families in public-housing projects by the Public Housing Administration. In our opinion, the public-housing standards represent an absolute bare minimum for decent family living. A comparison between the standards set by FHA and those set by PHA for a two-bedroom unit as well as a three-bedroom unit is included as appendix C.

Gentlemen, I speak with the utmost sincerity when I say here today that if we permit these trends to continue, we are not only encouraging the construction of the slums of tomorrow, but we are creating definite psychological and community problems which will have a seriously injurious effect on every aspect of American life.

One of the most important reasons why we favor the cooperative housing bill is just because it can do so much to arrest this trend toward the construction of so-called homes which simply do not permit decent family living. We believe that this bill provides a workable method whereby moderate-income families can get together in cooperatives to build decent homes at prices that they can afford to pay.

No doubt others who have appeared before you have discussed the provisions of this bill in detail. I simply want to mention a few items with which we are particularly concerned.

Perhaps the major change in the bill now before you as compared with the legislation which your committee considered last summer, is the provision which will enable this program to be privately financed rather than supported by a system of direct Government loans. We approve the creation of a National Mortgage Corporation for Housing Cooperatives which would raise money by floating Government-guaranteed bonds and in turn loan this money to voluntarily organized cooperative housing associations. We believe that the financing arrangements in this bill will make possible an effective program under which the monthly housing costs in the projects constructed will fit the pocketbooks of middle-income families.

This bill will permit a 3-percent interest rate and a 50-year amortization period for the cooperative projects. I want to emphasize the fact that any increase in the gross interest rate or any decrease in the amortization period will be reflected in an increase in the required rents or monthly payments. This inevitably would mean closing off from the benefits of the program some of the families who are most in need of it. Likewise, any increase in the down payment will make it impossible for many middle-income families to participate in this program.

We have only one major criticism to make of the proposed amendment. That pertains to the question of administration. The legislation which you are now considering establishes a division within the Office of the Housing and Home Finance Administrator which would be charged with the administration of this program. We strongly believe that the cooperative housing program would be handicapped under such an arrangement.

A cooperative housing program for middle-income families represents a tremendous undertaking and an entirely new departure from previous housing programs. It must be headed by an individual who believes completely in the program, is vested with a certain amount of independence, and is fully responsible for the success of the program. That means that the agency he heads must be on the same administrative level with the Public Housing Administration and the Federal Housing Administration. It means further that the individual in charge of the program should be appointed by the President. We, therefore, strongly urge the establishment of a new unit, to be known as the Cooperative Housing Administration, within the Housing and Home Finance Agency, which would be responsible for the administration of this program.

I want to close my statement this morning by telling you in concrete terms what we think this cooperative housing program can accomplish.

We think that most of the cooperative groups organized under this program will construct multiunit developments, many of them so-called garden-type apartments. We think the savings made possible under this program will permit construction of apartments which, unlike so many of the apartments now being built under the FHA program, will be very attractive and of a decent livable size. These apartments could be built at an average cost of $8,000 for a 4½-room unit involving rents or monthly payments of no more than $55 to $65. This compares with rents for comparable units insured under the FHA of about $85 to $95 a month. These savings will be made possible through the nonprofit nature of the program, a very low vacancy rate, the use of tenant maintenance, and by the very substantial reduction achieved through the favorable financing terms.

Not all of the cooperative housing groups will wish to construct apartment-type projects. In some communities, particularly rural or semirural areas, members of such groups will undoubtedly want to construct free-standing homes. To cover such a possibility, the bill wisely provides a means whereby such families can eventually acquire individual ownership of their own homes after utilizing at the outset all the advantages of participation in a cooperative nonprofit group.

The American Federation of Labor is proud to have taken a leading part in the movement to obtain the cooperative-housing program for middle-income families. We have done so because we think it is the only program that can adequately meet the housing needs of millions of workers and their families. But I do not want to leave the impression that industrial workers will be the only group to benefit from this program. The fact that we have worked very closely with representatives of veterans, church, housing, and other public-interest groups indicates the broad support and the widespread appeal this program has.

I confidently expect that when this legislation is enacted members and affiliates of the A. F. of L. will play a leading role in making this program a success. I know from my own intimate knowledge of the housing needs of the American workers that there will be an immediate favorable response from A. F. of L. members and groups all over the country. I am sure that they will be taking a leading part in organizing cooperative housing projects for middle-income families. All of them are looking to your committee for the opportunity to participate in this great program.

APPENDIX A

STATEMENT ISSUED BY EXECUTIVE COUNCIL, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR, ON HOUSING AND RENT CONTROL

There has been much self-congratulation by the real-estate industry because 1949 was a record home-building year.

However, we feel it necessary to view that record realistically to find out how far it has contributed toward meeting today's acute housing shortage. Upon examination, it develops that the 1,019,000 homes built in 1949 is only slightly higher than the number constructed in 1925, a year when our population was smaller by more than 35,000,000.

Compared with the 1920–29 decade, production of housing has increased much less than production of automobiles or other consumer goods. Indeed, the 1949 record still represents only two-thirds of the level that is necessary if we are to lick the housing shortage within the next decade.

Not only has the 1949 level of construction failed to meet the over-all need, but it has particularly failed to meet the needs of moderate-income families, including, in particular, the majority of American workers. The average wage of factory employees today is about $55 a week. According to recognized standards, these workers cannot afford to pay more than 25 percent of their income or $60 a month for housing purposes. Last year, however, under the existing FHA private-housing program, rentals of new apartments averaged $90 a month and prices of new homes for sale averaged about $8,000, involving a monthly housing cost upward of $80. Clearly the housing needs of American workers and their families are not being met.

The real-estate interests point to the fact that moderate-income families are moving into these high-rent apartments and are buying these high-priced houses. The fact that soon moderate-income families may have somehow managed to pay far more than they can afford for privately built homes and apartments, in many cases at the expense of their health and well-being, does not indicate in any way that the real need of hundreds of thousands of middle-income families for decent homes at a price they can afford is being met under existing programs.

The crying need among American families today is a middle-income housing program. Such a program is now before Congress.

In the Senate, the Banking and Currency Committee is considering S. 2246 introduced by Senator JOHN SPARKMAN, as modified by an amendment introduced by Senator BURNET MAYBANK. In the House, a similar bill has been offered by Congressman BRENT SPENCE.

These bills would make possible private financing of long-term low-interest loans for cooperative housing projects for middle-income families. We estimate that under the terms of this bill rents for an average 4½-room apartment would be reduced to $55–$65 a month. This corresponds with rents of similar dwellings offered by private builders of $80 a month or more.

This program offers a practical means of obtaining decent homes for thousands of middle-income families at prices they can afford to pay. We urge its immediate enactment so that we can begin to meet the acute housing shortage of our moderate-income families.

However, we recognize that at the present time, the housing shortage is still with us.

Until the middle-income housing program as well as the low-rent public-housing program enacted last summer greatly increases our supply of homes, an effective rent-control program must be continued. We can safely remove rent controls in only one way—by building an adequate supply of homes that fit the pocketbooks of the millions of families who are without decent housing today.

JANUARY 31, 1950.

APPENDIX B

Housing started in Washington, D. C., Metropolitan Area, July–September 1949

ONE-FAMILY HOUSES

Number of rooms	Units		Average (square feet)	Comments
	Number	Percent		
Less than 3½	30	1	----------	No information available.
3½ and 4 rooms (1 bedroom)	450	14	790	Approximately ½ less than 700 square feet.
4½ and 5 rooms (2 bedrooms)	1,450	45	850	Over ⅛ less than 800 square feet.
5½ and 6 rooms (3 bedrooms)	1,200	38	1,160	Over ⅛ less than 1,000 square feet.
Other and unknown	60	2	----------	No information available.
All houses	3,190	100	970	30 percent less than 800 square feet, 20 percent more than 1,200 square feet.

APARTMENT PROJECTS

Less than 2½ rooms (no separate bedroom)	2,310	21	[1] 450	35 percent less than 400 square feet.
2½ and 3 rooms (no separate bedroom)	3,540	31	580	28 percent less than 500 square feet.
3½ and 4 rooms (1 bedroom)	4,050	36	650	33 percent less than 600 square feet.
4½ and 5 rooms (2 bedrooms)	1,370	12	730	46 percent less than 700 square feet.
All apartments	11,270	100	600	23 percent less than 500 square feet, 9 percent more than 800 square feet.

[1] Approximate.

Source: Characteristics of Homebuilding in the Washington Metropolitan Area, Third Quarter of 1949, Bureau of Labor Statistics, U. S. Department of Labor, Dec. 24, 1949.

APPENDIX C

Comparison of minimum space requirements Federal Housing Administration and Public Housing Administration, Washington, D. C.

Room	FHA requirement (square feet)	PHA requirement (square feet)
2-BEDROOM UNIT		
Living room	150	160
Kitchen-dining space	90	105
First bedroom	100	125
Second bedroom	70	110
Total	410	500
3-BEDROOM UNIT		
Living room	150	180
Kitchen-dining space	90	125
First bedroom	100	125
Second bedroom	70	110
Third bedroom	70	110
Total	480	650

Source: Minimum Physical Standards and Criteria for Planning and Designing PHA-Aided Low-Rent Houses, Dec. 13, 1949, Public Housing Administration. Minimum Property Requirements for Properties of Three or More Living Units, August 1948, Federal Housing Administration, p. 24.

About That Controversy Over Colorado River Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN R. MURDOCK

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, it was with pleasure I accepted an invitation from radio station KFI to send a transcription about 14 minutes in length on any subject which was thought to be of interest to the radio audience in the section around Los Angeles. I could think of no more important topic to discuss than one or two phases of the water controversy over pending legislation. There are so many aspects of this controversy and so little can be said in a 14-minute presentation, that I confined my radio talk to the two phases of the discussion which I thought of greatest interest to that radio audience. I wanted to make it clear to the people of the Los Angeles area that their municipal water supply was not endangered by my legislation, and I also wanted to make clear that any legal question as to who might rightfully use the waters flowing in the Colorado River could be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States under a provision inserted by two able Senators in the Senate version of the bill, and that the desired definite judicial decision would not be effected or even hastened by the various suit resolutions which have been so vociferously called for by some in Los Angeles. The transcription is as follows:

Friends, I am grateful to radio station KFI in Los Angeles for this opportunity to speak to this radio audience. As Congressman from the neighboring State of Arizona, I am deeply interested in our mutual progress. Commercially, Arizona is the hinterland of Los Angeles. We are in the same trade zone, and we have commercial and business ties that are very close. What hurts one hurts the other, and what benefits one benefits the other. Therefore, we ought to consider our mutual relations with great care. There exists a controversy between Arizona and California, or rather between Arizona and certain agencies in southern California over the division of the waters of the Colorado River. This is a tremendously vital problem which I want to discuss, but first let me say I have many personal friends throughout the great State of California and I have a deep personal interest in the State of California, second only to my interest in the State of Arizona. Now to this controversy.

All Members of Congress from Arizona are sponsoring legislation such as S. 75 and H. R. 934 in the present Congress which would provide for building another large dam on the Colorado River at the head of Lake Mead at the Bridge Canyon site, very much like the Hoover Dam which forms Lake Mead. Another feature of this legislation besides the dam and the power plant would be an aqueduct and facilities to carry 1,200,000 acre-feet of water annually from the Colorado River into central Arizona, very much as the All-American Canal and the metropolitan aqueduct are now carrying water into southern California. This central Arizona project as a whole is estimated to have a total cost of a little over $700,000,000. However, less than $300,000,000 of that would be the cost of the facilities to carry the water where it is greatly needed in central Arizona. Competent engineers and water authorities, not only in the Government but outside the Government in the Western States, have given long and careful study to this Arizona proposal and have approved it in spite of all contentions raised against it. Can all of these water authorities and engineers be wrong? That question ought to be considered by every citizen of the Pacific Southwest who does not want to be hoodwinked by a fog of propaganda.

The chief opposition to this Arizona project emanates from Los Angeles. Most of the witnesses who have appeared before congressional committees have been members of, or attorneys for, the Colorado River Board of California who have contended that Arizona has no such quantity of water to be legally used by her out of the Colorado River and that should Arizona be given the use of that quantity of water, it would deprive California of the use of water which is legally hers. That is what they say or clearly imply. That contention I most emphatically deny and I shall presently explain why I deny it.

The widespread propaganda which is being carried on conveys the idea to the millions who are reached by it that this Arizona move, if successful, would deprive Los Angeles of her municipal water even to the extent of robbing kitchen faucets today and would also prevent the great metropolitan aqueduct from serving the purpose for which you built it. This spirit of propaganda is very misleading. They may not say in so many words that the present aqueduct is running full now with water for Los Angeles which would be taken to Arizona, but they imply as much and millions of people believe that such is true. Such is not true. Arizona wants to take no water from Los Angeles.

The metropolitan aqueduct is a great piece of engineering. It is a waterway capable of carrying a billion gallons of water daily from the Colorado to Los Angeles. To build another today like it would undoubtedly cost a half billion dollars, but it would not be necessary, as this one is scarcely used. How much is the metropolitan water district using their aqueduct today? Let me tell you. I fear it would make the citizens of Los Angeles very indignant if they knew how little it is being used and for what they are paying. The United States Geological Survey knows to the gallon how much water has been diverted into that aqueduct out of Lake Havasu on the Colorado River during the 9 years from 1941 to 1949, inclusive. Has it been used to full capacity? No. Or to three-fourths capacity? No. Or to one-half capacity? No. Or to one-quarter capacity? No. During the 9 years of its use it has been used to less than 7 percent of its capacity. If there is a water shortage in Los Angeles, there need not be, because Lake Havasu behind Parker Dam is a great man-made lake in the Colorado River from which that aqueduct leads and it has always been ample during the past 9 years to supply Los Angeles with approximately a billion gallons daily if the authorities had seen fit to use the aqueduct's capacity. Your experts testified in Washington in 1948 that

Los Angeles was using one sixty-fourth—mind you, one sixty-fourth of its capacity.

Ah, but some of you who know the fact that Los Angeles is getting her water supply from other sources may say, "We are holding the Colorado aqueduct in reserve for future when our population has doubled." Well, how much could Los Angeles expand over and above the present population and still be amply provided by the present Colorado aqueduct? According to reliable figures, the present population of Los Angeles might double today and still not require the billion gallons daily of additional water from the Colorado River which the aqueduct could bring to add to the present supplies from the Owens River aqueduct and local sources. Ah, but you say, "Los Angeles is going to more than double in population within the next 15 or 20 years. In fact, the population has doubled each decade since 1890." Yes, we are told in congressional hearings, that the population of Los Angeles has doubled every 10 years for a half century, and the implication of one witness was strong that he expects the population of Los Angeles to continue to double each decade for the next 50 years. If such should be a fact, which I more than doubt, it would mean that the Los Angeles area, by the close of this century, would have a population of 100,000,000 souls. Such a notion is ridiculous. Let us combine sense and justice in our planning.

No, my friends, if the metropolitan water district would carry through the Los Angeles aqueduct 1,212,000 acre-feet of water annually which it can carry, that amount, in addition to the supply from your local sources and the Owens River, will provide for a population of more than 10,000,000 souls according to the best authorities. The additional water for the metropolitan aqueduct is in the Colorado River and no one in Arizona will deny that it is California's water. Why do I say that? Because California is allotted a supply of 4,400,000 acre-feet by Federal law and also by California law, which is not disputed by Arizona, and that amount is exactly four times what the big aqueduct was designed to carry. Think of it—you could build three more such aqueducts of the same size and still be within the large amount legally allotted to California.

Well, you say if it is a matter of legal right, let's have it settled by the Supreme Court. I too would like to have the Supreme Court tell these two States—Arizona and California—definitely just how much water they are legally entitled to out of the main stream of the Colorado River. The problem is to get such a controversy squarely before the Court so that it will take jurisdiction and make that definite decision. Certain Californians have proclaimed loudly that they want a Supreme Court decision and have introduced suit resolutions ostensibly to obtain such a decision by the High Court. But such resolutions will not effect a decision. Although these various suit resolutions have been fully considered by four different committees of the House and the Senate in the Eightieth and in the Eighty-first Congresses, none of these four committees has taken favorable action on those resolutions. Since these committees are made up mainly, or entirely, of distinguished lawyers, their refusal to report out these resolutions is very significant.

I am positively convinced that enactment of one of these suit resolutions would not bring about an effective judicial settlement which we want. Instead, I believe that had one of these California-sponsored suit resolutions been favorably acted upon by Congress, that such would have had the effect of stymieing all necessary legislation by Congress without furnishing Arizona or California a day in court. The effect of such a resolution, instead of furthering a settlement by the High Court, would have been a blind alley—a dead-end street—which would have gotten us exactly nowhere toward a final judicial settlement.

It's easy to say that a controversy of this sort ought to be decided by the highest court of the Nation, but we must remember that it is necessary to have a justiciable issue—that is, to get the issue squarely before the Supreme Court so that it can take judicial notice and jurisdiction. Now, what is the situation? Arizona can get no water out of the Colorado River, even though it is clearly her own water, unless we have legislation by Congress authorizing it. California needs no further legislation since the Boulder Canyon Act of 1928 granting her 4,400,000 acre-feet of firm water, and California has the physical equipment to take three times that amount of water out of the Colorado River.

What Arizona is asking for now in House Resolution 934 is an act of Congress authorizing Arizona to use her share of water, just exactly as Congress authorized California to use her share of water in 1928. Incidentally, California did not ask for any Supreme Court decision either before or after the passage of the Boulder Canyon Project Act which authorized the Hoover Dam and the All-American Canal.

If it is true that the supply of Los Angeles' water is not jeopardized, why are all these highly paid lobbyists here in Washington opposing the Arizona measure? It is plainly apparent that authorities of Los Angeles have been willing workers, along with a small group of Californians managing the Imperial Irrigation District, to prevent Arizona from getting any water out of the main stream of the Colorado River. They have put up the same fight unsuccessfully before.

Now, Imperial Valley is a great winter garden spot. Does it need water? Yes, but it has more water than it can use, so that the managers of the All-American Canal which furnishes the water to the Imperial Valley have been wasting into the Salton Sea more water annually than the Colorado Aqueduct could carry to the west coast. If you ask them why, they say they have more land bordering Imperial Valley to irrigate. But the Federal Department of Agriculture, the Department of the Interior, and the University of California have all declared that such land is not irrigable.

No, citizens of Los Angeles, there is really no quarrel between your city and my farmers. Your water supply is not jeopardized by my farmers or even by the farmers in the Imperial Valley, who are using more water than they need and who could give up some. Your water supply from the Colorado River is being jeopardized, just as Arizona's water supply is being jeopardized, by Californians who want that water to pass the Parker Dam (where your supply is diverted) in order to use that water, not for irrigation even in California, but for profitable use on and beyond the Mexican border. This is a matter which needs a thorough understanding of the people of the metropolitan area.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, at San Francisco

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at San Francisco, Calif., on February 9, 1950, at a Lincoln Day meeting under the auspices of the California Republican State organization and the San Francisco County Republican Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Americans, tonight we celebrate, with other meetings across the land, the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln, the great emancipator, the great American, the cofounder of our party, and the molder of its never-dying principles.

The American people believe in the precepts, the admonitions, and the examples of Abraham Lincoln.

"Four score and seven years ago our fathers brought forth on this continent a new nation, conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

True, oh, so true, are those words of Lincoln.

And again:

"Now, we are engaged in a great civil war; testing whether this Nation, or any nation so conceived and so dedicated, can long endure."

Once again that crucial test confronts us: whether we shall preserve in America individual freedom or surrender it to an all-powerful Federal Government; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures or continue to lose the peace by secret agreements, inefficiency, and drift.

Upon the decision of the American people hangs the life or death of our Republic.

We shall fight for our American heritage.

We will fight against the radical, alien-minded forces that are plunging America down the road to an all-powerful, spend-thrift, socialistic Federal Government.

And, of one thing I am sure, this time, in the 1950 election, we Republicans are going to fight.

In our opposition to their phony panaceas we shall give no quarter, no compromise, no "me too."

Red socialism has not worked anywhere, and we don't want it here.

Oh, yes; there are those who say: Don't worry; just relax.

They say all the President and his followers in Congress are attempting to do is to lure votes; making demagogic appeals; and that they have no intention to enact their socialistic spendthrift legislation.

This view of such a cynical procedure raises the naked issue of sincerity.

But challenges of insincerity will not stop this menace which threatens our form of Government. It can only be stopped by the Republican Party in the 1950 election.

I come to you from the firing line in Washington; and make no mistake about it, the President, over and over again, has officially demanded adoption of his radical schemes, which lead straight to the police state.

Don't let anyone mislead you. President Truman is going all-out to socialize America, just as they are socializing Great Britain. That is the pattern.

He has asked officially for power, power, and more power: power to deliver to the pressure groups; power to put ceilings over prices and wages, and floors under prices and wages; power to build and operate steel plants, and any other plant, in direct competition with private enterprise, to meet his ideas of what a balanced national economy should be; power over education, housing, health, and worst of all: power over food from farm to table.

He seeks to impose the monstrous Brannan plan, under which farmers would become the regimented wards of Government bosses, and all taxpayers and consumers would be swindled.

Under its provisions, the farmers will have to account for every head of livestock and every head of cabbage.

It will take a Gestapo to enforce it, penalties, fines, and jail sentences.

And, you consumers, out of your hard-earned dollars will be taxed to pay the bill.

Ah! don't be fooled, you are not going to get something for nothing.

All of these proposals are before the Congress. Many of them are on the calendar. And this administration is going all-out to elect Congressmen who will help force passage of these measures.

His campaigners will promise you this, and they will promise you that, but they never tell you what they will cost.

They will cost billions and billions of dollars; and, think of it, the Federal Government, today, is broke, flat broke.

The Government will be in the red five billion this fiscal year, much more next year, and the national debt is now more than the actual wartime peak.

The President is playing hocus-pocus. He is manufacturing money, through the banking system, to cover up the deficit.

This administration is spending $250 more than it takes in—every time your watch ticks.

This administration wrote 274,000,000 checks last fiscal year.

These deficit-spending dollars are contagious inflation dollars. They are Typhoid Marys. The President and his lieutenants, boldly attempt to justify deficit spending. They glorify it, but let me remind you, it has wrecked every government that has tried it.

It is just as certain with the Government, as it is with you, if you continue to borrow more than you can repay.

Deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy. And the first victims, already hit by the shrinkage in the purchasing power of the dollar, are people who live on fixed incomes, people who hold life-insurance policies, people who have saved for the rainy day, and for their children's education.

At the rate this administration is going, our dollar, which is already a rubber dollar, will be worth about as much, in the market place, as a bale of Chinese currency.

To finance his venture into the great blue yonder, the President asks for higher taxes.

He says he will relieve you of additional taxes by placing them on business.

But, again, fellow Americans, don't be fooled.

You carry the tax burden.

Wherever taxes are taken from business, they are passed on in your cost of living.

Do you know that in the building or the purchase of a house, there are 639 Federal and State taxes?

Do you know that in a loaf of bread there are more than 150?

And, now, you ladies listen to this: Do you know that when you buy your Easter bonnet, you will pay 150 different taxes?

When the Truman campaigners tell you that a little socialism won't hurt, remind them of Lincoln's simple words:

"Property is the fruit of labor; property is desirable; is a positive good in the world. That some should be rich shows that others may become rich, and hence is just encouragement to industry and enterprise. Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

The warning alarm of insolvency is coming from all sides.

Democrat Representative CANNON just said: "From every point of view, our fiscal situation is the most unfavorable in the peacetime history of the Republic."

Remember what Lenin, the Russian dictator, said:

"Some day we will force the United States to spend itself into destruction."

Is this terrible prophecy coming true?

Fellow citizens, the day of reckoning is here. What are you going to do about it? Why, the only sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government; cut government down to size; balance the budget; get on a pay-as-you-go basis, and provide for orderly reduction of the public debt.

Stand firmly on this Republican economy platform, carry it to the people; and you will elect a Republican Congressman in every district in the State of California, and a Republican President in 1952.

When the Republicans have a majority in Congress we will have a government by law and not by man. We will stand for no more bypassing of law, such as President Truman has done to the Taft-Hartley Act. In the coal dispute he has been playing politics with human misery.

He has made commitments to labor racketeers to sabotage this law, or he is befuddled by sheer incompetence. A long-suffering public at long last has compelled the President to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act in the coal dispute.

We Republicans believe in the continuation of the Taft-Hartley Act, because it has restored equality between employer and employees, guaranteed the right of collective bargaining, the recognition of unions, and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of the public and the union members.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs; wages have risen to record levels; and strikes have decreased.

There is a desperate need for a strong policy against the spread of communism within our gates. And we insist that America's efforts toward that end be directed by those who have no sympathy with communism.

We condemn the failure of the administration to recognize the full implications of this threat to our security. We deplore the dangerous degree to which Communists have been employed in important government posts. We shall see to it that no Communist is on the pay roll of the Federal Government.

There is no room in our Government for the Alger Hisses and their fellow travelers.

We Republicans are fighting communism on all fronts. And in the front ranks is your own Congressman NIXON, who has made an all-out effort to expose these enemies of our Republic.

We need more NIXONS to get out and hit communism wherever it raises its ugly head.

Fellow citizens, there is the President's record of confusion, confusion that deficit spending is a sound fiscal policy; mounting national debt is an asset, not a liability, and higher and higher taxes can be imposed without killing initiative, incentive, and enterprise.

The President is confounded by the prolonged stoppage in coal production when, at the same time, he refuses to enforce the law.

He is bewildered by failure when it is pointed out his administration is infected by disloyal persons.

He reminds one of what Abraham Lincoln said of another President in his time:

"His mind, taxed beyond its power, is running hither and thither, like some tortured creature on a burning surface, finding no position on which it can settle down and be at ease.

"* * * He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man."

This confusion also holds true in foreign affairs, chapter after chapter of failure and defeat.

The American people face the hard fact that although hundreds of thousands of lives have been sacrificed, and billions have been spent, 5 years after the explosions of war we do not have peace.

The root cause of this failure goes back to recognition of Communist Russia, in 1933, when self-styled New Deal Democrats captured control of our Government.

Republican Presidents had refused to recognize Soviet Russia, because her dictators gave no assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine our Government.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded in 1933. It was then that the Red rulers of Russia were welcomed into the family of nations.

At Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, through secret agreements, the gate was thrown wide open for the expansion of Russia.

All of these secret deals to remap the world and freeze the ultimate peace were ratified and confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam.

The Republican Party had no part in those secret agreements, under which Soviet Russia gained jurisdiction over Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Balkan countries, and under which China was eventually to be taken over by Moscow-directed Communists.

When the terrible consequences of the secret agreements became apparent—the appeasement of Russia, the Morgenthau plan to keep Germany forever an agricultural state, and the impossibility of shifting of millions upon millions of people from one jurisdiction to another—it was then the President called in some Republicans, ostensibly, to initiate and develop a bipartisan foreign policy.

But, the President, confronted by his own signature ratifying the betrayals of Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, picked and chose his spots for advice, leaving out wide areas of foreign affairs.

From then on the administration has been using the bipartisan label as a pretense to cover up its own mistakes and escape responsibility for its tragic failure to win lasting peace.

Around the entire executive branch the Truman administration has built an iron curtain against information going to duly authorized committees of the Congress.

The President has issued orders that no department head or bureau chief shall give testimony to congressional committees at variance with his views.

This attitude of the President is in conflict with the principles of good government, and in defiance of the right of Congress, the policy-making branch, to information necessary for the discharge of its duties.

Is it any wonder we have no firm peace?

Is it any wonder we are losing the cold war?

Russia has grabbed and annexed into its orbit over 13,000,000 square miles and about 800,000,000 human beings.

So, while Secretary Acheson and his pal Alger Hiss were calling the signals in the State Department 14 men in the Moscow Politburo have captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface, and one-third of all mankind.

Since the end of the war wrangling and back-biting have raged in the National Defense Establishment. The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, long ago could have put an end to this scandalous situation with one forthright order: unify, cooperate, or get out.

Our defenses in Alaska are woefully weak in the light of modern warfare, spear-headed by long-range bombing, rockets, guided missiles, atomic bombs, and now the hydrogen bomb.

Gov. Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, reported to Congress the defenses there are so weak that two air-borne divisions could capture Alaska in 1 day.

The blackest chapter in America's history, save one—Pearl Harbor—is the loss of China to Communist Russia by appeasement of this administration.

But there is still time to stop the Red tide in the Pacific, as has been so ably pointed out by your Senator KNOWLAND of California, if only the administration had the will to do so.

The first step is to assure China, and other countries in Asia, that the United States

morally supports their cause. This should be backed up by economic and military aid, wherever feasible.

Most important of all, take Acheson's hands off our military strategy, and keep the defense and national security in the Department of National Defense where they belong.

Formosa is the last citadel of freedom-loving people of China. Hold Formosa against the Communists and there will be kept alive active resistance by millions of Chinese on the mainland who want liberty and are eager to fight for it.

The Chinese nationalists have never asked for American troops to help them hold Formosa. They do desperately plead for military equipment.

Surplus military equipment is already in the Pacific and should be supplied them. Congress has authorized this aid and provided the funds, but the President refuses to act.

On the European front the American people have been most generous in helping ECA countries recover from the war's devastation.

More than $30,000,000,000 of your money, and your children's money, have been poured into western Europe, in 23 different money-spending schemes.

All the ECA countries have reached goals of productivity far above prewar levels. The economic problems, which now confront them, can only be solved by themselves.

Our procedures, in aid, for those countries now, should be directed toward restoring peacetime, private channels of commerce.

To attract private capital, the ECA countries must eliminate trade barriers, establish free convertibility of their currencies, and recognize that Germany's recovery, minus war-making power, is vital to the recovery of all Europe; and that Germany must have the tools to earn her living.

Fellow Americans: The solution of these problems, foreign and domestic, is up to all of us, every American. Public opinion, when aroused, is the strongest force in the land.

It is your job, and the job of every American, to see to it that the people never lose sight of the truth, that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Let us, here and now, rededicate ourselves to the proposition: "That this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Let us go forward, as modern Paul Reveres and minutemen, sounding the alarm. Carry the facts to the people, into your business, the shops, the homes, the farms, into every precinct, and into the wards.

Ring all the doorbells and tell the American people:

We Republicans stand for a government in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people, and not their masters.

We Republicans maintain Government can help its people to prosperity, by lightening the burdens of debt and taxes, laying down rules of fair play, and by protecting those whose own strength and resources are not sufficient to protect themselves.

We Republicans stand for the maximum of freedom of choice for the individual, consistent with the right of all to the same freedom.

We Republicans stand for competitive enterprise, under just laws fairly administered.

We Republicans stand for efficiency and pay-as-you-go economy in Government.

We Republicans stand for an equitable distribution of our tax burden, to stimulate enterprise to give incentive for investment in new and expanding plants for the increase of productivity, and to provide jobs at fair wages.

Tell them, the American people, we offer them a new leadership for the achievement of a lasting peace.

We Republicans insist upon restoration of our foreign agreements to their proper place inside the Constitution, and we insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action unless the spirit and letter of our constitutional procedure are followed.

We Republicans oppose secret agreements, and insist upon restoration of our foreign commitments to their proper place inside the Constitution.

We Republicans favor full support of the United Nations.

We Republicans support aid to those states resisting communism, but such aid should be given only if it is essential to our national security, if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford, if it will be effective, and if there is a program for progressive reduction.

We favor promotion of world trade on the basis of fair and reasonable competition. We assert this can be done within the Republican principle.

Products of underpaid foreign labor should not be admitted to this country on terms which imperil the living standards of the American workman, or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

Fellow Americans, on these principles we take our stand.

On these principles America will go forward to greater and greater strength, financially, economically, and spiritually.

This is the road to lasting peace, prosperity, and contentment for the American people.

And for the Republican Party this is the road to victory.

Air Engineering Development Center

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am honored to be able to request to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a most enlightening address by our most able Secretary of the Air Force, W. Stuart Symington, delivered at a meeting of the Nashville Chamber of Commerce, Nashville, Tenn., on February 10, 1950, at which time a large number of the high-ranking staff of the Air Corps were present, together with scientists, educators, members of the press, and interested citizens of Tennessee and the Southeast. The meeting at Nashville was a very enthusiastic one, and certainly demonstrated the wholehearted cooperation of Tennessee and the Southeast in their desire to help the National Defense Establishment and the Air Corps in the development of this highly necessary air engineering development center. Tennesseans were delighted with the announcement of Secretary Symington that the center will be named in honor of that foremost American airman, Gen. Hap Arnold.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is my privilege to be here today in this great city of the South, center of all that America cherishes, home of the immortal Andrew Jackson, who believed that all the people of our country should be represented in and by their Government.

It is particularly fitting that this part of the country, which has such a record of devotion to the cause of liberty and freedom, should be selected as the location of this new project, so essential to our national security, and approved by our Secretary of Defense, our President, and the Congress.

At one time it did not appear as if such was to be the case, because many people for many reasons, desired that this development should not be placed on the waters of the Tennessee Valley.

Some felt it should go farther west, because they felt the West was the future of America.

Some announced that Tennessee was unhealthy. They probably had not met your great senior Senator.

Some even questioned whether, and I quote, "the brains of America would be willing to live in the Tennessee Valley."

I mentioned this to your own Congressman at a dinner for the President last Saturday, and just about ruined his dinner. We sat next to each other and with every course, my good friend Congressman PRIEST said, "The more I think of that remark, the madder I get."

All of those opinions were against the recommendations of those qualified engineers who studied this question of the right site for many years.

The history of the American people has been one of free enterprise and fair competition, always against any form of consolidation for special interests. This should be especially true in matters that affect national security.

Someone has said the last war was won by the small-town garage, and the boy on the farm, who could fix any kind of engine. In New Guinea, the Aleutians, all over the world, the American GI knew how to make the motors work.

But the war of tomorrow will require far more than mechanical ability. It will require real knowledge of such basic technical arts as electronics.

As an illustration, our reenlistment rate in electronics is less than half what it is in other branches of the service.

Investigation shows the reason is the desire of the airmen to go into the industry of television.

In other words, the taxpayer trains these boys; and they then leave to accept far larger salaries in private industry.

There is no such problem in any totalitarian state. You work where you are told.

It seems to us, therefore, that all parts of our country, not just a few locations, or a few institutions, or a few corporations, should be the core of America's security. It would seem all of America should be that core. Every engineering university in this part of the world should have the same opportunity to obtain this type and character of work as any institution in any other part of the country.

This Air Engineering Development Center will require programs that in turn will demand extensive engineering work in many laboratories; and regardless of some of the opinions mentioned, I believe that, given the same start, those engineers can be obtained just as much from the boys in the Tennessee Valley—boys of Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Kentucky, and Alabama—as they can from any other part of the country. I hope that in the future not only will large wind tunnels and test stands be at the AEDC at Camp Forrest, but also that many small ones will be in the universities which make up our great and growing South.

As we go into this air-atomic age, the more such vital questions as supersonic speeds and nuclear fission are disseminated throughout the youth of American schools, the greater will be our chance of survival.

The term "supersonic speeds" is one of those technical terms used in connection with this Air Engineering Development Center—words like "sonic barrier," "subsonic," "transonic," "supersonic," and "hypersonic." One can hardly discuss the AEDC without using those words.

Here are some summary definitions.

The "sonic barrier" is an invisible wall encountered when the flight of an airplane approaches the speed of sound—the later being 764 miles an hour at sea level. When an ordinary airplane approaches this speed, strange things begin to happen; its wings and controls flutter, excessive vibration sets in, and usually the airplane is difficult, and sometimes impossible, to control.

This sonic barrier is so important to modern aeronautical design that airplane speeds are now measured in terms of percentage of the speed of sound. This percentage is known as the mach number. Aeronautical engineers give the speed of sound a value of (1), and any speed up to nine-tenths of the speed of sound they call subsonic speed.

Speeds between nine-tenths of the speed of sound (about 680 miles an hour) and up to about one and two-tenths times the speed of sound (about 915 miles an hour) are called transonic—in other words, the speed at which we pass through the sonic barrier.

Beyond that barrier, speeds up to five times the speed of sound (around 3,500 miles an hour)—they call supersonic; and speeds beyond five times the speed of sound—that is, more than 3,500 miles an hour—they call hypersonic.

The Air Force has had subsonic and transonic wind-tunnel facilities for many years; but it has never had wind-tunnel facilities for tests at supersonic and hypersonic speeds. That is one reason why these tunnels to be built at the Air Engineering Development Center are so urgently needed.

It is no secret that before World War II other nations were far ahead of us in supersonic research and development, as in many other aspects of national preparedness.

Now here are some more facts about this Air Engineering Development Center.

In technical terms, this AEDC initially will be what is known as a propulsion test center, where we will use laboratory-type tests, under closely regulated conditions, to help solve design and manufacturing problems encountered during the manufacturing and development stages of engines of all kinds. The test units are designed to simulate various conditions of altitude, temperature, and speed; and we expect to obtain much information which in the past we could get only by building the equipment and testing it in flight—an extremely costly and time-consuming method compared to what will be done here.

When fully developed, this new location in Tennessee will be one of the greatest aviation test centers of the world.

Who can forget the startling news in August 1944 that our pilots in P–47's and P–51's, which flew only about 440 miles an hour, had encountered jet and rocket-powered Nazi Messerschmitt 262's and 163's which flew between 500 and 600 miles an hour? In that connection, remember also that our 500-mile-an-hour jet fighter, the P–80, never got into action.

No airplane was used by the United States in World War II which had not been designed before we entered the war. Only improvements were made after Pearl Harbor; there was no change in fundamental design in any plane which saw war service.

I am glad to say we profited by that lesson. Since that time we have come a long way; and in 1947 the Air Force XS–1 penetrated the sonic barrier—an achievement ranking in importance with the first flight of the Wright brothers.

AN EXAMPLE OF UNIFICATION AT WORK

One could hardly find a better example of unification at work than the evolution of this project from its initial beginnings as a technical staff study at Wright Field in 1945, on through the passage of Public Law 415, Eighty-first Congress, which authorized the unitary wind-tunnel plan, and established the AEDC as an element of that plan.

The official language of that law describes it as "An act to promote the national defense by authorizing a unitary plan for construction of transonic and supersonic wind-tunnel facilities and the establishment of an air engineering center."

In other words, AEDC is just one part of an integrated unified plan to provide this Nation—the military as well as private institutions and industry—with the necessary facilities for exploring that relatively unknown world of flight beyond the sonic barrier, so that we may continue to improve our ability to use the air space more effectively, both in peace and war.

This whole over-all plan is the result of careful studies, extending over the last 5 years, by the Air Force, Army and Navy; the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics; the Research and Development Board; the Air Force's Scientific Advisory Board; many private institutions, including colleges and universities engaged in aeronautical research; and private industries.

These studies took a long time, not only because of the highly technical nature of the subject, but also because it was necessary to establish without question that there were no existing facilities that could be altered or improved to meet the capacity requirements for the proposed supersonic and hypersonic test work; and therefore, it was necessary to build a new facility.

As a result of these studies, and the legislation authorizing the unitary wind tunnel plan, we may be sure that the effort is being truly integrated on a national scale.

When completed, the AEDC will serve not only the Air Force but also the Army, Navy, private educational and research institutions, and private industry.

WHY CAMP FORREST WAS SELECTED AS THE SITE

Camp Forrest was selected as the site of this center after many possible locations throughout the United States had been exhaustively studied by an expert firm of consulting engineers. They devoted 3½ years to studying possible locations, seeking a site which offered the best possible combination of many features.

The three most essential requisites were:

1. An adequate supply of electric power, huge amounts of which would be required. Camp Forrest met that requirement because it is within the power network of the Tennessee Valley Authority, and can furnish the necessary power without curtailing its service to other customers.

2. A large dependable water supply, particularly for cooling purposes. Anyone flying over this area will see ample proof that there's no water shortage in the Tennessee Valley.

3. A sufficient land area. The State of Tennessee took care of that by offering to donate some additional 33,000 acres.

The final report of the engineers, submitted to the Air Force in November of last year, pointed out that although no possible site could be superior to all others in all of those essential features, they believed that the Camp Forrest area was the best site for the country. After carefully reviewing that report, the Air Force agreed with the private consulting engineers; and accordingly, with the approval of the President, Secretary of Defense Johnson, and the Research and Development Board, Camp Forrest was selected as the site.

SUMMARY SCHEDULE OF DEVELOPMENT

It is difficult to give a brief yet clear picture of how such a tremendous, long-range project is to be developed, but I shall attempt to present a quick over-all summary of our plans.

First, a word about legislative authority.

By Public Law 415, the Eighty-first Congress authorized $252,600,000 for the Unitary wind-tunnel program, and specifically earmarked $100,000,000 of that amount for the Air Engineering Development Center.

That, however, was the authorization bill, not the money bill; the latter was Public Law 430, which appropriated an initial increment of $30,000,000 in contract authority and cash, to begin construction of AEDC during the fiscal year 1950.

With this $30,000,000 it is planned to begin construction of three principal test facilities.

The first facility planned is the high-altitude engine-test unit, which will make possible the testing of engines under conditions representing 75,000 feet pressure altitude. Incidentally, the nucleus of this unit is a jet-engine test plant taken over from the Germans at the end of the war, and modernized and expanded to increase its capacity. We have had that German equipment in storage since the war, but our existing facilities lacked the power capacity necessary to operate it. This unit would test jet engines much larger than those now used in our jet aircraft. It would have a testing capacity 6 to 8 times the capacity of Wright Field and would require about 75,000 horsepower.

The second principal test unit would be the hypersonic wind tunnel—capable of development-evaluation testing of models of aircraft and guided missiles at speeds in excess of 3,500 miles an hour. Here again we would be taking full advantage of captured German designs and drawings, as well as the services of the German designers. These German designs have been thoroughly checked by competent American authorities and have been modified to incorporate the most recent developments.

The third principal unit would be a supersonic propulsion wind tunnel, designed for development testing of scale models of high-speed aircraft, as well as aircraft power plants. The speed range of this tunnel covers an important part of the supersonic range from the high transonic—above 700 miles an hour—well into the supersonic, which goes on up to several thousand miles an hour. Approximately 200,000 horsepower will be required to operate this tunnel—a power demand equivalent to that of the entire greater Nashville area. By comparison, the 20-foot wind tunnel at Wright Field requires only 40,000 horsepower.

Construction of utilities and buildings should start in the near future, in order to be ready to receive the test equipment as soon as it is produced. In accordance with standard policy, all construction of structures and utilities will be handled by the Army Corps of Engineers.

Construction on the site is planned for midsummer this year. If everything goes according to plan, the center should begin limited operation within the next 2 or 3 years, and should reach full operation within 4 to 5 years from now.

INITIAL CONSTRUCTION PLANS

As businessmen, you will want to know what we intend to buy, and when we expect to begin letting contracts.

Answers to both those questions depend upon actual release of funds. Thus far, of the $30,000,000 already appropriated by Congress, $1,000,000 has already been released. This money is being used to complete the master plan for the project, also to provide initial funds for the Army engineers.

Our able Secretary of Defense, Louis Johnson, desires that there be no duplication in these facilities and that every dollar expended will bring maximum return to the taxpayer, this especially because of our already high cost of security. The Air Force has pledged to him that such will be the case. Plans will be reviewed constantly to insure that everything installed is essential to our national defense.

Pending release of additional increments of that first $30,000,000, we have authority to proceed with the preparation of procurement specifications for $20,000,000 worth of equipment, the issuance of circular proposals, the reception of bids, the award to low bidders, and preparation of contracts up to the point of signature.

During the rest of this calendar year the population of the center will be relatively small because the work to be done is preliminary, and requires only a small force. Thereafter, and of course, contingent on congressional appropriations, the center's activity and population would pick up rapidly.

AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT OF OUR NATIONAL-SECURITY PROGRAM

Up to this point, I have discussed this project from the technical and commercial standpoint, and what it means to the South.

Of course, from the standpoint of our national security, it means a great deal more—not only to you but to your children and your children's children.

Two years ago, when the United States enjoyed a monopoly of atomic weapons, the President and the Congress each appointed committees to analyze our national-defense problems with respect to the role of air power in defending our freedom. Both of these distinguished groups—the President's Air Policy Commission, and the Joint Congressional Aviation Policy Board—pointed out that our security would be jeopardized unless we achieve and maintain technological leadership.

The Congressional Aviation Policy Board said:

"Technical preeminence is fundamental to air power. This can be achieved only through intensive research and development. The frontiers of aeronautical knowledge must be continually explored and pushed back through research to obtain new information required for the development of our air equipment."

And the President's Air Policy Commission said:

"For national security, second best military aircraft are simply not good enough. On the commercial side, inefficient or unsafe aircraft and unreliable or inadequate navigational aids cannot be tolerated.

"We must keep ahead in the race for military supremacy. And it is a race. Although the great aeronautical laboratories of Germany, Italy, and Japan have been dismantled and destroyed, other strong contenders are now in the field."

Have you ever considered the fact that the four scientific achievements which make possible the existence of the very long-range bomber and the atomic bomb, all have occurred within the memory of living persons? I refer, of course, to the gasoline engine, invented in 1885; the airplane, in 1903; radar-electronics, in 1936; and nuclear fission—the atomic bomb—in December 1942.

Could there be any clearer illustration of why the Air Force attaches so much importance to this air engineering development center; and why you, as leaders of this southeastern region, have a great opportunity to serve both yourselves and the Nation by giving this project your full support and cooperation?

Lincoln Day Dinner Address by Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, at the Lincoln Day dinner held last night at the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City by the National Republican Club, Governor Driscoll, of New Jersey, made a notable address which I am happy to call to the attention of all of our colleagues here in the Senate.

In behalf of my colleague the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON] and myself, I ask unanimous consent that this address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It was Theodore Roosevelt who once said that the Republican Party "in the days of Abraham Lincoln was founded as the radical progressive party of the Nation." From the standpoint of our lineage we are therefore assembled here as "radical progressives." We know what a radical is. He is anyone who does not agree with us. But a progressive? If he cannot be defined, he can at least be identified. He is not only a person, he is an idea; he is not static, but flexible; he is not reluctant, but prudent; and if I were to place him in the environment of today, I would describe him like this—as one who thinks as much in terms of freedom as he does in terms of welfare.

Now, no party has a monopoly of these qualities. It was in 1894 that Democratic President Cleveland called out Federal troops to suppress the Pullman strike. It was in 1902 that Republican President Roosevelt averted a coal strike by compelling arbitration and motivating a settlement advantageous to labor. It was Republican President Taft, speaking in 1912 before a group similar to our meeting here tonight, who told you that "the development of business (has) provided problems which call for additional action by the Government to prevent the abuses of the concentration of wealth and the combinations of capital." It was Democratic President Roosevelt who assured the Commonwealth Club of California meeting in San Francisco in 1932 that "the Government should assume this function of economic regulation only as a last resort."

1860 PLATFORM QUOTED

We have come a long way since Lincoln led us to our first victory on a party platform (of 1860) which promised to secure "to workingmen liberal wages, to agriculture remunerating prices, to mechanics and manufacturers an adequate reward for their skill, labor, and enterprise and to the Nation commercial prosperity and independence." The world has since grown smaller. People and ideas now crowd each other within the confines of an industrial society. The frontiers of learning have taken place on land boundaries on the horizon of mankind. Political, social, and economic questions which were once the concern of a colony, a nation, or a continent are now the concern of the world.

We have come a long way only to find ourselves once again on the doorstep of conflict and destruction. No one can be certain why we are where we are or what the outcome may be, but every one knows that we are now reaping the harvest of careless war and postwar promises, of trifling with communism, of fumbling with containment and of squandering our assets. I venture to predict that when the history of this age is written, it will once again be the destiny of the Republican Party to preserve union—union within our own boundaries, union within the United Nations, and ultimately union within the hearts and minds of the people of the world.

What can America best do to steel herself against the force of its yet forming world responsibilities? The answer to this question is more important to our future as a nation, to the welfare of the little man and the big man, to the conservative and the liberal, than any of the battles of words and labels that would divert us from the problems of survival itself. It is to this question that I would like to address myself primarily tonight, not from the point of view of spelling out new principles or even of testing old ones, but rather to bring to bear the meaning of some of the experiments in our laboratories of democracy—the States and local governments—in terms of what we know to be the foundation requirements of national security.

Long before big government, big spending, and big taxing became commonplace at the national level, the torch of liberalism was lighted in the individual States. In the States, Republican administrations were adopting social and labor legislation to meet the needs of growing industrialization. Workmen's compensation, industrial-safety laws, minimum wages, eight-hour day, unemployment compensation were originated in the States. Even today, of the five States having temporary disability (cash sickness) benefits laws in operation, four of them were developed, sponsored, and enacted under Republican administrations. All of these four allow full opportunity for private enterprise and initiative. To assert that this is "me-too-ism," is to indict the course of history and to belittle Alexander Hamilton, James Madison, and John Jay, the authors of The Federalist Papers, because they recognized common problems and concurred in some solutions. Let us not divide our house against itself by an inability to say yes.

The Republican Party, still in the progressive tradition, stands committed to a government fully conscious of the needs of our industrialized age, ready and willing to take care of its casualties whenever and wherever they may occur. The real issues of today, however, are essentially of method rather than objective. Some would have us assume a defensive attitude, limit our objectives and orientate our party in favor of a vanishing order. We cannot come to praise Lincoln and at the same time to bury his philosophy. The creed of liberal Republicanism asserts broad social objectives sensitive alike to the needs of competitive business and interdependent labor in an industrialized society, to a constructive view of party responsibility and to adapt government to the requirements of private initiative and enterprise. To use Lincoln's words: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they have need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot do so well, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

This is the dilemma of our day. To the party now in power the answer is: The people can do little for themselves—big government, a paternalistic philosophy, and a socialized economy are the answers. To the party we represent the answer is very different—the people can do much for themselves, self-

government, a self-sustaining philosophy, and a free economy are the answers. But there can be little hope of even a start toward a solution of this dilemma so long as we are governed under that version of liberalism which promises the southern planters and the eastern labor unions the same utopias, and all at the expense of the western rancher and the Pacific fruit grower who need not worry because it is all coming out of the Marshall plan anyhow. This is not even paternalism—it is false, disappointing, and dangerous.

HUSBAND OUR RESOURCES

Our position in the world as the sole remaining arsenal of democracy is reason enough to hold the line on new expenditures. Republicans are doing this in the States and fighting for the same policy in Washington. The one thing we can all do for the cause of peace is to husband our resources. It is foolhardy to act as if the capacity of the American people to buy and pay for more and more government knows no limits. If we spend ourselves to death in peacetime, what hope can we have for survival in an emergency? What hope can we have to survive at all?

The country is beginning to understand that starry-eyed predictions of the gross national product at the end of the next half century cannot hide the fact that those who make them are already being buried under increasing deficits and mountains of surplus potatoes. Suppose our total national income should be quadrupled by the year 2000, and suppose the average family's income in today's dollars should be $12,000 by the year 2000. The same method that arrives at that rosy prediction would give us a National Government taking no less than 40 percent of the total production of the country. Even last year it was 14.4 percent. If we project the future of the dollar in the same way that the President would project the future of the national income, those people who have any dollars left in the year 2000 will be able to buy 18 cents worth with each dollar. It has been estimated that this will mean a mere $3.75 for a pound of roast beef and $250 for a medium-price suit. Who is the administration trying to fool?

WONDERLAND OF BUREAUCRACY

This promise of a government which grows bigger and bigger, of prices which rise higher and higher, and of taxes which take more and more is fitting from a party which has already given us a wonderland of bureaucracy. Money would circulate like mad. The taxpayer would pass his earnings on to the big government faster and faster. We would truly live in a different country—if we are not there already—the like of which can be seen only through the eyes of Alice after she had been driven by the queen to run faster and faster.

"The queen propped her up against a tree and said kindly, 'You may rest a little now.'

"Alice looked round her in great surprise. 'Why, I do believe, we've been under this tree the whole time. Everything's just as it was.'

" 'Of course, it is,' said the queen. 'What would you have it?'

" 'Well, in our country,' said Alice, still panting a little, 'you generally get to somewhere else—if you ran very fast for a long time as we've been doing.'

" 'A slow sort of country,' said the queen. 'Now, here, you see, it takes all the running you can do to keep in the same place. If you want to get somewhere else, you must run at least twice as fast as that'."

We have not come a long way only to get nowhere. The plain dealing of Lincoln can still mean a balanced budget followed by true tax reduction. The formula is simple: stop promising every one too much from too few. It has been said that the function of finance is to be sure that nothing is ever decided upon the basis of finance. But it is common sense to demand that the price of merchandise be plainly marked and to look at the price before we buy. This is neither liberal nor conservative, it is prudence—if we want pensions and annuity benefits to provide what our present hard-earned premiums are supposed to be buying.

A vital, liberal, progressive Republican Party can offer the America of our day, as Lincoln did in his, something better than government by political expediency. We can offer stability as well as security—by taking full care of those who need and want government programs, without treating the butcher, the baker, the grocer, and the manufacturer like so many children for whom Uncle Sam knows best. That is, we can provide a floor of security below which no one would be permitted to fall, but we would not knock every one down to the floor to prove the point.

The common man would still rather place his emphasis upon individual initiative and private enterprise than dependence upon government. What we object to in the welfare state is not that it implies a "state of welfare," as Governor Dewey has so well described it, but rather that it would make us all wards of the Government with only incidental private enterprise. The Republican Party still believes that liberalism and progressivism thrive best in the free air of competitive ideas—that they will wither and die under any form of authoritarian government—even under the sweet-sounding phrases of welfare. We are steadfast in our faith in the ultimate rightness of the many as opposed to the select judgment of the few. But let the many confide the great powers of big government to the few and the few will contrive to defeat the will of the many—this is the common knowledge of mankind.

We are ready and willing to take a new approach to the weakness of bigness—uncontrolled power—wherever it occurs, in big business, big unions, or big government. The curse of bigness does not lie in bigness as such. What was big in Lincoln's day might be small today. Big machines require big investment of capital. Big production for lower prices requires big management. Big industry requires big unions. What we oppose is not size but bigness which produces power or responsibility which can neither be controlled, managed, nor held accountable. This is the kind of bigness which is just as much a threat to the liberal as to the conservative.

NEW FUNCTION FOR PARTY

We have already staked out the answer to big government through decentralization to the States. This is a matter of party policy which might imply a new function for the political party in our Federal system of government. This function is to become the balance wheel of federalism by formulating Federal-State policies to be carried out in the Congress. These policies would turn over to the States—even as the present unemployment-compensation system—the responsibility for more and more services of government. This is the only way to prevent a socially minded Federal Government from crushing its citizens by its own weight. It is the best way to restore government to the people.

A century ago both parties to the conflict deprecated war, but one of them would make war rather than let the Nation survive, and the other would accept war rather than let it perish, and the war came. Today, both parties deprecate second-class citizenship, but one would rather talk about it, while the other would rather act. In our neighboring States of New York and New Jersey, Republican administrations have acted. Here, Governor Dewey has shown the way, and every citizen knows his name, his efforts, and his accomplishments. Throughout the Nation, Republicans want action. It goes to the heart of decent and responsible government at home, as well as a respected government abroad, to set ourselves squarely to the guaranty of one first-class citizenship throughout our Nation.

In another day and under the stress of arms, Lincoln declared:

"Our popular Government has often been called an experiment. Two points in it our people have already settled—the successful establishing and the successful administering of it. One still remains—its successful maintenance against a formidable internal attempt to overthrow it."

There are ways to destroy a popular government without armed rebellion—ways more subtle but more devastating. There are those who would destroy the substance and leave the frame—that is the method of world communism. Our task is to combat it without losing that for which we fight. Others would bleed popular government to death by squeezing it into their own pattern of interest. The task of a political party is to avoid attachment to any one interest or group and to express the best interests of all.

The force of political absolutism is, perhaps, the most subtle of all dangers to popular government today. It thrives on the emotional appeal of majority vote. Its symptoms are an unshakable faith in the infallibility of government and an unquenchable capacity to tell other people how to dispose of their earnings.

It is startling to think of how much absolutism may flourish in a democracy—the absolutism of a rampant majority, the absolutism of a boss-controlled political machine, the absolutism of business monopoly, the absolutism of boss-minded union leadership, the absolutism of taxing authority which knows no restraint. One is as bad as the other. One weakens our capacity to meet our world responsibilities as much as the other. These are the common problems of the liberal and the conservative today. The Republican Party is free, willing, and able to face them honestly and effectively. In the true heritage of Lincoln, this can yet be our greatest contribution to the security of popular government and to the welfare of the common man.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Kenneth S. Wherry, of Nebraska, at Los Angeles

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at Los Angeles, Calif., on February 10, 1950, under the auspices of the California Republican State organization and the Los Angeles County Republican Committee.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an honor to come to California and join you Republicans in celebrating the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln.

Glory hallelujah His truth marches on! Under his leadership, our Republic was saved when its life hung in the balance. And,

it will take that kind of leadership, the Lincoln leadership, to save our Republic now.

The American people are downright worried over the disastrous trend in our domestic and foreign affairs.

They face the hard fact that though they won the war nearly 5 years ago, they have not yet won the peace.

They see we are losing the cold war.

They are alarmed by the mounting cost of government, deficit-spending, and administration demands for more taxes.

And, worst of all, they are fearful of losing their freedom to alien-minded government spoilers.

In Lincoln's day the issue was preservation of the Union.

Today, the crucial, fateful issues are whether we shall preserve in America human liberty, the dignity of the individual, and freedom of choice, or, surrender them to an all-powerful government, which seeks to control our lives and all of our activities; and whether, in foreign affairs, we shall restore constitutional procedures, with even-handed justice, or continue to see the peace frittered away by secret agreements, incompetence, and drift.

The people want, and deserve, that the issues be clearly drawn.

The Republican Party adopted a platform in Washington this week, which gives the people a clean-cut choice on the issues in the 1950 elections.

It is your job in California, my job in Nebraska, and the job of all Republicans, to see that candidates are nominated who stand foursquare on those issues.

Let those who believe in free competition, and the right of the individual to make the most of his skill, initiative, and enterprise, come into our corner.

And, let those who are for spendthrift socialism, get in President Truman's corner.

In the elections of 1950 there can be no compromise. There is too much at stake.

Liberty and socialism won't mix. One or the other will be destroyed.

As Lincoln said: "This Government cannot endure permanently half-slave and half-free."

During the past few months, as I have traveled across the length and breadth of the land, I have been asked this question, over and over again: "What can we, as citizens, do about it?

The answer I gave them, is what I say to you now.

You cannot win the fight or preservation of the principles of our Republic, by wishful thinking.

You cannot stop inflationary deficit-spending, by wishful thinking.

You cannot stop passage of the Brannan Farm Plan to sovietize the American farmer, by wishful thinking.

You cannot prevent compulsory health insurance, by wishful thinking.

You cannot get rid of Communists and their fellow-travelers, by wishful thinking.

And, you cannot by wishful thinking, win the cold war through the administration's incompetence, vacillation, contradictions, and confusion.

Your job as Americans is to enlist in the cause of freedom, see that those who represent you restore stability and competence in Government, and keep open the doors of opportunity.

These are worth fighting for.

And this time, we Republicans are going to fight.

Most of our troubles, the secret agreements at Yalta, the armament race, back-breaking taxes, inflation, and deficit spending, stem from a leadership that is tainted by a concept of government, which does not square with the American heritage.

Is it any wonder that an administration which harbors so many radicals at home, is tolerant of the spread of socialism and its twin brother communism abroad.

We all know that foreign policy is like a chess game, move after move, a long series of moves. The decisive moves now being made will determine whether the principles of our Republic will prevail.

The present administration's foreign policy line was laid down in 1933, when the self-styled New Deal Democrats captured control of our Government.

Republican Presidents, up to that time, had refused to recognize Soviet Russia because her dictators would give no assurance against spreading their propaganda to undermine our Republic.

Unfortunately, no such guaranty was demanded and none given in 1933, when Soviet Russia was officially recognized and taken into the family of nations.

At Cairo, Yalta, and Tehran, through secret agreements, the gates of the world were thrown wide open for the expansion of Russia and her Godless communism.

All of these secret deals to remap the world and freeze the ultimate peace, were ratified and confirmed by President Truman at Potsdam without the knowledge or consent of the American people or their Congress.

At Yalta, with approval at Potsdam, the Red rulers of Russia were handed Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other Balkan countries; and China, our faithful war ally, was betrayed into the grip of communism.

Even the text of the monstrous Yalta agreement was kept secret by the Truman administration until the Republican Eightieth Congress, under threat of refusal to authorize Greek-Turkish aid, forced publication of its hideous terms.

The terrible consequences of these secret deals, bombed the free world into confusion.

Couched in no uncertain language were appeasement of Russia, the revengeful Morgenthau plan to keep industrial Germany forever an agricultural state, and, the herding of millions upon millions of human beings, from one jurisdiction to another.

When President Truman attempted to put these terms into effect, chaos spread around the world. It was then, he called in some Republicans, ostensibly to initiate and develop a bipartisan foreign policy.

But, confronted by his own signature at Potsdam, he picked and chose his spots for advice, leaving out China, and other wide fields of foreign affairs.

Already the way had been paved for Russia to grab and annex into her orbit over 13,000,000 square miles and about 800,000,000 human beings.

While Secretary of State Acheson and his pal Alger Hiss were calling the signals in the State Department, 14 men in the Moscow Kremlin, captured control of one-fifth of the globe's land surface and one-third of all mankind.

In its conduct of foreign affairs, the administration has broken faith with the Republican Party and the Nation.

It has bypassed constitutional procedures.

The administration has been using the bipartisan label as a pretense to cover up its own mistakes and escape responsibility for its ghastly failure to win lasting peace.

Around the entire executive branch of government the President has an iron curtain against information going to duly authorized committees of the Congress.

He has issued orders that no department head or bureau chief shall give testimony to congressional committees at variance with his views.

He has exerted his powerful influence in efforts to smother congressional exposure of Communist spy rings that have run through the Government like water through a sieve.

When the House Committee on Un-American Activities uncovered the Alger Hiss scandal the President cried "red herring."

But, he knows differently now. He learned the hard way.

He has ordered withheld from Congress the official loyalty records of Government employees.

Think of it, fellow Americans, such an attitude when Congress, the policy-making branch, has the inherent right to all information necessary to the accomplishment of its duties.

That kind of government must end.

Instead of suppressing information and yelling "red herring," the President should give the FBI the "go" sign to get rid of these Communists.

And, right here, I just can't help mentioning that your Congressman RICHARD NIXON is doing a great job in the battle against communism. He is a credit to California and the Nation.

We need more men like NIXON, who have the courage to expose Communists and their fellow travelers in our Government.

Since the end of the war wrangling and back biting have raged in the National Defense Establishment. The President, as Commander in Chief of the armed forces, long ago could have put an end to this scandalous situation with one forthright order: Unify, cooperate, or get out!

Our defenses in Alaska are woefully weak in the light of modern warfare, spearheaded by long-range bombing, rockets, guided missiles, atomic bombs, and now the hydrogen bomb.

Governor Ernest Gruening, of Alaska, reported to Congress the defenses there are so weak that two air-borne divisions could capture Alaska in 1 day.

The blackest chapter in America's history save one, Pearl Harbor, is the loss of China to Communist Russia by appeasement policies of this administration.

There is still time to reverse the Red tide in the Pacific.

Your Senator, BILL KNOWLAND, has been battling in the front line at Washington, prodding and pleading with the administration to act, to do something, get off dead center, and toss overboard its policy of abandoning all China to the Moscow-directed Communists.

The first step is to assure China and other countries in Asia that the United States morally supports their cause.

This should be backed up by economic and military aid—wherever feasible.

Most important of all, take Acheson's hands off our military strategy and keep the defense and national security in the Department of National Defense where they belong.

Formosa is the last citadel of freedom-loving people of China.

Hold Formosa against the Communists and there will be kept alive active resistance by millions of Chinese on the mainland who want liberty and are eager to fight for it.

The Chinese nationalists have never asked for American troops to help them hold Formosa. They do desperately plead for military equipment.

Surplus military equipment is already in the Pacific and should be supplied them.

Congress has authorized this aid and provided the funds but the President refuses to act.

In Europe, the American people have been most generous in helping ECA countries recover from the war's devastation.

More than $30,000,000,000—$30,000,000,000—of your money and your children's money, have been poured into western Europe in 23 different money-spending schemes.

All the ECA countries have reached goals of productivity far above prewar levels. The economic problems that now confront them can be solved only by themselves.

But ancient nationalistic patterns again are taking shape over there, thwarting the intent of Congress in authorizing ECA.

Those countries should be eliminating trade barriers, establishing free convertibility of currencies, and recognizing that

Germany's recovery is vital to the recovery of all Europe and must have the tools to earn her living. If these countries are to get any more cash and goods they should be required to carry out the purposes of the act.

They should now be looking forward to a return to private channels in commerce rather than depend upon the United States to finance and support them indefinitely.

Our foreign commitments are having a terrific impact upon our domestic economy.

The administration is bolstering socialism abroad. And when we charge them with socialistic programs for the United States, they say we are using scare words.

Well, let's see if these are scare words.

If the administration's bill, to give the President—one man—absolute power to put ceilings over prices and wages and floors under prices and wages is not socialism, what is it?

If giving the President, one man, power to build and operate steel plants and other plants in competition with private industry is not socialism, what is it?

If federalized education, through control, is not socialism, what is it?

If compulsory health insurance, managed and directed by the Government, is not Government control of the lives of the people, what is it?

If Government, all taxpayers, paying part of the construction cost and rental of homes for some of the people, dictating the design, size, and type of house they shall live in, is not socialism, what is it?

If the making of foreign-trade agreements in secret and refusal by the President to explain, when he cuts tariff rates to ruinous levels for American industries, agriculture, and labor, is not socialism, what is it?

And, worse of all, is the Brannan plan, a plan to sovietize the farmers. It is a swindle.

Under it, farmers would work for the Government. They would produce surpluses of food so that prices would be low. The farmers would be paid a production subsidy, and the American taxpayers would pick up the check.

Whenever the farmers are forced to stand with tin cups in their hands, in exchange for their freedom, then a long step toward complete regimentation of the food industry, from producer to consumer, will have been taken.

Fellow Americans, the solution of all of these problems, foreign and domestic, is up to all of us, every American.

The road to peace, security, prosperity, and individual freedom is clearly marked in the 1950 Republican platform.

Your job is to see to it that the people never lose sight of the truth that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

So let us, here and now, rededicate ourselves to the proposition: "That this Nation under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that Government of the people, by the people, for the people, shall not perish from the earth."

Go forward as modern Paul Reveres and Minute Men.

Carry the facts to the people, in your business, the shops, the homes, the farms, and into every voting precinct.

Ring the doorbells.

Tell the people, every voter, the fate of the Nation is in their hands.

Tell them:

We Republicans offer a new leadership, untainted by communism, that will win the peace.

We Republicans insist that the United States shall not be bound to any course of action, unless the spirit and letter of our Constitutional procedure are followed; and that means no secret agreements bartering away their rights and liberty.

We Republicans stand for a strong policy against the spread of communism at home and abroad, and we insist that the offices of Government shall be purged of those who are disloyal to America.

We Republicans favor aid to other countries resisting communism, only if it is essential to our national security; if it is within the total limits which the American economy can afford; if it will be effective; and if there is a well-conceived program for progressive reduction.

We Republicans favor the promotion of world trade on the basis of fair competition, within the Republican principle that American industry, agriculture and labor must be protected against ruinous importations.

We always have and will continue to insist that the national defenses be completely adequate to any emergency.

We are for the Taft-Hartley labor law, because it guarantees the right of collective bargaining and recognizes unions and the right to strike, while protecting the rights of union members and the public.

Under this law union membership has increased to new highs and wages have risen to record levels.

We favor amending the law in the light of experience under its fair and just provisions.

We won't stand for any bypassing the law.

At long last the President has been compelled by public opinion to enforce the Taft-Hartley Act in the coal dispute, after months and months of playing politics with human misery.

We Republicans, true to the example of Lincoln, the Great Emancipator and cofounder of our party, believe the right of equal opportunity to work, to vote, to advance in life and to be protected under the law, should never be limited in any individual, because of race, religion, color, or country of origin.

We Republicans believe agriculture is fundamental to a prosperous America.

We favor a fair price for the farmers' products in the market place, aided by a system of price supports and tariff protection.

And, fellow Republicans, carry this message to the people:

Deficit spending leads to national bankruptcy.

Deficit spending will further cheapen the dollar, rob the wage earner, impoverish the farmer, and destroy the savings, pensions, insurance and investments of millions of people, winding up in jobless millions and a national poorhouse.

We believe the only sound, sensible thing to do now is cut the cost of government, balance the budget, get on a pay-as-you-go basis, cut the debt, and cut taxes.

Fellow Republicans, all these Republican principles and objectives will build and maintain a strong America; strong economically, strong financially, and strong spiritually.

The overwhelming majority of Americans cherish our heritage of freedom and will join us in this crusade to see that it shall not perish from the earth.

America is the custodian of human liberty.

Let us be worthy of its guardianship.

Opposition to Ratification of the Genocide Convention

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by the Honorable Leander H. Perez, district attorney of Louisiana, against ratification of the Genocide Convention before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee at a recent public hearing.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY LEANDER H. PEREZ, DISTRICT ATTORNEY OF LOUISIANA, AGAINST RATIFICATION OF THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

The Senate has been requested to ratify a United Nations Genocide Convention which calls for the punishment of individual citizens of a state for the newly defined crime of genocide, and which, if ratified, would compromise our system of constitutional government and would internationalize matters which are solely within our domestic jurisdiction.

At the same time this Genocide Convention would not make any contracting party or government responsible for genocidal crimes committed by it against its own nationals, nor would it add to the existing responsibility of any government for genocidal acts committed by or at its instigation or with its complicity against nationals of a foreign state.

Therefore this proposed Genocide Convention is nothing more than rank meddling with our domestic affairs, and is a violation by the United Nations of the article of its Charter which prohibits it from intervening in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state.

THE EXECUTIVE MESSAGE

On June 16, 1949, the President delivered a message to the Senate urging ratification of the International Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, and submitted an explanation of the Acting Secretary of State in support thereof (81st Cong., 1st sess., Senate, Executive O).

The report condemns the genocidal acts of the Nazi government, and cites that disintegration of the mind caused by the imposition of stupefying drugs may destroy a group—evidently referring to such well-known acts recently committed by the Communist governments of Europe in their so-called treason trials.

But this horrifying build-up for support of this Genocide Convention is shown by the report itself to be entirely irrelevant and immaterial.

GOVERNMENT'S NATIONALS UNPROTECTED

When the representative of the United States voted in favor of the Genocide Convention in the United Nations General Assembly, he made the statement that if "responsibility of a state" for genocide or any of the other acts enumerated in article 3, is not used in the traditional sense and if these words are intended to mean that the "state can be held liable in damages for injury inflicted by it on its own nationals, this provision is objectionable and my Government makes a reservation with respect to such an interpretation." Then the Acting Secretary, with the endorsement of the President, recommended to the Senate that it ratify the Genocide Convention "with the understanding that article 9 shall be understood in the traditional sense of responsibility to another state for injuries sustained by nationals of the complaining state in violation of principles of international law, and shall not be understood as meaning that a state can be held liable in damages for injuries inflicted by it on its own nationals." (See p. 6, Executive O.)

Therefore it is clear that the Genocide Convention is not aimed at governments which may commit genocide against their own nationals. Furthermore, under established international law, governments are and have been responsible to other states for killings or injuries of their nationals in violation of the principles of international law.

International law applies to nations and governments in their international relations.

Further, all members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which has jurisdiction to decide controversies between them in accordance with the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

Article 93 of the United Nations Charter, clause 1, provides:

"All members of the United Nations are ipso facto parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice."

The Statute of the International Court of Justice, article 38, section 1, provides:

"The Court, whose function is to decide in accordance with international law such disputes as are submitted to it, shall apply: * * * c. the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations."

GENOCIDE INTERNATIONAL CRIME

The fact is, that all civilized nations, members of the General Assembly of the United Nations, have recognized "that genocide is a crime under international law," by its adoption of resolution 96 (I) dated December 11, 1946. (See p. 7, Executive O.)

Therefore, we see that "genocide" has been recognized as a crime under the general principles of law recognized by civilized nations.

So, what would be the purpose of the Senate ratifying this Genocide Convention, when, first, genocide under general principles of law recognized by all civilized nations is an international crime, and secondly, the International Court of Justice has jurisdiction to adjudge against states through whose governmental policy or complicity genocide may be committed. Surely the ratification by the United States Senate of this proposed Genocide Convention, with the recommended reservation that it would not make a state or government liable for injuries inflicted by it on its own nationals, could add nothing to the international crime of genocide.

GENOCIDE CONVENTION AGAINST PERSONS

It is plain that the whole purpose of the proposed Genocide Convention is to make the international crime of genocide apply to individuals and thereby to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the state.

Article I of the proposed Genocide Convention confirms what the United Nations General Assembly has already sufficiently declared by its resolution 96, that genocide "is a crime under international law"; articles II and III define the crime of genocide, and article IV limits the commission of the crime to persons (not states or governments), and article V provides:

"The contracting parties undertake to enact, in accordance with their respective constitutions, the necessary legislation to give effect to the provisions of the present convention and, in particular, to provide effective penalties for persons guilty of genocide or of any of the other acts enumerated in article III."

Regarding article II defining genocide, including the killing or maiming, or causing mental harm to, any member of any national, racial, or religious group, the United States representative on the United Nations Legal Committee said: "However, if an individual is murdered by another individual, or by a group, whether composed of private citizens or government officials, as part of a plan or with the intent to destroy one of the groups enumerated in article II, the international legal crime of genocide is committed as well as the municipal-law crime of homicide" (p. 4, Executive O).

The purpose, therefore, of this proposed Genocide Convention adopted by the United Nations is to extend the international crime of genocide to the individual citizens of a state.

UN VIOLATED ITS CHARTER

Bear in mind that article II, paragraph 7 of the United Nations Charter specifically provides that nothing contained in that charter shall authorize it to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state. Therefore, it is plain that by the United Nations proposing such a Genocide Convention to operate against citizens of the state, or to interfere in local law enforcement within a state, which is essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of the state, is nothing more nor less than rank intermeddling in the domestic affairs of the state, and is a violation of the specific provision of the United Nations Charter.

Therefore, how can the United States Senate be asked, or urged, to ratify this so-called Genocide Convention which is a direct encroachment on the domestic affairs of this country under the Constitution of the United States, in face of the fact that adoption by the United Nations of this so-called Genocide Convention is a flagrant violation of one of the solemn provisions of its own Charter, or a violation of that part of the international agreement by which the United Nations came into being?

The fact that the Acting Secretary points out (p. 3) that this so-called Genocide Convention was prepared under the chairmanship of the United States representative and that the United States delegation played an important role in the formulation of the convention, offers no alibi for the violation of the United Nations Charter provision in article II, paragraph 7, that the United Nations shall not interfere or meddle in domestic affairs of member states.

The American members should have known better. They should have been duly respectful of the provisions of our Constitution under which the municipal sovereignty of law enforcement is reserved to the individual States of the Union and not to the National Government, such as would result if this so-called genocide convention were ratified by the Senate and would become the supreme law of the land. If such convention as submitted were ratified, it would become the supreme law of the land and would displace State constitutions and laws wherever they may conflict with the broad provisions of the Convention.

TREATIES UNDER FEDERAL AUTHORITY

The United States Constitution provides, in article VI, clause 2 "that all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land; and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

Article III, section 2 of the Constitution provides that "the judicial power of the United States shall extend to all cases arising under treaties made, or which shall be made, under authority of the United States."

The United States would become a contracting party if the Senate should ratify the Genocide Convention.

Under a decision of the United States Supreme Court in the case of *Missouri* v. *Holland* (252 U. S. 416) the conclusion of a treaty by the Federal Government confers upon it authority in fields of action reserved to the States which the Federal Government would not have without such a treaty.

The ratification of the Genocide Convention, as submitted, would therefore confer upon the Federal Government jurisdiction which it does not now possess under the Constitution, and likewise deprive all States of the Union to the same extent of their jurisdiction, police powers, and the right of law enforcement in any cases which might be claimed to be genocide, or crimes or offenses committed against any person or persons of a national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, whether it be homicide, mayhem, assault, libel, or slander, or other mental harm to person or persons of any such group (art. II).

BROAD FIELD INVOLVED

It must be noted in this regard, and should not be overlooked, that the crime of genocide applies to all persons regardless of whether he is of the same national, ethnical, racial, or religious group.

In other words, the crime of genocide is not limited to a crime committed against persons of different national, ethnical, racial, or religious groups, but to any individual of any such group, even when committed by one or more persons of the same groups.

Therefore, if the Senate should ratify the Genocide Convention and make the United States a contracting party thereto, a vast area of police powers and criminal law enforcement could be transferred from the State and local governments under State laws, to the National Government under laws to be enacted by Congress and enforced solely through the Federal courts.

Thus, at one fell swoop a large part of the municipal sovereign reserved to all the States of the Union over the domestic affairs of their citizens and their police powers and law-enforcement authority would be supplanted.

If this ever comes to pass, then State and county criminal judges, prosecutors, and law-enforcement officers would become largely unnecessary, and they might as well be supplanted by the Federal police, prosecutors, and courts.

CONSTITUTION INVOLVED

Every member of this committee and of the Senate and Congress well knows that the Bill of Rights was adopted as amendments to the United States Constitution promptly after its adoption by the American people, and that the States entered into the compact to create the United States Government with a solemn understanding that the States, or the people of each State in their collective sovereign capacity, would retain their right of self-government, regulation of law enforcement in regard to their domestic and personal affairs, and that these powers of government specifically were not granted to the United States.

The provision for control of their own internal affairs was the chief concern of the States in their Constitutional Convention which wrote the United States Constitution in 1787 and they were careful to delegate to the United States Government only those powers which were deemed necessary to enable it to perform the functions of a central government which were beyond the powers of a single State, such as military operations, interstate and foreign commerce, and foreign affairs.

So, to make the position of the States and their people more secure, the Constitution was ratified by the various States, with reservations which were later embodied in the Bill of Rights, including the tenth amendment which reserved to the States, or the people thereof, all rights and powers not delegated to the National Government nor prohibited to the States.

After the adoption of the fourteenth and fifteenth amendments, there were those who contended for the United States Government, that its authority had been extended over the legal rights of individual persons, but the United States Supreme Court held in various cases (*U. S.* v. *Cruikshank*, (92 U. S. 589 (1876)) to a late case, *Adamson* v. *California* (302 U. S. 319 (1947)) that while the fourteenth amendment protected citizens of the United States against any State violation of their civil rights, individual invasion of individual rights was not the subject matter of the amendments, and they did not invest Congress with power to legislate upon subjects which were within the domain of State

legislation or to create a code of municipal law for the regulation of private rights as between individual citizens.

In 109 United States, page 18 (1893), the United States Supreme Court held that—

"Such legislation by Congress cannot possibly cover the whole domain of rights appertaining to life, liberty and property, defining them and providing for their vindication. That would be to establish a code of municipal law regulative of all private affairs of man and society. It would be to make Congress take the place of all State legislatures and to supersede them.

"It is repugnant to the tenth amendment of the Constitution, which declares that powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the United States are reserved to the States respectively or to the people," (p. 24).

Thus what has been prohibited to the Federal Government, is attempted through the route of the so-called Genocide Convention which plainly is not aimed against a repetition of the genocide horrors of the Nazis during the last war, nor of the reported liquidation of many thousands of Russians and of other nationals by their own governments behind the iron curtain; all of which would be exempted from the Genocide Convention, according to the reservation made by the representative of the United States Government when voting to adopt the Genocide Convention, and by recommendation of the President and Acting Secretary of State in the message submitted to the Senate, because the ratification would leave a government's own nationals unprotected.

WOULD COMPROMISE CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

We submit that the only effect of the ratification by this Senate of the Genocide Convention would be to make the United States a contracting party so as to give the Genocide Convention the effect of an international treaty and under article VI of our Constitution, would make it the supreme law of the land and under article III, section 2, would extend the judicial power of the United States to all criminal cases which could be put in the category of genocide and would effectively annul all applicable State criminal laws, the police powers and the right of law enforcement by all the States of the Union, in any of the kindred crimes under which the broad mantle of the so-called Genocide Convention could be thrown, and would in large measure repeal the tenth amendment of the United States Constitution.

Thus, the ratification of the Genocide Convention would most seriously compromise our system of constitutional government prevailing in the United States. It would displace State constitutions and laws wherever they may conflict with the provisions of the convention, which is very, very broad because it applies to all persons of whatever national, ethnical, racial, or religious group, without exception. It would convert the simple misdemeanor of slander or libel which causes mental harm to any person of any national, racial, or religious group into the category of the international crime of genocide just as it would all physical crimes whether of assault, mahem, or homicide, which now are all covered by the common law or State criminal codes.

We should bear in mind that, with the exception of France, the United States is the only nation in the world whose Constitution provides that its treaties (or conventions) are included among the supreme law of the land on the same basis as provisions of the Constitution and acts of Congress pursuant thereto. Certainly we are not committed to destroying our constitutional form of government nor of destroying the reserved right of States and their people to the right of self-government, police powers, and law enforcement by any international commitment assumed in the Charter of the United Nations. To the contrary, article II, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter specifically provides that nothing contained in that Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any State.

VIOLATES SENATE RESERVATIONS

It is pointed out in editorial comment of the American Journal of International Law, volume 43, October 1949, at page 735, that when the Government of the United States accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article XXXVI of the statute, the Senate attached the Connally reservation which retained for the United States the determination of whether or not a matter is within its domestic jurisdiction. The Genocide Convention bypasses this reservation, as well as the Vandenberg reservation relating to the interpretation of multilateral treaties, and confers jurisdiction upon the International Court of Justice in all disputes relating to the interpretation, application, or fulfillment of the convention at the request of any party to the dispute (art. IX).

Therefore it should be remembered in this connection that, according to an advisory opinion of the Permanent Court of International Justice, a matter solely within the domestic jurisdiction of a state becomes a matter of international concern when a treaty is entered into on that subject. This principle of international law must not be overlooked if we are to maintain the internal enforcement of our constitutional rights without risk of alien interference or submission to an international appellate jurisdiction.

For the above and other reasons which will be submitted by representatives of the American Bar Association and other opponents of the Genocide Convention, we therefore respectfully submit:

1. That this committee report unfavorably on the matter of ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States Senate;

2. That the United States Senate refuse to ratify the Genocide Convention; and

3. That the committee and the Senate suggest to the United Nations that the crime of genocide, properly defined, is inherently one committed by or at the instigation or with the complicity of a foreign state which already has been declared to be a crime against international law; that this proposed Genocide Convention adds nothing to the responsibility of governments or states in their international relations, but is only an attempt to inject the United Nations in the domestic affairs of member states, in violation of article II, paragraph 7, of the United Nations Charter.

Respectfully submitted.

LEANDER H. PEREZ,
District Attorney of Louisiana.

JANUARY 24, 1950.

The CVA and Conservation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ZALES N. ECTON
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ECTON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an open letter entitled "The CVA and Conservation," to the editors of Nature magazine, written by Mrs. Winton Weydemeyer, master of the Montana State Grange.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CVA AND CONSERVATION

OPEN LETTER TO THE EDITORS, NATURE MAGAZINE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

JANUARY 7, 1950.

GENTLEMEN: Having been a member of the American Nature Association for a quarter of a century, perhaps it is my privilege to comment on the editorial, What About CVA? appearing in the current (January 1950) issue of Nature magazine. This editorial, as I read it, places a general stamp of approval upon the proposed CVA legislation, as the essential basic approach to coordinated-resource management in the Columbia River Valley. It repeats the familiar charge that some of the opposing groups are merely fronts for the power interests; it implies that all programs of the three directors would be responsive to local views because the administrators of any such agency as CVA would be continually on trial before Congress; it expresses opposition to supergovernments and dictatorial tendencies, but seems to decide that these should be risked in the interest of natural-resource management. The closing sentence carries not only a challenge, but an accusation that seems unjustified. "If the opponents of the specific proposals now before Congress would exert as much energy in constructive suggestion as they now do in blind and often uninformed opposition, there would be happier prospect of a solution vital to all of us."

I shall comment briefly on these statements, consider the main conservation issue involved, and finally answer the challenge and accusation of the final sentence of the editorial. But first I think it will be agreed that endorsement of the pending CVA legislation automatically carries endorsement of the full plan for dividing the entire Nation into a group of watershed regions administered by huge Government corporations to be known as Authorities or Administrations.

Now it is true, and it is perfectly logical, that power interests are opposed to this national plan as patterned by the CVA bill before Congress (S. 1645). For the system planned would not merely regulate power companies to prevent monopoly in private enterprise; eventually it would eliminate them completely, creating in their place one gigantic power monopoly little subject to regulation by the people. It is also true that some of the opposition to CVA bears—in the words of the editorial—the "invisible fingerprints of equally opposed power interests"; but it is likewise true that much of the support for CVA arises thusly: "If the damned power interests are ag'in it, I'm all for it." Neither side has a corner on blind and often uninformed opinion.

"What about CVA?" carries the belief, doubtless sincere, that the provision for local advisory groups and the need for the administrators to stand continually on trial before Congress would insure responsiveness to local views and interests. If this theory works in practice, why is the National Grange—one of the two leading general farm organizations of the Nation—asking that provision be made for court settlement of disputes between the United States Forest Service and citizens having a voice through present local advisory groups? The CVA bill provides that the directors shall establish such advisory boards and councils as they may decide to be necessary or appropriate to achieve the objectives of the act—as they interpret these objectives. Such a provision is hardly reassuring to those of us who feel that conservation programs must have maximum flexibility to deal with local conditions. Neither is the editorial's continually on trial before Congress statement reassuring when the CVA bill gives the directors power to

determine the necessity for and the character and amount of its expenditures and the manner in which they shall be incurred, allowed, and paid; provides for lump-sum appropriations from which the directors may allocate construction costs (of dams, reservoirs, buildings, industrial plants, hydroelectric plants, and transmission lines) without approval by Congress; and provides that the directors may use receipts of power and other projects to pay for costs incurred in projects constructed according to their own allocation.

Let us examine two general arguments in the editorial, What About CVA. In support of arguments for a coordinated conservation program: The topsoil of other rich lands washes down the river for lack of an integrated soil-conservation program and funds to carry this through. Denuded watersheds erode for lack of funds to reforest, as a part of an over-all plan. Fish and wildlife suffer as a byproduct of both of these situations." In other words, the present Soil Conservation Service, United States Forest Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service are failing to do their conservation job for lack of funds granted by the people through Congress—in our democratic manner. Contrast this with an earlier statement that under the CVA the functions of these present Services "would not be taken over by CVA but coordinated into its over-all conservation and development plan for the area. Such a plan the CVA would be charged with preparing, basing it upon consultation with all Federal, State, local, and private agencies in the region." The reasoning behind these statements postulates one or the other of two theories: (1) That upon creation of a CVA the taxpayers will gladly shell out the extra dollars for which the Forest Service has repeatedly been asking for replanting of denuded lands, and the money which they have been refusing the Soil Conservation Service for the reduction of soil losses; or (2) under the CVA funds can be used for conservation—according to the ideas of the Directors—without consent of the people. The first theory appears merely to be wishful thinking; the second raises the fundamental issue involved in CVA and related schemes—an issue more important and far-reaching than valley authority legislation itself. Can conservation best be accomplished by Government planners or by the people?

Perhaps because a necessary foundation in resource conservation in America was laid by Theodore Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot through providing Government ownership and administration of vast land, forest, and mineral areas, we conservationists through the years have overemphasized the role of public ownership or control of natural resources. Even today, with conservation becoming such a popular religion that it is used to camouflage numerous political power and vote-getting schemes, it is essential that public ownership be employed to save resources which we wish to preserve in their natural state for the benefit of all people, such as our national park areas; to set aside for national defense needs certain mineral resources; and to insure adequate administration of areas having multiple-use values, such as our western mountain and plateau watershed areas. But it is high time we realize that programs of conservation for use can never be adequately successful if applied primarily as Government programs devised by the planners and dictated to our citizens—even if Congress approves. The wise function of government is to provide tools with which its citizens, independently or cooperatively, can accomplish the field work of conservation. If enlightened through conservation education to the necessity of—and opportunity for—proper soil, water, forest, and wildlife conservation rather than compelled to action by legislation or forced to support Government programs through taxation, the citizens of America can and will do the job with vision, vigor, and generous use of elbow grease.

If anyone doubts this statement, let him consider carefully the amazing development and accomplishment in soil and water conservation under the democratic soil-conservation-districts system. Under this successful program, local farmers elected by their neighbors study the needs of their area, devise and finance their own conservation activities, and carry them out with the use of technical tools provided by the Soil Conservation Service and other public agencies. The local citizens themselves plan and administer the programs, while Government experts act as advisers—just the reverse of the CVA set-up. And the system works—it results in conservation achievement. It is working so well that in a dozen years it has been extended to cover three-fourths of the Nation's farms—by voluntary vote of the landowners themselves. It has given the rural people of America a chance personally to use their own brains and brawn in saving the land they love. It is providing the means for expanding programs of forest and wildlife conservation on private lands. It refutes completely the familiar argument that Government must step in with sweeping conservation programs because private citizens won't do the job.

Some conservation programs, of course, are too large for such local action. Some are geographically too extensive for separate States to deal with. I heartily join the writer of What About CVA? in the statement "We are convinced that coordinated handling of all the natural resources of such a geographical and biological unit offers the only answer" to adequate watershed resource management. I am forced to disagree, however, with the assertion made regarding the needed broad plan, "Whether it is CVA or some other combination of initials is not too important." It is vitally important. To eliminate the weaknesses of present separate local, State, and Federal agencies by adopting the CVA plan would be like eliminating spot fires by fanning the whole forest into one flame. Administration of the CVA and other valley authorities could easily destroy the successful democratic soil-conservation-districts programs; it could put an end to the gradually improving conservation programs of the Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Soil Conservation Service; of State and local game, forestry, and water-conservation agencies; and the cooperative programs of citizen organizations. It would divide Glacier National Park between two authorities, Columbia Valley and Missouri Valley—with these two perhaps squabbling for jurisdiction of that large section of the park lying in the Saskatchewan River watershed.

The valley-authority plan is like so many bright dreams of public-welfare planners; if it could be administered by angels, it would establish a measure of heavenly peace and well-being upon earth. But with human nature being what it is, adoption of such a plan would reveal the basic mistakes of most vanished civilizations and crumbled nations of history; the concentration of too much power and authority in too few hands, and denial to the individual citizen of opportunity personally to contribute to the welfare of his country according to his own beliefs.

In closing, lest the labels "tool of the power interests" and "uninformed groups" be applied, let me say that I am supporting the vigorous stand against CVA and similar valley authorities taken by members of the Montana State Grange and the Montana State Farm Bureau after long and careful consideration of the issues involved; and that I am writing as a long-time member and supporter of a dozen of the Nation's leading conservation organizations. I have written at some length because I appreciate the influence of Nature Magazine, and feel that the views herein expressed should come to your attention.

In further reply to the closing sentence of the editorial, may I refer you to the plan of watershed administration being proposed by the National Grange, featuring coordination of activities of present State and Federal agencies, study of economic feasibility of projects proposed, emphasis on agricultural values, and regional policy-making boards of which the majority membership would represent the watershed area. Your near neighbor in Washington, Dr. J. T. Sanders, at National Grange headquarters, 744 Jackson Place NW., would be glad to explain the plan further.

Most sincerely yours,

WINTON WEYDEMEYER,
Master, Montana State Grange.

Development of the Cumberland River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a splendid editorial entitled "Looking Forward," by Mr. W. Percy Williams, publisher of the Paris (Tenn.) Post-Intelligencer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LOOKING FORWARD

Tennessee and Kentucky Congressmen have petitioned the President to exercise a provision of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act to permit a thorough study of possibilities for developing flood control and electric potentialities of the lower Cumberland River.

At the time the TVA was established it was thought that someday the Cumberland watershed would, and should, come under its jurisdiction and consumption of electricity by the Government has developed so rapidly that a larger output will be needed to supply increasing demands for power on the part of the public for industrial and domestic purposes.

When TVA was established no one dreamed there would ever be such a thing as the Oak Ridge Atomic Energy development, nor the new airforce installations to be constructed at Tullahoma, both of which will require enormous supplies of electricity. We did not even anticipate the large increased use of current for industrial purposes.

TVA is the only source of power for a large territory in five States and it must keep pace with the increased demand. We would expect the same from private industry if it were the source of supply.

There will always be those who regard TVA as socialistic, and accuse the Government of tricky bookkeeping by building dams for flood control and using them to produce electricity for sale in competition with private industry, but they are 15 years too late to present arguments against the practice.

The taxpayers have invested a billion dollars in TVA for flood control and power production and, while there is an honest difference of opinion on whether it was right to do it, it is an accomplished fact now and we had might as well make the best of it, which is exactly what we people of the Tennessee Valley are doing. If TVA were in New

England we suspect the folks in that area would do the same.

It is our opinion that the taxpayers' investment in TVA would be justified as a flood-control proposition even if the Government didn't produce a dime's worth of electricity. We think that has been proven since the first of the current year.

We have had more rainfall in the watershed of the Mississippi, Missouri, Ohio, and Tennessee Rivers this year than we had in 1937 when flood damage was estimated at more than $50,000,000. If we have saved that much this year by controlling the flood we have earned at least 5 percent on the full amount invested in river development.

It will be up to Congress to determine whether the Cumberland shall be placed under TVA jurisdiction eventually, but we believe our Congressmen from Kentucky and Tennessee have acted wisely in asking the President to proceed without delay a study of the possibilities.

Conditions in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM CONNALLY
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Three Bad Weeks," written by Mr. Walter Lippmann and published in the Washington Post of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY AND TOMORROW
(By Walter Lippmann)
THREE BAD WEEKS

If our object is to make everything as easy as we can for Moscow and as difficult as possible for ourselves, then we have managed one way and another to do a lot during the past 3 weeks. But if we are still trying to win the cold war, we have hurt our own cause very seriously indeed in Asia and in Europe.

The Republican minority in Congress which adheres to Chiang, unable to impose its own policy on the administration, has nevertheless succeeded in impairing, perhaps ruining, the chances of any other policy. It cannot be their intention to hamstring the United States Government. But that is precisely what they are doing.

The record shows that when they were overruled by the President on the issues of intervention in Formosa, they did not accept the decision but instead took steps to nullify it. Their method was to vote against economic aid to Korea in the House in order to log-roll the administration into giving additional support to Chiang in Formosa. Their plan was to compel the administration to keep itself tied to Chiang or to sacrifice the American position in Korea.

The President and Secretary Acheson chose to appease them and agreed to buy aid to Korea with aid to Chiang. This act of appeasement was followed promptly by Chiang's use of American planes to bomb Shanghai and by his threat to bomb Peiping. When we protested against our being involved against our will in this massacre of Chinese civilians, Chiang rejected our protests haughtily. He felt able to defy the American Government and to bomb the American power plant in Shanghai and the installations of the Socony-Vacuum Oil Co., and to kill or maim a thousand Chinese civilians. Why? Because he interpreted the actions in Congress as meaning that he had such strong supporters in Congress that he could thumb his nose at the President of the United States.

And what is Chiang's purpose in these raids? They have no conceivable military value in his war with the Chinese Communists. It is an insult to anyone's intelligence to argue that Chiang, from Formosa with his tiny air force can defeat, or seriously injure the Red regime of the Chinese mainland.

Chiang's purpose in these raids is not to fight his war but to keep us entangled so that his war may become our war. By using American planes and American bombs against defenseless Chinese civilians he means to provoke the Chinese into reprisals against Americans and westerners generally. Chiang's object is to embroil us in a Chinese war. For he thinks that then he would get unlimited money and arms.

Nothing could suit the Kremlin better. Their object is to force Red China into the Soviet orbit and to isolate it from the United States. That is easy to do if America is represented in China only by Chiang's American airplanes killing Chinese civilians. The Russians have nothing to fear from Chiang or from any military help that Senator KNOWLAND or Representative JOHN DAVIS LODGE could or would get Congress to give to Chiang. But the Russians have everything to gain by keeping us permanently entangled with Chiang and forever embroiled and hated in China.

That is their very best insurance against any form of Titoism in China. It is their very best way of diverting the attention of the Chinese from the north, where Chinese and Russian interests conflict, to the south. For if China can be provoked into becoming engaged in a struggle for Indochina and Thailand and Burma, what will be the result?

The struggle will surely be indecisive. But it will also be exhausting both to the Chinese and to the western nations involved. The Chinese will be too weak to win in the south against the British, the French, and the Americans. They will be too weak to resist the Russians in the north. On the other hand, the French will not be strong enough to reconquer Indochina—they already have their whole professional army engaged and have denuded themselves of effective military power in Europe. But with American help the French will be strong enough to remain pinned down in a cruel and indecisive little war.

What could suit the Russians better than to have the only land army in western Europe fighting guerrillas in Indochina? If there is a cheaper and easier way to nullify the military-aid program of the Atlantic Pact, I do not know what it is.

Chiang's Republican friends in Congress are assuming an awful responsibility.

And simultaneously we have gravely injured our position in Europe by the thoughtless frenzy of our dealings with the hydrogen bomb. The net result of the announcements, congressional hearings, and press conferences on that subject has been to inform our Allies that we do not know how they can be defended because we are afraid we cannot even defend ourselves. That, I repeat, is the net result, the practical, human consequence of the unmanly, demoralizing, and most un-American yielding to panic at the sudden and belated discovery that we do not have undisputed military superiority.

This cannot go on, or we shall destroy our influence in Asia and in Europe, and we shall worry and frighten ourselves into a humiliating and dangerous isolation. We have before us the inordinately difficult task of reorienting our foreign policy, which has been overextended and miscalculated, to what Mr. Acheson calls the existing situation of fact.

It cannot be done while we are frightened out of our wits, and so divided among ourselves by partisan hatreds and personal suspicions that we think only with our viscera and not with our minds. We shall have to become sane again if we are to be safe, and we shall have to rally to some standard and close our ranks.

That standard cannot be raised by the minority members of a minority party. It will have to be raised by the President of the United States.

The Fulbright Exchange Program in Operation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, in the news letter of the American Council of Learned Societies for December 1949, there appears an article entitled "The Fulbright Exchange Program in Operation," by Charles E. Odegaard. I think the article is one of the best on the subject, bringing up to date the operation of the program. Therefore I ask that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

The manuscript as submitted is estimated to require two and three-fourths pages in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $225.50.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE FULBRIGHT EXCHANGE PROGRAM IN OPERATION
(By Charles E. Odegaard)

With a truly substantial exodus of American professors and students to foreign parts under Fulbright awards beginning in the fall of 1949 the time has finally come when the influence of the Fulbright Act will be felt throughout the length and breadth of the United States as well as in a number of foreign countries. It has been more than 3 years since Senator FULBRIGHT's highly significant proposal became law (Public Law 584, 79th Cong., approved by the President, August 1, 1946), and many persons in America whose hearts skipped a beat at the thought that they might study or teach abroad have long since wondered if anything would ever come of the Fulbright Act and if their personal dreams would ever have a chance to be realized.

Now that a considerable number of Fulbright exchanges of persons between the United States and other countries are taking place, it seems especially appropriate that more people know something of the procedures which have been developed for the administration of the Fulbright program, and of its difficulties and limitations. The description which follows is drawn from the personal experiences of one who has served this past year as a member of the Committee on International Exchange of Persons established by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils. It is not an official statement of the Committee, nor of course of the Department of State. It is partial in the sense that it does not concern directly exchanges in the student category or in the primary and secondary school teacher category, although many things said here apply to these categories as well as to the research scholar and professor category. It is hoped

that this description will provide interested persons with some understanding of the present operation of the Fulbright program.

It is important to note at the very beginning that the basic legislation establishing this program of educational exchanges, the Fulbright Act, is in substance an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944. Where outside of the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska (including the Aleutian Islands), Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, there was United States surplus property at the end of World War II, and where the countries concerned are able to pay the United States Government for it only in their own currency but not in dollars, there, and there only, is the possibility of negotiating a Fulbright educational-exchange agreement. The entire Fulbright program rests financially on this nondollar base in those specific countries in which surplus property owned by the United States happened to be located. There are no dollars available for grantees, and this fact constitutes one of the rigid limitations of the program with which individual Americans and foreigners must reckon in any plans for the utilization of a Fulbright award. The hope that supplemental dollar aid might come from the Smith-Mundt Act has only recently materialized; and there seems to be good reason to believe that supplemental dollar aid from this source will always be limited.

Under the act the Secretary of State is authorized to enter into executive agreements with foreign governments for the disposition in each case of not more than the equivalent of $20,000,000 to be spent on educational exchanges at a rate of not more than the equivalent of $1,000,000 a year. The maximum figure of $20,000,000 will probably be available only in the United Kingdom, Italy, France, and China, though conditions in the last country obviously threaten the extinction of a Fulbright program there. For other countries which now participate or might participate in Fulbright exchanges, the available sums fall at different levels below this maximum.

Executive agreements were signed long enough ago with Burma, China, the Philippines, Greece, and New Zealand that Americans have actually been present in these countries on Fulbright awards during the academic year 1948–49. The program with China has perforce been suspended, but for the year 1949–50, except for China, there will be Americans abroad on Fulbright awards in these countries and also in Norway, the Netherlands, France, Italy, Belgium-Luxemburg, and the United Kingdom and its colonies. Agreements have recently been signed with Iran, Egypt, and Australia, so that awards will presumably be made for 1950–51, if not before. It is possible that in time agreements will be signed with Austria, Korea, Siam, Turkey, Pakistan, and India, thus permitting exchanges with these countries.

For any understanding of the Fulbright program and an evaluation of its present operation it is essential that one grasp at least the main outlines of its administrative peculiarities and the reasons for them. The Secretary of State is responsible for the general administration of the program but for the purpose of selecting students and educational institutions qualified to participate in this program and to supervise the exchange program the President was authorized to appoint a Board of Foreign Scholarships consisting of 10 members serving without compensation. It is this Board then which actually approves policies for the educational programs under the act and the types of programs and projects to be undertaken, which selects the institutions abroad approved for participation, and which makes the final choice among candidates for awards, both American and foreign.

These onerous responsibilities could obviously not be borne unless the Board received substantial assistance. To bring together all the elements involved into a working program of exchanges it has been necessary to establish a rather elaborate machinery. Responsibility for gathering together the recommendations from various agencies concerned and for taking the necessary action pursuant to the Board's decisions is vested in its immediate secretariat, which is located in the Division of Exchange of Persons of the Department of State, the Division which carries the responsibility within the Department for the administration of the act.

Since the Fulbright program is established through diplomatic agreements with foreign countries to permit educational exchanges both ways, it is obviously necessary to have a base of operations in the foreign countries. In accordance with the act, there is therefore established in each country a United States Educational Foundation, the exact character of which is determined in each case in the executive agreements negotiated by the Secretary of State. In most instances the Foundations consist of 10 members, half of whom are United States Embassy officials or other Americans resident in the foreign country concerned, the other half being nationals of the foreign country who are associated with the educational and research activities of their own country. Since the funds are actually impounded abroad, the Foundation abroad is responsible for their disbursement in accordance with directives of the Secretary of State based on policies approved by the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The foundations, however, play a very large role in the determination of the actual character of the exchanges. They prepare in the first instance the program proposal for each year of operation, including recommending fairly specific allocations within the budget. Since the act requires that Americans going abroad be associated with schools and institutions of higher learning, the Foundations recommend the foreign institutions with which they should be connected and negotiate with these institutions to secure their acceptance of American candidates who have been recommended for awards. The foundations also screen and recommend to the Board of Foreign Scholarships foreign candidates for what can be in the nature of things merely travel grants to the shores of the United States, there being no dollars available in the Fulbright program for the support of foreigners while they are in the United States. Some of the implications of these responsibilities of the foundations will be discussed later.

The recommendations of the foundations to the Board of Foreign Scholarships clearly call for analysis and subsequent implementation which in kind and in amount exceed the capacity of the board to bear alone. For this reason it has asked for the assistance of the so-called cooperating agencies. The act provides for "financing studies, research, instruction, and other educational activities of or for American citizens in schools and institutions of higher learning." The Board of Foreign Scholarships and the Department of State have construed the act to permit the granting of awards to Americans who fall into three main categories: (1) Students, and for the present this means students at the graduate level, (2) teachers in elementary schools, secondary schools, and junior colleges, and (3) professors, specialists, and advanced research scholars. To secure recommendations concerning American applicants, program proposals originating with the foundations, and other related matters, the Board of Foreign Scholarships turned for assistance to agencies already in existence with well-established means of tapping appropriate information concerning persons and policies in American education. Accordingly students are directed to make application to the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York 19, N. Y., which maintains a national committee to review applications and submit nominations to the board. Teachers are directed to submit applications to the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington 25, D. C., whose committee performs a similar function for these applicants. Professors, specialists, and advanced research scholars are directed to submit applications to the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C., composed of representatives of the American Council of Learned Societies, the American Council on Education, the National Research Council, and the Social Science Research Council, organizations whose connections reach out into all areas of research and instruction in higher education in America.

A further word is appropriate here concerning the actual screening procedures used by the conference board. Responsibility for submitting specific nominations in its behalf is vested in its Committee on the International Exchange of Persons which consists of eight members representing the various areas of concern to the four councils (Messrs. Bellinger, Bronk, Brumbaugh, Counts, Graves, Herring, Trytten, and Voegelin). The operations of the committee require a substantial secretariat which is directed by Dr. Gordon Bowles, executive secretary. The applications received by the conference board, complete with the individual letters of recommendation, are distributed in appropriate groupings for review by experts on standing committees of the councils or ad hoc committees established for the purpose as circumstances require. If there are only a small number of applications in given areas, this review may be conducted by mail. If there is any considerable number in a given area, as is often the case, these committees meet in person to discuss the candidates and prepare their recommendations. The reports of the screening committees are then reviewed by the conference board committee which makes the final nominations but always within the limitations set by the country programs as proposed by the foundations and subsequently approved with or without modification by the Board of Foreign Scholarships.

The nominations of the conference board committee, like those of the Institute of International Education and of the United States Office of Education, are submitted directly to the Division of Exchange of Persons within the Department of State, where they pass through an additional stage before they are presented to the Board of Foreign Scholarships. The Department forwards the application of each candidate to the United States Educational Foundation abroad, for the Board of Foreign Scholarships must look to the foundation for assurance that the candidate will be welcome in the host country, that he will be acceptable to an approved institution or research center in that country, and that the facilities for carrying out his project are sufficiently adequate to insure him a reasonable measure of success. It is on the basis of these assurances and other information, including possible evidence of disloyalty, that the Board of Foreign Scholarships makes its final selection among the applicants included in a recommended panel.

Many will remark immediately that this machinery is cumbersome. Yes; but it is difficult to see how, without some such structure which takes into account all the interests involved, an international educational exchange program can be operated at all. With more experience it will be possible to speed up and to streamline the various parts of this complicated process, thus reducing the long intervals of waiting so disheartening and exasperating for the applicants. There will always be, however, an irreducible minimum time required for action on applications, and those who aspire to receive Fulbright awards will have to accept a certain period of waiting.

So much for the bare machinery for operating the program. Now for a discussion of some of the problems which vitally affect the character of the program but which can be understood only against the administrative background here described.

This article is addressed to an American audience. The first reaction of individuals within this group is likely to be, I wonder if I can obtain a Fulbright award to permit me to go to this or that country to continue study, research, or teaching in this or that special field in which I have a great interest. The answer may turn out to be in many cases a very flat "no" regardless of the high competence of the individual and of his particular fitness for study in the country of his choice. No applicant can be successful no matter how great his qualifications, unless he personally is accepted abroad for a particular billet within the annual program of the country concerned. There are these two elements in the program which are insufficiently understood by Americans; namely, the availability within the program of an appropriate billet and the acceptability of the individual applicant to the foundation and to particular institutions abroad. On having these unexpected elements in the program explained to them, some Americans are wont to snap back in irritation at discovering this unforeseen possibility of the frustration of their hopes: "What do these foreign institutions have to do with this program? It is based on our money, isn't it?" Unfortunately—though perhaps in the long run it is not a complete misfortune—the Fulbright program is based on foreign currency which may technically accrue to the United States Government as credit for the sale of surplus property but which cannot be spent without the cooperation of the foreign government. There is then a bilateral aspect to the Fulbright program which cannot be ignored. No educational exchange program could work successfully anyway on a strictly unilateral base. The opportunities for study, research, or teaching abroad desired by Americans almost always depend upon a hospitable welcome from foreign institutions. It is by no means then a complete loss that circumstances require their consent in fact to the Fulbright exchanges.

The foundations have exerted a profound influence on the character of the exchanges to date. The highly commendable effort of the board of foreign scholarships and the Department of State to set the program in operation as quickly as possible has in the past often precluded the possibility of extensive review of country proposals by the cooperating agencies in the United States prior to the acceptance of the program by the board of foreign scholarships. As the program in various countries moves into the second year of operation, there is more time for such review. It must be admitted, however, that there are serious difficulties in any last-minute attempt to make significant modifications in these proposals in view of the danger of the charge of American cultural imperialism. There is a very real need of increased understanding of all parts of this program on the part of foundations, cooperating agencies, the Department of State, and the board of foreign scholarships. More is required than good will—of which there has been an ample stock in this past year. There is needed also considerable knowledge and information. Americans need to know more about the special circumstances, needs, and opportunities in the various Fulbright countries. The foundations in turn need to know more about the potentialities and aspirations of Americans. The kind of knowledge required is not gained overnight, certainly not in the atmosphere of haste and emergency action which has prevailed of necessity during the last, really the first, year of significant exchange operations.

The Department of State has endeavored to instruct its emissaries abroad in the operation of the program, a few of whom, being recently in the United States, have discussed various aspects of the program with the cooperating agencies before going to their foreign posts. In a number of cases in the spring and summer of 1949 the Department arranged for persons associated with various foundations to come to the United States to discuss the program with appropriate persons. This has been most helpful; and it is to be hoped that there will be still more activity of this kind. The cooperating agencies and the State Department officials concerned with Fulbright matters are far better equipped now, after reviewing the programs for 11 countries and endeavoring to operate under them, to discuss problems and possibilities than they were 6 months ago. It would seem highly advantageous not only to continue bringing individuals associated with the foundations to the United States but also to send to the Fulbright countries a team of experienced persons representing the Department of State and the cooperating agencies. Such a procedure in the early phases of the Fulbright program should ensure the establishment of annual programs which are more likely to be mutually satisfactory. Discussions of this kind prior to the submission of the annual program proposals are likely to be far more effective than any modifications suggested after the foundations have made formal submission of them; and from such discussions Americans are likely to gain a better understanding of the conditions and purposes which underlie these proposals.

It has been an interesting experience this past year to discover as one program after another has been submitted how widely the basic conceptions of the foundations have differed. The earliest programs received tended to be especially rigid, giving relatively little room in which to accommodate a professor or research scholar whose specialty did not happen to coincide with very specific interests expressed in the program. The New Zealand program affords a good illustration of this tendency, partly because of the very clarity with which it was presented. The professional and research billets were carefully described and grew out of a specific stated need in New Zealand, generally of an applied character. In a number of instances the foundation stated the special problem which it wished a particular named American to undertake. A program of this sort containing a large percentage of these billets is often very difficult to fill for lack of American candidates with these specific interests who in the given year are free to leave their normal habitat for a year abroad. Meanwhile there may be other well-qualified Americans desiring awards who cannot be given serious consideration. When faced with this situation, the conference board committee has tried to loosen up the program by submitting the names of a limited number of well-qualified Americans for whom there are no stated billets in the hope that the foundations will take a favorable interest in these nominees for positions in the program which have not been filled.

The British program, one of the largest, is very different in character; it has proved to be one of the easiest to manage and in all probability will be the one in the first year of operation which will bring the greatest satisfaction to both countries concerned. This is due in large part to the happy circumstance that Sir Hector Hetherington, vice chairman of the foundation, visited the United States prior to the submission of the British program to discuss the Fulbright exchange with all parties concerned. In the course of this visit he made a notable contribution to the thinking of many persons concerning the operation of the program. The basic plan of the British program is very simple. It assumes that the American agencies know more about the personal qualifications of American candidates and should be left with the responsibility for nominating good candidates with serious interests which may presumably be furthered by a year in Great Britain. The foundation, being better informed concerning institutions in Great Britain, endeavors, in the spirit of a good host, to determine if there is a suitable place available for the nominees. The British program has not specified a large number of rigidly defined billets, thus leaving room for a relatively free expression of interest on the part of Americans which may be gratified. The foundation has indicated a very limited number of special fields in which for some particular reason it hopes to see an American representative nominated. The generosity of spirit which pervades the program as proposed by the foundation obviously invites strenuous efforts on the American side to gratify these few special wishes.

In judging any program one must, of course, take into account the special circumstances of each country in relation to the interests and possible contribution of the United States. A program such as that of Great Britain is calculated to work easily and well when the intellectual developments, scientific skill, and educational institutions of the foreign country and the United States are roughly comparable. This condition prevails with reference to the west European countries, and in the category where there might be some difficulty, that of the professors, a policy such as that adopted by the Netherlands, would go far to eliminate difficulties. The Dutch universities have chosen to regard the courses offered by visiting American professors as outside the normal curriculum. In this way the American is free to make his contribution without having to fit his offering into a preexistent scheme with which he may not be familiar and which might place upon him cramping burdens which are not truly essential to a profitable educational exchange.

In the case of countries where educational interests and institutions are not comparable to those of the United States, the program is likely in each instance to take on a special character. For example, the Burmese Foundation, eager to reconstruct its educational institutions and to improve the welfare of its rural population, places a heavy emphasis on filling particular vacancies in its university structure and on agricultural extension activities. The Philippine Foundation, seeing in the Fulbright program an opportunity to obtain American assistance in building a public-school system which will raise the general level of education of the Philippine people, places a heavy emphasis on educationists in its program.

It is inevitable that the foundations, using as a starting point an analysis of needs of the foreign country, will tend to propose programs which involve bringing to their countries Americans who, it is believed, can make a contribution to these needs. Sometimes the requests within the programs prove to be unrealistic in the sense that they cannot be filled. For example, there is an impressive number of requests for nuclear physicists, but the premium on them is so high in the United States that there is little likelihood that they can or will leave the United States. The demand for specialists in various kinds of medicine is often difficult to fill.

Starting with an analysis of needs in the foreign country, foundations have a natural tendency to overlook interests which Americans may have in study in their countries. Those countries which are impressed by what they regard as their need of American technology and science, out of their very humility tend to think that Americans can have very limited research interests which would lead them to wish to come to their countries. Yet there may be Americans who wish to study their human culture and their physical

environment and who could conduct field studies very profitably even if there is no highly developed program in these subjects in their educational institutions.

The aspects of the programs which have been discussed affect particularly the professor and research scholar category of awards. There are similar complications with reference to the teacher category, especially in view of the fact that the linguistic hurdles are greater at this level in educational institutions and that many countries have licensing requirements for teachers in the school systems which interfere seriously with utilizing Americans. Foundation proposals are least rigid with regard to the student category, though students have to face serious limitations in the great differences in opportunities for actual study in the various countries.

The comments presented here have had to do primarily with factors affecting the flow of Americans to foreign countries. It has been indicated, however, that the program is based on more than a unilateral agreement permitting a flow in one direction. It is based essentially on a bilateral agreement which permits a flow in two directions, of Americans abroad and of foreigners to the United States. To secure the kind of cooperation needed for the reception of Americans abroad and, indeed, to serve the ultimate high purpose which is at the base of Senator FULBRIGHT'S plan, a mutual understanding among peoples, Americans must not forget the need of encouraging the flow of foreigners to the United States. Indeed, a considerable measure of responsibility for insuring the success of these exchanges rests with individuals in the American academic world, administrators and professors, who have the opportunity to show initiative in procuring the dollar support necessary to permit foreigners to teach or study in the United States. Fulbright funds can be used in most cases to pay the travel expenses involved in bringing to the shores of the United States foreigners who have been recommended as qualified by the foundations. The United States Government has only very limited dollar funds which can be tapped. In very few instances are the foreigners able to procure from their own governments or from private sources abroad the necessary dollars. In almost all cases, then, the dollars must be provided by agencies within the United States.

By showing some ingenuity, American universities and colleges have created opportunities for a considerable number of scholars to visit them for the purpose of teaching, study, or research. Most institutions at one time or another discover that they have funds available which cannot be used for long-term commitments, but which could be used for a short-term grant. Since the larger part of the travel costs can be paid for with Fulbright funds, fairly modest sums may enable the institution to bring a scholar or student to its campus.

The Board of Foreign Scholarships has recognized the importance to the program of bringing as many foreigners as possible to the United States, and at the same time the difficulties in obtaining extensive dollar support, by permitting shorter term grants for foreigners than for Americans. Americans going abroad can be supported in full with Fulbright funds, and much the largest part of the Fulbright funds will accordingly be used for the expenses of Americans. There is, then, no strong practical reason why Americans cannot stay abroad for a period as long as a normal academic year. Only under exceptional circumstances has the board approved grants for periods as short as 6 months. Because of the shortage of dollars the board has been willing to make grants to foreigners who have secured sufficient dollar support for shorter periods within the United States. The board has even approved grants for foreign professors who were invited to teach in summer sessions. It would certainly be preferable, however, if more of the opportunities offered foreigners were for longer periods of time.

Thanks to this foresight on the part of various individuals in American institutions, a fair number of foreigners will attend American institutions in the year 1949–50. It would be desirable from all points of view to see more such opportunities. In most cases in the past exchange arrangements have been made by direct contact between an American institution and a foreign scholar in person or his institutional connection. Subsequently application has been made to the foundation for a Fulbright travel grant. The American interest could be equally well served if institutions, willing to receive a foreign scholar or student, submitted the specifications of the opening, along with an indication of the dollar support available, to the appropriate cooperating agency in the United States for forwarding to the foundation. In particular, openings which could well be filled by visiting professors from abroad should be called to the attention of Dr. Gordon T. Bowles, executive secretary of the conference board committee. The foundation could then nominate qualified candidates. It should be remarked that American institutions would have the same veto power now possessed in fact by the foreign institutions in that their failure to accept the nominee would preclude the possibility of the board's giving the nominee a travel grant.

The Fulbright program is by all odds the greatest fellowship program in the world's history. Anyone who has had the slightest connection with the operation of a fellowship program within a single college or university knows the difficulties involved in making proper selections. These difficulties increase when more institutions become involved. In the case of the Fulbright program the wishes of innumerable institutions in a variety of lands with very diverse traditions must be considered. There is, and will continue to be, a steady stream of new problems calling for rational analysis and policy determination. Many of these cannot be foreseen in advance. Under these circumstances there are bound to be delays, and what may turn out to be in some cases outright mistakes. The indulgent sympathy of the entire educational world in America and abroad is needed. The cooperative agencies are certain to welcome constructive comments on various aspects of the program and its awards; interested persons should not hesitate to write them.

At the same time, it is important that those who are gratified with various aspects of the program as it now unfolds should make that gratification known. The Fulbright Act is a tool which has been fashioned in the expectation that it would lead to better international understanding. Support by the United States Government of such efforts is still in its infancy. Those who believe in such efforts have a responsibility not merely to criticize mistakes of operation, but also to make known in all appropriate places the full meaning in terms of human experience and understanding of a Fulbright year.

Jefferson as a National Planner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. BLATNIK

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. BLATNIK. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Party is preparing to honor two great Democratic Presidents—Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson—at our annual Jefferson-Jackson day dinners, and while we do so, the atmosphere is filled with the anguished cries of reactionary politicians and Wall Street plutocrats about the "evils of Democratic planning" and the dangers of the welfare state. I believe that the best answer to these calamity yowlers is found in the words, deeds, and philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. Under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the article entitled "Jefferson as a Planner of National Resources" which appeared in the July 1943 edition of the magazine Ethics, and which was authored jointly by the eminent political scientist at the University of Chicago, Prof. Charles E. Merriam, and my good friend Mr. Frank P. Bourgin, of Virginia, Minn., a former graduate student at the University of Chicago:

JEFFERSON AS A PLANNER OF NATIONAL RESOURCES

(By Charles E. Merriam and Frank P. Bourgin)

The clue to the understanding of Jefferson is found in his idea of liberty. Jefferson was for freedom, not only from something but for something. Jefferson hated tyranny and demanded freedom from oppression, but he also demanded the pursuit of happiness. In his thinking, equality, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness were real and inseparable parts of a world in which human beings might best develop. Underlying this was his confidence in the perfectibility of mankind, in the possibilities of continuing growth and development.

Jefferson was against tyranny in any form, whether physical or mental, whether by public or private agencies, whether by State, church, land jobbers, or bankers. The tyranny of landlords and land speculators, the tyranny of central government or local government, the tyranny of ignorance—all these were the objects of his attack from time to time. What may seem inconsistent in the thinking of Jefferson arises from failure to observe his real objectives—the ends toward which he moved in the emancipation of mankind and in the equipment of men for the pursuit of happiness.

Jefferson was not merely a philosopher; he was also a statesman and a social engineer—also a party leader, to be sure, but that is not our present topic. Jefferson not only set forth the ends but also planned constructively the means of attaining liberty, equality, the pursuit of happiness, and the consent of the governed.

Jefferson was a planner and, indeed, the first great American and democratic planner. But he was first, last, and always a planner with a philosophy. The roads he indicated might wind round and at times even seem to be going in opposite directions, but his sense of direction remained the same.

The keen intelligence of Jefferson, which found recognition in his repeated election as president of the American Philosophical Society, led him to elaborate his programs and plans, not alone in the grand manner of philosophy but with the care and pains of the practical observer and technician. Jefferson's Notes on Virginia was the first report on State planning in the United States and may well be compared with some of its later followers in forty-odd American States. He was concerned from the first with the development of all the resources of his State and, later, his Nation—both physical and human resources. Thus he brought over the Italian, Mazzei, to advise him regarding the development of olive growing and wine making in Virginia; and in like manner he organized the University of Virginia and per-

sonally supervised the construction of the first buildings. His land planning, his educational planning, his transportation planning, and his broad national expansion planning are marked all the way by their broad range of vision and also by their minute attention to technical detail. He planned not only a land and free-labor policy for the Northwest Territory, but also the method of land survey. He was concerned not only with education as a basis for democracy, but with the way the bricks were being laid in building the University of Virginia.

LAND PLANNING

Jefferson was deeply concerned with land planning, thinking of agricultural development as a basis of democracy. From his earliest days Jefferson planned energetically and constructively for the development of democratic land resources. He sought to incorporate a homestead provision into the Virginia constitution. In his draft of the new constitution this paragraph appeared: "Every person of full age, neither owning nor having owned 50 acres of land, shall be entitled to an appropriation of 50 acres, or to so much as shall make what he owns or has owned 50 acres in full and absolute domain." The Virginia convention refused to incorporate the free-land-grant principle into the constitution. But Jefferson went further to attack the land problem from other directions.

In Virginia, in the first session, after the Declaration of Independence, the privilege of primogeniture was abolished and alsq entails. Furthermore, it was provided that the land of intestates should be divided equally. "These laws," said Jefferson, "drawn by myself, laid the ax to the root of pseudoaristocracy."

No less important than the abolition of feudal land tenures for the future of America's democratic land system was the establishment of a system of land disposal avoiding the dangers of large-scale land speculation. Few persons today realize the dangers that existed at the close of the Revolution, threatening our whole land policy.

For years prior to the Revolution speculative land companies, made up of some of the most influential persons both in England and in America were engaged in intrigue at the royal court to obtain grants of land in the Ohio Valley amounting to millions of acres. Following the breach with England, the scene of conflict for land-grabbing shifted from the royal court to the new State legislatures. The extent of the speculators' power may be judged by the fact that, through their influence over certain legislatures, they were able to delay for over 3 years the ratification of the Articles of Confederation. Had they been successful, it is possible that the vast territory of the Northwest would have been organized into great baronial estates rather than a multiplicity of small land holdings. Had the land speculators been able to seize the territory of the Ohio Valley in a few great tracts, Congress would probably have been precluded from launching its constructive land surveys and territorial policies.

As a landowning gentleman, cultivating his own acres, Jefferson had a healthy dislike for the practices of the land jobbers. He disdained personally to adventure in land speculations, and he readily appreciated that it was completely at odds with his own policy of saving the land for the actual settler. He was not slow in acting to make sure that the land speculators would get no more of Virginia's western lands than was unavoidable. The great northwest territory was saved by Jefferson from the land jobbers and speculators and held for land settlers. Virginia did not cede its western lands until it was given assurance by Congress that the land would be disposed of for the common benefit of the United States.

Jefferson's engineering mind went further and led him to the organization of a rectangular survey system. He even attempted, but unsuccessfully, a decimal land system, corresponding to the decimal coinage system he was endeavoring to apply on a national scale. Great pressure was brought to repeal the land-survey system inaugurated by the act of 1785, but these efforts were unsuccessful and the Land Act of 1796 settled the principle.

Most significant of all, however, was Jefferson's plan for free labor in the new land economy. After the year 1800 it was provided that there should be neither slavery nor involuntary servitude in any of the States organized in this new area. In his Notes on Virginia Jefferson explained his legislative program for the abolition of slavery in that State through a process of gradual emancipation on reaching the ages of 18 and 21 for females and males.

Jefferson likewise planned in great detail for the rehabilitation of southern agriculture, with which he was thoroughly familiar. He proposed a threefold scheme for the betterment of agriculture in his own State. It comprised (1) the gradual abolition of slavery, (2) a gradual breaking away from the one-crop tobacco culture, and (3) the introduction of household manufactures. On the basis of his own experience he recommended a diversification of products, with a view to giving greater strength and stability to the agricultural economy of Virginia.

But not only did this planner plan for the development of agriculture in Virginia and in the Northwest Territory; he also reached out to acquire further lands in the famous Louisiana Purchase. He believed that the foundation of freedom in the United States for many years to come rested upon the abundance of its lands and also that Congress should declare the policies for the newly acquired areas. When the chance to acquire the new vast domain of Louisiana was placed within his reach, he seized the opportune moment and extended our national boundaries as far as circumstance would permit. He contemplated an extensive program of economic development by the Government of the United States for the Territory of Louisiana.

EDUCATION

Jefferson held that education is fundamental to a democracy. "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be." On the subject of extending equal opportunities, Jefferson wrote: "The object is to bring into action that mass of talents which lies buried in poverty in every country, for want of the means of development, and thus give activity to a mass of mind which in proportion to our population shall be the double or treble of what it is in most countries."

The reservation of the sixteenth lot of every township for the maintenance of schools in the land ordinance of 1785 was one step in this direction. Congress also reserved the sixteenth section of every township for schools and also two complete townships for universities when it arranged for the sale of lands in the Northwest Territory to the Ohio Company in 1787. In 1802, however, when Jefferson was President, the United States Government made land reservation for education a fixed and binding policy of the Federal Government. When the public lands in the southwestern part of the Louisiana Purchase were offered for sale in 1806, the same policy of reserving the sixteenth section for the use of schools was continued. With the exception of the States of Texas, Maine, and West Virginia, every State admitted into the Union since 1802 has received a grant of land from the Federal Government for the endowment of its public schools.

In his own State of Virginia, Jefferson planned the development of the University of Virginia and gave much personal time and attention to the details of organization and construction. On a national scale he looked with interest and sympathy upon proposals for the national establishment of education and also upon Barlow's plan, modeled on the National Institute of France.

Nowhere is Jefferson's belief in the close affinity between democracy and science more clearly and concisely summed up than when he referred to the "value of science to a republican people; the security it gives to labor by enlightening the minds of citizens; the protection it affords against foreign power; the values it inculcates; the just emulation of the distinction it confers on nations foremost in it; in short, its identification with power, morale, order, and happiness."

TRANSPORTATION

Jefferson laid the foundations of a national transportation system, to be developed at public expense. The farmer was having trouble transporting his products to market and needed the Government's help in road and canal improvements. Jefferson and his Secretary of the Treasury, Gallatin, planned to provide relief for the transportation needs of the Nation. This plan centered in the famous Gallatin report of 1808.

This document did not merely propose an expanded program of Federal aid; it was also an exact plan to establish a national system of transportation improvements, accompanied with a detailed financial program of how this was to be done. It was proposed that $20,000,000 be appropriated from the anticipated Federal surplus over a period of 10 years for the construction of roads and canals. The specific improvements recommended were as follows: (1) Great canals along the Atlantic seacoast, uniting New England with the South; (2) communications between the Atlantic and the western waters; (3) communications between the Atlantic, the St. Lawrence River, and the Great Lakes; and (4) interior canals and roads.

Gallatin argued in his report that his transportation program would aid in promoting the economic development of the Nation by making the maximum use of its natural and financial resources. The kind of projects outlined were on too large a scale for private organization alone. Without subsidy from the Government, they could not be built at all. Gallatin estimated that the transportation costs saved by new roads and canals would in the long run pay the costs of their construction. In addition, the value of the unsold public lands held by the Government would be enhanced. The Government could easily sell the improved lands at a higher price if the produce of the land could find better markets. Gallatin was not dogmatic as to the specific method to be used in pursuing these objects. The Government might itself undertake the improvements, but Gallatin believed in private enterprise where possible. Under such circumstances the Government might make loans to private companies or, preferably, might subscribe to shares of their stock. Detailed problems of this kind could be worked out in practice. As an immediate step he urged that surveys be made to determine more definitely the feasibility of each project.

Gallatin's transportation program was also urged as a necessary measure for our national security. Not only would roads and canals shorten distances so as to promote commercial intercourse but they would, in addition, improve our defenses and provide an alternative to maintaining a large standing Army and Navy. Good roads would make possible mobility of our existing military forces and afford the means of rapid concentration of that force and a formidable body of militia at any given point.

Jefferson also planned to finance the proposed transportation improvements by allocating a fixed portion of future revenues for that purpose.

In addition to offering to the newly admitted State of Ohio the sixteenth section of every township for the support of schools, it was proposed that the State be given one-tenth of the net proceeds of all lands sold thereafter by Congress (after deducting the expense of the sales) to "be applied toward laying out and making turnpike and other roads, first from navigable waters emptying into the Atlantic to the Ohio and afterward continued through the new States; such roads to be layed out under the authority of Congress and of the several States through which the same will pass." Since some form of compensation to the States was necessary for their loss of revenue due to the fact that the public lands, being sold on credit, could not be taxed for a 5-year period thereafter, Gallatin devised this scheme for reimbursing the States and also for obtaining future road improvements. This proposal was accepted, although the grant of the net proceeds of the land sales was reduced from one-tenth to one-twentieth, or 5 percent. In a subsequent act, Congress remitted 3 of the 5 percent to the States for constructing roads within the State; the remaining 2 percent was retained by the Federal Government as a fund for the construction of the national road.

In 1806 Congress appropriated $30,000 for a survey and authorized the President to appoint three Commissioners to report a plan for the road. The amount of money contained in the 2-percent fund was obviously not sufficient to construct a road of the dimensions planned. In 1807 Gallatin wrote President Jefferson that the "money already appropriated would be sufficient to construct about 4 or 5 miles of the road." He was determined to build the road "in the most complete manner just as many miles as the money will pay for." Once the road was begun he felt sure that Congress would appropriate enough money to complete it. He regarded it "as a national object of primary importance." He estimated that the road would effect an annual saving of transportation costs of over $200,000. "Ten thousand tons will be carried westward annually and perhaps 100,000 barrels of flour brought back."

The Cumberland National Road represented the first completed part of Jefferson's national transportation program. Because of shortage of funds, the completion of the road was seriously delayed. The first 10 miles of the road west of Cumberland, Md., were not completed until 1812. Jefferson and Gallatin planned to extend the road west as far as St. Louis, on the Mississippi River. The rapid growth of railways during the decade of the 1830's made unnecessary the extension of the road as originally planned, and it was never built beyond Illinois.

INDUSTRIAL ENTERPRISE

It is quite true that Jefferson was primarily concerned with the development of an agricultural economy, just as his contemporary, Hamilton, was primarily concerned with the industrialization of the United States. It cannot be too hastily concluded, however, that Jefferson was indifferent to industrial development, particularly in the later years. In time Jefferson came to be more familiar with the facts of America's growing industrialization. Concerning the Nation's reliance for its national security upon its ability to produce its own armaments, Jefferson's later views were substantially similar to those of Hamilton in his Report on Manufactures. In 1816, for example, he acknowledged to Benjamin Austin his change of policy:

"You tell me I am quoted by those who wish to continue our dependence on England for manufactures. There was a time when I might have been so quoted with more candor, but within the 30 years which have since elapsed, how circumstances changed."

He insisted that views must be governed by conditions of time and place. The trend toward industrialization in the United States required corresponding adjustment of our national policies:

"To be independent for the comforts of life, we must fabricate for ourselves. We must now place the manufacturer by the side of the agriculturist. The former question is suppressed, or rather assumes a new form. Shall we make our own comforts, or go without them at the will of a foreign nation? He, therefore, who is now against domestic manufacture, must be for reducing us either to dependence on that foreign nation, or to be clothed in skins, and to live like wild beasts in dens and caverns. I am not one of these; experience has taught me that manufacturers are now as necessary to our independence as to our comfort."

Jefferson even raised the question whether or not the national growth of manufacturers might some day permit going beyond our own supply, and he characteristically answered that no a priori answer could be made:

"If it shall be proposed to go beyond our own supply * * * will our surplus labor be then most beneficially employed in the culture of the earth, or in the fabrications of art? We have time yet for consideration, before that question will press upon us; and the maxim to be applied will depend on the circumstances which shall then exist; for in so complicated a science as political economy, no one axiom can be laid down as wise and expedient for all times and circumstances and for their contraries."

PLANNING FOR THE GENERAL WELFARE

Jefferson's plans for social improvement were contingent upon the prosperity of the country and upon the resulting state of Federal finances. The policy had been marked by success; as the Government commenced its second term of office, only $10,500,000 of Federal bonds remained to be immediately discharged. For the first time the country could relax Gallatin's policy of stringent economy. The Government could choose between a reduction of taxes or a diversion of the surplus revenues to other objects.

In order to understand why Jefferson adopted the latter course, it is necessary to understand the nature of the Federal tax structure at this time. Of approximately $11,000,000 constituting the total annual revenue of the Government at the beginning of Jefferson's administration, about 90 percent was derived from customs duties. The Government had, in effect, continued the tariff rates established by the previous administrations and had not seen fit to alter them. Opposition to them was virtually nonexistent, even in the purely agrarian sections of the country. For the greater part, they bore chiefly on luxury imports. They afforded, furthermore, some measure of encouragement of domestic industry. The internal taxes had been abolished in 1802, and, as far as the mass of the people was concerned, taxes for the maintenance of the Federal Government hardly existed. Some additional revenue was derived from the sale of public lands and from postage, but this was more in the nature of fees for services rendered. There could be few justifiable complaints against the continuation of the import taxes.

The problem of the surplus offered its own answer. The solution lay in a continuation of the existing taxes and in a diversion of the surplus revenues to realizing objects of social improvement which would not otherwise be possible. In his second inaugural address, Jefferson indicated his intention of converting the Federal surplus into a permanent fund for creating public welfare:

"Redemption once effected, the revenues thereby liberated may, by a just repartition among the States, and a corresponding amendment to the Constitution, be applied, in time of peace, to rivers, canals, roads, arts, manufactures, education, and other great objects within each State."

It was proposed that the annual amounts set aside for debt payment be reduced from $8,000,000 to four and a half million, thereby leaving three and a half million for public improvements and defense expenditures.

Again, in his annual message of December 2, 1806, Jefferson informed Congress that the goal of full redemption of the debt was rapidly being approached. Did Congress thereupon propose to suppress the import duties on foreign goods, he asked? To his own question he replied negatively. The elimination of the tariff would only give an advantage to foreign manufactures over our own. He pointed, furthermore, to the fact that the most of the goods upon which the impost was paid were luxuries, purchased only by those who could afford them:

"Their patriotism would certainly prefer its continuance and application to the great purposes of the public education, roads, rivers, canals, and such other objects of public improvement as it may be thought proper to add to the constitutional enumeration of Federal powers."

He looked forward to the time when a continued, wise utilization of surplus revenues might achieve on the Federal level many of the reforms which Jefferson and his colleague Gallatin had fought to effect through action by the States. Nowhere in his writings did Jefferson better express the policy he envisioned for the United States than in his letter to his friend, du Pont de Nemours:

"We are all the more reconciled to the tax on importations, because it falls exclusively on the rich and, with the equal partition of interstate's estates, constitutes the best agrarian law. In fact, the poor man in this country who uses nothing but what is made within his own farm or family, or within the United States, pays not a farthing of tax to the general government, but on his salt; and should we go into that manufacture as we ought to do, we will pay not one cent. Our revenues once liberated by the discharge of the public debt, and its surplus applied to canals, roads, schools, etc., the farmer will see his government supported, his children educated, and the face of this country made a paradise by the contributions of the rich alone, without his being called on to spare a cent from his earnings. The path we are now pursuing leads directly to this end, which we cannot fail to attain unless our administration should fall into unwise hands."

It should not be supposed that Jefferson at all times necessarily favored defining Federal powers within extremely narrow limits. He believed in a written enumeration, to be sure, but the enumeration of powers was not intended to become a governmental strait jacket. Jefferson's constitutional doubts did not prevail when he feared he might fail to acquire the Louisiana Territory. He did not prepare a written draft of the constitutional amendment which he recommended to make possible his program of public improvements. For one who is generally accredited with desiring to keep Federal powers within the narrowest scope, the number of powers which he would have conferred on the Federal Government is truly astonishing. In addition to empowering Congress to dispose of the land of the new territory and to exchange lands with the Indians, he proposed "to work salt springs, or mines of coal, metals, and other minerals within the possession of the United States or in any others with the consent of the possessors; to regulate trade and intercourse between the Indian inhabitants and all other persons, to explore and ascertain the geography of the province, its productions and other interesting circumstances; to open roads and navigation therein where necessary for beneficial communication; and to establish agencies and factories therein

for the cultivation of commerce, peace, and good understanding with the Indians residing there."

That Thomas Jefferson was a national planner, and a distinguished one, can hardly be doubted in view of the evidence presented in these pages. His activities show clearly his concern with the systematic and intelligent development of our national resources. The various proposals offered by Jefferson reveal not only his philosophy but also the technical care with which he proceeded. While appealing to the interests of the immediate beneficiaries of his plans, he was consciously trying to shape a policy for many years to come.

We may now summarize his contributions toward planning. (1) Jefferson anticipated the Homestead Act by about 85 years. As long as the finances of the Government could permit a generous policy, he recommended donating small tracts of land to actual settlers. Society would be compensated, he said, by the increase in the wealth and income that would result from more rapid settlement of the land. (2) In his own State Jefferson successfully brought to an end all feudal survivals in the land laws. By laying the ax to primogeniture and entail, he influenced their abolition elsewhere, thus further promoting democratic equality on the land. (3) The beneficial effects of Jefferson's activities in frustrating the attempts of the large speculative land companies were so great that they cannot be measured except by comparing the early Federal policy with that practiced in almost all the States. The national land policy, without doubt, not only was more democratic but also promoted more orderly settlement. Had Congress early parted with the title to the western lands, our history would have been written quite differently. (4) Jefferson contributed directly to the development of the land surveys by his land plan of 1784 and by his consistent support for the survey system. (5) The Northwest Ordinance of 1787, one of the great monuments of national policy, bears undeniable evidence of having been influenced by Jefferson's territorial plan of 1784. (6) In the period after the Revolution, Jefferson was most vigorously opposed to slavery. He tried to abolish it in his own State and, having failed, sought to arrest its growth by prohibiting its expansion into any of the Territories. (7) Jefferson's purchase of Louisiana was an outgrowth of that agricultural expansion of which he had always been an ardent advocate. (8) Jefferson laid the foundation for our democratic system of education. (9) Jefferson's plan included a broad system of national transportation.

We may measure Jefferson's open-mindedness by the fact that he was convinced of the desirability of encouraging domestic manufactures. His thinking was at first dogmatically opposed to the conduct of manufacturing enterprises in this country. Later, as he began to see how machines not only made goods more plentiful but also improved the comforts of life, he too began to sense some of the possibilities of the industrial revolution. Here he joined hands with Hamilton.

We conclude that Jefferson was not only a philosopher of democracy; that he was not only a party leader; that he was not only a great statesman, but that he was also, in the modern sense of the term, a planner of national resources, both physical and human. The Jeffersonian planning equipment included a knowledge of trends and tendencies, a keen insight into surrounding conditions, ability to use the latest developments of scientific techniques with imagination, courage, and practical judgment, and, above all, broad social vision giving him a sense of direction toward the realization of the higher and finer values of life.

Deliberately and systematically, Jefferson planned to put a floor under equality and liberty: first, through a free public land system, matching and complementing Hamilton's commercial system; second, through a broadly conceived transportation system; and, finally, through an American democratic educational system, of which he laid the foundations. Jefferson planned not only liberty from evils but also liberty for something—for the pursuit of happiness of all men.

World Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT HALE
OF MAINE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, some publicity has been given recently to the fact that the Georgia Legislature rescinded a resolution passed some time ago in support of the organization of a limited world federal government.

In the last session of the Maine Legislature held in the winter of 1949 a similar resolution had been adopted by the Maine Legislature. In a special session of the Maine Legislature held last week an attempt was made to rescind the action taken at the general session. This attempt was defeated in the State House of Representatives by a vote of 58 to 57.

For the information of the Members, I append the text of an editorial from the Portland Evening Express of February 9, 1950.

MAINE'S DECISION STANDS

The House of Representatives of the Maine Legislature has done well in its refusal to make the lawmaking body of this State look ridiculous by recalling the pledge of support given less than a year ago to the proposition that world peace might best be secured under a world federation of national governments.

In its regular session of 1949 the legislature had adopted a memorial urging the Congress of the United States to do everything in its power to seek a limited world federation of governments in the name of peace.

But the Maine Senate on Wednesday, by a roll-call vote of 18 to 10, and at the urging of a Knox County member who made the absurd charge that some sources behind the World Federalist movement "have been found to be * * * Communist in tone," approved a memorial to Congress which would have rescinded last year's memorial in support of the Federalist plan.

The House yesterday—albeit by a 57-to-57 tie vote which was broken by Speaker of the House Nathaniel M. Haskell—defeated the Senate proposal, which means that last year's legislative memorial favoring world federation will stand.

The State of Maine will not be made to appear, therefore, like a community incapable collectively of making up its mind and standing by its avowed principles from one year to the next. Instead, the memorial sent by the State of Maine to Congress in 1949 continues to represent Maine's made-up mind in 1950.

As for the Knox County senator's heated charge that "some sources behind the World Federalist movement have been found to be non-American, Communist in tone, and directly opposed to anything we call American," we have today the strong rebuttal from Chairman William E. Clark, of the United World Federalists of Maine, Inc., who reminds the senator that:

"Those who seek to pin the label 'Communist' upon every person or cause they oppose for any reason are unwittingly playing the Communist game." And Mr. Clark adds:

"I charge that those who shout 'Communist' at every new solution proposed for today's political, social, and economic problems are unintentionally disloyal to democracy.

"It is nothing less than stupidity to give the Soviet Union or its Communist agents here credit for every decent impulse which arises on the American scene."

Amen to that.

Educational Trends

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BURR P. HARRISON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I hereto append an article by Mr. Branch Spalding, headmaster of Christchurch School at Christchurch, Va., which I earnestly commend for the consideration of those who may be disturbed by the present trends in public education.

The article appeared in the Richmond (Va.) Times-Dispatch under date of February 5, 1950.

DANGEROUS EDUCATIONAL TRENDS SEEN

(By Branch Spalding)

Phony educational philosophies abroad in the land constitute the heaviest handicap laid upon the school of 1950. They have resulted in a tampering with the high-school curriculum which has misshapen it out of recognition as a pattern for preparing youth for either college or vocation or citizenship.

Boys and girls graduate from Averageville High with credit units in band, physical education (meaning not even good athletics), music appreciation, social studies (not usually meaning sound history or economics), language arts (not French or Latin or English seriously taught), general mathematics, and other gimcrack courses.

This might be all right if parents had the money to spend on such mildly beneficial indulgences in addition to what students really need. But these taxed parents are paying for something more substantial. Their sons and daughters are entitled to get it.

Moreover, the preponderant majority of these parents wish their offspring to go to college, and the offspring share the desire. This program of study does not prepare anybody for college. It simply cheapens the quality—but not the price—of a product still sold under an old and respected label, diploma.

VICIOUS CIRCLE

And herein enters the expanding effect of lowered standards backed by law:

State-supported colleges must admit the high-school students on the strength of such credit units—in many States as few as 15 of them. Inevitably the colleges, to accommodate the boys and girls from Averageville High, must lower their standards. The law requires that they accommodate them. Thus grows a vicious educational circle.

A most detrimental tenet of the current educational philosophies is that there is no

failure. A student must not be told that he failed; that might impair his morale. Surely he has gained something in the nine months spent in this course; pass him on up to the next grade.

Result: It being human nature to take the line of least resistance, even capable students study and learn but little. Why should they when they will be promoted anyhow? Why work when reward comes without it in this convenient kindly world? Along with the lazy and the incapable, they move up from grade to grade, and finally to a false diploma.

It is obvious that this process spells a lack of sound learning. Worse still, for the Nation, it involves a plethora of dangerous false learning: namely, that good things may be had without hard work. "Life is that way, society will look out for me. In fact, the world owes me much; I owe it nothing."

WRONG PHILOSOPHY

If this scheme of schooling does not conduce to some such citizen logic, then a guiding providence does, indeed, have the Nation by the hand; America gets a break. For no procedure would seem better designed for development of a colossal welfare state on the broad north continent. It is like that if Joseph Stalin himself were permitted to draw the plan for that end, he might not change one line of this blueprint.

Be that a far-hauled jeremiad or not, it is false teaching and a moral wrong to youth to instill in the young mind the idea that there is no failure and that good ends are achieved otherwise than by hard work in high emprise.

It may be rightly argued that the high school is not simply to prepare youngsters for college; there are vocational and living purposes. But it may be rightly answered that in an attempted straddle Averageville High is not doing either. It permits the obviously unqualified college candidate to remain in school (complying with truancy laws) and offers him no good preparation for any useful vocation.

What with the great American white-collar fallacy it is insulting to tell a young man he should not go to college. But it ought not to be taboo to tell a teen-ager that, while he has failed in mathematics or science, that does not mean that he or she will fail in auto mechanics or bricklaying or cooking. They are vocations highly useful to society—and highly profitable and satisfying to those who do them well.

WHITE COLLARS—ALL

We have defaced the dignity of labor. Not enough of us want our children to become good carpenters, electricians, dietitians, machinists, and housekeepers.

We do not recognize that the usefulness of the occupation should combine with the temperament and talents of the individual in governing vocational selection. And many of us are pathetically prone to think that nature automatically invests the temperament and talent to be a doctor or lawyer in the sons of men engaged in those professions.

Nature is whimsical with her gifts. Man cannot afford to be so in administering education to implement them. He faces a categorical imperative to find them in the sons and daughters of artisans, or whoever's child, and adapt the education accordingly. A sound democratic society allied with individual happiness lays down this imperative. Averageville High has no department of vocational education to which the noncollege material must go.

The lamentable watering down of the curriculum is due in large measure to another line of crooked thinking by the currently dominant educational philosopher, the vicious tenet that the purpose of education is to enable one to adapt himself to his environment. Hence it is that courses loom in automobile driving, personality, salesmanship, and a form of civics which resembles too closely communism, spineless public welfare, and other side-line social quarterbacking.

MUST SHAPE ENVIRONMENT

Aren't these false prophets of pedagogy tending to blink the fact that social and spiritual evolution of man has had its impetus from leaders who devoted their talents to shaping their environment rather than to adapting themselves to it?

While Mr. and Mrs. American Taxpayer Parent have given priority to other business, the self-appointed philosophers have gone about their redesigning of the curriculum to the near-exclusion of geometry, history, foreign languages, English grammar and composition, and science worthy of the name.

The old bone and flesh of the structure can scarcely be found for the bloated overbarding frill and fancy dress. But life, for which this education must prepare, is not fancy dress.

The present situation is aptly stated in a recent comment of a sane authority on education: "It would seem that they are not running schools but welfare agencies."

And then the matter of financial support for education. It has been kicked around in the press until the public labors under a dangerous delusion: "All that the schools need is money." They need money, true; but all the gold of Croesus will do them little good without removal of these other evils only tenuously related to financial need.

SCHOOLS STINTED

This does not at all minimize the penuriousness of Mr. and Mr. A. T. Parent. They have been downright miserly toward the most important function of a democratic society. In this they present serious contradictions. Never before did they have so much money, and never did they, in spending it, make the proverbial drunken tar so closely resemble a skinflint.

They do not hesitate to spend hundreds running into thousands for another car, a trip to Florida, a television set, an elaborate party, or other superficial accretions of mid-twentieth century civilization. But when it comes to investing a thousand in the sound education of a fine boy or girl—now there is another matter; there is cause to pause. For the most precious potential they and the Nation possess is purchased a cheap product at a cheap price. They will get what they pay for—or less.

The latest patent medicine afforded under specious ballyhoo to cure this ill is Federal subsidy of education. The spuriousness of it lies in the double-barreled fact that it will cost not less but more, and that it is an extremely hazardous thing for a democracy. It is all right for a collectivist state headed by a dictator.

A NEW DANGER

If Americans have not already learned the bitter lesson of extravagance in bureaucratic centralization of citizens' functions in Washington, when will they learn? It is evident they have not learned that lesson and have not otherwise thought through this vital decision now before the public mind, for all the handwriting on the public-opinion walls proclaims the early enactment of legislation for Federal subsidy of education, in all its aspects.

It is more than an accidental coincidence that one of the first official acts of a Mussolini or a Hitler or a Stalin upon gaining control of a nation is federal subsidy and supervision of all education—control of the mind.

Mr. and Mrs. Average Taxpayer Parent are a kindly, well-meaning, even sentimental, couple. At moments, they appear stupid. Just now they are enjoying no end of pleasure in this splendid American civilization that has come to them through clear convictions, accompanied by stalwart courage and vigilance in their ancestors. They are drawing off a rich cream in national wealth and spending it on themselves, buying luxuries hitherto undreamed of.

They are not spending it in keeping with the realistic vision and patriotism of their forebears. They are not investing it in the future of this America, their own potentially fine children. They are defaulting to the teacher for development of that human national resource and denying her the essential means for its development while they buy other things. They are getting what they want.

They think they are paying for it, but democracy is apt to pay in the end. The darkest omen for a self-reliant democracy is its mature citizens wanting the wrong thing.

Will Mr. and Mrs. Average Taxpayer Parent's epitaph read: "They sold their finest birthright for a mess?" Will that automatically be the epitaph of American democracy?

Unfinished Task in Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article which appeared in the Wilkes-Barre Times Leader of Saturday, February 11, 1950:

UNFINISHED TASK IN POLAND

The story of Thaddeus Kosciusko, who was born at Siechnowicze, Poland, on February 12, 1746, has been told many times, so it need not be repeated here today as America prepares to salute on Sunday the memory of the Polish soldier who fought for United States liberty and died in exile in Switzerland because his own beloved country was enslaved then as now.

The conditions that prevailed in Kosciusko's last days were not unlike those prevailing today. It was in 1815 that Russia, Austria, and Prussia signed an agreement to partition Poland again. The Russians had promised an autonomous kingdom of Poland with the czar as king, but this was to be only a small part of the true Poland, just as today so much of Poland is incorporated into Soviet Russia and what remains is a puppet state.

Kosciusko, true patriot, refused all offers of office and honors in the newly partitioned Poland. He would not lend sanction to the act of partition by his presence. Instead, like so many Poles of this generation, he chose to remain in exile, first in France and later in Switzerland where he died on the evening of October 15, 1817, far from home but surrounded by a few devoted friends who shared his love for Poland and liberty.

The birthday anniversary of Kosciusko tomorrow not only recalls the life of one who has been called the greatest of Poles but it focuses attention again on the present plight of his country. Save for a brief spell of freedom between the First and Second World Wars, Poland has not achieved the objective for which Kosciusko and others struggled and sacrificed so much.

In the hearts of the people of Poland, the name and spirit of Thaddeus Kosciusko live on. We may be certain no tribute will be paid to him tomorrow by the Soviet stooges in Warsaw, but that does not mean the day will go unobserved in Poland or elsewhere in the world where men and women with Polish blood in their veins are gathered. They will take courage from his inspiring example and they will rededicate their lives to the unfinished task before them.

Quakers Warn Against Intervention in China

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VITO MARCANTONIO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herein a letter appearing in today's New York Daily Compass written to the President by Mr. Clarence E. Pickett, executive secretary, American Friends Service Committee:

QUAKERS WARN AGAINST INTERVENTION IN CHINA

DEAR EDITOR: The following letter has just been mailed to the President, expressing the views of the American Friends Service Committee on our policy toward China:

The PRESIDENT,
The White House, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The executive board of the American Friends Service Committee has asked me to express to you its gratification at your statement of January 5 on China. It seems to us most appropriate for you to have stressed the moral basis for our country's policy, viz: international respect for the territorial integrity of China, and, no desire to obtain special rights or privileges.

For over 8 years, Friends have been engaged in relief work in China. Some 400 people have taken part in our projects there and have seen intimately the sufferings of that country under conditions of peace and war. Of these 400, approximately a hundred have lived, traveled, and worked in both Nationalist and Communist territory. They have constantly impressed on us at home their concern that the United States should not follow "a course which will lead to involvement in the civil conflict in China," to quote your recent statement. The primary consideration is moral, but in addition, we would like to present some of the practical facts that have led our workers to the conclusion that further American intervention is unjustified.

First of all, we wish to point out that the Communist success in China is a phase of a deep-seated revolution that grows out of the ancient sufferings of the Chinese people. In 1911, the revolution was proclaimed by Dr. Sun Yat Sen, the leader of the Kuomintang. For many years, the Kuomintang was the party of the revolution. Now the Communist Party has assumed leadership of the revolution and it is largely because of this leadership that they are now in power. They are riding on a tide which has been swelling for many decades. They have received a very large measure of popular support among the peasants and the educated classes of China. Our workers have observed a marked enthusiasm for the new regime among the people, not just among the members of the Communist Party, who number only about 3,000,000. The younger generation of educated Chinese has thrown itself into governmental activities with a self-denying and enthusiastic spirit that is in striking contrast to the despair and cynicism with which those same students regarded the Kuomintang government. This attitude toward the Communist government, whether justified or not, is important to reckon with.

Secondly, our protracted observations in Communist territory during the past 3 years have led us to the conclusion that the success of the Chinese Communist Party cannot be attributed to the Russians. We have never had any workers in Manchuria and, therefore, cannot speak for that part of China. But none of our returned workers with experience in many parts of Communist-held China below the Great Wall has ever seen any Russian military equipment or Russian military advisers. Our observations confirm the view generally held by others who have been in China during recent years that the Communists have won because the Nationalist Government has lost popular support.

Thirdly, we have been struck with the sensitivity of the Chinese people to foreign intervention. The Chinese people as a whole are opposed to military aid from the outside. Not only is the Chinese Communist movement an outgrowth of the economic revolution, it is also a manifestation of the growing nationalism of China. The people of China are determined not to be puppets of any foreign government, and the Communists have adopted an aggressively nationalist attitude in order to capitalize on this determination. The large-scale American military intervention during 1947 and 1948 has played into the Communists' hands in a most dramatic and effective way, of which we could cite many instances. Countless towns and village in north China have been indiscriminately bombed by American-made planes which this country furnished the Nationalists. Some of our own workers in China have had to take shelter in trenches from these bombing attacks. This has helped them appreciate the feelings of the peasants with whom they shared the trenches. Quantities of American arms have been captured by the Communists when Nationalist armies have surrendered. The ordinary people all over China have been quick to notice these evidences of American intervention, and the Communists have not let them forget it.

AID TO NATIONALISTS DEPLORED

The foregoing facts and others appear to us to refute the assumptions on which the proponents of further aid to the Nationalists rely. These assumptions are:

(a) That the Communist victories in China represent the conquest of China by Russia, which has imposed a puppet regime upon the unwilling Chinese people; and

(b) That the United States can by force thwart this Russian penetration.

On the contrary, our observations indicate:

(a) That the Communist movement in China has been committed primarily to carrying out a revolution within China. It has close ideological ties with Moscow, but has framed its program with reference to the conditions and traditions of China;

(b) That American intervention has impelled the new government in an anti-American and pro-Russian direction. The Chinese people are hostile to foreign intervention from any source, and at present that hostility is directed primarily against the United States.

(c) That no amount of future intervention short of war can turn the tide.

We believe that further intervention will result in the hardening of Chinese resentment against America, perhaps beyond redemption, and the strengthening of Sino-Russian ties. In the future we should give ample evidence of our sympathy for the welfare and wishes of the Asian people. We believe that by treating Communist China as an enemy and by refusing to recognize her, we are not isolating China, we are isolating ourselves and throwing away the chance of influencing the course of events in the Orient.

It is part of wisdom to know the right limits of power and the right methods of influence. There is a time for waiting and a time for action. The United States must now wait in China, whether we like the turn of events or not. The time will come when the United States can once again take positive action of a constructive sort. Through voluntary religious and welfare groups, through international organizations, including UN, through encouragement of private capital and through technical assistance and other aid as set forth in your point IV, our country can someday restore the good will we once enjoyed in China, which is the only reliable basis for peace between nations.

On behalf of the executive board of the American Friends Service Committee,

CLARENCE E. PICKETT,
Executive Secretary, American Friends Service Committee, 20 South Twelfth Street, Philadelphia, Pa.

Should the Hoover Commission's Fishery Recommendations Be Adopted?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, public interest in and demand for the reforms suggested by the so-called Hoover Commission prompt me to insert in the RECORD a pertinent discussion which took place at the National Canners Association convention last month.

I had the honor of presiding at this discussion, and I listened to both sides of the general question: Should the Hoover Commission fishery recommendations be adopted? The opinions were so interesting and enlightening to me that it impresses me they might well have a similar effect on my colleagues. I, therefore, insert them under leave granted:

SHOULD THE HOOVER COMMISSION'S FISHERY RECOMMENDATIONS BE ADOPTED?

STATEMENT BY DONALD P. LOKER, DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC RELATIONS AND LABOR RELATIONS, FRENCH SARDINE CO., AND CHAIRMAN, FISHERY PRODUCTS COMMITTEE, NATIONAL CANNERS ASSOCIATION

One of the most important and constructive pieces of legislation ever approved is Public Law 162, Eightieth Congress. This law led to the creation of a body entitled "Commission on the Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government," or as it is more familiarly known—the Hoover Commission.

For once, partisan politics seemingly had no part in a proposal to promote economy and efficiency in Government, since a far-seeing Democratic President appointed a Republican ex-President to head the Commission, which itself was made up of 12 members, consisting of 6 Democrats and 6 Republicans.

The commercial-fishing industry took a keen and sincere interest in this legislation and in the Commission set up to carry out its purpose. Our industry just as any other, or indeed, as any good citizen, is interested in efficient and ecnomic government, and like all industries—and in both management and labor—it contributes many millions of dollars each year in taxes to pay the cost of running our Government.

But the commercial industry had an exceptional interest in the activities of the Hoover Commission, as it was required to make recommendations as to the proper placement of fisheries in the Federal Government.

For more than 75 years there has been in existence in one form or another some agency of the Federal Government directly concerned with fishery matters. The genesis of such an agency was the act of February 9, 1871. By statutory authority more and more fishery functions have been delegated over the years, so that the present agency now exercises a very considerable degree of influence over the fisheries of the Nation, whether they be sport or commercial. Today that organization is known as the Fish and Wildlife Service and is incorporated among the units in the Department of the Interior.

Nevertheless, as is true to some extent with most Government agencies, the Service has been built up in a most haphazard manner. It is quite possible that less basic planning has gone into the evolution of the Service as now constituted than in the development of any other Government group.

Let us go back a little into recent history and see what this Fish and Wildlife Service is and how it was put together.

The Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey were transferred to the Department of the Interior July 1, 1939. In the message transmitting this reorganization plan to Congress, the President stated:

"The plan provides for the transfer to the Department of the Interior of the Bureau of Fisheries from the Department of Commerce, and the Bureau of Biological Survey from the Department of Agriculture. These two Bureaus have to do with conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the country, terrestrial and aquatic. Therefore, they should be grouped under the same departmental administration, and in that Department which, more than any other, is directly responsible for the administration and conservation of the public domain."

It should be noted that the President's only reason for transferring these two agencies to the Department of the Interior was that each was connected with the conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the country, but the President failed to mention or apparently to take under study that in the Bureau of Fisheries there were many functions involved relating to the importance of fish as a commercial food product.

Congress gave little consideration to the desirability of this transfer, and there were no hearings, no printed committee reports, and very little discussion on the floor of Congress. In fact, as Congressman Dirksen pointed out in the House, the reorganization plan was approved by the Senate in approximately 6 minutes. And for your information this transfer of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey was not even mentioned on the floor of the Senate.

In 1940 the President went one step further and consolidated the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey into one agency—the Fish and Wildlife Service, in the Department of the Interior. In his message transmitting to Congress the reorganization plan which accomplished this change, the President stated:

"Reorganization Plan II transferred the Bureau of Fisheries of the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of Biological Survey of the Department of Agriculture to the Department of the Interior and thus concentrated in one Department the two Bureaus responsible for the conservation and utilization of the wildlife resources of the Nation. On the basis of experience gained since this transfer, I find it necessary and desirable to consolidate these units into a single bureau to be known as the Fish and Wildlife Service.

"The Bureau of Biological Survey administers Federal laws relating to birds, land mammals, and amphibians, whereas the Bureau of Fisheries deals with fishes, marine mammals, and other aquatic animals. The natural areas of operation of these two Bureaus frequently coincide, and their activities are interrelated and similar in character. Consolidation will eliminate duplication of work, facilitate coordination of progress, and improve service to the public."

Here again, the sole reason for the consolidation seems to be that both agencies had some relation to conservation. Again the President failed to mention those additional activities in the Bureau of Fisheries which relate to the use of fish as a food.

Congress again appeared disinclined to consider the merits of this reorganization plan and the consolidation of these two Bureaus. There were no committee hearings, no printed committee reports, and no discussions on the floor of Congress. This reorganization plan also went into effect and opponents of such a consolidation were given no opportunity to be heard.

Perhaps you can understand now why the commercial fishing industry was so intensely interested in the creation of the Hoover Commission and in the task force which was set up to study natural resources.

I see no reason why I should take the time at this point to go into the report of this task committee, since that report, together with supplementary material, may be readily obtained by anyone. For the benefit of those who may not have read it, however, it is known as Task Force Report on Natural Resources (appendix L), prepared for the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government.

This task-force report is briefly summarized as follows:

1. That the Federal functions dealing with fishery resources be consolidated in a Fisheries Service.

2. That the other responsibilities of the Fish and Wildlife Service be placed under a Wildlife Service.

3. That both the Fisheries Service and the Wildlife Service be placed in a Department of Natural Resources.

4. That the basic data and research activities of the Fisheries Service and the Wildlife Service be made adequate to assure the development of sound policies and effective administration.

5. That the Federal Government give adequate attention to the need for sound development of fishery and wildlife resources and the needs of an expanding fisheries industry.

6. That adequate provision be made for the coordination of the work of the two Services with each other and with other agencies of the Department of Natural Resources and other departments.

The Hoover Commission then submitted to the Congress reports containing its recommendations as to proposals to reorganize the Departments of Commerce and Interior.

These reports, approved in toto by eight Commissioners, contained the recommendation that all commercial fishery activities of the Department of the Interior be transferred to a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of Commerce. Four of the twelve dissented from this recommendation but three of the same four supported in part the recommendations of the Natural Resources task force. The fourth dissenter simply favored retention of the Fish and Wildife Service in the Department of the Interior.

It is significant that all concerned with this study—all completely disinterested persons, mind you—agreed that reorganization would promote efficiency in Government handling of fishery matters. All here today do not necessarily agree with that premise but I am sure all of us are interested in the increased efficiency and effectiveness of a fisheries department. We may have different ideas as to what is needed. Some, for example, may feel that all that is necessary to improve efficiency is increased appropriations; some may feel decreases in some appropriations would accomplish the same result, while others present may—and I might add, certainly do—feel that other steps are necessary to achieve the most efficient management of fishery matters.

What then does the commercial fishing industry think of the foregoing recommendations?

The commercial fishing industry agrees with all of the recommendations in part but not in whole.

It definitely favors the separation of fisheries from wildlife, whether fisheries be transferred to Commerce or whether a new Department of Natural Resources be created.

May I explain:

President Roosevelt's statement of the advantages to be gained by the consolidation are very compelling and if experience since 1940 had shown that advantages have resulted in respect to fisheries, our case would be very weak indeed. In actual practice, however, these advantages simply do not appear. The natural areas of operation seldom coincide. Consolidation cannot reduce duplication of work because there is very little duplication. It does not facilitate coordination of programs which by nature are separate. A wildlife biologist cannot be substituted for a fishery biologist and this has not been attempted. The administrative details of fishery programs are so different than those of wildlife programs that they cannot be handled except by men who have different backgrounds, training, and experience.

These are but a few examples of areas where because of the comparatively close relationship, it was expected the claimed benefits would materialize, but experience has proven it necessary to have fisheries work done by people with fisheries training and wildlife work handled by people with wildlife training. The lack of promised benefits from the consolidation has not been our only worry. One of our primary concerns has been that consolidation of fisheries activities with wildlife activities has resulted not in coordination but in subordination.

A logical reason for this is the chain of command in the Fish and Wildlife Service. Not only is the Director and one of the two Assistant Directors from the Wildlife branch, but so are all of the regional directors. Not only is the director of the Alaska region a Wildlife man, but so are the directors of the New England region and the Pacific coast region. There we have men with no experience or training in fisheries, directing Federal fishery policy in regions now producing 4,000,000,000 pounds of essential food annually and probably where, with efficient management, this harvest could be vastly increased.

The most important fishery functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service is the conservation of the Alaska salmon fisheries under the White Act of 1924, by which the Service is given authority to adopt and enforce regulations for the protection of Alaska salmon. Although the Service, by virtue of this authority, has undertaken an extensive program of research and regulation, the fact remains that production from the resource has been steadily going down. A few pack figures will suffice to illustrate this point:

	Cases
1935	5,155,826
1936	8,454,948
1940	5,026,378
1942	5,089,509
1945	4,338,692
1946	3,971,109
1947	4,302,466
1948	4,010,612

Why is this condition present?

Subordination of interest in fishery matters and lack of sympathetic understanding of this resource has resulted in inefficiency, misdirected research, improper and insufficient regulations, and inadequate enforcement.

Of course, it may be claimed that wildlife enforcement officers have been assigned to enforcing the Alaska fishery regulations on occasions, but those occasions have been few and far between; the number of men so assigned is extremely small and there is some question as to whether the assignment of men inexperienced in problems of these fisheries has contributed at all to the effective enforcement of the fishery regulations. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that enforcement of the Alaska fishery regulations has suffered by reason of diversion of funds, and of planes and patrol vessels which could have been operated with those funds, to enforcement of Alaska game regulations. And these are some of the reasons why experienced and capable fisheries experts have resigned from the Service in great numbers in recent years, or have been transferred to other assignments, and have thereby crippled the program.

The situation in Alaska had become so dangerous that the Alaska salmon industry itself in 1947, in cooperation with the University of Washington, established the Fisheries Research Institute, financed entirely by the salmon industry, but under the complete control of the university, to find the answers to the problems that the Fish and Wildlife Service had been looking for, but which, as has been indicated above, it failed to find.

We have been told by representatives of the Fish and Wildlife Service that one of the reasons fisheries have been better off since the transfer of the old Bureau of Fisheries from the Department of Commerce, and the consolidation of the fisheries with wildlife in the Department of Interior, is that the Fish and Wildlife Service has been able to obtain appropriations of far greater size for fishery work than was obtained by the old Bureau of Fisheries.

Let us examine that for a moment.

I wonder whether we are getting as much return per dollar spent as we obtained while the Bureau of Fisheries was in the Department of Commerce. The commercial fishing industry feels that we are not, for while we may be getting more dollars, inflation has lowered the dollar value to such a degree that increased appropriations are woefully offset.

The correct scale to use, from the standpoint of conservation, business, or just plain common sense, is what has been accomplished? Very frankly, not enough, and the industry feels that proper attention has not been accorded our fishery problems, and as a result the industry is profoundly disturbed.

And again, let me emphasize at this point—it is not necessarily the number of dollars appropriated—maybe we have enough now. What counts is how efficiently those dollars are used toward the solution of our grave and pressing problems.

The only other reason I have ever heard advanced by those who oppose the separation of fisheries from wildlife is that such a splitting up would be a step backward. But they cannot tell us why.

I spoke a moment ago about subordination of fisheries to wildlife. If this were the only instance wherein handling of fisheries were subordinated, it would be bad enough, but the facts are that fisheries are not only subordinated to wildlife by the authorities of the Department of the Interior, but fisheries are subordinated to every other single activity in that Department where there is even the slightest contact between the respective interests.

I merely mention this now to remind you that the reason for this subordination is the fact that fisheries apparently are considered only a minor part of a not-too-important unit within the Department of the Interior.

Now may I call your attention to an important point that is frequently overlooked by our friends in the wildlife field as well as by a good many of our friends connected with recreational fishing interests. This is that the fisheries functions of the Federal Government and the interests of the commercial fishing industry are concerned almost entirely with high-seas fishery resources, with the notable exception of the Great Lakes fresh-water fisheries. Only to a minor degree, moreover, do the inland sport fisheries of the Nation, the fisheries of our streams and lakes, come within the scope of the Federal Government. The Federal Government's activity in this field is limited to the operation of some hatcheries and to some minor biological studies, but nowhere does it have the authority to regulate the inland fisheries. In fact, except in the Territory of Alaska, and the sponge fishery of Florida, the Federal Government has no authority to initiate regulations for any fishery. Recreational fishing on the high seas by comparison with commercial fishing on the high seas is extremely minor. It must re recognized, however, that many of the fishes in the commercial fisheries are important to the recreational fishermen and it is for this reason that the commercial fishing industry, while attempting in no way to speak for the sport fishermen of the country, feels that all fishery functions of the Federal Government should be together and that any attempt to separate them might prove unwise. Not only could it lead to conflicts between the two groups when there is no real conflict of major interest, but in all probability it could result in a loss of efficiency and too much duplication of effort. The area wherein the interests of both groups coincide far exceeds the area wherein their interests differ.

The commercial fishing industry, as well as the sportsmen, is intensely concerned with the conservation of resources and, we believe, to an even greater degree, for fish are the necessary raw material of our business.

Our interest in conservation is neither theoretical nor recreational—it is absolutely essential—for if the fishery resources decrease, our business becomes uneconomic and we go broke. We conserve properly or we die.

To show what I mean, let me list a few illustrations of the conservation activities in which the commercial fishing industry is directly involved:

1. The Atlantic States Marine Fisheries Commission: This is the organization of all the States on the Atlantic seaboard which was set up under authority of Congress and 11 State legislatures to correlate and extend the fisheries conservation work of the Atlantic States. In the 7 years of its activity it has accomplished a great deal toward this end.

Commercial industry men pushed this compact in the Congress and the State legislatures and industry men from each of the States serve as commissioners, and the chairman of the commission is the owner of a thriving commercial fish business.

2. The Pacific Marine Fisheries Commission: This, like the one above, was adopted and put into action through pressure by the commercial fishery people who serve actively on its advisory board, and strongly support conservation research and proposals for proper fishery management.

3. Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission: This is almost identical with the Atlantic States Commission. Industry men pushed for its adoption, act as commissioners, and are interested in pushing its program for conservation research.

4. International Fisheries Commission: The halibut fishery is the outstanding example of fishery conservation management in the world. The halibut industry forced the adoption of the treaty between the United States and Canada that set up the Commission, has worked with the Commission at every step of its way for 25 years, and is continuing to do so today. This is the strongest and most strictly regulated commercial fishery in the world. The industry not only supports the regulations of its activities but is pressing both Governments today to give the Halibut Commission additional regulatory powers.

5. There are four other similar international treaties to set up commissions which will have the responsibility for conservation in fisheries which produce nearly a billion pounds of fish per year for American fishermen. These are (1) The International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission, (2) the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, (3) the International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna, and (4) the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission.

In each case the commercial fishing industry has pressed for the adoption of these treaties and in the Salmon Commission has already participated for several years in planning and carrying out intensive regulations governing the catching of salmon covered by the Commission's authority.

6. California Sardine Advisory Commission: Let me tell you about something of which we Californians are a little proud. A few years ago our California sardine began to decline in productiveness. Immediately the sardine industry forced through the California Legislature a measure which doubled our tonnage tax and set aside new funds for conservation research. I do not know of another United States industry that has voluntarily increased its tax bill for the specific purpose of having investigations made which would restrict its activities, and a comment as to this fact appears in the State of California Legislature.

7. Fisheries Research Institute: The Alaska salmon industry, alarmed by the decrease in the source of their raw material, as I have already reported, voted to tax themselves voluntarily so much per case of salmon packed in order to provide a fund for biological research to find out what was the matter with the present conservation regulations and where they could be improved to maintain normal abundance, which so obviously was imperative, if the Alaska salmon industry was not to perish.

This voluntary program of taxation has been going on for 3 years and has raised more money for biological research than the Federal Government itself puts into the Alaska fisheries. It comes directly out of the salmon canners' pockets and it is given willingly. This program has, in fact, been broadly increased in each of the 3 years since its inception.

We are trying to be foresighted, for we realize the necessity of these treaties, these investigations, these regulations, before the resource is depleted and not afterward.

I have dwelt in some detail on what the industry is doing to get the information necessary for adequate conservation regulation. Where conservation is needed we not only help to get it, we demand it, and we are proud of the record of the commercial fishing industry in the conservation of this great resource.

But while we have intense interest in fish conservation, this is only half of the worries we have with raw material. We have a problem of supply and we must explore continually for new sources to feed the Nation and to meet the growing demand for our product.

Also, as a food industry we are in the fortunate position of dealing with one of the greatest potential sources of protein food in the world.

Centuries of land abuse in every civilized country have lessened the ability of that land to produce essential protein foods, but the vast resources of our seas have scarcely been touched.

Rich new areas are known to be available close to the United States in both the Atlantic and the Pacific and are believed to be in the Gulf of Mexico.

The reason why these and other fishery resources all over the world are not being utilized is that at the present time they cannot be brought to market at a price the consumer can pay. We need to know more about the seasonal abundance and occurrence of these resources so that our fishermen can be adequately informed. Too, there are a thousand and one other problems that we have in getting the costs of harvesting, processing, and marketing down to the point where we can afford to get the food out of the sea onto the consumers' table where it does good.

This is where our problems depart widely from those of the inland fisherman and hunter. The game and fish resources of the land and inland waters are known and are certainly less than we would like. Production from those resources can only be maintained and increased by strong conservation regulation measures. Here there is no room for expansion of any consequence, and all thinking must be directed toward conservation.

But for our major ocean fisheries the emphasis must also be on better and cheaper means of harvesting.

I want to drive home to you as hard as I can that waste from underutilization is just as dangerous as waste from overutilization, and more food is being wasted in the sea each year from underharvesting than is being taken from the sea. This is our problem, too.

Besides conservation, both sport and commercial groups have another point in common which should weld us together. The noncommercial fishing groups emphasize the recreational feature of the Nation's fisheries, but they would be the last to claim that there is no commercial importance attached to recreational fishing. Indeed, they hasten to point out the tremendous value to the Nation's economy of the sale of tackle, boats, bait, and also the vast revenue derived by the States from the sale of fishing licenses. It would seem, therefore, that the recreational fishing interests would, of necessity, derive definite benefits from being included within a department whose primary interest is the welfare of the business economy of this country. And to us it seems quite obvious that this reasoning points to the Department of Commerce.

The preceding discussion has clearly expressed the convictions of the fishing industry, and we are sure that the Department of Commerce would support those convictions.

Surely no department would wish the destruction of this natural resource of our country, nor would the fishing industry allow it. Therefore, we concur with the Hoover Commission's recommendation that the Bureau of Fisheries be established in the Department of Commerce, while a Bureau of Wildlife or a Wildlife Service remain in the Department of the Interior.

Such a move would insure that fisheries would be managed by men whose primary interest would be fisheries; whose training would be in fisheries, and whose outlook would be a practical businesslike outlook.

Additional advantage would result from the removal of fisheries to a department where their interests would not be subordinated—again note the use of this word subordinate—to the interests of other groups, and policies of other bureaus concerned with empire-building and paternalistic schemes. In plain, blunt language, I am referring to the domination of the Department of Interior by the Bureau of Reclamation, the Bureau of Land Management, the Bureau of Indian Affairs, and the various power administrations. The record of the treatment accorded fisheries when any seeming conflict of interest arose between it and these other groups is shameful indeed. Ask any salmon packer, commercial salmon fisherman, or any man who fishes salmon for sport on the west coast, about the proposals to destroy this valuable salmon resource by the unwise construction of dams. Their side of the story reveals facts of interest and importance not only to them but to every citizen in our country. The benefits we were told would result from the reorganization which threw the Bureau of Fisheries and the Biological Survey together simply did not materialize.

The Hoover Commission recommended splitting fish from wildlife and putting the former in the Department of Commerce. The task force on natural resources recommended splitting fish from wildlife, but putting both resulting services into a new Department of Natural Resources.

We in the commercial fisheries think the transfer of fisheries to the Department of Commerce, where it functioned so well for so many years during the growth of our fisheries would be the soundest move.

We are, however, not at all adamant on this point and if it is the consensus of the majority that the task force recommendations be followed, we will not complain.

Where we are adamant is that the basic recommendation of the Hoover Commission be followed; that is, to split fish from wildlife so that we can once again have efficient management for both of these valuable natural resources.

We must have a fisheries service in the Federal Government which is administered by men who know fisheries, who have been trained in fisheries administration and fisheries research, and who by experience know how to deal with a fishery problem when it is put before them.

We must have a fisheries service that has a sympathetic interest in fisheries, staffed by men who have the imagination and vision required to plan fisheries programs of their own and coordinate those programs with the programs of the sovereign States, the commercial industry, the sportsmen's associations, and the trade associations.

These men must review the basic objectives of Federal policy concerning fisheries and organize a dynamic program for the maximum utilization and sound conservation of this valuable resource.

This revitalized service must be capable of providing expert guidance and efficient aid to the fisheries agencies of the 48 States and the Territories in dealing with the problems of sport fish in inland and coastal waters. It must be able to lead the industry and the State agencies in high seas biological and oceanographical research; it must establish vastly improved programs for technological problems of gear utilization and development, marketing of species not now utilized, consumer education, and we must have additional help in surveys of potential foreign markets; collection of statistical data; and the analysis of marketing trends and developments in the United States market, and in the markets of the world.

In short, gentlemen, we must have a fisheries service that will know fish, think fish, and dream fish. A service which will represent our industry at high level in the Federal Government and which we can proudly support. A service, finally, which will lead us to the full utilization and proper conservation of the fisheries resources of the seas.

STATEMENT BY C. R. GUTERMUTH, VICE PRESIDENT, WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT INSTITUTE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

It is a distinct pleasure to attend this large gathering of food processors and to participate in this panel discussion on natural resources. Heretofore, my contacts with your industry, other than that of a consumer, have been limited almost entirely to fighting with some of your contemporaries about stream-pollution abatement.

Much has been said and done in recent years to encourage better land use throughout the Nation, but it took a critical water shortage in one of the largest population centers in the world to focus public attention on the importance of water and upon the seriousness of stream pollution. New Yorkers ultimately may be able to use heavily chlorinated water from the upper Hudson for drinking purposes, but they may have to use toothpicks after each drink for a while until they get those upstream industrial and municipal wastes out of that badly polluted river which flows past their door. Today, on Times Square, you can hear, "Water, water, everywhere, but not a drop to drink."

Those so-called sentimentalists, the conservationists of the country, have been pleading for consideration for a third of a century or more, and when it gets so bad that prosperous Wall Street brokers can't shave on Fridays, then things begin to happen. President Truman appointed a temporary Water Resources Policy Commission but it is questionable if that recently created body will make any new or different recommendations.

All of us must be concerned with the wise use of natural resources. There can be no other choice since health, wealth, and security stem from nature's bountiful gifts which form the basis of all commerce and industry. Agricultural production may be high now with hybrid corn, more potent fertilizers, and everything, but how long can science continue to compensate for those deficiencies resulting from improper use?

Freedom, continuing prosperity, and everlasting enjoyment of the high standards of the American way of life depend upon the sound management of our shrinking resources, which for generations have been regarded as inexhaustible.

The time has come in this modern age when critical decisions must be made. We must adopt a well-defined and efficient pattern of land and water use on this continent to avert a crisis. There may be objectionable features to the Hoover report, but they recognized the problems and called attention to the imperative need for action.

The Hoover Commission, after a long study of Federal Government activities, made the following recommendations that would have a pronounced effect on the administration and utilization of natural resources. The Commission would retain the Department of the Interior but would make that agency more of a water-development and mineral-management service. To accomplish that objective the Commission suggests a construction agency in Interior created largely by combining the present activities of the Bureau of Reclamation and Army Corps of Engineers, together with the construction functions now assigned to other agencies.

Briefly, the recommendations are as follows, it being understood that the present bureaus in Interior would remain there unless otherwise indicated.

1. The Department of the Interior should be given clear major responsibility for governmental development of the Nation's water and mineral resources. Since those activities require large public works, other major public works also should be managed by this Department.

2. To these ends, the Interior Department should take over the flood-control and rivers and harbors works of the Army engineers, plus public building construction and community services from the Federal Works Agency. It also should manage certain other major construction on assignment from other governmental agencies.

3. The following agencies should be shifted from Interior to other departments: (a) Bureau of Indian Affairs to a new department; (b) Bureau of Land Management (except minerals) to the Department of Agriculture; (c) Division of Commercial Fisheries to the Department of Commerce.

4. A Board of Impartial Analysis for Engineering and Architectural Projects should be created in the President's office, consisting of five members of outstanding abilities appointed by the President. It would review and report on the economic, social, and technical worth of all projects proposed by the Interior Department. It also would review authorized projects periodically and advise as to their progress or discontinuance.

Although the Hoover Commission tactfully refrains from mentioning it, such a board, with sufficient prestige, might materially diminish congressional logrolling and pork-barrel grabs.

The Hoover Commission, in its final recommendations affecting conservation agencies, did not follow the reports of any of the task forces which made extensive proposals regarding renewable natural resources. The report by one committee would have scattered the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a drastic reorganization of the Department of Agriculture and included a transfer to Agriculture of all major public-land administration activities and functions. The task force on natural resources developed an even bolder and more far-reaching program. It would abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, consisting of a consolidated water-development service to administer the present functions of the Bureau of Reclamation the river-development functions of the Corps of Engineers and numerous related activities of other governmental agencies and departments. It recommended the division of the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service.

The minority report, by Vice Chairman Acheson did not disagree too much with the task force on natural resources. The minority did disapprove of the separation of the Fish and Wildlife Service but recommended:

1. A Department of Natural Resources consisting of a Water Development Service (including the Bureau of Reclamation and river-development functions of the Corps of Engineers), a Forest and Range Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Mines, National Park Service, and Fish and Wildlife Service. The Department of the Interior would cease to exist.

2. The consolidated Forest and Range Service would be based on the present Forest Service and furthering its general policies, but including the functions of the Bureau of Land Management, now in Interior, and research functions of the Agriculture Department relating to forest insects and diseases.

3. Retention of the Tennessee Valley Authority in its present form but the establishment in the President's office of a board of review which would coordinate the programs of the Department of Natural Resources and those of the new regional authorities, if any, with each other and with such governmental agencies as Agriculture and the National Military Establishment.

Although the Commission steered a somewhat midway course among the committee recommendations, the final report included the feature of consolidating all water services in Interior, but retained the Department of the Interior as presently constituted, except that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Division of Commercial Fisheries, one unit of the present Fish and Wildlife Service, would be shifted out of the Department.

Needless to say, there are differences of opinion over the recommendations which should receive support. Those conservation organizations interested primarily in forests tend to support the recommendation of the transfer of public lands administration to Agriculture which would leave Forestry in Agriculture where it has been for many years and where it has fought vigorously to stay. The agricultural task force based its recommendation on the premise that trees and grass are crops. It argued that research, management, and conservation of all crops might well be concentrated in one organization. It recommended a drastic regrouping of present functions and assignments which would cause most of the present agencies in the Agriculture Department to disappear or be divided and distributed between regulatory services, conservation services, extension services, research services, and others.

Regardless of the name by which the Department would be known, it seems that the recommendations in the minority report, with minor exceptions, offer the soundest conservation program. Ignoring the perennial contest between Interior and Agriculture, this report urges the placing of the water-development services and public land-management agencies under one head. This approaches closely the idea of a Department of Conservation that has been advocated by many conservationists for several years.

Perhaps the one point that will be raised most frequently will be to question the advisability of combining all water services into one huge unit and then placing fish and wildlife, national parks, and other relatively small but exceedingly important units in direct competition with the large division. Some will feel that this might intensify the disadvantage under which small bureaus operate in Interior now when their need for funds or their programs conflict with proposals of the Reclamation Service. Nevertheless, if a coordination and review board were established in the Office of the President simultaneously with such consolidation, perhaps there would be some check on the apparently endless ambitions of Government-paid engineers to make over the entire face of America in the shortest time possible.

The one inconsistency that stands out in a review of the Commission's recommendations is the one which would divide the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units, a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service. With this single exception, the Hoover Report recommends consolidation and closer coordination. Only in this instance does the Commission recommend the division of one small unit into smaller units. In my judgment, it would be a serious mistake to follow this suggestion. This would divide the present Fish and Wildlife Service, which is small now compared to many Government bureaus, into still smaller units which might make it even more difficult to deal successfully with large issues. Furthermore, I can find no logic in the recommendation.

In many States the same agency is handling the administration of both resources. The basic biological problems are largely the same, differing only in details rather than fundamentals. The only argument advanced in favor of this recommendation is the understandable one of tradition. The Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries were operated separately for many years and some of the present members of the Fish and Wildlife Service can remember this condition. Perhaps they hope to restore it.

Prior to the consolidation, Dr. Gabrielson, who served as Director of the Service for many years, opposed the plan largely because he already had plenty of troubles in the administration of wildlife work. Gabrielson, who is president of the organization that I represent, now admits that most of his fears proved groundless and that from an administrative standpoint, there were good reasons for the merger. The obvious advantage to both groups has been that of presenting a united front. Both lines of work have secured increased appropriations. They have had additional money to more adequately perform their responsibilities, and more than they ever were able to secure alone.

Consolidation gives those interested in outdoor recreation, both hunting and fishing, a single unit to deal with on their problems. There is an obvious advantage from this standpoint. Therefore, I believe that the recommendation calling for the division of the Fish and Wildlife Service into two units is unsound.

The proposal to put the commercial fisheries division by itself in the Department of Commerce borders on the ridiculous. There can be no logical reason for it other than perhaps the desire of some commercial fishing interests to have a group which might be more sympathetic to their pleas.

A few States have separate units for commercial and sport fisheries, the latter usually combined with the fish and game agency. In the majority of such cases, however, the two fishery units have spent fully as much time trying to undermine each other as they have in conducting their work. The same thing could be expected if the commercial fishery groups succeeded in getting the commercial fishery activities in a unit by themselves. In fact, the basic reasoning behind the desire for separation is one of the strongest arguments for keeping the administration of the resource in one agency.

It obviously would be foolish to divide administration and research work for one group of fish into two separate parts, depending upon whether the man who catches it is going to eat it himself or sell it for someone else to eat. Such a procedure would be comparable to breaking down the administration of agricultural production by establishing one branch to handle regulation, research, and so forth for the parts of crops consumed by farmers and another unit for those to be processed by you folks or sold in the market place. The fishery resource is a unit and should be administered as a unit. Establishing two competing administrative groups would be a long step backward and an invitation to duplication of effort and wasted funds, which the Hoover Commission was intended to correct. Such an idea deserves no support from those who really are interested in the wise, efficient, and economical management of a valuable resource.

If the eventual reorganization follows the recommendations of the Hoover Commission report, those interested in fish and wildlife will be confronted with a rather difficult dilemma. Fish and wildlife are effected by both land and water management. If the Commission report is followed, water development will be in one agency and land management in another. In that case, the fish and wildlife unit, wherever it is placed, will be faced with the necessity of working across departmental lines to secure proper management.

The minority report and the one by the natural resources task force recommended a Department of Natural Resources which could administer both the public lands and water resources. It is the only plan which would place to a considerable extent in one department the administration of both the public lands and the water resources, and that would afford an opportunity for closer cooperation. Even then, these agencies still would have to cross departmental lines to work with the others dealing directly with farmers and private landowners on crop and pasture land.

In conclusion, it seems that the proposal for the establishment of a Department of Natural Resources comes nearer to meeting the requirements of a sound, Nation-wide conservation program. We certainly should not separate the Fish and Wildlife Service.

STATEMENT BY ROBERT O. BEATTY, CONSERVATION DIRECTOR, IZAAK WALTON LEAGUE OF AMERICA, INC.

I believe I should take just a moment, preceding my remarks on the vital question before us, to clarify for you just what the

Izaak Walton League of America is. Although the name may connote otherwise, it is much more than a sport fisherman's club. The league is a broad-gage organization of laymen, operating through 550 chapters and 19 State divisions in the United States and Alaska. The organization has as its principal objective the fostering of sound management, in the long-range public interest, of all renewable natural resources. Broadly speaking, the league concerns itself with promoting better management of, and disseminating to its membership and the public factual information about soil, forests, waters, fisheries and wildlife.

A large number of our members are held together by a common interest in fishing and hunting. A great many more—perhaps 25 percent—have never gone afield with rod or gun and probably never will. We believe—we know—that good fishing and good hunting are but byproducts of the proper use and husbandry of our basic natural resources, land and water.

As the fisheries of the Nation, at one and the same time, are a vital recreational, economic and food resource to the people, they come well within our legitimate field of interest and have received a large share of our attention over the years.

The question before us today is broader and more basic than just that of whether the Hoover Commission recommendations on fisheries should be adopted. That something is wrong with the management of the Nation's fishery resource, both sport and commercial, we all agree. The basic questions are: "What can we do about it?" and "What should we do about it?" By "we" I mean a sizable segment of the American public made up of assorted interests in the whole resource, most of them legitimate interests and some of them certainly in conflict.

The Hoover Commission, in its final reports to Congress on the Department of the Interior and the Department of Commerce, has proposed one solution. The Commission recommended that the commercial fishery activities and functions of the Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, be transferred to a Bureau of Commercial Fisheries in the Department of Commerce. Enabling legislation which would, among others, translate this recommendation into fact was introduced in the Senate on January 11, 1950, by Senator CAIN, of Washington. That's Senate bill 2833.

As far as we can gather from the assorted Commission reports, the chief reason given for this suggested transfer is:

"A Bureau of Fisheries can be one of the most important industrial and commercial agencies in the Government. It is related to industry, to commerce, and to the merchant marine at many points."

In our opinion the recommendation completely ignores three basic facts: (1) (And this is pointed out by a dissenting opinion of 4 of the 12 commissioners) that the chief problem is one of how to achieve better management, exploration, and development of the fisheries as a natural resource, rather than how better to exploit the fishery commercially as a dollar resource; (2) that the dollar value of the recreational fishery is exceedingly important and, in fact, closely approaches that of the commercial fishery; and (3) the commercial and sport fisheries are closely interdependent in the natural environment.

I'd like to discuss my reasons for those two statements in a little more detail, but in so doing want to make it perfectly clear that it is not my hope, nor my intention in any way to widen further the breach in points of view between commercial and sport fishing interests.

Such a breach apparently exists in some places in spite of honest and sincere efforts by many parties to close it. By the very nature of any natural resource, which is subject, first, to the laws of nature and, second, to man-made laws, nothing will be gained by either group in the long run taking a "stand off and let's fight it out" attitude. Much can be gained, however, if both parties will stand to one side together and try to look at the total fishery as a vital present and future natural resource. That is what I am trying to do here.

We concur that the commercial fishery resource needs considerably more and careful attention and development, but it needs these things along two lines, (1) in the field of marketing and manufacture, and (2) in its management as a renewable natural resource. We know all too little about what makes for sustained-yield populations of commercially valuable fish species. There is only one example of a fishery resource that has been successfully studied and conserved over most of its range—that is the Pacific halibut administered by the International Fisheries Commission since 1930. This is the only fishery agency that has to date come even close to being adequately supported with money and personnel.

Far too little is known of the life habits, cyclic influences, and other factors affecting the abundance or scarcity of fishes, especially with regard to salt-water species.

There is ample testimony available to show that an important reason for the decline of many commercially valuable species has been overexploitation over the years—taking too many fish of too small a size the year around without regard to spawning seasons, migration habits, etc. Placing the management and administration of the commercial fishery back in the Department of Commerce, whose chief function is the development of industry for economic reasons, would, it seems to me, be inviting more of the same, and would be a dangerous and false solution to the problem.

I do not think I am being idealistic about the practical economic problems facing the industry when I say that. I believe, in fact, that I am being quite hard-headed, for I am thinking about what the economic status of the fishery will be 10 or 20 years from now. Nobody profits if there are no fish and we are rapidly approaching the "no fish" stage, for practical purposes, with many commercially valuable species in more than one area.

The second basic fact which the Hoover Commission report on Interior ignores in its recommendation is the close interdependence between sport and commercial fisheries, plus the great economic value of the sport fishery itself.

The same basic problems of lack of adequate research, personnel, and management which plague the commercial fishery also plague the sport fishery. The latter is by no means picayune from an economic standpoint, yet under the Hoover Commission recommendations receives bare lip-service recognition.

Let me show you, in dollars and cents, what status sport fishing has as big business in this country. For the year ending June 30, 1949, 15,478,570 American citizens bought angling licenses. Most of these are freshwater anglers, as only one State I know of, California, requires a license for salt-water sport fishing. Conservative estimates place at an additional 5,000,000 the anglers who fish costal and off-shore waters from Maine to Texas and from Washington to southern California.

In 1944 the Fish and Wildlife Service, as a part of its river basin work, began studies to determine the amounts of money fishermen and hunters spend in pursuit of their respective sports. They determined that the average annual outlay for fishing tackle, which represents but 5 percent of the fisherman's total expenditure in pursuit of his sport, was $6.25 per person. Even if we ignore the estimated 5,000,000 nonlicense buying anglers, that amounts to $99,740,000 annually for tackle alone. The other 95 percent includes what anglers spend for transportation, clothing, meals, and lodging and miscellaneous items of equipment including $32,657,940 annually for licenses. It makes a total of $1,995,000,000 spent annually by fishermen in pursuit of game fish. Bear in mind that these are 1944 cost figures applied to 1949 angler numbers. As such, the total undoubtedly is quite conservative.

In Colorado, the National Opinion Research Center made a survey of thousands of resident anglers and hunters on what they spent to pursue their sport in 1946. Among other things, they found that warm-water fishermen spent an average of $47.80 each and trout fishermen, $76.22. The number of resident fishing licenses sold in Colorado last year was 257,925, of which number, it is safe to say that four out of five were trout fishermen. The money placed in circulation by Colorado's resident anglers last year amounted to upward of $18,192,000.

Colorado's tourists were estimated by official State sources to have spent $216,000,000 in the State in 1949. It has been calculated by the same sources that sport or family food fishing is the major attraction for approximately 35 percent of the visitors. They generally spend at a considerably higher rate, per capita, than the residents—based on the above figures, about $75,500,000 annually. Added to the amount spent by resident anglers, that's upward of $93,500,000 spent for sport fishing in just one State.

Colorado is fairly representative of most of the 11 Western States with the exception of California which had a considerably larger number of license buying fishermen; 1,030,617.

These figures are not just pulled out of thin air. They are based on just as careful statistical surveys, interviews, and inventories as are used in business. As a matter of fact, it is business, big business.

The economic value of the sport fishery, therefore, and the number of persons in industries employed directly and indirectly in meeting the sport fisherman's needs in the tackle, boat, railroad, air line, auto, gasoline, restaurant, and resort businesses, compares quite favorably with the 1947 estimated consumer value of commercial fishery products, of $1,000,000,000 which furnished employment directly and indirectly for some 525,000 persons. These figures are taken from a report on the commercial fisheries to the natural resources task force by a technical consultant representing the industry.

The other fact to remember has been well stated in the report of the task force on natural resources: "Sport fishing is becoming increasingly dependent on commercial fishery resources." But one example of this is the increasing numbers of fish species which are sought after by both the commercial and the recreational angler. Here are but a few: In fresh water—the salmons, yellow perch, walleye or yellow pike, smelt, catfish and bullheads, sheepshead, paddlefish, buffalo, red horse, white bass, crappie, northern pike and pickerel, hickory shad; in salt water—amberjack, tuna, barracuda, bluefish, bonito, cod, haddock, halibut, mackerel, sea trout, croaker, shad, porgy, sea bass, striped bass and many others. The basic biological research and controls needed to better manage many of these species would be of lasting benefit to both commercial and sport fishing interests.

But the Hoover Commission would separate the management of commercial and sport fisheries. Certainly the management of sport fisheries does not belong in the Department of Commerce. Even if we could honestly agree that commercial fisheries did, we would not support such a move on the basis of its demonstrated interdependence with the Nation's sport fisheries.

I have probably taken too much time on this one question but it seems the principal problem before us and one difficult to cover adequately in a short time.

The other two recommendations we should briefly consider are those of the task force on natural resources and the minority report on the Department of the Interior signed by Dean Acheson, James K. Pollock, and James H. Rowe, Jr. Both of these recommend a Department of Natural Resources with cabinet status. As you know, they differ with respect to treatment of the fisheries.

The task force recommends that fishery functions and wildlife functions be split, in a proposed Department of Natural Resources, into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service. The minority recommendations appended to the Hoover Commission report on Interior opposes this split for lack of adequate definitive study to show the need for it.

There is another basic difference between the two reports which I want to call to your attention. The task force report has no status before Congress today. It has served its function. As a document it is today proud but poor—proud, as perhaps the best blueprint yet drawn for the sound management of the Nation's publicly owned and publicly controllable natural resources; poor—as a document which will begin to gather dust on the shelves unless the people decree otherwise. The minority report, on the other hand, does have status as part of an active document presented to Congress for translation into legislation.

The question is: "Split 'em or not split 'em?" In my opinion, the only things we are splitting by devoting a lot of time and worry to that question are hairs.

The task force gave a few not too specifically documented reasons for splitting. The minority dissenters said: "That's not proof enough." As far as we in the Izaak Walton League are concerned, based upon the evidence we have seen on both sides, it is a question needing further specific study and proof one way or the other. In its arguments for a split between wildlife and fisheries, the task force gaves some excellent additional reasons for not separating commercial from sport fisheries.

From the standpoint of the long-range good of the total fishery resource and its subsequent benefit to the people, the question of separating it from wildlife hinges, I think, on whether we would have a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service operating together in a Department of Natural Resources or whether we would have a Fisheries Service in Commerce or Public Works and a Wildlife Service in Interior or Agriculture or—God knows—maybe the Army Engineer Corps.

This much we do know today: The Department of Natural Resources idea, without the split, is before Congress. As an organization, the Izaak Walton League has gone on record in favor of such a department. It has not yet been demonstrated conclusively to us that a split between fishery and wildlife functions is either necessary or desirable. On the other hand, the beginnings of a good argument for a split have been started and have demonstrated that the commercial fishing industry, as well as the sport fishing industry, is in crying need of better administration, financing, and management. We would, however, support legislation for a Department of Natural Resources regardless of whether fisheries and wildlife were separated.

That's a good safe middle-of-the-road course on a burning issue perhaps. But we do not take it through any desire to avoid an issue. Those of you who are acquainted with the work of the Izaak Walton League know that, I am sure. We take it rather because we are trying to view the over-all natural resource picture of which fish and wildlife are just a part—albeit an important one.

We do not speak for all of the organized groups of sport fishermen in the country, by any means. But this you can be sure of: We will fight until the last goose is hung for what we believe to be the best plan for the wise use and husbandry of all the Nation's resources. In this particular case the Department of Natural Resources transcends in importance the question of whether fisheries and terrestrial wildlife should be managed together or separately. We would not bicker over the question to the detriment of whatever chance such a department might have.

That some better set-up for administration of commercial and sport fisheries is needed, we agree. Frankly, we don't know the answer. We do not set ourselves up as experts in administrative matters. We do believe strongly, however, that the administrative and management changes in the fisheries as currently proposed by the Hoover Commission and as outlined in S. 2833 would work to the ultimate detriment of the fishery resources of the Nation.

You have heard, or will hear, ample testimony today in favor of the split, and you have heard, or will hear, ample testimony opposed to it. The thing we must all do is remember that we are considering first and foremost the long-range welfare of a vital renewable resource which in all its aspects provides revenue, food, and the increasingly important health and well-being through recreation for a sizable segment of our population. Let us first determine how we can surely perpetuate that resource, and, secondly, how best to use it to the benefit of all concerned.

STATEMENT BY ALBERT M. DAY, DIRECTOR, FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE, UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

It is hardly proper for me as Director of the Fish and Wildlife Service, one of the agencies that is proposed for reorganization by the Hoover Commission, to discuss whether that Commission's recommendations are sound and should be adopted. Rather, I prefer to make some general observations about the background of the Hoover Commission report on this particular subject and explain what the Fish and Wildlife Service is attempting to do to aid in the broad development and utilization of the highly important fishery resources of this Nation.

In the first instance, it should be well understood that the final recommendations of the Hoover Commission resulted only after a great deal of conflicting and diverse testimony on this important subject had been given careful consideration. The whole problem is complex because fishery management is complex. It must always be woven into the intricate patterns of land and water uses and human needs in our expanding civilization. This fact is well emphasized when we recognize that the three different task forces studying the organization of the Government came out with three different recommendations when it came to fish and wildlife matters.

The report of one committee would have dispersed the conservation agencies through the Government and would have put the Fish and Wildlife Service in a Public Works Department. The Agricultural Committee recommended a transfer to Agriculture of all major public land administration activities and functions including the Fish and Wildlife Service. The task force on natural resources proposed to abolish the Interior Department and create in its place a Department of Natural Resources, in which would have been a division of the present Fish and Wildlife Service into a Fisheries Service and a Wildlife Service, each separately administered. The final recommendations of the entire Commission were that only the commercial fisheries activities of the Service should be transferred to the Department of Commerce. As evidence of the diversity of opinion among the members of the Commission, it should be noted that dissents to this proposal were expressed by Vice Chairman Dean Acheson and Commissioners James Forrestal, James K. Pollack, and James H. Rowe, Jr.

With this divergence of opinion among the members of the Hoover Commission and the various task forces as to the proper place in Government for the Federal responsibility for fishery activities, it is not surprising that the resultant reactions of the public also have been mixed. The American Fisheries Society, organized in 1872 and now the oldest scientific biological organization in the United States, at a meeting in Winnipeg, Canada, last September, passed a resolution endorsing the task force recommendations of the report on natural resources, with the exception that the society opposed that portion of the report which recommends the separation of fisheries administration from wildlife administration.

Likewise, a meeting of the International Association of Game, Fish and Conservation Commissioners, also meeting in Winnipeg, in September, passed a resolution endorsing the general purposes of the natural resources task force report, but also stated that they opposed the recommendation of the report which would separate fisheries from wildlife in the present Fish and Wildlife Service. Within the past few weeks, the executive officers and the legislative committee of the international association again reaffirmed to Secretary Chapman their strong opposition to this proposal. The international association is made up of representatives of all of the State conservation departments in the country, the great bulk of which administer both fisheries and wildlife in a single organization of the State. In fact, of the 48 States only 8 have separate departments devoted to commercial fisheries. In the other 40, commercial and sport fishery and wildlife management activities are all in the same department. The same, of course, is true in Alaska.

To the contrary, the Pacific Fisheries Conference, composed largely of members of industry operating on the west coast and in Alaska, by action taken at a recent meeting in California, adopted the following resolution, and I quote:

"Whereas the consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one Bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective; and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries, and whereas the Commission for the Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government, commonly referred to as the Hoover Commission, recommended that the administration of fisheries should be separated from the administration of wildlife: Now, therefore, be it

"*Resolved*, That the conference heartily endorses the recommendation that such separation should be made and also urges that the reestablished Division of Fisheries should be transferred in toto to the Department of Commerce or to a new Department of Natural Resources if such a Department should be created, and now, in whichever Department placed, fisheries should be under direct charge of an officer of the rank of Assistant Secretary."

It is to the assertion of the Pacific Fisheries Conference that the present organization has been demonstrated as "unsound, illogical, ineffective, and has not served to further the sound, efficient administration of fisheries" that I wish to direct my remarks today. I challenge that statement as incorrect, and I call upon the drafters of the resolution to furnish proof of their assertions. The present organization is sound, it is logical, and it is effective. In the 10 years it has been in effect, it has done more to further the interests of fishery management, conservation, and utilization than was accomplished in the three or four decades previously

Memories about public affairs and previous events are short, and I feel that the drafters of the resolution that I have just mentioned must have been unfamiliar with the background and did not know the original reasons for the consolidation of the Bureau of Fisheries and the Bureau of Biological Survey. Such moves are seldom made without good reasons, as was the case in this instance. At the time of the merger in 1940, both of these predecessor agencies were weak and to a considerable extent were discredited in the public mind. The Biological Survey, which I joined in 1918 and in which, together with the present Fish and Wildlife Service, I have served continuously ever since, had suffered from weak administration for several years prior to the merger. Waterfowl coming under Federal regulation under a treaty with Canada had been consistently declining over a period of years. The only remedy that the Bureau seemed to be able to prescribe was ever-shortened seasons and ever-smaller bag limits. Because of resultant public dissatisfaction and clamor, President Roosevelt appointed a special committee of citizens to study the problem and to recommend remedies. "Ding" Darling, the famous cartoonist, prominent in conservation circles in the Midwest, served on this special-study committee. It recommended a positive-action program—the acquisition and restoration of marshes along with severe restrictions on the take by hunters. Darling was induced to serve as Chief of the Biological Survey, an organization that had been virtually leaderless since the disability retirement of the previous bureau chief. He remained less than 2 years and was succeeded by Dr. Ira N. Gabrielson, an outstanding scientist and able administrator, but in 1940, when the merger came about, the public had not yet regained confidence in the efficiency of the administration of the Biological Survey.

A similar situation existed in the Bureau of Fisheries. It was a small organization and the morale of its employees, as well as the confidence of the public, suffered severely because of the quality of its leadership. Controversy raged, particularly in the Alaska fisheries field, where the Bureau then had and still has as the Fish and Wildlife Service sole regulatory authority over the extremely valuable salmon and herring fisheries. We are still trying to live down some of the things that happened in Alaska in in those days.

Government reorganizers concluded that there might be a strengthening of the administration of both fisheries and wildlife programs if the two closely related small bureaus were merged into one larger group. This has been the trend of Government for many years and, with the exception of the recommendations for the transfer of the commercial fishery activities to the Department of Commerce, was also the philosophy of the Hoover Commission.

When the merger of the Biological Survey and the Bureau of Fisheries came about in 1940, the Biological Survey was on its way back into public esteem under the leadership of Dr. Gabrielson. It was, therefore, logical that he should become the first Director of the new Fish and Wildlife Services. As a minor employee in Washington at the time of this "shotgun wedding" of the two Bureaus, with Secretary Ickes, incidentally, holding the old double-barreled gun on us, I can personally testify that it was an unpopular move with the employees of both Bureaus, particularly those who revere tradition and the "good old days" of the past. I also know that the proposal to return to those "good old days" does not fall upon completely unsympathetic ears with some in the present organization. It is difficult to understand their philosophy, because I cannot think of a single individual who has not personally benefited in rank and salary by the creation of a larger and more important agency. With some, tradition is truly a potent factor.

But, of more importance to you and the other people we are paid to serve, did the mandatory trip to the altar pay off? Let us merely check the records.

First, let's review the appropriations for fishery work for the past 20 years—the 10 years of operations under the present system and the 10 years immediately preceding. Granted that during recent years the costs of operations have risen and appropriations have been more liberal to take care of these factors, appropriation figures are probably still the best over-all yardstick to measure the services the Government gives its citizens in matters pertaining to the fisheries.

In 1930, Federal fishery appropriations amounted to $2,498,550; in 1940, $2,421,075. That represents a decrease during the 10-year period of almost $100,000. The average for that period was approximately $2,000,000 per year. The fishery appropriations for the fiscal year 1950 amount to $10,875,251. Of even greater significance, the budget which the President sent to the Congress within recent days and which Fish and Wildlife Service representatives justified before the Appropriations Committees a week ago carry proposed appropriations for fishery items amounting to approximately $12,000,000 for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. To be more specific as to items in which you are most interested, the work of the Branch of Commercial Fisheries received $229,540 in 1940; $668,500 in 1950. The Branch of Fishery Biology received $390,835 in 1940 as compared with $1,546,000 in 1950; Alaska Fisheries, including the Pribilofs, from $516,460 to $1,480,100 in those 10 years. And the wildlife appropriations have likewise increased at the same time. In 1940, they amounted to $6,149,343, almost three times the then appropriated sums for fishery activities. For 1950, they amounted to $16,502,-049. This sum included duck stamp and Pittman-Robertson revenues. Not bad for an "unsound, illogical, and ineffective" organization.

At the time of the merger, not a single research or exploratory vessel was owned and operated by the Bureau of Fisheries. Now, the *Albatross III* is carrying on investigations extending from the Grand Banks to the Carolinas on the Atlantic coast. Within recent months, two vessels, the *Oregon* and *Alaska,* have been acquired through special legislation and appropriations and are now stationed in the Gulf of Mexico. One will do exploratory fishing and the other will do biological research. A new vessel, the *John N. Cobb,* was commissioned at Astoria, Oreg., this month to carry out exploratory and experimental fishing in the North Pacific, reaching far into Arctic waters. The *Black Douglas* is carrying on experimental and biological work in an effort to find answers to some of the perplexing problems surrounding the pilchard fishery off the coast of California and lower Mexico. The *Hugh M. Smith* is conducting biological and oceanographic research, while the *Henry O'Malley* and the *John R. Manning* are doing exploratory fishing in the waters of the South Pacific in a program that has been developed in close cooperation with tuna-fishing industry of the west coast. The *Spencer F. Baird,* the *Theodore N. Gill,* and the *David Starr Jordan,* three well-equipped research and exploratory vessels, are now completing a 5-year study of the South Pacific fisheries in connection with the rehabilitation of the Philippines. It is planned that the *Theodore N. Gill* will soon be stationed in the Great Lakes to undertake the difficult study of the decline in that great fishery, made possible by special legislation and appropriations passed during the present session of Congress. That adds up to 11 large vessels compared with not a single one at the time of the merger. In the entire previous history of the Bureau of Fisheries, reaching back to 1871, in fact, there were never at one time more than three ships doing that sort of work and that occurred for only 2 years. None had been in service since 1932—8 years before the merger. Does that add up to the assertion that the present Fish and Wildlife Service is an unsound, illogical, and ineffective organization?

Ten years ago the famous laboratory at Woods Hole, steeped in traditions of fishery research and oceanography since the days of Spencer Fullerton Baird, had been virtually abandoned. Within the past 2 years we have rehabilitated the station, have transferred the scientific staff of the New England area there for headquarters, and the *Albatross III* is now berthed at Woods Hole. The laboratory at Beaufort, N. C., is being reconditioned and important studies in cooperation with the Atomic Energy Commission are being conducted at that point. A new laboratory is being constructed in Hawaii and the technology lab at Ketchikan, Alaska, has within recent months been enlarged and expanded. During that decade, a small laboratory was constructed in Puerto Rico, and fisheries research in the Caribbean area was carried on. In addition, the research stations at College Park, Md.; Milford, Conn.; Seattle, Wash.; and Pensacola, Fla., have been expanded.

Never in the 80 years of Government participation in matters pertaining to the fisheries has there been such great activity in the international field as there has been during the past few years. That is perfectly logical because of the increasing influence of the United States in world affairs. I should like to cite some of the more recent developments, however, as proof that fishery matters are not suffering at the hands of the present organization.

The Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Convention concluded just a year ago and ratified by the President last September 1 brings 11 nations having common interests in the North Atlantic fishing grounds under treaty arrangements for the first time in history. The fisheries of this great area have been the battleground for some exceedingly tough international problems that date back to days prior to American independence. A convention between the United States and Mexico for the establishment of an International Commission for the Scientific Investigation of Tuna was signed at Mexico City in January 1949, and has been ratified by the President. A similar convention between the United States and Costa Rica for the establishment of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission was signed at Washington in May 1949, and was ratified by the President on September 1, 1949. Three years ago 22 nations, including Canada and the United States, met in Washington and arrived at an international agreement which established the International Whaling Commission, empowered to conduct investigations and regulate whaling throughout all the marine waters of the globe. In 1946, a treaty was negotiated with Canada for the protection and management of the Great Lakes fisheries. This, so far, has been the least effective of the treaty programs because of opposition of one or two States surrounding the Great Lakes.

I have mentioned some of the more recent developments but I should record also the continuing activities in connection with the Sockeye Salmon Commission which came into being in 1936, and which has now assumed regulatory powers after the first 10 years of investigation. This has included the construction of the $2,000,000 fishway at Hells Gate on the Fraser River. I serve as one of the American members of this Commission. Assistant Director James is a member of the Halibut Commission, established in 1937, which has done a remarkable job of restoring the stocks of halibut along the stretches of the North Pacific coast.

In the field of management of the fisheries of Alaska, I am proud of the progress that is being made. For the first time in history, we are now developing a closely integrated program, using all available manpower and equipment for enforcing both the fishery and wildlife laws and regulations in a joint operation. Enforcement of the fishery regulations is now vastly improved because of the use of Alaska game agents as well as about a dozen transferred from the States each season. During the war years the fishing regulations were probably more liberal than they should have been. This was due to the pressure for food for our own people and our allies. Many of our trained personnel were in the Army and Navy and many Service ships were devoted to military uses. Inadequate observations and patrol, together with overfishing, created a serious depletion in the Alaska fishery. I am happy to say that it looks as though the situation is improving rapidly. Following severe restrictions during the past 3 years, the southeastern Alaska pack of pink salmon responded to the point where the pack last year not only returned to but also exceeded the previous normal 20-year average. Two large vessels have recently been secured by transfer from the Navy to augment our Alaskan fleet, and several smaller ships have been built as a result of new appropriations by the Congress. In the Service's combined Alaskan operations, there are now owned and operated 18 vessels ranging from 40 feet to 150 feet in size, with 11 additional patrol vessels ranging from 30 to 40 feet. There are also about 100 speedboats used in fishery patrol. Surplus planes have been made available since the end of the war and we now have a very excellent fleet of 20 planes which services both fishery and game agents in the Territory. Congress, last year, appropriated $250,000 for a new airplane hangar and shop at Anchorage, and as a result our facilities for observation and patrol will be much improved in future years. Moreover, Alaska regulations are now being made and enforced without fear or favor.

Ten years ago there were no effective means of correlating the needs of fish and wildlife with the construction programs of the Army engineers and the Bureau of Reclamation. That is not the case today. The Fish and Wildlife Service maintains a river basin staff whose responsibility it is to review the plans of the construction agencies while the projects are in the making. We work in close coordination with these two Bureaus. Much has been done to protect and increase the fishery potentials in the reservoirs because of this service.

The relations of the Fish and Wildlife Service with the Congress and the Bureau of the Budget are excellent. The needs of both fisheries and wildlife are given sympathetic attention both as to appropriations and as to legislation. This, in my opinion, is due in large part to the fact that practically every Member of the Congress has a personal interest in something that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing. If he or his constituents are not particularly interested in the commercial fisheries, it is a pretty safe bet that he either likes to hunt ducks and geese or he enjoys fishing for trout or bass or bluegills. Maybe he comes from the West and is more interested in the coyote and ground squirrel control program of the Service, or perhaps he wants to go to Alaska to hunt moose or brown bear. It is an assured certainty that if there is a Federal fish hatchery in his district, he is anxious to see that it produces as many fish for his sportsmen constituents as can possibly be done. I doubt that there is another single agency of Government that has such wide interest for so many people as do the varied activities of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

Last year there were 13,500,000 people who bought fishing licenses and almost 13,000,000 who bought hunting licenses. Another 2,000,000 bought duck stamps to hunt ducks and geese. Many probably purchased all three kinds of licenses, but yet the fact remains that approximately one out of every five people in the United States is influenced in some degree by the activities of this Service. As such, the single organization known as the Fish and Wildlife Service yields much more power and influence than either the Bureau of Fisheries or the Biological Survey ever did before or would ever do again, if they were reconstituted separately.

I could continue this recitation all day, but I fear that I have already used my allotted time. I shall close by inviting the members of the resolutions committee of the Pacific Fishing Conference, or anyone else for that matter, who believes that the "consolidation by Executive order of the former Bureau of Fisheries and the former Bureau of Biological Survey into one Bureau in the Department of the Interior, called the Fish and Wildlife Service, has been demonstrated as unsound, illogical, and ineffective" to take a little more careful look at the record. I sincerely believe that if those members of industry who are not satisfied with the present accomplishments of the Fish and Wildlife Service would tell us and the Congress, frankly, what in the way of accomplishments they want but are not now getting, they will come closer to seeing it done than if they were to depend upon a much smaller agency, with much less prestige. Remember the appropriation figures I gave you—$2,421,075 in 1940 as compared with $10,875,251 in 1950, and approximately $12,000,000 which President Truman has recommended to the Congress for next fiscal year. Again, I say, study the record.

Poem by Horace G. Carlisle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following poem by Horace G. Carlisle, poet laureate of Washington, titled "There's But One Way, Then Why Delay?'

If the natural law of supply and demand,
And the Master's divine Golden Rule,
Were obeyed by Americans, throughout the land,
And they all would quit acting the fool,
By engaging in covetous methods and schemes
To acquire more than their just due,
The peace past understanding would come, and our dreams
Of a prosperous day would come true.

Russianized communism can't grow in a soil
Wherein faith, hope, and charity thrive—
Communism depends on confusion, turmoil,
Hate, and enmity, to keep alive—
There is no force on earth, anywhere, that retards
Communism's advance, that we know,
More than true Christianity, which it regards
As its most indestructible foe.

When Americans practice what they'd rather preach,
In the church and the home and the school,
Communism's defeat will be within their reach;
For the Master's antique Golden Rule
Is effective today—as it ever has been—
And by it alone just wars are won—
The peace past understanding all nations will win
When they pray, "Not my will, Thine be done."

Grass Roots Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN BELL WILLIAMS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I want to present to the House of Representatives an editorial that records the progress of a unique farm program in Pike County, Miss. This program is unique in that it did not originate with a bureaucrat or a swivel-chair farmer. The businessmen and farmers of Pike County worked out definite goals to obtain, and the editorial reports the amazing progress that has been made in the 2 years of its operation. Oliver Emmerich, editor of the McComb Enterprise-Journal, suggested this program and it was aided and encouraged by his newspaper. Recognition of his leadership was recently made when he was named "man of the year" in the service of agriculture by the Progressive Farmer, one of the South's most widely circulated farm magazines. The achievements of this program, as recorded in the following editorial of the McComb (Miss.) Enterprise-Journal of February 8, 1950, prove that local citizens can help themselves more in 2 years than an all-powerful, all-benevolent Federal Government can in a hundred.

GRASS ROOTS PROGRESS

HISTORY OF 16-POINT PROGRAM

Cooperation has made the Pike County 16-point farm program the success that it is recognized to be. Now in its third year, the program has kept pace with the dreams of the men and women who have sponsored it. It was set forth as a 3-year program with 16 projects and involving the close partnership in community activity of the business leaders of McComb, Magnolia, Summit, and the farmers of Pike County.

The idea was first suggested editorially by the McComb Enterprise-Journal. Five Pike County banks actively participated.

The Illinois Central railroad system, the Pike County board of supervisors, the Mississippi Power and Light Co., the Mississippi Agricultural Extension Service, all have worked hand in glove.

The community leadership picked up the challenge and 110 sponsors, including individuals and firms, have worked earnestly to make it succeed. The budget called for an expenditure of $20,000 annually for each of 3 years. The first year's expenditures, that of 1948, amounted to $20,882, and all of this money was paid into the program's treasury. The second year cost was $17,526.79.

Committees from numerous counties and parishes have visited Pike County to witness the program in operation. From Tangipahoa Parish alone, in Louisiana, came a delegation of 55 citizens to learn of the program. The good work is spreading. The third year of the farm campaign, 1950, gives promise of far exceeding the achievements of 1949. The sponsors know that farming is basic in Mississippi and to the end that agriculture may prosper farm and business leadership will continue to march arm in arm to new triumphs.

NEW FARM INCOME, $1,362,625

The leadership of Pike County carried a campaign of basic economy improvement to the grass roots of America. Herewith is presented results of the achievement during

the second year of a widely recognized program: 1949 was a bad cotton year. Cotton production, on same acreage as 1948, dropped 3,200 bales. Cotton income in Pike County in 1949 dropped $690,000, but farm income from other sources increased $1,362,625. Rain may hurt cotton but it makes green grass grow.

CORN YIELD OF COUNTY DOUBLED

The 1947 announcement was that the goal of the 16-Point Farm Program in 1947 was to double the corn yield in Pike County on the same acreage within 3 years. What has happened since 1947? Think of a county with a goal so ambitious.

With use of hybrid seed and proper fertilizers corn yield increased: 1947—28,000 acres averaged 15 bushels per acre, value $420,000. 1948—28,000 acres averaged 24 bushels per acre, value $672,000. 1949—21,000 acres averaged 25 bushels; 7,000 acres averaged 49 bushels. Value of gain $448,000. 1949 average per acre, 31 bushels.

The corn yield of Pike County was doubled on the same acreage, not in 3, but in 2 years.

NEW MONEY FROM BEEF, $172,000

In 1947 the number of beef cattle in Pike County was 17,300. In 1948 the number of beef cattle was 18,500, with value of increase, $142,000. In 1949 the number of beef cattle was 20,100, with value of increase being $172,000.

SPRING CATTLE SHOW SUCCEEDS

In the spring cattle show 260 head of cattle were shown in 1948, 290 in 1949, with prize money to farmers in the amount of $2,650. Receipts from calves sold were $9,225, with a total value of $11,875.

COWS BRED ARTIFICIALLY, 5,394

In the artificial insemination program 870 cows were bred in 1947, 1,507 in 1948, and 1,948 in 1949. Nine hundred and eighty heifers thus bred showed milk increase over their dams valued at $46,315.

In the artificial insemination program, the total cows bred artificially in 6 counties bordering Pike in 1948 was only 300, while the total cows artificially bred from Pike plant in 6 counties in 1949 was 3,446. The total number of cows thus bred in 6 counties plus Pike County in 1949 was 5,394. The Pike County program is expanding values over other Mississippi areas.

In the investment in bulls, the number of bulls at the artificial breeding plant in 1948 was 6; in 1949, 9, with a value of $15,000. This program is benefiting all of southwest Mississippi. The number of cows bred throughout this area in 1949, 5,394. The valued increased milk flow to this area, $138,945.

CLUB'S DAIRY CHAIN GROWS

In the 4–H Club dairy chain, the Illinois Central Service Club donated two heifers in 1948. The Magnolia Rotary Club donated two heifers early in 1949. Value of calves from this dairy chain, $2,000. This chain will go on forever.

4–H BEEF CHAIN GROWS

In the 4–H beef cattle chain, McComb Lions Club donated two purebred heifers in 1948. The Summit Rotary Club donated one purebred heifer early in 1949. Value of calves from this chain, $1,800. This endless chain will go on indefinitely.

In the 4–H Club banquet program, two banquets were staged for top-flight members—one for white clubs and one for Negro clubs. 4–H Club membership increased from 2,346 in 1948 to 2,826 in 1949. Value of 4–H Club products, $72,195.

BANG'S DISEASE FIGHT LAUNCHED

In the eradication of Bang's disease program, as a result of leadership of the Magnolia Rotary Club, the board of supervisors has launched a county-wide Bang's disease program with a value of immeasurable possibilities.

BIG INCREASE IN LIME

In the pasture-land improvement program, 33 carloads of lime were imported in 1947; 205 carloads in 1948; 224 carloads in 1949; and in 1949, 11,000 acres were mineralized. The value of this program in meat and milk is $220,000.

The total number of acres of improved pasture in Pike County in 1947 was 2,000 acres; in 1948, 10,000 acres; and in 1949, 21,000 acres. The total acres of potential pastures in the county, 45,000 acres. The goal is 100 percent.

DAIRY EXHIBITS INCREASED

In 1948 there were seven counties with 165 head of cattle that participated in the State dairy show established by the 16-point farm program with the cooperation of the Mississippi Legislature. In 1949 there were 14 participating counties with 195 head exhibited. In the highly competitive dairy circuit 13 Pike County cattle won top prizes at five dairy shows. Value of fair prizes won: $3,154.85.

SWEETPOTATO FESTIVAL STAGED

In 1949, 600 acres commercial sweetpotatoes were grown, 600 bushels commercially stored, and 11,000 bushels farm stored. The profit through improved production and handling, $23,200.

The sweetpotato festival, sponsored by the McComb Exchange Club, with the purpose "to glamorize the yam," exhibited 24 individual farm exhibits, 23 4–H Club exhibits, and 4 community exhibits. A farmer was crowned king and a 4–H Club girl queen. Top price for potatoes at festival was $25.50 per bushel.

The sweetpotato festival parade was widely publicized. In 1948 the parade provided 9 community and commercial floats, while in 1949 there were 68 floats in the parade. It is growing bigger, and one of the biggest crowds in local history came to town to the 1949 parade.

ONE HUNDRED AND EIGHTY THOUSAND DOLLAR GAIN IN POULTRY

In 1947, 4,900 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with annual value of $20,000. In 1948, 31,000 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with annual value of $124,800. In 1949, 60,000 birds were produced every 12 weeks, with an annual value of $200,000. The 1950 goal is 150,000 birds every 12 weeks.

The corn yield of Pike County was doubled on the same acreage between 1947 and 1949, but poultry production increased 1,000 percent. All Pike County merchants and all Pike County people are asked to give Pike County birds first choice when purchasing poultry products.

FORESTRY METHODS PRODUCE PROFITS

In the forestry improvement with adult farmers in 1949, 356 farmers made forestland improvement, 3,500 forest acres were checked by foresters, 1,070 units of pulpwood were marked and sold, 2,870,100 feet of saw logs marked before sale, with resultant increase in sale value of above being $64,910.

In the forestry improvement with 4–H Club members, sponsored by the Summit Rotary Club fire prevention was guaranteed on 21,484 acres of forest land. Conservation schools sponsored with adult farmers and 55 4–H Club boys in marking timber and other forest improvements to an increase in value amount to $21,484.

ONE MILLION THREE HUNDRED AND SIXTY-TWO THOUSAND SIX HUNDRED AND TWENTY-FIVE DOLLARS FROM $10,026.79

Cost of Pike County's 16-point farm program (NOTE: This does not include cost of regular farm and home agents and their 4–H Club assistants) shows the following figure: State extension service, $2,160; additional county appropriation, $5,400; contributions of 110 sponsors, $10,026.79. The total cost in 1949 was $17,526.79. Return in extra farm income, total, $1,362,625.

It was reasoned that the way to overcome hazards of a one-crop cotton system was through diversification and improved land utilization. Here are the results of 1949 as compared with same categories in 1948:

Actual dollar value increase of 1949 over 1948

1. Sweetpotatoes	$23,200
2. Artificial breeding	138,945
3. Corn-yield increase	448,000
4. 4–H Club projects	72,195
5. State dairy show premiums	2,465
6. Poulty increase	180,000
7. Beef chain	1,800
8. Dairy chain	2,000
9. Lime program	220,000
10. State compensation	2,160
11. Bang's disease fight	[1]
12. Yam festival	[1]
13. Spring cattle show	11,875
14. Beef production	172,000
15. Forestry improvement	87,285
16. Pasture contest (prizes)	700
Total	1,362,625

[1] Inestimable.

Early Excise Tax Action Imperative To Aid Small Business and Its Employees

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have publicly stated that war-imposed excise taxes should be reduced or eliminated at an early date. I now reiterate that point of view.

However, Mr. Speaker, irrespective of the merits of that position, I consider it imperative for an entirely different reason that a definite decision be made at the earliest possible date with respect to the action which the Congress is going to take on the reduction or elimination of all or selected excise taxes. An early decision must be made to prevent further losses being incurred by small businesses and their employees by reason of the understandable unwillingness of prospective purchasers to purchase taxed articles while so much talk about excise taxes causes the buying public to expect widespread and appreciable tax reductions.

Mr. Speaker, unbiased surveys show that in Delaware and throughout the Nation small manufacturers, distributors, and retail merchants are suffering substantially from a lack of sales, and workers are becoming unemployed in increasing numbers for the same reason. These facts show that all lines of merchandise on which there are excise taxes are considerably affected, but that those suffering most severely are businesses engaged in the production, distribution and retail selling of furs, luggage, jewerly, handbags, and cosmetics. The public is simply waiting for the taxes to be reduced or removed, and the decline in sales of these articles ranges from 20 to 50 percent in comparison with sales of 1 year ago.

Consequently, Mr. Speaker, I urge that in the interest of small businesses and of continued employment that final action on the subject of excise-tax adjustments be brought about at the earliest possible moment. I understand that certain delays are unavoidable because of our legislative procedure and the desire for fair and adequate consideration of all interested parties. However, I do urge that whenever it is known that excise taxes in certain categories will in no way be altered by this Congress, that appropriate announcement to that effect be made to the public. The public, as well as small businesses and employees in the affected industries, have a right to be so informed. Furthermore, it may be added, unnecessary delays will result in additional revenue losses to the Government not only in the form of excise taxes, but in the form of seriously reduced corporate income taxes as a result of unprofitable or less profitable business.

Resolutions Adopted by United Farmers of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 26, 1950

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to attend and address the annual convention of the United Farmers of Minnesota. This organization is made up of actual farmers, who are vitally interested in the future welfare of American agriculture. Mr. Martin B. Tongen, a farmer in my home county in Minnesota, is the president of the Minnesota organization. He and his associates in the organization are men of courage and conviction. Since farm legislation is still an important matter before Congress, I feel that Members of the House of Representatives will be interested in studying the following resolutions, which were adopted at the annual meeting of the United Farmers of Minnesota:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE MINNESOTA UNITED FARMERS SECOND STATE CONVENTION

To the Congress of the United States and to the State Department we submit the following resolutions, adopted at the second State convention of the United Farmers of Minnesota, Inc., assembled at Wanamingo, Goodhue County, Minnesota, November 26, 1949:

We resolve that—

1. The Department of Agriculture be made entirely independent from any organization representing farmers. Taxpayers are, at present, actually helping support an organization representing farmers by paying taxes for the support of the Department of Agriculture, the Extension Bureaus, and the Colleges of Agriculture.

2. The cost of producing any agricultural product must be the primary basis for determining the market price for that product. Cost of production floor prices in the market place for all agricultural products shall be determined by Federal statute and enforced just as industrial wages are set at a minimum of 75 cents per hour. Subsidy programs, such as the Brannan plan, and government buying of surpluses under the Agricultural Act of 1949, are not the answer to a lasting farm program because of the excessive cost involved in tax money and because of the unpopular and unnecessary regimentation through acreage allotments and marketing quotas. Farmers want no hand-outs, but simply protection of equal opportunities in a free-enterprise system.

3. Cost of production floor prices must be high enough to secure for agricultural workers an average net income in balance with the average net income of nonagricultural workers. Such a price program alone can provide a true parity for agriculture, in contrast with the "outmoded, theoretical parity" of the past. Setting up a guaranteed income for farmers is not advisable since it may result in inefficiency, but setting up guaranteed cost of production floor prices on individual products will be an incentive to raise more products, thus resulting in higher efficiency.

4. The Granger bill be enacted. Anyone importing fats and oils in competition with domestic fats and oils shall pay a fee on the import making its price equal to the cost of production floor price of fats and oils produced here. The failure of the Government of controlling these imports has had a widespread depressing effect on the prices of not only oil-bearing crops but on almost all farm commodities. It is advisable, for the benefit of our whole national economy, to have this bill extended to cover all farm products that are imported in competition with products we can produce domestically.

5. The present Federal tax on oleomargarine, colored to imitate butter, be continued. The dairy business cannot survive if butter must compete with yellow oleo.

6. Purchases must stop of agricultural products raised in foreign countries to be given away under the Marshall plan when the same products are bought up as surpluses and stored in our own country. Any farm surpluses not needed for domestic use or for reserve stock piling shall be offered to world trade at world prices. Our Government shall not try to support world prices.

7. The proposed plan of compulsory health insurance be rejected. It is an undemocratic, socialistic scheme.

8. Federal employment, Federal taxes, and the Federal debt be reduced, and Federal spending be cut to the minimum. This will aid our national economy by encouraging new private enterprise and increasing the national income.

9. The trend toward socialized education be discouraged. Reorganization of school districts must be carefully undertaken as not to result in too much centralization of control.

Nature Songs To Make America Conservation Conscious During Wildlife Week, March 19–25, Featuring the Antlers of Flint, Mich.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM W. BLACKNEY
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BLACKNEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I am inserting an article from the National Wildlife Federation, of Washington, D. C., featuring nature songs appropriate during Wildlife Week, March 19–25, in which the Antlers of my home city of Flint, and the Nation's third-ranking quartet, play a prominent part:

It shouldn't require a water-shortage crisis in New York City to arouse Americans into becoming conservation conscious, according to the National Wildlife Federation.

Americans like music, especially old-time barbershop harmony, so why wouldn't a song like Cool Water, as harmonized by a barbershop quartet—the Antlers, of Flint, Mich., for example—help to promote the idea of conserving cool, clear water, and other natural resources, the federation would like to know.

Anyway the federation wants Americans to sing songs of the outdoors and nature in connection with the celebration of its thirteenth annual National Wildlife Restoration Week, March 19 to 25. It will be assisted by 600 city and small town chapters of the Society for the Preservation and Encouragement of Barber Shop Quartet Singing in America, Inc.

The Antlers, the Nation's third-ranking quartet, recently became the first SPEBSQSA foursome in the society's 12-year history to entertain at the White House, as well as to sing barber-shop harmony for a world-wide radio audience through the United States State Department's Voice of America transcribed programs. The Antlers are among the quartets being considered to accept a United States Army invitation to tour the Far East to sing for our troops there next spring.

After entertaining in the east wing of the White House, the Antlers, past Michigan champions, presented albums of their latest recordings, including Cool Water, to Maj. Gen. Harry H. Vaughan, military aide to the President, for himself and the President, a member for several years of Kansas City chapter of SPEBSQSA.

Later the Antlers sang Cool Water for Carl D. Shoemaker, Washington correspondent of the National Wildlife Federation, and member of the Federal Water Pollution Control Advisory Board. The occasion was Mr. Shoemaker's appearance before the International Board of SPEBSQSA, in convention assembled at Hotel Statler, to thank President O. H. King Cole, of Sheboygan, Wis., and the society's directors for their cooperation to "keep America singing" during wildlife week.

Already barbershoppers are participating in conservation radio programs in New Jersey, according to the Federation's representative in that State, Reuben Cain, of Plainfield, and in other States they are preparing for special wildlife-week events.

Milwaukee's High Life Quartet has volunteered its services for wildlife week to Rudy Kornetz, of Milwaukee, president of Conservation Unlimited, Inc., Wisconsin State affiliate of the National Wildlife Federation. This quartet features a special wildlife-week version, written by its tenor, John Sutschek, of a song, Way Up North in Wisconsin, originally composed by Edward Berg, Milwaukee barbershopper and group chairman of the industrial-arts department of Washington High School.

Herbert McKnight, of 51 Cherrywood Avenue, Toronto, Canada, has written the words and music of a song for wildlife week, about a 4,000-acre wildlife sanctuary, in which he states he has made 9 lakes "for wild water birds to rest during the migration period in flight to and fro between Canada and the United States." Mr. McKnight has offered his song to the Federation "to further wildlife conservation" in the United States and Canada.

To aid in the musical activities in connection with the wildlife-week conservation drive, SPEBSQSA headquarters in Detroit has furnished a selected group of songs from a recent society compilation of 500 songs arranged for four-part harmony.

The list includes the Hunters' Chorus, for hunters; I Get the Blues When It Rains, for sport anglers; Trees, for foresters; Listen to the Mocking Bird, for bird lovers; Deep River, for boating enthusiasts; and My Music Mountain Home, for mountaineers.

Several songs are suggested for farmers and soil conservationists, such as By the Watermelon Vine, Old MacDonald Had a Farm, the Three Little Pigs, and Coming Through the Rye.

For zoologists, the list includes Down in Jungle Town, the Monkey's Wedding, and Don't Go in the Lion's Cage Tonight. Dog lovers can sing Old Dog Tray and You Gotta Quit Kicking My Dawg Around.

For trail riders, there are Old Pal of My Saddle Days, the Old Grey Mare, and I Found a Horse Shoe. For cattlemen, Home on the Range. For hikers, While Strolling Through the Park One Day. For yachtsmen, Moonlight Bay. For apiarists, When the Bees Are in the Hive. For horticulturists, Sweet, Sweet Roses of Morn. For water conservationists, How Dry I Am; the Old Oaken Bucket; and Old Man River.

Even insect collectors have such familiar numbers as Moth and the Flame and Blue Tail Fly; while mineralogists can harmonize Down in a Coal Mine; geologists, You're Not the Only Pebble on the Beach; and orchardists, In the Shade of the Old Apple Tree.

In the Good Old Summertime appeals to millions of recreation seekers, while seashore devotees have Cockles and Mussels, and motorists, Highways Are Happy Ways.

According to the federation, there are literally hundreds of American songs relating to water, soil, trees, plants, and wildlife, all essential to human living, that are appropriate for Wildlife Week harmonizing.

"Barber shoppers" are distinguished as civic-minded preservers and encouragers of barber shop quartet singing, the federation said, and they set an example for 150,000,000 Americans to be militant preservers and encouragers of sound conservation and wildlife management practices.

Some species of wildlife today are only a memory, and unless Americans take conservation problems more seriously still other species will be remembered by future generations only in song and story, the federation warned.

Shall I Wasting in Despair would fit the situation if the conservation battle were to be lost, it has been suggested.

Let's preserve our natural resources together with the good old songs of the outdoors, and Americans will lead truly harmonious lives for many generations to come, the federation declared.

As reminders of our heritage of wildlife and plants, the federation is distributing millions of its 1950 series of full-color wildlife conservation stamps in connection with Wildlife Week. Proceeds from the sale of these stamps, depicting birds, mammals, flowers, and trees, are used for maintaining its conservation-education program and its news and legislative reporting services.

National chairman of Wildlife Week is to be announced. Honorary chairman is Bing Crosby, famed songster and outdoor sportsman. Governors of the 48 States have been asked by Federation President David A. Aylward to serve on the National Wildlife Restoration Week Committee. Several governors are already preparing to proclaim Wildlife Week in their respective States, including New Hampshire, Ohio, Oregon, and Tennessee.

Veterans' Newspapers Favor National Lottery

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, on the inspection trip I made with members of the House Foreign Affairs Committee last fall, I noticed that a great many of our neighboring countries used a national lottery to support their eleemosynary institutions. They have found that Government-controlled gambling will help defray a great part of the necessary expenses for hospitals of all kinds, homes for the aged, and so forth.

Here in the United States we have not looked with favor upon legalized lotteries either in our States or in the United States as a whole. I was surprised to learn, however, from the following editorial, that our forefathers helped finance the Revoluntionary War with a national lottery which was voted by the Continental Congress in 1776.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an editorial appearing in the December 17, 1949, issue of the Vet-Times, together with the February 1950 Veterans Report editorial entitled "Vote National Lottery":

[From the Vet-Times of December 17, 1949]

We think the time has come to plan the method to be used in paying a Federal bonus to the veterans of World War II.

We think we have the logical plan, but it is up to you veterans yourselves to say whether or not you want us to begin and carry on the long and costly crusade which will be necessary.

Here's the idea: Do you think the Federal Government should finance the payment of a bonus by legalizing and holding regular national lotteries?

We say "Yes."

The only objection we have ever heard raised against a Federal bonus is the cost involved. We have been told—falsely—that it would bankrupt the country. We have been told that the veterans themselves would have to pay for the bonus in taxes.

We think that the time has come when the problem of a bonus and the method of paying such a bonus should be looked into in the light of common sense. A national lottery is the logical answer to all of the problems involved.

The readers of the Vet-Times have long since proved themselves accurate barometers of veteran opinion throughout the United States. Therefore, if a preponderance of our readers vote to endorse payment of a bonus by means of a national lottery, we shall forthright launch a crusade to get Congress to enact the required legislation.

Such a crusade will not be an easy one. There has been public agitation in this country for a national lottery before. This time, however, the wishes of 16,000,000 veterans and their families should be given some heed by the Congress.

During the progress of any such crusade the Vet-Times will expect to be the target of editorial abuse in many areas. The "do-gooders" and the supermoralists will cry "shame."

But once the crusade is launched and backed by your support and the support of your buddies in every walk of life, we can't lose.

Aside from the great advantages accruing from a national lottery in the payment of a Federal bonus, we believe that it will play a substantial part in decreasing the kind of crime which breeds upon such illegal forms of gambling as the numbers racket, off-track horse-race betting, etc.

The arguments in favor of a Federal bonus lottery are many and valid. Every year the American people expend billions of dollars on gambling in one form or another and more often than not become lawbreakers in the process. Too often the odds are all against them.

Horse racing—the sport of kings—has become such big business in this country that it now gives direct employment to about 260,000 people and its annual take runs into the multimillions.

The numbers racket, flourishing illegally in every major American city, reaps a golden harvest for those who operate it outside the law and is charged with corrupting and demoralizing law-enforcement agencies through the pay-offs that are necessary for unhampered operations.

Rarely do the profits from such illegal sources of income find their way into the United States Treasury in the form of payment of taxes in full.

There is no way to stop Americans from gambling if they want to gamble any more than prohibition laws could stop Americans from drinking if they want to drink. And today, with the Treasury receiving huge dividends from liquor taxes, those who oppose drinking on moral grounds still do not drink themselves.

While almost all forms of gambling are illegal in this country, Americans gamble constantly. Seldom is there anything pernicious in the type of gambling that attracts the majority.

Money from this side of the Atlantic makes up more than half of the millions which are gambled yearly on the famous Irish sweepstakes. But hospitals in Ireland—not veterans in the United States—are the beneficiaries of this money.

Although lotteries are banned in every one of the 48 States, churches and other charitable projects from coast to coast are financed by lotteries, disguised in a variety of forms to get around the legal ban that few believe in and even fewer obey.

Office pools on football and baseball games, election bets, turkey drawings, bingo games, slot machines, pinball machines, even those friendly Friday night poker games, usually involve gambling and as such are illegal.

Millions of dollars in monthly revenue would pour into the Treasury through a national lottery. The proportion of the money necessary to finance prizes for winners and to pay the costs of administration would be deducted from the pool and the balance deposited in the Treasury for use in paying the Federal bonus.

Most veterans of World War II were drafted in a national lottery. If it is legal to draft men to fight and die by lottery, why should it remain illegal to use a lottery to give them a small reward for their service?

[From the Veterans Report]

VOTE NATIONAL LOTTERY

Our forefathers financed the Revolutionary War with a national lottery, voted by the Continental Congress in 1776.

If you don't believe it, just check the files of the Library of Congress, which further reveal that prizes were awarded the holders of lucky numbers in the form of United States Treasury notes which could be converted into cash within 3 to 5 years.

We don't have the figures on the kind of money collected by our founding fathers to fight the British, but we do have the figures on what gambling racketeers are collecting annually, in many instances outside the law and without benefit of taxes.

They pocketed $21,500,000,000 last year, exclusive of such forms of gambling as lotteries, raffles, and carnival games.

That's a whale of a lot of money that rightfully should be diverted into the United States Treasury, which today is spending more than it takes in to finance the staggering cost of modern government.

The biggest item in Government today is national defense. We appropriated roughly $13,500,000,000 this year to guarantee defense of the United States against a potential aggressor.

That is a tremendous amount, and even though it represents a large proportion of every dollar collected in taxes in this country annually it still is $8,000,000,000 less than organized gambling syndicates in America are grossing each year.

With the remaining $8,000,000,000 we not only could pay a bonus to every veteran of World War II, thereby rewarding him for the sacrifices he made to defend our country against Germany and Japan, but we could also virtually eliminate the tremendous drain on the Treasury incident to Veterans' Administration costs, which amount to $7,000,000,000 per year.

What's all this talk about the necessity for more taxes to pay current governmental obligations, when with one stroke of the pen our President could sign into law a bill that would serve to wipe out our multi-billion-dollar deficit in slightly more than 10 years?

We speak of a bill to authorize a national lottery—just such a bill as was passed by the Continental Congress in 1776 at a time when the United States was struggling for independence.

Last month we cautiously suggested in a small editorial that depending on the reaction of our subscribers, Veterans Report might suggest to Members of Congress that a national lottery should be authorized to pay a World War II bonus.

Since our January issue was published, we have thrown all caution to the winds, for we know that our subscribers are behind us, and, further, we know that there is an excellent historical precedent for authorization of a lottery in time of national emergency.

From now on, Veterans Report will actively campaign for a national lottery, not only to pay a bonus, but also to guarantee defense of the United States against all potential aggressors, and to ensure balancing of the Federal budget, while at the same time guaranteeing a more abundant life for the underprivileged of our great Nation.

Who says a bonus for World War II veterans would be a grab on the United States Treasury if financed by a national lottery? Rather, we say it would be a grab on the purse strings of the gambling tycoons in America, who are making more money illegally today than it costs to rearm against the Soviet Union.

Since January, hundreds of ballots favoring a national lottery have been arriving in the office of Veterans Report with every mail. These are not enough, we need thousands of ballots in every mail so that we can put sufficient pressure on Congress to bring the matter of a lottery to a vote this year.

Throw those ballots in. You'll find yours on page 6 of this issue. If you need more ballots, write us, and we'll send them to you for circulation among your friends.

To fight your battles, we need your full support.

The Rising Demand for Sound and Economical Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, many earnest and thoughtful citizens of this country are demanding a change in Government policies and cessation of wasteful spending.

There is submitted herewith for the consideration of my colleagues a letter from prominent residents of Idaho:

EMMETT, IDAHO, *February 9, 1950.*

DEAR MR. WHITE: We are very much in favor of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission and sincerely hope it will be put into effect very soon to stop this vicious senseless waste of taxpayers' money. We do not mind paying taxes but when there is such a terrible waste and still up goes the cry for more and more taxes, we feel a stop should be put to it. The budget certainly should be balanced and if it isn't in times of such prosperity just when is it going to be? It can be now and with lower taxes, too, if this criminal waste is stopped. Many of the policies of the present administration are mighty hard to take to say the least. This food surplus fiasco is a disgrace. Why are potatoes coming in from Canada when 50,000,000 bushels of our own are to be destroyed? Why are dried eggs and milk coming in from Communist China when we have a huge surplus? To think that a country and one of the few in the world which has enough food should have men in power who order that food destroyed is almost unbelievable and such tragic, vicious nonsense should be stopped. These are only a few of the things that weigh heavily on us and we are wondering why such policies are being continued. It is a Democratic (so-called) Congress it is true, but it seems to many of us that there are enough Republicans and others too, who, if they do not agree with these policies, could change them if they wanted to. If the opposition would spend some of the time on these problems that they spend disagreeing with each other perhaps more needed changes could and would be made. Look at some of the proven charges against some of our officials. Shameful to say the least. Still some seem to want to discredit Mr. Hoover of the FBI. Seems to many of us that Mr. Hoover has given much more service to his country than he has been paid for and that he, if anyone, needs not only more pay but more men too. There are so many things that point to our country being sold down the river that we are just getting plenty tired of it and feel our Representatives and Senators alike can do something about it while there is still time. Let's hope that one of these days we will have the kind of government resembling the one built on the principles that made our country great.

We are,

Sincerely yours,

Mr. and Mrs. FRANK LEECE.

Rent Control Robs an Infant

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, all too often the administration and the Congress, under its control to remedy some real or fancied hardship, has forgotten the principles laid down in the Constitution.

Let us lay aside the thought that legislation is sometimes enacted because those who desire it, who will be benefited by it, are voters and outnumber those who do not want it, who would be injured by it.

Nevertheless, it is true that when the administration or the Congress under its guidance attempts to take from one class of citizens a part of the income from its property, make another group the beneficiaries of that income so taken, it violates that provision of the Constitution which guarantees that a man shall be secure in his property, that it shall not be taken from him, even by the Government, without just compensation.

In recent years, the Supreme Court has been giving us judicial legislation. Apparently, instead of seeking out the true intent of the Congress and measuring that intent by the standard set up in the Constitution, it has, by judicial legislation, imposed upon the people its theory of what the law should be.

I am familiar with the decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Woods* v. *Miller Co.* (333 U. S. 138), where it upheld the validity of the rent-control law, but, notwithstanding that decision, I assert that it is unjust and unconstitutional through rent control to deprive an individual of a part of the rent from his property in order to benefit another citizen.

Neither the Congress nor the Court has authority to take from one man even a part of his property and give it to another.

An example of how the rent-control law robs an infant is found in the following correspondence, I quote:

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
ATTORNEY AT LAW,
St. Joseph, Mich., February 3, 1950.

The Honorable CLARE E. HOFFMAN,
Member of Congress.

DEAR CLARE: I am reluctant to bother you knowing the heavy demands upon you in these difficult times. However, the application of the rent-control law in one of my cases seems so very unfair and unreasonable that I feel constrained to do so.

As the guardian of the estate of Joan Faith Pitcher, a minor and the victim of a broken home, I leased the only asset in the estate, a residence in Niles, under date of February 14, 1949, at $420 payable semiannually for a term of 3 years. The lease was approved by the probate court. The lessees were very anxious to obtain the premises at this rental.

The rent director, as you will see by the enclosed correspondence, admits that at the time the lease was executed the premises were not under rent control as they had not

been previously leased having been occupied by members of the family; nevertheless, he tells me that I must cease accepting payment 6 months in advance and threatens to reduce the rent from $70 a month to $45 a month unless I can show comparable rentals on similar properties in the neighborhood as of April 1, 1941. You can realize in view of the increased cost of living since 1941 how much of a chance I have of doing that.

The area rent attorney denies that the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 thus operates ex post facto and, though the rent is reduced by $25 per month and cannot be collected in advance, yet he maintains that this does not vitiate the contract (see penultimate paragraph of his letter dated January 11, 1950).

I am asked to refund to the lessees all rents over $45 per month since April 1, 1949, or $275. The estate does not possess this sum as the taxes are high and I have paid $25 a month for the child's care and comforts since lease was signed under order of the probate court so you may have to bail me out of jail as I certainly will not pay from my own funds.

The rent attorney (Cholis) is well thought of. This matter is no reflection upon him as he probably gets directions from Washington.

Sincerely yours,

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW.

P. S.—If the estate had any money I would fight the matter in court but that is not possible.

JANUARY 10, 1950.

Re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich. Docket No. M-3230.

R. L. JACKSON, Esq.

Rent Director, South Bend, Ind.

SIR: I acknowledge the receipt of Form No. D-402 stating that you have been advised that I am in violation of the rent regulation.

As guardian of the estate of Joan Faith Pitcher, minor, I did on February 14, 1949, with the approval of the probate court enter into a 3-year lease of the above premises to Emerson Vaughn and Cleo Vaughn, husband and wife, for the sum of $2,520, i. e., rent of $420 payable semiannually in advance.

Members of my ward's family advised me that from the time the Emergency Price Control Act of 1942 went into effect and up to the time the lease was executed, the premises had not been rented but had been occupied by members of the family. As the lease was executed before the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 went into effect it was my understanding that it was not necessary for me to register the above housing accommodation. If I have been wrong in this assumption I should be grateful if you would advise me wherein I have been in violation. I shall hold Form D-402 pending your reply.

Sincerely yours.

A true copy of the signed original.

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind., January 11, 1950.

In re: 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.

Mr. ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Attorney at Law, St. Joseph, Mich.

DEAR SIR: Acknowledgment is made of your letter of January 10, in reference to the above-captioned premises. Under the Housing and Rent Act as it existed prior to April 1, 1949, certain housing accommodations were exempt from rent control. Among these were those accommodations which were not rented to anyone, other than immediate members of the owners' family, for 24 consecutive months between February 1, 1945, and March 30, 1949. Thus, from your letter, it is obvious that the premises in question were free of rent control up to April 1, 1949.

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949, effective April 1, 1949, however, would modify and change the rent act, among other changes, eliminating the above exceptions. Thus, the premises in question reverted to rent control on April 1, 1949, and as a result, a registration statement should be filed showing the maximum ceiling rent that was charged on April 1, 1949. This Office, in turn, will process the registration and, if it deems the rent in excess of what comparable units are renting for, it will, after due notice to you, reduce the rent to that of comparability. In addition, the rent act provides that only 1 month's rental at a time may be collected.

It is appreciated that the contract was entered into during a period of time in which the premises were free of rent control. In spite of this, the premises in question are subject to rent control and the maximum rent subject to being properly fixed by the rent office. If the rent office does decrease the maximum-ceiling rent, in my opinion it does not vitiate the contract, but rent suspends any portion of that contract which is in conflict with the rent act so long as the rent act is in effect.

If you have any further questions in this matter, please feel free to call on us.

Very truly yours,

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS,
Area Rent Attorney.

A true copy of the signed original.

JANUARY 12, 1950.

Re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.
Area Rent Attorney,
South Bend, Ind.

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS, Esq.,

DEAR SIR: I acknowledge receipt of your letter dated January 11, 1950. As guardian of the little girl who owns the above property I am under the jurisdiction of the probate court here. For this reason it will be necessary for me to submit the matter to the court in the event that the sole income of the estate is affected. I should, therefore, appreciate your advising me concerning the specific retroactive provisions of the Housing and Rent Act of 1949 since it was passed ex post facto. I do not see how it can be contended that a decrease in the maximum rent ceiling as established by the lease and a refusal to permit me to accept rent in advance as provided by the contract would not in fact vitiate the contract.

My ward is the victim of a broken home and these rents represent the only income of her estate. The mother has had a very rough time of it through no fault of her own if I read the files in the divorce case correctly and any reduction in the rents would work a genuine hardship. The people who rented the property were very anxious to pay the rent demanded and were restive under the delays which were necessary in order that the probate court might approve the lease.

Sincerely yours.

A true copy of the signed original.

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind., January 18, 1950.

In re 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.

ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Attorney at Law, St. Joseph, Mich.

DEAR SIR: I am in receipt of your letter of January 12, in reference to the above captioned premises. As yet, no rent reduction has been ordered. A request has been merely made that a registration statement be filed, showing the rent first charged on April 1, 1950, as being $60 per month. The rent office will then make a determination as to whether this amount is excessive. It will before entering an order of reduction, if any, give you an opportunity to present evidence as to whether you think the sum of $60 per month is proper. The only action which should be ceased immediately is the prepayment of rent 6 months in advance.

The Housing and Rent Act of 1949 would not operate ex post facto. It merely stated that the particular premises in question would be controlled from April 1, 1950, and thereafter. It did not effect the rental prior to April 1, 1950. I assume that since a contract had been entered into, prior to April 1, 1950, it is your contention that the setting aside of that lease is the ex post facto action. The following paragraph is indicative that the provisions of the Rent Act controlling the property from April 1, 1950, is constitutional.

It has long been established that "the operation of reasonable laws for the protection of the public cannot be headed off by making contracts reaching into the future" (Holmes, J., in *Dillengham* v. *McLaughlin* (264 U. S. 370, 374).) "Federal regulation of future action based upon rights previously acquired by the person regulated is not prohibited by the Constitution" (*Fleming* v. *Rhodes* (331 U. S. 100, 107)). There are many other decisions under the old rent act and the new rent act. Among these decisions are: *Woods* v. *Cobleigh* (75 F. Sup. 125, affirmed 175 F. (2d) 167, certiorari denied, 337 U. S. 924); *Woods* v. *Durr* (176 F. (2d) 273); *Porter* v. *Shibe* (158 F. (2d) 68).

Affirming the judgment of the *Woods* v. *Cobleigh* case, the court of appeals, speaking through Chief Judge Magruder, declared in *Cobleigh* v. *Woods* (175 F. 2d 167, certiorari denied, 337 U. S. 924 (at p. 169)):

"The constitutional power of Congress so to provide is none the less effective though it may involve prospective modification of existing agreements between landlords and tenants, valid when made" (*Fleming* v. *Rhodes* (1947, 331 U. S. 100, 107, 67 S. Ct. 1140, 91 L. Ed. 1368); *Taylor* v. *Brown* (Em. App. 1943, 137 F. 2d 654, 659, certiorari denied 1943, 320 U. S. 787, 64 S. Ct. 194, 88 L. Ed. 473)).

If there are any further questions, please feel free to call on me.

Very truly yours,

ALEXIS T. CHOLIS,
Area Rent Attorney.

A true copy of the signed original.

[Stamp of issuing office]

(Concerning 520 Cedar Street, Niles, Mich.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER

NOTICE OF PROCEEDINGS BY RENT DIRECTOR

OFFICE OF THE HOUSING EXPEDITER,
AREA RENT OFFICE,
South Bend, Ind.

To ROLLIN R. WINSLOW,
Guardian, 17 Shepard and Benning Building, St. Joseph, Mich.:

A preliminary investigation by the rent director indicates that the maximum rent for the above-described accommodations should be decreased.

(xx) On the grounds stated in section(s) 5 (c) 1 of the rent regulation. Therefore, the rent director proposes to decrease the maximum rent from $70 per month to $45 per month.

(xx) The rent director further proposes that the order decreasing the maximum rent shall be effective to reduce the rent from April 1, 1949, for the reason(s) stated in section(s) 4 (e) of the rent regulations.

In the event you wish to file a reply to this proposed action, such reply must be filed within 10 days from the date of this notice.

Written evidence supporting your reply must also be filed. Your statements and supporting evidence should be typed or legibly written. The address of the above

housing accommodations and the docket number appearing on this notice should be placed on each document filed.

If no reply and supporting evidence are filed within the above period, the rent director may enter an order decreasing the maximum rent without further notice.

R. L. JACKSON,
Rent Director.

JANUARY 31, 1950.

A true copy of the signed original.

Washington and Lee University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, last June, pursuant to a Senate joint resolution, a congressional committee, including members designated by the President of the United States, attended the bicentennial celebration of a relatively small but highly distinguished southern college. In view of the contribution of Washington and Lee University through the years to the training of men from all States in the Union for public leadership, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD the account of the bicentennial of Washington and Lee written by the editor of the Iron Worker, E. A. Watson, and reprinted in the twentieth anniversary edition of Dixie Business—The Voice of Southern Progress, as its article of the year from a company magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARTICLE OF THE YEAR FROM COMPANY MAGAZINE

(By E. A. Watson, editor, the Iron Worker)

WASHINGTON AND LEE UNIVERSITY AND ITS BICENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The editor of the Iron Worker, E. A. Watson, has written for his spring 1949 issue a notable account of the bicentennial of Washington and Lee. The editors of Dixie Business have selected it as the finest feature in any company magazine published in 1949. The Iron Worker is published by the Lynchburg Foundry Co., Lynchburg, Va.)

Events marking the bicentennial observance of Washington and Lee University have focused national attention on the institution throughout the school year and will be climaxed in special programs scheduled for April, May, and June. When its first two centuries come to an official close on June 18, 1949, a celebration in keeping with its history and traditions will have ended, and plans for a future befitting the faith and ideals of its founding fathers will have been outlined and inaugurated.

An impressive opening convocation in September started the celebration, with an address by Chief Justice of the United States Fred M. Vinson. Its formal academic procession, led by the Chief Justice and the university's thirteenth president, Francis Pendleton Gaines, included regional bicentennial chairmen from all over America and the school's 1,250 male students, among whom are numbered the distinguished two sons: James and Fred M. Vinson, Jr. Each month since that time has brought additional features to the bicentennial calendar.

President Harry S. Truman, who heads the official commission established by joint congressional resolution to represent the Government and the people of the United States, has stated his expectation of participating in the grand finale of the official national bicentennial celebration. A delegation from the United States Senate and House of Representatives will be present also, and a special State commission created by the Virginia General Assembly and headed by two Washington and Lee graduates, Gov. William Tuck and Lt. Gov. Preston Collins. For the round of final events planned for June 16–18, several thousand of the university's 11,000 alumni have indicated their intention to return to the campus.

Prior to the culminating exercises will be the observance on April 12 of Washington-Cincinnati Day, and on May 10–11 the centennial celebration of the Washington and Lee School of Law. Set for the April date also is the first-day sale in Lexington of the 3-cent bicentennial stamp, the first United States postal issue honoring a college or university.

The contributions of George Washington and the Virginia Society of the Cincinnati to the school in its early days of struggle are commemorated annually by Washington and Lee, and the 1949 date has been set aside for special emphasis. President Harold Willis Dodds, of Princeton University, has been selected as the principal speaker for this occasion, in recognition of Princeton's influence on Washington and Lee's history. Other arrangements for the strictly academic program include awards of honorary degrees to Americans of scholarly endeavor, and a procession of presidents and faculty representatives of leading colleges and universities, national sponsors of the bicentennial, the university's trustees and faculty, the board of directors of Alumni Inc. and student representatives.

In the celebration of the hundredth birthday of the Washington and Lee School of Law, scheduled for May 10–11, the annual series of John Randolph Tucker lectures will be inaugurated with one of the university's most distinguished graduates, the Honorable John W. Davis, as lecturer, Mr. Davis (A. B. 1892; LL. B. 1895; LL. D. 1915), is national chairman of the bicentennial committee and a member of the university board of trustees. He is a former Solicitor General of the United States, one time Ambassador to Great Britain, and was the Democratic nominee for President of the United States in 1924.

The Tucker lectures hereafter to be offered yearly and published by the university, memoralize the contributions of the late Judge John Randolph Tucker, for many years dean of the law school. Subject of one of the initial lectures will be Dr. Tucker's foremost study, constitutional law, viewed in the light of recent trends in that field. A convocation of law students and lawyers in Lee Chapel will further signalize the founding of the Lexington Law School, a private institution started in 1849 by Judge John Brockenbrough, and incorporated into the university during Gen. Robert E. Lee's presidency of Washington College. Faculties of nearby law schools are being invited to join in the observance, which will include also the award of honorary degrees to a group of distinguished American jurists.

In all the planning for the bicentennial year and the development of its program Washington and Lee's heritage has been kept dominant, without any sign of willingness to rest on its laurels. Its noble past has been reviewed in a spirit of natural pride in its enviable traditions, but the beckoning future has been its main theme. The motto on the university's official coat of arms, "Non in cautus futuri," in free translation: "Not unmindful of the future," expresses aptly the feeling that pervades the entire bicentennial observance. When the funds sought for Washington and Lee's advancement are in hand the university may be expected to enter its third century with confident stride. In planning its future it has accepted the obligation of its past. No better pattern could guide it in the years ahead.

Little eighteenth-century Augusta Academy, named for the Virginia county in which it was founded in 1749, was the modest beginning from which has developed the present Washington and Lee University. This progenitor described as "a tiny mathematical and classical school" in the Shenandoah Valley some 15 miles southwest of the town of Staunton, was established by Robert Alexander, who continued as its head for 11 years, and was followed by his close associate, the Reverend John Brown. The academy, said to have been the first of its kind west of the Blue Ridge, drew its pupils from the families of the Scotch-Irish settlers of that section, many of whose descendants have been prominent in the making of America.

John Brown, who became the second rector of Augusta Academy, was a 1749 graduate of Nassau Hall, New Jersey. He was succeeded in 1776 by another Princetonian, William Graham, who took over his duties shortly before the trustees of the school on May 6 of that year, almost 2 months before the signing of the Declaration of Independence, registered their zeal for the cause of the colonists by changing the name of the academy to Liberty Hall. Augusta Academy of the British Colony thus became Liberty Hall Academy of the new independent nation.

The Reverend William Graham, said to have been "a man of extensive acquirements, great originality of thought, warm patriotism, and indomitable energy," is credited with having made possible Liberty Hall's continuance "during the troublous times of our Revolutionary struggle." The academy, reestablished in 1776 at Timber Ridge, near the village of Fairfield, has been described as a log structure in which some 30 youths gathered from their boarding schools in the neighborhood, carrying their dinner with them, to study and recite "Latin, Greek, algebra, geometry, and such like scholastic mysteries." These were still pioneers days and instead of broadcloth coats, the students generally wore a far more graceful garment, the hunting shirt, homespun, home-woven, and home-made, by the industrious wives and daughters of the land. "In this rustic seminary a considerable number of young men began their education, who afterwards bore a distinguished part in the civil and ecclesiastical affairs of the country."

In 1782, Liberty Hall Academy, which meantime had moved to the location where its ruins now stand, received its charter from the Legislature of Virginia granting it authority "to confer literary degrees" and "to appoint professors, as well as masters and tutors." The new site was in Rockridge County, formed in 1778 from Augusta and Botetourt, at Lexington, the county seat, so called after Lexington, Mass., where "the embattled farmers stood and fired the shot heard round the world." At its first commencement exercises, on September 14, 1785, 12 graduates received the bachelor of arts degree. It was that same year that the State of Virginia voted Gen. George Washington the stock in the James River Company that he afterwards presented to the school, giving it the stimulus that kept it alive after the Revolution and is still felt to this day.

Since his engineering days, Washington had dreamed of the project to link the Atlantic Ocean with the Ohio River by a navigable waterway. It was therefore a happy expression of appreciation for the general's service to the State and country when the Virginia Legislature awarded him stock in the newly formed canal enterprise, the James River Co. Washington was not willing to accept the gift for his own personal

benefit but agreed to hold securities valued at $50,000, until they began to show profits, and then turn them over to some worthy purpose. In 1796, when revenue began accruing to the company, President Washington, feeling uninformed on Virginia institutions because of his long absorption in national affairs, asked the legislature to designate a recipient. This it preferred not to do, but offered the suggestion that he might select a seminary in the "upper country."

Upon learning how the matter stood, Gen. Andrew Moore of Rockbridge County and Gen. Francis Preston of Washington County, Representatives in Congress from the "upper country" called to Washington's attention the merits of Liberty Hall Academy. To press its cause further, General Moore wrote the Reverend William Graham, the school's rector, suggesting that the academy apply for the gift. Mr. Graham and the board of trustees prepared an address which they forwarded to the President along with a map of the "upper country."

After giving consideration to other possible beneficiaries, Washington decided to bestow the endowment on Liberty Hall because, he said, he wanted to help a school that was helping itself. In reply to a letter from the trustees informing him that in appreciation of his donation the name of the institution had been changed to Washington Academy, he wrote on June 17, 1798, that "to promote literature in this rising empire and to encourage the arts have ever been amongst the warmest wishes of my heart, and if the donation which the generosity of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Virginia has enabled me to bestow on Liberty Hall—now by your politeness called Washington Academy—is likely to prove a means to accomplish these ends, it will contribute to the gratification of my desires."

Through reinvestment the gift is still a part of Washington and Lee's endowment, the State of Virginia having taken over the corporate powers of the James River Canal Co. in 1818, and at a later date replaced the stock with certificates of indebtedness which were in time redeemed. Additional funds came to the school in 1802 from the Virginia Society of the Cincinnati, the organization formed at the close of the Revolution by General Washington's officers in the Continental Army. Inspired by their leader's gift, the group bestowed upon Washington Academy their total holdings valued at $25,000, accumulated through the contribution by each member of a month's military pay. This donation likewise continues to bring income to the university.

The third gift in those early years was the bequest of John Robinson, native of Ireland, a soldier under Washington and afterwards a trustee of the college, who left his entire estate to the school. This brought the endowment up to a little more than a hundred thousand dollars, which was the financial foundation for its operation during most of the nineteenth century.

On Christmas eve, 1802, the stone building that housed Liberty Hall was destroyed by fire, the complete devastation of which may be judged by the masonry that has been left standing on the spot. This loss was a staggering blow, but George Baxter, who shortly before had succeeded William Graham as rector, felt that Washington's gift carried with it the obligation to continue the school regardless of setbacks. Classes were therefore held in rented buildings in Lexington until, upon the purchase of a portion of today's campus and the erection on it of another school, in 1804, Washington Academy was again ready to go forward. With the authorization of the legislature, in 1813, the name became Washington College.

Construction of Washington Hall, center building of the present colonnade known as the Washington College group, was begun in 1824, with elaborate ceremonies marking the laying of its cornerstone. The development of the college from that time to the outbreak of the War Between the States was gradual but progressive. By the time of the presidency of the Reverend Henry Ruffner, who was inaugurated in 1837, the number of students ranged from 80 to 100, which was the maximum that could be accommodated. Upon the completion of additional buildings in the 1840's the college increased its capacity to 150 students.

In Henry Howe's History of Virginia, published in 1845, is an interesting drawing of the ante bellum buildings and campus and an account of the school that includes a statement of the cost of higher learning of that day: "The bill of expenses in the college are: Treasurer's bill for tuition, room rent, deposit, and matriculation, $42 per annum; board $7½ to $8 per month; washing, fuel, candles, bed, etc., about $3 per month. Total per session."

Soon after the outbreak of the War Between the States the students of Washington College formed the Liberty Hall Volunteers, a military company which fought with distinction in the Confederate Army. So few were left in the college as the tragic conflict wore on that classes at first were curtailed and eventually had to be discontinued entirely. When the Federal forces driving down the valley under command of Gen. David Hunter entered Lexington in June 1864 and destroyed the Virginia Military Institute barracks and other buildings, Washington College also was damaged, though not so extensively as its neighbor. Local tradition has it that ladies of the town, pointing out the wooden statue of Washington atop of the college's main building and explaining its endowment from the "Father of His Country," persuaded the Northern officers to spare the property.

Although Washington College was never officially closed during the War Between the States, it was on the verge of financial collapse when hostilities ceased. Only by borrowing on their personal credit were the trustees able to reorganize the institution and begin the work of repairing the buildings and bringing about its general rehabilitation. When the matter of the presidency of the war-torn college came up for consideration, the name of Gen. Robert E. Lee was proposed. The trustees knew that the beloved leader of the Confederate forces had already refused offers carrying large salaries, but they had heard that he favored a connection with an institution of learning. Some thought it "unmingled impudence to tender to General Lee the head of an institution which had nothing then and must start at the bottom rung of the collegiate education ladder." Others reminded those who hesitated that if the college had nothing, then General Lee's acceptance would immediately correct that condition. The vote to extend him an invitation to the office was unanimous.

In a letter dated August 5, 1865, and delivered in person by Judge John W. Brockenbrough, the rector, General Lee was told that Washington College, though a great sufferer from havoc and desolation was still blessed with a vigorous vitality, and needed only the aid of his illustrious character and transcendent attainments to reanimate her drooping fortunes and restore her to more than pristine usefulness and prosperity. General Lee considered the matter thoughtfully for days and then wrote the treasured letter of August 24, 1865, in which he stated his willingness to accept, but his fear that it might draw upon the college a feeling of hostility because of his being excluded from the terms of amnesty in the proclamation of the President of the United States, and an object of censure to a portion of the country. The trustees, casting aside his objections, adopted resolutions asking him to enter upon the duties of the presidency of the college at his earliest convenience. Rejecting offers that would have paid him as much as $50,000, General Lee on October 2, 1865, was formally installed as head of Washington College at a salary of $1,500 a year.

In the biography, General Lee, by Fitzhugh Lee, his nephew and cavalry commander, it is said that one of the professors of Virginia Military Institute termed the offer that brought the idol of the South to Lexington the happy audacity. The same book describes his arrival. Traveller, the famous gray which had borne him so faithfully amid the flying bolts of battle, now carried him to peaceful pursuits. Unheralded and unattended, having ridden from Powhatan County in 4 days, he drew rein in front of the village hotel, an old soldier recognized him, gave the military salute, placed one hand upon the bridle, the other upon the stirrup, and stood, waiting for him to dismount.

Through the "happy audacity" of its trustees the college was soon back on its feet. In the academic year of 1859–60 there had been 95 students, all except 1 from the State of Virginia. In 1867–68 there were 410 students enrolled from 20 States and 1 foreign country, with 68 percent from outside Virginia. The University's present cosmopolitanism—it is one of the most cosmopolitan in America—derives from General Lee's regime as its president. General Lee was president until his death on October 12, 1870, and in his 5 years' administration of the college's affairs its growth was phenomenal.

Under General Lee came not only this greatly increased enrollment but also many changes in the curriculum. During his first year, five new departments in liberal arts were added and a limited elective system of study was introduced. In 1866, through affiliation with the Lexington Law School, a private institution founded in 1849, a department of law and equity was established. A school of civil and mining engineering was organized that same year, and the students' business school set up the following year, laid the foundations for the present School of Commerce and Business Administration. From General Lee's proposal in 1869 to establish instruction journalism, the first program of training in journalism on the collegiate level in the world, eventually came the present Lee Journalism Foundation.

The greatest development of this postwar period, however, came in "the drama of reconciliation * * * unfolded first in the heart of Lee and then on the campus of his school. From every section great benefactors joined hands with him in strengthening an institution that was to be as broad as his own inclusive loyalty: Cyrus McCormick, of Chicago; and George Peabody, of Massachusetts; and W. W. Corcoran, of Washington; and Warren Newcomb, of New Orleans; and Thomas A. Scott, of Philadelphia—he had been Mr. Lincoln's Assistant Secretary of War; and Henry Ward Beecher, of Brooklyn, even a distinguished group of English admirers, and hundreds more who wanted a part in Lee's work." Through General Lee's leadership nationalism replaced sectionalism in the school.

Upon the death of General Lee the college trustees, noting that the two most celebrated influences in their respective centuries were Washington and Lee, resolved that they be hereafter associated indissolubly as founder and restorer of the school. Gen. G. W. Curtis Lee succeeded his father as president in 1871, and that same year the name of the institution was changed to Washington and Lee University.

Through succeeding administrations, each marked by its particular adjustment to social and economic conditions and educational needs, the university has continued to press on despite occasional discouragements. William Lyne Wilson, Member of Congress and

Postmaster General under President Cleveland, became head of the school in 1897. Dr. George H. Denney, who followed him in 1901, was succeeded in 1912 by Dr. Henry Louis Smith, Dr. Francis P. Gaines has been president since 1930.

Washington and Lee University, loving both church and State, has never received from either a dollar of its support or a suggestion of its policies. Through its two centuries it has remained a small school, a personal school, a school of accepted tradition. Its students maintain manners that are apparent to even the most casual visitor, dress like gentlemen, and accustom themselves to the better conventions, as befits the memory of its founders and the columnal dignity of its academic buildings. Here they speak to each other and to strangers with courtesy and the sincerity of friendship.

Institutions of learning elect for varied motives the title they bear; tribute to a personage revered, suggestion of locality, declaration of identity with a group.

But the name of Washington and Lee is history and testimony and creed.

Farley Appeals to the People To Force Curb on Spending

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including herewith an article from the Buffalo (N. Y.) Evening News of February 11, 1950, entitled "Farley Appeals to the People To Force Curb on Spending":

FARLEY APPEALS TO THE PEOPLE TO FORCE CURB ON SPENDING

SYRACUSE, February 11.—Checking Government costs is not a political issue but an American issue and true Americans had better do something about it at once.

This was the blunt advice Friday night of James A. Farley, former national chairman of the Democratic Party, in a hard-hitting endorsement of the Hoover Commission recommendations on Government spending. Mr. Farley, board chairman of the Coca-Cola Export Corp., addressed the convention banquet of the New York State Press Association in Hotel Syracuse.

The speaker minced no words in supporting most of the Hoover report: "It is the solemn duty of every American citizen to take this report with the utmost seriousness and to cooperate, as the years pass, in bringing about the adoption of its helpful and excellent recommendations."

SIX TIMES THE NATIONAL INCOME

If Government costs increase for the next 50 years as they did from 1900 to 1950, said Mr. Farley, the Government by the year 2000 will cost $6,000,000,000,000, or six times the whole national income. On that basis, he said, 20,000,000 employees would be on the pay roll at the time.

"The lesson of these simple figures," said the executive, "is that unless we find some way of reducing the cost of Government it will soon grow so great as to consume not only everything that we all earn, but everything that all have saved, and ultimately everything that we call property, which is owned by all of us.

"This is a very sobering situation. It is to the interest of every citizen to impress upon those whom he has elected to office the necessity that this increase in the burden of Government be checked, or we shall find ourselves living under a form of government which is utterly different from that in which we were born and under which our forefathers built a great country."

AN AMERICAN ISSUE

The problem, declared the former postmaster general, "is an American issue and every true American, regardless of party, owes it to himself to study it, understand it and do something about it."

The former Democratic chairman lauded former President Herbert Hoover and the members of his Commission for the tremendous investigative and detailed accomplishments they performed. Mr. Farley sketched several of their recommendations designed to reduce expenses and expedite services by streamlining Government functions and agencies. He continued:

"One of the most startling things in this report is the fact that it proves pretty conclusively, I believe, that Government, as now constituted, has grown so fast, so great, with such haphazard methods, that it is actually out of control of the very people conducting its affairs.

"That means that, with things as they are, Congress lacks the real means of controlling its own expenditures, and the President himself lacks the means of controlling the very departments over which he has the constitutional responsibility of direction."

ASKS ACCOUNTING OF PROPERTY

Especially needed in the Federal set-up, said Mr. Farley, are separate auditing and accounting systems as well as a "real accounting of the property" the Government owns. Such advances, he said, would place the Government in the pattern set up by modern business administration methods.

Mr. Farley emphasized that the extent to which the Federal Government, through grants-in-aid, is absorbing obligations and responsibilities of State governments is "one of the most serious tendencies in our Federal system."

"The way to stop this trend," he advised, "is to restore to the States some of the sources of taxation that the Federal Government has taken over. Here again the Hoover Commission has some very constructive and important recommendations."

It's easy to recommend things as the Hoover group did, said Mr. Farley, but it's another thing to get the recommendations accepted.

URGES PRESSURE TO RETRENCH

"Congress is under so many demands for the expenditure of funds that it finds it almost impossible to resist them," he declared. "What is needed is that Americans be organized to put just as much pressure on Congress to save as various pressure groups have put on it to spend.

"We must make a decision as to what should come first in the way of Government expenditures and then stop the increase."

The former Democratic chieftain told his listeners:

"We have got to have men in Congress who look to the need for a sound national economy with a balanced budget, and a little less concern for what certain communities and particular departments are demanding. This is a national cause and it requires a national point-of-view.

"We cannot, if we expect to remain a great and growing nation, indulge in an extension of the practice of deficit spending in times of great prosperity such as these. Our tax burden now is about all that we can support. An increase in our income taxes would probably yield less, rather than more revenue.

"We must reduce our cost of government, and we must reduce it even if some people get hurt in the process."

Rebuilding the Philippines

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE W. ANDREWS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address of Frank A. Waring, Chairman, United States Philippine War Damage Commission, before the Women's National Democratic Club, Washington, D. C., Monday, February 13, 1950:

Madam Chairman, members of the Women's National Democratic Club, and guests, I am delighted to have this opportunity to discuss with you the Philippines and its problem of reconstruction—delighted because the United States Philippine War Damage Commission has had a part in this work since 1946, and it is a subject which lies very close to our hearts.

Recently I had the privilege of appearing before the Appropriations Committee of the House of Representatives in connection with the Commission's last budgetary request. To the members of that committee I was able to say, "Gentlemen, this Commission is one agency of the Government which will finish its job before Congress said it must, and for less administrative expense than the Congress authorized." Every member of the Commission's staff is proud of that record. I do not suppose that many of you realize that today, in Manila and throughout the Philippines, a staff of approximately 100 Americans and 900 Filipinos is engaged in paying the war-damage claims of the Philippine Government and of individual Filipinos and Americans. The members of that staff, involved in a great and unprecedented task, are working diligently, at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 claims each working day, to terminate their own employment.

In 1946 the Congress passed the Philippine Rehabilitation Act which authorized the appropriation of $400,000,000 for the payment of private property claims for war damages in the Philippines. It also established the United States Philippine War Damage Commission which was assigned the task of adjudicating these claims and distributing the funds. Under the terms of the law, the Commission is required to assess the damage on the basis of prewar values less depreciation. Such values are obviously very much less than current costs. The law further provides that the Commission must pay in full all claims approved for $500 or less. On larger approved claims the Commission must pay $500, and then make a pro rata distribution insofar as its funds permit. On these larger approved claims the Commission is currently paying $500 plus 30 percent of the remainder. It expects that the funds authorized will be sufficient to permit a final liquidating payment of 15 percent. Thus, on the large approved claims, the total payment will be $500 plus 45 percent of the remainder, whereas approved claims not exceeding $500 will be paid in full.

When the statutory filing period of 12 months closed on February 29, 1948, the Commission had received 1,250,000 claims, valued by the claimants at more than $1,200,000,000 and 1,000,000 of these claims, or 80 percent, were for $500 or less in claimed amount. By January 31, 1950, 1,205,000 of these claims had been liquidated and $269,000,000 paid into the Philippine economy. Claimants had valued these processed claims at $938,000,000, and the Commission had approved them for $417,000,000. Thus, with more than 95 percent of the task completed,

the average rate of disallowance has exceeded 55 percent. On the average, therefore, the Commission has approved approximately 45 percent of the amount claimed. This does not mean that all claims were approved for 45 percent of their face value; 82,000 claims, valued at more than $107,000,000, have been disallowed in their entirety. Others, because they were well-prepared and adequately supported, were given a higher-than-average allowance.

Despite this rigorous and business-like policy of adjudication, the Philippine people appear to feel that they have received fair and equitable treatment. Under the law claimants are granted the opportunity to appeal to the Commission for reconsideration of their claims if they feel that an injustice has been done. Thus far, however, appeals have averaged less than 2 percent of the claims liquidated. We believe this to be a very real testimonial to the Commission's record of integrity and equity.

The Commission plans to conclude its work by December 31 of this year, 4 months ahead of the termination date fixed by Congress. We will finish the adjudication of all claims by June 30. Then, when the exact amount of the total authorization remaining for distribution has been determined, we will be in a position to make the final liquidating payment to those with approved claims in excess of $500. Such payments will be made to about 120,000 firms and individuals. At the rate of 2,000 payments each working day, this task alone will require 3 months. Thereafter, we will dispose of the Commission's assets, close our doors, and arrange for the return to the United States of the American members of the staff. You may be interested to know that, in this calendar year, we will pay into the Philippine economy approximately $150,000,000. And this aid comes at a time when it is sorely needed.

There is one impression which has gained some attention that I should like to dispel. It has been said that these funds, paid to small and large claimants alike, have been squandered on luxuries. The statement is simply not true. The Commission has conducted impartial surveys to ascertain the facts. As a result we know that the funds distributed by the Commission have gone where they were intended to go—to rehabilitate the Philippines. A very few exceptions there may be, but they do not constitute 1 percent of the total.

The small claimant has reconstructed or repaired his home, purchased land, or bought work animals, farm implements, tools, and essential clothing for his family. Thus he has become a more productive, and hence mor useful, member of society. The large claimant has taken his war damage funds and, of necessity, added new capital to advance the rehabilitation of his business. On December 31, 1949, claimants with claims in excess of $50,000 had received $39,000,000 from the Commission, but they had invested a total of $116,000,000, or more than three times the amount received from the Commission; thus the effective aid granted by the Commission has been trebled.

The task of investigating and appraising 1,250,000 claims has not been easy. Scattered from one end of the Philippines to the other, property under claim had to be visited for on-site inspections. This travel has involved personal inconvenience and often hazard. All possible means of transportation have been employed, from planes to shoe leather. Several investigations required extended trips in dugout canoes on crocodile-infested streams. An airplane, landing on an infrequently used airstrip, narrowly missed a water buffalo. A Philippine revenue cutter was pressed into service for several weeks to visit isolated islands not connected by commercial services. One assignment necessitated a week's journey on foot, blazing a trail through tropical jungles to reach a mine site accessible before the war only by aerial tram now destroyed. The days of the pioneer are not past, or if so, they have been revived in the work of the Commission.

In addition to the $400,000,000 authorized for the payment of damaged private property, the Congress, as a gesture of good will to the Philippine people, authorized the appropriation of $120,000,000 to assist the Philippine Government in repairing the tremendous damage to its public structures and facilities. For purposes of administration these funds were allocated to four agencies of the United States Government: $57,000,000 was allotted to the War Damage Commission for the reconstruction of hospitals, schools, and Government buildings; $40,000,000 went to the Bureau of Public Roads for the reconstruction of roads and bridges; $18,000,000 to the United States Army Corps of Engineers for the rehabilitation of ports and harbors; and $5,000,000 to the Public Health Service for the restoration of that vital service. I cannot overemphasize the importance of this last activity. Disease has caused an appalling loss of manpower and, hence, production in the Philippines. Malaria is still a chief cause of illness and death, and the incidence of tuberculosis is 10 percent as compared with less than 1 percent in the United States. The Public Health Service, under the able direction of Gen. Howard Smith, has made an invaluable contribution to the welfare of the Philippine people. Filipinos owe General Smith a tremendous debt of gratitude, and the American people should be proud of his accomplishments.

Because of the importance of health, the War Damage Commission gave first priority to the construction of hospitals and municipal waterworks. Second priority was assigned to schools, and, third, to Government buildings, national, provincial, and municipal. All of the Commission's funds have now been awarded, and construction has either been completed or is in process on all approved projects. It is expected that these projects will be completed by June 30, and this phase of the Commission's work will then be terminated.

The funds available to the Commission have been inadequate to restore more than a fraction of the damaged public property. The Philippine Government presented the Commission with claims aggregating $190,000,000. It has therefore been necessary to undertake only the most urgent projects. Yet, the Commission is proud that the American people have made it possible to restore, for the benefit of our Philippine friends, hospitals with accommodations for 3,000 bed patients, schools for 3,000,000 pupils, and water facilities to care for the needs of 6,700,000 persons. Moreover, the accomplishment of these tasks has provided labor for more than 16,000 workmen. We can be proud, too, that we have restored the legislative building where the Philippine Congress meets, that we have provided a home for the supreme court, and two excellent office buildings for the executive branch of the Government. In addition, we have restored all of the provincial capitol buildings throughout the country, and the city halls of chartered cities. The supervision of this work has been arduous, but it has also been gratifying because of the essential facilities which were restored to a people whose land was laid waste in a common cause.

The extent of war damage in the Philippines defies description, and even imagination. Manila, now a city of 1,200,000 inhabitants, was more than 50 percent destroyed. General Eisenhower is quoted as saying it was "the worst damaged city in the world with the possible exception of Warsaw." But destruction was not confined to Manila. It was spread with lavish impartiality from one end of the land to the other. Other principal cities, such as Iloilo, Cebu, Zamboanga, Davao, and Baguio, the summer capital, were laid waste. Factories were bombed, burned, and looted. Major businesses were destroyed, and some of the agricultural land damaged. Many of the people were driven from their homes; farmers lost work animals and tools; thousands were practically penniless, lacking the bare essentials of food and clothing. Sources of employment vanished. The physical damage to property has been variously estimated as ranging from $800,000,000 to $1,250,000,000, the latter figure having been submitted by a reputable American engineering firm.

But despite this damage, some have said, and perhaps some of you are thinking, that other lands have also been damaged by the war. Why then should the United States take this unprecedented action for the benefit of the Philippines? The Philippine Rehabilitation Act was an effort by Congress to fulfill promises made to the Philippine people during the dark days of the occupation. It represented the generous gesture of the United States to aid in the rehabilitation of the war-torn economy of the Philippines at a time when that country was about to embark on a new course as an independent republic. It represented, also, a recognition by the United States of the valiant aid which countless Filipinos had rendered to the allied cause.

But more than that, I would call your attention to the special and peculiar relationship of the United States to the Philippines during the last half century. In that period we labored as best we could to assist the Filipinos in their education and development so that they might be able independently to sustain democratic self-government. I submit to you that our prestige in the Far East is inextricably bound in the success of the Philippine experiment. Equally important and significant is the fact that the cause of democracy in southeast Asia is directly involved in the Philippine success, for southeast Asia, today in a fluid state, has its attention focused on the Philippines and how democracy functions there. Also, I need not remind you that, with recent developments in China, the Philippines has assumed an increased strategic importance. Secretary Acheson, not long ago, referred to the line of defense stretching from Japan, through Okinawa, to the Philippines. Moreover, the Philippines has been a significant factor in the foreign trade of the United States, serving as a major market for American products and a source of essential commodities such as sugar, copra, manila hemp, and hardwoods. For all of these reasons, some more important than others, the United States, in my opinion, cannot afford a failure in the Philippines. If the investments now being made help to insure success, they are investments which will pay dividends in the future.

You may ask, "What are current economic conditions in the Philippines, and what is the outlook for the future?" First let me say that the Philippines is rich in natural resources. Fertile agricultural land combined with a tropical climate will grow many products, such as rice, corn, sugar, coconuts, fibers, fruits, and tobacco. In addition, great stands of timber, including some of the finest hardwoods in the world, are awaiting a market. Production could be doubled or trebled without exceeding the natural rate of forest growth. Although a comprehensive geological survey has never been made, known mineral resources are extensive and sources of water power abundant. Significantly, there is no pressure of population, now estimated at 20,000,000 persons, upon the land; this is not true in other major Asiatic countries. With adequate capital, efficient management, and technical skill, the Philippines could well become one of the world's favored lands, a garden spot in the Far East.

But what are conditions today? Since the war, imports of consumers' goods have been abnormally large because, for more than 3 years of enemy occupation, the Philippines was isolated and its people had exhausted completely their supplies of basic necessities. It is true that some of these imports consisted of nonessentials, such as cigarettes and cosmetics. But I suspect that you ladies realize how important these things can become, especially if they had been denied to you for 3 years. In addition, imports of building materials, machinery, and equipment have also been large because they were required in the work of reconstruction. Without them, industries could not be rebuilt and production resumed. Rehabilitation, of course, was, and is, essential to provide exports, employment, and governmental revenue for the new Republic.

The rehabilitation of agriculture and industry has been a tremendous task, necessarily time consuming. As a result exports have failed to keep pace with the demand for imports, and the Philippines has experienced sizable import balances since liberation. In 1949 the United States paid into the Philippine economy more than $200,000,000 in war-damage payments, veterans' benefits, and other disbursements. These receipts, however, were insufficient to offset a trade deficit of approximately $300,000,000 and reserves, the dollar deposits of the Philippines in the United States, declined.

To strengthen its financial and economic position, the Philippine Government, in recent months, has taken positive action. It has imposed quota controls to curtail sharply the importation of luxuries and nonessentials, and the Central Bank has followed with credit restrictions designed to accomplish the same purpose. Finally, in December, the Government, operating through the Central Bank, imposed exchange controls to provide a mechanism for the protection of its dollar reserves. Steps are also being taken to increase agricultural production, with special emphasis on sugar and manila fiber for export, and on rice to eliminate the necessity of importing it. Moreover, the Philippine administration is presenting to the Philippine Congress a balanced budget for the fiscal year 1950–51. This they propose to accomplish by the introduction of economies, the increase of certain taxes to offset the anticipated decline in customs revenue caused by import controls, and the improvement of their tax-collection procedures.

In 1946 President Manuel Roxas made a hurried trip to the United States to seek a loan so that the Philippine Government might, in those early days, have funds with which to operate. At that time I asked my old friend whether the damage and destruction could be repaired in 5 years. He shook his head sadly and said, "No, Frank, it will take at least 10." One-half of that period is now gone, and much has been accomplished. But the task remaining is very great. For this new Republic, troubled with grave economic problems, I bespeak the continued interest and sympathetic consideration of the people of the United States.

Hon. Eugene O'Sullivan, of Nebraska

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 14 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "O'SULLIVAN's Oratory," which appeared in the Kearney Daily Hub, of Kearney, Nebr., on Friday, February 3, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

O'SULLIVAN'S ORATORY

Nebraska's Representative EUGENE O'SULLIVAN, of Omaha, apparently is making quite a splash in Washington—particularly in the field of verbose, unnecessary, and downright silly oratory.

Mr. O'SULLIVAN, who represents the Second Congressional District, apparently has decided that a freshman in the House must be noted for something in order to get into the public eye, so he has launched into speeches on the floor of Congress, a sample of which follows:

"Political reactionaries today may advertise haughtily their venal verdure, personally and through equally venal media, spread themselves like the Biblical green bay tree—Larus Nobilis—and claim that the power of gold is supreme, but what doth it avail them; it, too, shall pass away like a drunkard's disturbing dream and be lost forever in fathomless nothingness long before their life's bad book shall have found its last resting place in oblivion's uncataloged library."

In trying times such as these, with the future of the world resting on the shoulders of America's Congress and the people who elected them their delegates, the above-quoted remarks leave one perturbed as to the ability of a nation to survive.

George Dixon, a Washington columnist, after reading the passage quoted, was moved to call Mr. O'SULLIVAN's remarks as "undiluted bilge poured forth without any apparent reason by that great reservoir of hogwash, Representative EUGENE DANIEL O'SULLIVAN, of Nebraska."

It rather makes a Nebraskan blush—even a nonresident of the Second District.

Second-Class Mail Subsidies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, I want to correct what may have been an erroneous impression from my remarks on the postal-rate bill on the floor of the House Wednesday, February 8.

I was pointing out that the Chicago Tribune is the beneficiary of certain second-class mail subsidies which give it advantages over local newspapers in the so-called Chicagoland area. The advantages admittedly exist.

I did not mean to infer that the Tribune favored those subsidies. It is a repeated matter of record that the Tribune's editorial columns have stated the paper's willingness to give up such subsidies if and when Congress should remove them from other newspaper and magazine mailings.

In the issue of April 16, 1948, the Tribune declared editorially:

The Tribune repeatedly has stated that it does not want a free ride in the mail cars. A publisher has no more right than any other manufacturer to a Government subsidy in the distribution of his product.

The newspaper also makes the valid point on several occasions that magazines benefit more from the subsidies than do newspapers.

In June 1942 the Tribune expressed itself thus:

Consistently over the years the Tribune has argued against the use of the second-class mail privilege as a concealed subsidy. That was our position, it is our position, and it will continue to be our position.

I make special note of this situation on the floor of the House because it marks a very special occasion, the first approximate agreement between Colonel McCormick and myself that I can remember. I want to make perfectly clear that I disagree with many of the other conclusions and some of the statements made in the rest of the editorials here quoted in part.

J. Edgar Hoover

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD H. VELDE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, I have received a great many letters from people all over the country asking that I use my utmost efforts to back Mr. J. Edgar Hoover and to oppose the traitorous efforts of those who would seek an investigation of his activities or cause his dismissal as FBI Director. Two of the letters I have received follow:

CREVE COEUR, ILL., *February 11, 1950.*
To Our CONGRESSMAN:

I am of the opinion that those who talk of firing Edgar Hoover, because of wire tapping, or any other means used in order to catch spies and traitors and Communists in our country must have a very guilty conscience. Any means used to catch these people should be used. It looks to me as if Hoover is a better patriot than those that say fire him. I think the Government and lawmakers are entirely too easy on traitors to our country. If you are a true American and loyal to our country, would you object to FBI tapping your wires, if they had any suspicion that you were doing wrong? Of course you wouldn't. I for one say, let Edgar Hoover use his own judgment, just so he catches our spies and criminals. Keep him on the FBI force. He is a wonderful man, worthy of all the respect given him. If it were not for him, Fuchs would still be a free man helping enemies to this country.

Respectfully,
BERTHA WITTEN.

PEORIA, ILL., *February 10, 1950.*
Congressman HAROLD VELDE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. VELDE: I have read in the paper that there is a move being made to get President Truman to fire John Edgar Hoover because the G-men used wire-taps on Russian agents in this country.

If this be so, I urge you to support Mr. Hoover, the most capable head of the best run Government agency we have. He has served his country loyally for 25 years and deserves every true American's support.

Sincerely,
Mrs. ERNEST C. MAGNUSON.

Falling Prices of Farm Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAT SUTTON
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. SUTTON. Mr. Speaker, for the past several weeks much disgust has been expressed over our potato mess.

It must not be overlooked that potatoes are not the only sore spot, because, as of a few days ago, the Government had invested in dried eggs, $89,317,233; in butter, $59,518,797; and in dried milk, $27,399,460. In fact, the surplus-commodity purchases by the Department of Agriculture has been so extensive that it has necessitated a request by the Department to the Congress that an additional $2,000,000,000 be made available for price support.

In this connection, I commend the following editorial which appeared in the Nashville Tennessean on Friday, February 10, 1950, entitled "Eggs for Mr. Kline." Another very timely article is likewise set out below and was published in the February edition of the Southern Farmer, which, by the way, has over 1,000,000 subscribers. The article is entitled "Farmers Threatened With 1920–28 Prices."

[From the Nashville Tennessean of February 10, 1950]

EGGS FOR MR. KLINE

The latest statistics from the United States Department of Agriculture on the results of the Farm Bureau's price-support program should serve to stir even the board of directors of the American Farm Bureau Federation. The reports show that the Department has stock piled now, and available free to public and private welfare agencies for relief distribution, enough of several foods to supply a million Americans in these quantities:

One powdered egg a day for 7 years, 2 pounds of potatoes a day for more than 2 years, and 1 quart of skim milk a day for more than 2 years.

The proportions of the agricultural program sponsored by Mr. Allen Kline, president of the American Farm Bureau Federation, and Governor Dewey's secretary of agriculture if the New Yorker had made the grade, mount with each monthly report. Its absurdities and contradictions multiply. All the relief agencies in America could not consume such surpluses even if the Government would agree to add to its expenses the cost of freight haul and distribution to the relief client.

Such a program seeks to stifle the productive genius of American agriculture by making a mockery of its achievements. Such a program, deliberately plowing under the constructive effort of the American farmer, and at the same time hijacking the urban food consumer is defended by a few self-designated "realistic" farm leaders as an expression of the American way.

Secretary Brannan's program that would allow the farmers a parity price and pass on to the consumer the benefits of high production, they condemn as "a socialistic interference with the basic economic law of supply and demand." What an odd and elastic set of labels the times have brought us.

[From the Southern Farmer, Montgomery, Ala., for February 1950]

FARMERS THREATENED WITH 1920–28 PRICES

There is no longer any point in farmers refusing to face what is happening. For over a year now prices of everything farmers have to sell have been falling. During the last 12 months prices have dropped 22 percent. We are warned by the Department of Agriculture that they probably will fall 12 percent to 15 percent during 1950.

PRICES HEADED FOR FURTHER DROP

In some parts of the country eggs are selling as low as 15 cents; hogs as low as 13 cents; cream as low as 45 cents a hundredweight; poultry has skidded to as low as 21 cents. Dollar income of farmers has been clipped $3,000,000,000. If present prices are allowed to continue farmers will be nicked another $2,500,000,000. If the expected further drop in prices happens—and there is nothing in the present picture to stop them from falling—farmers' income will be sliced by more than one-third, or seven to eight billion dollars.

This means only one thing to thousands of farm families—it means bankruptcy and ruin. It means hunger for lack of enough food, it means sickness for lack of a doctor and medicine. It means debts, and for many it means foreclosure—loss of their farms.

Is there nothing that can be done to head off this ruin? Must farmers sit and watch all that they have labored and sweated to accumulate destroyed before their very eyes?

GORE-ANDERSON ACT CAUSES FALLING PRICES

Farmers can stop falling prices if they will act. First they will have to spot the people who have caused the drop in prices. And that is going to be a painful business for a lot of farmers. The ugly truth is that the people most responsible for the floor falling out from under farmers' prices are their own leaders. The hard truth is that the leaders of both the Farm Bureau and the Grange opposed the bills in the last session of Congress which would have put price supports under falling prices. They opposed the Pace-Brannan bill and supported the Gore-Anderson bill. The Pace-Brannan bill had price supports for hogs, poultry, fruits, beans, tomatoes, legumes of all sorts, milk, and dairy products, etc. The Gore-Anderson bill left out all of these.

Farmers must face up to the fact that present price supports only cover about 25 percent of what farmers have to sell. They must face the fact that 75 percent of what they grow and take to market is out in the cold.

ONLY 25 PERCENT OF CROPS COVERED

If farmers are going to stop their falling income they have got to demand and secure a fair price for all of their labor and not just that labor and work which they put into so-called basic crops. They are just kidding themselves or being kidded by somebody when they allow themselves to be hoodwinked by any scheme which includes only 25 percent of their labor and crops.

It is now all too clear that farmers are going to have to go around the leaders of the Farm Bureau and the Grange if they are going to get anywhere with Congress in stopping falling prices. The only national leaders who are supporting fair prices for all crops are the leaders of the Farmers Union. The leaders of the Farm Bureau and the Grange are all actively lobbying against including perishables, etc.

FARMERS SHOULD WRITE

What ought to be done now, immediately, is for every farmer to write his Congressman and the two Senators from his State and demand that price supports be revised to include all perishables. Name all that you grow and demand that each of the things you grow be put in. Congressmen pay more attention to letters from the folks back home than most people realize. They are all up for election this year. If farmers don't get action to stop falling prices, it will really be their own fault.

Now you can't fight something with nothing. The farm leaders who are responsible for the present law say they mean to stick by their guns and not permit any changes. It is clear that the only way you can beat these fellows is by being for some other plan or bill.

PACE-BRANNAN COVERS PERISHABLES

The Pace bill of last year is the answer. This bill provided for a trial run on 10 perishable commodities along lines suggested by Secretary Charles Brannan. By this means if there are some bugs in the Brannan plan, they can be found and eliminated.

But whether you agree with us about the Brannan plan, you must agree that something should be done to include the 75 percent of what farmers grow, now left out, and that Congress is the body that must be convinced.

Coyote Valley Dam Needed To Prevent Bad Floods

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUBERT B. SCUDDER
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. SCUDDER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I enclose the following editorial from the Press-Democrat of Santa Rosa, Calif., for Tuesday, February 7, 1950:

COYOTE DAM WOULD CUT FLOOD DAMAGE ON RIVER

Nature gave an unanswerable argument last week for the earliest possible construction of Coyote Valley Dam. Flood damage, happily, wasn't great. Some basements were flooded and a relatively few homes had water lapping around their foundations.

A look back over recent years shows that flood damage could have been far worse. A little more rain, a few more feet of water added to the flood crest and it would have been a much different story.

In 1937, for instance, 40 feet of water rolled down the Russian River causing a million dollars damage in Sonoma County and a similar amount in Mendocino County.

In 1940 a 54-foot-peak crest caused damage in the two counties estimated at $3,000,000 by present values. These are figures given by the Army Corps of Engineers.

In the past 70 years there have been 11 floods on the Russian River causing appreciable damage. Thus, they have occurred more often than once every 7 years.

Future damage, according to the Army engineers, will amount to more than $600,000 per year. This means that, unless checked, floods will cost the two counties more than $30,000,000 over a 50-year period. Besides, rich topsoil will be washed to sea.

It is estimated the proposed Russian River flood-control and water-conservation project will cut flood damage by at least 60 percent.

The Coyote Valley Dam is now before Congress for authorization. Its merits warrant congressional approval and speedy allocation of funds to get it started.

Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the millions of Americans in paying tribute to the memory of Gen. Thaddeus Kosciusko, that great Polish patriot, whose birthday we celebrate each year on February 12.

There is no need for me to recite the deeds of valor and the life of honor of this splendid patriot-soldier. The magnificent contribution he made to the cause of American freedom is indelibly etched upon the memories of all of us as well as on the pages of history and he merits the continued gratitude and undying respect of not only all Americans of all generations but of all freedom-loving peoples everywhere.

Poland was always a champion of freedom and the people of Poland in 1776 were no exception. When they heard about America's struggle, they became greatly concerned and it was the universal wish of all the people of Poland that sent Thaddeus Kosciusko to America to help us gain the freedom for which Poland on many occasions bled and died.

General Kosciusko came to America in order to help our revolutionary leaders achieve independence and he succeeded in his efforts. However, his attempt to free his own people from the Russian yoke met with defeat. He struggled in Poland for the same ideals for which he fought here, but he was defeated by an overwhelming force.

During World War II, the war which started in Poland for Poland's freedom, words of encouragement and praise were given to the Polish Nation from all quarters. Our soldiers were fighting alongside their comrades in arms of the Polish Army. Nations everywhere pledged support to the valiant Poles. As everyone knows, the Polish Nation kept on fighting and suffering. While we achieved victory in our struggle, Poland found herself still under an oppressor's heel even though she had been praised throughout the war as a most faithful member of a victorious team.

There is no difference between the ideals which America and Poland are seeking today and those for which they fought in the war of 1776.

There is no more fitting date to review our moral obligations toward the people of Poland than the anniversary of General Kosciusko's birth. That great heart would be saddened by the plight of his own country today. If he were alive at present, he would be fighting his country's cause with the same intensity of spirit with which he fought our cause and certainly we could do no less than render all possible assistance to him.

We must dedicate ourselves to Poland's cause and assure her of our full support. We must prevail upon the United Nations to exert every possible effort in her behalf. We must insist that she be liberated from the forces of totalitarianism and regain her full independence. In doing so, we shall keep faith with General Kosciusko and the other Polish patriots who gave their all so that our Nation might live. Poland must be free.

Forty-fifth Anniversary, Brooklyn Real Estate Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, while at home during a recent week end, it was my pleasure to attend the meeting of more than 1,000 members and friends of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board, who were celebrating the forty-fifth anniversary of the founding of that board. It was also my privilege to listen to an inspiring address by John A. Kervick, director of the New York field office of the Public Housing Administration.

While the speaker's address was directed primarily to the problems of Brooklyn, the explanation of the Housing Act of 1949, in its breath of scope, made it national in its application. I have, therefore, included a summary of it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I respectfully commend the reading of it by all. It follows:

The modern city of this era is far more than a mere political subdivision. It is a civic entity which has for its purpose, among other things, the furnishing of a design for good living and proper facilities for business growth. Only if it succeeds in both of these respects, will it have a chance for continued growth and development in this period of a $255,000,000,000 national income. Brooklyn must compete with the other great industrial areas and highly developed ports of this country and Europe if it is to move forward.

The tools of government, under the Housing Act of 1949, provided the necessary plans and wherewithal for pooling the powers and resources of the Federal Government with the initiative of localities and the know-how of private enterprise, to achieve the essential widespread rehabilitation and redevelopment of our cities, so drastically needed, so that they can provide those facilities for living and business expansion, without which they cannot grow and prosper.

The realtors of Brooklyn can well afford to examine closely the provisions of this Housing Act. It seems to be tailored for the use of "Brooklyns" all over the country where there is a crying need for, not only slum prevention, but slum eradication and the rebuilding of good housing and the opening of new vistas for commercial and industrial expansion in the downtown areas.

The tools are here. The Federal Government provides the funds through which the city can acquire the land and remove the blighted and substandard buildings. The Federal Government provides the funds to meet two-thirds of the write-down cost which, everyone agrees, is the only scheme through which rebuilding of vast areas can be accomplished. The city must, in turn, pay one-third of the same write-down. The city is then free to resell the land for private housing development, commercial expansion, low-rent housing use, or may utilize the land for a civic purpose or as an aid to the downtown business area, by way of the establishment of municipal parking lots. If the realtors are to take advantage of any part of the Housing Act of 1949, they must certainly recognize the advantages to them and to their city in this redevelopment provision.

The low-rent, public-housing program, which is also provided for in this act, is expected to play a vital part in the replanning and remaking of our cities. In all legislative history, no other piece of social legislation has ever been enacted with more careful attention to the protection of private enterprise from unfair competition, and with due regard for all segments of the housing and real estate field, than the public housing section of this act.

1. It respects the established American tradition of home rule in all its provisions. It is a local program with Federal assistance.

2. It is restricted to the assistance of families of low income, with veterans of World War II receiving first preference.

3. There is no outright local cash contribution, and the local taxpayers' pocketbook is hit only through the tax exemption granted this program, which is necessary to achieve the housing of low-income families.

4. Sites are acquired and developments are designed, constructed, and financed through private facilities, including, in a very generous measure, the real estate profession.

The constructive interest of the Brooklyn Real Estate Board is vitally needed for this community endeavor. I am sure that the board will have a sympathetic ear at city hall and at the New York City Housing Authority, which has done such an outstanding job under the able direction of Gen. Thomas F. Farrell. This display of leadership, in positive support of a worth-while program, will help rebuild New York City.

Campaign of Lies—Hoover Report Versus Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the St. Louis Globe-Democrat of February 12, 1950:

CAMPAIGN OF LIES

Thousands of jittery Federal job holders are moving swiftly and silently to sabotage, in advance of congressional debate, the efficiency recommendations of the Hoover Commission. A favorite device is misrepresentation of those recommendations to pressure groups so that Congressmen, fearing political reprisals, will vote to pigeonhole them.

An example is the current propaganda seeking to convince war veterans that the Hoover reorganization plans for the Veterans' Administration would reduce the benefits available to them. The fact is the benefits are set by law and can be changed only by separate act of Congress. This the Hoover report specifically stressed in detailing how common-sense office efficiency could save $70,000,000 a year in VA without the slightest decrease in service to veterans.

The Hoover Commission's VA task force, which incidentally included several leaders of veterans' organizations, found at least

that sum could be saved by eliminating excess VA personnel, overlapping duties, useless red tape.

It found VA employees are handling only one-fourth the policy load handled by private life-insurance companies. It found VA issues 88 different manuals, 665 varieties of technical bulletins, and 400 circulars of various kinds. It found more than 50 percent of all replies on insurance matters were delayed or improperly handled.

It found VA takes 80 days to pay a widow's claim, compared to 15 days for private insurance companies. It found VA had expanded two laws of 8½ pages into 994 pages of explanations.

It found one VA office had 24 supervisory employees for 25 persons being supervised. It found VA was letting bids for a $25,000,000 hospital almost immediately adjacent to a similar Navy hospital less than half full.

It found the per-bed construction cost for private hospitals was $16,000, and for VA hospitals $20,000 to $51,000.

This is the kind of gross waste of taxpayers' money the Commission proposed to wipe out in VA and other Government departments. But the jobholders are distorting the facts to suggest veterans will be the victims—even though most veterans themselves are well aware of VA's extravagant inefficiency.

It is a self-seeking campaign of falsehoods, and ex-servicemen should join the public in slapping them down. They have nothing to lose in benefits and everything to gain in lower tax rates.

Israeli: Arab War Looms Again Unless We Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on innumerable occasions our Government has announced that our foreign policy is dedicated to furnishing assistance to the people of all democratic nations so that they may live in peace and prosperity free from the threat of aggression by outside powers. If that truly be our aim, it is extremely difficult to account for the complete and deliberate failure by our Government to note the threat of aggression to the nation of Israel as a result of the arming by Great Britain of the Arab nations with whom Israel now has a temporary truce.

For a number of months, dispatches from the Associated Press have reported statements appearing in newspapers of the Arab countries which indicate they are looking to the next round of their war with the Israeli. They assert that the conflict temporarily concluded was but a preliminary skirmish and that there will be no doubt of the outcome of the next engagement. The receipt of vast quantities of arms from England adds fuel to their flame and gives substance to their threat.

When I was in England last December, I visited the office of the American Ambassador and called his attention to the fact that war fever was again rising with the shipment of more and more weapons, including American Sherman tanks. When I asked for an explanation, I was sought to be assured by the statement that the arms were being delivered in accordance with the Anglo-Egyptian Treaty and that at no time would the supply of arms be sufficient to permit another war. I was also informed that the Arab papers printed propaganda for internal consumption and that the stories were not to be taken seriously. I was told I was unduly disturbed.

Since then, the situation has steadily deteriorated. The arming of the Arabs has continued at a steady pace. Apparently, Egypt has made available to other Arab nations a portion of the weapons she received from Britain. In the meantime our State Department has steadfastly looked in other directions, making no protest to England and totally ignoring the alarming developments in the Middle East.

If our aim is to preserve peace, we must use our influence before it is too late. The time for action is not after the shooting has started.

The Christian Science Monitor is no scare-mongering or headline-seeking newspaper. Its reporting is characterized by fact and objectivity. That is why significance must be attached to its report on the Israeli-Arab situation, which appeared on its front page on January 31, 1950. Note the arms that are being supplied:

MIDEAST ARMS RACE BREWS AS ISRAELIS LASH "AID TO EGYPT"

(By Francis Ofner)

TEL AVIV, ISRAEL.—Through the steady shipment of British arms Egypt rapidly is becoming the center of a Middle East arms race which may have tragic consequences in this strategically important corner of the world, according to the official view of Israel.

The Egyptian efforts, as understood here, aim in three directions:

First, substantial purchases of modern war equipment for Egypt and the other Arab states; second, an increased training of new officers; and, third, the reorganization of Egypt's army based on the lessons of last year's defeat.

Israel's military command charges that since last summer Egypt's shattered ground forces are being rapidly transformed into a mechanized, mobile, and modernly equipped army, with its four combat brigades, which were heavily damaged in the war against Israel, already reequipped and modernized.

ARMORED BRIGADE REPORTED

In addition, one new armored brigade has been formed recently and equipped with British supplies, according to the Israelis, which include American-made Sherman tanks. An agreement for the purchase of 40 heavy Centurin-type tanks armed with powerful 25-pound cannon was concluded last month, it is reported.

Egypt's navy has been enriched also. Six frigates built between 1941 and 1943 have been supplied by Britain during the past 3 months. These frigates are equipped with 4-inch guns, 20-millimeter antiaircraft cannon, and torpedoes.

Egypt's air force also has undergone a very substantial change. Until last fall it had only Spitfires. Recently, however, one squadron of De Havilland Vampire jet fighters, one squadron of Venom jet fighters, and an unspecified formation of Meteor jet-propelled night fighter-bombers have been purchased in Britain by Egypt, according to the Israelis.

A part of these orders already has been delivered, the Israelis say. Negotiations are going on now for the purchase of a number of American Liberators, also to be delivered by Britain, the same sources declare.

NOT DENIED IN BRITAIN

[In London, a Foreign Office spokesman turned down the Israeli assertion that heavy sale of British arms to Arab countries will lead to a middle eastern arms race and possibly to a renewal of the Palestinian war.

[Although claiming that these sales were made in order to carry out existing treaties with the Arab nations, this spokesman did not deny that such extremely powerful weapons as destroyers, submarines, jet aircraft, heavy tanks, and heavy artillery were going to countries which are still technically at war with Israel.

[The spokesman confined himself to saying that Britain's commitments in western Europe and to the British Commonwealth of Nations limited its flow of arms to the Arabs.]

Egypt also serves as a transit area to supply Syria, which has no arms agreement with Britain. Since Syria's last governmental overthrow by Col. Adis Shishakli, Egypt has been ceding its own surplus to Syria. Twenty fighter planes supplied by Egypt have already reportedly reached an airport near Damascus.

PACT WITH RAF REPORTED

An agreement to train 2,000 Egyptians at Royal Air Force bases was reached last month. Although the place has not been fixed, it is most likely to be Cyprus or Cyrenaica.

A school for training civil pilots recently is reported to have been opened at Ambaba, near Cairo. Besides Egyptians, the pupils are said to include Syrians, Saudi Arabians, and Iranians.

The intention to send 2,000 Egyptians into the factories of France, Belgium, and Sweden was announced last month by the Egyptian Government as the first step to open an arms factory in Egypt.

Egypt seems to have learned the military lessons from its defeats between October 1948 and January 1949. Last year's lack of armored forces, mobility, and reserves is unlikely to occur again.

While most Arab countries are only now starting the reorganization of their armies, Egypt reportedly began these efforts immediately after the armistice with Israel, signed 11 months ago.

Since the Wafd Party gained power at the beginning of this year, these efforts have continued. The new War Minister, Mustafa Nusrad Bey, already has announced that Egypt is to become the strongest mideast army.

IRAQ BUILDS UP ARMS

Arms efforts are going ahead in Iraq, too. Last November, Britain concluded an unusually generous currency agreement with Iraq, releasing £1,000,000 a month to Iraq's account in hard currencies, instead of half this amount, as hitherto. The Israelis charge that this is connected with Britain's earlier decision to supply arms to Iraq.

The Arab Legion of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, which suffered only unsubstantial damage in the war with Israel, has already been reequipped by Britain. The effort is being made now to lay the foundations of Hashemite Jordan's air force. Two Arab Legion captains, Ali Abu Newar and Mohammed Bey Ruisan, were sent the end of last year to Britain's staff college.

This arms situation, coupled with the fact that no peace settlement has been concluded yet with any Arab states, makes Israel feel more isolated than ever. This is forcing Israel to increase its own defense capacity to the maximum of its ability, is officially stated here.

The Dishonest Attack on the Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, the Capital Times of Madison, Wis., a fearless liberal newspaper edited by a great progressive, William T. Evjue, carried an interesting article by Mr. Evjue in its issue of February 6. Mr. Evjue broadcasts over a number of Wisconsin radio stations every Sunday, and his speeches are carried the following day in the Capital Times.

His strictures on Republican leaders whom he characterizes as men who are preaching hate and distrust of government are particularly interesting. His address, The Dishonest Attack on the Welfare State, follows:

Hello, Wisconsin. During the coming week end the American people, over the radio and through the press, must go through the annual ordeal of listening to Republican spellbinders as they use Abraham Lincoln's birthday as the springboard from which to launch the current Republican propaganda at their Lincoln Day dinners. We shall be told again with great eloquence that Lincoln is the patron saint of the Republican Party and that today he is the personification of Republican ideals.

If it becomes necessary to distort some of the things that Lincoln said in order to fit the Republican ideology of today, the Republican orators will not be above taking liberties with the pronouncement of the Great Emancipator on such subjects as freedom, human welfare, and a good life for all our people. Have not some good Republicans only recently been convicted of misquoting Lincoln in order to shore up the campaign being now carried on by the Republican Party against the so-called welfare state?

Recently Representative BOLTON of Ohio introduced into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a list of 10 sayings which were attributed to Lincoln. Look magazine picked up these sayings and used them in a big splash article in the Cowles publication against the welfare state. Then Time magazine challenged the authenticity of these statements and said they were never uttered by Lincoln. Here is one of the statements attributed to Lincoln and which was to be used as propaganda against the welfare state: "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could do for themselves." When an effort was made to trace the source of the 10 statements, Representative BOLTON said that she had gotten them from a friend who had heard them on a broadcast by a radio commentator named Galen Drake. Drake in turn couldn't remember where he had picked them up, but he said he thought he had seen them in a house organ of a New Jersey machine manufacturer. These fake Lincoln sayings were traced as far back as 1942 when they were distributed in a leaflet by the Committee for Constitutional Government, the well-heeled, reactionary Washington lobby backed by Frank Gannett, the publisher of a chain of newspapers in New York.

I can't conceive that, if Lincoln were alive today, he would be joining the smug reactionary spokesmen of the Republican Party who are denouncing the welfare state. The men who are today trying to use the words "welfare state" as a term of opprobrium are men who are more concerned with property and profit than they are with human welfare. Who will deny that Lincoln was always more concerned with human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or color, than he was of dollars and cents? Isn't it always the Republican who tells the American people that what we need in Government today is the businessman's point of view; that we need the type of man who has met a pay roll and knows how to meet responsibilities? Abraham Lincoln hardly met those specifications. He was an impecunious lawyer who wouldn't have rated very high in any Dun & Bradstreet of his day. He challenged the property and economic interests of his day by branding the institution of slavery as loathesome. The property-minded Republicans of the Civil War wanted to ditch Lincoln near the end of his first term. Carl Sandburg, the Lincoln historian, said that early in 1864, near the end of his first term, not a single Member of the United States Senate and only one Member of the House would stand up and speak out in support of Lincoln. My guess is that if Lincoln were here today he would spurn the selfish, big-business philosophy of the Republican Party and aline himself with the second bill of rights enunciated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt when he said in 1944 that these rights should be: "The right to a useful and remunerative job in the industries or shops or mines of the Nation; the right to earn enough to provide adequate food and clothing and recreation; the right of every farmer to raise and sell his products at a return which will give him and his family a decent living; the right of every businessman, large and small, to trade in an atmosphere of freedom from unfair competition and combination by monopolies; the right of every family to a decent home; the right to adequate medical care and the opportunity to achieve and enjoy good health; the right to adequate protection from the economic fears of old age, sickness, accident, and unemployment; the right to a good education."

No; Abraham Lincoln would not be aline himself today with the men who are preaching hate and distrust of government. He believed in a government responsive to the needs and wishes of the people rather than one owned and manipulated by and for the special privileged few. Lincoln gave a pretty good definition of the "welfare state" when he said, "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they cannot by individual effort do at all or do so well themselves." When the Republican spellbinders mount the rostrums this week to convince the American people that modern-day Republicanism is in any way related to the humanitarianism of Lincoln they should remember another famous Lincoln quotation: "You can fool all of the people some of the time and some of the people all the time, but can't fool all the people all the time."

The fraudulent use of quotations attributed to Lincoln by the conservative orators is typical of the insincerity with which the whole attack against the so-called welfare state is being carried on. The men who cry loudest against the welfare state will never tell you what welfare services they would cut off if given control of the Government. Would they abolish social security, aid to agriculture, subsidies to the newspapers, shipping interests, or the air lines? Would they cut out veterans aids, the school-lunch program, rural electrification? When pressed they will never be specific. Like Governor Dewey in the 1948 campaign, they will merely say that they can do better what has already been done. This same insincerity was evident a few weeks ago when the news hit America that the labor government in New Zealand had been defeated by the conservatives. The news was hailed in the press of this Nation as repudiation of the welfare state in New Zealand. It wasn't until weeks later that we learned that the welfare state was not even an issue in the New Zealand election. The conservatives had adopted the social reforms of the Labor Party and campaigned on a platform promising no interference with the gains made by the Labor Party. The same thing happened in the Australian election where the conservatives were victorious on a platform of continuing the welfare services inaugurated by the Labor Party in that country.

We are now hearing the same refrain about the election to be held in Great Britain. The press and reactionary politicians, hoping for a defeat of the Labor government, are hailing the election as one between the welfare state and free enterprise. It is obviously anything but that, if one can judge from the manifesto issued by the British Conservative Party and the conservative British press. Commenting on the manifesto of the Conservative Party, the London Times, one of Great Britain's most noted conservative papers, said: "The so-called welfare state with food, homes, work, social security for all is to be preserved and improved. To many conservatives not very long ago, this manifesto would have seemed a socialist tract itself. Its conservatism appears in the claim to put these collective arrangements on a sounder economic foundation by better and more thrifty management." The election in Great Britain does not involve the issue of the welfare state, for British Conservatives, unlike our Republicans and Dixicrats, have come to recognize the Government's obligation to provide people with safeguards against unemployment, hunger, homelessness, and sickness. The forces of the right in Britain are demonstrating a more honest attitude. There is none of this clamor about the welfare state. They frankly accept it and promise only that they will administer it more efficiently. Our conservatives in this country, however, try to travel in both directions at once. They denounce the welfare services on the one hand and declare that they will administer them better on the other hand.

Isn't it about time that our conservatives in this country recognized that the people see through this kind of duplicity. The people are not going to condone any retreat from the welfare gains that have been made. The Republicans tried such a retreat in the Eightieth Congress and the result was the stunning upset election of 1948. For all his "me-tooing," Governor Dewey could not convince the American people that his party was not trying to take the country back to the days of McKinley. But the dishonesty and insincerity of the attacks on the welfare state will continue even if it requires putting words in the mouth of the dead Lincoln.

Civilian Control Over Military Procurement and Related Activities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the legislative framework for performing efficiently the so-called housekeeping activities of the Federal Government, including procurement and other aspects of property management, is provided in Public Law 152 of the Eighty-first Congress, first session, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949.

In developing this legislation we gave careful attention to the problem of the relationship between the military and civilian aspects of procurement and related functions. I believe it was the intent of Congress that, to the maximum degree possible, these activities should be under the control of the General Services Administration as the civilian agency charged with certain duties and responsibilities in Federal procurement and property management under Public Law 152. That law contained a proviso permitting the Secretary of Defense, from time to time and unless the President should otherwise direct, to exempt the military services from action taken by the General Services Administrator in the field of procurement and property management whenever he determines such exemptions to be in the best interests of national security.

I wish to stress, Mr. Speaker, that the proviso exempting the military from control by the General Services Administrator is strictly limited. The Secretary of Defense may exempt only one, from time to time; two, subject to Presidential approval; three, when a matter of national security is patently involved. The President also has authority in Public Law 152 to prescribe to the executive departments and agencies such policies and directives as he deems necessary to effectuate the provisions of the act. Pursuant to this authority, the President has issued a directive to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services defining the relationship between military and civilian procurement to be presently maintained and instructing these agency heads to work out areas of understanding on what military supply activities might be appropriately exempted from or included in the jurisdiction of the civilian administrator. Until further order, the Secretary of Defense is specifically directed not to make any exemptions under the proviso mentioned above, without the prior approval of the President. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this directive of the President comports with the spirit of Public Law 152 that military exemptions from civilian control shall be held to a minimum.

Following the issuance of the Presidential directive on July 1, 1949, the Secretary of Defense, the Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget signed a statement expressing certain general policies and their determination to expedite the development of areas of understanding within the framework of those policies.

I recognize, Mr. Speaker, that many delicate and difficult matters are involved here. The military have always been jealous of their bailiwick; they tend to operate as a self-sufficient entity unto themselves. Because national security and defense now involve the whole economy, the whole population, this kind of military self-sufficiency in the making of policy can no longer be accepted as a matter of course. For example, I am not prepared to accept the clause in the General Policy Statement signed by the heads of the three agencies which reads "while it is recognized that the great bulk of military procurement in both peacetime and wartime will continue to be handled by the military departments themselves."

That is recognizing too much, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe that it was the intent of Congress in Public Law 152 to put the "great bulk" of military property outside the purview of the Administrator of General Services and to leave only the small remainder within the "areas of understanding." It may be that in the interests of national security, dire necessity or some sudden emergency may compel us to recognize that the bulk of military procurement should be handled by the military. But let us not start with that as a general policy; let us have resort to that only if there is no alternative.

If, as the general policy statement further asserts, it is desirable to consider "all phases of Federal Government supply as a part of an over-all supply management concept," this is an argument for less and less, rather than more and more, military exemptions from civilian control. Otherwise we are forced into a degree of military control of the civilian economy, under the impact of present-day security needs, that is inimical to American traditions and dangerous to democracy.

For the information of the Members, I include with these remarks the President's directive to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, the Secretary of Defense, and the Administrator of General Services, and the general policy statement signed by those officials:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 1, 1949.

To the DIRECTOR OF THE BUREAU OF THE BUDGET, THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, THE ADMINISTRATOR OF GENERAL SERVICES:

By virtue of the authority vested in me by section 205 (a) of the act entitled "An act to simplify the procurement, utilization, and disposal of Government property, to reorganize certain agencies of the Government, and for other purposes," approved June 30, 1949 (the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949) it is hereby directed that:

1. Pending determinations made in the course of the studies hereinafter directed to be instituted, the several departments and agencies constituting the National Military Establishment shall continue to procure through the Administrator of General Services such supplies, materials, equipment, and other personal property, and have performed by the Administrator such related functions of the types specified in section 201 (a) (1) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 as were customarily procured or performed for the departments and agencies of the National Military Establishment by the Bureau of Federal Supply prior to the taking effect of said act. Until further order of the President, the Secretary of Defense shall not, without the prior approval of the President, issue any order or directive exempting the National Military Establishment in accordance with the proviso in section 201 (a) of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, from action taken or to be taken by the Administrator of General Services under said section.

2. The Administrator of General Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget (1) shall forthwith undertake, and diligently pursue, studies aimed at developing areas of understanding with respect to the extent to which the National Military Establishment should be exempt from the jurisdiction of the Administrator under sections 201 and 206 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, and (2) shall present any appropriate recommendations to the President.

HARRY S. TRUMAN.

GENERAL POLICY STATEMENT ON DEVELOPMENT OF AREAS OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN GENERAL SERVICES ADMINISTRATION AND DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE PURSUANT TO PUBLIC LAW 152, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

The President's memorandum of July 1, 1949, to the Secretary of Defense, Administrator of General Services, and the Director of the Bureau of the Budget, directed that areas of understanding be developed between the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense with respect to the application of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.). Considerable progress has been made in certain areas. Completion of the task will be expedited by acceptance of basic principles.

It is a necessary part of our national defense to keep appropriations within bounds. Our economy requires it, the President and the Congress rightfully expect it consistent with the fulfillment of primary missions. The preservation of our nonrenewable resources from unnecessary exploitation in our time will mean that future generations may also have the substance of defense.

Modern war is total war involving all agencies and segments of our economy—farmers, factory workers, professional groups, as well as the traditional military forces. Within the Government, many, if not all, civilian agencies have wartime functions, and a careful planning and providing for their needs is essential to a consideration of the whole problem.

The accomplishment of this task requires detailed examination of many areas of effort and assignment of tasks to both military and nonmilitary agencies. While it is recognized that the great bulk of military procurement in both peacetime and wartime will continue to be handled by the military departments themselves, nevertheless there are certain procurement areas and other areas of effort, such as certain parts of surplus property disposal, real property management, traffic management, etc., where it will be important during peace and war for the military departments to continue to depend upon the General Services Administration. Because effective military supply planning covers both current peacetime operations and wartime functions, it appears essential that if sound planning is to be done the military departments must have assurance that the General Services Administration will continue in existence in wartime and will be protected against undue inroads by selective service. To develop "areas of understanding" for peacetime use only would greatly complicate the problem.

In a war economy, especially, each item should be considered as being a scarce item. Transportation, storage, manpower, and other scarce components are involved in producing items which may be fabricated from abundant basic materials. We are a have-not nation with respect to some materials and are fast reaching that status with respect to some once-abundant materials.

All agency requirements in peace and in war should be coordinated so as to constitute a minimum impact upon the Nation's economy.

The military and nonmilitary supply systems must be coordinated at both the policy and operation levels so that the constituent agencies will not compete against each other for their requirements thus creating artificial scarcities and inflationary prices. This

objective can best be attained by considering all phases of Federal Government supply as a part of an over-all supply-management concept, rather than by isolating the segments and making each the object of special administrative or statutory attention. To accomplish this end there will be required wholehearted cooperation between the military and the civilian agencies.

Every effort will be made by the undersigned to expedite the development of areas of understanding within the framework of the above policies.

LOUIS JOHNSON,
Secretary of Defense.
JESS LARSON,
Administrator, General Services.
FRANK PACE, Jr.,
Director, Bureau of the Budget.

Congress Should Act Now!

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, as a matter of national security, is it not imperative that less time be spent on discussing the atom bomb and H-bomb and that immediate action be taken by the Congress to protect the people from the insidious and subversive enemies located in the key positions of our Government? Is there any assurance that the infiltration of spies into Government departments is not being aided and abetted by administration officials right now?

To suffer and permit it to aid and abet in the wholesale betrayal of our Government through failure to act on available information by those clothed with constitutional power and responsibility to protect and defend the Government raises a question of duty of the first magnitude. Has the power of impeachment also gone with the wind?

Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting an editorial entitled "The Spies' Best Friend," which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald under date of Tuesday, February 14, 1950:

THE SPIES' BEST FRIEND

The point of Mr. Willard Edwards' remarkable series of articles about Russian spies in this country is not that the Russians have spies here. There is nothing extraordinary about that. No doubt other countries have spies here, too, trying to get their hands on secret information.

The more important a country becomes in world affairs, the more likely that spies of foreign governments will seek to ferret out its diplomatic and military secrets.

NOT ALL TRIED TO STEAL SECRETS

To be sure, the Russian spies were not all engaged in trying to snatch our secrets. Some of them were under orders to gain control of trade-unions, especially in vital industries like transportation and communications. The purpose there was to hamper industrial production, promote discontent, and establish a fifth column to disorganize the country from within in preparation for the moment when Russia might attack it from without.

What is chiefly noteworthy about these activities is that anyone as late as 1933 should have accepted at face value Stalin's pledge not to engage in them.

What is genuinely remarkable about the Russian spying and what Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Truman, and their friends have never been able to explain is why the spies were allowed to continue at work after our Government not only had proof that hundreds of them were entrenched in Washington offices but knew who they were and what they were doing.

The information reached our highest officials from many sources. Whittaker Chambers told all he knew to Adolf Berle 10 years ago. The FBI had accumulated a great mass of damning evidence. Later the Canadian investigation revealed much more of the same sort, all of it placed at the disposal of our administration. The House Committee on un-American activities had accumulated a mass of evidence. And there was much more beside.

With all of this information at its disposal, all of it telling the same story, Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. Truman and their Attorneys General sat tight and did next to nothing.

The Department of Justice was all set to forget even about Hiss and would have done so except for the persistence of the House committee in pursuing the matter and Hiss' own foolhardiness in bringing his suit for slander against Chambers.

F. D. GAVE THEM JOBS THEY WANTED

There is no honorable explanation of the administration's conduct. The only theory which fits the facts is that Mr. Roosevelt was himself sympathetic with the aims of the Communists.

Certainly they were his stanch political allies and were immensely useful to him, especially in carrying elections in New York. In return for their help he gave them all the jobs they wanted in Washington, even in the State and Defense Departments. He knew what he was doing, and why.

He wasn't gullible. He was the willing partner in a conspiracy directed against his own country.

United States Chamber of Commerce Distorts CVA Issues

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, it is no secret that the United States Chamber of Commerce is opposed to the establishment of a Columbia Valley Administration. As I have pointed out many times, this attitude of opposition is not shared by those forward-looking businessmen of the Pacific Northwest who are willing to analyze the issues on their merits. As an example I cite the following letter from Mr. Lloyd B. Dysart, a member of the Centralia (Wash.) Chamber of Commerce, who points out the distorted and misleading statements made by the United States Chamber of Commerce on CVA. I also include an article from the Labor News, Seattle, Wash., of February 8, 1950, which also deals with the United States Chamber of Commerce stand on CVA.

JANUARY 25, 1950.

Mr. CLARENCE R. MILES,
Manager, Department of Government Affairs, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. MILES: I am a member of the Centralia Chamber of Commerce, which is affiliated with the Chamber of Commerce of the United States. Your office has just mailed me a copy of Governmental Affairs Legislative Daily, being volume 7, No. 6, under date of Tuesday, January 10, 1950. This copy is subheaded Special Number, and is devoted to valley authorities, particularly to CVA.

Under the heading The Issues you state: "The Chamber of Commerce of the United States is strongly opposed to regional authorities. * * * The valley-authority idea should be rejected for the following principal reasons."

You then list six reasons for which you claim the valley-authority idea should be rejected, and I will discuss them in the order in which you have set them out.

As reason No. 1, you state, "The carefully developed and coordinated planning for resource development that has aided the Pacific Northwest over the years would be abandoned in favor of a three-man board of political appointees responsible only to the President." You then, in the same reason, state the fact that 4 years ago Federal and State agencies formed the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee to coordinate development of the area.

You do not call attention to the fact that the present existing agencies, and in particular the Columbia Basin Interagency Committee, have been severely condemned as being inadequate by the Hoover Committee. I quote briefly from its report:

"The difficulty is that no effective method has been found for reconciling conflicting opinions and programs. The Federal Interagency Basin Committee and its two field subsidiaries, the Missouri and Columbia Basin Interagency Committees, have not performed this function to any appreciable extent. * * * In virtually no instance has the Committee been able to resolve a major interagency conflict."

Your second reason is that under the valley authority "States' rights could be obliterated." You apparently have overlooked the tenth amendment to the Federal Constitution. If your statement is correct, then Congress, by the simple process of passing a valley authority act, could amend the Constitution of the United States. You surely do not expect your readers to believe this.

For reason No. 4 you say, "An authority in the form of a Federal corporation having substantial autonomy would be free of many of the legal and congressional checks and restraints.

"Projects probably could be initiated at the will of the authority directors. Their purpose could be that of the directors only."

I assume that you have read the bill, and, if you have, you must know that this statement is either untrue or badly distorted. The bill, and you must well know, is replete with provisions for congressional checks and restraints. I will not attempt to enumerate them all, but will quote from only one:

"The Administration shall not initiate construction of any major water control or electric generating projects or major transmission line into a new service area, or undertake any major new type of activity authorized by this act, unless such project or activity has been included in the annual budget program or amendment thereto approved by the Congress" (sec. 12–c, lines 18 to 24).

Since the last of the bill is so plain that "he who runs may read" you surely do not expect any of your readers to be mislead by your so-called reason No. 4.

For reason No. 5 you state, "Untold new billions of dollars in taxes would have to be

raised." Now, this statement is very misleading to say the least. You surely do not mean that the bill itself provides for any such thing. Manifestly, if the development of the Columbia River is to go ahead under the authority, or otherwise, many dollars in taxes in the course of years ahead will have to be raised; but you must be fully aware of the fact that the bill itself does not require the addition of a single dollar in taxes. On the contrary, the plan, if effective at all, should greatly reduce taxes by the elimination of waste and duplication of effort which is going on under the present system.

For your sixth objection you seem to advance the conflict between flood control and power development as a reason why the plan should be rejected. You overlook the fact that the Hoover Commission has specifically pointed out this conflict as one of the strongest arguments for remedying the present situation. In this respect I quote the following from the Hoover report:

"There are glaring defects in the organization of these services of government * * *. (c) There is an inherent conflict between the most efficient operation of storage dams for the purpose of flood control and of dams used for the generation of hydroelectric power."

The above statements were made by the Hoover Commission under the general heading, "Defects in organization of water development and use." The Commission was referring, of course, to the present set-up, which you say would be abandoned as your No. 1 reason for opposing the valley authority.

Now, the Chamber of Commerce of the United States has, I presume, the right to support or oppose the valley-authority idea, or the CVA bill in particular. In my opinion, as a member of an affiliated body of your organization, you have no right to circularize your membership with false, distorted, or misleading propaganda. You must feel that the grounds upon which you oppose the valley authority, or the CVA in particular, are so unstable that you must abandon cold logic and resort to the type of propaganda published in your January 10 issue.

As a member of a chamber of commerce located in the region directly affected by the CVA bill I want to place myself on record as being unalterably opposed to the tactics adopted by the Chamber of Commerce of the United States in its opposition to this bill.

Very truly yours,

LLOYD B. DYSART.

[From Seattle (Wash.) Labor News of February 8, 1950]

WESTON AND CARSTENSEN HIT UNITED STATES CHAMBER OF COMMERCE FOR DISTORTING CVA FACTS

Leaders of Washington's two largest labor and farm organizations this week accused the United States Chamber of Commerce of a serious distortion of fact in its recent attack on the proposed Columbia Valley Administration.

The charge was made in a letter to the chamber from E. M. Weston, Washington State Federation of Labor chieftain, and Henry P. Carstensen, State grange master.

They attacked the United States Chamber's statement that the idea for creation of a CVA had no support in the Pacific Northwest except from some locals of the CIO and from the farmer's union.

Carstensen and Weston pointed out that every organization that represents the people is on record for CVA. This includes, they said, the Washington, Oregon, and Idaho Federations of Labor; the Washington and Oregon State Granges, the CIO, the farmers' unions, railway brotherhoods, International Association of Machinists, as well as many smaller chambers of commerce and civic organizations.

These groups represent more than 1,500,000 people in the Pacific Northwest.

"The idea that the people don't want CVA is a fiction that the anti-CVA lobby persists in perpetuating despite the fact that organizations representing less than 50,000 of our area's people are on record against CVA," they added.

"Sure, nobody wants CVA," Weston added. "Nobody at all—just the people."

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE HIT

The two leaders also charged the United States Chamber of Commerce with ignoring the Hoover Commission's findings on the present system of resource development in the Pacific Northwest and elsewhere in the Nation.

"It is inconceivable to us," they said, "how the United States Chamber of Commerce, which recently fully endorsed the Hoover Commission recommendations, can ignore its findings on resource development which clearly point out the inefficiency of the present system, which has cost the United States taxpayer $1,250,000,000 more than it should.

Meanwhile, the league has challenged the principal anti-CVA front group, the Pacific Northwest Development Association, to make public its 1949 financial statement. The proposal was made in a letter from Joe Miller, league executive secretary to Daniel Noble, secretary-manager of the so-called development group.

PROPAGANDA

The letter declared that the development association had distributed hundreds of thousands of anti-CVA pamphlets and other material, circulated many anti-CVA speakers throughout the region and taken every possible step to block this legislation, so vital to the best interests of the Pacific Northwest.

Declaring that such a campaign obviously takes huge sums of money, the CVA league spokesman said, "We believe that the public of the Pacific Northwest is entitled to know where this money came from.

To date, Mr. Noble and the Northwest Development Association have not answered this challenge.

The Future of Free Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GEORGE A. DONDERO

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the Synchroscope magazine of February 1950, written by Mr. James W. Parker, president of the Detroit Edison Co., of Detroit, Mich. This magazine is the publication of the Detroit Edison Co. The article traces free enterprise in the United States and outlines what the future means to us. Mr. Parker points out many things not evident to the general public because of his experience and knowledge in the field of free enterprise. The article follows:

THE FUTURE OF FREE ENTERPRISE

(By James W. Parker)

When I happen to be the speaker at the annual meeting of the Power Club I usually try to give something of an account of how things have been going in the last 12 months. It has all been very well reported, I think, in the articles that have appeared in Synchroscope. The annual report will soon be in your hands and I hope you will read it—there's some exceedingly cheering information.

Fellows, I think we've got a good team. I think we've got a good company, and it's giving the kind of service that people want and appreciate. I think they set us down as a good citizen although we are a corporation and a big one. After all, it's a corporation made up of a lot of individuals. We have managed to keep contact and friendship with the people in our service area. That is what makes this company a good place to work and a good company for the community.

You and I and most Americans, as we've grown up in this country, have come to take some things for granted. I think all of us have been inclined to believe ourselves forward-looking and liberal-minded. We have believed in a fair deal, a fair chance for every man. We Americans haven't attained this by a long shot, but still we've come a long way toward it.

A LOOK AT HISTORY

After the Civil War, when the country was consolidating itself, big business began to grow and get rather powerful. Some of it was corrupt. And so the people of the United States, through Congress, set themselves against this sort of thing and, about 60 years ago, passed the Sherman Antitrust Act and 10 years later the Clayton Act.

The people made up their minds that they would break these great concentrations of economic and industrial power. They feared them the way the founders of our Republic feared royalty and the old monarchy of England when it controlled us.

Down the years since the founding of the Republic there has gone that same spirit, the belief that men themselves are the best judges of their own welfare, that they want to keep things reasonably in their own hands. This is the effort, the ideal of the men I call liberal. Sometimes one political party has led the fight, sometimes another.

CENTRALIZED GERMANY

There was no antitrust legislation in Germany before the war, none in Europe nor, for that matter, in England. It was in 1848 that liberal thought failed in Germany. From then on the idea of running the show from the top, controlling every last move that every man made, prevailed and went on growing. It ended in terrible disaster for that nation and for the world.

Do we have a free competitive system in America? I've asked and looked around and the answer, by and large, is yes. I don't mean everywhere in every industry. We have a competitive economy because for 60 years, with antitrust legislation, the American people have been determined to have it. They haven't always succeeded, and so it's been necessary to bring suit after suit to break up some of the practices that keep cropping up.

I don't approve of the methods that the Antitrust Division in Washington has employed. I think they have done it unfairly. But it has never hurt my feelings when they made some big corporation stop a monopolistic practice. I hope that every time unfairness shows its head they'll crack it. We should stick to our principle.

Americans are now faced by two new growths of power. I don't think anyone of us is very happy about the manifestation of centralized power that has developed in the United Mine Workers under John Lewis. The men who mine coal need unions, but I don't think it is to their advantage, any more than it is to the advantage of the people of the United States, to have a czar with the power that Lewis has.

Fortunately, all this is being aired very well in the newspapers and in people's discussions. I have enough confidence in the

American people and in the fact that they still have the political power to tell their Congress what they want, to believe that in the long run this problem is going to be straightened out.

But I want to talk in more detail about the growth of another great centralized industrial power. This is the tendency to concentrate power in the Federal Government.

Let's talk about it in terms of our own industry. We who have made it our business to see what is going on, to talk to the heads of other companies, can see things that aren't evident to the general public or to most businessmen. The story appears in patches in the newspapers, but until you put it all together you don't realize how far this thing is going.

HOW ABOUT REA?

The idea of subsidizing the building of electric power lines to farmers where companies couldn't economically serve them was, in principle I suppose, all right. Of course, the Rural Electrification Administration was, say, levying taxes in Michigan to build lines in Arkansas. If, in the wisdom of Congress, that was a good thing to do, I can find no fault with it. But here's what happened:

The report (from Statistical Bulletin, Electric Light and Power Industry) is just out that 97½ percent of the occupied dwellings in the United States now have electricity available to them. That includes cities, villages, and agricultural areas alike. In our service area electricity is available to 100 percent. We don't serve every house because some folks haven't wired them. But it wouldn't cost any of them one penny for extensions to have Detroit Edison bring the current to them and put a meter on the house and start serving them.

The Rural Electrification Administration did its part in many sections of the country. It helped do the job, and with that I have no quarrel.

But with the farm job well over 85 percent accomplished, can anybody tell me why on earth the Rural Electrification Administration should still have unexpended appropriations of $1,250,000,000 at their disposal? Money like that never goes back unspent into the Treasury; it gets spent for something.

And I'll tell you what they are trying to spend it on. They are going into the transmission business and coming up with the super co-op. It's cropping up in two places in Michigan right now. This is just plain competing with money that is already invested, with lines that are already in existence.

I remember very well when Harry Snow, our one-time controller who has since passed away, gave us, at the luncheon table, his analysis of the Rural Electrification Cooperative in our own territory at Ubly. You will recall that this got started at just about the time we began serving the Thumb and building lines up there.

Harry Snow said, "There's a million dollars of Government money that need never have been expended. Detroit Edison would have spread its service to that area at its own expense—that is, at its own investors' expense, using money voluntarily put into the business, not taken by the tax collector from the public in the form of forced investment."

Has this been a good investment for the United States of America? Has this even been a profitable thing for the people in that rural cooperative? We know that they pay higher rates than Detroit Edison would charge them—and they don't get Detroit Edison service.

Why it's good for the people of Ubly and that area to have a cooperative is more than I can tell you. Why it's good for the people in western Michigan to build a super co-op I can't say either. But I do know there is $1,250,000,000 of unexpended appropriation and that the REA is out to spend it. And they'll spend it for purposes that weren't contemplated when the thing was started. Once these things get started they keep growing.

An ambitious scheme was put before Congress to create valley authorities practically all over the United States, dividing the whole country into districts. Congress hasn't swallowed it. But Congress did appropriate for the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Southwestern Power Administration, and a lot of others.

WHAT IT COSTS

Although the Tennessee Valley Authority estimated that the annual damage caused by Tennessee River floods amounted to $12,500,000 a year, they have admittedly spent $149,000,000 on flood control projects charged to that account. Yet even this won't control all the floods, they admit, and Chattanooga and nearby towns will have to put up another $20,000,000 for their own flood-control works. And of course there's going to be maintenance cost on all these projects, too.

Figure out what it has cost to save that $12,500,000 flood loss and you'll find the Nation's taxpayers are spending several times that every year * * * just to save that estimated loss in the first place.

And if you talk about the flood lands that are now usable, the joker there is that they have permanently flooded with their dams just about as much rich bottom land as used to be flooded once in a while. And by their own estimate, that "once in a while" is once in 500 years.

The plan to extend these valley authorities is being pushed steadily. They are persistent—and do you know who "they" are? Not Cabinet members. It wasn't Cap Krug, Secretary of the Interior. Rather, it's the staff in behind—obscure people the public has never heard of, men who are bent on making this thing grow.

LOCAL OPPOSITION

They are now proposing a Columbia Valley Authority and running into the solid opposition of local boards of commerce and all the business associations of the Northwest. They say, "We don't want it. This isn't a backward, undeveloped part of the country. We don't want the Federal Government in here telling us how to plant and reap. We've done a good job developing this great and lovely country, and we think we local folks can continue to do it well."

But the staffers in the departments at Washington don't want it that way. So you hear a great deal about a power shortage in the Northwest. The Federal Government itself has caused that shortage by insisting on making aluminum, in peacetime, with underpriced power subsidized at public expense.

The Government fellows just made up their mind that it would be a good thing for the Northwest to have an aluminum industry there. The people didn't want it because aluminum plants don't employ very many. This jumble of power project, aluminum, shortage, and local dismay is just a sample of what happens when you centralize industrial power in Washington.

You can't run the industry of the United States from Washington. Nevertheless, that's what these men whom no one elects are trying to do. And that's why a number of us in the light and power industry are trying to tell the story. I honestly believe that if the real facts get understood there will be no question about the outcome.

When the affairs of a private business enterprise go wrong, the company gets a new management or goes out of business, letting other sound enterprises carry on the work of the Nation. But what happens when a Government project goes wrong? A deficit doesn't put them out of business; they just go back to Congress for a larger appropriation next time.

I think a nation's enterprise must be based on making ends meet. Its industrial life should seek money in the open market, where people entrust capital to enterprises that are well managed and can pay a reasonable interest or dividend on investment.

That is what makes Detroit Edison sound. And when the light and power industry of our whole country is made up of a lot of Detroit Edisons, all of them sound, then that much of the Nation's economy is sound.

FUNDAMENTAL DANGER

But once you put half of that industry into the hands of Government—and that is what some departments are planning—once half of the industry doesn't have to meet budgets and stay sound, then that much of the American economy has an unsound basis. Something very much like that threatens our country.

I'm not at all downhearted about this. It's good having a hand in trying to see to it that the public gets wise, and that's what we are out to do. I think we and other freedom-loving Americans are going to win.

Can We Preserve Our American Free Enterprise System?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BEN F. JENSEN

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address delivered by me before the Electrical Engineers Association at Baltimore, Md., February 14, 1950:

Fellow Americans, I am glad to speak here in your great city of Baltimore tonight. It has been almost 86 years ago that Abraham Lincoln spoke in this city at the Sanitary Fair on April 8, 1864, to be exact, at which time Lincoln said, "The world has never had a good definition of the word 'liberty.' We all declare for liberty; but in using the same word we do not all mean the same thing. With some the word liberty may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the products of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and the products of other men's labor."

I am sure if "Honest Abe" could talk here tonight he would say, "I have the definition for the word liberty now." But in his absence you and I must define the word and shout it from the house tops. Liberty means the exact opposite of Nazi or Communist tyranny, and British socialism, all of which most any American school child can define today. Of course, in Lincoln's time that type of tyranny had not yet raised its ugly head. Today, this very hour, most of the people in this world have taken a stand for liberty or tyranny. The fight is on, my friends, and make no mistake about it. Yes, the fight is on right here in your America this very minute, and the hour is late to enlist, a lot later than some folks think.

Can we save our liberties?

Can we preserve free private enterprise for America, the keystone of our liberties? That is the question we face today.

My answer is yes, if we are worthy of it in your sight and it be the will of God to save us from our own folly at this late hour. Where do we start, you ask? First, we must take stock of our debits and credits in order to ascertain about where America now stands as a going concern, and what is most needed to keep America in business. As you know,

there are three sure roads to national suicide—bankruptcy, dictatorship, and starvation. Is it necessary to remind the American people that every nation in the wide world that has traveled the full length of the wasteful, reckless spending route we are now traveling at breakneck speed has come to utter ruin and tyranny. Look at old Germany. A great people who enjoyed their best times when the wage earner made 50 marks a week, but they, too, followed the siren call of Utopia of a wasteful, national spending program, which finally brought a bogus high national income and uncontrollable inflation. Then the wage earner received an armful of marks each week, but it took almost all of it to buy bread. Sure, we can have a $300,000,000,000 national income. Germany had a billion trillion mark income, just as Red China has today, and just as America will have unless we stop this mad rush to financial national suicide.

Think this one over for a minute and please remember it. If everyone in the United States cashed in all their life-insurance policies, the total would amount to about $44,000,000,000, which is less than it will take to run your Government just for the year 1950. Or if every farmer in America sold all his farm land, all his farming equipment, and all his livestock, the total would amount to around $43,000,000,000. Again this would not run your Government a full year. Do those figures mean anything to you? I'm sure they do, but not to a lot of fellows in Washington who I could name. Facts are those fellows simply don't care so long as they get theirs. Now you may ask, How can we stop it? The answer is, When America thinks and speaks up America is safe. So speak up, Americans.

Since it is a known fact, and these are figures which cannot be disputed, the white-collar workers, of which you engineers are a part, plus the blue-denim workers, plus our retired elderly folks, represent about 60 percent of our consuming public; our farmers, who consume 1½ times more on an average than the rest of us, represent about 30 percent of our consuming public; and the employers in business and industry, and a few more of us, make up the balance of around 10 percent. The consumer pays all taxes in the final analysis, so I'll leave it to you as to just who is paying our tax bill, and should be most vigorously opposing wasteful spending. You folks are paying your share in income taxes, withholding taxes, and hidden taxes. Maybe you can stand it now, but the end is not in sight.

I presume that most of you engineers are now employed by private industry, tax-paying industry, which is the whipping boy among the great economic planners headquartered in Washington. And they are honeycombing throughout our country, planning and scheming ways to drive free, private, tax-paying industry to the wall. I know what I am talking about, for I have been fighting that gang ever since coming to Congress, and have really been in the thick of the fighting for the past 8 years.

As a member of the House Interior Subcommittee of Appropriations, one of those who hear and pass on all requests for funds for the Bureau of Reclamation. That Bureau is in the Federal electric power producing and distributing business up to their necks. There is no end it seems to the length they want to go to finally get control of all the electric energy and distribution of power in our Nation. They have well-developed plans to cover our entire country with hydroelectric power and steam plants and a complete network of distribution systems, such as they now have in operation in the TVA, and Bonneville areas in Washington and Oregon, where the private utilities are already on their knees. This is especially true in the State of Washington where a State law permits private utility facilities to be taken over by public utility districts by condemnation proceedings, and many private electric utility distribution lines have already been condemned and taken over by the public utility districts, which works hand and glove with the Bonneville power officials and the Socialists in the Interior Department.

Time will not permit me to tell you even a small part of the story, but I will give you an inkling of how this scheme is worked. There is a promoter running loose in the Northwest by the name of Myers. He went there after doing a job on the people of the great State of Nebraska, which is now a 100-percent public power State, to the peoples' sorrow, as it is today one of the darkest States in the Union so far as electric lighting is concerned. But Myers walked away with a pocket full of money. Now he is really going to town in the State of Washington with the help of a group of Wall Street money brokers. Myers will say to the folks in a certain area, "You are paying too much for your electric energy. I will help you take over under public utility district State laws with the blessing of the officials in the Department of Interior, and with money from Wall Street, this section of the private power companies' facilities. The minute you take it over you will have no Federal income tax to pay, hence we can pay the company a good price for it. The Wall Street boys will be happy for the business, and you will get cheap power." So, the deal is made and carried out. Myers gets a nice fat drag, the Wall Street money barons get a nice money take over a long period of years, the Socialists have cut the heart out of taxpaying free enterprise, and thus another mighty blow has been struck for socialism and national suicide at the expense of every American taxpayer, the people of the State of Washington included. How do you like it?

Now about the same kind of business is being carried on by the Bureau of Reclamation, with White House blessing, all over the 17 Western States, and spreading fast to other sections of our Nation. Folks, I have not $1 invested in any private utility company, but I cannot sit idly by and see this kind of business going on in America without speaking up and telling the truth so that all may hear.

Dictatorship. I am sure it is not necessary for us to look behind Stalin's iron curtain to know the sad story of follow the leader and his promises of security. All people who have done that now have neither liberty nor security. That we do know, at least.

Starvation. Thank God the farmers of America are solving that problem for all of us by good soil-conservation practices and crop rotation and other scientific farming methods. But there is yet much to be done. Let us never forget that every nation in this world that neglected to take proper care of their priceless top soil are now at our doors crying for bread.

Also, do not forget that our national income is always about seven times our farm income, and that for every dollar of farm income, the businessman sells $4.20 worth of goods and labor collects over $4 in wages for each dollar of farm income. All wealth springs from mother earth, she is our only economic generating plant. We must never again turn off that kind of power in America. Remember also that we have never had a depression with good farm prices, but have always had a depression with poor farm prices.

"If destruction be our lot, we must ourselves be the author and finisher," Abe Lincoln said that almost 90 years ago. I believe that admonition to be just as weighty and true today as then.

It was Lincoln who said, "The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of free society." Jefferson also expounded a preachment of millions of Americans today when he said, "When all government, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will become oppressive."

Today, millions of us are fighting the battles to preserve our American concept of life as laid down in the principles of both those great Americans, Lincoln and Jefferson. We are fighting for the economic system of America, which is as much a part of America as is our tradition of Bunker Hill and Valley Forge—as much as is our industry, our people and our countryside.

The paramount over-all issue that confronts us is: Do we believe in the principles of our Republic as it has been operated for 170 years? Do we believe in our American way of life, the private enterprise system, as opposed to socialism?

On this question, there can be no compromise. One stands for the dignity of the individual, his inalienable rights and freedoms, and his sovereignty over public servants. The other, socialism, stands for an all-power state, directing the lives, the activities, and the affairs of the people. The preservation of our American way of life and our private enterprise system depends entirely on how well you and I discharge our duties as Americans. Americanism and socialism do not mix. One or the other will be destroyed. America cannot survive half free.

A true American is one who believes in the right of every American to work and prosper—to establish his own security by industry and thrift—to make a better life for himself and his children through his own initiative and energy. Lincoln said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves."

Let me quote a few more pertinent words of Abraham Lincoln. He said, "You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you cannot strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help strong men by tearing down big men; you cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich; you cannot establish sound security on borrowed money; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Do any of these precepts have a familiar sound today?

In recent years, we have seen the extent to which Government has interfered in the lives of its citizens. We have been led into a time of great danger by oppressive taxation, extravagant and wasteful spending by Government, deficit financing and a staggering national debt. And the end is not yet in sight.

Whose fault is it? We have allowed the cost of Government to grow and grow, year by year, until we are consuming nearly one-third of our income just to govern ourselves.

What is the reason? Have the American people lost their capacity for self-government? Must the cost of Government be so great as to endanger our national existence? Lenin, the great Communist leader, said shortly before he died just a few years ago, "We will force America into bankruptcy then we will take her over."

Must peacetime taxation placed upon our people be so burdensome as to destroy all incentive for industrial growth and economic progress?

Must the people give up to Government such a large share of their earnings that they are deprived of all opportunity to get ahead? Will Lenin's prediction come true?

The greatness of America was not built by Government spending. It was not created in legislative halls. It was not produced by the enactment of laws which led people to believe that they were getting something for nothing.

The greatness of America is ours because of the toil and sweat, and the inventive genius of generations of courageous, industrious, self-reliant Americans. They were willing to work and sacrifice and save to build economic security for themselves, for their families, for their communities, and for their country.

And they did not export jobs as we are doing today under a system of tariff reductions that permit the importation of cheap foreign goods through a so-called reciprocal-trade agreement at the discretion of one man which has caused whole industries in our country to be shut down and our workers thrown out of work. We now have not only a national socialist philosophy at work in our country, but a global concept of this system. This, in spite of the fact that those governments which have tried socialism over a period of years have turned their backs on it.

How else can we recognize the Trojan horse of socialism which is being offered to the American people? We have been told that we can produce a $300,000,000 economy, providing jobs for everyone without any large increase in taxes. It sounds good, doesn't it? And it is good, provided our liberties, as we know them, are not sacrificed in its achievement.

But we are presented a 5-year plan. Where have we heard of 5-year plans before? Russia had a series of them. Germany had them. Italy had them. They all ended the same way—starvation, misery, dictatorship, and inflation. Yes; they had a high national income, but it was a bogus income. Their currency was not worth the paper it was written on. A basketful of bills was needed to buy bread. That was not so good. Sure those folks were all promised utopia. All that was required was for them to bow to wasteful spending by the leaders. Does that song sound familiar to you?

What else did these three dictatorships have in common? They are all socialistic states. Socialism and communism are sisters under the skin. Remember the official name of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

How did all of this start? Let's take a brief look at how the Trojan horse of socialism took over in England and then show the deadly peril here. First they took over all banking, then all electric power—the people were then told to be good or you get neither money nor electric power—the rest was easy. Remember this, few Socialists of modern times will admit that they are a Socialist. The large majority of American Socialists abhor the name while doing the deed. They call themselves economic planners and other high-sounding titles. But their objectives are all the same—the regimentation of the people into robots to obey the commands of the big brains fastened onto the pay rolls of the Government.

In England the Socialists masking under the name of the Labor Party were a small group at first. They fastened themselves onto the larger Liberal Party and bored from within. They worked slowly and began to take more and more power over the Liberal Party until in the last election several years ago the Liberal Party was practically out of existence. They came into power with catch slogans such as "jobs for all," "security from the cradle to the grave," and other vote bait. Then the real planners of the so-called welfare state got to work. I need not go into any details as to what has happened to once mighty England. You know she is bankrupt and living off the dole of the United States, the last and most powerful free-enterprise country in the world. How long can we take it? But you say it couldn't happen here. Listen to this: There is a bill called the Spence bill, H. R. 2756, called the Economic Stability Act of 1949. It is part of the 5-year American Socialist plan. It sounds good, doesn't it? Everyone wants economic stability. But this bill gives the President the right to go into any business with Government funds to compete with any private business. Last year they wanted to put the Government into the steel business. Under this Spence bill, the President can also channel scarce materials and facilities into what he may deem essential production and uses. If the Socialist planners feel that your business is not essential, they can put you out of business by simply refusing you materials or plant facilities. You could also be subpenaed in person with your records and books and, if you refused, be in contempt of court and suffer the penalty. This bill permits the President to fix prices. I have not time to go into all phases of this Spence bill, but these are a few examples to show you how far down the road to socialism a powerful, well-organized clique are determined to take America.

The Brannan farm bill is another example. High prices to farmers and low prices to consumers also sounds good. But even the author himself or his experts either cannot or dare not estimate the cost to the taxpayers of this one. And my advice to all young men planning to be farmers is to learn accountancy good to keep the numerous records and reports which are necessary if this plan ever went through, in order to keep himself out of jail—for there is a jail penalty in the 15 pages of penalties written in this bill which would regiment farmers beyond anything Americans ever dreamed would happen here. Farming is the greatest private enterprise in our land. I am happy to report to you that only a very small percent of our farmers are falling for the Brannan scheme.

The time has come when we must abandon our easy-going attitude toward regimentation and needless and wasteful Government spending. We have been presented this year with the largest peacetime budget in our history, plus the fact that we will have a 1950 fiscal deficit of at least $6,000,000,000, according to my figures.

What are we going to do about it?

We must give the people a clear-cut choice of the issues confronting us today. Let those who are for a Socialist state get into their corner. Those who are for our free-enterprise competitive system get over in our corner. Let's fight it out on clear-cut issues. Anyone who can think and read and who has followed the goings on in Washington for a long, long time, can have no doubt as to where the road ahead will lead.

We must stand for a republic in which the elected representatives and public officials are servants of the people and not their masters.

Public opinion, when aroused, is yet the strongest force in this land. It is your job to see to it that the people understand the truth; understand that eternal vigilance is still the price of liberty.

We must stand up fearlessly against the folly of a domestic program that teaches people to depend upon Government for all good things in life remembering that Lincoln said: "You cannot build character and courage by taking away a man's initiative and independence."

We must constantly warn against the dangers of a Federal policy that deceives the sane of mind and strong of body into thinking that they get something for nothing. But we must ever remember our duty and responsibility as Americans to the aged and infirm, to the widows and orphans, and our disabled veterans who are paying the greatest price for our wars. This we must do and can do unless we spend all America into bankruptcy needlessly.

We must place where it properly belongs, full responsibility for secret agreements which betrayed free governments into socialistic and communistic enslavement.

And we must fight here against the drift into a socialistic pattern of government because that system has brought death and destruction to every country where it has been attempted.

Let us plan courageously and well. And let us work diligently. Let us carry the truth to the people.

Let us again dedicate ourselves to the proposition "that this country, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

A Tribute to Susan B. Anthony, a Woman of Consecrated Purpose

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KENNETH B. KEATING
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, today is the birthday of Susan B. Anthony. Although 130 years have elapsed since her birth and nearly half a century since her death, her influence is still a powerful force in the promotion of an improved status for women and of enlightened government.

Miss Anthony was a zealous and valiant campaigner for any cause to which she devoted her unusual talents. Halfway measures she spurned. She is best remembered, of course, for her pioneer work in obtaining suffrage for women, which, unfortunately, did not become a reality until 14 years after her death. But her activities in furthering the advancement of women and in other worthwhile causes were by no means limited to this single field.

I am proud the women of the party which gained the allegiance and loyalty of this distinguished woman have formed in my community a flourishing organization known as the Susan B. Anthony Republican Club, thus perpetuating the memory of a great woman leader and furthering those principles of government which she espoused. This daughter of Rochester belongs to the ages. Let us who follow profit by her example through clinging steadfastly and, if necessary, militantly to the ideals and principles which conscience, rather than expediency, dictates.

Recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. M. G. BURNSIDE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter from Mr. Joe H. Tonahill, a division commander of the American Legion in the State of Texas. It seems to me to be a very fine statement, and the million other veterans of his State stand on that part of the Hoover Commission report concerning veterans' affairs.

The letter follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS,
Jasper, Tex., February 3, 1950.

Hon. M. G. BURNSIDE,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN BURNSIDE: The purpose of this letter is to commend you for the very intelligent and patriotic stand you are taking relative to the recommendations of the Hoover Commission Report on Veterans' Affairs. I refer to your speech in the House February 1, 1950, which is printed on page 1330 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Your statement that any change in the Veterans' Administration program of hospitalization must be viewed from the standpoint of better service to our disabled, and that the Hoover Commission proposal of the consolidation of hospital care for veterans with all other hospital programs of the Government is a complete reversal of our national policy of special treatment for veterans, meets squarely with the conscientious and considered belief, in my earnest opinion, of the 1,000,000 veterans of Texas, their families, as well as their leaders, the 100,049 paid-up members of the American Legion, Department of Texas.

We Legionnaires are for real economy in the Government's discharge of the Nation's obligations to its 19,000,000 veterans. As a matter of fact, the American Legion has always abhorred wastes in Government effort. We likewise recognize that improvements can be achieved in the operations of the Veterans' Administration. However, we of the Legion believe very strongly that such improvements in services and savings in costs can best be made within the existing framework of the Veterans' Administration.

In considering the Hoover Commission report one must naturally look to the nature and character of the research and investigation that was conducted by the Hoover task forces. It, of course, is no absolute disqualification of that report in connection with veterans' affairs that Hoover himself in 1929 told the Nation that efficiency, economy, and more uniform administration required consolidation of the three separate agencies then handling veterans' affairs, for instance, (a) Veterans' Bureau, (b) Pension Bureau, and (c) National Homes for Volunteer Soldiers, and that Congress responded by placing those three agencies under the Veterans' Administration; yet now, though 20 years later, statesman Hoover tells us that for the same reasons of economy and efficiency the Veterans' Administration must be carved up into not just three agencies but five agencies. We are wondering whether Mr. Hoover was wrong in 1929 or whether his Commission is wrong now.

Nor is it an absolute disqualification of the report that there is no existing defect that cannot and should not be corrected within the four walls of the Veterans' Administration. Neither is the report disqualified by virtue of the fact that the Hoover task forces completely ignored the American Legion in reaching its findings, originated, conducted, and prepared and discussed their investigations for 2 years into the matter from offices located just four doors removed from the American Legion headquarters in Washington, D. C.; nor either for the fact that the American Legion asked to be heard to present the side of the veteran on four occasions and that their request went unheeded; and likewise neither is it a disqualification that Chairman JOHN RANKIN, Veterans' Affairs Committee, were not consulted.

Though those observations do not vitiate the structure and credibility of the Commission's recommendations, yet one cannot ignore the unmistakable fact that had the Commission sought the benefit of the experience, the lessons gleaned from a long period of trial and error of those more familiar with the veterans', their dependents', widows', and orphans' problems, that virtually that report would have contained an entirely different approach to the economy aspect of administering veterans' affairs and the problems in connection therewith. Failing to consider the valuable information at its disposal, the unbiased mind cannot consider that the Hoover task forces went about their business with open minds.

You, of course, know that the American Legion contends that the cost of rehabilitating the human wreckage of war is as much a part of the cost of waging war as is the building of battleships, tanks, planes, and guns. Those weapons are paid for in cash on the barrel head. The Government leans over backward to see that every wartime contractor gets a square deal. But the human costs of war are put on the cuff. They constitute a sacred obligation of the Nation. This debt cannot be honorably discounted or evaded by simply writing it off as a so-called economy measure.

We want you to know, Congressman BURNSIDE, that we down here in Texas truly hope and feel that your veteran population there in West Virginia, your home State, will not let the intelligent and patriotic stand you are taking on this highly important matter go unnoticed when you ask for retention in office. Our hats are off to you and to your concluding statement, "I am opposed to transferring from the Veterans' Administration any of its duties or responsibilities to our disabled."

With best wishes for your continued success, and as one of millions who has asked for no benefits and as one of the 100,049 legionnaires of Texas who are receiving no benefits, and ask none for themselves, my highest compliments and great admiration are to you extended.

Very respectfully yours,
JOE H. TONAHILL,
Second Division Commander.

Traffic Management in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government expends approximately $1,000,000,000 a year for the transportation of public property. A task force of the Hoover Commission and other investigators have called attention to the huge potential savings to be derived from improving the traffic management functions of the Government. The Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, of which I am chairman, is considering the need for legislation in this field.

On January 10 the Washington Chapter of the Society for the Advancement of Management held an important meeting to discuss traffic management problems in the Federal Government. This was one of a series of round-table discussions on Federal property management under the able direction of Mr. Ray Ward, chief, Property Management Group of the Bureau of the Budget. It was my privilege to attend and participate in this discussion as did Congressman BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, a member of the subcommittee, and Congressman MACK, of Illinois. The magazine Traffic World in its issue of January 14 carried a very full account of the traffic management meeting. I believe the Members will find this article of interest in view of legislation about to be proposed:

UNPROGRAMED CALL FOR REDUCED FARES FOR CIVILIANS IN GOVERNMENT STIRS MEETING—MANAGEMENT GROUP HEARS SUGGESTIONS THAT REDUCED FARES FOR MILITARY PERSONNEL APPLY TO CIVILIAN EMPLOYEES OF FEDERAL GOVERNMENT—CALL FOR WIDER APPLICATION OF REDUCED RATES ON PROPERTY ALSO VOICED

There were two developments at a meeting of the Washington chapter of the Society for Advancement of Management round table on property management, the evening of January 10, that were not on the official program.

Maj. Gen. William O. Reeder, deputy director of the logistics division of the Army, General Staff, drew a round of applause when he responded to a request for comment on what had been said about centralization of traffic-management functions in the Federal Government and a current program of the General Services Administration for coordinated Federal traffic management. Said the general:

"When you have everyone with a good traffic manager, and you have the rates all down, and your purpose has been achieved, it seems to me the rates would have to go up to keep the carriers going."

The other development came when Stanley Crosthwaite, of the Division of Supply, Bureau of Reclamation, asked Col. E. B. Gray, of the Office of the Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, how the Army had obtained a 10-percent reduction in passenger fares for military personnel from the railroads and the air lines, and a 5-percent reduction from the bus lines. The resulting discussion brought a suggestion that civilian employees of the Government ought to enjoy the same reductions and eventually the subject broadened out into expressions of opinion that the property of Government departments moving in transportation should be considered the property of Uncle Sam and special rates made to one department of the Government should apply to the movement of all similar Government property.

TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT AS A PROFESSION

Dr. John H. Frederick, professor of transportation, University of Maryland, was the first speaker of the evening. His subject was Professional Aspects of Traffic Management.

"No one who has observed the development of business in this country can avoid being impressed with the fact that, gradually and over a period of years, the various vocations or subdivisions of industry have tended to become professionalized," said Dr. Frederick. "This has been true not only in the fields of law, medicine, and insurance, which are not directly connected, but in the fields of industry, management, purchasing, accounting, and other activities which at one time were considered to be but part of the day-to-day work of any businessman.

"The word 'professional' is one that is very easily misunderstood. It does not mean that a smug group considers the work it does as something better or more difficult than the work other people do. But it does mean that certain criteria of judgment have been applied to a vocation. It means (a) there is a reasonable compensation paid to those who work in the field; (b) there is a reasonable opportunity for advancement based upon professional efficiency, commensurate with talent and devotion to the work; (c)

there is a high degree of attraction to the work; (d) there are high ethical standards applied, and (e) there is a firm belief that the work is related to public service.

"Professionalization may be brought about in several ways. One is to prevent, by law, anyone from practicing a profession until certain educational and ethical standards have been complied with. This is the case with physicians, lawyers, pharmacists, and other professional men who render such a personal service to their clients that they must meet certain standards before being permitted to practice. Another way is followed by engineers, architects, and the like who serve the public in a semi-personal way and practice their professions without having complied with such rigid standards but still with general rules prescribed by professional societies or even by law.

"All of the numerous reasons which have influenced any group to organize for professional, promotional, and educational work are present in the field of traffic management. However, the basic reason why professionalization is needed in traffic management is that it will establish and then maintain essential and uniform standards of practice. It will be another important step toward better standards and more efficient and economical transportation.

"If the profession of traffic management is ever to amount to anything several things must be done by individuals and groups. (1) The public must be told of the importance of traffic management. (2) Employers must be sold more and more on traffic management. (3) Traffic managers must broaden their horizons and extend their knowledge of transport practice, the economics of transportation and general management in order to prepare themselves for larger fields of service. (4) A high standard of ethics must be established and maintained.

"Traffic management has already developed a group consciousness which facilitates further and stronger organization. A number of able men have achieved positions of prominence in the field through their efforts and opportunities they have grasped, and many of these men are willing and eager to assist others for the good of the profession. Much has been done, but not enough. The foundation has been laid, now the building must be erected.

"If professional status is to be brought about it will be necessary for someone or some group to suggest what the professional standards should be. This is a delicate point. No one has yet done this with any exactness. Perhaps no one is ready to do it, but it merits early attention.

"No one can deny the fact that traffic management is not and cannot ever be a profession such as medicine, law, and the like. It does, however, have much in common with what might be termed professions such as engineering, architecture, accounting, and the others, and it is certainly affected with the public interest. It is time that steps toward professionalization be taken."

TRAFFIC CONSULTANT SPEAKS

E. B. Ussery, a traffic consultant of the firm of Bell & Ussery, Washington, D. C., in his talk on the increasing need for centralization of traffic management functions in the government, after reviewing studies of alleged payment of excess rates on Government traffic in the two world wars, and an investigation his firm made for the Committee on the Reorganization of the Government, headed by former President Hoover, asserted that the problem of rates on Government shipments could not be solved unless there was centralization of the top-flight functions of traffic management. He observed that Public Law 152, Eighty-first Congress, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, gave the new General Services Administration centralized authority insofar as civilian agencies of the Government were concerned, with provision for the Administrator to perform the function of negotiating rates for the military unless his decision was vetoed by the Secretary of Defense.

There was now a clear-cut line of authority, power, and duty, he said, and that, when the agency could obtain the necessary personnel, it must first perform the basic task necessary to obtain information on whether or not charges were reasonable or unreasonable. He said it was now very easy to determine what traffic of the Government moved on class rates, on exceptions rates, or on commodity rates.

Among other things, Mr. Ussery asserted that, if the basic scale prescribed by the Commission in its class-rate case was prescribed in the light of costs in the various territories, it could not be assumed that the redistribution of the burden among commodities now moving under exceptions would not, under the uniform classification and the elimination of exceptions, move under rates also to be made in relation to the cost of rendering the service.

Col. E. B. Gray, Chief of the Movements Division, Office of the Chief of Transportation of the Army, described the Department of Defense land traffic program. After reviewing the development of military traffic management during and after the war, Colonel Gray said recently a central military land traffic office was established in the Department of Defense by an order of the Munitions Board. He said the order stated that the Munitions Board would establish policies of traffic management and would assure compliance with those poliices with a view to developing the most efficient and economic operation of those functions in the Department of Defense. He listed 10 duties of the central military land traffic office, which he said was being shaped up in the Office of the Chief of Transportation. Those duties were, he said: Negotiation of certain rates and charges, including classifications and exceptions ratings; negotiation of fares and charges for passenger traffic; issuance of billing guides; negotiation of weight and average demurrage agreements; negotiations incident to loss and damage claims and related investigations, including technical review and recommendations concerning the prevention of damage; issuance of export rules for war or emergency only; promotion of maximum use of service-owned equipment; operation of freight consolidating and distributing stations if established; development of proposed regulations pertaining to traffic management; administration of centralized statistics. Colonel Gray then gave a brief explanation of each of the duties.

GSA PROGRAM

William E. Hayghe, Acting Chief, Division of Traffic and Utilities, Federal Supply Service, General Services Administration, read a paper on "The current program for coordinated Federal traffic management." Under the act setting up GSA, he said, the function of traffic management was created as an integral phase of personal-property management, the GSA Administrator having been given the duty of prescribing policies and methods relating to transportation and traffic management. He said GSA, because of the ineffectiveness of previous attempts at traffic management, found itself without any reliable index of the nature, volume, and channels of freight moving for Government agencies. He asserted that those best fitted to analyze the Government's transportation policy knew that from 2 percent to 10 percent of the amounts paid annually for the transportation of property represented excessive charges. The object of GSA's plan, he said, was centralization of policy establishment and decentralization of operations.

Mr. Hayghe said GSA had developed a plan for attacking the Government's freight traffic management problem on four broad fronts: Establishment of policies and methods of shipping to insure that the fullest advantage is taken of benefits available under published tariffs; examination and study of existing and proposed rates, classifications, rules, and regulations to determine to what extent they may be, or become for the future, unreasonable or unlawful on movements of public property; attempt by direct negotiation to effect voluntary adjustment of rates, following up as to items that cannot be so adjusted by petition or complaint to Federal or State regulatory bodies; and establishment of direct personal contact with Government shipping personnel throughout the country, to insure compliance with policies and methods centrally developed, and to improve such policies and measures.

Mr. Hayghe developed each of the proposed measures in a brief way. In the course of his remarks he said, in developing the described plans, no facility of government that was functioning efficiently and effectively to reduce costs of transportation would be destroyed simply for the purpose of substituting something else, but that the purpose would be to develop such a facility so that it would function for the future on a more comprehensive basis than in the past. He said that, underlying the whole structure of the system of traffic management covered by the plan, would be the object of furnishing all agencies the maximum of service at the minimum of cost, to the end that payments by Federal agencies of excessive transportation costs will be eventually eliminated or reduced to a negligible quantity.

QUESTION PERIOD

Ray Ward, Chief, property-management group, Bureau of the Budget, who is chairman of the property management round table, and who conducted the meeting, called for questions.

Carleton Shugg, Deputy General Manager, Atomic Energy Commission, asked Mr. Ussery what part of the excessive charges for transportation to which the latter had referred came about because of an unusual demand put on a transportation agency, and in clarifying his question indicated he meant the charges on shipments that did not move when they should have moved, but before or after that time. Mr. Ussery spoke of two areas of rates—those that could be adjusted because the proper rate was published in tariff form or subject to section 22 quotations; lower rates quoted the Government under section 22 of the Interstate Commerce Act—and those that were legal rates but unlawful under the act. Mr. Hayghe said the Government must first determine what was moving, how much was moving, and where it was moving, because, he repeated, no one in government had a reliable index of those facts.

Col. Frank H. Dryden, Assistant Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, said 87.3 percent of that agency's traffic moved in carload or truckload lots, which, he said, showed the agency was planning its shipments, which he said moved to several major depots out of which between seven and eight hundred installations were served.

SPECIAL RATES TO GOVERNMENT

It was here that Mr. Crosthwaite, of the Reclamation Bureau, asked Colonel Gray how the reduction in fares for military personnel was obtained when "we can't get it for the rest of Uncle Sam's employees." Colonel Gray said it was "because we went after it, I presume." He observed that reductions had been in effect for a long time, going back to land-grant days, with the present reductions negotiated since the Land-Grant Act was repealed. He said the railroads and busses had agreed to the reductions in fares for travel on transportation requests if the

military services would distribute traffic on an equal basis among the individual carriers.

Mr. Ussery said Mr. Crosthwaite had "put his finger on an evil I think is abominable." He asked why one agency of the Government should have preferred treatment, adding he thought all the transportation contracts should be made in the name of the United States Government. He said that if contracts had been negotiated for the Government it could have used the bargaining power of the military services for the benefit of all departments of the Government. Mr. Crosthwaite expressed the view that the civilian agencies were using transportation, in the aggregate, to a greater extent than the military agencies, and said he thought the civilian agencies should "take whatever action we can to get in on this gravy train." Mr. Hayghe said that there had been a movement about 2 years ago for the other Government agencies to obtain the same agreements as the military, but that it was felt then that if all the agencies of Government followed that course it might jeopardize the advantages the military had gained, and the matter was dropped. He said he thought it perfectly proper for the railroads to give to an agency having volume movement, such as troop movements, rates comparable to those for excursion movements.

CENTRALIZATION OF PLANNING

After General Reeder had made his remark concerning the ultimate effect of rate reductions, Mr. Crosthwaite said it was not believed that the entire determination of Government transportation policy could be consolidated in Washington because, he said, "it's too big." He said there were transportation management problems "down at the level where you are doing the ordering and receiving of your supplies," and that "if we are going to accomplish the maximum benefit," it would be necessary to "push down to those levels" the principles and doctrines established in Washington.

Representative HOLIFIELD, of California, a member of the subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments which handled the bill that became the Administrative Services Act, asked if the things planned by GSA could be done without further legislation to give GSA power to go into the matter a little more thoroughly. He said he looked on the act as a basic act on which could be developed several facets of Government economy and efficiency.

Representative BURNSIDE, of West Virginia, also a member of the afore-mentioned subcommittee, called on by Mr. Ward for comment, said he was sorry the newspapers throughout the country did not carry stories that Government employees gave their evenings to such conferences without overtime pay.

SPECIAL RATES TO GOVERNMENT

Russell Forbes, Deputy Administrator of the GSA, said the Government should be getting around to the point of view of considering Uncle Sam as a shipper of property and get away from the idea that departmental property transportation was a separate proposition. In the past, he said, special rates granted under section 22 had, in a great many cases, been considered a secret within one agency that secured that rate. He said he thought the Administrative Services Act opened the field for that type of consideration, that all Government property is viewed as owned by the taxpayer and the shipper is the United States Government. If the civilian shipping requirements were combined with those of the military, he said, he did not see how it could help benefiting all around and that the ultimate beneficiary would be the taxpayer.

He continued by saying that although GSA did not contemplate in its set-up going into the matter of passenger rates, he thought it would be proper to accept the challenge Mr. Crosthwaite has thrown out and see what could be done through GSA to make available to the employees of civilian agencies the same rate or a comparable rate to that given the Military Establishment. He said travel of Government servants was at the expense of the taxpayer and should be subject to discount. He said he did not think the effort to obtain reduced fares for civilian employees would jeopardize the arrangement the military group had made.

DECENTRALIZATION IN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Jack Somers, of the Department of Agriculture, said the Commodity Credit Corporation had had an opportunity in the past few years to compare experience under two methods of operation, that is, with shipments moving on Government bills of lading on a centralized basis, and with those moving on commercial bills of lading on a decentralized basis. He said experience, as far as efficiency was concerned, showed that the decentralized operation on commercial bills of lading, shipping wheat and other products, with the settlement of transportation bills at regional area levels, was far more satisfactory than under the centralized operation, where all the bills of lading came into Washington. He said one of the reasons for overpayment was that Government bills of lading were not audited before they were paid. Under decentralization, he said, the bills were audited before they were paid.

He agreed that the negotiation of rates was centralized in Washington, and that procedures and rules were also set up in Washington.

SECTION 22 DISCRIMINATION

At this point Mr. Hayghe expressed the view that a section 22 quotation for one agency of the Government was in violation of section 3 of the Interstate Commerce Act, because it was a discrimination against other agencies. However, he added, "the lawyers do not agree with that." He said the same rate should apply for all departments for the same transportation services. In answer to a written question sent up to Mr. Ward, Mr. Hayghe said there would be bulletins, circulars, and other educational matter sent to clerks in the field offices until such time as GSA had personnel sufficient to maintain direct contact with such employees.

Homer S. Paul, of the Office of the Chief of Transportation, Department of the Army, described the work of a voluntary interdepartmental committee formed about 3 years ago. He said rate information had been exchanged between its members so that, when a rate had been obtained by negotiation for one department, the others would request that the rate be made to cover their transportation, with the assurance that the agency that had obtained the rate in the first place would assist other agencies to obtain it.

Mr. Ward, in closing the meeting, said the subject of the next conference would be records management.

Prepaid Health Care

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACK Z. ANDERSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. ANDERSON of California. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am including a self-explanatory communication and enclosures from the California Physicians' Service. In my opinion it is a program like this that answers the continual cry for socialized medicine in this country:

CALIFORNIA PHYSICIANS' SERVICE,
San Francisco, February 9, 1950.

Hon. JACK Z. ANDERSON,
United States Representative, House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. ANDERSON: California Physicians' Service—one of the largest of the many voluntary blue shield health plans established in the United States by the medical profession—is announcing today another major improvement in its system of prepaid health care for the public.

California Physicians' Service is aware of the great financial shock of many of the prolonged illnesses and in an endeavor to protect the public against the shock of such illnesses it is now making available catastrophic coverage which offers protection against the heavy and prolonged costs connected with some of mankind's most feared diseases. The list includes 23 illnesses such as cancer, infantile paralysis, tuberculosis, etc., and for these it offers complete medical care.

The cost of this extremely valuable protection is quite modest. It will range from 70 cents per month per individual to a maximum of $2.20 per family no matter how large.

We are sure, Mr. ANDERSON, that you are giving very serious consideration to public discussions regarding the Nation's health and the various types of health insurance which may protect it. We feel that the announcement of our catastrophic-coverage plan has an important bearing upon this whole problem and we are sure that you will wish to refer to the enclosed material which contain rather full information about catastrophic coverage.

Sincerely yours,

LOWELL S. GOIN, M. D.,
President, Board of Trustees.

The following concise account of the founding and growth of California Physicians' Service may be useful as background material to supplement the accompanying news release, regarding the offering of catastrophic coverage by CPS. It may also be useful for editorial writers who may wish to comment editorially on the CPS record of service and achievement since 1939.

WHY IS THERE A CPS?

The objective of CPS is to provide Californians with a prepaid membership plan by which they can budget for serious illness and injury, thereby removing as much as possible the financial burden of health care. In addition, the basic philosophy behind CPS is to provide this plan on a cooperative, voluntary, and nonprofit basis under sponsorship of the medical profession. In this way it is possible to maintain the vital, personal relationship between doctor and patient—as well as to uphold the high standards of American medical practice.

HOW DID CPS GET STARTED?

For many years prior to the beginning of CPS, the medical profession had recognized that the amazing discoveries in medical science had raised the costs of providing modern medical care to the public. In 1927 a national committee on the costs of medical care was formed with the late Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur as chairman. The committee's 5-year study, published in 1932, included among its specific recommendations the establishment by the medical profession of a voluntary health security plan on a group, prepayment basis.

In December 1938 the California Medical Association took a great pioneering step when it decided to sponsor the formation of California Physicians' Service. Shortly after, on February 2, 1939, CPS opened its doors—the first State-wide, medically sponsored health plan in the United States. Now 11

years old, CPS has had the added distinction of being a model for similar plans organized throughout the country. It has also been instrumental in causing health insurance to be offered by commercial carriers.

HOW DOES CPS OPERATE?

CPS functions under the direction of a 15-man board of trustees—11 doctors and 4 laymen—all of whom serve voluntarily and without remuneration. The late Dr. Ray Lyman Wilbur, who also played a leading role in the founding of CPS, served as president of the board of trustees from 1939 to 1945. He was succeeded by the current president, Dr. Lowell S. Goin.

CPS is a nonprofit corporation, and its funds are received in the form of dues paid by beneficiary members. Approximately 85 percent of the money thus received is paid out for claims made by the beneficiary members. The remaining 15 percent is used for administrative expense and for building a reserve fund.

HOW LARGE IS CPS?

CPS has had a remarkable growth which reflects the wisdom that was responsible for its founding. Today, approximately 900,000 Californians are beneficiary members and 10,300 of the State's leading physicians and surgeons are physician members. Approximately 27,000 new beneficiaries enroll monthly, and approximately 50,000 claims are paid each month.

WHAT HAS CPS ACCOMPLISHED?

As the pioneer in the previously uncharted field of prepaid, voluntary health plans on a State-wide basis, CPS had no precedent or previous experience to guide it. The early formative years were difficult; as a nonprofit organization, CPS had to adjust dues to cover actual costs for services rendered to beneficiaries; there was no yardstick to indicate the rate of utilization by beneficiaries of their prepaid health protection.

Necessarily, therefore, there were frequent adjustments through hard experience. However, there was also the determination of California doctors to evolve a workable solution to voluntary, prepaid medical care on a large scale, even at their own expense. Almost from the start, doctors have willingly accepted reduced fees in order to assure the ultimate success of the program. For the same reason, CPS doctors are still accepting less-than-normal fees for services rendered. In this spirit, most problems have been successfully overcome—a fact which is largely attributable to the flexibility of CPS and its administration by those best qualified to serve the health needs of the public, the doctors themselves.

Not only did CPS work out its problems; it also constantly enlarged the scope of its coverage and benefits.

1942: Membership extended to dependents of employees.

1943: CPS the first health plan in the Nation to cover conditions existing at the time of joining.

1944: Diagnostic and hospital care increased to provide additional services not formerly covered.

1945: Employed persons over 65 eligible for group membership.

1946: First complete rural health program established in cooperation with California State Grange.

1946: Veterans' program for home-town medical care of veterans with service-connected disabilities established in cooperation with Federal Government.

1948: All age limits withdrawn throughout California for dependents as well as employee members of group enrollment.

1949: CPS individual memberships, designed for persons not able to join through group enrollments, available throughout northern California. (Soon to be offered in southern California.)

1949: New plan inaugurated to provide equal medical services in the hospital for all family members, plus hospital and surgical benefits.

1949: Greater protection for lower- and middle-income groups provided by raising of income ceiling to $3,600 annually.

1950: Vast extension in coverage for more than a score of catastrophic ailments, including cancer and tuberculosis.

California Physicians' Service led in the formation of the Associated Medical Care Plans in 1947, a national organization of medically sponsored, voluntary, prepayment health plans in the United States. While each plan is independent, all carry the same emblem of the blue shield and each is known as a Blue Shield Plan. Altogether there are 64 Blue Shield Plans, in virtually every part of the country, and total membership is approximately 11,000,000.

NOTE.—In northern California CPS writes complete membership contracts—for medical, surgical, and hospital benefits. In southern California the Hospital Service of Southern California Blue Cross provides the hospitalization in a joint offer with CPS.

Oconomowoc Scholarships

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a unique scholarship plan whereby an entire community can assist the education of some of its young people who otherwise might be denied a chance to attend a college or university has attracted much attention to the city of Oconomowoc, in my district of Wisconsin.

Some time ago, in order that I might call this Oconomowoc idea to the attention of my colleagues and to other sections of the country where similar plans might be established, I sought to obtain details of the plan's operation from Editor C. W. Brown, of the Oconomowoc Enterprise. I fear he has been too modest about his accomplishments to supply that information. While the fine generosity of the people of Oconomowoc has made this plan an annual success, it took the initiative and directing enthusiasm of Editor Brown to make it possible. I am glad to note that the current issue of Publishers' Auxiliary, a newspaper trade journal, pays deserved credit to Editor Brown and the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc.

Under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to include that story from Publishers Auxiliary:

SCHOLARSHIP PROGRAM SCORES FOR WISCONSIN WEEKLY EDITOR

OCONOMOWOC, WIS.—With seven students attending universities and colleges as the result of the successful operation of the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc., the past 2 years, the Oconomowoc Enterprise which originated and sponsors the scholarship project, now is raising funds for the third year of scholarships with the hope that the amount of money subscribed the past 2 years will be equaled or surpassed.

The fund is an example of community service which can be adopted by any newspaper in the United States.

Speaking before editors of the State at a press conference at the University of Wisconsin at Madison last fall, E. B. Fred, president of the school, said, "It is my belief that nowhere in the country is there a finer example of public service than this educational plan sponsored by the Oconomowoc Enterprise."

The fund grants $1,000 in 4-year scholarships or $250 per year. The scholarships are outright gifts, not loans.

The Enterprise itself raises the money each year for the scholarships through its news columns by asking for voluntary donations from residents of the city and area. There is no direct solicitation. The first year more than $3,000 was raised; last year a total of more than $3,400 was contributed. Raising of funds for the 1950 scholarships, which will be granted at the end of the school year in June, was started December 15. A total of $1,150.50 was in by January 10, showing the raising of funds running ahead of the other 2 years for the same period of time. To start the fund-raising campaign each year, the Enterprise donates $250.

The student must make application for the scholarship. Once having been granted a scholarship he may attend any accredited school—university, college, technical, or trade school. He may also be attending one of these schools when he applies for scholarship which may be granted for the number of years remaining in his university or college studies. The awards are based on scholastic standing, character, desire of the student to continue his or her education and the benefit to society in general.

Once having been granted a 4-year scholarship, the student's work is reviewed each year by the board to determine whether the grant should be continued.

When the Oconomowoc Scholarship Fund, Inc., a nonprofit organization, was organized, the Enterprise sought the aid of prominent local people, a cross section of the area, to launch the program. The corporation has 21 members, elected for 3 years. It is operated by an executive committee of five.

"Newspapers have the instrument with which to do a job such as this," declares C. W. Brown, publisher of the Enterprise. "The good accomplished, which affects the entire life of the student, is so much greater than the effort required by the sponsoring newspaper, that we urge other newspapers to inaugurate such projects for the benefit of their own communities.

"We are really amazed at the amount of interest shown in this project throughout the State and Nation," Brown emphasizes.

More on the Shubert Inquiry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, the attorney for the Shuberts, Mr. Milton Weir, has said that I do not know about conditions as they exist in the theater. I do not care to enter into an alley-cat fight with Mr. Weir, who is a good lawyer,

and naturally wants to protect his clients, but even the most uninitiated in the ways of the theater knows that unwholesome practices abound therein.

Perhaps Mr. Weir, or his principals, would be able to tell us something about the following:

First. In productions like South Pacific, the Shuberts insist on taking, and receive, 50 tickets a performance—the best seats in the first rows. This totals 400 tickets a week for 8 performances, for 52 weeks a year, making a total of 20,800 tickets for that one smash hit. These tickets are presumably for the friends of the Shuberts. The public is clamoring to see this play, but it does not have any opportunity to buy these 20,800 tickets at the regular box office.

Who gets these tickets? Do favored brokers procure them? Is there any accounting of them? What is paid for most of them? Who gets the proceeds? Is the admission tax paid? Is the income tax paid on the profits from their sale? What do the favored brokers pay for the privilege of disposing of these tickets? What are the kick-backs?

Second. For Kiss Me Kate, the Shuberts demand, and receive, 40 choice tickets a performance, or 320 per week, totaling 16,640 per year.

Third. For Happy Time, another hit show, the Shuberts take 25 tickets a performance, or 200 tickets a week, totaling 10,400 tickets per year.

Fourth. This practice is in operation in every theater under Shubert control. I make a rough guess that the gains taken in by these tickets run into millions of dollars a year. How long must an abused public continue to suffer?

I am sending this information to the Commissioner of Internal Revenue, whose duty it is to insure proper collection of the revenues in the United States, and to bring to book evaders of the revenue laws. I am asking him, furthermore, to check carefully all the records of the disposal of these so-called free tickets.

Fifth. Mr. Weir, in addition to being the attorney for the Shuberts is also the attorney for the League of New York Theatres, which in turn is dominated by the Shuberts, who own and control 60 percent of all New York theaters. The League of New York Theatres insists that 75 percent of the remaining orchestra tickets for each performance go to brokers.

The league was organized to protect the interests of the theater owners, and also to enhance the public's interest in the art of the theater. Apparently, the league has merely become the fulcrum to hoist the interests of the Shuberts.

Sixth. Mr. Weir, aside from acting as attorney for the Shuberts and the League of New York Theatres, was, by some mysterious maneuvering, appointed to the committee created by the municipal authorities, to investigate the theater ticket scandal. Thus the investigated became the investigator. Shubert investigates Shubert.

What a hoax. Perhaps Mr. Weir will make answer.

Taxes With Trouble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

TAXES WITH TROUBLE

(By Hugh Park)

Not many seasons back, the financially elect of every community were a distinguished crowd, made known by the posting of their names on the billboard in the local postoffice.

How time has changed the things of life. No longer does Uncle Sam rent an ordinary building at some $50 per month and therein house the custodian of mails. Now Uncle Sam owns the best building, right in the best part of town, and if it's any kind of a postoffice at all, there are almost as many caretakers as there are rural mail carriers. And we all like it—and point to it with pride—while cussing the Government for raising rates and losing money handling the mails.

No longer does the postmaster solemnly walk out each spring and proclaim to the community the payers of Federal income taxes by posting their names on the bulletin board. Today the lobby is decorated with pictures of gangsters wanted by the FBI and signs advertising air-mail stamps and savings bonds. The list of taxpayers then could be printed in big type on a postcard; now it would take a whole ream of paper to publish the names. For it's a pretty poor citizen, or a pretty prolific papa, who doesn't pay an income tax these days. It would take much less room and time to just post the names of those who are exempt from the tax.

Far be it from me to vilify the collection of taxes. We people here in America have asked for it, and if we didn't ask for it, we let it be pounded upon us, piece by piece. While we decry the continued rise in taxes on the one hand, we yelp louder and louder for more assistance on the other. We shake our heads in fearful disdain against communism in Russia, against socialism in England, and we hold up the merits of our own democracy. And all of us know that we are simply whistling in the dark, for the road we are traveling is nothing less than government autocracy under another name.

If that is what the people of America want, we have no complaint to make. But do we want it? Are we being led, bit by bit, into some kind of a situation which we all despise? Can we be happy in a state where every person is told what to do, when to do, and how to do it? Do farmers want to be regimented, like miners under John L. Lewis, and have no freedom to use their own ingenuity?

The last week has been taxpaying time around the Argus office. And it's had us in a nervous frenzy—for it is time for us to make our annual report as an unofficial but real, nevertheless, tax collector for Uncle Sam. They don't get any pay for it, but every businessman in America today is a tax collector. And the chances for error are so great, and the whole set-up is so complicated, and the penalty in fine and imprisonment so fearful, that no businessman will venture to hire more than one or two helpers until he has one trained person to take care of the tax records.

The power to tax is the power to destroy. Business labors under the tax burden. On Monday, our own little county newspaper turned over to the Federal Government nearly $500 ($499.87 to be exact) as taxes it had collected from employees and customers during the last 3 months of 1949. Our business didn't pay those taxes, we collected it from our employees and our customers. Out of every pay check there came a tax. Onto the price of every bit of paper there went a tax!

Like most manufacturing business firms, we have had during the last year an undesirable but yet stupendous turn-over in personnel. Labor itself is restless under the yoke. Our bookkeeper made a report on 14 different employees during the year. A strict personal record is kept on each one—as to their Government number (social security), the size of their family, the hours they worked at straight time, the hours they worked at overtime, their rate of pay, the amount they earned in each category of time, the deductions the Government allowed them for having a family, the amount we took out of their check as they paid for old-age assistance, the amount we took out of their check each week for the Government income tax, and the balance that was their due. Then at the end of the year a detailed report on each item must be made.

Our normal staff is eight employees. You can see, then, the necessity of having one trained employee to look after all these items. That is her first and major responsibility. And several hours each week of her time is donated to Government tax collection. Last week when year-end reports were made, she gave the Government a lot of time, including some night work of overtime and a half. Last week she gave the Government more than she gave the business which maintains her salary.

It's not to fuss, or to find fault, that we discuss this situation. We really believe that few people know just how many tax collectors we do have in this country; few people stop to think how far we are drifting. For instance, we doubt very much, if the key employees in our own little publishing business know that last year all but one man, father of five children, practically tithed for the Government. Several chipped into the Federal Treasury more than $1 out of every $10 they were due in pay for their work.

It slipped by them, because their tax was hidden from them. They never handled it at all—it was taken from them by the girl tax collector at the bookkeeper's desk, before they ever saw it. She gave them a report on it, of course; but you don't miss a dollar until you have to reach down and pull it out of your own pocket, where you had been keeping it to spend it on something you wanted.

No, labor has no idea just how much it does pay in hidden taxes that go into a higher cost for homes, cars, and washing machines. There's a tax on everything from cradles to coffins. And, above all, the entire structure is so complicated that it is actually nerve-wrecking. We had such an example this week right here in our own office.

There is a tax the Government levies on a man who hires more than seven persons to help him in a business. In 1948 our bookkeeper figured that the Press-Argus had to pay $73.24 for having that honor. This year a new bookkeeper, confronted with that tax for the first time, turned in a report that we owed the Government $193.21 for excise tax on eight employees. It was a blow to us, chiefly because we had notes at the bank which demanded our immediate attention. We didn't have $193.21 to spare. We thought something surely was wrong, so we began to dig into the demand.

We turned to "Instructions for form 940, United States annual return of excise tax on employers of eight or more individuals under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act." Four big solid pages of small type flashed an ominous warning to us to be cautious, and go careful. And we did.

Sentence by sentence, and section by section, we went through the small type. We noted on page 1 that if the return was not filed on time, there was a penalty of interest at 6 percent, plus a delinquency assessment of 5 percent to 25 percent of the tax. We had no time to lose. In detail we read every sentence, every paragraph. We went through page 1, we went through page 2, we went through page 3.

Down in the lower one-half of page 4 we found what we were looking for:

"How to prepare schedule B—computation of credit."

We are tempted to reprint that section just to show you how complicated these tax reports can become. But you wouldn't read it unless, like us, you were forced to.

It took us a whole day to find the error, but it was worth it. Our bookkeeper, tired and confused, had passed over a sentence following the word "Important." It so happened that our experience rate for taxes on employees during the year was changed from 1.5 percent in the first quarter to 0.5 percent for the other three quarters. Our bookkeeper had lumped the whole pay roll together for the year, and had not taken credit for our experience rate. We did what the "Important" said, and divided the pay roll up by quarters. Our tax was not $193.21 for the year; it was $54.99 paid by us for the privilege of giving employment to eight instead of seven employees.

And now we repeat—it's not to fuss or find fault; it's a sincere desire to help our country that we write. We know taxes are always necessary to preserve our Government. High taxes are necessary right now. There is no way to get around them. We pay them willingly and cheerfully. We hope we never get to the point that we growl about the privilege of paying a reasonable tax to build our Nation.

But we do say this: The people who levy the taxes these days don't have to collect them. They force a businessman to do that. It is an onerous task; an expensive item; and most unpopular system. It's especially hard on little firms such as this small group of people who print your county newspaper here every week.

I sincerely believe that the whole thing can be simplified, and much expense saved. Think of the printing bill, for instance, on the set of instructions that goes with that excise tax. Think of the loss in time and money that our own little business had in trying to figure out that tax.

Today every person is allowed by the Government to make a certain amount of money before he pays an income tax. If you are single, it's $50 a month; if you're married the Government allows you another $50 a month to support your wife; and then you also are allowed another $50 for each child. Well, when you earn more than your allowance, the tax collector takes out 20 percent of the balance—or one out of every $5 goes to the Government. That's simple—and efficient—but the Government doesn't stop at that—as I have told you—and there isn't a small-business man in America who isn't confused, angry, and disheartened over the details that he has to study and interpret to do his part as a citizen.

The small-business man is the forgotten man in America today—he is actually harassed on every side. If you don't believe it, ask one, any one, of them.

Depletion and Oil for National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. A. S. MIKE MONRONEY

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. Speaker, because of the great importance of adequate petroleum reserves for national defense, because of its importance to our national economy and for continuing development of national resources, I am unalterably opposed to the Treasury's proposals of reducing the 27½ percent depletion allowance for oil and gas production.

Yesterday I appeared before the Ways and Means Committee to give my views, and also those of our distinguished Oklahoma Governor, Hon. Roy J. Turner.

Because of the importance of this issue to all groups, producers, laborers, and farmers in the 22 oil-producing States, as well as to the Nation to have a dependable supply of oil, for peace and war alike, I would like to insert here the testimony presented at the hearings:

STATEMENT OF HON. ROY J. TURNER, GOVERNOR OF OKLAHOMA

We are unalterably opposed to any change of policy in connection with oil and gas depletion allowance, and I wish to submit to you the following information in support of our stand:

Oklahoma, as an oil-producing State, depends heavily upon the taxation of that industry to support its State government. Depending entirely upon special and excise taxes, a reduction from this source of revenue would seriously affect the entire State financial structure.

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the total received from all State taxes, exclusive of the unemployment-compensation taxes, was approximately $138,000,000. Approximately 60 percent of this total was from either a direct tax on the oil industry or on services depending upon the products of that industry. A loss in this revenue would place a direct burden on the individual taxpayer, either in the form of income or sales taxes, or upon the local ad valorem taxpayer, to replace that loss.

Ad valorem taxation in this State is for local purposes only.

For the year 1949, the total assessed property of personal and public utility properties was $725,000,000, of which approximately 20 percent was on the properties of the oil industry. Local units of government share in the taxes collected on this industry by the State. Of the total 60 percent thereof was returned to the local units of government to help pay the costs of those governments. I repeat, it would mean a complete breakdown of the tax structure that supports Oklahoma government, and I am of the opinion that all other oil-producing States would be likewise affected.

The depletion allowance has been of basic consideration of operators from its inception. Also States and local governments have given consideration to this allowance in determining equitable taxation.

This allowance is now a basic factor that any change made at this time would materially affect consumer prices, employment by thousands of independent operators, suppliers of materials used in the oil industry, and State and local government revenues to the point of jeopardy in many States. But of the greatest importance of all, the reserves needed for national defense. Such an action would have greater and more far-reaching effect than first meets the eye.

I can think of no congressional action that would do more to cripple the economy and safety of the Nation as a whole.

STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE MONRONEY BEFORE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 14, 1950

Mr. Chairman and members of the Ways and Means Committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you on the matter of reduction of the 27½-percent depletion allowance which has been a vital part of the development of our oil industry for more than 25 years.

Four points seem to me to be vital in your consideration of the Treasury's recommendation for such a revolutionary change as the cutting almost in half of this historic pattern of allowance for exhaustion of capital wealth in natural resources.

These four points are:

1. The misleading and prejudicial claim that this depletion allowance, investigated, studied, and written into law by this committee many times, is a tax loophole.

2. The fallacious claim that this change will result in more revenue to the Treasury. By crippling the exploration for oil, the Treasury will have far fewer new oil fortunes to tax and will lose far more in the course of years than it can gain by this ill-advised action. State revenues, geared to gross production and excise taxes on oil and its products also will suffer.

3. The oversimplification by inexperienced Treasury experts that only big corporations and the very wealthy benefit from depletion. Actually, it is the one feature that keeps the wildcatter, the small-lease men, the farmer and the small royalty owner investing in the hazardous search for more production.

4. The completely misleading claim that oil exploration enjoys tax advantages not available to other segments of our economy. Many far safer fields, such as stock-market profits, business-property development, and even industrials enjoy long-range tax advantages far superior to the uncertain investments in oil developments.

(1) The misleading label of tax loophole is not borne out by facts. Since 1918 this committee has recognized the equity of discovery depletion. In 1926, this committee enacted percentage depleton and I am sure knew what it was doing. Countless times it has been studied and each time the Congress has sustained it intentionally, not accidentally, on the basis of facts. This committee and Congress are not in the habit of approving any loopholes over a period of 25 years.

If the Treasury wants to make one single industry make up the major share of the $700,000,000 loss of excise-tax revenues, they should be honest enough to advocate singling out petroleum as their sacrificial lamb instead of using this fallacious loophole claim.

As further evidence of shifting this burden to oil, even the Treasury experts advocate and endorse the percentage depletion allowance and intangible drilling costs in principal, but want to cut it about in half and place it at 15 percent, an arbitrary figure picked out of thin air without relation as to its effect on whether it will cripple our present development of domestic oil resources.

The present rate of 27½ percent was the result of careful study and determination by the House and Senate. Its soundness has proven itself by the large amount of taxes it has raised and the steady, expanding discoveries of petroleum that it has helped to encourage. It has proven itself by test and is in no way an arbitrary figure but a foundation on which the industry rests.

(2) The second point that the Treasury needs the revenue and that this would add $200,000,000 of those needed dollars to the till is equally fallacious. If you don't make money—you don't pay taxes. If oil exploration is crippled—or even drastically curtailed—less money in the long run will come into the Treasury.

Your big tax take comes in the discovery and development of new oil fields and the creation of new wealth. If you are satisfied to tax only the fields you now have—it won't be long until you will find one-half of your big revenue gone—then two-thirds gone. Without new fields, new tax sources, you'll be in a stripper operation yourself before long—as you'll learn the real meaning of depletion.

If you have a good cow that gives lots of milk, you can't get production without adequate feed. Cut her feed in half and your milk supply dwindles. You can butcher the cow and put her in a deep freezer and live on steaks for a while, but in the long run you're depleting your assets.

But if you are a prudent operator you'll see that the cow produces the maximum amount of income—enough feed to produce more milk. Then you'll probably get more cows and more milk and more income.

The same rule applies. Government revenue depends on American business, all of it, being a going and expanding concern, and any tax policy that restricts expansion means revenue losses in the long run.

By the same token, the decline of development of new oil sources—and consequently new taxable wealth—will strike a severe blow at State revenues. Big portions of State budgets in our oil-producing States are dependent not on a static but on an expanding oil industry. If exploration were stopped—or drastically curtailed—my own State would suffer tremendously—as would every other oil-producing State, all of which tax oil heavily.

(3) The third point involves the naive assumption by the Treasury experts that each segment of the widespread oil industry operates in a carefully cataloged, hermetically sealed specialty. I know the oil industry and know of no operators who fit into the neat little packages the statisticians have worked out in their testimony.

All of them are producers, lease buyers, royalty owners—most are wildcatters or work on submarginal lands—and even the big refiners lease, wildcat, produce and even operate stripper wells. It is completely fallacious to think that you can divide the industry up into individual segments, for it isn't that kind of a divisible business.

For example, the statistically minded experts assume that all operators of "stripper wells" operate only wells of extremely small production. Actually, most all oil men and all big operating companies, producing and refining as well, have much stripper production. The 27½-percent depletion keeps them working the submarginal fields and recovering millions of barrels of oil that would otherwise be lost forever.

The 27½-percent depletion makes it possible for them, big and little, to go in for expensive "secondary recovery programs" which will result in the production of at least 4,000,000,000—I repeat 4,000,000,000 barrels more oil from these depleted fields than we would otherwise recover. Secondary recovery is expensive and hazardous—as expensive and hazardous in many instances as original drilling—and without the 27½-percent depletion allowance, I fear it will be largely discontinued.

Further, the Treasury claimed major oil companies get the lion's share of the benefits of depletion allowances. This is again over-simplification. Most of the fields, it is true, are found and developed by individuals or smaller companies. But it is the reward for taking the big risk that keeps them drilling. Their price for a proven acreage—in other words, the value of their discovery—is dependent upon the present tax structure. To drastically change it now would lower these values of the small operator and the independent producer tremendously.

The financing of independent oil operations in every bank and in every oil State is based on the 27½-percent depletion allowance. Directors calculate the engineering of an oil field or lease, its probable production, and estimate its worth for drilling loans. Without the 27½-percent depletion allowance, I know of few banks which would continue this financing of drilling operations. With it reduced by half, credit for independent operators would be frozen.

Already in my State, and I have just returned for these hearings, drilling has been stopped to see whether Congress takes this ill-advised step or not. If the incentive to small business is not there—there'll be little new exploration or development of new "pimple" fields where the risk of striking oil is tremendously great.

If the depletion allowance is taken by the big integrated corporations, it's only on the exhaustion of the production some independent operator has found and sold to them. And the high sales value of the production is based on the 27½ percent depletion allowance. Cut this allowance in half and the major companies will drastically cut their purchase prices to the independent wildcatters and producers.

Tens of thousands of small farmers and small investors today draw royalty checks. Standard royalty payments to the owner of the subsurface oil equals one-eighth of the value of the oil produced from that property. Cutting depletion in half will collapse the value of their properties by about one-half. The farmer and the royalty owner would find that not only their income would be severely reduced, but the sales value of the owner's rights to the soil would go down to a depression level. Far more than the $200,000,000 in revenue would be lost immediately on the value of these owners' oil rights.

The claim that oil enjoys special or unusual tax advantages is completely fallacious. Compared with the risk taken—four dry holes to every five wells drilled—the advantages are far smaller than that accorded stock-market gains where only a 25 percent capital gains tax is paid on securities held for 6 months.

The single individual who makes a million net on the stock market pays only a 25 percent capital gains tax, or $250,000. If he makes a million net operating revenue in oil, he'll pay $755,570. He would have used up $275,000 of his capital worth and his actual profit would be only $67,320 out of a million net operating income.

This committee and Congress passed the stock-market law to get more revenue on the theory that a more rapid turn-over of stocks would result in more revenue. By the same token of more business and more taxes, greater revenue results from oil.

It is fallacious to compare depletion with depreciation. Tens of thousands of business buildings today, almost fully depreciated over the years, are bringing in from 10 to 100 times more revenue because of their advantageous location on Main Street than they did when built in 1905 or 1910.

Yet everyone knows that an oil well, after its first few years of production is almost a dead duck. It will never again produce as much oil as it did the first year and is on a rapid and steady downgrade from that time on.

Much has been made of the charge-offs for development costs by the Treasury experts. Yet in the same breath, they admit frankly that four out of every five wells drilled are dry and nonproductive. Some way, somehow, the inference is left that the oil industry is avoiding taxes because of these exploration losses and that there is some special advantage in drilling dry holes.

Holes in the ground have little value—you can't pull them up and sell them for post holes—yet from the Treasury testimony you would think these losses had some special value. Almost any building, railroad, factory, utility, or machinery has some value once the development is completed. Dry holes have none.

That one out of five is a producer furnished income, which after depletion is taxable at our present high rates during its few years of flush production. After that it is a stripper well and the capital wealth from its discovery has been fully dissipated.

In closing let me say that I think it would be foolhardy to sabotage a system that has given us an abundance of essential oil under free, competitive enterprise in two world wars. Oil is an absolute essential in today's mechanized warfare, and without an expanding and abundant domestic supply our entire defense effort would collapse.

The major targets of bombing both in Germany and in Japan were their oil and when they had been knocked out, their war machines on land, sea, and in the air were unable to move.

While the Treasury has supplied your committee with ample tables on alleged excessive depletion and development costs, they have failed to furnish you with the amount that the industry does pay. The corporate tax total, your Joint Committee on Revenue and Taxation advises, came to $512,000,000 in 1947. Add to this the hundreds of millions (the total amount not available from the Treasury) from individual stockholders of these corporations. Add also the tens of millions from individual oil operators, the farmers who own the oil lands, the oil-machinery men and you have a staggering amount of Federal revenue produced by this industry.

Obviously, the purpose of this drastic change is to make up a part of the loss of $700,000,000 in excise taxes on furs, jewelry, transportation, light bulbs, etc. May I respectfully call your attention to the fact that the oil industry has long paid heavy excise taxes, and is not here asking that these be removed or reduced.

The best estimate I can get shows that more than $2,000,000,000 is paid by oil products in excise taxes—$1,453,000,000 in State gasoline-excise taxes; $500,000,000 in Federal gasoline taxes, and $83,000,000 in lubricating-oil taxes. In many States, these excise taxes on gasoline will run as high as 35 percent or 7 cents per gallon.

The total taxes paid other than Federal will run between two and a half billion and three billion dollars. I ask leave to insert here the list of taxes and their estimated amounts. It is by no means complete as it does not and cannot reflect the hundreds of millions paid by individuals.

I sincerely hope that this committee, in the light of all the dangers for such a drastic change will not single out this already heavily taxed industry to make it the goat in the removal of small excise taxes from other items.

Petroleum tax bill

	1948	[1] 1949
State gasoline tax	$1,342,975,000	$1,453,000,000
Federal gasoline tax	498,363,000	500,000,000
Real and personal property	217,000,000	200,000,000
Federal and State income tax	932,000,000	600,000,000
Severance taxes and drilling permits	164,000,000	164,000,000
Lubricating-oil taxes	81,883,000	83,000,000
Pipe-line taxes	19,643,000	20,000,000
Import taxes	15,006,000	15,000,000
State inspection fees	8,550,000	9,000,000
Local gasoline taxes	7,884,000	8,000,000
Other taxes	76,000,000	75,000,000
Total	3,363,304,000	3,100,000,000

[1] APIC estimates.

The Late Francis W. Durbin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN McSWEENEY
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. McSWEENEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted by the Allen County (Ohio) Bar Association on the life and services of Francis W. Durbin, late of Lima, Ohio:

Francis W. Durbin of Lima, Ohio, died of pneumonia on December 10.

He was born in Kenton, Ohio, on December 8, 1891. He entered Notre Dame University from which he was graduated in 1913 with the degree of LL. B.

In 1913 he was admitted to the bar of Ohio and immediately embarked upon the practice of his profession in Lima.

He is survived by his widow, three daughters, his mother, and a brother.

William W. Durbin, father of Francis, was examiner of claims in the Treasury Department from 1886 to 1890, and for several years thereafter was law partner with Phil M. Crow at Kenton. William W. Durbin showed unwearied devotion to the Democratic Party, beginning in that long period when that party was seldom victorious in local or State elections. He held the chairmanship of the Ohio State Democratic Committee longer than any other man, his first work as chairman being in the Bryan campaign of 1896. He went to more Democratic National Conventions than any of his contemporaries either as district delegate or delegate at large, attending those of 1900, 1912, 1920, 1924, 1928, 1932, and 1936. He became register of the United States Treasury in 1933.

Francis W. Durbin was a powerful and colorful figure in the councils of his party for 40 years. During that period not a campaign in the county or State was conducted without his active participation. Yet, strange to say, he was never elected to public office. In fact, he tried only on one or two occasions. However, he received many appointments during his career to boards and commissions, among which were the Civil Service Commission and the Allen County Board of Elections.

In politics Francis was possessed of that indispensable trait found in all great political leaders—a remarkable memory. It was said of him that he knew, and could call by name, as many prominent Democrats not only in Ohio but in the Nation as any one with the exception of James Farley.

One of the outstanding achievements of his career which many have forgotten was his leadership in the fight for the adoption of the Ohio old-age-pension plan when he was president of the Ohio State Association of Eagles.

Francis W. Durbin was a devout Catholic, being a member of St. John's Church.

Fraternal affiliations were Elks Lodge, Knights of Columbus, and the Eagles, of which he was past president.

Francis loved his home and was a loving, faithful husband and a kind and exemplary father.

As a lawyer he was able, faithful, honest, dependable, and diligent.

Both as a lawyer and in politics he was fair, honorable, courteous, respectful, and gentlemanly.

Perhaps the trait we loved the best about our brother was his affability and his inability to hold a grudge. He was quick to forgive and after the heat of a courtroom battle or a political campaign he was the first to insist that "bygones be bygones."

Serving on the memorial committee were Leslie Reid, John L. Cable, Howard Everett, Paul T. Landis, Melvin C. Light, E. T. Lippincott, L. E. Ludwig, Harry R. Meredith, and B. F. Welty.

Resolutions Adopted by the American Coalition and Remarks of Its Retiring President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN PHILLIPS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. PHILLIPS of California. Mr. Speaker, the American Coalition is a vigorous and patriotic group of fraternal, civic, and similar societies, with a joint membership of some 3,000,000 men and women in the United States. It was founded 25 years ago, in New York, by Capt. John B. Trevor, who has been its president from that time until the 26th of last month when, of his own desire, he relinquished that office, and was succeeded by Mr. John W. Finger, a businessman of New York and Georgia, and president-general of the National Society of the Sons of the American Revolution.

Among the constituent members of the American Coalition are the Sons of the American Revolution, National Society; the Daughters of the Revolution, National Society; the Military Order of the World Wars; American War Mothers; General Society of the War of 1812; National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims; National Society of New England Women; Society of Old Plymouth Colony Descendants; the Federation of Huguenot Societies in America; Congress of State Societies in America; Grand Army of the Republic; Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Commander in Chief; National Constitution Day Committee; National Society for Constitutional Security; Regular Veterans Association; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council; the Wheel of Progress; and the Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, United States of America.

It is a particular pleasure to me, as a member of one of these constituent organizations, to include in this extension of my remarks, the pertinent and timely address of the retiring president and founder, Captain Trevor, and the resolution adopted at the January meeting. The address and resolutions follow:

ADDRESS OF JOHN B. TREVOR AT ANNUAL MEETING OF THE AMERICAN COALITION, MAYFLOWER HOTEL, WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1950

Ladies and gentlemen, this is my farewell speech as President of the American Coalition. Today I retire. I understand that the nominating committee is going to present for your consideration the name of a man for whom I have the greatest admiration—admiration not only for his patriotism, his business ability, and his gift of speech, but above all, for his aggressive courage in defense of our traditional institutions.

I cannot, however, leave the position which I have occupied for so many years without thanking my old friends, and my new friends, representing the societies which make up the American Coalition, for their loyalty and helpfulness in the performance of my duties. I am inclined to think such loyalty must be unique; certainly, it has been outstanding.

As for the American Coalition itself, I believe that it has potentialities which are of transcendent importance in this time of crisis. They should be developed. I, therefore, am particularly glad that the nominating committee has selected a young man as its candidate for the presidency who is able to travel, and make contact with the societies which you represent, without having to consider the difficulties which have hampered me for many years.

Our organization is dedicated to the preservation of American institutions without partisanship in any form whatsoever. I have never known, or considered, how the members of the constituent societies are politically divided. They were patriots, and that was all that mattered.

Unfortunately, it has seemed to me that President Truman's predecessor opened wide the gates of the executive branch of our Government to people who have had ideas and ideals which are the antithesis of those held by all the members of the constituent societies of the American Coalition. As a consequence, we have had the Marzani case, the Coplon scandal, the Hiss trial, and we are being pushed down the road to socialism at a terrifying speed. I need hardly to say to you that socialism is the negation of liberty. I am not original when I say to you today that the search for security and its promotion by the Federal Government can have in reality but one result—slavery.

Beveridge, in England, admitted quite frankly that his universal plan was utterly dependent upon compulsory labor. That means the complete subordination of the individual to the state.

It has always seemed to me that the founders of the Republic, and, for over a hundred years, their successors, planned the Government of the United States to be solely an agency to be operated for the benefit of the citizens of our country. Now, under the present holders of high office, we see advocated the support of Socialist regimes based on Marxian principles. These governments seem unable to remain in power unless they receive subsidies from the economic system still extant in the United States.

We were taken into a war for purposes, I venture to say, which were quite contrary to our national traditions. Do not forget that Winston Churchill called it the unnecessary war. Because of a dramatic gesture calling for unconditional surrender, probably 100,000 Americans had to die upon the battlefields of the world. What is worse, I suggest, that we thereby had to utterly destroy two great barriers against bolshevism. These barriers might have been saved in some form to fortify our present position in the appalling situation which now confronts us.

I have had left at your place at the table a reprint of a letter which I addressed to a Senator of the State of New York who sponsored a resolution advocating a constitutional convention for the purpose of integrating the United States in a federal union of all nations. I have taken the liberty on the basis of resolutions adopted by the American Coalition to oppose what seems to me a wholly fantastic and dangerous policy.

At the moment, Senator McCARRAN, chairman of the Judiciary Committee of the Senate, is fighting a great battle to prevent this country being inundated by immigrants from central Europe, who cannot legitimately be classed as displaced persons actually displaced as a result of military operations during the war. Some of you have probably read what I have written about this matter, and I hope that you have read what Senator

McCARRAN has set forth in his statement about this problem. Throughout the discussion on Capitol Hill, Senator McCARRAN has been facing a majority in his committee which seems to be more sympathetic to the requirements of alien blocs and left-wingers than to the desires of the great unorganized mass of the American people. However, we are greatly indebted to the Senator for his successful effort in securing the inclusion in the amended bill of certain safeguards which have been lacking in the Celler bill. For this reason, I suggest that every member of the American coalition and their friends stand foursquare behind Senator McCARRAN in his efforts to block passage of the iniquitous measure which is now before the Senate, even though, for parliamentary reasons, the Senator may be recorded as voting for the bill reported by his committee. It seems to me that everybody present, and those of you who meet in the Women's Patriotic Conference, have a duty to perform, and, that is to go to the Capitol and call upon every Senator to defeat the amended Celler bill in whatever form it may reach the floor of the Senate.

Approximately a million dollars have been spent by our opponents to put this measure through the House, and through the Senate; and, as you know, we have never had the means to purchase the radio, to hire speakers, and to flood the country with propaganda, as has been done by the other side.

Once more, I thank you, my friends, for supporting my efforts with such extraordinary loyalty, and I want you to understand, that I deeply appreciate the wonderful friendships which have been built up between us, and between some of the splendid men on Capitol Hill, who have been and who are now carrying on our fight in their official capacity.

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY THE AMERICAN COALITION AT ITS ANNUAL CONVENTION IN WASHINGTON, D. C., JANUARY 26, 1950

As the fundamental purpose of the American Coalition is to keep America American, it is hoped that each participating organization will exert every effort to bring the information contained in these resolutions to its members, and through them to mobilize activity in their communities on these vitally important subjects.

GRACE L. H. BROSSEAU,
Chairman, Committee on Resolutions.

IMMIGRATION

Whereas the debate in the Senate on October 13, 14, and 15, 1949, on the merits of the Celler bill (H. R. 4567) revealed deplorable facts relating to the admission of displaced persons into the United States, and a recent statement since his return from a study of conditions on the spot in Europe, by Senator McCarran, reinforces the comments therein made relating to the administration of the law: Be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to suspend all immigration into the United States so long as more than 1,000,000 persons in the United States are unemployed, except for the admission of husbands, wives, and minor children of citizens or aliens lawfully admitted as permanent residents in the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That pending such suspension of all immigration into the United States, the Displaced Persons Commission be abolished and its functions be transferred to the Immigration and Naturalization Bureau of the Department of Justice; and be it further

Resolved, That insofar as the so-called displaced persons are to be admitted into the United States, the cut-off date established by the Displaced Persons Act of 1948, shall be maintained in force, and in addition, screening boards be established abroad, whose members shall be composed of a single delegate from the Immigration and Naturalization Service of the United States, the State Department, the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Department of Defense. The approval of admission of any person shall be by unanimous vote and the rejection of an applicant for admission shall be final and not subject to review; and be it further

Resolved, That the American coalition expresses its deep appreciation of the gallant efforts of Senator PAT MCCARRAN, of Nevada, to uphold our immigration barriers in the face of outrageous assaults from minority groups upon his character and his motives, and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled earnestly entreats its constituent societies and the individual members thereof to urge their State legislators to oppose this infamous and dangerous scheme to destroy the United States of America.

SOCIALIZED MEDICINE

Whereas great pressure is being exerted on Congress to pass legislation which would place under Government control the health and medical care of the people of the United States; and

Whereas such action would destroy, or at least impair, the personal interest, initiative, and private research on the part of the medical profession, and put that profession under the control of a paternalistic bureaucracy with direct socialization as a result: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, expresses its emphatic opposition to the establishment of socialized medicine and thereby the expansion of a parasitical and paternalistic bureaucracy in the United States.

FEDERAL AID TO EDUCATION

Whereas the American Coalition has consistently opposed over a long period of years the enactment of legislation which would place in the power of the Federal Government the right to intervene in local systems of education either directly or indirectly through the imposition of restrictions or conditions as to the expenditure of Federal appropriations: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention, assembled reiterates its opposition to all legislation in whatsoever guise to place the control of education under any department or bureau of the Federal Government.

OPPOSING WORLD GOVERNMENT

Whereas there are now active organizations and individuals in our country which endeavor to establish a world government, a world federation, or any other international organization which would abrogate any of our national sovereignty; and

Whereas it has been openly admitted by advocates of such a world government, by whatever name it be called, that no secession would be permitted to any nation which joined such a world government and which later wanted to withdraw; and

Whereas the voting strength of the United States of America in any such World Government would be overwhelmingly outnumbered by the vast populations and geographical areas of Asia, and by the uncounted millions of Africa; and

Whereas world government law would be enforced directly upon individuals in our country, and world government taxing power would directly tax our citizens independently and in addition to our own national taxation, and the world government would take over the gold reserves of the United States and of all member nations, thus rendering our own currency worthless; and

Whereas the power to tax is the power to destroy, and if the United States of America should join such a world government, it would cease to be a free nation, its people would lose their precious liberties and become the slaves of a world superstate founded on the philosophy that the individual is not the master of his government but its servant: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled declares itself as uncompromisingly opposed to a world government or any other international organization with supreme authority over all national governments; and be it further

Resolved, That the individual members of this convention most earnestly urge their Representatives in the Congress of the United States and their State legislatures to oppose this infamous and dangerous scheme to destroy the United States of America.

BILL OF RIGHTS DAY

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, earnestly urges upon the Congress of the United States the adoption of a joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to issue annually a proclamation designating December 15 as Bill of Rights Day and calling upon officials of the Government to display the flag of the United States on all Government buildings and inviting the people of the United States to observe the day with appropriate ceremonies and prayers.

UN-AMERICAN ACTIVITIES

Whereas the American Coalition is deeply appreciative of the superb service rendered to the country by the Committee on Un-American Activities of the House of Representatives, in exposing to public view the activities of individuals and organizations who are, or have been, engaged in efforts to bring about a change in the form of Government in the United States; and

Whereas it is all too evident from subversive literature and other propaganda emanating from innumerable agencies of varied affiliations that our free institutions and our constitutional form of government are in real peril: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges upon the Congress to appropriate such funds as will enable the committee to function effectively; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition urges upon the committee not to relax its efforts to expose the operations of all subversive activities in the country or its dependencies.

ARMED FORCES

Whereas strife and contention are still very much in existence today, and the peace of the world is in jeopardy; and

Whereas our philosophy of life and the rights of the individual as well as our productive industry are precious possessions which we must at all times be prepared to defend against invasion or subversion: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to provide for the maintenance of an armed force sufficient in strength and equipment to meet any attack by land, sea, or air of any aggressor, until the Reserve forces are made ready to meet the emergency; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition further supports continued research and technical development in all branches of the armed services.

OFFICERS' RESERVE CORPS AND RESERVE OFFICERS' TRAINING CORPS

Whereas, historically, the security of the United States has rested upon a strong civilian army; and

Whereas in the opinion of the patriotic leaders of the country, some form of military training is essential; and

Whereas it seems apparent that universal military training is not going to be put into effect; and

Whereas a reasonably satisfactory means of physical and military training can be effected through a system of military training in the colleges and secondary schools; and

Whereas such training could effectively be carried on by Reserve officers on inactive duty: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled, earnestly requests that the Department of Defense and the Congress of the United States, in cooperation with State and local authorities, provide for training the youth of the country through establishment of a form of military training in colleges and secondary schools.

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

Whereas the United States Marine Corps always has been an integral part of the fighting forces of the United States and its record and inspiration to the American people: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges upon Congress that the personnel strength of the United States Marine Corps always be maintained at not less than 6 percent of the combined strength of the armed forces of the United States, and be it further

Resolved, That we urge that the commandant of the Marine Corps be made an ex officio member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to sit in with the staff on all matters pertaining to amphibious operations and/or the Marine Corps.

ESSENTIAL MATERIALS

Whereas the encouragement by the Government of the United States of foreign production of raw and manufactured materials, which can be found in, or manufactured in, American Territory, is a direct assault on American labor and the business institutions of the United States; and

Whereas the Soviet Government is reported to be constructing a gigantic fleet of submarines, which, in the event of war, might deprive the United States of access to foreign sources of essential materials: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, opposes any Government policy or legislation which threatens the economic independence of the United States; and be it further

Resolved, That the American coalition favors any Government policy or legislation which will promote the economic independence of the United States.

WASHINGTON SESQUICENTENNIAL

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled, endorses the celebration of the sequicentennial of the founding of Washington, D. C., as the Capital of the United States, as authorized by Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That every patriotic organization be called upon to participate in making this a national event of first importance.

ANTARCTICA

Whereas the Antarctic continent was discovered and explored in large measure by American citizens; and

Whereas extensive outcroppings of valuable mineral deposits in Antartica have been frequently reported; and

Whereas foreign nations which are in debt to us are now claiming sovereignty over large portions of this territory; and

Whereas the United Sates has gravely depleted its natural resources in coming to the rescue of present claimants to this territory: Be it, therefore

Resolved, That the American coalition, in annual convention assembled, urges Congress to make it a condition precedent to the extension of any economic aid to any nation, that that nation shall cede to the United States all claims to sovereignty in this region.

JUDGE MEDINA

Resolved, That the American coalition in annual convention assembled, desires to express its sincere appreciation of the marvelous patience and completely judicial attitude assumed by Judge Medina under great provocation occasioned by a very trying situation in the Communist trial in New York.

TRAITOROUS CITIZENS

Whereas at long last there is being made successful prosecution of some of those charged with disloyalty to the people and Government of the United States, and with service in behalf of foreign powers: Be it therefore

Resolved, That the American Coalition, in annual convention assembled, hereby commends the action of all those, in and out of Congress, who have contributed to the work of investigation and prosecution of those thus charged; and condemns and deplores the action of those who, in positions of authority, have shown themselves to be unsympathetic with, or scornful of, the efforts thus made to bring to the bar of justice those who have been engaged in such treasonable conduct; and be it further

Resolved, That the American Coalition here and now urges the Congress and the law-enforcing agencies of the Federal Government to continue, and to broaden, the scope of such investigations, and to make speedy and fearless prosecution of all such offenders, whoever they may be and wherever situated.

TRIBUTE TO MR. TREVOR

Whereas over a period of 25 years the destinies of the American Coalition of Patriotic Societies have been wisely guided by Mr. John B. Trevor, as president; and

Whereas he not only founded it but has sustained and developed it into a power; and because of his ability, courageous heart, gentleness of spirit, and honesty of purpose has won the respect, affection, and complete confidence of his officers and coworkers; and

Whereas he has with great discretion done valuable work for his country and for the American Coalition in legislative matters affecting the welfare of the Nation; and

Whereas Mr. Trevor feels it necessary to relinquish his active leadership: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the American Coalition in annual convention assembled signifies not only its keen regret but its appreciation of his rare ability and unselfish service by a rising vote of thanks and at the same time wishing him many years of health and happiness.

Let There Be Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 7, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave I am inserting in the RECORD the broken-hearted plea of a young mother in my district for peace—peace in our time and in all time to come, not by surrender to totalitarian forces and aggression, but by refusing to surrender to hysteria and fear.

As you read this letter, you may say that it is theatrical and melodramatic; perhaps it is.

But the whole theme of peace and war is theatrical and melodramatic. It runs the gamut of all human hopes and emotions, and the prize to those of us in this dreary world who find the answer to the international riddle is preservation of human civilization.

This letter was written to me, Mr. Speaker, by Mrs. Ben Bernstein, of 384 Madison Street, New York. It is only one of scores that I have received in recent weeks. I hope that some of our colleagues who are ready to plunge the world into war for nothing will read it and ponder, and perhaps think of their own children who may be maimed or killed in a new holocaust.

NEW YORK, N. Y.,
Monday, February 13, 1950.

Hon. ARTHUR G. KLEIN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I have just tucked my three little girls into bed and kissed them good night. They are only 5 years old, 2½, and 10 months old, and I love them very much.

As far as it is within my humanly power to do so, I protect them, I feed them, I clothe them, I bathe them. When they are sick I worry over them, until, with the doctor's help, they are well again.

And, in turn, my children love me. They need me, they depend on me, they trust me.

But now a very real and terrible threat hovers over us all. My little girls are too little to understand, so their world is still safe. Happy, lucky little girls. But not so lucky am I. Not so safe is my world.

The atomic age has come and released upon the earth a fury more deadly than the mind of man could ever dream possible. And men have lost their reason.

What is man, or who is man that he dares use the mighty brain God gave him to conspire with the devil and plot chaos, fear, and impending violent death upon His beautiful, wonderful world?

I am a simple person. I was not ordained by fate to help shape the destiny of our world, nor to carve myself a niche in its hall of fame.

No, I leave the making of history to our able and honorable statesmen, financiers, and politicians. For myself, I want only to be free to fulfill my own duties as wife and mother—an old and noble profession.

But I must have peace of mind in order to build and plan a future for myself and my children. I want to see growing bodies and happy faces. I want to see graduations, weddings, and grandchildren.

My voice is a small one, but its message is mighty, for my sentiments are universal. Every mother, every father everywhere shares these hopes for a bright tomorrow.

I am not a deeply religious woman, but if it were possible I would have written this letter to God Himself.

Instead, I am writing to you, as a member of the human race, as a father, and as my elected voice in Congress.

I beseech you to rise before that body and speak as you have never spoken before, and tell them what I have said.

Perhaps as a little person I am not too well informed as to what goes on in the inner sanctums and private circles of our Government. But this I know:

There is no time for false pride. There must be active, genuine attempts made to iron out our difficulties with Russia, since she seems to be the reason for all our atomic research.

We must bend over backward, if necessary, to find a common meeting ground with her. For Russian mothers, too, love children, and they, too, have their dreams.

There can be no point of difference so great that world destruction, as an alternative, would be justified.

And, if need be, let's shout across the rooftops until our voices pierce the iron curtain, and we can make them understand that, despite our differences, we are all as brothers and that we have a common destiny.

Let there be talk of peace and work for peace and peacetime spending. Not talk of war and work on atom bombs and billions for defense.

This, then, is the sworn duty of our elected Congressmen: To secure the peace and to maintain the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity.

And if our Congress feels itself inadequate to cope with world affairs, then let the American people subscribe to a world government that will have the vision and the authority to set the world right again.

Surely, civilization has not emerged from the dark ages to the magnificent heights of modern times only to face annihilation at the hands of its own monster.

People's hearts the world over are united in a prayer for permanent peace.

From this common denominator we can build new hope, slowly perhaps, but surely, and may Almighty God lead us back to a saner, safer, and happier life.

Amen.

Sincerely yours,

CORINNE BERNSTEIN
(Mrs. Ben Bernstein).

Gen. H. H. Arnold: "A Man To Match Our Mountains"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEROY JOHNSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, at the entrance of one of our State capitol buildings in Sacramento, Calif., is an inscription that reads, "Give us men to match our mountains." Gen. Henry H. Arnold was undoubtedly the type of man that the author of this statement was thinking about. General Arnold was not a native Californian but he spent a good part of his adult life in our State. When he retired from active service, he went to California to make a home in the beautiful Sonoma Valley, christened by Jack London as "The Valley of the Moon."

Unfortunately, God called him recently and those of us who had known him were deprived of his friendship, comradeship, and leadership. He will go down in history as one of our great military leaders. In times of crisis, the Lord seems to produce the types of men that are needed to bring us the victory. General Arnold's work as head of the Air Forces during the Second World War was one of the most stupendous jobs ever performed by a military man. He built an air force, starting with practically nothing, to the greatest air armada and striking force that the world had ever known. It contributed mightily to our victory in every theater of the war. He was the last one to proclaim that his particular group deserved any more credit than the other two groups composing our armed forces, namely the Navy and the Army.

After he retired to California he took part in public affairs and at the request of Gov. Earl Warren he served as a member of the State Fish and Game Commission. He took part in the affairs of his local community and became a member of the Kiwanis Club of the little city of Sonoma. One of its members, A. R. Grinstead, wrote a poem about him when he was conferred an honorary membership of the Kiwanis Club of Sonoma. I believe that it describes General Arnold and his work very well.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the poem which reads as follows:

"A MAN TO MATCH OUR MOUNTAINS"

"Give us men to match our mountains,"
Every city, town, and State
Long has yearned for men gigantic
Who in thoughts and deeds are great
So, within our tiny valley,
We have wished for men who share
The dignity and grandeur
Which our rugged mountains bear.
And now our wish is answered
And our yearnings satisfied,
Since General Henry Arnold
Has come here to reside.

But this vale is not his measure,
Our small mountains not the test,
Nay, compare him with the grandeur
Of the nation's highest crest.
He's a match for any mountain,
Aye, more than a match is he;
He's o'ercome the highest ridges
As he's spanned the widest sea.
For the far-flung operations
Of his Air Force in its might,
O'er this world's loftiest ranges
Carried victory in its flight.

Yea, for men who match our mountains—
There's a need throughout the land,
For men of giant stature,
Who'll in war and peace command.
May that need ne'er be unanswered;
Let their strong arms e'er insure
The success of every venture,
That this nation may indure,
May there e'er be stalwart leaders,
Who'll protect in direst plights,
May there always be "Hap" Arnolds
To guarantee our rights.

—*A. R. G.*

Bad Bugs in Bed With REA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

BAD BUGS IN BED WITH REA

(By the Country Editor)

If the United States Government has ever done one good thing, and it has, that thing is the rural electric program, the REA.

No newspaper in America has given more space to the REA than has the Press-Argus. The daddy of REA in this part of Arkansas has been John H. Hobbs. We freely turned over our columns to him to espouse the cause. And he has used it—hundreds of columns—more space, we suspect, than was given to the REA by all the other weekly newspapers in Arkansas, all put together.

Several times we have personally spoken a good word for REA, for we like the set-up. It's simple. The Government, through the REA congressional act, simply gives a group of rural people the privilege of forming a business corporation, and such corporation can borrow sufficient money from the Government at low, long-term rates. With this money, the farmer-owned, farmer-managed corporation can build power plants, can build electric lines, and can within its own discretion sell electricity to farmers and to all small communities that cannot be profitably served by other privately owned power companies.

It's a sensible set-up. We've said so several times. But of late we have had a feeling, a hunch, that all was not above the board in REA. We noted they had expanded their pay rolls to take in public-relations employees. We noted that money was not available for extension of lines. We had no time or inclination to dig into the situation; but we had a feeling that the fellows back home who have been on the front line fighting for better service for REA have not been told all the things that were going on in brass-hat circles.

Last week our hunch was proven true. In a sensational disclosure, our own Congressman BOYD TACKETT flushed the covey from the bushes—and there it was: the blackbirds of the SPA had gone to roost with the REA. The bureaucrats of the Southwest Power Administration, evidently in cahoots with the higher-ups in REA, had concocted a clever plan to set up a giant power empire here in the Southwest—in positive defiance of the decision of Congress.

TACKETT deserves a vote of thanks for his fearless disclosure. He did some immediate good—loans that had been held up for months upon months were immediately allowed by the REA. Many farmers can soon get the electric service they had been promised for month after month.

But it's not all thanks that he's getting. TACKETT is catching criticism for his stand in the matter. The "public relations" men supported by tax funds have sent out the word that he is "ruining REA." There's not a word of truth in it. TACKETT is the best friend REA ever had. In fact, we believe that he has saved REA as we have known and admired it.

We know that talks on Government are dull things; but, honestly, if the people don't awaken to their dangers, it is going to be too late to claim there is freedom in our democracy.

This SPA-REA combine is a fair example of what is going on right under our noses under the guise of "good government." Let's study it a minute.

The SPA is a Government bureau, created by Congress. Its task was simple. Its job was to take control and to sell electricity generated by water power at dams along the streams here in the Southwest. The SPA was to do nothing more than hook all this electricity together and to sell it—to REA first, to other companies second.

But SPA seems to be made up of a remnant of a mob of schemers once quite popular in Washington under the name of "Brain Trust." They want more than just electricity to sell. They must want to operate with tax money the same kind of "big business" which they denounce as "dangerous to democracy." Their idea is to have the Government set up a power empire to drive the privately owned companies out of business. So they asked Congress for more money. And Congress said "No." SPA was not to be a Government manufacturing business.

Well, now, the REA has money for power plants. In fact, one is to be built down here at Ozark. Congress, which has always been friendly to REA, told REA to buy their electric power from private companies such as the O. G. & E. and the Arkansas Power & Light, or to buy from SPA. And if the two agencies, one privately owned, the other owned by the Government, couldn't supply REA with electricity at a fair rate, Congress

gave REA authority, and funds, to build its own power plants.

It was that last item that the SPA schemers grabbed onto. TACKETT charged, and we have heard no denials, that SPA seduced the REA in Washington to borrow the money to build the power plants. And when REA completed the plants, they were to lease them to SPA on a long-term basis. Eventually SPA, without authority by law, would acquire the plants that were owned by the farmers who borrowed the money to build them.

It was a slick scheme to circumvent the will of Congress, and might have succeeded, and may succeed yet, if folks don't wake up to the fact that some big lumps of their tax money are being used to put taxpayers out of business.

We don't like it—and we are pretty sure that farmers around here like John Hobbs and others who have put their money and time in REA don't like it either. I know these men and their ideals. They are not socialistic planners. They don't want the Government to take over private business. I know they are not in harmony with the idea of these bureaucrats who have such schemes.

Well, as one little small-town editor who has fought for REA all the way through, we say: 'Thanks to BOYD TACKETT." His courage will be appreciated some day—we hope it's not too late—as it was in England, to stop the drift toward absolute slavery of all citizenship—through bureaus who are administering so-called good government.

The trouble with bureaus is that they are dictators before the people know it. Once entrenched with authority, the bureau can rule with an iron hand that subdues by the power of the purse. Those who disagree with them are punished by withholding funds, denial of projects, and other methods to beat into line those who disagree. Those are the evils of bureaucratic government. We marvel at the political fortitude of BOYD TACKETT. He has attacked a pretty big tiger.

H. P.

Anti-Semitism in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the February 1950 issue of the Jewish Layman, together with the remarks of our high commissioner, Hon. John J. McCloy:

ON THE RISE AGAIN—ANTI-SEMITISM IN GERMANY

(By Harry Greenstein)

To get an authentic account of the alarming undercurrents in postwar Germany, the Jewish Layman asked Harry Greenstein, former adviser on Jewish affairs to the United States occupation authorities, to comment on the restoration of anti-Semitism and the future of Jewish life in Germany. In reply he sent us a copy of his report to the Secretary of the Army on his observations in Germany and Austria from February to October 1949. The following article contains excerpts of that significant document. Mr. Greenstein recently returned to the United States to resume his position as executive director of the Jewish Charities and Jewish Welfare Fund of Baltimore.

During my tour of duty I found relatively little in Germany of what might be termed overt forms of anti-Semitism. In an occupied country, where basic attitudes are necessarily repressed, this fact is no gauge of the intensity of the anti-Semitism that still exists. No one can work in Germany for even a brief period without being conscious of the deep, underlying hatred and hostility against the Jews. It will take years, perhaps generations, before the virulent form of anti-Semitism will have spent itself.

All competent observers agree that militant nationalism in one form or another has been on the rise in Germany since early 1948. There is a reason to believe that with the creation of the Federal Republic of Germany, it will, in all likelihood, increase. This nationalism which expressed itself without restraint in the speeches of the political candidates of all parties in the recent German elections, is a danger signal which no one can afford to ignore. It is true that the Bonn constitution is democratic in concept and provides for many safeguards for the protection of the basic rights of man. However, constitutions are not self-executing. From the standpoint of the future, what counts is the spirit in which Germany will be governed.

It is highly significant that in the recent elections no party, competing for the votes of the German electorate, found it politically expedient to denounce Hitlerism and its vicious anti-Jewish complex. The generation which grew up during Hitler's regime has been schooled in the leader principle and unless there is decisive rejection of Hitlerism by those elected to high public office, the German masses will continue to nurture the hatreds planted in them by their former leaders.

Chancellor Adenauer and President Heuss took a step in the right direction when, in extending New Year's greetings to the Jews of western Germany and in inviting them to take part in the intellectual, social, and political reconstruction of Germany, they said, "The Jews will not forget—the loyal Germans must not—but together we must overcome our evil inheritance." While these sentiments will be appreciated by people with democratic instincts, wherever they may reside, they will remain hollow words unless the new German Republic takes positive steps to combat anti-Semitism and to disassociate itself from its evil inheritance by a concrete program of action.

On the basis of my observations and work in Germany, I have formed the following conclusions:

1. It is imperative that the occupying powers recognize in anti-Semitism the rejection of the democratic principle and as the unmistakable sign of the resurgence of German nationalism in its most vicious form.

2. It is imperative that those entrusted with authority in Germany be ever vigilant against any manifestations of anti-Semitism and that they deal with it in vigorous and militant fashion.

3. It is imperative that the powers reserved by the authorities in the occupation statute be so exercised as to guide the press and other media of communication in bringing about a genuine regeneration of the German people.

4. From a long-range point of view it is of the utmost importance to develop a positive, democratic program which will reach into the governmental circles, into the church, the family, the schools, and into the daily lives of the German people.

There is no single cure for anti-Semitism. This is true of any country where the disease thrives. It is doubly true of Germany, where, sanctioned by law and dinned into the ears of the old and the young, it had become a national fetish whose validity few people questioned, and fewer had the courage to challenge. It will take at least as much time and effort to destroy the virus of hate as it took the Nazis to implant it in the hearts of the German people. It will be a long and uphill fight, to which all the liberal and enlightened elements, in and out of Germany, will have to apply themselves if any perceptible dent is to be made in meeting this problem.

A conference on the future of the Jews in Germany, conducted at Heidelberg by Mr. Greenstein last September, brought together for the first time in 16 years the major local and international Jewish organizations operating in Germany, and laid the ground work for coordinating efforts of every element in Germany interested in the welfare of Jews.

Facts brought out included:

In 1939, there were approximately 550,000 Jews in Germany; by the end of 1949, the number had been reduced to approximately 30,000.

The remaining community of Jews is over 50 percent intermarried, and in an overwhelming majority of the cases the children of these intermarriages are being raised in the Christian faith.

Hitler and his National Socialists, especially certain SS units, killed in a very short period of time at least 5,000,000 Jews; that is, most of the Jewish people in Europe, including more than four-fifths of the Jews of Germany.

Jewish religious services and education are still carried on in Germany, but there is a shortage of rabbis and schools. In fact, in all of continental Europe today there are only a few Jewish seminaries.

From his experience, Mr. Greenstein concluded:

1. For all practical purposes, the DP chapter in Germany has come to an end.

2. There will continue to be a Jewish community in Germany. Its ultimate size will depend upon such factors as world conditions, economic stability, the duration of our armed occupation of Germany, and the extent to which the German Government makes it possible for all minority groups to feel secure in Germany.

3. Nothing must be permitted to take place which will in any way weaken the restitution law. It is impossible to restore the lives of the millions who were murdered under the Nazi regime. It is, however, possible in some measure to effect a restitution of property of which the dead and the handful of survivors were robbed. The power to render the final decision in restitution cases must rest with an American tribunal and the United States authorities must be vigilant that the restitution cases which reach the courts are expeditiously handled.

4. It is imperative that no person with a Nazi background and record be permitted to hold any position of public responsibility in Germany.

5. The Jews of the world have an important stake in what happens in Germany. In our fast shrinking world every spot on the globe is important. A land which could very well become the rallying point and a source of strength for the reactionary forces of the world is of special importance to the Jew. It is already abundantly clear that Germany will strive to regain its former status in the family of nations and will make every effort to become an important factor in world affairs. The future attitude of Germany toward its Jews, regardless of how large or how small the number may be, will have a profound effect and influence on Jews everywhere.

6. For these reasons I feel it is important that the local Jewish organizations in Germany, specifically the Kultus Gemeinde and the Central Committee of Liberated Jews develop a coordinated program in meeting common Jewish problems.

7. I feel it is equally important that the international Jewish organizations, functioning in Germany, coordinate their efforts and work closely together in safeguarding Jewish rights and in helping create a truly democratic regime in Germany.

It will take many years before we can have an atmosphere of tolerance and breadth of view in Germany. I hope those years will be fewer than some people fear. The attitude of the Jew who remains in Germany will probably have a great deal to do with it. He will be laboring under a strain and will be moving against the current. However, I cannot but believe that with the tenacity, persistence, courage, and vigor of the race and with the habit of honest and fair dealing, the Jew in Germany will be restored to a position which he occupied in the past in this community and will reach even higher levels.

JOHN J. McCLOY,
High Commissioner,
United States Zone, Germany.

Problems of the Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 6, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members a resolution I am introducing today which would create a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on the Problems of the Aging, which would be authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the employment problems of persons who, by reason of their age, are faced with difficulties in securing suitable and adequate employment.

The United States Bureau of Employment Security found in a special survey of six cities in May 1949, that in all six areas studied employers had significant restrictions against the hiring of older workers. The proportion of employers in each city who would hire no one over 44 ranged from 32 percent in Denver, to 79 percent in Birmingham, Ala.

In all six areas older workers remained listed in the active file of the local employment offices longer than younger workers. In one city where a special study was made of a lay-off wave that hit the area at the end of 1948, it was found that workers over 40 were most sharply affected, that employers became increasingly reluctant to hire older workers as unemployment increased the supply from which they could choose, and that where opportunities were available, they were in service industries where the wages and conditions of work were not attractive to younger workers.

Prospects for the future point to an extension and deepening of this problem.

America is aging. One-third of the people of voting age in 1945 were 50 or more years of age; by the year 2000 this proportion will be over 45 percent.

People 65 and over were 4 percent of the total in 1900; today they are 7.5 percent; by 1960 they will be over 9 percent. This is the fastest-growing section of our population.

On the other hand the youngest section is declining. Children under 5 were over 12 percent of the population in 1900. Today they are less than 8 percent.

Every age group below 40 is decreasing in relative size, while every one over 40 is increasing.

The hearings on social security that are now being held by the Senate Committee on Finance have thrown a piercing light on a problem that all of us face.

It is not a new problem.

It has been with us as long as man.

In other times and other civilizations, when people grew old, they were taken to a cave or igloo and left there to die, or otherwise neatly disposed of. We have not done that, at least not quite as openly.

Where a man is a Senator or a Congressman, or even a President, we the people of America, have recognized the contribution he can make from experience. Witness the fact that one-third of our Senators are over 60 years, and almost one-fourth of our Congressmen. To put it more forcefully, more than three-fourths of our entire Congress is over 45 years—an age beyond which most workers seeking employment find the doors closed.

Where a man is a doctor, or a lawyer, or a teacher, or an entrepreneur if you will, age has been recognized as adding to his ability, his experience, his know-how. But for the vast majority of America, the workers, the prospect is indeed dark.

Several hundred years ago, a worker could count on his trade and his skill remaining substantially static. He would live and die a skilled cobbler, a tailor, or blacksmith.

But the modern industrial system is one of rapid and frequent change. No man starting out in one occupation can be certain that it will remain unchanged long enough for him to die in it. On the contrary, the likelihood is that he and it will change many times in the course of his life.

While industry changes more and more rapidly, the working population grows older and older.

There is no doubt that physical and physiological changes occur in the older worker—the worker over 45 years. His strength, his agility, his sight, his speed may be lessened. At the same time his sense of responsibility, his lack of absenteeism, his ability to supervise and train younger workers, his concentration, his stick-to-it-iveness may increase—a fact which employment of older workers during World War II so clearly showed.

As Ewan Clague, commissioner of the Bureau of Labor Statistics so clearly pointed out in his article in the December 1947 issue of the Monthly Labor Review entitled "Employment of the Older Worker":

> Under ideal conditions, the worker would be graduated at about this time into more responsible work, perhaps into some form of supervision or direction of the training of young workers, or "paper" work of some kind which capitalizes his knowledge. If this were the normal outcome, no social or economic problem would arise.

But that is not the normal outcome at the present time.

The common notion is to retire a man or woman of 65, to make them comfortable—not in a cave perhaps, but certainly apart from the steady stream of activity to which they may long to contribute and to which they are capable of contributing in good measure. A man may retire, that is, if he has been able and lucky enough to hold onto one job long enough to derive pension benefits from long employment.

But where a worker is not yet aged, where he is what we call near old—over 45 years of age, like the vast majority of Congress, and looking for a job, then what?

Remember, he is not yet eligible for old-age or retirement assistance, yet he finds employers increasingly reluctant to hire him. He is classed as too old to work. Then what?

The problem as I see it is twofold:

First. What to do with the aging worker, the worker over 65 years who is able, willing, and seeking work, who has some productive years before him, and much experience behind, and

Second. What to do with the near-old worker, the man or woman over 45, who has at least 20 or 25 years, productive years, ahead, and yet whom industry, as it is now developing, finds it increasingly difficult to use?

There is need, therefore, to know the full extent of these employment difficulties: What basis there is in fact, if any—medically, physically, psychologically—for employer opposition to the hiring of workers over 40, what may be done to prolong useful employment opportunities for such workers, and what greater measure of security can be afforded for those who are genuinely beyond working age.

Some governmental and private agencies have already begun to think and work on the problem of an increased aged population in the United States.

I feel that Congress could assist in throwing further and very much needed light on the problem. For that reason I have drawn the following resolution:

Resolution creating a select committee to conduct an investigation and study of the problems of the aging

Whereas today many of our people are being forced to recognize that their age has become a block to their further employment; and

Whereas this is a drain upon their own and the national welfare and tends to obstruct commerce; and

Whereas prospects for the future point to an extension and deepening of this problem: Therefore be it

Resolved, That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Select Committee on Problems of the Aging to be composed of seven Members of the House of Representatives to be appointed by the Speaker, one of whom he shall designate as chairman. Any vacancy occurring in the membership of the committee shall be filled in the same manner in which the original appointment was made.

The committee is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete investigation and study of the employment problems of

persons who, by reason of their age, are faced with difficulties in securing suitable and adequate employment.

The committee shall report to the House (or to the Clerk of the House if the House is not in session) as soon as practicable during the present Congress the results of its investigation and study, together with such recommendations as it deems advisable.

For the purpose of carrying out this resolution the committee, or any subcommittee thereof authorized by the committee to hold hearings, is authorized to sit and act during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, to hold such hearings, and to require, by subpena or otherwise, the attendance and testimony of such witnesses and the production of books, records, correspondence, memoranda, papers, and documents, as it deems necessary. Subpenas may be issued under the signature of the chairman of the committee or any member of the committee designated by him, and may be served by any person designated by such chairman or member.

Freedom Versus Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, the events of recent days have proved that it is possible for the Republicans to become an effective, united party of intelligent opposition to the Fair Deal if the issues are pointed up in such a way as to inspire the more thoughtful people to work for political action.

Adoption of the slogan "Socialism or freedom" is a forward step. Every American who can put two and two together and come up with four as the answer knows that these are the alternatives facing this Nation today. Ten years from now we shall be either a socialistic nation or we shall be a free nation.

It is possible that we still will have a mixed economy, of the type in which many of our people now are suffering, but the odds are against the continuance of the mixed economy. When a nation has gone as far along the road to totalitarianism as this Nation has gone, the time comes when the admixture of freedom and slavery either must become separated or the whole thing becomes slavery.

What we have had for some years is a mixture of wheat and chaff. The time has come when the wheat must be separated from the chaff, or else the whole "shebang" will become polluted.

It is easy enough for any intelligent person to sit down and understand clearly why the present policies of this Administration are leading us to socialism, which is just another name for the controlled state, totalitarianism, or communism.

As millions of our citizens become more and more dependent upon the Federal Government for hand-outs, more and more of them are afraid to speak for fear of jeopardizing the hand-outs. As millions of our citizens become tied up in labor unions dominated by racketeers and goons, there is less and less freedom of speech. A coal miner in a Pennsylvania town spoke out against John L. Lewis the other day. He shortly was run out of town, his name erased from union rolls, and he lost his right to work in that town forever. He swore that he never would go back for fear of his life.

We are losing freedom in these—and hundreds of other—ways, through the steady, unremitting growth of the Federal Government. As Federal expenditures go up, taxes rise. As taxes rise, you and I have less and less left of our income to invest as we please. The Federal Government has more money to invest. It uses the money to start power companies, to build steam plants, to go into various businesses.

Whatever else this may be called, it actually is socialism, under any definitions found in the dictionary. Also, it represents a contraction of the areas of economic freedom. If the Federal Government takes over hotels, naturally the number of privately owned and privately operated hotels shrinks. This is true in the field of electric power and in dozens of other fields possible to name.

The loss of freedom is so gradual, so subtle, that many citizens do not understand what is happening to them. The outward forms of government do not change, perceptibly, but the spirit of government becomes just the opposite of what it has been. It is like a man who is affected with a dread disease that affects his bones, or certain vital portions of his body. He looks the same, but actually his health and vitality are sapped and eaten away. That is what has been happening, is happening, and will continue to happen to our precious freedoms so long as a majority of the people vote for the Fair Deal.

Every one of us should devote all of our available time, effort, ability, and money to fighting against socialism. For, in so doing, we are fighting for nothing less than freedom itself, for ourselves, for our children, and for generations yet unborn.

The Lincoln Day box supper held in Washington was a rousing success because it brought together 12,000 persons who were united for freedom. If every such affair throughout the Nation will emphasize again this fight for freedom against tyranny of a very subtle kind, we can start building the kind of America for which all men of good will yearn.

Abraham Lincoln said that a nation could not exist half slave and half free. He proved in his day that when freedom was an issue the people would not falter, they would not fail. Let us prove it in our day.

Smoking Mice Live Normal Span

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL T. DURHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. DURHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from United States News and World Report for February 3, 1950:

SMOKING MICE LIVE NORMAL SPAN—UNITED STATES EXPERIMENTS FAIL TO PROVE CANCER RISE

Cigarette-smoking mice show this about tobacco:

Cancer—it is just as common among nonsmoking mice as it is among the smokers.

General health—mice who smoke half their lives reach the same ripe age as nonsmokers, none the worse for cigarettes.

Tests of the effect of cigarette smoking on health, conducted by the United States Public Health Service and others, result in these conclusions:

Cigarettes, so far as proof can be established, are not a cause of cancer of the lungs, lips, throat, or other parts of the "smoke tract." There is no clear evidence that smoking tends to shorten life. Digestion, however, does appear to be affected by excessive smoking. Cigarettes probably are harmful for people with some types of heart disorder. Smoking is not, so far as proof goes, a limiting factor in reproduction.

A sharp rise in the incidence of lung cancer—at a time when smoking has increased greatly—has led to the theory that cigarettes are the cause of the lung-cancer rise. To answer that theory, cancer experts of Public Health Service are reporting the results of experiments that they have conducted, using mice for men. Mice were induced to take up smoking, and keep at it for half their normal lives.

Specifically, for 4 hours daily, except Sunday, and for as long as 300 days, these mice were exposed to an automatic cigarette-smoking machine "which closely imitated human smoking habits." The mice used by Dr. Egon Lorenz, Chief of the Government's National Cancer Institute Biophysics Unit, were of the strain most susceptible to lung cancer.

Yet smokers among the mice showed no special tendency to develop lung cancer. In fact, they developed no more cancers in any part of the body than the "control" mice—the nonsmokers.

Dr. W. C. Hueper, Chief of the Institute's Cancer Studies Section, on the basis of these experiments with smoking and nonsmoking mice, makes this observation to United States News and World Report:

"No lung tumors among the mice were induced by smoking. Since other chemical agents can induce lung tumors in this strain of mice within a few months, the conclusion was reached that, under conditions simulating human smoking habits as closely as possible, tobacco smoke is not a cancer-causing agent, at least so far as the lungs of this strain of mice are concerned."

To explore further into the theory of smoke-induced cancers, the research workers repeatedly painted mice in one group with tobacco tar—supposedly a cancer-causing agent. Tobacco tar was injected under the skin of another group. Still another group had tobacco tar suspended in its drinking water. In addition, a tobacco-tar suspension was injected repeatedly into the blood stream of still another group of mice so that tar particles would be lodged in the lungs.

Results, again, were purely negative.

Still another approach was used in the effort to learn whether smoking is a cause of lung cancer. Research scientists reasoned that, if smoking is a cause of cancer, then a spectacular rise should be appearing in the incidence of lung cancer among women, who have taken up the habit in a big way in recent years. Young people, too, should be developing more lung cancers, since cigarette addicts are found more and more among the young. Also, cancer of the lip, tongue, and throat should be on the rise.

Yet there is no evidence that the rise of lung cancer among women is more noticeable than the increase among men, or that any other of these developments have occurred.

Dr. Hueper says, in this regard, "Certainly there is insufficient evidence to support the claim that the recent spectacular rise in the incidence of lung cancer is due to an increase in the smoking habit."

Cancer experts also have an answer for the physicians who report that they have found more lung cancer among smokers than among nonsmokers. Research workers point to proof that the average income of heart patients is far below that of the average person. But that doesn't prove that poverty causes heart trouble. The fact is, as has been shown, that many heart patients have low incomes because their ailment handicaps them.

As Dr. Hueper puts it, "The smoking habit may play a role in the production of human cancer, but the available evidence is in no way conclusive."

Other effects claimed for smoking arouse even more argument among physicians and scientists than the cancer claims. The research scientists, it seems, are less convinced than most physicians and writers on this subject. They are not willing to make dogmatic statements. But on the basis of their judgment, this can be said:

Digestion can be hindered by smoking, especially excessive smoking. Nicotine, in some tests, has stepped up secretion of stomach juices: acid, bile. That could be good. But, if it is overdone, it could be bad. Most experts doubt, for example, that an acid condition from smoking causes stomach ulcer. But they feel that, for the individual who already has an ulcer, smoking, at least excessive smoking, can serve to aggravate the condition. Few physicians fail to order their stomach-ulcer clients to stop smoking cigarettes.

Length of life, it appears, could be shortened by too much smoking, or by any smoking, but nobody seems to know for sure. Some sets of statistics indicate that heavy smokers tend to die at an earlier age than nonsmokers. But, say the experts, a man who is careless about his smoking habits is likely to be careless about his other health habits. Besides, who knows whether a heavy smoker dies at an earlier age from smoking or from the fact that the heavy smoker is likely to be a high-strung individual who wears himself out quickly, anyway?

The mice, again, provide a clue. The Lorenz tests showed that the normal mouse of the type used could look forward to an active life of better than a year and a half whether he took up smoking or not.

There is another clue. Some tests show that smoking increases the individual's blood-sugar level. What that indicates is that the smoker is putting a strain on his central nervous system, is producing energy unnecessarily. Logically, the individual who overdoes that sort of thing should expect to age more rapidly. Whether he actually does is something that has not been proved.

Heart troubles of various types are popularly connected with cigarette smoking. The evidence depends on the type of disorder. For the common angina pectoris, for example, most physicians play it safe and order their patients to reduce their smoking or, for more severe cases, to swear off entirely. Reason is that angina results from an insufficient flow of blood to the heart. And smoking can constrict the blood vessels and reduce that flow still further. But, again, most experts believe that smoking does not cause angina in the first place.

As for high blood pressure, the picture drawn by the experts is hazy. Individuals who are not used to smoking usually get a brief rise in blood pressure by smoking a cigarette. But there is evidence that smoking does not cause permanently high blood pressure. For example, rats subjected to much the same tests as used by Dr. Lorenz showed the same temporary rise in blood pressure. But they developed no permanent condition.

Actually, most physicians—and other scientists—are not much worried about tobacco effects on any but the most severe cases of high blood pressure where complications are present. That goes, too, for arteriosclerosis—hardening and narrowing of the arteries.

Local irritations, it is agreed, can be a result of smoking for some persons. Still, few people develop what might be called a cigarette cough, and these are not always attributable to smoking.

Reproductive processes seem unaffected by tobacco. Smokers among the mice, for example, were just as prolific as their nonsmoking friends.

What seems indicated, in sum, is that the ordinarily healthy individual can get by without serious effects if he smokes in moderation, if he stays within the limits he has established as his tolerance. But individuals who have heart pains, ulcers, or other conditions that seem affected by smoking will do well to take it easy on smoking, or to swear off.

Prospect, however, is that more and more people will take up smoking and complain about how harmful it is. Already, people spend more on smoking than they pay all physicians and dentists together. And, a Government study just out shows, people whose incomes decline cut their spending on tobacco far less than they trim spending on food and doctors.

Has America's Strength Been Sacrificed for So-Called Economies?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL W. SHAFER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a very timely article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop which appeared in the Washington Post and other newspapers. It is an article that I believed should be read by every Member of Congress:

HAS STRENGTH BEEN SACRIFICED FOR JOHNSON'S ECONOMIES?

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON, February 13.—It is a grave act to charge a high official with deliberately misinforming the Nation. But it is graver still for the Nation to be grossly and persistently misled about vital matters, as we are now being misled by Secretary of Defense Louis A. Johnson's many misrepresentations. The time has come to call a spade a spade. Johnson has not been telling the truth about the national defense.

Specifically, on December 7, Johnson told the National Association of Manufacturers that his savings in the defense budget were being made without any reduction in our state of preparedness. He then reiterated this claim in his official annual report, stating that we are obtaining greater national security at less expense. All precautions are being taken, he said, to increase rather than diminish the over-all combat capabilities of the armed forces. Many other similar statements of the Secretary of Defense might also be cited.

Only a few of the facts that flatly and utterly refute these claims of Johnson's can be compressed into the space of a newspaper column. Yet even these few facts are sufficient to prove that the Secretary of Defense has been practicing what amounts to a confidence trick upon the Nation.

As between the services, the Navy is, of course, the heaviest sufferer from Johnsonian "economy." Taking the 1949 strength as the base, and the new budget as the comparison, the fleets at sea are being reduced from 18 cruisers to 13; from 8 heavy carriers to 6; from 5 light and escort carriers to 3; from 155 destroyers to 140; from 79 submarines to 70; and from 439 other active ships to 414. Naval manpower is being drastically cut, and the strength of the Marine Corps, never noted for its overhead, is being reduced by nearly the equivalent of a division, down to 72,000 men.

In the air, the Navy's attack carrier groups are being cut from 14 to 9, with further weakening of the fighting strength of each group.

Nor is this the worst. Johnson has also taken his axe to the vital replacement of obsolescent and obsolete aircraft. The 1951 budget will give the Navy only about 60 percent of the new planes which are needed to keep even the shrunken naval and marine air arms continuously provided with fully modern types.

The case of the Air Force is less dramatic, but hardly less grave. As everyone knows, all competent authorities, including the Joint Chiefs of Staff, have established an Air Force of 70 groups as the minimum needed to provide adequate offensive striking power, reasonable air support for our ground armies, and minimum air defense. Working toward this goal, the Air Force had activated (but not equipped) more than 54 groups. Then came the cut-back to 48 groups. The 15 activated heavy-bomber groups were maintained. But tactical groups, including light bomber and fighter, were reduced from 32 to 27, and troop-carrier groups were cut from 7 to 6.

The Air Force retains as many planes as in 1949. But the Air Force, like the naval air arm, is not being permitted to keep its group continuously provided with modern aircraft. For this purpose more than $1,700,000,000 was requested when the budget was being prepared. The figure allowed under the Johnsonian "economy" program is $1,300,000,000.

This means that the Air Force replacement rate has been cut approximately 25 percent below what is thought necessary to keep the 48 authorized air groups fully ready for modern war.

In the Army alone genuine economies have been made without cuts in combat strength. By the firm insistence of Secretary of the Army Gordon Gray, the fighting units of the ground forces remain what they were. Even so, with our ground force strength stationary, and our naval and air power being continuously impaired, our net loss of strength is already very great. And the loss will be far greater still if this process goes on.

Johnson has, to be sure, succeeded in paring something from the outrageously swollen overheads of the services. He has also saved funds by eliminating such foolishly competitive enterprises as the giant carrier. Yet the facts cited above add up to only one possible conclusion—outright sacrifices of strength account for the vast bulk of Johnson's economies.

This Johnson has repeatedly denied. One must take one's choice, therefore, between two views—either the Secretary of Defense is too hopelessly incompetent to recognize a cut in combat capabilities when he makes it or he stands convicted of untruth in detail as charged.

Repeal the Wartime Excise Taxes Now

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, following is a statement which I submitted to the Ways and Means Committee today. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

Mr. Chairman, I want to take this opportunity to express my thanks and appreciation to you and the members of this committee for allowing me to present my statement.

It is my earnest conviction that the wartime excise taxes very definitely constitute a case of taxation without justification. The sooner we repeal these burdensome taxes which are stifling business activity in our country, the sooner we shall help bolster the general economy and maintain our high level of employment.

Ever since I have been a Member of Congress I have advocated the repeal of all wartime excise taxes. I have introduced bills, both in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congress, calling for the termination of these wartime excise taxes, including the tax on retail sales of furs, jewelry, cosmetics, and luggage; the tax on admissions to movies, theaters, and other forms of amusement; the manufacturers' excise tax on electric, gas, and oil appliances; the manufacturers' tax on electric light bulbs and tubes; the tax on electrical energy which is sold for domestic or commercial consumption; the tax on transportation of persons and property; the tax on communications, including telegraph, telephone, radio, and cable facilities, the tax on photographic equipment, and others.

In fact, I was so fearful of a serious setback to certain of the trades and industries affected, that last July, I initiated a petition to bring out of committee one of my bills calling for elimination of the retail excise taxes in order to obtain action on it on the floor of the House of Representatives. Unfortunately, my fears were verified by subsequent developments in several of these industries. The fur industry, for example, recorded a drop in sales last year of 30 percent as compared with 1946 and a drop in employment of 60 percent. Something similar has happened in the jewelry industry.

Today I am even more firmly convinced of how detrimental the excise taxes are on our economic life. In fact, I would urge the committee to eliminate the taxes not only on the items I mentioned above, covered by the bill referred to in my discharge petition, but to extend that list considerably to include many more items, before additional industries are just as badly affected and our whole economy seriously undermined.

In the case of transportation of persons, we have in effect a 15-percent tax. During the war the railroads were operating at full capacity and it was therefore important to discourage unnecessary travel, which the tax did. Now we hear of a reduction in travel of between 25 and 40 percent. Instead of encouraging business we are still following our wartime policy of discouragement.

The tax on theater admissions is 20 percent. We have all heard of the terrific crisis in the theater and movie industries which have been hard-hit by the admissions tax. I mean the little people, the owners of the thousands of movie houses and theaters throughout the country and the many thousands of people who depend on them for a livelihood. Relaxation is recognized by medical authorities today as a necessity not a luxury. Yet the admissions tax deprives thousands of our lowest- and middle-income earners of this vital and often only means of relaxation.

The tax on photographic equipment is one of the highest—25 percent. During the war the excise tax imposed on cameras and photographic materials was justified on the ground it helped to discourage civilian consumption of these articles in order that they might be available for wartime purposes. There is no longer any justification for this tax, particularly since the demand for these articles has been considerably reduced due to the high prices still in effect because of the tax.

Similarly high is the tax on communications: 25 percent on telegraph, cable, radio, and long-distance telephone, and 15 percent on local telephone service. In our modern system of living these services no longer constitute a luxury, but are a vital and essential part of our daily life. This tax should be entirely eliminated or drastically reduced.

Take a little item like electric-light bulbs, on which there is a 20-percent tax. Are electric-light bulbs a luxury item today? Is electrical energy for our homes and business establishments to be regarded a luxury? Or appliances for the preparation of food, whether gas, electric, or oil fueled? The tax on these items serves only to discourage homeowners and hotel and restaurant operators from purchasing necessary equipment to replace some of the obsolete equipment of prewar days.

I could go on in this fashion and cite other instances as to how excise taxes are affecting conditions in many industries. The examples cited, I believe, are sufficient to indicate the seriousness of the situation and the need for speedy action. The excise taxes, as you well know, were imposed during the war not so much for the purpose of raising revenue, but to restrict consumer purchases of these items and to preserve basic raw materials which were in short supply at the time. It was universally understood by our people that as soon as the war was over, these war measures would be repealed and the excise taxes would be removed. The Congress promised as much.

Here we are in the fifth year since the end of the war and to date we have failed to keep our promise to the American people. But while there may have been some justification for continuing these taxes in the early postwar years until the supply caught up with the the demand and while business activity remained at an all-time high, there is certainly no justification for it today.

No valid reason exists now for retaining such burdensome taxes, which are properly called nuisance taxes. To continue such taxes in normal times is to undermine the economic foundation of many important industries in this country and to destroy the confidence of the people in the legislative branch of our Government.

In the fiscal year which ended June 30, 1948, the United States Treasury obtained $470,000,000 from retail excise taxes. In the fiscal year ending June 30, 1949, the total income obtained by our Treasury from this source was $449,000,000, a decrease of $21,000,000 in one year. I am certain that at the end of the present fiscal year it will be still less. This in itself, the steady decline of revenue from these excise taxes, is the best proof of the effect it is having on our industries and how it is paralyzing economic activity in these trades. This alone justifies the repeal of the retail taxes.

None of the raw materials used in the manufacture of these items, which we sometimes label erroneously as luxury items, is today in short supply. Supply has long ago caught up with demand, so that now these industries need incentives and inducements to consumers in order to maintain in a sufficiently high level of production and sales which will prove profitable. All of these industries are suffering from consumer resistance which is bound to increase in the coming year if restrictions on retail sales continue as heretofore.

I am also fearful of the effect this will have in the near future on the employment situation, not only in the industries affected by the excise taxes where already considerable unemployment is being reported, but even in other fields beginning with the production of basic raw materials and continuing through each successive step of manufacture and wholesaling of the component parts, as well as the retailing of the finished articles.

It is now generally conceded that the Government is losing almost as much, if not more, in potential income-tax revenues as it has been collecting from luxury taxes. By the repeal of the excise taxes we shall make possible the release of some $400,000,000 annually into consumer purchases. The overall sales resulting from this release will bring increased income tax and profits tax to make up this loss.

Governor Driscoll's Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GORDON CANFIELD
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the New York Herald Tribune today editorializes as follows on the speech of Governor Driscoll before the National Republican Club at the annual Lincoln Day dinner in New York last Monday night:

GOVERNOR DRISCOLL'S SPEECH

The annual Lincoln Day dinner of the National Republican Club in New York found upon the platform two Republican governors who share the merit of having faced and dealt with the most pressing problems of the modern State. Governor Dewey spoke briefly, introducing Governor Driscoll as the chief executive of a State government that is clean, solvent, and progressive. Mr. Driscoll has aroused much interest since he won reelection last fall, the first New Jersey Governor to succeed himself and the only Republican to win high office in the scattered elections of that time. Not well known to his neighbors, New Yorkers had an opportunity on Monday night to hear him speak on the broadest of national problems.

The Governor revealed himself a man of prudent speech and of liberal ideas. He took his stand squarely with that wing of the party which demands something more than obstruction and negations: "Let us not divide our house against itself," he said, "by our inability to say 'Yes'." "The Republican Party," he continued, recalling the progressive tradition of Lincoln, "is committed to a government fully conscious of the needs of our industrial age, ready and willing to take care of its casualties whenever and wherever they may occur." But at the same time Mr. Driscoll warned against the extravagances, the waste, and the defeatest reliance upon big government which marks the opposition. "The real issues of today," he summed up, "are essentially of method rather than objective."

To emphasize method, to insist that the way a thing is done is no less important than the doing, takes the courage of lucidity and clear purpose. Finding that the Democrats led the country into a dissipation of its resources and a debasement of its ideals, the easy way is to condemn their goals, root, and branch. But that can be a fatal way for a great party, bent on recapturing national power. The harder, but

in the end the more hopeful course is to maintain, as Governor Driscoll did, that the goals of a stable and progressive society can be pursued by means compatible with individual judgment, initiative, and responsibility. As Governor of an industrial State, Governor Driscoll has a chance to exemplify what he teaches; and the party could scarcely do better than to search both his words and his deeds for light upon the path ahead.

Great Caution Should Be Used in Filling Vacancies on Federal Reserve Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL W. SHAFER
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. SHAFER. Mr. Speaker, President Truman will soon be called upon to fill two vacancies on the Federal Reserve Board. This will be a great responsibility for the Chief Executive. The importance of his action is well stated in a press release which appeared in Washington newspapers over the week end. The release, I understand, was issued by a highly respected Member of the other body and should be available to every Member of Congress. Therefore, under permission to extend my remarks, I include this statement which I commend to all Members:

FEDERAL RESERVE VACANCIES

There are two vacancies to be filled on the present Federal Reserve Board. This Board, as you know, was set up to act as an independent regulator of the country's financial policies and was never designed to be a tool of the executive branch. It is supposed to be nonpolitical and nonpartisan. The Board is designed to serve as a traffic light in national fiscal policy.

It is important for the American people and our democratic institutions that these very fine and important positions, paying $15,000 a year for 14-year terms, should be filled by men of independence and caution. The credit of the Nation is nothing to be trifled with. We must be strong financially to stand the strains from within and without nowadays.

There has been a tendency of late on the part of the Board to move closer to the orbit of the White House. That is against the spirit of the law which created the Board. This Board could very well be packed to agree to the fiscal policies laid down by the White House and the Treasury. There are reports in Washington that this is a possibility. Let me point out that the line of control from the White House to the Treasury to the Board could well have as its ultimate result the control of the banks through the Board's credit policies and through the banks to the industries of the country.

The Board has embarked in recent years on some radical actions which are more or less questionable. If we do not get independent men as new appointees these questionable actions might well become rules of future action. The subject of the consumer's dollar is a precious one in this country. I am sure the President will realize that a strong, independent Federal Reserve Board, acting according to the intent of Congress and not moving in the White House orbit at all, is an asset which the American people cannot well afford to lose.

Object Lesson in Race Relations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the following article appeared in the New York Times magazine of February 12, 1950. It is extremely apropos as well as most enlightening. The author of the article, Gen. Thomas F. Farrell, is chairman of the New York City Housing Authority, a position which he took up after the end of the war. During the war he served with distinction as a major general in the Engineers and as Deputy Commander of the atom bomb project. His article follows:

OBJECT LESSON IN RACE RELATIONS—NEW YORK CITY'S PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS DEMONSTRATE THAT NEGROES AND WHITES CAN LIVE TOGETHER AS GOOD NEIGHBORS

(By Thomas F. Farrell)

"Therefore be at peace henceforward
And as brothers live together."
—*Longfellow.*

This week the new nondiscrimination policy of the Federal Housing Administration and Veterans' Administration will be put into effect. There is no crystal-ball answer on how well these policies will work, but it may be helpful to look at the experience of New York City's public housing projects where Negro and white families have lived side by side as neighbors for the last 10 years.

While the results may be less than are demanded by those who want full race equality at once, in New York City there has been definite and increasing progress in the serious problem of getting people of different races to live together in peace with mutual respect and trust.

The New York City Housing Authority first adopted nonsegregated housing as a policy with the opening of Red Hook Houses in 1939, the first project in New York City completed under the Federal Housing Act of 1937. In its previous public housing projects—two built under the Public Works Administration and a small group of rehabilitated buildings—the tenants with one or two exceptions had been completely segregated, with the Negroes selected for Harlem and the whites for Brooklyn and the lower East Side. The management staff for each project was largely selected in the same way. At the start of Harlem River Houses in 1936 it was apparently assumed that all tenants would be Negroes.

It is interesting to speculate on the reasons why, only 3 years later, nonsegregation was not only possible at Red Hook Houses but was a declared policy of the people of New York State in the then new public housing law which required that no person shall, because of race, creed, color, or national origin, be subjected to any discrimination.

Perhaps widespread interest in public housing explains such a major change in public opinion, although there is no question that Negroes made gains in other fields at the time. Whatever the reasons for the law, Negro and white families were assigned to their apartments in the same building and on the same floor at Red Hook Houses, perhaps with some reservation about the outcome.

In those early days the number of Negroes was kept small—24 families out of 2,545. At that time a delegation of white women tenants visited the manager to suggest that all Negroes be moved to one all-Negro building. The manager pointed out the logical conclusion to that proposal—an all-Italian building, an all-Irish building, an all-German building, and since there were 38 nationalities and only 25 buildings, under their plan some tenants would have to get out. He then offered for their consideration another way of doing it—all-Catholic, all-Jewish, all-Lutheran buildings. They were intelligent enough to get the point.

Although there were objections to Red Hook's new Negro tenants from the neighborhood and, of course, occasional arguments between tenants, no serious trouble developed.

At stair-hall meetings, tenants and staff discussed their problems and gradually got acquainted, although, on the whole, the first tenants treated each other with considerable reserve. In the sitting areas on the grounds, white mothers grouped themselves and their baby carriages together, and Negro mothers wheeled their carriages to a place apart. After some weeks a white mother asked a Negro mother to keep an eye on her child while she went to her apartment. The Negro woman gladly agreed and the ice was broken.

Soon white women were performing the same favor. Then came a rotation plan, with each mother taking her turn in looking after all the children. Later there was some visiting of each other's apartments and shopping together. The barriers were gradually lowered within the limits of the project. But outside the project there was a difference in their relationship. On the whole, families did not go to Coney Island together, nor visit each other's friends on the outside, nor go to the movies together.

The situation remains much the same today at Red Hook Houses. The families may feel that their friendship would not be understood by outsiders; it is a project affair. Or, more likely, the relationship which develops between two families living in one building—whether they are both white, both Negro, or mixed—is merely a neighborly one, as it is in private housing, and the instance when a solid and lasting friendship ripens is unusual. Negro and white families have the same tolerance and consideration for each other as other apartment dwellers. One white woman, a grandmother baby-sitting with her two grandchildren at Amsterdam Houses, summed it up to an inquiring sidewalk sociologist: "They're no different. They mind their own business and I mind mine. When people mind their own business they get along."

Since 1939 all public housing projects have been nonsegregated, and more Negro families have moved into Red Hook Houses and into the almost all-white Williamsburg Houses as vacancies occurred.

It may be pointed out that most public housing projects were built in areas already occupied by many racial groups. There were several reasons why a project would be likely to have among its tenants the same kind of people already in the neighborhood. Families moving from the site to make way for the project were given first preference in the new apartments if they met the eligibility standards. A heavy percentage of applications came from the neighborhood families who had watched the buildings rise. People want to remain in their own neighborhood. Negroes and whites alike want to be near the stores, churches, clubs, and movies which they use and are used by people they know. Applicants were allowed to express a preference among the projects, which was honored whenever possible. As a result there have been no drastic upheavals of populations, no great moving of large numbers of Negroes into areas predominantly white, no great moving of large numbers of whites into areas predominantly Negro.

These conditions may have helped the nonsegregation policy to succeed, but the atti-

tude of the manager and his staff, who are thoroughly "briefed" before being charged with carrying out the policy, has always been an important factor. Since staff members are assigned, like tenants, without regard to race, the tenant expects fair treatment. Although some families may feel they have the hardest-hearted landlord in the city, complaints about race discrimination are rare. Meetings with tenants whenever they ask for them, and a conscious effort to see that normal arguments do not develop into racial issues, are helpful.

When a project is built in an area where there are no Negro families, as in the case of the postwar projects built on vacant land, there is sometimes a more difficult experience with the neighborhood. Taxpayers' organizations and civic associations may object to the project because, they say, and very likely believe, it would "tend to depreciate realty values." They are often quite vocal, suggesting that the project would be filled with "undesirables." While such groups rarely become specific, they sometimes refer to the "intrusion of the Negro."

At the ground-breaking ceremony for Woodside Houses in Queens, a group of objectors picketed the ceremony with signs accusing the authority of communism. At earlier public hearings, the small group of protesting citizens warned of dire results to the neighborhood if the project was approved. Now that Woodside Houses has been completed and fully occupied, including about 8 percent Negro families, the furor has died down, and the surrounding area is being built up with business properties.

Instead of depreciating realty values, there is evidence that they have been increased, as anyone who drives around the project can see. Once a large vacant tract, the construction of new shops kept pace with the project, and when the tenants moved in, the stores were ready for business. The Negro tenants have met no hostility in the community. A Negro tenant was amazed to learn of objections from the neighborhood before Woodside houses was built. "Why, the shopkeepers are just grand to us," she insisted.

Administering this policy of nondiscrimination and nonsegregation is not left to luck and good will. We must be sure that tenants are selected on their need alone, and once a project is open its business must be conducted smoothly. Although much of the problem is one of human relations and justice, there are two objective measures used as safeguards.

In the selection of tenants, based on need, with priority for former site residents and veterans, the following things are done to assure equal treatment: Preliminary registrations, on which there is no information about race, are filed by mail. The information is translated into code numbers and the name into a serial number, and punched on International Business Machine cards. Families are called for interviews as they are sorted by machines, according to their need and priority.

The second measure is to require that all public facilities in a project, such as nursery schools and recreation programs, are operated on an interracial and interfaith basis. Many an otherwise worthy organization has been refused space because its interest is limited to the members of one faith or one race. In contrast, the Urban League has adopted an interracial program in opperating one of our nursery schools, and several Catholic and Jewish groups have adopted interfaith recreation and child-care programs in our projects.

Hewing a middle course, we often make a target for so-called public-interest groups representing both points of view on nondiscrimination. Once we got caught in a crossfire between two special interest groups, both supporting nondiscrimination wholeheartedly. One group suspected that we must be discriminating, since we kept records of the tenant's race; they had frequently asked for the statistics but thought it discriminating to keep records to provide these statistics. The other group suggested that we should maintain definite proportions of minority groups, including Negroes; they objected to calling it a "quota" system but said that a "conscious effort should be made to secure heterogeneity in occupancy"—whatever that may mean.

One group says we should have a leavening of religions as well as races. Others say we should waive the veterans' preference, required by law, in order to avoid a monotony of relatively young families in a development. Some who preach nondiscrimination urge us to check on a person's race before assignment to a particular project in a particular section of the city, so that a proper distribution can be made. To these critics our director of management answers: "There is only one way to carry out our policy of nondiscrimination, and that is not to discriminate." It's as simple as that.

Children play a big part in welding the white and Negro families together. One is reminded of the South Pacific lyric, You've Got To Be Taught To Hate. A lot of the business of living centers around the care, schooling, and play of the children. The attitude of the children toward their neighbor children is carried into the home of the parents. Our chief of community activities finds that the 2-to-5-year-olds seem completely unaware of adult racial prejudices, though they notice and point out the fact that you're black or you're white.

She tells the story of two 4-year-old girls, one Negro and one white, in a preschool center, who were fast friends. One day they had a fight which ended with each child screaming at the other. The next day the white girl came in with a bag of candy and told her friend of the day before that she couldn't have any because she was black. She then gave candy to all the other children, Negro and white, and said to the Negro teacher, "Of course, you'll have to get some because I love you."

Three years ago a staff writer from a national magazine made an investigation of Kingsborough Houses with the aim of debunking a news story reporting on how well the Negroes and whites lived together. After interviewing many people he finally found a white tenant with a bitter complaint about her Negro neighbor. She delivered a long oration, relating in all its details a housewife's argument over a borrowed tray of ice cubes, and ended with, "And it makes my blood boil when I think of the soup I used to make for that woman when she was sick!"

How do the tenants feel about nonsegregated housing? A veteran of World War II, now a policeman, summed it up this way: "Well, I was sort of worried when I came to Amsterdam, but, you know, I've learned a lot. They're just like the whites. When people are decent their color doesn't count." Or, as the manager of Amsterdam Houses reports, if some trace of prejudice remains they may say, "The Negroes in the project are O. K.; it's the ones across the street that we don't like."

The effect of housing projects on neighborhoods has been generally good. There has been no tendency for neighborhood people to move away because of the projects. The projects are well built and are well maintained. Business in the neighborhood improves. With rare exceptions the tenants are good neighbors.

Just how far has nondiscrimination gone and what does it mean? It would not be right to claim too much.

All white families in public housing have not immediately become friends of the Negro race, nor is the reverse true. Conditions vary between projects; in general, the older the projects and the longer families live together the better friends and neighbors they become.

The effects of nonsegregation are largely limited to the families within the project boundaries, although as far as the commerce of the neighborhood is concerned Negro families are generally welcome.

Racial intermarriage is not involved, nor are the problems of discrimination in employment, places of amusement, hotels, and in other activities. Human nature has not changed and some strife between persons of the same race or of different races will continue as before.

Within the projects, the results have been solid and enduring. In the business of raising families, of children playing together, of lending a hand in emergencies, of living side by side in peace, much has been done. In caring for each other's children, helping in sickness, working together in tenants' organizations and social and athletic events; in practicing tolerance in the best sense of the word, the tenants have raised a little the iron curtain between races.

Race prejudice dies hard—and often comes to life when seemingly dead. It has taken a long time and required great effort to get this far ahead and there is a long way to go. There are many to whom nondiscrimination is largely an abstract ideal to talk about, but in New York City's public housing it is a reality. It can work; it is working.

The President's Address at the Law Enforcement Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the thoughtful address delivered by President Truman in Washington on February 14 at the Law Enforcement Officers' Conference, which was called by Attorney General McGrath.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Attorney General and gentlemen of the conference, when the Attorney General told me of his plan to hold this conference, I welcomed the idea. It seemed to me that it would be most useful for Federal, State, and local officials concerned with law-enforcement problems to gather together to devise ways and means of making law enforcement better and more effective.

There has been a substantial postwar increase in crime in this country, particularly in crimes of violence. This is disturbing, but it is one of the inevitable results of war, and the dislocations which spring from war. It is one of the many reasons why we must work with other nations for a permanent peace.

I might remind you that after every war this country has ever been engaged in, we have had exactly the same problems to face. After the Revolutionary War, we had almost exactly the same problems with which we are faced now, out of which came the alien and sedition laws, which we finally had to repeal because they did not agree with the Bill of Rights.

Then, after the War Between the States, or the Civil War, we had all sorts of banditry. My State was famous for some of the great bandits of that time, if you recall. We had

the same situation after World War I. We had a terrible time then with the increase in crimes of violence. We managed to handle the situation, and I am just as sure as I stand here that we will do it again.

This postwar increase in crime has been accompanied by a resurgence of underworld forces—forces which thrive on vice and greed. This underworld has used its resources to corrupt the moral fiber of some of our citizens and some of our communities. It carries a large share of the responsibility for the general increase in crime in the last few years.

This is a problem that, in one degree or another, affects every community in the country, and every level of government. Our rural areas as well as our cities are involved in this.

MUST AID GENTLER FORCES

It is important, therefore, that we work together in combating organized crime in all its forms. We must use our courts and our law-enforcement agencies and the moral forces of our people to put down organized crime wherever it appears.

At the same time we must aid and encourage gentler forces to do their work of prevention and cure. These forces include education, religion, and home training, family and child guidance, and wholesome recreation.

The most important business in this Nation—or any nation, for that matter—is raising and training children. If those children have the proper environment at home and educationally, very, very few of them ever turn out wrong. I don't think we put enough stress on the necessity of implanting in the child's mind the moral code under which we live.

The fundamental basis of this Nation's law was given to Moses on the Mount. The fundamental basis of our Bill of Rights comes from the teachings which we get from Exodus and St. Matthew, from Isaiah and St. Paul. I don't think we emphasize that enough these days.

If we don't have the proper fundamental moral background, we will finally wind up with a totalitarian government which does not believe in rights for anybody except the state.

Above all, we must recognize that human misery breeds most of our crime. We must wipe out our slums, improve the health of our citizens, and eliminate the inequalities of opportunities which embitter men and women and turn them toward lawlessness. In the long run these programs represent the greatest of all anticrime measures.

And I want to emphasize particularly equality of opportunity. I think every child in the Nation, regardless of his race, creed, or color, should have the right to a proper education. And when he has finished that education, he ought to have the right in industry to fair treatment in employment. If he is able and willing to do the job, he ought to be given a chance to do that job, no matter what his religious connections are, or what his color is.

I am particularly anxious that we should do everything within our power to protect the minds and hearts of our children from the moral corruption that accompanies organized crime. Our children are our greatest resource, and our greatest asset—the hope of our future and the future of the world.

STRESS ON IDEALISM URGED

We must not permit the existence of conditions which cause our children to believe that crime is inevitable and normal. We must teach idealism—honor, ethics, decency, the moral law. We must teach that we should do right because it is right, and not in the hope of any material reward.

That is what our moral code is based on: Do to the other fellow as you would have him do to you. If we would continue that all through our lives, we wouldn't have organized crime—if everybody would do that.

Our local, State, and Federal law-enforcement agencies have a major role to play in this whole task of crime suppression.

As law enforcement officers, you have great powers. At the same time, you must never forget that hand in hand with those powers go great responsibilities. You must make certain that these powers are not used for personal gain, or from any personal motive. Too often organized crime is made possible by corruption of law-enforcement officials.

But, far more than that, we must always remember that you are officers of the law in a great democratic Nation which owes its birth to the indignation of its citizens against the encroachment of police and governmental powers against their individual freedoms.

Now there isn't any difference, so far as I can see, in the manner in which totalitarian states treat individuals than there is in the racketeers' handling of these lawless rackets with which we are sometimes faced. And the reason that our Government is strong, and the greatest democracy in the world, is because we have a Bill of Rights.

You should be vigilant to enforce the laws which protect our citizens from violence or intimidation in the exercise of their constitutional and legal rights. The strength of our institutions depends in large measure upon the vigorous efforts to prevent mob violence and other forms of interference with basic rights—the right to a fair trial, the right to vote, and the right to exercise freedom of speech, assembly, and petition.

It is just as much your duty to protect the innocent as it is to prosecute the guilty. The friendless, the weak, the victims of prejudice and public excitement are entitled to the same quality of justice and fair play that the rich, the powerful, the well-connected, and the fellow with pull thinks he can get.

Moreover, the guilty as well as the innocent are entitled to due process of law. They are entitled to a fair trial. They are entitled to counsel. They are entitled to fair treatment from the police. The law-enforcement officer has the same duty as the citizen—indeed, he has a higher duty—to abide by the letter and spirit of our Constitution and laws. You yourselves must be careful to obey the letter of the law. You yourselves must be intellectually honest in the enforcement of the law.

THE RESPONSIBILITY OF OFFICE

Now, as President of the United States, I have the most honorable and the greatest job in the world—the greatest position that can come to any man on earth. I am invested with certain great powers by the Constitution of the United States in the operation of the Government of the United States.

But, I was put into this place by the people of the United States. I am the servant of the people. And in the first place, I am a citizen of this great country. And as a citizen it is my duty as President of the United States to be exceedingly careful in obedience to the Constitution and the laws of this great Nation.

I believe that as President it is necessary for me to be more careful in obeying the laws than for any other person to be careful. I never infringe a traffic rule. I never exercise the prerogatives which I sometimes have of going through red lights. I never exercise the prerogative of taking advantage of my position as President of the United States, because I believe, first, that I am a citizen, and that as a citizen I ought to obey the laws first and foremost.

And every one of you has that same responsibility. You yourselves, as I said, must be intellectually honest in the enforcement of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. And if you are not, you are not a good public official.

I know that it would be easier to catch and jail criminals if we did not have a Bill of Rights in our Federal and State Constitutions, but I thank God every day that it is there, that that Bill of Rights is a fundamental law. That is what distinguishes us from the totalitarian powers. I am confident that you share these convictions with me, and that you will not lose sight of them in your efforts to wipe out organized crime and reduce lawlessness.

I know that your discussions here will be fruitful. I hope that you develop a sound plan by means of which the cooperative efforts of every American law-enforcement agency will be effectively brought to bear upon organized crime.

Your task does not end with today's meeting. It only begins with today's meeting. The spade work must be done in the communities where you live and work. It will be your task to mobilize local opinion and resources against organized crime and the conditions which create it.

In this task I pledge my wholehearted support.

Thank you very much.

Amendment of the Antitrust Laws

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, on January 23 I introduced Senate bill 2912 to amend the antitrust laws so as to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraints by labor organizations. This morning I testified on behalf of that measure before a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee. Since the issue involved is one of national importance and inasmuch as my statement before the subcommittee is not unduly long, I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, for the information of Members of the Congress.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR A. WILLIS ROBERTSON (DEMOCRAT OF VIRGINIA) BEFORE A SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE CONSIDERING HIS BILL (S. 2912) TO PROTECT TRADE AND COMMERCE AGAINST UNREASONABLE RESTRAINTS BY LABOR ORGANIZATIONS

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to discuss with you my bill S. 2912 which is intended to protect trade and commerce against unreasonable restraint by labor organizations.

This bill was written following hearings which I conducted on behalf of the Banking and Currency Committee. The committee report, following these hearings, concluded that, "The order of the United Mine Workers imposing a 3-day workweek is the very antithesis of collective bargaining. If this usurpation and abuse of the power to control production and price is tolerated by the Congress, its unbridled use will quickly spread from union to union, from industry to industry, and the Congress will never regain its own narrowly circumscribed power to control the economy of the Nation con-

sistently with the Constitution of the United States."

My bill was predicated upon these findings in the belief that labor leaders and labor unions have the power, and will continue to have the power until Congress acts, to unreasonably restrain trade to any extent their whims dictate, including control of production and prices by unlawful means as well as lawful means.

At this point I would like to offer for the files of your committee, the printed hearings upon the Economic Power of Labor Organizations which were held by the Senate Banking and Currency Committee from July 25 to August 26, 1949.

I also should like to offer, as part of your record, Senate Report No. 1234, Eighty-first Congress, second session, which resulted from these hearings and, as an exhibit, a topical digest of the testimony.

I might point out here that although these hearings were held, at my suggestion, because of an acute situation which existed with regard to the coal industry, our inquiry was not confined to that industry but covered the whole industrial field. At these hearings we asked witnesses to tell us whether or not labor unions were using monopolistic powers in an effort to control prices or production in a manner that was adverse to the public interest in any industry and we also asked those concurring in this view to suggest possible remedies.

Witnesses heard by the Banking and Currency Committee told us that labor monopolies exist in various stages of the process of making numerous commodities. Detailed information was given as to how this monopoly power has been exercised by the United Mine Workers Union and the direct and indirect effect of this on transportation, manufacturing and other industries, on commercial enterprises and on private individuals.

It was testified, for example, that John L. Lewis first proposed to the coal mine operators that a 3-day workweek be instituted on a voluntary basis. If the operators had consented, of course they would have been subject to action under the antitrust laws for entering into a conspiracy with the union to control production. The possibility of such prosecution was clearly shown by the action in the case of *Allen Bradley* v. *Local Union No. 3, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers* (325 U. S. 797).

But when the operators refused to join in such a conspiracy, Mr. Lewis, on June 30, 1949, addressed a letter to all of his local unions in which he advised and instructed the miners as follows: "All members in all mines heretofore under contract will return to work Tuesday, July 5, and produce coal 3 days, namely, Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday. Each following week thereafter, until you are further advised, the workdays will be Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday, on which days coal will be produced. All other work except the production of coal may be performed without restrictions in accordance with the usual practice."

Note that statement, if you please. Here was a Nation-wide industry which is basic to our industrial system and which is essential to the health and welfare of the people of our Nation. Yet, one individual writes a letter and says that hereafter Monday, Tuesday, and Wednesday are the only days on which coal will be produced.

I do not have to tell you that this order was effective and for most of the time since it was issued coal has been produced only on those 3 days in each week.

At the end of his letter Mr. Lewis said: "The cooperation of each member with this policy is requested." He did not have to remind the miners of what might happen to anyone who failed to cooperate.

But to let the coal operators know where they stood in the matter he also said in this circular letter: "Operators of all mines will be expected under this policy to maintain the same terms, wages, hours, and conditions of employment heretofore existing under the agreement expiring June 30. Local unions will immediately report to their proper district the identity of any coal company refusing to cooperate with this policy."

Here, then, in this country which boasts it is the home of free enterprise, we have a spokesman for labor, who is vested with monopolistic powers, able to use and using that power to tell the owners of the coal mines when and how they can operate their businesses and use their property.

Of course, if the union can say coal will be mined only 3 days a week it can say coal will be mined only 2 days or 1 day, and it might just as logically say that coal shall not be mined unless it is to be sold for a certain price. It is a clear-cut case of the use of union power not to increase wages or to improve working conditions but to control prices and production.

The future of small companies was jeopardized because they could not operate profitably on a 3-day-week basis or were unable to meet their commitments to fill orders. Much coal was lost permanently because of cave-ins where supports were not adequate during the lay-off periods. The coal industry as a whole lost to competitors such as gas and oil because industries were unable to get or were afraid to depend on their accustomed source of fuel.

Employment figures and pay rolls dropped sharply because 60 percent of the cost of producing coal is labor cost as compared with 8 percent for the oil to which many plants shifted. Railroad traffic and railroad employment were reduced. Communities dependent on mining operations had general business depressions.

The effects of allowing this labor organization to control the production and prices of coal were not limited to the coal industry. They spread to other allied industries and had a serious impact upon our whole economy. The country has refused to accept monopolistic dictation by industrial leaders and it should not be required to accept any such dictation by a labor leader.

It is true that Congress has given certain immunity to labor unions and the interpretation of the law by the Supreme Court has also contributed to making all labor and pseudo labor activities safe from any corrective action by any court. Rightness or wrongness, wisdom or unwisdom, selfishness or unselfishness, and the gravity of the effect on the national welfare and security have now become factors which labor unions can, if they desire, disregard.

Not only do we here have an example of monopoly by a labor leader over business but I call your attention to an editorial of the Washington Evening Star commenting upon the monopoly exercised by this same leader in suspending from the union for 6 months one of its members who spoke out in disagreement to the actions of this leader. In this connection I also call your attention to a letter printed by the Philadelphia Inquirer, February 3, in their column The Voice of the People. (Editorials offered for record.)

This monopoly power in all of its ramifications and arrogance has, since the close of our hearings and the introduction of my bill, been exercised and abused daily. I need not detail for your committee the manner in which this monopoly, accompanied with utter defiance and disregard of public needs, rights, and interests, has aroused our entire Nation to a recognition and demand for some corrective legislation. In any contest for power between the public represented by the Government and any group, large or small, there should no longer be any doubt as to which contestant must win. This country cannot afford dictators—government or private.

I shall not at this time go into the testimony offered as to the potentiality, at least, of something similar happening in other basic industries, but you will find it in the hearings. And there are numerous such instances.

The evidence at our hearings, in general, gave point to the warning of another Member of the Senate, the Honorable JAMES E. MURRAY, who cannot by any stretch of the imagination be regarded as biased against labor. On January 1947 this colleague aptly said: "If democracy is to survive, it must be vigilant, strong, and constantly able to defend itself against any force or organization which sets itself up to dictate to the Government. When rulers of industrial empires, when rulers of big unions, when any economic power grows so big and becomes so arrogant as to threaten the state, then indeed is the people's government in jeopardy. This has become such a time."

If then, action is required against a condition which jeopardizes the people's government, the next question is: Where shall we find the remedy?

The objective of my bill is to restore to the Sherman Act the meaning which Congress always intended it to have. In fact the Supreme Court accepted that meaning until in 1941 five members of the Court gave it a new interpretation. They then declared that the Norris-LaGuardia Act (29 U. S. C.) had modified the antimonopoly laws so as to give immunity to all labor activities. Up to that decision in 1941 the Supreme Court had previously said, time after time, that this had never been intended by Congress.

Under Justice Frankfurter's decision in the Hutcheson case of 1941 (*United States* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U. S. 219) no injunction can be issued and nothing can be a criminal offense or the subject of a suit if it arises out of any kind of a labor dispute. This state of the law gives labor an unlimited license to do anything it chooses, by unlawful as well as lawful means, and still be safe from prosecution, injunction, or liability under the Sherman Act.

My bill would modify the ruling in the Hutcheson case (supra) to the extent that when a labor union or its members have unreasonably restrained trade in commodities or services essential to the national economy, health or safety, they cannot use the cloak of the Norris-LaGuardia Act to escape a criminal prosecution or injunction.

The public can be hurt just as badly when restraints are imposed by a labor union as it can when these restraints are imposed by business combinations. In fact, no business combination of which I have ever heard has achieved the kind of arbitrary power and control that John L. Lewis now possesses and wields.

In the case of coal, John L. Lewis has been dictating to the industry in such a way as to govern production and prices. If this continues, the whole industry will be run at the discretion of one man. That tends to drive out small business and put the remaining big business under the control of a monopolist. My interest is in the general public and the health of the national economy. I am also interested in the mine workers. They, too, have been hurt.

In the Supreme Court decision in the Allen Bradley case (supra) in 1945, Mr. Justice Black, speaking for the court, acknowledged the inconsistency of a law which allows labor unions to destroy competition provided they act alone. He said: "This, it is argued, brings about a wholly undesirable result—one which leaves labor unions free to engage in conduct which restrains trade. But the desirability of such an exemption of labor unions is a question for the determination of Congress."

Let us see, then, briefly, how labor obtained its exemption from application of the antitrust laws when it restrains trade in a manner which is prohibited to the managers of industry.

Generally speaking, until 1842, organizations of wage earners were held to be criminal conspiracies in restraint of trade. In that year, in the case of *Commonwealth* v. *Hunt* (45 Mass. (4 Metcalf) 111), Massachusetts held to the contrary and thereafter peaceful combinations of workers to better working conditions were generally recognized as lawful. As we developed more complicated processes of manufacture calling for greater capital investments than any one man could command, or any partnership could conveniently handle, we developed of economic necessity, the corporate form by which sufficient capital could be assembled to construct the large plants and acquire complicated and expensive machinery. The growth of unions followed, on the correct theory that the individual could not bargain on terms of equality with employers.

Because industrial units became larger and more powerful and some tended to engage in monopolistic practices, the Congress, in 1890 passed the Sherman Act (26 Stat. 209; 15 U. S. C.) which declared unlawful "every contract, combination, in the form of trust or otherwise, or conspiracy in restraint of trade or commerce among the several States." Enforcement of the Sherman Act has varied from time to time, but generally speaking, it has succeeded in preventing any single corporation or combination of capital (excluding labor organizations) from gaining a throttlehold on any section of the economy and has prevented any business group from exercising the same autocratic powers now possessed by unions.

In 1908, the Supreme Court of the United States, in the Danbury Hatters case, *Loewe* v. *Lawler* (208 U. S. 274) held that the Sherman Act applied to labor unions as well as to business organizations. The Court stated in its opinion that the act "made no distinction between classes. It provided that every contract, combination, or conspiracy in restraint of trade was illegal."

The records of Congress show that several efforts were made to exempt, by legislation, organizations of farmers and laborers from the operation of the act and that all such efforts failed.

Then, in 1914, Congress passed the Clayton Act (38 Stat. 731), and section 6 of that act stated that the labor of a human being is not a commodity or article of commerce. It goes on to say:

"Nothing contained in the antitrust laws shall be construed to forbid the existence and operation of labor, agricultural, or horticultural organizations, instituted for the purpose of mutual help, and not having capital stock or conducted for profit, or to forbid or restrain individual members of such organizations from lawfully carrying out the legitimate objects thereof."

That act, however, did not have the effect, according to decisions of the Supreme Court, of exempting unions from the prohibitions of sections 1 and 2 of the Sherman Antitrust Act, dealing with restraints of trade and mnopolies. Historically, the Supreme Court has taken the position that labor was subject to the antitrust laws as evidenced by *Loewe* v. *Lawler* (208 U. S. 274); *Duplex Printing Press Co.* v. *Deering* (254 U. S. 443); *Coronado Coal Co.* v. *United Mine Workers of America* (268 U. S. 295); *United States* v. *Brims* (272 U. S. 549); *Bedford Cut Stone Co.* v. *Journeyman Stone Cutters' Association* (274 U. S. 37).

The jurisdiction of the Federal courts in labor-relations cases was further restricted in 1932 when Congress passed the Norris-LaGuardia Act, which was in name an anti-injunction act.

The public generally, and I am sure most Members of Congress, regarded that law merely as a law regulating court procedure and greatly limiting the use of injunctions in labor cases. Actually, however, it has been construed as an amendment of the Sherman Act and Clayton Act and has resulted, through its interpretation, in giving unions almost complete exemption from the antitrust laws.

Reverting from a long line of decisions that labor was subject to the antitrust laws, the Supreme Court, in the Apex case (*Apex Hosiery* v. *Leader* (310 U. S. 469)), concluded that labor is not liable under the antitrust acts where its conduct did not result in controlling price and restraining competition.

The Court justified its position by holding that:

"The congressional end was the prevention of restraints of free competition in business and commercial transactions which tended to restrict production, raise prices, or otherwise control the market to the detriment of purchasers or consumers of goods and services, all of which had come to be regarded as a special form of public injury."

The Court developed the "price and competition" test from the legislative history and reviewed earlier decisions only to find that the activities "affecting interstate commerce were directed at control of the markets and were so widespread as substantially to affect it."

Shortly thereafter in the case of *United States* v. *Hutcheson* (312 U. S. 219) the court asserted the legality of a union's conduct even when directed against interstate sales and customers, so long as it is peaceful and otherwise within the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts.

Against this reasoning, Mr. Justice Roberts vigorously dissented saying:

"By a process of construction never, as I think, heretofore indulged by this court, it is now found that because Congress forbade the issuing of injunctions to restrain certain conduct, it intended to repeal the provisions of the Sherman Act authorizing actions at law and criminal prosecutions for the commission of torts and crimes defined by the antitrust laws. The doctrine now announced seems to be that an indication of a change of policy in an act as respects one specific item in a general field of law, covered by an earlier act, justifies this court in spelling out an implied repeal of the whole of the earlier statute as applied to conduct of the sort here involved. I venture to say that no court has ever undertaken so radically to legislate where Congress has refused to do so."

As Mr. Thurman Arnold put it, the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case (supra), read the words "legitimate objects" right out of the Clayton Act and left the union free from either injunction or criminal indictment regardless of the objectives which it sought to obtain.

The Hutcheson case, as some of you may recall, grew out of a dispute between machinists and carpenters over who should install machinery for a brewing company in St. Louis. The carpenters attempted to boycott the brewery's products all over the United States, and they practically stopped all building operations in St. Louis because of their dispute with another union, yet the court refused to uphold an indictment against them under the Clayton Act.

In another case that originated in New Orleans the teamsters' union prevented a group of truckers from entering the city because the truckers were dealing with a CIO union which had been certified as the proper bargaining agent by the National Labor Relations Board but the Supreme Court refused to hear and affirmed, without opinion, a dismissal of the indictment against the teamsters (*United States* v. *Building and Construction Trades Council of New Orleans et al.* (313 U. S. 539)).

In a third case arising in Chicago, the hod carriers insisted that ready-mixed concrete should not be used; that concrete should be mixed by the old puddle method, or, if the employer chose to use these concrete mixers, then he should have enough people standing around to fill the complement which would be necessary if the puddle method had been used. That prevented the importation of concrete mixers in Chicago. It raised the cost of building and lowered the quality of building materials. Thurman Arnold thought surely that was not a legitimate union purpose. However, a dismissal of the indictment in that case was affirmed by the court without opinion and without even the opportunity of filing briefs. (*United States* v. *International Hod Carriers and Common Laborers District Council of Chicago and Vicinity* et al. (313 U. S. 539).)

Thurman Arnold then took the cue from the Court and concluded that it seemed there was no limitation whatever upon the power of a labor union to engage in any activities whatever.

Even the Anti-Racketeering Act of 1934, which makes criminal the use of force, violence, or coercion to obtain money or other valuable consideration was incapable of halting featherbedding by unions. The Supreme Court (*U. S.* v. *Local 807* (315 U. S. 521)) held that the exemption in this statute for "the payment of wages by a bona fide employer to a bona fide employee applied to instances where members of the teamsters forced payment of wages from employers of nonunion truck drivers to members who tendered their services by riding in trucks."

The Supreme Court said this exemption may be applied to a union which uses or threatens violence to find employment for its members, though the offer to work is rejected and payment is made for protection rather than for services rendered. After that case had been decided, Congress patched the loopholes by repealing this exemption in the Hobbs bill (60 Stat. 420, 18 U. S. C. 1951 Sup. 1948).

Again, in *Hunt* v. *Crunboch* (325 U. S. 821), decided in 1945, a union refused to permit members to work for one employer and refused to permit his employees to join the union. So they completely destroyed his business in revenge for his previous hostility. The majority of the Supreme Court held that such a conspiracy to punish an employer was a legitimate exercise of the rights of concerted action with which labor organizations have been endowed by Federal law. Four Justices of the Supreme Court dissented in that case, holding that the conspiracy was within the prohibition of the Sherman Act and not within any immunity conferred by the Clayton Act. Mr. Justice Jackson, in one of the dissenting opinions, made the following trenchant observation:

"With this decision, the labor movement has come full circle."

After pointing out how the workers had struggled long for their freedom from economic oppression, he continued:

"This Court now sustains the claim of a union to the right to deny participation in the economic world to an employer simply because the union dislikes him. This Court permits to employees the same arbitrary dominance over the economic sphere which they control that labor so long, so bitterly, and so rightly asserted should belong to no man."

As a result of these decisions we find ourselves with no protection against the abuse of labor's power except the limited declaration in the Allen Bradley Co. case (supra) that the antitrust laws apply to labor unions when, and only when, they conspire with business organizations to restrain trade.

It is this inconsistency that I wish to correct through S. 2912. I wish to put an end to this unlimited license granted to the union to do anything it chooses by unlawful

as well as by lawful means, and still be safe from prosecution, injunction, or liability under the antitrust laws. I am convinced that Congress never intended such a result.

The text of the bill which I have offered is an amendment to section 1 of the Sherman Act (15 U. S. C., sec. 1), as follows:

"Section 1 of the act of July 2, 1890, entitled 'An act to protect trade and commerce against unlawful restraints and monopolies,' as amended (U. S. C., title 15, sec. 1), is amended by inserting before the period at the end thereof the following: *'Provided further,* That when a labor organization or the members thereof have unreasonably restrained trade or commerce among the several States, or with foreign nations, in articles, commodities, or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, or any substantial segment thereof, such conduct shall not be made lawful, and the jurisdiction of any court of the United States to issue an injunction against any such conduct shall not be restricted or removed, by the act of October 15, 1914, entitled "An act to supplement existing laws against unlawful restraints and monopolies, and for other purposes," as amended, or the act of March 23, 1932, entitled "An act to amend the judicial code and to define and limit the jurisdiction of courts sitting in equity, and for other purposes".'"

There is a second section identical in language to what I have just read amending section 3 of the Sherman Act, which deals with trade and commerce involving the District of Columbia and the Territories of the United States, as distinguished from commerce among the several States and with foreign nations. This second section of the amendment merely conforms section 3 to section 1.

The objective of the bill is not to change the Sherman Act itself in any way, but to restore to the Sherman Act the meaning which Congress always intended it to have, and which the Supreme Court had always said it had, until five members of that Court, speaking through Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219), declared in 1941 that the Norris-LaGuardia Act, an act purporting to deal, and intended by Congress to deal, solely with the availability of injunctive relief, was interpreted by the Court to have modified both the Sherman Act and the Clayton Act, so as to immunize all labor activities from the Sherman Act, a result which the Supreme Court had previously said, time after time, had never been intended by Congress.

The amendment I have proposed would overrule the Hutcheson case, to the extent that when a labor union or its members have unreasonably restrained trade in commodities or services essential to the maintenance of the national economy, health, or safety, they cannot use the cloak of the Norris-LaGuardia Act or the Clayton Act to escape a criminal prosecution or injunction which Congress in the Sherman Act itself declared were the appropriate and necessary methods for dealing with unlawful activity of this kind.

In the course of our subcommittee hearings, a number of other kinds of legislation were proposed for dealing with this situation. One proposed method was to outlaw union activity on a Nation-wide basis. An extreme measure of that kind cannot enlist my sympathy or support. Another method proposed was to define especially and to spell out the particular kinds of labor-union activities which are legal, and those which are illegal. Such a task has seemed to me, after studying all the proposals that were made, an almost impossible objective. The difficulty is that once a list is made of the specific activities which are declared to be unlawful, the list must always be qualified by some sort of an exemption of activities of these kinds when they are clearly pursued with the primary purpose of furthering a legitimate union objective. Once such a qualification is introduced, the whole matter of intention and purpose, i. e., whether the primary purpose is in furtherance of legitimate union objectives like bettering working conditions, or whether the primary purpose is to control production or prices, becomes controlling. Thus the final decision of whether the conduct is lawful or unlawful again comes back to a finding by the court to which the matter is submitted, and I believe that the better approach is to let the original, general language of the Sherman Act itself stand, making no attempt to spell out particular kinds of conduct which are lawful or unlawful, but merely prohibiting unreasonable restraints of trade and monopolies.

Some suggestions have been made of modifying the Sherman Act by outlawing labor monopolies rather than by attacking unreasonable restraints of trade by labor. In other words, such a proposal would amend section 2 of the Sherman Act, dealing with monopolies, rather than section 1, which deals with restraints of trade. However, although either business or labor can engage in restraints of trade which to any fair-minded court would seem to be unreasonable obstructions to the free flow of commerce and the free play of competition, the monopoly provisions of the Sherman Act cannot be said to have the same sort of application to labor unions as they have to business combinations. Every labor union is seeking to monopolize the supply of labor either on a comparatively limited scale or on a national scale. That kind of monopolization is the avowed objective of labor unions, and it has been approved as a matter of public policy by Congress not only in the Wagner Act but also in the Taft-Hartley law. I have no intention or desire of asking that Congress outlaw that type of labor monopolization, strongly as I do feel that restraints of trade by labor can be as vicious and far-reaching as any restraint of trade ever attempted by a business combination.

The original purpose of the Sherman Act was to prevent restraints of trade and monopolizations intended to restrict production, fix prices, or otherwise control the market to the detriment of the consuming public. The public can be hurt just as badly when these restraints are imposed by business combinations, and in fact no business combination of which I have ever heard has achieved the kind of arbitrary power and control that John L. Lewis now possesses and wields. My bill will not abolish, or even threaten, the existence of Nation-wide unions or their right to strike. It will not destroy industry-wide bargaining, as will be obvious to anyone who reads cases like *United Mine Workers* v. *Coronado Coal Co.* (259 U. S. 344 (1922); 268 U. S. 295 (1925)). Nor will my bill undertake to police interstate commerce or to regulate the internal affairs of unions. Under the doctrine of the Apex Hosiery Co. case (supra), decided less than a year before the Hutcheson case, the Supreme Court declared that the regulation of union affairs is not governed by the Sherman Act, but is to be controlled by the acts dealing with labor such as the Wagner Act.

My bill would overrule the Hutcheson case. It would not overrule the Apex case or any of the other cases through which, over a period of 50 years, the Supreme Court of the United States had forged the Sherman Act, pursuant to the will of Congress, into a vital and potent force in keeping our economy a free one—free not only from the unreasonable restraints imposed by business combinations but also free from the unreasonable restraints which labor had imposed and might seek to impose. The Apex case shows that buried beneath the artificial veneer with which Mr. Justice Frankfurter in the Hutcheson case had coated the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts, the Sherman Act still condemns restraints of trade, by labor as well as by business, in the same forceful language this Congress enacted in 1890. Labor unions today are immune only because of what I believe was a completely erroneous interpretation by the Supreme Court in the Hutcheson case of these two subsequent acts of Congress. The control of production and the fixing of prices by union action in commodities or services essential to the public welfare of the United States seems to me just as objectionable from the standpoint of the ultimate effect on our economy as similar action by employer groups. The bill which I have offered would in plain and simple language remove the immunizing effect of the Clayton and Norris-LaGuardia Acts from conduct which up until 1941 had been almost universally branded as illegal and against the public interest, and which had always been regarded as outlawed by the Sherman Act. It would leave the Government free to go into a court and it would leave the court free to put a stop to labor-union practices which are so detrimental to the national welfare that some remedy beyond the temporary stop-gap remedy of the Taft-Hartley Act is essential to protect the people of this country. The Sherman Act would then again serve, as it originally served, as a brake on unions which seek to put their own activities ahead of the national welfare.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEVERETT SALTONSTALL
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me in Knoxville, Tenn., on February 12, at a dinner celebrating the one hundred and forty-first anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Fellow Republicans, we are here tonight to celebrate the one hundred and forty-first birthday anniversary of Abraham Lincoln. Abe was born on Sunday, February 12, 1809. I dug out the other day what the Senate was debating in February 1809. I found it was a problem of foreign relations. They were discussing with much bitterness the interference of Great Britain with our trade. That interference 3 years later led to the War of 1812. I found too that the Senate was discussing with minute care the expenditures of our Government—but how differently from today. Then the United States Government had a cash balance in the Treasury of over $13,800,000. The total appropriations proposed for the fiscal year 1809 were $13,000,000. Eight million of that $13,000,000 appropriation was to reduce the Government debt which amounted to $56,000,000. Today we know only too well our debt stands at $256,000,000,000, and we are finding difficulty in balancing our budget—let alone any reduction in our debt.

We are now commencing the second half of the twentieth century. Again, what was Congress debating when the century opened in 1900?

I found that Congress then was wondering how to distribute the surplus in the Treasury. Bankers were worried in 1900—not by inflation—but from the heavy withdrawals from the banks by the Government in distributing this surplus. Now we have only a deficit to distribute after 18 years of a Democratic administration.

On the morning of February 12, 1900, the Boston Herald had a lead, "China's New Policy"—just as today, a question of our relations with China. This article then says, "Those acquainted with Chinese affairs are supposed to regard the decrees as significant of the beliefs of the Empress and her advisors that China is sufficiently prepared to resist by force of arms all further aggressions of foreign powers on Chinese territory and that future policy will be in line with this view."

Problems over the years remain very similar.

A proper determination of the Chinese problem is surely a headache today.

Government spending, government debt, taxation are very much in the news. They too are the subject of daily debate on Capitol Hill in Washington.

Today while we have the largest production this country has ever known, we live in an uncertain world. We have just fought and won the most destructive war in the world's history. We have devised weapons capable of terrific destruction. Now we are to devise one immensely more destructive. The battles are over, but no peace treaties, except for those with Italy, Hungary, Rumania, and Bulgaria are yet signed. And the last three countries are satellites of Moscow. We have found ourselves up against many road blocks, literally and figuratively speaking, on our road to peace. We live in a period of a cold war. We live in a period where there is a fierce desire on the part of peoples in many different parts of the world to be the rulers of their own fortunes. Indonesia, Pakistan, Burma, India are countries which have set up their own governments. Germany is split. China has been overrun. Russia is governed by an ideology that is hostile to our way of life. In the last year and a half there have been many sudden changes of government among our neighbors in South America. While peoples have this fierce desire to be rulers of their own fortunes, they are still hungry, miserable, and uneducated.

Today peace and security are the No. 1 objectives of all of us. But we must remember we cannot have peace by mere wishful thinking. There is no easy road to peace. Don't ever be fooled by a quack panacea that promises it. We must never lose faith in our ability to secure peace. If we lose faith we will lose the peace. Too many people today are trying to find reasons to give up many of the things we are doing to obtain a peaceful world. Let us examine carefully their motives. Are they in every case patriotic American citizens or are they playing the game that Moscow desires? We simply cannot afford to settle back once again into a state of isolationism and happy complacency.

If Lincoln were alive today, he certainly would work for a world at peace with the greatest possible security here in our own country. We cannot go ahead to better standards of living, more happiness, greater contentment; we cannot long invent better automobiles, radios, airplanes, electrical appliances, and electronic gadgets that bring us that higher standard of life without the feeling of security that goes with a world at peace. Our Republican Party today stands for peace in the world. It also stands for the United States of America having sufficient armed strength to maintain our responsibilities throughout the world and our defense at home.

To help insure our security we must maintain our military forces adequately. President Truman has reported that today we have 1,506,000 men in uniform and 725,000 civilians in our armed services. Pay allowances, subsistence, and clothing for these men costs you and me $7,600,000,000 a year. But, pay allowances and subsistence are not enough. We must give them the best of modern equipment in order that, if they must fight, they can do so efficiently and with as much safety to themselves as possible. So, we are planning in the next 2 years the building of 5,100 airplanes of the most modern type. These planes cost money. A B–36 costs over double the amount of its predecessor, the B–29. A modern jet fighter costs many times that which a fighter plane cost during the World War. We know, too, that the weapons of another war will be far different. The atom bomb, the possibility of the H-bomb, the lengthening range and accuracy of a guided missile, the importance of a radar screen are all developments that now enter into our problem of security.

Call it bipartisan, or nonpartisan, the Republican Party is composed of patriotic American citizens who, knowing only too well the meaning of a world conflict, pray and work for a world at peace. I only wish the present administration would understand this and take greater advantage of the brains, experience, and knowledge of Republican leaders in reaching their decisions on foreign relations.

In this 1950 world that has grown so much smaller than it used to be through the use of airplanes and modern communication systems, we know that we must have friends in other countries. I have seen much of that devastation and know how they must be strengthened. We want those friends in this period of a cold war to have their economic and industrial strength built up. We want, in short, to help them to help themselves, as we need their strength. If they can trade with us and other countries they will build up their own security to a far greater degree. So, we devised the Marshall plan for economic aid. That plan is now in operation. We know that it has already cost us many billion dollars. We know it will cost us more billions. But we are spending that money for our own security. We are spending that money in order that those friendly nations in other parts of the world may be economically strong, have more confidence in their own security in this cold war and thus be a greater aid to our security.

Likewise the Republicans in Congress by a large majority have voted to consummate a military-assistance pact—within the framework of the United Nations—with 12 European nations. I know I voted for the pact because I believed it gave a better opportunity to those people in those countries to help our boys in our country to maintain peace in the world. By a great show of strength in many free countries we make any nation that wants to start trouble think and think carefully before it comes to grips with the mighty strength of our own country and her friends.

But no one of us wants to build up our strength for imperialistic purposes. Will we be considered imperialists if we send a mission to Formosa? Will we lose face in Asia because of our continued support of Chiang Kai-shek? Should we recognize the Communist government of China? These questions ultimately come before the Congress which has to appropriate the money with which the administration carries out our Government's relations with China and the other nations of Asia. Today we see the great change that has come over China. We read of the foment in Asia. The problem of Formosa has been debated at length in the present session of Congress. How to adjust these problems? How to prevent the spread of an ideology which is hostile to us requires patience, tact, diplomacy, firmness, and an everlasting vigilance on our part today. We must exercise to the best of our ability these qualities in order that our security may be maintained and the peace of the world obtained. Then and only then can we go forward with greater opportunities here at home.

Tonight when we celebrate Lincoln's Birthday and think for a few moments of the strength of his character, the soundness of his philosophy of government, and his deep understanding of the needs and problems of the individual man, we can soliloquize as to how he would think and act today on some of the questions that are so troubling us within our great country.

He was the leader of the Republican Party. His views became the principles upon which the Republican Party was built and on which it governed our country for so many years.

Let me ask you some of these questions. Let me give you my answers and see whether we agree. Many of our problems boil down to the answers that you as citizens make to these questions.

1. How much service do you people expect of your Government?

Answer. When Abraham Lincoln was asked how long should a man's legs be, he replied, "Long enough to reach the ground." The Government should be big enough to do the job you expect of it and no more. It should never be big for bigness' sake.

2. How do you want your Government to perform those services you require of it?

Answer. You want it to perform them for your benefit without dictatorship and without undue direction. You want them performed economically and without undue bureaucracy.

3. How much leadership do you people expect from your Government?

Answer. In the question of foreign affairs the Government must be the leader. In the domestic field the Government should act in behalf of the individual in order to give him opportunity and freedom and liberty. He should be independent, not the servant of government.

4. Do you want to maintain freedom, independence, and opportunity for yourself?

Answer. Of course you do.

5. How much of your earnings are you willing to have taken in the form of taxes to pay for government, local, State, and National?

Answer. The answer is, just as little as is consistent with our national security and our national welfare.

Let me discuss for a few minutes some of the problems concerned with these answers:

Since 1900 we have had a Republican President for 24 years and a Democratic one for 26 years. The total appropriations for 24 years under a Republican amounted to about $59,000,000,000. The appropriations of the Eightieth Congress, second session, and the Eighty-first Congress, first session, amounted to about $88,000,000,000. I would hate to tell you the total figure that has been spent in 26 years by Democratic Presidents. True, most of it was for war. The aftermaths of war are always expensive, but today spending is going on in many directions all at once. The Government is like a railroad train running loose on a straight track. Everything is fine until it hits the curve where the red warning light is flashing. That curve is still ahead. But, the light is on. Will we heed the lessons of the past to guide us in the future before the train goes off the track and our bubble of prosperity bursts?

The Republican Party stands for the principle of the balanced budget because we all know that if our budget in peacetime remains unbalanced over the years, then the dollar in our pockets will buy less and less. In the terminology of 100 cents in 1938 the dollar today is worth only 60 cents yet in 1900 that same dollar of 1938 would buy $1.95

worth of goods at retail. Certainly today we are paying more to run our Government in peacetime than ever before in our history. It takes over 25 cents out of every dollar you and I earn, to pay for our Government. Over $7,000,000,000 of Federal Government receipts today come from excise taxes. Many are wartime taxes. When we buy baby powder, a ticket on the railroad, or go to the movies, we pay the Federal Government a tax. These were not intended to be peacetime taxes. I believe, as does the great majority of Republicans in Congress today, that many of these taxes should be reduced this year, and some of them repealed. This means two things: First, that we must either find some more revenue to help make up for these taxes in order not to increase the deficit or else reduce expenditures. I want to see us make an honest, sincere effort to reduce expenditures before talking about new taxes. That is the No. 1 fiscal problem.

Here is one suggestion for reducing expenses. We have heard a great deal of discussion about the total number of civilian employees working for your Government. The latest figure is 2,000,000. The turn-over is around 500,000 a year, some 25 percent. At a time when we are running a deficit, the President is still asking for additional employees. If you were running a business in the red and found you could drop employees by simply adopting a policy of not replacing anybody who voluntarily leaves your service, wouldn't you do it? I certainly believe it is time—unless Government service is seriously interfered with—or unless a very specialized purpose is involved—to adopt a nonhiring policy. Let me say this however. I have heard and read a great deal of abuse about Federal employees. I do not doubt there are those, as in any other business, who do not do their fair share, but I have dealt with a great many individuals in a great many departments, and I have found them almost without exception conscientious and thoughtful citizens who are trying to do their job to the best of their ability. I believe a policy of nonhiring might save the Government as much as a billion dollars a year without sacrifice of anyone who wants to continue to work.

Another way to get economy is to do all that we can to stimulate our Government to secure more efficient operation. The Hoover Commission has made 288 recommendations. One hundred and twenty-four of these require legislation. Thirty-six of this one hundred and twenty-four are already law. I hope Congress will go forward with enacting into law more of these recommendations.

But, unless there is the will on the part of the administration to improve the business methods of our Government, Congress alone can accomplish little. I have yet to see this will.

Today we hear much talk of statism and welfare state. To me essentially they signify concentration of power in our Government in Washington. They purport bureaucracy and regimentation. Republicans are not opposed to welfare. As a matter of record Republicans started many of our social-security laws. Our Constitution calls on our Government to promote the general welfare. The essential opposition of Republicans in Congress today to the present administration of our Government is based fundamentally—not on giving service of a personal nature to our individual citizen—but on the manner and method by which that service is rendered. Our Government essentially begins at home. It begins in the fashion of the old town meeting where every citizen is able to once a year express himself. It begins there because the people at home have common problems, understand each other, and know their own individual needs. Your individual needs can never be as well understood by bureaucrats in Washington as they can be by the local administrator in your home town. I believe we can help our friends at home who need the help of our Government, more by assisting his local government to help him, than by trying to do it directly through growing bureaucracies headed by an appointive official in Washington. That, in my opinion, is the difference between the general welfare and the welfare state. That is my opposition to the constantly increasing bureaucracy under Democratic administration.

Government must give not only efficient service if it is to promote our social security, but it must give honest service. It cannot give honest service if it spends beyond its ability to pay for that service. So, essentially, we Republicans feel that we must not develop the services of government beyond our willingness to pay for those services; otherwise, we are not honest with those whom we are helping.

I am opposed, as you are, to regimentation. Let me give you two recommendations of the present administration that, in my opinion, lead to regimentation and directly to the domination by government over our individual lives—domination to such an extent that opportunity for advancement becomes essentially limited. I have in mind socialized medicine, so-called, and the regimentation of farmers—the Brannan plan. But that does not mean that government should not develop ways to help us with those problems. Today government is helping to build hospitals. It is promoting research to eliminate the scourges of cancer, tuberculosis, and the ills of the heart and mind. Today we are more conscious of our health and of the cost of staying healthy.

So we want our Government to assist us to stay healthy but that does not mean we favor the regimentation of our doctors. We want the incentives that provide for greater knowledge of scientific methods that will make us more healthy. We don't want that research for greater knowledge to become stagnant through lack of initiative. Likewise, we realize that there must be support of our farm products at proper levels, if our agricultural and industrial economy are to go forward together. But, the Brannan plan would have it that if when the farmer sells his products at a loss, the consumer—even though he may get his food cheaper—must pay other taxes to make up the farmer's loss. Ultimately that plan will put our farmers completely under regimentation by the Government. So, in determining how government is to help us be healthy, housed, or get assistance in social security, we want to remember that the average American citizen is moderate. He wants his Government to help, but he does not want his Government to regiment his life or to socialize the natural resources of this great country of ours.

Today we hear much of another "ism"—communism. That word indicates an ideology absolutely contradictory to our ideology. The best way to eliminate it from our lives is to convince our people that our opportunities for education, for advancement in life through freedom and opportunity, with a government of service to help us but not to lead us, is the best method of attack. A strong offense is always the best defense in any game of sport or experience of life. In the words of Vannevar Bush in his new book, Modern Arms and Free Men, "If we lose our liberties it will be because we abandon them."

The Republican Party today is the minority party in Congress. Its platform and principles can only be put into effect by endeavoring to incorporate them where it is wise to do so in legislative proposals of the majority party. The responsibility of a minority party is to look critically at the recommendations of the majority party. It is the duty of the minority party to make these recommendations more workable and more practical, to make sure that the ultimate composite result of the conflicting views will be for the best interests of the country as far as the strength of the minority will allow. In this connection we hear much discussion of the relation of government to the problems of industry and labor. Certainly, the Republican Party believes in collective bargaining. Certainly, the Republican Party wants to fashion our laws to be of the greatest possible assistance to those who work in industry and to those who manage industry, but always with an eye to protecting the public interest. I have always felt that the best labor-management relations come from a friendly discussion around the table. Government must set up the principles upon which these discussions are held. We want our laws to be fair to both sides and to make certain that those laws protect the public interest as well.

We are now in the second month of a new half century. Think back over the last 50 years since 1900—and many of us can easily do just that. Would you have considered building a garage in 1900? A hangar or a radio tower or an airfield? Who would then have known how to construct a concrete road or build a boat of plastic or put shatterproof glass in a windshield? Yet today the building of a garage, a radio tower, an airfield, a concrete road, and the use of shatterproof glass and plastic is just too common for even a news item. It is just too common because we have made conveniences out of the inventions which came from the minds of free men of science, of imagination, of courage, and of hard work. We have built up the present-day comforts in our homes through the ingenuity, the imagination, and the hard work of our women folk. Who in 1900 would have believed that this country would have to fight and win two disastrous world wars? We have won two world wars because of the same spirit of inventiveness—independence, and the fighting qualities of our young men. These are facts of our life of which we are proud. These are now part of our heritage, just as Lincoln, Jefferson, Washington, and the lives of other leaders of our country are our heritage.

So tonight when we are thinking of the greatness of Abraham Lincoln, who was called forth in a time of crisis in our national life, we must think well of the challenge that faces us today—perhaps an even greater one than was faced in Lincoln's day. We can recall the principles and traditions which have become a Lincoln legacy. We can recall with gratitude the breadth, the concept of freedom and liberty, the deep confidence that a political party must serve a useful destiny. With those thoughts that always come to us when we think of Abraham Lincoln, we must dedicate ourselves once again to the proposition that "this Nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom." A greater opportunity of service to our people—a rigid upholding of our responsibilities to obtain the peace in the world—and the maintenance of our security and the future of our children and their children, is what we all so fervently pray for today. Let us in the words of Lincoln "here highly resolve" to make it our job.

Wisconsin's Rank in United States Dairying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, is it surprising that a State like

Wisconsin, that produces more than one-eighth of the milk of the Nation, is worried about the economic effect of displacing butterfat with highly subsidized vegetable oils in the manufacture of oleo, filled milk, oleo ice cream, and other synthetic dairy products?

The following is from the Wisconsin official report of Mr. Milton H. Button, director of the State department of agriculture:

Wisconsin's rank in United States dairying

	Percent	Rank	Production
			Pounds
Milk production	13	1	14,914,000,000
Munster cheese	94	1	7,989,867
Brick cheese	86	1	15,725,547
Malted milk powder	77	1	23,866,095
Swiss cheese	65	1	43,192,053
Limburger cheese	56	1	3,637,143
American cheese	45	1	386,020,278
Powdered whey	45	1	64,685,687
Powdered whole milk	41	1	73,335,597
Italian cheese	40	1	19,492,282
Condensed whole milk (unsweetened)	28	1	53,840,494
Powdered skim milk	28	1	204,865,972
Evaporated whole milk	27	1	875,122,712
Condensed whole milk (sweetened)	24	1	43,635,642
Cream cheese	24	2	13,339,007
Condensed skim milk (unsweetened)	21	1	88,411,938
Condensed skim milk (sweetened)	11	1	30,946,629
Butter	9	3	99,992,300
Ice cream (gallons)	3	11	16,639,156

Washington Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a national broadcast which I delivered on February 12 over Station WMTR, at Morristown, N. J.

There being no objection, the broadcast was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Good afternoon. I am very happy to be able to join in this series of broadcasts. In this talk I think it may be best for me to concentrate on just two or three broad questions which have been asked of me and which appear to be especially important right now. Here is the first question: "Some people say that the program of the present administration will lead to a 'welfare state.' Just what does this mean, and how do you stand on this program?"

That's a very big question and a vitally important one. First of all, let me say as clearly as possible what I mean by the term "welfare state."

The idea of the welfare state is simply that the Federal Government, by assuming new powers and going into new programs, can solve all the perplexing problems of human welfare that we have in our American society—problems of inadequate income for some groups; problems of high prices, poor living conditions, bad health, inadequate education, and so on. In simplest terms, the people who favor the welfare state urge us to give the Federal Government more and more power to deal with all these problems.

Now, there are many of us in Congress, members of both parties, who refuse to go along with this idea. For instance, we refuse to enact a national system of compulsory health insurance which would give a Federal bureau the power to regulate all aspects of medical and hospital care, and to say what the rights and duties of both patients and doctors are throughout the country. As another example, we refuse to enact a Brannan farm plan under which the Department of Agriculture would regulate the daily activities of farmers throughout the country, telling them how much of what crop they may plant and how big an income they may aspire to.

I am one of those who oppose these measures, even though they are urged in the name of welfare. My reason is simply this. I believe that the destiny of the American people lies primarily in their own hands, and not in the bounty of an all-powerful government.

Now, this doesn't mean that the Federal Government should follow a hands-off policy in problems of human welfare. Far from it. In my own experience I have seen that Federal action in problems like the hospital shortage and the matter of public education has been not only useful but necessary if anything effective was to be done. What I am pleading for is a different kind of Federal action. Instead of trying to run the whole show, instead of trying to force a Federal program down the throats of 150,000,000 people, I want to see the Federal Government play a role of partnership in these programs. For years I have been a sponsor of a national health bill whose main principle is just that—a cooperative partnership between the Federal Government, the States, and voluntary groups.

We must put an end to the dangerous idea that Federal domination is the only way to get things done. The idea can be put into effect only at ruinous cost—not only in money and taxes, not only in efficiency, but in the individual and local freedom which we Americans cherish.

To sum up, I believe that the so-called welfare state means in reality the setting up of a centralized monopoly government. It means the abandonment of the freedom and responsibility of the individual citizen. It means the stifling of the free creative energies of the American people. So, instead of the idea of the welfare state, I propose another principle on which Government can help us attain our goals—the principle of a free and equal partnership between the Federal, State, and local governments, and the people generally, in which each does what it is best equipped to do. That, I firmly believe, is the way of progress.

Now I want to turn to a question in the foreign field. One of my constituents has asked me: "Do you think it is worth while for us to continue supporting the European recovery program?"

My answer is that I not only believe it is worth while; I believe it is of the highest importance.

Recently, as you may know, I have been very much concerned with the Communist conquest of China, and the need for a positive American policy in the Far East. But my concern in that field does not for a moment diminish my interest in carrying through our positive policy in Europe.

We embarked on this historic venture with the European nations 2 years ago, when Congress enacted on a bipartisan basis the Economic Cooperation Act of 1948. At that time the free nations of Europe were literally living on a hand-to-mouth basis. The war had devastated many of their productive resources and had disrupted most of their long-established channels of trade. The peoples of Europe were exhausted by the war; they were surviving from day to day with the help of American relief; and they were losing hope for a better future. The Communist Parties, especially in France and Italy, were profiting by all this distress and were growing dangerously powerful.

It was in this situation that the United States proposed a new approach. We said, in effect, to the nations of Europe that we would help them in the gigantic task of recovery if they would get together and help themselves. Immediately this proposal raised the hopes and morale of the European Continent. Sixteen nations took up our challenge and formed an organization to plan their recovery together. After careful congressional study, we embarked on a program of aid to these 16 nations designed to run for 4 years.

We are now approaching the midpoint of that 4-year program. Tremendous problems still face us but I am convinced they are no greater than the problems which have already been overcome. Under the brilliant direction of ECA Administrator Paul Hoffman, we have enabled those nations to get away from the old basis of hand-to-mouth relief and put their energies behind a great program of reconstruction. Production levels have risen dramatically, until now western Europe is producing as much or more than before the war. The extremely difficult task of removing barriers to trade between these countries, and between them and the rest of the world, is one of the toughest problems that we are now endeavoring to cope with. And, step by step with the progress that is being made, the threat of Communist subversion and revolution in all these hard-pressed countries, especially France and Italy, has definitely been checked. I am sure this will go down in history as one of the greatest achievements of the free world in our century.

In the remaining 2 years of the program the political and economic integration of these countries of Europe will be the primary goal of our ECA operations. Let me emphasize here that the cost of this whole program has been a constantly decreasing one. We appropriated approximately $5,000,000,000 in the first year and $4,000,000,000 in the second year. For the third year we are planning about $3,000,000,000 and in the final year approximately $2,000,000,000. This is a very large total expenditure, but it is a relatively small price to pay for the economic recovery of the free nations of Europe and the definite blocking of the disintegrating forces of communism.

In that connection another very important question has been raised with me. Here it is: "Do you think there is a good chance that Germany will cooperate peacefully in a free Europe?"

I think there is an excellent chance. The three western zones of Germany were set up last year as the Federal Republic of Germany, which has since taken its place as the seventeenth member of the Marshall plan group. Recently, as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, I had an opportunity to talk with Mr. John J. McCloy, our representative on the allied high commission in western Germany, who was back in this country on a short visit. His comments confirmed my belief that steady progress is being made there in both the political and the economic fields.

From the point of view of western Europe, Germany poses both a threat and a promise. The promise lies in the fact that western Germany is still the biggest single industrial unit on the European Continent, and the other countries vitally need her products. The threat lies in the old German tradition of aggressive militarism, which has led three times to an invasion of France and twice to world war.

I think the greatest hope today is that Germany—at least western Germany—can be brought more and more into the society of free European nations as a self-respecting member. If this can be done, Europe will be able to benefit from Germany's economic promise, and at the same time will be able to do away with the German militaristic threat. Fortunately, Chancellor Adenauer, the present head of the German Federal Republic seems to be entirely in accord with this idea.

We hear many reports nowadays of a revival of extreme German nationalism and military spirit. I am confident that this trend can be effectively combated if we concentrate on three goals:

First, we must be sure that Germany makes steady economic progress along with the rest of Europe, because it is economic distress that leads to these extreme political movements.

Second, we must devise some way of guaranteeing the military security of Germany, probably under the provisions of the North Atlantic Pact, so that the Germans will not be driven by fear into demanding an army of their own.

Third, we must step up our efforts, by radio broadcast and every other means of education, to teach the German people the real meaning of democracy, which most of them have never experienced and do not really understand.

This problem of Germany is an important part of the whole problem of Europe. I believe the continuance of our part in the European recovery program for the remaining 2 years is absolutely essential if we are to see this great venture through. The dollar cost to us will be less this year than it was last year, and still less in the final year. It is many times worth the cost, because it means that the free and friendly nations of Europe will once again be able to proceed on their own.

In conclusion, let me emphasize that in this cold-war period we need more than a European policy or a far-eastern policy. Our foreign policy must be world-wide if it is to make sense. As the most powerful free nation in the world, we Americans have a tremendous responsibility. If we are going to stop communism we must travel the long and difficult road of aiding to build peace, freedom, and plenty; and we must do it not only in Europe, not only in the Pacific, but everywhere in the world.

And now my time is up for today. This is Senator H. ALEXANDER SMITH reporting from Washington.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address delivered by me at a Lincoln Day dinner sponsored by the Summit County (Ohio) Republican Central and Executive Committees, at Akron, Ohio, on February 11.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a high honor to be invited to speak here tonight.

I am indeed grateful for the privilege of joining this splendid assembly in tribute to one of the most illustrious figures in world history, the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

The great State of Ohio is an appropriate place to discuss real Americanism. No State of the Union has produced so many outstanding leaders in government, politics, industry, education, and the church. No State has contributed more to the advancement of American progress and human welfare.

On this birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of all Americans it is a sincere pleasure to tell you how much your Pennsylvania neighbors appreciate your distinguished United States Senators, my colleagues, ROBERT TAFT and JOHN BRICKER.

Ohio and the Nation are indeed fortunate to have in the Senate of the United States two men of such exceptional ability, unquestioned integrity, and fervent patriotism.

Of both of them it may be truthfully said they are fearless champions of liberty, courageous defenders of the Constitution, and ardent protectors of the inalienable rights of free Americans.

Their forthright Republicanism is in accord with the ideals and principles of Abraham Lincoln, whom we honor tonight as one of the founders of the Republican Party and as the first Republican President of the United States.

More than any other man in the history of our Republic, Abraham Lincoln knew the real meaning of Americanism. The story of his humble birth and early struggles are known to all. He suffered extreme poverty and the hardships of pioneer life on the rough frontier. He experienced defeat, disappointment, and discouragement.

But he never lost faith. He held firmly to faith in himself, faith in the people, and faith in God.

Perhaps the outstanding characteristic in Lincoln's make-up was his undeviating faith in the capacity of a free people to govern themselves.

He realized that the people might be led astray for a time by false hopes and deceptive promises. But he was firm in his belief that the good judgment of the American people and their love of freedom would lead them, in the end, to the right decisions.

Today, as in Lincoln's time, America's greatest need is faith in the fundamental truths of the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights. Under these immortal documents our people have enjoyed a greater measure of individual freedom than any other people since the world began.

Lincoln's great task was the preservation of the Union. The great duty before us is to preserve individual freedom and the God-given right of every American to live in liberty, free from the strangling dictatorship of state socialism.

The dangers that confront us are plainly manifested in the course taken by the present and the preceding administration in Washington.

The grave menace to our free American institutions is clearly indicated in programs and policies that invite national bankruptcy.

We are asked to accept the alien teaching that the concentration of all government power and authority in a gigantic Federal bureaucracy will provide security and prosperity for all the people.

We are told that the more we spend the better off we will be, even though the people are shouldered with taxes that grow more oppressive year after year, with an ever-increasing burden of debt and with inflated prices for food, clothing, housing, and all the other necessities of life.

My fellow Americans, that philosophy of government is the economic road to socialistic ruin and the destruction of American liberty. It has brought us to a time of crisis just as challenging as that in Lincoln's time.

The paramount issue before us is this: Shall we fight for the principles which have made America the last remaining hope of freedom in the world or shall we be led in a Socialist pattern of government that has brought disaster to every country where it has been attempted?

We meet tonight as Republicans, but the great issue I have outlined is so important that it is not bound by party lines.

Distinguished leaders in both parties, Democrats as well as Republicans, are fighting on the side of true Americanism against the creeping paralysis of the socialistic state.

Let me recall to you the words of a great Democratic statesman, former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, who said, and I quote:

"The Nation is going down the road to statism. Where it will wind up no one can tell, but if some of the new programs seriously proposed should be adopted there is danger that the individual—whether farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state."

Another distinguished Democrat, the senior Senator from Virginia, HARRY F. BYRD, has been equally emphatic in his warnings against the dangers of excessive taxation and reckless squandering of the people's earnings for political purposes.

No American should ever forget the warning sounded by that great patriot, our only living ex-President, Herbert Hoover, when he said, and I quote: "Through governmental spending and taxes our Nation is blissfully driving down the back road to collectivism at high speed.

"Along this road of spending the Government takes over, which is socialism, or dictates institutional and economic life, which is fascism."

Let us turn now to the wisdom of Abraham Lincoln. Nearly 100 years ago he expounded a principle of government to which the Republican Party has adhered ever since.

He said, and I quote:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all or cannot so well do for themselves in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can do as well for themselves government ought not to interfere."

Lincoln recognized that interference by government in the lives of its citizens is an encroachment upon individual liberty and a barrier to opportunity.

If he were with us today and would speak out against the trend toward socialism, I have no doubt he, too, would be called a reactionary. He, too, would be ridiculed as being 150 years behind the times. His principles would be attacked as vicious, representing selfish interests, against the welfare of the people.

The attack would be led by those who call themselves liberals.

They claim Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson as their patron saints. But they pay only lip service to the principles of those American statesmen. They do not follow the teachings of Jefferson and Jackson.

Thomas Jefferson was a great prophet of the evils of government debt and government grown to monstrous size.

It was not a reactionary, not a Republican, it was Thomas Jefferson who cried out in warning:

"We are ruined if we do not overrule the principle that 'the more we owe, the more prosperous we shall be' and that 'a public debt furnishes the means of enterprise.'"

It was Thomas Jefferson again—and I hope they are listening down there in Washington—who said:

"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers. To preserve our independence we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between economy and liberty * * * or profusion and servitude."

Yes; that was Thomas Jefferson talking.

And what of that other patron saint, Andrew Jackson? This is what he believed:

"From our past experience, it cannot be doubted that simplicity in the character of the Federal Government and a rigid economy in its administration should be regarded as fundamental and sacred."

Let me remind the socialistic-minded free spenders at Washington that these quotations express the philosophy of Jefferson and Jackson. Let me ask:

Will you brand them as reactionaries and tories because they, too, preached economy and limitations upon the growth of the central bureaucracy?

Let us step forward to the year 1893.

The great Grover Cleveland, first Democratic President after the Civil War, is being inaugurated for his second term. In his inaugural address he said:

"The lessons of paternalism ought to be unlearned and the better lesson taught that while people should patriotically and cheerfully support their government, its functions do not include support of the people."

Will they in Washington sneer at Grover Cleveland and disown his great memory?

Then, in 1913, the next Democratic President occupied the White House—Woodrow Wilson. Let me quote briefly from Mr. Wilson. He said:

"The duty of economy is not debatable. It is manifest and imperative."

I turn now to the Democratic National Convention of 1932. The platform adopted contains this language:

"We advocate an immediate and drastic reduction of governmental expenditures by abolishing useless commissions and offices, consolidating departments and bureaus, and eliminating extravagances, to accomplish a saving of not less than 25 percent in the cost of Federal Government."

May I point out that in that year, the entire cost of operating the Federal Government was less—I repeat, less—than this year's interest on the national debt alone.

Running on that platform was Franklin D. Roosevelt, who declared in a major address:

"Any government—like any family—can for a year spend a little more than it earns. But you and I know that a continuance of that habit means the poorhouse."

Ladies and gentlemen, those are magnificent words. They should be hung in every office in every department and bureau in Washington—and I include the President's own offices in the White House.

Then in 1943 a Democratic Member arises in the United States Senate. He says:

"It seems that when public funds are to be expended no one has any interest in what happens to them, no matter what his responsibilities may be under his oath of office.

"I dislike to make such a statement, but unless this body and the House of Representatives exercise their prerogatives in connection with the purse strings of the Government, much of the money appropriated will be thrown away for no good purpose whatever."

At that time we were engaged in total war. The Senator who made that statement was the chairman of the Special War Investigating Committee. He was Harry S. Truman, then a Senator from Missouri.

And so, when I hear them call those of us who are economy-minded, reactionaries and horse-and-buggy folks, I remember the strong stand of every Democratic President in our history, down to the time of the New Deal and the so-called Fair Deal.

Were they all wrong? Were they all reactionaries? Were they all horse-and-buggy tories?

Were all these great men fools because they feared deficit financing and growing Federal encroachment upon the liberties of the citizens?

Were Roosevelt, the candidate, and Truman, the Senator, reactionaries and tories?

We who are called tories and reactionaries because we fight for economy and solvency are struggling to preserve the greatest blessing given by God to mankind—freedom and opportunity.

Recently I ran across a quotation which impressed me greatly. It was from an English philosopher who lived 200 years ago. It was this:

"The greatest glory of a freeborn people is to transmit that freedom to their children."

Is it not right and proper for us, at this time of crisis, to demand that the great freedoms that freeborn Americans have enjoyed be preserved inviolate for our children and their children?

I say it is not only right and proper but it is our sacred duty.

If we are to retain freedom of the individual for ourselves and for posterity, we must reverse the present socialistic trend.

If America is to survive as a land of liberty and opportunity, we must return to principles of Abraham Lincoln and Thomas Jefferson.

We must preach the gospel of American patriotism—self-reliance, work, thrift, tolerance, and love of God.

We must impress upon all our people that security has no meaning if liberty must be surrendered to get it.

The freedom that was established and preserved by the blood and sacrifice of heroes in every generation is too precious to be lost through indifference or neglect of our responsibilities.

If we are to help save America, we must all interest ourselves in politics, because the kind of government we are to have is decided at the ballot box.

We need a deeper understanding of practical, patriotic politics, the kind of political activity that is based on the highest standards of morality, honesty, sincerity, and love of our country.

With those standards as our guide, with courage and vigilance, we can defeat every attempt to enslave the American people under the tyranny of socialism.

In the immortal words of Lincoln at Gettysburg, let us again dedicate ourselves to the proposition "that this country, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom, and that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

Cheese

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, the CCC advises that there is 24,000,000 pounds of cheese in storage. The following official letter indicates that there were over 32,000,000 pounds of cheese imported the last calendar year:

Cheese: United States imports for consumption, by types, 1949 [1]

Type	Quantity	Value
	Pounds	
Emmentaler or Swiss, with eye formation	5,776,778	$3,732,243
Gruyere process cheese	1,334,474	985,940
Italian-type cheeses:		
Romano, in original loaves	7,981,578	3,977,436
Pecorino, in original loaves	3,335,563	2,150,241
Reggiano, in original loaves	1,369,046	614,379
Parmesano, in original loaves	12,909	10,840
Provoloni, in original loaves	936,373	534,584
Provolette	37,956	21,184
Sbrinz, in original loaves	1,374,949	515,946
Goya, in original loaves	265	137
Total, Italian-type cheeses	15,048,639	7,824,747
Roquefort, in original loaves	1,393,902	1,017,839
Cheddar cheese, whether or not in original loaves, but not including any cheese processed otherwise than by division into pieces	3,136,201	964,494
Blue-mold cheese, in original loaves	1,301,641	570,441
Edam and Gouda cheese:		
Containing 40 percent or more of butterfat	101,147	394,974
Containing less than 40 percent of butterfat	4,794	1,604
Bryndza cheese, in casks, barrels, or hogsheads, weighing with their contents more than 200 pounds	973	446
Other cheese and substitutes for cheese	3,115,771	1,342,646
Total	32,014,42	16,835,374

[1] Preliminary.

Source: Compiled from official statistics of the U. S. Department of Commerce.

Mr. Speaker, this is just one example showing that the products accumulated by the CCC as surplus are partially the result of imports. Is this not another indication of the need of an international agricultural agreement comparable to the International Wheat Agreement?

Minimum-Wage Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement which I submitted relating to the minimum-wage bill last year, which was ordered to be incorporated in the permanent RECORD. Because of the fact that the permanent RECORD is not available to anyone at this time, I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On October 18 Senator PEPPER submitted a statement expressing the views of a majority of the Senate conferees as to the intentions of the conference which prepared the conference report on the minimum-wage bill. It seems to me that this report was prepared in the first instance by the attorneys for the

Wage and Hour Division in an effort on their part to retain jurisdiction in various fields which the conference report clearly intended to take away from them. The Wage and Hour Division for years has been trying to extend its jurisdiction beyond the field provided by Congress and is now trying to nullify the present congressional action.

The conference committee never considered this statement, or summary, nor was there ever any meeting of the Senate conferees to consider or discuss it. My own view is that the report and the act finally adopted speaks for itself. I am quite certain that the conclusions of the report submitted by the senior Senator from Florida as to the intentions of the conferees are incorrect in many important particulars, and that the report of the House managers is much closer to their actual intentions.

Since other individual views have been submitted, however, I have prepared a partial discussion of some of the points at issue and submit it herewith.

Considered in its entirety the summary submitted by the senior Senator from Florida does not state what the amendments are intended to accomplish. Its approach is a negative one of pointing out what the amendments are not intended to accomplish. This is especially true with respect to those amendments which were introduced to limit the coverage of the act as interpreted by the Administrator and the courts. For example, the retail and service establishment exemption adopted by the overwhelming vote of the Senate was intended to prevent the Administrator and the courts from asserting coverage over those retail and service businesses on the main streets of America which were never intended to be covered when the original act was written in 1938.

Likewise the conferees agreed to a redefinition of the term "produced" intending to prevent extension of coverage to such operations as window cleaning and grass cutting on the far-fetched theory that such operations are necessary to the production of goods. We specifically authorized Belo type contracts because the Administrator, refusing to accept the decision of the Supreme Court which had held such plans to be in conformity with the act, had made a series of attempts to modify or overrule that case. The summary, prepared in the office of the Administrator, in many instances seeks to confirm those very interpretations of coverage which the conferees were seeking to reverse.

PRODUCED

The conferees in their meetings had before them a memorandum setting forth specific cases showing the extreme lengths to which the Administrator and the courts had gone in interpreting the term "produced." The conferees were in agreement that such cases should be overruled. The cases discussed and the agreement of the conferees are set forth in detail at pages 14–15 of the statement of the managers on the part of the House.

During the meetings of the conference committee the House conferees insisted that the definition of the term contained in the House bill be agreed to. They yielded only to the extent of agreeing to substitute the words "directly essential" for the word "indispensable" in the definition. It was understood by both the House and Senate conferees, however, that the definition as finally agreed to was intended to have a substantially limiting effect upon the coverage of the act as heretofore interpreted by both the Administrator and the courts. Nothing is more clear than that there would never have been any conference agreement on a minimum-wage bill, had the Senate conferees not agreed to such narrowing of the act's coverage.

The summary, however, in effect states that the redefinition of "produced" has not had the effect of cutting down the coverage of the act at all, but has merely provided a more specific guide and created more certainty as to coverage. The summary concedes only that under the redefinition coverage is not to be extended to the following activities or employees:

1. Procurement of land for a new factory.
2. Manufacture of bricks for new factory buildings.
3. Employees of a local real-estate firm renting apartments or dwelling houses to tenants, some of whom are employees of a factory producing goods for interstate commerce.

But no change in the definition was needed to assure that the act would not be extended to such activities or employees, since neither the Administrator nor the courts had ever held or even hinted that such activities or employees were covered.

The summary is chiefly concerned with pointing out that the redefinition of "produced" has done no more than to confirm all outstanding interpretations of such term, both administrative and judicial. For example, it cites *Consolidated Timber Co.* v. *Womack* (132 F. (2d) 101 (C. C. A. 9)), *Hanson* v. *Lagerstrom* (133 F. (2d) 120 (C. C. A. 8)), and *Basik* v. *General Motors Corp.* (311 Mich. 705, 19 N. W. (2d) 142) as authority for the proposition that coverage has not been withdrawn from "employees engaged in operating or maintaining living facilities for employees of a producer of goods for interstate commerce in situations where living facilities such as food and lodging are provided as a means of assuring continued and efficient production." The employees in such cases were cook-house employees in a lumber camp and cafeteria workers in an industrial plant, providing eating facilities for employees engaged in producing goods for interstate commerce. There may be situations where such services are "closely related" and "directly essential," but the conferees never intended to create such broad coverage as the quoted passage indicates.

I am in agreement with the summary that under the redefinition of "produced" the act continues to apply to office workers, plant guards, watchmen, and maintenance workers of the primary employer engaged in producing goods for commerce as well as to production employees of tool and die concerns and public utilities furnishing things without which the primary employer could not conduct his business. Many of the cases the summary cites, however, go far beyond the situations to which I have just referred. For example, it cites:

1. *Roland Electrical Co.* v. *Walling* (326 U. S. 657)—office employees of a firm which made, repaired, or maintained machinery for customers within the State who used same in producing goods for interstate commerce.
2. *Meeker Cooperative* v. *Phillips* (158 F. (2d) 698 (C. C. A. 8))—office employees of an electric power company supplying electrical energy to customers within the State for use by the latter in producing goods for interstate commerce.
3. *Borden* v. *Borella* (325 U. S. 679)—employees maintaining, servicing, and guarding an office building owned by an interstate manufacturing company and occupied primarily by its executive and administrative offices.
4. *Walling* v. *McCrady Construction Co.* (156 F. (2d) 932 (C. C. A. 3))—employees of a construction company some of whom were engaged in constructing new facilities for existing interstate manufacturing plants.
5. *Bozant* v. *Bank of New York* (156 F. (2d) 787 (C. C. A. 2))—custodial and maintenance employees of an office building occupied by lawyers, brokers, and banks. Coverage was asserted as to the custodial and maintenance employees because the banks prepare, execute, or validate bonds, shares of stock, etc., some of which move out of the State.
6. *Tormey* v. *Kiekhafer Corp.* (76 F. Supp. 557 (E. D. Wis.))—employees doing research and experimental work for an interstate manufacturer. Their work was abandoned and no new or improved products were shipped in commerce as a result of their activities.
7. *Walling* v. *Hamner* (64 F. Supp. 690 (W. D. Va.))—employees of a sawmill operator who produced and sold mine props within the State to supply companies, which in turn sold them also within the State to interstate coal companies for use in producing coal for interstate commerce. The employer also made mine props for a coal company within the State which produced coal that it transformed into coke and shipped out of the State.

RETAIL AND SERVICE ESTABLISHMENTS AMENDMENTS

The summary states that the retail and service establishment exemption provided by the amended section 13 (a) (2) is not intended to apply to establishments which are not ordinarily available to the general consuming public, citing *Boutell* v. *Walling* (327 U. S. 463), which involved a repair garage serving exclusively an affiliated interstate motor carrier. I agree that the rule of the Boutell case is not changed by the amendment made to section 13 (a) (2), because the establishment involved in that case is same as the repair department operated by the interstate motor carrier itself and its servicing would not be recognized as retail in the industry. The conferees intended, however, that the exemption should apply to any establishment meeting the tests set forth in the amended section 13 (a) (2) regardless of its location, whether in an industrial plant, an office building, a railroad depot, a Government park, etc., even though arguably establishments so located are not ordinarily available to the general consuming public. See page 25 of the House managers statement which sets forth the agreement of the conferees on this matter.

In its discussion of the 13 (a) (4) amendment the summary states:

"The goods must be made or processed at the establishment in which they are sold in order for the exemption to apply."

This statement appears susceptible of being construed to mean that although an establishment is otherwise exempt under section 13 (a) (4), it might lose its exemption unless all the goods it makes or processes are sold across the counter, dock, or platform of said establishment. Such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the intent of the conferees. Exemption is not to be denied an establishment under section 13 (a) (4) because it sells substantial quantities of goods it makes or processes through driver salesmen rather than across the counter, dock, or platform.

This is only a partial statement of my disagreement with the summary prepared by the Wage and Hour Division.

Criticism of Federal Bureau of Investigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert in the Appendix of the RECORD a copy of a telegram addressed to President Truman under date of January 27, 1950, by Charles O. Blaisdell, president, Society of Former Special

Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Inc., 70 Pine Street, New York, N. Y., together with a copy of an answering telegram to Mr. Blaisdell, by Peyton Ford, the Assistant to the Attorney General, on behalf of the President. I make this request at the instance of this society, believing that it may be of interest to the Members of the Congress and I do so in a completely objective manner.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

President HARRY S. TRUMAN,
White House, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: We have noted with alarm increased criticism in the public press of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. In the very recent past the National Lawyers Guild, which many responsible persons have stated is a Communist-front organization, has requested you to order an investigation of that Bureau. We respectfully address this communication to you as a completely independent organization of over 1,600 men who formerly served as special agents of the FBI.

Our membership includes men in all walks of life. A substantial percentage of our members are active attorneys and we believe that our views might be of some interest to you.

As average Americans we have a genuine interest in the preservation of civil rights, and as former law-enforcement officers we have a keen appreciation of the constant need of protecting those sacred rights of our fellow Americans. However, we feel that our Government also has the duty of protecting the security of our country. We believe that our Government has the duty to use every moral and proper means authorized by proper authority to combat espionage, treason, and other traitorous subversive activities which imperil the present or future security of this Nation. It is of special interest to note that most of these recent attacks have centered around investigations by the FBI, in loyalty and espionage cases. There is no doubt that many of the critics of the FBI, often unfortunately misinformed, are motivated by a sincere desire to render a public service. However, there are those who, for reasons which do not include a patriotic devotion to American principles, desire to reduce the present effectiveness of the FBI in security investigations.

In recent weeks the FBI has been criticized for the use of wire taps in the conduct of espionage investigations. Many of these critics have left the erroneous impression with the general public that the FBI has been engaged in the unauthorized use of wire taps. That is not a fact. The Attorney General of the United States has very recently stated that the FBI uses wire taps in national defense and kidnaping cases and then only upon his authorization. This policy was approved by the late President Roosevelt in 1941, and has been followed consistently by the Attorneys General since that time. Under these circumstances, when the situation warranted, if the FBI failed to avail itself of this method of obtaining information in either national defense or kidnaping cases, it would be derelict in its public duty. The Joint Congressional Committee on the Investigation of the Pearl Harbor Attack, in its report to the Congress, after pointing out that Japanese diplomatic establishments on our mainland and Hawaii, had uncensored channels of communication with Tokyo up to the time of the attacks on Pearl Harbor, stated: "The situation should never again be permitted whereby the efforts of our Government to combat forces inimical to our national security are hamstrung by restrictions of our own imposition which aid the enemy."

We heartily subscribe to these views of that committee:

We feel that recent criticism of the FBI's wire-tapping activities has led to an entirely distorted conception in some quarters as to the extent of the wire tapping done by that agency. Many persons have been led to believe that the FBI has engaged in indiscriminate wire tapping to the detriment of many innocent persons. That, also, is not a fact. As Mr. J. Edgar Hoover recently stated publicly, the FBI had less than 170 telephone taps in operation and all of these were used in internal security investigations. When it is considered that the FBI has thousands of cases under investigation at all times, that small number of wire taps is indicative of the fact that wire tapping has not been used indiscriminately by that agency.

Today the FBI stands as a symbol of integrity and efficiency in law enforcement. Interstate gangsterism and many types of vicious crimes, including kidnaping and bank robbery, have been sharply reduced as a result of the work of that agency. Through the police-training program of the FBI, police organizations at the State and local level have made unprecedented advances during the past two decades. The war record of the FBI is an excellent one. Not a single act of foreign-inspired sabotage was committed in the United States during the last war, and many espionage agents and others intent upon wrecking our security were uncovered and brought to justice.

We deem it most regrettable that unwarranted attacks are being made on one of the most efficient agencies of our Government. It is not improper to suggest that current criticism is emanating from the same individuals and groups who over many years have sought to undermine the Federal Bureau of Investigation. Such criticism only indicates a complete lack of concern for the fundamental security of this Nation. We believe there never has been a time in the history of this Republic that greater vigilance is required to insure the internal security of America. Internationally we are engaged in a titanic struggle with great totalitarian forces of aggression, and national chaos would result should we be called upon to meet this challenge with an impotent FBI and a public disunited by the influences of subversive propaganda, sabotage, and espionage.

To those of us who have lived and worked in the FBI charges of the character being impressed upon you are not merely unwarranted—they are outright lies. There is today no public servant more vitally concerned in preserving our fundamental civil rights than the Director of the FBI. Our members are proud of their past service with the FBI. We are proud of the fact that we were able to take some part in the relentless fight made against domestic lawlessness and subversive activities. We are proud that we dispatched our duties without resorting to illegal tactics, and we are proud of the genuine confidence which the great bulk of the American people reposes in the FBI.

It is for these reasons that we are constrained to write you in this instance, as well as by reason of the further consideration that the FBI, occupying the position that it does in our governmental structure, is unable to defend itself from the unwarranted and malicious attacks to which it has been repeatedly subjected. It is our sincere conviction that you will not be swayed by the attacks of those whose primary purpose it is to discredit and harass the FBI; nor will you be influenced by the criticism of sincere but misinformed individuals and groups.

Respectfully yours,
CHARLES O. BLAISDELL,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc.

CHARLES O. BLAISDELL,
President, Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI, Inc., New York, N. Y.:

Re urtel to the President expressing concern over unjustified criticism of Federal Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice. Rest assured that complete Government and public confidence in the Federal Bureau of Investigation will not be weakened in the slightest by unwarranted and malicious attacks. You may also rest assured that the Government will not be swayed adversely to the interest of either the national security or the Federal Bureau of Investigation by the attacks of those whose primary purpose is to weaken our security and discredit the FBI; nor by the criticism of sincere but misinformed individuals and groups. The interest and views of the Society of Former Special Agents of the FBI in this matter are sincerely appreciated.

PEYTON FORD,
The Assistant to the Attorney General.

Summary of Provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2, Abolishing the Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a brief summary which I have prepared of the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2.

There being no objection, the summary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 2

Senate Joint Resolution 2 is a proposed constitutional amendment which was passed by the Senate by a two-thirds vote of 64–27 and which aims to abolish the electoral college; count the electoral vote in proportion to the popular vote; and provide for a vote in the newly elected Congress between the two highest candidates in case no candidate for President receives 40 percent of the electoral vote.

This proposal completely eliminates the present possibility of an election being thrown into the House with each State having only one vote; it establishes the constitutional right of the people to direct vote; it does away with the so-called unit-rule system of counting electoral votes whereby the candidate receiving a plurality of the popular vote in any given State is credited with all the electoral votes of that State regardless of how small the plurality may be; and, finally, by making it impossible for anyone to become President of the United States who has less than 40 percent of the electoral votes, it materially reduces the power of splinter parties.

As all Members know, the present electoral college unit rule system is seriously defective and has been criticized for more than a century.

The dummy office of presidential elector is in effect an inaccurate rubber stamp since on occasion these electors actually vote against the popular will.

Under the present system, the failure of a candidate to obtain a majority of electoral

votes throws the election into the House of Representatives where each State has one vote. This would have happened in January of 1949 if only a few thousand votes in Ohio and Illinois had gone differently. On the first ballot the result would have been: Truman, 21; Dewey, 20; and Thurmond, 4. And 25 would have been necessary to a choice.

The unit-rule method of crediting all other States' electoral votes to the plurality candidate in each State puts a tremendous premium on a few large States, limits the campaign to a minority of States, and restricts political preferment to a man who happens to live in one of a few so-called pivotal States.

The present system has led to the election of a President who actually had a smaller popular vote than the man whom he defeated—Adams over Jackson in 1824, Hayes over Tilden in 1876, and Harrison over Cleveland in 1888. This possibility cannot, of course, be completely eliminated without going to a straight popular election, but the pending proposal very much reduces the danger. The Brookings Institution is authority for the statement that the provisions of Senate Joint Resolution 2 "will practically eliminate" such an occurrence.

Moreover, in pivotal States there are pressure groups which, under the present system, can sway the balance in those States. In the last election, for example, the candidacy of Henry A. Wallace swung all of New York's 47 votes to Dewey in spite of the fact that Truman received 45 percent of the popular vote in that State.

In this respect, Senate Joint Resolution 2 effectively reduces the power and influence of splinter parties. The provision that the newly elected Congress, voting as individuals, would choose between the two highest candidates in the event that no candidate initially received 40 percent of the electoral vote is another deterrent to splinter party growth.

The proposed amendment completely preserves the rights of the small States, who retain their allocation of two electoral votes regardless of population.

It would tend to give a more truly national character to both our major parties and would greatly enhance and invigorate the two-party system in the United States. It neither helps nor hurts either party. It is sponsored by persons from both parties representing all sections of the country. I believe that upon careful study members of both parties will conclude that it simply eliminates restraints on the two-party system as a whole and thus opens up the field for imaginative and courageous political leadership in the future, the ultimate advantage of which none of us can accurately predict.

Let us send it to the legislatures so that the people in the States may have the chance to pass on this constructive reform.

American Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, recently in my State of New Jersey we again celebrated the anniversary of the birth of great inventor, Thomas A. Edison. In connection with that celebration I have had called to my attention the work of the Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, a nonprofit organization which is attempting to discover "new Edisons" and to sell the principles upon which our way of life was founded.

This important and significant foundation is directed by a distinguished retired naval officer, Vice Adm. Harold G. Bowen, who made an important address on the subject of American industry at a luncheon meeting of the Kiwanis Club in New York City on January 18.

I ask unanimous consent that Vice Admiral Bowen's address be placed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN INDUSTRY

(Address delivered by Vice Adm. Harold G. Bowen, U. S. Navy (retired), executive director, Thomas Alva Edison Foundation, before the Kiwanis Club, New York City, January 18, 1950)

We are living in the midst of that phenomenon, which let us call, the modern industrial state.

The modern industrial state depends on several fundamentals, some of which are a patent law which recognizes ownership of ideas as well as ownership of property; mass production which, of course, depends upon a large home market enjoying a sufficiently high scale of living; industrial management relying very heavily on accounting; risk capital; research and development laboratories; marketing; transportation; and inventions. The loss of any one of these fundamentals would be as bad as the loss of a strategic battle.

The grouping of nations in the future will be along industrial and economic and not political lines. The world will be divided into primary industrial states and satellite nations thereof; and the first necessity of a primary industrial state is a large enough home market with a sufficiently high scale of living to support mass production, one of the keystones of the modern industrial state.

The backward condition of England as respects modern industry was plainly apparent during the high-pressure, high-temperature steam fight in our Navy in the late 1930's. England, which had led the navies of the world in innovations and improvements for several centuries, did not follow us in the radical and extensive modernization of our machinery which preceded and was completed before Pearl Harbor. The royal navy lagged with its machinery because England was lagging in industrial research and in that complete mechanization of industry which accompanied the rise of mass production. There is a grave doubt in my mind that England, on account of insufficient home population and insufficient scale of living, can ever again become a primary industrial state, even after she has copied all of our American practices.

Russia, China, and India have sufficient populations for mass production; but whether or not their scale of living can be sufficiently increased over the years for them to become, in the future, serious competitors of our own industrial civilization is something only time can answer.

Remarkable and fascinating as they are, I find no appreciation of the rise of our present industrial civilization in Toynbee's books and articles. I find no recognition of the fact that our present industrial civilization has no parallel in history. Churchill, the glorious and the inimitable, recently ascribed America's rise to ascendency to the fact that we are a union of States. Oh, that life were as simple as that.

Prof. Harold Laski is quoted as having advised the labor unions, during his visit to this country, to organize a labor party like they have in England. He says that would fix everything. That's what I'm afraid of—that it would fix everything. But he forgets to tell us who will support England if we go socialistic.

Toynbee, Churchill, and Laski apparently haven't the faintest conception of the modern industrial state based on those fundamentals which I enumerated earlier. Why pick on Toynbee, Churchill, and Laski? I doubt if such a conception is present in the minds of either the Conservative or Socialist Party.

World War II was won because our allies, and principally ourselves, were able to apply more horsepower per man in our military operations than our enemies and more horsepower per man than had been applied in any previous war. Industry and research won the war; and, right here, let me state that the technology of any armed service cannot rise above the technological ceiling of its national industry.

National defense depends in large measure on the ability to rapidly mobilize a large proportion of industry. Industry, therefore, has the double role of putting bread into the mouths of the multitude and in defending the multitude from aggression.

That, American industry can and will do if it is not pestered to death by an omnipotent state.

Of all the fundamentals of the modern industrial state, certainly the most recent and fundamental ones are mass production, research, and development.

There is a constant battle going on in industry between rising wages, costs of raw materials, increased taxes, and reduction of production costs. Management endeavors to keep down its production costs by such well-known and orthodox methods as increased mechanization, extensive use of more and better labor-saving devices, and improved or new processes. There may come a time when management's only out will be through improved or new processes. Besides constantly improving processes or substituting more and better processes for older ones, it is also the function of research and development continuously to provide new wants and thus build up a bigger market for the concern with which the research laboratory is associated.

When we compare the equipment we had to work with 50 years ago with the equipment we have at our disposal today, we should remember that the unbelievable strides we have made in the mechanical and electrical arts are due to the amazing contributions of scientists, research workers, or development engineers. None of these improvements just naturally happened; they are results of long, hard, and generally disheartening work by many unsung heroes in research and development.

For instance, General Electric acquired the rights to manufacture the Curtis turbine when it was more of an idea than a turbine. The reliable and dependable steam turbine of today—industry's work horse—is the result of many years and millions of dollars' worth of effort.

Radio, before it reached its present efficiency, had to await the development of the vacuum tube and the amplifying circuit. These great components of radio began with Thomas A. Edison's invention of the Edison effect, which was followed by the work of Fleming, deForest, and Armstrong. Hertz, Marconi, and other early pioneers did but set in motion certain forces which development engineers, at a later period, fashioned into that which we now know as radio.

The great Michael Faraday made his discovery that a conductor carrying electricity could be made to move in a magnetic field, but his model of the first electromagnetic machine was of no earthly use as it was. His discovery was followed by the work of

brilliant research engineers, development engineers, and others, who in my opinion, made as great a contribution to technology and all knowledge as Faraday. Certainly Edison, with his invention of the electric light, the central power plant, his rapid and radical improvement of the dynamo, and his development of all the devices necessary for the mass production, distribution, and metering of electrical energy—not to mention the first bulb manufacturing plant and many other details—showed, in a graphic way, the contributions which research workers have made to modern industry.

The story of the invention and development of the phonograph presents, in a neat fashion, the wonderful way in which the material arts have profited by our technological progress. The phonograph could not have been invented by a scientist, nor could it have been brought to its present state of perfection by an inventor. .

It has been said that, if Bell and his associates had known of the mass of technological knowledge required before telephony was really possible, they would never have attempted to invent the telephone.

The same is true of Edison and his phonograph.

Edison didn't know that his phonograph should never have worked; and not having this load on his mind, he invented it. That's what makes an inventor.

Edison was the first man in the history of the world to reproduce the voice of man; and this should rank him next to and immediately after Prometheus.

The work of development engineers, after Edison's invention of the phonograph, is fairly well known to us all; but it remained for Bell Laboratories to put the finishing touches on the phonograph. The contributions of Bell Laboratories' research workers in the phonograph development is typical of the work of industrial research laboratories, in innumerable fields, today.

It is interesting to note that the phonograph is an American invention and, further, that its wonderful perfection resulted from years of work by a telephone industry which is a free enterprise. Telephone companies in Europe, which are run by their respective governments, had the same opportunity as Bell laboratories to do this work, and they didn't do it.

There are mouths to be fed in this world—a brutal way of saying that our population must be kept employed if our economy is to succeed.

Research and invention have put more people to work than any element in our civilization, and it will forever be the glory of applied or industrial research that it represents the first time in the history of the world that an art became self-supporting.

It has been my good fortune to have witnessed the rise of many industries and parts thereof, and one of the most inspiring has been the rise of the Diesel engine.

The steady advance in the reliability of the Diesel engine has been perfectly astonishing, and few today remember the trials and tribulations of the Diesel engines in the early 1900's and, as a matter of fact, until quite recently.

The Navy, prior to Pearl Harbor, became convinced that we would never have good submarines until they were powered by engines of the type being manufactured by General Motors and Fairbanks-Morse. About the time the Navy started buying General Motors' engines, as I remember it, General Motors was employing 140 men in building Diesel engines. Today, at the LaGrange plant, they are employing in excess of 14,000. I know of no better example in this day and age which indicates so forcibly the role of the research engineer in helping to feed the multitudes.

I read and hear a great deal about labor and management, collective bargaining, social security, and old-age pensions; but I don't hear enough about the work and contributions of the industrial research workers, and this I object to. I am concerned that such a large proportion of our people don't know that there is something more to industry than labor, management, financing, and marketing.

The Edison Foundation is endeavoring, in various ways, to acquaint the public with the fact that we have attained, in this country, considerable material progress and that material progress requires long and laborious work in the material arts. There is no such thing as push-button progress.

The Edison lecture series is sponsored in cooperation with the Newark Evening News every winter, and such distinguished lecturers as Charles F. Kettering, Dr. Harold G. Moulton, Dwight R. G. Palmer, and Benjamin F. Fairless present addresses on various facets of our modern industrial state. These lectures have set such a high standard in explaining industry's position that they are beginning to attract most favorable attention.

We are publishing booklets describing Mr. Edison's principal inventions. In each story, we are making the point of bringing Mr. Edison's inventions up to date so as to show the almost incredible effect of Mr. Edison's original inventions on today's industry, and also because they provide perfect examples of what happens to fairly simple inventions when they become subjected to modern technological development. The history of the incandescent light has already been published in booklet form, suitable for use in schools and shops, and the story of the invention and development of the phonograph is presently being prepared.

Not enough of our people realize the fundamental fact that American industry is a natural resource. The story of industry, if told at all, has been told by advertising and public relations people who are largely influenced in their natural desire to market a product. The significance of our industry as a fundamental factor in our economy and in our life has never been told, at least successfully.

We are living in a period which is probably best described as Toynbee describes it—the western Christian civilization—and we are all its beneficiaries.

I like to think of our civilization as a great revolving fund, from which, until we mature, we constantly make withdrawals. By the time we reach maturity, therefore, we have incurred a tremendous debt to this fund which we are duty bound to repay.

I have the greatest admiration for American industry. It is one of the pillars of our civilization. If it goes down, down goes America and, with it, western Christian civilization.

Lincoln Day Address by Mr. Talmage Wilcher

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by Mr. Talmage Wilcher, State Republican committeeman from Arlington, Va., on February 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln should be a time of rededication of those general principles for which he stood, as applied to present-day problems. We are proud to honor the memory of this great man who was a father of the Republican Party, and one of America's great Presidents.

In simple terms he expressed the relationship between the people and their Government: "In all things which the people can do for themselves as well or better than the Government—the Government should never interfere." For the past 20 years we have had the opposite of this theory of government dinned into our ears from the theorists in Washington. Young people are led to expect security from the cradle to the grave—that the Government will take care of them. This is socialism—it has never been successful in any country in the world—it cannot be successful here. It is a deliberate attempt to lull our younger people into a sense of false security. The Government secures money from its citizens in the form of taxes. When money goes to Washington, where there are 1,154 bureaus, these bureaus take their toll from it—a 15-percent handling charge before any money is returned to us in unproductive charges.

The man who said "Nothing is certain but death and taxes" had something there. The Fair Deal, as do all other socialistic forms of government, appeal to the man of lesser income by appearing to soak the rich in taxes. The catch is that the poor man pays too. The rich man pays in income taxes and the poor man pays in hidden taxes. Newsweek has recently released a report on taxes which should interest every citizen since all of us pay taxes. It tells us that a tax research organization discovered 150 taxes levied on the manufacture and sale of a woman's hat, 116 taxes on a man's suit of clothes, 151 taxes on a loaf of bread, yet we find no reduction in cost of bread even though we have the largest surplus of wheat in our Nation's history—at least 100 taxes on a dozen eggs, yet we have $15,000,000 worth of eggs rotting in caves in this country.

There are 11½ cents in taxes in the cost of a pack of cigarettes, $500 on a $2,000 car, $2,000 tax on a $10,000 home. These are a few of the items used daily by almost every family. It is time we Republicans told the man of moderate income that it is not only the rich who pay taxes. All of us, rich or poor, must have food and clothes, and we must all, therefore, pay the taxes. If business and industry are taxed out of existence, as there is reason to fear they may be, what will happen to our standard of living, the highest in the world. We own more automobiles, radios, television sets, cars, telephones, and other refinements of living than all the other nations put together.

What then have we to gain by adopting state socialism? We know there are people in high places in government who would have us adopt the "isms" which have caused economic disaster wherever they have been accepted. We have the words, placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, of Senator HOLLAND, of Florida, a southern Democrat, who admits that "There are present on this floor of the Senate public officials representing this Nation who see state socialism as one of the objects for which they are working and to which they think we should soundly go."

The day has come when we Republicans must say, in no uncertain terms: "We are for the free and private competitive-enterprise system. We believe in the ability of people to maintain their homes, their families, their businesses and professions without Government interference. We believe in the pay-as-you-go form of government, and a tax scale that is safely within the bounds of a

democratic system as opposed to socialism. We believe that the individual 48 States are sufficiently able to maintain their governments without benefit of Federal regulation, for which we pay a frightful toll. We believe that curtailment in Government cost is an absolute necessity, in view of the mounting Federal debt—already in excess of two hundred and fifty billion.

We do not believe in national socialized medicine. We do not believe in regimentation. We do not believe in Federal control and regulation in any forms.

Lincoln's philosophy of government should be applied to present-day problems, and what I mean is we cannot ditch all of the social gains—such as grants-in-aid to States. Some of this legislation has real merit, such as care of the aged, Federal aid to education and dependent children. Social-insurance labor laws, which have proven a blessing, and such other legislation, as Federal housing insured loans, Farm Credit loans, but I reiterate that subsidies should be ditched, bureaucratic control should be ditched, and any law that tends to regulate and control large segments of our population should be repealed.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not an easy thing to tell one's children that there is no Santa Claus; it is not an easy choice to tell the American people that its Democratic-elected Representatives in Government have not been honest in their interpretations to the people. It would be much easier for us to go along the primrose path, outpromising the Fair Dealers, but we cannot do this, we will not do this, and we must not do this. We have reached the crossroads where we must forget political expediency in favor of telling shocking truths. From here on out we are fighting to preserve a mode of life; our battle is not between two major political parties. It is a question of whether Americanism or socialism shall dominate.

The impossibility of socialism has been proven by 4,000 years of failure. The American way of life has proven itself in less than two centuries. Southern Democrats, let me ask you, "Who is kidding whom?"

You know that the Lincoln philosophy of government is the same as the Jeffersonian Democrat. Both of these political philosophies represent equal rights and State rights, freedom of action, free competition and free enterprise, decentralized governments as against centralized governments. You who call yourselves Democrats are not Democrats in the main. You are Republicans in belief, because the national administration is not Jeffersonian democracy—but Fair Dealers, fellow travelers of a socialism which is alien to Americanism. Awake, Southern Democrats and join hands, because our fight is yours also.

This is our country, if we love it, and hope to keep it, and to keep the freedom to be let alone, to pursue our way of life as we wish as individuals, the burden is on us to fight for it. That means work. We must inform ourselves, we must educate others regarding the fallacies, that are being saddled on us every day. The last Presidential election some 45,000,000 people failed to vote. We must see that they cast a vote this year and that it is an informed vote. Begin at home, with your neighbor, the families on your street, the person next to you in the grocery store. There you can mention a few of the items in his grocery basket—cigarettes, bread, and eggs. Tell him about the hidden taxes he is paying there. See that your friends and acquaintances are registered and that they vote. It is a job that must be done individually and one that we must all share—else we fail.

Many of you Virginians attended the Lincoln Day box supper last Monday night in Washington and your morale was boosted by the tremendous crowd there. It was an inspiring and wholesome thing to see. The Fair Deal Democrats say that the Republicans are the party of privilege and of the rich—yet we have a dollar box supper while they have $100-a-plate dinners for the party faithful—and they aren't going to pay a tax on the $100, badly as they need tax money—it will go into the till to elect more good Fair Dealers and fellow travelers to spend more of your money. If you don't like this flagrant insult to your intelligence—there's only one thing to do about it, and that is to join the Republican Party now.

There is a job to do and that job is to tell others over and over again just what socialism means to every man, woman, and child. Let's tell this story in every American home until the dangers of socialism are forever past. If you continue to work and to do this job sincerely and honestly, I feel certain that the future of our Republican Party and the American people will be secure.

Closing of Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Say It Isn't So," published in the Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune under date of Saturday, February 11. The editorial relates to the tragic closing of the Waltham Watch Co.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SAY IT ISN'T SO

Government officials and leaders of his own party many times have had cause to be disturbed at President Truman's faculty for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. The latest outbreak of foot-in-mouth disease on the part of the chief executive hit Waltham Watch Co. at a most inopportune moment.

Mr. Truman, it should be pointed out, has promised much to Waltham's precision industry and given less than nothing.

By less than nothing we mean that he has dismissed this vital concern without even waiting for the results of a study he himself had asked for concerning Waltham's essentiality to the national defense.

He has consistently failed to do anything in Waltham's behalf despite his oft-quoted statement that no segment of American industry would be harmed by reciprocal trade.

His off-the-cuff statement that everything possible has been done for Waltham is puzzling indeed. By everything he can't mean tariff or quota relief. Neither the State Department nor the Tariff Commission has acted despite incontrovertible proof the Swiss import flood has strangled the domestic watch industry.

By everything he can't mean RFC assistance. About all the RFC did was to pay off banking indebtedness and enable the firm to capitalize on its inventory—through a half-price sale. That was something to be grateful for, of course. But RFC advanced no reasonable amount of working capital, and is now reluctant to release part of $2,000,000 earmarked for machinery despite the fact that the concern's asset value is far in excess of its debt.

No, Mr. Truman, we don't think everything has been done for Waltham. We believe a tragic disservice is being done the country's security by your casual dismissal, which so ironically came within an hour of the time when the Munitions Board was reaffirming Waltham's vital defense role.

The President's aides say he wouldn't want to be directly responsible for barring the firm from a chance to reopen. Well, Mr. Truman, just say it isn't so. Tell us it really counts to be a 100-percent producer of timing mechanisms during wartime. Tell us that 2,300 jobs mean something.

If Waltham is expendable, won't Elgin or Hamilton be next?

Statement by Hon. Leonard W. Hall, of New York, Relating to Edward Lamb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT A. TAFT

OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, a statement by Representative LEONARD W. HALL, of New York, in regard to Mr. Edward Lamb, who seems to be arranging President Truman's trip to Ohio.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. LEONARD W. HALL, OF NEW YORK

It should be of interest to the American people that within a few hours after the New York Times had printed President Truman's reaffirmation of his "red herring" stand, that the President should receive at the White House one Edward Lamb, a man whose association with Communist fronts and Communist causes is a matter of public record.

The official White House calling list issued today, February 15, reads, in part: "12:15, Mayor Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, with Publisher Edward Lamb, of Erie Dispatch."

An hour after Mr. Lamb had visited the White House, the Associated Press carried the following report on the AP wire:

"Edward Lamb, Toledo, Ohio, lawyer and publisher of the Erie (Pa.) Dispatch, told reporters after seeing the President: 'The President said he would wage as aggressive a fight to elect a Democratic Congress this fall as he did to get himself elected in 1948.'

"Another White House visitor, Mayor David L. Lawrence, of Pittsburgh, joined Lamb in making the announcement.

"Mr. Truman is expected to go into other States in a speaking tour for Democratic nominees after the primaries are over, White House aides say.

"The President himself has said that he does not expect to participate in any Democratic primaries outside of his own State of Missouri.

"Lamb said Mr. Truman assured him and Lawrence that after the nominees have been chosen he would be 'free to campaign aggressively in Pennsylvania and Ohio for a Democratic, aggressive Congress.'

"He and Lawrence are here to attend tomorrow night's Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner."

Mr. Lamb's affinity for Red causes has been the subject of debate on the floor of the

House of Representatives on at least five occasions. The discussions are to be found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 93, part 1, page 538; volume 94, part 4, pages 5237 and 6816; volume 94, part 7, pages 9232 and 9233; and in the Appendix of the RECORD, volume 94, part 11, page A3653.

In addition, a special House Committee To Investigate the Federal Communications Commission (80th Cong., 2d sess.), devoted 5½ pages of its final report to the House to publication of Mr. Lamb's record. This document is known as House Report No. 2479, and the pages cited are pages 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, and 25.

I was a member of the special committee investigating the FCC and signed the final report. Congress interested itself in Mr. Lamb's record because Mr. Lamb within the space of 2 weeks in 1948 received five operating licenses from the FCC. Congress considered it a proper matter, and perhaps the President might also, to inquire into the Communist associations of a man who would control the airways of five outlets under Government license.

Here is Mr. Lamb's record in part:

Mr. Lamb was executive vice president of International Labor Defense; he was vice chairman of the American Committee for Protection of Foreign Born; he was a member of the executive committee of the National Federation for Constitutional Liberties. All three of these organizations have been cited in the Attorney General's list, and have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was an executive vice president of the National Lawyers' Guild, which is now seeking an investigation of the FBI; he was a member of the National Committee of the International Juridical Association; he was a sponsor of the Civil Rights Congress. All three of these organizations have been cited by the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Mr. Lamb was the signer of a telegram addressed to the President in 1940 and sent by the Emergency Peace Mobilization condemning military conscription as un-American; he was a signer of the call for the International Action Conference for Civil Rights; he was a signer of a statement addressed to the President of the United States on March 5, 1941, defending the Communist Party; he was a signer of the open letter for closer cooperation with the Soviet Union in September 1939. Mr. Lamb was twice the author of articles appearing in the magazine of the Friends of the Soviet Union; he was a signer of a letter to President Roosevelt protesting attacks on the Veterans of the Abraham Lincoln Brigade and condemning the "war hysteria being whipped up by the Roosevelt administration."

Mr. Lamb acted as counsel for Mrs. Sarah V. Montgomery when she was a witness before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, and he stated at that time that he was attorney for the American Peace Mobilization; he was an attorney for Alex Balint, a witness called before the Special Committee on Un-American Activities, who was a Communist later ordered deported.

Mr. Lamb also is the author of a book called The Planned Economy in Soviet Russia.

The record cited above dates from 1934 into 1948.

Mr. Lamb has been mentioned favorably on numerous occasions by the Daily Worker and by New Masses. The records of the Special Committee on Un-American Activities list 21 citations involving Mr. Lamb's name.

This is Mr. Lamb's record, and it is appalling that President Truman should summon him to the White House to help make campaign plans for the election of Democratic Congressmen in 1950. In his interview in the New York Times today Mr. Truman asserts that his loyalty board has done much more effective screening of Communist sympathizers and fellow travelers than has Congress through the action of its committees. While this may be questioned by the American public in the light of the Alger Hiss case and numerous other cases, perhaps the American interest would be better served if the President's loyalty board moved over to the White House doorstep and screened the guest list. It is high time that somebody in this administration determined when "herring" ends and "red" begins.

Reestablishment and Maintenance of Free and Competitive Enterprise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY DARBY

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. DARBY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the American National Livestock Association at its fifty-third annual convention at Miami, Fla., on January 5, 1950.

This resolution, which was brought to my attention by a prominent Kansas farmer, cattleman, and businessman, Richard W. Robbins, of Greensburg, Kans., expresses the concern of the members of the association over the present trend toward a socialized state, and deserves the attention of all Members of the Senate.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its citizens which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American cattlemen of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialist state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the State of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors.

The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to natural bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the American National Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depend on the reestablishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to diligently and actively work toward this objective and toward the defeat of the fallacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

No Security Without National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "No Security Without National Security," published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NO SECURITY WITHOUT NATIONAL SECURITY

The popular cry of the times is "security" and everybody is clamoring for it, egged on by political leaders who fear to urge caution.

Security is most desirable. All of us want it and we are seeking it.

It was the dream of the men who founded America. They had been oppressed by the centralized government of the British monarchs of the era or other despotic rulers of Europe.

To the founders of our Republic, freedom for the individual was the form of security most desired. They wanted to be freed from the shackles of serfdom.

Time marches on and we are now in an era in which we are turning again to the security promised by a centralized government which is being granted more and more power.

The security of freedom was sufficient for several generations of Americans. They wanted only the opportunity to work and strive for something they could call their own, secure in the conviction that it could not be taken from them by government taxes. Leaders of those generations refused to permit heavy taxation. They knew that the power to tax offered opportunities to gain power. They refused to use it because they had been closely associated with generations of peoples who had been ground down into vassals of the state through imposition of such levies.

Now, a little more than a century and a half later, we seem too far removed from our founding fathers to remember or realize the experiences which so infuriated and inspired them that they fought a bloody revolution to gain the security of freedom.

In this era, for a degree of security in the distant future, we are permitting a revival of centralized government. Home rule of the townships and municipalities is being lost to States and the rights of States are being absorbed by the Federal Government.

What good will this future security be if the Government which pledges it is not built on a firm foundation?

What is the condition of our Government today?

It has a debt of $256,000,000,000 and is entering upon a period of deficit financing to maintain itself.

An individual under such circumstances would be considered hopelessly bankrupt.

Despite this situation there is no serious effort to adopt sensible financial practices.

The Government would not permit an insurance company to collect premiums from individuals if its affairs were being conducted in such a manner because of a lack of security.

To create security for ourselves and those who follow us we should demand a return to normal and sensible financial practices.

Educational Advancement in Mississippi

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN C. STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, my attention has been called to a news item which appeared in the February 11, 1950, issue of the Memphis Press-Scimitar. This news story clearly presents the progress which the great State of Mississippi is making in trying to solve its educational problem and also indicates the good relationship now existing between the white and colored races in our State.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the item was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UPON THIS RICH DIRT SHALL GROW A NEW COLLEGE FOR NEGROES—GOVERNOR WRIGHT AND PRESIDENT WHITE SINK SPADES INTO ITTA BENA SITE FOR VOCATIONAL SCHOOL

(By Clark Porteous)

ITTA BENA, MISS., February 11.—Last year's sere cotton stalks, brown and still flecked with bits of white, wave in the wind on 450 fertile acres of Delta dirt near here.

Come September, a college will be ready on the acres, ready to start serving Negro boys and girls of the Delta, and some day of the entire State.

Mississippi Vocational College, a State 4-year institution for Negroes, was started officially at 4:15 p. m. yesterday.

It was then that Gov. Fielding L. Wright, of Mississippi, and Dr. J. W. White, a Negro and the president of the new college, turned the first spadefuls of Delta dirt in a groundbreaking service.

TO KEEP SPADE

The new spade is destined to be kept in the archives of the college as a memento of the ceremony which drew white and Negro leaders from afar and hundreds of just plain people, both white and Negro.

The ground breaking followed more than 2 hours of speeches, music, and ceremony in the jam-packed Leflore County Training School here, a high school for Negroes. More than 1,000 were at the school, and there was standing room only. Hundreds were outside, many listening to the Governor and others at windows. Inside whites and Negroes sat side by side in many cases, and no effort at segregation in seating was made. There were white officials and Negro educators on the speakers' platform.

The ground breaking was to start construction of $300,000 worth of buildings—a classroom building, a shop building and the president's home. The current Mississippi Legislature is being asked for $700,000 to build dormitories and a cafeteria.

Dr. White hopes to have these by September, but he plans to open the college whether or not he has them. He is expecting an enrollment of 500 next fall, and if there are no dormitories, trucks, and school buses will haul the students back and forth.

The long-range plan for the college calls for 40 buildings, 2 barns, and a stadium. It's a 25-year plan, but leaders hope the plans drawn by Raymond Birchett, Jackson architect, can be carried out sooner. MVC eventually will accommodate 2,000 students.

It's part of the plan to give Mississippi equal educational opportunity for Negroes, though the plan still calls for segregated education. Mississippi Vocational College will be the third State-supported 4-year college, the other two being Alcorn A. and M. in Alcorn County, northeast Mississippi, opened in 1820 and a large Negro college since 1871, and Jackson College in the State Capital, center of the State, opened in 1940. There is also one Negro junior college, Coahoma County Agricultural Junior College, which became a 2-year college this year.

Governor Wright promised the audience equal education opportunities for Negroes and equal pay for Negro teachers as soon as the State can afford it, but said he will continue to be for segregated education.

* * * * *

"We will have great advances in Negro education, but there is no use expecting them to happen tomorrow," Governor Wright said. "Insofar as I'm concerned both as a citizen and as Governor, I shall do everything I can to promote progress, development, and betterment of all citizens regardless of race, color, creed, or anything else."

"I said to the teachers in the colored Mississippi Education Association 2 years ago that as Governor of the State I recognize your right to equal facilities in education, opportunities, and advantages, and I still recognize that. I recognized that before I became Governor, or Congress began talking about FEPC or other legislation. That's not what's bringing it into Mississippi. But it's not coming overnight. Let's be realistic.

"DIDN'T GET ENOUGH

"I don't claim credit. The legislature and others are doing it. The educational appropriation was $12,000,000 for common education. You (Negroes) did not—and I have no objection to saying it—get enough. I am going to see before this session of the legislature is over that you get your proportionate share.

"There is a program in the legislature to equalize school teachers' salaries. It's not going to help if you don't like the past, to build a grudge in your heart. If you've been discriminated against—forget it. Think about what is happening today and in the future.

"I have to be careful what I say, speaking as the Governor of the State. What I say, as chief executive, I hope to do my part to carry into effect. Don't expect the great day to be tomorrow. When we turn a spade of dirt and leave, there will just be a hole. In a few months, I hope there will be buildings, in a few years I hope a campus full of buildings.

"The University of Mississippi, Alcorn, Mississippi State, Delta State, MSCI, Jackson, and the rest did not grow overnight. They have been years growing. Maybe we have been backward in furnishing education for your children. It is not altogether my fault, nor the fault of my forefathers or yours. With privileges and opportunities goes responsibility. Through the cooperation of all citizens, white and black, is the only way. If you want to cooperate with me, the men on the board and in the legislature—we will solve the education problem. It's a big one. When you do not have responsibility, it is easy to say what to do. When you have responsibility, there is a limit to what you can do.

"LONG STEP

"I say in all seriousness to this mixed gathering, if we have that cooperation from you, we will take a long step in our program to eventually furnish equal education and equal opportunity with no discrimination."

The Fulbright Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article on the Fulbright program, by James W. Silver, chairman of the history department of the University of Mississippi.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger of December 20, 1949]

FULBRIGHT PROGRAM IS ONE GOOD THING THAT GREW OUT OF WAR, STATE MAN AVOWS

(By James W. Silver, chairman, history department, University of Mississippi)

ABERDEEN, SCOTLAND, December 19.—Until I saw most of the windows of the Southampton-London boat train plastered with the word "Fulbright," I was not conscious of the size of the movement with which I had become connected. Most of our contingent took up the pronunciation of the dockworker who was curious about the meaning of "Foolbright," but, regardless of how you say it, my guess is that one of these days the word will find its way into the dictionary.

For the Fulbright program is undoubtedly the most comprehensive experiment of its kind yet undertaken. It is one of the few good things that have come out of the war and should be a great force for making American democracy more completely understood by people we like to call our friends.

With his background as Rhodes scholar and as president of the University of Arkansas, it was only natural for Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT to introduce Public Law 584 which received the President's signature on August 1, 1946. This Fulbright Act, an amendment to the Surplus Property Act of 1944, set in motion the machinery which has already enabled nearly 2,000 students, teachers, and scholars to study and work in lands other than their own. Its basic purpose is an "increase of mutual understanding between the people of the United States and people of other countries."

Administrative responsibility rests with United States Department of State, whose Division of Exchange of Persons initiates with other countries executive agreements under which United States educational commissions are set up abroad. To present time, agreements have been consummated with China, Burma, Belgium, and Luxemburg, France, Greece, Italy, New Zealand, the Philippines, the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Norway, and negotiations are well under way with Austria, Australia, Egypt, India, Pakistan, and Turkey.

Financing of the program comes solely from the sale of surplus property abroad which we refused to bring home after the war and which our allies were eager to buy as they were lacking in dollars. For instance, Britain's settlement of lend-lease

brought the United States sterling credits of some $650,000,000. To have withdrawn these would have partially frustrated our whole plan of economic aid to non-Communist countries. In December 1945 Britain agreed to set aside $50,000,000 (in sterling) for educational purposes. Under the Fulbright program, up to one million of these dollars may be used annually for the next 20 years; similar agreement has been made with each of the other nations mentioned.

President Truman has appointed an eminent Board of Foreign Scholarships which approves policies and types of programs and selects both Americans and foreigners for Fulbright awards. Graduate student applicants are certified to the Board by the Institute of International Education, 2 West Forty-fifth Street, New York, N. Y. Secondary teachers who want to swap jobs for a year with foreign pedagogs must first be O. K.'d by the United States Office of Education, Federal Security Agency, Washington, D. C., while those interested in university instruction of advanced research must be recommended to the Board by the Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, 2101 Constitution Avenue NW., Washington 25, D. C.

The American student lucky enough to snag a Fulbright appointment receives tuition, maintenance, and travel allowances. The teacher or research worker does still better with a stipend in addition to travel and maintenance. The foreigner who comes to the United States under the program gets only travel allowances, inasmuch as no dollars are available. Under this condition we hope to have both a professor and a graduate student from Britain at the University of Mississippi in 1950–51.

So far, 562 students, 124 teachers, 68 professors, and 115 research scholars have gone abroad with Fulbright appointments. From foreign lands to America have come 382 students, 11 teachers, 38 professors, and 111 research scholars.

The United States Educational Commission in the United Kingdom, which looks after the Silver family with such painstaking care, was set up by an executive agreement of September 1948, signed by Ambassador Lewis Douglas and Foreign Minister Ernest Bevin. Under its administration there are over 250 Americans working in Britain and a slightly smaller number of Britons in the United States. Another year will see an increase on both sides.

My 3 months' experience in Scotland has convinced me that we would do well to examine carefully the assumption that even our close friends are informed regarding us and our way of life. I know, too, that the average well-informed American is likely to live in blissful ignorance of the real problems and feelings of millions of people abroad. War itself brought a considerable advance in mutual respect and understanding. The Fulbright program may well be another important milestone on the road to international comprehension and good will without which there is small chance of permanent world peace.

A Novel Plan To Raise Revenue

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "A Novel Plan To Raise Revenue," written by Arthur Krock in the New York Times of February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—A NOVEL PLAN TO RAISE REVENUE

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 9.—A suggestion that the Federal Government charge fees for special services, and thus in one move cut down costs and add to revenues, may not get serious attention from the Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee, but it should. They are hard at work on proposals affecting taxation, their basic problem, as always, being how to relieve burdens on the industrial economy without reducing the Government's income.

The suggestion was made in some detail by John A. Kennedy in the San Diego Journal, of which he is publisher and editor. In substance, it is to put special Government services "on a cafeteria style or pay-for-what-you-get basis."

Local governments do this regularly; they also make a charge for an automobile driver's permit or a marriage license, which are ordinary and not special services. But Mr. Kennedy gave a number of examples of the second variety which the people get free from Washington and add measurably to the cost of the central Government. Here are some:

A citizen expects to pay, and does, a pro rata share of the expense of a new road or sidewalk in front of his house. He pays gasoline taxes so that roads may be built and maintained. But he pays nothing beyond his regular taxes, or in some instances only a nominal sum, for Federal licensing and inspection of great and direct benefit to him. And as part of a corporation he gets free special services of great business value from the Federal Government.

"Why," asked Mr. Kennedy, "should Uncle Sam not exact a payment for the valuable export licenses the Department of Commerce issues to business men? Or for the certificates of operation, charters, and inspection services given gratis to interstate motor and freight carriers by the Interstate Commerce Commission? Why shouldn't the Civil Aeronautics Administration or the Maritime Commission be reimbursed, at least for the paper work involved in issuing charters to aviation and shipping companies?"

OTHER EXAMPLES

The Federal Communications Commission, he submitted, should charge for the valuable franchises it issues in the form of licenses every 3 years to more than 2,000 broadcasting stations. Some of these may have entered the business wholly as a concept of public service, but also it is "a pleasant way of earning their bread and butter."

The Departments of Agriculture and Interior furnish hundreds of free services to farm and other groups, and some of these, said the editor, "could fairly be the basis of a small charge." American Overseas Airlines and Pan American have kept a Federal staff busy for months on the application of the latter to buy the former for $17,500,000, and he thinks the buyer and the seller should pay the costs. Also, when the railroads seek increased rates they should reimburse the Interstate Commerce Commission for the expenses of the long hearings, and so should others in the same position—telephone companies, power companies seeking grants from the Federal Power Commission and corporations asking the approval of the Securities and Exchange Commission for bond and stock issues.

"Why," inquired the editor, "should the 500,000 pilots and technicians have been issued their CAA licenses for nothing; likewise the 80,000 radio 'hams' and 60,000 commercial radio operators who hold 5-year licenses from the FCC?" He cited the Government Printing Office, which distributes most of its huge output free, except for a small charge that reflects only the actual cost of printing documents prepared for individual Government agencies. "In 1947," said Mr. Kennedy, "the Public Printer sold 36,000,000 pamphlets for $3,200,000 but over twice that number—86,000,000—were distributed free by Members of Congress and others.

"I imagine [he wrote] that some skeptics will look down their noses at this suggestion as providing too little in additional Government moneys to offset the added headaches of bureaucratic bookkeeping. But this is to ignore the basic fact that multiplied throughout the whole fabric of Government, such fees could be fixed on the cost of services performed and could add up to a lot of money for the Treasury.

"I am also in the radio and television business. Why shouldn't I pay the Government for servicing my various requests which have helped make my radio business profitable?"

SOME PAY FOR OTHERS

In addition to the good sense of much of this, it has a particular appeal for the great mass of citizens who pay for these special services, few or none of which they ever request for themselves. No calculation of the cost could even be approximated, but the amount is very large. And, going beyond the Hoover Commission, Mr. Kennedy has managed to devise a plan by which public revenue is increased and the budget reduced simultaneously.

In The Great American Bandwagon, Charles Merz, the editor of this newspaper, once observed that if Government charged admission to celebrated trials and like events, and held them in stadia about the size of the Yale Bowl, the take would greatly shrink the public debt. Mr. Merz wrote that with his tongue in his cheek, though his would be a sound revenue measure if the dispensing of justice were not the matter involved. Mr. Kennedy, however, is serious and has made a serious case.

What Is Prosperity?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD MARTIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "What Is Prosperity?" published in the Washington (Pa.) Observer.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT IS PROSPERITY?

WLat is that state generally referred to as prosperity? Webster gives various meanings to the word. Prosperity is an advance or gain in anything good or desirable, according to the dictionary. It is also a general condition of industrial and commercial activity in which goods and money are comparatively plentiful, according to the same authority.

Presently goods and money are comparatively plentiful. But it can be seriously questioned whether there actually is an advance or gain in anything good or desirable. Money is plentiful, but that condition exists largely as a result of political manipulation

by the Federal administration, which has scattered public funds with a lavish hand, unmindful of the mounting debt, constantly striving to put off the evil day when these obligations must be met.

True prosperity can be based entirely upon the permanent prosperity of the people and while Americans do have money to spend, they cannot be permanently prosperous so long as they are saddled with debt which is mounting daily. Present prosperity is not bringing a gain that is either good or desirable, and must be followed by readjustment.

Plight of the Baltic Countries

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NEIL J. LINEHAN
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LINEHAN. Mr. Speaker, the plight of the Baltic Nations is of great concern to the United States and all liberty-loving people. The aggression of the Soviet Union against these nations on June 15–17, 1940, and the ensuing occupation put an end to a period of independence in which great strides had been made in self-government, economics, culture, and education. With other countries, the United States condemned this occupation by Soviet Russia, but unfortunately to no avail. The three nations on the Baltic have been put under the iron heel of Moscow and their recent history is a good example of the meaning of the Soviet system to the other peoples of the world. They are suffering all the hardships and cruelties to which any totalitarian tyranny subjects the people in its power. Many have been killed or tortured to death, while others have been deported to the interior of the Soviet Union or perished in concentration camps. These former independent countries are now more isolated from the west than any other countries. There are no foreign diplomatic or consular representatives there, nor can any of their inhabitants travel west.

In an appeal to the General Assembly of the United Nations in November 1947 the representatives of the Baltic states made the statement that June 1940 "also marked the beginning of a planned, systematic, and cruel genocide of these peoples." This appeal also quoted from a secret instruction from Moscow in January 1941 that "the removal of anti-Soviet elements from the Baltic Republics is a political task of great significance," which is the background for the tragedy now going on there. The policy of annihilating the Baltic nations and executing Lithuanians, Estonians, and Latvians is continuing to this day, despite the fact that Soviet Russia signed the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations wherein man's rights and fundamental freedoms are assured.

The Baltic people are fighting a grim battle for life against the deliberate policies of the Kremlin. It is obvious that the Kremlin intends to completely eliminate the freedom-loving Balts. Arrests, executions, and mass deportations for slave labor in Russia threaten to destroy the Baltic nations completely. Many of the national leaders and much of the intelligentsia were killed off or deported during the Russian invasion of 1940. The deportation of larger numbers, classified according to progressive degrees of untrustworthiness, began after the Russians returned in 1944. Tested Russian Communists were sent to take their places, taking over their holdings and even their names. Russian has become the official language. Recent testimony before a subcommittee of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the proposed genocide treaty pictured the Soviet Union as systematically extirpating the Lithuanian and Ukrainian peoples to solidify the extended Soviet frontiers with safe Russians and to provide sure base areas for an onslaught on Europe and North America. However, it is reassuring that the United States and other nations have refused to recognize the status of the Baltic states resulting from Russian aggression and continue their de jure recognition of them as independent states. The declaration of the Secretary of State on July 23, 1940, condemning Russia's aggressive acts still stands.

Unemployment Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. STEPHEN M. YOUNG
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, in 1931 and 1932 I was a member of the Ohio Commission on Unemployment Insurance. I helped draft the unemployment insurance bill of Ohio, which served as a model for many States of the Union throughout the past 18 years. I believe in a strong unemployment-insurance program and introduced a bill, H. R. 7331, to extend and improve the Federal-State unemployment-insurance program. This bill is designed to meet the present-day needs of workers and to extend and improve the program generally.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I report that the following is a summary of the bill providing for an extension and improvement of the unemployment-insurance law.

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF LEGISLATIVE PROPOSAL FOR EXTENSION AND IMPROVEMENT OF THE UNEMPLOYMENT-INSURANCE LAW

In brief, title I provides for the observance by the States of certain minimum standards with respect to the eligibility of employees for unemployment compensation benefits, amounts and duration of benefits, and permissible reasons for disqualifying insured workers. In this regard the bill reflects standards which, with respect to amounts, duration, and eligibility for benefits, are already largely embodied in a substantial number of State laws. It would, moreover, stem the trend manifested in recent years in some States to extend the disqualification provisions, even to the extent of a complete denial of benefits in many situations. These provisions would thus provide greater assurance that involuntarily unemployed workers shall receive the benefits to which they are entitled. This title would also provide unemployment-compensation benefits to many workers who are presently excluded from State unemployment-compensation programs, primarily because the Federal Unemployment Tax Act is inapplicable to firms with less than eight employees.

Title II makes certain improvements with respect to financing the States' costs of administering their unemployment-compensation laws and public-employment offices. Among other matters, this title would provide for the earmarking of the proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and make such funds available for the exclusive purposes of defraying the States' and Federal Government's expenses incurred in the administration of the unemployment-compensation program and public-employment offices, and for providing reinsurance grants to States. This title would require States to incorporate into their laws certain provisions designed to assure that benefits will be paid only to persons legally entitled thereto and to assure participation by States in appropriate arrangements for the payment of interstate claims.

Title III provides for the making of nonreimbursable reinsurance grants to States, thereby assuring the continued solvency of the States' unemployment funds in the event of an unexpected diminution of State revenues. In this connection, mention may be made that the provisions for making reimbursable loans to States whose unemployment funds fall below a certain margin of safety expired on December 31, 1949.

Title IV contains provisions for extending the duration of benefits in critical unemployment areas. This title contains certain safeguards to assure that only those persons who have an attachment to such labor-market areas shall be entitled to receive benefits for an extended period. The additional cost of providing benefits for the period of acute unemployment in any labor-market area would be borne by the Federal Government.

Title V would extend the States' unemployment programs to Federal employees, including military personnel.

A brief summary of the more important provisions of the bill follows:

TITLE I. AMENDMENTS TO CHAPTER 9, SUBCHAPTER C, INTERNAL REVENUE CODE

Section 101 would amend section 1603 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require the States to observe, in addition to the standards presently provided for in the code, the following additional minimum standards as a condition of securing the credit-offset allowances of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act:

First. Amount of benefits: Benefit payments to unemployed insured claimants of at least an amount substantially equivalent to 50 percent of a claimant's weekly wages up to at least $30 a week for individuals with no dependents; 60

percent of a claimant's weekly wages up to at least $36 a week for individuals with one dependent; 65 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $39 a week for individuals with two dependents; 70 percent of the claimant's weekly wages up to at least $42 a week for individuals with three or more dependents.

Second. Potential duration of benefits: Benefit payments to unemployed insured claimants equivalent to at least 26 weeks of benefits in a benefit year, if a claimant remains unemployed. Cancellation of wage credits or the reduction of benefits would be permitted only in case of fraudulent claims for benefits.

Third. Eligibility for benefits: Qualification for benefits if the employee has earned in his base period in covered employment (1) as much as 30 times his basic weekly benefit amount; or (2) as much as 1½ times his high-quarter earnings; or (3) if he was employed in as many as 20 weeks in his base period. The State would decide which one of these methods it chose to apply. A State would be permitted to adopt lower eligibility requirements if it so chose.

Fourth. Disqualifications: Benefit payments to all insured claimants able and willing to work, except that a State may deny benefits for the first week of unemployment in a benefit year; it may postpone the payment of benefits for periods up to 6 weeks if the claimant voluntarily quit work without good cause, or was discharged for misconduct connected with his work, or refused suitable work without good cause. A State may deny benefits to employees participating in a strike for the duration of the strike. It may postpone or reduce the amounts of benefits potentially payable, or cancel the wage credits, of any employee who makes a false claim for benefits.

The bill provides that these standards would become effective July 1, 1952. Each State would thus be afforded ample time to amend its laws to the extent necessary to bring them into conformity with these minimum standards.

Section 102 would extend coverage by redefining the term "employer" in section 1607 (a) of the Internal Revenue Code to include any person who has one or more individuals in his employ, thus removing the present limitation on the size of employers taxable under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act.

Section 103 would redefine the term "wages" in section 1607 (b) of the Internal Revenue Code in substantially identical language as such term is defined in the Social Security Act Amendments of 1949 (H. R. 6000) passed by the House on October 5, 1949. The only substantial difference is that the bill increases the maximum wages subject to the Federal Unemployment Tax Act from $3,000 to $4,800 (cf. sec. 208 (a) of H. R. 6000). The effective date of this section would be January 1, 1952.

Section 104 (a), (b), (c), (d), and (e) redefines the term "employment" in section 1607 (c) of the Internal Revenue Code so as to provide with some modifications, the same coverage and exemptions as are provided by H. R. 6000 (compare with section 205 (a) of H. R. 6000).

Section 104 (f) would redefine the term "employee" in section 1607 (i) in language substantially similar to that used in H. R. 6000 in defining this term (compare with section 206 of H. R. 6000). Thus this bill, as H. R. 6000, would specifically include within the term "employee" certain classes of persons who are economically dependent upon an employer, such as outside salesmen, full-time insurance salesmen, homeworkers, contract loggers, and certain classes of licensees of space in mines. In addition, the bill sets forth certain basic principles to be applied in determining the employer-employee relationship with respect to all other classes of employees, as provided in H. R. 6000.

Section 104 (g) would redefine the term "State" in section 1607 (j) of the Internal Revenue Code to include Puerto Rico, making Puerto Rico, upon the concurrence of its legislature, eligible for participation in the Federal-State unemployment insurance program—see also section 106.

Section 104 (h) would redefine the term "agricultural labor" in section 1607 (l) of the Internal Revenue Code in language identical with that used in H. R. 6000 in defining this term—see section 205 (d) of H. R. 6000.

Section 104 (i) defines certain miscellaneous terms, including "American vessel and American aircraft," "American employer," "benefit year," "high-quarter wages," "weekly wages," and "week of unemployment."

Section 104 (j) provides that the effective date of this section would be January 1, 1952.

Section 105 amends section 1609 of the Internal Revenue Code so as to require the Secretary of Labor to consult with the States on matters of policy with respect to any rules or regulations affecting the States which he may issue to carry out the purposes of this measure.

Section 106 defers the extension of this bill to Puerto Rico until January 1 of the first calendar year which begins 90 days after the legislature of Puerto Rico by concurrent resolution resolves that it wishes its extension to Puerto Rico.

Section 107 provides that the unemployment taxes in Puerto Rico shall be collected by the Bureau of Internal Revenue and that the minimum standards with respect to the amounts and duration of benefits and eligibility for benefits shall not be applicable to Puerto Rico until 4 years after the act becomes applicable to Puerto Rico.

TITLE II. AMENDMENTS TO TITLE III OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 201 would amend section 301 of title III of the Social Security Act to improve the administrative financing of the States' unemployment-insurance program and public employment offices.

Subsection (a) amends section 301 to provide a permanent appropriation of the proceeds of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to the Federal Unemployment Account. It also authorizes appropriations to the Federal unemployment account of such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this bill.

Subsection (b) contains new provisions authorizing appropriations from the Federal unemployment account to the Department of Labor of such sums as are necessary to provide payments to States to finance the administrative costs of their unemployment compensation laws and their public employment offices.

Subsection (c) contains new provisions authorizing appropriations from the Federal unemployment account of the sums necessary for the Departments of Labor and of the Treasury to carry out their functions under the Federal Unemployment Tax Act and the Wagner-Peyser Act and to provide reinsurance grants to States.

Section 202 would amend section 302 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States, as a condition for receiving administrative grants, to conform to the provisions of the Wagner-Peyser Act.

Section 203 amends section 303 (a) of the Social Security Act so as to require States to incorporate into their laws, as a condition of receiving administrative grants, provisions for, first, additional methods of administration which the Secretary of Labor finds are reasonably calculated to prevent the misuse of the unemployment-compensation program by fraudulent claimants and to assure the payment of compensation only to individuals entitled thereto; and, second, for participation in plans and methods of combining wage credits and handling interstate claims which the Secretary of Labor finds are reasonably calculated to assure the prompt and full payment of benefits to interstate claimants.

Section 204 amends section 304 of the Social Security Act by redefining the term "State" to include Puerto Rico—see, however, section 107, above, as to effective date.

TITLE III. AMENDMENTS TO TITLES IX AND XII OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, AS AMENDED

Section 301 rewrites title XII of the Social Security Act. This title, as rewritten, would provide for outright grants of funds to States, from the Federal unemployment account, whenever on the last day of any calendar quarter a State's unemployment compensation fund falls below the amount of compensation paid during the 6 months' period ending on such date. The amount of the grant would be the amount estimated by the Secretary of Labor to be equal to three-fourths of the excess of the compensation which will be payable under the provisions of the State's unemployment law during the quarter for which such grant is made, over 2 percent of the taxable pay roll for such period.

In order for a State to qualify for such reinsurance grants, it would be necessary for the State to levy a minimum contribution rate of 1.2 percent for the first and any subsequent taxable year after December 31, 1952, and prior to December 31, 1957, and for each of the five preceding taxable years beginning after December 31, 1957, whenever, on the computation date for such taxable years, the State's unemployment fund fell below an amount equal to 6 percent

of the most recent taxable pay roll, or less than the amount paid from such fund during the 2 years immediately preceding such date, whichever amount was greater.

Funds provided by reinsurance grants could be used solely for the purpose of paying unemployment benefits. Any unused funds would have to be returned to the Treasury to the credit of the Federal unemployment account when the State was no longer eligible to receive a grant.

Section 302 would amend section 904 (h) of title IX of the Social Security Act, as amended, so as to authorize the appropriation to the Federal unemployment account of the proceeds of the Federal unemployment tax collected prior to December 31, 1950, less the amount expended for administrative expenses.

TITLE IV. EXTENSION OF DURATION OF BENEFITS IN CRITICAL UNEMPLOYMENT AREAS

Title IV of the bill would add a new title to the Social Security Act—title XIV—which would provide for an extension of the duration of benefits in critical unemployment areas. The program would be administered by the States, and the Federal Government would reimburse the States for the benefits paid under this title. In brief, title XIV of the Social Security Act, as amended, would provide:

Section 1401 would define certain basic terms used in this title.

Section 1402 would authorize the Secretary of Labor on behalf of the United States, upon the request of the Governor of any State, to enter into an agreement with such State which would provide for the prolongation of benefits of insured workers up to 52 weeks in their benefit year in any labor market area—as defined by the Secretary of Labor—in which during each of the immediately preceding three calendar months unemployment exceeded 12 percent of the average monthly covered employment in the State during the preceding calendar year. Insured workers would be entitled to receive benefits for such extended period of time only if they were last employed in such area and had resided therein for at least 26 weeks. Extended benefits would terminate as soon as the Secretary found that unemployment of insured individuals had fallen below the 12 percent figure during each of the three immediately preceding calendar months.

Section 1403 would make the pertinent provisions of title XIII of the Social Security Act—reconversion unemployment benefits for seamen—applicable to the administration of this title and for reimbursing States for the additional sums expended for benefits under this title.

TITLE V. UNEMPLOYMENT COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR FEDERAL WORKERS

Title V of the bill would add a new title to the Social Security Act—title XV—which would provide for unemployment compensation benefits for Federal employees. In general, the program would be administered by the States, as agents of the Federal Government, pursuant to agreements entered into between the States and the Secretary of Labor. In the absence of such an agreement with any State, the program would be administered by the Secretary of Labor. Federal employees would enjoy the same rights and be subject to the same disqualifications as provided by the unemployment compensation law of the State where they last performed Federal services. The Government would either advance or reimburse the States for the sums necessary to carry out the provisions of this title. The States would be entitled to additional grants under title III of the Social Security Act for the additional administrative expenses incurred as a result of administering this program. In brief, this title contains the following sections:

Section 1501 defines the terms "Federal services," "Federal wages," "Federal employee," and "benefits." The term "Federal employee" is defined to include any individual who has performed Federal services, including military services. The term "Federal services" is defined to exclude services performed by an elective officer in the executive or legislative branches of the Government.

Section 1502 would require the various branches of the Federal Government to make available to the Secretary of Labor, or to the appropriate State agency administering this title, such information as the Secretary of Labor finds is practicable and necessary to determine a Federal employee's entitlement to benefits.

Section 1503 would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with any State whereby the State would act as an agent of the Federal Government in the administration of this title. A Federal employee would be entitled to receive benefits on the same terms and be subject to the same disqualifications as are provided by the State law where such employee last performed Federal services. Federal employees who last performed services outside any State would have their rights determined under the law of the State of their residence. In the absence of an agreement with any State, the Secretary of Labor would administer the payment of benefits in the same amounts, on substantially the same terms, and subject to substantially the same conditions as though such an agreement had been entered into with the State.

Section 1504 contains provisions for the adjustment of benefits in cases of employees who would qualify for benefits under this title as well as under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944.

Section 1505 provides that Federal employees shall have the same right to have their benefit determinations reviewed by appropriate State administrative and judicial tribunals as other employees covered by the State law; that States shall be entitled to receive grants under title III of the Social Security Act for their expenses incurred in the administration of this program, and that the States shall furnish such information to the Secretary of Labor as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this title.

Section 1506 provides for reimbursing the States, either in advance or by way of reimbursement, for the amount of benefits paid by the States under this title.

Section 1507 provides that a Federal employee would not be entitled to receive unemployment-compensation benefits until he has exhausted any accrued annual leave, whether or not paid in a lump sum.

Section 1508 authorizes an appropriation of the necessary funds to carry out the purposes of this title.

Section 1509 authorizes the Secretary of Labor to issue such rules and regulations as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of titles IV and V of this bill.

EXPLANATION OF PROPOSED UNEMPLOYMENT-INSURANCE AMENDMENTS

In his state of the Union message, the President said with respect to unemployment insurance:

> I also urge that the Congress strengthen our unemployment-compensation law to meet present-day needs more adequately. The economic downturn of the past year was the first real test that our system of unemployment insurance has had to meet. That test has proved the wisdom of the system, but it has also made strikingly apparent the need for improving its operation and increasing its coverage and its benefits.

In his budget message, the President outlined more specifically the recommendations he would make with respect to amending the Federal unemployment-compensation legislation. This bill, although not the administration proposal, with a few exceptions, embodies the President's proposals.

The proposal provides additional minimum standards which State laws must meet as a condition for Federal approval in order that employers may receive credit against the Federal unemployment tax for their contributions under such State unemployment-insurance laws. Certain standards are already required in the Federal legislation. The additional standards proposed are designed to assure that unemployed workers will receive a minimum of protection, no matter what State unemployment-insurance law they come under. The State laws must provide at least this much protection; they will be free to provide more adequate protection. These new standards would not have to be met until July 1, 1952, in order to give the States time to make such changes in their next regular legislative sessions.

With respect to benefit amount, the States would be required to pay 50 percent of the former weekly wages up to a maximum of at least $30 a week for totally unemployed individuals without dependents, with supplementary allowances for dependents up to 70 percent of weekly wages or at least $42 a week as a maximum for individuals with three or more dependents. At present, the highest benefit paid by any State not paying dependents' allowances is $27 a week and 19 States have a maximum benefit of $20 a week or less. Ohio now pays maximum benefits of $25 a week for persons without dependents and a maximum of $30 a week for persons with dependents.

The measure would require that benefits be paid for a duration of 26 weeks to all persons who remain unemployed that long. This standard at present is

met only by the State of New York, although 14 other States pay up to a maximum of 26 weeks, depending on the amount of previous employment or wages. Ohio pays up to a maximum of 26 weeks, but duration varies from 12 to 26 weeks, depending on former earnings.

The proposal would place certain limitations on the disqualifications which the States could impose. A State could impose a maximum of 6 weeks' disqualification for voluntary quitting, discharge for misconduct, or refusal of suitable employment. Ohio disqualifies for a maximum of 4 weeks for voluntary quitting and disqualification for misconduct, but with respect to refusal of suitable employment Ohio disqualifies for the duration of the unemployment. The bill would permit postponement but not reduction nor cancellation of benefit rights by the amount of the disqualification. About a third of the States reduce or cancel benefit rights in connection with such disqualifications. Ohio reduces benefits with respect to voluntary quitting and discharge for misconduct. Ohio is therefore in some respects more lenient and in some respect more stringent than the proposed standard.

The bill would also limit disqualification in case of labor disputes to unemployment due to strikes. Ohio is one of the nine States which would conform with this limitation, since it does not disqualify for unemployment due to lock-outs.

The present restriction of coverage of the Federal Unemployment Tax Act to employers of eight or more persons would be removed by the bill. At present 29 States cover smaller firms than 8 or more, Ohio covering employers of 3 or more. However, the States have held back on extending coverage to small firms until the Federal Government leads the way. Most of the States have passed provisions which would automatically extend the coverage of their laws when the coverage of the Federal tax is extended. The bill would supply the Federal leadership in covering the small firms.

The measure follows H. R. 6000, which amends Federal old-age and survivors insurance, with respect to certain other extensions of coverage, namely coverage of border-line agricultural workers and a new definition of employee. These new definitions are the result of exhaustive study by the Committee on Ways and Means and will result in a more equitable definition of who is covered by the act.

The bill also provides for unemployment benefits for unemployed Federal workers, both those who have been in civilian and military service. Benefits would be paid according to the laws of the States in which the Federal employee worked or was resident.

In title II of the act it is provided that all the proceeds from the Federal unemployment tax would be automatically appropriated to be used for unemployment-insurance purposes. The first call on these funds would be for grants to the States to defray their costs of administering unemployment insurance and the employment service, and the balance would be accumulated as a reserve to provide for reinsurance grants to those States in jeopardy of exhausting their unemployment funds.

In addition to the present requirements which States must meet in order to receive grants for administration, the bill would require the States to provide effective procedures for the prevention, detection, and adjudication of fraud and to cooperate in interstate plans for the payment of benefits to interstate workers.

Reinsurance grants would be made to States whose reserves have dropped below the previous 6 months' benefit costs. The grants would be equal to three-fourths of the benefit cost in excess of 2 percent of taxable pay rolls. In order to assure prudent financing on the part of the States, a State applying for reinsurance must have established a minimum contribution rate of 1.2 percent of taxable pay rolls when its reserve fell below 6 percent of taxable pay rolls or 2 years' benefit expenditures.

A Lesson for Truman to Learn

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "A Lesson for Truman to Learn," published in the Williamsport Sun for February 13.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A LESSON FOR TRUMAN TO LEARN

A picture of Abraham Lincoln and his son, Tad, has been distributed by the United States Savings Bonds Division of the Treasury Department. It tells its own story, and teaches its own important lesson.

It is a famous drawing of the martyred President which has become popular because it has a tone of warmth and security about it. How trustingly the lad turns to his father for explanation of the book they are reading! How much the picture seems to speak of home life and parental concern for the boy's future welfare!

The text which the Savings Bonds Division has written under the picture is important, too. It emphasizes the value of thrift. It stresses the importance of frugality, of living within one's income, of laying aside regularly a portion of one's earnings against "a rainy day." It commends private initiative and lauds both ambition and resourcefulness.

It says that comfort and security, a home and education, are "the heritage of every child." Such who have attained this heritage heretofore have done so by habits of thrift and careful living.

All this the Treasury Department applauds. Then, it adds the wise counsel that future security—a home and education—"can be attained through a regular and automatic investment in United States Savings Bonds."

That is good advice. And it would be well for more people to heed it.

But we find ourselves wondering whether, by the remotest chance, this Treasury Department sales talk on thrift and savings has come to the attention of President Truman. We believe that it contains a lesson for him, and for those around him who seem to find it so easy to spend money.

If thrift and systematic saving are so desirable for individuals, why does not the Federal Government practice it? If savings bonds are to guarantee happier and better futures for the children of this generation, then the Federal Government needs to operate on a balanced budget and in a condition of solvency which will assure the soundness of its investments.

If the people are to turn over their savings to the Federal Government through the purchase of its bonds, then the Truman administration is obligated to restrain its spendthrift inclinations and to conduct public affairs in a manner designed to win public confidence.

It is well for the Treasury Department to urge the purchase of savings bonds. But President Truman must remember that, when people invest money, they look at the balance sheet. They want evidence of solvency. Annual deficits running into billions of dollars do not encourage investors.

That is a lesson for President Truman to learn.

Greetings by Commander in Chief Lewis, Congressional Dinner, February 15, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, it is a pleasure for me to include a splendid, inspiring, and effective speech made by Clyde A. Lewis, national commander in chief, Veterans of Foreign Wars, in the greetings extended by him at the commander in chief's congressional dinner, Hotel Statler, the evening of February 15, 1950:

Secretary of Labor Tobin, Senators, and Members of the House of Representatives, Gen. Omar Bradley, and distinguished senior officers of the armed forces of the United States, national officers, department commanders, and comrades of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, I bid you welcome.

It is an honor for me, on behalf of my organization, to greet such a distinguished body of leaders of our American governmental, military, and civil life. I am impressed by the fact that yours is a trust of unbounded opportunity and great influence in our Republic.

It has been the pleasure of the Veterans of Foreign Wars for the last two decades to hold the traditional dinner—we please to call it the congressional dinner—because it is given in honor of the Members of Congress who have served in the armed forces of the United States. We think it a splendid opportunity to meet the honorable gentlemen from the Hill, most of whom were once our buddies, our comrades in arms, and our shipmates—veterans all.

I should like at the outset of our program to reaffirm our pledge that this gathering is not—I repeat not—for the purpose of talking veterans business or official "shop," but rather to break bread and, if the spirit moves

us, to have a small libation together, all in the spirit of comradeship.

In my 75,000 miles of travel during the past 6 months as an official and commander in chief of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I find our people intensely interested in the general aspects of our foreign affairs, our national defense, and in the state of the Union. Daily I am impressed by the keen interest of the people because, to my view, it means that democracy is functioning definitely at the "grass roots level." My observation is that our freedom-loving citizens want to know more than ever before just where they are going and what will be their status when they get there. For, as they proceed, so proceeds the Republic.

They sense that ominous political forces are loose in the world; they feel that the atomic era has brought us all to a crossroads in the history of mankind, and furthermore, the turn we are making, or should make, is a critical one for the United States, and possibly for the entire world.

There is something else I find the people are deeply sensible of and that is that the United States holds the leadership, whether we like it or not, of the so-called democratic bloc of nations. And gentlemen, your constituents believe with all their hearts that this bloc holds the greatest hope for all of humanity. The faith of the people in democracy is great.

Most of our people are truly thankful that in our native land is found the greatest abundance of the good things of life ever known to the average man in all the melancholy history of civilization—the most precious of them being liberty and the opportunity to pursue happiness and prosperity. This trust and faith of the people is an inspiring fact.

Never have our people placed such high value on competent leadership in national and international affairs. This is easily explained—because the people feel that only by the wisdom, the resoluteness, and the courage of our leaders will we be able to fulfill our destiny and thereby play our great part among the Nations of the earth.

We of the Veterans of Foreign Wars pledge ourselves to uphold those measures you leaders take for the good of the United States in general: a strong national defense and a realistic foreign policy. We believe peace may be maintained only by a strong defense and a realistic foreign policy. But a weak defense, any major loss of United States sovereignty, a flabby foreign policy and an impairment of the Constitution of the United States is, in our considered judgment, the quickest road to involvement in war. The VFW does not believe in peace at any price; it must be peace with honor.

Finally, permit me to say that because you gentlemen, our guests, are confronted with a multitudinous number of grave problems, the solution of which is of highest importance to our beloved Nation we thank you again for taking some of your valuable time to join us here at a dinner given by veterans for veterans.

Gentlemen, we are profoundly honored.

A Real Answer to "Methodism's Pink Fringe"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD H. VELDE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. VELDE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article appearing in the Herald, published by the First Methodist Church, of Peoria, Ill., entitled "Methodism's Pink Fringe":

"METHODISM'S PINK FRINGE"

What about it? The immediate and direct answer is that Methodism does not have one.

The article by Stanley High in the current issue of the Reader's Digest, bearing the above title, has provoked wide-spread discussion and has given many good Methodists a great deal of anxiety. Good Methodists do not like to have any reflection cast upon their church. They do not like to be numbered with those whose loyalty to basic American principles is subject to question. For these and many other sound reasons the publication of items like the Digest article is disturbing.

Let those Methodists who love their church cease worrying. There is, and there can be, no question of the loyalty and the sound common sense of the Methodist Church. It is probably the most thoroughly American institution in the country. It came into being as a direct result of the Revolutionary War—and from its inception has been American to the core. It always will be. Not in a narrow nationalistic sense—for it is also one of the greatest missionary agencies in the world. Sprung from the good earth of this great country, nurtured with the vigor of our American institutions—it has given back to this country an unsurpassed devotion, its purpose and prayer being best expressed in the familiar words: "America, America, God shed His grace on thee, and crown thy good with brotherhood, from sea to shining sea."

But the Methodist Church has no patent on the name, or rather the word "Methodist." It has been appropriated by many groups with various kinds of prefixes and suffixes. So, there are many organizations that somewhere in their title include the word "Methodist"; among them the Methodist Federation for Social Service. None of them should be identified with the Methodist Church, the official name of the church which was organized and established by John Wesley, and which is a duly incorporated body. What is more important, none of them, including the Methodist Federation for Social Service, has any right to speak for or in the name of the Methodist Church.

The only body that can speak for the Methodist Church is the general conference of the church, which is a delegated body whose membership is made up of delegates whose election begins with every local church in the denomination. The general conference meets every 4 years. It is to the Methodist Church what the Congress of the United States is to the Nation. It is the supreme legislative body of the church. Its actions and its pronouncements are regularly printed in a volume known as the Discipline of the Methodist Church. No other group, not even the Council of Bishops, can speak in the name of the church.

Methodism's official pronouncements upon social questions is found in paragraph 2020 of the Discipline of 1948. That pronouncement is as American as Yankee Doodle and as Christian as the Sermon on the Mount. Every intelligent Methodist should be familiar with it and will be proud of it. There is no other Methodist word and no other Methodist position upon current social matters and problems than that. There is therefore no pink fringe to Methodism.

Why did Stanley High write the article in the Digest? Only Stanley High can answer that question—but there is room for deduction. Probably Stanley High does not like some of the things that the federation has been saying; even more probable he does not like some of the spokesmen of the federation. Giving him full credit—it is likely that he does not like to see a great church suffer for some of the radical statements made by an organization that includes in its membership some of the most highly placed ministers and officers of the church. If that be true he has the support and gratitude of many thousands of the leading ministers and laymen of the church.

It is regrettable that an organization that, admittedly, deals with controversial issues, and that seeks radical changes in the economic and social life of the Nation, should appropriate the name of a great church even though its membership is made up almost entirely, if not exclusively, of members of that church. It ought to stand upon its own feet. Having said which it needs to be said that the members have every right to hold and espouse their own ideas on the problems and issues involved so long as they do so within the bounds of proper respect for law. About this there has been no question. In Voltaire's famous statement—we can differ with everything they say and yet defend their right to say it. But it ought not to be said in such a way as to convey the impression that a great church is saying it.

The conclusion of the whole matter is this: the Methodist Federation for Social Service is not the Methodist Church. It has no official connection with the Methodist Church. When it speaks it speaks only for itself.

There is no Methodism's pink fringe—and nobody knows that better than Stanley High.

W. T. S.

Faker Einstein Joins Communists in Attacking Judge Medina

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on February 13 I inserted in the RECORD excerpts from the report of the Un-American Activities Committee showing a large number of Communist-front organizations that Albert Einstein, the alleged scientist, is now, or has been, mixed up with.

Now, I find that this same Albert Einstein has joined in filing a brief in the United States court of appeals, in New York, to reverse the decision of Judge Harold R. Medina for adjudging six Communist lawyers in contempt of court for their efforts to demoralize and intimidate the court and the jury during the trial of certain Communists for their treasonable efforts to overthrow this Government.

This information will probably come as a shock to the average American, for nobody ever heard of Albert Einstein being a lawyer before.

In order that no Member of Congress may be misled about this proposition, I am inserting at this point a column from page 16 of the New York Times of Tuesday, February 7, 1950, carrying the whole story, and showing that Albert Einstein is one of the signers of the petition to reverse the action of Judge Medina in punishing these communistic lawyers for their contemptible efforts to harass, disturb, and demoralize his court.

The article referred to reads as follows:

CIRCUIT COURT GETS RED LAWYERS' PLEA—DEFENSE SAYS MEDINA LACKED RIGHT TO IMPOSE CONTEMPT SENTENCES AFTER TRIAL

(By Russell Porter)

Six defense counsel at last year's Communist trial asked the United States circuit court of appeals yesterday to reverse Judge Harold R. Medina's action in convicting them of contempt of court.

After 2½ hours of defense argument, the case was adjourned until this morning, when the defense has asked for another hour and Government counsel for an hour. Pending completion of the argument, another stay of execution was granted on the 1-to-6-month prison sentences imposed by Judge Medina last October. The sentences were originally set to begin in November, but were stayed during appeal.

Eleven members of the Communist Party's American Politburo are also free on bail pending appeal from their conviction for criminal conspiracy to teach and advocate violent overthrow of the Government.

At the end of the 9-month trial Judge Medina immediately adjudged defense counsel guilty of wholesale contempt throughout the trial as part of a conspiracy to obstruct the administration of justice and sabotage the trial.

Eugene Dennis, the party's general secretary, who acted as his own counsel, was convicted in both groups. The other defense counsel held in contempt were Harry Sacher, of New York; A. J. Isserman, of Newark, N. J.; Louis F. McCabe, of Philadelphia; George W. Crockett, Jr., of Detroit; and Richard Gladstein, of San Francisco.

Paul L. Ross, of New York; Thomas D. McBride, of Philadelphia; and Charles J. Katz, of Hollywood, Calif., appeared yesterday as attorneys for defense counsel.

SAYS POWERS ARE LIMITED

They argued that Judge Medina's legal powers to impose summary punishment for contempt were restricted to immediate emergency action on contempts committed in his presence that would interfere with the administration of justice unless checked.

He had no right, they insisted, to take such action at the end of the trial, when there was no disturbance or other threat against the order of the court, or to do so because of an alleged conspiratorial agreement that obviously could not have been made in his presence.

The constitutional right of due process, they contended, required that any action at the end of the trial should have been taken after a hearing by an impartial judge.

In comments from the bench, Judge Jerome N. Frank sharply questioned defense arguments. Judge Frank pointed out that Judge Medina had repeatedly warned defense counsel during the trial that they were in contempt and that he was going to do something after the trial. It was obvious, Judge Frank added, that Judge Medina didn't mean he was merely going to write a nasty letter.

"The judge thought it would disrupt the trial if he sent them to jail during the trial," Judge Frank added.

Judge Frank raised the question whether Judge Medina's warnings were not equivalent to a judge's recognized power to impose judgments of contempt for various acts as they occurred, and to suspend sentence until after the trial.

As to the alleged conspiracy by defense counsel, Judge Frank asked if a judge who saw all the outward manifestations in his presence that such an agreement had been made, had not the right to draw inferences that it existed.

"Only after a hearing," Mr. Katz insisted.

QUESTIONS VALUE OF HEARING

Judge Frank then asked what evidence could be adduced at such a hearing aside from defense denials of conspiracy.

"They are now getting a hearing before three judges," said Judge Frank. "If we find no reasonable judge could reach any other conclusion [than Judge Medina's] wouldn't it be foolish to send it back to another judge?"

Judge Frank asked whether any error that might have been committed in the district court wasn't a harmless one.

Mr. Katz replied that at a hearing defense counsel could explain their reasons, which did not appear in the trial record for doing and saying what they had said and done. He said they could bring evidence whether or not they had sneered at or badgered the judge as charged, and as to how loud they had argued.

Particularly in view of Judge Medina's charges that defense counsel had falsely accused him of racial discrimination and lack of integrity and had tried to impair his health, it was argued, another judge should have disposed of the case.

Mr. Ross denied there had been any conspiracy by defense counsel or that the individual instances cited by Judge Medina warranted punishment. He said defense counsel had only exercised their legal right to present their clients' case vigorously and persistently.

Several lawyers were allowed to file briefs as friends of the court. These briefs bore several hundred signatures, including those of Albert Einstein and Thomas Mann. Judge Augustus Hand, presiding, said the introduction of the briefs seemed very foolish, since they could not add anything to the legal arguments fully briefed by defense counsel.

Judge Frank raised the question whether these briefs were not intended merely to indicate a lot of people are rooting for the defendants.

Judge Charles E. Clark was the third member of the court.

Housing: The Political Football

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY J. LATHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, for the benefit of the Members, I wish to extend in the Appendix of the RECORD a talk given by Clarence R. Knickman, a distinguished citizen of my district, on the subject of housing:

Many Federal, city and State officials have found that housing is a subject that the public is sympathetic with and very much confused about. The peoples' sympathies are being exploited; hence housing is fast becoming the biggest give-away program in the country.

Low-cost housing and tax exemption started under the heading of slum clearance but every conceivable subterfuge has sprouted from this and is gaining momentum, and if unchecked, will result in full-scale socialized housing.

The backbone of good American citizenship is home ownership. What incentives can a family have for home ownership when they realize that the more tax-exempt housing that is created, the larger is the home owners tax burden. What incentive will investors have to build rental housing when Government subsidizes construction that is tax free in competition with and at the expense of higher taxes of private owned and operated properties.

Up to the present time there existed an emergency; that emergency is definitely over. There are plenty of vacant houses and vacant apartments. Apartment-house owners have started offering 1 and 2 months' concessions in order to try to fill their vacancies. These vacant apartments are for families earning $3,500 annually and up. Advertisements in the newspapers also offer free moving expenses for prospective tenants. That is the condition now, but in addition to these vacancies there are many thousands of additional apartments in the New York metropolitan area under construction, and many thousands more planned and approved for immediate start in the spring.

Some of our legislators and housing officials are trying to enact legislation permitting families earning up to $9,500 per year to live in tax-exempt housing; just think of such an outrage, when the average home owner and legitimate rent payer whose tax will increase because all these tax exemptions, earns only about one-half of that income.

There now exists city owned public housing, tax-exempt renting at $8 per room assisted by cash subsidies by the State and Federal Governments. Also city owned middle-income housing at $17 per room tax exempt. Tax exemption is also granted on redevelopment housing. It is also granted on limited-dividend housing both for rental and cooperative ownership. The latter is for private investors, such as organized groups, labor unions, etc. This limited-dividend housing is increasing rapidly. These groups realize the benefits their members can achieve in cooperative ownership and renting units in projects carrying tax exemption. Most of these groups who are enjoying these benefits consist of families high above the $3,500 income group.

When you stop to realize that at the present time one-fourth of the real estate in the city of New York is tax free ($6,000,000,000 is tax free). This, of course, includes city and Government-owned property within the city, institutions, churches, etc., but $216,000,000 of this is in tax-exempt public-housing redevelopment and limited dividend projects. This will increase considerably upon the development of the vast number of these projects now being planned and being voted on by the legislators.

The low-income group earning less than $3,500 is the group that needs help, and they are the only ones that should be helped.

The city of New York or any large municipality could make a very profitable investment through slum clearance by condemning slum areas or outmoded areas which now produce very little tax revenue. A good many of these sectors are very convenient to transportation. The city could readily auction this property off to private builders at low prices with a distinct agreement that low-cost rental housing be built thereon for families earning less than $3,500. The increase in taxes due to the building, plus the creation of new business areas surrounding these developments, would provide great income in additional taxes for the city.

It is a well established and proven fact that private enterprise builds cheaper than government, and private enterprise can operate and manage these properties with greater efficiency and economy. Elected and appointed Government officials should go all out to cooperate and assist private builders who are really the creators of the source from which taxes are derived.

Home purchase should be encouraged. Home ownership is the American way of life; it is the American's dream.

Reduce carrying charges on new home ownership. This will create a building boom and all talk of housing shortage will vanish. At present the city of New York assesses new homes much higher than the old ones. Why discriminate between the outs and the ins? Partial exemption on small, new one- and two-family houses would go a long way in reducing monthly carrying charges.

Further reduction in carrying charges could be made by using semiliquidating mortgages. Why make a new house prospect liquidate his entire mortgage in 15 to 20 years? A well-built house, well kept, will have great value after this period. Write a mortgage for 15 years semiliquidating. Most of these owners will have achieved enough success to pay the balance at that time. If not, this mortgage could be renewed for the balance and for a period commensurate with the condition of the house and with the owner's ability to pay. At this time if the mortgagee wants his money, the remaining mortgage would be a conservative investment for any mortgagee.

Rent control is no solution to the problem of providing low-income groups with adequate housing. Most of the controlled rental units are in old buildings where rents are very low. Many of the tenants in these controlled units have achieved great success and greater incomes, but their controlled rental unit is a protected franchise which when once surrendered can never be regained. So, no matter how inconvenient or undesirable it might be to the higher-income family, selfishness prevents his releasing it to some family who could not afford better. Rent control creates such inequities between the outs and the ins, that it cannot be justified.

I repeat again, the emergency is over—let's solve these problems with some sound, common-sense thinking.

Alternative to Atomic Chaos

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Alternative to Atomic Chaos" from the Christian Century of February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ALTERNATIVE TO ATOMIC CHAOS

Can this atomic arms race toward universal destruction be stopped? Apparently neither Truman nor his State Department is greatly concerned whether it is stopped or not. They accept passively the stalemate in the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission, which has brought atomic control negotiations to a halt. They will not even act on the silly dispute over Chinese representation on the Commission to get the negotiations started again. They are adamant against direct exchanges with Stalin. They insist on the Baruch control plan, even though the props were knocked from under that plan when the American monopoly of atomic weapons ended. But they think public fatalism has produced such widespread apathy that there will be no serious pressure for any change in official policy. So that policy is to make the most terrible bombs possible as quickly as possible, and for the rest to let things drift along and see what happens.

So far only one national leader has challenged this drift toward disaster. To be sure, Senator VANDENBERG and a dozen scientists who helped start the atomic arms race have suggested that the United Nations be assured that, after we have produced a hydrogen bomb, we will never use it except in retaliation. But that sort of assurance will never stop an arms race—especially since we did drop atomic bombs on Japan without any necessity whatever. Washington rumors hint that David E. Lilienthal may have something important to say on this atomic arms race after he gives up the chairmanship of the United States Atomic Energy Commission. At this writing, however, Mr. Lilienthal is still gagged by his official position. Only one national leader has spoken the truth as to where the atomic arms race is taking us and coupled with that truth a proposal both statesmanlike and Christian as to how to stop it. But that courageous speaker is the one Member of Congress who knows most about what is at stake.

On February 2, hard on the heels of President Truman's order to the AEC to continue work on the H-bomb, Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, of Connecticut, made a speech in the Senate freighted with destiny for the Nation and for all mankind. Senator MCMAHON, as chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy of both Houses of Congress, knows as much as any living man about the nature of the atomic arms race, where it has carried us thus far and where it is headed. His speech should be read word by word, it should be studied clause by clause, in every high school, college, editorial office, discussion club, public affairs group, adult Bible class, ministers' meeting, radio forum or other place where citizens consult together in the United States.[1] If the newspaper in your town has not printed the McMahon speech in full, ask it to do so, making sure that enough citizens endorse the suggestion to give it maximum weight with your newspaper publisher.

I

Every thoughtful citizen, on reading the McMahon speech, will see at once that here is the first proposal for dealing with the atomic arms race commensurate with the urgency of the crisis this race has produced. Senator MCMAHON began by agreeing that under present circumstances President Truman had no choice but to approve production of the hydrogen bomb. He went on, however, to point out that this insures that the Russians will build a similar bomb and that any military advantage we may gain by building the H-bomb first will be short-lived.

"Let me warn, with all the solemnity at my command, that building hydrogen bombs does not promise positive security for the United States; it only promises the negative result of averting, for a few months or years, well-nigh certain catastrophe."

"We are plunged into a truly terrible arms race," the Senator warned his colleagues. What can be done about it? There are only two choices. The United States can go on with the cold war, as President Truman seems content to do. But "5,000 years of history" teach that will end in another world war—this time, a hydrogen war. Moreover, maintaining the cold war is undermining liberty in this country, and if we keep it up in terms of an atomic arms race "We will find ourselves more and more compelled to imitate the totalitarian rival." Liberty, as well as human survival, is at stake.

Our only other choice is to move heaven and earth to stop the atomic armaments race. How? We must regard no suggestion as too startling or unconventional for careful consideration. And we must be guided, disciplined, and inspired by our code of ethics, and democratic peace-loving decencies. The Baruch plan, when originally proposed, was such a pioneering and morally acceptable policy. But it failed to win the concurrence of the Russians. Today, with the American monopoly of atomic weapons broken, it is obsolete. So we must try again. "It is my intense conviction," said Mr. MCMAHON, "that our decision, born of necessity, to build the hydrogen bomb, must be accompanied by the immediate initiation of a moral crusade for peace having far greater potential effect than any physical weapon, even chunks of the sun. Otherwise we would deal a severe blow both to our moral position and to our fervent hopes for a secure future."

To make this new proposal succeed where the Baruch plan failed, Senator MCMAHON pointed out, it must be made known to the Russian people and others behind the iron curtain and must be "sold" likewise to the peoples on this side of the iron curtain, our formal allies, who today are just about as afraid of where American atomic policy is heading as are the Russians. In this latter observation, the Senator was making the same point the Christian Century has tried on many past occasions to emphasize. (See, for example, Let's Change the Voice of America, December 14, 1949.) He insisted that until the American people spend more on trying to make their peace proposals known to others than they spend on advertising cosmetics, they cannot pretend even to themselves that they are seriously tackling this problem. The Connecticut Senator advanced various thought-provoking specific suggestions as to how to go about this task of penetrating other minds—particularly Russian minds.

"At almost any cost we must assure that the Russian people have opportunity to consider, side by side, the atomic proposals of their own rulers and our atomic proposals—and that the Russian people act as part of the world jury which brings in a verdict concerning this monumental issue."

Then Senator MCMAHON tackled the key question as to what the United States proposal for control of A-bombs and H-bombs should be if the atomic arms race is to be stopped. It must, he insisted, provide for "strict control of raw materials, strict control of plants, and continuous inspection." Walter Lippmann interprets this to mean that the Senator was still calling for Russian acceptance of the outdated Baruch plan. The words, to be sure, do conform to the general structure of that plan, but they do not necessarily involve adherence to its details. In the interest of good faith, however, Senator MCMAHON should, if he intends to push any plan involving continuous inspection of plants by an international body—which would include Russian representatives—ask the Senate to adopt a prior resolution affirming its readiness to ratify such an agreement. One reason the Baruch plan failed was because few believed that, if adopted by the UN, the Senate would ever have given it the two-thirds majority required by treaties.

Whatever provisions are proposed to set up effective atomic controls, Senator MCMAHON made clear his belief that these must be accompanied by certain constructive and imagination-stirring proffers on a scale of generosity sufficient to induce other nations and peoples to accept the necessary international controls. It was at that point that Senator MCMAHON sketched the idea which captured the headlines in the daily press. "Let this Nation," he said, "offer to spend for the next 5 years two-thirds of its present military outlay—that is, $10,000,000,000 a year for 5 years—on giving substance to

[1] The full text of the speech is to be found in the New York Times for February 3, or may be obtained from Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

President Truman's point 4 idea, on developing peaceful uses of atomic energy, and on giving economic aid to all nations, including Russia.

The $50,000,000,000 would not be given without conditions. It must be matched by acceptance of the conditions for an effective UN control of the production of atomic weapons and by an undertaking on the part of the other nations that they likewise would devote two-thirds of their present spending on armaments to the constructive ends outlined by Senator McMAHON. But with any such devotion of resources during the next 5 years to raising the living standards of all mankind—and Senator McMAHON hinted, out of the great knowledge he possesses as chairman of the Atomic Energy Committee, at productive triumphs of breath-taking immensity which are now within reach—the tension and fear now harrying the nations toward disaster can be lifted. Then the atomic arms race will end. Then mankind will recover the opportunities of peace.

Senator McMAHON had no illusions as to the difficulty of winning the Russians to acceptance of such a proposal. But difficulties are something to be tackled, not bowed to in despair. He had no illusions, moreover, as to the fatalistic cynicism with which his proposed policy will be greeted by some Americans. But he asked that those who reject this plan for ending the arms race bring forward a better one. "In 1945 and 1946, when our thoughts were focused upon the Hiroshima bomb, we enjoyed an opportunity to wage atomic peace that somehow—despite the magnificence and generosity of our proposal to the United Nations—we did not fully exploit. Our present concern with the hydrogen bomb furnishes a second opportunity. I do not think a third will be given us."

II

There, for the present, Senator McMAHON left his proposal. It was as much warning as proposal—warning based on the immense knowledge he possesses. And it was as much appeal as warning. It was an appeal to his fellow Members in Congress. It was an appeal to the President of the United States and to the State Department. It was an appeal to Stalin, to the government of the Soviet Union and to the Russian people. It was an appeal to the conscience and the moral courage of all mankind. Is such an appeal to be allowed to drop into obscurity? Is it to molder in the files of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD until those files disappear in a hydrogen blast along with the other works of man? Is public apathy, murmuring at the approach of catastrophe but accepting it as inescapable, to let this appeal "echo away into silence as though it had never been"? That is the question which now confronts the American public, and particularly the American churches.

Senator McMAHON did not present his proposal as the final word by which to end the atomic arms race. He did not claim for it any such plenary inspiration as the administration has tried to impute to the Baruch plan in the meetings of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission. We believe, for example, that the McMAHON plan could be strengthened at the point of immediate action if it included the proposal of the American Friends Service Committee for an interim sealing of atomic stockpiles by the United Nations pending the conclusion of permanent agreements for atomic disarmament. We see no reason why Senator McMAHON should not incorporate that Quaker suggestion in his program. Details of the policy toward which Mr. McMAHON is pointing are all to be worked out—and that is one of its signs of wisdom.

But the McMahon speech should have important historical consequences. First, because it shows how many possibilities for ending the atomic arms race and using the new powers of atomic fission for constructive purposes are still unexplored. Second, because by showing this and by the boldness and imagination of its proposals it may arouse the people from the apathy into which they have sunk as atomic devastation has drawn ever closer. Third, because it should make it extremely difficult—in fact, well-nigh impossible—for White House and State Department to go on talking piously about the reluctance with which they are pushing the atomic arms race while they do nothing positive to stop it.

Nations, legislatures, citizens—we have had our warning and we have heard an eleventh-hour appeal. The warning and the appeal have come from the man in Congress who knows best the awful fate in store if this atomic arms race is not soon stopped. But the warning and the appeal have been pointed with a promise: "If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in our history; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed." The voice of prophecy on the floor of the United States Senate. Will the churches give the prophet the irresistible support he deserves?

"He Belongs to the Ages"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James Morgan, from the Boston Sunday Globe of February 12, 1950:

"HE BELONGS TO THE AGES"

LINCOLN'S MEMORY NEVER MORE ALIVE THAN TODAY WHEN OUR POLICY MAKERS NEED TO DRAW LESSONS FROM HIS AGELESS PRINCIPLES

(By James Morgan)

It is five and eighty years since Edwin M. Stanton is said to have turned from the death bed of Abraham Lincoln with the remark, "Now, he belongs to the ages." We, in our time, can bear witness to the truth of that prophecy attributed to the Secretary of War. For the memory of Lincoln never was more alive than it is on this anniversary of his birth.

Yet, the issues with which Lincoln directly dealt are dead. That human slavery ever existed in the United States is all but unbelievable to us. Secession no longer is a debatable question and southerners would not reverse the verdict of the Civil War. All Americans are Unionists now, when the Blue and the Gray, like the Red and the White in the War of the Roses, awaken only echoes of—

"* * * old, unhappy, far-off things
And battles long ago."

Nevertheless, Lincoln is no ghostly figure of a dead past, but a living presence. The reason for this needs to be understood by our policy makers today, who are too easily satisfied with expedients to serve the moment. Lincoln checked and double-checked his course at every step with an American tradition and an enduring, universal principle. He did not see the grave crisis of his time as an isolated incident but as part of the never-ending, world-wide struggle for freedom. Hence, now, when government by the people stands challenged the globe around, there is no truer spokesman among the living for liberty in all lands than this voice from the grave.

Why he belongs to the ages

Lincoln foretold the larger, enduring significance of the war for the Union in his second annual message in 1862, when he sounded the warning, "We cannot escape history * * * no personal significance or insignificance can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we are passing will light us down, in honor or dishonor, to the latest generation * * * we shall nobly save or meanly lose the last, best hope of earth."

Stanton was by no means alone among the contemporaries of Lincoln in perceiving that he belonged to the ages. Even while the corpse of the assassinated President was borne across the country, Ralph Waldo Emerson told his mourning Concord neighbors, "The weight and penetration of many passages in his letters, messages, and speeches, hidden now by the very closeness of their application to the moment, are destined hereafter to wide fame." A few weeks later in that same year, 1865, James Russell Lowell dared to predict in his commemoration ode at Harvard:

"Great captains, with their guns and drums,
Disturb our judgment for the hour,
But, at last, silence comes;
Then all are gone and, standing like a tower,
Our children shall behold his fame,
The kindly, earnest, brave, farseeing man,
Sagacious, patient, dreading praise, not blame,
New birth of our new soil the first American."

Our leaders in Washington could profit by taking thought of Lincoln's method in meeting the questions that crowded upon him. He met them with no snap judgments or impromptu answers in press conferences. He took them, one by one, into the laboratory of his deep spiritual nature, and to that sanctuary this prairie mystic admitted no man.

The still, small voice

The more momentous decisions of Lincoln's life on the national stage were made in the solitude of the secret places of his inner self. Unknown to anyone, he took his stand in the "house divided against itself" speech, which logically led him into the great debate with Douglas and, finally, to the Presidency. In a retreat within himself, he selected his Cabinet and wrote his inaugural. Against the advice of all but one of the members of his Cabinet, he determined in a sleepless night to provision Fort Sumter and thereby accept the fateful challenge to war.

When he surprised his counselors with the Emancipation Proclamation, he told them that he was not asking their opinion of the measure itself, because already he was pledged to it in a compact with God. A gnawed penholder is treasured as the only witness to the anxious care that weighed upon him while, unseen, he prepared that historic document. In the same hidden recesses, he thought out his immortal Gettysburg Address, which told in 2 minutes the greater, the timeless meaning of the war to save the Union, that "Government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

I do not wish to give the false impression that Lincoln acted without advice. No President ever listened to more of it. It was only after he had heard all sides of an argument that he retired within himself, weighed the conflicting answers in the scales of his conscience and his common sense and formed his judgment in quietude.

Few Presidents, if any, have had the patience of mind, the strength of body, and the good humor to bear with the wrangling that raged about him in the Cabinet and among the Senators, Representatives, and Governors who stormed in upon him. Throwing his door wide open to Tom, Dick, and Harry 4 days a week, he called these receptions to the unknown and unprivileged his public-opinion baths, in which he said he was renovated and reinvigorated. "No hours of my day," he insisted, "are better employed than those which bring me again within the direct contact and the atmosphere of the average of the whole people * * * they renew in me a clearer and more vivid image of that great popular assemblage out of which I sprang and to which I must return."

Two Lincolns

This seemingly most gregarious of men in the gallery of our history really went through life alone, with no chum in boyhood, no confidant in manhood. There was the outer Lincoln, the plain, simple, small-town man, who milked his cow, bedded his horse, went to market with a basket on his arm, and sat on a box at the foot of his office stairs, telling stories to a group of street loiterers. There was the circuit-riding lawyer who, tilted back in his chair, set on roar a crowd in a country tavern. Even his closest associates caught only glimpses of the poet, dreamer, idealist, prophet, who pondered within those somewhat grotesque externals.

It is this duality which has baffled the attempts to reenact on the stage the most dramatic life in our biography. These depict but the shell of the man. It is Hamlet, without the soliloquizing, soul-searching, melancholy Dane. There is yet to appear a playwright capable of dramatizing the thought, the spirit concealed within the outer Lincoln.

The key to the secret of the power in this man's memory was given by himself in his explanation of the lasting, widespread influence of the Declaration of Independence. He said of the framers of that manifesto, what may as truly be said of him, that they reached far out into the future and sought to place a stumbling block in the path of every form of tyranny everywhere in all time. They aimed, Lincoln said at Independence Hall while on his way to his inauguration, to "give liberty not alone to the people of this country, but hope to the world for all future time * * * that the weights would be lifted from the shoulders of all men and that all should have an equal chance."

Lincoln and the cold war

Today, we are involved in a cold war, and we can win it if we will only keep cool. Lincoln did not lose his temper when all about him were losing theirs in the bitterness of a family quarrel. Should we not be equal to holding onto ours in this controversy with an alien antagonist in another hemisphere?

His adversaries could not provoke Lincoln into recrimination or into any retort. Whenever we let the propagandists of Moscow incite us to bandy epithets with them we surrender the initiative and are thrown on the defensive. We play their game, with the inevitable result that they win and we lose a trick.

While we are talking back at Moscow, we are wasting time at Washington which should be given to thinking out what we stand for, instead of telling only what we are against. For lack of a positive policy we rely on scares to rally Congress and the country in support of negative policies. Not fear but courage should be our weapon in this war of nerves. Let us observe this birthday of the man who belongs to the ages by following his example of upholding principles that are ageless.

Migratory Farm Workers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, the conditions under which millions of migrant farm workers and their families work and live—and travel from one part of the country to another seeking work—are a long-standing national disgrace.

On October 26, 1949, I wrote our President, Harry S. Truman, as follows:

OCTOBER 26, 1949.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Having entered politics because of my anxiety to do something in behalf of migratory farm workers, I have continued to be concerned with their welfare and that of all farm workers, throughout the period of my political activity.

We have been much concerned in recent years with maintaining and stabilizing farm income but we have done nothing to stabilize the work or income of farm labor, except the hope that some of the money at the top would trickle down—an idea that we Democrats have never felt would work.

In addition we have established, and are preparing to extend, the system of social security. But we have left the farm worker out. We have given industrial workers the benefit of the National Labor Relations Act, but exclude the farm worker from its benefits.

I believe that we should give the farm worker some of the attention he deserves, and I wish to join those who have recommended to you the appointment of a commission to investigate agricultural labor. Such a commission could perform a major service which has been left almost neglected until now.

Yours sincerely,

HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS.

On November 5 the President replied to that letter as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, November 5, 1949.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: Your letter of October 28 with reference to the problems of migratory farm workers raises several questions concerning complex areas in our national economy.

The Department of Labor is currently exploring the feasibility of recommending the establishment of a Presidential commission to investigate the problems of agricultural labor, and I am sure that in case such a commission is established the problems of adequate income to which you specifically refer will be one of the basic matters for its consideration.

Please be assured that I deeply realize the fact that agricultural workers present a special problem in our economic pattern and that I shall continue my efforts to alleviate the difficulties of this important group of the American people.

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

Last August I obtained from the State Department the text of the international agreement between our Nation and Mexico providing for the admission of Mexican farm workers in such amounts as the United States Employment Service certified as necessary to meet labor shortages in the various States.

On September 2, September 8, and again on October 11, 1949, I wrote Secretary of Labor Tobin, requesting that I be kept currently informed of the number of such certifications, the actual recruitment figures, and the number of workers returned to Mexico.

Since then, I have received periodic reports. The latest of these, dated December 14, 1949, covering the period August 1 through December 2, 1949, shows—

Number of Mexican workers requested and certified as needed	209,690
Cancellations	12,410
Number actually employed under contract	98,408

Of these 98,408, about 78,000 were Mexicans illegally in the country who were legalized under the international agreement; 20,625 were actually imported from Mexico under the agreement up to December 2, 1949.

These figures are derived from the following letter from Robert C. Goodwin, Director of the Bureau of Employment Security, United States Department of Labor, who administers the United States Employment Service:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF LABOR,
BUREAU OF EMPLOYMENT SECURITY,
Washington, D. C., December 14, 1949.

Hon. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MRS. DOUGLAS: In accordance with my letter to you of November 7, I am listing below the transactions in the importation of Mexican nationals for agricultural employment in the United States for the period ending December 2, 1949:

State	Requests for Mexican nationals as of Dec. 2, 1949		Record of contracting as of Dec. 2, 1949	
	Certifications, number of workers	Cancellations, number of workers	Number of "wetbacks" legalized	Importations from Mexico
Arizona	6,560	0	2,299	3,924
Arkansas	43,707	8,215	17,986	0
California	6,470	0	6,470	0
Colorado	2,025	0	0	124
Kentucky	100	0	87	0
Louisiana	1,915	0	1,352	0
Mississippi	9,554	4,591	1,454	0
Missouri	5,655	515	2,993	0
Montana	750	0	0	627
Nebraska	250	0	----------	----------
New Mexico	21,300	1,064	9,369	9,568
Tennessee	193	0	191	0
Texas	110,651	25	35,582	5,382
Wyoming	625	0	----------	----------

There is enclosed herewith, also, Form I-120a, issued by the Immigration and Naturalization Service, which covers information of your interest, for the period ending September 30, 1949.

For other copies of this release of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, you should address Mr. Willard Kelly, Assistant Commissioner, Employment Division, United States Department of Justice, Washington 25, D. C.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT C. GOODWIN,
Director.

In recent months, traveling up and down and across our marvelously productive California valleys, I met people everywhere who were concerned over the

welfare of the migrant when the picking season would end. They were teachers, businessmen, farmers, doctors, welfare workers, and so forth. Everywhere one heard the refrain: "When the work in the fields comes to an end shortly, then the hunger will begin. How do we meet it? What do we do?"

The situation became so acute this winter that a conference was called in Fresno by the State department of public health. Before presenting the text of this report I insert in the RECORD an excerpt from an article in the San Francisco Chronicle of January 4, 1950:

[From the San Francisco Chronicle of January 4, 1950]

THE MIGRANT WORKER—HEALTH DIRECTOR CALLS PROBLEM BAD SORE ON OUR BODY POLITIC

(By Stanton Delaplane)

The State board of health heard some plain talk about the migrant farm worker yesterday: His diseases and infant deaths, his unemployment and muddy shacks.

Bluntly, Dr. Wilton Halverson, State director of public health, declared, "This is primarily an economic problem, a bad sore on our body politic. All we (the health department) are doing is applying a poultice."

Dr. Halverson believed that the boards of supervisors in the six San Joaquin Valley counties might take "a less restrictive policy" in applying public-health remedies to the 35,000 cotton pickers' families stranded in the valley by the annual season of unemployment.

In a sense, he returned the responsibility which county supervisors, welfare directors, and health officers tried to put upon the State at a 2-day meeting last week.

WARREN'S POSITION

The migrant farm picture, however, looked brighter than it has for some years as Governor Warren yesterday said the State would mobilize every agency to lick the problem of poor housing, poor health, and unemployment that is the annual hang-over of California's rich harvest.

With the huge demand for cotton pickers as California's new "4–42" cotton shot up to 1,300,000 bales, the bulk of the State migratory workers reach the end of the harvest trail in the Valley.

There they face a 3- to 4-month unemployment season until spring brings new crops to work.

Governor Warren said he would not ask emergency legislation in the March session of the legislature. But he said the situation again points up the need for including agricultural workers in the State unemployment insurance set-up. They do not have it now.

FRESNO MEETING

Last week, State agencies met with county officers at Fresno at the Governor's request to work on the migrant farm-labor problem.

The counties largely felt it was up to the State to provide funds and services for health, education, and relief.

An offer was made by the Federal Agricultural Department to distribute surplus foods in this year's emergency. At present, almost unlimited quantities of dried eggs and milk, apples, potatoes, and honey are surplus and available for a phone call.

To date, only Kern and Madera Counties have asked for surplus, both for potatoes.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT PLANS

The board of health yesterday heard department of health plans discussed by Dr. Ellis Sox who attended the joint meetings last week in Fresno.

Of prime importance, he said, was a study of the unknown infant diarrhea which accounted for 28 deaths, mainly among Mexican cotton-picker families, this year.

He thought much of this was due to lack of education and somewhat to restrictions on health services by the counties. A large number of migrants are not eligible for county medical service except in emergency because of short residence in the country.

It was recommended (if county supervisors approve) that (1) any illness in a child be classed as emergency and, therefore, admissible to county medical care; (2) pregnancy be classed as an emergency so that prenatal care can be given. At present only actual labor and delivery of the baby is classed as emergency.

Dr. Sox hit upon the economic theme again in reporting that the conference of health officers thought Federal social security should be extended to cover agricultural workers. But he said it would be a long pull to put over.

Mr. Speaker, the excellent report of the conference to which the Chronicle refers can well be a guide for the work of a Federal commission to study the problems of migratory labor. The text follows:

REPORT OF CONFERENCE ON HEALTH AND RELATED PROBLEMS OF AGRICULTURAL WORKERS, FRESNO, CALIF., DECEMBER 29, 1949

This conference was initiated by the State department of public health in order to appraise the various problems related to agricultural workers in the six southern San Joaquin Valley counties.

Included in this conference were representatives of local health departments and local official and voluntary agencies, which were present by invitation from the local health officers, as well as various State official and voluntary agencies, who were also invited to be present.

In addition to the general public health problems which face local health departments and the community generally, basic aspects such as the need of agricultural workers, their movements throughout the State, the responsibility of growers for sanitary facilities and housing, the better correlation of community activities in meeting this essentially local problem were discussed.

The conference was opened by a short general presentation of the problems to be considered and then was divided into two major sections, one on health and medical services and the other on housing and sanitation. The first major section was further divided into three subsections, one on health and medical facilities and services, the second on community organization and education, and the third on auxiliary services. These sectional reports were presented to the conference as a whole and were acted upon by the group.

The results of this conference have been discussed with Governor Warren and the State department of public health and other State agencies, as well as local agencies, have already initiated a program to meet many of these problems.

Following is the report of the sections of the conference, as acted upon by the conference as a whole, with a short résumé of progress made since December 29, 1949:

REPORT OF SUBSECTION OF HEALTH AND MEDICAL SERVICES AND FACILITIES, FREDERIC M. KRIETE, M. D., CHAIRMAN

The conference made six recommendations on health problems. These recommendations were prepared by a small working committee, approved by the section on health services, and finally accepted with only one change, by the conference as a whole. The recommendations are presented as they were finally approved by the conference.

Following each recommendation there is a summary of some of the discussion which developed during the course of the meeting.

Recommendation No. 1: The six counties do not have sufficient personnel to meet the health needs of the agricultural worker and will require additional financial assistance to augment staff and facilities. The group recommended that such assistance be provided by the State government.

No one in the group felt that county governments were in a position to spend any additional money for health services to the agricultural worker. In the first place, they felt that county financial resources are already strained; in the second place, they felt that the county should not be held solely responsible for services to this group.

Furthermore, the counties vary in their financial resources and would find it difficult to provide an equal level of services. Any county which provided better services than the neighboring counties might find itself burdened with more than its share of migratory workers seeking assistance.

The type of personnel most needed in staff expansion seemed to be the nurse. This was true even in those counties which have not filled all the budgeted positions, although obviously they could not expect assistance until such positions were filled. There was no discussion in this particular section of the relative functions of registered nurses and public-health nurses. Emphasis was laid not only on the need for improvement in the quantity of care, but also in the quality of care. Mention was made of need for more participation in these programs by local physicians.

Recommendation No. 2: The high infant mortality rate indicates the need for additional and better health services for expectant mothers, infants, and children; and the group recommended that these be provided on a decentralized basis. This applied to both preventive and therapeutic services; and the planning for decentralization must include participation by the health department, the welfare department, the growers, and other community agencies.

This recommendation reflected the group's feeling that the services, to be effective, must be carried to the farm worker. This was particularly true of preventive and educational measures. No attempt was made to define the exact methods of decentralization, since this would vary from county to county. It was felt that in many places the growers would cooperate in furnishing housing facilities; and it was hoped that welfare departments might cooperate in decentralizing some of the out-patient services now available only at county hospitals. The use of trailers was mentioned by several.

One of the problems which frequently came up in this connection was the necessity for administrative flexibility in shifting personnel and program in response to the fluctuations in camp populations.

Recommendation No. 3: The group recommended that the San Joaquin Valley Supervisors Association include prenatal and postnatal care and medical and hospital services for indigent sick children in the definition of a medical emergency. The group further recommended that the problem of county residency in relation to medical services be studied by a committee appointed by the Governor.

This recommendation was made because of the difficulty in securing medical care for those expectant mothers and sick infants who are indigent but who do not meet the indigent act residence requirements of 3 years' State residence independent of assistance and 1 year county residence. It seemed to the group that it is a waste of time to teach mothers to seek medical care for their children early in sickness, only to have them turned away from the hospital until the infant is sick enough to qualify for medical care as an emergency. The original recommendation called for a relaxation of residency requirements for county medical services; this, however, involves legal complications, as medical services for the indigent are provided under terms of the indigent act,

and a change in the law would then also affect eligibility for general public assistance. The adoption of a simple definition of an emergency by the San Joaquin Valley Boards of Supervisors does not require legislative action, and can probably be secured. This would assist in getting mothers under prenatal care in county hospital clinics, rather than waiting until they go into labor to accept them for service. Since adequate prenatal care does seem to be effective in reducing both maternal and infant mortality, as well as the incidence of prematurity, this would seem most desirable.

Recommendation No. 4: The group recommended that the Federal Social Security System be broadened to include agricultural workers of all categories.

There was a great deal of discussion about the income of agricultural workers, particularly the migratory workers. Aside from the general statement that migratory workers have periods of income alternating with other periods of no income, there was no agreement on either the amount of annual earnings or the wisdom of family expenditures. Little or no factual information on this matter was available in the section, and personal opinions were freely, even emotionally, expressed. However, everyone agreed that the several social-security benefits, both Federal and State, would help to cushion the effect of unemployment.

Recommendation No. 5: The group recommended that the State department of public health arrange for fundamental epidemiological studies on the diarrheal diseases in the Central Valley.

This was felt to be an obvious need, and the recommendation was unanimously supported.

Recommendation No. 6: The group felt that the measures recommended above will help to alleviate some of the acute health problems in these counties. However, the basic problem is a chronic one, complicated by a variety of social and economic factors. The group recommended that serious and intensive study be carried on to discover some means of meeting the labor needs of this area, while simultaneously helping the migratory worker to develop into a permanent contributing member of the community.

This recommendation came out of the original committee as an indication of the great difficulty which individuals had in attempting to keep their attention focused on the matter under discussion. The committee was supposed to work out methods of improving health services to migratory agricultural workers, but the discussion kept shying off into broader areas of social and economical implication.

One of the great difficulties in rendering health services to the migratory groups is the fact that they do not stay long enough in one place to facilitate good educational and service programs. As they move from county to county, there are serious problems of sharing of health information about individuals by the different health jurisdictions. There was a good deal of wistful talk about slowing the migrant down; and it is inescapably true that the best solution to the problem of migratory labor is to have no migration. Hence this recommendation.

The committee which produced the recommendations originally consisted largely of public-health personnel. There was only one representative from a local welfare department, there were no county supervisors, and only four educators. On the other hand, all the counties concerned were represented, and toward the end of the session Mr. Don McColly of the State chamber of commerce was present and contributed to the deliberations.

REPORT OF SUBSECTION ON AUXILIARY SERVICES, HELEN E. WALSH, CHAIRMAN

A. Surplus commodities

The discussion of surplus commodities was limited to the utilization of these foods by the families, since the respective county welfare departments have worked out the details of distribution within the county.

1. The committee members expressed the opinion that limited cooking equipment and facilities and inadequate storage space are factors that would influence the acceptability of surplus commodities. In addition, the two food items—dried milk and dried eggs—present a further problem because of the lack of familiarity on the part of the recipients in handling these products.

Accordingly, it was suggested that instructions be outlined regarding the use and cooking of dried milk and dried eggs and simple recipes be compiled for distribution with these products.

Since the distribution of the surplus foods will commence immediately, the home economist from the Fresno County Welfare Department, the home advisers from the Fresno County Agricultural Extension Service, the school-lunch nutritionist from the State department of education, and the district nutritionist from the State department of public health met on Tuesday, January 3, 1950, in Fresno to develop this material. In addition to the instructions and recipes, a list of foods to supplement the surplus commodities will be prepared for use by the directors of county welfare departments in advising volunteer groups of foods to donate.

2. The committee felt that in addition to this mimeographed material there was need for cooking schools to demonstrate the use and cooking of foods. The problem of where such schools might be held was discussed. The local churches were mentioned as a possibility. It was suggested, also, that the growers might be approached regarding the provision of a demonstration kitchen in the camps. Earlier this year owners of two camps in Kings County contributed $25 each to cover the costs of a series of nutrition classes held in their camps under the auspices of the health department.

It was agreed that the home economists and nutritionists from the various agencies in the six counties would plan jointly the content and schedule for the cooking schools.

3. In connection with the discussion of cooking schools the problem of limited cooking facilities was again discussed. It was pointed out that this is one of the factors that handicap these families in providing even a minimum adequate diet. This is particularly true for the infant and small child.

(a) It was recommended that the Housing Division and the growers give attention in their study of housing to minimum food storage (shelves and coolers) and stationary cooking equipment.

(b) It was further recommended as a part of this study that the possibility of community kitchens be explored.

These community kitchens (similar to community showers, laundries, etc.) to be used either by individual families to prepare their meals, or rotating committees to prepare and serve meals to a group of families.

(c) Another suggestion that the committee felt should be studied was the possibility of a nonprofit cafeteria which might be operated by the families or the growers.

The last two recommendations to be considered as a part of a long-range program.

4. Throughout the discussion it was apparent that more information concerning the food practices of these agricultural workers was needed.

Therefore, it was recommended that a study be made which would not only point up the dietary habits but food marketing and preparation practices.

The State department of public health in cooperation with the State interagency nutrition committee would construct the questionnaire and be responsible for tabulating the data.

The local home economists and nutritionists in the counties would be responsible for collecting the data.

B. Day care of children

5. The many problems encountered in providing supervised day care of small children were enumerated. These included such problems as financing, adequate housing and play areas, isolation units, and trained personnel. The magnitude of the problem pointed up the need for assistance beyond the resources of the local area.

For this reason it was felt that the problem should be referred to the State child-care program and that the Department of Education and other concerned agencies should study the possibility of extending its program to children of agricultural workers in rural areas.

This type of program would not only provide an educational program for the parents but an adequate lunch for the children.

6. The committee felt that in addition to the day-care program a long-range educational program to teach parents proper child care is essential.

It recommended that local health departments, welfare departments, and agricultural extension assume this responsibility, which would necessitate additional public-health nurses, welfare workers, and home advisers.

C. Recreation

7. The importance of providing adequate recreational facilities for agricultural workers and their families was discussed. Several county representatives pointed out that the counties employ recreational supervisors.

It was recommended that this problem be referred to the respective counties for consideration by the boards of supervisors.

The resources at the State level were discussed, and it was recommended that these be mentioned to the local counties. Those listed were the State recreation commission, State department of education, and youth authority.

It was further suggested that the growers be advised of this need. In certain camps the management have recognized the importance of recreation and have provided recreation personnel to supervise and guide a program for the workers and their families.

REPORT OF SUBSECTION ON COMMUNITY ORGANIZATION AND EDUCATION, MRS. ANN W. HAYNES, CHAIRMAN

A number of resources are available in the counties which can contribute to an educational program directed to—

1. Teaching agricultural workers more healthful ways of living.

2. Helping the community provide more opportunities for participation by agricultural workers in community life.

In both phases of the program, education should be "not something we do for people but something we do with people."

Not all agencies and groups that can be interested in participating in the program were represented in the section. The following specific resources, aside from those of health departments, were mentioned:

Local chapters of the American Red Cross: The representative of the Pacific area office stated that the Red Cross is interested in expanding its program of classes in home nursing and in infant and child care with particular emphasis on reaching agricultural workers. The Red Cross recognizes that it will be necessary to modify the course to meet the needs of this group and to be adaptable to the conditions under which they live. A training course for teachers of the two courses will be held in the valley, including nurses employed by health departments, willing to take the training.

Agricultural Extension Service: Home and farm advisors of the UC Agricultural Extension Service will be able to work more intensively with agricultural workers than has

been possible in the past. Because of the methods used by the advisers, it is believed they will be successful in discovering leaders in the agricultural-worker group. These leaders can be made available also for programs of other agencies.

Schools: The health-education programs of schools in the valley have been greatly improved during the past few years. An additional important contribution the schools can make is in provision of opportunities for agricultural workers and their children to participate in community life.

Growers: One large firm in Fresno County has indicated an interest in employing a nurse to work in the camp under the direction of the local health department.

It was felt by the section that many additional resources could be discovered by exploration at the local level.

There are serious needs and problems in all of the counties that stand in the way of community organization and education. Among those brought out by the section are:

1. Need for an over-all community organization that includes professional and lay people and reaches into small communities.

It was felt by the local people present that the councils now operating do not completely meet this need.

2. Need for personnel: (a) People trained in teaching methods of working with this particular group; (b) people trained in community organization.

Only one of the health departments employs a health educator and that position is now vacant. Vacancies exist in nursing positions in health departments. Not all departments have sufficient nursing staff to meet the normal needs.

3. Need for facilities in camps: (a) A place for group meetings; (b) provision for supervision and recreation for children while meetings are being held for adults.

4. The problem of finding a time for meetings that is possible both for the agricultural workers and teachers.

It was felt that much of the teaching might have to be done on person-to-person basis.

5. The problem of the heterogeneity of the agricultural-worker group, the lack of organized and natural subgroups.

6. The problem of how to reach the people who are not concentrated in labor camps.

The section felt that not all needs could be met, nor all problems solved, immediately. However, they do not present insuperable difficulties and, through utilizing all resources that are available, a sound program of community organization and education can be developed in each of the six counties. As a start toward that program the section presented the following recommendations:

Recommendations

1. At an early date, the local health departments should take the leadership in bringing together in each county the people and agencies concerned with planning, developing, and coordinating the educational program.

2. A training course should be held on a county or regional basis, whichever is practical, to train the people who will work in the educational program in (a) content—so that confusion and contradictions in information given agricultural workers may be eliminated; (b) methods of working with agricultural workers.

3. Provision should be made at the State level for joint planning and coordination between all agencies concerned with the educational program.

REPORT OF SECTION ON HOUSING AND SANITATION, ELLIS D. SOX, M. D., CHAIRMAN

1. The following was submitted for action by the conference as a whole:

"It is recommended that the provisions of the State labor code relating to housing be amended to include labor camps, labor supply centers, tent camps, and so-called house courts, and that authority be vested in the State board of public health to adopt regulations governing the construction, maintenance, and operation of such camps and courts, with particular reference to the sanitation facilities provided therein; it is further recommended that enforcement of these sections and of any regulations promulgated be delegated to the State and local health departments."

In view of the far-reaching implications of such proposed legislative changes upon both the State department of industrial relations and the State department of public health, and upon industrial housing throughout the State, the conference acted as follows:

It is recommended that above motion be tabled pending a later meeting to be called by the State department of public health in cooperation with the State department of industrial relations, such meeting to include representation of both official and nonofficial agencies, and other persons having an interest in this problem.

Discussion included reference to the area of the State not presently served by organized local health departments and which could not assume responsibility for enforcement if such authority were provided without budgetary provision. It was also felt that the original recommendation, with its State-wide implications, was premature and justified more extensive study.

It was suggested, although not formally adopted, that this matter might be referred to appropriate committees of the State legislature for study and action.

The basis for consideration of this matter included the following factors:

(1) Authority and responsibility for inspection of labor camps are vested in the Division of Housing of the State Department of Industrial Relations, and have so existed since 1913, at which time there were no organized county health departments.

(2) A labor camp includes housing facilities provided for five or more employees of an employer on his property. Technically speaking, therefore, when less than five of the inhabitants are employees of the owner, it ceases to be a labor camp and the responsibility for inspection and supervision by the Division of Housing ceases. The labor camp then becomes a responsibility of the local health department under the health and safety code provisions governing disposal of sewage and wastes, etc., or as provided by any pertinent local ordinances. The questions arose at this point: "When is a labor camp not a labor camp?" and "Is this shifting responsibility and authority sound and efficient administratively?"

(3) The local health authorities, with one exception, felt very strongly that the delineation of responsibility should be made more definite, and that it should be placed in the local health department. Additional personnel would be required if such a change were made, and it was suggested that State subsidy should assist in their provision.

(4) The division of housing, on the other hand, has been inadequately staffed. Assurance has been made that augmentation of that staff will be made at once.

(5) Pending action one way or another as to legislative changes, it was agreed that the division of housing would assign its personnel to cover a specific county, and that they would work in close cooperation with local health-department personnel. It was suggested that they might be housed in the local health departments, but agreed they would not be under the direction of the local health officer. This would assist in meeting the immediate problem, in that specific cases could be handled jointly by the two agencies. The details of this arrangement are to be worked out between the division of housing and the local health departments.

2. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that consideration be given to amending the Labor Code in the section pertaining to agricultural-labor housing to include the provision of a permit system as a part of the administrative procedure carried out by the Division of Housing.

It was further recommended that local health officers and boards of supervisors in the development of local ordinances pertaining to housing in the unincorporated area, or pertaining to the control of environmental sanitation include in the local ordinances the provision for the issuing of a permit prior to the construction, maintenance, or operation of such facilities, and with the privilege of revoking such permit by the health officer after a proper hearing on the matter.

Discussion on this item was concerned with the difficulties now existing in finding areas which have sprung up as part of the housing provisions for agricultural laborers, whether they be in labor camps or in facilities not included under the purview of the labor code.

It was agreed that this would place upon the grower or the operator of such a housing facility the responsibility for informing the local health department or the division of housing of his intent to establish such a facility. Further, it would facilitate enforcement of violators.

3. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that local health departments and boards of supervisors consider adoption of the principles of two ordinances adopted by the Kern County Board of Supervisors. These are:

(1) Ordinance G–53, referring to the designation of certain areas of the unincorporated area of counties as "urban" areas, the definition being as follows:

"Urban areas shall consist of those portions of the unincorporated area of the county (of Kern) which are closely built up and largely given over to business and residential use and that area adjacent to such built-up areas which is potential business or residential area, and its inclusion is reasonably necessary to preserve the character and stability of the existing built-up area, in all of which area it is feasible, practicable, and necessary to provide uniform health, sanitation, and safety ordinances, and regulations which are not adaptable to sparsely populated and rural areas."

It was felt that the adoption of this principle would permit the passage of local ordinances and regulations by the health officer which would assist in the control of conditions existing in the so-called fringe areas around incorporated cities and in other built-up areas where increased density of population is associated with accentuation of sanitation problems.

(2) Ordinance 302, which covers the construction, reconstruction, or maintenance of "house courts, apartments, camp, car and/or trailer, tent-camp space, and squatter camps, giving authority to the local health department for the enforcement thereof."

This ordinance covers a field of housing used by agricultural workers and others which are not completely covered by the provisions of the State labor code or of the health and safety code. It constitutes a stop-gap to cover the jurisdictional no man's land between the local health department and the State division of housing.

4. The following recommendation was adopted:

It was recommended that a study be made immediately looking toward the establishment of camp sites for agricultural workers, with acceptable sanitary facilities, with adequate management, operating with the ap-

proval and under the general supervision of the local health department.

There were two phases to the discussion of this item. One was whether or not such camps should be operated by counted government. There was a unanimous feeling that neither the Federal Government nor the State government should operate such facilities. There was a general feeling that county government should not operate such facilities.

There was relatively unanimous agreement that such facilities can be effectively sponsored and operated by growers' associations, as has been the case in Tulare and Kern Counties. One grower, a Mr. Thomas, of Madera County, expressed the opinion that such camps, particularly when operated after the harvest season is over, become places for organized unrest and labor difficulties. Mr. Stein, manager of the two grower-operated camps in Tulare County, with 8 years' experience in both Federal and privately operated camps, expressed the opinion that this was not the case, particularly when the camp management was strong and leadership of the inhabitants themselves was cultivated and encouraged.

It was brought out that education, for both better living habits and other aspects of public health, could be accomplished more easily under conditions where there are large groups of people in a single area for a long period of time. The provision of health services to such a group of people is easier and more effective than when the same number of people are scattered throughout the county.

5. It was recognized that with all the discussion concerning the problem there appeared to be no concise or accurate knowledge available as to the need for housing of agricultural workers in this area, particularly at the peak of labor demand, its relative adequacy, the status of sanitary facilities, etc., or any sound method of evaluating either the quality, the quantity, or the actual need. The following recommendations concerning this were adopted:

(a) It was recommended that information available from the State department of employment and the bureau of labor statistics be utilized by State and local agencies in anticipating labor needs on an area basis, in order that more effective planning for the provision of adequate housing and sanitary facilities might be developed.

(b) It was recommended that by January 31, 1950, local health departments in cooperation with the staff of the Division of Housing make a survey of existing facilities for the housing of agricultural workers, including the number and the type of housing facilities, and percent of occupancy, and some estimation of their sanitary status, utilizing the standards of the Division of Housing as the minimum requirements to be met.

(c) It was recommended that the Governor appoint a study committee to develop techniques for evaluating the need for housing of agricultural workers throughout the State, to study the flow of agricultural workers throughout the State, and that after such techniques have been developed, and if it appears necessary, an actual survey of these conditions be conducted.

(In the discussion of this latter resolution it was brought out that agricultural workers are brought into various areas of the State, particularly during the peak of demand, from urban centers.)

RÉSUMÉ OF PROGRESS SINCE DECEMBER 29, 1949

The State department of public health reported on the activities of the above conference to Governor Warren at a conference in his office, attended also by representatives of other State departments.

To further implement some of the recommendations of the conference, the State department of public health has assigned Dr. Donald Davy, assistant chief of the division of local health service, to correlate the activities of the department, with headquarters temporarily in Fresno at the departmental branch office in the Rowell Building. The phone number is Fresno 4-1129. Dr. Davy in addition to integrating the activities of the department will assist local health departments and other agencies in any way possible.

The department is seeking health educators to be employed temporarily by the State and assigned to this area to assist in the community organization and general health educational program. The nutrition services of the department are active, along with the Agricultural Extension Service and the local welfare departments, in giving advice and consultation to those utilizing surplus commodities. A basic educational program is being started immediately.

The department of public health is preparing a recommended project of research in the epidemiology of the diarrheal diseases for submission to the United States Public Health Service.

The bureau of sanitary engineering is cooperating with the division of housing of the State department of industrial relations in an attempt to make more effective the program of sanitation and housing which much be carried on jointly by State and local agencies.

The bureau of vector control of the State department of public health is investigating methods whereby its services may be tied in to the general sanitation services in the control of insect vectors of communicable diseases.

In cooperation with the various welfare departments, the State department of public health and local health officers will confer with the San Joaquin Valley Supervisors Association on February 10, 1950, to discuss basic problems which are of concern to county supervisors. This includes the distribution of surplus commodities and the decentralization of both health and medical services and, possibly, the lowering the admission requirements for indigents by making prenatal and postnatal care and medical and hospital services for indigent sick children medical emergencies.

As further problems present themselves the State department of public health will cooperate with other agencies in meeting them in any way possible. Your suggestions should be presented to your local health officers or to Dr. Davy in our Fresno office for further study and action.

STATE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH,
DIVISION OF LOCAL HEALTH SERVICE.

Mr. Speaker, California's State director of public health, Dr. Wilon Halverson, says this migrant farm labor problem "is primarily an economic problem."

The California conference, as its report shows, looked at this problem steadily and saw it whole, not as an isolated health problem, or school problem, or housing problem.

The economic problem is basically affected by the supply of labor in relation to the need for labor. I am convinced that there is a surplus of farm labor, not only in California, but throughout the Nation.

Of course, to provide the largest number of days worked for the labor supply that is available, we should have an up-to-date system of recruiting, transporting, placing, and housing migrant workers.

Instead, we ignore available labor here in the United States, all over the United States, and continue to make our unemployment picture worse by bringing in more Mexican workers to share the already insufficient number of jobs.

The most recent information I have received as to the situation among agricultural workers in California is in a report on the Imperial Valley dated January 30, 1950. The report was submitted by Hank Hasiwar, a representative of the American Federation of Labor's National Farm Labor Union.

The union has presented this report to President Truman and Secretary of Labor Tobin with a request for an immediate investigation and action.

This report recites low wages, inhuman living conditions, and insecurity among American citizens caused by the influx of Mexican nationals under the international agreement and by thousands of Mexicans who enter in violation of our immigration laws. This report should shock the conscience of all who read it. The text follows:

NATIONAL FARM LABOR UNION, A. F. OF L.,
Bakersfield, Calif., January 30, 1950.

REPORT ON THE IMPERIAL VALLEY

PREFACE

The Imperial Valley is located in the southern most region of California, bounded on the south by the Republic of Mexico. It is a fabulously rich agricultural area whose climate conditions enable this valley to grow and harvest fruit and vegetables while the rest of the Nation is fighting blizzards and hail.

Yet in this valley American people, mainly those of Mexican descent, are slowly starving because illegal aliens from Mexico have their jobs.

To the north in the vast agricultural empire of the San Joaquin Valley, where all crops have been harvested, American people of all races and creeds are suffering hunger because there is no work. In the great Central Valley of which the San Joaquin is the major part, between fifty and sixty thousand farm workers are unemployed.

It is indeed a tragic mystery for many farm workers that in areas where work is going on, all avenues to secure employment have been closed to them by the most rapacious group of employers who operate in the American economic system.

THE IMPERIAL VALLEY

The writer of this report arrived in the Imperial Valley on January 23 to survey that area at the request of many American people of Mexican descent who were being forced against the wall of poverty by thousands of their former fellow countrymen employed illegally in the Imperial Valley by the growers in that area.

The writer found a condition that was unbelievable, hardened as he was the last 3 years by the inhuman exploitation of the farm laborers in the State of California.

He found that many Americans of Mexican descent and others legally in the United States for many years were earning wages scarcely comparable with that of an American standard by any stretch of the imagination.

Typical of such pay checks earned by energetic Mexican-Americans who are known for their ability as farm laborers were such checks as follows:

For week ending Jan. 7	$8.70
For week ending Jan. 13	5.10
For week ending Jan. 20	9.20

Another energetic Mexican-American worker, the father of seven children, earned for the—

Week ending Jan. 13	$9.90
Week ending Jan. 20	15.90

These figures are from the check stubs of a leading firm operating in the Imperial Valley—the Arena Imperial Co., located in Brawley, Calif. Further, these stubs and many others are in evidence.

Yet even these examples can consider themselves fortunate, for there are many residents of towns in the Imperial Valley, as El Centro, Brawley, Holtville, Calexico, and Calpatria, who cannot even secure employment to earn even such pittances.

Additionally, hundreds of laborers not only those of Mexican descent but colored and white Okies and Arkies have been turned back from the Imperial Valley for lack of employment and forced to return to their origins where they at least could secure a roof over their heads. Many of these ran out of gas money to drive their jalopies back and became stranded in the Imperial Valley. At the time of the organizer's visit, in Brawley alone, 200 Okies and Arkies were completely stranded and absolutely destitute.

In the Imperial Valley there is no relief program, for no direction of human interest extends from the growers to the people who make their industry possible.

In the great Central Valley of California farm workers are going hungry because there is no work. In the Imperial Valley farm workers are going hungry because illegal Mexicans have the jobs.

The illegal Mexican is commonly called a wet-back, supposedly derived from getting wet in crossing the Rio Grande. The wet-backs or wets cross from Mexicali over the border into Calexico, El Centro, and Brawley. From there many thousands work their way as far north as the State of Washington. It would be safe to estimate, although no official figures are available, that there is at least 60,000 wet-backs in the west-coast States. However, the Imperial Valley, because of its nearness to the border and because of its outright control by the corporate farm interests receives more than its fair share of the wet-backs.

In the Imperial Valley at present there is a total work force of some 18,000 farm laborers. At peak in the month of March between 23,000 and 24,000 are employed. Of this number there are 5,000 Mexican nationals working now in the valley due to a contract negotiated between the United States and Mexico for the legal importation of foreign Mexican nationals. Additionally there are 6,000 wet-backs working now who come regularly over the border or who shack up in towns within the valley or who live on the ditch banks. This makes up a work force of 11,000 citizens of the Republic of Mexico as against 7,000 citizens and legal residents of the United States.

This is the work force in agriculture which at the present is primarily engaged in harvesting carrots, lettuce, and cabbage. Additionally, numbers of wet-backs are employed in other pursuits besides those of stoop labor. The A. F. of L. Central Trades and Labor Council in El Centro has found wet-backs in the restaurant industry, the retail trades, and the building. They, too, are most concerned with this encroachment, and particularly so when they discover numbers of them with social-security cards.

The supply of wet-backs seems to be a never-ending one. At the writing of this report there were 25,000 Mexicans gathered in Mexicali, all waiting for jobs in the United States. Each week 1,500 to 2,000 enter this new port of entry hoping to find their fortunes in the United States. This labor pool at first was supposedly set up to provide for the legal entree of contract Mexican nationals into the United States, but so effective has been the propaganda that from all over the interior of Mexico are arriving Mexican citizens eagerly looking forward to their long-awaited manna. Only a few of these can be used contractually, the others must find employment as wet-backs or starve. For this the Republic of Mexico deserves its full share of discredit. It is common to hear our Mexican-American citizens explain this phenomenon by saying that Aleman has sold out. Miguel Aleman is the President of the Republic of Mexico.

Separating Mexicali, Mexico, from Calexico, United States, is a 5½-mile fence. The fence has holes in it and for those who are more energetic the paths are well worn on each side. The fence is patrolled by the United States Immigration Service but twice a day, thus providing ample opportunity for any number to cross at the proper intervals.

Certainly the United States Immigration Service must be a frustrating occupation for as soon as this service does pick up illegal aliens for deportation (wet-backs), and they have picked them up at bursts of 2,000 per week, the wet-backs infallibly return, all the wiser for having been caught. It is commonly joked that when the wet-back is picked up and returned to Mexicali, he hops a cab and beats the Immigration Department back over the border.

All admit that the United States Immigration Department has a hopeless task in cleaning up the wet-backs problem. At most the border patrol can only be a source of irritation to the growers whom they raid for wets.

The composite of the employer force in the Imperial Valley typical of farming in the State of California. There are 100 grower firms that control 50 percent of the total acreage in the Imperial Valley. Approximately 5,900 other growers control the other 50 percent. Farming in the Imperial Valley is on a cash-crop basis and controlled in spirit as well as financially by the corporate farmers.

Although a curse need not necessarily be imposed on bigness nevertheless an emulation on the part of many smaller operators takes place that often results in even more abuses. It can commonly be said that wet-backs are exploited severely. Many small growers and even renters have called the Immigration Service in to clean out their wet-backs and refused to pay them wages that were due them. In one week it was reported that certain small growers and renters refused to pay 461 wet-backs for their labor. The organizer discovered from his Mexican contacts that this practice takes place among larger growers as well. It has become a most convenient custom to tell the wet-back to go back to where he came from when it is time to pay him off.

Wet-backs are again in a most unfortunate position because of their inability to get protection or redress for their grievances. They cannot complain about sleeping on irrigation ditch banks—nor can they complain about getting 30 or 35 cents per hour—which is less than half the scale of the 60 cents per hour for the contract Mexican national.

The scale of 60 cents per hour set for contract nationals has rapidly become the prevailing wage for all American workers in the Imperial Valley.

Even the contract nationals (those who are legally here for the duration of the contract) are exploited unfairly. Reports that they are inadequately housed, that they do not receive the scale of 60 cents per hour through manipulating them to lower piecework rates are common. Complaints from the nationals are so numerous that the Mexican consul finds himself inadequate to police the contracts.

It is obvious to the most superficial observer that the contract Mexican nationals and the wet-backs are being used by the growers to destroy American living and working standards for the American farm workers. It becomes further obvious that the wet-backs and the Mexican nationals are being exploited even more greatly than our own American people.

Spanish-speaking Americans will tell you that Brawley, the largest farm labor supply center in the Imperial Valley looks like Mexico in the early mornings when the growers' trucks come in to pick up the wet labor, dressed in ragged clothes, wearing a large straw sombrero and serape around their shoulders. The residents of Brawley look on while the wets are picked up and leave for work. So serious has this problem become that Mexican-American ex-GI's and the wet-backs have had small outbreaks of violence.

Living year round in the Imperial Valley are a sufficient number of workers to form a basic work force. At present the farm labor population in the leading towns are:

Brawley	3,900
El Centro	3,700
Holtville	2,000
Calexico	2,000

In surrounding areas there is an additional resident work force of 6,500. Supplementing this work force are migrants who make their regular trek to the Imperial Valley to assist in the harvesting of carrots, lettuce, melons, beets, and other vegetables. This year the trek is not as large because the wet-backs have the jobs. Additionally, the population of the main towns in the Imperial Valley have been going down because of the steady loss in job opportunities for the original resident farm population. Steadily increasing the labor pool of available illegal labor in Mexicali is the increasing number of 25,000 Mexican citizens in Mexicali, growing from 1,500 to 2,000 each week. Consequently, the San Joaquin Valley is becoming increasingly flooded with displaced Mexican-Americans from the Imperial Valley. At this writing hunger, privation, and loss of homes, combined with bewilderment and hopelessness, is the symbol of the times for the farm workers in the San Joaquin Valley.

CONCLUSIONS

It is of foremost necessity that immediate action be taken to prevent the further demoralization and impoverishment of the American farm workers in the Imperial Valley.

1. The border must be plugged against the entrance of any further "wetbacks." Those in the United States should be immediately rounded up by the United States Immigration Service and returned by the Mexican Government to the Interior of that Nation. The recently acquired pool of 25,000 laborers waiting in Mexicali must be dried up by shipping them back home under clear instructions by the Mexican Government.

2. The State of California now prevents the employment of illegal aliens on public projects. This should be extended by law into agriculture with penalties attached, otherwise the growers will violate the law as they are doing at present.

3. The State of California in conjunction with the National Farm Labor Union, A. F. of L., should begin to shift unemployed and qualified farm workers to the Imperial Valley to complete the harvest. Transportation will have to be arranged for most since they are completely penniless, having no unemployment insurance to rely on. All harvesting prior to World War II was done with American labor in the Imperial Valley thus there is no reason why it can't be done with the same now.

4. The present contract under which 5,000 Mexican nationals are employed should be immediately abrogated by the American and Mexican Governments.

If these things are done immediately, we can still save an immensely perilous situation. This is an obligation which both the Mexican and United States Governments owe their people. If these proper actions are taken we can rest assured that we will have

restored faith in the people themselves as well as in their respective governments.

HANK HASIWAR,
Western Representative.

Mr. Speaker, we have a migrant farm labor problem. It is a continuing problem. It is being aggravated by the continued importation of migrant labor from Mexico and the West Indies.

My conclusion is that we ought to stop the importation of foreign migratory labor. We have a surplus of domestic farm labor. The problem is to supply these men and women with full employment at decent wages and working conditions. The problem grows worse daily. It is not a seasonal problem. It is not just a California problem. It is not a Southwest or a Mexican border problem. It extends all over America, as Mr. Goodwin's table of certifications shows.

I believe that, if the full facts about migrant farm workers' problems can be assembled and spread out for all to see, the American people and Congress will do what is right.

We have had complaints, we have had surveys, investigations, and reports for the past quarter of a century dealing with this, that, or the other phase of the migrant farm labor problem. Labor, church, civic, and welfare organizations have reported on conditions among migrant farm labor families, on the health of children of these workers, on their working conditions, on their nutrition and health, and, in at least one instance, on the extent of disease, starvation, and death in the midst of the plenty they helped to harvest for the tables and the clothes closets of America.

But we have never had a thorough Nation-wide examination of the entire problem with findings and recommendations for raising this great depressed segment of our people to an American standard of living.

Since the war, this American tragedy, once described in John Steinbeck's Grapes of Wrath but dismissed as a temporary phenomenon of the last depression, has returned. It is with us again. The most recent employment figures show that unemployment has increased, seasonally it is true, from three and one-half to four and one-half million employable persons. It is emphasized that a large proportion of this increase in unemployment is among farm workers. The hope is expressed that, as spring comes on, these workers will again find jobs.

But the most optimistic estimates of employment in 1950 say only this: that, if business holds up, the level of employment may be maintained through the end of 1950. With a net increase in the labor force of at least 800,000, composed of GI's who are finishing their education and training and other young men and women finishing school, the prospect now is for more than 4,000,000 unemployed by the end of 1950.

The effect of this upon migrant farm labor will be to make the search for work more desperate, the trips from one crop area to another more frequent. Farm wages and working conditions may be pounded down by employers facing lower farm prices on the one hand and on the other hand seeing larger pools of unemployed available.

I hope President Truman will create at the earliest possible moment a Commission to assemble the full facts about the conditions under which migrant farm workers are employed or seek to be employed and live or seek to live. Such a Commission, appointed by the President and given the cooperation of all agencies of the executive and legislative branches of the Federal and State Governments, and county and municipal agencies, can give us sound bases for intelligent action, adequate to meet the need.

If this is done and if the American people and their elected representatives respond as I believe they will respond, we can then eat our food and wear our clothes without our consciences telling us of sins of omission, economic, social, and political sins against millions of fellow Americans.

If this is done now and if we act as we should act on the basis of such findings and recommendations, our Nation will be healthier, stronger, happier, and more secure within and without.

Senator McMahon and His Proposal to Neutralize the Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT S. KERR
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Mr. William S. White regarding the able Senator from Connecticut [Mr. MCMAHON], which article appeared in the New York Times magazine of February 12, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M'MAHON, SENATOR AND ATOMIC SPECIALIST—THE FATHER OF CIVILIAN ATOM CONTROL PROPOSES A BOLD NEW APPROACH TO NEUTRALIZING THE BOMB

(By William S. White)

WASHINGTON.—For the people of the earth first the atomic bomb discovery and now the urgent progress toward the infinitely more destructive hydrogen bomb have thrust into the ordinary way of life a clutching, mass fear of death not even fully understood.

Perhaps no one in all the world has been more vitally stirred than a young United States Senator from the State of Connecticut. Like everyone else, he, too, is to live or die upon the issue. But for this dreadful business BRIEN MCMAHON would be only 1 of 96 Members of what used to be a rather droning, pleasant old club called the Senate—and he most likely would be a quite obscure and junior one, speaking for the most part when spoken to, and careful not to move forward into the chairs reserved by ancient custom for the patriarchs.

Instead he has, in a single term in the Senate, accumulated a frightening responsibility, as chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy, which oversees the agency that in turn controls all in this field, the Atomic Energy Commission. He did not reach that post by soft means or manners; by the polite, after-you-sir bows expected of a Senate newcomer. He fought and clawed for it with the single-minded toughness of a zealot upon whom a great and fearful urgency had fallen.

He got it, against all tradition of seniority and over the claims of men who had been in the Senate for years before him, for two reasons. If he was not the first man in Congress fully to understand the meaning for men and government of what was afoot in the grim laboratories, certainly he was the first doggedly and plainly to articulate that meaning.

He was, moreover, the leader among the congressional forces that fought fiercely, and from the beginning, to take the atom away from the military and to lodge it in civilian control. He was in short, the author of the McMahon Atomic Energy Act for which, quite naturally, there was no precedent, since the fact of the atomic bomb was quite unprecedented itself. It was against this background and in his capacity as the highest lay authority on atomic matters that Senator MCMAHON made his recent great speech—and the adjective is used to denote a tour de force—proposing bold new approaches to the Russians for neutralizing atomic weapons. He urged the United States to set aside $10,000,000,000 yearly for the next 5 years (about two-thirds of present defense expenditures) for a global Marshall plan of atomic and other developments for all countries, including Russia—provided all participants in the program, which the United Nations would administer, accept world atomic control with full inspection.

When the word was flashed in 1945 that our first A-bomb had fallen upon Hiroshima in Japan, BRIEN MCMAHON, who had been in the Senate only about long enough to know the respective locations of the Republican and Democratic lounges, was at breakfast with his brother in Vermont. He was, then, too young a chap in the Senate to be trusted with anything important, including important information. He did not know that an appropriation of $2,000,000,000 had been put through Congress mysteriously for a hush-hush thing called the Manhattan District Project. Indeed, he did not know that there was a Manhattan District project.

His instant response to what was coming in over the radio in that peaceful Yankee farmhouse was no different, in substance, from that of many intelligent men everywhere: That monstrous thing, too big for thought, had been wrought by the scientists. But he had a secondary, and quick, response that was wholly different. This thing, he thought, must first of all be understood, even by politicians—perhaps most of all by politicians.

He set out at once to try to understand and the first data to help him along the line, he says, "were the pioneer articles written by William L. Laurence, of the New York Times." Senator MCMAHON took on all that Mr. Laurence had to offer and then, a man with a legal education and not a scientific one, he began to read all the heavier stuff besides. Certainly, he would not claim today that he approached, then, the dim corridors where lay the essential secrets; all he did was keep his foot thrust into the outer door.

What he learned and heard frightened him to an exquisite degree. It put him in fear not only of the atomic engine itself, but in fear for the survival of the kind of government we have always had. He saw, as he puts it now, an ever-constricting ring of

secrecy. He heard an ever-growing observation among politicians, based upon the obvious fact that leaks in the wrong direction might physically destroy the United States and all it had and hoped for: "We can do nothing but leave it to the experts, the military and scientific experts."

To Mr. McMAHON this concept of secrecy was a dangerously creeping thing, particularly when it implied—as it did in those days—a barrier raised even against the elected representatives of the people. Insofar as military security would permit, he has always been antisecrecy; has always sought ways to lift the curtain.

So, in what seemed to some at the time a quixotic mission of hopelessness, he began drafting the McMahon Act as a counterattack upon a War Department proposal for continued military control. It is more or less the thing in Congress that when a man introduces a successful resolution for setting up a special committee he gets the chairmanship. In this case, though, this was no committee to investigate coal prices or to preserve wildlife. What was being created here was a group with immense power over the military and possible civilian use of the greatest force known to man.

McMAHON was, in the common view of the Senate, a New Dealer, young, untried, a Johnny-come-lately and a man who at the very least, had to be much more seasoned before taking on anything so breath-taking. McMAHON was a New Dealer, all right; but he also was a sophisticated product of urban politics; he knew plenty of people in the right places—and passive resistance was not his strong point. He pulled wires, he lobbied among Members, he struggled onward—and he got the job. Did personal ambition play a part here? Certainly. Was there also a sense of mission apart from self? On all of the evidence since, yes.

But when the committee to serve under Senator McMAHON was appointed, the then President of the Senate, Senator KENNETH D. McKELLAR, of Tennessee, was filled with gloomy forebodings. He put upon it, as junior to Mr. McMAHON in this new job, the greatest, long-lived stars of the Senate—men like CONNALLY, of Texas, VANDENBERG, of Michigan, TYDINGS, of Maryland. It was rather the way in which Balkan countries have sometimes surrounded with a stern regency of elder statesmen a young nominal king of insufficient years and doubtful designs.

The mere presence, sitting at the table below him, of such powerful figures as CONNALLY, and VANDENBERG, and TYDINGS would have been well calculated to put into young Senator McMAHON the greatest fear in the Senate—the fear of seniority, with its crushing disapproval of the pushing and those not mellowed by tradition and tried by debate.

But Mr. McMAHON'S parents had raised no softy and, by a combination of deference to his elders at some points and aggressive chairmanship at others, he has managed always to sit at the head of the table. It was helpful also that regardless of his obvious and undenied personal ambition, he was profoundly sincere about the job at hand. The elders watched carefully and as this was slowly borne in upon them they seemed content on the whole with the arrangement.

By the observation of this correspondent and by the private word of those who would be bound to know—fellow Senators who see things proceed in camera—McMAHON, in the atomic field, is in the deadliest of earnestness. Indeed, he is said by some of his colleagues to be hipped on it. He himself, in moments of reflection, sometimes falls into deep melancholy as he contemplates matters not known outside the committee room. Once, to illustrate his anxieties to a friend, he observed: "You know, this may be, literally, the apocalypse."

All this should not leave erroneous impressions about McMAHON as a man. He is not by any stretch of the imagination any St. George in plume and armor. He is, when he is not "the Atomic Senator," a hard-boiled politician from a closely divided State where there are no stately minuets in the party clubrooms and where the instinct for self-preservation is profoundly developed. Whenever a good turn can be done for the Democratic Party—apart from the atomic field, which in fundamental matters he seems honestly to try to keep inviolate—McMAHON is the man to do it.

In ordinary affairs he is deeply partisan, untroubled by philosophic hesitations and not at all deterred by excessive scruples from hitting a Republican, in the political sense, over the head with any odd bit of plank or masonry that happens to be lying about. He is aware every minute, in the most urgently practical sense, that he is running in this off year for reelection in a State that at such times has tended to be quite inhospitable to sitting Democrats.

When he sits with the Democratic policy committee—an extraordinary position for a first-termer which he got by virtue of the fact that he is secretary of the Senate Democratic conference, or caucus—he is what his associates there call an attack man. Among the functions of his committee (which embodies the Democratic leadership of the Senate) is to decide what bills the Senate shall take up at a given time. Rarely does Mr. McMAHON find, in these meetings, anything particularly pressing or specially worthy about a bill of Republican authorship.

The more easygoing, and older, policy committee members chuckle a bit about this. When, on occasion, they suggest that such and such a Republican Senator has made an interesting legislative proposal that might just possibly be worth letting to the floor, Senator McMAHON is apt to put in a vehement dissenting opinion. "Why the hell," he may demand, "can't a Democratic Senator put in a better one? And then let's take that one up."

On the floor—again one is discussing the ordinary issues—Mr. McMAHON is a stalwart and faithful Truman Democrat, as regular in this sense as any good soldier in an infantry platoon when the order comes to set off on patrol. On all these matters he is careful to bow to his seniors in the party—and particularly to the salty and high-tempered CONNALLY, of Texas, the greatly feared (and beloved) prima donna of the Senate as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee.

Mr. McMAHON is on this committee, too, and his membership here, so early in his career, represents an upward climb of the greatest good fortune. Mr. CONNALLY accepted him a little grudgingly at first, and it used to be, when the mood was upon him to dress down the troops, that he would absently refer to Senator McMAHON on the Senate floor as "Mister Mackmohahn," thus leaving the suggestion that one really couldn't bother to know how to pronounce everybody's name. Senator McMAHON, who is good enough himself at this sort of thing to appreciate a great artist in the mysteries of rank, would grin, with a kind of rueful enjoyment of the skill of the master, with the rest of the Senate.

Suddenly it became apparent that Senator CONNALLY had now definitely put Senator McMAHON on the foreign-policy first team. He is now, by the Connally appointment, chairman of a Foreign Relations Subcommittee that has the antigenocide treaty—itself a revolutionary thing in history—in its charge. It thus comes about that Senator McMAHON'S almost exclusive present concerns, apart from the day-to-day routine necessary to any Senator, are with two concepts of horror: The possible mass destruction of human life by atomic-hydrogen bombs and the actual murder in the recent past of millions for no other reason than their race.

While Mr. McMAHON is no bundle of palpitating emotion, he is basically a sensitive man—as are a great many men in the political trade—and profound anxieties often lie upon him.

Out of these anxieties grew the Senate address in which he proposed his world-wide Marshall plan. When President Truman was considering whether to go ahead with the hydrogen bomb, while the world waited upon his words, Senator McMAHON sent privately to the President a proposition in two parts: First, that by all means we should build the bomb, but, second, that we accompany this with a new and dramatic proposal intended to halt the atomic armaments race.

The President did not accept this suggestion and Mr. McMAHON as a loyal Democrat did not complain. Still, haunted by what he knew and what he feared, he felt himself unable simply to stay silent. He began to prepare his address, helped along by one of the most competent professional staffs in the Senate. He told only a few outside persons what he intended to say, but these were men in the highest position of American life. He listened to their suggestions.

Finally, he went forth one morning to the Senate floor, holding, with concealed nervousness, an extraordinary manuscript. As he began to deliver it, in his rather high, breaking voice, much of the Senate, as is its custom, went on noisily about its own business. At length, however, a silence fell and at the end it persisted for a full minute until colleague after colleague began to rise in congratulation.

What Senator McMAHON wants to say is this:

That this country must, of course, build every weapon possible for its defense, but that it ought not to do so without the most desperate efforts to make unnecessary the use of those weapons.

That piling secret weapon on top of secret weapon tends increasingly to exclude both public and Congress, and more and more to leave terrible decisions in fewer and fewer expert hands.

That something must be attempted, some crusade against the atomic armaments race, if only as the highest moral duty, and if only for history's sake.

To those who objected that what he was proposing was impractical and even dreamlike, the Senator retorted: First, find a better plan then, and, second, that the point had been reached where even dreams should not be too quickly tossed aside.

The speech, one gathers, was not made with thought of the rather precious little coteries of professional idealists who always come chattering about to lionize a man in such a case; neither was it made for those who think necessarily and always that there is an honorable alternative to honorable combat.

By what sort of man was it made? First, the vital statistics and the like. BRIEN McMAHON was born in Norwalk, Conn., in 1903. He graduated from Fordham University and the Yale Law School. He served as an attorney in the Department of Justice from 1933 to 1939. In 1935, when President Roosevelt appointed him an Assistant Attorney General, he was the youngest man ever to hold that place. He was 31 at the time. He had a good record as a Government prosecutor.

Mr. McMAHON was elected to the Senate in 1944. He got the Democratic nomination with powerful support from the Federal wing of the party, for he had never before held any sort of elective office in Connecticut. He reached here without having had to play the somewhat dreary game of musical chairs which most Senators have had to play—first county attorney, then State legislature, and so on up.

He is a sophisticated, reasonably party-going man in Washington; heavy shouldered,

blocky, not lacking in the light, harmless cynicisms of this city in small matters, and wearing the marks of good living upon him. He married the former Rosemary Turner, a beautiful woman by any standard, and they have a 9-year-old daughter, Patricia.

The Senator, by the private testimony of those who know best—his colleagues on the floor—is well liked there; not "in the top 2 percent of popularity," as one says, "but well up there." A criticism of him one hears is that, especially in dealing with atomic matters, where he is so well informed, he has a tendency sometimes to shrug off less intense associates and to insist too much on his own way.

It is said here and there that he has, at times, a faintly pontifical manner. This, it seems from the outside, probably is actually a reflection of the fact that he really is hipped on atomic things and cannot resist the temptation to try to instruct. It also could spring, in part, from another cause. Senator McMAHON has a rather formal courtesy, dresses in the highest mode, and lacks the casual, happy-go-lucky touch that many of the old-timers have achieved through long-secure seats and through the belief, as the years go by, that all things pass.

It may be, indeed, that Mr. McMAHON cannot put down the urge to pontificate against that very assumption when he looks upon the sun and reflects upon the glittering brightness—or malignance—that lies there for mankind.

Prayers for Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, on February 13, 1950, the Tory leader, Winston Churchill, made a statement wherein he stated that, if elected, he would do all in his power to bring about another meeting with Stalin. To my mind, his statement was purely political, because the vast majority of the people of the world are in favor of peace, yes—a lasting peace.

In that connection, Mr. Speaker, it gives me sincere pleasure, particularly in these days of stress and strain, to insert two resolutions in the RECORD, one which was passed by the Jewish War Veterans of the United States of America at its fifty-fourth annual encampment, held in Miami Beach, Fla., October 19 to 23, 1949, and the second resolution, which was adopted at a conference of Agudath Israel of America, Inc., held during the week of November 28 to December 5 at the Manhattan Towers Hotel, New York City.

Both of these outstanding groups of citizens have lent their whole-hearted support to a rapidly growing movement in the United States very justly called "Prayers for Peace Crusade." The movement was quietly started last October 28 by the Honorable Herve J. L'Heureux, Chief of the Visa Division, Department of State, in his home town of Manchester, N. H. At that time Mr. L'Heureux stated that it would be fitting if a custom sprang up for a daily 1-minute prayer for peace in every town and city in the country. The idea, as Mr. L'Heureux presented it, was that all traffic, industry, and other activities should cease for just 1 minute at noon each day. Simultaneously every man, woman, and child would offer a prayer to God to grant the world lasting peace.

To date some 751 religious, civic, social, veteran, and industrial organizations have adopted a resolution to pause for 1 minute daily in silent prayer for peace.

I would like to add my personal stamp of approval to a truly magnificent purpose of action, born by a remarkably outstanding citizen and servant of humanity.

The resolutions afore-mentioned follow:

RESOLUTION PASSED BY THE JEWISH WAR VETERANS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA AT ITS FIFTY-FOURTH ANNUAL ENCAMPMENT HELD IN MIAMI BEACH, FLA., OCTOBER 19 TO 23, 1949

Whereas two dreadful wars and the present disconcerting international circumstances have left this world in confusion; and

Whereas mankind seems unable to find a basis upon which to build a happier understanding among the nations of the earth: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Jewish War Veterans of the United States approve the Prayers for Peace Crusade, and that all members are urged to participate in this movement by joining in 1 minute of prayer at 12 o'clock noon each day; be it further

Resolved, That each of us, in his own way, will, at this time, ask God to reveal to mankind the way to peace on earth and good will to all men, so that man's mind shall be receptive to God's way, and that in the words of the prophet, Isaiah, "Nation shall not lift up sword against nation; neither shall they learn war any more."

JACKSON J. HOLTZ,
National Commander.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED AT A CONFERENCE OF AGUDATH ISRAEL OF AMERICA, INC., HELD DURING THE WEEK OF NOVEMBER 28 TO DECEMBER 5, 1949, AT THE MANHATTAN TOWERS HOTEL, NEW YORK CITY

Whereas we have seen the terrible destruction the last war has brought on the human race; and

Whereas we feel that war degenerates man's action into that of an animal whose only desire is to destroy and annihilate everything good that exists: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Agudath Israel of America, Inc., lend its wholehearted support to the Prayers for Peace Movement and urge all its members in this country to participate in the movement by joining in 1 minute of prayer for peace at 12 o'clock noon each day; be it further

Resolved, That we call upon our sister organizations throughout the world to adopt a similar resolution so that there be created a unity of action for this historic cause.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World, Lets Its Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over, the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

BAD RIVER LAND PRETTY, BUT WON'T RAISE FOOD

(By Rod Van Every)

The rickety, unpainted Indian houses—"picturesque," the tourists say—that line smooth Highway 2 as you drive through Odanah contain hunger and squalor. Almost every family is sustained by some kind of public relief.

Odanah is the population center of the Bad River Reservation in Ashland County. The reservation borders Lake Superior, and there are some lovely views. But the land is bad.

There are no resorts, no white tourists. When tourists zip along Highway 2, they may look at the Chippewas' houses but they do not stop. Why should anyone stop?

JOBS RARE AT BAD RIVER

The Lac Court Oreilles people are in worse shape, but not much.

There is virtually no work at Bad River. The painters and the carpenters are jobless. Six men are section hands on the railroad, and if there is heavy snow, a half dozen more may get short-term jobs. A few work in the wood-processing plant and the paper mill at Ashland. There are three Indian service mechanics, and a few part-time employees of Odanah stores.

Some winters many men get work cutting pulpwood. But there has been no market for pulpwood in the area for almost a year. To complicate matters, men are returning to the reservation in increasing numbers. They have lost their jobs in the cities.

There are 1,275 Chippewa names on the tribal roll at Bad River, but the guess is that there are no more than 1,000 persons on the reservation. Most of them live in the North, along Highway 2 and at Odanah.

SOME HOMES CONDEMNED

Only a few homes at Odanah have electric lights. Virtually none have inside toilets. Water must be hauled from several community pumps. Although there is a serious housing shortage, with many families doubled up, there are about 10 boarded-up homes. Some have been condemned as unfit for human habitation, but others are empty because their owners are working in the large cities.

The man to see is Al Arbuckle. He is 35, chairman of the tribal council and chairman of the broke town of Sanborn. He knows everyone in the area, and as you drive along the streets he rattles off the economic condition, number of children, amount of relief and the working ability of every family. "I don't see how it could be any worse," Arbuckle says. "It is always bad, but this winter has been the worst. I don't know what we'd do if we didn't have the project."

CEMETERY PROJECT IS ECONOMIC CORE

"The project" is made work at an Indian cemetery, about a mile out of town. Tombstones have been straightened, brush on the graves cut down and more brush on a 40-acre adjacent tract whacked off. The by-product, fuel wood, is distributed to the needy.

"The project" is the economic core of the community.

There are 89,500 acres in the town of Sanborn. But only 11,300 are taxable. Their value with improvements and personal property amounts to $116,000. Sounds good, doesn't it? One hundred and sixteen thousand dollars. But much of the land is no good, covered with swamps and cut-over

brush and scrub. The total tax should be $7,902, Arbuckle says, but, because of the delinquencies, actual tax collections are about half that. So $4,000 is the total tax income of the town of Sanborn. Many Milwaukee wage earners make that amount for one family.

FAMILY SIZE SETS WAGE

There are various State aids to help the town of Sanborn, but they were not enough. So the town went to the State emergency board a year ago, and in 1949 special State funds spent in the town totaled $19,000. Now the average monthly expenditure is about $3,000.

With this money, the little town operates its pitiful "project."

Not everyone gets a chance to work daily on the project. A man is rated on the number of mouths he has to feed. One man with a big family gets 160 hours a month. He earns 70 cents an hour or $112 a month—about $26 a week. Other men work as few as 26 hours a month—$18.20.

No one can get on the project until he has used his last resources. The wages are paid once a week by check, and the town board has instructed the Odanah stores that they may not sell anything fancy to relief recipients—just staples, the starches.

Some surplus commodities—mostly potatoes—have come into the reservation. There was one shipment late last fall and another late in January. It has not been nearly enough to help much.

LIQUOR PURCHASE COSTS JOB

There also is a very firm understanding about purchase of liquor. If a relief project Indian is caught with liquor, his name comes off the hour list, Arbuckle says, but adds: "We've never seen any evidence of liquor among them."

Arbuckle himself is well off, compared with most of his constituents. He draws a few dollars as town chairman, and he is the janitor for the Indian service's group of clean, white buildings at Odanah. Still, it is not easy, with six children to feed.

Arbuckle works closely with Peter Walz, 37, a district agent of the Indian service who comes to Odanah once a week. Walz also visits the Red Cliff Reservation and works in the office of the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian Service at Ashland.

SUMMERS DON'T IMPROVE ECONOMY

In most Indian communities, things are easier in the summer. There are more jobs. But the summers do not bring much economic sunshine to the Odanah Chippewas. Some men sail the Great Lakes on ore and coal boats. Others work on the coal and ore docks and on railroad section crews. A few follow the harvests, especially as bean pickers.

CAN'T AFFORD CURING DIET

Let's visit some of the people.

This old woman lives on an old-age pension of $27 a month. Her son has a shaky job in Milwaukee, but he is able to send her $10 now and then. The woman has high blood pressure and rheumatism, and the doctor has told her she must drink much fruit juice. She has bought none. She can't afford it.

"Ah, this is worse than the depression," Arbuckle says. "Then, at least, there was WPA, and everyone had work."

In this little house an Indian service mechanic supports his wife, two children, and an aged father on $37 a week.

This old bachelor has only himself to feed, and he is lucky. He has an old-age pension.

PENSIONS MAKE HIM MAD

"Those pensions make me mad," Arbuckle says. "Out here they aren't as much as in other places in the county. The county welfare department says you can live cheaper here, and there are free fish and deer. So they cut the amounts for old-age pensions, blind pensions, and aid to dependent children.

"Worst of it is, you can't live any cheaper here. It's the food that costs so much. And we pay rent and interest on our house loans, just like everyone else. Then there are transportation costs—getting to and from Ashland, if you're lucky enough to have a job there. That's 10 miles.

"The only solution is to leave the reservation," Arbuckle insists. "But where are you going to go? There are no jobs in the cities, and you got to have at least a little capital, $50 or so, just to go looking for a week."

LITTLE CRAFT WORK

There is almost no craft work—beads, baskets, or buckskin—on the reservation.

St. Mary's Catholic Church helps where it can, and its big school, taken over by the State several years ago, provides a warm refuge for children. That hot school lunch at noon is welcomed.

The sisters at the church also operate an orphanage in which about 20 children are cared for. County funds help.

Twenty youngsters go to Ashland high school, but many hate to go because of their poor clothing and the jibes of the white children.

CONTRACT DOCTOR KEEPS CLOSE EYE ON HEALTH

Pretty close tab is kept on Indian health at Bad River. Dr. Del Andrus, 65, of Ashland, comes out to the spic and span Indian agency clinic a couple times a week.

Dr. Andrus is one of five contract doctors in the northern part of the State. The contract doctors are paid a fee by the Indian service. Serious cases of illness go to the 45-bed, 10-bassinet Indian hospital at Hayward, with its one full-time doctor and six nurses. The Indian service also has contracts with six counties and two townships for free hospitalization and medical care of Indians.

ONE DENTIST, THREE STATES

One full-time dentist, working chiefly among Indian children at the schools, must cover all of Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and Iowa. Tooth decay, caused by inadequate diet and improper care, is a major problem on reservations and in nonreservation Indian communities. But the one dentist, Dr. Charles B. Fisher, has such a huge territory to cover that he cannot visit any area oftener than about once every 2 years. Congress has not appropriated enough money to hire more dentists and doctors.

Dr. Andrus says the health situation at Bad River is pretty fair.

The Red Cliff Reservation takes up the scenic tip of the Bayfield Peninsula, the northernmost part of Wisconsin. It is the smallest of the Wisconsin reservations, and the Chippewa tribal roll contains only 653 names. The Indian service believes that about 400 people live on the reservation; local estimates are 60 families, about 250 persons.

Conditions are better at Red Cliff than Odanah. The houses are better, neater. There is more work for the people. There is more saving of earnings. Only a few are on relief, and they are a heavy financial burden on the penniless town of Russell.

Several Indian families operate small farms. Many men are cutting pulpwood, working for whites, who are required by the tribal council to hire Indians before they are granted timber rights. Some work in Bayfield and Ashland.

NO ONE DESTITUTE

"No one is destitute here," says George Gurnoe, Jr., 57, a member of the tribal council.

When a family gets in a tight spot the town of Russell provides relief food in return for work on town roads and other projects.

Childless Mr. and Mrs. John Buffalo have a spick-and-span house and are doing all right. John works on the ore boats during the summer and fall, and he saves his money.

The James La Ferniers are making it this winter okay, but it is a tight squeeze. Mrs. La Fernier, 46, works 9 hours a day, 6 days a week in a Bayfield restaurant. She gets $20 a week. James suffered a broken leg last September, and it didn't heal properly. He has been unable to do much work.

As everywhere with the Indians, summers are kinder. Then the men and women of Red Cliff harvest strawberries, raspberries, apples, and string beans, and work in the bean cannery. There is off-and-on work with the commercial fishing boats and the tourist trollers. Then in the fall come the terrific herring runs. Everyone works around the clock—on the boats, in the canneries, processing, cleaning, and packing the fish.

WANTED: SMALL INDUSTRY

Here, too, the Indians would like to acquire a small sawmill or box factory to use the poplar and the few stands of balsam. All the financial bumps would be ironed out smoothly by the pay roll of such an industry, they are sure.

No Indian-service doctor has visited the neat agency clinic at Red Cliff for several years, but there are plans to contract with a 75-year-old doctor from Ashland for once-a-week visits.

Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver: From Slave Cabin to Hall of Fame

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. COMPTON I. WHITE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are commemorating the birthday and honoring the memory of Abraham Lincoln—the Great Emancipator, it seems to me particularly appropriate to mention the achievements of those two great Negro leaders—Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver.

In 1946, the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, of which I was then chairman, favorably reported H. R. 6528 for the minting of 5,000,000 Booker T. Washington memorial half-dollars to honor that great Negro leader who, by devoting a lifetime of service to his people, rose from slave cabin to the hall of fame.

The bill passed the House and Senate without a dissenting vote, was signed by the President, and became Public Law 610, Seventy-ninth Congress.

These coins are being distributed by the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial, Booker Washington Birthplace, Va. This memorial is a nonprofit organization dedicated to the perpetuation of the ideals and teachings of Booker T. Washington, and to establish trade and industrial schools for the training of Negro youth, thereby improving the economic status of the Negro and benefiting our entire national economy.

The Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial has acquired the Vir-

ginia plantation where he was born, restored the buildings including the log cabin, established the Booker Washington Birthplace, Va., post office, and are using the land for agricultural training.

In nearby Roanoke, Va., an industrial training school has been established where 250 Negro GI's are receiving industrial training; and the memorial plans to establish similar trade schools in all parts of the United States where there is a substantial Negro population in need of such training.

Booker T. Washington early recognized the talents of the eminent Negro scientist, George Washington Carver, and induced him to come to Tuskegee to carry out his scientific agricultural experiments which have so materially benefited southern agriculture, adding millions of dollars to the revenues of the southern farmer.

Several years ago a national monument was planned by the Federal Government for the birthplace of George Washington Carver, in Diamond, Mo. In 1943 Federal legislation was passed authorizing the expenditure of $30,000 to purchase the property on which Dr. Carver was born. Last year the Federal court made an award of $79,000 to clear up claims and expenses against the property. The total court acquisitional cost amounted to approximately $80,000. The original $30,000 will be applied to this, leaving a deficit of $50,000 on the property. The indebtedness has to be cleared up before plans can be carried out to establish a national monument on this spot.

Since the lives of Booker T. Washington and George Washington Carver were so clearly associated, the trustees of the Booker T. Washington Birthplace Memorial felt that something should be done by the memorial to help make the monument possible. To this end, in their 1949 annual session, the trustees made plans to establish the George Washington Carver National Monument Foundation so that the George Washington Carver National Monument might become a reality.

The entire movement was initiated because of information submitted to the memorial by a Federal agency to the effect that the award would go by default if some public-spirited organization or organizations did not take hold. Since one of the main objectives of the memorial is helpfulness toward others, the trustees decided to assume the leadership.

Attorney Paul E. Bradley, of Joplin, Mo., has informed S. J. Phillips, president of the George Washington Carver Monument Foundation, that Missouri has granted a charter to this organization, with headquarters at Diamond, Mo. The charter stated that the purposes of the newly organized foundation are as follows:

First. To work out ways and means by which the needed $50,000 will be raised;

Second. To assist other nonprofit organizations;

Third. To help underprivileged youth through opportunity scholarships;

Fourth. To establish community service clubs;

Fifth. To do research in the field of agriculture and rural leadership; and

Sixth. To promote racial understanding.

Mr. Phillips, in commenting on the activities of the foundation, said that months before the granting of the charter considerable work had been done toward making local and national plans whereby the American public might have the opportunity to help acquire the birthplace of George Washington Carver, so that the national George Washington Carver monument might be developed as planned.

To make it possible for the Secretary of the Interior to carry out the direction of Congress to acquire on behalf of the United States the 210 acres comprising the birthplace of George Washington Carver, I will introduce the following bill on Monday, February 20, 1950.

I am advised that the Director of the Budget has no objection to the proposed legislation.

A bill to amend the act of July 14, 1943, relating to the establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to permit the acquisition of the necessary land for establishment of the George Washington Carver National Monument, section 4 of the act of July 14, 1943 (57 Stat. 563), is hereby amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 4. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the provisions of this act, including an amount not to exceed $80,000 to be used in payment for land to be acquired pursuant to this act."

Who Is Responsible for the Adverse Report on FEPC Legislation?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate death of our colleague Chairman BLAND will justly preclude speeches on other subjects today. Inasmuch as continuous inquiries as to the status of the civil-rights legislation pour into my office, and inasmuch as I feel that the country should know who is responsible for the bottling up of this worth-while legislation, I am inserting a copy of a statement to the press which I issued today on this subject, for the information of all concerned. The release is as follows:

STATEMENT BY HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH, REPRESENTATIVE FROM ILLINOIS

Congressman ADOLPH J. SABATH, Democrat, Illinois, explained today why the highly important and controversial Federal fair-employment practice bill has continually met with unfavorable action in the Committee on Rules. Mr. SABATH is the chairman of the Committee on Rules and dean of the House.

He said: "In view of the farcical performance yesterday and in the past several weeks on the part of the Republicans aided by the Dixiecrats by forcing seven roll calls in an effort to delay action on the civil-rights legislation and other important bills, I called a meeting today of the Committee on Rules in order to put an end, once and for all, to these ridiculous and dilatory tactics."

The 84-year-old veteran said: "I place the responsibility for the failure to obtain favorable action on the FEPC bill, in a great measure, on the shoulders of the Republicans. The Republicans have consistently opposed this measure notwithstanding their party platform, which reads as follows:

" 'One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their right to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.' "

Mr. SABATH stated that both the Democratic and Republican national conventions went on record, in no uncertain terms, in favor of civil-rights legislation. Under one pretense or another, the Republicans succeeded in obtaining delays and postponements on the consideration of FEP legislation before the Committee on Rules and, "I, as chairman, never have been able to obtain sufficient votes from the Republicans to offset those who are opposed to the measure."

Mr. SABATH pointed out the fact that the very last request our great and revered President Franklin D. Roosevelt made on the last day of his life was one wherein he "urged me to endeavor to obtain a rule establishing an FEPC. Not only that, but on the day of President Roosevelt's funeral, President Truman assured me, and has demonstrated beyond a doubt, that it is also his aim and intention to bring about favorable action on this legislation."

Mr. SABATH pointed out that again in the Eightieth Congress when the Republicans had absolute control over the Committee on Rules and had the votes, they again failed to carry out their pledge to the American people; namely, to support FEP legislation.

The dean of the House very candidly stated that the same dilatory tactics were again used during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. He said: "Though four Democratic members of the Committee on Rules tried on several occasions to obtain favorable action on a rule for the FEPC bill, due to the evasive position assumed by the Republican members of the committee in conjunction with the Dixiecrats, no favorable action has been taken and adverse action was taken today." A motion to reconsider the bill carried, and one additional Republican vote could have carried the rule.

The chairman said that "In view of the fact that other important legislation is being delayed, I finally came to the conclusion that the country should know specifically and practically where the membership of the Rules Committee stands on this important and worth-while bill. I insisted that a rule be granted today for the consideration of the civil-rights measure. As a matter of fact, I felt that the meeting and the vote therein should be held at an open hearing, but the gentlemen opposed insisted that a closed session and a closed vote be taken. All this notwithstanding the fact that the clever newspapermen at all times, and even before I leave the chair, manage to obtain complete information as to any vote considered in an executive session of the Rules Committee."

Consequently, Mr. SABATH stated, "the country should know that if one more Republican had voted for the rule today, it could

have resulted in a rule being granted and the bringing of the bill to the floor of the House for consideration and debate by the membership."

Mr. SABATH charged that the Republicans have played politics with this bill from the very beginning and they are playing politics now. He said: "Next week the Republicans will continue to play politics with FEPC. At another meeting of the Rules Committee some of the Republicans who voted against the granting of a rule contemplate making a motion to reconsider the adverse vote taken today—all for the sake of confusing the American people."

The chairman stated that "I am confident that such tactics will not inure to their benefit. Let the responsibility rest on the shoulders of the Republicans who are responsible for the bottling up of this legislation."

Stichman Program Assailed by Moses as Unfair to City

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, with committees in both Houses of Congress now devoting much time to consideration of cooperative housing, I believe the following item which appeared in the New York Times of December 12, 1949, will make interesting reading:

STICHMAN PROGRAM ASSAILED BY MOSES AS UNFAIR TO CITY—LIMITED DIVIDEND HOUSING PLAN WOULD GIVE AWAY LOCAL TAX FUNDS, COORDINATOR ASSERTS—SAYS MAYOR BACKS STAND—STATE HOUSING HEAD DISPUTES THIS—TO GO AHEAD UNLESS HE HEARS FROM O'DWYER

City Construction Coordinator Robert Moses attacked yesterday State Housing Commissioner Herman T. Stichman's program for the construction of tax-exempt housing projects under the State's limited dividend housing law as a too generous waiving of city taxes without the approval of appropriate city authorities.

Saying he was speaking with the authorization of Mayor O'Dwyer, Mr. Moses declared that in future all projects of this kind involving city tax exemption, city planning, and city improvements "must be discussed and agreed upon in advance by the appropriate city officials." "This procedure," he said, would have to be followed before Mr. Stichman "make public announcements to the press that they have been consummated through his unaided efforts."

Mr. Moses said his statement was prompted by Mr. Stichman's recent announcement that he had applications for 50 more limited-dividend housing projects.

In a sharp rejoinder Mr. Stichman said he had discussed the State's program for nonpromotion cooperative housing with the mayor at the outset, and that the latter had endorsed it. He added that until the mayor "personally advises" him of the withdrawing of such support he will continue with the program.

MOSES REPROACHES STICHMAN

Mr. Moses reproached Mr. Stichman for seeking to give the impression that he had the authority to establish such projects "subject to perfunctory approval by the city." Mr. Stichman, Mr. Moses said, also implied that these developments would largely eliminate the need for any intermediate type of public housing such as the city's nonsubsidized projects.

Mr. Stichman was accused of constantly criticizing such city projects while failing to indicate that all he offered the limited-dividend corporations under his program was city tax exemptions of the entire improvement. The developers pay full taxes on the land.

"Commissioner Stichman has no right to give away huge sums of city taxes for many years to come without the city's approval nor has he the right to charter and locate city-housing projects until after full investigation by the appropriate city officials, including the city planning commission and board of estimate," Mr. Moses said.

"Commissioner Stichman has some very foggy ideas as to the incidental problems and costs, all of which fall on the city, for drainage, sewerage, schools, streets, transportation, playgrounds, neighborhood zoning, and other purposes," Mr. Moses declared.

"All the projects announced by Commissioner Stichman appear to be on vacant land. They do not involve genuine slum clearance, which is the best justification for partial tax exemption. In most cases, also, the builders and developers have very little if any real equity. At most they have a small investment representing part of the cost of land and promotional expenses. They usually get an FHA guaranty nominally representing 90 to 95 percent of the full value and actually often representing more than 100 percent. This guaranty enables them to borrow all the money needed for the enterprise."

Nearby speculative builders with FHA guaranties, he added, could not compete against the limited dividend companies sponsored by the State official, which would enjoy a huge amount of city tax exemption.

Mr. Stichman, declaring that he could not recognize Mr. Moses' right to speak for the mayor "in this vital matter," said:

"I plan to go ahead trying to help lower middle-income families acquire mutual home ownership and rental housing at costs within their means. Let the city try to block this and tell the homeless its reasons. I don't think Mayor O'Dwyer or Commissioner Moses will do so.

"The mayor has told labor leaders and others who have discussed our program with him that he would cooperate with us, stating that I had always cooperated with him in housing matters. Unless and until Mayor O'Dwyer personally advises me that he is withdrawing that support from our efforts to help lower-middle-income families obtain mutual home ownership at costs within their means with State and city aid, I must continue to believe that he will keep his word with respect to cooperation from the city."

During Mr. Moses' absence in South America, Mr. Stichman said, his assistant, Harry Taylor, was kept fully informed of the State's plans. On Mr. Moses' return recently, Mr. Stichman said, the former advised him he would go along with more projects under the State program.

While the State projects are being built on vacant land Mr. Stichman said that also was true of the approximately $250,000,000 worth of the so-called nonsubsidized city projects. Speculative builders, he said, were dropping their rentals 25 percent to meet competition in sections where the State was erecting dwelling units.

He said tax exemption was only part of the program. Builders, he explained, were limiting their profits under the State program to 5½ to 7½ percent, or less than half that on city projects. Labor also was more productive on State developments, he continued, because workers knew that under the cooperative program they "will benefit themselves and other wage earners who need housing."

The Government Can't Do It All

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is with the greatest of pleasure that under an extension heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by Mr. Herbert Hoover, our former great President, which article appears in the American Economic Security, volume VII, 1950.

This article really comes from the heart of our greatest living humanitarian, and should cause people to reflect and act through every means at their command to preserve our own form of government from the devastating disease of socialism:

THE GOVERNMENT CAN'T DO IT ALL

(By Herbert Hoover)

We have seen a steady expansion of Government into welfare activities. I am not criticizing the expansion of Government aid to public welfare. It has a place in American life—provided the cloak of welfare is not used as a disguise for Karl Marx. But parallel with this expansion, we have stupendous taxation to support the hot and cold war. That makes it difficult for the citizens to support voluntary welfare agencies. It requires more personal sacrifice than ever before.

From all this, many citizens ask themselves: For what reasons must we continue to support the voluntary agencies? Why not let the Government do it all?

The first short answer to this question is that you cannot retire from the voluntary field if you wish our American civilization to survive. The essence of our self-government lies outside of political government. Ours is a voluntary society. The fabric of American life is woven around our tens of thousands of voluntary associations. That is, around our churches, our professional societies, our women's organizations, our businesses, our labor and farmers' associations—and not least, our charitable institutions. That is the very nature of American life. The inspirations of progress spring from these voluntary agencies, not from bureaucracy. If these voluntary activities were to be absorbed by Government bureaus, this civilization would be over. Something neither free nor noble would take its place.

MORALS ARE PRIVATE PROPERTY

The second answer to this question is that it is our privately supported and managed hospitals and educational institutions that establish the standards for similar governmental agencies. It is the voluntary institutions which are the spur to official progress. Without them our governmental healing and educational agencies would lag and degenerate.

The third answer to this question is that morals do not come from Government. No Government agency can create and sustain a system of morals. Even when private charities are not working specifically in the religious field, their works confirm religious faith and morals.

There is a fourth answer. Governments and bureaucracies cannot build character in our youth. With the brutalization which results inevitably from war, character building

has never been as necessary as it is today. Many private welfare organizations are, directly or indirectly, helping build character. Some, for example, support the development of sports in our youth. The ethics of good sportsmanship are second only to religious ethics.

There is a fifth answer. The greatest and, in fact, the only impulse to social progress is the spark of altruism in the individual human being. "But the greatest of these is charity" has been a religious precept from which no civilized people can depart without losing its soul. Governments practice charity solely because it rises from that spark in the hearts of the people. The day when altruism in the individual dies from lack of opportunity for expression, it will die in the Government. At best, charity by government must be formal, statistical, and mechanistic. We need charity in its real sense—from the heart.

There is a sixth reason. The world is in the grip of a death struggle between the philosophy of Christ and that of Hegel and Marx. The philosophy of Christ is a philosophy of compassion. The outstanding spiritual distinction of our civilization from all others is compassion. With us, it is the noblest expression of men. Those who serve receive an untold spiritual benefit.

THE GOOD SAMARITAN'S SOLUTION

The day we decide that the Government is our brother's keeper, that day the spirit of compassion will have been lost. If we abandon private charity, we will have lost something vital to America's material, moral, and spiritual welfare.

But a simpler answer than all this lies in the parable of the good Samaritan. He did not enter into governmental or philosophic discussion. It is said that when he saw the helpless man "he had compassion on him; * * * he bound his wounds * * * and took care of him.".

Genocide in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, today, February 16, 1950, marks the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuania's independence. Americans of Lithuanian extraction throughout the country will observe this day fittingly. We are well aware of conditions in Lithuania at the present time and we know that the voice of her people is mute with the heel of the Soviet tyrant on the throat of a nation and a race.

So it is that I am proud to give my voice to the cause of this brave little nation and let it resound in behalf of their liberty and freedom in this Chamber, the "home of the free and the land of the brave." Before God these people are our brothers—in thought, word, and deed.

Evil begets evil. Spawned and sired by the modern antichrist, perfected and refined in all its subtleties by these dictators who would make a god of the omnipotent state. A new and terrible crime against humanity is being perpetrated on what remains of the Lithuanian people in their beloved Baltic homeland. The purpose of Russia is to erase them as a nation and a people—right off the map.

This new horror is called genocide.

God save Lithuania from this inhumanity of man against man.

THE TOLL OF GENOCIDE IN LITHUANIA

In a memorandum dated October 3, 1949, the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation informed the United Nations of the series of major waves of genocide operations carried out by the Russians since their reoccupation of Lithuania. These operations were in addition to the systematic detention and exiling of from 2,000 to 3,000 persons monthly. The toll of Lithuanians murdered and exiled during the years 1941–48 was: 300,000 victims of the Nazi occupation and 520,000 victims of the second Russian occupation. The net manpower losses since 1940 amounted to 30 percent of the indigenous population. For a small nation of 3,000,000 people this is an irretrievable injury inflicted by a foreign state with which excellent relations had been maintained prior to the surprise invasion. The memorandum pointed out that forcible collectivization of agriculture constitutes a refined method of genocide which deprives the Lithuanians remaining in the homeland of their churches, of all personal freedom and property, of all contact with national culture, religious instruction, independent thinking. The opposition to collectivization cost 100,000 deportees in 1948 and 120,000 in the first half of 1949.

In addition to outright killings, deportations, suppression of national culture, and separation of families, the nation is deprived of all normal family life and the continuity of the nation is stopped. Young men of Lithuania are drafted into Soviet armed forces to serve in Russia. Other young men and women are drafted into "volunteer" labor battalions for service in Russia. Children are forcibly taken away from their parents and sent to specialized training schools to be reared as Russian heathens.

Lithuanian youths are waging an armed struggle as guerrillas and are dying fast. Prisoners are tortured in an unbelievable manner. Female prisoners are deliberately raped and infected with venereal diseases, and men's sexual organs are mutilated. Masses of Russians and Asiatics are brought in and settled in Lithuania.

The picture of Russian misrule and oppression is too horrible to relate in detail.

NEED FOR INTERNATIONAL ACTION

Genocide is being perpetrated in Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, East Prussia, Eastern Poland, the Ukraine, and so-forth. It is perpetrated by the political organs of Soviet Russia, by Russian armed forces in occupation of these countries and areas, and under the direction of the supreme state organ of the Soviet Union—The Politburo. Collateral genocidal operations at the same time are effected against prisoners of war of other innumerable nationalities. All told, it is multiple genocide, under all five heads of the definition of genocide, affecting many peoples and many races. It is international in its operations.

International cooperation is necessary to stop international crimes. Genocide is a more horrible crime than slave trade of the former ages, or piracy, or opium trade or other crimes which are international in scope and are being suppressed by concerted international efforts.

International law is, after all, but a set of usages accepted by nations. The first step in developing new international standards is to accept the definition of certain acts and to denounce such acts as international crimes. When most members, or major members of the international community of nations accept these standards, they become established international law.

The United States is a major member of the international family of nations bound to observe the principles of the United Nations Charter. Other countries are accustomed to look to us for moral leadership, and action by the United States is reflected in all corners of the globe. Can we with honor refuse to help establish international law standards to make genocide an international crime? Our refusal to ratify the Genocide Convention would be tantamount to encouraging Serov and his ilk to expand their genocidal operations and to ignore the Ten Commandments.

It is true that, in the absence of established international machinery capable of preventing and punishing international crimes, the Genocide Convention when ratified by the required number of countries will remain ineffective against states choosing to ignore the international verdict of public opinion. Under the terms of article VI of the Genocide Convention an international penal tribunal, if and when formed could acquire jurisdiction only "with respect to such contracting parties as shall have accepted the jurisdiction of such tribunal." At this time, there is no international penal tribunal.

Had there been no Kellogg-Briand Pact, which was but a pious declaration, we would not have had an established concept of aggression, and could not have developed our notions of opposition to forms of aggression. We could not have tried the major Nazi war criminals, for conspiring against peace.

And the same with the Genocide Convention. If we ratify this treaty, it will remain for some time a set of principles with no machinery for enforcing them. However, it will have contributed to international acceptance of new standards and will carry the force of law, as part and parcel of international law. Our leadership will encourage ratification of other countries. Enforcement machinery can be discussed later. When that time comes, the United States will have ample opportunity to discuss the project on its merits. The main thing is that there will be a law against genocide. This fact alone may deter criminals.

RESOLUTIONS DULY VOTED BY THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS HELD ON THE FOURTH, FIFTH, AND SIXTH DAYS OF NOVEMBER 1949, AT HOTEL NEW YORKER IN THE CITY OF NEW YORK, UNDER THE AUSPICES OF THE LITHUANIAN AMERICAN COUNCIL, INC.

I. MESSAGE TO THE PRESIDENT

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949, after the opening)

The Honorable HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Thee White House, Washington, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York, unanimously send a message of greetings to the President of the United States.

Deeply touched by the sentiments motivating your policy as expressed in your message to this Congress, the delegates in behalf of themselves and their constituencies reaffirming their undying loyalty to the principles of American democracy, pledge their loyal cooperation with your administration toward the goal of equitable domestic tranquillity and international peace founded on principles of national self-determination and Atlantic Charter, in other words on principles of freedom and justice which you invoke with God's help.

The Lithuanian American Congress will voice their views and aspirations in a set of resolutions after due deliberation, and copies thereof will be presented to the White House. At this time please accept our unanimous expression of gratitude for your unswerving policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet partnership in aggression and for your continuing recognition of sovereignty of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

II. MESSAGE TO THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949)

His Excellency Archbishop AMLETO CICOGNANI,
The Apostolic Delegate,
Washington, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York, request Your Excellency to transmit their message of respects to His Holiness the Pope.

Gratefully recalling the incessant papal intercession in behalf of the martyred people of Catholic Lithuania and their just cause of liberty, the delegates beg His Holiness to bless and invoke Divine guidance in their deliberations and their efforts seeking justice for the freedom-loving Christian people of Lithuania and other countries presently enslaved by militant Soviet communism.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

III. MESSAGE TO UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS

(By wire, voted November 4, 1949)

UKRAINIAN AMERICAN CONGRESS,
Washington, D. C.:

Delegates of 1,000,000 Americans constituted in a Lithuanian American Congress meeting at Hotel New Yorker in the city of New York send their greetings and best wishes to their fellow citizens and fellow freedom fighters of Ukrainian descent. This congress wholeheartedly supports the just cause of the Ukrainian people as that of other liberty-loving peoples presently enslaved by Russian Soviet communism.

LEONARD SIMUTIS,
President.
Dr. PIUS GRIGAITIS,
Secretary.

IV. BASIC DECLARATION

(Voted November 5, 1949)

The Lithuanian-American Congress, representing by duly elected delegates the preponderant majority of Americans of Lithuanian descent or extraction, reiterates its constituency's devotion to the principles enunciated in the American Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, the Wilsonian 14 points, the Atlantic Charter, the 4 freedoms, the Truman doctrine, the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, the objectives of the United Nations Charter, and North Atlantic Pact.

Firmly espousing the inalienable rights of men and nations, the principle of equality of men and races, the right of all peoples capable of self-government to pursue individual happiness and to develop their creative national talents in freedom under a representative form of democratic government, the sovereign equality of states, large and small, and international cooperation under the rule of reason, of justice, and of law, the Lithuanian-American Congress carefully reviewed the events of the past decade and the deplorable state of international affairs at the close of the year 1949.

In old Europe the cradle of modern civilization, a major half of the continent lies under the sway of lawless rule by a group of conspirators established in the Kremlin of Muscovy who had extended their police-state regime over formerly independent peoples of the western Christian community of nations. The march of lawlessness and aggression initiated by Hitlerite Germany in partnership with Soviet Russia, has submerged in bondage the easternmost representatives of western civilization and democracy who had for centuries past defended Europe from barbaric onslaughts, to wit: Lithuania, Poland, Latvia, Estonia, Ukraine, Rumania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Albania, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, and parts of Austria and Germany. Human rights are totally extinct in all of these countries. Western Christian religions are being forcibly eradicated in the Baltic states and the Ukraine, freedom of religion is constricted in other countries, and formerly independent Christian churches are being subverted to serve the interests of the Communist Party and its political police. Living standards of the subjected peoples are lowered below the meager standards of Eurasian Russia. Millions of innocent people are being starved to death in slave-labor camps of Arctic Russia under a program of incessant genocide operations of unprecedented scale. The most formidable European races of the best fighting traditions are being molded into a mass of robots trained to destroy their own peoples and their friends of the Western World.

Resistance to Communist enslavement first exemplified by heroic Finns in a defensive open war and taken up, in underground resistance at first and in guerilla operations later, by gallant Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, and Poles, failed to evoke a world-wide understanding of the aspirations of these champions of the Atlantic Charter. The great democracies failed to champion the principles enunciated by themselves during World War II, and brave bands of patriots, abandoned by the signatories of the Atlantic Charter, are facing extinction in their lone fight for liberty against the armed might of Soviet Russia sustained by lend-lease. Nevertheless, underground resistance survives in the Baltic states, Poland, and the Ukraine, and is in the pangs of birth in other Communist-dominated European nations east of the Stettin-Trieste line.

In Asia, the most populous continent lies prostrate in convulsions. Militant communism is completing the subjugation of China and rearing its ugly head in other parts of the continent. The sun of freedom which had brightened the Asiatic horizon in 1945 is obscured, is setting under the hammering blows of lend-lease arms wielded by hosts directed by Moscow-trained conspirators. Unfortunately, the peoples which had recently gained their freedom at the hands of western European and American powers, evince a deplorable lack of understanding of the Communist conspiracy and its methods, and heedlessly profess their neutrality.

On other continents, the situation is more promising, even though poverty and exploitation present a dangerous contingency not to be ignored by United Nations of the non-Soviet world.

In our own country, people are recovering from their short-lived artificially fostered "love Russia" complex and are awakening to the Communist menace to American security, to American ways of life, and to international peace. The American reawakening is occasionally attended by outbursts of intemperance. Nevertheless, civil rights are imperiled nowhere in the United States, and there is every indication that Communist conspirators will be ultimately eliminated from the seats of power in the national Government and in labor unions.

The current international confusion is the heritage of the political errors and maladjustments of the fateful conferences of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Abandonment of the central-eastern European and Chinese peoples, the siege of Berlin, the veto-ridden United Nations, the huge armaments outlay and the Marshall plan—are the price for the ill-advised arrangements imposed by Stalin on gullible western statesmen, constitutional representatives and servants of the American and British peoples who posed as chiefs of state at the ill-fated conferences. These secret political decisions were never submitted for ratification, and were never ratified, by either the Senate of the United States or the Parliament of the United Kingdom. The Soviet Union itself had already violated and repudiated the letter and the spirit of the Yalta and Potsdam agreements.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States:

That the Government of the United States rescind in toto the unratified political decisions of Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam conferences, which were nullified by Soviet violations;

That, having abrogated the said unratified maladjustments, the Government of the United States reaffirm its determination to reconstitute peace in conformance with the principles of the Atlantic Charter applied to the friends and former foes alike, pursuant to the declaration by original United Nations of January 2, 1942, and the Russian adherence to said principles in the international treaties signed with the United Kingdom and the United States in 1942;

That the Government of the United States insist on the sanctity of treaties, much advertised by Soviet spokesmen since 1939, by demanding that the Soviet Union honor its international treaty obligations under the peace treaties and nonaggression and friendship pacts concluded by the Soviet Union with the Republics of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, and Poland in the period of 1920–38, and withdraw the Russian occupation forces and police-party apparatus from said states;

That the Government of the United States take cognizance of the existing threat to international peace and security in consequence of the armed struggle continuing in the Russian-occupied Baltic states and in the allegedly sovereign Ukraine, a member of the United Nations, and invoke applicable

provisions of the United Nations Charter as a dutiful member of the United Nations and a permanent member of the Security Council;

That the Government of the United States reaffirm its policy enunciated on July 23, 1940, regarding the devious policies and predatory activities of the Soviet Union as part of a deliberate attempt to annihilate the political independence and territorial integrity of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia, and, taking further cognizance of the barbarous Soviet policies applied against the Baltic peoples, invoke the aid of the United Nations in stopping the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Government of the Soviet Union and its single ruling party.

V. THE GENOCIDE CONVENTION

The Lithuanian American Congress expresses its gratification over the very active initiative of the United States Government in drafting the Convention for the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide.

This Convention was signed by a majority of the United Nations and is ratified by several States. Its ratification is currently pending before the United States Senate.

The Lithuanian American Congress views the need to ratify the Genocide Convention as an issue second only to the problem of liberation from bondage of the Baltic states and other countries enslaved by the Soviet Union in the aftermath of the late war.

The Genocide Convention represents the first international legislation designed to effectuate at least one part of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and to abolish the barbarous practices in mid-twentieth century.

Heedless massacres committed in the heat of passions by uncivilized barbarians in the ancient times, were elevated by the Soviet and Nazi regimes into a status of a planned party-state policy which added more refined methods of genocide, viz, planned starvation, sterilization, kidnaping of children, systematic disruption of family life of the allegedly inferior races and of the large segments of society at home and in occupied foreign countries, creation of conditions preventing a natural development of national cultures and religious life, and slow death by exhaustion at hard labor in the Arctic slave labor camps.

These practices did not disappear with the United Nations victory over Hitlerite Germany and the publicized transformation of the Soviet dictatorial system into an allegedly peace-loving and democratic regime. Jews and certain Slavic peoples were the primary victims of the Nazi-managed genocide, not counting the masses of the German people opposing the Nazi system. The Lithuanians, Latvians, Estonians, Ukrainians, Volga Germans, Greeks, Crimean, and Caucasian peoples are presently the principal victims of the Russian-managed genocide, not counting the masses of the Russian people opposing the Communist totalitarianism.

Having fought two world wars in defense of the basic principles enunciated by two American Presidents and spontaneously adopted by other peoples, principally the long-suffering nationalities imprisoned within the former Russian, German and Austro-Hungarian empires, the American people are obviously determined to see these principles honored, especially by governments of the countries which were saved from destruction through American intervention in the wars and American lend-lease aid. Genocide is the most horrible crime which must not be countenanced by the civilized society and must not be encouraged by inattention, inaction, indifference and failure to ratify the Genocide Convention.

Wherefore the Lithuanian-American Congress, in behalf of one million constituents represented by the delegates voting unanimously for this resolution, respectfully urge their representatives in the United States Senate to ratify the Genocide Convention by an unanimous vote.

VI. DISPLACED-PERSONS LEGISLATION

The Displaced Persons Act of 1948 marked a significant congressional action developing out of a serious realization of the need for American contribution to the solution of the vast international problem of political refugees from the iron-curtain countries and of the persons displaced in consequence of the ravages of war. American responsibility for the creation of the problem itself was large, inasmuch as the United States Government, as a party to the unratified political maladjustments of the Tehran, Yalta and Potsdam conferences, was responsible for the presence in western Germany, Austria and Italy of the masses of people from countries which were committed at Yalta and Potsdam to the tender mercies of the Soviet Union and its cohorts of political police.

The DP legislation of 1948 represented a provisional compromise between the widely divergent views held by the respective congressional committees. The act is defective in several respects, particularly because of a comparatively small number of authorized admissions, the failure to provide for a priority to eligible persons who had spent most time in involuntary exile, acceptance of an unsatisfactory definition of displaced persons hammered out by the United Nations in the face of continuous disruptive Soviet misrepresentations and attacks, failure to provide for a fair proportional distribution of admissions among the ethnic groups, and particularly because of the unjust freezing of the small immigration quotas of the Baltic states.

The Congress failed to enact amended legislation in 1949, even though the House of Representatives had voted a Celler bill. The Celler bill contained some improvements, such as an enlarged number of admissions and a more equitable cut-off date. On the other hand, it retained the unjust provisions of freezing the immigration quotas and failed to provide for a priority to persons who had spent most time in involuntary exile. The Displaced Persons Commission pointed out other unworkable provisions, such as stiff housing guaranties, but its suggestions for amended liberalized legislation attacked principally the features which it termed "discriminatory" against Catholics and Jews. These arguments failed to convince the Senate committee which could not fail to note that the arguments of alleged discrimination were not borne out by facts and statistics.

Liberalized legislation for admission of displaced persons is needed, and the United States must share in the solution of the problem by accepting greater numbers of refugees from the iron-curtain countries. However, in solving the problem, due attention should be paid to the element of justice. The unfreezing of the immigration quotas and elimination of the restrictions not contained in the regular Immigration Act, should receive serious attention in the enactment of liberalized legislation.

Calling these reflections to the attention of Members of Congress of the United States, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits that these considerations be carefully weighed and that a liberalized Displaced Persons Act be enacted early in 1950.

VII. UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The Lithuanian American Congress commends the ably rendered service of the Lithuanian American Council in educating its constituency regarding the proper mission and organization of the United Nations. Back in 1945, at the San Francisco Conference, a memorandum was submitted by this council outlining very serious observations on the plan of organization and suggesting that the veto power be entirely eliminated. At that time, spokesmen for the bipartisan foreign policy were not prepared to concede the validity of these observations fearing that the Senate of the United States would not renounce the veto power out of its regard for the extreme notions of sovereignty. By 1949, the abuse of the veto power by Soviet representatives at the UN Security Council has changed the views of a great many of our statesmen.

United Nations raised great hopes in the universe when its organization was planned and while the people firmly believed that the Atlantic Charter and the "four freedoms" would be fulfilled. These hopes faded as American and British policies floundered over the pitfalls of the gradually revealed secret commitments of Yalta and Potsdam. Some hope is still lingering, as gallant guerrilla forces continue to fight and die with the Atlantic Charter on their lips, in Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and the Ukraine. Resistance forces emerging in the satellite countries of central Europe are recalling the selfsame promise of the Atlantic Charter. But in the United Nations, the Charter is passed over in silence, inasmuch as the authors of the Atlantic Charter fail to champion it and are content with debating over harmless declarations carrying no obligation to enforce these declarations.

Nevertheless, the United Nations remains a useful organization not only as a forum for the discussion of international problems that might otherwise be settled in secret compromises as at Yalta and Potsdam. Inheriting a number of international institutions from the late League of Nations, the new international organization developed and expanded their useful functions. It brought new institutions into play to deal on a more efficient basis with vast problems of the refugees, cultural exchange and information, economic cooperation, etc. The influence of these new institutions is beneficially exercised in the countries outside the Soviet orbit—as the Soviet single-party regime brooks no interference or propaganda within the territories brought under its control in consequence of the surrender of central-eastern Europe by the American and British Governments. This influence is beneficial in spite of the fact that persons not genuinely representative of the Christian outlook of civilization serve in international councils, and that Soviet agents are permitted to terrorize anti-Communist refugees committed to IRO care in the American, British, and French zones of Germany and Austria.

United Nations would be much more effective if the veto power were eliminated entirely and if majority decisions bound all members, particularly in security matters and in the employment of force against states menacing peace.

Furthermore, any aggrieved nationality should be enabled to present its grievance and to be heard. Some excellent precedents in this respect were provided in the case of the Indonesians and Israelis—but their cases did not involve grievances against the Soviet Union. The Baltic states, the Ukraine, representatives of the true will of the nations classed as satellites, should be equally entitled and enabled to present their cases to the United Nations if that organization is to justify its existence as guardian of peace, security, and human rights.

VIII. VOICE OF AMERICA

While the facilities of the late OWI served to channel the spurious Soviet propaganda to the detriment of a number of occupied nations, the Voice of America and the United States Information Service have developed into major instruments of interpreting America, the American policy, and a genuine reporting of world events to the people of the

world, particularly to clandestine listeners among the unseen multitudes enslaved by the conspirators of the Kremlin.

The standards of information have much improved within the past few years, and materials broadcast were made understandable to foreign audiences for whom they are intended. The number of languages employed is likewise expanding and embracing ever larger audiences.

These developments are warmly commended by the Lithuanian American Congress. Their effectiveness is well attested by the growing Soviet attempts to jam the Voice of America broadcasts and to bar the USIS personnel from direct access to the people of the occupied countries.

The Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits that the facilities of the Voice of America broadcasts and other information services be expanded to include transmissions in the Lithuanian language. Information should be compiled in cooperation with spokesmen of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation and, at least occasionally, broadcast in person by personalities well known and respected in Lithuania. Similar facilities should be directed toward informing the people of Latvia and Estonia. Limited information reaches the Baltic states through the medium of German-Polish, and Russian-language broadcasts. But the masses of the population are excluded from sharing this information as long as it is not made available in the native languages understood by millions of survivors.

The Lithuanian American Council is authorized and directed to extend every cooperation to Government agencies entrusted with this service in behalf of the American people.

IX. ALL-AMERICAN COLLABORATION

The Lithuanian American Congress realizes the presence of objections to so-called "hyphenated Americans" in some sections of the country, alongside the existence of certain slavishness among the first and second generation of Americans in their eagerness to assimilate superficial "Americanism" of their own imagination. Nevertheless, "hyphenated Americans" and second and third generation Americans are second to none in their supreme devotion to the United States and in their distinguished record in the war, both on the fighting and on the home fronts. They are second to none in their sense of civic duty, and they have a superior understanding of problems associated with the countries of their ancestors and enriching their cultural contribution to America.

This superior knowledge of specific European affairs should be placed at the service of the country and should be availed of by Government agencies concerned with such affairs. In addition to local activities and keeping the neighboring communities properly informed and immunized against subversive propaganda, coordination on a national scale would be most beneficial to the country and to the cause of liberty everywhere.

The Lithuanian American Congress commends the hitherto humble efforts at collaboration made by the Lithuanian American Council, and suggests that this cooperation be made permanent, particularly with like representative organizations of fellow Americans of Latvian, Estonian, Polish, Ukrainian, Slovak, Czech, Hungarian, Rumanian, Bulgarian, Yugoslav, and Albanian descent. All of these representative organizations have at their disposal numerous newspapers, magazines, and radio programs, and a well-coordinated movement in behalf of a proper understanding of the problems of central-eastern Europe would best serve the conduct of American international relations on a well-informed and stable base.

X. SUPREME LITHUANIAN COMMITTEE OF LIBERATION

The Lithuanian American Congress welcomed the presence at the Congress of a number of former members of the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation (the VLIK), former underground leaders and guerrilla freedom fighters, and former prisoners of the NKVD and the Gestapo.

The underground resistance of the Lithuanian people, rising spontaneously since the first day of the Russo-German partnership in aggression and the first Russian occupation of the country, became a most effective movement under a coalition of political parties and resistance combat units—the VLIK. All of the German plans of mobilization of Lithuanian manpower and economic resources failed completely, and Lithuania was one of the only two European countries which, during the Nazi occupation, failed to produce SS legions for Hitler. The passive resistance under the leadership of the VLIK and its clandestine network of information services ultimately developed into armed resistance to the German occupation and to the second Russian occupation. The experience in clandestine resistance activities gained under the VLIK leadership, enabled the Lithuanian people to continue to this very day their resistance to the most barbaric Soviet occupation.

Political collaboration between the VLIK and the diplomatic missions of the Lithuanian Republic still recognized in the capitals of the western democracies, presents another aspect of political maturity of the Lithuanian people and the unbroken unity of views and aspirations of the people surviving in the homeland and their spokesmen abroad.

The Lithuanian American Congress extends, through the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, its greetings and expression of the most profound admiration for the gallant Lithuanian Freedom Fighters still waging battle against the dark forces of enslavement and oppression in Russian-occupied Lithuania, and for their good neighbors and friends in Latvia and Estonia.

Lithuanian Americans not only admire the fight for freedom of the Lithuanian people, and of the Latvian and Estonian peoples. They will continue to render, as they had in the past, every moral and political encouragement and assistance to the heroic forces of freedom in Lithuania and the other Baltic states until these martyred peoples shall achieve complete liberation of their homelands to resume their proper place, as masters of their own destinies, among the community of free nations.

XI. SELF-DETERMINATION AND REUNION OF ALL LITHUANIAN LANDS

The Lithuanian American Congress welcomes the activities of the Council of Lithuania Minor, spokesman for the indigenous Lithuanian population of northern East Prussia, seeking a reunion of their homeland with the sovereign Lithuanian state.

Survival of the Lithuanian speech, customs, and national orientation in northern East Prussia after nearly seven centuries of thralldom under the German rule, presents a most heartening example of the Lithuanian fitness of survival and of a Lithuanian individuality. The aspirations for a reunion with a preponderantly Roman Catholic Lithuanian state prove a genuine fraternal feeling and a great trust in the traditional Lithuanian religious tolerance which Protestant Lithuanian inhabitants of East Prussia repose in their brethren of Lithuania Major.

The Potsdam decision granting a tentative American and British support to the Russian claim to northern East Prussia violates every tenet of historic honesty, political vision, the right of self-determination, the principles of the Atlantic Charter, and the spirit of the United Nations Charter. This tentative decision, made without the advice and consent of the American people and of the population directly concerned, would condemn all of the Baltic peoples north of the Braunsberg-Goldap line in East Prussia to slavery and extinction under Russian totalitarianism. Russia has no historic, ethnic, national, economic, cultural, or security title to the Lithuanian areas of East Prussia, and a Russian or pseudo Byelorussian military-naval base at Koenigsberg could only serve as a springboard and bridgehead for further Russian aggression and expansion westward.

Wherefore, the Lithuanian American Congress respectfully submits to the President, Secretary of State, and Members of Congress of the United States that the Potsdam promise of support for Russian imperialist claims to northern Lithuanian half of East Prussia be rescinded, and that the United States espouse the legitimate aspirations of the indigenous population of that area to reunite with the sovereign and independent democratic Republic at Lithuania. Furthermore, that Lithuanian inhabitants of East Prussia, presently classed and treated as nationals of Germany, be reclassified as Lithuanian displaced persons and refugees entitled to American protection from the tentacles of Russian repatriation missions and from forcible Germanization, or cultural genocide.

XII. GRATITUDE TO RESETTLEMENT AGENCIES

The rolls of delegates to the Lithuanian American Congress were swelled with numerous new Americans who until recently had been nameless displaced persons.

Among these new Americans taking an active and intelligent part in the deliberations of this congress were former statesmen, functionaries, diplomats, scientists, professionals, teachers, army and navy officers, university students, clergymen, friars, excellent agronomists and farmers, artists, laborers, stage and opera stars, former guerrilla fighters, and victims of Russian and German concentration camps. Among them were Catholic, Protestant, and liberal men and women, former leaders and members of political parties of the Right, Center, and Left, business people and labor-union leaders. Their spirit of genuine democracy and tolerance, and high regard for human dignity and freedoms, proved that they will become, as a great many already had done, excellent American citizens with a highest sense of civic duty. Their model use of the ancient Lithuanian language coupled with their equally facile use of the English language, evoked a feeling of profound pride among the second and third generation Americans of Lithuanian descent who formed a majority at this congress.

These new Americans, the former DP's, were welcomed with warmth of feeling by the old Americans.

The new Americans have found shelter and opportunity for a resumption of normal life on the hospitable shores of America thanks to the wisdom of the executive government and of Members of Congress of the United States who made Displaced Persons Act a living reality, and thanks to the charity and selfless devotion of the National Catholic Welfare Conference and its war relief services and resettlement council, the Church World Service of the American Protestant Churches, the International Refugee Rescue Committee, the American Friends Service, Jewish volunteer agencies, and other American organizations which sponsored the program of resettlement in America of former DP's. Their combined efforts, their devotion and material contributions enriched the American community with more than 100,000 men, women, and children of finest qualities.

The Lithuanian American Congress unanimously voted to commend the executive and legislative departments of the United States Government, and the voluntary agencies

mentioned above, for their excellent contribution and humanitarian service in rehabilitating the victims of Nazi-Soviet partnership in aggression and enslavement. The National Catholic Welfare Conference is particularly gratefully commended for the great assistance rendered in aiding Lithuanian DP's, more than three-fourths of the Lithuanian refugees, of various religious affiliations, who had arrived in this country under displaced-persons program, were resettled by the Catholic agency without discriminating among Catholics, Protestants, and persons not affiliated with any Christian church.

XIII. ON CONSPIRACY OF SILENCE AND PRO-RUSSIAN DISCRIMINATION

A number of American organizations have sprung up within the past few years purporting to halt communism and save our freedom, to aid iron-curtain refugees, to present a common cause of the Soviet-enslaved peoples, etc.

As a general rule, these committees are not in any way associated with representative organizations of the American people most directly concerned with problems of the nations enslaved by Russia. Second phenomenon common to such committees is the long list of members of their boards, enumerating on their stationery persons formerly highly placed with Government departments, thus tending to create an impression of intimate association with policy-making media. At least one such organization features its endorsement by the Secretary of State.

Unfortunately, another phenomenon common to some of these committees is the pro-Russian bias and evasion of mentioning the Baltic states.

One such committee, endorsed by the Secretary of State and listing among its board of directors a former Under Secretary of State, several former Assistant Secretaries, department heads, officials of the OSS, ambassadors, the former supreme commander of the liberating allied forces in western Europe, etc. Gifts to this committee are said to be deductible for income-tax purposes. The objectives are most commendable.

However, the map printed in its informative leaflet contradicts the official policy of the United States, in effect since July 23, 1940, in that it shows the territories of Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania, one-half of Poland, northern East Prussia, Carpatho-Ukraine, and sections of Rumania as territories of the Soviet Union. New Poland and Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary, Yugoslavia, and old Bulgaria are shown in different color, to illustrate the countries meriting the interest of this committee. The Baltic states and Albania are shown outside the area. The printed text repeats the list of countries, again excluding the Baltic states and Albania, and recites that 80,000,000 sturdy people living between Germany and Russia are now in bondage. A conclusion is obvious that many other millions—in the Baltic states, Albania, Poland east of the Curzon line, the Ukraine east of Slovakia and the Pruth, as well as in Russia itself—are not now in bondage.

The Lithuanian-American Congress, taking note of the existence of such organizations misrepresenting the official policy of the United States while professing to have the endorsement of the present Secretary of State, calls the attention of the Secretary of State and of the distinguished fellow Americans serving on boards of such committees, to the misguided use of their endorsement, and respectfully suggests that they owe a duty of honor to correct the misrepresentations made ostensibly with their endorsement.

Furthermore, certain map publishers and map syndicates contribute to Soviet propaganda and to misinformation of American school students and newspaper readers, by publishing maps featuring Russia in its new frontiers, lacking any international recognition. A particularly painful impression is created by the use of such synthetic maps in the press sympathetic to the cause of liberty of the Baltic peoples and antagonistic to the predatory subversion of communism.

The Lithuanian American Congress calls on the editors and publishers of the free American press to exercise their right of calling to the attention of map-making syndicates the harm and disservice to the American people which they render by channeling Soviet imperialistic propaganda to American children and news readers. Maps shown in the official publications of the Department of State could best be utilized, and would contribute toward a better understanding of American foreign policy.

XIV. THANKS TO DISTINGUISHED STATESMEN

The Lithuanian American Congress unanimously expresses greatest appreciation and gratitude to the many distinguished statesmen who lent their moral encouragement and sympathy with the objectives of a just and stable peace which motivated this Congress.

President Harry S. Truman, of the United States, transmitted a warm message in writing. This congress found itself in unanimous agreement with the goal of freedom and justice which the President is seeking.

Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, of the State of New York, honored this congress by addressing it in person. His views coincided in a great many respects with the policies advocated by Lithuanian Americans.

Senator HERBERT R. O'CONOR and Representative DANIEL J. FLOOD addressed the congress, and affirmed their cooperation for justice and liberation of Lithuania and the other Baltic states.

United States Senators Scott W. Lucas, Robert A. Taft, Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., Millard E. Tydings, Brien McMahon, Irving M. Ives, John Foster Dulles, William F. Knowland, Homer E. Capehart, Owen Brewster, John J. Williams, Paul H. Douglas, Leverett Saltonstall, Sheridan Downey, and Edward Martin; and Representatives John W. McCormack, Philip J. Philbin, Adolph J. Sabath, John J. Rooney, John Davis Lodge, Lawrence H. Smith, Ivor D. Fenton, Ray J. Madden, James J. Murphy, Edgar A. Jonas, Harold D. Donohue, Charles A. Buckley, Lansdale G. Sasscer, Peter W. Rodino, Jr., Edward A. Garmatz, George H. Fallon, and Barratt O'Hara, transmitted their statements and declarations which greatly encouraged the delegates in their deliberations and in their hopes of ultimately achieving justice and understanding for the peoples of Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, and other nations enslaved by Russia.

Bishop Joseph F. Flannelly, of the Catholic archdiocese of New York, touched the delegates with his profoundly Christian sermon at St. Patrick's Basilica in New York, and his moving encouragement and blessing.

Mayor William O'Dwyer, of New York City, through Deputy Mayor John J. Bennett, welcomed the delegates to the greatest American city and voiced views which convinced the delegates that the American people are practically unanimous in supporting the administration's policy of nonrecognition of the fruits of Nazi-Soviet partnership in rapacity, and in demanding liberation of Lithuania and other freedom-loving peoples from bondage.

Their excellencies, Povilas Zadeikis, Julijs Feldmans, and Johannes Kaiv, the ministers of the Republics of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia accredited to the Government of the United States, and their diplomatic and consular colleagues who addressed the Lithuanian American Congress, greatly contributed toward a most realistic understanding of the direst situation of their victimized nations. The Lithuanian American Congress found itself in full accord with their pleas for justice and demand to stop the crime of genocide being perpetrated by the Russian occupant of their countries.

The Lithuanian American Congress: Leonard Simutis, President; Anthony A. Olis, Vice President; Pius Grigaitis, Secretary; Michael Vaidyla, Treasurer.

Resolutions Committee: Constantine R. Jurgela, Chairman; Matas Zujus, Secretary; Msgr. John Balkunas, John Januskis, Stanley Geguzis, Dr. Matas J. Vinikas, Jonas Valaitis, Vincent Rastenis, Vytautas Abraitis, Members.

Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter from Mr. Hubert E. Howard, Chairman, Munitions Board, Washington, D. C., to Mr. Harley Hise, Chairman, Reconstruction Finance Corporation, saying "the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States and should be preserved." I include also an editorial from the News-Tribune, Waltham, Mass., on the same subject. A recent news item quotes the mayor of Waltham as saying the city of Waltham can find other industries to take the place of the Waltham Watch Co. If Waltham does not want the Waltham Watch Co., Watertown or many other cities and towns in that vicinity would be glad to have it. Over 600 employees of the company now reside in Watertown.

MUNITIONS BOARD,
Washington, D. C., February 9, 1950.

Mr. HARLEY HISE,
Chairman, Board of Directors,
Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

DEAR MR. HISE: The Munitions Board has heretofore expressed to you the position and importance of the American jewel-watch industry as a resource for national defense.

You were informed that there are approximately 8,000 highly skilled workers in the industry, and that the acquiring of the degree of skill required from 2 to 10 years of intensive training. The essentiality of the maintenance of this nucleus as a basis for expansion in times of mobilization is apparent.

The Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. employed 100 percent of their capacity in Government work from December 1941 to August 1945, manufacturing such items as aircraft instruments, chronometers, fire-control watches, time fuzes, etc.

It is considered that the maintenance of at least a minimum level of operation by the Waltham, Hamilton, and Elgin Watch Cos. is vital to the defense of the United States, and should be preserved.

The above information is provided again for your consideration of the application of the Waltham Watch Co. for financial assistance.

Sincerely yours,

HUBERT E. HOWARD, *Chairman.*

[The Waltham (Mass.) News-Tribune of February 11, 1950]

SAY IT ISN'T SO

Government officials and leaders of his own party many times have had cause to be disturbed at President Truman's faculty for saying the wrong thing at the wrong time. The latest outbreak of foot-in-mouth disease on the part of the Chief Executive hit Waltham Watch Co. at a most inopportune moment.

Mr. Truman, it should be pointed out, has promised much to Waltham's precision industry and given less than nothing.

By less than nothing we mean that he has dismissed this vital concern without even waiting for the results of a study he himself had asked for concerning Waltham's essentiality to the national defense.

He has consistently failed to do anything in Waltham's behalf despite his oft-quoted statement that no segment of American industry would be harmed by reciprocal trade.

His off-the-cuff statement that everything possible has been done for Waltham is puzzling indeed. By everything he can't mean tariff or quota relief. Neither the State Department nor the Tariff Commission has acted despite incontrovertible proof the Swiss import flood has strangled the domestic watch industry.

By everything he can't mean RFC assistance. About all the RFC did was to pay off banking indebtedness and enable the firm to capitalize on its inventory—through a half-price sale. That was something to be grateful for, of course. But RFC advanced no reasonable amount of working capital, and is now reluctant to release part of $2,000,000 earmarked for machinery despite the fact that the concern's asset value is far in excess of its debt.

No, Mr. Truman, we don't think everything has been done for Waltham. We believe a tragic disservice is being done the country's security by your casual dismissal, which so ironically came within an hour of the time when the Munitions Board was reaffirming Waltham's vital defense role.

The President's aides say he wouldn't want to be directly responsible for barring the firm from a chance to reopen. Well, Mr. Truman, just say it isn't so. Tell us it really counts to be a 100-percent producer of timing mechanisms during wartime. Tell us that 2,300 jobs mean something.

If Waltham is expendable, won't Elgin or Hamilton be next?

Free Lithuania Shall Live Again

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on this thirty-second anniversary of the independence of Lithuania, I think it is fitting that we in the Congress of the United States should convey as best we can to the people of Lithuania, some message of our abiding friendship and our hope for their attainment in the near and approaching tomorrow, all of the blessings of human contentment under a government of, for, and by the people in the family of free nations in a democratic world.

The inspiring story of the part played by men and women of Lithuanian blood in building the bulwarks of civilization, and in defending the rights of man, gives us assurance that with such a people there can be no backward steps. Free Lithuania shall live again. The guaranty of that is in the quality of the character of the Lithuanian people.

In my own city of Chicago, are many fine men and women of Lithuanian birth or descent. They have made a large contribution to the great metropolis of the American melting pot. In the army of the toilers, in the professions as doctors, dentists, teachers, and lawyers, in the world of business and especially in music, where many great Lithuanian artists have excelled, the sons and daughters of Lithuania have established themselves on a proud pedestal in the city of Chicago. I am happy to number many of them among my warmest friends.

To Miss Euphrosine Mikuzis, executive secretary of the Lithuanian Council of Chicago, whom I have favorably known and admired for many years as a champion of liberty, I send this message to the large mass meeting on February 19 in Chicago, commemorating Lithuania's independence: Free Lithuania shall live again, because the quality of Lithuanian blood has never failed to prove itself when put to the test.

I feel confident that in the sentiment of this message my colleagues on the floor of this historic Chamber would join with me. In this hour it will be heartening for the people in Lithuania to know that with them is the abiding friendship of the people of the United States.

Segregation in the Armed Forces

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, the time has come to clear the good name of the United States by eliminating the remains of racialism in the military forces. We just fought a war against Nazi racialism and we stand forth as world leaders of democracy and the unique right of every man to be respected, but the United States Army, perhaps the greatest of our public institutions, still retains its little citadel of racial discrimination.

The Navy and the Air Force have by now cleared themselves. During the war, the United States Navy broke the taboo under which it had labored for many years. Formerly Negro sailors could be nothing but messmen; that is, they could serve only in what was regarded as a menial capacity. There were no Negro officers. Then the Navy changed its policy, handsomely, as is the way of the Navy when it does have to make a change, and not grudgingly. It began to admit Negroes as reserve officers for wartime service, and has no complaints to make of the service rendered by these officers. Now the Navy is admitting Negroes to Annapolis and as cadets under the Holloway plan, and is commissioning Negro officers in the Regular Navy. It accepts Negro enlistments, without quota basis, and these enlistees serve on Navy ships completely integrated with white sailors. They sleep, eat, and work as individuals along with members of the majority group, without distinction, and this although it has always been customary for large numbers of the enlisted personnel of the Navy to come from the Southern States, whose inhabitants are supposed by northerners to be far more intolerant than, as individuals, they really are.

The Navy grasped the situation with courage. Authorities thought when they initiated this policy they might have a good deal of trouble. They did not have any trouble. One semiofficial writer describes the situation which ensued in these words:

> The Navy discovered that white and Negro personnel equally competent and trained, berthing, messing, and working together aboard ship and at shore establishments, and relieved of the pressures of home and family environments, and in the absence of local traditional attitudes of prejudice and discrimination, can live and work together harmoniously. It is doubtful if whites desired to make lifelong friendships of Negroes, or that Negroes themselves were desirous of future civilian associations with their white coworkers because of this experience. Nevertheless this experience tended to prove that when pressure realms are reduced, segregation and discrimination break down completely, and integration is made possible.

Since the war, the Navy has confirmed and amplified its policy of nondiscrimination, which has now been stated officially as follows:

> It is the policy of the Navy Department that no distinction be made between individuals wearing the naval uniform or the uniform of any armed service of the United States, because of race, color, or creed. All naval personnel are assigned to the various branches of the service in accordance with their mental, moral, physical, and professional qualifications. The Navy accepts no theory of racial differences in inborn ability but expects every man wearing its uniform to be trained and used in accordance with maximum individual capacity determined on the basis of individual performance.

The Air Force also, the youngest of the services, has cleared itself of its former exclusiveness based on color. This process began, rather grudgingly at first, during the war but has been, as in the case of the Navy, confirmed and amplified since, until at the present time the Air Force claims that no discrimination exists in the service.

The Army alone seems to be seeking to retain all it can of its old policies of discrimination. The Army did not have so far to advance as the other services, but it has done less advancing. There were always Negro units in the Army, at least since the Civil War, and these units have made fine records. There have been Negro officers and Negro cadets. One Negro reached the grade of brigadier general. But the Army still insists on

segregating Negro soldiers in Negro units up to the company level. Until recently, while it educated Negro specialists in Army schools, it would not assign Negroes to the work for which they were specially trained, unless opportunities could be found in Negro units.

It has been the steadfast insistence of the Army that this is in the interests of military efficiency. Negroes make better soldiers, it is said, if they serve in units with other Negroes, and the Army insists that it is not an institution for social reform but for fighting.

The claim of efficiency based on segregation has never been substantiated under modern conditions. The hard core of opposition to any elimination of segregation, which has undoubtedly always existed, and still exists in the Army, has resisted even the formation of experimental unsegregated units. Why is that? It can only be inferred that the military diehards are afraid, not that the experiment will not succeed, but that it will.

There can be no doubt that eventually the military-efficiency argument would work the other way around. Other things being equal—that is, training, leadership, equipment, opportunity, and the like—every man is going to have better morale and serve more efficiently as his individual worth is recognized, his manhood conceded, and the opportunity to make good as an individual is offered to him. All our democracy is built on that, though it has yet to be recognized completely in the United States Army.

The Negro, though in our history he has been subjected to second-hand citizenship or to no citizenship at all, has played a very large and very honorable part in all the wars of the United States except that with Mexico. The first blood shed in the American Revolution was that of Crispus Attucks, a Negro, on the streets of Boston. A Negro fired the first shot at Bunker Hill, killing an English major. George Washington had between 3,000 and 4,000 Negroes in his Continental Army. About one-sixth of the whole Navy personnel in the Revolution were Negroes. There were few Negroes in the Army during the War of 1812, though some Negro irregulars saved the day for Andrew Jackson at New Orleans. The Navy enlisted Negroes in the War of 1812. Union armies in the Civil War were made up one-tenth of Negroes. There were also many Negroes in the Navy. The United States Army began the First World War with 10,000 Negroes already in service as regulars, and ended up with a total of 400,000 in military service. Among the first American soldiers to be decorated for heroism in France, were two Negroes.

Negroes participated largely in the Spanish-American War; there was even a Negro volunteer regiment made up in North Carolina, which had completely Negro officers, including the colonel. Negro Army regulars saved Colonel Roosevelt's Rough Riders from embarrassment and perhaps from destruction at San Juan Hill. In the Second World War all the services began with heavy discrimination against Negroes, which gradually broke down as the war deepened. The Army had more than 690,000 Negroes in 1945 including more than 6,500 commissioned officers. The Air Force had 563 Negro pilots and a total Negro personnel of over 80,000.

We have always asked the Negro to shed his blood for the United States, and he has done so, in spite of frequent shabby treatment. Such loyalty is one of our greatest national assets.

The present situation is far better than it ever was before in the armed services, but—at least in the Army—it is not good enough, and the present international situation points up the inconsistency between our international professions and our erring practice. All over the world, especially among the millions of Asia, communist propaganda against the United States points out to the nonwhite peoples of the world this gap between our principles and our performance. No doubt the situation is exaggerated in these reports. The question for us is, Why should there be anything for them to exaggerate?

Stock-Piling Policies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER S. BARING
OF NEVADA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, I wish to bring to the attention of the Members a statement made by the Munitions Board in its semiannual report to the Congress, dated January 23, 1950.

The Board says:

The probability that stock-pile procurement could not be accelerated but would rather decline during some future period of mobilization emphasizes urgency of procurement now while materials are generally available for purchase in large quantities. The unexpectedly prolonged postwar demand for materials eased somewhat during the calendar year 1949, and surpluses appeared in some commodities. Unless the stock-piling program is able to take up a sizable portion of these surpluses as they appear it is probable that production of these commodities—especially by marginal producers—will decline to new reduced levels of demand. Once this decline in output has taken place procurement for the stock pile would become more difficult. It is obviously easier to take a portion of production of a commodity in surplus than one in which the supply-demand ratio is in fair balance. This circumstance is particularly true in the case of domestically produced minerals. The Munitions Board has not taken a position as to the expediency of any action to keep domestic mines in operation. Nevertheless, the Board does realize the impact both on military strength and on stock piling of any decline in domestic minerals production. A strong, prosperous, and efficient domestic mining industry is basic to the national security. Within the limits of a balanced stock pile the procurement program, the purchase of surplus strategic and critical minerals should proceed as rapidly as possible.

Mr. Speaker, I would have you note how logical and how sweetly reasonable these words are. It is, I think, the first time the policy of the Munitions Board has been stated in just this fashion. It will give great mental aid and comfort to the miners in Nevada and elsewhere whose mines are closing down by the score. Even if it pays no bills at the grocery store, we now know the Board means well and understands the problems involved.

Especially, I call to your attention the statement, "The Munitions Board has not taken a position as to the expediency of any action to keep domestic mines in operation." Mr. Speaker, if this responsible agency has not the fortitude to take a stand, I say with all earnestness that the Congress should have. We should pass an adequate mine-incentive bill without delay, save the industry from disaster, and secure this Nation from dependence on foreign sources of supply wherever possible.

Thaddeus Kosciusko

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, February 12 is the birthday of Thaddeus Kosciusko, Poland's great patriot and national leader and America's Revolutionary War general and aide to Gen. George Washington.

It is significant as well that today is the birthday of a great American patriot and hero, Abraham Lincoln. Certainly February 12 is emblazoned upon the hearts and minds of the liberty-loving people throughout the world for all time.

How better can we focus attention upon the loss of liberty superimposed upon the freedom-loving Polish people by a foreign Communist power than to bring to the attention of everyone that on the old square at Kraków, Poland, on March 22, 1794, Kosciusko took the following oath which was the signal for the Kosciusko insurrection:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, swear to the Polish Nation, in the presence of God, that I will never employ the power which has been entrusted to me against any citizen, but I will exert it only to defend the integrity of my country, to recover the nation's independence, and so strengthen the general liberty of our country. So help me God.

Is it any wonder that with these sentiments in his heart the news of the outbreak of hostilities in America kindled his imagination, and he determined to go to the aid of America—a Polish knight in the cause of liberty.

It is with justified pride that Poles regard the role played by their hero, Kosciusko, in the American Revolution as a material contribution to the victory and independence of this new Nation.

Little remains of some of the great fortifications designed and built by this master of military engineering, but it is again significant that the monument erected to his memory at West Point by

American youth will remain at the citadel of American qualities of heroism and leadership a grateful tribute forever.

The hand of God must, in some way, have appeared in the selection of February 12 as the birthday of two such defenders and fighters for freedom and equality for all peoples. During the southern campaign of the Revolution, Kosciusko, with his keen susceptibility to every form of human suffering, acquired that profound sympathy for the American Negro, which 17 years later, was to dictate his parting testament to the new world, which was written as follows:

I, Thaddeus Kosciusko, being just in my departure from America, do hereby declare and direct that should I make no other testamentary disposition of my property in the United States thereby authorize my friend, Thomas Jefferson, to employ the whole thereof in purchasing Negroes from among his own as any others and giving them liberty in my name, in giving them an education in trades and otherwise, and in having them instructed for their new condition in the duties of morality which may make them good neighbors, good fathers or mothers, husbands or wives, and in their duties as citizens, teaching them to be defenders of their liberty and country and of the good order of society and in whatsoever may make them happy and useful, and I make the said Thomas Jefferson my executor of this.

It follows that the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, did, with his heart's blood, write forever an unforgettable memorial to the same sense of justice.

Upon returning to Poland after the American Revolution, there soon flamed under Kosciusko's leadership all through Poland once again the cause of freedom and liberty against a Russian tyrant. And today there still rings clear in the minds and hearts of all the freedom-loving Poles in the motherland the clarion call of Kosciusko when it is realized that once again, under the heel of the Russian tyrant, free Poland lies bleeding.

But it is certain to know that, as ever, with the help of Almighty God, Poland will rise again.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a short biography of Thaddeus Kosciusko, published by one of the outstanding patriotic organizations in the United States, the Polish American Congress, and may I conclude my tribute to the great Kosciusko with this quotation from the said document:

Kosciusko's body now rests in the Wawel Cathedral in Krakow, where lie Poland's kings and her most honored dead; but his heart is in the Polish conquerors. To his memory, 3 years after his death, the nation raised a monument perhaps unique of its kind. Outside of Krakow towers the Kosciusko Hill, fashioned by the hands of Polish men, women, and children, bringing earth from the battlefields where Kosciusko had fought. The act is typical. To this day the name of Thaddeus Kosciusko lives in the hearts of the Polish people, not only as the object of their profound and passionate love, but as the symbol of their dearest national aspirations. His pictures, his relics, are venerated as with the devotion paid to a patron saint. Legend and music have gathered about his name.

"His dust in Poland rests—
His urned heart a shrine!
Poland! He is thy son!
Columbia! Also thine!"

James Dempsey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. O'NEILL
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article which appeared currently in the Scranton Tribune, Scranton, Pa., paying tribute to my constituent, James Dempsey, 1619 North Webster Avenue, Dunmore, Pa., who received honorable mention in the science talent search for Westinghouse science scholarships.

DEMPSEY CITED IN CONTEST—GETS CHANCE AT SCHOLARSHIP

(By Gene Coleman)

How many 17-year-old high-school seniors do you know who can conduct a project delving into the mysteries of the isolation, purification and crystallization of the alpha-hemolysin of staphylococcus aureus and come up with honorable mention in the science talent search for Westinghouse science scholarships?

Well, there is one here, in fact he's the only one in this city.

His name is James Dempsey, son of Mr. and Mrs. James Dempsey, 1619 North Webster Avenue, Dunmore, and he's a member of St. Paul's High School senior class.

Jimmy was awarded honorable mention in the Nation-wide competition sponsored by Westinghouse and a chance for a possible scholarship at a college of his choice.

It all started some time ago, in fact, it was last September. He decided to enter the contest and picked his project—that scientific tongue twister above.

When the reporter regained his composure from the spelling gymnastics involved, Jimmy explained, "It's a study of the bacteria which cause such external infections as boils, carbuncles and the like. It's not really as bad as it sounds," he laughed.

He worked on this project steadily since last September and then on December 12 took the examination, which is open only to high-school seniors pursuing a science course. Of the 13,500 competing, 40 were chosen to go to Washington, D. C., where one girl and one boy will be chosen for scholarships.

There were 260 others given honorable mention—and only 11 were from Pennsylvania. These students' names will be circulated among the colleges which usually offer a scholarship to the student. However, the student has his choice of schools.

Jimmy said he never bothered with scientific pursuits until he came to St. Paul's as a freshman. However, today he has his own laboratory in the basement of his home with equipment totaling about $1,000.

"I needed a lot of special equipment which isn't usually found in school labs," he explained, "so I saved up enough money from working as a life guard at Moosic Lake and tutoring at summer school last year to buy what I needed."

He also stated that he made some of his equipment himself.

In the course of working on his project Jimmy told how he lost three rabbits through his experiments.

"They were the only casualties," he laughed, "outside of myself. I wound up in the hospital for 2 weeks after an explosion in my lab last summer."

How about fellow students' reaction to the embryonic scientist's work? They're so cooperative they even give their blood to help him out.

In the course of his research Jimmy needed human blood—and almost had himself tapped dry.

His plight was soon made known to his fellow students and after some time he had a list of donors.

"Dempsey's taking blood again" would be whispered through the halls as coatless students walked out of the lab rolling down their sleeves.

"They were swell about it—and nobody seemed to mind losing a couple drops of blood," Jimmy chuckled.

In a more serious vein, Jimmy said that his ultimate goal is to become a doctor of medicine. He would like to attend the University of Pennsylvania for his preliminary training.

The young scientist also plans to enter the State-wide competition sponsored by the same organization again this year.

From all indications it seems as if he has a head start.

Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, the thirty-second anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania finds that brave country and its people still enslaved by the godless Communist dictators. Another year of subjugation has passed, during which unspeakable crimes against religious tolerance, individual rights, and personal liberty have been committed by Moscow's henchmen. But these cruelties and inhumanities have not diminished in the slightest degree the fervor, the yearning, the unquenchable thirst for liberty and freedom so deeply rooted in the hearts and souls of the Lithuanian people. This passion for liberty, so basically imbedded in the very being of all oppressed peoples, cannot be, and never has been in all history, weakened or destroyed by the terrible physical outrages dictators invariably employ in their efforts to bring about complete domination and subservience to their will.

The pages of history will brilliantly portray the gallant struggle Lithuania has made and is making to rise from under the iron heel of her betrayers. The darkness and gloom behind the iron curtain cannot continue forever. Streaks of light are commencing to show through the chinks in the rusting metal, for that metal is subject to erosion and corrosion. Once the decay gains momentum, the time will be short when the free minds and the free souls of an indomitable people will again bask in the sunlight of that cherished liberty which seemed so hopeless during the darkened days of imprisonment.

That freedom will be realized when Lithuania, the Baltic states, and the other oppressed small nations now en-

gulfed by Stalin's Communist tyrants and other dictators are again restored to their rightful places in the family of free nations. It is my fervent hope that we, as the rightful leaders in the universal struggle for democracy, will continue to lend every possible assistance to these unfortunate peoples. Lithuania will rise again to its desired place in the full light of true democracy and complete freedom and liberty.

Again, in the Second Year Since the Civil Rights Commission Reported, the South With No Federal Legislation To Force Action, Made Great Progress in Education and Other Facilities for Its Negro Citizens

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 2, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, today, on the second anniversary of the President's message on civil rights, I would like to point out that not a single one of the proposals has received congressional approval and we are still engaged in a divisive controversy. The proponents of FEPC, for example, insist that the Congress pass only the committee-sponsored bill, including its penalty and coercive provisions, with the result that a policy of promoting nondiscrimination through proper methods is not entertained.

One year ago, Mr. Speaker, I outlined a program upon which an honorable and just solution of this problem could be based. I repeat the words used at that time:

> The answer we should seek is not the conventional southern answer nor the nonsouthern answer. We * * * must find the right answer.

While my suggestions have received strong support in the South and elsewhere, the advocates of FEPC and other civil-rights bills have refused to consider anything less than the President's program.

Fortunately for the country, the political stalemate is not retarding educational progress in the States, particularly in the South. The events of the past year demonstrate that we are cooperating effectively for the advancement of both races.

Inequalities in school facilities are being rapidly corrected. North Carolina, for instance, has embarked upon a $50,000,000 construction program. In Arkansas, last November, almost every school district in the State voted to increase the tax for school districts considerably above the 18-mill limit which had previously prevailed. Much of the increase will go to finance construction of buildings for Negro students. In all other Southern States similar programs have been inaugurated. Another significant educational development in the South has been the adoption of a teacher-certification plan, under which all teachers, white and Negro, are placed on an equal competitive basis for salaries. The salary is determined by the grades teachers make on national teacher examinations and their years of educational preparation and experience. In North Carolina, as a result of this system, the salaries of Negro teachers average slightly higher than those for white teachers.

Continued strides have been made in making available to qualified Negro students an opportunity for a college education and graduate and professional study. In Arkansas, an increase in the annual appropriation for the State A. M. and N. College for Negroes from $175,000 to $450,000 was voted. In addition, the college board was authorized to issue bonds to construct many needed buildings. The number of students has increased accordingly. Most Southern States maintain a comprehensive on-the-farm training program for Negro veterans—a program that is doing much to build a strong agricultural economy through the encouragement of better farming practices and farm ownership.

I am also proud to report that in my home city of Little Rock, Ark., the citizens voted a $359,000 bond issue for a Negro park and recreational facilities. Under the urban redevelopment and slum-clearance program, the city will use that sum not only to build the facilities contemplated in the bond issue, but also 1,000 new homes for Negro residents.

Mr. Speaker, these are just random samplings of some of the things done in the South during the past year for the benefit of our Negro citizens. There is a growing awareness that much remains to be done, but we can, with the help of both races, achieve wider opportunities for all and a better understanding between the races.

Lithuanian Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL J. FLOOD
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Times of today:

LITHUANIAN INDEPENDENCE

With courage that rises above despair, the Lithuanian nation today observes the thirty-second anniversary of its independence with ceremonies which will unite Lithuanians everywhere except in Lithuania itself. This sturdy people, speaking one of the oldest living languages, proclaimed their independence amid the flames of the First World War on February 16, 1918, ending generations of oppression by the Russian Czars. Today, after another world war against tyranny and in defense of freeom, Lithuania, like the neighboring Baltic countries of Latvia and Estonia, is again under the iron heel of an oppressor. Only those who have escaped from this little country can still raise their voices in its behalf.

The Soviet Government is attempting to "Russify" Lithuania by settling it with Russian Communists. According to charges submitted to the United Nations by the Supreme Lithuanian Committee of Liberation, some 600,000 Lithuanians out of a total population of less than 3,000,000 have already been deported to Russian slave-labor camps, killed, or starved to death, and the deportations are proceeding at the rate of 2,000 to 3,000 each month. A Lithuanian underground is still active, and Lithuanian independence is still recognized by the Government of the United States.

Department of Veterans' Affairs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDITH NOURSE ROGERS
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to call attention to yesterday's action of the national legislative committee of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, when it adopted a mandate calling for Cabinet status for the Veterans' Administration. For a number of years I have been advocating such a move and I am glad that this powerful veterans' organization of 1,200,000 members is lending its support to my measure.

In accordance with permission previously granted, I include the text of my bill, H. R. 1844:

A bill to establish a Department of Veterans' Affairs

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby established at the seat of government an executive department to be known as the Department of Veterans' Affairs, and there shall be at the head thereof a Secretary of Veterans' Affairs, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. The provisions of chapter 1 of title 5 of the United States Code shall be applicable to said Department, and in furtherance of such purpose, section 158 of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., title 5, sec. 1), is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following: "Eleventh. The Department of Veterans' Affairs." The said Secretary shall cause a seal of office to be made for the said Department of such device as the President shall approve, and judicial notice shall be taken of said seal.

SEC. 2. There shall be in said Department an Under Secretary and five Assistant Secretaries, who shall be appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, who shall perform such duties as shall be prescribed by the Secretary: *Provided,* That one of such Assistant Secretaries shall be the Surgeon General and another of the Assistant Secretaries shall be the General Counsel. Such Assistant Secretaries shall receive compensation at the rate of $12,000 per annum each.

SEC. 3. There is hereby transferred to the Department of Veterans' Affairs all personnel, files, records, property, reservations, and facilities of the Veterans' Administration of both the central office and field stations. The balances of all appropriations and all trust funds of the Veterans' Administration shall be available for expenditure by the Department in the same manner as if originally

specified in the respective statutes authorizing or creating such appropriations or funds.

SEC. 4. All contracts and agreements entered into, and all orders, rules, regulations, delegations, permits, or other privileges issued or created by the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, shall continue in effect until modified, superseded, or terminated. All laws relating to the Veterans' Administration, and those relating to veterans' benefits generally, shall remain in effect except as hereby modified and shall be administered by the Secretary of Veterans' Affairs.

An Example of Chinese Brutality and Helplessness

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, there appears in the February 7 issue of the Oberlin Review, a publication of Oberlin College at Oberlin, Ohio, a shocking report of Chinese cruelty and duplicity which I insert for the information of my colleagues:

CHINA MISSIONARY TELLS OF NATIONALIST BRUTALITY

To the EDITOR:

Those who are interested in the situation in China, or who are concerned about United States policy there, will be interested in the following report on the liberation of Chungking. It is written by Rev. F. Olin Stockwell, a Methodist missionary who was delegated to represent the United States Government in Chungking when the American consul departed:

"The last days of November brought the news of the rapid advancement of the Communist troops, with the assurance that the government was fighting stubbornly and retreating slowly. On Saturday, November 26, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California, spoke in Chungking, assuring the leaders that the war was not lost if they but took courage and fought to the last. Three days later the last of the troops abandoned the city, and on the evening of November 30 the firing of firecrackers announced the entrance of the Red Star troops. Peace had come at last.

"The troops which came reported that they had no opposition. A few hundred troops had taken the city, without firing a shot. Some reported that in the long miles from Changsha to Chungking the Government's troops fled before them so rapidly that they had not even had a chance to use their ammunition. The rumor that the enemy was approaching sent them scurrying like frightened rabbits, throwing away their equipment and deserting into civilian clothes by the scores. The war had become a victory parade."

OVER 3,000 DIE IN ARSENAL DESTRUCTION

"Not only were men and leaders alike fear-crazed, but they exhibited a brutality that is almost unbelievable. On the night of November 29, the death-like quiet of the city was punctuated with the blowing up of ammunition dumps and arsenals. Not until later did we learn that the blast had wiped out from three to five thousand people—coolies and workmen at the arsenal who were given no warning of the plans and who were blown to pieces by those for whom they had spent their lives.

"In addition to this act was the machine-gunning of between three and four hundred political prisoners at the concentration camp at Tze-chi-keo on the outskirts of Chungking. This camp was organized as a training center during the war, and American personnel assisted Chinese personnel in developing spy work against the Japanese. Since the war the secret agents of the Central Government have carried on at the same center, directing their activities against the Communists. Stories of brutality, of secret arrests and executions, have been whispered about from time to time.

"On the night that the Central Government left Chungking, from three to four hundred men, political prisoners held on the charge of being Communists, were brutally machine-gunned and burned at this one center, their bodies thrown into ditches or left to rot in the open. Several escaped to tell their story. A YMCA foreign secretary (American) visited the center 2 days and saw with his own eyes the ghastly scene. The order for this crime came straight from the top, signed by the generalissimo himself. It is a complete copy, on a smaller scale, of Nazi actions in Germany. Unfortunately, because of America's former relation to this center, the crime is accredited to America, as well as to the dying Central Government.

"In Methodist circles in America, Chiang Kai-shek is remembered as he who gave property and endowment for an orphanage at Chungking, where today there are 200 smiling children. In Chungking circles he will long be remembered as the cruel and despotic ruler who ordered the slaughter of more than 300 political prisoners as a last-minute gesture of helpless defiance."

DON WILLMOTT.

Letter From a Constituent

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER NORBLAD
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. NORBLAD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith a letter from Mr. Fred Crisman, of Salem, Oreg.:

SALEM, OREG., *January 23, 1950.*

Mr. WALTER NORBLAD,
Member of Congress,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In England when the average Britisher feels put upon or has a feeling that all is not right with the "tight lil' isle" he writes a letter to the London Times. In the United States he writes his boy in Congress and tells him what he thinks. This is what I think.

You, sir, are a member of the Military Affairs Committee, I believe, as such, you, in all probability, keep your eye on what is going on overseas. As a vet you are interested in the steady threat that creeps along, both in Europe and Asia. In the past, while I didn't like the troubles in Germany and eastern Europe, I felt that our State Department was in capable hands that knew and understood the people there better than I could ever hope to. I have changed my mind. China has fallen to the Reds. I know China, and when I see what can happen there, Mr. NORBLAD, it makes me stop and think. I met Ho-Chi-Mnh (Ho-Chin) in French Indochina, for my money he was wrong then, and now the French forced by the fall of Chiang must not resist. Indo-China is on the verge and will go soon. What next, Mr. NORBLAD? India? That is what has changed my mind.

The Commies are raising such a fuss in Burma that the country is in chaos, admittedly falling fast to their control. What a dirty shame. I feel this very bitterly. I was badly wounded in Burma. I was shot down in flames over My-Bon, during the small battle for Ru-Wa on the coast of Burma. I left a lot of blood out there and it makes me mad to see it all go, while people I thought were in the "know" grovel and back up before a gang of international brigands whose only difference from the Nazis is the cut of their uniforms.

I no longer think the people guiding our State Department know just what they are doing. They do not seem to rate the "loss of face" in the same manner as those who have spent some little time in the Orient. It is a matter of tremendous importance to a nation as well as to the individual.

I do not have any illusions that this small letter will rate any "big beer" in Washington, but I have it off my chest, and you are the man to tell it to, I feel. I need not tell a Member of Congress that for every single letter one of us will take the trouble to write, there are more than several people who feel the same way. I just happen to feel a bit worse about the CBI—it was "my" corner of the earth during the late ruckus out there.

Yours truly,

FRED CRISMAN.

CIO Urges Congress To Pass the Middle Income Housing Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the executive board of the CIO today adopted a resolution urging the early passage of the Spence bill, H. R. 6618, which will provide cooperative housing to the middle-income groups. In that connection the CIO issued the following statement today, which I commend to the attention of the House:

The CIO urges the Congress to pass the middle-income housing bill.

Millions of American families, including the overwhelming majority of the membership of the CIO, now fall within an income group whose housing needs have been ignored by the Congress.

CIO's housing committee has repeatedly urged the Congress to take steps to eliminate this gap and to complete its program by providing for this no man's land in housing.

Banking and Currency Committees of both Houses are now considering the administration's proposal in this area. The proposals, known as the Maybank amendment (to S. 2246) in the Senate, and the Spence bill, H. R. 6618 in the House, provide lower costs through long-term loans of private investment capital at low rates of interest to cooperatives. This program can reduce housing costs by approximately 30 percent. With this reduction in costs most of the gap in the present housing program can be filled without additional expense to the Government.

We are heartened to see the wholehearted support which this program has been given

by widely representative groups and organizations such as the American Legion, the Cooperative League of the U. S. A., the National Housing Conference, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the National Conference of Catholic Charities, the Jewish War Veterans, and many other organizations.

Major segments of the organized real-estate industry, either out of greed or shortsightedness, have continued to oppose Government action to solve our housing shortage. They seek Federal aids for themselves, they try to deny it to those who would produce more adequate housing at lower costs. Some of them seek to meet the problem by selfishly securing unto themselves, tax exemptions which would be denied the rest of the community. That way leads to the bankruptcy of America's cities.

The CIO urges the Congress to ignore the pleas of the greedy and support the program pending before it on a bipartisan basis reflecting the bipartisan nature under which the program was developed and widely supported.

We urge the Congress to permit this program to go ahead and give it as a new instrument the kind of sympathetic support and administration which will make possible the solution of the middle-income housing problem to as high a degree as the achievements of the REA which brought electricity with all its benefits to 80 percent of the farms in this country.

False Economy in the Post Office?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BARRATT O'HARA
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, there is much concern among many people in Chicago over the effect upon workers generally of an order of the Post Office Department assigning laborers receiving less pay to do the work now performed by the Federal postal clerks. It is felt, and I believe with some justification, that while at the present time this would affect a total of only six or seven hundred workers there is the great danger that it will set a pattern by which a general fall of wages throughout the Nation, and not only in the departments of the Government but in industry as a whole, will be effected.

I bring the matter to the thoughtful consideration of my colleagues. No one more sincerely believes in economy in Government than do I, but I do not wish those things to be projected in the name of economy that will wreck our economy. The conditions that preceded the depression of 1929 are too fresh in my memory for me to be blind to the consequences that inevitably result when high economic crimes are committed by those wearing the disguise of economy.

There is a real economy, a sound economy, an honest economy and that is the kind of economy that we in this Congress should be committed to. Merely to reduce in one group the wages of humble workers already underpaid, and thus continue the process of pilfering from the pay envelopes of other underpaid workers is the economy that destroys. It is the signpost on the road to depression. This was the kind of economy that ushered in the depression of 1929 when, to ward off a growing depression, the only remedy that was offered was to cut down wages.

No man in the public life of America is more highly esteemed than the Postmaster General, and justly so. I have confidence that when he has reviewed the immediate effect and the possible repercussions of the order we have been discussing that he will take such action as in his judgment and from his long and rich experience will seem to him proper, and which will be satisfactory to all of us who do not want another depression to start in the germ-beds of false economy.

That my colleagues may know the depth of feeling on this subject among the workers of Chicago, I am including in my remarks the following resolution adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor on February 7, 1950:

Whereas the Post Office Department has issued orders assigning cheaper mail handler (laborers) help to work presently performed by post-office clerks; and

Whereas this order increases the assignments of the mail handlers at the expense of the post-office clerks; and

Whereas the object of the order is to employ mail handlers in great numbers at average salaries of $600 a year less than the present salaries of post-office clerks; and

Whereas the pay scales and working rules governing the employment of post-office clerks represent the energies and labors of many decades by the trade-unionists who honor their membership in the National Federation of Post Office Clerks and the American Federation of Labor; and

Whereas the many milestones of progress accomplished by the organized-labor movement in Government industry are now currently wiped out by one stroke of the Postmaster General's hand; and

Whereas the order results in a lowering of the standard of living of large masses of post-office workers, resulting in a defeat of the aims and objectives of the organized-labor movement of the United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Chicago Federation of Labor go on record as favoring that the anti-labor orders of the Postmaster General, issued on October 27, 1949, Change Order No. 250, be immediately rescinded and the work restored to post-office clerks; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS and Senator PAUL H. DOUGLAS, and the Congressmen of the Chicago area, and urge them to do all in their power to have the order by the Post Office Department of October 27, 1949, known as Change Order No. 250, rescinded.

Adopted by the Chicago Federation of Labor, February 7, 1950.

Gettysburg Address—1950 Version

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR.
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HUGH D. SCOTT, JR. Mr. Speaker, the biographers of Abraham Lincoln tell many stories of his humor, which sometimes was delievered with the sardonic touch. Nothing in our literature compares to the immortal Gettysburg Address. Yet, somehow I am sure, that if he were alive today he would forgive generously—and perhaps with a smile—this parody which comes to me, the original author unknown:

GETTYSBURG ADDRESS—1950 VERSION

Ten score plus 7 years ago, our fakers brought forth upon this Nation a new tax, conceived in depredation and dedicated to the proposition that all men are surtaxed, unequal.

We are now engaged in a great mass of calculation, testing whether that taxpayer—or any taxpayer—so confused and impoverished, can long endure. We are met on Form 1040. We have come to dedicate a large portion of our income to a final resting place with those men who here spend their lives that they may squander the fruit of our toil.

It is altogether anguish and torture that we should do this. But in the legal sense we cannot evade—we cannot cheat—we cannot underestimate this tax. The collectors, clever and sly, who computed here, have gone far beyond our poor powers to add or to subtract. Our creditors will little note nor long remember what we pay here, but the Bureau of Internal Revenue can never forget what we report here.

It is not for us, the taxpayers, to be consulted here on the tax receipts which the Government has thus far so ignobly spent. It is rather for us to be here dedicated to the great task remaining before us—that from these vanishing dollars we take increased devotion to the few remaining; that we here highly resolve that next year will not find us in the higher income bracket; that this taxpayer, underpaid, shall figure out more deductions; and that taxation of the people, by the President, for the Government, shall not cause our solvency to perish from our hearth.

Thirty-second Anniversary of Adoption of Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. B. W. (PAT) KEARNEY
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KEARNEY. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to join with the other Members of the House in paying tribute to the Americans of Lithuanian descent who today are celebrating the thirty-second anniversary of the adoption of the declaration of independence at Vilnius. This occasion is commemorated not only by our citizens of Lithuanian ancestry but by all like-minded individuals. The good and brave people of Lithuania, existing under the heel of the oppressor, do not sit by passively and accept without resistance the yoke of slavery. Despite the constant persecution and indescribable humiliations to which they have been subjected in their struggle, they have had the fortitude and courage to carry on a resistance against their oppressors. Fighting for liberty and freedom and for the belief in the church of their ancestors is the tradition of Lithuanians. They still hold high the torch of their tradition and do not break faith. They look

forward to the day when the march of communism is stopped; and on that day a new proclamation of liberty will again bring joy to the hearts of the people of Lithuania and all other freedom-loving nations of the earth.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World—Lets Its Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a Government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over—the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

UNHAPPY HUNTING GROUNDS (II)—INDIANS PRONE TO ILLS BECAUSE OF FAULTY DIET

(This is the second story in a series on Indian conditions in Wisconsin.)

(By Rod Van Every)

The most stark poverty among Wisconsin Indian reservations stalks the Lac Court Oreilles in Sawyer County.

But Lac Court Oreilles is not much different from other reservations.

No one has starved to death at Lac Court Oreilles (pronounced "Cooderay"), and this is taken by many to mean that things can't be too bad. But the diet is inadequate and malnutrition has laid many Indians open to diseases which have killed them. The death certificates do not list starvation as the cause.

There is almost no work in winter in the vicinity of Hayward, Stone Lake, and Couderay. A few Indian men cut pulpwood. A few work for the United States Indian Service, usually the same ones. The old ones get old-age-assistance checks. Some families that have taken in abandoned children get foster-home funds. Almost everyone is getting, or trying to get, relief.

But see for yourself. Step into the home of George Wade, 67, of Reserve, the largest Indian community at Court Oreilles.

CHIEF INCOME IS PENSION

On the outside the house looks pretty good, but inside you find its three rooms bare. There are two beds in the bedroom, one in the living room; another is in the kitchen. Here George Wade lives with his wife and six children. Two of the girls are at St. Paul looking for work. Paul, 21, recently came home after his discharge from the army. He brought with him his 19-year-old bride, a frail, frightened white girl from Missouri.

The chief income for this family is George Wade's $50 a month old-age pension. He was very glad to become 65.

Mrs. Wade sits at a table. There are saucers of beads on the table, and she is working at a small wooden frame over which threads are stretched. Most of the women at Reserve and at the poorer community of New Post, 13 miles away, are at that moment doing the same thing.

They are making strips of beads, about 1 inch wide and 30 inches long. The strips will be sewed to leather belts and sold to the summer tourists in the novelty stores in Hayward and other resort towns. Mrs. Wade sells her work to a white woman living just off the reservation, who sells the strip to a belt company. The white woman furnishes the beads and thread. The beads have been counted, and broken or defective beads must be returned so that there can be no chance of the women selling their work directly to tourists.

WORK AT HARVESTS

The pay for this, one of the main industries of the Court Oreilles Reservation? It is 25 cents a strip. As the Indians tell it, one woman, if she works hard all day and pays not too much attention to the home and children, can make three.

At the white stores the belts cost $3 and up.

In the summer the Chippewas at Court Oreilles pack up and go to the Door Peninsula to pick cherries or farther north to pick strawberries. They also follow the bean, potato, and cranberry harvests. Some guide for fishermen. Others work at summer resorts as handymen or the women as maids. There is some town road work, and some Federal blister rust-control work. Some gather wild rice.

"But you can't save enough for the winter," they say.

The fact is, many do not try. "Too many live for the day," says Father Engelhard Troseken. He has worked with Indians for 40 years, 35 with the well off Menominees at Keshena, 5 at Court Oreilles. He is pastor at the St. Francis Solanus Catholic mission and school at Reserve.

CHURCH IS DOING MUCH

The church is doing much to help the Indians, and the good-looking, 6-foot 2-inch Father Paulinus Groskopf rushes around the reservation in his 1948 Plymouth, concentrating as much on the Indian's empty belly as his soul. Father Paulinus is 36 and a dynamo of energy. Often, very often, Father Paulinus is a scratchy burr on the hide of the Indian Service.

Father Paulinus is a realist. He saw starvation in China, and he recognized the signs at Court Oreilles.

"Sure, he is a fat Indian," the priest said. "But that is potatoes. Or maybe beans or macaroni, all starch. Malnutrition is general here."

The father has many friends over the Nation. He is not bashful about asking them for financial help for the Indians. He gets it, too, but not nearly enough.

Father Paulinus' Indian parish is at New Post, 18 miles from Reserve and the worst slum of Court Oreilles. Take a look.

RELIEF WAS DELAYED

Here is Clyde Miller, 53. His wife, Violet, 34, is in a Federal tuberculosis sanitorium. He must care for the six children. He cannot get out to work. When Violet took sick last June, he applied immediately for relief. He got it in October, he said.

Mrs. Katie Martin, 67, lies in bed in a cluttered, dirty room on the second floor of her rickety house. She has been ill most of the winter.

Her two daughters and their four small children live there. There is no man. Katie's husband died 3 years ago, and her daughters' husbands are not around.

They have been getting $10 worth of relief groceries a month for 3 months, Katie said. While she lies in her bed, Katie Martin keeps working at the beads and the buckskin.

POPULATION UNKNOWN

Walter Thayer, 42, and his wife and four children live in a one-room tar-paper shack. His cupboard contains flour, a can of green beans, potatoes, raisins, one can of condensed milk, and some coffee.

Nine children live in another two-room shanty. A 17-year-old girl is in charge while the mother is having her tenth baby in the Hayward Indian Hospital. The husband left last September—not an uncommon Indian custom—and he won't be back.

There's Charlie Wolf, 49, who has one of the best and cleanest houses at New Post. He attended Oshkosh State Teachers' College and now guides and does carpenter work in the summer. Bill Conger, 31, deep in debt, lives in a one-room hut with his pregnant wife and two children. Hank Smith, 45, who wanted to start a grocery, says it took him 1½ years to get a $900 tribal loan.

No one knows exactly how many Indians are living on the Court Oreilles Reservation (or any reservation, for that matter). Father Paulinus thought there were about 1,000—perhaps 250 families. Two Indian-service sources said 900 and 700, respectively. On the tribal roll are 1,707 names, but many of the people are scattered throughout the State.

SKINNY WINTER DEER PROVIDE LITTLE FOOD

Few homes at Court Oreilles have electricity. Kerosene lamps provide light. There are only a couple of telephones. Water must be brought from one of several community pumps. Toilet facilities? The privy is at the rear of the house.

Deer are not much of a source of winter food at Court Oreilles. The heavy snows drove them far into the swamps, and they have grown skinny and their meat is strong from eating bark and pine needles. When you can get through the deep snow a deer can be a good source of income. The white man will buy it, but you are a violator, and the game warden cannot be very understanding.

At Reserve, "the Farmer" says that the Indians have a way of taking care of each other, of sharing what they have. The farmer is Walter M. Bagley, district agent for the Indian service. He is liked by most of the Indians. The title derives from the old treaties which gave reservation Indians the service of "a farmer" or adviser on agriculture.

Bagley has some surplus commodities—potatoes and cans of dried eggs—in a back room, but not nearly enough. One day the newspapers had stories about how the Federal Government was going to dump 50,000,000 bushels of surplus potatoes. But there are no Indian Service funds to pay for shipping them to the reservations.

Last week end the people of Rice Lake, 50 miles south of Court Oreilles, sent two truckloads of food to the reservation.

Although the Indians believe that Bagley is doing all he can to help them, they look with some suspicion on the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian Agency at Ashland. The agency oversees Indian affairs, except for the Menominees, in Wisconsin, Michigan, and Iowa. Jesse C. Cavill is the general superintendent. Many of the things the Indians complain about are the result of policies made in Washington, D. C., he says. He explains that the agency funds are strictly earmarked and he cannot spend them for such things as food, even though it may be needed badly.

Actually, the agency did provide a small relief fund by a year's end saving in other funds. Most of it went to Court Oreilles, Cavill said, but other reservations needed it, too.

CHILDREN GET LUNCHES

The amount of food on hand at Bagley's headquarters at Reserve was pitifully small.

Bagley issues it on an emergency basis, often to tide over a hungry family before it receives relief food through a joint tribal town fund.

From time to time there have been surplus commodities. Many Indians did not know until very recently that they could get surplus foods and Federal relief packages.

The school free-lunch programs are a godsend to underfed Indian children. No matter what the condition at home, they are assured of at least one substantial meal a day.

The clothing situation generally is good. Many families fit themselves out for the rugged winters with summer earnings. Others get clothing from the church, at such prices as $1 for an overcoat, 15 cents for a dress or 20 cents for long handled underwear.

CRANBERRY PROJECT DESIGNED FOR WORK

The land of the Court Oreilles Reservation, the backbone of any Indian economy is poor. It is sandy and very dry in the summer.

There is little good timber in the area. It is mostly poplar, good for pulpwood and perhaps barrel staves. Everyone thinks that the solution to the Indian poverty would be a small mill or factory of some kind, but efforts by the tribal council to bring something to the reservation have been halfhearted. And there hasn't been much help from the Indian service.

The Federal Government has financed, on a $105,000 loan, a 32-acre cranberry marsh project at Court Oreilles. The plants will be set out this spring but they will not bear for several years. The project is designed to give some Chippewas work and to build up the shaky tribal fund.

Henry Joe La Rush, 67, chairman of the tribal council, is very proud of the cranberry project. It took some doing to get a small majority of the tribe to vote for it.

LIQUOR IS PROBLEM

La Rush, one-quarter Indian, is pretty well off compared with most other Indians of the reservation. He has a 15-acre farm and three cows. He rents boats to fishermen in the summer.

One of the big problems in getting a community project going or in bringing an industry to the reservation is the varying ownership of land. Some is in heirship, some is delinquent; there is tribal land, Federal land and allotted land. To get timber rights on any large tract would require long negotiation and hundreds and hundreds of signatures. There is little reforestation because of the land title mess.

Liquor is a problem on every reservation and in every nonreservation community. Some Indian leaders minimize it, but it is always there and it is always serious. Under Federal law no Indian may be sold liquor, yet they get it easily. Some buy it openly in taverns; some have it bootlegged to them at higher prices.

Indians everywhere believe that they should be allowed to buy liquor when and where they choose. Indian servicemen and many other whites who know the ways of the Indian agree with them. They believe there will be less drinking when the law is changed.

HOSPITAL IS NEARBY

Much of the white prejudice against the Indian in communities around a reservation comes from contact with the drunken Indian who is in town on a spree and frequently is in fights. "The Indian is moral until he drinks," Father Paulinus said. Then he is very much like a white drunk, committing assaults, burglary, and petty theft.

"We don't have much Indian trouble," said a Hayward policeman. "But what trouble we got is Indian. In hard times there is less money and less trouble. There hasn't been much trouble lately."

There has not been an unusual amount of sickness at Court Orielles this winter. The fine Indian agency hospital at Hayward, with its one doctor, is nearby. The doctor is far too busy to get to Court Orielles, but the one ambulance is available for emergency cases. However, it is not always on hand. It also is on call for all reservations in Wisconsin, and the hauls may be 100 miles or more.

If you do not own one of the old jalopys that clank around the reservation, you must pool up with friends to pay a neighbor to drive you to Hayward. The total cost may be $5 to $7 and your share $1. The $1, even if you have one, is needed badly for food.

So you don't go to the Hayward doctor.

Statement by Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson, Texas Railroad Commissioner, Before the House Ways and Means Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, we have been very fortunate to have such a qualified person of the oil industry to come to Washington and explain to the House Ways and Means Committee the reasons that the depletion allowance on our oil and gas production should be maintained. Lt. Gen. Ernest O. Thompson is a member of the Texas Railroad Commission and in this capacity acts as the State's conservation agency for natural resources. He has had an outstanding military career and at present is the commanding general of the Texas National Guard.

I believe that General Thompson's explanation is a very well thought out argument to maintain the incentive plan for a progressive oil industry. I trust that the Ways and Means Committee will see fit to take favorable action on his recommendations.

Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the statement made by Gen. Ernest O. Thompson before the House Ways and Means Committee:

Mr. COMBS. Mr. Chairman, may I take a minute to introduce General Thompson, and explain how he happens to be here?

The CHAIRMAN. All right.

Mr. COMBS. On Monday I called General Thompson, who is a member of the Texas Railroad Commission, which is our conservation agency, and requested him to come here. I doubt that he has had time to prepare anything like a formal statement, but I asked him to come this morning in order that he might testify and subject himself to questioning because I regard him as one of the best informed men in public life. He is an elected official and not a representative of any particular group or company. I think he has served 17 years in this position.

General THOMPSON. My name is Ernest O. Thompson and I am and have been a member of the Texas Railroad Commission since June 1932. I might also say that I am representing Governor Allan Shivers, of Texas, who requested that I appear here on his behalf.

Among other duties of the Texas Railroad Commission, is that of conservation of oil and gas, administering our statute, waste prevention statutes, and so forth.

In addition to being a member of the railroad commission, I have long been a member of the Texas National Guard. I served in the first war as commander of a machine-gun battalion in the Ninetieth Division. I remained in the Guard all the time between the two wars and trained two regiments in this war. President Roosevelt sent me as his representative to the World Petroleum Congress in Paris in 1937. Secretary of War Robert Patterson sent me on a survey of oil and gas supplies throughout the European theater in March 1945 and then to make a survey of the oil fields in the Middle East, which I did.

My efforts have always been as a citizen-soldier. Today I am the commanding general of the Texas National Guard. We have in our State an infantry division, the Thirty-sixth Division, and an armored division, the Forty-ninth Division, an air wing and an antiaircraft battalion with 15,000 enlisted strength. I mention that because my speech today will be as a railroad commissioner and as a citizen-soldier.

My thinking, naturally, is of national defense. It is in this way that I have always approached the conservation of oil and gas. In the final analysis, oil is a munition of war. It used to be that an army traveled on its stomach. Today an army travels on gasoline and oil. Our ships, planes, tanks, trucks, and missiles depend upon oil and gasoline for their motive power.

Ten long years of strict conservation of oil and gas and proration of production in Texas, prior to Pearl Harbor, made it possible for our Nation to have all of the oil it needed for the war effort in World War II. We were never short of oil, although I must say that we were severely taxed in our producing ability many times during the war. We produced our fields to the limit. We had no extra capacity to produce and rationing of civilian needs was necessary in order to conserve the oil.

Just last week, speaking at Baylor University, one of our great colleges, a 100-year old school, Secretary Symington came down with our distinguished junior Senator, Senator LYNDON B. JOHNSON, whom I am happy to see in attendance here this morning, to make an address and to receive a degree at Baylor University. Secretary Symington, who certainly ought to know and be in a position to know, said, among other things, "Russia has the atomic bomb. Russia has the means of delivering it. I am not so sure that we are prepared."

The late Secretary for Defense, Secretary Forrestal, who gave his life fighting for the preparedness of our Nation, is my authority that we need 2,000,000 barrels per day extra oil-producing capacity above peacetime requirements. We do not have one-half of that extra reserve capacity today.

If you gentlemen of this committee ask the Military Defense Department how much reserve oil-producing ability is enough to guarantee the security of this Nation, they will tell you, as they told Senator Johnson when inquiry was made by him at my request on this very question, they will tell you that we must have a virile, active, prosperous domestic oil-producing industry, constantly expanding to meet the ever-changing and ever-greater necessity for motor fuel.

I have kept closely in touch with the oil requirements for our defense. Only a week ago I made a personal inquiry of the Secretary of Defense and asked Secretary Johnson how much reserve daily oil-producing ability was enough. I simply wanted to know how much was enough to be ample for our national requirements in case of an emergency. The reply was again, as I have stated before, that we need an active, virile, prosperous domestic oil-producing industry for our defense. That is sound defense policy. It is not safe to do anything that would hamper or impede this prime requisite for our defense.

Oil, gentlemen, is ammunition. In defense, oil is prime mover. The proposed saving here put forward by the Treasury Department of $200,000,000 by the Government, by cutting depletion allowance from 27½ percent down to 15 percent, would, in my opinion, be poor economy. Why tamper with a system which has twice in a generation brought forth a drilling which is the only way to find oil and has made oil available in such quantities that we have been able to win two wars? Men venture in risky drilling for the reward which follows success. Remove the rewards and our domestic supply in oil will shrivel, and we will become dependent upon foreign oil. Foreign oil, of course, could be denied us.

We know that certain people are concentrating on submarines and we would be denied foreign oil. Especially is this true of the great Persian Gulf area, the Middle East, Iran, Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Bahrein Islands where they have discovered more than 47,000,000,000 barrels of oil with just a few wells having been drilled. Their production in that area has already gone up to 1,400,000 barrels a day.

These great Middle East fields, gentlemen, lie under the shadow of the Russian bear right at the border. I have heard it testified in the committees of Congress by the high military officers that the Persian Gulf oil fields could not be counted upon by us if war should come. Therefore, I urge the members of this committee not to change the 27½ percent depletion not to reduce it in any way. The system is working, it is producing the oil. It means national security. It is my considered opinion, gentlemen of the committee, that we cannot afford as a nation to tamper with a system of incentive, namely, the 27½-percent depletion allowance on our oil and gas production that is getting the job done.

We do not yet have enough ready reserve oil-producing capacity for our national security, not half enough. Revenue, however badly needed, cannot be considered when our national security is at stake. Our very freedom is involved. Come war there will be no time to drill oil wells. To be useful for defense, gentlemen of the committee, the oil wells must have already been drilled. Reserves lying undrilled are of no value, and there would be no time to drill them, there would be no steel available for the drilling. The oil wells must have already been drilled, equipped, and ready to produce, hooked up and connected to the pipe lines and to the refineries of ample capacity, ready to make the products required in sufficient quantities and of proper quality.

Since the close of World War II the oil industry has gone faithfully forward with new drilling, new pipe-line construction, new refineries to the amount of more than $7,000,000,000, perhaps even more. I know that is a conservative figure. They have done that in order to keep up with the ever-expanding American economy and to help get ready for the national defense in time of possible emergency. I feel that we should not now imperil the progress in this field and become dependent on foreign oil.

That, gentlemen, is my statement. I have tried to stay within the time limits I gave. I shall give to the clerk of the committee, with your permission, some charts and tables and data that brings the situation up to date.

Here is a book written by a man named Wallace Pratt, one of the great authorities in this country on geology, entitled, "Oil in the Earth." I simply have two pages marked here showing how much drilling is necessary to discover an oil field through all the years from 1920 up through 1938 and 1940. I have other data here which supplements it and brings it up through 1949.

Gentlemen, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before you.

Mr. BOGGS. General, I know that you were here yesterday when we were questioning the representatives of the Treasury Department?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. You probably listened to my questions which were put to the representatives of the Treasury Department in connection with the statement that depletion was the same thing as depreciation. Now, of course, I do not subscribe to that theory at all and I do not think that the Treasury Department can establish any such theory.

I should like for you to explain to the committee the difference between depreciation and depletion.

General THOMPSON. Depreciation, Congressman BOGGS, in my opinion, is a method of setting aside money to rebuild something that can be rebuilt. Depletion is a consideration which the Congress has wisely provided to take the place of an irreplaceable natural resource. You cannot replace it. Man did not make oil and man cannot make it. It is an irreplaceable natural resource, expending the capital as it comes out of the ground, never to be replaced by man.

Mr. BOGGS. And the whole theory of depletion is the replacing of capital, is it not?

General THOMPSON. So you can search for more oil; yes, sir.

Mr. BOGGS. General, in your opinion, is it fair, in view of the fact that 27½ percent depletion has been in our law since 1926 and some similar arrangement has been a part of our law since 1918, to say that the character of percentage depletion is a tax loophole?

General THOMPSON. It certainly would not be a tax loophole, Congressman BOGGS. It is the secret of the oil-producing business. The reason that oil men go out and hunt for oil is because they hope to get a reward. This depletion is the thing that has kept the oil business going. As a matter of fact, the profits in the oil business are less by statistics than 400 industries in the Nation and in my papers here, I set them out and show that the amount that they make is less than the amount made by ordinary business.

Mr. BOGGS. You have been the railroad commissioner for Texas for 17 or 18 years. I know you have had a long and distinguished career. I know you are equally familiar with the entire Southwest. What in your opinion would be the effect upon the economies of Texas, Oklahoma, Louisiana, California, if this Congress took action which adversely affected the continued expansion of the oil business?

General THOMPSON. Congressman BOGGS, Texas has at this time 117,439 producing oil wells. We produce 2,000,000 barrels per day and we have the well shut down tight half the time because our statute says that production of oil in excess of market demand is waste. So our State is already suffering from the shut-down because of the fact that we are producing more than market demand. Now if you cut off the depletion allowance, drilling will stop and we will again be faced with a shortage of oil.

The economy of our State depends almost entirely upon revenue from oil, 56 percent of the revenue that comes into our State, the State government, comes from oil taxes. We call it a severance tax.

Mr. BOGGS. That supports your schools, welfare programs and your highway programs and 56 percent, or whatever percentage you mentioned, goes to the State government?

General THOMPSON. More than that. Fifty-six percent is from oil production, Congressman BOGGS. Then you have the oil refining, the pipe-line work, thousands of people who work for the oil companies in pipe lines are in the fields. If this oil business should drop in Texas, Louisiana, Oklahoma, Kansas, California, and all of the 22 States that produce oil, it will stop the advancing economy of this Nation and the impact would be terrific. Other industries would topple, such as steel for example and many, many other industries.

Mr. BOGGS. How much would you estimate as the total employment directly and indirectly in Texas and in the Southwest generally is dependent upon the oil business?

General THOMPSON. I would say eight or ten million people are dependent on oil for their livelihood.

Mr. BOGGS. Directly?

General THOMPSON. Directly, sir. One hundred and seventeen thousand wells are scattered from east Texas clear out to El Paso and from the Panhandle all the way down to Corpus Christi. Three-fourths of the counties in our State produce oil.

Mr. BOGGS. General, has anything happened since 1942, when the Congress investigated this very subject quite thoroughly to justify an arbitrary reduction in percentage depletion at this time?

General THOMPSON. On the contrary, if it was good in 1918 and in 1942, when it was started and when it was reinvestigated, it should be even more so at this time, because of the fact that costs of drilling have constantly increased. We are going deeper and deeper all the time to get oil.

As you go below 8,500 feet the costs go up not only arithmetically, but geometrically. You can hardly get a contractor to go below 8,500 feet. Many of our discoveries are being made below 10,000 and 12,000 feet. Many of them are dry holes and cost as much as $500,000. I know one well which was drilled in Florida at a cost of $1,500,000, and was dry. Of all the wells drilled, 36 percent are dry. Exploratory wells, 81 percent are dry. You do not hear about the fellows who hit dry holes. You just hear about the fellows who, like the man who hit the daily double, hits oil.

Mr. BOGGS. General, do you have any figures on the approximate amount of money which has been spent by the industry in developing or attempting to develop the offshore areas in Louisiana and Texas?

General THOMPSON. Congressman BOGGS, those off-shore operations are terrific in cost. Some of the platforms where they drill cost a half million dollars, just to build the platform from which to drill, and then they have converted LST's, these ships that hauled equipment during the war, big tanks, they converted these to barges for drilling at terrific cost. I would say that off-shore drilling would certainly be $500,000 a well.

Mr. BOGGS. Yesterday in the testimony of the Treasury Department did you find in that testimony any scientific basis for the reduction of the allowance from 27½ to 15 percent?

General THOMPSON. I certainly did not see any scientific reason for it. I will say this that the conservation of oil, gentlemen, is being practiced in a most exacting manner. We allow oil to be produced all over the Nation only at that rate which will cause the greatest possible amount of oil to be produced.

Mr. BOGGS. The figures given yesterday struck me as being arbitrary figures. Did you get that impression?

General THOMPSON. Certainly they were arbitrary figures and I did not think they had a proper grasp of it, if I may be pardoned for saying so.

Mr. BOGGS. I thought so too. Thank you.

General THOMPSON. I thought your questioning yesterday was to the point and Mr. Mason put some questions right to the point too.

Mr. COMBS. I have just a few questions, General, to amplify a few points that Mr. Boggs brought out. For one thing, you brought out the point that peacetime is the time to continue your explorations and bring your wells in because in wartime, you cannot drill because you have neither the time nor the steel or other equipment and manpower needed to develop new wells in wartime in large number?

General THOMPSON. That is right.

Mr. COMBS. And to keep up production and to have potentially more production you have to keep up the drilling and exploration during peacetime?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir; that is correct. That is the only time you can do it.

Mr. COMBS. Now when you bring in your wells under proration, your actual production is kept down to the point where the oil is needed theoretically at the time?

General THOMPSON. We do that to preserve the pressure, Congressman COMBS, so that you will not have to put the wells on pump.

Mr. COMBS. That is the conservation feature, but I say from the standpoint of having available oil, you do keep the production down, regardless of the number of wells to

the total of what is needed from time to time?

General THOMPSON. We prorate among all the wells in the State and the different fields so that each field gets its pro rata share of demand; that is a technique of conservation. Prorating is a tool of conservation and a necessary one.

Mr. COMBS. I brought that out to emphasize this point. Under that system, if you have the wells and the deposits in the wells available, you can rapidly step up production if the wells are there?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir; you can open them up as needed and produce them at that rate which is the maximum efficient rate. The maximum efficient rate is that rate beyond which you dare not go to keep from harming the reservoir.

Mr. COMBS. In that connection then, in the interests of national defense, it is advisable to develop every possible deposit and have the wells there ready?

General THOMPSON. You must have the wells drilled and all hooked up so that you simply turn a valve. If you do not do that you will not have oil.

Mr. COMBS. That is necessary to national defense to have this oil in an emergency?

General THOMPSON. You could not fight a war without it.

Mr. COMBS. You think the proration allowance is one of the main encouraging factors that make possible that kind of development?

General THOMPSON. Judge, I can best explain that by giving you our experience in the East Texas field. There are 22,000 oil wells in that field. It is 19 years old. The expert said when that field was discovered and outlined with dry holes, when the limits were defined, that the total production would be in the nature of 1,000,000,000 barrels. By reason of conserving the pressure, we have kept those wells flowing 19 years and we have already produced and saved 2,600,000,000 barrels of oil and the pressure still stands at 1,028 pounds. If the pressure is protected in the future as it has been in the past, that field will produce another 2,500,000,000 barrels, making 5,000,000,000 barrels of oil where 1,000,000,000 was expected.

Mr. COMBS. Now General, does that type of operation put an added burden on an oil company to operate under the conservation practice?

General THOMPSON. Those wells in east Texas, Judge, as you well know, because you have tried many cases and I have been before you, we have wells at east Texas that can produce 30,000 barrels of oil today, if opened wide open but they are only allowed to produce 12½ barrels per day because the market demand is such that we can only make room for 12½ barrels from a 30,000-barrel well. That is building up an arsenal of ammunition come war. Does that answer your question?

Mr. COMBS. That answers the question. Would you explain the oil commission of which you are a member?

General THOMPSON. Through the permission of Congress in 1935, the conservation agents of the various 20 States that produce oil got permission of the Congress to enter into a treaty each with the other, the Interstate Oil Compact Commission. That gives the States the right to coordinate their police powers in waste prevention. As a result, the idea developed in one State can be quarterly transmitted to the authorities and the engineers of the other States. We meet four times a year and exchange freely technical information, one with the other. It has been a great blessing to get uniform waste prevention measures. We are grateful to the Congress for that treaty between the States where we can coordinate the powers. It has made Federal control unnecessary.

Mr. COMBS. One other question that suggests itself. You are familiar through that relationship with production problems and exploration problems, you might say, throughout the oil-producing area in the United States?

General THOMPSON. That is correct, sir.

Mr. COMBS. You have seen oil brought in in States that heretofore have not had any oil, like Mississippi?

General THOMPSON. All over the country, 22 States now produce oil.

Mr. COMBS. In most instances enormous sums were spent drilling and testing and searching for those deposits before they were found?

General THOMPSON. Millions and millions of dollars have been spent, unsuccessfully in many cases.

Mr. COMBS. I will ask you if those great reserves were not in large part made possible by the fact that the producing companies could retain a sufficiently large operating fund after payment of taxes in order to do it?

General THOMPSON. I think the 27½ percent depletion has made possible the finding of field after field after field. At the close of World War I we had 5,000,000,000 barrels reserved in this Nation. Since that time we have used tweny-seven billion out of that five billion and now we have twenty-five billion. It is working, is a fine system, and should not be tampered with.

Mr. COMBS. Do you think that an attack upon the system, on the principle of proration allowance as to each individual lease would be proper?

General THOMPSON. You could not do that, Judge.

Mr. COMBS. One particular lease might show rather large profits.

General THOMPSON. You have to take all of the properties and throw them into one pot. You could not take separate properties and proceed on that basis because you would break the little fellow, and he is the man that goes out and gets the oil.

These stripper wells could not exist. Out of 439,000 wells in this Nation, 200,000 of them produce less than 6 barrels per day, but they are the backlog of our oil supply of the Nation because every well will be a stripper by and by.

Mr. COMBS. That is all, thank you.

Mr. REED. You are a great expert in this line and I just want to ask this brief question. If they were to reduce this 27½ percent, or wipe it out, it would be absolutely devastating to the stripper wells, would it not?

General THOMPSON. It would put them out of business and make us dependent on foreign oil and would also make oil go up; it would be higher than a cat's back.

Mr. KEAN. General Thompson, the Treasury has testified that the benefits of percentage depletion have tripled since the original depletion provision was put into the law owing to the increase in the corporation tax and the personal income tax, is that not so?

General THOMPSON. You mean that they testified that, Congressman?

Mr. KEAN. Yes.

General THOMPSON. Well, I do not know whether you meant dollars or what.

Mr. KEAN. The corporation tax having increased so greatly since the bill was passed, the benefits to the taxpayer have tripled, dollarwise, since that time?

General THOMPSON. I would say that the cost would more than absorb any such difference. The cost of drilling has gone up so greatly, in other words. As I said awhile ago, it increases geometrically. You cannot get a contractor to work below 8,500 feet. It works against the little independent who is the fellow who finds the oil. They said yesterday that a little fellow can discover it and sell it to somebody. Why should he sell it? Why in a free nation could he not produce? All these companies were little at one time. The Texas Co. started in Texas, the Gulf Co. started in Texas and the Humble Co. started in Texas. Many big companies started there and why can we not keep an opportunity open for the little man today? Why say that he should sell out to somebody else? Let him grow and prosper to the wise and beneficent law you passed here. It is a wise law and gives a little man a chance to live.

Mr. CARROLL. I have just one question. You placed great stress upon the cost of drilling?

General THOMPSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. CARROLL. All that you testified to applies with greater force to the Rocky Mountain area?

General THOMPSON. Your costs in the Rocky Mountain area are terrific. Getting stuff up there costs as much as it does to drill a well in a lot of places.

Mr. CARROLL. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, General Thompson.

Uncle Sam Plays Santa Claus to the World, Lets the Native Indians Starve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN E. O'KONSKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. O'KONSKI. Mr. Speaker, the neglect and inefficiency by the Federal Government of the native American Indians is a blot on mankind. For a Government that dishes out billions to irresponsible governments and people the world over—the blot becomes a shame.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a series of articles by the Milwaukee Journal on this subject:

FOOD AND JOBS SCARCE FOR WISCONSIN INDIANS

(By Rod Van Every)

Most of the 14,000 Indians living in the progressive State of Wisconsin exist deep in degrading poverty.

No one has starved. Many are hungry. There is general malnutrition.

Serious illness is not apparent, but State statistics show that the Indian health record is far worse than the white's.

Most Indians are poorly but warmly clothed. The clothing comes from charities and surplus army warehouses.

Jobs are scarce. It was better in the black depression of the thirties.

L"ICKY HAVE PENSIONS

The lucky ones draw an old-age pension of $30 to $50 a month.

But still the diet is potatoes and bread, macaroni and rice, spaghetti and beans, potatoes and bread, maybe with some lard on it.

We're back now after 1,200 miles over old tote roads, crisp and crackling at 30 below; icy town roads, plowed too late; fast, dry highways with frost heaves that fling you through the air.

We're back to furnaces, television sets, orange juice, and hypertension.

But we wonder about the Winnebago woman near Wisconsin Dells. Her man had left her and the six children 2 weeks before. There were potatoes and bread for breakfast; potatoes, bread and bacon grease at noon. She had 50 cents. The woodpile was gone and the temperature then was 15 below zero. She had laughed as she said she guessed her

time had come. Her labor pains had started during the night. We'll have to telephone to the Dells and find out about the baby.

THIS WINTER IS "WORST"

And what about the old Chippewa woman at New Post on the Lac Court Oreilles (pronounced "Cooderay") Reservation? She had been lying ill in the shivery loft of her rickety home for many weeks. She was nearly blind, nearly deaf, and the pains hurt.

Everywhere the Indians say that this winter things are worse than in other years. Industrial conditions in the cities have tightened, and the Indian has lost his job. Right or wrong, most Indians believe they are the last to be hired by the white boss in good times and the first to be fired in bad. There is no doubt that prejudice against the Indian exists among the whites in cities and villages near Indian communities.

JOBS AND MONEY SCARCE IN WINTER

Except during World War II, winter economic conditions among the Indians have been bad, to one degree or another, for many, many years. There was work in the cities during the war, and many men left the reservations and Indian communities. Many more went in the Army, Navy and marines. Their departures relieved the pressure, and so did the pay checks they sent back.

Now, the Indian wage earner and his family are trekking from the cities to the reservation, back to the old folks, back to the only roof they can be sure of. Families double and triple up. It makes no difference that they are penniless now that the wonderful unemployment compensation has been used up. They are welcome, and there always is room for one more.

The summers are relatively kind to the Indians. There is work. There are the harvests to follow and the gardens to plant. Some men guide for fishermen at $10 or $12 a day. Women work at resorts. The sun is warm, and there is money. It is hard to remember that winter will come, as surely as tomorrow's sun.

HEALTH RECORD POOR

In the winter, there may be some pulpwood cutting, a little timber cutting, trapping, town work on roads and in woodlots to earn the relief food, odd jobs when you can find them. Depending on the locality, the women may work off and on while caring for the home and children at basket weaving, bead crafts and buckskin sewing. The white tourist will be outraged by the price, which, broken down, may have brought an Indian family a wage rate of 10 cents to 25 cents an hour.

The Indian health record in Wisconsin is far below that of whites, Indian service officials do not have readily available statistics—although Indian health is one of the service's prime functions—but they thought it was good.

"The Indians in Wisconsin have a better health service than the average white, believe it or not," said Jesse C. Cavill, general superintendent of the Great Lakes Consolidated Indian agency at Ashland, in charge of about 19,000 Indians in Wisconsin, upper Michigan, and Iowa.

Statistics of Dr. Allan Filek, of the State board of health show a different picture. They are for 1945–47. On a comparison with whites, the figures show that the Indian birth rate is slightly higher, infant deaths are two and one-half times higher (75 of every 1,000 Indian babies die in their first year, compared with 29 for the State as a whole).

PNEUMONIA TOLL HIGH

Indian mothers die at the rate of 2.9 per 1,000 live births, compared with 1.2 for white mothers; 94 of every 100,000 Indians die of pneumonia, compared with 34 whites; the Indian death rate from tuberculosis is six times that of whites, but the Indian death rate from heart disease, cancer, and cerebral hemorrhage is lower than that of the whites.

When the average citizen thinks about Indians, he often thinks in terms of a reservation. To many whites that means security, a free home, a comfortable dole, and happy year-around hunting and fishing.

The reservations were set up in treaty agreements. The Indians signed away vast, rich lands at low prices. They reserved certain lands for themselves—the reservations. The agreements also called for cash payments and other types of payments—teachers, blacksmiths, and agricultural assistance. Those agreements still are in force.

RESERVATION DOESN'T MEAN SNUG SECURITY

There is no security on an Indian reservation. You live there and your land is not taxed. You must pay all other State and Federal taxes. You must finance your own home, make your own living. You do not have to live there, but it is the only place to return in time of stress.

There is no dole. Because of some old treaties there may be a tiny cash payment once a year. In one instance it is 52 cents.

There is no Indian service appropriation for relief of Indians in Wisconsin. But the service spends about $713,000 in the State yearly. Some is for forestry practices, construction of roads and looking after the financial and land problems of reservation Indians. But much goes to the State and counties for Indian education, health, and hospitalization and boarding dependent children.

Hunting and fishing the year around? Just step out the back door of your shack and bag a deer? Drop a line and pull up a muskie? Not quite. Fish and game are no longer on the reservations in great numbers. You must walk many miles to kill a deer, and when the big snows come and the deer go deep into the swamps, it is very tough work, even on snowshoes, to find them.

RELIEF IS PUBLIC PROBLEM

Relief is handled on the town or county system, just as it is for whites. Some towns strongly resent the financial burden placed on them by down-and-out Indians, but at the same time make no objection to giving relief to whites. But the Indian has the same citizenship status as a white man, even though he may contribute little to the economy of the community.

George M. Keith, director of the division of public assistance of the State public welfare department, estimates that fewer than half of Wisconsin's Indians need some kind of financial or medical help. Over-all that figure might be right although Keith is asking all county welfare departments for exact figures. But on a reservation basis, the figure probably is low.

If a town or county is in such a bad financial situation that it can't take care of needy Indians and whites, it can get money from a special State emergency fund, just as the town of Sanborn in Ashland county has done. Forest and Florence Counties also are getting such help. Failure to request special funds is taken to mean that everything is all right.

LAC COURT OREILLES WORST

Conditions vary a lot from reservation to reservation, from community to community.

The worst is the Lac Court Oreilles Reservation, just like old Michael Wolf told the legisative subcommittee several weeks ago. Probably 1,000 Indians live there. It is hard to tell. Families come and go. There are deaths and births, slow to be recorded.

The Red River Reservation runs a close second. The Winnebago Indians, scattered from Wisconsin Dells to Black River Falls and as far east as Wittenberg, have no reservation. They are desperately poor. The Chippewas, on the beautiful lake-dotted Lac du Flambeau Reservation, are in somewhat better straits, and the Oneidas west of Green Bay, with no reservations, are about the same.

At the northernmost tip of Wisconsin is the Red Cliff Reservation, near Bayfield. Things are not too bad there. The Indian service says the Chippewas in Burnett, Polk, and Barron Counties, the Mole Lake (Forest County) Chippewas and the Potawatomis in Forest County are having a tough time. They were not visited. They are so few.

The aristocrat of the Wisconsin Indians is the Menominee. His reservation, heavily timbered, is near Shawano. There is a lumber mill, and regular wages. The white man's ax did not get a chance to whack off the miles and miles of towering white pine and hemlock. With selective logging, the timber will last for many years, perhaps forever. The Stockbridge Indians, neighbors of the Menominees, share some of their good fortune.

Indians live in many other places in Wisconsin. There are about 300, mostly Oneidas, working in Milwaukee County.

The Security and Strength of America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER D. ANGELL

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I include as a part of my remarks an article entitled "The Security and Strength of America" appearing in the current issue of Liberty, a magazine of religious freedom, by C. S. Longacre, an associate editor of the magazine, which is a most excellent discussion of the critical problem of the security and strength of our Nation facing us today. In considering this article it is worth while to have in mind the declaration of principles of the Religious Liberty Association, the publisher of this magazine, which are:

We believe in God, in the Bible as the word of God, and in the separation of church and state as taught by Jesus Christ; namely, that the church and the state have been placed side by side, each to work in its respective sphere (Matthew 22:21; John 18:36).

We believe that the Ten Commandments are the law of God, and that they comprehend man's whole duty to God and man.

We believe that the religion of Jesus Christ is comprehended in the principle of love to God and love to our fellowman, and thus this religion needs no human power to support or enforce it. Love cannot be forced.

We believe in civil government as divinely ordained to protect men in the enjoyment of their natural rights, and to rule in civil things, and that in this realm it is entitled to the respectful and willing obedience of all.

We believe it is the right and should be the privilege of every individual to worship or not to worship, or to change or not to change his religion, according to the dictates of his own conscience, but that in the exercise of this right he should respect the equal rights of others.

We believe that all legislation which unites church and state is subversive of human rights, potentially persecuting in character, and opposed to the best interests of the church and of the state; and therefore, that it is not within the province of human government to enact such legislation.

We believe it to be our duty to use every lawful and honorable means to prevent the

enactment of legislation which tends to unite church and state, and to oppose every movement toward such union, that all may enjoy the inestimable blessings of religious liberty.

We believe in the individual's natural and inalienable right of freedom of conscience, and the right to profess, to practice, and to promulgate his religious beliefs; holding that these are the essence of religious liberty.

We believe that these liberties are embraced in the golden rule, which says, "Whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them."

The following is the article to which I refer:

THE SECURITY AND STRENGTH OF AMERICA

(By C. S. Longacre)

What constitutes the real source of American security and strength? A British poet tells us in his graphic style what a state is not, and what really constitutes a state:

"What constitutes a state?
Not high-raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick walls or moated gate;
Not cities proud, with spires and turrets crowned,
Nor bays and broad-arm ports
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride;
Not starred and spangled courts,
Where low-browed baseness wafts perfume to pride—
No! Men, high-minded men,
With powers as far above dull brutes endued,
In forest, brake, or den,
As beasts excel cold rocks and brambles rude—
Men, who their duties know,
But know their rights; and knowing, dare maintain,
Prevent the long-aimed blow,
And crush the tyrant, while they rend the chain—
These constitute a state."

—*Sir William Jones.*

Many mighty nations with walled cities and moated gates, with splendid navies and thick-walled fortresses, with unrivaled armament and numberless soldiers, have gone down into defeat and passed into oblivion. Will our American Republic, which every true and loyal patriot loves so dearly, meet the same fate as did the world powers of Egypt, Assyria, Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome? There are certain tendencies operating in our Government, and unless they are checked and corrected the United States is headed for a similar fate.

The one and only hope of the American Republic's maintaining its unique position of true greatness, strength, and security lies in its preserving the ideals and fundamental principles of liberty, justice, equality of rights, equality of opportunity, individual initiative, the free exercise of the conscience in religious concerns, the separation of church and state, freedom of speech and the press, and the inalienable right of the individual to propagate his religious convictions without interference from the Government so long as he respects the equal rights of his fellow beings in the exercise of his God-given prerogatives. The moral sense and character of the American people constitute the greatest asset of our Republic, and as long as the majority of the people maintain the ideals upon which our forefathers founded our constitutional form of government, our heritage of liberty will be secure.

We hear that our greatest defensive weapon is the atomic bomb or the poison-gas bomb that can wipe out all the inhabitants of a large city within a few moments. There is no one who doubts or who belittles the fantastic, destructive power of these deadly weapons. But the security and strength of America is not found in the exclusive possession of these terrible instruments of destruction which, we are told, can wipe out whole nations.

We must never forget the divine admonition that "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle to the strong." "Except the Lord keep the city, the watchman waketh but in vain" There is nothing more deceptive, more misleading, or more dangerous to the security of any nation than for its people to put their trust in princes or in the son of man, in whom there is no help. But, as the psalmist says, "Happy is he whose hope is in the Lord his God." The strength of a nation lies not in its superior armaments but in its superior ideals and principles of government, reflected in the lives of its rulers and its people.

George Washington and a weak, ragged, impoverished army of the American Revolution demonstrated that fact in their conflict with superior forces. It is possible for a boomerang to smite the head of its hurler. The cause of right, however inferior in numerical strength, is mightier than the cause of wrong, however superior. What has made America so strong, prosperous, and invincible is the ideals, the virtues, and the faith and character of the rulers of the people who have believed in and protected the precious heritage of liberty and essential justice that is for all the people.

Liberties once surrendered are exceedingly difficult to regain. Eternal vigilance is the price that has to be paid for our security and our blood-bought liberties. Every citizen must view with alarm the first attempt to encroach upon our liberties and our inalienable rights. Our weakness and our danger lie in our apathy and indifference toward our American way of life. We are weak in the same proportion as we lose faith in the ideals upon which our Republic was founded and which have made us as a people a great and influential nation in a short period of time.

The greatness of America does not lie primarily in military strength, nor in American thrift and free enterprise, nor in economic soundness and reform legislation in the field of morals and religion; it lies rather in the strength and vitality of our ethical and spiritual ideals, promoted and fostered on a voluntary basis without governmental sanction and support. As long as the people of America place the conscience of the individual in all religious matters above the supremacy of the state, and safeguard the inalienable rights of the individual above the exercise of human authority in government, both the dignity and the safety of the individual and of the state will be maintained, and governmental stability will be insured. This is the only basis upon which liberty, peace, and security both for the individual and for the state can possibly be maintained.

Here the rulers are not the masters but the servants of the people. The actions of government officials may be freely criticized without reprisal. The right of dissent is sacredly guarded so long as the individual does not indulge in malicious libel or slander. Diversity of opinion, diversity of religious creed, diversity of political faith, and diversity in the practice and propagation of divergent views in religion and politics is the unique distinction between a republican and a totalitarian form of government. As long as ethical, moral, and spiritual standards function on a voluntary basis, without interference or molestation on the part of the government, religious freedom is safe.

For liberty to be secure, it must be so deeply engraved upon men's hearts that they would rather surrender their lives than to give it up. This love of liberty must be woven into the warp and woof of the fabric of the character of the people, or it will be lost—given up for promised gain or through fear of suffering.

Double Taxation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. TEAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to the attention of the members of the Ways and Means Committee and also to all the other Members of the House of Representatives an article which appeared in the Mexia Daily News, Mexia, Tex., regarding double taxation. I realize that our Ways and Means Committee is studying this problem of Federal revenue revision and I hope that serious consideration will be given to this matter of taxing both the profits of a corporation and the dividends which are paid out to the stockholders. This has proved to be a considerable drain on the small corporation and on the stockholders with their small investments.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I wish to include an article written by Mr. E. C. Deane, of the Mexia Daily News:

THE WAY IT SEEMS TO ME

(By E. C. Deane, editor)

Facts of life sometimes make a bitter pill that's mighty hard to swallow.

This is true whether we're fruit growers in California, fishermen in Massachusetts, newspapermen in Texas—or farmers anywhere.

Yesterday, on invitation of my friend Barney Davis, I had the pleasure of eating lunch with about 60 stockholders of the Mexia Production Credit Association. They're farmers and ranchers from Limestone, Freestone, and Leon Counties.

After lunch came a most informative talk on PCA achievements by a man from Houston. The achievements he outlined are things that PCA stockholders—and the general citizenship of Texas as well—can take pride in.

You see, Texas production credit associations have paid off their debts to Uncle Sam, who financed PCA originally. Texas is the first State in the Nation to attain this goal.

The PCA, it should be explained, is the organization set up by Uncle Sam to provide money on credit to farmers and ranchers for various approved operations.

While PCA was in debt to Uncle Sam, the association's profits were exempt from Federal taxes.

Now that the debt is paid off—and the association is owned solely by its stockholders—the association's profits are subject to Federal taxation just the same as those of any other corporation.

That's where the bitter pill came in yesterday—when the talk got around to Federal taxation on the association's profits.

One stockholder asked this question:

"If our association makes profits on its operations, and then splits up those profits into dividends for its stockholders, can't we charge off the dividends as operating expenses—won't that lower the Federal taxes on the profits?"

No, sir; explained the man from Houston, Uncle Sam takes his share of profits before you pay any dividends. In Uncle's eyes, dividends aren't counted as operating costs.

It doesn't take any genius in mathematics to figure that if Uncle dips his big hand into the association's profit pot, the dividends the stockholders get will be smaller as a result.

Well, asked another stockholder, Uncle Sam won't charge us individuals any personal income tax on dividends we might get from our association's profits, will he?

Oh, yes, sir; Uncle certainly will do that very thing, the man from Houston said.

That's double taxation, somebody suggested.

It sure is, said the man from Houston, adding "that's what a lot of corporations have been complaining about."

I wish Mr. Truman could have seen the looks on the faces of some of the PCA stockholders when that bitter pill went down.

Everybody who gets his hopes and his money invested in a corporation these days soon learns how bitter that pill of double taxation really is.

The sooner more of our citizens, newspaper men, housewives, farmers, city slickers, politicians, rich, poor, mild, and meek, get personally acquainted with this damnable evil of double taxation, the sooner we'll be rid of it.

Let nobody mistake me, please.

I feel just as concerned about the matter personally as those good farmers and ranchers did at that meeting yesterday.

I don't think stockholders of the PCA, who are anxious for their corporation to prosper and to pay them a return on their investments, are being treated right when they are hit by double taxation.

And I don't think we fellows who publish newspapers, or make peanut sacks, or sweat blood over any other little business, are being treated right, either. I wish I knew what to do about it, besides complain and pay.

If any of my New- and/or Fair-Deal friends think I'm taking a Republican or Dixiecrat attitude on this, I ask 'em to think again.

I consider myself a good Democrat, and a danged sight better one than a lot of jokers who are parading under its banner these days, promising everything to everybody and let the devil take the hindmost.

Lithuanian Independence Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, this thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian independence finds those who love the cause of liberty for this proud land cloaked in sorrow and anxiety. Lithuania, once a great kingdom extending from the Baltic to the Black Sea, now suffers the oppression of a foreign power.

The history of Lithuania for over 900 years has been the story of a nation fighting for freedom. Struggling against centuries of Polish and German and Russian rule, throughout the years the yearning grew ever stronger for a land of their own in which they could live in their own traditions and mold the future with their own hands.

In 1918, when the great nations of the world were exhausing themselves in a world war, the chance came; and their leaders seized the moment to declare their land a free and independent nation.

The two decades of independence that followed are as splendid as any period in Lithuania's rich history. She established a government based on the will of the people. She created an independent state as progressive and enlightened as any in the family of nations. International trade increased. A program of agrarian reform was inaugurated. Education and cultural pursuits multiplied in a free and prosperous land.

But just as its people were receiving the benefits of liberty, the Second World War broke out and almost at once Lithuania was overrun by first one invader and then another. At the close of hostilities and after a series of violations of national integrity seldom equalled since Napoleonic times Lithuania found itself annexed to the Soviet Union. In 1944 the iron curtain closed around her and the nation was cut off from the rest of the world.

However a passion of liberty as deep and vigorous as theirs is not to be crushed so easily. In the past 6 years we have received word of an almost superhuman struggle being fought to maintain their freedom under the smothering oppression of communism. Guerrilla warfare, stubborn civil resistance, and a determined refusal of the people to accept Russification has thwarted the Soviets at every turn. Few nations have fought so valiantly to resist the Communist power as have the Lithuanian people.

But in the past year we have also heard of the savage methods invoked by the conquerors to stamp out this attempt at freedom and individuality. Mass deportations to the interior have drained the population away. Punishment and retaliation are imposed on those who resist the collectivization programs. The most brutal methods of the dictatorial state are being invoked to bring about conformity and submission.

And yet it is right that we are commemorating this anniversary of independence today. Thirty-two years ago, the people of Lithuania did more than establish a new government. In their declaration of independence, they set forth a solemn dedication of a courageous people to the principles of liberty. And it is this spirit, so sorely tried today, which we honor.

Lithuania has been conquered before but never for good. Today she lives only in the hearts of her sons and daughters, and with the freedom-loving people of the world, but we must look forward to the day when her representatives will again join us as equals around the world's conference tables.

For the present we have certain responsibilities. We must keep her name alive and we must strengthen her people's faith in a future of freedom ahead. We must continue America's refusal to recognize the Soviet claims to this land; and we must extend our sympathy and support to the Free-Lithuanian legations in this country.

Above, all we must do everything within our power to strengthen the United Nations until it becomes a world agency of such influence that such brutal subjugation of small nations will not be tolerated, and the rights and traditions of the Lithuanian people will again be recognized and respected in the family of nations.

Lithuania's Independence

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include herein an address which I delivered at the anniversary of Lithuania's independence, St. Francis Church Parish Hall, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 12, 1950. This annual affair sponsored by Rev. Father Francis M. Juran, pastor, was very well attended and many enlightening and educational addresses were delivered by the able and capable speakers on the program.

The address follows:

Friends of freedom, we meet, not in celebration, but to recall the days when your homeland belonged to you and not to strangers, when men and women were happy at their work, and fear did not walk in the night.

From these recollections of better times, we fortify our determination to rescue this world from the evil which threatens it, so that no man or nation shall be the downtrodden slave of another.

It is fitting that this anniversary should begin with religious ceremonies for the great struggle going on in this world is between those who believe in God and the dignity of man, and those who would destroy the last best hope in human life.

The only effective resistance to the red terror in Lithuania and other countries behind the iron curtain is centered in the clergy and the faithful. We are pained when we think of the sufferings endured by Archbishop Stepinac and Cardinal Mindzenty and a host of lesser martyrs. We grieve for the millions of your countrymen who sacrificed their lives rather than yield to the Fascist and Communist barbarians.

But this terrible price is a warning to us, telling us that we must wake up before it is too late. Communism is the anti-Christ that will not be satisfied until it has the whole world in chains to satisfy the power lust of a few men. It is clever, it is without conscience, and it is working at its diabolical conspiracy night and day.

And the pity is that some otherwise good people are deceived by its sugar-coated falsehoods.

This is the supreme danger.

This is what we must guard against with unceasing vigilance.

If the tide of communism is to be stopped and rolled back, it must be done with superior faith and intelligence.

Already it has a large part of the world in its grip. It has economic and military power, but these things we can see and measure and offset by security provisions of our own making.

We know, also, that we must work to improve our own society; to encourage production and full employment; to provide security for the individual in time of sickness, disability, and old age; to open up greater opportunities for all so that, by example, we prove that freedom offers the highest material advantages.

But man does not live by bread alone.

He has a mind and a soul.

If these can be enslaved all is lost.

The Communists understand this. If they can first confuse a man by causing him to

lose faith in himself and in his God, the rest is easy.

This is one of the prime objectives of their propaganda.

This is what they are trying to do within the United States. By spreading false rumors they try to arouse antagonism among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews. They try to set race against race, knowing that if they can break down our tolerance and our unity, and get us to fight among ourselves, they can seize control in the resulting chaos.

They even tried to disrupt our economy by working their way into key posts among a few labor unions, but American labor leaders exposed this conspiracy and quickly eliminated these treasonable elements.

Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, estimates that there are close to half a million Communists in this country. Of course, they are not so proud as to identify themselves, but I can assure you that the FBI is not asleep on the job. Once they transgress the law the Communists find themselves in trouble.

But there is no law against what appears to be harmless gossip, and that is where you and I have a job to do. Stop any rumor in its tracks, refrain from criticizing any race or creed, and we will be helping to stall the "divide-and-conquer" strategy of the Reds before it gets started.

Remember that the day-to-day practice of democracy is the way to strengthen it.

Perhaps most of us had the good fortune to be born in the United States. We are apt to take our blessings for granted because we do not know what it is to be deprived of them. If we did know the dark side of the picture we would be more earnest in our devotion to the Christian-democratic standards of our society because we would really appreciate them.

In this audience today, there are some displaced persons who have escaped from the Red terror. With their own eyes they have seen churches despoiled and homes violated, freedom of conscience and freedom of thought crushed by a brutal power that knows no law but that of its own appetite.

These victims have escaped to a land where, in spite of minor imperfections, the state is the servant and not the master of human life. Where men deal with one another as men and not as animals. Where men have faith in God and in one another and are encouraged to develop their talents without fear.

I have talked with some of these displaced persons and I have seen how difficult it is for them to believe that the freedoms we enjoy are a fact, and not some trap to ensnare them. So vivid is their recollection of oppression that they had almost lost all hope.

I have been humbled as I listened to them and watched the pathos in their eyes as they seemed to plead for reassurance that this freedom of ours is not a bubble that might burst.

It will not, if we listen to them and learn from their experience that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty.

I am sure that, as they become citizens, they will become better than those who never had to earn it. In so doing they will help to rouse many from the complacency which unintentionally allowed communism to undermine so many other countries.

Thirty-two years ago, the people of Lithuania declared their independence. For the next 22 years, the young republic surged with joyous effort, and the liberated people accomplished more during that time than at any other generation in their history.

Then the darkness came, first from one side and then from the other, until Lithuania was forcibly taken over by the Soviet Union. Since then, more than 50 percent of the Catholic clergy has been annihilated by the ruthless conquerors. In 1948 alone, more than 200,000 civilians were sent as slave laborers to Siberia.

The United States Government has never recognized the annexation of Lithuania and its incorporation into the Soviet Union. And I am sure that it never will.

There are holes in the iron curtain, tiny though they may be. Even if Russia had 50,000,000 troops, they could not stifle the religious zeal and sturdy independence of the Lithuanian people. They have outlived other tyrannies and their spirit will finally prevail over those who now oppress them.

The news that leaks through to us tells of brave resistance. The one thing that the Communists fear above all else is the truth. They realize that if people get to know each other as fellow human beings, the fabric of lies upon which communism is built will topple like a house of cards.

The hydrogen bomb could kill millions of people, but it is the truth that will finally win. And the truth put to work now could immobilize this hideous weapon of destruction and all others like it.

Eventually, the free peoples of the world will get their message through the iron curtain, even to the people of Russia, and then they too will rise up against these who keep them in bondage.

The light is dim in Lithuania, but it has not been extinguished.

It glows in every Lithuanian heart where the Communists cannot reach it. It glows in their resistance. It glows as they think of the United States and its fine Lithuanian citizens who have not forgotten their homeland.

It is prophetic that Lithuanians and non-Lithuanians assemble on this day to share in our mutual dedication to the cause of freedom. For this is the birthday of the Great Emancipator, Abraham Lincoln.

He led the fight to free the slaves just as we must exert ourselves to keep the light of freedom burning brightly until it illuminates the whole world. Then Lithuania will be herself once more and we will meet again to celebrate the rebirth of her independence with hearts overflowing with joy.

February 16, 1918, is a date whose anniversary will be celebrated in festival and song throughout Lithuania, when black fear is lifted from the earth.

That happy time may be nearer than we dare to think.

Food Prices

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. REID F. MURRAY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, an article in the Sunday Star includes the following sentence:

But the nutritionists don't like the milk situation. They said less whole milk and cream were being used for the fifth consecutive year and this was reducing the amount of calcium in the American diet.

Calcium is a mineral people need for teeth, bone, and other body equipment.

With constantly less milk produced per capita for year after year it is not surprising that the nutritionists are worried. The subsidizing of vegetable oil substitutes that have infiltrated into the dairy-products business is constantly making this situation more serious.

Good News From RFC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, this morning's papers announce that the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has ordered foreclosure on the $37,500,000 loans to the Lustron Corp., of Columbus, Ohio.

The RFC is to be commended for this action. No matter what will be lost through foreclosure proceeding, one rat hole down which the taxpayers' money has been slipping will be plugged. On January 14, I received a letter from Mr. Carl G. Strandlund, enclosing certain "Facts About Lustron."

An analysis of the facts, shows that on each Lustron home built up to December 1949, the loss, which was the cause of the foreclosure, amounted to $9,403.85 per home. The analysis of Lustron's operating losses follows:

LUSTRON CORP.'S LATEST ALIBI

Lustron Corp., of Columbus, Ohio, borrowed $37,500,000 from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation. The loans were made over a period of 2½ years, starting from June 30, 1947.

As of October 29, 1949, principal in the amount of $22,000,000 was in default, and with but a small amount of cash on hand the corporation was unable to meet its obligations to RFC as agreed.

MR. STRANDLUND'S LETTER

Under date of January 14, 1950, Mr. Carl G. Strandlund, president of Lustron Corp., addressed a letter to each Member of Congress, stating:

"In order to help clarify the conflicting stories about Lustron and its operations, I am glad to attach a summary statement outlining the financial status of Lustron Corp. at the present time."

Analysis of the financial data accompanying Mr. Strandlund's letter reveals that the financial status of Lustron, as of November 30, 1949, was as follows:

Assets:	
Cash	$1,603,356.43
Accounts receivable	916,950.25
Inventories, material, etc.	3,039,042.96
Machinery and equipment	14,360,381.62
Cash deposits, etc.	471,787.59
Total	20,391,518.85
Liabilities:	
RFC loan	37,500,000.00
Current accounts payable	538,480.59
Capital stock	[1] 841,000.00
Total	38,879,480.59
Apparent deficit	18,487,961.74

[1] Represents income from stock sales. Mr. Strandlund reportedly received 86,000 shares, par value, of the capital stock for himself and wife, on an original cash investment of $1,000.

In the Facts About Lustron it is stated that shipments of houses to 35 States, Alaska, and Venezuela totaled 1,952, and that 14 completed houses were in inventory. Since when have the American taxpayers been financing the production of houses for

Venezuela? No explanation was included in the facts.

Receipts from customers shown at $11,206,044.06, indicates that the houses produced were sold for an average of $5,740 each.

The deficit from operation, distributed on the basis of houses produced indicates an average loss on each house of $9,403.85.

A former chief accountant for the Government, in reading the Strandlund letter and accompanying facts, said:

"This appears to be a compilation intended to confuse and deceive the Members of Congress."

Lustron is being operated with less than 3 percent private capital and more than 97 percent of Federal funds. The plant leased by the corporation was built during the war at a cost of over $28,000,000.

Here is a chance to trim operation loot by denying more Federal funds to Lustron.

A Community Sorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include a eulogy delivered by Archbishop Richard J. Cushing, of the archdiocese of Boston, Mass., at the solemn high funeral requiem mass for Mrs. Mary Curley Donnelly and Leo Curley, daughter and son of our former colleague, the Honorable James M. Curley, who also served as mayor of the city of Boston on several occasions, and Governor of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I know that each and every one of us share the feelings expressed by Archbishop Cushing in his expression of sympathy on this occasion.

A tragedy such as that which has befallen James Michael Curley transcends any political, personal, or other private considerations. It immediately becomes a community sorrow and the hearts of all, without any possible exception, go out to the devoted father of a family so suddenly, so overwhelmingly visited by the angel of death.

I am conscious that I speak for all our citizens, for every class and condition of persons in the community, when I pause for these few minutes before the final absolutions of the church are given to speak a word of Christian comfort to the bereaved father of Mary and Leo Curley, to their relatives and their friends.

Chosen by our city as its mayor on numerous occasions thoughout his long life, chosen by the people of the commonwealth as their governor, elected to other offices in both local and national political life, the chief mourner in the tragedy of the Curley family has more than once demonstrated personal qu..lities which have endeared him to millions in moments of good fortune and which have enabled him manfully to bear adversity in seasons less propitious.

Never has Jim Curley more genuinely won the hearts of his neighbors, however, than in those hours, recent and remote, when death has visited his family. On these occasions, past and present, he has inspired us all with the firmness of his personal faith in the promise of our Blessed Lord that with those who die in Him life is only changed, it is not taken away; for with the dissolution of the earthly body of our mortality, a new and eternal dwelling place is opened up to the souls of all who love God and believe in His Christ.

That conviction, guaranteed by Christian faith, argued by sound reason, confirmed by the experience of the devout heart, must be the consolation of Mayor Curley as he gives back to God two more of the children to whom he has been so affectionate a father.

I want to say to him this morning that everyone, everyone whose mind believes in divinity and whose heart beats with humanity, is grateful to him for the example of faith and fortitude which he has given in the face of death. In this he has taught a truly inspiring lesson to a generation so often feeble in that faith or too selfish, too ungenerous to accept death in its proper perspective.

More than one person has said to me in the last 2 days that Mayor Curley had spoken in the spirit of Holy Job himself in the public pronouncements which he made when it must have been so difficult for him to speak for public ears out of the heart of his private, personal grief.

I want him to know that we are all grateful for his demonstration, under difficult circumstances, of the truth that the Christian, confronted with tragedy, must not languish in fruitless and unavailing grief, nor sorrow as those who have no hope. Rather, he must take the loss of his loved ones as itself a passing thing, a necessary condition of their own salvation in God and of his eternal reunion with them in the land where sin and sorrow have no part.

Meanwhile, the firm believer, even through his tears, will look meekly up to God, the God of all consolation. He will not be ashamed of his tears of human grief, but he will know how to transmute these tears into something much more precious, into prayers to almighty God that God may grant these children, their souls, and all the souls of the faithful departed, eternal pardon, peace, and life. Through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Triangular Margarine Tangle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. REID F. MURRAY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, this news item from the Washington News indicates that our oleo friends do not wish to sell their product as oleo. The reason they give for their dislike of the triangle is just as phony as was their experiments that didn't prove what they claimed to be proven. The claim of costs of a triangle cutting machine is ridiculous. Why should a machine cost more to make triangles than squares?

The following is the article:

TRIANGULAR MARGARINE TANGLE

House-Senate conferees are deadlocked on margarine tax repeal bill. Majority of Senate group—TAFT, MILLIKIN, BYRD—is holding out for amendment which would force all yellow margarine to be made triangular before sale. Majority of House group opposes this. Next conference is scheduled for February 20, more than a month after Senate passage of the bill.

Some margarine people say they'd rather have Federal law as it is, tax and all, than have to buy new machinery to make triangular margarine.

Our oleo friends evidently show their hand. They do not want any law or any regulation that would disturb the process of passing off oleo as butter.

Asia's Challenge to Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, in the New York Times magazine for last Sunday there appeared an article by Raymond B. Fosdick, containing some very sage observations in regard to why things have gone so wrong for us in China. In the article Mr. Fosdick makes some interesting and, I think, well-considered recommendations as to the future. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ASIA'S CHALLENGE TO US—IDEAS, NOT GUNS

(By Raymond B. Fosdick)

No one can begin to understand what is happening in the Far East today without an appreciation of the vast revolutionary forces that are on the march in Asia. From Manchuria to Indonesia, from the Mediterranean basin eastward to the south Pacific, explosive ideas have awakened millions of people from an age-old fatalism. For these millions a new faith has been born that poverty and misery are not the unavoidable attributes of human life, and that disease, flood, and famine can be controlled. A rice bowl that is never full enough, an intolerable system of land tenure, illiteracy and ignorance, a life expectancy of 25 or 30 years—it is against these conditions that the floods have risen.

In this upheaval which is long overdue, the old lethargy and acceptance of the inevitable on the part of the masses has been supplanted by a belief that an era of wider justice and greater abundance lies ahead, and by a determination to follow those leaders who promise to guide them there.

This revolutionary movement is not only an economic awakening; it is a social and political awakening as well. It is rooted in rebellion against colonialism; it is linked to a passionate nationalism, to an ambition for freedom and independence and sovereignty that will not be denied. This is the tide that proved to the British the wisdom of withdrawing from India and Burma, and that led to the separation of Indonesia from Dutch control. This is the tide, too, that threatens the half-measures with which the French have tried to stem it in Indochina.

These revolutionary forces which have been unleashed in Asia go back at least to the opening of the century. They precede the bid by Russia for the political hegemony of the continent. In China they were beginning to stir before Sun Yat-sen vitalized them into overt rebellion. In India they were moving under the surface before Gandhi whipped them into flame. Slowly and irresistibly they have been growing over the years, occasionally smothered by military force, sometimes betrayed by their own leaders, often thwarted by the inexperience and ineptitude of the people

themselves, but in the end rising in a flood of protest and demand which has inundated the continent.

It is a tragic misconception to think of this mighty movement as inspired solely by communism, and thus to try to write it off as a tactic in the cold war. What has happened is that the Communists have captured the revolution, or are in danger of capturing it; but the revolution itself, and all that it stands for, stem far back to ideas and principles which we here in the United States helped launch in the world. For our Nation was born in revolution, and the echo of our trumpet, sounding around the globe, has brought the walls of kingdoms crashing down.

The concept of liberty, equality, and fraternity of the French Revolution was forwarded by our example, and for 175 years governments and charters have been patterned from our design. Resistance to tyranny is in our blood, and the right of people to throw off alien yokes and build themselves up into sovereign nationhood is the tradition we live by.

Always in our thinking and often in our action we have identified ourselves with the sufferings and aspirations of our neighbors overseas. Our sympathies instinctively and ineradicably are with the underdog. We do not like to see big people push little people around. When the Latin-American countries revolted against Spain we erected a Monroe Doctrine as a shield against other European attempt to reenslave them. When Napoleon III was overthrown in 1870 we recognized the Third French Republic within 48 hours. When the Spanish monarchy was upset by revolt 3 years later our minister at Madrid, on instructions from the State Department, paid his respects to the new republic the day after its proclamation.

We gave asylum to Kossuth and Carl Schurz and to the leaders of revolution in foreign lands, including those from Imperial Russia. The Chinese revolution of 1911 under Sun Yat-sen stirred the imagination of America, and although we resented the anti-American features of the second revolution of 1926, China's attempts to become a modern state had our complete sympathy.

This is not solely our tradition; it is, of course, the tradition of the western world, but our example and precept have helped mightily in its building and shaping. Over decades our missionaries and teachers in the Far East, Protestant and Catholic alike, have been telling the story of Lincoln and Washington and the faith that sustained them. Our textbooks and our courses of instruction in scores of schools throughout the area have spelled out the inalienable privileges of liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and the right of people to govern themselves. It is not without significance that when the Allied troops took over the area in September 1945, they found the streets of cities like Saigon and Batavia plastered with mottoes taken from the Declaration of Independence and the writings of Jefferson and Lincoln.

In brief, the revolution in Asia is rooted in western traditions. In a real sense, it is our revolution with which American sympathies and creative capacity ought now to be actively identified. Instead of that, communism has moved in to take the initiative away from us. It has appropriated both the economic and the political goals of the revolution, so that when we attempt—as we should—to discover workable methods by which the imperialistic designs of Russian communism can be contained, we find ourselves in the unhappy position of seeming to oppose some of the objects of the revolution which, because they are flesh of our flesh, should have our complete understanding and support.

This is the bitter aspect of our dilemma, and it comes to a tragic climax in China. Here is a great and sturdy people to whom over the years we have felt ourselves intimately bound, and whose struggles with internal and external handicaps and foes have compelled our admiration and often our assistance. From the days of John Hay, and even before, we have felt it a duty and a privilege to serve as a friend and a protector of China's welfare and integrity. Today we are regarded by the new regime and millions of its followers as their enemy No. 1, and we are execrated over large areas of the country. Even Great Britain, whose occupation of Hong Kong has long symbolized to the Chinese all that was evil and sinister in imperialism, now appears in almost friendly guise in comparison with the United States.

It is easy to say that the Communists did it with their propaganda, and certainly the Communists have had their fair share in producing the result. But it is an oversimplification to pin the responsibility on the cleverness of Mao Tse-tung and his associates alone. America has herself played a part in forfeiting her own position in China, because she has not understood the desperate character of the economic situation and the mounting determination of influential segments of the Chinese to get on with the revolution.

For example, we have lost our hold on a large part of the intellectual class and practically the whole of the student population, people who were brought up on our ideas in institutions which we supported. They have gone over to communism because it, rather than the Western democracy, appears to them to be the more promising vehicle for accomplishing the objectives of the revolution. Many of them do not like communism, particularly its freedom-curbing, thought-control aspects, but for the moment at least, in their minds, it offers the most effective means of ridding the nation of its colonial backwardness, and making it strong and self-reliant.

We are shutting our eyes to the realities of the complete picture when we think of China as another Czechoslovakia, or talk about "acquiescence by rifle butt." There is undoubtedly an element of truth in this characterization, but it is based on inadequate perspective. From many unimpeachable sources in China—business, missionary, and governmental—the reports are coming that in the desperate thinking of millions of people communism represents a new hope, a chance for escape from incredible poverty, a promise of dignity and independence for the nation. We cannot shrug off this development, and if in our perplexity we turn our backs on it, we do so at our peril.

But how did we lose our position in China? Why do we seem to be so hated by large elements in a nation which we still admire and still desire earnestly to help? The question has no single or simple answer, and the situation is streaked with controversy. The vast war-weariness of the Chinese people undoubtedly reacted against what seemed to be the efforts of the United States to keep the war going. As has been indicated, Communist propaganda, probably inspired from Moscow, also played its insidious role. But a gross error of judgment on our part, based on an ignorance of the forces that were moving in China, gave the Communists an opening which they have been quick to exploit.

That error of judgment was our continued support of Chiang Kai-shek long after he had lost the confidence of all classes of the people of China, Communists and non-Communists alike. Chiang is undoubtedly a perplexing character to understand. Ambassador Leighton Stuart, who is his friend, describes him as "a completely sincere and completely mistaken man." Our own difficulties with him have been thoroughly documented in the white paper issued by the State Department last July.

It is not, however, what we think of Chiang that counts, but rather what the Chinese think of him. To them, or to most of them, he has betrayed the revolution. He has forgotten all about its objectives—the economic and social reforms involved in the platform of Sun Yat-sen: the correction of the odious land-tenure system, the agricultural rehabilitation, the schools that were to be built, the clinics that were to be established. Whether the judgment is just or unjust, Chiang and his government have become a symbol of reaction and moral bankruptcy.

It is this disillusionment which has been one of the potent influences in driving the progressive elements of the country into the Communist ranks. There has been no other alternative; and between Chiang and the Communists the latter, in spite of their ties with the unpopular Russians, seemed to promise far more for the future of China. In brief, to use the phrase of the Chinese, Chiang has "lost the mandate of Heaven." Expressed in our idiom, Chiang is through. Indeed, in the opinion of the Chinese, as it has come to us from many creditable and objective sources, he has been through for 4 years or more.

But we here in the United States refused to admit it, and we went ahead with the business of trying to restore the sovereignty of a discredited regime to an obviously reluctant nation. Our persistent military assistance to Chiang, of which the chief item was the $125,000,000 voted against General Marshall's advice by the Eightieth Congress, was worse than futile. To the legions of Chinese who were our friends and wanted to remain our friends, it seemed to be the final and conclusive proof of the Communist assertion that by standing behind this reactionary regime, America was herself betraying the revolution.

The British, far wiser in this matter than we were, stayed aloof from this ill-starred attempt to bolster Chiang's tottering rule—and so did all the other powers. Our unilateral action not only cost us the support of a substantial fraction of liberal opinion in China but has had unfortunate repercussions in southeast Asia as well. It has alined us in popular opinion with the maintenance of the status quo rather than with the forces making for a new Asia. It has awakened suspicions that we regard the people of Asia as pawns in a chess game with Russia, and that their advancement and welfare are secondary to our considerations of strategic interest.

No program in Asia today has meaning or promise which does not integrate itself with the struggle of the common people for a better life. As far as American relations with Asia are concerned, one, and only one, door is open to the future: we must identify ourselves with the just and humane purposes of this revolution, and make them our own. They are part of the heritage which the democratic West has given to the East, and they do not belong in the hands of those who would use them for devious purposes.

Our task is clearly defined, although the techniques to be employed are not yet wholly in hand. That task is to make sure, as far as we can, that the aspirations of the people of Asia for freedom and justice and more abundant living have a fair chance. We must prove to the East our traditional concern for the deprived people of the world and the sincerity of our desire to be of help. We have the skills and technology, the cultural values and ideals, to make us the friend and counselor of revolutionary Asia. What we must now demonstrate is that we have the determination and vision to use them.

That is why point 4—an unemasculated point 4—is of such vital significance to our far-eastern policy. It is a positive declaration of our faith in mankind and a practical application of that faith to underdeveloped

areas. It clears the way for a new approach. It gives us our most effective weapon in halting the spread of communism. For communism grows in tissues made gangrenous by disease, poverty, and exploitation, and the cause of the malady does not readily respond to a therapy of guns and tanks.

Of course, the United States by itself cannot underwrite the ambitions of Asia for a better life. In a sense, no outside nation or group of nations can underwrite them. The initiative and leadership must come from the Asians themselves. As Secretary Acheson said, we can help only where we are wanted and only where the conditions of help are sensible and possible. But acting on this principle, the Commonwealth nations at the Colombo conference have already taken a realistic step in relation to Burma, and we have demonstrated through the ECA how effective and revolutionary rural reconstruction work can be in China. These various efforts must be coordinated; this is a conception which requires team play and the pooling of resources in terms both of money and of men. Many nations and agencies will collaborate in the undertaking—particularly the United Nations with its world-wide contacts—and private capital will share in the enterprise.

The idea behind point 4 is to prime the pump, to get people into a position where they can help themselves. There are pilot plants to be developed, rural areas to be built up, an agricultural economy to be modernized, schools to be built, hospitals and medical care to be established, local personnel to be trained in the creation of adequate governmental civil services. Let us not minimize the quality of patience required in the undertaking, or the paucity of tested methods for dealing with it. The concept is daring and bold, and it requires imagination and courage to back up our belief that men are capable of planning and achieving a better life.

But what has all this to do with China? Probably very little at the moment, except as our example in the countries of southeast Asia, and in Korea, Japan, and the Philippines starts a genuine rehabilitation in the people's interest which reverberates through the entire continent. If we can help to demonstrate in countries like Siam and Indonesia and Korea that we are alive to the dangers of a world half prosperous and half slum, the news of what we do there will flow back into China like a refreshing tide.

As far as the Chinese Government is concerned, difficult days undoubtedly face us, and no one can foresee the pattern of events. It is to the advantage of the Communist regime to maintain the specter of American hostility in order to keep popular sentiment at white heat against capitalist imperialism. This gives them the opportunity to charge us with the responsibility for their mistakes and failures, as well as for the hardships which will undoubtedly harass the Chinese people in the months ahead. To the extent that we blindly accept this role of hostility we play into the hands of the Communists. Whether there is among the Chinese people a reservoir of good-will toward America which can outlast the attempts of their Government to drain it, remains to be seen. But no provocative acts on our part should help them drain it.

Certainly through missions and schools, through commercial and cultural exchange, through the United Nations, we should keep open the channels of ideas and influence, to the extent that the Communist regime will permit and we ourselves consider desirable.

And there is one other service we can render. Because of our long historic relationship in which we have consistently championed the territorial integrity of China—and no one knows this better than the Chinese themselves—we are in an excellent position to point out to her the danger she runs in involving herself in the ambitious design of the U. S. S. R.

That design, cloaked in the beguiling promises of Marxism, stems directly from the old Czarist policy of territorial aggrandizement. It is a type of imperialism far more lethal to national hopes than anything which the people of Asia have thus far suffered. It is the kiss of death to the political and economic independence and freedom to which the Chinese aspire. What is happening in Manchuria and Outer Mongolia is a palpable example of Russian intentions. The relationship between China and the U. S. S. R. is in its honeymoon stage, but it does not take a prophet to foretell the disillusionment which lies ahead.

This we can bring home to China as an old and loyal friend who wishes her well, and whose hopes for her future are genuine and deep, even though we believe that her present alliance is for her, and for the free world to which she belongs, a tragic mistake.

What confronts us is a war not with armaments but with ideas. It is a war to determine which of two systems is really dedicated to the people's welfare, and which of the two, in terms of concrete results, is better adapted to promote it. We must prove to the nations of Asia that in their struggle for freedom and for a fairer share of the rewards of labor and the good things of life, western democracy can offer them far more in the way of understanding and championship than can communism. Only as we carry this demonstration to a successful conclusion, and make these hopes come alive, can we recapture the initiative which communism has gained.

Those who talk of arms and a display of power as the principal counters in the game misunderstand what the game is about. Arms undoubtedly have their place, but we are up against a set of ideas, and ideas cannot be stopped with bombs or battleships. The only way to beat an idea is with a better idea, and that better idea has got to be an idea that works.

It is our high faith here in America that we have that better idea. Over long years we have proved it to ourselves. We now have the chance to prove it to Asia.

Is the A & P Suit in the Public Interest?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 16 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have included in the RECORD the very timely and interesting discussion entitled "Is the A & P Suit in the Public Interest," which was recently presented on the American Forum of the Air by Theodore Granik, founder and moderator. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] ably presented the question in the affirmative and the negative side of the issue was equally well taken by Carl Byoir, public relations counsel for the A & P Co.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Senator O'MAHONEY. Bigness itself is not a crime, Mr. Granik. I would not pretend to say when business is too big. The description of the difference between bigness in business which is good for the public and bigness which is bad was best made by the only man in the history of the United States who ever served both as President of the United States and Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. I quote from William Howard Taft.

"If they use no other inducement than the constant low price of their product and its quality to attract custom, and their business is a profitable one, they violate no law. But if they attempt by a use of their preponderating capital and by a sale of their goods temporarily at unduly low prices to drive out of business their competitors, or if they attempt by exclusive contracts with their patrons and threats of nondealing except upon such contracts or by other methods of a similar character to use the largeness of their resources and the extent of their output compared with the total output as a means of compelling custom and frightening off competition, then they disclose a purpose to restrain trade, and to establish a monopoly and violate the act."

That is what William Howard Taft said to the Congress of the United States. It is the basis of this suit.

Chairman GRANIK. Mr. Byoir, do you want to answer Mr. TAFT or Mr. O'MAHONEY?

Mr. BYOIR. I think I would rather answer Mr. O'MAHONEY. Because I can see that the Senator, who in my book has been one of the great liberals in the United States over a long period of years, has been listening to the Antitrust Division, because the Senator through all those years has never made any bones of the fact that he thinks that big business is too big. He hasn't maintained it was criminal, but he has maintained that it was too big and that something ought to be done about it.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You have not listened to me. I have never said it was too big.

Mr. BYOIR. I will quote you for 2 hours and 40 minutes——

Chairman GRANIK. Not today; we are not in the United States Senate.

Mr. BYOIR. About big business being too big and the concentration of assets and 7 percent of the companies, and how many they employed.

Senator O'MAHONEY. But that is a very different matter.

Mr. BYOIR. I don't want to get away from this. I am perfectly in accord with the idea that no American business should be allowed to grow big by the violation of any law—State, Federal, or local.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why not accept the injunction in which the Department of Justice seeks merely to restrain you from doing the things again of which your company was convicted?

Mr. BYOIR. Let's look at that. The antitrust laws are very vague laws. They don't tell you, like the automobile law, that you must not pass a stop light or that you mustn't go 40 miles an hour. They say, in effect, you must not drive an automobile in an improper manner. So you don't know whether you are violating the antitrust laws in many cases—and you can ask all the lawyers in the United States—until some court has told you what the law is. The Antitrust Division——

Senator O'MAHONEY. The court of appeals has told you what the law is.

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It has found you guilty of coercion. It has found you guilty of blacklisting. It has found you guilty of unduly low prices to drive out competition, and then fixing prices after you have driven it out.

Chairman GRANIK. You don't agree with the charge that the real basis of the attack on the A & P is the Government's theory that it has been able to undersell competitors?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Not at all, not at all. If A & P will abandon these practices and

undersell competitors only by efficient methods, believe me the Department of Justice wouldn't have a leg to stand on, and no attorney general would bring a suit, but that is not the case. In this Danville case in which the A & P was found guilty, and which it appealed to the circuit court of appeals, there was a unanimous decision rendered by that court of appeals, a fine of $175,000 was assessed, the A & P paid the fine, and now the Department of Justice says, "Let's not have any more offenses of this kind." Why doesn't the A & P accept that injunction?

Mr. BYOIR. Wait a minute, Joe. Let's get the story straight and the record straight. The story of the Danville trial is not the whole story of the A & P and the Antitrust Division.

Senator O'MAHONEY. How about——

Chairman GRANIK. Let him finish.

Mr. BYOIR. The identical case that was tried at Danville was brought on originally in Dallas, Tex., and in the sworn statement of the representatives of the Antitrust Division it was identically the same case. In that case the judge said that even if they proved everything they alleged, there was no violation of the law. So the Government appealed to the circuit court, and two circuit court judges said, "This is vague, it is inflammatory, but you can go back to Dallas. There is enough to have a trial about."

One circuit judge said, "It is no good. There ought not even to be a trial. There is nothing here that violates the law." So we went back to Dallas, Joe. I think we ought to obey the circuit court. The court said, "In conformity with what the circuit court has decided, we are striking out this inflammatory matter and we are asking the Government to tell the defendants what they are charged with."

The court gave them 75 days to bring in that bill of particulars, and it hasn't been delivered yet. They went into court and dismissed their own suit.

Chairman GRANIK. Maybe you will get it now.

Mr. BYOIR. This time they said all the judges are wrong, the three circuit judges and the district judge.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I ask a question?

Mr. BYOIR. Let me tell you one more thing.

Senator O'MAHONEY. All right.

Mr. BYOIR. The peculiar advantage that these people have. With all the power of all the people of the United States, which ought to be used carefully against American citizens, they could look all over the United States for any judge that they thought agreed with their theories about what the Congress meant when it said you must not restrain trade. They went up to Dallas, and there was a judge who didn't throw it out, but, Joe, he didn't bring in any such decision as you say.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's ask the Senator what Congress meant.

Mr. BYOIR. Yes, let's see what the judge said. I have it right here.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Here is your story, sir. Assuming that everything that you have said about Dallas is absolutely correct, you must acknowledge that what I have said about Danville, Ill., and the circuit court of appeals' decision is correct.

Mr. BYOIR. No.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why did you then not take that case to the Supreme Court of the United States instead of paying your fine? If you were not guilty there, what about those 23 cases in the District of Columbia, in the police court, in which the A & P was found guilty of short weight, weighing the butcher's thumb when selling the steak? How about that?

Mr. BYOIR. In the first place, I sat through the Danville case and Judge Lindley made no such decision. Judge Lindley said the A & P did one thing which, if they had not done, probably everything else they did would have been legal. He said there was one thing that tainted the operation of the A & P, and that one thing was that our subsidiary dealing in fresh fruits and vegetables accounted as both a buyer and a seller. He said that was wrong. He said that was a violation of the law. I am not prepared to say to you that Judge Lindley wasn't right, but all I can say to you is that under the Perishable Commodities Act which was passed by the Congress of the United States, nobody can engage in trading in fresh fruits and vegetables without a license from the Department of Agriculture, and the Department of Agriculture had not only issued such a license, had not only never made a single complaint that there was any violation of properly trading under that license, but they even issue licenses so people can engage as dealers, as brokers, and as commission merchants. I think they know something about the agricultural business.

But, Joe, let me answer your question about the circuit court. I admit that Judge Minton adopted a good deal of language of the Government and said we did some things that were pretty bad. You say why didn't we appeal to the Supreme Court. We read the decision of the court and we said, "The best thing to do here—and this will be all over and we won't be in court and won't be spending millions in legal fees—is to assume that the judge is right even though we think he is wrong, and to do everything that he says we ought to do and to discontinue every practice that he thinks we ought not to indulge in." We did that and paid the fine.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Is that the reason why in Massachusetts, in another case in Connecticut, in another case in Rhode Island, in another case in the State of Maine, when you were charged with fixing prices, you pleaded nolo contendere and paid the fines? Is that the reason why——

Mr. BYOIR. Wait a minute.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You pleaded nolo contendere in the southern district of New York and why you also acknowledged the correctness of the Government's case in the District of Connecticut? There is case after case, including the case of the Federal Trade Commission which ordered A & P to cease and desist from its violations of the Robinson-Patman Act, and while this Danville case was being tried and that cease-and-desist order was outstanding against you, you were rebating, taking rebates from the Borden Dairy Co. and from the Bowman Dairy Co. in Chicago to the tune of a million two hundred thousand dollars?

Mr. BYOIR. We are not even a defendant in that case. The Department is suing those companies, and if they thought we had done something wrong, they could have sued us.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The grand jury found that that was the fact.

Mr. BYOIR. No. There hasn't been any decision in that case. You know as a lawyer—

Senator O'MAHONEY. You and I could spend the whole 15 minutes saying, "You did," and "you didn't."

Chairman GRANIK. That is right. Let's get to the public interest.

Senator O'MAHONEY. My first statement to you is, you ought to accept the injunction and say, "We won't do these things any more." If you didn't do them, the injunction does you no harm. If you don't intend to do them, the injunction does you no harm. Now what are the other—

Mr. BYOIR. Now let's debate that.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you willing?

Mr. BYOIR. A & P has never had an opportunity to say whether it would accept the injunction. The boys down there said what you must do.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You have the opportunity to say it now. Are you willing to do it now?

Mr. BYOIR. I am sure that the A. & P. will accept a consent decree in which they undertake not to violate ever any law of the United States, and they don't believe they ever have.

Senator O'MAHONEY. And that will be specific? You will accept such an injunction?

Mr. BYOIR. I am sure they will. I am neither their legal counsel nor the trustee of the company.

Senator O'MAHONEY. It will include the Federal Trade Commission, will it, sir?

Mr. BYOIR. Do you want me to tell you about the Federal Trade Commission?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Will the injunction include the Federal Trade Commission?

Mr. BYOIR. Did you vote for the Robinson-Patman bill, Senator?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I did.

Mr. BYOIR. And you don't know that it cost the American people 6 or 7 or 12 billion dollars in the food and clothing and the drugs that they do not get?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Oh, nonsense. That is perfect nonsense.

Mr. BYOIR. I am not against the Brannan bill for the small retailer. I am for the small retailer.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You are talking about something very different now.

Mr. BYOIR. No, I am not. I am just keeping you on the beam, you see, because you and the rest of the Congress, and it is within your power——

Senator O'MAHONEY. If the courts could keep A. & P. on the beam, it would be a great benefit for the consumers of the United States.

Mr. BYOIR. We say we are on the beam. We paid the fine, and we have discontinued all those practices. We say this is like a case where you fine a man $10 for passing a red light in the traffic district, and then you say, "And now we must cut off the man's arms and legs and prohibit him from ever being able to drive an automobile again."

Senator O'MAHONEY. All right, now, Mr. Byoir.

Mr. BYOIR. That is what they ask for in this complaint, not an injunction, Mr. O'MAHONEY.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You come here defending an organization which has been found guilty in the Federal courts, in the trial court, in the Court of Appeals—you haven't appealed to the Supreme Court—in the Federal Trade Commission, and in the police court of the District of Columbia. Now you talk as though this were an organization, just a beneficent organization, created for the purpose of distributing food to the housewives of the Nation. You are representing, sir, an organization of holding companies, piled one upon the other, an operation under 17 or 18 different aliases, manufacturing, distributing, warehousing, brokerage, and tea companies, operating in 39 different States, with sales totaling about $2,000,000,000.

Mr. BYOIR. The figure is $2,700,000,000.

Senator O'MAHONEY. $2,700,000,000?

Mr. BYOIR. Eight hundred million.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Isn't it wonderful. In the trail which has been followed, you have been crushing competition, you have been operating at a loss in New England and in the eastern district, operating at a great profit in other States. I have your exhibit here——

Mr. BYOIR. I gave them to you.

Senator O'MAHONEY. The exhibit which your company filed in the trial. In the case this is defendant's exhibit 499, at page 1, showing that you planned in 1938 to operate in New England throughout the year 1939 at a loss.

Mr. BYOIR. At an operating loss?

Senator O'MAHONEY. At a loss, and that in the Central Western States, where you were doing exactly the same number of sales—122,000,000 sales—you were planning to operate at a profit.

Chairman GRANIK. Let Mr. Byoir answer that. Go ahead, Mr. Byoir. It will take a long answer.

Mr. BYOIR. I think you get reduced here to a de minimis. Here is a company that has ten to twelve million, fifteen million individual sales transactions a week, with ten or twelve million women. In one instance it was found that in 29 sales out of the total of all the billions of sales a weight inspector said somebody was shorted.

Senator O'MAHONEY. In the District of Columbia.

Mr. BYOIR. In the District of Columbia; and in the District of Columbia the same people said we conspired to reduce the price of bread, and Judge Alan Goldsborough said, "This is the worst case I have heard in 40 years. Any good trial lawyer would have told you there is no evidence at all." They accused us of conspiring to reduce the price of potatoes in Carolina, and the judge said, "You can't make a case without facts."

Senator O'MAHONEY. Of course, all the $2,000,000,000 worth of sales weren't wrong. I will acknowledge that.

Mr. BYOIR. I want to ask you, Joe, if we are putting all the retailers out of business with these unfair methods, how is it that there are 400,000 of them in the United States and that they are rushing forward literally by the hundreds to tell the Antitrust Division that they don't need any help, that we are the best friend they ever had?

Chairman GRANIK. And advertising to that effect.

Mr. BYOIR. And advertising in the newspapers.

Senator O'MAHONEY. May I answer you?

Mr. BYOIR. Just a minute. The farm organizations that we are supposed to hurt, including the Farm Bureau Federation, are passing resolutions representing millions of farmers, that this case is no good. The consumers have increased our business $2,000,000 a week. So, evidently they don't think we are a lot of crooks. I want to tell you that if any lawyer or any political leader or anybody else thinks that 50,000,000 American women don't know whether they are getting the right weight or fresh fruit or spoiled meat or good meat, they just don't know the American woman. She gets her money's worth, and she has made the A. & P. the greatest retail company in the history of the world.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Why not try it in the courts?

Chairman GRANIK. Gentlemen, how about letting the consumer ask some questions? Go ahead, Miss Penuel. You have a question there.

QUESTION. Mr. Byoir, do you believe that the fine paid by the Atlantic & Pacific Co. is a sufficient deterrent to prevent a recurrence of the violation of the antitrust laws?

Mr. BYOIR. No, I don't but I don't think the people who run the A. & P. need that kind of deterrent, although they paid the fine. In the first place, I know they went to the Department and said, "You tell us what to do, and we will do it to obey this law," and the Department said, "There isn't anything you can do. It is so terrible, you have to break this company up and quit manufacturing and have seven different companies. Nobody who ever had anything to do with the company before can be in the new company."

Let me answer your question about the $175,000. As the courts have said over and over again, and the antitrust lawyers have said over and over again, there is only one motive to violate this law, and that motive is greed. You want to make more than I. You get together with your competitor and try to raise the price. The whole history of the A. & P. negates greed. I just want to show you something here. What kind of people are the people who run the A. & P.? John Hartford, 77 years old, works 5 days a week. George Hartford, 85 years old, works 5 days a week. Rich beyond the dreams of avarice because the American people have made them rich.

What have they done for the American people? I think the best test of an employer of a big business is how he treats his people. Does he try to make his profit out of the sweat of the brow of the people who work for him? Just take a look at these charts for a minute. There is the picture of A. & P. employment. I showed these to Senator O'MAHONEY. He is familiar with them. In 1933 this company had 87,000 employees. Today it has 112,000, or the number has increased 29 percent. The cost of living for the American people in that period has gone up 82 percent. Do the Hartfords just try to keep a little ahead of the cost of living? No. Their pay roll has gone up 195 percent over that period of years, and they are paying an average in the grocery business, which was the worst paid business in America a generation ago, $60.50 a week to all employees, not including any executive employees.

Chairman GRANIK. Go ahead, Senator. Do you want to comment on that chart?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me say this, Theodore. The Standard Oil of New Jersey had just such a monopoly as this. The Supreme Court of the United States decreed that it should be broken up. The result of it was more business and lower prices to the consumers, more profit to the operators. Instead of one gigantic company, out of the Standard Oil trust we had almost a dozen new companies.

The Congress of the United States when President Harding was in the White House passed a law compelling the packers to give up their ownership of the stockyards. It was signed by Mr. Harding. It was unanimously passed by the Congress. The result was cheaper prices for meat to the consumer and better prices to the producers of cattle.

The same thing will happen if the A. & P. were compelled to separate manufacturing from retail, if it were compelled to divide into its seven divisions so that it could not throw its losses into one area of the country to sell temporarily at a low price and make profits in an another area of the country so as to suppress competition and work over the consumer.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's see what another consumer has to say. Go ahead sir.

QUESTION. Senator O'MAHONEY, if A. & P. is hurting competition, why are so many small independent grocers rallying to its aid?

Senator O'MAHONEY. I have no evidence that so many are. Of course, I might say to you that the Department of Justice has been following A. & P. for 10 years, and that has been very helpful to little business in competing.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment on the Senator's point of view?

Mr. BYOIR. The fact is that competitors all over the country, at their own expense, have run advertising in newspapers stating that they don't need any help from Uncle Sam or from the antitrust lawyers. There is a typical advertisement from farmers. Down on the Jersey coast more than 1,200 Atlantic County farmers protest Government action against A. & P. and strangely enough, they say they rise to the defense of the best friend the farmer ever had. The fact is that the A. & P. has benefited its competitors in the retail field, and not hurt them.

Senator O'MAHONEY. What bothers me about this, Carl, is that if your company is such a perfectionist as you describe, if it is so beneficient, so kind, so concerned in the interest of the public, what have you got to fear in going to court? Why do you have to spend $5,000,000 in advertising in the newspapers and here in the city of Washington the newspapers into which you place the advertisements decline to receive the advertisements of the little business people?

Mr. BYOIR. No, they have run them.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Are you trying to do anything about getting the trial in the papers instead of in the courts?

Mr. BYOIR. What a minute. We are not afraid of the trial in the courts, but we have 10, 12, or 15 million women dealing with us every week. I don't think the American women are the kind of people who would want to deal with that kind of company. Suppose we had waited a year in Washington, where they said we were raising the price of bread, that we were the kind of people who would take bread out of the mouths of poor people. It took a year for that to come to trial. What would have happened to our business in Washington, when Judge Goldsborough said at the end that the evidence showed that we sold bread cheaper than anybody else in Washington, not higher. What would have happened to our relations with the farmer?

I don't think we have to sit silent under these, plus the fact that we are not spending $5,000,000, Joe. We are running stories about this in the regular space that we would use if we were running our price ads; and, strangely enough, the public is so interested in it and believes us against our adversaries, that business gets better every day.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Now will you prepare an ad—you are a skilled public relations man.

Mr. BYOIR. Thank you, Senator.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Prepare an ad tomorrow or next week on the southern New York case where you pleaded guilty, a story on the Massachusetts case, on the Rhode Island case——

Mr. BYOIR. Keep the record straight. We didn't plead guilty in any of these cases.

Senator O'MAHONEY. You filed a nolo contendere. You said, "No, we don't contest it." On the short weighting in the District of Columbia you had a trial, and you were found guilty in the police court.

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Senator O'MAHONEY. Well, put an ad about that in the papers, won't you?

Mr. BYOIR. That is right.

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to answer, or do you want to go into the summary period? You each have a minute. Senator O'MAHONEY, do you want to sum up?

Senator O'MAHONEY. Let me say just that we are struggling here with the great question of centralization. The United States is either going to have decentralization, self-government in the regions and in the States, or it is going on the road to big government. The A. & P. a typical national organization operated from a central office in such a manner that little competitors can't keep pace with it, is leading down the road to socialism. That is why I am for competition and for little business and for restraints upon predatory big business.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, Senator. Mr. Byoir?

Mr. BYOIR. I say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable, I have represented many American companies, and I have never known a company that tried as hard to obey every facet of every law, local, State, and Federal, as the Great Atlantic & Pacific Tea Co. I say to you with all the sincerity of which I am capable that no little retailer has been hurt. The little retailer who used to work 7 days a week and who worked 5 and 6 nights a week, today has a big supermarket and makes $250 or $500 a week. Due to this competition he gets his groceries cheaper, and the wholesaler gives him a better and cheaper service.

I would just add that the proof of all this, that we have not restrained competition, that the charge emanates against us because we

are too competitive, is that in all things you buy your wife takes a dollar to any store—clothing, household utensils, anything for the children or the husband—and she gets 62 cents worth of goods and gets 38 cents worth of the cost of distribution. She can go into any grocery store in the United States and, due to the competitive pressures of the A. & P.—everybody in the grocery business will tell you it is so—she will get 85 cents worth of food and she will pay only 15 cents for all the costs of distribution. She can do it in a thousand grocery stores that are not A. & P. grocery stores.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

You have been listening to a discussion on the A. & P. case. Our speakers have been Senator JOSEPH C. O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, and Carl Byoir, the noted public relations counsel.

Resolutions Adopted by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, one of the most highly respected and greatest patriotic organizations of our country is the Grand Army of the Republic. There are only a few members of that great organization still left. The Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic is a great organization that will carry on the work of the Grand Army of the Republic long after the last member of that organization has passed away.

On January 21, 1950, the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in regular convention assembled here in Washington adopted a set of resolutions which are well drawn and which are firm in their defense of the United States of America and its institutions.

I am glad to have these resolutions printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as a part of my remarks. These resolutions were offered by Mrs. Margaret Hopkins Worrell, chairman of the resolutions committee of the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic. Mrs. Worrell is a resident of the district which I have the honor to represent and also of my home city of Ironton, Ohio. The resolutions are as follows:

Whereas for several years there has been moving throughout these United States of America a very stealthy scheme for a "one world" government, which if put into effect would abolish the United States of America; and

Whereas the principal leaders of this scheme are the World United Federalists, Inc., and Union Now, propagandizing for a world government in which they have been so successful that the legislatures of 21 States have favored resolutions to repeal the Declaration of Independence; and

Whereas the legislatures of six States—California, Connecticut, Florida, Maine, New Jersey, and North Carolina—have approved a resolution which "calls for a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution to expedite and insure the participation of the United States in a world federal government, open to all nations"; and

Whereas approval by 32 States would compel Congress to call a convention for that purpose; furthermore, action favoring world government has been suddenly instituted in our Congress itself, with 91 Members of the House of Representatives (64 Democrats and 27 Republicans) introducing a concurrent resolution whereby Congress would declare that world government is the fundamental objective of American foreign policy"; and

Whereas the United World Federalists says: "World law shall be enforceable directly upon individuals—that means we give up the right to make our own laws, but would obey laws made by foreign politicians, tried by a foreign court with no enforceable appeal by our United States, which would have but one vote against hundreds of foreign votes—it means said world government would direct and decide how much taxes we Americans should pay without consulting our own Government (we would be taxed to support the world)—it means that our Nation could not possess armament or forces unless approved by world government and that we would strip ourselves of all power for self-defense and be at the mercy of well-armed international, mercenary forces, under the heel of some political clique, possibly Communist—it means that world government would take our gold hoard at Fort Knox and spend it for the enrichment of their own countries and themselves—it means that they would cancel any debts owing to the United States. In consequence of the above proposals, the United States would cease to exist as a free Nation—our Constitution destroyed—our liberties destroyed, and that we become slaves of a world superstate government founded by the socialist totalitarian philosophy that the individual is the servant of the government and not its master; and

Whereas our elected members of the United States Congress took an oath to defend the American Constitution, therefore the loyal citizens of the United States cannot sit silent while they listen to such outrageous proposals for the destruction of our Nation: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic in regular convention assembled this 21st day of January 1950, and in the name of our forefathers who saved the Union of these United States, That we call upon each and every patriotic organization, every loyal supporter of our Constitution and Bill of Rights to inform their Senators and Representatives that they are absolutely against any form of world government or superstate, that we have prospered and grown rich under our system of government and will not tolerate any change; and be it further

Resolved, That we hold each and every Member of our elected body to cast their vote in the interests of the United States and not on international foreign policy.

Whereas for the last 2½ years a Senate committee has been investigating our entire immigration and naturalization system; and

Whereas their report shows that the floodgates of our Nation are opened for the entrance of millions of aliens from all over the world who are coming in as displaced persons; and

Whereas certain pressure groups have been lobbying in the Congress for the repeal of all our safeguards on immigration and are spending millions of dollars for the dissemination of propaganda for that purpose; and

Whereas our country operates under an immigration quota system, whereby approximately 154,000 quota immigrants may be admitted every year for permanent residence, also United States citizens may bring in their relatives on a nonimmigration quota; and

Whereas certain pressure groups are trying to drive the Celler bill (H. R. 4567) through the Senate, which provides the admission of some 15,000 persons from behind the iron curtain who have not yet been displaced; and

Whereas an official of our principal intelligence agency (operating abroad), expressed his opinion that this provision of the Celler bill would constitute a dangerous threat to the security of the United States, and would be another loophole for the infiltration of Communist agents; and

Whereas upon uncontested evidence of a complete break-down in the administration of the immigration law which has opened the gates to persons who will not become good citizens, but will become ready recruits in subversive organizations to tear down the democracy of the United States; and

Whereas during the first 6 months of 1949, illegal entries over the Mexican border were at a rate of 25,000 a month, and a former American consul on the Canadian border estimated the number of illegal aliens in the United States to be from 3,000,000 to 5,000,000: Therefore, be it

Resolved, by the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic, Department of the Potomac, in regular convention assembled this 21st day of January 1950, That we will oppose with all our strength and will immediately inform our Members of the United States Senate that they must protect our immigration system and promptly provide funds for the detection and deportation of these thousands upon thousands of aliens who have illegally entered our borders; be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be transmitted to Senator PAT MCCARRAN, with the request that he place it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Coercive Unions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, as of today, February 8, 1950, some unions are following a practice directly contrary to their pronouncement. Some union labor officials insist, and rightly, that no man can be forced to work at a particular job.

Then they go to the other extreme and insist that a man shall not be permitted to work at a job where the wages and the working conditions are satisfactory to him, unless he belongs to the union, pays the union initiation fees, union dues, and special assessments levied by the union.

Unions claim and exercise the right to ban a union man from membership in the union if he violates a union rule or if he exercises his right to free speech. They may be correct in insisting upon the right to expel a member who does not comply with their rules, but under no circumstances should they have the right, nor should they be permitted to exercise the right to expel a man or prevent his employment when he honestly expresses his own opinion.

The public is rapidly approaching the conclusion that if unions insist upon the right to clog the telephone service, to refuse to dig coal, to cut off transportation, the citizen's supply of light, heat,

water, food or clothing, by the calling of a strike, as a union might well do by calling out the teamsters, we will shortly get a law curbing that union power—a law which will provide that when a man goes on strike and that strike results in injury to the public health, welfare, or safety, that man on strike, if he persists in refusing to work, shall have his status as employer-employee taken from him.

Stating it in different words—the proposition is this—an employee shall have the right to refuse to work at any time, at any job, but he shall not have the right, by picket line, show of force, abuse, or in any other manner, to prevent another man from taking that particular job.

Union officers will best serve their organizations when they discover, as they ultimately will, that they have no right and will not be permitted to exercise power to drive any man from his job.

Answering a union official, who is a good citizen but just does not understand the term "democracy," an editorial from the Allegan Gazette, published in my home town of Allegan, Mich., reads:

DEMOCRACY NOT MAJORITY RULE IF IT VIOLATES INDIVIDUAL RIGHTS

In a recent letter to the Gazette, published in the January 19 issue, Robert Gibson, president of local 709 UAW-CIO Allegan, took exception to our criticism of certain union activities and stated that we have been kicking the wrong dog.

A review of our editorials reveals that we have never found any fault with the fundamental principles of unionism in general, but that the Gazette has repeatedly and consistently criticized the illegal and oppressive actions of the large vertical unions, the methods that they have used to extort money from industry, the public, and their members, the dictatorial actions of their leaders, their destruction of property and assaults upon individuals in connection with their strike activities, their usurpation of the rights of individuals and of the functions of our courts, their interference with the political freedom of their members, their own disregard of contracts with their employers, their wildcat strikes, and their blind assumption that their first and only loyalty is to their union.

We do not believe for one moment that Mr. Gibson approves, for instance, the raid by union members, on the Shakespeare plant, in Kalamazoo, and the personal attacks upon individual workers at that plant by members of the goon squad. We do not think for one moment that if we had trouble in Allegan, Mr. Gibson would himself commit assault and battery upon anyone or that he would willfully destroy property. But why, if he doesn't believe in such illegal union activity, doesn't he come out and condemn it and why should he criticize us because we do condemn such practices?

Frankly we think the reason is that the unions are not democratic, that he is afraid to engage in any criticism of the activities of the CIO or of their policy because he feels that he would be jeopardizing his standing with the CIO.

In his letter Gibson writes of the high profits realized by many of our large corporations and the effect those profits have in increasing our standard of living. It is significant that Gibson does not mention that these profits are subjected to a very high rate of double taxation, and that if he and other employees of these large concerns are to remain employed, some money must be retained by these concerns for expansion, for replacement costs, for experimental purposes, in general to not only keep the industry operating but to improve its product and its methods of production. If all the profit of any year was paid out in salaries, wages, and in dividends to its stockholders, how long could these concerns continue to employ the union members, continue to produce the best and the cheapest goods of any country on earth?

If Gibson has any complaint against the present high cost of living he should take it up with Harry Truman and his Fair Deal; the Government is responsible for the high cost of living, not the large corporations.

Did you know, Mr. Gibson, that the people of the United States are paying out more money for interest on our indebtedness today than it took to operate our Government in 1932? Reduce our governmental expenditures, balance our budget, quit kidding ourselves that the Fair Deal will work, reduce our national debt while we still have a chance and you will discover that the cost of living will go down and that the working man will be a lot better off than he is now.

Mr. Gibson also speaks of having been discharged from some position that he held because of a difference of opinion regarding politics. Of that, of course, we have no knowledge but we do know that in unions there are many members afraid to express their opinions because of union coercion and the power of some union official to blacklist them. We know of instances where union officials have sat in judgment upon the individual members and fined them just as a court would fine an individual for disobeying some law.

The unions today have acquired power because of the pressure that they exert. Fear is one of their weapons. Men must join unions in order to obtain employment, they have no choice. Men often go out on strikes not because they want to, but because they have to. Many persons stay away from work because they are afraid they will be beaten up by some union thug. Many newspapers refrain from voicing an honest opinion of unions because of union pressure. National unions today are guilty of the same kind of treatment that you complain of when you say that you lost your job on one occasion because you expressed a political opinion, and on a scale such as never witnessed in this country before.

In your letter you indicate that you are not familiar with the meaning of the word "democracy" as practiced in this country. You assume that the "majority rule." You disregard one of the main principles of our country as established by our Constitution and that is that the individual has certain rights and privileges which if the law is enforced cannot be violated by the majority.

In fact you belong to an organization, that would, if it could, take over complete control of the Government and rule the people for the benefit of the unions and their members.

We remain of the opinion that some of present-day vertical unions as now operating are detrimental to the general welfare of the country. They have assumed too much power, they have become too large, they no longer respect the rights of individuals and of the minority within their ranks, they disregard the law, commit acts of violence, they have, and in some instances still do, harbor Communists working for the destruction of our Nation, in some instances their leaders are known criminals.

No, Mr. Gibson, we don't believe that these unions you defend are the underdogs of today, and we are firmly convinced that the average workingman would be better off if unionism was limited to that particular plant where he was employed.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Signing of the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, today as the forces that would destroy freedom move in an attempt to enslave the world I would like to pause and notice a special anniversary of freedom. Thirty-two years ago today the Council of Lithuania signed their declaration of independence. I would like to join with all free Lithuanians, and invite all free people throughout the world to recall this declaration. I would like to join the enslaved, liberty-loving people of Lithuania in their hope for future freedom. In establishing an independent state, Lithuania received her chief external support from United States and today people of America solemnly hope that Lithuania will soon enjoy the cherished independence she seeks.

Lithuanian history is clear during the last 700 years. It is a history of war and a constant fight for freedom. During the Middle Ages Lithuania established a powerful state and successfully defended her independence against the Germans, the Mongols, and the Tartars. They knew and appreciated the fruits of freedom and governed themselves by the philosophy of freedom. They fought and died to preserve their freedom. In 1795 Lithuania lost her freedom under the occupation of Czarist Russia. From 1795 to February 16, 1918, Lithuania was at constant war with Russia and Germany in an attempt to recover her lost liberty.

On February 16, 1918, Russia and Germany, as did the United States and other nations, recognized the Declaration of Independence of Lithuania. Russia gave up all claim to Lithuania and Lithuania was seen to grow and progress with remarkable achievement until Russia enslaved her again in 1940.

During the years of true independence Lithuania contributed much culture and industry to civilization. Her people were truly happy, self-supporting, and justly proud of their independence.

Since the Soviet occupation Lithuania has seen her soil abused and her forests wasted. Families have been separated, deportation has reached appalling heights. The personal freedom, the inherent rights of all people are denied the people of Lithuania. But the spirit of freedom is not dead, it is enlivened and activated by the very denial of actual freedom.

In view of the splendid record and generous contribution to humanity given by this small country we cannot but recognize her plight and hope for her quick recovery.

We extend best wishes to Lithuania on this anniversary. We hope that Lithuania who has suffered for the cause of

freedom will soon enjoy what she deserves and be delivered from her present plight which she does not deserve. We hope that Lithuania will soon take her seat among the family of democracies and contribute freely to her own internal peace and to the peace of the world.

The Mindszenty Trial

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. LOUIS B. HELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. HELLER. Mr. Speaker, prior to my election, a year ago today, and within a matter of hours after Cardinal Spellman delivered his crusade sermon, I publicly called upon our distinguished President, requesting that he direct our Secretary of State to release to the world all the facts our Government must have in the Mindszenty case, feeling confident that such disclosure would completely exonerate the cardinal. I also urged that the entire matter be referred to the United Nations, with a view of obtaining the cardinal's liberation.

I have closely followed the events in this case, and commend to the reading of my colleagues the following article which appeared in the New York World-Telegram on February 4, 1950, entitled "The Mindszenty Trial: A Chapter in Infamy," which justifies my stand and continued protest against Soviet religious intolerance:

THE MINDSZENTY TRIAL: A CHAPTER IN INFAMY—PROSECUTION OF CARDINAL CONVICTED RED JUDGES IN EYES OF FREE WORLD

(By Gabriel Pressman)

A year ago today, I saw brought to trial a brave man who acted like a coward. I saw a people's court from which the people were barred. I saw an ex-Nazi sitting as a Communist chief judge. I saw a defense attorney outprosecute a prosecutor.

On February 4, 1949, second day of the trial, I was admitted to a dimly lit courtroom in Budapest, where Joseph Cardinal Mindszenty and six co-defendants sat before the bar of Communist justice. Edward Korry of the United Press and I were the only American correspondents representing American publications admitted to the trial.

There was one catch: I could not choose an interpreter, I was told by Ivan Boldizar, pudgy, nervous-eyed government press chief. The government would supply a bright, young Communist to translate for me.

GUNS GUARD COURT

The courtroom was two flights up—with six checkpoints of submachine gunners from the door of the dirty, red-brick courthouse on Marko Street to the door of the trial room itself.

It was a small, dark room. Not much light pierced the huge windows. On the dais sat the people's court president and four associate judges. On the first bench beneath were the seven defendants, charged with a royalist conspiracy to overthrow the government.

Their faces were drawn. Their attitudes ranged from indifference to resignation. Alongside each sat a militiaman. Throughout the courtroom, militiamen stood or sat among the carefully screened spectators. Only seven relatives of defendants were present.

FROM NAZI TO RED JUDGE

Through an American's eyes, it was a trial of paradoxes. There was Vilmos Olti, before and during the war one of Hungary's foremost Nazis, now playing Communist chief judge.

Olti fired an endless stream of questions at the defendants, methodically building up the case against them with "yes" and "no" answers. He allowed seven prosecution witnesses, no defense witnesses. As he carried the case through in a lightning 3 days, the hard-faced prosecutor-juror seldom looked up from the papers he read.

The "trial" seemed a little academic. The defendants had confessed everything days before at the headquarters of the dread secret police, 60 Andrassy Street. And the government had the confessions bound neatly into a "yellow book" for the convenience of Red propagandists.

EAGER TO CONFESS

The defendants vied constantly to confess. Once it was even too much for the court. The Cardinal tried to read a repudiation of his prearrest warning against any future "confession," but Olti silenced him: "You don't want to read that now." So the Cardinal sat down and read it when directed.

Young Andreas Zakar, the Cardinal's secretary, was once his stubborn, good right arm. Now he stood, weak and timid, most pathetically trying to follow wherever Olti led. And the judge coached him benignly, like a teacher with a backward child.

Zakar used the word "democratic" in the Western sense. "Liberal, bourgeois democratic or people's democratic?" Olti demanded.

Zakar (searchingly): "Er * * * liberal."

Olti (with fatherly severity): "That means against progress."

Zakar: "Yes, sir."

ROLE FOR CARDINAL

The Cardinal, an excellent orator before his arrest, spoke monotonously, reading from prepared papers. Under prodding from the rasp-voiced director, the Cardinal said: "I'm very sorry" about everything—the book he had written, letters, money manipulations.

The script called for a Mindszenty of repudiation, confession, and apology. And this, the Communists wanted the world to believe, was the same man who in a last interview said staunchly: "I will never take back anything I have said against the Communist government * * * Hungary has degenerated into a gigantic chamber of horrors, a den of robbers and thieves."

Crudest of the crudities was the attitude of the so-called defense attorneys. They spent most of the trial twiddling their mustaches or gazing into space. I didn't see them take a single note, nor consult each other once.

Kalman Kiczko, a Communist of 30 years' standing, "defended" the cardinal. Joseph Groh, prominent Catholic lawyer, had been jailed for offering to serve.

Kiczko pleaded well * * * for Kiczko. Most of his final speech told how much he, Kiczko, loved the people's democracy.

Then, removing his spectacles, he denounced western newspapers: "The foreign press has written numerous calumnies against Hungary." He disputed that the trial was unfair: "Nobody either at home or abroad can accuse us of restricting freedom." He cringingly thanked the prosecution for bringing up the charges against his client. And, when he sat down, even Olti smiled.

A year has passed and the world still wonders what made the defendants act as they did? Was the cardinal tortured, drugged, or hypnotized?

Pro-Communist correspondents reported the cardinal seemed perfectly normal in every respect. It was hard to agree when you saw a man weak and cowardly, whose actions for 4 years had spoken strength and courage.

CHANGED MAN AT TRIAL

Was he in his right mind when he offered to resign if the charges against him were dropped? Only the Pope could accept such a resignation. Before his arrest, he could deliver a perfect sermon from a few notes. At the trial he forgot frequently and—the interpreters did not hide it—had to be prodded by the court.

The key to what happened is, of course, the 38 days the cardinal spent with the secret police before the trial. I did not speak to the cardinal—the Government forbade it—but I have spoken to others educated to confess at 60 Andrassy Street. The Communists have a standard curriculum: questioning for days on end under bright lights, standing with arms overhead until faint, repeated blows with blunt instruments on the kidney, electric shock treatments.

It is possible that all the standard methods and perhaps more were used on the defendants. Perhaps Zakar was tortured to arouse the cardinal's pity. Zakar's white face and trembling impatience to please marked him a likely graduate of the torture chamber.

Not all the clues were outside the court. In the cardinal's final speech, he spoke with some feeling for the first time:

"I stand here with half a century of basic principles * * * principles that guide us as railway tracks guide trains. * * * I was not and am not an enemy of the Hungarian people * * * worker or peasant."

Perhaps the cardinal here revealed his true thoughts—that he believed as he always did, that he still loved the people but not the Communist government.

REFUSE TO BOW TO REDS

Significantly, the Hungarian press and radio did not carry the statement. For weeks before the trial, these government-controlled media trumpeted the cardinal's guilt. "A pitiable worm, a scared scoundrel, a bloodthirsty beast of prey," they called him.

Meanwhile the government had nightly press briefings to tell correspondents what to write. Boldizar, the press czar, said: "Tell your readers that the cardinal is not a brave hero of freedom, but a weakling and a coward." The second night Mr. Korry and I refused to sign a Communist-sponsored resolution, signed by the others, affirming there was no censorship and translations were accurate.

A Hungarian journalist secretly applauded our stand: "There are two kinds of censorship: one where the censor's pencil scratches out the words, the other where the fear in your heart scratches them out." He told me how every Hungarian-speaking person in that courtroom had been intimidated.

After my refusal to sign, the government pretended I did not exist, withdrew even its slanted help. I had to scrape together at least the official version of what was happening—and that was damning enough.

FINAL COURT SCENE

Time will never dim that last, sad scene of February 8. The defendants stood for more than an hour while Olti issued an anti-western political tirade and their sentences.

The cardinal's head was slightly bowed, his hands clasped before him. As he was sentenced to life imprisonment, his cheek twitched. Princess Esterhazy knelt in prayer. A Government camera's flash bulb exploded.

There was a weird moment when Laszlo Toth, almost deaf Catholic editor, stepped forward to hear Olti shout his fate—10 years.

Then it was over. The heavily guarded defendants filed out. In the corridor I stopped gray-haired Hildegarde Zakar, the defendant's sister. Glancing nervously at detectives, her eyes moist, she said in French:

"My brother is a good boy. He has always served God. If God wills it, then this must be."

The reaction of the people in the streets and coffee houses was bitter. Through a Hungarian-speaking American, they told me: "They were afraid to give him the death sentence because they know his hold on the people is too great."

HAS PLACE IN HISTORY

The cardinal, says the Hungarian underground, languishes today in Gyujtofoghaz jail, 10 miles north of Budapest.

Whatever happens, Cardinal Mindszenty's place in history is assured. A Hungarian student friend expressed it well that last night in Budapest as we strolled along the banks of the Danube. I had just come from a final press conference at which Boldizar said: "The trial is over, but the trial of you correspondents has just begun. You must tell the world the truth about this traitor."

My friend looked up at the sky. "You know, for once Boldizar is right," he said. "This was more than the trial of Cardinal Mindszenty. In the court of world public opinion, a cardinal has convicted his judges and communism stands condemned."

One World a Fantasy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES C. AUCHINCLOSS
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. AUCHINCLOSS. Mr. Speaker, under permission granted me, I am glad to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "One World a Fantasy," which appeared in the Oil, Paint, and Drug Reporter, on February 6, 1950.

This editorial was written by the editor, Mr. Craig, and it appealed to me as being a penetrating and thought-provoking article which I thought would be of interest to the Members of the House.

ONE WORLD A FANTASY

Altogether too much is being said by tongue and typewriter about how we can't get along with Moscow. It is time that consideration was given to getting along without those for whom that name popularly stands.

It should be clear to everyone that the high-minded, optimistic idea of melting all the peoples, or merging all the countries, of the man-inhabited globe into one world has faded into fantastic nothingness. The United Nations should recognize that it has a much better purpose in enabling friendly folk to live as they would.

It is unquestionable that there is going to be, while man exists, various numbers of worlds, depending on the characteristic on which group divisions are based. All sorts of characteristics, race, color, creed, for example, will be the dividing lines among worlds, even as they are now within existing countries. But, the characteristic which calls most loudly for consideration—and disposition—is that of political ideology. It is beyond all question that there is going to be a red world. That is no reason why the other main division of the inhabitants of the globe should be blue.

United Nations and individual governments—at least the human instruments thereof—are greatly bothered over what will be the result of the childish refusal of the reds to participate in an increasing number and variety of UN deliberations. Much solemn pondering is being directed to the discovery of ways and means of getting their participation. It would be far better for those who believe in the UN purposes to proceed in the pursuit thereof as though there never had been any reds in the organization.

It may be argued that decisions made and actions taken without the participation of the uncooperative Reds would not be accepted by the latter. What of it? That acceptance at best is wholly a matter of expediency. It must be admitted that, if they were not in on any program, it would be clear where they stood. When they are in, there is no such clarity.

The world can get along without being red if it will but not be blue. But, it must be ready. It also must be realistic in facing the fact that not all who now are averse to being red are white. Expediency, as a road to advantage, has not lost any of its popularity. There must be also a clear recognition of the extent to which the profit motive transcends all color lines, whether dermal or political.

The peoples of this globe are not ready for world singleness. They are going to continue to be divided politically into at least two entities. There is a deal of substantiation for the belief that the group which aspires to a world brotherhood cannot get along with the other. There is much reason to feel that it is largely, if not wholly, a waste of time to endeavor to remedy that condition. So, the white world should quit being blue, carry on in pursuit of its ideals—and be ready, able, and willing to kick out those who may try to block its progress. It can get along without them, politically, socially, and commercially. And it wisely should quit moaning and begin to demonstrate its independence.

James Patrick McGovern

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following article which appeared in the National Naval Medical Center, Bethesda, Md., on February 13, 1950:

POET, LAWYER CELEBRATES SEVENTY-FIRST BIRTHDAY HERE

Friends, fellow patients, corpsmen, and nurses gathered for a party recently up on Tower 11, to help James Patrick McGovern celebrate his seventy-first birthday. Mr. McGovern is a well-known person in the hospital. His bombastic nature and Celtic conviviality are always rife.

Here is a fighting man from way back. During the First World War he became a captain in the Army.

He is a poet, a lawyer, a crusader, and an ardent Irishman; his poems have been included in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for many years. His first poem attacked Wall Street interests, and found him expelled from school for promoting the spirit of anarchy. Unabated he went forward to become a brilliant lawyer and the originator and founder of the Coconino Sun, a paper that is a collector's item today.

When asked to recite a poem, he chose Too Old, a piece written when he was refused entrance into the service for World War II:

"The surge of battle rises everywhere,
From cap and field to office, home, and street;
The soldiers' vibrant step, the drum's deep beat,
Stir the blood even as they fill the air.
But who are they that, chafing, stand and wait,
Though speed is victory and men's the need?
Why must they press, while none will pay them heed,
To serve at any cost, in scorn of fate?
Scarred veterans whose valor shone before,
They have stepped forth to take their posts again;
'Too old, too old,' they hear in a refrain,
As their steeled honor urges them the more.
Faith with their past, which knew no compromise,
Calls them to fight until their life tide dies."

The Need To Combat Interstate Crime and Rackets

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to offer for inclusion in the RECORD a statement of Mayor de-Lesseps S. Morrison, of the city of New Orleans, which was made on February 15, 1950, before the Attorney General's conference to combat crime and rackets. Mayor Morrison's discussion of the growing menace of organized Nation-wide gambling syndicates is very timely. It is forthright action such as Mayor Morrison suggests that will do much to aid in our fight against widespread crime and gambling.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF MAYOR DE LESSEPS S. MORRISON BEFORE THE ATTORNEY GENERAL'S CONFERENCE TO COMBAT INTERSTATE CRIME AND RACKETS

My name is deLesseps S. Morrison. I am the mayor of the city of New Orleans and the immediate past president of the American Municipal Association, whose viewpoint and recommendations I have been asked to present here today. The AMA speaks directly and indirectly for 10,152 towns and cities of America.

On September 20, 1949, our association addressed to Attorney General McGrath a letter expressing concern over the growing menace of organized Nation-wide gambling syndicates. We proposed Federal Government coordination and cooperation with local agencies in coping with this problem.

This conference is a most significant milestone in the history of crime fighting in the United States. Certainly it marks the first coordinated step to be taken by the Federal Government in recognition of the growing power of organized crime syndicates in our country.

On behalf of the American Municipal Association, I should like to express our genuine

appreciation to Attorney General McGrath for his interest and initiative in calling this meeting. And to President Truman, certainly, for his presence. Both the conference and the stature of the participants offer the greatest encouragement to public officials and civic-minded citizens who are sincerely concerned with the problem and who believe that an immediate, strong, and effective plan of coordinated action is necessary.

Before going further I would like to make plain and clear two important points. We of the AMA recognize fully the responsibilities and duties of local officials for local law enforcement. We do not ask the Federal Government to take over this task—nor do we condone the failure of indifferent or inefficient local officials to work for enforcement in their communities.

But we do say, however, that when local officials wage war on nationally organized underworld elements whose supply lines, communications, and general operations cut across municipal, county, State, and even national lines—then this problem is no longer a local one to be handled solely by local officials whose jurisdiction and information is so limited.

Secondly, I would like to say that we do not pretend to be experts on this subject. There are many gaps in the information available to us and to the other municipal officials present—gaps which we hope will be corrected to some extent by this conference.

For instance, the Federal Government agencies have an extensive data on Nationwide operations of racing-wire services, the slot-machine syndicates, and allied activities. Yet much of this is not available to municipal officials, and some not even available to other United States departments.

A few days ago we learned of an extensive report on racing wire services compiled several years ago by the FBI. Yet, when our police superintendent asked for a copy he was told that none was available in New Orleans. And, even if there were, the FBI said, it could not permit us to see such a confidential document. (Mr. Morrison explained that the FBI did not have jurisdiction to do so; that the FBI had cooperated in every way possible.)

There is an urgent need now of central coordination for such information among Federal departments, making same available to law-enforcement agencies of the cities and States.

We do not have the whole picture, but each of us present—and hundreds of other mayors, public officials, and crime commissions in various States—have seen small segments of this national scene of organized interstate crime. These pieces fit together in a pattern of mounting evidence concerning several highly organized gambling and racketeering syndicates whose wealth, power, scope of operations, and influence has recently grown to gigantic and alarming proportions. It is an ugly, vicious, un-American picture of systematic law violation, huge profits, corruption of public officials who can be bought—and operations outside the jurisdiction of those who cannot be purchased.

According to our information, there are two major criminal syndicates operating in America today. One controls the large slot machine industry and engages in allied gambling rackets; the other dominates the racing wire service. On the basis of checkable information, these activities are the largest steady sources of income in the underworld.

Their shrewd and efficient overlords have adopted the techniques and methods of business. They operate in a loose confederation of mutual respect, cooperation, allocated territories, and huge profits.

Here are the most conservative figures on these operations:

The annual slot-machine take in the United States is estimated by the best authorities from $1,000,000,000 to $2,000,000,000 a year. This figure is based on the fact that 105,000 gaming machines, mostly one-armed bandits, were registered in 1949 with the Bureau of Internal Revenue. The total number operating is considered double or triple that figure. The average net take of each machine is $10 to $15 a day.

The principal racing wire service in the country is Continental Press Service, which is the key to the multi-billion-dollar-betting business. Its 16,000 miles of leased wire service over 300 key handbook areas. It is difficult to pin down the annual take of this industry but the best estimates put it at double or treble the volume of pari-mutuel betting at legalized race tracks—or from $3,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000 per year.

There is an abundant fund of facts which point to control of this wire service by the old Capone gang. Although the wire service has been domiciled in Cleveland since its late operator James M. Ragan was killed, the Chicago Crime Commission and other sources believe that Continental is dominated by the Chicago and underworld interests.

We have good reasons to believe that the slot-machine syndicate is controlled by Frank Costello. The shy and retiring czar of the slot-machine racket always understates his interest in rackets and governments in his public denials of the facts about his potency and influence.

The numerous case records of his interstate operations could take our entire day. For the record I will briefly sketch a well-documented case and the one with which I am most familiar—the Costello syndicate operations in Louisiana.

According to his own Federal grand jury testimony some years ago, Costello moved his New York slot machine operations to New Orleans in 1936. He said that he sent down Dandy Phil Kastel, exconvict and one time associate of Arnold Rothstein, to incorporate and run the business. Today he lives and operates in Jefferson Parish above New Orleans beyond our jurisdiction.

Kastel first formed the Bayou Novelty Co. which later became the Pelican Novelty Co., and which today is the Louisiana Mint Co., to handle the distribution of slot machines and other coin devices.

From 1936 until 1946 the Costello-Kastel interests operated in New Orleans under an exclusive monopoly.

Some idea of their profits may be seen in the figures revealed during the income-tax evasion trial of Costello, Kastel and five associates in the New Orleans Federal court in 1939. The Government charged that they had conspired to evade payment of about $500,000 taxes on income approaching $3,000,000 from their New Orleans slot machine business in 1936–37. That was before they installed their maximum amount of 5,500 slot machines in New Orleans. We have no figures on their take between 1937 and 1946, but at $10 to $15 a day per machine it must have been enormous.

With the election of the present city administration in 1946 the syndicate retreated across the parish line. No slot machines have operated in New Orleans since that time.

One day in 1947 our police superintendent learned of a cache of new slot machines stored in New Orleans for shipment to nearby distribution points. Police raided the place and destroyed 390. Kastel, as an owner of Louisiana Mint Co., promptly filed a suit against us for $117,000. Listed in the suit as company manager was Dudley Geigerman, brother-in-law of Frank Costello.

Their suit was dismissed, but the Louisiana Mint Co. continues to thrive and prosper outside of New Orleans. They own most of the 8,000 gambling devices for which the Bureau of Internal Revenue issued $100 tax stamps in Louisiana last year.

Meanwhile, Kastel was following another of the syndicate's recognized techniques—that of entering into allied businesses. This syndicate built the Beverly Club in Jefferson Parish, La., a luxury gambling house. Its charter, copy of which is attached, shows its registered agents to be Phil Kastel and Carlos Marcello. The latter is a local ex-convict and syndicate man. In addition to operating the Beverly Club, this group finances bar and tavern proprietors at lower interest rates than the banks charge—with the understanding, of course, that these places must install their machines.

The Continental Wire Service, as already noted, does not come into New Orleans. Its leased Western Union wires do service their Louisiana distributor at several points just above and below our city. Through batteries of telephone relays they service handbooks below and above our city limits. Despite the continuing enforcement efforts of our police there are still sporadic bookie operations in our city. But the lack of direct wire service and our insistence that the telephone company pull out telephone lines of all raided establishments has held these operations down to a minimum.

To our knowledge, the Costello syndicate and the wire-service heads today are not personally violating any municipal or State law in New Orleans. But they are doing it all around us. And they are causing the law to be violated in our city.

Mayor Bowron, of Los Angeles, and the California Crime Commission, headed by Admiral Standley, have called attention to similar situations in the far West. The Citizens Crime Commissions of Chicago and Greater Miami have compiled almost identical facts. So has the Massachusetts Crime Commission. Others present, including Mayor Darst, of St. Louis, and Mayor Cobo, of Detroit have similar corroboration.

Mayor Dorothy Lee of Portland, Oreg., has publicly stated:

"Seven weeks after my election, slot-machine operators sought to organize in Portland and at the same time get me out of office."

Municipal officials everywhere will tell you that in investigations of local criminals we continually run into frustrating blind alleys and dead ends—and the trail often winds out of the local jurisdiction over a city, county, or State line.

Does all this not point up the very vital fact that the great need is not to get at the small fry, but the absentee syndicate bosses who direct the financing, supplying, strategy, and rapid movement of law breakers back and forth across the country? All States and cities are not yet infected, but no State or community is immune from invasion.

It should also be made a part of this record that for several years the United States Immigration and Naturalization Department has had complaints in its files that Costello committed perjury in swearing to his final citizenship papers in 1926. When he swore that he was not in violation of any United States laws, it is our understanding that he was at that time the Nation's top-ranking rum runner.

The American Municipal Association proposes to attack the problem on three levels: at home, within the States, and through joint efforts of city, State, and Federal Governments. In presenting our recommendations, I wish to make three preliminary comments.

The first goal of the AMA is to assure the basic honesty and integrity of municipal officials, so they will deserve the respect of the people. One of our major efforts will be to strengthen the backs of those municipal officials who have the courage to uphold the law.

Here questions of State laws arise—laws designated to protect individuals and free

enterprise from undue governmental interference—but laws whose loopholes have been exploited for years by high-priced legal talent defending illegal operators. The attorneys general are the most competent authorities to go into this point. Then there are Federal-city problems.

I should like here to express the admiration and implicit confidence of municipal officials in the law enforcement agencies of the Federal Government. We believe that they are doing the best possible job under conditions laid down by Congress and within the limits of their budgets.

Insofar as permissable, there exists today excellent teamwork between local and Federal enforcement agencies. Many of the best city police are graduates of the FBI academy, or have served actively with the Bureau—and this suggests a further expansion of this type of training.

Wise legislation in the recent past has extended the jurisdiction of the Federal authorities so that they may assist local police in combatting crime. For example, kidnaping, bank holdups, interstate transportation of stolen cars. No responsible persons would consider this a usurpation of local power.

If the Federal Government can invoke its power against those who use its mails to defraud, does it not follow logically that similar powers should be invoked against those who use interstate shipments and communications against the public interests.

Today it is a Federal offense to traffic in prostitution across State lines, but responsibility for suppressing prostitution remains local. Similarly, unauthorized possession of narcotics is a Federal offense, but the local war against the dope traffic goes on strong as ever.

This all adds up to the fact that the last major area of big profits from illegal enterprise in which the jurisdiction of the Federal Government has not been extended is that of interstate gambling operations that violate the laws of 46 States.

Here is where Federal action truly seems to be indicated—not to invade home rule, nor to centralize police power—but to move into a field that needs its help.

We must conclude that for the world's best investigators to materially help us in this problem there must be new legislation to extend their jurisdiction and fill in the gap that now exists.

We know, too, the political power of the underworld lies primarily in its financial strength. And its financial strength stems largely from the syndicate operation of slot machines and the control of racing and sports pool news.

The key objective before us is an attack on the supply lines and income of organized gambling as a Nation-wide industry.

Today the records of any collector of internal revenue will tell you who has bought gaming tax stamps and where the business is situated. We believe that it would be equally valuable to know who owns the machines as well as those in whose place of business they are installed.

Finally, if we can deport those who have fraudulently obtained their priceless American citizenship, we will rid the country of undesirable elements who are a menace to American democracy and our way of life.

The American Municipal Association endorses and will actively support these concrete recommendations:

1. Development of a coordinated master plan of action on the whole system of Nation-wide rackets by Federal, State, local governments and citizens' groups. The Attorney General for the United States should be coordinator for the entire effort.

In that connection, it would be of tremendous help if we could receive a confidential quarterly or semiannual report from the Attorney General, correlating all available data—giving municipal officials a continuing, complete picture which cities do not have the facilities or jurisdiction to obtain ourselves.

2. Support of the Kefauver bill to investigate the entire problem of interstate gambling rackets and allied operations. A Senate investigation that can call witnesses and make them tell the truth under threat of perjury indictments is the only way some of these dead ends can be routed out.

3. Legislation to outlaw dissemination of race results across State lines by telegraph, telephone, or radio for illegal gambling purposes. Such a law would not be designed to prohibit dissemination of sports information through the generally accepted press associations and newspapers.

4. Legislation to prohibit the interstate shipment of slot machines, other gambling devices, and their parts; requiring Federal registration of all such machines sold within States, and prohibiting foreign export of such devices. The Preston bill to prohibit shipment of gambling devices in interstate or foreign commerce has been endorsed in principle by FBI Director Hoover.

5. Amending the Bureau of Internal Revenue tax regulations on gaming devices to require registration of owners of devices on which tax stamps are purchased, as well as the user of such gaming devices. Penalties for failure to register gaming devices should be stiffened.

6. Legislation to extend the jurisdiction of the FBI to permit that agency to lend needed assistance and information to State and local officials.

7. Amending the immigration and naturalization laws providing that aliens obtaining citizenship by fraud or perjury may have that citizenship revoked at any time after discovery of said fraud or perjury.

8. Complete and continuing tax investigations of the head bosses of the rackets syndicates.

9. Amending Bureau of Internal Revenue regulations to provide that the now closed income tax records of known police characters and ex-convicts may be inspected by law enforcement agencies of the Federal, State, and local governments.

10. Inter-city cooperation, exchange of information and action. This was begun some months ago through the AMA by Mayor Bowron, myself, and the Chicago Crime Commission, Mayor Lee, of Portland, and several others. We will work to strengthen and improve the facilities for exchange of information among local police departments, through AMA as a coordinating agency.

11. While all the recommendations above are important, if we are to accomplish all of our joint objectives, there needs to be a thoroughly coordinated Federal effort or agency through which the cities and States can work.

To sum up—I wish to acknowledge the interest and assistance of numerous mayors and the crime commissions of Chicago, Greater Miami, and of Massachusetts.

The American Municipal Association believes that the flourishing existence of these nationally operated gambling-racketeering syndicates presents one of the greatest threats to society and to good government. At the very least, the alliances between the wealthy organized criminal element and local gamblers make more complex and difficult the problem of law enforcement at the local level. At the very worst, these underworld czars, through entrenched special privileges in a community, can wield tremendous influence over its government. From profits and power in one locality they go on to another. That is a danger and threat to our democratic way of life hardly less real than the Communist menace. Indeed, nothing could please the Russians more than the crumbling corruption of democratic government from within and consequent loss of faith in democracy by large segments of the American people.

I do not believe that the combined resources of the organized underworld rackets are greater than those of the Federal, State, and municipal governments of the United States.

It is our firm conviction that if everyone in this room determines to do something about the problem it can and will be conquered. Our cooperative action must not end when this meeting adjourns.

In this objective we pledge you the full and active cooperation of the American Municipal Association.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Robert C. Hendrickson, of New Jersey

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Saturday, February 11, 1950, before the Queens Village Republican Club, at Queens, N. Y., my colleague, the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. HENDRICKSON], made the annual Lincoln Day address. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the adress was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is indeed a pleasure to meet with you tonight in this Republican stronghold of the sovereign State of New York.

We gather together for a dual purpose; first to honor the name of the greatest American of all time, the founder of our Republican Party, who was born 141 years ago tomorrow and, second, to commemorate another important birthday.

Certainly this magnificent audience before me is aware that 1950 marks the seventy-fifth anniversary of the founding of the Queens Village Republican Club, the oldest club of its kind in the Nation in continuous existence.

I am honored more than I can say in having been asked to speak to you on such an auspicious occasion.

And that isn't all—I consider myself fortunate in sharing this rostrum with Bill Groat, your very able district leader.

My respect for Bill began when I first met him; it grew in 1948 when he invaded New Jersey to preach the gospel of Dewey and Warren and Hendrickson to the voters of my State, and is even greater now that I have watched him serve as an outstandingly capable administrative assistant to a Senator for whom I have the greatest admiration and affection, your own IRVING IVES.

I wish to speak to you tonight about Abraham Lincoln as viewed from two different vantage points: First, President Lincoln, the wartime leader who brought this Nation successfully through its most crucial test, and secondly, as the leader of a new and struggling political party which became the most potent force ever known for the welfare of a great people and the development of our now great constitutional Republic.

To review Lincoln's humble origin, his struggles for mere existence and for an education, and his rise to fame would be "carrying coals to Newcastle," for I realize that this audience knows as well as I that stirring and inspiring story.

But I do want to impress upon you, my good friends and neighbors of Queens, that his devotion to the cause of common honesty and simple decency, his unimpeachable integrity, and his love for his fellow man were the traits of character which have enshrined him in our hearts and in the souls of free men everywhere—it was these humane qualities, not the power that he wielded as a wartime President or the authority he exercised as the Chief Executive of the Nation.

On the other hand, it was these very virtues which gave birth to our party and which saved the Union; it is these virtues alone which can be our salvation today as we struggle for domestic fortitude and strength and international peace and prosperity.

The Republican Party was born to make men free. It was conceived in a period in our Nation's history when vested interests were in complete control—when property rights were absolute.

When Lincoln was a boy, a man was only as important and powerful as the wealth he possessed, and, of course, a part of that wealth was often the possession of other human beings, of slaves or chattels.

The Republican Party, therefore, originated as the Liberal Party; its lofty purposes and high ideals gave it victories at the polls for almost a half century with very few interruptions and it was the hope of progressive forces in the United States and throughout the world during that entire period.

Under Republican leadership, all men were made free and welcomed into the company of American citizens; public land in our Western States was given to all who would care for it and live on it; the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Labor were established; the Sherman Antitrust Act was passed to meet the challenge of big business to free government—all of these were Republican achievements which led the United States from its position of a divided second-rate world power to a unified, powerful Nation whose natural wealth and industrial might combined with its concern for individual dignity and freedom, made it the beacon light for all the people of the world who desired the better things of this world.

As has happened often in the past, however, the dominant faction for good in a country sometimes goes off the beam and ignores the well-charted course it has so carefully plotted.

This happened to our own party shortly after the beginning of this century and, as we lost our vision, we lost our momentum.

Then the desire for unqualified services to mankind at all levels, was greatly impaired.

We became smug and lazy and content to enjoy our sense of superiority and invincibility. Our leaders forgot that the Republican Party was established to serve all people and that the GOP was only as strong as the place it occupied in the hearts and minds of the voters of the Nation.

We lost the confidence of the people; we overlooked some of their just demands for betterment in their working or living conditions, and we fell under that axiom uttered by the Great Emancipator himself "* * * you can't fool all of the people all of the time."

As the Republican Party became overconfident and less observant, a second political party held us on downs, took the initiative, and became first in the hearts of our citizenry and first at the ballot boxes.

But now we find that that party itself is less vigilant and virile and that our great party has another opportunity to prove to the Nation that we are competent to serve all the people without regard to race, creed, or color.

That our party can meet the challenge of an industrial society in an uncertain world; that it can give honest and intelligent government to millions of people, that it can effectively guarantee civil liberties to all citizens regardless of their origin is demonstrated beyond doubt in the neighboring States of New York and New Jersey.

Your Governor, Thomas E. Dewey, and my Governor, Alfred E. Driscoll, have functioned most effectively as chief executives of two of the most important and diversified States in the Union.

They have been able to operate on a sound financial basis; they have been able to provide clean government, administered by men of integrity; they have been able to cooperate with other governmental units in planning, constructing, and operating jointly-used facilities without Federal aid or contributing to the ever-growing trend which is fast reducing State and local governments to mere fictions.

I refer, of course, to the present very dangerous and parasitical system of Federal grants-in-aid on a hand-out basis.

Above all, Governors Dewey and Driscoll exemplify the sort of leadership that the revivified Republican Party can provide for a Nation which demands statesmen of great stature as never before in its history.

Incidentally, speaking of New York, as I was, and of Democrats, as I was not, brings to mind a little story Representative Abraham Lincoln told the Congress in 1848:

"I have heard some things from New York, and if they are true, one might well say of your party there, as a drunken fellow once said when he heard the reading of an indictment for hog stealing. The clerk read on till he got to and through the words 'did steal, take, and carry away 10 boars, 10 sows, 10 shoats, and 10 pigs,' at which he exclaimed, 'Well, by golly, that is the most equally divided gang of hogs I ever did hear of.' If there is any gang of hogs more equally divided than the Democrats of New York are about this time, I have not heard of it."

One of the greatest shortcomings of the fat and incompetent Democratic administrations down in Washington is their policy in treating with those who would betray their Nation.

Lincoln, as a wartime President in a divided Nation, found that there were those in his immediate circle who wished him ill and who gave aid and comfort to their country's enemies.

But President Lincoln never reacted as has our present national leadership to the threat of treason and disunity.

After some 10 or 11 years of hiding behind his benefactors' official skirts and his White House entree, the high New Deal and Fair Deal officer, Alger Hiss, who would sell his own country down a Volga River, has been brought to justice.

This conviction was made against the wishes of the administration and despite the efforts of those men who have sworn to serve their Nation faithfully and to protect it against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

They have protected Hiss; they have secreted vital and damning evidence; they have procrastinated; they have lied. What faith can we have in such leaders?

We Republicans reject the soft and kid-glove treatment of communism—or of any foreign ism.

We repudiate the Democratic Party's handling of this specific case and their entire philosophy in this regard.

We condemn this record.

In 1858, when he was asked to define his position, Lincoln said, "I hope to 'stand firm' enough not to go backward, and yet not go forward fast enough to wreck the country's cause."

I feel that this could very well be the GOP's watchword for the 1950 and 1952 elections.

We cannot hope to prevail if we are content to look complacently back at our past record of achievements, but we reject a rapid rise to socialism and un-American schemes engineered by the Democratic Dealers.

Those now in power would give their programs a trace of respectability by allowing it to bask in the sunshine of Lincoln's progressive ideals, but it is too deeply pocked with the scars of intolerance, reckless and extravagant spending, hypocrisy, and the rankest demagogic appeals to the selfish instincts in man to be able to breathe that exalted air.

Its extreme efforts to maintain itself in control are marked with such atrocious examples of summary dismissals from high military posts as Admiral Denfeld's removal which can only demoralize young and efficient officers who want to serve their country with honor and distinction.

The administration's hypocrisy is nowhere better indicated than in the President's recent message to the Congress on taxes which is a masterpiece of double-talk and plain simple untruths.

You may remember that he said "we must continue to exert rigid economy" at the very time that his extravagance was bringing about a record peace-time deficit of some five or six billion dollars. This despite the fact that there is a high level of employment and a near-record national income.

These practices must end and in lieu thereof, we must have a positive and vigorous course of action based upon sound and staple principles. Such a program was ably "spelled out" by our great party at its convention in Philadelphia in 1948.

That platform was and is a masterpiece.

It is a progressive document which minces no words in its treatment of the problems of the day. It uses as its central motif, a quotation from Lincoln, and I quote: "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew."

Clearly any mind which can conceive such a forward-looking philosophy in respect to a nation's purposes and objectives according to the standards of our times, is a great liberal.

What, I ask, did Mr. Lincoln mean by this statement?

How, I ask, would he apply this terminology today?

Would he use its broad and noble meaning to usurp the legislative and judicial powers of his Government?

Would he permit its generality to be a guise to allow foreign ideologies to seep into and destroy the basic principles of his great charter of constitutional government for which he gave his life?

Would he allow such a noble utterance to be the means of wasting our great natural resources for the advancement of nations who would one day destroy us for their own ends?

Would he permit an interpretation of such eloquence to advance and establish a program which could only lead us to national bankruptcy and internal collapse?

Would he so use his own utterances to entrench himself and his party in power so firmly that he and his successors might one day dominate his people as the Roman emperors of old in complete disregard of his constitutional powers and prerogatives?

Would he, I ask you, as men and women who have enjoyed the blessings of Lincoln's mold and greatness, have ever done any of these things because of the high and lofty vision which inspired him to say and repeat:

"The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new, so must we think anew and act anew." The answer is "No."

Then, my dear friends, what did he mean when he said it?

Your great party in convention assembled in Philadelphia not only interpreted the meaning of this now historic utterance, but they also applied it.

One has but to read these solemn pledges made by our party to the people of America to realize that this pronouncement of Mr. Lincoln was the inspiration for the enlightened approach and the course of action promised by the delegates to that gathering.

Let me say that our failure then was not due to our aim, but to our methods.

We will again prevail if we are only as courageous in deed as we were in words.

I can assure you that there is no tendency in our ranks in Washington to ignore the present through gazing at the past.

We reject the trend toward centralism, toward Government control of every aspect of our lives, and toward statism.

I feel that Abraham Lincoln expressed these ideals well 96 years ago, when he said:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

And—

"I think a definition of 'popular sovereignty' in the abstract would be about this: That each man shall do precisely as he pleases with himself, and with all those things that exclusively concern him. * * * That a general government shall do all those things which pertain to it, and all the local governments shall do precisely as they please in respect to those matters which exclusively concern them."

Of course, these are not definite answers, and there are other questions which must be answered, but I feel that they do mark out a course of action and a basic philosophy of the role of government.

On some things, there can be no compromising.

The record of civil-rights legislation in New York and New Jersey has won praise for our party throughout the Nation, and must be supported with equal vigor at the Federal level.

Sound fiscal policies based on a "pay-as-you-go" premise are a "must" if the United States is to remain strong and vigorous. The excessive spending, the tremendously high level of taxation, and the red ink of deficit financing are inexcusable.

America is the hope of free men throughout the world and we cannot escape our responsibilities all over the globe.

To meet these needs, our foreign policy must be nonpartisan and aboveboard.

Of late, it has been neither and we propose to make it a truly bipartisan and cooperative undertaking.

I have given you what I feel to be the proper stand for the Republican Party to take on a few of the momentous issues of the day.

In a large part, I feel that our party is fostering these ideals and striving diligently for these ends.

We are back on the right road; we are the truly progressive and liberal party—certainly no statist or centralist supporter of economic and social bondage can claim that creeping socialism is either progressive or liberal.

Lincoln said: "In this age, and in this country, public sentiment is everything. With it, nothing can fail; against it, nothing can succeed."

Our task, then, for 1950 and for 1952, is to convince the people of this Nation that our purpose is as steadfast as our aims are worthy.

It is to this end that all of us must work; it is to this end that we must all give more of ourselves and our precious time than we have ever given before.

There is no more important mission left to us than that of saving our way of life for the generations yet unborn.

Let us then here highly resolve that through our party, the spirit of Abraham Lincoln shall live on in this land of ours; that "it is for us the living, to be dedicated to the unfinished work" which he "so nobly advanced"; that from his life we shall take "increased devotion" to those things for which he "gave his last full measure of devotion" that his party of the people "shall not perish from the earth" but shall have a "new birth" of vigor, courage, and vision with which to meet the challenges of the day.

Lincoln Day Addresses by Hon. Edward Martin, of Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD two addresses delivered by me.

There being no objection, the two addresses were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A LINCOLN DAY DINNER SPONSORED BY THE WARD COUNTY REPUBLICAN EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE AT PARKERSBURG, W. VA., FRIDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 10, 1950

It is most appropriate to pay tribute to the greatness of Abraham Lincoln in the State whose whole history has been one of loyalty to our Republic.

In the tragic days of crisis, when the fate of the Union hung in the balance, West Virginia took its stand with Abraham Lincoln.

True to the tradition of its sturdy and courageous pioneers the Mountain State severed relations with the Old Dominion. The gallant sons of West Virginia rallied to the Stars and Stripes. They fought and died to preserve the ideals of freedom—one nation and one flag.

We are assembled tonight as true Americans and loyal Republicans. We meet to honor the memory of a plain, humble, God-fearing man of the people who rose from a life of poverty and hardship to become one of the outstanding figures of world history.

We celebrate the birthday anniversary of one of the greatest of Americans, one of the founders of the Republican Party and first Republican of the United States.

The principles of Abraham Lincoln's Americanism were firmly rooted in profound and abiding faith. In the face of disappointments, defeat, and discouragement he never lost faith in the common sense and wholesome instincts of the people. He held firmly to faith in God, faith in himself, and faith in the future of America.

As a young lawyer, less than a year after he was admitted to practice, he summed up his philosophy in a speech at Springfield, Ill. He declared that the future support and defense of the Nation depended upon general intelligence, sound morality, and, in particular, reverence for the Constitution and the law.

Those principles were given further expression in the first resolution ever adopted by the Republican Party in national convention.

That resolution is one that can be adopted without reservation by every good American today. It touches upon the vital issues of our own time. It was as follows, and I quote:

"*Resolved*, That the maintenance of the principles promulgated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Federal Constitution are essential to the preservation of our republican institutions; and that the Federal Constitution, the rights of the States, and the union of the States must be preserved."

The delegates to that history-making first convention, held in the city of Philadelphia 94 years ago, were summoned by a call which could be echoed today.

It was addressed, and again I quote: "To all the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions, who are opposed * * * to the policies of the present administration * * * and in favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

The words of that Republican platform are just as timely and just as inspiring today as they were in the crisis of Lincoln's time.

Republican devotion to individual freedom, to the Constitution, and the Bill of Rights has never faltered or diminished.

Republican programs and policies are those of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln. The platforms of the Republican Party have charted all the expansion and all the prosperity which this Nation has enjoyed in the half-century of its greatest progress.

The prosperity of that period was produced by the inventive genius, the resourcefulness, initiative, hard work, and thrift of the American people.

It was encouraged and stimulated by government through economical administration, sound fiscal policies, a stable currency, and national solvency.

Freedom of the individual was the door to opportunity for every American, no matter how humble his birth or origin.

Slavery was the great question that inflamed the passions of men in Lincoln's day.

Today, another form of slavery threatens the future of America and all its people.

The creeping paralysis of socialism is spreading through our country. If allowed to run its course, it means slavery to the Government. It means the destruction of individual freedom and the loss of all liberty.

And the great tragedy of it all is that we are being bribed with our own money into the bondage of the socialistic state.

You will note that the first Republican convention was organized under a call to all the people of the United States who were opposed to the policies of the Democratic administration then in power.

Let us examine briefly the policies of the Democratic administration now in control at Washington.

Let us consider its plans and proposals and see what awaits us at the end of the road over which we are being driven.

Recently we have had three messages from the President dealing with the state of the Union, the economic plans of his administration, and its fiscal program. In none of them was there a mention of socialism, but all the elements of the socialistic state were outlined in unmistakable terms. Mr. Truman advocated and demanded increased taxation, unlimited spending, deficit financing, and the piling up of more billions on top of our staggering national debt.

He submitted a budget of $42,500,000,000—the largest peacetime budget in the history of the world. Then he told the American taxpayers they would have to go in the red $5,100,000,000 more, just to pay the expenses of the Federal Government.

But that's not all. He proposes that Congress enact laws and appropriate funds to place education under Federal control, to socialize the practice of medicine, and for political dictatorship of agriculture through the Brannan plan.

No one, in the administration or out of it, has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of Government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon the worker, the farmer and every other taxpayer.

These are just some of the schemes that spell socialism under the cruel and discredited theory that an all-powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

What are the American people offered in return for this proposed surrender to Government control and regimentation?

President Truman has given us a beautiful picture of the bright-colored, rosy prosperity and happiness that he envisions some time in the future.

A dream world of health, happiness, and security awaits us in the year 2000, he said in effect. At that time, 50 years from now, every wage earner would enjoy an income of $12,000 a year.

We were told also that this fabulous income of $12,000 a year would result from an expanded industrial plant and an expanded economy.

We were not told, however, that the whole philosophy of the proposed program would dry up investment capital and would prevent industrial and economic expansion.

We were not told that the enormous increase in the cost of government and the tremendous increase in the national debt would so greatly reduce the value of the dollar that it would have less than one-third the purchasing power of today's dollar.

The dollar buys much less today than it did 50 years ago. Expert economists have figured that 50 years from now we will have an 18-cent dollar if the Government's present spendthrift course is continued through that period.

Nevertheless, we are promised ease and security for all. No one will have to take the hard knocks that so many of us have encountered upon the road of life.

But first—and always keep this in mind—first, we must go broke. We must spend ourselves into national bankruptcy. We must forget all about economy and a balanced budget. We must not worry about taxes that become more and more oppressive every year. We must not care a rap how high the national debt climbs.

Spend, spend, spend—that is the order of the day in President Truman's program for the Nation.

My fellow Americans, I say it is a dangerous, dishonest, and immoral program.

It is stealing and squandering the savings of the people. It is destroying initiative and all incentive. It drains off savings that might be invested in job-creating productive enterprise. It is robbing youth of this and future generations of the opportunities America has held out so generously in the past.

And most important, it must result in national bankruptcy and the slavery of the socialistic state. It must place our people under the same strangling controls and regulations that have brought ruin to every nation where socialism deprived people of their freedom.

The Truman socialistic spending program, to which so many of our people have been attracted, recalls the warning of Lincoln when he said, and I quote:

"If destruction be our lot we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

The Truman socialistic-spending program is contrary to the teachings of Thomas Jefferson, whom those in control of the present administration pretend to follow. It is contrary to the philosophy of Lincoln who declared, and again I quote:

"The principles of Jefferson are the definitions and axioms of a free society."

When these self-styled followers of Jefferson hail him as their patron saint at their $100 dinners they neglect to recall his words of solemn warning. Jefferson said and I quote:

"I place economy among the first and most important of republican virtures and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be feared."

They likewise conveniently forget that it was Thomas Jefferson who said, and again I quote:

"When all government * * * in little as in great things shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power * * * it will become venal and oppressive."

Those were the definitions and axioms of a free society in which Abraham Lincoln believed. They are principles to which the Republican Party has subscribed throughout its history. They are American principles, not a socialistic pattern based on the false teachings of Marx and Lenin.

Lincoln based the critical period of his administration on a text from the Bible: A house divided against itself cannot stand.

That quotation from scripture applies with equal force to the critical situation of the present day.

We can have socialism—or we can have liberty and freedom of the individual.

We cannot have both. One or the other will be destroyed.

We are, therefore, faced with these overall questions:

Do the American people want a socialistic system of government?

Would they vote for socialism in a free election if the issue was presented under its true label?

Are they willing to be bribed with their own money into accepting socialism because it promises an easy way of life?

Are they willing to surrender the dignity and freedom of the individual in exchange for so-called free hand-outs from an all-powerful central government?

Let us pray to Almighty God that the time shall never come when these questions will be answered except by a loud and resounding "No."

And that time will never come if we take Lincoln as our guide and face the menace to American freedom with general intelligence, sound morality, and reverence for the Constitution and the law.

Prosperity has never been achieved through tricky political promises. The happiness of the people has never been advanced by the Government taking away their earnings and then giving them so-called free hand-outs.

Security has never been established for any people on earth through the demagog's deceptive offer of something for nothing.

The free spender of other people's money is always popular. But his wasteful, extravagant course always ends in financial and moral bankruptcy.

Our first line of defense must be a strong, stable, solvent America. We want a self-reliant, prosperous dynamic America.

We need as a definite policy of Government control of spending, not control over people.

America was built on a dream of liberty. Let us fight as Americans and Republicans against turning that dream into a nightmare of socialistic slavery.

Today as Republicans we are fighting to preserve the concept of life as laid down by Thomas Jefferson and Abraham Lincoln.

As an army of truth and righteousness let us go forth to battle to save America and to preserve the God-given rights of free men.

ADDRESS BY HON. EDWARD MARTIN, OF PENNSYLVANIA, AT A LINCOLN DAY DINNER OF THE LINCOLN REPUBLICAN CLUB OF OAKLAND COUNTY, MICH., AT PONTIAC, MICH., MONDAY EVENING, FEBRUARY 13, 1950

I am sincerely and highly honored by the privilege of joining with you in this Lincoln Day celebration.

Just 5 years ago tonight it was my extreme pleasure to welcome your distinguished ex-governor, the Honorable Harry F. Kelly, as the Lincoln Day speaker in the city of Pittsburgh, Pa. His eloquent and forceful presentation of Lincoln's service to America and to mankind was a real inspiration.

Later in the same year, as Governor of Pennsylvania, I attended the Conference of Governors at Mackinac Island. On that occasion I experienced the warmth and cordiality of Michigan's generous hospitality. I was thrilled by the unforgettable beauty of your great recreational areas.

Michigan holds a proud place among the States of the Union. It exemplifies the American system of free enterprise at its best.

Here you have created a vast empire of production. Your giant industrial strength was a bulwark of national defense in time of war and makes a mighty contribution to world progress in peacetime.

Most noteworthy is the fact that your unparalleled industrial growth had its beginnings in the dynamic energy of plain men of the people, skilled mechanics and craftsmen who worked with their hands.

Here the miracle of mass production was brought to its highest stage of development. Great names stand out in your industrial history, Ford, Olds, Chalmers, Durant, Willys, Chrysler, and many others.

It is important to remember that their wonderful achievements were accomplished without looking to the Government for help when difficulties were encountered.

Neither were they hampered by bureaucratic controls or regulation. They planned and worked in an atmosphere of individual freedom which has given America the highest standard of living and the highest level of opportunity the world has ever known.

Since I have been a Member of the United States Senate, nothing has given me greater satisfaction than the fine association I have enjoyed with your courageous and able Senators, ARTHUR VANDENBERG and HOMER FERGUSON.

They are not only great Senators, but they are great American patriots. They are statesmen in the tradition of Abraham Lincoln. They are imbued with the same love of liberty and devotion to American ideals.

The principles of Abraham Lincoln live on in the honorable career of your distinguished Representative in Congress, GEORGE DONDERO. He is a credit to your State and the Nation as one of the ablest Members of Congress.

A profound student of American history he has gained national recognition as an outstanding authority on the life of Abraham Lincoln. No man in America is better qualified to apply the ideals of Lincoln to the problems we face today.

Michigan's Republicanism stems from that outpouring of patriotic spirit that took place in July of 1854 at Jackson in your own State. There the name of the Republican Party was formally adopted and Michigan took her place in American political history as the first State to give the Republican Party victory at the polls.

I am proud to recall that my own Commonwealth of Pennsylvania shares with

Michigan the honor of participating in the founding and development of the party of Abraham Lincoln.

In February of 1856, courageous and patriotic Americans met at Pittsburgh and formulated plans for the first Republican National Convention.

That convention, dedicated to the ideals of human rights, individual freedom, the maintenance of the Constitution, and the preservation of the Union, was held, most appropriately, in the birthplace of American independence, the city of Philadelphia.

The delegates were summoned by a call that can be echoed today. It was addressed and I quote:

"To all the people of the United States, without regard to past political differences or divisions who are opposed * * * to the policies of the present administration and in favor of restoring the action of the Federal Government to the principles of Washington and Jefferson."

I repeat, that call can go out today, renewed in strength and vigor by the greatness of Abraham Lincoln and the proud record of the Republican Party in three generations of American progress.

We face a crisis today just as challenging as that in Lincoln's time.

We, too, in our day, must fight to restore the action of the Federal Government to the fundamental principles that have come down to us from the founders of our Republic.

Lincoln's great task was the preservation of the Union. The great duty before us is to preserve freedom of the individual and the God-given right of every American to live in liberty, free from the strangling dictatorship of state socialism.

We must defend our country from the destructive blight that is corrupting American morality with its false promise of something for nothing.

We must resist the ever-increasing centralization of governmental power and authority at Washington by insidious grants of so-called aid to the States.

We must awaken the American people to the dangers of deficit financing and a continued policy of taxing and spending that means bigger debt and more oppressive taxes year after year.

We must summon all the patriotic strength of an aroused people to prevent a headlong plunge into national bankruptcy.

The party of Abraham Lincoln is committed to these things and will continue the fight because we know that freedom depends upon a sound, strong financial and spiritual structure. An insolvent nation cannot be a free nation. Economic bankruptcy is the road to political and moral disaster.

My fellow Americans, that is the perilous road over which we are being driven with no thought of the price we must pay.

The paramount issue before us is whether we are to continue on the primrose path to disaster or whether we are to return to the road of constitutional government and individual freedom.

One leads to the slavery of socialistic regimentation and control. The other is the way to real progress and prosperity. It is plainly marked with the signposts of sound fiscal policies, stable currency, economical administration, and national solvency.

Let us survey briefly the program of the Truman administration and see over which road the so-called Fair Deal is taking us.

Recently we have had three messages from the President dealing with the state of the Union, the economic plans of his administration, and its fiscal program.

In none of them was there a mention of socialism—but all the elements of the socialistic state were outlined in unmistakable terms.

Mr. Truman advocated and demanded increased taxation—unlimited spending, deficit financing, and the piling up of more billions on top of our staggering national debt.

He submitted a budget of $42,500,000,000—the largest peacetime budget in the history of the world. Then he told the American taxpayers they would have to go in the red $5,100,000,000 more, just to pay the expenses of the Federal Government.

But that's not all. He proposes that Congress enact laws and appropriate funds to place education under Federal control, to socialize the practice of medicine, and for political dictatorship of agriculture through the Brannan plan.

No one, in the administration or out of it, has been able to estimate how much these dangerous proposals would cost. But we do know that they would add billions of dollars to the already swollen cost of government. They would place an additional back-breaking burden upon the worker, the farmer, and every other taxpayer.

These are just some of the schemes that spell socialism under the cruel and discredited theory that an all-powerful central government can manage the people's lives better than they can for themselves.

What are the American people offered in return for this proposed surrender to Government control and regimentation?

President Truman has given us a beautiful picture of the bright-colored, rosy prosperity and happiness that he envisions sometime in the future.

A dream world of health, happiness, and security awaits us in the year 2000, he said in effect. At that time, 50 years from now, every wage earner would enjoy an income of $12,000 a year.

We were told also that this fabulous income of $12,000 a year would result from an expanded industrial plant and an expanded economy.

We were not told, however, that the whole philosophy of the proposed program would dry up investment capital and would prevent industrial and economic expansion.

We were not told that the enormous increase in the cost of government and the tremendous increase in the national debt would so greatly reduce the value of the dollar that it would have less than one-third the purchasing power of today's dollar.

The dollar buys much less today than it did 50 years ago. Expert economists have figured that 50 years from now we will have an 18-cent dollar if the Government's present spendthrift course is continued through that period.

Nevertheless, we are promised ease and security for all. No one will have to take the hard knocks that so many of us have encountered upon the road of life.

But first—and always keep this in mind—first, we must go broke. We must spend ourselves into national bankruptcy. We must forget all about economy and a balanced budget. We must not worry about taxes that become more and more oppressive every year. We must not care a rap how high the national debt climbs.

Spend, spend, spend—that is the order of the day in President Truman's program for the Nation.

My fellow Americans, I say it is a dangerous, dishonest, and immoral program.

It is stealing and squandering the savings of the people. It is destroying initiative and all incentive. It drains off savings that might be invested in job-creating productive enterprise. It is robbing youth of this and future generations of the opportunities America has held out so generously in the past.

And most important, it must result in national bankruptcy and the slavery of the socialistic state. It must place our people under the same strangling controls and regulations that have brought ruin to every nation where socialism deprived people of their freedom.

The Truman socialistic spending program, to which so many of our people have been attracted, recalls the warning of Lincoln when he said, and I quote:

"If destruction be our lot we ourselves must be its author and finisher. As a Nation of freemen we must live through all time or die by suicide."

My fellow Americans, if we are guided by the wisdom and the example of Lincoln, America will not die by suicide but will survive as a nation of freedom and opportunity.

If we are to help save America we must all take a more active interest in politics. The kind of government we have is decided at the ballot box.

In reviewing the greatness of Abraham Lincoln we must remember his genius as a politician. He was a strong party man. He believed in party loyalty and party discipline. His statesmanship represented political action at its best. He believed in good government, honest government as the best politics because it truly advanced the welfare of his fellow Americans.

Lincoln's birthday should be celebrated wherever men rejoice in the ideals of freedom. His devotion to true Americanism guided him from a life of poverty and hardship to a place among the world's immortals.

True Americanism is just as important in our day as it was in Lincoln's time. The great issue confronting us is to drive the Reds out of the Government and to get our Government out of the red.

As Americans and as Republicans, we can pay no greater honor to the memory of Abraham Lincoln than by planning and working to preserve the Republic he so nobly served.

National Health Insurance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a discussion entitled "Do We Want National Health Insurance in the United States," in which the Honorable Harold Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and the distinguished Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] participated, on Sunday, January 29, 1950. Senators will find this an illuminating discussion on the subject of adequate medical care for the people of the United States.

There being no objection, the discussion was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ANNOUNCER. The National Broadcasting Co. presents the American Forum of the Air, founded 21 years ago by Theodore Granik and dedicated to the full and public discussion of all sides of all issues, coming to you today before a large crowd in the famous Continental Room of the Wardman Park Hotel in Washington, D. C.

Now here is your moderator, Theodore Granik.

Chairman GRANIK. The current issue of Reader's Digest magazine carries to its 50,000,000 readers throughout the world a vital and dramatic report, the second of a series of articles on the British national health program written by Harold E. Stassen, former Governor of Minnesota, and now president

of the University of Pennsylvania. Commenting on the services performed by London hospitals Governor Stassen says:

"The conclusion would be that Londoners are now getting less than they once did and at higher costs."

He quotes a British doctor as saying, and I read from the Digest:

"Please tell our friends in America, 'Never, never, never adopt such a program.' "

However, Oscar Ewing, United States Federal Security Administrator, while in London recently, heard that most of the critics tried to mislead the American people on facts about the British National Health Service. "What we have seen in England," said Mr. Ewing, "confirms my deep conviction that the national health insurance proposal will be good for America."

So today the American Forum of the Air, in cooperation with Reader's Digest, presents a discussion on this timely subject. We are privileged to have as our speakers Governor Stassen and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, member of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and coauthor of the administration's bill proposing national health insurance for the United States.

Now, Senator PEPPER, if you met this British doctor what would be your answer to his "never, never, never"?

Senator PEPPER. Mr. Granik, in the first place, I would tell the British doctor that we do not propose to adopt the British plan in the United States. Under the British plan the Government pays about 90 percent of the cost of the medical care dispensed under the plan. In this country about eight-ninths or seven-eighths of the cost of the plan would be paid for by those who are covered, who pay the required payments periodically.

In the second place, I would say that our plan is not state medicine or socialist medicine. It is a national health insurance plan, which the British plan is not.

Then I would say to this doctor that in the United States there are about 40,000,000 people, roughly, who are part of income groups who make less than $2,000 a year, and about 60,000,000 people who are part of income groups who make less than $3,000 a year; that all our data show that these people and many more simply cannot pay, without ruinous cost to themselves, the cost of the hospital and medical care they require in this expensive age of excellent medicine.

Chairman GRANIK. Would you care to comment on that, Governor?

Senator PEPPER. Therefore, what we propose to do, in the language of Winston Churchill, who proposed the basis of the British plan in the House of Commons in 1911, to use his words, is "to bring the magic of averages to the rescue of millions," through giving an opportunity to participate in national health insurance to these people who need the care they don't now generally get.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen.

Governor STASSEN. Of course, I immediately would have to say that Senator PEPPER has misquoted Mr. Churchill. In other words, he has gone back to the Lloyd George proposal of 1911, which was something entirely different, which was private and not governmental in its nature. So I first want to clear up his misquotation.

Then I want to point out that the statement that they are not trying to copy the British program is definitely not correct. In fact, Mr. Ewing, the commissioner, has indicated that that is the program they are following.

Senator PEPPER'S statement simply was that they are going to raise the money in a different way. It doesn't change the nature of the program whether you collect the taxes one way or another.

The key point is that under the program that President Truman and Senator PEPPER have presented for adoption by the American Congress, you would bring a large sum of money, perhaps $6,000,000,000 to $8,000,000,000, under the direction of a national committee appointed by the President, of different men, and you would bring all the doctors and the nurses and the hospitals and dentists under the thumb of this committee of five. All the experience in the world says when you do that you injure the health of the people rather than promote the health of the people.

Chairman GRANIK. How about that, Senator?

Senator PEPPER. In the first place, I am quoting from the Evening Star in Washington, excerpts from the text of Churchill's broadcast on war progress and postwar hopes, March 22, 1943. This is Mr. Churchill's language in 1943, when he thought what he said in 1911 was pertinent because here is what Mr. Churchill said:

"Here is a real opportunity for what I once called 'bring the magic of averages to the rescue of millions.' Therefore, you must rank me and my colleagues as partisans of national compulsory insurance for all classes, for all purposes, from the cradle to the grave."

Furthermore——

Chairman GRANIK. Do you want to comment, Governor?

Senator PEPPER. Let me continue. Furthermore, this same Hon. Winston Churchill in a radio speech on January 23, 1950, said the following:

"As head of the wartime government I proclaimed the 4-year plan of social reform, education, family allowances, and the national-health scheme. Although mu'led and twisted a bit by ministerial ineptitude, this program has now largely been carried through."

The first sentence under the title "The Health Service," in the pamphlet This Is the Road, of the Conservative and Unionists Party for the elections of this year, which is Churchill's party, reads:

"We pledge ourselves to maintain and improve the health service."

So they are not going back on their national health service.

Mr. STASSEN. The Senator is very clearly quickly shifting between talk of the health service or talk of the national compulsory insurance system. I think that when we definitely analyze what has happened under the British system, we realize that it is a system that we should never, never follow. The facts are that the death rate has increased in England under this new national health program. It went up rather sharply. The facts are that illness and sickness and absence for illness increased in the first year of the plan.

It is true that the coalition government during the war appointed the so-called Beveridge Commission, and that out of that arose in the postwar situation the adoption of the plan. It is also true that they clearly aren't going to make any major change in their plan until they have tried it out for a few years, certainly not in the first year. But there has been one significant reversal already which the coalition of both parties have already adopted, and that is when they started out to give away all medicine, they found the abuses so extensive that Mr. Attlee on October 24 reversed that policy and began to make a change.

I think in quoting specific Britishers we are getting a bit off the point. The point is, we want to advance the health of the American people. We want better health in America. How can we get it? The main point would be some constructive moves, but definitely we do not want to take the move that has caused so many other countries to go down in their health programs.

I have here the statistics of all the nations in the world, the point presented by the United Nations. These statistics show that the United States today has the best health record of any major country in the world; in other words, more favorable death statistics, better situations as to maternal deaths, as to illness, and all of those major factors of health. When we have the best health record in the world, why don't we improve the system we have rather than start to copy countries with records not as good as ours.

Chairman GRANIK. Senator? Go ahead, Senator.

Senator PEPPER. Let me say in the first place that we are talking in respect to Mr. Churchill and the British health scheme which the Governor had so severely criticized in his two articles in Reader's Digest. We are both talking about the same thing.

In the second place, the governor, in his Reader's Digest article, has attributed to the health insurance service of Great Britain greater sickness and more deaths. The distinguished Governor pointed dramatically at the conclusion of his first article to 72,000 more tombstones in the cemeteries of Britain, which he clearly inferred, if he didn't charge, were attributable to this national health service. The Governor and I are in politics, or we have been. He may still be—both of us. I would like to ask my distinguished friend if it is likely that Winston Churchill, slashing as he is at the Labor Government, if he believes and if the British people believe that a national health scheme in effect was causing more tombstones in the cemeteries and more illness, if the British Conservative Party which Churchill leads would have said "We propose to maintain and improve the national health service," and if Dr. Charles Hill, who is to the British medical profession what Dr. Fishbein used to be to the American, before the American Medical Association let him out, if Dr. Charles Hill would say that no political party dares to propose the repeal of the national health service.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, may I point out when you quoted Mr. Churchill, he said, "We will improve the health service to the British people." He did not say "We will hold onto this complete compulsory system that was put in." The manner in which the British will proceed, in my judgment, will be that after they have had 2 or 3 or 4 years' experience, they will again appoint a coalition commission, which is the way the British do things, and on a bipartisan basis they will review and study what has happened, and then you will begin to see the major change in the British approach. They never have and they do not make issues in their campaigns of things of this kind. They study them. Then they move together and then if they find they are mistaken they will study them again under a bipartisan commission and move again.

Let me point out that it was the Churchill government that received the Beveridge Commission report. Obviously, as I say in those articles in the Reader's Digest, you shouldn't expect a conclusive judgment in 1 year's time, but when President Truman and yourself are proposing that we should copy the British, then I say let's look at the 1-year record, and when the 1-year record shows more deaths than the year before, shows more illness than the year before, shows this discontent among the doctors and hospitals and nurses, then I say that means, let us not do it. Let's continue to watch the British, but let's move on some of the problems that definitely need action in America and upon which we can all agree and upon which we can cooperate with the American doctors.

Senator PEPPER. The Governor means that the British political parties don't raise issues when they don't think it would be politically wise to raise those issues.

Mr. STASSEN. That isn't what I mean, Senator, and you know it.

Senator PEPPER. You as Governor know that the British Conservative Party issued this statement on the health service, and then we will pass on.

Mr. STASSEN. Let's get to our own pattern here. Do we want it here?

Senator PEPPER. Let's get one fact. Do you say that the British Conservative Party proposes to repeal the compulsory health service in existence at the present time?

Mr. STASSEN. Of course not. Neither party proposes it now. I merely say——

Senator PEPPER. Having settled that, now let's go——

Mr. STASSEN. There are other important issues in this British election that is coming up. They will reexamine their health plan in a few years by a commission similar to the Beveridge Commission.

Senator PEPPER. We are examining ours, and having examined it, we are discovering the deficiencies we are trying to correct by national health insurance. That is where we are today. As I said a while ago, ours is a national health-insurance program. It is not State medicine; it is not charity. The individual covered under our proposal would simply pay, as he does under social-security coverage at the present time a percentage of his income up to a maximum amount. For example, it is proposed now that a covered worker would pay when the program is in operation 1½ percent of his income, not to exceed $400 a month. The maximum he would pay would be $6 a month, if he made $400 a month income. If he made $100 a month in income, he would pay $1.50, 1½ percent of the $100. His employer would pay the same amount. That fund would go into the health fund, as it were, out of which hospital and medical costs would be paid, with the distinct and the very clear reservation that the covered individual, the patient, would have the free choice of his doctor, and the doctor would have the free choice of determining whether he would accept a given patient or not.

I ask the question, if it is found important and no political party proposes to repeal it, to establish social security, where in order to provide retired people something like an annuity at 65, we require them to make a periodic deduction from their income, then surely the importance of life and health to those people would justify the extension of that social-security principle so that they would always be assured of adequate hospital and medical care.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, you present, of course, President's Truman's and your own proposal in a very appealing way, and it sounds good on the surface, but this is what actually happens. When you provide a central fund which is billions of dollars, and you say you are going to pay all the hospital and medical bills out of that fund, the experience in every country in the world has been that then abuses arise; in other words, that a small percentage of the people who are malingerers or hypochondriacs, call up the hospitals, call up the doctors' offices, and the doctors cannot perform as good service as they did before. The result of these abuses is that rather than having better health service, you have a depreciating health service, and, as I said, a higher death rate and more illness. So the people who think they are going to get something better and cheaper find that actually they are paying through taxes a higher cost for something available in greater quantity but of lower quality, and that that has been the result throughout the world. That is the evil of your compulsory health service.

The other thing is that you bring all the doctors under the politicians. You bring the political situation into the patient-doctor relationship. I say that clearly under such a system it would become more important for a doctor in Florida to know Senator PEPPER or for a doctor in Missouri to know the Democratic leaders there, than it would be for him to make progress in his own profession and do a better job. When that political situation comes about, when you bring the political aspect into medicine, then the health of the people suffers.

Senator PEPPER. I think the quality of medical service that we get out at Walter Reed and at the Naval Hospital at Bethesda and generally the quality of medical service being given in the Veterans' Administration hospitals over the country and in the Public Health hospitals, it might be called political in that it is provided by the Government, but it is of a quality that I think commends itself to the people.

The Governor has stated the assumption that the quality of British medical service was impaired by this plan. I have here a letter dated the 20th of January 1950, from the secretary of the British Medical Association. When I quoted to him the governor's statement about "more medical care, lower quality for more people at higher cost," here is what Dr. Hill, who, as I said, corresponds to what Dr. Fishbein was in this country, said:

"Lower quality. We do not admit this."

The gist of the whole matter is that we have all readily admitted that there would be many administrative problems to be overcome. I have here what the British Conservative Party proposes to do. It proposes to improve the administration of this bill, but not to change its basic essentials, so that all the British people will get the medical and hospital care they require. But surely it is easier to overcome that than the people to be denied service they need and can't pay for.

Chairman GRANIK. Let's take some questions from our audience. Miss Penuel has a gentleman there with a question.

Question. Senator PEPPER, basically isn't the shortage of hospitals, clinics, nurses, and doctors the fundamental problem facing us today, and not the need for compulsory national health insurance, in your opinion?

Senator PEPPER. No; that is not the exclusive problem. However, the Senate passed a bill—and I was the principal author of the bill and handled it in the Senate, which is now awaiting passage by the House—under which for the first time the Federal Government gives aid in the establishment of medical schools, and I hope Florida will get one from it, and I hope some Florida people are listening in. It provides a Federal assistance fund to aid in the operation of medical schools so as to train more personnel and other aid to train more dentists and nurses and hospital administrators and technologists. However, even when we have more professional people and more hospitals—and the Federal Government is now contributing $150,000,000 a year to do that, and I am one of the authors of that bill, and that is in effect—we are also expanding vastly our research programs, and I have been identified with nearly every one of them. But when we get the doctors and professional people, the hospitals, and these expensive drugs, I say to you that the simple income facts of the people of this country show that the major part of our people simply cannot pay the cost without being ruined or without having to accept charity.

Chairman GRANIK. Governor Stassen?

Mr. STASSEN. The facts of the matter are that the greatest deficiency in medical service now is for the Negro population of the South. Those are the people who are most being denied health services, and that rests directly with the discrimination on the part of the leaders of the Senator's party in the South. That is one of the problems that we ought to move on to correct.

In this matter of providing facilities for them, the facts are that the great advance that has been made is under the Hill-Burton Act. The Hill-Burton Act was a bipartisan act passed some 5 years ago and, of course, when Senator Burton, now a Justice of the Supreme Court, was in the Senate. That was a bipartisan measure upon which everybody agreed, and 1,000 local hospitals and facilities have been increased through it. That is the kind of constructive American type of action I want to see.

Likewise we have this measure to assist in medical education, and yet it doesn't get passed. Why don't the President and Senator PEPPER, instead of asking for something which all the doctors and all the experience of the world say is bad, bring through some of these constructive measures for improvement of medical education, for more medical education, and opportunities in hospitals for the Negroes of the South, and for an advance in the sound medical program in mental health which we all agree is a governmental problem, instead of trying to upset the whole medical profession and the whole, great, magnificent health service in this country?

Senator PEPPER. The Governor is certainly overlooking the obvious non sequitur which must appear in my distinguished friend's argument. We are not trying to upset anything, unless it upsets the doctors a little bit to have to agree to a reasonable schedule of fees if they perform services for this health-insurance fund. They are performing services already for the Veterans' Administration. They are working on salary at Walter Reed and at the Naval Hospital. I find Senators and Congressmen who speak very loudly against national health insurance are quite ready to go out and take the services of a salaried doctor at Walter Reed.

Chairman GRANIK. A question from a lady over there.

Question. Governor Stassen, can there be an effective alternative to a national health insurance program?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes; definitely. We can move on a constructive program, and it could be worked out on a bipartisan basis and with the doctors. In fact, the third and fourth articles in the Reader's Digest will come forward strong on the constructive side. The important thing is first to conclude that we don't want to go into a program which causes all these other countries to have bad health statistics. We want, rather, to work out an American type program. When Senator PEPPER speaks as if the veterans' medicine program is an example for it, he knows that that is not a correct example. In the first place, you are talking about a service limited in a total free profession, and the voluntary deans committees and things of that kind that have helped in the veterans' medical program have built it up. But the facts of the matter are that the great advances in medicine in the United States have not come under Government medicine. They have been made by the free medical profession and by the great universities of the country, such as Harvard Medical School, Chicago Medical School, and our own University of Pennsylvania Medical School, which was the first one established in this country. We will give due credit for a fairly good job in the veterans' hospitals, but that is certainly not any argument for taking over the whole of the medical profession and putting them under the thumb of a group of politicians appointed by the President.

Senator PEPPER. Nobody proposes to take over any part of the medical profession or any hospital in the country. Contrasting our proposals with that of Britain, they have taken over practically all the hospitals, but we do not propose to take over a single hospital. We only give Federal assistance in the establishment and in the construction or in the enlargement of hospitals. So, if doctors didn't wish to come under the other plan by accepting a reasonable schedule of fees, they could stay out from under it.

Mr. STASSEN. Senator, may I pick you up on that?

Senator PEPPER. Just one minute. You made a statement or two, Governor. Allow me to speak of one other fact.

The Governor has mentioned the question, why do we fly in the face of experience. I am prepared to show here that even Sweden who, like most other countries, started off with the ordinary private fee for service system, finally moved along to the next step, the voluntary system, as England did for a while, found those were inadequate because the people who needed to be in it didn't join and they dropped out before they should have. Then they moved on to the compulsory, and that is exactly the evolution here. Now we are up to the voluntary stage, and we are seeing the necessity, as the American Medical Association did in 1932, of moving on to the compulsory to protect the masses of the people.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, we just have time for summaries. I understand you want to comment. Will you comment in your summary, Governor?

Mr. STASSEN. Yes. First of all, your reference to Sweden. The facts of the matter are that under the semisocialist medical program in Sweden, they are not making as good a record as they are in a similar place in the United States. Let me put it this way so you understand it: A Swede in Minnesota lives longer and is healthier than a Swede in Sweden. That is an extreme way of putting it, but it is true. In other words, an American of Swedish background in Minnesota has a better health record under the American system than do the Swedes in Sweden under the semisocialist system which doesn't even go as far as the Senator's proposal.

Now on your statement that you were not taking over the professions, let me quote you section 717 of the bill which you and President Truman are proposing. This says that every doctor, every nurse, every individual, every hospital that comes under this act shall enter an agreement "which shall contain an undertaking to comply with this title and with regulations prescribed by the National Health Board thereunder."

In other words, everybody in all these professions would have to comply with all the regulations and rulings of this five-man board appointed by the President. If that wouldn't bring them under the thumb of the politicians, I don't know what would.

Chairman GRANIK. Thank you, Governor. Your summary, Senator.

Senator PEPPER. Governor, it has been made very clear in the hearings and in the discussion of this measure that the administration of this measure will be in local hands, not only the State levels but down at the local level, and affecting all professional matters that every local committee which has decisive authority shall be composed of a majority of professional people.

Mr. STASSEN. The bill does not so provide.

Senator PEPPER. There is a sentence in there that would allow any other effect? All your Republican member has to propose is to amend it, and he will have a sympathetic hearing. On the subject of Sweden, the Governor evidently didn't recall that the Swedish system, the voluntary plan, goes into effect in 1951, so he is not talking about the same thing that they are going to have over there a little bit later.

Mr. STASSEN. Semisocialist system, I said.

Chairman GRANIK. I am sorry, gentlemen, the time is up.

Our speakers have been Gov. Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania, and Senator CLAUDE PEPPER, Democrat, of Florida, who have been discussing the question, "Do we want national-health insurance in the United States?"

Thank you gentlemen.

Happenings in Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio address delivered by me on February 13.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HAPPENINGS IN WASHINGTON

(Program No. 18)

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital, and bringing you another discussion of Happenings in Washington.

As you know, in these broadcasts I have always tried to discuss matters in which the people of our State have indicated they are vitally interested.

In recent weeks my mail has been unusually heavy on the subject of communism and the Alger Hiss case. I have had dozens of letters from all parts of Pennsylvania condemning the Secretary of State, Dean Acheson, for his statement following the conviction of Hiss.

Certainly this whole matter is timely and important. It must be given prompt, serious, and sober attention.

Certainly Americans are wise to ask whether our Government has been properly purged of seditious elements. Certainly they are right in insisting that nothing be done or said in high circles that would give encouragement to those who conspire to destroy this Nation or surrender it to foreign ideologies.

My own stand on communism is well known to you. For years—for many years—I have fought communism and I have warned our people to be on guard against it.

I was in the forefront of this fight at a time when it was decidedly unpopular to take a stand against communism. Not so many years ago, you will recall, those who were trying to explain to Americans that communism was a cancerous growth, a deadly menace to American freedom, were sneeringly called red-baiters. We were ridiculed. We were laughed at. Some were even smeared as Fascists.

Today, I am happy to say, we have come a long way toward winning that fight. Today I believe most Americans are alert to the danger. Not many are fooled by claims that communism is a better system of government than our own plan of individual freedom in a self-governing republic.

Today most Americans understand that communism is another form of ruthless dictatorship which denies God and destroys liberty. Today a man can say these things without being called a black-hearted Fascist.

There is no doubt that the disclosures of the Alger Hiss trial have been tremendously important. Now no one can fail to be convinced—despite official denials—that Communists had worked their way into high places in our Government and were coloring our foreign and domestic policies.

I don't know whether these men have all been rooted out yet. I do know that much of their influence remains.

I do know that some of the policies which the Administration has been following at home and abroad are policies which Communists, or fellow travelers, or their innocent dupes, would set in motion and support.

Think that over. I'll come back to it later.

I want to talk briefly about Dean Acheson, the Secretary of State. In the press and in my mail there have been many demands for his impeachment.

First of all, I am sure he is not a Communist. But I do believe he made a bad and indecent blunder when, after the conviction of Alger Hiss, Mr. Acheson said in effect that this traitor was his friend, and that even if the Supreme Court should uphold the conviction, he, Acheson, would not desert his friend.

Had Dean Acheson first resigned as Secretary of State, and then made that statement, it might have been a courageous and noble thing. He, as a private individual, would be standing by a friend. But Dean Acheson did not resign. He is not merely a private citizen.

Dean Acheson stands at the head of the department which makes, directs, and carries out the foreign policy for this Nation of 150,000,000 men, women, and children. Dean Acheson speaks not only for that department, but to the rest of the world he is the official spokesman for the United States.

Alger Hiss was formerly a high official of the State Department. Alger Hiss betrayed his country by stealing secrets of the State Department and transmitting them to a foreign dictatorship whose sole aim is to enslave the world by climbing over a prostrate America.

Thus we have the head of our State Department endorsing and supporting a man in his own department who resorted to perjury and hide his part in a disloyal conspiracy.

And, as I said earlier, Dean Acheson's policies regarding China and other places strongly indicate that he is the victim of policies laid down by Communists and Communist sympathizers, like Alger Hiss.

Now, my fellow Pennsylvanians, it seems to me that this entire Administration is tarred with the same brush in this case.

Let me remind you that 1,336 Federal employees resigned while being investigated, rather than face questioning by a loyalty board, and another 848 quit their jobs before the board could issue rulings in their cases. Only 123 were fired for disloyalty in the weeding-out process which began in 1947.

Not only has the administration been riddled with Communists but at the very top it adopted a policy of evasion and concealment, scoffing at protests and denying that Communist infiltration in the Government was a serious matter.

Up to the very top, this administration joined in the smears against those who tried to arouse the Nation to what was going on. It ridiculed those who warned America that Communists had wormed their way into high places.

I don't imply that the administration leaders realized they were aiding a foreign conspiracy. I am certain they had no realization of it.

But I point this out because they are the people who ask you to trust their judgment, their good sense, and their inside information to run your country and to protect you.

Let me remind you of just a few incidents of the many that happened.

As Pennsylvanians you will remember that George H. Earle, a former Democratic Governor of our State and a former diplomat under President Roosevelt attempted, early in 1947, to warn Mr. Truman against the Communist dangers at home.

But President Truman did not accept the warning. In his reply to George Earle he said—and I quote—"People are wrought up about the Communist bugaboo, but I am of the opinion that the country is perfectly safe as far as communism is concerned."

At that time, back in February 1947, the administration was liberally sprinkled with

Communists and fellow travelers. At that time domestic and foreign policies were being formulated under the influence of these people.

At that time, every Government department was under orders from the White House to withhold its files from a congressional committee seeking to ferret out communism.

Mr. Truman was certain it was nothing but a "bugaboo." Let me remind you that more than a year later, when public clamor had risen to a high pitch, the President reluctantly, and for the first time, ordered the FBI to check the loyalty of Federal employees.

In 1948, you will remember, when the House investigating committee asked cooperation in its probe which led to uncovering the disgraceful Alger Hiss case, the President only ordered his departments to lock up their files, but he said in a public statement—and I quote:

"The public hearings now under way are serving no useful purpose. On the contrary, they are doing irreparable harm to certain persons, seriously impairing the morale of Federal employees, and undermining confidence in the Government."

That was what Mr. Truman said. One of the persons who was being done "irreparable harm," I might advise you, was Alger Hiss.

Then Mr. Truman went on to make another charge. He declared that these investigations into a spy system working right here in Washington, in Government agencies, was—and I quote—"a red herring."

Surely you all remember that. It was the considered judgment of an administration which asks you to trust it to make foreign and domestic policy in your best interests.

There was still another Presidential statement in June 1948, when Mr. Truman was pooh-poohing what he called a red herring. He said—and I quote:

"I went to Potsdam in 1945 * * * with the kindliest feelings toward Russia and we made certain agreements, specific agreements. I got very well acquainted with Joe Stalin and I like old Joe. He's a decent fellow." End of quote.

Do you folks all remember that?

My fellow Pennsylvanians, I have a confession to make.

I like old Harry. I believe that deep down he's a decent fellow.

But let me add this. I'd like old Harry a lot better if he would just confess error once in a while.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd admit to the country that he was wrong about the red herring and wrong about Joe Stalin.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd clamp down on his high officials so they would not go around extending the hand of friendship to traitors to our country.

I'd like him a lot better if he'd admit that a terrible blunder was made at Yalta—that a sick Franklin Roosevelt, influenced by Communist Alger Hiss, sold out anti-Communist China to Joe Stalin and the Soviet Union.

I'd like him a lot better if he would admit that he, Harry Truman, blundered terribly when, fooled by his pro-Communist advisers, he made a deal which gave us a zone of Berlin but without a highway leading to it, so that we had to use the airlift, and are having more trouble even now.

I'd like old Harry better if he'd admit error in the Chinese policy which caused us to sell out the Nationalists to the Communists.

But I guess he won't.

The disclosures of the Hiss case and the more recent revelation that atomic secrets have been betrayed to Soviet Russia make it imperative for every American to be on his guard.

From all parts of our country indignant and aroused citizens and organizations have demanded a full investigation.

I shall support that demand.

You have a right to know the full story of Communist infiltration into places of trust and importance in our Government.

You should know what hidden influence made it possible for disloyal conspirators against America to gain access to secret security information and to deal with Communist agents and spies.

Let us demand a thorough search to determine whether the Hiss influence still prevails among those who guide national policy in domestic and foreign affairs.

Let us open the files of the State Department and the records of the Department of Justice and let the FBI bring out the evidence it has to support the statement of J. Edgar Hoover, which I now quote:

"Communism, in reality, is not a political party. It is a way of life—an evil and malignant way of life."

As free Americans let us proclaim our loyalty to the American way of life.

This is ED MARTIN, speaking to you from the Nation's Capital. I will be with you again in 2 weeks. Thank you for your attention.

Law-Enforcement Problems

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix an address by Hon. J. Howard McGrath, Attorney General of the United States, on law-enforcement problems. General McGrath delivered this very excellent speech at the Attorney General's conference on February 15, 1950, which was attended by State law-enforcement representatives. I think General McGrath's approach to this pressing problem is one that should be widely discussed and seriously considered.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Civic leaders as well as lawyers are accustomed to look for and benefit from precedents. In arranging this conference of municipal, State, and Federal law-enforcement officials, we observed that in recent years, since the First World War, this country has had a number of challenging crime problems, Nation-wide in scope, which have lent themselves to the technique of cooperative conference, study, and action, by cross-section of the country's enforcement agencies.

Beginning in 1929, the lawlessness precipitated by war and prohibition was examined into by the National Commission on Law Observance and Enforcement. In 1934, the fast-moving, violent gangster and racketeer, successor of the bootlegger, was the cause for concern, and resulted in the calling of a conference on crime. In 1940, enforcement problems relating to national defense caused the summoning of the Federal-State Conference on Law Enforcement Problems of National Defense. In 1946, Attorney General Clark summoned the National Conference on Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency. All of these conferences resulted in notable developments in law enforcement.

Today, a new phase of the old problem is upon us, requiring the concentration of the combined efforts of all our law-enforcing agencies. The mobsters of the 1930's have not been entirely eliminated. But their leadership is being supplanted. The modern version combines the worst features of big-business manipulations with violence and corruption to clamp a monopoly or monopolies on the illegal businesses of bookmaking, slot machines, policy, or the numbers game, and other forms of commercialized gambling. These operations of the American public cost billions of dollars and threaten to make a mockery of respectable local self-government. There is reason to believe that such operations are tied in with prostitution and narcotics, and the more violent forms of underworld criminal activity.

Bookmaking, slot machines, numbers games, and the like are illegal in almost every State. It is, therefore, an inescapable conclusion, evidenced by the surveys of a number of local crime commissions and a few successful prosecutions, that in this modern society gambling as a private business cannot operate on its present gigantic scale without corrupting what it touches.

In organized gambling, we are dealing with the biggest illicit traffic since prohibition. Everywhere the pattern is the same—struggling and double-crossing, to eliminate competitors for the right to cheat the public. The racket produces nothing. It contributes nothing to society but trouble.

As an example, the modern numbers racket has been built upon the nickel and dime bets of hundreds of thousands of our poorest people. In more recent years it has moved into offices, shops, and factories where the money wagered makes it a business estimated by investigators to yield $2,000,000,000 dollars annually. Employee absorption in the play has so affected production in plants in some localities as to cause company and union investigations, and combined action to drive out those employees acting as numbers runners.

Businessmen's associations are concerned, not only with the numbers racket, but with bookmaking, slot machines, punch boards, and all forms of lotteries. They find that in communities where the business of gambling openly flourishes the clientele of the legitimate businesses are not paying bills and are dissipating their earnings.

I need not dwell on the demoralizing effect upon our children, who are everywhere bombarded, by sight and by hearing, with the temptations of gaming and lotteries. Benjamin Franklin wisely said, "Keep flax from fire, youth from gaming."

The people of this country, State by State, painfully and painstakingly evolved a public policy against the gambling business. At one time public gambling in lotteries was an accepted means of raising funds for public use. The State legislatures, and even Congress, authorized lotteries and chartered private companies to conduct them. The corruption that flowed from lotteries, marked by the bribery of public officials, and the mere trickle of funds into the public treasuries as compared to the huge sums raised, led gradually to the prohibition by the State of lotteries and other forms of gambling. This policy was capped by congressional legislation in 1890 forbidding the sending of lottery tickets in the mails, and supplemented 5 years later by legislation forbidding the transportation of lottery tickets in interstate commerce.

Still later, in 1934, Congress forbade radio broadcasting of advertising and information concerning lotteries.

This basic Nation-wide public policy against the gambling business, which grew from local roots, has remained steadfast. The only substantial deviation has occurred in the situation where, by judicial decision or direct legislative action, approximately half the States have made an exception for betting at the track on horse or dog races, usually in connection with the so-called parimutuel system. This has not been accom-

panied by validation of the professional off-the-track betting, generally described as bookmaking. And, except for a very few States which have allowed local option in permitting the licensing of certain kinds of gambling, I believe we are justified in taking the view that throughout the United States there is, and has existed for many years, a public policy that condemns organized gambling and makes its activities criminal.

Are we then to allow that policy to be set at naught?

The President has expressed his grave concern with the increase of crime. We know that there are many sources and causes from which this condition arises. From information that has been coming to me, from your letters, and from the resolutions of your organizations forwarded to me, I believe we are in agreement that if there is a single most prolific source, constituting one of our greatest dangers, it is the continued flourishing of organized gambling, about which, as the most lucrative of the illegitimate enterprises, revolves many nefarious activities of the underworld. Out of this conviction, and in order not to dissipate our energies in a 1-day session devoted to exploration, I have felt constrained to focus attention without delay upon this major problem.

This is your meeting, called principally at your request. It is your views that will be most important. You are free to discuss all phases of organized crime. Our interdependence in matters of law enforcement, our need and determination to cooperate and help in our mutual problem will carry us forward.

I believe the agenda will develop clearly what are the fundamental problems, and from the discussion we will perceive the means for studying their solution. As part of our thinking upon solutions, we cannot avoid being acutely aware of the division of governmental responsibilities in dealing with crime. Let it be stated at once on behalf of the Federal agencies that it will not be the purpose of the Federal Government to usurp the functions of the State and local police, or to conduct activities that extend beyond constitutional limitations or the usages of our people. We must never lose sight of the fundamental principle that local responsibility, fully realized, makes for sound government and healthy law enforcement. That is the true meaning of "States rights" and "home rule." Conditions which breed contempt for law can only become worse if we allow ourselves to be lured away from sound principle by the temptation to pass off State and municipal responsibilities to the Federal Government. Nevertheless, adherence to this view will not detract from the common purpose to assist and complement the law-enforcing agencies charged with primary responsibility, and to devise means of aiding each other, within the limits of law, however responsibility is vested. In this connection, I draw your attention to the presence here, not only of representatives of the United States attorneys and the various divisions and bureaus of the Department of Justice, but of the several specialists in particular kinds of law enforcement representing, among others, six units of the Treasury Department, the Post Office Department, and the Federal Communications Commission. The enforcement programs of these Federal agencies and their programs of cooperation with local authorities are known to you; but their representatives have promised to be available to inform you further, and to consult on means of advancing the purposes of this meeting.

It may be that the discussions today will reveal the need for new legislation of a municipal or State or Federal character. I believe that there is much that can be done by way of reexamining and modernizing local codes which the pressure of the past war and related absorptions have caused us to neglect. In fields where cooperation among the States is required it may be useful to review and strengthen what has been done in the field of interstate compacts pursuant to the blanket congressional consent given in advance to all compacts entered into by any two or more States for the prevention of crime or the enforcement of criminal laws and policies. There should also be a complete review by both Federal and State authorities of the present so-called Fugitive Felon Act. If it is found that Federal legislation is needed we must take care that we do not recommend laws which will bring back the prohibition era. We must at all times be conscious of the need to present a program acceptable to our people and capable of effective enforcement. And certainly, I think we would all prefer to see that the methods adopted represent a direct approach to the problems requiring solution rather than any indirect or disguised method of prosecution. I would judge that the detailed study and continuing efforts necessary for the development of the various phases of a program of work can best be handled by committees, or a similar form of continuing machinery, to be provided by this conference. It may be that a further and broader conference will be required, when the detailed preparatory work is ready, in order to consolidate these efforts.

But whatever be the methods or techniques propounded in this fight against crime, we must not lose sight of the big, vital factor—the need of public support. I have already mentioned the insidious and clever propaganda activities of the organized gambling fraternity to legalize some of their operations. The American Municipal Association and others have informed me of well-organized and financed drives, now under way and conducted by the same fraternity, to oust mayors and other public officials who have had the temerity to stand for enforcement of the law. These activities and this kind of attempted intimidation indicate powerful opposition, which is being unwittingly aided by perhaps well-meaning but misguided appeasers, who believe that since the desire to gamble is found in many persons it must be a virtue which should be legalized and permitted to flourish commercially. It will take fertile minds and strong backs to plan and disseminate a campaign of persuasive education, which will interpret for the public the work you public officials are undertaking to do. Until the psychology of our people is so affected with an abhorrence of the kind of crime we are seeking to eliminate, high-minded public officials will continually be fighting an uphill battle.

I think the time is ripe for the drive for public support through press, radio, motion pictures, civic clubs, business leaders, churches, schools, labor unions, and every form of decent organization. The stage is set for you to capture the popular imagination in a stirring campaign to crush organized crime in your communities. I want you to know that in this effort I stand ready to give you every possible assistance.

Labor-Management Cooperation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, today labor-management disputes are once again front-page news. This would seem an appropriate occasion to consider the basis of labor-management cooperation. On November 1, 1949, a resident of my State discussed this subject in a speech that has attracted wide attention and much favorable comment. The address by Millard Cass, assistant to the Under Secretary of Labor, on the Basis of Labor-Management Cooperation is still being reproduced almost 4 months after it was delivered. Numerous labor and industry magazines and newspapers have carried it. I believe that my colleagues in the Congress will find Mr. Cass' address both interesting and challenging. I ask unanimous consent to insert it in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE BASIS FOR LABOR-MANAGEMENT COOPERATION

One hundred and one years ago Marx and Engels declared that society as a whole is more and more splitting up into two great hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other—the class of modern capitalists and the class of modern wage-laborers. They asserted that property in its present form, is based on the antagonism of capital and wage-labor. Their one sentence cure was the abolition of private property.

Since 1848 crackpots all over the world have been attempting to divide and alienate management and labor. Occasionally dictators have managed to take advantage of this and to subjugate both management and labor to serve their undemocratic and barbaric purposes.

Yet in over 100 years Communists have been unable to prove their charge that management and labor have antagonistic and irreconciliable interests. They have been unable to prove their point because it is just plain false. In the United States we have built the greatest industrial machine and the highest standard of living the world has ever known. We have produced more than any other nation in history and have distributed it more widely among our people than has any other nation. This dramatic record was achieved by labor-management cooperation. It would have been impossible had there been a class struggle such as Marx and Engels declared was inevitable. In America the whole people, not a class, is the tree on which the fruit is to be borne.

Recently a businessman wrote Secretary of Labor Maurice J. Tobin that as a result of the industrial revolution there has developed in this country a division into definite classes, namely the employer and the employee. This ever-increasing struggle has in the past few years gained tremendous momentum. If the tempo of this conflict is not reduced, we will eventually end up with a caste system of society.

Secretary Tobin's reply reflected his deep faith in our system. He said: "I should like to express my own strong belief that American society is not crystalizing into a caste system. Actually, un-American, totalitarian forces have based their hopes largely on such a division. It seems to me that the cleavages they have attempted to create do not exist, and that we have an extremely fluid and mobile society."

Promoting labor-management cooperation is a cardinal objective of the Labor Department. It is for that reason that Secretary Tobin asked me to speak to you.

It is a pleasure to meet with you tonight to discuss human relations in industry. You are to be commended for your constructive attitude toward this problem. When important business groups like the Rotary Club and the chamber of commerce seek means

of promoting industrial peace, they make a valuable contribution to our economy. I am always happy to speak to any group sincerely interested in labor-management cooperation. This voluntary cooperation of free partners in our industrial democracy is our strength. It is an enlightened capitalistic society's answer to the totalitarian philosophy of force, restriction, and abolition of freedom. The record speaks for itself. We find no need to hide behind an iron curtain. Let any honest observer judge which system provides greater benefits for its people.

Incidentally, I feel confident that we can cope with the threat of communism both domestically and internationally. The continued strengthening of democracy and democratic economies at home and abroad is the most effective blow we can deal to communism. We have already taken a number of important steps to strengthen and assist democratic governments. The foresight and courage which President Truman and Secretary of State Dean Acheson have demonstrated in the conduct of our foreign policy is assurance that it is in good hands. Secretary Acheson is now an adopted son of Maryland. His farm home near Sandy Spring gives the Free State first claim to him, and I know all Marylanders are proud that he is a resident of this State.

During recent weeks big strikes have made front-page headlines. The issues involved have been tried in advertisements and on the editorial pages. This publicizing of labor disputes is nothing new. From such publicity, however, many Americans have over the years gathered the impression that there is no such thing as industrial peace and that labor-management cooperation is a contradiction in terms. Nothing could be further from the truth.

There is a high degree of labor-management cooperation in our country. Every year about 100,000 collective-bargaining agreements between management and labor are peacefully negotiated. Tens of thousands of disputes and grievances are settled annually without a strike or lock-out. Hundreds of joint labor-management committees are still operating effectively. There are, under the auspices of the United States Department of Labor, 6,500 local joint apprenticeship committees. The 33,000 members of these committees, representing management and labor, work together to promote apprenticeship. Hundreds of persons from the ranks of management and labor are working together to promote industrial safety through the President's Conference on Industrial Safety. This is a continuing program sponsored by Secretary Tobin at the request of President Truman. In all of these fields workers and employers are working together to develop good human relations.

These instances of labor-management cooperation do not even get newspaper publicity, much less front-page billing. Disagreements get better coverage than agreements—and the more violent the disagreement, the more widely it is publicized. It is no wonder that we sometimes get a distorted impression of ourselves.

In the international field the same situation exists. There too we have a high degree of labor-management cooperation that receives extremely limited publicity. The United States has been a member of the International Labor Organization for 15 years and spends more than a million dollars a year on this account. Yet I should be surprised if many of you ever heard of this Organization. How many of you know that it is not a labor organization at all, but a specialized agency of the United Nations? How many of you know that management and labor are voting partners with governments in this Organization?

Outstanding Americans have been associated with ILO. Samuel Gompers helped found it. John Winant was once director general, and former Under Secretary of Labor David A. Morse is its present head. American Government, management, and labor have sent capable and conscientious representatives to the ILO. On the business side has been J. D. Zellerbach, president of the Crown Zellerbach Corp., and now chief of the United States special mission to Italy of the ECA. Your own fellow businessman and Marylander, Charles McCormick, president of McCormick & Co., of Baltimore, is the present representative of American employers. At the 1949 conference the junior Senator from Maryland, Hon. HERBERT R. O'CONOR, was United States Government delegate.

Over the years American employers and workers have found a large area for agreement in ILO deliberations. Yet these achievements have received comparatively little attention.

It is axiomatic that it takes two to make a bargain. It takes only one to start a fight, but it takes two to make a contract. There can be no industrial peace without the cooperation of both management and labor.

While we seek industrial peace, we recognize that the right to strike is important in a democracy. It is a badge of freedom. Only in totalitarian countries is the right to strike denied to workers in private industry. We are anxious for industrial peace, but recognize that there are instances when free people will disagree. At such times non-Government employees must be free to walk out. Compulsory arbitration is equally opposed by management and labor.

The basis for labor-management cooperation would appear to be threefold: the desire to have industrial peace; mutual understanding; and a community of interest.

The desire to have industrial peace is shared by management and labor generally. There are very few persons on either side who will not make sacrifices to achieve this end. Employers and workers are both well aware of the cost of strikes and lock-outs. The public suffers from labor disputes, but it is the parties who suffer first and most. Consequently, it is their own needs, rather than public pressure, that will in the first instance drive the parties to seek agreement.

Workers do not like to see wives and children hungry, to incur debts, and generally to imperil their economic security. A man does not treat lightly the stopping of his income, with all its attendant consequences. Employers also can seldom afford the luxury of strikes and lock-outs. They too may find themselves without income but with continuing responsibilities and expenses. Stockholders expect profits. Markets for products can be lost during a prolonged cessation of operations. Economic necessity requires that both management and labor seek industrial peace. It creates the desire for good human relations which is a basic element in their cooperation.

Mutual understanding is clearly a prerequisite to labor-management cooperation. It has been stated that: "Industrial warfare will plague America until leaders of labor and management understand and respect the survival needs of each other." That need for understanding is a fertile ground for all who are really interested in industrial peace. There is still much to be done to bring the story of labor to management and the story of management to labor. Let's consider it both ways.

Many employers have spent much time and energy and huge sums of money fighting unions. Yet some of them know little about the unions they condemn. For example, how many employers have attended union meetings before they became experts on democracy in unions? I need not tell you how wrong some of these experts have been. The Christian Science Monitor stated in an editorial published January 17, 1949:

"A lot of water has rolled under the bridge since the wave of big strikes and the framing of the Taft-Hartley Act in 1946 and 1947. A few widely held assumptions have been swept down the stream of experience. It ought to be clear by now that American workers, by and large, want to join unions and do so of their own free will; that, by and large, the rank and file dictate the acts of their leaders and back them up, and that, with very few exceptions, American labor doesn't like political strikes or Communist machinations any more than do Americans in general."

The accuracy of this statement was underscored by the votes of workers in National Labor Relations Board union-shop elections under the Taft-Hartley Act. In more than 94 percent of these elections the employees voted for a union shop.

Mutual understanding must be based on facts. Many workers think the boss coins money and gets an inordinately high return on his investment. What do employers have to fear from giving the true facts to their employees? How many employers attempt to explain to their workers pertinent facts about the company's financial position? There is, after all, a close relation between the company's economics and the worker's personal economics.

There are some serious omissions on the other side too. When workers talk of the company's ability to pay, how often do they first try to ascertain the facts? Some workers fail to consider the employer's investment. Thousands of employers have worked their way up from the bottom. Many risked their life's savings and put in long, hard hours to build the business. Yet some workers believe that employers are concerned only with their own self-interest. How many realize their own job is dependent upon the soundness of the company's economic position?

Workers need food, clothing, housing, and recreation, and look forward to saving something for old age or illness. How many employers know whether their workers can feed their families and live decently and healthfully on their wages? Some employers opposed raising the Federal minimum wage above the obsolete 40-cents-an-hour figure. Can you imagine raising a family today on $16 a week? Actually the higher minimum wage will help businessmen and farmers as well as workers because it will increase purchasing power and provide a strong, broad base of consumer demand.

While some employers are overlooking the needs of their employees, some workers are overlooking the needs of the business. Thus, in some instances workers do not feel any pride in the accomplishments of their company. A recent survey demonstrated that some workers do not even know the company's products, the location of other company plants, the name of the top officer, or the operations which precede and follow their own.

Employers are, without exception, proud of their products. They constantly advertise the merits of the things they sell or produce. I wonder how many employers are equally proud of their human relations. How many have such good employee relations that they are willing to advertise their human-relations programs?

Mutual understanding must be based upon knowledge as opposed to ignorance—facts as opposed to fiction. I have mentioned some of the areas in which additional facts are needed by management and labor. It is up to employers and workers to supply each other with the information necessary to an understanding of their respective problems and needs.

The third prerequisite to labor-management cooperation is a community of interest. There can be no doubt that employers and workers have a common interest in the economic well-being of each other. There is

a tendency in some quarters to forget that from time to time. Nevertheless, wages, purchasing power, sales, and profits are all interrelated. Both management and labor benefit from high levels of income. High wages create heavy consumer demand. Strong demand for goods and services supports high wages. There can be no prosperity for workers if there is none for employers. On the other hand, depressed wages mean reduced sales and lower income for business. The depression was rough on management and labor alike, while in 1948, for example, was good to both. The prosperity of both employers and workers is a matter of their mutual concern.

To be sure, the economic interests of workers and employers are not entirely the same. While both have a common interest in maximum production, there are conflicting interests in how the income from that production will be divided. There are only so many slices of the pie, and both management and labor cannot have all of them. At that point, their economic interests do conflict—since each wants as large a share as possible. If the pie is large enough, however—that is, if the gross national product is great enough—it would appear that both groups can get all they need. Consequently, instead of merely fighting over the division of a small pie, management and labor should be primarily concerned with producing a larger one.

I am not a Pollyanna. I cannot share the philosophy of Voltaire's Dr. Pangloss that "all is for the best in this best of all possible worlds." Nevertheless, I do believe that industrial peace is clearly within our grasp. It is required by the mutual interest of management and labor. It awaits only more widespread mutual understanding.

Naturally, in a democracy there will always be some labor disputes. From time to time economic tensions and adjustments may temporarily upset the delicate balance upon which successful bargaining depends. Moreover, human frailties may cause transitory disturbances based on irritations, bad judgment, personal ambition, or greed. In the main, of course, labor disputes will continue to reflect honest disagreement in spite of all good faith efforts to come to terms Nevertheless, men of good will usually can find a way to make and keep agreements.

Two recent examples of industrial statesmanship will demonstrate what can be done. A union bargaining committee did not feel satisfied with the employer's offer. Nevertheless, they felt that the offer was made in good faith. They invited the employer to come to the union meeting to explain to the workers his side of the case. This is not an area for compulsion or legislation. It is, however, an area for statesmanship. How much better off we would be if more employers were invited to union meetings and union leaders were invited to stockholders' and board of directors' meetings.

In another instance, after a strike over a different issue, a company's board of directors continued the plans to institute pensions for the workers. You can imagine the surprise of union leaders who returned from a strike to be asked to bargain concerning a pension plan. This refusal to be deterred from high humanitarian purposes is most commendable. It could well be emulated by employers and workers generally. It is a practical application of the Golden Rule.

In a democracy employees of private enterprise must retain the right to strike. It is up to both workers and employers, however, to eliminate the need for exercise of this right in as many cases as possible. We do not want to sacrifice or curtail the democratic freedoms of management and labor in order to obtain industrial peace. Peace at any price is too high a price. An honorable peace fair to both sides is, however, fully consistent with democratic freedoms.

It has often been said that it is harder to wage peace than to wage war. This is as true in the field of labor relations as it is in the field of international relations. The fruits of peace are infinitely more satisfying than the spoils of war. Consequently, it behooves all of us to continue to seek the road to industrial peace.

The Coal Shortage in New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, as an indication of the seriousness of the coal shortage in New York, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a message to the legislature by Gov. Thomas E. Dewey, under date of February 14, 1950, certifying to the necessity of an immediate vote on a bill before the legislature entitled "An act providing emergency measures for the controlling of coal supplies."

This bill was passed by the legislature and approved by Governor Dewey on the 14th of February, and is now chapter 15 of the laws of 1950 of the State of New York. As soon as a copy of chapter 15 is received by me, I shall request that it be inserted in the RECORD, believing that it may be of interest to the Members of Congress.

There being no objection, the message was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF NEW YORK,
EXECUTIVE CHAMBER,
Albany, February 14, 1950.

To the Legislature:

Pursuant to the provisions of section 14 of article III of the Constitution and by virtue of the authority conferred upon me, I do hereby certify to the necessity of an immediate vote on assembly bill, introductory No. 2050, print No. 2151, entitled "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies."

The facts necessitating an immediate vote on this bill are as follows:

The long-continued partial strike of miners in the present Nation-wide strike in the production of coal has reduced the supplies in this State to the point of grave peril. There is generally on hand in the State less than 10 days' supply. In some communities, the supply will last only 3 or 4 days.

If coal mining should resume tomorrow, it would take some 8 to 12 days for coal to reach our consumers. There is presently a small amount of coal moving into the State from strip mines in Pennsylvania but this source is dwindling rapidly.

Many hospitals in the State have no coal reserves and depend upon dealers for daily deliveries. In many communities dealers no longer have sufficient coal on hand even to meet the needs of hospitals and vital public services.

In Jamestown, electricity is now being rationed. In Buffalo and other cities night schools have been canceled. In the southern tier counties, a number of milk-processing plants are finding it extremely difficult to get enough coal to operate their pasteurizing facilities.

Further reduction in the coal supply would cause many schools to close. It would also threaten the continued operation of water and sewerage systems, as well as other services essential to the welfare of the health of the people of the State of New York.

Industry has already curtailed production in many cities and a number of plants have been forced to close down.

If we knew that coal mining would be resumed within 2 or 3 days and that coal would be delivered within the State in 12 to 14 days, we could meet the existing emergencies by voluntary plans of rationing and sharing.

We have no means of knowing whether coal mining will be resumed in 2 days, 2 weeks, or 2 months. If the present strike should continue longer than a few days more, our State would face a catastrophe. Industry would be forced to close down widely and unemployment would spread rapidly, Rail transportation of food and its processing would be gravely imperiled, and many of the services essential to the maintenance of life would be curtailed or terminated.

Fortunately, most of the public utilities of the State have been farsighted in their accumulation of coal reserves, but if the strike should continue even these reserves might not be sufficient and it might be necessary for the State to profit by their foresight and take from them coal essential to the maintenance of the milk supply and other food processing, and the operation of hospitals, water and sewerage systems.

Since we presently face an immediate and serious danger to the health and welfare of our people which will become a grave emergency if the coal strike is not immediately brought to an end, I ask that your honorable bodies establish the office of solid fuels administrator.

I ask that you confer upon this office the power to regulate the distribution of coal still remaining in the possession of coal dealers in the State and to establish a system of priorities for the use of that coal. I further ask that you give the administrator authority to restrict the use of electric power, manufactured gas, and other products of coal, to the extent that he deems necessary.

I do not at this time seek power to appropriate coal in private hands and I hope the emergency will not require it. In the event that it becomes that grave, I shall not hesitate to return to you for all authority which may be needed to cope with whatever problems arise.

Given under my hand and the privy seal of the State at the capitol in the city of Albany this 14th day of February in the year of our Lord 1950.

By the Governor:

THOMAS E. DEWEY.
R. BURDELL BIXBY,
Assistant Secretary to the Governor.

Lights Stop Truman; He's Law-Abiding Man—Truman Flits Past 20 Red Lights

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. WILLIAMS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article

entitled "Lights Stop Truman; He's Law-Abiding Man," appearing in the Thursday, February 16, 1950, issue of the Washington Post.

I also ask unanimous consent to have inserted, immediately following it an article entitled "Truman Flits Past 20 Red Lights," appearing in the next day's issue, February 17, 1950 of the Washington Post.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Washington Post of February 16, 1950]

LIGHTS STOP TRUMAN; HE'S LAW-ABIDING MAN

President Truman told some of the Nation's law-enforcement officers yesterday that he was a law-abiding man.

"I never infringe a traffic rule," Mr. Truman said, bringing smiles. "I never exercise the prerogatives which I sometimes have of going through red lights. * * * I believe, first, that I am a citizen, and that, as a citizen, I ought to obey the laws."

Reporters who traveled behind the President on his way to the Department of Justice Building for his address noticed that his new Lincoln stopped for all red lights.

[From the Washington Post of February 17, 1950]

ENVIOUS GO GREEN AS TRUMAN FLITS PAST 20 RED LIGHTS

President Truman, who told a crime conference Wednesday he never exercised the prerogatives of his office to crash red lights, went through 20 of them yesterday.

It was all perfectly legal though. It occurred while the President was en route from Blair House to the Democratic Jefferson-Jackson Day shindig at the local armory under a police and secret service escort.

As other motorists waited enviously for the green, Mr. Truman's escort hit 28 traffic lights. Twenty were red.

Reply by Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem to Article by Dorothy Thompson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, recently a fact-finding mission on Jerusalem, under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, made an extensive visit to Israel and reported on the situation with regard to the Holy places in Jerusalem.

Some days ago, Miss Dorothy Thompson, an eminent and distinguished columnist, wrote an article about the findings of this mission. I have at hand a statement written by this mission, composed of six outstanding American Christian ministers and scholars, in reply to Miss Thompson's column. I ask the unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this statement in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT ANSWERING DOROTHY THOMPSON

As the members of the Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem which made an extensive visit to Israel in January under the auspices of the American Christian Palestine Committee, we wish to record our protest against the statements regarding our mission made by Miss Dorothy Thompson in a recent syndicated column. Miss Thompson states correctly enough that we have "reported against UN internationalization of Jerusalem as dangerous and unnecessary," and that we are not in agreement even with the less inclusive Garreau scheme to internationalize a smaller area of Jerusalem. Then, Miss Thompson proceeds completely to ignore the positive recommendation made by us for international supervision and safeguarding of religious interest in Jerusalem. She categorically states: "In short, it would appear that the mission wishes to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether." This is a dangerously untrue statement of our position. Our report cautions against the drafting of a Jerusalem statute by the United Nations that would interfere with the just territorial sovereignty of any nation, in this case the territory of Israel and Jordan. Both of these nations properly object to the UN plan on this ground. Freedom of access and protection of the holy places can easily be secured without the internationalization of territory or people. Though we so clearly opposed international administration of territory or people in Palestine, we quite as clearly proposed the setting up of a United Nations commission, with no territorial sovereignty, but with full right to seek the removal of existing limitations of access to the old city of Jerusalem and the holy places, all of which are in Arab territory. We went on to add the guaranties should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. It is difficult for us to understand how this proposal can be interpreted by Miss Thompson as indicating a desire to keep the United Nations out of Palestine altogether. The basic distinction we made between international control of the city and people of Jerusalem and international supervision of the sacred places, was quite clear to editorial writers in a great number of American newspapers, all of whom viewed our proposal with sympathy. It should have been quite as clear to Miss Thompson, particularly since in a column of hers printed in the latter half of December 1949, she herself set forth a similar approach to the problem of international control of Jerusalem: "It would, it seems to me, have been wiser (however unsatisfactory)," she said, "to have confined United Nations supervision and protection to the holy places of all religions and to have left the secular and political solution to negotiations between Israel and Transjordan." The passage of time and continued reflection upon the issue have merely reinforced our conviction that the true interests of Christianity and the progress of peace in the Middle East would best be served by United Nations adoption of a plan guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places without infringing upon the territorial sovereignty of the nations occupying Jerusalem. Christian spokesmen in Israel with whom we spoke are, we found, in substantial accord with this point of view.

Signed by Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor, the Watchman-Examiner, national Baptist magazine; Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, former adviser on Latin-American Affairs to the State Department, and member of the Federal Council of Churches Commission of International Good Will; Dr. Victor Obenhaus, of the University of Chicago, Department Church in Agricultural and Industrial Life, and national chairman of Council for Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of American Baptist Theological Seminary; Mrs. M. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights, and field representative of the Southern Regional Council; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College, St. Paul, Minn.; members of Fact-Finding Mission on Jerusalem.

The Patriotism of a Catholic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, in these times when there are current divergent ideas as to what constitutes patriotism in the truest sense, a significant contribution to the discussion is made in an address delivered by the Honorable James A. Farley, before the Calvert Province, fourth degree Knights of Columbus jubilee banquet in New York on February 12.

Never have I seen the topic discussed in a more forthright and convincing manner. It so well deserves to be given widest attention that I ask unanimous consent that it be published in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE PATRIOTISM OF A CATHOLIC

If the American Philosophical Association had asked me to address one of its sessions on the works of Aristotle, I should feel about the same as I feel addressing fourth degree Knights of Columbus on the subject of patriotism of a Catholic. Who would know more about the topic than the listeners themselves? Who could enlighten them further, except possibly some renowned scholar out of their own ranks, full of years and learning?

In any gathering of fourth degree Knights of Columbus the whole atmosphere is charged with the spirit of patriotism in its high and historic sense. Your first three degrees pledge you to universal qualities—to charity, which seeks the good of all—to unity, which makes you stand shoulder to shoulder in defense of the one truth—to fraternity, the spirit of the brotherhood of all men under one Father. Your fourth degree, patriotism, gives a local direction to these universals, applying them first to the land in which you live.

The very name of this province—Calvert Province—summons up memories of the great Catholic Lord Baltimore, who founded the State of Maryland and left it a patriotic tradition celebrated ever since throughout the Republic. The names of assemblies gathered here commemorate patriotic laymen like Dr. John G. Coyle; Thomas Dongan, first Catholic Governor of this State; Joyce Kilmer, convert, poet, and war hero; and Charles Carroll of Carrollton who pledged the greatest fortune in the Colonies to the cause of the American Revolution. They also commemorate patriotic members of the hierarchy, such as Father Duffy, Archbishops Corrigan and Hughes, and Cardinal Farley.

Who am I to hope to enrich the tradition of Catholic patriotism typified by those illustrious names?

Yet perhaps I can make some simple offering. The university of practical politics bestows no degrees, but it does contribute a certain rough erudition of its own. I have been exposed to that rude learning, and I hope it is not immodest to say that some of it has been rubbed into me. If I speak to you as the representative of that university, I cannot be sure whether I come as faculty member, alumnus, or student. There are those who would say that I am a professor emeritus. I should not like to think that is so. There are, I think, really no alumni of the university of practical politics. I regard myself as one who is and always will be a student.

Many years of faithful attendance in the classroom of government have taught me some things about practical politics. As all students should, I reflect on what I have learned. One of the things I have learned is that you can find among the citizens of this country all degrees of patriotism, ranging from complete and true devotion to the Nation and its welfare, through indecision, indifference, and disrespect, down to concealed and even open contempt and hostility. I have also learned something about why that is so. Lastly, I have learned that the reasons for it are the very reasons why a high and pure degree of patriotism is and always will be found among our true practicing Catholic citizens—why, in particular, the public order in America has no more vigilant and militant defenders than the Knights of Columbus themselves.

This fact itself needs no proving. The time is past and gone when there was any organized belief among non-Catholic Americans that Catholics are alien in sympathy or aim. It may be that in a few perverse and stubborn souls there is still a conviction that the first allegiance of American Catholics is to a foreign sovereign plotting on a Roman hill. It may be, though I doubt it. We still hear these things said from time to time but they have all the flavor of hate and conscious falsehood. They have no flavor of honest conviction. It is certainly true that when some one like Commander John J. Shea, of the United States Navy, writes from abroad to his small son, "Be a good Catholic and you cannot help being a good American," and the admonition is broadcast after the commander's untimely death, the emotional response throughout the entire Nation is that it rings profoundly true.

But I would not think that I had said anything of great value if I cited only the recognized quality of Catholic patriotism and its proof by common consent. Inquiring minds are always asking the reasons for things. When you know the reason why a thing is what it is, you feel that you have an intelligent and satisfying knowledge of the thing itself. When someone says, "It isn't so," you can answer not only that it is so, but that you know why. If the reason is good, you have won the argument.

Why is it that the patriotism of a Catholic is intense? Why is it firm? Why is it immune to the infections that have played such havoc with the old-fashioned love of country in the hearts of so many citizens not of our faith? As I have seen it, the basic cause is the sound sense of values which every Catholic youngster absorbs with his catechism and which never leaves him so long as he remains true to his faith. The basic fact on which every Catholic orders his whole life down to the smallest detail is that the supreme and absolute value—the value on which all other values are built and to which they are all referred—is the will of God. To the secular society of the twentieth century, as to the pagan Greeks, man is the measure of all things. To the Catholic, God is the measure of all things. The will of God, revealed to us through Christ, puts everything in its proper place. Man is a creature of body and soul. Man has certain direct relations with God. A spiritual organization—that church—was established for the purpose of regulating man's spiritual activity in relation to God. Man also has relations with other men. A political organization—the state—was established to regulate those relationships, so that each man can satisfy his needs and be free of undue interference by others.

The Catholic knows that both organizations were established by God and that each is given its specific function and authority. His keen sense of the divinely established order in all things impresses on him that the authority of the state in temporal affairs is as much a part of the order of creation as the cycles of the planets. The natural reason which shows to the Catholic the hand of God in all his intimate personal affairs, also makes him feel the hand of God in the laws imposed by the state, and tells him that his moral obligation to give respectful obedience and devotion to the state in matters relating to its proper field of action is no different in substance from his moral obligation to accept the injunctions of the church in spiritual matters.

Natural reason might well be enough to make the Catholic a dutiful and patriotic citizen. But he has more. He has a positive edict from Christ himself, probably the most celebrated and dramatic edict in all Scripture, "Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's and to God the things that are God's." This was no mere ironic reprimand. The Eternal Light never spoke an idle word. He was giving a vivid reminder of where the temporal and eternal authorities stand with reference to each other, and He was making clear that though the temporal authority stands infinitely below the eternal authority, it has a legitimate claim upon the conscience of its subjects. As I have said, all this, in one way or another, is in the catechism. Is it surprising, then, that Catholics hold themselves bound, as a matter of lifelong habit, to a standard of proper behavior as members of the temporal society, just as they hold themselves bound to a proper observance of their spiritual duties? No one would say that exceptions cannot be found, yet, in the main, the reverence and love of our Catholic citizens toward the temporal authority and society, symbolized in the Nation, is a natural and characteristic expression of their reverent submission to the will of God in all things.

Where in the world will you find a clearer perception of the whole order of creation and the place which temporal authority plays in that order? Where in the world will you find a more lively sense of moral obligation strictly binding in conscience?

And one thing more—where else will you find a more constant and keener realization that the same moral law governs temporal and spiritual affairs—that the same moral standards which the Catholic knows he must maintain for his own soul's salvation, are also the standards that the state must maintain in order to secure a peaceful and orderly life for its citizens? The Catholic is as loyal and faithful a supporter as the state has. He is, in the main, a supporter with the integrity and courage to profess publicly that just as he must serve the state, so the state must serve God, and that if the state acts immorally it will destroy itself.

Make no mistake about it, the state is in grave danger of destroying itself. As Professor Toynbee's celebrated works on history clearly prove, every civilization that has perished in the history of the world, has destroyed itself in very much the same way that we see our own society beginning to cut itself to pieces. We don't even have to take it from Toynbee. There are other forceful witnesses. In the university of practical politics we do hear of ancient happenings and classical authorities. We have heard of the disintegration of Rome and we have heard what the Roman historian Tacitus had to say about it. He said:

"We are entering upon the history of a period rich in disasters, gloomy with wars, rent with seditions and savage in its very hours of peace—there was defilement of sacred rites, adulteries in high places, the sea was crowded with exiles, island rocks drenched with murder * * * all was one delirium of hate and terror; slaves were bribed to betray their masters, freedmen their patrons. He who had no enemy was destroyed by his friends."

Who was to stop it? Not the Christians, for they were yet no moral force in that society. Who is to stop it now? Who cares about the defilement of sacred rites? Who protests adulteries in high places? Who pleads against the barbarous contempt for the dignity of the human soul which makes the seas and the air tragic roads for displaced persons? Who is horrified at murder, and especially at the new and polite kinds of murder like euthanasia and abortion? You know the answer. The voices of the Catholic clergy and laity—of the Holy Father—of the hierarchy of America—of the Knights of Columbus—cry out above all in the name of Christ against this coming darkness which a pagan society is bringing down on itself.

That is true patriotism, the patriotism which yearns with religious fervor for the truth and morals in our society, for integrity in government and for the happiness and prosperity of our beloved America.

Balance the Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. RUSSELL V. MACK

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, our national debt, today, is $257,000,000,000. Despite that staggering debt load, our Federal Government is spending at the rate of $5,000,000,000 a year or $15,000,000 a day more than its total income from all taxes. These taxes, this year, are several times those of any prewar peacetime year.

A family that is heavily in debt and which, despite its debt, continues year after year living beyond its income, inevitably will become bankrupt. Similarly, a government that is heavily in debt, which continues spending beyond its income, piling deficit upon deficit, is headed, as all history will reveal, for devaluation of its currency and inflation.

There is only one way to avoid the ruinous disaster to which our present fiscal policies inevitably will lead. That is by balancing the Federal budget. We can balance the budget in only two ways. Either we must raise taxes by $5,000,000,000 annually to make our income equal our outgo or we must reduce our Federal spending to bring it into balance with our tax income.

Local, State, and National taxes even now confiscate 30 percent, or almost one-third, of the national income. Can we

increase these taxes higher without undermining the incentive and thrift of our people? I think not.

Demagogs say that we will take the additional taxes from the rich and the rich alone. We cannot do that for taxes on the rich are already so high that if we took all of what they now have left after paying taxes, we would not get enough, at the present rate of spending, to balance the budget.

The latest year for which income-tax figures are available is 1947. In 1947, according to the Treasury Department, there were 195,675 individuals in this country who had incomes of $25,000 a year or more. After paying their personal income taxes these 195,695 individuals had $2,037,000,000 left. If the Government confiscated all of the income above $25,000 of all of these people, the Federal Government, at the present rate of spending, still would have a deficit of $3,000,000,000.

Obviously, if we attempt to balance the budget by increased taxes the little fellow, as well as the big one, will have to dig up more money. The little fellows would have less to spend on themselves and their families. If they have less to spend on their own needs and those of their families, buying will decrease. When buying decreases unemployment increases.

The surest way to throw business and employment of this Nation into a tail spin would be by raising taxes.

But we can and should balance the budget of this Nation by reducing wasteful and extravagant spending.

This year, we paid out $100,000,000 of taxpayers money to buy up potatoes, and then we destroyed these potatoes while at the same time importing 10,000 carloads of spuds from Canada.

The Hoover Commission Report says that the Post Office Department by spending $10,000,000 to modernize its equipment and methods would effect savings of $170,000,000 a year. Yet nothing is done to bring about those savings.

Of the Nation's postmasters, 22,000 of them never had a day's experience in a post office prior to their appointment to the highest salaried job in their home town post office. Meanwhile regular postal employees, with years of experience in post office work, were denied consideration for promotion to the position of postmaster. The Hoover Commission has recommended that the post office be taken out of politics for the efficiency and good of the service, but nothing is done about that, either.

Twenty years ago there were 570,000 civilian employees in the executive branch of the Federal Government. Today there are almost 2,000,000 or about four times as many as in 1930. In 1930 the pay roll of the civilian Federal employees was about $1,000,000,000 a year. Now it is nearly $7,000,000,000 a year. Is the service of the Federal Government to the average citizen seven times what it was in 1930?

Most of the recommendations in the Hoover report are good. Most of them should be adopted as quickly as possible. But it will require more even than the Hoover report recommendations to bring economy and efficiency to our Federal Government. There must be a will for economy and a will for efficiency in the executive branch of the Government before the great goals of efficiency and economy can be accomplished. That will for efficiency and economy is not there now.

Manistee County Reports Real Soil Progress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT J. ENGEL
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. ENGEL of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a portion of the annual report of the Manistee County Soil Conservation District for 1949, and to make a few comments on it.

I am extremely proud of the progress that has been made in my district in recent years in soil-conservation work. Ours was one of the areas that needed such a program badly, for much of our area has suffered from wind and water erosion and from that type of one-way farming which took everything from the soil, put nothing back, and forgot that our young people had a right to just as glorious a future for themselves as their forefathers before them.

The Manistee district is only 5 years old. But I think no district any place within that short period has had such practical results. Today the soil conservation district there is one of the liveliest organizations in the area. It cannot begin to keep up with the demands being made on it. The present directors are: Ro. S. Anderson, chairman; Forrest Chrestenson, treasurer; Wayne I. Crompton, secretary; Floyd Beers, Harry Taylor, and Edward Swanson, Jr.

I have fortunately been with these men on several of their inspection tours. I admire the program they have created and to point it up I offer the following brief quotations from their 1949 report, just published:

Since its organization in the late summer of 1945 the Manistee County Soil Conservation District has been working aggressively to halt erosion and depletion of the soils of its farm lands and forest areas. The actual work on the land has been done through the assistance of soil-conservation technicians loaned to the district by the United States Soil Conservation Service. These men have worked with many of the farmers of the county helping them in the understanding and application of conservation practice. It is this down-on-the-land work which is the real purpose of the district. However, in order to facilitate the work of these technicians, the board of directors of the district have been working steadily at the task of acquainting the people of the district with soil conservation, its purpose, and its benefits. This report is the record of 1 year's work by the Manistee County Soil Conservation District. It has been prepared by your board of directors with able assistance from Wayne Crampton, county agent and secretary to the board; D. Z. Balog, unit conservationist, United States Conservation Service assigned to the Manistee district; and Lindo Bartelli, district conservationist, Soil Conservation Service, who supervises technicians in this region. The several sections of this report have been prepared by the several directors as shown.

Of particular interest to the directors has been the way the farmers have turned to better land-use practices. During the past year more time has been spent on development of natural resources than the healing of old scars or gullies.

Our cooperators seem to have learned which of the two ways of farming is best. The conservation way, which requires the farmer to keep putting something back into the soil instead of mining it for all it's worth. Thus managed, the soil's earning capacity can be maintained indefinitely at a high level. They seem to find that most class 7 land can be put to a better use than the growing of row crops. As as example, one cooperator, Richard Linke, with considerable acreage, asked for a woodland-management plan and plans for fish ponds instead of clearing the land.

We also have five irrigation ponds built during the past year. These have furnished water to irrigate both row crops and pastures.

The Ashcraft irrigation outfit saved a crop of strawberries that would have otherwise been frozen. Also in a few cases the pond lowered the water level a few inches and made it possible to develop some muck acreage. About 3 miles of open drains were constructed on cooperator's farms.

The interest in sod waterways seems to continue. Almost 4 miles of waterways were constructed during the year. It seems that farmers like to drive across a strip of sod better than across a gully.

There have been nearly 4 miles of terraces built. Most of them with regular farm equipment, a few with an old road grader, and a few with a grader attached to the tractor. Of interest was the group enterprise that tackled building terraces on the Ed Lingg farm. When the day was done, almost a mile of terraces was finished. Also about one and a third miles of diversion terraces were constructed to prevent gullies and eliminate wet spots in fields.

In the past, orchard practices have consisted mostly of heavy cultivation; the spreading of barynard manure, if available; some nitrogen and lime; very little phosphorus and potash. As a result, considerable topsoil has been lost and soil fertility has gradually been decreasing.

This year, cooperating fruit growers of the district have made a definite step forward in orchard practices through the use of more complete fertilizer, lime, and better soil management. They have been able to hold or build soil fertility and produce a good quality of fruit, along with good terminal growth. The district has furnished technical assistance in laying out 50 acres of contour cherry orchards. The contour rows were 26 feet apart and the trees in the rows were spaced 23 feet apart.

We are able to report this year that we have had some encouraging results from planting cherry trees on a site that had been laid out and mulched 2 years previously.

Approximately 325 acres of orchard and strawberry beds have received mulching material in the past year. The materials used were sawdust, shavings, and straw.

Orchard covers of various types were again used by cooperators. Rye, rye and vetch, or rye and oats were used for annual covers. Some permanent covers are being used and old sod covers were trashy cultivated in the early growing season and then allowed to come back in late July or early August. A complete fertilizer is used on the covers.

Some very good frost prevention was carried out on strawberries by the use of irrigation systems. One grower was able to pro-

duce over 900 crates to the acre on a frost protected patch.

In 1949, the Manistee County Soil Conservation District cooperators have planted 159,000 pine trees or approximately 159 acres. These plantings were on class 6 and 7 lands, consisting of about 50 percent red pine, 25 percent jack, and 25 percent white pine.

The district's aim is to promote the planting of about a million trees per year as soon as the trees are available. The Manistee district has about 36,000 acres of class 6 and 7 land which will take about 36 years to complete or area that is definitely marked for reforesting.

At the present time we have about 1,150 acres under woodland management, such as thinning, selective cutting, and restriction from grazing. There are approximately 60,000 more acres that can be put under this same kind of management.

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the above there was a year-around educational program sponsored by the district, including articles in the newspapers and broadcasts over the radio, programs in the schools and various demonstrations and public meetings throughout the year. In the way of planning, during the year 12 study clubs were formed which were attended by 72 farmers. These farmers have applied their knowledge of conservation and land-use fundamentals to the development of 61 farm conservation plans designed to stop erosion and depletion on 8,643 acres of land within their district.

The real barometer of success for this Manistee district lies in the fact that 1950 will see a snowballing of its work load. Success likes company and the farmers in that area are really climbing aboard the soil conservation band wagon so much so that the directors are now warning their people that there is bound to be a backlog all through 1950 in the demands for technical assistance. I want to say again that I am proud of this Federal service which is making such progress and doing such constructive work in my district.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. H. ALEXANDER SMITH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on Friday night, February 17, I had the privilege of speaking before an interdenominational brotherhood meeting, attended by citizens of all faiths, at the synagogue of the Congregation B'nai Israel, of Elizabeth, N. J. The subject of my address was Brotherhood, and I endeavored to relate the principle of human brotherhood to world conditions today and to American responsibilities both at home and abroad.

I ask unanimous consent that my address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is an inspiring experience for me to be a part of this gathering of Americans of all faiths, joined together here to rededicate ourselves to our ideal of human brotherhood. Brotherhood Week symbolizes the fundamental moral principle on which our Nation was founded—a principle which all of us, in our churches and our synagogues, hold in common. This principle was stated in our Declaration of Independence in words which changed the course of human history for all time: "All men are created equal."

I want to examine those simple and profound words for a moment, because in this secular age we are inclined to think of them as nothing more than a political principle. Actually, what gives these words their power is that they state a basic moral and religious principle.

I call your attention to one word in that famous sentence: the word "created." The self-evident truth which our American forefathers proclaimed was not simply that all men are equal, but that they are created equal. They are equal because they are all equally creatures of one Creator—God—a just and loving God who commands them to be just to one another and to love one another. And so, by that one word, "created," this principle is elevated above the idea of mere equality to the idea of brotherhood. There is a world of difference.

Let me restate this thought. Human brotherhood is more than mere human equality. Human brotherhood flows from the belief that we are all equally the creatures of one God. I think it is appropriate today to stress this point, because, to my mind, it sums up the vital, fundamental difference between the faith we hold in common and the other great movement at large in the world today, which is called communism.

The presence of communism in the world faces us with an entirely different set of problems from those with which our Revolutionary forefathers had to contend. We were the revolutionaries of those days, and because our ideas were powerful we carried the world before us. Today the dynamic revolutionary movement is in the hands of others, and it is sweeping many countries with its ruthless force. It is up to us to oppose it, not only because it threatens our safety but also because it is fundamentally evil.

I think it is vital for us to understand what the essential evil of the Communist movement is, and why it has become so powerful. We are all aware of its ruthless violence, the setting of class against class, its suppression of freedom, its distortion of truth, its mad drive for power. With all these ugly features, it is astonishing to us to see how this doctrine has managed to command the allegiance of various misguided idealistic souls who somehow hoped that communism was the road to social justice.

I think we can clarify our understanding of this amazing movement if we remember that communism as a doctrine does preach the idea of human equality. It appeals to the oppressed and hungry peoples of all lands who think they see in it a promise that they will no longer be oppressed and will receive under communism the same equal treatment as everybody else. To those submerged classes of the world who have experienced this oppression, the appeal of communism to class warfare seems the only way out of their difficulties. In their misery and despair, the Communist doctrine spreads before them a vision which is the very reverse of their unhappy experience—the vision of a so-called classless society in which all men are equal.

Now, obviously, the evils of communism do not stem from this idea of equality itself. In my mind, they stem from the fact that the equality which communism preaches entirely omits the proposition that all men are creatures of God. In other words, communism is completely materialistic and atheistic. It denies God altogether. And in denying God it also denies the moral basis of equality.

Without that moral basis, the idea of equality is bound to be empty and vain and frightfully destructive. Communism perfectly illustrates this fact. The equality it preaches leads to strife and hatred, envy and malice. It denounces justice, mercy, and love as fatal weaknesses. It ignores the priceless value of the individual soul and looks upon man as a mere instrument of the state. It denies brotherhood and all the noble motives of the mind, and in the end it brings on the very antithesis of brotherhood—the ruthless domination of man by man.

Yet it is not enough for us to condemn this evil atheistic force of communism. Our condemnations do not change the fact that it is on the march in the world today, and I believe it is our duty to assume our share of responsibility for that terrible fact. If we can understand why we of the Western World share the responsibility for this tragic state of affairs, then we may gain some insight into the question of how to stop it.

The successes of communism, I think, directly represent the shortcomings of the free, democratic world. We of the West, in our concept of human equality and brotherhood, with its profoundly moral and religious basis, have evolved an idea of incalculable power—an idea which could have become the moral basis for the ordering of human society all over the world. Our failure was that we did not manage to apply that idea throughout the world. Even in our own countries, in western Europe and America, we have shown certain weaknesses, we have tolerated injustice in various ways, and as a result we have seen the growth of extreme and ruthless movements under the banners of both fascism and communism. And even more, in the colonial areas of the world, the principles of brotherhood which we professed at home have often been totally ignored.

Today the most urgent crisis in the struggle with communism is in the Far East. That should not surprise us too much—for it is in the Far East that the western nations for centuries past have failed most tragically to carry out their own principles of human brotherhood. This has been the great area of the supposed supremacy of the white man, the great area of colonial subjection, and the great area of economic exploitation. We are challenged today to show the peoples of the Far East that we represent not racialism, colonialism, and exploitation, but their very opposites: Individual human dignity, national independence, and free economic development for the benefit of the people.

In my travels in the Far East last fall, I was profoundly impressed with the power of these ideals in the minds of all Asiatic peoples. Everywhere I went I found a yearning for nationalism and freedom.

But the problem I am discussing is not confined to the Far East or to any one region. It is world-wide. The fact is that nowhere in the world can we Americans afford to ignore or condone human misery. This is not only because misery is a breeding ground for communism—that is one reason, and a very vital one, but it is the negative reason. We have a higher and more positive reason for being concerned with human misery, and that reason is our fundamental belief in the brotherhood of man. We are our brothers' keepers. We are interested in them for their own sakes, simply because we view them as human beings, creatures of the same God who created us.

It is vitally important that we succeed in bringing the peoples of the world to an understanding of this moral attitude of ours. No nation is likely to welcome an American policy if they think that policy is a mere

defensive move designed to strengthen America against communism. No nation will be happy over the idea of being used as an American shield. Therefore we must show that we seek the development and freedom and prosperity of these nations for their own sakes, in order to carry out our ideal of human brotherhood. If we proceed on that basis, then I feel sure we will have the strongest alliance against Communist tyranny that it is possible to have—an alliance based not on fear but on mutual understanding, and on hope for the future of mankind.

But if it is vital for us to make clear our ideals and our motives, it is equally vital that we keep our actions in line with those ideals, both at home and abroad. America is being carefully watched all over the world, and especially the Communists are eager to seize on our shortcomings for propaganda purposes. I would like to mention two or three areas in which I think it especially vital that we in the United States live up to our professed ideals of brotherhood.

The first of these areas is the matter of our program for European displaced persons. In the welter of world events this may seem a very small question, but in reality it is of the highest moral significance. In 1948 Congress passed an act by which the United States assumed a share in the job of resettling these unfortunate victims of Nazi aggression. It was clear from the beginning that the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 was very inadequate both in the numbers of displaced persons to be admitted and in the unfortunate restrictions and hidden discriminations which were placed in their way. Many of us in Congress have been urgently trying since that time to amend the act so as to make it more adequate and more just. It seemed most unfortunate to us that a program inspired by feelings of brotherhood and compassion should be hedged about with all these intimations of distrust and unfriendliness.

The time for action to improve the displaced-persons program is at hand in Congress. I believe there is an excellent chance of amending the bill on the Senate floor in order to bring it more into line with the original purposes of the program. For my part, I shall do all in my power to bring about this result, because I believe this program is a moral imperative for the United States. Our solution of the displaced-persons question will be watched by all those in the world who want to see whether the United States is willing to live up to its high ideal of human brotherhood.

A second area in which our American ideals are on trial is the area of civil rights. This is a dramatic test of whether or not we in the United States are ready to practice in our own homeland the ideal of brotherhood which we seek to promote in the world. From the standpoint of our fundamental morality I can see only one solution to this question, and that is a solution based on our common belief that we are all equally the creatures of one God.

But perhaps we can gain an added sense of the importance of this question if we remember once again that the whole world is watching us. Especially in Asia and Africa, where the peoples of vast former colonial areas have known the humiliation of being treated as inferior races, the way in which the United States acts to implement the rights of its own Negro citizens is of the highest significance. I know of no other field in which the quality of our own actions at home so directly affects our moral power in the world.

Enlightened men may differ in detail as to the best way for us to proceed, but I think none of us can deny the importance of acting quickly and vigorously. This is a question on which there should be no conflict between our political parties. Naturally, I am most anxious to see that my own Republican Party continues to maintain its historic advanced position on this question.

In this connection I cannot conceal my disappointment that the recent Republican statement of principles and objectives, issued on February 6, did not speak out decisively and clearly on civil rights. For my part—and in this I think I speak for many Republicans in Congress—in my attitude and voting on civil rights I shall continue to feel bound by the words of the Republican platform of 1948:

"Lynching or any other form of mob violence anywhere is a disgrace to any civilized state, and we favor the prompt enactment of legislation to end this infamy.

"One of the basic principles of this Republic is the equality of all individuals in their rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. This principle is enunciated in the Declaration of Independence and embodied in the Constitution of the United States; it was vindicated on the field of battle and became the cornerstone of this Republic. The right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic.

"We favor the abolition of the poll tax as a requisite to voting.

"We are opposed to the idea of racial segregation in the armed forces of the United States."

That is a strong statement, and I still support it in its entirety. As many of my friends know, in the field of fair employment practices I believe that the primary emphasis should be on education and conciliation. But I am extremely anxious that we get ahead with Federal fair employment legislation, and I myself plan to work and vote for the very best law that we can possibly achieve in this field. I earnestly hope that we will get a good and workable law in this session of Congress. I am keenly aware that the eyes of the world are upon us in this matter.

Lastly, I want to mention briefly a third area of American action in which I think our ideal of brotherhood is involved. I refer to that whole complex of our domestic affairs which comes under the heading of welfare. I believe that we cannot stand effectively as champions of social and economic progress in the world unless we are prepared to grapple with the problems of social and economic progress in our own country. This is not the place for me to outline my ideas on the proper role of government in promoting our objectives in this field. But I do want to make it clear that in my judgment government—on the Federal, State, and local levels—cannot ignore the demands of the people for economic security and opportunity, for better health and housing and education. These are the concerns of all of us, and it is right and proper that all levels of government in this country should take a hand in solving these problems.

Yet it is of the highest importance that the actions we take be compatible with the principle of freedom for the individual. I cannot for a moment subscribe to the proposition that the salvation of the American people lies in the erection of a monumental, centralized, monopolistic government machine. On the contrary, it seems to me that our way of progress lies primarily in the enlightened creative efforts of the people themselves, aided and encouraged by a government which acts not as a master but as a servant—and perhaps as a partner.

The United States stands before the world as a living proof that economic and spiritual welfare for the people can best be attained in an atmosphere of freedom—an atmosphere where the free inventive capacities of every individual citizen are allowed the fullest possible play. In this atmosphere we have maintained a society which has no sharp class divisions and which spurns the Marxian idea of class warfare.

I think this is a tremendously hopeful fact for the peoples of the world to contemplate. In the United States we are all middle class. Our system is far from perfect, but the fact remains that we are committed to a system of equal opportunity, equal justice, and social progress for all the people. We have managed to make that system work, not by the dominant power of government but by the moral power of our faith in the principle that all men are brothers.

We must have the courage to maintain and continuously perfect this system of ours in an atmosphere of individual freedom. The peoples of half the world are being courted today by the insidious appeal of communism. It is not enough for us to show them that the Communist doctrine of so-called equality is vain and frightfully destructive. We must show them also that there is an alternative way of life. The fundamental principles of this alternative of human freedom have been established by the blood, sweat, and tears of generations of our forebears. These fundamental principles will work for all humanity as they have worked for us here in America. We must persuade these people, who earnestly aspire to be free, that the way to freedom lies not through hatred and conflict but through the practice of human brotherhood. We must show them, as clearly as we know how, the true meaning of the words in our Declaration of Independence: "All men are created equal."

Flood Threat in Louisiana

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, January 12, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial:

FLOOD THREAT IN LOUISIANA

The flood menace is growing more acute in those Louisiana areas in the watersheds of the Mississippi, Ouachita, Black, and Red Rivers. On the Atchafalaya also there is an increasing threat.

There has been no loss of life so far and a great measure of credit for this can be given those governmental agencies charged with early warning of oncoming high waters and with construction and maintenance of our levee systems.

But more than 1,500 families have been routed from their homes and countless head of livestock have been endangered or lost to the flood waters.

The National Guard has thrown amphibious military vehicles into the struggle to remove residents of low-lying areas. Refugees are being taken to 10 camps on high ground in the stricken sections. The Red Cross is aiding them with warm clothing and food.

The rivers are still brimfull and forecasters are eyeing the Midwest for rainfall which would further increase the danger in the lower Mississippi Valley. It is felt that river stages of the Mississippi, the principal controlling factor, will continue to be near or at flood stage for most of the month of March.

The crisis then is real in all flooded areas, is imminent in others now threatened, and will be continuous for some weeks ahead.

No workable method of reducing these high levels can now be used. Opening of the Bonnet Carre spillway near New Orleans will afford a measure of protection to that city which in years past has been under recurrent threat of flood. The city of Alexandria is on high ground, protected by levees and will probably not suffer any more than in past years. Monroe too lies under the protection of a system of levees that extends up into Morehouse Parish. Baton Rouge is also free of threat.

Our chief cities in the flood area seem able therefore to escape any serious damage. But in many other parts of the State bordering the swollen rivers, residents are hourly awaiting the warning to flee.

If the rains continue upstream, flood stages exceeding the disastrous overflow of 1927 have been predicted. If this forecast actually materializes, it would represent a real calamity to our State.

Apparently the only possible plan to prevent further flood-water damage would be opening of the Morganza floodway. This would turn the waters of the Black and Mississippi Rivers into a leveed channel to the Atchafalaya River and thus to the Gulf. By providing an alternate route for the flood to follow, pressure would be relieved in New Orleans and a quicker, more direct route for the water to follow would be provided.

There is one hitch to this. The Morganza floodway is not yet completed. The giant levees and other structures are finished as far south as Morgan City. Below that, the Morganza spillway does not exist or exists in only partially complete form. Engineers say that if the spillway is opened now to relieve the flood threat of the Black and Mississippi, a seven-parish area south of Morgan City would be inundated.

If further evidence were needed, the present flood situation surely is proof that completion of the Morganza spillway should be rushed with a minimum of delay and red tape. It is, of course, too late to do anything about the present flood, or so the engineers say, but residents of the State should take such action as seems necessary to obtain quick completion of the spillway. This could easily be the chief factor in effecting a practical solution to the high-water problem in the Red and Black Rivers and the areas affected by their juncture with the Mississippi.

International Conference on Control of Atomic Energy, World Disarmament, and Revision of United Nations Charter

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, we are all agreed that the most critical single problem in the world today concerns our relations with the Soviet Union, particularly now that she possesses the secrets of the hydrogen and atomic bombs. In this connection I released on Sunday a statement urging the Department of State to request a poll of the members of the United Nations on their reactions to the idea of a new international conference which would consider control of atomic energy, world disarmament, and revision of the United Nations Charter. The hunger of the world is for peace, and this hunger must be met by constructive action—realistic, yet imaginative.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of the statement I issued, together with a copy of a letter I wrote to Secretary of State Acheson, be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement and letter were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WILEY SUGGESTS UNITED NATIONS POLL COUNTRIES REGARDING WORLD CONFERENCE TO REVISE CHARTER, DISARM

A poll of members of the United Nations to determine their reactions to world federation, atom control, and disarmament proposals has been suggested by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin.

The Wisconsin Senator, second ranking Republican on the Foreign Relations Committee, made public a letter which he has written to the Secretary of State suggesting the United States ask United Nations Secretary General Lie to make such a poll.

Senator WILEY stated that the United States should make this request, rather than "proceed unilaterally and suggest outright, without any preliminary consultation with anyone else, an international conference. We must determine whether the nations believe a new conference would accomplish anything that the United Nations could not of itself right now accomplish."

The full text of Senator WILEY's letter reads as follows:

"The Honorable DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.

"DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I am writing to you both in my capacity as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and as a member of the special subcommittee which has been evaluating World Government, Atlantic Union, and other resolutions and informal proposals designed to meet the current critical situation throughout the world.

"It is agreed among all thinking men that the present course of events, if left unchecked, can potentially lead to disaster for the entire world because of the specter of the hydrogen and even worse bombs to come.

"I feel that there are two major shortcomings of the various proposals thus far presented to the subcommittee:

"WE CANNOT ACHIEVE MILLENNIUM BY A MERE ORGANIZATION

"1. All of them may lead to a sense of false security on the part of the American people; may lead to the creation of an illusion that by simply setting up the framework of another international organization, or calling another international conference, we would automatically be accomplishing the millenium and resolving all differences between ourselves and the Soviet Union.

"I have consistently questioned all witnesses to this effect; assuming that some form of new international structure were set up, suppose the Russians continued to refuse to cooperate—would we not be then in the very same situation, and, in fact, far worse a position than we are now?

"WE CANNOT ASSUME WE AUTOMATICALLY KNOW WORLD OPINION

"2. A second shortcoming is that all of the proposals would have the United States in effect drag the rest of the world behind it, without first ascertaining what the other nations think about these ideas. While we are a leader among nations, we cannot presume on so important a subject as this that we automatically know the opinion of the member nations without even asking them as to whether or not they feel any of these proposals are at all feasible and desirable.

"MY TWO SUGGESTIONS

"May I respectfully suggest, therefore, that as Secretary of State you—

"1. Instruct the United States delegate to the United Nations General Assembly to contact the Secretary General of the United Nations, Mr. Trygve Lie, and Mr. Lie proceed to poll the member states to determine whether or not they believe it would be both desirable and feasible for a new international conference to be called at which the member states, represented on the highest possible level, would discuss (a) proposals for revision of the United Nations Charter or setting up some new form of international organization; and (b) in connection therewith to consider ways and means of ironclad international inspection of atomic energy and other weapons and possible disarmament, so as to halt the armaments race now existing.

"2. I believe that simultaneously the Department of State through its own embassies, ministries, and missions abroad should contact foreign governments to learn directly what the opinion of those governments are in relation to an internation conference and the other proposals which have been made. By determining at the outset Russia's position, we would avoid building up any false illusions.

"I OPPOSE WORLD GOVERNMENT RESOLUTION

"May I indicate at the present time that I for one believe that it would be premature and foolhardy for the United States to consider abandoning its constitutional prerogatives and sovereignty and to enter into a world government at the present time. I do, however, believe that further cooperation and coordination between our country and other lands is necessary and that is why I submit the above suggestions.

"THESE ACTIONS WOULD BE A PART OF OUR PEACE OFFENSIVE

"I believe that in taking these actions the United States would be demonstrating its good faith in consulting with foreign powers and that this demonstration should be communicated by the Voice of America to the peoples of Russia and those countries behind the iron curtain, as well as to the rest of the world. This would be a part of an over-all peace offensive designed to mobilize the spiritual power of the peoples of the earth for constructive actions leading toward peace. Years ago, I introduced legislation to establish a cabinet department of peace for this very objective.

"WE NEED A PEACE BOMB

"It has been well stated that we possess an A-bomb, are working toward an H-bomb, and what we now need is a peace-bomb which will create rather than destroy and scatter blessings rather than havoc.

"I know that you will agree that every American parent feels a deep anxiety over the future of our children and our children's children in this atomic age and that any step we may take to relieve that fear is that much to the good.

"Sincerely yours,

"ALEXANDER WILEY."

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. John Davis Lodge, of Connecticut

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on Monday, February 13, 1950, before the New Haven Republican organization's

annual Lincoln Day dinner, held in New Haven, Conn., the distinguished Congressman from the Fourth District of Connecticut, Mr. LODGE, made a stirring Lincoln Day address.

Because of its enlightened approach to many of the pressing problems of the day, it merits careful study by every Member of the Congress. To this end, I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Ladies and gentlemen, it is a privilege to have been asked to address such a distinguished gathering. And it is a pleasure to meet with you here to celebrate the great Republican principles of which Abraham Lincoln was the founder and is the living and inspiring symbol.

It is particularly appropriate that we should celebrate this occasion in the historic city of New Haven, the city of elms, the city of industry, the site of Yale University, the city which recently reelected as their Republican mayor, our good friend and able administrator, William Celentano.

Surely as Abraham Lincoln leans over the battlements of Heaven and watches the Republican Party in its efforts to preserve intact the two-party system on which our freedoms depend, he must be particularly interested in what we say and do in celebration of his birth 141 years ago. And assuredly at this stirring and challenging time in the story of man it is not sufficient for us simply to commemorate Lincoln's birth. Rather, it seems to me this banquet should be an occasion for solemn rededication to the timeless truths for which he fought and worked and died. This is no time for doubt, defeatism, and despair. We are confronted with great issues, and we must meet these issues with vigor, with imagination, and with courage.

In Lincoln's own words, "The dogmas of the quiet past are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our case is new so must we think anew and act anew." Indeed, the sayings of Abraham Lincoln constitute a veritable bible for the present-day guidance of the Republican Party. It is altogether fitting that we should be reminded of his wisdom and understanding at this difficult and dangerous time.

Now it has been the fashion in some quarters to think that our party is on the horns of the dilemma of choosing between a philosophy which some have called me-tooism and a point of view which others have labeled as reactionary. But this is not our choice. Certainly we must not follow and imitate while others lead and create. But neither must we be obstructionists. We must not disagree for the sake of disagreement. We must not come out against the Ten Commandments just because they are favored by the Democrats.

In its policies and in its actions our party must reflect the fundamental divisions of thought among the American people.

That does not mean that we must be horse-and-buggy die-hards. It does not mean that we should advocate the doctrine of laissez-faire. Nor does it mean that we must follow in the recent tradition of a small segment of the Republican Party who classify themselves as isolationists rather than in the older and more widespread Republican tradition that what goes on outside our borders is of great concern to us. It does mean that we must produce feasible alternatives to the schemes of the Democrats which, if they were adopted, would destroy the very welfare of which the Democrats are the self-styled champions. It does mean encouraging the large number of independent voters to express themselves politically through the medium of the Republican Party. It does mean that our party must convince a majority of the people who vote that it has a constructive plan of action which will respond more effectively to the needs and aspirations of all the people than the tired clichés, the reckless promises, and the special-interest appeals with which the Democrats have in recent years preyed upon the fears and apprehensions of the voters.

As a matter of fact, if one could believe Democratic oratory, the Democratic Party would be the me-too party. A curious example of this attempt to be all things to all men is found in the President's recent message on the state of the Union which, I may say, contained a minimum amount of comment on the state of the Union and a maximum quantity of cynical political bait strangely reminiscent of the promise to reduce prices for the Connecticut housewife made by our present Governor during the campaign of 1948. The speech is interesting because the President, wishing to reassume a growing body of aroused Americans, resorted to the very me-too philosophy which he has often attacked on those occasions when certain Republicans have agreed with him. In an effort to attract the support of those who are alarmed by the increasing cost of Government, by deficit spending at a time of high national income, and by the growing might of the Washington bureaucrats, the President stated that "businessmen must continue to have the incentives necessary for investment and for the development of new lines of enterprise."

Yet in the same breath he recommended a program which would go far toward eliminating these incentives, preclude the development of new enterprises, and concentrate more power in Washington.

In his message on the state of the Union, the President also reiterated his desire for the repeal of the so-called Taft-Hartley law which he used last week in connection with the coal strike. He advocated repeal in spite of the fact that this law was favored by a large majority of the Democrats in the Eightieth Congress, and in spite of the further fact that the overwhelming majority of the Democrats in the Eighty-first Congress are opposed to repeal. Indeed, when repeal of the Taft-Hartley law came before the first session of the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress, out of 263 Democrats only 30, none of whom were from Connecticut, voted in favor of repeal. In spite of the President's request for repeal, the Democrat leadership has apparently decided to keep this issue for the 1950 campaign. I believe that this is a grave disservice to labor. I believe that labor is entitled to be influential in both parties. I believe that the welfare of the working men and women of America is entitled to the same bipartisan consideration as that which is accorded to the welfare of the Europeans.

Let us see what Lincoln has to say about this question: "Capital is only the fruit of labor—could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves the much higher consideration." And he went on to say: "That men who are industrious and sober and honest in the pursuit of their own interest should after awhile accumulate property, and after that should be allowed to enjoy it in peace is right. The prudent penniless beginner in the world labors for wages a while, saves his surplus with which to buy tools or land for himself, then labors on his own account for another while, and at length hires another to help him. This is the just and generous and prosperous system which opens the way to all, gives hope to all, and consequently an improvement of condition to all."

Lincoln said: "I believe each individual is naturally entitled to do as he pleases with himself and the fruit of his labor, so far as it in no wise interferes with any other man's rights."

Labor and capital are component parts of what is essentially a cooperative effort. It should be the mission of the Reupblican Party to take labor legislation out of politics.

Furthermore, in order to provide more jobs and higher wages, in order to raise our standard of living, we must increase and improve our tools of production. This we cannot do if incentives are stifled, if risk investments are made so risky that people won't take a chance. This is the paramount interest of all of our citizens, and in particular of labor. It has been estimated that the average job in America requires a $6,000 investment. It is a disservice to labor to discourage such investments.

The Republican Party should also point out to what degree the working men and women of our country are weighted down with taxes. Our Federal Government annually costs the average American between $275 and $300. It now owes the average American family of four somewhere between seven and eight thousand dollars. The average American citizen is plagued by dozens of invisible taxes. Yet the President talks of substantial tax increases.

And at this very moment while the people of our country are carrying this great tax burden the Democratic administration is in possession of 65,000,000 bushels of potatoes, 219,000,000 dozen eggs, and 96,000,000 pounds of butter. This food was bought with the taxpayers' money in order to keep prices up.

A notable omission from the President's message is that it contains no reference to the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations which hitherto had been thought to have substantial bipartisan support. This is sad indeed particularly in view of the budgetary deficit because I believe that the overwhelming majority of the American people, including those who want the Government to do so much, want it done without waste, and with efficiency.

And while the Hoover Commission reports and recommendations are not a partisan matter; while they are supported by many citizens in both parties and by independent voters, certainly there is a tendency in some administration bureaucrats to prevent a proper streamlining of our Government. The Republicans should assert themselves to the utmost in order that the President and the Democrat-controlled Eighty-first Congress should with such adjustments as may seem desirable proceed with dispatch to the implementation of these recommendations.

With regard to what is often referred to as social legislation, there is no need to embrace the solutions offered by the Democrats. However, neither should we ignore these problems where they exist. It is up to us to demonstrate our imagination and our intellectual vigor by coming out with better solutions. Principally, however, the difference between our point of view and the view of those who are in power is that for us it should be an effort to respond to a human need while for them it is usually part of a plot to concentrate additional power in Washington. Such centralization is, of course, pleasing to the Communists since it enables them more easily to undermine the morale of our people and to destroy the political fabric of our country.

Because the Government must be the servant of the people it must also be strong enough and wise enough to respond effectively to the problems of the day. While we provide incentives for the creation of new wealth, we must also intercede on behalf of those for whom lief is particularly difficult in order that the people should retain their enthusiasm for the private property system. While, in order to raise our standard of living and buttress our economy, we should reduce the national debt, effect large-scale

economies in government, and return to sound fiscal policies, we must also assist those who have no more than a substandard on which to eke out a meager existence.

Abraham Lincoln said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities. In all that the people can individually do as well for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

But we should burn into our brains the incontrovertible truth that the ultimate, the essential welfare of the American people depends upon the continuation and increase of the vital opportunities inherent in our free society. Aid to the needy, to the unfortunate in our society, is right and just and feasible. But if every family receives housing, food, clothing, medical care, and education from Washington, we shall have embarked upon a course which will cause a break-down not only in the American economy but also in the American character. And when a government attempts to redistribute to the citizens more than the citizens can produce, inflation and dictatorship are the inevitable result.

Acting in the clear and vigorous tradition of Abraham Lincoln, we Republicans should take a forthright stand on the question of civil rights. This is in keeping with our platform. It is in accordance with the first article of the constitution of Connecticut, which declares "that all men, when they form a social compact, are equal in rights." It is in furtherance of the Constitution of the United States. And it is in keeping with the enlightened principles and vigorous leadership shown by our late great Gov. James McConaughy, when, on March 14, 1917, he signed the Connecticut Fair Employment Practices Act.

On this matter the Democrats have been arguing among themselves while the Republicans have been acting—not only in Connecticut but in seven other States—New York, New Jersey, Wisconsin, Indiana, Oregon, Washington, and Massachusetts.

With regard to this issue, the Democrats are hesitant, apologetic, and ineffective. We can and must be united and strong. We should carry the banner on the civil-rights program. This is not only right and just and in the best Republican—Lincolnian—tradition, but it will also be of great help to us in the battle for men's minds which we are waging throughout the world with the godless forces of Communist aggression.

And this brings me to the primary issue which faces our Nation—the issue of war and peace. For it is relentlessly true that any social gains we make will melt like snow in the sun if we have war. Concerning our intercourse with other nations, Abraham Lincoln said: "* * * in the case of a long and threatening misunderstanding let us prepare for the worst and work for the best." It can hardly be said that we are preparing for the worst when we reduce our national defense establishment and use these unwise savings not to give tax relief to the American people but on further Government extravagance during an election year. And while we have reduced our forces to a mere fraction of the Soviet military strength, the Russians have improved and modernized their striking power so that today they have a more effective fighting force than they had during the war against Germany.

The possibility of large-scale destruction and loss of life by terrible new weapons does not change the fundamental issue. It does underscore the urgency of the problem of peace. We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into ill-advised actions and panic-stricken statements by these new engines of destruction. The road to a less precarious peace is hard and long and requires steady nerves and firm resolve. All right-thinking people agree as to the desirability of peace. It is my conviction that in the world of today peace is a product of strength and war is a derivative of weakness. Certainly World Wars I and II bolster that conviction. Statements by members of the administration party which attempt to bait and bribe the Russian people to disarm do not reach the Russian people but may well convince the Kremlin that we are leading from weakness.

It is well to recall that at the end of the war we offered Russia a loan of some $10,000,000,000 for rehabilitation. There were no strings attached to this loan. All we desired was continued collaboration in the cause of peace. All we wanted was a reduction in armaments. The offer was not accepted. And in 1947 the Soviet Union was invited to share in the Marshall plan. Molotov, who was asked to participate, tried to wreck the plan. This has been established Russian policy ever since.

In 1948 Henry Wallace proposed before the Foreign Affairs Committee the creation of a global Marshall plan to include Soviet Russia and involving an expenditure of $50,000,000,000 over a period of 10 years. Now, after the Communist forces have overrun huge territories in Asia involving the subjugation of 450,000,000 people, there is another $50,000,000,000 proposal to include the Russian Communists. Although the suggestion is no longer original, intervening events have not endowed it with greater validity.

The fact is that there is no easy solution to the great dilemma with which we are faced. There are no pat answers to these problems. There is no open sesame by which we can suddenly emerge from the dark clouds of oppression which are crowding down upon us into the bright sunlight of a secure freedom. There is no sudden deed of excellence which will guarantee for us overnight the peace for which we recently sacrificed so much. We are inextricably involved in a conflict of titanic proportions, and it will take all the energies, all the stern resolve, all the balanced judgment and all the spiritual fervor and spirit of sacrifice of which we are capable to surmount our difficulties. We cannot afford to grow tired at this time.

In addition we must recognize that the world crisis cannot be solved solely in terms of dollars and commodities, military equipment and personnel, plans and agreements. It is also most emphatically a question of moral leadership. In fulfilling this exacting role we must bear in mind that while men and women the world over yearn for safety from war and from want they are also interested in how and why they are living. We who take sharp issue with the Marxian theory that man lives by bread alone must realize that the problem is not simply one of matériel. It is not just a battle of industrial potential, of things. It is also a battle of ideas.

And while this overriding issue of war and peace should be met without regard to party advantage, it is more important to be right than to be bipartisan. And it must be increasingly clear to the people of America that it will be to their advantage to have in Washington a Government which devotes its time not to a justification of its errors in the Far East but to correcting them; not to covering up mistakes but to policies which will safeguard the peace. We have a right to demand of our officials that they place loyalty to America ahead of loyalty to their friends and cronies.

In the words of Abraham Lincoln, "Revolutionize through the ballot box, and restore the Government once more to the affections and hearts of men by making it express, as it was intended to do, the highest spirit of justice and liberty."

This is the Republican Party's opportunity for distinguished service. This is the challenge to us in Connecticut. This is the challenge to America.

Government Spud Muddle

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD an excellent statement by Mr. George B. Buck, a Maine potato grower, in a letter written to the Belfast Maine Republican Journal, and published in that newspaper on February 2, 1950.

His observations of the "spud muddle," I believe, accurately reflect a growing sentiment among Maine potato farmers. I invite the attention of all Members of this Congress to his statement.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HITS AT GOVERNMENT SPUD MUDDLE

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The following letter, addressed to the editor of the Republican, is written so clearly by George B. Buck that we commend it to the attention of our readers. So many with whom we have talked—while trying to blaze a mental trail out of the wilderness of the potato muddle—have voiced quite similar opinions, but we didn't take down their words.)

This is the first time I ever undertook to write anything other than an advertisement for your paper, and there isn't much doubt in my mind but it will be the last.

There is so much discussion about the potato situation, perhaps a better word would be a mix-up. And having raised potatoes for over 60 years, and shipped both hay and potatoes for 40, I can truthfully say I was never any more discouraged. But, perhaps I will feel a little better when I get this pill off my stomach.

We do not seem to know where we are at. Personally, I would rather sell cheaper and not be bothered with the Government. I do not like this dictatorship.

It seems too bad, after years of such hard work here in this county and State to build up a market and then give it to the Canadians. And we cannot blame them. We would do just as they are doing if we had a chance. When you let the bars down the cattle are going to come out and seek better food. That is the law of nature.

Many times, both last year and this year, when we wire any of our old customers they reply, "Sorry, Mr. Buck, but we can do better in Canada." For example, I am going to quote what a chain-store manager in Derry, N. H., replied when I wrote about hay. Just a few years ago we shipped them around 165 cars. Read what they say now:

"The writer found your letter of January 16 on his desk, and in reply I wish I could tell you something definite about hay. Our sales are still slow, with the bulk being on real good quality out of Canada. The market on other quality is very mixed, with quotations spreading $4 per ton on comparable lots. The low figure is quoted by truckers out of the Maritimes who will sell to dealers when they can, and deal directly with consumers if they have to."

This is a good sample of letters and telegrams we have had during the last 2 or 3 years. We cannot compete with them because, for instance, they can press their hay for five or six dollars per ton where it costs us nine and ten dollars per ton. Then, too,

there is the 10 percent discount in the exchange of money. That in itself is quite a profit.

As it is, our Government is cutting our quota while the Canadians are planting more and more to put on our market. I call this real tough medicine. And it isn't only potatoes and hay, but other things. At present they are even bringing over eggs. And they bring over meat, dairy products, whatever it may be. All these things have a tendency to hurt the farmers here.

As I see it, the high ceiling has cost us a lot of money. It has made some people all around us wealthy, but it hasn't helped the small fellow raising 25 or 30 acres. Only just recently I heard a young farmer say in our store that he didn't know what he was going to do. He has been raising 30 acres. They are cutting him down, and he has quite a large family. He has a daughter who wants to go to college, and he wants her to go, but he can't see how in the world, in planting so few acres, he is going to do it. This is only one case in many.

And then another thing about this high ceiling. It has taught some States, that you might say are right in the market, to go into potatoes. They, too, are hurting us. They have no such advantage, about $1 difference per barrel in freight. We are way up north here with a heavy freight—but we can raise the potatoes.

I personally feel confident that after World War II every producer should have been allowed to go right back the old-fashioned way, on his own risk, planting as much as he wanted to. It was all right when they gave us a goal to encourage production when we were feeding the world. There was no cut then.

I would just like to try it—to go back the old-fashioned way, every producer taking his own chances and I say to you, in all fairness, I sincerely believe that the law of supply and demand will fix it better, fairer, than any man or men. That is the way this great Nation was built up.

GEORGE B. BUCK.

Basing-Point Legislation Directed Against the South

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1950, Dr. George Stocking, head of the department of economics of Vanderbilt University, met with a group of Senators and Congressmen for the purpose of discussing informally the effects which the basing-point system would have, if restored by S. 1008, upon the South. He was invited to give us the benefit of his views by Senator KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, who felt that unless we knew what the effects of this proposed bill would be on our region we would be more or less in the position of legislating in the dark.

At the end of the discussion I asked Dr. Stocking whether he would be good enough to put his remarks in the form of a statement. This he has been good enough to do, and it is this statement which I now wish to include in the RECORD.

Briefly his statement shows, in cold figures, that the steel mills of Birmingham, Ala., although constituting probably the lowest-cost mills in the entire country have been able to secure only a relatively small share of their own home market. Under the basing-point system it makes no difference to the ultimate buyer located in the South or anywhere else which mill he buys from since all mills offer him the same delivered price. Consequently the Birmingham mills have not received the benefit of their natural location, and they have been forced to sit idly by while orders which should have been theirs have gone to distant northern mills. Since the Birmingham mills have thus not been able to gain the benefit of their natural market, their expansion has been held down. Similarly, since the steel users in the South have been unable to obtain the benefits of the Birmingham mills' natural location and cost advantages, their expansion has also been retarded.

I think the figures set forth in Dr. Stocking's statement should make it clear to every southern Senator and Congressman that S. 1008 is a bill aimed directly at the South and should be opposed with all the resources at our command.

The statement follows:

EFFECTS OF BASING-POINT PRICING ON THE SOUTH'S IRON AND STEEL INDUSTRY

The following analysis was made by Dr. George W. Stocking, of Vanderbilt University, as part of a study of the significance of basing-point pricing to the South, which he is making for the Committee of the South. The basic data were compiled by the Temporary National Economic Committee from questionnaires covering shipments of major iron and steel products for the month of February 1939. TNEC hearings, part 27, give a description of the questionnaire and a statement of its coverage at page 14133 and following pages, and 14350.

STRUCTURAL SHAPES

This analysis shows that during February 1939 nine Alabama counties surrounding Birmingham received from all sources included in the TNEC study, 1,623 tons of heavy structural shapes. Birmingham mills supplied only 1,017 tons of this or 62.6 percent of the total. Far away Chicago supplied 453 tons or 27.9 percent; the Pittsburgh-Johnstown district supplied 122 tons or 7.5 percent; eastern Pennsylvania supplied 31 tons or 1.9 percent. Average freight charges on shipments by Birmingham mills to buyers in that area were 94 cents a ton; on shipments from Chicago, $11.62 a ton; on shipments from Pittsburgh-Johnstown district, $12.82 a ton; on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania, $15.16 a ton.

All other Alabama counties bought only 52.5 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham. They got the remaining 47.5 percent from Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, Buffalo, and eastern Pennsylvania districts. Freight charges on the Birmingham shipments averaged only $6.55 a ton; on the shipments from northern mills they ranged from an average of $11.91 to $16.67 a ton.

Mississippians bought only 27.9 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham. Average freight charges on these purchases were only $6.83 a ton. This compared with $12.17 and $14.86 freight charges on shipments from Chicago and Buffalo. Despite higher freight charges, Mississippians got 72.1 percent of their requirements from these remote production centers.

Georgians got 66.5 percent of their heavy structural shapes from Birmingham on which freight charges averaged only $6.29 a ton; they bought the balance from Buffalo, Chicago, and Pittsburgh-Johnstown districts which average freight charges ranged from $13.20 to $14.59 a ton.

Birmingham's second best market for heavy structural shapes during February 1939 was Tennessee. Tennesseans bought a total of 502 tons from Birmingham on which average freight charges were only $5.40 a ton. They bought the balance of their requirements—45.6 percent of the total—from the Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, northern Ohio, and Buffalo districts on which average freight charges ranged from $9.44 to $11.70 a ton.

Sharing their nearby markets with far distant suppliers under a basing-point pricing system that robbed them of their advantages of location, Birmingham mills reached out for more distant markets. Other southern markets took a part of their surplus but these, too, had to share with less advantageously located mills. Florida bought 63.4 percent of its requirements of structural shapes from Birmingham on which freight charges averaged only $10.03. It bought the remainder of its requirements from Chicago, eastern Pennsylvania, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Buffalo districts on which average freight charges ranged from $12.64 to $20.33 a ton. South Carolina bought only 36.7 percent of its requirements from Birmingham, although average freight charges were only $9.70 a ton. This compared with $12.01 and $13.30 a ton on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania and Pittsburgh. Despite the higher freight charges, these two districts supplied most of South Carolina's requirements.

Birmingham supplied only 8.6 percent of North Carolina's requirements of heavy structural shapes, although average freight charges on shipments from Birmingham were $8.53 a ton as compared with average freight charges ranging from $9.19 to $11.43 on shipments from eastern Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh-Johnstown and northern Ohio districts whose mills supplied the bulk of North Carolina's requirements.

Birmingham's sales in Kentucky were negligible—24 tons, or 5.32 percent of Kentucky's total requirements. Average freight charges on Birmingham shipments to Kentucky were only $2.25 (apparently water shipments) as compared with average freight charges ranging from $5.71 to $12.44 on shipments from the St. Louis, Chicago, Buffalo, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and eastern Pennsylvania districts.

On shipments to the Texas market—more than twice as large as that of any other Southern State—Birmingham had the lowest average freight charges on structural shapes of any supplying area. Yet it supplied only 12 percent of Texas requirements. The eastern Pennsylvania, mountain, St. Louis, Chicago, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Buffalo districts shared the other 88 percent.

Unable to dispose of its output in nearby markets under the share-the-market program of a basing-point system, Birmingham shipped 223 tons, or 5.3 percent out of its total, to northern California. Freight charges on these shipments averaged $21.99 a ton. The Birmingham mills absorbed $21.49 of this amount.

STEEL PLATES

Mills of the Birmingham district shipped 12,836 tons of steel plates in February 1939. These shipments exceeded total purchases of all consuming districts in which Birmingham mills had a clear freight advantage. Birmingham mills supplied most of the southern market, but not all of it. Georgia shared 29 percent of its market with the eastern Pennsylvania, the Pittsburgh-Johnstown, and Baltimore districts. Yet average freight charges on shipments from the Bir-

mingham district were only $4.75 a ton compared with average freight charges ranging from $10 a ton to $12.87 a ton on shipments from the northern mills. While sharing the Georgia market, in which it had a freight advantage, Birmingham mills were forced to go far afield to dispose of their surplus. They sold 486 tons of steel plates in northern California on which they absorbed an average of $16.21 freight a ton.

PLAIN DRAWN WIRE

Birmingham mills shipped only 321 tons of plain drawn wire during February 1939. Freightwise their best markets were Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia. Although they had a sharp freight advantage in both the latter States, they supplied only 27 percent of Georgia's requirements, at an average freight charge of $6.45 a ton and 26 percent of Tennessee's requirements at an average freight charge of $4.21 a ton. Georgia got the balance of its requirements from the Baltimore, Pittsburgh-Johnstown, Indiana, Illinois, and New England districts. The average freight charges on shipments from these mills ranged from $12.52 to $16.50 a ton. Tennessee got the balance of its requirements from St. Louis, Indiana, Illinois, and Pittsburgh-Johnstown district mills, with average freight charges ranging from $9.40 to $11.73 a ton. Birmingham supplied none of the big Texas market, although most Texas shipments were priced on a Birmingham base; that is, they were destined for points in Texas, freightwise nearer to Birmingham than to any other mill. Neither did South Carolina buy any plain drawn wire from Birmingham, although it was freightwise nearer to Birmingham than to the mills that supplied it.

Apparently Birmingham output was kept below that necessary to supply its natural markets.

HOT-ROLLED STRIP

Birmingham mills shipped 528 tons of hot-rolled strip during February 1939. Freightwise their best markets were the Alabama, Birmingham, Georgia, South Carolina, and Tennessee consuming districts. Yet the Youngstown district supplied 81 percent of shipments into nine counties constituting the Birmingham district, 31 percent of the shipments into Georgia, and 65.9 percent of the shipments into Tennessee. On shipments into Georgia average freight charges from the Birmingham district were $1.93 a ton; from the Youngstown district, $13.31 a ton. On shipments into Tennessee average freight charges from Birmingham were $6.67 a ton; from Youngstown $10.97 a ton.

Sharing its nearby markets with distant producers, forced Birmingham mills to go farther afield for business. They supplied 84 percent of North Carolina's requirements at an average freight charge of $8.21 a ton. The Pittsburgh-Johnstown area and Youngstown supplied the balance with freight charges of $10.75 and $12.60 a ton respectively. Birmingham mills absorbed an average of $6.76 a ton freight to ship 55 tons, representing 10.4 percent of their total shipments to Ohio. They absorbed an average of $3.09 a ton freight to ship 98 tons, representing 18.6 percent of their total shipments into Kentucky.

HOT-ROLLED SHEETS

Birmingham mills shipped 6,572 tons of hot-rolled sheets in February 1939. These shipments went to 19 different States—small shipments being made to both the Pacific coast and northern Atlantic coast States. Had Birmingham supplied only the six States (Alabama, Georgia, Tennessee, Mississippi, Louisiana, and portions of Texas) on which freight charges from Birmingham were lower than shipments elsewhere and in supplying which Birmingham had a freight advantage over all other mills, it would have had to expand its output.

Assembly cost of raw materials for production of 1 long ton of basic pig iron and 1 long ton of finished steel at different centers, 1939 [1]

[Dollars]

	Pig iron				Finished steel			
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	Total cost	Iron ore	Coal	Limestone	Total cost
Pittsburgh	5.38	0.28	0.33	5.99	6.24	0.50	0.62	7.36
Chicago-Gary	3.55	3.56	.20	7.31	4.12	5.79	.37	10.28
Duluth	1.53	3.13	.20	4.86	1.77	5.54	.37	7.68
Detroit	3.55	2.91	.17	6.75	4.12	5.15	.31	9.58
Cleveland	3.08	2.32	.24	5.64	3.57	4.11	.45	8.13
Buffalo	3.08	2.70	.24	6.02	3.57	4.78	.45	8.80
Youngstown	4.84	1.53	.19	6.56	5.61	2.71	.34	8.66
Weirton-Steubenville	5.12	.67	.37	6.16	5.94	1.19	.68	7.81
Hamilton	5.40	2.31	.33	8.04	6.26	4.00	.61	[2] 10.96
Ashland	5.36	1.03	.33	6.72	6.22	1.82	.61	8.65
Bethlehem	1.56	3.35	.28	5.19	1.81	5.93	.51	8.25
Sparrows Point	6.17	3.19	.57	9.93	7.16	5.65	1.05	13.86
Birmingham	1.26	1.35	.08	2.69	1.46	2.39	.15	4.00
St. Louis	4.90	1.20	.14	6.24	5.68	2.12	.27	8.07
Pueblo	3.85	1.73	.43	6.01	4.47	3.06	.79	8.32
Provo	3.06	2.18	.14	5.38	3.55	3.86	.26	7.67
San Bernardino	3.35	6.60	[3]	9.95	3.89	11.68	[3]	15.57

[1] In deriving these assembly costs, blast-furnace practices shown in table 26 for Youngstown were used for Pittsburgh, Cleveland, Buffalo, Weirton-Steubenville, Ashland, Hamilton, and St. Louis; those for Chicago-Gary were used for Detroit and Duluth; those for eastern New York were used for Bethlehem and Sparrows Point and those for Provo were used for Pueblo and San Bernardino.

Following are the proportions of iron ore and coal from the different sources which were used. They are those used by Marion Worthing in Pittsburgh Business Review, Jan. 31, 1938, p. 23, and they are also found in Beaver and Mahoning Rivers, Pa. and Ohio, hearings before the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, House of Representatives, 77th Cong., 1st sess., 1941, pp. 47–48:

Iron ore: 75 percent Minnesota, 25 percent Michigan (100 percent direct ore at points on Lakes: at inland points, 80 percent direct ore and 20 percent dock ore).

Coal: Pittsburgh and Weirton-Steubenville, 100 percent western Pennsylvania by barge. Chicago, 70 percent eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, 30 percent Pocahontas—50 percent rail-lake; 50 percent all-rail for coking; southern Illinois for other coal. Cleveland, 80 percent Pittsburgh field by barge-rail, 20 percent Pocahontas, all-rail. Detroit, 80 percent eastern Kentucky and West Virginia, 20 percent Pocahontas—80 percent rail-water, 20 percent all-rail. Buffalo, 60 percent Pittsburgh and central Pennsylvania, rail-water; 20 percent Pittsburgh field, all-rail; 20 percent Pocahontas, rail-water; Youngstown, 85 percent western Pennsylvania, barge-rail, 15 percent Pocahontas, all-rail. Duluth, same as Chicago, except none from southern Illinois. Other points obtained materials from the cheapest available source.

[2] This figure applies at Middletown, which is 12 miles from Hamilton. Hamilton does not make steel and Middletown does not make pig iron.

[3] Negligible.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation. S. Doc. 80, 79th Cong., 1st sess., p. 124.

Transportation charges for supplying Houston with 1 ton of finished steel from selected producing centers

[Assembly cost and freight charges in dollars per long ton]

Producing center	Freight rate in cents per 100 pounds	Assembly cost, 1 ton of steel	Freight charge on steel	Total
Birmingham	[1] 33–2/3	4.00	8.29	12.29
Pittsburgh	[2] 35	7.36	7.87	15.23
Sparrows Point	[3] 20	13.86	4.48	18.34
St. Louis	[4] 51–3/20	8.07	11.46	19.53
Pueblo	55	8.32	12.32	20.64
Chicago-Gary	[5] 58–3/20	10.28	13.03	23.31

[1] Rail charge, 19 cents per 100 pounds to Mobile and ocean charge of $2.88 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, Mobile to Houston.

[2] Barge charge of $7 per net ton, 500 tons minimum.

[3] Ocean contract-carrier rate of $4 per net ton, effective Mar. 20, 1942.

[4] Barge rate to New Orleans of $8.40 a net ton and ocean charge of $1.83 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, New Orleans to Houston.

[5] Barge rate to New Orleans, of $9.80 a net ton and ocean charge of $1.83 a net ton, 500 tons minimum, New Orleans to Houston.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 126.

Transportation charges for supplying Seattle with 1 ton of finished steel from selected production centers

[Assembly cost and freight charges are in dollars per long ton]

Producing center	Freight rate in cents per 100 pounds	Assembly cost, 1 ton of steel	Freight charge on steel	Total
Birmingham	[1] 69	$4.00	$15.46	$19.46
Provo	72½	7.67	16.24	23.91
San Bernardino	[2] 42	15.57	9.41	24.98
Sparrows Point	50	13.86	11.20	25.06
Pueblo	85	8.32	19.04	27.36

[1] Includes rail charge of 19 cents per 100 pounds to Mobile.

[2] Includes rail charge of 9 cents per 100 pounds to San Pedro Harbor.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 126.

Comparative value and cost ratios for blast furnaces, 1939 [1]

	Value of blast-furnace products per ton of pig iron (1)	Value added by manufacture per ton of pig iron (2)	Wages per ton of pig iron (3)	Fuel cost per ton of pig iron (4)	Cost of material and supplies per ton of pig iron (5)	Fuel and power cost per ton of pig iron (6)	Total, columns 3, 5, and 6 (7)
Pennsylvania	$17.29	$2.84	$0.78	$3.71	$10.72	$3.73	$15.23
Ohio	16.07	2.49	.88	4.13	9.42	4.17	14.47
New York	15.81	3.91	.87	4.35	7.42	4.48	12.77
Illinois	15.97	2.15	.74	5.65	8.10	5.72	14.56
Indiana	14.01	1.50	.73	4.83	7.66	4.85	13.24
Alabama	12.48	3.00	.90	3.14	6.31	3.18	10.39
Average[2]	15.27	2.65	.82	4.30	8.27	4.36	13.44

[1] Blast furnaces produce byproducts including gas, slag, and ferro-alloys. The importance of byproducts is relatively small compared with pig iron, its value representing more than 90 percent of total output value in 1939. In computing the ratios for each State, the pig iron tonnage reported by the census for that State was utilized.

[2] Represents an arithmetic average for the 6 major producing States shown here.

Source: U. S. Bureau of the Census: Sixteenth Census, 1939; Manufactures. BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 127.

Pig-iron, steel-ingot, and finished hot-rolled capacity, by States, 1925, 1929, and 1938

[Capacity is in long tons]

	Pig iron		
	1925	1929	1938
United States	51,159,000	55,349,405	51,401,480
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	37.9	35.2	32.4
Ohio	23.1	21.5	21.7
Indiana	6.8	9.0	10.5
Illinois	9.1	9.7	11.0
New York	7.8	7.5	7.0
Alabama	7.1	6.2	6.2
Maryland	1.9	2.7	3.7
West Virginia	1.1	1.3	1.6
Michigan	1.6	1.3	2.5
All others	3.6	5.7	3.4
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

	Steel ingots		
	1925	1929	1938
United States	61,147,000	66,735,471	73,047,892
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	37.0	34.5	32.1
Ohio	23.5	23.7	21.4
Indiana	9.5	11.4	12.5
Illinois	8.4	8.8	8.6
New York	4.4	4.3	4.9
Alabama	2.8	3.1	3.2
Maryland	1.8	2.7	4.1
West Virginia	1.8	2.5	2.5
Michigan	.1	1.7	4.1
All others	10.7	7.5	6.6
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

Pig-iron, steel-ingot, and finished hot-rolled capacity, by States, 1925, 1929, and 1938—Con.

[Capacity in long tons]

	Finished hot-rolled products		
	1925	1929	1938
United States	[1] 48,185,300	55,972,200	57,818,900
Percent of total:			
Pennsylvania	40.5	36.6	32.7
Ohio	19.1	20.9	20.3
Indiana	12.0	12.7	11.9
Illinois	7.0	8.6	7.8
New York	4.5	4.2	4.7
Alabama	2.7	2.8	3.2
Maryland	1.6	2.2	3.6
West Virginia	2.2	2.9	3.5
Michigan	.7	1.6	5.1
All others	9.7	7.4	7.2
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0

[1] This figure was calculated from those for production and average percent of capacity operated during the year.

Source: Figures for 1925 were compiled from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1926; those for 1929 are from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1930, and are taken from a table compiled by Daugherty, de Chazeau, and Stratton, Economics of the Iron and Steel Industry, p. 28; for those for 1938 were compiled from the Iron and Steel Works Directory of the United States and Canada for 1938.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation p. 103.

Estimated per ton assembly costs in production of basic pig iron, 1934

[In dollars per long ton]

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coal	Flux	
Birmingham	1.250	1.635	None	2.885
Buffalo	3.257	2.807	0.270	6.334
Cleveland	3.257	3.057	.270	6.584
Pittsburgh	5.771	.650	.337	6.758
Detroit	3.257	3.265	.270	6.792
Chicago	3.245	3.349	.270	6.864
Wheeling	5.771	.796	.373	6.945
Youngstown	5.131	2.070	.189	7.390
St. Louis	4.336	2.901	.180	7.417
Ashland	5.966	1.155	.315	7.436

NOTES. Material ratios used:

1.94 gross tons of ore per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which a ratio of 2.5 gross tons was used.

1.54 net tons of coal (producing 1 ton net coke, i. e., 65 percent yield from coal) per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which a ratio of 2.07 net tons was used.

0.45 gross ton of limestone per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham for which no limestone ratio was used (Birmingham was generally self-fluxing).

Source: Special computations made for bureau of business research, University of Pittsburgh, by H. R. Moorhourse, of Arthur G. McKee & Co., Cleveland, Ohio. Based on rail, rail-water, and water transportation according to typical routes over which the materials are transported to their districts. Costs are based on a 100-percent ore burden of 51.5 percent iron content.

Table is from C. R. Daugherty, M. G. de Chazeau, and S. S. Stratton, The Economics of the Iron and Steel Industry (New York, McGraw-Hill, 1937), vol. I, p. 378.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 116.

Relative cost (in dollars) of transporting raw materials for the production of 1 ton of basic pig iron in various districts, 1939

	Material			
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	Total
Cleveland	3.512	3.130	0.270	6.912
Buffalo	3.512	2.975	.270	6.757
Detroit	3.512	3.434	.225	7.171
Pittsburgh	6.150	.734	.374	7.258
Youngstown	5.452	2.021	.207	7.680

Relative cost (in dollars) of transporting raw materials for the production of 1 ton of basic pig iron in various districts, 1939—Continued

	Material			
	Iron ore	Coking coal	Limestone	Total
Wheeling	6.150	0.887	.414	7.451
Ashland	6.344	1.340	.414	8.098
Chicago	3.415	3.485	.270	7.170
Birmingham	1.375	1.760	None	3.135

NOTE.—Assumptions: (*a*) 1.94 gross tons (2,240 pounds) of ore per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which a ratio of 2.50 gross tons of ore per gross ton of pig iron was used.

(*b*) 1.54 net tons (2,000 pounds) of coal, 65 percent yield of furnace coke from coal, per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which a ratio of 2.07 net tons of coal per gross ton of pig iron was used.

(*c*) 0.45 gross ton of limestone per gross ton of pig iron, except for Birmingham, for which no limestone ratio was used (Birmingham ores are generally self-fluxing).

(*d*) The computations are based on 100 percent ore burden of 50 percent iron content and on rail, rail-water and water transportation according to routes over which materials are usually transported to the several districts.

(*e*) No scrap used in burden except that produced at furnaces.

Source: William A. Haven, The Manufacture of Pig Iron in America, p. 22. BIR. Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 117.

Estimated per ton assembly costs in the production of basic pig iron [1]

[In dollars per long ton]

	Material			Total
	Iron ore	Coal	Flux	
Birmingham	1.25	1.64	0.09	2.98
Gary	3.52	3.99	.26	7.77
Pittsburgh	5.88	.31	.37	6.56
Provo	2.87	2.30	.14	5.31
Pueblo	4.16	1.49	.43	6.08
San Bernardino	3.35	6.60	[2]	9.95

[1] No date was given in the source, but the data have been compiled recently and were said by the source to be an approximation to typical conditions in each district.

[2] Negligible.

Source: J. R. Mahoney, Basic Factors Affecting the Economic Soundness of the Developing Iron and Steel Industry of Utah and the West, Utah Economic and Business Review, June 1942, p. 5. The column on San Bernardino has been estimated by the author of this report.

BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 117.

Ton-miles required to assemble raw materials for 1 long ton of pig iron [1]

Producing center	Iron ore		Coal		Limestone		Total		Total rail equivalent [2]
	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	
Pittsburgh	338	1,366	0	79	[3] 21	0	359	1,445	832
Chicago-Gary	142	1,550	435	750	0	98	577	2,394	832
Youngstown	230	1,366	127	0	5	0	362	1,366	507

[1] Railway mileages were obtained from Handy Railroad Maps of the United States (Chicago, Rand McNally & Co., 1942) and the Official Guide of the Railways and Steam Navigation Lines of the United States, Puerto Rico, Canada, Mexico, and Cuba (New York, National Railway Publication Co., January 1942). Mileages for the Great Lakes were obtained from Transportation of the Great Lakes, Transportation Series No. 1, 1937, Corps of Engineers, U. S. Army. Mileages for rivers were obtained from Light List: Mississippi and Ohio Rivers, 1942, U. S. Coast Guard.

[2] In reducing miles by water to their cost equivalent in rail miles the following ratios were used: Lakes, 9.4:1; rivers, 3.3:1; ocean, 18.8:1. The ratios for lakes and rivers are those used by J. R. Mahoney, Utah Economic and Business Review, June 1942, p. 5. In normal times the rate from Chile to Sparrows Point varied from $4.20 to $4.70 a ton, compared with a rate of 80 cents a ton on the Lakes. Thus, a given sum of money would carry iron ore twice as far on the ocean as on the Lakes.

Ton-miles required to assemble raw materials for 1 long ton of pig iron—Continued

Producing center	Iron ore		Coal		Limestone		Total		Total rail equivalent [2]
	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	Rail	Water	
Cleveland	123	1,366	194	0	0	122	317	1,488	475
Detroit	142	1,372	204	118	0	69	346	1,559	512
Buffalo	123	1,620	194	183	0	177	317	1,980	528
Bethlehem	110	0	225	0	4	0	339	0	339
Sparrow's Point	15	7,709	136	0	21	0	172	[4] 7,709	582
Hamilton	426	1,281	110	153	16	0	552	1,434	735
St. Louis	456	1,345	104	0	5	0	555	1,345	708
Birmingham	[3] 22	0	[3] 24	0	[3] 3	0	[3] 49	0	49
Duluth	142	0	435	851	0	141	577	992	673
Ashland	530	1,366	85	0	28	0	643	1,366	788
Weirton-Steubenville	303	1,366	0	153	28	0	331	1,519	522
Pueblo	640	0	126	0	[3] 42	0	808	0	808
Provo	392	0	154	0	[3] 10	0	556	0	556
San Bernardino	250	0	1,051	0	[3] 1	0	1,302	0	1,302

[3] Figures used by J. R. Mahoney, the same.

[4] In this and the following tables nautical miles have been converted to statute miles.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 120.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Chicago, at selected producing centers [1]

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel			Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent [2]	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Rail	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Chicago-Gary	0	0	0	832	832
Birmingham	85	896	365	49	414
Detroit	0	633	122	512	634
Cleveland	0	740	142	475	617
Buffalo	0	893	172	528	700
Youngstown	63	740	207	507	714
Weirton-Steubenville	110	740	252	522	774
Pittsburgh	131	740	273	528	801
St. Louis	0	808	155	673	828
Duluth	0	365	114	708	822
Middletown	295	0	295	747	1,042
Ashland	0	1,201	375	788	1,163

[1] In this and the similar tables which follow, the water mileages have been reduced to their cost equivalent in rail mileages. The following ratios were used: Lake, 5.2:1; rivers, 3.2:1. These ratios were obtained by averaging the rates of tables 55 and 56. The ratio for rivers is the average of rates for a 500-ton minimum; the ratio for cargoes of 200-tons minimum is 2.1:1.

[2] The figures on pig iron for Middletown were obtained by taking the figure for Hamilton and adding 12 ton-miles, the distance between the 2 places being 12 miles. Hamilton, which does not make steel, supplies pig iron to Middletown, which does not have blast furnaces.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 121.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Memphis, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel			Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles rail equivalent
	Rail	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	252	0	252	49	301
St. Louis	0	405	127	708	835
Weirton-Steubenville	0	1,140	356	522	878
Pittsburgh	0	1,208	378	528	906
Ashland	0	885	277	673	950
Chicago-Gary	0	770	241	832	1,073

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 121.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Houston, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel		Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	988	[1] 328	49	377
St. Louis	1,673	523	708	1,231
Weirton-Steubenville	2,408	753	522	1,275
Pittsburgh	2,746	774	528	1,302
Ashland	2,153	673	788	1,461
Chicago	2,038	637	832	1,469

[1] Rail haul of 19 miles to Port Birmingham.

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 122.

Number of ton-miles necessary to assemble the materials for 1 long ton of pig iron and to transport 1 long ton of steel to Dallas, at selected producing centers

Producing center	Ton-miles per ton of steel		Ton-miles per ton of pig iron, rail equivalent	Total ton-miles, rail equivalent
	Water	Total, rail equivalent		
Birmingham	657	657	49	706
St. Louis	687	687	708	1,385
Pueblo	748	748	808	1,556

Source: BIR, Economics of Iron and Steel Transportation, p. 122.

Louisiana Leads in Welfare Aid

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, January 9, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article:

LOUISIANA LEADS IN WELFARE AID—HIGGINS CITES REASONS FOR NATIONAL HIGH

Louisiana has the highest number of old-age pensioners in the Nation because she has gone to the trouble to investigate the need and try to fill it, State Commissioner of Public Welfare Lawrence E. Higgins said here Thursday.

Addressing the annual meeting of the Orleans Parish Department of Public Welfare at the Hutchinson Memorial Building, 1430 Tulane, Higgins said the dependency of large numbers of adults in this State harks back to the days following the War Between the States when the South's whole economy was upset.

Few opportunities and low wages in the intervening years, lack of medical care and proper diet, have all contributed to a tremendous backlog of adult dependency, he said.

He foresaw a lowering of the adult case loads in future years provided child welfare and other programs are carried on adequately now.

Meantime, the mounting number of cases is neither "alarming nor surprising," he said.

In Orleans Parish in 1949, total assistance paid to needy people was $17,746,080.97. This was an increase of $8,421,781.33 over 1948.

Number of applications for aid decreased in 1949 by 6,229 to 13,497.

Despite the fewer applications, more money was spent because bigger payments are being made to applicants, said Miss Lillie H. Nairne, Orleans Parish welfare director. She said "more adequate care is being afforded."

Higgins called upon employees in the department to interpret the needs of assistance to the taxpaying public. He said taxpayers will gladly maintain the welfare services when they understand the need.

He said the Louisiana Department of Public Welfare is pushing for an expanded old-age and survivors insurance plan under social security, so that all wage earners in their years of productivity may provide for their periods of old age.

A break-down in last year's $17,000,000 expenditure is $11,369,490 for old-age assistance; $226,192 for aid to blind; $3,760,959 for aid to dependent children, and $2,389,438 for assistance to incapacitated adults from 18 to 65 years of age.

Average amount of money paid during the month of December was $47.28 to old-age beneficiaries; $49.12 to blind; $52.93 to dependent children, $42.90 to incapacitated adults.

William J. Guste, chairman of the Orleans Parish Board, said the 1949 operations of the department were "very successful and creditable." The department's functions, methods, and integrity have never been questioned because of the high type of sincere personnel employed, said Guste.

Expenditures for institutional care for 1949 were $110,640 for indigent men and women patients at Touro-Shakespeare Home; $53,092 for temporary care of uprooted children at Sophie Gumble Home, and $160,604 for delinquent boys and at the Milne Boys' Home.

Fifty-second Anniversary of the Sinking of the "Maine"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BARRATT O'HARA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'HARA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this is the fifty-second anniversary of a naval tragedy that more profoundly affected the fate of mankind and the history of the world than any other loss of ship or any destruction of an entire fleet in the records available for modern scrutiny.

February 15 of 1898 is a date the significance of which will grow with the centuries. We are still too close in proximity properly to give appraisement. The fact is clear, however, that with the sinking of the *Maine* in Habana harbor on February 15, 1898, was started a chain of events, tremendous in their impact, that brought to the high responsibility of world leadership the Nation of freedom-loving men and women that had grown from 13 straggling colonies on the Atlantic seaboard.

The period from the sinking of the *Maine* to the end of hostilities in World War II covered a half century during which three wars were fought and won and from which the United States of America emerged the first power of the world. Between each two of these wars was an intermission of peace, when muscles were being flexed, but the common circumstances that surrounded them and the inescapable consistency of the purposes of destiny that was revealed would justify the future historian, viewing at long range and writing when cause and effect had become a matter of recorded fact, to group the three separate wars—Spanish-American, World War I, and World War II—as one war, the 50-year war starting with the sinking of the *Maine* and ending with the bombing of Hiroshima, the 50-year war that ushered in the golden age of American influence as the first power of the earth.

It is immaterial at this time upon whom should be fixed the guilt of the *Maine*'s destruction while anchored peacefully in a friendly harbor. Suffice that on the morning of February 16, 1898, when in the newspapers of an outraged Nation men and women of good will read of the death of 260 of their countrymen, sailors on the *Maine*, a hot wave of indignation swept into every crevice of the Nation and from the cities, the hamlets and the farms the cry "Remember the *Maine*" swelled into an irresistible chorus of demand.

Time has tempered the passions of the period, and today there is nowhere in the United States any desire to convict, without the positive evidence which never has been forthcoming, the then Government of Spain of a crime which if perpetrated was the most dastardly of any in all history. For the Spanish Government of the time, and the officers who served in its army and its navy, I can say only that after the opening of hostilities they fought honorably and cleanly a war which they lost.

But the sinking of the *Maine* was a large contributing influence in disrupting our relations with Spain, already strained. The Honorable William E. Mason, Senator from Illinois and father of the Honorable Lowell Mason, presently serving on the Federal Trade Commission, was one of the dynamic forces in the debates in the Congress which preceded the war. On April 12, 1898, almost 2 months after the *Maine* was destroyed, he said in the Senate:

I am for war, and have been since the hour our flag was lowered in Habana Harbor and the lives of our citizens taken by the Government of Spain. * * * I have no desire to destroy the Spanish Nation, but her flag must be dishonored by surrendering her sovereignty over Cuban territory as an atonement for lowering our flag, sinking our ship, and murdering our men.

The war with Spain was fought and won in 101 days, her Pacific and her Atlantic fleet completely annihilated and in Cuba, Puerto Rico, and the Philippines the flower of her once proud all-powerful armies crushed by the greatest all-volunteer army in the history of warfare.

Because the victory of the American arms was so quick and so devastating the legend, properly resented by Spanish war veterans, has grown with the years that Spain was a set-up.

To get the picture straight, as it was seen by the people who lived in that period just before the sinking of the

Maine, permit me to quote from an editorial in the London Globe of June 1897:

The American Navy is absolutely unfit to protect the islands of Hawaii, which lie at the mercy of any Spanish ships appearing at Honolulu, while Japan's sea power is so immeasurably superior to that of the United States that a Japanese naval demonstration would place President McKinley in a difficult and perilous position.

If I here may be permitted for the moment a personal note, and only for the purpose of giving a better understanding to a younger generation of the "spirit of 1898," born in the heat of wrath over the destruction of the *Maine* and which was destined to continue for half a century of warfare, with intermittent periods of peace, to permeate the hearts and minds of Americans: When the news came of the tragedy in Havana Harbor, I was 15 years of age, a sophomore in the high school at Benton, Harbor, Mich. With seven other boys in that high school in Michigan I forthwith enlisted for the period of hostilities and until the *Maine* had been remembered so that nowhere ever again would American lives be endangered by the treachery of professing friends.

A little over 4 months after the sinking of the *Maine* those eight high-school boys from Benton Harbor, wearing winter clothing in the heat of the tropics and armed with smoking Springfields to face the modern smokeless Mausers of the Spanish defenders, were splashing through the waters of the Carribbean from the small boats from the transport toward the Spanish earthworks at Siboney defending Santiago.

On July 1, 1898, when the first general assault was made on Santiago, with Teddy Roosevelt and the Rough Riders storming San Juan Hill, it was the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, mostly high-school boys with antiquated smoking Springfields and wearing on the hottest day they had ever known an issue of heavy winter clothing, that held Shafter's attacking line on the coast of the Carribbean at Fort Aquadores. It was M Company that suffered the first casualties, M Company every soldier of which was the son of a veteran of Grant's army from the North, and when I in I Company, stationed immediately ahead of M Company, heard of the deaths among those sons of veterans the thought ran through my mind that in the grief of their parents would be mingled the pride of blood running true to blood.

Although my pride and my heart ever have been with that old Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry that went largely from the high schools of Michigan to the battlefield at Santiago, a sense of the proprieties on this occasion would have commanded my silence on the subject of any specific regiment, and certainly of my own regiment.

But yesterday I learned for the first time that my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF] also was a soldier in the Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry, a private in Company H, from Owosso, and I thought it noteworthy that after these 52 years, of the four veterans of the Spanish-American War in the House of Representatives in the Congress of the United States, two, or 50 percent of the whole, were from the old Thirty-third Michigan Volunteer Infantry.

Under the circumstances, and in justice to the memory of young Shanks, about my age, who, after the Santiago campaign, went to the Philippines and fell in action over half a century ago; of Charlie Loeffler, and so many others who fell in action or who died of fever, including the brother of my beloved friend, Arthur Evans, of the Chicago Tribune, I could not remain silent about the regiment of high-school boys, and the boys from the towns and farms, that was the first volunteer outfit after the Rough Riders to land in Cuba and which, 52 years after that landing, had two survivors serving in the Congress of the United States dedicating themselves to the task of saving our country from another and more devastating war.

Four of the Members of this House are veterans of the Spanish-American War which followed the sinking of the *Maine*. Another of my distinguished colleagues, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER], was a soldier in the Thirty-fifth Michigan Volunteer Infantry, of which the then Secretary of War, Russell A. Alger, had been colonel. I trust the State of my adoption, Illinois—where I have spent all my adult life, where my children were born, and which, to the best of my ability and with devotion I have served—will not hold me as one giving preference to the State of my nativity when I direct the attention which I think due, to the fact that of the four Members of this body who served in the Spanish-American War, three served in Michigan regiments.

The fourth veteran of this war of 52 years ago who is a Member of this body is the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], whose long and honorable service in this body has been a sequel to that service to country, to justice, and to humanity which he rendered as a young soldier in the American Army which landed in 1898 in Puerto Rico and took the oppressed people of that island under the folds of the American flag.

Only four of us. It has been a long time since the cry "Remember the *Maine*" stirred America as perhaps never before it had been stirred. But from that cry has followed a sequence of events which only the historian of the future properly can evaluate. The spirit of 1898 was the spirit of American idealism. To Spain, defeated, we gave the hand of friendship, exacting none of the tribute of the conqueror. To the peoples of Cuba and Puerto Rico we gave bountifully of our means to save them from threatened starvation and to aid in their rehabilitation. To the Philippines we sent our doctors, our nurses, and our school teachers, pouring out our wealth with no expectation of return, other than the satisfaction of adding another self-respecting, self-governing, independent nation to the family of the world. That was the spirit of 1898, which has not faltered and which will continue to prevail despite the threat of dictatorship, atomic bombs, and the destruction of civilization through biological warfare and hydrogen bombs.

It is not reasonably to be expected that the number of Spanish-American veterans on the floor of this historic Chamber ever will be increased. Another decade, more or less, and no one in this House will represent that war of 52 years ago that started the United States of America on the way to world leadership.

It is our hope that in our absence this anniversary of February 15 will be observed annually in this Chamber during all the years to come, when in the spirit of 1898 and idealism that is its embodiment, our country, with large responsibility for human contentment, shall lead mankind from the fog of strife and friction to the heights of brotherhood.

Do not underwrite the Spanish-American War. Do not minimize the significance of the February 15 memorial anniversary which today and tonight every Spanish-American War veteran is joining with the representatives of all patriotic orders in observing with fitting ceremonies.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot close without mentioning a letter which I received from a good woman in Columbia, S. C., and which brought vividly back to mind the yellow-fever experiment in Cuba many, many years ago when soldiers of the Spanish-American War permitted themselves to be inoculated with deadly yellow-fever germs that medicine might score another great triumph in the eradication of this dread disease. The letter is from Mrs. May Jernegan, box 97, Columbia, S. C., and reads:

Hon. BARRATT O'HARA:

I am very much interested in (the House memorial service) having lived in Cuba during the Spanish-American War, with my husband until our Government troops left the island.

I am 74 years old, the widow of Warren G. Jernegan, who during his Spanish War service, rendered extra service to science, humanity, and our Government. He took more yellow-fever experiments than any of that group of men at Camp Lazear, Quemados, Mariano, Cuba, under the yellow-fever board of which Walter Reed was the head. Walter Reed's memory lives in the great Walter Reed Hospital in Washington. My husband's memory lives only in the heart of his wife and only child—for he has slept in a lonely grave in Spartanburg, S. C., for he was still in the Government employ * * * at the date of his death in 1919. He died during the flu epidemic.

My husband was the only man to take four different experiments and the only man to take the inoculation of human yellow-fever blood from the Spaniard, Jose Martinez. In this experiment they took the syringe of yellow-fever blood from the Spaniard and my husband permitted them to inject this Spaniard's yellow-fever blood into his own system, from which my husband became desperately ill—thus proving the yellow-fever theory.

I have an 8-ounce gold congressional medal of his for this service, and congressional pension of $125 per month for this service. This pension has never been increased. Other widows have had their pensions increased, but my congressional pension was not increased 20 percent like theirs.

I also have a Panama Medal given my husband for his Panama service during the building of the Panama Canal where my

son and I lived with him for many years. This medal was given him by Teddy Roosevelt. * * *

I thank you.

Very truly,

Mrs. MAY JERNEGAN.

It was 21 years ago this month of February that the Congress gave recognition to the high public service rendered by Maj. Walter Reed and those associated with him in the discovery of the cause and means of transmission of yellow fever. One name was omitted from that list of heroes, and for 21 years Gustaf E. Lambert has fought in the "spirit of 1898" for that recognition of his magnificent service which cruelly and without adequate reason has been denied him. He is now an old man, his health is frail, and his days are numbered, and he hopes, and I pray, that before he has passed to the final rendezvous of all heroes, the Congress of his country at long last will have added his name to those of the others recognized for high public service in the yellow-fever experiments of the Spanish-American War.

Our distinguished and beloved former colleague, the Honorable Raymond McKeough, who for years represented brilliantly the district which now I have the honor to represent, introduced a bill to give this recognition to Gustaf E. Lambert, but for reasons difficult to fathom the opposition blocked the way to this doing of simple justice.

At the request of many comrades of the Spanish-American War, and responding to the resolutions passed by the United Spanish War Veterans, Department of Illinois, and posts of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, I introduced the same bill in the Eighty-first Congress, H. R. 2257. I think it is fitting that on this occasion, when we are observing the anniversary of the sinking of the *Maine*, attention should be called to the case of the one hero of the yellow fever experiments in Cuba who so far has been left shivering in the cold of his country's ingratitude.

It is said by some who stubbornly stand in opposition that Lambert was only an army nurse as though being a nurse should deprive a hero of a hero's recognition.

I bespeak for my comrade, Gustaf E. Lambert, and in behalf of all surviving veterans of the war of 52 years ago, the sympathetic consideration of H. R. 2257. That my colleagues may know the facts from a first-hand source I read the following letter dated March 3, 1949, from Paul L. Tate, 1530 Tyler Street, Berkeley, Calif., to the Honorable JOHN J. ALLEN, JR., a copy of which has been furnished me:

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I am writing this to ask your support of House bill No. 2257, asking recognition of the work of Dr. Roger Post Ames and Nurse Gust. E. Lambert for their work during the yellow-fever experiments conducted by the Walter Reed Board in Cuba during 1900–1901.

I was the clerk of the Hospital Corps at Columbia Barracks, Cuba, during the time of these experiments and have some familiarity with the subject.

I kept the post hospital records and knew personally all the doctors there, including the members of the board and their various duties. I also knew personally all the members of the Hospital Corps who volunteered for the yellow-fever experiments, and saw most of them daily before and after the experiments.

There is one thing that is not generally known: After these men were inoculated with the fever virus by infected mosquitoes and/or blood transfusion, they were then treated by one doctor only, and that one was Dr. Roger Post Ames. That all of them were cared for by one nurse only, Gust. E. Lambert, of the Hospital Corps. And that every one of these cases was cured.

Not only that, but Dr. Ames and Nurse Lambert treated and cured (including all the experimental cases) about 67 cases of yellow fever. Many other cases of Army personnel and officers treated by other doctors and nurses during this same period died of the disease.

I well remember the horror we all had of yellow fever—its mystery, and swift, awful, death. So I know for a certainty that if only one of these experimental cases had died, there would have been no more volunteers to conduct the experiments with, and it would have ended in failure.

But the wonderful success of Dr. Ames and Nurse Lambert in curing each case as it developed encouraged more volunteers to take the risk.

Another fact not generally known is that neither Ames nor Lambert were immune to the disease. They were both as vulnerable to it as anyone else, and, in fact, Dr. Ames did contract yellow fever during the final phase of the experiments, and yet through the aid of Lambert saved another patient from death while he himself was sick.

Dr. Ames, besides being the only physician to treat these cases, personally made transfers of infected blood and applied disease-bearing mosquitoes to experimental cases at various times. So he performed practically every duty that any member of the board did and more.

As for the Hospital Corps men who bravely volunteered for these experiments, without detracting one iota from the courage of any one of them, I still think that, all facts considered, Gust. E. Lambert was their equal or better in heroism. During the contagion tests each volunteer went through his siege, but Lambert, equally vulnerable, worked and slept constantly in these quarters, never leaving day or night through all these tests. He took more chances of becoming infected than all of them combined.

No one has solicited me to write this and I have no special interest in the case, but I wish only to add my testimony in the hope that it will aid long-delayed justice to two of the key figures in that great medical experiment that conquered one of the most terrible scourges, yellow fever. At least I was there, and present briefly here just a few of the facts known to me.

Sincerely yours,

PAUL L. TATE.

Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Potatoes, Politicians, and Atom Bombs: Aroostook County Has Done Its Job Well," published in the Bangor (Maine) Commercial of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

POTATOES, POLITICIANS, AND ATOM BOMBS: AROOSTOOK COUNTY HAS DONE ITS JOB WELL

Today our editorial, which is rather longer than most, deals with potatoes, politicians, and atom bombs:

Potatoes, because we are pro-Aroostook, for reasons which we think are sound.

Politicians, because we think too many of them are too willing to play politics with Aroostook County's future.

Atom bombs, because we suspect that too few people are looking at the problem of our food surpluses in its true light. A clearer view may reveal that everyone with a stake in civilization has a vital interest in what happens to Aroostook's potatoes.

The price-support crisis that is making headlines out of potatoes has brought plenty of resounding statements from Washington. As yet it hasn't brought anything that is very constructive.

Congressmen, like other people, aren't fond of solving difficult problems. It's easier to blame somebody when the going gets rough.

As soon as it became known that many of 1949's spuds would be returned to rot on the fields that bore them, the name calling started. Some of our lawmakers began lambasting the growers.

Representative THOMAS J. LANE, Democrat, of Massachusetts, whose constituents live by Government-protected manufactures, called the potato farmers a parasite group. Senator SPESSARD L. HOLLAND, Democrat, of Florida, whose State is at the early end of the potato-growing cycle, piously described Maine growers as "principal sinners" in the price-support crisis.

SCOTT W. LUCAS, Democrat, of Illinois, the Senate majority leader, got even more sanctimonious this past week. He talked of "those potato farmers who are taking advantage of the pocketbook of Uncle Sam." A "scandalous situation," he said.

The whole performance was absurd. What is needed is less oratory and faultfinding—and more common sense.

First of all, Congress makes the laws. If there has been something grievously wrong with the law affecting potato prices, then it would seem that Congressmen, rather than farmers, are at fault.

We suggest, too, that the veil is going to have to be ripped away from a lot of economic hypocrisy before Congress gets to first base with any proper remedial measures.

Hoisting the standard of free enterprise, a lot of professional banner wavers are pretending that it would be quite all right to turn potatoes over to the tender mercies of the law of supply and demand. They talk as though there is something inherently wicked in supporting the price of potatoes.

But in our book Aroostook County has no need to apologize for the fact that its principal crop is price-supported.

Have you heard the steel industry apologize for the governmental protective wall that has safeguarded the prices of its products for so many generations?

Do you hear Representative LANE and his home town (Lawrence, Mass.) apologizing for the tariff protection given to the textile mills?

Are any apologies made by the spokesmen of many other industries that have enjoyed governmental largess in one form or another since Alexander Hamilton and other sound men introduced the protective tariff? Or

by the growers of other price-supported farm crops?

And, if supply and demand are supposed to rule supreme, how about labor? Is it bad to support the price of potatoes but good to support the price of labor with a minimum-wage law? Mr. LUCAS seems to see no inconsistency in his loudly proclaimed position. But we do.

One man's free enterpriser, it seems, is another man's parasite.

Further economic hypocrisy is involved, we believe, in what looks like a definite effort to whittle down Aroostook's earned share of the Nation's annual potato output.

By the most orthodox teachings of traditional economics, men and regions are entitled to produce the things they produce most economically. It simply doesn't make sense that Aroostook, which produces potatoes more efficiently than anybody else, should suffer production curtailments for the sake of others who can't produce them as efficiently.

If the price-support plan is to be readjusted, why readjust it in a way that puts a penalty on being up to date and knowing how? Neither sound economics nor national interest is going to be served by shackling Aroostook just because it has done the world's best job of raising potatoes.

Now let's go a step farther. Let's see what is sinful or scandalous about producing food in a hungry world.

Unless all the ancient virtues are dead, and they aren't, the ethics of potato raising require that a man do the best job he can. If he can raise more on an acre, it's not only his privilege but his ethical obligation—his social responsibility—to do so. It's his equivalent of industry's honest day's work.

One may well talk of sin and scandal in connection with the destruction of potatoes in a world in which many people lack food. But the sin cannot be laid at the door of the man who raised the potatoes. He did his part.

We are pro-Aroostook because we like Aroostook's way of doing things. In its particular branch of agriculture, the county is modern civilization's advance guard. It has been showing the world how food can be produced in the twentieth-century way. It has been showing the world how to have a better future.

Aroostook's potato crop is just as much a product of modern science as the atom bomb. They have another affinity in that wars are fought, in large measure, over food. Rake the ashes of the last two wars and you will find the bones of people who could be led to destruction because they wanted more to eat.

In time of war we are a bold and imaginative people. We marshal our best brains, unleashed our resources, and take huge problems in our stride.

In time of peace, apparently, the too successful cultivation of potatoes can throw us for a loss.

Face enough facts, and you collide with this plain truth: Potatoes are going to be destroyed—in a world that still needs potatoes—simply because the American people as a whole haven't been ingenious enough, industrious enough, or even interested enough to find out what else to do with them.

The American taxpayer who feels that he can't feed the world may do well to start counting the comparative costs of potatoes and atom bombs.

As we see it, Aroostook points up the epic challenge of our times.

It is a challenge that calls for our best brains and our most earnest effort.

If Congress, for instance, could just do its job as well as Aroostook has been doing its job of raising potatoes, we suspect that things would be a lot different. And if all the rest of us—taxpayers, voters, and civil leaders—could rise to the same standard of performance, we would have solved much more than a marketing problem.

We'd be well on our way toward learning how to live in the twentieth century.

Economic and Military Problems in the Pacific

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES E. MURRAY

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, on February 16, 1950, Gen. William J. Donovan delivered a very important address on the occasion of the presentation to him by Columbia University of the Alexander Hamilton award. His address deals with the very important economic and military problems in the Pacific. I think General Donovan is probably one of the best informed Americans on the situation in Asia, and I think the Members of this body will be very much interested in reading the address. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Soviet Union has completed the conquest of China and this has been given formal approval by the 30-year peace treaty.

Throughout the Far East this marks a defeat for the United States.

This victory now makes Russia the dominant power in Asia as well as in Europe.

There may be disagreement whether this breach of the former balance of power in Asia has already gone so far that it threatens our security. But there can be no difference of opinion that the balance of power on which formal peace depends will be hopelessly upset if the Russians carry out their projected extension of the Chinese conquest to Indochina, Hong Hong, the Philippines, Siam, Malaya, Indonesia and Burma. This was the path by which the Japanese before them got all the way to India.

I visited all these countries, except Burma and Korea, and also visited Japan. During my trip the Russians boldly announced that they were going to try for just such an extension of their continental conquest. They made that announcement by recognizing the Communist revolutionary parties as the Government of French Indochina. Within a week the Western Powers had to accept the challenge. The British, the French and ourselves recognized the opposition government of Bao Dai. In Asia it is completely appreciated that the Russians have declared a subversive war on the rest of non-Communist Asia and ourselves. I wonder if the significance of that choosing up of sides has really come home to us here in the United States.

In the face of this Russian declaration of further conquest beyond China, with the Russians having demonstrated that they do know how to wage this kind of war, the non-Communist Asiastics wonder if the poet Shelley does describe us, if we indeed are "An ineffectual angel beating in the void his luminous wings in vain."

They want to be on our side if we're safe to be with—if we can be relied upon to stick with them when the going gets bad.

What is there we can do to justify their reliance upon us? What are the elements in that area that we can pull together for the sake of the people there as well as for our peace and security? As a line of departure I accept the statement of the Secretary of State that "It is hardly necessary for me to say that an attack on the Philippines could not and would not be tolerated by the United States but I hasten to add that no one perceives the imminence of any such attack." Let us see how, even at this late day, this defense could be accomplished.

Southeast Asia stretches from the subcontinent of India to the Australia subcontinent. In the center of this great south Asian triangle lies the spreading culture of Southeast Asia—on the Indochinese Peninsula, on Burma, Siam, and Malaya; on the island at its base are the archipelagoes of Indonesia and the Philippines.

Within this triangle live almost 600,000,000 people or about 25 percent of humanity.

The first thing we have to do is to recognize that the theater is one theater—Burma, India, Siam, Indochina, Manila, Malaya, Formosa, Korea, Japan.

That it is all one in spite of the differences that lie between. That it is one in which victories won, time gained, or material salvaged, in Indochina or Formosa, may greatly help in an intelligent defense of the Philippines or in the reconstruction of Burma or Indonesia.

When we look at our map and wipe out of our minds the wartime artificial separation into theaters of operation, we see that the Western Pacific is a strategic unit of which the Philippines are an integral part.

There is disorder to the point of chaos in Burma. Yet it is the bulwark before India and only speedy political and economic reform can save it from Soviet exploitation. In Indochina the Soviet has picked Ho Chi-Minh, to do there what they used Mao to do in China proper. In Malaya the British are contending against a campaign of ambush and assassination by the Malayan Communist Party.

Japan and its associated islands 1,600 miles from the Philippines give it protection from the north and Formosa almost halfway between must be denied to enemy occupation by Nationalist China until next June at least.

Indonesia is the master key for the defense of the Philippines because with Malaya it forms a protective shield against the south and that shield is given depth by Australia only 300 miles south of it. Strategically, Southeast Asia is of more than local interest. Whoever controls the Strait of Malacca and Singapore dominates a sea route comparable in importance with the Panama Canal. Indonesia is an island gate between the Pacific and the Indian Ocean. In 1942 Japan took the islands and broke out of the Pacific to extend its operations as far west as Ceylon. The Indian Ocean may well be the warm water target that Russia has always sought.

The American naval and air bases in the Philippines are only a thousand miles from Saigon in French Indochina.

Indonesia is the most important of the southeast Asian countries that have emerged from colonial status into nationhood. An archipelago stretching nearly 4,000 miles, or one-seventh of the way around the earth, and and having some 750,000 square miles of land area, and a population of 75,000,000.

It is probably the most westernized of the far-eastern countries. Its economic, financial, and even its transport system are based upon Western models. It is even by modern standards rich in resources and is fully able

to repay any loans advanced to it for reconstruction and capital expenditures.

Its top leadership is anti-Communist by conviction. Although on lower levels there is needed experience in organization and administration, the government in control is about the best that could be obtained. The four or five leading men are competent and honest. They seek United States technical advice both of an industrial and military nature. If we could meet this request for aid as well as counsel, our position would gain strength from the fact that for the last 2 years we have carried out a policy there, consistent, definite, and to a degree successful.

In addition, our Ambassadors in the vital countries of India, Siam, and Indonesia are men of training, experience, and understanding. They already have the respect and friendship of those countries to which they are accredited.

There is general agreement among those whose opinion should be given weight that Russia has a program in southeast Asia and that the timetable for that program has been stepped up in an endeavor to take full advantage of the momentum from their speedy victories in China.

The urgency requires leadership now. It requires a leader—whether you call him a supreme commander or a high commissioner with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems. He should be vested with the discretion to deal with those problems on the spot and should be located in the theater close enough to see it at first hand, yet not so close as to lose his perspective.

The cooperation of the British, the French, and the Dutch would be eagerly given, and they know our leadership is needed. The establishment of such leadership would be welcomed by the people of the countries concerned and would allay their present fear that we would abandon them.

We must make clear to them that having picked our friends we will stay with them to the finish whatever the consequence.

We have a precedent for this action.

In June 1948 Russia, in the Berlin blockade, employed a menacing and dangerous tactic to test the will of the Western Allies and to stop the European recovery program at the outset.

General Clay met the challenge with boldness and resolution. The dramatic success of operation "vittles," which maintained Berlin's food supply despite the seizure of the city, caught the Soviets flatfooted with surprise.

General Clay saw that if the Soviets intended war, war could not be avoided by a retreat from Berlin. On the contrary, it would mean that we would be driven progressively to weaker positions. He saw, too, that if Russia was bluffing, that the moment had come to call the bluff or to surrender the initiative he had won.

The courageous and common-sense action of General Clay in that crisis is a guide and an example for us all.

We have shown our great desire for peace with Russia and our willingness to settle differences. But we have learned that up to now at least agreement with the Russians is a hopeless illusion.

We now see that what happens in Berlin or in Peking has its repercussions in every area of the world where our country and the Soviet Union face each other. It is a war of subversion on a global scale in which Russia is trying to whipsaw us from one side of the world to the other.

We must win now the war in which we find ourselves. It is a war which on many fronts Russia has been waging and winning. A war that we can lose without a shot being fired. A war that, if we win, may make impossible a shooting war. We can neither buy our way out nor appease our way out. Our strength must be found in ourselves—in our decision and in our resolution.

Leadership in Asia

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. MURRAY
OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, immediately following the printing of the address delivered on February 16 by General Donovan, a very valuable editorial entitled "Leadership in Asia," published in the New York Herald Tribune of last Saturday.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LEADERSHIP IN ASIA

The revolutionary changes that have swept over eastern Asia during the last few years in an accelerating tempo of change have found the United States, in great measure, unprepared. Successive missions by individuals and groups, conferences of ministers and ambassadors such as that which recently ended in Bangkok, long and futile exchanges of recriminations in Congress and the press, have all testified to a basic lack of organization and intelligence (in the military sense) in respect to a vast and complex continent. It was toward that situation, no less than toward the spreading danger of Communist expansion in Asia, that Gen. William J. Donovan directed his address on Thursday night.

General Donovan proposes effective leadership, the appointment of an official representative of the United States, "with the authority, the experience, and the ability to deal with political as well as military problems" in Asia. His theater of operations would be vast, territorially, but it is so closely linked strategically that no confusion or cross-purposes should be permitted to divorce policy in the Philippines, for instance, from policy in Indonesia. He would need discretionary powers for an emergency, but the over-all program would have to be laid down clearly in advance, and close liaison with Washington is essential. Such an individual, backed with a suitable organization, would be evidence of America's intention to form a core of resistance to communism; it would also provide the information and the operative facilities needed to enlist the support of the peoples of the area and provide channels through which to strengthen the native forces of freedom.

A high commissioner for southeast Asia would not, needless to say, be the whole answer to the multiplying problems of that continent. The creation of such an office would not absolve the State Department, the Defense Establishment, Congress, or the American people from the hard thinking and strong action which the Asiatic dilemma demands. Rather, it would be a tool, a very useful tool if filled competently and used imaginatively, to implement American purposes in a region full of peril. General Donovan's suggestion is well worth consideration—in some form or other what he proposes must be done, and done speedily.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM BENTON
OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BENTON. Mr. President, on the occasion of Brotherhood Week, now being celebrated throughout the United States, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very incisive address by a citizen of Connecticut, Mr. Joseph J. Morrow, personnel manager of Pitney-Bowes, Inc., of Stamford, Conn., before the Catholic Interracial Council of New York on November 20, 1949, entitled "Prejudice—A Moral Problem."

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PREJUDICE—A MORAL PROBLEM

We've heard a lot about prejudice in the past few years, associated mainly with the problems of American minorities. Not many people nowadays would be caught admitting they were prejudiced about anything. There are a few exceptions, of course, such as the rather notable southern gentleman who earlier this month offered to devote a breath-taking sum of money to the cause of segregation, with a lack of success that was equally notable. To us, he seems a perfect example of extreme prejudice; but when we stop and think, a good many of our own daily actions are guided by prejudices which take the form of likes and dislikes about a variety of things—feelings which have no sensible basis. Localized in our own lives, they harm few people, if any. Still, their existence can help us understand how easily prejudices are formed, and how, spread out as race attitudes, they can defeat Christian purposes more readily than conscious scheming ever could.

We all recognize now that negative feelings about people who belong to certain racial or religious groups are an extremely disturbing factor in our country, and one of utmost importance to us right now. After all, every American, at some point in this world, is a member of a minority—one of less than a 150,000,000, among a world population counted in billions. The American is set apart by his thinking and his ideals from a very great part of the world; and is different in ways which have lined him up willy-nilly, on one side of an ideological struggle with an aggressive and powerful opponent. We must not forget for a moment that American Negroes, or Jews, are not the only Red Riding Hoods in this world; or that there is more than one kind of wolf in the forest. Justice and self-protection have become inseparable for us; and Americans of all races and all beliefs must cling together for their common salvation as they never have before.

Just not to be prejudiced against a minority group isn't enough. Passive tolerance is certainly a more valuable attribute than intolerance, of course, but its value is limited to the tolerator himself. On the other hand, tolerance combined with action develops a chain reaction which increases daily. I think that's the kind of tolerance we are beginning to have in much larger quantities than before. The evidence is in the press; in the growing number of State fair employment practice laws; in organized promotion of unrestricted job opportunities for Negroes in many cities; and even in the

movies. Most everyone reads the papers and goes to the movies; and both have tremendous influence on public thinking. Continued increase in the number of fair employment practice laws, and in local fair employment efforts, means that more and more people will eventually either be working with Negroes, or will at least know someone who does. At the same time, they'll be learning first-hand that a Negro is a normal human being, with a personality as separate and distinct as any white man's—that he is someone who certainly doesn't look or act like a social or economic menace.

These are some of the results we can get, and are getting, from the growth of aggressive tolerance. If I have made them sound like cure-alls, I haven't meant to. Naturally, these weapons have little effect yet in those parts of the Nation where the causes of prejudice are deep-rooted and complex, and often expressed with violence. Nor can they be immediately effective with those whose prejudice stems from strong personal insecurity. There are many kinds of insecure people. You all know the fellow who becomes angry and feels frustrated when he sees a Negro driving a new car; who is resentful when a Negro takes over the shop bench next to his and gets an identical wage for his work. There is the salesgirl, too, who waits on the Negro woman with coldness and inward humiliation, and the mother who first teaches her child about bias when she tells him his dark-skinned playmate doesn't belong.

The people with only a little of those feelings are the most receptive to education in tolerance when they are exposed to it. As a group, they are also the people who live in a reassuring, well-established home and community atmosphere, free from physical need. They are quite different from the group in the hand-to-mouth economic bracket, whose lower living and social standards paradoxically increase their estrangement from the even more underprivileged Negro. They are different from this group because the idea of advancement for the Negro is no real threat to their own firm and well-defined position in our social structure. They can afford to be generous.

What bridge, or link, then, can be provided for those people whose precarious spot in our class structure prevents their accepting the idea of equal job rights and fair personal treatment for Negroes? Obviously the link must provide an incentive toward sympathy which is stronger than fear-bred race hatred and compelling enough to overcome the compensating belief in the righteousness of their hatred.

In each man's life there is only one influence which can meet these requirements. It is his church. The Christian and Jewish religions are the strongholds of the philosophic idea of brotherhood among men—not the destructively leveling brotherhood of collectivism, but the kinship in love and hope of those who worship God. All arguments against discrimination must have their roots in religion if they are to furnish convincing answers to the "why?" of the biased.

I do not in any sense believe that the amount of prejudice in the United States is a sign that the faith of American Christians is weakening. If all Christians were automatically infallible, there would be no need for the spiritual leadership which heavenly wisdom has provided through our church. And when Christian ears are plugged by un-Christian resentments, the church need only raise its voice enough to reach beyond these obstacles.

At this point I want to fall back on my own experience in the city where I live and work, to make a statement which I am sure must hold true in many other parts of our country. Prejudice in our city of Stamford is no greater than that in any other northern industrial city, but the prejudice I have found does not come from our old Yankee stock, but from some of the comparative newcomers—the first or second generation Americans who come to the United States from Italy, Poland, Ireland, or any other country you might mention. The country isn't important; but it is important that some of these people are not yet secure and settled enough in their jobs and community relationships to be ready for the idea of equal working opportunities for Negroes in industry and commerce. They are good citizens otherwise; and they can respond to the kind of guidance which will stir their consciences. For these people, help should and will come from the church, particularly our own Catholic Church—because a majority of such newly transplanted citizens are Catholics, from Catholic countries. This is no more a reflection upon catholicism than the bigotry of some southerners should be considered a reflection upon protestantism. But to me it is a sign that the church's voice ought to be raised especially for these people, to give them understanding of true tolerance, how it may be applied within their own lives, and to what end. Along with the immense satisfaction of practicing their Catholic faith as it is meant to be practiced, those who listen to the church's voice will find a good measure of the security in community existence which has been lost somewhere along the way. For what can add more to a man's self-respect and spiritual fulfillment than knowing he is capable of replacing his fear with compassion; his hatred with friendship; and his self-seeking with charity?

The subject of race attitudes in foreign-born Americans produced an interesting by-product when I was discussing it a few weeks ago with a young Negro employee at Pitney-Bowes. He spoke of the excellent treatment given the Negro GI's in the western countries of Europe during the war, and the cordiality and friendship they found nearly every place they went. He told me that many Negroes, received warmly in the churches, homes, and public places of Italy, have actually returned there to live. They have found complete freedom to work at any job for which their abilities have qualified them, or to continue their education in any of Italy's universities.

While the welcome they were offered in Europe was undoubtedly extended, in part, because of their status as United States soldiers, I believe it was due mainly to the generally recognized absence in Europe of anything which could be called class feeling against Negroes. This doesn't prove that Europeans are basically more generous than we; or even that they have learned to be. Race tolerance isn't something human beings are born with, to be unlearned later; it simply does not exist unless a set of unnatural conditions have produced it. The Negro was never a slave in Europe, or an economic problem; and he has no history of social ostracism there to frustrate his attempts to live as others do. How ironical it seems to hear American Negroes, even a few, finding their free home in Europe, while western Europeans look to the United States, with hope and longing, as the land of the free.

Class patterns in the United States explain easily why the Negro has been so often labelled "inferior," in spite of proof that, all things being equal, his mentality and spirit are identical with the white man's. Class levels are chiefly levels of material worth, and the Negro, as a whole, still exists on the fringe of the very lowest economic bracket—the spot into which he immediately fell upon his release from slavery, and where prejudice has kept him ever since. Many brilliant Negroes, of course, have carved out places for themselves which are in true proportion to their worth; but still mor have fallen by the wayside trying—college men working as janitors, college women working as domestics; intelligent high-school graduates often not working at all. Industry and commerce, in many States, are already beginning to recognize their personal responsibility to do something about this tragically wasteful aspect of prejudice, and to accept it by employing Negroes in capacities which are equal to their skills.

Well-paying jobs are the only practical answer to the question of how to remove the Negro from the "inferior" class into which poverty has forced him. We are doing our best at Pitney-Bowes to meet our own responsibility; and we know that not one of our Negro employees is "inferior" in any sense. We have chosen them carefully for the skilled jobs in which most have been placed; but we have not gone beyond our own locality to find them. We will employ more Negroes, as we have an opportunity to do so, and as they come to us—just as we do qualified whites. If we started our program with a little feeling of self-conscious philanthropy, and some doubt of our success, these have long since left us. The Negroes in our company have proven themselves almost without exception to be responsible, loyal employees, not charity patients; and they are accepted on that basis now by our entire plant.

With the complete support and encouragement of our top management, we started an active program of employing skilled Negroes in our shop about 5 years ago, and placed our first Negro office worker on the pay roll in the summer of 1946. We had some anxious moments trying to anticipate as best we could the type of problems which might arise from employee resentment at working with Negroes. We had always worked for a healthy relationship with our people, and believed that this record would make our job easier—which it did. When we began to employ a few skilled Negroes to fill shop jobs as machinists and assemblers, no objections reached us except those of a very few who thought the company might be planning to flood the plant with poorly paid Negroes at the expense of our white personnel. This, incidentally, is a good example of the sort of irrational reaction produced by a feeling of economic insecurity. The story got little attention, and died a quick death, apparently because the great majority of our employees had found within our plant a measure of the security and sense of personal identification with the company's aims which we had tried to give them.

We knew our real problem would come in placing Negro girls within our office departments. The first young woman we hired was assigned to our personnel department, among employees who understood what we were trying to do and who had assured us of their cooperation. At first, some negative comment did come from girls in other departments whose work was related to hers; but her ability and pleasant manner later earned her the friendship and support of everyone who had become acquainted with her. She has worked hard to improve her value to the company during the 3 years she has been with us, and I think she is deeply happy in her job.

We have employed a number of young Negro women for office work since then, and have encountered very little opposition of a really serious type. What we did find seemed to be completely checked when we made it plain that our employment policy would definitely be continued, and that we would insist upon cooperation from everyone in helping to make the program work.

We have found frank discussions of the prejudice problem with our white and Negro

personnel to be a real help. Through such discussions we have prepared our new Negro employees for possible rebuffs, and at the same time emphasized the importance of their behavior as missionaries for their race. Through similar talks with the white employees among whom the newcomers will work, we have explained the purpose of our program and tried—successfully, I think—to enlist them on our side by bringing the subject of prejudice into the open ourselves, not waiting until trouble puts us on the defensive.

Whatever factor weighs most heavily in the success we have had, our employees, white and Negro, have found the secret of working together with harmony and forbearance. Our own company is not the only industry where this has been done, by any means. Some of our largest corporations, both northern and southern, have taken the leadership in destroying race barriers inside their own gates. Some job opportunities are opening up for Negroes in stores and public utilities, too. Still, "some" is not most, or anything like it. A lot of education and guidance will be needed all over the Nation before we can really say that industry is taking its share of responsibility for the Negro's economic betterment.

I know, as we all do, that complete equality for Negro citizens in all the segments of our national life is a long way off. The revolution in thinking which will bring it about won't be the product of a brief, white heat of inspiration. It will need a lifetime—or two—of steady consecration from those who carry Christian principles closest to their hearts. When the job is done, American democracy will be its own triumphant answer to the haters and the doubters who are challenging the strength of our faith, and the truth of our ideal.

Brotherhood in America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I hold in my hand an editorial from the New York Times of yesterday, February 19, 1950, entitled "Brotherhood in America." Confronted as we are in the second session of the Eighty-first Congress by major issues affecting the brotherhood of mankind, this editorial, during the current week has been designated as Brotherhood Week should be a forceful reminder to us of our clear and unmistakable course of duty.

I, therefore, ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the body of the RECORD at this point in my remarks.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD IN AMERICA

The week of Washington's Birthday has been set aside, appropriately enough, as Brotherhood Week. Its spirit is well expressed in Washington's prayer following his inauguration, that "Thou wilt incline the hearts of the citizens * * * to entertain a brotherly affection and love for one another and for their fellow citizens of the United States at large." It is the week, conceived by a Catholic priest in Denver and observed every year since 1934 under sponsorship of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, that recalls to all the inhabitants of our land the basic principles of human fellowship on which our democratic society is founded.

A respect for the dignity of man is one of the distinguishing characteristics of our western civilization. It is not an empty phrase. While it is of course true that this country of ours is not yet entirely rid of racial conflicts and religious prejudices, it is also true that all that is best in America stands with increasing strength in firm opposition to such forces of retrogression and despair. The dignity of man requires firm adherence to the principle and practice of civil and political liberty, of racial and religious tolerance. Those who belong in the free world understand this. Brotherhood Week is a good time to think about it.

History of the Military Order of the Carabao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an excerpt from the history of the Military Order of the Carabao, written by Commander Arthur Stanley Riggs, United States Naval Reserve, for the 1939 Wallow, and published in the Army and Navy Journal of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CARABAO MAKES HISTORY

The Military Order of the Carabao was organized in Manila, P. I., in November 1900, for the purpose of fostering a high standard of military and social duty and to perpetuate the memories and associations of military service in the Philippines during the early days of American occupation.

In the closing days of the great Boxer campaign in China, when the fighting was all over, the officers of the allied armies met in the Temple of the Dragon in Peking and decided to perpetuate their comradeship in arms with a military order of their own. That was the origin of the famous Order of the Dragon, limited to officers of the American, British, Russian, French, German, and Japanese armies who had served together during those hectic days. The officers of the Sixth United States Cavalry in particular had had a wonderful time in China, and when some of them arrived in Manila, sporting the yellow ribbon and gold badge of the new order, some officers of the Philippine Expeditionary Force—it wasn't called that in the days of the empire—among them Col. John Biddle Porter, United States Army, and Maj. George L. Byram, United States Army, at a dinner in the old Army and Navy Club in the Walled City, decided to form a joke society to offset the Chinese organization.

To spoof the proud wearers of the dragon, something ridiculous was necessary as a badge of the new society. Major Byram promptly suggested the most lowly, despised, cursed-at, and best-loved animal the forces knew, the patient water buffalo, or carabao. The name caught instantly, and the Military Order of the Carabao came into being with a cheer. The carabao, as anybody who ever had to work with him knows, is a beast of cow-like demeanor and docility—so long as he stays wet. He is the donkey, the mule, the elephant, the abused and inevitable drudge of the Filipino and of all who live in the islands. When our troops reached the islands they had no mules. The roads were bad, the bush impenetrable, all the conditions such that the guns could not go up without reliable motive power that would not bog down in the rains or wilt under the torrid heat. The answer was God's gift to the little brown brother, the most faithful of all beasts of burden, so long as he can have his daily supply of something wet. Deprive this docile creature of his right to water in unimaginable quantities, and the time to wallow in the muddy shallows, and he becomes a very different and a very formidable beast indeed. This characteristic made the carabao the butt of infinite jest in the Army. Even the fact that the first field artillery used in the islands got into action only by grace of the humble carabao, did not save him from the ribald joking the troops enjoyed so much. As a name for a derisive organization, also, carabao was priceless, and wallow as a name for the dinner meetings when Carabaos gathered from far and wide to gambol and swap reminiscences of the fighting days, had something more than a poetic significance.

With the gradual development of the order into an organization of Nation-wide significance, and the transfer of the main corral from Manila to Washington, the annual wallows or dinners have become affairs of the greatest interest and importance. Carabaos come from remote sections of the country to attend. The President of the United States is always invited, as are the members of his Cabinet. Invitations to these hilarious affairs are eagerly sought, and legend has it that a Marine will fight anybody for one at any time.

Ex-President William Howard Taft, who was delighted at his election to the order, enjoyed the fun and satire at the wallows with great heartiness and always requested the singing of the song, He May Be a Brother of William H. Taft, But He Ain't No Friend of Mine. Sometimes these festivities included very trenchant comment upon national affairs. The press was quick to realize the tonic effect of such outspoken criticism from men who were themselves a part of the Nation's administration, and gave the wallows the widest publicity. One of these famous dinners gave rise to perhaps as curious an incident as ever marked the lives of any public officials in the United States.

During his first term as President, Woodrow Wilson was invited to become an honorary member of the Carabao Order by Maj. William E. Horton, Grand Lead & Wheel Carabao. Writing from the White House on November 22, 1913, President Wilson replied:

"MY DEAR MAJOR HORTON: Allow me to thank you for your very kind letter of November 19, and to say that it affords me much pleasure to accept your tender of honorary membership in the Military Order of the Carabao.

"With assurance of my appreciation of this compliment, believe me,

"Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON."

On December 11, 1913, came the annual wallow with the familiar, somewhat boisterous good time. Included in the program of stunts was a satire upon the policies of the President, of the Secretary of the Navy Josephus Daniels, and Secretary of State William Jennings Bryan. The whole thing summed up into a good-humored poking of

fun at our Philippine policy and the peacefulness of Secretary Bryan—subjects hardly to be expected to excite the admiration of sturdy fighting men sworn to maintain, uphold and defend the Government. During the festivities an army officer who was not on the official program got to his feet and began to sing the famous Insurrecto song. With a wild shout of applause, the diners responded and the chorus nearly unroofed the sedate old Willard Hotel. After one verse, the chairman of the program committee pulled the speaker down.

Then, mounted upon the shoulders of stout lads from the Navy and the Marine Band playing "Columbia, the Gem of the Ocean," three battleships hove into sight: U. S. S. *Friendship*, U. S. S. *Fellowship*, and the U. S. S. *Piffle*. The last-named was rigged up with nosegays, grape-juice bottles, lecture platform, and other gadgets thrusting adroitly at the policy of the State Department.

The applause was uproarious. Secretary Daniels chuckled over it as heartily as anybody. The next day he wrote the following letter officially:

THE SECRETARY OF THE NAVY,
December 12, 1913.

Rear Admiral THOMAS B. HOWARD,
United States Navy, Navy Yard,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR ADMIRAL: I wish to congratulate the patriarch of the herd for the brilliant entertainment given by the Carabaos last evening and to tell you how much I enjoyed the steady stream of wit and wisdom that flowed around the festal board.

I assure you, my dear Admiral, that I shall always have a happy memory of the dinner and beg to thank you most cordially for giving me that pleasure.

With best wishes,

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPHUS DANIELS.

President Wilson, however, was not only not at the dinner, but he was not at all pleased with the ridicule his policies had drawn. A day or so later he directed Secretaries Daniels and Garrison to investigate and report to him. When he received their reports, he ordered one of the sharpest reprimands on record for the officers who had arranged the program.

The climax of the affair was reached when, still smarting with irritation, the President wrote as follows to Major Horton:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, December 17, 1913.

MY DEAR MAJOR HORTON: Sometime ago I had the pleasure of accepting honorary membership in the Military Order of the Carabao. I now beg to be permitted to withdraw my acceptance. I am constrained to make this request because of circumstances which I am sure the society will understand.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Both President Wilson's letters and all the documents covering this amazing outburst are in the official archives of the order. There was some talk of court martial for the officers concerned, but naturally nothing came of it. The reprimand was more than enough. Secretary Daniels suggested to Admiral Howard that he relinquish his office as patriarch of the herd. Asking a naval officer to be a quitter had the result to be expected. The society backed him up steadfastly, and the only civilian among the officers, former Col. Joseph M. Heller, Medical Corps, assumed the entire responsibility for the entire incident and made a public apology. The order also officially apologized, and the incident was closed. Though the amende honorable had been made, not a Carabao retreated an inch from the ground taken. The years that quickly followed demonstrated that whatever President Wilson thought of the patriotism and intelligence of the officers he had censured so caustically, they were straining at their moorings when the call came in 1917 that scattered them over the seven seas and throughout a war-torn world from the icy steppes of Siberia to the south of France, spread them over the man-killing cold and storm of the North Sea and the Channel and into the hell of the Argonne. The World War added fresh laurels to the order, and sounded taps for many a devoted Carabao who, when the moment came, joked with death as cheerily as he had with the herd when the lights blazed and the wine sparkled at the wallow that brought him into disfavor.

Since then two more decades have gone by, and wallow has followed wallow without any repetition of the incident, though the herd remains as always ready on the instant for frolic or fight, with the leaders of all the services and hundreds of eager civilian guests gathering each year on the date closest to the day when the Philippine Insurrection broke out, February 4, 1899.

Today the order is centered in Washington, where many of the officers of all three services are quartered, and in Manila, in a newer, more comfortable Army and Navy Club. All the other branch corrals are gone, but the inextinguishable spirit that won the Philippines, first from Spain and then from some seventy thousand Filipino irregulars as elusive and hard to catch as tropical fleas, lives on and burns as brightly through the years as when the first shot fired in the Islands lighted it.

WALLOW MARKS CARABAO'S FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY

Its members bonded and blended together in historic camaraderie, the famed Military Order of the Carabao, conceived in the tropical brain of a socially and spiritually inclined officer, and named to honor an animal of distinction so constitutionally created that frequent libations are necessary to his very existence, tonight celebrates its fiftieth anniversary.

At this historic wallow, old grandads of pre-World War I Philippine service will thrill alike with youthful Virginia gentlemen who sailed or flew across the Pacific to liberation action in World War II to the lofty words of the bountiful bombinero.

Sober pedants may insist petulantly that the celebration should be delayed until November, for it was in that month of the year 1900 that the Military Order of the Carabao was founded in Manila.

But neither Carabao nor hombre need tip his hat or his glass either to such a scholar, for no search of archeological ruins or examination of nonexisting archives ever will disclose the actual date of the first meeting.

And there is a reason for this. It is not, as some might suspect, because members were too Scotch to provide proper record books. As Col. Herbert A. White, United States Army, the bombinero of the epic 1913 wallow, revealed the true story, it went as follows:

"The paramount Carabao was found to be in such a high state of exhilaration over the future of the order that he was unable to put a motion, and the secretary was in such a similar state of exhilaration that he was unable to record a motion that had been put."

As a hang-over from that first meeting, each successive wallow has been characterized by great exhilaration. At times, notably in 1913, the effervescent spirit of the order's annual wallow has bubbled over into unprecedented situations of corking national interest.

Thus it was in the unlucky year of thirteen that President Wilson, not present at the wallow but disturbed at traditional Carabao satire which his policies evoked, ordered a very serious reprimand for officers responsible for the program.

Of this reprimand, the New York Sun commented editorially: "Let us quote the classic rebuke; it is a model for any pedagogue who may ever have occasion in the course of stern duty to administer verbal chastisement of men of war."

Official apology was made by former Col. Joseph M. Heller, Medical Corps, United States Army—the only civilian among the order's officers and the incident was closed. Not ended, however, was the unwavering adherence to the creed which keeps the herd, as tonight, "always ready on the instant for frolic or fight."

Among the 270 persons present at the 1913 wallow, described in detail in the history reprinted herewith, was Assistant Secretary of the Navy Franklin Delano Roosevelt. Records do not reveal his reaction to the evening of mirth, but the undisputed belief is that his famous smile was much in evidence at the wallow, symbolized by many refills and only that solitary one but straight reprimand.

At the 1939 wallow Assistant Secretary of War Louis Johnson told the Order of the Carabao that "you are the romantic old guard of the services and your achievements in song and battle have been perpetuated in the traditions of the Army and Navy."

Then, in Sybilline words, Secretary Johnson made this wry observation: "The reactionary and the conservative are not of the same type. A reactionary resents change merely because it is change. A conservative comes from Missouri.

"He is slow to change. Once convinced that the change is for the better, he becomes eager and ready to turn to the new. The old guard is properly conservative. It could never become reactionary."

Just as the 1939 wallow saw the inauguration of a Marine Corps officer, Maj. Gen. James C. Breckinridge, as grand paramount carabao, so tonight, Gen. Clifton B. Cates, Commandant of the Marine Corps, takes over the reins of Carabaos, an organization eager to demonstrate that there will be no watering-down of the order's richly deserved reputation, and exhilarated at the prospect of another evening devoted to "a temperate amount of prudence and a prudent amount of temperance."

"Housing" Is a Misnomer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. BRICKER
OF OHIO

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled " 'Housing' Is a Misnomer," published in the New York Times of February 20, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOUSING IS A MISNOMER

Thomas B. McCabe, chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, speaking for that body, has gone on record as opposed to the administration's $2,000,000,000 so-called middle-income home-financing bill, as now set up. The Board's position is hardly surprising. Nobody charged as the Reserve Board is with responsibility for stabilizing the Nation's credit system could conscientiously or logically support a measure so economically irresponsible.

This newspaper has consistently favored public-housing programs where they could be justified on legitimate humanitarian or

social grounds. But to describe this proposed bill as a housing program in that sense of the term is a complete misnomer. The plan is not restricted to families with substandard incomes. The Internal Revenue Bureau classes persons in brackets up to $6,000 as in the middle-income group. Actually, this bill doesn't even include that limitation. The nearest it comes to it is to provide that the particular residential project contemplated should meet the need of moderate-income families in the locality.

Specifically, the bill calls for the creation of another Government lending agency, this one to be known as the National Mortgage Corporation of Housing Cooperatives. The new institution would be authorized to make long-term low-interest rate loans to housing cooperatives and other nonprofit organizations for housing purposes. The proposed terms for such loans are so fantastically liberal that they come close to being merely thinly disguised subsidies. Lending rates would be only slightly higher than those at which the United States Government itself can borrow. In fact, the bill provides that the two should be tied together. The loans would be amortizable over a period of 50 years—half a century. Nor is that all. An extension of another 10 years would be obtainable by the borrower; also, the Corporation would be authorized to defer payment on both principal and interest for as long as 3 years during the life of the loan. No wonder that Mr. McCabe observed that "we know of no mortgage credit currently available in this country on amortization terms of 50 to 60 years or at interest rates such as are contemplated here."

Surveying the provisions of this bill, we find ourselves tempted to repeat an observation we made after going through the Brannan farm bill—namely, that no measure which rested on a sound economic basis would have to be made so thoroughly delectable as this one politically.

The New Grand Paramount Carabao

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The New Grand Paramount Carabao," written by Carabao Robert Sherrod, and published in the Army and Navy Journal.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NEW GRAND PARAMOUNT CARABAO

(By Carabao Robert Sherrod)

Clifton Bledsoe Cates, who becomes tonight the forty-sixth grand paramount of the Military Order of the Carabao, took office as the nineteenth commandant of the Marine Corps on January 1, 1948.

It is not difficult to discover why there have been more Grand Paramounts in 50 years than there have been commandants in 175 years. In the early years of the Republic—and of the Marine Corps—commandants served unconscionably long terms. Of the late, great Archibald Henderson it is said that after 37 years in the office he forgot and willed the commandant's quarters to his son.

General Cates' son is a naval officer.

As a colonel the new Grand Paramount commanded the First Marines at Guadalcanal. There he gained a distinction among his gyrenes which stuck with him throughout the war; he always looked as if he had just stepped out of a bandbox. Let it rain, let the mud get shin-deep, let Pistol Pete fire until his guns melt—Cliff Cates' pants were still pressed.

The legend persisted throughout the Tinian battle in 1944, the still immaculate General Cates commanded the Fourth Marine Division in what was probably the corps' smoothest amphibious operation of World War II. During that beachhead in hell which was called Iwo Jima, General Cates had his division CP in what had been a Japanese underground ammunition dump. Despite an almost total lack of sleep, despite the gore and brimstone, despite the dank quarters, General Cates nontheless managed to turn up each morning clean-shaven and neatly pressed. His only concession to the surroundings was his failure to wear a necktie.

Outside this CP one of General Cates' staff planted a street sign, "Maui Blvd." The Fourth Marine Division always returned to the Hawaiian island of Maui between battles, and the people of the island referred to the outfit as the "Maui Marines." Probably nowhere on the globe was there a closer affinity between the local population and the military visitors. Whenever the marines came back, almost every man, woman, and child among the island's 45,000 population turned out to greet the transports, and Cliff Cates became by common consent No. 1 citizen of the island. General Cates still has a petition signed by 1,191 citizens, beseeching Admiral Nimitz to send the division back to Maui "when it has finished its current battle." Nearly every inhabitant of Maui made friends with someone in the division, which was stationed there well over a year. Greatest of all the homecoming welcomes was after Iwo Jima. The local citizens outdid themselves when the transports docked this time—there were coffee, doughnuts, cakes, and flowers, and huge street signs welcoming the Fourth Division. But after the ships docked a great wave of sadness swept over the crowd. Half the Fourth Division failed this time to come back. Nearly two thousand of the "Maui Marines" were dead; six thousand others lay in hospitals from Saipan to San Diego. As long as he lives, Cliff Cates will probably remember above all else the return to Maui after Iwo.

In World War II General Cates was awarded two DSM's and a Legion of Merit. His record in the First World War, in which he served as a platoon commander and company commander of the Sixth Marines, was equally distinguished: two DSC's, a Navy Cross, two Silver Stars, two Purple Hearts, and a Croix de Guerre with two Palms and a Gold Star. He was wounded and gassed at Chateau Thierry, and wounded again at Soissons. He acquired the nickname "Lucky" during an assault on the village of Bouresches, which he survived with ten of his men after being knocked cold by a bullet which bashed in his helmet. A week later, only Cates and Private Levine were left of his entire company. The nickname and the trait stayed with him throughout World War II, which he escaped without a scratch, although at Iwo a warrant officer standing next to him was decapitated by a Japanese mortar fragment.

Concerning his nickname Cliff Cates has one standard answer: "Better born lucky than good looking."

General Cates was born in Tiptonville, Tenn., 56 years ago. He started out to be a lawyer, and graduated in law from the University of Tennessee. He enlisted in the Marine Corps June 13, 1917, and has not shown any disposition to return to law since then.

America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio commentary entitled "America's Role in the Chinese Tragedy" by W. Earl Harr, managing editor of the Mason City Globe-Gazette, of Mason City, Iowa, and appearing in the February 6 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the commentary was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE MAN'S OPINION—AMERICA'S ROLE IN THE CHINESE TRAGEDY

(A radio commentary by W. Earl Hall, managing editor)

There may be such a person but I have yet to meet an American who is proud of the role our country has played in China these past 10 years. In my opinion we should be hanging our head in shame rather than throwing out our chest in pride.

Actually the policy pursued by our State Department almost from the time of Pearl Harbor could have had no other result than the one which we now behold in China—complete domination by the Communists.

The Communists are in control of China for the plain and simple reason that those at the helm in the shaping of our foreign policy considered them better than Chiang Kai-shek and his Nationalists.

LIKE A BIRD ON A PLATTER

Joseph Alsop in his recent series of articles on why we lost China in the Saturday Evening Post didn't overstate matters when he wrote:

"Throughout the fateful years in China, the American representatives there actively favored the Chinese Communists. They also contributed to the weakness, both political and military, of the national government (under Chiang Kai-shek).

"And in the end, they came close to offering China up to the Communists, like a trussed bird on a platter, more than 4 years before the eventual Communist triumph."

Mr. Alsop in his articles reviews the whole sordid mess, going back to the time shortly after the war broke out when Gen. Joseph ("Vinegar Joe") Stillwell was placed in charge of America's interests in China. Qualified to lead an army in the field, Stillwell was as ill-equipped for a post calling for diplomacy as anybody who could have been named.

"IDIOT" AND "RATTLESNAKE"

The general from the start had an abiding contempt for the Chinese generalissimo. "Idiot" and "rattlesnake" were two of the endearing terms applied by the crusty old general to Chiang.

It was probably because of his unreasoning loathing of the generalissimo rather than because of any affinity for communism that Stilwell cultivated and propagated the idea that China's Communists weren't Communists at all in the real sense of the term. They were merely agrarian reformers.

From the day of his arrival on the assignment, General Stilwell was obsessed with two ideas. One was opening up the Burma road; the other was sinking a stiletto into Chiang Kai-shek. No cost was too great for bringing embarrassment to the generalissimo.

In Stilwell all of this can be explained as a manifestation of senility in a venerable man attempting to fill an assignment for which he wouldn't have been qualified even in his better days. It's regrettable that this had to be the closing chapter of a life story which otherwise was lustrous.

USED BY OUR PINKOS

But the wholly unfortunate fact in the situation was that the Stilwell childish prejudices geared into the philosophy of those in the State Department who had the loudest voice in determining American policy toward China.

In June, 1944, Henry Wallace, then Vice President stopped off in China, accompanied by three left-wing advisers. Most of his 2 weeks there was spent trying to persuade Chiang Kai-shek that he should take the Communists into his family.

Chiang knew, as Wallace could have learned if he had been interested, that the Communist troops in those days weren't much interested in fighting the Japanese invader. Their interest was in setting the stage for taking over China after the war.

THE SAME HENRY WALLACE

On his return to America, the Vice President reported to President Roosevelt in these words:

"Chiang, at best, is a short-term investment. It is not believed that he has the intelligence or political strength to run postwar China. The leaders of postwar China will be brought forward by evolution, or revolution, and it now seems more likely the latter."

Yes, this is the same Henry Wallace who a few short months ago sought the Presidency on a platform which found nothing to criticize the Communist ideology. He helped shape our policy toward China in the critical war years.

At Cairo, President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill pledged undying loyalty to China and the nationalist cause for which Chiang Kai-shek spoke. Without reservations they promised him a larger measure of assistance in a military way.

WE WERE "INDIAN GIVERS"

Josef Stalin wasn't in on that Cairo conference. A diplomatic nicety had to be observed. China's war was with Japan and Russia hadn't come into that war as yet. Whether she ever did is debatable—but that's another matter.

Anyway, a few days after the Cairo meeting Churchill and Roosevelt met with Stalin at Tehran. On Russian demand all available landing craft—including those promised to Chiang Kai-shek—were promptly reallocated to the European theater.

"Thus," as Mr. Alsop points out, "a major promise to Chiang Kai-shek was broken almost as soon as it was made."

And so it went month after month as China, already weary from years of war against the Japanese, sought to protect its homeland from an invader. The people of America thought they were allied with the government under Chiang, but State Department policy was all slanted at building up the Communists.

JUST A BLANKET CHARGE

In the closing months of the war Gen. Albert C. Wedemeyer replaced General Stilwell in the Chinese theater. Like many another, he had been told what a "monstrous crook" Chiang Kai-shek was. But he never was told what crooked things Chiang had done. It was just a blanket charge.

As recently as last November General Wedemeyer had this to say about the Chinese Generalissimo:

"My faith in the Chinese people remains unshaken. Personally, I have never questioned Chiang Kai-shek's sincerity of purpose and I am convinced of his desire to establish true democracy in China. He has already been a symbol of China's consistent opposition to forces of aggression."

With the war ended, those with a Communist leaning in the State Department—including one Alger Hiss—were free to step up their program designed to help the forces of Mao Tse-tung and throw the harpoon into Chiang. That's exactly what they did.

YES; ALGER HISS WAS THERE

It's not to be forgotten, or minimized, that at Yalta the President's aide was Alger Hiss. Could that have had something to do with the secret agreement giving Russia Outer Mongolia, Sakhalin, the Kurile Islands, Dairen, Port Arthur, and vast railroad properties in China and Manchuria?

One of the commonest charges laid at Chiang's door is that much of the arms and ammunition intended for Chiang's Nationalist forces fell into Communists' hands. Are you naive enough to believe that just happened?

At the conclusion of the war in Europe it was decided that some of the surrendered German arms and ammunition should go to China. The order was dispatched to General Eisenhower and compliance set under way. At least one ship was started toward Asia.

Then something happened. A countermanding order on White House stationery was dispatched to Eisenhower. It was signed by Lauchlin Currie, administrative assistant. No further German arms went to China. Where have you seen that name, Lauchlin Currie? In the testimony of both Whittaker Chambers and Elizabeth Bentley, former workers in the Communist fold.

CONGRESS WAS IGNORED

In 1948 Congress wrote into law an affirmative policy of resisting communism. This was long before the Reds even reached the Yellow River. But nothing much happened. There was delay and dawdling in the State Department. The clear-cut intent of Congress to aid Chiang was aborted.

More recently a white paper covering the Chinese situation has been issued by the State Department. Mostly it's an apology for our policy of do-nothing in the face of the constant extension of the Communist grip on all of continental China.

In September 1947, General Wedemeyer at the conclusion of his second mission to China turned in a report which gathered dust for more than 2 years in some Washington office. It outlined a plan of supervised military aid to the nationalists to halt the march of the Communists.

WHERE ACHESON STOOD

In the line-up within the State Department of pro-Communists and anti-Communists, Dean Acheson in his days in subordinate position usually could be found alongside those highly critical of Chiang Kai-shek—and not so critical of the Communists.

In 1947—at just about the time General Wedemayer was recommending military aid to Chiang—Mr. Acheson, as acting Secretary of State, made this report to the House Foreign Affairs Committee:

"The Chinese Government is not in the position at the present time that the Greek Government is in. It is not approaching collapse. It is not threatened by defeat by Communists. The war with the Communists is going on much as it has for the last 20 years."

This point of view is in quite violent contrast with the one expressed by Mr. Acheson, now as Secretary of State, in that white paper of last year:

"The unfortunate, but inescapable, fact is that the ominous result of the civil war in China was beyond the control of the Government of the United States. Nothing that this country did or could have done within the reasonable limits of its capabilities could have changed that result; nothing that was left undone by this country has contributed to it."

ALL RESPECT FOR US GONE

Well, that's the story in sketchy outline form. That brings us down to where we are now—with the Chinese Communists tossing our officials into jail without fear of appropriate reprisals. In India and elsewhere in the Orient, American prestige has taken a terrific wallcping.

The question of whether Chinese Reds are true Communists has been answered, at least in part. Mao Tse-tung, the man about whom the Communist forces have centered their efforts in China, has been a guest of the Kremlin. Later his first assistant joined him for the conferences.

According to some dispatches out of China, which may or may not be wishful thinking, Moscow is making some unreasonable demands on China. One writer mentions insistence on a half-dozen ports for Russian use. Another talks of demands for large shipments of food from underfed China.

WE ASKED FOR IT

By the nature of the policy we've pursued in China—buddying up to the Communists when we ought to have been giving full support to the forces seeking to halt the Communist march—we're getting exactly what we asked for.

The time is past when we can give effective aid to Chiang Kai-shek or the cause which he represents. The hazards involved in trying to protect Formosa are all out of line with any possible benefits to be derived from what would have to be a military operation.

History tells us that no conqueror of China ever prospered. Always the invader has been swallowed up. We can only hope that history will repeat itself and help us out of the hole which we deliberately dug for ourselves.

Expensive "Wildcats"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Expensive 'Wildcats'," published in the Oil City (Pa.) Derrick of February 14, 1950. The article should be of great interest to the Members of the Senate because of the study now being given to depletion charges for income-tax purposes.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EXPENSIVE WILDCATS

Last year, the American Petroleum Institute announces, the oil industry drilled about 7,250 wildcat wells—the greatest number in any one year since the discovery of oil in 1859.

Wildcat wells are test wells which the oil men drill in the course of exploring new or unproved territories. Through them new pools are discovered and new fields brought into production. Our proved oil reserves have now reached the enormous figure of nearly 27,000,000,000 barrels—and the wildcats are largely responsible for that.

A wildcat, however, is not a safe, sure, and conservative piece of business. It involves great financial risks since four out of five of them turn out to be dry holes. The science of geology has made great progress, but it isn't foolproof by a long shot. The only sure way to prove that there is oil in any given place is to go down and look.

Last year's wildcats cost the oil industry more than $350,000,000 in drilling expense.

Since only one out of five was a producer, the average cost of finding a worth-while well was about $250,000. And that doesn't include the huge sums paid to landowners for leases, the cost of geological and geophysical exploration, and other heavy and necessary costs. In 1949 the total cost of exploring for oil and gas within this country was over $1,000,000,000.

In a free-enterprise economy, men will take these risks for the possible rewards for success—thus bringing progress and a better life for millions of people. What is true of oil is true of all the rest of our basic enterprises.

Portrait of a Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN J. SPARKMAN
OF ALABAMA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. SPARKMAN. Mr. President, there recently appeared in the Montgomery Examiner a very excellent article entitled "Portrait of a Statesman," under the pen name of "Rev. A. S. Turnipseed." I ask unanimous consent to have the article printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PULPIT ECHOES—PORTRAIT OF A STATESMAN

(By the Reverend A. S. Turnipseed)

Week before last I happened to have been on the campus of the University of Alabama talking with the Reverend William Graham Echols, director of the Wesley Foundation at the Capstone. Dr. Echols told me the story of the spring elections of 1913 at the university when LISTER HILL made a successful race for president of the student body. Echols was then a student from Russell County and managed HILL'S campaign.

Echols was the campus champion of the "little man" and had well organized the nonfraternity element of the university. Echols led the nonfraternity men in choosing HILL as their candidate.

HILL was a member of Deke. It must be remembered that Deke is often referred to, whether rightly or not, as the "snob club." Thus it was quite a tribute to HILL for the nonfraternity men to choose him as their candidate against the organized opposition of the whole fraternity system at Alabama. According to Echols, HILL lost friends in his own fraternity, to say nothing of the other fraternities, because of this move. It was a bitterly contested election but HILL won.

Cynics may say that even at this early date HILL was simply the demogague going the way of the most votes. Surely the selfish element was in it but that is not a full explanation.

NO ARISTOCRAT

This incident out of HILL'S student days is indicative of the man himself. I always am a little confused when people refer to HILL as an aristocrat. I do not venture in this column a definition of the term "aristocrat." But to my mind HILL is not an aristocrat in the usually accepted sense of the word.

This man's grandfather, the Reverend L. L. Hill, was one of the leaders in Methodism during the last half of the last century who fought for democracy in the church. He was ordained in the Methodist Protestant Church which was a protest movement against some of the autocratic practices of the main Methodist body. Today the things for which the Methodist Protestants stood, such as lay rights, have long been accepted by the main body of Methodists. (The Methodist Protestant Church has gone out of existence because of the unification of all Methodist churches in 1939.) The Methodist Protestant movement was to the Methodist Church what the Populist movement was to the Democratic Party. A lot of that old grandfather was showing up in young LISTER when he was the candidate of the nonfraternity element at the university.

Now that LISTER HILL is up for reelection he should be reexamined in the light of his contemporary setting. Representing a deep south State his liberalism is far more to his credit than the liberalism of representatives in the Congress of large industrialized and urban constituencies. It takes time and circumstances to develop a statesman. Maybe for the first 14 or 15 years HILL'S performance in Washington indicated no deeply worked out social philosophy. It remained for the New Deal really to develop this man. His stands on such things as labor legislation, TVA, hospital legislation, social security, and agriculture during the last 12 or more years have been so consistently liberal as to indicate that his politics is motivated by a basic social philosophy.

I asked Dr. Echols if HILL were a good student at the university and he enthusiastically answered in the affirmative. When he first went to the United States Senate it was not uncommon to hear people say that HILL was an opportunist and intellectually superficial. His consistent liberal record in the Senate would confirm Dr. Echols' opinion rather than that of his detractors of some dozen years ago. In November 1939 I heard Senator HILL address the Alabama conference on the application of Christianity to social problems. It was a scholarly address which led many of us to conclude that religion was central in the motivation of the Senator. This speech caused some of the older ministers in the conference to recall that HILL made a profession of faith and joined the church in a revival meeting here in Montgomery when he was a young man just starting the practice of law.

It is remarkable that in a State that elected a very reactionary governor not more than 12 years ago, LISTER HILL stands today as the almost unchallenged leader. (I believe one or two have indicated they might run against HILL but at the present I cannot think of their names.) Two years ago the lamentations of modern Jeremiahs were heard everywhere to the effect that HILL was a "dead duck." In the midst of the terrible storm over civil rights, which everybody knew was used in Alabama as a blind for reactionary rights, HILL emerged to lead the ticket of those elected to the Democratic convention.

PROPERTY VERSUS PEOPLE

Books have been written around the thesis that the Negro is the determining factor in southern history. To me this is a thin thesis. The real fight in the South, since the days of Thomas Jefferson on down to the days of LISTER HILL, is property versus people. This is what makes southern politics so precarious for any man with any independent proclivities. All the reactionaries have to do is use the Negro issue against him to discredit everything else for which he stands.

HILL has vigorously opposed the imposition of civil rights by the Federal Government and has contended that the South must work out its problems within the Democratic Party. This in effect puts the Negro question where it ought to be put—off to the side and out of the center of southern politics. This seems to be the tact taken by all liberal men who are effective in southern public life.

The great burden of this region is to rid ourselves of all forms of exploitation—whether it be the exploitation of our natural resources, such as erosion of the land, or the exploitation of our human resources, such as the economic exploitation of poor whites and Negroes. We can save ourselves from an economy dominated by economic monopolists by preserving free enterprise for little operators. But how can there be any free enterprise for little people who have diseases, ignorance, and superstitious religion directly derived from abject poverty? What makes HILL a statesman is his consistent advocacy of Government policy that strikes at this abject southern poverty.

RACE ISSUE INJECTED

The political fortunes of LISTER HILL sank the lowest in 1944 when he was returned to the United States Senate by a close margin. The issue of property versus people was smoke screened in that race by the skillful injection of the Negro issue by the monopolies. In large part HILL won that fight because the majority of the people of Alabama believe that property should be held by a constantly increasing number with a corresponding lessening of control of property by monopolies. But the balance of power in that election was tipped by a large element in this State that abhors another form of exploitation—that perpetrated by the liquor traffic.

When Col. Oscar Tompkins, of Dothan, Ala., wrote letters to the church periodicals of this State pointing out the record of James Simpson in the legislature on the alcohol issue thousands of people began to veer toward HILL. Protestant preachers became indignant and a wave of resentment went over the State large enough to sweep into the HILL fold enough additional votes to get him over the hump.

I know political prophecy is precarious but I venture the prediction that LISTER HILL will stay in the United States Senate as long as he wants to.

Youth Rally Attracts 2,000 White and Negro Students

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, voluntary attendance of some 2,000 white and Negro students in the public, private, and parochial schools of Baltimore made possible an interracial meeting for better understanding and tolerance in Baltimore's Polytechnic Institute last week.

As reported in the Baltimore Morning Sun of Saturday, February 18, the principals in this most laudible effort, held in connection with the silver anniversary week program of the Urban League of Baltimore, were James J. Lacy, Jr., former Loyola College student and basketball star, and Levi Jackson, Negro

captain of the Yale University football team. Judge Herman M. Moser, of the supreme bench of Baltimore, was the adult speaker for the occasion.

Because of its widespread favorable implication, I ask unanimous consent that the report of this meeting be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

YOUTH RALLY ATTRACTS 2,000 WHITE AND NEGRO STUDENTS

More than 2,000 white and Negro students in the city's public, private, and parochial schools joined yesterday in a youth rally in the auditorium of the Polytechnic Institute, which was a feature of the silver anniversary week program of the Urban League of Baltimore.

The large interracial attendance, which was by invitation to all students and not obligatory, was particularly gratifying to the sponsors of the meeting, some of whom said it was, in their opinion, the largest outpouring of white and Negro youths to attend an interracial event held here under private auspices.

The interracial theme was carried to the stage where James J. Lacy, Jr., former Loyola College student and a basketball player of national reputation, and Levi Jackson, Negro captain of Yale's football team, were the principal speakers with Judge Herman M. Moser, of the supreme bench of Baltimore.

BAND, CHOIR PROVIDE MUSIC

The music was provided by the Baltimore City College Band under the baton of Donold B. Norton, and the Frederick Douglass High School choir directed by Mrs. Georgianna Chester.

Without directly mentioning discrimination or integration, the speakers, who were introduced by Nick Campofreda, used sports to show how teamwork can produce results both on the playing field and in other spheres of life.

Judge Moser emphasized that the United States must not give aid and comfort to enemies by disunity. America, he insisted, must be united at all times.

Mr. Lacy said that boys and girls must apply to their lives the same rules that apply to sports, a determination to do a good job, play as a team, train for it and be a good sport, "playing the game to the hilt."

Mr. Jackson said each boy and girl must take advantage of every opportunity offered them, especially opportunities of going to college. He insisted that "schools can't aid you unless you desire that aid." Sports, he said, are a "wonderful adjunct to education."

Edgar M. Ewing, president of the Urban League, presented Mr. Lacy and Mr. Jackson with citations pointing out their successes not only as leaders in sports, but as citizens looking toward the advancement of all persons.

DINNER SLATED MONDAY

The anniversary week program will end Monday night with a dinner at Morgan State College.

Alexander J. Allen, executive secretary of the league, will make his annual report.

Addresses will be made by Dr. Paul S. Douglass, president of American University, Washington; Dr. Martin D. Jenkins, president of Morgan College; and Dr. Broadus Mitchell, first president of the Urban League of Baltimore, a former member of the Johns Hopkins University faculty, and currently professor of economics at Rutgers University.

Miss Anne Baedenkopf will present the local league an original oil painting. There will be a business meeting and election of officers.

Prohibition of Interstate Liquor Advertisements

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a letter I have received from the Honorable Harlan M. Calhoun, judge of the twenty-second judicial circuit in Moorefield, W. Va., who expresses his opinions on S. 1847, which is the bill proposing to prohibit interstate liquor advertisements.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MOOREFIELD, W. VA., *February 7, 1950.*

Hon. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR KILGORE: I am writing to you to express my very great interest in the enactment of Senate bill No. 1847, prohibiting interstate liquor advertisement. I trust you will pardon a rather extended expression of my views.

Definitely this is not a mere wet and dry issue. I am not a dry in the sense of being an abstainer myself, nor in the sense of favoring a return to prohibition. I was prosecuting attorney of my county during prohibition days and in that capacity I learned the futility of such a law. I am confident, however, that just as many wets as drys are keenly conscious of the need of a law such as this.

Perhaps the Democratic Party, of which I have the honor of being an ardent member, was the political party most directly responsible for repeal. However that may be, I feel that all those individuals or groups who were in any way responsible for repeal owe to the American public a responsibility for keeping faith. There can be no denial of the fact that the theory back of repeal was that liquor was a necessary evil; that a great portion of our people were determined to have it, lawfully or unlawfully; and therefore advocates of repeal had the very plausible argument that intoxicants should merely be made available to meet this insistent demand. Reasonable regulation was to follow repeal.

But the most ardent advocates of repeal never once asserted that prohibition should be repealed because liquor represented a public good. They never once, in urging repeal, asserted that there should be a greater consumption of liquor for the good of the country. They never once urged that any individual consumer should consume more, nor that the number of drinkers should be increased. Most certainly they never urged that our youth should be urged to consider drinking a social necessity nor to believe that all men of distinction are necessarily drinkers.

On the contrary, the very logical, plausible argument for repeal was that liquor, as a necessary evil, should merely be made available for those who insist upon having it, and that it should be reasonably regulated. In that, I feel, we must keep faith.

As an argument against this proposal, it is urged that it represents one step toward a return to prohibition. On the contrary, the best insurance against a return to prohibition, the best assurance against a further extension of the dry areas of the country, is for the liquor and beer industries to submit to reasonable regulation. A prominent official of this State, during the recent Christmas season, told me how his small children had been hurt and disillusioned by an advertisement showing Santa Claus consuming a popular brand of beer. From a purely selfish standpoint the liquor and beer industries must submit to a reasonable restraint upon such avaricious inclinations or else suffer the public reaction.

In connection with the hearing before the Senate committee, I noted the effort to characterize as "drys" all advocates of this legislation. One could be guilty of no greater error than to assume that there is reasonable truth in such a position. It happens that, for years, I have keenly felt a need of such legislation. Meantime, I have discussed the matter with perhaps hundreds of people. I am quite certain that the vast majority of these people drank to some extent, some to a most unfortunate degree. I have not yet encountered one single individual, wet or dry, but who favored such a law. Opponents of this bill are hard-pressed to find any semblance of a logical argument to support their position. I urge you, in your own mind, to consider what sound argument may be advanced against the proposal.

If we admit that a greater consumption of liquor should not be encouraged among a greater number of people, particularly youth, then there can be no logical basis of opposition to this bill.

I have no way of knowing the number of millions of dollars spent annually on such advertisements. Let the "wet" opponents of this bill bear in mind that this cost is paid by the "wet" consuming public for whom they assume to speak. Or, if this immense cost of advertisement remains the same, let us consider the field for public revenue which will be created thereby.

I have endeavored in this letter to disabuse your mind of any impression you may have that this legislation is favored only by a lot of long-faced prudish cranks under the general characterization of "drys." I am not an advocate of prohibition, nor a "dry."

Nevertheless, perhaps I am in a better position than the average citizen to note the havoc which is being wrought by liquor on an America which owes it to the world to be strong. Other judges of my acquaintance agree with me that at least 50 percent of criminal law violations in our courts of record relate in some way to liquor or its use. I cannot estimate the cost in divorce, broken homes, juvenile delinquency, public welfare grants, poverty, loss of health, or loss of mind. Any impartial observer, wet or dry, must agree that liquor probably constitutes the greatest curse of civilization next to the institution of war. Why, then, permit a systematic, immensely-financed program to extend its evil tendencies?

The motive of gain will doubtless drive to great lengths both the liquor interests and portions of the press. Excluding these two groups, I venture the assertion that 90 percent of the American people who know of the proposal favor its enactment into law. I urge further investigation on your part to determine whether or not my estimate is correct.

I am the father of two teen-age children. There is a very sordid side to liquor and beer not portrayed in the enticing advertisements in expensive magazines. I believe American parents may reasonably expect the cooperation of Congress in their efforts to shape the thinking of their teen-age youngsters along lines you and I know to be sound.

Very respectfully yours,

HARLAN M. CALHOUN.

It's Fun To "Speak Your Piece," Too

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, sometime ago I had the distinction and pleasure of participating in a program at Manistee, Mich., which was a part of a plan for spreading in that community the ideals of good citizenship under a slogan, "It's Fun To Live in America." One of the leaders in that movement has been Judge Max Hamlin. He has sent me a copy of a piece of literature, which is one of several that go into the homes of Manistee citizens each month. It is in the form of a letter to a Member of Congress and is headed "It's fun to 'speak your piece,' too." This particular piece reflects Judge Hamlin's ideas and my own with respect to the objectives of the Hoover Commission, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the folder was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IT'S FUN TO "SPEAK YOUR PIECE" TOO

MY DEAR MR. SENATOR AND CONGRESSMAN: I am writing you about this business of Federal spending. I am what you call one of the little guys. I am single, make 50 bucks a week and own a second-hand car. It may sound corny, but I want to save enough to buy that little white cottage.

Out of my 50 bucks, my boss has to withhold $5.45 for Federal income tax. That's $283.40 a year, and brother, that ain't hay. That means I work about 34 days out of every year just to pay income tax.

Now, I don't mind spending for good Government. I think our defenses should be strong and that we ought to pay for such things as the Postal Department, FBI, and other necessary services. But I don't believe in waste. My grandpop used to say, "A penny saved is a penny earned." As I look back on it now, grandpop was a pretty smart old duck. He saved his money, bought a horse here and a mule there, and finally had a livery stable. Automobiles came along, so he sold his stock and started a garage. He didn't ask nobody for nothing, just saved his money, worked hard and wound up with a pretty good stake. When he got old he was able to sell his business and take it easy.

Well, to get back to this business of Federal spending. As I said, I don't mind spending for good Government, but it burns me up when a lot of bureaus up there in Washington come along and put the heat on you fellows to give them more and more money to keep adding people to their departments.

The other day I got hold of one of these reports by the Hoover Commission, the group appointed by the President to look into the cost of Federal Government. Believe me, some of the facts I read made my blood boil.

For instance:

That approximately one-half the several million purchase orders issued by the Government each year are for items totaling less than $10, yet the paper work done on every purchase transaction costs more than $10.

That Government records fill a space of 18,000,000 square feet at a cost of $20,000,000 a year and the filing equipment alone is worth $154,000,000.

That in one county in Georgia, 47 Government employees attached to seven separate field services of the Agriculture Department have been working with only 1,500 farmers.

That the Government worker handling my GI insurance policy carries a work load of only 450 policies, whereas the worker in a private insurance company handles 1,762 policies.

These are just a few of the facts that this report gave. All this talk in millions and billions is mighty confusing, but I have enough common horse sense to know that a lot of this money has been wasted just like pouring sand down a rat hole.

Now, Mr. Senator and Congressman, and I don't care what your politics are, I am writing you to ask you point blank to get behind some of these ideas recommended by the Hoover Commission. We little guys have heard this business about soak the other guy quite a while. Now we realize that every dollar we pay in taxes is just as hard on us as it is on the other fellow. So, we want you to do something and do it quick.

Respectfully yours,

JOE DOAKES
(Just an Average Joe.)

The Buchanan Committee's Task in the Light of Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK BUCHANAN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Public Opinion Quarterly early next month will publish an article by Dr. Edgar Lane, instructor in politics at Princeton University, entitled "Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying." I have been fortunate enough to read an advance proof of this article, and I am deeply impressed by the scholarly job performed by Dr. Lane in analyzing the three previous investigations of lobbying activities conducted by committees of the Congress during this century. Out of his research into those previous inquiries, the author reaches some interesting conclusions as to the fields in which he believes the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities of this Congress can perform the most worth-while public service.

Although it is not scheduled to appear for several weeks in the Public Opinion Quarterly, I have obtained the permission of Dr. Lane and of his publishers to have this article appear now in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I have requested that permission because I believe this article, with its careful review of the background of our present investigation, can serve as a useful subject of discussion within the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities and among those Members of Congress, the press and the general public who are demonstrating a deep interest in the subject matter of our investigation.

I have called an executive session of the House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities, which includes, in addition to myself as chairman, Representatives LANHAM, ALBERT, DOYLE, HALLECK, BROWN, and O'HARA of Minnesota, for Tuesday afternon, February 21, at 3 p. m. At that meeting, we may decide on a priority list for intensive investigation and for hearings.

As a prelude to that meeting, I think it would be most helpful if we could have this article before us for study and review and I know other Members would also find it exceedingly interesting. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, Dr. Lane's article, Some Lessons From Past Congressional Investigations of Lobbying, as prepared for the Public Opinion Quarterly, is inserted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

SOME LESSONS FROM PAST CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF LOBBYING

(By Edgar Lane, Ph. D., instructor of politics, Princeton University, Princeton, N. J.)

(Congress has conducted three major investigations of lobbying activities since 1900. None of these has been completely successful, and it is to be hoped that the House lobbying investigation of 1950 will profit by the experience of its predecessors. Such an inquiry is most likely to serve the public interest if it adheres to a predetermined agenda, is based on careful research, does not bog down in colorful detail, submits periodic reports, and avoids partisan division. The present committee could make a major contribution by concentrating its attention on the improvement of legislation governing lobbyists, a subject which has been too much neglected in the past.)

Congress has decided to take another long look at the lobbying problem.

Under the terms of a resolution passed in August 1949 by the House of Representatives, a select committee of seven Members, headed by Representative FRANK BUCHANAN, has been empowered to study all lobbying activities, both private and governmental, which are "intended to influence, encourage, promote, or retard legislation."[1] Only an end-of-session jam of business prevented the Senate from becoming a partner in the enterprise. The primary purpose of the investigation, at least according to published reports, is to disclose the inadequacies and loopholes of the Regulation of Lobbying Act of 1946 and to seek means of correcting them.[2]

If the Buchanan committee does nothing more than find correctives for the internal contradictions of the Lobbying Act, it will have performed a valuable even though somewhat limited service. The present act stands very much in need of careful revision, and an investigation which looks in this direction is thoroughly opportune.

The committee has not yet indicated, however, whether or not it intends to tie itself to proposals based on the present system of regulation by registration. Even if it does not recommend a radical change of approach,

[1] 81st Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 298. The President made an early session pledge that there would be a full-dress lobbying investigation, but expressed a preference for the joint investigating committee envisaged in S. Res. 23. The Senate failed to act on this resolution, however. New York Times, October 9, 1949.

[2] Ibid. See also Washington Post, October 7, 1949.

the group will be obliged to face during its investigation more complex problems than the mere clarification of conflicting statutory language. Primary among these is the necessity of agreement on purposes. What end is the investigation intended to serve? Is it conceived of as a means of informing congressional and public opinion on the scope and meaning of pressure-group activity? Or is it designed to serve primarily as a medium for the development of a more satisfactory system of pressure-group regulation?

Assuming that the Buchanan committee clearly accepts one or the other of these alternatives—and this in itself is unlikely—there immediately arise corollary questions of investigation procedure. Is it more productive to investigate extensively or intensively? Should the approach be spectacular or scholarly, carping or gentle? The manner in which these questions are resolved cannot help but materially affect the Buchanan committee's contribution to the effective management of the sprawling complex of modern pressure politics.

In attempting to meet these problems of purpose, scope, and method, the committee can profitably turn for guidance to the experience of past congressional lobbying investigations, although more often than not this guidance is negative in character. The investigations of 1913, 1929, and 1935 yielded valuable information on pressure operations, but at the same time they were in most cases models of confused purposes, inadequate planning, poor procedure, and wasted opportunity. Their primary value is that they demonstrate graphically the errors of omission and commission which can so easily blunt the impact of any congressional effort in this area. They suggest pitfalls to be avoided rather than guidelines to be followed.

We do not imply that the record of these earlier inquiries is necessarily predictive of the success or failure of the present effort, for the context in which the Buchanan committee works is somewhat unique. The purposes of this paper are rather to indicate the ends which earlier investigations have best served, to suggest the approaches which have yielded the most useful results, and to show how this experience can be particularly relevant to the new undertaking.

CONGRESSIONAL INVESTIGATIONS OF LOBBYING

The investigations of 1913

Congress did not suddenly awaken to the existence of lobbying in 1913. The history of the latter half of the nineteenth century is dotted with frequent cases of corrupt lobbying and subsequent congressional investigations.[3] Outright bribery was not uncommon in the 1870's and 80's, and to buy Congressmen for the smallest possible sum was all too often "the acme of ambition to the successful lobbyist." [4] But by 1913 both the methods and practitioners of lobbying had changed, and the investigations of that year represent the first congressional recognition of lobbying in its newer forms. Persuasion and promotional activities had supplanted overt corruption. Pressure group representatives and public relations experts had largely replaced the brokers of éntree and influence of an earlier era.

The impetus to the investigations of 1913 came primarily from President Wilson's statement to the press on May 27. Referring to the tariff lobby, which had been particularly active in opposing the administration's Underwood tariff, the President charged:

"Washington has seldom seen so numerous, so industrious, or so insidious a body. The newspapers are being filled with advertisements calculated to mislead the judgment not only of public men, but also the public opinion of the country itself. There is every evidence that money without limit is being spent to sustain this lobby and to create an appearance of a pressure of public opinion antagonistic to some of the chief items of the tariff. * * * It is thoroughly worth the while of the people of this country to take knowledge of the matter. Only public opinion can check and destroy it." [5]

Within 2 days, the Senate authorized its Judiciary Committee to "investigate the charge that a lobby is being maintained at Washington, or elsewhere, to influence proposed legislation now pending before the Senate.[6]

In the House, approval of a resolution providing for a parallel investigation lagged. It was not until the appearance of a series of articles in the Chicago Tribune and the New York World, beginning on June 29, 1913, that the House was provoked to action. These articles, which have since become known as the "Mulhall Revelations," charged a number of past and present Members of both Houses of Congress with having entered into various improper dealings with the National Association of Manufacturers through the agency of one Martin Mulhall, a former representative of the association. The House, apparently fearful of another Credit Mobilier, quickly authorized its own select investigating committee to inquire into these charges and to report whether the NAM or its agents had actually influenced "any officer or employee in this or any former House of Representatives in or about the discharge of their official duties." [7] Thus began the two investigations which gave the first thorough airing to lobbying in the Nation's Capital.

SENATE INQUIRY WANDERS

What did these inquiries accomplish, and what can be learned from them? In the case of the Senate investigation the record of accomplishment was highly uneven. The committee's hearings were both brief and diffuse, and the entire investigation suffered from a failure to focus on any central theme.[8] President Wilson's charge had been made with particular reference to extensive lobbying by beet-sugar interests, and the investigation at first centered on these activities. But within 2 weeks, the committee's attention had wandered to charges made by President Lovett, of the Union Pacific Railroad, to the effect that David Lamar, an alleged "Wall Street scavenger," had impersonated two Congressmen over the telephone in seeking to aid one Edward Lauterback in securing employment in the then-pending Union Pacific dissoluation case.[9] Nor was this the end. Before its hearings were concluded, the Senate Committee had plunged exuberantly into the Mulhall affair, which was ostensibly the province of the House investigation.

This lack of concentration, although understandable, was unfortunate. Even more unfortunate from the tactical point of view was the committee's failure to present to the Senate any interim or final report of its findings. President Wilson's angry indictment had at first been dismissed as the exaggerated statement of a newcomer in the National Capital. When the Senate investigation was completed, there was little doubt that his charges had been more than substantiated.[10] The committee found that the Beet Sugar Growers Association and the Wholesale Grocers Associations had each raised and spent over $500,000 in their efforts to influence the passage of the Underwood tariff. One million five hundred and twenty-five thousand pieces of literature, pro and con, had been mailed under the frank of friendly Members of Congress. Recalcitrant Members had been threatened with political reprisals, and deliberately falsified statistics had been righteously submitted to congressional committees.[11] The evidence of diverse and powerful pressures was both abundant and disquieting, and had the Senate committee submitted a report recommending the enactment of regulatory legislation, Congress might well have acted on its recommendations.

House report outlines pattern of lobbying

The House investigation undoubtedly rendered a more valuable service than did the more discursive Senate inquiry in two respects: the scope of the committee's hearings was successfully confined to the Mulhall charges and to the even-then multifarious legislative activities of the NAM; [12] and when these hearings were ended, the House committee submitted a report which is still notable for its balance and prophetic insight. The committee found that the NAM was—

"An organization having purposes and aspirations along industrial, commercial, political, educational, and other lines, so vast and far reaching as to excite at once admiration and fear—admiration for the genius which conceived them and fear for the effects which the successful accomplishment of all these ambitions might have in a government such as ours." [13]

This statement of the broader problem implicit in organized group activity is as modern as tomorrow.

The most tangible contribution of the report, however, consisted in the light which it threw on the methods by which the NAM had sought to obtain its objectives. The committee found occasional instances in which NAM representatives had attempted to prevent legislation by striving to induce Congressmen to remain away from the Chamber when a vote was being taken.[14] It found, too, that the chief page of the House had been in the employ of the NAM, and that at least one Congressman mentioned in the Mulhall papers, James E. McDermott, of Illinois, was guilty of acts of grave impropriety, unbecoming the dignity of the distinguished position he occupies.[15]

But these activities were trivial, except for the moral turpitude involved; [16] the NAM placed far heavier reliance on more subtle and tangential avenues of approach. The committee found that the association con-

---

[3] See Spofford, A. R., Lobby, Labor's Cyclopedia of Political Science (New York, 1893), pp. 779–781, for a spry account of events in this period.

[4] Reinsch, P. S., American Legislatures and Legislative Methods (New York, 1907), p. 231.

[5] Reprinted in Herring, E. P., Group Representation Before Congress (Baltimore, 1929), p. 44.

[6] 63d Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 92.

[7] 63d Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 198. Although he did not accuse them of impropriety, Mulhall named ex-President Taft, ex-Vice President Sherman, and Senator Lodge, inter alia, as being very tractable.

[8] U. S. Congress, Senate, Committee on the Judiciary, Maintenance of a Lobby To Influence Legislation, hearings, 63d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1913), 4 vols.

[9] For comment, see Inquiries About Lobbyists, Independent, vol. 75 (July 10, 1913), p. 69.

[10] The Lobby Exposed, Current Opinion, vol. 55 (August, 1913), p. 75.

[11] O'Laughlin, J. C., Invisible Government Under Searchlight, Review and Reviews, vol. 48 (September 1913), p. 337; Hunting the Insidious Lobbyist, Literary Digest, vol. 47 (July 5, 1913), pp. 3–5.

[12] U. S. Congress, House, Select Committee on Lobby Investigation, hearings, 63d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1913), 4 vols.

[13] 63d Cong., 1st sess., H. Rept. 113, printed in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 51, pp. 565–684.

[14] Ibid., p. 571.

[15] Ibid., p. 582. No action of censure was recommended by the committee majority, however, nor was such action taken by the House.

[16] "Mulhall Lobby Charges Upheld," Literary Digest, vol. 48 (Apr. 4, 1914), p. 743.

tributed through its agents to the election campaigns of properly disposed congressional candidates; that it carried on a disguised propaganda campaign through newspapers, publicists, speakers, and literature in schools, colleges, and civic organizations throughout the country; and that it had promoted employee alliances for use in opposing prolabor congressional candidates.[17]

These activities may have been less than forthright; they were certainly concealed as carefully as possible. But, withal, there was a notable absence of the widespread and systematic bribery which had disgraced Congresses in the past. If the report proved only that outright corruption was no longer a principal instrument of the lobby, it had served an important purpose.[18]

Beyond demonstrating the new modus operandi, the report was significant as the first official congressional expression concerning the status of the lobby. It clarified that status and suggested a new code of practice for the future.[19]

Equally, the report gave unmistakable notice that Congress would not tolerate indefinitely a continuation of the devious means of special pleading which it had found were employed by the NAM. The committee agreed that:

"To place the Congressman in a cloister to legislate, rendering him immune to extraneous influences, would be impossible, and, if possible, it would be exceedingly ridiculous." [20]

But, at the same time, the committee warned that the NAM and its agents had gone beyond the limits of legitimate effort and that they deserved "the severest censure as well as a pointed invitation and suggestion that they completely reform their methods or else remain away in the future." [21]

The report recognized, however, that these secretive, reprehensible, and disreputable methods were largely vestigial aberrations, and that the deliberate creation of a charged public opinion and a consequent coercion through propaganda were the important means by which the new lobby operated.[22] Although it never submitted a formal statement, the Senate investigating committee had been led to a similar conclusion. Senator Overman, chairman of the Senate group, declared that lobbying consisted less of personal appeals to Congressmen than it did of "the newer form of organized activity to mold public sentiment and to influence Senators by means of public pressure from various sources." [23]

The recognition and at least partial documentation of this changed approach were probably the most useful contributions made by the investigations of 1913. They had the further effect of indirectly stimulating the introduction during the Sixty-third Congress of 12 bills calling for various kinds of congressional regulation of lobbying.[24] No one one these bills was ever reported from committee. It seems reasonable to conclude that they might have been differently received had they been actively sponsored by the two investigating committees.

[17] H. Rept. 113, loc. cit., p. 574.

[18] Herring, op. cit., p. 46.

[19] Ibid., p. 45.

[20] H. Rept. 113, loc. cit., p. 574.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Herring, op. cit., p. 46. Herring suggests that these investigations were the government actions which had the most direct effect on "the reform of lobbies in the National Capital." (p. 43). One might equally well conclude that these investigations reflected reform more than they stimulated it.

[23] "The Lobby Exposed," loc. cit., p. 75.

[24] These bills called for either prohibition of various lobbying methods, or for registration of lobbyists.

Near-regulation and investigation, 1927–29

The investigations of 1913 had injured several reputations and forced a number of notorious lobbyists to leave town, but pressure group activity did not diminish as a consequence. Lobbying activity, in fact, became steadily more intense. The world war prompted a greater vertical mobilization of industry, which in turn resulted in a substantial increase of economic groups and associations.[25] This increase in interest alinements combined with the war-spurred development of propaganda techniques to heighten pressure activities during the 1920's.

Apart from the occasional introduction of proposals for registration of lobbyists, Congress gave relatively little consideration to the problem during this period. It was not until 1927 that lobbying again came to the forefront of congressional and public attention. Interest was first provoked by the dubious character of many of the witnesses and organizations who had opposed the Federal estate tax before congressional committees during the Sixty-ninth Congress.[26] Congressional suspicions were aroused, and when the new Congress met in December 1927, a number of regulatory bills, resolutions of inquiry, and proposed rules amendments were immediately introduced in both Houses. One of these bills, a registration and reporting measure sponsored by Senator Caraway, was actually passed by the Senate in March 1928, but was pigeonholed in the House Judiciary Committee until the end of the Congress.[27]

Lobbying and the tariff

The big storm still lay ahead, however. On April 22, 1929, Senator Caraway reintroduced the resolution of inquiry which he had unsuccessfully offered in 1927.[28] The resolution was referred, and during the long summer nothing was heard of it. Meanwhile, the Senate Finance Committee was conducting hearings on the Smoot-Hawley Tariff bill. These two seemingly disparate matters were dramatically joined in the Senate on September 25, when Senator Harrison, following extended debate on tariff increases proposed by the Finance Committee, charged that:

"The rates upon which such increases may be based are determined by such methods as should cause the American people to revolt against them.[29]

Senator Harrison then read the following newspaper statement into the record:

"An executive of one of the country's most important lobbying organizations sat in the secret sessions of the Senate Finance Committee's tariff meetings, investigation by the Hearst newspapers disclosed today. * * *

"Charles L. Eyanson, assistant to the president of the Manufacturers Association of Connecticut, is that man.

"He admits he helped draft some of the provisions of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill.

"He acted as tariff 'expert' for Senator Hiram Bingham, Republican, of Connecticut, during June, July, and August when the Senate Committee was revising the bill's various schedules." [30]

[25] Herring, op. cit., p. 51.

[26] Ibid., pp. 253–254.

[27] 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. 1095. For editorial comment on the bill, see "To Tame the Lobbyist," Literary Digest, vol. 96 (Mar. 17, 1928), p. 11.

[28] 71st Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 20.

[29] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (Sept. 25, 1929), p. 3948.

[30] Ibid., p. 3949. E. E. Schattschneider's Politics, Pressures, and the Tariff (New York, 1935).

"Here is what this paper said," asserted Senator Harrison; "It calls for a reply." Senator Bingham attempted to justify his action on the ground of needing expert information in order to properly serve his constituents' best interests. The Senate does not appear to have been satisfied with the explanation, however, for 6 days later the Caraway resolution was passed and a Judiciary Subcommittee headed by Senator Caraway was authorized to investigate not only the Eyanson affair, but also the activities of all other "lobbying associations and lobbyists," their revenues and expenditures, and "the effort they put forth to affect legislation." How far did this authorization extend? Senator Caraway had very decided ideas on the matter. When asked if the resolution were broad enough to allow investigation of the "social lobby," he replied, "Yes, sir; it is broad enough to investigate anything in which one might feel interested." [31]

Investigating trees rather than the forest

During the course of its investigation, the committee heard from some 92 witnesses whose testimony filled over 5,000 pages. The hearings, which began on October 15, 1929, were not finally terminated until November 24, 1931.[32] What did this lengthy and detailed investigation accomplish? In the first instance, it brought forth massive proof of the charges which had been made against Senator Bingham. The Senate had sought expert aid on tariff questions, and the president of the Connecticut Manufacturers Association had supplied Mr. Eyanson to provide it. Eyanson continued to draw his private salary but at the same time accepted employment as a clerk to Senator Bingham. He returned his Government salary to the the Senator, who, in turn, forwarded the money to the permanent clerk who had been dismissed to make room for Eyanson's appointment.

If nothing else, the Caraway committee report on the affair showed that Senator Bingham had used bad judgment and that Eyanson has pursued his employment as clerk with conspicuous success.[33] These disclosures alone, however, were hardly enough to warrant an investigation which extended for almost 2 years. As had been the case with certain of the more disreputable NAM activities in 1913, the offenses exposed were trivial in importance. But while the House committee of 1913 had placed the whole pattern of NAM pressure operations in a broad and thoughtful framework, the Caraway committee seemed content to take its data where it found it and to present this data without attempting to organize it or to evaluate its significance.

This apparent lack of basic orientation was revealed in the subsequent reports which the Caraway committee submitted to the Senate.[34] Each of these reports dealt only with

[31] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (Sept. 25, 1929), p. 4115.

[32] U. S. Congress, Senate Committee on the Judiciary, Lobby Investigation, Hearings, befor a subcommittee, 71st Cong., 1st, 2d, and 3d sessions; 72d Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1930, 1931, 1932).

[33] 71st Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 43, pt. 1, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (October 26, 1929), p. 4922. See also Lobby Investigation, Hearings, pp. 149–296. Senator Walsh, of Montana, alleged that Eyanson's advice had resulted in increases in 44 of 52 commodities of interest to Connecticut manufacturers. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71 (October 16, 1929), p. 4925.

[34] S. Rept. 43, pt. 2, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 71, p. 5393; pts. 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72, pp. 352, 993, 1568, 3069, 3071, 9268, 9330, and 11151, respectively.

a single individual or a single pressure organization. There was, for example, a separate report on Mr. Joseph R. Grundy by reason of the "extraordinary and commanding place he holds among the lobbyists in the National Capital." There was no suggestion that Mr. Grundy had acted illegally; the committee merely concluded that "the consumer does not figure at all in Mr. Grundy's views in respect to tariff legislation." This information was no more novel than was the committee's irresistible inference that Mr. Grundy believed that his campaign-fund raising services would enable him to influence his party associates in Congress.[35]

There were other reports in similar vein, each of which drew attention to some particularly notorious or free-spending lobbyist or pressure group.[36] These reports detailed the money spent and received, the methods employed, and the legislation in which the individual or organization was interested. They did not, however, suggest means by which the situation could be improved. The committee never proposed the enactment of a lobbying law, a surprising omission in view of Senator Caraway's earlier efforts in this direction. The committee did not, in fact, submit a final or general report of any kind. It neither summarized its activities nor proposed any correctives for the abuses which it had found.

Another factor which sapped the initial promise of the investigation was the development of political antagonisms among the members of the committee. The first six reports were submitted unanimously, but with the seventh, Senator Robinson, of Indiana, the only administration Republican in the group, felt obliged to leave his colleagues and submit a minority report. Senator Robinson charged that the majority report was purely political condemnation of Mr. C. H. Huston, who happened to be chairman of the Republican National Committee.[37] Senator Robinson dissented from the eighth report on similar grounds and presented his separate views.[38] Thereafter there was considerable discord within the committee as regards both its purposes and its jurisdiction.

The very time for which the investigation extended was also a factor which limited its utility. When the investigation began in 1929, there was reason to believe that it could serve as the motive force behind congressional adoption of a system of pressure-group regulation. Particularly after the Eyanson disclosures, a substantial body of editorial opinion demanded the adoption of a regulatory law, or a code of practice, or an enforced code of ethics.[39] But the Caraway committee proposed nothing: it merely reported. The iron cooled very rapidly after October 1929, and the Caraway Committee never succeeded in reheating it.

Finally, Senator Caraway's attitude toward lobbying undoubtedly contributed to the practical failure of the investigation. He did not treat political pressure as an inevitable concomitant of economic development, nor did he recognize that this pressure was effecting vast changes in the representative system. Rather he believed that lobbyists were greedy and dishonest and that 90 percent of the associations in Washington were what he called fake organizations.[40] Thus the Senator's incessant badgering of witnesses, noticeable in the must cursory examination of the committee hearings, may well have sprung from his determination to buttress his existing convictions about the dishonesty of lobbyists as a group. Whatever the cause, the results were frequently more tasteless and time-consuming than they were informative.

These factors, then, combined to make the investigation a rather sharp disappointment. It threw some light on the development of pressure group methods, particularly in electoral campaigns, and it indirectly reaffirmed the major conclusions of the investigations of 1913; namely, that overt corruption was infrequent and that group pressures had to a very great extent replaced personal solicitation. But given the broad scope of the enabling resolution and the initial receptiveness of congressional and editorial opinion to regulatory proposals, the drawn-out and uncoordinated reports submitted by the Caraway committee were less than might reasonably have been expected.

Congressional action in 1935–36

For the 4 years following the Caraway investigation Congress was quiescent concerning lobbying. Occasional proposals to regulate or investigate lobbying were introduced without success. But with the seating of the Seventy-fourth Congress, there began a period of lobby-busting which was ultimately more significant than either of its predecessors. As in 1913 and 1929, the impetus to congressional action was provided by the particularly extensive pressure exerted in connection with a single piece of legislation. In 1913 and 1929, lobbying on tariff bills led to investigations: in 1935 the legislation at issue was the Wheeler-Rayburn bill to regulate public utility holding companies.

Even prior to 1935 the series of monthly Federal Trade Commission reports on public utility corporations, submitted over the period from March 1923 to December 1935, had amassed impressively detailed information on the pressure and promotional activities of these companies.[41] The methods by which they opposed the Wheeler-Rayburn bill were not wholly new ones, but because they were excessively used they attracted Nation-wide attention.

Congress was well aware of the utilities' efforts to escape regulation. As the House Rules Committee reported subsequent to the passage of the Holding Company Act, the campaign waged in opposition to the measure was probably as "comprehensive, as well-managed, as persistent, and as well-financed as any in the history of the country." [42]

Nor was the congressional recognition of extreme pressure wholly retrospective. Before the Wheeler-Rayburn bill ever came to a vote the Senate had acted favorably on a lobbyist registration measure sponsored by Senator Black.[43] The House took no action on the bill during the remainder of the session, but shortly after the passage of the Holding Company Act both Houses took steps to investigate the pressure which had been exerted for and against the measure. The Senate authorized a special committee of five Senators, headed by Senator Black, to investigate all efforts to promote or retard the passage of the Holding Company Act "or any other matter or proposal affecting legislation." The committee was charged with reporting to the Senate as soon as possible the results of its investigation together with its recommendations.[44]

The utility-lobby investigation

In the House the investigation was authorized with respect only to attempts to influence legislation affecting holding companies during the Seventy-fourth Congress.[45] While the Senate investigation was to be conducted by a special committee, the House investigation was made the responsibility of the already overtaxed Rules Committee. There was, in addition, a hard core of opposition to the House investigation on the ground that Congress already knew that every big utility company had had lobbyists in Washing to keep the Wheeler-Rayburn bill from passing. As Representative Blanton put it: "No new facts will be developed that will be worth 5 cents to the people." [46]

This prophecy partially matured, at least with respect to the House investigation. The Rules Committee held hearings only between July 9 and August 23. A large part of these hearings, furthermore, were dedicated to an examination of charges by Representative BREWSTER, of Maine, that Thomas G. Corcoran, a key administration strategist, had attempted to coerce him into supporting the Wheeler-Rayburn bill by threatening to block clearance of the Passamaquoddy project, in which BREWSTER was particularly interested.[47] The case was colorful, even brazen, but it was trifling when compared to the enormous pressures brought to bear by the private utilities.

When the Rules Committee did turn to an investigation of these pressures, it became embroiled with the Black committee over the custody of a witness, Mr. H. C. Hopson of the Associated Gas & Electric Co. It is perhaps significant that the only response of the House to its Rules Committee's request for authority to arrest Mr. Hopson was the introduction of a resolution to return the committee's unexpended funds to the General Treasury.[48]

The Rules Committee submitted one six-page report on its investigation to the House, and this almost 6 months after hearings had ended.[49] This report, inaccurately labeled "preliminary," agreed that there had been a widespread and well-organized campaign in opposition to the Holding Company Act. The report did not condemn the campaign per se, but rather decried it because it appeared to have been excessive. Thus it scored as "arrogant" Mr. Hopson's candid admission that his company had spent $900,000 in an effort to defeat the "death sentence" for utilities. No question was raised as to the ethics of this particular use of investors' money.

The excessiveness of the campaign notwithstanding, the committee seemed to have little faith in its own investigation. The report moodily concluded:

"The truth is that coming (as the investigations do) after the legislation in question has been disposed of, they are too much like closing the stable door after the horse has departed, usually leaving a very dim and uncertain trail." [50]

The Senate investigation had its limitations, but self-doubt was not one of them. The Black committee fought a lively skirmish with the House Rules Committee over

[35] S. Rept. 43, pt. 3, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72 (December 10, 1929), p. 352.

[36] E. g., the American Taxpayers' League (pt. 4), the Million-Dollar Sugar Lobby (pt. 5), the Muscle Shoals Lobby (pt. 7).

[37] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 72 (May 21, 1930), p. 9269.

[38] Ibid, p. 9331.

[39] A Show-Down on Lobbying, Christian Century, vol. 46 (October 16, 1929), p. 1269; Fifth Estate, World's Work, vol. 58 (December 1929), pp. 34–35; W. P. Hard, Consider the Ethics of Lobbying, Nation's Business, vol. 17 (October 1929), pp. 50–52.

[40] Herring, op. cit., p. 259.

[41] Utility corporations, 70th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. 92, pts. 71a (Efforts by Associations and Agencies of Electric and Gas Utilities To Influence Public Opinion, 1934), and 81a (Publicity and Propaganda Activities by Utility Groups and Companies, 1935).

[42] 74th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. 2081, p. 3.

[43] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. 2512.

[44] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. Res. 165.

[45] 74th Cong., 1st sess., H. Res. 288.

[46] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79 (July 5, 1935), p. 10717.

[47] U. S. Congress, House, Committee on Rules, Investigation of Lobbying on Utility Holding Company Bills, Hearings, 74th Cong., 1st sess. (Washington, 1935), pp. 1–182.

[48] CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, vol. 79 (August 15, 1935), p. 13292.

[49] 74th Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. 2081.

[50] Ibid., p. 3.

the custody of Mr. Hopson. It later became involved with Mr. William Randolph Hearst over the seizure of certain telegrams which Hearst had sent to his employees concerning the Wheeler-Rayburn bill. This dispute was finally settled in the District of Columbia Court of Appeals in a manner which cast the committee's procedures in a distinctly unfavorable light.[51] Both the Hopson and Hearst episodes did considerable damage to the good public relations which the committee needed to bring its investigation to a fully successful conclusion.[52]

The Black committee further failed to submit either a final report or the recommendations which it had been charged with submitting as soon as practicable. It reported to the Senate only once, and this report was confined to a discussion of Mr. Hopson's failure to respond to the committee's summons.[53]

On the positive side, the Black investigation had at least one tangible consequence. The committee's carefully documented evidence on the utilities' campaign to defeat the Wheeler-Rayburn bill was certainly an important factor in the approval by the House on August 22, 1935, of the death sentence clause in only slightly modified form.[54]

The Black investigation was also significant from the purely procedural point of view. The committee's staff was painstakingly attentive to details, and this careful spadework contributed significantly to the nature and conduct of the investigation. To give but one example, Senator Black submitted sworn statements from telegraph office managers in 20 towns which indicated that of 31,580 telegrams sent to Washington regarding the Holding Company Act, all but 13 were filed and paid for by utility company agents, almost invariably without the consent of the person whose name was used.[55] Nor is this example an isolated one. Throughout the committee's hearings an abundance of comparable evidence was introduced on other facets of the utilities' campaign. This documentation both speeded up the committee's hearings and gave substance to its findings.

But beyond its contribution to the passage of the Wheeler-Rayburn bill and its demonstration of the possibilities of the documentary approach, it is doubtful whether the Black investigation had any other lasting value. The committee developed a fairly full picture of a particularly intensive pressure campaign, but it left untapped a great part of the broad investigatory power which it had been granted. It failed to give any essentially new insight into either the methods or significance of organized group action. And, finally, if it is presumed that an investigation means little unless it stimulates congressional action, one would have to concede that even this relatively well-conducted investigation was a failure.

CONCLUSION: APPLYING THE PAST TO THE PRESENT

It would be extravagant to predict that the new investigation will succeed only insofar as it transcends limitations which have marred earlier investigations. Certainly the subject matter involved is too broad, too complex, and too fluid to be dealt with purely in terms of methods which have succeeded or failed in the past. Every investigation has been addressed to a specific situation which can have no exact counterpart. These reservations notwithstanding, past experience strongly suggests a few general conclusions as to the most viable means of conducting a lobbying investigation. Let it be noted that these conclusions are offered only as rules of thumb; no stronger term is possible.

First, considerable research should precede the actual hearings. It seems safe to say that this has never been done in the past, and that the investigations have suffered as a consequence. This research should begin with an analysis of past investigations and a survey of the literature on both pressure groups and pressure-group regulation. Assuming that the Buchanan committee is particularly concerned with improving the present Lobbying Act, this research should also include a careful examination of the act's operation over the past 3 years and a parallel examination of the content and efficiency of State regulation of lobbying laws.

Second, an agenda for hearings should be established and adhered to. Here the Buchanan committee is in a particularly favorable position. Past investigations have come in immediate response to charges of heavy pressure on specific matters. The committees have usually probed these charges with great initial energy, but when this source has been thoroughly mined the investigations have usually petered out in planless confusion, the House inquiry of 1913 being the one notable exception. The present investigation is addressed to a general situation rather than to specific cases, and this fact should enable the Buchanan committee to plan its work more carefully than did any of its predecessors.

Third, the committee should make every effort not to let its hearings bog down into a welter of interesting but trivial detail. Here again the example of the House investigation of 1913 is worth following, while the Black committee's hyperscrupulous attention to the utilities' telegram campaign in 1935 is an obvious case of the extreme to be avoided.

Fourth, the committee should strive to avoid an overly caustic treatment of witnesses or an excessive use of its subpena power. The experience of the Caraway and Black committees on these points is persuasive. The temptation may be overwhelming, but untoward grilling or unnecessary seizure of evidence tends to turn the public against such an investigating committee.

Fifth, the provocation and maintenance of congressional and public interest in the investigation is essential. To this end, the committee should submit interim progress reports on its work as did the Caraway committee in 1929 and 1930. A final report embodying the committee's recommendations for revision of the Lobbying Act is even more important, particularly since the hope that the committee can find means of strengthening the present act is a central reason for its existence.

Sixth, the committee should take steps to avoid the development of the internal political cleavages which so seriously handicapped the latter part of the Caraway investigation. The present committee's authority to study the Government lobby is potential political dynamite and is, therefore, liable to become a serious divisive factor. One can only hope that the Buchanan committee will approach this problem cautiously, with full awareness that the publicity activities of Government agencies are not strictly comparable to those of private interest groups and require different techniques for both investigation and regulation.

These suggestions relate primarily to procedure. It is somewhat more difficult to indicate the proper scope of the investigation since this is so largely a function of the substantive purposes which the investigation is designed to serve. On this point, the Buchanan committee has not yet clearly declared itself.

What purposes can an investigation of this kind serve? There would appear to be two primary alternatives, both of which may be present at once: the investigation can be a means for the development of an improved system of regulation, or it can be a medium for the development of information. Every previous investigation has centered on this second alternative to the exclusion of the first, and it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that this choice has usually been unfortunate. This past experience, buttressed by the general limitations of the congressional investigatory process, suggests that the Buchanan committee is unlikely to make a comprehensive, meaningful, or informative analysis of group pressures on Government. It is highly doubtful for example, that the committee could add much more than recent detail to the broad coverage, the basic and penetrating orientation of Donald Blaisdell's TNEC monograph, Economic Power and Political Pressure.

It would appear, therefore, that the present investigation can be of greatest service in fulfillment of the first purpose, i. e., the development of improved regulation. This is not to suggest that the Buchanan committee could or should rewrite the Lobbying Act without a fairly broad investigation into the whole pattern of pressure group activities, particularly into those parts of the pattern such as institutional and editorial advertising, or other indirect pressure practices whose standing under the present act is uncertain. Information and regulation cannot be wholly divorced; it is, rather, a question of emphasis. Effective regulation should be the first consideration, not because further information in unnecessary but rather because a congressional committee is simply not equipped to provide this information in a complete or well-integrated way. The Buchanan committee should do that which is most urgent and that which it can do best. On either score, its primary task is to find democratic solutions for the problem of political pressure.

[51] Judge Groner held that the seizure had been unlawful, but that complaint had been made too late to affect the committee's use of the material. *Hearst* v. *Black* (87 Fed. (2d) 68 (1936)).

[52] See, as examples of critical comment, Black Booty, Time, vol. 2 (March 16, 1936), pp. 17–18; New York Times, March 15, 1936, see, IV, p. 10.

[53] 74th Cong., 1st sess., S. Rept. 1272.

[54] McGeary, M. N., the Development of Congressional Investigative Power (New York, 1940), p. 40.

[55] U. S. Congress, Senate, Special Committee To Investigate Lobbying Activities, hearings, 74th Cong., 1st and 2d sess., 75th Cong., 3d sess. (Washington, 1935–38), pp. 1014–15.

Control of Coal Supplies in the State of New York

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, in line with my remarks of February 17 and my insertion in the Appendix of the RECORD, page A1179, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD, chapter 15 of the Laws of 1950, State of New York, which is the text of "An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies" approved by Governor Dewey on February 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

An act providing emergency measures for the control of coal supplies

The people of the State of New York, represented in the Senate and assembly, do enact as follows:

SECTION 1. Legislative finding: The legislature hereby finds that in the State of New

York the exhaustion and scarcity of coal constitute a public emergency directly affecting the health, safety, and welfare of the residents of the people of the State. At the present time such a scarcity exists. Coal supplies in important cities are so reduced that industrial establishments have been forced to stop work and there is danger of widespread further stoppages. Unless coal mining is resumed immediately, existing and anticipated supplies of solid fuels will be insufficient to assure the continued operation of hospitals, water systems, sewage systems, food processing plants, schools, and other facilities essential to the health, welfare, and safety of the people. It is therefore necessary that the distribution and use of solid fuels be regulated in order to ensure the continuance, as long as may be possible of services, activities, and functions essential to the people of the State.

SEC. 2. Solid fuels administrator: There is established in the Department of Public Works, the office of solid fuels administrator. The head of the office shall be the solid fuels administrator who shall be appointed by the Governor and serve during his pleasure. In the event that he should not be a public officer or employee, he may receive compensation to be fixed by the Governor within the amount made available by appropriation therefore. He shall be reimbursed for his actual expenses necessarily incurred in the performance of his duties. With the approval of the Governor, he may employ such assistants as he deems necessary and fix their compensation within the amounts made available by appropriation therefor.

SEC. 3. Definitions: (a) The term "solid fuels" as used herein shall be termed to mean and include all forms of anthracite, bituminous, subbituminous, and lignitic coals. (b) The term "dealer" as used herein shall include any person employed or engaged in the business of selling, transporting, or distributing solid fuels at wholesale or retail.

SEC. 4. Powers of the administrator: The administrator shall have the following powers and duties: (a) To establish a system of preferences in the use of solid fuels.

(b) To ration and allocate supplies of solid fuels in the possession of or subject to the control of a dealer and assign priorities with respect thereto.

(c) To limit, regulate, or prohibit the sale, transportation, delivery, or transfer of solid fuels in the possession or subject to the control of a dealer.

(d) To restrict the use of solid fuels by ordering the full-time, part-time, or intermittent closing of any building, facility, or plant in connection with which solid fuel is used for any purpose and to restrict the use of electric power, gas, steam, and other products requiring solid fuels in their manufacture.

(e) To adopt, promulgate, and make effective plans, regulations, rules, and orders to implement and carry out the purposes of this act.

(f) To make such investigations and surveys as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act and to inspect the premises or property, books, records, and other writings of any person, partnership, company, or corporation. Except in accordance with proper judicial order or as otherwise provided by law, it shall be unlawful for the administrator or for any person who is permitted to inspect any book, record, or writing which has been produced in accordance with this paragraph or to whom any information contained in any report or record as a result of the production thereof pursuant to this paragraph, to divulge or make known in any manner any of the particulars set forth or disclosed in any book, record, or writing hereunder. Any violation of the provisions of this paragraph shall be punished by a fine not exceeding $1,000, or by imprisonment not exceeding 1 year, or both, at the discretion of the court.

SEC. 5. Standards: In establishing the preferences, rationing, allocations, and priorities provided for in the preceding section and in performing his other duties under this act, the administrator shall with respect to each use of solid fuels under consideration take into account:

1. The relationship of such use to the preservation of the health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State.

2. The consequences with respect to the health, welfare, and safety of the people of the State of the cessation or curtailment of such use.

3. The amount of solid fuels which such use requires.

4. The degree to which fuels other than solid fuels may be substituted with respect to such use.

5. The degree to which the public benefits of such use may be otherwise obtained.

SEC. 6. Prohibitions: No person shall sell, deliver, transfer, or otherwise distribute coal in violation of the rules, regulations, or orders of the administrator.

SEC. 7. Utilization of State and local agencies: The administrator is hereby empowered to direct or authorize any department, agency, or officer of the State or any political subdivision thereof to provide such facilities, personnel, assistance, and data as will enable him to carry out the purposes of this act.

SEC. 8. Exercise of powers through State and local agencies: The administrator may exercise any power, authority, or discretion conferred upon him by this act through any department, agency, or officer of the State or any political subdivision thereof in conformity with any rules or regulations which he may prescribe.

SEC. 9. Inconsistent laws: Superseded. All laws, general, special, or local, or parts thereof, which may be inconsistent with the provisions of this act shall be superseded and suspended in their operation to the extent that they are inconsistent with the provisions hereof or any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder.

SEC. 10. Injunctions: Whenever in the judgment of the administrator any person is engaged or is about to engage in any acts or practices which constitute or will constitute a violation of any provision of this act or of any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, the administrator, through the attorney general, may make application to the supreme court for an order enjoining such acts or practices, or for an order enforcing compliance with such provision, rule, regulation, or order, and upon a showing by the administrator that such person is engaged or is about to engage in any such acts or practices, a permanent or temporary injunction, restraining order, or other order shall be granted without bond.

SEC. 11. Penalties: Any person who willfully performs any act prohibited or willfully fails to perform any act required by any provision hereof or of any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, shall be guilty of a misdemeanor. Any public officer who willfully violates any such provision, rule, regulation, or order shall be subject to removal from office by the governor in the manner provided by law for the removal of sheriffs.

SEC. 12. Contract liabilities: No person shall be held liable for damages or penalties for any default under any contract or order which shall result directly or indirectly from compliance with this act or any rule, regulation, or order issued hereunder, notwithstanding that this act or any such rule, regulation, or order shall thereafter be declared by judicial or other competent authority to be invalid.

SEC. 13. Expiration date: The provisions of this act shall take effect immediately and shall continue in effect for 90 days.

Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER FERGUSON
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, one of the fundamental problems in the Government of the United States today is a blurring of the lines which mark the separation of powers between the three coordinate branches of legislature, executive, and judiciary. The distinctions are basic in the Constitution. Encroachments, particularly on the functions and powers of the legislature, are serious threats to representative government. On February 11 Senator BRICKER delivered a penetrating and scholarly address before the State of Illinois Bar Association at Peoria on one phase of this matter. The subject of his address was "Judicial Legislation: A Threat to Constitutional Government. His remarks are so significant that I feel they deserve permanent reference and I therefore ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

JUDICIAL LEGISLATION: A THREAT TO CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

(An address by Hon. JOHN W. BRICKER)

The paramount political issue of the day is that of liberty versus the planned economy of a socialist state. There are some, of course, who do not agree with Herbert Hoover that we are now on the last mile to collectivism. There are others who feel that the promised economic security is worth a substantial price in terms of individual freedom. It is not my intention this evening to restate my opposition to the so-called welfare state. That issue should be resolved by the Congress after the people have spoken in the elections of 1950 and 1952.

Unnoticed by the general public, however, is the increasing amount of judicial legislation which tends to make the votes of the people and the deliberations of Congress academic. In spite of the political beliefs which individual lawyers may hold, usurpation of legislative powers by the Supreme Court should lead to vigorous opposition on the part of all the members of the American bar.

First, let me emphasize that there is a vast amount of so-called judicial legislation which does not undermine the constitutional separation of legislative and judicial powers. One common type of legitimate judicial legislation arises out of the interpretation of statutes couched in such vague language that Congress has by implication delegated legislative power to the Court. Also, the Court frequently applies a statute to a specific situation never contemplated by Congress and where a decision either way would not contravene the intent of Congress as disclosed either in the statute or its legislative history. Judicial legislation of the type described does not upset the constitutional division of labor between the Court and Congress, however unwise some of it may seem.

By virtue of its power to determine the constitutionality of laws passed by the Congress, the Supreme Court also exercises what can be described as a legitimate legislative

function. Since 1937 the Court has refrained from junking legislation on constitutional grounds, and, to this extent, has increased the power and responsibility of Congress.

In the past 10 years, there has been increasing evidence of another type of judicial legislation which conflicts with article I, section 1 of the Constitution providing:

"All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress of the United States which shall consist of a Senate and House of Representatives."

It is this illegitimate judicial legislation to which my remarks this evening are directed. This judicial legislation springs from the insistence of a group of justices to establish, under the guise of statutory interpretation, their own preconceived notions of wise social and economic policy. Justices Black, Douglas, Murphy, and Rutledge comprised this group. They frequently succeeded in having one or more of the other Justices join them in resorting to some process of illegitimate statutory interpretation to reach a result coinciding with their own left-wing attitudes and opinions. In general, the political philosophy underlying judicial lawmaking is strikingly similar to that involved in State socialism. That philosophy consists of: (1) a desire that State regulation be superseded by Federal regulation; (2) hostility toward business in general and big business in particular; (3) an irrespressible sympathy for the under dog in both economic and political activities; (4) suspicion of the rich; (5) the conviction that labor organizations can do no wrong; and (6) the belief that administrative action should not be hampered by judicial review.

A collectivist society requires virtually complete centralization of all governmental powers. Because the draftsmen of the Constitution feared a strong central government, they not only divided authority at the national level, but reserved the bulk of political power to the States. That constitutional plan has been thwarted, of course, by decisions construing the welfare clause as conferring substantive powers on the Congress and by imaginative expansion of the interstate commerce clause. Nevertheless, Congress has generally been unwilling to supersede State regulation to the full extent permitted under recent constitutional doctrine. The Supreme Court, however, has been eager to centralize authority through the unwarranted expansion of existing legislation.

An example of this type of judicial legislation is the East Ohio Gas case,[1] decided on January 9 of this year, where the Court held that the Federal Power Commission's authority extended to a distributor of natural gas operating solely within the boundaries of a single State and selling gas only at retail. In spite of the clearly expressed desire of Congress not to intrude upon the area of effective State regulation, the East Ohio case sanctions overlapping regulation, nullifies an uncertain amount of State regulation, and, unless Congress acts, will lead to complete Federal regulation of the natural-gas industry. Other decisions by the Supreme Court involving electric power companies reveal a similar type of judicial legislation. Similarly, in the Southeastern Underwriters case[2] the Court cast aside prior judicial decisions accepted by numerous Congresses over a period of 75 years for the purpose of federalizing insurance regulation.

The centralizing influence of the Supreme Court's legislation is not confined to insurance and public-utility regulation. By now most lawyers are thoroughly familiar with the manner in which the Fair Labor Standards Act, the National Labor Relations Act, and other Federal laws have been thrust upon businesses as far removed from the stream of interstate commerce as the corner drug store and grocery store. In each case an unbiased examination of legislative history would have disclosed that Congress never intended its statutory definition of interstate commerce to be determined by any ingenious "house that Jack built chain of causation."[3]

There is a peculiar quirk in the mind of every socialist planner that employers who provide gainful employment to several hundred men and who compete for the consumer's favor are exploiters, but that the bureaucrat who fixes prices, allocates markets, and limits competition is a public benefactor. This curious thinking is reflected in much of the judicial legislation affecting business.

In the famous Cement case,[4] for example, the Court approved the fantastic theory of competition advanced by the Federal Trade Commission that manufacturers discriminate unless they net the same price from each customer. This mill-net theory, of course, is sufficient to outlaw all delivered pricing and freight absorption. Congress certainly never intended any such result because language having that result was deleted from the Robinson-Patman Act, and specific anti-basing-point legislation was rejected. The Cement case apparently requires many manufacturers to sell only on an f. o. b. mill basis. As a result many industries are threatened with balkanization; each company selling only within its freight-advantage territory. When the Department of Justice notes the rise of a series of local monopolies sponsored by the Federal Trade Commission, it may then invoke the Sherman Act. Unless Congress reverses the Cement-case legislation, lawyers will be placed in the unhappy position of offering their business clients a Hobson's choice.

Hostility toward business is also reflected in the Supreme Court's patent cases. Time does not permit me to delve into the intricacies of patent law. However, since the first patent law of 1790, Congress has tried to perform its constitutional duty of encouraging invention by granting to inventors an exclusive right to work their invention for a limited period. The extent to which the Court's legislation has been substituted for that of Congress is revealed in a recent dissent by Mr. Justice Jackson. Summarizing the effect of the Court's decisions on patent law during the past 10 years, Mr. Justice Jackson said: "The only patent that is valid is one which this Court has not been able to get its hands on."[5]

Evidence of the Court's hostility toward business is clearly evident in its expansion of the Sherman Act far beyond what the Congress of 1890 and subsequent Congresses intended. Quite appropriately, this law is now commonly referred to as the new Sherman Act, but it was amended not by Congress but by the Supreme Court. As a result, no lawyer can advise a company with any confidence that it is not a monopoly and not engaged in restraint of trade. Intent to monopolize or to restrain trade is now immaterial. Competition which hurts competitors is suspect. Patent uses held valid under numerous Court decisions, and accepted by the Congress, are now invalid.[6] Meeting the price of competitors has become per se proof of conspiracy. In short, the Supreme Court has given the Federal Trade Commission and the Department of Justice blanket authority to harass business at will.

For many years Socialists have been preoccupied with the plight of the economic and political under dog. Unfortunately, the sometimes sincere desire to help the less fortunate means that rules of law must be twisted and bent beyond all recognition. The Supreme Court has been motivated by the same compassionate instincts, sometimes laudable, but generally doing violence to the principle of equal justice under the law.

In the Federal Employers Liability Act, Congress established negligence as the rule of liability. By the simple process of never reversing a judgment in favor of the worker and never failing to reverse a directed verdict for the carrier, the Court has transformed that act into one of absolute liability.[7] It has done the same thing in many cases for the benefit of injured seamen.[8] In fact, its sympathy for injured railroad employees was so great that it permitted them to shop for the most liberal forum regardless of established rules relating to the convenience of the carrier and of the Court.[9] It may be true that the Federal Employers Liability Act is outmoded, but the Supreme Court has no constitutional right to act as a legislative reformer by making the act a workmen's compensation statute.

There has always been a close affinity between socialism and communism. This is only natural since both have the same ends, the only difference being in the method and speed of attainment. In at least three cases, Communists or Communist sympathizers have been the beneficiaries of judicial legislation.

In the case involving Harry Bridges,[10] the Attorney General and two lower courts found substantial evidence of Bridges' membership in the Communist Party and ordered his deportation. The statute provided that the decision of the Attorney General should be final. Nevertheless, the Supreme Court reviewed the proceeding de novo and reversed on the ground that some hearsay evidence had been introduced. With much more tenuous support in the evidence, the Supreme Court has affirmed findings of the Labor Board and most other administrative agencies. It should be obvious that Congress did not intend to give Communists a broader type of judicial review than that available to American citizens of unquestioned loyalty.

In the Schneiderman case,[11] an avowed and ardent disciple of communism escaped denaturalization through the Court's rationalization that a spreader of communism can be attached to the principles of the United States Constitution within the meaning of the naturalization laws. It should be unnecessary to add that no Congress has ever believed that a man can be genuinely attached to both the Communist manifesto and the United States Constitution.

In a case decided last year, the Court set aside the conviction of Harold Christoffel for perjury before the congressional committee, because there was some evidence that only 11 Congressmen, 2 short of a quorum, heard the lie that he was not a Communist.[12] The Court disregarded prior decisions, established parliamentary authority, and the custom and practice of Congress for over 150 years that a quorum is presumed to continue unless a point of no quorum is raised.

A common delusion under which all Socialists and planners labor is that the wealthy have an inexhaustible pool of money which can be tapped at will for what they conceive

---

[1] *Federal Power Commission* v. *East Ohio Gas Co.*, 18 U. S. Law Week 4080.

[2] *United States* v. *Southeastern Underwriters Association*, 322 U. S. 533 (1944).

[3] *See Borden Co.* v. *Borella*, 325 U. S. 679 (1945).

[4] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Cement Institute*, 333 U. S. 683 (1948).

[5] *Jungerson* v. *Baden*, 335 U. S. 560 (1948).

[6] E. g., *United States* v. *Line Material Co.*, 333 U. S. 287 (1948); *Scott Paper Co.* v. *Marcalus Manufacturing Co.*, 326 U. S. 249 (1945).

[7] See concurring opinion of Frankfurter, J., in *Wilkerson* v. *McCarthy*, 336 U. S. 53, 64 (1949), for a review of the Court's decisions over the past 10 years.

[8] *Johnson* v. *United States*, 333 U. S. 46 (1948).

[9] *Miles* v. *Illinois Central Railroad Co.*, 315 U. S. 698 (1942).

[10] *Bridges* v. *Wixon*, 326 U. S. 135 (1945).

[11] *Schneiderman* v. *United States*, 320 U. S. 118 (1943).

[12] *Christoffel* v. *United States*, 338 U. S. 84 (1949).

to be the common good. It has been discovered in England, and it is rapidly being found out here, that persons of modest means pay the cost of social and economic experimentation. The Supreme Court's ability to redistribute wealth has been necessarily limited. However, those of you who deal with tax questions can appreciate that the Court has made some progress in that direction.

In the famous Clifford case [13] the Court plugged a sizable loophole in the income-tax law. However, it was a loophole which the Congress, in providing for a different method of taxation for trusts and individuals, had expressly refused to close. In common with most judicial legislation, the Court's Clifford rule proved so vague and confusing both to tax lawyers and the lower courts that the Treasury was forced to implement it with a body of administrative legislation. What has been said with reference to the Clifford case applies also to the Court's family-partnership cases.[14]

The Court has been no less ingenious in milking large estates. In the Spiegel case,[15] for example, the Court sustained a $450,000 tax on the estate of a decedent because of a possibility of reverter, which, if it existed, was never worth more than $4,000. Speaking for the Court, Mr. Justice Black refused to consider the future-interests law of Illinois to see if the tenuous possibility on which the tax rested did in fact exist.

It is indeed ironic that workers who suffer most under a totalitarian regime have, through their labor organizations, supplied the springboard to power. Much of the Supreme Court's legislation reflects the attitude that labor organizations, in spite of their economic power, should not be hampered by any legal restrictions.

The outstanding example of judicial legislation in this field is the famous Hutcheson case.[16] Although Congress in the Norris-LaGuardia Act had banned the injunction remedy for certain acts of labor unions outlawed under the antitrust laws, the Court proceeded to repeal all other remedies for labor union antitrust violations. The work of removing labor unions from the reach of the Sherman Act was completed in the Carpenters case,[17] where the Court immunized labor unions from liability for the unlawful acts of their duly authorized agents. Other decisions of the Court have sanctioned labor union violence,[18] forbidden by Congress in the Antiracketeering Act, and kickbacks of wages to dishonest union officials,[19] clearly outlawed by the Kickback Act of 1934.

In Dr. Friederich Hayek's brilliant work, the Road to Serfdom, chapter 6 is devoted to planning and the rule of law. The first two sentences of that chapter are:

"Nothing distinguishes more clearly conditions in a free country from those in a country under arbitrary government than the observance in the former of the great principles known as the rule of law. Stripped of all technicalities, this means that government in all its actions is bound by rules fixed and announced beforehand—rules which make it possible to foresee with fair certainty how the authority will use its coercive powers in given circumstances and to plan one's individual affairs on the basis of this knowledge." (P. 72.)

If you fully understand the meaning of those sentences, you will appreciate why the symbol of justice wears a blindfold. It simply means that justice is based on standards which are both rational and communicable, and above all else impersonal. In other words, in a free society justice is dispensed in accordance with definite rules which in themselves prevent arbitrary action for or against particular individuals. In a collectivist society, those who plan the details of the lives of the people necessarily require power of such magnitude that it cannot be tested by any definite act of the legislature. The authority granted to the OPA, for example, meant that whatever action it might take in controlling prices would be legal. The growing trend toward what Dean Pound has described as administrative authoritarianism is due in part to legislation by the Supreme Court.

In the Dobson case,[20] the Supreme Court completely nullified the law providing that decisions of the Tax Court not in accordance with law should be reversible on appeal. The Court, on behalf of itself and the circuit courts, abdicated authority to review Tax Court decisions not showing at first blush a serious legal error.

In numerous cases involving the definition of employee, the Court, contrary to the intent of Congress, has relinquished the burden of interpretation to the administrative agency involved. Until the decisions of the Court were reversed by Congress, the Labor Board, and the Treasury Department under the Social Security Act, were empowered to define employee under vague standards of the broad social purpose of the legislation, instead of the usual common law test intended by Congress.[21]

By abdicating powers of judicial review, the Supreme Court has granted to many administrative agencies arbitrary power over the businesses they regulate. In cases involving, for example, the Federal Power Commission,[22] the Federal Trade Commission,[23] and the Securities and Exchange Commission,[24] the Court held, in effect, that Congress intended the courts to give rubber-stamp approval to the actions of those agencies because of their presumed expertness.

What are the dangers involved in judicial legislation inasmuch as Congress has already corrected many of the examples already discussed?

First. The desire of Congress to reestablish its original intent can be thwarted by a Presidential veto.

Second. Considerable time is required for Congress to correct judicial legislation as shown by the aftermath of the Cement case. This increased work has been thrust upon Congress at a time when its responsibilities with relation to foreign affairs and national security have been greatly increased.

Third. Correction of some judicial legislation subjects the Congress to unwarranted, but perfectly natural, criticism. The general public still assumes, almost instinctively, that the Supreme Court should be immune from criticism, because, unlike Congress, it is emotionally unconcerned about the desirability or undesirability of particular legislation. In 1947, for example, the Congress wiped out retroactively the effect of the Court's portal-to-portal legislation imposing a multi-billion-dollar liability on business and the Government. It is only natural that many wage earners would be bitter about the action of Congress in taking away the money so generously promised by the Court.

Fourth. Some judicial legislation is virtually beyond the power of correction because the Court has blinded itself to socially desirable practices and equitable principles, universally recognized but difficult to express in legislative form.

Fifth. Judicial legislation, because it is generally retroactive and incomplete, befuddles the lower courts and lawyers until such time as Congress makes the necessary correction.

Sixth. Judicial legislation, sooner or later, must lock the Supreme Court and Congress in another open struggle for power in which the reputation of both may be damaged.

There is no more important work which members of the bar can undertake than to devote their exceptional talents to a study of judicial legislation. The separation of legislative and judicial power is one worthy of eternal vigilance, because the judiciary owes no responsibility to the electorate. The impending struggle between the Court and Congress concerns the right of the people, through their elected representatives, to make the laws under which they choose to live. Lawyers, whatever their political affiliation, should be willing to work together toward seeing that the right of the people to rule shall never be impaired.

[13] *Helvering* v. *Clifford*, 309 U. S. 331 (1940).
[14] *Commissioner* v. *Tower*, 327 U. S. 280 (1946).
[15] *Spiegel* v. *Commissioner*, 335 U. S. 701 (1949).
[16] *United States* v. *Hutcheson*, 312 U. S. 219 (1941).
[17] *United Brotherhood of Carpenters* v. *United States*, 330 U. S. 395 (1947).
[18] *United States* v. *Local 807*, 315 U. S. 521 (1942).
[19] *Carbone* v. *United States*, 327 U. S. 633 (1946).
[20] *Dobson* v. *Commissioner*, 320 U. S. 489 (1943).
[21] *Labor Board* v. *Hearst Publications, Inc.*, 322 U. S. 11 (1944); *Silk* v. *United States*, 331 U. S. 704 (1947).
[22] *Federal Power Commission* v. *Hope Natural Gas Co.*, 320 U. S. 591 (1944).
[23] *Federal Trade Commission* v. *Morton Salt Co.*, 334 U. S. 37 (1948).
[24] *Securities and Exchange Commission* v. *Chenery Corp.*, 332 U. S. 194 (1947).

Jefferson-Jackson Day Dinner Address by the President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the Jefferson-Jackson Day dinner speech of the President of the United States is included herewith under the unanimous consent granted me. In this speech, delivered on February 16 to more than 5,000 Democrats at the dinner and to a radio audience of millions, President Harry S. Truman outlined clearly the forward-looking goals of the Democratic Party, and the means of achieving those goals. The President made clear the contrast between the two major parties. The Democratic Party looks forward to the future with faith and confidence, while the Republican Party yearns for the past predicting a gloomy future.

Fellow Democrats, this is a most remarkable dinner.

This dinner and others like it throughout the land are evidence of the growing strength of the Democratic Party. They show that our party is determined, more than ever before, to carry its message to the voters of this country.

It is very significant that such great interest and enthusiasm are being shown in a congressional election year. We know that congressional elections are as important as Presidential elections. We found out in

1946 how much harm can be done to our country when a congressional election goes wrong. We are not going to let that happen again. We don't want another do-nothing Eightieth Congress.

These dinners carry forward a great tradition. The original Jefferson-Jackson dinner was held in this city in 1830, 120 years ago. It was given in memory of Thomas Jefferson, and its guest of honor was President Jackson. At that first Jefferson-Jackson dinner President Jackson gave his famous toast: "Our Federal Union, it must be preserved."

Tonight we meet again to think of our Federal Union, to be thankful that it has been preserved, and that it has grown in strength and in service to the people. As in Jackson's time we meet to discuss some of the problems that our country faces.

We have some very serious problems today. We are living in a troubled period of the world's history. Our responsibilities as a Nation have never been so great, and the decisions we face have never been more difficult. We confront serious questions of foreign policy. We have the problem of maintaining an adequate national defense. We have the task of maintaining prosperity and protecting our economy from depression. We have the question of handling the Nation's finances and the national debt.

These are grave issues. And the Democratic Party is meeting them squarely. We do not believe in trifling with the people about these issues. We do not offer to solve them with vague generalities or worn-out slogans. We know that the solution of these problems requires all the wisdom and energy we possess as a Nation. We know that their solution requires heavy expenditures. The Democratic Party does not propose to deceive the people either about the problems we face or the cost of solving them.

The Democratic Party has confidence that the United States will meet these great responsibilities. It knows that the United States is a dynamic, growing Nation. We believe that this country will make as much progress in the next 50 years as it has made in the last 50 years.

But we cannot meet the responsibilities of today or the challenge of the future by following the outmoded concepts of 50 years ago. The promise of the twentieth century cannot be fulfilled by those who would like to return to the days of McKinley.

We must go forward with our programs for peace through defense and foreign aid. We must proceed with our domestic programs for health, education, social security, and economic stability. Both our foreign programs and our domestic programs are necessary to answer the demands which this critical period of history makes upon us. We cannot have prosperity at home unless we play our full part in the defense and the revival of other free nations. We cannot have peace abroad unless we increase the strength, the freedom, and the well-being of our people at home.

There are some who would like to see us turn our backs upon the rest of the world and drop our efforts to strengthen our domestic economy. At the present time they are spreading the mistaken idea that we can save money by going backward. They advocate slashing our expenditures for peace and for our domestic programs. These people are blind to the problems that confront us. They can see that a tax cut would help their own pocketbooks temporarily. They fail to see that in the long run false economy would endanger not only their pocketbooks but their lives and the continuation of civilization itself.

It is true that our present expenditures are large. But the Democratic administration is working toward a balance in the Federal budget. I wish we could balance the budget immediately by the simple expedient of cutting expenses. But that is out of the question. More than 70 percent of our Federal budget goes to pay for past wars and to work for peace in the future. Anyone who says that these expenditures are extravagant does not understand the kind of world we live in. Our other expenditures are less than one-third of the budget, and less in proportion to the national income than they were 10 years ago.

I would like to cut expenditures further, and I intend to do so at every opportunity. But I do not propose to weaken the strength and security of this country. I do not propose to place the peace of the world in jeopardy to satisfy the advocates of false economy.

In this difficult world situation some people are talking about general tax reductions. I regard this as political hypocrisy. We had one recent experience with an ill-timed, irresponsible tax cut. Much of our present financial difficulty is the result of the sweeping tax reduction which was enacted in 1948 over my veto—at a time when expenditures for defense and foreign policy were inevitably rising. We must not make the same mistake again.

In this election year the Democratic Party will not play politics with the Federal budget. We will state the honest truth about the budget, just as we will about all other issues. We believe that the people are entitled to the plain facts about every issue, so that they can make up their own minds.

The Democratic Party can afford to be frank and truthful, because it is working for the general welfare of all our citizens. It does not serve any narrow group or clique. This makes it easy for the Democratic Party to put its program before the country openly and completely. We have nothing to hide from the people. Our strength lies in explaining our program and our policies to the people. And the more thoroughly we explain to them what the Democratic Party is trying to do, the more certain we can be of their continued support.

There are many differences between the Democratic and the Republican Parties. But I think the greatest difference is that the Democratic Party is the party of affirmative action—it is for measures to achieve prosperity and progress. The Republican Party is the party of negative inaction—it is always against things.

The principal thing that Republicans are against, of course, is the Democratic Party. But they can't win on that plank alone. They must try to find reasons for being against the Democratic Party. They must persuade people to vote against the Democratic Party. And that is getting harder and harder to do.

One reason it is hard to do is that the Republican Party has no affirmative program of its own. It refuses to face the problems of our economy. It refuses to take thought and make plans for the future. Instead of presenting a positive program of their own, the Republicans sit around waiting for us to make a proposal. Then they react with an outburst of scare words. They are like a cuttlefish that squirts out a cloud of black ink whenever its slumber is disturbed.

Right now, the main problem of the Republican leaders seems to be to find some new scare words. They have not had much luck along that line lately. They tried using the phrase "welfare state" as a scare word for a while, but they discovered that the people are in favor of a Government that promotes their welfare. So they dropped that scare word. Then they tried "statism." But my good friend Governor Lehman took care of that one in the New York election—so they had to drop it, too.

Now, the Republican leaders have had to go back to an old stand-by. Frankly, I don't think it's as good as some of the others, but it appears to be the best they can think of. Their current scare word is "socialism."

It's perfectly safe to be against "socialism." The difficult thing is to make the country believe that the Democratic Party stands for socialism. How in the world can the Republicans persuade people that all you Democrats at all these dinners are socialists?

It can't be done. But the Republicans will try it just the same. That's what they've been trying to do ever since 1933. For the last 17 years they have called every new Democratic measure "socialism" or "communism," and they have made constant predictions of doom and disaster. The plans and proposals that we have advanced for improving the condition of the people of this country have been greeted with these same old scare tactics during all these years.

And I'm going to prove that to you.

Let us take it step by step.

In 1933, this country faced some of the greatest problems in its history—the problems of providing food and work for millions of jobless persons and their families, of saving millions of farms and homes from foreclosure, of restoring a banking system that had collapsed, of placing the entire economy on the way to recovery.

The Democratic Party rolled up its sleeves and went to work. It took steps to provide relief and jobs, to save farms and homes, to restore banks and businesses. Bit by bit the economy responded to those vigorous measures. Income began to grow, confidence returned, business activity mounted. This was the response of the economy to our farm and labor and business programs—our programs for resource development and public works and the building of homes.

As this miracle of recovery unfolded, what was the attitude of the Republican Party?

In 1934, the Republican National Committee issued a policy statement. And in that statement they said:

"American institutions and American civilization are in greater danger today than at any time since the foundation of the Republic."

That sort of talk may have frightened the members of the Union League Club. But it didn't frighten the people who had been saved by the New Deal from bread lines and bankruptcy.

In 1936, the Republicans thought the danger was worse. In that year, the Republican platform cried out:

"America is in peril. The welfare of American men and women and the future of our youth are at stake * * *. The New Deal administration"—this is from the 1936 Republican platform—"has bred fear and hesitation in commerce and industry, thus discouraging new enterprises, preventing employment, and prolonging the depression."

People weren't scared by that one either. They knew it just didn't make sense, because the national income had risen more than 50 percent in the previous 4 years, and it was still rising.

In 1940, the Republicans tried to scare us again. This time their platform said:

"The administration has imposed upon us a regime of regimentation which has deprived the individual of his freedom and has made of America a shackled giant. * * * The New Deal administration has failed America."

That's what the Republicans said, but the America that the New Deal had saved—the economy that the New Deal had freed and made productive again—became the arsenal of democracy that overwhelmed the forces of totalitarian aggression.

But that still didn't teach the Republicans anything. In 1944, when we stood at the peak of our wartime production—the economic bulwark of the free world—the Republican Party platform proclaimed: "The fact remains that under the New Deal, American economic life is being destroyed." That's what they said in 1944—"American economic life is being destroyed."

Apparently, they never learn anything. Today, when we have a national output of over $250,000,000,000 a year, and a higher standard of living than ever before, the Republican Party still cannot see anything good about the situation. In their policy statement issued 10 days ago, the Republican National Committee declared: "The major domestic issue today is liberty against socialism: * * * Basic American principles," they said, "are threatened by the administration's program. * * *"

It's the same old story—the same old words and music—the same empty and futile attempt to scare the American people—in complete contradiction of the plain facts that are visible to every citizen in his daily life.

For the past 17 years, the same outcry has greeted every proposal advanced by the Democratic Party—whether it was for better housing, social security, rural electrification, farm price supports, minimum wages, or any other program for the general welfare.

In 1944 Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., summarized the Republican attitude toward all these progressive steps in one brief paragraph when he said:

"For 11 years we have been steadily drifting into a regimented nation, with absolute control vested in a power-mad group of bureaucrats and social planners. Unless there is a change in government this year"—that was in 1944—"we can be reconciled to some kind of totalitarian, socialist government."

That is what the Republicans said about our programs in 1944. That is the way they talked about them in 1948. That is what they are saying about them now.

Today, we are proposing further development of our resources, further strengthening of our economy, new measures for the welfare of the people. And what do we hear? The same old story. It is all repeated in that latest statement of the Republican National Committee:

"This program"—they said, and they were talking about the program of the Democratic Party—"This program is dictated by a small but powerful group of persons who believe in socialism, who have no concept of the true foundation of American progress, and whose proposals are wholly out of accord with the true interests and real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen."

Well, let's look at the record. What is our program? Where did it come from? Our program is the platform adopted by the Democratic Party in its convention of 1948. And it has been voted on by the people of this country, including the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

If our program was dictated, as the Republicans say, it was dictated at the polls in November 1948. It was dictated by a small but powerful group of 24,000,000 voters.

And I think they knew more than the Republican National Committee about the real wishes of the workers, farmers, and businessmen.

Of course, this program is not socialism. It is based upon a firm faith in the strength of free enterprise. It is designed to strengthen the markets of free enterprise and to expand the investments of free enterprise. It will make our citizens economically secure, well-educated, and confident of the future. Only in a nation of such citizens can free enterprise grow and expand and reach its full possibilities.

The program of the Democratic Party is aimed to promote the prosperity and welfare of the American people. It is aimed to increase the freedom of the American people.

Freedom is not an abstraction. Freedom is a reality in our daily lives. The programs of our party have freed workers from economic subjection to their employers. They have freed farmers from the fear of bankruptcy. They have released farm wives from the bondage of ceaseless drudgery. They have freed older people from the fear of a dependent old age.

Our programs look forward to the day when our people will be freed from the fear of inadequate medical care and crushing medical expenses. They are aimed at freeing our young people from ignorance and poor education. And on these foundations for greater freedom for all our people, we are going forward to break down the barriers to economic opportunity and political liberty that have been created by prejudice and discrimination.

This is the record and the promise of the Democratic Party in expanding the freedom of the American people. And when the Republican Party proclaims that we are engaged in restricting freedom—that we are the enemies of freedom—I ask, "Whose freedom?" Let the American people look into their own lives and ask themselves whether they enjoy greater freedom or less than they did 18 years ago.

About the only freedom we have limited is the freedom of Republicans to run the country. Maybe that is what they are complaining about.

For the Republicans to drag out the same old moth-eaten scarecrow of socialism again in 1950—after having used it, or something very like it, in opposition to every progressive step the Nation has taken since 1933—is an insult to the intelligence of the American people. Out of the great progress of this country, out of our great advances in achieving a better life for all, out of our rise to world leadership, the Republican leaders have learned nothing. Confronted by the great record of this country, and the tremendous promise of its future, all they do is to croak, "socialism."

The Democratic Party is going right ahead to meet the needs and carry out the aspirations of the American people.

Our objective is to advance in freedom—to create a system of society that is ever more responsive to the needs of the people—to establish democratic principles so firmly in the hearts of the people that they can never be uprooted.

In the present anxieties and troubles of the world, the real strength of our country lies not in arms and weapons, important as they may be, but in the freedom of our citizens and their faith in a democratic society. Among the nations of the world, we stand as an example of what free men can do when they are in control of their own affairs and dedicated to the concept of a better life for all.

To work for the prosperity, the welfare, and the freedom of the American people is to work for the vindication of democratic institutions everywhere. And it is only through the growth of democratic institutions that a just and lasting peace can finally be achieved.

In this troubled world, it is more than ever important that the Democratic Party remain steadfast in its devotion to these ideals. It it more than ever important this year that the Democratic Party present its program to the people so plainly that it cannot be misunderstood. If we do that, I am confident that the people will again voice their approval of the principles which lead to increased prosperity, welfare, and freedom—not only for this country, but for free nations everywhere.

Macaulay's Prophecy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend heretofore granted, I am inserting in the RECORD a very interesting article entitled "Macaulay's Prophecy," which appeared in the February issue of Partners:

MACAULAY'S PROPHECY

(By George Peck, executive editor of Partners)

On May 23, 1857, Thomas Babington (Lord) Macaulay wrote from London, England, to his American friend, Congressman H. E. Randall, of New York. In this letter he predicted that in the twentieth century America would experience a severe period of depression when "Hundreds of artisans will be fairly brought to the test. Distress everywhere makes the laborer mutinous and discontented and inclines him to listen with eagerness to agitators who tell him it is a monstrous iniquity that one man should have a million, while another one cannot get a full meal."

Space does not permit reproducing here the entire letter, but I would like to quote one significant paragraph from it: "I seriously apprehend that you will, in come season of adversity, as I have described, do things which will prevent prosperity from returning, that you will act like people in a year of scarcity, devour all the seed corn, and thus make the next year not of scarcity, but of absolute distress. The distress will produce fresh spoilage. There is nothing to stay you. Your Constitution is all sail and no anchor. As I said before, when society has entered on this downward progress, either civilization or liberty must perish. Either some Caesar or Napoleon will seize the reins of government with a strong hand, or your Republic will be as fearfully plundered and laid waste by barbarians in the twentieth century as the Roman Empire was in the fifth century; with this difference, that the Huns and Vandals who ravaged the Roman Empire came from without, and your Huns and vandals will have been engendered within your country by your own institutions."

Macaulay died long before the term "Fair Dealers" had been coined, else he probably would have used it instead of the word "barbarians." But the terminology makes no difference. Shakespeare wrote: "What's in a name? That which we call a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." Macaulay was keen enough to foresee that here in America we would sow the seeds for our own eventual destruction by nursing vipers in our bosom.

I TOLD YOU SO

Macaulay died in 1850. Were he alive today, he would have ample justification for saying, "I told you so." Here he would see the sickening spectacle of the American people abandoning the right to govern themselves, delegating more and more power to the Central Government, and looking to that Government for their very need; forsaking the spirit of initiative, thrift, and enterprise which was responsible for making America the great country that she is.

He would listen to soap-box orators haranguing on street corners and to demagogs over his radio advocating various and sundry crackpot economies to replace the splendid one we now have. In certain news-

papers and magazines, Macaulay would read ridiculous charges against the American system of free competitive enterprise—accusations so false, so utterly lacking in factual evidence to back them up, that even he, in spite of his skepticism, would wonder what could have happened to a formerly sane people to cause them to give heed to such drivel.

He would witness the alarming spectacle of National, State, and local governments piling up debts, spending and borrowing with no thought of the morrow, while Americans apathetically look on, making little or no protest about the profligate waste of money and resources.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIFTY YEARS OF PROGRESS

Our founding fathers set up a beautiful thing here in this country. For 150 years we closely followed the pattern they designed for us. We became the envy of the entire world. What has happened to us? Are we going to let the barbarians within our gates destroy us? My fervent prayer is that, before it is too late, America will awaken to its senses, get back on the pathway that led it to unprecedented heights and which, if followed again, will carry it to a new record high in civilizations.

During those first 150 years, the American people established an economy that gave more wealth to more people than has ever been achieved by any nation at any time in world history. It is true that the millenium was not reached; there still existed inequalities, but the gaps between these inequalities were slowly but surely being narrowed. Now we have turned our backs on the tried and proven formula for creating wealth. Barbarians within are propelling us into the welfare state, which more properly should be called the farewell state.

LESSON FORGOTTEN

We have forgotten the lesson learned that the wealth of any nation consists of those things which its people are able to have over their bare needs for existence. It is the surplus of food, clothing, etc., plus luxuries and semiluxuries which people are able to accumulate. Part of this excess must be used as seed corn, to be plowed back in order to insure necessities and luxuries for future years. Just as long as this seed corn is taken from surplus, a nation is progressing in the right direction—the green lights are showing. But when a nation is forced to take seed corn from food supplies really essential to proper subsistence of its people, it is on a dangerous road with red lights showing against it.

All wealth formerly was created by human labor, but today an ever-increasing proportion is created by human imagination. With the advent and development of the machine, labor has become mostly mechanical and now is of value chiefly for carrying out the ideas of human imagination.

For instance, stop to consider the amount of labor that goes into the making of a book. An author writes a book, a best seller. While his imagination was at work, men were laboring months and years ahead of the book coming off the presses. Men in the forest had been cutting down trees; other men in paper mills took those trees, made them into pulp and then into paper. Other men transported the paper from mill to printing plant. While this was being done, other workers were digging in the ground, mining the lead for the type; still others were making the ink.

Finally linotype operators set the type on machines made by other men, and pressmen ran the books off presses that were made by still other mechanics. All of these men were put to work through the imagination of but one man, the author of the book. Even then the author was not finished putting people to work Men had to transport the books from the printing plant to the bookstores of the Nation, where sales clerks were employed in the selling of the book.

IMAGINATION REQUIRED

It takes far more imagination to build up and conduct a successful business than to write a best seller. As in the case of the book, most of the work which enters into any manufactured product is planned months, sometimes years, ahead of the day the finished article rolls off the assembly line. Since it costs about $6,000 for plant and machinery to put a man to work, new wealth must be created constantly, else there can be no new jobs, no rising standard of living. In recent years there has been an artificial temporary creation of new jobs in America. It has happened because we have made and are still making use of some of the stored-up wealth, or of the credit arising therefrom, to create new jobs. This means, in essence, that we have been eating our seed-corn. This can only end in disaster if long continued. The red lights are up.

One of the functions of business is to create new wealth (more seed-corn), by increasing production (increasing the yield per acre), by building new plants (planting additional acres). That and that alone gives more new permanent jobs and an increasingly higher standard of living.

CAPITAL MUST BE ENCOURAGED.

If we continue to eat our seed-corn as we are presently doing, inevitably the day will come when we shall not have enough left to plant the acres already under cultivation, and with fewer acres planted, our standard of living will take a severe tumble. So it is with capital and industry. The flow of new capital into industry must be increased; the using up of present capital must be discouraged, else we shall live to see unhappy time when there will not be sufficient capital to keep the wheels of industry moving. Only by giving capital an opportunity to make a profit commensurate with the risk taken, can new venture money be lured into taking the chance of backing new enterprises and expanding old ones—the two ways, the only two ways—by which new wealth can be created.

The hour is late—very late—but we can still save ourselves. The barbarians within can be defeated and our Republic saved if we demand a halt to wasteful governmental spending and insist on decentralization of bureaucratic power at Washington. If we have the will, the courage, the unselfishness, we can still save America from the sad fate which Lord Macaulay predicted for us—and thereby make him a poor prophet.

The Future of the Republican Party

REMARKS

OF

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion recently about the future of the Republican Party. The subject is of interest to Democrats and Republicans alike, because, strange as it may seem to some, most Democrats are sincerely interested in preserving the two-party system in American politics. And most Democrats believe that the best chance of preserving that system is that drastic action be taken to keep the Republican Party from fading from the political scene.

I do not believe that the Republicans can chart a course for the future without understanding their mistakes of the past. For this reason, in a spirit of sincere effort to aid my distinguished and respected Republican colleagues in the Congress, I am inserting into the RECORD as a part of my remarks a scholarly and thoroughly documented article by Dr. Walter Prescott Webb, of the University of Texas, entitled "How the Republican Party Lost Its Future," as carried in the autumn issue of Southwest Review.

This thought-provoking article, written, of course, without political bias, discloses how the Republican Party has successively turned its back on great segments of our society—on the farmer, on the small-business man, on the workingman. As Dr. Webb so forcefully phrases it, the Republican Party quit the people long before the people quit the Republican Party. I hope that my patriotic Republican colleagues who share my concern over the current threat to the traditional two-party system of our Nation will digest this historical study of their party and profit from its lessons.

HOW THE REPUBLICAN PARTY LOST ITS FUTURE

(By Walter Prescott Webb)

Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR. published in the Saturday Evening Post of January 29, 1949, an article entitled "Does the Republican Party Have a Future?" Though he spoke with objectivity, the fact that he could ask the question indicates that he realizes the dilemma of the party of which he is a distinguished member. It is probably the first time in the history of the party that the question has been asked in such seriousness. Senator LODGE believes the party has a future, but he suggests that it can be realized only on condition that the Republicans clean house, discard old concepts, and adopt a program more in conformity with the will and the aspirations of the American people. In short he implies that the house is in disorder, that the party's present concepts are archaic, and that its program does not mesh with popular spirit and desires.

Many thoughtful persons have tried to explain the recent surprising defeat of the Republican Party, but most of them have been content to do so by analyzing the current situation in terms of such factors as the labor vote, the farm vote, or the Roosevelt vote. At least I have read no account that viewed the present state of the Republican Party down the long gun-barrel of history. I believe that history throws a strong clear light on the problem and makes the eclipse of a once very powerful institution understandable.

It must be remembered that the Republican Party set out as a great crusader bent on emancipating those Americans who were not yet free to enjoy the benefits of democratic life. The cause was one that made a tremendous appeal to the idealist and to the common man. The cause gathered that strength known as moral force. The party that espoused the cause became the champion of suffering humanity, of freedom, of real democracy extended to all men, even the most humble slave. There was something here of unselfishness, of humanitarianism, of philanthropy, and the appeal of it reached in some measure every man whose pecuniary interests did not outweigh his idealism. The party first appeared in 1852, and by 1860 it had enough strength to capture the National Government.

As a result of its first success in the election of Lincoln, the Southern States withdrew from the Union, giving the Republican party its second and its greatest opportunity, that of saving the Union. In saving the Union the party proved itself able to win the hardest war the Nation has yet fought,

and to add to the moral prestige it had exhibited in the election of Lincoln the prestige of physical force sufficient to hold the Nation together in the gravest crisis. Here was the deed that stirred the patriotism and fervor of people everywhere, cementing their allegiance to the party with something approaching blind devotion. If you believed in freedom of men, you were a Republican, or should be; and if you believed in the Union and in loyalty to the flag, you could be nothing else. Thus it happened that the Republican party emerged from the 4 years of civil war triumphant in the shining armor of high moral purpose and armed with the keen sword of patriotic devotion. No political party ever set out on the path of peace—to last for more than three decades—under more favorable auspices. It had found in the shortest time the political holy grail.

But there was a structural weakness in the young party, a weakness which had considerable effect on policy for 10 years after the war, and indirectly for a much longer period. The party was not geographically in the beginning a national party, and this despite the fact that it had kept the Nation from dividing, had saved the Union. It originated as a sectional party, drew its total initial strength from the North, gained its first national election from northern votes, and had relatively little following elsewhere. Had its leaders inherited Lincoln's wisdom as they did his power, the party might in time have become truly national, but it never did. It has in essence always been sectional.

Because the South became so Democratic as to be known as the Solid South, it has been assumed in some quarters that the Democratic Party was sectional. On the contrary it was a national party before the Civil War, through reconstruction, and remains so today. Its members were distributed over the whole Nation, though for long they formed a minority in the more populous region. It was the sectional nature of the Republican Party that led directly to the harsh reconstruction measures. The Republican leaders in Congress knew that they had no Members in the South to speak of, and that if the Southern States were permitted to return Members to Congress, the Democrats would have a majority in the House of Representatives. The only safe thing they could do was to keep the southern Democrats out until the victorious Republicans could be assured of a majority in both Houses of Congress. This political party maneuver, or gerrymander, was carried out under the guise of reconstruction with the result that no Southern State really was represented in the National Congress for nearly a decade after the war closed.

In this decade the Western States were not represented either. They were not represented because 12 of them had not yet been admitted to the Union. They existed as Territories, and these Territories were governed and administered by the National Government, in this case the Republican Party. When time came for the admission of new States, every step was taken to guarantee that they came into the Republican fold. By eliminating the South and conditioning the West, the Republicans built up their strength to a point where they could safely permit the Southern States to send Democrats back to the Congress. But for a period of 10 years the Republican Party, operating from the Northern States, held undisputed political control in theory and in fact over the entire Nation—over the South because it was being reconstructed, over the West because it was largely unoccupied and still Territorial in status.

The Republican Party, having gained a breathing spell by disfranchising southern Democrats, set itself to the task of consolidating its strength and binding its membership to it before memory of its original high idealism and its patriotic achievement in saving the Union had faded into the background. It is perhaps a good political maxim that a party cannot live by its past alone. It must make good every day, at least every administration. This the party succeeded in doing.

Its position after Appomattox is probably unique in political history: unique in that within 5 years from the time it came to power it had completed its program. It would be a mistake to assert that the Republican Party of 1860 or 1864 had but one plank in its platform, but it is no mistake to say that it had only one that was important. The others were window dressing. By 1865 it had carried out the reform that gave it its birth and its original strength. As a reformer it had completed its mission and should have been ready to die, but the Republican Party was not ready to die—as what party is? It was confronted with the necessity of finding another plank, evolving another program that would justify its existence and assure its growth. Fortunately its unlimited power and prestige at this juncture were matched by an unequaled opportunity, and that opportunity was seized with the unerring instinct which comes when the cards of success are falling right.

The whole Nation lay at the feet of the Republican Party for development and exploitation. The South was no longer a rival or even an obstructionist and the West was a fallow field with untouched and all but limitless resources. The Nation was founded on agriculture, the farm, and the plantation, but this old force was not the thing to build a program on. The South had tried that. The new force—with all its dynamic future before it—was the one for the new party to champion. The new force consisted of wheels, pulleys, belts, blades, gears, driven by water, steam, and electricity in the fabrication and distribution of goods and commodities. The North had made a considerable start in the development of technology before the Civil War, and in the war it had knocked out completely any competition that the South might have developed. It was in supreme command of the dynamic power generated by the industrial revolution.

The Republican Party, in complete political control of the North, the South, and the West, was free to choose what it would go in for. It chose well. It embraced the new and most dynamic force, not the old agriculture which was mature and comparatively static, but rather that combination known as business, meaning manufacturing, transportation, and distribution. Here was an alliance of a sectional economic power with a coterminous political power, a partnership for great achievement.

The program followed by the Republican Party was designed, whether wittingly or not, to foster with loving care the economic power and smooth the way for its eager and powerful partner to seize the material resources of the Nation and concentrate control in the North, and thus to make both economics and politics sectional. The policy of the Republican Party was to make the North prosperous, and as long as the North prospered, the North would give its allegiance to the party and keep it in control. "The party of prosperity" was a good slogan to soothe a whole Nation, but those inside knew that the real policy was Republican prosperity.

The assets of the party after the Civil War were staggering in their immensity, so enormous that they could not help but bring relative prosperity to all sections. The business interests had in hand the technology and skill to manufacture unlimited quantities of goods, enough for the entire Nation. What business needed was protection from competition, domestic and foreign, and a system of transportation that would assure distribution. Government, in control of the Republican Party, could protect against domestic competition by granting patents and against foreign competition by levying tariffs. Patents cannot be considered a party measure, but as luck would have it, they turned the chief benefits to the North where patentable articles were being devised and used. The Republican Party made the protective tariff a broad plank in all its platforms, and throughout the Republican era the curve of the tariff was constantly upward, higher and higher. This tariff funneled the wealth of the Nation into the Republican section and built up a surplus in the National Treasury which was also dispensed for Republican and northern benefit.

Business needed railroads, in order to transport the goods it manufactured to all parts of the Nation, but the task of building them into the West was too great for business to undertake on its own hook. It did not need to. It called on Government to finance the venture. The road to the Pacific—across the plains—was projected before the Civil War but was not built because the two sections could not agree on a route. The South wanted it; the North wanted it. Neither would yield, and so nothing was done. In 1862, with the South out of the Union, the Republican Congress authorized the building of the Union Pacific from the West into the northern region. From 1862 until building ceased, the whole railroad system was designed to feed into the northern section. And much of the building was done at Government expense.

The Government had in its possession after the Civil War two enormous tangible assets which the Republican Party disposed of largely to its own benefit. The first asset and the larger one was the public lands comprising approximately one-half the continental area of the United States. Until 1862 the policy had been to sell the public lands to individuals, but in that year of fateful and far-reaching Republican legislation the Homestead Act was passed and the lands were given away. It was not difficult to convince any recipient of a homestead ranging from 160 to 640 acres that the Republican Party was beneficent and worthy of support. Though small areas were given to individuals, much larger ones were given to corporations. The railroads received western lands equal to the area of France. This lavish distribution of the greatest relief fund in history to individuals and corporations took nothing away from the popularity of the Republican Party, but it relieved the Government of its landed estate and national resources and prepared the way for another and less popular form of relief.

The second asset in the hands of the Government during this era was cash in the Treasury, cash accumulated from the tariff imposed by the Republican Party for the benefit of the infant industries of business. The question was not one of how this surplus cash could be returned to all the people, but rather how it could be placed safely in the hands of the chosen section and in the hands of good loyal Republicans. The solution was easy, the answer almost obvious. Give it to the Union soldiers of the Civil War in the form of pensions. Thus would it reward loyalty and strengthen business—and the Republican Party. The pension rolls were set up during the war and increased constantly until 1923, nearly 60 years after the war ended. Here was a safety valve that would relieve the Treasury of its surplus.

In any attempt to account for the deterioration of the Republican Party the declining influence of these pensions cannot be ignored. Not only did the receipt of a pension check each month hold the members of the GAR to the Republican Party, but it likewise held all his kith and kin, especially those on whom he might other-

wise have been dependent, and friends whom he might influence. That this pension money, gathered from the pockets of the entire Nation, flowed mainly into the pockets of one small section, the records in Washington will abundantly prove. Of each $100 paid in pensions, about $85 went North and $15 was distributed to scattered Republicans in the South and West. Here was one of the most dependable blocs of votes that any party could hope to have.

It should not be difficult, then, to understand the loyalty of business to its political partner. Business had never known such opportunities, and nowhere in the world had it made more of the possibilities that lay before it. An increasing population in an expanding frontier lapped up all the commodities that could be produced and each year called for more. The resources were so great that there was something for all, enough to hide many inequalities. The Republican Party rode this dynamic wave and won election after election. A part of its advantage was the fact that its position was positive; it was doing things, and much was being done in its name. The opposition had to content itself with blocking, interfering, and protesting. What could you do with a party that had emancipated the slave, saved the Union, given everybody a bounty in land or tariff, assured businessmen of prosperity and poor men of a full dinner pail?

The answer, as the opposition found out, was nothing—nothing but wait. The waiting was long. The South, sitting disconsolately outside the warmth of the charmed circle, sans tariff, sans pensions, was always in protest, but could be ignored. In the seventies and eighties the farmers of the West—though Republican by inheritance—raised their voices against monopolies more than against the party that had fostered them. The Populists got nowhere. But the campaign of 1896—foreshadowing that of 1932—gave the Republicans a great scare and caused them to adopt, under the leadership of the able Mark Hanna, tactics as effective as they were reprehensible in order to win. This should have been a warning.

Despite the party's splendid record of achievement, keen observers might have detected by the turn of the century the deterioration that had set in, a deterioration in position. No party can live on its memories or expect to live on gratitude for past favors. By 1900 people were a little tired of hearing that Lincoln, the only great President the party has produced, had freed the slaves. By then the Union was so well saved that even the bloody shirt no longer evoked patriotic emotions. These things lay far in the past. The giving away of the public domain lay largely in the past too, and some were saying that the policy had been carried too far. The pensioners were dying rapidly, and the political loyalty of the GAR was becoming less important. The one vital force left to the Republican Party was business.

Between the close of the Civil War and the eclipse of the Republican Party in 1932, business made spectacular progress. As everyone knows, it got very big and more powerful than any other factor in American life. We emphasize this in books and politics by the use of capitals: Big Business. It has already been pointed out that business was the principal ally of the Republican Party, the only one that survived the passage of years and retained its vitality. Its crystallized around the corporations which the Republicans got the Supreme Court to define as individuals in order to override the will of the States and other protestants. The party did everything that could be done to clear the track and give cannon-ball right-of-way to the business special. The Republican boast, so effective in many campaigns, of being the party of business was sound and true.

This alliance between business and the dominant political party made an unbeatable combination as long as they could deliver prosperity and keep the factory wheels turning and the people employed. With the passage of time, subtle changes began to take place in the relationship between the two partners and also within the domain of each partner.

In the beginning both partners were young, each with its special vigor, but of the two the political partner was dominant. It was the Republican Party that had the political power to grant the land to the railroads, to give a tariff bonus to manufacturers, and to grant pensions to the GAR. In the process of doing this it transferred the Government's wealth—which theoretically belongs to all the people—into the hands of the party section, party members, and party supporters, that is, into the hands of business. The result was that business grew very powerful and became dominant. In the beginning the party had political power and economic assets; in the end it had only political power, the assets having been transferred. Therefore when it needed economic assets it became a supplicant before a power it had formerly controlled and helped to make.

Time brought changes in business and these changes compelled the Republican Party to make two hard choices, neither of which was politically wise. Shortly after the Civil War the original numerous small businesses began to merge into fewer bigger businesses, forming trusts and approaching monopolies in one field after another. In the struggle that ensued the Republican Party had to choose its destiny: would it champion the cause of small business or would it go where the power and money were, with big business? It is doubtful whether, given the background, the Republican Party could have made any choice but the one it did. The choice in favor of big business was natural, logical, and under the circumstances inevitable, for, as a matter of fact, the men who were operating big business were by that time the prime movers of the Republican Party. They were on the board of directors of the corporation and of the party.

Another division in business compelled the Republican Party to make a second choice. With the rise of the great industries, there was a sharp division between the owners or managers and the employees who did the work; there was capital on the one hand and labor on the other. The Republican Party could not champion the cause of both. Its whole history of opposition in greater or less degree to the demands of organized labor indicates its decision in favor of capital.

The important thing to notice in both these decisions is that the Republican Party threw its support to the minority as against the majority. There were more small businesses than big businesses, and there were far more laborers than there were managements or managers. Slowly but surely the Republican Party was narrowing the base of popular support upon which any party in a free democratic country must in the long run depend.

After it ran out of homesteads, the Republican Party had no place at all for the farmer. It may have given him lip service, but it never could accept the poignant plea of 1896 that the farmer too was a businessman. He was something else, a farmer. Even if it had granted him the status of a businessman, the party would have classed him as a small-business man, and his interests would still have been made secondary to those of big business. Throughout it compelled him to buy in a protected market and permitted him to sell in a free market with all the world as his competitor. For the farmer's mule or cow or cotton or tobacco there was neither tariff nor patent.

It is difficult to explain the long record of loyalty of middle western farmers to the Republican Party, why they clung to it for three-quarters of a century to the detriment of their own welfare. The most reasonable explanation is that they inherited their Republicanism. The fact that their fathers received free homesteads and pensions brought them into the party and a loyal inertia held them there for a very long time—but not forever. They woke up at last to the fact that the party had done nothing for them lately.

Thus the Republican Party successively turned its back on one great segment of society after another, on the farmer, on small business, on labor. The party quit the people long before the people quit it. Finding big business a jealous god, it gave it complete and undivided devotion, sacrificing its Lincolnian idealism and its early patriotic fervor for the downtrodden man, and thus cutting from under itself the foundation on which popular support could with any reason stand. It is not surprising that the Republican Party eventually went down in defeat known to no other major party in history; the surprising fact, the one that needs explanation, is that its defeat was so long delayed. The explanation of the delay must be sought in the unbroken success of business.

The party was never really defeated in the sense that it lost prestige, until its main partner—and we might almost say its only one—collapsed. Since business near the end was the only ally of strength the party had, the condition for the continued dominance of the party hinged on the ability of business to provide prosperity. It was business that had to make and distribute the goods, maintain employment and provide hope for the future. As long as business did this, the voters went along voting the Republicans into power with only an occasional interlude by protesters and reformers.

The union of business and the Republican Party was never more felicitous than in the years following World War I. It is quite true that one President was not quite up to the standard expected, but the two that followed were well-nigh perfect. President Hoover, the engineer and humanitarian, was the ideal man for the party of business. And business was so good during the early part of his administration that the Republicans promised to make prosperity permanent and to put two cars in every garage. It would be hard to beat a party that does either.

Then it happened, overnight. The bottom fell out, not of the Republican Party, but of business. From 1929 to 1933 the administration—representing the Republican Party—moved around in a daze, completely stunned by the disaster that had come to its partner and main support. Though there was some vague talk about turning a corner, the Republicans were never able to make the turn. Their policy had been to let business take its course, and it was perhaps too much to expect a sudden reversal of a time-honored and well-established system.

In the next election the Republican Party had nothing on which to base a campaign. Born on a platform of one plank, slavery, it died on a platform of one plank because that plank, business, had decomposed and fallen from under it. It began as a sectional party, carrying only Northern States; it died as a sectional party carrying six States, all of them in the region of its original strength. Four years later it carried Maine and Vermont. Gone from it were the farmers of the Middle West, gone the votes of the laboring men, now jobless, around the silent factories of the industrial North. Gone also the tradition of invincibility and the belief that the Republican Party alone knew the magic formula of prosperity and success.

The collapse of business in 1929 and of the Republican Party in 1932 gave the opposition the first opportunity it had had since long before the Civil War to seize the initiative and launch a constructive program. It is true that in a period of 72 years, from 1860 to 1932, the Democrats won 4 elections, serving 16 years to 56 for the Republicans. But none of these victories gave the Democrats a broad initiative. They were due in Cleveland's case to protests against Republican rule, and in Wilson's case to disaffection in the Republican Party and to war. The foundation under the Republicans in each case remained strong and sound, and as soon as the reformers had failed in their reforms, control slipped back into safe Republican hands. The party still stood for the constructive force, the development of business, and not for the complainers, obstructionists, and amorphous dissident elements which have always been a plague to the out party.

The entry of the Democratic Party in 1932 was a triumphant entry such as it had not known before. Not only had the opposition been defeated, but its old sources of strength lay in complete ruins about it. The task was to build from the ground up on another principle. Twice before the Democrats had had the ball but had not known what to do with it. This time they had the ball and, as it turned out, they knew how to keep it and what to do with it.

What the Democrats did after 1932 was to launch a bold program much greater than but comparable to the one undertaken by Lincoln. And that program was based on an entirely new principle. The forces of government were directed, not to the restoration of business alone, but toward the rehabilitation of the suffering and destitute of the entire Nation. It was in the words of Roosevelt himself a "crusade to restore America to its own people." That was a long-range program. In the short range it would give bread to the hungry, clothes to the naked, fuel to the freezing, jobs to the jobless, security to the aged, and insurance to the bankers; and, having no public domain to give away and no other Government assets, it would pay for all this by taking money away from those who had it, mainly from Republicans and big business, and giving it to those who needed it. It was the taking and not the giving that stirred the bitterness and acrimony, just as Lincoln's taking away property in slaves had stirred it three-quarters of a century earlier.

In this analysis we are not concerned with the merits of the program, its constitutionality, or its rightness or wrongness. We are concerned with its political effectiveness, with the broad appeal it had for the majority and its seemingly utter disregard for the powerful minority. This program gave the Democrats an initiative based on a new principle which for the time being the Republican Party cannot possibly take from it and remain the Republican Party. The Republican Party for the first time in its history is now definitely on the outside. It can only complain, criticize, claim it can do the job better and more efficiently. It has as yet nothing constructive to offer, and under present conditions it seems doubtful whether it can find anything to offer that its members would accept or the American voters would take at face value. The Republican Party worked out to the last grain its vein of success and for the present it is through. It carried to a logical conclusion the policy of taking from the many—either the Government or the people—and giving to the few, taking from the three sections and giving to the favored one. Here was a principle that was good as long as it lasted, but it was not an eternal principle. Senator LODGE refers to archaic concepts of the party, but I would like to suggest to him that the great principle of the party is archaic and that therefore practically everything about it is now out of date. The old place may be tidied up a bit, but it will still be a Victorian palace with its gingerbread and gewgaws showing.

By way of being specific let us examine some of the cherished details of the establishment—relics of a dead past—that have no place save in a political antique shop. The first of these is the front porch. Now in its day that was quite an institution. It was a comfortable place for the Presidential candidate who was sure of election to reside in dignity while the opposition beat its brains out trying to gain the attention of spellbound voters. It was a good place from which to make no mistakes, commit no errors. The front porch is one antique that the Republicans will have to give up until they get a house to go with it.

Another outworn formula has to do with the off-year elections. This formula held that if in the rare Democratic innings the Republicans gained control of Congress in the off-year election, that was a sure sign that the Democratic President was on his way out, come next election. In 1946 the Congress became Republican and it was taken for granted that the formula would work. The White House was as good as won.

So eager was the Eightieth Congress to please its favored constitutents that it jumped the gun and began the work of destroying the principle which the Democrats had adopted and practiced for 16 years. The result was that this Congress frightened the farmers, resolved labor's doubts, and lost the election of 1948. The formula did not work.

In the last election we did not hear much about the full-dinner pail and sound money, the first a bauble for the workingman and the second a booby trap for small-business men. For 3 years the workingman looked into the pail and found it always empty. And as for sound money, the Republican Party ran out of money of any kind as did most of the voters. It appears that the dinner pail has been lost now and sound money, if not forgotten, is never mentioned.

It is customary for losers to quarrel among themselves in trying to apportion the blame for their defeat. According to news reports this jowering is going on now in the party high command. It seems that Mr. Dewey, who would have been so great if he had won, is taking the brunt of the attack. It may be pointed out that Mr. Dewey's whole campaign was in the very last Republican tradition. He conducted himself with the utmost propriety, said very little, and might even have remained on the front porch so far as results go. He was careful not to be specific or forthright but to depend on his supporters to make the commitments. He could not be expected to go over to the left of the Democrats, and his own party would not have followed him had he done so. His position was to the right of Mr. Truman's, and Mr. Truman's position was anchored firmly in the middle of the new principle of government. Actually Mr. Dewey had no principle. He was simply trying to get the voters to shoulder Mr. Truman out of his position, and the stubborn voters flatly refused to do it.

Nor can the Republicans find an alibi for their last defeat in the personality of the opposition. The two candidates were just about a hoss and a hoss in personality, though the man from New York is a little slicker than the man from Missouri. Certainly Mr. Truman's personality is not such as to give the opposition an inferiority complex. The people voted on the issues and not on the men.

President Truman's victory was so spectacular as to obscure important aspects of the last election. Had Mr. Truman been elected on personality, he might have found himself faced with a Republican Congress and with Republican governors in control of a majority of the States. The inarticulate but interested voters admired his courage and the desperate fight he made with practically nobody in his corner, but they did not vote for him through sympathy. They had simply had enough of the other party as it exhibited its program in the Eightieth Congress to know that they wanted no more of it. Wanting a modern Government that will deal with modern problems and not an antiquity, they went to the polls and swept the little champ back to the White House, and with him they sent Democrats to Congress and into the governors' offices across the Nation.

Of course we need two parties to debate the issues of the Nation. It seems from our own political history that the debate swings around a principle. One party thinks the principle is right and the other is equally convinced that it is in great part wrong. The party that originates the principle and establishes it, does so in a national crisis. If the Nation comes out of the crisis, the principle is accepted and the people go on supporting it for a long time, say until it runs into a crisis. This is what happened to the Republican Party after the Civil War; it is what happened to the Democratic Party in the great depression. During the time of trust and confidence in the principle, the party that originated it and put it into effect has a tremendous advantage, such an advantage that it may get away with almost anything. As long as the principle being acted upon works, it is almost impossible to dislodge the party that discovered it. This the Republicans need to bear in mind. They are going to have thin pickings until the present principle of developing a social state has failed. They are going to beat their brains out trying to get the attention of voters. They are going to quarrel, divide, complain, and criticize.

Their plight is like that of the man who had spent his life preparing for the future. It was his obsession. He awoke one morning on his birthday and began to appraise himself, his age which was considerable, his hair which had grown thin, his muscles a little flabby now, and his bones which seemed to have sand grains in the joints. After some contemplation, he struck his hand to his head and exclaimed, "Heavens! This is my future!" And so it may be for a considerable period with the Republican Party.

This Is Your Congress

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL ELLIOTT

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, the Congress of the United States is closer to the people today than ever before. Each year hundreds of thousands of people visit the Capitol and observe Congress at work. High school students throughout the country read and study about all phases of Government, including the Congress. The newspapers and magazines, the radio and television bring Congress increasingly closer to the people.

Senior Scholastic, a magazine with a large circulation among high school students, devoted a special section of its February 1, 1950 issue to the Congress, under the title of "Congress at Work." The articles in Congress at Work are factual and instructive. They were collected, edited, and for the most part written by Mr. Herbert L. Marx, Jr., associate editor of Scholastic Magazine.

I include as a part of my remarks the article "This Is Your Congress":

THIS IS YOUR CONGRESS

Under the dome of the Capitol in Washington, D. C., beats the heart of America.

Here our Congress—our Senators and Representatives—speak for America. They decide and shape our country's future. They do so for us and in behalf of us, as our chosen representatives.

No matter where you live—the Pacific coast, the prairies of the Middle West, the Cotton Belt of the South, the villages or industrial towns of New England—you have your spokesman in Congress.

If you feel he does not speak your mind, it is your privilege and duty not to support him in the next election. This is a basic principle of a representative democracy.

Our Congress is no youngster as national parliaments go. It is now more than 160 years old. But it is showing no signs of age. It is still as youthful and vigorous as any legislative body in the democratic world.

The present Congress is the eighty-first in number. The First Congress, which assembled after the Constitution was ratified, served from 1789 to 1791. The Second Congress served from 1791 to 1793, and so on for every 2-year period.

The Congress that met in January 1950 is the second session of the Eighty-first Congress.

The President has the right to summon Congress for a special session. This is usually done in the event of a national emergency or crisis, as in September 1939, following the outbreak of war in Europe.

However, the last special session of Congress, called by President Truman in the summer of 1948, was for the purpose of enacting bills dealing with our national economy.

A Congress lasts for 2 years because all Members of the House of Representatives and one-third of the Senate are elected every 2 years. All unfinished legislation "dies" at the end of each 2-year Congress.

The Congress which meets on January 3 after the regular general election every other November is called the new Congress although many of its Members may have served in the old Congress.

Let us now go inside the Capitol. We notice that there are two wings on the building. These include the Chambers of the House and the Senate. According to tradition, they may not be used for any purpose except for congressional sessions.

The next thing you notice is the surprisingly small attendance most of the time in both the House and Senate Chambers. This often baffles visitors. Where are our national legislators? The answer is there is much more to Congress' work than meets the eye of a visitor to the House or Senate Chamber.

Actually, almost 90 percent of the work of Congress is done not in the House and Senate Chambers but in congressional committee rooms. These congressional committees have been called, and with justification, our little legislatures. As former President Woodrow Wilson once remarked, "Congress in its committee rooms is Congress at work."

What is the difference between the two Houses of Congress? Let's start with the Senate.

In Roman times, the Senate meant a council of old men. Its members were regarded as persons of high rank and wisdom.

The same attitude is retained to a large extent in our Nation today. The United States Senate, called the upper House, was intended to serve as a check on the sometimes hasty actions of the lower House (the House of Representatives). George Washington explained that "the Senate is the saucer in which the House tea is cooled."

Senators were not even elected directly by the voters of each State until the seventeenth amendment to the Constitution was adopted in 1913. Before that Senators were chosen by the State legislatures.

The United States Senate consists of 96 Members—2 from each State, regardless of the population or size of the State. Thus Nevada (with a population of only 174,000) and New York (with a population of more than 14,000,000) have the same number of Senators.

A Senator is elected for a term of 6 years. One-third of the Senators are elected every 2 years. Thus the Senate has been a continuing body since 1789, because it never changes its entire membership at any one time.

Article I, section 3, of the Constitution says, "No person shall be a Senator who shall not have attained the age of 30 years, and been 9 years a citizen of the United States, and who shall not, when elected, be an inhabitant of that State for which he shall be chosen."

The Vice President of the United States is automatically the President of the Senate. He may vote in the Senate only in case of a tie. In other words, only when the Senate is evenly divided on some issue may the Vice President cast a vote to break the tie.

In addition, the Senate elects a President pro tempore (for the time), to preside when the Vice President is absent.

Now let us cross to the southern wing of the Capitol, to the House of Representatives. This "lower House" consists of 435 Representatives apportioned among the 48 States according to population.

All Representatives are elected every 2 years for terms of 2 years. A Representative (according to art. I, sec. 2, of the Constitution) must be 25 years of age; a citizen of the United States for 7 years; and a resident of the State in which he is elected. He is customarily a resident of the district from which he is elected, but this is not required by the Constitution.

Critics of this custom say it forces a Representative to ignore national interests and concentrate on local problems in order to get reelected. They add that it also has a tendency to make the Representative take orders from the local political bosses, because defeat in his own district may mean the end of his career in Congress. In Britain, a candidate for Parliament is free both by law and custom to run for election in any district selected for him by his party.

On the other hand supporters of this custom contend that the Representative should be a resident of the district he represents so that he will be more familiar with the needs of the voters who elected him. It is also pointed out that this tradition keeps us as close as possible to pure democracy, in which every citizen has a direct voice in the conduct of his government.

States entitled to only one Member in the House have a Representative at Large, elected by the entire State. At certain times other States have Representatives at Large, too.

Under changes made by Congress in recent years the total number of Representatives is fixed at 435. The quotas among the 48 States are reapportioned every 10 years, following the regular census of population. The next reapportionment will take place after the 1950 census.

However, each State, no matter how small its population, is entitled to at least one Representative. On the average a Representative is elected by a district inhabited by a little more than 300,000 people. But this is not always true. Nevada's one Representative is elected to represent its population of only 174,000. Thus election districts differ in size of population.

They also differ in area. For example, one of New York City's heavily populated districts, which is only three square miles in area, contains as many people as the 28 counties which make up one of the districts in Texas.

POWER OF THE SPEAKER

The Presiding Officer of the House is the Speaker. He is elected every 2 years by the House.

The Speaker is entitled to all the privileges of an ordinary Member, but usually votes only in case of a tie. He presides over sessions of the House or appoints a Speaker pro tempore to replace him. He announces the order of business, and sees to it that Members stick to that order.

When the House meets as a Committee of the Whole (which includes all Members), the Speaker appoints the Chairman. The Speaker also picks the chairmen of temporary committees. He may give the floor to Representatives in any order he wishes, and directs his party lieutenants to guide the debate as he sees fit.

Because the Speaker has the power to control debate on the floor of the House, and to push bills favored by his party, he is the most influential Member of the House, if not of the entire Congress.

OUTSIDE THE 48 STATES

The organized Territories of Alaska and Hawaii are each entitled to a Delegate in the House of Representatives. Puerto Rico, as a dependency, is represented in the House by a Resident Commissioner.

These three men have all but one of the privileges accorded Representatives. They receive the same salary and have the same rights to speak on the floor of the House and to serve on House committees. The one vital exception is that they have no vote in Congress.

There are 870,000 American citizens who have no Representatives or Senators of their own in Congress. These people are the residents of the District of Columbia. Washingtonians may not vote in Presidential elections, either. The District of Columbia, seat of all branches of our Federal Government, has always been treated as an exception to the rule of representative government.

How Taft-Hartley Costs Every Worker Cents Per Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a very timely article which appears on pages 29, 30, and 31 in the February 1950 issue of the magazine published by the International Union of the United Automobile, Aircraft, and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW–CIO). I feel that this magazine article more adequately explains the position of labor with reference to the Taft-Hartley law than any other article which I have read upon the subject. It is written in common, everyday, understandable language, which the average voter, I am sure, will appreciate.

This article is as follows:

HOW TAFT-HARTLEY COSTS EVERY WORKER CENTS PER HOUR

THE PROPAGANDA PROGRAM

June 23, 1947, the Taft-Hartley Act was enacted into law over the veto of the President of the United States.

Bought and paid for

The law was passed as the climax to a supercharged propaganda campaign in which the National Association of Manufacturers, according to Senator AIKEN of Vermont, spent $2,000,000 for advertisements on the Taft-Hartley Act alone.

Altogether, Senator AIKEN estimated the corporations spent $100,000,000 on propaganda to procure the passage of the law.

Newspapers and radios repeated over and over again (this was what the $100,000,000 paid for) that the public was demanding the Taft-Hartley law.

Public-opinion polls were fixed to give the impression the people wanted Taft-Hartley.

Bought and paid for surveys pretended to show the workers in the plant wanted the Taft-Hartley law.

With the possible exception of the artificial clamor produced to secure the repeal of the OPA, the propaganda campaign on behalf of the Taft-Hartley law was the noisiest, the most deafening ever purchased through the collective efforts of monopolies and corporations in the history of mankind.

The vote on Taft-Hartley

After Taft-Hartley was passed, the law itself provided for elections which were, in effect, a test of some of the claims made by the corporations.

The union-shop elections, for example, were a fair test of whether or not workers did or did not believe in the "right not to belong to a union."

Actually, in 35,120 elections, 3,200,000 persons out of 3,400,000 voted in favor of the union shop. That is about 19 to 1.

Every honest poll shows the country opposes Taft-Hartley Act. Union-shop vote is 19 to 1 for the union. Truman was elected.

Galluping Ropes, Inc., polls on any anti-labor subject.

The November 1948, national election was decided largely on the issue of Taft-Hartley. Fred Hartley, a sponsor of the bill, did not run again, but his seat was won by Peter Wallace Rodino, the son of a UAW member, who campaigned on a specific promise to vote for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Nationally, the reelection of President Truman was an approval by a majority of the voters of his stand for repeal of the Taft-Hartley law.

Wherever people had a chance to be counted, they stood up to be counted in majorities opposed to Taft-Hartley.

The people, the radios, the newspapers, and the magazines who said they were for Taft-Hartley turned out to be obliging gremlins who lived in the minds of the propagandists hired by the National Association of Manufacturers.

ADDING UP THE COST OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Is Taft-Hartley a slave-labor law?

Taft-Hartley has been called a slave-labor law.

Some people have said slave labor was too strong. Where, they ask, are some of the workers who have been enslaved under Taft-Hartley?

Under the Taft-Hartley law, people who go on strike for better wages, or hours, or working conditions may be discharged by their employer.

The employer may hire other workers to replace them.

Then the scabs may petition for a collective-bargaining election.

If the scabs vote nonunion, the employer may get a Taft-Hartley injunction forbidding the people on strike from picketing.

How to destroy job security under Taft-Hartley:

Employer forces a strike—hires scabs.

In NLRB election only scabs vote.

Injunction forbids workers to strike.

Seniority abolished; wage cut follows.

If they persist in picketing, they may be sent to jail.

The Taft-Hartley thus provides companies with a 1-2-3 formula for taking away your union protection.

Being a free worker depends in part on your freedom to enjoy the working conditions your union has won for you.

In the printing trades these working conditions have been won over a period of 75 years and are part of the union's conditions of employment.

Under Taft-Hartley, the National Labor Relations Board and the courts have ruled that the union's insistence on these established working conditions is a refusal to bargain by the union and an unfair labor practice.

To defend its working conditions the Typographical Union has spent more than $15,000,000 in the last 2 years. Taft-Hartley has cost union printers millions of dollars in assessments.

Just as important, the fight to defend working conditions from the Taft-Hartley attack has made it impossible to give full time to bargaining for better wages. There is no way to estimate how much printers have lost because they failed to win wage increases they might have otherwise gotten.

This is the cost of Taft-Hartley to the printers' union—more than $15,000,000.

One of the major purposes of the Taft-Hartley law was to destroy the United Mine Workers and to outlaw the industry-wide contracts which provide basic union standards for all mine workers.

Partly as the result of the Taft-Hartley injunction procedure, the hard-won pensions of the miners are not being paid today. The health and welfare program is providing enormous bounties to the lawyers in the courts, but no health or welfare to the miners. For the first time in many years the miners are working in violation of their own no-contract-no-work principle.

Taft-Hartley means wage cuts

Obviously these penalties provided in the Taft-Hartley law could be applied against you.

But there is another, more insidious, way the Taft-Hartley injures wage earners.

As everyone knows, there is a persistent movement by the companies from union-standard communities to unorganized, low-wage areas.

Companies that don't run away are subjected to unfair competition from low-wage runaway companies.

Workers with standard wages are losing out in competition for jobs to runaway non-union shops.

The Taft-Hartley, by permitting employers to ask for representation elections, by facilitating sweetheart agreements between phony unions and the company, and by preventing workers from organizing boycotts of sweatshop employers, actually manufactures the antiunion acid which is corroding the wage and working-condition standards of all workers.

Even unorganized workers have a tremendous stake in the repeal of the Taft-Hartley. For unorganized workers benefit from the wage-increase patterns won by union workers.

GM office workers, for example, get wage increases after the UAW wins increases for the production workers. If the production workers are prevented by Taft-Hartley from winning improvements, the office workers stand still or go back.

THE SECRET AUTHORS OF TAFT-HARTLEY

Double-standard legislation

The Taft-Hartley law is special-interest legislation.

Despite its name, the Taft-Hartley law was not written by Senator ROBERT TAFT or ex-Congressman Fred Hartley. Senator TAFT himself has admitted that clauses got into the bill that he regards as a mistake. (P. 1916, Senate hearings on S. 249, pt. 4.)

Who wrote the law

Here are quotations from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 16, 1947:

Representative O'TOOLE: "It was written, sentence by sentence, paragraph by paragraph, and page by page, by the National Association of Manufacturers."

Representative POWELL: "This bill was written on the fifth floor of the Old House Office Building, written by over a score of corporation lawyers, paid, not by the Government of the United States, not even by small business, but by big business, monopoly business."

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 15, 1947:

Representative KLEIN: "The new House labor bill was not written with the help of the Democratic members of the committee. In fact, they were not consulted and no full committee meetings were held to discuss it. The bill was actually written with the help of several industry representatives from the National Association of Manufacturers and the United States Chamber of Commerce. Some of the most valuable assistance came from William Ingles, who reports a $24,000 annual salary as a lobbyist."

Representative BUCHANAN: "The program of labor legislation drafted by the National Association of Manufacturers last December and published in full-page advertisements in the New York Times and scores of other papers on January 8 of this year is embodied in its entirety in the proposed bill. * * * Sections of this NAM program are written into the bill word for word."

PLUSH JUSTICE FOR THE BOSS—IRON TALONS FOR WAGE EARNERS

Taft-Hartley is exactly the kind of law you would expect once you are told who wrote the law. Imagine, for example, how a labor law would read if it were written by the lawyer for your company. That is the kind of law Taft-Hartley is—a law with double-standard justice. One standard of justice for employers—easy, gentle, courteous, apologetic. Another standard of justice applies to workers—tough, aggressive, punitive, bristling with penalties and jail sentences.

Here are examples:

Plush justice for the employer: Taft-Hartley provides that nothing an employer says or prints can be used against him in a Taft-Hartley hearing (unless his expression contains threat of reprisal or force or promise of benefit). Under cover of a free speech, an employer is given a blanket license of irresponsibility for anything he says.

The iron talon for the worker: In any court hearing, criminal or civil, involving you, anything you say can be quoted against you, provided it is relevant under court rules.

Plush justice for the employer: If an employer is shut down because of a strike, he can call on another employer to help him out by taking over his work (and requiring the workers of the second employer to scab).

The iron talon for the workers: But workers who are locked out by an employer may not ask brother union members in another shop to help them out by refusing to scab.

Plush justice for the employer: A voluntary association of employers may engage in politics in any way it chooses (and the American Medical Association may assess its members $25 each to go into politics).

The iron talon for workers: But the workers in a voluntary association (a union) may not spend one cent to support candidates in Federal elections.

Plush justice for the employer: Any employer can use the NLRB and put it to work for his purposes, whether he files financial statements, is a Communist, a Fascist, or a criminal violator of the antimonopoly laws.

The iron talon for workers: But no group of workers can use the National Labor Relations Board until their union officers file affidavits swearing they are not Communists, along with a copy of the union's financial statement (plus other things).

Plush justice for employers: The NLRB may ask for injunctions against employers only when it chooses to. The courts cannot issue these injunctions until after a court hearing is held.

Iron talon for workers: But the NLRB must apply for an injunction against workers and their union in some situations, and these injunctions can be issued without any hearing for the workers involved.

Plush justice for employers: Certain employers' charges of unfair labor practices against workers and their unions must get priority under Taft-Hartley.

Iron talon for workers: But a worker's charge of an unfair labor practice against an employer gets no priority. Certain day-old complaints by an employer must take precedence over a worker's complaint that has been on the books for 2 years.

Plush justice for the employer: Workers may not require employers, through their unions, to employ more workers than they need.

Iron talon for workers: Nothing prevents an employer (except the union) from speeding workers up and giving them more work than they can do without hardship.

Formosa Could Be Saved—If

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article from the Washington Post of February 19, 1950. It should be instructive to note that Walter Bosshard, a seasoned observer in the Far East, believes that despite all the unfavorable factors in the Formosa picture—and I do not believe some of them are quite as bad as he portrays them—we should extend effective assistance to the defenders of the island. The prospects of success are still good, and the stakes are so great as to justify the effort.

FORMOSA COULD BE SAVED—IF
(By Walter Bosshard)

TAIPEH, FORMOSA.—"With a minimum of foreign aid," said an American officer to me on my arrival in Taiwan, or Formosa, "this island could be saved, if * * *"

The same day, the English edition of China News published an article under the headline, "Save Taiwan—Save China." It was an emotional appeal to eradicate inefficiency and corruption in government offices. It continued:

"We have been the victims of international power politics and intrigues. We have been petted. We have been idolized and we have been double-crossed. The Nationalists having lost practically all of the mainland; Taiwan is the last ditch to hold. This is the last chance left for the freedom-loving Chinese people to save themselves. We cannot and we must not fail. There is only the sea left for our retreat. There is only one way open for us—to live or to die."

Chinese and foreigners alike fully approved this remarkably frank statement, adding, however, "if only * * *," followed by a number of reservations which are constantly made, whether people are discussing the political, military, or economic aspects and prospects of Taiwan.

TWO MAJOR CLIQUES

To start with the biggest problem, there is dissension among the ranking officials which makes any concerted action very difficult. This conflict has its roots in the history of the Kuomintang when individual members or entire groups who ventured to disagree with Chiang Kai-shek were severely censured, if not punished. Several of the smaller factions disappeared or joined the Communists, but suspicion and open conflict continues between the two major cliques, despite the danger knocking at the very gates of this island.

In this fight, the reactionary C-C clique, led by the two Chen brothers, Chen Li-fu and Chen Kuo-fu, seems to have the upper hand. The Kwangsi clique, with Acting President Li Tsung-jen, now in the United States, and Gen. Pai Chung-hsi as prominent members, is fast losing ground.

The C-C clique is the watchdog in Chiang Kai-shek's headquarters. He remains chairman of the Kuomintang, but otherwise holds no official position in the government. He is still considered the strong man in this last bastion of Nationalist China, however, pulling the wires from his sumptuous retreat in the hills above Taipeh. He will not tolerate any man in a responsible position who has not been approved by his inner circle, a sort of private supercabinet.

According to the Chinese Constitution, Gen. Li Tsung-jen is the actual head of the National Government. When he left for the United States in December, he delegated his power to the Prime Minister, 70-year-old Gen. Yen Hsi-shan, who has frequently been at loggerheads with Chiang but is now too old and weak to make a determined stand against the constant pressure brought upon him by the generalissimo and the powerful C-C clique.

Yen Hsi-shan takes his orders from Chiang Kai-shek and his ministers rubber-stamp the decisions of Chiang's private cabinet. If General Li should ever return to this island, his only choice would be either to fall in line with the inner circle or be ousted through all sorts of intrigues and accusations already in the offing.

YOUNG MEN DISCOURAGED

Thus it is not surprising to see numerous politicians and defeated generals, who escaped with their loads of gold bars to Formosa, seeking favors with the powerful group and getting lucrative appointments, while any outsider, however meritorious his achievements, is cold-shouldered as long as he refuses to join this mutual admiration society.

There is a number of younger, very able officers in Taiwan, ardently patriotic and willing to fight, but getting discouraged by the prevailing favoritism. The tragedy of the present situation is that the ruling class consists of tired, worn-out members of the old Kuomintang, who continue to think in terms of "face-saving" and are unable to inspire any confidence or enthusiasm among the young generation.

The return of Madame Chiang Kai-shek from the United States will further aggravate the tension. She has never been known as a peacemaker, and her overbearing likes and dislikes will hardly encourage amity outside her own circle.

There is also disunity among the native population. Different groups are clamoring for a share in the island administration. None, however, represents the majority of the Formosan people, and it is even questionable whether popular opinion has yet crystallized on what is the best political future for Formosa.

The native inhabitants are generally anti-Communist. But they are also strongly antagonistic toward the Nationalist administration, whose past excesses and exploitations are difficult to forget. And the presence of the refugee government on the island stirs fears of an early Communist invasion.

The newly appointed governer of Taiwan, Dr. K. C. Wu, former mayor of Shanghai and one of the ablest administrators in China, is trying by justice and fair play to bring the different parties together and to create a common front. The lack of trained and able native leaders whom he can trust makes it difficult for him to combat the creeping defeatism, which centers around the argument that any resistance is useless if no immediate help can be expected from the United States.

A WILLING ARMY

There is one bright spot in this rather gloomy picture. The new army, trained by Gen. Sun Li-jen at Fengshan in the southern part of Taiwan, is exceptionally good. Despite many handicaps, this general and his very able staff of partly American-trained officers has built up a defense force which not only is ready to fight, but which knows the stakes.

Its equipment, however, is not too good. Most of the material supplied earlier by the United States was lost in the fighting on the mainland and is now in Communist hands. There is an urgent need for transport vehicles for the mechanized army, for spare parts and ammunition for the artillery, and also for smaller weapons.

It is a surprising fact that there is no over-all command for the coordination of the army, navy, and air force. Each of these branches has its own program and works independently of the other two. Each is under direct orders of the Ministry of National Defense, which takes orders from Chiang.

An inborn mistrust prevents him from appointing any officer to the over-all command. He wants to keep all the power in his own hands. In spite of the disastrous results of his past strategy and policy, he subbornly considers himself the only man in China capable of defeating the Communists.

Under such circumstances, is it possible to save Formosa and would it be wise to extend any more help to the Nationalist government? The answer to both questions is, in my opinion, yes. As my American officer friend said, with comparatively little help the present defense forces can be made strong enough to prevent a Communist invasion, provided, of course, that Russia did not actively take part in any such operation.

ECA HAS SHOWN HOW

Should any material help be given to the Nationalist Army, it would need strict supervision to prevent further abuse. That such control can be made effective has been demonstrated in Formosa by the ECA and JCRR. If a similar pattern were followed on military aid, the morale of the defense forces and the native population alike would be tremendously encouraged, so that Formosa could well become the turning point in the battle against communism in the Far East.

It would be the best solution, of course, if Chiang Kai-shek and his entourage could be persuaded to let other, better-equipped men decide the future strategy. This being beyond any hope of realization, the only course is a clear-cut policy with no loopholes for compromise.

Formosa well defended would inspire the oppossed people on the mainland. It would encourage the nations of southeast Asia to join forces against their common enemy. And it would dispel that feeling of fear and weakness which now paralyzes life in this part of the world.

Yes, Formosa is well worth saving despite the many if's. But time is running short, and the Red typhoon may devastate this beautiful island before statesmen and ambassadors, now discussing the problem from many angles, can make up their minds.

Biography of Susan B. Anthony

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, last Wednesday was the anniversary of the birthday of Susan B. Anthony, one of the great women in American history. I think it fitting to remember her, and I ask unanimous consent that a short biography of her be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the biography was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Susan B. Anthony—one of the great women of our country—stands in the doorway of the house where she made her home for 40 years. This brick house was one of the early ones built in the Bush and King Tract. After the death of Daniel Anthony his wife, Lucy Read Anthony, bought the house in 1866 and lived here with her two daughters until her death April 3, 1880, in her eighty-seventh year. Then Mary became the owner and every year when she paid her taxes she added to her bill—"Paid under protest," since she believed that taxation without representation was tyranny.

THE HOUSE A MEMORIAL

Through voluntary gifts the house was bought December 31, 1945. It has been restored in keeping with the time in which Miss Anthony lived. Furniture, books, pictures, and many objects have been returned. There is a great deal of source material here about the woman suffrage movement. Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, who was one of Miss Anthony's able, younger assistants and who followed Miss Anthony and Anna Howard Shaw as president of the National American Woman Suffrage Association, sent her valuable collection of framed photos of noted women who believed in rights for women. By bequest there came also her mahogany desk on which she drafted her strategic plans for the nineteenth amendment. The house is a unique center which commemorates Miss Anthony and also "the mightiest woman's crusade the world has ever known, led by as great generals as ever headed armies and finished fights for victory."

INCIDENTS CONNECTED WITH THE HOUSE

November 1, 1872, the two sisters went out with some other women and registered for voting. Then on November 5 they voted—thus testing the right of women to vote under the Constitution. Miss Anthony was arrested here by the United States deputy marshal for voting illegally. She was tried at Canandaigua and fined $100 which she told the judge she would never pay.

In 1894 when New York had a constitutional convention Miss Anthony started a great campaign to secure an amendment allowing women to vote in the State. This house became the headquarters and many worked here all summer, sending out literature and petitions. Miss Anthony at the age of 74 went forth every week to speak in the 60 counties.

Here plans were made to persuade the University of Rochester to open its doors to women. Mrs. Elizabeth Cady Stanton was present at one evening meeting and answered every objection. Miss Anthony was the leading person in raising the necessary fund.

Miss Anthony and her sister were very hospitable and many workers for woman suffrage and many noted people were their guests. Some of the meetings of her suffrage board were held here.

Here with the help of Miss Anthony who recognized the need of recording women's history, Ida Husted Harper wrote the Life and Work of Susan B. Anthony and volume IV of the History of Woman Suffrage.

LIFE OF MISS ANTHONY

She was born at Adams, Mass., February 15, 1820, and passed on at 17 Madison Street, March 13, 1906, in her eighty-sixth year. In her early youth she taught school. She was teaching in Canajoharie, N. Y., at the time of the first woman's rights convention in Seneca Falls, N. Y., July 19 and 20, 1848, and also when the adjourned convention was held in Rochester August 2, 1843. Her interest at the time was in organizing Daughters of Temperance, and it was not until 1851, after she had met and talked with Elizabeth Cady Stanton, that she saw the need for woman suffrage and joined her in a life-long crusade for the rights of women. Soon Miss Anthony became the driving force of the woman's rights movement, assuming the responsibility of its conventions and of building up a strong woman's rights organization. On May 15, 1869, she organized the National Woman Suffrage Association with Mrs. Stanton as president.

HER WORK

Susan B. Anthony gave 55 years of devotion with singleness of purpose and unbelievable persistence for the enfranchisement of women. Through her efforts and that of Elizabeth Cady Stanton, woman suffrage was debated on the floor of Senate in 1866 and a resolution was introduced in 1868 in both Houses of Congress providing that citizenship be the basis of suffrage. In the "Life of Miss Anthony" she says: "I have addressed the committees of every Congress since 1869, and our New York Legislature scores of times." Senator Sargent introduced in the Senate the first woman suffrage amendment in 1876. This amendment was reintroduced year after year through the tireless efforts of Miss Anthony. It was finally adopted in 1920, 14 years after her death.

Because she believed that the movement for woman's rights and woman suffrage should be world-wide, she organized in Washington, D. C., in 1888, the International Council of Women.

In 1890, the National Woman Suffrage Association and the American Woman Suffrage Association united, forming the National American Woman Suffrage Association, with Mrs. Stanton as its first president. Miss Anthony succeeded her in 1891 and for 9 years until 1900, she served as its president.

Her interests were wide and in addition to directing State and National campaigns for woman suffrage and attending hearings, she never lost an opportunity to speak, write and work for the advancement of women in education, in the professions, in business, and to win for them full civil rights. Her scrapbooks kept for 50 years are now in the Rare Books Section of the Congressional Library. They give a record of her life work.

HONORS

The nineteenth amendment which became the law of the land August 26, 1920, was the goal to which Susan B. Anthony dedicated and devoted her life. A commemorative 3-cent stamp bearing her profile was issued August 26, 1936, on the sixteenth anniversary of the nineteenth amendment.

The governors of many States issue proclamations, commemorating her birthday—February 15—and calling attention to her and her work.

In the Capitol at Washington is the Woman's Monument by Adelaide Johnson. Rising out of an 8-ton base of Italian marble are the heads and shoulders of Mrs. Stanton, Mrs. Mott, and Miss Anthony—who were known as the Great Triumvirate in the work for woman suffrage. In the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York City was the bust of Miss Anthony by Adelaide Johnson. It has been loaned to the Anthony House. There is a bronze tablet to Miss Anthony along the grand staircase of the capitol at Albany.

Rochester memorials: Anthony Hall of the Women's College of the University of Rochester; Anthony Room in Cutler Union of College for Women; bronze tablet to the sisters in the Unitarian Church which they attended; bronze tablet in chapter house of Irondequoit Chapter, Daughters of the American Revolution, of which she was a life member; tree in Genesee Park—near Dr. Moore's monument—dedicated by department of parks, 1935; School No. 27 is called the Susan B. Anthony School; exhibits in Rochester Museum and in Rochester Historical Society headquarters; Susan B. Anthony House.

California memorials: Susan B. Anthony Memorial Collection in Los Angeles Public Library; Susan B. Anthony Tree in Sequoia National Park; Susan B. Anthony Day in public schools; mementos of Miss Anthony in Mission Inn, Riverside, Calif.; Susan B. Anthony Memorial Committee.

TRIBUTE

At Miss Anthony's funeral Mrs. Catt gave this tribute: "This woman for a large part of half a century was the chief inspiration, counselor, and guide of our movement. There were women associated with her from time to time, women of wonderful intellect, of superb power, of grand character, yet she was clearly the greatest of them all, the greatest woman of our century, perhaps the greatest of all time. We shall never see her like again."

Sound Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAMES C. DAVIS

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DAVIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, on February 16, 1950, the East Atlanta Post, No. 159, the American Legion, Atlanta, Ga., adopted a resolution regarding the gold standard.

Under leave previously granted, I insert this resolution herewith:

SOUND MONEY

Whereas we are fighting a global war of terrific intensity, but it will be easier to win the war of arms than to overcome the forces of financial evil which will not even hesitate to throw the entire world into economic chaos before they will willingly relinquish the power to manipulate and control money; and

Whereas formally silver and gold were used as money by weight being the unit of value in ancient transactions. Abraham gave, in weight; 400 shekels of silver for the cave of Machpelah. He was rich in flocks and herds and also silver and gold. David, King of Israel, paid 50 shekels of silver for a threshing floor; and later, 600 shekles of gold for the entire field in which the threshing floor was located; and

Whereas silver and gold were thus used as a medium of exchange, having an inherent value by weight and thus representing the value of goods, services and property in all business transactions. Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, in the first great economic conference (of which we have record) there he instituted gold as the standard of value, pronouncing the death sentence for anyone

who would refuse to abide by the ruling (Daniel 3: 1–6); and

Whereas by setting up gold alone as money there was instituted a rigid, inflexible monetary system, placing those in charge of gold to manipulate price levels and bring about periods of depression, thus they continually dominate the purchasing power of money, the price level, regardless of the actual value of things purchased: Therefore be it

Resolved, That East Atlanta Post, 159, the American Legion, Department of Georgia, memorialize the Executive Department of the National American Legion to petition the United States Congress to take steps necessary to assume its constitutional authority to coin money and regulate its value. Making gold and silver to function together making standard its value, like lineal measure which does not vary in length—the yardstick; and a standard of weight that is constant—the pound; as well as the measure of, capacity the gallon thus creating a ratio between demand and supply, further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be furnished our Representatives in Washington, D. C.

Unanimously adopted by East Atlanta Post, 159, the American Legion, Department of Georgia, February 16, 1950.

R. L. HARDEGREE,
Commander.
W. B. JONES,
Service Officer.

Beware of a Loafer's Paradise

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by James P. Lynch from the Exeter (N. H.) News-Letter of February 16, 1950, commenting on a Lincoln Day address by Harold E. Stassen, now president of the University of Pennsylvania:

BEWARE OF A LOAFER'S PARADISE

(By James P. Lynch)

Considerable advice on how to redeem the Republican defeat of 1948 has been given but we believe the greatest contribution to the Republican cause was made the other evening by a man who played a prominent part in the last presidential race.

Cautioning the people of America to beware of the establishment of a loafer's paradise, Harold E. Stassen, president of the University of Pennsylvania and former Governor of the State of Minnesota, declared: "Let us always have in mind that every attempt in the history of the world to establish a loafer's paradise has wound up in a dictator's hell-hole.

Typical of the fighting spirit of this great Republican leader, the speech was a sincere plea to Republicans throughout the Nation to step forward and meet the challenge of the exceptional task that confronts the party of the Great Emancipator.

This phrase "Beware of a loafer's paradise" should definitely be adopted as the fighting words of the Republican Party. It is much more defining, much more critical of the wasteful administration in Washington than the present ammunition of words.

Stassen paid tribute to Abraham Lincoln as one of those few men in all history who deeply understood the nature of man and one who had the unshakable courage to act in accordance with his convictions.

In his opening remarks the university prexy stated: "Lincoln believed he knew that man was meant to be free, and in moving addresses he declared that this Nation could not endure permanently half-slave and half-free.

"Standing fast upon this principle, Lincoln welded together a powerful and victorious political party, he took the leadership of the Nation and brought it through the hour of grim trial as one undivided United States of America."

Unlike some other orators that we heard during Lincoln Day dinners, Stassen did not dwell on the historic events of Lincoln which we are all so familiar with. He chose to discuss the more important issues of the day which we believe is the way Lincoln would prefer.

He pointed out that through the vigilance of the Republican Party and through some key decisions by the Supreme Court, the people of this country, thus far, in the main, have retained our economic freedom.

He stressed how we are being challenged by a new set of proposals that are weakening our independent structure. The advocates of these ideas have adopted the slogan, "Let the Government do it."

The methods of this school of thought, as the majority of us realize, call for nationalization, Government ownership, blanket controls, price fixing, heavy taxes, governmental distribution of goods, and governmental operation of all or a major part of the economy.

Cautioning the people against following such a course, Stassen declared: "If a man becomes subservient to the men in authority in his government for what he may eat and what he may wear, for where he may work, and what he may earn, for what he may produce and how he shall profit, for what he may build and where he may live, then he cannot truly be free in what he may say or write, or how he may worship, or how he may live."

"A man must either have complete freedom or he will not for long be truly free at all. A man cannot permanently be half a slave and half a freeman."

These are really threats to the future freedom of America although many probably are willing to accept them as a new trend. The Republican Party certainly can alter the direction of this freedom-losing road if it is willing to take a firm and definite position, not in words but in action. Republican Party leaders must make certain that those who are willing to participate in the give-away programs should be exposed and defeated at the polls. This includes the Truman Republicans. If the Republican Party is willing to take such clear-cut action the people will rally around such a fighting program.

Stassen's advice against increasing the power and bigness of Government is quite sound. Government is like a fire. If it is kept within bounds and under the control of the people, then it contributes to the welfare of all. But, and that word is very big, if it gets out of its place, gets too big and out of control, it destroys the happiness and even the lives of the people.

As the university president pointed out: One of the lessons of America's unparalleled progress is that Government's principal role is to protect men and to prevent crushing burdens from being laid upon them, to leave them free—truly free and completely free.

Stassen's suggestions certainly demonstrate that the Republicans made a drastic mistake in not appreciating his capabilities as the presidential nominee in the last campaign. We feel certain that if the people had been given the opportunity to select the candidate acceptance of the me-too nominee would not have been.

The former chief executive of Minnesota has not lost any of his political stature, in fact he has become increasingly strong. The people realize that he talks with them and not down to them. They know he wants to work with them and not be their caretaker. They see in men of his caliber a great Republican Party.

Stassen called for the adoption of the following basic objectives: "Let us rebuild the Republican Party as a dynamic, fighting party with the issue of the true freedom of man as our central rallying point.

"Let us make it clear that if people are looking for a political party that will promise to everyone ever larger hand-outs from the Public Treasury, they should look elsewhere, that we hold that the Public Treasury is in reality the people's pockets and that we will not seek to win votes by false promises nor by leading the country down that road that inevitably ends in a cheapened dollar and ultimate misery and suffering for all when resources are drained.

"Let us make it clear that if the people want a political party that will take over and politically dominate the medical professions in exchange for promises which the experience of Britain show cannot be fulfilled, they should look elsewhere.

"Let us make it clear that if they want a political party that will try to delude them into thinking that someone else is going to pay the tax burdens, they should look elsewhere.

"Let us make it clear we seek to build a political party that is frank and forthright with the people—a party that promises above all that it will not weaken or destroy any of the freedom of the people, that it will seek ever to maintain an incentive for every man and woman to use his hands and brains and capital in worth-while and productive accomplishment and service, and that it will steadfastly refuse to maintain or to operate any system of governmental hand-out, to provide soft cushions for loafers and chiselers or dishonest 5-percenters.

"Let us also declare with deep sincerity that man cannot truly be free if discrimination against him because of his race or religion or ancestry shuts doors to him of education or of employment or of shelter or of justice. Thus we shall make clear that having adopted this great principle, our party cannot contemplate and shall not consummate a fusion with those forces in our country affiliated by name with the opposition party who seek to join with us partially to protect economic freedom for themselves, but even more to deny freedom to others in their midst."

The humanitarian approach offered by Stassen makes certain that we should provide for the aged, infirm, or unemployed, but there is no room for the loafer. It also called for the curbing of the dictators within the unions. He emphasized that it is necessary to have a sound, strong union, directed by the freely made decisions of its own members. His plan denounced monopolies and called for real competitive production and distribution.

The Republican Party would do well to follow the advice given by this great statesman. It would lead to the road of victory for the GOP—a mighty important road, especially after being off it for so many years.

Taking From All of Us To Give to Some of Us

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CLARE E. HOFFMAN
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOFFMAN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, the coal strike, the scarcity of coal, the resulting unemployment and

suffering should bring home to us the fact long known, but consistently ignored by too many, that all of us are being penalized through higher costs for the benefit of first one group, then another.

Coal miners, steel workers, motor employees have from time to time received increases in wages, special benefits given them through contracts requiring primarily the employer, ultimately the consumer, to pay for those benefits.

Periodically, organized labor asks for an increase in wages or, like the miners, an increase in the tax levied upon production, for the benefit of that particular group.

Each time a group receives an increase in wages or payments for unemployment, sickness or pensions, obtains a shorter work week, or a subsidy, the cost falls upon everyone.

Everyone who thinks knows this to be true; that it cannot forever continue without giving us uncontrollable inflation.

To date, no effective action has been taken.

To bring home to the average citizen the procedure followed and to emphasize the danger in such a procedure, by permission granted, I am reprinting a leaflet put out by the Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., 205 East Forty-second Street, New York 17, New York, entitled "Exploitation by the Privileged Versus Equality Before the Law." It reads as follows:

EXPLOITATION BY THE PRIVILEGED VERSUS EQUALITY BEFORE THE LAW—WHICH DO YOU FAVOR?

Being a good American, you will probably answer without hesitation, "Equality before the law." But wait a minute. Is this your real attitude, or is equality before the law merely a shibboleth? Are you consistent? Do you advocate equal economic rights for everyone, all the time, or only for some people in special cases? Do you always object to exploitation?

Before you answer these questions definitely, it may be wise to consider certain specific instances.

You have a good job and a steady income. Suppose that you move to a new locality and start buying groceries from Mr. Brown who has a store near your home. If you continue to patronize him for a month, do you feel that you thereafter have a right to quit buying from him if you find that you can get equally good groceries cheaper elsewhere? You will probably say, "Of course."

IS BROWN'S CLAIM VALID?

But suppose that you discover that Mr. Brown has a wife and seven children to support, and that his net annual income is far smaller than yours. He insists that, under such circumstances, he has a right to compel you to patronize his store indefinitely. He also says that it is your duty to provide him and his family with adequate insurance against sickness and death, and to arrange to give him an old-age pension when he retires.

You will probably say that you never heard of such a preposterous proposition. Why should the fact that you have bought some groceries from Mr. Brown obligate you to support him and his family? Aren't you free to stop trading with him any day you please? What are his family's affairs to you? When you paid for your groceries you had fulfilled all of your obligations to him—and that's that.

Next, let us suppose that the grocers in the neighborhood discover that too many stores have opened there and that none of them are making decent profits. Is it legitimate for them to get together and agree to double all the prices charged for their goods? Under such circumstances, do you have a right to buy groceries from some store in the next town, and bring them home with you?

HOW WOULD YOU ANSWER?

You will probably say that it is not only your right—it is your duty to oppose any such high-handed attempt to rob you. The grocers ought to be prosecuted under the Sherman Act.

Now, let us go further and assume that all the grocers in the whole region unite in an association, and then inform you that, hereafter, you will have the option of either buying groceries from members of the association, or going without groceries and starving. They also warn you grimly that, if you order groceries from anyone else—for example from a mail order house—it will be your own fault if your car is wrecked, your house burned, or you are beaten up.

However, they tell you that they intend to be very reasonable about the whole matter, and that, if you and the other customers will appoint a committee to represent you, they will be willing to discuss calmly the question of whether grocery prices are to be trebled or merely doubled.

You will doubtless say that any group of merchants making such outrageous demands would promptly be sent to prison for long terms, and that they would richly deserve such punishment.

APPLY IT IMPARTIALLY

Now, we come to the vital issue. Is your antipathy for persons making such demands confined to merchants, or does it apply equally to all other persons guilty of the same offense? At first thought, you will say that your sentiment is general—you will see no reason for discriminating in favor of or against any particular class. But will you stick to this point of view when this test is applied to a specific case? Let us consider that of Mr. Green.

Unlike Mr. Brown, who sells groceries, Mr. Green sells his services as a coal miner. He also has a wife and seven children. For some months, he has been selling his services to Mr. Smith who owns a small coal mine. Mr. Green belongs to the United Mine Workers. He insists that, since Mr. Smith has been purchasing his services for several months, it is now Mr. Smith's duty to continue indefinitely to buy his services, and under no circumstances to patronize Mr. Black—a "scab" who is ready to sell as good or better services at a lower rate.

Do you still stick to your guns and say that Mine Owner Smith, as an American citizen, must have freedom to buy where he can buy cheapest; or do you feel that Mr. Green has a vested interest in his job?

YOUR OBLIGATIONS PILE UP

Mr. Green also insists that it is the duty of Customer Smith to see that Mr. Green and his family receive adequate care in case of accident or sickness, and that Mr. Smith provide Mr. Green with an old-age pension when the latter retires. Do you still consider this demand preposterous? Do you still hold that, when Smith pays for Green's services to date, Green has no right to ask Smith for anything additional?

Mr. Green says further that the United Mine Workers' demand that Mr. Smith buy coal-mining services solely from union members, at double prewar rates of pay, or else stop buying such services from anyone, and that, if he does buy services from others, he alone is to blame if his car is wrecked, his plant is burned, and he is beaten up. However, Mr. Green generously informs Mr. Smith that he may join with other coal-mine owners and appoint a committee to bargain with Mr. Green and his colleagues as to whether pay for coal mining shall be two and one-half times or only double prewar rates.

If Mr. Smith and his fellow mine owners are unreasonable and refuse to discuss the proposed rates of pay, they are free to close the mines and let coal users shut down their plants and allow their homes to remain unheated.

Incidentally, of course, at the time that Mr. Green is making this demand for the coal miners, Mr. White is making a similar demand for the trainmen, and Mr. Blue is joining in for the telephone operators. Mr. White and Mr. Blue state bluntly that, if their people cannot market their services at greatly advanced rates, the Nation can go without transportation.

IT'S COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Are you still ready to denounce such demands as outrageous, and urge that those making them be sent to prison for long terms? Before you so decide, remember that Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue are merely talking about collective bargaining—an institution which most reformers insist marks a great social advance. Remember also that, even under the Taft-Hartley law, the "slave labor act," industry-wide collective bargaining is permitted. Remember further that no coal miners, no railway workers, no telephone employees, have been sent to prison for making the just-mentioned demands on their employers.

"But," you will say, "the point overlooked is that Mr. Brown is selling commodities—groceries—while Mr. Green and Mr. White and Mr. Blue are selling personal services." However, is this difference real or merely fancied? Is it not true that Mr. Brown, like Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue, is engaged in selling his own services? Of course, grocers must pass along to you the costs to them of the goods at wholesale, clerk hire, rent, etc. But what they net is mostly pay for their own efforts in supervising the buying and selling of their merchandise.

YOU ARE BEING EXPLOITED

There seems, then, to be no escape from the fact that, if you wish to be logical, you must condemn equally Mr. Brown, Mr. Green, Mr. White, and Mr. Blue for engaging in most reprehensible conspiracies to injure their customers and the public in general. All alike are trying to exploit those who do not belong to their organization. If Mr. Brown ought to be sent to prison, so ought the others.

The only logical way to avoid this conclusion is to assume that members of labor unions are a privileged class who are entitled to plunder the underprivileged nonunionists. This is, indeed, the purport of such statutes as the Clayton Act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act, and the Wagner Act. If, after thinking matters over, you feel that, after all, most of us voters are so dumb that we deserve to be exploited, and that it is only fair to give to those keen enough to organize unions the special privilege of exploiting the rest of us, you will urge that the status quo be maintained. If, however, you should happen to decide in favor of equality before the law for all of us, you will demand the repeal of the just-mentioned statutes. It's up to you. What are you going to do about the whole matter?

The Spiritual Base of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, Under permission to extend my remarks, I include a thinking, a penetrating, and a powerful address made by the Honorable John E. Peurifoy, Deputy Under Secretary of State, before the International Christian Leadership, Inc., in Washington, D. C., on February 3, 1950:

I welcome the opportunity to talk with you tonight. As members of the Christian fellowship groups, you are primarily concerned with the advance of spiritual values. I believe that the most certain legacy that we, as fathers, can leave our children is one of the spirit. Our hope for future generations of Americans must be based on bequeathing them an inheritance of spiritual and moral leadership. The enduring thing we can pass on to them is a living tradition.

The great nations of this world, those that have exerted most marked influence for good on the history of man, are those nations whose leaders were men of vision with great spiritual qualities. The dictators, the tyrants have their brief innings, fall, and are remembered only for the evil they worked. The work of moral leadership lives on. Ancient Greece, constricted in size and arid in soil, gave the standards of truth, beauty, and liberty as we know them today. From tiny Palestine came a philosophy which has influenced the moral code of the Christian world for nearly 2,000 years. The might and wealth of greater nations have vanished but the vision of the prophets of Judah and the teachings of Christ are a potent influence in the world today.

Our United States, the richest country in the world in physical wealth and material resources, must be great in spiritual leadership if we are to play our great role in the destiny of nations. We must have a living spiritual philosophy to fight the material forces of communism. Communism is a philosophy of materialism and refuses to acknowledge the existence of God. Even more, communism is an avowed nonrecognition of God. Mark how many thousands of priests and churchmen have been arrested in Communist-dominated countries. The Communist action against the clergy in Czechoslovakia is the most recent example of their campaign against the spiritual leaders of a society.

This is evidence of Communist recognition and Communist fear of the strength and durability of spiritual leadership and their acknowledgment that the churches are spiritual strongholds that stand against efforts to enslave mankind.

In taking control of a nation, the Communists have followed a consistent pattern. Their first move is the seizure of governmental powers. Their next move is always the same, either to liquidate the spiritual leaders or to make these leaders subject to them. Once these two steps have been accomplished, a Communist minority as small as 2 percent can control a country.

We must face this fact at the outset. The forces of communism are on the march. We must recognize that this is not alone a fight between the Catholic Church and communism, but a fight between communism and all faiths—Catholics, Jews, and Protestants.

In this battle, the various religious faiths have at hand effective weapons, and the major weapon in the religious arsenal is that of the Christian principle. The moral force of that weapon is immeasurable.

The programs that the United States has launched since 1945, and the projects in which we have participated, individually and collectively, conform to the Christian ideal. As far as America is concerned, the elements of these principles have long been an integral part of this democracy. It is only to be expected that we should project them into our dealings with other nations.

Since VJ-day, American policy in dealing with other nations has involved a number of important steps. We took a leading role in UNRRA and contributed substantial amounts of food, clothing, and other necessities to peoples made destitute by the war. Subsequently, we provided huge quantities of food, materials, and equipment to stricken nations in western Europe to help them get back on their feet. This was under the Marshall plan and I call to your attention that much of these goods and equipment were grants-in-aid. In other words, they were gifts from the American people.

Of course, we did these things partly out of self-interest. We were aware that American welfare depended on the welfare of our neighbors.

Some of our programs have been in effect long enough to show what strength, resolution, and moral force can accomplish.

A freely elected Greek Government is still in office, and with a determined assist from us, has routed the forces of Communist guerrillas which threatened its survival. Internal conditions, in the economic sphere, have improved considerably. With our aid, the Turkish Government fended off a threat of encroachment and is measurably more solidly established. An American mediator, as an official of the United Nations with the power of that organization behind him, succeeded in resolving a dispute between the Arab states and the Israeli which had flared into open conflict.

The United Nations, in which we take an active part, must be given a large share of the credit for the establishment of the free nations of Indonesia and of the Republic of South Korea. The Marshall plan has been, and is still, instrumental in an inspiring revival of the economies of the states of western Europe. Conditions in those nations, in comparison with the state of affairs that obtained immediately after the war, are enormously better. Food is far more abundant than it was—although some shortages still persist. In most nations the rate of production, which is economic lifeblood, is moving steadily upward and has passed the 1938 levels.

Furthermore, the North Atlantic Treaty and the mutual defense assistance program have done much to allay the fears of invasion and have provided a sense of security that is essential to political stability and to further economic recovery.

This is only a partial and certainly a cursory review of what has been achieved. Even as such, I submit that it is an impressive record.

In western Europe and in the Middle East, and even in certain segments of the Far East where it seemed to be making sweeping progress, communism has received a series of set-backs from which I hope it may never recover. This I am sure provides a practical and convincing answer to the question about the power of Christian principles intelligently applied.

Nonofficial organizations, such as the Christian fellowship groups, can be of real service in turning back the tide of communism. They can help in extending the application of the Christian principles we have been discussing. Earlier I pointed out that the spiritual leaders of a society are regarded by the Communists as major threats to Communist power.

It is conceivable that vigorous promotion of human rights will compel the Communist leaders to alter their course and to deal with the rest of the world in a more Christian manner. They might be forced to live up to their international commitments and so begin to cooperate with free nations in establishing a world system of law and reason.

Of this you can be sure: news of each gain in human rights will penetrate the iron curtain. The fact that men outside the curtain are successfully working out the pattern of living together in which the individual is free of oppression, can come and go as he pleases, and is guaranteed certain basic rights—which are enforced by law—will make itself felt among the masses of Russia. It may take a generation but once that fact gains acceptance, we can look for a more tractable Soviet policy. We can expect a Soviet Government which will discharge its obligations to other nations.

When that happens we will have established the basis for an enduring peace—an achievement to which you may justly claim a considerable contribution. You will have helped to assure an increase of spiritual values in the world of tomorrow.

Basing-Point System: Its Catastrophic Effects on Growth of Various Regions of the Country as Attested to by Leading Economists—Excerpts From Statements by Dr. Walter A. Adams, Dr. Fritz Machlup, and Dr. Vernon A. Mund

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important aspects of the basing-point system is its effect upon the growth of the various regions of this country. This question has been examined at some length by economists appearing before the House Small Business Committee. Under permission to revise and extend my remarks, I would like to include a few excerpts from the testimony of Dr. Walter A. Adams, professor of economics, Michigan State College; Dr. Fritz Machlup, professor of political economy, Johns Hopkins University; and Dr. Vernon A. Mund, professor of economics, University of Washington, bearing on this point. These excerpts make it abundantly clear that, in view of the experts who have carefully studied the basing-point problem, the restoration of the basing-point system will have exceedingly injurious effects upon the regional development.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF WALTER ADAMS, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, MICHIGAN STATE COLLEGE, EAST LANSING, MICH., BEFORE THE HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 5, 1949

The fourth objection to the basing-point system (and to the pricing system which this bill would authorize) is that it results in an uneconomic location of both producers and consumers. As far as producers are

concerned, they experience no particular pressure to respond to changing locational factors. They tend to maintain their investment in locationally anachronistic areas, because "under the umbrella of a controlled-price system the test of profitable plant location ceases to be essentially a matter of cost of production and distribution. * * * Plants thereby may be established at uneconomic points in terms of production costs."

Why, it may be asked, should Detroit have only 5 percent of the Nation's steel capacity, when Detroit industries consume more than 15 percent of the total steel output? This question becomes especially embarrassing when it is considered that Detroit has a more favorable location in respect to scrap, iron ore, and a substantial portion of the market than Pittsburgh, for example. It is indeed strange that Pittsburgh, with the decreasing locational pull of coal resources and the increasing locational attraction of steel markets,[1] should be able to retain 40 percent of national steel capacity, when the industries in that area consume only about half that amount, thus necessitating an exportation of the rest. This anomalous situation can be attributed largely to the basing-point system which tends to neutralize geographic advantages and disadvantages between steel producers by allowing every steel mill to compete on a substantially equal footing for any piece of business anywhere in the country, a criticism which applies (although to a lesser degree) to any system of pricing involving freight absorption.

In addition to this uneconomic location of producing plants, the basing-point system tends to encourage the location of steel-consuming plants in areas which, under other pricing systems, would not have been selected. The reason for this is that, under the basing-point system, the lowest price for steel is not necessarily obtained by locating close to a steel mill, but rather by locating in the proximity of a basing point. Thus a steel consumer who, under f. o. b. mill system, might have located in Detroit would instead establish his plant at Pittsburgh or Chicago or some other basing point, in spite of the fact that the latter location results in higher social costs.

Such distortion in the location of both producing and consuming plants tends to favor a geographical concentration of industry, a phenomenon which might prove very hazardous for national security in case another total war materialized. Aside from economic considerations, it would seem unwise public policy to encourage a pricing system which tends to stimulate a geographical concentration of industry by allowing freight absorption. Instead, our interest in national defense should constitute a compelling reason for advocating such pricing systems as will favor a progressive locational diversification and decentralization of industrial establishments.

Finally, we should recognize that, in spite of the official opposition to the f. o. b. mill system emanating from steel circles, some companies are in no danger of loss as a result of the basing-point system's abandonment. Bethlehem Steel, for example, is favorably situated for the eastern seaboard and export market; Inland Steel has the vast Chicago market at its plant gate; National Steel operates in steel-starved Detroit; Republic Steel is favorably situated in Cleveland. That these companies have not, to date, suffered adversity under the f. o. b. mill system is best seen in their recent profit figures. Other companies, to be sure—notably United States Steel—with substantial capacity in the less advantageous Pittsburgh-Youngstown area are not so fortunate. They will have to look for new markets when steel demand slackens. With systematic freight absorption illegal, United States Steel and others like it will eventually have to move part of their capacity to better locations, that is, closer to markets and scrap sources. Such moves are entirely in accord with sound economic development and should not be discouraged by a reimposition of basing-point pricing.

[1] D. Lynch, The Concentration of Economic Power, New York, Columbia University Press, 1946, p. 191.

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF DR. FRITZ MACHLUP, PROFESSOR OF POLITICAL ECONOMY, THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY, SUBMITTED TO HOUSE SMALL BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 6, 1949

The basing-point system of pricing enables each member of an industry to calculate the exact prices that he may expect every one of his cooperating competitors to quote for the product delivered to any of the 60,000 or more destinations in the United States. The system thus permits the competitors to eliminate price competition and without prior consultation to quote to any one buyer exactly identical prices despite the different freight costs from the various production places to the destination. One of the great advantages of the basing-point system to the industries in which it is employed is that it permits price fixing, without traceable communication among the cooperators and, hence, with less direct evidence of conspiracy than can possibly be discovered in other forms of combinations in restraint of competition. If the cooperators are careful, they can maintain such a price-fixing scheme indefinitely without being caught unless the very adherence to the system is accepted as prima facie evidence of collusion. Section 1 of S. 1008 in its present form immunizes the inherently collusive practice unless the existence of the combination, conspiracy, or collusive agreement is proved.

An advantage of the basing-point system to the largest corporations in the industries in which it is employed is that it permits those firms to dominate and oppress the smaller firms in the industry without leaving any direct evidence of the oppressiveness of the discriminatory policy. These large corporations can restrict the operations and prevent the growth of the small businesses by using the discriminatory pricing practice of the basing-point system and professing that they are merely "meeting the equally low price of a competitor." The oppressive effects are discernible only by subtle methods of economic analysis. It is uncertain whether the results of such an analysis would be admitted as the "substantial and probative evidence" which is required by section 4 of S. 1008.

The collusive-monopolistic and oppressive-discriminatory nature of the basing-point system was exposed in chapters 4 and 5 of my book, The Basing-Point System (published in March 1949 by the Blakiston Co., of Philadelphia). This book incorporates the results of years of painstaking and impartial study of the established facts in several court cases as well as to the economic analyses presented by opponents and defenders of the controversial pricing system. The contentions denying the monopolistic and discriminatory nature of the basing-point system proved to be absolutely untenable and sometimes deliberate falsehoods. The case against the basing-point system and against similar "freight-equalization systems," as they are sometimes called, proved to be so strong that a condemnation of these systems in the strongest terms became inescapable.

The 1948 decision of the Supreme Court in the Cement case, holding that the basing-point system was illegal under existing law, was a late but incontrovertible recognition of the monopolistic effects of the system. In a thorough analysis of the economic consequences of the operation of the basing-point system—in chapters 6 and 7 of my book—I came to the conclusions that "the system—

"(1) reduces the degree of competition in the sale of the products concerned;

"(2) causes wastes in transportation by encouraging shipments over unnecessarily long distances and by unnecessarily expensive means;

"(3) raises the level, reduces the flexibility, and distorts the structure of prices;

"(4) facilitates the increase or maintenance of concentration of control in the industry;

"(5) reduces the utilization of productive capacity in the industry;

"(6) severs the price connection between expansion of capacity and growth of demand;

"(7) distorts the location of productive capacity in the industry by retarding its decentralization; and

"(8) distorts the location of fabricating industries by fostering undue centralization."

EXCERPT FROM STATEMENT OF DR. VERNON A. MUND, PROFESSOR OF ECONOMICS, UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON, SEATTLE, SUBMITTED TO HOUSE SMALL-BUSINESS COMMITTEE, JULY 5, 1949

From a public point of view, various economists have pointed out, the practice of sporadic discrimination is an undesirable method of competition (1) because it forces some customers to pay excessive local prices, and (2) because it subjects small competitors in distant areas to the fear and hazard of anarchic price cutting. The large producer may honestly not intend to kill off a distant competitor, but the fact remains that no seller likes to see a competitor grow bigger and more powerful if he can prevent it. Thus, sporadic discrimination, used by a dominant firm to meet competition, may be exercised to hold prices at an unremunerative level at distant points, so that rival sellers fail to grow, wither on the vine, or eventually drop out of production. Since the discrimination is exercised in accordance with no principle except that of meeting competition, a small producer can never be sure about the prices which he is likely to find in his area. The resulting uncertainty and the fear of retaliation thereupon frequently become important factors in inducing the small firm to follow the leader in a policy of cooperative, systematic price discrimination.

Basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems force buyers to purchase two commodities—the manufactured goods and freight—on terms and conditions determined solely by the producers. In charging phantom or fictitious freight, a mill forces a buyer to purchase transportation service which he doesn't want and which he doesn't get. This gives a particular mill net prices higher than the base price by the amount of the fictitious freight. On the other hand, in the case of absorbed freight, the railroad is paid the actual freight cost, and the mill secures net prices which are lower than the base price of the amount of the absorbed freight.

Buyers (fabricators) located at or near a nonbase mill do not want to pay phantom freight, for such a charge places them at a competitive disadvantage with fabricators located at or near a base bill. Likewise, buyers located near a base mill which is engaged in freight absorption, find that they are denied the advantage of their location and are forced to pay high local prices which help to defray the delivery cost to other buyers.

The Pacific Northwest is now producing approximately 50 percent of the total aluminum ingot production in the United States. However, we are doing very little in manufacture of finished aluminum products. The situation has led many to question the advantages of the aluminum industry to the region in view of the fact that it is a heavy power consumer, but a relatively small employer. The question is frequently asked why with all of our aluminum production we

don't have more fabricating facilities. The fact is that insofar as basic commodities—such as aluminum—are produced locally and sold freight allowed, with an average freight item included, local prices are high, as high as elsewhere in the country, and fabricators find no cost advantage in locating in the Pacific Northwest.

Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE D. O'SULLIVAN
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. O'SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call your attention to a splendid article which appears on pages 3 and 4 of the February 1950 issue of the Progressive, a magazine published monthly by The Progressive, Inc., 408 West Gorham Street, Madison 3, Wis.

This article presents the most readable break-down of what President Truman's $42,000,000,000 1950–51 budget request is to be spent for and dispels many of the wild claims of some people and silences many of the untrue claims and spurious arguments heretofore made by persons against this present-day budget request.

The article which I refer to is as follows:

The President's 1950–51 budget, second highest in the Nation's peacetime history, drew howls of protest from the conservative press and politicians. The $42,000,000,000 budget, and its $5,000,000,000 deficit, were blasted as "the bankrupting cost of the welfare state" and as "laying the bricks on the socialist road to economic ruin."

Analysis of the budget shows how weirdly inaccurate such charges are. Nearly three-quarters of the budget's forty-two billions—72.4 percent, to be exact—is earmarked for war, whether for past wars, the present cold war, or preparation for future wars.

Item-by-item break-down of the recommended expenditures reveals that of every dollar of expenditure provided in the budget:

Thirty-one and nine-tenths cents will go directly for national defense.

Thirteen and two-tenths cents will pay interest on the national debt, most of it incurred in the two World Wars.

Fourteen and three-tenths cents will be disbursed in the form of veterans' benefits.

Eleven and one-tenth cents will be paid in international security grants to foreign nations.

One and nine-tenths cents are earmarked for atomic-energy development.

The total of these war and defense appropriations is 72.4 cents out of every dollar of Federal spending.

Conversely, the total of all Government activities which could be classified as welfare or social-service programs comes to 18.8 cents, of which aid to the aged, the blind, and the otherwise handicapped comes to 3.6 cents; other social welfare and health services, 2.8 cents; purchase of housing mortgages, 2.3 cents; housing and slum clearance, 1 cent; aid to agriculture, 3.6 cents; rural electrification and rural housing, 1.6 cents; and subsidies to business, 3.9 cents.

Significantly, the last item is the largest but, of course, provokes the least outcry. These subsidies go to newspapers and magazines, the merchant marine, and air lines, all privately owned and operated for private profit.

We shall be watching with great interest when the economy bloc goes into action. We have no doubt that there is waste in the Federal establishment, and that sound economies can be made without disturbing vital functions of the Government. But we're convinced that any genuine effort at economy must be made with the understanding that the budget finances a warfare state, not a welfare state."

A Fact We Sometimes Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, religion is on the defensive in many parts of the world today. This is a time which calls for utmost cooperation among the great faiths of the world in spreading religious tolerance of our fellow men. Better understanding among the people of all groups would, in these days of moral crisis, contribute most effectively toward better relationship in the political and socio-economic spheres which have so rent the world asunder.

One of the most constructive methods toward interfaith understanding is the annual observance of Brotherhood Week, which occurs this year during the week of February 19–26. In connection with that observance, I am placing in the RECORD an editorial written by the Rev. Richard Ginder, editor of the publication the Priest, as follows:

BROTHERHOOD WEEK, FEBRUARY 19–26, 1950

It will come as a distinct surprise to many a Christian when, on the last day, he confronts, as his judge, a young man, exceedingly handsome, and with a face that is unmistakably Jewish. It's only natural, especially in these latter centuries, to identify Christianity with the non-Jewish element in the world, that to say a man is a Christian is practically, by that very word, to spot him as a Gentile, or a non-Jew.

We tend to forget that when the Wise Men came to Jerusalem they inquired, "Where is He that is born King of the Jews?" And Herod sent them to Bethlehem, the ancient city of David, where they found Jesus.

And when the Messiah began His public life, He surrounded Himself with 12 Jews—the Apostles. It was a Jew, St. Paul, who first carried the Gospel to the Gentiles. It is through him that the rest of us have been made sharers in God's revelation.

That Blessed Virgin Mary, who was His mother and to whom Christianity has had such a tender devotion throughout the ages, was a Jewess, the daughter of St. Anne and St. Joachim.

Catholics venerate a Jew, St. Peter, as their first pope, and another Jew as his successor.

It was the children of Abraham who, through generation after generation, handed down God's truth in a world that else would have lost it. Moses, David, Solomon, Isaiah—Jews, all of them—were God's instruments in penning the most sublime pages of our literature. They were His people, chosen above all others, to preserve orthodox dogma, the concept of an invisible Creator of all things. It was their mission to school the world in a religion of sacrifice and atonement, to sensitize the human conscience and educate it to ideas of justice, truth, and purity.

And they fulfilled their mission admirably. They had their lapses, it's true, but always somehow they managed to get back on the track. So that when Our Lord did come, finally, He could speak to a people that understood His language, a people well versed in things of the altar.

Protestant or Catholic, our spiritual ancestry is Jewish. It is a fact we should never forget.

REV. RICHARD GINDER,
Editor, the Priest.

Torture in Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include an article, by Mr. Lawrence R. Goldberg, appearing in the January 8, 1950, edition of the Boston Sunday Post, which graphically describes the terrible conditions in Lithuania today as the result of Soviet tyranny. It is a poignant reminder that the tremendous sacrifices in two World Wars will have been in vain if Lithuania, and the other small democratic nations, are not liberated from ruthless imperialism. Let us hope that the new phase of our foreign policy will include a stern demand that Russia relinquish her strangle-hold upon Lithuania and permit a peace loving people to rule themselves as they have a right to do under God's law as well as international law.

The article by Mr. Goldberg follows:

BARE TORTURE IN LITHUANIA—UNDERGROUND LEADERS SEND GRAPHIC STORY AND PICTURES TO SHOW WHAT REDS ARE DOING

(By Lawrence R. Goldberg)

A series of photographs brought to the United States from the underground resistance movement in Lithuania—accompanied by sworn-to facts and figures—poignantly depict what is going on behind the iron curtain enveloping that country.

They show conditions there under Soviet rule growing steadily worse in all phases of life—moral, social, political, economical, cultural, and military—and pose a dramatic plea to the free part of the world for aid.

"Our nation is being crucified," writes one of the underground leaders in a letter accompanying the photographs. "Our blood-stained hands reach out to you. It is our own blood. It flows in streams. Our burning homesteads light up the sky, nothing but blood and suffering everywhere. The summer sun does not dry up the blood, nor do winter colds congeal it. This blood is only washed away by the tears of our mothers, wives, sweethearts, and children as they embrace us."

COLD FURY

"As we look around at the devastation of our homes; as we see the hideous crimes of violence; we forget our exhaustion and a calm, cold fury gives up strength to fight on.

"The bodies of our men, robbed, bared, and mutilated lie in piles in town market places for weeks; by such display our oppressors attempt to intimidate us. Our people are spied on through the windows to discover any sorrow on the part of families for

their dead. Occasionally a mother, a sweetheart or a sister breaks down and embraces the corpse of her beloved. Then hundreds of Russians, like a pack of bloodthirsty wolves, pounce upon the relatives—new victims for Siberia."

TERRIBLE TRAGEDY

"There is no place, no school, nor factory job for the relatives of the fallen. There is not a single village nor a home which has not experienced the terrible tragedy of reprisal.

"We shall fight for our homeland to the last. Our lives we shall sell dearly on our own ancestral soil rather than waste away in Siberia. Our bodies will fertilize our beloved soil and succeeding generations will be imbued with a greater love for this—our motherland. We pass into eternity with a mouthful of the sacred soil.

"During the past 3 years of fighting we have lost hundreds of thousands of lives—some fallen in battle in the homeland, others suffering in Siberia. But the 3,000,000 of us keep on fighting against the 200,000,000 strong occupants armed with most modern weapons. And we shall win.

SPRING WILL COME

"Spring will come. Nothing can change the tide of our Nemunas, father of our rivers. All praise to our gallant priests—there were 1,000 here in 1945, 600 have died or are in Siberia or are with us in the forests. All praise to our students. Born free men in a free homeland, they refuse to become enslaved. Some 16-year-olds, with fettered hands and feet, defiantly march to die in Siberia—with heads held high. Inhuman torture has brought about no instance of betrayal; he who has tasted freedom will never become a slave.

"The occupants fear us. The doors are never left unbarred. Our people have produced few traitors—our oppressors bear foreign names. Our own striking squads eventually take care of those few who betray our people.

"We are not cruel, but we are dealing with rapacious beasts. Not one Russian died without first being warned to leave our soil. But when they victimize our people without any conscience—we simply defend ourselves.

"For 3 years we have listened to ravings regarding the paradise which would follow the 5-year plan. Yet the situation gets worse every month. Selling our last overcoat, we buy food for our children. We work long hours to earn one-tenth of what is needed to fight hunger."

SCANT FOOD

"Our children no longer know what sugar, butter or meat look like. After a hard day's work we must go to the agitpunkt to listen to what Stalin had said regarding life after 5 years. We go home at night with clubs in hand lest militiamen or soldiers should attack and disrobe us. A great many lives have been lost because of a well-worn overcoat.

"The silhouette of an approaching human figure causes us to make a wide detour. The militia check our papers at night—in other words, we are robbed by the representatives of law and order. If one complains, he is accused of being a counter-revolutionary by drunken militiamen.

"There is very little electricity. Fences, window sills, and partitions were burned for fuel. Roofs are holed. Only 10 percent of our production remains in the country, the rest is moved to Russia—to the paradise where father and teacher Stalin feeds everyone with milk and honey, where orange factories are producing in three shifts."

5-YEAR PLAN

"The Communists now tell us that our beautiful structures erected in 1935 and earlier were built by the working people as part of the 5-year plan. Should one evince the slightest doubt, he is exiled to Siberia for 10 or 15 years. Lavishly furnished shops for Communists sell at black market prices.

"These are not for us: our 1 month's earnings are not enough to buy 1 day's needed supplies. Officially, we are all equal, but Communists live extravagantly in sumptuous apartments while in the grace of their masters. They eat in separate restaurants and buy in special stores. Those who earn their bread in sweat are hungry and ragged.

"Under armed guard we are forced to march in the demonstrations of joy. The bayonet troops prod us to hail when passing the reviewing stand. Nevertheless, our heads sag or turn away. * * *

"We are very much surprised at the timidity of the Vatican broadcasts. Why be afraid? We are not afraid to die for our faith, for our homeland and for civilization. Fear not to lift your voice in loud protest. Harbor no fears for us—nothing could possibly be worse. We are dying, but in dying we want to know that there are people in the free part of the world who do not fear to raise their voice in behalf of the oppressed. Do not be afraid to drop the atomic bomb which our oppressors fear so greatly. We are prepared to pay this price for freedom."

LATEST STATISTICS

Latest available statistics divide the country's 3,250,000 population as follows:

	Percent
Lithuanians	80.60
Jews	7.15
Germans	4.10
Poles	3.04
Russians	2.35
Latvians	0.69
Whiteruthenes	0.21
Others	1.86

Before the Russians came this population distribution by religion was:

	Percent
Roman Catholics	80.48
Protestants	9.54
Israelites	7.26
Greek Orthodox	2.54
Other Christians	0.09
Other non-Christians	0.09

The following show what has happened to Catholics since June 1940, when the Soviets occupied the country:

	1940	1948
Archbishops and bishops	14	1
Clergy	1,646	400
Monastic order members	1,586	0
Churches	1,202	60
Parishioners	2,776,422	0
Theological seminaries	4	0
Catholic faculty in universities	1	0
State assistance	L1,383,278	0
Church taxation	0	0
Divinity students	470	0
Killed or exiled clergymen (percent)	0	75
Catholic press 1935:		
Number	52	0
Circulation	7,030,200	0
Religious-philosophy books	209	0
Sodality-fraternity members	800,000	0

RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

The underground data does not disclose clandestine cathechetic instruction by clergymen and laymen, and the secret religious press. Religious books and articles bring highest prices in the black market. All of the Catholic scientific, educational, social, athletic, labor, economic, publishing and charitable institutions, academies, schools, libraries, kindergartens, associations, sodalities, et cetera, have been closed and their property confiscated by the Russians.

No religious literature—no catechism, missals, discourses, etc.—is printed; no paper is alloted by the government—and all printing places are state-operated. No priests are permitted to enter hospitals, schools, barracks, and prisons to administer the sacraments. The priests enter jails only as prisoners.

Since 1947, the Russians have attacked the church from another angle—clamoring against the Vatican and demanding creation of a "national Catholic Church."

Priests are repeatedly summoned and urged to break with "the fascist Vatican"—or be imprisoned for "espionage" and contact with "the Vatican intelligence." In several parishes pastors have been arrested and apostate priests installed, without the Bishop's blessing. Bishop's representatives were barred. Local Communist officials became ardent and regular "church-goers"—but no one else goes there.

SEARCHING PARTIES

Persons exhibiting religious icons and crucifixes in their homes come under persecution. Religious pictures and statuettes found in homes by armed searching parties infuriate the Russians and their stooges. Religious objects are smashed, bayoneted, spat upon, and trampled.

The "boss" of the country is a satrap of the Kremlin—comrade Shcherbakov, titled All-Union Communists party's Bolshevik Plenipotentiary for Lithuania.

Of the so-called "Luthuanian Units," only one survives—the 16th Infantry Division stationed in Vilnius. The enlisted and non-commissioned officers personnel is roughly 80 percent Lithuanian, but the officer cadres are predominantly Russian on all levels. Orders are given in Russian. Colonel Motieka is the divisional commander, and political "General" Macijauskas is deputy commanding officer. All other mobilized Lithuanians are dispersed throughout Russian units.

MAJOR NAVAL BASE

Klaipeda (Memel) is converted into a major submarine and naval base.

During the first half of 1948, regular Soviet army forces (exclusive of the navy and spy units) stationed in Lithuania numbered about 80,000 men of infantry, artillery, aviation, armored, and tank units. The artillery is concentrated along the seacoast.

Preparations for war are in evidence everywhere. New airfields are constructed, old fields are expanded and modernized. Armored units, air squadrons, and artillery are constantly in transit. Closely guarded military trains travel by night. The populace is kept in a state of nervous war tension.

Mobilization exercises are periodically staged. Speakers addressing mass meetings denounce American and British "imperialists" and "warmongering aggressors." War morale permeates the administrative apparatus, the party and army circles. Workers are urged to strain every effort for the "defense of the Soviet motherland" and to increase the output.

The United States and Rearming of the Arabs

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, from all sides reports have been coming in about the current rearmament program of the Arab countries. Fears have been expressed by various well-informed people in this country and abroad that the British rearmament of the Arabs will

lead to a general armaments race in the Near East and to an inevitable renewal of warfare in that part of the world which will result in the most dire consequences: Instead of peace, we shall witness bloodshed; instead of economic development and upbuilding of underdeveloped areas, we shall have widespread destruction; instead of security and tranquillity for the people of the Near East and the safeguarding of American interests and American policy, the entire region will be thrown into chaos.

This very day a delegation of responsible Jewish leaders in the United States submitted a memorandum on the subject of rearmament of the Arab states to the Department of State. This delegation was headed by Mr. Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American-Zionist Council which comprises all Zionist groups and organizations in this country. In addition to Mr. Lipsky, the delegation included Mrs. Moses P. Epstein, Dr. Pinchus Churgin, Mr. Louis Segal, Mr. Elihu David Stone, of Boston, and Rabbi Jerome Unger, executive director of the council.

In their memorandum, the delegation presented the facts and urged our Government to use its great influence to avert the dangers to the peace of Palestine involved in the situation which is being created, and to request Great Britain to discontinue the shipment of arms to the Arab countries. I think the overwhelming majority of Members of this House will desire to read the memorandum in order to get acquainted with the facts.

Mr. Speaker, now is the time to forestall bloodshed and to put an end to plans for revenge and for a second round against Israel. Tomorrow may be too late. Here is ample warning that a dangerous situation is developing in the Near East which is reaching explosive stages. It will be a very sad day for the world if we suddenly discover that we failed to heed this warning.

The full text of the memorandum submitted by the American Zionist Council to the Department of State, as well as the statement by Mr. Lipsky following the conference at the Department of State, are as follows:

THE REARMAMENT OF THE ARAB STATES—MEMORANDUM SUBMITTED TO THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF STATE BY THE AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

1. We have the honor to address you, on behalf of the American Zionist Council, to express to you the deep concern felt by American Zionist bodies over American policy with respect to the rearmament of Egypt and other Arab states. We refer, in particular, to your recent letter to Congressman JACOB K. JAVITS.

2. It is a matter of public knowledge that the Jews of Israel have engaged in the most difficult resettlement program in the history of our times. They have absorbed into the economic life of Israel in a period of 19 months 354,169 Jews who have made their way to the homeland under great difficulties from many lands of persecution. The Jews of the United States have been active partners in this work of reconstruction and rehabilitation. They have given of their means with unparalleled generosity to enable the struggling state to integrate the returning settlers in the economic and cultural life of the community.

3. The threat to the peace of Israel implicit in the rearming of the Arab states has evoked apprehension and uneasiness on the part of all American Jews, as well as large segments of American public opinion on the whole. We are greatly concerned lest the constructive work of the State of Israel and its program of absorbing the tens of thousands of refugees may have to be curtailed and the community forced by the growing menace of a renewal of warfare to take up the heavy task of preparing to defend their lives and the communities they have established. We are greatly disturbed lest the hard-won truce with a number of Arab states may be broken by the incitements of the forces of aggression who are being stimulated by the fact that their governments are assembling large quantities of formidable destructive weapons available for immediate use.

4. It has been a source of pride to us that the Government of the United States played a memorable role in the United Nations in the rise of the people of Israel to independence and statehood, that our Government was the first to recognize the State of Israel and that it has cooperated with the new state in the solution of many of the problems confronting it.

5. Moreover the Government of the United States participated constructively in the deliberations at the United Nations to end the conflict in the Near East and actively supported those steps which led to the signing of armistice agreements between Israel and her four Arab neighbors.

6. It is our sincere belief that our Government maintains the policy of continuing helpfulness to the State of Israel, and, indeed, to all the states of the Near East, but we are constrained to admit our inability to reconcile your recent letter with that policy.

7. It will be recalled that when the Security Council voted to lift the arms embargo on August 4, 1949, there was widespread concern lest an armament race develop in the Near East. Israel's representative to the Security Council, Mr. Aubrey S. Eban, expressed doubt that the newly won peace could survive the strains of that competition and urged a moral directive by the Security Council to exert influence on the arms-supplying states in order to insulate the Near East against the worst dangers of an armaments race.

8. Members of the Security Council shared Mr. Eban's apprehension and there was general agreement that care and restraint must be exercised in the Near East to prevent large-scale rearmament. Thus, Sir Terrence Shone, the representative of the United Kingdom, declared that any supplies of arms which his Government might send would be for the internal security and defense requirements of the States concerned. But he said the United Kingdom was opposed to the Middle Eastern states acquiring war material in excess of their legitimate defense requirements, and, he said, "We believe the states themselves would not wish to exceed such limitations." Dr. Ralph Bunche, the former acting mediator, observed that in the absence of a firm injunction, coupled with observation machinery, "the burden really seems to rest upon the states in a position to ship arms."

9. And, as you note in your letter to Congressman JAVITS, former Senator Austin, on behalf of the United States, told the Council that export of arms to the area should be "strictly limited to such arms as are within the scope of legitimate security requirements."

10. Events since the lifting of the arms embargo challenge the assurances that were given during the Security Council's deliberations. The Arab countries are now acquiring heavy arms which far exceed those necessary for the purpose of maintaining internal law and order by the governments concerned in the legitimate exercise of constituted authority and for the purpose of providing for reasonable requirements of self-defense.

11. The facts are well known. The 1949–50 budget approved by the Egyptian parliament was fixed at 87,457,280 Egyptian pounds (before devaluation), and of this fully one-third—the extraordinary sum of 62,000,000 Egyptian pounds—was allocated for rearmament. Since that time, newspaper dispatches have fully reported Egypt's purchase of jet planes and heavy bombers, destroyers, frigates and corvettes, hundreds of heavy tanks and heavy artillery of all calibers. In addition, there have been authoritative reports of the establishment of armored formations both by Egypt and Syria, the establishment of an arms industry in Egypt, and the acquisition of hundreds of armored cars by Egypt, Syria, and Hashemite Jordan.

12. Manifestly, equipment of such range and striking power is intended for purposes other than internal order and security. While it is conceded that there may be internal unrest in Egypt—the inevitable consequence of poverty—the people are unarmed and jet planes, tanks, and destroyers are not needed to subdue them. Economic unrest is not quieted by the diversion of a huge proportion of a country's substance to the nonproductive weapons of war.

13. In our judgment, there is every ground for fear that these arms will eventually be used for a renewal of Egypt's aggression against Israel, if not immediately, within the foreseeable future. Apart from this, we hold the view that this huge-scale armament program prejudices the prospect of a peace settlement between Israel and Egypt.

14. It has been the hope of all friends of both the Jewish and Arab peoples that Israel and the Arab states would soon find it possible to transform their armistice agreements into final and lasting peace treaties. It is the conviction of most observers—based on the successful negotiations of the armistice accords—that such treaties can be consummated if Israel and the Arab states can engage in direct negotiations.

15. But it is clear that such negotiations will be retarded rather than accelerated if the balance is upset in the Near East, if one side is rearmed and if the interests of the people are diverted to military channels. In Egypt and in every other Arab state, there are war parties which are eager for a second round in which they hope to recoup their losses and remove the stigma, and exculpate themselves from the responsibility of their last defeat. They oppose a peace settlement. To put arms into the hands of their governments strengthens their intransigeance. They have announced their intentions, repeatedly, in the press, on the radio, and on the public platform. Now they are being given the tools to turn their words into missiles. They have no other identifiable enemy in sight. What basis is there for the belief that the second round which they so eagerly advocate is not, in fact, in preparation? What guaranty is there in the circumstances of the Near East's endemic political instability that these forces may not succeed to power and make use of the weapons in accord with their avowed program?

16. If it is not the purpose of the Arab countries to use these arms for a second assault against Israel, then one must ask why are they being rearmed at such fantastic cost? Is it the belief of the proponents of this rearmament program that the Arab states can be regarded as worthy and reliable allies of the democratic countries in the event of another world conflict?

17. Past experience answers these questions. In the Second World War, Egypt remained a nonbelligerent, and although the country was invaded by General Rommel's forces, the Egyptian army remained passive and the defense of Egypt was left to the British army, including thousands of recruits from the Jewish population of Palestine. It is an ironic commentary that British arms are now going to Egypt and may be used against those who were the sole allies of the democratic forces in the Near East in the last war.

18. In Iraq in 1941, Nazi forces seized control of the government and were finally eliminated only after a show-down with the British army. Palestine Jews took part in that action and they were active also to remove Nazi influence from Syria and Lebanon. Throughout the entire war, the Arab world remained aloof from democracy's banner, while many of its leaders, like the former Mufti of Jerusalem, were actively on the side of the Axis and made their headquarters in Berlin.

19. Can the democratic forces regard Egypt or Iraq, or any other Arab country, as a shield of substance in the light of the past record, and particularly in the light of Arab weakness in the war in Palestine? Although their forces and their arms far exceeded those of the nascent state of Israel, they were quickly overwhelmed in battle. Does this type of alliance fit into the mosaic of democracy's defense?

20. Quite apart from our natural feeling of sympathy for our Jewish kinsmen in Israel, we deem it our duty as Americans vitally concerned about American policy in the Near East and American defenses throughout the world to express the strongest misgivings on the military support of a dubious ally. The fact that it is Britain which is extending this generous aid should not obscure the fact of indirect American participation, for it is surplus American Army equipment that is being used in many cases, and it is the United States which is today providing arms for these same countries which divert their stocks to the Near East.

21. The paramount need of the entire Near East is the development of resources to lift standards of living for millions of depressed people. In the context of this urgent need, the extravagant expenditure of interest, energy, and funds on armament and mobilization is a disservice to humanity.

22. This view was eloquently put forth by the representative of the United States, Mr. Austin, in the Security Council debate on the armistice agreement. He said:

23. "It is essential that the resources of that area be used for peaceful purposes, for economic development, for the resettlement of refugees, and for the achievement of higher standards of living for the populations of the area. It would be tragic and wholly wrong if the resources of the area were to be dissipated in an unproductive arms race."

24. In this connection, one thinks of the obligation of the Arab states to their Arab brethren who, victims of Arab aggression against Israel, were forced to leave Palestine and who today are homeless refugees. If the Arab governments were disposed to expend their funds for resettlement projects, as Senator Austin suggested, they would make a constructive contribution, not only toward the regeneration of a people for whose misery they are primarily responsible, but in the development of their own underdeveloped countries.

25. Precise figures on the cost of resettling the Arab refugees are not available; but in a recent survey published by the Royal Institute of International Affairs, it was suggested that the cost of resettling an estimated 713,000 dould be £56,327,000 (before devaluation). The Chatham House experts estimate an average of £79 for settling a refugee on the land in the Near East. It is startling to reflect that Egypt's budget for armaments in 1 year actually exceeds the total estimated cost of resettling all the Arab refugees. No one would dare to compare the moral validity of two projects like refugee resettlement and military armament. Nor would one debate which enterprise more effectively promotes the cause of internal order and security as well as the stability of democratic institutions in the Near East.

26. For its part, relieved of the threat of a renewal of hostilities, the Government of Israel would be enabled to continue its dedication to the resettlement of Jewish refugees who have come to Israel after a decade of wandering and helplessness—an undertaking to which the American Jewish community has proudly contributed substantial sums. It would be a sad day if the Government of Israel were compelled to reduce or halt its resettlement program because it felt obliged to spend large sums for armaments to keep pace with its neighbors.

27. The people of the Near East must have peace. It is for the Governments of the United States, United Kingdom, and other great powers to use their best efforts to ensure peace and tranquillity in the Near East so that its peoples may work together to raise the living standards of the entire area. To plunge these people into an armaments race is to serve the cause of their impoverishment, debasement, and destruction.

28. We respectfully urge our Government to reconsider the problem in the light of the facts herein set forth. We ask that it use its great influence to avert the dangers to the peace of Palestine involved in the situation which is being created; and that the United Kingdom be requested to discontinue the shipment of arms to the Arab states.

Respectfully submitted.

AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL.

(Representing: Hadassah, Women's Zionist Organization of America, Hashomer Hatzair, Labor Zionist Organization of America—Poale Zion, Mizrachi Organization of America, United Zionist Labor Party (Achdut Avodah—Poale Zion), Zionist Organization of America, Zionists-Revisionists of America.)

STATEMENT BY MR. LOUIS LIPSKY, CHAIRMAN, AMERICAN ZIONIST COUNCIL

We repeat that we regret the position taken by the State Department. We are convinced that American public opinion will not share the complacency of Mr. Acheson toward the rearming of the Arab states. The danger we refer to is not far off; it is right around the corner. The state of Israel is now engaged in negotiating for peace agreements to take the place of the armistice arrangements with the Arab states. Sending them large quantities of arms at this time inevitably disturbs all talks of peace with them. It is like handing a revolver to a potential assailant, who has once been disarmed. It is no rational defense of the act to say that the supplier of the deadly weapon will wait to see what he will do with it, and is prepared to take action if necessary. We will be too late then. British assurances as to the kind and quantity of arms she is sending to the Arab states cannot be taken seriously in the light of past performances.

We solemnly declare that the approval of England's sending of new planes and heavy artillery and submarines to any Arab state at this time is a direct encouragement of Arab aggression. We deplore that the state of Israel will have to use a larger part of its hard-pressed budget not for the restoration and rehabilitation of the tens of thousands of new settlers, but for the mobilization and equipment of its armed forces.

Biweekly Broadcasts by Hon. Francis J. Myers, of Pennsylvania

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD certain biweekly broadcasts which I made over certain radio stations in Pennsylvania in the month of February 1950.

There being no objection, the broadcasts were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF FEBRUARY 3–5, INCLUSIVE

(No. 19 in biweekly series)

As this second session of the Eighty-first Congress rounds out its first month, I think we could characterize our accomplishments most accurately by saying that the largest part of our efforts have gone into what we might term "spade work"—in other words, we've spent most of our time on those preliminaries that are necessary to get legislation in final shape for passage.

When the first session ended the middle of last October, we had managed, by and large, to clean up most of the major legislation then on the calendars of the Senate and the House, and as a result, our initial task when we returned early last month was primarily directed at completing committee work on a number of bills which we hadn't found time to finish during the last session.

As I explained in my last radio report 2 weeks ago, when I talked about the steps necessary to pass a law, some of you may recall that each Member of the Senate serves on two of the 15 legislative committees. Now actually, the situation is somewhat more complicated than it would first appear, because, as I also explained at that time, the legislative committees are, in turn, broken down into a number of subcommittees which consider specific bills. So, while it's true that each Member of the Senate is assigned to only two legislative committees, the practical effect of this is that we serve on six or eight subcommittees.

In my particular case, there are several other complications as well, because in addition to my legislative assignments on the Finance Committee and the Senate Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I am also a Member of the Joint Senate-House Committee on the Economic Report, a committee established to advise the Congress in matters of national economic importance. Over and above this, I am one of the 8 Democratic members of the majority policy committee, which meets for an hour or so each Tuesday to schedule the sequence of legislation in the Senate, and I also serve on the majority steering committee, which meets periodically to consider such matters as assigning Senators to membership on various legislative committees. And finally, I have other duties and obligations as the majority whip.

Now my purpose in explaining this to you is to point out that every Member of the Senate frequently finds himself confronted with the difficulty of having two or three committee or subcommittee meetings going on at the same time. Up to now none of

us has worked out a suitable means for being in several different places at once. About the best that we are able to do when we are confronted with three simultaneous meetings is to select one of them, attend that meeting, and then somehow, in the next day or so, manage to get our hands on the written transcription of what took place in the two meetings we missed.

This obviously isn't an altogether satisfactory solution, because frequently, in reading over the transcriptions of the committee meetings we missed, we think of questions we would have asked the various witnesses had we been present to do so.

I think I can illustrate this pretty well by an example. The Senate Finance Committee opened its hearing on the new social-security amendments shortly after the middle of January. Now those hearings are of tremendous importance for a number of reasons. For one, the social-security bill, in the form in which it passed the House of Representatives late last year, contains more than 200 pages. This alone is some measure of the tremendous complexity and comprehensiveness of that legislation. It is perfectly understandable that the Senate intends to examine every aspect of that bill with great care. Furthermore, hundreds of people, most of them expert in particular phases of the bill, have asked to testify in opposition or support of certain provisions. These people should be heard, and the committee intends to hear them.

I have wanted to attend every one of those hearings, but it has been simply impossible for me to do so. As a general rule, the Finance Committee has scheduled hearings all day long, 6 days a week, and I have been present whenever it has been possible for me to do so. I think this may also be said of the other 12 Senators who serve on the Finance Committee, because they, too, are keenly aware that virtually every American will feel the impact of the changes the Congress will make in our social-security laws this year.

I won't take time now to develop any of the details of the social-security bill for you, but at the present time, I am preparing a News Letter which summarizes the major social-security proposals that are now being considered by the Senate. In all honesty, I think every American should know the basic provisions of the social-security law, whether he is presently paying social-security premiums or not, and if you are not already receiving my News Letter regularly, I invite you to write for a copy of the one which describes the social-security proposals. I believe you will find it helpful in understanding the provisions of the bill now before the Senate Finance Committee.

If you'd like a copy, address me, Senator FRANCIS J. MYERS, Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

At the start of this broadcast, I remarked that we had been busy at our "spade work," and the social-security bill is only one example of this. The Senate Banking and Currency Committee spent almost the entire month of January putting finishing touches on the middle-income housing bill, in order that we could get it ready for Senate action.

The Senate Judiciary Committee completed its work on the displaced-persons bill January 24, just 1 day ahead of the schedule ordered by the Senate last fall when the DP bill was returned to committee for further consideration. I might add, in connection with the DP bill, that I believe the Senate itself will wish to make a number of changes in the committee bill before it is ultimately passed. The newspapers, when the DP bill was first reported from the committee, noted that a number of liberalizing changes had been included in the committee bill, but later editorial comments on the bill have changed quite a bit as editors have had an opportunity to study the measure further. I certainly go along with many of the papers in criticizing the shortcomings of the Senate bill as it now stands, and I believe that the DP bill, as it passed the House last year, is much fairer and far more nearly in line with what I would regard as a decent and suitable law.

A couple of weeks ago there was a bit of spade work going on over in the House of Representatives. I refer in these terms to what happened because the issue there did not result in legislation, and merely represented a struggle for power. I have in mind, of course, the fight over the so-called discharge rule. The whole issue in that fight in the House boiled down to deciding whether the 12 members of the House Rules Committee had the exclusive power to block the passage of legislation. The majority of the Rules Committee contended that it had such authority. When we consider for a moment that there are 435 Members in the United States House of Representatives, it is hard to go along with the argument that 12 men should be permitted to speak for all of them.

The background of the Rules Committee fight developed more or less in this fashion: The House has never been troubled with filibusters, simply because it has long been recognized that if 435 Representatives were permitted to talk without limit, the result would be pandemonium and absolutely no legislative accomplishment whatsoever. As a consequence, the House operates under the strictest kind of rules to limit floor debate in order that it may get its work done. Naturally, this means that legislation can't be talked to death in the House as it can be in the Senate through the tactic of filibustering.

Thus, minority groups who have opposed passage of certain classes of legislation have been forced to resort to other strategems which would accomplish the same result as the filibuster. Until the Eighty-first Congress, the blocking tactic of these House minorities has been accomplished through the operation of the House Rules Committee, a body, as I've already indicated, composed of 12 members. These 12 men had the sole power of deciding what measures the House would consider. Needless to say, if 7 of the 12 Rules Committee members objected personally to a bill, they could kill it completely by refusing to report it out to the House for a vote. Bill after bill has been killed in this fashion.

Early in 1949, Democratic Congressman HERMAN EBERHARTER, of Pittsburgh, came up with an idea which made it possible for a majority of the House to bypass the Rules Committee when it sought to bottle up a bill. The technique Mr. EBERHARTER suggested was cumbersome, it is true, but for the first time the House had found a way for the majority to express its will in those cases where a stubborn handful of Representatives refused to go along with the measure supported by an overwhelming number of our people.

So, early in the Eighty-first Congress, the House adopted the Eberharter proposal, and without question, the Eberharter discharge plan broke the power of the House Rules Committee. Early in this present session of Congress, the Rules Committee of the House sought to regain its old dictatorial powers, and for several weeks the battle raged. The move by the Rules Committee to get back in the saddle was vigorously attacked by everyone who believes in the democratic process, because, as I've said, the opinions of 7 men, or for that matter, 12 men, cannot substitute for the full expression of the 435 men and women who represent the American people in the House of Representatives. For some days the fate of the Eberharter rule hung in balance. No one was really sure of what the outcome would be.

Finally, on Friday, January 20, 1950, the matter came to a vote in the House. The outcome represented a smashing victory for the democratic process. The House voted 236 to 183 to reject the Rules Committee's demands that its old power be restored. The Eberharter discharge rule remains in force, and henceforth, the House will have the unqualified opportunity to consider every issue on its merits and bring it to a vote in a democratic fashion.

I notice that my time is about to run out, but I want to mention one other extremely important bit of spade work that is going on in both Houses. The Congress has adopted this year a new method for handling the appropriation of funds for the Federal budget. In the past, we have considered the budget in a series of packages, that is to say, that we have drawn up separate appropriation bills for particular agencies and functions. For example, we'd have one bill for our military budget, another bill for flood control and rivers and harbors, and an agriculture appropriation bill—all told, a dozen or more separate measures, which taken together, furnished the total moneys which the Government spent in any one year.

This year we are seeking to wrap the budget up in a single appropriation bill, and as a result, largely of recommendations made by the Hoover Commission, a number of changes have been made in the form in which the President's budget was submitted to the Congress. The one-package approach to the budget was adopted because it was felt that by handling the matter in this fashion the Congress would have a better perspective of the whole budget picture. The old system of considering each appropriation measure separately was criticized on the grounds that not enough attention was devoted to the over-all budget picture. The Appropriations Committees of both the House and the Senate have worked steadily for almost a month on their budget hearings, and remarkable progress has been made thus far. If the balance of the appropriation job is completed as speedily as work has progressed this month, we should be able to avoid completely the kind of log jam that developed last year in the Senate when we were faced with the task of handling billions of dollars' worth of legislation in the tired and harassed closing weeks of the session. This year we should be able to take on the budget in an orderly fashion and give it the time and studied consideration it deserves.

Thank you for joining me. I hope you will listen in again when I return to the air in 2 weeks.

TEXT OF TRANSCRIPTION BY HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS, OF PENNSYLVANIA, OVER PENNSYLVANIA RADIO STATIONS, WEEK END OF FEBRUARY 17–19, INCLUSIVE

(No. 20 in biweekly series)

When President Truman announced 2 weeks or so ago that America would go forward with the development of the hydrogen superbomb, there was a reluctant, though overwhelming, public endorsement of the decision.

This is certainly understandable. Such a decision as this is a dreadful one to have to make. I believe America had no other choice than to make the decision that was made. I believe the American people overwhelmingly agree that in the light of the world conditions existing at this moment, we cannot risk the security of the free, democratic nations by failing now to follow where science is leading us. I say this because it is impossible for me to believe that America could remain free if the Russians had the hydrogen bomb, and we did not.

It is this single reason—that is, that the Russians might some day have the hydrogen bomb—which has compelled us to make this decision.

I want to make it clear, however, that there is much more behind the story of the atom than this fact alone. I intend on this broadcast to point out some of the historic landmarks of the Atomic age in an effort to indicate where we stand now, and what I regard as our prospects for the future.

On August 6, 1945, a shocked world learned for the first time that a single bomb had virtually obliterated a city in which almost a third of a million people lived. That bomb, as all of us know, was dropped from an American Air Force B–29 on the city of Hiroshima in Japan. The bomb killed 67,000 people. Four days later a bomb composed of an element—plutonium—previously unknown to science, was dropped on the city of Nagasaki. In less than a week the war with Japan was ended.

President Truman, in announcing that the atomic bomb had been used, said that this had been done to save the lives of hundreds of thousands who would otherwise have been lost in the conquest of the Japanese homeland. The grave decision to use the bomb at that time was not lightly made. It was done in recognition of the fact that at Guadalcanal, Saipan, and Guam, in the Philippines, at Iwo Jima, and in Okinawa the Japanese had resisted to the last man. Even when fully possessed with this knowledge, the decision to use the atomic bomb was not one easily made. We could not justify such an act by the cold thought that the Germans or the Japanese would have used the bomb on us if they had got it first. The American decision rested on a most careful weighing of all the inhumanities that are the consequence of war.

From the day that the first atomic explosion occurred to this day, it has been the unqualified policy of the Government of the United States to bring the atom under a workable system of international control. The American people have not been alone in insisting that the atom should forever be removed from the arsenal of war. Peace-loving people the world over are fearfully aware that the atom, if misused, is capable of destroying man and his civilization.

In stopping to consider the atomic developments which have occurred since the end of World War II in 1945, I think we must consider first the condition of the world as it emerged from the war. The United Nations Organization had been born at San Francisco in the spring of 1945. Those who dreamed of lasting world peace in those days had great expectations for the UN.

Twenty-five years earlier it had been hoped that the League of Nations would provide for a framework of world government in which war would forever be impossible. America, following a policy of isolation, had not joined the League of Nations, and it was commonly said that the League failed because America had refused to participate in it.

With the UN, it was hoped things would be different. The victorious wartime Allies had all agreed to join this adventure in world cooperation to promote lasting peace. The Russians were there, the British were there, the French were there, the Americans were there, and for that matter, there were at the start, all of the nations which had not participated with the Axis in the Second World War. It was planned that the defeated Axis nations would ultimately join the United Nations after they had established democratic governments of their own.

The year 1945 was a year of enthusiasm and hope for the future of a world at peace. The world had survived the worst war in history, and that war had ended in a thunderous climax brought about by the explosions which ushered in the atomic age. People all over the world believed that we had seen enough of war, that the atom had introduced a new and compelling reason for never going to war again, and people believed that the United Nations would provide us with the necessary machinery with which to construct a world that would remain at peace.

For the next few years, though they didn't know it at the time, those who dreamed of peace were in for some bitter disappointments.

The atomic bomb, of course, had been developed in America. Through our intelligence sources we knew that the Germans had been working on a similar project throughout the war, but finally the production of the first atomic bombs had actually taken place in America. The Government of the United States was clearly aware of the huge responsibility that placed upon us.

Very shortly after the close of World War II, a group of distinguished Americans drawn from public and private life, were asked by the President to work out a method for harnessing the atom. No group of men has ever been assigned a more important job, and they undertook it with all the seriousness that it deserved.

The primary responsibility for doing the job was assigned to Mr. Dean Acheson, who at that time was Under Secretary of State. Mr. Acheson called upon David E. Lilienthal, then Director of the vast Tennessee Valley Authority, to act as chairman of a committee which was to work out the basic proposals for international control of the atom. There were four other members of the Lilienthal committee—Dr. J. Robert Oppenheimer, certainly one of the outstanding scientists of our time—and three great industrialists—Mr. Chester Barnard, then president of the New Jersey Bell Telephone Co., Mr. Charles Thomas of the Monsanto Chemical Co., and Mr. Harry Winne of the General Electric Co.

The Lilienthal committee was given the unlimited authority to learn everything there was to know about the atom. For weeks members of the committee sat day and night listening and learning as the top atomic scientists explained to them, chapter and verse, the theory and the application of atomic energy. This was their first job, and the committee stayed with it until every member understood every point. Thereafter they visited all of the laboratories and all of the plants in which the giant atomic program was being conducted. They looked into every step—the research programs and the production itself, starting with the crude, raw materials, and finally with the bomb itself.

Everywhere the committee went it sought after, and listened to, the many proposals advanced for international control of the atom. By this time each of the five committee members had some ideas of his own as to what should be done to make control effective.

The big task still lay ahead, that of working out the details of the proposals which they later recommended. Mr. Lilienthal and the members of the committee decided from the first that they would stay with each controversy that arose between them until a way had been worked out upon which all five men could agree completely. In this way there was no unfinished business left aside to the last. If a particular dispute became serious among them, they would frequently get on a train or plane and revisit the plants in which that particular phase of the work was being conducted. Thus, they acquired additional facts and were able to iron out every disagreement.

The finished report of the Lilienthal committee was submitted with the unanimous approval of all five members. That report today is an outstanding monument to clear-headed thinking and statesmanship.

The report proposed an International Atomic Authority. This authority would conduct all of the research. It would control all the raw-material sources of the explosive elements. It would own and operate all of the facilities for producing atomic materials. And because this Authority would be operated by all of the 2,000,000,000 people on earth, the Authority would possess the power to inspect every part of the world to guarantee that no nation could develop atomic weapons in secret.

The Acheson-Lilienthal report became the basis of the proposal submitted to the United Nations by that great American, Bernard M. Baruch, in the fall of 1946.

Nineteen hundred and forty-six, you will remember, was the year that the Russian delegate on the Security Council began throwing around the Russian veto whenever he was outnumbered on a proposal that did not meet with the fancy of the Kremlin. Along in that time the Russian delegates introduced the now-familiar practice of walking out on the UN every time they felt their feathers were ruffled. They weren't willing to give an inch. Proposal after proposal that came before the UN was submitted, not once, but many times, and in different forms in an effort to obtain Soviet cooperation. And the Soviets sat, unwilling to budge, insisting on doing things their way, or not at all. They made countless impossible demands. The true intentions of the Communists to dominate the world were daily becoming more clear.

The Soviet delegates, and the delegates from the satellites they controlled, rejected the Baruch proposal. They did so on the ground that they would not permit unlimited inspection, saying they were willing to take the inspectors to their atomic plants, show them what they had, and that thereafter, the International Atomic Authority would have to take their word that there were no other projects elsewhere in Russia, or otherwise under their control. This counter demand would have made adequate inspection impossible, and the Russians knew it.

In the 3 years and a half that have elapsed since the Baruch proposal, a special committee of the General Assembly of the UN has stayed busy trying to work out the dilemma, thus far without success. In the meanwhile Russia has developed and exploded an atomic bomb of her own, and America has moved steadily forward in her own developments in the atomic field, producing more bombs, and more efficient bombs. Now that it appears practically possible to do so, America is going ahead with plans for the superbomb, which it is expected may be a thousand times more devastating than its uranium and plutonium parents. There's where we stand * * * busy at work on more efficient means of destruction, while efforts for international control appear to be stalemated.

Since the announcement of the superbomb, a number of new proposals have been put forward. One Senator has suggested that a giant fund could be established in the United Nations that could be put to work for economic development of the entire world, if every nation of the world would agree to international control of the atom along the general lines of the Baruch proposal. This fund, he went on to explain, could be created by having each nation contribute to the UN two-thirds of what it now spends for armaments.

Another Senator has suggested a new move for world disarmament.

Secretary of State Acheson and President Truman have stated that it is their intention to stick by the Baruch plan, because it represents, as they see it, the only effective way that the atom may be harnessed and put to work for man's use instead of for his destruction.

We cannot let fear immobilize us. Many world problems which troubled us a year, or 2, or 3 years ago, no longer bother us today. Solutions to them were found through con-

structive thinking. For the moment there are a number of suggestions for solving the atomic problem, and there will be more. We must examine and reexamine all the possibilities of every one of these. We must bend every energy to this problem upon which the fate of mankind depends. I am convinced that the 2,000,000,000 people on earth have sufficient intelligence to find a workable answer. By ridding ourselves of fear, by continuing to think constructively, by a continued willingness to cooperate, and by promoting world understanding, we will succeed. The need is compelling and the will is there.

Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support "Whipping Boy"?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR V. WATKINS
OF UTAH
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WATKINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Should Utah-Idaho Potato Grower Be Farm Support 'Whipping Boy'?" published in the Deseret (Utah) News of February 15, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SHOULD UTAH-IDAHO POTATO GROWER BE FARM SUPPORT "WHIPPING BOY"?

Isn't it about time somebody said something on behalf of the Utah-Idaho potato grower, who is being made out a villain's accomplice by all the criticism of the Federal potato-support program?

Certainly, there is plenty wrong with a program that costs the taxpayers $50,000,000 for a foodstuff that has to be dumped or burned. Constructive criticism of such a program is welcome and deserved. But the innuendo that the growers of either Utah or Idaho are responsible for this great economic waste, or are opposing proper correction, is hereby resented on our own, and on their behalf.

Potato growers in this section have taken drastic acreage reduction whenever and wherever they have been requested. So far as they are concerned, all this talk of producers blocking acreage curtailment to eliminate the surplus is just so much idle chatter.

There is an earnest question, too, as to just how much this section is contributing to the 50,000,000 bushel tuber surplus. Idaho State agricultural department reports indicate that very few Idaho potatoes have been sold to the Government, and so far as we can learn, the same situation exists in Utah where potato production is not a very big item. Even now the best grade of Idaho russet potatoes are bringing around $3 per 100 pounds, compared with a Government support price of $2.05. Of course, the situation in Maine might be something else again, but that is not our particular problem.

It does seem unfair, also, to make the potato grower the whipping boy for the whole support program. While they are talking about potatoes, they shouldn't forget that eggs and poultry, cotton, wheat and other grains, milk, and butter are not in too greatly different positions. The Government holds vast surpluses of all these products. For instance, the Government now holds about 2,700,000,000 surplus eggs, for which it paid $100,000,000. Despite the fact that it doesn't know what it is going to do with them, it already has agreed to buy more. And, unfortunately, if egg support is not continued for a time at least, there will be a great many poultrymen who will be broke or badly bent.

But why make the potato grower the whipping boy? There are no growers, in this region, at least, who have been taking the taxpayers for a $50,000 to $500,000 support ride. Nor are they making a killing on spuds at present prices. Just figure it out for yourself. One substantial Idaho russet grower comes up with these figures on the cost of growing and sacking 100 pounds of marketable tubers—seed, 40 cents; sack, 21 cents; picking up off the ground, 12 cents; loading on truck and hauling from field to warehouse, 5 cents; sorting, 30 cents; inspection and miscellaneous, 10 cents. That adds up to $1.18 in just harvest and preparation labor costs. It leaves only 87 cents of the $2.05 support price to take care of the 25-percent culls and rotten potatoes, and for all the other costs of plowing, planting, irrigating, and growing, with all the taxes, water assessments, fertilizer, and general overhead thrown in. "In a nutshell," said our informant, "it boils down to this: If you are a good grower with an efficient spud operation, and have some good luck with the weather, you can make a little money; otherwise not."

So perhaps we had all better think twice before villainizing the Utah-Idaho potato grower for a shocking situation that is being dramatized, partly, no doubt, by Brannan to aid the Brannan consumer subsidy program.

Control of Imports and Exports of Agricultural Commodities

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OWEN BREWSTER
OF MAINE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a report from the solicitor of the Department of Agriculture dealing with the authority of the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, and other officials of the executive branch to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities.

There being no objection, the report was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR,
Washington, D. C., December 20, 1949.

In accordance with your request of December 1, 1949, there is transmitted herewith a list of the authorities which can be invoked by the President, the Secretary of Agriculture, or other executive branch official to control imports and exports of agricultural commodities.

Title III of the Second War Powers Act, as amended and extended (50 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, sec. 633, and Public Law 155, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to impose import controls with respect to fats and oils and rice and rice products. Such authority is exercised by the Secretary of Agriculture under delegation from the President.

The Export Control Act of 1949 (Public Law 11, 71st Cong.) authorizes the President, for the purposes of protecting the domestic economy and national security and carrying out the foreign policy and the international responsibilities of the United States, to prohibit or curtail the exportation of any articles, materials, or supplies, except under such regulations as may be prescribed. The President has delegated this authority to the Secretary of Commerce. The act provides that such authority shall not be exercised with respect to any agricultural commodity during any period for which the Secretary of Agriculture makes certain determinations concerning the supply of such commodity, subject to certain exceptions.

Section 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act (of 1933), as amended (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed., Supp. II, 624) authorizes the President to impose restrictions on the importation of articles when they threaten programs undertaken by the Department of Agriculture with respect to any agricultural commodity or product thereof. However, such action may not be enforced in contravention of any treaty or other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

Section 402 of the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 (Public Law 152, 81st Cong.) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine whether agricultural commodities which are sold abroad by executive agencies of the Government as excess property may be imported into the United States.

The International Wheat Agreement Act of 1949 (Public Law 421, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to impose such controls on the importation and exportation of wheat and wheat flour as may be necessary to implement the International Wheat Agreement.

Section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended (19 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 1351 and Public Law 307, 81st Cong.) authorizes the President to modify and impose import restrictions as required or appropriate to carry out any foreign-trade agreement entered into under the act. The Secretary of Agriculture has advisory functions under the act.

The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. supp. II, 135–135k), for the purpose of preventing the importation and exportation of adulterated and misbranded products and for related purposes, restricts the importation and exportation of insecticides, fungicides, rodenticides, herbicides, and certain devices and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Federal Seed Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 1551–1610) restricts the importation of seeds for the purpose of preventing the importation of adulterated or misbranded seeds and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Plant Quarantine Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and supp. II, 151–167), for the purpose of preventing the introduction of insect pests and plant diseases, restricts the importation of nursery stock and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to apply such restrictions to other plants and plant products, to prohibit importation of nursery stock and other plants and plant products, and to make regulations to carry out the act.

The act of January 31, 1942 (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 149) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to regulate the entry into the United States from Mexico of vehicles and freight and other materials and to require cleaning and disinfection thereof to prevent the introduction of insect pests and plant diseases.

The Meat Inspection Act, as amended and extended (21 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 71–98), for the purposes of assuring that exported meats are wholesome and fit for human use and exported animals are free from disease, requires Federal inspection for cattle, sheep, swine, goats, and horses, and the meats and meat-food products thereof,

which are exported, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the act. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to apply, under such regulations as he may prescribe, the inspection and certification provisions of this act to dairy products for export. He may also extend inspection pursuant to this act to reindeer.

The Tariff Act of 1930, § 306 (19 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 1306) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the countries where certain animal diseases exist, and after publication of his determination the importation of certain animals and meats from such countries is prohibited. The section prohibits importation of meats unfit for human food. It also authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations to carry out the section.

The Tariff Act of 1930, § 201, paragraph 1606, as amended (19 U. S. C., 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 1201, par. 1606) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe regulations for determining the purity of breeding of animals offered for duty-free importation.

The act of March 3, 1891, as amended (46 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 466a–b) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe, by regulation, accommodations for exported animals.

The act of August 30, 1890, as amended (21 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 101–105), for the purpose of preventing the spread of animal diseases, authorizes the President to suspend the importation of all or any class of animals when necessary to protect animals in the United States, and authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to designate ports through which certain kinds of animals must be imported, to quarantine and inspect such imported animals, and to prescribe regulations and take other actions relating to imported and exported animals.

The act of May 29, 1884, as amended, and the act of February 2, 1903, as amended (21 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 111–122) authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make regulations and take measures to prevent the introduction of contagious diseases of animals into the United States, to seize, quarantine, and dispose of certain materials and products coming into this country from infected foreign countries, and to make regulations and take measures concerning the exportation of livestock and live poultry to prevent the spread of animal diseases.

The United States Grain Standards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 71–87) generally requires that grain which is shipped in foreign commerce and is sold by grade be officially inspected and graded and the grade by which it is sold be a grade fixed in the official standards which the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Naval Stores Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 91–99) establishes certain standards for spirits of turpentine and rosin, authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish further standards, and requires the use of such standards for such naval stores when sold in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

The Virus-Serum-Toxin Act (21 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 151–158) prohibits the importation of any virus, serum, toxin, or analogous product without a permit from the Secretary of Agriculture who is authorized to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Sugar Act of 1948 (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. Supp. II, 1100–1160) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to fix quotas for importation of sugar from foreign countries.

The Agricultural Marketing Agreement Act of 1937, as amended (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. and Supp. II, 601–671) authorizes handlers of certain agricultural commodities to enter into marketing agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary to issue orders, limiting the amount of such agricultural commodities that may be purchased, handled, or shipped in foreign commerce, for the purpose of stabilizing farmers' purchasing power.

The Anti-Hog-Cholera Serum and Hog-Cholera Virus Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 851–855), to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of serum and virus and for related objectives, authorizes handlers of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus to enter agreements with the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary to issue orders, imposing restrictions on the handling of such serum and virus for or in foreign commerce.

The Tobacco Seed and Plant Exportation Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 516–517) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to issue permits for exportation of tobacco seeds and plants for experimental purposes only and prohibits exportation of such seeds and plants without a permit.

The Tobacco Inspection Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 511–511a–511q) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for tobacco and generally requires inspection according to such standards of all tobacco sold at auction at previously designated markets where tobacco moves in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Export Apple and Pear Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 581–589) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to prescribe certain requirements which apples and pears for export must meet and to issue certificates showing that such commodities comply with such requirements and with the standards of the country of destination, and to make regulations to carry out the act.

The Process or Renovated Butter Act (26 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 2320–2322, 2324–2327) imposes inspection and other requirements for process or renovated butter prepared for shipment to foreign countries. The Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to make regulations to carry out certain provisions of the act. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue may make certain other regulations, as authorized.

The Honeybee Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 281–282) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the countries in which no honeybee diseases exist and from which honeybees may be imported for experimental or scientific purposes under regulations of the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Treasury.

The United States Cotton Standards Act (7 U. S. C. 1946 ed. 51–65) authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to establish standards for cotton and generally prohibits the use of unofficial standards in connection with transactions in cotton in foreign commerce. The Secretary is authorized to issue regulations to carry out the act.

Under the act of April 12, 1926 (16 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 616), timber lawfully cut on any national forest or on the public lands in Alaska may be exported from the State or Territory where grown if, in the judgment of the Secretary, the supply of timber for local use will not be endangered. The regulation under this act is found in 36 CFR 221.3 and permits the free movement from the national forests except those in Alaska where the prior approval of the regional forester is required.

Many of the statutes listed contain other provisions than those mentioned in the list, but reference has been made only to those provisions which appear relevant to your inquiry. Pursuant to the telephone conversation of December 14, 1949, between your office and Associate Solicitor C. W. Bucy, the list of authorities is limited to those authorities in the administration of which this Department participates. The list is limited, moreover, to those authorities which provide for the exercise of control over the importation or exportation of agricultural commodities. It does not include those statutes such as the Packers and Stockyards Act, as amended (7 U. S. C., 1946 ed. 181–231), which merely provide for regulation of trade practices with respect to foreign commerce, since we understand from your request that you are not interested in this type of authorities. If you do desire information concerning such trade-practice authorities or further information on the authorities listed, we shall be pleased to furnish it to you at your request.

Sincerely yours,

W. CARROLL HUNTER,
Solicitor.

S. 1008

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, on February 9, 1950, at the request of Senator ESTES KEFAUVER, of Tennessee, Dr. George Stocking, head of the department of economics at Vanderbilt University, appeared before a group of Senators and Congressmen interested in basing-point legislation. He discussed explicitly the effects the basing-point system, if reimposed as the result of the passage of S. 1008, would have on the future growth and development of the South. He showed rather clearly that these effects would be extremely harmful.

A number of us from the West were interested to know whether or not a reimposition of the basing-point system would have similar adverse effects upon the West. In order to obtain an authoritative view on this matter, I requested Dr. Vernon Mund, professor of economics at the University of Washington in Seattle, to prepare a statement describing the effects of basing-point pricing upon the future growth and expansion of the West.

Under permission to extend my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I wish to include the statement prepared by Dr. Mund:

The purpose of this analysis is to explain the injurious effects of S. 1008 on the West, the South, and the entire Nation. Upon the basis of the national interest—rather than of the narrow, selfish, commercial interests of variously located organized producer groups—it is submitted that the principles of S. 1008 should not be enacted into law.

Significant reasons (a) for continuing the legal ban on systematic freight absorption whenever the effect is substantially to lessen competition and (b) for giving all needed legislative support to the Staley, Corn Products, Cement, Rigid Steel Conduit, Malt, Milk Can, Crepe Paper, Pittsburgh-Plus, and Standard Oil of Indiana decisions are as follows:

1. To give buyers and fabricating industries (a) the advantage of their location by eliminating an overcharge for freight and (b) the privilege of arranging for the purchase of their own transportation: Basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems force buyers to purchase two commodities—the manufactured goods and freight—on terms and conditions determined solely by the producers. In charging phantom or fictitious freight, a mill forces a buyer to purchase transportation service which he does not want and which he does not get. This gives a particular mill net prices higher than the base price by the amount of the fictitious

freight. On the other hand, in the case of absorbed freight, the railroad is paid the actual freight cost, and the mill secures net prices which are lower than the base price by the amount of the absorbed freight.

Buyers (fabricators) located at or near a nonbase mill do not want to pay phantom freight, for such a charge places them at a competitive disadvantage with fabricators located at or near a base mill. Likewise, buyers located near a base mill which is engaging in freight absorption find that they are denied the advantage of their location and are forced to pay high local prices which help to defray the delivery costs of other buyers.

Sellers using zone-delivered pricing systems typically include in their prices the freight costs which are charged for less-than-carload shipments. A fabricating mill, however, frequently is in a position to make up a consolidated shipment of supplies (such as paint, copper products, aluminum sheets, and pneumatic machinery) and secure a lower carload rate. It is denied this opportunity under the zone-delivered pricing systems. Under basing-point systems, moreover, buyers are typically charged the rail freight even though cheaper forms of transportation are available (or actually used).

2. To prohibit the device of local price cutting by which dominant firms injure geographically separate independents: The principal objective which Congress had in mind in drafting section 2 of the Clayton Act was to prohibit geographic price discrimination which substantially lessens competition. The term "substantially" apparently was inserted on the ground that the law is not concerned with trifles. According to the House committee, section 2 of the Clayton Act "is expressly designed with the view of correcting and forbidding a common and widespread unfair trade practice whereby certain great corporations and also certain smaller concerns which seek to secure a monopoly in trade and commerce by aping the methods of the great corporations, have heretofore endeavored to destroy competition and render unprofitable the business of competitors by selling their goods, wares, and merchandise at a less price in the particular communities where their rivals are engaged in business than at other places throughout the country." [1]

Various lawyers and some Congressmen now appear to be reluctant to curb local price discrimination, thinking that the action of a seller in cutting prices in one area while maintaining them elsewhere is a wholesome act of competition or a meeting of competition. This view contains economic error. The making of discriminatory lower prices is only a limited kind of competition which experience has shown works always to the advantage of the larger and financially stronger concerns. It is not the kind of competition found in real market or contemplated by the antitrust laws.[2]

The practice of geographic price discrimination is an undesirable method of competition (1) because it forces some customers to pay excessive local prices and (2) because it subjects small competitors in distant areas to the fear and hazard of anarchic price cutting. A large producer may honestly not intend to kill a distant competitor, but the fact remains that no seller likes to see a competitor grow bigger and more powerful if he can prevent it. Geographic price discrimination, used by a dominant firm to match or undercut prices in a distant area may be exercised to hold prices in that area at an unremunerative level, so that rival sellers fail to grow, wither on the vine, or eventually drop out of production. Since the discrimination is exercised in accordance with no principle except that of meeting competition, a small producer can never be sure about the prices which he is likely to find in his area. He is not free, moreover, to expand and develop upon the basis of his productive efficiency.

When a small business firm is getting established in a particular area, it frequently finds that it must offer its goods at prices somewhat below those of a large rival. Its prestige and reputation are not firmly established, and some inducement must be offered to secure customers. If a large distant mill is permitted to meet the local prices by reducing its mill net prices on sales in that area, the small rival has little opportunity of ever developing his business.[3] A prohibition of geographic price discrimination would do much to enable small business firms to develop in the local areas in which they have a freight advantage. A decentralization of industry would tend to develop, and the efforts of local firms to extend their sales areas would also exert a constant pressure on distant rivals to reduce their base prices.

3. To promote a decentralization of industry: Industrial pricing systems which employ eastern base prices (such as Pittsburgh or East St. Louis) plus rail freight make for high-cost prices in the West and South and discourage the development of local fabricating industries. Local fabricators which to develop, moreover, are unable to ship their products eastward to any appreciable extent in competition with fabricators situated near an eastern basing point, for the delivered costs of their basic supplies are higher.

Insofar as basic commodities (such as aluminum) are produced in the West and South and sold freight allowed, local prices are high, as high as elsewhere in the country, and fabricators find no cost advantage in building plants near the sources of supply. The sale of fabricated products (such as copper wire, sheets, and tubing) by eastern mills at zone-delivered prices (by including an average freight item) also serves to discourage the development of distant fabricators, for the established mills, in effect, are able to dump into the distant areas by absorbing some or all of the freight, at the expense of their nearby customers.

4. To provide locally separate mills with a genuine motive to reduce their base prices: The requirement of f. o. b. mill pricing will undoubtedly result in a reduction in prices at locally separate mills, for a given seller cannot get distant business by quoting a high base price plus freight. Locally separate mills will thus be given a genuine motive to reduce their mill prices, even though local competition is lacking. Consumers living adjacent to a producer will also get the advantage of their location, as they do under conditions of effective price competition. With the collective use of basing-point and zone-delivered pricing systems, sellers do not have a motive, a competitive pressure or compulsion, to reduce prices to all buyers in order to provide a selling outlet for their capacity.

A principal reason that some businessmen in the Pacific Northwest support S. 1008 grows out of the fact that the governing base price for a number of steel products used in our area is Sparrows Point, Md. Our delivered price is this base plus water freight to Seattle. Steel mills in Chicago (prior to the cement decision) matched this delivered price in Seattle instead of charging Chicago plus rail freight, for the latter combination would be higher. This practice involved freight absorption (systematic) by the Chicago mills. Now, insofar as the Chicago mills do not absorb freight on sales to Seattle, they quote a higher delivered price or they do not enter our area. Thus, some Pacific Northwest buyers believe that the ban on systematic freight absorption denies them the benefit of competition.

Like all error, this view contains an element of truth. With the use of systematic freight absorption, some Seattle buyers may have the advantage of sales competition as identical prices. With rare exceptions, however, they never enjoy price competition under the basing-point plan. The Chicago and Sparrows Point mills have identical base prices, and the basing-point practice is to charge the base and freight which gives the lowest combination price. This is price matching, not price competition. The type of competition upon which American industry must stand or fall is price competition. Price competition, moreover, is the type of competition called for by the antitrust laws.

At present, some Chicago and Pittsburgh mills appear to be content to quote a high delivered price in the West (their identical base prices plus rail freight) and forego some or all of this business, for they can sell all they can produce in their nearby areas. Sooner or later, however, the Chicago and Pittsburgh mills may eagerly want to sell in the West and South, in order to expand their sales volume. To do so—with the present ban on systematic freight absorption—they will have to cut local base prices in Chicago and Pittsburgh. This would be real competition and just what the Nation needs. Fabricators and consumers in the Middle West would thereupon be benefited by the desire of the Chicago and Pittsburgh mills to ship westward and southward. First-hand producers in the West and South would also be encouraged to build new mills, for they would know that the eastern mills could not dump into their areas while making up their freight absorptions on sales in the East.

A ban on systematic or sporadic freight absorption which substantially lessens competition, it may be noted, does not preclude the quotation of uniform, national retail prices. Some manufacturers, for example, provide for a national, uniform retail price—such as $8.80 for a pair of Regal shoes—and at the same time quote f. o. b. factory prices, uniform to all dealers. This method of pricing results in a slightly lower mark-up for dealers at distant destination points. The ban on injurious price discrimination, moreover, would not necessarily preclude the charging of local, zone-delivered prices for newspapers, milk, groceries, and other consumer merchandise. In the absence of established freight stations, published tariffs, or significant freight differentials, it would be possible for an administrative agency to accept local, zone-delivered prices based upon an average delivery cost. The resulting discrimination would be a trifle. A legal maxim developed in ancient Rome declares that "the law does not concern itself with trifles."

THE POLICY OF CONGRESS TOWARD DISCRIMINATORY DELIVERED PRICES

The Clayton Act, as amended, and the recent court cases on price discrimination provide rules with respect to monopoly and unfair competition which have a high degree

[1] Committee on the Judiciary, Antitrust Legislation, 63d Cong., 2d sess., H. Rept. No. 627, May 6, 1914, pp. 8–9. For recent data on the use of geographic price discrimination to injure small business, see *U. S. v. N. Y. Great A & P Tea Co.* ((Criminal case) 67 F. Supp. 626, 666–667, 1946.)

[2] See also the statement by Senator Hoar, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, April 8, 1890, p. 3152.

[3] In 1948 a midwestern manufacturer of vegetable oils wrote to a Senate committee investigating basing point delivered price systems, stating "We have long felt that the practice of many of the larger companies in quoting delivered prices and absorbing the freight was a serious threat to our business, as they have been making deliveries of competitive products from remote parts of the country to customers in our area at prices we have been unable to meet." Senate Trade Policies Committee, release No. 15, November 7, 1948, page 2.

of clarity and certainty. In the great majority of cases the problem is not that the law is uncertain, but rather that it requires a significant change to be made in present-day pricing methods—namely, the creation of fair-price competition analogous to that found in open markets.

What course should Congress now take? The recommendation made by the Temporary National Economic Committee in 1941, under the able leadership of Senator O'MAHONEY, provides a sound approach upon which the preservation of the American competitive system will depend. According to the TNEC—

"We therefore recommend that the Congress enact legislation declaring such pricing systems to be illegal.

"Because such systems have resulted in uneconomic and often wasteful location of plant equipment it is recognized by this committee that the abolition of basing-point systems should provide for a brief period of time for industries to divest themselves of this monopolistic practice.

"The committee is not impressed with the argument that a legislative outlawing of basing-point systems will cause disturbances in the rearrangement of business through a restoration of competitive conditions in industries now employing basing-point systems. Such disturbances may be costly to those who have been practicing monopoly. But the long-term gain to the public interest by a restoration of competition in many important industries is clearly more advantageous." [4]

Mr. Speaker, in view of the very complex nature of this whole matter and also in view of the fact that no regular hearings on this particular bill were ever held by either the House or Senate Judiciary Committees, I believe that every Senator and Congressman, particularly those from the South and West, should study the effects of this proposed legislation on their home States and districts.

In making their statements on the South and the West, Dr. Stocking and Dr. Mund have rendered us a great service in outlining the probable consequences of this legislation. These two men, I might add, are generally considered to be among the Nation's leading authorities in the field of antitrust law and basing-point pricing.

Keep Flood Control Under the United States Engineers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM M. WHITTINGTON
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include therein an editorial from the Vicksburg Evening Post, Thursday, February 9, 1950, one of the leading newspapers of the State of Mississippi and the lower Mississippi Valley, I include the following:

[4] Final report and recommendations of the Temporary National Economic Committee, 77th Cong., 1st sess., S. Doc. No. 35, 1941, p. 33.

KEEP FLOOD CONTROL UNDER THE UNITED STATES ENGINEERS

Under a recommendation made by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of Federal Departments, there is a grave possibility that the civil activities of the United States Engineers will be transferred to the Department of the Interior. This possibility should bring the people of the Mississippi Valley and particularly the people of Vicksburg into united action to keep flood control under the Corps of Engineers.

The record of the United States Engineers in the combat of floods and in their prevention is a record of magnificent accomplishment, a record of devotion to duty, a record of outstanding engineering feats, a record which has given new hope and security to the people along the great river. Under the administration of the Engineers there has never been one instance of scandal or graft, though there have been projects which in total reached into billions of dollars. The Engineers have the know-how and they have the efficiency and precision to put into action this know-how. They have lived with the river—they are a part of the river, and it would be next to criminal to take away from this wonderful Corps of Engineers, their greatest avenue for peacetime service.

The people of the Mississippi Valley have a great stake in this proposed change. The Mississippi Valley has the greatest confidence in the Engineers. The lives and property of the people of the Mississippi Valley have been safe in the custody of the Engineers through their flood-control work. The Mississippi Valley people will thoroughly resent a change from an efficient, smooth-working organization. And good business practice dictates no change where such an outstanding job is being done.

There are some who think no exceptions should be made in the Hoover reorganization plans, feeling that the former President has performed a great service to the country in his study and recommendations. While we believe Mr. Hoover has made some very beneficial suggestions, which we think should be adopted, we cannot follow him in his suggestion to transfer flood control to the Department of the Interior. First of all, and most important, it would place flood control in politics. Political expediency or just plain politics have never been a part of United States Engineer operations, but under the Department of the Interior one can readily understand how politics could be injected. Behind the great river, our people want none of this. The lives and property of the people of the valley are sacred and should be held thus, as they have been held these many years by the Engineers. Secondly, we believe flood-control work by the Engineers is the greatest training facility for combat engineers. The record of the men who fought the big Mississippi, is proof of that. Some of the greatest Engineer officers of the last war were men who carried on their peacetime activities on the Mississippi River. Many top-flight commanders of our armies in the war were men who were here in the Vicksburg district office at one time or another. Many of the techniques used by the Engineers in the late war, were developed in work on the river. Many technical features of the engineer work in the war were initiated here at our United States Waterways Experiment Station. Why should we take away from the corps this opportunity for training?

We cannot adequately express our deep appreciation for the work of the Corps of Engineers. And we admit to great apprehension that the guardians of the great river might be relieved of their present assignment. We call upon Senators EASTLAND and STENNIS and our entire delegation in the House of Representatives to spearhead the fight to keep flood-control activities with the Corps of Engineers. And we call upon all of the States along the river to join in this protest. There is little time to lose in the matter. We must not be content to sit back—we must go into action at once. And the fight is ours, not that of the Engineers. Regulations prevent them from taking a stand in the matter.

We trust our people will realize the seriousness of the matter. A change in flood control would affect every man, woman, and child in the Mississippi Valley. We cannot afford to jeopardize our lives and fortunes. We must keep flood control under the United States Engineers.

Summary of Report Introduced at Request of Representative Porter Hardy, of Virginia, Written by James Baylor Blackford, School of Geography, University of Virginia, Before Joint Senate-House Committee on Economic Report, January 27, 1950—A Virginia Location for a Steel Mill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WRIGHT PATMAN
OF TEXAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a study introduced at the request of Representative PORTER HARDY, of Virginia, James Baylor Blackford, School of Geography, University of Virginia, pointed out that steel interests were planning to spend much over a billion dollars on erection of taconite beneficiating plants to enrich Lake Superior low-grade iron ore as the high-grade ore there is fast becoming depleted. He pointed out that the cost of the erection of a steel plant in Virginia would be a fraction of that amount and that steel products would cost the consumers much less if steel were produced where the high-grade ores from Venezuela, Brazil, and Labrador would meet the coal and limestone at the nearest deep water point which would be in the vicinity of Tidewater, Va. He pointed out that the end of the basing-point system and the need for dispersion of strategic plants for defense purposes made it imperative that steel plants be scattered out. The study told of the shortage of adequate water resources throughout the heavily industrialized sections of the country did not apply to parts of Virginia where the necessary 50 to 100 million gallons of water per day required for operations of a steel mill could be found.

The study brought out the fact that there was a shortage of job opportunities for men there and Virginia was losing its high school and college graduates to other States whose steel mills attracted other industries which paid better wages. Ships now carrying coal to South America could pick up iron ore from Brazil or Venezuela all 12 months of the year. For cheaper steel prices and a less vulnerability from concentration the Blackford study recommended a plant be erected in Virginia where there was adequate supply of labor and water supply and where the raw materials could be brought together most cheaply.

Let's Keep the Record Straight

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend, heretofore granted, I am inserting an article by George Sokolsky, which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald on February 6, 1950:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

Oh! that my son should never write a book!

Franklin D. Roosevelt might have spoken these words. For now that the foreign policy of the United States, which he had conducted from 1933 to 1945, has proved such a failure, Elliott Roosevelt's book, As He Saw It, comes to plague the record.

On page 249 of that book, Elliott Roosevelt, discussing the Cairo Conference attended by Roosevelt, Churchill, and Chiang Kai-shek, says:

"At Cairo, Franklin Roosevelt wrung a promise from the feudal warlord who happened also to be the de facto war leader of China. The promise was that before the cessation of hostilities a truly representative government of China's national unity would be formed, and that under the aegis of this new and more democratic government there would then * * * as promptly as possible * * * be held national elections."

1. Chiang Kai-shek was not a feudal warlord; he was then head of the state—as much head of the state of China as Roosevelt was of the United States. Each was in his position in accordance with the basic law of his country.

2. Chiang Kai-shek was not a de facto anything. He had been at the head of the Government of China, under one title or another, since 1927. His government had been recognized by every other government involved in Chinese affairs. So far as the United States is concerned, such recognition was complete (de jure, the diplomats call it), the two countries having exchanged ambassadors for nearly two decades.

3. It is utter nonsense to speak of a national election prior to the cessation of hostilities. Much of China was then in the hands of the Japanese. How could an election be held until the country was freed from the Japanese?

In a word, Elliott's statement is nonsense and if that is what his father told him, it is evidence that his father had no understanding of the situation.

Now, let us proceed, Elliott Roosevelt continues to say: "* * * True, it was a conditional promise. Chiang's conditions were two: First, that father should obtain from the Soviet Government full assurance that Manchuria would be returned to Chinese sovereignty and full assurance that the future Chinese boundary would be respected, this commitment to include an understanding that the Soviets would not interfere in China's internal political problems; second, that the United States should back the Chinese in their postwar refusal of extraterritorial rights to the British in Hong Kong, Canton, and Shanghai * * *."

(Extraterritoriality had long been abolished in Shanghai and Canton and never existed in Hong Kong.)

Let's get at dates. The Cairo Conference was held a few days prior to the Tehran Conference in 1943. Chiang, who had flown from Chungking to Cairo, with his wife, wanted to attend the Tehran Conference. Stalin objected.

Obviously it was a bit surprising to discover that the fourth ally, Stalin, refused to attend the Cairo Conference, and objected to the presence of Chiang Kai-shek at Tehran.

This is what was agreed to at Cairo:

"It is their purpose that Japan shall be stripped of all the islands in the Pacific which she has seized or occupied since the beginning of the First World War in 1914, and that all the territories that Japan has stolen from the Chinese, such as Manchuria, Formosa, and the Pescadores, shall be restored to the Republic of China."

But at Tehran a few days later, this agreement was nullified. Chiang was not notified of the nullification. In the official pronouncement on Tehran, nothing was said on the subject. This pious wish was expressed:

"From these friendly conferences we look with confidence to the day when all peoples of the world may live free lives untouched by tyranny and according to their varying desires and their own consciences."

Yet at Tehran, in December 1943, the double-cross was in. At Yalta, in February 1945, it was implemented by an agreement. Elliott Roosevelt seems shocked in his book that the December 1943 platitudes did not work out and blames the State Department.

But it was his father, Franklin D. Roosevelt, who personally attended the Cairo, Tehran, and Yalta Conferences, and who personally affixed his signature to all the documents, as did Winston Churchill.

At Yalta Roosevelt was advised by Alger Hiss.

Russian Canned Crab Is Now Flooding American Market

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RUSSELL V. MACK
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. MACK of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on last Thursday 15,000 cases of Russian canned crab, valued at half a million dollars, were unloaded in Seattle. This crab was caught by Russian fishermen, in Russian waters, and canned by Russian cannery workers.

This was the first shipment since the war of Russian crab meat into the United States. If these shipments continued, and there is every reason to believe they will continue under our present free-trade policies, our Pacific coast canned-crab industry soon will be knocked into a cocked hat. Our American crab fishermen cannot compete with the low wages and low living standards of the Russians.

It is interesting to note that prior to Pearl Harbor, December 7, 1941, 85 percent of all canned crab sold on the American market was imported from Japan and only 15 percent of it supplied by our American fishermen.

Pearl Harbor blew the Japanese out of the American market. Americans then built thousands of crab-fishing boats and scores of crab canneries, investing millions in developing a prosperous crab-fishing industry in this country.

The Russians, under our treaties with them, have now largely taken over the fisheries previously operated by the Japanese. Last week's Russian crab import seems to indicate that Russia now has opened a drive to take over the American crab market and thereby drive our American crab-fishing fleet from the seas and to force our American crab fishermen and crab-cannery workers into unemployment.

We are today spending billions to prevent Russia from engulfing Europe. At the same time we pursue a policy of admitting Russian canned crab into United States markets in order that the Russians may be made more prosperous. The two policies are absurdly inconsistent.

The State Department ought to take immediate steps to stop further imports of these Russian crabs into the United States. If we do not, our Pacific coast fishing industry and its thousands of workers will be irreparably injured.

New England Tragedy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER E. MERROW
OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MERROW. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which appeared in the Carroll County Independent, published in Center Ossipee, N. H., of February 10, 1950:

NEW ENGLAND TRAGEDY

The closing down of the Waltham Watch plant is tragic. Nothing can be done to cushion or to soften the blow to that community in particular and to New England in general. Some 1,200 people were involved when the final notices were given.

When a shoe plant, a textile mill, or a canning factory folds up through any one of a number of causes, the help can sometimes find places in similar plants. Many hardships are involved, but quite often work can be found for which the freshly unemployed man or woman is trained.

But when a watch factory closes, there are just no other watch factories to which the help may migrate. There are such plants in this country, but they simply cannot absorb all the help. Anyone who works in a watch plant has a very high degree of manual skill and should be able to adapt himself to other precision work. But the retraining process may be long and costly.

Much more is involved than the closing of a factory and the throwing out of work of about a thousand people. Looking at our national economy as a whole, the opening or the closing of one such a plant means very little.

But from the viewpoint of national security, the loss is absolutely irreparable. In time of war there is a tremendous demand for chronometers for the Navy, for absolutely accurate watches for pilots, airplane navigators and for Army officers.

In the manufacture and assembly of certain types of bomb and shell fuses, airplane navigation instruments and optical equipment, extremely high standards of precision are demanded.

A watch plant is a great center of know-how, skill and teaching ability to help meet such demands.

During the last war we amazed both ourselves and the world in our ability to teach people to do precision work in mass production. But certain skills cannot be taught in an intensive learning course.

They come only the hard way, by years of both schooling and bench work.

Oftentimes it is a question of finding the highly skilled man who knows how to make the tool, to make the tool, that makes the final tool with which the semiskilled worker does his precision work. Often it is a question of finding an old shop foreman who knows both theory and actual practice and who carries in his head information that is just not found in any shop manual or text book.

When a plant such as Waltham Watch closes down the precision machinery either depreciates, is lost, sold or stolen. The great pool of irreplaceable skill is broken up and can never be replaced or reorganized.

If we as a Nation can afford to subsidize the growing of potatoes, cotton and tobacco, if we can engage in economic and social experiments of highly debatable value, we can most certainly afford to subsidize factories that may easily be of vital importance to our national safety a few short years from now.

Today's Dollar Tomorrow

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to include one of the most thoughtful and factual statements I have yet seen regarding the necessity for instituting some semblance of fiscal sanity in our national and international affairs. Because of its value, I have secured permission from Mr. Frank Lilly to print his address on this subject.

TODAY'S DOLLAR TOMORROW

(Address by Frank Lilly at the Spokane Valley Kiwanis Club, February 6, 1950)

Today's dollar, like the old gray mare, is not what it used to be.

The 75 cents that I paid for a good shirt, according to the diary which I kept while a student at the University of Missouri, would not today buy the shirt tail of the same quality shirt. The $2,50 that I paid for shoes would today barely pay for the rubber heels, soles, and shoelaces of similar shoes. The $15 that I paid for a good suit would today pay for little more than one leg of a pair of pants of the same quality suit. The $1.50 a week that I paid for board at the Union Boarding Club would not today buy a good meal at a first-class hotel. Today I pay the barber $1 for trying to find some hair to cut as compared with the 25 cents I paid at that time for a real haircut. The 5-cent loaf of bread of that day has become a 16-cent loaf and the 5-cent Saturday Evening Post of that day is now 15 cents.

When I recently received payment on a small loan made in 1933, my elation over the unexpected reimbursement passed quickly when I realized that I was actually receiving back in today's dollars only about 35 cents of the value of each of the dollars that I had loaned.

In this connection, my attention was recently called to the fact that even if one now has a third more funds on deposit in the bank than he had in 1945, he will still actually have about 5 percent less in purchasing value than he had 5 years ago. In other words, the figures on your $20 bill and the figures in your bankbook do not mean what they say; their true meaning lies only in terms of what their value is in purchasing power.

YESTERDAY'S DOLLAR GOLD BACKED

The value of the dollar was relatively stable from the time of resumption of specie payment in 1879 up to 1934 because the dollar of that period was a different kind of dollar than we have had for the last 15 years. It was either a gold dollar or a gold-backed dollar, and I shall refer to that type of dollar as "yesterday's dollar." You will recall in this connection that the old gold certificates, national bank notes, and the Federal Reserve notes were redeemable in gold coin.

Yesterday's dollar was money; today's dollar is merely paper currency, with the exception of silver certificates and silver dollars. It is important to distinguish between currency and money. Currency performs only two of the functions of money, namely; it serves (1) as a medium of exchange and (2) as a measure of value. Money's most important and necessary function, especially from the standpoint of the man who is earning and saving his money, is as a storage of value. This "storage of value" is best provided by gold and/or silver.

From the banker's standpoint, interest is the most important consideration and as long as he can get interest on currency, notes, or what-not, he places little or no emphasis upon "storage of value." The Government's chief objective seems to be spending, and it, therefore, overlooks the "storage of value" which is of so much importance to the man who is endeavoring to establish a competence through savings.

TODAY'S DOLLARS MOSTLY NOTES

Nearly two-thirds of today's paper currency is in the form of Federal Reserve notes. Now a note is a promise to pay, and you will find on the Federal Reserve note the provisions that it "is redeemable in lawful money at the United States Treasury or at any Federal Reserve bank." If you should send a $10 Federal Reserve note to the United States Treasury with a request that it be redeemed in lawful money, you would probably receive two $5 United States notes which you would find are also "redeemable in lawful money." And that would be as far as you could go unless you demanded silver dollars or a silver certificate which calls for payment in silver dollars that actually contain only about 70 cents worth of silver on the basis of the price of 90½ cents an ounce that the United States Treasury pays the miner for his silver.

The silver dollar in China, by the way, will buy three times as much as our paper dollar, because, in every nation, people have more confidence in hard money than in paper. Although lack of confidence in paper currency may not be an important factor in the lower value of today's dollar, no one could succesfully contend that redeemability in gold would not inspire greater confidence in its value.

The contention that our currency is backed by gold in the vaults at Fort Knox is, at best, an academic distinction and not a practical fact. Cream in the icebox that the waitress will not serve you is not cream in your coffee.

The best evidence that gold is of major importance in a monetary system lies in the fact that our Government seized and nationalized gold in order to keep it from flowing out of the country and into the hands of foreign governments and their citizens. Incidentally, it was the devalued English pound which resulted from Great Britain's abandonment of the gold standard in September 1931 that precipitated the flow of gold out of this country and, in January 1934, resulted in our Government's raising the price of gold to $35 an ounce. If we had not then increased the price of gold to offset the devaluation of foreign currencies, we would, in time, have lost this all-important gold.

GOLD GOING ABROAD AGAIN

This Nation is today again faced with the same situation as in 1933 and 1934, except that this time it is on a greater scale, as a result of Great Britain's recent devaluation of the pound sterling which was followed by devaluation in over 40 other countries. For the first time in 15 years, gold is now flowing out of this country and we will soon be forced either to increase the price of gold or we will continue to lose our gold in ever-increasing quantities. In other words, the price of gold in terms of foreign currencies is now higher than in the United States in every other country except Switzerland (whose money is 100 percent gold backed) and it goes without saying, that other nations, including our own, will send their gold to whatever place they can get the best value for it in goods.

NOT ENOUGH GOLD

There is still a rather general impression that we have a large amount of gold, and it is true that we have the greater part of the world's gold—more than any other nation. But in relation to our national debt, the amount is only about 11 percent as compared with nearly 50 percent in 1940; and in relation to our total money supply, including bank deposits, our gold holdings are only about 12 percent of the total. Actually, therefore, we now have less gold in proportion to our national debt and our monetary supply than we had before our money was converted into irredeemable currency, and our gold holdings are far smaller than they should be for the safety of our money and Government bonds.

In this connection, it is of interest to note that during the 124 years from 1784 to 1910 the entire cost of the United States Government was $8,000,000,000 (and this includes the entire cost of the War of 1812, the Mexican War, the Civil War, the Spanish-American War, and the Panama Canal). Since 1910, the cost has reached $360,000,000,000 and the expense involved in running our Federal Government is now close to $45,000,000,000 a year. On the basis of $35 an ounce for gold, it would take more gold than there is in the entire world to meet the expenses of our Federal Government for 1 year.

DEBT-BASED DOLLARS DANGEROUS

The importance of maintaining the current value of today's dollar, and increasing its value, if possible, cannot be overestimated. If the value of today's dollar should continue to decline as it has during the past 15 years, insurance policies, annuities, pensions, and savings of every kind will be practically destroyed.

This has happened in other countries—take France as one of several examples that could be cited—and it can happen here unless we put our financial house in order and establish a sound monetary system. A nation cannot, any more than an individual, get out of debt by going further into debt. A currency that is based upon debt cannot endure.

In emphasizing the foregoing danger, I am not questioning the intent of our Government officials, for the matter does not involve a question of intent but of fact. Lenin is quoted as having said that Germany would arm itself out of existence, Great Britain expand itself out of existence, and the United States lend itself out of existence. The first has happened; the second, practically so; and the third could happen. The fact that a large amount of the loans have been made to ourselves does not alter the situation, for debts are debts—they must sometime either be paid or repudiated.

NO BUSINESS CAN BE BETTER THAN MONETARY SYSTEM

No business or bank, no insurance system, can be any better than the monetary system of the nation in which it operates. No plan for old-age security can work unless the nation has a monetary system with which to maintain a sound and stable value for its money. Calling paper currency money does not make it money, nor does good intent put value into paper currency.

It is too much to hope that tomorrow's dollar will again have the value of yesterday's dollar, because we have probably gone too far down the road of debt and inflation. I do believe, however, that we can restore to tomorrow's dollar some of the value that yesterday's dollar had.

TOMORROW'S DOLLAR VALUE CAN BE INCREASED

There are two ways in which the value of tomorrow's dollar can be increased. One way would be to bring about a lowering of prices, which involves a decrease in labor and material costs. This may sound like heresy to many people, but even the laborer and supplier should prefer lower wages and prices to continued debt and an inflation that could end in repudiation.

The other way to meet the situation is to utilize the power that is inherent in gold. Incidentally, we are not doing this when we sterlize gold and render it inactive by withdrawing it from use and burying it in underground vaults as we have done in this country. There is neither life nor growth in sterility and stagnant inactivity.

HIGHER GOLD VALUE ABROAD

A legal recognition of the higher value for gold which now prevails in every country in the world except the United States, and even indirectly here (in "natural gold"), is merely facing the facts of the situation. To establish a higher price for gold and permit citizen ownership of it would not involve more inflation and a further decrease in the value of today's dollar, but would merely be a realistic adjustment to the current value of today's dollar.

Everyone knows that the price of practically everything except gold has increased since 1934. It follows, therefore, that the price of gold must be increased correspondingly; otherwise, the price of all other things must soon be decreased proportionately.

An increase in the price of gold is a proven method of meeting financial crises that has been used a number of times in the past. Great Britain, for example, has, in one way or another, increased the price of gold seven times in the last six centuries.

GOLD BEST CURE AND PROTECTION

It is not by chance that, from the beginning of history, gold has been the only sure cure for inflation and the best protection against deflation. Time and time again nations have tried to get along without gold in their monetary systems, but such attempts have invariably failed and in every instance, when these nations have returned to a gold standard, gold has been given a higher monetary value than it had before.

British Foreign Secretary Ernest Bevin acknowledged the major importance of gold when in a speech to the British Trade Union he said, "If you find another gold mine (district) in the world it would assist you, it would be a great advantage."

DEVALUATION MADE TO GET GOLD

Great Britain's recent devaluation of its currency was, by the way, made not just for the purpose of getting dollars as is so generally believed in this country, but primarily for the purpose of getting gold because, in many instances, Great Britain can use other currencies to better advantage than she can dollars; and with gold she can obtain all currencies, including dollars. There is no gainsaying the fact that there is not a nation in the world, including Russia, that would not prefer to be on a gold standard, for an ample supply of gold is a big advantage in world trade. Why, then, should the United States, like an ostrich, bury its head in the sands of paper currency?

MONEY LIFEBLOOD OF COMMERCE

Because money is the lifeblood of commerce, and because commerce is an essential phase of modern civilization, the monetary blood stream must be kept pure and vital. You can pump several things into the human blood stream and the substitute will function for a little while, but the individual will not live long unless he gets real blood—either by transfusion or the creative forces of his own body.

Fortunately, this country is in a position to obtain the gold and silver needed to maintain the monetary blood for a healthy economic body, both from the mines in its own body and also by transfusion, so to speak, from abroad. As matters stand, however, efforts to produce gold from our own mines are being discouraged by forcing our producers to sell only to the Government, and at a lower price than they could obtain in foreign countries. Also, due to our failure to recognize in trade a higher value for gold, we are not obtaining the gold we were formerly getting through trade with foreign countries—exports are declining and imports that take our gold abroad are increasing.

Governments have ever been slow to act. It is freely admitted in well-informed financial circles that the disastrous depression of the early thirties could probably have been avoided, or at least ameliorated, if our Government had taken quicker action in raising the price of gold. There are, I think, good grounds for believing that this fact is now well recognized by a large number of Congressmen and other Government officials, and that constructive action can reasonably be expected within the near future.

GOLD BEST FOR PROFITS

Meanwhile, is there anything an individual can do to protect himself against a possible further decrease in the value of the dollar and/or profit by or through the situation? If, as has been said, one can best judge the future by what has happened in the past, gold and stocks in gold-mining companies offer the best protection and the largest profit possibilities.

Consider what happened in France during the last decade when the price level increased seventeen-fold, so that it now takes 17 francs to buy what 1 franc bought in 1939. During this period of currency management, the French investor could put his money into government bonds, food and services, industrial stock equities, real estate, stocks of gold-mining companies, and gold itself, the last-named being a privilege now denied to citizens of the United States.

The man who put his francs in government bonds suffered a loss, both in the franc value of his investment and its buying power. Those who converted into food and services showed a 98 percent loss in real value. The equity investor lost 40 percent, although stock prices advanced ten-fold. Those who bought farm lands realized a big increase in franc value but in real value they gained less than 20 percent. However, those who bought stocks of gold-mining companies and/or gold itself, wound up with a tremendous increase in franc value and a real net of over 50 percent.

British citizens who purchased stocks of gold-mining companies before the recent devaluation of the pound saw their stocks advance over 300 percent within a few days following the devaluation of the pound by 30½ percent. Sir Stafford Cripps had repeatedly declared that he would not devalue but he did.

In our own country, those who purchased stocks of the leading gold producers in the thirties during the depression realized enormous profits in market appreciation which, without exception, have more than offset the decrease in the purchasing power of today's dollar.

INDIVIDUAL INITIATIVE AND ACTION NECESSARY

There has in recent years been a general tendency to leave everything up to the Government, but this leads to socialism and communism. Individual initiative and action are necessary if this Nation is to maintain and preserve a free enterprise system.

Unless the decline in the value of the dollar is at least stopped, people will find that what they have saved and are saving to live on tomorrow when their productive days are over will have little value; the security they have been attempting to provide will have vanished.

A return to the hard-money system as it was set forth in the United States Constitution is a primary need—other necessary reforms can then be established on a firm and lasting foundation.

Inflation of paper currencies throughout Europe set the stage for World War II, a shooting war; conflict over paper currencies in the Berlin area has been the real issue in the cold war; devaluation of the paper currencies of Great Britain and its some 30-odd satellite nations has precipitated a gold war. This we must win. We can do so by (1) recognizing the world-wide higher value of gold which these devaluations involve and, (2) reestablishing our monetary system on realistic and honest monetary values for both gold and silver. Quick action should be taken; delay is dangerous.

In the meantime, every individual owes it to himself to endeavor to protect himself and his loved ones against a decreasing dollar value by putting his today's dollars at work in equities of companies whose assets are in natural resources, for these will roll along with, or even move a little faster than, the spiraling inflation which has so greatly reduced the value of the dollars that he has been saving for tomorrow.

Fifty-second Anniversary of the Passing of Frances Willard

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JOSEPH R. BRYSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BRYSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address I delivered in Statuary Hall on Friday, February 17, 1950, under the auspices of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of the District of Columbia, observing the fifty-second anniversary of the passing of Frances Willard:

Madam President, officers, members of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, and friends, on this fifty-second anniversary of the passing of Frances Willard, it is quite appropriate that we hold this observance here in Statuary Hall, this hallowed Chamber of our Nation's Capitol, at the feet of the statue of one of history's most remarkable and influential women. As evidence of the unusual and outstanding character and service of Frances Willard, her statue is the only one representing our women in this chamber. All around us are impressive figures of stalwart sons, brave soldiers, great statesmen, leaders in industry, education, business, and politics. In their midst stands this statue of imperishable granite of a frail little woman. Since the dawn of history women have contributed more than their share in

the advancement of Christian civilization. Someone has said that God could not be everywhere all the time so he gave us our saintly mothers.

We have just observed the birthday of President Lincoln who, like other great leaders, attributed his finer qualities to his mother. Mr. Lincoln said, "Whatever I am I owe to my mother."

Frances Elizabeth Caroline Willard was the daughter of teacher parents. Education, next to religion, played the most important part in their ideals in life. Circumstances made it necessary for the Willard family to leave their native State of New York, and journey westward through Ohio, Illinois, and Wisconsin.

Early in life Miss Willard displayed talents of leadership and for many years taught in schools and colleges. Her record as an educator is outstanding but is overshadowed by her work in the cause of temperance.

Although considered by some as an impractical dreamer, Miss Willard fought hard for political enfranchisement of women. She was a pioneer in the contention for equal opportunities, equal pay, equal rights, equal responsibilities in the home, in the professions, in industry, and affairs of state, for women. She insisted upon provisions for vocational guidance for girls, upon education for citizenship, upon physical education, and sports. She advocated the 8-hour day, a minimum-wage law, and many other ideals which in her day were considered the ravings of an impractical dreamer.

When those of us who still fight for temperance and decency become discouraged, we are heartened to learn of the untiring efforts for a better world in which to live as sought by Miss Willard.

She believed that intoxicating beverage was God's worst enemy and the devil's best friend. As we contemplate the example of this good woman, we shamefully confess the fact that so many still clamor for booze even if there is no bread. The selfish, greedy attitude of those who transform food into strong drink has so recently been revealed by their opposition to any restrictions in the use of grain for the distillation of liquor. In like manner, the selfish, wicked influences vigorously oppose any restriction of advertising the falsehood that alcoholic beverages are good and wholesome food. They would teach the children that drinking is the proper thing to do.

By reason of her devotion and zeal in the cause of temperance, our subject advanced from a subordinate position to that of president of the World's Women's Christian Temperance Union.

This guiding genius of the national temperance cause early recognized the importance of the printed page. She wrote six books, and edited the Union Signal. She believed in temperance education, and promoted this cause for schools, colleges, and churches. She agitated for legislation, and participated in securing constitutional prohibition amendments in various States.

Not only was Miss Willard interested in the cause of temperance and justice in our own country but her theater of operation covered the entire world.

A half century has gone since this saintly woman was called to her reward. In spite of the present chaotic plight of this troubled world and in spite of the destructive wars through which we have passed, her marvelous influence is still with us.

This is not the only statue or memorial to Frances Willard. Throughout the world there are hospitals, educational institutions, and other agencies of mercy and culture bespeaking the fine qualities of this good woman. In Willard Hall at Northwestern University on a marble bust of Miss Willard are chiseled these lines from the pen of the poet Whittier:

"She knew the power of banded ill,
But felt that love was stronger still,
And organized for doing good
The world's united womanhood."

Soon after the passing of Miss Willard, the great State of Illinois placed this marble statue of her likeness here. The Congress paused that day to mark the eventful occasion. Many impressive eulogies were delivered. Inscribed on the pedestal of this statue here are these words from the lips of Miss Willard:

"Ah, it is our women who have given the costliest hostages to fortune. Out into the battle of life they have sent their best beloved with fearful odds against them. Oh, by the dangers they have dared, by the hours of patient watching over beds where helpless children lay, by the incense of 10,000 prayers wafted from their gentle lips to heaven, I charge you give them power to protect along life's treacherous highway those whom they have loved."

Our Nation, our churches, our people do well to remember the life and service of so noble, so self-giving, so loving a soul.

She was a brave true soldier, a great commander, and finally and best of all, a kind and gentle woman who loved her fellow beings with such an unstinted devotion that she has been christened the mother of all mothers.

When called by that Master with whom she walked so closely all through life, she answered with tones of utmost content: "How beautiful it is to be with God."

May the memory of this good woman, who did so much for the cause of humanity, be forever preserved, perpetuated, and transmitted to the generations yet unborn.

Presentation of Bust of Abraham Lincoln by Eloy Alfaro International Foundation

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE DOYLE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday afternoon, February 12, 1950, I had the pleasure, at the Ford Theater in the very room where Abraham Lincoln was shot, of presiding at a memorial service in memory of the birthday of that great American who became a citizen of the ages. This annual memorial program is conducted under the joint auspices of the Lincoln Group, of Washington, D. C., and of the National Park Service.

One of the features of the program was the gift of a bust of Abraham Lincoln to the Lincoln Museum at 511 Tenth Street by the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation is devoted to perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, and to encourage the propagation of the liberal ideals and principles for which this great South American patriot and statesman fought for more than half a century. Its headquarters are located in the city of Panama, but its membership extends throughout the North and South American Continents.

The memorandum given to me as chairman for the basis of my remarks about the bust of Abraham Lincoln being presented by the foundation was as follows:

That the people of many nations have paid tribute to the memory of Abraham Lincoln is not surprising. His contribution was not to the welfare of his countrymen, alone, but to all humankind. That he should be revered by the common people and the oppressed is easily understood. But Lincoln did more than that. He inspired the chiefs of other nations to look upon their own downtrodden peoples with compassion and the effects of his humanitarianism were widespread, offering new hope and opportunity for the people of many lands.

This afternoon, Dr. Emeterio S. Santovena of Habana, Cuba, author of the best work on Abraham Lincoln ever written in the Spanish language, has sent a bust of Abraham Lincoln to this museum to be presented in the name of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of which he is President. This is being done as a token of respect for the memory of Abraham Lincoln and gratitude for the blessings which he helped to bring to the peoples of all of the American nations.

Eloy Alfaro was born in Ecuador in 1842. As a young man, he followed closely the career of Abraham Lincoln and was deeply moved by Lincoln's championship of the rights and dignity of the common people and his principles of freedom and democracy. When he became President of Ecuador, he devoted his efforts to free the native Indians, who had been held in virtual slavery by tyrannical dicators, from exploitation and inhuman treatment. The measures which he adopted in bettering the conditions of the masses in Ecuador and his humanitarianism have had so widespread an influence that he is commonly called the Abraham Lincoln of South America. Like Lincoln, he too had many enemies. But he was willing to sacrifice his great personal wealth, banishment from his native land, and finally his life to further the ideals of democracy. Again, like Abraham Lincoln, he met death at the hand of a cowardly assassin.

But his death was not in vain. Today he is not only heralded as the father of Ecuadoran democracy and the apostle of Pan-Americanism, but he has gained the accolade of history. In almost every South and Central American Republic his name is synonymous with freedom and his memory has been perpetuated by many monuments and memorial institutions.

I now have the honor to present Mrs. Karna Wilgus, whose husband, A. Curtis Wilgus, is professor of Latin-American history at George Washington University, a founder of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation and of the Inter-American center of Florida. Mrs. Wilgus will present the bust of Abraham Lincoln to the United States, in the name of the Foundation.

Mr. Speaker, and, then, in a most gracious manner, Mrs. Wilgus presented the magnificent bronze bust to the Museum within the walls of which we hold these annual memorials to the memory of President Lincoln.

I also had the pleasure of introducing to the audience Mr. Colon Eloy Alfaro, youngest son of the martyred Ecuadorian president—and himself a great Ecuadoran patriot and friend of the United States. "Captain" Alfaro, as his friends like to call him, has served his country both as Ambassador to the United States and Ambassador to the Pan-American Union. He is a graduate of West Point

and the father of three sons who also have graduated from the United States Military Academy.

A further memorandum handed me by the distinguished son of this martyred President of Ecuador said, and I quote:

[From the Star and Herald, Panama City, of September 10, 1949]

To perpetuate the memory of Eloy Alfaro, martyred ex-President of Ecuador, a movement has been started which will be devoted to the task of encouraging the study and propagation of the liberal ideals and principles for which this Ecuadoran statesman and leader fought during more than a half century of his existence.

The headquarters or seat of this organization to be known as the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation will be established in the city of Panama, because it was in this city that Eloy Alfaro, in the early nineties organized his liberating action to free his country from the backwardness in which it was held by a reactionary conservative regime and to bless his fellow countrymen with progress of liberalism.

Writing in Informacion, of Habana, Cuba, Dr. Emeterio S. Santovenia, president of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, explains the aims and purposes of the organization in an extensive article which is translated as follows:

"With its permanent headquarters established in the city of Panama; with Sic Itur ad astra as its motto: and, by the will of citizens of North, Central, and South America, there exists today the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation.

"This denomination is very expressive both because of the ecumenical meaning of the high purpose it covers and, also, because of the significance of the name of the great Ecuadoran patrician.

"The selection of Panama as the headquarters of the FIEA obeys the scope of fundemental facts in the life of him who presented the complete delineations of a liberator of the people.

"The motto Sic Itur ad astra, is closely related to the trajectory of the extraordinary existence of Eloy Alfaro: It can well be said, on appraising his progress forward and upward, that it is thus that the stars are reached.

"The FIEA, has neither political nor lucrative purposes. Its finality is to tribute the memory of Eloy Alfaro and make available all knowledge of his life and his works as a statesman and liberator. What Alfaro undertook and did throughout half a century, constitute the essential, transformation norms of men and people.

"Against ignorance, backwardness, and despotism in Ecuador he fought ceaselessly. For the realization of the maximum ideals of a common welfare he sacrificed his belongings and his prosperity, his peace and tranquility, and the immediate happiness of his family.

"To the yearnings for improvement and dignity of his country he added those redeeming undertakings which had achieved success in other far regions of America.

"The magnificent lessons from so many noble undertakings are worthy of being transmitted from generation to generation for the honor and benefits of an entire community of nations.

"The statutes of the FIEA, includes the bestowal of a high decoration by its Council of Dignitaries. The FIEA's Cross exists to reward eminent services. These must have been rendered in two ways: (a) To the memory of the patrician, (b) to the ideals and causes for which he struggled, suffered, and sacrificed his life.

"There is thus a close relation between the greatness of the remarkable transformer and the virtuous aptitude of the believers in the value of historic continuity.

"The FIEA can confer a medal. This is particularly destined as a means to recognize journalistic, scholastic, and analogous merit resulting from activities devoted to exalting the virtues of Eloy Alfaro. This medal will serve as an ostensible bond between the past, the glorious past, represented by Alfaro and the present, the promising present, administered by those who understand and can develop the principles of which he was a champion.

"The details of the FIEA's Cross are also symbolic. The extremes of the jewel represent the singular points of human fraternity and the 5th of June, 1895, the date which marks the beginning of the great social and political transformation in Ecuador launched by Alfaro. The circular figure superimposed on the points, signifies the wheel of progress. Its red color is that of Ecuadoran liberalism; the blue, red, and gold are the colors of the present flag of the country of Alfaro; the colors of the ribbon specially devised to serve as the collar of the Cross are also the colors of the Ecuadoran flag; corresponding to each point of the star, the crown of unity. In the background, sustaining the Cross are the laurel and olive branches symbolic of victory and peace. The motto Sic Itur ad astra, is the inscription which accompanies the bust of the great fighter in the center of the beautiful jewel.

"The FIEA, gathers and encourages the permanent political and moral values of America. Eloy Alfaro is the most outstanding Ecuadoran in the Western Hemisphere. The action and thought which he placed at the service of his country were instrument and agency of the highest aspirations of half the globe. He worked for a broad land and for a long time when he strove to raise the social level of the Indian, to spread education among his countrymen, to banish the exploitation of man by man, to act for the defense of liberty regardless of frontiers, to create American public law, and to free the flesh and the spirit from its chains."

Mr. Speaker, and, then the beautiful booklet, published about Eloy Alfaro, as president of Ecuador, in part, said:

Eloy Alfaro, soldier, patriot, statesman, and martyr, the centenary of whose birth was celebrated on June 25, 1942, was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, he was a citizen of America. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice, and friendship among nations, the self-control and self-sacrifice that marked his 70 years of unflagging service to his country and to America extended his sphere beyond the confines of his own country, awakened unbounded admiration in distant lands, and brought him unsought but richly deserved fame and honor in far places as well as at home. He was a rebel, a conspirator, but his rebellion and conspiracy were directed against hatred, injustice, discord, and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire for political action for the welfare of their country.

Born in Montecristi in the Province of Manabi, Ecuador, on June 25, 1842, Eloy Alfaro was the son of Manuel Alfaro, a native of Rioja, Spain, and of Dona Natividad Delgado. His childhood and youth were spent under the parental roof in an atmosphere that inspired in him the love of liberty, the sense of honor, the diligence, and the clear-sightedness that were to be his guide throughout his life.

In all the history of Pan American relations there is no name more distinguished, yet lesser known to North Americans, than that of Ecuador's greatest contemporary hero, Gen. Eloy Alfaro.

The student of inter-American affairs is cognizant of Alfaro's contributions toward hemispheric cooperation. The amateur in American relations has yet to know his greatness. This pamphlet is presented as a humble contribution to these latter.

In the writer's mind, two important phases of General Alfaro's life stand out above all others. A study of his thoughts, as expressed in his writings and his acts, clearly demonstrates the steadfastness of purpose which kept before Alfaro the wide and far-seeing aim of inter-American unity in action. During those years he held the supreme power in Ecuador he accomplished miracles in social changes for his fellow countrymen. Yet, and observe from his acts, he never once lost an opportunity to advance the cause of the Americas as an entity. While yet a loyal Ecuadoran, thinking of the welfare of his people and their advancement, he saw always before him the ultimate goal of inter-American unity of action and thought—Pan Americanism.

The other salient feature in this great American's life is found in his ability to translate his thoughts and ideals into solid concrete facts. Through the strength of his character and the fame of his name, he was able to preserve peace in Central America when war seemed the only solution to a boundary dispute involving three of the nations which had once formed the Republic of Central America. His ideal of Pan Americanism was put to the test and found not lacking.

Again, when the people of Cuba were the object of as cruel a despotic terror as any land has seen, and when political forces both in the Americas and abroad were using the struggle of those gallant Americans as a means to an ignoble end, Alfaro's ideal gave him the strength of character to intervene publicly on behalf of his fellow Americans. No other American of like standing found within himself the moral courage to do this.

Following in the footsteps of every great American from Bolivar to Blaine, General Alfaro was inspired to call the American nations to a hemispheric conference at Mexico City. The reader shall see that this conference, as measured by the usual standards, was as stated by Ignacio Mariscal, Secretary of State of Mexico, a failure analogous to that of the Congress of Panama, notwithstanding the powerful influences of the liberator (Simón Bolívar), yet it is significant that the Central American countries which had seen Pan Americanism at work found merit in the general's call, and were represented at the conference.

Mr. Speaker, upon the adjournment of the very largely attended meeting, and before leaving the hall, hundreds of those in attendance went forward to more closely observe the bust and to personally meet Mrs. Wilgus who had presented it on behalf of the foundation, and also to meet the distinguished son of this former President of Ecuador, Capt. Colon Eloy Alfaro.

"They Reap Every One His Corn in the Field; and They Gather the Vintage of the Wicked"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my desk an article from Aufbau—Reconstruction, an American weekly printed in German and English, written by Manfred George, the editor, which does an excellent job of rationalizing the difficult position maintained by

those of us who believe that the United States was engaged in a crusade for justice and democracy in World War II, and that the Nazi leaders cannot be quickly forgiven for their crimes against humanity.

This article attempts to discuss dispassionately, and as a moral issue, the case of Kirsten Flagstad, and, by obvious analogy, similar cases such as those of Wilhelm Furtwaengler and Walter Gieseking. Mr. George comes to the conclusion that basically these are problems involving the honor of the United States.

As you can readily imagine, I have been severely criticized for almost everything I have done in public office; most people in public life have that experience. In particular, I have been accused of inconsistency, because on the one hand, I was, at least in part, responsible for the expulsion of Walter Gieseking, and I have opposed the entrance into the United States of others who were conspicuous for their adherence to nazism, yet hardly culpable to the point of being called war criminals; on the other hand, I have tended to intervene in behalf of minor and harmless people who were, almost by accident, members of the Nazi Party for varying periods.

Mr. George supplies the moral content of my position, and it is with pleasure that I insert his article in the RECORD under leave:

THE FLAGSTAD CASE

(By Manfred George)

This article deals with timely ethics and politics. The fact that a Wagnerian soprano by the name of Kirsten Flagstad may again appear at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York does not interest us from an artistic point of view. Kirsten Flagstad is a first-rate singer. We have no way of judging whether or not Miss Helen Traubel is on a par with her presumptive successor as far as box-office appeal and artistic qualifications go; some critics who apply only the highest standards, are inclined to give preference to Mme. Flagstad. This, however, does not concern us here. What concerns us are the moral aspects of the matter; this case is but one in the lengthy discussion about art and politics which, in themselves, are meaningless unless coordinated with human beings and humanity.

Here are the facts: Mme. Kirsten Flagstad's husband, Henry Johansen, made a fortune by treacherous collaboration with the Nazis and the Norwegian quisling regime. Disregarding the pleas of her loyal countrymen in the United States, disregarding the requests of the Norwegian Legation here, Mme. Flagstad returned to occupied Norway. In contrast to other artists of Allied nationality, she never helped the war effort in any way. Fate punished her husband for his treachery: he died in a prison hospital shortly before he was to go on trial. In view of the incriminating evidence, the Norwegian Government confiscated his property—which was also Mme. Flagstad's property.

After the war, Mme. Flagstad was not permitted to make concert or operatic appearances in Norway, Copenhagen, and Stockholm. An attempt of hers to sing in Stockholm resulted in a public scandal. As far as the United States is concerned, the Americans of Scandinavian descent made it impossible for her to tour the Middle West as she had planned. In San Francisco, however, she enjoyed a carefully prepared triumph. If she is now to appear at the Metropolitan Opera House, she will be able to laugh at the fools who attempted to oppose her reappearance.

What is the real issue behind the matter? The issue is not to perpetuate the concept of the enemy as it was held during World War II. Hate and enmity can never be constructive. We can understand those who say with conscious indifference: "We don't care about the past. Kirsten Flagstad is a great singer. This is the only thing which matters."

Yet they have not thought it over completely. True enough, one cannot pin down for years on end the countless little and not so little enemies who made life hard for us during the war and who are responsible for the death of many an American soldier. Relations between peoples change from one day to the other; one canrot sit down with a notebook and keep track of millions of insignificant Nazi fellow travelers in Allied countries. It is impossible, and in many instances where decisive changes have taken place, it is also unjust. But this attitude cannot apply to internationally known celebrities.

This is where we have to draw the line between forgiveness and recollection. A great name means great responsibility, because those who bear it are a symbol as well as an example. The Americans of Scandinavian descent doubtlessly have forgiven many a traitor among their former nationals. There is a deep meaning in their reluctance to forgive Kirsten Flagstad, an attitude, incidentally, which is shared by the Norwegian Government. Knut Hamsun, who definitely was a great writer, has not been forgiven either.

Anyone who has identified himself with our enemies to such an extent—in a way which, although it might be called passive, speaks for itself very actively—has forfeited the right to appear in this country, even if he or she is as great a singer as Mme. Flagstad, except for the exclusive benefit of wounded war veterans.

To those who say: "We don't care about these things; we cannot afford to forego such outstanding art," may we reply that there is no art outstanding enough to justify an insult to our national honor.

We realize that these lines will not achieve anything. Who are we to compete with the mighty ones who organized Kirsten Flagstad's triumph over decency and ethics? We are doing our duty anyway. And although, with Beethoven's Choral Symphony, we would like to embrace all the world—diesen kuss der ganzen welt—our friendship for all the world compels us to see to it that this kiss is not turned into a kiss of Judas.

The Columbia River

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 14, 15, and 16 in the series on the Columbia River region by Mr. Leon Starmont:

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 4, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 14)

(By Leon Starmont)

About $460,000,000 of the $2,250,000,000 asked in the comprehensive plan for Columbia Basin development is intended for use in Idaho. That includes half of the $334,000,000 Hells Canyon Dam on Snake River, and all the $31,070,000 cost of Albeni Falls Dam on the Pend Oreille, which is just above the Washington line.

The biggest single item entirely in Idaho was slashed by the Budget Bureau, as forecast in article 12 of this series. It called for $253,234,000 to irrigate 192,000 acres, develop 180,000 kilowatts and store 1,225,000 acre-feet in Payette and Boise Rivers east of Boise. Parts of the Mountain Home project were retained, however.

HOME OF EARLY IRRIGATION

This part of Idaho saw the first large-scale irrigation in the Northwest. A right was granted in 1865 for diversion from Boise River for irrigation of a tract now included in the Boise city limits.

Age of the settlement, and the varied nature of early projects, create a problem not faced elsewhere. With the Weiser and Owyhee, six different rivers, including the Snake, flow through the region. The irrigable area extends roughly from Mountain Home, Idaho, to the Oregon side of the Snake above Huntington.

Contiguous areas are divided into numerous districts and Federal projects, and much of the ground can be served with almost equal efficiency from more than one source.

The Owyhee now irrigates about 150,000 acres in three States, the Bruneau 21,000 acres in two States, the Boise 340,000 acres, the Payette 160,000 acres, and the Weiser some 40,000 acres, the last three items being all in Idaho. These streams provide more than 700,000 irrigated acres.

MANY OTHERS AUTHORIZED

Now authorized and under construction in this area, which the Bureau of Reclamation at Boise calls the Middle Snake, are Payette division of the Boise project, for 52,760 new acres, and the Anderson ranch dam, to be completed in 1951, which will send supplemental water to 300,000 acres. The dam will generate 27,000 kilowatts.

Also nearing completion is the Owyhee project, extending into Oregon, to add 103,000 acres. These plus the new project would total about 1,060,000 acres.

Above this area is the upper Snake country, extending into Wyoming. It now has more than 1,500,000 acres irrigated, or about three times the area now qualified in central Washington's Big Bend.

The Minidoka project, nearing completion, will add 318,700 acres of new land. The Minidoka and Palisades projects, the latter somewhat delayed, will add supplemental water to 1,350,000 acres where the present supply is insufficient.

The total is approximately 3,000,000 acres for Idaho, southern Idaho, exclusive of the Salmon, Clearwater, and Lost River drainage systems, but including portions of Wyoming, Nevada, and Oregon which are tied to it economically.

TWO ITEMS ATTACKED

Strong efforts have been made to have two of the Idaho items, the two largest, deleted from the list of 93 projects for immediate authorization.

One is Hells Canyon, which is a power project with no irrigation angle. The contention is that a series of low dams with locks on Snake River, between Lewiston and Weiser, would develop approximately the same amount of power at a much earlier date, and would make up-river navigation possible. The principal loss would be the proposed storage capacity of 3,880,000 acre-feet.

It got by the Budget Bureau, however, with removal of $120,000,000 for transmission facilities, which the message said might better be constructed by another Federal agency.

Efforts to change budget recommendations and to add items may still be made in Congress.

The Bureau of Reclamation "blue book," which covers all future projects, specifies 17 possible power development, totaling 1,665,-

000 kilowatts, and 32 irrigation schemes, to cover more than 1,000,000 acres. They would in time bring the region's irrigation acreage to 4,500,000, and its power, including the items now being debated, to nearly 3,250,000 kilowatts.

That is roughly half the irrigable acreage and one-tenth of the power potential of the entire basin.

WOULD BAR BONNEVILLE

Most of the open debate in southern Idaho centers around proposals for a large Bonneville power administration transmission line through the State.

Idaho Power Co. serves the territory now. Its recent expansion has exceeded that of any other private member of the Northwest power pool. Many chambers of commerce and State commercial organizations have backed its position that no BPA line is needed, that left to its own devices, and its own financing, Idaho Power will deliver all the energy needed in the region, including much of eastern Oregon.

Presently installed capacity on the Snake and its tributaries above Weiser is approximately 350,000 kilowatts. Some of the installations would be reduced in capacity by diversion of water for other purposes. For that reason figures from different sources disagree.

Summarizing, it appears that:

1. Idaho lags behind the downriver States in power development, but much of the opposition to projects in the original Army-Interior agreement comes from within the State. This applies also to Albeni Falls Dam on Pend Oreille River, which got by the budget without change.

2. Idaho is far ahead of the downriver States in irrigation acreage, and there is no indication that either Oregon or Washington will ever catch up.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 5, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 15)

(By Leon Starmont)

Ten water-short States are making eyes at Columbia River. California's plea has been most publicized. The others interested and potentially benefitted are Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, Colorado, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma and Texas.

They would not all get water directly by ditch along the Wasatch and the Continental Divide. Only California would receive water through the suggested big pipe taking off below Bonneville Dam.

What Interior Department planners really are studying is a mammoth project for water-sharing by displacement. It would work somewhat as does the existing Northwest power pool, by which an emergency in Seattle can be met by juice poured into the Utah Power and Light lines by a copper company plant at Bingham Canyon, Utah—or somewhere else.

INTERCONNECT SEVEN VALLEYS

Participants in this great interconnected system of water diversion gates would be:

1. Columbia river, which enters the Pacific between Oregon and Washington at Astoria.

2. California's Central Valley project, whose Sacramento and San Joaquin rivers reach salt water at San Francisco bay.

3. Colorado River, which rises in Wyoming and Colorado and flows into the Gulf of California between the Mexican States of Baja California and Sonora.

4. The Salt Lake Basin and adjacent Nevada areas which have no direct outlet to the sea.

5. Rio Grande, which rises in Colorado, and below El Paso forms the boundary between Texas and several Mexican States.

6. Arkansas River, which rises in central Colorado and flows into the Mississippi south of Memphis, Tenn.

7. Platte River, which starts just over a hill from the Arkansas, with another branch out of Wyoming, and enters the Missouri south of Omaha, Neb.

ONE TUNNEL BUILT

Already built and delivering Colorado River water to the Platte is the Alva B. Adams tunnel of the Colorado-Big Thompson project. If you wondered several months back why Bureau of Reclamation officials held an all-western conference at Grand Lake, Colo., that's the reason.

Grand Lake is where the 13-mile tunnel starts under Rocky Mountain National Park to deliver 550 second feet of water to Big Thompson River above the town of Estes Park. This water serves farmers all the way to Julesberg, on the Nebraska State line.

The man in the street is likely to ask: "If California needs water so badly, and the Colorado flows past its eastern border, why do they divert Colorado River water for irrigation as far east as Nebraska?"

And his wife may chip in: "If Colorado water is diverted to Nebraska, why talk about taking water out of Snake River, in Idaho or Wyoming, for delivery to the Colorado?

The answer, says, the Bureau of Reclamation, is "exchange."

That's where the similarity to the Northwest power grid comes in. The principal difference is that the power grid was organized by private companies, and the water grid is being planned by engineers of a Federal bureau, acting under authority contained, or at least implied, in an act of Congress.

These studies, started last year, are to be completed in 1952. They are being handled in a special division at Salt Lake City, entitled "United Western Investigation." S. P. McCasland is engineer in charge. Assisting the planning office are four regional offices of the Bureau at Salt Lake City, Boise, Boulder City, Nev., and Sacramento.

The present task is estimating the water that may be available in the Columbia and its tributaries, also the Klamath and other streams of northern California, after all the needs of the Pacific Northwest have been reserved.

Investigations now going on, McCasland explains, form a preliminary reconnaissance to ascertain the justification for a more detailed investigation.

The reconnaissance was initiated because of the badly unbalanced distribution of supply and demand throughout the West. McCasland points out, for example, that the entire supply afforded by the Colorado River is estimated at less than 5 percent of the water which now flows to the ocean in north coastal streams.

In keeping with congressional policy, all States affected by the study will be invited to review the Bureau's reconnaissance report and make comments on it. These comments, together with those of other Federal agencies, will be transmitted to Congress.

A summary is being made of all the lands that might ever be irrigated under future conditions, McCasland said. A similar estimate is being made for industrial, municipal, and all other foreseeable water uses which might arise. Considered as available for export are only the waters which would remain after a supply had been reserved for present and potential local demands.

VARIOUS MEANS SUGGESTED

The study also will include making costs estimates of the various ways in which any surplus water in the Northwest might be transported to the areas where it would be used, and such costs will be compared with the benefits.

Investigation will be made of the means by which the plan could compensate for any disadvantage to existing or future power production. Exploration will be made of the possibility of using steam power for such means.

McCasland said that municipal, industrial, and agricultural use for water in large areas, particularly in the southwestern United States, is growing at a rate which will in the near future exceed the supply. As local surface supplies are fully exploited and ground-water reserves exhausted, expansion or even maintenance of the accomplished development will depend upon imported water.

The feasibility of exchange which might permit greater upstream utilization of the Colorado and of other rivers is an important phase of the study. An example is a possible multiple exchange of water whereby imported water would replace or expand present uses in southern California, thereby releasing some Colorado River water now used in that area.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 6, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 16)

(By Leon Starmont)

Backers of irrigation from Chief Joseph Dam at Bridgeport, Wash., are not at all discouraged by failure of the Budget Bureau and President Truman to include in the pending Columbia Basin legislation the $17,920,000 item which appears in the Army-Interior deferred list.

The bill does set up the so-called basin account, into which Chief Joseph's power revenues would be paid, and provides that a subsidy from the interest component may be applied to future new irrigation projects only by specific authorization. This is a complex situation, on which experts decline to express opinions until they have had a chance to study the budget letter as printed in Friday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

STUDIES STILL GOING ON

The Bureau of Reclamation has not yet finished the studies necessary, either for the Greater Wenatchee project or the proposed Douglas-Okanogan project. Much more land than first thought possible may yet be irrigated both by gravity and pumping from the pool behind Chief Joseph Dam.

Meanwhile, preparations are being made to step up construction of the Okanogan River bridge and preparation of housing facilities at Bridgeport and the dam site as soon as weather conditions permit.

Col. E. C. Itschner, district engineer at Seattle for the Corps of Engineers, recently gave assurances that the preliminary designs, as now approved, permit later installation of irrigation works. He also revealed that a working model of Chief Joseph Dam has been built and is now being used in the Army's hydraulic laboratory at Bonneville Dam, which it built and still operates at the lower end of Columbia Gorge.

A complete account of Chief Joseph and Brewster, with 18 photographs and 2 maps, was published in the Spokesman-Review's Inland Empire magazine on January 8.

LONG CONSIDERED AS SITE

Foster Creek dam site is one of those recommended in the first "308" report of the Army engineers, undertaken as a result of congressional direction in 1927, and finished 5 years later. It was mentioned, however, in many earlier reconnaissances, including that of Lt. Thomas W. Symons prepared in 1881.

It was also mentioned in the Federal Power Commission's report on uses of the upper Columbia River, undertaken by a commission appointed in 1921, which made its report in 1923. At that time the site, known as Foster Creek, was being considered as a possible location of a pumping project for some of the land now about to be irrigated from the Grand Coulee Reservoir.

It is interesting to note also that the 1881 report by Lieutenant Symons mentions the course of Foster Creek, entering the Columbia from the south of Bridgeport, as the only route that might be followed by a railroad designed to cross the Columbia to connect Spokane Falls, W. T., with the Okanogan country.

BUILDER A CHELAN RESIDENT

Colonel Itschner, under whose office the dam is to be built, is a property owner and legal resident of the Lake Chelan area, and expects to make that part of the State his home when his Army service is concluded.

Describing the model installed at Bonneville, he said:

"Extensive model studies were conducted to determine how well the contemplated design would function and how it could be improved.

"The over-all model was constructed to one-eightieth scale, and was in itself quite a project.

"Every detail of the river for some distance above and over a mile below the dam was reproduced carefully, and the major parts of the dam were duplicated in plastic.

"For instance, the spillway section of the dam was about 20 feet wide. By finding where the flaws lie, we have been able to experiment with corrective measures in order to improve the theoretical design. Splendid results have been obtained, and the savings in construction costs have amounted to many times the cost of the model."

UNIQUE PROBLEMS

There are many problems connected with the design and construction of a project such as Chief Joseph. One of these, somewhat unique, arises from the nature of the various deposits on the north bank of the river at the dam site.

A porous gravel formation, generally about 100 feet thick, through which water flows at a rather high rate, 100 miles a year, lies on the bedrock. On top of the gravel and extending almost to the ground surface is a dense watertight formation of glacial till about 150 feet thick.

To prevent excessive leakage of water from the reservoir, something had to be done to prevent flow through the lower stratum of gravel.

Two alternate solutions were considered.

The first was to place a watertight blanket of glacial till, consisting of nothing but soil thoroughly compacted, on the bank above the dam.

The second was to tunnel back one-half mile through the top of the gravel stratum, and to excavate from this tunnel down to rock; then to fill the holes with concrete to form a continuous wall 5 feet thick resting on rock, extending up into the impervious layer, and back so far that water would be greatly retarded in seeping around it.

Since the soil blanket probably will be satisfactory, and it can be placed for considerably less cost than the cut-off wall, Colonel Itschner elected to use the blanket.

Resolution Creating a Commission To Establish an Alternate Capitol of the United States

REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the heart of Washington, D. C., can be destroyed and a large percentage of its inhabitants killed or injured by one atomic bomb strategically exploded by an enemy power.

In that eventuality the nerve center of our Nation would be paralyzed.

Within the square miles of destruction accredited to one atomic bomb—not a hydrogen bomb—the White House, the defense establishments, the legislative offices and chambers, the Supreme Court, and the central offices of practically every vital department of Government are presently concentrated.

I have just introduced a joint resolution for the establishment of an alternate Capitol of the United States.

I have taken this step after sober consideration of the need for such action. My decision that an alternate Capitol should be established came as the result of an accumulation of knowledge during my service for the past 4 years on the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. That knowledge imposes on me, as a matter of conscience, this proposal in the hope that a thorough study will be made of the subject. The continuity of Government functions in a period of national emergency created by atomic or hydrogen bomb disaster must be guaranteed. Such guaranty does not exist at the present time. It is the duty of Congress to proceed to reevaluate the importance of this facet of our national security in the light of present potential danger. Congress should make this study now, while there is time to make security plans with calmness and without any semblance of hysteria.

Joint resolution creating a commission to investigate the measures which can be taken to insure the continuous operation of the Government of the United States in the event of attack by a foreign power

Whereas the development of atomic weapons has reached the point where large cities and their inhabitants could be destroyed by a single explosion; and

Whereas an atomic explosion in or near the city of Washington could paralyze the functioning of the executive, legislative, and judicial branches of the Government of the United States; and

Whereas it is appropriate that timely measures be taken to protect the people of the United States, and to insure the continuity of their Government in the event of an atomic attack by a foreign power: Now therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That there is hereby created a commission to be composed of seven members, as follows:

(1) One appointed from the Senate by the President of the Senate;

(2) One appointed from the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House;

(3) One appointed from the Supreme Court of the United States by the Chief Justice of the United States;

(4) Three appointed by the President of the United States, one from the National Security Council, one from the National Security Resources Board, and one from the Atomic Energy Commission; and

(5) The Secretary of Defense, who shall serve as chairman of the Commission.

SEC. 2. (a) The Commission shall investigate and study the feasibility of establishing an alternate seat for the Government of the United States, to be used in the event of attack by a foreign power. The Commission shall consider particularly (1) possible sites for such alternate seat of government which would be secure against attack by a foreign power, (2) the buildings which would have to be constructed on or under any such site, and the facilities which would be required in connection therewith, to insure the efficient and continuous operation of the Government, and (3) the extent to which duplicate copies of documents and records would have to be made available at any such site to ensure the efficient and continuous operation of the Government.

(b) The Commission shall also investigate and study the various procedures which might be followed in selecting the successor or any President, Vice President, or Member of Congress who becomes unable to perform his duties as the result of attack by a foreign power.

SEC. 3. The Commission shall report its findings and recommendations to the President and to the Congress, together with such proposals for amendments to the Constitution of the United States as may be required by such findings and recommendations, on or before January 31, 1951.

SEC. 4. The Commission, or any member designated by the Commission, may, in carrying out the purpose of this resolution, hold such hearings and sit and act at such times and places, and take such testimony, as the Commission or such member may deem advisable. Any member of the Commission may administer oaths or affirmations to witnesses appearing before the Commission or before such member.

SEC. 5. The Commission may, without regard to the civil-service laws or the Classification Act of 1949, appoint and fix the compensation of such experts, consultants, technicians, and clerical and stenographic assistants as it deems necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SEC. 6. Each department and agency of the United States shall, upon request made by the Chairman of the Commission, furnish to the Commission such services, information, facilities, and personnel as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

SEC. 7. Each member of the Commission shall be reimbursed for travel, subsistence, and other necessary expenses incurred by him in carrying out the functions of the Commission.

SEC. 8. There are hereby authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this resolution.

Economy and Our National Defense

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN F. KENNEDY
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, the article by Joseph and Stewart Alsop in the Washington Post of February 20 gives us clear warning of the effect that economies are having in our defense structure.

Important economies should be made in other sections of our appropriations, because upon the degree of strength in our armed services rests our survival.

MATTER OF FACT

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

JOHNSON AND THE CHIEFS

The hardest question to answer about Louis A. Johnson's concealed disarmament program is why the Joint Chiefs of Staff have stood for it so long. The answer would seem to fall into several parts. The first part is the new atmosphere of blended favoritism that now pervades the Defense Department.

A pretty good symbol of the favoritism is to be found in the Secretary of Defense's

outer office. Brig. Gen. Louis Renfrow, a plump relic of Johnson's American Legion machine, now presides there as his patron's special assistant. For a far from brilliant reserve officer serving as Johnson's appointments secretary, Renfrow has received remarkably high promotion. But that is not all. He was once a dentist. He is also drawing $100 a month supplementary pay under a rule designed to attract young dentists into the services.

The sum is not large. The arrangement is at least technically legal. But the symbol remains: the crony gets his perquisites while Johnson's economies bite deep into the sinew of American strength.

As for the intimidation, there is plenty of evidence concerning the Secretary of Defense's special methods of getting his way. One authenticated incident involved one of the two or three ablest senior officers in the Army, whose unpopularity with Johnson may probably be traced to his serious approach to defense problems.

Mere threats would of course not frighten the Joint Chiefs themselves. Yet it must be remembered that Bradley and Collins, Vandenberg and Sherman were all trained in an earlier period, as members of the defense services of a country that had no defense.

This prewar psychology has quite visibly survived, for example, in Gen. J. Lawton Collins, who is fond of repeating that his ground forces are in better shape than ever. It is true, and has been recorded in this space, that the Army alone has maintained its fighting units under the impact of Johnsonian economy. It is also true that these fighting units are in a fine state of training.

At least in his public statements, this seems to satisfy General Collins, yet he is making do with Second World War weapons which are in many cases obsolescent or actually obsolete. He has no tank force worth speaking of. He has in prospect only the smallest trickle of the new antitank weapons. Above all, because of Air Force economies, he cannot count on the slightest effective close air support, without which modern armies literally cannot take the field.

Finally, the Joint Chiefs must be well aware that in this matter of defense economy, the Secretary of Defense only differs from the President in wishing to go further and faster. The President made the original decision, in 1948, to forget the requirements of a serious defense, and to sacrifice defense planning to budgetary convenience.

Meanwhile, however, Soviet strength has grown visibly, and the world situation has worsened appallingly. Meanwhile, the defense planning of the Atlantic Pact nations, which is under the personal charge of the incorruptible General Omar Bradley, has begun to show how enormous are the gaps in our security. Meanwhile, Congress has been waking up, as is shown by Senator MILLARD TYDINGS' fine speech last week.

Thus far, Secretary Johnson has been able to count upon the Joint Chiefs' acquiesence, and to take advantage of it. But that acquiescence may not endure forever.

The Brannan Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANDREW J. BIEMILLER
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 14, 1950

Mr. BIEMILLER. Mr. Speaker, there has been a lot of confused talk here in Washington about the Brannan plan. I have ample proof every day that the farmers are not confused about it. They understand it and they want it. And so do the consumers. Both groups realize that it would be the best way to keep the farmer solvent, cut food prices, and eliminate the terrible waste which is a by-product of our present plan.

Under leave, I insert in the RECORD a column written by Miles McMillin in the Capital Times, of Madison, Wis., reporting on sentiment on this vital program:

Democratic candidates for Congress in 1950 campaign will undoubtedly take a firm stand for the Brannan farm plan. But where will Republicans stand?

So far most of the Wisconsin Republicans in Congress have been doing a soft-shoe dance all around the question. Not long ago Representative Frank Keefe was put on the spot at a university forum when he was asked to state his position. He first tried to talk around the question, but when pressed for an answer he spoke favorably of the production-payment provisions of the plan, then launched into a denunciation of it and finally wound up by saying that he hadn't made up his mind.

Senator JOSEPH MCCARTHY, however, seems to have set the pitch for the GOP delegation from this State. He spent some time the other day in the Senate heckling Senator LANGER, North Dakota Republican who is an ardent supporter of the Brannan plan. MCCARTHY opened his remarks by saying: "I very heartily disagree with the Senator [LANGER] that the enactment of the Brannan plan will be of any benefit either to the farmer or the consumer."

MCCARTHY may change his tune when he finds that a lot of Wisconsin farmers, particularly those who have had an opportunity to hear the plan explained, don't share his views. There doesn't seem to be any doubt that the dairy farmers of this State are safe leaning more and more toward the Brannan plan because of the recognition it gives to perishables.

Farm Bureau people in Wisconsin will tell you that the intransigent opposition of the American Farm Bureau Federation to the plan has caused local Farm Bureau leaders a great deal of embarrassment. The opposition of the national leadership is not being followed by the rank-and-file member in this State, and the local Farm Bureau leaders know it.

A significant meeting was held down in Crawford County the other night at which the Brannan plan was debated. Crawford is a strong farm-bureau county, and the local there sponsored the debate. More than 300 farmers attended.

Herman Brandt, a farm-bureau man who owns a large farm outside of Oshkosh, spoke for the Brannan proposal, and another farm-bureau member opposed it. Ballots were passed around among the farmers who attended.

The farmers were asked to indicate on the ballots whether they were members of the farm bureau. They were asked to indicate their views on the plan before the meeting started and after. The results of the poll are quite significant.

Of the farm-bureau members who voted, 45 were for the Brannan plan before the meeting and 61 voted in favor of it after the discussion. Thirty-six were against it before the meeting and forty-six against after the meeting. Fifty-eight were neutral or undecided before and thirty-two after. This indicates that of 26 farmers who were undecided before they heard the plan explained, 16 voted for it and 10 against it.

Of the nonfarm-bureau members who voted, 30 were for the plan before the meeting and 42 after. Nine were against it before the meeting and sixteen after. Thirty-four were undecided before and fifteen after. The discussion convinced 12 of the soundness of the plan as against 7 who decided against it.

Equally as significant as the poll was the attitude of some of the farm-bureau members in the audience toward the national farm bureau. The speaker who was present to uphold the position of the national organization heard farm-bureau members stand up and quote recent Capital Times articles showing the tie-up of the national organization with big business.

It was obvious from the meeting, which lasted past 11 o'clock, the Brannan plan is certainly going to be one of the biggest and hottest issues in the 1950 campaign. Republican Congressmen are going to have a hard time ducking it.

What Can Be Done To Bring About Peace and Dispel the Clouds of War?

REMARKS
OF
HON. USHER L. BURDICK
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BURDICK. Mr. Speaker, in my own mind I can see danger ahead for the security of the United States, and being of this opinion I ought not sit here and do nothing about it. We are today further from peace than we have been at any time since the actual fighting in World War II ended.

The United Nations organization was a good gesture, but nothing has been done by that organization and nothing can be done to stop a war between the United States and Russia if both countries pursue the course followed for 5 years.

I am certain the people of the United States and Russia do not want any war, and the question is: Are the people of the United States and the people of Russia powerless to prevent such a disaster? Is the fate of both countries tied up with what action the leaders take?

At the present moment both countries are feverishly arming and in five short years we find the United States and Russia, allies in the late war, hating each other and arming themselves to the teeth. I think nothing can be gained by not talking frankly. Russia is mortally afraid the United States will, with others, seek to subjugate the Russian country and we are mortally afraid that Russia seeks world dominion and will eventually destroy our system of government. When two such powerful nations are afraid of each other, naturally they arm; naturally they get ready to defend themselves.

And so the armament race is on and it will drain the substance of the people of both countries to keep it up, and if history repeats itself there will be a war to justify this unprecedented preparation. We were the first to have the atomic bomb, and we thought that would protect us, but since science cannot be bottled up, since minds still function, there is no monopoly on ideas and brain power. We must admit that, because Russia has the atom bomb. We are building a much

more powerful bomb, one that will destroy millions in 1 day. Instead of keeping that to ourselves, we publish what we are doing in the newspapers, evidently to scare out Russia. Evidence comes right back to us that we have no monopoly on that devastating bomb and there is little doubt but what the Russians have it now.

The threats of what each country has done and can do is not going to settle anything. In this state of mind we will not be bluffed and neither will the Russians. These new destructive weapons will only increase the possibility of war and will not prevent war.

Our North Atlantic Pact was another mistake and I so expressed myself on the floor of Congress. That only added proof to Russia that there was a movement being formed to crush Russia. It did not contribute to peace and the only effect was to foment war.

We financed the Marshall plan which we boldly stated was for the purpose of stopping the spread of communism. There was nothing said about facism or any other isms detrimental to the welfare of the people of the world. Russia has not invaded any country for any purpose since the fighting stopped. Their ideas of government may have spread, but we have not money or resources enough in the United States to stop the spread of any idea.

We here in the United States quite overlook the fact that a great change is taking place all over the world. The day of exploitation is doomed and many countries that have lived on exploitation will be doomed. Does Great Britain, for instance, housed on an island two-thirds the size of North Dakota and one-fifth the size of Texas, expect to continue to maintain 47,000,000 people? She has succeeded because she was the manufacturing center of the world. She brought in raw materials from India and Africa and other points all over the globe and manufactured in England. These great fields of exploitation like India and Africa are fast disappearing. England used to buy a great deal of raw materials from us, but today we manufacture our own merchandise. Factories in America are moving to the fields of production too, and even New England will feel the loss in this new adventure of moving manufacturing plants to the places where the raw materials are produced.

It will make no difference whether there is a Socialist government in England or a conservative one. It will make no difference how much money we give away to England; it is becoming apparent that this British Empire will crumble and people will have to move out of England and settle elsewhere.

Our pouring of money into these foreign countries does not have the effect of bringing peace, but, rather the opposite effect.

What specific things should be done to stop this armament race between Russia and the United States? No other countries seem to be involved—or if they are, their ability to fight with effect has been pretty well reduced in the last two wars. President Truman in October 1948—or a short time before—proposed sending some new envoys to Russia to talk matters over. I think for one, he suggested Chief Justice Vinson. Our would-be leaders on foreign affairs blew up and the Secretary of State threatened to resign if that were done. Others said this move would offend the United Nations. In face of this bluster, the President did not take action. The United Nations have sputtered for 5 years and have not accomplished peace, our State Department has failed and all the representatives we have sent to Europe have accomplished very little that makes for peace, but have recommended action that in my opinion will prevent a peaceful solution of our differences with Russia. Do not the American people think it is time to send some other representatives? Send those who have not already created so much prejudice that they would be worthless in a mutual discussion with the Russians.

The President should again try to discuss matters with Russia and his so-called advisers should let him alone. They have all had their day in court and have not brought about peace.

Regardless of what the Russians do or how they may respond to the President's move for a discussion of peace, we should put our cards on the table and express a desire for a discussion and send representatives who have not lambasted the Russians from Dan to Beersheba. If we do that, it is more likely that Russia will keep the Vishinsky's, the Molotov's, and the Gromyko's out of such a discussion. In the hands of the United States and Russia rests the fate of the world, the fate of civilization, and I do not think either country wants to be a contributor to this complete destruction. If the United States and Russia can understand together what course to take, never mind other countries, never mind the United Nations, never mind the Atlantic Pact, but get right in and determine that this world shall not be destroyed and that there is room enough in it for both the Russian theory of government and the theory of free enterprise and individual freedom, which is our philosophy of government. It can be a peace with honor to the United States, a peace with honor to Russia, and a peace with honor to all countries and all peoples. These destructive bombs can be laid aside and an agreement reached to use this new scientific knowledge for peaceful progress and not for the extermination of all living things on this earth.

We do not have any monopoly on this destructive agency; neither has Russia, and neither side can be threatened. But neither side should use such a weapon, and if we can have this common understanding with Russia, we can go a step further and ask each other, "Why have any war at all?"

Above all we must convince the Russians that we seek no territory that belongs to Russia; we seek no new territories anywhere; all we want is peace in the world. That is the only aim of the President, as everyone knows, but our approach to the greatly desired end has bogged down by the action we have taken in Europe and Asia.

A new approach must be tried, even if it fails, and if the President again wants to try some new representatives to accomplish this purpose, he should not be harassed with threats of resignations or potshots from Congress.

Workers in Rubber Footwear Industry Imperiled by Proposed Tariff Reductions

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ANGIER L. GOODWIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. GOODWIN. Mr. Speaker, evidence accumulates that organized labor is becoming more and more alarmed at the tendency of the administration to overlook the threat to industrial workers in the failure of our Government to stop the flow into this country of foreign products manufactured at a cost with which we cannot compete without lowering our standard of living. The peril to the century-old Massachusetts rubber footwear industry and to the 20,000 men and women workers in the industry is well shown in the following letter and statement which I have received today from the president of a local located in my district:

RUBBER WORKERS F. L. UNION,
LOCAL NO. 22763,
Malden, Mass., February 16, 1950.

Mr. ANGIER L. GOODWIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. GOODWIN: I am writing to you in my capacity as president of Rubber Workers F. L. Union, American Federation of Labor, Local No. 22763, and also in behalf of those rubber workers in our plant who are not union members.

We are authoritatively informed that a still further reduction in the tariff on waterproof and canvas rubber footwear is contemplated. Rubber footwear coming from Japan with its oriental standard of living and from Czechoslovakia with its nationalized industry which is within the Soviet orbit are produced with a labor cost with which we Americans cannot compete.

The threat, represented by tariff reduction, to an old New England industry concentrated chiefly in Massachusetts imperils not only our standard of living but our jobs as well.

I am enclosing a paper which sets forth the facts of the case.

I hope that you will use your influence to protect our jobs and our standard of living.

Sincerely,

FRANCIS MULCAHY,
President.

FEBRUARY 14, 1950.

Members of the rubber-footwear industry are greatly concerned and disturbed over the possibility that the administration may put into effect further tariff reductions on imports of waterproof and canvas rubber footwear. This concern is based upon information which is considered authoritative.

Any further reductions in the tariffs on these items would produce an effect upon the American rubber-footwear industry little short of disastrous. It would be impossible for the domestic industry to produce articles which could compete in price with the prod-

ucts of the nationalized industry of Czechoslovakia or with those of Japan with its debased oriental standard of living. These are the countries of origin of the rubber footwear which would be sold here.

The rubber-footwear industry is an American enterprise about 100 years old, and at one time it supplied most of the world. But since the early thirties the American industry has been confined to the domestic market because of its inability to meet foreign low-wage competition. This domestic market the American industry is amply equipped to supply.

At present imports from these countries are priced at from 20 to 40 percent under the usual American prices. One must understand that the presence of even a small amount of low-priced goods in an industry as seasonable as rubber footwear can be a most upsetting influence on the market.

In the decade of the thirties, the threat to the American industry by the influx of rubber-footwear imports was so great that both President Hoover and President Roosevelt issued proclamations making duties on these products applicable on the American selling-price basis. That is to say, the rates of duty which were 25 percent on waterproof and 35 percent on canvas remained unchanged, but they applied to the domestic selling price of American-made footwear similar to the imported articles rather than to the selling price of the foreign product. In 1937, when the Czechoslovakian trade treaty was under consideration, this policy was sustained by President Roosevelt. In 1947, at the reciprocal-trade conference in Geneva, the American delegation granted concessions to Czechoslovakia on waterproof-rubber footwear which, in effect, cut the American duty in half, which means that the duty on Czechoslovakian footwear was reduced to 12½ percent.

This industry is one in which the labor cost in proportion to the total cost of the product is very high, namely, 47 percent. An attack upon the price structure becomes therefore an attack upon the wage structure of the American worker in this field and is also a direct threat to his job.

The industry at present is doing a business of about $62,000,000 annually, and it employs more than 20,000 men and women. These may not be, in relation to the total annual income, and to the vast army of employed workers in this country, imposing figures. However, this is of vital importance to New England and especially Massachusetts. Over 75 percent of this industry is located in southern New England, a small area already hard pressed economically, struggling to maintain its position in the American scene. A very substantial portion of this 75 percent, much more than half, is located in Massachusetts. This becomes, therefore, a matter of vital significance for this area, and some particular communities in it would suffer extreme hardship were this industry to become blighted.

Here is an example of how this thing works out with respect to a canvas oxford coming from Japan at an invoice price when landed here of $0.49. This shoe can be compared to an American canvas shoe that sells at $1.80. Now the tariff at the present rate of 35 percent of the American selling price is $0.62, which makes the total price of this shoe $1.11. The American shoe, you remember is $1.80. Now, with the tariff reduced by 50 percent, it would become 17½ percent of the American selling price. This is $0.31, making a total price of the Japanese shoe $0.80. With the tariff remaining at 35 percent but applied to the Japanese price, the tariff becomes $0.17 which makes the price of the Japanese shoe $0.66.

Precisely the same situation prevails in the field of waterproof footwear which comes from Czechoslovakia and on which the tariff rate is 25 percent.

These are the facts, a vital New England industry with a long history is faced with a situation which would make sheer survival difficult and certainly make any prosperity impossible.

Fallacy of Sea Water

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, during recent months the Nation suddenly has become aware of a painful fact—that we cannot be sure forever of getting enough water for our growing cities, industries, farms, and other water-consuming needs.

The West has been up against the problem for generations. Congress has approved projects that would help provide better distribution of what scant supplies we have out in the area that has become known as the reclamation States. During the past couple of years, the East has started to realize—in painful fashion, as evident from stories about shaveless and bathless days in New York, as indicated by burned up lawns and family gardens in New England communities last summer.

Whenever some of the people from California have pointed that water is essential to growth, remarks have been made that it can be obtained from the sea. There are suggestions about dropping dry ice on clouds or firing chemicals into the sky to bring about precipitation. Many sincere suggestions have been made about changing the course of rivers—killing two birds with one stone by ending flood damage while at the same time supplying areas without enough water.

Science has proved that rivers can be changed, clouds can be made to drop rain or snow, and salt water can be turned into fresh. Yet, I have not seen any explanation of who would pay the terrific costs involved in applying these methods to solve New York's present water shortage—that has been on the front page for several weeks. If the Federal Government is going to subsidize all the rainmakers and water distillers, to take care of New England and the Middle West in summer, California and Arizona the year round, we are going to have to get ready for a wallop at our pocketbooks.

But, Mr. Speaker, I want to warn my colleagues that this is no simple problem. It is going to cost large amounts of money to perfect methods of distilling salt water and making it available at reasonable cost. Perhaps when the scientists have found out how to use atomic energy for peaceful means the cost will be much less. So far, though, they have not cleared that hurdle.

Everybody admits the problem is complex from a scientific standpoint. The financial difficulties have been clearly stated in a recent letter to the Los Angeles Times from Samuel B. Morris, general manager of the Los Angeles department of water and power. His department serves a large part of a fast-growing metropolis and is always on the alert to meet future demands. Mr. Morris says it will take a dozen Hoover Dam power plants to provide enough electric energy to run the stills and other apparatus required to provide Los Angeles with water from the ocean. If oil is used, the requirement is 40,000,000 barrels, which cannot be spared according to experts who say the United States is running out of petroleum and could not fight another war with its own supplies.

The problem is pointed up by the letter which follows:

[From the Los Angeles Times of February 6, 1950]

COST OF FRESH WATER FROM SEA

Recent letters from Times readers indicate a great interest in the subject of producing fresh water from sea water.

It is encouraging to see such evidence of community thinking on the very serious problem of water supply and we of the Los Angeles City Department of Water and Power appreciate the spirit that prompts the readers' comments.

However, we believe it is our duty to point out the matter of high cost entailed in the best known present methods of converting sea water. An authoritative article in Engineering and Science Monthly, published by the California Institute of Technology Alumni Association, shows that costs are almost prohibitive.

For example, water produced by a vapor-compression or thermal-compression distillation unit would be 13 to 17 times the present cost of Colorado River water. It would require 40,000,000 barrels of Diesel oil per year to provide the 1,000,000 acre-feet we expect ultimately to use from the Colorado River source of supply.

The electrolytic process is even more expensive. It would take 12 power plants as large as the Hoover Dam plant to generate power needed to furnish the equal of our full share of Colorado River water.

This statement is not intended to discourage research, but to show the great cost problems that will have to be overcome. In our enthusiasm for scientific progress we must not overlook the practical fact that our share of Colorado River water will enable cities in the southern California area to serve at least 5,000,000 persons, with a corresponding increase in industrial and commercial activity, in addition to the millions served by local and Sierra supplies.

The Colorado River supply is under attack now by Arizona, through legislation pending in Congress. If we are successful in defending the Colorado River water that is legally ours, and for the delivery of which we have constructed works, we will have added time in which to search for a sea water conversion process that is within the ability of our homeowners and our industries to pay.

Present known methods are completely out of reach financially.

The department of water and power always has endeavored to furnish water (and electric) service to its citizen owners at low rates. I therefore feel strongly that it is my obligation to bring this practical money matter to the attention of Times readers and the public generally.

SAMUEL B. MORRIS,
General Manager and Chief Engineer.
LOS ANGELES.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include articles 11, 12, and 13 in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont, entitled "Let's Explore the Basin." Today's episodes indicate some of the problems in settling the huge Columbia Basin project.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 1, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 11)

(By Leon Starmont)

Spokane will get a taste of the Big Bend highway fight next Monday, when a victorious Warden group will lay before the Columbia Basin committee of the chamber of commerce the case for the easternmost north-south highway, preferred by a 32-to-11 vote at Monday's Ephrata session.

Meanwhile, the Columbia Basin Commission will study a plan submitted by James H. Dodson, Grant County engineer, at Ephrata, for a series of county primary roads and arterials to be financed by the State or Federal Governments, construction of which can parallel settlement of the newly irrigated lands as now projected for the next 5 years. The Ephrata gathering of 125 persons proposed that State funds be distributed on county roads until settlement is complete, causing State highway construction to be deferred until later years.

WAHLUKE SLOPE BARRED

James E. Travis, assistant manager of the Hanford plutonium works for the Atomic Energy Commission, said the AEC would have to turn down all of three proposals advanced by the Yakima Chamber of Commerce for an east-west highway through the Wahluke Slope. More than 200,000 acres have been withdrawn for security purposes, of which 165,000 acres are classed as irrigable.

Turned down were:

1. A right-of-way for the Yakima-Connell cut-off via either the Wahluke ferry or a bridge to be constructed there.

2. Guarded gates at the east and west ends of the routes, that could be closed in case of danger from the plutonium plant.

3. A convoy system that would permit highway travel in groups with AEC guards preceding and following the cars so nobody could stop.

No objection would be raised to a new State road from Priest Rapids via Beverly, Smyrna, Corfu, and Othello, little longer than the Wahluke route, said Travis.

SKIRMISHING REGRETTABLE

Jack Rogers, chairman of the State Columbia Basin commission, and W. A. Bugge, State director of highways, agreed the bitterness exhibited by delegations favoring specific highways was regrettable, but that in a free country every man and group is entitled to speak its piece.

Most of those present refrained from voting on the question of the Warden route over the Othello route, 6 miles west, for a north-south State highway through the basin.

The Warden route already exists as a county highway, while the plan proposed by the county engineer would provide an east-west county highway along Crab Creek from Beverly and connecting at the county line with an extension into Othello. This is the same route suggested by the AEC executive for a State highway connecting Yakima with the Lind area.

A delegation interested in the easterly north-south route, scheduled for next Monday's luncheon of the Columbia Basin committee here, will be headed by Al Wedmer, president of the Warden Chamber of Commerce, and Fred Radach, chairman of its road committee.

DODSON'S PLAN IN DETAIL

County Engineer Dodson submitted several alternate plans, but sentiment at Ephrata apparently favored his No. 1, which covers some roads in Adams and Franklin Counties as well as Grant

Dodson presented a map with the land to be irrigated by 1952 in orange, the 1953 tracts in green, the 1954 in pink, and the 1955 in yellow.

For 1951 construction he proposes a road straight north from Moses Lake to Stratford, crossing the Northern Pacific branch at Gloyd. The distance is 20 miles. He also plans 27 miles of county arterials in the area east of the main road and below the east low canal. He also plans about 32 miles of highway in the second largest of the first-year irrigation blocks, generally southeast of Quincy and south of the State highway.

For 1952 construction he plans some north-south feeders in the Quincy and Winchester areas, north of the State highway, and about 18 miles of arterials south of U S 10 and east of Potholes Reservoir, surrounding on three sides the Barkan dunes.

Dodson's third-year road-building program would call for new roads in the Warden area, extending into Adams County, and some additional construction south and west of Quincy and southeast of Trinidad.

That would leave for the fourth year an extensive area west of Warden and another lying generally east and southeast of Burke, between U S 10 and the almost forgotten Lowgap, where a tunnel is to pierce a low spot in the Frenchman hills for ultimate irrigation of their south slope north of Crab Creek.

Dodson figures that 25 percent of the roads will be arterial and will cost $15,000 per mile to construct. The other 75 percent can be constructed at $8,000 per mile or a total cost of $12,300,000.

Grant County's share of new roads is 870 miles, to cost $8,500,000.

SEVEN YEARS TO FINISH

The total cost of $12,300,000 for Grant, Adams, and Franklin Counties, over 7 years, Dodson said, will mean an expenditure of $1,850,000 per year.

"The counties do not have the money. It will have to come from some outside source in the form of a grant, loan, or bond issue," he added.

PARKER FOR 1950 START

H. A. Parker, supervising engineer for the irrigation project, made it quite clear that if the roads are not built in time for the settlers, the Bureau might as well slow up in its efforts to get water on the land. He said work could be started this spring on roads leading to the farm units that will receive water in 1952.

"It can be done in 1951, after the legislature meets, but it will be a big job," Parker said.

By a resolution presented by the Quincy Chamber of Commerce, the Governor was asked to declare an emergency for roads in the Columbia Basin, and State funds allocated for building new State highways in the area, would be used for county roads.

Jack Rogers, chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, and presiding officer at the meeting, pointed out that the law would have to be changed to reallocate State road funds. He thought this would be hard to do.

"An adequate system of highways must be provided," Rogers declared. "It is the State's responsibility."

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 2, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 12)

(By Leon Starmont)

Spring'll be along soon, but deep snow and clogged roads have halted work at most Columbia Basin construction points. So, while waiting for chinooks and snow plows, let's take a quick look at current basin projects in Oregon. Montana and southern Idaho, finishing Sunday with the present status of interbasin shifts such as moving Columbia River water to California.

Oregon, of course, shares Bonneville and McNary Dams with Washington and will share the major dams also proposed at The Dalles and John Day River's mouth, to provide 980,000 and 1,105,000 kilowatts respectively in their power installations, and to irrigate 286,000 and 380,000 acres.

ALSO SHARES HELLS CANYON

Another major project, Hells Canyon Dam on Snake River, to generate 900,000 kilowatts, will have its east end in Idaho and its west end in Oregon.

These dams are all included in the list of 93 projects placed before Congress and the Buget Bureau, with request for authorization, by the Army's Corps of Engineers and the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation.

Omitting, for the time being, the other 312 projects slated for ultimate development, the must list for Oregon alone includes four Bureau projects to irrigate 22,000 acres, and nine Army power projects to develop 323,000 kilowatts. Largest of the power projects asked is Meridian Dam, on the Middle Fork of the Willamette, 115,000 kilowatts.

The figures mean little unless coupled with data on projects already authorized or already constructed.

Also in the Willamette, under construction, is Detroit Dam, on the North Santiam, which with added facilities will develop 84,000 kilowatts and store 432,000 acre-feet of water for downstream use.

And on the Willamette's Coast Fork, south of Eugene, Dorena Dam is going up. Its principal purpose is storage, plus flood control.

Also authorized are three major storage projects—Sweet Home on the South Santiam, 315,000 acre-feet; Lookout Point on the Middle Fork, 600,000 acre-feet, and Quartz Creek on the McKenzie, 785,000 acre-feet, with 128,000 kilowatts of power.

STANDS BY ITSELF

Willamette River, rising in the Calapooyas and running northward between the Cascades and the Coast range, generally has more of a flood than an irrigation problem.

Yet the Army engineers, who have done cost of the planning there, figure on watering 514,000 acres, or roughly as much as is now left, with the Wahluke and wheatland withdrawals, in the Big Bend project in central Washington.

More than any other tributary of the Columbia, the Willamette stands self-sufficient by itself. There are 34 power sites in the valley, according to the latest information on the comprehensive plan. The Army plans ultimate power development at three of the seven sites originally marked for flood-control storage only.

There are already 24 power plants operating in Willamette, with 135,000 kilowatts capacity. It is the most thickly settled of the Columbia's valleys.

While these waters, entering the Columbia below Portland, play no part in inland empire irrigation projects, they nevertheless contribute to the Northwest power pool.

SCARCE IN REST OF OREGON

There are enough votes in the valley to make sure that the middle Columbia, upper

Columbia, and Snake are not going to permit upstream projects to outstrip the first-settled section of Oregon.

Insiders say a fight is already being made to eliminate one central Oregon bureau project, the Crooked River part of the Deschutes irrigation set-up, from the comprehensive plan now before the Budget Bureau in Washington. It would irrigate about 10,000 new acres northeast of Bend and send supplemental water to 10,000 more. Its cost is estimated at $5,278,000.

This would leave only the 4,000-acre Bully Creek extension of the Vale project, and the 4,500-acre western Dalles project, for eastern and northern Oregon. The power projects in the present list, outside the major dams, are all in the Willamette Valley. Largest, aside from Meridian, is the Green Peter, in the middle Santiam, 81,000 kilowatts and 322,000 acre-feet storage.

FLOOD-CONTROL ESTIMATES

The budget request calls for some $130,000,000 for minor lower Columbia and Willamette Valley projects, including $20,000,000 for a fishery plan and most of the rest for channel improvements, levees, snag clearing, and betterments to navigation.

Bank protection is proposed at 66 locations, levee modification at 28.

For comparison, there is $15,227,000 asked for upper-stream flood control, including projects at Bonners Ferry and Clark Fork, Idaho; Missoula and St. Regis, Mont., and the Okanogan, Wenatchee, Yakima, Entiat, Methow, Crab Creek, and Wilson Creek, Walla Walla, Touchet, and Mill Creek channels in Washington.

The total cost of the 93 projects, as indicated earlier, is $2,250,000,000, at current price levels. With efforts going on to remove some of the Oregon and Idaho projects, observers indicated addition of any central Washington irrigation item would face an uphill fight.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 3, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 13)

(By Leon Starmont)

Montana has only one major power project and two minor irrigation projects among the 93 for which authorization is asked in the comprehensive plan of the Army engineers and Bureau of Reclamation, now before the Budget Bureau at Washington, D. C.

Montana's share of the $2,252,664,000 program is $248,200,000, or a little more than 10 percent. That doesn't mean much for most of Montana is in the Missouri rather than the Columbia Basin. The Missouri "comprehensive" involves $6,125,000,000 or almost three times the Columbia. That is one fact emphasized by those who believe the Pacific Northwest should stick to the custom of going to Congress every session for appropriations.

LIBBY DAM AT JENNINGS

Libby dam, on Kootenay River at Jennings, is the one big project left in the current Montana picture. Glacier View Dam on the Flathead having been eliminated because of the protests of sportsmen and dude ranchers, backed up by the National Park Service and the Department of the Interior.

Hungry Horse, on the Flathead's south fork, a Bureau of Reclamation project, is already under construction. It will regulate water for Montana Power Co. plants at Polson and Thompson Falls, and for all the other plants down the Pend Oreille and Columbia, including Grand Coulee, Chief Joseph, McNary, and Bonneville.

Libby Dam will cost $239,077,000, develop 588,000 kilowatts, and store 4,250,000 acre-feet for the dams down the Kootenay. It is second only to Grand Coulee (9,700,000 acre-feet) among the projects now built or authorized, or for which authorization is sought. It will back water far into British Columbia, which will receive compensating benefits. Another Kootenay River dam at Katka has been deferred.

BITTERROOT IRRIGATION

A Bitterroot Valley project in the comprehensive plan will cost $8,979,000, store 88,700 acre-feet above Missoula, irrigate 1,700 new acres, and supplement the water supply of 48,300 acres now irrigated.

There is also a 1,200-acre addition to the Missoula irrigation district, at a cost of only $184,000.

Channel improvements are also proposed on Libby and Flower Creeks in the Kootenay drainage. Marked for later development, but not present authorization, are reservoirs on Yaak and Moyie rivers to store 435,000 and 322,000 acre-feet, respectively, the outlet of the latter being in Idaho. Also scheduled for later consideration is a 25,000-kilowatt power project on Yaak River.

On the tributaries of the Pend Oreille a much more extensive power development is contemplated, much of which has been delayed by objections of several localities to valley flooding.

In Montana, 23 potential power projects in the Pend Oreille Basin, not including those already developed, total 1,797,000 kilowatts. To others down river in Idaho total 175,000 kilowatts.

FLATHEAD IRRIGATION

In the Flathead, major tributary of the Pend Oreille, about 85,000 acres are now irrigated. This is to be much enlarged by projects in which the Indian Service has a hand. Because of the more complex picture caused by Indian projects and private ventures, estimates of irrigable land in the Flathead lack the exactness now charted for other Columbia Basin areas.

Irrigation development in the lower Flathead and Little Bitterroot Valleys was initiated by the Reclamation Service in 1907 and was turned over to the Office of Indian Affairs for completion and operation in 1924. All of the irrigated land is within the Flathead Indian Reservation, much of which was opened to non-Indian settlers under the act of April 23, 1904, and virtually all of the irrigated area is within the Flathead Indian project.

The Flathead Indian project, with a designated ultimate area of 138,195 acres, is made up of three units or divisions: Mission Valley, 111,660 acres; Camas, 13,170 acres, and Jocko, 13,365 acres. Of the ultimate project area, nearly 107,000 acres are now under constructed works.

NON-INDIAN DISTRICTS

The non-Indian lands of the project have been organized into three irrigation districts under Montana law and each has entered into a repayment contract with the United States. The district lands aggregate 99,405 acres. Indian-owned lands within the project total about 28,500 acres, and the remaining 10,290 acres of the ultimate project area are State and county lands.

The Camas division, in the valley of Little Bitterroot River, is irrigated by gravity diversion from that stream, supplemented by storage. The water supply currently available is inadequate for the 13,170 acres of the designated ultimate area of the division with the result that not more than 5,000 to 10,000 acres are usually irrigated each year.

The Mission Valley division is irrigated by gravity diversions from tributaries of Flathead River, supplemented by storage and by pumping from Flathead Lake.

The Jocko division is supplied by gravity diversions from Jocko River and Finley Creek. Both the Mission Valley and Jocko divisions occasionally experience moderate water shortages.

Storage for the entire project is provided in 14 reservoirs with a combined capacity of 142,725 acre-feet. The Flathead River pumping lift is approximately 330 feet.

The Cost of Mr. Johnson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT HALE

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HALE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I want to call the attention of the House to an article entitled "The Cost of Mr. Johnson" written by Joseph and Stewart Alsop and appearing in the Washington Post for Friday last.

Secretary Johnson is very boastful about the preparedness of our armed forces and emits from time to time utterances that are alarmingly jingoistic. I am very much afraid that the estimate of the situation by the Alsop brothers is entirely correct.

The article follows:

THE COST OF MR. JOHNSON

(By Joseph and Stewart Alsop)

There should be no mistake about it. Behind the false front of Louis A. Johnson's defense "economies," there lurks something even more unpleasant than petty domestic politics. There lurks, in fact, the specter of our eventual defeat in the world struggle with the Soviet Union.

The reason why this is so can be very simply stated. The Soviet Union is in midphase of a program of rearmament considerably surpassing Adolf Hitler's. Meanwhile, because of Louis Johnson's policies, the United States, the leader of the Western World, is patently failing to give solid strength to the western confederation against Soviet aggression. This is happening in several different ways, and on several different levels.

It is obvious, for example, that the divided and mutually suspicious nations of the Atlantic Pact can never organize efficient defense unless this country takes the lead in the hard, day-to-day planning. Almost all the regional defense groupings in Europe wish us to do so. The biggest and infinitely the most important grouping, the western union, has actually asked for an American officer to replace Field Marshal Montgomery in command at Fontainebleau.

Both the British Field Marshal, who would be supplanted, and General de Lattre de Tassigny, who rearely agrees with Montgomery, are at least in accord on this point. Western union can accomplish little without an American to serve as umpire. Yet "my Joint Chiefs of Staff," as Johnson sometimes calls the JCS, have refused to take part in the European planning process in this responsibility-creating manner. Atlantic Pact planning has thus been limited to the vague and cloudy top-level.

The motive is plain. If we assumed serious responsibility for western defense planning, we should immediately be pressed to make western defense a real thing. Johnson's economy policy forbids this sort of effort. The military-aid program for Europe has some psychological value, but on balance the Atlantic Pact is degenerating into

a mask for weakness. Here again we are being misled by Johnson, as his annual report discloses.

Despite the power of the Red army, despite the Soviet atomic bomb, a serious defense of the west can be organized, at reasonable cost, by our allies and ourselves. It is not being organized simply because we are not making our necessary contribution, and because this, in turn, demoralizes the European effort. The plainest case in point is that of Europe's air defense.

The Soviet heavy bomber force is relatively small, and comprises only obsolescent aircraft of B–29 type. These aircraft can be rather easily stopped by a modern air defense, combining first-rate fighters and the powerful antiaircraft guided missiles that are now proven. Thus an effective European air defense, which would neutralize the Soviet atomic bomb, is now entirely possible.

However, the western Europeans lack the resources to build this sort of air defense themselves. Meanwhile our own fighter groups, already shockingly reduced, are being further weakened by the low aircraft replacement rate that is one of Johnson's major economies. Our guided-missile programs are also being held back to their inexpensive early phase. In short, the job is not being done. The growing Soviet atomic stockpile will therefore be available to terrify the Europeans into submission

The truth is that the strength of the United States must be the very backbone of the strength of the west. That backbone is being chipped away at, if not broken, by Johnson. Previous reports have disclosed the progressive, still continuing impairment of our capability to guard the sea lanes across the oceans. Yet who can expect determined European resistance to Soviet aggression if the Atlantic sea lanes are even temporarily interrupted?

Equally, it has been shown that we may not be able to press home strategic air attacks against Russia's vital centers in 2 or 3 years' time. Yet a promise to destroy the Soviet vital centers, very shortly after the outbreak of any war was the chief contribution of our representatives to the Atlantic Pact staff talks. If our allies see that we probably cannot keep our major promise, who can suppose that the western confederation would hold together? Indeed, certain signs of disintegration are already appearing.

These are the reasons why the specter of defeat now looms before us. It does not so much matter as yet that this continent is also totally devoid of air defense, and that Alaska, the natural Soviet bridgehead, is quite unguarded. In the new era of intercontinental struggle it is unlikely that we shall suffer the first attack. The Kremlin's first goal will be control of the Eurasiatic land mass and the decisive isolation of the United States.

Because of Soviet rearmament and American disarmament, the Kremlin already has this goal in sight. Because our allies will feel deserted by us, the western confederation will most probably crumble under Soviet menaces, whenever Soviet rearmament is complete. In that event, we shall experience the equivalent of a gigantic defeat in war, without, perhaps, a shot being fired.

Let no one suppose, either, that after our expulsion from Europe and Asia, the situation can be restored by warfare between continents, carried on by us alone. It is unthinkable that we should try to force our way back across the oceans behind a barrage of guided missles carrying hydrogen bombs, germs to produce pandemics, and the like. If these events we are inviting are allowed to come to pass, we shall have only two alternatives.

One alternative will be to surrender in our turn. The other will be to abandon all that is good in our society, and to transform this continent into one vast, bristling, wholly militarized, permanently alerted armed camp. Such is quite possibly the cost of Mr. Johnson's policy.

The Federal Deficit

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert an article by David Lawrence, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 17, in the RECORD:

TRUMAN FINDS HIMSELF ON DEFENSIVE OVER BIG FEDERAL DEFICIT—JACKSON DINNER SPEECH INDICATES HE REALIZES EXTENT OF VULNERABILITY

(By David Lawrence)

President Truman seems to have found himself on the defensive in the political arena. His speech at the Jackson-Jefferson dinner reveals for the first time that, while the leader of the Democratic Party doesn't like to admit it, he realizes how vulnerable his administration is on the big Federal deficit.

The President implied that it would be easy to dispose of the new cry of "socialism" by a simple denial that any Democrats are Socialists. He pointed to the prosperous-looking diners, intimating that those who pay $100 a plate for dinner aren't believers in socialism but rather the exponents of a firm faith in the strength of free enterprise.

What the President omitted to mention was that the diners were, for the most part, job holders on the big Federal pay roll or persons directly or indirectly benefiting by the largess of the Democratic administration.

REPUBLICAN "SCARE WORDS"

Mr. Truman revealed that he felt somewhat the sting of the recent Republican platform with its "liberty or socialism" slogan, which he referred to as "scare words." He went back to 1933, as all Democratic stump speakers do nowadays, to remind his hearers about the unemployment, of those days and the reconstruction job done by the New Deal in the thirties. Unfortunately, the unemployment figures have just reached a new postwar high and the deficit is the largest in any peacetime year.

Mr. Truman devoted a large part of his speech to explanations as to why expenses couldn't be cut and accused the economizers of being willing to weaken the security as well as the domestic economy of the Nation. The group in Congress which is demanding economy includes many Democrats. So, in that sense, Mr. Truman was perhaps more nonpartisan than he realizes.

The speech undoubtedly will be regarded as a keynote. It will, unless circumstances change before the autumn elections, furnish the main line of political campaigning.

Mr. Truman's words, which were directed at the status of the deficit, sound as if he knows already the attack that is coming from the Republicans. He says:

"At the present time, they are spreading the mistaken idea that we can save money by going backward. They advocate slashing our expenditures for peace and for our domestic programs. These people are blind to the problems that confront us."

WORKING TO BALANCE BUDGET

"It is true that our present expenditures are large. But the Democratic administration is working toward a balance in the Federal budget. I wish we could balance the budget immediately by the simple expedient of cutting expenses. But that is out of the question."

Mr. Truman then repeats the old wheeze about 70 percent of the expenses being for past wars and for peace in the future. He says: "I would like to cut expenditures further, and I intend to do so at every opportunity."

But the answer to this is that the administration has recommended increases in spending nearly every year since the war and, notwithstanding a severe decline in receipts due to a business recession, the expenses for this year and next are scheduled at a high level.

The Republicans have a real chance to influence the whole course of Government policy by fighting it out on the economy issue, showing the proposed cuts that the Hoover Commission recommended and economy proposals that Democrats like Senator BYRD, of Virginia, have offered.

Maybe the Republicans hope to blend the word "socialism" with something akin to communism, but isms are rather abstract things to understand, whereas a government running in the red by billions is something everybody can understand. Much more descriptive than a welfare state or a socialistic state is the bankrupt state which develops when political spending becomes a habit.

How Far Dare We Let the Government Go?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Arkansas Democrat of January 19, 1950:

HOW FAR DARE WE LET THE GOVERNMENT GO?

Arkansas Representative BOYD TACKETT has taken a hot shot at the Federal Interior Department and its Southwestern Power Administration. His target is a loan asked of the Rural Electrification Administration by six big rural electric co-ops in Missouri, Oklahoma, Arkansas, and Texas, to build steam generating facilities and transmission lines.

Mr. TACKETT charged that the SPA would have control over the co-ops, under its contracts with them, and is using this method as a back door to an expansion which goes beyond the authority given it by Congress.

He said the SPA is thus seeking to use the good name of Mr. Claude Wickard and the fine rural-electrification program to foster a grandiose scheme of dominating electric power in the Southwest. He declared that the REA's funds should go to provide more electric service to farm people, and not to advance what he charges is the Interior Department's aim of socializing electric power in the United States.

Mr. TACKETT has introduced a bill to require congressional approval of REA loans for electric facilities which would be used by any other group or agency—like the SPA. Senator THOMAS of Oklahoma has introduced a similar bill in the upper House.

This is another case which brings home to Arkansas the menacing growth of Federal authority. If we countenance it, and support it when we think we have something to gain, how can we, without hypocrisy, denounce the extension of that authority to serve the interests of other groups elsewhere?

You will recall that the TVA, as urged by President Roosevelt, was to be primarily for flood control and navigation work. The power generated was to be a yardstick of costs for regulating private utilities.

But look at the yardstick now. The Federal Government will soon be producing 15 to 20 percent of the Nation's power—with many other huge projects being pushed. If the Government takes up the distributing of this power, building stand-by steam plants and lines competing with private lines, what will happen to private enterprise in this field?

Let the Government sell the power generated at its flood and navigation dams to private concerns. It has ample authority to regulate them. If we help to cripple, maybe kill, one private enterprise, be sure that others will be the next victims.

Vigilance and Effective Opposition Can Save the Medical Profession From Socialistic Control

REMARKS

OF

HON. EDGAR A. JONAS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. JONAS. Mr. Speaker, it is my candid opinion that the apathy which has prevailed for the past number of weeks in pushing a program relating to the welfare state and socialistic legislation, is only the lull before the storm.

The proponents of legislation dealing with such a program may be sitting out and awaiting the February 23 election in England. If they succeed in duping the people into voting them back into office, such occurrence may have certain repercussions in our own country. The success of the Socialists in England may be hailed by certain segments of society in this country as a great victory for the welfare state. That may prompt the present administration to make socialized medicine and public-health insurance the first order of business on the welfare program.

To date, all polls, investigations and personal surveys indicate that the medical profession is decidedly opposed to socialized medicine; but what is more encouraging, the people of America are evidencing their mistrust in the plan and their dislike for it. Decided opposition has cropped up, and is presently manifesting itself in terms of protests from many individuals and organizations who are not affiliated with the medical profession or interested in activities that are incidental thereto.

Aggressive opposition to the plan should not be relaxed for a single minute.

A recent poll, published in the Washington Post, discloses that throughout the Nation people who understand the administration's over-all socialized medical plan and compulsory health-insurance plan, were opposed to it in the ratio of 3 to 2.

Only 54 percent of the adults questioned were able to present arguments for or against the Truman proposal—the opening wedge for his welfare state, which is bound to lead us down the road to socialism just as surely as it did in England.

The principal argument which the proponents of the plan rely on is that it would provide medical aid to those sick and indigent who are not financially able to meet the cost, all of which, they maintain, is tantamount to assisting the impoverished and thereby improving the Nation's health.

The argument interposed against the compulsory medical plan deals chiefly with prohibitive costs—the encroachment upon the private rights now enjoyed by the individual practitioner by Government functionaries, and the inescapable fact that it would lower the standards now prevailing in the practice of medicine and mitigate against the patient in need of medical care and attention.

One person in three, or 30 percent, could give the correct answers when asked how the plan would be paid for; saying "pay-roll deductions," "taxes," or "like social security." When informed that both pay-roll deductions and additional taxes were necessary to meet the bill for the national health program to be administered and controlled by the Government, 10 percent voted in favor; 17 percent, against; while 3 percent reserved decision.

It is my contention that the information broadcast by the administration has not only been confusing—with an idea of creating an aura around its head—but that the tabulations dealing with costs, method of operation, and just how far the plan would apply to individuals who are nonwage earners, Government employees, or those on public-assistance rolls have been distorted deliberately. Under the proposed plan more people would be omitted than under the social-security plan, now being administered by the Government. Nonprofit health plans and that of commercial insurance would be destroyed, and medical attention would be geared to quantity—not quality.

Unless an educational program is undertaken by the medical profession, supported by States, counties, cities, and communities, our people will discover—just as did the people of England—that governmental control will reach not only every life in America, but deeper into every purse, and that Federal control means the kind of compulsion which Americans like no better than Englishmen.

We are gradually being drawn into a socialistic pattern. The insidiousness with which it is done works on the same principle as creeping paralysis. A popular definition of socialism is that it is a disease which fastens itself upon a weakened society. The depression years from 1921, war, and the loss of export trade, which meant England's lifeblood, are all partially to blame for the British allowing themselves to be insinuated into statism, with welfare and security as the bait.

Many well meaning and thinking Americans contend that we are being victimized by similar tactics.

At the time the National Health Service was foisted upon the British there were few, if any, private plans available for medical insurance which was within the means of the average wage earner or heads of families.

That is not true in this country, where numerous forms of insurance, such as Blue Cross plans, Blue Shield, commercial insurance, and so forth, are within the reach of 70 percent to 80 percent of our population. The rapid growth and development of the various methods of voluntary health protection during the past decade is a clear indication that the American people prefer to pay for their medical, surgical, hospital, and all types of incidentals thereto as they see fit, and to whom they choose.

During 1948, the number covered against loss of income increased by more than 2,000,000, while the number covered against the cost of hospital and surgical care increased by approximately 8,000,000.

I quote from a survey made by the survey committee of the Health Insurance Council, in which you will see that the total number of persons covered, for hospital benefits is 60,995,000; for surgery, 34,060,000; and for medical coverage apart from surgery, 12,895,000. These figures show an increase of 93 percent in the past 10 years, without the cooperation of the Government for its employees.

The following statistical tables reflect the progress of health protection through private enterprise:

Number of persons protected

Type of protection	Dec. 31, 1948	Dec. 31, 1947	Increase in 1948 (number)	Percent
Loss of income	33,410,000	31,224,000	2,186,000	7
Hospital expense	60,995,000	52,584,000	8,411,000	16
Surgical expense	34,060,000	26,247,000	7,813,000	30
Medical expense	12,895,000	8,898,000	3,997,000	45

Comparisons over a longer period are not available in every case, but the following figures serve to illustrate the growth in protection during the past decade:

Number of individuals covered at end of indicated year

Coverage	1938	1943	1948	Increase during last 5 years	Increase during last 10 years
Hospital expense: Group insurance and Blue Cross plans combined	3,200,000	19,400,000	47,200,000	27,800,000	44,000,000
Surgical expense: Group insurance and plans sponsored by medical societies or affiliated with Blue Cross	100,000	5,900,000	24,400,000	18,500,000	24,300,000
Medical expense: Group insurance and plans sponsored by medical societies or affiliated with Blue Cross	----------	800,000	7,500,000	6,700,000	7,500,000

It will be noted that these comparisons are noted only to show the rapid rate of growth. Because of the inadequacy of statistical sources prior to 1947, the preceding table omits the very impressive record of coverage provided through individual insurance policies, consumer-sponsored prepayment plans and other important methods of voluntary protection.

SUMMARY OF SURVEY

1. Insurance against loss of income due to disability

A. Insurance companies and fraternal societies	20,640,000
B. Paid sick leave:	
In private industry	4,560,000
In civilian Government service	2,750,000
C. Employee mutual benefit associations	1,460,000
D. Union plans and other employer-employee methods	2,000,000
Grand total	33,410,000

2. Hospital, surgical, and medical coverage

	Hospital	Surgical	Medical
A. Insurance companies and fraternal societies: [1]			
Personal	$13,689,000	$11,203,000	$2,442,000
Dependents	12,295,000	8,425,000	902,000
Total	25,984,000	19,628,000	3,344,000
B. Blue Cross plans sponsored by medical societies: [1]			
Personal	13,636,000	4,774,000	2,711,000
Dependents	17,610,000	5,833,000	3,001,000
Total	31,246,000	10,608,000	5,712,000
C. Other organizations: [1]			
1. Bituminous coal industry:			
Personal	230,000	269,000	269,000
Dependents	300,000	350,000	350,000
2. Consumer sponsored	1,600,000	1,600,000	1,600,000
3. Industrial, excluding coal mining	1,260,000	1,220,000	1,215,000
4. Private group clinics	275,000	285,000	305,000
5. University health plans	100,000	100,000	100,000
	3,765,000	3,824,000	3,839,000
Grand total	60,995,000	34,060,000	12,895,000

[1] This does not include individuals covered solely by Government under compulsory plans.

With these figures in mind, let us look at England, which more nearly resembles the administration's prospective plans than any other. Their experiment in socialized medicine—instead of being the blessing they anticipated—has proven to be a tragedy. That Britain sorely needed more medical care is not open to challenge. On the other hand the indisputable fact is that she has not obtained it. What actually took place was that care made available was spread so thin that it is now inadequate for everyone.

In England, the National Health Service, which came into being on July 5, 1948, has cost twice the original estimate—and for many of their patients seeking examinations or medication in one form or another, it has meant endless hours of waiting; overcrowded conditions; and in most instances, indefinite appointments for hospitalization; and that those seeking medical attention must "queue" up in a fashion resembling a depression bread line.

Mr. Aneurin Bevan, Minister of Health, said in a press conference at the end of the service's first fiscal year—October 6, 1949, that—"the total cost of the service was not to be regarded as an additional burden on the community—but in the main as a vast transfer from the private to the public purse."

The public purse, as everyone knows, is fed by individual contributions made from private purses—in England, just as it is here. Those contributions are measured only by one yardstick—taxes. The British felt the bite and the decreased efficiency in their medical service, and they do not like it. We, too, will feel the bite of taxes, and deplore the inferiority of professional service and care, in the field of medicine, if we are gullible enough to accept in full the administration's socialized medical plan.

Payments from the national insurance fund—pay-roll deductions—to the National Health Service in England, were $112,000,000. The cost to the end of the first year was $840,000,000. The balance of $738,000,000 was paid by additional local and national taxation. This meant more taxes for overburdened industries, and yet another load added to a people who were already the heaviest taxed in the world.

The service as administered by the Socialists has become a vast, calloused, inhumane, and cold-blooded machine, which only adds sorrow to the suffering, and deepens their misery. This system has conclusively demonstrated, in addition to its unworkability—that it leads to a rationing of doctors; the destruction of initiative and professional independence. It has redounded to the benefit of only 2,000 out of some 18,000 who "joined" the National Health Service, by their own admission.

According to the pattern followed in England under state medicine, the pharmacist is circumscribed by his share of red tape comparable to the rationing days in the United States.

The preparation and sale of prescriptions is not managed in terms of convenience—or choice; but governed by zoning areas measured in distances of miles. For instance, if a patient lives 1 mile or less he gets his drugs from the store nearest the doctor. If he lives 2 miles or more from a store he gets his drugs from his doctor, who is supplied by the government. If he lives between a mile and 2 miles it is optional whether drugs are supplied by his doctor or not.

This makes the druggist subject to the personal likes or dislikes of the zone physician. The natural consequences are that the druggist stands to lose both financially and in patronage. Clearly, under such a system it is quite impossible to build up good will.

As an example of the meagerness of the entire service we might point to their slogan, which is, "security from the cradle to the grave"—yet the evaluation of this security is $16 for the cradle, and $80 for a Christian burial.

The United States has always been known to have the highest medical standards in the world, and the lowest mortality rates. Supporting this proof is the difference in the medical facilities for care and hospitalization in England, as weighed against ours.

I quote from The National Health Service of Great Britain, page 8, by Willard C. Rappleye, M. D., published by the Josiah Macy, Jr., Foundation, New York:

> On the appointed day (July 5, 1948) 3,426 hospitals, convalescent homes, and clinics passed from the control of their own boards to that of governmental agencies, which had been created during the tooling-up period, a transaction of major dimensions.

No other country in the world has a network of hospital facilities that are comparable with ours. This network represents $45 per capita or $108 per employed person. In terms of assets each bed represents an investment of $4,598.

The Federal Government owns only 372 hospitals which have a capacity of 185,000 beds for the armed forces, United States Public Health, Veterans' Administration, Indian Affairs, Penal, and Narcotic.

State, county, city and city-county operate 1,528 hospitals, with bed capacities as follows: State, 648,386; county, 101,327; city, 73,797; city-county, 11,159.

Total governmental, including Federal, amounts to 1,900 hospitals, with 1,019,767-bed capacity and 15,757 bassinets.

In the nongovernmental classification, there are 4,435 hospitals which fall into the following categories:

Church, 1,068; nonprofit organizations, 2,016, with a total bed capacity of 352,972, and a bassinet capacity of 62,635, according to a table published by the American Medical Association, May 7, 1949. This classification is rather confusing since the Catholic Welfare Council lists 725 hospitals in the United States, which are run by 184 different religious orders or units. The Protestant Hospital Association, lists more than 550 hospitals which are directly connected with Protestant churches, with a possibility that there are 500 more interdenominationals, which are directly or indirectly connected with church groups.

To permit the Government to take these over, as President Truman proposes, would, in the instance of those of the Catholic faith, regiment 184 orders which are dedicated to the care of the indigent and ill. Those of the Protestant faith provide facilities of the same nature and would be similarly affected. That also can be said of the great Jewish hospitals in the country. Aside from the humanitarian aspect of a hospital, religious, fraternal, and racial contacts not infrequently come into play in the conduct of the institutions.

I personally believe it not out of place to assume that removing or interfering with impressions and the comfort derived from the respective faiths they cling to, would deny to the sick the unimpeded opportunity to give full expression to their spiritual beliefs, and by indirection would interfere with individual religious commitments.

In addition, there are 973 individual and partnership-owned hospitals, which have a bed capacity of 27,567, and a bassinet capacity of 5,668. Those run by

corporations or on an unrestricted profit basis total 378, with a bed capacity of 23,214 beds and 3,536 bassinets.

In 1946, the last figure available showed 496 unregistered—either AMA or AHA—hospitals with a bed capacity of 16,172—or an average of 50 beds per unit. These hospitals are usually owned by group doctors and surgeons, who have pooled together to supply the needs of their communities and their patients in rural or local areas. There is no reason to believe that this number has not increased since the lifting of building restrictions due to wartime priorities.

I would like to point out here that there are more than 10,000 bills and resolutions presented—all on problems relating to public health, during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. Some of these are duplicates, but 291 bills are now pending, along with a large number in the Senate.

The Hill-Burton building plan, Hospital and Construction Act, which became Public Law 725 in the Seventy-ninth Congress, and was amended by laws 830 and 380 in the Eightieth and Eighty-first Congresses, reached an early stage of operation in 1948, with its matching of Federal, State, and local funds; while leaving control in the communities and localities in which the hospitals are built as needed, and according to the requirements of the population seeking benefits from this plan. There are 1,019 projects. Of this number 662 have been finally approved. More than 139 general hospitals, health centers, clinics, and laboratories have already been completed.

A great many hospitals are also being built without Hill-Burton plan funds which will help round out the country's hospital facilities. The Hill-Burton program was painstakingly planned to produce a balance of facilities for all communities.

When the FSA propaganda campaign began setting forth the great need for the compulsory health-insurance program in 1948, it is significant to note that despite all the danger signals—we had the lowest death rate ever recorded in our history. Specific attention was called to the fact in the FSA statements that 1,241,185 citizens per day were receiving hospital care—but there were factors involved which offset the alarm. The first of the following is, of course, the most important. The last, is the obvious reasons for Nos. 2 and 3.

First. Admissions went down.

Second. Percentage of occupancy went up.

Third. Daily census went up.

Fourth. Length of stay went up.

It is also important to note that 1948 brought a sharp downward trend in admissions after many years in which this figure climbed steadily. And, lest the figure for the number of the population daily hospitalized startle you—let me emphatically point out that while there might have been 1,241,185 citizens in hospital beds—99 percent of our population were ambulatory and active.

It is my contention that it is not only dangerous to allow bureaucratic laymen to dabble in the sciences of which they know nothing—but that it would disorganize and impede the splendid progress the medical profession has made in this country. Under free enterprise and competition, commercial, philanthropic, and religious organizations are being constantly urged forward by the pressure of public demand for expanding research and scientific exploitation in the medical arts.

Assuming the Government becomes the sole overlord in the management and operation of hospital and health services, it is quite probable that the advantages gained in the medical profession would be slowed down and unnecessarily impaired. This would tend to restrict a profession that constitutes one of the most vital segments of our democracy.

The foundation of our country was laid—and depends upon the sense of personal responsibility which exists in the hearts of its citizens. Compulsory insurance—this opening wedge of statism, with the same promises of welfare and security which duped the people of Britain should be militantly opposed. Why? Because it would abrogate not only the responsibility of the individual—but do great and irrevocable harm to the inhabitants of the community and the state as well.

Let us keep in mind the many facets of the issue when we are again called upon to face this cunning internal revolution—this insidious approach to the eventual completion of the plans for a welfare state, as was so aptly presented in the February 4 issue of Collier's article, Mr. Welfare State Himself, which clearly outlines the plans afoot, as well as the ambitions of the satellites who head up the FSA. In the February 11 issue, Collier's presents the story of Dr. Ralph Jocelyn Gampell, The Doctor Who Brushed off "Utopia."

We are in the danger zone, make no mistake about that, when our United States Supreme Court has ruled: "The State has a perfect right to control and administer whatever it subsidizes."

With the obvious draw-backs provoked by socialized-medicine experiments, with their attendant deteriorations of standards, there is no excuse for our allowing the lives of our ill and indigent to be turned into nightmares of neglect—offering them additional distress and indifferent and stereotyped attention.

I quote Mr. Truman:

> I depend upon our peculiar genius for combining governmental and voluntary activity to expand and maintain our hospital system.

Candidly speaking, this is being done to a limited extent, with the aid of such acts as Voluntary Health Insurance Act (S. 1456); the National Health Insurance Act (S. 1581), and the National Health and Public Health Act (S. 1679) in conjunction with the Hill-Burton legislation and others, which is designed to aid the individual communities to fulfill their needs—whether it be for assistance in building hospitals, or in the interest of educating and training specialized personnel to staff them, or providing needed equipment.

In all of these, particular emphasis has been directed to giving special consideration to rural, local, or sparsely populated areas where the greatest needs are for more available doctors, and proper equipment for treatment and diagnosis.

Legislation to amend the Public Health Service Act of 1946, and known as H. R. 5940, is now pending in the House, and was drafted with a view of lessening the tension related to some of the apparent grievances with which the medical profession has to contend. In this bill provision is made because of the shortage of physicians, optometrists, dentists, dental-hygienists, nurses, and other health personnel, including hospital administrators, for the education and training of such personnel, and the expanding of facilities and opportunities through Government aid and financial grants.

Practical nurses are also included in the vocational-education section of the bill. They are to be trained for subacute, convalescent, and chronic patients under the direction of a licensed physician or a registered professional nurse.

H. R. 5940, and others which have preceded it, nor the legislation which may follow, may not prove to be a complete cure-all or panacea tending to alleviate the conditions with which we are confronted. However, it must be conceded that there are not now enough doctors and nurses to meet the ever-present demand for such personnel. The legislation herein noted is designed to improve upon the present situation and to make immediately available opportunities and facilities for those who wish to have a share in protecting and guarding the health of the people of our country.

Basically, the bill proposes not to regiment personnel or socialize medicine. The fundamental objective of Federal aid as contemplated, and through legislation outlined in H. R. 5940, is to financially aid students who aspire to become doctors, dentists, nurses, and so forth.

The legislation also has for its objective that of providing funds for building health centers and modern hospitals and providing means for securing proper and modern equipment to operate them.

In the final analysis, the bill places the management as well as the allocation of funds not exclusively in the hands of inexperienced or untrained Government appointees, but the management and supervision of what H. R. 5940 hopes to accomplish, is with conditions attached delegated to the United States Surgeon General and his council.

Bills like H. R. 5940 are worthy of study and consideration. If they are intended to prevent regimentation of personnel and institutions or the administration thereof, and restrict interference with the curriculum of medical schools in general, we are on safe ground—provided that there is no radical deviation from maintaining the present high professional standards, ethics, and scholastic requirements.

Continuing forward in the science of medicine, under those circumstances, may show a swift, steady, and healthy growth, without destroying anything that has made it what it is today. The objective which transcends all others involved in this timely subject is that we will not relinquish in any degree our basic probity nor the trust and confidence which has obtained through practical and traditional achievements

and experience in the great profession of medicine.

The connotation of the word "compulsory" itself instinctively stirs up in the consciences of men and women accustomed to independent thinking an impulse toward rebellion.

Laws which are venal and obnoxious of their very nature have always been frowned upon and treated as incompatible with the fundamental principles of liberty and justice.

Therefore, it may be assumed that the medical profession, and any or all activities that are kindred or incidental thereto, will not readily lend themselves to the enactment of any legislation which is inherently destructive in character, and objectively despotic, and is obviously partial to a socialistic philosophy.

Controlled and socialized medicine unquestionably requires additional revenue, that can only be secured through one source; that is, higher and more taxes. In place of helping the poor and the needy, is it not logical to assume that such a course would exact from them contributions they could ill afford? It is axiomatic that the moneys they part with must be withheld from expending them for other needs or comforts.

Would not then the whole plan mitigate against the poor man in that he has to skimp and save and forego buying clothing, food, and those commodities which constitute his daily sustenance in order to get the tax load off his back?

All of which might militate against improved conditions in public health in place of contributing to the objective of advancing sciences where it is sought to prolong life in place of lessening the opportunities to live.

Economy and Self-Reliance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN SANBORN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SANBORN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I am inserting a letter I received from an Idaho housewife, Mrs. Lester M. Johnson. Her letter is well stated, to the point, and constructive. I believe it should be made available to others.

DEAR MR. SANBORN: May I express the hope that, as Representative from Idaho, you will take a leading role in directing the country back into the path of economy and self-reliance?

My husband is a veteran, a member of the Reserves, and in the moderate-income group, yet we feel very strongly that any favors done to any of these groups will, in the end, cost us far more, as taxpayers, than the price we would have to pay for them if we were able to save and achieve them for ourselves.

We believe that people should be encouraged to provide for their own medical care, housing, retirement, etc., except in cases of extreme poverty. I am also in favor of the Taft-Hartley law as a very necessary control over the labor monopolies and feel that it might have been invoked more often.

I should like to see CVA shelved—at least until sincere public demand from this area and a surplus of Government funds make it more advisable to consider it. The present Government hardly has a record for efficiency, honesty, or plain common sense that would lead anyone to want to confide any greater powers to it.

I feel that the thinking voters of the country would prefer a little belt-tightening to the present hopeless spiral of increasing taxes, national debt, and expensive projects. You can hardly expect us to welcome a tax increase if we believe that, instead of paying for past and present debts, it will go into some crack-brained scheme for a Government-owned Utopia.

We can still "cut our coats to fit our cloth"—why can't the Government do the same?

MRS. LESTER M. JOHNSON.

BOISE, IDAHO.

Cooperation, Not Competition, Will Pay

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Southwest American:

COOPERATION, NOT COMPETITION, WILL PAY

(By C. F. Byrns)

A good way to cut Federal Government expenses is to use private enterprises instead of competing with them. That is exactly what will happen in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States in this area if pending contracts governing Federal electric power sale are approved by the Interior Department.

Douglas Wright, director of the Southwestern Power Administration, is responsible for the sale and distribution of electric power generated at federally owned dams on the Red, White, and other streams in this section of America. Lately, he negotiated contracts with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and Public Service Co. of Oklahoma for distribution of Federal power through the privately owned electric utilities. Similar negotiations are under way with other power companies in the same area, including Arkansas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., and Missouri Utilities Co.

This week, Wright told the House committee considering his budget requests that he will cut $5,000,000 off the expense for the year beginning next July 1 if these contracts for finally approved. The reason is this: He is asking for $5,000,000 in that 1 year, with more to follow, for construction by the Federal Government with Federal money of facilities for distribution of Federal power. Those facilities will not be needed if the contracts are approved for distribution by the private companies.

The proposed contracts make the best possible use of the electric power being generated and planned in the Southwest.

They provide a way to use the hydro power for peaking purposes—that is, for carrying the excess load of demand at the peak hours, while steam plants owned by the private companies carry the normal around-the-clock demand.

Everybody in the power business, both Federal and private, recognizes that peaking power is the most profitable use of hydroelectric energy in this part of the Nation. The stream flows in this area are widely variant. Continuous power from hydro plants requires continuous flows of the streams in large quantities. We do not have that. But we do have many opportunities for developing hydro power as an incident to flood control, silt control, navigation, and other water uses. That power should be put to use in the public interest, on the most economical basis possible.

Under the proposed contracts with the private companies, Federal power will be sold to them at the Federal power plants and at existing interchange points between federally owned and private lines. The private companies will deliver power for the Federal Government to customers now on their lines or hereafter put under contract for use of Federal power.

This arrangement removes the necessity for spending large sums of public money to build power plants.

No Government Will Work in a Land Where Everyone Tries To Work the Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES A. PLUMLEY

OF VERMONT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a very great pleasure for me to take advantage of the opportunity afforded for permission to extend my remarks to include a statement recently made by the Honorable W. Arthur Simpson, commissioner of social welfare of the State of Vermont.

He has reduced to six paragraphs all worth while which has been said in volumes. Every Member of Congress ought to cut this extension out of the RECORD and carry it with him or else learn it as he would the Ten Commandments. It is the complete and perfect answer to all those who insist that this is a good Government to live in so long as they may live off it. With these people, unfortunately, every State is filled to overflowing today.

He well says that security is not the product of political power. He might well also have said you cannot legislate to make men honest, tolerant, or civic-minded.

This comprehensive yet compact statement of the issue which confronts the American people of today should have wide distribution and greater comprehension:

If this Nation is to survive we must learn that security is not the product of political power.

Government can wave no magic wands, issue no decrees, make no laws which will provide things for a people who do not produce.

The only riches which enable us to eat and drink, to clothe, shelter, and educate ourselves and our families, to provide a measure of security in old age and to enable us to aid the less fortunate are the riches that are created through the skills of men in industry and business or grown through the efforts of men on farms.

The moral basis of society is being destroyed by the incessant scramble for higher wages, higher profits, higher pensions, more leisure and rigid prices for agriculture.

It is easy to forget how to plow when everyone wants to be a harvester.

No government will work in a land where everyone tries to work the government. When you take away the incentive to produce and the penalty for loafing, you are on the slippery road to ruin. We can take out of our economic system only what we put into it.

W. ARTHUR SIMPSON.

Rural Electric Co-Ops in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns from the Southwest American for February 14, 1950:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

Representatives BOYD TACKETT and JIM TRIMBLE have lately disagreed in House speeches on a proposed plan for rural electric co-ops in Arkansas to build a steam-generating plant and electric transmission lines and lease them to the Southwestern Power Administration for a long period. Gordon Brown, Associated Press Washington writer, said in a Sunday column their disagreement is holding up REA approval of the local asked by the Arkansas co-ops.

A disagreement between these two men which reaches the point of House speeches is rare enough to provoke interest. Both are ardent supporters of rural electric cooperatives. Both are accustomed to speaking their frank opinions. I imagine a good many people in the Fourth and Third Congressional Districts would like to know what the disagreement is about. I wanted to know, too, so I asked each of them to tell me.

After reading the speeches of both of them on the floor, it is clear to me that both are strong for the rural electric co-ops, as they always have been. They have a different view of the effect of a proposed contract between the rural co-ops and the Southwestern Power Administration.

This proposed contract would provide for the newly formed group of Arkansas electric co-ops to borrow money from the Rural Electrification Administration to build a large steam plant to generate electricity and transmission lines to distribute its product, and then lease it to the Southwestern Power Administration for operation. The contract with the SPA is the point at issue between the two western Arkansas Congressmen.

Representative TACKETT interprets it to mean that SPA would own the steam plants and transmission lines built with REA money at the end of the proposed contract period. He points out that Congress has refused to appropriate money at SPA's request to build steam plants and transmission lines. He urges that SPA is trying to do indirectly what Congress has refused it permission to do directly. In addition, he charges SPA is using the good name of the rural electric co-ops and the REA to accomplish its purpose of building duplicate facilities to compete with privately owned electric utilities in the area. He believes the contract would give SPA eventual control of the policies of the rural electric co-ops.

Representative TRIMBLE does not agree with Representative TACKETT's interpretation of the contract nor his conclusions as to its effect. Representative TRIMBLE says the proposed steam plant and transmission lines would remain the property of the rural electric co-ops and would not pass to SPA at any time. Neither, in his opinion, would SPA be able to dominate the policies of the rural co-ops. Representative TRIMBLE points that the rural electric co-ops are private enterprises, owned by their members, buying electric energy wherever they can get it at the best price, from either privately operated utilities or the SPA which sells power from Federal power projects in the Southwest. He thinks the proposed contract with SPA is a proper exercise of the co-ops' right to make the best arrangement possible for purchase of power. He sees no danger of SPA domination of the co-ops operations.

Representative TACKETT has introduced a bill to require congressional approval of any REA loan to build any facility to be leased to any other agency for operation. Representative TRIMBLE thinks such a bill would be a serious restriction on the freedom of the co-ops to manage their affairs efficiently.

The two Congressmen agree on their support of the co-ops. They disagree up to now on the meaning of the proposed contract. Everybody concerned will likely have a clearer idea of what it's all about as a result of the controversy.

Resolution of Council of Lithuanian Societies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GEORGE H. FALLON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my many American Lithuanian friends, I include a resolution passed on the occasion of the banquet held under the auspices of the Council of Lithuanian Societies in commemoration of the Thirty-second Anniversary of the Declaration of Independence by the people of Lithuania, held at the Lithuanian Hall on the sixteenth day of February 1950, in Baltimore, Md.:

"Whereas by overwhelming military forces Soviet Russia occupied Lithuania in 1940 and now arbitrarily deprives Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia of their independent political life; and

"Whereas since the said occupation of Lithuania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics pursues a ruthless policy of planned liquidation, deportation, and dispersion of the Lithuanian people in order to destroy the Lithuanian national entity, and

"Whereas the crime of genocide, which the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is perpetrating upon the defenseless Lithuanian nation violates all principles of human rights and has been outlawed by the convention of the United Nations General Assembly; and

"Whereas the afore-stated genocide pact will be presented for action before the United States Senate: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That our representatives at the United Nations request that steps be taken by the General Assembly to impel the withdrawal of all Russian organizations from Lithuania; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That the United States Government enter into no peace settlement without the restoration of the freedom and independence of Lithuania and similar nations; and be it further

"*Resolved*, That we urge our esteemed members of the United States Senate to ratify the genocide convention."

The foregoing resolutions were adopted by unanimous vote at the Thirty-second Anniversary of the Republic of Lithuania Day, under the sponsorship of the Council of Lithuanian Societies held this sixteenth day of February 1950, in the Lithuanian Hall, Baltimore, Md.

ANTHONY J. MICEIKO,
President.
MARTIN RAILA,
Secretary.

Truman and the Press—Once-Humble President Tells Off Reporters at Heated Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. NORRIS POULSON
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include the article by Doris Fleeson, published in the Washington Evening Star of February 17. The article speaks for itself, and would apply to a President of either party after he becomes power hungry:

(By Doris Fleeson)

"Pray for me," the new President of the United States begged Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt on April 12, 1945.

February 16, 1950, the same President of the United States told the Washington press corps in so many words that the king can do no wrong.

Harry Truman's brush with the press is an amusing story. The President is a very human and transparent man with a touchy temper. Reporters tend to be creative and imaginative, else they would not be reporters, and while they are usually congenial as individuals, they can be hard to handle collectively.

But superseding questions of public interest stem from the unprecedented press conference yesterday where a cocky President baited the press and the press stood its ground.

What is eating the President?

Does the secrecy which is the order of the day regarding paths to peace hide some dreadful revelation that is still to come?

Or it is that power has tended to corrupt the once humble man who closed his first message to Congress April 15, 1945, with a prayer for "an understanding heart * * * for who is able to judge this Thy so great people? I ask only to be a good and faithful servant of my Lord and my people."

NOT BATTLING OWNERS

It is important to the understanding of why Washington asks these questions to realize that President Truman this time was not battling and belittling newspaper owners. Many of them, perhaps a majority of the most important ones, prefer the Republican Party.

President Roosevelt, this being so, skillfully created the illusion of a deathless feud between himself and newspapers in which reporters secretly sided with him but were helpless to interfere. President Truman has retouched this pretty picture along the same lines. At this two hundredth press conference recently he said he liked the conferences and reporters as distinct from their bosses.

But the President first robbed, then sought to bulldoze: (1) His real friends among the rank and file with whom he was more popular than any President since T. R.; (2) by-line writers who can take Harry Truman or leave him alone but who support his aims and keep them in perspective before the public.

What the President did was to break a White House rule by giving an exclusive interview to Arthur Krock, head of the Washington Bureau of the New York Times. Like everything Mr. Krock writes, it was a lucid, beautifully written story, and it explored the state of the President's mind with respect to our present cruel dilemmas.

Mr. Krock concluded it with a bread-and-butter letter in the form of a tribute to the President which is one of the very good notices that the Democratic Party, the Fair Deal or New Deal, or the last two Presidents have got under his signature in years. What Mr. Krock's favorite statesman, Senator BYRD, of Virginia, said when he read it is, unfortunately, not on record.

GREAT JOURNALISTIC FEAT

It was a great journalistic feat and reporters who are not still too speechless with rage are begging Mr. Krock for lessons on how to batter a man so gracefully that he will beg you to accept the Kohinoor diamond.

When the story broke Wednesday irate reporters pounded Charles Ross, the President's press secretary, regarding it. Mr. Ross, who never permits a syllable of news to pass his lips until it has first been printed in the World Almanac, fended them off as best he could. At the same time, puzzled Democratic politicians were asking how come.

At this point versions vary. Some reporters profess to know that Mr. Krock had the idea of synthesizing what he had heard the President say at social gatherings, that Mr. Ross helped fix up the interview, that the President saw Mr. Krock Monday and approved it.

A politician who saw the President is authority for the statement that the President did not authorize the interview as printed, that he had consented to have his views expressed socially printed without direct attribution but that calling it an interview and the Q. and A. form employed were unfair to him.

In any case, the President was spoiling for a fight when the press entered the oval study the next morning.

It is not permitted to quote him directly—it's a White House rule—which is a pity because only the abruptness of the Q. and A. conveys the President's attitude fully.

ALL IN DEAD EARNEST

The scene would have had its comic side for a disinterested observer. But the angry, emotional participants were in dead earnest.

The President had the advantage of respect for the presidency. Mad as they were, the reporters sensed their peril and their voices fairly throbbed with objectivity.

The first to take the gloves off, the President said yes; he had authorized the interview. Then he pitched in.

The reporters, he said, seemed to be in kind of a disgruntled mood. The President is his own free agent, he continued, he will see whom he pleases, when he pleases, and say what he pleases to anybody he pleases, and he is not censored by reporters or anybody else. He said he had tried his best to be polite and courteous but he didn't like the reporters' attitude that morning, so they should just cool off.

Being the aggrieved party, the reporters who are allergic to being lectured, too, paused for breath and one of their elder statesmen, Earl Godwin, radio commentator, sought to pour oil on the troubled waters. Every bureau chief and reporter in Washington considered the story a reflection on them, he said soothingly.

The President replied that it was nothing of the kind. He said he didn't intend for anybody to edit his actions, he was a free agent.

After some skirmishing in which the President again exclaimed that he was a free agent, the question was put whether or not interviews would now go by favor with the no-interview rule discarded.

WILL DO AS HE PLEASES

The President replied that there was a custom and that they would continue that custom and that he would do as he pleased in regard to interviews.

Asked if this somewhat contradictory statement were his answer, he said it was. He added impatiently that he would like to answer some questions that had a bearing on the present situation.

"Some of us think our business is very important, sir," a reporter said.

The President replied that sometimes he was not so sure.

A really ominous pause ensued. Some reporters weighed giving the signal for the end of a press interview—"Thank you, Mr. President." How many then would have walked out is a question. Probably the President would have retaliated by ending the press conferences for good.

But other questioning began, none of it very fruitful.

The President remains the President. He has lost personal ground, however, that he cannot regain.

PREVIOUS EXCLUSIVE RECALLED

Many people are convinced he means to run again. The operations of his temperament are such that incidents like these will make him want to do just that. It is probable, for example, that he really didn't intend to put the rest of the press in the hole, exactly as he told his political visitors, but that when he got pounded he could not refrain from telling them where to go. That is Mr. Truman.

Mr. Krock also got an exclusive interview with President Roosevelt on the Supreme Court packing plan. Mr. Roosevelt always claimed he was betrayed by Mr. Krock; nobody who knew him well took that seriously. Mr. Roosevelt thought a New York Times interview would help him, so he connived at it but bruited his alibi about.

Mr. Truman has no such guile in his makeup. He probably did not realize that such a storm would ensue or that his pals would turn on him. And Mr. Krock is a very plausible reporter. If this is the situation, Mr. Ross is the one to blame.

It is probably good for the Washington reporters to have "put not your trust in princes" driven home to them again. In this city reporters have social standing, they are sought after and catered to. Many Democrats now in power are singularly beguiling people. But reporters need to write on their hearts Lord Acton's dictum, "Power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

Use of Rural Electrification Funds

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Texarkana Gazette for January 26, 1950:

TACKETT ON GUARD

Congressmen these days must be eternally alert to prevent an ever-expanding bureaucracy from usurping the powers of Congress and pushing forward projects which not only have not been approved by the Congress but have been disapproved by that body.

A case in point is the program dreamed up by the Southwestern Power Administration to use rural electrification funds to build a $4,825,000 steam-generating plant and $4,740,000 to build transmission lines.

Congressman BOYD TACKETT of the Fourth Arkansas Congressional District caught on to the scheme in short order and is doing everything in his power to block it.

TACKETT charged that the arrangement was a scheme to gobble up electric coooperatives and eventually to federalize electric power. In doing so, he said, the SPA has, in effect, gone deliberately contrary to a refusal by Congress to give it such funds.

Congressman TACKETT deserves the commendation of his constituents for bringing this matter to the attention of the Nation. He has introduced a bill which would effectively curb such schemes.

Jeffersonianism Is South's Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, being a friend of Mr. Charles Coburn, distinguished actor and movie star, I take pleasure in asking that his article, Jeffersonianism Is South's Need, and also the editorial on this subject by the Savannah Morning News, be inserted in the RECORD. Mr. Coburn, in addition to being a great actor, is also a realist and is deeply concerned about the welfare of his country.

The matter referred to is as follows:

JEFFERSONIANISM IS SOUTH'S NEED

(By Charles Coburn)

We often hear the expression, "I am a Jeffersonian Democrat." Why not say, "I am a Jeffersonian Republican." The original name of Jefferson's Party was the Republican Party. And, according to the Encyclopedia Britannica, "the day of its birth has been definitely fixed as May 13, 1792, that being the date of a letter from Jefferson to Washington in which is made the first authoritative claim of a name for the party of which Jefferson had become the recognized head. Actually, the seeds were sown in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 when the first battles were fought between those who wanted a strong centralized Federal Government, and those who wanted the least possible Federal Government consistent with national security. In the debates of that convention can be located the democratic germ plasm, the ultimate growth of which, under Jefferson's genius, was the establishment of a party whose theory aimed at direct popular control over the Government; which championed the rights of the masses and was really democratic in theory and in fact; which was based on the fundamental belief that the people are capable of governing themselves * * * equal rights for all, special privilege for none, and stood mili-

tantly for religious liberty, free speech, and a free press."

Later Jefferson's party became known as the Republican-Democrats, and it wasn't until after Andrew Jackson's election in 1827 that the party name really changed from Republican to Democratic.

Therefore, it would seem to me that an intelligent political point of view would be one that is influenced only by the principles of a party, regardless of its name.

Thus we find that Jefferson's Republican principles grew out of the anti-Fascist principles, and the principles of the original Democratic Party grew out of the Jeffersonian Republican Party. So, while the principles remained the same, the name of the party changed three times. Those principles were strongly for States' rights, and for a government to serve the people and to protect them in the pursuit of happiness which included the principles of free enterprise, free speech, free press, and freedom of religion.

The Republican Party of today embraces all of the foregoing political principles of Jefferson. Now let us look at the picture from the other side. The present Democratic Party, after the election of Franklin D. Roosevelt, and now, of Harry S. Truman, has completely abandoned the democratic principles of Jefferson, through the centralization of governmental power in Washington—by gradually robbing the individual States of local self-government; by impoverishing the individual citizen through abusive use of the power to tax; by a fantastic increase in the number of Government employees; by unnecessarily spending more and more money for the purpose of drawing more and more votes to its political banner; by shackling our system of free enterprise; and strongly advocating the principles of socialism under the alluring titles of "welfare state," "planned economy," "socialized medicine," and "security for all."

If this Government continues at its present rate of taxation and spending, in a very short while the United States will be in a worse position economically than is England today, for in a helpless world we will have no one to help us, and that is exactly what Stalin wants.

If you believe in the political principles of Thomas Jefferson, but because of a prejudice against the name "Republican" you vote to keep the present Democratic administration in power, then you are subscribing to principles contrary to Jefferson's; you are a traitor to your own political belief; and you are as guilty of establishing a dictatorship as if you believed in a dictatorship.

A SOUTHERNER SPEAKS OUT

In his article on this page today entitled "Jeffersonianism Is the South's Need," Charles Coburn, the distinguished actor, advances some thoughts regarding the Republican Party as differentiated from the New Deal Party which the Morning News believes it would be well for all voters in this region to consider seriously and carefully.

Mr. Coburn, an internationally known figure in the movie and stage world, is a native of Macon, Ga., and spent his boyhood and youth in Savannah. Starting as an usher in the old Savannah Theater he has risen to fame in the amusement world and is considered one of America's outstanding actors. Throughout his career he has been an ardent supporter of the finest traditions of the Old and the New South. He has adhered to the customs and manners of this region and has been a loyal adherent of the principles for which the hosts of Lee and Jackson fought during the fateful days of 1861 and 1865.

He has been one who views the political scene in the South realistically. He believes in the two-party system as being the only means by which the States of this region can ever hope to establish their rightful place in the national political sun. He is a conservative who recognizes the solemn truth that the Government cannot continue its wild orgy of spending beyond its income without running into disaster.

His article on this page today sketches the evolution of the Democratic Party as Mr. Jefferson conceived it, first as the Republican-Democratic Party and then as the Democratic Party. Mr. Coburn emphasizes the historical truth that Mr. Jefferson's Republican principles grew out of the anti-Federalist principles and that the principles of the original Democratic Party grew out of the Jeffersonian-Republican Party. "Those principles," he points out, "were strongly for States' rights and for a government to serve the people and to protect them in the pursuit of happiness which included the principles of free enterprise, free speech, free press, and freedom of religion."

The Morning News believes it is important for our leaders to consider what this distinguished son of the South has to say, because we believe he puts a finger on the real truth as to what southerners should do in the future if they wish to vote intelligently in national elections. Our men and women for too many years have been disposed to follow blindly the idea that because their fathers and grandfathers supported the so-called Democratic Party they should support what today is the New Deal party.

The Roosevelt New Deal and the Truman Fair Deal, as Mr. Coburn convincingly points out, have completely abandoned the democratic principles of Jefferson through the centralization of governmental power in Washington. To which he adds that these two regimes have robbed the individual States of local government, brought about a fantastic increase of the Government employees, abused the power to tax, and challenged our system of free enterprise.

Mr. Coburn thus bespeaks the argument that The Morning News, for many months, has advanced that southerners should cease their ill-advised loyalty to the New Deal and Fair Deal and return to the kind of republicanism and democracy for which Thomas Jefferson stood. The challenge is obvious. It is summed up in Mr. Coburn's stern view that if this Government continues its present rate of taxation and spending, in a very short while the United States will be in a worse position economically than is England today. For, in a helpless world we will have no one to help us, and that is exactly what Stalin wants.

The actor's arguments, in the opinion of this newspaper, are sound and convincing and, therefore, are among the most challenging we have seen for a long time. It should be remembered that they come, not from a citizen of the North who knows nothing about the traditions, customs, and manners of the South, but from a man who was born and bred here, one who loves the South and all it has stood for in the past, one who is as anxious as any southerner alive to see this section become an important political segment of these United States of America.

Taxpayers Carry Bogus GI Schools

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from New Orleans States of February 15, 1950:

TAXPAYERS CARRY BOGUS GI SCHOOLS

Probably hundreds of thousands of GI's, possibly several millions of them, dipped into the education and job-training program without any appreciable benefit to themselves outside of the money collected, but with tremendous cost to taxpayers. Abuses of the Bill of Rights benefits have been enormous because Congress in drafting the legislation left the doors wide open for slick promoters to organize weird schemes having the color of legality but little else.

The large-scale hatching of gyp schools to milk the Government and bilk the vets was described in a series of articles printed in this newspaper several weeks ago. They were written by Benjamin Fine, education editor of the New York Times. The majority of the schools was asserted to have been organized to reap the fat fees Uncle Sam paid, in good faith, to school and train his fighting men. Irregularities and inadequacies in 1,237 of these institutions were reported to the Veterans' Administration.

President Truman now presents a catalog of abuses to Congress and asks remedial action. The vocational and trade schools having real merit and offering sound instruction and training are not to be confused with the gyps that are clearly substandard and offer merely makeshift training. The VA admits that enough poor-quality training is in evidence to warrant serious concern.

The annual cost of GI education and job training is still running about $2,500,000,000 nearly 5 years after the end of the war. Huge gobs of this money are wasted. Representative TABER says a billion could be lapped off the annual outlay without harm to a sound GI program. Here is a compelling invitation for Congress to get economy-minded.

Farm-Support Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NORRIS POULSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I am asking permission to insert in the RECORD a letter which I consider to be a fine analysis of the farm problem, especially as it looks to us who are from the city. Mr. Blank, as you will note in the letter, has had considerable experience along this line. I certainly concur in his sentiments.

The letter follows:

MARTIN H. BLANK & ASSOCIATES,
Los Angeles, Calif., February 2, 1950.

Congressman NORRIS POULSON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN POULSON: My purpose in writing to you is to convey my thoughts in regard to farm-support programs, not only as a taxpayer and consumer but as an experienced agricultural economist. I am not only experienced in paying taxes for farm-support programs, paying food bills for six members of our household, but I have made a successful living from services rendered to clients in the marketing of agricultural products over the past 17 years. Many years ago, I worked in Washington as a junior economic expert for the Federal Farm Board. Therefore, I feel properly qualified to discuss the matter of legislation covering farm-support programs.

I have no quarrel with the basic concept of Government supports and assistance to our farmers and to our agricultural industries. I realize that in a great democracy, such as our own, a free play of economic forces can prove disastrous to our farmers and undermine the basic stability of our country. I further recognize we were obligated to our farmers to assist them in adjusting from peak war-production levels. However, we have already given this assistance and discharged this obligation. What is disturbing to me is the fact that our farm-support legislation is rapidly veering away from the original point of justification and of economic soundness. Too often, it appears, support levels for various agricultural commodities are established in response to the pressure of groups only interested in getting a larger share of the Government's purse.

In considering the basis for aiding agriculture, we seem to have lost sight of the fact that farming is a mode of living, as well as a means of livelihood. The life of a farmer has always had certain advantages to offset its disadvantages, compared to working and living in a city. We have now reached a point where we consider farming purely on a dollars-and-cents basis, in comparison with the income received from industrial enterprises.

Agricultural production has always responded to prices, except when hindered by such uncontrollable factors as the weather. It is difficult to accept as necessary the high support level of prices being established for agricultural products, in view of the output of agricultural commodities during the last few years. On the basis of Government support prices, much new agricultural land has been developed, and production has been increased for only one reason—the operations have been highly profitable on the basis of the returns received with the aid of Government supports.

As a taxpayer, I do not believe it is my obligation to help keep millions of individual farmers in a highly profitable position. I do believe it is my obligation to help prevent disastrous conditions from arising among our farmers. I am now convinced the farm-support legislation, generally, has been carried to a point where my Government is obligating me to provide a level of profits for one group of our population, beyond anything warranted by sound democratic procedure.

I have often wondered how long taxpayers can be expected to support the production of cotton in amounts so far in excess of the quantity which can be marketed domestically and in foreign countries on any reasonable price basis. Is it sound, in a democracy, to take the position that, because some citizens choose to continually produce a certain commodity, or engage in a certain enterprise beyond the needs of the country, the taxpayers should be obligated to provide enough income to absorb the production from such citizens? I can only come to the conclusion that any programs that thrust such an obligation upon the taxpayer will eventually bring dissension and ruin to our country.

I have mentioned cotton, specifically, in my previous remarks. However, my conclusions apply to any of our agricultural industries which are continuously producing commodities far in excess of the quantities that can be marketed soundly in domestic and foreign channels. An examination of the statistical data on stocks, production, consumption, and export requirements of a large number of our agricultural products will quickly show that Government-support programs have been a stimulus to the building up of surpluses far in excess of normal reserve requirement.

In conclusion, I urge you to keep the following factors in mind in your deliberations on farm-support legislation:

1. The use of public funds to assist any group of citizens should be limited to amounts necessary to maintain stability.

2. In judging necessary support levels, consideration should be given to recent records of production in relation to farmers' returns.

3. Support programs which result in the necessity of the Government constantly making hand-outs to agriculture because of excessive production cannot be justified.

4. Support programs increase the consumer's cost of living both in direct taxes and in the higher levels paid for food commodities.

5. Unduly high-support prices will, eventually harm all agriculture by creating disastrous surpluses and maintaining marginal production, while, at the same time, curtailing consumption.

Thank you for any consideration you may choose to give to the opinions and remarks expressed above.

Very truly yours,

MARTIN H. BLANK.

Volunteer Fire Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced two bills for the relief of the volunteer fire companies throughout the United States.

H. R. 6954 would exempt all fire fighting equipment purchased by volunteer fire companies from the 5-percent excise tax. The other bill, H. R. 6955, provides that contributions and gifts to volunteer fire companies shall be deductible for income-tax purposes.

Everyone knows that these splendid groups of men are organized in the communities where they cannot afford a paid fire-fighting force. They are ready day or night, in fair weather or foul, to speed to the homes of their neighbors to fight fires. They are dependent upon contributions for the barest necessities in the way of fire-fighting equipment. They are the unsung heroes of thousands of rural counties throughout the United States today. It seems to me little enough for us to exempt from excise tax equipment they have such a difficult time buying, and I believe that if the average citizen could deduct from his or her income tax any contributions made to volunteer fire companies, these men would not have such a difficult time getting the equipment they need, and our volunteer companies would be able to purchase more adequate equipment.

I should like to say that I am very proud of the volunteer fire companies in my district. They own the most modern type of fire-fighting equipment and the personnel is composed of the most outstanding citizens in the community in which they are located. I know of no group who are more worthy of our help, a group of men who are willing to serve any time, and some even give their lives, to protect the property of their neighbors. Some of these companies even furnish free ambulance service in the communities in which they serve. I bespeak the approval of the Ways and Means Committee on H. R. 6954 and H. R. 6955 and will appreciate the support of the House membership when these bills are presented to the House for a vote, which I hope may be in the near future.

Waltham Watch Co.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I include an editorial appearing in the Boston Post of February 4, 1950, and one appearing in the Boston Traveler of the same date relating to the action of the RFC in failing to take action to assure the continuance of the Waltham Watch Co., of Waltham, Mass.

Of the $6,000,000 heretofore advanced to this company by the RFC, $2,000,000 was set aside or "frozen" to buy new machinery and equipment over a period of from 3 to 4 years. At the most, $500,000, and probably considerably less could be used this year to purchase new machinery and equipment. The final proposition made to the members of the RFC board was that $1,500,000 of this $2,000,000 be released so that it could be used as new working capital. If adopted, this would not have increased the original overall commitment of the RFC.

This suggestion was made at a time when the reorganized company was in the best shape possible to operate with fine prospects of success.

I think it most unfortunate that the members of the RFC board rejected this proposition.

We must bear in mind that we only have in the United States three American watch companies, of which Waltham Watch is one.

We must bear also in mind that in case of emergency or war—particularly as shown by World War II—that an American watch industry is a very important part of our national defense.

It is my opinion every effort should be made to keep this company a going concern. It is vitally important for many reasons, and in particular from the angle of national defense.

I hope the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will reconsider its previous action and take steps to extend reasonable and justifiable loan assistance to this company.

It seems to me that the RFC has the responsibility, if necessary, to negotiate with any interested person or persons to keep this company and its plant in existence as a part of the already small but very important American watch industry, to keep it in operation by American interests for the benefit of our country in case of another emergency.

If the present law relating to the powers of the RFC does not permit national defense to be considered as a factor in the making of a loan, it is my opinion that the RFC should either propose such legislation or cooperate in its enactment.

Our colleague the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DONOHUE] has introduced such a bill. It could be the basis of consideration by the RFC and the Committee on Banking and Currency.

In any event, if the important plant of this company—as well as its employees—is to be preserved, action of an effective nature must be taken immediately.

The officials of the RFC have the burden of preserving this company in the interest of our national defense. Every effort should be made by them to ascertain from the Department of Defense and from the Munitions Board the value of this company as a part of our national defense, the Munitions Board having already recognized its importance, and between them some kind of proper action should be taken to assure the continuance of this company. If this is done the future prospects of this company will be good. It can, with the use of sound judgment on the part of our officials, and with good management, be made a proper risk for the loan already made by the RFC, and for the release of the $1,500,000 of the $2,000,000 of the original loan that was frozen for the purchase of new machinery and equipment.

The matter referred to follows:

[From the Boston Post of February 4, 1950]

THE WATCH COMPANY CLOSING

The news that the Waltham Watch Co. closed its doors yesterday afternoon, perhaps for all time, comes as a numbing shock, not only to the city in which it is located, but to all New England. Certainly it is the worst industrial set-back this section has had to take in a decade or more, not only in the number of employees that must lose jobs—well over the 1,000 mark—but in the prestige of a plant that had become world famed for its product.

The very suddenness of the closing cannot help but leave the impression that a bad blunder has been committed in allowing this fine 100-year-old concern to go by the boards so casually. There had been no inkling of the action, except for a stray rumor or two within the plant, yet yesterday workers were told not to return, the management moved to put the company into bankruptcy, and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation took over physical possession, to dispose of the assets as it sees fit.

Not a great amount of money was involved, as Government loans go. The refusal of the RFC to allow $1,500,000 of the last $2,000,000 of a loan already approved to be used by the company as working capital was the final straw that precipitated the shut-down. This money, in the original $6,000,000 loan, had been earmarked for new machinery. It seems hard to believe that the company, regarded as meriting a loan of $6,000,000 a few months ago, had its outlook so drastically altered since then that it now must be cut off needing only a quarter of that sum.

For the fact remains that the company had been doing well of late. Its new 1950 line of watches had been nicely received by the trade. Orders had been coming in at a good pace and the short-handed personnel had found it hard keeping up with the work at hand. In view of these facts, this is a tragic time indeed to have the roof fall in on such a promising start.

Aside from the cold profit-and-loss angle, it is a crime to deny a helping hand at this critical period to one of the last firms in the Nation employing precision workers so badly needed in our defense set-up. Why, you can't set off an A-bomb or an H-bomb unless you have precision workers to make fuses, as one of the former trustees of the company has so aptly pointed out. It doesn't make sense to give the boot to some of the most experienced and best precision men in the country at just the moment we are embarking on our great H-bomb project.

These workers showed their value during the war, when their services were badly needed. Now they find themselves out of jobs because the Government allows Swiss imports to flood our watch market and harms loyal citizens who have proved their worth and patriotism. This dosn't look much like gratitude.

We appreciate the fact that our representatives in Congress and influential State officials did all they could to prevent this closing. Their efforts were in vain, yet they must not give up now, as long as there is a possibility that the RFC may reconsider its decision. When we look at all the millions it has thrown away needlessly, on loans that have no vital bearing on our defense, as the precision trade has, we find it hard to believe that it will continue its adamant attitude when presented the full facts in the right light.

[From the Boston Traveler of February 4, 1950]

THE WALTHAM DEBACLE

From beginning to end, the sorry story of the Waltham failure should serve as a glaring object lesson on how not to manage something.

Waltham Watch had a proud old tradition. But through the years it did not modernize, nor did it maintain the quality of its product. The inevitable result was that Waltham lost its markets. When that happens only two courses are—or should be—possible. One is to fold up; the other is to reorganize thoroughly both as to management and machinery.

Unfortunately a third, faltering middle course was followed in Waltham Watch. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation was called in last fall and put up a loan which hauled Waltham off the rocks but didn't provide enough to really float it. The money was used to pay old debts and set the ship in order, but there wasn't enough to put in a new engine and speed it up. Without a real engineering overhaul, Waltham just couldn't get back in the race. So although we really can't blame the RFC this time for not putting the money up, we can blame it for doing a half job last fall.

And we have no patience whatever for the brutal abruptness with which notice of this second failure was sprung upon the world. Almost overnight the 1,200 workers were given terminal notice. In this day and age that seems a shockingly callous procedure. Why, for instance, couldn't the RFC have bestirred itself to see whether another business group would take over the factory space, or whether some other product could have been made profitably, using part of the equipment available? If Waltham failure was inevitable, wouldn't it have been possible nonetheless to carry on for another 30 or 60 days until terminal notices could have been accompanied by news of a new project?

There are two other suggestions which seem to us worth considering. Should not liquidating companies when financially able to do so be required to pay a high terminal wage to enable employees to look around without being immediately forced on relief? Secondly, why shouldn't State and Federal employment agencies expand training facilities so that workers who suddenly found themselves stranded might have a means of adapting themselves to a new trade? Both of those proposals would cushion the rank-and-filer against a disaster which was certainly none of his making.

We are profoundly sorry for all concerned with the Waltham fiasco. We only hope that something can be done to salvage the working force before serious economic depression assails the city of Waltham.

Fred Othman's Column

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CHARLES E. POTTER

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. POTTER. Mr. Speaker, last week Mr. Fred Othman, who in my mind is one of the most clever columnists in Washington, clearly demonstrated in his column titled "Don't Jump Yet, James!" how Government agencies can work at cross purposes with John Q. Public squeezed in the middle.

Mr. Othman's article of February 16, which appeared in the Washington Daily News, is quoted below:

DON'T JUMP YET, JAMES!

(By Fred Othman)

The man with 1950's toughest problem so far seems to be James B. Bender, the Somerset, Pa., shoe manufacturer, whose Government insists that he raise his own salary—and which says also that if he does he's going to be in serious trouble.

This sorry tale comes from Bender himself. His facts I have checked with appropriate governmental sources, which agree, red-eared, that he is in trouble. Pending passage of still another law by Congress to get him out of the soup, they agree (off the record, of course) that his best bet simply is to drown himself.

In the hope that he does not find such a drastic solution necessary and that maybe somewhere there is a Federal lawyer who can find him a way out alive, I'm reporting his predicament here in full.

Bender, his father, brother, four uncles and 57 stockholders organized the Bender Shoe Co., in July 1948, to manufacture good, solid shoes for small boys. The elder Bender became president and treasurer; his son, James, became secretary and superintendent.

They decided that until such time as the corporation got into the black they, as the only salaried officers, would pay themselves $60 a week apiece. But they needed more working capital.

So they applied to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for a $40,000 5-year loan. This was granted. It tied up the company's funds, the personal assets of father and son, and froze their salaries until either the firm shows a profit or pays off the entire loan.

This, young Bender reported regretfully, is unlikely to be soon. But everybody was happy making shoes. Until day before yesterday, that is.

At 10 o'clock that fateful morning a brisk young man dropped into the Bender Shoe Co., identified himself as a representative of the Labor Department and wanted to look over the pay roll to see whether it adhered to the wages and hours bill. He noticed that the superintendent earned only $60 a week.

"You've got to pay him $75," he said.

"He's me," replied young Bender, sounding a little flustered.

"Well, he's responsible for purchasing and * * *."

"Me," interrupted Bender.

"And that makes him an administrative employee," the man said.

Bender learned that as a company officer he was required to pay all administrative employees; namely, himself, a minimum of $75 a week. Ah, well, if he had to, he had to.

"Oh, no, you don't," said the RFC. "You raise your own salary and you violate the loan agreement; under the law we will be forced to foreclose."

"Hm-m-m-m," Bender said to himself. He drew up a list of questions which he wanted answered: "(1) Are the consequences of defying the RFC more serious than disregarding orders from the Labor Department? (2) How do I go about suing myself for back wages? (3) What is the proper method of running a factory without making purchases? (4) Are the marines giving out billets to Reserve officers for immediate active duty in Pago Pago?"

There you are, lawgivers. You answer Shoemaker Bender. And kindly don't tell him to go jump.

Lincoln Was a Republican

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I delivered at a Lincoln Day banquet on February 13, 1950, at Defiance, Ohio:

Mr. Chairman, I have had the good fortune of passing through your beautiful city several times, and I also have enjoyed the privilege of knowing a number of the residents of your county, and I feel proud of the opportunity to meet with you today.

When your Congressman, Mr. CLEVENGER, invited me to come to visit with you, I felt that I could not refuse to come because he has, ever since his coming to Washington been one of the stalwart Republican Members in the Ohio delegation and has never failed to cooperate with me and others in any program that we had for the advancement of our party and of the country generally.

In my somewhat extended service in Congress, I have had occasion to observe the work of many Congressmen. I have often thought that the best Congressman for his district and for the country is not the one who talks the most or the loudest. I think that the best characteristic of a good Congressman is that he should be a man of good judgment. A man may be ever so brilliant and highly educated but if he is flighty and uncertain in his judgments he would not be well qualified to consider the very difficult and important matters which confront the Congress nearly every day.

To be successful, a Congressman must be a man of good character. He must be able to say "yes," and "no," and to stand by his decisions. A man of unstable character will soon be discovered and his colleagues will treat him accordingly. And again a man to be a good Congressman must be industrious. If he is not industrious he will never get his work done. The work of a Congressman is oftentimes very exacting and demands upon him are great. Of course, if he is a man of poor judgment and poor character, people will not depend upon him and consequently will not communicate with him very frequently. But, on the other hand if he has the qualifications of a good Congressman the people of his district will have confidence in him and will communicate with him frequently with the result that his mail will be heavy and his tasks will be numerous.

And again a Congressman should represent the interests of his district. Sometimes we hear it said that a Congressman looks after his own district and does not have the interest of the country at heart. Under our theory of Government a Congressman is expected to represent the interests of his district. If he comes from a cotton district he should look after the best interests of the cotton industry. If he comes from a big city district he should look after the interests of his constituents. If he should come from an agricultural district, such as your district, he should know the problems of agriculture and the problems of rural life and should stand up for the interests of rural people.

When Mr. CLEVENGER first went to Congress I was the Ohio Representative of the Committee on Committees which had to do with the placing of the Members on the various committees. It was not long until Mr. CLEVENGER was placed on the Agriculture Committee which is one of the top committees of Congress. Agriculture is the biggest industry in the country. More people are employed in tilling the soil and making their living from the soil than are employed in any other industry. Mr. CLEVENGER conducted his work on the Agriculture Committee in such a way as to make him a recognized leader on questions of agriculture. The Agriculture Committee is the food committee of Congress. Frequently alert members of this committee have done much for the relief of the people by demanding strict adherence to the law. This was demonstrated conspicuously by Mr. CLEVENGER and Mr. ANDERSEN when they forced the removal of sugar rationing with the result that the people immediately got sufficient sugar.

A Congressman cannot be well posted on all subjects. He learns the subjects that have been assigned to him and then he seeks the opinion of other Congressmen who are recognized authorities on different subjects. Mr. CLEVENGER'S work on the Agriculture Committee convinced the leaders in Congress that he was a man who could be depended upon and he was promoted to a place on the Committee on Appropriations. His Scotch blood had manifested itself early in that he always voted against extravagance and it was thought that he would be a safe man to look after the spending of the finances of the Government. He has been a member of the Committee on Appropriations now for several years and his work has been very satisfactory. For the last 17 years I have been a member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives.

As you know this committee has the responsibility of raising the money to meet the expenses of government. This is not an easy task especially in these days of extravagance. Before Mr. Roosevelt came into power we were spending only about $6,000,000,000 a year to run the Government. Under the management of Roosevelt and Truman, $6,000,000,000 will not pay the interest on the national debt for a year. I hope to have more to say about this matter later.

All over the land these days, we Republicans are celebrating Lincoln's birthday. We have a perfect right to do this because he and Washington are generally considered the two greatest Americans of all time. And again we Republicans are entitled to carry on these celebrations because Abraham Lincoln in 1856 laid the foundations of the Republican Party. When the Whig Party went out of existence, Lincoln and those who believed as he did established a new party. This party was truly and surely established for the preservation of liberty and freedom both personally and nationally. In those days the motto was "liberty and union now and forever, one and inseparable." Thousands of Lincoln Day banquets are being carried on all over the United States. This great movement for this year was started in Washington last Monday. By way of encouragement I want to say to you that I have seen and participated in many political rallies, but the rally in Washington last Monday night was the most enthusiastic and most promising that I have ever seen. It was really beyond description. From the standpoint of crowds we had secured the largest auditorium in Washington which seats about 12,000 people. Every seat was taken and that part of the auditorium given over to parades was filled by three or four thousand people who sat on the floor and three or four thousand people were turned away. That audience was made up altogether of grown people and there was no foolishness about it in any way. Those who took part in the program were outstanding men and women including Senators, Congressmen, governors, and the highest officials in the Republican ranks.

Every shade of Republicanism was given recognition. Every section of the country was recognized; all races and creeds were recognized and the meeting was a gigantic success in every respect. It was spontaneous, and no pressuring or duress was applied by anyone to get a crowd.

Washington has long been known as a very poor place to have enthusiastic political meetings because it is the seat of the Government and political strife naturally is more tense here than anywhere else, but in spite of this, the Republicans put on the most successful rally that was ever put on in Washington and they did this for only $1 a ticket. I think this will shame those who have been putting on the $100 dinners. It is a well-known fact that many persons who attend these $100 banquets consider that that is the price they are paying for the Government job which they hold, or for their opportunity to claim that they are on friendly terms with the White House and with those who have favors to dispense.

H. G. Wells, one of the world's greatest historians, on one occasion named the six men whom he thought were the world's greatest. He named Jesus as the greatest, and in this list he included the name of Lincoln. His reason for choosing Lincoln was that he thought Lincoln typified the great movement for liberty, freedom, and justice which the Pilgrim fathers and their followers had established on this North American Continent. He considered that America was the symbol of human liberty and that Lincoln was its greatest expositor.

It was Lincoln who said in his Gettysburg Address that we were then engaged in a great conflict which would determine whether our Nation should continue or should perish from the earth. In other words Lincoln saved America. All over the world where people strive for human freedom they revere and respect the name of Lincoln. I once heard a great world traveler say that he had visited the homes of humble people in all parts of the world and in many, many places he had seen the picture of Lincoln, which of course indicated that human liberty was their great hope.

Lincoln was not only a great person but his writings were very extensive and are widely read in all parts of the world today. Who will ever forget his "with malice toward none; with charity for all" and his timely words that we cannot live "half slave and half free."

How applicable are his words in these days of political and economic unrest. He said, "You cannot help men permanently by doing for them what they could and should do for themselves. You cannot bring about prosperity by discouraging thrift; you can-

not strengthen the weak by weakening the strong; you cannot help strong men by tearing down big men; you cannot help the wage earner by pulling down the wage payer; you cannot further the brotherhood of man by encouraging class hatred; you cannot help the poor by destroying the rich; you cannot establish sound security on borrowed money; you cannot keep out of trouble by spending more than you earn."

Lincoln was seldom in error in his conclusions. His prophecies generally came true. In only one instance in his writings have I found that he missed his guess. Progress in the manufacturing of destructive implements of warfare has come faster than he had been able to foresee. He was not as imaginative as his contemporary Alfred Tennyson was when he wrote—

"Heard the Heavens filled with shouting
And there rained a ghastly dew
From the Nations' airy navies,
Grappling in the central blue."

The quotation with reference to whom Lincoln missed his guess was as follows:

"At what point shall we expect the approach of danger. By what means shall we fortify against it. Shall we expect some trans-Atlantic military giant to step the ocean and crush us at a blow. Never. All the armies of Europe, Asia, and Africa combined, with all the treasure of the earth—our own excepted—in their military chest, with a Bonaparte for a commander, could not by force take a drink from the Ohio or make a track on the Blue Ridge in a trial of a thousand years."

How glad we would be if the conditions at present were what Lincoln thought they would be. Let us hope that we will be able by peace agreement to prevent a test of this prophecy made by Lincoln.

Now, my friends, no Republican speech would be complete today without some reference being made to the conditions in Washington. I am afraid that nobody can tell anybody else just what is going on except that in a general way the conditions in Washington are terribly confused.

I think it would be a fair statement to say that the chaotic conditions in Washington are the result of the maladministration of Franklin D. Roosevelt. I think that when the impartial historians write the history of America they will be forced to say that Mr. Roosevelt is directly responsible for the plight in which we find ourselves. With perfidy and deceit he sowed the seeds of distrust and destruction and we are now reaping the harvest. Woodrow Wilson refused to recognize Russia because she was a Communist state; Mr. Harding also refused. Mr. Coolidge did the same thing. Mr. Hoover also took the same position. It was Franklin D. Roosevelt, the so-called great humanitarian, who loved most all of the rest of the world apparently better than he did America, who gave recognition to the unchristian, unholy, arrogant, tyrannical, and in many instances inhuman Russia. It was he who opened the doors to the crooks, commies, and criminals of all the world to come to this country, strictly in violation of our laws and distinctly contrary to every principle of government and decency that typifies America. In order to guarantee that this class of people would have free movement in our country, he had as his right hand advisers such men as Alger Hiss and many others that I could name. In addition to flooding our country with the scum of the earth he elevated to high positions many people, both men and women, who could not pass the ordinary test of Americanism. He permitted the Government itself, especially the State Department, to be honeycombed with men whom he must have known were anti-American in their philosophies and in their sympathies. Many of these are holding high positions in the Government today. A sample of the inefficiency of the Roosevelt and Truman administrations is shown by the recent arrest of this man Fuchs whose very countenance would indicate his instability of character. It is a terrific travesty on justice to have permitted this man with such a background of communistic associations to roam at will in the factories where we were carrying on scientific research work which was supposed to be of the highest military value and to be secret from everybody.

Mr. Truman with his Pendergast training has never been courageous enough to clean out these nests of slimy spies and traitors, but on the other hand, a few months ago dismissed the whole subject with a wave of his hand and with the statement that it was all simply a "red herring." He was either very inept and ignorant for not knowing what was going on or else he purposely held back the facts which are now shocking the whole civilized world. The Hiss case and the Fuchs case have shown to the world that the United States has the poorest defense against espionage and foreign intrigue of any country in the world. A year ago we boasted proudly that we had the atom bomb and that nobdy could take it away from us. We used it as a balance of power on many occasions. At last we woke up and found that Russia, which we look upon as benighted nation of barbarians, had our secret. Only a month ago we Americans heard of the hydrogen bomb which is a thousand times more destructive than the atom bomb. Today we hear that Russia also has this secret.

I should like to give you an illustration of Mr. Roosevelt's inclinations to admit these foreigners. It developed when he was trying to have passed a bill designated as the fourth-Presidential-powers bill. This was a bill that sought to give to the President the arbitrary power to admit any persons into the United States that he wished. The bill would also give him power to move people now in the country from place to place as he might see fit. I am proud of the fact that it was largely due to my efforts that that bill was defeated in the Ways and Means Committee. In connection with it there is a long story which I will not have time to delineate at this time. Suffice it to say that the fact and the information by which I was able to defeat this terrible proposal was given to me by someone in one of the branches of the Government who did not want to openly oppose the President but whose patriotism was such that he felt it his duty to let me know what the real condition was.

Ladies and gentlemen, I think I should also talk to you briefly about some of the economic conditions in the country. As you know, Mr. Truman has in peacetimes spent more money than all of the rest of the Presidents who served in peacetimes. He ran behind last year $5,500,000,000 and he will run behind again next year at least that much. At no time since Roosevelt came into power has the Government lived within its means except during the 2 years when the Republicans had control of the Eightieth Congress. The President is still demanding an increase in taxes and is still refusing to reduce excise taxes as should be done. He knows that Mr. Roosevelt was able to elect and elect by spending and spending.

He proposes to do the same thing. The country is clamoring for a reduction of excise taxes on many commodities. These taxes were put on as war taxes and should have been taken off a long time ago. If the Republican Party had been elected to power in Congress in 1948 we would have reduced these taxes last year. Mr. Truman has recommended the reduction of a few excise taxes this year because he knows that will be a popular thing to do. He is not in favor of a general reduction because he will not have the money to spend and spend so that his party can elect and elect. How long can we continue to spend $15,000,000 a day more than we take in? How long can we continue to pay $17,000,000 a day for interest on the national debt and still continue to run the debt up at the rate of $15,000,000 a day.

Ladies and gentleman, I say with all of the emphasis at my command that the greatest need in America today is the election of a Republican President.

What is the duty of we Republicans in Ohio? It means more to be a Republican in Ohio than to be a Republican in any other State. Ohio Republicans have more responsibility than Republicans in any other State. Let me prove this to you in a very factual and convincing way. As I have already stated, the Republican Party started with Abraham Lincoln. From Abraham Lincoln down to Franklin D. Roosevelt there were only two Democrat Presidents. These were Grover Cleveland and Woodrow Wilson. During all of that time every President that was elected through the grueling contest of a national convention in that time, came from Ohio except Herbert Hoover. You may think that I am wrong but let me explain, Chester A. Arthur, Theodore Roosevelt, and Calvin Coolidge all came into the Presidency by virtue of their having been Vice Presidents. So I repeat that all of the Presidents elected from Lincoln to Roosevelt who went through the grueling vicissitudes of a national convention for his first election to the Presidency came from Ohio, except Mr. Hoover. Ohio is the mother of Presidents and from all indications old lady Ohio may give birth to another President if we can elect Senator Taft by a big majority next November.

Now my friends in summation, let me say that the country is in a bad way. Just a few days ago I heard two very prominent men discussing how long our country will last. One fixed the date at 15 years and another doubted that we would last that long. I definitely disagree with them both because I firmly believe that we will survive the storm. We must do so and the best way to do this is to strive to elect a Republican Congress in 1950 and a Republican President in 1952 and thereby clean out from the Government all the Reds and pinkos and again put the Nation on a basis of liberty and justice for all.

Prosperity by Lowering Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Robert Montgomery on excise-tax repeal:

This is about a country that has increased the prosperity of its citizens by an unusual plan that would shock most of our politicians. This country brought prosperity by lowering its taxes.

Some distant, small country? Not at all. This is our friendly, sturdy, next-door neighbor, Canada. A country very much like our own—great farm lands—mines—growing industries.

As they used to say in the Navy, Now hear this.

Since the end of the war, Canada has five times reduced its taxes. By these five reductions Canada has cut its citizen's tax bill almost in half.

While making these sweeping reductions, Canada also balanced her budget.

After the last drastic tax cuts, unemployment in Canada dropped to less than 2 percent. At a time when the jobless in our country, where there has been no tax reductions, rose to triple that percentage.

Sounds like a miracle, doesn't it? But it isn't. It's just proof of what can be done through ability and imagination.

Ability, on the part of Canadian leaders, to realize that the prosperity of a country does not lie in the money taken out of the pockets of its citizens, but in how much money is left in their pockets.

Canadian Finance Minister Douglas Abbott is one economist I can understand.

Taxes, he said, should cause as little harm and irritation as possible. Amen. He said he wanted his people, the taxpayers, to have more money to spend, so that they would be able to buy more of the goods raised by the farmers, made by the manufacturers. Makes a great amount of sense to me.

But stop a minute and recall what another leader said recently about taxes. Just the reverse as I remember it. I quote now from President Truman. He argued:

"Events of the last few years have proved that our economy can grow and prosper * * * at the same time that individuals and businesses are paying taxes high by prewar standards."

But what about our budget? It's not balanced.

What about our deficit spending—to the tune of some five billion?

Is that a prosperous economy?

Canada is putting her money back to work. She's on a mounting spiral of increased national income. Less taxes; more money to spend. More spending; more production.

The more I found out about what our good neighbor is doing the more I wondered if anybody in Washington was thinking along these lines. So I made a few phone calls. I had two particularly interesting conversations.

One was with Senator PAT MCCARRAN, Democrat, from Nevada, chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee, and a high-ranking member of the Appropriations Committee. I thought you might like to hear what he had to say so we made a recording. Here he is now. Come in, Senator MCCARRAN.

"Well, Mr. Montgomery, I am certainly for any sound program for reducing all taxes, income and excise. Since before World War II, the Federal budget has been pyramiding and the burden on the American taxpayer has been increasing to the point where this burden can no longer be borne. As more services are performed for the people, a greater share of the people's income goes for taxes and they are less able to perform these services for themselves. If the economy is to grow, it must be encouraged, and what better way than to leave the people enough money so they will be able to buy the goods they make.

"The figures you mention, Mr. Montgomery, indicate that the Canadian people have prospered as a result of the sweeping tax-reduction program."

Thank you very much, Senator.

Now, what about those excise-tax cuts we've been hearing about? Cuts already made by Canada. What's Congress going to do about them? Let's hear a word from Representative JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Republican, House minority leader, as recorded during my talk with him. Come in, Congressman MARTIN.

"Bob, I believe Canada is on the right track. The history of previous tax reductions is that every tax cut is followed by an increase in revenues. However, our immediate problem is the elimination of the wartime "discouragement" taxes—the taxes that discourage you from buying, from traveling, from telephoning, and actually take your jobs away. Those taxes were enumerated in the American Weekly articles.

"The wartime taxes should be repealed now. There is a feeling throughout the country that long overdue action to reduce these excessive rates is coming in this session of Congress. Consequently, buyers are adopting a "wait and see" attitude. We must not wait for tax revision 6 months hence."

Thank you. I hope we don't have to wait much longer. President Truman has talked of a trillion-dollar national income by the year 2000. I'll swap my share of the Truman trillions for sound, honest tax cuts tomorrow morning.

A $50,000,000,000 Bubble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, here we have further evidence that our American foreign policy is the American dollar. We are trying to buy our way all over the world and without appreciable success.

Mr. Henry Hazlitt, writing in Newsweek for February 20, 1950, calls the turn on Senator MCMAHON'S proposal of last week. He suggests that it is a wholly absurd proposition and millions of Americans agree. At this point I include a copy of Mr. Hazlitt's article:

FIFTY BILLIONS FOR TRIBUTE?

(By Henry Hazlitt)

Senator BRIEN MCMAHON'S proposal that our Government contribute $50,000,000,000 over 5 years for a global Marshall plan is the culmination, the reductio ad absurdum, of the befuddlement on foreign economic policy in which Washington has wandered for the last 5 years.

Senator MCMAHON'S proposal is, to put it baldly, a proposal to pay unparalleled tribute. No other word fits. "Tribute" is defined in the dictionary as "a stated sum * * * paid by one sovereign or state to another in acknowledgment of submission or as the price of peace, security, protection, or the like."

When we were small and considered weak, our minister Charles Pinckney, on being told by Talleyrand that a gift to the directory might avert war with France, made his famous reply: "Millions for defense, sir, but not 1 cent for tribute." Yet today Senator MCMAHON, at a time when we are by far the strongest Nation in the world, proposes that we pay up to $50,000,000,000 as the price of Stalin's promise to stop threatening us with atomic or hydrogen bombs.

This mere proposal, by the chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, is certain to be taken by the leaders behind the iron curtain as a sign of fear and weakness. The leaders of the iron-curtain countries have already found that they can with impunity plant spies in our midst, blockade us at Berlin, beat or imprison our envoys, and insult and vilify us every day. What further move may they not be encouraged to take by this timorous offer of ransom? Even Secretary Acheson's emphatic rejection cannot fully offset this blow to our prestige.

The McMahon proposal obviously lacks sense. Would we make ourselves safer by pouring billions of our dollars into Russia, by reducing our economic and military strength to increase hers, by intensifying the problems of our free-enterprise system to mitigate the problems of her Communist system? And if for 4 years Stalin has unswervingly refused to call off the atomic-bomb race, even when we were far ahead of him, and even at the risk of the annihilation of millions of Russians and of his own regime, does it make sense to suppose that he will reverse his stand now for a mere monetary bribe?

It is time we asked ourselves frankly, in fact, whether an atom-bomb agreement might not actually be more dangerous than the present known lack of agreement, by binding us and not the leaders of Russia. These are the same leaders who have broken promise after promise, who believe that the end justifies any means, who live by systematic perfidy. The proposals for international inspection of the vast depths of a totalitarian Russia are not realistic. Even if our inspectors finally did catch up with a plant in Russia that had been working on the bomb—after we had poured in our $50,000,000,000 to help finance it—what recourse then?

But the real point of this article is economic. Senator MCMAHON himself calls his proposal a "global Marshall plan," and casually drops point 4 inside it. It is a super-give-away program. It is not only politically preposterous, but it rests on the same fundamentally false economic assumptions as the Marshall plan and point 4. It wrongly assumes that the American capital thrown into such schemes is a net addition to the world's capital. It is in fact a mere diversion of such capital. And it is a diversion, in the main, from productive private enterprises into far less productive collectivist projects.

Such schemes do not encourage private lending abroad; they discourage such lending. They do not speed up recovery and development of world resources; they retard that recovery and development. For as long as foreign countries can get easy money, seized from our taxpayers, out of the United States Government, they will neither give the assurances nor make the economic reforms that they would have to make to attract private investment.

It is time we called a halt to the give-away mania.

Two From St. Louis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD BOLLING
OF MISSOURI
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, it gives me real pleasure to include under unanimous consent an editorial from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of Tuesday, February 14, 1950, which gives well-deserved recognition to two of my distinguished colleagues from Missouri:

TWO FROM ST. LOUIS

A perfect attendance record may not be the supreme test of a Representative's devotion to duty. There are times when he may be of much greater service at a congressional committee meeting than by being on the floor to answer a relatively unimportant roll call.

Still, it was something of an achievement to have been on hand each of the 121 times during the 1949 session that the House of Representatives was asked to vote "yea" or

"nay." Only 16 of the 435 Members managed to achieve this record. And two of the 16 were from St. Louis.

For this, a bow to Representative JOHN B. SULLIVAN and Representative FRANK M. KARSTEN.

Bountiful Future

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I am sure that all my colleagues agree that our Nation has a magnificent future provided we take certain actions to maintain this as a land of opportunity. Yes; one of the conditions for achieving an ever higher standard of living for our people is an equitable system of taxation which will encourage rather than penalize private enterprise and will promote the widest possible production and consumption of consumer items.

In this connection, Mr. President, there was carried in Sunday's issue of the American Weekly, the national periodical published by the Hearst newspapers and distributed throughout the Nation among many independent journals also, a very fine article by Mr. David Camelon.

This article analyzes the future of our American people, the prospects for an even more prosperous America in which the infants of today will enjoy even greater blessings some day than we do now.

The article emphasizes the importance of a sound system of taxation, a system for which I personally have fought, for example, by trying to overhaul the obsolete excise tax structure and repeal many nuisance tax burdens. I ask unanimous consent that the text of Mr. Camelon's article be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BOUNTIFUL FUTURE

(By David Camelon)

"What chance have my babies got?" The nice young mother was worried and confused.

She'd heard calamity howlers say America is through. Its natural resources are exhausted. Opportunity is dead. The courage that made America has vanished—and there is no future.

"I don't really believe it," she said. "But I want so much for my babies—and sometimes I'm scared."

You don't have to be, mother. The calamity howlers are wrong.

The future belongs to your babies—and to you. The coming century is theirs—and it can be the finest, richest century America has ever known. Our country is not exhausted—we are only beginning to realize its possibilities.

You can take the word of such outstanding men as Dr. Harold G. Moulton, president of the Brookings Institution, and one of the world's leading economists, for that.

There are some "ifs," of course. There are some things you'll have to fight against—such things as repressive taxes. But you're a good fighter. Baby's future is in your hands.

First, what is this America you brought your baby into?

It has put more money into the hands of more people than any other country in the world—and it is progressively giving more and more to those the Communists like to call the masses or the little people.

Dr. Moulton gives the facts in his latest book, Controlling Factors in Economic Development, published by the Brookings Institution.

Twenty years ago, only about 10,000,000 families—28 percent of all the families in America—had incomes in the $2,000–$5,000 range. But by 1946, half of all the families in the country—23,000,000—were in this group.

Twenty years ago, the families in the $2,000–$5,000 range got only one-third of the total individual income. But by 1946 more than half of America's income—55 percent—went to families in that group.

The picture is even more striking if you lump together all of the moderate-income groups—those families whose incomes ranged from $2,000 to $7,500 a year. In 1929, they received only $38,000,000,000—but in 1946, they shared $111,000,000,000—65 percent of America's income.

Does that look as though America were dying—as though opportunity were dead?

Every year there are fewer really poor people in our country. In 1929, Dr. Moulton's figures show, 65 percent of the families in America had incomes of less than $2,000. By 1946 only 40 percent were in that group, and the number is going down all the time.

It's folks like you, mother—folks in the great American middle class—who are getting a constantly greater chunk of our country's wealth. Meanwhile, the people in the higher brackets are getting less. Those earning more than $7,500 received 30 percent of the country's income in 1929. In 1946 they got only 20 percent.

Dr. Moulton describes what's happening in this way:

"Prior to 1929, and especially in the decade of the twenties, the distribution of income in the United States was becoming increasingly concentrated. Since 1929, the situation has been strikingly reversed."

Meanwhile, figures provided by Dr. Moulton showed that, despite the inflated dollar, wages were rising far more swiftly than prices. By 1946, hourly wage rates were seven times as high as they had been in 1900—while wholesale prices were only two and one-half times as high.

That meant that more people could buy more things. And those who talked of America being through, Dr. Moulton said, didn't see the big market that existed in the unfulfilled desires of the existing population—desires that could increasingly be attained as incomes rose.

So that part of it is all right, mother. Never before has a baby been born with such a good chance to earn a comfortable income.

But the calamity howlers say our country is running down. They used to contend, for instance, that our population was leveling off—they went so far, Dr. Moulton said, as to predict that America's population would become stationary by 1980—with births balancing deaths.

You made them look silly on that prediction, mother—you and all the other mothers of America. In the last 10 years, Dr. Moulton said, the records show an astounding and progressive increase in births.

During the depressed thirties, births ranged from 2,074,042 in 1932 to 2,286,962 in 1938. The insecurity of the depression years kept the birth rate down.

It was to be expected, Dr. Moulton continued, that the rate would increase during the war—as it did. In 1940 there were 2,400,000 births, and the wartime peak was reached in 1943, when 2,900,000 were born. There were 2,700,000 babies born in 1945.

But the amazing thing, Dr. Moulton said, is the way babies kept increasing after the war. From 1946 through 1949, births averaged 3,600,000 a year. There were 30,000,000 babies born in America from 1940 to 1950. Subtracting deaths during those years, that meant our population increased by 18,000,000.

That completely confounded the gloomy experts. The more optimistic had predicted a population of 141,000,000 by 1950. The fact is that the population reached 150,000,000 last October.

That doesn't sound like a dying country, does it?

Those youngsters—your babies and the others—will be grown up in the 1960's and the early seventies. They'll be getting jobs, marrying, establishing their own homes. They'll want automobiles, and refrigerators, and all the other things that go with homes.

They'll form a new market in the sixties and seventies—a market that will help keep America going.

What is responsible for that sharp increase in births?

You've got the answer to that, mother—you know it far better than the economists. In part it's undoubtedly your own courage, your own confidence in your country and yourself.

Girls are marrying earlier. It used to be assumed at girls' colleges, Dr. Moulton said, that only 20 percent of a graduating class would be married in the first year after leaving school.

Now, however, large numbers of girls—and young men—are married before they graduate. The figures show, too, that they want larger families. Higher incomes, and the fact that there are jobs for all, encourage them.

But whatever the reason, you mothers were smarter than the gloomy experts. Your instincts told you America was sound—and you were right.

But what good is all this—what good is higher incomes, and increasing markets, if America can't support those new babies? You've heard that America's natural resources are exhausted—that there isn't enough left to go around. You've heard that we'll have to lower our standard of living.

Mother—that just isn't true.

Dr. Moulton looked ahead for 100 years, and asked:

"So far as natural resources and productive capacity are concerned, might the United States a century hence support a population double that of the present day on a plane of living eight times as high as that now prevailing?"

The answer was "Yes."

"There can be little doubt," he wrote, "that the onward sweep of science and technology as a whole is such that in one way or another scientific advancement as applied to the processes of production could yield results of (this) magnitude."

Dr. Moulton did not predict that we would have twice the present population, with a standard of living eight times as high, in another 100 years. What he said was that we can have it—and that American resources can support it.

How so?

He found that five things go to make up the basic parts of a high standard of living: Food and nutrition, for which, in 1946, we spent $55,000,000,000; shelter and home maintenance, for which we spent $31,000,000,000; attire and personal care, $24,000,000,000; education and health, $12,500,000,000; and recreation and travel, $21,500,000,000.

First, then, could we feed 300,000,000 people—with a higher standard of living?

Yes. Dr. Moulton estimates that we would need to triple our present food supply to do it. But by bringing new land under cultivation through reclaiming swampland and irrigating deserts; by controlling soil erosion to protect existing land; and through the use of scientific discoveries to increase the crop yield, we can feed your children, and their children's children.

America need not go hungry.

Can we shelter 300,000,000 people?

Yes. Dr. Moulton estimates that we'd need eight times the amount of building materials we're now using, and he continues:

"Residential construction materials are entirely adequate. They are of many kinds, of which the most important are wood, brick and tile, cement, stone, cinders, glass, aluminum and steel. In the case of stone, brick, glass, cement and cinders raw materials are virtually unlimited."

Systematic reforestation can preserve our supply of wood. Plastics and other synthetic materials will be used increasingly. Steel and other metals, he found, will not be exhausted.

"It seems clear," he said, "that there is no danger of running short of materials."

Our needs for attire and personal care, he estimated, would be increased 20 times. But there, he found, the supply of natural—and synthetic—materials is virtually inexhaustible.

The fields of education and health, he said, make little demand on material resources. America can meet the requirements.

The largest rate of increase, he found, would be in recreation and travel; which make heavy drafts on mineral resources. You've heard, perhaps, that we're coming to the end of our iron ore—that the great Mesabi ranges in Minnesota hold only 40 years' supply of high grade ore at the rate of wartime consumption.

But Dr. Moulton showed that newly discovered Canadian ores, modern methods of using low grade ores, and the use of substitute metals for many purposes, assure adequate supplies for hundreds of years.

Coal is virtually unlimited. The sources of electric power are superabundant. And the potential supplies of natural and synthetic oils, he found are adequate. "Abundant supplies of oil and gasoline seem assured," he continued, "for many generations to come." So great is the progress in making synthetic oils, he continued, that much of our reserve of natural petroleum may be left in the ground.

Yes, mother, your babies have a future—a great one. What can you do to make sure that they achieve it?

Protection and conservation of our natural resources is necessary. You can help fight for that.

We've got to produce more—every one of us. For if you double the population, and raise the standard of living you far more than double the things people want to buy. We can't sell—or use—things we don't make. We can help achieve that.

Too high taxes can injure your babies' chances. Beyond a certain point, Dr. Moulton said, taxes "dull incentives, and may destroy the principal source of funds for new enterprises." He explained:

"To state the matter in extreme terms, there can scarcely be any question that the private enterprise system would function more vigorously with a tax system that absorbs, say 10 to 15 percent of the national income rather than under one that absorbs 25 or 30 percent."

You can fight for lower taxes.

But most of all, you can face the future with confidence—for yourself and your babies.

America is not exhausted. The future is alive and strong.

Tribute to Hon. Alexander Wiley, of Wisconsin, From the Northwest Republican

---

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I was glad to note in the January 1950 issue of the newspaper the Northwest Republican, a very fine and well-deserved tribute to our colleague, the senior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY]. This independent Republican newspaper, published monthly for Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, and Wisconsin, has presented some deeply interesting facts regarding Senator WILEY's outstanding record of service in Washington. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this tribute be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEWS LETTER

November 1950 will see many crucial battles for positions in the United States Senate. Upon the outcome of those battles will, in large part, depend the future of the American economy—of the free-enterprise system and of our constitutional Republic. When the voters go to the polls in Ohio, in Indiana, in Missouri, in Wisconsin, in Iowa, in Colorado, as well as elsewhere in our country, they will have a vital opportunity to reelect Republicans of integrity and achievement now in the Senate.

In this connection, the Northwest Republican invites the attention of all Wisconsin voters to the outstanding qualifications of their senior Senator, ALEXANDER WILEY.

Few Senators in recent American history have won for themselves so warm a niche in the hearts of their countrymen, and in particular, in the hearts of their constituents as has ALEX WILEY. Possessed of a broad background in farming, law, business, fraternal organizations, public service, he has brought to the Senate folksy, human qualities of friendship, good nature, and humility as well as the statesmanship necessary for so high a position.

WILEY'S SENIORITY IS CRUCIAL

Wisconsin voters should bear in mind that Senator WILEY stands among the third highest ranking Republicans of the entire United States Senate. He is the first Wisconsinite in history ever to serve as chairman of the influential Senate Judiciary Committee and is now its highest ranking Republican. He is second highest ranking Republican of the powerful Foreign Relations Committee which will in considerable measure help shape the future peace of the world. Senator WILEY has won these positions by virtue, in part, of his continuous, unbroken record in the Senate. Wisconsin voters note the fact that, at long last, they have in Senator WILEY a man representing Wisconsin who has the necessary seniority to do an effective job for Senators from other States who have no seniority and who rank them, in contrast to freshman low in the party councils, thus being relatively unable to help shape national policy.

PUBLICATIONS APPLAUD WILEY

Ample commendations of Senator WILEY can be found in many of the magazines and newspapers of State and Nation. The Northwest Republican is privileged at this time to devote space in listing some of the fine expressions of commendation of him. In so doing, we feel that we are helping to inform the citizens of Wisconsin of the outstanding caliber of their devoted public servant.

Read what a newspaper columnist close to the Washington scene and writing in the Alexandria (Va.) Gazette said about the Senator:

"Senator WILEY conceives more original ideas than anyone I know in Congress."

Here is what a Washington, D. C., newspaper said about him:

"He works hard. As chairman of the important Judiciary Committee, which handles a third of all Senate legislation, he personally reported out 205 bills last session, more than any other man in the House or Senate."

A Young Republican newspaper commented:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has compiled one of the most enviable records of service and achievement for State and Nation * * * an energetic campaigner—he presents the strongest possible Republican opponent (in 1950 Wisconsin race) * * * Senator WILEY deserves bipartisan support on the basis of his middle-of-the-road record of conservative, but forward-looking achievement."

That is what the Reserve Officer magazine said last year about him:

"Senator ALEXANDER WILEY has scored a long list of legislative firsts in his career in the United States Senate, including his warnings long before the advent of World War II, of the danger of an attack on Pearl Harbor, the potential danger of critical shortages of wartime materials, the dangers of overcentralization of government and industry. His pioneering suggestion for a permanent liaison group between the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the Department of State was acclaimed during the war by the Christian Science Monitor as 'The most important, constructive, and forward-looking suggestion on behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war.'"

WILEY'S FIGHT AGAINST DEMO BLACKJACK

A long list of commendations in the Wisconsin press could be added to this summary. Most recently, many Badger newspapers applauded Senator WILEY's blast against Democratic finance headquarters in Milwaukee for its "outrageous tactics in seeking to blackjack humble service employees into making financial contributions to the Democratic Party."

Wherever there has been an issue of importance to Wisconsin—to Badger white-collar workers, farmers, merchants, housewives—WILEY has been in the front lines battling for Badger interests. What could be more important to the leading dairy State of the Nation than a Senator who won this commendation from the world-famous magazine, Hoard's Dairyman:

"Although burdened with many pressing administrative responsibilities, Senator WILEY * * * has been one of the United States Senate's most vigorous defenders of the dairy farmer. His work in the Eightieth Congress last year was primarily responsible for the failure of (antidairy) legislation to pass prior to adjournment."

Since Wisconsin is half-industrial and half-agricultural, the Senator has devoted equal yeoman work to the problems of Wisconsin business, in particular to the needs of the little fellow. WILEY has been among the Senate's hardest battlers for tax relief, balancing the budget, Federal economy, and

application of business horse-sense to Government.

The Northwest Republican is proud to point out these facts to the people of Wisconsin and the Nation as its contribution to continuation in high office of a real Republican statesman and a fine human being—ALEX WILEY.

Displaced Persons Legislation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE
OF WEST VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Minority Report," from the New York Times of February 19, 1950, with respect to the displaced persons bill.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MINORITY REPORT

The impressive minority report on the Senate Judiciary Committee's displaced persons bill is very nearly a majority report. Of the committee's 13 members, 3 have signed the minority report, 2 more said they "now subscribe" to it, and another 2 stated that they favor "further liberalization" of the committee draft. With so much support from among the Judiciary Committee's own members, it should not be too hard to convince the rest of the Senate next week that the DP bill, as it emerged from committee with Senator MCCARRAN'S blessing, needs drastic overhauling.

The way to do this is indicated in the minority report, which bears the signatures of Senators KILGORE, GRAHAM and FERGUSON. They propose revising the bill generally along the lines of the measure passed by the House of Representatives last June, which is now all but unrecognizable as a result of Mr. MCCARRAN'S hacking and mangling job in committee. The exposé of Mr. MCCARRAN'S efforts to defeat the original purpose of the law by opening its provisions to the 8,000,000 German expellees, or Volksdeutsche, who, however sad their plight, are not DP's in the internationally accepted use of the word. To confuse the issue by mingling German expellees with DP's would, as the report points out, bring about hopeless complications in the administrative machinery of the entire program and leave the DP question unsolved.

The minority report rightly attacks the restrictions in present legislation requiring that 40 percent of the DP's be from Baltic countries and that 30 percent be agricultural laborers. The agricultural provision has forced the DP Commission to cut shipments down from 16,000 to less than 6,000 a month and to hold back some 10,000 otherwise eligible DP's until the 30-percent quota can be filled.

The minority statement repeats the observation made in the recent report submitted by Representative WALTER of the House Judiciary Committee that the DP Commission has performed its function "in a diligent and satisfactory manner." This comment is particularly noteworthy in view of the loose and unwarranted charges that Mr. MCCARRAN has been in the habit of flinging around whenever the word "DP" is mentioned. But by this time the Senate doubtless knows how to evaluate Mr. MCCARRAN'S rash and reckless words.

William P. Rogers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR
OF MARYLAND
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, an editorial in the Washington Post of this morning pays tribute to the manner in which the Senate investigating committee and its retiring chief counsel, William P. Rogers, have conducted the investigations which have engaged the committee's attention.

As a member of the investigating committee who feels, as does the Washington Post, that Mr. Rogers has performed his difficult duties with tact and with due care for the rights of all who appeared before the committee, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MODERN INVESTIGATOR

The investigator who knows how to bring to light all the facts about scandal, corruption, or wastefulness in Government without unfairly maligning any individual is rare enough to deserve a special type of recognition. Such a man is William P. Rogers, who has resigned as chief counsel for the Senate investigation committee. Following the tradition of the Truman committee, which it succeeded, this investigative arm of the Senate has given us a good demonstration of the restraint, judgment, and persistence that constitute the investigative art. The appointment of Francis D. Flanagan, former assistant counsel, to the head of the investigative staff is a further tribute to the quality of the work the staff has done under Mr. Rogers' direction.

The departing counsel has served the committee under both Republican and Democratic chairmen. Apparently the change in the chairmanship when the Eighty-first Congress assembled made no appreciable difference because the committee's investigations were being conducted on a level above partisanship. Conscious of the necessity of respecting the rights of citizens, the committee formally adopted rules of fair procedure to guide its activities. Witnesses were given a right to be accompanied by counsel, to defend themselves against accusations and to cross-examine other witnesses through questions submitted to the chairman. Investigations were undertaken only with unanimous approval of the subcommittee or majority approval in the full committee, and reports had to have the unanimous approval of the subcommittee.

The care exercised by Mr. Rogers to avoid smearing any citizen unfairly was well illustrated last August when he stopped a witness after he had brought Major General Vaughan's name into the deep-freeze scandal. There was not a trace of whitewash in this action, as the committee subsequently gave us the full story of the five-percenters and their friends. The chief investigator was simply taking precautions against the careless listing of names until the background facts could be carefully checked by his staff. That this method is effective against corruptionists (as well as protective in the case of innocent citizens) is indicated by the part Mr. Rogers played in exposing such scandals as those involving Maj. Gen. Bennett Meyers, Representative Andrew May and the Garsons. Probably far more important are the changes brought about in governmental machinery as a result of the committee's efforts to prevent the development of fraud and waste in the future. Mr. Rogers has helped to set standards that should long be a potent influence in investigations on the Hill.

Why Not Investigate OHE, FHA, and VA?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PAUL CUNNINGHAM
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks, I include a letter recently received from Mr. David P. Weaver, Des Moines, Iowa, relative to houses bought by 100 GI's in the Franklin Park project at Des Moines, Iowa:

DES MOINES, IOWA, *February 16, 1950.*

DEAR SIR: Please read this letter. It is an urgent appeal for justice long overdue. It is mimeographed only because of necessity and is being sent to every Member of the Congress—both the House and Senate—and to the President as well, and to many newspapers and news writers and commentators throughout the country. It is because of desperation that such action as this is being taken.

I need help from some red-blooded, honest Americans who will not hold still and let a group of veterans be sold down the river, almost a hundred veterans who have been defrauded in the purchase of their home—homes that were built under a veteran's priority and to specifications that were given to our Government in order to obtain that priority.

Over 100 homes built and sold in violation of a law of the United States in a housing program known as Franklin Park, in Des Moines, Iowa, built in 1946 and 1947.

Housing Expediter Tighe Woods knows of this scandal, and so does the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The Attorney General of the United States knows of it, as well as the Veterans' Administration—and none of them will do anything about it.

The Housing Expediter ordered an investigation made of Franklin Park and the result was that he placed a claim against the contractor in the amount of from $50,000 to $60,000, but for some mysterious reason it has been shelved. The Franklin Park Co., headed by one Samuel Rosoff, of the Rosoff Construction Co., New York, N. Y., built these homes, and it is common knowledge that for political reasons Mr. Rosoff has been able to bring about enough pressure to cause this scandal to die a natural death. Five percenter Tighe Woods, and also the members of his Chicago office, won't even talk about this matter with we victims, and we are pushed aside wherever we turn for assistance. Our last dealing with his office was in August 1949, when he sent a Mr. Evans, of the OHE Chicago office, to Des Moines, along with a couple other men from the Washington OHE office, and at that time they gathered here in a Des Moines hotel room with some of us who had filed claims with the OHE. Mr. Evans and his cohorts brought us greetings from Mr. Tighe Woods in the form of a settlement offer, one being an offer to pay us $14 for an omitted row of concrete blocks which was left out of our basement foundation by the contractor, and another offer of something like $10 for the

felt composition left off of the roof, and then they offered us another few dollars because of the contractor's failure to give us a dry basement. And the fact that our basement is substandard in height makes no difference as far as they were concerned even though the Federal priority granted to the builder called for a full 7-foot basement—and this in spite of the fact that the OHE claim against the builder asked $500 damages for that alone. That is the solution Tighe Woods offered a few of us veterans who gathered in a Des Moines hotel room with his henchmen. Not all of these veteran home buyers were invited to that meeting—just those whom he thought were the hell raisers asking justice.

How did they arrive at the ridiculous figure of $14 for an omitted course of concrete blocks? They told us that the FHA gave them that figure. The total settlement offered us was around $40, and naturally we turned it down and because of it we are being persecuted. All of this happened after the OHE had placed a claim against the contractor for something like $60,000 for his omissions and deficiencies in our home at the time of construction. Certainly we won't sign a release for $40, who would?

We paid almost $10,000 for our homes but with the "shenanegan" pulled on us regarding trees, curb, and gutter, to be paid for by us over and above the purchase price, these homes are costing us nearly $11,000, and get this, gentlemen, the priority granted for the building of these homes placed a maximum selling price on them at $10,000 including curb, gutter, and paving. With the interest piled on top of all of this, and over a 20-year period, we will be paying nearly $16,000 for these homes.

One hundred families here in Franklin Park have been treated miserably by the representatives of several Government agencies involved in this deal, all of them covering up for the contractor because of his political connections. The Iowa Federal Housing Administration flagrantly double-crossed these veterans with the false report they turned into Franklin Richards, Commissioner of FHA in Washington (ask me for the proof, I have it), and the office of the Iowa Chief of the Loan Guaranty Division of the Veterans' Administration here in Des Moines is no less a violator and party to this fraud.

Where is the justice of the Department of Justice; they know of this mess? Where is the integrity of the office of Tighe Woods and his expediters, and why hasn't he turned this case over to the Justice Department for prosecution? Why don't the sleuths of the Federal Bureau of Investigation give their report if they have one—the Omaha office does. How can Tighe Woods and his gang place a claim against the contractor for almost $60,000 and then decide these veterans in Franklin Park don't even have a case, if that's what it is?

Our local newspapers, the Des Moines Register and Tribune, have printed many thousand words of this case in many stories over many months' time, and the record is clear that somewhere along the line these veterans have been washed out of the picture because of a mere handful of shameful politicians.

We carried the flag when you needed us, and it looks as though you may need us again in this troubled world, but how are we going to cope that with the vicious and flagrant violation that is allowed to exist in the buying of our $10,000 dream house purchased when we came back from the wars? How can false reports be turned in by Government agencies to conceal this swindle, and why did the office of the chief of the loan guaranty division of the VA here in Des Moines minimize the fact that there is forged paper in this case when he was told about it? They won't give us these answers, nor will they tell us what happened to the progress of this case which has now covered 2 years. I believe, gentlemen, that they will talk with you about the matter if you ask them.

Iowa's Lilienthal investigator, Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER, knows all about this Franklin Park case but apparently his hands are tied also, at least that is what he has led his constituents to believe. Even the American Legion and the AMVETS ran for shelter because of the pressure they ran into, and their promise of assistance melted away with the heat of their burning inability to right this vast wrong. Only the Veterans of Foreign Wars stood their ground and they to this day are being fought off by 5-percenter Tighe Woods whom you all have heard gloat over the success he has had in getting refunds for cheated and defrauded veterans.

You men in Washington, and elsewhere, can come to our aid, and my earnest plea is that you do so. Let's have a little investigation at the OHE, FHA, and VA, and find out who shelved this Franklin Park fraud and why.

For 2 years now we have tried in vain to get justice, and for 2 years men in high places in Government have kept the facts buried. May I ask that some of you true Americans come to the front for us?

Sincerely yours,

DAVID P. WEAVER.

Brazen Illegality Seen in Interior-REA Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by Ray Tucker, from the Shreveport (La.) Times of February 18, 1950:

BRAZEN ILLEGALITY SEEN IN INTERIOR-REA PLAN

(By Ray Tucker)

WASHINGTON, February 16.—Resorting to strategy that has been assailed as a brazen defiance of the law and expressed will of Congress, public-power officials in the Department of Interior and Rural Electrification Administration have concocted a scheme that will eventually bring a vast section of the Nation's electric generating plants and transmission lines under Federal control.

The device, which represents a greater bid for power by Interior than even Harold L. Ickes ever dared to dream of, obviates the need for the series of power authorities proposed by President Truman—Missouri, Arkansas, Columbia River, St. Lawrence, etc. Under the method already in effect a power system gridironing the country will fall into Federal hands by indirection.

Oddly enough, the first experiment has been made in the home State of President Truman and in the district represented by CLARENCE CANNON, the czaristic chairman of the House Appropriations Committee. He forced approval of grants totaling $44,000,000 over the objections of Representative JAMIE L. WHITTEN, of Mississippi, who heads the subcommittee handling these matters.

Representative BOYD TACKETT, of Arkansas, seeks to block the scheme through a measure that will prevent use of Federal funds for this purpose, especially as the Flood Control Act of 1944 specifically denies Interior the right to build steam generating plants.

Other attempts to break up the plan will be made when the measure providing money for these two agencies reach the floor of the House and Senate.

Besides Missouri, other States where these loans have been made or are now under consideration are Arkansas, Oklahoma, and Texas. But these are only the beginning, according to REA-Interior officials, the Cannon group, and the public-power lobby headed by former Representative Clyde Ellis, of Arkansas. As well-paid president, he heads an organization here known as the National Rural Electric Cooperative Association.

The device for funneling Federal funds into allegedly illegal channels is simplicity itself. It is described by Members of the House as one of the neatest schemes for "bypassing" and "defying" plainly written prohibitions of law that has been seen around Washington in many years.

Under the intent of Congress and its original management, REA loaned money to cooperatives to build steam generating plants where they were required and to transmit electricity to their rural customers. When the property had been paid for by liquidation of the Government loan the generating and distribution system was turned over to the farmers.

Now, however, three or four of these farm groups form what is known as a supercooperative, with their operations covering a fairly large area. As in the past, they obtain money from REA for construction of electric power plants and lines.

But now their applications and contracts contain a new provision under which they merely lease the property, with Interior becoming the actual owner at the end of 40 years with only a $10 payment by the Government.

By building these systems in various sections of the country, and then tying them into into the great power dams and plants already operating or under construction—Randall in South Dakota, Fort Peck in Montana, Big Thompson in Colorado, Bonneville in Washington, Boulder in Nevada, and the lower Colorado network—the Government will be in a position to nationalize power. Private utilities would not be able to hold their own against such a rival.

In view of President Truman's demand for extending the TVA technique to the Northeastern States, especially Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and New England, that area would also become part of the network.

The taxpayers who must ultimately finance this Federal industry may find themselves holding an empty bag at the end of the 40-year period. In view of prospective changes in the generation and transmission of power, based on development of atomic energy for commercial use, these plants and transmission lines may be obsolete after four decades.

Congressional friends of the rural electrification movement, including Senator ELMER THOMAS, of Oklahoma, contend that the REA-Interior tie-up will mean less rather than more power for farmers and rural communities. Incidentally, it is estimated that there are still 1,000,000 farmers without these necessary and convenient facilities.

It is their contention that money to be spent in building generating plants should go into construction of transmission lines, with the firm power coming from private utilities, wherever that is possible. They argue that construction money will also be eaten up to pay salaries of an even larger number of Federal agents and administrators.

Save for the areas directly affected in the Southwest, the diversion of REA funds and

cooperatives' property into the hands of Interior has commanded scant notice on Capitol Hill. But it will get excited attention when appropriation measures for these two agencies come up for debate and vote.

Even proponents of the scheme do not know how they will reconcile Interior's gamble in generating power with several specific declarations by Congress against such activities. Moreover, only last year, Congress instructed Interior to negotiate with private utilities for construction of transmission lines under the Texas formula negotiated by Speaker SAM RAYBURN on behalf of his Texas utility friends.

Questions and Answers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT F. RICH
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following questions and answers from the News-Bulletin of February 21, 1950:

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Question. Can a government which spends more than it takes in be a prosperous and solvent government?

Answer. Manifestly, the answer is "No." A government, like an individual, must live within its income and means in order to remain solvent.

Question. Why is that true, since the Government, after all, is merely "we, the people?"

Answer. That is true because the Government has nothing to spend except what it takes from the people, either by borrowing or by direct and hidden taxes.

Question. If the Government borrows money from the people, do not the people merely owe themselves the amount borrowed by the Government?

Answer. If the people loan the Government money, and the Government does not have the money to repay the loan when it becomes due, then the Government must either borrow more money from the people or tax them to pay what it owes. Such a course of action sets in motion an endless chain of borrowing that may never be broken short of national bankruptcy. It is even worse than an individual loaning money to another to purchase an automobile, the purchase price of which cannot be paid by the borrower when the loan falls due. Manifestly the lender-seller must lose.

Question. Is government spending inflationary?

Answer. Certainly; because, when the Government spends money usually nothing of substance or wealth is produced to take the place of the money spent—but whatever is added to the economy to take the place of the amount spent, usually costs more than if private capital operating under the free enterprise system did the spending. President Truman on August 1, 1946, admitted that Government spending was inflationary and urged the deferment of public works, except such as were absolutely essential to the Nation's business.

Question. What of the welfare state? If it comes, will it add to inflationary pressures?

Answer. Of course it is, and it will. The more the Government spends, both of what it has and what it borrows, the greater will become the inflationary pressure on the national economy.

Increases in wages, passed on to consumers, are inflationary; and all payments for old-age, survivors, unemployment benefits, and the like are likewise inflationary, though they do all add to the cost of goods and services to the consumers, since they are passed on in increased prices.

Question. Will the Government be able to meet promised payments of $30, $50, or $100 a month as welfare benefits, when such payments become due?

Answer. Manifestly such payments cannot, and will not continuously be met, because taxes to produce funds for such payments have almost reached the saturation point. It has been estimated that, if carried to its logical and proposed end and conclusions, such welfare plans will cost in the first 50 years a total of $1,250,000,000,000. This would mean that every worker would have 15 cents of each dollar in wages deducted.

Question. If such payments are promised and undertaken, what will the money in which payments are made be worth?

Answer. It has been estimated that, if the national income reaches $1,000,000,000,000—one trillion dollars—that the dollar will be worth only 18 cents in purchasing power.

Question. Have welfare and social benefit systems succeeded in other countries?

Answer. No. They have failed wherever they have been tried.

Question. Is there a chance that the welfare state will bring destruction to our national economy and our republican form of government?

Answer. Yes, there is such chance. For the welfare state to be successful, there must be absolute governmental control. In short an oligarchy would be set up not materially different from the absolute dictatorships the whole world apparently abhors but sometimes puts up with as in Soviet Russia and her satellite countries.

"Commerce is the equalizer of the wealth of nations."—Gladstone.

Porcupine Jr., says: "The time has come for Uncle Sam to close up his international gift shop."

Steel Age for New England

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHASE GOING WOODHOUSE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. WOODHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I insert herewith an editorial from the Boston Herald for August 25, 1949:

STEEL AGE FOR NEW ENGLAND

A group of unrelated events offer New England an opportunity for prosperity such as we have not enjoyed since the days of the clipper ships. We have almost, but not quite, been handed a great industrial and commercial expansion. So far the fates seemed to have worked in our favor without any effort on our part; from now on it is up to us.

The story, as it is being told by W. E. Playfair elsewhere in the Herald, is an astonishing picture of jigsaw pieces falling as if by themselves in place. A little while ago New England's hope for an iron and steel industry was dashed by the findings of the Econometric Institute that an integrated plant, producing finished steel shapes from iron ore, was economically impossible here. Today another kind of steel industry, but one of even greater potentiality is virtually within reach.

These are the unrelated circumstances that have so strongly worked together for us:

1. The decision of the Supreme Court sustaining the Government's power to prohibit the basing-point system.

Under this system, the steel companies have set prices, including freight charges, as if the steel had been shipped from certain basing points which usually were not the actual shipping points. Abandonment of the system means either that industries using steel must move nearer existing steel plants or new steel plants must be built in areas of large consumption. Up until recently the high cost of new plants would weigh heavily in favor of the former alternative, a sad blow to New England's growing hard goods industry. But the picture is reversed by—

2. New technological developments in steel production.

These new discoveries include the oxygenation system, by which the output of a given steel mill can be increased 25 percent, and the continous casting method, which permits the efficient use of compact and less costly equipment. Not only do these make steel production possible in smaller units, but they make the present big producing units out-of-date and inefficient. Decentralization of the industry, with plants in New England, is made almost inevitable.

3. The discovery that the Labrador-Quebec iron deposits outstrip the mighty Mesabi mines.

The possible limitless deposits, almost at New England's back door, are ready to take the place of the Mesabi mines, in the Lake Superior district, which have been the source of 85 percent of America's iron ore, but which are running out. There are now no known reserves in North America to compare with the Labrador-Quebec deposits. But though relatively near to New England, there is the difficulty that ships bringing the ore here would have to return empty. This difficulty has been greatly eased by—

4. The decision to use the abundant water power available to reduce the Labrador-Quebec ore by electricity to sponge iron.

This means that New England would import not ore but iron, which can be shipped at a great saving in cargo space. New England is better fitted for the secondary manufacturing processes, any how, and the production of steel especially fitted for our uses would serve us better than an integrated steel industry. The difficulty here, however, is that it will be at least 5 years before Labrador-Quebec can be in production. But there may be iron to tide us over in—

5. Production of iron as a byproduct of the titanium smelter soon to be built by Kennecott Copper at Sorel, Quebec.

This, too, may be a matter of several years, but it offers an earlier, or at least a supplementary source, of 800 tons daily. (The Mystic furnace has been producing 500 tons daily.)

6. A number of minor factors, such as the expected piping of natural gas to this region and the world dollar shortage which will impel Canada to export as much as possible to this country.

All these factors do not assure a big steel industry to New England. They make such an industry a natural for us, but it will not come by itself against the inertia of the country's present industrial set-up. There is already on foot a powerful move to have Congress restore the basing-point system, which, if successful, would tend to freeze the present steel concentration of the country. We need to combat that.

This present iron famine should be exploited to bring home to the steel companies the urgency of our requirements and the

growing demands of our hard-goods manufacture, now New England's most rapidly growing industry. We need to bring out that this is the center of an enormous market.

This can be, as we have said, the greatest thing for New England since the clipper ships—if we do not muff the opportunity.

Vocational Education

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MERLIN HULL
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, may I include a statement on legislation now pending in the Eighty-first Congress pertaining to the expansion of services to the physically and mentally handicapped, by Mr. W. F. Faulkes, chief of the rehabilitation division of the Wisconsin State Board of Vocational and Adult Education. Mr. Faulkes is one of the Nation's outstanding authorities on the subject, having specialized in the field of rehabilitation in an official capacity since 1920, and on a voluntary basis prior thereto:

STATEMENT ON LEGISLATION NOW PENDING IN THE EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS PERTAINING TO THE EXPANSION OF SERVICES TO THE PHYSICALLY AND MENTALLY HANDICAPPED

It is my understanding that there have been presented to the Eighty-first Congress two bills for the purpose of expanding the services to the physically and mentally handicapped. These two bills are H. R. 3095 and H. R. 5577. The latter bill, H. R. 5577, is based upon the Federal-State cooperative relationship that has obtained since June 2, 1920. It is my further understanding that a committee has been appointed for compromising the various items involved in these two bills. It would seem that careful consideration should be given before making such a drastic change in administration as is predicated in H. R. 3095. The latter bill, in my opinion, is based entirely upon hypothetic and presumptuous data, while H. R. 5577 is based upon more than a quarter of a century of rather successful experience, especially when for nearly 20 years, the Federal allotment did not exceed $3,500,000 per annum.

In this statement, it will not be my purpose to indulge in any acrimonious or sarcastic statements about anyone, assuming that a discussion of such an important subject should divest itself of all personalities and prejudicial statements. Our purpose and aim should be the setting up of an adequate program that is vested with sufficient authority and the necessary funds to carry on a program of rehabilitation that will adequately serve all physically and mentally handicapped, and even those who are severely disabled and those who are blind.

Bill H. R. 5577 provides for rehabilitation centers where the severely disabled, such as those who are suffering from multiple sclerosis, hemiplegics, paraplegics, and those with other severe disablements may be remedied and rehabilitated to the end that they may again function both economically and socially. On the other hand, I do not believe that the rehabilitation service should be the agency for the granting of pensions. In my opinion, that properly belongs to the agency in charge of public assistance; but I do think that a proper liaison should be provided between the rehabilitation service and the public assistance agency in regard to pensions which may be arranged for on an individual case basis, as many severely disabled persons may be feasible for at least partial rehabilitation. In my opinion, if proper rehabilitation facilities are provided, such pensions will be few in number. These rehabilitation centers should be supplemented by training centers and sheltered workshops, where those persons who are home-bound and cannot be recommended for competitive employment can be trained for suitable craft or other work that can be carried on in the home as well as elsewhere. Such training centers are now being set up in Wisconsin, but the number has necessarily been limited to the funds that are now available. There should be instituted, also, a more liberal policy for setting up individual business enterprises for both the severely disabled and the blind. All of these items for expansion are provided for in bill H. R. 5577.

The close relationship of rehabilitation to health and education predicates that these services should be in close relation to each other. Such relationship now obtains in the Federal Security Agency. Anyone who has had any experience in rehabilitating disabled persons realizes that physical therapy and education play a major part in such service to the disabled person in procuring suitable and successful employment. My experience of over 30 years has demonstrated that the employment service providing counsel and guidance alone can never solve the myriad of problems that are involved in a program of complete rehabilitation. In Wisconsin, a rehabilitation service was set up in the office of the State employment service back in 1918. The supervisor in the employment office stated that in most cases the disabled person should have some training, and even some physical restoration, before being recommended to a job. The writer was requested to take charge of the program even before the Federal Rehabilitation act was approved in June 1920.

After a disabled person has had the necessary therapy and preparation for a particular suitable job he can be effectively placed, and usually, when placed after such careful preparation, his turn-over on that job is reduced to the minimum. I am in thorough agreement that there should be a very close liaison between the rehabilitation service and the employment service, and that is more easily accomplished after the preparation has been completed than to arrange for such liaison in the midst of the program of preparation.

The writer's interest in the physically handicapped extends back to 1914, when he had an extended conversation with Senator Page, of Vermont (now deceased). I had at that time been appointed a member of a Commission to go to Europe for the purpose of studying vocational education. About that time I had conversations with several State commissioners of workmen's compensation relative to providing amendments to the Workmen's Compensation Acts, to the end of granting lump-sum settlements for injuries sustained, for the purpose of preparing such injured employees to become adjusted to some other job that would be more suitable to the injured client. Since 1920 the writer has had charge of the rehabilitation program, and organized the present rehabilitation service that obtains in Wisconsin. In other words, the writer's interest in the physically handicapped has extended over a period of 36 years, being actively in charge of the program for a period of 30 years.

The original Wisconsin Act was probably in 1920, the most comprehensive act on the statute books of any State, inasmuch as it provided for physical restoration, prosthesis and maintenance, as well as vocational preparation for a suitable employment. It is my firm opinion that bill H. R. 5577 will provide for an adequate service for all the disabled, providing adequate funds are provided by the State and Federal Governments.

Again, the present management of the rehabilitation service is in the right hands, and the program should be retained in the Federal Security Agency. I have worked with this service since its inception, when it was under the Federal Board for Vocational Education; when it was under the Department of the Interior; and now, under the Federal Security Agency, and I have no hesitancy in stating that more progress has been made since the last transfer, 1944, than in all of the previous years. The subcommittee on Aid to the Physically Handicapped of the House Committee on Labor, after a careful study of this problem, made, in part, the following statement in its report in 1946: "It is important that the administration of health, rehabilitation, and education services should be kept closely related because a high degree of coordination is necessary if the services are to be fully effective."

I am convinced that the present administration of the rehabilitation service on a national level through the Office of Vocational Rehabilitation is being effectively carried on, and that the Federal-State relationship has been built upon a very friendly and sound cooperative basis.

I am confident that the approval of H. R. 5577 will make possible an even more adequate service for all the handicapped, and enable many more disabled to make their potential contribution to our society, to which they are entitled as their birthright.

Resolution of Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OVERTON BROOKS
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I present a telegram which I have received from Mr. A. B. Smith, Sr., president of the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board, Baton Rouge, La., which reads as follows:

BATON ROUGE, LA., *February 18, 1950.*
Congressman OVERTON BROOKS,
Washington, D. C.:

The following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board on February 18, 1950:

"Whereas due to the present existing conditions of flood water stages in the lower Mississippi Valley and its tributaries, there is considerable agitation from some quarters for the Morganza spillway to be put into operation by the United States engineers; and

"Whereas the Morganza spillway has not been completed, and due to its incomplete condition, opening it would cause untold damage in the Atchafalaya Basin and adjacent territory if said spillway should be opened before it is completed: Therefore, be it

"*Resolved,* That the Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board in special session assembled this 18th day of February 1950, hereby goes on record as being unalterably opposed to the opening of this spillway under the present existing conditions of incompletement and

in view of the present predicted stage at Red River Landing, nor should it be opened under any other circumstances in its present incomplete condition, unless deemed imperative by the United States engineers and the engineers of the Louisiana Department of Public Works; be it further

"*Resolved*, That this resolution be sent to the Louisiana Department of Public Works, Gen. P. A. Feringa, Col. Charles G. Holle, Maj. Gen. Lewis A. Pick, Gov. Earl K. Long, Senators Ellender and Long, and all Louisiana Congressmen."

A. B. SMITH, Sr.,
President, Atchafalaya Basin Levee Board.

Playing Politics With Your Money

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Booneville Democrat of February 17, 1950:

PLAYING POLITICS WITH YOUR MONEY

What would you do if someone came to you and asked you to contribute several dollars to the building of a grocery store, a print shop, or other business in a town in eastern Tennessee—not only to contribute, but to add another contribution each year to keep it operating—and you not get any profit out of it? You'd say no, of course, and you might be tempted to add a short, four-letter word that some folks say is naughty. And you'd be right—dead right. Yet that is exactly what you are being asked to do to build a steam electric-generating plant in New Johnsonville, Tenn.

Congress is being asked to appropriate over $80,000,000 for a steam electric-generating plant at New Johnsonville, Tenn., to be operated by the TVA (officially known as Tennessee Valley Authority).

Some years ago Tennessee Valley Authority was established as a flood-control project with hydroelectric power as a byproduct. The Government has put almost a billion dollars into it, your tax money, mine, and other citizens, and now they have decided they want to built a steam plant—with the taxpayers' money. The plant will serve a million population, we are told, and will be a good thing for Tennessee—but what about Arkansas?—when we are doing all we can to locate industries in the State?

Why should the people of Arkansas, or Oklahoma, or any other State pay for an electric plant for TVA, so they can sell electricity below cost to people in business in that area? And how does TVA sell electricity so dirt cheap? It sells it that way because TVA pays no Federal taxes, no interest, borrows their money from the Government, and has many other advantages that privately owned companies do not have. What it really amounts to is that it is selling electricity below cost and you, and me, and other citizens are making up the difference. How can we attract more business to Arkansas and at the same time subsidize through our taxes business for TVA?

Another thing, if the Government can build an electric plant in Tennessee with our tax money, it can build another one anywhere else. And building plants everywhere means putting tax-paying electric companies out of business. No one can compete with tax-free, interest-free, Government-babied businesses. And remember, too, if Government can go into the electric business it can also go into the grocery, or hardware, or other business. Ridiculous, you say—maybe, but it has been in the printing business since before this writer was born.

We know our electric companies, privately owned, have done a good job—the way they hooked their different companies together during the war so that power could be delivered where it was most badly needed shows their attitude toward America when America needs them most—and they have kept prices down, given good service and made living a pleasure. Rates are cheaper now than they were during the late war. Their rates are regulated by State commissions, they are allowed a certain percent profit on their investment and they couldn't go above that if they wanted to.

Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., that serves this area is now engaged in a $35,000,000 expansion and building program. Other companies are doing likewise, keeping pace with the rapid growth of their State. They have the machinery either in service or on order to serve all electrical needs. They pay their full share of local, State and Federal taxes.

Government in business is what we are cussing communism for—but it is time we understood what is going on. Let's insist that Congress call a halt to this useless expense of our tax money to put the Government in business. We don't want any part of it in this country—but we may wake up some morning and find a new Government store on Main Street—and wonder how it got there. Think it over.

A Citizen Speaks

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I have received a letter from a resident of my congressional district so typical of the feelings of a steadily growing body of our citizenship that I believe it merits the attention of every Member of the Congress. The writer is an informed citizen properly concerned over the tragic situation resulting from continued administration delay in the coal crisis. His letter follows:

OLNEY, ILL., *February 11, 1950.*
Hon. EDWARD H. JENISON,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE JENISON: With coal stocks at a new low, and getting shorter, schools closing, trains being cut off because of a coal shortage, it seems to me that it is high time that Congress passed a law which will restrain one man, or a small group of men, from tying up the economy of the country. It seems ridiculous to me that we permit a John L. Lewis or a Phil Murray to throw their weight around and stop the wheels of this country.

In all the strike settlements that have been made, it is we, the consumers, who ultimately pay the cost of the settlement because it is reflected in our higher coal bills and other things we purchase.

Now do not misunderstand me. I am not opposed to labor unions, and believe that in the right kind of responsible leadership, they have and can accomplish considerable good for the welfare of the laboring man. But the immense powers vested in the labor leaders that we have in this day and age, is not being wisely handled. The cause of labor is being injured rather than aided.

This coal shortage could be seen by everyone a month and a half ago, except by the man from Missouri, who for political reasons, did not want to invoke the Taft-Hartley Act. Now that he has had to proceed under it, it is too late to put coal above the ground. In the event of more rough winter weather there will be immense suffering among the people of this Nation.

Mr. Representative, the time has arrived for you and your colleagues to do something for the good of this country, and that is to curb the powers of these labor leaders, just as your predecessors in office curbed the powers of the corporations, so that in the future the people will not be harassed by the whims and fancies of John L. Lewis, Phil Murray, and all the other power-drunk labor leaders who like to throw their weight around and show just what they can do.

Very truly,

DONOVAN D. MCCARTY.

The Time Is Here for the Test

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Batesville (Ark.) News:

THE TIME IS HERE FOR THE TEST

Members of Congress never overlook an opportunity to promise reduced taxes if they can find a way to reduce them. It was to this end that a commission was appointed, headed by former President Hoover, to make a study to determine what overlapping agencies could be eliminated and what streamlining could be done to cut expenses of government and thereby reduce taxes.

Several highly important recommendations have already been made by this Commission. Reports by Mr. Hoover's group indicate that tremendous cuts can be made in the personnel of tax-financed bureaus.

One of the groups of experts working for the Hoover Commission has made a thorough investigation into the question of Government electric-power projects. It was made by independent engineers and accountants. And it has made the startling report that electric power developed at tax-financed dams in the country is actually not cheap power as has been claimed. Rates would have to be drastically increased if the Government recovers even a major portion of the huge tax outlays it has made on these projects, according to the Hoover report.

The report points out that public-power bureaus do not charge themselves with nearly all of the things that are necessary for sound business operations; they pay no taxes; they enjoy special low-interest rates; and have many other subsidies that the taxpayers must pay out of their pockets. The report even recommends that one useless public-power bureau, the Southwestern Power Administration, be dissolved, and that the Army engineers sell power generated at Federal hydroelectric dams in the Southwest.

Here is a definite and concrete proposal for reducing taxes. It is going to be interesting to see just what our Congressmen, who say they want to reduce our taxes, do about this plan. The time for their true test is at hand.

Every American Must Do What He Can

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, this morning I made an announcement that I would be a candidate for the Republican nomination for United States Senator in the South Dakota primaries, June 6. Petitions are being prepared and will be sent to the State immediately.

I am led to this decision as the most effective way to say to every corner of South Dakota that our national life is in peril from the power-drunk, color-blind, inept and spendthrift leadership. As of today, for me the best place to combat that is in the United States Senate. The President in his appointments and Secretary Acheson in his administration of foreign affairs act with the advice and consent of the Senate.

No one bears the responsibility for this decision but myself. It is not easy to give up a seat in the House which many say I could keep with little campaign effort or personal expense. I do it, however, in the belief that many others could well carry on there and that I can render a greater service to South Dakota and the country by making this effort regardless of its cost to me.

Friends of South Dakota development familiar with my work in behalf of the people and district I have had the honor to represent will know that if I am elected to the Senate, every person and section of the State will receive the best representation that my 14 years of experience in Washington can bring. And those who know of my personal interest in farming will be sure that every day I will be doing something for our basic industry. In effect, we are all farmers in South Dakota; without farm prosperity there is none.

Whether my name is selected to be at the head of the Republican column on the South Dakota ballot next fall or not, my time and energy will be at the command of the Republican Party next fall.

Our life as a nation is at stake in a fearful world of shadow boxing with domestic problems like John L. Lewis and of bluffing with unmade H-bombs at a literal-minded Red Russia. It is a time when every American must live up to the best light he has and do what he can.

Imports Versus Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BEN F. JENSEN
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Speaker, business in surplus foods is very, very good, particularly if you are an exporter in a foreign country and want to sell in the United States.

Recently I reported the imports of some surplus foods July through November 1949. Today I have the figures from July 1 to December 31, 1949, and there has been, as I had previously indicated, a sharp increase, during the month of December. I am advised the Secretary of Agriculture remains unconcerned, despite seeming surplus problems and the outcry resulting from the waste of food and taxpayers' money.

It would appear that it is about time the administration, the State Department, and ECA and Secretary Brannan face facts and reconcile the conflict between our one-sided foreign-trade policy and the welfare of our domestic economy. The simple facts are that tariffs on most food and agricultural products have either been eliminated entirely or reduced so low that they no longer afford American agriculture the protection it needs. Meantime, the American farmer is being held up to scorn, and it is forgotten that we must maintain our farm income, so essential to our entire economy. Secretary Brannan apparently is now attempting to sell his impractical plan by using foreign imports as a club, that will result in further production cuts for the American farmer.

The imports of some surplus food commodities, as covered in my statement of February 7, 1950, totaled approximately $45,000,000, for July 1 to November 30, 1949. The new total for the July through December figure is approximately $57,000,000. These are commodities that the Commodity Credit Corporation owns and are in surplus supply or are under price-support programs or in danger of being soon. Given proper tariff protection, the cost of our agricultural price-support program could have been reduced by over $55,000,000 during the past 6 months.

From July through December, we imported 19,435,000 pounds of cheese—Government holdings on December 31 were nearly 24,000,000 pounds.

From July through December, we imported 795,000 bushels of wheat, not counting wheat in bond—Government stocks on December 31 were over 475,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 359,000 bushels of corn—Government stocks on December 31 were over 180,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 8,260,000 bushels of barley—Government stocks on December 31 were over 53,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 9,478,000 bushels of oats—Government stocks on December 31 were nearly 42,000,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 7,436,000 bushels of rye—Government stocks on December 31 were nearly 760,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported over 48,940 bags of dried beans—Government stocks on December 31 were 10,850,000 bags.

From July through December, we imported 701,000 bushels of apples, while we were paying an export subsidy on over 1,500,000 bushels.

From July through December, we imported 86,000 pounds of raisins, with the surplus under marketing agreement orders estimated at 100,000,000 pounds.

From July through December, we imported 2,202,000 pounds of pork and pork products, while hog prices declined sharply.

From July through December, we imported 1,587,000 dozen eggs from Canada.

From July through December, we imported over 1,746,000 pounds of dried eggs, mostly from Communist China. We also imported 283,000 pounds of frozen eggs. The Government stock pile of eggs on December 31 consisted of over 73,500,000 pounds of dried eggs, and they are still buying at the rate of over 2,000,000 pounds a week.

Again I wish to ask the questions: How long can this foreign give-away last? When is the Secretary of Agriculture going to act to protect our farm markets?

The REA Versus SPA

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Waurika (Okla.) News-Democrat of June 10, 1949:

THE REA VERSUS SPA

Nobody, so far as we are able to learn, is in any way opposed to the REA, which has already brought electric light and power into much of the rural area of the United States. It has done much to improve living conditions in these areas and the move has the backing of practically all the people. But what a lot of people do object to is the Government going into the business of generating electricity in competition with private industry.

Private industry could not extend lines into the sparsely settled districts. This is a project that had to be subsidized by the Government. But some of the power-mad Government-ownership crowd want to dub everybody who oppose their schemes as being against REA.

There is a lot of talk now about increasing taxes in order to balance the budget, yet the Government continues to invest in private industry, using up a lot of Uncle Sam's revenue and at the same time putting out of business many of those concerns that supply that revenue.

The House of Representatives has passed a bill approving an appropriation of $12,625,530 for SPA.

The significant part of this bill is that it is all in southeastern Oklahoma. Of the lines that are proposed to be built none are less than 66,000 volts, and the line from Lulu to Anadarko is 132,000 volts. It covers the southeastern part of the State completely, extending into 28 counties and reaching every county seat in those 28 counties.

The program calls for the building of 33 substations where the current may be taken from the line and stepped down for use at lower voltages. For instance, the lines go to McAlester, where private companies already have three large lines running into Hugo now—no shortage of power at all. Yet

one of these 66,000-volt lines extends to Hugo and a substation will also be built at Hugo.

The SPA claims it intends to serve the REA's, some public bodies, and the rest will be new business. But they are building lines and substations sufficient to take over the entire electric load in this area just as completely as it has been taken over in Nebraska and in Tennessee.

Then, after they get this area entirely cleaned up, they plan on some other areas. Just which ones, we do not know.

They are doing this in the face of the fact that up until today this area has had all the current it wants and still has plenty for some time in the future, and before any great need would arise, the private companies will have installed an abundance of power.

This is just a scheme of the public-power advocates to go into the general electric business, and what alarms us is that the people, generally speaking, seem to think that we are in no danger at all of being swamped into socialism. Just take a look at what has happened in the last 10 years in England and then picture Uncle Sam still further in before another 10 years has passed.

Free enterprise has made America great and will, properly safeguarded, continue to make her great. Well, just write your Congressman and United States Senator and tell him how you feel about things.

We defy anybody to be any stronger for REA than we are, but, on the other hand, we take a back seat to nobody in being against the Government going into business against her own taxpaying citizens.

Rent Decontrol and New Housing Need

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, in the near future, the Congress will begin consideration of a proposal to extend rent controls. The decision of Congress in this regard will have an immediate effect on virtually all of the Nation's renters, builders, and property owners.

Recently, Mr. Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter, directed a communication on this subject to the Washington Post. Mr. Wood, clearly analyzes and discusses the current problem in his communication which follows:

A COMMUNICATION—RENT DECONTROL AND NEW HOUSING NEED

(By Tighe E. Woods, Housing Expediter)

In the Washington Post of February 12, there appeared an article by Ysabel and Robert Rennie entitled "Rent Control Distorts Housing." The authors of the article say that the purpose of decontrol was to increase building, and that this objective was attained. In support of their statement they cite the increase in the total number of nonfarm units started from 1947 through 1949.

Since there never have been ceilings on the sales prices of new homes, the decontrol of rents for new construction was obviously not intended to stimulate construction for sale. It was intended to spur the building of rental property. The real estate industry had repeatedly asserted that if rent ceilings were removed from new construction enough rental housing would be built to wipe out both the housing shortage and the need for rent control. On July 1, 1947, when the Housing and Rent Act of 1947 went into effect, rent control was removed from all new construction, including houses completed on or after February 1, 1947. The decontrol of new rental housing now gave them their chance.

What happened after decontrol? The authors admit that most of the new houses were for sale, not for rent. Between July 1947 and October 1949, 431,400 rental-type units were started in nonfarm areas.

Rental-type housing since July 1947 constituted only 19 percent of all new nonfarm construction, and represented an addition of less than 3 percent to the number of occupied nonfarm rental units in the United States reported by the Census Bureau in April 1947.

Thus, decontrol did not result in any great outpouring of new rental housing as the real estate industry had predicted that it would. On the contrary, it fell far short of our previous achievements in this field. During 1925 and 1926 a total of 723,000 rental-type units were started in nonfarm areas. In other words, in those 2 years we produced 68 percent more rental-type housing than in the 28-month period after July 1, 1947, when new construction was decontrolled.

Obviously, we are paying a premium in high rents for new housing and, as the authors point out, there are two levels of rents—a high one for uncontrolled new construction, and a lower one for controlled housing. The authors state that when rent controls go off the differential will disappear—rents for new construction will fall, and the formerly controlled rents will rise. In a general sense that is true, although there will probably always be some differential between new and old housing. People are willing to pay something more for the latest equipment in a new house, for lower initial costs of maintenance, and for the general feeling of comfort in a new home. Nevertheless, the two groups of rents will tend to move toward each other.

The real question, which has been left unanswered, is "At what point will they tend to be equalized?" All evidence points to the conclusion that the high rents will drop very little and the presently controlled rents will rise a great deal. In other words, the more than 11,000,000 families now paying controlled rents will pay considerably more; the few hundred thousand families now paying uncontrolled rents for new housing will pay a little less. For new houses, high construction costs will act as a brake on rent reductions.

For controlled housing, a survey recently made by the Bureau of Labor Statistics in Dallas, Tex., where rents were decontrolled in June 1949, shows the probable effect of decontrol. Let us see what happened to the rents of the units in Dallas which were under rent control at the time the city council voted decontrol, excluding those units which were under lease and could not have their rents increased. The survey showed that by November 1949, only a few months later, 67 percent of these units had rent increases averaging 35.4 percent. If we throw in the 33 percent of the units which had no increase, the general rise in rents is 20.5 percent, but this figure does not measure the actual burden on the majority of the tenants who had to pay rent increases. To use a combined average including the units which had no increase is like saying that a millionaire and a pauper have average assets of $500,000, and just as unrealistic. The significant fact is that two out of every three tenants had to pay an average rent increase of 35 percent.

The authors imply that all controlled units have been held frozen at low levels. I should like to correct this false implication. Rent increases have been granted through individual adjustments to more than 2,000,000 units under rent control, and to more than 430,000 units through area-wide increases. Over 2,250,000 units have had rent increases through voluntary 15-percent leases signed in 1947 and 1948. Finally, almost 3,000,000 units have been decontrolled since April 1, 1949. This certainly does not add up to any picture of a rigid freezing of rents.

The authors say that the high premium on new rental housing encouraged builders to bid up costs, that prices for homes for sale were consequently inflated because they are a mirror of inflated rentals, and that if rent controls go off builders will have to cut costs and lower profit margins if they want to tap the great new potential market for homes at lower prices that will be created by decontrol.

This is really putting the cart before the horse. In the first place, the premium on new rental housing was, in itself, in part a recognition that construction costs had already risen to such an extent as to require a rent differential between new and old housing. In fact, during the period when new housing was subject to rent control, we recognized this need and established higher maximum rents for new construction to compensate for higher construction costs. What the authors are saying, in effect, is that the builders of new housing for sale—and this new sales housing was 81 percent of the total since July 1947—went ahead merrily bidding up their costs because rents were decontrolled for the remaining 19 percent of the new construction which was of the rental type. That makes no sense whatsoever.

If the authors' reasoning had any foundation in fact, we should find that the big rise in building costs had taken place since the decontrol of new construction in July 1947. Exactly the opposite happened. The Bureau of Labor Statistics reports that by June 1947 its index of wholesale building material prices had increased 58 percent above the 1942 average. After June 1947 the index increased only 17.2 percent to its peak in September 1948, and it has declined since that date so that in December 1949 it was only 9.3 percent above June 1947.

The biggest factor in the rise of construction costs was the premature lifting of price ceilings in November 1946. The building material price index jumped 29 percent in the short period from October 1946 to June 1947. Average hourly earnings of building-construction labor show a similar big rise before July 1947 and a much smaller increase since that date. Since most of the increase in building costs took place before July 1947, attributing the rise in building costs to decontrol of new construction (which did not take place until July 1947) is a distortion of the facts.

The great new potential market that the authors talk about is not something that will magically come into being the day rent controls are lifted. That great potential market is here today. Our real need today is for low-priced and low-rent housing within the means of the vast majority of our people—for homes to sell for less than $8,000 and to rent for less than $75 a month. Builders don't have to wait for the end of rent control to tap this market. They can do it right now, if they will cut costs and lower profit margins.

The end of rent control will not create that market. That is the cart before the horse all over again. But if builders will build for that market now, and build enough homes, the need for rent control will be ended. That is something I should like to see happen as soon as possible. However, premature decontrol will mean great suffering and hardship for the American people; and until most men can house their families decently at a rent or price within their income, decontrol would be premature and foolhardy.

Incorporating Girl Scouts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM P. BOLTON
OF MARYLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BOLTON of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to vote for H. R. 6670, to incorporate the Girl Scouts of the United States with domicile in the District of Columbia.

The Girl Scouts were organized to promote the qualities of truth, loyalty, helpfulness, friendliness, courtesy, purity, kindness, obedience, cheerfulness, thriftiness, and kindred virtues among girls as a preparation for their responsibilities in the home and for service to the community. No higher ideals could be taught to the future womanhood of America. These young women will, in large measure, guide the future destiny of this great Nation, because it is the hand that rocks the cradle that rules the world. Together with the Boy Scouts, these young women will be the future leaders of our country. They are doing a splendid job to preserve democracy in America and in teaching the youth of other countries who attend their conventions, what we mean by democracy. Would that we had more Girl and Boy Scouts in America to make their Scout promise, as follows:

On my honor, I will try to do my duty to God and my country; to help other people at all times; and to obey the Scout laws.

What of the Night?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I have just come upon a copy of the December 1949, issue of the Ohioan Post, published by Ohio University at Athens, Ohio. One of the contributors to that issue was our distinguished colleague, Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON, of the Twenty-second District of Ohio.

Mrs. BOLTON'S article, What of the Night?, is so replete with political, economic, social, financial, agricultural and labor facts and economies, that it merits the reading of every Member of this House.

Her pictorialization of the news of the day, of changes that have taken place in these last 20 years of congressional activities; of the days when annual appropriations by the Congress were still in the millions instead of billions of dollars; of the waste, inefficiency and extravagances that have characterized the maladministration of Federal affairs in recent years; her discourse on bureaucracy; so-called Federal aid; of a Government that is today spending more than $4,000,000 an hour every day of the year; make it worth while to all to read this article by FRANCES BOLTON, What of the Night?

WHAT OF THE NIGHT?
(By Congresswoman FRANCES P. BOLTON)

As the outline of this article is being written, the telegraph wires, the radio, the television, and the cables are carrying the happenings of today to the people of the world.

Over the radio comes word that "the weatherman advises that a blanket of snow is being laid over the Midwest"; "there is no further news about the steel strike, affecting not alone the steelworkers, but hundreds of thousands in other industries"; "that settlement of the coal strike is further away than ever"; "schools are closed in Indiana for lack of coal," says the Governor of Indiana; "the Governor of Illinois stated today that coal will be rationed in that State if the strike continues 10 days longer"; "the Government opened negotiations with eight foreign nations to provide them with arms under the military-assistance program"; "Dictator Tito of Yugoslavia will be permitted to buy several civilian, but no military planes"; "Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland, upon his return from Europe, states that 'the Russian Army is many times larger than our own, but the United States Air Force is about equal to Russia's.'" Now comes word that "the Governor of Minnesota has just stated that with snow falling, the small towns of Minnesota are in a pathetic condition for want of coal."

"Within a few hours President Truman will address the Nation. The title of his speech has not yet been announced, but the President says it will be 'bipartisan and nonpolitical.'" The country is awaiting the President's address.

To quote a Nation-wide popular radio commentator, "That is the top of the news as it looks from here."

Many in Congress feel with me that each day brings not alone a new challenge but a new crisis to the people in America. These challenges have to do not alone with the lives and fortunes of individuals, both young and old, but seemingly have to do with every spiritual and material interest to which all studious and contemplative minds address themselves in this modern civilization.

Tremendous and epochal changes have taken place in America in these last 20 years. They first appeared as the backwash of the great world-wide economic depression which engulfed this Nation in the late twenties and the early thirties. They continued insofar as our domestic front was concerned until the lush boom times which struck our country with the beginning of World War II.

A veritable catalog of changes have occurred. Changes with respect to industry and agriculture, in production, marketing and in the pricing systems. Changes with respect to bank deposits and banking controls affecting deposits and loans and reserves. Changes having to do with labor and management in their relations with wages and with hours. In the field of social security, changes have taken place as to the care of the aged and the indigent. Then there are questions of taxation * * * extended bureaucratic controls * * * management of the public debt * * * the extent of financial support that is being rendered not alone to the veterans of all wars but for the support of foreign nationals across the seas. The foregoing are all problems to which the youth of America will some day have to address themselves and solve in their own time and in the national interest.

My personal knowledge of congressional activities goes back before the days of billion-dollar Federal appropriations, when Government expenses were still in the millions. This Eighty-first Congress, in its first session, appropriated roughly $37,000,000,000 in cash, but pledged another additional four and a half billion in contract authorizations. These figures do not include six billion for interest on the public debt * * * half a billion for statutory public debt retirement * * * and another billion for annual indefinite appropriations. It all adds up to the staggering total of almost $50,000,000,000 which we, the taxpayers, must meet.

How well I recall the occasion and the clamor provoked by the first year of deficit spending by the Congress. Yet during the past 16 years I have seen billions annually appropriated and expended in excess of Federal income. The exception to this current practice was the two memorable years when the Republican Party controlled both Houses of the Eightieth Congress of these United States.

The waste, the inefficiency, the extravagances which have characterized the maladministration of Federal affairs in recent years were most vividly disclosed by the talk recently made in Cleveland by the Honorable Louis B. Johnson, Secretary of Defense. In discussing the economy drive which he recently launched, Secretary Johnson said he was convinced he could save hundreds of millions and even billions of dollars without reducing the fighting efficiency of our armed services, and even a billion dollars, my friends, is a saving of one thousand million of the taxpayers' dollars effected in but one department of Government alone.

It is my conviction, reached after careful study, that a saving of more than $5,000,000,000 could be effected in Federal expenditures in the next fiscal year alone if equally sound business principles were made applicable to expenditures in all other departments.

Second only to the proper management of the national debt comes a factual and long-delayed revision of the tax structure of the Federal Government, which has not been basically altered in the last three quarters of a century.

Up until 1939 all the new revenue measures that have been written were amendments and additions to, or extensions of, the basic tax structure, which dates back to the year 1874.

To have even a meager idea of the tax laws of these United States one must make practically a lifelong study of tens of thousands of pages of small print comprehended in hundreds of volumes of tax digests.

In addition to the laws themselves as enacted by Congress and signed by the President, are hundreds upon hundreds of amendments thereto, administrative rulings, regulations, interpretations, which cover the collection of taxes and which by virtue of usage alone are now part and parcel of the law of this land.

Because of congressional delegation of power to executive departments in order to execute loosely drawn legislation, and because of rulings pertinent to legislative enforcement, the day is not far distant when the Congress of these United States will be called upon * * * actually to repeal laws which as a Congress they never enacted.

The number of these instances are legion. The rulings, orders, and so forth, are applicable to farmers, to manufacturers, to common carriers, to those who come under the provision of the Federal Trade Commission, the Pure Food and Drug Administration, the Federal Power and Security and Exchange Commissions * * * and a host of other agencies who have now issued hundreds of administrative rulings which because of usage courts have held * * * to have the full force and power of law.

The last two decades have seen deep and penetrating incursions made into the field of States' rights. The adjustment of the rights of sovereign States to a highly centralized form of government is a matter which is going to invoke the greatest intellects that

will develop in those who now constitute the American youth.

For years past I have argued with my colleagues that there is in fact no such thing as extending Federal or financial aid to the States.

Political aid, Yes. Financial aid, No.

On innumerable occasions I have advanced argument that every last dollar that is covered into the Federal Treasury at Washington must first be collected either by direct or hidden taxes from the people in the 48 States, our insular possessions, the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii, or the District of Columbia itself.

So-called Federal aid to States whether for highways, bridges, roads, schools, or any other purpose whatever, must first be collected from the States—by the tax gatherers of the Federal Government. Then, by congressional action, and by another group of Federal agents it is returned in part only to the States from which it was collected.

Experience has taught me that the dollar which citizen taxpayers in the States send to the Federal Treasury in Washington is not as big a dollar when it gets back home, because bureaucracy imposes a heavy "brokerage fee" for first making the collection and then the refund.

It is both significant and startling that for the year 1948 the total of all grants and aids returned to the State of Ohio (which grants total 45 in number for various activities) but exclusive of the $157,000,000 paid for veteran benefits, the Federal Government paid back to the State of Ohio a bare $80,000,000 as contrasted with the total of $2,665,000,000 that it took out of the State.

PART II

I have just listened with deep interest to all that the President had to say in the memorable broadcast on this the last day that marks the 100th anniversary of the Louisiana purchase and the establishment of the territory of Minnesota.

In no one sentence did the President address himself to a single one of the many issues which confront this country.

He characterized as reactionaries each and every one who gives any thought to the future or to the administrative tasks which lie ahead!

He totally ignored what Governor Thye of Minnesota, who sat on the platform with him, had stated earlier in the evening about the pathetic condition of the small towns of Minnesota suffering for want of coal.

Neither did the President make mention of the fact that one person out of every nine in these United States is now on the pay rolls of Government, Federal, State, and local, drawing all or a part of his income from the taxpayers of the United States.

He made no mention of the fact that there is one Government payroller for every three families in the United States. Neither did he mention the impending deficit of nearly $6,000,000,000 which the Government is at present facing in this the first fiscal year since his reelection to office.

What the President stated in fact was that his personal program was not alone to continue, but that he intended to extend the peculiar brand of national socialism which has been slowly engulfing America.

The President did say in his talk that this was a day of change—but what a change. From a balanced economy to reckless bureaucracy, and still more reckless spending.

He did not tell the people that he is spending more than $4,000,000 an hour of the taxpayers' money, or nearly a million dollars more every hour of the day and year than is collected in taxes.

Yes; it is a different day—it is a day of change—a day when it would seem that our National Government no longer believes it must pay as it goes.

It is because of the President's unwillingness to face these facts that I put the question to you, my readers: What of the night?

Platform of American Veterans' Committee

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, under the unanimous consent granted me, I include that portion of the platform of the American Veterans' Committee which deals with veterans' affairs:

VETERANS' AFFAIRS PLATFORM

PREAMBLE

We believe that military service in time of war is an obligation of citizenship in defense of our families, our homes, our security, and our freedom.

We further believe that to each man or woman, physically disabled by such service, and to the immediate families of those men and women who suffered death in such service, our country should provide adequate medical, financial, and other benefits and assistance. We are opposed, however, to Treasury raids and grab-bag legislation and believe that rehabilitation and reintegration into the community is the scope and purpose of a veterans program.

We maintain that it is the veterans' basic need and right that he be properly restored to the economic and social status which he would normally have achieved as a civilian had he not entered the service, without regard to his race, color, creed, or political belief.

The achievement of economic security for veterans through sound economic planning as citizens rather than through special grant or favor as veterans is basic AVC philosophy. To effect these ends, we urge:

CARE OF THE DISABLED AND DEPENDENTS

Adequate care of veterans disabled in military service and of the immediate families of those who suffered death in such service requires:

(a) Comprehensive, careful review of the adequacy and fairness of the existing compensation rates, and of the rating system employed by the VA;

(b) Provision for adjusting compensation rates periodically in accordance with movement of the BLS Consumers' Price Index;

(c) That the VA should raise its compensation schedule for disabled veterans with dependents;

(d) That the VA conduct a continuing active program to aid disabled veterans in securing gainful employment;

(e) Ironclad preference in Federal, State, and local governments for veterans who by reason of their war service are amputees, paraplegics, hemiplegics, blind, or otherwise disabled to a degree of 50 percent or more;

(f) Comprehensive, careful review of the adequacy and fairness of the existing medical facilities for treatment of veterans with a view to extending the service provided by the VA in this respect.

(g) Provision for increasing Government appropriations to the VA to carry out the extension of medical service to veterans.

(h) Provision for developing a training program to adequately staff VA hospitals.

(i) An equalization of the benefits of hemiplegics and paraplegics.

(j) Extension of the GI bill of rights benefits to widows and orphans of the men and women who died in the service.

EDUCATION, TRAINING, AND REHABILITATION

We affirm that use of Federal funds to speed full adjustment of the veteran to civilian life not only constitutes simple justice, but represents a worth-while investment in increasing the productivity and enhancing the culture of our Nation. Therefore, we support:

(a) The reversal of the apparent trend by the Veterans' Administration denying educational and vocational rehabilitation benefits through cutting the essential staff for these services and through unreasonably stringent requirements of veterans who need these services.

(b) Increasing the base-subsistence allowances from their present figure to such figure as is justified by increases in the cost of living as measured by the BLS consumers' price index.

(c) Legislation assuring veterans in the employ of the Government of the right to educational leave at the earliest possible date and in no case later than 1954.

(d) We call for the raising of the present limit of $500 for books and tuition to $600, and that the maximum total allowance for the purpose be raised from $2,000 to $2,400. Ceilings on earnings should be raised proportionately.

HOME-LOAN GUARANTIES

Increases in building costs and in the cost of living have rendered the home-loan-guaranty program, ostensibly guaranteed by the GI bill of rights, relatively meaningless. To accomplish the purpose of the original act, we believe that it is to the best interest of the veteran that the present rate of interest on loans be decreased and to this end we urge that the Government establish a Veterans Home Owners' Loan Corporation, providing for 100-percent financing of GI loans at a rate of interest lower than the current 4 percent.

DISCRIMINATION

We call upon the VA and all State agencies administering veterans benefits to discharge their duties without any discrimination whatever based upon race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, or political belief, and we urge these agencies to exert every effort to induce employers, loan agencies, and education institutions to make veterans benefits available to all veterans without such discrimination.

We urge the elimination of Jim Crow practices within all branches and departments of the armed forces. Furthermore, we call for a review of all blue discharges by an interracial civilian examining board.

We call for the initiation by the Veterans' Administration of machinery to investigate reports of unpaid terminal-leave benefits and the denial of the 52–20 payments to Negroes in the South, and for provision of machinery to aid in the collection of these benefits and to insure the collection of the pending NSLI refunds.

EMPLOYMENT

In addition to the assistance we urge for disabled veterans, and within the context of AVC's long-standing support of the Full Employment Act of 1946 and the various improvements in that act which we urge elsewhere in the platform, we ask that the Congress revive the benefits of the Readjustment Allowance Act, otherwise known as 52–20, and extend these benefits, increasing the benefits therein in accordance with the movement of the BLS Consumers' Price Index since the amount of benefits was set.

We urge elimination of superpreference in the civil service except as mentioned above in the case of disabled veterans. Veterans, whether in public or private employment, should be given seniority credit for the time spent in military service and in vocational rehabilitation after release from such service. The present 5- and 10-point preference in civil-service examinations should be continued, but a passing grade should be required before the preference is given.

Until Congress acts to remove the absolute preference given veterans in civil service, reductions in force in the appropriate Government agencies should give consideration to measures alleviating the hardship imposed upon career employees by such preference policy. These measures should include:

(a) Where reductions in force are ordered the workweek of all employees be shortened to minimize the number of lay-offs.

(b) Reducing the retirement age for those involuntarily separated from service.

(c) Maintaining an over-all Federal seniority list so that those laid off by one agency may be transferred to another agency.

BONUSES AND PENSIONS

As citizens first and veterans second, we stand opposed to bonuses and general pensions, the right to which rests solely upon service in the armed forces of the United States. We regard such bonuses and pensions as economically unsound political hand-outs, for which the veteran himself would ultimately pay. We propose, instead, as benefiting veteran and nonveteran alike, the AVC program of social legislation.

RESOLUTIONS

Employment

Resolved, That the chapter of the AVC should encourage local organizations to assist in the economic rehabilitation of the disabled veterans by urging their employment by local employers and by assisting in the merchandizing of their products.

Insurance

Resolved, That we call for making renewable term insurance a permanent program on a convertible and automatically renewable basis.

Because of large overpayments, veterans are now going to receive a large refund on payments made. We ask the VA, therefore, to immediately reduce the amount of premiums on GI insurance, and to make available to veterans any additional amounts of insurance they desire.

We ask that AVC take definite steps toward insuring that all veterans in the South are made aware of this refund, and that some plans be devised through southern AVC chapters and the Veterans' Administration to get the necessary forms for refunds to all who are entitled to them.

Arthur Krock's Interview With President Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, considerable comment has appeared in the press recently in connection with an interview with President Truman published by the New York Times over the byline of Arthur Krock.

Mr. Krock, who usually expresses the Republican viewpoint in his column on political and governmental affairs, can scarcely be regarded as an admirer of the Democratic Party or of its program.

For this reason it is especially interesting that Mr. Krock finds, despite the Republican sloganeering concerning socialism, that our President is sincere in his efforts to preserve our great free-enterprise economy and our democratic form of government.

For the convenience of the Members who may not have read this article, I am inserting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AN INTERVIEW WITH TRUMAN: HE SEES MAN'S BETTER NATURE BRINGING PEACE TO ILL WORLD—COVERS WIDE FIELD—HE SEES NORMAL DEALING WITH SOVIET HOPELESS—BROKEN PACTS CITED—DEFICIT SPENDING DECRIED—GOP TAX SLASH IS BLAMED—"RED HERRING" HELD TO APPLY TO SPY HUNTERS' METHODS

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 14.—In the age of atomic energy, transmuted into a weapon which can destroy great cities and the best works of civilization, and in the shadow of a hydrogen detonant which could multiply many times that agent of destruction, a serene President of the United States sits in the White House with undiminished confidence in the triumph of humanity's better nature and the progress of his own efforts to achieve abiding peace.

This President, Harry S. Truman, is a controversial figure in the world and in domestic politics. But to those who talk with him intimately about the problem of global life and death, his faith that these good things will happen, and probably in his time, shines out with a luminous and simple quality which no event or misadventure of policy can diminish.

The following is an account of the President's current views on the international and domestic issues of his time which I can vouch for as to accuracy. It may serve further to reveal to doubters and critics what manner of man he really is; and crystallize in the minds of those who instinctively supported him in the campaign of 1948 what were the personal qualities they sensed but did not always comprehend.

UNDAUNTED BY WAR CLOUDS

He sits in the center of the troubled and frightened world, not a world he ever made; but the penumbra of doubt and fear in which the American Nation pursues its greatest and most perilous adventure—the mission to gain world peace and security while preserving the strength of the native experiment in democracy—stops short of him. Visitors find him undaunted and sure that, whether in his time or thereafter, a way will be discovered to preserve the world from the destruction which to many seems unavoidable, as moral force is steadily weakened by the conflict of two great rival systems and by new skills in forging weapons of destruction that make the discovery of gunpowder seem like the first ignition of the parlor match.

His reasons for this serenity and this sureness emerge from current conversations with the President on the issues of the time. For Mr. Truman is the kind of American who must be observed at first-hand, free to speak with the candor and natural piety of his make-up, to be wholly understood.

In such meetings he answers questions that bear directly on the problems before him. And these questions and his answers that follow (the latter put mostly in the indirect discourse which is due to a President for his own protection and that of the country) reveal the man and what he conceives to be his mission and his methods of accomplishing it better than the formal record can do.

CHANGE ON SOVIET EXPLAINED

Question. You recall the hopeful prospect of peace that surrounded you, and you expressed, at San Francisco in 1945 when the United Nations was organized. What has happened since to bring about deterioration to the point where a member of your Cabinet can say of it: "The cold fact is that we are still in a hot war?" When did you conclude that normal negotiation with the Kremlin was hopeless?

Answer. The President said he remembered that time well, and with what good-will toward the Russian people and their rulers he went to Potsdam shortly thereafter. There he explained to offer help for reconstruction, of Russia as well as the rest of the world, on a very large scale. He remembered with pride and sympathy how Russians had smashed the German armies in the East, and he believed their assistance was necessary to win the war against Japan. But he found that all Stalin wanted to talk about was the abrupt cessation of lend-lease; hence the atmosphere was unfavorable to what Mr. Truman had in mind.

"To abolish lend-lease at the time was a mistake." But he was new then; the papers had been prepared for Roosevelt, and represented a Government decision. He felt there was nothing else he could do but sign. He had no staff and no Cabinet of his own. Now he has both.

The agreement the Russians made at Yalta to enter the war against Japan was the only one they ever kept out of nearly forty. He has no hope they will keep any which now it would be good policy to seek. But he remains hopeful of the outcome.

When the Russians, after the Potsdam agreements, blocked East-West trade he began to lose the last vestige of hope that what seemed so good a peace prospect at San Francisco had survived. Gen. George C. Marshall, he recalls, came back from Moscow deeply discouraged. And when Ambassador Bedell Smith reported to the President from Moscow that the Russians were carefully concealing from the people all facts about the war assistance we had given them, and what our proposals had been for joint reconstruction of the world, that last vestige disappeared.

BARRED DIVISION OF JAPAN

It would have been the same in Japan as in Germany if the President had not demanded an American as the allied generalissimo there at the signing of the surrender on the *Missouri.* Otherwise the Russians would have divided that country as they have Germany; and the situation in the Far East would have been so much worse than it is that one can take comfort from it.

The real trouble with the Russians is that they are still suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned. If a campaign had not been in progress in 1948 he would have sent Chief Justice Fred M. Vinson to try to straighten out Stalin and the other Russians leaders on this and on our real intentions. Maybe that will be the thing to do some time. But in nothing must we show any sign of weakness, because there is none in our attitude. To appreciate some of the importance of this read "Berlin Command" (a book by former Brig. Gen. Frank L. Howley, published by Putnam's, New York).

He is reliably informed that the Russians have 16,000,000 people in concentration camps. This is the way of the police state, which he finds utterly abhorrent.

Question. In view of your background, training and dislike of debt, how do you reconcile these with your toleration of deficit spending and your advocacy of new spending programs? Critics of the Fair Deal program say it proposes permanently to burden the more able, diligent and successful with the cost of "insuring all others against the results of their own improvidence, ill-luck or defective behavior"; that this is very nearly the Marxian doctrine, "to each according to his need, from each according to his ability."

Answer. In no sense does the President tolerate deficit spending. There wouldn't be any now if the Republicans had not cut the income taxes in the Eightieth Congress. Tax changes should not have been made piecemeal at any time, but conformed to a general and revised plan. This was equally

true when he approved the repeal of the excess profits tax. He wishes he had not done this, because it was piecemeal also. But then again he was new at the job.

AIMS AT EXPANDED ECONOMY

His object is steadily to expand the economy so as to provide jobs and careers for the million and a half young people who come annually into the stream of commerce. This cannot be done without the measures outlined in the Fair Deal. From a peak of 59,600,000 of persons employed in civilian activities last September, the number has gone down to 56,000,000, with 4,800,000 unemployed. A certain amount of unemployment, say from three to five millions, is supportable. It is a good thing that job seeking should go on at all times; this is healthy for the economic body. But the main thing is to keep the economy rising to absorb the new entrants into the stream of commerce. There are now 62,000,000 employed in the labor force in the United States, including the military. Ten years ago whoever had suggested that this could happen would have been written down a fool or a dreamer.

Senators GEORGE and BYRD call for a reduction of $6,000,000,000 in the budget. They know very well it can't be done. The President has cut the defense requisitions this time from $22,000,000,000 to less than $14,000,000,000 and paid for the military-aid program for the North Atlantic Treaty nations out of it also. He is an old hand at budget making, and at the last session he sent a tight one to the Capitol and they sent it back with increased totals. He feels he has cut this one as much as can be done in consideration of the basic needs of the foreign program and of the dynamic domestic economy he seeks to create and maintain. This in itself will bring an end to deficit spending, which represents exactly the amount the tax cut of the Eightieth Congress cost the revenues. He hates deficit spending as much as HARRY BYRD ever could, and it is only a temporary condition, brought on by necessities which could not be removed by any genius of statecraft known or available to him.

A reduction of more than $8,000,000,000 in the defense bill, with $1,000,000,000 for the military-assistance program (MAP) found extra, compares rather well with the blueprint of the economizers.

He has no policy which contemplates permanently burdening the more able, diligent and successful with the cost of insuring all others against the results of their own improvidence, ill luck, or defective behavior. This charge—also that the Fair Deal approximates the Marxian doctrine—is absolutely untrue. The President's aim is to preserve life and property and expand opportunity and the standards of living. There isn't a drop of Marxist or Socialist blood in him.

The globe shows vast areas inhabited by hundreds of millions of people who want to improve their lot, and this can be done with our American surpluses and with a moderate amount of our assistance, financial and technical. When that is done the chief threat of international communism will pass, and this is the primary objective of his policy.

Question. Your views on party obligation: that all elected as Democrats must abide by platform pledges. Suppose (1) you construe a pledge in detail differently from a Member of Congress; or (2) he has made a commitment to the contrary prior to the adoption of the platform. Is he recreant as a party man?

Answer. The President does not expect 100 percent support from those elected to Congress on the same platform with him. He recognizes that local situations may require some Members to refuse to follow a President on certain matters. As a Senator, he reserved the right of independence at times for himself. But he does not believe that, after a platform has been duly adopted by a convention, all those who have participated or run on that platform should generally abide by its detailed construction by the national candidate.

Only that national candidate, the President, can translate a platform into actionable terms. There are few chairmen of congressional committees who follow the platform and the President's construction of it more than 50 percent of the time, and this is very bad. These chairmen should be the right arm of the administration in orderly government by party. If there is any other way to have a responsible Government, he does not know what it is.

GIVES HIS STAND ON FEPC

Question. You favor the Fair Employment Practice Commission legislation providing Federal police powers in the States to correct employment discriminations, some of which are implicit in the present condition of racial minorities. You know intimately the condition of the Negro race and the limitations of its capacity to fill certain kinds of employment. Many believe that education will be required before an FEPC could operate even on a voluntary basis. Why then is it desirable in mandatory form, requiring that the burden of proof be on the employer?

Answer. The President would not support or continue to support any legislation which deprived a citizen of the right to run his own business, for which that citizen was responsible, as he thought best. The President does not agree that the administration's FEPC legislation would have any such result. If he thought so, he would not be for it, and under him it will not be so administered.

But opportunities to get jobs for which applicants are fitted by every fair test must not be denied in this country on grounds of race, color, or any similar discrimination. The value of the FEPC bill will be to give this position the dignity, strength, and clarity of a national policy, not just political, but social and economic as well. For that reason he wants the bill passed, even if it were only to serve as a club in the closet.

EARLY "INADEQUACY" DESCRIBED

Question. When you became President you expressed a sense of inadequacy which many thought was far too humble for your abilities. Now and for some time you seem to have dropped that feeling overboard, where it belongs. How did this change come about?

Answer. When Mr. Truman became President he did not intend to convey the sense of inadequacy which many people thought he did. He came into office without a single member of the Cabinet who was devoted to him personally, without having been briefed on the processes or current problems of government, without knowing who the people were to whom he should apply for the counsel and facts a President must have to serve the best interests of the country. Often some member of that Cabinet tried to see him privately to complain about another one. He stopped that: first, by recounting the incident at the Cabinet meeting and asking the two or three involved to work it out; second, by getting his own Cabinet. Now he is served by the best personal staff he could find and by a loyal and able Cabinet. The problem remains how to find the very best qualified persons outside for counsel and for collecting the facts in special matters. That is an unending task, as well as a vital one. But the inadequacy of the position he was in to do that has disappeared, and that was all he meant at the time.

Question. It is true that chairmen in Congress get these places through senority, and it is a bad system. Have you any idea of a better one, or any other that would be operable?

Answer. The seniority system by which chairmen of committees in Congress are selected is a defective one because the best qualified men do not always get the jobs. But any substitute that has been proposed is unworkable, and the present system has the merit of keeping order in the legislative process. If the Administration were allowed to pick the chairmen, which is one substitute that has been proposed, the Executive would dominate Congress and this is not only undesirable but contrary to the intent of the Constitution.

Question. Will you explain your use of "red herring" and "hysteria" in the context of the spy trials and hunts since you are charged (1) with not comprehending the gravity of this situation or (2) playing for votes of groups under suspicion?

Answer. When Mr. Truman on several occasions spoke of "hysteria" and "red herrings" in connection with revelations about espionage, and so forth, he was criticizing the methods employed by the Un-American Activities Committee and by individuals in Congress and out of it. The objective of having only loyal citizens in Government service and in positions of importance and responsibility has been his fundamentally, too.

His loyalty board (Chairman Seth W. Richardson) has done much more effective screening of this kind without headlines and personal publicity than the congressional spy hunts, which have been animated chiefly by quests for headlines and personal publicity. These produced the hysteria he was talking about, reminding him of the public excitement in the days of the Alien and Sedition Acts, the Know-Nothing Movement, the Ku Klux Klan, and the red scares of 1920. And he has never changed his opinion that the way the Un-American Activities Committee handled the Hiss and other cases was a red herring to distract public attention from the blunders and crimes of the Eightieth Congress.

When the President was chairman of the special Senate committee during the war, he followed a method which he sought to endorse by contrast when he made the above comments about hysteria and red herrings. Whenever he found something wrong or some indication of potential wrong in the war program, he privately communicated the facts to the departments concerned, and usually it was corrected or averted without the kind of publicity that unfairly shakes public confidence, and spreads through the more than two millions in Government employ a feeling of insecurity in their jobs which hampers and damages their work.

The result was that no major scandal occurred in the war. This is the responsible method which, because it was not followed in these other matters, impelled him to say what he did. The Government service is 99 percent plus loyal and secure.

If the facts about a Government employee show the contrary, out the man will go at no expense to public stability—though, it is true, without a headline for a politician who has that chiefly in his mind.

Such are the President's statements on his views.

Those who have the privilege, necessarily a limited one, of searching in this way the mind and purpose of Harry S. Truman usually come away with faith in his honesty and courage. They usually come away also with the conviction that, whether or not he has the greatness which the times require—a question that must be left to the verdict of history—he means to preserve the basic system by which this Nation attained its greatness, and to achieve and maintain that peace which has been the highest aspiration since 1783.

Commemorative Stamp Issues

REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCES P. BOLTON
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. BOLTON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, for several years I have been pursuing the matter of special and commemorative issues of stamps with only confused information from the Post Office Department.

I have received a most clarifying letter from the Third Assistant Postmaster General in whom rests the departmental responsibility for these issues. Certain that many other Members have sought information in this field I am inserting General Lawler's letter in the RECORD as part of my remarks:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
THIRD ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, D. C., January 26, 1950.
Hon. FRANCES P. BOLTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MRS. BOLTON: This will acknowledge your letter of January 5 and other correspondence relative to commemorative stamps.

In the Postmaster General's letter of February 9, 1949, it was explained that under section 351, title 39 of the United States Code, he has the authority to issue new stamps of both the ordinary and commemorative variety. Prior to 1948 all postage stamps were issued under this authority, the ordinary stamps being determined by the various postal rates in force and the public convenience. Commemorative stamps are issued to recognize important historical anniversaries of events of national importance, or of famous persons. The Postmaster General, under the authority cited above, determines the number of new stamps to be issued.

There is a limit to the number of commemorative stamps that may be issued each year, as they must be manufactured and distributed in addition to approximately 20,000,000,000 stamps of the ordinary variety. It has been found from experience that not more than 10 or 12 commemoratives can be issued each year without dislocating normal functions or being accused of exploiting the collecting public. After a program of this extent had been approved for 1948, the Eightieth Congress enacted legislation requiring 14 additional stamps to be issued in a period of 6 months. This greatly augmented program had many unfavorable results, one of which was the delay in filling orders by the Philatelic Agency, as was brought to the attention of this office in your letter of February 1, 1949.

Philately is a hobby enjoyed by millions, among whom are many school children and people in modest financial circumstances who can ill afford more than a few pennies at a time for stamps. To issue a large number of commemoratives each year makes the cost of collecting prohibitive to these people, who then protest vigorously to the Department. A problem is also presented by our Philatelic Agency when stamps are issued in such profusion. Additional personnel, working quarters, and equipment are not immediately obtainable, and new clerks must be trained in the technicalities of philately if patrons are to receive the service they demand.

You will note in the attached table showing the issues in 1948 that the number of each stamp printed was reduced from 115,000,000 to 50,000,000 or 60,000,000, beginning with the Salute to Youth issue. This action was necessary in order to keep abreast of the numerous issues being released. Such reduction results in a higher philatelic value being placed on the stamps, which is undesirable from the small collector's point of view, as he is then required to pay higher prices to dealers for the stamps he was unable to obtain from the post office. The Philatelic Agency could not keep apace with such a program as that of 1948, which also seriously retarded the distribution of operating supplies of ordinary stamps to postmasters.

There is attached a statement showing the commemorative stamps issued during 1948 and 1949, together with the number of each sent to postmasters, and their total manufacturing cost. Also given is a statement showing the sales, salaries, etc., of the Philatelic Agency. To determine the total cost of providing commemorative stamps it would be necessary to add to the manufacturing cost and philatelic salaries not only that part of the cost of transportation, heat, light, power, and storage involved, but to apportion the time and salary of every clerk in the 41,000 post offices who handled them. While it is possible to determine this cost, the Department has not undertaken the task, as the final result would be of no value. The profit derived from the sales of commemorative stamps cannot be found by deducting this cost from the receipts. The profit depends rather on the number of commemorative stamps sold that are never used for postage purposes. It is impossible to even accurately estimate this, as a great many collectors buy sheets of 50 or 100 stamps and select only a few for their collections, the balance being used for postage. Then again there are those who have been collecting for years that unfortunately meet financial reverses and are forced to use their collections for postage purposes. In order to ascertain with any degree of accuracy the profit derived from the sale of commemorative stamps, it would be necessary to know the number of stamps used strictly for collecting purposes and those affixed to mail. It is of course impossible to obtain this information.

It is hoped that this will clarify the situation sufficiently to enable you to furnish satisfactory answers to your constituent's inquiries.

Sincerely yours,
JOSEPH J. LAWLER,
Assistant Postmaster General.

Commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1948

Date issued	Name of stamp	Number issued
Jan. 5	George Washington Carver	121,548,000
Jan. 24	California Gold Centennial	130,709,500
Apr. 7	Mississippi Territory	[1] 117,000,000
May 28	Four Chaplains	[1] 115,000,000
May 29	Wisconsin Statehood	[1] 115,000,000
June 4	Swedish Pioneer	64,198,500
July 19	Progress of Women	[1] 115,000,000
July 31	Golden Anniversary, City of New York	38,449,100*
July 31	William Allen White	77,643,600*
Aug. 2	United States-Canada Friendship	[1] 115,000,000
Aug. 9	Francis Scott Key	[1] 115,000,000
Aug. 11	Salute to Youth	[1] 75,000,000
Aug. 14	Oregon Territory	52,214,000
Aug. 25	Harlan Fiske Stone	53,958,100
Aug. 25	Palomar, Mount, Observatory	[1] 50,000,000*
Sept. 7	Clara Barton	[1] 50,000,000
Sept. 9	Poultry Industry	52,975,000*
Sept. 21	Gold Star Mothers	[1] 75,000,000*
Sept. 22	Fort Kearny	[1] 50,000,000*
Oct. 4	Volunteer Firemen	[1] 50,000,000*
Oct. 15	Indian Centennial	[1] 50,000,000*
Oct. 27	Rough Riders	53,875,000*
Oct. 29	Juliette Low	[1] 60,000,000*
Nov. 4	Will Rogers	[1] 60,000,000
Nov. 5	Fort Bliss	63,490,000
Nov. 9	Moina Michael	[1] 60,000,000*
Nov. 19	Lincoln's Gettysburg Address	[1] 60,000,000*
Nov. 20	American Turners Society	[1] 60,000,000*
Dec. 9	Joel Chandler Harris	[1] 60,000,000

[1] Number of stamps ordered printed rather than the number issued. This is given when the issue is not yet complete.

*The asterisks mark the stamps that were required by congressional action. The others were approved by the Postmaster General.

Total number of new stamps issued in 1948 was 2,009,111,000 at a manufacturing cost of $442,123.

Commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1949

Date issued	Name of stamp	Number printed
Mar. 3	Minnesota Territory	100,000,000*
Apr. 12	Washington and Lee University	110,000,000
May 11	Alexandria Bicentennial	70,000,000*
May 23	Annapolis Tercentenary	100,000,000*
Aug. 29	Grand Army of the Republic	110,000,000
Oct. 7	Edgar Allan Poe	112,000,000
	Universal Postal Union:	
Oct. 7	15-cent	35,000,000
Nov. 18	10-cent	20,000,000
Nov. 30	25-cent	15,000,000
Dec. 17	Wright Brothers Air Mail	75,000,000

*The asterisks mark the stamps that were required by congressional action. The others were approved by the Postmaster General.

The total number of commemorative stamps issued to postmasters in 1949 was 1,144,456,700, at a manufacturing cost of $204,036.

Work load and cost of clerks

Fiscal year	Average number of employees	Salaries	Orders	Amount of business
1947	47	$124,767	161,251	$3,331,291.00
1948	46	117,643	124,208	2,490,705.00
1949	58	169,782	194,660	4,136,122.01

Veterans' Organizations Disagree With Part of the Hoover Report

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS A. JENKINS
OF OHIO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, about 2 years ago Congress passed legislation providing for a Commission to study the numerous Government departments with the idea of making much needed economies in many departments of the Government. Former President Hoover, America's greatest administrator, was placed at the head of this Commission. He, with other members of the Commission and a large corps of experts in Government management selected to advise them, brought forth a few months ago a masterful document known as the Hoover Report. This report recommended certain drastic changes in the management of the medical centers and hospitals which are now under the control of the Veterans' Administration.

The national commanders of the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans and the American Veterans of World War II protested vigorously that it was not for the best interests of the disabled veterans of the country to have the recommendation of the Hoover Commission carried out. These veterans' organizations made a thorough study of the problem and published their recommendations in well-written briefs. I have read these briefs and feel that these organizations have made a good case. I feel that the views of these organizations can be carried out without seriously affecting the usefulness of the Hoover Report.

I expressed my views on this subject in a short speech that I made in the House of Representatives in Congress on February 2, 1950. This speech is as follows:

RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE HOOVER COMMISSION WITH REFERENCE TO VETERANS

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, the various veterans' organizations in the country are objecting to one of the recommendations of the Hoover Commission. They assert that this recommendation if carried into effect will work a severe hardship on disabled veterans and those needing hospitalization.

I want to commend the leaders of these organizations for the thorough study they have given to the subject before they announced their opposition to this one section of the Hoover report. I have read the statements made by the American Legion and other veterans' organizations on this subject and I feel they made a good case. It shall be my purpose to assist them in their efforts.

The people are strong for the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission and, likewise, they want to do justice to the veterans, especially those who are disabled and those who are in need of medical care and hospitalization.

I think Congress can work out a plan that will meet the wishes of the veterans and not seriously disturb the recommendations of the Hoover Commission.

The high officials in several of the veterans' organizations approved my speech and complimented me for making it. At a meeting of American Legion leaders from Ohio recently held in Washington the viewpoint expressed by me was in good part the viewpoint of most of those present.

The First World War affected the United States and the whole world tremendously and in many ways. It brought many difficult national problems. One of these problems was what to do for the disabled veterans and the widows and orphans of veterans who had given their lives for their country. Millions of our young men participated in this war and many thousands gave up their lives and many more thousands returned as permanent cripples.

Lincoln said after the Civil War that it was the obligation of the Government to care for him who bore the brunt of the battle in the heat of the day and for his widow and orphans. To the everlasting credit of our country the Government through the actions of Congress has always done this.

Soon after the First World War, Congress passed legislation setting up what is known as the Veterans' Administration. In this new department of the Government was reposed the authority and the responsibility of administering the laws providing for pensions and compensations and also the laws providing for the management of medical centers and hospitals for the care of disabled veterans.

The Veterans' Administration has become a very important Government department and employs many thousands of office employees and physicians. These employees have the responsibility of caring for many thousands who are receiving assistance and medical care of different kinds.

The Second World War brought many of the same problems with many hundreds of thousands of additional disabled to be cared for.

The burden on the Veterans' Administration came to be tremendous in volume and tremendous in expense. It was only natural that there would be many complaints made against this organization and while many of these complaints may not have been justified, it is only natural that many of them would be well founded. In fact, the work of this great organization became heavier and heavier by reason of the increased load that came with the passage of new legislation giving to veterans many new privileges for training and education, all of which called for the expenditure of great amounts of additional funds.

In my somewhat extended service in Congress, I have had occasion to serve many thousands of disabled veterans in their efforts to secure pensions and other assistance. Likewise I have assisted in securing pensions for thousands of widows of war veterans. Back in the period following the First World War when the veterans of that war were claiming pensions and compensation for injuries and the effects of gas, I think the records will show that I had for two separate years gotten more pensions than any other Congressman. My experience as a lawyer and with the help of efficient office assistants, enabled me to secure material assistance for many worthy veterans.

The GI bill of rights which passed Congress following the Second World War, and for which I voted, brought to Members of Congress a great deal of additional work. By reason of this law thousands of deserving veterans have been able to equip themselves to fill responsible positions in the professions and in every form of social activity.

I feel confident that this Congress will give favorable consideration to the expressed wishes of the several great veterans' organizations with reference to the maintenance of the medical centers and hospitals now under the control of the Veterans' Administration and that this will be done without weakening the power and influence of the Hoover Commission whose recommendations have quite generally met with the most hearty approval of the American people.

The veterans' organizations are to be commended for their efforts in securing for the sick and disabled veterans what they are entitled to. If the Veterans' Administration has been inefficient in its handling of the medical centers and hospitals, it will, I am sure, immediately endeavor to correct its faulty methods.

I hope that the veterans' organizations will in the future encourage the Veterans' Administration in its management of the medical centers and hospitals to which the disabled veterans are sent. If these agencies are properly and economically operated by the Veterans' Administration, the veterans will be benefitted and the general public will be satisfied.

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. HESELTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include an eloquent address by the Honorable Joseph Mruk, mayor of Buffalo, N. Y., together with introductory remarks by Hon. Chester T. Skibinski, chairman of the Massachusetts Board of Arbitration and Conciliation, recently delivered over the radio under the auspices of the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish American Congress, Inc.:

JUSTICE FOR POLAND

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY CHESTER T. SKIBINSKI, CHAIRMAN OF THE MASSACHUSETTS BOARD OF ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION

Poles came to America before the Pilgrim fathers arrived on the Mayflower and even before Henry Hudson sailed into what is known today as the port of New York. The first Poles landed in 1608 and helped to establish the oldest American colony at Jamestown, Va.

During the next two and one-half centuries, the immigration consisted mostly of Polish intellectuals who left an indelible stamp on the progress and development of the United States, which is too lengthy to narrate in this brief introduction. The massive influx of Poles, however, began in the middle of the nineteenth century and was comprised chiefly of people engaged in agricultural pursuits. Today there are some 6,000,000 Americans of Polish ancestry in the United States.

Since one of the characteristics of Poles is an intense love of freedom, it was not surprising that during our war for independence, the noble Polish military leaders volunteered their services to General Washington. The address you are about to hear is devoted to the evaluation of accomplishments of one of them.

Our speaker was born in Buffalo, N. Y., in 1903, the son of Polish immigrants. In 1937 he became a member of the Buffalo city council and in 1943 a Congressman from the Forty-first New York District. In 1949 he was elected mayor of the city of Buffalo, a city of 600,000 inhabitants, on the Republican ticket. I feel proud and honored to present to you, the recorded address of the Honorable Joseph Mruk, mayor of Buffalo.

ADDRESS OF HON. JOSEPH MRUK, MAYOR OF BUFFALO, N. Y.

When a famous French writer met Thaddeus Kosciusko at a banquet, and asked him bluntly, "General, please tell us all about your revolution," Kosciusko answered, "I have been a soldier, and I fought."

This little story gives us a more convincing picture of the man, whose birthday we commemorate today, than lengthy biographies. For, modesty is an attribute of greatness, and Kosciusko was a great man. There are no doubts about it. But he was so modest that he probably never realized that his birthday would be celebrated in speech and writing for many, many years to come, not only in his native Poland, but also in the United States, which became his beloved country of adoption. He never guessed that after 204 years his name would be heard by millions of listeners, in the privacy of their homes, thanks to an invention called the radio.

I wish that not only his compatriots, but that all Americans could join today in a tribute, paid the man who was justly called the Polish Washington.

Strangely enough we are facing almost the same problems that worried Kosciusko and stirred his heart to action. In his times Poland was victimized by three rapacious neighbors. The country was partitioned, and overrun, by Russian and German armies. Nowadays, Poland is again a victim of a ruthless occupation, but many other countries are suffering the same hardships. If only the world would have more men of the stature of Kosciusko, who never hesitated to risk his life defending a just cause, we would not have to worry.

The life of that political refugee, who later became a general of the young American Army, should be taught in every school as an inspiring example. He came to the United States of America as a heartbroken, displaced Polish soldier, a refugee from a defeated country; and a few years later he was planning the defense of Billingsport and of Saratoga, he was constructing fortifications of our first Military Academy at West Point, where we may now admire his monument. He joined the army of Washington, and had the privilege of firing the last shot in the American Revolution.

Even in Charleston, deep in the South, the name of Kosciusko sounds familiar to all inhabitants, because it is connected with the memorable day of December 14, 1782, when victorious armies marched into the city, and a young American colonel, of Polish origin, was cited by General Greene for his extraordinary zeal, vigilance, and brains.

Kosciusko arrived in America in 1775 as a political exile after the first partition of Poland, because the noble words of the American Declaration of Independence prompted many enthusiasts to leave their countries and help the heroic American soldiers in their strive for liberty.

The American war for independence became thus his personal problem. Kosciusko embraced the ideal of democracy and became its promoter in his own country, where he returned 10 years later as an American general to lead a fabulous insurrection against three powerful occupants. Before his departure from America, where his promotion was recommended by Washington as an individual proclamation, he was bestowed another honor by a city where he lived for a long time. The exclusive Society of Cincinnati, with only three foreigners in its midst, offered Kosciusko a perpetual membership. Washington gave him his own sword, which he used during the battle of Saratoga. That token of a lasting friendship between a statesman and a soldier was for many years one of the greatest treasures of the Polish National Museum, because of its symbolic meaning, namely, that of the friendly relations that existed from the very beginning between the United States of America and Poland. A friendship cemented with the blood of Polish heroes, Kosciusko, Pulaski, and many others.

After his departure from America in 1784, "he took with him," as a biographer states, "besides ideas of political and military nature which had, up to then, been less effective in the Old World, also the treasures of experience, of endurance, and of authority which were to prove so invaluable to Poland." His liberal manifesto, assuring Polish peasants of their rights, was an echo of the American Declaration of Independence.

Almost single-handed he waged a war against Russia, and its allies. He dared to challenge not only Catherine of Rusisa, but also the German and Austrian rulers. Guided by a truly American democratic spirit, he mobilized men of all social classes.

For the first time, members of the Polish nobility and peasants joined their hands, and formed a powerful living chain. Unfortunately, it did not prove strong enough to withstand the joint onslaught of three well armed enemies. The hero of both the American Revolution and Polish Civil War, was critically wounded and thrown in a dungeon in St. Petersburg. But such was his prestige that the newly elected czar paid him a visit and set him free.

Kosciusko never surrendered. He remained faithful to his principles. Even the magnetic charm of Napoleon would not make him collaborate with the French Army, because the Emperor refused to promise complete independence to Poland. "Everything or nothing" was the motto of Kosciusko. Heartbroken over the plight of his native land he went into voluntary exile, and returned to his beloved United States of America, for the independence of which he fought with such unselfish zeal and devotion. Americans freed from a foreign rule were gladly building the future of the New World. They greeted Kosciusko in 1797 like the best of friends. They forgot their shops and labors, their troubles and quarrels, and—as his biographers state—they poured en masse on the wharf of Philadelphia to celebrate the return of the "illustrious defender of the rights of mankind." The citizens of Philadelphia, in their ardor, unharnessed the horses from Kosciusko's carriage, and dragged it to his lodgings.

The popularity of Kosciusko in this country grew even more after the publication of his last will, addressed to his dear friend President Jefferson. In that testament the noble Pole asked that all his meager funds be used for the freeing and educating of Negroes. And though his intentions have never been carried out, he nevertheless, deserves the title of a pioneer of their emancipation. The last words of his will "each citizen must defend his country against foreign as well as internal enemies," sound nowadays more timely than ever.

Kosciusko is a symbol of all the values that make a good citizen. And today again, his inspiring example appeals to all those who suffer persecution and who strive for freedom. He is also a shining example for all Americans of foreign birth who came to this blessed country of ours from their native lands, as war victims or political refugees, and instead of becoming a burden to America are her real asset. He is a symbol of the indomitable Polish spirit.

Once more Poland lost its independence through no fault of her own, but solely through the fault of greedy, imperialistic-minded neighbors, and through the short-sightedness of the modern world which did not realize that not only Poland but the entire civilization is threatened by an impending danger of a totalitarian enslavement. Once more the lovely country which in 1918 regained its independence, dreamed of by Kosciusko, and accomplished many striking achievements, only to be overrun in 1939 by German and Russian Armies, joined again in an unholy alliance, became in our times a target of despicable political bargaining which caused her enslavement by Soviet Russia. And once more Thaddeus Kosciusko seems to rally young and old, men and women around the historic Polish flag, which bears the memorable motto: For your freedom and ours.

Poland, the country of Kosciusko, Pulaski, and so many other heroes, will never die.

Why I Had To Step Aside

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH S. WHERRY

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 17 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article by Dr. Edwin G. Nourse, who recently resigned as Chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers because he could not twist economic facts to suit political purposes.

The article should be of interest to every American citizen, since it sheds light upon the policy of the Administration and how political and personal bias sway official decisions and warp their thinking on economics. The article is entitled "Why I Had To Step Aside," and it appeared in Collier's magazine for February 18, 1950.

I am informed by the Public Printer that the manuscript is estimated to make approximately three pages of the RECORD, at a cost of $246.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHY I HAD TO STEP ASIDE

(By Dr. Edwin G. Nourse)

(In 18 years of Democratic rule in Washington, no one man's break with the White House has had deeper meaning than the resignation of Dr. Edwin G. Nourse as chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers. Past rifts between presidential righ-hand men and their boss have stirred up louder tempests and juicier gossip. But Dr. Nourse is no mere disgruntled politician or disaffected crony. At 66 an economist of the highest distinction, formerly vice president of the Brookings Institution, head of the American Economic Association, and United States delegate to international economic conferences, he quit his council post as an act of intellectual protest against the things he saw done and the attitudes he met behind the top-level Washington scene. This is Dr. Nourse's own story of why he quit. He tells it with characteristic dignity, restraint, and lack of sensationalism. But in it he raises one of the most important questions of our time: How far do we want to let political and personal bias go in swaying the official decisions which daily affect our economic lives?—The Editor.)

It made live newspaper copy to say I fired a blast at the administration and that this act cost me my job as Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers. But such an explanation does not square with the facts, and it fails to shed any light for my fellow citizens on some developments in our system of free government which I believe important for our future.

The mere addition of one individual—technically past retirement age—to the ranks of the unemployed would in itself have no importance or general interest. But in this particular case the individual was connected with a highly important innovation in the United States effort to make free enterprise work splendidly within a system of free government. Thus my departure has significance for the businessman, the worker, the taxpayer, the voter, and the reasons should be frankly told.

I did not resign because of any doubts or disillusionment about the Employment Act of 1946 itself, which set up the Council of Economic Advisers. I still firmly believe in the declaration of national policy with which the act begins. It states a purpose which is practical, sound, and deeply held in the hearts of most Americans. It registers an intention of ending, or at least lessening, the periodic depressions which have plagued us in the past.

The act proposes no panacea. But it seeks to mobilize our economic brains, inside Government and outside, to improve our public and private economic practices, and to coordinate the economic thinking and policy making of business executives, labor leaders, farm organization officials, and Government people. It promises unprecedented recognition to the scientifically trained economist as a practical aid in public affairs.

Nor did I resign because I felt that the Council of Economic Advisers itself was either inadequate or ill-designed to promote the purposes of the Employment Act. It was set up as a small advisory agency, with no administrative powers or responsibilities. It was not to gather its own facts or rely exclusively on its own interpretations, but to

synthesize data from many agencies in Government and in private business. Its task was to bring this data into focus for use by a greatly overworked and heavily pressured President.

This exacting job was to be done by three men who, as a result of training, experience, and attainments were especially qualified to analyze and interpret economic developments, appraise Government programs and activities, and formulate and recommend national economic policy.

A LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

When Mr. Truman asked me to become Chairman of the newly established Council of Economic Advisers, I first tried to see what kind of a council was expected or desired. After our initial discussion I wrote to the President, outlining my view of the Council's role. I said I saw no need for it to become in any way involved in the rival beliefs and struggles of different political and economic factions. I added that, if this statement correctly interpreted the act and reflected his hopes and purposes for the Council, the position offered me was one of unparalleled opportunity as well as responsibility, and one to which I would give my most loyal service. Mr. Truman at that time expressed agreement with my interpretation.

In my more than 3 years on the Council, my troubles stemmed entirely from the interpretation placed on qualifications for Council membership and from the way Council members interpreted the general instructions laid down in the act. In the end, I felt I had to step aside because I had become convinced that the Council of Economic Advisers could not, under present circumstances, be operated as the professional and nonpolitical agency I had supposed was called for by the Employment Act of 1946.

The impasse which led me to feel that I had to step aside began to develop early. When I accepted the post of chairman, I was entirely unacquainted with either Mr. Leon H. Keyserling or Dr. John D. Clark, the other members. As we got down to work, it became evident that both my colleagues conceived the role of the Council as one of much more active participation in the political process by which policies are carried out than I did.

I had stated my idea of our duties in a paper read before the American Economic Association in late January 1947, under the title Economics in the Public Service. I disavowed the idea that we were the three wise men of economics standing at the President's elbow to give him pontifical answers to every economic problem as it arose.

Instead, I said, we should undertake to show him the agreements and disagreements among qualified economists and experienced business, labor, and agricultural leaders and the grounds on which these disagreements arise. We should tell him briefly and simply which courses of action we, individually or collectively, believe promised best results for the national welfare. My paper concluded: "When we have brought this sort of material to the President's desk, we shall have discharged our responsibilities under the act as I conceive it."

That paper was called to the President's attention, with this passage specifically pointed out. He later said he had read it with approval. But our Council discussions soon made it clear that neither of the other members would have stated our role in any such terms. Instead of marshaling pros and cons for the President's consideration and analyzing probable consequences of alternative policies or actions, they were emphatic that the Council should come to the President with a single definite policy recommendation and do our best to "sell" him on it. After he had bought it—or taken a different policy line—they thought the Council should be prepared to testify on the President's policy if asked to do so by the Congress.

One member insisted strongly, and the other more or less acquiesced, that a three-man Council must follow a majority rule, certainly as to operational matters such as the Council's role and scope or activities and, hopefully, even as to economic views. I did not feel that the Council could or should be expected always to come to agreement. Since actual agreement was impossible and formal agreement was demanded, both omission and verbal subterfuges were resorted to in order to produce documents to meet deadlines. Subsequently, a member could claim that his pet idea was still there by implication.

It was also argued that it was fruitless, if not improper, for us to draft analyses and expositions whose conclusions varied with the President's known and publicly stated beliefs and intentions. My answer was: "We are not here to take our economics from the President. We are here to bring him the best thinking that economic training and enlightened business experience (including labor and agriculture) have to offer. If any one of us believes the course he is following or proposing is harmful to the best interests of the economy, it is his duty to keep saying so (privately to the President) and to make as clear as possible to him the reasons for our concern."

In the first 2 years of the council, our difficulties were somewhat minimized by the fact that the reports published were explicitly Economic Reports of the President and appeared in his name. No separate statement appeared over the signatures of the council. Even so, there were gentlemanly brawls around our council table in which I was accused of running out on the President because I insisted on holding to reservation or dissents I had originally expressed, but which had been removed or stultified in the devious literary process ending under the editorial pencil of the White House staff.

In the first 2 years, there was considerable criticism of the President's Economic Reports as being infused with politics. Presumably this infusion occurred after documents of pure economics had been given him by the council. The President was peculiarly sensitive to this charge as the campaign of 1948 got under way.

He urged me very strongly, therefore, to have the council present a report of its own in conjunction with the Midyear Economic Report of the President.

DISQUIETING POSSIBILITIES

My colleagues were delighted at this proposal. I finally acquiesced, although with great misgivings. I felt that either the document signed by the council would be so written as to support the President's program, whatever that might be, or that the public would note real or alleged discrepancies between the council's analysis and his recommendations and thus embarrass the whole relationship between the council and the President.

The midyear report of 1948 contained a separate Review of the Economic Situation over the signatures of the Council. I tried to have it limited to a factual statement and an objective analysis, with no policy recommendations, thus preserving the principle that the Council is not itself a policy-making agency. By dint of what I called persistence and others called stubbornness and overreaching the Chairman's prerogatives, I had the Review's concluding section limited to an examination of the issue between inflation and stabilization rather than devoted to the argument that inflationary dangers demanded the reimposition of price and other economic controls. The situation was made somewhat delicate by the fact that presentation of the midyear report had been postponed until after the Democratic National Convention so that it would not seem a political document designed to influence the country and the delegates.

But when Mr. Truman made his acceptance speech to the convention at 2 o'clock on the morning of July 15, he announced that he would call a special session of Congress to enact a rather specific program of controls. Thus he scooped himself on his forthcoming Economic Report. When that report appeared, on July 28, the President's statement was limited to five pages of general policy on the theme "A time for action," followed by a page and a half excerpt from his message to the special session on July 27. This presented an eight-point program, which ran from an excess-profits tax to price control for scarce commodities.

General public comment was that the Council's Review, presented separately in the report, was factual and objective. But it was also commented that the President's program for the special session did not logically follow from our analysis. Thus the division of the document into two parts with separate responsibilities did not allay the charge of politics, but sharpened it.

It was at this time that I definitely broke with the practice of trying to arrive at single, unified statements of the Council's views in private documents prepared for the President's guidance. Sometimes I would merely append a dissenting opinion. Sometimes, if my views basically differed from my colleagues', I would submit a separate document with my own evaluation of the available facts, or if the facts were agreed on, indicating the logic by which I had arrived at a different recommendation.

Developments in connection with the third annual Economic Report of the President, on January 7, 1949, caused the Council's position to deteriorate still further. The special session had not enacted the President's eight-point program, and there was every indication it would be reintroduced in the new Congress. There was a strong move to add to this program specific proposals that the Federal Government take steps to enlarge industrial capacity, notably steel, on the theory that inflationary danger stemmed from a persistent shortage of industrial output.

The Council's Review at this time limited itself to observing that "attention should be given to the possibility" that allocation controls might be needed and that "selective price controls also call for consideration" as well as "special measures (that) may be needed to stimulate the increase of capacity and production."

But the legislative recommendations in the President's report went somewhat further than mere consideration. He asked for selective price-control authority and for measures which would "remedy shortages of supply in certain critical areas so serious as to impede maximum production in an expanding economy and to limit programs related to national security."

PROVISION FOR FUTURE NEEDS

He concluded that "immediate legislation * * * should impose upon the Government specific responsibility and provide the funds to make careful surveys of future supply needs and productive capacity * * * at maximum employment, production, and purchasing power. To the extent that facts reveal the need, it should provide additional authority to deal more adequately and effectively with inadequacy of capacity and supply."

Out of these recommendations there promptly came the Spence bill. That bill provided for promotion of production and supply, priorities and allocations, price control and decontrol, and the adjustment of wages, salaries or other benefits through collective bargaining. It was widely hailed by those who believed in it as a new action

program by Government to carry the Employment Act into effect. Those who feared this bill branded it as the opening wedge to nationalization of industry and eventual state socialism.

Certain members of the Council and its staff lent their support to the Spence bill. They not only helped draft it, but gave assurance that it was in line with the Council's findings of fact and its private recommendations to the President. Such a course was not justified by any Council understanding, but this could not be made clear in view of the peculiar circumstances. It might be all very well in the political game of a party administration to have a bill of uncertain parentage go to the Congress without specific Presidential sponsorship, be used as a trial balloon and abandoned when that seemed expedient (as was done). But for members of the Council, unofficially and somewhat surreptitiously, to give such a measure a cloak of Council approval created an impossible situation for the chairman of the Council.

February 1949 saw the first real show-down between the political and the economic interpretations of the Council's role. The President had several times told us, "You bring me the economics of the question. I'll take responsibility for making the political judgments and final decisions." I was content to obey this directive, but other members of the Council were not willing to terminate their activities at this point. They were not content to wait for the Council to win prestige and usefulness based solely on professional competence, mature judgment, practical realism, and a stubborn refusal to let economic judgment be warped by political considerations. They wanted to advance philosophies or causes for which they had a personal enthusiasm.

One said, "People who were interested in seeing me attain a place on the Council are chiding me for my ineffectiveness, now I am here."

The most direct and dramatic means of gaining such personal influence was, of course, to go before a congressional committee in active support of the President's program.

This question had not arisen sharply when the first economic report of the President went to the Congress in January 1947. But in January 1948 it was proposed that I appear on Capitol Hill to argue in support of the President's economic program. When I demurred, several members of the Cabinet agreed with me that this was not appropriate for the chairman of a professional and nonpolitical body. They recognized that the Council has a unique role within our frame of government, which calls for a detachment from active political affairs comparable, in its way, to that of the Supreme Court.

The Employment Act of 1946 made this nonpolitical role of the Council as clear as possible without actually forbidding legislative activities by Council members. At the same time it set up in the Congress an entirely distinct machinery for carrying the purpose of the act into legislation. This is a Joint Committee on the Economic Report, composed of seven Senators and seven Representatives, instructed to make its own continuing study of matters relating to the economic report. For this purpose it has both committee funds and the extensive Legislative Reference Service of the Library of Congress. Thus it is entirely unnecessary for the committee to draw the Council over into the inevitably political atmosphere of the Congress.

Such a course is also mischievous and fatal to the Council's unique character as a staff arm on which the President could rely for politically disinterested or colorless analysis and advice. If a member of the Council exposes himself to merciless questioning in the political and partisan atmosphere of Capitol Hill, he faces a dilemma of a sort intolerable to an economist of professional training and scruples. Shall he accept the role of economic attorney and, by rhetorical agility, make the most plausible case he can for someone he serves as mouthpiece? Such following of the party line would be not only repugnant to professional standards, but also self-defeating in the case of anyone who had previously contributed to serious economic literature.

It is quite unthinkable that the President would always follow the economic philosophy of such a Council member; and, in supporting the President, the Council member would be liable at an awkward moment to be trapped by some well-read Congressman who would confront him with contrary views he had expressed in private life.

On the other hand, if a Council member stated his honest conviction that a policy espoused by the President was, in his judgment, economically unsound, this would be exploited by political opponents as evidence of stupidity or of willingness by the President to subordinate economic soundness to political advantage. Such an episode or series of episodes would embarrass and strain future relations between Council and President.

I, for one, have been unwilling to stultify myself and my profession by arguing for positions I could not honestly support. I have been equally unwilling to appear debating, criticizing, and in effect tearing down the policies espoused by my chief—for whatever reasons. The moment such a situation was allowed to arise, my usefulness and that of the Council itself would be seriously impaired, if not destroyed.

My colleagues kept insisting that I took much too restricted a view of the Council's function, and that I was hampering its usefulness and lowering its place in public esteem. I was told that we should not merely contribute material for the President's use in formulating his economic policies, but that we should go on to play an important part in effectuating those policies in the Congress and through the public, on the cheerful assumption that the President always followed our (not unanimous) advice or that we were prepared to accept his decision, whatever it might be.

This view was also shared by some, though not all, members of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. When Senator TAFT was chairman of this committee I explained my view to him and he refrained from requesting either my appearance or that of other Council members. The President had said that he would not urge me to appear, since I felt such activity improper. Nor would he dissuade the other members if they wished to appear.

MESSAGE PRECISELY WORDED

Senator O'MAHONEY became chairman of this commitee in January 1949 with the change of party control in the Congress. On February 4, he wired me the first formal request for the Council to appear before the committee. The message was worded with notable precision. He asked us to appear to develop and amplify those major analyses and findings in the Annual Economic Review of current problems and prospective trends and developments which accompanied the President's report. However, anyone of normal political sophistication would realize in advance that the question of whether our analyses justified the President's recommendation would arise at every stage of the discussion.

The Senator's telegram arrived after I had left Washington for a long-standing speaking engagement in New York. On my return I at once wrote him:

"I understand that Mr. Keyserling and Mr. Clark freely and gladly accepted your invitation to appear before the committee. If I had been here, I would have had, in good conscience, to ask that I be excused.

"I think you are aware * * * of my belief that this agency cannot, over the years, discharge its functions effectively and without embarrassment either to the Chief Executive or to Council members if it is drawn out of the Executive Office into the political atmosphere of Capitol Hill. * * * I would strongly regret being put in a position where my testimony could be used to embarrass or weaken the position of the President."

The presentation before the joint committee, chiefly by the vice chairman of the Council, stressed the imminence of inflationary dangers. This made the Council not a little ridiculous, since, by that time the problem to be faced was the onset of recession. The President's program had been framed in the latter part of 1948, when it was still possible to be worried about inflation. But even then, there had been evidences of a reversal of trend; this was clearly noted in the Council's review, but was underplayed in the preparation of the President's program.

Instead of appearing publicly in support of a Presidential policy already made obsolete by the march of events, all members of the Council should have been diligently weighing the significance of the latest recessionary developments and privately advising the President as to revisions of policy that would square with the new facts.

This episode is a striking example of how active participation in the process of political persuasion will corrupt the Council's performance of its duties in the sphere of economic analysis.

During the time of the joint committee hearings I was on the Pacific coast, fulfilling speaking engagements, business and academic, arranged long before. There, and after my return, I began to hear rumors that I had resigned or was about to do so. Reporters inquiring at the White House were told: "Just the routine resignations such as many officials submitted at the opening of the new Presidential term."

My resignation had been handed to the President on December 14, 1948, and was intended to be taken seriously, not as a mere gesture to protocol. As I pondered the meaning of the November election returns and noted the reaction of my fellow members, I became convinced that my departure from the council was only a matter of time—a very short time. In my letter to the President, I reiterated my deep concern that the council become established on a high professional plane, with its members not subject to the vicissitudes of politics but retained or replaced solely on the grounds of their qualifications as objective economists."

The fact that this interpretation had not been accepted and observed had made my work as chairman so difficult, and the internal tensions so great that I expressed a wish to be relieved at a not too distant date. I would defer my going until I had completed any duties or responsibilities in connection with your forthcoming Economic Report.

The President responded, neither orally nor in writing, to my December resignation. I discussed the difficulties of my situation with Dr. John R. Steelman, Assistant to the President, on two or three occasions but did not press the matter for some 8 months. Circumstances made it apparent that this was no time for anyone in the executive office to rock the boat.

The program of anti-inflation controls included in the President's Economic Report in January of last year, his call for $4,000,000,000 of new taxes, and the alarm caused by the section of the Spence bill providing for Government action to enlarge steel and other industrial plant capacity had now to be considered against a background of rising unemployment, failing production and lower prices. It was obvious that everyone

concerned for our economic welfare should stand by to give all the aid he could.

For the council this meant having the best possible council review and midyear economic report of the President.

TRENDS EVALUATED IN REPORT

I therefore did all I could to quiet the talk of my resignation and to prepare a council evaluation of trends which would have greatest guidance value for the President. When the midyear report appeared, the reactions of informed persons made me feel that this end was measurably accomplished.

One other task remained. On July 1, at a meeting of various major department heads in the Cabinet room, the President handed me a letter requesting a Council critique of the economic impact of budget ceilings being considered for the fiscal year 1951. As the Council undertook the drafting of this document, it became glaringly evident that no common ground for evaluation of fiscal policy existed between us. Hence, I set about drafting my own independent analysis. Without waiting to complete this task, I decided that the time had arrived for me to seek early acceptance of my resignation.

August 9, 1949, third anniversary of our swearing-in ceremony, seemed a fitting date for raising the matter again with the President. Referring to my letter of resignation of December 1948, I urged as much speed as possible in the selection of my successor.

On September 9 I renewed my request.

"I have not had any direct response from you to my letter (of August 9), but Mr. Steelman informed me on August 11 that the only question which would be involved was that of timing of the announcement of my retirement. He said you desired to name my successor at the same time that you announced my resignation. You could thus avoid pressure on behalf of persons whom you would not care to consider for appointment. In accordance with this suggestion, I have not mentioned my pending retirement even to my colleagues on the Council. This has caused delay in organizing our program of work and our staff arrangements between now and the Economic Report in January. My relations are rendered ambiguous also with reference to Mr. Pace and budget discussions. If the work of the Council is to be kept from serious demoralization (these men should know) that I shall be leaving not later than November 1."

This matter proved one of the best-kept secrets of recent Washington experience. It was not until the morning of October 17 that the story appeared in print and then obliquely, through a commentator's column, rather than directly, as a news release.

By coincidence, I was addressing a trade association group at the Mayflower Hotel the following day on a program that had as its theme the March of Progress. Speaking from the economic side, I reviewed the enormous potentialities for progress within our grasp and then expressed concern lest policies and practices being followed in private and in public areas might seriously impede that progress. My speech had been written some days in advance, and I was completely surprised when the belated story of my resignation broke the day before this meeting. The fact that the news was out did not infuse any added feeling into what I said on this occasion. Nor did it occur to me that I should withhold or modify my prepared paper. The press, however, seized upon my speech as either a parting shot to relieve my mind after I was out, or as an indiscreet utterance which caused prompt acceptance of a resignation which otherwise I might have been urged to withdraw. The facts as here cited make it clear that neither interpretation was correct.

In fairness to the job, I had felt I could not press for acceptance of my resignation during the first half of 1949. But, in fairness to myself, I could not defer it longer than the autumn. After the age of 66, this sort of thing takes a heavy toll. While the midyear report was in preparation I hung on at my office till nearly midnight on both Saturday and Sunday nights of one of the hottest, most humid bouts of Washington summer. On several occasions over the preceding 2 years I had seen the physical and nervous breaking point too close ahead for me to feel that I could, under existing conditions of work, risk the strain of another annual report.

I would gladly have taken that risk if it had appeared that such a gamble on my part would be offset by a reasonably good prospect of being able to make any really effective contribution to sounder economic policy. I felt deeply that this is a serious juncture in the history of our country—looked to now as the bulwark of a free world. But I knew that the chance of effectiveness had gradually fallen near zero.

At various times, one of them as late as the summer of 1949, the President had expressed a courteous regard for the labors of the Council. When we handed our final draft of analyses and suggestions to Mr. Truman his almost unvarying formula was: "I'll take this home with me—or on the *Williamsburg*—and read it with great care. Then we can discuss it further." But never—from the first annual report of January 1947 to the third midyear report of 1949—did such a discussion materialize.

To be sure, the President's course often substantially paralleled our recommendations. We could beguile ourselves with the thought that our labors had borne fruit. But on no occasion did the Council have so much as a single hour's time in which we could sit down with the President to answer any question that arose in his mind, clarify data, or examine alternative courses and probable consequences. We learned of his final policy decisions through an assistant or an assistant to an assistant on the White House staff. "Arm's-length bargaining" has become a phrase of frustration in the business world. Our position might be called "arm's-length economic advising."

On the last council assignment in which I took part—a memorandum on the economic impact of the budget ceilings proposed for 1951—differences of view were so basic that I submitted a separate analysis. In handing these memoranda to the President, I suggested that the majority view be stated first. I then commented that I felt that that memorandum gave an unduly complacent view of moderate deficits, soon to be followed by comfortable surplus.

I said I could not derive any such easy confidence from a reading of the discernible facts and foreseeable trends. I thought the President was being encouraged into taking inflationary short cuts, which give us a superficial short-term prosperity but which seemed to me to carry unwarranted risks for the longer, but not very distant, future.

DEFICIT SPENDING DEFENDED

The President said he would read both memoranda with care. But we never heard anything further from him. However, when I read his Pittsburgh address of last September 5th, it seemed to me a very clear reply not alone on the fiscal issue but on almost the whole of national economic policy. Deficit spending was depicted as only a "scare word" to "turn the American people against the programs which the people want and need." I quote:

"The selfish interests [a phrase repeated 22 times in the speech] say we can't afford these programs during a boom because that would be inflationary. They say we can't afford them during a recession because that would be deflationary. They say we can't afford them during a war because we are too busy with defense, and we can't afford them in time of peace because that would discourage business. So according to the selfish interests, we never can afford them. But the truth is—we can't afford not to put these programs into effect. We can afford them, we ought to have them, and we will have them."

It seemed to me a casting to the winds of any economic analysis of the intricate process by which the several segments of a total economy can be helped into workable balance and sustained high production. In its place I seemed to discern a highly political and dangerously inflationary economic program.

I view this as a menace to our American hope of making free competitive enterprise produce continuing abundance within a framework of free government. And since my position as chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers gave me no opportunity to do anything effective to bring economic analysis honestly to bear on the merits of these pressing issues, I was glad that the day of my retirement had already been set.

I left the council deeply disappointed over a purpose not fully accomplished, but stubbornly hopeful for the future. It will take time for successive Presidents to learn how to use a nonpolitical advisory staff agency effectively. It will take time for successive council members to learn how to bring the most competent and realistic analysis of economic problems simply and effectively to the President's aid.

A position on the Council of Economic Advisers should come to be regarded as the highest recognition to which any economist can aspire after he has risen to mature stature in the profession. Choice should not fall so much upon the most brilliant theorists, as upon men wise in the realities of current business organization and behavior, capable of recruiting and directing an able staff and of drawing effectively upon the wisdom and cooperation of businessmen and administrative officials. Most of all, council members must be above and beyond the temptation to make economic rationalization serve any predetermined conclusion or policy.

Problem of National Security

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THURMAN C. CROOK

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. CROOK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following petition given inception by Hon. Charles C. Price, head of the chemistry department, University of Notre Dame, South Bend, Ind., and his local chapter for world federation, in support of House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the world federation resolutions.

The petition embraces the names of many prominent citizens of the Third District, Indiana; and, to date, the names of 1,250 citizens of various sections of Indiana in favor of said resolutions are on file in my office for inspection.

FEBRUARY 6, 1950.

A PETITION TO THE UNITED STATES SENATORS AND CONGRESSMEN FROM INDIANA

We, the undersigned citizens of Indiana, believe the following to be true:

1. The atom bomb and other weapons of swift, long-distance mass destruction have

revolutionized the problem of national security.

2. Armies, navies, and air forces cannot protect civilians from atomic attack. Their power to retaliate may deter an aggressor, but they cannot insure us against the possible annihilation of vast numbers of our people and a large portion of our capital assets.

3. Achievement of security in the atomic age, security for our own people as well as those millions throughout the world who look to this country for the leadership we alone can give, is therefore the most important challenge which you as our representatives in Government must meet.

4. We believe that the preatomic system of security through the control of armaments by sovereign nations must give way in the atomic era to a system of security based on enforceable world law—in short, a world federal government endowed with those powers necessary to settle international disputes without recourse to war.

5. We cannot state with certainty that the endorsement of this policy by the United States will break the chainlike reaction of events now leading to a third world war. However, should the United States advocate such a system of world security based on law, and yet fail, we believe that our country would be strengthened morally and politically by the stand which we had taken, and thus be in a better position to fight, if fight we must.

In view of the above, and in view of the moral and economic benefits which would inevitably follow the substitution of world law for the present international anarchy, we request that you use your position as our national representatives to insure that our Government undertake every possible action toward this goal while there is still time.

House Concurrent Resolution 64 and Senate Concurrent Resolution 56, the world federation resolutions, have been sponsored by 105 Members of the House of Representatives and 22 Senators. These resolutions read as follows:

"*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring)*, That it is the sense of the Congress that it should be a fundamental objective of the foreign policy of United States to support and strengthen the United Nations and to seek its development into a world federation open to all nations with defined and limited powers adequate to preserve peace and prevent aggression through the enactment, interpretation, and enforcement of world law."

We ask full support of this resolution in the belief that it will be an essential first step in the establishment of a just and enduring peace through world law.

Listed below are some of the leaders among some 1,250 signers of the above petition. The positions or occupations are listed solely for the purpose of identification:

L. M. Hammerschmidt, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

Sherman L. Egan, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

Rev. Philip S. Moore, C. S. C., dean, Graduate school, Notre Dame, Ind.

Loyal B. Wilson, insurance, South Bend, Ind.

Sig Welber, president, Robertsons Department Store, South Bend, Ind.

Paul A. Gilbert, clothier, South Bend, Ind.

Lincoln B. Hale, president, Evansville College, Evansville, Ind.

I. Lynd Esch, president, Indianapolis Central College, Indianapolis, Ind.

Otto A. Pfaff, president, American Wheelabrator Corp., Mishawaka, Ind.

Frederick L. Hovde, president, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, Ind.

V. F. Schwalm, president, Manchester College, North Manchester, Ind.

Frank Leahy, coach, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, Ind.

J. H. Quam, Bendix Products, South Bend, Ind.

Richey W. Whitesell, Bendix Products, South Bend, Ind.

Violet Conner, Star City, Ind.

Milo K. Miller, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

B. I. Lingeman, M. D., Crawfordsville, Ind.

E. H. Clauser, M. D., Muncie, Ind.

Prince G. Huston, Salem Realty Co., Salem, Ind.

D. Logan Dunlap, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

A. E. Kemmer, contractor, Lafayette, Ind.

Frank E. Allen, superintendent of schools, South Bend, Ind.

Courtney Johnson, Studebaker Corp., South Bend, Ind.

George W. Blair, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

E. A. Lurenberger, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

R. V. Cleary, United States Rubber Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

William Mayo, CIO regional director, South Bend, Ind.

Edward F. Dose, secretary, St. Joseph Building Trade Council, South Bend, Ind.

Irma Collmer, Tuberculosis League, South Bend, Ind.

Richard C. Kaczmarek, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

W. F. Gaunitz, Associates Investment Co., South Bend, Ind.

Andrew Petrass, M. M., South Bend, Ind.

Elizabeth Alexander, South Bend, Ind.

Stephen C. Grzeskowiak, trustee, Portage Township, South Bend, Ind.

Eleonore Ciesielski, South Bend, Ind.

A. J. Goes, Goes Motors, South Bend, Ind.

James E. Mark, farmer, Mishawaka, Ind.

A. Santford Durham, farmer, Tipton, Ind.

John E. Will, jeweler, Mishawaka, Ind.

Harry Castleman, coal merchant, Mishawaka, Ind.

William R. Ogle, manufacturer, Goshen, Ind.

E. R. Dykstra, coach, Mishawaka High School, Mishawaka, Ind.

John M. Obenchain, Bell Telephone Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

Morris N. Tomlinson, school principal, Mishawaka, Ind.

Lester Roberts, foreman, Bendix Aviation, South Bend, Ind.

LaNola Cross, director Limeblost Camps, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. C. Milnor, newspaperman, Fort Wayne, Ind.

J. M. Murphy, M. D., South Bend, Ind.

Eli Rubens, M. D., South Bend.

N. D. Altman, auto dealer, South Bend, Ind.

C. J. Donovan, attorney, Bedford, Ind.

J. Robert Edwards, Bedford, Ind.

J. B. Farmer, insurance, Bedford, Ind.

Nick Kattis, restaurateur, Bedford, Ind.

Ruby Perkins, teacher, Mishawaka High School (and 600 signatures collected by her students), Mishawaka, Ind.

Sanford M. Reece, South Bend, Ind.

Charles B. Croxall, minister, South Bend, Ind.

F. K. Baer, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

John Ewbank, patent attorney, Lafayette, Ind.

Paul R. Laughlin, Lumbermen's Wholesale Supply Corp., Indianapolis, Ind.

Lyle L. Mabe, State Board of Accountants, Indianapolis, Ind.

Clark L. Jones, mayor, Crawfordsville (and 41 other members of Crawfordsville Kiwanis), Crawfordsville, Ind.

Alfred L. Scanlan, professor of law, Notre Dame, Ind.

Robert J. Mahoney, attorney, South Bend, Ind.

J. E. Otis, Jr., president, Dodge Manufacturing Co., Mishawaka, Ind.

Thurman C. Crook, Member of Congress, Third District, Indiana.

Charles C. Price, Department of Chemistry, Notre Dame University, South Bend, Ind.

A Congressman's Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALBERT RAINS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in a recent issue of Scholastic magazine, our colleague, the gentleman from Alabama, the Honorable CARL ELLIOTT, is featured in an article called, A Congressman's Day. This is a most interesting article, and depicts clearly the busy life of a Member of Congress. Scholastic magazine could not have chosen a more outstanding Member to be featured than CARL ELLIOTT. His colleagues here in the House of Representatives, and especially those from Alabama, share with his constituents, deep pride in his accomplishments.

The article follows:

A CONGRESSMAN'S DAY

(By Herbert L. Marx, Jr., associate editor, Scholastic magazines)

"I tied 'em by myself," said 5-year-old Martha Elliott, as she pointed to her neatly tied shoelaces. It was 7:30 a. m. Thursday, January 12, and this was one of my first glimpses into the life of Representative CARL ELLIOTT and his family.

I had come to Washington to spend a day with Congressman ELLIOTT, a freshman Representative from the Seventh District of Alabama. From the railroad station the taxi driver had taken me to 3623 Alton Place, the Elliotts' new brick home in northwest Washington. At the door to meet me were Carl Elliott, Jr., eight (who was soon very busy again reading about Indians), and Mrs. Elliott. Inside were Lenora, toddling around at 15 months, and the Congressman himself—a tall, serious-looking man of 36. It was at this point that Martha came proudly down the stairs to display her tied shoelaces, and in a few minutes 2-year-old John followed—to complete the Elliott family.

Representative ELLIOTT's day had begun at 6:30 a. m. He was downstairs before his children, to read the previous day's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and the daily newspaper. At 7:20 his assistant called him from home, to check on a detail of the day's schedule. At 7:30 the four children were downstairs and Mrs. Elliott was in the kitchen. The Congressman took these few moments to play with his children. Except for week ends, he has almost no time to be with them.

At 7:45 the Elliotts sat down to breakfast. After breakfast, Carl, Jr., was packed off to school, and the Congressman and I, with Mrs. Elliott and Martha, drove in the family car to the Old House Office Building. There Mrs. Elliott and Martha took over the front seat, and Mr. ELLIOTT and I headed for his third-floor office. Now, here's a minute-by-minute account of Representative ELLIOTT's day.

8:45 a. m.: We arrive at room 140. The Congressman's staff has not yet arrived, so he picks up the first of eight daily mail deliveries already outside the door. He unlocks the door and leads me into one large room where his assistant, Hershell McNutt, and his three secretaries work. To the right is another room of the same size. This is Mr. ELLIOTT's own room. His large desk stands under a window and is flanked by United States and Alabama flags. To either side are deep easy chairs for visitors, and along one wall is a long couch. Sitting on that couch most of the day, I watched the Congressman at work.

9:10 a. m. (Sorting out some of the mail and handing it to his assistant): "Tell these folks I appreciate the expression of their views, but I don't agree with them." "Make me a couple of copies of this letter." "Keep sending this boy the information he wants. He's ———'s brother, a mighty fine boy." "Let me see an Alabama road map. I can't tell just what road this fellow's talking about." "And get me the county agent of Cullman County on the telephone."

9:40 a. m.: The Congressman pushes a signal button, and two secretaries come in. Now begins the morning attack on the mail. During this day I was to learn how very important these letters are to the Congressman. Just listening to them being answered gave some idea of the breadth of interests and demands of his constituents. For this morning session of answering letters, the Congressman moves from his desk to a long table in the center of the room. The Congressman dictates his replies standing up, pacing back and forth. Here is the gist of some of the 37 letters which Mr. ELLIOTT answers in the next hour and a half.

"I am enclosing an Alabama road map. Please sketch in the exact road you are talking about, and I will take up the matter with the Bureau of Public Roads."

"In answer to your request to be a census taker, may I suggest that you write the district supervisor. I am enclosing a paper listing the necessary qualifications." This was only one of dozens of similar letters the Congressman answered. These short-lived jobs for the 1950 census are made by appointment of district supervisers, who are, in turn, recommended to their jobs by Congressmen.

COTTON, OLEO, LOANS

10 a. m.: Interruption to speak to the Cullman County farm agent on the telephone. Cullman County is a heavy cotton producer in Mr. ELLIOTT's district. The Congressman is worried about effects of a 1949 cotton acreage allotment law, which Congress may revise. The agent tells Mr. ELLIOTT that there have been only a few complaints and the law ought to be left as it is.

10:10 a. m.: More letters. "The House has already passed a bill to repeal taxes on oleomargine, and I join you in hoping that the Senate will do likewise."

"I shall be happy to place a copy of your editorial, which I have read and reread in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD."

"Please be advised that the Post Office Department informs me today that it has authorized a new rural route in our district."

10:25 a. m.: Assistant announces that Mr. Howard Hopkins, Assistant Chief of the United States Forest Service, wants to see the Congressman. Mr. ELLIOTT tells his assistant to have Mr. Hopkins wait.

10:27 a. m.: Telephone call from Representative LINDLEY BECKWORTH, of Texas, about a bill before the House.

10:29 a. m.: (More letters.) "The Birmingham office of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation may make loans up to $100,000. Please send me more details on your proposed project, and I will submit them to RFC headquarters here and get their expression of views on it."

"There is no possibility of changing the law to raise minimum wages from 75 cents to $1 at this time.

"I am interested to learn of your plan to run for Lieutenant Governor of Alabama, and am a firm believer in cooperation between the State officials and the congressional delegation."

11 a. m.: Assistant reminds the Congressman that Mr. Hopkins is waiting.

11:01 a. m.: More letters, more about census taking, a number about possible post office jobs, one thanking the Congressman for his part in getting a local housing project started, and others urging him to vote for certain bills before Congress At this point, Mr. ELLIOTT sends out the two secretaries who have been alternating in taking dictation.

11:15 a. m.: Mr. Hopkins of the Forest Service comes in. This was the first time the two men—one a freshman legislator and the other a career employee of the Government—had met. But it took only a moment for them to find common interests.

Within Mr. ELLIOTT's district there is a national forest, owned by the Government and operated by the Forest Service. Mr. Hopkins commented on the fine timberland in the forest. The Congressman told him about a 70-year-old bridge which needs repairing. Then the two men talked about making greater use of the forest to create new jobs and new recreational facilities for the people of Alabama. Mr. Hopkins pointed out the necessity of the Government's buying up little parcels of land to "fill out" the forest and make it a larger unit.

Behind Mr. Hopkins' visit, at least in part, was the hope that Mr. ELLIOTT would support the Forest Service's request for funds when they were voted on in the House. And Mr. ELLIOTT, in his turn, was looking for more activity by the Service in the national forest in his district.

11:28 a. m.: A young lady from Mr. ELLIOTT's district telephones. She is in Washington, looking for a job. Can he help? He makes a few suggestions, and tells her to call again if she has no luck.

11:45 a. m.: As Mr. Hopkins leaves, Representative JOHN RANKIN, chairman of the House Veterans' Affairs Committee (of which Mr. ELLIOTT is a member) comes in. They discuss details of the committee's work, scheduled to start again in a few days.

A TRIO FROM ALABAMA

11:55 a. m.: Representative RANKIN leaves, and Representatives ROBERT E. JONES, JR., and ALBERT RAINS, both from Alabama, come in. Representative ELLIOTT has asked them to come in to discuss the President's budget proposals as they affect Alabama districts. Congressmen JONES and ELLIOTT were classmates at the University of Alabama. (They and Congressman RAINS are shown in photo above.) Their talk today soon turns from the budget to more general topics—of how the Southeast can best make use of its resources. They agree that the southeastern States must join together in asking for river development and other projects, rather than simply requesting them piecemeal, each man for his own district.

12:10 p. m.: Congressman ELLIOTT looks at his watch and reminds his two colleagues of the session of the House now beginning. We all get up and leave the office. Congressman ELLIOTT and I go through the long passageway which connects the Old and New House Office Buildings with the Capitol.

12:20 p. m.: The House is just marking time this week, waiting for legislation to be cleared to the floor. The brief session is devoted to routine business. Mr. ELLIOTT carried out his promise to place an editorial into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

12:41 p. m.: The House adjourns, and the Congressman goes to a special room reserved for the Alabama delegation. Once a week the nine Alabama Representatives (and occasionally the two Senators) meet together for lunch. Other State delegations have similar arrangements, to permit the Congressmen to discuss problems of their State. At today's luncheon Representative FRANK W. BOYKIN is host. Among the guests are several officials of the Mobile, Ala., real-estate board, who are friends of Mr. BOYKIN. To meet these men Mr. BOYKIN has also arranged for Tighe E. Woods, the Federal Housing Expediter, to be present. Seated at an adjoining table is Majority Floor Leader JOHN W. MCCORMACK, of Massachusetts. He is asked to say a few words to the delegation. Lunch includes servings of freshly baked southern corn pone, made at the special request of the Alabama delegation.

2 p. m.: Luncheon is over, and the Congressmen return to their offices. Mr. JONES returns with Mr. ELLIOTT to discuss the cotton-acreage law. They exchange views and tell each other what they've been writing to the folks at home about it.

2:25 p. m.: Congressman JONES leaves, and Mr. ELLIOTT returns to his mail, still stacked high.

2:40 p. m.: The secretaries reappear, and there's more dictation.

2:47 p. m.: The Congressman talks by telephone to one of the experts who works for the Veterans' Affairs Committee. Mr. ELLIOTT wants to find out what would be necessary to extend the GI bill of rights so that veterans could continue to qualify for medical school with Government financial aid.

3:15 p. m.: Now the Congressman turns to me, and for the first time during the day, he has a few moments to relax. I asked him about this double job of his—being a member of a lawmaking body and also doing favors for his constituents. "To be an A–1 legislator," he told me, "you would have to spend all your time at it. But then you'd be living in a vacuum, out of touch with the folks whom you represent. Yet the way it is now, it's always a fight to preserve enough time for legislative matters between running errands for the people at home."

I asked the Congressman if there were any bills in which he had a particular interest. "I've introduced a bill," he replied, "to permit the Federal Government to lend money to needy boys and girls on a long-term basis so that they can get a college education. Our greatest resource is the boys and girls who read your Scholastic magazines. I started college at 16 with $2.30 in my pocket. I had to work 8 to 10 hours every day—for 20 cents an hour back in those depression days—to pay my way. I don't regret any of that, because it's given me strength for hardships which were to come. But not everyone can work it out that way, and young folks deserve a chance for a full education."

4 p. m.: A lobbyist for a Mississippi Valley association telephones to discuss his hopes for new laws with the Congressman.

4:10 p. m.: More letters, more dictation. But by now the Congressman is sitting slumped in a chair at the table. He's had a long day since he was pacing up and down the floor so energetically this morning.

5 p. m.: An army colonel drops in to say hello.

5:15 p. m.: Representatives JONES puts his head in the door to arrange to leave with Mr. ELLIOTT for the President's party in half an hour.

5:45 p. m.: The Congressman calls his wife, telling her when to expect him at home. He ends his dictation—leaving about 50 letters to be answered tomorrow.

5:50 p. m. (By now the Congressman has his hat and coat on): A telephone call comes from the Alabama Governor's representative in Washington. They discuss plans for the forthcoming Democratic State Committee meeting in Montgomery, which the Congressman plans to attend.

5:55 p. m.: The Congressman leaves the building with Mr. JONES. They take a taxicab to the Shoreham Hotel, where President Truman is host at his annual buffet supper for all Democratic Senators and Representatives.

7:45 p. m.: The Congressman leaves the party and takes a taxicab home.

8:15 p. m.: Home again. There's time to see the children for a few moments, and then, in his little workroom in the cellar, the Congressman spends the evening working, undisturbed. These hours he uses every evening to work on bills he is going to propose and studying other bills before his committee or the full House.

12 midnight: And so to bed.

While this is a typical day in a Congressman's life, it is by no means the same as all others. For instance, the House often meets from noon until 6 p. m., and Representative ELLIOTT makes a point of attending every session. Often there are committee meetings in the mornings. Sometimes he is called upon to testify before other committees, and must often make visits to Government agencies downtown.

But, as long as Congress is in session, the pace never slackens, although Saturdays and Sundays are less crowded. Does this portrait of a Congressman seem a little different than the speech-making, hand-shaking, hail-fellow-well-met you may have had in mind? We hope so. It would be difficult to find a group anywhere more hard working and more conscientious than our 435 Congressmen.

Soil Conservation Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OTTO E. PASSMAN
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PASSMAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement I made before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Appropriations Committee, February 10, 1950:

Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am most grateful for the opportunity to appear before this committee in support of the budget item of $52,255,000 for the soil-conservation program. In fact, I hope, in the wisdom of this committee, that an increase can be justified over the amount recommended by the budget.

I have stated on other occasions and should like to state at this time that I realize the very great importance of keeping Government expenditures to a minimum, and as a member of the House Appropriations Committee, I expect to be a party to keeping Government expenditures at a minimum. May I further state that, in my opinion, with the high degree of prosperity we are now enjoying, deficit financing is undesirable and unsound. However, I am convinced that certain budget recommendations should not be reduced, and, in some instances, should be increased. In my opinion, soil conservation is one program that may suffer unless the budget's recommendations are increased. Almost all the money appropriated to the Soil Conservation Service is used to provide soil-conservation districts with technical assistance needed to carry on a high-quality program of soil and water conservation. The money now available to this Service barely provides for a minimum assistance to the districts now organized in the 48 States of the Nation, and the Territories. It is encouraging to note that farmers are organizing new districts, and if these districts are to receive the vital technical assistance they expect and need, some provision must be made for them in the appropriation we are considering for the Soil Conservation Service.

It has been directed to my attention that the budget's recommendation for fiscal year 1951 is approximately only $400,000 over the amount appropriated for fiscal 1950. In effect, this is a decrease inasmuch as the recommended increase is more than offset by public laws passed during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress which, of course, include salary increases authorized by the Congress.

Mr. Chairman, in my opinion, a sound soil-conservation program would be one of the best investments that the Congress could make. There is a published table which I consider accurate and dependable, disclosing that for each dollar spent in the field of soil conservation, the wealth of the Nation is increased by $2.25. Certainly if these figures are accurate, then soil conservation is a good investment.

I have been furnished on what I believe to be good authority, information that every year enough top soil is being washed or blown from American fields by erosion to fill a train of freight cars long enough to reach around the earth 19 times at the Equator. This would make a train of freight cars almost half a million miles long. A conservative estimate on the value of top soil lost annually by erosion is in excess of $1,000,000,000.

Today our standard of living requires 3 acres of cultivatable soil to provide food for each person. It has been well established that soil erosion has now reduced our cultivatable soil to the point where we only have 3¼ acres of cultivatable soil for each person in the United States. With our population increasing and soil erosion running rampant, in another 12 to 15 years we will be on the border line. In 25 years, unless this evil is checked, we could very easily be importing part of our food supply.

The Soil Conservation Service cooperated with 2,078 districts during the current fiscal year. This is an increase of 154 districts over the previous year. These districts cover more than 1,100,000,000 acres.

Mr. Chairman, by July of this year there will be 150 new soil-conservation districts organized. They will expect, and are entitled, to receive needed technical assistance from the Soil Conservation Service. Unless the amount recommended by the budget is increased, these new soil-conservation districts will have to go without funds or the standard of service afforded the active districts which is already at a very minimum must be lowered.

I am sure that this committee has in its possession all technical data and statistics dealing with the soil-conservation program. Therefore, I shall not incur added expenses to the Government by filing for the record additional statistics and technical data. However, I should like to reemphasize the need for an increase in the budget's recommendations because certainly it can be established that funds expended in the field of conservation are a wise and profitable investment.

Our Federal Government Team

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ELLIOTT
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. ELLIOTT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD an interesting and informative article from the February 1, 1950, Congress at Work section of Senior Scholastic magazine, styled Our Federal Government Team. This article was prepared by Herbert L. Marx, Jr., associate editor, and Mary Jane Dunton, art director, Scholastic magazines.

OUR FEDERAL GOVERNMENT TEAM

Do you sometimes find yourself expressing thoughts without knowing the precise meaning behind them?

Try yourself on this 30-second test: You have learned that the United States is a Federal Republic which operates under a system of separation of powers with checks and balances. But, if you are challenged, can you give real meaning to each of the phrases used above? If you can, score 100 and turn to the next page. If you're a little doubtful, let's take a look at each of them.

I. A FEDERAL REPUBLIC

The word "Federal" tells us that the United States is a union of individual States, each of which reserves certain powers to itself. The national (or Federal) Government has broad—yet limited—powers.

By contrast Britain is not a federal government. Her counties (geographically equivalent to our States) have few powers of their own. However, our Canadian neighbors do live under a federal form of government, with certain powers retained by the provinces within the national dominion. Several of the Latin American nations are also federal republics.

"Republic" comes from the Latin words res (thing, affair) and publicus (public)—in other words, a public affair, or matter concerning the people at large. The United States is a republic because qualified voters select the President, Senators, and Representatives by direct vote.

The Constitution of the United States was written and signed more than 160 years ago. Since the adoption of the first 10 amendments (the Bill of Rights in 1791) the Constitution has been amended only 11 times. Yet it remains a living thing, guiding our democratic form of government through every kind of trial and strife.

The Constitution is proclaimed (in Article VI) as our permanent guide in government: "This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof * * * shall be the supreme law of the land."

II. SEPARATION OF POWERS

In earlier sections the Constitution provides for the separation of powers among three branches:

Article I: "All legislative powers herein granted shall be vested in a Congress."

Article II: "The executive power shall be vested in a President."

Article III: "The judicial power * * * shall be vested in one Supreme Court and in such inferior courts as Congress may from time to time ordain and establish."

The founding fathers were breaking new ground when the Constitution was written. Never before had the theory of the separation of powers within a national government been put into practice. Since our early days other nations have patterned their systems of government on ours. The Philippines, Liberia, and many of the Latin American countries are examples.

The British Commonwealth nations and most European countries follow the parliamentary system. Under this system the prime minister and his cabinet (the executives) are members of the legislature, and the courts have much more limited power than in the United States.

But the men who wrote the Constitution went still further. They felt that each branch of the Government should have certain checks over the other two—in order to balance the power and prevent any one branch from becoming too strong. Thus we come to our system of:

III. CHECKS AND BALANCES

Congress has these checks (or restraints) on the President and the courts:

1. The Senate must approve the men whom the President appoints as Cabinet members, other high officers of the executive branch, Ambassadors, and Ministers, and as Federal court judges.

2. The Senate must ratify (approve)—by a two-thirds vote—all treaties which the President works out with foreign countries.

3. The Congress may remove a President or a Federal judge from office for serious misconduct ("high crime and misdemeanor"). In these circumstances the House impeaches (accuses) the official, and the Senate sits as judge and jury in a trial to convict or clear him.

4. Congress also holds a check over the lower Federal courts, through its power to create or eliminate these courts.

5. Through its "power of the purse" Congress exercises a very effective control over the President's activities. By refusing to approve funds Congress can prevent the President from carrying out certain activities—even if he has the authority for them.

6. Finally, Congress is a check on itself. The House and Senate must agree on the exact terms of each bill before it becomes law. Every session hundreds of bills are passed by one House, and are either rejected or ignored by the other. Most important bills are modified in conference, so that the varying opinions of the House and Senate can be brought closer together.

The President has these checks on the legislative and judicial branches:

1. His most powerful check is the veto. He may disapprove any bill passed by Congress by returning it to Congress with his veto (which, in Latin, means "I forbid"). However, if both Houses of Congress repass the vetoed bill by a two-thirds majority it becomes law without the President's signature.

2. The President acts as a check on the Supreme Court and other Federal courts by his power to appoint new justices when vacancies exist.

The judicial branch—and the Supreme Court in particular—holds one all-important check over the other two branches:

The Supreme Court may set aside any law passed by Congress and approved by the President if it finds that the law conflicts with the Constitution. We know that the Constitution is the "supreme law of the land." When a person or State challenges a law, claiming that it conflicts with rights granted in the Constitution, the Supreme Court makes a decision. If it finds the law unconstitutional, it is declared null and void and is no longer a law. However, the Supreme Court does not examine Federal laws unless a case is brought before it by a citizen or a State.

IV. CHANGING THE CONSTITUTION

It is true that our Constitution has served us well throughout the years, with only a few changes. But the people of the United States may alter the Constitution. It may be amended in a variety of ways.

One Hundred Taxes Hidden in an Egg

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOSEPH W. MARTIN, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 15, 1950

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following broadcast by Robert Montgomery on hidden taxes:

There's been a lot of talk about taxes this week. Some of the talk about reductions reminded me of a magician's patter when he tells you to watch his left hand so you won't notice what his right hand is doing.

Before I comment on the President's tax message, I want to take a look at what we really pay in taxes—the ones we don't realize we're paying—hidden taxes.

We'd do a lot more thinking about hidden taxes, if for just one day, every time we made a purchase, we were told how many taxes were tucked away in the price we pay.

Let's try the experiment right now. Let's start with something just as simple as buying an egg. It seems we haven't just bought an egg, we've also paid a hundred hidden taxes.

One hundred, hidden in an egg.

What are they? Well, for example the grocer. He paid 14 Federal, State, and local taxes. Among them Federal income, Federal transportation, Federal safe-deposit box, and Federal social-security tax.

In an excellent article in the American Weekly, reporter Dave Camelon tells how the Tax Foundation discoverd 116 taxes woven into a man's suit of clothes—150 on your Easter bonnet.

Now you say, most of these hidden taxes are pretty small, fractions of a cent. What do they really amount to in the course of a year?

Listen carefully. If you are an average American family, hidden taxes cost you more in 1 year than your income tax.

For what really happened is that the President agreed to reduce certain luxury taxes provided * * * Congress will increase the taxes on necessities.

On necessities? How so? Because increased corporation taxes will, in fact, increase your hidden taxes. The tax burden on corporations is so great today that further increases can mean only one thing—that these increases are passed on to you in the form of higher prices.

In other words, you the consumer, will be no better off. You may pay less for your wife's handbag, less for a trip to the country, but more for your necessities—more for your eggs.

No party, Republican or Democratic, can wipe away overnight the staggering debt we accumulated to win the war. We owe this money. We owe it to the future prosperity of ourselves and our children. But it's high time responsible leaders in Washington cut our expenditures so that we can have a real reduction in our tax burden * * * start reducing our national debt. So that we, as a Nation, can risk more, make more, and so buy more.

Next week I'll have something to say on how we can begin to reach that goal * * * a lower tax plan that has proved it brings prosperity.

Reduction of Government Expenditures

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM S. HILL
OF COLORADO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the Appendix of the RECORD a communication from a management-labor committee of the Denver, Colo., Chamber of Commerce urging the adoption of legislation recommended by the Hoover Commission "as a possible means of reducing governmental expenditures and promoting efficiency."

JANUARY 24, 1950.

To the Certain Members of Congress of the United States, Washington, D. C.

GENTLEMEN: This communication is from a management-labor committee initiated during the early days of World War II. It is composed of the active heads of the major labor organizations of the State of Colorado and the city of Denver, and a number of business leaders of the community, all meeting under the auspices of the Denver Chamber of Commerce. The purpose of this committee has been to perpetuate the friendships formed at a time when the common defense was paramount and factional disputes were subordinated in the all-out effort to win the war.

The committee holds regular meetings about twice a month to explore in a friendly fashion the many areas in which such widely diverse groups can think and act in concert for the common good of all.

This committee has been much concerned over the failure of the Congress to take action on more than a small part of the recommendations made by the Hoover Commission on Reorganization of the Executive Branch of the Government. They feel very deeply that the present situation of an outgo of money exceeding by billions the income is deplorable. They believe that obvious waste in many quarters, overlapping of functions in Government, excessive red tape, unnecessary expenditures, and unwarranted extension of bureaus should be eliminated at the earliest possible moment.

The committee therefore urges the Congress, and specifically the representatives from this territory in both branches of Congress, not to forget the principles expressed in the Hoover Commission report, but to constantly keep these principles in mind as a possible means of reducing governmental expenditures and promoting efficiency. Bills for this purpose should be introduced, kept free from entangling riders, and be constantly pushed forward to the end that some reasonable economy in Government will be attained.

It is the intention of this committee to make detailed study of the various recommendations contained in the Hoover report, and from time to time to express the views of this committee to the Members of Congress with respect to the items so studied.

O. H. Knight, President, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; Michael Livoda, Regional Director, CIO; A. R. Kinstley, Vice President, Oil Workers International Union, CIO; George A. Cavender, President, Colorado State Federation of Labor; Charles O. Voigt, President, Stearns-Roger Manufacturing Co., President, General Iron Works Co.; Roger B. Mead, Secretary-Treasurer, Mead & Mount Construction Co.; B. Vissig, Vice President, Gardner-Denver Co.; Paul Ducey, President, Local Union 111, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers; J. Cline Evans, President, the Denver Fire Clay Co.; Fred Lusk, Business Representative, Denver Building and Construction Trades Council; John A. Ferguson, Jr., Vice President and Secretary, Morey Mercantile Co.; R. S. McIlwaine, President, Rainbo Bread Co.

Communists in China Demand Hostages for Release of American Citizens—American Prestige in Far East Is at a New Low

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I have in my possession reliable

information to the effect that the Chinese Communist Government refuses to permit American citizens to leave that country unless a Chinese guarantor or hostage is provided. If this is true, then President Truman and Secretary Acheson should resign forthwith as they are derelict in their responsibilities to citizens of the United States who are abroad.

The information, Mr. Speaker, comes to me from Mr. Alfred Kohlberg, one of the vice presidents of the American China Policy Association, Inc. I include as part of my remarks a telegram addressed to Dean Acheson, a letter of February 9, 1950, from Troy L. Perkins, Department of State, and a letter in reply thereto from American China Policy Association by Alfred Kohlberg:

NEW YORK, N. Y., *January 15, 1950.*

Hon. DEAN ACHESON,
Secretary of State,
Washington, D. C.:

We have received reports from China that each of the employees of the American State Department in that country now ordered to return home will have to provide a Chinese guarantor or hostage before being granted exit permit. Is this accurate and is the State Department permitting its employees to accede to this demand?

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 9, 1950.

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y.

DEAR SIRS: Reference is made to your telegram of January 16, 1950, addressed to the Secretary, concerning reports you have received that Department of State personnel returning from China "will have to provide a Chinese guarantor or hostage before being granted exit permits."

These reports undoubtedly refer to the regulations enforced in recent months by the Chinese Communist authorities that foreign nationals must provide shop guaranties as a prerequisite to the issuance of exit permits. It should be noted that this requirement is not limited to official American personnel, and that, so far as is known, there has been no general stipulation that the guarantor must be Chinese. It is our understanding that officials of other nonrecognizing countries have also been subject to this requirement. Furthermore, it is believed that the word "hostage" is misleading in this context. As you are probably aware, the shop guaranty, although not a standard requirement under previous governments for persons wishing to leave China, is widely used in China, and is generally equivalent to the type of bond which is required in this country of persons in positions of financial responsibility.

Prior to the departure some months ago of certain official American personnel from Nanking, protests were made by our Embassy in Nanking to the Chinese Communist authorities on the basis that diplomatic and consular officials are exempt from such requirements. These protests were disregarded by those authorities for the stated reason that our Government personnel in China were considered by the Communists to have no official standing. To enable these persons to return to the United States as instructed, the Embassy was authorized to comply with this demand, and at the same time was instructed to emphasize to the Chinese Communist authorities that this treatment of United States Government representatives was considered contrary to international custom and usage and that the Embassy action did not constitute a waiver of any rights under such diplomatic usage.

Recent reports indicate that the shop-guaranty procedure may be changed somewhat by the substitution therefor of advertisements in newspapers of the intention to leave China.

The Department is giving its attention to this problem and will take all those steps to protect its prerogatives under existing treaties and diplomatic usage as are consonant with this Government's policy of withdrawing all official personnel from China.

Sincerely yours,

TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs.

AMERICAN CHINA POLICY ASSOCIATION, INC.,
New York, N. Y., February 15, 1950.

Mr. TROY L. PERKINS,
Officer in Charge, Political Affairs,
Office of Chinese Affairs,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Your letter of February 9 in reply to my telegram of January 15 confirms my understanding of the system of so-called shop guaranties required of Americans, both official and unofficial, seeking to leave Red China. You are, I believe, mistaken in referring to such shop guaranties as widely used in China insofar as Americans are concerned. In my 34 years in business in that country, I had never heard of it, except as a bond or guaranty for Chinese holding positions of financial responsibility.

I think you are also mistaken in assuming that "advertisement in the newspaper of the intention to leave China" will be a substitute therefor. This advertisement has been a requirement in Shanghai in addition to the shop guaranty since the Reds took over, and is not a substitute therefor.

In writing "that the word 'hostage' is misleading in this context," I fear you may not be familiar with the actual working of this Communist requirement. For example, a certain American, one of those who was able to get out on the *President Gordon*, September 22, 1949, talked to the press when the *Gordon* arrived at Hong Kong. A few days later, at sea from Hong Kong en route for San Francisco, he received a radio from the man you call his guarantor and whom I call his hostage, reading approximately: "Please make no statements of any character about China because authorities will hold me responsible."

Feeling grateful to his Chinese friend, without whose guarantee he could not have escaped, he has since remained silent. You may not consider this American's guarantor a "hostage" for his satisfactory behavior. I do.

The man I refer to was not an official. This same system applies to our officials and your Department's authorization of their compliance with this demand must lead either to the public gagging of Americans leaving China, or the punishment of their "hostages." This latter would result in refusal by responsible Chinese to further guarantee their American friends and thus make it impossible for the Americans remaining there to leave.

If this is the best that the State Department can do for Americans, both official and unofficial, stationed abroad, I do not believe that I will be the only American who will wonder whose interests the State Department serves.

Sincerely yours,

ALFRED KOHLBERG, *Chairman.*

Proposed West Point of the Air

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I received a letter addressed to the Congress of the United States from a Mr. Ted Essex, of Douglas, Ariz., which is in district 2.

Mr. Essex' letter is brief and to the point and sets forth the voice of many of my constituents as well as other citizens in the State of Arizona. You will find his letter timely and certainly brings forth to us in this, the second half of the twentieth century, the great possibilities that are available to our Nation in the West.

As an ordinary citizen of our great country, Mr. Essex is asking that his voice be heard.

DOUGLAS, ARIZ., *December 16, 1949.*

An Open Letter to the Congress of the United States.

GENTLEMEN: I am a native Arizonian, born and reared in the baby State, and I feel that my State is not receiving due consideration in your search for a favorable site for your proposed air academy. Arizona has been neglected so many times and in so many instances that I made up my mind to speak out in defense of our young but virile State. There is no better locale in the Nation than ours, but because we have a small population and so few millionaires, you continue to give us the run-around. We have two able Congressmen and we are proud of their efforts in our behalf, but they are not enough so it seems, and I feel that there must be some sort of bloc against our efforts to get the recognition accorded other States with much less to offer than politics.

I know that for such a venture as the proposed West Point of the Air, you naturally seek an ideal location, and we have that in every sense of the world. We have the best all around climate in the country, and no State has a greater safety record in aviation. We have all the facilities necessary for such a venture, and our geographical position cannot be surpassed. Above all, our people are loyal and would support it to the hilt. We have never had to submit to a so-called loyalty check, and never will. We are proud of our country, and our record in every crisis is unblemished and unsullied. We need such a program as is being proposed to build up our prestige and earn the respect so readily given to the more populated sections of the Nation. Of course, I know that the lobbyists are fighting for the project on every hand, and of course they will be given priority, being heavy on cash but light on the stuff called patriotism to gain their ends. We, being westerners, are not of the ilk that uses this sort of procedure. We merely operate on merit. It could mean much to us, but we would not want it any other way than the right way. We are the most discriminated-against State in the Union and if it were not for our hardiness and indomitable will to survive we would still be a Territory plagued by Indians, and our deserts would still be barren wastes instead of the great agricultural praradise we have become. We are also proud of our strides in the fields of culture and business, and all we need to really become a State on equal terms with the others is to be given something such as

the proposed air academy to prove we are qualified and ready for recognition. We are not asking too much and neither are we beggars, because we will become prosperous regardless. But you could help us to achieve our goal at a faster pace by giving us the consideration due us.

I am just a mere citizen asking for a break for my State of Arizona. No one has prompted me to make this request, as I hold no office of any kind. But being an Arizonian, I feel it my duty to further the ambitions of my State. I am not a lobbyist as they have money behind them and I have not. But I feel that you gentlemen of such high position can help if you will. Leaving this plea in your hands and hoping you will give it some thought, I am,

Very truly yours,

TED ESSEX.

Thank you.

Dr. Paul S. Heath

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday last, an event of interest took place in my home town of Buffalo, N. Y., which was indeed a fitting preview to the official opening of Brotherhood Week, which we are celebrating this week.

Dr. Paul S. Heath was installed as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery to succeed Dr. Frank L. Janeway, who is retiring.

The fact that this auspicious event was attended by Protestant leaders of many denominations represented in the western New York area is, indeed, significant of the spirit of unity and brotherhood which exists in Buffalo among the various church groups.

Our need for brotherhood is even greater today than it was when our great Republic was first proclaimed, and certainly the expression of cooperation such as was evidenced at this impressive ceremony is a splendid example of the efforts of all religious groups in Buffalo to implement the Christian concept of the brotherhood of man under the fatherhood of God at a time when all such proposals are under such violent attack by the forces of totalitarianism.

I join the citizens of Buffalo in extending to Dr. Heath a cordial welcome and my very best wishes for a long and happy stay in my native city. To Dr. Janeway I extend my felicitations and warm personal regards. The affection with which he is held in the hearts of the people of Buffalo is proof of the splendid spiritual influence he has generated and nurtured among so many thousands and he has spent many years of fruitful endeavor for his Church and our community.

It is indeed fitting that all of us, at the beginning of Brotherhood Week reaffirm our faith in God and rededicate ourselves to brotherhood under God through all the peoples of the world.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include herewith articles from the Buffalo Evening News and the Buffalo Courier-Express relating the details of this happy occasion.

[From the Buffalo Evening News of February 15, 1950]

DR. PAUL S. HEATH FORMALLY SEATED AS GENERAL PRESBYTER

In a ceremony significant for its interdenominational spirit of unity, Dr. Paul Silas Heath was installed Tuesday evening as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery.

Protestant leaders representing a score of denominations heard the former minister of First Presbyterian Church, Kalamazoo, Mich., receive the charge in spacious Lafayette Avenue Church from his predecessor, Dr. Frank L. Janeway, who is retiring.

Dr. Heath was congratulated by the Rev. Harlan M. Fronst, executive secretary of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County, "on behalf of a Christian community * * * of 270 (Protestant) churches."

Then, on the flower-decked altar, the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, told an audience of 200 that there is "a need in these days * * * for a united Christian witness." He added: "There is a growing cooperation among most bodies of Christians."

URGES RETURN TO LOVE OF GOD

The number of denominations present, he said, was a token of cooperation in praying together and seeking together the truth.

The problem of life today "is really the problem of Cain and Abel," Dr. Harold E. Nicely of Rochester, moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of New York, declared. The answer, he noted, lies in a return to love of God.

"Sooner or later Cain and Abel will come together," Dr. Nicely observed. "And how they come together will determine our future. Will one say, 'I have an adversary; he wants to destroy me, so I'll destroy him first'?"

A fair question, the Rochester clergyman added. is "What have we in this power-driven, industrialized age to do with the Galilean carpenter?"

"Yet, if we look for * * * peace only in science, or in apparent progress, we are likely to be guided into a false complacency which can be turned overnight into despair."

COMMISSIONERS ELECTED

The Rev. William Thomas Heath, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church and brother of the new general presbyter, read from the Scriptures. The invocation was by the Rev. David S. MacInnes, minister of the host church, and the constitutional questions of the ceremony were administered to Dr. Heath by Dr. James W. Laurie, Presbytery moderator.

The installation prayer was given by the Rev. Murray S. Howland, former minister of the Lafayette Avenue Church, who officiated at Dr. Heath's ordination in 1921.

Earlier, the Presbytery elected these commissioners to the General Assembly in Cincinnati in May:

The Reverend Richard W. Firth, Fredonia; the Reverend Clair S. Emerick, Ellicottville; the Reverend Ray K. Hallin, Niagara Falls, and these elders; Harold Rich and Edward P. Lupfer, of Buffalo, and Edward H. Cartwright, Tonawanda.

[From the Buffalo Courier Express of February 15, 1950]

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH SEATS NEW PRESBYTER

Dr. Paul Silas Heath was installed last night as general presbyter of the Buffalo-Niagara Presbytery of the Presbyterian Church, United States of America, at the Lafayette Avenue Presbyterian Church.

Dr. Heath, former president of Auburn Theological Seminary and minister of First Presbyterian Church, Kalamazoo, Mich., was praised for his accomplishments and devotion as an educator and postor by Dr. Harold E. Nicely of Rochester, moderator of the Presbyterian Synod of New York, and by Dr. Frank L. Janeway, stated clerk and retired general presbyter.

During the month that Dr. Heath has served unofficially as general presbyter, Dr. Janeway said, he has demonstrated a calm spirit, judicial mind, and deep sincerity.

In giving the charge to Dr. Heath, the retiring presbytery leader urged him to get to know intimately all the 80 ministers and 32,300 members of the presbytery's 62 churches. He further admonished him to be a patient and willing listener and to free pastors of organizational details in order that they can devote their full efforts to curing souls and preaching the word of God.

The presence of clergy and laity of other communions at the installation ceremonies was cited by the Rt. Rev. Lauriston L. Scaife, bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Western New York, as an evidence of a growing spirit of cooperation in the Christian church.

"In these days there is need for a united Christian witness as the forces of godlessness wax strong among us," Bishop Scaife declared. "There are those who impatiently call for an immediate uniting of all Christians into a single church in order to combat this godlessness.

"That is not possible, but what is possible is the churches themselves working together, praying together, thinking together, sharing a faith greater than we have yet grasped and deeper than we have ever fathomed, seeking together the truth which none may know in its fullness alone."

Greetings on behalf of other churches were extended to Dr. and Mrs. Heath by the Reverend Harlan M. Frost, executive secretary of the Council of Churches of Buffalo and Erie County.

The Reverend William Thomas Heath, rector of Trinity Episcopal Church and brother of the new general presbyter, gave the Scripture reading. A processional of clergy of Protestant denominations and elders of the Presbyterian Church was led by Dr. Ralph B. Hindman, minister of the First Church.

Dr. Murray S. Howland, a retired minister who officiated at Dr. Heath's ordination at the Lafayette Avenue Church in 1921, gave the prayer of installation. Dr. James W. Laurie, moderator of the presbytery, presided and asked the constitutional questions.

Rogers Is Right

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. S. HERLONG, JR.
OF FLORIDA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HERLONG. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include therewith a short editorial from the Tampa (Fla.) Tribune commending my colleague, Congressman DWIGHT ROGERS, for his resolution proposing an amendment to the rules which will provide that no appropriations shall be passed without a yea-and-nay vote:

ROGERS IS RIGHT

Representative DWIGHT L. ROGERS, of Florida, has a level head, containing a sound

mind. Concerned about the tendency to vote millions and billions of the people's money without due process or consideration, Mr. ROGERS has introduced a resolution, in these wise words:

"*Resolved*, That rule XXI of the rules of the House of Representatives is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:

" '5. No bill or joint resolution of a public character making an appropriation shall be finally passed, and no amendment of the Senate to, or report of a committee of conference on, such a bill or resolution shall be agreed to, unless the vote of the House is determined by yeas and nays.' "

Mr. ROGERS briefly stated the reason for his resolution. He said: "I do this for the purpose of letting us become appropriation conscious. I have seen in this House not millions but billions of dollars of the taxpayers' money appropriated without even having a majority of the Members of the House present. I think we owe it to the taxpayers of this Nation, our constituents, to let them know how we stand on the appropriation of their money. I hope you will give consideration to this resolution."

The Rogers resolution, intended to make it harder to "railroad" appropriations, thus promoting governmental economy, may not get through, but the Floridian is thoroughly right in his plan and purpose. Members of Congress should at least be required to go on record on vast expenditures of Federal funds. Voting billions by a minority of the lawmakers is the worst kind of bad business.

Ancient Ferry May Escape Scrap Heap

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mr. Frank O. Braynard which appeared in yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, when I read this article, which had with it a picture of the old *Brinckerhoff* ferryboat, which we who lived on the west bank of the Hudson River used so many years to cross the river in order to go to Poughkeepsie, it brought back very pleasant memories. I think that it is no more than fitting that this article about the *Brinckerhoff* be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the benefit of my many constituents who, like me, must still have a very soft spot in their hearts for this old ferry. I hope that it will be possible to give it a permanent location for those interested in the history of the Hudson River Valley.

In the old days I used to use this ferry when driving to Poughkeepsie with a good team of horses and a buggy and again occasionally in the winter with that same team and a cutter. Sometimes the ferry would be unable to make the trip because of the thick ice in the river. Then the great thrill was to drive across the river in a sleigh back of a good snappy pair of horses and very often you could pick up quite an exciting race. Most of the time, however, the old *Brinckerhoff* kept the channel open and you wondered how it stood the wear-and-tear banging away and dashing against the floating cakes of ice.

This article speaks of the *Brinckerhoff* in connection with the annual intercollegiate rowing races held on the Hudson River. What a service it did for thousands of people in those days. It was quite an event to be one of the passengers on the old boat to view the race from that vantage point.

When the Mid-Hudson Bridge was built, of course the old *Brinckerhoff* could not withstand that competition. It did its best, however, to keep going and very often we would use the old ferry, during those trying days for its existence, just for old-times' sage.

The article follows:

ANCIENT FERRY MAY ESCAPE SCRAP HEAP—MUSEUM BERTH OPEN IF VETERAN CAN MAKE TRIP

(By Frank O. Braynard)

The historic ferryboat *Brinckerhoff* may yet escape the scrapper's blow torch. Eastern members of the Steamship Historical Society of America hope to find ways and means to sail or tow the 51-year-old craft from Kingston, N. Y., to a permanent location at the Marine Historical Association's Mystic, Conn., Museum.

The *Brinckerhoff* is the last of dozens of small sidewheel ferries that criss-crossed the bays and rivers of the Northeast a generation ago. She has been described as a choice specimen of nineteenth century ferryboat architecture—from her quaint pilot houses—topped by huge, old-fashioned range lights, each with its gilded ball—to her two horse-and-buggy-size vehicle gangways.

If successful, the society will deliver the boat to the Mystic museum to be "enshrined" alongside such famous relics as the square-rigged *Joseph Conrad*, the whaler *Charles Morgan*, and the original clubhouse of the New York Yacht Club, towed last year from Glen Cove, L. I.

There will be no lack of a good crew to man the ancient craft if it is found feasible to move her under her own steam to Mystic. A good percentage of those attending a recent New York chapter meeting of the society volunteered to help. Capt. Earl C. Palmer, vice president of the society and an executive of Moran Towing & Transportation Co., has offered to skipper the 140-foot craft to her final resting place.

The *Brinckerhoff's* former captain and chief engineer also have offered their services for the voyage, according to William Hopkins Ewen, society president and assistant advertising manager for the Borden Co. Ashby O. Reardon, a society member and secretary of the Mutual Ice Co., Alexandria, Va., has volunteered to provide a ton of coal and to shovel it himself.

Capt. Elwell B. Thomas, proprietor of the Thomas Boat Yard at Stonington, Conn., has offered to bring a crew of workers to Mystic to paint or otherwise put the *Brinckerhoff* into exhibition trim. If the society succeeds in bringing the boat to Mystic, a joint society-museum committee will be set up to determine what work is necessary for her upkeep and to get volunteers for it.

But many problems beset the society in its efforts to save the *Brinckerhoff*. Built in 1899 for the Poughkeepsie Highland (New Paltz Landing) Line, she ran faithfully until 1941 lowered tolls on the mid-Hudson bridge forced the company to close after continuous operation since 1798. From 1942 to May 1948, the ferry served Bridgeport, Conn., as a pedestrian link between the city and nearby Pleasure Beach. She made an occasional moonlight cruise on Long Island Sound.

The *Brinckerhoff's* years on the Hudson were fairly uneventful, except for the annual intercollegiate rowing races. On these occasions she carried hundreds of spectators and her crew once saved eight boys when their canoe capsized.

The *Brinckerhoff's* engine, built by the W. & A. Fletcher Co., Hoboken, N. J., still operates with flawless smoothness. It is one of the few of Fletcher's 200-odd beam engines to survive. More recent such engines are in the Hudson River steamboats *Robert Fulton* and *Bear Mountain*, and in the Lake Champlain steamer *Ticonderoga*.

Last May the *Brinckerhoff* was sent to her regular lay-up spot at Roundout Creek, Kingston, and it was found that her outboard paddle-wheel braces would have to be replaced. The cost of restoration led Bridgeport to decide not to return her to service. It is hoped that her general condition will permit a temporary certificate from the Coast Guard for her projected trip. Mr. Ewen estimated that it will cost $1,500 to reconnect pipe lines and tow or steam the *Brinckerhoff* to Mystic.

The historical society entered the picture last fall when its former president, Freeman R. Hathaway, passed through Bridgeport. Inquiring about the old ferry, he was led promptly into Mayor Jasper McLevy's office. He explained why the society was interested and was told the case would be taken up in due course. Last December the Bridgeport City Council turned the ferry over to the Mystic Museum.

The society has been designated as the intermediary in the transaction, and is conducting complex negotiations. Towing is being investigated if the more romantic way of sailing her under her own power is ruled out. Coast Guard certification also is being investigated and insurance coverage, particularly if society members run the boat, is being studied. Permission from the various maritime unions for such a voyage has been requested.

The matter has been discussed with the National Maritime Union and the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, CIO, affiliates, and the AFL Masters, Mates and Pilots of America. All three unions are considering the project and representatives have indicated that no objection probably would be made to the 200-mile voyage of a 51-year-old vessel manned by a volunteer crew.

A general appeal for funds for the project will be launched tomorrow by Mr. Ewen for the society. He will ask that interested persons send checks or money orders to the Marine Historical Association, Inc., Mystic, Conn. Checks should be made out to the association and not to the Steamship Historical Society, he said.

Donations will be recorded, and in the event the required $1,500 total is not reached all gifts will be refunded, according to Charles A. Brooks, association business manager.

Freight Trains on the Highways

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RAY J. MADDEN
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, the following editorial from the Hammond (Ind.) Times sets out some factual information regarding the rapid deterioration of the Nation's highways. A complete survey should be made as to the vast number of trucks that have been added to the various truck fleets throughout the country in recent years. One has only to drive his automobile on any sin-

gle-lane main highway to find that his progress is blocked by great numbers of trucks driving bumper to bumper and refusing to allow passenger cars to pass.

Unless the truck interests of the country do something regarding their heavy trucks from taking over the highways, Congress must take the necessary steps.

FREIGHT TRAINS ON THE HIGHWAYS

One of the most important questions affecting the taxpayers of the Nation is this: Are the huge modern commercial trucks paying their way—or are the vast sums needed to build and maintain highways suitable for this kind of traffic being paid by the rest of us?

Various authorities have spoken on the subject. And here is what some of them say.

The chief engineer of highways, State of California, said: "Big trucks in this State are responsible for 55 percent of the total cost of new highway construction."

The highway-traffic problems commission of Illinois said: "Private automobiles in this State are paying three times more tax per ton-mile than the largest-type truck."

The United States Commissioner of Public Roads said: "The chief destructive factor of highways is overloading (of heavy trucks)."

The Cincinnati Post said: "What * * * every State is up against is an effort to put freight trains on the highways, with the taxpayers providing the right-of-way—not the railroads, as happens when freight cars are kept on rails."

The American Automobile Association said: "Billions of dollars worth of the Nation's finest highways are being pounded to pieces by overweight and overloaded commercial vehicles."

It's no wonder that more and more highway officials—to say nothing of the people who pay the bills—are looking anxiously for ways to solve the critical highway-destruction problem.

The Drift Toward Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. L. MILLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include a special resolution adopted by the American National Livestock Association at their convention in Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950.

Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States and the Democratic administration, at the Jefferson Day powwow, chided the Republicans about their charge that this administration was leading us down the road of socialism. Apparently the consciences of the Democrats are being troubled. They protest too much.

Mr. Speaker, your party should be called the Labor-Socialist Party. It is nothing more nor less. If socialized medicine, socialized housing, the Brannan farm program, and a host of other pending legislation does not lead us down the road of socialism, then it is hard to understand just where such proposals will lead the American people.

The resolution passed by the American National Livestock Association on January 5 reaffirms the thinking of this large group as to the direction the legislative program of this administration is leading the country.

The livestock association is worried about becoming mere numbers in a completely socialized state. They further state that "our country is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state."

I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that your party heed the warning of the livestock industry. They speak the truth in their resolution. Your party will find it hard to throw off the yoke and charge that you are sponsoring socialistic legislation. The resolution follows:

There impends today a threat to our country and the freedom of its citizens which so menacingly overshadows the future that we, American cattlemen of all shades of political belief, feel it our duty to speak out in unmistakable terms.

This threat lies in the fact that our country—without conscious choice on the part of its people—is rapidly and unmistakably drifting toward the consummation of a false concept—the socialized state.

Tokens of this danger are everywhere and undeniable. The growing power and expansion of wasteful government; the colossal public debt; the heavy burden of taxation; the malicious attempt to substitute an artificial economy for the natural economy which alone can function in freedom; the gradual assumption by the state of financial responsibility for every hazard incident to life—hazards which should be personally met and borne by every human being who has the instinctive will to survive and the inherent impulse to be free; the arraignment of economic and social groups, one against the other, and numerous other conditions and proposals similarly inspired and equally false.

Government produces nothing and has no means by which to support these false and destructive theories except by exacting from its citizens the fruits of their labors.

The course the Government is now taking, unless it is promptly reversed, must inevitably lead to national bankruptcy. In a vain effort to prolong a specious sense of security, more similar expedients will be applied until we become mere numbers in a completely socialized state: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the American National Live Stock Association in convention assembled at Miami, Fla., January 5, 1950, reaffirm our solemn conviction that the future health, strength, and prosperity of our country depends on the re-establishment and maintenance of free and competitive enterprise and hereby pledge ourselves as individuals and as an association to work diligently and actively toward this objective and toward the defeat of the falacious philosophies that are beguiling our country into socialism.

Iowa People and Their State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, the story is told of four European statesmen who were conducted on a tour of the United States last year. They saw the skyscrapers of New York, they visited Niagara Falls, they descended into the Grand Canyon, they flew over the snow-capped Rockies, and they were entertained in Hollywood. But when someone asked them to name the most impressive sight they had seen, they all agreed that it was the tremendous expanse of rich farmland in the upper Mississippi Valley.

This story is a striking reminder of the fact that we Americans sometimes forget that we possess, in our great heart land, one of the largest areas of fertile land on the globe. In a world in which food for hungry millions is a major problem, the importance of this area cannot be overemphasized.

Anyone who has taken a morning plane west out of Chicago on a clear autumn day has seen below him the ocean of patchwork grain fields stretching for miles in every direction. To use the psalmist's phrase, these prairies "stand so thick with corn that they laugh and sing."

The State of Iowa is the food-producing core of this great valley. We are situated almost in the Nation's center with the great Mississippi River on the east and the great Missouri River on the west. Our State contains a quarter of all the Nation's grade A farmland and 97 percent of our soil is under cultivation. Those of us who live in Iowa—who have literally heard the corn grow on hot summer nights—love that deep black soil. We love it because we know it and can work with it. Each spring it challenges us; each autumn it rewards us with abundant crops.

Iowans are proud of their 36,000,000-acre garden spot between two great rivers. We are proud of our children and our churches, our schools and our industries. We rejoice that we have no really showy mansions and no really sordid slums. We brag that Anton Dvorak found inspiration for his New World Symphony in our own Spillville, but we are just as proud of the fact that we conduct a music festival each year in which over 5,000 high-school boys and girls participate.

Most of all, perhaps, we rejoice in the role of creating food for this great Nation and for the world. Our food-production statistics are almost unbelievable to some people. Iowa normally leads all other States in the Union in cash farm income—over $1,808,000,000 in 1949; in the value of our market cattle; and in the production and marketing of corn, hogs, eggs, poultry, and oats. During the past year, Iowa produced for the homes of America a total of 3,750,000,000 pounds of pork, 156,000,000 pounds of butterfat, and 332,000,000 dozen eggs. Translated into breakfasts, that is bacon and eggs every morning for over a tenth of the population in this country.

Last fall, 11,303,000 acres of corn in Iowa produced a total of 554,000,000 bushels. This year's corn crop, is in its own way proof of the fact that corn can be raised in the Hawkeye State under almost any circumstances, since especially adverse conditions prevailed. No million-dollar rain appeared for weeks during the critical period of July and

August. In addition, the worst corn-borer manifestation in the history of the State appeared. Still Iowa produced a record crop of corn and, in addition, raised the largest number of pigs ever produced in peacetime.

For the most part, as many of you know, our grain crops reach the tables of the Nation through corn-fed hogs and cattle. Iowa produces and markets more hogs than any other two States in the Nation combined—and has enough corn left over to fatten about a million head of cattle imported each year from the western ranges.

We are proud of last year's record in Iowa. We look forward to the future even as we are proud of our past. But even with mechanization which has revolutionized farming in the last decade—even with improved strains of grains and livestock which have added so much to our productivity—we know that the crops have been raised and the livestock has been fed in spite of storm or snowdrifts and at the cost of sore muscles and weary bones. In this sense we are close to those stanch pioneers who built our State and we are aware of the kind of courage and self-reliance which they possessed.

The history of Iowa, like its present, is more a story of slow achievement than of spectacular but fleeting glory. We can offer to our visitors neither historic battle sites nor elaborate shrines which preserve a golden antiquity. But in a very real way, the name of every village and every county in our State speaks of our own history and of the story of our country. The eighteenth century French period gave us such names as Dubuque and Des Moines. The roll call of our counties is studded with Indian names—Winnebago, Pocahontas, Wapello, Mahaska, Winneshiek, and Pottawattamie—which remind us of the days of the buffalo and the tall grass. Interspersed between the musical Indian names in the county roll call are other more familiar names which are part of American history. Fort Madison, named for the fourth President, was first built in 1808 and was burned and evacuated during the War of 1812. As more and more settlers began to cross the Mississippi at Davenport and Dubuque and Keokuk, the names of other Presidents—Washington, Jefferson, Adams, Monroe, and Jackson—began to appear on county maps. The Mexican War added the Spanish names—Cerro Gordo, Buena Vista, and Palo Alto—to the county roll call. Webster and Calhoun Counties, standing side by side, suggest the debates in Congress which were echoed on the frontier as settlers from the North and the South continued the argument around log-cabin fires. Lee County is said to take its name from the surveying trip which brought the young Gen. Robert E. Lee to Iowa.

Some of the names chosen for our cities and towns reflect the delight of the first settlers in the beautiful country they found—names such as Iowa Falls, Spirit Lake, Cedar Rapids, and Greenfield. Outstanding men of the pioneer period are remembered in such names as Grinnell, Fort Dodge, and Grimes. The European migrations to Iowa beginning in the 1840's brought the Germans and Hollanders, the Irish, Scots, and Swedes. But from the beginning, Iowans, regardless of their origin, have joined together to harvest crops, to establish schools and churches, and to maintain law and order.

By December 28, 1846, when James K. Polk signed the bill admitting Iowa into the Union as the twenty-ninth State, its residents had already discovered that corn grew taller than any other place in the world. Many of the early towns grew up around mills established for the purpose of grinding the grist. At the end of its second decade of statehood, Iowa had sent 48 regiments of its young men to the battlefront in the Civil War, had subdued Indian raids from the north, and had extended its farmlands to the Missouri River.

A special chapter of Iowa history in the 1860's records the story of the mad race of the railroads across the State to be the first to connect with the Union Pacific at Council Bluffs. This race was won by the North Western on January 22, 1867, but the Rock Island and Burlington lines continued to build, and today all three roadbeds serve major transcontinental railroad lines and take the food we raise to market.

Iowa's first century brought tremendous changes. During this period the canoe, the barge, the steamboat and the stagecoach have been replaced by trains, streamlined cars, busses, and planes. It is interesting to note that the river traffic on the Mississippi, which was the major means of transportation in the early period, is showing a marked revival. With the outbreak of World War II especially, traffic on the upper Mississippi grew to giant proportions. A striking fact is that three modern towboats can push as much freight upstream in one trip as four steamboats could carry in a year in the period from 1900 to 1910.

In 1846 there were 102,553 people in the new State of Iowa. A century later there were over 2,500,000—a growth equal to that of the Thirteen Original Colonies between the settlement of Jamestown and the outbreak of the Revolution.

Iowa is proud of the fact that our factory pay rolls are increasing to the point where the State's manufacturing has recently passed the billion dollar mark in valuation. When William H. Voss invented a washing machine at Davenport in 1877 he built the basis for a famous Iowa industry. In 1873 George W. Douglas and Robert Stuart brought to Cedar Rapids the Scotch process for making oatmeal which is now produced in one of the largest factories in the world. In 1878 John H. Morrell, of Ottumwa, founded the packing company which bears his name. In 1913 W. A. Shaeffer, of Fort Madison, established in a back-room workshop the world-famous Shaeffer Pen Co., which is now one of the largest fountain-pen factories in the world.

Already Iowa has an industrial income virtually equal to its agricultural income, from its packing plants, its farm implement and tractor factories, its canneries, and its food processing plants. Today Iowa and Nebraska, together, produce nearly a fourth of the country's serums, vaccines, toxins, and other biological products. Des Moines ranks second only to Hartford, Conn., as an insurance capital. Department store sales increased 201 percent from 1939 to 1948 and bank deposits went up during the same period from 1 to 1½ percent of the national total. We are glad that this industrial growth is integrated into our economy instead of dominating it. About 160,000 Iowans are working in packing houses, tire factories, machine shops, mining and other industries. Unions are well organized and many of the workers are exfarm boys who retain close ties with the farm. Many of them, indeed, are hoping to save enough money to buy a farm.

Iowa is equally proud of the sustained interest in education and cultural pursuits which has kept our State close to the top in literacy since 1870. The first public-school law was passed in Iowa in 1839—7 years before the State entered the Union. Within the year after we became a State, the State University of Iowa was organized. Today more than 50 buildings are scattered on the 386-acre campus which is cut in two by the Iowa River, and dominated by the old stone Capitol so dear to all Iowa hearts. Over 10,000 students are enrolled in courses including the liberal arts, medicine, law, dentistry, pharmacy, engineering, education, commerce, journalism, religion, and the fine arts. In a very real sense, the university reflects the rich cultural tradition, the fine family environment, and the splendid education facilities throughout the State. Walter Damrosch first called Nation-wide attention to Iowa's love of music when he noted that he received more letters from there than from any other State. The annual musical festival and the fine concert and symphony programs at the university draw a State-wide audience. Iowa's graduate school of art, which was inspired by a group of Iowa artists is the largest in the country. The list of famous Iowa writers includes many well known names. Since its first newspaper, the Dubuque Visitor, appeared in 1836, the press in Iowa has grown to produce prize-winning country weeklies, as well as the famous newspapers and widely read magazines.

The Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts at Ames, established in 1858, not only serves as the home of Iowa agriculture but has become internationally famous in its field. Early in its history Iowa State became a pioneer in the establishment of a cooperative extension service between farm and college. Today the county agricultural agent pattern has extended throughout the country. Radio broadcasts, home demonstration agents and printed matter spread the knowledge gained in laboratory and experimental farms operated by the college to all of our farmers and to their sons and daughters. Most Iowa farm boys and girls have participated in the 4–H Club livestock and homemaking demonstrations at Iowa State before they enter high school. In addition to these State institutions, 29 denominational colleges, 4 universities, and 23 junior colleges make their own contri-

bution to Iowa sons and daughters. This year the school budget in Iowa reached $101,500,000—an increase of $7,000,000 in 1 year. In addition, a capital outlay of $15,000,000 is anticipated. In the rural districts, approximately 400 consolidated school districts have been established to supplement the little white schoolhouses which dot the landscape.

It is a privilege for me to bring you a part of the story of Iowa—of its history, its people, its industries, and its farms. As the Iowa farmer and laborer work today, they know that their State is important not only to the Nation but to the world. It is endowed by nature and by its citizens with the capacity to respond to the world's plea for food. It is geographically situated to distribute that food to the Nation's markets and the Nation's ports. And with its paved roads, its extensive railroad mileage, and its broad rivers, it has the transportation facilities to get the food moving to the consumer.

Today the young men and women of Iowa are seeing visions just as their grandfathers dreamed dreams as they sat on the hard seats of covered wagons. As farm markets have become a part of the great complexity of world trade and world politics—and as they themselves have participated in a war which took them to so many parts of the globe—they have gained at once a new perspective and a new appreciation for their home State. Their radios and newspapers bring the football games, the fashions, and the symphonies of the world into their homes; their automobiles and their airplanes make the whole country more accessible. They have seen the bitter fruits of concentrated living. And they believe that only as our country fuses the vigor and might of the cities with the peace and security of our farms, will we achieve a new beauty, and harmony, and completeness which will be our own.

Yalta Agreement—Roosevelt and Churchill Sell China Down the River—Congress Stands Supinely By

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, when President Roosevelt returned after his conference with Stalin and Churchill at Yalta, he addressed a joint session of the Congress early in March 1945. At that time he was obviously a very sick man but nevertheless he tried to appear jovial and happy. I shall never forget his statement to us that "there were no secret agreements at Yalta."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the sordid details of the agreement consummated at Yalta are in the open. Many Members have asked to see such a copy as they did not believe that President Roosevelt could be a party to the sell-out of a loyal and trusted ally.

The people of this country will not forget, Mr. Speaker, that Alger Hiss, the convicted Communist sympathizer was Mr. Roosevelt's adviser at Yalta. The agreement placed Russia in a strategic position to take over all of China which is an accomplished fact today.

As part of my remarks, I am including a copy of the famous Yalta agreement:

AGREEMENT REGARDING JAPAN

The leaders of the three great powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Great Britain—have agreed that in 2 or 3 months after Germany has surrendered and the war in Europe has terminated the Soviet Union shall enter into the war against Japan on the side of the Allies on condition that:

1. The status quo in Outer Mongolia (the Mongolian People's Republic) shall be preserved.

2. The former rights of Russia violated by the treacherous attack of Japan in 1904 shall be restored, viz:

(a) The southern part of Sakhalin, as well as all the islands adjacent to it, shall be returned to the Soviet Union.

(b) The commercial port of Dairen shall be internationalized, the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union in this port being safeguarded and the lease of Port Arthur as a naval base of the U. S. S. R. restored.

(c) The Chinese-Eastern Railroad and the South Manchurian Railroad, which provides an outlet to Dairen, shall be jointly operated by the establishment of a joint Soviet-Chinese company, it being understood that the preeminent interests of the Soviet Union shall be safeguarded and that China shall retain full sovereignty in Manchuria.

3. The Kurile Islands shall be handed over to the Soviet Union.

It is understood that the agreement concerning Outer Mongolia and the ports and railroads referred to above will require concurrence of Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. The President will take measures in order to obtain this concurrence on advice from Marshal Stalin.

The heads of the three great powers have agreed that these claims of the Soviet Union shall be unquestionably fulfilled after Japan has been defeated.

For its part the Soviet Union expresses its readiness to conclude with the National Government of China a pact of friendship and alliance between the USSR and China in order to render assistance to China with its armed forces for the purpose of liberating China from the Japanese yoke.

JOSEPH V. STALIN.
FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.
WINSTON S. CHURCHILL.

FEBRUARY 11, 1945.

One Big Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN L. McCLELLAN

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial appearing in the Washington Daily News of Monday, February 20, entitled "One Big Bill."

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ONE BIG BILL

This year, for the first time, Congress is trying to combine all its annual appropriations of money into one big omnibus bill.

That's a fine idea—if it works.

In previous years a dozen or so appropriation bills reached the House and the Senate, one at a time, over a period of months. Until the last of them was passed nobody could know what the total amount appropriated would be.

With a single big bill Congress can know its total, and, if so minded, can reduce that total to bring it within the Government's anticipated revenues. Or, at least, Congress can make a much more intelligent effort to economize. That's the theory.

But there's one danger in the plan. If Senators and Representatives start logrolling, the one big bill can become much too big. And, because President Truman has no authority to veto items in an appropriation bill, he may be forced to approve even more spending than he proposed in his $42,439,000,000 budget.

Congress should give the President power to veto items.

Whether it does that or not, Congress most certainly should shun all temptation to swell the size of the one big bill by logrolling and back scratching. Otherwise, the fine one-big-bill plan will either have to be abandoned or all the economy talk by Members of Congress may turn out to be a costly bad joke.

As to the future, another good idea comes from Senator MCCLELLAN, of Arkansas: Establish a joint House-Senate committee on the budget, with an adequate, capable, full-time technical staff.

At present, some 500 people in the spending branch of the Government work all year preparing the President's budget.

Congress needs a well-staffed committee on the job all year, every year, studying the budget while it is being prepared and equipping Congress with the accurate information it needs—and does not now get—to do properly its duty of controlling the public purse strings.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, this is Brotherhood Week throughout the country. Whether by coincidence or by Divine impulse, most significantly, in every synagogue and temple in the world—Orthodox, Conservative, and Reform—the portion of the Torah, the Old Testament, that will be read this week deals with the Divine revelation on Mount Sinai, through which Moses received the laws for dispensing justice to mankind.

These laws covered every imaginable classification. For the purpose of emphasis of brotherhood it suffices to remind you here of a few of those statutes, to wit: the laws establishing the principle of majority rule and of equal justice for all, forbidding oppression of foreigners, and prohibiting malicious gossip.

The last rule of neighborly living is observed too often in these Halls by its breach.

With pointed reference to that rule, permit me to call your attention to the following editorial by Dr. Harry Halpern, which appeared in the current issue of the Bulletin of the East Midwood Jewish Center:

FROM WHERE I STAND

I have just read one of the periodic reports issued by the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, and I found it to be a very interesting document. What interested me particularly was a report on race riots in Chicago and a discussion of what was involved in them.

Let it be made clear from the outset that B'nai B'rith cannot be accused of Communist tendencies by anyone in his right mind. The record of service to our country which the organization has achieved is an imposing one. Its efforts in behalf of the men and women in our armed forces during the war and its contributions to the work of rehabilitation after the war have earned for it a place among the great patriotic agencies in our land.

The aforementioned report points out that the Chicago riots started out with an anti-Negro slogan which, in turn, became anti-Communist and finally as anti-Jewish. This metamorphosis of a hatred is worthy of note because it follows a pattern which is becoming alarmingly too familiar.

That relations between Russia and our country are strained is clear to all; that ideologically, religious people are opposed to the antireligious crusade of Russia is obvious; that there have been clear-cut cases of espionage, particularly in the matter of atomic-energy experimentation, no one will gainsay. And yet, knowing of all this, we must be on our guard lest the struggle against communism becomes a smoke screen for all anti-Semitic and reactionary forces in our country. For, under the impact of war, many subversive groups found it the wisest policy to suspend operations or, at least, to keep out of the glare of publicity. But now the lunatic fringe sees an opportunity for attacking Jews under the guise of fighting communism.

The method of accomplishing this is really very simple. First, you label something "communistic." Then you show that many Jews are in favor of the thing you've so labeled. Finally you attack Jews, not because you're anti-Semitic but because you want to protect America.

It is true that many Jews are progressive. They believe in social security, in old-age pensions, in unemployment insurance, in proper schooling for children, and adequate housing for families. They believe that the Government should intervene to make these things possible. Does this mean that they are taking dictation from Moscow or are trying to overthrow the Government? Oscar Ewing, the Federal Security Administrator, who is a Wall Street lawyer, has been attacked as a Socialist by those who oppose what they call the welfare state.

All of us should clearly understand that dealers in prejudice hate first and then find slogans to rationalize their hatred and to justify the protection of some selfish interest. The struggle against communism must not be permitted to become a weapon in the hands of Jew-baiters or Negro haters. We should recall the rabbinic statement that Satan, the evil inclination, and the angel of death are merely different names for the same unholy and dangerous character.

FEPC Legislation—White Americans Betrayed

REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN E. RANKIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if George Washington could come back tomorrow and see the communistic FEPC program that is being proposed on his birthday, and especially if he could look up and see that hideous distortion of the United States seal, and the American eagle, right over our heads, he would be shocked beyond measure.

The FEPC bill which is to come before the House tomorrow is the most dangerous piece of communistic legislation with which this country has ever been threatened.

If it should become a law, it would do more to drive industry out of this country than anything else that has ever been done by the Congress of the United States.

CALIFORNIA

Remember that it was referred to the people of California for a popular vote, and was defeated by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State.

Are you Members from California now going to vote to impose this hideous monstrosity on your people who have said by their votes, by more than a million majority, and by a clear majority in every single individual county in the State, that they do not want it?

PENNSYLVANIA

Are your Members from Pennsylvania going to vote to impose this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your great State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive industries out of Pennsylvania by harassing them with a program of this kind that could not pass the Legislature of Pennsylvania?

OHIO

Do you Members from Ohio want to force this monstrosity on your people after the legislature of your State has killed it twice?

Do you want to drive your industries to Canada, or to some other foreign country by harassing them with this monstrosity?

Remember that this is going to be an issue in every congressional district in the United States in the primaries this year.

MICHIGAN

Do you Members from Michigan want to drive your industries out of the country by imposing this monstrosity on your people, after your legislature refused to pass it?

If you were to place it on the ballot in the State of Michigan, Pennsylvania, Ohio, or any other State in the Union, and let the people vote on it, they would kill it in every county just as they did in California.

ILLINOIS

Do you Members from Illinois want to impose it on your people after your legislature has killed it as dead as Hector?

Do you want to run industries out of Illinois and across the border into Canada, or to some other foreign country?

You know, and I know, that it would not carry in a single county in Illinois, if left to a popular vote and explained to the people who would do the voting on it.

MINNESOTA

They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Minnesota last year, but when the members of the legislature of that State found out what it meant they refused to pass it.

Are you Members from Minnesota now going to impose it on your people and drive your industries across the line into a foreign country?

It would not pass in a single county in Minnesota if left to a popular vote.

COLORADO

Take the State of Colorado. They tried to pass it through the Legislature of Colorado last year and failed.

Are you Members from Colorado now going to vote to impose it on your people, when the legislature has said they do not want it, and when you know it would not pass in a single county in Colorado by a popular vote?

The same thing applies to every other State from Iowa to Maine, from North Dakota to Florida.

You cannot pass this thing in a single county in a single State in this country if left to a popular vote of the people if they are told what it means.

NEW YORK

They rammed this measure through the Legislature of New York and appointed a commission to enforce it, with the result that they have tantalized and annoyed the business people of New York beyond measure. The best thing the Legislature of New York could do would be to repeal it.

If they had left it to a vote of the people of New York, it would have been buried worse than it was in California.

And the same thing would have happened in Massachusetts, New Jersey, Connecticut, and Rhode Island.

I am inserting at this point excerpts from a speech which I made on this FEPC in New York in 1947, and am setting out 18 different questions that you cannot ask a person seeking employment in that State.

I want every Member to read them and see whether or not he would like to have these restrictions, these paralyzing restrictions, imposed upon the people of his own State.

Here are some of the things you cannot do under the law of New York:

"Unlawful employment practices before hiring anybody."

Those words are written in capitals, and here is the first unlawful practice:

First:

"Inquiry into the original name of the applicant for employment, whose name has been changed by court proceedings or otherwise."

If you inquire as to his name or what his name used to be you violate the law. You commit an unlawful practice. For instance, take this man who writes for PM, who calls himself I. F. Stone. His name was Isadore Feinstein, as Cordell Hull once pointed out. Suppose he comes to you asking for employment and you ask him that question. Then you will have committed an unlawful act.

Second. Here is the next one:

It would be unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the birthplace of the applicant for employment, the birthplace of his parents, spouse, or other close relative."

How would you like that in Iowa, Illinois, Texas, or Nebraska? In California I know you do not like it, because you have just voted on it.

Third. Here is the next unlawful practice:

"Requirement that the applicant for employment produce a birth certificate or baptismal certificate."

That would be an unlawful practice under this FEPC Act in New York.

I was surprised to see Governor Dewey get his mustache in the wringer on this proposition. I do not see how he is ever going to get loose from it.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. What about this requirement during the war that every person employed in certain industries had to prove that he was born here before he could get a job?

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If we had had this law all over the country then, the Japs would have had a spy at the elbow of every man in a key position; so would the Germans, and so would every other enemy country.

I thank the gentleman from Illinois for his timely suggestion.

Fourth. It is an unlawful practice in New York, under this law, to make "inquiry into the religious denomination of an applicant for employment, his religious affiliations, his church, parish pastor, or religious holidays observed. Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist."

Inquiry into whether an applicant for employment is an atheist is forbidden, although you may be publishing literature for the Methodist Church, the Baptist Church, or any other denomination.

Fifth. Another thing, an applicant for employment—and I am reading from the rules laid down by this Commission:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that this is a Catholic, Protestant, or Jewish organization."

In other words, if you are in the business of publishing religious literature you cannot even give him that information under this law which the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen] now proposes for the whole country, including Illinois.

Sixth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that the following holidays will be observed by the firm and no others, naming the holidays; e. g., Decoration Day and July the Fourth, etc."

You cannot tell them under the laws, rulings, and regulations of the State of New York that they may observe the Fourth of July.

Seventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

"An applicant for employment may not be told that employees are required to work Rosh Hashana and Yom Kippur."

Frankly, I did not know there were any such days until the last few years.

Eighth. Another thing, it is an unlawful practice under this New York law to make "inquiry into the complexion of an applicant for employment."

Inquire into his complexion and you are likely to get yourself tangled up with the law of the State of New York.

Ninth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment annex a photograph."

That would be an unlawful employment practice. You are not supposed to know how he looks.

Remember, this is not in Russia, but in New York.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. MASON. And yet the State Department, in order to grant a visa, requires a photograph of the person to be presented with his application.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly, and they ought to do so. Much as I respect the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON], I certainly would not want to employ him unless I knew how he looked. If I had never seen him, I would certainly want to see his picture.

Tenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry whether an applicant for employment is a naturalized or native-born citizen; the date when the applicant acquired citizenship; whether the applicant's parents or spouse are naturalized or native-born citizens of the United States; the date when such parents or spouse acquired citizenship."

You cannot inquire into those questions under this FEPC law in New York.

Eleventh. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Requirement that an applicant for employment produce his naturalization papers or first papers."

He may lie to you and tell you that he is a naturalized citizen, but you cannot ask to see his papers.

Twelfth. Another unlawful practice in New York is to "inquire into the lineage of an applicant for employment, his ancestry, or national origin."

You remember a few years ago the Dallas News inserted an advertisement for a colored janitor, and this FEPC outfit down the street, ordered them to take it out, said it was an unlawful practice.

One member of this FEPC outfit here in Washington went into the office of Swift & Co. in Chicago. This FEPC man asked them: "How many Negroes do you have on your board of directors?"

The answer was "None."

Then the FEPC man asked him: "Why haven't you?"

That was the FEPC down here in Washington a few years ago before it died because a few radicals could not browbeat Congress into perpetuating it.

But it is now in force in the State of New York.

Thirteenth. Here is another unlawful practice under the New York law:

"Inquiry into the location of places of business of relatives of an applicant for employment."

Fourteenth. It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the place of residence of the parents, spouse, or other close relatives of an applicant for employment."

I am reading from the records at Albany.

Fifteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the maiden name of the wife of a male applicant for employment and/or inquiry into the maiden name of the mother of a male or female applicant for employment."

The other day we had the Eislers down here. One of them has been shown to be representing the Comintern, according to his sister's testimony. He has a brother out in California, who seems to be poisoning the public mind through the moving-picture industry. He tries to defend his brother and refers to this woman as "my former sister." If you wanted to employ any of them and check the name of at least one of them as given here, you could not inquire into those names at all—if you are trying to do business in the State of New York—even though one of them has a half dozen aliases. You could not even ask where they came from or when they got here or when they changed their names.

Sixteenth. Here is another unlawful practice, in New York:

"Inquiry into the general military experience of an applicant for employment."

Seventeenth. I wish every ex-serviceman could read that, and the next one.

Here it is: It is an unlawful practice to make "inquiry into the whereabouts of an applicant for employment during the First World War, i. e., during the period from 1914 to 1919."

In other words, inquiry as to his whereabouts in the period from 1914 to 1919 is forbidden as an unlawful practice in the State of New York.

Is that what you want in Colorado? Is that what you want in Massachusetts?

Mr. GIFFORD. We have it.

Mr. RANKIN. Get rid of it, and we will help you.

Is that what you want in Kansas, in Ohio, and in other States?

Let your States vote on it. Michigan is going to vote on it right away. If you will tell the people of Michigan the whole truth, let them know the whole truth about this monstrosity, I will guarantee you they will beat it worse than they did in California.

Eighteenth. Here is another unlawful practice:

"Inquiry into the organizations of which an applicant for employment is a member, including organizations the name or character of which indicates the religion, race, or national origin of its members."

I presume, if they should ask me if I am a member of the Masonic lodge, I could have them jerked up and brought before this inquisition board or probably prosecuted at various places throughout the country.

Mr. Speaker, I am not criticizing the people of New York. I have long since learned in going from one State to another that real Americans are about the same everywhere. I believe if they had a vote on it the people of New York would beat it, just as they did in California.

They are having a vote on it in Michigan because a little minority group has been attempting to browbeat the Legislature of Michigan into passing it. I dare say when it goes on the ballot in Michigan and the people of Michigan understand what it means they will defeat it more thoroughly than they did in California. The same thing would happen in probably every other State in the Union.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell us what the penalties are in New York?

Mr. RANKIN. In addition to being harassed to death with orders and directives to cease, desist, rehire, and so forth, there is a punishment provided of "imprisonment in a penitentiary or county jail for not more than 1 year or by fine of not more than $500, or by both."

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to remind the gentleman that we have that law in Massachusetts.

Mr. RANKIN. I was afraid of that.

Mr. GIFFORD. I was thoroughly amazed when I looked into it; I had not learned what the rules were. But, perhaps we carried it too far. I am so sorry, and I have been, and I am not in favor of this, I can assure the gentleman.

Mr. RANKIN. I know the gentleman is not, and I am sure the people of Massachusetts would not favor it if they had a vote on it.

Mr. GIFFORD. Employers always inquire and must know whether you come from a respectable family or not. They are so careful. Perhaps they overdid it. But I think a man ought to be able to find out whether he came from a respectable family.

Mr. RANKIN. There are a great many questions that should be asked, which are forbidden under this law.

FEPC IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

Mr. Speaker, in order to give the new Members an idea of what a mess this FEPC was here in Washington during its existence under Executive order, I insert a speech I made on this subject in 1945.

It reads as follows:

"FEPC A BETRAYAL OF WHITE AMERICANS

"(Speech of Hon. JOHN E. RANKIN, of Mississippi, in the House of Representatives, Thursday, July 12, 1945)

"Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, the passage of a law at this time legalizing this so-called FEPC would be a betrayal of the white people of the country. If every individual in the United States could understand just what it means, there would be such a roar of protest coming from every State in this Union that it would never see the light of day.

"If every Member of Congress would 'screw his courage to the sticking place' and vote his convictions on this so-called FEPC, it would not get 50 votes out of the entire membership of 435.

"It is a most dangerous and brazen attempt to fasten upon the white people of America the worst system of control by alien or minority racial groups that has been known since the crucifixion.

"When I read the names of the personnel of this outfit you will understand what I mean.

"To sanctify this organization by law would give the lie to everything we have told our American boys they were fighting for. Instead of coming back to liberty, freedom, and democracy, they would find themselves sold into this bondage, herded, humiliated, and regimented by alien influences directed by a foreign comintern representing the deadly doctrine of Karl Marx that is based upon hatred for Christianity and for everything that is based on Christian principles.

"It is a manifestation in legislative form of that infidelity that has closed thousands of Christian churches in Europe and been responsible for the murder of untold millions of Christian human beings.

"This measure is not directed altogether at the white people of the South. If it were, you folks in the North would not have so much ground for alarm. We in the South know how to combat subversive elements. As Henry Grady once said, 'We wrested the South from such domination "when Federal drum beats rolled nearer and Federal bayonets hedged closer to the ballot box of the South than it ever will again in this Republic."'

"But you people in the North have not had that training, and this FEPC is likely to bring grief, strife, hatred, race riots, and chaos in your northern cities if this vicious agency is perpetuated and sanctioned by your votes.

"Do not forget that the returning servicemen know what this thing means, and they are going to call you to account next year—beginning with the primary. They are not going to wait until the general election.

"Do not forget that every businessman, every farmer, every professional man, and every other independent individual whose blood glows with the instinct of American liberty, is going to join these men, and those other patriotic forces that are fighting to save American institutions for which these boys have been fighting and dying upon every battlefield in the world.

"If every man and every woman in the United States could just read the list of individuals that compose the personnel of this crazy FEPC, and its subdivisions throughout the country, I dare say there would not be enough of you left who vote for it, even if nominated in the primaries next year, to form a corporal's guard.

"For your information, and for the information of the American people generally, I am going to read you the official personnel as it exists today. Remember, this list is taken from the official record. This is the group that wants to nose into and control every business in the United States. Remember, they can search the files and records of every business establishment in America where some disgruntled individual is willing to trump up a charge of discrimination. They can drag them all over the country and try them, and in that way destroy any ordinary business concern.

"The next thing they are going to try to do is get control of your schools and force their communistic henchmen into the schools and teach your children their subversive doctrines.

"Read these lists carefully, which, as I said, are taken from the official records here in Washington, and you will see that not 1 out of 10 on these rolls is a white gentile American.

"Here is the official list:

"Committee on Fair Employment Practice, Washington, D. C., office of the chairman

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ross, Malcolm	Chairman	White	$8,000
Johnson, George M.	Deputy Chairman.	Colored	8,000
Hubbard, Maceo	Hearings examiner.	do	5,600
Bloch, Emanuel	do	White	5,600
Copper, Evelyn	do	do	5,600
Berking, Max	Assistant to Chairman.	do	3,800
Alexander, Dorothy	Secretary to Chairman.	Colored	2,600
Clifton, J. Jeanne	Secretary to Deputy.	do	2,000
Brooks, Mary	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Banting, Myra	do	White	1,800

"You will note that in this office of the chairman, consisting of 10 people, there are 5 Negroes and 5 white people, most of whom have foreign names. One of the whites is a stenographer who receives the smallest salary of anyone on the list.

"Remember that the members of this group preside over the destiny of every business enterprise in America, and are using their assumed powers to harass white Americans out of business.

"This is the organization Members of Congress are being asked to perpetuate by the passage of this bill.

"FIELD OPERATIONS

"Here is the Division of Field Operations:

"Field operations

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Maslow, Will	Chief	White	$6,500
Mitchel, Clarence	Principal fair-practice examiner.	Colored	5,600
Davidson, Eugene	do	do	5,600
Beall, W. Hayes	Senior fair-practice examiner.	White	4,600
Mercer, Inez	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Rogers, Eleanor	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Saito, Otome	do	Japanese-American.	1,800
Thompson, Mildred	do	Colored	1,800
Cornick, Emma	do	do	1,620

"You will note that it consists of nine people—five Negroes, one Japanese, and three others—two of whom have records of affiliations with Communist-front organizations, according to the reports of the Dies committee.

"Imagine this group going about over the country riding herd on the white American businessmen of the Nation, telling them whom they shall employ, whom they shall promote, and with whom they may associate.

"It would be interesting, and probably enlightening, to check up on these people and see how many of them are native-born Americans.

"Members of Congress had better do this now, before they get caught in this trap, because this question of un-American activities is going to be an issue in every congressional district next year, beginning with the primaries.

"The people are not going to wait until the general election for someone who holds a commission as a result of the pernicious activities of Sidney Hillman and his gang to wrap the party cloak about him and shout to the people of his district that 'I am a Republican' or 'I am a Democrat.'

"More than 2,000,000 young men have already been discharged in this war, and they are organizing now to try to save America for Americans. They are going to read your records, and they are likely to ask you some very embarrassing questions when you get home.

"REVIEW AND ANALYSIS DIVISION

"Now look at this list and see who reviews all these records of racial discrimination when they come to Washington, and you will understand how the editor of the Dallas News felt and how other white gentiles feel, including Cecil B. DeMille, the great American movie producer, when they are harassed out of business.

"Here is the list:

"Review and analysis division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Davis, John A	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Lawson, Marjorie	Research analyst.	do	3,800
Colightly, Cornelius.	Compliance analyst.	do	3,200
Hemphill, India	do	do	2,600
Coan, Carol	do	White	2,600
Davis, Joy P	do	Colored	2,600
Hoffman, Celia	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Spaulding, Joan	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of six Negroes and two white people, one of whom is named Carol Coan and the other Celia Hoffman, a white stenographer receiving the lowest salary on the list.

"Now, if you sign the petition to bring out this bill or vote for this monstrosity, do not forget that when you get home those white American businessmen who help to sustain this Nation in time of peace and whose sons are fighting its battles in time of war are going to want to ask you some questions that you may not be able to answer.

"LEGAL DIVISION

"But if you want a real laugh, look at this legal division.

"Legal Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Reeves, Frank D	Attorney	Colored	$4,600
Stickgold, Simon	do	White	4,600
Gordon, Jernevive	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800

"You will note that this so-called Legal Division consists of two Negroes and a Simon Stickgold.

"INFORMATION DIVISION

"Now we come to the Information Division. If you want information about this outfit, write to this Division:

"Information Division

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Bourne, St. Clair	Information specialist.	Colored	$3,800
Whiting, Margaret	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes, one registered as an information specialist and the other as a clerk-stenographer.

"BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

"Now we come to the Budget and Administration Division. This Division not only makes up the budget but administers the regulations. Here is the list:

"Budget and Administration

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Jones, Theodore	Chief	Colored	$5,600
Jeter, Sinclair	Assistant administrative officer.	do	3,200
Baker, Vivian D	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Jackson, Bosales A	Clerk-typist	do	1,620
Paynter, Minnie A	do	do	1,620
Hollomon, Irving	Clerk	do	1,440
Selby, Ralph R	Chief, fiscal	do	2,600
Ross, Sylvia B	Voucher auditor	do	2,000
Nelson, Otelia	Accounting clerk	do	1,620
Carpenter, Elizabeth.	do	do	1,620
Brent, Pearl T	do	do	1,620

"This outfit, which is composed of 11 Negroes, and no whites at all, not only makes up the budget for financing this aggregation, but it seems to have the power of administration. I hope you will read this list to your white businessmen, farmers, and exservicemen at home when you get back and ask for renomination in the primaries next year.

"MAIL AND FILES DIVISION

"Now, here are the ones that have control of the mails and filing system:

"Mail and Files

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Douglas, Lela	Chief, Mail and Files.	Colored	$2,000
Welch, Selena	Docket clerk	do	1,800
Gamble, Jessie	File clerk	do	1,620
Phillips, Rose	do	do	1,440
Reed, Charles	Messenger	do	1,380
Mitchell, Regina	File clerk	do	1,440

"You will note that this division is composed entirely of Negroes—six Negroes, and no whites at all. I wonder why they discriminated against the white race in setting up these two powerful branches of this most dangerous agency?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW YORK

"Now, let us turn to the regional offices and see who is going to harass the business people back in the States. Here is the list for the State of New York:

"Regional office, New York

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Lawson, Edward H.	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Jones, Madison S	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Robert G	do	do	3,800
Donovan, Daniel R	do	White	3,800
Irish, Miriam	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	2,000
Asepha, Tillie	do	White	1,620
Schwartz, Sonia	do	do	1,620

"This is the list that is going to help Governor Dewey harass the white American businessmen of the Empire State. You will note that it is composed of four Negroes and three white people. Please read the names of the three white people and see if you can figure out their antecedents.

"Businessmen of New York are going to have a hard time after this war without having all this communistic conglomeration to deal with, to say nothing of the one which Governor Dewey and his political henchmen have now heaped upon them.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, PHILADELPHIA

"Now, let us turn to Philadelphia, the birthplace of the Constitution—the City of Brotherly Love. At the risk of causing glorious old Benjamin Franklin to turn over in his grave, I read you the list:

"Regional office, Philadelphia

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Fleming, G. James	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Greenblatt, Mildred	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Manly, Milo A	do	Colored	3,800
Risk, Samuel R	do	White	3,800
Grinnage, Willard	do	Colored	3,200
Gorgas, Helen	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Klinger, Karyl	do	White	1,800
Brown, Grayce	do	Colored	1,440

"You will note that it is composed of eight individuals—five Negroes and three whites, Mildred Greenblatt, Samuel R. Risk, and Karyl Klinger.

"Don't you know there will be some brotherly love when that crowd gets going on the businessmen of the Philadelphia area?

"REGIONAL OFFICE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

"Now, here is the regional office in Washington, D. C., the Nation's Capital, where there has been so much persecution of white gentiles in the last few years. Here is the list:

"Regional office, Washington, D. C.

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Evans, Joseph	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Houston, Theophilus.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,200
Kahn, Alice	do	White	2,600
Chisolm, Ruby	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,800
Urback, Dorothy	do	do	1,620

"You will note it consists of four Negroes and Alice Kahn. Just what chance a white gentile will have with this group is entirely problematical, to say the least of it.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CLEVELAND

"Now, let us move out where the West begins and take a look. Here is the list in the Cleveland regional office:

"Regional office, Cleveland

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
McKnight, William.	Regional director.	Colored	$4,600
Abbott, Olcott R	Fair-practice examiner.	White	3,800
Glore, Lethia	do	Colored	3,200
Kelley, Berniza	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,620
Wasem, Edna	do	White	1,800

"You will note that this group is composed of three Negroes and two whites, Olcott R. Abbott and Edna Wasem.

"Don't you know the white people of Cleveland will enjoy being dominated by them?

"CINCINNATI REGIONAL OFFICE

"Cincinnati seems to be largely under the jurisdiction of the Cleveland office since it only has two people:

"Cincinnati

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
James, Harold	Fair-practice examiner.	White	$4,600
----------	Clerk-stenographer.	----------	1,800

"DETROIT REGIONAL OFFICE

"Now let us move on to Detroit, Mich. Here is the regional office for Detroit:

"Detroit

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Swan, Edward	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$4,600
Sese, Doris K	Clerk-stenographer.	Japanese-American.	1,620

"You will note that it is composed of one Negro and one Japanese. I know the businessmen of Detroit are grateful for this consideration.

"I should like to hear some of the comments they will make to you gentlemen from Detroit when you get home next summer, if you support this vicious measure.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, CHICAGO

"Here is the list of the regional office in the Windy City:

"Regional office, Chicago

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Henderson, Elner	Regional director.	Colored	$5,600
Gibson, Harry H. C.	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Schultz, Joy	do	White	3,800
Williams, Le Roy	do	Colored	3,200
Zeidman, Penny	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800
Ingram, Marguerite S.	do	Colored	1,620

"You will note it is composed of four Negroes, Joy Shultz, and Penny Zeidman. I am told that a representative of this group went into the office of Swift & Co. and asked how many Negro members they had on their board of directors. The answer was, 'We have no Negro members on our board of directors.' Then the question came back, 'Why haven't you?' This just shows what this supergovernmental set-up is driving at. They want to communize America and destroy everything which our glorious ancestors have left us and for which our boys are now fighting and dying all over the world.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, ATLANTA

"Here is a list of the Atlanta office:

"Regional office, Atlanta

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Dodge, Witherspoon.	Regional director.	White	$4,600
Hope, John	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,800
McKay, George D	do	White	3,200
Chubb, Sally	Clerk-stenographer.	do	2,000
Ingram, Thelma	do	Colored	1,800

"You will note that it consists of two Negroes and three whites; the most important post in this office, that of examiner, is held by a Negro. I wonder how

the people of Georgia enjoy the domination of this group. I may have more to say about them later.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, KANSAS CITY

"Here is the list of the Kansas City office:

"Regional office, Kansas City

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hoglund, Roy A.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Ormabee, Eugene	Fair-practice examiner.	do	3,800
Jones, Mildred	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620
Schlien, Helene G.	do	White	1,620

"You will note that this office force consists of three whites and one Negro. You can read the list of whites yourself and then judge how many of them really represent the people of that area.

"ST. LOUIS REGIONAL OFFICE

"Here is the list of the regional office at St. Louis:

St. Louis

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Theodore Brown	Examiner in charge.	Colored	$3,800
Morris Levine	Examiner	White	3,200
Armatha Jackson	Clerk-stenographer.	Colored	1,620

"You will notice that it consists of two Negroes and Morris Levine. Just how they came to select these particular individuals to preside over the destiny of the white businessmen of the great State of Missouri I cannot understand.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, DALLAS, TEX.

"The members of the regional office at Dallas are as follows:

"Regional office, Dallas

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Castenada, Carlos	Regional director.	White	$4,600
(Vacancy)	Fair-practice examiner.		3,200
Gutleben, Willetta	Clerk-stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note there is one vacancy. Last year that position was held by a Negro, namely, Roy V. Williams. The other two members, Carlos Castenada, the regional director, and Willetta Gutleben seem to be in charge of the office at the present time. This is the regional office that attacked the Dallas News last year for carrying an advertisement for a Negro janitor. This fellow Castenada, the director, held the same position that he holds now. If this set-up is made permanent, then I presume the rest of the white American businessmen in Texas may expect to be harassed just as the Dallas News was.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, NEW ORLEANS

"The regional office at New Orleans consists of the following members:

"Regional office. New Orleans

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Ellinger, W. Don	Regional director.	White	$3,800
Morton, James H.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,200
Ronning, Evelyn	Clerk stenographer.	White	1,800

"You will note that there are two whites and one Negro in this office. As the Negro is the fair-practice examiner, just what the decent people of Louisiana may expect at the hands of this outfit is something to contemplate.

"REGIONAL OFFICE, SAN FRANCISCO

"The San Francisco office consists of the following individuals:

"Regional office, San Francisco

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Kingman, Harry L.	Regional director.	White	$5,600
Rutledge, Edward	Fair-practice examiner.	do	4,600
Ross, Bernard	do	do	3,800
Seymour, Virginia	Administrative assistant.	do	2,000
Mazen, Jewel	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800

"This is the only office we have found yet that consists entirely of white (?) people. Just what the background of each one of them is I am unable to say.

"LOS ANGELES REGIONAL OFFICE

"The Los Angeles regional office consists of the following:

"Los Angeles

Incumbent	Title	Race	Salary
Hunt, A. Bruce	Hearings examiner.	White	$5,600
Brown, Robert E.	Fair-practice examiner.	Colored	3,600
Lopez, Ignacio	do	White	3,800
Vetter, Vera G.	Clerk-stenographer.	do	1,800
Lerna, Marie	do	do	1,620

"You will note that there are four whites and one Negro in this office, the Negro being the fair-practice examiner. I do not know what consideration the white businessmen of the Los Angeles area are receiving at the hands of this group, but from what I can hear there is considerable gnashing of teeth over the situation.

"Mr. Chairman, this FEPC is a supergovernment of commissars, with more power for evil than any other agency that has ever been created in this country. If Congress should ratify it and make it the law of the land, then we will have sacrificed and destroyed that sacred freedom for which our brave men are now fighting and dying on every battle front in the world.

"We have no right to pass such a drastic revolutionary measure that literally changes our way of life, as well as our form of government, while these boys are away from home in uniform, fighting to sustain American institutions.

"As I said before, we are going to carry this battle against such un-American activities into every congressional district in the United States next year, in the primary, so that no one can crawl behind the party cloak and claim immunity at the hands of any segment of our people.

"This is a battle for the survival of free constitutional government, for the survival of the American way of life, for the survival of free enterprise, for the survival of American liberty itself.

"It is a battle to save America for Americans."

The New McCloy Spanks Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues, as well as I, have, from time to time, called the attention of this House to what appeared to be a deterioration of democratic thinking in Germany.

Today I desire to call your attention to what I believe will cause a great improvement thereof.

The following article by Don Cook in the New York Herald Tribune of February 19, 1950, is worthy of your perusal:

THE NEW M'CLOY SPANKS GERMANY—VAST CHANGE FOR BETTER FORECAST IN FIRM POLICY

(By Don Cook)

FRANKFURT.—Decisive pronouncements of foreign policy or political policy generally are well-marked historical events, such as the Monroe Doctrine, the Truman doctrine, the Harvard speech of Secretary of State George C. Marshall, or the British decision to get out of India.

But at least as decisive, though less well marked, can be a change in the application of a policy or doctrine already laid down—the mood or attitude of the responsible official whose objectives remain the same but whose method of approach suddenly takes a radical alteration almost as if he had been handed a new directive.

This, it appears, has happened suddenly in western Germany, and in the opinion of a good many Allied officials it has happened none too soon. The basic Allied objective of restoring a free and independent government to the western European community of nations is unchanged, but since the Stuttgart speech of United States High Commissioner John J. McCloy the whole atmosphere of the German situation has altered.

From a defensive position Mr. McCloy has suddenly carried the Allied High Commission over to a new high point of psychological authority in western Germany. No longer is everybody wondering what Chancellor Konrad Adenauer will do next: The question now is what the High Commission will do.

This Mr. McCloy has achieved by the simple act of telling the German people clearly, concisely, and unmistakably that they are still committing a lot of their old traditional political mistakes, and that before the world will trust the new Germany she must humble herself and learn the lesson that "humility leads to strength and not to weakness * * * that the highest form of self-respect is to admit mistakes and to make amends for them."

To understand the impact of such relatively obvious and elementary remarks one must first understand the instinctive fashion in which Germans respond to the voice of authority. Mr. McCloy has that authority by virtue of his position and the power which the United States represents here in the heart of Europe.

But the voice of authority must be clear and unmistakable and it must be heard continuously if it is to be kept effective. It need not threaten to get results, but certainly it must speak strongly enough and judicially enough to demonstrate a constant sympathetic interest in the future of this somewhat autocratic democracy.

Last November 30, for example, Mr. McCloy was confronted here with a request for comment on a directive which the German cabinet had issued to government civil servants, forbidding them from talking to the press. He remarked very carefully: "Free comment on the acts of government leaders must always be encouraged, and if any errors are committed in that respect they should lie on the side of liberal rather than restrictive policy."

This comment was barely even reported by the German press, but when Mr. McCloy arrived in Stuttgart and was asked for comment on the efforts to suppress news of the Wurttemberg-Baden denazification scandal, he got strong results from this statement:

"I cannot too strongly indorse the right of freedom of the press and the principle that public officials must exercise their responsibilities under the bright light of public discussion. Any thought of suppression of the news is intolerable and I commend the German press for its demands for the facts and the punishment of the guilty."

In the contrasting wordings of these two statements, each involving the same principle, lies the difference between strong psychological authority here in Germany and ineffective comment. What has produced the change in Mr. McCloy's attitude?

"A man can't go on being patient with the Germans forever," one of his high advisors remarked in discussing the matter. In 6 months here Mr. McCloy gave in tremendously to Chancellor Adenauer and the west German government—gave in at what many felt was an alarming rate in the hope that demands would cease, but only to be confronted with other demands from other quarters.

"I remember a remark Ernie Bevin made in a discussion about Germany," a British official said, talking about the McCloy speech. "Some one at the foreign office asked him at a conference one day if we weren't trying to make Germany a democracy. He hit the table with his fist and said, 'Of course, I want them to be a democracy. I want them to think what they like and do what I tell them'."

A chief factor in Mr. McCloy's new approach was the mood of American opinion he found on his last trip home—concern, he felt, at the growth of the old German autocratic temperament instead of the humility and pan-European spirit of which he spoke in Stuttgart.

The high commissioner had set a new pace for his mission here in Germany and the favorite topic of conversation now is the question: "Is this the new McCloy?" Germans being the people they are and the politicians they are, he should not have to wait long to prove whether his speech is backed with policy.

Petition To Reject World-Government Resolution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LAWRENCE H. SMITH
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am including a petition signed by women of 35 patriotic organizations which met in conference in the city of Washington in the last week of January. These 35 patriotic groups represent 3,000,000 women in the United States. As part of my remarks I am including the petition together with the signatures and a copy of the resolution adopted by the twenty-fourth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense held in the city of Washington, January 6, 7, and 8, 1950:

A PETITION TO REJECT WORLD GOVERNMENT RESOLUTIONS PENDING BEFORE THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

A petition to reject the world government resolutions now pending or which may be presented; a petition to hold strictly to the liberty with which we are endowed by the Constitution of the United States and to ask Congress to vote against any efforts to supplant or overthrow the Constitution of the United States and place in the hands of a world government authority, necessarily dominated by the totalitarian world, the rights, freedoms, and liberties of we, the sovereign people of the United States.

Kathryn M. New, Buffalo, N. Y.; Mrs. Carl O. Oyleo, Fostoria, Ohio; Mrs. William B. Shelton, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mrs. Josephine Jarvis, Hartford, Conn.; Mrs. Irene E. Wangel, Milwaukee, Wis.; Mrs. Emma Johnston, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. Earl Atkinson, Forest Hills, N. Y.; Josephine W. Ottman, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. Alice B. Huntington, Maplewood, N. J.; Edna H. Brown, Washington, D. C.; Gladys Thomas, Lafayette, Ind.; Mary E. Porter, Eloise E. Whitmer, Mrs. Anna Hansman, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Lillian Nugent, Rutherford, N. J.; Mrs. Leonard J. Bradley; Mrs. W. Graydon Painter, Lewisburg, Pa.; Pauline Walker, Waverly, Va.; Mrs. H. Klyspeel, Providence, R. I.; Mrs. Anne H. Drysdale, Warren, R. I.; Mrs. Ola D. Lee, Washington, D. C.

Ruth B. Niece, Chagrin Falls, Ohio; Gertrude I. Stone, Biddeford, Maine; Myrtle H. Knox, Hartford, Conn.; Mary E. Shields, Collingdale, Pa.; Loretta C. McGill, Philadelphia, Pa.; Harriet Eaton Hughes, New York, N. Y.; Grace A. Hartley, Cambridge, Mass.; Mrs. M. Russell Kelley, Washington, D. C.; Miss Alice D. Butterfield, New York City, N. Y.; Mrs. T. W. Ballard, LaGrange, Ill.; Mrs. Frances Cordaro, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Mrs. Bernice Weiss, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.; Mrs. Florence W. Braum, Irvington, N. Y.; Mrs. J. E. Cauklin, Hubbell, Nebr.; Mrs. Alberta S. Tucker, Bloomfield, N. J.; Imogene Philibert, Arlington, Va.; Dous Patch, Townsend, Mass.; Mrs. David D. Good, Osceola Mills, Pa.; Mrs. Ralph Ord, Dravosburg, Pa.; Mrs. Mildred Sterem, Mrs. Amelia Thiele, Mrs. W. M. Thomas, Kansas City, Mo.

Madalin Dingley Leetch, Mrs. Ethel E. Fuin, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Lou Ella Allen, Ennis, Tex.; Mrs. L. H. Breuer, Rolla, Mo.; Mrs. Wm. Hilgert, Duquesne, Pa.; Mrs. W. W. Stearns, Willoughby, Ohio; Mrs. J. B. O'Brien, Bronxville, N. Y.; Mrs. Eleanor Carty, Yeadon, Pa.; Frances B. Cox, Mrs. Marion Alterrus, Silver Spring, Md.; Mrs. Doris Hohn, Chicago, Ill.; Mrs. Milton W. Davis, Atlanta, Ga.; Mrs. Harrison Smith, Philadelphia, Pa.; Mrs. Calvin F. Shugg, Rutherford, N. J.; Mrs. E. S. Alvord, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. C. J. Keller, Wauseon, Mrs. Lee E. Moore, Zanesville, Ohio; Mrs. J. A. MacGalloway, Arlington, Mass.; Mary F. Barclay, Uniontown, Pa.

Mrs. Harry C. Hassinger, Northumberland, Pa.; Mrs. Eola Wright, Washington, D. C.; Mrs. Ruth E. Martin, Brentwood, Md.; Mrs. Gertrude Harris, Pearl Heagerty, Washington, D. C.; Margaret M. Locke, Myra Judd, Miss Theodora Read, Helen C. Miller, Mary B. Hartman, Miss A. Clare Tozzer, Mrs. C. H. Garret, Mrs. L. Coats, Mrs. Edward H. Dolle, B. Dorothy Fulton, Mrs. Lowell F. Hobart, Sr., Cincinnati, Ohio.

Dorothea G. Norman; Mrs. Ramsay Peuguet, Bronxville, N. Y.; Mrs. D. A. William, Washington Court House, Ohio; Mrs. A. J. Dexter, St. Paul, Minn.; Grace L. H. Brosseau, Greenwich, Conn.; Elizabeth B. Coddington, Douglaston, N. Y.; Mary Ruggiero, Brooklyn, N. Y.; Myra Hacker, West Englewood, N. J.; Mrs. Ethyl M. West, Ketchikan, Mrs. Nema Ellis, Anchorage, Alaska; Mrs. Harry G. O'Connor, Drexel Hill, Pa.; Mrs. D. C. M. Hart, Kansas City, Mo.; Nagene C. Bethune, Washington, D. C.; Gladys B. Coffin, Helen Welch, Cincinnati, Ohio; Mrs. John F. Lustenberger, Mt. Aub, Mrs. Lyall Lipscomb, Mitchell, Fort Mitchell, Ky.; Mrs. Ruth Martin, Mrs. L. B. Crawford, Cincinnati, Ohio; Ida McMillan, Covington, Ky.; Helen Mullen, Nina Brewster, Frieda Roesser, Cincinnati, Ohio.

Resolution No. 22

Subject: Oppose surrender of national sovereignty, world government

(Presented by National Society of New England Women and amended on floor of conference)

Whereas various schemes are advocated to bring about world government, world federation, or world union under world law of unknown character, which would supersede the Constitution of the United States or, indirectly, by international treaty, to establish an international central council planning group which would control the lives, work, investment, and genius of free Americans and thus abrogate the national sovereignty of the free people of the United States;

Whereas the United States has 7 percent of the world's population and, as one of the few solvent nations, would be outnumbered and outvoted in any scheme for world government;

Whereas United States gold reserves, currency, taxes, and immigration would be regulated by the world government, with world courts to try and sentence Americans;

Whereas the Army, Navy, and Air Forces would be abolished for an international police force maintained at the level approved by the world government;

Whereas the destruction of the United States Government would be accomplished by the stroke of a pen, thus serving the aims of the Communists: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Twenty-fourth Women's Patriotic Conference on National Defense oppose membership in any international organization which would inevitably have powers and rights over the United States, including Atlantic Union, and its sovereign people and supersede the Constitution of the United States.

Christian Leaders Term Jerusalem Plan Dangerous

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ABRAHAM J. MULTER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Speaker, the hopelessness of attempting to internationalize Jerusalem in contradistinction to the internationalization of the holy places within Jerusalem is now established beyond contradiction. In support of that statement I am pleased to submit the following item which appeared in the February 1950 edition of the New Palestine:

CHRISTIAN LEADERS TERM JERUSALEM PLAN DANGEROUS

A fact-finding mission of Christian leaders and spokesmen, sent to Israel to investigate the feasibility of the internationalization plan for Jerusalem, concluded in a report that "the United Nations plan to internationalize the Jerusalem area is dangerous and unnecessary." Having rejected the internationalization plan, it recommended that a United Nations commission "with no territorial sovereignty" be established in order to insure the free accessibility of the Christian world to the holy places of Jerusalem.

"Guaranties should be given to such a commission by both Jordan and Israel assuring the freedom and sanctity of the sacred places within their territories. This is all that the Christian world has a right to require of two sovereign states, which we believe will in time compose their differences. This making of the peace will be accomplished all the more speedily if Israel and Jordan are encouraged in their negotiations by the western powers," the report emphasized.

Members of the investigation commission, who occupy leading positions in the Presbyterian, Methodist, Baptist and Congregational denominations, included: Dr. Samuel Guy Inman, former adviser on Latin-American Affairs to the State Department and member of the Federal Council of Churches Commission of International Goodwill; Dr. Charles J. Turck, president of Macalester College in St. Paul and president of the National Council of Presbyterian Laymen; Mrs. H. E. Tilly, member of President Truman's Commission on Civil Rights and field representative of the Southern Regional Council; Dr. John W. Bradbury, editor of the national Baptist magazine, the Watchman-Examiner; Dr. Ralph W. Riley, president of the American Baptist Theological Seminary; and Prof. Victor Obenhaus of the University of Chicago, national chairman of the Council of Social Action, Congregational Christian Church of America.

The Jerusalem investigation group disclosed that while it was in Israel and the Holy City, it had discussed the problem of internationalization with representatives of the Coptic Church, the Greek Catholic Church, the Copt Catholic Church, the Roman Catholic Church, ministers of Protestant groups, and with Jews and Arabs. From these discussions, the fact-finding mission was able to conclude, according to its report, that the UN plan was unworkable.

IMPEDE PEACE

"The overwhelming majority of leaders of religious groups we interviewed expressed the belief it would not work. Many held it was impractical and certain to add confusion and impede peace negotiations now in progress," the report stated.

The mission called upon the United States Government to press for a reconsideration of the United Nations Assembly decision. It asserted that a reconsideration by the United Nations of its internationalization plan was within the prerogatives of the international organization, and that the formulation of a just and workable plan for guaranteeing the sanctity of the holy places would enhance its prestige and power.

At the same time, Louis Lipsky, chairman of the American Zionist Council, threw up a charge of inconsistency at the State Department for its statement that the United States would participate constructively in the Trusteeship Council's consideration of the Jerusalem issue.

Mr. Lipsky made direct reference, in his statement, to the State Department's failure to amplify its meaning of the term: "participate constructively."

The Zionist leader stated: "To 'participate constructively' in the Trusteeship Council—a principle by which our Government has always been guided—should not mean that the United States has yielded its strong feelings of opposition to an impotent and impossible regime for Jerusalem which, according to the views conveyed by the United States delegation on December 5, 'does not in any way express the wishes of the people of that city.'"

Mr. Lipsky went on to quote from statements made at Lake Success by John C. Ross, United States representative to the United Nations, pointing out the impracticability of the Jerusalem plan.

In that conection it is well to set forth the following excerpt from an address delivered by the Israel Ambassador to the United States before a Jewish National Fund gathering in San Francisco:

WE WILL NOT FORGET OUR RESPONSIBILITY FOR JERUSALEM

(By Eliahu Elath, Israel Ambassador to the United States)

Our efforts for lasting peace and security for Israel and its population were seriously hurt by the ill-starred plan which the United Nations has just adopted for Jerusalem. This plan ignores experience and reality and violates fundamental principle, for the United Nations was established to defend the right of a people to govern themselves. The United Nations is seeking to annul Israel's authority in Jerusalem and has no means by which to assert its own. By passing this resolution, which is foredoomed to futility, the United Nations has fallen victim to incredible light-mindedness. Those who sponsored the resolution have charged themselves with grave moral responsibility for the moral authority of the United Nations.

Let me state with full clarity that Jerusalem is an integral part of Israel and cannot be severed, neutralized or separated in any way from the state. The failure to implement an internationalization plan in 1947 is tragically marked in Jerusalem's cemeteries by the graves of 1,490 Jews who fell in Jerusalem's defense.

Jerusalem, throughout the ages, meant to the Jews the embodiment of everything Jewish. Today, Jerusalem, in addition to being a symbol, is a reality. The new city of Jerusalem is as much a part of Israel as Tel Aviv, because it was built up by Israelites, is inhabited by Israelites, and draws its livelihood from Israel. But for our successful stand against aggressors, Jewish Jerusalem would have been signed off the face of the earth.

The government of Israel does not believe that there has ever been any fundamental clash of interests between the Christian world and Israel as to the safeguarding of the holy places. Only about 5 percent of the holy places in Jerusalem are located in the Israeli-held part of the town. Approximately 95 percent are in the Old City, which is controlled by Jordanian forces.

It must be stressed that the Arab authority in control of almost all the holy places refuses to concede any title or function whatsoever to the United Nations.

My government has solemnly declared its determination to honor the rights of every faith and religion in Israel, to protect the shrines and holy places in its territory and to guarantee free access to them. My government is equally determined to protect, with all its means and power, the security and well-being of the Jewish community in Jerusalem and its sovereign rights in its historic capital. We will protect Jewish Jerusalem with the same vigor and, if necessary, self-sacrifice as in our defense of Haifa, Safed and Negba.

We in Israel are fully aware of our sacred responsibility to the Jewish people for justice to Jerusalem. We will not forget and not betray that responsibility.

Displaced Persons

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BURNET R. MAYBANK

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article relating to displaced persons, by William A. Millen, from the Washington Evening Star of yesterday.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DP'S ARE APT TO LEAVE SUDDENLY, FARMERS IN NEARBY STATES FIND

(By William A. Millen)

An up-to-date version of "How you gonna keep 'em down on the farm?" is plaguing Maryland and Virginia farmers who have employed displaced persons.

A tendency of the recently arrived Europeans to move out without warning was cited by area farmers as probably their greatest fault.

L. M. Walker, Jr., Virginia commissioner of agriculture and State DP committee chairman, put it this way:

"The biggest all-round objection is that the DP's leave suddenly, and the farmers are left high and dry. The farmer provides a house and some furniture. But he still is worried whether the DP will be there next week, or will move to the big cities—Chicago, Philadelphia, Baltimore or Washington.

He blamed the screening of DP applicants in Europe—an apparent failure to select farm people for farm work.

Virginia has about 120 DP families now. About 40 percent of these originally employed on farms have switched to other occupations. More than half the Virginia DP's are Ukrainians, with Lithuanians and Poles making up most of the others.

Dr. T. B. Symons, dean of the School of Agriculture at the University of Maryland, figures Maryland has between 400 and 500 DP's.

In addition to a need for screening, Dr. Symons believes the DP program would be improved by a follow-up check on performances, a requirement that DP farmers remain on farms for a reasonable time, and that they be registered for a reasonable period.

Anne Arundel County's members resigned recently from the Governor's Committee for the Resettlement of Displaced Persons. They charged the DP program has been "haphazard."

Anne Arundel County Agent Stanley E. Day said that often "farmers" turn out to be tailors, beekeepers, or florists.

To illustrate, he told how one DP family, given a chicken by a farmer, had to ask him to kill it for them.

Other difficulties arise from the difference in languages. Some farmers, believing they were more than generous in wages and living quarters, were amazed to find DP's walking out on them at a minute's notice, Mr. Day said.

At Joyce Lane, Md., Dr. Charles E. Iliff, a Baltimore eye specialist, invited a young Ukrainian family to work on his farm last May. The DP's were given a third-floor apartment in the large farmhouse, with their own bath, radio, and a large fan to keep cool in the summer.

The Ukrainian woman did not know how to cook, so Mrs. Iliff patiently coached her.

The immigrant often talked about how nice things were back home and said that some day, when the Russians left, they would move back. Almost without warning last month, the Ukrainians left the Iliff farm.

On the Arnold (Md.) Angus cattle farm of Charles B. Lynch, there's an empty house. It was prepared for another Ukrainian family last April. Last month the tenants shoved off for parts unknown.

In Montgomery County, where some of the first DP's landed, there has not been a request for a DP farm family in 10 months.

S. Gilbert Brown, manager of the Silver Spring office of the Maryland Employment Security Department, said, "They went sour on us and the word spread like wildfire."

"Now, instead of the 14 DP families in the county, there are 4 such groups, all Lithuanians," he said.

Montgomery County Agent O. W. Anderson said, "The DP's showed they were interested only in getting into this country and then going their own way."

Dissatisfaction also was expressed by Agent P. E. Clark, of Prince Georges County, where 30 foreign families still reside on farms.

"They should be called in many cases misplaced persons instead of DP's," he said. "They are chosen like picking a pig out of a bag. They land in Baltimore and the farmer is told to meet them there. The DP's have pictured to them that this is a land of milk and honey, and somebody will take care of them."

But not all the criticism of DP farm families is derogatory. Many hard-working groups have proved satisfactory, as tomorrow's concluding article will describe.

FEPC Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, this is a statement by eight Republican Members of the House on the FEPC bill coming up Wednesday:

The 1948 platform of the Republican Party contained these ringing words:

"This right of equal opportunity to work and to advance in life should never be limited in any individual because of race, religion, color, or country of origin. We favor the enactment and just enforcement of such Federal legislation as may be necessary to maintain this right at all times in every part of this Republic."

In line with our party platform we shall oppose any attempt to remove from the FEPC bill adequate provisions for its enforcement. Specifically, we shall oppose any amendment or substitute which would have that effect.

We realize that an FEPC law must be administered with wisdom, understanding and restraint. We shall insist that it will be so administered. All the experience under State FEPC legislation amply justifies our confidence that this can be done.

But if the FEPC law is to have any effect it also must be administered with firmness and to this end it must contain adequate machinery for its enforcement. A law without sanctions is no law at all.

We recognize that the various State FEPC commissions have been making great progress in the elimination of discrimination in employment and that they have not found it necessary to resort to the penalty provisions which their laws contain. But the evidence is overwhelming that it has been the very existence of such penalty provisions which has made resort to them unnecessary. The testimony of State FEPC commissioners is conclusive on this point. And the hearings before the Committee on Education and Labor are replete with evidence of the failure of voluntary efforts at the elimination of discrimination and the quick success of such efforts when backed by adequate legal sanctions.

We agree completely with the 15 prominent businessmen, including William L. Batt, president of S. K. F. Industries; Henry R. Luce, editor of Time, Life, and Fortune magazines; Beardsley Ruml, chairman of the board of R. H. Macy & Co.; and Spyras P. Skouras, president of Twentieth Century-Fox Film Corp. who declared to the committee:

"We like the reliance which the bill puts upon education and conciliation. On the other hand, we recognize the necessity of governmental sanctions when conciliation breaks down."

The existence of discrimination in employment is recognized by everyone. The need for a Federal law to eliminate such discrimination is generally conceded. That need cannot be met unless we enact a law with real enforcement provisions and not the mere statement of a lofty principle and the expression of a pious hope for voluntary conformity.

CLIFFORD P. CASE,
Republican, Sixth District, New Jersey.
JOHN W. HESELTON,
Republican, First District, Massachusetts.
JACOB K. JAVITS,
Republican, Twenty-first District, New York.
KENNETH B. KEATING,
Republican, Fortieth District, New York.
JOHN P. SAYLOR,
Republican, Twenty-sixth District, Pennsylvania.
HARDIE SCOTT,
Republican, Third District, Pennsylvania.
HUGH D. SCOTT, Jr.,
Republican, Sixth District, Pennsylvania.
THOR C. TOLLEFSON,
Republican, Sixth District, Washington.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALT HORAN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include articles 17, 18, and 19 in the series on the Columbia River region.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 7, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN
(Art. 17)

(By Leon Starmont)

Warden brought its highway battle to Spokane yesterday, and will stage another demonstration at a special highway meeting at Coulee City, Wash., next Sunday.

Warden is trying to have its north-south paved county road designated as part of the State highway that will connect Pasco at Coulee Dam. This route, once approved, the Warden spokesmen maintain, is threatened with abandonment in favor of a more westerly road through Othello, Moses Lake, and Ephrata.

Twenty-one chambers of commerce, from Vancouver, Wash., to Oroville, on the Canadian border, have been invited to a special highway meeting at Coulee City next Sunday. A special strategy meeting has also been called at Soap Lake tonight.

JUST STUDIES, SAYS ROGERS

The State highway commission will decide where the highway goes, according to Jack Rogers, ex-officio chairman of the State Columbia Basin Commission, who poured a little oil on the troubled waters at yesterday's luncheon of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce's Columbia Basin Committee.

"I believe the surveys now being made of the westerly route are merely in line with the expressed desire to determine the least expensive right-of-way as well as one that will best serve the greatest permanent population," said Rogers, who had presided at a road meeting in Ephrata just a week before.

"W. A. Bugge, State highway director, is new in office, and doubtless wants to canvass all possibilities before his office commits itself to any definite route for the road.

"But action must come soon. The irrigation districts and the Bureau of Reclamation should know where the State highways will be before they start laying out irrigable units in that part of the area that will get the first flow of water."

The Bureau of Reclamation, he said, can pay for crossings of canals on county roads designated but not yet improved, but cannot do that on State highways not yet located.

WARDEN DELEGATION

The basin commission, said Rogers, expects to meet early this summer with the interim State highway committee. He doubted whether it is practical to delay selection of the highway route until the 1951 legislature acts on a proposal to establish a seven-man State highway commission.

Warden's delegation yesterday comprised Millard Steele, president of its chamber of commerce; Finley Imbert, city councilman and treasurer of the chamber; Albert Widman, past president of the chamber, and Fred Radach, chairman of its road committee, who acted as spokesman.

Maps on the wall showed the routes in dispute. Radach answered many questions. More than a dozen stayed after adjournment to bring out more facts about the roads and the necessity of determining soon where the State arterial will be built.

The present paved road through Warden follows a 60-foot right of way and is 18 miles long, said Radach. It is oiled from the junction on U S 10, straight south, to another junction 6 miles east of Othello. It is graveled 4 miles more, almost to the Franklin County line. From the present south end, a 9-mile extension would connect with State secondary highway 11—about 4 miles north of Mesa.

EPHRATA "TRICK" SEEN

"We thought this road route was all settled until we discovered State-highway surveys were being made of the Othello route," said Widmer. "We suspect Frank T. Bell, an Ephrata political power and member of the State Columbia Basin commission.

"Of course we don't blame Ephrata for trying to have all roads directed toward the county seat. But the fact we can't get definite answers from the Bureau of Reclamation and the State highway department arouses our suspicions.

"Ephrata also tried to put over the so-called Burke cut-off, bypassing Quincy. They were stopped on that, and we think they can be stopped on this."

Adams County commissioners, the Warden spokesman said, favor the Warden road, despite the fact Othello is the only Adams County town on either route. They said they also had support from Pasco, Connell, Soap Lake, Coulee City, Grand Coulee, Coulee

Dam, and Okanogan County towns as far north as Oroville.

"We believe this road will ultimately be part of the proposed U S 197 running from Omak to Pasco via Coulee Dam, Sun Lakes State Park, and Soap Lake," said Steele.

ARGUMENTS STUDIED HERE

Spokane Chamber of Commerce should come out definitely for the Warden route, Radach maintained.

J. K. Cheadle, chairman of the chamber's Columbia Basin committee, said more information must be developed before the group can take any part in the argument.

"We don't know what facts may be brought out by the State highway department in its study of the Othello-Ephrata route," he explained.

"This group, organized in 1918, is the oldest in years of any of the several official and volunteer groups which are cooperating in bringing the hopes of many years to fruition.

"We will not take any part in any controversies among local groups until it is clearly demonstrated that one of several alternatives is the best plan for the basin project as a whole."

Several maps brought by the Warden group were left for study by the Spokane committee, which also was invited to participate in Sunday's Coulee City meeting.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 8, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 18)

(By Leon Starmont)

One of the forgotten men in the colorful history of the Columbia Basin project and Grand Coulee Dam is E. W. Southard, Ephrata (Wash.) attorney. He was talking about a dam at the head of Grand Coulee nearly 50 years ago. He is generally credited with being first to get the dam proposal onto newspaper front pages in Spokane, after 1914, when the State irrigation bond issue was voted down.

Potholes Dam, west of Warden, having been renamed for James O'Sullivan, the proposal is now being made in the district that South Dam, at Coulee City, be named for Ed Southard, one of the small group who made O'Sullivan's early labors possible.

NICHOLLS IDEA ALIVE?

Incidentally, Southard maintains that the ideas of Ralph Nicholls, former Seattle State senator, about reviving the original gravity project, to reclaim high land in Spokane, Whitman, and Adams Counties, should be taken seriously.

Southard reports—and this is verified by ex-Senator C. C. Dill—that Nicholls was working on this project many years ago, but even then included a river diversion plan at Grand Coulee.

"In 1913 I took a party to the present site of Coulee Dam, and Senator Nicholls suggested construction of a dam so high it would run water through Grand Coulee," the pioneer attorney recalls. "I considered the idea wholy impractical, as it would have drowned out all the railroad crossings of the Columbia in Canada."

This was essentially the same idea that had been advanced by Laughlin McLean in 1892, and revived periodically. It was later suggested by William E. Clapp, another Ephrata attorney, in 1917.

FILED DESERT CLAIM IN 1902

Southard recalls that he filed a desert claim a mile below the present dam site in 1902, when the Brookfield family controlled the Columbia's west bank at the coulee head.

"Bill Brookfield and I talked about the wonderful dam site even then," Southard continues, "but nobody thought it possible to get the development money."

James O'Sullivan became interested in 1919, as Southard now recalls, the gravity plan having been suggested at a Spokane meeting by E. F. Blaine in 1918.

"It was James O'Sullivan who interested Arthur Powell Davis, of the Reclamation Service, in the possibilities of the Coulee Dam site," according to Southard. Evolution of the dam idea was gradual, but neither the highest dam suggested in 1892 and 1913 nor the low power dam originally envisioned by the Army engineers had much resemblance to the structure that now stands.

Southard's own scheme, for a dam to divert water into a tunnel emerging below Dry Falls in the lower coulee, was revived as late as 1943 by a Seattle engineer.

SOME UNTOLD HISTORY

Here is some other previously unrelated history, as now recalled by Ed Southard:

"In early 1929 the idea of a dam that would irrigate by pumping was being developed by the Army engineers under Maj. John S. Butler, Seattle District engineer. But they had not yet given up the idea of a power dam at Kettle Falls. That spring I wrote a protest to the Federal Power Commission at Washington. The reply I received indicated that a permit was to be granted Washington Water Power Co. for the Kettle Falls site, which could later be condemned if the high dam at Grand Coulee ever were adopted.

"That alarmed me, so I wrote Senator Wesley L. Jones, and he visited the Power Commission and obtained assurance that the Kettle Falls permit would be held up pending further study of the high dam at Grand Coulee.

"By 1934, when President Roosevelt scheduled his visit to the project, quite a fight was going on between O'Sullivan and some of the State Columbia Basin commissioners. By that time Jim was all for the higher dam, and we in Ephrata backed him to the limit.

DANA AND GOSS AID

"Some of those concerned with the President's visit wanted the matter of the higher dam kept out of it while he was here. I sought a way to sell Jim O'Sullivan to the President and the Secretary of the Interior. So I wrote Bob Kipp, of the Portland Chamber of Commerce, to try to get me a conference with Marshall Dana, who had been making speeches for the Columbia Basin project since the early 1920's. I impressed Dana, a former president of the National Reclamation Association, with Jim O'Sullivan's qualities and asked him to intercede with A. S. Goss, head of the National Grange. That he did.

"When the President reached Portland, Dana got his ear, and when the President reached Ephrata on his inspection trip, Secretary Ickes astonished a lot of the natives by getting off the train and asking for Jim O'Sullivan.

"I have always been proud of the little trick I played to get O'Sullivan the needed audience. From that time on his going was easy."

Southard might have added that he was among those who financed O'Sullivan's early efforts in the Columbia River Development League—which fought for the pumping plan when the gravity system was still the official choice of both State and Nation—and that he also drove possibly 50,000 miles over early unpaved roads to get O'Sullivan wherever his arguments could do the greatest good.

[From the Spokane (Wash.) Spokesman-Review of February 9, 1950]

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 19)

(By Leon Starmont)

Unique among State agencies is the Columbia Basin Commission. It has no power, but lots of influence. It is sitting right now in an important spot as principal spokesman for the State in dealing with the Federal Government and the other States through the interagency committe, and in dealing with Canada through the international joint commission.

Chairman of the Columbia Basin Commission, by virtue of his office, is Jack Rogers, State director of conservation and development, who also acts as Gov. Arthur B. Langlie's delegate on the Columbia Basin interagency committee. Rogers, former mayor of Wenatchee, succeeded Frank A. Stewart, who succeeded Art Garton, of Chelan. Neither Stewart nor Garton participated officially in CBIAC activities, because former Gov. Monrad C. Wallgren refused to recognize that body as a proper instrument for advancing Columbia Basin plans.

MILLER, HAMBLEN, WOODS

Appointed by the Governor on the basin commission, as provided by statute, are three men:

H. Lloyd Miller, of Sunnyside, as mentioned in an earlier article, was with E. F. Blaine in 1918 when that noted irrigationist revived the Columbia Basin project, then dormant 4 years, and started the chain of events that led to construction of Bonneville, Grand Coulee, and other dams, and creation of today's comprehensive plan.

Herbert M. Hamblen, of Spokane, former speaker of the House of Representatives, is the youngster of the basin group, but W. S. Gilbert, his father's law partner, was one of the earliest advocates of the project.

Rufus Woods, Wenatchee publisher, began to take a serious interest in Columbia basin affairs about 1922. He opposed the gravity system of irrigation and argued for substitution of the Grand Coulee pumping plan.

The State Grange also officially opposed the Columbia Basin project until 1931, and according to A. S. Goss, State master, approved it then only on condition it be consolidated with the Grand Coulee power project.

THREE STREAMS UNITED

The so-called industrial membership of the State commission, therefore, is made up of spokesmen for three groups which approached the subject from different angles from 28 to 32 years ago.

Hamblen may be said to carry on the work started in 1918 by the hastily formed Columbia Basin committee of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce.

Miller represents the slightly older element which gathered around E. F. Blaine, and which became regionally vocal after organization of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League at Pasco in 1922.

Woods was for some years president of the Columbia River Development League, organized several years later, whose principal objective was power rather than irrigation.

By law the three irrigation districts in the Columbia Basin (Big Bend) project elect the other three members of the State commission—Leon L. Bailie, of Mesa; Don Damon, of Cunningham; and Frank T. Bell, of Ephrata as representative of J. A. Weber, of the Quincy-Columbia district. Other irrigation districts of the State are not represented.

These district men have generally acted with a State-wide outlook, says Hamblen. There is no present movement to have the law changed.

THREE EARLIER COMMISSIONS

There were three earlier Columbia Basin commissions. The first was a State board authorized by the 1919 legislature to resume surveys for the project. The second was a Federal group appointed by the Bureau of Reclamation. The third was a five-man State group authorized in 1933, after the pumping plan had been adopted.

The 1933 chairman was E. F. Banker, now deceased, of Winthrop. Other members were A. S. Goss and Rufus Woods, already mentioned; James E. McGovern, of Spokane; and Harvey Smith, now deceased, of Neppel (Moses Lake).

The 1933 board also had an advisory board, including State Senator Horace E. Smith, of Omak; W. C. Morse, of Seattle; D. C. Henny, of Portland, author of one of the 1920's reports on the basin project; and A. F. Darland, of Tacoma, who later became assistant to Frank A. Banks, chief engineer in charge of the construction of Grand Coulee Dam.

For several years both the irrigation league and development league carried on their programs, one based mainly on irrigation and one mainly on power. Both leagues had members in both Spokane and Wenatchee. The irrigation league, however, drew its support from all over the Northwest States, and became in effect after 1925 a spokesman for a comprehensive basin program. The development league was concentrated in Chelan, Grant, Okanogan, Douglas, Lincoln, and Kittitas Counties.

He's Still Here

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. DANIEL A. REED
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the fact that J. Edgar Hoover has asked for 700 more men to assist the FBI in running down spies and to protect the Government from the subversive elements working to undermine our representative form of government, I for one favor full cooperation with his request. It has been my opinion for a long time that he has been one of the greatest sources of security this Nation has had not only in war but in peace. There should be no interference with the work of this outstanding public servant, and if given the cooperation which he deserves every law-abiding person can feel more secure in life, liberty, and property.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting an editorial which appeared in the Washington Times-Herald of February 21, 1950:

HE'S STILL HERE

On May 4, 1949, the Times-Herald in an editorial entitled "Who Is the Man?" urged an all-out hunt for the big brain behind Russia's spies planted throughout our Government agencies.

It was pointed out that the machinations of this spy system are so cleverly directed that the master mind must be a top man in the Government. He must be a person of authority. He must be trusted in the inner circles. He must be an American traitor. Else he would not be so diabolically clever in placing his agents in our Government agencies where they milk so many secrets for the Kremlin.

Since that editorial was published the United States Civil Service Commission has reported that 123 Government employees have been fired for disloyalty, 848 have quit while under investigation, and 6,076 cases have been handled by the special loyalty board.

The disclosures of Elizabeth Bentley, Whittaker Chambers and Henry J. Wadleigh have resulted in the conviction of Alger Hiss as a perjurer in swearing to a Federal grand jury that he had not stolen important documents from the State Department for the Communist conspiracy.

Judith Coplon has been convicted of stealing documents for Russia from the Department of Justice.

NOT GOOD ENOUGH

All that is to the good. It proves the point of the May editorial beyond a doubt. But it's not cause for going back to sleep. In that May editorial we said:

"Actually there isn't much to be proud of in the fact that we have combed out a few of these agents. We can't go around patting ourselves on the back and say 'Look, 94.8 percent of the Government employees are loyal, law-abiding citizens.'

"Because we've caught only a few bunglers. The really efficient spies are still operating and the biggest fish is still at large."

The same goes today. FBI Director Hoover reported recently that 99.6 percent of the employees investigated have proven loyal. But what good does it do us to have 2,000,000 loyal employees and one or two thousand spies?

Did you ever hear a bank president boast that all of the bank's employees were honest except two tellers, the cashier and a vice president?

Hoover also has reported there are 45,000 card-holding Communists in this country and about 10 times that number of fellow travelers or Communist sympathizers. They prey on our Government night and day. They must be thwarted in their espionage attempts or the security of this country won't be worth one thin dime.

Hoover has asked for 700 more men to help the FBI do the job. He should have them. And he should be encouraged in his efforts to find the Soviet master spy who still is hidden in the works of the Truman administration.

Who is that man?

Advice to the CAB

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAN GURNEY
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very thoughtful article appearing in the American Aviation magazine on February 15, 1950. I ask my colleagues who are interested in aviation to give it their attention, if possible.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADVICE TO THE CAB

In a speech the other day CAB Member Russell Adams indicated quite clearly that the Board would continue to pursue its policy of ordering investigations of air lines which it considers to be uneconomic in route structure and of route segments which it thinks have excessive competition.

The purpose of these investigations, the Board has said, is to correct deficiencies in the air-route pattern and to reduce the dependency on mail pay of the entire air-line network. To this end there can be little disagreement. Everyone wants the most efficient and the most economical air-line system possible under our present system of private enterprise.

In his strong feeling that something must be done, Mr. Adams proposes that industry itself assume the obligation of initiating corrective measures. He admits quite frankly, as other Board members have admitted, that the Board does not have the powers under the law to force mergers and radical route adjustments. He hints that unless industry does take the initiative, the Board ultimately will have to seek the necessary powers from Congress to remake the air transport system.

It was on September 28, 1948, that the Board instituted its first investigation order, against National Airlines. The hearing on the expanded proceeding resulting from this 1948 order is now scheduled to start March 6. A year ago the Board ordered investigations of Western, Northeast and Colonial, but no hearing dates have ever been set. Mr. Adams in his recent speech indicated there may be one or two other air lines needing similar inquiries.

We would like to give the CAB a little friendly counsel in its current efforts to correct the deficiencies which it believes to exist in the air-route pattern.

1. MAY IMPERIL THE ACT

First and foremost, we are certain the CAB, as well as the industry itself, does not want to upset the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938. It is as fine an act as any industry could ever expect to obtain from Congress. If there is anything wrong, it is with the manner in which the act has been administered. No legislative move now would bring any advantages. The act as it stands must be retained.

We are not sure, however, that the CAB fully understands that it imperils the act every time it shocks the industry and air-line stockholders with new and broad investigation orders—orders which it admits that it cannot back up with enforcement powers. We are not sure the CAB fully realizes that each investigation is in reality an investigation of itself. In seeking to correct existing deficiencies the CAB is actually seeking to correct its own mistakes.

We say this not to belabor the Board again for past errors of judgment. Perfect forecasting and perfect planning in aviation is a goal impossible to attain. Industry's judgment has often been just as far amiss as the CAB's. Yet for this very reason the burden for corrections cannot be placed in toto on industry when it is the CAB that is the regulatory and the deciding agency. The Board's own record has been all too noteworthy for its whims and inconsistencies.

What we do say is that Congress currently has the impression that something is wrong with the air lines, due in part at least to the financial troubles of early 1949 which were directly traceable to the Board's delay in adjusting mail pay to reasonable levels. And due in part to the shocks which the CAB issues in the form of investigation orders. By making enough fuss over current deficiencies, the CAB might well lead itself and the industry into a full-scale investigation by Congress. And in any such inquiry the CAB is apt to come out considerably blackened, to say nothing of the repercussions on the air lines. This is no time to imperil the Civil Aeronautics Act. No matter how many accessories to the crime a congressional inquiry may line up, the biggest sentence after conviction will go to the CAB because CAB made all of the decisions.

2. GET HOUSE IN ORDER

Another bit of friendly counsel is for the Board to get its own house in order. By moving ahead more rapidly on the raft of pending proceedings, the Board might well find many deficiencies corrected if the proceedings are acted upon promptly and wisely.

Embarking on broad investigations without expediting pending matters is like an industrial firm calling in high-priced efficiency experts before the company straightens out defects and inefficiencies which are obvious and known. Investigations are conducted, and efficiency experts called in, to discover what is not known and what is not obvious.

In his speech Mr. Adams was frank to admit that there isn't too much wrong with the existing air-line network. A few relatively minor operations are all that are needed, he says. But how many of these corrections are already involved in pending proceedings? We suspect quite a few.

3. A BETTER APPROACH

A third suggestion is a changed approach by the Board in its relations with the industry it regulates. The CAB has issued a general invitation to the air lines to come forth with corrective proposals but it makes no guaranty that it will approve them when made.

Why not a more specific invitation, formally issued to each air line with a time limit on replies, to submit in a few pages the specific, concrete suggestions which each air line thinks would bring about greater efficiency and economy, and which can be acted on expeditiously by the Board with its existing powers. Hundreds of small, quickly made corrections, saving in the aggregate large sums of mail pay, might well be the result of this more specific approach.

Industry today has a feeling of futility about making proposals. Time lapses between filing of applications and decisions are much too long. CAB must give a better indication of good faith. If all airlines submitted proposals at the same time, CAB might not find a complete pattern, but it might find many of its wishes answered.

4. A FEEDER POLICY

As a final bit of counsel, the Board must clarify its feeder policy. One of the greatest steps toward moving trunk lines into the self-sufficient category could be the transfer of small towns to the feeders, or the entire elimination of costly small stops in the absence of feeder service. The Board seems to be reaching the idea that feeders can give better and more economical service to small towns. We believe this is a sound trend.

But trunk lines are reluctant to apply for suspension of service without having some assurance from CAB that this is in line with a firm policy. No trunk line wants to abandon a stop which a competitive trunk line might grab up. Without a lot of hullabaloo and scareheadline investigations, CAB has within its powers the means of clarifying a situation which is, today, inexcusably confused.

A recent test case was Chicago and Southern Air Lines which applied for suspension at Peoria, Ill., an unprofitable stop. CAB approved. Just lately Northwest Airlines has filed for suspension of three local stops in Wisconsin, towns served now by Wisconsin Central, the certificated feeder. Approval of suspension means removal of losses for Northwest and means net gains for the feeder. All major trunk lines have been discussing the elimination of unprofitable stops, but the answer is up to CAB. Industry is waiting for the cue from headquarters.

In conclusion it seems to us that CAB is doing some fairly straight thinking—or at least exploration—of the major economic and air-route problems. But in trying to find solutions it may be making things difficult both for itself and industry. It has alarmed unduly the Congress, the companies, and the stockholders. It is thinking too much about a new house which will never be built and not enough about making repairs quickly to keep the house livable.

CAB really needs no more powers and no more staff. It merely needs to bring itself closer to the industry and its own proceedings files and get caught up with what's in the mill. Every time it has had a chance to take a crack at a big problem, it has compromised and backed away. This will happen with all big investigations. Meantime, there is much corrective action that can be taken without more staff and more legislation.

WAYNE W. PARRISH.

The Business Outlook Is What We Make It

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 21 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a very interesting address by the Hon. Thomas C. Blaisdell, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Commerce, delivered before the economic conference on the business outlook, at the Read Hotel, Chattanooga, Tenn., on February 17, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

You have had the privilege of listening this morning to Dr. Marcus Nadler. Although I have not been privileged as you have to hear Dr. Nadler's address, I know him and I know his abilities, and I know there is no necessity for me to repeat the kind of statement which he can give you so much better than I. My comments with regard to the business outlook and what the banker can do about it will be more general than Dr. Nadler's. But they will be specific enough, I hope, to be helpful.

The business outlook is not like the weather. Mark Twain's famous statement that everybody talks about the weather but nobody does anything about it is definitely not applicable to business. In fact, just the opposite is true about business. Not only does everybody talk about it, but everybody does something about it, so that when we try to predict, we are trying to predict what everybody is going to do. This is no small task.

Each of the owners and managers of our 4,000,000 business firms makes decisions every day that affect the business outlook. The businessman decides to expand his business, or to contract it. He decides to do something, or to do nothing. In any case, he does something which automatically affects the business situation. But it is not only the businessman who affects the business situation. All the rest of us—as customers in stores, as buyers of houses, as workers who are happy or unhappy about our wages, as Government officials making decisions about regulations, controls, taxes, and Government purchases—all of us affect the volume and the kind of business that is transacted. The important question, then, is why do people do what they do? And all our study of business developments is fundamentally a study of why people act as they do. Considering the state and complexity of this mass of decisions being made every day, it is small wonder that the science of predicting business conditions is not yet perfect.

Before looking ahead, let us look back—not too far but far enough to just get a little perspective and, if you don't mind, far enough so we can do a little boasting. The Southeast has been going through a period of development which has rarely been duplicated, and the results of this period of development are evident on every side. They represent the achievement of a period of great vigor in American life.

In 1929 we saw the beginning of the great depression. For a time we literally did not know what had hit us. Only gradually did we realize we had to take concerted action, but finally the combined intelligence of the people responded to the challenge to put this country back on the road to vigorous growth and development. You will recall that during those years some people were saying that America's great period of expansion had passed. There was a certain amount of truth in this statement, since expansion in certain directions had stopped. It was true, if we were convinced that we had taken full advantage of all the material and human resources with which we had been endowed. Actually, of course, it became clear that there were new frontiers and that the use of free land and the wasteful exploitation of nature's gifts of forest and field and underground were not the only ways by which people achieved the good life. We learned—I hope for all time—that our real wealth lies in our minds and hearts and hands—that knowledge and strength and vision create the material things which we ordinarily think of as wealth.

This knowledge is so broad that it includes all the skills of our community. It is the self-respect and the broad back of manual labor. It is the skilled hands of the craftsman. It is the directing power of a manager of a plant. It is the organizing skill of a corporate executive. It is the far-seeing eye of the investor and developer. It is the understanding of people and the arts of governing of the mayor and the municipal council. It is the engineer's measuring of stresses and strains and his power to build. It is the school teacher's instilling of ideals and handicrafts in the children. It is the banker's ability to sit down with the businessman and work out his line of credit or think through the industrial development which can come from a new investment, and recognize the needs of the growing community in which he lives. All these together, and many more, are what determine our ability to grow.

But if they are to be used they call for an understanding of the way these human and material parts fit together and make us into a going concern, whether as a business organization, a city, a great government agency such as the Tennessee Valley Authority, or a corporation like du Pont or United States Steel.

What has this new concept of our capacities meant to the Southeast? If we compare the peaks of achievement in 1929 and today, we can be amazed at our growth and development as a nation; but we can be even more amazed that the proportionate growth here in the Southeast has been even greater than for the Nation as a whole. This is for the good of the Nation as well as for the good of the South. Only a decade ago there were areas of the South in which individual productivity was too low to permit the people to contribute much to the economic life of the Nation. When we look at the facts about the rapid growth of the South in recent years, we all take pride in knowing that the inherent human resources of this great region have been used by the people to make their own lives more worth living.

One does not need to have figures to be convinced of the truth of what I have been saying. Anyone who has traveled through the Piedmont, or through the Coastal Plain, or down the rivers, or over the length and breadth of the area in a plane can see with his own eyes what it means when a whole community moves ahead as rapidly as this area has. But since you are all more or less acquainted with figures and handle them easily, it is not out of place if we throw in a few statistics. Since 1929, the South's share of the Nation's total income has increased from 10.5 percent to 14 percent. This relative increase of a third is matched by only one other area in the United States, namely the Far West. This growth was not limited to any one of the States in the South; it was shared by all.

If we turn to the income of individuals, the per capita income of the Southeast, computed simply by dividing the region's total

income by the total population, expanded 175 percent from 1929 to 1948. This was three-fourths again as large as that occurring on Nation-wide scale, and in every one of the 11 Southeastern States the relative growth of income per person during this period substantially exceeded that of the country as a whole.

There were many people who said that the wartime expansion of industry in the Southeast was a temporary phenomenon. This has been proven not to be true. The progress during the war was a clear extension of prewar trends. Since the war, the South has retained the relative gains achieved during the war, and extended them. Even under the unusually severe impact of the postwar readjustment, the steady trend of the growth which was taking place was clear.

The opportunity which lies ahead is indicated by the fact that the per capita income is still below the national average. And this fact points to the necessity for further growth and further use of the great resources and opportunities which are here.

I can remember very well, and I am sure many of you will remember, the campaigns undertaken by chambers of commerce, by newspapers, and by business communities throughout the Southeast for diversification of the economy of this area. This movement showed foresight. The dependence on King Cotton, the overemphasis on crop agriculture, had not been healthy. Now we can measure the results of the campaigns of those farsighted men who worked to bring more industry to the South. Industrialization has moved forward with great strides and added its contribution to the income advance. From 1929 to 1948, the increase in manufacturing pay rolls was fourfold in the Southeast; nationally it was less than threefold. The expansion was shared by nearly every State in this area, and in most of them exceeded the rate of development in other parts of the country.

The South can still use more industry and there are numerous opportunities for further industrial development; but this does not mean that agriculture is not an important part of the economy. Agriculture is more productive now than it was 10 years ago; and it is in better balance with industry. The proportion of agriculture to the total income of the area has declined somewhat. It was one-fifth of the region's income in 1929; one-sixth in 1948.

The important point is that southern land now produces a different range of agricultural products. All of you recall the time when the farmer's income from cotton and cotton byproducts made up the greater part of the farm income. Actually, between 1929 and 1948, the gross cash income from cotton and its products to farmers declined from 43 to 28 percent of the gross cash income. At the same time, livestock and livestock products advanced from less than a quarter to a third of the total.

This refers to money income, but I am sure that you will recognize what I mean when I say there have been some other gains from this shift. I can still fly over these plains and these rivers and see the great yellow floods held back by the dams or rushing down to the sea, but the program of livestock farming and the cultivation associated with the planting of kudzu and the other soil-building legumes have had a real influence on the landscape. Contour ploughing is saving soil as the practice becomes more and more prevalent. We are learning not only to create wealth, but also to conserve some of that which a kind providence has given us.

This is what we have done. We have worked together. Private development has produced new and better products in our factories and on our farms. Private business has increased the range of services we enjoy and has built new utilities for better transportation, power, and communication. Government has developed new sources of power, built new utilities to meet the needs of our growing population, and carried on its program for conserving our water, soil, and other natural resources.

For the last 3 years we have maintained high levels of business activity, high levels of employment, high levels of investment as well as high levels of consumption. As a Nation, our living standards have been rising steadily. In fact, they are so far superior to anything we have had heretofore that we are the envy of the world.

As a matter of fact, the most potent weapon in our whole international arsenal is not some new-fangled engine of destruction, but the envy of other peoples for what we have achieved in a material way. The desire of people to come to our shores and share this good life is the finest compliment we can have. The fear on the part of those who control the Soviet bloc that the peoples behind the iron curtain will learn of the good life which we have built is powerful testimony to the strength of our best weapon. We hear much talk of fifth columns and boring from within by Communists in a capitalist society. Let us not forget that we too can bore from within. Our secret weapon is the weapon of a good life so superior to anything which can be produced in a nonfree society that those who wage the cold war against us do their best to prevent the knowledge of what we have done from reaching their people.

The last few years have indeed been years of high activity. We must, however, look forward, and the forward look calls for imagination if we are to continue our high achievements.

This conviction that we must continue to maintain our high levels of business and employment we have expressed, not only in our actions but in laws passed by the Congress. We have said that, as a matter of national policy, we intend to maintain full employment. This is the same thing as saying the Government has certain responsibilities which it cannot sidestep. Furthermore, it says that private industry and private business must continue to carry out their part of the productive process, for our Government alone cannot supply full employment.

We believe in growth and in full employment because our kind of society is designed for growth and cannot remain healthy unless it grows. But a more immediate fact dictates the absolute necessity for growth. I refer to our rapidly increasing population. Each year 700,000 workers are added to our labor force. This means more hands to work and more need for the growth of production which those hands make possible. To provide the new jobs and new business opportunities, the initiative must be taken by business with relation to its phase of our activities, and by Government with relation to the phases for which it has responsibility.

Just to be sure I am not misunderstood, I should like to remind you of what takes place in a growing community. Wherever there is a real estate development, when lots are sold and houses are built, there have to be streets, there have to be water mains, sewers, gas mains, industrial power and lighting developments. All these call for government responsibility and initiative. When Government does not carry out the work, Government lays down the terms on which private activity goes ahead.

In a growing community there is always a danger that the attempt to restrict Government activities can go too far. The people must speak clearly to their respresentatives so that the development of the community facilities and community services are provided. This means schools; it means hospitals and many other of the services which we now call on our Government institutions—either local or State or Federal—to carry out.

The second important factor in the business outlook is the business population. Immediately following the war, there was a remarkable growth in the number of business enterprises. In the normal course of things, there are many new businesses formed and there are many business disappearances. This is part of our way of doing things. But during the past year, the rate of growth in the number of businesses has declined. This need not be a long-time development. I mention it, however, because the growth of healthy new businesses is important if we are to maintain the kind of competitive society that we want, and if we are to maintain the rate of increase in our population which is essential to higher living standards. We cannot allow our business structure to stagnate, either in terms of the number of businesses or in terms of their total volume of production. The stability of the business community must be the stability of the gyroscope, which depends upon the rate at which the wheels turn over. Business is stable only as it is active. The other kind of stability is the stability of stagnation, in which we are not interested.

The expansion of population, the expansion of business firms must be paced by the expansion of capital investment. We have learned to increase production by harnessing the energy of the earth to the strength of man. We have done it, however, only by using many machines in complex organization. The intangible is as important as, if not more important than, the tangible.

The guaranties of property ownership, which are preserved by nothing more than contract, are more stable, and must be more stable, than the material things which they represent. After all, you can destroy a building, but the ownership of the building and the knowledge of how to rebuild it and the insurance against its destruction can make possible its replacement. These various agreements between people are more permanent than the building itself. They can be valued just as material things can be valued, and so we say that there must be a growth of capital investment in these productive arrangements of our society.

We are interested in investment abroad as well as at home. We have found with this growing society of ours that we have a place in the world which we did not seek. This fact is unpleasant to many of us. But our good life depends on our relationships with other peoples. We export and we import in great volume. They have things we want; we have things they want. The richness of the cultures of the world can be shared without loss. This growing place which we must have for ourselves provides not only opportunities, but it imposes responsibilities which are difficult to assume and to carry out.

The banking community holds an unusually crucial and strategic position in all this development. It is no accident that banks play such an important role in our community. In the first place, they share with the Federal Government that most essential function: coining money. Credit advances are our primary monetary medium today. Without the invention of this device for carrying on trade, we would still be somewhere in the Dark Ages. This joint monetary function is carried out, of course, through the Federal Reserve System and its relationship to the Federal Treasury. This linkage between the banking system and the Treasury is critical to our business system. The problems involved here have been clearly described in a recently published report of the Joint Committee on the Economic Report. Those of you who have not seen it will be interested in this document.

In the hands of the banking community rest the fundamental judgments on whether

business as a whole moves ahead or moves back. The implementation of fiscal policy through the banking community is of first importance. Next is the bank's role as lender of short-time funds and as middleman for long-time funds. Productive capacity must be created, and it can be created only by these new investments. The banking community's part in this process is apparent once one becomes aware of the process.

In our society, where the responsibility for most of our activities rests with private business, finding the key to community responsibility in private business is one of the major tasks before us today. The outlook is good if we look at potentialities. The outlook is good if we look at our capacities. If we can maintain our objective of moving forward in concert, we can keep business good.

I should like to illustrate the point that the level of business activity will be what we make it. During the war, normal civilian productive activities were reduced to about half of our total activity. When the war was over, business had to redirect its energies to peacetime pursuits. Everyone who studied the size of this reconversion job was staggered by the difficulties which presented themselves. This was true of every business in the land which was engaged in war activity.

The Committee for Economic Development, a farsighted organization of businessmen, sensed this problem, and worked out a method for dealing with it. In essence, the committee said to businessmen, "Plan the way you will reconvert when the time comes. As far as possible know the next moves, how you will engineer them, how you will finance them, how you will reorganize production lines." This program was carried to meetings of businessmen throughout the country, and I would be surprised if some of the people here today had not been active participants in those meetings.

One of the results of this program was that thousands of businesses all over the land knew what their developmental programs, their capital investments, and their plans for new business were going to be, before the war was over. The minute the fighting stopped they were ready to move ahead, and did. Thus, the people who predicted heavy unemployment and large-scale dislocation were proven wrong.

The important thing to note is that when the problem was seen clearly and when the business community moved in the same direction at the same time, the results in terms of productivity astounded not only the rest of the world, but even surprised us.

I am not suggesting that this planning was the only factor which was involved. One of the related factors was the speed with which Government contracts were settled when the war was over. Many of those settlements might have been made better had more time been spent on them, but from the standpoint of the national economy speed was more important than detailed correctness. This process released credit which otherwise would have been frozen.

If we are to continue to use this kind of approach, we must be in agreement on the fundamentals. As long as total population is growing, there must be a growth of production and investment. As long as we are improving our knowledge, we can improve our living standards. Knowing these two fundamental facts, we can look forward with great confidence, for they tell us that potential markets exist to be explored and developed.

I think it is clear why I have spoken to you of these fundamentals behind the outlook. Focusing on details to the exclusion of fundamentals can lead anyone astray.

I feel confident that the banking community which deals with these details will operate in the light of the major possibilities which lie ahead rather than the detailed difficulties which must be overcome.

Samuel Gompers, a Great American

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, due to my absence on account of illness on January 27, 1950, the one hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers, I was unable to carry out my intention to pay tribute to the memory of this great leader of labor, outstanding citizen, and loyal and patriotic American.

It was my great privilege to have known Mr. Gompers intimately and to have worked with him in many of his accomplishments for the improvement of labor conditions in this country.

Under unanimous consent, I extend my remarks in the RECORD on the life and work of Mr. Samuel Gompers.

On January 29, 1950, all American workers and industrialists alike did honor and paid their respects to Samuel Gompers on the occasion of the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of this distinguished American whose works and efforts gave substance and life to the destiny of a great and powerful America. This centennial observance should continue after January 29.

I had the happy privilege of knowing intimately and well Sam Gompers, who, during his lifetime in an era of grim foreboding and discouragement for the success of the labor movement and the welfare of the worker and the toiler, had to arm himself with patience, breadth of understanding, vigor, and patriotic leadership in order to realize his goal of betterment of conditions for the working class.

Here, in the life and works of Samuel Gompers, is an outstanding example of one who becomes a distinguished American, rising from humble beginnings to high and exalted position in American industrial, political, and social life.

Here, in the career of Samuel Gompers, born in London of Dutch-Jewish stock, is found a striking example of what millions of immigrants before and after him have accomplished, namely, infusing into American life the energy and spirit of industry, honesty, and thrift which have made America the most formidable Nation in power and prestige in the world.

I like to dwell on this point because there exists too strongly in many quarters and sections of our country, a tense feeling and prejudice against our newcomers, immigrants who, like Gompers—little schooled, dissatisfied with conditions in their homeland, seeing no future there for themselves or their offspring—seek liberty and freedom in our country, and at the same time advance the interests of their adopted country. Like Gompers, they worked 6 days a week from 12 to 14 hours daily at their trade or employment, plodded their weary way home and in recent years read their paper or listen to their favorite programs, and except for one night out either on Saturday or Sunday, retire to their rest to be prepared for the next day and next week's battles extending into the years. Thus do they build up a backlog of simple but firm, honest endeavor and accomplishment which goes into the sinews and lifeblood of the Nation which gave them succor and aid. And if these contributions were not enough, they and their children further acted to repay the debt of asylum given them, when in large and overwhelming numbers, they rushed to the aid of the Nation in time of two devastating wars and write distinguished feats of valor and sacrifice in illustrious pages of history, for Americans of posterity to emulate and revere.

My friend Sam Gompers came from a so-called minority group. As a true American, he would not and did not permit wholesale or mass mistreatment of the human race. He fought with all his might the totalitarian way of life exemplified by Kaiser Wilhelm who sought to make slaves and serfs of freemen and women. Gompers labored in the vineyard of human rights and freedom. He fought to protect the minorities regardless of race, religion, or class.

In America we find many minorities so-called, which make us the greatest melting pot of all races, creeds, and colors on the face of the globe. America is great because the virtues of patriotism, liberty, and justice abide with resolute heart among her people. There are, however, though fortunately small in number but nevertheless vocally strong, those who sound notes of hate and discord against these minority groups, attempting to set minorities against each other.

This hate mongering which begets prejudice, bigotry, and discrimination must be met and overcome by means of education and by law.

Samuel Gompers did just that. He built up a sound and enduring trade unionism first as a hard working official in his Cigarmakers International Union, composed of all sorts and conditions of men. Later he organized the Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, which, together with the printers, the iron and steel workers, the granite cutters and other lesser craft unions, united about 1881 to sow the seed which later brought forth the American Federation of Labor.

I am aware of the organization called the Knights of Labor which, although, it claimed at one time over 700,000 members, moved like a meteor along the sky and fell just as quickly to earth leaving practically no concrete or beneficial results from its existence.

Neither time nor space permit me to set forth in detail the complete record of the activities of Samuel Gompers. To do so would fill volumes. It is sufficient to point out a few which demonstrate that he was a pioneer in a field which called for sound, constructive, and forward-looking leadership. The labor movement in the eighties was in a critical period. The Knights of Labor had failed because of inefficient leadership.

Slowly, but the organizer, leading exponent of craft unionism, Gompers welded together an organization with his

small group of trade-unionists as a nuclei and then moved forward and pressed ahead regardless of the great obstacles confronting him on all sides which big business set up. He succeeded in keeping his organization intact, whether in time of adversity or good fortune. Gradually he became the spokesman of labor and oftentimes the spokesman of the large army of unorganized labor.

HIS PHILOSOPHY

I believe that it can be correctly stated that as president of the American Federation of Labor Mr. Gompers had no special or particular philosophy as to the aims of the labor movement. In the years before World War I his program did call for better wages, shorter hours, healthier, and safer working conditions.

These aims, he felt, could be furthered by pursuing or following business-union procedures and working within the framework of the existing order which he always upheld, supported, and protected. For a time he took the position that labor did not aspire to share with the employer or take over control of the industry.

EXPANSION OF LABOR UNION AIMS

After the war, however, Mr. Gompers was forced to adopt a different or expanded position, namely, that viewing wages and hours as its only concern and collective bargaining as its sole aim was not only the program of the American Federation of Labor; that included also was "the bidding for a progressive share in the proceeds of industry and a voice in industrial management." The union he urged would become responsible for the workers in industry. Along with this new statement of principles, he held strongly to the laissez-faire doctrine of individualism—voluntarism, he called it.

He was strongly insistent that industry "organize itself to govern itself, to impose tasks and rules and bring order into its own house." Thus it came about that in 1923 the American Federation of Labor recorded itself against the antitrust laws.

I remember in my friendly and close association with this sublime spirit whom we now honor, many instances of greatness. One, however, has always stood forth in my mind, namely, the deep and profound patriotism of my friend. The period was that of the First World War. America and Americans were debating the issues of participation by our country in the great war then being waged abroad. The country and our people were in the throes of a great debate. Indecision and vacillation were riding the crest when firm action and resolution should have been in command. The workers, like other groups, were uncertain as to whether our participation was necessary or justified. Many of the union locals opposed our entry into the war.

GOMPERS LEADS THE A. F. OF L. TO A GREAT TRIUMPH

It was at this psychological moment that Samuel Gompers as president of that great labor organization, the American Federation of Labor took hold. Here again the exceptional qualities of leadership asserted themselves. He readily realized the dangers of isolationism, its dangers not only to his own group but most important of all its danger to his adopted and beloved country. To work he went. No man ever waged a more relentless and soul-stirring fight against Kaiser Wilhelm and his type of totalitarianism than did Sam Gompers. Although ill, almost 70 years old, he traveled from one end of the country to the other, addressing meeting after meeting and exhorting the union members and the unorganized workers to action. Then biding his time, he prepared the course of the American Federation of Labor and at its convention in November 1917, at Buffalo, N. Y., he invited President Wilson to address the convention. As Mr. Wilson entered the hall, every delegate stood up and gave support and approval to the President's position, "to make the world safe for democracy." This was one of the greatest triumphs in the life of Gompers and the American Federation of Labor. The force and influence of this great body of American workers did much to dissipate and scatter the power and influence of the pacifists and isolationists. It had the effect of clearing the atmosphere of doubt and indecision for those deluded but sincere Americans, as well as casting aside the specious and untenable arguments of the Germanophiles and traitors. Gompers had more than established himself as a labor statesman.

PRESIDENT WILSON'S CONFIDENCE IN GOMPERS

Wilson showed his confidence in Samuel Gompers in October 1915 when he named him one of the five members on the Advisory Commission to the Council of National Defense. His was the job to make ready the forces of labor for the battle to be fought. His colleagues on the board were Daniel Willard, Julius Rosenwald, Bernard M. Baruch, Dr. Hollis Godfrey, and Dr. Franklin Martin. How well he did his part is best demonstrated by the great part labor played in producing the implements and matériel of war in 1917–18, just as in 1941–45 the laboring groups did the same spectacular job a second time.

President Wilson again called on him when he appointed Mr. Gompers on the Commission of International Labor Legislation in 1919. This Commission, composed of two representatives from each of the five Great Powers at the Peace Conference, were to act on matters affecting labor and work within the League of Nations for common action on conditions of employment. Although not fully satisfied with the work of the Draft Convention, he accepted it, as did the American Federation of Labor.

OPPOSITION TO COMMUNISM AND SOCIALISM

His opposition to communism and socialism manifested itself in strong, unmistakable language. He warned that "communism can only be successful if it succeeds in tying itself to the masses by directing its appeals in language of jingoistic sentiment, by aggravating and exploiting every manifestation or display of discord or discontent." Note, for example, in our day, the Communist parades and pickets for civil rights, better housing, and so forth. He knew that communism profits from the political mistakes of political parties, since these errors permit the Communists to proclaim themselves as the sole and only defenders of the national welfare and the country's traditions. Gompers kept the Communists in the labor movement on the defensive and never permitted them to take the initiative.

COMMUNISM, A THREAT TO UNION AUTONOMY

He fought communism because it constituted a distinct threat to union autonomy. To him, it meant absorption of the union by the totalitarian state and thus becomes a mere cog within the framework and machinery of politics.

He knew and recognized early in life as a union leader that when Communists win control of a union, not only do they change the personnel but also the objectives and functions of the union. In addition they form and organize opposition to the parent body. It becomes a tool, an ally of the Communist regime and loses its character as a trade-union.

His New York was a maelstrom of revolutionary groups and many different national extractions. He saw in these formative years, the actions of the extremists and the anarchists and soon came to the conclusion, how little organized labor would gain if it joined or cooperated with these groups.

Hence he was attacked by the leaders of Bolshevism, Lenin, and Trotsky who called him an enemy of the proletariat. Communists accused him of being a "bourgeois and labor faker." Lenin spoke in glowing terms of Daniel De Leon often referred to as the "Pope of the Socialist Party." De Leon was an arch enemy of Gompers in the labor movement.

It was at this time that Communists had infiltrated into a few trade-unions such as the Needle Trades in the State of New York and New England, into textile, miners, and steel workers unions. There developed consequently an aggressive left wing movement in the American Federation of Labor which constantly attacked the conservative program of Gompers, continually demanding the immediate recognition of Soviet Russia.

OPPOSITION TO SOCIALISM

Mr. Gompers had studied the principles of socialism in his youth. He soon learned to oppose it. Socialism to him meant the overthrow of free enterprise and the existing order to be replaced by socialism. Then, too, the Socialists were pacifists and opposed the war. He was viciously attacked by them because he stood for and promoted private enterprise which was and is today anathema to Socialists whose program is that of nationalization of industry. Led by Gompers, the American labor movement accepted the concept of "private property as a necessary agency for securing opportunity for individual independence and resourcefulness."

FEUDAL BARONS OF WEALTH DENY RECOGNITION TO LABOR

The enemies of labor and trade-unions with whom Samuel Gompers had to contend in the early days of their development and growth were powerful indeed. One look at the imposing list of those who opposed and fought incessantly and with every unfair weapon at their command, serves only in increasing my

admiration and regard for the man we honor:

John D. Rockefeller, Jr., who had acquired his wealth, as did some of the others I name, at the expense of low wages paid the workers. He refused to recognize the union miners of Colorado.

Andrew Carnegie, who with Henry Frick in 1892 opposed better conditions for labor and fought the Amalgamated Association of Iron and Steel Workers in the homestead strike with Pinkertons and help from unconscionable quarters, thereby almost crushing the cause of labor.

George Pullman of the Pullman Palace Car Co., at Pullman, Ill., who advocated wage reduction and whose action resulted in the Pullman strike, producing hard and heavy burdens on the laboring man and his family.

Jay Gould, an industrial tycoon of his day, a ruthless individualist, who, drunk with financial and economic power, believed that progress meant accumulation of great private fortune at the expense of the worker paid starvation wages.

James Fisk, who used his resources to beat down labor, ably seconded and abetted by another arch foe of labor, Judge Elbert H. Gary, of the United States Steel Corp., whose sense of economic justice set a new low even in those early days of high-handed action against labor unionism.

John P. Morgan, along with Carnegie, Rockefeller, and E. J. Harriman, were among those who at the beginning of the twentieth century built up and developed powerful systems of high finance, great monopolies in trade and railroad industries—all by the sweat of labor, but denying the laborer just compensation.

Take the case of miners forced always to strike for a living wage to keep out of peonage. Never given the opportunity to work the number of days of other industries, the miners were forced to put up with seasonable fluctuation in production.

Forced to trade for their food supplies in the company stores owned by the coal barons because of lack of funds, unable to obtain or afford decent housing for their families, the miners lived in squalid surroundings near the mines. Always in debt to the coal barons who held them in servitude, with no safety appliances and working hundreds of feet below the ground under perilous conditions the plight of these workers has always been a desperate one.

However, they found a champion in Gompers, encouraged by men such as William Green who fought successfully to improve these disgraceful conditions in slave wages and galley slave working situations imposed by the autocrats of the coal industry. Truly does history repeat itself.

Strange to say, these men have their exact counterparts today—ruthless men in their self-same positions in the trusts, monopolies, holding companies, who vote themselves large pensions upon retirement notwithstanding the high salaries they receive as an official of the corporation for many years. Yet these self-same men deny pensions and security to those who made possible their millions, who as they are about to complete their span of life, seek in a manner of attempted appeasement to their complaining conscience, to distribute small sums proportionately to their wealth, to worth-while purposes such as endowments for educational institutions, libraries, medical, and economic research.

But I say to them—too little and too late for they have robbed the worker and his family of the just and equitable share of the fruits of his honest and productive labor. Well did the apostle of a new era, another of my admired friends, William Jennings Bryan, phrase it in his Cross of Gold speech which I had the high privilege to hear at the Democratic National Convention in 1896 at Chicago:

> You shall not press down upon the head of labor this crown of thorns,
> You shall not crucify mankind upon a cross of gold!

GOMPERS WAGES GIGANTIC FIGHT FOR LABOR'S LEGAL RIGHTS

The Sherman Act passed in 1890. Labor unions' activities were not included in the act. But the Supreme Court in the *Danbury Hatters case* (308 U. S. 774) declared the act did apply to labor unions. Then came the Clayton Act of 1914, for which I had the honor of voting, signed by President Wilson, declaring that "the labor of a human being was not a commodity or article of commerce." This act was called by Gompers the Magna Carta of labor, and made lawful the existence of labor organizations which feared that the Government might start dissolution suits against labor unions such as those successfully prosecuted by the Government in 1911 against the Standard Oil Co. and Tobacco Trusts.

Another provision of the Clayton Act prohibited the granting of injunctions by Federal courts against certain specific labor activities such as peaceful picketing. But the interests keep up their opposition to the Clayton Act and the Supreme Court in the *Duplex Printing Co. case* (254 U. S. 443) stated that the Clayton Act did not give any blanket immunity to labor. In this and other decisions the Supreme Court read into the work unreasonable restraint of trade and commerce, the so-called rule of reason into the Sherman Act passed by the Supreme Court in 1911.

Another act, the Norris-LaGuardia Act of 1932, which I also supported, made it an absolute prohibition for any Federal court to issue an injunction in almost any case involving a labor controversy. Labor held that this act which was interpreted by Justice Frankfurter in the *Hutcheson case* (312 U. S. 219) in 1941 makes labor injunctions forbidden.

Today we find efforts made by the enemies of labor to overrule these protections and safeguards properly given to labor on the ground they say, and without authority and reason, that labor unions are seeking to monopolize the supply of labor either on a large or limited scale in restraint of trade. These opponents of labor falsely charge and urge today that labor controls of production and the fixed prices by union action in commodities or services essential to the public welfare require that labor unions come under the restraint of trade provisions of the Sherman Act. In Gompers' day, he met up with William Howard Taft whom he fought step by step as an injunction judge, and later as a presidential candidate; as President and later as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, Gompers opposed him. Taft contended that labor sought class legislation of the most vicious sort. Gompers replied that all legislation is class legislation and that organization of labor having their origin in human need should be exempted from the provisions of the Sherman antitrust law. President Wilson accepted this viewpoint of labor notwithstanding the fact that Gompers had opposed him in 1912 as against my friend Champ Clark, Speaker of the House in 1910, whom Gompers called "a more intrepid friend of labor never occupied that position."

POLITICAL ACTION FORCED UPON LABOR

From 1906 to 1912 Gompers took up political action through necessity of self preservation of the labor movement. He had always believed that the courts under the Sherman Antitrust Act of 1890 had gone far beyond the use of their equitable jurisdiction and had rendered strikes ineffectual by unfair restrictions on picketing, free press.

These injunctive measures destroyed the rights of the union members because the working man when deprived of his most effective means of protection namely the right to refuse to work unless justly rewarded for his labor, is placed under a serious handicap. Thus, faced with injunctions obtained by employers based on flimsy evidence untrue and false testimony, Gompers and his organization had no other alternative and determined to "reward our friends and punish our enemies. Elect those who support anti-injunction bills in legislative halls." He made it clear, however, that this action did not mean the formation of a labor party. Gompers always fought those who advocated a labor party. In fact he feared it.

After World War I we find Mr. Gompers changing and modifying his views on political action. He was forced to the conclusion that economic action and non-partisan political activity could not obtain the benefits union labor was now seeking. For labor now insisted on a share in the control of industry. A great struggle was raging between labor and capital. I saw that struggle in progress here in the House. The United States Steel Corp. and all big business, making use of the injunction, also either controlled or had great influence in the Republican Party. A few members of the Democratic Party were at times too much influenced by these predatory business groups. Something had to be done. Hence much against his former views, Gompers took labor out into the political arena. The National Association of Manufacturers was already there. Big business had been there for many years.

The opposition was firmly entrenched in politics. It had men like Penrose, Root in the Senate and others in the House who placed every obstacle in the

path of labor's progress. Here is an illustration of this.

If you will pardon the personal allusion, I remember well that in the first session of the Sixtieth Congress, I introduced the first bill in the House—H. R. 21962—which embodied the principles of workmen's compensation. The Republican majority influenced by the large railroad interests refused to consider it. They said it was unconstitutional and too costly, that it would seriously impair the financial structure of the railroad industry. History records otherwise.

For 10 years we had endeavored to pass the Employers' Liability Act abolishing the barbaric doctrines of assumed risk, contributory negligence, and the doctrine of fellow servant. No sooner had we passed this act, than the railroad interests began to agitate for repeal. And on March 1, 1913, in the closing hours of the session the Republican-controlled House railroaded through the House with only 40 minutes of debate and over 100 amendments to be acted upon, a measure—S. 5382—which practically repealed the small benefits in the then existing law. This legislation favored the great railroads and corporations of the country, was a railroad measure to the *n*th degree and against the laboring men of the Nation.

On this eventful occasion, my thoughts and my memories revert to those memorable days in my early career, as a Member of Congress when labor was fighting for its very life and for a rightful place in our social and political and economic life. Its champion was Gompers and a braver, a more spirited and able fighter and leader never lived. His opposition came both from within and without. He traded blow for blow and he fought his way to the top amid a morass of confused thinking with no compass to chart the course, and dissension to quell in his own ranks.

The enemies of labor saw in him a distinct threat to their stranglehold and control of the worker—control to time, wages status, and general welfare of their workers whom they kept in serfdom. He raised their status to that of free men. He protected the rights of the union, forced the employer to collective bargaining and bettered the working conditions of the laboring men and women. Samuel Gompers represented a dynamic force in American life and left a record of rectitude, sincerity, and altruism which brought about a labor movement in America which is strong, more inclusive, and more united and compact than in any other nation in the world.

Today the American Federation of Labor reflects the aims, hopes, and aspirations of Samuel Gompers for the welfare of the worker and the Nation of which that worthy organization is an integral and necessary part.

Although departed from our midst almost a quarter of a century ago, the spirit of Samuel Gompers lives in that great organization whose objects he furthered and in whose behalf he dedicated and consecrated his entire life.

One of his admirers aptly summed up his place in American history:

America was his world. * * * Every spot and every country outside of his American horizon was merely subsidiary and suburban. As a matter of fact, Samuel Gompers was the American American, although born in Whitechapel, of his time. What he lacked in greatness of soul or brain, he made up in loyalty of untarnished rectitude.

The whole world respects and reveres the memory of Samuel Gompers and the exalted Americanism of a great American whose last words were so typical of a patriot: "God bless our American institutions. May they grow better day by day."

Haste Makes Waste

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. J. GLENN BEALL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. BEALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Morning Herald, Hagerstown, Md., February 18, 1950, entitled "Lustron Fiasco Proves Again That Haste Makes Waste":

LUSTRON FIASCO PROVES AGAIN THAT HASTE MAKES WASTE

The country's costliest experiment in mass-producing prefabricated homes apparently is doomed to failure. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation has decided to start foreclosure proceedings against the Lustron Corp., maker of all-steel dwellings.

The RFC has loaned the Columbus, Ohio, firm $375,500,000 in an effort to get it well launched on big-scale housing operations. Both the company and the agency figure foreclosure may cost the Government $30,000,000 of that sum.

The Lustron case is a sad history of dreams never realized. It is made all the more dismal by the fact that the project seems to have had the blessing of high Government officials, probably, including President Truman, from the beginning.

Why were these men so interested in Lustron? From the days of Wilson Wyatt, former Federal Housing Expediter, there's been a notion in Washington that a well-developed prefabricated housing industry would go far toward bringing the cost of a decent home down to the average man's level.

At the same time it was felt this goal couldn't be achieved simply by waiting for the tiny prefabricated-housing output of established companies to swell into the desired heavy production. Government interest centered on initiating a bold effort to telescope this growth process.

The way to do it, Wyatt and others decided, was to help ambitious firms get quickly into automobile-style mass production of houses. The Lustron Co. turned out to be the prize guinea pig in this plan. It gained control of former aviation-plant space in Columbus. The RFC lent it money for machinery and operating expenses. Big things were in the wind, but the promises were lavish.

But somehow the dream always remained just out of reach. Many problems arose. It was hard to find the necessary skilled labor force, to set up a sensible selling organization. Continued rising costs wrecked hopes of a really cheap sales price.

Several times Lustron came back for more money to keep going until it could get over the hump. The story was always about the same: "Just let us have a few more millions and we'll really be rolling." So much Government money had been put into the experiment it looked unwise to let Lustron sink while there was still any hope at all. But, inevitably, there had to be an end to doling out funds without results.

The Government has decided that moment has arrived. This doesn't mean the prefabricated housing industry has failed. There are numerous small companies doing well in the field, with a few showing impressive growth. But the evident collapse of the Government's bright dream does seem to mean there'll be no spectacular catapulting of the industry onto a level with the motor makers. Progress henceforth will likely be slower than hoped for—but surer.

Weekly Newspaper Editor Points Up Difficulty in Reducing Appropriations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, there are approximately 60 weekly newspapers and 4 daily newspapers published in the ninth district of Minnesota. I make an effort to read every one of them, and in this way I keep in touch with the activities of my congressional district, which comprises 15 counties in northwestern Minnesota.

Several of the weekly newspapers have personalized special columns written by the editor himself or a member of his staff. These columns usually are very interesting and I make it a point to read them every week.

One which attracted by attention last week was entitled "Letter to My Congressman." It appeared in the Warren (Minn.) Sheaf for February 8 under the heading "Chips off the block." It was written by Neil Mattson of the editorial staff of the Warren Sheaf.

The column points out the fact that groups and individuals desire appropriations for their own needs but are opposed to all other appropriations. The article points up the difficulty of trying to cut appropriations in Congress.

I recommend the reading of the article to my colleagues. It follows:

CHIPS OFF THE BLOCK

(By Vic Boo)

A LETTER TO MY CONGRESSMAN

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I see by the papers where Congress wants more economy in government. I see they hope to put a lot of the Hoover Commission's report into action to save the taxpayers' money. I just want to tell you that it is about time Congress thought about cutting down on spending money. You can bet, I'm all for this economy. Our taxes are high enough, let's start cutting costs so we can cut taxes.

I see the Hoover Commission recommended some changes in the Post Office Department. I'm all for cutting down the cost, you understand, but I think the Post Office has been doing a good job so far and if we were to

make any changes there, it might mean service wouldn't be as good, and if their efficiency went up too much, it would mean a lot of people would be out of work. I'm in favor of cutting costs but maybe we better leave the Post Office Department alone. After all, it is nice to have a job to offer the political precinct workers.

This economy program has been long overdue and there are perhaps a lot of changes that could be made in the Department of the Interior, but one better tread pretty lightly there. What if there are only 32 Indians for each employee of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. After all didn't we take this land away from them? To see that they have plenty of people to look out for their welfare now is the least thing we can do. Economy is a good thing, but the Interior Department is such a small part of the Government that what it spends don't amount to much anyway.

You maybe don't know me, Mr. Congressman, but I was in the Navy during World War II and I belong to the veterans' organizations. You know us veterans' organizations hate to see waste in the Government. We are 100 percent for economizing. Naturally, we feel it would be false economy to see any changes in the military set-up. We won the wars didn't we? The Army-Navy Departments must be pretty O. K. the way they are. Then there is the other agencies that serve the veterans. You know we can't do enough for the veterans. Why shoot, we shouldn't mind paying out the money that goes to the veterans' departments in the Government. We want you to know us veterans' organizations back up this economy program to the hilt as long as you don't cut the appropriations to the veterans' agencies.

Up in this neck of the woods we make our living by farming primarily so I would not recommend any cut in the appropriations to the Agriculture Department. Our folks get a lot of help from this Department.

My brother-in-law writes me (he works in the Government Printing Office) that he backs up this economy program, too, but he says they better not cut appropriations to that department otherwise there would be a lot of disappointed people when they quit printing booklets like Mist-Netting of Birds in Japan.

I want you to know our whole family is behind this cutting down on Government waste. My brother (works for the Department of Reclamation) says pretty near every time they figure out some dam or something the Army engineers do, too, and he thinks the Army should cut down. Course it's like I said before, too, the Army does a lot of good so it wouldn't be wise to cut them out.

There are many other departments to the Government, too, that do wonderful things, but I wouldn't just start cutting their appropriations. First, I would find out if there were any objections to cutting the appropriations to these other departments and then if there were some that didn't think they should be cut I would look into other departments and cut down on the departments that didn't have any objections or that said they could get along on less. That's what I'll do if I were a Congressman.

Well so long for now. I just thought you would like to know that I am all for economizing and cutting down in Government.

By the way, my hobby is to read up on all sort of insects and birds and things, and I wrote in once about a book on Hypentelium nigricans. They told me the Government didn't print this booklet so I was wondering if you couldn't see about getting them to put one out on this subject. In case you are not familiar with this scientific term, Mr. Congressman, it means a stone-roller or hammer-head bat.

Yours for cutting down Government expense.

Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following copy of my address at the annual observance of Lithuanian Independence Day, Lithuanian Citizens' Club, 41 Berkeley Street, Lawrence, Mass., Sunday, February 19, 1950:

The President of the United States and the Secretary of State have recently announced that it is almost useless to negotiate with Russia, because its word means nothing.

From now on the free peoples of the world must build up their strength because power is the one and only factor which tyrants understand and pay attention to.

The Lithuanian people have known the brutal truth of this for centuries. In recent years they have been caught between the twin tyrannies of nazism and communism. One has been defeated, but the other is triumphant. The war is over. The shells and the bombs no longer ravage your homeland. It is supposed to be a time of peace, but there is no peace. Unseen terror clutches at every heart, for the Communists are putting into operation a plan to destroy the Lithuanians as a people.

No wonder they have drawn an iron curtain between themselves and the world to hide the shameless crimes they are committing. By keeping us in ignorance they hope to accomplish their devilish purpose, and then it will be too late for us to wake up.

But we have ways of knowing even now what the Russians are doing, and it is not a pretty story.

We meet on occasions such as this to consider the most recent evidence, to put ourselves on guard against the red terror, and to pledge ourselves anew to the struggle for those human rights which will banish tyranny in any form from the earth.

The United States has its Independence Day, and the Lithuanian people have theirs. Ours is open, complete; but that of your countrymen can be celebrated only in the underground. Americans and Lithuanians are brothers because they believe in the dignity of man and will bow the knee to no one but God. As we in America learn of the sufferings endured by your friends and relatives overseas, we cannot rest content. Freedom is universal. It cannot exist one-half in light and the other half in darkness. When it is stamped out in one country tyranny is on the march again; and that constitutes a threat to us here in the United States. For we can never be truly free until the whole world is liberated from slavery.

Today we face an enemy who looks like a civilized person. He even talks about democracy. But what is he doing behind the false front he shows to the world?

With the lie and the club he is trying to destroy people who never harmed him. In this we see the criminal viciousness of the Soviet regime. Russia has more land than any other country in the world. Russia may have more natural resources. But Russia is not satisfied with these.

Russia wants all.

By torture and murder, the Communists destroy many bodies but they cannot conquer the soul. In their plan for a world governed only by materialism they left no room for God. But they are discovering that all the force at their command cannot crush the faith in a man's heart. Instinctively they realize that the human spirit will not surrender, and so they are doing everything they can to crush it.

Lithuania was a free nation, asking only to live in peace with her neighbors. But Russian armies have blacked out her independence, have forced a puppet government upon the people, have robbed them of their liberties, seized their properties, gagged their newspapers, enslaved their schools, persecuted their clergy, torn people from their homes, and have made murder the rule of the land.

This we know in spite of every Russian effort to conceal or excuse her crimes against humanity.

Three hundred thousand Lithuanians perished during the Nazi occupation. That was hideous. It occurred during a time of war. In time of so-called peace, however, the Soviets have exterminated 520,000. More than 60 percent of the priests have been liquidated.

My friends, these facts strike us with horror. If applied to the United States they would mean that 40,000,000 of our people here would be wiped out if we had been conquered by the Communists. Not as soldiers in the line of battle but as innocent civilians who fell before the fury of godless hate.

We need to know of these tragic happenings so that we shall be armed against them not alone in military might but in the spiritual strength to recognize and resist this evil before it extends its brutal power.

Tear parents from their children, scatter them in the icy wastes of Siberia, break up homes and you break up the Nation, that is the Soviet technique in your homeland.

Even some who have been bedridden for years have been deported. At Birstonas a dying person was arrested but died in the motor truck some minutes later. The wife of an organist was compelled to carry her two babies in her arms for 2 miles while the Red soldiers beat her with the butt ends of their guns.

Attempts at escape are made even if there is no chance of success. Whoever has been arrested by the MVD will always prefer death to falling into their hands once more. Despite the fact that it rained hard on May 22, 1948, the forests were full of men, women, and children who had gone into hiding.

Those picked up for deportation are loaded into freight cars like cattle, and the cars are then boarded up. Strangely enough, the trucks used to carry the victims to assembly centers are of American manufacture, which we gave to them during the war under lend-lease. The Reds boast of the fact that American transportation is carrying Lithuanians to their doom—as if to kill off all hope in the hearts of the deportees.

This is the power-thirsty dictatorship which has fooled so many people with its promise to provide heaven on earth and gave them hell instead.

A power that is without conscience or mercy.

Remember after the war when the United States had a monopoly on the atom bomb? If we were evil, we could have used this fearful weapon to destroy Russia. We didn't, because our statesmen and scientists believe in God and in the sanctity of human life. We had no quarrel with the Russian people, and we would not use this tremendous weapon for aggressive purposes.

On the other hand, do you suppose the men in the Kremlin, if they were in our position, would have been deterred by any moral considerations for the rights of other people? Let us thank God that they did not find this secret first.

On this day dedicated to the memory and the hope of Lithuanian Independence, I say that the United Nations should call upon Russia to give up her occupation and control of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations.

The Soviet Union has violated the political decisions made at Tehran, Yalta, and Potsdam. Unless restitution is made, the Government of the United States should not be bound by these unratified agreements. It should use its moral leadership in the United Nations to speak up for the rights of subjugated nations so that they will not be forgotten.

Just as you who have escaped, you who live in a free country beyond the dread reach of the secret police—proclaim Lithuania's irrevocable right to independence.

As long as your voice is heard in protest at meetings like this, Lithuania's cause will not die.

For yours is the voice of truth and justice, appealing to the world conscious for recognition of Lithuania's right to live.

This is a spark that appeals to all decent men and women, and there are tens of millions of them; and there are some even in Russia for they too are enslaved and bear a heavy cross.

Not even an iron curtain can keep the peoples of this world apart. When they get together, as they surely will, we shall see the dawn of a new age where mankind will be free. Lithuania will rise again to enjoy true independence, this time forever more.

The Late Lloyd Noble

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CARL ALBERT
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I advise the House of the untimely death of a great son of Oklahoma, Lloyd Noble. Born and reared in Ardmore, in my congressional district, he kept his home in that city until his death. Though he became a giant in the oil industry, he never left the people and things he had known and loved as a boy.

Mr. Noble's total contributions to his native community and State will probably never be known. Certainly it can be said that he played a major role in bringing our State university to its present status as one of the great institutions of higher learning in our country. As an active alumnus and member of the board of regents, he gave unstintingly of his time and money to the development of his alma mater. Dr. George L. Cross, president of the University of Oklahoma, said of him:

> His many years of service to institutions and his great generosity with respect to gifts, which he would not permit to be published, indicate his very great interest in higher education.

Lloyd Noble was a lover of the land. Through the establishment of the Samuel Noble Foundation, he began during his lifetime the job of rehabilitating and improving the soil in his own part of our State. His job did not stop there. His soil-improvement work was not only an end but also a vehicle by which he sought to show others that the elimination of fear through knowledge would lead mankind to a better life.

His primary interest was in people—an interest that he maintained until the very last. Only a few days before his death he had accepted the chairmanship of the fund drive of the Oklahoma Heart Association.

Those who knew him best loved him most. A Republican in politics, he was elected to the Oklahoma Legislature as a very young man from one of the strongest Democratic counties in the country.

Lloyd Noble's death is a great loss to Oklahoma and the Nation.

In Defense of the Congressman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, an interesting article has been called to my attention by a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Edward J. Devitt, of St. Paul, Minn. Mr. Devitt is now judge of the probate court of Ramsey County in St. Paul.

The article he submitted to me for reading was entitled "In Defense of the Congressman" and was published in Plain Talk magazine for January 1950. The editorial comment on the article was as follows:

> The Members of Congress will hardly overlook Oscar H. West's In Defense of the Congressman * * * it seems to us that such a plea has long been needed in the interest of representative government, especially in view of the indiscriminate and ignorant criticism to which the Congress is so often subjected.

I thought it would be interesting to Members of the Congress and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD so I am glad to include it herewith with my remarks.

The article follows:

IN DEFENSE OF THE CONGRESSMAN

(By Oscar H. West)

Every year some American cities name a schoolboy to be "mayor for a day." A similar custom might well be tried out in Washington, by nominating Mr. Average Citizen to step briefly into his Congressman's shoes. After a single hectic day in the Capitol, I am sure, Mr. Citizen would breathe a sigh of relief and place a much higher value on the services of his representative.

We hear a good deal these days about what's wrong with our Congressmen, but too few of us have a real idea of what their job entails. Yes, $15,000 may be a lot of money, but the pay check is garnished with headaches. Do we employ our Congressmen to be errand boys or statesmen?

What's that guy representing me in Washington for, anyway? is the attitude of many constituents who flood their Congressman with inquiries about trivial matters and requests for personal favors. They expect his never-failing interest in everything from getting tickets for the world series to getting a job for some ne'er-do-well relative or friend of a friend; from helping to name the new baby to pursuing a petty personal complaint against Uncle Sam.

One constituent swamped his Congressman with letters concerning a $6.20 claim against the Government, plus two taxi fares, a hotel bill, and meals. The file was voluminous. The man-hours and clerical time consumed were astounding. Finally the constituent wrote: "You are just not doing any good down there in Washington."

A Senator put it this way, "I came to Washington to represent my State in the United States Senate. Instead of devoting my thought, time, and energy to subjects before the Congress which affect our economy, our way of life, the future of our country and its people—subjects that determine our place among world powers—I have to give more of my efforts to demands from my constituents about wholly unimportant matters."

Then there are the constant calls on him for speeches. Whether it is a church social, political rally, county fair, civic club luncheon, or crowning a festival queen, the Congressman has to respond. Asked about vacation plans, one Senator replied: "I can't go home. I'd be hounded to death about speeches and give most of my time listening to personal problems. Don't misunderstand—my people are well-meaning. But after a man has been in the Capitol for 7 months wrestling with problems before Congress, he should be entitled to a rest at home. I'll have to take my family and go somewhere else."

I believe that most Senators and Representatives are sincerely trying to do a good job. Yet few ever get any thanks from their constituencies. Too often Mr. Average Citizen takes no interest in decisions to be made by his Congressman, makes no effort to inform himself on proposed legislation, yet cries to high heaven when the vote is cast if it doesn't suit him.

Notwithstanding the barrage of criticism heaped upon every Congress—charges of blundering, waste, undue influence from Government bureaus, and accusations from disgruntled pressure groups employing caustic adjectives—the record of Congress down through the years is one of which we can be justly proud. When we consider the myriad complexities of problems with which our national legislative body has to deal, the personalities and individual viewpoints of its 531 Members, plus conflicting views of their constituents, it is indeed noteworthy that the vast majority of laws are enacted with reason rather than with passion. True, accumulated pressure and frayed nerves blow the lid off sometimes. Unfortunately, such episodes are played up by the press and radio. We get only a smattering report of the conscientious hours of honest endeavor put in by our lawmakers. The long, detailed, powder-dry committee hearings, requiring both patience and eagerness to get at the facts concerning proposed legislation, are seldom recounted unless colored by a spectacular witness.

For the way he handles irritating situations, the average Congressman measures rather high in terms of human behavior, I believe. But such situations are a deterrent to his efficiency. There is little he can do about it, but we can do something if only we will. All too many citizens, especially businessmen both big and small, overlook the fact that what goes on in Washington controls the hopes and heartaches of millions of Americans like themselves.

With our freedom and security and our free-enterprise system at stake; with the tidal wave of a new philosophy washing at the dikes of democracy, we are defeating our own best interests by harassing and shackling the Congressman with insignificant matters when his mind should be left unencumbered to weigh and resolve matters of national and international importance. Consider the difference between the Atlantic Pact or the ECA and the $6.20 claim.

This country has had thrust upon it the leadership of a world bogged down with the after-effects of war, beset with sinister forces.

With the Congress of the United States, which underwrites policy and sets the pace, rests the hope and security of mankind. We the people must see to it that the right men are sent to Washington—and after they get there, support and help them.

Resolutions at Lincoln Day Dinner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES I. DOLLIVER
OF IOWA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolutions adopted at the Lincoln Day dinner of the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa:

RESOLUTIONS OF THE REPUBLICANS GATHERED AT LINCOLN DAY DINNER

We, the Republicans of Wright County, Iowa, gathered to honor the memory of the great emancipator, Abraham Lincoln, adopt the following resolutions:

The United States are threatened by dangers both from within and from without, in a degree unparalleled in our history. As citizens, we feel it incumbent upon us to point out these dangers and to state our convictions.

FREEDOM

The historic mission of the Republican Party always has been and is today the preservation of human freedom. The freedom of millions of people in eastern Europe and in Asia has been sacrificed because of the tragic blundering of the Democratic Party. The lives, the property, and the freedom of every American citizen is being jeopardized by certain of the policies of the current Democratic administration. We assert that human freedom is the divine right of every person, the first obligation of every Christian government, to protect. It is the sacred obligation and the high honor and privilege of the Republican Party to forever oppose tyranny, and to forever champion and defend freedom here and throughout the world.

SOCIALISM, COMMUNISM, AND CAPITALISM

Every Socialist is a potential Communist. Every Communist is a radical Socialist. Socialist and Communist governments always destroy freedom, because they are monopolies and therefore exercise tyrannical power.

Socialism has been tried, unhampered and beside capitalism, here in Iowa, and it has failed as it has failed throughout the world to provide as high a standard of living as has been provided by the American capitalistic system. We denounce socialism and communism as delusions and snares. They promise a land of plenty, they create a land of scarcities. We assert that the present administration is controlled by men who believe in socialist principles and are opposed to the principles of American capitalism. We assert our faith in the American capitalistic system, properly regulated by law, as being the best system to bring the highest standard of living to the greatest number of people which has ever been devised by man. We believe in its continuance and its improvement.

MONOPOLY

Every monopoly tends to oppression and tyranny, and therefore is opposed to freedom. The basic principle of our Constitution upon which our Government is founded is opposition to monopoly and the restraint of power. We therefore divided the political power into three equal branches of Government. We placed restraints upon the exercise of judicial or military power. We provided guaranties for freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of assemblage, and freedom of the press, which monopolistic governments have always suppressed. The monopolistic economic power now in the hands of the administration at Washington is a thousand times more dangerous to our freedom than a monopoly of economic power in the hands of Wall Street. We denounce monopolistic power in the hands of a political party of Government, of industry, of labor, or of any other group as a threat to freedom. We denounce Socialist and Communist governments as monopolies.

SECURITY

The security of the family from want and the security of the Nation from invasion depend upon maintaining the solvency of our National Government. We denounce the reckless deficit spending of the administration in time of full employment as jeopardizing our national security. Its continuance will lead to the devaluation of insurance policies, of Government bonds, and our American currency. It will injure our charitable institutions, such as hospitals, colleges, and libraries. It will lower the American standard of living for everyone.

SPIES

The shocking revelations of the Fuchs case prove the truth of our own Senator HICKENLOOPER'S indictment of the handling of atomic affairs.

We assert that the action of Justices Felix Frankfurter and Stanley Reed in testifying as to the good character of Alger Hiss and the statements of Secretary of State Acheson render them unfit for public service. We denounce their conduct and demand their removal from public office. The statement of President Truman that the Hiss case was a "red herring," together with the conduct of Acheson, Frankfurter, and Reed show conclusively that the security of this Nation cannot be entrusted to the Democratic Party, that a new administration is necessary if we are to rid ourselves of spies from without and the disloyal from within our National Government.

FOREIGN AFFAIRS

Day by day, we are losing the cold war with Russia. We denounce the abandonment of eastern Europe and of China to the Communists. We point out that the traitor, Alger Hiss, was a high official in the Department of State in the Division of Far Eastern Affairs, that he was a personal adviser to the President at Yalta, where the dismemberment of Poland was agreed to, where Russia was awarded three votes in the United Nations, and the power of veto was agreed to.

We denounce secret agreements with foreign powers and the failure to inform Congress and the public of these agreements.

We favor the support of the United Nations and the adoption of a foreign policy which will insure peace, justice, and freedom at home and throughout the world.

TAXATION

The heavy burden of Federal taxes is oppressing the individual. It is inflating the cost of State and local government, destroying their independence and making them subservient to the National Government. It is destroying initiative and lowering our standard of living. It is handicapping our youth in their efforts to build their homes and their careers.

We declare that:

1. Federal taxes must be reduced.
2. Deficit spending must be ended.
3. Federal spending must be substantially reduced.
4. Efficiency and economy along the line recommended by the Hoover committee report should be adopted.
5. There must be a new division of sources of revenues between the Federal Government and the State and local governments.
6. The responsibilities of the Federal Government and those of the State and local governments should be redefined.
7. Because the power to tax is the power to destroy freedom, a limitation upon the percent of the national income which is spent by taxation must be fixed by Congress.

We have too long traveled the road to bankruptcy and ruin.

AGRICULTURE

Agricultural prosperity is essential to national prosperity. We point out the fact that the income of the farmer is steadily decreasing at a time when his taxes and his cost of operation is steadily increasing.

The farmers of the Nation must not become dependent upon the National Government for their income. They must not become a pawn of political bickering.

We must continue to work with farmers and all friends of agriculture, to bring about a sound solution of the problems confronting the farmers of the Nation.

Farm policies must be developed which are in the interests of all, the farmer, the consumer, and the national economy.

LOYALTY

One of the cornerstones of free government is loyalty, disloyalty, greed, and irresponsibility by individual citizens or organized groups within the Nation can become a greater threat to our national security than the force of arms from without. The spirit of freedom must be reborn. There must be a new and a deeper understanding of our American way of life. We must acquire a deeper understanding of the meaning and the threat of communism to Christian institutions and to human freedom not only to the people of Russia and of China, but to the people of the United States.

CONCLUSION

Freedom is not just a heritage which men hand down to their children. It is a glorious blessing and achievement which each generation must achieve for itself, the right to worship God in our own way, to choose our own vocations, to speak our minds freely, without the fear of reprisal or even death, and to live our lives and run our business free from the dictates of an all-powerful government.

The issue of a free government and a human freedom with equal opportunity for all, under the law, as opposed to socialism and communism within security and fear for all is the issue before the people of this State, this Nation, and of the world which transcends all other issues in importance.

What shall it profit our children, to gain security for them if we lose them their freedom?

Too Much Government in Agriculture

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the Appendix of the RECORD the following editorial from the Middletown Times-Herald, a daily newspaper in my district:

TOO MUCH GOVERNMENT IN AGRICULTURE

A generation ago farmers complained they were getting too little help from the Gov-

ernment. There was widespread agrarian demand for farm relief, as it was then termed.

Today by all the signs the farmers is getting too much help. It has been proposed to guarantee him everything through a program that is running into deep trouble. Mountainous surpluses have already blotted up billions of tax dollars.

There is a current request in Congress for $2,000,000,000 more to augment the previous authorization of $4,750,000,000 to support prices. The program has not only grown financially unwieldly to the point that a crash is in sight but is hurting the small farmer by restricting his acreage.

In fact, the mockery of the current philosophy seems to be always to injure the little man the high priests of the temple have promised to help.

Now as in the 1920's the need of agriculture is markets. Now, as then, the markets are lacking. Consumption in fact is curtailed by prices held artificially high.

The farmer himself is reported to be getting impatient. He doesn't want to drift on until the tentacles of the Government completely enfold him, leaving him no decision of his own to make. More and more farmers are beginning to see that they can do better for themselves than by waiting for handouts from bureaucrats.

If there is a prospect that there will be a diminution of Government in agriculture, it is all to the good.

Carl Elliott

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALBERT RAINS
OF ALABAMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. RAINS. Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, there is no more diligent Member of Congress than my colleague from Alabama, CARL ELLIOTT. I have noted with interest that the newspapers of Mr. ELLIOTT's district are appreciative of his efforts. I include herewith an editorial from his home-town paper, the Mountain Eagle, of Jasper, Ala., entitled "Reelect CARL ELLIOTT," and an editorial from the Franklin County Times, of Russellville, Ala., entitled "Let's Keep ELLIOTT," and another editorial from the Sulligent News, Sulligent, Ala., entitled "ELLIOTT Making Good":

[From the Mountain Eagle, Jasper, Ala.]
REELECT CARL ELLIOTT

When CARL ELLIOTT defeated Carter Manasco for Congress in the Seventh Alabama District in 1948, Mr. Manasco had the magnanimity to say that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition for the office in 1950, because it is exceedingly hard on a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years. That should be the sentiment of a majority of the people of the Seventh District.

The Mountain Eagle is in favor of the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT in Congress during the next 2 years, not for any sentimental reason, but because he has proven during his first term of office that he is a legislator of unquestioned ability and efficiency and has gained a strong following not only in the Seventh District but in the Halls of Congress, and he is able to compete with the best minds of the Nation in Congress. He has made a thorough canvass of the seventh district and is familiar with the needs and aspirations of the people of this district.

In a speech at Russellville, Ala., recently, Congressman JONES stated that in order to make a good Congressman one must have three requisites, good character, intelligence, and hard work, and CARL ELLIOTT has all three, he said. He said Representative ELLIOTT is the hardest worker he has ever seen in Congress.

Congressman ELLIOTT can be depended on to stand firm in his opposition to the spread of communism in any part of the world. It is the greatest menace today to the freedom and independence of the United States.

[From the Franklin County Times, Russellville, Ala.]
LET'S KEEP ELLIOTT

On more than one occasion and in various sections of his congressional districts, have we heard people say that they hoped CARL ELLIOTT, our Franklin County boy, now a Congressman, would have no opposition this year—and many years without opposition as long as he continues to do as good a job as he is now doing.

This newspaper, on more than one occasion, has suggested that Congressman CARL ELLIOTT have no opposition this time—and none for many years to come.

No young Congressman has ever done a better job than Mr. ELLIOTT is doing now in Washington.

Now comes the Mountain Eagle at Jasper, in the home town of Mr. ELLIOTT, favoring the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT as Congressman. The editorial of this newspaper under the date of January 26, follows:

When CARL ELLIOTT defeated Carter Manasco for Congress in the Seventh Alabama District in 1948, Mr. Manasco had the magnanimity to say that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition for the office in 1950, because it is exceedingly hard on a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years. That should be the sentiment of a majority of the people of the Seventh District.

The Mountain Eagle is in favor of the retention of Mr. ELLIOTT in Congress during the next 2 years, not for any sentimental reason, but because he has proven during his first term of office that he is a legislator of unquestioned ability and efficiency and has gained a strong following not only in the Seventh District but in the Halls of Congress and he is able to compete with the best minds of the Nation in Congress. He has made a thorough canvass of the Seventh District and is familiar with the needs and aspirations of the people of this district.

In a speech at Russellville, Ala., recently, Congressman JONES stated that in order to make a good Congressman one must have three requisites, good character, intelligence, and hard work, and CARL ELLIOTT has all three, he said. He said Representative ELLIOTT is the hardest worker he has ever seen in Congress.

Congressman ELLIOTT can be depended on to stand firm in his opposition to the spread of communism in any part of the world. It is the greatest menace today to the freedom and independence of the United States.

[From the Sulligent (Ala.) News]
ELLIOTT MAKING GOOD

Congressman CARL ELLIOTT representing us in our Seventh District in Washington has been rapidly making a name for Alabama in the Halls of Congress. Congressman ELLIOTT has done this through hard work and intelligent thinking.

Former Congressman Carter Manasco stated that he hoped ELLIOTT would not have any opposition in 1950 because it is difficult for a Congressman to have to run for reelection every 2 years, having gone through the same hardship for several terms. This newspaper agrees with him.

CARL ELLIOTT has kept in touch with his constituents and is familiar with their needs and those of his district. We have found him dependable and to stand firm on his convictions when he is right.

When we have able and efficient representation in Congress we believe we should keep it there.

Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following address of National Commander Henry Selvitella, Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., in Washington, D. C., February 20, 1950, at dinner concluding three national conferences:

Fellow Americans, we are signally honored to have with us this evening in the Capital City of the Nation, the distinguished Secretary of Labor, Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, his excellency, the Ambassador to the United States from Italy, Albert Tarchiani, majority leader of the House, Hon. John W. McCormack, of Massachusetts, United States Senator Irving H. Ives, of New York, Congressmen William T. Byrne, of New York, Angier L. Goodwin, of Massachusetts, R. Walter Riehlman, of New York, Aime J. Forand, of Rhode Island, Thomas J. Lane, of Massachusetts, John F. Kennedy, of Massachusetts, Foster Furcolo, of Massachusetts, and many other distinguished guests.

As national commander, I welcome these outstanding leaders of our National Government and grateful to all of them for honoring us this evening with their presence. We have successfully concluded a 3-day conference of policymaking for our organization, and you members of the national executive committee, State commanders, and post commanders, and officers of the auxiliary, who have come from all parts of the United States, are to be congratulated on your fervency of devotion and attachment to your duties and obligations.

May I reiterate at the outset, some of the things that you know, and I am sure our guests this evening will want to know about our organization. That is perfectly natural.

The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States was founded in Hartford, Conn., on November 11, 1931, and represents more than 1,700,000 Americans of Italian heritage who served under the American flag in both World Wars.

In the American way of life, there is a place for all organizations established in good faith and which have a designated sphere of activity. The problems faced by all are such that together they could never do too much work. The Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States makes a constructive and positive contribution as an organization in the community and Nation.

Here is the preamble to our constitution:

"To aid and maintain the honor, integrity, and supremacy of our country.

"To maintain true allegiance to the United States of America.

"To hold aloft the torch of true patriotism.

"To strive for a better understanding between nations.

"That peace and good will may prevail.

"To cherish and preserve the memories of our military association, and records of patriotic services performed.

"To aid and assist veterans, their widows and orphans."

There are more than 300 IAWWV posts throughout the country with about 100,000 Americans of Italian extraction enrolled as active members and a ladies' auxiliary of many thousands. The numbers are growing daily. There is no conflict whatsoever between joining any other organization, nor should there be any confusion as to the choice between them. Ninety-five percent of the IAWWV members belong to other veteran organizations.

The Italian-American World War Veterans specializes and is actively engaged in:

1. Veterans' welfare: Hospital visitations, involving individual gifts to veterans of all creeds; entertainments; presentation of facilities at hospitals and convalescent centers.

2. Servicemen's service on all problems: Veteran rehabilitation, claim filing, educational vocation training employment, personal assistance.

3. Flag education: Cooperation with parent-teacher associations and other welfare groups fostering Americanism. Cooperation with public and religious schools. Citizenship classes and group interrelationship activities.

4. Organization activity: Ladies' auxiliary, membership work, band and drum corps, and athletic clubs.

The Italian-American World War Veterans have regularly adopted annual resolutions advocating legislation to provide this Nation with a military and civil defense of sufficient strength and training to cope with any possible emergency. To speed the economic rehabilitation of all war veterans; they have repeatedly appealed for national conferences of business, labor and governmental representatives so that a constructive program might be formulated to absorb the disabled and jobless into the national productive economy. They have consistently supported programs that would extend humane and judicious assistance to those deserving nationals overseas whose struggle to establish free governments have been handicapped by hunger and illness, by inadequate shelter and lack of productive machinery. And from the very beginning of their existence as an organized group, they have vigorously affirmed their opposition to totalitarianism of any kind by closing the doors of members to believers in or servants of, political extremism, whether of the left or right.

Because America was the world's first great haven of refuge from tyranny, oppression, and liberty, the Italian people of this country have since been privileged to defend freedom as every man who is given such a privilege should defend it—in the uniform of his country.

In America, a man may serve his God and his country by no other dictate than those of his own religious convictions and a set of laws he himself helps to establish. That is why Americans of Italian extraction have served equally and proudly in every war of the Republic. They have served as Americans and they know only one allegiance. That loyalty was to our country, because America asked only if they wanted freedom; if they wanted freedom enough to do battle for it. The answer in every way has been in the affirmative. That is why the Italian-American World War Veterans is in existence.

The men who organized the Italian-American World War Veterans sought to insure that their descendants would carry on, in years to come, the ideals that made our country the freest in the world. The Italian-American World War Veterans is an organization of men who have met the first responsibility of good citizenship. We have defended our country and her way of life in time of war. But our obligations did not cease when we exchanged a soldier's uniform for civilian clothes. Our primary responsibility has not changed. Our first duty has been, and must always be, to work for the security of our country and her free institutions both at home and abroad.

Our organization brings together men and women of one racial group to use their combined influence for the purpose of making this a better America for all minority groups. We bind ourselves together to dedicate ourselves to a special job that non-Italian veteran organizations are not especially interested in, and an example of this special work can be best illustrated by our active participation to defeat communism in the general election held in Italy on April 18, 1948. We in the United States were fearful and apprehensive that the people of Italy would not defeat communism and pass this supreme and historic hour with a victory for the Catholic Party.

Our fathers and forefathers, who immigrated to the United States, carried with them the ideals and heritage of a country that gave so much to world civilization. These ideals, we feared, would be swept aside if Italy became a prey of the giant octopus that slowly was engulfing Europe with its tentacles of communism.

Early in January 1948 a campaign of letter writing was started by our organization, the first of its kind in the United States, and as part of this campaign booths were set up in our large cities where volunteer workers of our organization asked and secured Italo-Americans in the United States to write a letter to some kin or relative living in Italy and urged them to ally themselves against communism and reminding them that a victory for communism would subjugate Italy to the tenets of Stalinism and would mean the end of free election and disfranchisement of civil rights in Italy and above all the loss of world prestige as a nation.

As a result of this campaign more than 10,000 letters were sent to Italy and on Easter Sunday of April 1948, a special plane was chartered and christened by the Franciscan Fathers of Boston and named the "Freedom Plane," and on board of this plane bound for Rome were thousands of letters to supplement the work already accomplished by our organization. We did not expect this special and peculiar work to be done by any other veteran organization. We feel supremely proud of the small part played by this organization in this campaign in Italy.

Premier Alcide de Gasperi and His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, commended our participation by letters to our organization.

In the glorious history of the last war, no page more glamorous could be written than that of the story of the contribution made by individuals of Italian blood, who have so distinguished themselves in battle that they have won the plaudits of this Nation and been the recipients of the highest awards for valor. The Congressional Medal of Honor is the highest award for gallantry within the power of any nation to bestow upon its heroes, and 13 of these Congressional Medals of Honor were received by Americans of Italian heritage, and the foremost of these that comes to our minds is that of Gunnery Sgt. John Basilone, United States Marine Corps, where on July 25, 1949, in my home city of Boston, I was present when a new destroyer was commissioned and named in his honor. What a halo of proud glory surrounds these valiants of a peaceful race who have upheld the banner of gallantry on the bloody fields of battle. More than 35,000 of these Americans of Italian extraction died in battle and more than 100,000 were wounded in battle. Over 150,000 awards of various types were received by our members of our race.

Therefore, as a matter of patriotic pride and the militant contributions rendered by our boys, the Italian-American World War Veterans' Organization is an essential part of the American way of life, as any other veteran organization.

American Legion Endorses Prayers-for-Peace Movement

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD A. PATTEN
OF ARIZONA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, I feel it only proper, that during these times of great unrest throughout the world, that all Americans would do well to heed and follow the action which was taken by the American Legion in calling upon its members to pause for 1 minute at noon each day to pray for enduring peace. Herewith is submitted the resolution approved by the American Legion and other national organizations:

AMERICAN LEGION ENDORSES PRAYERS-FOR-PEACE MOVEMENT

The American Legion, through its national executive committee, meeting in annual session at Indianapolis, November 4–6, 1949, called on its 3,000,000 members to pause for 1 minute at noon each day to pray for enduring peace.

The national executive committee adopted, unanimously, a resolution submitted by its national chaplain, Edward J. Carney, O. S. A., who informed the committee that the movement for the daily prayer at noon for peace was started by American Legionnaires at Manchester, N. H., October 28, 1948, as a result of an inspiring address by Hervé J. L'Heureux, a career officer of the American Foreign Service, who is presently assigned to the Department of State as Chief of its Visa Division. Mr. L'Heureux is a founder of the American Legion.

Father Carney's resolution, as adopted by the national executive committee, follows:

"Whereas at this moment of confusion, doubt and uncertainty in the affairs of our country and of the world, all free men lift up their hope for continued peace and security; and

"Whereas in times of travail and trouble freemen turn to their faith in Almighty God for solace and strength; and

"Whereas the American Legion by its first declaration in its constitution has asserted its belief in God and constantly seeks divine aid in all its official acts: Now, therefore, be it and it is hereby

"Resolved by the national executive committee in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Ind., November 4 to 6, 1949, That having complete confidence in the ability of our fellowmen with the aid of Almighty God to establish a just and enduring peace in the world, does hereby recommend to all Legionnaires everywhere that they pause for 1 minute in each day in their employments of whatever kind at noontime to raise their hearts and minds to God asking that He help us to so adjust our differences among men so as to enable the nations of this world to secure an equitable and abiding peace; and be it further

"Resolved, That all departments of the American Legion, through their officers and agents, seek to have this moment of daily prayer observed by Legionnaires as an example and an encouragement to all citizens in furtherance of a common aspiration."

According to Mr. L'Heureux, at least 809 organizations and other groups in the United States have endorsed the movement as of February 15, 1950. The nature of these groups are indicated as follows:

Veterans' organizations (individual posts)	512
Veterans' auxiliary groups	18
Service clubs (Rotary, Lions, etc.)	9

Fraternal societies, clubs and sororities	67
Student bodies (schools, academies, universities)	53
Alumnae groups	11
Church groups	22
Business firms, including professional offices	108
Groups of Federal employees	9
Total	809

The following national organizations, included in the foregoing categories, have adopted resolutions, urging their members to pause at noon each day to pray for peace:

1. The Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States—annual convention, Cleveland, July 13, 1949;

2. Greek-American Progressive Association—annual convention, Milwaukee, Wis., August 5, 1949;

3. The Order of AHEPA—annual convention, Miami, August 19, 1949;

4. The Society of American Legion Founders—annual meeting, Philadelphia, August 27, 1949;

5. The Delta Theta Phi Law Fraternity—annual convention, Detroit, Mich., August 31, 1949;

6. Jewish War Veterans of the United States—annual convention, Miami, October 19–23, 1949;

7. The American Legion—annual meeting National Executive Committee, Indianapolis, November 6, 1949.

The Case of Mr. Robert Vogeler, Jr.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. T. VINCENT QUINN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. QUINN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

FEBRUARY 20, 1950.

Hon. DEAN G. ACHESON,
The Secretary of State,
Department of State,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: According to the latest press reports Mr. Robert Vogeler, Jr., of Jackson Heights, N. Y., the eastern European representative of the International Telephone & Telegraph Co., who is imprisoned in Hungary and held incommunicado since November 18, 1949, has confessed as follows:

1. That he had received special training in espionage at a Federal Bureau of Investigation school in 1942.

2. After the war he was assigned to Hungary to collect military, economic, political, and technical data for United States Army Intelligence authorities.

3. That in 1948 in a Budapest hotel, "Colonel" Sosthenes Behn, president of International Telephone & Telegraph Co., instructed him in the methods to be employed to sabotage the Hungarian economy.

4. That he gave his reports to the United States Military Attaché while in Budapest, to be forwarded to the United States Counter-Intelligence Corps in Vienna.

The truth or falsity of these statements can be readily ascertained from the following:

(a) The Honorable J. Edgar Hoover, Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation.

(b) Rear Adm. R. H. Hillenkoetter, Director of Central Intelligence Agency.

(c) Mr. Sosthenes Behn, president, International Telephone & Telegraph Co.

If the answers to these inquiries are in the negative then it is conclusively proved that the purported confession of guilt was induced by threats, fear, the use of drugs, or by other unlawful means.

It is significant to note that this alleged confession follows that of Josef Cardinal Mindszenty, who was tried before the same judge, Dr. Vilmos Olthy, in the same courtroom, and by the same prosecutor, Gyula Alap.

As I wrote you in my letter of February 10, 1950, to permit this outrage to continue will be interpreted as an admission of weakness on our part. We will in effect tell the world we are unable to protect the life and liberty of an American citizen from Communist tyranny. What is our answer to Robert Vogeler's children when they ask "When is daddy coming home"? Or what answer shall we give to his wife and father when they ask "Why can't something be done"? What answer shall we give to the American people who will wonder what would happen to their loved ones if they found themselves in a similar position to that of Robert Vogeler? Shall we hang our heads in shame and say that we are powerless?

The people of my congressional district would like to know the answers to these questions, Mr. Secretary, and although they appreciate everything that has been done thus far they feel that something further should and must be done.

Sincerely yours,

T. VINCENT QUINN,
Member of Congress.

Legislative Program of Italian-American World War Veterans

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following national legislative program of the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and adopted at the national conference of the organization, held in Washington, D. C., on February 18, 19, and 20, 1950:

In the years that have intervened since the last war, the economic and social progress of this Nation has not been compatible with our democratic ideals, our unparalleled productive resources and our wartime victory. We have not moved ahead on the domestic front toward the effective implementation of the ideals for which war was fought and won. Today, an impoverished world looks to America as its sole source of economic assistance. The success or failure of our domestic economy is the difference between starvation and survival for the people of the world. We must fight the forces which are inconsistent with our fundamental freedoms whenever and wherever they arise.

VETERANS' UNEMPLOYMENT

Inasmuch as there is a consistently increasing and abnormally high rate of unemployment among veterans, we urge appropriate Federal agencies to inquire into the cause of such unemployment and take prompt and effective corrective action to arrest this trend.

IMMIGRATION AND NATURALIZATION

Our country is a nation of many races and creeds, and no particular nationality, religious or ethnic group can take full credit for its achievements. When Congress enacted barriers to immigration and naturalization based upon race and color, it turned its back upon the lessons of our history. We call upon the Eighty-first Congress to remove all barriers presently existing to the immigration and naturalization laws.

REPATRIATION OF AMERICAN-BORN ITALIANS

We urge the enactment into law of H. R. 6616, sponsored by Congressman WALTER, of Pennsylvania. This bill has already passed the House and would allow 3,000 or more native-born Americans who lost their citizenship to become repatriated to their American citizenship. These 3,000 or more Americans of Italian extraction were in Italy and voted in the elections held in 1946 and 1948 when the fight against communism was the chief issue. Many injustices have been done these good people who rendered such valiant service to Italy and, incidentally, to all liberty-loving people in America and throughout the world. These people have no way of returning to the United States except by special act of Congress.

We urge the favorable consideration and enactment of the following proposals that have been introduced in the Eighty-first Congress and subject to the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

1. We favor the extension for 2 years the period during which World War II veterans may receive readjustment allowances under the Servicemen's Readjustment Act. H. R. 1374 by Mr. HUBER.

2. We strongly oppose any legislation that would reduce the hospital benefits now available to veterans suffering from non-service-connected disabilities.

3. We urge the enactment of legislation increasing compensation by 20 percent for those having combat-incurred disabilities and diseases. H. R. 903 by Mr. RANKIN.

4. To amend Veterans Regulation 2676 (B) (4) so as to permit acceptance of lay testimony in determining service connection for malaria.

5. We favor the enactment of H. R. 4234 by Mr. RANKIN for legislation to enable veterans rated totally disabled service-connected to reinstate Government insurance.

6. We urge the passage of H. R. 5331 by Mr. RANKIN, which authorizes an equitable adjustment of certain NSLI policies by applying contemplated dividends to unpaid premiums so as to revise lapsed policies.

7. The speedy passage of H. R. 909 by Mr. RANKIN, which will increase disability compensation and pensions for World War I and World War II veterans and widows and orphans.

8. We favor the passage of H. R. 4617 by Mr. RANKIN, entitled "Veterans' Pension Bill," and now pending before the Senate Finance Committee.

9. We urge the enactment into law of H. R. 921 by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts, to increase the income limitations governing eligibility for widows' and veterans' non-service-connected death pension to $2,000 for those with no children, and $3,000 for those with children.

10. We urge the President of the United States, (a) to rescind his orders for the cutback of the 16,000 beds, and (b) to issue orders for the prompt construction of these and such other beds as may be required for adequate care of America's disabled veterans. H. R. 5965 by Mr. RANKIN.

11. To support the liberalization of existing law relating to the granting of automobiles to disabled veterans so that the Government contribution will be $2,000 instead of $1,600.

12. The enactment of H. R. 5509, by Mr. RANKIN, which will provide a statutory seniority equal to the time spent in the armed forces during World War II for those veterans employed in an industry governed by the seniority system.

13. To amend Public Law 483, Seventy-eighth Congress, so that widows of World War II veterans would be eligible for pensions on the same basis as now provided widows of World War I veterans.

VETERANS' BONUS

Federal legislation for a bonus or adjusted compensation for World War II veterans is presently in the minds of all veterans in the country. This issue must be faced head-on sooner or later, and somehow steps must be taken to speak in loud tones instead of the hush-hush manner in which this subject is now being discussed.

Undoubtedly this will be a No. 1 resolution in all future conventions of veteran organizations, and the Italian-American World War Veterans of the United States, Inc., and representing more than 1,700,000 American veterans of Italian heritage in America, favor legislation authorizing $3 for each day of domestic service and $4 a day for overseas service; and said bonus to be paid in 10 years with interest-bearing bonds. Any benefits received by a veteran under the GI bill of rights would be deducted from the bonus.

Potatoes in the Soup

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith an editorial which appeared in the Washington Post on Tuesday, February 21, 1950:

POTATOES IN THE SOUP

Congressman DANIEL REED, of New York, draws some remarkably misleading conclusions about the potato glut in his letter appearing elsewhere on this page. Mr. REED implies that it is not high support prices for potatoes, but imports from Canada that are primarily responsible for the present mess. This is ridiculous in light of the fact that imports from Canada will be at most 12,000,000 bushels for the 1949 crop, whereas the domestic crop will run about 402,000,000 bushels, and the Government probably will be forced to buy 70,000,000 bushels. Actually imports are a small factor in the surplus.

Where Mr. REED goes astray, it seems to us, is in his comparison of present prices of $1.36 a bushel with the 1943 price of $1.31 and only slightly lower prewar prices as evidence that farmers now are getting a fair price. In determining a fair price he apparently takes no account of the effects of mechanization and increased use of fertilizer in lowering costs to producers. The significant fact is that under the stimulus of high supports more potatoes have been grown on progressively less acreage. In Maine alone, for example, the 1935-44 yield per acre was 275; in 1948 it was 370 and in 1949 it was 450.

The tariff on Canadian potatoes is 37½ cents per 100 pounds on amounts up to one million bushels of table stock and 2,500,000 bushels of seed potatoes, and 75 cents a bushel on all above that. Out of the 12,000,000-bushel import figure quoted by Mr. REED must come the Canadian seed potatoes which have been used in the Carolinas for years. The United States, of course, exports some potatoes to Canada from the West, and there is no Canadian tariff. The real point, however, is that Canada imports large quantities of other fruits and vegetables from the United States. If this country raised the tariff on potatoes, Canada could reciprocate on other commodities with harmful effect.

The potato problem cannot be treated in isolation. It is a part of the whole price support issue, and it is a graphic illustration of the disastrous consequences of past rigid supports unrelated to supply. The 1949 Anderson law, to be sure, adhered to the principle of variable supports, and this is a distinct gain. But it is apparent that even the 60 percent of parity floor provided by the Anderson law is too high for potatoes—and the Department of Agriculture has repeatedly called the potato problem to Congressional attention. The Brannan plan formula of production payments to farmers and removal of price supports would be preferable to the present system. Here, however, the difficulty would be that farmers who have no business growing potatoes would be kept producing. The production payments and strict marketing quotas which are being mentioned in Congress will be no solution unless there are concurrent efforts to direct potato farmers into more useful production.

Amendment of the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, when the Railroad Retirement Act was first set up in 1937, the tax rates and scale of benefits were based on the average rail worker's earnings. Since 1937 wages have increased over 100 percent. There is an inequality existing that should be corrected, and the benefits due the railroad workers will be justly taken care of in a bill I am introducing to provide full annuities at half salary or wages, based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who shall have completed 30 years of service or have attained the age of 60.

This legislation can be enacted, and the Railroad Retirement Act can be amended in this manner, without bankrupting the retirement fund or increasing pay-roll deductions.

The money now in the unused reserve, approximately $2,061,690,640, is the present reserve as taken from the figures of the Railroad Retirement Board published in the November 1949 Monthly Review. This leaves ample for the railroad workers to receive improved retirement benefits for which they are paying and are entitled to.

From figures cited in the November Review the reserve increased from an amount on June 30, 1937, of $60,741,671 to the present reserve figures as stated above.

An interesting fact to be considered when judging the results of the legislation contained in this bill, is that there is more money in the unused reserve than the whole amount paid out in all forms of retirement benefits since the retirement fund has been in operation, and is an honest justification for asking that the railroad workers be given improved retirement benefits.

For the year 1948–49, 45 percent of the annual income of the Railroad Retirement Board was paid out in benefits. Fifty-four percent was placed in the unused reserve. One percent was used for administrative purposes. These figures taken from the November Review show the unused reserve increasing at the rate of about $400,000,000 a year.

The passage of this legislation would not mean an appreciable reduction in the reserve of the retirement fund, it would not mean an increase in pay-roll taxes. The increased benefits can be financed without jeopardizing the soundness of the retirement system.

The Late Amadeo Peter Giannini

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY R. SHEPPARD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include in the RECORD a memoriam on behalf of Amadeo Peter Giannini. I knew this gentleman for many years during his lifetime. He was highly respected by the citizens of California and did very much to bring the State of California into its present state of economy. He was always sympathetic to the interests of the people whom his institution served, and his passing is deeply regretted by all.

The memoriam follows:

IN MEMORIAM: AMADEO PETER GIANNINI

Whereas on the morning of the 3d day of June 1949 the Almighty Father summoned from our midst Amadeo Peter Giannini, our beloved "A. P.," fellow director and founder of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association; and

Whereas "A. P." was born of strong immigrant stock in San Jose, Calif., on May 6, 1870; and throughout his career exhibited the pioneer spirit inherited from his Italian parents, his fixed purpose and ceaseless energy carrying him forward from the humble circumstances of his youth to a position of preeminence in the financial world; and

Whereas endowed with extraordinary mental and physical qualities and dominated by an unbounded faith in the destiny of California and neighboring Western States, he created a great and unparalleled financial organization designed to serve and develop the West; and

Whereas Bank of America, the largest unit of that organization and the world's foremost bank, is the outstanding product of its founder's genius and dynamic personality, and the embodiment of his will to create a public-service institution capable of supplying, within its sphere, the financial needs of worthy people in every walk of life; and

Whereas A. P. was a living symbol of the American system of free enterprise, and with herculean strength fought many a battle with powers in and out of government to preserve this system and the financial organization which he had builded within its bounds; and

Whereas at the time of his demise this seemingly indestructible warrior was leading his forces in what was destined to be his last battle for the cause of free enterprise and the preservation of his life's work; and

Whereas A. P. has left behind him a battle force fully capable of carrying on in his tra-

dition under the able leadership of his illustrious son, Lawrence Mario Giannini, president of Bank of America for the past 13 years, and who, blessed with the fighting spirit and genius of his father, has long demonstrated his ability to preserve and further develop this great institution of service; and

Whereas A. P. was a public-spirited citizen and a powerful influence in the determination of the social order of his native State, and through the medium of his financial organization contributed more to the economic development of California in his time than any other man, thus earning for himself the fitting appellation, "Colossus of the West"; and

Whereas ever mindful of the fact that financial circumstances had denied him opportunities for advanced education in his youth, he made or caused to be made generous contributions for educational purposes, important among which were a gift to the University of California to further the agricultural interests of the State, and the establishment of the Bank of America-Giannini Foundation to assist worthy members of organizations with which he had been associated in obtaining higher practical and cultural education than their means or circumstances would permit, to advance medical research, and to accomplish other charitable purposes; and

Whereas A. P.'s frankness and warm personality won for him the esteem and affection of his thousands of business associates and a host of other friends, and his indomitable spirit was a source of inspiration that carried his organization forward to incomparable achievements; and

Whereas in his demise his children have lost a loving and devoted father, this association, the State of California, and the entire West have lost a fearless champion, and the Nation has lost a great American: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by this board of directors of Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association in regular meeting assembled, That the loss of our beloved fellow director and founder, A. P. Giannini, is the source of deepest sorrow to us, and that when we adjourn today we do so in respect to his memory; and be it further

Resolved, That we tender to his sorrowing family our deepest sympathy in their bereavement; and be it further

Resolved, That we dedicate ourselves to the task of perpetuating the ideals and principles of our founder as expressed in the fruit of his labor—Bank of America National Trust and Savings Association—and that we stand in solid phalanx to preserve this glorious work as a monument to the memory of its creator and as an institution of public service to the West; and be it further

Resolved, That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting held on the 14th day of June 1949, and that a suitably engrossed copy thereof be sent to the surviving son and daughter of our beloved "A. P."

A. J. GOCK,
Chairman of the Board.

Farmers Want 100 Percent Parity and Less Bureaucratic Meddling

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD C. HAGEN
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, the farmers of the Ninth District of Minnesota are seriously concerned about many farm problems which are confronting the country at this time.

During recent months, both the Farmers' Union and the Farm Bureau county organizations have held their annual county-wide meeting in most of the 15 counties of the Ninth Congressional District of Minnesota, which I have the honor to represent in the United States Congress.

One of the most thorough and comprehensive sets of resolutions adopted was sent to me in the mail late last week from the West Otter Tail County Farm Bureau. Its secretary, Mr. Theodore Hegseth of Fergus Falls, Minn., mailed me a copy of the resolutions adopted at the last annual Farm Bureau meeting.

I believe the resolutions will be of interest to the Members of the House and readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I am glad to attach them to these brief remarks.

The resolutions are as follows:

I. FARM PROGRAM

In past years Farm Bureau thinking on a farm program has centered around the theory that it is in the interest of all groups that the prices farmers receive for their products should be such that they are on a fair level compared to things that farmers have to buy—in other words, at a parity level. We believe, first of all, that to achieve that end, farmers themselves must do everything they can and only in times of emergency should they call on their Government to use its aid in trying to restore that economic balance between groups. We have always opposed vigorously any direct subsidy program in food products as unsound and unfair and will continue to do so. We believe farmers themselves should decide the kind of program they want for agriculture and that the leaders in that department should confine themselves to administering such a program in a manner sympathetic to the way in which it was written. We agree with a farm leader in a neighboring State that Farm Bureau wants 100 percent of parity but we don't want it in checks from the Government. We believe that the flexible price-support program should be given a fair trial before it is discarded as being of no value.

II. GAS-TAX AMENDMENT

We again go on record in favor of the amendment on the division of gasoline-tax money to be submitted at the next election whereby gas taxes are to be divided 50 percent to the State, 44 percent to the county, and 6 percent to the metropolitan cities.

III. SOIL TESTING

We urge Farm Bureau members to take advantage of the new soil-testing laboratory and make soil tests on fields to be fertilized before buying large amounts of commercial fertilizer.

IV. RECOMMENDED GRAIN VARIETIES

Since many farmers in recent years have been victimized by smooth talking seed and fertilizer salesmen, we urge Farm Bureau members to buy only varieties recommended by the State experiment stations and at prices set up as fair by the Crop Improvement Associations.

V. FARM SAFETY

We commend the county agent for his efforts on farm safety as carried out in 4-H Clubs and by special meetings for that purpose. We urge that farm safety again be stressed in 1950 and should feel repaid if such a program saved only one life.

VI. BANG'S TEST AND CALFHOOD VACCINATION

We again urge that continued study be made on Bang's disease testing in combination with calfhood vaccination as a means of controlling Bang's disease.

VII. NEW USES FOR AGRICULTURAL CROPS

Since we have again reached the point where certain crops appear to be in overproduction in this country and unless a worldwide distribution plan can be worked out to relieve the situation, we urge that research be carried out to find new uses for surplus crops, new and cheaper methods of production and handling so lower prices could be accepted without seriously affecting the normal margin of profit in producing such crops. We also urge that an advertising campaign be inaugurated on sale of surplus farm products and that producers themselves stand the cost of such a campaign.

VIII. POLIO SITUATION

We urge that every effort be made to combine the March of Dimes and Sister Kenny campaign for funds so as to conserve effort in raising money for this worthy cause. We would urge people without protection to consider taking out a polio insurance policy with a reliable company and through a local representative. In like manner we urge Farm Bureau families without hospital and medical protection to make use of the Blue Cross hospital plan and the Blue Shield medical plan. We would offer these plans as being better and less expensive than any compulsory health plan advocated by the Government.

IX. OCCUPATIONAL DISEASES

We again urge that some definite action be taken to help eliminate such occupational diseases as undulant fever, strep throat infection, and erysipelas.

X. RADIO PROGRAMS AND COMIC NEWSPAPER SECTIONS

Since parents everywhere are finding increasing objection to crime programs on the radio and comic sections of the newspapers that are not either comic nor educational, we, therefore, urge as a means of combating these objectionable features that a campaign be started by the Farm Bureau people of the county to get churches, parent-teachers' associations, mothers' clubs, and other interested groups to systematically object to the sponsors of these programs and to the owners of the newspapers as a means of doing away with them.

XI. SOIL CONSERVATION

Besides new uses for crops in surplus production, we urge the use of soil-conserving crops such as grasses, especially legumes, and that steep slopes or poor land be taken out of production and planted to trees and in so doing conserve the soil and help to reduce surplus production.

XII

We again urge support of the Farm Credit Administration, Farmers Home Administration, Soil Conservation Service, REA, and Production and Marketing Administration.

XIII

We urge farmers to take advantage of the new telephone program to be offered by the REA.

XIV

We believe that manufacturers of cars, trucks, tractors, and machinery use too many different sizes and types of ball and roller bearings, some of which vary as little as one-sixty-fourth of an inch. We believe the bearings could be made much more interchangeable, which would greatly simplify obtaining repairs.

XV

We wish to extend a word of thanks to the newspapers and radio stations of the county

for generously giving space to items of interest to farm people, to the board of county commissioners for their sympathetic interest in the agricultural extension program and especially to County Agent Gustafson and Home Agent Judith Nord for carrying out the extension program so vital to all people in the county, both farmers and city folks.

Water for Irrigation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER K. GRANGER
OF UTAH
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I am inserting in the RECORD a poem by a pioneer woman in my State that emphasizes again that water for irrigation is of paramount importance to the people who live in the semiarid West.

When the Mormon pioneers, led by Brigham Young, settled in the great dry valley that was to become the center of Utah, many felt it would be impossible to grow any crop but sagebrush.

But on July 23, 1847, William Carter broke the bank of a small creek and brought water on to the parched earth, which he afterward plowed and planted. This was the first irrigation by an Anglo-Saxon in North America.

William Carter's daughter, Annie Carter Johnsen, who now lives in St. George, Utah, has watched the wasteland being transformed through the power of irrigation, and she well knows what miracles water can perform in our western lands. I am proud to insert in the RECORD the poem she has written:

GIVE US WATER, UNCLE SAM

What we want out here is water,
Just plain water, Uncle Sam,
And we think you ought to bring it
From a governmental dam.

We've just learned that you've decided,
After many years delay,
To supply the West with water—
If you find the scheme will pay.

We've been praying hard for moisture,
Through the hot and arid years,
But our cry for "water" * * * "water"
Has just lately reached your ears.

We have other kinds of liquids,
From the best brands to the worst,
And they're all quite efficacious
When it comes to quenching thirst.

We maintain out here that water
Its great function best fulfills
When it irrigates our ranches
And brings power to our mills.

If you can't resist the impulse
That impels you to expand,
You can find room for expansion
On our western arid lands.

As we furnished you with silver,
When you wanted to resume,
Now that you've espoused expansion,
We'll provide the bridal-room.

Come out West and help us finish
What God left about half done,
When he turned this desert over
To the lizards and the sun.

You can go up in the canyons
And construct a reservoir
For a tenth of what you squandered
In your recent foreign war.

You can go down in the valley
And produce a flowing well,
And won't have to run your auger
More than half-way down to hell.

With the differential duties
Which you pay the Sugar Trust,
You can pump sufficient water
To forever lay our dust.

You can dig a hundred ditches
From the Platte to Tonopah
For much less than you have taxed us
For your ditch at Panama.

If you'll only bring us water
To our arid lands out West,
We will ask no further favors
And we'll quickly do the rest.

We will make this desert blossom
Like the fertile Philippines,
Where you're educating natives
While we furnish you the means.

We will show you what strong muscles,
When engaged in honest toil,
Can produce on barren uplands
From a dry and sandy soil.

We will fill your empty coffers
With the stuff you like so well,
Then the bankers can't control you,
For you'll have gold bricks to sell.

When this prayer of ours you answer,
And our arid lands redeem,
You will see the full fruition
Of our hydrographic dream.

Then you'll see our verdant valleys
Smiling 'neath our azure skies,
Circled round by purple mountains,
Like the vales of Paradise.

What we want out here is water,
Just plain water, Uncle Sam,
And we think you ought to bring it
From a governmental dam.

—*Annie C. Johnsen.*

Eat High on Hog

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT A. MEYER
OF KANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an editorial from the Daily Reporter, Independence, Kans., relative to the recent $100-gold-plate "break bread with your Government" dinner of the Democratic Party on which no tax was paid:

EAT HIGH ON HOG

Thomas Jefferson may have been, but we doubt if Andrew Jackson would have been, able to read the menu of the $100-a-plate Jefferson-Jackson dinner held in Washington last night. Items such as pommes rissoles, petits fours, and filet mignon bordelaise probably would have meant nothing to old Rough-and-Ready any more than they mean to ordinary Republicans of the present day, who go in for $1-a-head box suppers, featuring good old American fried chicken, held in the hand and gnawed at.

The party which boasts of its affection for the common people doesn't have room at such parties for many common people—not at $100 a plate.

Nowadays the Democratic chieftains are eating mighty high on the hog, when they condescend to eat from such a common critter as a hog. Maybe some of that French on the menu means some part of a hog, you couldn't prove it by a Kansas Republican not educated to such fancy gorging.

The $100-a-plate eaters talk a great love for the "peepul" and do a lot of bragging about what they do for the common herd. That is exactly the same line of talk put out by Stalin and Hitler, the British Socialists, and the like.

But none of these great humanitarians loves the people enough to give them the kind of government Thomas Jefferson always said was the best government—the one that governs least. None of them trust the people to spend their own money either. They tax it way from them and spend it for them on their great humanitarian projects.

On the way they deduct enough from the money passing through their hands to pay salaries to an immense number of jobholders. They're the boys who attend the $100-a-plate dinners.

The Farmer and the Chamber of Commerce

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, last Tuesday night the distinguished junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] delivered an address regarding the relations of the farmer and the chamber of commerce at the Association of Commerce banquet held in Bloomington, Ill. I ask unanimous consent that this illuminating address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Toastmaster, ladies and gentlemen, when Walter Meers called me, requesting me to come here for this address, I naturally assumed it was a farmers' meeting. He described what a nice auditorium you would have, what a distinguished group of people would be here, and how much I would enjoy another visit to Bloomington. I accepted his invitation, but awakened a few days later to discover that I had committed myself to address the Bloomington Association of Commerce.

Perhaps it is just as well. Surely this community, tied as closely as it is to rural America, united as it has to be with the welfare of agriculture throughout this Nation, is one where a farmers' meeting or one held by the Association of Commerce should have pretty much the same subject and definitely an identical point of view.

I want to talk tonight for a few moments about the farmer and the chamber of commerce, but before I do I must admit to you that I have first-hand information about Bloomington. My good friend and close associate is the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois, SCOTT W. LUCAS. When it is an election year, he may fall into the habit of public servants and travel over the State recalling how much time he has spent in every county courthouse and how well he is acquainted with the people of every village where there are votes. But it just so hap-

pens that he has the goods on Bloomington. This is, according to SCOTT, his second home because he came here, attended the Illinois Wesleyan School of Law, lived among you for many years, and seems to have a perfectly valid right to say that part of his roots are in this community.

I have a frightful time trying to keep up with speaking engagements. I try not to leave Washington when the Senate is in session, and when I do I seek to pack several appearances into one trip. At 8 o'clock tomorrow morning, God willing and the weather not too bad, I will fly into San Francisco to talk to western meat packers. We are going to explore the question as to whether the West can feed itself. Not too many hours later I will be in Boise, Idaho, where faithful Democrats will be permitted to pay $50 a head for the purpose of learning more about the virtues of Thomas Jefferson and Andrew Jackson. Soon I will be in Houston, Tex., to talk about cotton. Those subjects are too diversified to permit the use of the same speech. So I had trouble with this one.

Down in my heart I want to discuss some of the things that farmers must do to keep intact their program of price supports. We have been wrestling, you know, with the question of potato supports and have before us the unpleasant prospect of dumping many millions of bushels of good Irish spuds. I wanted to discuss the implications of that and hoped that I could lay down as a central theme a paraphrase of Wendell Phillips' famous statement that eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. I feel that eternal vigilance is the price of the farm-support program, and my talk ought to be punctuated with that sentiment.

But steadily there was a theme that kept bothering me. People have been coming to Washington in droves these past few weeks outlining what they thought the Government should do for one particular commodity. The cotton people want us to increase greatly the acreage permitted to be planted in 1950. The peanut growers do not seem to care how big the increase in acreage is that they receive as long as it's substantial and everlasting. The potato growers don't feel that we should change the rules in the middle of the game, regardless of how they have been playing the game.

Through it all, no one seems ready to remember that the Government can give you nothing it has not first taken away.

Most of the reading matter that comes out of Washington is of high order but there is a recent pamphlet to which I want to call your attention. It is entitled "The Federal Budget in Brief." It covers the fiscal year 1951 and was issued by the Bureau of the Budget. When you read that pamphlet you understand from charts and from language clear and concise why taxes now are high, why present high levels will pretty largely be maintained for some time to come and why, if relief is not shortly obtained, the burden of taxation will continue to grind down the availability of venture capital, will continue to make it more attractive to go into the stock market and purchase a seasoned security that at current prices will yield 6 to 10 percent rather than to put money into a new venture that may have only a 50–50 chance for success.

We have been living at a rapid pace these last 10 years. We have changed our Government substantially and we have altered its activities greatly. That is why you cannot view an agricultural program solely from the standpoint of its individual desirability. The Senate of the United States today has been voting on the central Arizona project, a great reclamation undertaking that would dam up and divert the waters of the Colorado River far into central reaches of the great State of Arizona. Its total cost will probably exceed a billion dollars but in the initial stages will involve the expenditure of slightly more than $700,000,000. Now you and I can argue whether it is or is not a desirable project. I personally feel that it is but you may disagree with me. Regardless of our discussions of its validity, if it were to be constructed in this fiscal year, we would come up against the problem of our national budget and we might rule that it could be profitably postponed until there might evolve a more favorable financial atmosphere. Fortunately, the bill contemplates that.

The same thing may be said of many of our agricultural programs. It may be right to say that every agricultural product ought to be supported and the day may come when all of them can be supported. But any proposal to support them all immediately and simultaneously runs squarely into the question of whether or not it can be accomplished within the framework of the present budget and, if not, what is to be dropped out to make room for the new program. Therefore we look at all these proposals not only from the effect of the individual suggestion but against the background of the whole financial structure and current need of our National Government.

When we make that over-all examination, we discover that our Government has been moving forward rapidly in fields that we scarcely thought of cultivating a dozen years ago, but we find as well that some of the older and well-established functions of Government have mushroomed to an expanded importance out of all relationship to their earlier importance. I know it's an old story, but it may be worth telling again that for the current year we face a deficit of possibly $5,000,000,000 in contrast to a deficit that ran under $2,000,000,000 last year; that if our legislation remains as it is, if we live on under present economic circumstances, and leave our tax levels about where they are, the outlook for the coming fiscal year is not black balances but more red ink and another very substantial deficit.

Possibly as I proceed both of these themes may be integrated and woven together. Possibly if we remember that the Government can give us nothing which is not first taken away, we may be a little more cautious in our demands for price-support programs that would further distort our budget, and, finally, if we are more cautious and more modest in our demands, we may then look for some method to handle these agricultural problems without immediate recourse to the Federal Treasury, as in the case of voluntary marketing agreements or learn that the mechanism by which it can be accomplished is the same mechanism which makes those business enterprises whose membership constitutes the association of commerce function and succeed, the old-fashioned idea that it takes salesmanship to move a product. In other words, I like to sell agricultural products to the trade and not to the Treasury.

Now, after that introduction if there is anyone here who has a clear idea of what I'm going to talk about, he has my sincere congratulations. If his services could be available to me the next time I start to write a talk, I'd be better off than I am now.

For my launching point I take a brief glance at the calendar and realize that we are approaching the ominous date of March 15. I am reasonably sure that income-tax Form 1040 is now in the mails and from the magazine section of the New York Times, I take these soulful lines:

"Naughty be our deeds or pure,
Rough or calm the seas we sail,
Toil, our life, or sinecure,
Death and taxes will prevail"—

Death and taxes will prevail. I could just as well have used that as the launching platform for my Jefferson-Jackson Day rocket because income taxes are about equally unpopular with labor, businessmen, and professional people. In fact, higher personal income taxes have about as much appeal to these groups as the prospect of socialized medicine has to the doctor.

Somewhere in the Government, I have heard, a determined group plans to do something about our health and when the program is adopted and in full swing, death will be swallowed up in victory and the span of life may be stretched from three score and ten to four score and five. Those of us in Washington who are well into our fifties and fairly well along toward our sixties are much more jubilant today than we were a year ago because the new toast of the town is the Vice President and his bride. One can get along fairly well at a large reception in Washington until the Vice President and Mrs. Barkley arrive and then you must be careful not to be bowled over in the rush. Love is sweeping the country and the greatest argument for improved health facilities and extra medical attention is the youthful vigor of the Vice President as he rides past three score and ten and heads toward the century mark. He has about persuaded us that death will not prevail and thereby he has doubled our conviction that increasing old-age benefits and pensions make it certain that taxes surely will.

When I have discussed the budget difficulty with friends and neighbors, they inevitably ask, "Why don't you simply balance the budget?" It's a good question. Why does the Government spend four times as much this year as it spent 10 years ago?

You have your answer principally in the fact that 72 percent of the money spent by the Federal Government pays for the cost of past wars or for insurance against future wars. May I run quickly through the figures: $41,800,000,000 or 30 cents out of every tax dollar for national defense; $6,300,000,000 or 14 cents for present commitments in the international field, for ERA, for occupied areas in Japan and Germany; $5,700,000,000 or 13 cents of every tax dollar for interest payments of the national debt; $6,600,000,000 or 15 cents for veterans' services and benefits. There you have it—$31,400,000,000 or 72 cents out of every dollar the Government will spend in 1950 is chargeable either to past wars or to the prevention of future wars.

Now I think it will be conceded that we're not going to change those figures much. If anything, the interest on the national debt may move up. There may be some slight saving in veteran affairs but it will be small. The pressure is on always for greater rather than less expenditures in the field of national defense, and we're not yet at the point where we can anticipate the complete elimination of our activities in the international field even though we hope to see them taper off rapidly in the next 2 years.

So out of the remaining 28 cents of the taxpayer's dollar you must pay the normal running expenses of the Government, the carrying of the mail, the enforcement of laws, the collection of taxes, the assistance that must every day be given to industry, to agriculture, to our working classes in the mediation of their difficulties. Along with that must go the great programs of the Department of Interior in the conservation, preservation, and final development of our resources. We must maintain our public-health service, our transportation-communication facilities, our contribution to the advancement of the science of aviation. New and better public roads must be engineered and constructed. You will find that in all these fields economies are possible but they are small compared to the total expenditures.

One of the experts of the Bureau of the Budget put it in what to me was a clearer and more understandable form. Let me use his simplification of the budget:

"The Government spent $8 for national defense in 1939 for each man, woman, and

child in the country; this year it is spending $85. The Government spent 15 cents for international affairs 11 years ago; today the cost is $42. The Government spent $4 for veterans' programs in 1939; in this fiscal year, the cost to each person will be $44. To service the debt cost $7 per person before the war; it costs $38 this year. For all other activities of Government in 1939, the cost per person was $49. Today, in sharp contrast to other increases, that cost has risen only to $80 per person."

When we examine those figures and see how tight the present budget is, how difficult it is within the framework of that budget to find funds for the most worth-while activities, then we recognize how true it is that when we ask for new services, when we ask for new price supports when we suggest new aviation schedules and new airport construction, we come back to the fundamental proposition that the Government can give us nothing it has not first taken away.

Here in Bloomington you have a new soybean-processing plant. You should be very proud of it. It is a fine contribution to your community. You want to see it succeed and expand its usefulness. But you and I know that there could come a time when soybeans might be in price distress again as other crops have been before. If that happens, I can hear welling up from many areas a demand that soybeans be protected by support prices to help not only the planter, but the processor as well. When that day comes, you people know that I will be on the side of those who try to give protection to the soybean grower through a price-support program, but if it's a new program and a costly program, you and I will remember that we can't do it unless we can find the spot to pick up that cost within the framework of the then current budget. We can't take that money out of thin air. We have to take it from taxpayers. We can't give the farmers of this country something that the Government has not first taken away, and taken either from the farmer, the laborer, the businessman, or a combination of all. So this new business and the soybean producer realize that their programs must be worked out with an eye on the welfare of each group and with consideration by each for the other. If the cost becomes so excessive that the present budget cannot accommodate it and we have to find new sources of income that we can tap, then we might raise corporate taxes and thereby so discourage the free flow of investment capital into the expanding enterprises of this country that there will be no new soybean processing plants. We must be sure that in the long run the soybean-processing plant is not more important to the farmer than is the temporary price-support program.

I am trying to say to you that I want farm supports at reasonable levels. I prefer them at flexible levels so that the consumer shares in some degree the unexpected good fortune of a large outturn. I want to be sure at all times that the sciences of growing, harvesting, processing, and manufacturing the food and fiber of this country move ahead under a program of research that never slows down.

While I was Secretary of Agriculture, the Congress of the United States passed a Research and Marketing Act. I urged that more millions than had been appropriated be poured into the fund to implement that act, that we would shortly be facing surpluses and that it was of extreme importance that we begin then to find ways of utilizing those surpluses. I felt it was urgent that we begin to learn if there were new uses for cotton, corn, and wheat and that we needed to be ready with new processes, whatever they were, at the earliest possible moment because it seemed apparent that the day of surpluses would soon be upon us.

We have not gone far enough in that field. We ought to compare what industry does in the field of research. If a great industrial firm like du Pont spends a portion of its revenue from rayon on continued research projects seeking to reduce the cost of production and broaden the field of utilization of their product, then the American farmer might be justified in having a proportionately equal amount spent to improve the growing of cotton and the utilization of the cotton crop. I don't know how much money that would involve but I know it would be well beyond what is now being spent for research in the Department of Agriculture, our land-grant colleges, and the experiment stations and farm-product laboratories over the United States. That's the cheapest money we will spend and it will lighten the burden of future surpluses.

Which brings me again to the suggestion that eternal vigilance is the price of farm supports.

Yesterday the Senate of the United States wrestled with a proposal that no price support of any kind should be available to Irish potatoes unless marketing quotas were in effect on those potatoes. That's different treatment from what is given to other commodities. Generally speaking, the basics are supported at 90 percent or near that figure. Some nonbasic commodities may receive from 75 percent to 90 percent; others from 60 percent to 90 percent; all the rest at the discretion of the Secretary, from zero to 90 percent. But by the rider which Senator LUCAS offered and which the Senate Agriculture Committee felt it should attach to the cotton-acreage law, the Secretary of Agriculture cannot support potato prices at any figure unless marketing quotas are in effect.

Why such drastic and discriminatory treatment? The answer is, of course, that some potato farmers dipped greedy hands into the Federal Treasury. They went beyond the necessity of supplying potatoes for the domestic market of the United States. They grew potatoes to receive price support and when they did that, they jeopardized every other price-support program existing in the United States.

Let me give you some figures: In 1920 (and I quote these figures from miscellaneous publication No. 707 of the United States Department of Agriculture, p. 44) the average production of potatoes in the United States was under 100 bushels per acre. In 1949 it was 220 bushels per acre. That exceeds the normal progress of American agriculture over a 30-year period. In 1940 the average production was just over 130 bushels per acre. By 1945 it had reached the 160-bushel level. Suddenly it zoomed upward to 220 bushels and the end is not yet in sight. No one knows how much further the application of fertilizer, the development of better seed, the use of improved insecticides, the practice of narrowing the spaces between hills, can jump the per acre production.

The Congress believed there was power in marketing agreements to control this uptrend and wrote legislation into the Agriculture Acts of 1948 and 1949 to accomplish that, but the experience of 1949 was disappointing. Maine, Idaho, and California produce about one-third of all the potatoes grown in the United States. California, in 1920, produced less than 140 bushels per acre; in 1949, 380 bushels. Maine started in 1920 with a production of 235 bushels to the acre, stayed at the level of 290 bushels till 1935, but in 1949 its average was more than 450 bushels per acre.

The Senate Agriculture Committee felt that it just could not stand that sort of a performance. The potato growers are suggesting to the Congress that we kiss and make up, that we let them try the same program again in 1950. This time, they say, it will work. We learned from the cotton-planting experience in 1949 that they might recognize this as the last big chance to make a killing from the Federal Treasury and we have no way of knowing to what length they would go. Therefore, Senator LUCAS proposed his potato amendment to the cotton-acreage bill prohibiting any support to potato growers unless and until legislation could be passed providing for a system of marketing quotas and such marketing quotas could be applied to an oncoming crop. I think that will save the Federal Government $50,000,000 in 1950 alone. Eternal vigilance is the price of a continued farm-support program.

You may be thinking, "So what? It's a little bad with potatoes. We'll get that straightened out. Is there anything else in the farm price-support program that looks dangerous?"

Possibly. Take peanuts, for example. In 1948 there were 3,312,200 acres of peanuts harvested, so the 1949 acreage allotment was reduced to 2,628,970 acres. In Public Law 272 there was a new formula adopted which permitted the Secretary of Agriculture drastically to reduce peanut acreages but provided that in the year 1950 he could not drop the acreage below 2,100,000 acres. Nearly half of the 1949 crop of peanuts must be crushed for oil or exported to the Army and ECA. Losses under the shelling program or amounts charged to section 32 funds of the Department of Agriculture are going to be terrific, perhaps $35,000,000 on the 1949 crop. If an effort is made to drop the 1951 allotment down where it belongs, under 1,500,000 acres and probably as low as a million acres, there'll be a terrific outcry. If the allotted acreage is not greatly dropped, the legislative history on potatoes may be repeated on peanuts. Right now we are also having some trouble with cotton acreage.

That brings me to my final suggestion: Salesmanship. Perhaps the farmer and the chamber of commerce ought to work much closer together. The farmers primarily are producers. Every large industry needs a good sales manager. The farmer should join forces with the chamber of commerce or the Association of Commerce and try to take advantage of the sales experience of the men in these organizations. Let me illustrate what I mean.

We're running into a little trouble with dairy products. Right now it looks as if the per capita consumption of all dairy products on a fat solids-milk equivalent basis may remain considerable below wartime levels and slightly below prewar levels. I may not be up-to-date on my figures but I believe that cheese and evaporated milk are moving at record high levels. The continued low consumption of butter is chiefly responsible for the over-all drop in the consumption of dairy products. Ice cream is being sold at a rate substantially below the peak reached during the war, but it's still above the prewar rate. The consumption of fluid milk and cream and other whole-milk products is above prewar consumption, but butter is down or at least in 1948 was down 40 percent below the prewar average. Just prior to the war in the period 1935–39 the average commercial consumption of butter was 17 pounds but last year it was about 10 pounds per person. That much of a drop in the consumption of butter between prewar and last year represents a loss to the dairy industry of the equivalent of about 13,000,000 pounds of milk. Oh, I know a lot of that loss was compensated for by the increased percapita consumption of whole-milk products such as fluid milk, evaporated milk and cheese, but the fact remains that a great deal of the market of the dairy farmer of the United States has been lost in the slump of the sale of butter and I doubt if he has gone out to find himself a new market for the products that he produces.

In the free-enterprise system the answer to that is salesmanship. Too often in the present circumstance the answer seems to be price support. I still think farmers can sell.

The population of this country is moving upward rapidly. New demands ought to be steadily developing for the products of the farm. If we depend upon Government programs to utilize these products, as we have been doing with dried skim milk powder and dried eggs, then the day will come when the farmer of this country will be in trouble and bad trouble because overnight these programs can be wiped out. But if he has built up his list of customers, if he has built up a trade for his commodity in normal trade channels, then he has a market where he can solicit and sell and which he can steadily expand as the population of the country increases and there are more mouths to feed.

Salesmanship does not always mean expanding markets for the old product. Sometimes we need new products. The drop in butter consumption from 17 pounds to 10 pounds may be only an indication of future reductions in butter consumption. What would the dairy farmer do if the drop was to five pounds per person? That could happen in the next 5 or 10 years. The world changes fast and we ought to change with it. Maybe we won't be eating fats in the same degree that we now eat them.

A few weeks ago my doctor gave me a cholesterol test, found that I was carrying a little fat in my blood stream, knew that it might lead to deposits that could be the forerunner of a coronary if not watched, and so he tells me that I must eat no more butter. Salesmanship won't sell it to me. I may buy a new product that research will help the dairy farmers develop. If we approach our problem on any other basis we may finish by building up burdensome surpluses of butter with consequent great losses to the Treasury and a new demand for the elimination of another price-support program.

So there you have my story.

The Government can give you nothing it has not first taken away. The more the Government gives to farmers, the more it must first take away in taxes—with the usual collection costs added to the take or deducted from the gift.

Similarly, if farmers want adequate returns from potatoes, if they want to receive from price-support programs, the Government must first take away from the grower the liberty of planting as many acres as he would like and of marketing what he does grow as he pleases. He must plant only what the Government permits and market only those grades and quantities that the Government decides are needed. That, to be sure, is regimentation.

The bigger and better the returns the farmer expects from the Government through price support, the greater the regimentation and the tighter the controls.

To illustrate: There is intensified pressure for additional and extra cotton acreage to be still allotted for 1950 planting. That is because the support price will be relatively high—over 27 cents. If the lowest permissible levels of the Agricultural Act of 1948 had become effective this past January, the support level would have been about 6 cents less, and the demand for extra acreage would have been less. Cotton farmers want a bigger part of a better deal.

From which it would appear that marketing agreements would work better. Under them, the farmers receive little from the Government and surrender little to the Government. The farmers run their own show with the Government as referee—as is the case in Federal milk-marketing agreements—and operate without financial aid from the Government by getting their money in the market place—as citrus growers largely do.

Notice the difference in public acceptance. The citrus growers pile up unwanted quantities and qualities of oranges, spray them with oil, and burn them to sustain grower returns—and not one soul utters a protest. The Government piles up unwanted quantities and qualities of potatoes, sprays them with oil and burns them to fulfill price-support obligations—and a cry goes up all over the Nation. There may be a lesson in that.

How much better off the potato people would be today if they would seize upon the marketing-agreement provisions of the Agricultural Act of 1949 and make them work instead of producing and showing to the Government endless quantities of unwanted potatoes. Control could have been achieved through marketing agreement—but like any other agreement, success only comes when both parties to it proceed in good faith. The Government must desire the agreement to work and the grower must want to live up to its provisions. We do not have that possibility in the present situation.

That is why I have proposed that your association of commerce, established in a community whose ties are strong with the rural life around it, needs to study what the farmer gives and what he gets.

For farmer and businessman are not of different classes. "Men," said Confucius, "are near one another by nature, but practice sets them apart."

May it be the purpose and practice of your community to bring them together.

Missouri Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HUGH BUTLER

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 20 (legislative day of Wednesday, January 4), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by W. G. Sloan, chairman, Missouri Basin field committee, delivered before the thirty-first annual convention of the Mississippi Valley Association, St. Louis, Mo., February 7, 1950.

The address exceeds in length that which is permitted to be printed without an accompanying estimate of cost. Therefore, I attach an estimate by the Public Printer of 3¼ pages of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, at a cost of $266.50.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

This morning I am taking the opportunity to discuss with you the role of the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee in the Missouri Basin resources development and to answer, in part, some of the criticisms which have been published concerning the conception of the plan of development and the manner in which it is being executed.

I expect to give you some of the details of the workings of the interagency committee so that you may have a better insight, not only of its accomplishments but, of its limitations.

There is a popular idea that the Missouri Basin Inter-Agency Committee was set up to accomplish the same thing as a board of directors for a corporation and because it does not take upon itself some of those duties which would ordinarily fall to such a board, there has been a studied effort on the part of some people to create the impression that it has many shortcomings. The interagency committee is a unique organization. Nothing like it has existed in the world of internal resource development and for that reason, it has been critically examined and studied by students of political economy and well-intentioned planners for the purpose of searching out its flaws and in seeking a conclusion as to its workability in other sections of the United States. Having been a member of the committee for about 4 years and its chairman for the past year, I believe I can speak with some assurance concerning the workings of the committee and I will not attempt to inflict my personal convictions upon you as to its competence. That you must decide for yourselves after hearing both sides of the question.

Early in the year 1943 a voluntary Federal interagency committee was formed in Washington for the purpose of bringing about better cooperation among the various Federal departments in Washington having to do with resource development in the United States. On March 29, 1945, this Federal Inter-Agency Commitee passed a resolution which states in part as follows:

"In order to facilitate progress on the multiple-purpose development program authorized by the Congress for the Missouri River Basin, there is established a Missouri Basin Interagency Committee. The purpose of this committee is to implement the policies and purposes of the Federal Interagency River Basin Committee established under the Federal Interagency Agreement dated December 29, 1943, by providing a means through which the field representatives of the participating Federal agencies may effectively interchange information and coordinate their activities among themselves and with those of the States in the preparation of reports and in the planning and execution of works for the control and use of the waters of the Missouri River Basin. The establishment of this committee should not be interpreted as related to or in any way affecting the consideration now being given by the President and the Congress to the possible creation of a Missouri Valley Authority, or any other administrative device."

Note that the principal purpose for which the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was established was to provide a means through which field representatives of Federal agencies may interchange information and coordinate activities among themselves and with the States in preparation of reports and planning and execution of works.

The committee has no authority in the administration of the public works within the Missouri Basin nor has it responsibility for execution of the works. It is simply a voluntary coordinating body.

Committee membership: At the time the committee was activated there were designated one member from each of the four Federal departments and four Governors from the basin States to represent all of the States in the basin. In May 1947 Federal participation was increased by one member who represents the Department of Commerce. State representatives then were increased by one member to keep pace with the Federal representation. The Federal members are named by the heads of the respective Federal departments. State representatives are selected by a committee known as the Missouri States Committee which was organized in 1943 for the purpose of coordinating State activities in the basin toward promotion of the development of the entire basin. The Missouri States Committee is composed of the governor of each of the States and two other representatives of each State selected by the respective governors. The committee meets only once or twice a year or, at the call of the chairman. It is quite informal but important in that it has the responsibility of selecting the governors who will become members of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee and thus represent all of the States in the basin.

Each of the Federal departments has functions distinct from the other. Therefore, the representative of each department

functions for his department in different ways.

The Corps of Engineers is organized in such manner that all of the activities in connection with the civil functions of the Department of the Army, of which it is a part, are centered in the Division Office of the Division Engineer at Omaha, Nebr. This division covers the entire Missouri River Basin. Therefore, the division engineer is the top-ranking official for the Department of the Army in the entire basin and can speak for all the civil functions of his Department in the basin.

The Department of the Interior, however, is not thus organized. Its activities are much more diversified than those of the Corps of Engineers. These activities are divided among seven Bureaus of the Department, each of the Bureaus having special functions in its particular field. These Interior agencies are as follows: Bureau of Reclamation, Fish and Wildlife Service, Geological Survey, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Bureau of Land Management, Bureau of Mines and National Park Service.

For the purpose of coordinating the wide variety of activities of these agencies, the Secretary of the Interior has set up the Interior Missouri Basin Field Committee. The field committee meets once a month to coordinate all the activities of Interior in the Missouri Basin, formulate programs, and recommend allocation of annual funds for the purpose of producing a balanced coordination of all of the work assigned to the Department of the Interior in the Missouri Basin development. The chairman of the field committee is appointed by the Secretary of the Interior and is the present representative of the Interior Department on the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee.

Likewise, the Department of Agriculture has many varied activities within the basin, but to date there has been little acceleration of its activities toward the sole purpose of matching the intensified activities of other departments in the Missouri Basin development. In order, however, to coordinate the activities of numerous of its agencies so that it can be adequately represented on the interagency committee the Secretary of Agriculture has appointed on his staff a field representative. His responsibility, like that of the chairman of the Interior field committee, is to coordinate and program the activities of Agriculture agencies to the end that Agriculture may serve to implement the purposes of Missouri Basin development to the greatest extent.

These three Departments, Army, Interior, and Agriculture, carry the bulk of action work in the Missouri Basin development, but as necessary complement to the work of these agencies, the Department of Commerce is represented on the committee for the purpose of channeling the vast amount of statistical information which it gathers and its knowledge of business enterprises and opportunities to the over-all study of basin development being pursued by the interagency committee. The Weather Bureau and Coast and Geodetic Survey are important agencies of Commerce with active participation in the basin work. The present representative of Commerce on the committee is the regional director of the branch of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The development and distribution of power is one of the important purposes of basin development. Therefore, the regulatory powers and market forecasts of the Federal Power Commission are necessarily involved. Consequently, their representative, who is the regional director for the Chicago regional office, represents that phase of development on the committee.

During the history of the interagency committee a total of 20 persons have been members, which represents about one complete turn-over in membership. Changes in membership have come about through transfers of Federal personnel or election of new governors in the Missouri Basin States. The present representative of the Federal Power Commission is the only member, Federal or State, who has held office as a member continuously since the committee was activated.

Finances: Since the committee is a voluntary organization it receives no appropriations as an entity of the Federal Government, nor does it receive any contributions from any of the States involved. The salary and expenses of each of the Federal members are paid by the respective departments of the Government. The expenses of State personnel are provided by the respective States. Expenses of the monthly meetings are usually provided by the community in which the meeting is held. The duty of preparing, mimeographing and distributing the minutes and agenda of the meetings usually falls upon the Federal member who happens to be chairman of the committee. The secretary of the committee is appointed by the chairman from his own staff and it is his duty to prepare and distribute the minutes of the meeting. When the committee decides to issue a pamphlet or publication, the expense of such work is usually prorated among the committee agencies.

Method of operation: The first meeting of the Missouri Basin Interagency Committee was held on July 19, 1945, in the office of the Division Engineer of the Corps of Engineers at Omaha, Nebr. Prior to the general meeting, the four Federal members of the committee met for the purpose of electing a presiding officer. He, in turn, selected his secretary.

At the August 1945 meeting it was agreed that meetings would be held monthly so far as practicable, that they would be rotated from State to State and that all questions, resolutions, or motions should be carried only by unanimous approval. If unanimous approval was not obtained the subject should be referred to the Federal interagency committee for disposition. In compliance with the instructions of the Federal interagency committee the Federal members only were considered as having a vote on the committee but, as the meetings proceeded, this requirement has been waived and the votes of State members have been recognized as having equal validity with those of the Federal members. It never has been necessary to refer any questions to the parent committee.

All meetings are open to the public and the press. It is the usual procedure at each of the meetings to devote at least the first half of the day to a report by agency representatives of the progress and plans of those agencies within the State where the meeting is being held. The afternoon session is usually devoted to a discussion of general and specific problems in the basin. Quite often papers are delivered to the committee by specialists on some specific problem in the basin. A custom has grown up and is generally being followed, of having a general civic meeting in the evening which is sponsored by the local citizens and at which some member of the committee is called upon to discuss the over-all development of the basin and the progress which is being made. In this manner businessmen and local citizens who have no opportunity to attend the routine sessions of the committee, may learn about basin development.

As construction work progressed, opportunities to view the work in progress have been taken by making a field trip on the second day of the meeting whenever the weather and location of the meeting place would permit. Thirteen of these all-day tours have been made to date.

When problems of coordination arise they usually involve only one or two of the agencies. It has been the practice of the committee to advise these agencies to work out their problems among themselves and bring the matter before the full committee only if they have been unable to reach an agreement.

The need for an over-all coordinating body: In the development of the Missouri River Basin the plan envisions development of all of the natural resources of the basin. In the beginning, major emphasis was placed upon control and use of the water resources but, in authorizing the development, the Congress stated the principle of broad development of all of its resources and thus enlarged to a great extent upon the original conception. Consequently, any interpretation of the concept of broad resource development involved many other things besides the use of the water flowing in the streams. Thus minerals, fish and wildlife, recreation, industrial, and all the activities which make up the basic, natural, renewable, and processed resources of the basin were brought into the picture. No single agency of the Federal Government has been functioning or has jurisdiction over all of such activities. It became of paramount importance, therefore, that there should be a central body to view the basin development as a whole and to coordinate all of the individual activities for the purpose of achieving the final goal in resource development. Each of the Government agencies is expert along particular lines. Each of them has built up organizations to fulfill its specific functions and each of them receives annual appropriations for the purpose of carrying out the mandates of Congress. The voluntary interagency committee is endeavoring to bring about this coordination without compulsion, without authority and with only the will and desire to work together toward a common end.

Achievement: No committee can be effective unless there is continued interest and attendance at regular meetings by each of its members. One measure of the effectiveness of the committee is the attendance record of those members. The committee has now held 36 meetings during the 3½ years of its existence. The attendance by Federal members of the committee has been approximately 98 percent. This percentage holds true of personal attendance by Federal members. An alternate appearing for a Federal representative is a rare occurence. As for the Governors who represent the 10 States in the basin, they have registered an average percentage of personal attendance of 62 percent throughout the period of the committee's existence. When it is realized that eight to nine meetings are held each year and that the Governors, who are especially busy people within their own States, are called upon to travel long distances and that each loses from 2 to 4 days from his own office to give his attention to the over-all basin affairs, such high attendance by the Governors is indicative of their sincere desire to be effective on the committee. It is only on rare occasions that the States represented on the committee do not have an official alternate, even though the Governor may be absent.

The first step in coordination of the program of the agencies was taken at the very first meeting of the committee. Each agency representative presented a statement of the interests of his department in the program. Soon thereafter a compilation was made of all of these programs for the information and guidance of the committee. From that date to the present there has been a studied effort by the committee to thoroughly inform not only the members of the comittee but also the attending press and public, of the myriad details of the program, progress which is being made and the problems which are continually arising in coordination and accomplishment.

In the beginning there appeared to be a reluctance on the part of State members to voice in public, questions concerning the advisability of constructing this part or that part of the project, its effect upon conditions in their own State or the need for some of the work which had been programed. But as time went on and a better understanding and better acquaintance was acquired this reluctance changed to an eagerness and willingness to lay their cards on the table and work the problems out in public. The mere presentation of the programs of the various agencies has tended to make them conscious of the need of coordinating their work and producing effective results which will stand up in the spotlight of a public meeting.

Responsible administrators of the various agencies have become acquainted with each other. The break-down of a specialist's viewpoint to that of a broader, more civic-minded attitude has become increasingly apparent as the meetings have followed one after the other. It is in this educational aspect of the committee's work that the most effective results can be seen.

The average attendance by those registered at the meetings throughout the years has been as follows: 1945, 44; 1946, 61; 1947, 57; 1948, 69, and, 1949, 83.

At the present time agenda and minutes of the meetings are distributed to approximately 450 individuals and Government agencies.

All members of the committee take back to their own agencies and to their States an understanding of the over-all problems and progress which could be obtained in no other way. Early activities of the committee were toward probing the interrelated activities of the agencies and a groping to understand the relationship of each of the program with others.

As of today most of the important or key structures in the development plan are either contracted for or have been initiated. A new stage is approaching wherein the attention of the committee is being devoted more and more to operational programs, the conflicts between State and Federal jurisdiction, and the methods and means of continuing harmonious cooperation beyond the construction stage into the operational stage.

In addition to the activities of the Federal Government in a broad program such as this, each of the individual States is carrying on many activities complementary to or related to and affected by the activities of the Federal agencies. The interagency committee offers and accepts the opportunities to enable each of the State agencies to understand and realize the relationship of the individual States to the Federal program. Thus there is brought about a meeting of the minds of those in charge of State activities with those in charge of Federal activities.

The more important actions taken by the committee are described in the following list:

(a) Unanimous agreement was obtained on the height to which Garrison Dam should be built.

(b) At the request of Governor Donnelly, of Missouri, the Corps of Engineers agreed to restudy their flood-control plans of the Osage Basin in cooperation with the State of Missouri and other agencies. A similar cooperative study is now being taken on the Grand River in Missouri.

(c) A controversy over jurisdiction of the construction of Baldhill Reservoir in North Dakota was resolved through meetings between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers and State officials of North Dakota.

(d) A controversy over the construction of Glendo Reservoir in Wyoming is being worked out between the States of Colorado, Wyoming, and Nebraska with the Bureau of Reclamation. Reports on progress are being made at each meeting of the committee.

(e) A controversy over the construction of Moorhead Reservoir in Montana and Wyoming was discussed and agreement reached to postpone action until Montana, Wyoming, and the Bureau of Reclamation had reached an agreement.

(f) Repeated urging by the committee resulted in the production of a comprehensive agricultural program for the entire basin by the Department of Agriculture. This program awaits further action by Congress.

(g) Controversies over the sale and distribution of power from plants being constructed in the Missouri Basin have been discussed at several meetings of the committee, all of the known facts have been presented, and steps are being taken by the various States and the Bureau of Reclamation to bring about a harmonious agreement.

(h) Discussions on methods of future operation of the entire project are under active discussion at this time.

So much for the make-up and workings of the interagency committee.

There appears to be a growing recognition of its role in this great development. Its effectiveness must be measured by the unanimity of the support it receives from the people in the basin.

There are some honest critics of the Missouri Basin program but, in the main, no adverse criticism stems from the well-informed. Therein lies the strength of the interagency committee—to inform the people—critics and supporters alike. To be well-informed on the many complex facets of the program is to support the development. There has always been opposition to the program since it was first proposed and authorized, but this opposition originates largely from interests outside the Missouri River Basin. Charges have been made that the Government bureaus operating under the program are wasting Federal funds, that they are torn by rivalry and have refused to work together. Panaceas have been proposed to demolish the straw men they have constructed. Lately there has been a new rush of criticism and some of it has come from within the Missouri Basin itself. Perhaps the criticism which has been made has received its greatest impetus from a document which was incorporated in the task-force report of the Hoover Commission on natural resources. This task-force report has often been erroneously referred to as a part of the Hoover report. It is not. Apparently the Commission felt that a case study of the Missouri Basin development would yield basic information to assist their Commission in formulating recommendations as to reorganization of the Federal Government for greater efficiency. They, therefore, employed a young professor of geography from the University of Chicago to make such a case study for them. He had never before had any experience in resource-development planning, nor had he ever visited the Missouri River Basin. His case study was based upon such reports, newspaper articles, etc., as he was able to find in libraries and with the aid of conversations with various executives in Washington. Neither the findings nor the recommendations of this case study were quoted by the Commission in its final report. The prestige given to his report is a natural result of its incorporation within the task-force report on natural resources and, therefore, deserves serious consideration in any study of the advantages or disadvantages in carrying out a basin-wide development on such a big scale as is proceeding in the Missouri Basin.

The report occupies some 30 printed pages and is accompanied by a bibliography setting forth the publications used as a basis for the study. The author apparently did not realize that the development has now been proceeding for 5 years and that there is already under way at least 40 percent of the work contemplated in the development. Such a conclusion can be drawn from the opening statement of his report which is as follows:

"For many years Missouri River Basin development has been the subject of an intermittent but fierce struggle between seemingly irreconcilable groups in the United States."

Such a statement might have been true 5 years ago. It certainly has not been true at any time since the development program was authorized by the Congress in December of 1944. Whatever differences of opinion there might have been prior to that time and however bitter the controversies might have been, all were resolved upon the passage of the authorizing act, and from that day to this opponents have been searching in vain for evidences of noncooperation, competition, and waste—without success.

You people in the lower part of the Missouri Basin are well aware of the struggles in the basin and in the Congress over the plans of development before the whole problem was aired within the committees of Congress. You are also aware that since that time there has been such a unanimity of opinion in all parts of the basin that the Congress has appropriated increasing amounts from year to year to carry out the work with very little argument or controversy.

In the summary of the case study to which I am referring there is a prelude to those findings. The statement is made that while the Missouri Basin will benefit greatly from the works to be constructed and other Federal activities in the area, the procedure is not recommended as a pattern for similar development in other areas. Seven conclusions are listed to support this statement. Let me make it clear that those of us who are engaged in this development program do not consider ourselves missionaries to other parts of the United States nor do we contend categorically that what is being accomplished here can be used again in other parts of the country. Each area of the United States has its own peculiar problems, and in outlining a program for other basins the problems peculiar to each should dictate the nature of administration required and the manner in which the work should be executed. We do contend, however, that within the Missouri Basin the job is being accomplished as expeditiously as the funds made available will permit, with a minimum of friction and with a greater degree of cooperation by the various Federal agencies than has ever been attained in the history of the country.

Now, to get back to the seven conclusions in the case study.

1. In referring to the plan, "It has not been sufficiently evaluated in terms of national interest."—It may be the opinion of the author of the report that such evaluation has not been made. Could it be that he is oblivious to the fact that voluminous documents were submitted to the Congress basic to the plan; that extensive public hearings were held all over the basin and within the committees of Congress, and that debate was frequent and furious during the time it was under consideration? When the program was finally authorized it was done by voice vote of Congress. Surely, a great deal of attention had been given to evaluating the project in the national interest, perhaps not by a board of political economists but by the Representatives of the people themselves.

2. "Planning was not undertaken in the proper order, especially because of a lack of basic data * * * Operations have been commenced in the face of uncertainties." There are three clauses in this statement. Let us consider them one by one:

(1) "Planning was not undertaken in the proper order." This is a vague generality.

Who is to determine the proper order, the author of this report? The engineers who did the planning? Or, the Congress, who authorized it? It could not ordinarily be stated that a single person without experience in planning resource development should be the sole judge of the "proper order" in which it should be planned. The Missouri Basin development was planned by qualified engineers and approved by the Congress. There is no clue in the report as to what that proper order should have been, nor has 5 years of experience in carrying out the work disclosed any upside down undertaking to date.

(2) "Especially because of a lack of basic data." I doubt if there ever was a large undertaking commenced of any type in the United States with all so-called required basic data at hand. Indeed, if all development were to await the time when a board of experts had concluded that all basic data necessary were on hand nothing would ever be accomplished. The problem we always face is to accomplish a purpose with available data. If you want 50 additional years of records you must wait another 50 years. The people chose not to wait. We have records of the discharge of the streams for periods from 10 to 50 years on more than 400 individual stations on the streams of the Missouri Basin. We had preliminary surveys of all of the proposed projects. We had preliminary soil classifications of all the land proposed to be irrigated, a background of more than 40 years of experience along these particular lines, and over 70 volumes of basic data gathered in the course of the previous 5 years of intensive study. That the basic data were sufficient and that the planning was sound is evidenced by the fact that after 5 years of intensive and detailed study of the program the over-all changes now in sight amount to less than 10 percent of the plan as first proposed. We are continuing to obtain basic data and we will not have such complete data within the course of the next 40 years, in fact, at no time will there be all the data available that we would like to have.

(3) "Operations have been commenced in the face of uncertainties." The plan was authorized near the close of the greatest war in history. It was started at a time when materials were scarce, there was a distinct undersupply of both labor and skilled personnel, and no one could foresee what the future would bring forth. But, was there ever a time in the history of the United States when an undertaking that may require from 20 to 30 years to complete could be started without uncertainty? Such a time has not occurred nor will it ever in the future. On the other hand, we were dealing with an area with perhaps the least internal development in the country; an area ravaged by drought and flood; an area losing population. It was high time something was to be done about it and the time to begin was when the people agreed that it should begin.

3. "Organization for the administration of the program lacks flexibility." Again, a search of the text fails to reveal why there is inflexibility. By voluntary agreement the work of each of the agencies was laid out for them within their particular expert field. Adjustments are being constantly made in programs to fit the changing conditions from time to time. Flexibility is one of the greatest features in the present procedure as is well illustrated by the fact that the vast agricultural program now proposed in Congress can be fitted into the program as complementary to it and without interference with any of the work now going on. There is flexibility to the highest degree.

4. "Congress and the President are the only effective coordinating authorities." I have taken some considerable time to explain to you the workings of the interagency committee, which is a coordinating body. It was specifically agreed at the beginning of the committee's existence that if agreement could not be reached on any problem it would be referred to higher officials in Washington or to the Congress. To date not a single problem has been thus referred. As for furnishing funds to carry on the work the Congress itself always has been and always will be the final coordinating authority as it should be in any democracy.

5. "There is no complete program for the valley as a whole." Again, who is to judge what is a complete program? The author of this case study? The Congress? The officials of the various agencies? Or, the people themselves? Consideration has been given to every facet of natural-resource development in the basin so far as its features could be recognized, not only by the different departments but by the interagency committee. If there is lacking any part essential to a complete program none of us is aware of it and we would certainly be glad to be informed of such a weakness. The study, however, discloses no part of the text which points out wherein the program is incomplete.

6. "The procedure leaves causes for future sectionalism." In an area as big as the Missouri Basin comprising one-sixth of the area of the United States and, with parts of 10 States involved, sectionalism is inevitable in any over-all program development.

The people in Missouri will worry as to whether they are going to receive too much or too little water; the people in Montana in the other end of the basin will have the same worries. The people in Nebraska will be content if they receive the lion's share of the power in the basin, while the people of South Dakota will worry about their proper share of the power since much of it is developed within their own State. The people in Nebraska may worry because a reservoir in Wyoming on a stream flowing through their State may interfere with some of their water rights. Such worries and fears and evidence of sectionalism could not be avoided under any type of plan or administration and the interagency committee and all other departments and agencies are continually striving to smooth out such worries and apprehensions. But none of these quarrels or arguments have become of any great consequence, nor have they interfered in any way with progress in the development plan. In fact, the wonder is that the States are working together so well and so harmoniously. Could it be because they feel that they are a part of the development themselves, are kept continually advised and are given opportunities to express their feelings before a body which does not meet behind closed doors? Any community or group which is alive to its opportunity under the plan can be heard.

7. "The system of accounting is complex and difficult to understand." With this conclusion I can fully agree, but such a conclusion was drawn by the Hoover Commission on practically every department of the Federal Government. It has always been so and probably always will be so, as long as we are working in a Nation so huge and with such a complex Government organization.

I have dealt at some length on the findings in this particular study simply because it has probably had wide circulation and has been dignified by its association with the Hoover Commission reports, but since I personally have had such a prominent part in the unfolding of this plan and since it has hit directly at the fundamental concepts which motivated the plan, I feel that I am justified in standing up to its defense. There is no intention on my part to be critical of the findings of the Hoover Commission in general. I am treating this study by itself and I hope you will interpret my comments as a contribution to the increase of your knowledge of what is going on and how it is being carried out in the Missouri River Basin.

Let's Beware of a 1950 Munich

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GORDON CANFIELD

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. CANFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under the caption "Let's beware of a 1950 Munich," the Morning Call of Paterson, N. J., editorially contends that history will show that the good will and friendship of a hostile conquest-bound nation cannot be bought, and the proposal for our country to spend $50,000,000,000 as economic aid to Communist Russia to obtain peace would be the writing of another Munich. This editorial was written by the Call's editor, Henry A. Williams, who was an aviator in World War I. The editorial follows:

LET'S BEWARE OF A 1950 MUNICH

Through all the pages of history there is no recorded instance, to our recollection, of successfully buying the good will and friendship of a hostile, conquest-bound nation. It was tried in the ancient days of glorious Greece and later of the mighty Roman Empire. It was tried in the more recent era of the diabolic Hitler 20 centuries later. It was tried in the case of militaristic Japan, only to have our own scrap iron and oil rain down death upon our fellow citizens from Jap planes at Pearl Harbor.

It is hard, therefore, to believe that the majority of our Congressmen in the Senate and House of Representatives, who profess to be solicitous of the taxpaying citizens of America, will be so gullible as to fall in with last week's proposal of Senator McMAHON of Connecticut. This contemplates the spending of fifty billions of United States dollars (none of any of our allies, mind you) on a peace crusade involving economic aid to Communist Russia, which now has billions of its own to spend on atomic weapons, as well as to our more friendly associates in the United Nations. * * * Where could one find a better way, from the Moscow viewpoint, for us to play into the hands of Russia's Communist conspirators who have pledged their lives to the destruction of our constitutional democracy.

Every international event since Japan's surrender adds proof to the Call's long-held conviction that the present crop of fanatical Soviet leaders will never abandon their Marxian dream of world conquest until forced to. Before our statesmen's eyes they have been allowed to acquire new territory and subject millions of people to the status of serfdom, and to seize spoils of war, much of which belonged by the rules of war to the United States rather than to Russia. Instead of showing appreciation to our Government for acceding to their demands, they have taken these concessions as a sign of American weakness and an invitation to go a step further in defying us and all their former allies.

Russia still owes our country millions upon millions in lend-lease and her wealth-laden leaders show not the slightest desire to live up to her agreement and pay it back. How then can we for a moment expect them to live up to an agreement to stop making atomic weapons and scrap those already made if we lower ourselves in their eyes by seeking to buy Stalin's signature with a billion or more dollars? Honor from people of dishonor can never be purchased by dollar bills. That kind of attempted appeasement might prove to be Munich all over again, but on an even more calamitous scale.

Religious and Racial Bigotry in George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, on this two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I am sickened by learning of the recent outburst of religious and racial bigotry in the head of the university which was founded by Washington, which bears his name in the city which is his namesake, and which was chartered by Congress over a century ago with a specific prohibition of discrimination.

Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin has in recent weeks, and to my intense sorrow and disappointment, conducted himself in a pattern reminiscent of the late and unlamented Herr Dr. Goebbels. The disgraceful situation at George Washington University, the only Jim Crow institution of higher learning in the District of Columbia, has come to a head in this most completely incongruous time, the week in which we celebrate the memory of the founder of his country; the period proclaimed Brotherhood Week; the week in which the District of Columbia has discovered that its un-American pattern of discrimination and segregation is illegal.

It was not many weeks ago that the George Washington Hatchet, student weekly, ran an editorial declaring it was time for GWU to rejoin the United States by abandoning its anti-Negro policy. George Washington left 50 shares of C. & O. Canal Co. stock to found a college "to teach democracy to the people." James Monroe and John Quincy Adams supported and patronized Columbian College, out of which GWU grew.

The Newman Club, the Hillel Foundation of B'nai B'rith, and a number of Protestant and secular student groups endorsed the editorial.

There was no reaction from the president of the university until the Jewish press widely reprinted a brief story sent out of Washington by Milton Friedman, JTA correspondent here.

Immediately the wrath of Olympus descended on Hillel Director Irwin Glatstein. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Dr. B. H. Jarman called on Glatstein. Not satisfied with Glatstein's assertion that he could not confirm or disavow the statements in the JTA story except as to the resolution, Jarman haled Glatstein before the great man himself for a 1½-hour stormy interview.

JTA says that Dr. Marvin threatened to have Glatstein fired, and later tried to carry out the threat; that he also threatened to ban Hillel from the campus; that he talked wildly of a Jewish plot against the university and demanded that Glatstein sign a letter dictated by Marvin saying the JTA story was untrue. Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, national director of Hillel Foundations, was forced to come to Washington in an effort to smooth out the row, in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

The Jewish community of Washington is up in arms.

During depression days, Abram Lisner and other Jewish philanthropists bailed out George Washington University when the going was tough. Lisner Auditorium was built by funds bequeathed by Abram Lisner. By his direction the Bill of Rights is inscribed on the walls. His direct command that no discrimination be practiced is openly flouted by barring Negro citizens from the hall. At various times Protestant churches and private philanthropists have helped George Washington University. Yet so far as I am aware there is not a single Negro student in the university, and the medical school follows the infamous AMA quota system.

For the benefit of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin I want to quote from the famous Washington letter to the Hebrew congregation at Newport:

> The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy. * * * All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions effectual support.

Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the great American who helped free the slaves and the man who tried to impose a permanent pattern of segregation on the District of Columbia, is vice president of George Washington University.

The Lincoln Philosophy of Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a Lincoln Day address entitled "The Lincoln Philosophy of Government," delivered by me at Tuscon, Ariz., on February 14, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

After I received the invitation to join you here at this celebration of Lincoln's birthday, I spent some little time in thought and study about what to talk about. I got hold of a biography of Lincoln. Although I have read Lincoln's life before rather carefully, I got a great deal of pleasure out of glancing through those volumes again. I also secured a collection of quotations from Lincoln's speeches, letters, and other statements.

As I read this material, I could not help but becoming enthusiastic about joining you here today for your Lincoln Day celebration. I got this feeling because as I read over some of the things that Lincoln had said, it struck me so forcibly how directly they applied to the problems we face today. It almost seemed that I was reading the work of some great statesman who was commenting on the problems of 1950.

For example, listen to these words of Lincoln: "Coming expenditures must be met, and the present debt must be paid; and money cannot always be borrowed for these objects. The system of loans is but temporary in its nature, and must soon explode. It is a system not only ruinous while it lasts, but one that must soon fail and leave us destitute. As an individual who undertakes to live by borrowing soon finds his original means devoured by interest, and next no one left to borrow from, so must it be with a government."

How could any comment be more to the point of our present problem? This administration would have you believe that some new formula has been found that makes deficit financing or borrowing money a good idea. This quotation from Abraham Lincoln shows us clearly that there is nothing new about Government financial problems. There is nothing progressive or modern about going into debt. Then, as now, there was a tendency for demagogic governments to promise more than they could perform. That is as old as the hills.

Lincoln faced that issue frankly and boldly. He knew that excessive spending and borrowing would destroy the national prosperity, and particularly, the prosperity of the average man. That is why he was so firmly against it—because he knew that the chief burden would fall on the average man.

There is one thing he probably did not know. I doubt if he ever could have imagined any national administration throwing around such gigantic sums of money as Harry Truman's $42,000,000,000 budget. Do you know how much it cost President Lincoln to run his administration during the entire Civil War? In 4 years his administration spent just $3,250,000,000. That was the entire cost of the Civil War and all the other Federal expenses during those 4 years. That $3,250,000,000 would be enough to last this administration not quite 1 month.

In fact, it is hard to get any realization of what a tremendous money-spending machine our Federal Government has become. During the nearly 5 years since Truman became President, he has spent more than all the 32 Presidents spent before him in the 156 years up to the beginning of the Second World War. The war has been over for almost 5 years now, and yet the Government is still spending at a rate five times as great as President Roosevelt's average rate of peacetime spending. Before the war we used to think that F. D. R. was a fairly expensive President.

Of course, when I talk about President Truman's spending, I am talking about just those programs that are already in effect. I don't include those spending programs that Congress has refused to authorize, such as the Brannan plan for agriculture and the socialized medical proposal. If Congress gave the President everything he asked for, we would hit some new high records on spending. That is why it is all-important to send some more Republican Congressmen and Senators to Washington.

Lincoln stood for sound finance. He also stood for another ideal which is even more important, and that is human freedom. We meet today at a critical time in the history of our Nation and the world. While vast areas of the earth are being covered with tyranny, we meet to honor a man who not only believed in freedom but fought for freedom. Much of the world seems to have retreated into a new kind of dark ages. It is particularly fitting at such a time that we turn our eyes once more to a man who stood

out as a symbol of light and hope at another time when darkness seemed to be moving over the face of the earth.

We meet to honor a man about whom numberless eulogies have been written and speeches have been made. Nothing ever has affected the American people so greatly and so unanimously as the assassination of Abraham Lincoln in 1865.

A tree is best measured when it is down. Men who had never considered Lincoln great while he was alive suddenly went into deep mourning for one whose works they suddenly understood.

Why did Lincoln's death bring so many men—North and South—to their knees in prayer? Why have we not been able to forget him although he has been dead for almost 85 years? I think I can tell you why.

Abraham Lincoln lived by great principles. He built his life on those principles. He developed, step by step, a philosophy of government based on the finest of the American tradition he inherited. He could give more life and meaning to those principles of government because he himself had gone through a hard life on a harsh frontier.

He had been handed an ax when but a lad and told to start cutting. He had hewn rails by the thousands. He had felt the cutting chill of a prairie wind against his worn clothing. He had tried a variety of occupations and had struggled to establish himself as a prairie lawyer. In political life he had known both success and failure, but until his election to the Presidency, more failure than success. Even during his term as President, he was subjected to the most unjust and unworthy criticism and ridicule.

In short, by the time of his death Abraham Lincoln symbolized America as no other man could. He bore in his heart and his mind the spirit of the honest toil that has created America. He revealed, by his speech, the pride of living in a free land under a free government. None before him and none after him was able to state so well as he the principles by which he lived and to stir the people as he could. His supremacy in leading the people by those principles was due to the fact that he expressed those principles in his personal life.

What are some of those principles that Lincoln lived by? Before I answer that, let me say this. Times change. The appliances that we use change. Circumstances and problems change. But principles never change. Lincoln's principles were sound because they have stood the test of time. Those principles are still sound today.

I have mentioned the fact that Lincoln did not believe in phony finance that swindled the people out of half of their savings and their earnings by cutting the buying power of their money in half. One of his principles was simple honesty, and that quality is something we need badly in public life today.

I have also mentioned his love of freedom. He sought to free the slaves but he also sought to maintain the freedoms of the average man against Government regimentation and Government confiscation. He said on one occasion, and I quote: "We see it and to us it appears like principle, and the best sort of principle at that—the principle of allowing the people to do as they please with their own business." On another occasion he said: "Let not him who is houseless pull down the house of another, but let him work diligently and build one for himself, thus by example assuring that his own shall be safe from violence when built."

He believed that every man was entitled to the fruits of his own labor and that the Government had no right to take them from him.

He was a practical statesman as well as an idealist. He knew that once the process of Government regimentation and of confiscating wealth began, it would be very difficult to stop. He said, and I quote: "A house divided cannot stand. I believe this Government cannot endure permanently half slave and half free." He referred, of course, to the immediate challenge before him—the issue of Negro slavery. But in a broader sense the words ring true when applied to our economic problems today. We cannot long maintain a free political system if our economic system is not free. We cannot have socialism and capitalism at the same time, no matter what President Truman may say. The systems are the very opposite of each other. If we have socialized medicine, socialized farming, socialized banking, socialized housing, how can we have a free economic system?

The entry of government into new fields always has meant a gradual strangling and elimination of free economic forces in that field. The Germans tried it and got war instead of security. The British have a poor house. The Russians have a police state. It is the lesson of experience that if the government goes into the housing business to any extent it drives out those who want to construct private homes. If it goes into the railroad business, privately owned railroads cannot long stand against subsidized competition. It is the same in every field. The government cannot afford, once it is engaged in any economic operation, to have competition. To allow competition is to allow the people to see the inefficiency of government operation. For free men working freely are able to do a better, more resourceful job than men who are working for a top-heavy centralized government, tied up in every step by red tape and excessive supervision from top to bottom.

That is the central issue we must face today. Shall we move toward a greater and greater concentration of power in Washington? If we adopt the President's program, control of something like half our economic system will be in the hands of the Federal Government. If we reach that point can we remain half controlled and half free? Or will the growing power of the Federal Government be able to pull us the rest of the way toward socialism until every man's daily life and activities are completely controlled. Remember that socialism, practically speaking, is nothing more nor less than an extreme concentration of power in the hands of the central government.

The trend toward totalitarianism of some sort has been running pretty strong over a good part of the world, but perhaps you don't realize that all of these various types of centralized government are merely varieties of socialism. We used to call the Hitler doctrines fascism, but Hitler himself called it national socialism. We usually call the British Government a labor government, but it calls itself a socialist government. And don't forget the correct name for the Government of Russia is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We have our own brand of Socialists in this country too, only here they don't generally call themselves Socialists. There is a Socialist Party and a Communist Party, but most of the Socialists in America don't belong to those parties. They have found it more expedient to join up with the Democratic Party, gain control of its party machinery, wrap themselves in its traditions of Andrew Jackson and Thomas Jefferson, and pretend to espouse its time-honored principles. They refer to themselves as believers in economic planning or perhaps in a controlled economy. They never use the ugly word "Socialist." In practical effect if they succeed in their aims, they will have changed our form of government.

There are several roads to socialism and the Socialists in this country have been smart enough to choose those roads that arouse the least opposition. For example, this administration does not generally talk much about Government ownership of our major industries. That might arouse too much public opposition and criticism. They believe they can achieve the same results through controls over business and industry and through confiscation of a major portion of the people's income through taxation. If they can concentrate all power in Washington, they can run the country just as if it were a fully socialist state.

Observe how closely the proposals of the President follow the path that has already been laid down in socialist England. The Ewing proposal for socialized medicine is almost an exact duplicate of the British health program which has failed so miserably. In fact, Mr. Ewing, during his visit to England, pointed out the similarity and openly said that his program would draw directly on the experience of the British.

Take a look at the Brannan plan for agriculture. Under this proposal farmers would be subsidized to produce and overproduce so that the market would be flooded with farm surpluses, and farm prices would fall to unbelievably low levels. Then Mr. Brannan promises he would pay the farmer directly with a Government check enough to give him a living income. The result, according to Mr. Brannan, would be low prices to consumers and high incomes to farmers. I don't need to point out the obvious catch in this plan. Anything you saved on your grocery bill you would have to pay on your tax bill. That stands to reason. That is the way it works in England where they have the same system.

There is another point to this Brannan plan which is more subtle. Once the farmer's market has been destroyed, he will be completely dependent on his Government check for a living. The income he gets from the sale of his produce at the market place will be too small to live on. He will be so dependent on that Government check that he won't dare to argue with the Government official about the program or about his rights.

I can imagine one year they will pay him for producing. Perhaps the next year they will pay him for not producing. The third year maybe they will run out of money and not pay him at all. He wouldn't be in a position to argue or complain if he gets a raw deal. He will just be a pawn in a vast system of regimentation. He will have to do what the Government bureau tells him to do, regardless of how impractical it may be.

Take another example—the Federal housing program or programs, because there are so many that I can hardly keep them straight. Last year Congress passed a bill to subsidize housing for the low-income groups. The subsidy for this limited program alone will be vast and extremely burdensome. I can't tell you just how large the subsidy will be because it will spread over a 40- or 50-year period, divided between Federal, State and local governments and mixed up with tax exemptions and fancy financing.

This year we have up in Congress another bill which is supposed to take care of housing for the middle-income groups. It is another vast subsidy program, but it is not called that. The subsidies are cloaked under a system of low-interest-rate loans, tax exemptions and maturities running far beyond sound lending practices. I am certain that this program also, if enacted, will run into heavy expense to the taxpayer but no one can say just how much it will amount to. If this bill is enacted to go along with the public housing law of last year, we will then have the Federal Government in the field of both lower income and middle-income housing, and that makes up about two-thirds of the entire housing field.

Altogether, the Ewing proposal for socialized medical care, the Brannan plan for socialized agriculture, and the new program for socialized housing would put the real basic needs of the average man—food, shelter, and

health—on a substantially subsidized basis. And once you subsidize all these basic needs, you can control both their production and their use.

There is another road to socialism which our economic planners are also following, and that is the road of excessive spending and taxation. I mentioned the President's $42,000,000,000 budget. The taxes to support this program will not only break the back of American industry; they will also confiscate the surplus of the average workingman.

When we talk about destroying the incentive to produce, we mean the incentive of the average man on a salary or a wage just as much as the incentive of the businessman who is working for profit. In England today, a working man is not interested in overtime work even at time and a half. Too little of what he makes on that extra pay is left to him after the Government income tax. He has no hope of bettering himself by working an extra day or by trying for a job with better pay. He has resigned himself to a life of poverty.

The excessive concentration of power in Washington has been brought about to a material extent through these gigantic spending programs. The kind of budget that the President proposed is a long step on the road to socialism. We have to fight against excessive spending, just as we have to fight against direct regulations and controls from Washington.

And in that connection, I can't resist quoting another great American, Thomas Jefferson. Of course, the Democrats claim Jefferson and sometimes they hold celebrations in his honor, but they never quote him. They never quote him because they can't find anything he ever said that backs up what they are doing. On one occasion, Jefferson said: "I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest dangers to be feared. * * * To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. * * * If we run into such debts, we must be taxed in our meat and drink, in our necessities and our comforts, in our labors and in our amusements. * * * If we can prevent the Government from wasting the labors of the people, under the pretense of caring for them, they will be happy."

Thomas Jefferson was speaking of the New Dealers, Fair Dealers, demagogues of his day. Political demogogy is not a new invention. Jefferson knew about it and Lincoln had plenty of demagogues to deal with in his time. There have been plenty of men in every age who have promised that every problem would be taken care of if only they were given more and more power. Lincoln knew how to handle such men. He faced the issues boldly and courageously. He did not try to fool the people. Instead, he told them frankly what the problem was, how it could be handled and what he proposed to do about it if elected to office. He did not always win, but when he did win he was in a position to perform the supreme service for our country.

He knew two and two always make four—and he could give that moral a homely application that made it clear to the average man of his day. One story is told by a Mr. Roland Diller, one of his neighbors in Springfield, that illustrates his practical wisdom. Mr. Diller tells us that one day he heard the cries of children in the street. When he looked, he saw Lincoln striding by with two of his boys, both of them wailing at the top of their lungs. "Why, Mr. Lincoln, what's the matter with the boys?" Diller asked. "Just what's the matter with the whole world," Lincoln replied. "I've got three walnuts and each boy wants two."

That's what's the matter with so many of the New Deal and Fair Deal promises. They promise you a great deal more than they can perform. They tell you that they are going to give you this or that, but when the time comes to make good on the promises, they pay you off in 50-cent dollars.

Whenever any of us have criticized any of these peculiar New Deal and Fair Deal programs, it has been customary for them to call us all sorts of names, and say that we are reactionaries and against all progress. You know that is not true. Of course I believe in progress and I am willing to work for it and to fight for it in Congress and elsewhere. For example, most Republicans believe we should expand our present system of Government security until its provides real security, not phony security, to everyone. All of us are in favor of making real progress. We want to build up our land. We want to see the desert bloom. We want to see public improvements and we want to see the number of happy people increased day by day. That is not the real question we are arguing. The real point is, What kind of progress; and progress toward what? If we are going to progress toward a police state, I am against it. But if we are going to progress toward more production, more security, a fair distribution of the world's goods, better living for all, I am for it.

Can we make progress by wasting billions of dollars? Of course not. Can we make real progress by promising people more money for less work, something for nothing, when it is impossible to deliver on those promises? Of course not. Is it progress to pay off social-security obligations to our old people with a 50-cent dollar? Of course it isn't. If we are going to make real progress, we had better think about setting up a sound system that will really work. If you measure progress as I do—by the number of happy homes with well-fed, well-clothed children—you will agree that we have made very little progress under the New Deal and under the Fair Deal. When Lincoln spoke of progress, he did not mean a booby-trap type of progress that offers you a benefit with one hand and picks your tax pocket with the other.

There are plenty of other issues I would like to talk about but I haven't time for all of them. There is one that I want to mention particularly. It is one that Lincoln had to deal with, also. Abraham Lincoln believed in reserving the American market for the American producer. He is the real father of the Republican system of protective tariffs; the system under which America made more and faster progress than it ever has before or since.

Ever since 1934 when the Trade Agreements Act was first passed, the State Department has been promising us everything from peace to prosperity as a result of those trade agreements. We know that the trade agreements did not give us peace, and we have not achieved real peace even yet. As for prosperity, I don't think we will ever get that by importing goods and exporting jobs.

Before I came out here, I stopped to look up what had happened to some of the industries of Arizona as a result of this trade-agreements program. I can tell you that the facts I obtained really shocked me.

Arizona is a leading copper-producing State. The prosperity of the copper mines is highly important to the prosperity of Arizona. Under trade agreements negotiated by the State Department, your protective tax has been cut from 4 cents to 2 cents per pound and for a temporary period suspended entirely. As a result of that reduction, imports in 1948 for domestic consumption amounted to 466,000 tons of copper content. And for only the first 9 months of 1949, it amounted to 417,000 tons, an even faster rate of imports. That imported copper threw American miners out of jobs. American mine production has run about 100,000 tons less than it did last year, and about 300,000 tons less than it did during the peak war years.

The story on lead is about the same. The tariff on lead has been about cut in half. Lead imports for consumption last year amounted to 318,000 tons, and in the first 9 months of this year, ran over 228,000 tons. Before the war, there were no imports to speak of. Meanwhile our domestic production has been declining steadily. In 1937—which was not a terribly prosperous year—domestic mines produced 465,000 tons. In 1948 American production had fallen to only 390,000 tons. I don't know how many displaced jobs those imports represent. I am sure it is substantial.

Zinc is another good example. The tariff on zinc has been cut in half. Zinc imports before the war didn't amount to anything but in 1948 they were over 226,000 tons, and during the first 9 months of 1949 they were 167,000. Meanwhile American production of zinc ore in terms of zinc content was only 630,000 short tons last year, a decline of over 100,000 tons from the peak figure reached a few years ago. The trade-agreements policy has just simply exported to foreign countries the jobs of the miners who used to produce that 100,000 tons of zinc.

That is one of the most important problems we have to face. We are going to have to install a flexible import-tariff policy to replace the so-called reciprocal trade policy of the New Dealers, which is not reciprocal in the least. Under it, import rates have been reduced on more than 1,500 items and there has been not one single rate increased. Under it, factories have become idle and men have lost lifetime jobs. In some States the unemployment-insurance fund has been exhausted. Unless we change these socialized deals in Washington, there will be many million of idle men in America.

We Republicans have a terrific job to do. First of all, we will have to work and organize more effectively than we have ever done before. We will have to show the people where these policies are leading us. We will have to show how false the New Deal and the Fair Deal policies are. We will have to show how real progress can be made. We will have to organize effectively at the grass roots, at the precinct level, if we expect to win elections.

Lincoln had his election problems, too. After serving as a Congressman, he was defeated for reelection, and then in 1858 he was defeated again. During his Presidency, his wise, far-seeing policies were threatened time and time again by the dangers of a political overturn. Lincoln maintained a calm faith in the face of these obstacles. He did not give up his principles and he never stopped fighting. If we Republicans expect to carry on his tradition, we will have to be just as firm in our faith as he was.

Then when we come into power, we will have the biggest job of all. We will have to clear up the evil results of years and years of misrule. There are a lot of things we will have to do. First and foremost, we have got to put a stop to this movement in disguise toward socialism. That means we have got to stop spending ourselves into socialism. Modern Socialists figure on carrying us into socialism by one or the other of those two means. If they can tax private industry to death, they can make us all dependent on the Federal Government for jobs. Maybe that is what the President had in mind when he proposed a few days ago that the income-tax allowance for mineral depletion be taken away from the mining and oil companies.

Another thing we will have to do is to clean the administration out thoroughly of all the Red sympathizers and fellow travelers. I won't speak of Alger Hiss because even the administration now admits that he is a bad one. It would be impossible to say how much damage he did to our security on such occasions as the Yalta Conference. But, at least, he is out of the Government now. I am thinking more of those with the

same cast of mind as Hiss, who are still in the Government. It is an extraordinary thing when the Secretary of State, the man who holds the threads of peace and war in his hands, publicly announces his faith and sympathy in a convicted spy. It is still more extraordinary when it is the same man who has been telling us for months past that the best thing to do with China is to let the Communists have it. When the clean-up finally comes in Washington. I certainly hope it starts with the State Department.

There are a lot of other things we will have to do, too—too many for me to mention today. It will be a big job, but I believe we can do it if we all work together. In the meantime, the important thing is to go to work and elect Republicans to office.

We must give the people a definite choice between our system and the system of those who propose to overturn it. We must meet the danger boldly and firmly, not by compromise and half measures. We must know what we stand for and be unafraid in defending that stand. We have the best system in the world in this country, and we should have no hesitancy in saying so.

Lincoln fought for what he believed in. When the Republican Party has dared to fight, it has won. Lincoln said: "Let us have faith that right makes might; and in that faith let us to the end dare to do our duty as we understand it." That was Lincoln's way. I hope it is still the way of the Republican Party.

Is This a Government Under Law or Is It a Government of Men?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, is this a government under law or is it a government of men? Under leave to extend my remarks, heretofore granted, I am inserting the following article by David Lawrence, which appeared in the New York Herald Tribune of February 21, 1950:

GETTING MINERS TO WORK IS CALLED RESPONSIBILITY OF TRUMAN ADMINISTRATION, NOT COURTS

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 21.—This week has witnessed a serious break-down of democracy—a sacrifice of the prestige of the Government itself on the altar of political expediency and group selfishness.

The failure of the coal miners to obey the Federal Court injunction is not just an incident in a labor dispute. It has nothing to do with the merits of any wage or labor controversy as such. It has everything to do with the fact that tens of thousands of American citizens have decided to disobey their Government's judicial decrees.

This amounts to open insurrection. The only saving grace about it is that the rank and file of the miners probably do not know that they cannot lawfully defy an injunction. They do not know that they cannot even hold a union meeting and vote to refrain from work when there is a court order telling the union not to exercise such influence.

SITUATION MISCONSTRUED

The union leaders, on the other hand, have counsel. They have education. They know what it means to ignore a court order as a group. It is amazing, moreover, to note how many persons of education outside the coal industry have also misconstrued the situation, weakly commenting that there is nothing anybody can do to get coal mined—that no injunction can get the coal mined.

This is tantamount to saying that an insurrection in the United States cannot be coped with by the Government itself and that the majesty of the judicial authority has vanished. The idea that the right to strike in concert as a union is inviolate and supersedes the rights of a court of the United States is one that has been mistakenly nurtured for a long time by the radical groups in America. The present administration is culpable because it has sabotaged both the spirit and the letter of the present labor-management law through a prolonged period of inaction.

Today the Nation is suffering a tremendous economic loss apart from the inconvenience arising from the shortage of coal. The Truman administration refused to apply for an injunction until the crisis reached a danger point. Now, in the face of determined opposition by rebels against judicial authority, the administration is content with the filing of a contempt charge against the union and a 4-day lapse before any hearing is held on the charges.

All last week the court's order was flouted. No contempt charges were filed. The evidence was published in the press. The miners held meetings and, in effect, voted to violate the injunction. News of these acts has been broadcast. Judicial notice apparently could not be taken of such violations until the Department of Justice was ready to present evidence to the court. Had an act of contempt been committed before the court, the judge would have been empowered to act immediately, but, since the incidents occur far and wide, it is necessary for the evidence to be presented by the Department of Justice as petitioner.

WASTE OF TIME SEEN

Seemingly the refusal of the miners to go back to work and the apparent unwillingness of the locals to obey the instructions given them by the miners' chief officer were not adequate to impress the administration here that quicker action could be taken. As a consequence of this slowness, more time is wasted and more economic loss is inflicted.

Judge Keech, before whom the contempt charges will be tried, is a former executive assistant to President Truman but there is no indication that he is to blame.

The responsibility for pressing the court to act on the contempt charges and to mete out fines or other punishment to those violating the injunction rests squarely on the administration rather than the court.

What's Wrong With the American Lawyer?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GUY M. GILLETTE

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address on the subject, What's Wrong With the American Lawyer, delivered by Luther L. Hill, publisher of the Des Moines Register Tribune, before the Harvard Law School Forum, at Cambridge, Mass., on February 8, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Dean Griswold, members of the faculty, students of the law, and friends, when your program chairman asked me to be with you tonight, I, frankly, was pleased. "The halls of history," it is said, "are constantly filled with the sound of wooden shoes going up the stairs and patent leather ones coming down." Your law school and its graduates are a refreshing exception to that observation. Perhaps because here is practiced the admonition of "that which thy fathers hath bequeathed to thee, thou must earn again, if thou wouldst possess it."

The title "What's Wrong With the American Lawyer" has a belligerent ring and reminds me of my friend Pat Murphy who was very sick and the padre was sent for. The padre, looking down at Pat, said, "You are a very sick man, you may not be with us much longer, you must at once embrace the Lord and renounce the devil." Pat looked up at the padre and said, "As sick as I am and the life I have led, I am in no position to renounce anyone." So let's change a few words and say the subject is A Layman Looks at the Lawyer.

Speaking with you in this historic building of rare grace and dignity, I cannot but reflect that except for the untimely interference of a certain William Hohenzollern, one time King of Prussia and Emperor of Germany, I would be a member of your chosen profession.

Yet, I have not lived isolated from the atmosphere of the law. My brother, three uncles, one of whom is a graduate of your law school, and innumerable first cousins are lawyers—not to mention a hostage to the future—my son. From all these, I gather that the law is a jealous mistress and demands your close attention. The potency of your reputation was brought home to me when I mentioned to a friend about being here tonight and he said, "You are like the chap who entered a mule in the Kentucky Derby—he knew he couldn't win but thought he would benefit by the association."

As members of the legal profession, you profess to have acquired special knowledge to be used by way of either instructing, guiding, or advising others in a way that promotes their interest or happiness. For perspective, let me say there are 180,000 lawyers in this country compared with 22,000 architects; 78,000 authors, editors, and reporters; 140,000 clergymen; 76,000 college presidents, professors, and instructors; 71,000 dentists; 152,000 doctors; 100,000 civil engineers; 1,100,000 teachers; 5,300,000 farmers; and 250,000 insurance agents and brokers.

There are two aspects in which I wish to consider the 180,000 lawyers. First, as professional men, qualified to advise and act for private clients in regard to their legal affairs. The other as citizens learned in the laws of the land, familiar with the Government of the country, and peculiarly competent to assist in the conduct of the community and the State.

As to the first aspect, I say that today the lawyer's place in trade, in finance, in business affairs, is unique—stronger and more entrenched than ever before. The whole fabric of the business world is permeated by the law—the lawyer's influence is far greater than other serving professions: engineers, economists, statisticians, analysts, accountants, advertising, public-relation experts, etc. In short, if the businessman sometimes finds it difficult to live with the lawyer, he finds it impossible to live without him.

This strategic position now occupied by the lawyer is due primarily to the growth and the presence of the corporate era, together with the legal and political conditions arising therefrom. The spread of Government

controls, perhaps as an inevitable result of the problems so created, over most fields of business activity has enormously increased the need for legal services. One businessman expressed his feelings by saying that "what started as a government of laws not of men, has ended as a government of lawyers and not of men."

What do I, as an individual or as an officer of a corporation, expect of my lawyer? I agree with George Shattuck, law partner of Oliver Wendell Holmes, "the business of a lawyer is to know law,"—he must keep abreast of changes. In other words, be prepared and that means constant study. Now, I realize that to ask for unqualified opinions on most legal problems is absurd. Mr. Justice Brandeis aptly described the lawyer's position thusly: "I can tell you where the edge of the cliff is, but I cannot tell you how hard or in what direction the wind will be blowing when you pass it."

Second, my lawyer must study and know not only the law but be equipped to advise and counsel with me on economics, politics, and the related social sciences. I ask him to adjust law to life. To remember and to remind me that we are dealing with human beings, and not just things.

I want advice before wrong action is taken and thus prevent trouble. I ask him to accept the responsibility of seeing that his client is legally fit and well. Legal planning is essential to a successful business operation.

I need to feel that confidential information may be given him without any fear of disclosure.

I ask for the skill in negotiations which comes from an innate sense of fairness and honesty combined with the will to win.

Yes; the law is referred to as the calling of thinkers. I believe that the specifications of my lawyer are in keeping with that definition and I trust you would not have it otherwise. Parenthetically, may I say that our general counsel, a graduate of your school, fully meets, in my judgment, every requisite I have just enumerated.

Let us now observe the lawyer in a broader sense as a specially equipped citizen. We are privileged to live in one of the decisive periods of history. Our country urgently needs the services which you are being prepared to give. Such a role is your heritage.

The judgment of history as of today says America was a colony—not her own master. Under the leadership of lawyers we became free, have grown, prospered, and, better still, preserved freedom and opportunity, the like of which the world has never before seen. It is unnecessary to tell of the faith this Nation has placed in her lawyers—as, for instance, the one simple fact that for the 160 years of selection of their Presidents the people of the United States have chosen a lawyer three times out of four. Approximately 1 person out of 800 of our population is a lawyer, yet this small minority has held, roughly, 70 percent of the positions of Government trust and authority.

No tradition of your profession is more cherished than that of leadership in public affairs. As Fowler Hamilton recently wrote, "The political traditions and the gifts for government that have enabled the United States to maintain dynamic balance find expression in laws and the task of reconciling the concentration of business power and labor power with our characteristic democratic dispersal of political power can be performed only by the legal processes, of which the lawyer is an essential part"; and, I might add, the most essential part.

The great figures of the law inspire our reverence, as they have used their special gifts for the advancement of public interest. Yet, candor would force the admission that today the bar does not occupy its traditional position of public influence and leadership. The changes have come by almost imperceptible stages and are only now beginning to be recognized. I mention these changes, not to condemn, but to describe. The changed character of the lawyer's work has made it difficult for him to see himself and his profession in proper perspective. No longer does his list of clients represent a cross-section of society. The demands of practice are more exacting. He is more a man of action and less a student of history and government. Big business, big labor, and big government have produced inevitable specializations of the bar. The successful lawyer is today very often the general manager of a mass production factory of legal products.

More and more the amount of his income is a measure of his professional success. These conditions have given us a bar whose leaders, like its rank and file, are on the whole, less likely to be well rounded professional men than their predecessors. The energy and talent for public service and for bringing the law into harmony with present conditions have been largely absorbed in the advancement of the interests of clients. The changed system has, at best, given the commercial world a superior proficiency and technical skill, but at its worst, it has made the learned legal profession the servant of the market place and tainted it with like morals and manners. I am not unaware that criticism of lawyers and law administration is no new thing. Much of it is merely a reflection of dissatisfaction with the prevailing political and social order.

To me, as a layman, the license which you will obtain to practice law is not a right, but a privilege to be granted, or withheld, or withdrawn by the court. The bar has been properly called a "democratic aristocracy," democratic in that its ranks are open to all who meet the requirements prescribed by law and aristocratic in the true sense, being a body of selected citizens qualified by learning and character to advise upon the laws of the land.

What are the standards which a layman has a right to expect of you as citizen lawyers?

1. The making of money shall be secondary. It must not be the sole standard of success or measure of service rendered. Here I would like to interpose and say, as a businessman, that lawyers, as a group are poorly paid, mind you, I did not say underpaid. According to available figures for the year 1948, the median income for all lawyers was $6,336.

2. Your sense of public service shall be at least equal to that of a minister or a doctor. The lawyer must be conscious of a feeling of trusteeship for he is a necessary part of the State's function of administering justice—in the part he plays, he is just as essential as the judge.

3. The practice of law represents the applied science of law just as medicine represents the applied sense of biology and chemistry.

Thus, set apart as a profession, you must practice your legal ethics which limit, yet uplift your means of livelihood. This philosophy of conduct is something that a lawyer must practice in his day-to-day dealings with his individual clients and the public.

What does a representative cross section of men and women think about the legal profession? Through the research department of the Register & Tribune Co. of Des Moines, using the accepted techniques of public opinion research, I can give you some of the answers from the people of Iowa. For the benefit of those not so fortunate as to live in Iowa or to be familiar with it, may I say that the State ranks in the top 5 percent of all the States in literacy and that its economy is evenly balanced between agriculture and industry. In Iowa we have a thrifty, homogeneous population with a high general level of well-being. You may be skeptical of such a survey. I don't claim it is 100 percent or 95 percent accurate, but the pattern is there.

One of the questions which the trained interviewers asked was: "Which one of the following do you regard as the most important in protecting your personal rights—the President of the United States—the courts—Congress. Forty-seven percent said the courts, 25 percent said all three equally, 17 percent Congress, 5 percent the President, and 6 percent had no opinion.

Have you ever hired a lawyer to handle something for you? Forty-nine percent said "Yes" and 51 percent replied "No."

Incidentally, one out of five believed they were charged too much for the legal services they obtained.

If you had a legal claim for damages, do you think you would settle out of court for one-half or less of what you felt you had coming to you rather than go into court and maybe recover the full amount? Forty-three percent would settle for one-half or less, 34 percent would go to court, and 23 percent were undecided.

A great many of our Senators, Congressmen, legislators, and other elected governmental officials are lawyers. In general, do you think having lawyers elected to these offices has been good or bad for our country? A strong majority considered that this had been a good thing for the country. It is interesting to note that the favorable majority is stronger among women than it is among men.

How does the public rate your profession along with other professions and businesses? The research people took a list of seven groups: doctors, bankers, teachers, businessmen, lawyers, farmers, and dentists. The list was presented in alphabetical order and the question was asked which group the people thought did the best job of leading and participating in worth while community affairs. The businessmen were at the head of the list; teachers second; farmers third; bankers fourth; doctors fifth; lawyers sixth; with dentists bringing up the rear.

What do our people consider the best life work for their sons if they plan to go to college? Engineering was at the head of the list, which is not surprising, since this is widely publicized as a scientific age. There is food for thought in the fact that over seven times as many named engineering as the legal profession and over four times as many thought young men going to college would do better by preparing for the medical profession than the law. Twice as many named business, and the teaching profession came in a little ahead of the legal profession. Only dentistry and ministry trailed the number naming the profession of law.

The question was asked, which one of six groups they trusted the most. The medical profession headed the list, bankers were second, teachers third, businessmen fourth, lawyers fifth, and dentists at the bottom.

I know that neither you nor I are satisfied with these answers. One may not simply shrug his shoulders or easily explain away the results of this survey. For the moment, I am not concerned with the truth or falsity of the beliefs. I am concerned with the fact that the beliefs exist. If the beliefs continue to exist even though they be false, you and I will see action predicated upon them. For that reason, it is vital to the future of the legal profession that it have available to its use the facts concerning the profession and its services to the public and that it tell its story clearly and understandably.

I offer one simple suggestion; there would be greater trust if the public knew that the unworthy member of the profession was promptly and effectively punished. The public may very likely believe that the unpunished practices of the few are condoned by the many. The dishonesty of Samuel Insull was harmful to the whole private utilities industry. So may the conduct of a few lawyers injure the public confidence of the

entire profession. The bar should itself be the first line of defense against sharp or dishonest practice. This distrust can be remedied. To do it is your job. To accomplish it will be a great public service of which you will be the direct beneficiary.

May I suggest that one function of the organized bar should pertain to the selection of judges? For example, in the selection of municipal judges in my city of Des Moines there were 11 candidates, of whom 8 were to be nominated and 4 ultimately to be elected. The average voter had no knowledge or ready means of knowledge as to their training, ability, or desirability for a position where liberty, property, and reputation are directly involved. It seems to me the bar should know who is or is not qualified. Does not the organized bar, directly related as it is to the administration of justice, have an obligation to give the public the benefit of its appraisal? Naturally, the weight of the bar's recommendation will be in direct ratio to the voters' confidence in the organized bar and their belief that such recommendations are entitled to respect as being solely in the public interest.

Listen to these words of the Honorable Learned Hand: "The profession of the law has its fate in its own hands; it may continue to represent a larger, more varied social will by broader, more comprehensive interpretation. The change must come from within. The profession must satisfy its community by becoming itself satisfied with the community. It must assimilate society before society will assimilate it: it must become organic to remain a living organ. The lawyer must learn to live more capaciously or become content to find himself continuously less trusted, more circumscribed until he becomes hardly more important than a minor administrator, confined to a monotonous round of record and routine, without dignity, inspiration, or respect. There can be no ambiguity in the answer of those who are worthy of the traditions and the power of a noble calling."

Gentlemen, one thing more: Our Nation began as a brave experiment based on the conception of the rights and dignity of the individual. Today an imperialistic, totalitarian state, under the rule of atheistic communism, seeks to destroy the hard-won freedom of man. We want, above all else, to hold on to freedom in our half of the world, at least.

In America, through the expansion of suffrage, the enormous increase in popular education and the perfection of techniques of modern mass communications, unprecedented power is today in the hands of the plain people. So really, the future of freedom is in the custody of the ordinary man. Therefore, the man in the street must know, as you do, the full connotations of the phrase "constitutional guarantees"—he must know that only in a government by law—not men—are these guarantees safe, and their maintenance depends on the independence and integrity of the court. Yes, let every American realize the writ of habeas corpus in his defense against a concentration camp.

Our people must be aware of the requisites of popular rule and stable self-government—they must understand how justice is administered and the importance of maintaining law and order.

Yet, even assuming these things were all understood, then I say knowledge alone is not sufficient. Free men must learn and practice self-discipline or freedom cannot be preserved even in an educated United States. The present world conflict is essentially a struggle of fundamentally opposed social disciplines. The discipline of the totalitarian is forced, regimented, ruthless, and built on fear. Ours is self-imposed and is built on hope and aspiration—on the promise of greater happiness and well-being. Freedom is secure only when it marches hand in hand with responsibility and again I repeat, self-discipline.

I ask you, the straight-thinking lawyer, to take the lead. Our case, our future, must rest upon the foundation of justice and you have decided to enter into the priesthood of justice. If you accept the challenge of leadership, you shall find in your work great and rewarding satisfaction.

Resolution of the Executive Committee of Young Republican League of Minnesota Opposing Construction of the Hydrogen Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a resolution adopted by the executive committee of the Young Republican League of Minnesota, on January 29, 1950. I feel that the resolution adopted by the Young Republican League of Minnesota is not only thought provoking, but most timely.

There being no objection, the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE YOUNG REPUBLICAN LEAGUE OF MINNESOTA, JANUARY 29, 1950

There was a time not many months ago when it could be argued that any attempt to compromise with the Russians would be interpreted as a sign of weakness on our part. Many of us could not see that the risk of a cold war was as great as the risk of a partnership with tyranny.

Nothing has occurred to alter our opinion of the Russians. They are today as dangerous, as enigmatic, and as antidemocratic as they were a year ago. Their system of government and their system of economics are equally incompatible with our own.

But the risk of the cold war has multiplied itself beyond belief and almost beyond comprehension. Somehow or other, we must put a stop to it—must welcome or wheedle or bully the Soviets into the society of free nations. Hateful or not, we must work out a way of living with them, or face the alternative of universal suicide.

The reason is the hydrogen bomb. The uranium and plutonium bombs dropped in Japan were primitive little gadgets equivalent to only 20,000 tons of TNT and with a destructive radius of only 2 or 3 miles. There was a merciful limit to their size. Above the critical mass these bombs fizzle and are scarcely more lethal than an earthquake.

But the hydrogen bomb now contemplated by our Government, and by the Russians, is something else. It suffers from no limitations. It threatens not only our big cities but the earth itself. The first one would be a thousand times as powerful as the atomic bomb; the last might blow the earth out of its orbit.

It must not be built. Not by us, not by them, not by anyone else during this generation or ever in the future. There is no possible justification for its existence. It is totally and solely an instrument of destruction. Unlike the uranium bomb, it could not be used for the peacetime production of energy. It is fiery death and Armageddon.

If the democracies cannot now avoid the building of the bomb for fear of Russia, it is criminally naive to assume that we can build it, let the Russians build it, and then prevent it from being used. When, and by whom, matters hardly at all. When the first hydrogen bomb is dropped civilization will have ended.

President Truman is considering a final authorization to the Atomic Energy Commission to proceed with the development of the hydrogen bomb. David Lilienthal's resignation as head of the Commission was intended as a protest against any move toward the fatal decision before all possible negotiations with the Russians had been exhausted.

There still remains some hope that Russia may agree to UN control of atomic energy. Although the U. S. S. R. has rejected the Baruch plan for unlimited inspection of atomic plants, Vishinsky has submitted a plan for limited plant inspection, which, with all its weaknesses, would open a door in the iron curtain. If it did not break down, such a plan would lead eventually, we believe, to the development of a plan of fool-proof inspection. At the moment, the only alternative to the acceptance of a limited inspection plan is the development of the hydrogen bomb.

The choice should not be hard to make. There will be no hope for a world dominated by the hydrogen bomb. The Russians may someday be brought to see reason; the bomb will never be tamed. Once this monstrous power has been unleased, the problem of maintaining our democratic institutions against the Communist threat will disappear into thin air and we along with it: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That the executive committee of the Young Republican League of Minnesota opposes the construction of the hydrogen bomb until all possible means of international control of atomic energy through cooperation with the U. S. S. R. have been exhausted and that we specifically recommend consideration of the proposal made in the United Nations for limited inspection of atomic plants in the belief that such a plan would lead eventually to a foolproof unlimited inspection plan. Acceptance of such a plan would hinge upon the inclusion of adequate safeguards and would allow construction of the hydrogen bomb only in the event that such an inspection plan should fail to prove effective.

Atlantic Union

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, the Washington Post of February 18, 1950, published a very thoughtful editorial setting forth the next logical step in our foreign policy. I hope the State Department will consider further the desirability of this proposal. In any event, Congress is demanding and the people are expecting the Department of State to move on from the present sit-tight program.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ATLANTIC UNION

To give men's thoughts a direction is the highest mark of statesmanship. If the new direction points to closer ties for living and working together in amity, then the statesman is insuring his immortal soul. Moreover, such a direction inspires a drive in behalf of the good and the true which otherwise would remain potential. On this subject we have in the past quoted the great nineteenth century historian, Lord Acton. Lord Acton out of his erudition and wisdom observed that "the pursuit of a remote and ideal object which captivates the imagination by its splendor and the reason by its simplicity evokes an energy which would not be inspired by a rational, possible end, limited by many antagonistic claims, and confined to what is reasonable, practicable, and just." This is the reason we have backed the resolution calling for a convention of the free world to discuss a union of the Atlantic community.

Now the State Department, playing Mr. Obstinate to this Pilgrim's Progress, thinks the pilgrimage is a will-o'-the-wisp. As the administrative unit of our foreign affairs, perhaps this was inevitable, though a better attitude might have been one of neutrality. It is hardly wise to include the illusion of the brotherhood of man in the current slaughter of illusions. The opposition, the Department may be sure, will be no deterrent to this growing movement, nor to the friendliness exhibited toward it by so many of the legislators. Since the H-bomb decision, Members of Congress have been searching for a parallel line to pursue along with that of what may at any time be a provocative and a frightening line of militarization. The line on which the State Department was asked to comment has as its goal freedom and union. Surely that is the hope of the world.

Even the President shares the vision that the (more or less) world government or federation advocates are working to achieve. At any rate, on June 28, 1945, he said, "I am anxious to bring it home to you that the world is no longer county size, no longer State size, no longer Nation size—it is one world, as Willkie said. It is a world in which we must all get along. And it is my opinion that this great Republic ought to lead the way. It will be just as easy for nations to get along in a republic of the world as it is for you to get along in the Republic of the United States."

The way is more difficult than the President then seemed to envisage—a way that he seems himself to think is too full of road blocks to venture further. But some of the road blocks are imaginary. For instance, there seems to be an idea that if there were a union, Europeans would throng their ports immediately and make for America. Not the slightest reason exists for this fear. Are any of the immigration quotas, except that of Italy, filled? Not at all. A State Department spokesman objected that few Americans would allow foreigners to outnumber them in a union parliament. This was a misstatement of the aims of the union movement. The fields of activity of an over-all body would be as limited as the constituents cared to make it, and the voting could be weighted—and might well be—instead of numerical.

However, the advocates of one form or other of union would welcome the ventilation of real as well as imaginary difficulties. That is the reason for this resolution. It simply calls for a convention. Such a convention would clearly put men's thoughts in the direction of ways and means of living together better, and togetherness is the only means of survival. Presumably the convention would dissolve into working committees which would seek agreement on details for further discussion. The process itself would be of great service in furthering existing American policy of cooperation, as, for instance, in making the Atlantic Pact a reality. In sum: The unionists have a goal, and they serve a purpose to the rest of us in showing us the end of the route toward which we are, presumably, walking. The trouble is that time is not on the side of the pedestrian.

Coal: The Eleventh Hour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from the New York Times of February 22 which concludes with this significant sentence:

If the administration is not now convinced of the necessity for such a course (namely, more adequate law than is now available for the protection of the public in the current coal crisis) the Congress should and, in our opinion, must shoulder that responsibility without further delay.

Senate bill 2912, to make what John L. Lewis has done in denying coal to the consuming public subject to the provisions of the Sherman Antitrust Act, is my answer to the responsibility of Congress in the premises. Hearings on that bill are now being conducted by a subcommittee of the Senate Judiciary Committee.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

COAL: THE ELEVENTH HOUR

President Truman issued an Executive order on February 6 which set in motion the machinery provided in the emergency sections of the Taft-Hartley Act. Theoretically, this offered two approaches to the problem of restoring normal coal production. First, it provided for the enforced resumption of negotiations between Mr. Lewis and the coal operators; second, it paved the way for the issuance of an injunction which would compel the miners either to return to work or face penalties for contempt of court.

A Presidential fact-finding board named under this same machinery reported to the White House on February 11. In this report it said:

The Bureau of Mines reported to this board of inquiry on February 9 that over-all stocks (of coal) have declined to approximately 22,100,000 tons. Based on an estimated daily consumption of 1,385,000 tons, this represents a 16-day supply in the hands of consumers.

Twelve of those sixteen days have now passed. Meanwhile, on the evidence available to date, the two approaches opened up by the President's reluctant invocation of the Labor-Management Act have proved for all practical purposes dead end roads. Cyrus S. Ching, Director of the Federal Mediation Service, who has been sitting in on the so-called negotiations between Mr. Lewis and the operators, says he can see no signs of progress in that direction. Meanwhile, not only have the miners flouted the Government's court order directing them to return to work, but they have indicated a similarly defiant attitude toward a citation by Federal Judge Keech for contempt of court.

In theory, the stalemate on either or both of these fronts could be broken any day and at any hour. In theory, Mr. Lewis, who was reported yesterday to be "jaunty and unconcerned" and "smiling broadly" at the way things were going, could suddenly abandon his 9-month-old strategy and agree to a reasonable settlement of the contract dispute. And, in theory, the rebellious mood of the miners could miraculously disappear overnight. But the time for dealing with the coal emergency in terms of theory and wishful thinking has passed. There is little, if any, reason to believe that we are moving toward a solution along either of the two routes now being followed. But even if there were a reasonable basis for hope in these directions, the country is no longer in a position to proceed on such an assumption. We are now at the point where, if we are to guard against a national catastrophe, we must assume the worst—namely, that both negotiations and the injunction process have failed. If the administration is not now convinced of the necessity for such a course, then Congress should, and, in our opinion, must shoulder that responsibility without further delay.

Cooperative Action Against Water Pollution

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on previous occasions in the Senate I have pointed out the critical problem of water pollution existing throughout our Nation. I have pointed out the tremendous interest of the conservationists of Wisconsin—members of the Isaak Walton League and other fine conservation groups—in preserving our water heritage clean and unpolluted.

As an aid, I personally have introduced legislation providing for rapid tax depreciation benefits to industries developing waste treatment facilities. In the House of Representatives there is companion legislation for this objective.

So far the action that Congress has been taking is in the too-little-and-too-late category, but I trust that even at this late hour, while the waters of Wisconsin and of Ohio and of New York are becoming increasingly befouled and diseased, we in the Congress will help conservation organizations, municipalities, States, and private industries working on this tremendous challenge.

In the February 1 issue of the Conservation News published by the National Wild Life Federation here in Washington there is a fine write-up of the efforts of the Water Pollution Control Advisory Board which was set up in accordance with the act which we passed. I ask unanimous consent that the text of this statement, as published by Mr. Carl D. Schoemaker, the able Washington correspondent of the federation, be printed in

the RECORD. I know that his comments will be of deep interest to Waltonians and other conservationists in my own State and elsewhere.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WATER POLLUTION CONTROL BOARD TAKES ACTION

There are not many problems facing the American people that are more important and vital to their health and well-being than those which center in cleaning up the pollution, both domestic and industrial, which is hourly dumped into our rivers and lakes, the National Wildlife Federation reminds us. Increasing populations, the creation of new and the expansion of old industries, aggravate the nuisance and add to the burdens of solution. People must have clean water to use and drink. Industry likewise penalizes itself when the waters so essential to its working are loaded with filth. It requires a crisis or an epidemic to bring home the urgent need for action.

The Ohio River watershed or drainage basin covers the whole or parts of 14 States. A tip of southwestern New York, the western third of Pennsylvania, the whole of West Virginia, the southwestern portion of Virginia, nearly all of Indiana and Kentucky, about three-fourths of Ohio, and the eastern fringe of Illinois are embraced in the area, and total 154,880 square miles. Pittsburgh, Wheeling, Columbus, Cincinnati, Louisville, Indianapolis, and some 1,100 other cities and towns drain their sewage and waste, either directly or indirectly, into the Ohio River. North Carolina, Tennessee, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi, likewise, in lesser degree make use of the Ohio for drainage purposes.

It was at the turn of this century that the people of Ohio began to notice a change in the great river that bears its name. They were conscious of a stench that reached them from the deposits of pollution coming from as far upstream as Pittsburgh and augmented by the rapidly growing industrial communities in West Virginia, Kentucky, and Ohio itself. These people, who were looking ahead, decided to take the matter to their State officials. Contrary to their expectations the State in 1908 declared that no Ohio River city need install sewage treatment facilities until the communities on the banks of the river in other States did likewise. Here was the germ of an interstate compact. Nothing, however, was done about it until 20 years later when the States mentioned above entered into an informal agreement to control taste-producing phenol discharges coming from coke plants.

The droughts of 1930 and 1934 made it extremely difficult to produce safe drinking water from the polluted streams in the area. The Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce screamed its protests just as New York City is now battling the means to increase its safe water supply. In 1936 the United States Congress passed an enabling act which gave permission to the Ohio River States to enter into a compact or agreement to fight this menace to the health and prosperity of their people. This act of Congress was merely the push button that started the campaign. It took another 12 years to get the States—eight of them were needed—to sign on the dotted line. On June 30, 1948, at a gala ceremonial the compact became effective and plans were immediately set in motion to tackle the job and clean up the rubbish in the waters. There are well over 16,000,000 people within the watershed of these eight States which have signed the agreement, officially known as the Ohio River Valley Water Sanitation Commission. Each State contributes a share of the annual budget in proportion to its area and population in the basin. Joseph L. Quinn, of Terre Haute, Ind., is chairman of the board which is made up of three members from each State appointed by the Governor. Edward J. Clearly, of Cincinnati, is executive director and chief engineer.

THE TAFT-BARKLEY ACT

On the same day that the Ohio River compact was signed, President Truman affixed his signature to the Taft-Barkley Water Pollution Control Act which brought to a successful conclusion the long and bitter fight in Congress for a measure of Federal control over the increasing horrors of pollution. The act provides for the establishment of a Water Pollution Control Advisory Board upon which are representatives of the interested Federal agencies and others who represent industry, States, and municipalities, and wildlife.

This board last month held its quarterly meeting in Cincinnati and for 1 day met in joint session with the Ohio River Valley Commission. It was brought out with remarkable clearness that the main burden, as well as the responsibility for water pollution control, belongs to the States, their cities and towns and their private industry. The part that the Federal Government plays is to give a large measure of assistance and encouragement to local governments and their industries. The Water Pollution Control Advisory Board is required to develop comprehensive plans covering all the major watersheds in the Nation. This board did not get under way until over a year after the law was passed—Congress did not provide appropriations—but since it did get the green light, it has moved fast and much has been accomplished to cover the preliminary phases which are so essential to later smooth working of the machinery. Ten regional offices have been set up and staffed with sanitary engineers and water biologists; $800,375 have been approved as grants to the States for industrial waste studies; $67,508 have been allocated for special studies such as citrus wastes, treating wool-scouring wastes, the effect of industrial wastes, including paper and pulp mills, on aquatic life and the treatment of wastes from beet-sugar refineries and intensive research into State sanitary laws for pollution control. There is room for much improvement in this latter category.

NO LOAN MONEY IN BUDGET

While the Taft-Barkley Act authorizes $22,500,000 annually for 5 years for loans to municipalities for construction of treatment plants, no money for this purpose was appropriated last year and the President's budget sent to Congress early last month carries no recommendation for such loans.

The law further provides that such loans shall not exceed $250,000, or one-third of the construction cost, whichever is the lesser amount. Assuming that the maximum loan would be made to every applicant, the $22,500,000 authorized by Congress would be available only to 90 communities in the United States. New treatment plants, expansion of present facilities or replacement of obsolete equipment to the number of 13,952 are required throughout the Nation, according to an official survey made in 1948. Should all these take the maximum loan, it would take appropriations totalling $3,487,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury to do the job. To depend upon the Federal loan feature of this bill would prolong the day when such treatment works would be installed throughout the country. For instance, one Congressman says that in his small district there are eight towns which want immediate loans. There are 435 congressional districts in the United States. Inasmuch as these are loans and not grants, the amount involved must be repaid to the United States. Therefore, it seems to be a better philosophy for the municipalities to finance these plants through bond issues sold to private financing concerns.

The present plight of New York City, through its shortage of water and the need for extensive increases in the supply, has brought forth the suggestion that the waters of the Hudson River be used for this purpose. These waters are, of course, thoroughly polluted, unfit for drinking, unfit for recreational use. Pumping the waters from the river into the present reservoirs or into newly constructed ones would call for treatment before it could be used domestically. Senator LEHMAN, who only recently took his seat in the United States Senate from New York, introduced Senate bill 2823 2 weeks ago. This bill seeks to liberalize the loan provisions of the Water Pollution Control Act. He wants to increase the annual authorization from $22,500,000 to $50,000,000 a year. Furthermore, he seeks to raise the amount that may be loaned for any one project from $250,000 to $5,000,000. This bill is aimed directly to aid and assist New York in its water crisis. Should it pass and the limits raised as proposed, and assuming that other large cities would want to avail themselves of the loan feature, only 10 such projects could be undertaken each year. The Water Pollution Board, at its Cincinnati meeting, reaffirmed its position that States, municipalities, and private industry accelerate their respective efforts at once and provide the needed revenues from their own resources. This matter of financing these local activities for pollution control should be under such terms and conditions as will encourage private investors to extend private credit and money into this field.

The Board recommended to the Surgeon General the establishment of a National Technical Task Committee on Industrial Waste. The proposal was made by L. F. Warrick, a senior sanitary engineer for the State of Wisconsin. The proposal calls for a committee to be composed of industry's representatives of 150 to 200 of the best minds in the country. Its functions would include inventorying, appraising, coordinating, and promoting research and development work on treatment and control of industrial wastes; stimulating close working relations on technical phases with industry and Federal, State, and local governmental agencies; and would aid in the establishment of Federal grants-in-aid for industrial-waste problems in water-pollution control where major needs exist.

The Board tentatively agreed to holding three more meetings this year, one on the west coast, one at Boston to study the extremely hazardous pollution problem in the Merrimack River Valley, and another in Washington, D. C.

Relations of the United States With International Organizations

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Where the 'One World' Effort Runs a Little Wild," by Arthur Krock, which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1950.

This article is a summary and analysis of Senate Report 1274, prepared by the Subcommittee on Relations With International Organizations of the Committee

on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which it is my privilege to be chairman. Because it deals with the tremendous rise in this Government's international-organization expenditures during the past fiscal year and emphasizes the need for economy and efficiency in this important field, I feel that the Members of this body will be interested in examining it.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE NATION—WHERE THE ONE WORLD EFFORT RUNS A LITTLE WILD

(By Arthur Krock)

WASHINGTON, February 20.—A Senate subcommittee, dealing with the costs of executive departments, has made some recommendations which appear to possess the rare virtue of pointing the way to lower costs and greater efficiency in government. This virtue the reports of the Hoover Commission revealed on a much larger scale, but the Senate document was dealing only with the expense of United States participation in international organizations.

The subcommittee chairman is HERBERT R. O'CONOR, of Maryland, with Eli E. Nobleman as counsel, and these were in charge of the survey. Its stated purpose was to examine "United States policy with respect to the Government's relation with international organizations * * * to determine the extent of the benefits which accrue * * * the need for careful analysis of any increased participation, the advisability of continued membership * * * and the possibility of reducing the financial burdens." In the fiscal year, which ended June 30, 1949, these burdens amounted to $144,600,000 plus.

SOME STATISTICS

Of this sum the Government contributed about $129,000,000 to permanent and temporary world organizations, spent above $3,300,000 on missions and other conferences, advanced $11,500,000 to the United Nations toward its $65,000,000 building loan and otherwise disposed of the remainder. In fiscal 1948 the total was about $127,500,000.

Of the 1949 amount, the bulk, $104,100,000, was expended on emergency agencies and projects—$70,600,000 to the International Refugee Organization, $25,500,000 to the United Nations' children's emergency fund and $8,000,000 to the Palestine-Arab refugee relief fund of the United Nations. The money was spent in connection with 258 conferences involving about 6,000 meetings, 8,000 documents printed in five languages, and travel over the spaces between New York and Shanghai.

THE EAGLE'S SHARE

The subcommittee found that the average United States contribution to the cost of all these activities was 47.2 percent, ranging from 2 percent to 70 percent, and from $50 per year per organization to $70,000,000. It found also that these contributions are higher to postwar than to prewar organizations and highest to inter-American agencies, where membership is limited and disparities in financial capacity are greatest.

The Senators and their counsel also discovered a lack of coordination among Government agencies and departments represented in this international field serious enough to suggest waste and duplication that may impair the effective presentation of this Government's policies and position in the conferences and meetings on global subjects. Thirty-three interdepartmental committees have been set up, dealing with politics, economics, health, labor, education, transportation, communication, and finance. But, said the report, they are not properly coordinated.

Since February 1948, however, the report noted, the State Department has headed off the creation of 10 new agencies—5 in new world-wide organizations and 5 in the pan-American area. Proposed were a study of conservation, a control committee of the issuance of identity cards to foreign correspondents, an irrigation and high-dams committee, an international rice organization, and a court of honor to deal with cases involving journalists and foreign correspondents. On the other hand the Department is supporting the creation of four new specialized agencies—the International Trade Organization, the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the World Meteorological Organization, and a Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Commission.

IMPROVEMENTS RECOMMENDED

Much good work is done by the global and hemispheric groups on which the United States is spending these millions and underwriting their costs at an average of 47 percent. But some of these have been used by officials to provide agreeable junkets at the taxpayer's expense for personal friends of good human intent and influential outsiders. So the Senate subcommittee came to the following conclusions:

1. These activities should be recognized as a cornerstone of our foreign policy and contributory factors of peace. But in 3 years the cost of the United Nations and related agencies has expanded from $43,000,000 during 1947 to $220,000,000 during 1949.

2. The United States can no longer afford to sit by and await the advent of improved economic conditions in * * * other nations * * * before seeking to reduce these expenses. No new agencies should be created. Where duplication or overlapping exists, and it is frequent, there should be liquidation. Better budgeting and auditing should be required. And pressure should continue toward reduction of the assessments these organizations levy against the United States.

3. The President by Executive order should establish guiding principles for all in this Government concerned; also an over-all interdepartmental committee with Cabinet and sub-Cabinet membership and a permanent secretariat. The personnel now constituting the scattered groups should be required to conduct this business without any additional expense and at a saving.

These proposals, if carried out, ought to get more and better results for less out of this important segment of foreign policy.

Brotherhood

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KARL STEFAN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, January 24, 1950

Mr. STEFAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me, I include in my remarks the following editorial appearing in the Washington News on Wednesday, February 22:

This is Brotherhood Week.

The fact that men are brothers and should live as such has been recognized in the religions of many lands and many ages.

Selwyn Gurney Champion, an English physician, has recorded a study of the world's major faiths in a book, The Eleven Religions, published by E. P. Dutton & Co. It contains 4,890 quotations.

We cite just 10 of the quotations which show that the golden rule is a teaching of 10 of the 11 religions. Here they are, in the alphabetical order of the religions:

1. Buddhism: "Hurt not others with that which pains yourself."

2. Christianity: "All things whatsoever you would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them: for this is the law and the prophets."

3. Confucianism: "Is there any one maxim that ought to be acted upon throughout one's whole life? Surely the maxim of loving kindness is such—do not unto others what you would not they should do unto you."

4. Hebraism (the Jewish religion): "What is hurtful to yourself do not to your fellowman. That is the whole of the Torah and the remainder is but commentary."

5. Hinduism: "This is the sum of duty: Do naught to others which if done to thee would cause thee pain."

6. Islam (Mohammedanism): "No one of you is a believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself."

7. Jainism: "In happiness and suffering, in joy and grief, we should regard all creatures as we regard our own self, and therefore should refrain from inflicting upon others such injury as would appear undesirable to us if inflicted upon our selves."

8. Sikhism: "As thou deemest thyself, so deem others."

9. Taoism: "Regard your neighbor's gain as your gain; and regard your neighbor's loss as your own loss."

10. Zoroastrianism: "That nature is good only when it shall not do to another what is not good for its own self."

The eleventh religion, missing from that list, is Shinto, the religion of imperial Japan. Shinto has no Golden Rule.

Mr. Speaker, most of us regard the Golden Rule as the chief, at least the most practical part of our religion. It gives us respect for the other fellow's religion to know that he, too, has the Golden Rule.

The fact that the Golden Rule has been taught by many religions, in many ages, shows that the mind of man has always seen that, by the very nature of humanity, we are bound to live together.

Brotherhood, then, is not something we may choose or not choose, if we would live. Inescapably, we are brothers and must live as such or suffer the consequences.

General Pulaski's Memorial Day

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following resolution adopted by the American Legion Pulaski Post, No. 562, of the city of Los Angeles, Calif., on January 20, 1950, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Day resolution now pending in Congress:

Whereas a resolution providing for the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year as General Pulaski's Memorial Day for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski is now pending in the

present session of the United States Congress; and

Whereas the 11th day of October 1779 is the date in American history of the heroic death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski, who died from wounds received on October 9, 1779, at the siege of Savannah, Ga.; and

Whereas the States of Arkansas, California, Connecticut, Delaware, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucy, Louisiana, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, New Jersey, New Hampshire, New York, Nevada, Ohio, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, Texas, West Virginia, Wisconsin, and other States of the Union, through legislative enactment designated October 11 of each year as General Pulaski Memorial Day; and

Whereas it is fitting that the recurring anniversary of this day be commemorated with suitable patriotic and public exercises in observing and commemorating the heroic death of this great American hero of the Revolutionary War; and

Whereas the Congress of the United States of America has by legislative enactment designated from October 11, 1929, to October 11, 1949, to be General Pulaski's Memorial Day in the United States of America: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the American Legion Pulaski Post, No. 562, of the city of Los Angeles and State of California—

SECTION 1. That we hereby memorialize and petition the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski Memorial Day resolution now pending in the United States Congress.

SEC. 2. That certified copies of this resolution, properly authenticated, be sent forthwith to the President of the United States, the Vice President of the United States, and each of the United States Senators and Representatives from California.

PHILIP A. FINIE,
Commander.
FRANK A. HARASICK,
Americanism Chairman.
JOHN KULCZYK,
Post Adjutant.

Racism at George Washington University

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. ARTHUR G. KLEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mr. KLEIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been brought to my attention a situation in the District of Columbia, at George Washington University, which I feel under obligation to bring to light and to do what I can toward correction.

A statement which I issued to the press today contains the essence of this unsavory story, and I am including that release as a part of my remarks. Since this morning I have been informed by a former GWU student that when he enrolled in a course in the economic history of Europe at George Washington summer school in the second summer term of 1948, he was shocked by the initial lecture by a Professor Ragatz, which outlined and advocated a theory of racial superiority.

It has also been brought to my attention that George Washington University has been the beneficiary of Federal funds from many sources, and that the substantive legislation governing some, at least, of these grants contains specific prohibitions of discrimination. I am taking appropriate steps to ascertain the closest possible estimate of such funds, with a view to insisting that all discriminatory practices cease before any further Federal funds are made available to the university.

The text of my release follows:

In a prepared statement Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York, today made a slashing attack on bigotry at George Washington University. Congressman KLEIN said:

"On this two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of George Washington, I am sickened by learning of the recent outburst of religious and racial bigotry in the head of the university which was founded by Washington, which bears his name in the city which is his namesake, and which was chartered by Congress over a century ago with a specific prohibition of discrimination.

"Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin has in recent weeks, and to my intense sorrow and disappointment, conducted himself in a pattern reminiscent of the late and unlamented Herr Dr. Goebbels. The disgraceful situation at George Washington University, the only Jim Crow institution of higher learning in the District of Columbia, has come to a head in this most completely incongruous time: the week in which we celebrate the memory of the founder of his country; the period proclaimed Brotherhood Week; the week in which the District of Columbia has discovered that its un-American pattern of discrimination and segregation is illegal.

"It was not many weeks ago that the George Washington Hatchet, student weekly, ran an editorial declaring it was time for GWU to rejoin the United States by abandoning its anti-Negro policy. George Washington left 50 shares of Chesapeake & Ohio Canal Co. stock to found a college 'to teach democracy to the people.' James Monroe and John Quincy Adams supported and patronized Columbian College, out of which GWU grew.

"The Newman Club, the Hillel Foundation of B'nai B'rith, and a number of Protestant and secular student groups endorsed the editorial.

"There was no reaction from the president of the university until the Jewish press widely reprinted a brief story sent out of Washington by Milton Friedman, JTA correspondent here.

"Immediately the wrath of Olympus descended on Hillel director Irwin Glatstein. According to the Jewish Telegraphic Agency, Dr. B. H. Jarman called on Glatstein. Not satisfied with Glatstein's assertion that he could not confirm or disavow the statements in the JTA story except as to the resolution, Jarman haled Glatstein before the great man himself for a 1½ hour stormy interview.

"JTA says that Dr. Marvin threatened to have Glatstein fired, and later tried to carry out the threat; that he also threatened to ban Hillel from the campus; that he talked wildly of a Jewish plot against the university and demanded that Glatstein sign a letter dictated by Marvin saying the JTA story was untrue. Rabbi Arthur Lelyveld, national director of Hillel Foundations, was forced to come to Washington in an effort to smooth out the row, in cooperation with the Anti-Defamation League.

"The Jewish community of Washington is up in arms.

"During depression days, Abram Lisner and other Jewish philanthropists bailed out George Washington University when the going was tough. Lisner Auditorium was built by funds bequeathed by Abram Lisner. By his direction the Bill of Rights is inscribed on the walls. His direct command that no discrimination be practiced is openly flouted by barring Negro citizens from the hall. At various times Protestant churches and private philanthropists have helped GWU. Yet so far as I am aware there is not a single Negro student in the university, and the medical school follows the infamous AMA quota system.

"For the benefit of Dr. Cloyd Heck Marvin I want to quote from the famous Washington letter to the Hebrew Congregation at Newport:

" 'The citizens of the United States of America have a right to applaud themselves for having given mankind examples of an enlarged and liberal policy. * * * All possess alike liberty of conscience and immunities of citizenship. It is now no more that toleration is spoken of, as if it was by the indulgence of one class of people that another enjoyed their inherent natural rights. For happily the Government of the United States, which gives to bigotry no sanction, to persecution no assistance, requires only that they who live under its protection should demean themselves as good citizens in giving it on all occasions effectual support.'

"Gen. U. S. Grant III, grandson of the great American who helped free the slaves, and the man who tried to impose a permanent pattern of segregation on the District of Columbia, is vice president of GWU."

LEGISLATION INTRODUCED IN 1947

In connection with this situation, Mr. Speaker, I wish to remind you and the House that on January 13, 1947, I introduced in the Eightieth Congress H. R. 867, a bill to prevent certain payments by the Veterans' Administrator to any educational or training institution which consistently pursues a policy of discrimination.

The bill was adversely reported by all agencies to which it was referred; and I deferred reintroduction in the belief that I would be able to find time to reword the bill to meet the valid objections made on administrative grounds; and of course there can be no valid objections on ethical and moral grounds.

Under leave, I am including the text of the press release I issued at that time and also the text of the bill:

An amendment to the GI bill of rights to forbid any payments to schools which purport to be nonsectarian but actually discriminate against veterans belonging to minority races or religions was offered today by Representative ARTHUR G. KLEIN, Democrat, of New York. The bill is based on studies of discrimination against GI's in schools of higher education made by the Jewish War Veterans and the American Jewish Congress jointly which reveal that numerous veterans are unable to take advantage of their rights under the GI bill because of the fact that many schools have adopted a quota system limiting the number of Jews, Negroes, Catholics, and persons of Italian descent who may be admitted.

The proposed law would empower the Veterans' Administrator to hold hearings wherever a school is charged with discriminating against veterans. The Administrator would first attempt to eliminate the discrimination by means of conciliation and mediation, but if the school refuses to discontinue the practice the Administrator is empowered to stop all further payments to the offender. Students already enrolled in such a school will continue to receive regular payments. In proposing the bill today, Mr. KLEIN said:

"A GI who was not excluded from the hedge rows of Normandy or the beaches of Okinawa should not be excluded from the so-called educational institutions of our country. Discrimination by an educational institution against a veteran because of his color or religion strikes at the very heart of

the democracy for which he fought. This bill may not eliminate this un-American practice but will at least stop these institutions from feeding at the public trough. There is no reason why the Treasury should subsidize un-American practices."

H. R. 867

A bill to amend Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) to prevent certain payments by the Veterans' Administrator to any educational or training institution which consistently pursues a policy of discrimination, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph 5 of part VIII of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) be amended to read as follows:

"5. (a) The Administrator shall pay to the educational or training institution, for each person enrolled in full-time or part-time course of education or training, the customary cost of tuition, and such laboratory, library, health, infirmary, and other similar fees as are customarily charged, and may pay for books, supplies, equipment, and other necessary expenses, exclusive of board, lodging, other living expenses, and travel, as are generally required for the successful pursuit and completion of the course by other students in the institution: *Provided,* That in no event shall such payments, with respect to any person, exceed $500 for an ordinary school year unless the veteran elects to have such customary charges paid in excess of such limitation, in which event there shall be charged against his period of eligibility the proportion of an ordinary school year which such excess bears to $500: *Provided further,* That no payments shall be made to institutions, business or other establishments furnishing apprentice training on the job: *Provided further,* That any institution may apply to the Administrator for an adjustment of tuition, and the Administrator, if he finds that the customary tuition charges are insufficient to permit the institution to furnish education or training to eligible veterans, or inadequate compensation therefor, may provide for the payment of such fair and reasonable compensation as will not exceed the estimated cost of teaching personnel and supplies for instruction; and may in like manner readjust such payments from time to time: *And provided further,* That no payments shall be made to any educational or training institution holding itself out to the public to be nonsectarian which engages in a practice or pursues a policy of discrimination in the admission of, or in providing the full use of its facilities to any such eligible persons, otherwise qualified, by reason of the race, creed, color, national origin, or ancestry of such person or persons.

"(b) Whenever it is charged by a person aggrieved or by an association or organization formed or organized to protect the rights of veterans or the Administrator has reason to believe that any educational or training institution has engaged in the practices of discrimination or exclusion set forth in subparagraph (a), the Administrator shall cause a preliminary investigation to be made, and if such investigation establishes a prima facie case of the existence of any discriminatory practice or policy, he or his representative shall attempt to eliminate the same by conference, conciliation or otherwise. In the event of failure to eliminate such practice or policy, the Administrator or his representative shall hold and conduct one or more hearings, invite or subpena and compel the attendance of witnesses and the production of books, papers, records, and other documents, administer oaths, take the testimony and evidence of the witnesses and reduce the same to writing. The transcript of the minutes of such hearings shall be deemed a public record and a copy thereof shall be given to any person or organization interested therein and requesting same. If after such hearing or hearings, the Administrator or his representative is satisfied that the educational or training institution has engaged in such practices of discrimination or exclusion, the Administrator shall cause such educational or training institution to be placed upon a list of disapproved institutions. No payments shall be made under this part with respect to any eligible person who shall register or enroll therein after the publication of such list of disapproved institutions, but payments shall be continued to be made as provided in this part with respect to eligible persons who theretofore registered or enrolled in such institution.

"(c) Any institution or any person claiming to be aggrieved by a determination of the Administrator pursuant to this paragraph or any association or organization formed or organized to protect the rights of veterans may obtain a review of such order in the circuit court of appeals for the circuit wherein the institution affected is situated or within the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia by filing in such court a written petition within 60 days after the publication of such determinations, praying that the determination be modified or set aside in whole or in part. A copy of such petition shall forthwith be served upon the Administrator, and thereupon the Administrator shall certify and file in the court a transcript of the record. Upon the review by the court, the findings of fact by the Administrator when supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive. The judgment and decree of the court shall be final subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certification or certiorari as provided in section 239 and section 240 of the Judicial Code, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 28, secs. 346 and 347).

"(d) Any educational or training institution placed upon a list of disapproved institutions may petition the Administrator for removal therefrom. If the Administrator shall be satisfied that the discriminatory practice or policy has been eliminated, he shall cause the institution to be removed from the list of disapproved institutions and it shall thereafter be eligible to receive payments under this act."

Repeal of Excise Taxes on Entertainment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks I would like to include petitions that have come to my office in recent days from patrons of the movies in my district urging that the Federal excise tax on movie admissions be repealed.

One petition from the United Artists Theater contained over 2,000 names affixed over one week end. Another, from the Town Theater, contained almost a 1,000 names, all willingly and gladly listed. A third from the Bill Robinson Theater also contained almost a 1,000 names.

The petitions state that a tax of 1 cent on each 5 cents of movie admission discriminates against that form of entertainment and unfairly taxes those who seek and need relaxation and entertainment at moderate cost. It states futher that movies have become so much a part of the American way of life, that such a continuing tax upon them imposes an unjust and discriminatory burden.

The House will remember that in the past I have urged the repeal of various excise taxes: First, because many of them were discriminatory; second, because they fell upon those who often could least afford to bear them; and, third, that their emergency need during the war had long since passed.

I feel that excise taxes on movie admissions fall into the same category as excise taxes on telephone, telegraph, and transportatiotn, whose repeal I have urged since 1947. My most recent bill, H. R. 6151, introduced August 26, 1949, would repeal all Federal excise taxes except those of a regulatory character. That would include taxes on telephone, telegraph, transportation, entertainment, and so forth.

As additional petitions are received, I will ask permission that they be recorded.

The Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, recently 15 United States editors made a 3 weeks' journey in Europe studying the operations of the Marshall plan in England, Germany, Italy, and France. One of these distinguished editors was Mr. Edward Lindsay, editor of the Herald and Review of Decatur, Ill. Mr. Lindsay has written a most interesting article about his trip and his convictions and conclusions with respect to the ECA, published in the Herald and Review, and an editorial for the same newspaper entitled "Vital Marshall Plan." I ask unanimous consent that the article and editorial be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES IS WINNING COLD WAR, BUT RUSSIA IS BETTING WE WON'T FINISH THE JOB—EDITORS SEE ECA GAINS—STAKE RESTS WITH FUTURE

(By Edward Lindsay, editor of the Herald and Review)

The United States is winning the cold war in Europe—with dollars and know-how—but Soviet Russia is betting that we can't or we won't finish the job.

The people of the 19 Marshall plan nations of Europe are grateful for what we have done but turn white at the thought of a United States depression of even modest proportions and regret that we have hesitated to take our own advice of full economic cooperation in Europe for ourselves.

This is a brief summary of the findings of 15 American editors—of whom I was one—just returned from a 3 weeks' visit with political, business and labor leaders of all complexions in England, Germany, Italy and France.

Since the beginning of our program for rebuilding Europe we have spent $8,250,000,000. Large as this sum is, it seems relatively small when compared with the cost

of a hot war. Our economists have not been able to estimate within $40,000,000,000 the cost of World War II. The total figure is somewhere between 340 and 380 billion dollars.

In the forefront of the American cold war leadership are American industrialists, businessmen and labor leaders. Their mission is to help European countries make a success of free-enterprise economics in the United States pattern.

WHO IS RUNNING THE SHOW?

Our top man in ECA is Paul Hoffman, president of the Studebaker Corp. He spends most of his time in Washington, but makes frequent trips to Europe.

W. Averell Harriman, financier, chairman of the board of the Union Pacific until 1946, is the United States special representative located in Paris. He has over-all responsibility for dealing with the representatives of the cooperating countries.

Our labor mission, also located in Paris, is headed by Boris Shishkin, economist for the American Federation of Labor. His job, among other things, is to wean European labor—especially in France and Italy—away from Communist leadership.

The heads of our missions in individual countries include such men as Barry Bingham for France, W. John Kenney for England, and James D. Zellerbach for Italy. Bingham is the publisher of the Louisville Courier-Journal; Kenney is an attorney; Zellerbach is chairman of the board of Fibreboard Products, president of Crown Zellerbach Corp., paper manufacturers, and director of numerous companies and the California State Chamber of Commerce.

It will be recalled that A. E. Staley, Jr., chairman of the board of the A. E. Staley Mfg. Co. of Decatur, has just returned from a year's tour of duty as head of the ECA mission in Norway.

One of the architects of the ECA approach to European recovery was Roy W. Gifford, chairman of the board of Borg-Warner International Corp. A year ago he was making speeches around Illinois and elsewhere urging that we show European industry how to be self-supporting so we would not have to continue to think in terms of relief.

These topflight business executives and labor leaders are working in close cooperation with our State Department representatives on the ground. They are putting hard-headed business judgment behind the United States position as it is discussed by our diplomats and diplomatic advisers.

WHAT HAVE WE ACCOMPLISHED?

The strictly relief stage of European recovery was passed a year ago.

All of the editors felt that genuine recovery, apparent on all sides in Europe in January 1950, had progressed much further than we had heard about through the news accounts that have been published in American newspapers.

Statistically, industrial production is 125 percent of the prewar figure (1938). Agricultural production, on the average, equals prewar production.

The shops are full of goods of all kinds. There is no unemployment in England or France, and the unemployment in Italy and Germany has been sensationally reduced.

These figures do not mean that life is easy for the average European workman—industrial or white collar. All European countries still are operating under wartime wage controls and prices in relation to wages are higher than in the United States and, in many instances, higher than in prewar Europe.

A Paris architect told me that the average Frenchman pays as much as 80 percent of his income for food, but only 5 percent for housing. This last because rents have been frozen at prewar levels.

Our impression was that the architect's statement was an exaggeration but that it is true that food takes a disproportionate share of the European's income.

Inflation, that was running rampant when the Marshall plan started, has slowed to a walk with every indication that it will be stopped entirely. The pound, the D-mark, the franc, and the lira have relatively stable values since devaluation. While there is a black market in money, it now is a relatively furtive and unprofitable business.

In France, for instance, the official rate is 350 francs to the dollar and the black market rate is 380. We heard no black-market quotations for pounds or lire but we were warned in Italy to deal with only reliable people in cashing traveler's checks because of the possibility that we would get counterfeit money.

The reconstruction of buildings destroyed by war in England, Germany, and Italy was so far advanced as to be sensational to the visitor who saw these countries 4 years ago. We did not see the invasion coast of France.

All of the countries of Europe are working hard to develop export business. All of them have plans for getting into the dollar market (the United States, Canada, and some South American countries), but so far they have done the best selling job in the sterling countries.

WHAT IS HAPPENING POLITICALLY?

The European recovery that we saw is reflected in a marked swing to the right in political thinking in all countries.

Prominent members of the Labor Party in England think the party will return to power on February 23, but with a reduced majority. Both the Conservatives and Liberals have real enthusiasm in this campaign.

We got the impression that if the question of nationalizing more industries were put to a vote that a good many people who would vote for the Labor Party would vote against further nationalization. In fact, a minor labor official said that was his opinion.

In Italy about 30 percent of the population voted for Communist deputies in April of 1948 and 70 percent voted for non-Communist parties.

A majority of the deputies were elected as Christian Democrats, the party of Alcide de Gasperi.

This was a remarkable turn around for Italy in response to American aid. All of the Americans we talked with who were in Italy during 1947 thought the Communists could have taken over the Government at any time, but that they deliberately chose to wait for the April 1948 elections so that they could go in legally and without risk.

De Gasperi is regarded by American observers as the finest, most dependable and sincere leader that Italy has ever had. He deserves the characterization of statesman.

For 15 years he was in hiding in the Vatican because of his opposition to Mussolini. When he returned to politics, he had the financial backing of Italian industrialists and the Vatican and yeoman support throughout Italy from Catholic laymen.

He could have formed a Christian Democrat Government, but insisted on bringing in as many of the non-Communist parties as possible. He realized that the vote of 1948 was not a genuine Christian Democrat vote but the result of rallying of the non-Communist voters from all parties.

After the election De Gasperi established a system of collecting dues from party members so he would not need to rely upon industrialists and Vatican financing of party activities.

Since the recovery in Italy the Liberal Party (rightist), which ran the country for 40 years before Mussolini, is gaining in strength.

Most American observers believe that a new election in Italy would see a further loss of Communist deputies and a loss of Christian Democrat votes to the Liberals and Moderate Socialists.

In France the Communists have been the strongest single party and have about 30 percent of the deputies. The second party, the MRP, which is made up essentially of the Catholics of liberal thought, is expected to lose a good many of its followers in the next election to the Radical Socialists (rightists despite the name) and even to De Gaulle's Rally of the French People.

Like Illinois, France has a reapportionment problem. In France this has resulted in too many deputies from some of the districts in which the Communists are strong. An effort is being made to get a reapportionment bill through the Chamber of Deputies. Even if it fails, most observers think that the Communists will lose some seats in the next election.

Of equal significance is the weakening of the Communists' grip on the trade-union movement in Italy and France. In Italy the non-Communist unions are growing rapidly. In France the big Communist union, CGT, is losing membership more rapidly than the non-Communist unions are gaining.

It is becoming increasingly difficult for Communist leaders to deliver their members in nuisance strikes for political effect. The big-shot Communist leaders can send word to a port, for example, suggesting a strike against the unloading of military equipment from the United States. The strike will not come off unless one of the well-known Communist leaders appears in person to demand it. If the French Government sends troops to unload the ships, as it has been doing, there is no violence and no real resistance from the unionists, most of whom did not wish to strike anyway.

WHERE DO WE GO FROM HERE?

Nineteen hundred and fifty is the critical year in nailing down the gains we have made among the 270,000,000 people of western Europe. (This is an increase of 20,000,000 since prewar.)

The word "integration" appears early in every discussion of Marshall-aid plans. By this is meant the reduction of tariff barriers and particularly the elimination of the quantitative quotas on the movement of goods between countries. We also mean simplifying the exchange of money and permitting the freer movement of peoples.

We have been insisting on sound fiscal policies within European countries and the balancing of budgets.

(On this last point, one of the editors asked a American leader if it wasn't embarrassing to demand that European governments balance their budgets in view of our own in the United States. He replied, off the record, that if we would take two-thirds of the good advice we are giving Europe what a wonderful country we would have. He did point out that our savings and reserves made it possible for us to do deficit financing for a little while, but that we could not keep it up indefinitely.)

We already have gotten quantitative restrictions taken off of 50 percent of the import items in each of the countries of Europe. At the recent meeting of the council of European leaders who administer the Marshall plan (OEEC), France took the lead in proposing that restrictions be taken off an additional 10 percent of the import items.

It should be understood that there has been no genuinely free movement of goods in Europe since before World War I. The wave of nationalization that swept through Europe like a plague was the incentive for each nation to try to be economically self-sufficient.

The result of this was that Italy, which has neither coal nor iron ore, attempted to maintain a steel industry.

France, which is not as far advanced as either Italy or England in the textile trade, attempted to create an artificial market for French textile makers within France by erecting not only tariff walls but actually

to set a limit on the quantities of textiles that could be imported regardless of price.

We are at the point now where we are beginning to make actual accomplishments in easing the flow of goods, money, and people throughout Europe and the world on a multilateral basis. The success of this program is the best hope of giving permanence to the European recovery that has been primed with Marshall plan money.

If we stop now, with the program half accomplished, we not only risk losing the gains we have made but laying ourselves open to later greater expenses for a military preparedness budget and for a return to emergency relief grants.

The leaders of ECA planning for European countries have agreed with our officials that they can stand a reduction of a billion dollars in the United States appropriations for the coming year to a total of $3,100,000,000. They have agreed to a further reduction to $1,700,000,000 for the following year, and to an end to the program in the middle of 1952.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO UNITED STATES?

About 75 percent of the Marshall plan money we are putting into Europe returns to the United States. Basically it is a plan to underwrite for Europe purchases in the dollar area. The second largest salesman of goods for delivery to Europe with Marshall plan dollars is Canada, which in turn does a good deal of business with the United States.

While Marshall plan appropriations underwrite European recovery to a considerable extent, they also are a means of underwriting the American economy. We saw United States corn, wheat, and machine tools in all the countries we visited.

A part of the difficulty in the United States coal fields today is the loss of the European market. Coal cannot be economically exported, but we had to export it anyway until British, German, and French mines got their production up and until the electrical generating industry in Europe could be stepped up to an all-time peak.

We will not lose the European market for agricultural and some manufactured goods if the present phase of the Marshall plan succeeds.

Of the countries we visited, only France can feed herself. England, Germany, and Italy must continue to import foodstuffs in large quantities. There is no possibility (because of the available acreage per thousand people) that England, Germany, and Italy can increase agricultural production sufficiently to support their populations.

There is no possibility that Italy, for example, can produce steel in quantities that will satisfy her needs. Fiat automobiles are now being made with steel ingots and bars purchased from Bethlehem and Republic steel companies in the United States. It is not immediately likely that Germany, England, and France can produce steel in sufficient quantities to supply their own needs and Italy's.

WE SHOULD GET IN DEEPER

The real problem in economic and political integration in Europe is the absence of European leadership.

We are attempting to get Europe's 270,000,000 people under 19 governments to work out their own salvation economically with advice and financial aid from the United States but without our actual participation as a party to the decisions.

Historically, England, the banker for the sterling area, has been the only leader Europe ever had. Most European countries feel, and with some justification, that England's only interest in the continent has been to exploit it.

Today, England puts economic integration in Europe in second place to her plans and obligations in reference to the commonwealth. A part of this commonwealth thinking in England is based on her fear of competition from a revitalized Germany. This fear of German vitality and productivity is shared in greater or lesser degree by all the countries of Europe.

It is apparent everywhere in Europe that our plans for integration would move quickly to realization if they were extended to include the Atlantic Pact countries, especially the United States.

It is difficult for us fully to realize the extent to which we are the bellwether in world affairs. We are the leading nation in the world by every measure. It is for us to decide not only the economic and political future of Europe's 270,000,000 people, but the future of our own economy which now is so productive that it cannot operate within the confines of our own borders, a market of 150,000,000 people.

As we decide, we must be aware of the fact that the future world will be slave or free, depending entirely upon which way the people of Europe drift. These people, next to the United States, are the people with the resources and the skills to win a war or win a peace.

If we should permit them to be enslaved by Russia, there is grave doubt if our civilization could stand in anything like its present form 9 hours away by air.

VITAL MARSHALL PLAN

Hearings in Congress will begin February 21 on appropriations for Marshall plan aid to Europe for the next 2 years.

We are now at the half-way point in this program that has a definitely scheduled end on June 30, 1952.

This is not a give-away program as Paul Hoffman says. It is a planned program for making the economy of Europe sound and self-supporting. We do not get into the details of the use of Marshall plan money except to approve the items that the representatives of European countries decide upon.

We get each country to agree upon its minimum needs, then in meetings with representatives of all of the countries to pare these figures down to an over-all total that we think is reasonable.

Each manufacturer or farm organization needing American equipment or commodities, must pay for them in the money of their own countries. The governments of the individual countries make the necessary dollar exchange available to the would-be purchaser out of Marshall plan funds.

The European governments then have what we call counterpart funds. In the case of England these funds are used for debt retirement. In the other European countries they are used for public-works projects such as drainage, irrigation, roads, public housing.

Last year this cost us roughly $4,000,000,000. The total to June 30, 1950 will be about eight and a quarter billions.

Our ECA officials and the representatives of European countries have agreed upon a reduction of a billion dollars for the next fiscal year—June 30, 1950 to June 30, 1951. This makes the appropriation request $3,100,000,000.

The plans for the final year—June 30, 1951 to June 30, 1952—call for an additional appropriation of one billion seven hundred million.

The Marshall plan program, administered by some of the best business brains of this country on a nonpartisan basis, has been accomplishing more than we had a right to expect from it in so short a time. (See Edward Lindsay's report on a recent visit to Marshall plan countries.)

The year 1950 is a critical time in the Marshall-aid program. It is this year that we expect the recovery that has taken place in western Europe to be given permanence through a program of economic integration—a reduction of quantitative quotas, a reduction in tariffs, a stepping-up of the interchangeability of moneys, and the freer movement of peoples.

It would be a mistake for the United States to permit its need for a reduction in the Federal budget—which is real enough—to jeopardize the success of the Marshall program. This program is our best hope not only of continuing to win the cold war, but stabilizing and making sound the foreign markets for American goods so necessary to the success of our own economy.

We should not only finish the Marshall-aid job, but should agree to a further revision of our tariffs to permit a freer interchange of goods between the United States and western Europe, actually between the United States and the rest of the free world.

We cannot afford the consequences of a weak or unstable Europe.

Settlement of Alaska a National Necessity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM LEMKE

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, the Alaska settlement bill, H. R. 4424, will come up on the floor before very long. This bill is necessary for our national defense. It is also necessary for the development of Alaska. The Territory of Alaska belongs to this Nation as a whole, not to a few monopolistic corporations, nor to the stooges of these corporations. The rank and file of the Alaskan people want Alaska settled. They know that their future prosperity depends upon that. A few despoilers do not want it settled.

This bill provides for the settlement of Alaska by giving to the homesteaders an enlarged homestead. It permits the Secretary of Interior to designate the lands that will be first surveyed and offered to homesteaders for settlement. These homesteads will be laid out in lots large enough to sustain an American family on the American level. It provides for the sustained yield on a timber claim.

It gives the veterans a 1-year preference whenever an area is opened for homesteading. If we want to get Alaska settled, we must give them more than 160 acres. When our Midwest and West was settled, we gave to settlers a homestead, a tree claim and a preemption, consisting of 480 acres. Later we increased it to the so-called dry farming or desert claims.

That is how the Midwest and West was settled. It was settled by adventurers and pioneers. Tenderfeet are not proper people to settle Alaska, any more than they were fitted for the settlement of the West. It is mere nonsense to think that prospective homesteaders will go to Alaska for 160 acres unless they are given special inducements by the Government as was done at Matanuska Valley.

We are told that Russia has over a million settlers right across the strait. The time has come that we wake up and get Alaska settled. This for our national defense as well as for the development of Alaska for Alaskans and not monopolies.

With my remarks I enclose herewith a letter from the Veterans Alaska Cooperative Co.; also a letter from a veteran in Oregon:

VETERANS ALASKA COOPERATIVE CO.,
Washington, D. C., June 9, 1947.
Re Settlement of Alaska by war veterans.
Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: After many hours of study and investigation in regard to your proposed bill for the settlement of Alaska by war veterans, I am more firmly convinced of the need for assistance by the Government and a public purpose corporation such as would be the position of the Alaska Rural Rehabilitation Corp.

The thousands of requests for information that have been received by Government agencies, as well as our company, is proof that veterans want to settle Alaska. The Canadian Government reports hundreds of requests daily to drive the ALCAN highway. The largest percentage of the inquiries to our company have been made by veterans who want to settle in Alaska and who are married with an average of three and one-half members per family. The average age of these people is approximately 28 years old. This age is important, as it shows a person in the prime physical condition of his life, as well as a balanced mental attitude. These people are not speculators but desire to become good, solid Alaska citizens. Veterans who take their families, and the majority of them will, cannot afford to be gold seekers and adventurers for the sake of adventure.

My investigations show that the contents of this bill are apparently misunderstood by many people. Several remarks have been made that this bill will void present homestead, home-site, and business-site regulations. If this be so, the bill will certainly discriminate and discourage thousands of veterans who wish to make their living in the small-business basis. It is extremely necessary that any veteran should receive the benefits of this bill regardless of the size tract he requests.

Past records show that certain lands have been denied a settler on the ground that it was not properly classified as suitable. It is important that a method such as is proposed in this bill be used to insure the settler absolute minimum of delay due to administrative procedure. The experiences of this company is such that it has cost the individual members much of their private capital that should have been used to make their home in Alaska.

It is unbelievable that any so-called resistance should be stopping the development of Alaska. I have talked with members of the War Department and they agree with us that the industrialization of Alaska with the small "unit-veteran-settler" to expand the hinterlands will be the true defense of Alaska more than the millions being spent to make another Maginot Line. An uncontrolled settlement of Alaska is dangerous, and this is going on right now and will continue. It is therefore important that this bill be put into effect as soon as possible. Should this method be but 20 percent effective, I am sure that it will be beneficial to the settler and Alaska more than the haphazard individual action that is now going on.

History shows that it is always the pioneer who struggles and battles his way through the wilderness and eventually goes bankrupt or dies of the hardship. To let this happen to hundreds of veterans who are once again voluntarily accepting many hardships to improve our country, would be the individual responsibility of all Members of Congress.

A continued delay of any help to Alaska discourages the veteran-settler to such an extent that he is forced to take other work. This has been our sad experience. Veterans who are just out of the armed forces are enthusiastic about such an experiment as the settlement of Alaska. After a year's delay, they will lose this spirit. This bill can be adjusted as problems develop and can be a true aid to the veteran-settler.

Should any member of this committee make a trip to Alaska, our veterans' settlement at Port Chilkoot at Haines, Alaska, will be extremely glad to offer them accommodations as we are sure there are none to compare with it in Alaska. You will get the opportunity of seeing what veterans have done without this bill and can judge for yourselves the great possibilities that are there, with this bill. We again hope to have you as our guests.

Sincerely,

CARL W. HEINMILLER,
Executive Vice President.

RIDDLE, OREG., *January 8, 1950.*

GENTLEMEN OF CONGRESS: Every week I read something in the newspapers pertaining to settlement of Alaska. Seems to me someone wants to get our main line of defense built up so as to defend the greater portion of North America and the population of the United States. A small front like Alaska would be easier and cheaper to defend than the great plains across Canada if our northern line of defense was walked through as Hitler walked through the European countries. Who has control of building up this line of defense? The Army or Navy or Marines don't. Congress does. What does Congress do about it? Nothing but talk. You've been talking 2 years I know about two bills that a Mr. LEMKE has introduced. While you're talking, Russia is rumored to be killing off thousands of slaves by working them to death building up an army and stocking up war supplies not far from Alaska. In other words concentrating on our northern line of defense. Are you going to sit and talk through this session of Congress and let Russia get another year of preparation ahead of us and have another catastrophe like Pearl Harbor except on a larger scale? Russia is acting every hour you talk.

The homstead law (H. R. 4424) introduced by Mr. LEMKE in 1949 should be dusted off and passed. The sooner the better. The Department of Agriculture says wheat, potatoes, all vegetables, some fruit, meat, milk, eggs and many other foodstuffs can be raised in Alaska. In fact it can produce enough for Alaska and its Army with possibilities of some for export. The big drawback that is curtailing this production is transportation. No roads or railroads. Also people who went up to Alaska to fight these odds against making a living couldn't get needed assistance and some couldn't get a title to the land. There are, to my understanding, too many restrictions to the present homestead law. If you will modernize the homestead law or pass H. R. 4424 which provides land and assistance that is all you need to get Alaska settled. The assistance is for the man who will go because the man that has a bank account necessary to put him through a year in Alaska starting a homestead isn't walking off his job, comfortable home, and security to go up there. He isn't the pioneer type. Which of you gentlemen will give up your job for a homestead in Alaska? This assistance is to be paid back but even if you didn't get a cent back it would be as some gentleman said in one of your hearings last year if you want airplanes you pay a subsidy; what for? Nothing. If you want butter you pay a subsidy; what for? Still nothing. But if you pay a pioneer a subsidy to stay on his homestead, what do you get? More pioneers and a stronger home front or line of defense.

A pioneer will need equipment to clear lands, tools to build with, tools and machinery to produce, trucks for transportation, the market is already available and will increase with each family that comes to Alaska. Each homestead will decrease the unemployment roll of 5,000,000 of today. Each timber homestead claimed and worked will start competition which will bring prices of lumber down so that the lower-income people can afford to buy lumber which in turn will give another man a job further decreasing the unemployment roll.

Under this homestead bill, H. R. 4424, if I were to go and stake a claim I probably would have a neighbor or two soon after I got started building a house. Soon there would be enough people to start a school, have a church, need a store and post office and other business and community establishments.

If you want Alaska settled pass H. R. 4424, or one similar, include a subsidy clause, which I say is to be paid back by 95 percent of total assistance loaned. (Check your veteran-loan figures.) Pass it by April 1, 1950, and I'll be in Alaska on April 30, 1950. All I need is assistance after I get there and I know two more families that will drive alongside me.

I am sure I wouldn't get lonesome going or be lonesome after I got settled. These two men are good, hard-working men who would be the makings of a good settler. I have a truck and a semitrailer and also a portable sawmill. Plenty of hand tools and enough furniture. I could get to Alaska and carry another family's furniture but I couldn't eat very long with my small cash outlay. I couldn't work at public works and build a home and clear land. I personally would need a loan to buy food and some building materials as nails, windows, and roofing and equipment to get my homestead to produce a living and repay the loan.

I would like to ask you to remember the VFW Resolution No. 5 pertaining to veteran settlement for Alaska when you pass this bill. Or are you going to pass up the opportunity to get Alaska settled and let Russia walk in our back door and ram a bayonet down our throat and make us like it?

It is up to you gentlemen of Congress to do something besides talk. Talk is all right sometimes but not right now. Action is needed. I would fight a bear (Russia) with a gun until I dropped but I would run if I were barehanded. Are we going to be caught barehanded again?

Thank you.

RALPH L. MEALER, Jr.

Japanese Naturalization Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HELEN GAHAGAN DOUGLAS
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 16, 1950

Mrs. DOUGLAS. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I should like to call to the attention of the Members of this distinguished body the fate of House Joint Resolution 238, a resolution to remove the racial restrictions which prevent the naturalization of some 90,000 resident aliens of Japanese and Korean descent in this country.

This joint resolution was adopted by the House unanimously last year and was unanimously approved by the Judiciary Committee of the other body last fall.

When it came up on the floor of the other body under unanimous consent on February 1 of this year, objection was raised and the resolution was passed over.

Fear has been expressed in certain quarters that if this resolution is adopted all sorts of aliens at present in this country because of special status—students, treaty merchants, and so forth—would be blanketed in and naturalized.

Not only is that not true, but both the House and Senate reports expressly state that this resolution does not affect the status of any but long-time permanent residents. Therefore, it does not, and cannot, affect any persons who have come in under special arrangements, whether by treaty or otherwise, with other countries.

Injustice and racial prejudice in our naturalization laws must not be permitted to continue. These persons of Japanese and Korean descent have been residents of this country for more than 25 years. They have demonstrated their loyalty and devotion to their adopted country these many years. Almost all of them had sons and daughters who served the armed services during World War II, and many with distinction.

In all fairness to this minority in our midst, we should hasten to correct this all-too-long injustice and inequity by removing race restrictions from our naturalization procedure, and granting to these people the recognition and dignity which is justly theirs.

I sincerely hope when this resolution comes up again in the Senate it will be unanimously approved, as the House has long since done.

In the Shadow of the Sun and Death

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I recently received from the editor and publisher of the Wynnefield Forum, Mr. S. Bakove, a copy of a poem entitled "In the Shadow of the Sun and Death," of which he is the author, and which was published in the February 11 edition of his paper. I ask unanimous consent that the poem be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the poem was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

IN THE SHADOW OF THE SUN AND DEATH

(By S. Bakove)

Hush and rush: a ghastly mission—
Fission, fusion, and then perdition.
Ah! S-U-N is the clue:
A strong UN is overdue.
Foreboding stuns the world.
An H-bomb hurled
May doom to incandescence
And gradual evanescence
The very earth we tread.
The havoc we so dread
As to induce delirium
When pondering the chaos deuterium
Wed to helium may beget,
That cataclysm may be averted yet.
Renounce all war: that's the quintessence,
Or be adjudged supreme assassins.
Hasten, lest a chunk of Sun
Blast us to oblivion.

Morganza Floodway Funds Badly Needed

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY D. LARCADE, JR.
OF LOUISIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, February 22, 1950

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an article by Mr. George W. Healy, staff writer of the New Orleans (La.) Times-Picayune, published on February 19, 1950, as follows:

MORGANZA FLOODWAY FUNDS BADLY NEEDED—PROJECT IN PROGRESS 12 YEARS STILL NOT FINISHED

(By George W. Healy, Jr.)

The Morganza floodway has been in the talking and planning stage for 22 years.

It has been a-building for 12 years.

But today, with backwater forcing thousands of families from their homes just upstream from the point where the floodway would relieve the Mississippi of thousands of cubic feet of water each second, the Morganza floodway is not ready for operation.

Louisianians are asking "Why?"

The only thing the United States engineers need to complete the floodway is money.

This is the statement of Brig. Gen. Peter A. Feringa, president of the Mississippi River Commission, who recently told a congressional Appropriations Committee that completion of the floodway is a vital need.

TWENTY MILLION DOLLARS SPENT

The United States has spent about $20,000,000 in work on the floodway. Actual allocations have been $20,811,597, including $1,781,000 for a combined control structure and rail and highway crossings at the point where the floodway touches the Mississippi River.

The engineers estimate that $18,899,000 more will be required to complete the project.

First legal step toward building of a spillway from a point near Old River, north of Baton Rouge, to the Gulf of Mexico was taken in 1928, when Congress adopted the Flood Control Act.

That first act contemplated a floodway along the right bank of the Atchafalaya River from its source to the Gulf. The Atchafalaya runs out of Old River, near the point where the Red River runs into Old River—the stream which connects the Old and the Mississippi Rivers.

SUBSTITUTE PROJECT

In 1936, Congress amended the Flood Control Act of 1928 to substitute the Morganza floodway for the so-called East Atchafalaya floodway. Morganza floodway would take water direct from the Mississippi below Old River and drain it into the Gulf over a route partially the same as that planned earlier for the East Atchafalaya floodway. The latter project would have taken water from Old River, instead of from the Mississippi.

In 1938, a modification in design for the project was adopted, and work on the Morganza floodway, as such, was started. This work was interrupted by World War II and was resumed in 1946.

In reply to an inquiry from the Times-Picayune, General Feringa reported Saturday that by June 1950 all parts of the floodway with the exception of the control structure will be essentially complete. This means that the guide levees will stretch from the Mississippi River to a point near the Gulf, that rail and highway bridges over the spillway will be operating, and that incidental works, such as canal locks, will be installed.

DAM FOR CONTROL

The control structure, for which only $1,781,000 had been allocated, will be a dam, or weir, over which will be a railroad and highway crossing.

This dam will be used, when it is complete, to permit water from the Mississippi to flow into the floodway or to stop it from flowing into the floodway—as conditions dictate. It will be operated just as the United States engineers operate the Bonnet Carre spillway, opening or closing it at will.

Demand for completion of the Morganza floodway was loud in north Louisiana in 1945, when backwater covered large acreage in Concordia and Catahoula Parishes—just above Old River. The demand, as expected, died down when the waters subsided. Now, with about 7,000 families evacuated from backwater areas, the demand is louder than ever.

Completion of 17 cut-offs in the Mississippi River between Memphis and Old River has aggravated the backwater problem in the Concordia-Catahoula area. By shortening the big river, these cut-offs have speeded the flow of water in the stretches where they have eliminated bends in the stream. As a result, water flows from Memphis to Old River faster than it did before the cut-offs were made. However, the Mississippi River channel below Old River is no larger than it was before the cut-offs were dredged or blasted. A greater proportion of water is reaching the Gulf by way of the Atchafalaya than was the case before the cut-offs, but the Atchafalaya's carrying capacity is limited by the size of its channel, which is enlarging.

FAVORS SHORTER ROUTE

From Old River to the Gulf by way of the Mississippi River is 322 miles. From Old River to the Gulf by way of the Atchafalaya River is 159 miles. Naturally, the water seeks to follow the shorter route, but it can't flow to the Gulf any faster than available channels can carry it.

The Morganza floodway would be an added channel, speeding the flow of water from a point where it is being "piled up" by the new channels, or cut-offs in the river, upstream.

The "piling up" of water in the Old River area is blamed by Concordia and Catahoula Parish citizens for the flooding of towns and farms which formerly had no difficulty with backwater. They believe that opening of the Morganza floodway would stop the backing of water up the Red and Black Rivers.

But, Morganza floodway isn't ready for operation—yet. It's only half finished—measured in dollars and cents.

Given adequate appropriations, General Feringa says the engineers will have the floodway finished before high-water time in 1953.

"The rate of engineering progress," said the general, "is entirely dependent upon congressional appropriations."

FHA Discriminates Against Indians Under Housing Law

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANCIS CASE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 9, 1950

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, a most unfortunate ruling has been made by the solicitor in the Department of Agriculture. It makes a mockery of all this talk that the Truman

administration is opposed to racial discrimination.

Under permission given by the House, I include herewith a letter from the Administrator of the Farmers Home Administration to Felix S. Cohen, attorney for a number of Indian tribes, and Mr. Cohen's reply thereto. They tell the story:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF AGRICULTURE,
FARMERS HOME ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 31, 1950.

Mr. FELIX S. COHEN,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. COHEN: In your letter of December 22, 1949, you raised a number of questions regarding the eligibility of certain Indian tribes for the benefits of the financial assistance authorized under title V of Public Law 171 (81st Cong.). We referred your letter to the Office of the Solicitor of the United States Department of Agriculture, and in reply we received the following comments:

"I. TRUST PATENTS

"According to Mr. Cohen's letter most of the land in the reservations of the Blackfeet Tribe, the Omaha Tribe, and the Oglala Sioux Tribe has been allotted to individual Indians in severalty under trust patents as provided by the act of February 8, 1887 (24 Stat. 388). The trust patents in effect provide that the holders thereof are only entitled to the use and possession of the land, legal title being retained by the United States, and that the land cannot be alienated while the United States holds legal title thereto. The act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 984 (25 U. S. C. 462)) extended the trust period and the restraints against alienation indefinitely.

"Section 5 of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended (25 U. S. C. 348), provides that any conveyance of, or any contract made touching, allotted lands prior to the expiration of the trust period shall be null and void and, as stated above, the trust period and the restraints on alienation have been extended until otherwise directed by Congress. The holders of trust patents will not be entitled to fee patents to their lands until it is determined that they are competent to handle their own affairs. The act of May 14, 1948, 62 Stat. 236 (25 U. S. C. 483) authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in his discretion and upon application by Indians holding land under trust patents to remove the restrictions against alienation and issue fee patents.

"One of the requirements of eligibility set forth in section 501 (c) of the Housing Act of 1949 is that the applicant must be the owner of a farm. Since section 502 (b) of said act requires that each farm housing loan be secured by the equity of the borrower in his farm, it is our view that the term 'owner of a farm' as used in the act contemplates that the applicant have such an interest in his farm that he can alienate or encumber it. Inasmuch as Indians holding land under trust patents cannot alienate their land or their interests therein, it is our opinion that they would not qualify as being 'owners of farms' and for that reason would be ineligible for Farm Housing assistance.

"II. FEE PATENTS

"On the reservations of the Blackfeet, Omaha, and Oglala Sioux tribes part of the land is held in severalty by individual Indians under fee patents. It is our opinion that these Indians would qualify as being owners of farms, providing the land falls within the definition of a farm as set forth in section 501 (b) of the Housing Act of 1949, since the issuance of a fee patent removes the restraints against alienation and enables the Indians to deal with their property the same as any non-Indian. See *Larkin* v. *Paugh* (276 U. S. 431 (1928)); *Marks* v. *Brooks* (32 F. Supp. 422 (1940)); section 6 of the act of February 8, 1887, as amended (25 U. S. C. 349).

"III. TRIBAL LAND

"As stated in Mr. Cohen's letter, part of the land comprising the reservations of the Blackfeet and Omaha tribes is unallotted, held in tribal ownership, and occupied by tenants of the tribe for grazing and agricultural purposes. These tribes have been incorporated under a Federal charter issued by the Secretary of the Interior under section 17 of the act of June 18, 1934 (48 Stat. 988, 25 U. S. C. 477), and exercise the usual powers of a municipal corporation. On the reservations of the San Carlos Apache and Hualapai tribes, all the land is tribally owned and is occupied by Indians as tenants of the tribe for grazing and agricultural purposes. These tribes also have been incorporated pursuant to the authority cited above. Likewise on the reservations of the Pueblos all the land is held by the tribes, the tribes having been incorporated under an act passed by the New Mexico Territorial Legislature in 1847, and is assigned by the tribe to its members for occupation and agricultural purposes. On the reservation of the Oglala Sioux tribe, an unincorporated association, certain lands are held by the tribe and occupied by tenants of the tribe for agricultural purposes.

"Land held by the tribe constitutes the public property of the tribe and the individual members of the tribes do not have a vested interest in any specific part of such land, although they may have a perpetual right of occupancy in the lands occupied by them under the laws of the tribe. See *Tuttle* v. *Moore* (3 Ind. T. 712, 64 S. W. 585); *Crowell* v. *Young* (4 Ind. T. 148, 64 S. W. 607); *Sizemore* v. *Brady* (235 U. S. 441 (1914)); *Franklin* v. *Lynch* (233 U. S. 269 (1914)). A member of a tribe cannot alienate or encumber tribal lands occupied by him because tribal lands can only be disposed of by treaty or convention as provided in R. S. 2116 (25 U. S. C. 177). Inasmuch as members of a tribe do not have an alienable interest in the land they occupy, it is apparent that they would not qualify as being the owners of farms for the reasons hereinbefore set forth in our consideration of Indians holding trust patents.

"Until 1871 Indian tribes were recognized by the United States as being nations for treaty purposes. However, the act of March 3, 1871 (25 U. S. C. 71), made all Indian tribes subject to the legislative power of Congress. Nevertheless, Indian tribes are distinct political communities as long as the tribal relation is maintained and possess powers of local self-government. The internal affairs of Indian tribes are controlled and directed by a tribal council which is established pursuant to the tribal charter or constitution. The council so established can enact whatever laws and regulations which are deemed necessary for the government of the tribe and the control and use of tribal property, providing such legislative action is not inconsistent with the laws and Constitution of the United States. See 27 American Jurisprudence—Indians, sections 6, 7, and 9. Since Indian tribes may properly be classified as being corporate or quasi corporate bodies politic, we are of the opinion that farm-housing loans cannot be made to Indian tribes as such in view of our previous determination that farm-housing assistance could only be extended to natural persons.

"In conclusion, it is our opinion that only those Indians occupying land under fee patents can be considered as owners of farms and as eligible in this respect for farm housing assistance.

"In view of our determination that Indians holding land under trust patents cannot be considered owners of farms for the purposes of the Housing Act of 1949, and that Indian tribes are ineligible for farm-housing assistance because the act limits assistance to natural persons, it is not necessary to consider the instruments used by the Department of the Interior to pledge income from trust property as security for loans made pursuant to the lending programs carried on by that department."

The comments of the Office of the Solicitor explain the position of the Farmers Home Administration with respect to the eligibility of Indians for farm housing loans and grants. If you have further questions on this subject we shall be glad to discuss them with you.

Sincerely yours,

DILLARD B. LASSETER,
Administrator.

WASHINGTON, D. C., *February 6, 1950.*

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The decision of the Farmers Home Administration on January 31, 1950 (copy attached), declaring about 400,000 American Indians ineligible for farm housing loans, will shock all consistent supporters of the civil-rights program to which you have given such courageous leadership.

As attorney for the Blackfeet Tribe of Montana, the Omaha Tribe of Nebraska, the Oglala Sioux Tribe of South Dakota, the Hualapai and San Carlos Apache Tribes of Arizona, and the All-Pueblo Council of New Mexico, comprising some 40,000 of our first Americans, I appeal to you to end this executive discrimination.

Of all the racial strains that make up our America, our Indian fellow-citizens are probably most in need of Federal housing aid. They do not ask for any special favor to them as Indians. All they ask for is fair treatment as American citizens.

There is no excuse in law or in public policy for denying to Indians the aid that is now given to home owners of every other race.

Your own humane concern for Indian welfare is beyond question. I had the best possible evidences of that concern when I served as Associate Solicitor under your first two Secretaries of the Interior. Equally clear is your consistent backing of housing aid for the ill-housed rural population of our country. Your concern for the principle of equal rights to all, regardless of race or ancestry, is clear to all of us, and is particularly clear to me. When I called upon you at the White House 3 weeks ago you made it perfectly plain that the executive branch of the Government was fully and wholeheartedly committed to the principle of nondiscrimination. Unfortunately, as we both have reason to know, the executive branch of the Government contains a good many otherwise decent Americans from whom the principle of nondiscrimination receives only lip-service.

Lip-service to the principle of nondiscrimination in the Farmers Home Administration begins and ends with the Administrator's first regulation on applicants:

"In considering the qualifications of applicants to receive farm housing assistance, no discrimination shall be made on the basis of race" (sec. 302.1, 14 Federal Register 6546).

The decision of Farm Housing Administration to exclude Indians (except for the 1 percent or so of Indians who hold lands under unrestricted fee patents) from the scope of the Federal rural housing program is not based on the existence of any other special fund for Indian housing. There is no special housing fund for Indians in any other department or agency. Until now Indians have been led to assume that their applications for farm housing loans or grants would receive impartial consideration.

The decision of the Farmers Home Administration is inconsistent with the settled policy of other departments and agencies of the Federal Government to treat Indian land

owners on a par with other land owners in the allocation of Federal assistance.

The only grounds given for the decision are technicalities more specious than any "grandfather clause" technicality ever invented to justify discrimination against an outcast minority without using racial terms.

The first argument advanced is the senseless contention that Indian land owners have no equity in their lands. The Supreme Court has consistently held that the entire equitable estate in Indian lands is vested in the Indian owners. *United States* v. *Paine Lumber Co.* (206 U. S. 467); *Shoshone Tribe of Indians* v. *United States* (299 U. S. 476).

The second of the solicitor's arguments is that Indian land owners are not owners of land because their lands are protected by acts of Congress from alienation. These acts of Congress were passed in all good faith to protect, and not to deny, the land-ownership rights of Indians. Their land "is not the land of the United States" (*United States* v. *Paine Lumber Co.* (206 U. S. 467, 473)). Your Secretaries of the Interior for many years have encouraged Indians to hold their lands under these congressionally authorized protections. Under that form of tenure, Federal loans based upon Indian land as security have been repaid with a delinquency rate of only one-half of 1 percent.

The Farm Home Administration appears to be in fundamental conflict with Interior Department Indian policy in suggesting that any Indian, to qualify for housing loans from his agency, must give up his right to Federal protection.

The final argument of the Farmers Home Administration is that individual Indians are not entitled to loans as farmers because Indian tribes are really corporations. It would make just as much sense to say that workers who are members of incorporated labor unions are not employees entitled to the protection of labor laws.

No other department or agency of the Government has found any difficulty in recognizing that Indians are human beings.

Even the Department of Agriculture made Farm Security loans to Indians. The ridiculous character of this argument is shown up by the fact that it is applied even to the Oglala Sioux Tribe, which never has incorporated. It assumes that these Indians are a quasi corporation. So, I suppose, are all of us who are members of any cooperative, trade association, labor union, or other organization.

Obviously, an agency that will invoke such legal cobwebs to disqualify an entire race from the beneficent protection of your rural housing policy will not be influenced by legislative or judicial authorities, and I therefore refrain from citing here the statutes and the decisions which establish the invalidity of each of these arguments. In any event, the authorities are collected in the Handbook of Federal Indian Law which I wrote for the Government some years ago.

There are two things that you can do, as President, to right this latest injustice to our Indian fellow citizens. You can instruct your Farmers Home Administrator to reverse his decision. Or you can ask the Budget Bureau to arrange for, or recommend to the Congress, the allocation of a reasonable portion of Federal farm housing funds in current and future appropriations to some agency that will be willing to consider the housing needs of our first Americans, our own original displaced persons. I would estimate that of the 700,000 or so farm homes most in need of Federal loans or grants for improvement, approximately 70,000, or 10 percent, are owned by Indians. I suppose the Commissioner of Indian Affairs can give you a more precise figure on this.

Here is a situation in which two Departments of our Government, Agriculture and Interior, are at odds on Indian policy and Indian law, and the result is Indian suffering, disease, and everything that goes with bad housing and racial discrimination.

In such a dispute between Departments only the President of the United States can set right the injustice that is being done. The 40,000 Indians that I represent appeal to you to set right this injustice. I think that millions of my white fellow Americans will join in that plea. What is at stake here is basically the issue of Executive respect for civil rights.

Indeed, the Farmers Home Administration is attacking the most basic and most widely supported of all civil rights when it attacks the principle that the Federal Government, in its public services, is equally the servant of all its citizens.

Respectfully yours,

FELIX S. COHEN.

Mankind at the Crossroads

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an address by the junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] at the Young Democrats' rally in Greensboro, N. C., February 11, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor which you have shown me to invite me to address this large and enthusiastic meeting of the Young Democrats of North Carolina. I am glad to have the opportunity of speaking in the home district of my friend, CARL DURHAM, who is a conscientious Member of the House of Representatives and with whom I enjoyed serving for many years. Also I note that present here tonight is Congressman HAMILTON JONES of Charlotte, with whom I have served in the House of Representatives and whom I call my friend.

I am delighted to be here with Senator FRANK GRAHAM, who I think is one of the great statesmen of our times. As a matter of fact, I have much admiration for both of your United States Senators. Senator HOEY is a very conscientious, hard-working statesman, and of course FRANK GRAHAM has already made a remarkable impression for the good in the United States Senate.

It should be noted that North Carolina in recent years has been furnishing many most capable men and women to the national scene. Such people as Mrs. Gladys Tillett, Gordon Gray, Kenneth Royall, Jim Webb, Jonathan Daniels, Lindsay Warren, Lamar Caudle, and many others whom I could name, have brought much credit to this great State and to the Democratic Party.

The newspaper headlines of the past 2 weeks have dramatically spelled out for us again the brutal fact that mankind stands at the crossroads.

By direction of the President, the United States is moving ahead with production of the hydrogen bomb—a weapon supposedly 1,000 times more destructive than that which wiped out Hiroshima.

The ink was hardly dry on the front pages carrying this announcement when we were confronted by another, equally shocking—that our plans for this bomb may lie, even now, in the hands of a potential enemy.

We cannot help but feel a certain sense of futility at a time of such developments as these.

It must seem to most of us that the individual is powerless to halt this headlong race toward chaos—that the individual is hopelessly victimized by forces over which he has no control.

Inevitably we ask ourselves—what can I do? What possible influence can we, who are gathered here in Greensboro, N. C., bear upon a future decision of peace or war to be made halfway around the globe—particularly when that decision rests with men to whom an appeal to reason, or an appeal made in the name of humanity itself, would probably be fruitless.

We shall find our answer, I think, if we reexamine the over-all strategy with which the United States attempts to insure a lasting peace among nations and if we seek to relate our individual thinking and action to that strategy.

We Americans are motivated, first, by the faith that a world in which men enjoy the full fruits of freedom will be a world at peace; a world in which the orderly processes of popular, representative government can function effectively will be a world at peace. Nations where there is a true expression of popular will do not provoke wars. Free nations do not promote those economic and social conditions which drive men to fight through desperation, greed, fear, or hatred.

In support of this principle we are providing economic assistance, to the limit of our present capacity, to Europe—where the two great wars of this century began where free men today are waging a mighty effort to stem the tide of Communist tyranny. The aid we have offered so far was given just in time to rescue a continent from the jaws of oppression and slavery.

We are studying a program of economic aid on an even broader scale under the proposed point-4 program. Through this policy, we envision the use of American capital to provide higher standards of living for other areas where modern industrialization and democratic government are still a novelty.

A second principle which guides our planning for peace is that cooperation among nations is essential to world order. This lesson we neglected to learn a generation ago, and we paid for our oversight with 300,000 American lives.

Formation of the United Nations, even before the end of World War II, gave us high hopes that through international cooperation the many grave problems of the postwar era would be solved. These hopes faded fast with the realization that the Soviet Union felt no genuine desire to approach such issues in a cooperative spirit.

Hence we felt the necessity to draw ourselves closer into the fellowship of other free nations. The signing of the North Atlantic Pact exemplifies this third principle of our strategy for peace—that those nations which earnestly seek a free and peaceful world must work in closest harmony, utilizing their collective moral force to challenge the ambitions of any aggressor. The Atlantic Union Resolution, now before the United States Congress, providing for a limited federation of the Atlantic democracies, is a logical successor to the Atlantic Pact—and is, indeed, a forward step along the path toward effective world government.

The fourth principle is another which the democracies failed to grasp in the aftermath of World War I—that an aggressor nation knows no language but that of force, that military weakness invites armed attack.

We in the United States have built the strongest, most efficient peacetime Military Establishment in world history. We are providing arms for our friends abroad.

We do not intend to be caught asleep at the switch.

We do not intend to give anyone the idea that the democracies will be a push-over.

And if there is some consolation that we may derive from development of the hydrogen bomb, we can assure aggressive powers that we will strike back with as devastating a blow as any that may be loosed against us.

Economic assistance to Europe—full support to the United Nations—Atlantic cooperation—strengthened military defenses: These are the tangible weapons in the arsenal of peace which we are forging today.

These tangible weapons are costly.

They consume nearly three-fourths of our tremendous Federal budget.

They are investments we cannot afford not to make, even though years may pass before they yield the dividends for which we fervently hope.

But the intangible weapon we possess provides the key to our salvation.

Our intangible weapon contains the destiny of civilization itself.

That intangible weapon is the vitality, the creative energy, of the free democratic system we have fashioned here in America.

It is clear that the free economy of the United States must be, for at least a generation, the foundation of world order and peace.

If we permit our economy to remain static, or if we revert to the old cycle of boom-and-bust, we cannot possibly meet the cost of those economic and military aids which help to preserve an uneasy peace.

However, the necessity that America remain strong and secure is not merely a matter of dollars and cents.

The people of the world who yearn for freedom and peace need our dollars, our arms; but they need something more.

They need a living example of a fundamental truth—that freemen, and freemen only, can enjoy the abundant life on this earth.

It is this faith which will sustain them when all else fails.

If we cannot continue to make democracy work here; if we cannot maintain a productive, ever-expanding economy within the framework of free enterprise; if all Americans cannot share the liberty, justice, and opportunity which is our birthright, all will be lost. Where else, but America, can mankind find that faith and hope without which it cannot survive?

Our contribution, as individuals, to the cause of world peace can only be made in the forging of this intangible weapon—the vitality of a free America.

We cannot enter the walls of the Kremlin—nor the halls of the United Nations—to alter the deliberations and the policies which evolve there.

But in our homes, our towns and cities, we have the opportunity to work actively for peace—by seeking to assure for all our people the full realization of the democratic ideal.

We have the opportunity to keep alive the hopes of a despairing world by proving, in our own communities, the lasting worth of the free society.

We have in our country today an unparalleled oportunity for economic advance if we have the courage to take advantage of it. We have relatively full employment and a high rate of national income. A tremendous demand for consumer goods and services remains unfilled. American technology almost daily is developing new products which contribute to more comfortable living for all. Perhaps most significant, we have brought under control many of the destructive forces which lead to depressions. We understand, more clearly than ever before, the nature of these upheavals which gnaw at the foundations of free enterprise—which, uncontrolled, would destroy it. We have legislation which enables industry and the individual to weather periods of minor decline and uncertainty.

President Truman, in his recent state of the Union message, pointed to the phenomenal growth of the American economy in the past 50 years.

Our national production has risen in value from $50,000,000,000 a year to $255,000,000,000.

The income of the average family, in terms of buying power, has doubled.

The average hours of work have declined from 60 to 40 hours per week, while the hourly production of the average worker has tripled.

Average wages have increased from 45 cents an hour to $1.40 an hour.

The President predicted even more remarkable expansion in the next 50 years. He estimated that our total national production in the year 2000 will be nearly four times as much as it is today, and that family income will be about three times as great as in 1950.

You who may still justifiably regard yourselves as young must experience a keen sense of expectancy as you stand on the threshold of this half-century—as you consider the richness of our Nation's promise which our President outlined for us.

With such expectancy there should come an evaluation of the responsibility you have to see that promise fulfilled.

It is gratifying that you indicate, through your membership in the Young Democratic organization, your willingness to accept a share of that responsibility.

Let us think for a while of the particular sphere in which you will work to mold a stronger, more free, more democratic nation in the years ahead.

Your first sphere of action will be one of geography.

Most, if not all of you will live out your span of years here in the South—and I have no hesitancy in asserting that the South can take its place in the very front rank of the tremendous economic advance we anticipate. Today we may accurately describe the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic opportunity. A new spirit is stirring here which has startled the Nation. While we conquered the last geographical frontiers of the Nation many years ago, the South is one economic frontier whose possibilities have never been fully explored.

Your responsibility is all the more challenging, and its acceptance will be all the more exciting, because the South has a potential more vast than any other section of the Nation.

We southerners frequently have cause to wonder why we attract so much attention from writers, scholars, journalists, and political leaders outside the region.

It seems that there are thousands of experts and would-be experts on the southern problem—but we never hear about a northern problem, an eastern problem, or a western problem.

One might think we in the South have a monopoly of all the problems on the American scene.

I believe we may well regard these commentaries as compliments, whether they are intended to be such or not.

The fact is that the South today is the most interesting, the most significant, region of our Nation.

The South is interesting because our pattern of living is more complex than that of any other part of the country. The fact that we manage to live harmoniously and fruitfully despite these complexities is something of a tribute to the character of our people.

The South is significant today because of its very diversity—because, in some ways, we southerners live, think and act differently from our fellow Americans.

Those qualities of mind and heart which distinguish us as southerners are rightfully the subject of national comment. Our way of life is of concern to all the American people. The South can no longer isolate itself from the rest of the Union. At a time when national unity in the common cause of peace and freedom is essential, it is imperative that we minimize the effects of the diversity.

These distinctive characteristics of the South do, indeed, merit the attention of other Americans.

But they deserve our attention more. It is we—and we alone—who must determine the South's course in national affairs.

Let us not deny that we have problems, merely because an outsider happens to mention them.

Let us freely admit that we do have complex problems—let us talk about them frankly—and move courageously ahead to seek their solution.

No one has ever condemned the South for refusing to stand still.

Volume upon volume have been written by southerners and others who have sought to dig deep to the root of the South's problems. Perhaps I risk gross understatement and repetition in outlining a few of those problems here.

No discussion of the South today would be accurate if it did not point to our unique political system as a matter for our concern.

The one-party system which is deeply rooted in our tradition undoubtedly works to our advantage as Democrats.

However, if we look beyond partisan considerations, we see that this archaic structure is neither normal nor desirable because it saps the vitality of our political institutions here, and has widespread effects on national policy.

In many of our Southern States, absence of an opposition party destroys the incentive of the Democratic Party to provide sound, serviceable government—and to attack vigorously those conditions which are properly the concern of government.

The absence of an opposition party has too often contributed to the development of corrupt, entrenched machines.

It has permitted the rise of demagogs who do not pretend to voice the genuine opinions, nor to execute the will of the majority of the southern people.

Because it has destroyed political competition and interest in government matters, the one-party system is largely responsible for the failure of southern citizens to exercise regularly their privilege to vote. The South lags far behind the Nation in the percentage of registered voters who participate in primaries and elections. The State of Ohio outranked my own State of Tennessee about 3 to 1, in this respect, in elections for governor from 1920 to 1946. About 58 percent of the eligible voters of Ohio went to the polls in these elections, while we in Tennessee had a turn-out of 18 percent in the Democratic primaries over the same period.

This pattern extends to too many States other than my own.

Surely none of us can take pride in a political system where the majority of potential voters, either through artificial methods designed to hold down the vote, or through lack of interest, do not participate in the affairs of their government.

The suggested amendment to alter the electoral college offers great promise that we may some day have a two-party system in the South. However, until we have Republican leaders in the South who are more in-

terested in principles than in patronage, our improvement will be retarded.

We must remember that as long as we have one-party domination, the South will not receive from either major party the consideration to which it is entitled in the determination of policy.

Many commentators have suggested that the basic trouble of the South was for many years an impoverished economy—that economic development is the answer to all our problems.

Not so many years ago, Franklin Roosevelt described the South as the Nation's No. 1 economic problem.

We did not like to be labeled that—but there was considerable justification for it.

For nearly three-quarters of a century the South had trailed the Nation in almost every measure of economic progress.

Our farmers were shackled to a one-crop agriculture.

Our soil was being rapidly depleted.

Our industrial development was retarded by a lack of wealth for capital investment.

Our State governments and municipalities were too poor to provide the people adequate educational and medical services.

Millions of our people lived in abject poverty.

We have witnessed dramatic changes in the past 15 years.

We are overcoming the blight of poverty. The average income of the people here has risen more and faster in recent years than that in any other part of the United States.

Our industrial facilities have expanded rapidly. We are taking advantage of our great natural resources, our stable labor supply, our favorable climate—and we are pointing out these advantages to industrialists elsewhere who are coming to join us in building a new South.

We have learned that the absolute reign of "king cotton" is at an end, and we are beginning to achieve a well-balanced agriculture.

We are able to spend more and more money for our schools and for the health of our citizens.

These are encouraging developments. They show us that we have come far along the way to economic maturity. But we have further to go yet before the South will realize its potential effectiveness in the expanding national economy, so necessary to world stability.

A very real problem of the South is our social structure, the pattern developed here whereby two races live side by side in relative harmony.

It should be obvious to everyone that our customs are traditional, that they will continue to exist until southerners themselves decide to change them.

No social custom can ever be altered or changed immediately by law or by force.

This truth should be obvious to those outside the South who demand that we change overnight a system under which we have lived in peace for generations.

This truth should be equally obvious to those within the South who resist every effort to better the lot of the minority race—on the false notion that these efforts will disrupt our way of life.

The problem imposed by our pattern of living is that it provides a convenient weapon to oppose any program, however mild, which seeks to benefit the minority race. The fear that we may lose this pattern is a useful instrument for the demagog who plays upon the passions and prejudices of the people. By a strange coincidence, this fear is an instrument used largely by those southerners who oppose economic and social improvement for the average man of either race.

Most of us realize that to accord the minority race a full measure of legal justice, and its share of economic, educational, and political opportunity is the only sound basis for the progress of both races.

Most of us realize that such goals can be achieved without disrupting, in any manner, the accepted pattern of social relations.

These principles have won general acceptance among the people of North Carolina, which is the major reason North Carolina has won true leadership among the States of the South.

You in North Carolina are well aware that the heavens have not fallen as a result of your determination to raise the living standards of the minority group.

The South has paid a great price in regional vitality because some of its people will not follow the example you have set in North Carolina.

We have seen that your contribution to a stronger America, and hence to a peaceful world, will be made here in the South, your home and mine. The South is your first sphere of action.

We acknowledge that the South is beset with complex problems, each inter-acting upon the other. Our political system influences the growth of our economy—our economy in turn may help relieve the poverty and ignorance which create a faulty political pattern—the delicate nature of our human relations will be held in balance as we attain broader political and economic development—psychological factors may determine whether we shall take positive action on these matters, or whether our prejudices, fears, and resentments will distort us.

There is no one concrete procedure by which we can emerge immediately from these complex patterns, which are peculiarly southern, and play the dynamic role in national life which is within our power.

I do wish to suggest one underlying principle without which we cannot hope to solve any problem in human affairs on a world basis—on the national scale—or here in the South.

That principle is one which, if it were enshrined in the hearts of men everywhere, would wipe out the hatred, the greed and the lust for power which today foster man's inhumanity to man.

That principle lies at the very foundation of our Christian civilization and of our democratic faith.

I refer to the principle that every man—regardless of his color—regardless of his creed—regardless of his name or origin—has been endowed by his Creator with a certain innate dignity. Every man has a certain value and worth by the mere fact that he is a human being.

And when the dignity, the value, the worth of any man on this planet is impaired, the dignity of all men suffers thereby.

Because we live and work in the South, we can see more immediately how this great principle can simplify our task here, if we courageously put it into practice.

We can apply that principle to our political system—and we will find that every man is entitled to have a voice in the conduct of his government—and that no individual may rightfully enjoy more influence in government than another.

We can apply that principle to our economic system—and we will find that every man is entitled, by his dignity as a man, to an education, to a decent place to live and rear his family, to the benefits of medial science, to perform useful work, and to receive just compensation for it and we will find that every man should be free to move as far up the economic ladder as his ability, initiative, and effort will carry him.

We can apply that principle to our social pattern—and nowhere, more than in the field of human relations, do we need to evaluate each individual for his individual worth—and to judge him by no other standard. There should be no other valid measurement.

The idea of the essential dignity of man is indeed a simple one.

But while we can send a message around the world in seconds, it takes years, generations sometimes, for a single idea to penetrate half an inch of human skull.

There are certain institutions of society which have as a major function the teaching of this principle—and placing it into practice.

It is the home which first is charged with implanting this idea in the mind of a man; it is the church which encourages its development throughout his life; the school and the university train the individual to utilize his talents and realize his worth, at the same time teaching him how to live in tolerance and in peace with others.

It is the duty of government to assure every individual that his basic rights will not be impaired by others—to guarantee to every individual the fullest freedom to exercise those rights. Government is the one institution in society in which all men have a share—the one medium through which the people can maintain a balance of the complex forces of modern life—

You are practitioners in the art of government—as I am privileged to be. It is your second sphere of action.

We have chosen to take part in government through the Democratic Party—the only party which, throughout its history, has consistently demonstrated its concern for the dignity of the individual—the only party which has consistently followed a policy assuring every individual a chance to realize his full worth.

The Democratic Party was founded in the South, by a great southerner—Thomas Jefferson—149 years ago.

The Democratic Party and the South have come a long way together.

The principles of the Democratic Party have not changed since the time of Jefferson.

We still believe, as Jefferson did, in equal rights for all and special privileges to none.

We still believe that government is not the master of the people, but their servant.

We still believe that the interests of the majority must not be submerged to the greed of a minority.

We still believe that the protection of property in its legitimate rights is essential, but that in any conflict between property and men, the rights of men come first.

The opponents of the Democratic Party, particularly here in the South, like to recall that Jefferson said, "That government is best which governs least." These self-styled Jeffersonian Democrats assert this quotation to oppose any government effort to improve the welfare of the people. They contend that the Democratic Party of today has changed the philosophy laid down by Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson supplied our answer to this charge when he said: "Nothing is unchangeable but the inherent and unalienable rights of man."

Democrats—true Democrats—have always insisted that government must be adapted to the needs of the time. If bold action has been necessary to make government responsive to the will of the people, the Democratic Party has dared to take such action. If new techniques of government are essential to preserve our free enterprise system, the Democratic Party has dared to experiment. We have never repudiated imagination as a component of the art of government.

No, the Democratic Party has not left the South as its enemies charge. Nor is it going to leave the South.

The Democratic Party acknowledges its debt to the South. Three of its immortal leaders—Jefferson, Jackson, and Wilson—were men of the South. Southern delegates

nominated Franklin Roosevelt in 1932, and southern leaders in Congress charted the course of Franklin Roosevelt's New Deal.

The South in turn must acknowledge its debt to the modern Democratic Party.

It was the New Deal of Franklin Roosevelt which restored the income and the land of the southern farmer, which gave dignity for the first time to the southern worker, which brought southern industry from the brink of chaos.

Much of the economic progress we have made in the South in recent years can be attributed directly to the wise policies initiated during the Roosevelt administration.

The Fair Deal program of Harry S. Truman offers continued promise for constructive action to improve the welfare of the southern people.

The Fair Deal is not a revolutionary concept.

It is not a radical departure from previously accepted techniques of Government action. It seeks simply to provide what its name implies—a fair deal for every American. It was not devised in hostility to the interests of any group of our pepole, but to advance the prosperity and security of all.

The Fair Deal concept is that the economic interests of all our people are interdependent—that the businessman cannot sell his product unless the consumer can buy at a reasonable price, that the farmer will suffer if the workingman's wages are cut, and that the social consequences of inadequate housing, health facilities, and of failure to conserve our natural resources must be shared by all in equal measure.

Any statistical measure will clearly show that the South outstripped all other sections of the Nation in economic growth under the New Deal; we can make equally rapid strides forward under the present Democratic Party.

Undoubtedly many of you—and many other southerners—may oppose some of the methods of the administration to achieve a better life for all our people.

It is heartening indeed that so many Democrats, in North Carolina and elsewhere, are willing to work these differences out within the party. I disagree with some parts of the President's program but I'm going to try to work out these differences in the party.

If we believe that some phases of the President's program are an unwarranted invasion of the field of State government, it is our task to initiate local action which will make Federal intervention unnecessary. For a number of years we have heard a great deal in the South about States' rights; we have never heard, and do not hear now, enough about States' responsibilities.

If you, or anyone you know, believe the Fair Deal program to be socialistic—take the trouble to read the actual legislation which the program calls for. There is no phase of the President's program which does not provide a maximum amount of local responsibility, a maximum amount of freedom for private enterprise, and a minimum of Federal regulation in view of the task to be accomplished.

If you believe that the Fair Deal is an invasion of personal freedom, remember that the same charge was leveled against the New Deal 17 years ago—and you can name anyone today who does not enjoy greater personal freedom and security than he did 17 years ago?

I mention these charges because they are the same which have been used, in vain, by the enemies of the Democratic Party for 17 years.

Our enemies may circulate all the scare words, myths, hysterical attacks and gloomy predictions they desire.

But in spite of the mistakes we have made, our opponents cannot charge that the Democratic Party of Roosevelt and Truman has ever wavered in its determination to bring a more abundant life to all the people of this Nation, and to serve the cause of human dignity and brotherhood.

It has been a genuine inspiration for me to be with you this evening—to think, with you, about the grave responsibility which our Nation has accepted for preserving peace; about the role which American free enterprise must play in keeping America strong and secure; about the modern South, with its complex problems and vast potentialities, the new frontier of America; about your participation as individuals, and through the Democratic Party, in bringing the South and the Nation more fully into the service of human freedom.

You as young Democrats are heirs to a great tradition of democratic liberalism.

It is heartening to know that you are bringing to the Democratic Party the ideals, energies and enthusiasm of youth * * * that you seek to preserve in the Democratic Party those dynamic qualities which have made it great.

Through your party service you not only build a better South, you not only strengthen the free traditions of a Nation. You are quickening the hopes of men the world over for a new era of peace and justice among nations.

The H-Bomb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I should like to present to the Congress a letter by York Sampson, editor and publisher of the Sioux Falls (S. Dak.) Forum addressed to the Honorable Harry S. Truman, President of the United States. Mr. Sampson is a careful and competent editor who is interested in maintaining the financial and moral integrity of this Nation. I hope that every Member of the Congress will read this communication with great care, as it contains some questions which I believe are vitally important to the future of America. The letter reads as follows:

SIOUX FALLS FORUM,
Sioux Falls, S. Dak., February 12, 1950.

Hon. HARRY S. TRUMAN,
President of the United States,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: You recently made the gravest decision facing mortal man in modern history.

We are stuck with the most lethal weapon man has ever conceived—the H-bomb. Perhaps we need it for self-preservation. We certainly don't for any other reason.

But why, in heaven's name, didn't you take Congress into your confidence?

Why didn't you take the United Nations into your confidence, or, at least, the friendly nations therein?

More important than all, why didn't you take us—we the people—into your confidence in making this unprecedented announcement?

Why did you pass up the chance to explain your reasons over a world-wide radio network? Why did you pass up this marvelous opportunity to explain American ideas and ideals (which would have had more telling effect than a trial H-bomb)?

The history of the world may have been changed by your decision.

If this is a free country, and we believe it still is, how can you now expect any American, or any one else in the world, to believe you haven't thus irrevocably taken away a great deal more of our liberty than we yet realize?

We believe this deserves an answer at once.

SIOUX FALLS FORUM,
YORK SAMPSON,
Editor and Publisher.

The Fair Deal and Socialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LEONARD W. HALL
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LEONARD W. HALL. Mr. Speaker, under the leave given me, I desire to include for the RECORD a letter written to me by one of my constituents who is mortally sick of the antics of this administration. He says he reflects how 99.9 percent of his friends feel. He wants action taken to squelch the socialized medicine scheme, the crazy Brannan farm plan, he wants Congress to throw the traitors—Communists—out of our Government. He says what he thinks about the Taft-Hartley law and those who flaunt it, and the betrayal of China. He makes an appeal to this Congress for clear and sound thinking and certainly I want to meet his request to include his letter in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Here it is, as follows:

JANUARY 31, 1950.

The Honorable LEONARD W. HALL,
United States House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is an exceedingly hard letter to write, for instead of writing these few lines, I would like to write books. I have spent 20 years in civic work, so I can appreciate that no matter what you do and no matter how sincere you are in your efforts, you are criticized on all sides and especially from those who do nothing. I have such little time to write and I have put it off for months but I decided to let you know how one of your constituents feels and how 99.9 percent of my friends feel.

I am really worried about the political situation in our country today. I feel that we will have a Socialistic government in another 3 or 4 years unless someone stops the Fair Deal.

I realize that you are a mighty busy man and I sincerely admire what you stand for, because I know that you are opposed to practically every one of the Fair Deal socialistic schemes. I wish that you could find time to answer a few questions for me:

1. Who is going to stop the Fair Deal from shoving through the Federal aid-to-education bill? Forget about religion, I am a Protestant. I am opposed to paying for someone else's education. When I moved to Elmont from Philadelphia my child had to go to school one-half of a day; I was one of the ringleaders in getting a new school, our children go to school a full day now. If the people want their children educated they will see that they get it. If Truman and Ewing can put this bill through, we the people, will not have a thing to say about our children's education in a few years for the Government keeps taking over a little here and a little there until they do it all,

and imagine what the cost will be, with all the thousands of additional Government employees required, and who will vote for Truman.

2. Who is going to squelch this Fair Deal socialized medicine scheme?

3. Who is going to squelch the idiotic, stupid, crazy Brannan farm plan?

4. When is Congress going to throw the traitors—Communists—out of our Government? I refer especially to our State Department (Acheson and Butterworth in particular). I realize that this is a serious accusation but I'll back it up, for actions speak louder than words.

5. When is Congress going tc put the United States first and Great Britain last?

6. When is Congress going to run our country instead of know-it-all Truman? We have the Taft-Hartley law on our books but Truman has flouted it twice and our poor Congressmen, that the people had confidence in, sit meekly by. If this isn't a dictatorship, then I want to know what is.

7. Is Congress going to sit by while Nationalist China goes under? No words can describe our shameful betrayal of Nationalist China; it stinks to high heaven and Congress does nothing but talk. There's a possibility that Formosa will be deserted, just so Great Britain can keep their socialistic Government in power and sc Russia can take over Asia, then Africa, then the Americas, and then set up Acheson as the dictator of the Americas.

8. How long must the American people put up with this fake ECA program? All the stuff we read about what good it is doing is plain bunk. Have you ever been in some of the mental hospitals around New York? My oldest daughter is a nurse in one and I do work in them through the American Legion and my Masonic lodge. How can I describe the crowded conditions and the need for better medical treatment in this letter? Go into New York's Harlem, go into the Bowery, go into southwest Washington, D. C., and see the need for help. Why not put our people first for once? I know that Jesus said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself" and I recognize that the Europeans are our neighbors and need help but doesn't Congress realize that Americans are our neighbors too? Why aren't the Spaniards and the Chinese Nationalists considered our neighbors too?

9. How many Congressmen realize that every decision they make will be judged by the Supreme Architect at the day of judgment? Their responsibilities are so much greater than the average man's, therefore their judgment will be more severe.

Could this letter be put in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

May God give wisdom to every one of our Representatives and Senators, so that they may rule wisely, for the benefit of all mankind.

Most respectfully yours,

FREDERICK W. HILL.

ELMONT, N. Y.

Statement on Percentage Depletion by Gov. Frank Carlson, of Kansas, Before House Ways and Means Committee, February 17, 1950

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLIFFORD R. HOPE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an excellent statement recently made before the Ways and Means Committee of the House by Hon. Frank Carlson, Governor of Kansas, and a former distinguished Member of this House and of the Ways and Means Committee.

The statement follows:

The administration, through the Secretary of the Treasury, has again attacked percentage depletion as a loophole in the income-tax law through which the Treasury is losing large sums of revenue.

The Secretary has proposed to the Congress that percentage depletion on oil and gas production be reduced from 27½ percent to 15 percent of the gross revenue of the property and that the gross revenue of the property be reduced by the intangible drilling and development costs to arrive at an adjusted gross revenue subject to the 15-percent application.

Coming as I do from a State in which oil and gas production and mining operations are important activities, I feel that I have more than a passing interest in percentage depletion. When the Treasury made the proposal in 1942 to eliminate or modify this provision, I made my position clear on the subject in my statement before the Ways and Means Committee.

Those who have questioned the deduction in the past have evidently done so on the assumption that it represented the grant of a special tax privilege, or that it represented an unwarranted subsidy to a favored group at the expense of all other taxpayers.

To make such a claim is tantamount, in my opinion, to contending that Congress for a period of nearly 30 years acted either in such ignorance of the subject as to amount to gross negligence or that Congress deliberately and intentionally legislated against the best interests of the country.

Since I am unwilling to attribute such a motive or such ignorance to Congress, my studies of the history of the legislation have been made with the object of ascertaining, first, just why Congress adopted and continued the provision and, second, whether circumstances now existing warrant a change in congressional policy with respect to the subject.

Depletion is an allowable deduction from gross income which the Congress has authorized in order to arrive at taxable net income and to avoid the taxation of the return of capital values. In this respect, it is related to depreciation allowance provision for the recovery of a taxpayer's investment in plant facilities and other physical equipment or properties used in the production of income.

Depreciation is allowed because the taxpayer's plant wears out or becomes obsolete in the course of producing income. Depletion is allowed because the taxpayer's minerals or other natural resources are being exhausted. It is, therefore, obvious that, in its simplest sense, depreciation is the impairment of the quality of replaceable property, while depletion is the reduction of the quantity of an irreplaceable commodity.

Depreciation is necessary to replace machines and plant facilities when they wear out. Depletion is similarly necessary to replace mineral deposits when they are extracted from the earth and consumed.

In order to remain in business and to meet the continued and increasing demands for supplies of minerals, the producers must continually explore new areas. They must find and develop deposits which experience indicates will be deeper, more remote, harder to find, and harder to develop.

This unending search and development becomes more and more costly. Thus, while the capital recovered through depreciation provides a substantial part of the funds required to replace machinery even in high-cost periods, this is decidedly not true in the case of mineral deposits.

The cost of finding and developing new sources of mineral supply tends to be many times as great as the cost of those recently exhausted. The producer must have available for these hazardous ventures a fund far exceeding the mere recovery of his former investment.

Those characteristics of depreciation and depletion began to receive serious consideration by Congress when our participation in the First World War quickly sent the income-tax rates up to the point at which refinements in computing taxable income became a really serious matter.

Concurrently the vital importance of ample proven and developed mineral reserves, as an absolute necessity for national defense and economic security, was dramatically brought to the attention of Congress and the public.

Among the many proposals to encourage a speedy and widespread increase in the search for new mineral reserves the most effective were those aimed at mitigating the burden of the income tax on those who were willing to take the financial risks involved in the search. In the light of experience such tax measures were deemed necessary in addition to measures for making the public lands available for development and measures for intensified governmental geological surveys and research in the technique of mineral production.

One of the outstanding tax provisions was discovery depletion. It was founded upon recognition of the enormous hazards that characterized mineral prospecting and development, and is thus distinguishable from subsidy measures. Designed to modify one of the deductions in arriving at net income, it forms an appropriate part of an income-tax law. It was also remarkably successful in its other purpose, which was to stimulate a vastly increased and sustained effort to find and develop more and more mineral reserves.

Although a deduction for exhaustion or depletion was provided in earlier acts, it was in the Revenue Act of 1918 that Congress first dealt comprehensively with the subject. It provided for a deduction which, by the time the recoverable mineral content was exhausted, would amount to the value of the property within 30 days after discovery.

In other words, it put the discoverer on the same footing as one who had bought the property after its value was demonstrated by discovery. Congress thus recognized, as a fundamental principle, that the computation of an adequate depletion provision must have a broader base than the concept of recovering the historical cost of the discovery property itself.

This provision for a base other than cost, in the case of discoveries of oil and certain other minerals, was by no means unique. Congress had also provided generally, with respect to any kind of property held by a taxpayer at March 1, 1913, that the value at 1913 would be recognized in lieu of cost, as the base for computing depreciation, depletion, or gain from sale, wherever such value exceeded cost.

The discovery-depletion provision was, in effect, merely a special substitution, of the discovery date for March 1, 1913, for the purpose of the depletion allowance, in recognition of the special character of mineral reserves hidden in the earth.

In 1921, without departing from the discovery-depletion principle, Congress limited the amount of allowable depletion for any single property (tract of land) to the amount of the net income before deducting depletion. In 1924 the limit was set at half of the net income before depletion. (These limits did not apply, however, to depletion computed on a base other than discovery value.)

In 1926 there was a widespread demand for simplification of the depletion procedure, provided it could be accomplished without seriously impairing the established and highly successful policy of encouraging continued effort in petroleum exploration and development. Ascertainment and proof of discovery value was complicated and burdensome. Congress solved this problem, in the case of oil and gas, by substituting a depletion deduction computed as a specific percentage of gross income. It did so with the express intent of preserving the essential effect of the existing law and of continuing the existing policy.

In an effort to approximate roughly the average result obtained under the discovery provision one branch of Congress proposed 25 percent and the other 30 percent. They compromised at 27½ percent of gross income, and the law was enacted accordingly.

At the same time the existing limitation to 50 percent of the net operating income from the property (before depletion) was continued in force; also, the exception to such limitation where cost depletion would be greater.

Later, beginning in 1932, as the operation of the simplified procedure proved successful in administration, percentage-depletion provisions were enacted in the case of other minerals. (Possibly, if Congress had provided percentage depletion for mines at the same time it did so for oil and gas, the mining industry would have been in a stronger position to meet the requirements of World War II.) The percentage-depletion provisions are still in effect and have survived after intensive review by committees of Congress intent upon weighing revenue needs against its merits.

Depletion allowance based on a value calculated on the price of oil at the time of discovery and estimated reserves proved to be arbitrary and inaccurate. The percentage depletion allowance based on actual selling cost over the producing life of the property has resulted in an allowance reflecting actual selling value and the actual quantity of production.

In 1926 when percentage depletion was adopted by the Congress, a special Senate investigating committee, after an exhaustive study of the problem reported to the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation that the new percentage system "distributed the depletion more uniformly among the industry without regard to price of oil on discovery" and that it "reduced valuation work in the bureau". The report also concluded that the new percentage system did not materially affect the revenue. It is my own opinion that the application of percentage depletion has materially increased the national tax revenue.

The conclusion of World War II did not terminate the very real and serious national concern over the maintenance of adequate reserves of petroleum and other minerals. This is evidenced by the fact that within the past year the Special Senate Committee To Investigate Petroleum Resources made an extended investigation of the petroleum situation, hearing many witnesses and examing evidence over a period of several months.

The testimony has been published, and I consider noteworthy the following observations taken from the testimony of Mr. Charles R. Bell:

"Obviously as new pools are discovered the number of undiscovered pools is correspondingly reduced. Because of this the producer's hazards and costs will necessarily increase. * * * Producers * * * are pledged to greater effort to replace and if possible, increase by new discoveries, the Nation's accessible reserves which were so seriously depleted by the greater-than-normal draft of wartime requirements. We believe that Congress, having adopted or approved both the intangible development cost and percentage depletion provisions as a long-range policy, will be the first to realize that their continuance is essential to the Nation's postwar petroleum program * * *. I wish to remind you that the intangible development cost provision had been in the Commissioner's regulations for 8 years before Congress adopted the percentage depletion provision. It is thus clear that Congress intended that both types of deductions remain in effect, complementary to each other."

In its final report, the Senate special committee endorsed the current congressional policy in the folowing language:

"Because oil, like other minerals, is a diminishing resource, and because investments incident to exploration involve unique risks with danger of large financial loss, the Congress through income-tax provisions has allowed deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs." * * * To take steps to guarantee a domestic petroleum supply adequate for all eventualities * * * we should enact those laws which are most conducive to stimulating additional exploration and development in the United States. * * * Encourage free competitive enterprise by tax reforms to provide incentives for the risk of private capital in new ventures. * * * Continue the provisions of the income-tax law permitting deductions for depletion and intangible drilling costs."

The special Senate committee, after its thorough review of over 80 years of oil-industry operations, presented the conclusions quoted above as major features in its recommendations for a national petroleum policy. That committee's report and recommendation are, in my opinion, of direct and conclusive significance to us, because they clearly disclose that Congress is fully and currently aware of the necessity of continuing the existing policy of taxing income derived from natural resources.

In 30 years the depletion provision has become a vital factor in the economy of our extractive industries. Although its contribution toward the widespread and highly competitive search for minerals cannot be precisely measured, we do know that these extremely hazardous ventures have continued.

The resulting discoveries of mineral reserves have contributed substantially to national welfare and to the successful conclusion of the recent world war. These discoveries likewise have benefited our peacetime economy through wide expansion of employment and increased products.

With demand for minerals at an all-time peak, and with prospects of unforeseen world-wide demand, we shall need the full and continued effort of all present and prospective producers of minerals. The hazards and costs of exploration are increasing. Petroleum industry exploration has had to follow new, expensive scientific methods, and drilling has reached greater depths.

Search for all minerals has expanded into relatively inaccessible areas. Such conditions have substantially reduced the intended effect of the depletion allowance, namely, to partially offset the cost of replacing currently produced minerals.

Reversal or modification by Congress of the policy it has consistently followed for so many years would dangerously interfere with the peacetime economy. This is certainly no time to penalize the prospector and the wildcatter.

It is the constitutional obligation of the Congress to levy taxes for the national defense and the general welfare. Our income-tax laws have been framed to the end that these objectives may be accomplished with the least possible burden upon the enterprise of our citizens.

The strength of our Nation in peace and in war is the result of a sound economic system of which the petroleum industry is an integral part. The wisdom of the national legislative program with relation to petroleum has been well justified.

Percentage depletion has been a revenue-raising measure, because it has been an important factor in developing a strong and healthy petroleum industry which has resulted in increased oil and gas production which in turn has produced greater taxable income. Increased production of oil and gas has been in the public interest because it has reduced the price of petroleum products to the consumer.

Our system has given the American public an abundance of petroleum products at costs far below the level of any other country. Under our system, the domestic industry was prepared to supply the wartime petroleum needs of our own military forces and those of our allies in two world wars.

The American oil industry has in turn produced almost scores of other industries which contribute to the national tax revenue, for example, the automobile industry, the trucking industry, the aviation industry, and the tire industry. Both Federal and State gasoline tax receipts have increased with the overexpanded consumption of this petroleum product.

It is thus evident that percentage depletion was adopted to implement a policy on the part of Congress to promote the national welfare through encouraging private industry to risk its capital in the hazardous search for new sources of supply, and that the policy was continued in force in the realization that it was accomplishing its purpose.

My conclusion is that the policy of Congress, as expressed in the past by its actions and at present by the report and recommendations of the special Senate committee, is justified both on the basis of pure merit and on the basis of results obtained. It is my recommendation that this committee go on record as being opposed to any change which would restrict the percentage depletion provisions as they now stand.

Similarly, the right to deduct intangible development costs in the year in which they are incurred is based on a regulation of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue authorized by statute. This right has become an established national policy in the taxation of income derived from crude petroleum and natural gas and has been a substantial factor in the expansion of the petroleum industry.

This just regulation was promulgated in 1917, and is today substantially in its original form. The wisdom of this regulation and its effect on the operation under the income-tax laws has been reviewed and approved by the Congress repeatedly.

The serious effect of a change in this regulation was recently demonstrated when exploration and development in the petroleum industry was greatly disrupted by a court decision reflecting on the authority of the regulation. This was quickly corrected by the Congress again reviewing and reaffirming its previous position.

It is likewise my recommendation that this committee oppose any change in the income-tax laws that would restrict the right of oil and gas producers to deduct intangible development costs as an item of expense in the year in which they are incurred.

Sesquicentennial Concert Honoring Massachusetts

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following remarks made

by me as guest speaker at the sesquicentennial concert honoring Massachusetts:

Friends and fellow Americans, it is a genuine privilege for me to appear tonight in this very appropriate and distinguished program honoring Massachusetts.

On the birthday of the great Father of our Country, who gave so much of his life and of himself for the cause of human freedom and democracy, it is fitting that we should dedicate a portion of this program to honoring the memory of the immortal George Washington with whom the history of my own beloved Commonwealth of Massachusetts was so intimately associated. It was under an elm tree on historic Cambridge Common in Massachusetts that Washington took command of the Colonial Army and within the confines of nearby Harvard College still stands the house which served as his headquarters.

Freedom found no more fertile ground in the Nation for its early growth and development than in Massachusetts. Faneuil Hall, the cradle of American liberty, Bunker Hill, and Concord and Lexington and many other places of the Old Bay State are truly historic landmarks of the early struggle of the American people to throw off the yoke of oppression and set up free institutions and a free way of life.

Massachusetts not only contributed unselfishly of its resources in blood and treasure to the forging of a great new democracy here in the Western World. It furnished some of the strongest, ablest, and most effective leadership in guiding and directing the conflict which led ultimately to the establishment of American freedom. As Congressman from a great and patriotic district in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, I am proud indeed of the services, contributions, and sacrifices of the people of my district and State in behalf of the cause of free government.

Since the time it was first achieved here in America, the ideal of freedom has survived many dangerous threats. In war and peace, our free way of life has been gravely jeopardized. The tempests of civil dissension and international conflict have beat about our temple of freedom, but no foe has been able to destroy it.

But we face today greater dangers than we have ever faced before. Freedom is under attack on a world-wide front. Powerful forces intent upon the complete destruction of the free way of life have spread over much of the earth throttling democratic government and individual liberty. These forces are possessed of great strength of arms, resources, manpower, and the secrets of the awesome atomic bomb and its even more destructive twin—the so-called H-bomb.

These very same forces threaten our own liberties at home by setting up internal conspiracy designed to destroy our individual and collective freedoms through stealth, secrecy, and subversion.

My fellow Americans, freedom still lives tonight in the minds and hearts of the people, but everywhere it is in danger. Everywhere it is assailed and attacked by resourceful and powerful enemies.

In the name of Faneuil Hall, Bunker Hill, Concord, and Lexington, and all the other imperishable shrines of America, in the name of our martyred dead who gave their all that freedom might live, in the name of every principle and virtue we cherish as a people, let us solidly unite in this perilous hour to preserve our birth right of freedom. Once we lose it, it can never be regained. Let us join together under God as our forefathers did through brotherhood, through courage, through strength, and through unbounded faith in democracy to save our precious freedom before it is too late.

Thank you and good night.

What the Republican Policy Statement Really Says About a Bipartisan Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. KARL E. MUNDT
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "GOP Policy on Bipartisanship," taken from the Daily Plainsman, published in Huron, S. Dak., dealing with the foreign-policy section of the recent Republican policy statement, together with a few comments of my own.

There being no objection, the editorial and Mr. MUNDT's statement were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GOP POLICY ON BIPARTISANSHIP

Apparently undetected and unnoticed by the press pundits and syndicated columnists in Washington and New York is the fact that in the recent Statement of Principles and Objectives, or policy statement, by the Republican Members of Congress and the GOP National Committee, took a big step toward eliminating the tragic bipartisan foreign policy.

The bipatrtisan foreign policy has been one of the two main defects of United States foreign policy.

Primary defect, of course, has been the ineptness, lack of vision, lack of understanding of Communist influences at work, and apparent lack of intelligence on the part of Truman and his advisers.

Next to that in importance has been the bipartisan principle, whereby the Republicans agreed in advance not to criticize the administration's foreign policy, nor even debate it. That principle led to formation of foreign policy by the administration without the strengthening factor of critical debate. Many of the steps, in fact, were taken in secret and kept secret.

The most terrible consequence of that bipartisanship was that it kept the public in ignorance of what was happening, both Republicans and Democrats alike conspiring to keep the public ignorant. The result is that it has taken the public five long years to realize that the administration's policies have, step by step, literally and actually endangered the future lives of every United States citizen.

Note, therefore, what the recent GOP statement says about foreign policy:

We oppose secret commitments, and we denounce the refusal of the administration to furnish accurate and adequate information to the Congress.

"Under our indispensable two-party system, we shall be vigilant in critical exploration of administration foreign policy. We favor consultation between the Executive and Members of both major parties in the legislative branch of Government in the initiation and development of a united American foreign policy; and we deplore the tragic consequences of the administration's failure to pursue these objectives in many fields, particularly in the secret agreements of Yalta, subsequently confirmed at Potsdam, which have created new injustices and dangers throughout the world."

The statement fails to state specifically that it deplores the bipartisan foreign policy and doesn't restate its evils, as it could have done, but it does show a recognition of the fact that the safety of the public demands a restoration of vigorous two-party debate in foreign policy, as in every other field.

Note well that the statement specifies that there should be consultation on foreign policy between the Executive and Members of both major parties. This newspaper happens to be in receipt of information that the word "members" was carefully inserted by those on the policy-framing committee.

That is all-important, for it means that the Republican policy is definitely not to have a Senator VANDENBERG labeled as a spokesman for the entire party and then drawn into a secret conference.

The foreign policy is to be discussed by Members of both parties, which means debating it in Congress before the public.

That is of tremendous importance and it is a paragraph to which the Republicans themselves ought to draw more attention. For it is significant that it is one section which it would be politically unwise for Truman to criticize and he is not attacking it. He has attacked the domestic affairs section of the GOP policy and the "liberty versus socialism" phrase.

The GOP's new approach to foreign policy is its strong point and it is conversely the President's most pitifully weak and vulnerable side.

Foreign policy is literally the life-or-death issue facing the American public and it therefore ought to be the chief campaign issue.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR MUNDT

Mr. President, many have read into the Republican policy statement which was recently issued an interpretation of the Republican stand on foreign policy which is not in precise conformity with the carefully worded text of that important statement. Others have permitted what they hoped the statement would contain to color their observations about what the statement in actuality did contain.

Robert D. Lusk, one of our distinguished South Dakota editors, has analyzed the Republican policy statement on foreign policy carefully and has compared it with other earlier Republican platform expressions and Republican attitudes on foreign policy. To Mr. Lusk goes credit therefore for making an accurate and discerning report of the fact that the new policy statement definitely indicates that from this point forward the Republicans in Congress expect to insist that if we are to have a bipartisan foreign policy it must be created by bipartisan action and advice as well as supported by the Members of both major political parties.

Mr. President, I call attention to Mr. Lusk's interpretative editorial on this important subject.

What Have You Learned?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN C. STENNIS
OF MISSISSIPPI
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have a copy of an address made by Mr. David Lawrence on February 15, 1950, at the commencement exercises of Temple University. Mr. Lawrence is one of the outstanding editors and columnists of the

Nation. His ideas are sound, his suggestions constructive, and his approach always patriotic. I consider this address of value to the Congress and to the people of the Nation, and, therefore, ask unanimous consent that it be included in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT HAVE YOU LEARNED?

I appreciate personally your award to me of the honorary degree of doctor of letters, but I appreciate it impersonally even more because you have seen fit in your citation to refer to the dissemination of news about the operations of our Government as a field of service worthy of recognition.

From the pen of George Washington we have these arresting lines: "In proportion as the structure of a government gives force to public opinion, it is essential that public opinion should be enlightened."

Next October will complete my fortieth year in our National Capital. Perhaps this experience permits some observations on what are the essential prerequisites to an enlightened public opinion. But I shall sum it up with one simple axiom: Without enlightened individuals there is no enlightened nation. It is, therefore, to the individual as a citizen that these remarks are addressed.

"Commencement" can be a meaningful word in your life. It can mean the beginning of self-examination. It can mean the beginning of an adjustment to life itself—a new perspective.

It is a time to ask: "What have you learned?" There is implied in this, of course, no questioning of the nature of the curriculum. More and more in recent years educators have recognized that the textbook and lecture do not suffice—the student must be stimulated to apply the knowledge he derives from books. The question goes rather to the point: "What have you learned about life itself? What do you know about that broad field which we call human relations?"

There is no phase of education which does not, in one sense or another, touch directly upon the fundamental problems of human relations. The rules of law, or science, or economics, can be set, but what does human nature do to those rules? We meet this factor constantly in almost every applied phase of written knowledge.

Whether in the home, in the neighborhood, in one's profession or trade, in national or international affairs, the adjustment of human relations today yearns for understanding.

Human relations, of course, includes human friction. And the sources of all human friction are quite tangible. Whether on the picket lines of trade unionism, or in the intercourse of nations, friction arises out of misunderstandings due to distrust, or antipathy, or selfishness. This friction frequently produces violence. Economic war appears at times as unrestrained as military war. Indeed, if we come to understand the characteristics of individual behavior, we will understand the behavior of nations.

Naturally, because it has been for many years my responsibility to report and analyze current happenings, I have had a chance to see the seeds of controversy as they originate, as they sprout, from time to time, in our domestic affairs. I have been able to trace, sometimes in their incipient stages, those international episodes which have led to two world wars and now threaten us with a third world war.

There is little new to discover about human relations as such. The pattern is drawn and redrawn on the pages of history. Through centuries of time men have behaved toward one another in virtually the same way; human nature is really not much different than it was, for instance, in the days of ancient Greece or Rome. The scale of human friction is more extensive today and the methods of warfare are more destructive, but the human ingredients are the same. Basically there is no novelty in the truism that when nations grow sufficiently suspicious or distrustful of one another they rationalize their fears and assert the right to kill one another in self-defense.

The main task of the modern world, therefore, is to weigh anew physical and moral force as a means of preventing war. This is not to imply a denial of the rightful part which physical force plays in obeying the law of self-preservation. But I do assert that moral force as a means of averting human friction has not played, and does not now play, its rightful part in human relations.

Moral force is relatively untried in the world. Men have proved conclusively that they can use their fists. But they have not proved that they can use their heads. All the ingenuity of mankind today is focused on the making of destructive weapons. The constructive energies of mankind have never been mobilized for peace.

The real reason, of course, is that the acquisitive instincts of the human being, the materialistic instincts, the poisons of pride and selfishness, have ruled individuals and permeated governments in a strong lust for possessions and power.

Let us not make any mistake about this—governments are the creatures of peoples. Governments are no better then their constituents' desire. If we are to have better government in the world, or if we are to have better relations between governments, we must start not just with the study of theories of government but with the practices of individuals to whom the obligations of responsible citizenship are entrusted.

But how are we to get responsible individuals? Inevitably we come back to the school as the institution from which this primary influence must radiate. But education is unjustly blamed sometimes for the misbehavior of the educated as well as the uneducated.

If prescribed courses alone could stimulate individuals to an understanding of their responsibilities this would be a different world. Yet precisely because what is written or spoken in the classroom needs interpretation by the individual in terms of his own experience, responsible individualism must be developed outside the classroom—when the individual begins to apply the lessons of life itself.

What is responsible individualism? In these days of "isms" and ideologies, we are told that rugged individualism was a ruthless exercise by the individual of his economic powers of exploitation. We are told that liberalism, on the other hand, provides a real recognition of the public interest—the greater good of the greater number.

Unfortunately, in our day there are too many people who call themselves liberals but who really believe in the mastery of the citizen by the state. Their concept of the public interest is that all rights belong to the state and that the individual must be subservient thereto. They ignore the Constitution with its clear definition of individual and state power. While the Constitution enumerates certain specific powers as belonging to the Federal Government and to the States, the tenth amendment declares explicitly that all rights not delegated to the Federal Government or to the States are reserved to the people—to you and to me as individuals.

The broad premise that those governments are best which rest upon the consent of the governed is still, to be sure, the best guaranty or assurance of human freedom for the individual. But just because we have emphasized rights and freedoms in an abstract sense, and because we have defined governmental powers in a legal sense, we may have overlooked the true meaning of individual responsibility. For the best of governments cannot function effectively if the individuals themselves fail to live up to their responsibilities.

Responsible individualism means, therefore, that there are duties and responsibilities as well as rights inherent in the enjoyment of individual freedom.

In the world today we are discussing communism, fascism, and state socialism as imposing new restraints upon the individual. We view with apprehension statism as a method whereby governments exploit peoples. But we must not deceive ourselves. These extreme forms of government have arisen largely because individuals have abdicated their responsibilities. Economic discontent and chaos have plunged peoples into a state of desperation. Out of this they have grasped at any straw, at any "ism," as a means of extricating themselves from their tragic plight.

The main objective of a responsible government is to make sure that no group or faction exploits the majority and that economic stability is made possible for the maximum number. But government in a democracy cannot legislate morals nor introduce rules of ethics for individuals. It cannot cure the excesses of materialism. Good government is dependent only upon the morality of the community and the standards which decent men and women recognize as standards.

Have you, therefore, learned your responsibility as an individual? It is time to begin. It is time to note that in an age of materialism there are spiritual values which can afford you great compensations—great happiness.

The rituals written in the various religions of mankind are not in themselves complete. It is in the everyday life of the individual that the lessons contained in those rituals must be applied.

Having been permitted to observe government over a long period of time, I do not hesitate to say that the most effective men we have had in the public service are the men in whose private lives there is no taint of dishonesty or fraud. I am referring not merely to the fraud involved in a piece of graft or bribery. I am referring rather to the integrity of men—those who give their word and keep it, who say what they mean and who do not camouflage through the phrases of expediency what their honest purpose really is. I am referring to men with a deep sense of moral values.

Politics is a euphemism which too often covers intellectual dishonesties of educated persons—those who justify expediency and openly rationalize deception.

A courageous press can expose this form of hypocrisy and assist the citizen so that he may express his disapproval of those artifices which are all too numerous in the legislative and executive bodies of our Government today.

Never underestimate the importance of a free press as a servant of democracy and good government. It is not perfect. It has flaws. But do not be misled by those who say the press in America is controlled. Controlled by whom? The criticism we sometimes hear is that the press is controlled by its advertisers. But who are the advertisers? They are the businesses of the country, large and small, which have goods to sell. Unless the public finds publications truthful and interesting to read, there will be no opportunity for the advertisements to be read. The readers—not the advertisers—are sovereign.

Some irresponsible critics have arisen to say that news is suppressed at the dictation of advertisers. What news? There have been times, no doubt, when some member of an advertiser's family has gotten himself

into trouble and maybe some kindly editor here or there has kept the name out of the paper, perhaps out of a mistaken sense of reciprocity. I seriously doubt whether the infinitesimal number of such instances in our whole press has any more significance than the occasional suppression of the name of a kidnaped child while the police work on clues.

The real test is this: Can any one point to an important piece of national or international news that has been suppressed? I mean, of course, outside of the military orbit—economic news, political news, crime news, any important news touching on social welfare?

The reason why the press is so frequently attacked as being under the control of materialistic influences is that those who have a materialistic ax of their own to grind have not been able themselves to obtain control of the press.

Theoretically, the entire press might be expected to be controlled by the workers. Virtually all of its readers work for a living. But workers are tolerant citizens of the broad community. They are not a separate class. Newspapers have long since learned that the moment they become organs of classes or groups they cease to fulfill their main function in the community. That is why you will find that the statements by labor-union leaders and the statements by employers all get attention in the news columns of the American press.

Nothing like the freedom of the press which we enjoy in America can be found in the nondemocratic countries. A single group or a single man can overnight plunge those countries into war. When public opinion functions, however, as in a democracy, there is restraint and caution and the people demand that every step that can possibly be taken to avoid war be taken.

There are some defects, however, to which I would like to call your attention.

Not enough people read about their own government—what it is doing with the taxpayers' money and what it is doing or failing to do to enforce the laws of the land.

Not enough people are concerned with the basic principles of fairness in governmental operations.

Not enough people demand the information that they are entitled to receive on national and international problems.

Good citizenship requires that you be well informed. The dissemination of knowledge about our Government is increasing rapidly, but the number of persons who are actually concerned with governmental trends and who read carefully what is going on is too small a group. One would think that with a large number of college graduates the circle would be wider. It should be. The fault lies with those educated individuals who delegate this responsibility of citizenship to other citizens.

Do not be misled by the defeatist cry, "What can I do?" Do not feel that you are a helpless individual among many hundreds of millions of persons. This is the feeling that leads directly to an abdication of your responsibilities as a citizen in a democracy.

What you do in your precinct, among your friends, among your business acquaintances, in your profession, can influence others. The power of example—the power of good example—is still the greatest force that mankind has ever known.

There is happiness and satisfaction ahead for you on the day you discover the spirit of human service—when the quests of vanity and pride, the pursuit of material gain and advantage, become to you valueless if obtained at the expense of a troubled conscience. The day that you conquer yourself and learn by searching self-examination to differentiate between right and wrong, between truth and untruth, between selfishness and unselfishness—on that day you will emerge as a truly educated person—a responsible individual—in a world all too anxious to entrust you with leadership and the guidance of others who crave an understanding of that better way of life.

I venture to speak of these things only because I have felt that we depend too much on the words of written formulas, or agreements, or laws, or treaties, in order to make our institutions more effective, and too little do we search our hearts and our consciences for those motivating influences that give us character as individuals—influences which can make or unmake written formulas and the most carefully drafted laws.

I commend to you the importance of spiritual values in our modern life.

I urge you to give your attention to the sources of human friction and to pledge yourselves to try not to increase friction but actually to do your level best to diminish friction within your own individual area of activity.

Perhaps such a plea is superfluous. Perhaps the youth of today will be compelled in an atomic world to evaluate human relations with a new realism. Perhaps they see in perspective already this distraught world. Perhaps they will perceive more quickly than our generation has that communism and state socialism can thrive only when individualism throws up the sponge. Perhaps the youth of today are wiser and will not make the same mistakes because they cannot afford the risks of doing otherwise. The prayers of mankind will support that hope.

You have in the short span of years that lie ahead of you the opportunity to remake your world. It is not an unsolvable problem. What we sometimes call a new approach is as old as the ten commandments.

There is but one answer to the ills of the world—a willingness on the part of all of us as responsible individuals to listen to the guidance of God and to feel His presence as the master of conscience.

What can you do? Just remake yourself—and your example will be followed by others.

Then will nations, too, be remade. Then will real peace come to us all.

Individual character and national character are inseparable.

Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JAMES P. KEM

OF MISSOURI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Nylons and Lipsticks Ruin Marshall Plan," published in the Kansas City Star under date of February 17, 1950.

This article was sent to me by a lady in Missouri with this notation: "Is this what we pay such exorbitant taxes for? I'm tired of being taxed to death."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NYLONS AND LIPSTICKS RUIN MARSHALL PLAN

PROVIDENCE, R. I., February 17.—The Marshall plan is choking itself to death on nylon stockings, lipsticks, plastic combs, and canned tuna fish, Nicholas Farmakis, a Greek student at Bryant College here, charges.

The insistence of the United States in shipping little but finished products—and then things that are unnecessary to life in Greece—is stifling Greek economy and making the people lazy and dependent, Farmakis said.

INDUSTRY LAGS

Raw materials which could be converted by native labor into articles really needed by the Greeks would start up industry in Greece and make it a strong bulwark against the Communists to the north.

But the American idea that what an American thinks is right and all that foreigners think is wrong is causing the Marshall plan to backfire into an agency of dissatisfaction among the people of Europe, Farmakis thinks.

Tuna is an ideal canned product for America with its vast inland territory, Farmakis admits, but it could help make idle thousands of Greeks who fish for a living, when shipped in large quantities to Greece if only the Greeks would use it.

But they don't. They prefer the native, fresh-caught fish. The American tuna is stored in warehouses until the space is needed, then it is dumped. But it keeps coming, Farmakis said.

FRILLS FOR WEALTHY

Lipsticks and nylons do a lot for the American girl, said Farmakis, who is a student of more than business administration, but their use among the economic level of persons supposed to be helped by the Marshall plan is slight in Greece.

The tall, 23-year-old student, who hopes to go into politics in Greece when his studies in America are completed, feels that all aid under the Marshall plan should be stopped immediately until the nations involved can meet with the United States and set up a program by which they can get the things they need—and the things that we think they need can be left in this country.

Farmakis's father is president of the Greek Rubber Co., and he wants to import raw rubber to Greece so that it can be manufactured by Greeks into things that Greeks need. But the Greek need for these products is met by Marshall plan administrators with shipments of finished rubber goods.

These fail to benefit the people because the Greek Government imposes import taxes on them to protect the native rubber companies, so other Greeks suffer.

The Danger Facing America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM E. JENNER

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JENNER. Mr. President, I present a copy of an editorial which appeared in the Arizona Republic, of Phoenix, Ariz., the Indianapolis News, and Muncie (Ind.) Press, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WITH THE WORLD ON FIRE

The President of the United States made a speech to the Nation Thursday night. He spoke via radio to millions of Americans who may be living on borrowed time, now that an avowed enemy is building weapons of atomic

destruction aimed at America. The President spoke to a people who have been told that the even more fearful hydrogen bomb may wipe out civilization and all life on this planet in one flaming breath. At the moment he spoke, the Red tide of communism that has engulfed almost all of the continent of Asia was pressing hard against the last friendly outposts in the Pacific. In captive Berlin the noose again was being tightened by a new blockade.

On the same night the President spoke, the fires were going out in basic industries all over America. Schools were being closed, and homes and hospitals were reaching into their last reserves of coal. Men by the thousands were being laid off their jobs, trains were being canceled, and the Nation was faced with suspension of vital telephone service. Food products bought with the taxes of the people were being piled up to rot while millions throughout the world went hungry to bed. As the President spoke, citizens all over the Nation were reflecting on the treachery of those in high positions of trust who had been found guilty of betraying their country. And all over the world desperate men were shoring up the hasty defenses of freedom.

Against this background of national peril and acute drama the President of the United States made a speech.

He said the only danger to the American Nation is the Republican Party.

In the name of Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln we reverently ask: How much lower can the leadership in Washington descend?

Social-Security Coverage of Police Officers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, on February 9 I caused to be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by John J. Goff, chairman of the Committee of Associated Pension Funds of New Jersey, in opposition to the enactment of H. R. 6000.

Today I should like to supplement that statement with a communication and statement of Howard J. Devaney, president of the New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., which clearly indicates that the patrolmen of New Jersey have precisely the same concern about the effect of H. R. 6000 in its present form as have all other public employees at the State and local levels of government.

To the end that this correspondence and statement may be properly before the Senate, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that they be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEW JERSEY STATE PATROLMEN'S BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION, INC.,
Glen Ridge, N. J., February 22, 1950.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: Apropos your suggestion, we respectfully submit in writing our objections to H. R. 6000, insofar as police officers who are members of existing retirement systems are concerned. We would appreciate your presenting our objections to this bill and our endorsement of the amendment, before the Senate at your convenience.

I have the authority to express the deep appreciation of our organization and the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police for your interest in behalf of the policemen of the State of New Jersey. Your outstanding courtesy during our 1 hour's interview with you left an impression with our delegation that will be remembered for a long time.

Thank you very much.

Respectfully yours,
HOWARD J. DEVANEY,
President.

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Re H. R. 6000, social-security bill.

Hon. ROBERT C. HENDRICKSON,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR HENDRICKSON: The New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association, Inc., and the New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police, Inc., represents an active membership of 12,000 police officers in 563 municipalities in New Jersey.

We are opposed to the extension of social-security coverage to police officers who are members of an existing retirement system because we earnestly believe such coverage would injure police officers instead of benefiting them.

The local taxpayer will not stand for supporting both systems, nor is it economical or just to expect the taxpayer to do so. Apropos this situation, social security would impose a double burden of contribution upon police officers who are underpaid in many States. The forcing of police officers under social security would inevitably lead to the destruction of their own local pension systems, regardless of the Federal-State agreement as to coverage.

Our specific objections to social-security coverage is outlined as follows:

1. Present public retirement systems in the States and subdivisions thereof are adequate to provide for their employees.

2. The benefits under the typical retirement plan for death, disability, old age, and survivorship are better adapted to the needs of the public employees than the benefits under the Social Security Act, which was set up for industrial workers.

3. Public employees have grave doubts that many States and subdivisions thereof can afford to have both, present retirement systems and social-security coverage, without affecting their salaries or impairing public services.

Now, as to H. R. 6000, all that has been said applies besides—

(a) The proposals under this bill as to contribution costs contemplates an increasing cost to the individual as the years go by; thus, imposing a real hardship on public employees who now belong to a retirement system, as two deductions must be made from his salary.

(b) The proposed higher benefits under this bill would not exceed those paid by public retirement systems—Federal or State.

(c) We recommend that public employees covered by a State or subdivision thereof retirement system should be excluded from the bill, H. R. 6000.

4. A referendum may take us into social security, but the State or State subdivision may drop us out without a referendum. If a State withdraws from social security it loses all moneys paid in. There is no provision for any return of funds.

5. Public employees do not wish to interpose any objections to the extension of social-security coverage or benefits to those not so well covered and protected as they are under public retirement systems, but they most respectfully pray and ask that they be excluded from coverage and be permitted to remain undisturbed in their present contractual rights and expectations that they now enjoy and that they may continue to look forward to an age of retirement under a protected public retirement system.

We therefore beg the Senate Finance Committee to endorse recently introduced amendments to H. R. 6000 which would definitely exclude police officers now covered by a pension system from the scope of the bill; and we respectfully urge that the Finance Committee recommend this course of action to the Senate.

Respectfully submitted.

HOWARD J. DEVANEY,
President, New Jersey State Patrolmen's Benevolent Association.
FRED A. ROFF,
Executive Secretary, New Jersey State Association of Chiefs of Police.

The Coal Situation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, like nearly every other American, I am trying to determine and understand why many of the soft-coal miners of the Nation are refusing to obey the law of the land. For the reason that it offers one point of view on the question, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial which appeared in the Cleveland Plain Dealer on Tuesday, February 21.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE MINERS' REBELLION

The Nation's soft-coal miners are engaging in a rebellion against the Government of the United States. They have refused to obey an order of the Federal court directing them to end their strike which is imperiling the health and safety of the Nation. The miners also appear to be engaging in a rebellion against John L. Lewis. But are they? Or do they have reason to believe that Lewis is secretly in sympathy with their conduct, despite the fact that twice he has ordered them to return to work?

It will be recalled that Lewis' first message to the miners, following the issuance of the injunction, was a telegram to his district presidents, couched in legalistic phraseology, in which he made it clear that it was the court's idea, not his, that the miners should go back to work. Under the circumstances, he had no alternative but to direct the miners to obey the injunction, he said.

A week went by with nothing happening, except that the union strong-arm squads, which are always responsive to Lewis' wishes, roamed the mine fields, threatening any miners who showed an inclination to return to work, and preventing any mines from reopening.

By the end of the week the strong-arm squads were in complete control of the situation. Under their influence the miners presented a solid front behind the slogan "No contract, no work."

By that time it was evident that the miners had been organized to stay out of the pits. Whereupon Lewis then sent another telegram, this time addressed to the locals, instructing them to comply with the injunction and end the strike, but the locals ap-

parently had been well briefed as to what they were to do. They ignored the second instruction as they had the first.

Was this a prearranged, phony rebellion against Lewis? Anyone who stopped to consider how Lewis in the past ruled his union with an iron hand and how the miners responded to his slightest command would conclude that it was.

It was less than 3 weeks ago that a young miner in Library, Pa., Joseph Dickmon, was suspended from the union for 6 months for calling Lewis a dictator and saying the miners ought to work full time instead of the 3-day-a-week schedule then in effect.

Another miner, George H. Livengood, of Uniontown, Pa., was expelled from the union because he asked for an accounting of the miners' welfare and pension fund.

In the past, if any mine-union official had dared to disobey an order from Lewis, he would have been fired forthwith. Any miner who expressed the sentiment "to hell with John L. Lewis," as some of the strikers have, would have been taking his life in his hands.

We think if Lewis really wanted to end the strike, he could do so. All he would have to do would be to give the right signal. But he is now engaged in a struggle to nullify the Taft-Hartley Act, an attempt to demonstrate to other unions and to Congress that it cannot be enforced and that it need not be obeyed.

Prayer for Peace

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ELBERT D. THOMAS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, Mr. James Patrick McGovern, a former captain in the AEF during the First World War, and a member of Bethesda-Chevy Chase Post, No. 105, of The American Legion, Department of Maryland, has composed a poem which reflects such a basic spiritual force as mankind must cherish if civilization is to survive—let alone to advance. He has titled it "Prayer for Peace," and has dedicated it to the national welfare. I ask unanimous consent that it may be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the prayer was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PRAYER FOR PEACE

Men's prayer for peace through brotherhood world-wide
Had never need so great as in this hour;
Love calls, with God's infinitude allied,
Regardless of the race, the creed, the power.
Now that both space and time, the atom's fire,
And all the secrets of the sun unfold,
The helmless mind speeds to a brink so dire,
Who can foretell what death's abyss would hold!
But none can steal, like land, another's soul,
Or any virtue in its quality;
But rather will thieves make good-will their goal
When heart finds heart in true democracy.
May strength have leaders who like Christ forgive—
Who for the spirit live and would let live.

—*James Patrick McGovern.*

A Kansan's Appraisal of George Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ERRETT P. SCRIVNER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission previously granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to submit an editorial appraisal of George Washington which appeared in a recent issue of the Argonia (Kans.) Journal, as follows:

OUR FIRST NATIONAL HERO

All over this broad land the 22d of February—George Washington's Birthday—is celebrated.

How shall any man add aught to the praise or eulogy of George Washington? History and biography, eloquence and poetry have exhausted their combined riches upon the successful leader of the American Revolution and the founder of the American Republic—our first great national hero.

Every great crisis in the history of the world has found its man to control and guide it. Call it providence, accident, or what you will, the American Revolution was no exception. Before the first murmurs of discontent were heard in that struggle the man was being prepared for the crisis. On the banks of the Potomac and the Rappahannock, 30 years before Lexington and Bunker Hill, a truthful and manly boy was growing up, ripening into stalwart young manhood. With only the common-school education of that early day, the young man was being educated in the broader nature and experience, in the great forest, under the open heavens, with his surveyor's chain and sword, in Indian wars, defending the frontier settlements from the savage incursions.

Growing still apace the young Virginian was soon the leading spirit and military commander of all that Patomac region, and his skill, endurance, and courage in those campaigns swelled the measure of his fame. Then with peace, the young commander laid aside his sword, married, and settled down on his inherited country seat at Mount Vernon and, like his ancestors, was a rich-landed proprietor, a Virginia farmer and planter, and a country gentleman. So he might have remained to the end, had not the voice of patriotism called him to take part with his neighbors and the oppressed people of the Colonies against the tyranny of the mother country.

He was elected a delegate to the Continental Congress, and it was by that body that he was unanimously elected Commander in Chief of the American Army in 1775. After the war, when the Constitutional Convention was called in 1787, he was unanimously elected its chairman, and his influence had much to do with the framing of the Constitution and getting it accepted by the States. When this new scheme of government went into operation, he was unanimously chosen as its first President and reelected in 1793. Washington never accepted a cent for his services for his country during the Revolutionary War and his two terms as President, and was paid only his actual expenses.

At the close of his second term, he delivered his famous farewell address, which has become one of the outstanding public documents of all time, and which contained statesmanlike advice and sound counsel. One of his admonitions to the young republic is just as worthy today as it was 160 years ago: "Avoid the accumulation of debt, not only shunning occasions of expense, but by vigorous exertions in time of peace to discharge the debts which unavoidable wars may have occasioned, not ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden of debts which we ourselves ought to bear. Bear in mind that towards the payment of debts there must be revenue; that to have revenue there must be taxes; and that no taxes can be devised which are not more or less inconvenient and unpleasant." In the light of recent history, what an old fogy George Washington was.

He retired to his home in 1797 and resumed his plantation life. The following year he was again made commander in chief of the army in expectation of a war with France, but in the midst of military preparations he was stricken with a sudden illness and died December 14, 1799.

At the time of his death, one Member of Congress was Gen. Henry Lee, "Light Horse Harry," father of the famous leader of the Confederacy in the Civil War, Robert E. Lee. He was appointed to deliver the oration in a memorial service by Congress and it was in that speech that there was uttered that famous phrase, "First in war, first in peace and first in the hearts of his countrymen." Those words have stood the test of time, which were not only true at that time but were prophetic of an opinion which exists to this day.

F. J. C.

Reservoir of Christian Hope

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article which appeared in the February 18 issue of America, National Catholic weekly, titled "Reservoir of Christian Hope." In these days when we are looking for a sedative for our nerves, I commend this article to all thoughtful Christians. In this atomic age people are becoming increasingly apprehensive because they do not know the solution to the problem of control of atomic energy. The encouragement that this article offers should be reassuring.

The article follows:

RESERVOIR OF CHRISTIAN HOPE

It is news, and it is welcome news, when scientists find it necessary to appeal to the moral sense of the Nation.

This is what happened on February 4, when Prof. Samuel K. Allison, director of the Institute for Nuclear Studies at the University of Chicago, expressed his own frank opinion. "I am appalled," said Dr. Allison, "to hear talk of the hydrogen bomb as just an improved piece of machinery. * * * After all, we are a nation with a sense of morality. This is a moral issue."

Yes; we are, by and large, a moral nation. Yet to exactly what extent? How deep, how sure are our moral resources when we are confronted by the need of making a moral decision of this magnitude?

Almost more terrifying than the bomb itself is the generally baffled air of the American public when the entire world is looking to us for our decision. It is hard to say which phase is the more disturbing: popular apathy and apparent inability to grasp what we are really up against, or the hysteria and demoralization that prevail when imaginations are finally stirred.

This sense of bafflement, this perplexity, this inability to take other than a merely emotional approach, is the direct result of the decay of religious and moral teaching, of the continual erosion that materialistic subjectivism has worked in our Nation's moral fiber. "The greatest change I find in the United States since my last visit," remarked a distinguished Japanese educator recently, "is the widespread weakening of moral standards."

Yet mere lamentation is of no avail. The present is the time for all citizens who have a clear sense of good and evil to do what they can to restore and strengthen our sanity, to stabilize our emotions, and clarify our thinking. If we must face such a crisis, let us face it as mature men, not as children.

No fear is more demoralizing than an hysterical fear of death. No conviction is more apt to restore courage and tranquillity to the soul, even when walking in death's own shadow, than the conviction that death, after all, is not the most dreadful of all evils.

In time of crisis more men and women will be found to share that conviction than we are likely to suspect in the piping days of peace. The greatest military mistake Hitler ever made was occasioned by his inability to understand how the people of Britain would prefer being bombed to death by German planes to the disgrace and slavery that would follow compliance with his demands.

If this is true for the patriot, it is doubly true for every convinced Christian. For we know, with the certainty of natural reason, with the certainty of all God's revelation and the supreme certainty of the Resurrection, that no H-bomb in creation can destroy a human soul. Strange anomaly, that we Christians who today are asserting the sanctity of human life on earth in the face of the abortionist and the mercy killer, at the same time maintain that the supreme values are those of life eternal, and that all human policies and decisions must ultimately be judged by the immutable standards of such a life. Yet that anomaly is only apparent, since it is the immortal in man that lends such significance to his temporal years.

What is true of one man's fate is true of the whole human race, even were the worst possible forebodings to be realized and all humanity exposed to destruction. In one instance as in another, the pivotal truth remains that we can afford to risk all on earth, if that is the only way by which we can save the liberty of our own souls. After all, as America said on August 18, 1945, the providence of God, not the schemes of man, will finally set the time for ending the earthly sojourn of the human race.

Much is said, and correctly said, to the effect that the Russians can better afford to face the risks of vast bomb destruction than can the Americans. Nevertheless, when it comes to the absolute choice of life or death, those of us who have retained our faith in God and His teachings possess a hope that is lacking to the boldest materialist. Let those of us who have such a hope in life everlasting make every effort to impart it to our entire country. No matter how tremendous the cause for alarm, we are not and we never will be intimidated. This quiet certainty that we can save our lives by dying is a weapon as mighty in its own way as the H-bomb itself.

Rescue of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. FRANK P. GRAHAM
OF NORTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a plea by Archbishop Michael that Greek children be rescued, which appeared in the Orthodox Observer.

There being no objection, the plea was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ARCHBISHOP MICHAEL PLEADS GREEK CHILDREN BE RESCUED

My heart is full of gratitude as I take this opportunity to greet the American people and pay my respects to this wonderful democratic country.

I have just come from Greece and I want to express the warm and enduring thanks of all the Greek people for the vital aid that has been extended under the leadership of the President of the United States of America to Greece in her hour of need.

My message to you today is one, alas, of tragedy, which again hovers over the homes of Greece.

In America at this Christmastime gladness prevails in millions of homes. The mothers of America have their little ones at their own firesides and God's blessings of peace, freedom, and security are the possessions of everyone here.

It is not so in Greece. Though that nation was liberated from enemy occupation, military intervention on the part of the Communist neighbors of Greece followed that liberation and plunged the country into a long period of conflict on Greek soil. Once again Greece found herself defending freedom and Christian civilization as she so often has done through the centuries.

Under cover of this conflict the Communist guerrillas conducted one of the most unspeakable campaigns in all human history by abducting thousands of Greek children, ranging in age from 3 to 15, from the areas of guerrilla operation and transporting them behind the iron curtain.

Of these 2,000 were taken to Albania; 2,650 were taken to Bulgaria; about 3,000 were taken to Hungary; 3,800 to Rumania; 2,235 to Czechoslovakia; 11,000 to Yugoslavia; and many have since been moved to Poland and eastern Germany.

The pretext was that these children were to be given salvation from famine and that they were carried away in order to undergo a program of education in free democracy.

Some of the older ones since have actually been captured while fighting in the guerrilla bands.

I am speaking this morning from New York City, which is the headquarters of the United Nations, dedicated to peace and justice. The United Nations has condemned this violation of fundamental human rights but its resolutions asking the immediate restoration of these young people to their mothers' arms have been ignored. The continuous appeals of their heartbroken parents have fallen upon deaf ears.

There is no joy, only sorrow and heartbreak, in these Greek homes at this season of rejoicing for so many of you within the sound of my voice.

In the name of our Lord, Jesus Christ, whose eternal theme is peace on earth, good will toward men, and who is full of compassion for little children, I earnestly appeal to you to lift your voices with us on this day, December 29, in denunciation of this inhuman action.

In the name of the Christ Child, whose birthday we celebrate, I ask you to express with us—through your Christian churches, through your organizations of women, through whatever groups to which you may belong—your wish to exert all possible moral influence upon the members of the United Nations so that all civilization will demand the return of these thousands of boys and girls to their grieving and broken homes.

In the name of all decency and all religion, I ask you to pray that all the humanitarian instincts of mankind will be brought to bear against this mass outrage.

To you Americans who are so rich in spiritual gifts, as well as liberty and well-being, I address this appeal with all the fervor at my command.

May the blessings of Almighty God and our Saviour be with you.

Lincoln Republicanism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. IRVING M. IVES
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. IVES. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the text of the Lincoln Day address entitled "Lincoln Republicanism," delivered by me on February 11, 1950, at Schenectady, N. Y.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Every year at this time the American people join in observing the anniversary of the birth of Abraham Lincoln. In frank recognition of the eternal debt owed by all Americans to Lincoln, all Americans—regardless of race, creed, color, national origin, ancestry, place of residence, or political party—pay sincere tribute to this man who contributed so greatly to our present well-being.

For us Republicans the anniversary of Lincoln's birth has come to be almost a sacred occasion. At these annual observances we pay tribute not only to Lincoln, the man, the statesman, the leader in crisis, but to Lincoln the first Republican President.

For Abraham Lincoln, besides having been one of the greatest of all Americans, was the greatest Republican who ever lived. He shaped the formative years of the Republican Party and established for it the high tradition of service to the American people which carried our party to greatness.

I suggest, however, that there is a way in which we can pay even higher honor to Lincoln, and at the same time do a greater favor to ourselves, than by staging annual ceremonies highlighted by effusive panegyrics of the Great Emancipator.

That way is the day-by-day practice by us of what he preached.

Even as we cannot forget that Lincoln was the greatest Republican who ever lived, so we should not forget that he was also the most successful Republican who ever lived. To try to emulate the example set by Lincoln

is to do more than to praise him; it is also to benefit ourselves as Republicans.

In March of 1832 Lincoln had just passed his twenty-third birthday. Announcing his entry into politics as a candidate from Sangamon County to the Illinois Legislature, he used these words:

"Holding it a sound maxim that it is better only sometimes to be right than at all times to be wrong, so soon as I discover my opinions to be erroneous, I shall be ready to renounce them."

Lincoln lost that election in 1832, but he never lost the habit of open-mindedness which was revealed in that early message to the voters of Sangamon County.

Thirty years later, in 1862, Lincoln, then President of the United States and approaching the peak of his magnificent career, wrote a letter to Horace Greeley which contained the following solemn promise:

"I shall try to correct errors when shown to be errors, and I shall adopt new views so fast as they appear to be true views."

Thus it is plain that from the modest beginning of Lincoln's public life to its glorious, yet tragic, conclusion, his was a steadfast rule ever to be receptive to new ideas, and never to hesitate to recast his thinking in the light of changing circumstances. Nowadays those Republicans who decry so-called "me-tooism" would do well to reflect upon this conspicuous quality in the character of the greatest Republican of all.

As we pause in 1950 and look back through the years, we can clearly see that during the first half of the twentieth century there has occurred such a world-wide upheaval of nineteenth century institutions and traditions as to amount to no less than a gigantic social, economic, and political revolution.

World Wars I and II were the most violent explosions of this revolution. Communism in eastern Europe and China, socialism in Great Britain, and their reverberations in Asia, Africa, and South America are dramatic evidences of the new and overpowering forces which have been operating on a global scale during the last 50 years.

Here in this country—fortunately for us—this revolution has taken a milder, more moderate course. But a revolution has nonetheless, been taking place.

It is most unfortunate, for the country as well as for the Republican Party, that our party has failed too often to adjust itself to the consequences of this revolution. Too often we have not been receptive to new ideas. Too often we have not exhibited that open-mindedness which characterized Lincoln. The voters of this country have repeatedly told us so. They told us in 1932; they told us again in 1936; they repeated it in 1940, 1944, and 1948.

"If you once forfeit the confidence of your fellow citizens, you can never regain their respect and esteem."

That warning comes from Lincoln and unhappily is applicable to our party's record, especially in the field of civil rights where our party's performance has failed miserably to conform to promise or tradition. Unless party platform pledges are made with the solemn conviction that they shall be kept, the party responsible for them is deserving only of the hostile public reaction which disregard for them inevitably provokes.

It seems to me that today the Republican Party can do no better than to adopt again a course based on the abiding principles and fundamental integrity of Abraham Lincoln. And never in the history of the Nation has there been more urgent needs for a reapplication of those principles and a rededication to that integrity.

As Republicans, we believe profoundly in the free competitive enterprise system. An unfortunate result of our party's traditional defense of this system has been an identification in the minds of too many Americans of the Republican Party and big business. This condition has arisen largely from the fact that through our insistence that there can be no genuine human rights without property rights we have appeared frequently to place property rights ahead of other basic individual rights and freedoms guaranteed in the Constitution.

Yet it is a fact that, while we emphasize that human rights without property rights are illusory and nonexistent, it is and always has been a fundamental principle of the Republican Party that political liberty for the individual is of greater importance than his economic security. For without political liberty, economic security constitutes no better than a condition of slavery. As Lincoln said, "Republicans are for both the man and the dollar, but in case of conflict the man before the dollar."

It is exceedingly interesting to note that at the time Lincoln was expressing this principle of Republicanism, he was criticizing the Democratic Party of his day for a complete reversal of the basic position of its founder, Thomas Jefferson, that the rights of property are secondary to other personal rights of men and women.

How equally valid is such a criticism today, as successive Democratic administrations, by glowing promises of everything for everybody everywhere, shamelessly bribe the American people to trade their political liberty for so-called economic security.

Another basic principle of the Republican Party was expressed by Lincoln in a speech made in 1854 at Peoria, Ill. During the course of this speech, an impassioned attack on the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, he made the following statement:

"If there is anything which it is the duty of the whole people to never intrust to any hands but their own, that thing is the preservation and perpetuity of their own liberties and institutions."

Today it is imperative, if this Nation is to remain a Nation of free men, that the Republican Party most vigorously reaffirm this principle. It is not, definitely not, a case of crying "wolf, wolf" to say that through its control of the strings of the enormous Federal purse, the administration has been and is moving this country toward a highly regimented state, wherein individual freedom will have been bartered away for alleged economic security through deficits, debt, and intensified bureaucratic control.

This trend to socialism, begun in 1933, is a growing one, as witnessed by such recent administration proposals as socialized medicine and, under the name of the Brannan plan, socialized agriculture.

Through financial aids, grants, subsidies, and other forms of economic persuasion, the Federal Government is promoting the further surrender of personal liberty and jeopardizing the integrity of those free institutions of American society which are the foundation of our system of free government.

It is of transcendent importance to the American people that the Republican Party, by reviving and sustaining its Lincoln heritage, arrest, and arrest now these false concepts and the trend toward a planned economy, a socialist state.

For what has until recently been only a trend is now being accelerated to a degree at which it is becoming a mad rush.

Within the past year we have seen developing in our country dangerous theories and notions. The idea that a national debt of $255,000,000,000 or $265,000,000,000 is inconsequential; the thought that uninterrupted deficit spending is not alone justifiable, but even desirable; the growing feeling that economy in government, far from being a virtue, is actually a vice and to be shunned—these are some of the theories and notions to which I refer, and they are signposts on the road to moral bankruptcy and national decay.

Striking proof of this situation is provided by the proposed budget which the President submitted to the Congress last month.

For the fourth successive year since World War II, he has presented to the Congress a Federal budget higher in amount than the one submitted by him the year before. Each successive request has set a new all-time record for Government spending in peacetime.

By seeking authority to spend more than $5,000,000,000 in excess of anticipated revenues in 1951, the President urges the Nation to increase its staggering national debt at a time when the level of national income is such that we should be rapidly reducing the debt.

To permit ourselves to indulge in continuous deficit spending, as urged by the President, is only to yield up more economic, and therefore more political, freedom. For the excessive Federal spending envisaged in his budget is the inevitable prelude to excessive Federal control. Furthermore, the increasing concentration of influence over our lives exerted from Washington marks the imminence in this country of a regimented society similar to those social orders elsewhere in the world today, which we view with such abhorrence and alarm.

The so-called New Dealers or Fair Dealers are fond of quoting the following passage from Lincoln's writings:

"The legitimate object of government is to do for a community of people whatever they need to have done, but cannot do at all, or cannot so well do, for themselves, in their separate and individual capacities."

That is often cited by the Fair Dealers as the Lincolnian expression of approval of the Fair Deal.

These people, however, fail to complete the passage as written by Lincoln. In view of his full words, this is understandable, for they are as follows:

"In all that the people can individually do for themselves, government ought not to interfere."

There, in those few words of Lincoln, lies the essential difference between the present Democratic Party and the Republican Party, from which stem the important political issues that confront us today.

The few quotations from Lincoln which I have cited in my remarks tonight are enough to reveal a very important and very distinctive part of Lincoln's personality and character. It is, however, one that too frequently is not remembered today.

Not only was Lincoln possessed with high principles, but he was practical. Not only was he a consummate statesman, but he was a shrewd politician. Not only could he hope and plan for achieving greater goals, but he could achieve them. Not only, in short, was he a thinker, but he was a doer, as well. In the truest and best sense of the word, he was a realist.

Probably today the Republican Party has greater need for realism than for anything else. It seems to me, in fact, that a lack of realism has been one of our party's chief handicaps.

If in our opposition we blindly ignore great national problems demanding solution or if—perceiving these problems—we refuse either to provide solutions or to accept solutions offered by others, we serve neither ourselves nor our country. We then present the sorry spectacle of a party devoid of ideas

or imagination, and we fail in our obligation to the American people.

Ours is the party of opposition, yes. Ours must not, however, be the party of opposition simply for the sake of opposition.

Oppose we must. But we must propose, too.

To attract the support essential to our success, we Republicans must stand for things. And we can stand for things without being a "me-too" party.

Our great task is to combat the reckless spending, the glaring incompetence, and the socialistic programs of the Fair Deal. In doing so, we must show that we possess genuine solicitude for the welfare of all the people.

We must point the way to the maintenance of our free society while indicating the steps to be taken to improve continually the lot of the ordinary man. The mighty challenge confronting us is to provide the means for the reconciliation of the ever growing demand for security with the even more vital requirement for the preservation of freedom.

Ours is the job of convincing the majority of the American people that the way to a better society lies not through ever bigger and more powerful government which would finally destroy freedom. Ours is the job of convincing the majority of the American people that only through government's cooperation with, and not its operation of, our free institutions can those institutions be fully utilized and expanded and remain free—for the benefit of all.

So tonight, in rededicating ourselves to the ideals and principles of Lincoln, let us not forget that he was also a very real and a very practical human being.

But more important, let us not forget that with all of Lincoln's practicality and shrewdness, there stands revealed in his writings and speeches, and especially reaffirmed in his everyday life, a rare appreciation and acceptance of the great moral and spiritual values. If Lincoln's success in his day was owing in large measure to his realism, his greatness for posterity is owing in even larger measure to his lofty idealism, his basic integrity, and above all, his abiding compassion for humanity.

And so let it be with the Republican Party today. Mindful of these things, profiting by them, we can move forward now to new goals of achievement and success and secure for ourselves the gratitude of generations to come.

America, World Leader Against Imperialism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LESTER C. HUNT

OF WYOMING

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, on the evening of February 22 the junior Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE] delivered an address on the subject America, World Leader Against Imperialism, at the Arlington Jewish Center. I ask unanimous consent that the address be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICA, WORLD LEADER AGAINST IMPERIALISM

We are celebrating today the two hundred and eighteenth birthday of George Washington. Most Americans think of George Washington as the Father of our Country, and that is the way our children are taught to think of him in school. Yet the name of George Washington is known throughout the world for a different reason. Before he could become Father of the Country he had first to be its liberator. George Washington, more than any other one man, was responsible for the liberation of the American Colonies from the British Empire.

Washington was the first of a long line of liberators. The United States of America was the first new country to appear on the map of the world in more than a hundred years. Its appearance was the signal for the beginning of a world-wide struggle that has continued down to this very day, and that is going to continue until every subject people on earth has finally achieved liberation and nationhood. Many great men have followed in the Washington tradition as liberators of their countries:

In South America, Simón Bolívar and José de San Martin.

In South Africa, Jan Smuts.

In Italy, Garibaldi and Mazzini.

In Czechoslovakia, Masaryk and Beneš.

In India, Gandhi and Nehru.

In Israel, Ben Gurion, Beigin, and others.

In Indonesia, Sukarno and Sjarir.

And many more whose names stand out in their countries' history.

Washington, the liberator, has been the symbol for the anticolonial struggles for freedom on every continent for the past 150 years. His words and acts have inspired such recent liberation movements as those of the Jews in Palestine and the Republicans in Indonesia. His model will be followed again and again in the struggles for freedom of all the remaining colonial peoples.

As the first great liberator, Washington started a historic movement the end of which we cannot yet see. As Father of his Country, he and the great men working with him founded a new kind of country endowed with a new kind of society. Americans who came after them have perfected the miracle—and America—a new country with a new type of society has become an example for oppressed peoples everywhere to emulate.

In recent years the deep current of national liberation has swelled to a mighty flood. The historic trend that began with Washington's liberation of America swept unchecked through the Western Hemisphere in the early nineteenth century. Then there were set-backs. Though Spanish and Portuguese colonies in America achieved independence, European empires were extending themselves over Africa and tightening their grip on Asia.

The first years of this century saw, in the Boer War in South Africa, a reversal of the trend. Since then the drive for liberation from imperialist domination has mounted with ever greater intensity. The Austro-Hungarian, German, and Turkish Empires were smashed by the First World War. Germany's overseas colonies, however, were taken by French and British mandates. The break-up of the Turkish Empire produced a series of weak states dominated by France and Britain.

There was another reversal of the trend during the period from 1931 to 1944, when the Japanese, Italian, and German totalitarians tried to establish vast empires by military force. They, too, were smashed—largely because of American efforts, it should be noted, as in 1918. In the wake of their destruction, other European empires are staggering and collapsing.

Since 1945 we have seen more than a dozen new countries appear on the map of the world.

Syria and Lebanon drove out the French, with British help.

Israel achieved her independence.

India, Pakistan and Ceylon are now partners of the Commonwealth.

Burma is wholly independent.

We have granted full independence to the Philippines.

Indonesia is liberated from the Dutch.

Libya has been declared free from Italy.

Eritrea will be free from Italy 10 years from now.

Jordan has been granted nominal independence from Britain.

Korea has a half-way, precarious freedom.

Ethiopia is again a free country.

In the past 5 years hundreds of millions of people have begun the great adventure of independent national life—and this is not yet the end.

But again the trend is not all in one direction: The Soviet Union, expanding into Europe, has transformed some nine countries into colonial dependencies. In Poland the process has gone so far as to put a Russian general in command of the Polish armies. These colonies all work for the greater glory of the Soviet Union, as India once worked for Britain. Yet even there a counteraction has set in, producing the phenomenon called Titoism—national communism that rejects Moscow's rule of Yugoslavia. And no one can predict when a similar phenomenon may arise in Communist China.

But, setting aside for the moment the onrush of Soviet imperialism, we can see that almost everywhere else in the world the current is running strong against colonialism. The shot fired at Lexington is still echoing down the corridors of history.

Regardless of what anti-American propagandists may say, this country throughout its history has, far more often than not, been actively in support of people fighting for their freedom—whether it was the Irish, the Czechs, the Greeks, the Israelis, the Boers, the Arabs or anyone else. We have granted independence to the one Asiatic colony we stumbled into: the Philippines. There are today before Congress bills seeking to transform two of our remaining territories into full-fledged States—and I am supporting statehood for Hawaii and Alaska. Americans are uncomfortable in the role of colonial imperialists.

America has always been a profoundly anti-imperialist country. Even when, from time to time, our Government has temporarily abandoned the traditional support for colonial fighters for freedom, our deep-seated feelings sooner or later have always forced the Government to return to the path. I am thinking now of the recent period when the American people insisted that their Government stand on the side of the Israelis against the British-instigated Arab invasions and on the side of the Indonesians against the brutal attempts of Dutch imperialists to crush the Republic of Indonesia. And no one forgets the unending efforts of vast numbers of our people during the whole war period to persuade the British to grant independence to India.

When we think of the origins of our country and its struggle against the totalitarian political philosophy and the mercantilist economic philosophy of the empire it fought against—why should we be surprised that America has been and still is today the world leader against imperialism? The surprising thing would be if America were not. We can't be anything else but anti-imperialist. It is in our history to be so. It is in our best interests economically to be so. It is in our blood to be so.

Compared to the American who stands against imperialism, the Communist or Socialist who preaches—but never practices—anti-imperialism is a "Johnny-come-lately"—a poor imitator of something begun long ago by the colonists strung out along the eastern seaboard of North America, under the lead of George Washington.

This is a fact of extreme importance today. We are all aware that one of the most potent propaganda weapons of the Communists is their attack on colonial imperialism in Asia, the Middle East, and Africa. With this weapon they are hitting the weakest plates in the armor of our European allies—and through those allies are hitting at us. This is producing one of the most acute dilemmas in our foreign policy today.

The embarrassment which our alliance with Europe causes us elsewhere can be seen in all its ugliness in the Indochinese crisis. Unlike Indonesia and Israel, where we had similar though lesser embarrassments, Indochina is next door to a great new Communist power—China. Unlike Indonesia and Israel, Indochina's nationalist movement is mainly controlled by Communists. We decided, when the chips were all down, to back the Israelis and the Indonesians against the British and the Dutch Empires. We were right to do this—it was in our long tradition of anti-imperialism. History is already vindicating those many Americans who worked for this policy in Israel and in Indonesia.

Our Government's policy is not yet clear on Indochina, though the indications are that we have decided to make an all-out effort—including economic and military aid—to back the French-sponsored Indochinese regime of Bao Dai, against the Communist-dominated nationalists under Ho Chi-minh. Here our decision is influenced by factors that did not exist—or that were far less important—in Indonesia and Palestine. The question in Indochina is not only one of colonial independence versus European imperialism but also of a modified European-type imperialism against a dynamic, driving Communist imperialism.

If the French win, we will at least have the possibility of effecting reforms and even one day of seeing Indochina become independent of French imperialism. If the Communists win, we will not only lose this possibility but the Indochinese will promptly be taken over by a new and more virulent form of imperialism run either from China or from Russia. Indochina is a great gamble, and the odds at present are not in our favor. We have been forced to back the French and their puppet, because the Soviet Union and Communist China recognized Ho Chi-minh.

The fact that we find ourselves in such a trap illustrates what I have been talking about. We are being forced to compromise our traditional opposition to European imperialism in order—we hope—to stop an even worse Russian Communist imperialism. We must realize why we have been driven into this trap. I hope we insist, before it is too late, that in other parts of the world where the Communist pressure is not as immediate or as powerful as in Indochina, there will be undertaken reforms and steps toward liberation that will strengthen colonial areas so that they do not later involve us in more civil wars. I am thinking of British Malaya which lies just south of Indochina, of Iran, Iraq, and other Middle East countries, of French North Africa, British Nigeria, the Gold Coast, and the rest of Africa controlled by Britain, France, Belgium, Portugal, Italy, and Spain.

There is almost no part of our foreign policy, outside our direct relations with the Soviet Union and the arms race on which we and they have entered, no aspect of our foreign affairs that calls for more attention, more deep thinking, than on the colonial question. The day is long past when we can afford to ignore what the European colonial powers are doing in their possessions and dependencies. We are tied to them by the North Atlantic alliance, by the military-assistance program, by the European recovery program, by all manner of strategic and economic interests.

It is foolish to think we do not have sufficient influence with the European colonial powers to be able to propose—and have accepted—vital and necessary improvements in their colonial policies and regimes. That doesn't mean declaring, as some rash individuals suggest, "Do what we tell you, because we're putting up the money." That is the last way to accomplish anything. Such an approach smacks of the very thing we are opposing: Dictation by a stronger power to a weaker one. But it does not mean either that we are forced to sit back, hands folded, and watch while other Indochinas and other Indonesias develop before our eyes, doing nothing to prevent the crisis, only stepping in when the policy of the European power involved has proved bankrupt.

The stakes in the colonial problem are too high to leave it to ambassadors on the spot, area desks in the State Department, or experts and specialists. Of course, what we decide to do will vary in each area according to local and particular conditions. But we can certainly develop what we do not now have: an integrated body of principles on the colonial question that will form the fundamental approach to our policymaking throughout the colonial world.

If our decision, for example, is always to go through the colonial offices of the mother countries when we want to deal with a colonial people—then the outcome of any action we take will be one thing. If, however, we make it a policy to go directly to the colonial peoples themselves—bypassing the colonial offices and their pretensions to superior standing above the "backward" peoples—we will obtain quite different results.

Take the Indo-Chinese dilemma again. If we decide to give aid to the forces fighting the Communists—as it is almost certain we are going to do—then to whom do we give this aid? To the French army which all Indochinese, Communists, and non-Communists, detest as their oppressor? To Bao Dai, the French-sponsored leader of the non-Communist Indochinese? To some other man or group less suspect in the eyes of the people we are trying to draw away from the Communists? The success of any program we may invent for Indochina will largely depend on this decision.

Take the new point 4 development for economically retarded areas—mainly for colonies and semi-colonial countries. Do we channel technical assistance and investments through colonial offices in London, Paris or Brussels? Or do we send it directly to Nigeria or French Equatorial Africa or the Belgian Congo? If we do one thing, any development that takes place will be primarily in the interest of the imperial power. If we do the other thing, the development will be for the benefit of the colonial people—their economy will grow on a broad base and their political freedom will grow on top of that.

Such decisions cannot be left to State Department officials, no matter how expert they may be. There is a crying need for a statement of general American policy on the colonial question. This means that a public body of outstanding men and women is needed to state the issues, study the alternatives, suggest the course to follow.

The colonial problem is one of relations between subject peoples and their masters. It is complicated by our alliance with the masters and by the Communist efforts among colonial peoples to identify liberation with communism. We have to think through this problem so as to attain two goals:

First. To retain our alliance with Europe, now that it exists, and to transform it, if possible, into a federal union including Canada and the United States.

Second. To prove to the colonial peoples that we favor their liberation from the very countries with which we are allied.

I doubt if a more difficult problem—involving more people and more intricate relationships among them—has ever faced this country. If we do not solve it correctly I can safely predict that we will either turn the Europeans against us as muddled meddlers in their colonial backyards, or that we will finally lose the colonial peoples to the agents of world communism. We cannot permit either of these to be the outcome.

One of the most dramatic and most fruitful ways of concentrating public attention on this problem and on its possible solution would be a national conference on the colonial question. We should have a conference called—perhaps by Presidential direction, perhaps not—to include representatives of all Government departments and agencies that deal with the colonies of other nations, Members of the House and Senate, leading representatives of business, labor, universities, professions and civil bodies, people from the United Nations, visiting witnesses from colonial areas. Such a conference would make a thorough study of the colonial issue as it affects our standing in the world, our foreign policy goals, our relations with the millions of colonial peoples. It should report its findings and recommendations to the Congress, to the executive department, to the people at large through press, radio, and other media.

I would not want to leave the impression with you that I am considering the colonial question solely in respect to its role in the cold war. Even if there were no cold war the problem would confront us. The cold war has merely accentuated it and brought it more sharply to our attention. The march toward freedom of colonial peoples began long before communism was ever heard of.

What makes me proud is that we in America began that march. The man whose birthday we are celebrating today was the first leader in that march. Millions of Americans since his time have participated in one fashion or another in the liberation of other peoples. In a very real sense our participation in both world wars had as its purpose the liberation of peoples conquered by imperialist armies. And though no one stresses it much, one of the basic issues in our present conflict with the Soviet Union is the colonization of eastern Europe by the forces of Communist imperialism.

America cannot help being an anti-imperialist country. Our Nation was born in a struggle against foreign imperialism, and our history will never let us forget it. The democratic society we have built has made it impossible for the type of feudal ruling class to develop that European nations depend on for the conquest and rule of colonial peoples. Our economic system is designed primarily to satisfy consumer wants for all the people, not to perpetuate and enrich a small ruling class of the sort that in Europe has ruled at home and ruled in the colonies.

America is never truer to herself than when she is engaged in a great liberating task. Many feel we have somehow lost the track in recent years, that we are stumbling across the world like a powerful but dizzy giant. I believe that one way to bring us back on to the path we have so long followed in the past—the true path of George Washington's America—is to make up our minds about the colonial question and to proclaim publicly and before the whole world, that one of our primary goals in foreign affairs is to help speed the process of liberation of all colonial peoples wherever they may be.

We Mustn't Flinch in the Face of Mounting Russian Threats

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Connersville (Ind.) News-Examiner of February 17, 1950:

WE MUSTN'T FLINCH IN THE FACE OF MOUNTING RUSSIAN THREATS

This is a time of supreme urgency in America. Not since Russian fighters buzzed our air-lift planes over Germany have we had greater need to view the future with courage and determination.

Dr. Harold Urey, atomic scientist, tersely expresses the danger: "If the H-bomb is created, there will be no place to hide."

Another eminent scientist,. Dr. Vannevar Bush, warns that the only real defense against the A-bomb or the H-bomb or any other explosive weapon is to keep it away from our shores.

Urey underlines that warning by telling us that not only Russian bombers but innocent-looking tramp steamers which slip almost unnoticed into our harbors may bear the dreaded explosive cargo.

He foresees a possible Soviet effort before the year is out to split European Atlantic Pact nations off from us by mining their key harbors with atomic charges.

Rumors are rife that Russia may strike any time at defiant Tito in Yugoslavia or at Finland, tiniest partner in the Soviet Union's circle of compulsory friends.

Admiral Sherman, chief of naval operations, declares the Russians have a vast submarine fleet in Asiatic waters. Military experts see submarines as prime carriers of superexplosives for possible launching against our island outposts or our western shore.

A Government aviation research official reiterates an old story: Russia has a bigger air force than ours.

Air Secretary Symington goes him several points better, asserting that Soviet dictators have the world's largest armed forces and are capable of a surprise attack upon any part of America's 3,000,000 square miles.

These signals of peril have not gone unheeded. The cry for action to stave off civilization's ruin has risen everywhere. And that call has been answered, by Secretary of State Acheson, with the full support of President Truman.

Our policy for dealing with Russia in this hour is to be founded solely on strength and power. For these blunt tools of diplomacy are the only ones which impress Moscow.

Let the meaning of that decision sink in. There'll be no more big-power meetings, no peace treaties with Germany and Japan, no disarmament or atomic control talks until we and our friends among free nations are strong enough to establish conditions that Russia must accept whether it wants to or not.

We do not have that kind of strength now. Therefore it is clear we must set about getting it without delay. Otherwise our policy of power is a string of empty phrases.

As a beginning we must stop deluding ourselves that we do have such strength. Nothing is more dangerously misleading than the statement of Secretary of Defense Johnson that we're ready to "go over and lick hell out of Joe Stalin."

The truth is we plan to reduce our military budget for the coming fiscal year by some $2,000,000,000. Obviously we aren't going to get more defense for less money.

To obtain the power we need will force us to some hard choices. Expanded military strength almost certainly will mean contracted civilian comforts. We'd better find out soon where those choices lie—and start making them. We can't stand off a worldwide menace while enjoying business as usual.

Our military and scientific experts make the maddening decision as to the relative value of atomic bombs, guided missiles, long-range bombers, naval forces and land armies in a future war. We must seek balance in our strength.

We can't assume any weapon, including a hydrogen bomb, would give us decisive advantage even if we had it exclusively. And the story of Dr. Klaus Fuchs' spying is a reminder that we'd better not count on sole possession. Spies don't go out of business just when the stakes get bigger.

What Democracy Means to Me

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWIN C. JOHNSON
OF COLORADO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Madam President, on behalf of my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] and myself, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a radio script by Anne Pinkney, a 17-year-old Trinidad, Colo., high school senior, which was one of four national prize winners in the annual I Am an American contest. This contest was jointly sponsored by the National Association of Broadcasters, the Junior Chamber of Commerce of the United States and the Radio Manufacturers Association. It was endorsed by the Office of Education of the United States Government.

The contest, now in its third year, this year had more than 1,000,000 entries, high school boys and girls from every State and Territory, writing on What Democracy Means to Me. The entries were recorded for radio and were judged by an eminent group of Americans, which included Associate Justice Tom C. Clark; Douglas Southall Freeman, noted Virginia editor and historian; J. Edgar Hoover; Morgan Beatty, NBC newsman and radio commentator; Edward R. Murrow, CBS newsman and radio commentator; Mrs. Raymond Clapper; Wayne Coy, chairman of the Federal Communications Commission; Andrew D. Holt, of the National Education Association; and James Stewart, motion picture star.

I was fortunate enough to be present yesterday when the two boys and two girls who were adjudged the winners were presented with their plaques and $500 each for college scholarships. As Assistant Secretary of State Edward Barrett, who presented the awards, observed, it was a fine example to the people behind the iron curtain of how democracy works. It was inspiring to note the enthusiasm and understanding these boys and girls have of America.

Naturally, my colleague [Mr. MILLIKIN] and I are very, very proud of Miss Pinkney, and we congratulate her parents and the faculty of Trinidad high school.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I speak for democracy.

Perhaps you're wondering who I am.

I am a symbol, existing only in the minds of men.

As a symbol I stand at the shores of our country.

As a symbol I cover the whole land, I exist elsewhere, but never so much as here.

Can it be you don't recognize me?

In one form I stand and welcome many travelers to our land. I am robed in skirts of iron, and I hold a bright torch aloft in my right hand. All peoples have thought of me in their dreams; many have defended me.

Do you recognize these words, "Give me liberty or give me death"? They were spoken by one of my defenders, Patrick Henry, and in times of stress have been echoed by millions after him.

What did I mean to Patrick Henry and those early patriots of our country? I meant enough to them that they risked their lives in order to set up a country in which I should reign supreme. They wrote our Declaration of Independence and our Constitution, which today stand as models upon which many governments are founded. They conceived the truths that all men are created equal in the sight of God and man, and so wrote into the Constitution of my country these things which I stand for: freedom of religion, freedom of speech, the right to vote, trial by jury, freedom of the press, and the right to do as you wish if it doesn't harm other people.

As you see, without me none of these would have any meaning—and that is why you find my name written so many times in our Constitution.

To the men who followed these early champions of me I meant a great deal too. I was the magnet that drew millions of people from across the seas in reaching our Nation. Many of these people became pioneers, pushing our frontiers steadily westward. Many of them did not go exploring however. They settled in towns and villages across the Nation, starting businesses, using skills which they had brought with them from across the waters, thus, in time, making this one of the greatest industrial nations in the world.

You say that you know all this, that you've studied it since the first grade, that it is ancient history and you want to know what it means today.

It hasn't changed. It means more today than it did then.

Democracy, through freedom which I symbolize, is still the brightest hope of mankind.

There are three institutions which are fundamental to our democracy: the home, the school, and the church.

The home lays the foundation for democratic living, the schools continue this building in many ways, through the student councils, leadership programs and even through sports, for there the student learns fair play and if he has any totalitarian instincts he can always work them off by booing the umpire.

The church is the cornerstone in cement that holds these other two together, for it was the first democratic institution teaching the brotherhood of all men.

We have the right to choose, to vote for those whom we wish to guide us. Millions of people today would tell us how wonderful and precious this is, if they could speak without fear and with freedom.

You can. You can complain of any action, even of your Government, which seems un-

fair and your complaint, if just, will be printed in newspapers all over the country so all men may see and act to remove it. But in many countries your speech would not get into the newspapers. Instead, you would be arrested and taken to court, tried and judged, a traitor to your country. You would be liquidated, so that never again would you be a problem to the government.

The trial would not be such as you have known in America either. It would be short, brutal, the sentence predestined. In America your liberty is guarded by a jury of 12 of your own neighbors, a competent judge, a lawyer who believes in you and you must be proved guilty beyond a question of a doubt.

These are my fruits, and, as the Bible puts it, "by their fruits shall ye know them."

You say you have not realized in how many ways and how importantly I had entered your life. You may not see me in all these invisible ways but every day you see my greatest symbol. The flag of the United States of America. Symbols have no voices to be heard as you are hearing me now, but this, I think, would be what the symbol of freedom would say, because this is what democracy means to me.

These Days

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. VIRGIL CHAPMAN
OF KENTUCKY
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CHAPMAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the major portion of an article entitled "These Days," by George Sokolsky, which appeared in today's issue of the Washington Times-Herald.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THESE DAYS

(By George Sokolsky)

War is still our most serious business. War costs us more than 70 percent of our budget. War determines both our domestic and foreign policies.

Naturally, when a situation is so critical, differences of opinion develop as to the best way to handle the situation. Thus, the Navy and the Air Force differed, and that led to wild public recriminations.

The problem centers on two factors:

1. How much can this country afford to spend year after year on the national defense without wrecking the national economy?

2. After the maximum permissible amount is settled upon, how is the money to be allocated?

The responsibility for the conduct of the national defense rests upon Louis Johnson, Secretary of Defense; the responsibility for determining the amount to be spent rests upon the President and the Congress.

The amount that can be spent on the national defense is limitless; the amount that will be spent is limited by the judgment of the President and the Congress as to how much the national economy will permit. For the present budget, the amount is $13,000,000,000.

Secretary Johnson has emphasized economy and has won the dislike of the following elements in our population: Contractors who live by enormous expenditures; those officers of the various services who prefer high expenditures without increased effectiveness; the pro-Russian crowd who want so much spent that it will crack our national economy; the pro-British crowd who want us to maintain as much of the British Empire as is left.

These groups take potshots at Secretary Johnson. Their latest falsehood, however, sounds true because of the previous quarrel between the Navy and the Air Force. They try to give the impression that a violent quarrel has developed between Secretary of Defense Johnson and Secretary of the Air Force Stuart Symington. The object of the story is to imply that Johnson can get along with no one.

I have thoroughly investigated this story and have confirmed that it is a lie.

The Alsop brothers, who rather fancy themselves great experts, have been calling Secretary of Defense Johnson a liar and have accused him of fooling the American people.

The gist of their complaint is that while he is practicing economy, he is impairing the efficiency of the defense forces. Emphasis is placed upon the appearance of discrepancy in public statements made by Louis Johnson and Stuart Symington.

I have examined the public statements of both these officials and there are no actual discrepancies.

The gist of the thinking of both is identical:

Johnson says:

"Our establishment of defense must be so strong—in the conception of the President and myself and the joint chiefs of staff it must be so strong that it will deter anyone who wants to start trouble in this world; and secondly, it must be so strong that if somebody does start trouble, there is no question about America being the victor in the final outcome of that discussion."

Symington says:

"America is reconciled to the necessity for a peacetime defense program greater than ever required in the past. We must remain steadfast and alert until that day—God hasten it—when we can have complete assurance that any power, or combination of powers, which threaten peace will abandon their aggressive schemes and participate effectively in the community of nations to advance, and not destroy, civilization."

But there is more than that. The President, Johnson, and Symington, and every other official associated with the national defense now have the problem of turning fat into muscle, of using economy to produce efficiency, of ending the cost of Mexican and Civil Wars installations so that the needs of 1950 can be met without wrecking our national economy.

In a word, money must be saved to be used to the best advantage. This is what the Department of Defense is trying to do. It is a difficult task under any circumstances; it is particularly hard when every plan to accomplish both economy and efficiency encounters unfair opposition.

National Health and Medical Care Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. HART
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HART. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the press of New Jersey and New York City published a statement of aims and purposes comprising a national health program put forward by the Medical Society of New Jersey, as an alternative to the compulsory health insurance plan which has been advocated by Hon. Oscar Ewing, Administrator of Federal Security Agency.

The alternative plan is largely the work of Dr. James F. Norton, an eminent physician of Jersey City, president of the Medical Society of New Jersey and vice president of the medical association.

Without commenting upon the details of the program or offering any opinion as to its value, I append it herewith as part of my remarks:

PROPOSALS OF THE MEDICAL SOCIETY OF NEW JERSEY FOR A NATIONAL HEALTH AND MEDICAL-CARE PROGRAM

A 12-point cooperative health program, in which National and State Governments may participate without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom, or scientific progress was set forth on January 30, 1950, by the Medical Society of New Jersey.

The program was revealed by Dr. James F. Norton, of Jersey City, president of the State Medical Society and vice president of the American Medical Association. In introducing the medical society's proposals, Dr. Norton said:

"We believe this positive cooperative health plan constitutes a 'standard to which all men of good will can repair.' We propose to seek endorsement and active support of this program from every private and public organization in the community.

"We are convinced that people working together can solve their social problems, acting through the many voluntary organizations that already have accomplished so much in making life safe, healthier, and happier for everyone.

"Government—local, State, and National—has a part to play, but it should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens, not to supplant or supersede those efforts. We have tried in this statement, to define the proper role of government and to show how voluntary agencies, including the medical profession, can exert the leadership that the public expects of us."

Text of the society's statement follows:

"The Medical Society of New Jersey favors, and always has favored, a constructive approach to the solution of the national health problem, particularly as it applies to the citizens of New Jersey. The solution of medical and health problems should be undertaken in a realistic, scientific spirit. Moreover, since the health of the people transcends all political considerations, it must be considered on a nonpartisan basis.

"In view of the fact that the Congress of the United States and the State legislatures are considering various extensions of the health program, the medical society believes that the following statement, presented as a definite and comprehensive program of action, will be helpful at this time.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey believes there are large areas in which Government may beneficially cooperate with the citizens, individually or acting through voluntary associations, in furthering a health program—in the interest of all the people, and without jeopardy to individual liberty. It is generally recognized that voluntary cooperative effort should have priority at all times. Government should seek to promote and supplement the efforts of free citizens (not to supplant or supersede voluntary action) whenever voluntary cooperative effort can meet the need.

"Any constructive approach to solution of the health problem must take into account the several classifications of those who require medical care, namely:

"1. Those not employed, but able to sustain the full cost of providing for hospital and medical care.

"2. Those who are employed.

"3. The medically indigent, whose income does not suffice to meet the costs of catastrophic illnesses.

"4. The totally indigent, who are on public-assistance rolls.

"5. The chronically ill.

"Any adequate program to meet health needs should include medical and hospital care. Insofar as possible, such care should be so inclusive that everyone may budget in advance against the financial burden of sudden illness. In addition, the program should assure every community of basic health protection through well-organized professional public health departments.

"No matter what program is devised, it should be experimental, flexible and evolutionary in character. It should be sufficiently concrete as to be readily understood and practically adaptable everywhere.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey, therefore, offers the following proposals for a cooperative health program, in which National and State Governments may participate, without endangering individual initiative, personal freedom or scientific progress. The sequence in which this program is set forth does not necessarily indicate the relative importance of its parts.

"1. Voluntary nonprofit organizations should be used as the best means of budgeting hospital and medical service for the individual and his family.

"(a) The Blue Cross movement, providing for hospital care on a nonprofit, minimum cost basis, is recognized as the outstanding development in this direction. First established in New Jersey less than 20 years ago, Blue Cross has extended to nearly every part of the United States. There are now 96 Blue Cross organizations with a combined enrollment of more than 35,000,000 people. In New Jersey, approximately one-third of the population now enjoys this protection.

"(b) The Blue Shield movement, launched within the past decade, has made possible the prepayment of medical care on a budget basis, which in some areas means that the doctor's bill for eligible care is covered in full for 80 percent of subscribers and their dependents, of whom there are now more than 12,000,000 persons enrolled throughout the United States. Blue Shield in New Jersey has enrolled 350,000 people in only 7 years.

"2. For persons not employed, but able to meet the cost of enrollment in such voluntary nonprofit organizations, we propose that the premiums be made eligible for deduction for income-tax purposes, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber or the amount of the premium paid.

"Such deduction is equitable, inasmuch as employers who pay or contribute to the enrollment cost for their employees are already permitted to deduct these costs for income-tax purposes, in cases where the latter enters into the computation of Federal income tax.

"3. For employed groups, it is encouraging to note the growing practice of the employer contributing toward the cost of health and welfare programs for his employees and dependents. As mentioned, such payments are usually tax-deductible as part of the cost of production, and are being increasingly recognized as a legitimate part of that cost.

"4. As an immediate encouragement toward employer contribution toward the enrollment cost of hospital and medical protection, government, at every level from municipal to national, should promote the program of such protection for its own employees, by assuming either a part or all of the cost of enrollment in voluntary prepayment plans.

"5. As rapidly as possible, consistent with actuarial experience and sound administration, the services eligible under such voluntary nonprofit organizations should be extended to cover all nonchronic ailments on an inclusive basis. An encouraging step in this direction is the decision of the Blue Shield Plan in New Jersey to provide complete coverage (within the $5,000 annual income limitation) for maternity services, including delivery and pre- and post-partum care, in the hospital, the home, or the physician's office.

"6. After sufficient enrollment is attained, we recommend that consideration be given the practicability of providing medical-care protection on an inclusive basis to subscribers in voluntary, nonprofit plans, regardless of the financial status of the subscriber, and with no salary limitation for over-all inclusive service.

"7. We propose that immediate study be given the possibility of providing voluntary, nonprofit protection for those who are medically indigent though not on public-assistance rolls, through the use of State and local funds for the purchase of such protection. As a rule of thumb to determine 'medical indigency,' the criterion might be the question whether one's taxable income is such as to exempt him from payment of Federal income taxes.

"8. For the medical and hospital care of persons on public-assistance rolls, we recommend the providing of service through State-county-municipal funds, with such Federal aid as may be found necessary or may be provided from time to time, perhaps utilizing on a cost basis the voluntary nonprofit organizations for the actual provision of the required services.

"9. There is no actuarially sound basis yet established for treating the chronically ill as an insured group. We suggest, therefore, that study be given to providing care for needy persons suffering from chronic illness, on a cost basis at State level, again with the possibility of utilizing the facilities of voluntary nonprofit organizations.

"10. The need for better local public-health service in most areas of the United States has long been recognized, but progress in providing it has been discouragingly slow. We recommend that every State government—particularly our own in New Jersey—adopt such legislation as may be needed to permit consolidation of local health jurisdictions into districts having sufficient size and resources to support at least a minimum staff and facilities for complete modern basic public-health protection.

"11. There are numerous areas in certain States where the private practice of medicine is economically or professionally impractical, because the areas will not sustain a sufficient number of capable physicians on a fee-for-service basis, or because hospital facilities are inadequate or lacking. Progress is being made under the Hill-Burton Hospital Survey and Construction Act toward meeting the deficit of hospital accommodations. We suggest exploring the possibility of the United States Public Health Service providing competent physicians to such areas when requested by State or local agencies.

"12. Such a cooperative health program as is here envisaged may require a considerable increase in the number of physicians, health officers, nurses, and other medical personnel. Ideally, every qualified person desiring to enter the field of medicine and public health should be able to do so. We support a program of Government subsidy, where needed, to assist qualified individuals in obtaining professional training and to expand professional training facilities where it is found possible to expand existing schools or to establish new ones. In this connection we renew our plea for early action looking toward establishment of a medical school in New Jersey. We believe that any governmental subsidy that may be provided for these purposes should be granted unconditionally to approved institutions.

"The Medical Society of New Jersey submits that through such voluntary cooperative action the problem of attaining an adequate national health program can and will be solved. This suggested program is not intended as a nebulous proposal for the indefinite future, but might well be inaugurated within the present year."

FEPC Resolution of New York State Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, the following is the memorial passed by the Senate and Assembly of the New York State Legislature on February 21, 1950, with only seven dissenting votes in the assembly and two in the senate memorializing the Congress to enact FEPC legislation with enforcement powers in the Commission, as contained in H. R. 4453:

Senate Resolution 42

(By Mr. Scanlan)

Whereas there is now pending in the Congress of the United States, a bill, H. R. 4453, known as the Fair Employment Practice Act, the purpose of which is to establish a permanent agency of the Government to eliminate discrimination in employment; and

Whereas the State of New York has been among the pioneers of the States of the Union to enact such legislation which has been successful in reducing or eradicating such discrimination in the industries of this State; and

Whereas all citizens without regard to their race, creed, color, or national origin are entitled to equal opportunity to be gainfully employed and it is in the public interest that such unfair practices, which tend to engender bitterness and unrest among large segments of our population be eradicated as opposed to the principles of our form of government; and

Whereas during the last war when it was essential for our war industries to keep production at their highest level, the fair employment practice committee was highly successful in reducing or eliminating such discrimination in such industries: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That it is the sense of the people of the State of New York, expressed through the considered judgment of their representatives in the legislature, that the enactment of such legislation is of the greatest importance to the people and will tend to unite the country and create greater respect for our institutions among the other peoples of the world; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, respectfully memorialized to enact with all convenient speed H. R. 4453 or such other, similar, appropriate legislation as will accomplish the purposes of this resolution; and be it further

Resolved (*if the assembly concur*), That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the Secretary of the Senate, and the Clerk of the House of Representatives of the United States, and to each Member of the Congress of the United States duly elected from the State of New

York, and that the latter be urged to do all within their power to bring about the enactment of such legislation.

By order of the senate:

WILLIAM S. KING,
Secretary.

In assembly, February 21, 1950, concurred in without amendments.

By order of assembly:

ANSLEY BORKOWSKI,
Clerk.

How Much of the World?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Thursday, February 23 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article written by Livingston Hartley, which was published in the January issue of Freedom and Union. Mr. Hartley is a well-known student and writer on international affairs.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

HOW MUCH OF THE WORLD?

(By Livingston Hartley)

WORLD UNION MINUS RUSSIAN BLOC WOULD CONTAIN ONLY 3.7 PERCENT MORE PEOPLE IN LOOSE UNION THAN WOULD TIGHTLY KNIT ATLANTIC UNION PLUS ASSOCIATED PEOPLES

Advocates of world government make much of the quantitative difference between a government representing the world's people and an Atlantic Union including initially only a minority of them. This quantitative difference shrinks surprisingly if the comparison is made on a basis which considers political and economic relationships.

When we take account of those relationships, we have to expect that Russia and the other countries now under Communist control would not participate in a world government, a conclusion which is now accepted by some leaders in the world-government movement. We have also to expect that nations closely associated with the Atlantic democracies today would be closely associated with the Atlantic Union. If these conclusions are valid, a comparison of populations in an all-conclusive world government and in an initial Atlantic Union has little meaning. A far more pertinent and realistic comparison is that between a world government which does not include the Russian bloc and an Atlantic Union together with associated peoples.

Before proceeding further, it should be stressed that such a comparison in no way implies that these two alternatives are equally feasible. We can, if we wish, compare the size of a projected liner which is soon to sail the Atlantic with the theoretical size of an atomic rocket which some scientist calculates might some day fly around Mars, without implying that both are equally practicable.

The Atlantic Union would be based upon common institutions, common interests, a common cultural heritage, and a sense of community which has developed over many centuries. The peoples who would form it have already combined for defense in the North Atlantic Pact, and for European recovery through the Marshall plan. The union is directly in line with historic evolution and its many instances of voluntary integration based upon community and proximity.

Proposals for world government, in contrast, depart abruptly from the pattern of historic evolution, disregard the controlling factors of community and proximity which have brought about previous voluntary integration, and seek at one step to bring into one government democracies, dictatorships, and all continents, races, religions, and stages of political development.

Few objective people will challenge the conclusion that in considering any form of world government today it is more realistic to consider one without the Russian bloc than one including the Russian bloc. The Russians have established this point rather clearly by official statements, and even more clearly by their actions. The attitudes toward it of many leaders in the world government movement appears to rest less upon a belief that Russians would actually participate, than upon a desire to avoid themselves any responsibility for further dividing the world.

The conclusion that peoples now associated with the Atlantic democracies would be associated with the Atlantic Union may require more substantiation. Before going into cases, let us look at the general pattern of world trade.

The Atlantic democracies account today for the greater part of international trade. The seven sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact alone, not including their dependent territories or the British dominions, accounted for 45.4[1] percent of world trade in 1948. Most nations outside the Russian bloc are associated with the Atlantic democracies closely economically, depending upon them both for markets and for goods.

Atlantic Union would develop, not diminish, these economic ties. Because it would increase the purchasing power of its own people, it would provide a larger market for the exports of all these outside peoples. Because it would also open new opportunities for its people for mass production and specialization, it would produce goods more cheaply than the Atlantic democracies have done. Thus the union would provide outside peoples with both expanded markets and cheaper goods, strengthening and enlarging the economic bonds between them and the Atlantic peoples.

It may be objected that the Russian bloc might disrupt this progressive economic association by expanding its own trade with all peoples outside the Atlantic Union. But the Russian bloc, including China, which appears destined soon to fall completely under Communist control, has played a relatively small part in international trade. In 1938 it accounted for only 8.6[1] percent of world trade. The trade statistics of most of its people are hidden today by the iron curtain, but it seems likely that the iron curtain itself and the conditions in China and many of the satellite countries have reduced this proportion.

Russia, moreover, lacks the merchant marine to conduct an extensive overseas trade, whereas the Atlantic democracies are the preeminent maritime nations. Russia's overland trade is hindered by inadequate transport and, in parts of Asia, by mountains and deserts. Finally, most of the nations associated economically with the Atlantic democracies need industrial products and the Russian bloc has failed to produce enough indusrial products to meet its own requirements.

The association of peoples all over the world with the Atlantic democracies is not only economic, but also political. These peoples, which are listed individually in the table with this article, may be divided into the following six groups:

1. The colonies or dependent territories of the seven Atlantic democracies which sponsored the North Atlantic Pact. These would presumably become, for an initial stage, dependent territories of the union.

2. The democracies and dominions which were not among the sponsors of the North Atlantic Pact, but may be expected to enter the Atlantic Union either when it is established or soon afterwards. They include three parties to the North Atlantic Pact, three dominions and Switzerland, Sweden and Eire.

3. The Latin-American Republics which have long had intimate bonds with the United States. Most of them could be expected to enter the Atlantic Union soon after its creation. None of them, not even Argentina, would be likely to remain outside the union more than a few years.

4. Six Asiatic countries which were formerly dependent territories of the Atlantic democracies and have now achieved either independence or dominion status. While most of them could not be expected to join the Atlantic Union in the near future, they are today closely associated with the Atlantic democracies and would continue to be closely associated with the Atlantic Union.

The most important of them is India, which has been attempting to avoid definite involvement in the clash between Russia and the West, yet maintains special political and economic links with Britain. If Britain, as well as the United States, became part of a union dedicated to freedom and the dignity of man, these links with the West would become not weaker, but stronger. Old antagonisms towards the British would not apply to the union, while trade ties with the Atlantic area would rapidly increase.

5. Western Germany and Japan which are now occupied by the Atlantic democracies and under their control. Western Germany which would border directly upon the Atlantic Union, might soon be enabled to join the union.

6. A somewhat heterogeneous group of countries which now has close associations with the Atlantic democracies. Greece and Turkey depend upon American military aid for security. Portugal and Italy are parties to the North Atlantic Pact. Egypt, Ethiopia and Thailand have close relationships with Britain while Liberia has long had a special relationship with the United States. Spain has been included in this group because it is reasonable to believe that by the time her European neighbors and some Latin American republics had joined the union, the Spanish people would turn from Franco to freedom in order to join it themselves.

When the economic and political realities underlying the association of all these countries with the Atlantic democracies are analyzed, two conclusions concerning their relationships with the Atlantic Union become apparent.

First, more than half the countries of the world could be expected to seek to join the Atlantic Union within a few years of its creation.

Second, the association of the others with the Atlantic Union would become stronger than their association with the Atlantic democracies. All of them would look to the union not only for expanded markets and cheaper goods, but also for security against a third world war. All peoples among them who aspired to preserve what freedom they had won would see the union as the world's great bastion of freedom. Farseeing statesmen among them would seek practical means of closer association with the union and begin to work for the day when their peoples could join in.

This analysis indicates also that the nations who would be either in the Atlantic Union or closely associated with it, actually comprise most of the world outside the Russian bloc. It may be advisable, however, to

[1] Compiled from Summary of World Trade Statistics, Statistical Office of the United Nations, October 1, 1949.

omit those whose future possibilities of association with the union may be open to some doubt, however much their peoples may aspire toward it. It is usually best to understate a case.

Iran, Palestine and the Arab states of Asia have close ties with the Atlantic democracies today, but might become subject, because of their geographical situation, to powerful Russian pressure. Similar pressure might be applied to Afghanistan and Nepal. The future of both Austria and Korea is uncertain. In order to be conservative, these peoples are omitted from the long list of those who would be associated with the Atlantic Union. It may be suggested, however, that not all of them would be willing to join in a "government" which the Russian bloc refused to join.

The accompanying table gives a comparison between the populations included in a world government without the Russian bloc and in the Atlantic Union and associated peoples. Population figures are from the World Almanac of 1949, taken to the nearest million for simpler presentation.

Exception may be taken to some of the specific items in the population chart, since the inclusion or omission of some countries is necessarily a matter of judgment. It might be objected, for example, that Saudi Arabia, Yemen, Jordan, and Palestine should be added, or that French Indochina should be omitted because the Chinese Communists have reached its borders.

Such adjustments may be made according to individual judgment. It is not believed, however, that any reasonably sound adjustments will materially affect the over-all figure for the Atlantic Union plus associated peoples. To illustrate, an adjustment so sweeping as to eliminate French Indochina and all of the last group, which contain countries as closely tied to the Atlantic democracies as Greece, Turkey, Italy, and Portugal, would reduce the over-all figure only to 1,209,000,000, or 53.4 percent of the world.

But to compare such radically different political entities as a world government without the Russian bloc and the Atlantic Union plus associated peoples on the basis of population alone would be misleading, just as it would be to imply that both are equally feasible.

Such a world government would be loosely constructed of widely divergent peoples, democracies, autocrats, and various shades between, who would lack common interests, common heritage, and any sense of community. Its functions would be limited to efforts to preserve peace. Since the Russian bloc would continue to maintain vast armies, air power, and atomic weapons, the world government could not preserve peace by enacting world law. Peace would then depend, just as it would in the case of the Atlantic Union, upon the creation and successful maintenance of an unquestioned world predominance of power.

The Atlantic Union, in contrast, would be founded solidly upon common interests, common heritage, and a sense of community as well as upon free institutions. Its functions would include not only preservation of peace, but also regulation trade, currency, and communications. It would be inherently much more closely knit and efficient. Functioning as a solid nucleus surrounded and supported by associated peoples and itself possessing 80 percent of the industrial capacity of the world, it would be infinitely better equipped to create and successfully maintain an unquestioned world predominance of power.

Both political aggregations would comprise almost the same proportion of the world's population. Both would depend upon exactly the same peoples to maintain peace, the Atlantic democracies which would form the initial Atlantic Union. In the world government without the Russian bloc, the Atlantic democracies would be only a minority, unable to apply their decisive combined power and influence effectively without the agreement of a heterogeneous majority composed of peoples far behind them in political and economic development. In the union these Atlantic democracies could operate as effectively as we Americans can in our Union, not only to preserve peace, but also to promote prosperity and to foster freedom.

Independence for Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, February 16, 1950 marked the thirty-second anniversary of Lithuanian Independence Day. On the evening of that day, the priests and members of Our Lady of Vilna parish and their guests assembled in the parish hall, Worcester, Mass., for the purpose of celebrating the event with appropriate patriotic exercises. During the exercises, those assembled unanimously adopted and passed the following resolutions:

Whereas the United States of America has ever defended the God-given right of all nations to determine for themselves the form of government under which they desire to live; and

Whereas the United States of America with Great Britain signed the Atlantic Charter, the principles of which guarantee all nations, both large and small, this right of self-rule without interference of any kind from any outside and alien source; and

Whereas the United States of America joined with the Allies in World War II to assure for the entire world a just and lasting peace which can and shall exist only when all nations, both large and small, live as free and independent nations in accordance with recognized principles of justice and charity; and

Whereas the Republic of Lithuania, a small freedom-loving nation, which made astounding advancement and progress in all fields of endeavor during the 21 years of her independence (1918–39), has been forcibly and unjustly denied the exercise of this right by a cruel and ruthless Soviet and has been refused a place and a voice in the United Nations by the great powers who have acquiesced to the unjust and immoral demands of the Soviet; and

Whereas authoritative sources of information clearly indicate that the present policy of Soviet Russia calls for the shameless commission of the international crime of genocide upon liberty-loving Lithuania by the complete destruction and annihilation of Lithuania's Government and of her cultural, educational, economic, industrial, and agricultural systems: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the United States of America continue to maintain and uphold its present policy of recognizing the "de jure" independence of Lithuania despite the unjust absorption of Lithuania's territories within the Russian orbit; be it further

Resolved, That the United States of America insist upon invoking the principles of the Atlantic Charter, thereby guaranteeing the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania; be it further

Resolved, That the Republic of Lithuania be admitted and accepted as an active member of the United Nations and that her officially appointed representatives be permitted to enjoy with full privileges the status of duly elected delegates of that organization; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States of America ratify the Genocide Convention, ratification of which would open up the way for Lithuania to present her case against Russia to the entire world; be it further

Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency, the Honorable Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the head of the United States Delegation to the United Nations, the Honorable Warren R. Austin; to the chairman of the Senate subcommittee now considering ratification of the Genocide Convention, the Honorable BRIEN MCMAHON; to the Senators of Massachusetts, the Honorable HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR., and the Honorable LEVERETT SALTONSTALL; to the Representative of the Fourth Congressional District of Massachusetts, the Honorable HAROLD D. DONOHUE, and to the press.

CONSTANTINE A. VASYS,
Chairman.
MRS. TEKLA MAŽEIKA,
Secretary.

Mr. Keogh's Reappointment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EUGENE J. KEOGH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial which referred to the redesignation of my brother, J. Vincent Keogh, as United States attorney for the eastern district of New York. I am proud, indeed, to include this editorial in view of its being an objective appraisal by the outstanding newspaper of the district of the work performed in the office of the United States attorney during the last 4 years.

[From the Brooklyn Eagle of February 10, 1950]

MR. KEOGH'S REAPPOINTMENT

President Truman's redesignation of J. Vincent Keogh as United States attorney for the Brooklyn, Long Island, and Staten Island area, called the eastern district of New York, is well-merited recognition of our Federal prosecutor's excellent record. As was noted in these columns recently, the prosecutor's office, under Mr. Keogh, compiled an amazing record of approximately 98 percent convictions in cases in the Federal court.

Mr. Keogh's career has been an interesting one. A native Brooklynite, he was a public school teacher for 12 years, an assistant district attorney for 2 years, a lieutenant commander in the Navy in World War II, and has been active in many charitable and civic organizations. He was first named United States attorney 4 years ago. President Truman's decision to rename him is an excellent one.

The President's Foreign Policy Speech

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include President Truman's foreign policy speech at the unveiling of a statue of George Washington:

It is a great privilege to dedicate this inspiring statue of George Washington.

This is the climax of many years of planning and effort. I congratulate particularly the Order of DeMolay, whose contributions have made this statue a reality. This heroic likeness of our first President makes even more impressive the entrance hall of this temple. It is altogether fitting that this work should stand in the community that Washington did so much to build, and so near his own home at Mount Vernon.

George Washington, like ourselves, lived in a period of great change—a period when new forces and new ideas were sweeping across the world. He was the leader of his people in a revolution against tyranny. He commanded an army in a long and bitter war. He was a major figure in the creation of a new kind of constitution. Finally, as the first living President of our Nation, he translated that Constitution into a living government.

Washington's efforts for freedom were twofold. He was concerned first with making the ideal of democratic government work. He was also concerned with the defense of that ideal against the forces opposed to it.

UNWAVERING IN DEVOTION

Washington was unwavering in his devotion to the democratic concept. He never yielded to those who urged him to assume extraordinary powers. Even in the darkest days of the Revolution, when his task as commander in chief of the American forces was rendered doubly difficult by the weakness of the Congress and the rivalries among the States, he always considered himself as a servant of the people. In all that he did, he strove to make democratic institutions more effective.

He knew, too, that they had to be defended; that there were times when the use of force to defend democracy could not be avoided. He not only led the armies in the Revolution but, as President, he was always alert to the necessity for a vigorous national defense.

The task of Americans today is fundamentally the same as it was in Washington's time. We, too, must make democracy work and we must defend it against its enemies.

But our task today is far greater in scope than it was in Washington's time. Not only are we concerned with increasing the freedom, welfare and opportunity of our people. We are also concerned with the right of other peoples to choose their form of government, to improve their standards of living, and to decide what kind of life they want to live.

Since Washington's time the great principles for which the American Revolution was fought have become known throughout the world and have uplifted the hearts and hopes of generations of men. At the same time, through the progress of science, the nations of the world have been drawn together into a common destiny. Our security and progress are today more closely related than ever before to the advance of freedom and self-government in other lands.

A TIME OF RESTLESSNESS

This is a time of restlessness and change. In many parts of the world men are searching for a better social order. They demand a way of life that will provide greater freedom and more widespread opportunity. They yearn to own the land they live on, and to be secure against poverty, disease, and hunger. Above all, they want to live their own lives as they see fit. This rising demand of men everywhere for independence and a better life puts the ideals of freedom and self-government to their greatest test.

At the same time, these ideals are under deadly attack from those who would destroy them. The most aggressive of these enemies today is communism. Communism seeks to induce men to surrender their freedom by false promises of a better life. But the great danger of communism does not lie in its false promises. It lies in the fact that it is an instrument of an armed imperialism which seeks to extend its influence by force.

This threat of force is a challenge to all peoples who are free or who wish to be free. The fundamental issue is whether men are to be free to choose their one way of life, or whether they must live under a system imposed upon them by force.

Just as our Thirteen Original States found that survival and progress depend on closer association and common effort, so the free nations of the world today must seek their salvation in unity and concerted action. The real strength of the free nations is not to be found in any single country or any one weapon, but in the combined moral and material strength of the free world as a whole.

As members of the United Nations, the free nations are working for peace and international security in accordance with the principles set forth in the Charter. Within the context of that larger association many of the free nations have joined together to strengthen the common defense of particular areas against aggression. That is the meaning of the North Atlantic Treaty and the mutual-defense assistance program.

FOR THE COMMON DEFENSE

We shall continue to work with the other free nations associated with us in the common defense—for our defense is theirs, and their defense is ours. The united defense of these nations is a powerful deterrent to aggression, and it will become more powerful as time goes by.

In creating a common defense we do not seek to impose a way of life on any nation. Freedom is not expanded by conquest. Democracy is not created by dictation. Freedom and democracy grow only by persuasion and example, and through the actual experience of what they mean.

At the same time, freedom cannot grow and expand unless it is protected against the armed imperialism of those who would destroy it. The free nations, therefore, must maintain military force as a defensive measure.

While the free nations stand prepared to resist aggression, they are doing their utmost to find peaceful means for settling international disputes. They know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike.

Consequently, we in the United States are doing and will continue to do all that lies within our power to prevent the horror of another war. We are working for the reduction of armaments and the control of weapons of mass destruction.

We are convinced of the necessity for an international agreement to limit the use of atomic energy to peaceful purposes, and for a workable international system to assure that such an agreement is effectively carried out. We believe that the United Nations is the proper forum in which to reach such an agreement. We firmly believe that all nations would gain by such an international agreement. We shall continue to work honestly and wholeheartedly toward that end. But we must remember that the outcome is not ours alone to determine. The actions of men in other countries will help to shape the ultimate decision.

We believe that the plan for controlling atomic energy, which has been worked out in the United Nations and has been approved by the overwhelming majority of its members, would be effective. That plan, therefore, has our support. It has our support not because of its form or its words, but because we believe it would achieve effective control. The stakes are too large to let us, or any nation, stand on pride of authorship. We ask only for a plan that provides an effective, workable system—anything less would be a sham agreement. Anything less would increase, not decrease, the dangers of the use of atomic energy for destructive purposes. We shall continue to examine every avenue, every possibility of reaching real agreement for effective control.

In the long run, however, our security and the world's hopes for peace lie not in measures of defense or in the control of weapons but in the growth and expansion of freedom and self-government. As these ideals are accepted by more and more people, as they give greater meaning and richer content to the lives of millions, they become the greatest force in the world for peace.

The purpose of our participation in the United Nations and other international organizations is to strengthen this great force for peace. That is the purpose of the European recovery program and our point four program to assist underdeveloped areas. That is the purpose of our foreign trade program and our other measures to help build world prosperity.

These programs are positive measures to increase the strength of freedom and self-government by helping men to meet the needs and fulfill the aspirations of their daily lives.

Today, in many countries of the world, the concepts of freedom and self-government are merely vague phrases. They express little to people who are engaged in a desperate struggle with ignorance and poverty. They mean little to men who must work from sun-up to sun-down merely to keep alive. They are not fully understood by men who cannot read or write.

On the continent of Asia and the islands of the Far East, in Africa and in the Near East, are millions of people who live in poverty and who have never known real freedom or democratic government. In their present condition the immediate benefit of steel plowshares, or smallpox vaccinations, has more appeal than abstract ideas of democracy.

FALSITY OF COMMUNIST CLAIMS

The Communists are saying that they will bring food and clothing and health and a more secure life to these poverty-stricken peoples. We know that is not true. But it is not enough to tell such people that communism is a modern tyranny far worse than that of any ancient empire. It is not enough to tell them that communism leads only to oppression. People who have never known freedom and security themselves have little basis for judging how false are the claims of communism.

These people will turn to democracy only if it seems to them to be the best way to meet their urgent needs. The benefits of freedom and democracy must be demonstrated to them.

In many of these areas there are governments which are working to improve the conditions of their people. They know that the claims of the Communists are not made in good faith. They do not want Soviet domination. If these governments are successful in raising living standards, and in

building strong and stable democratic institutions based on popular support, their people will not go over to communism.

But these governments are struggling with titanic problems as their people attempt to climb in a few years from economic misery to better standards of living. They need help. If these nations are to grow in freedom they urgently need assistance in improving their health, their education, their productive capacity, their transportation and communication systems.

That is why I have requested the Congress to act as rapidly as possible on legislation to expand our programs for giving technical assistance to such countries as these, and to encourage American investment in those countries on a mutually beneficial basis. We are not trying to sell them automobiles and television sets. Our purpose is to help them to grow more food, to obtain better education, and to be more healthy. That is the way they can gain the physical and moral strength to be free and to maintain their own governments.

As these nations prove to themselves and to others the effectiveness of free institutions in meeting their people's needs, they will show as nothing else can the true value of democracy and the false claims of communism.

PROBLEMS IN EUROPE

But the problem of making free institutions work is not confined to underdeveloped areas. The highly developed nations of Europe came out of the war with serious problems of their own. They were threatened with economic chaos. Their ability to maintain freedom and democracy was challenged.

The purpose of the European recovery program was to meet this challenge in the area of the world where the preservation of free governments was of supreme importance. The results, which have been achieved so far under that program, have amply demonstrated its wisdom.

With the aid we have provided, the nations of Europe have already made great advances in their production and have improved their trading relations with the rest of the world. Much more must be done before they reach the firm basis of economic self-support, which is essential to the maintenance of free and democratic governments. Consequently, we must complete our program of assistance. It would be utter folly to lose sight of the importance of the European recovery program. It is essential to our hopes for peace.

The preservation and strengthening of free governments depends in large measure on the creation of firm economic conditions throughout the world and on an expanding world trade. Free nations can expand their trade only on the basis of mutual respect and fair dealing.

Our reciprocal trade agreements program and the International Trade Organization are the kind of international machinery which is necessary for increasing the trade of the world. We shall continue to use the procedures of the reciprocal trade agreements program to reduce trade barriers, but more than this is needed. That is why I have urged the Congress to act favorably on the creation of the International Trade Organization, through which the nations of the world can work together effectively to increase world trade.

This program and our other plans for international action are the practical way to move forward toward peace. They recognize that we must deal with the difficult world situation which actually exists. We must not be discouraged by difficulties and set-backs. We must not be misled by the vain hope of finding quick and easy solutions. We must move forward persistently and courageously along the hard path to a peace based on freedom and justice.

The progress we have made in this country since the days of George Washington is proof of the vitality and truth of the ideals he fought for. We must be no less firm, no less resolute, no less steadfast than he was. We move upon a greater stage than he did, but our problems are fundamentally the same problems that faced the first President of this Nation—to make democracy work and defend it from its enemies.

George Washington sought guidance from Almighty God as he faced these tasks in his time; let us be guided today by divine providence as we strive for lasting peace with freedom and justice for all mankind.

Congress Must Take Immediate Action on the Old-Age Pension Problem

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, I came to Congress in January 1939. Then, as today, the general problem of old-age pensions has been before the Congress of the United States.

Along with other Members of Congress, I have actively supported not only by voice but also by vote all legislation designed to give the aged of this Nation the benefits to which they are entitled. During the Seventy-sixth Congress I was among the "101 immortals" designated by Dr. Francis Townsend, founder of the Townsend organization, as having the courage to vote for the Townsend bill.

Much water has flown over the dam since 1939 and Congress is still toying with old-age pension legislation. As in the past 10 years, I am still engaged in a determined effort to have Congress do something with respect to old-age pension legislation.

Since the opening of the Eighty-first Congress I have continued my activities in the field of pension legislation. Not only am I a member of the congressional steering committees for the Townsend and the American pension groups, but I have also appeared before the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee in urging immediate action on pension legislation. In addition, I have spoken on this floor and called attention to the plight of our elderly citizens. I have also signed the discharge petition now being circulated in behalf of the Townsend bill.

My statements during this session of Congress on the subject of old-age pensions are as follows:

STATEMENT BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE THE HOUSE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE, MARCH 15, 1949, IN SUPPORT OF LIBERALIZATION OF THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to appear before you and the members of the committee to discuss the importance of broadening and liberalizing the Social Security Act.

All of you are familiar with the efforts I have been making, since I first came to Congress, to liberalize the provisions of the Social Security Act. On various occasions I have introduced amendments to the Social Security Act and made every effort to have them considered by Congress.

In addition, I have joined with groups such as the Townsend plan, American pension plan, and others in support of legislation to provide an adequate old-age pension for the benefit of millions of Americans who are in the twilight of life and dependent upon old-age assistance or other forms of social-security benefits.

Time and time again statements have been made on the floor, and the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD has been full of impassioned pleas for action by the House leadership with respect to improving benefits under the Social Security Act. The present plight of elderly citizens is a national disgrace and has existed for the past several years.

It is a known fact that social security is here to stay and that it is intended to provide elderly citizens with a means of livelihood in their declining years. Yet, we seem to forget, in viewing earned social-security benefits, that the formula used in computing them has never been changed since the law was first passed. Meanwhile, the cost of living has soared to the point where it has doubled itself. Since 1933 the cost-of-living index has increased considerably. It is common knowledge that persons gainfully employed are having a difficult time in making both ends meet.

The Congress of the United States has ignored the elderly citizens of America, who by their labor and taxes, built this great Nation. Yes, we have forgotten them in turning our attention to world problems. Hardly a day passes that we have not heard on the floor of the poor unfortunate people abroad. When you pick up your daily newspaper, it is not uncommon to find full-page advertisements directing your attention to the needs of millions of persons abroad. This week the House approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute displaced Arabs and Jews in the Middle East. But there is not one word said in defense of millions of our own American citizens who are on starvation diets and restricted in many instances to one scanty meal a day.

Let us examine, for a moment, the amount of financial assistance we have given to the peoples of the world. According to the United States Department of Commerce, from March 11, 1941, to December 31, 1946, in the form of lend-lease aid alone, the American taxpayers contributed $50,243,996,159. In addition, we have contributed toward world recovery since July 1, 1945, the sum of $25,495,052,923 which has been allocated as follows:

United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation	$2,700,000,000
United Nations Organization	41,426,162
Lend-lease (postwar)	2,163,000,000
International Monetary Fund (authorization)	2,750,000,000
International Bank	635,000,000
Export-Import Bank (loans authorized)	2,258,300,000
Loans to Great Britain and the Philippines	4,390,000,000
War Department, grants for relief	1,771,926,293
Surplus property sales (credits extended)	1,148,000,000
Greek-Turkish loan (authorized amount)	400,000,000
Relief in occupied area (Army)	2,230,000,000
International Relief Organization	71,073,000
International Refugee Organization	182,327,468
European Cooperation Administration	4,754,000,000
Other appropriations for foreign or international objectives by Eightieth Congress	300,000,000
Total	25,495,052,923

With the passage of the Marshall plan by the Eightieth Congress, we have obligated ourselves to spend what may amount to more than $17,000,000,000, which no doubt will be only a starter in bailing out Europe from its financial mess.

When you add together all of these sums for foreign aid, you have the almost unbelievable total of over $90,000,000,000 being sent abroad to help foreign nations.

In other words, since this Nation was founded in 1776 until 1933—a period of 157 years—we spent, in conducting the affairs of Government, less than $90,000,000,000. Yet, in 7 years we have sent abroad over $90,000,000,000, which should not be such a bad record in the eyes of foreigners for a Nation that has been called repeatedly a race of Shylocks.

Let us recognize the fact that all groups in America have received some recognition with respect to the increased cost of living. Virtually all employees in Government and industry have received wage increases. Yet little attention has been given to the plight of our elderly citizens receiving old-age assistance, and no attention has been given to those who earned retirement benefits under the Social Security Act.

For example, in the State of Pennsylvania in 1948 the minimum figures for bare existence of an individual amounted to $20 for food, $4 for clothing, $25 for shelter and maintenance, and $4 for incidentals or a total of $53.

The cost of living in Pennsylvania is typical of conditions in the United States. Yet, in Pennsylvania in 1948 the average old-age assistance paid was $3.52 per month. At the same time, retired employees under social security received an average monthly benefit of $25, with $13 additional if married, or a total of $38 monthly.

In some States many recipients of old-age assistance receive $10 to $15 a month and are told to live on such an allowance. Yet, at the same time, Great Britain has been paying, by comparison, $33 monthly to each needy person. Our gifts to the British Socialist Government in recent years have averaged $1,500,000,000 annually; and, in dispensing money under the European recovery program, Great Britain will receive approximately one-third of the money that American taxpayers are contributing to support the so-called Marshall plan. It is a ridiculous situation to realize that American taxpayers are doling out billions of dollars to foreign nations and permitting them to pay to the needy nearly three times the amount we expend for our own elderly citizens.

Even though we approved legislation to enable States to increase old-age assistance $5 monthly, is there anyone in the United States that when he reaches age 65 can be expected to live on $12.75 monthly, $25 monthly, or $38 if married? The answer is so apparent that it is an insult to question one's intelligence to even ask such a ridiculous question. Yet, that is exactly what we have been asking the elderly citizens to do the past several years.

I feel it is needless for me to continue to describe the plight of the elderly citizens of this Nation.

You have listened to the testimony of Mr. Russell Saville of the American Pension Plan, Inc., and to Dr. Francis Townsend and his son, Robert Townsend, who explained the merits of the Townsend plan. Other pension leaders have added their voice in pleading that something be done for our aged and without further delay.

Members of Congress like myself have introduced legislation for the American pension plan and for the Townsend plan. We are serving as members of the Congressional Steering Committee for both groups. We are giving our time and devoting our efforts toward securing some relief for our elderly citizens.

Before coming to Washington for this session of Congress, I talked with honest, God-fearing Americans whom I know personally and in whose homes I have visited. I learned of their poverty and the fact that the very roof over their heads is mortgaged to the State in return for the paltry sum they receive in the form of old-age assistance.

Mr. Chairman, there are many Members of Congress who share my belief that something must be done to relieve the want and suffering of our aged.

At this very moment Congress is showing great effort to hurry through the Senate and House an appropriation of nearly $6,000,000,000 for the relief of the people of Europe. Petitions are in circulation asking relief for the people of China. As I said previously, this week we approved an appropriation of $16,000,000 for destitute Arabs and Jews.

Why not apply the same concern and attention to the plight of our own American citizens.

All I ask is action by this committee in getting to the floor of the House a bill that will bring relief to our own American people who are victims of neglect by their Government.

STATEMENT ON THE FLOOR OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES BY REPRESENTATIVE JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, OCTOBER 5, 1949, IN CONNECTION WITH H. R. 6000, A BILL DESIGNED TO AMEND THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Chairman, during my career in Congress which began in 1939, very little has been done toward amending the Social Security Act. Every effort made since 1939 was met with the excuse "there is a war to be won."

As a result no action was taken for 10 years despite the fact that there was need for revising the existing law. Each time we tried to do something we were told that a committe or a commission was engaged in studying the structure of the Social Security Act. The inference was that if we were patient long enough, Congress would receive recommendations for streamlining the Social Security Act.

Now we are considering H. R. 6000 which we are informed represents the efforts of the House Committee on Ways and Means over a period of 6 months.

The bill is not only disappointing in its provisions but it lacks features that should have been included in such a measure. To have waited 10 long years and then be handed a tailor-made bill without the right to amend it is a blow to the great American principles of fair play and justice.

We are considering a bill that affects the lives of over 50,000,000 persons and their families. We are taking such action at a time when the pension issue has invaded every segment of American life. We witness the pension issue being discussed freely in management and labor circles where it has become the focus point of collective-bargaining conferences.

The controversy over the need for universal pensions is so pronounced that the day is not far distant when such an objective will be realized.

Today, I am in utter dismay over the fact that this Congress is being asked to approve a bill in a take-it-or-leave-it atmosphere. This is especially disheartening when we are asked by such procedure to turn a deaf ear to the plight of the elderly citizens who helped build this great Nation.

According to the Bureau of the Census there were 16,799,000 persons in the United States aged 60 years and over on July 1, 1948. A large percentage of this number includes men and women who are unable to work or support themselves. It is this great class of citizens that we have completely ignored despite the fact that it is not their fault that they toiled and paid taxes when pensions and social security were but vague dreams.

It is a national disgrace to realize the tears we shed over displaced persons overseas while we give the "cold shoulder" to deserving American citizens who in the twilight of life have not enough material assistance to keep body and soul together. We send billions of dollars overseas and plan on sending billions more to help what are called the backward nations of the world. At the same time our only concern for the aged citizens of this Nation is the shedding of a few "crocodile" tears every time a political platform is adopted.

I cannot in good conscience remain silent any longer while this bill is lauded as being for the welfare of the American people. While I approve heartily of the increased benefits for those recipients who have earned them by contributions from their pay, it is a deplorable fact that the House Ways and Means Committee after 6 months of hearings and study failed to heed the anguished cries of the millions of elderly citizens who are left with no assurance that the present Congress intends to do anything for them but to continue to promise to consider their plight. Let us search our own conscience and face the fact that we are by our actions betraying millions of God-fearing American citizens.

I shall support this bill but I do so in a spirit of reluctance and with great disgust.

STATEMENT BY JAMES E. VAN ZANDT, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, TWENTY-SECOND DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA, BEFORE SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE WITH RESPECT TO AMENDING THE SOCIAL SECURITY ACT, FEBRUARY 20, 1950

Mr. Chairman, I supported H. R. 6000 when it passed the House of Representatives during the first session of the Eighty-first Congress. I did so, because I felt it was a step in the right direction. Yet at the same time it was my belief that the provisions of H. R. 6000 did not truly meet the general problem of old-age pensions.

As many of you know, I have long been associated with various groups in the old-age pension field including the Townsend organization and the American pension plan. I am sure that you will agree with me that these pension groups are entitled to a lot of credit for they are pioneers in the effort to bring to the attention of the American people the general problem of old-age pensions.

Fifteen years ago the American people were faced with the problem of old-age pensions and from that day until this there has been a constant effort by pension groups and many of us in Congress to bring about a general revision of social security in all of its aspects.

You know as well as I do that when Congress approved the Social Security Act our Government accepted the responsibility of that segment of the population covered by the act. This was the beginning of a program that was designed to provide eventually for the problems of our aged.

Since the Social Security Act became effective statistical information furnished by Government agencies reveal that the number of aged persons is increasing rapidly due to the lengthening of the span of life because of the rapid strides made by the medical profession in treating human ills.

Then, too, we must recognize that the Social Security Act has resulted in many people depending upon the Government for

security in their old age. While this attitude may be subject to criticism, yet it actually exists and the condition must be faced.

We cannot escape the fact that the cost of living has aggravated the general problem of old-age pensions and that present benefits under the Social Security Act are wholly inadequate. Then, of course, we have the cost of social security which has developed to be quite a problem to the Federal and State Government, as well as to the employer and employees.

While I was not in Congress when the Social Security Act was approved, yet I felt at that time that since our Government was committed to provide benefits to the aged the program was not broad enough since it did not cover all citizens. Many of you will remember that at that time I was identified with the Veterans of Foreign Wars as commander in chief and my activities brought me in contact with not only those covered under the law but also with a large number not covered. To be frank, the glaring defects in the Social Security Act were immediately apparent.

Today we are faced with the terrific problem of old-age pensions. It is my opinion that the Congress of the United States through its failure to take positive action in this field over a period of 15 years, is responsible for the situation we are confronted with today. If Congress had kept abreast of developments in the field of old-age pensions and had taken action instead of using delaying tactics, the issue would have been met and we would have today the necessary laws to meet present day needs.

Without doubt the question of industrial pensions and the many pension plans in effect at the preesnt time have made this general problem of old-age pensions an acute one. As I have already said, it is my opinion that if Congress had taken action, the pension problem would have been solved years ago and we would not have the conglomeration of pension plans now being offered to the American people.

It is the consensus of opinion that the Social Security Act will have to be rewritten or a substitute adopted. It is freely predicted that the cost of social security benefits in the near future will be so great to employer and employee that a Federal Government subsidy will be necessary.

Then, let us not forget, that we are talking only about earned benefits under the Social Security Act and that we have not considered the cost of old age or public assistance to persons who are not contributors to the social security fund. The cost of these old-age pensions, as you know, is shared by the Federal and State Governments.

In mentioning the total cost of the Social Security Act, it is evident that the day is not far off when the cost of taking care of our aged under all phases of the Social Security Act will become an unbearable burden to Federal and State Governments as well as to employer and employee.

In closing, I recognize that your committee has access to Government statistics that concern all phases of the general problem of old-age pensions. For that reason, I have confined my remarks to a general discussion of the subject. It is my considered judgment, however, that the only answer to the old-age pension problem is a universal pension for the aged of this Nation. It may be the Townsend or American pension plan or some similar pension proposal that will provide the answer to this problem. One thing certain, we are not on the right track at present. It is a known fact that the aged of this country are not being taken care of for many of them are hungry. Therefore, I say to you, Congress had better devise a universal pension plan in keeping with the solvency of our Government and the needs of the American people.

Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE CENTURY PRESS,
New Castle, Ind., February 17, 1950.
Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARVEY: I have just been going over some figures for our business and I have come up with some things on the retail excise tax which might be of interest to you.

Taking 1946 as the norm, or as 100 percent, our business has for 4 years been as follows:

1946	100
1947	119
1948	130
1949	129

Now the excise taxes we have paid show no such consistent record. Actual figures are as follows:

1946 (December only)	$162.59
1947	220.48
1948	197.59
1949	92.25

Our excise taxes are mostly on fountain pens, billfolds, and brief cases.

Our pen sales now are mostly on those that are not taxable. Our billfold and brief case sales are way off in volume as tax records show.

Since our annual total volume is over $100,000 you can see that generally speaking our business has not been so bad though items carrying retail excise taxes are another matter.

It is our judgment that in most cases the unsettled situation with regard to the excise taxes has practically stopped the purchase of products carrying these taxes except in cases of absolute necessity.

We are aware of the fact that there are only two ways to make up for any revenue loss that may result from a law abolishing the excise taxes; one is to spend less and the other is to secure revenue from another source. Why not do both? Spend less and if the saving is not sufficient, tax those who are not now paying their fair share.

* * * * *

It was nice seeing you the other day and I hope that one of these times you can do something for small businesses along the lines suggested above.

Your truly,

HENRY L. CHESICK.

Resolutions of Society of Mayflower Descendants

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ROY O. WOODRUFF
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WOODRUFF. Mr. Speaker, knowing the high character, intelligence and patriotism of the members of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I include the resolutions of this splendid organization adopted January 31, 1950. I wish to say, Mr. Speaker, that I agree in every particular with these resolutions and thank the members of this society for their timely action.

RESOLUTIONS OF THE SOCIETY OF MAYFLOWER DESCENDANTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA, ADOPTED JANUARY 31, 1950, IN RE PROPOSED WORLD GOVERNMENT

At a meeting of the Board of Assistants, the governing authority of the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia, held in the city of Washington, on January 31, 1950, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted, to wit:

"Whereas there are pending before the Congress of the United States proposals for the establishment of a so-called world government, to embrace all nations and peoples of the earth, with the United States of America as a constituent member; and

"Whereas because of the wide divergences, prejudices, antagonisms, distrusts and misconceptions attendant upon the existing differences of race, custom, creed, religion, speech, economic aim, interest, and need, political concept, ideal, ideology and ambition; and because, also, of the inherent urge and force of self-interest and demagogic appeal everywhere to be encountered—a single government, created for all lands and tongues, functioning with power, authority and universal harmony and beneficence, is absolutely impossible and out of the question; and any reign thus set up would prove to be a veritable babel of criminal folly and confusion; and

"Whereas the joinder of our own Nation in such a tragic and colossal misadventure would surely result in the overthrow of its system of liberty and constitutional government, and the regulation of its internal and domestic affairs; the inevitable loss of its nationality and freedom; the destruction of its unexampled enterprise and progress; the ultimate depletion and pillage—for the world at large—of its vast resources; and its reduction to a condition of hopeless impotence and futility: Be it therefore

"Resolved, That the Society of Mayflower Descendants in the District of Columbia absolutely opposes any and all efforts for the establishment of such world organization, and respectfully calls on the American Congress to register its prompt and overwhelming disapproval of all such schemes and proposals; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be furnished to the Congress and its appropriate committees, for their consideration."

Postmaster Goldman and H. R. 4678

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me by unanimous consent to extend my remarks I take pleasure in including therein the statement made by Hon. Albert Goldman at the hearing of the House Post Office and Civil Service Subcommittee on February 9, last, in connection with H. R. 4678 and H. R. 4757.

Mr. Goldman has been postmaster of the New York post office for the past 16

years during which time the receipts of the New York post office have increased tremendously and the efficiency in the handling of the mails has been greatly bettered by reason of the high morale of our New York post office employees. No small part of the credit for this achievement is due to Mr. Goldman, who has demonstrated unusual ability as an executive.

Mr. Goldman's statement follows:

The New York post office is one of the most intensive centers of industry anywhere to be found. It is the largest mail-distributing and financial center in the postal service in the United States.

As indicative of the enormous volume of the present business, it may be said that the receipts for the calendar year 1949 amounted to $164,474,009.02. This is an increase of $15,468,347.53 over 1948.

The postmaster's salary at New York, N. Y., was fixed at $12,000 per annum as far back as July 1, 1930. Only three increases in salary were granted since then—one of $400 in 1946 under Public Law 386, another of $450 in 1948 under Public Law 900, and another of $120 in 1949 under Public Law 428. In 1945, under Public Law 134, postmasters at offices with salaries in excess of $6,000 were not considered for any increase in salary, although postmasters whose salaries were under $6,000 received the benefit of this legislation.

During my incumbency as postmaster since 1934, the postal receipts of this great city have increased from $61,162,758.97 to $164,474,009.02 for the calendar year 1949; while the personnel has increased from 16,620 to 33,081 during the same period. The volume of mail and the various activities likewise, have increased correspondingly.

At New York, N. Y., the postal area embraces all postal activities in New York and Bronx Counties, and the village of Pelham in Westchester County. This includes the main post office, 4 large annexes, viz: Morgan Station—through which is cleared the bulk of foreign mails originating in the United States; Grand Central Station; Church Street Station; and Bronx Central Station; 46 classified carrier stations, 46 finance stations, and 8 contract stations; and the Postal Concentration Center in Queens, where foreign parcels and prints and overseas APO's and naval mails are distributed.

In addition there is the responsibility for the administration, supervision, maintenance, and operation of 24 Federal buildings having 93,143,113 cubic feet, ranging from the Main Post Office with 26,305,000 cubic feet; Morgan Station with 24,000,000 cubic feet; Church Street Station, a 15-story office building with 17,423,000 cubic feet; Bronx Central Station with 3,095,000 cubic feet; to the smaller buildings with 144,000 cubic feet.

The land value of these buildings is over $17,000,000, and the construction cost of the buildings $40,000,000, or a total cost of $57,000,000, which does not include equipment, machinery, furniture, or other appurtenances that are necessary for our financial and mail handling activities.

The motor vehicle service, operating two large garages with overhauling and repair units, is required to house and maintain a local fleet of 712 Government-owned trucks, plus the periodical overhauling of trucks assigned to 131 other post offices in the States of New York and Connecticut.

The mail handling operations of the New York Post Office are of such gigantic proportions that they stagger the imagination to visualize their enormity. During the calendar year 1949, there were 67,598 solid cars of mail loaded at the railroad stations located in the metropolitan area. This tremendous stream of cars, end to end, would extend from New York, N. Y., to Louisville, Ky., a distance of 865 railroad miles. In reducing the carloads of mail to sack equivalents, there were handled and transported 54,478,400 sacks of mail. In addition to the mail dispatched on trains, our Morgan Station and Postal Concentration Center prepared and dispatched on outgoing steamers 6,021,288 sacks of foreign mail, and 804,295 sacks of mail prepared and dispatched for United States military units outside the United States. With respect to the handling of air mail, there were 12,261,963 pounds of air mail, equivalent of 613,098,150 letters, prepared and dispatched during 1949.

During 1949, the division of registered mails handled 42,378,962 articles, a large percentage of which consisted of articles and pouches containing currency, and articles containing negotiable securities of great value. The registered mail addressed to foreign destinations, including parcel post of considerable value, is also handled in the registry section. Mail for all over the world is made up to connect with steamers leaving all ports.

During 1949 this office transported and delivered over 9,600,000,000 pieces of mail. Over 3,733,000,000 pieces of mail were canceled. The above statistics give you a good idea of the huge volume of mail now being handled in the New York office.

A word about our pneumatic-tube service, an underground system for the transportation of ordinary mail, daily papers, and miscellaneous letter-sized pieces of other mail when included with letter mails. The points connected with pneumatic-tube service include the general post office and 21 stations located in New York, and the general post office in Brooklyn, and consists of 27 miles of tube lines. Approximately 6,000,000 pieces of mail are transported daily via the pneumatic tubes.

The financial transactions at this office are of a magnitude exceeded by very few of the large banking institutions in the city. There were 7,953,539 domestic money orders issued amounting to $183,558,508.33, and 20,711,878 domestic money orders were paid amounting to $291,963,355.87. In addition 110,704 international money orders were issued for payment abroad amounting to $1,799,065.89, while 20,955 international money orders received from abroad amounting to $275,980.13 were paid. The New York office is also the international exchange office, and during the year, 600,483 international money orders were certified for payment abroad amounting to $9,639,691.22, while 58,439 international money orders amounting to $509,480.66 were received from abroad for payment in the United States. There were 4,962,947 postal notes issued amounting to $28,607,277.29, and 11,025,720 postal notes were paid amounting to $58,231,526.08. Furthermore, all money orders issued by Army post offices and post offices on naval vessels outside the United States and in foreign waters are under the jurisdiction of this office, excepting those in the South Pacific islands and in the Pacific Fleet.

The number of domestic money orders processed through the electrical accounting unit of the New York post office in 1949 totaled 45,669,529, which were received from 59 tributary offices, amounting to $704,176,150.16.

Postal savings are maintained at most of the stations of this office, and there are 212,152 postal savings depositors, with a total of $117,001,704 on deposit. The operation is comparable to any similar banking organization in the city.

During the calendar year 1949, we sold 327,814 United States Savings bonds amounting to $16,219,368.75 (issue value), and United States Savings Stamps amounting to $1,165,818.35 were purchased by our patrons.

This office deposited funds to the credit of the Postmaster General during 1949 amounting to $767,773,594.65.

The office collected $2,365,814.01 in postage due money; adjusted 100,716 indemnity claims, and made payment in settlement of these claims amounting to $1,119,474.36.

In my capacity as the disbursing officer for all employees of the New York, N. Y., post office, it also embraces the personnel of the inspection service and headquarters force of the New York division; the postal transportation service, second division, and rural carriers throughout the State of New York.

New York, N. Y., is also the central accounting office for a total of 1,750 second-, third-, and fourth-class post offices in New York State, and is also the depository for certain first-class offices and all second-, third-, and fourth-class offices in New York State, a total of 1,926 post offices.

The transactions at this office are constantly increasing in volume as a result of expansion and growth of New York City, inasmuch as it is the largest business center in our country. The New York, N. Y., post office is the District Central Supply Unit filling requisitions from the Assistant Postmaster General, Division of Federal Buildings, for post offices located in Federal buildings in 15 States, having a total of 1,500 Federal buildings supplied throughout the United States, including Alaska. In addition, jurisdiction is maintained over postal supplies for all the New York, N. Y., post-office units, and for 716 third- and 667 fourth-class offices in New York State, including APO and naval units.

The foregoing indicates that the New York, N. Y., post office operates one of the country's largest businesses. It has reached such gigantic proportions with ramifications so numerous and far extending that the postmaster's salary should at least approximate those of executives in private industry. In every private enterprise throughout the United States salaries have advanced in rapid succession with the times and each succeeding advance has been equally substantial. It is fair to state that salaries paid by banks, commercial houses, and mercantile establishments to those directing such activities are larger than those paid by the Government for similar qualifications and responsibilities.

The postal service is the outstanding and largest business enterprise in the United States—if not in the entire world. The New York, N. Y., post office, in turn, is the largest in the country. It may be of interest to mention that this office not only includes practically every feature of the service conducted elsewhere, but certain additional features, such as the handling of immense volumes of foreign mail and the certifying to and from foreign countries of international money orders on behalf of the entire United States. The extensive development and use of the domestic air-mail service and the inauguration of foreign air-mail service, which will further expand with the completion of the International Airport, are added features of the service.

In fact, statistics show that approximately 10 percent of the entire postal revenues of the Nation are produced through the New York, N. Y., post office. It is evident that the offices producing the greatest postal receipts are in areas where the cost of living, rents and taxes are the highest. The question presents itself whether these offices which handle the bulk of the business are to be given the recognition and proper comparable credit for the large receipts, which are the backbone of the service.

As you are aware, the salaries of postmasters are based upon the gross postal receipts of their offices, and it is obvious that a revision of this system should be made because of its existing inequalities. To be consistent, the receipts of post offices should be readjusted to include, in all equity, those offices where the receipts far exceed the present $40,000,000 and up.

A glance at the salary chart will reveal that postmasters are graduated according to postal receipts of the office, and that there is

a finely graduated ratio of postal receipts in the lower salary brackets. The graduation in postal recipts is nonexistent above the $40,000,000 and up, consequently if the bracket system based upon postal receipts of a given office is the most desirable medium of adjusting salaries, then the policy should be followed through to a more favorable and reasonable conclusion. In its present limited form, it only serves as a penalty to postmasters where the receipts of the office double or triple and quadruple the top bracket of $40,000,000 and up.

The inconsistencies of such a situation clearly serve to emphasize the need for an upward revision of the salary structure of the postmaster, assistant postmasters, and postal supervisors.

Something should be done at this session of Congress to enact a law to adequately compensate these officials because of the tremendous volume of business involved, together with the numerous responsibilities, both financial and physical which they are required to handle and direct.

I, therefore, strongly recommend the reclassification of salaries of postmaster, assistant postmasters and postal supervisors, which I deem worthy of favorable consideration.

Coal-Supply Situation in Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.
OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, on February 21, 1950, I received the following telegram from Stanley J. Davis, the mayor of Grand Rapids, Mich. This telegram clearly indicates the seriousness of the situation facing the citizens of western Michigan. Sometime ago I introduced a resolution calling for immediate action to prevent suffering among our citizens. I trust the President's unwise delay over a period of several months will not ruin our national economy at this critical hour.

GRAND RAPIDS, MICH., *February 21, 1950.*
Hon. GERALD R. FORD,
United States Representative:

Coal-supply situation in Grand Rapids, Mich., critical. Every effort must be made to get coal in this area to meet our domestic-heating needs. By the week end our supply will be exhausted. Dealers have no coal in yards or in transit. We are deeply concerned from standpoint of public health and safety.

STANLEY J. DAVIS, *Mayor.*

Resolution of the South Dakota Legislature

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD O. LOVRE
OF SOUTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LOVRE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to insert the following concurrent resolution passed by the Legislature of the State of South Dakota at a recent special session of that body and which is of great importance to the United States:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 1
(Introduced by Mr. Houck)

Concurrent resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States, His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate, thorough and exhaustive study and investigation of the loyalty of the members, officers, and employees of the State Department, and to take such further appropriate action to rid the Department of State of procommunistic employees in order that the safety of our Nation will not be further endangered by men in high places who condone acts of treason which endanger the safety of the United States of America and the people

Be it resolved by the Senate of the State of South Dakota (the house concurring therein)—

Whereas through the activities of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, Alger Hiss was twice tried in the Federal courts of the United States of America and convicted of the crime of perjury; and

Whereas members of the United States Supreme Court, Supreme Court Justices Frankfurter and Reed voluntarily testified in the first trial as character witnesses, thereby breaking all of the precedents heretofore existing in relation to our Federal courts, and creating in the minds of the American people a disregard for members of our Federal judiciary; and

Whereas, upon the conviction by a Federal jury in a Federal court of the said Alger Hiss, Dean Acheson, Secretary of State of the United States of America, issued a prepared and considered statement in which he said, "I do not intend to turn my back on Alger Hiss," which statement was designed to belittle the actions of an American jury in an American court and to raise in the minds of the American people a doubt as to the guilt of one of Dean Acheson's friends and former State Department employee in spite of, and in total disregard of results of a free and fair trial and a verdict rendered by a jury as provided by the Constitution and the laws of the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate of the State of South Dakota, the House concurring therein, do memorialize the Congress of the United States and His Excellency the President of the United States, to make an immediate check of the loyalties and beliefs of the men employed in the State Department of the United States from Dean Acheson on down to determine whether or not the ideas and ideals of such individuals are such that the American people can have continued faith that such Department through its representatives will safely keep and guard the secrets of the United States of America from foreign enemies and that such Department and its employees in preparing and carrying out a foreign policy in relation to Russia and other foreign countries will adopt and carry out policies which are not contrary to the ideas and ideals of the American people as expressed by the Constitution of the United States and the laws adopted thereunder; be it further

Resolved, That His Excellency the President of the United States, make immediately available to the House Un-American Activities Committee all secret files and lists and reports of investigations covering the loyalties and activities of any and all employees of the Government of the United States which in any way show or indicate disloyalty to the United States of America as expressed by Communist membership or otherwise; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this concurrent resolution be forwarded to His Excellency the President of the United States, to United States Senator Chan Gurney, to United States Senator Karl Mundt, to Congressman Francis E. Case, to Congressman Harold Lovre, and to the presiding officers of both Houses of Congress.

REX TERRY,
Lieutenant Governor, President of Senate.
Attest:
NIELS P. JENSEN,
Secretary of the Senate.
A. E. MUNCK,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.
Attest:
W. J. MATSON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Why a New Farm Program?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. LOWELL STOCKMAN
OF OREGON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. STOCKMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the Members to an article by my constituent, Mr. Henry Baker, president of the Oregon Wheat Growers League. It represents the viewpoint of those who are actually engaged in growing wheat and is very indicative of the fact that the wheat farmers only want a fair price for their produce and not Federal subsidies. I have introduced H. R. 7245, to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, to establish a two-price plan for wheat, and the bill is intended to implement the income certificate plan for wheat which is discussed in the following article:

WHY A NEW FARM PROGRAM?

The Agricultural Act of 1949 extended the support program of 90 percent of parity for wheat to include the 1950 crop. The high Government loan support program has been continued since the war as a temporary relief in aiding the readjustment of the agricultural economy to postwar conditions. In his opening speech to Congress, the President of the United States recognized the shortcomings of present farm legislation and urged the approval of the Brannan Plan. Since it is apparent that present agriculture legislation is temporary and will be changed, the wheat producers in Oregon would like to have a voice in determining what national program is finally adopted.

Looking forward to the time when a permanent program is adopted, the wheat growers in Oregon through the Wheat Growers League have for more than 7 years, been developing in cooperation with the Pacific Northwest Farm Council the self-supporting certificate plan for wheat.

Along with other segments comprising national economy, American agriculture is faced with more complex problems than ever before. The Department of Agriculture endeavors through the establishment of a Federal farm program have been comparatively successful in the maintaining of a high farm income and a balanced economy for the Nation. This we believe essential and applaud all efforts which have this end in mind. It is recognized, as history emphatically verifies, depressions arise when farm prices reach such a low point that buying power is reduced. It is agriculture's responsibility and that of all organizations which have farming

interests at heart, to develop and support programs which protect that national economy. Labor and industry are highly organized, which emphasizes that agriculture must also be strong. These three groups, labor, industry and agriculture must not be divided in their goals—they are interwoven and dependent upon each other. And there can never be a sound and healthy economic condition when any one of these three has a crippling advantage over the others. We must maintain agriculture on a par with labor and industry; if we are unable to do this, we are shirking our responsibility not only to the farmers but to all the people who make up this great Nation.

While Federal assistance to agriculture has become necessary, it must be realized that both labor and industry have had legislative assistance for a long time. Where it is essential to the national economy to provide financial assistance to agriculture, we should consider the program in the light of an insurance premium to guarantee a healthy, long-lived agriculture.

We favor the continuance of the policy of maximum production geared to economic use of the Nation's wheat lands, by the enactment of a bill providing for the income certificate plan for wheat. This plan was presented at hearings held by the Agricultural Committee of the House by a Wheat League delegation last year with favorable acceptance. They requested more detailed information and asked the Wheat League to prepare a bill which has now been drafted and is available to all growers for their analysis and comments.

Our proposed income certificate bill is a direct and simplified approach to what we believe to be a sound long-range program for wheat producers. This action by our league is consistent with action taken for several years by the wheat farmers of Oregon. Discussion of our plan with wheat organizations of other States gives assurance that support of the major part of the wheat growers of the United States may be expected. National legislation of such an important nature cannot be secured on the spur of the moment. The Wheat League has a reputation for persevering until its aims are acocmplished. Genuine progress has been made in preparing the way for legislation we have consistently recommended. We urge wheat growers to take such aggressive action as will secure enactment of the wheat income certificate plan.

In view of the fact that it will not be possible to secure the enactment of such legislation immediately, we recommend that in the meantime the Oregon Wheat Growers League give support to a program providing 90 percent of parity for wheat as long as acreage allotments are in effect. This should not be construed to mean that we favor a high-support policy over a long period of time, but merely in the interim until the income certificate or other satisfactory plan for wheat is realized.

HENRY BAKER,
President, Oregon Wheat Growers League.

Fair Employment Practice Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AUGUSTINE B. KELLEY
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. KELLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the Powell bill, H. R. 4453, embodying the establishment of a Fair Employment Practice Commission, is the heart of the civil-rights program to which the Democratic Party so vigorously and forthrightly dedicated itself in its platform adopted in 1948.

As a democratic people founded on the precept of equality for all, we must take action to guarantee that equality. There is almost no section of our country today which is entirely free from discrimination in some form. Although it is generally associated with the plight of the Negro, there is discrimination just as insidious to other racial and religious groups, and to people of foreign descent. In one place it may be directed at Jews and Catholics, another Mexicans or Japanese, and in my own part of the country I know well it is experienced many times over by our large number of people of European descent—Italians, Polish, Greeks, Slavs, and innumerable others.

That intolerance of this kind should exist in this country is a sad commentary, and I have long felt that our Government has an obligation to promote safeguards of the freedom of opportunity. Every time an individual is denied employment because of some factor which he is powerless to change, the dignity of that individual is destroyed and his faith is shaken in the principles to which we profess belief. The passage of the Powell bill would go far to restore the hopes and ideals of the many who have suffered again and again, who have been unable to find decent employment and provide for themselves and their families.

Particularly has the principle of nondiscrimination with respect to employment opportunities been a subject of great international concern during the years following the formation of the United Nations at San Francisco. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations at San Francisco. Article 1 of the Charter of the United Nations declares that one of the purposes of the United Nations is "to achieve international cooperation in promoting and encouraging respect for human rights and for fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Under articles 55 and 56 of the Charter, all members of the United Nations "pledge themselves to take joint and separate action in cooperation with the Organization" to achieve "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion." Article 68 of the Charter of the United Nations directs the Economic and Social Council to set up a Commission for the Promotion of Human Rights. The Commission on Human Rights has manifested its concern with the problem of nondiscrimination in employment opportunities in a number of ways: First, it has set up a Subcommission on the Prevention of Discrimination and the Protection of Minorities; second, it has prepared and had approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations a Universal Declaration of Human Rights. This Declaration of Human Rights has been proclaimed by the General Assembly "as a common standard of achievement for all peoples of all nations, to the end that every individual and every organ of society, keeping this declaration constantly in mind, shall strive by teaching and education to promote respect for these rights and freedoms and by progressive measures, national and international, to secure their universal and effective recognition and observance, both among the peoples of member states themselves and among the peoples of territories under their jurisdiction."

Further concern with the principle of nondiscrimination in employment opportunities was manifested in international agreements and declarations adopted by the states of the Western Hemisphere at the Bogotá Conference in 1948. The International Labor Organization expressed its adherence to this principle at its conference in Philadelphia in 1944 in a declaration which reads in part:

> Believing that experience has fully demonstrated the truth of the statement in the constitution of the International Labor Organization that lasting peace can be established only if it is based on social justice, the conference affirms that (a) all human beings, irrespective of race, creed, or sex, have the right to pursue both their material well-being and their spiritual development in conditions of freedom and dignity, of economic security and equal opportunity.

So, despite our vulnerability at home, we are carrying forth abroad in our foreign policy the ideals of freedom and equality of the individual. As a Nation, we play a leading part in a number of international organizations in which we work with other nations of varied race and religion on an equal basis and in which we espouse a policy of nondiscrimination. Yet these nations are aware that we do not practice a like policy in our own country; consequently, our international position is weakened. In such inconsistency we give aid to those who would happily see an end to our system of government.

I have always been an ardent supporter of an adequate fair employment practices commission, one which would do as complete a job as possible toward the elimination of discrimination in employment. The bill which passed the House today, the McConnell bill, is totally inadequate. It is nothing more than a sop to those who have looked to this Congress for enactment of this long-needed legislation. The McConnell bill is not designed to operate effectively against the evil of discrimination in employment, and I was compelled to vote against it. Knowing this, I could not in conscience support it.

Hon. L. Pascual Martinez

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTONIO M. FERNANDEZ
OF NEW MEXICO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, in the debate on the Navajo rehabilitation bill yesterday I called attention to the fact

that Indians desire to have the privilege of having their personal and property rights protected by the State and the privilege of having access to the State courts for the enforcement of those rights. They are wondering why they are being denied these civil rights to which they should be entitled as citizens of the State.

In a newspaper from Taos which I just received, there appears a news item concerning the announcement of a prominent Republican as candidate for the State legislature, and in which he points out that the first move toward the civil rights of the Indians is up to the Federal Government.

Because the item is also of historical interest, I insert for the RECORD portions of that news item, which appeared in El Crepusculo of February 16, 1950. It reads as follows:

The June election picture began to take even more definite shape in Taos as L. Pascual Martinez, present mayor, announced Monday that he "may seek the Republican nomination as State representative." * * *

Pascual, incidentally, is descended from Padre Martinez. And this introduces an interesting angle to the legislature race, because the Democratic nomination-seeker, Doughbelly Price, is descended from Colonel Stirling Price, who led the troops against the Taos Rebellion of 1847, generally thought to have been started by Padre Martinez. * * *

Martinez hopes that Taos Indians will exercise their new right to vote in the next election. "Indians, too, should have elective and appointive county positions, and take their full share in civic life." As for Indian improvements, he stated that the Federal Government would have to make the first moves, such as approval of the Hoover report which calls for full Indian citizenship. "After that," said Martinez, "the State can begin to help—with my full support."

Russian Expansionist Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following statement:

Speaking in Palmer last night, Congressman PHILIP J. PHILBIN, of Clinton, declared that the expansionist policy of the Soviet Union and its refusal to cooperate with peace-seeking nations in measures to limit armament requires the United States to maintain costly and unprecedented national defense.

The Clinton Congressman asserted that while the atomic bomb and the H-bomb present terrifying prospects for the world, the American people should not allow the present campaign of terrorism regarding these weapons to produce a national hysteria.

PHILBIN, who is a member of the House Armed Services Committee, stated that such weapons should be directed to constructive and not destructive purposes, but that current Russian policy is making international cooperation for peace virtually impossible.

His remarks follow in part:

"Russia has spread its sphere of influence by ill-advised diplomatic concessions, by actual aggression and by the more subtle but equally coercive methods of infiltration. The gains of the Russian expansionist policy since the war are startling. One country after another has been swallowed up in the vortex, not only in Europe but in Asia. Reversing the situation during and immediately after the war when democratic nations exercised dominant control, communism has now spread to cover wide areas and large numbers of people until directly or indirectly Russian influence extends to almost half the population of the world.

"During this time worth-while, humane programs for world peace have been thwarted, and international cooperation for peace has been rendered virtually impossible. It has been necessary, therefore, though ironic in the light of our great wartime sacrifices, to saddle the American people with a gigantic cost of more than 20 billions of dollars to maintain adequate national defense, and try to check the wildfire spread of communism in western Europe and other parts of the world.

"The H-bomb presents another startling problem. Together with the atomic bomb, it encompasses the most terrible and destructive weapons ever known to mankind—weapons which, when implemented, might destroy overnight great cities and teeming populations. Weapons and substances of such devastating strength and ominous possibilities should be regulated and restricted by international compact. Universal disarmament should be vigorously sought and applied to this world before it destroys itself. Rigid international inspection should be established to control such lethal weapons. But all this cannot be achieved when one great power sets up continual road blocks against world peace and security.

"Under these conditions we must maintain armed services, adequate and ready for almost instantaneous action against potential enemies. But let us not be unduly aroused, disturbed, or worried by the current compaign to terrorize the American people by exploiting the potentialities of the H-bomb. While we originated and implemented atomic power and bombs, and while we have made the critical decision to develop the H-bomb because of current conditions in the world, we have actually had no choice. We will have to live with the horrifying reality of these weapons until the Soviet Union makes up its mind to join democratic nations in outlawing them and in effecting disarmament in the name of and for the sake of a just, lasting peace.

"That peace cannot be based upon aggression, upon infiltration, upon oppression, or injustice. It cannot emerge from organized movements against the security of this Nation or from internal or external conspiracies to destroy it and to spread the Marxist formula to the far corners of the earth. Peace can come only from earnest, sincere cooperative action by and between nations and by leaders of good will toward mankind, and not by men obsessed by fanatical hatred of God and every decent principle of government and life.

"I believe that our Nation is well prepared as it should be to defend our shores and way of life. Let us work together to weed out subversive elements which are working from within to bring about our destruction, because if another war should come—and God forbid it—our number one problem at the outset might well be that of our internal security due to the disloyalty and treason which has been fomented in our very midst by agents of communism and domestic traitors.

"To this end let us be vigilant lest our liberties be lost because of our own inertia and failure adequately to value and protect them. And let us be sure that the Nation will be constantly ready not only to ward off attacks but to visit swift and telling retaliation at home and abroad against those working to undermine the integrity of America."

The Tax on Life-Insurance Companies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER A. LYNCH
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LYNCH. Mr. Speaker, it will be recalled that on January 26, last, the House passed House Joint Resolution 371 by which the formula for the determination of the net investment income of life-insurance companies was amended so that these companies would pay taxes on their net investment income for the years 1947, 1948, and 1949. The resolution, which had been unanimously approved by the Subcommittee on Taxation of Life Insurance Companies of the Committee on Ways and Means and had been favorably reported by a vote of 24 to 1 by the full committee passed the House with only a few scattering votes in opposition and is now before the Senate Finance Committee.

In the insurance industry there is little opposition to the bill. Whatever opposition exists is more vocal than persuasive; it is the kind of opposition that is "agin" everything and everybody in the industry. I am reliably informed that 95 percent of the industry supports this legislation.

I believe that the forthright and patriotic position of the industry is clearly revealed in an interview given to a New York Times reporter by Mr. Leroy A. Lincoln, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co. I might say that Mr. Lincoln, by reason of his position as president of the largest life-insurance company in this country, is a dominant personality in the life-insurance industry. Furthermore, he is, in his own right, a man of outstanding ability and of wide vision, who understands the economic conditions of the country and who always has his feet solidly on the ground. Recognizing the critical need of the country for housing, he and his company have taken the lead in multiple-home construction. He is truly a great man and a great American.

Under the leave granted me by unanimous consent, I include herein the report of the interview which appeared in the New York Times of February 21, 1950:

LINCOLN DEFENDS RETROACTIVE TAX ON LIFE INSURANCE COMPANIES—NINETY-THREE MILLION DOLLARS LEVY BACK TO 1947, PASSED BY HOUSE, WAS A COMPROMISE, METROPOLITAN HEAD SAYS—DENIES IT SETS PRECEDENT

The Government's proposal for an income tax levy of $93,000,000 retroactive to 1947 on life insurance companies is eminently fair, Leroy A. Lincoln, president of the Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., said yesterday.

In his statement, made at a press conference at which he presented the annual statement of his organization, largest life insurance company in the world, Mr. Lincoln took issue with critics in business, finance, and the

life insurance industry itself who have attacked the retroactive features of the tax measure as establishing a dangerour precedent. The measure has been passed by the House.

The retroactive proposal, Mr. Lincoln said, was the result of 3 years of conferences of committees representing the House Ways and Means Committee, the Treasury Department and the life insurance companies. It was a compromise, he added, between two measures, one of which would have made the companies include the $93,000,000 assessment as part of their 1949 incomes.

"There was no way of insuring that the alternative measure which would have fixed the back taxes as current parts of the 1949 levy would have disappeared from the law books within a single year," Mr. Lincoln said. "Those who argue that the proposal which the Metropolitan along with 84 other life companies approved would set a dangerous precedent so far as retroactive Federal taxes are concerned, are in error.

"Because of the special circumstances surrounding our approval of the retroactive measure, it can hardly be argued that the special bill can be used as a precedent to apply to other industries. It is also certain that it will not force insurance companies to pay the special levy again in future years because of some legislative oversight."

Mr. Lincoln reported that his company had paid out $768,627,888 to policyholders and beneficiaries last year, the highest total in the company's 82-year history.

He added that the company closed its books for the year with $41,699,549,717 of life insurance in force, compared with $39,958,517,854 at the end of 1948. The amount of new life insurance issued was $2,778,793,267 in 1949 compared with $2,904,157,071 the year before.

The new insurance issued last year was divided into $1,656,021,996 in ordinary life insurance, $701,920,796 in industrial life, and $420,850,475 in group life.

Mr. Lincoln added that by March 1 the company will have written more group life insurance in 1950 than it did for the entire 12 months of last year. This, he said, will be due chiefly to the fact that his company has been designated as the insuror in Bethlehem Steel Corporation's new $325,000,000 group life and disability insurance program.

At the end of 1949 the company held assets of $9,707,947,682 for its 33,000,000 policyholders in the United States and Canada. The interest yield on all of the company's investments averaged 3.07 percent for the year, compared with 3.03 percent in 1948 and 2.94 percent in 1947.

Effect of Wartime Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following letter:

THE NEW CASTLE CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
New Castle, Ind., January 24, 1950.

Hon. RALPH HARVEY,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR RALPH: In the interests of finding out just what effect the wartime excise taxes are having on local sales—and on Federal revenue—we polled a number of local retailers and asked them to give us the excise taxes paid for two comparative months.

We used the months of December 1945 and December 1949. Our replies are not yet complete because the reports for last month are not due until January 31, but since the question seems hot now in Congress we thought we'd better send along what we have as the pattern seems fairly well established.

The totals run $6,641.54 for the month of December 1945 as against $4,412.83 for the month of December 1949. This indicates a drop in revenue of approximately 33 percent.

Such taxes certainly are a deterrent to business in the affected lines. We polled only on luggage, jewelry, furs, and toilet preparations. We did not ask the stores furnishing the information to identify themselves, although several have done so.

* * * * *

So you can see the kind of survey we made, I am enclosing a returned questionnaire from a firm which has no 1945 experience and therefore could not be used in our final results. There are 10 firms represented in the above totals.

We will be glad to make any further surveys on questions upon which you would like a sample of local sentiment or thinking and are always glad to be of assistance to you, if possible, in the difficult and conscientious job you are doing for us.

Cordially,

JIM
(J. B. Clements),
Executive Secretary.

The Food-Distribution Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. HESELTON
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. HESELTON. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I wish now to make available for your information and ready reference certain correspondence between myself and Mr. John C. Stalker, myself and Miss Faith Clark, economist of the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, and myself and Mr. John Dittrich, in charge of the northeastern area of Food Distribution Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration:

FEBRUARY 17, 1950.

Mr. JOHN C. STALKER,
Director, Food Distribution Division,
Department of Public Welfare,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: After talking with you this afternoon, I called Mr. Albin again and expressed the opinion that you and I were in accord that the allotments should be revised upward. He told me that the proper procedure would be for you to present any evidence of insufficient quantities to the New York area office and assured me the New York office had the authority to act immediately. I have not completed my study as to what any such increases should be, but will try to do this tomorrow, with the thought of having my suggestions in your hands Monday. I thought possibly you might be able to have some data assembled on the State basis and could then take the necessary action.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE, AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH ADMINISTRATION, BUREAU OF HUMAN NUTRITION AND HOME ECONOMICS,
Washington, D. C., February 21, 1950.

Hon. JOHN W. HESELTON,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. HESELTON: Following my telephone conversation with Mrs. Coupe of your office, I am quoting to you from another of our technical publications, Family Food Consumption in Buffalo, N. Y., winter 1948 (now out of print). Buffalo families consume on the average more potatoes than do urban families throughout the country. Since their consumption pattern probably represents consumption in your section of the country better than the over-all national average, you may want to use the Buffalo figures in arriving at a desirable surplus distribution schedule. The average purchased quantity of potatoes used by the Buffalo families was 9.6 pounds a week. That meant an average of 2.7 pounds per person a week.

As I told Mrs. Coupe, we do not have any break-down of our recent studies by size of household. Even the national urban sample was too small to allow for such a break-down and at the same time maintain the income classification. Any tabulations that we are able to make by household size will have to be for rather broad groups of foods.

Mrs. Coupe quoted to me the following surplus commodity distribution plan for families of various sizes. I have computed averages per person from this schedule. Compared with average consumption in Buffalo in the winter of 1948, this schedule appears to me to be on the low side.

Potatoes

Number in household	Amount per household unit per month	Average amount per person per week [1]
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1	10	2.33
2	20	2.33
3	25	1.94
4		1.45
5	35	1.63
6		1.36
7	45	1.50
8		1.31
9	55	1.42
10		1.29
11 and over	65	1.37

[1] Calculated at 4.3 weeks per month.

I hope that these figures will be of use to you.

Sincerely yours,

FAITH CLARK,
Economist.

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Mr. JOHN C. STALKER,
Director, Department of Public Welfare,
Food Distribution Division,
Boston, Mass.

DEAR MR. STALKER: Thank you for your telegram of February 21, in regard to the procedure which has been worked out. I hope it will be of value to communities not only in the First Congressional District but throughout the country.

Supplementing our telephone conversation of February 17, with reference to my belief that the schedule of maximum amounts per household unit, per month, should be revised, and the advice given to me that the regional office in New York has full power to revise those maximums upward, upon submission by the State director of a request with any evidence supporting it, I enclose a letter from Miss Faith Clark, economist in the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, Department of Agriculture, advising me of the result of their study in 1948 of family food consumption in Buffalo, N. Y.,

with reference to Irish potatoes. I have prepared a revised schedule in accordance with Miss Clark's report that the average consumption of potatoes by Buffalo families was 2.7 pounds per person, per week. While I believe this would still be inadequate so far as many families are concerned, at least it does offer tangible and convincing evidence of the immediate necessity of revising the existing schedule.

Realizing that you have met this situation temporarily so far as the Greenfield request is concerned by authorizing immediate delivery of a 3-month supply, may I request that you act as soon as possible to obtain a revision of the schedule so far as Massachusetts is concerned.

Sincerely yours.

FEBRUARY 22, 1950.

Mr. JOHN DITTRICH,

In Charge Northeastern Area, Food Distribution Programs Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, New York, N. Y.

DEAR MR. DITTRICH: I enclose copies of correspondence which I think will be self-explanatory. I am confident that you will act promptly upon any request made by Mr. Stalker.

Sincerely yours,

(Enclosures: Letter to Mr. Stalker of February 22, 1950, with table attached; letter from Faith Clark, economist, Department of Agriculture, of February 21, 1950, with table attached.)

Mr. Speaker, I have now submitted the following tabulation to Mr. Stalker based on Miss Clark's report and I believe it represents a far more realistic schedule of minimum quantities which should be established immediately so far as the reasonable consumption of Irish potatoes is concerned:

IRISH POTATOES

Schedule of maximum quantities issued by the Food Distribution Programs Branch, United States Department of Agriculture, effective July 1, 1949, compared with schedule of consumption in accordance with a survey made in Buffalo, N. Y., by the Bureau of Human Nutrition and Home Economics, United States Department of Agriculture, winter of 1948:

Number in household	Present maximum amount per household unit per month	Maximum based on Buffalo survey, amount per household unit per month
	Pounds	*Pounds*
1 person	10	11.61
2 persons	20	23.22
3 or 4 persons	25	46.44
5 or 6 persons	35	69.66
7 or 8 persons	45	92.88
9 or 10 persons	55	116.10
11 or more persons	65	127.71

Mr. Speaker, you will note that the variation is most marked beginning with families of three or four persons upward to families of 11 or more persons.

I have in my possession photographs of the actual weight of potatoes which are now available under the schedule of maximum weights established by the Food Distribution Programs Branch. For three persons in a family this would amount to an average of 2 pounds and one-third ounce per week, per person. That is one fair-sized potato and six small potatoes. For four persons the photograph indicates an average of 1 pound and 9 ounces per week, per person, which is illustrated again by seven potatoes slightly larger. Any one familiar with potatoes as a food knows that this amount would hardly provide sufficient food for one meal. The puzzling contradictions arising from this schedule and this study should be corrected promptly. This is all the more so since while surplus potatoes are doled out in such small amounts for food, 100-pound bags, dyed blue, have been seen on trucks by friends of mine within recent days, presumably destined for dumping or feeding livestock. While we have succeeded in establishing the procedure for diverting these potatoes for consumption by needy persons, we should not relax our efforts to get them to them in maximum amounts consistent with realistic utilization of them as food.

Charles Seymour

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN A. McGUIRE
OF CONNECTICUT
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. McGUIRE. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I wish to insert an article which appeared in the New Haven Register on Sunday, February 19, and call attention to the retirement this June of Charles Seymour, who has been president of Yale, one of our great universities, since the year 1937.

It is earnestly hoped that President Seymour, with his outstanding background and administrative experience, can be persuaded to turn to public life. It is interesting to recall at this time when our diplomatic relations are of the greatest concern to all of us that in his early years on the Yale faculty, President Seymour wrote a book entitled "Diplomatic Background of the War (1916)," which I understand so impressed the late Woodrow Wilson that he was invited to Paris in 1919 as a member of the United States peace delegation.

The article follows:

SEYMOUR OF YALE—SOON TO RETIRE, THE HEAD OF A GREAT UNIVERSITY GIVES FRANK ANSWERS TO A REPORTER'S QUESTIONS

Into Woodbridge Hall and past the famous table on which Napoleon signed his abdication the reporter walked into a small office, clutching his note pad somewhat apprehensively and groping to see whether the three sharpened copy pencils were still in his lapel pocket. Up from his modest desk immediately rose the president of one of the world's greatest universities.

Charles Seymour of Yale smiled and shook hands warmly with the newcomer. He knew the reporter's name, offered him a chair, had a pack of cigarets ready and proffered it. Not until then did he select a corncob pipe from the six on his ash tray. Lovingly he filled the corncob, tamped the tobacco with his fingers, lighted it with obvious relish.

President Seymour is tall, slender. His blondish moustache is slight and at 65 his light-colored hair has thinned out. His most striking feature is a pair of light blue eyes, set in a kindly face which is stamped with wisdom. He is a Yale man dyed in the Blue—class of 1908, teacher from 1911 to 1937, president from 1937 to 1950. He will retire in June.

The reporter looked around the unpretentious office, noticed the old Yale prints on the walls. Mr. Seymour said they had been "borrowed" from the Mabel Brady Garvan collection at the Yale art gallery.

THE ROAD AHEAD

On a small table within arm's reach were three recent books Mr. Seymour had been reading. They were a small volume, The Road Ahead, by John T. Flynn; a middle-sized one, My Retreat From Russia, by Vladimir Petrov (a Yale instructor and a latest publication of the Yale University Press) and a big one, Human Action—A Treatise on Economics, by Ludwig Von Mises (also Yale Press).

Mr. Seymour chatted briefly about the Flynn book, mentioned that the author had been at one time on the staff of the Register. Then he thanked the reporter for sending him a copy of his questions in advance. He emphasized that he would be speaking from his experience at Yale, and that because of the limitations of the interview his answers must not be construed as all-inclusive and detailed.

He began to answer the questions in a friendly and courteous way. There was no condescension or talking down to a younger man. He even paused occasionally to ask anxiously, "Does that sound all right to you?" By now the reporter had lost his nervousness, was enjoying the interview and had the feeling he was in the presence of a man who had made courtesy and consideration for others the foundation of his philosophy of life.

The questions and answers:

Are educational standards as high as they were, say 25 years ago?

"At Yale they are very much higher and student scholarship is much better. Ever since my first contacts with Yale—I was in the class of 1908—I have noticed that standards have been consistently rising. I taught history at Yale from 1911 to 1937 and my experience during this time was particularly striking in this respect. I noticed, for instance, that in 1930 I could get three times as much reading out of the average history student as I could in 1911."

The President's commission on higher education recommends a doubled college enrollment by 1960. Do you think this desirable—or feasible?

"I think the plan is impracticable if educational standards are to be maintained. It would be materially difficult to double educational facilities by 1960 and the cost would be astronomic. If the attempt were made without adequate financial support, with an inexperienced teaching and administrative staff and with hastily planned educational equipment and service, this program would seriously injure American education as a whole. Expansion involves the serious risk of dilution.

"At Yale, we recognize our obligation to offer an education to as many young Americans as we can within the limits of our facilities. These facilities are not designed and we do not plan to use them for mass education. The implication of the report of the educational commission appointed by President Truman, that the more students given a college education the better the country, is, I think, open to serious question. Yale's service to the Nation as I have said many times, will not lie in the number of Yale graduates but in their quality."

What do you think about Federal or State subsidies to private colleges?

"Direct grants certainly imply the danger of loss of independence, and I should be strongly opposed to the acceptance of grants for general purposes. But it is a fact that

certain divisions of a university such as the medical school may not be able to survive without such aid. If this is so, the institution will have to decide between accepting the grant or giving up the service which it is contributing to the national welfare in medical education. It would seem reasonable to suppose that industry would be interested in making contributions to medical education since national health is a vital industrial asset. But there seems to be no complete answer to this particular problem without State or Federal assistance of some kind. I repeat that if private institutions accept subsidies for general educational purposes, their freedom is certainly imperiled."

In the light of financial difficulties, do you think the privately endowed university will eventually disappear?

"The privately endowed university will certainly endure so long as it meets its obligation to serve the public welfare, but it is likely that institutions of this type will be compelled to restrict and probably ought to restrict their activities to those fields in which they can give superlatively fine service. They cannot compete and they ought not to try to compete with the great State institutions in various fields in which the vast funds of the latter assure them great educational advantage. The independent institution should concentrate upon quality and avoid overextension of activities."

Do you think that State, Federal, or municipally endowed colleges can do the same job as privately endowed colleges?

"I don't suggest that privately endowed colleges are better but they do possess a certain quality that makes them different. This diversity of type in our university system is a great asset to American education. It would certainly be a great loss to the Nation if the private institution should disappear. It is not uninteresting to note the high proportion of national leaders that have graduated from the independent institutions, not merely great universities but the small liberal arts colleges."

Has the value of an unspecialized Liberal arts education decreased?

"No, in my opinion it has on the contrary greatly increased. Providing that the program is well conceived, I feel very strongly about the importance of a broad general education before a man begins to specialize. This is all the more true in these days when the tendency toward specialization and technical education is clear."

What about the role of sports in college life?

"I am enthusiastic in my belief that college sports in America form an important aspect of education. This is true for the varsity player as for the member of the intramural team. But we must be careful that the teams that represent us are truly representative of the undergraduate body. There is real danger if we lay so much stress upon the quality of our players that we import them because of their athletic ability rather than because of the leadership which they are going to give to the undergraduate body. Yale wants good athletes because we believe they will make good Yale men and leaders in their later life; but Yale gives them no privilege or help that is not open to every undergraduate. We are very fortunate in our coaching staff here—teachers of the highest ability and imbued with the highest ideals of amateurism."

Why did Yale spend millions for buildings far more lavish than the majority of its students will live in after graduation?

"This is a misconception. We accepted gifts for buildings and constructed them according to the terms of the gift of bequest. This was true of the Harkness Quadrangle and the undergraduate colleges. The Sterling Library, the Divinity Quadrangle, the law school, were provided by the Sterling bequest. I think that during the terms of President Angell and myself, no Yale money has been spent on buildings. They have all come from gifts or bequests."

What do you consider the major accomplishments of your administration?

"I like to think that perhaps I have been holding on the three-yard line, while the college has been passing through a world war and its confusing aftermath. We have maintained the morale of our faculty and improved its quality. We have accomplished an integration of the various university divisions, bringing such schools as the Sheffield Scientific, Medical, Law and Fine Arts into a unified effort in which each division knows its function and mission. We have set up the University Council in order to bring the alumni closer to the life and operations of the University."

What is Yale's greatest current problem?

"Maintenance of freedom from external influences by which we may be threatened because of inadequate resources."

What is the foreseeable future for Yale?

"Fewer students—we hit a peak of 9,400—have now dropped to 8,500 and will eventually, I think, go down to 6,000. I do not think we shall have more specialization in studies; we shall maintain a broad general basis of liberal arts education for our first two undergraduate years before the student enters upon his specialized work."

What new developments are there in the current curriculum?

"We have organized an 'American Studies' program which seems to me of the first importance in the field of American civilization and history, in order to bring into a coordinated course of study, history, literature, economics, philosophy, in fact all phases of American life. We have made a general reexamination of our curriculum and have introduced various new educational plans designed to stimulate and assist the serious student: The Directed Studies Program and the Scholars of the House Program. It would take too much detail to describe them here but they indicate that we have been actively exploring our curriculum with regard to student needs. We are also giving increased attention to the need for enlarged teaching and research in the social sciences."

Why are so many Communists seemingly associated with universities?

"We haven't any Communists on the Yale faculty as far as I know. I wouldn't appoint a Communist, for his presence here would mean the negation of academic freedom. It is not possible, of course, to know the student body so intimately, but I would say that at Yale communism is practically nonexistent."

What is the most effective way of fighting communism on the college level?

"Well, in the first place, I am sure that Communist ideas ought not to be outlawed from college teaching. Rather they should be analyzed, discussed, and deflated. We must meet the menace of communism by positive and imaginative measures. A major obligation is to train our youth in the understanding and practice of American democracy, whether in the classroom or in our campus life. That is why I am so interested in pushing forward our program of American studies which I have already mentioned. That is a positive approach. A negative defense degenerates into a rearguard action. Our purpose is to lead democratic allegiance. It is, however, important to study Karl Marx and to understand the nature of contemporary communism."

Are our public schools properly training youth for college?

"The boys we select from public schools do a very fine job. In fact, in their devotion to their work and their scholastic marks, their record is higher than that of private-school graduates. However, I must also say that it is my experience that a good many of our public schools are neglecting education in the three R's."

What are your plans after retirement?

"I plan to live in New Haven, and devote myself to the study of history. My work will be done in the house collection of the Yale Library."

Would you be available for public office after your retirement?

"In all honesty it is very hard for me to picture my future except as devoted to historical study and writing."

Who's Who lists you as a Democrat. Is this correct?

"I suppose I should call myself a Woodrow Wilson Democrat. I was brought up in the tradition of William Graham Sumner and Grover Cleveland and cannot escape its continuing influence. So you can appreciate the fact that I find it difficult to accept various aspects of the New Deal and the Fair Deal."

Looking back on 13 years as a college president, what kind of an experience has it been—Disillusioning? Exhausting?

"By no means disillusioning. On the contrary very stimulating. The college president is one of a team made up of men of the highest quality, and my chief impression is a sense of privilege in working with them. There is probably no institution in which one can find the complete devotion to a common effort that one can in a college. Differences of opinion are honest. Criticism is constructive. Methods are direct and aboveboard.

"The position is no more exhausting than that of the normal hard-working professor."

What are your hobbies?

"Unfortunately I've had small time for hobbies during the past 13 years. Golf which I used to enjoy is too time-consuming. I still like to play a little poker. My summer hobby is harmless and healthy—weeding in my wife's garden."

Speaking with a historian's perspective, are these, as some would have us believe, the worst possible times?

"How can we tell? The present, you know, is never the best time. As I look back on history I see many times as bad or worse than those in which we live; the Dark Ages, the era of the feudal peasant, the 30 Years War in Germany. The times in which we live certainly produce a sense of insecurity but they might be worse. After all, you and I are sitting in a warm room, we slept under cover last night, we had lunch this noon, didn't we? The general physical level of the Western World is much higher than it has ever been. If you're talking of the level of manners throughout the population we compare very favorably with the past. My chief worry has to do with morals, and especially morals in the field of international relations. The disregard of treaties, the disappearance of good faith which has characterized the history of the past 30 years has numbed the conscience of the world. We must hope that it will be revived."

What individuals in your time have done the most for the world?

"The first who comes to my mind is Woodrow Wilson, who brought the principle of international association into practical politics. Among others would be Winston Churchill, who saved western Europe; Herbert Hoover, who brought the principles of international relief into practical operation; Albert Schweitzer, for his direct service to mankind as medical missionary and his indirect service as spiritual leader. I think I would also include Steve Benet (Stephen Vincent Benet, Yale '19, Pulitzer prize-winning poet). His John Brown's Body brought home to the American world a sense of destiny."

Are we educating the type of young people who can lead the world through the tremendous problems we are told lie ahead?

"Our present youth in the colleges represent a high type of humanity. If we lack for leaders it won't be for lack of material, but because we have failed to train them properly."

Suppose you were asked to give a few parting words of wisdom to a young man about to enter college, what would you say?

"I try never to give advice to young people, but the following would be running through my mind: 'You are about to enjoy a great privilege. Remember you carry a great obligation: To develop to the utmost your quality as a gentleman and a scholar; to add to the gaiety of your friends; to help those less fortunate than yourself.' "

The interview was over. Before the reporter could express his thanks, Mr. Seymour was already shaking his hand and saying: "Thank you very much. Thank you especially for making it so painless."

People's Confidence Shaken by Government Indecision Regarding American Watchmaking Industry

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, I have had occasion in the past to comment on the fact that the agencies of our Government have been created for the purpose of serving and aiding, first and foremost, our own American citizens.

I have also, before, brought to the attention of the Members of this House, by editorial insertions, unhappily evidence that our own people may be on the point of losing their faith, trust, and confidence in the institutions and divisions of Government whose only reason for being in existence is to assist them. As additional information on this score, which I believe will be of pertinent interest to my colleagues, I desire to insert another editorial, reflecting community conviction, which appeared in the February 13, 1950 edition of the Lawrence (Mass.) Evening Tribune.

The editorial follows:

THE PLIGHT OF WALTHAM WATCH

Maybe President Truman doesn't know all the facts about the difficulties of the Waltham Watch Co., and maybe we don't either, but it does seem that the problem is being dismissed a little too casually. If the Waltham Watch Co. goes out of business, and there are ominous signs that it may have to, the welfare of a lot of people will be affected. And it's not something which will make this State, as a whole, especially happy. Any wallop at Massachusetts industrial strength is a serious thing. According to what has been revealed so far about the plight of the company, its assets are not sufficient to warrant letting it use $2,000,000 of a $6,000,000 RFC loan as working capital instead of for the purchase of equipment. President Truman has said there doesn't seem to be anything which can be done to save the company. It seems to us that something in the way of a try could be made without ruining our economy.

The logic of the situation is rather baffling. The RFC previously authorized a $6,000,000 loan to retool the plant, evidently figuring that the mortgage it would hold on the equipment would protect its money if things went sour. But, surely, such security as highly specialized machinery designed for the construction of watches and other chronometric devices would not be easily liquidatable and would show marked depreciation from the day of installation. What we are getting at is that there doesn't seem to be any more apparent justification for the $6,000,000 loan, which the RFC was willing to give, than for the $2,000,000 allocation, which it balks at. The RFC says the company's assets are not sufficient; a spokesman for employees of the plant says they are. A government which can cheerfully throw good dollars down a rathole to support the price of potatoes seems inconsistent when it gets virtually economical all of a sudden and shudders at the prospect of risking a mere $2,000,000.

The fact that Waltham Watch played a role in national defense in wartime, and could be called upon to do so again, is an additional reason why something should be done. The issue is not a local one, it is national in its implications. And there are human factors involved in the way of the particular skills that watchmaking, a precision trade, calls for. Skills lose their edge if they are not used. It is certain that the watchmaking industry will not be able to absorb all the Waltham workers; some of them will have to turn to other industries. This loss by evaporation of trained technicians can be shrugged off as inconsequential but it shouldn't be.

There is a feeling in the air that the Waltham trouble is being handled ineptly.

Hoover Commission

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, there has been much propaganda in the press recently and also from certain groups throughout the Nation who are trying to create the impression with the general public that the Eighty-first Congress has not been diligent in enacting into law the recommendations of the Hoover Commission for the reorganization of our Government.

Contrary to that, I want to point out that many of these recommendations have already been enacted into law. When these reports were submitted to the Congress, they naturally had to be studied carefully and this, of course, entailed much time and study.

The work of the United States Government has grown more complex with the years. From the time of George Washington, when a few departments existed in the administering of our national needs, it has grown until there are over fifteen hundred agencies in the executive branch of the Government. Since all of these departments and agencies have some claim upon the attention of the President and the Cabinet, a good deal of their work has been taken up with administrative details, leaving less time for the more complex consideration of policy.

Mindful of these effects, in July 1947 the Congress authorized the establishment of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. This body was composed of outstanding citizens drawn from a panel of public officials and eminent private citizens. They, together with their staff or task forces as they were called, were admonished to analyze and study the areas of economy and services requiring needed improvement. This group, under the leadership of the distinguished former President, Herbert Hoover, explored the many phases of government operations and reported its findings to the Congress.

In this connection I might mention in passing that 12 of the 17 major reports embodying these recommendations have been referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, of which I am a member. It shall be the duty and responsibility of this Congressional Committee to analyze and evaluate these recommendations. From these studies and reports must be evolved the legislative drafts which will result in the accomplishment of the objectives recommended to the Congress. The Congress set as its immediate goal for attention those spheres of Government activity where the greatest savings could be effected at once. According to Bureau of the Budget sources, these areas were: The National Military Establishment, the Civil Service Commission, Procurement and Supply Activities, and the Post Office Department.

During the last session of Congress, by reorganization plans and substantive legislation, these areas have been amply explored and vastly improved.

Congress, as a prelude to the effectuation of the Hoover Commission recommendations, passed the Reorganization Act of 1949. This act allows the President, after a survey of the needs of the executive branch, to send up to the Congress reorganization plans which will regroup, realine, and improve that branch.

This is one of the means which can be employed for reorganization for the betterment of efficiency and economy in Government. However, two other avenues are open also for the accomplishment of these recommendations. They include: administrative action by the agencies concerned, and substantive or appropriation legislation by the Congress. By these three methods, then, the field of reorganization can be covered. There are in all about 288 recommendations in the Hoover Reports. If all were to be carried into law, the greatest amount of reorganizational work would have to be done through the administrative action of the executive branch, or by reorganization plans initiated by the President. According to the Bureau of the Budget, approximately 60 percent require initiation by the executive branch, while about 38 percent require initiation by the Congress through legislation.

In order to give a more rounded-out picture, it would be well to consider what has been done up to this time. In whole or in part, about half of the Hoover re-

ports have been acted upon favorably. Thus we have seen changes effected in the general management of the executive branch, personnel management, supply activities, Post Office Department, Department of State, Department of Defense, Department of Commerce, some regulatory commissions, certain functions of the Department of Labor.

It should be noted also that the Citizens' Committee for the Hoover Report, a research organization founded to press for enactment of these worth-while findings of fact, has stated recently that—

> More reorganization has been accomplished than at any previous time in the Nation's history.

The first session of Congress closed on a very encouraging note, for many of the recommendations eagerly sought by interested citizenry had been accomplished within 90 days of the termination of the life of the Commission on Organization of the Executive Branch of the Government. Among others, the following public laws saw their light in this session:

Public Law 109, Reorganization Act of 1949.

Public Law 92, Travel Expense Act of 1949, raising per diem from $6 to $9 per day.

Public Law 429, the Classification Revision Act of 1949, revising the civil-service classification system.

Public Law 359, the Executive Pay Raise Act: This increased the salaries of Cabinet officers and other heads of departments as a means of attracting high caliber individuals into public service.

Public Law 180, Civil Service Retirement Act: This consolidated various Government retirement programs.

Public Law 152, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949: This established a General Services Administration, transferring the Bureau of Federal Supply, the Federal Works Agency, the National Archives and the War Assets Administration into one consolidated agency for simplification of Government procurement, buildings management, records management, transportation, and surplus property disposal and utilization.

Public Law 231, operations of the Post Office Department: This provides for a long range development program for improvements in the methods, procedures, equipment and supplies used in the postal service.

Public Law 73, reorganization of the State Department: This provides for a thoroughgoing reorganization of the administrative and operational functions of this agency.

Public Law 216, reorganization of the National Military Establishment, under a performance budget, further providing for unification of the armed services.

Public Law 110, Central Intelligence Agency: This gave CIA the necessary authority to improve its internal operations.

Six of the President's reorganization plans were put on the statute books as of August 20, 1949:

Reorganization plan No. 2 tranferred the Employment Service and the Unemployment Compensation Bureau to the Department of Labor;

Reorganization plan No. 3 increased the authority of the Postmaster General;

Reorganization plan No. 4 has the National Security Council and the National Security Resources Board now residing in the Executive Office of the President;

Reorganization plan No. 5 acted to put the executive direction of the United States Civil Service Commission in the Chairman for administration;

Reorganization plan No. 6 vested the powers of the United States Maritime Commission in the Chairman; and

Reorganization plan No. 7 transferred the Public Roads Administration to the Department of Commerce.

In December 1948 Mr. Hoover stated in a press release that, if the whole of the Commission's recommendations were adopted, they would result in a savings of about $3,000,000,000 a year. Other speakers, in discussing the problems of reorganization since that time, have placed this sum at much higher levels. Be that as it may, we must point out that the primary objective was, not so much to achieve immediate economy, as to induce greater efficiency through better rearrangement of the executive branch. This will result in improved administration and will produce long-range economies of a continuing nature. Emphasis, therefore, should be placed on increased efficiency in the Government and improvements in the Federal service in order to insure a greater return for the tax dollar expended. Thus, it remains reasonable to expect economy from quite a number of the Hoover Commission recommendations, particularly through consolidation and elimination of many functions which duplicate each other. Just what the amount will be cannot be reckoned too accurately until operations have been conducted under such rearrangements for a definite period of time.

At present our committee is making studies and has held a number of preliminary hearings in fields aimed at the reduction of Government costs. It is hoped that this implemental legislation in the fields of records management, traffic management, and related fields will be fruitful of constructive legislation.

In closing, I should like to add that we must not be impatient. Much time and money has been expended to cull these facts for the aid of Congress in the work of reorganization. A good start has been made. The enthusiasm of the House and Senate membership augurs well for its continuance. Certainly, the people of the United States have displayed keen interest in the reorganization program. It would be well to proceed slowly, taking many forwardlooking steps in view of the staggering task that his problem presents. Rome was not built in a day. Worth-while legislation cannot be enacted in haste. Reorganization should mean change; but every change should bring progress.

Contract Settlement for Mining

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WALTER S. BARING

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BARING. Mr. Speaker, the vast bulk of war contracts with the Government already have been settled. It has even been proposed that the Contract Settlement Act of 1944—Public Law 395, Seventy-eighth Congress, second session—be repealed. I believe the settlements so far have reached the colossal figure of 20 billions of dollars. Very little further business is before the Office of Contract Settlement, which has been shoved about in the process of reorganizing the Government agencies until its very location nearly has been lost sight of. I want to point out to the Members that almost no mining claims have been allowed. Application after application has been rejected on some technicality or other, until our miners have become too discouraged either to press their cases, or to bother even to file for settlements.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that such treatment of the mining industry of this country was not the intent of the framers of the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, and neither was it the intent of the Congress which passed that act. It is true that at the time the act was drafted, stress naturally was laid upon the manufacturing industries. This, however, was largely due to ignorance of the special problems of mining, and was not due to any deliberate attempt to slight the mining industry. As soon as the deficiencies in the bill S. 1718, which became Public Law 395, were seen, Mr. WALTER in the House and Senator MURRAY in the Senate took immediate steps to correct the situation, and wrote language into the bill which brought mining within its purviews. Furthermore, President Roosevelt in the public announcement made through Mr. Donald Nelson in 1943, guaranteed fair treatment to each individual producer, this promise being made specifically and pointedly to the mining industry. The Congress attempted to translate this promise into law, even going so far as to make the War Production Board—the authority which stimulated most mining activities—a contracting agency under the law when, in fact, it had not been one. Along the same lines, part of the language of the act was made to read "or any other request to proceed from a contracting agency, the contracting agency shall pay such person fair compensation therefor." This was done because the sponsors well knew that most mineral and metal producers had no formal contracts with the Government. There is much other language in the act also in point, but I will not bore you by reciting it. Suffice it to say that the responsible agencies never did like the idea of compensating our mining producers and they

have ignored the intent of the Congress in some instances and in others deliberately misconstrued the act.

After the First World War, there was no law quite like the Contract Settlement Act of 1944. Realizing the plight of mining producers who were cut off from Government purchasing, sometimes with cars of minerals actually on the road, Congress passed the War Minerals Relief Act of 1919. From time to time, as experience dictated, the act was revised and the language was tested in the courts and precedents established. I mention this to show that the Congress did at that time and, I sincerely believe intends now, to see that justice is done.

As time went by after the 1944 act became law, it shortly became increasingly noticeable that mining claims were being summarily rejected, no matter on what theory they were based. Bills were introduced in both House and the Senate designed to clarify the 1944 act. In a detailed discussion of contract settlement for the critical and strategic minerals and metals industry, the Senate Small Business Committee Mining Subcommittee on May 21, 1946, said:

> Of course the mine operators entitled to fair compensation, after having exhausted their right of appeal provided in Public Law 395, may be able to enforce their claims in court, but such discrimination is not consonant with the acknowledged obligation of the American people nor with the expressed intent of Public Law 395. * * * every effort has been made to clarify, classify, delimit, and define (the clarifying bill) so that the small group affected may be paid what is due them for their work.
>
> The measure provides a separate channel for settlement for mining claims and places them in a category by themselves, where they belong.
>
> It adds no claims not already existent, nor does it create any additional commitments. It simply clears the way for the discharge of an obligation already recognized, but which has become snarled in administrative and procedural difficulty.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, after these carefully prepared bills were introduced the agencies concerned furnished the legislative committees with adverse reports, using every pretext to bolster the recommendation that the bills should not pass, the same opinions were exhumed from the same agency files each time a report was requested on these or subsequent bills, session after session, Congress after Congress.

The proponents of the measures trimmed their sails, revised the bills, and finally, after the committees dealing with the new bill found the cause was right, H. R. 834 was favorably reported in spite of agency opposition and passed by the Senate and House only to be vetoed by the President, who issued a detailed statement at the same time.

The veto message, Mr. Speaker, quite evidently was written by a novice with no knowledge of the history of mining settlements from the War Mineral Relief Act of 1919 to the present day, but armed with the same files full of adverse memoranda and reports which spawned the previous departmental attitudes. Unfortunately, Mr. Truman was induced to sign a statement full of obvious errors and flat misstatements of fact. Among other things the message by implication accused the mining industry of being grasping, with the words, "Other industries were urged to do their part in the war program, and other industries responded as splendidly to the challenge as did the mining industry. They too sustained losses in enterprises undertaken as a part of the war effort." Now I submit, if any other war industry has not been taken care of under the Contract Settlement Act of 1944, Congress certainly should look into the matter and take steps to rectify the oversight. I know of none. The message also said that S. 834 introduces a new principle—the gentleman who wrote it quite evidently never had heard of the War Mineral Relief Act of 1919.

Since the publication of the veto message on July 11, 1949, Mr. Speaker, H. R. 834 has rested in the Judiciary Committee awaiting action but it never has been reported to the floor with a recommendation to override the veto. I personally think that had the President had the time to give this bill the study and attention which it merits he not only would have signed it, but would have insisted upon expediting its passage. I cannot think he would have any serious objection to our repassing the bill over his veto, even though some minor bureaucrats were disgruntled thereby.

I understand from those who were here when the original act of 1944 was passed, that much was made of the urgent necessity for quick settlement of claims so that the funds could be reinvested promptly. Every effort to complicate the bill by a set of elaborate bookkeeping checks was resisted, on the theory that speedy action was more important than preventing a few errors of commission.

It is now 1950, Mr. Speaker, about 6 years since the Contract Settlement Act was passed. The producers of strategic and critical minerals and metals who labored so valiantly and successfully for the war effort still are unpaid. The agencies still show no inclination to pay them.

I beg the members of the Judiciary Committee to bring H. R. 834 to the floor again promptly and see if the Membership of this House, out of an innate sense of justice and fairness to our war mineral producers—the backbone of any plan for national defense—will not pass the bill with the necessary two-thirds majority, with a sense of correcting a mistake not within the President's power to rectify unless we take positive action and with a sense of certain satisfaction of a wrong righted, and a job well done.

The Federal Government and National Health

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN B. BENNETT

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BENNETT of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include a radio address given by me over radio station WJR, Detroit, on Friday, February 17, 1950:

The responsibility of the Federal Government for the health of the American people and the extent it should function in the field of public health has precipitated a bitter controversy in Congress and throughout the country. There are two extremes in this controversy—those who favor the President's program which would take over the medical profession and its related functions, lock, stock, and barrel, and regiment the individual citizen in matters pertaining to his health—and the other which holds the Federal Government has no business concerning itself with any of the health problems of the individual American family.

There is a middle ground between these divergent views which I shall discuss a little later.

There is a marked similarity between the President's proposals and the scheme of nationalized medicine now being practiced in England. Therefore, I would like briefly to tell you something about the British plan. In the first place, no matter how unsound a thing may be it always has its redeeming features. This is true of the British medical system. It has done at least three things which have tended to improve the health of millions of British people. Many people in England were not receiving adequate medical and dental care. This class was composed of people whose incomes were sufficient to make them ineligible for relief medicine, and yet inadequate to enable them to pay for the kind of medical aid they needed. The national scheme has helped these people considerably.

The second advantage is that it has permitted people to seek early medical and dental attention which all doctors agree is desirable. Since medical care is now free, there is no hesitation on the part of the British citizen to seek early advice and care for his ills.

The third advantage is the assistance the government has given to established institutions of medical research which for years have been handicapped because of lack of funds through private sources. This has permitted an important broadening in the fields of research.

But the disadvantages of the British system far outweigh the advantages, which I have mentioned. Here are some of the devastating disadvantages.

The system makes every doctor a government employee. With but few exceptions the private practice of medical and dental surgery in England has been completely eliminated.

Since the doctor is a government employee, he has no choice in location of his practice. He must locate in the town or city designated for him by the government. Theoretically, he may choose his own patients but actually he has no choice because his location is selected for him. Because he is a government employee, the British doctor finds himself enmeshed in an endless maze of red tape. Government reports must be made daily to a dozen different branches of the Ministry of Health, and in many instances the making of these reports consumes as much as 50 percent of the doctor's time. So he must practice his profession, not by the ordinary rules of medical practice, but by rules and regulations promulgated by a government agency. His fee schedule may be changed from day to day, or week to week; he may be moved from one community to another against his will; he may be disqualified as a practicing physician by capricious regulations of the Health Ministry. Under this system the British doctor is truly a politician. He must curry a favor of the Ministry of Health in order to do the things he wants to do. He has financial security, it is true, for as long as the British Treasury holds out,

but he has lost most of the freedom to live his own life, in his own way.

What will happen to the incentive and initiative of the doctor under such a system. It is certain that both these important attributes will be partially if not completely destroyed. Because the minute you place a limit upon the amount that a man can earn to that extent, you kill his desire to excel.

What about the effect of such a system upon the people generally. In the first place, the scheme is too luxurious for the British purse. The estimate of the first year's cost was £152,000,000. The actual cost exceeded £300,000,000—more than 10 percent of the total national budget. Were it not for the financial aid that this country is extending to Britain, the plan could never have been undertaken, and certainly not sustained.

So it is not only the doctor who suffers under such a scheme, the burden falls upon the whole economy. Nor is regimentation confined to the medical profession. It affects every individual in the country. In exchange for what he believes to be free medical care, the average citizen must accept the same bureaucratic regulation and red tape, and in the end he gets what might properly be termed "assembly-line medicine." He, too, must sacrifice many of his liberties to have medical security.

There is little essential difference between the British scheme and the President's proposals for this country. Both provide for Federal control of health problems. Both provide for the same type of regimentation. The British plan covers every citizen; the President's proposal covers only the wage earner whose income does not exceed $4,200. The British scheme is financed through general taxation plus American financial aid; the President's plan provides for a specific pay-roll tax.

But other than the mechanics of the system, there is little to distinguish either plan.

The socialistic aspects of the British scheme can well be illustrated by several significant factors. These factors prove that nationalized medicine will not work under a free government but will only work as part of a pattern of complete socialism. Since the British plan was inaugurated, the Government has taken over so-called related medical and dental industries. For example, the Government has taken over the artificial appliance business—all businesses connected with the manufacture or sale of dental appliances—likewise the industry which produces eyeglasses. When our committee was in England last fall, we were reliably told that the drug industry would be next. Under that plan the Government would operate central drug dispensaries—and the corner drug store would be a thing of the past. Similarly, dietary food industries are in line for Government seizure.

All of this proves a very simple fact—once you nationalize one important economic function it immediately becomes desirable to socialize all related functions, until in the end you have a complete socialized economy.

Such schemes are all based on the assumption that the individual can do nothing for himself that the Government cannot do much better for him—with his money. It assumes that a greater part of what a citizen earns should be turned over to a central Government agency, there to be spent by an army of bureaucrats to provide the things that the citizen could provide for himself if left unmolested.

I do not believe the rank-and-file citizens of our country want that type of government here. But they can only prevent it by constant vigilance, and by refusing to submit to the entering wedge of nationalization which will ultimately lead to a completely socialistic state.

While the socialization of the Nation's health is the kind of a system we must constantly guard against, it does not follow that the Federal Government should remain completely aloof in matters relating to the health of our people.

Indeed, there are many things the Government is already doing in this direction, and there are many more things it can do without getting into the realm of socialism. Strong, healthy children are of prime national concern, and Federal funds provided to improve health standards of children is, in my judgment, money wisely spent. Federal funds for medical research in order to help discover cures for serious diseases is likewise beneficial. Aids of this nature are consistent with our form of government, and can be accomplished without bureaucratic control or dictation.

There is one additional field in which the Federal Government could, in my judgment, render valuable assistance to its citizens. It lies in providing a system which will help the average family in the payment of catastrophic medical expenses. I want to give you briefly what I consider to be a worthwhile proposal to help solve this problem.

Two economic groups of our citizens are reasonably provided for from a medical standpoint. The first group consists of the well-to-do who are able to pay for all medical services they need or desire, although it is fair to say that this group is gradually becoming extinct by virtue of present tax laws. The second group consists of the poor who are given medical care on the basis of public support and private charity, supplemented by gratuitous services of the average physician.

But there is a third group made up of the average working man and his family who comprise the main element of our population. This group is not as well provided for in all respects as either of the two other classes. It is true that great progress has been made in recent years in providing adequate medical care for members of this economic group, as for example through Blue Cross and Blue Shield and through joint labor-management health care. However, none of these protective devices give satisfactory protection to the average American family against calamity illnesses. This is the type of illness which leads to catastrophic medical expenses beyond the financial ability of such families to pay.

The ordinary family budget can stand routine medical bills. It can provide for Sally when she has the measles or for Johnny when he needs a tooth filled. But this budget cannot stand for disasters. Too often it cannot meet the financial burden of serious surgery or prolonged hospitalization and medical care. Such emergencies create financial hardship which in many cases disrupts the family budget beyond repair.

I think the Federal Government can help solve this problem by acting as the insurer against calamity sickness. The Government can collect its premiums to pay for such insurance by the simple method of pay-roll deductions or direct contributions in the case of the self-employed, on an actuarial basis, with premiums geared to the risks assumed. Such a plan would be preferable to voluntary methods working toward protection against catastrophic medical expenses, which cannot be successful because the coverage is distributed among too few and the premiums necessarily prohibitive. Moreover, under such plans those who need coverage the most are least likely to have it. What is needed is broad and extensive coverage in terms of the numbers of people protected in order to diversify the risks and minimize the cost to those insured.

This plan is based on the assumption that the average American family can take care of its ordinary medical problems without Government interference or assistance. It assumes that the medical profession is doing a good job and will continue to do so without control from Washington. It recognizes, however, that the Federal Government can help protect the citizen against extraordinary medical bills. It recognizes that this can be done in a manner sound in principle and consistent with our free-enterprise system.

The standards for such calamity insurance would be specifically written in the law just as an insurance company writes its policy. There would be a minimum of administrative costs and control. There would be no need for an army of bureaucrats to harass the citizen. Finally, the plan would provide the answer to a very vital need without making every doctor a Federal bureaucrat and without putting either doctor or patient in a political strait-jacket.

Farm Price Supports

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. JAY LeFEVRE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. LeFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Mark Sullivan taken from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I hope Mr. Sullivan is correct in assuming that the farmers are becoming aware that continuing price supports only leads to further Federal controls over the lives of our farmers. A good many of us have envied farmers because they have always enjoyed a certain amount of freedom and independence. I have always believed that the farmer should be paid well for his efforts. The farmer who has put thought and sound judgment in his planning has always enjoyed a fair living. However, he must realize there is a limit to the subsidy program and that all things being equal, he is dependent upon the consumer when subsidies bring prices to the high level where consumers refuse to buy, something is wrong. Certainly the stories on potatoes and eggs are a disgrace. We have got to find a happy medium, and this is something the "planners" have failed to do.

FARMERS ARE BECOMING AWARE PRICE SUPPORT BRINGS CONTROLS—MARK SULLIVAN SAYS THEY BEGIN TO QUESTION POLICY THAT INCREASES PRODUCTION, CUTS CONSUMPTION

(By Mark Sullivan)

If the price of food is a principal private concern of the people, then Government actions and policies which affect the price are by that fact a principal public concern. This has come to be recognized in Congress and by the administration. The very existence of price support of farm crops is subjected to questioning. Within this field as a whole a concrete proposal in Congress, at once definite, yet limited, is especially important because of its origin; it came from the Democratic leader of the Senate, Mr. SCOTT LUCAS, of Illinois.

Senator LUCAS' proposal has to do only with potatoes. After the recent public outcry following spread of information about the immense cost of supporting potato prices,

the Department of Agriculture undertook to reduce the cost by reducing the quantity it would need to buy. Attempt was made to do this by requiring potato growers to reduce the number of acres planted. But it quickly became apparent that this would not be effective; potato growers, by planting rows closer together, liberal use of fertilizer, and intensified tillage, could grow more potatoes on the same acreage. So Senator LUCAS proposed that the reduction be imposed not on the number of acres planted but on the number of bushels raised and put on the market. This would enable the Government to establish a more effective check on growers.

FARMERS QUESTION SUPPORT

Senator LUCAS' proposal about potatoes illustrates what farmers are beginning to learn. Limitation upon the number of bushels a farmer may raise and withdrawal of price support if he raises more, is an extension of Government control. And the farmer is beginning to be aware that if he accepts the benefits of price support he must submit to regulation supporting it. Awareness of this on the part of farmers has led to an amount of questioning and discussion among them about price support comparable to the amount that goes on in Congress and among the people.

Potatoes are the example of price support that has become presently conspicuous. But the real public problem is price support as a whole, and price support covers practically every crop grown on a farm except a few minor ones. The methods of price support vary with different crops, as do the costs to the Federal Treasury and to the taxpayer, and the cost to consumers of food due to paying higher prices than they would otherwise need to. Adequate understanding on the part of the public would be facilitated by possession of as much information about all crops as the public has recently received about potatoes. An example, about which some degree of information has recently come to public attention, is eggs.

The Department of Agriculture is buying large quantities of dried eggs; in 1 week in February it bought 1,826,000 pounds. The fact that reports are in terms of pounds is one of many complexities that make public understanding not easy. A pound of dried eggs is the equivalent of three dozen eggs in the shell. The Department buys from processors, and these are required to certify that in buying eggs in the shell from farmers and other producers they have paid a price that the Department stipulates. The price thus stipulated varies with grades, sections of the country, and seasons. The purpose of buying the dried eggs is to support the price farmers receive for eggs, which means, of course, keep up the price consumers pay. The Department's average price-support figure this year, for all parts of the country and all the seasons, is 37 cents a dozen.

HUGE EGG SUPPLY ON HAND

While the department goes on buying more dried eggs, at a pace which is the equivalent of over 5,000,000 dozen of shell eggs a week, it has on hand more than 73,000,000 pounds, equivalent to more than 200,000,000 dozen of eggs in the shell, some bought last year, some the year before. The dried eggs tend to deteriorate, though the department says that less than a quarter-million pounds have deteriorated to a point where they could not be used for human consumption.

As in the case of potatoes, the department would like to get rid of its dried eggs. It has offered to give them away to charitable institutions and offered to sell them abroad at prices less than half what it paid for them and is daily paying for more. As in the case of every crop the department supports, it cannot sell for consumption as food in the United States at a price less than the support price it fixes, for that would defeat the very purpose of price support.

One of the many economic vices inherent in price support, the denials of reason and common sense, is its diverse effects on production and on consumption. It increases production, the farmer knowing that the Government will take the surplus off his hands. At the same time it reduces consumption by making prices high, leading some consumers to refrain from buying. The per capita consumption of potatoes last year was the lowest in years.

Amendment of Displaced Persons Act

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHESTER C. GORSKI
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is pending before the United States Senate several amendments to the Displaced Persons Act of 1948 which would give special consideration to persons who, during World War II, were members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland, who were honorably discharged from such services, who reside in the British Isles, and who upon the effective date of the new amendment have registered for an immigration visa with a United States consular officer in Great Britain prior to the effective date of the act, as amended.

I have been a strong and unwavering supporter of amendments to improve the present legislation on displaced persons in the many conferences which have taken place with respect to the study of various amendments now under consideration. It has been my privilege to present all the facts concerning those members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland whose heroic deeds in the defeat of Nazi Germany are well known to everyone. Consequently, a number of different amendments to the present law have been offered in the House of Representatives and in the Senate which would carry out my urgent pleas to permit a reasonable number of these gallant fighters for the freedom of Poland to gain admission to the United States as displaced persons.

I have made a very careful study of all these amendments and have concluded that the substitute bill now pending before the Senate, presented in the names of Senators KILGORE, GRAHAM, FERGUSON, MAGNUSON, KEFAUVER, O'CONOR, and WILEY offers the most practical amendment with respect to former members of the armed forces of the Republic of Poland now residing in the British Isles. It is my intention to offer every support I possibly can for the substitute bill when it comes before the House of Representatives for final consideration.

I should like to call to the attention of all those who have relatives and friends among these Polish soldiers who are now in the British Isles that it is imperative for them to telegraph immediately to these relatives and friends urging them to register for an immigration visa to the United States with the nearest United States consular officer in Great Britain. Unless such registration is made these relatives and friends will not be able to qualify for admission to the United States under the amendment I have been advocating. It is expected that the Senate will begin to debate this bill on February 23 and it is possible that the legislation will be ready for the signature of President Truman sometime during the second week of March. Therefore, such registrations in England must be made at the earliest possible moment.

Middle-Income Housing

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH A. GAMBLE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the New York Herald Tribune of February 22, 1950:

MIDDLE-INCOME HOUSING

Although the House Banking Committee has reported out the Administration's so-called middle-income cooperative housing plan, the reluctant testimony in which Thomas B. McCabe, Chairman of the Governors of the Federal Reserve Board, last week opposed this measure is still convincing. Not wishing to appear disloyal to the President's program, Mr. McCabe emphasized that his criticisms were limited to the economic and financial implications of the measure. Yet, these are precisely the aspects to which too little attention has been paid in the course of the bill's legislative history, and which are today of the greatest importance.

The cooperative housing idea is an attractive one to many people. Over it hangs the aura of Scandinavian prestige which was felt even by a hard-headed party of Senators who visited Sweden last summer to see for themselves how the "middle way" of housing fared. It has, for us in New York the further connotation of a rather long history and a rather successful application in the hands of our present State housing commission. But the cooperative program sponsored by the administration has nothing in common with these familiar measures except in name. When unmasked, the program appears as a thinly disguised plan for federally guaranteed mortgage lending that would allow cooperatives to borrow their building money for terms of 50 to 60 years at interest rates hardly more than the Federal Government itself pays. The objections raised by the Federal Reserve Board deal with the impact of such a multi-billion dollar program on the Federal debt and on private credit. But other major questions are posed by this measure. Why should members of cooperatives get better financing terms than other home owners? Where is the line drawn separating the middle-income sheep from the upper-income goats? Once the legitimate ground of public housing is abandoned, is there any reasonable stopping point whatever?

A notable group of Republican Senators, led by CHARLES W. TOBEY and RALPH E. FLANDERS, have participated in the creation of the bipartisan housing program enacted last

summer. Their cooperation is necessary in any further comprehensive housing legislation. What position should they and other Senators not tied by party loyalties to the President's program take now? The 1949 housing program is barely under way, but already there are grave questions concerning the wisdom and capabilities of those administering it. Part of that program included substantial new aids for middle-income housing that have been instrumental in raising the output of homes to present record-breaking levels. But where is the eagerness to press down the cost of housing through the manipulation of controls largely in the hands of the Federal Housing Administration? Where is the determined effort over a longer period of time toward lower cost housing through a better integration of the building industry? We believe that the administration should be required to give its present powers a fair test in the middle-income field before any new comprehensive legislation is authorized. Congress has done what was needed. It should now oblige the administration to do its part.

The Bicentennial Celebration in Haiti

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I wish to emphasize the importance of the good reports about the bicentennial celebration in Haiti given by Dr. Joseph F. Thorning, associate editor of the Americas and World Affairs. It was gratifying to all the Members of the Congress to know that this apostle of inter-American friendship had been invited by the Republic of Haiti to attend this international exposition as an honored guest. It is equally gratifying to know that, during his visit in Haiti, Dr. Thorning had interviews with the distinguished President of the Republic, His Excellency Dumarsais Estimé, as well as with the Foreign Minister, His Excellency Vilfort Beauvoir. Since the international exposition was the brain child of President Estimé, the latter must be happy to see that the realization of his dream has been widely appreciated in other countries, including the United States. It is also a triumph for Ambassador Joseph D. Charles, a most loyal friend of President Estimé and of the people of the Western Hemisphere. All of us have admired the work of Ambassador Charles in Washington. He, too, shares in the congratulations that rise in all quarters with respect to the success of the festivities connected with the two hundredth anniversary of the foundation of the Haitian capital, Port-au-Prince.

Dr. Thorning reports that the international exposition at Port-au-Prince is thoroughly worth while. As an eyewitness, he relates that the Haitian Pavilion contains numerous examples of national art. Furthermore, he was deeply impressed by the historical exhibit of documents and books which throw light upon the history of the people of Haiti and their long struggle for freedom and democracy. The exhibits of Cuba and France were also valuable, in the opinion of the Maryland educator, author, and lecturer. Naturally, Dr. Thorning was pleased to note that the Pavilion of the Republic of Venezuela featured the achievements of both Simón Bolivar, the Liberator, and Francisco de Miranda, the Precursor.

Enthusiastic praise was given by Dr. Thorning to the folklore music and dancing which, in the open-air theater on the exposition grounds, were a feature of many of the evening entertainments. The poetry of M. Jean de Brieur. Under Secretary of Tourism, was recited on these occasions, with universal applause. Many of these artistic events were dedicated to the honor of the President of the Republic and Madam Estimé.

It was noteworthy, Dr. Thorning stated, that the chapel of the Vatican, now on the exposition grounds, will be presented to the people of Haiti. This should indicate the good will and friendship of His Holiness Pius XII, and of the Apostolic Nuncio, Archbishop Francesco Lardone, as well as of the Papal Chargé d'Affairs, Monsignor Achille de Lupi.

In conclusion, Dr. Thorning related the beauty of the ceremonies which attended the formal presentation to the city of Port-au-Prince of a gold medal from the Forty Immortals, Paris, by M. Jacques de Lacretelle, a member of the French Academy, who came to Haiti with his charming wife for this express purpose. The response, in the name of the Haitian people, was given eloquently by M. Dantès Bellegarde, who in former times served his country as Ambassador to the United States and Ambassador to the Holy See. The mayor of Port-au-Prince, in turn, presented the gold medal, gift of the French Academy, to His Excellency Dumarsais Estimé, President of the Republic of Haiti. It is Dr. Thorning's most cordial recommendation that the international exposition at Port-au-Prince, Haiti, receive the most generous support and attendance on the part of the people in the other American Republics, including the United States of America.

Legislation Threatens the Oil Business

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD H. JENISON
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. JENISON. Mr. Speaker, I am confident all Members of the House of Representatives will welcome an opportunity to read the following editorial from the Robinson (Ill.) Daily News, published in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. The editorial comments in a comprehensive manner on the adverse effect certain to be suffered should present provision for the 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil production be reduced or eliminated, as currently proposed in new tax legislation before the Eighty-first Congress.

The writer of the editorial is Kent V. Lewis, editor and publisher of the Robinson Daily News and, in addition, the Illinois State senator from his legislative district. Senator Lewis writes from a background of a lifetime in a community where oil and oil development have been a major factor in the economy of the area. His clear presentation of the harmful effects of the proposal merit close study before any action is taken by the Congress.

His editorial follows:

LEGISLATION THREATENS THE OIL BUSINESS

Proposed elimination of the 27½-percent depletion allowance on oil production would be a crippling blow to oil development in Illinois.

It would mean an end to exploration by the small, independent producer, and since independents drill nearly all the "wildcats" which open new pools and pool extensions the lone drilling rig which has brought prosperity to so many areas of the State would become a rare sight.

Only the big integrated companies with refining and marketing facilities would be able to support drilling programs, so another section of small business would disappear as present leases belonging to independents are depleted.

More, thousands of stripper wells producing a few barrels a day would have to be pulled, with consequent permanent loss of the large amount of oil which in the aggregate they would otherwise produce. For the tax saving provided by the depletion allowance makes it possible for producers to pump many a well which would otherwise be plugged.

For many areas in Illinois, including this county, elimination of the depletion allowance would be almost an economic calamity. It is to be hoped that the Illinois delegation in Congress will keep in mind that for many sections of the State of Illinois oil is an industry second only to agriculture, and that in many oil-producing areas there are practically no other industries.

Oil has brought, and is bringing, comparative prosperity to many towns in Illinois which are located in what may be described as economically depressed areas.

The attack on the depletion allowance is based upon "plugging a tax loophole." Actually, the depletion allowance is not a breach in the tax structure, but a necessary incentive for continued exploration for a natural resource the discovery of which increases the taxable wealth of the Nation.

Without the allowance, exploration would be greatly curtailed, and areas in which geological indications point to small pools or wells of very limited production would be neglected entirely.

The end result would be the substitution of oil imports for much oil which will otherwise be discovered and produced in this country.

This might not injure a few of the major companies with extensive foreign oil production, but it would certainly handicap the industry as a whole and sap the strength of the war potential which enabled us to "float to victory on a sea of oil" in World War II. Certainly the very limited increase in tax collection can hardly balance the economic gain to the Nation of the continuous exploration and production of oil fostered by the depletion allowance.

Even discounting the undesirable monopolistic tendency of destroying the future of thousands of small independent producers there can be no permanent gain to the Nation in removing the incentive to wildcat

for small pools and producing wells. Only the depletion allowance justifies that risk, as any oil producer can assure you.

The picture of the rich oilman enjoying a large tax exemption may be a pleasant one in Washington, but in the oil areas of Illinois it is clear that the depletion allowance is only the cushion which persuades the wildcatter that he can leap into new exploration without the certainty of breaking his financial neck.

Resolution of Delaware State Dental Society

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. J. CALEB BOGGS
OF DELAWARE
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. BOGGS of Delaware. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to direct attention to a resolution adopted on February 15, 1950, by the Delaware State Dental Society in opposition to any form of compulsory health insurance or any system of medical or dental care containing the principles of federalized compulsory health insurance.

It is also appropriate, Mr. Speaker, for me to call attention at this time to the fact that both houses of the General Assembly of the State of Delaware last year passed resolutions memorializing Congress not to pass such legislation as is described in the resolution which follows:

Whereas the American people now enjoy the highest level of health, the best standards of scientific medical and dental care, and the finest medical and dental institutions ever attained by any major country in the world; and

Whereas these accomplishments of American medicine and dentistry are the results of a free people working under a system of free enterprise; and

Whereas in all countries where government has assumed control of medical and dental care the experience has been a progressive deterioration of medical and dental standards and care, to the detriment of the health of the people; and

Whereas this problem has been adjudged so serious by the people of Delaware that resolutions from its State legislature have memorialized Congress not to pass such legislation; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Delaware State Dental Society:

1. That the Congress of the United States be asked to refrain from imposing upon the citizens of this Nation any form of compulsory health insurance, or any system of medical or dental care containing the principles of federalized compulsory health insurance;

2. That the Honorable JOHN J. WILLIAMS, the Honorable J. ALLEN FREAR, JR., and the Honorable J. CALEB BOGGS, Members of the Congress of the United States from Delaware, be and they are hereby respectfully requested to use every effort at their command to prevent the enactment of such legislation.

3. That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the President of the United States, the presiding officers of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to each Senator and Congressman from Delaware.

Report From Washington County, Benton County, Madison County, and Van Buren County Soil Conservation Districts in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES W. TRIMBLE
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington County Soil Conservation District, the Benton County Soil Conservation District, the Madison County Soil Conservation District, and the Van Buren County Soil Conservation District in Arkansas have sent copies of their annual reports to me. I had hoped to be able to insert the entire reports of these districts in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, but their length precludes that, under the rules of the House, without special permission. I do, however, wish to quote from each report.

The Washington County Soil Conservation District, with its office at Fayetteville, Ark., is under the excellent guidance of the following board of supervisors: Walter D. Ramey, chairman, Winslow; M. G. Lewis, secretary, Farmington; C. D. Griscom, Lincoln; J. H. Pyeatt, Cane Hill; C. E. Shafer, Farmington. These men are outstanding farmers of Washington County. This year their district has had for its program soil and moisture conservation, and has stressed orchards, vineyards, and strawberries on contour in addition to the regular long-term program of soil conservation which they are carrying out. I quote from their report as follows:

Soil and moisture should be conserved on land being set to orchards, vineyards, and strawberries by planting on the contour. This practice is being encouraged by the supervisors of the Washington County Soil Conservation District. * * *

The advantages gained by planting these crops and cultivating them on the contour outweigh immensely the disadvantages. Farmers who have kept records state that they have received higher yields than they would have expected from the same crops planted the old way. These higher yields are the direct results of the savings in soil, moisture, and fertilizers which are kept on the field by the contour rows which act as small terraces.

Erosion is found at its worst in improperly managed orchards and vineyards. This is explained by the fact that few cultivated crops, other than fruits, are grown continuously on the same land for so many years. The cultivation of orchards and vineyards year after year up and down the slope throughout the life of the trees soon erodes out the middles between the trees, leaving the trees on mounds. This condition is too prevalent in northwest Arkansas.

The Benton County Soil Conservation District, with headquarters at Bentonville, is under the direction of the following fine supervisory staff: T. S. McNeil, chairman, Rogers; Harry F. Stitt, secretary, route 2, Rogers; Mac Givens, Gentry; Elbert S. Graham, Lowell; Wayne L. Shields, route 1, Siloam Springs. This soil conservation district is one of the most active in our section and it, too, is led by outstanding men of Benton County. I quote from the letter that Tom McNeil, the chairman, forwarded with the report:

I would like to call your attention to the fact that there are more farms under active soil conservation agreements with the district than ever before (773 farms covering 71,517 acres). Also there are more applications requesting assistance which have been approved by the board of supervisors than ever before (534 farms covering 57,925 acres), desiring conservation plans on their farms. This in face of the fact there has not been any campaign or action taken in years or any attempt to create a desire for farmers to make application for assistance. This district covers the entire county and from careful study there are 4,500 ownership farms covering 457,000 acres, most of which should have district coordinated conservation programs in the near future. Northwest Arkansas' agriculture is making progress and the soil and water conservation district program is advancing.

The Madison County Soil Conservation District, with head offices at Huntsville, is under the able leadership of the following board of supervisors: James M. Parker, chairman, route 2, Huntsville; Ewell E. Boyd, secretary, Huntsville; A. H. Berry, Hindsville; Hugh Hargis, route 4, Huntsville; Ralph Buck, RFD, Combs. As an example of what soil conservation is doing in our whole section, I give you one instance from the report of the supervisors of Madison County:

CONSERVATION PASTURE BRINGS WESTERN CATTLE TO MADISON COUNTY

Mr. Floyd Truman, from the State of Arizona, sold his ranch about June 1, 1949, but retained his 341 head of Hereford cattle. After having put his cattle on some very poor range, he started out in search of better pasture for his cattle. Mr. Truman, after looking for pasture for 2 months from Arizona to Arkansas, eventually landed in Fayetteville, Ark., where he contacted Mr. J. E. Critz, district conservationist of the Soil Conservation Service. Mr. Critz, having attended the "greener pasture tour" on the Paul Smith farm at Hindsville, Ark., knew that Mr. Smith, a cooperator with the Madison County Soil Conservation District, had done an excellent job of developing his pasture in connection with his soil-conservation plan on his farm. Also, he knew that Mr. Smith was short on cattle at this time. Mr. Critz directed Mr. Truman to Hindesville to contact Mr. Smith. The contact was made, and the two men made a deal to bring the western cattle to Mr. Smith's farm.

The cattle, consisting of 184 cows, 105 calves, 22 bulls, and 30 yearlings, arrived on August 16, at the Smith farm where they were tested both for TB and Bang's.

After the long trip by rail and truck the cattle arrived very tired, hungry, and gaunt. Even though the cattle were thin from being on poor pasture, there was not a casualty in the shipping. After being tested and kept in a close lot around straw stacks about 3 days, the cattle were turned on the lush pasture of the Smith farm, and they are looking better already. We know that the well-balanced, limed, and fertilized pasture on the Smith farm will start adding pounds of beef in a hurry.

Mr. and Mrs. Truman are looking for a location in this county.

Under the inspired leadership of the following men, the Van Buren County

Soil Conservation District, with headquarters at Clinton, is rapidly taking its place in the vanguard of fine districts in our section: Roy E. Tester, chairman; D. M. Baker, vice chairman; Clayton Graddy, regular member; J. O. Hill, ex officio member; J. B. Naney, secretary and treasurer. The attitude of this energetic group of supervisors can best be shown by the following paragraph from their report:

Farmers in Van Buren County have a higher standard of living today than any farmer has ever had, and we feel that the Production and Marketing Administration programs have helped them accomplish this. We have helped them by offering incentive payments for conserving soil and water on their farms. When we help the farmers, we indirectly help everyone—for the person who lives the farthest from the farm is still dependent upon the soil for his livelihood.

I am hopeful that the Congress, in this grave period of our Nation's history and in view of the absolute necessity for economy, can find ways and means to keep this great program moving forward, because wise economy dictates that we keep our soil strong and our young people on the farm.

Walter Featherly, Jr.—One of Twelve

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MIKE MANSFIELD
OF MONTANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I was delighted to have the opportunity at the National Boy Scouts of America breakfast last week to join with Walter T. Featherly, Jr., of Dillon, Mont., who represented region 11 at that gathering. It was a turn-out marked by the presence of the 12 most outstanding Boy Scouts in the country and it was a pleasure and privilege for me to be with Walter on that occasion.

Walter Featherly is a credit to his school, his State, and his region, and, of course, on that basis, he must be a credit to our country as well. Walter has had an extremely interesting life, having been a Life Scout for most of his Scouting career and also having received the God and Country award. His hobbies are music, marksmanship, and minerals. He conducts his own dance band in Dillon. He is also a Life Scout Explorer. Walter typifies the fine spirit of brotherhood which prevails among the Boy Scouts not only in our country but throughout the world.

It has been well said that "Today's youth will guide tomorrow's world. The feelings which youth of one nation harbor for the youth of others will undoubtedly influence the course of relations of all nations." The Boy Scouts of America have exemplified in their service the ideal of world brotherhood. They have taken an active part in the promotion of the United Nations appeal for children; they have sent over 9,000 CARE packages to other countries to be used as food for training courses for leaders and camping experiences for boys and leaders alike; they have contributed funds to bring to the United States the national director of the Cub Scouts for the Boy Scouts of the Philippines so he might observe our methods and procedures. They have done many other things of worth-while character and the are to be congratulated for the great amount of good they have performed in the many years of their existence. To Walter Featherly I extend my congratulations on the signal honor he has achieved; and to the Boy Scouts of America, I extend my best wishes on the fortieth anniversary of that great organization.

Your Move, Mr. President

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. WILLIAM L. PFEIFFER. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I would like to call to the attention of the House an editorial entitled, "Your Move, Mr. President," which appeared in the Buffalo Evening News, Wednesday, February 15, 1950.

On January 10, and again on January 20, I forwarded communications to the President relative to the coal situation in western New York. I earnestly begged of him to immediately recognize the fact that an emergency does exist; and that many persons would be deprived of employment, to say nothing of going without adequate heat, unless he took action at once.

I further advised that I was fully aware of the magnitude of his duties and the demands upon his time, but I, as a Member of Congress, do believe that I am entitled to a reply to my communications. To date I have not been extended the courtesy of a reply to my letters.

The editorial follows:

YOUR MOVE, MR. PRESIDENT

The coal crisis deepens; Buffalo public schools are closed; State and city officials are forced to impose strict regulation on such thinning supplies as there are; 350,000 miners continue their outlaw strike—and the White House says President Truman plans no further action at this time.

If the children and teachers miss their Easter vacations; if homes turn cold and businesses close and jobs are lost and pipes freeze, let one and all remember that the responsibility for letting affairs drift into their present critical state rests squarely with President Truman; that the responsibility for enforcing the orders of the Federal court is his alone, and that every sign of delay or irresoluteness encourages disrespect for the law, for his own office, and for the national safety he is sworn to protect.

Unless a contract should suddenly be negotiated, the next move is President Truman's. Until he makes it, we all remain the helpless pawns of a shameless game of power and politics that the United Mine Workers, the coal operators, and the President are playing at the public expense—at an expense mounting to disastrous proportions.

Practice What We Preach

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chicago Sun-Times of February 19, 1950:

PRACTICE WHAT WE PREACH

One hundred years ago Ireland's potato famine caused great numbers of persons to seek a new life in this country. There was a good deal of prejudice against the newcomers, who were mostly Roman Catholics. Sometimes it took the form of rioting and other crime.

A political group calling itself the Know-Nothing Party was formed. It wanted to repeal immigration laws. It wanted America for Americans. It wanted to forbid anyone except native Americans to hold public office.

In 1855 Abraham Lincoln felt called upon to deny that he was a Know-Nothing. Lincoln wrote to a friend:

"How can anyone who abhors the oppression of Negroes be in favor of degrading classes of white people? Our progress in degeneracy appears to me to be pretty rapid. As a Nation we began by declaring that 'all men are created equal.' We now practically read it 'all men are created equal, except Negroes.'

"When the Know-Nothings get control it will read: 'All men are created equal except Negroes, foreigners, and Catholics.' When it comes to this, I shall prefer emigrating to some country where they make no pretense of loving liberty—to Russia, for instance, where despotism can be taken pure, and without the base alloy of hypocrisy."

That was only one of hundreds of expressions by Lincoln on the subject of social harmony.

"Equal justice for all" means something more than equal justice in our courts. It means equal justice for neighbors in our thoughts, words, and deeds. This concept has inspired Brotherhood Week, which begins today.

It's a week in which Americans are urged to examine their consciences about their attitude toward all other Americans. It is a week to remember that the earliest settlers of the America which we ask God to bless came here to escape various kinds of intolerances practiced upon them elsewhere by people who thought they were different.

Prejudice, by dictionary definition, is "opinion or leaning adverse to anything without just grounds or before sufficient knowledge."

Listen to this description of a certain group:

"They introduce pauperism, slums, corruption, and crime. They are to blame for unemployment and panics. They deprive native Americans of jobs and they lower the wage scale. They are clannish, unassimilable, and half-witted."

It was used to describe Irish immigrants a century ago. Does it sound familiar today? Have you heard such words used recently to describe Americans whose family background is oriental, Jewish, Mexican, Polish, Italian, or Negro?

Most of the prejudice in this country is against members of minorities. But, as a reader points out in our letters column today, some members of minorities have prejudices, too. But two wrongs do not make a right. Prejudice against one group

cannot be justified by citing the fact that any of its members have prejudices, too.

The United States, considered a "white" nation, seeks the moral leadership of a globe populated largely by nonwhites. One of the greatest handicaps to our national leaders in their relations with leaders of other countries is the race discrimination practiced here at home. We are in a cold war which can't be won by construction of a hydrogen bomb, or a Marshall plan, or a point 4, alone.

To attract to the cause of democracy the millions in India, Pakistan, Indonesia, and Africa, America must live as well as preach the abolition of racial, religious, and economic discrimination.

Hon. Louis B. Heller

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. F. D. ROOSEVELT, JR.
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. ROOSEVELT. Mr. Speaker, February 28 marks the first anniversary in Congress of my distinguished colleague, LOUIS B. HELLER, of Brooklyn, N. Y. Mr. HELLER was elected to the Eighty-first Congress in a special election to fill a seat left vacant by the death of Congressman John J. Delaney. Well qualified for his post, Mr. HELLER already possessed legislative experience by virtue of having served in the New York State Senate. There, his sterling abilities were utilized as secretary of the temporary commission against discrimination. The splendid record he accumulated in this and other endeavors won for him the strong support of many groups and individuals and resulted in his election to the Congress of the United States.

Since coming to the House of Representatives, he has continued to serve the Nation as admirably as he did his State. Before taking his oath of office, he pledged himself to support all progressive and constructive legislation. He promised, further, to work to crush communism and to repeal the Taft-Hartley Act. Few Members of Congress can equal the record made by him in the pursuit of these goals.

Mr. HELLER has vigorously attacked the antilabor Taft-Hartley Act. Demonstrating his keen interest in the problems of labor, he analyzed the act point by point, listing specific reasons why it should be repealed. With insight and understanding he showed how the law has undermined collective bargaining, provoked unnecessary strife, and stripped workers of basic rights. Strong unions, he declared—

> With effective power to bolster the real wages of their members through collective bargaining, represent the most democratic means of preventing the boom-and-bust cycles which have plagued our economy over the past 100 years.

He cited the 1948 elections and his own special election as "clear and convincing mandates from the people" and stated that "immediate repeal of this unjust, unfair, and vicious legislation" was the way to carry out the people's will. A coalition of misinformed House Members has forestalled further action on this measure this session. Under the spirited guidances of such men as LOUIS HELLER, however, the fight for repeal will be carried on and the mandate of the people will be accomplished.

Important as the labor and economic problems of our Nation are, we have a still larger concern in the affairs of the world. In his first year in Congress, LOUIS HELLER has shown a grasp of these affairs scarcely rivaled by many who have longer tenure. Equally as admirable as his stand on labor issues has been his fight against communism and Communist aggression.

When it became apparent that recognition might be granted to Communist China, Mr. HELLER sent a personal plea to President Truman to prevent this tragic error. In an eloquent statement he asked:

> How can there be recognition of a government that cannot even maintain minimum standards of decency and hospitality in its dealings with foreigners? How can there be, moreover, recognition of a government which callously flaunts the basic international responsibilities of a sovereign state? Finally, how can there be recognition of a government which acts not in the interests of its own citizens but rather at the behest of a foreign master?

He urged the President not to be indifferent to the expansion of communism in China and southeast Asia and not to be swayed by the action of other countries.

But, like all true statesmen, he believes in a positive program for the reconstruction of war-torn countries and the building up of democratic ideals throughout the world. When the Korean aid proposal was before this body, Congressman HELLER enthusiastically rose to its support.

The point 4 program ranks high in his estimation as a solution to international ills. He believes, with President Truman, that we should make our technical knowledge available to peace-loving peoples in order that they may realize their aspirations for a better life. Improvements of this type, he knows, will also advance the cause of freedom and will help to develop international understanding and good will.

These ideals have been challenged, however, by hostile actions of the Soviet Union and the knowledge that the Soviet Union possesses an atomic weapon. This knowledge has forced a reappraisal of our strategic position in the world. The United States answer to this problem has been the creation of a military assistance program. Mr. HELLER firmly believes in this program and in the necessity for augmenting it. In a strong and forthright speech he called for the strengthening of the military forces of western Europe against the atomic threat of the Soviet Union. He stated at that time:

> Increased military aid to western Europe is even more urgent because the whole timetable of international strategy has been speeded up by the Soviet Union's unexpected atomic progress. Russian discovery of the atomic bomb came years ahead of the predictions of western scientists. The period of grace permitted to the western powers to strengthen their defenses has been considerably shortened. Consequently, additional American military help must be hastened to close the time gap in North Atlantic defenses.

When he went on record in favor of amending the Displaced Persons Act, Mr. HELLER revealed again his great humanitarian character and noble qualities of statesmanship. On that occasion he called upon the United States to exert moral leadership in the settlement of the displaced persons problem. We must change them. He declared:

> From displaced into placed persons. Maybe then, as we work and pray for peace, for a better world, the Great Architect will listen, for we cannot expect to receive the blessings of life if we do not give of ourselves in service to others.

To Mr. HELLER these words are more than phrases to be used in debate. Not content merely with supporting progressive legislation, he has taken advantage of every opportunity to effectuate it in a practical manner. Through his efforts, 760 Brooklyn Navy Yard workers, who would otherwise have been forced into idleness, are still employed. They will not soon forget LOUIS HELLER'S interest in them or his pleas to the President and the Secretary of Defense, explaining why for the good of the country, their jobs should not be abolished.

But LOUIS HELLER is not satisfied with a partial victory. With redoubled energy, he is continuing his attempt to see that workers in the navy yard area have employment. In this he has the support and cooperation of all Brooklyn citizens his eight Brooklyn colleagues, and the Brooklyn press. An editorial published in the Brooklyn Eagle on January 21, 1950, stated:

> Representative LOUIS B. HELLER has made a timely appeal to the Navy high command to assign to the Brooklyn Navy Yard one of the two giant aircraft carriers slated for modernization work. As he points out, the Brooklyn yard has pioneered in the work of rebuilding carriers along the lines dictated by postwar scientific developments and atomic research. And, as he adds, the work would provide employment for hundreds of Brooklyn workers who face dismissal on completion of several current jobs. * * *
>
> The Eagle is glad to add its voice to that of Congressman HELLER in demanding assignment of one of the two carrier modernization jobs to the Brooklyn Navy Yard.

A disturbing sidelight on the Brooklyn Navy Yard reduction-in-force problem was provided by the noted news analyst, Robert S. Allen. He revealed that among the employees discharged were six disabled veterans. Mr. HELLER'S answer to this violation of veterans' rights was an immediate and thorough personal investigation. He conferred with the admiral in charge who gave Congressman HELLER definite assurances that although the six disabled veterans had previously been informed that they were being separated from their jobs, he would offer them other employment. Each man was reemployed, and is presently working at his job in the yard. Mr. HELLER went further—he personally interviewed each veteran to determine whether or not he was satisfied with his new work.

As a result of this incident, Mr. HELLER has introduced a bill—H. R. 6547—to put an end to this sort of outrage. It would prohibit the dismissal from a Government job of any veteran who has lost a limb or the use of a limb, or has a disability rating of not less than 60 percent, as a result of service in the United States armed services.

Mr. HELLER expressed his opinion that there was no need to justify this measure on the basis of need. Such legislation, he feels, should be enacted because disabled veterans are entitled to special treatment from the Government they did so much to maintain at a most critical period in its history. I am sure, however, that we would heartily agree with Mr. Allen, who, in expressing his appreciation for this prompt and vigorous action, described Mr. HELLER's efforts as "splendid and humane."

Among other worthy measures which have earned his wholehearted support have been the repeal of the oleomargarine tax, the national health insurance bills, civil rights legislation, and pay raises for Government workers.

On the issue of civil rights, Representative HELLER has put himself firmly on record as being opposed to the poll tax. Nor has he neglected other forms of discrimination in his struggle for equal rights. I particularly admire his stand against unfair employment practices. He has stressed on many occasions his belief that the right to equality of opportunity of each individual to obtain useful employment without regard to race, color, creed, and national origin is essential to the well-being of the individual and to the progress of our society.

He abhors, particularly, the totalitarian arrogance which makes one man say he will respect another only if they agree in race, religion, and social position. From his service as a member of the New York State Commission Against Discrimination, Mr. HELLER learned that this problem cannot be handled by the States themselves. With insight gained from experience, he recommends Federal action to protect States having such laws against unfair competition from States that do not.

Along with a guaranty of civil rights security, Representative HELLER believes in an expansion of the social-security program. With commendable vision he sees the growth of this program as representing not only a growth in national security, but also an aid to our national defense and to our national future. He is one of the farsighted legislators in Congress to recognize that our prosperity and our national physical well-being depend heavily upon maintaining our health at the highest level.

To give substance to this conviction he is for the passage of a national health insurance and public health bill. There is no greater duty, he believes, that we owe to the electorate of this Nation, than to secure for them a reduction in sickness and premature death, thereby promoting individual and community welfare.

The plight of the underpaid Government worker is still another of the causes that has attracted the attention of the indefatigable LOUIS HELLER. Speaking before congressional committees, civic groups, and on the air, he has promoted legislation which would correct inequities and permit these worthy employees to enjoy a higher standard of living. Edward Zeltner, foremost political writer of the New York Daily Mirror and noted charity organizer, expressed his admiration in these words:

> Battling for postal pay raises, Representative LOUIS HELLER, the fledgling Congressman from Brooklyn, turns in an appraisal of Government service that merits thought. HELLER charges that the best talent, from top echelons to the bottom, are stepping out of Federal jobs because they don't pay enough. In the case of the average Government worker, it would be cheaper to grant him a pay raise than have him quit, the Congressman contends. He points out, by way of argument, that during 1947 at one post office 3,687 employees resigned for better jobs in private industry.
>
> Figuring that it costs $15 to add or subtract each of these persons from the Federal pay roll, the cost in this one instance was $55,305. These figures projected over the Nation, show how much the Government actually loses by constant employment turnovers. HELLER is trying to show that Federal employees can't live on salaries fixed by an act passed in 1923—when applied to the 1949 cost of living.

Referring to this and other accomplishments, Zeltner also commented:

> Representative LOUIS HELLER * * * has been on his toes every minute since he parked his satchels in Congress.

Representative HELLER has indeed been on his toes. He was on his toes when a Rule Committee coalition sought to obtain the power to block legislation. He saw in this move a denial of the principle of majority rule and diagnosed it as a design "to blockade a fair deal legislative program which the Democratic Party was chosen by the people to enact." "If the resolution is adopted," he charged, "the Rules Committe will become a graveyard where the policies of both political parties and the hopes of the American people will be buried." His strong voice, along with those of other farsighted legislators spelled the defeat of this ignominious proposal and has cleared the way for constructive action.

The record of LOUIS B. HELLER's first year in the House of Representatives speaks for itself. He has measured up fully to the ideals he has expressed and to the high expectations of his friends. When I look at the record he has achieved and the volume of work he has done, I wonder how it has been possible. I know, however, that the problems of the Nation, and particularly of his own district, are of such vital concern to LOUIS B. HELLER that no task is too great if done on their behalf.

The letters which come to his office are sufficient proof that LOUIS HELLER has, in great measure, accomplished the task he set out to accomplish. These letters are interspersed with such phases as "your whole-hearted support * * * has given our people new courage," "we wish for you * * * the blessings that must come from the knowledge of a good deed well done," "we are all fully aware that this brighter future is, to a very large degree, attributable to your efforts."

We are indeed fortunate to have in our midst such an able public servant as LOUIS HELLER. His qualities of liberalism and leadership are sorely needed in these trying times. I congratulate him on the completion of a most successful first year in the House of Representatives and express my appreciation for the inspiring work he has done.

One Was Worthy of the Name

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHAUNCEY W. REED
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, February 23, 1950

Mr. REED of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Harvard (Ill.) Herald of February 16, 1950:

ONE WAS WORTHY OF THE NAME

Public indignation, in pre-Revolution days, over treatment the American colonists were receiving at the hands of England set the stage for emergence on this continent of the great and beloved American whose birthday we celebrate next Wednesday—George Washington.

Public indignation, today, over the sorry state into which the great United States of America has been allowed to fall, merely because the man who today occupies the office of President did not regard the coal tie-up as a national emergency soon enough, will surely manifest itself through public action.

We can't believe the American people will take this tragic defect in a President's domestic conduct with nothing more than a shrug. We can't believe they will continue to regard him as a President above impeachment.

Now that the miners are defying a Government order and refusing to get coal to a desperate Nation, on the flimsy technique that they have no contract, we shudder at the immediate future of our community and our country.

Our college students are coming home from chilled school buildings. Our train service is being curtailed. The coal bins in our homes, our places of business, our hospitals are yawning. From here on in, we can expect to get colder.

Coal means too much to America's finely geared society today to let its supply be withheld from us because of a President's outrageous timidity to deal with the unions. Mr. Truman has waited too long. We, not he, will suffer. We, not he, will be fools if we don't remember this winter of 1950 and act accordingly when it comes time to vote.

George Washington showed beyond doubt his first and foremost responsibility was to all the American people—not just one class. Mr. Truman showed his first concern is for the labor vote. Let labor have him. The people should impeach him.

Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Hon. Arthur H. Vandenberg, of Michigan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, during the present week we have celebrated the anniversary of the birth of President George Washington. The birth of Alexander Hamilton came so close to that of George Washington that I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Story of Alexander Hamilton as Told by Senator ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG," published in the February 1950 issue of the magazine Sons of the American Revolution.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STORY OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON AS TOLD BY SENATOR ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG

In my impetuous youth I set out to right an historical wrong. I felt that America owed a long-overdue debt to the memory of Alexander Hamilton. I determined to make a small payment on account. So I wrote a book in 1921 to prove that Hamilton was the greatest American—meaning the greatest in the widest variety of contributions to his country's welfare. He was the most constructive statesman, the profoundest constitutionalist, the greatest lawyer, author, orator, and economist, the greatest political leader of his time, and one of its greatest soldiers. His was the most brilliant mind in an era of amazing genius. He was Washington's right arm in both war and peace. He was the brains in the pilot house when the ship of state set out into the perilous sea of history.

I have lived to realize that no one patriot can be called the greatest American in a land blessed with so many leaders of sublime and heroic stature. To that extent I overshot my mark. For example, I now freely concede that young America equally needed Thomas Jefferson and his basic rivalries with Hamilton. Jefferson would have been cheated of the presidency by Aaron Burr in 1800 but for Hamilton's refusal to permit his Federalists to condone the thought. Jefferson himself said of Hamilton, "He is really a colossus; without numbers he is an host within himself." But I have not outlived the conviction that Hamilton never has been given his historic due. Lord Bryce, in his admirable work, the American Commonwealth, said, "One cannot note the disappearance of this brilliant figure, the most interesting in the earlier history of the Republic, without the remark that his countrymen seem to have never, either in his lifetime or afterward, duly recognized his splendid gifts; equally apt for war and civil government, he stood in the forefront of a generation never surpassed in history."

We Americans love Horatio Alger heroes—brave young men who rise above adversity to win great place and fame. Well, here is the top prodigy of them all.

Hamilton was born on Nevis in the West Indies, January 11, 1757. His father was a Scottish ne'er-do-well. His devoted mother was a French Huguenot divorcee. The legitimacy of their union is still a subject of controversy. It never ceased to be a scandalizing weapon of Hamilton's enemies. It could have crushed a lesser soul.

At 14 years of age young Hamilton was successfully managing Nicholas Cruger's general store and countinghouse on neighboring St. Croix.

At 15 he emigrated to Boston—without a friend in this New World. At 16 he entered King's College, now Columbia, in New York. At 17 he was pushing his unbidden way to the rostrum at New York's famous "Meeting in the Field" to help promote the First Continental Congress. "It is the battlefield or slavery," he cried—a full year ahead of Patrick Henry.

At 19 he was captain of New York's first company of artillery, destined for 10 months of bitter combat in which his personal heroism brought him to Washington's attention. At 20 he became Washington's first aide and military secretary and in the final victory at Yorktown he led the first victorious American assault.

At 25 he qualified as a lawyer in four months of study, exciting the envy of one Aaron Burr, a fellow student, who subsequently became his lifetime foe and his dueling assassin. Shortly he was to be acknowledged as the leader of his Nation's bar.

At 30 he was in the New York Assembly struggling for full, free, public education and for easier debtors' laws. Here, too, he first enlisted in the mighty conflict which produced the Constitution. He forced his State into the Annapolis Convention from which came the call, which he wrote, for the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia. Then he sat in the Philadelphia Convention—the only New Yorker to sign the Constitution. He wrote the major portion of the Federalist Papers, the greatest exposition of the Constitution ever penned. It was, and is, the "bible" of the Constitution. Then came the terrific contest over ratification, chiefly centering in the New York convention.

At 31 he led a forlorn hope in this New York convention at Poughkeepsie, facing a hostile majority through six guerrilla weeks. At the end he won. It was little short of a miracle. "The overwhelming eloquence of Hamilton," wrote Chancelor Kent, "Was exerted to its utmost pitch and shook the most resolved in the majority." In the light of this reality I wonder if it isn't fair to say that without him there would have been no Constitution.

At 32 he was called to President Washington's first Cabinet as Secretary of the Treasury. By now he was the dominant figure in the Federalist Party, which held power for the first 12 years of the new Nation's political life. He immediately became the master craftsman of the great American adventure. Not only did he chart the basis for restoring Federal credit and for the redemption of the public debt but also, in flashing succession, he recommended navigation laws, drafted the first bill for the postal system, proposed the means for handling public lands, establishing the mint, advised the decimal system for our currency with the dollar as the unit, recommended the beginnings of the tariff system, proposed the patent system, and generally charted the Republic's structure. John Adams said he was "all the time the commander in chief of the House and Senate, of the heads of departments and of the President himself." This, mind you, is that immigrant boy on the docks of Boston only 17 years before.

At 36 he dominated America's first great decision in foreign policy. He demanded neutrality in the war between England and revolutionary France—squarely colliding with Jefferson. Washington agreed with Hamilton. In the light of this episode it is easy to trace the source of the eloquent warnings in Washington's Farewell Address—an address which Mrs. Hamilton, the lovely Betsy Schuyler, later testified came almost exclusively from her husband's incandescent pen.

At 40 he chose to strip the veils from every last detail of the only incidental scandal that ever blemished his private life, his affair with a Mrs. Reynolds, rather than leave a shred of suspicion against the integrity of his public works. He spared nothing and pleaded no palliation. His sole purpose was to put his public honesty beyond attack.

At 47, he was killed in a duel with Aaron Burr, his lifetime enemy. Burr chose a relatively inoffensive remark of Hamilton's as an excuse to invoke what was then the code of honor. Hamilton hated dueling, but honor was the touchstone of his life. He fell at the first shot. The tears of a nation followed him to Trinity churchyard.

This is the bare chronology of as great an American as ever lived. Ten thousand pages would be required to fill in the full story of his talents, his genius and his impact upon the foundation of America. He was ever the subject of white-heat controversy—in death even as in life. But for myself, summing it all up, I say that five words might be his epitaph, "The Republic Is His Monument."

The Indiana State Banner

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD the remarks of Mrs. Royal Eason Ingersoll, designated representative of Mrs. Roscoe C. O'Byrne, president general, Daughters of the American Revolution, at the Indiana State Society of Washington, D. C., celebration of the Sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory, 1800–1950, on February 19, 1950.

There being no objection, the paper was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE INDIANA STATE BANNER

At the Twenty-third Continental Congress of the National Society, Daughters of the American Revolution, held in Washington, D. C., on April 20, 1914, attention was called to the fact that Indiana had no State flag. Memorial Continental Hall, in which the meetings of the congress were being held, had been appropriately decorated for the occasion. The chief, and one of the most conspicuous decorations consisted of the flags of the various States placed about the auditorium of the hall, just below the cornice. Spaces had been left for the flags of those States having no emblems, and Indiana was found to be among this number. The want of a State banner induced Mrs. Gaar of Richmond, and Mrs. John N. Carey of Indianapolis, two of the delegates attending the congress, to procure a flag, displaying the coat of arms of the State, and to place it in the space allotted to Indiana, awaiting the time when the State should adopt a distinctive flag, and in a meeting of the Indiana delegates attending the con-

gress, Mrs. Henry Beck, the State regent, appointed Mrs. John N. Carey the chairman of the committee to secure a suitable emblem.

Upon her return to Indiana, by means of the press, Mrs. Carey offered a prize of $100 to the person who should submit the best design for a State flag. Meantime, the campaign begun in Washington was carried on at two of the State meetings of the Indiana Daughters of the American Revolution and a State banner committee, consisting of Mrs. John N. Carey, chairman; Mrs. F. F. Hutchins; Mrs. Robert McBride; Mrs. R. C. Bennett; Mrs. Henry Beck, State regent; Mrs. M. A. Potter; Mrs. Charles Thompson, and Miss Ames was appointed to develop the idea, and to secure the adoption of a State flag symbolizing the history, valor, products, and activities of the past 100 years.

A formal notice was issued by the State banner committee stating that the Daughters of the American Revolution and certain other patriotic organizations had decided that it was wholly suitable and desirable, that the Indiana centennial observance should be lasting marked by the creation and adoption of an Indiana State banner, and inviting citizens of the State to compete in the creation of a fitting emblem. The interest displayed was Statewide and the response was most gratifying to the committee. Between two and three hundred designs were submitted.

At the close of the competition on October 1, 1916, the State banner committee called together the heads of all the patriotic societies of Indiana, and 11 votes were cast for the design finally adopted and 4 votes for the next most popular design. The committee selected three designs, which were submitted to Harry B. Smith, adjutant general of the State. General Smith called the prominent military men of the State into his office and requested them to pass judgment on the proposed designs, and the same flag which was preferred by the representatives of the patriotic societies was the one chosen by the majority of the military men. The design executed and submitted by Mr. Paul Hadley was the one finally adopted.

When the design had finally been adopted, it was submitted to the general assembly of 1917 for formal and official approval and adoption. The committee succeeded in obtaining the passage of the bill through the Senate by the efforts of Senator Harry E. Negley, of Marion County, whose committee added the word "Indiana" above the Indiana star, an amendment to which the committee of the Daughters of the American Revolution advanced no objections. The bill finally passed on the last night of the session.

The field of the banner is blue with 19 stars and a flaming torch in gold or buff; 13 stars are arranged in an outer circle and 5 stars in a half circle below the torch and inside the outer circle of stars; the nineteenth star which is appreciably larger than the others, is placed above the flame of the torch; the outer circle is so arranged that one star appears directly in the middle at the top of the circle; the word "Indiana" is placed in a half circle over and above the star representing Indiana.

The reasons for the choice of the banner which was finally selected were, first its symbolic significance. The torch in the center stands for liberty and enlightenment; the rays represent their far-reaching influence. The outer circle of 13 stars stands for the original 13 States. The inner half circle of five stars represents the five States which next entered the Union. The nineteenth star, appreciably larger than the others, and placed above the torch, stands for Indiana.

The second reason for the selection of this banner was because of the simplicity of the design, because it is a contrast to the Stars and Stripes, and because military men generally admire a blue banner.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. Edward J. Thye, of Minnesota

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a Lincoln Day address delivered by me at Sacramento, Calif., on February 10, 1950.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

There is no place where I should rather speak at an event that commemorates the birthday of Abraham Lincoln than here in California, which, beginning a century ago, has developed into one of the greatest of our States and today is second only to the Empire State itself in the number of its citizens.

Yours is an empire, too, and one whose long history is colorful and significant. California, in a sense, is a State of States, for here, drawn together by pride in your great riches of climate and fabulous resources of nature, and no less by friendly western good will, are the sons and daughters of every State in the Union. Here, at the gateway to the Orient, you who shared so magnificently in meeting the impact of World War II are perhaps more keenly conscious than many others of our fellow Americans of the historic mission of our country in the world today. Here, too, is to be found a spirit of initiative and enterprise, of love of freedom and of faith in the American way that are typical of our country at its best.

It is not surprising that from such an environment there should come to the United States Senate to represent you a young Senator as competent, courageous, and effective as Senator KNOWLAND. It is not surprising that at the head of your State government is a man such as Gov. Earl Warren, respected and beloved by the entire Nation for his proven leadership of California. You have elected him twice as governor of this great State and once the American people chose him as a candidate for one of the highest offices in this land. I know you will again elect him governor of California.

You also have as a citizen one of the most distinguished living Americans—Herbert Hoover. He selected as the one place he wished to call home, Stanford University at Palo Alto, the college community in this State where he was educated.

And as I think of all of those statesmen—all members of the party of Lincoln—I am mindful also of another young man, Congressman NIXON, whose persistence and determination to focus attention on certain dangerous influences in our Government started a train of events which recently came to a most shocking climax. Congressman NIXON should be elected to the United States Senate in this coming election. There is a need for courageous, fearless fighters for the American way of government. Congressman NIXON and his committee members spread a net that some people scoffed at, others condemned, calling the committee findings of disloyalty of former Government employees in high Government office nothing but a political red herring. It proved to be a red fish but not a political red herring that some distinguished politicians talked about almost too glibly in the 1948 presidential campaign.

I mention this specifically because I think that the curious and devious operations that have been disclosed, and, even more, the attitude that is taken toward these matters by persons in high places in our Government in Washington, reveal a complacency that is not in keeping either with our ideals or our security as a nation.

They certainly do not bespeak the ideals and integrity in public office that Abraham Lincoln displayed. All over this land there are events such as this Lincoln Day dinner in honor of the first man to be elected President of the United States on the Republican ticket. Abraham Lincoln, in a very true sense, belongs to all Americans and to all men of good will everywhere. I would not wish to detract from the universality of the homage paid him by referring to his leadership in a partisan or narrow sense of exclusive possession. It is rather in a spirit of rededication that Republicans pay tribute to him today as the honored leader who laid down the foundations of our party.

Lincoln symbolized the power, the dignity, and the sovereignty of the people, and he put into phrases that will last as long as the English language is spoken the deep aspirations of the American people for unity as a nation, for liberty as human beings, and for the achievement of "a just and lasting peace among ourselves and with all nations."

Therein is the challenge to the Republican Party: To make these aspirations live—for freedom and democracy, for unity and justice, for opportunity and growth. These—and not a so-called standard of living—are truly the American way.

A Republican Party that is steadfastly true to these ideals will deserve to live—and will live.

Now, what do these ideals mean in practical reality?

What do freedom and democracy mean in an age of cold war between the philosophy they represent of a government "of the people, by the people, and for the people," and the Communist ideology and philosophy of government wherein man exists for the benefit of the state, where freedom of mind, the rights of man, and individual initiative do not exist?

What do unity and justice mean when translated into the complex problems of an atomic age?

What do opportunity and growth mean in a nation that has assumed historic obligations of world leadership as the United States found it must do immediately upon the close of the war—a leadership we must exercise the world over if a permanent and a lasting peace is to be achieved?

I want to say to you, ladies and gentlemen, that the very circumstances under which those questions are phrased—cold war, atomic age, world obligations—suggest that there are no easy answers. It will require men in public office with courage, loyalty without question to the United States, who will not play party politics in the selection of leaders in responsible positions.

The Republican Party has no easy answers to the complex questions of our day or any of the many related problems of the American people. Those who seek to enroll under a political banner that affords them an escape from reality will not find it here, for the party of Lincoln, in all honesty, must say to the American people: "These are your problems. They cannot be solved unless you are willing to think about them. Your representative government, which has endured for nearly two centuries, cannot be made to function effectively unless you are willing to shoulder your share of the responsibilities of citizenship. The American way cannot be preserved except by the same forces by which it was evolved—hard work, self-reliance, individual freedom, equality of opportunity, individual initiative, thrift, and prudence."

Those who would belong to a party which is all things to all men, whose policies are based, not upon the long-range needs of the future, but the immediate requirements to win the next election, and which promises all kinds of benefits to be paid out of what would seem to be an inexhaustible Federal Treasury, will not be at home in the Republican Party. Such a policy would lead this Nation down the road to socialism and eventual dictatorship, the road of many and many a nation in the past and which today is the experience of the great British Empire. Those who wish to play such politics must line up from the start with the party of which Santa Claus is the guiding spirit.

Those who imagine the Government owes them a living, must change not only their imaginations but the course of their thoughts. The great achievement of our industries and business has been on the basis of thrift, prudence, and economy and if the United States is to survive, thrift, economy, and a balanced budget in our National Government must be the keystone of our Government policy.

Now, there are a great number of people who think the Government can do everything, that it is a substitute for brains, thrift, and individual effort on the part of the people. They propose to abolish poverty oy law; they are sincere in believing we can spend ourselves rich.

There are some projects such as reclamation, flood control, harnessing the mighty powers of the water for generating hydroelectric power that individuals cannot do alone. That type of Government activity is needed. It enriches this Nation by the developing of such resources and man is better served by such developments. In fact, it is the new frontier of this era. It takes the place for the American youth of the vast undeveloped areas this Nation offered only a half century ago. We must recognize there is a need for such developments in order that we may meet our expanding population and the expansion of our industrial enterprise of this Nation.

The Republican Party has recognized these needs and has supported and worked for their achievement. The Republican Party does not propose to turn back the clock on the economic and social gains that have been made in this country.

The Republican Party has been a vigorous and vigilant minority party even in the heydey of the New Deal. We still have a strong two-party system in this country, regardless of what those who are preoccupied with election statistics may undertake to prove to the contrary. The two-party system is an absolute necessity for the survival of this democracy. One political party stands as a check against the other. We, the Republicans, shall continue to fight that the freedom of man and individual initiative may survive by holding the Government only as a servant to the people, rather than a power over the people.

Now, I have said that the Republican Party has fulfilled the historic duty of the opposition party in our representative Government. It has been critical and it has served as a brake. It has often said, "Well, now, let's examine this thing on the basis of facts." These are necessary functions of the party out of power.

Nevertheless, before we relegate the GOP to a permanent place as the minority party, let's see who is in the minority. Take the last election. Mr. Truman was reelected President with a vote of 49.5 percent—less than half of the total popular vote. Governor Dewey received 45.1 percent. The rest went to the third and fourth party candidates. It would be a wonderful thing if the winning candidate had received the approval of 49.5 percent of the qualified voters. Understand, I have said qualified voters but only 51.9 percent of the qualified voters voted. I call this to your attention because you have a responsibility as citizens to urge everyone to register and to vote in an election. Oh, if this cherished privilege of voting were actually taken away from us in the United States for a short period of time, we would then realize and appreciate what a privilege we had as free citizens—the right to go to the polls in a free election and vote for the men and women whom we want to serve us in public office.

The figure I have given you will prove conclusively that the Fair Deal cannot claim a mandate, even if it allied itself with those who did not go to the polls. We might say that those who did not go to the polls were just a little too certain in the last election that the Republicans had it "hands down." Don't let that happen in another election. Fight for the right that was given you when this country was founded. It is the only way this Nation will survive as a Nation of free people.

The prophets of doom who have relegated the Republican Party to an untimely death are facing the same disappointment as their fellow travelers who have long predicted the collapse of the American system of free enterprise and free government.

We believe that it is time the American people took stock of themselves. What other nation has created a better standard of living? What other country possesses the resources, the ingenuity, the incentive that America possesses? Where, under what political system, have as great strides been made to gain not only political but economic equality? What has been achieved in this great country has been done by the American people and it has been done under a two-party political system.

There are those who would be perfectly willing to entrust our representative Government to one party, perpetuated in power over long periods of time. One wonders sometimes whether the present occupant of the White House does not consider his leadership as the No. 1 Democrat ahead of being President of the United States. Certainly the Vice President is a Democrat first. There is no other way to explain the extravagant claims of the Vice President of the United States that credit for the progressive achievements of the American people during the first half of this century belong exclusively to the Democratic Party. That view is narrow and partisan. It puts a premium on politics. It forgets the united efforts of the American people to conquer the depression, or the costly sacrifices they made together to win two world wars. It is a claim unworthy of a Vice President of the United States. The American people have repeatedly rejected such smug claims on the part of their leaders in the past. They will do so again.

But, meanwhile, we Republicans accept the Veep's challenge that only good resides in Democratic control of the Government, and that nothing constructive can be expected from the Republicans if elected to power. Let's take a quick look at the record.

It was a Republican Congress under a Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, which passed the Reclamation Act of 1902 under which the Government of the United States undertook to champion the cause of irrigation by providing that irrigation works, beyond the easy reach of the ordinary cooperative methods, might be constructed with Federal funds. You in California know what this has meant in these 50 years since that act was passed.

And let me just add, in passing, that the Eightieth Congress—a Republican Congress—appropriated more money for reclamation and western development than any previous Congress in that half century.

When entrusted with power Republican Congresses and Republican administrations have done a great many other things for the benefit of the people during the first half of this century.

A Republican administration first made effective antitrust legislation, which has been called the Magna Carta of labor, agriculture, and industry.

A Republican administration, in 1903, established a Department of Commerce and Labor, which was divided 10 years later into two Departments of Cabinet rank.

A Republican administration launched the Panama Canal.

A Republican administration established the Postal Savings System.

A Republican Congress submitted the woman's suffrage amendment to the States.

A Republican administration adopted the Capper-Volstead Act to authorize the association of producers of agricultural products.

A Republican administration, in 1929, set up the Agricultural Marketing Act, a forerunner of modern agricultural legislation.

A Republican President, Herbert Hoover, recommended and obtained passage of the act establishing the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, one of the most important agencies used to conquer the depression, and still a vital agency of the Government in protecting savings and credit and assisting small business.

A Republican President led in the formation of the Federal system of home-loan banks and of the agricultural credit banks.

Republican governors and Republican administrations in a majority of States of the Union have made constructive, progressive, and brilliant contributions in every field of governmental activity in this half century.

The last national presidential election was won by Mr. Truman partly on the basis of a wholly unwarranted attack upon the Eightieth Congress when, as a matter of record, that Congress achieved much in spite of hostility and resistance from the entrenched administration. Let's name just a few of the achievements in that short 2-year period:

The Eightieth Congress launched the European recovery program.

The Eightieth Congress authorized unification of the armed services.

The Eightieth Congress cut six billion from the padded Truman budget.

The Eightieth Congress balanced the budget for the first time in 16 years.

The Eightieth Congress reduced wartime income taxes and gave 70 percent of the tax savings to those in lower-income groups.

The Eightieth Congress created a bipartisan Government Reorganization Commission, later known as the Hoover Commission.

When we consider politics and government, let me say that the American people, in the long run, will determine the type of government and the kind of policies they want. The Republican Party welcomes that fact because it wants the people to mold its policies and to determine its future.

There are some politicians who think that anything goes with the American people and, unfortunately, they have sometimes been correct in that unflattering analysis. Yet, these things have a way of coming out of the deep freeze, so to speak.

Take this matter of peddling influence in the high councils of the Government. A recent report of the Senate investigations subcommittee speaks of the eventual triumph for public virtue by pointing out that the fundamental reason for the success of the 5-percenter was that he was permitted to operate in secret behind the scenes. As long as this condition was allowed to exist, the 5-percenter flourished. Once the 5-percenter is exposed to the light of day, he can no longer survive.

So we are reassured, after all, that not everything goes with all the people. We find

that Lincoln was right when he said, "You can fool all the people some of the time, and some of the people all the time, but you cannot fool all the people all the time." I would just add the thought that if our people have access to the facts, you can't fool them for long, either on domestic matters or foreign policy.

As a matter of fact, we have recently had good reason to be concerned over commitments made in the international field without thorough understanding on the part of the American people or of Congress. Our Government participated in international conferences of great moment—at Yalta, at Potsdam, at other far places—but they were not open negotiations and some secret decisions were reached. We are still not certain what some of those agreements were, but we do know that they opened a whole world of difficult problems, on the continent of Europe, in the Near East, and most tragically of all, in the downfall or collapse of our once honored ally in war, Nationalist China.

Such conferences, in which our Government officials conferred in secrecy and inn which the American people did not participate through their Representatives in Congress, were not intended by the founding fathers. I doubt whether such an able leader as Senator VANDENBERG, had he been consulted, would have approved a situation where Berlin is permitted to sit virtually as an island, surrounded by Russian-controlled territory in Germany, where an air lift became a necessity for the allies to supply their sector in Berlin. I doubt if he or any other able congressional leaders would have tolerated the development of a similar situation in Austria where the Russians have delayed a peace treaty and where the great city of Vienna is completely surrounded by Soviet-held and Soviet-controlled territory.

Appeasement of the Soviet Government, so evident in all of these matters—in Manchuria, in China, in Germany, and Austria—is shocking enough when we realize what has taken place and how it has complicated the whole problem of world peace. It becomes even more shocking when we learn that a keyman who stood at the elbow of our President at Yalta, advising him on Russian and far eastern affair, since has been publicly convicted of being a fellow traveler of the Communists, if not worse.

We face a most critical situation with relation to China. It is obvious that we have not shown the same decisive, courageous attitude toward the problems in China that we showed in the defiance of Russia in our Berlin air lift and in our positive action in the European recovery program as well as the Atlantic Pact. I am not passing judgment on what we have done in China and what we are doing in Formosa except to say that the situation is not reassuring. We cannot desert our Government as it deals with these matters, but we have reason to be thankful, nevertheless, that we have in the Senate of the United States a vigilant Republican minority that wants to know what is going on and why.

There is need for a bipartisan foreign policy. The world problems are so perplexing, there is so much dependent upon the United States in world leadership, that we must stand united, we cannot be divided. We cannot be united unless the American people really know and understand our foreign policy. For that reason I say to the present administration, if it asks for a bipartisan attitude toward foreign relations, it must be a two-way avenue. They must be frank and honest with the minority on the foreign questions. The policy must be open to legitimate criticism. All questions must be open to intelligent debate to afford the American people an understanding of the problem. This is not an easy way, but it is the American way.

In much of the history of our representative government as it is written in the utterances of our political leaders, considerable stress is laid on such words as frugality, thrift, and economy, to say nothing of a shockingly reactionary phrase, "balanced budget." But in these days when the conservatives are in the "dog house," some new and shall we say foreign theories of fiscal policy have come into being, and with them the same cynical idea that anything goes. It reaches its climax in such slogans as "spend and spend, tax and tax, elect and elect."

Ten years ago Federal Government expenditures amounted to about $69 for each man, woman, and child in the country. In the fiscal year 1951 the per capita expenditure is estimated at more than four times that amount, or $278.

With this vast expenditure, amounting in total to an estimated $42,400,000,000 during the coming fiscal year, our Government has embarked on a policy of deficit financing. It is estimated that the deficit will be $5,100,000,000 next year; it is $5,500,000,000 for this year; it was $1,800,000,000 last year. Those figures, the amounts we are running behind year after year, represent a lot of money. They represent, also, a wholly unsound approach to Government fiscal policies in times of peace, and full production and plenty.

That question is one that must be weighed by everyone whether he be the man toiling in the shop, factory, or processing plant, the man classified as the white-collar worker, the executive who heads one of the great corporations of the land, or the corner merchant. Everyone must recognize that we cannot indefinitely spend more than we take in without passing on to our children financial burdens that they will not be able to carry. We cannot continue a free-enterprise system when we spend more than the revenue from sound taxation. Nor can we tax people too much and still have venture capital to create new businesses and expand present businesses, thereby creating the jobs that men and women are constantly seeking as a means of providing their own security. There would be no incentive for a man to work if he knew that it would all be taken from him in the form of taxation, either by inheritance taxes or the year-to-year taxes.

The best answer I can find to deficit financing is just to think of it in terms of a family budget. The credit of the family depends chiefly on whether the family is living within its income. And that is equally true of the Nation.

Our own course of deficit spending is not sound and it is our children who will be asked to carry the financial burdens in the future years.

The Republican Party stands for a sound program of Government financing. This means reducing the cost of government, staying within our income, and paying off our debt.

We advocate a program for agriculture that will give the producer necessary protection with a minimum of regulation and regimentation. We urge a program for labor and management that will assure fairness and balance in their relationship, with the Government an umpire and not a punitive agent.

In the field of social security and welfare, we intend to preserve and strengthen the gains that have been achieved as we have developed enlightened and humane policies, but we are vigorously opposed to radical experiments such as socialized medicine as advocated by Oscar Ewing and his associates.

We are determined to make this a Nation economically strong and productive, a Nation where civil rights and equal opportunity are confirmed in experience and not merely promised to catch votes, a Nation where national security and internal justice are commonplace and not virtues merely to be extolled by public speakers. These things we shall try to do for all, and not for one class arrayed against another class, or one group promoted at the expense of another group.

We propose to make secure and lasting the peace which was bought by such a costly sacrifice of American youth on battlefields of a global war, and by the vast investment of the productive capacity of our people. We shall do this by sustaining the European recovery program, implementing the North Atlantic Treaty, strengthening the United Nations, and revitalizing our far eastern policy, knowing that unless we go forward with courage and determination in these matters we may find that, by waiting until the dust clears, what we have to offer has become too little and too late.

Above all, the Republican Party stands for freedom of the individual, freedom of enterprise and initiative, and freedom from the evils of too great dependence upon Government.

With this challenge and this opportunity, let us, then, in the spirit of Lincoln, dedicate ourselves and our party to the proposition "that this Nation, under God, shall have a new birth of freedom."

"Old Order Passeth"

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter entitled "Old Order Passeth," written to the editor by Ed Wimmer, of Cincinnati, and published in the Cincinnati Enquirer of January 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

READERS' VIEWS

"OLD ORDER PASSETH"

To the EDITOR OF THE ENQUIRER:

I have just read your lead editorial of December 27 entitled "The Old Order Passeth." I write to congratulate you, not only on the soundness of this one editorial, but to express my appreciation of the many other excellent declarations of faith which have preceded it.

It is too bad that more people do not turn to the editorial page instead of so often to the news and comic strips.

In this editorial you rightly criticize the present tendency of the Federal Government to "graduate income taxes so steeply as to make it impossible for an individual to withhold any sizable amount of his earnings." You deplore this tendency on the part of the tax gatherers as one which not only deprives the individual of his just earnings, but which will in the near future tend to shut off private endowments to community projects, research foundations, universities, or other institutions.

The time has come when all thinking Americans should join in such a protest as you have voiced. This leveling off idea was the beginning of the end of freedom in other nations, and if continued in this country not only the wealthy but all individuals will be paying their surplus earnings into the Federal Treasury and be dependent upon the Federal Government for everything above basic requirements.

We all know that in many instances that wealth is unduly accumulated, but the present policy is almost wholly opposed to the idea that the essence of private security is the right to earn and save more than one may actually need, and then to put such savings to productive use. Viewing the present scene one might well inquire, "Who will defend liberty and democracy when the thrifty have been wiped out with too much care of the unthrifty?"

All around us is a changing of governments due to collapsing economies, and the only reason that we have not gone down and under with the rest is our faith in the Jeffersonian principle of "proper reward for effort expended."

The only thing that will open up the Golden Age now beckoning to us is a rebirth of self-reliance, self-determination, individual, competitive enterprise, and a rededication of ourselves to the preservation of self-government.

If the "old order passeth," in which men are rewarded according to their worth, the fault will not be that of the Federal Government, but rather will it rest with those citizens who are so willingly yielding their personal liberties in exchange for the subsidies and false security which a government can promise, but which no government can continue to deliver.

ED WIMMER.

CINCINNATI.

Fantastic Lustron Case

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD MARTIN
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Fantastic Lustron Case," published in the Pittsburgh (Pa.) Press of recent date.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FANTASTIC LUSTRON CASE

Carl G. Strandlund, representing a Chicago company in the business of building filling stations, traveled to Washington in 1946.

He wanted priorities for a little steel, then so scarce that the Government rationers would let him have none for filling stations.

But Government housing expediters gave him a new idea. Maybe he could mass produce prefabricated steel houses. If so, they'd get him steel.

Prefab housing was a field strange to Mr. Strandlund. He would need capital to venture into it and he could afford to risk only $1,000 of his own money. But the housing expediters had an answer for that problem—the Government's Reconstruction Finance Corporation had plenty of money.

So Mr. Strandlund organized the Lustron Corp., and leased, for $425,000 a year, a Government-owned former war plant at Columbus, Ohio. And, from the White House, Presidential Assistant John R. Steelman wrote a letter urging the RFC to make a loan to Lustron.

The first RFC loan, $15,000,000, was granted June 30, 1947. A year later Mr. Strandlund needed, and got, ten millions more. Four months later he needed and got, seven millions more. Thereafter he needed, and got, five millions more, bringing his total borrowings from the RFC to $37,500,000.

Lustron started line production of prefab houses in June 1949. Since then it has been able to produce and sell fewer than 2,000 of them. Cost to the purchaser, including a lot, has ranged from $10,000 to $14,000.

It has not been able to repay any part of the $37,500,000 owed to the RFC. Nor, in recent months, has Mr. Strandlund, been able to convince the RFC that he can make a go of the venture if only the RFC will lend him some more millions.

Now the RFC has decided to foreclose on its Lustron loans, with small chance of ever recovering more than a few cents on the dollar.

Well, of course, it's only money that the RFC will lose. But part of it happens to be your money, taken from you in Federal taxes.

So perhaps you'll agree with Congressman ALBERT M. COLE, of Kansas, that here is a sorry example of what happens when the Government goes into business and makes decisions on the basis of politics, favoritism, and wirepulling.

You will, we hope, want to add your voice to the demands for a congressional investigation of the Lustron affair and of other RFC lending activities.

And we may conclude, as we do, that Congress should call a halt on bureaucrats who risk the people's money in ventures which most of the people, if they had any say about it, would not undertake.

Segregation in the Army

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, in connection with the fight which I have been waging to eliminate all segregation from the Army, there is appended hereto a factual news report which illustrates again that given the same opportunity American troops will respond to proper training regardless of their race, creed, or color:

[From the New York Times]

ARMY FINDS NEGRO EXCELLENT PUPIL—THOUSANDS TRAINED AT SCHOOL IN GERMANY SHOW APTITUDE FOR BECOMING LEADERS

KITZINGEN, GERMANY, February 12.—The United States Army is turning thousands of Negro soldiers into top-notch fighting men at a base, once a German air force installation, on the outskirts of this old Bavarian city.

At Kitzingen Training Center, the largest Army school in the European command, a student body of about 1,200 men goes through concentrated academic, military, and character-building courses that raise educational levels and provide the students with a better understanding of military tactics and methods.

According to Col. Henry C. Newton, of Los Angeles, commandant of the center, the Negro students, whose ages range from 19 to 35, have demonstrated a remarkable talent for grasping knowledge and have shown a high potential for becoming military leaders.

Failures among the soldier students have been below 10 percent. At the end of 1949 more than 13,000 men had been graduated from the center with diplomas.

"These men will be a great asset to the Army," Colonel Newton said.

Asserting his belief in academic training for soldiers, Colonel Newton explained:

"Our Army is airborne and highly mechanized. Our men must know mechanics, understand orders, and have a thorough knowledge of maps and terrain. To an educated man these things come easier. That is why we have undertaken this program for Negroes who now comprise 10 percent of our strength in the European Command."

The training center here has a faculty of 70 instructors, both white and Negro. The curriculum is divided into three categories: General subjects, motors, and weapons. The academic instruction begins with basic education for men of less than fifth grade educations.

By means of careful screening, new testing methods and improved classroom instruction the basic-level group has been nearly eliminated.

The program also includes an 8-week development course for noncommissioned officers designed to strengthen qualities of leadership and initiative; an 8-week education instructors' training course planned to orient and instrument special personnel as teachers for the Army's regular educational program; a 1-month orientation course for new personnel; and a 4-week education refresher course to supplement and continue the training of educational instructors.

The center covers a wide area. It has rifle and pistol ranges, training fields, and 49 modern buildings including 11 dormitories, school buildings, and recreation centers. There is a well equipped library, a good gymnasium, bowling alleys, game rooms, club rooms, stores, and a moving-picture theater.

Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EDWARD J. THYE
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled, "Stalin's Stooges Left Imprint on American Policy," published in the February 25, 1950, issue of the Saturday Evening Post. The editorial is not only thought-provoking, but it calls to our attention things which have happened in the past, which may have a very serious imprint and effect upon our Government, not only for the present, but the future.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STALIN'S STOOGES LEFT IMPRINT ON AMERICAN POLICY

The turmoil caused by Secretary of State Acheson's citation of scriptural authority for visiting Alger Hiss in prison or even out on bail may have been a little overdone. After all, the Christian admonition does not limit such attentions to prisoners who have been acquitted. The fuss tended to obscure the main question, which is: What was the impact on American foreign and domestic pol-

icy of the presence in the Government of Alger Hiss and others who believed as he did? In the future annals of our history, it is certain that stolen documents will play a part less important than the ability of Communists and fellow travelers in Government posts to point American policy in directions favorable to Moscow. A memorandum here, a "minute" to a state paper there, perhaps slanting information necessary for decisions at the "policy-making level"—these will be seen to be the real reasons why Communists and fellow travelers were spotted in strategic positions throughout the administration.

Senator KARL MUNDT, of South Dakota, in a well-documented address to his colleagues, did something to keep current thinking on the right track. Going back over American postwar foreign policy, Senator MUNDT pointed out that Alger Hiss had received key behind-the-scenes assignments at the Dumbarton Oaks Conference; at Yalta, where we lost to Russia the war we had just won from Japan; and at San Francisco, where were laid the legalistic foundations for Soviet sabotage of the United Nations. At Yalta, Senator MUNDT points out on the authority of the late Ed Stettinius, then Secretary of State, Hiss continually expanded his functions so that at one point he was the sole United States representative on the committee which recommended giving Russia three votes in the UN Assembly to America's one. He was also called in to do the legal work on the Yalta decision on the Polish boundary dispute.

These official activities may mean much or little, but they provide fascinating material for speculation, perhaps for investigation as well. Certainly more damage to the cause of free peoples was accomplished through these conferences than by any secret papers our fellow-traveler friends managed to slip to Elizabeth Bentley or Whittaker Chambers. For example, Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who died before the House Un-American Activities Committee could go to town on him, is understood to be the real author of the so-called Morgenthau plan for the pastoralizing of Germany. White, in some mysterious fashion, acquired enormous influence on our German policy, theoretically administered by the State Department and the Army of Occupation. White's minions in Germany succeeded in postponing any constructive recovery program for Germany and are therefore in no small degree responsible for the expansion of Soviet prestige among the Germans. These characters managed to survive long after our policy toward Germany had changed. Upon being sent back home, some of them carried on their pro-Communist activities by explaining to liberals that General Clay or Commissioner McCloy or both were reviving nazism and cartels in order to promote an attack on Russia in world war III.

Who had the bright idea that Dexter White should step out from his job in the Treasury to take on the diplomatic task of forming American policy on Germany? Why wasn't his leftist attitude suspected by those who made the appointment? Or was White's point of view supposed to qualify him for such responsibilities? According to the Un-American Activities Committee, the purpose of the Red apparatus was not primarily espionage, but Communist infiltration of the American Government—the subordination of American policy to Russian purposes. Therefore, a probe of this infiltration should be as profitable as the investigation of espionage proved to be.

The justification for this curiosity is that the primary purpose of Red infiltration through innocents, fellow travelers and actual agents was largely achieved. On the vital issues presented by the war, we let Stalin write his own ticket. We consider ourselves bound by these disadvantageous agreements. If it can be shown that all or any of them were the result of the labors of Communist agents spotted among the stuffed shirts at international conferences, the world might as well know the facts.

The American Congress and people should know the facts, too, if only for use in detecting and ridding our services of remaining subversive influences. The truth about Red impact on American policy will also prove useful when and if our one-sided effort to play ball with Russia becomes impossible, and we decide to claim a foul.

Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Bankruptcy Results in Dictatorship," written by Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc., and published in the Hoosier Farmer, February 1950 edition.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BANKRUPTCY RESULTS IN DICTATORSHIP
(By Hassil E. Schenck, president, Indiana Farm Bureau, Inc.)

With the Eighty-first Congress again in session and with a great multiplicity of issues to be considered, there are a few which stand out as of utmost importance because they indicate trends which will influence the destinies of men in this Nation and probably in the world.

One of these is the matter of deficit financing. Many sound businesses resort to deficit financing on occasions. Sound government may well do likewise. No sound business, however, can continuously go in the red and stay in business. It will eventually go into receivership and be liquidated. When receivership takes over any corporate business, democracy ends so far as that particular business is concerned and dictatorship takes over. The stockholders no longer have a voice—the trustee in receivership, under the direction of the courts, issues the ultimatums. History bears out the fact that if governments approach insolvency the roads are paved for dictatorship.

JUST TWO BALANCED BUDGETS

Our Nation went into deficit financing in the latter part of the Hoover administration. We have had, from that day to this, just 2 years in which the budget was balanced and with slight reductions in the Federal debt. Those were the fiscal years ending in 1947 and 1948, with 1949 finding us back in the red again and with 1950 indicating a deficit of some $6,000,000,000.

Bear in mind that today our Federal debt is at the $257,000,000,000 level and also remember that in the middle thirties there was a congressional limit of $30,000,000,000 beyond which it was considered economically unsound for this country to plunge into debt. Our debt is now over eight and one-half times what 15 years ago was regarded by economists as the maximum debt which this country could stand. The Eighty-first and possibly Eighty-second Congresses will determine future fiscal policies, which will affect the everyday lives of our citizens.

An aroused citizenship can make its sentiments felt through the proper organized channels. With the farmers, this is through Farm Bureau.

NO SUCH ANIMAL

We seem to be living in an age when people want something for nothing. There just "ain't no such animal." Everything the public gets from the Government not only costs somebody, but it also costs additional for administration and interest on accumulated debts. No dollar can ever get to Washington and back without considerable leakage.

This, and/or the next Congress, will determine whether the farmer's security is to be subject to Government appropriations with Government control over what a farmer plants and markets and with Government regimentation of all handlers, processors, and distributors of food products, or whether we shall have a broad program with a minimum of regimentation, a maximum of personal liberties, and a guaranty to the farmers of an equitable income with an absolute minimum of subsidization. The latter can and should be effected.

GOVERNMENT MEDICINE IS AN ISSUE

Still another issue that will be determined is whether or not moneys shall be raised by Government from the taxpayers of our country to pay for hospitalization and medical care of our people. England is experiencing this now, and indications are that it is much to their sorrow. Government has some definite responsibilities to see that hospitals and/or medical centers under local controls are available in sufficient numbers and size to meet the actual needs of the various areas. Available local resources should be used wherever possible and in every instance Federal appropriations should be matched with local funds.

In recent decisions by the electorates of New Zealand and Australia, socialistic trends were definitely reversed. All the world has an eye on England to see what will happen in the weeks ahead. In the meantime every citizen in America should be thinking most seriously whether or not we should break away from precedents which have made our country the most independent, the most unselfish, the most powerful, the most resourceful nation in all the world, or whether we should pattern after those countries which are right now looking to us for help to prevent their economic collapse.

Liberty in Crisis

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HERBERT H. LEHMAN
OF NEW YORK
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, on Wednesday evening, February 22, I made an address at the thirtieth anniversary dinner of the American Civil Liberties Union in New York City. I ask unanimous consent of the Senate to insert this speech entitled "Liberty in Crisis," which proposes a point 4 program for human rights, in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LIBERTY IN CRISIS—A POINT 4 PROGRAM FOR HUMAN RIGHTS—AN ANALYSIS OF LIBERTY'S ROLE IN THE WORLD CONFLICT

We are gathered here tonight to do honor to a great captain in the unending battle for human rights. Roger Baldwin has fought all his life, to secure for his countrymen the full exercise of those rights. But I was told beforehand that Roger Baldwin wished tonight to be honored by a discussion of civil liberty rather than of Roger Baldwin. So, it is to do him not less but more honor that I turn attention from Roger Baldwin's personal achievements of the past to the problem which confronts him and all of us today—the problem of civil liberty in its international and world aspects.

Not only civil liberty but all liberty stands in serious peril as a result of the forces which face us in the world today. If we succumb in the current struggle against these forces, the lamp of freedom may be extinguished for us and for our children, and for generations to come. But the threat is not one of aggression alone. If it were only that simple? Liberty faces a triple threat—aggression from without, subversion from within, and finally self-destruction. In our efforts to ward off the first two dangers, we must not yield to the third. We can lose our liberties by denying them gradually to our own people, as surely as by surrendering them suddenly to an enemy.

This is the first paradox we face in a world torn by struggle and conflict. But this paradox is not as simple as it sounds. In order to uphold liberty in a world of clashing ideologies, our first concern must be to guard and maintain liberty at home. How else can we urge the blessings of liberty upon other peoples? But how can we prevent the enemies of freedom in our own country from using that very freedom to destroy it for the rest of us? In this question lies the riddle of 1950. That riddle has not yet been wholly solved. Any solution contains some elements of danger. But one fact we know from history, and that is this: Freedom is indivisible. To deny it unjustly or arbitrarily to some is to endanger it for us all.

We must bear in mind that the Kremlin is well aware of this inner paradox of democracy and is quick to remind us of it and to aggravate it. Nothing would suit the purposes of the Politburo more than the crumbling away of political freedom in America. Anything which the enemies of democracy can do to excite us into hasty and repressive action is marked as a success in Moscow.

But this is only the first problem which we face. Another, and perhaps an equally serious one, is the fact that all Americans do not have the same value in mind when they speak of liberty. We do not all mean the same thing when we speak of tyranny.

Almost a hundred years ago an American statesman said: "The world has never had a good definition of liberty. * * * We all declare for liberty, but we do not all mean the same thing. With some, the word 'liberty' may mean for each man to do as he pleases with himself and the product of his labor; while with others the same word may mean for some men to do as they please with other men and with the product of other men's labor."

The man who gave this definition of the problem of his day was Abraham Lincoln in a speech at Baltimore in 1864. The problem of 1860 is still with us. But today it is even more pressing than it was a century ago. Today the belief held by some few Americans that liberty is the right to exploit, regardless of the rights of those exploited, makes it all the more difficult for America to convince other peoples that our kind of liberty is a cause worth fighting and struggling for.

And finally, we come to the third and most difficult of the problems of liberty, the denial of full equality and rights to some of our citizens because of their race, religion, or national origin. Every such denial of equality in this country, every such denial of political, economic, or social rights is being magnified abroad today as a cynical contradiction of our professed claims of freedom and justice. And honest men must admit that these denials are hard to explain to foreigners who hear us describe our country as the homeland of liberty and equality.

These inequalities and discriminations exist in our country by virtue of law in some cases, but in most cases by custom. The most obvious of these discriminations and inequalities are those against American citizens of Negro race. And I say to you tonight, as I have said again and again, that this shame, this blot upon our national honor furnishes ammunition to our enemies more deadly than bullets and shells.

Of course, we must not be discouraged by thes circumstances into feeling that we have no right or duty to preach liberty to the world. The fact is that we are pressing forward, with full vigor, to eradicate the cancer of discrimination and inequality from the national body politic. The policy of our Government in this field is clear and determined.

We are holding out to the world an ideal which even some of our own people do not completely understand. But great things have been wrought in this world, and they have been wrought by imperfect men and women, and by imperfect nations. We need to be truly shamed by our failures only on the day we cease to struggle for liberty and equality at home. While we continue our efforts to expand the rights and freedoms of all our citizens, we must offer our energies in the struggle to bring rights and freedoms to all mankind.

But how is this to be done? There are 2,250,000,000 people in the world. It is true that the vast majority are not Communist. But neither are they prodemocratic. The fact is that they are uncommitted. Today they hear the siren song of the Kremlin and of other advocates of totalitarianism. Communism does not promise these people personal liberty. But communism does promise—however falsely—food, equality, and security.

Can we promise less? Or should we promise more? Of course, there are some among us who would have us stand only on the atom and hydrogen bombs, and on naked military power. Certainly it is necessary that we be militarily strong and powerful. But military power is not enough. Through single dependence on military might, we might avoid attack, but we would inevitably invite being isolated and engulfed. I believe that we must offer, in addition, a positive program to the peoples of the world.

I believe that we must acknowledge and take into account the desire of these peoples for economic security. It is a tragic fact of history that if men cannot have both freedom and economic security, they will often surrender freedom, or abandon the search for it, in the false and wistful hope of winning economic security. We must advocate both freedom and security. We must make our technology and mechanical know-how available to other peoples so that their dream of security may be truly attainable.

I believe that we must stand for food, for housing, and for the ordinary comforts of living for all men. I do not mean that we should undertake to support the rest of the world. Obviously we cannot. But we can and must engage in a cooperative undertaking with all other nations to help them raise their standard of living.

Finally, and above all, we should stand for liberty—for the right of every man and woman to think freely, to worship freely, and to live freely—free of the fear of economic as well as political and religious oppression.

This is my formula. It is, indeed, a general one. How are we to implement it? It must be implemented by more than words. It must be implemented by action.

That action can be undertaken on three separate but closely related fronts.

We have the Marshall plan. It is a good plan, and must be carried through to its completion. We have given, and are continuing to give, great amounts of food and other aid through which many millions of people have been and are being saved from starvation. We must continue that program on a sound, sensible but not extravagant basis.

More recently, we have conceived the point 4 program. This is an even more dynamic project. I have great hopes for it. Through it, we can carry on the work of helping peoples to help themselves. Through it our vast and almost unlimited store of knowledge can be shared with other nations and peoples. Through that knowledge the nations may find the tools, each people in its own way, to build a better economic life. In the wake of this program, investment will flow. In its aftermath, economic strength will develop.

And finally, liberty. It is axiomatic that peace, plenty, and security are empty values without liberty. But only exceptional individuals will continue to fight for liberty in the face of hunger and total economic insecurity. This is a fact we must face, but without discouragement. And so I propose tonight that we launch a point 4 program for human rights, in close association with our point 4 program for economic betterment. Let America lead the way in espousing freedom for oppressed peoples everywhere, and I mean everywhere, whether it be behind or in front of the iron curtain. Let America lead the way in espousing the cause of both freedom and plenty, of liberty and security. And let America show the way by strengthening and expanding democracy and equality here at home.

This is my challenge to you here tonight, and to all Americans. It is my challenge to the Roger Baldwins everywhere. I have deep faith in mankind's ultimate ability to contain the terrible forces which have been loosed among us. I shall never abandon the hope that freedom and security for all peoples is an attainable goal. It is a goal that may not be fully attained in my time, but it must come, lest we perish from the earth.

Costs of Election in the United States and Great Britain

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. OWEN BREWSTER

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with election expenditures and revenues in this country and in England, by Gould Lincoln, from the Evening Star of last night.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES ELECTION COSTS ARE STILL VERY HIGH—COMPARISON MADE WITH BRITISH EXPENDITURES

(By Gould Lincoln)

The high cost of elections in the United States has periodically been the subject of attack. The various corrupt practices acts, including the Hatch Act—the most recent of the statutes—may have put a check on these ever-mounting expenditures in political campaigns, but the cost of a national election is still tremendously high. Compare it, for example, to the cost of a national election campaign in England—which has just taken place.

Under the strict British election laws, one political party with a candidate for each of the 625 seats in the House of Commons is limited to $1,087,500 for campaign purposes. This is made up as follows: Each candidate in a constituency, whether county or borough may spend £450, about $1,260, plus about 1 cent for each registered voter. If 30,000,000 are registered voters, then it adds approximately $300,000 to the sum of 625 times $1,260. Treble the total and you have about $3,000,000, and probably far less was spent.

Take a look at the reported expenditures reported by 144 organizations participating in the 1948 national campaign in the United States. The total was $13,563,878. These reports came from the political committees of all parties with candidates in the field and from labor groups and other groups such as the Americans for Democratic Action. These are reports of committees. Individual expenditures, it is believed, run the total election costs much, much higher.

CHARGES LOOK SILLY

Although President Truman, like his predecessor, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has sought constantly to pin the label of "special interests"—wealthy interests—on the Republican Party, an examination of the contributions made by the so-called "fat cats" to the GOP and to the Democratic Party makes such charges look silly.

A recent and exhaustive survey of political contributions, made by Congressional Quarterly, shows that these fat cats are warming themselves in the Democratic corner. In the off year, 1949—when only a few State-wide elections and a handful of congressional elections to fill vacancies were held—contributions reported by the Democratic committees totaled $1,477,427, and by the Republican committees, $661,804.

The big contributors, too, were on the Democratic side, overwhelmingly. For contributions of $1,000 or more made up about one-sixth of the total intake of money by the Republicans and about one-third of the total intake by the Democrats. The list of these big contributors to the Democratic Party showed the names of many industrialists as well as of some of the wealthy members of the diplomatic corps. And the Democratic list made the Republican list puny by comparison.

MANY BIG CONTRIBUTIONS

Why do these people of wealth now contribute to war chests of the Democratic Party? Is it for favors they hope to receive from an administration that is doing billions of dollars worth of business? Is it because of fear of a shake-down? Or is it just for love of the Democratic Party and President Truman? There were 300 contributions by individuals ranging from $1,000 to $5,000 each, made to the Democratic National Committee.

During 1949, the expenditures by the political committees, especially the Democratic and Republican National Committees, were largely for the maintenance of their party headquarters and staff—now permanent, all the year round organizations of considerable size. With a congressional election coming up this year, the contributions and expenditures for the campaign will be tremendously increased. The labor groups have promised to spend millions to defeat Senator TAFT, of Ohio, and other Members of Congress who have incurred their wrath.

Byrd Joins GOP Attack on Truman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "BYRD Joins GOP Attack on Truman," written by Edward T. Folliard, and published in the Washington Post of February 18, 1950.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

BYRD JOINS GOP ATTACK ON TRUMAN—VIEWS GIVEN IN PARITY SPEECH ADD "INSULT TO INJURY," HE SAYS

(By Edward T. Folliard)

Republicans struck back yesterday at President Truman for his Jefferson-Jackson Day speech but the most vehement retort came from a member of his own party—Senator BYRD, Democrat, Virginia.

BYRD took up Mr. Truman's statement that the Republican slogan, "Liberty against socialism," was an insult to the intelligence of the American people, and said:

"If it is an insult to the intelligence of the American people to say that we are on the road to socialism, as the President 'cracked' last night, then the insult is added to the injury already done our intellect by Truman proposals and propaganda.

"We have been moving steadily down this primrose path for some time, but we shall be irrevocably committed to socialism—from which there is no retreat once it is entrenched—if Congress adopts but three more of the President's projects."

Senator BYRD, who was not one of those who paid $100 to attend the Jefferson-Jackson dinner, listed the three as follows:

"Socialized medicine (British brand)—the project assigned to Oscar Ewing, who was sent to England at public expense to get the 'low down' as a basis for his propaganda.

"Socialized agriculture—called the Brannan plan, after its propagandists of the same name—which would give the Federal Government control over the sale and distribution of food, despite fundamental opposition by the great farmers' organizations.

"Extension of socialized housing—the project long ago adopted by Propagandist Keyserling, who plugs his wares in reports of the Council of Economic Advisers."

DEBATE WITH TAFT PROPOSED

"Add to these the President's public embrace of chronic deficit spending and you have a nonstop, high-speed highway to socialism, with or without an insulted intelligence."

Representative WOODRUFF, Republican, Michigan, proposed that President Truman and Senator TAFT, Republican, Ohio, debate the issues of 1950 from a platform in TAFT'S home State. He was prompted to make the suggestion by Mr. Truman's announcement that he would campaign in Ohio this fall.

Said WOODRUFF:

"I would like to hear, and the people of the Nation would like to hear Senator TAFT and Mr. Truman debate publicly on the trend to socialism, the mounting costs of Federal Government, the entire lack of economy in Government, and the ever-increasing tax burden on the people. I feel sure that Senator TAFT would be delighted to meet the President on the hustings."

BROWN FOUND TRUMAN AMUSING

Representative BROWN, Republican, Ohio, had this to say about President Truman's speech:

"I was amused by Mr. Truman calling the Republican Party a cuttlefish squirting out black ink to confuse national issues. I prefer the black ink of a Republican cuttlefish to his red herring and the red ink in which it writes its deficits."

Representative CURTIS, Republican, Nebraska, said Mr. Truman once more "has proved he is a prisoner of the irresponsible, left-wing spendthrift groups—predominantly CIO—in our country."

Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, Democratic leader of the Senate, said Mr. Truman's speech was an excellent answer to the Republicans' "phony slogan, 'Liberty against socialism.'"

"It seemed to me," LUCAS added, "the President gave that phrase a complete knockout. I predict that before long they will be talking about some other slogan."

Appraisal of Military Defenses of the United States

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ESTES KEFAUVER
OF TENNESSEE
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial from this week's issue of Life magazine, which every Member of Congress and every American should read.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE NATURE OF THE ENEMY

This week Life appraises the military defenses of the United States in the light of the military capacity of the Soviet Union. This appraisal is undertaken in awareness that the problem of United States defense is not entirely a military problem. The American people could make no worse mistake than to assume that there is safety in military defense alone, however massive and costly the defense may become.

Then why undertake such an appraisal?

First, although there is no sure safety in military defense alone, there is sure ruin in any miscalculation or neglect of military defense.

Second, the wisdom and adequacy with which the officials who are in charge of United States policy calculate the defense necessities of the time provide a measure of the wisdom and adequacy with which they calculate the total necessities of the time.

The net showing of our report is that the defense necessities of the United States have

been avoidably underestimated by the President, by his Secretary of Defense and (to the extent that they have participated in final policy decisions) by the chiefs of the military services. Not in extenuation of these officials but to indicate the scale of the turn-about in attitudes and policy now required, this must be added:

The official estimate of United States defense necessities has on the whole been welcomed by the United States Congress, the public, and the press. The dominant desire has been to let the postwar economy run its course toward full civilian abundance. Most everybody had come to realize that the United States was in something called the world conflict, that the conflict might even be called a kind of war and that a certain amount of dollars and goods had to be put up for the fight against communism, which most everybody had come to detest. But hardly anybody really thought that the United States was really in a real war, a war for survival that might cut into the civilian economy and take more out of it than the United States has as yet been willing to pony up.

Now, chunk by chunk, the walls of illusion are falling away.

COMMUNISM AND THE OFFICIAL MIND

Some of the facts confronting the United States and all mankind are terrible, adding up to the single, elemental fact that Soviet communism is committed to the destruction of the free world. This elemental fact is still not accepted, not in its entirety and not in its full meaning, by millions who think in one corner of their minds that they do perceive the innermost fact of the Communist enemy but with another corner of their minds decline to accept and act upon the full implications of the fact. This is fatefully true of all too many of the men who mold and execute western thought and policy.

Consider Dean Acheson, the United States Secretary of State. He recognizes more and more of the separate facts of the conflict, but he still shrinks from the final fact. On February 8 Mr. Acheson said in a carefully considered statement that the Soviet system "is incompatible with a world situation which is based on peace" and concluded that only agreements based on the facts of power mean anything. So far so good—the statement was a decided advance on anything Mr. Acheson or any other administration spokesman had said previously. Yet Mr. Acheson, speaking of the achievement of peace, seemed to assume (as he has always assumed) a point at which accommodation if not formal agreement with Soviet communism would be possible.

NOW THERE IS NO TIME FOR LEARNING

Or consider Mr. Acheson's boss and admirer, President Truman. In an authorized interview with the New York Times the President said last week that he had given up any hope of meaningful agreement with the Soviet Union some years ago (although he has been talking confidently of getting over-all agreement within the past year). He said that in 1948 he wanted to send Chief Justice Fred Vinson to Moscow to "straighten out Stalin" and would have done so if the campaign had not been on. He indicated that he still has this in mind to do "some time." He also said (as paraphrased by the Times), "The real trouble with the Russians is that they are still suffering from a complex of fear and inferiority where we are concerned." Evidently the President still does not understand the real trouble with the Soviet Communists. It is, as cannot be said too often, their fixed purpose to promote by every possible means the destruction of all non-Communist societies.

Urgent demands for one more talk with Stalin are heard on every hand. Another talk with Stalin may be in order. But not on the assumption that any deal with Soviet communism can enable the two worlds (as Winston Churchill put it last week) to live their lives in separate peace. Statements assuming that the two worlds of freedom and bondage can do so, render a twofold disservice. First, they obscure and postpone the total understanding of the enemy's purpose which is necessary if Soviet communism is to be repulsed and in the end defeated without universal disaster. Second, they unwittingly serve one of the main purposes of Soviet communism's world propaganda. Soviet propagandists are doing their utmost to cultivate in the western mind a sense of responsibility for creating a war situation, a guilty conviction that the West is somehow failing to do all that it might to achieve agreement with a foe who makes agreement impossible. However inspired they may seem, however deep the yearning they may assuage, statements which elide or overlook the dedicated enmity of Soviet communism are so much grist for the Soviet mill of guilt.

Official and public understanding of the Soviet enemy has advanced considerably since Yalta and Potsdam. It has improved appreciably in the last year or so. Statesmen learn. We all learn. But now there is no more time for learning.

Two aspects of Soviet communism deserve special attention. They suggest that even the Communist mind is not immune to the pressures of the time—and that the first duty and best hope of the free world is to gird and guard its strength. These aspects are:

1. Rigid in purpose though it is, rigid in attitude though it always seems, Soviet communism has its own peculiar doctrine of change to meet changing circumstance.

2. Soviet Communists are schooled to believe that the final assault must come only when the forces of anticommunism are so rotted and so weak, and when the forces of communism are so strong, that the outcome is calculably certain. Stalin himself has told his followers again and again that they must wait, wait, wait until the world situation is "ripe" for victory.

WATCH FOR A SHIFT, BUT NEVER COUNT ON IT

Anything that smacks of departure from the fixed doctrine of Soviet communism is justified to the faithful on the ground that the doctrine has been newly "enriched by experience." In the past this theory of enrichment has never altered the end purposes of Soviet communism. But it has cloaked many important shifts of immediate aim and attitude—from revolutionary internationalism to Soviet nationalism, and then back to the present militant internationalism, for example. No less for Soviet communism than for the free world, the age of obliteration is likely to be a most enriching experience. The fact that atomic enrichment has as yet had no discernible effect in Moscow need not mean that it will never have.

What is needed is a precise yardstick by which to measure what to hope for and not to hope for. As we see it, the proper yardstick runs something like this:

To hope for any slackening or change of Communist purpose is worse than idle. To hope for any lasting agreement, balance of force, accommodation of aim and circumstance which will enable the two worlds of freedom and communism to live side by side in permanent peace is worse than idle. But to hope that the prospect of mutual obliteration will sink in upon and affect the guiding minds of Soviet communism is not idle. To hope in turn that it will alter the enemy's calculation of what pays and does not pay—of what does and does not constitute a situation assumed to be ripe for final Communist assault—is not idle. To hope further that the prospect of mutual obliteration will seep home to the peoples of the Communist world, as it is now seeping home to the peoples of the free world, is not idle. To hope finally that the enormous pressures engendered by these processes of realization will compel a shift of Soviet communism's attitude toward the uses and control of ultimate weapons is not idle. To watch for such a shift—never to count upon it, never to mistake it for a fundamental change of purpose, but always to watch for and seize upon it if it occurs—is the task of western statesmanship.

THE SUPREME QUESTION: HOW STRONG IS FREEDOM?

We have said, the free world must know its enemy. But knowing the enemy is not enough.

The free world must know itself. It must know—it must never forget—that its freedom and its strength are one. Without freedom it cannot have strength. Without strength it cannot preserve freedom. Without the will for freedom it cannot have the strength of freedom.

At this hour of this age these are not empty words. They have a very present meaning for free men, and especially for free Americans who guard the source and center of the free world's strength.

The danger and the power of obliteration on a nuclear scale are new to mankind. Only now, 5 years after Hiroshima, is the prospect coming home in its full meaning to Americans. As it must for all men, it will affect the lives, the ways, the standards of Americans. The supreme question—and the sooner it is spelled out the better—is whether it will alter the American idea and the American love of freedom.

The national habit, the good habit, is to say as a matter of course that freedom is something to enjoy, to defend, if need be to die for (though preferably not in person). The habit and the idea of freedom have been stronger than any force yet arrayed against them. Are they stronger, will they be stronger than the prospect and power of obliteration? The accustomed "what is life without freedom?" takes on an unaccustomed meaning when there is the prospect of no life. What price the free life in the free society, free men will ask, if to defend freedom is to risk all life and all society?

These are the questions, this is the risk that Americans will be living with until further notice.

Into Stalin's Vestibule

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "Into Stalin's Vestibule" written by Heptisax, being a discussion of the direction in which socialism is leading the United States, published in the New York Herald Tribune of January 9, 1950.

There being no objection the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

INTO STALIN'S VESTIBULE

A DISCUSSION OF DIRECTION IN WHICH SOCIALISM IS LEADING THE UNITED STATES

(By Heptisax)

The doings inside the Soviet Union have been of great interest to a limited number of persons for more than three decades. Now they interest almost everyone. The mess that Soviet foreign policy has made of

the peace has earned the Kremlin dictatorship and the administrative machinery of the police state an attention from great bodies of plain American citizens which they have never in the past given the workings of their own Government. Many features of the picture which they piece together from books by truants from utopia, from magazine articles and from news reports, are pretty horrible. Since the supreme boss of the vast Stalinist empire, and all the duly accredited apostles of Stalinism the world over, insist that a politico-economic system, to which we should not sentence those who have despitefully used us, is successfully applied socialism (Marxism-Leninism), there is not only much squirming among all sorts of Socialists, but a rank-and-file interest in radicalism which would be wholly unsympathetic if all the radicals were not so bitterly anti-Stalin.

The experiment in Russia began with an effort to implement revolutionary Marxist socialism. So, however eloquently our various Socialist friends protest that the system now clamped on Russia is not what should have come of the 1917 revolution, one damned question persists in thousands of well-informed minds—like Lady Macbeth's damned spot that would not out. The question is this: "Isn't that Mongoloid gangsterism in Russia and her neighbors the inevitable end of socialism, whether approached through an orthodox Marxist revolution, or through humanitarian reformism? That, I believe, is troubling so many different kinds of minds, bold and timid, that it accounts for the low ebb of moderate Socialist fortunes in this country. It also accounts for some interesting psychological phenomena.

Anyone who invades the circles of the tough-minded but anti-Stalinist Marxists will hear that, when one of their number has a change of heart and defects, he does not commonly retreat from the serene heights of Marxism to the lower level of the humanitarian Fabians. He makes one wild leap from extreme radicalism into the abyss of reaction. This means, of course, that he has looked over the 30-year record of the Soviet experiment and has decided that Stalinism is the unavoidable flowering of even the gentlest Christian socialism.

But the voting on socialism at the polls also reveals that a great body of reformist Socialists has shied away from guilt by association into the socialistically inclined liberal ranks of the Americans for Democratic Action, the Liberal Party, and so on. They hope to escape the stigmata which Stalinism has put upon socialism; but, at the same time, they hope to infiltrate the Democratic Party so heavily that they can turn it into an instrument of humanitarian socialism. Being persons of good will, they also hope that when the Democratic Party becomes the Social-Democratic-Labor Party, they can elect and elect by virtue of Federal largess, and herd us into a decent socialism that will bear no relation to Stalinism.

Partly they are right. They have done their infiltration; and they have President Truman functioning satisfactorily as a ventriloquist's dummy. If they can win him a lot of congressional victories in November, they will have converted poor old Jefferson's party of the horny-handed, rural individualists, who agreed on nothing so much as the cities were sores on the body politic, into a superunion of the proletarians and threadbare intellectuals (pending the arrival of Dr. Guillotine on the scene). Whether they can go on electing and electing, and can herd us into disguised socialism is another matter. That depends wholly upon the number of conservatives who have the courage to say that is what they are. If the Republican Party is not going to have the courage to say that it is the party dedicated to the conservation of American manliness, I for one shall have no interest in its bids for votes. If it is, for vote-getting reasons, going to be a party offering more efficient guidance into the vestibule of Stalinism, I shall try to compose a death song for the United States of America, based on Ecclesiastes.

Fortunately, we are not there yet. I personally do not believe that new dealism, fair dealism, welfare statism, the crypto-socialism of the ADA, skulking liberalism or the anti-Stalinist democracy of a lot of our best labor leaders, are going to fool the American people very long. I feel that the realization that these all lead into the Stalinist vestibule is very widely appreciated.

I personally feel that there is no other end to socialism. Aneurin Bevan, most popular of the British Laborites, has often been quoted on his bicycle theory. Socialism must keep going like the man on a bike, or take a tumble. Socialism must always call for more of the same, until the centralization of power is so great that the people have lost their check on it. We now have popular political power, through electoral representation, balanced against concentrations of economic power. The Socialists say that the check is not adequate. But the Socialists—the tamest of them—would put centralized political and economic power in the same hands. Upon that concentration of power, with a dozen political Al Capones fighting for it, the aroused proletarians would focus their great will—as they do in Russia through the one-ballot system.

It is just because the upshot of this welfarism is getting to be so evident that we have two marked developments. President Truman has stepped right into the vestibule of Stalinism and has asked the blessed liberals to follow him. They are swarming in. Their weng—one of the rarest of Chinese sounds, meaning the humming of insects—is all but deafening. The other development is the increasingly frequent and bold assertion of conservatism—meaning salvation of what is worth while in the United States—by top-notch persons like Dulles, Eisenhower, Hoover, Dewey, and such like.

These gentry are not against progress. As I have said many times, one can progress at high speed into a bog. (Look at Russia.)

We are all old enough to know that every extension of government service means a check on human liberty. The bigger the bureaucracy the less American we are. If we don't know it, we ought to know that every Federal school lunch to a local child has brought us just one short step into the Stalinist vestibule. No? Well, figure that out.

Communists in Government Employment

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. OLIN D. JOHNSTON
OF SOUTH CAROLINA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD an article appearing in the Washington Post on February 19. This is a story by my good friend and equally good reporter, Jerry Kluttz, concerning the activities of the United Public Workers of America, recently expelled by the CIO for following the Communist Party line. It should be pointed out at this time that this and similar articles by Mr. Kluttz were used by the CIO to support their action in expelling this Red union. Mr. Kluttz is to be congratulated for a job well done.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FEDERAL DIARY

ANONYMOUS TIP TO REPORTER SPOTLIGHTS UPW'S "RED" TACTICS

(By Jerry Kluttz)

(EDITOR'S NOTE.—The CIO executive board has voted to expel the United Public Workers from the CIO on charges of following the Communist Party line. Among the important pieces of evidence used to support the accusations were stories by Jerry Kluttz, the Washington Post's Government columnist. A background story follows.)

Her convincing words were spoken to me over the phone in a low and halting voice. I sensed she was scared—a thought she later confirmed. The time was late April 1946.

"You must go to the convention in Atlantic City," she urged me repeatedly. "Believe me, and I know, the Communists are all set to grab control of CIO's Government worker groups. Neither the CIO nor anyone else seems to know or care what's happening."

I hadn't planned to attend the convention as Congress was in session and making employee news at the time. Also, the main purpose of the gathering was to merge CIO's United Federal Workers with its State, county, and municipal workers union. It didn't promise to be a newsworthy event and I told my unidentified caller so. I also didn't take her Communist talk seriously.

A day or so later she was back on the phone. I thought she was using a bit of psychology on me when she said:

"So you're not going—that's swell with the Communists. You're the one reporter they're afraid of and they're hoping you don't go to Atlantic City."

By that time the convention was just about ready to get under way. But I told my caller that I would make last-minute arrangements to attend if she could convince me of her Red charges. I wanted specific details, I told her, not generalities. She asked for time to think it over and promised to call me back.

She did. She talked as though she were afraid of being shot at any moment. She then unloaded and this is the gist of it:

That certain union leaders—not all of them—had discussed in highly secret and preconvention gatherings the best way to pull an effective strike against the Federal Government—a walkout that would embarrass Uncle Sam in the eyes of the world.

This one specific thought was debated at length, she said. To launch an organizing drive among the service employees of the Government, the elevator operators, char force, and so forth, and to pull them out on a strike at the right time. Many of these jobs, she added, were held by Negroes and the leaders agreed they could be easily used for this purpose since their plight would arouse public sympathy.

She also told me that a foreign-policy resolution had been drafted that would express sympathy toward Russia while denouncing the imperialistic designs of the United States and her allies. She gave me other details of the preconvention talks.

I told her I'd change my plans and would attend the convention. There was another period of hemming and hawing on her part and then said she:

"Please handle this discreetly. It won't be easy. You're already suspected as being unfriendly. If you write anything they don't like you'll be smeared as antilabor, anti-Negro, anti-Jew, and a Red-baiter."

Her last words were "Good luck but be careful."

I arrived in Atlantic City after the convention had gotten under way. Union leaders reacted coldly to my appearance. I tried without success to talk with several of them about their attitude toward strikes against the Government—all of which convinced me my tipster was on the right track.

Eventually, one of the key unionists conceded to me in a begrudging sort of way that it would be possible to call a strike against the Government under a proposed constitutional provision. He and others, however, dismissed it as meaningless and they swore no strikes were planned against any government.

The strike provision was put before the convention and several Federal-worker members took the floor to demand the right to strike and to denounce the language as weak and soft.

I wrote the story. The following morning, after my column had been read, I became the target of the abuse my caller had warned me about.

Next came the foreign-policy resolution. It was late one afternoon and little had happened that day in the convention in the way of a news story. I was invited to leave as nothing more would take place on the convention floor. I stuck around.

Then a strange thing happened. A reporter covering the convention for the Communist Daily Worker suggested to union leaders that they get out the foreign-policy resolution and get it passed that evening. He was also covering a meeting there of CIO's Textile Workers, and it had just adopted a strong anti-Communist foreign-policy resolution that supported United States foreign policy. He wanted the UPWA to approve its resolution to offset the Textile Workers' stand.

UPWA leaders complied meekly. They pulled out the pro-Soviet foreign-policy resolution and jammed it through the convention over a scattering of opposition.

This proved to be too much for a handful of delegates to swallow and they began belated protests. The small uprising was the signal for an old commie trick—a favorite of the left-wingers became the leader of the opposition. This person confused and misled the objectors while cursing out the "damn" Communists, but when the right moment came he "left them in the lurch," a helpless and bewildered lot.

Several honest opposition members confided to me that they had been threatened and they left the convention early. Because of my stories, very few delegates had the courage to talk with me in public.

The postconvention reaction in Washington was both swift and drastic. Congress was ready to adopt riders to force all UPWA members off the Federal pay roll because of the strike provision. The UPWA executive committee was forced to adopt a flat no-strike provision against the Federal Government to save the jobs of union members.

The foreign-policy issue was taken up and debated in heated meetings of UPWA locals. Many units here went on record censuring the anti-American convention stand. Members began to drop out in large numbers.

I continued to hear occasionally from my informant who couldn't help from reminding me: "I told you so." She gave me advanced information on many UPWA actions. Incidentally, I still don't know who she is.

By this time, however, many former enthusiastic UPWA'ers were beginning to see that they had been duped. Several met me in isolated spots to tell their stories. One of the most helpful was a key Negro member of the union.

His stories of how people tried to get him and others to join the Communist Party, to foment trouble and strife in Government, and their guarded suggestions of strikes against Uncle Sam were a shocking eye-opener. He told me frankly that he thought seriously of joining the Communist Party because he thought it might help his people.

"But the more I looked into it," he explained, "the more I became convinced the Communists were merely using the Negroes for their own devious purposes." "Communism," he told me, "isn't for my people, as we'd lose what freedom we have under it."

I was not one bit surprised to see many UPWA leaders fired on disloyalty charges after what he and others told me.

The National CIO was acutely embarrassed by its UPWA. Its responsible leaders have been convinced for several years that the union should be either expelled or cleaned of Communist influence. About 2 years ago an anti-Communist rival, the Government Workers Union, was set up with top CIO support.

GWU has won nearly every fight it has had with the UPWA and it's slated to take over UPWA's jurisdiction in the Government field.

I Speak for Democracy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the original script entitled "I Speak for Democracy," by Robert Shanks, of Lebanon, Ind., who was one of the four winners in the Nation-wide contest participated in by a million high-school students.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

Hello; my name is Brown—Richard Brown. Remember me? No; I don't imagine you do. It's been almost 5 years since anyone has heard about me. And it seems people have a knack for forgetting kinda' fast now-a-days. How about the Battle of the Bulge? Does that strike a familiar note? Of course, you recall it. The papers gave it quite a write-up at the time. I'm glad you do remember it because that's where I was killed. It wasn't very dramatic—my death, I mean. There I was crouched in a fox hole, shaking from the cold so much that I know it was my teeth that gave my hiding place away, when—boom! went a hand grenade and (snap finger) it was over that quick.

You wanta know something, friend—you wanta know why I was over there? No; it wasn't because some big shot drew my number out of a fish bowl either. I'd of been there regardless of that. I was there because of a thing we have in America called democracy. That's a pretty important word when you take time to think about it. It means something strong, good, and just. To men like Hitler and Tito it meant something that had to be destroyed and wiped out if men of their breed were to exist. Well, I was just one of many Richard Browns who couldn't see it their way. Just one of a thousand young kids who'd rather dig ditches than be told he couldn't.

When I was living, it's true that I thought of democracy as—well, like our history teacher used to say: "A noble inheritance left to us by far-sighted statesmen, a beacon light in a world of darkness." This thought hit me particularly on the Fourth of July. Yet, somehow, to me, the true meaning of democracy was kinda' more every day.

It was hot dogs and baseball games, chicken every Sunday, hayrides and roasted marshmallows, giggling girls, and dignified high-school seniors. It was the evening paper and even more informing neighborhood gossip. It was the gang and your girl. It was rugged mountains and broad, flat plains, and big cities, and small towns, churches, schools, institutions. It was a chance to grab the world by the tail and give it a whirl. Sometimes you got to the top; other times, you didn't, but you still had the chance to try.

I saw democracy in our movies, in big fat political rallies, in our colleges, and even in lovers' lanes. Well, in fact, I saw just about everything I did or said. Take away even one of the things I've mentioned and you've weakened democracy. Leave them, and you've given America something to be very proud of—a way of life to build toward a better future.

As an American, I didn't want to fight; as an American, I didn't want to die. I had too much to live for, but when I realized that there were men in the world who didn't want my kid brother to be a Boy Scout, or my pop to be an Elk; then, is when I was ready to fight, ready to fight for America, for democracy. You might even say I fought because I was stingy, stingy for my rights to live and breathe a freeman.

Those of you who have seen a college football game, or a harvest moon shining through the sycamores on a Midwest cornfield, or have listened to the President make his inaugural address, or have attended a county fair—then I think you know why I fought and why I am speaking to you from, well, let's say a place far distant from that war-torn field in Germany. And if you do know, then dedicate yourself to the job of making sure that never again will a Richard Brown have to fight and die to protect our democracy.

Well, I guess I really got wound up, didn't I? Almost needed a soap box. Still, call everything I said drivel, call it sentimentality, if you will. I call it America. I call it democracy. Democracy comes from the Greek, I think. "Demos," meaning "people," "kratis" meaning government—the people's government.

Yes; that's what I'd call it—democracy. The people's right to breathe, to worship, to speak, to think, to gather together, to make an honest living, and, yes, to fight a freeman. That's it; that's what is speaking; that's why I fought.

ROBERT SHANKS.

(Original script written October 1949. Judged State and National winner in third annual I Speak for Democracy Contest.)

The Defense Budget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL
OF GEORGIA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article dealing with the defense budget, by David Lawrence, from the New York Herald Tribune of this morning.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TODAY IN WASHINGTON—PRESIDENT AND SECRETARY JOHNSON STAND FIRM AGAINST DRIVE TO INCREASE DEFENSE BUDGET

(By David Lawrence)

WASHINGTON, February 23.—There's a drive on to augment armament expenditures by about $4,000,000,000, which would further increase the deficit and postpone indefinitely the time for a return to a balanced budget.

President Truman and Secretary of Defense Louis Johnson are standing firmly against the drive, which apparently is coming from outside the armed services.

The basic claim being made in an effort to induce Congress to expand appropriations is that the United States is weak and not prepared for war. Much of the criticism is rather unjustly concentrated on the Secretary of Defense, who, after all, is given by the Director of the Budget the amount that the President, as the final authority, decides shall be spent by all the armed services.

The question of whether the armament which the United States now has is sufficient is one that depends for its answer on a definition of the meaning of the word "adequate." From the viewpoint purely of military theory, it would take from $25,000,000,000 to $50,000,000,000 a year to be prepared in every sense for an outbreak of war.

What a democracy, however, with a limited amount of money available out of a peacetime economy, must do is set up a defense establishment capable of immediate expansion. If that definition is applied, then the United States is ready for instant warfare and for the immediate expansion of each service in the months that ensue.

AIR FORCE HELD READY

Certainly the United States Air Force, which is the main instrument of instant retaliation, is in readiness to deliver retaliatory blows. No nation in the world with a government in its right senses will wish to invite the kind of retaliatory action of which America is capable today.

But, along with the United States Air Force, there are retaliatory blows which can be struck from the seas as well as from bases across the oceans. To follow up on such moves in succeeding weeks, it will be necessary to reactivate ships and planes now in moth balls. The manpower for such recommissioning of World War II ships and planes is available because reserves are steadily being trained for that purpose.

It is true that Russia is building ships and planes, but the United States has in reserve far more aircraft and ships than Russia is now building and enough antisubmarine strength to cope with any menace to shipping.

The key to preparedness lies in the kind of reserves trained for each of the three armed services. America has always depended on its regulars to form the nucleus of wartime operating forces. The public has been led to believe that next time there will not be time to mobilize armies and navies. There wouldn't be if the counterattack from the United States were not effective. But nothing has happened to our defense forces which in any way justifies the assumption that our retaliatory blows would not be effective. The power of the potential enemy to wage war would diminish from the day war broke out, as American strength would begin to grow.

HUGE SUM AUTHORIZED

The President has authorized approximately $13,500,000,000 for all three armed services for the current fiscal year. This is a large sum, and the armed service chiefs are well aware of the necessity of staying within their budgets. It is gratifying indeed to note the acceptance of budget limitations within all three services. The attitude toward economy and maximum use of the military dollar has undergone a remarkable improvement in recent weeks.

The Secretary of Defense has accepted the task of holding the budget to the limits set and is striving to make economies in overhead and auxiliary services. Cutting expenses in government always produces repercussions and criticism. But it is significant to note that the reductions which have been made are in line with a definite policy which assumes a continuance of peacetime conditions for the next few years at least. Even if a war arises, however, the scheme of our defense organization is such as to permit of instantaneous expansion.

The veterans of World War II are not yet too old to have lost their skills, and a refresher course of a few weeks will bring a manpower strength quite comparable to war conditions.

The drive to unbalance the budget by $4,000,000,000 in the name of national security will not succeed unless a war crisis develops. Then appropriations, of course, would naturally skyrocket far beyond any such figure. The outlook is for peace—and for the continuance of a military budget that the national economy can stand.

The Soul-Searchers Find No Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very timely and thoughtful article from this week's issue of Life magazine.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SOUL-SEARCHERS FIND NO ANSWER—IN THE FACE OF THE WORLD CRISIS AND THE H-BOMB THEY FORESEE ANNIHILATION BUT NOT HOW TO FORESTALL IT

The melancholy state of world affairs and President Truman's decision to make the hydrogen bomb set off 3 weeks of soul-searching on the part of American scientists and statesmen. Some considered only the moral issues, others merely the practical issues. But most wrestled with both—and with thoughts of the UN and American and Russian military potential as well. None found a real answer.

As the thinkers stood in what many deeply believed to be the shadow of death, some found comfort in groups. Thus, 12 top scientists, members of the American Physical Society, spoke in unison: "We believe that no nation has the right to use such a bomb, no matter how righteous its cause. This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality."

In New York another group—the most august that gathered anywhere to discuss the problem—issued no joint statement but several individual ones. This occurred on February 12, when Mrs. Franklin Roosevelt presided over the first of her series of television teas. Among the guests were Dr. Hans Bethe, physicist at Cornell; Senator Brien McMahon, chairman of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy; David Lilienthal, recently retired head of the Atomic Energy Commission; and Dr. Robert Oppenheimer, president of the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton. "Naturally," said Mrs. Roosevelt, "there can be only one subject we can deal with—and that must be the hydrogen bomb and the future of the atomic-energy program and its direct effect upon our future lives."

Said Dr. Oppenheimer, "The decision * * * to make or not to make the hydrogen bomb is rooted in complex technical things, but they touch the very basis of our morality. It is a grave danger for us that these decisions are taken on the basis of facts held secret."

Then the broadcast switched to Princeton, where Dr. Albert Einstein phrased the problem and offered one solution: "Annihilation of any life on earth has been brought within the range of technical possibilities. * * * Is there any way out * * *? Solemn renunciation of violence * * * is undoubtedly necessary. Such renunciation, however, can only be effective if * * * a supranational * * * body is set up." But neither Dr. Einstein nor the others suggested how a world state can now be established. Later Dr. Bethe said, "Let us state * * * that we will never be the first to use hydrogen bombs." Senator MCMAHON repeated his proposal for a world-wide Marshall plan. Then the program ended with the words of Mrs. Roosevelt: "May God grant us all the wisdom to find the true path to peace through cooperation with the other nations of the world."

Elsewhere other American leaders found themselves in agreement with Dr. Robert Oppenheimer. Gen. Dwight Eisenhower said, "I can't go along with those who believe we should hide the horror of the H-bomb in ignorance. I can see no good in ignorance. From the beginning of time, every invention of mankind has been capable of two uses, good and evil. It is up to the moral fiber of mankind to decide to which use an invention is put. But certainly at this time, faced as we are with a godless opponent. I do not believe we should bury our heads in the sand." Dr. James B. Conant, president of Harvard, was shocked because the simple fact is that many important decisions are being made in Washington today without adequate evaluation.

But no matter what had surrounded the making of the decision, the fact remained that it had been made and reactions to it soon came from all over the world. Returning from Germany, United States Commissioner John J. McCloy said, "I am glad of President Truman's decision. If there were an oxygen bomb that would be bigger than the H-bomb, I would build it." In Rome the Vatican newspaper announced that it is to be deplored, of course, that human society should have come to such a pass, and this is a sad commentary on the world's inability to insure peace except by force, but then went on to justify American manufacture of the bomb because of the mysterious power explosions in Russia. In Washington, Senator MILLARD TYDINGS said, "Our failure to build while other nations are building the H-bomb conceivably could * * * destroy our own security as well as dismember the democratic, liberty-loving world." In Air Affairs Bernard Baruch, whose proposal for international control of atomic energy has been blocked for almost 4 years by Russia in the UN, wrote, "Every effort must be pressed to maintain our overwhelming advantage in the development of atomic weapons. Nor should any time be lost in proceeding to develop the best possible system of atomic civilian defense, as part of a general plan of mobilization readiness against the danger of possible war."

But atomic defense was no easily solved problem. Dr. Vannevar Bush told the Senate Armed Services Committee "the only way to defend yourself against any kind of bomb is to stop the airplane or carrier before it

gets to the target, or to bomb the place that is manufacturing the bomb before it gets started. I know of no way to detonate an atomic bomb—or any other kind—once it is on its way." Dr. Harold C. Urey warned that atomic bombs in the holds of ships could easily be sneaked into the harbors of the United States or friendly nations, and there exploded or employed as the instruments of international extortion. Dr. Ralph Lapp, head of the Navy's Nuclear Research Division, said, "Horrible as it may sound, we must be prepared to lose ten to fifteen million people in the first day of the superblitz. In a certain sense we are like the man who lives in a tar-paper shack and develops a flame thrower to protect himself."

Meanwhile the soul searching of the leaders did not seem to upset the plain citizens of the Nation. Gen. Lucius D. Clay said, "So long as Americans are thinking about it, they will do the right thing." But there was evidence on every hand that many Americans were by no means ready to think about it. In Chicago a lawyer summed up one widely held attitude with, "I've ceased to even think about the prospect of war. The whole thing is so overwhelmingly depressing that I am glad I'm not running the Government right now, that I can go about my own daily business." In Boston a business executive put it this way: "Maybe we're building up an immunity. The world keeps going from crisis to crisis, and they cry 'wolf' so often that we don't pay much attention to it." In Kansas City a cafe owner said, "The only people talking about war are those who stand to make some money out of it. The boys who were in the last war and the parents who lost sons don't want any part of it."

But in Los Angeles a 14-year-old schoolboy named Maitland Hardyman, asked by his teacher to write a short composition as an exercise in the use of words, did so. He lacked the facility of the scientists and the statesmen, and he used one horrible word 11 times while he was writing only 49. The word he used was the one that underlay the thinking of them all. The soul searchers tidily tripped around it, but the schoolboy boldly picked it up and swung it like a sledge hammer. "The hydrogen bomb reeks with death. Death, death to thousands. A burning, searing death, a death that is horrible, lasting death. The most horrible death man has invented, the destroying, annihilating death of atomic energy. The poisoning, killing, destroying death. Death of the ages, of man. The lasting death."

The Same Old Answer

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "The Same Old Answer," published in the Palladium-Item, of Richmond, Ind., on February 22, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE SAME OLD ANSWER

Senator CAPEHART, Republican, Indiana, takes the position that the Truman administration does not know how to subtract.

He passed this judgment when he proposed a $7,000,000,000 cut in Federal spending. A balanced budget and a strong economy are more important than the things which the extra money will buy, the Senator said.

Budget Director Frank Pace, Jr., made typical New Deal reply. He said budget balance is something for the future if economic conditions remain reasonable.

Every administration official has made the same sort of evasive reply to suggestions and recommendations for cuts in Federal spending.

President Truman has sold himself on the idea of deficit spending. He proposes spending more than the Federal Treasury receives and making up the difference by borrowing.

The rapid and dangerous growth of the national debt does not disturb the President. He seems to believe that the people can carry a still greater tax load.

Whether the Federal debt will handicap future generations is of no concern to the President. He wants to spend now, and let future generations foot the bill.

Missouri River Basin Development

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement by Gov. Val Peterson, of Nebraska, on February 23, before the War Department Civil Functions Subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations. This is an enlightening statement about the conservation program being developed in the Missouri River Basin.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We are engaged, in the Missouri River development program, in the greatest undertaking of its kind in the history of the world. One can, if he desires, become lost in the blueprints of the engineers and other technicians' statistics relating to the size, numbers, and costs of the dams, and other intricacies of the program. However, boiled down to fundamentals, ours is simply a program to conserve the soil and to make water work for man, rather than to permit it to destroy him and his property.

We've had a great vision and upon that vision the Congress of the United States has placed its stamp of approval. We plan to so manage our soil that the maximum amount of the moisture which falls upon it is contained in it to produce crops and to stop erosion. Recognizing that after we have utilized the best soil management practices known to man, there will still be periods of the year when there will be tremendous run-offs of water gathering momentum as they rush pell-mell toward the ocean destroying all that lies in their path, we have planned to construct 105 dams to impound these destructive waters and by controlling them make them work to the benefit of the people of our region and all America.

The problem of soil conservation, while I am certain that all members of this committee are interested in it, as must be necessarily all Americans, is not before your group for consideration today. It is a phase of our work which must be stepped up immediately. However, every one of the other multiple features of the great Pick-Sloan plan, for the development of our basin, is properly within the province of your committee. When we build great dams to control floods, we establish the basis for all of the other multiple benefits of our program. The water impounded can be released to provide power, irrigation, navigation, firm municipal water supplies, and the great lakes of blue water, with which our area will be dotted, have tremendous potentialities for recreation.

Today, as probably never before in its history, the Government of the United States needs to economize. When any individual or government, whether it be local, State, or national is not on a sound fiscal basis, it is like a house built upon sand, and from its financial failures stem many other difficulties and eventual disaster.

We, in the basin, are thoroughly cognizant of the need for economy in government. In Nebraska, the State government owes no one a penny, has $40,000,000 in cash or in bonds, holds property worth hundreds of millions of dollars, is on a pay-as-you-go basis, and for fiscal 1949 had the lowest per capita taxes in America. Prudent forefathers and the sternness of nature have forced us to learn well the valuable lessons of frugality; frugality of money and frugality of those things which are worth more than money, and, of course, there are many such, including soil and water.

So, at the out-set, let me make it clear that we have no objection to accept such a cut in our activities as the Congress sees fit to apply evenly across the entire scope of governmental activity. We do feel, however, that there must be discrimination in the cuts that are made, that first things should be put first and that in the broadest and true sense, the poorest excuse for an economy movement would be that which would strike at the conservation of our great natural resources which are basic to the wealth and well-being of America. We maintain that if we continue to neglect our soil and our water we lay the foundation for the eventual and final bankruptcy of America.

Public moneys which are invested in projects which add to the wealth of America are expended wisely. They are investments for the future and must be made if our country is to survive and be able to support an expanded population. In our judgment, we simply must not make the disastrous mistake of attempting to balance the budget largely at the expense of soil and water conservation.

One phase of the control of water in the Missouri Basin is basic to all other multiple features of the Pick-Sloan plan. That is flood control. Floods can be ended completely on the Missouri River and its major tributaries, and when they are stopped we have created the foundation for all the other benefits. The other benefits flow, in a broad sense, from flood control.

We simply cannot afford the luxury of continued floods in the Missouri Basin, or, for that matter, on any of the great river systems in America. They are rapidly destroying vast sections of the finest farm lands in our country besides damaging other valuable property and destroying life. They are costly, so constant and costly in fact that our economy cannot stand the drain which they are upon it.

Floods have taken a costly toll of lives and property in the Missouri Basin. For the 14½ years ending June 1, 1949, in which official records are available, the estimated tangible property loss stands at $493,500,000. The loss of human life for the same period was 269.

Only fragmentary records of flood damage are available prior to 1935. Several of the greatest floods of record on the Missouri River

occurred prior to 1935, notably the floods of 1844, 1881, and 1903. High floods struck also in 1903, 1908, 1909, 1915, and 1927. The 1903 floods on the Kansas and Missouri Rivers which converged upon the Kansas Citys in 1903 caused damage to that metropolitan area alone of $23,000,000, and 19 persons lost their lives.

The impact of floods on the lives and prosperity of the people of the Missouri Basin is illustrated in the following table of destruction on a year-by-year basis from 1935 to midyear in 1949:

Year:	*Damage*
1935	$24,000,000
1936	1,000,000
1937	3,500,000
1938	4,500,000
1939	1,500,000
1940	1,000,000
1941	8,000,000
1942	22,000,000
1943	68,000,000
1944	51,000,000
1945	46,000,000
1946	9,000,000
1947	177,000,000
1948	33,000,000
1949[1]	42,000,000
Total	493,500,000

[1] Covers only first 5 months of 1949.

The full story of human misery and retardation of progress caused by floods in this great breadbasket region is not told in cold figures alone. Thousands of people were driven from their homes by the raging waters of the Missouri and its tributaries, dead livestock floated on the muddy crests, hundreds of thousands of acres of farm crops were washed out, industries dislocated, and highway and railroad transportation disrupted.

In the flood of 1947, 300,000 acres of land were inundated by floods on the main stream and tributaries, 26 lives were lost, and 65,000 persons displaced.

Moreover, the tangible loss figures do not include the tremendous damage to topsoil back on the farms and ranches resulting from erosion. No man is wise enough to put a value upon a ton of topsoil, but unquestionably the loss of topsoil, in terms of dollars, exceeds all other damage in floods many times over. It is an irreplaceable loss. Continued, it can mean regional and national impoverishment. They do not encompass the detrimental effect upon potential growth in natural industrial areas along the flood-menacing streams.

While the major flood damage has been on the main stem of the Missouri River, tributary basins have been hard hit by periodic floods that disrupted the economy of those areas and brought suffering and property loss to the people who live in them.

In my own State of Nebraska, for example, the Republican River Valley was ravaged by the worst flood in its history in 1935. In that flood alone which extended down into our sister State of Kansas, 105 persons, most of them Nebraskans, were swept to their deaths. And when the toll of property damage was tallied, it ran to the appalling figure of $9,000,000. Here again, topsoil losses are not calculated.

The Republican Valley has been hit again and again by destructive floods. In 1943 the loss was $1,100,000; in 1944 it was $1,700,000; in 1945, it was $2,400,000; in 1946, the toll was $1,300,000, and in 1947, it jumped to $20,000,000. On the night of June 22, 1947, 13 citizens of my State lost their lives when a flash flood on Medicine Creek, a tributary of the Republican, swept into the town of Cambridge, Nebr.

This story of suffering and waste is repeated over and over, year after year and basin by basin. In the drainage basin of the Kansas River, one of the major tributaries of the Missouri in the lower basin, the story is the same. In 1943 floods destroyed property in that basin valued at $10,000,000; in 1944, it was $4,800,000; in 1945, $13,700,000; in 1946 the loss was $2,500,000, and in 1947 property damage totalled $26,200,000 in the valley of the Kansas. In the 1947 flood, Kansas farmers saw 375,000 acres of their richest farm lands inundated and many cities and towns along the river were ravaged.

It is a story of waste, of destruction of natural resources which the Missouri Basin and the Nation cannot afford. It can and must be stopped. Under the Pick-Sloan plan, which is now out of the blueprint stage and well along the road to accomplishment, floods will be a thing of the past. Money now drained away by their destructiveness can be used to raise the level of well-being and productivity in the region and Nation. Every dollar invested by Uncle Sam in the control of floods, under our Missouri River development program, will help stop the unnecessary and disastrous destruction now caused by floods and will also help buy for us the constructive benefits that come from controlled waters.

There is no more sound program under consideration in America today. There is no major river development program which is as far along. There is no program which can bring greater benefits to a vast region or the Nation. We plead with you to provide funds in an orderly, regular manner for the development of our resources. For our selfish benefit? Yes. But more important, for your selfish benefit, for the selfish benefit of every American.

Don't force us, by your refusal to appropriate required funds, to stand along the banks of the Missouri next year, the following year, and in numberless other years, wringing our hands and exclaiming, "How long, O Lord, how long must we endure death and destruction."

I Speak for Democracy Essay Contest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANCIS J. MYERS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, it was recently my privilege to make the presentation of awards at the second annual banquet given by the Philadelphia Junior Chamber of Commerce in honor of the Philadelphia winners of the I Speak for Democracy essay contest conducted among the high-school students of that city.

I was greatly impressed with the clarity of thinking and the sincerity of these young people. In a world where adults are too often either discouraged or indifferent, it is both stimulating and challenging to find such firm conviction among our boys and girls of the need to make democracy work.

I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the three winning essays by Marie Jesakow, W. C. Beatly, and Lawrence J. Mellon, Jr.

There being no objection, the essays were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Marie Jesakow)

The days pass by softly, swiftly, and happily. Each day is full of sunshine, the bright smile of heaven. Each day is another day of honest labor, another day of progress, of love and respect for every common man regardless of his religion, race, or creed, another day of peace and faith. These are the days of democracy, the endless days of justice with a new, happy tomorrow, with a future filled with love and brotherhood. I look at the faces of American people radiating joy, peace, and serenity. Everywhere a song resounds with the glorious words, "We hold these truths to be self-evident. That all men are created equal; that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights; that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." This is the triumphant song of democracy which stands for the rights of a whole people to determine its own fate, democracy which has for its goal the development of each person into all that he may possibly become. Democracy dries bitter tears on the weary faces of thousands of people, giving them a sense of security and belongingness. It gives a driving faith that scales steeper heights and views farther horizons.

These are the happy days of democracy in America where every citizen is free. I was born in America with every right to liberty, but as a 7-month-old baby I was taken to Poland. There I stayed for 15 years, returning to this country over a year and a half ago. Fifteen years is a long time, long enough to learn to love freedom and to hate bondage. Those were years of terror, slavery, and death, when the roar of the bombs was deafening and stunning, when the soldier stood on the barricade looking at the burning city, and at the blood, streams and seas of blood. The piles of dead bodies with arms stretching out to heaven were whispering with dead lips words that sounded like thunder, "Vengeance, vengeance to the enemy, vengeance for blood, for burned homes, and for the dead ones that we loved." They did not want to die in slavery, nor to be burned in the concentration camps. Greater was the desire for freedom, stronger was the passion for liberty. They remembered those bright days of work in a sunny field where they lived simple lives playing their music, painting their pictures. No man had the right to destroy their happiness, to change their heaven into hell. No man had the right, but some had power, some had bombs, planes, and mortars. The sharp voice of Hitler declared, "It is a matter of course that a Pole deserves no equal rights," and "Humanism is but a mixture of stupidity and cowardice."

Then came those long, gray columns of people with angry gleams in their eyes and the burning desire for freedom in their hearts always followed by the same companion, death. "Krieg gefangener." Krieg is war, gefangener is slave. That word described everyone in those long, gray columns.

The light of that vision is painful, too bright and glaring to be borne without hurt. But the lesson that we once learned must be carried to those who live, to make them understand that democracy is the salvation of the whole world, democracy that gives us faith in which love is born, the service by which love is strengthened, and sympathy by which love is shared. Democracy has courage and wisdom to establish and maintain universal brotherhood and peace, with all nations joined in love and lawfulness to foster a life more abundant for all. Democracy gives us a belief in values, in dignity, and in the worth of every individual, and disciplines us in service to the common good. Democracy has power to make our world a

place where with fruitful industry, valiant truth, responsible freedom, creative love, and pure religion, all men may dwell in harmony.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By W. C. Beatly)

I speak for democracy, because I believe in it, live for it, and will endeavor to be worthy of it. But wait! What is democracy? We hear this term used in many newspapers, magazines, and in the press and pulpit. Webster says that democracy means the rule of the people. I say it means more than that. Yes, a great deal more than that.

Democracy is a living and breathing contribution to the life of man, for without the gift of democracy the present would be dismal and the horizon dark. Democracy is not license but liberty regulated by law. It says we are free to talk, think, write, and pray, provided our neighbors have the same privilege.

Democracy is life. It gives us the privilege to call our souls our own, and the right to pursue our individual desires, hopes, and aspirations, subject to the same gift being shared by others.

Democracy is a book, whereby we turn back the pages of history and read the minds of those whose lives and deaths made a contribution to the freedom, welfare, and happiness of mankind. Eternal truths remain the same yesterday, today, and forever. We hear today from Plato, Aristotle, Burke, Pitt, Fox, Bacon, Washington, Jefferson, and Lincoln, and other giants who left an imperishable foot-print in the walk toward liberty.

Democracy is a picture more beautiful and more inspiring than any artist can paint. It gives us views of the mountains of progress, the hills of success, as well as the valleys of disappointment, and failures. We can roam the plains of ambition, and the fertile fields of work, knowing that when the sun shines tomorrow opportunity will still be our heritage, and with the setting of the same we will have had an equal chance to work and play as had the giants of old who bequeathed to us the democracy for which I speak.

Democracy gives me individual freedom. It says that I may read whatever paper I choose in the morning, and learn what others think and do without being punished for my desire. It tells me that I have the inherent right to pursue any business or profession of my choice unfettered by any limitation other than I must not injure others.

Democracy is a teacher. It instructs me in the art of thinking of others and guides me to the altar of good citizenship. It points out the folly of selfishness and tells me that no man can live for himself alone. It is a way of life which when followed with humility and earnestness brings a sense of inner satisfaction, which cannot be measured in any terms other than those which come to all who endeavor to do the right.

Democracy is at my bedside when I awake each morning and gives me the light to see the day, whether the sun shines or the clouds are dark. When the day is over it is my companion when I retire. It is my ever constant friend and helper. Individuals may fail me, and I may be unworthy of friendship, or help, but my democracy is always at my side, ready to pick me up when I stumble and urge me on when the going is difficult.

Democracy gives me a pride of ownership and an interest in the greatest treasure which man can possess. Those who share democracy can call themselves rich, not in the terms of gold and silver, but in everlasting values.

Democracy is America, and America is democracy.

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

(By Lawrence J. Mellon, Jr.)

Democracy has been the principal topic of discussion in this vast world of ours for the past 200 years. Did you ever stop to imagine the power which this one word conveys? Did you ever stop to think why it makes the peoples of the world look and wait for new hope? It is small wonder that the world yearns for democracy. To the oppressed peoples of Europe and Asia, democracy is new hope, a new light, and a new promise.

In 1776 democracy was conceived in this great country of ours. Our forefathers chose the only form of government where the people determined by free elections those who would conduct the affairs of the Nation. You can readily see how the framers of our Constitution could choose no other form of government. They well knew the many hardships suffered by the subjects of the English king, and they were determined that their children in all future ages were going to live their lives, not in the dark shroud of submission and servitude, but in freedom to read what they please, to worship what they please, and to say what they please. It wasn't easy for such leaders as Jefferson, Franklin, Washington, and Adams to forget their own interests. They looked to the future. It was there and then that they knew that a democratic form of government was the only real one. How right they were we well know today.

How can any group of governing men fail to catch the magnificence of a democracy? Yes, how can they? It seems impossible doesn't it, but it has been done, and is still being done. Hitler and Mussolini and other similar tyrannical dictators scorned the democratic way of life, denouncing the voice of the people, cursing freedom of worship, freedom from want, freedom from fear, and freedom of speech. They, like all others who defied freedom, perished ignobly, cursed and hated by those they oppressed.

But what are we going to do about this democracy, we, the youth of America, who will some day direct the destinies of this great Nation? It's easy to sit back and say: "Well, it's not my problem. Why should I get excited?" Certainly it's easy to say this, but with such harmful indifference, would we be carrying on the patriotic traditions of our forefathers? We most certainly would not. We must zealously practice at all times the democracy we so glibly advocate for others.

Democracy is something that one feels. It is something that is deep down inside of him that makes him rise in anger every time he hears of the communistic freedom-haters. Democracy is something that we young Americans know is right and just, and as future leaders our stand for democracy must be sound and determined. It's not enough to talk about democracy. We must practice its teachings. In our churches, in our schools, and in our communities, we must be ever on the alert—always, at all times, thinking, acting, and speaking for democracy.

Yes; I speak for democracy. I shout aloud to the nations across the Atlantic and Pacific who denounce a democratic government that I speak for democracy. I stand and praise it. I stand and thrust its colors to the heavens and shout, without fear, that I believe in it.

Four hundred thousand other Americans also believed in it. They also spoke for democracy, only not by their tongue, but by their blood. Don't you think that they could tell you of this nine-letter word? They died for it in World War II. Yes; people have been dying for democracy for the past two centuries, and they will continue to die for it until those totalitarian nations which dot the earth correct their freedom-hating ways.

Yes; for the sake of those 400,000, let us pray God that some day the whole world will stand and with the power and majesty of an erupting volcano shout at the top of its lungs: "I speak for democracy."

Kidnaped Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, further bearing on House Resolution 456, which I introduced, to condemn the abduction of Greek children by Communist guerrilla forces and seek the return of these children to their homes and parents, is the following prose poem by Harry H. Schlacht from the New York Journal-American of Tuesday, January 24, 1950:

CRIME AGAINST CIVILIZATION

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Murder, looting and cruelty, kidnaping, outrages, and brutality are still the order of the day in Communist Russia.

The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrillas in Greece is a crime against humanity.

The American people are stirred by this shocking outrage against mankind.

It is but a succession of savage deeds and stands unparalleled in the annals of recorded history.

It is a new and unheard-of kind of warfare.

It is a new and unheard-of kind of barbarism.

It is designed to convert these children to communism.

It is designed to imbue them with a hatred against their country and religion.

The mothers of Greece plead for the return of their children.

From the woes and sorrows of Greek homes come the wailing of fathers and mothers that will not be silenced until their children are restored to them.

This is a time to give Greece—our ally in peace and war—a helping hand.

This is a time for American greatness.

America is the light of the world.

America must take the leadership in this godly cause.

This is an appeal to the conscience of civilization.

This is an appeal to the hearts of all civilized human beings.

Let us voice our thunderous protest against this communistic iniquity.

Let us speak of it until these depraved creatures will understand.

Let us speak of it until these morally deaf will hear.

Let the monsters of Moscow know that the Greek children will never be converted to communism.

Like their ancestors, they will hold aloft God's torch of liberty to light the pathway of civilization.

They will always be God-loving children, in spirit and language, in culture and religious sentiment.

They will always be the ramparts of Christian faith against the arch enemy of the world—communism.

We, as free people, must free these children from communistic bondage.

The cry of the mothers of Greece shall and will be heard.

We must not fail them.

We shall not fail them.

Acheson Logic

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART
OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, February 24 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a column of comment entitled "Acheson Logic," by Rev. James M. Gillis, C. S. P., appearing under date of February 16, 1950, under the headline of his column entitled "What's Right With the World," published in the Witness, the official paper of the Catholic archdiocese, of Dubuque, Iowa.

There being no objection, the comment was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WHAT'S RIGHT WITH THE WORLD

ACHESON LOGIC

(A column of comment by James M. Gillis, C. S. P.)

We had a few words in this column not long ago about inconsistency in the dealing of our Department of State with foreign countries. The instance cited was our hostile attitude toward Spain and China in contrast with our favoring Greece and Russia. Being asked to explain, Mr. Acheson said:

"There seems to be a great interest in many quarters in trying to point out a logical inconsistency. They say if you do so and so in Greece, why don't you do so and so in China. The idea is that we must always act exactly the same way in every country in the world. That, I think, is not a helpful way of discussing foreign policy and it is a very false trend."

Since Mr. Acheson mentions logic let's stop right here to remark that in those words he has played a logical trick. Nobody had demanded that he always act exactly in the same way in every country. What he asked, at least in this column, was since you say the United States refuses to send an ambassador to Spain because Spain has no trial by jury, no habeas corpus act, and no popular elections, why doesn't the United States refuse to send an ambassador to Russia which has no trial by jury, no habeas corpus act and no popular elections? We said nothing about always acting exactly the same way in every country of the world. You indicate that you don't care too much for logic. Neither do we, Mr. Acheson, if by logic you mean the device of answering a question that wasn't asked.

The Secretary of State went on to say: "The United States acts in regard to a foreign nation strictly in regard to American interests or those wider interests which affect American interest. If it is to those interests to do one thing in one country and another thing in another country, * * * I am not in the slightest bit worried."

Not to be too critical, let's pass over the dubious morality of America's acting in regard to any foreign nation strictly in regard to American interests. According to that principle American interests seem to be the touchstone of justice and right. How about the interests of the foreign nation? Should not America act toward China in accordance with the interests of China? Toward Spain in the interests of Spain? And so on? Shouldn't America act in accordance with justice and right whether it helps America or hurts America? But, I say, let that pass, and come back to the question not of ethics but of logic.

Bert Andrews, Washington correspondent of the New York Herald Tribune, suggested in his column on January 15, that Mr. Acheson's disregard of consistency may have been inspired by Ralph Waldo Emerson's familiar dictum: "With consistency a great soul has simply nothing to do. * * * Speak what you think toward in words as hard as cannon balls, and tomorrow speak what tomorrow thinks in hard words again, though it contradicts everything you said today." That was a familiar sentiment with Woodrow Wilson who, by the way, used to add the still more familiar phrase of Emerson's "consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds."

But we must not put the Emersonian sentiment into Mr. Acheson's mouth, though Mr. Andrews seems to have reason to do so. We simply say that the present tragic condition of Europe and Asia is due largely to the fact that the United States of America under two Presidents and at least two Secretaries of State has followed an inconsistent foreign policy.

In the startling disclosure of Mr. X in Life magazine, a couple of years ago, the world was let in on the secret that our State Department's left hand didn't know what its right hand was doing. "That's a heck of a way to run a railroad," said the farmer when he saw a head-on collision on the railroad. And it's a heck of a way to run a government when one Under Secretary in the State Department puts into effect a plan diametrically opposed to that of another Under Secretary.

Nor would it add to the stability of the world if Emerson's fantastic notion of inconsistency as a virtue were taken as the basis of our foreign policy. The Yankee philosopher (or was he only a poet and an orator) had in mind chiefly the difficulty—he would have said the impossibility—of ever finding and holding abstract truth. I think he would have been surprised if he could have known that a hundred years later inconsistency was to become a guide in such a practical matter as international relationships.

In that same passage on consistency (from the essay on self-reliance) he does mention little statesmen who worry about being consistent; so I suppose we are to understand that big statesmen, like Mr. Acheson, have no such worry. If that is what Emerson really meant, he was a more dangerous visionary than most of his admirers have thought him.

Be that as it may, the attempt to run the affairs of the Nation, still more of the world, by having one thing today and another tomorrow can lead only to anarchy. That was the principle on which Hitler and Stalin worked. They swore allegiance to each other one day and were at each other's throat the next. So of Russia and Japan. They had a neutrality pact so long as it served them, but when the time came they unceremoniously ditched it.

Is that the kind of thing we Americans must now be prepared to do? In fact, we have done it twice, at least—once in Yugoslavia and once in China. Mihailovitch used to be our man. We chucked him and took over Tito who then executed the man who had been our man. One cynic in high political circles has said, "Tito, of course, is a s. o. b., but he is now our s. o. b." Has the great and glorious American Republic descended to that base amoralism?

Also Chiang Kai-shek was our man. Now we have jettisoned him because to hold to him would no longer be in accord with American interests. Is that what we are to call statesmanship? And justice? And right? How about it, Mr. Acheson?

Editorial Comment on Proposed Constitutional Amendment Abolishing Electoral College

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. SCOTT W. LUCAS
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an editorial entitled "Constitutional Amendment on Elections," published in the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950, and the other entitled "Lodge's Amendment," published in the Rockford (Ill.) Star of February 4, 1950.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago (Ill.) Daily Calumet of February 4, 1950]

CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT ON ELECTIONS

An amendment to the Constitution of the United States affecting the election of President and Vice President of the United States is on the way. If enacted into organic law, no citizen will lose his vote, once he has cast a ballot.

Our own United States Senator SCOTT W. LUCAS, a Democrat, teamed with United States Senator HENRY CABOT LODGE, of Massachusetts, to win this week a two-thirds majority in the Senate providing for the election of President in the electoral college on a basis of proportionate votes of the electorates of the respective States.

Under the system which has prevailed ever since the electoral college was created the candidate who gets a plurality in any State in an election receives all its electoral votes. If a Presidential candidate defeated his opponent in Illinois by 1,000 votes say, he would be given all 28 of Illinois' votes in the electoral college. Remember, some 4,000,000 vote in Illinois.

As the law now stands, all citizens who voted for the losing candidate lose their choice in the electoral college. The proposed amendment will change that by having the State's electoral vote divided between the two candidates—or more—on a proportionate basis. For example in Illinois with 28 votes, a candidate receiving 75 percent of the popular vote would be given three-fourths of the electoral college markers. And so on, for any percentage involved.

Beyond a doubt the amendment for a fairer allocation of the electoral vote will meet with support among citizens generally. It frequently happens the popular vote of a State is divided between two candidates, with one receiving 51 percent of the ballots, and the other, 49. Yet under the present system the 2 percent plurality is enough to

give the candidate enjoying this shade of advantage all the electoral votes in the State.

Whether the amendment can succeed is another matter. It faces a long, long trial before enactment. It now must be approved by a two-thirds vote of the House. That accomplished, the amendment must be ratified by at least three-fourths of the 48 States. This may require from 5 to 7 years.

Make no mistake, this is a solid step forward for democracy because all the people have a voice right down to the wire. It would be interesting if one had the time, and inclination to statistical research, to delve back into history to see how many men missed the White House under the present system of winner take all.—H. F. W.

[From the Rockford (Ill.) Star of February 5, 1950]

LODGE'S AMENDMENT

From the time when Senator LODGE of Massachusetts introduced his plan for a proportional counting of electoral votes—a plan to take the place of the "winner-take-all" system in use today—we have looked with favor on the proposal. Nor has the argument that such proportional counting would tend to create splinter parties appeared to us to have much validity.

As for the new plan's being favorable to one party or the other, it has seemed to us that the long-distance gain would be to the Republican Party, since proportional counting would tend to make the "solid South" a ground of contest for both parties.

Yet when the resolution calling for presentation to the States of a constitutional amendment providing proportional counting, and actually doing away with the electoral college, came to a vote Wednesday, it was a bloc of 23 Republicans which offered the most opposition. The resolution was adopted, 64 to 27, with more than the required two-thirds margin. Opposing the resolution were those 23 Republicans and 4 Democrats; in favor of the resolution were 46 Democrats and 18 Republicans. Senator TAFT said he thought the amendment would work to the disadvantage of the Republican Party.

The amendment resolution must now go to the House, where a two-thirds margin is likewise required. If it passes the House, the States will take it up, and three-fourths of the States must ratify before it is proclaimed as a constitutional amendment and thus charter law.

Illinois offers an excellent example of how proportional counting would work. In 1948, Mr. Truman carried this State by a little more than 30,000 votes out of some 3,956,000 votes cast. Yet the entire electoral-college vote of Illinois had to be counted for Truman. Under the Lodge amendment, the vote would have been divided, with a margin of less than 1 percent for Mr. Truman, and with the rest credited to Mr. Dewey.

In a number of other States there was likewise a narrow edge of victory for Mr. Truman; and if the electoral vote had been divided in proportion to the popular vote, the margin would have been close, although Mr. Truman would still have had the edge.

Senator LODGE feels that, if proportional counting were used, there would develop a revived bipartisanism throughout the country, since, even in the South, a Republican could make his national vote count to the extent that it was a proportion of the total of his State's vote. A Republican in a traditionally Democratic State is disenfranchised as surely by the electoral method which we now use as he would be if he were interdicted at the polls by a poll tax.

As for splinter parties, the chief offender has been New York State, although the South presented a Democratic State's rights splinter party in the last presidential election. The splinter vote in New York, proportionately divided, would have given only a minor place to Henry Wallace. The South's splinter actually got recognition, since the electoral votes of the split-off States went to Governor Thurmond, the State's righter.

But, to meet any real splinter threat, Senator LUCAS, of Illinois, got accepted, as part of the Lodge amendment, a provision that the winning presidential candidate must get at least 40 percent of the electoral vote. If the leading candidate lacked 40 percent, Congress would decide between the two highest candidates, with each Senator and House Member having one vote each.

It is difficult to see how this Lodge arrangement would work to the disadvantage of the Republicans, save as it might create a real Republican Party in the South which could not be manipulated as to delegates in national conventions. In fact, the disadvantage would seem to lie with the Democrats if a south hitherto solid had to yield over some electoral votes to the Republicans.

We believe, with LODGE, that proportional counting of electoral votes would revivify the two-party system for the entire country. We also believe that it would reduce the talk of mandates by showing the narrowness of party victories.

Uncertainty in Steel

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY J. DAVENPORT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. DAVENPORT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial and letter:

[From the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette of June 7, 1949]

UNCERTAINTY IN STEEL

Last week the Senate made a laudable effort toward resolving business uncertainty when it passed a bill that would permit freight absorption in industrial pricing. But while this gives promise that the controversial basing-point issue, which was left up in the air in two Supreme Court rulings, will eventually be decided for good and all, the Senate's gesture can actually have a deterrent effect on future business unless the House quickly follows suit with similar legislation.

Take steel, which traditionally absorbed freight costs to its customers. Because recent Government policy on the matter has been vague, to say the least, the steel industry was changed over last year to f. o. b. or cost-at-the-mill method of pricing in practice, the latter method has proved more expensive to the average consumer of steel. Senator O'MAHONEY, the New Deal lawmaker, who sponsored the recent Senate bill to legalize freight absorption is certainly aware of this fact, thanks no doubt to his constituents way out in Wyoming, who, under the new system, have had to pay stiff freight charges on steel shipped to them. Now, however, since the Senate has voted overwhelmingly to allow industry to quit f. o. b. pricing, steel consumers may well expect that the outlook for similar action by the House is bright. And since freight absorption will mean cheaper steel on the average, these consumers may find it prudent to hold back on present orders which are still reckoned f. o. b. This added element of uncertainty is poor news for steel makers who are already experiencing a shrinkage of their markets. Production of steel, for example, has dropped from 102 percent of capacity in mid-March to 89 percent now. While this dip is due almost wholly to the general postwar readjustment of America's economy it could also be influenced in the future by a reluctance of steel customers to buy when they think there is a chance for cheaper prices. And that chance will exist as long as the House delays on the O'Mahoney bill.

For the short term as well as the long-term business good, then, the House should now give priority to writing this measure into law.

JOY MANUFACTURING CO.,
Pittsburgh, Pa., August 10, 1949.

Hon. HARRY J. DAVENPORT,
Congressman, Twenty-ninth
District of Pennsylvania,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. DAVENPORT: I read your speech on the basing-point bill, S. 1008, with much interest. Our company is not in the steel business, but we do have plants at different locations in the United States that will be most seriously affected in their business and their employment if we are prohibited from equalizing transportation costs to meet the prices of more favorably located competitors.

For example, our plant in New Hampshire, which manufactures rock drills, must compete in the western mining areas with competitors having plants located in California. We have no understanding or agreements with anybody respecting the prices of rock drills, but obviously we have to at least meet the prices quoted for deliveries from those west coast plants in the western mining areas. This we customarily do by paying the freight on our rock drills to our San Francisco warehouse and distributing from that point on a delivered price basis to meet the western competition. If we are compelled to cease this sales method we will, of course, be forced out of all of the rock-drill business of that great mining territory.

The same conditions prevail with respect to shipments of coal-mining machinery from that same plant in competition with plants of competitors located in or adjacent to the coal-mining districts.

This illustrates what we face in the sale of other products from plants located in New Hampshire, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana, Missouri, and Texas, each of which makes special products for national distribution, and, in various markets, must meet more favorably located competitors.

I am glad to see you speaking from your own personal experience, endeavoring to give some practical relief to manufacturers in this country from the decisions of the courts that will be most hampering and restrictive unless they are changed by amendments to existing laws.

Very truly yours,
J. D. A. MORROW,
President.

Proposed Airplane Trip to the North Pole

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HUGH BUTLER
OF NEBRASKA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Airplane Scheduled To Make Landing at North

Pole Next Summer; Hubbard on Flight," published in the Daily Alaska Empire, of Juneau, Alaska, of February 20, 1950. The article deals with the proposed trip to the North Pole by plane. Father Hubbard, the famous glacier priest, will be a passenger. I am particularly desirous of having this article printed in the RECORD in view of Father Hubbard's expressed views respecting statehood for Alaska.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AIRPLANE SCHEDULED TO MAKE LANDING AT NORTH POLE NEXT SUMMER—HUBBARD ON FLIGHT

SEATTLE, February 20.—Sometime this summer an airplane is scheduled to make the first recorded landing at the North Pole, and among its passengers will be the Rev. Bernard Hubbard, S. J.

It will be a thrilling climax to 23 years of Arctic exploration for the noted glacier priest.

"For years I have looked forward to conducting mass at the north pole," he said here Saturday.

Father Hubbard, who has covered thousands of miles on foot in the far north, climbing snow-covered peaks, studying volcanoes, and gathering a wide variety of scientific data, will make the forthcoming flight in a United States Air Force plane.

"The Air Force has made 400 flights over the pole," he said, "but no one has landed there—at least no United States plane.

REMAIN FULL DAY

"We plan to stay a full day. It is important to learn all we can about actual conditions on the top of the world.

"As more planes fly over the polar region we know some will be lost, but we want to save the men. It's to gain the information on survival there and to perfect the rescue program that this flight is planned."

At the North Pole the ice attains a maximum thickness of about 18 feet and the temperature rises considerably above zero, Father Hubbard said.

"In fact, it rains there sometimes," he added.

TO SOUND OCEAN

Among other things, the party will sound the ocean.

"It is reported to be 14,000 feet deep, but we want to find out for sure," he said.

Father Hubbard, who lectured and showed his latest color motion pictures of the far north at the Civic Auditorium last night, said he considers the defense of Alaska is progressing satisfactorily.

"The situation in Alaska is good," he said, "except that some places housing and recreation for the servicemen should be improved.

"Should Russia parachute troops and take some of our military fields, they could not maintain a line of supply, which would be a minimum of 1,000 miles long. And the worst handicap, the weather, works against foe as well as defender."

DECAY VERSUS INVASION

He said he feared decay from within the Territory far more than possible invasion from without.

"The vastness and impenetrability of Alaska are already strong defenses," he said. "As an offense base it has bases with runways 9 miles long—two near Fairbanks and one near Anchorage. We're ready for any kind of an air strike from Russia."

AGAINST STATEHOOD

The priest said he is opposed to statehood for the Territory because of possible exploitation of the area's rich natural resources.

"It has too few legitimate taxpayers to become a State. In the wrong hands it would make the Pendergast and Hague political machines look like peanut sellers," he said.

"I'm not nearly as afraid of penetration from without as I am of decay from within. If we ever have any real fear of the Russians coming into Alaska, we already will have been so hopelessly betrayed from within that it won't much matter."

Fight of Spain for Survival

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. L. GARY CLEMENTE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. CLEMENTE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I wish to have printed in the appendix of the RECORD an article on conditions in Spain. This article, written by Patrick F. Scanlan, appeared in the Tablet on February 18, 1950, It follows:

PRAISES HEROIC FIGHT OF SPAIN FOR SURVIVAL—NATION, VICTIM OF MISFORTUNE AND WITHOUT OUTSIDE AID, AROUSES ADMIRATION—FRANCO GIVES INTERVIEW—LEADER URGES FRIENDLY RELATIONS WITH UNITED STATES; NATION NEEDS FOOD

(By Patrick F. Scanlan)

MADRID, SPAIN, February 11.—The heroism and the unity of the Spanish people under most distressing and discouraging circumstances impresses the visitor to Spain. The government, facing obstacle after obstacle, has with rugged determination fought against an economic debacle from within and the pressure of boycott from without.

Spain's handicaps are as follows:

1. A fearful war of liberation from the Communist menace, which continued from 1936 to 1939, costing 1,000,000 lives, crippling thousands of others and destroying an inestimable amount of property.

2. The stealing by anti-Spanish forces of the entire gold currency of the county and transferring it to Soviet Russia.

3. Six years of drought which have proven almost catastrophic. The present government has erected 11 dams but today there is no water behind any of them. The water shortage has seriously affected crops, electric power, the water supply, and the raising of cattle. Some industrial plants have had to close down 3 days in the week and elevators in large buildings have been temporarily discontinued.

4. The boycott of the Spanish Government by many other nations has prevented trade relations and the obtaining of loans. Spain is one of the few European countries barred from obtaining aid from the United States or loans from the World Bank.

Yet Spain has courageously endeavored to make a go of it alone when almost any other country would have either abdicated or succumbed to the dictatorial power and interference of other nations.

MEETING WITH GENERAL FRANCO

Yesterday afternoon we had the opportunity of meeting Generalissimo Francisco Franco. The meeting, which lasted 20 minutes, took place in the former Palace of the Kings just outside Madrid. The approach to the building was simple and we noted only 16 guards around the ruler's headquarters, or less than the guard which usually surrounds President Truman in public appearances.

The General is a short, stoutish figure and, in a double-breasted navy blue suit with civilian tie, looks like an American businessman. He is completely unlike the ferocious type of dictator pictured by the foreign press; rather he is shy, retiring, pleasant, and friendly.

In a brief message, spoken fluently and without hesitation, he called attention to the value of the airplane in promoting concord, stating "since it has been the means of reducing space and bringing peoples of foreign nations together, so, too, should it by the mingling of distant peoples promote friendship."

The Spanish people, he added, have no differences of any kind with the American people, but, on the contrary, have many points of common interest. The General then said he welcomed visitors to Spain and added newspapermen were particularly welcome in the country and he assured them that every facility would be at their disposal.

Journalists, he continued, have a special mission to perform and by their sincere efforts can bring nations together and promote friendship among the peoples. "You have every facility to see the truth about Spain and the reality of what we are trying to do," he said.

Far from having differences, the Generalissimo pointed out, Spain, by reason of discovery, of blood and religion, has many ties with the people of America. He said he hoped the journalists would return often and that many Americans would come to visit Spain. He closed by stating truth was very important and as a part of good reporting made for understanding. He hoped this would be one of the results of the visit to Spain of journalists.

To call Spain a "police state" is completely incorrect, as any visitor will note. The members of the TWA press flight had little or no trouble getting into Spain and they traveled about as they pleased without having to show a police card or obtain a permit of any kind. Moreover, in covering several hundred miles, few soldiers were observed.

The food situation is critical. Nearly everything is rationed and bread and potatoes are particularly scarce. Many farms outside of Madrid—a fine, modern, up-to-date city, with large, clean thoroughfares and a variety of good shops—have been denuded by the lack of water and the number of cattle is alarmingly low. The people are industrious, law-abiding, and only ask for the minimum requirements to get along.

The houses, apartments, and other buildings in the city are well constructed of brick and stone and present a pleasing appearance. There is, moreover, a tremendous building program for everywhere one turns structures of all kinds are being erected.

We were particularly struck by what we saw at University City in the outskirts of Madrid. This huge educational center was practically destroyed in the war for liberation. Today, however, it has practically been rebuilt and the large, modern, well-equipped and well-lighted buildings would do credit to Harvard, Yale, Princeton, Notre Dame or any large American university.

RELIGIOUS CONDITIONS

The Spanish people are good Catholics and attend church in large numbers. The 8:30 mass on Thursday in a neighboring Capuchin church had more than 300 present—and half of them men—and the 11 o'clock mass in another nearby church on the following day had close to 100 present—and these were week-day masses. In the latter church while one priest celebrated the mass another from the pulpit recited the Latin and the congregation in unison made the responses, nearly all possessing missals.

The Irish Minister to Spain, Hon. Leo. T. Macauley, who recently served in the United

States, told us it was a great problem to get a seat at any mass in a Madrid church on Sunday unless one got there from 15 to 30 minutes in advance of the starting time. He also stated the Protestant church in the neighborhood of his house conducted services and the minister's Sunday sermons were frequently quoted by visitors to his residence. Incidentally, the attractive and most pleasant Mrs. Macauley is the former Miss Georgia Gorman, of Elmhurst, in the Brooklyn diocese and she attended St. Bartholomew's Church for many years.

OPINION OF SPANISH LEADERS

At a reception in the American Embassy we, with others, were talking to a Spaniard who is a figure in public life and someone asked "is criticism of Franco permitted?" "If it isn't," he said, "just listen to me." Then he proceeded to attack the Spanish leader largely on the grounds that he had evolved no program for continuing the government once he died or went out of office.

We asked if there were many political prisoners in Spain. He answered that their number was exceedingly small, and then he proceeded to attack the government's leniency in giving a recent amnesty to prisoners who had in the war of 12 years ag. committed serious offenses against people and property.

We then inquired about changing the form of government. He replied one of General Franco's strongest aids was the experience the people suffered in the war for liberation, for the horror and suffering of that period taught the people that communism and lawlessness were a far worse menace than anything that could come from the present regime—a regime headed by a man who had actually defeated both Hitler and Stalin and had restored public order.

"Do free labor unions exist?" was another query we submitted to several Spaniards. The answer was that in Spain the workers are united in syndicates and are protected by the government. In industrial disputes the government invariably rules in favor of the workers, it was said, and as an example it was stated that at present, while factories and huge industries could operate only 2 and 3 days a week due to the water famine, the government had ruled that employers must pay the employees a full week's salary. It was also observed that a government permit must be obtained for the dismissal of employees.

AMERICAN POLICY STUPID

Most Americans we talked to in Madrid denounced the United States policy toward Spain as inhuman, stupid, contradictory, and inviting disaster.

It was called inhuman because the Spanish people today are greatly in need of food and are willing to buy it, but the United States, following the appeasement of Russian policy adopted several years back, has made Spain a pariah and prevented aid to these men and women who are our friends.

It was called stupid because a strong Spain is America's best ally in the fight against communism.

It was called contradictory because the United States has been giving aid to Tito and other nations whose form of government and leaders we dislike.

It was said to be inviting disaster, for a collapsed Spain might permit the anti-American pro-Red forces to seize power, and if they did Italy, France, Spain, and Germany would likely fall to the Reds.

We asked an American official at the embassy just how the Government of Spain, to which the United States refuses full recognition and aid, differed from that of Portugal, which the United States fully recognizes and into which millions of dollars have been poured.

He answered: "The difference is that Salazar has ruled Portugal since 1927 and Franco has ruled Spain only since 1939."

We inquired as to whether the Salazar government was fully approved; the answer was "No, but then we should not interfere in the domestic affairs of foreign countries."

Yet this rule does not direct our policy toward Spain. Of this one may be sure, the Spanish people have resented the UN policy toward their country and the Russian-inspired plan to overthrow the Franco regime has made the government stronger in the minds of the masses, for the Spaniard has pride and objects to foreigners telling him how to run his country.

Spain today needs food, modern machinery, transportation equipment, and fertilizer for the farms. The United States could make no better investment from a viewpoint of humanitarianism, insurance against communism, and the cultivation of friendship which would extend all the way through Latin American countries, than by giving Spain this modicum of help and at once.

MAYOR OF MADRID FRANK

The acting mayor of Madrid—the mayor was in Rome on a Holy Year pilgrimage—was very frank in discussing the situation in Spain. He asserted the country was endeavoring to preserve civilization against communism and revolution and had succeeded thus far. It was, he added, astounding that the Marshall plan and United States aid to so many countries—some of which hated everything American—left Spain out of consideration. He urged that Americans include Spain, particularly the needy children of the country, in the help they were so generously giving to other nations and people.

BROADCAST TO THE UNITED STATES

Just how the Americans were impressed by what they witnessed in Spain was strikingly revealed on Thursday night of last week. While at a dinner given the TWA press flight deleg.tion in the Hotel Ritz in Madrid five, including the writer, were asked at midnight if they cared to go on the mighty Spanish broadcast to the United States. Not only did all immediately consent, but in a half-hour program each praised Spain and their commendation went all the way from voicing admiration of the orderliness and cleanliness of the city to urging that the Marshall plan include the interesting and worth-seeing country.

A BELGIAN'S VIEW

A much-traveled Belgian, a man of intelligence and discernment, gave us this apt observation on world affairs: "The only two leaders of nations who know what the world conflict is all about are Stalin and Franco. Stalin is consistent in his program aiming at world revolution and the destruction of Christian civilization. Franco is equally consistent in his opposition to communism, and all its adjuncts and fronts; he refuses to budge in his fight against the menace to Christianity and is the one leader who has, without deviation, sought to preserve the values which have made men and nations great."

Electric Power Industry in Arkansas

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the De Queen (Ark.) Bee for January 19, 1950:

NEWS, VIEWS, AND COMMENT

(By Ralph B. Kite)

Congressman BOYD TACKETT's stand against the proposed Federal grab of the electric power industry in Arkansas deserves the commendation of all who are becoming fed up with the creeping trend toward socialism in our country. The Southwestern Power Administration (SPA), the Interior Department's offshoot from Rural Electrification Administration (REA), would, with a flourish of a Federal pen, virtually take over the privately owned, well-managed, taxpaying electric power industry in the Southwest, and Arkansas in particular. They would ruthlessly disregard the interests of thousands of private citizens who have invested their savings in these power companies. We are happy to see BOYD TACKETT stand up on his feet and show up this power-mad tentacle of the Department of the Interior.

Sale of Federal Electric Power in Southwest

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. BOYD TACKETT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following article by C. F. Byrns, from the Southwest American, of Fort Smith, Ark., for January 28, 1950:

OFF THE RECORD

(By C. F. Byrns)

A good way to cut Federal Government expenses is to use private enterprises instead of competing with them. That's exactly what will happen in Arkansas, Oklahoma, and other States in this area if pending contracts governing Federal electric power sale are approved by the Interior Department.

Douglas Wright, Director of the Southwestern Power Administration, is responsible for the sale and distribution of electric power generated at federally owned dams on the Red, White, and other streams in this section of America. Lately, he negotiated contracts with the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co. and the Public Service Co. of Oklahoma for distribution of Federal power through the privately owned electric utilities. Similar negotiations are under way with other power companies in the same area, including Arkansas Power & Light Co., Southwestern Gas & Electric Co., Gulf States Utilities Co., Arkansas-Missouri Power Co., and Missouri Utilities Co.

This week, Wright told the House committee considering his budget requests that he will cut $5,000,000 off the expense for the year beginning next July 1 if these contracts are finally approved. The reason is this: He is asking for $5,000,000 in that 1 year, with more to follow, for construction by the Federal Government with Federal money of facilities for distribution of Federal power. Those facilities will not be needed if the contracts are approved for distribution by the private companies.

The proposed contracts make the best possible use of the electric power being generated and planned in the Southwest.

They provide a way to use the hydropower for peaking purposes; that is, for carrying the excess load of demand at the peak hours, while steam plants owned by the private companies carry the normal around-the-clock demand.

Everybody in the power business, both Federal and private, recognizes that peaking power is the most profitable use of hydroelectric energy in this part of the Nation. The stream flows in this area are widely variant. Continuous power from hydro plants requires continuous flows of the streams in large quantities. We do not have that. But we do have many opportunities for developing hydro power as an incident to flood control, silt control, navigation, and other water uses. That power should be put to use in the public interest, on the most economical basis possible.

Under the proposed contracts with the private companies, Federal power will be sold to them at the Federal power plants and at existing interchange points between federally owned and private lines. The private companies will deliver power for the Federal Government to customers now on their lines or hereafter put under contract for use of Federal power.

This arrangement removes the necessity for spending large sums of public money to build parallel and competing transmission lines. It eliminates the need for federally owned steam-power plants to firm up the hydro power. It cuts down the public investment in the river development program.

When the Southwestern Power Administration proposed in 1946 establishment of a network of transmission lines and steam plants in this area, the cost was estimated at $200,000,000 or more. It would be much more now. If that added cost were necessary, it would seriously threaten and possibly defeat the whole program of river development in the Southwest. If the proposed contracts are finally approved, these heavy Federal investments will be unnecessary, the private companies will not have to face tax-free competition, and the electric users will still have all the benefits of public power.

Useless Duplication

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Lawton (Okla.) Constitution for April 17, 1949:

USELESS DUPLICATION

One of the needless wastes in Government which the taxpayers must pay is the constant efforts of Federal bureaus to project the Government further into business, largely to make their own jobs more important and add to their personal power and prestige.

Probably one of the most useless duplications is the proposal, contained in the current Federal budget, to build huge power plants in various parts of the country. One of the projected plants is in southwest Oklahoma and would cost around $11,000,000.

There is no shortage of power in southwest Oklahoma that would warrant such expenditure. Existing utilities have expanded their power production to a point where they can supply ample power for any foreseeable need. To build additional plants is a waste of public money that is totally unjustified.

If Congress approves the proposed expansion of Government-owned power plants there can be only one ultimate outcome. That is the elimination of all private power production, with the resultant loss in taxes and the further expansion of big government. In most cases this will mean political manipulation of the power business and probably a loss in efficiency of operation and service to the public.

If the people want the Government to take over the power business, the logical thing is for it to take over existing systems. There is no point in duplicating existing investments where there is no need for additional facilities. We doubt that a majority of the people have become so socialistic minded that they want this to be done. The pressure for such action comes largely from the bureaucracy which thrives upon wastefulness and useless Government expenditures.

Free Enterprise Versus Welfare State

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Tulsa World for July 27, 1949:

FREE ENTERPRISE VERSUS WELFARE STATE

Current legislative fencing in Congress has obscured what could well be one of the most important domestic issues facing the lawmaking body—that of public power. The Federal Government is already deep in a program of power development and each session of the Congress is confronted with requests for increased funds to extend both the production and distribution of hydro and steam-produced power. The desirability and need for a national public power policy is clear.

The Government-subsidized Southwestern Power Administration is seeking a large appropriation in order to extend its facilities which will actually duplicate those of private electric companies. The tax-free SPA would then be in a position to offer a competitive rate to customers of existing private utilities lower than the companies' rates by an amount less than the total taxes now paid by the electric firms—and which taxes the politically managed system would not have to pay. Oklahoma's two Senators [ELMER THOMAS and ROBERT S. KERR] are opposing each other in this matter. Senator THOMAS takes the correct and wise position that there is no need or reason for duplication of present facilities. Senator KERR's stand is incompatible with sound economy and subscribes to a dangerous philosophy stemming from Socialistic doctrines. There is no uniformity to his stand. On the one hand he resents and vigorously fights threats of Government interference and regulation of the gas and oil industry—in which he is financially interested. And, on the other, he wants an unfair federally subsidized competition for the private power industry—in which he is interested only as a consumer.

Speaker SAM RAYBURN has also placed himself in an analogous situation. He was instrumental in furthering a contract between the SPA and private utilities in Texas whereby the latter purchased the Government-produced power, but he is opposed to a similar proposition for the Oklahoma utilities. The SPA program is of and for the welfare state. It wants $652,000,000. If that is granted it will kill 19 private utilities in the SPA domain. In nine short years these utilities will pay $737,000,000 in taxes.

Better Save This Twelve Millions

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BOYD TACKETT
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TACKETT. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Chickasha (Okla.) Star of June 2, 1949:

BETTER SAVE THIS TWELVE MILLIONS

The Government is asking for $12,000,000 to build high-voltage lines all over southeastern Oklahoma. No one can be found outside of the fellows whose jobs depend upon the expenditure of these funds who will claim that this expenditure of funds is needed or necessary. These lines are not needed to give any farmer in this area rural electricity. The promoters of the plan have only thought in mind to socialize the production of light and power.

They intend to completely take over the power business in southeastern Oklahoma just as they have taken it over in Nebraska and Tennessee. They do not claim that there is any dearth of power or power facilities in private hands in this section. What they want is socialized industry and the easiest group on which to start is the production and distribution of electrical power. With a mounting Federal deficit where would be a better place to start economy than by the lopping off of this twelve millions.

Mistreatment of Greek Children

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HENRY CABOT LODGE, JR.
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I have today called the attention of the Senate to the shocking abduction by Communist forces of thousands of Greek children, and I desire to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD various comments regarding that subject.

The first is an editorial entitled "Crime Against Civilization," from the New York Journal-American.

I also ask to have inserted an article entitled "Children or Slaves?" published by the Greek Government Office of Information.

Next I ask to have printed an article published by the Greek Theological Institute, 50 Goddard Avenue, Brookline, Mass.

I also ask to have printed in the Appendix a statement entitled "War Against Greek Children," published by the Hellenic Boy Scouts and Girl Guides Associations.

There being no objection, the matters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Journal-American of January 24, 1950]

CRIME AGAINST CIVILIZATION

(By Harry H. Schlacht)

Murder, looting, and cruelty, kidnaping, outrages and brutality are still the order of the day in Communist Russia.

The abduction of 28,000 Greek children by Communist guerrillas in Greece is a crime against humanity. The American people are stirred by this shocking outrage against mankind.

It is but a succession of savage deeds and stands unparalleled in the annals of recorded history.

It is a new and unheard of kind of warfare. It is a new and unheard of kind of barbarism.

It is designed to convert these children to communism. It is designed to imbue them with a hatred against their country and religion.

The mothers of Greece plead for the return of their children. From the woes and sorrows of Greek homes come the wailing of fathers and mothers that will not be silenced until their children are restored to them.

This is a time to give Greece—our ally in peace and war—a helping hand. This is a time for American greatness.

America is the light of the world. America must take the leadership in this godly cause.

This is an appeal to the conscience of civilization. This is an appeal to the hearts of all civilized human beings.

Let us voice our thunderous protest against this communistic iniquity. Let us speak of it until these depraved creatures will understand. Let us speak of it until these morally deaf will hear.

Let the monsters of Moscow know that the Greek children will never be converted to communism. Like their ancestors, they will hold aloft God's torch of liberty to light the pathway of civilization.

They will always be God-loving children, in spirit and language, in culture and religious sentiment. They will always be the ramparts of Christian faith against the arch-enemy of the world—communism.

We, as free people, must free these children from communistic bondage.

The cry of the mothers of Greece shall and will be heard.

We must not fail them. We shall not fail them.

[Published by the Greek Government Office of Information, 30 Rockefeller Plaza, room 1519, May 1948]

CHILDREN OR SLAVES?

(This is a reprint from the Union Jack (No. 1014), an English paper for the British Army in Greece)

On the 29th of February this year one of the grimmest samples of Communist-inspired cruelty was thrust at the people of Greece. The news came over in a series of broadcasts from Communist-dominated state announcing that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania were offering hospitality to 60,000 Greek children.

The ironical term of "hospitality" was given as a pretext that these states wished to save the children from famine and educate them in "free countries" but Greece has her own word for it—"Paidomazoma"—meaning "the stealing of the children."

FORCIBLE HOSPITALITY

On the same day from districts of northern Greece, children aged from 3 to 15 were torn from their families by armed bandits. The Communist program as usual, was well prepared in advance.

Markos and his colleagues, undoubtedly aware of the profound ties that attach Greek parents to their children, could have dealt no deadlier a blow to those thousands of mothers and fathers living in the danger zones, where his forcible hospitality would become an endless nightmare.

This unsurpassed piece of barbarism is one of which the world at large appears to be singularly unaware. The foreign press devoted little space to the kidnaping of the Greek children, nor did it seem to notice that this announcement coincided with the day on which UNO decided to form an organization for aid to children all over the world.

BLOW TO CIVILIZATION

What exactly does this deportation of children mean? How deeply does it infringe on the rights of freedom and on our conception of democracy?

Some may think that it is a purely local affair concerning Greece only, but we have seen before how totalitarian systems are aimed, not at one country, but at a whole civilization.

If the children of Greece are allowed to be abducted and to be taught the new Communist creed who can say where such methods may lead humanity?

For of course, the plan is to take those who are young and eradicate all memories of the past. To bring them up as citizens of a totalitarian regime with no thoughts in their heads other than those taught by the creed, with no feelings in their hearts other than a hatred for all people and races who do not agree with their creed.

Facts and figures, however, may convey more weight than generalizations. One of the most appalling of these facts is that up to date some 12,000 children have already been deported by the bandits.

How they were taken makes sad reading. Some were dragged from their parents who dared not protest, fearing that they would see them killed on the spot. In many cases mothers offered to go instead and were shot.

In long desperate lines these children were driven over the mountains clad in rags, shoeless and cold. Those who survived the forced marches were herded into camps in the countries where they will be taught to hate their own people.

Stories of tragedy and heroism are endless. Some of these young victims have managed to escape and have harrowing experiences to relate. From all over the threatened areas of Greece, refugees are now pouring into the main cities and most of them are children fleeing from destruction and exile.

A typical story of the courage and epic endurance of the stricken youth of Greece, is that of Eftychia Kalyva, from the village of Kalesmeno, some miles from Karpenissi.

GIRL'S HEROISM

One evening bandits entered the village to loot, and capture as many children as possible. Sixteen-year-old Eftychia was an orphan who lived with her two small brothers aged 8 and 11.

Hearing the noise of wailing and sobbing from neighboring homes, she realized what was happening, woke the children and took them away with her in the darkness. She knew that at Karpenissi there was a Greek Army outpost, but the main road would not be safe, so in spite of the heavy snows she started off on a rocky mountain path.

For hours she plowed her way ahead, digging through the snow with her bare hands while the children followed. Eftychia walked all night, her face and feet torn by thorns and rock, her hands and breast bleeding.

REACHED SAFETY

She reached the first military roadblock by dawn and when the sentry sprang forward to cry "Halt" it was one of the children who begged "Don't shoot."

Eftychia only had the strength to murmur "the children," before she fell in a heap at the sentry's feet and died. Today the two small boys for whom she gave her life are at a Red Cross convalesent home.

To save these children of Greece, the Government is now organizing a large-scale evacuation from the bandit-infested provvinces. Queen Frederika of Greece has been largely responsible for collecting the funds through which these youngsters are housed in camps all over the country, fed, and given proper care.

One of the Queen's ideas is to send evacuees to the Dodecanese Islands, especially to the island of Leros where available barracks can be transformed into suitable quarters.

The Greek Red Cross assisted mainly by voluntary nurses, takes care of the evacuation of the children and of looking after them in the camps. Last week a ship came into Piraeus carrying 1,200 young passengers from Macedonia and Thrace, who have been accommodated in the Athens area.

Many families, rich and poor alike, have offered to take refugees into their homes, but for the time being the Greek Government is keeping them together in camps where they can be cared for by welfare organizations.

Now that the United Nations Aid to Children has come into being, help will surely be forthcominig for these innocent victims of planned terror, but meanwhile their upkeep is a heavy burden to the war-stricken economy of Greece.

AMONG OWN PEOPLE

For the parents, separation from their sons and daughters is a long-drawn-out sorrow, but the consolation of knowing that they are safe and among their own people, makes it more acceptable. It is the parents whose children have already been carried away by the bandits, whose suffering is beyond words.

Our twentieth century has seen many crimes and much sorrow; most of the misery has been caused by attacks on that very freedom and tolerance which, from the earliest days of civilization, man has learned to cherish.

It was in ancient Greece that these principles of individual freedom reached their highest aspirations. Can we sit back today and remain unmoved when the youth, the future manhood of a free world, is being taken into slavery?

[From the Greek Theological Institute, Brookline, Mass.]

MORE THAN 28,000 GREEK CHILDREN ARE SUFFERING BEHIND THE IRON CURTAIN—WON'T YOU PLEASE RAISE YOUR VOICE AND FREE THESE YOUNGSTERS?

To All Fellow Christians:

Our Theological Institute, which has as its main purpose the ethical and religious training of our young Greek-American generations, in addition to the preparation and education of our present and future priests who endeavor to propagate our faith and ideals, considers it its duty and privilege to raise loud her voice in protest to the great wrong which is taking place in Greece and to 28,000 (a very moderate figure) Greek children.

The Communists and the guerrillas have seized these innocent children, have callously and heartlessly torn them from the arms of their mothers, and deported them far from our beloved Greece—to Albania, to Yugoslavia, to Bulgaria, to Hungary, to Poland, to Czechoslovakia, to Rumania. There they are kept forcibly under the false pretense that better provisions and accommodations are being made for their health and general welfare.

Actually, however, these children are being detained in these foreign countries for the main purpose of poisoning their hearts and consciences with the be-clouded, be-fogged, and utterly destructive communistic ideas and theories which are, even at this moment, being spread insidiously throughout the noncommunistic world. In other words, they wish to make murderers and janissaries of these children, so that in the future when they are released to return to their mother country they may put to the sword not only their beloved ones, by now long-forgotten, but their country, too.

The opposition which is being offered by the Greek people against the latest communistic attempts to enslave the whole of Greece is being countered by these barbarians in this evil, inhuman, ruthless, and barbaric manner.

For this dastardly crime, we protest from the depths of our hearts, and we earnestly plead with every man, woman, and child of Greek descent in America to do the same.

WIRE PRESIDENT TRUMAN AND STATE DEPARTMENT

Write to your State Senators and Representatives. Entreat them to make possible that which seems impossible—to set free from this communistic slavery these 28,000 children.

Request your newspapers and radio stations to raise their protesting voices in an appeal to the generous American public to become actively interested and sympathetic in this just and worthy cause.

Continue to discuss this intolerable situation with your friends, both Greek and American, old and young, so that we may see these unfortunate victims of aggression speedily returned to their native country and to their loved ones.

Consider this your duty as a member of a great democracy and your obligation as a Christian.

WAR AGAINST GREEK CHILDREN

Our children are being carried away.

On the 29th February, 1948, broadcasts from Communist-dominated states announced that Bulgaria, Yugoslavia, Rumania, and Albania offered "hospitality" to 60,000 Greek children. The pretext given was to save them from famine and to educate them in a free country.

On the same day from districts of northern Greece children aged from 3 to 15 years were torn from their families by armed bandits. They were dragged from the warmth of their homes. Mothers offered to go in their places. Some were shot for trying to save their children.

In long desperate lines the children were driven over the snow-covered mountains. Severed from home, parents and country they were forced across the frontier.

Since then other children have suffered the same fate. Every day more are being abducted. The threat hovers over every home in northern Greece. The children who survive the forced marches and hardships will be herded into camps across the frontier. They will be taught to hate their country and kill their brothers. The planned degradation of these children is a crime against humanity. Their abduction is an attempt to exterminate the Greek people.

We appeal to the civilized world to join in unanimous protest against this barbarous uprooting of children and to defend the ideals of the United Nations.

THE HELLENIC BOY SCOUTS AND GIRL GUIDES ASSOCIATIONS.

Rent Control

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the Congress has a real concern with the question of what ought to be done with Federal rent conrtol. The Washington Post of today offers its reasons for supporting the decontrol of rents. I think the observations are logical, sensible, and fashioned from common sense. I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "End of Rent Control" be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

END OF RENT CONTROL

The action of the Senate Appropriations Committee in refusing the Housing Expediter's request for additional operating funds is equivalent to a vote to end Federal rent control. We hope the Senate will sustain the committee's action, since the extension of control can no longer be justified on the ground that housing shortages are so acute and so widespread as to create a national emergency. It is nearly 5 years since the end of the war. Most wartime controls have long since been dropped. Housing congestion has been alleviated by population shifts and by the recent rapid expansion of new residential housing, although rental housing construction has lagged far behind construction of houses for sale.

To be sure, there are a number of areas where rent control is still needed to protect tenants against profiteering landlords. But if the Federal Government waited until every community in the land could safely dispense with rent controls, there would be no foreseeable end to the Federal control system. Housing shortages have, as shown by the evidence, ceased to be a concern of the Nation and have become a local problem that should be the responsibility of State and local governments. The local authorities are acquainted with conditions in their communities, indeed Federal officials have to depend on their knowledge and enlist their cooperation in administering control legislation.

The risks of decontrol are negligible compared with the advantages of relinquishing a discriminatory form of Federal regulation that denies to landlords the right accorded other property owners to sell their goods and service in the market for what they will bring. The patent inequity of the system is evident from the fact that rent increases in controlled areas have lagged far behind the rise in prices of other goods and increases in the wages and salaries of their tenants. It is further demonstrated by the gap between the rentals charged for occupancy of new properties not subject to control and rental of older controlled properties. Moreover, if Federal rent control were to be continued indefinitely, the construction of new rental housing would be discouraged. For even though the new structures are uncontrolled, rental charges cannot diverge too widely from those paid by occupants of comparable controlled properties.

Of course, removal of control will result in some rent increases that will be resented, and the transitional period of adjustment will bring hardships to some people. This is the price that has to be paid for the return to a system of free enterprise which will provide incentives for the construction of more housing accommodations in still congested centers of population. Meantime, State and local governments are in a position to ease transitional hardships by taking steps to prevent excessive increases in rentals. It is up to them to show the Federal Government that they are capable of handling their own affairs without being subject to its direction.

Lincoln Day Address by Hon. William F. Knowland, of California

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. BOURKE B. HICKENLOOPER

OF IOWA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a very able address delivered by the junior Senator from California [Mr. KNOWLAND] at a Lincoln Day dinner in the city of Des Moines, Iowa.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Mr. Chairman, Governor Beardsley, and fellow Republicans, it is a pleasure to once again be in the city of Des Moines and in the State of Iowa, and to participate with you in this meeting honoring Abraham Lincoln, whose birthday was 141 years ago. His party and ours has contributed much to our Nation's progress. I bring you a hands-across-the-continent greeting from the Republicans of California to the Republicans of Iowa.

There are several reasons why I was pleased to accept the invitation of your Republican State committee. One reason is that this is the home State of my friend and colleague Senator BOURKE HICKENLOOPER. Senator HICKENLOOPER is a member of two standing committees of great importance to the people of the Nation as well as to the people of Iowa. These are Agriculture and Foreign Relations. In addition to that he is a member and former chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy. I have served on the latter committee with him since its organization 4 years ago.

The recent case of Dr. Fuchs in England underscores the fact that Senator HICKENLOOPER was right in stressing the importance of security in matters dealing with atomic policy. The lack of adequate investigation by the British not only endangered the security of their country but endangers our own as well.

While President Truman, who has the primary responsibility for keeping men like Alger Hiss out of our Government, was calling congressional concern over espionage a

red herring, Senator HICKENLOOPER was fighting for the safeguarding of our atomic secrets. You are entitled to know the cold, hard facts of the situation. The breach of security which has taken place is of the most serious character, and I underscore the word serious. It perhaps helps to explain why the Soviet Government was able to develop an atomic explosion at least a year or two in advance of when it had been estimated they would be able to do so.

Another reason I am glad to be here is that I always feel at home in the heartland of America. This may be due in part to the fact that so many of the citizens of my State have come from Iowa and it may be partly due to the fact that my mother and her family came from Cherokee.

Tonight I wish to discuss with you some of the important problems facing us in our domestic life and in international affairs.

It is my strong belief that only with an informed citizenry can we solve these problems that confront us.

Within the last 4 months two catastrophic events have taken place. These are the Soviet success in atomic development (as announced by the President of the United States on September 23, 1949) and the establishment of a Soviet-recognized Communist regime in China. Only in retrospect will we be able to finally determine which event will have the most far-reaching influence. Both have set off "chain reactions" that have not yet run their full course.

These events separately are sufficient to cause everyone who believes we should have a free world of free men to examine his own conduct to determine if he is making his greatest contribution toward freedom. The combined events make it mandatory that we do it.

Our economic system is tied with Siamese-twin attachments to our Constitutional form of Government. If one is destroyed they both perish. There is no need for either catastrophe to happen if we get off the perpetual defensive and take the offensive.

There are too many people who have had our hospitality or advantages joining forces with Moscow and her satellites in spreading their views on "what's wrong with America".

Those who believe in our system should start a crusade to tell "what is right with America."

We, of course, will not close our eyes to the liability side of the ledger, but as citizens with our feet on the ground and common sense gained from experience and observation we know that America's assets in freedom of religion, speech and press and in agricultural, educational, fiscal, industrial, and governmental categories to mention but a few, greatly exceed our liabilities.

Seventy-eight million life insurance policyholders own policies with a face value of over $200,000,000,000.

Individuals who still believe that thrift is a virtue also own directly or through institutions for their account some $67,900,000,000 in savings institutions and $3,300,000,000 in the postal-savings system. A substantial part of the $35,800,000,000 of time deposits in commercial banks is theirs. They also have a stake in annuities and pension funds amounting to an estimated $5,000,000,000 and a direct stake in the social-security system (Federal, State, and local) of $29,000,000,000.

We have more stockholders and home owners than any other nation in the world.

To permit this solvent, going concern of ours to be liquidated by the strong-armed action of international communism or to consent to the voluntary bankruptcy proceedings of state socialism are both unthinkable and unnecessary. We need an alert and determined citizenry if the battle is not to be lost by default.

We must not let complacency destroy the spirit that has developed a great world power out of a small colony in less than 175 years. We must not build or depend upon military or economic Maginot lines.

This Nation has never been wedded to the status quo or ruled by the dead hand of the past. Our economic as well as our political system broke away from Old World patterns.

Shortsighted European-style capitalism built the gallows for its own execution by allowing and encouraging monopolies, cartels, low wages, and great aggregations of capital narrowly held.

The lifeblood of our system to the contrary is competition, productivity, good wages, and widespread ownership of our economic structure.

We must continue to demonstrate to the world that here in America we have political and economic freedom. Here our people, since the founding of the Republic, have looked forward to leaving to their children a better land than they themselves found.

The challenge we face is to meet the economic, social, and political needs of the twentieth century while we maintain free institutions under a constitutional government.

Certainly security alone is not the whole answer. The most secure man is the one who has his clothing, food, medical care, and housing guaranteed for life—as an inmate of a State prison.

The basis for an expanding standard of living for our people rests upon labor and management pulling together and not apart. It also depends upon a square deal for the farmer as well as for the urban dweller. It requires a full realization that when any part of our economy is in distress the chain reaction that takes place will soon react on all other segments. The American farmer must not be so regimented that he becomes primarily a statistic in a Washington bureaucrat's office.

The time has come, I believe, when labor and management, with the help of government, must get down to the nugget of what is really needed in America.

The sustained stability and progress of our American system of capitalistic free enterprise requires high real wages, sustained buying power for abundant markets, and maximum production at low unit costs. American agriculture, labor, and industry must not be undermined by the dumping of goods produced by low-paid labor abroad while outside markets are closed to our products.

In meeting the growing challenge of socialism and communism the dynamic American system must continue to demonstrate that labor, management, and investors all have a vital interest in maintaining our way of life.

High productivity and widespread distribution of that which our Nation can produce is more sound than the doctrine of scarcity brought about by stoppages of production or by governmental action.

Controls tend to multiply like rabbits. In the end they will destroy both the American economic and political system.

A free economy can better bring about a higher standard of living for our people than any permanent regimented economy of domestic origin or foreign import.

In the growth of our economy there have developed powerful groups in business and in labor. Not all of them have recognized that with power must go responsibility. No man or group of men in the ranks of labor or business have the right to strangle the economic life of 140,000,000 Americans and by do doing endanger the entire free world.

The Government of the United States established economic traffic laws many years ago to protect our businessmen and consumers against unregulated monopolies. These were the antitrust statutes.

More recently, first through the Labor Relations Act of 1935 and later through the Labor-Management Relations Act of 1947, the Government has sought to establish a national labor policy that would be fair and equitable, not alone to labor and management, but to the general public as well.

While some well thought out amendments are in order, they should be weighed in the light of their effect upon the entire population, and not just one part.

Our entire national economy must not be at the mercy of one man or small group who can give an order that will cause a creeping paralysis to close down our mines, factories, and transportation systems and work a hardship on countless people. This is far too much power for any responsible man to want and any irresponsible man to have.

Our Federal Government is now so large that prudent officials and citizens must examine new proposals which would increase costs to see if they will endanger its functioning or impair its solvency. We must find ways of eliminating duplication and waste, so that we may better meet essential needs. Recommendations of the bipartisan Hoover Commission should get a high priority on the legislative calendar.

There are some in Government who apparently believe that if an individual spends his own money it is inflationary whereas if the Government takes it from him and spends it such is not the case. This is economic nonsense and squirrel-cage thinking. Government spending has been, and is, a major inflationary factor.

I make no claim that we can "unscramble the eggs" of Government finance, but I do maintain that we should no longer ignore the warning lights that have led to disaster when ignored elsewhere in the world.

We should balance our Federal budget and pay something each year to reduce the national debt, which now amounts to over $250,000,000,000. This should be done by prudent economy rather than by disruptive new taxes.

For the last 17 years the Democratic administration has had control of the executive branch of the Government, and during 15 of those years has had a majority in both Houses of Congress. It is significant, I believe, that during that entire period of time the Federal budget has been balanced only during the 2-year period of the Eightieth Congress, wherein the Republicans had a majority in both the House and the Senate.

In a period of 20 years the number of civilian employees of the Federal Government increased from 570,000 to 2,100,000. Federal expenditures have increased from $9,000,000,000 in the fiscal year 1939 to over $43,000,000,000 for the current fiscal year.

For the next fiscal year, at the present rate of spending, there is another $5,000,000,000 deficit in prospect. Any business management that ran 16 out of 18 years in the red should be permanently retired. Nineteen hundred and fifty and 1952 are the years to eliminate the red ink and red herrings.

The problems facing us on the home front cannot be solved by Government alone. They cannot be solved by labor, management, or the farmer alone.

Here in America, as Lincoln put it, we have "this last best hope of earth." Each of us has an individual and collective responsibility for its preservation. We are interdependent one on the other. An American economic collapse would bring despair everywhere except in Soviet Russia.

There have never been so many people in the entire history of the world who have had as large a stake, as much to gain or as much to lose, as the people of the United States of America.

Nor does history record a people who have been as unselfish in their possession of their power, their resources, and their good will.

In this century which is not yet half over they have sacrificed blood and treasure in two world wars to prevent the destruction

of free institutions on the continent of Europe. Few dispute the fact that all of western Europe and perhaps even Britain would today be behind the Communist "iron curtain" if it had not been for the firm stand taken by this Republic and a considerable contribution of our resources to prevent the complete economic collapse of those war-torn nations.

Communism thrives on chaos. A rehabilitated Europe was the only chance for survival had by free institutions in that area of the world. While communism has been at least temporarily stopped in western Europe, it has made great gains in the Far East. At the end of the war communism ruled less than 200,000,000 people. Today 800,000,000 are within the "iron curtain."

Four factors relating to the ability of the Western World to defend itself against Communist aggression are:

1. Industrial capacity.
2. Population.
3. Raw materials.
4. Territory.

Except for the first, international communism now has the edge on all the others.

Fifty years of friendly interest on the part of our people and our Government in a free and independent China and the overwhelming contribution made by our Army, Navy, and Air Force in the Pacific during World War II, gave us the power, the prestige, and the opportunity for constructive action no western nation had ever before possessed. We could have pioneered in exporting the ideals that inspired men who loved freedom everywhere following our own break away from colonial status.

All this opportunity has been frittered away by a small group of willful men in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department who had the backing of their superiors.

In Europe where the record of Soviet aims was clearly outlined in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Bulgaria, Hungary, Rumania, Latvia, Lithuania, and Estonia, we finally stood up to communism in Greece, Turkey, Iran, Berlin, and western Germany.

Knowing that communism thrives on economic and political chaos we gave economic aid through the ECA. With the North Atlantic Pact and the arms implementation legislation, we have given moral and material support for the protection of western Europe and the Middle East from overt aggression. In that area we have given hope and support to those advancing the cause of a free world of free men.

Munich certainly should have taught us that appeasement of aggression, then as now, is but surrender on the installment plan. Mr. Chamberlain, Prime Minister of Great Britain 10 years ago, may have sincerely thought that he was gaining peace in our time by consenting to the destruction of a free and independent Czechoslovakia by Nazi Germany. We know now that paying such international blackmail only increased later demands that made World War II inevitable.

The men in the Kremlin are as power hungry as the Nazis and their system is as destructive of human liberty as was Hitlerism with which they were bedfellows while Poland was being dismembered in 1939. They have, however, learned some new techniques.

Communism is destructive of human liberty everywhere in the world. It is no less destructive in China or Korea than it is in Poland, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania, Hungary, Rumania, or Bulgaria. The pattern may differ slightly.

In Poland the opposition leader, Mikolajczyk, was forced to flee; in Bulgaria Petkov was hanged; in Rumania the King was given a 2-hour ultimatum to change the Government regardless of the Constitution; in Czechoslovakia Masaryk's life was forfeited when it became apparent that coalition with communism would not work.

A Chinese official put it clearly by saying to me recently: "There can be no real coalition with a tiger unless you are inside the tiger."

In Europe we have had a foreign policy in which the Republicans and the Democrats have contributed to the initiation and formulation of doctrines that are understandable. In the Far East there has been no bipartisan foreign policy. The Republicans in Congress have not been consulted in the moves leading up to the bankrupt policy which now stands revealed in all its sorry detail. The administration, and it alone, has the full responsibility for the debacle which has taken place on the Continent of Asia and which day by day and hour by hour is endangering the future peace of the world and the security of this country.

We stood up to communism in Europe and took substantial risks in doing so in Greece, Turkey, and Berlin. Certainly for the fainthearted the putting into operation of the Berlin airlift presented much greater risks than giving aid to the legal Government of China to enable it to hold the islands of Formosa and Hainan. During the airlift we were flying our planes across territory controlled by one of the great military powers of the world. This Government supported the Berlin airlift at a cost of $154,568,800. This was not the only cost, for accidents took the lives of 31 of our men. Nevertheless, had we backed down in Berlin, the Soviet Union today would have that city firmly within its grasp and might even have western Germany, if not all of western Europe. Certainly the yielding to international blackmail then would have increased the demands and made more arrogant the men in the Kremlin as an earlier yielding to Hitler at Munich increased his demands.

Our China policy has taken us to such a low point that prior to his return to the United States our Ambassador, Leighton Stuart, was confined to the Embassy compound for weeks by the Communists. A consular official was beaten by the Red police in Shanghai; our consul general, Angus Ward, was restricted to the compound in Mukden for a year, and more recently thrown into a common jail; our military attaché at Nanking, General Soule, has been trying for over 4 months to get out of the Communist area and has not had any success to date.

William C. Smith, chief electrician's mate, United States Navy, of Long Beach, Calif., and Elmer C. Bender, sergeant, United States Marine Corps, of Cincinnati, Ohio, have been held captive for over 15 months. Yes; we have waited for the dust to settle, and the American people can now see the wreckage of the position once held by this great nation in the Far East.

Our long-standing far-eastern policy was first compromised at Yalta. We gave to the Soviet Union vital rights in Manchuria which were not ours to give and it was done without prior consultation with the Government of China. It was done without the consent or approval of the American Congress or the American people. It was done in violation of the open-door policy of John Hays and of Woodrow Wilson's concept of open covenants, openly arrived at.

The Yalta agreement made Soviet domination of Manchuria and other border provinces inevitable. It made possible Chinese Communist domination of the balance of continental China. It also has opened the door to bringing the entire continent of Asia, with more than a billion people and vast resources, into the orbit of international communism. Sitting with our American delegation at Yalta and playing an important part was Alger Hiss, adviser to the Secretary of State.

The representatives of our Department of State persistently tried to get the Government of the Republic of China to form a coalition with the Communists. When they refused, we placed an embargo against the shipment of any arms or ammunition to the legal government of the country while during those same months the Soviet army of occupation, in Manchuria as the result of the Yalta agreement, was turning over to the Communist forces large amounts of captured Japanese war stocks.

Like a person with a bad conscience, the State Department, on August 6, released the China white paper. All the blame was placed on the National Government, then with its back to the wall. It was apparently issued with the hope that our own part and share of responsibility might be overlooked.

That the National Government of China made mistakes, has had "Benedict Arnolds" and men who betrayed their trust, needed no underscoring from us in the way and at the time it was done. Our own history also has examples of men who have betrayed their trust from Cabinet members down to ward bosses.

We have also been plagued with racketeers, highwaymen, and five percenters at various times.

The basic objective the United States should have kept constantly in mind was to preserve a free, independent, united, non-Communist China. In the postwar illness of that nation, we prescribed that the strychnine of communism be taken. The State Department having contributed greatly to the Chinese disaster still proclaims that we must follow a hands-off policy, or that we must wait for the dust to settle, or we must investigate some more. State Department policies were directed toward a post mortem rather than a consultation.

Had China been a former enemy, like Japan and Germany, we would have been giving large amounts of supervised material help and sending many of our ablest military and civilian leaders to stabilize her currency, feed her people, and protect her from Communist aggression. But the State Department policy has been to abandon free China, our wartime ally and friend, to the vultures of international communism.

In a very well written article in the Janurday 7 issue of the Saturday Evening Post Joseph Alsop has this to say about State Department excuses as contained in the China white paper:

"But there is also one carefully concealed defect in the State Department argument. If you have kicked a drowning friend briskly in the face as he sank for the second and third times, you cannot later explain that he was doomed anyway because he was such a bad swimmer.

"The question that must be answered is not whether the Chineses did their best to save themselves, which they most certainly did not, the question is whether we did our best to save China."

The new civilian governor of Formosa, K. C. Wu, is a graduate of Princeton. He has had an excellent record as an administrator, as mayor of Shanghai, and as wartime mayor of Chungking.

Gen. Sun Li-jen, the ground force commander on Formosa, is a graduate of the Virginia Military Institute. He is also in charge of their training centers which I visited. The morale of the men is excellent. The training program is very good. They do lack a sufficient supply of arms and ammunition for defense against the ultimate assault upon the island.

The people of Formosa are ably represented by a provincial legislature. Governor Wu has broadened his administration and consults with the representatives of the people of the island.

Like Mr. Chamberlain at Munich, there are some in this country and in Great Britain who believe that by appeasing the Communists they may change their way of life. This is naive and such a viewpoint is dangerous to the peace of the world and the security of this country.

First, the Communists will not be satisfied with mere de facto recognition. That will merely be the opening wedge for full de jure approval. When that happens, China's seat in the United Nations and on the security Council becomes a Communist one. Every Chinese embassy and consulate in this and other western nations will become centers of Communist espionage and fifth-column activity as in the case of similar Soviet establishments. At the peace conference with Japan, the Soviet bloc will have another voice and vote to help destroy the job General Douglas MacArthur has done in that country.

If the United States gives them full recognition the Chinese Communists will then consider it unfriendly unless their economic rehabilitation is financed. Such action would, of course, also increase their war potential, for power development, railroads, mines, ports, and factories are important in both peace and war. The United States is the only nation capable of such financing.

Are we to be called upon to pay out substantial sums to help stop communism in Europe while financing communism in Asia and with serious budget problems of our own? Are we to give arms and guaranties to western Europe to save that area from going behind the "iron curtain" while we or they accelerate the spread of communism in Asia?

It is my judgment that history will record the recognition of Communist China as being as great a betrayal of human freedom as was the pact of Munich. If other nations want to take that responsibility, let them do it with their eyes open. They can't for long play both sides of the street.

The signing of the Soviet-Chinese pact on February 14 is a Communist alliance. The secret sections have not yet been revealed. We may recall, however, that the secret provisions of the Nazi-Soviet pact were not disclosed until after Russia stabbed Poland in the back in 1939.

There are some American and British firms that are today sending oil and other supplies to the Communist regime which strengthens it in the effort to destroy what remains of the Republic of China. I well remember, as you no doubt do also, that there were firms, with State Department approval, which supplied scrap iron and oil to Japan in 1939, 1940, and 1941. It was used against our friends in China and ultimately against the American battle fleet at Pearl Harbor. While at Pearl Harbor 8 years after December 7, 1941, I visited the wreck of the Arizona. In her hull there are still 900 American sailors. Commercial transactions paid in "blood" money, should not set our foreign policy.

The question is asked: Can anything be done at this late date? I believe that it can. While desperate, the situation is not more desperate than it was at the time of Valley Forge or at Dunkirk.

First, of course, we need a foreign policy in the Far East. We have none there today. As a basis for such a foreign policy, I suggest the following:

1. That we make clear that we have no intention of recognizing the Communist regime in China.

2. That we have a major shake-up in the Far Eastern Division of the State Department. We cannot expect to get inspired leadership for a new policy in the Far East from those who have been receivers of the bankrupt policy we have been following. Also the people of the United States and the Congress should be informed how many persons recommended by Alger Hiss are still in the State Department?

Our policy itself, of course, will have to be set by our constitutional officers, the President, his advisers, and the Congress. Once we have a foreign policy there is great need for it to be coordinated in both its economic and defense phases. In that area of the world, so that the right hand will know what the left hand is doing, there should be selected as coordinator of American policies our outstanding soldier-statesman, Gen. Douglas MacArthur.

4. We should give supervised aid to the legal government of China in the same way we give it to the legal governments of Greece and Korea which have also been threatened by communism. I have never favored giving unsupervised assistance. A mission headed by a man of the caliber of General Wedemeyer could supervise the requests for aid, be sure that the Chinese Government was properly training the troops in the use of equipment, and make certain from a logistical point of view that the supplies were received at the points where they were needed.

5. Strengthen the American Navy in the Far East. The addition of at least two carriers and possibly three would do much to restore confidence in that part of the world just as the visit of American vessels to Greece and Turkey, while the war of nerves was at its height, restored confidence in that area of the world 2 years ago. Even the executive department now realizes there has been an overdraft in our Pacific defenses.

6. Make it clear that this Government will not sit back for more than a year and do nothing but send a series of notes when officials and service personnel representing this Government are illegally held by the Communist regime in China. They should be informed that until all Americans who want to get out have done so that an American naval blockade will prevent any ships from delivering cargoes to strengthen the Chinese Communist regime.

Yes, America has come of age. We can no more return to a policy of isolation than an adult can return to childhood. We must assume our responsibilities as a great world power without whose active support there can be no adequate international system of law and order.

We need a dynamic American foreign policy. Liberty is still a greater force than slavery. Our own fight for freedom electrified the world. Let us rekindle the torch. We must assume a moral leadership that we lost at Yalta.

Let us make it clear to freedom-loving Poles, Czechs, Hungarians, Bulgarians, Rumanians, Latvians, Estonians, Lithuanians, Koreans, and Chinese that their desire for liberty is understandable to us.

The Voice of America should become the voice of freedom. Each program beamed to iron-curtain countries should start with the ringing notes of the Liberty Bell from Independence Hall, Philadelphia.

We need new techniques to contend with communism's weapons.

Let us first make clear to the Soviet Union and her satellites that starting forthwith we and they are on a diplomatic quid pro quo basis.

The United States Government should serve notice that we will no longer tolerate our Ambassador and diplomatic officials being restricted to Moscow and occasional outside trips while theirs are free to roam from Massachusetts to California and from Michigan to Texas.

We should make it clear that we will no longer permit five times the number of visas to be issued for Soviet citizens to visit this country as are issued to our citizens to visit Russia.

It should be made clear to all the Soviet satellites that they will treat our diplomatic representatives and our citizens with respect and international law, or we will break off diplomatic relations and tell their people why it is being done. If the State Department is correct that American recognition of Bao Dai in Vietnam strengthens that new government, why will not our withdrawing recognition from the satellites weaken them?

Neither friendship nor respect can be bought by individuals or by nations. An offer of $50,000,000,000 for an atomic truce may appease today's Barbary pirates for a time. It will not change their determination to destroy human freedom in Europe, Asia, or on the Western Hemisphere. To a blackmailer the offer of a gratuity today becomes the minimum basis for increased tribute tomorrow.

Of course, we should seek a just and lasting settlement of the cold war, but not by another Munich or another Yalta. Any settlement to be worthwhile must include freedom from the tyranny under which millions of people suffer, in part at least, as a result of our past mistakes.

No nation or its leader had the moral right to barter the lives of millions of men, women, and children into the Godless hands of international communism. The Soviet Union has long since violated various parts of their wartime agreements with the west. To Polish and Chinese patriots a public denouncement of the Yalta Executive Agreement would clear the atmosphere and give them renewed hope and courage.

It was Lincoln who said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history * * * the fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the latest generation * * * we, even we here have the power and bear the responsibility * * * in giving freedom to the slave we assure freedom to the free. * * * we shall nobly save or we shall meanly lose this last best hope of earth."

If we use the same courage and common sense that motivated the men who sat in the Constitutional Convention at Philadelphia, there is no foreign foe we need fear, there is no domestic problem we cannot solve.

Soil Conservation Service Watershed Treatment Program

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. A. WILLIS ROBERTSON

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. ROBERTSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD the supplemental statement to the 1950 report of the Soil Conservation Service to the Subcommittee on Wildlife Conservation of the Senate Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments with reference to the watershed treatment program of that Service in the interest of flood control.

There being no objection, the supplemental statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SUPPLEMENTAL STATEMENT

The watershed-treatment program of the Soil Conservation Service, in the interest of flood control, reduces flood damages principally in three ways:

1. It retards run-off so that there is less flooding of bottom land along the small creeks and tributaries. This is effective primarily for the smaller floods of frequent occurrence;

2. It prevents erosion to upland areas, thereby reducing land damage and soil wastage; and

8. It makes substantial reductions in the amount of sediment which otherwise is transported into stream channels, harbors, and reservoirs.

The effect of such watershed treatment may be illustrated by the following few examples taken from survey reports submitted by the Department of Agriculture and approved by the Congress in the 1944 Flood Control Act:

1. In the Buffalo Creek watershed in New York, it was estimated that the treatment on farm lands would reduce the sediment that is filling Buffalo Harbor by about 12 percent. Stabilization of stream banks would reduce the total annual accumulation of sediment in the harbor by 135,000 cubic yards, or 72 percent, making a total reduction of sediment from the upstream program of about 84 percent.

2. In the Little Sioux River watershed in Iowa, the treatment program is estimated to effectively halt the advance of major gullies and thereby prevent further land damage from this cause. It also results in substantial reduction in filling of drainage ditches in the Missouri River alluvial flood plain. The program, likewise, would reduce the flood run-off on the tributaries from about 25 percent to less than 5 percent, depending upon the intensity of storm and the size of drainage area.

3. In the Trinity River watershed in Texas, the program will be particularly effective in reducing the damages from the smaller floods which, in the past, have caused as much total damage as the upper limit floods. The program is expected to reduce the aggregate total of acres inundated over a 15-year period by about 25 percent.

4. In the Yazoo River watershed in Mississippi, the annual contribution of sediment to the stream systems is estimated at 89,000,000 tons. In 20 years this is estimated to attain a total of 137,000,000 tons annually, if treatment is not applied. With the application of watershed treatments this total would be reduced by more than 75 percent.

Let's Explore Your Mind

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY P. CAIN

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, one derives solid satisfaction from being able to compliment the sovereign State which he represents. In a recent column, Let's Explore Your Mind, Albert Edward Wiggan answers three questions, one of which refers to the citizens of Washington State. The two other questions and responses are interesting. I ask unanimous consent that the column be printed in the Appendix of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

LET'S EXPLORE YOUR MIND

(By Albert Edward Wiggam, D. Sc.)

1. Are the chief effects of quack medical cures psychological rather than physical?

2. Will more playgrounds and recreation centers solve the juvenile delinquency problems?

3. Are there smarter people in some States in the United States than in others?

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 1

Yes. Quack medical scoundrels use the psychological principle that people believe what they wish to believe. George Mann relates in Science Digest that at the trial of "Dr." Chadiali, 112 people swore his spectro-chrome light (merely gaudy colored lights) had cured them of everything from worry to bald-headedness. One excited witness testified it had cured him of epilepsy and instantly fell into a fit. Mr. Mann says a number of prominent businessmen and politicos wear a cigarette sized gimcrack attached to their underwear. An essential element in the device is used by veterinarians as a remedy for sick horses. Getting rid of medical quacks is largely a problem in social psychology and public education.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 2

No, asserts Dr. Paul W. Tappan, sociologist at New York University. He shows the astonishing fact that juvenile delinquents have more group affiliations and are more often leaders in the groups than non-delinquents. Even church and school can have little effect except as they can cooperate with the home, according to Dr. Tappan. Other studies show the home outranks church, school, laws, and everything else combined in building character and preventing juvenile delinquency.

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 3

Yes. After World War I psychologists made an index of culture (indicating mental ability) for every State as shown by the following tests: (1) Number of soldiers who made A and B grades on the Army mental tests; (2) number of readers of both high- and low-brow magazines; (3) number of leaders in Who's Who in America; (4) number of illiterates; (5) number of mistakes made in making out census reports. This index shows there was more culture per square citizen in Washington State than in any other. Oregon, second; Massachusetts, third; California, fourth. My home State, Indiana, ranked twenty-ninth—probably because Mrs. Wiggam and I were then living in New York. For self-addressed postal I'll tell you where your State stands.

The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLYDE R. HOEY

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. HOEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD an article entitled "The H-Bomb: Humanity's New Peril," written by Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer, and published in the March 1950 issue of that publication.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE H-BOMB: HUMANITY'S NEW PERIL

(By Clarence Poe, president and editor, the Progressive Farmer)

A new crisis, a new challenge, and a new opportunity come to America as a result of America's decision to make the hydrogen bomb. From 10 to 1,000 times more powerful than the atom bomb, it carries the greatest possibilities for destroying human life and happiness of anything ever developed on this earth.

Atomic power has amazing possibilities for peacetime uses—uses which might bring the whole human race to new levels of well-being and prosperity. But the hydrogen bomb has no such uses. It can be used only for destruction, and not only destruction, but indiscriminate, wholesale destruction. All the men, women, infants, children, the strong and the weak, and the industries in an entire State might be destroyed almost in a moment of time—and there is no known defense against it. Ralph E. Lapp says, "A hydrogen bomb blitz could wipe out this country's major cities and kill 10 to 15 million Americans in a single day." The Federation of American Scientists made similar predictions and a group of America's foremost atomic scientists declared: "This bomb is no longer a weapon of war, but a means of extermination of whole populations. Its use would be a betrayal of all standards of morality and of Christian civilization itself."

Nevertheless President Truman decided that America should build the hydrogen bomb. He felt that if we do not build it, Russia might build one and decide to use one and so have us at a hopeless disadvantage.

With this decision itself we have no quarrel. But with the way he made it and his course of action, or inaction, since he made it we believe that all America is shockingly disappointed and appalled. Only God Almighty has ever had the power to let loose on humanity such destruction, and all humanity as represented in the United Nations should have been warned of its consequences and asked to join in plans for its control. Suppose Mr. Truman had gone before the United Nations and had first quoted what Bernard Baruch said when his plans for control of the atom bomb were presented:

"Behind the black portent of the new atomic age lies a hope which, seized upon with faith, can work our salvation. If we fail, then we have damned every man to be the slave of fear. Let us not deceive ourselves: We must elect world peace or world destruction."

And suppose Mr. Truman, in words heard round the world, had said: "Today an even greater danger and opportunity confronts us. Scientists in the United States of America can now make the hydrogen bomb. Scientists in other nations will soon know how to do so. For self-protection and under present circumstances we in the United States have no choice but to make it. But I pray God and pray you to so change circumstances that we may never have to use it. I summon all nations to join the United States in taking some gigantic steps that will prevent any nation from ever using it. * * * When God Almighty said, 'Thou shalt not kill,' He spoke not merely to persons, but to nations. America does not seek peace merely to save our own sons from being killed, their children orphaned, and their wives widowed, but equally because we do not wish to kill the sons even of our enemies. * * * This new crisis for all nations demands a new and heroic effort to save humanity from that crisis and to make the wonders of the atomic age serve humanity rather than destroy it."

All over the world—in Europe, Asia, and South America—Communists are telling these nations that the United States wants not peace, but war. By some new and convincing program for world peace we can now win these hesitant nations to our side.

WHAT MUST AMERICA ANSWER?

While President Truman and Secretary Acheson disappointed and appalled America by offering only a continuation of the cold war as an answer to the hydrogen bomb, we rejoice to say that, fortunately, there were

voices in the United States Senate and elsewhere which did summon humanity to do something majestic and far-reaching about this world-shaking peril. Senator BRIEN MCMAHON, chairman of the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy, proposed that the United States and all nations (1) forego the making and use of atomic or hydrogen bombs and instead (2) agree to use two-thirds of their present military expenditures for developing the backward and underprivileged peoples of the earth and other forms of peaceful progress. Senator TYDINGS proposed inviting all nations to a new disarmament conference. Senators GRAHAM and FERGUSON presented plans for strengthening the United Nations and Senators VANDENBERG and CONNALLY spoke constructively. Especially eloquent and historic was Senator MCMAHON'S appeal which we wish every American could read in full. In part he said:

"We now spend about $15,000,000,000 annually for armaments. Why not offer to take two-thirds of this sum, or $10,000,000,000, and, instead of amassing sterile weapons, use it to foster peace throughout the world for a 5-year period? Why not offer to spread the annual $10,000,000,000 over three programs: President Truman's point 4 proposal, development of atomic energy everywhere for peace, and general economic aid and help to all countries, including Russia?

"Such a global Marshall plan might combine with the marvelous power of peacetime atomic energy to generate universal material progress and a universal cooperative spirit.

"In exchange for our own contribution of $10,000,000,000 annually, we would ask: (1) general acceptance of an effective program for international control of atomic energy, and (2) an agreement by all countries, enforced through inspection, that two-thirds of their present spending upon armaments be devoted toward constructive ends. Administration of the annual $10,000,000,000 which we offered to make available would be carried out through the United Nations.

"If the proposal were actually accepted, we would have concluded the cheapest monetary bargain in our history; we would have probably saved mankind from destruction by fire; and we would have paved the way toward a new era of unimagined abundance for all men, based upon atomic energy constructively harnessed."

Maybe Senator MCMAHON'S plan is not the final answer. But to those who say it is not practicable, must we not answer, "If it is not practicable to spend $10,000,000,000 a year for world peace and progress, how practicable is it to spend ten to possibly fifty billion dollars a year for an armament race when, as Senator MCMAHON reminds us, '5,000 years of recorded history teach us again and again and again that armament races end in war'?" Of all plans so far proposed, Senator MCMAHON'S seems the most worthy of a nation that calls itself Christian and the one that seems surest to bring other nations to our side in a program to preserve world peace and prevent a hydrogen war.

As has been well said, "Every crisis is an opportunity." As we have frequently said, "Always thank God when a bad situation gets worse, for then something will be done about it." The very terribleness of our new situation may well drive us into some effective plan for strengthening the United Nations and setting up an effective program for world peace. But there must first be a driving force greater than any selfish desire to save our own skins and our own wealth. Only Christianity, we believe, can supply such a driving force. There must be a program which not merely talks of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, but proposes to act on this basic Christian principle. We must let Russia and all humanity know that we are just as anxious not to kill other human beings and their children as not to have other human beings kill us and our children. We must have not merely the negative, despairing program of a continuing and bankrupting armament race ending in war. Rather we must have the inspiration of a great, challenging, constructive, hopeful program of building a better world for all men—some such objective as Senator MCMAHON envisioned in his great address.

To all the Christian men in Congress, to the leaders in all churches, our Christian periodicals, to every Christian man or woman, and to all who believe in Christian ideals, whether or not they belong to any religious denomination, comes the challenge to work as individuals and through their organizations. Christianity must lead America and the world to that "peace on earth, good will toward men" which the very seriousness of the hydrogen bomb may now make the nations of the world bring to reality.

Repeal Telephone Excise Taxes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ALEXANDER WILEY
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Appendix of the RECORD a statement entitled "Repeal Telephone Excise Taxes," prepared by Mr. T. H. Sanderson, of Portage, Wis., director of the Wisconsin State Telephone Association, of Madison, Wis.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPEAL TELEPHONE EXCISE TAXES

(By T. H. Sanderson, of Portage, Wis., director, Wisconsin State Telephone Association, Madison, Wis.; also president People's Telephone Co., main office, Rio, Wis.)

The United States Government, during World War II, placed an excise tax on telephone usage to deter the public from demanding telephone service, except where absolutely necessary, at a time when materials, such as steel, copper, lead, zinc, etc., used in communication systems, were sorely needed for war purposes. Similar excise taxes were placed on certain so-called luxuries transportation, etc., but the Government, recognizing telephone communications as of prime importance to the success of the Nation's war effort, placed higher taxes as a curb, on the telephone user-public than were placed on other taxable commodities and services.

What Government considered as an effective wartime deterrent against greater usage of telephone communications, has become a more effective deterrent during postwar times, resulting in loss of business to the telephone industry and an unjustifiable tax on telephone users throughout the United States.

What the annual excise-tax dollar value amounts to in Wisconsin, is shown by the following table, which sets forth the amounts of excise taxes paid by the various classes of telephone companies, ranging from large to small, during the year 1948.

Class of company	Number of companies	Exchange revenues	Excise tax paid on exchange revenues	Toll revenues	Excise tax paid on toll revenues
Class A	11	$32,563,510	$4,884,526	$15,254,533	$3,050,907
Class B	6	382,198	57,330	184,576	36,915
Class C	64	1,155,302	173,295	547,015	109,403
Class D	111	616,141	92,421	213,848	42,770
Class E	87	150,825	22,624	40,081	8,016
Total	279	34,867,976	5,230,196	16,240,053	3,248,011

Recap of excise taxes paid in 1948 by telephone users in Wisconsin

On exchange revenues	$5,230,196
On toll revenues	3,248,011
Total excise taxes paid in 1948	8,478,207

In 1949 it is estimated the telephone excise taxes paid in Wisconsin were over $9,274,800.

The excise tax, as stated above, was imposed by the Government as a war measure. The war is over. It ended in 1945 and 5 years later, in 1950, this wartime tax is still saddled on the general public. It affects every breadwinner in the Nation for the reason that the telephone excise taxes paid by large or small manufacturers and service companies, along with their other overhead expenses, are considered as part of the cost of production or operation and included in the basis for price fixing. Therefore, the consumer not only pays the tax on his personal telephone usage but, in addition, pays the telephone excise tax on every commodity or service he buys. Canada discontinued a similar war tax a long time ago and it's discontinuance in the United States is long overdue.

In Wisconsin, the telephone companies pay up to 41.6 percent of their total net revenue to the Federal and State Governments for income taxes alone. In addition, telephone users must pay 15 percent on all local exchange service plus 15 percent on toll calls costing less than 25 cents and 25 percent on toll calls costing 25 cents and over.

This tax is becoming a serious problem to our State regulatory commissions. General Solicitor McDonald for the National Association of Regulatory Utility Commissioners testified before the House committee that State commissions are compelled to provide $1.61 in net revenue before Federal income taxes in order to enable the utility to receive $1 after such taxes.

In the telephone industry, with the excise taxes of from 15 to 25 percent added, the tax situation is even worse. It thus appears that most subscribers pay over $2, before income and excise taxes, to net the telephone company $1.

From 50 to 60 cents of every telephone revenue dollar is required for wages, as compared with 20 to 25 cents for electric utilities, due to the large operating personnel required. In other words, about 46 percent of the subscriber's dollar for local service goes to employees as wages, social security, etc. The starting and maximum rates of pay have more than doubled since 1939, while at the same time the period required

to go from the starting rate to the maximum wage rate has been shortened.

Under the 1949 Federal Fair Labor Standards Act the increase from 40 to 75 cents in the minimum hourly wage rate has made it necessary for many small telephone companies to raise their subscribers' rates in order to survive and by raising the subscribers' rates the Federal excise tax was automatically increased so that now, 5 years after the end of the war, paradoxically, telephone subscribers are paying higher war taxes on telephones than they paid when the war was on.

Further, the collection of this tax by telephone companies is very expensive. It takes a great deal of book work and accounting to collect and account for the tax on each telephone message and on each service charge. Many of the toll costs are 25 cents or less and the amount of clerical help necessary and the expense thereof is in many instances all out of proportion with the revenues received. For this service, the telephone companies receive nothing. Not only the tax but the expense of collection and remittance must in the end be paid by the subscribers and those who use the telephone service.

The removal of the Federal excise tax on telephone service will affect a direct saving to users of over 937,000 telephones in Wisconsin and, on their behalf, your valued support toward that end is earnestly solicited.

Notes Off the Record by Gertrude Pierson

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HARRY P. CAIN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. CAIN. Mr. President, the State of Washington produces many good things, including normal, intelligent, and curious people, among whom are found an occasional philosopher and Gertrude Pierson is one of them. Her column, Notes Off the Record which appears from time to time in the Cashmere Record is read by many and I ask unanimous consent that one of Mrs. Pierson's recent articles be printed in the Appendix to the RECORD for the enjoyment of others.

There being no objection, the column was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NOTES OFF THE RECORD
(By Gertrude Pierson)
MIND YOUR P'S AND Q'S

Joe and I are not especially concerned with the "Q's." It's the "P's" that are our pet peeve, namely, potatoes, politicians, pockets and purses.

We know little of politics and less of economics, with the exception of the kind of economics that keeps us busy chewing up pencils. Luckily pencils can still be obtained at two for a nickel. We wish we could say the same for eggs and potatoes; they'd make much better chewing.

But at 5 cents a pound potatoes have become almost a luxury; apples definitely so, and eggs to be rationed carefully. Of course, we are aware that we are not as important as the cattle being fed surplus (?) potatoes at the rate of 1 cent per hundredweight, but we do wonder why we cannot buy them at $1.25 a bushel, the price paid to the farmer by the Government. We wonder also why eggs are buried underground while children go hungry.

Speaking entirely from our own personal experience, because we cannot then be accused of not knowing what we are talking about, we feel sure the problem is a shortage of consumers' dollars, not a surplus of produce.

In our case, after we have paid for rent, clothing, fuel, insurance and so forth, not to mention taxes, we have exactly $15 a week to spend at the grocery store—no more. This amount divided by 21 meals per week for 4 people comes out at about 15 cents per meal per person, about 12 cents in reality because some inedible items such as soap are included in the grocery orders.

Our budget is completely inflexible, ironclad. There's no way for us to pile up a debt in the manner our Government does, we are forced to live within our resources. And we do not think we are less than representative of a large number of families in or near our income group.

The only solution in sight, since we cannot influence the kind of reasoning that allows malnutrition to exist because of a surplus of foods, to add to the surplus and remove ourselves from the consumers' list by planting our own "tater" patch, and let the cattle eat the farmers' surplus while we pay taxes to support the price and sweat while hoeing our own rows.

Maybe we'll get a few hens and a hog too, then work for wages to support the "critters."

All because petty, paltering politicians pick the pockets and the purses of the population to produce false price levels for the Nation's products.

Passingly peculiar, wouldn't you say? Just to get the "Q" in, too, we'll say we think it's also a little queer. No, we don't understand politics.

McCarthy's Creaking Limb

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. GLEN H. TAYLOR
OF IDAHO
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 27 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD an article from the Washington Daily News of today, written by Peter Edson. The article is entitled "McCARTHY'S Creaking Limb."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

M'CARTHY'S CREAKING LIMB
(By Peter Edson)

First one of Wisconsin Republican Senator JOSEPH R. MCCARTHY'S 81 security risk cases to be identified by name is David Demarest Lloyd. He is now employed as an assistant to Charles V. Murphy, who recently succeeded Clark Clifford as President Truman's counsel.

In Senator MCCARTHY'S 6-hour speech David Lloyd was identified only as Case No. 9. Here is what Senator MCCARTHY had to say about him:

"This individual, after investigation, was not given security clearance by the State Department. After failing to obtain clearance by the State Department he secured a job in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. And where do Senators think that man is today? He is now a speech writer in the White House. That is Case No. 9.

"So that there may be no question about this, we will refer directly to the investigative file. I think I am doing Mr. Truman a favor by telling him this. I do not think he knows it. I do not think he would have this individual there writing speeches for him if he knew it.

"Both the individual referred to and his wife—this is in the file of the investigative agency—are members of Communist-front organizations. He has a relative who has a financial interest in the Daily Worker. But in any event the State Department used good judgment not to clear this individual."

That's the end of what Senator MCCARTHY had to say about Case No. 9. Senator MCCARTHY may have a lot of stuff in his 80 other cases. But even Senator MCCARTHY admits today that he is not going to push this case. The record of David Lloyd's life may indicate why.

David Demarest Lloyd is 38. He is married and the father of two children. The family for the past 10 years has lived at 2501 Ridge Road Drive, Alexandria, Va. He was born in New York. His own father and mother were Democrats, but most of his relatives were Republicans. He had one great-aunt who died about 10 years ago who was considered something of an eccentric. She was one of three wealthy women who "angeled" and fronted as publishers for the Daily Worker in its early days.

Young Lloyd himself is medium-build, light-haired, and wears glasses. He is the quiet, serious, scholarly type. He is an Episcopalian. His hobby is painting water colors. He was graduated from Harvard in 1931 and Harvard law in 1935. He got into Government service through Department of Agriculture's Resettlement Administration.

In this period he joined the Washington Co-Operative Bookshop, along with a lot of other Washingtonians who thought they were joining to get discounts on books. Later on most of them found they had been sucked in on a Commie front organization and got out. Mr. Lloyd also joined the National Lawyer's Guild, in the days when Supreme Court Justice Jackson, Judge Ferdinand Pecora, and other prominent attorneys joined. When the guild revealed itself as way over to the left, Mr. Lloyd and all the other anti-Communists got out.

In 1945 Lloyd went to Europe with the Harriman economic mission. While there he says it became clear to him that communism was trying to destroy European recovery. When he came back to the United States in 1945 he looked around to see what could be done about it.

Americans for Democratic Action was being formed. Mr. Lloyd helped in its founding, joined its staff, and helped draft the anti-Communist planks in the ADA constitution.

About this time Mr. Lloyd made application for a job in the State Department. While he was being investigated, he got a job in the National Defense Establishment. But he asked the State Department to keep his file pending, because he might want to transfer to State.

In 1947, Representative KARL STEFAN (Republican, of Nebraska) asked the State Department for an abstract of its files on employees and applicants for jobs under investigation. Lloyd's file was sent to Representative STEFAN. It became his Case No. 99 in hearings of the House Appropriations Committee in January, 1948.

When these hearings were published Mr. Lloyd recognized his case, though he wasn't mentioned by name. He protested to the State Department, and he went to see Mr. STEFAN.

From the State Department's John Peurifoy, now Deputy Under Secretary of State in charge of administration and security, Lloyd

got an abject apology. It included an admission there were no questions of security risk in connection with his case, and an explanation that his file should not have been sent to the House Appropriations Committee.

From Representative STEFAN, Mr. Lloyd got assurances that a statement on his protest would be filed with his record. Mr. Lloyd thought the matter closed. Nevertheless, 2 years later he was to find that Senator MCCARTHY had picked up the old Stefan file and publicized it without any qualifications as Case No. 9.

Senator MCCARTHY's reference to Mr. Lloyd as "a White House speech writer" is hardly correct. He works under Presidential Counsel Murphy, principally on legislative matters.

Mr. Murphy and Presidential Press Secretary Charles G. Ross describe Mr. Lloyd as a man of all work, one of a team of able young men on the White House staff. His salary is about $10,000 a year.

Mr. ROSS says Mr. Lloyd has been thoroughly investigated by the FBI and cleared by the White House Loyalty Review Board. Everyone in the White House is convinced of his absolutely reliability. The President himself is said to have reviewed the Lloyd record and to have every confidence in his complete loyalty.

His record in the White House is that he has fought communism at every opportunity.

Our Foreign Policy at Midcentury

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. GERALD R. FORD, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. FORD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. Harold E. Stassen at a Lincoln Day dinner:

Chairman Tope, Congressman Ford, Mrs. Loomis, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen, it has been almost 5 years since that 16th day of April, 1945, when President Truman spoke to a joint session of the Congress and began his administration of our country.

We gather tonight in the home city of the outstanding Republican statesman and patriot of those 5 years, the Honorable ARTHUR VANDENBERG, your United States Senator. It is thus fitting and highly desirable that we should here and now review those 5 years in terms of foreign policy, and think together of the actions that should be taken by our country in the current state of world affairs.

On that 16th day of April in 1945, the armed forces of the United States and of her western Allies, under the superb command of General Eisenhower, were sweeping forward to complete victories on all fronts throughout the world. On that day the American Ninth Army crossed the Elbe River, last water barrier before Berlin. It was ranged along that river for a stretch of 150 miles, and at its nearest point it was only 75 miles from the German capital. On that day, the United States Third Army was only 7 miles from the Czechoslovakian border, and, at Chemnitz, was only 90 miles northwest of Prague. On that day, the American Fifth Army had moved forward through the last Apennine barrier and was only a mile from Argenta, the key to the Po River gap in Italy. On that day, the German Air Force had been destroyed, the German Navy had been sunk, and the German Army was rapidly retreating on all fronts before the American forces.

On that April 16, in the Pacific, the American armed forces, under the brilliant command of General MacArthur, Admiral Halsey, Admiral Nimitz, and General Kenny, had completed the recapture of the Philippines and had landed on Okinawa. Tokyo was 50 percent in ruins from air attack; the Japanese Navy was sunk; and the Japanese Air Force was largely destroyed.

On that 16th day of April 1945, the United States of America had in the field the most powerful armies in the world; we had in the air the most effective air force in the world; we had at sea the greatest fighting fleet in the world. Our homeland was undamaged by war; our industrial production was at an all-time high; our agriculture had favored us with bountiful crops.

Never, in all of history, had one nation put forth the tremendous fighting effort, or had achieved such vast production, or had exhibited the exceptional teamwork and courage and precision of execution, with which this Nation astonished the world in that war.

Never, in all of history, was the prestige of any nation as high or its position as strong as was that of our country on that day.

But today: In Poland, where Hitler's attack caused the beginning of the major war; in Czechoslovakia, object of the last desperate bid for peace at Munich; in Bulgaria; in Rumania; in Hungary; we find dictatorships which arrest American citizens, insult and attack leaders of the Christian church, trample on the human rights in which we believe, and mouth wild accusations against the Stars and Stripes.

Today, nearly all of China and its 450,000,000 people—the nation which we refused to permit Japan to subjugate and thereby suffered Pearl Harbor—is under the domination of a group of men who publicly attack us, call us imperialists and war mongers, arrest and insult our official consuls, mistreat our missionaries, and cruelly oppress their own peoples.

Today, in Berlin, our representatives find themselves in a precarious position, harried by recurring blockades of their railroads and highways and by other disruptions to the fulfillment of their rights and responsibilities in the capital of the German nation.

With your permission I should like to review concisely the major events of the 5 years intervening as a prelude to some specific suggestions for the future. I review them not with a spirit of rancor, nor of bitterness, nor of narrow partisanship. I review them because I believe that we have reached the point where a frank facing of hard facts will give us a better chance to evolve a sound program for the future.

It must be said, as we think back to April 16, 1945, and then look about the world today, that never before in the history of the world has a major nation, in 5 years' time, lost so many of its objectives through the executive conduct of its foreign affairs as has this Nation in these past 5 years.

How was it possible to lose so much in so short a time? How did it happen? Was it unavoidable?

What prevented it from being even worse?

A review of the record shows these following facts, and I recite them now quietly and carefully with an invitation to be corrected if they are inaccurate in any detail. Of course, the aggressive and coldly calculated deceptiveness of the leaders in the Kremlin has been a major cause for what has happened. But what of this country's contribution to the unhappy record?

On April 17, 1945, the day after the President began his administration, the drive of the American Army to Berlin was halted. Our Army stood still and did not move, and it was not until the 2d of May that Berlin fell to the Red Army. Then on May 6 United States troops began to withdraw from the Elbe River to a line more than 50 miles to the rear which is now the zone boundary to western Germany. That withdrawal took place without any written agreement for a corridor or line of communications to Berlin.

In Czechoslovakia the Third Army had moved forward until General Patton's patrols were only 7 miles from Prague, the capital city, and there they stopped—under orders—virtually within sight of Hradcany Hill and the spirals of its ancient cathedral, even though the Czech patriots in Prague had temporarily seized part of the city and sent out radio calls for American aid. When that aid was not forthcoming, many of those patriot leaders of Czechoslovakia were captured and executed by the Germans. Not until May 9 did the Red Army arrive in Prague.

In Austria, the American Army reached Steyr on the Enns River on May 6 and then waited there 3 days for the Russians to arrive.

I do not attempt to evaluate the varied accounts of the behind-the-scenes conflicts that are alleged to be responsible for these disheartening facts. I simply recite that which no one can deny and state the further fact that these armies would have obeyed the orders of their Commander in Chief, the President of the United States.

On July 17, 1945, the Potsdam Conference of the major powers was held. There was no Republican representation whatsoever at that conference. There was no Republican consultation in advance of that conference. The agreement there made contained many ambiguous and conflicting statements. On one hand it declared that Germany was to be treated as a single economic unit and, on the other, that the individual zone commanders would be supreme in their respective zone.

The Potsdam agreement was one of the most unfortunate ever entered into by a major nation. It made large and very definite concessions to the Russians, and it contained ambiguities concerning those things in which we had a vital interest.

The Potsdam agreement also provided for a Council of Foreign Ministers. It the midst of a series of their meetings, the Big Three Foreign Secretaries gathered in Moscow in December 1945—again without any Republican representation. It was at this December 1945 Moscow meeting that so-called agreements were made concerning eastern Europe. Actually they were concessions to the Russians. For instance, it was agreed to accept a token broadening of the Rumanian and Bulgarian Governments in exchange for United States recognition, even though the Ethridge Report had clearly shown that the Groza government in Rumania and the Georgiev government in Bulgaria were not broadly representative of the unhappy peoples of those nations.

Another similar development is noted in the European Advisory Commission's actions—without Republican participation, it rearranged the zones in Austria in such a manner that the entire northern border of Austria was placed in the Russian zone, thereby sealing off the southern border of Czechoslovakia and giving control of the Danube River to the Red army.

In December 1945 the able and distinguished General Marshall was sent to China. He was sent with specific instructions from the President which were drawn up without any Republican participation and without adequate opportunity for General Marshall to evaluate them. According to these instructions, his mission in China was specifically that of working out a coalition between the Nationalist government of Chiang Kai-shek and the Communist forces of Mao Tze-tung. The net result of these efforts clearly was to give to the Communist armies of the north time to build their strength, to move into Manchuria, and to arm; to further weaken, by delay, the already weak and corrupt government of the Nationalist Party;

and to contribute immeasurably to the subsequent Communist domination of China.

This entire series of facts has had very sad results for our country and for freedom. The result could have been even more disastrous if it had not been for other moves that were constructive. It is well for us briefly to consider them also.

The United Nations Charter was successfully completed and adopted. But in this instance there was Republican participation, carried through in accordance with appointments made by the late President Franklin Roosevelt. Under that Charter, Israel has arisen, a new and promising nation in the Near East; the Dutch Indies have emerged as a new commonwealth; French Indochina is gaining an increased measure of independence; an Atlantic Pact has been formed to bring closer together the North Atlantic nations in the face of the Communist threat. The official minutes of the American delegation at the United Nations Conference will show that not only was the American effort bipartisan in nature, but, that many of the key constructive provisions—provisions for peaceful adjustment of dispute regardless of origin for individual and collective self-defense, and for an amending convention—were all originated by Republican members of the delegation, and none of them were in the original Dumbarton Oaks draft. These provisions have been the basis of the Atlantic Pact. They have also been important in the work of Ralph Bunche in Palestine and of the committees that went to the Dutch Indies.

The aid to Greece and Turkey, which has implemented the Truman doctrine, was planned on a bipartisan basis and was constructively revised on a bipartisan basis in the Senate.

The second major constructive accomplishment in these 5 years has been the Marshall plan. This also was developed and passed on a bipartisan basis, and its success has in large measure been due to the insistence of Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG, your fellow citizen, that it be administered by an able executive independent of the State Department and approved by the Senate. That executive is Paul Hoffman.

The negotiation of the Italian peace treaty was concluded through a definitely bipartisan effort in which Senator VANDENBERG and John Foster Dulles played a large part. That accomplishment was of vast importance in saving Italy from communism and in moving her forward toward successful rebuilding.

One other constructive accomplishment has been the Inter-American Defense Treaty, which was negotiated at Rio in August 1947. This again was a bipartisan measure. It was stimulated by the Republicans, and was ratified by the Senate by an overwhelming bipartisan vote of 72 to 1.

The Vandenberg resolution was the forerunner and spark for the Atlantic Pact, and the Republican-originated articles 51 and 52 of the Charter made the Atlantic Pact legally possible.

In emphasizing these facts tonight, I speak not so much to Republicans as to all those impartial and fair-minded citizens who are deeply concerned for their country's future. I ask that this review be analyzed. I ask this: Is it not true that in this 5-year period the sad failures in American foreign policy have occurred when the administration has moved alone, when it has not sought Republican participation in making decisions? Is it not also true that those instances in which there has been a measure of success have been those in which there has been Republican participation?

I say sincerely that I do not wish by this review to claim disproportionate credit for the Republicans. It is natural that two groups of men, each with different backgrounds and different points of view, should together reach better solutions to grave long-term problems than either group alone. This is especially true when one of the groups is not handicapped by an urgent need to excuse or confirm past administrative actions. Furthermore, when thus addressing themselves together to far-reaching questions, they are likely to be lifted above petty considerations of political advantage.

Undeniably Republican participation has been beneficial, and I emphasize this point, not for the purpose of assessing blame or credit for what has taken place, but rather for the more urgent purpose of asking that the people of our country do now insist that their President and their administration from this date forward move in foreign policy with, and only with, Republican participation.

As one of the first steps to prevent a recurrence of past mistakes, the administration should make amends for the gratuitous slap which it took at Senator VANDENBERG when, in the organization of the Eighty-first Congress, it reduced the Republican representation on the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate to only 5 out of 13 members. This was done even though the Republicans, when in the majority in the preceding session, had granted six seats to the Democrats to seven for the Republicans, and then had cooperated wholeheartedly with the administration.

Having corrected that unwise and purely partisan error the administration should then invite the leadership of both political parties to meet with it in major conferences on the vital key questions of foreign policy before us today. Clearly these are:

First, what shall we do in Asia? When Ambassador Jessup returns from his Asiatic trip, a bipartisan conference, including Senator Vandenberg and Senator Taft, Senator Knowland, Congressman Walter Judd, and former President Hoover, should be held. From such a conference I believe an economic-aid program can be evolved which would convincingly demonstrate that the United States is interested in the future of the people of Asia and which would prove false the Communist propaganda that we are deserting all of Asia. Agreement should be sought on some able individual to become the administrator of the American aid-to-Asia program. That person would have powers and duties parallel to those of Paul Hoffman in Europe.

We cannot expect sound and favorable results until American Asiatic policy is brought together under one able man and geared in with the economic efforts of the other free nations.

It is not too soon to begin to look ahead to the end of the Marshall plan and to begin to discuss such proposals as that our separate policies for Asia and Europe should be brought together into a world-wide economic policy, which would be tailored so that its total demands upon the American economy will not be too heavy, and so directed as to give the maximum boost to the convertibility of currencies and the redevelopment of multilateral trade throughout the world.

The other major urgent question of foreign policy involves the hydrogen bomb. Clearly the decision to proceed to develop this bomb is right, for it comes at a time when there is every indication that the Soviet Union is proceeding to build its war strength in every way. But this decision, by itself, is not sufficient. Even though the chances of success may be only one in a thousand, this Nation owes it to its children, and to all mankind, to make every possible additional effort to bring about a basic change of policy in the Soviet Union and to obtain free and open United Nations inspections of atomic developments and joint world disarmament.

The President of the United States should therefore request a major midcentury conference with the leaders of the Soviet Union. American participation in the conference must be bipartisan. Its delegates must specifically include not only the President, Dean Acheson, Louis Johnson, and General Bradley but also Senator Vandenberg, Senator Taft, Bernard Baruch, and General Eisenhower. The conference should be held in a neutral location such as Stockholm, Helsinki, or Vienna. The Russians who participate must include the key men of the Politburo. In addition to Stalin, Malenkov, Molotov, Beria, and Voroshilov should be present.

To make my position very clear, I would be opposed to a conference with the leaders of Russia if it did not include Republican representation. Furthermore, the American participants must have preliminary conferences of their own to clarify their thinking in advance. In addition the President of the United Nations General Assembly and appropriate representation of Great Britain and France should be invited to sit in. A complete record should be kept of this midcentury conference, and he published in all languages and distributed throughout the world. I do not propose the midcentury conference with any view that agreements in words should be looked upon as success. Only the definite actions to carry out those agreements will indicate success.

I do not, in fact, propose this midcentury conference with any belief that it has bright prospects of success. But I do most earnestly believe that however small the chance of success the grim tragedy that would come to all mankind from a third world war, absolutely requires that a nation with our moral foundation exhaust every possibility and do so repeatedly, in an attempt to end the terrible threat of war, that lies in the race to increase atomic armament. Furthermore, even though such a conference fails, or if the invitation is rebuffed, our moral leadership in the world will be strengthened, and ultimately moral force will decide the future of mankind.

On a similar bipartisan basis, we should also formulate, and rapidly put into effect, a program of moderate economic aid to the underprivileged and less developed areas of the world.

And as we proceed, we must remain strong and alert. No matter what our individual views may be, everyone must clearly recognize that in the world situation that now confronts us we will not prove that we want peace, and we will not get peace, by permitting ourselves to become weak. But let me emphasize that it is never a sign of weakness to seek an honorable lasting peace. In fact the seeking itself adds to moral standing and ethical position which are sources of great strength.

It is my belief that if we do develop our foreign policy on a bipartisan basis, with Republican participation, and if beyond that we talk that policy through with the whole of the American people and do so frankly and sincerely, we will evolve policies that are consistent; that take a long-term view in accord with our fundamental moral and ethical principles; and that will hold the best prospect of contributing to the future peace and progress of ourselves and of all nations.

There have been those who have insisted that our foreign policy cannot be discussed openly with our people because that would involve disclosing too much of secret information. But recent court decisions and official investigations, which have revealed the presence of foreign spies in our Department of Justice, in our Department of State, and in our atomic energy program clearly indicate that the Communist leaders in the Kremlin have in fact known more about our policies and our secrets than have the American people themselves. I say, let us tighten up the American security against Communist activity, and let us open up increased information to the American people.

On this foundation, with participation by both political parties, this Nation will place

its foreign policy on a positive instead of a negative base. Even if the conference with the Russian leaders fails, America can then proceed, by employing every possible means—not only the radio but also literature distributed by balloons and high-flying airplanes—to send information over the iron curtain to the Russian people. By doing this we may well regain the ground lost for the freedom of mankind without the holocaust of war and notwithstanding the leaders of Russia.

My fellow citizens, with deep and earnest conviction I submit to you that this is the manner in which our America must give effective moral leadership to the world. This is the road that leads to the best prospect for peace and progress for the men and women and children of this Nation and of all nations.

Labor and Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, I append hereto a most important and interesting editorial from the New York Times of February 10 on this subject:

LABOR AND POLITICS

An interesting problem has been placed by David Dubinsky before the executive council of the American Federation of Labor. Mr. Dubinsky was one of the few important labor leaders in this city to support Newbold Morris for mayor last fall in the face of combined A. F. of L.-CIO backing for Mr. O'Dwyer. Presumably as a result of the position taken by Mr. Dubinsky and his union, the ILGWU representative was asked to resign from New York City's central A. F. of L. group. It is acceptance of this resignation by the Central Trades and Labor Council of Greater New York that Mr. Dubinsky is now asking the A. F. of L.'s highest executive body to reverse.

The problem raised by Mr. Dubinsky to the topmost Federation level is this: Should a labor organization following one political line require its officials—or, for that matter, its members—to conform to that line under pain of expulsion? This question becomes of increasing importance as labor unions as such tend more and more to take political positions. In the present case Mr. Dubinsky asks "whether a central labor union * * * has the power or the right to compel uniformity of political thought and action by all * * * members."

It seems to us in the interest both of labor and of democracy not to discourage independence of thought and action inside (as well as outside) the ranks of labor. Obviously, any labor organization, from local to top executive board, may participate in political activity if it wants to. But to enforce conformity under pain of expulsion (which is a very serious sanction indeed) would be to blanket the minds of union members. That is hardly a democratic procedure.

The CIO, to be sure, is now ridding itself of Communist domination. But there is a very real distinction, so far as labor is concerned, between political dissent as expressed within the framework of the democratic system and the tactics of distortion and disruption employed by the Communists inside the labor movement to further their own ends. The Communists use unions primarily as weapons in an ideological battle. To root out Communist influence is one thing; it is quite another for a labor group, whether A. F. of L., CIO, or independent, to require that all its members subscribed to whatever political line it may be following at the moment.

Where To Apply for Surplus Potatoes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. BROOKS HAYS
OF ARKANSAS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. HAYS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, supplementing the list published in the RECORD by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. HESELTON] of agencies authorized to handle surplus potatoes and other commodities, I include the following names and addresses of officials of certain Southern States with such authority:

Arkansas: J. H. Carter, State purchasing agent, 1817 Spring Street, Post Office Box 2940, Little Rock, Ark.

Kentucky: H. E. Walters, Department of Agriculture, New Capitol Building, Frankfort, Ky.

Louisiana: T. B. Kirklin, State Board of Education, Baton Rouge, La.

Mississippi: J. M. Tubbs, Department of Education, Old Capitol, Jackson, Miss.; W. D. Hilton, State Board of Trustees of Mental Institutions, 2550 North State Street, Jackson, Miss.

The distributing agents for the State of Texas are as follows:

Texas distributing agents, commodity distribution program

District	Name of distributing agent	Title	Address	Counties
Amarillo	Charles M. Rogers	Superintendent, Amarillo independent school district.	Senior high school, Polk St., Amarillo, Tex.	Armstrong, Briscoe, Carson, Childress, Castro, Collingsworth, Dallam, Deaf Smith, Donley, Gray, Hall, Hansford, Hartley, Hemphill, Hutchinson, Lipscomb, Moore, Oldham, Ochiltree, Parmer, Potter, Randall, Roberts, Sherman, Swisher, Wheeler.
Austin	T. N. Porter	Business manager, Austin public schools.	701 East 11th St., Austin, Tex.	Bastrop, Blanco, Burnet, Comal, Caldwell, Dewitt, Fayette, Gillespie, Gonzales, Guadalupe, Hays, Lavaca, Llano, Kendall, Travis.
Beaumont	Only Greer	County superintendent, Jefferson County School Board.	Courthouse, Beaumont, Tex.	Chambers, Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson, Liberty, Newton, Orange.
Brownwood	Harley H. Black	County superintendent, Brown County School Board.	Courthouse, Brownwood, Tex.	Brown, Callahan, Coleman, Comanche, Concho, Eastland, Jones, Mason, Monard, McCulloch, Mills, Stephens, Shackelford, San Saba, Taylor.
Corpus Christi	Deskin D. Snow	County superintendent, Nueces County School Board.	Courthouse, Corpus Christi, Tex.	Nueces, Aransas, Bee, Brooks, Calhoun, Duval, Cameron, Goliad, Hidalgo, Jim Hogg, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Kleberg, Live Oak, Refugio, San Patricio, Starr, Webb, Willacy, Victoria, Zapata.
Cameron	Charles Hicles	County superintendent, Milam County School Board.	Courthouse, Cameron, Tex.	Bell, Brazos, Burleson, Grimes, Lee, Leon, Madison, Milam, Robertson, Washington, Williams.
Corsicana	J. C. Watson	County superintendent, Navarro County School Board.	Courthouse, Corsicana, Tex.	Dallas, Kaufman, Van Zandt, Ellis, Navarro, Henderson.
El Paso	Lynn B. Davis	Business manager, El Paso public schools	100 W. Rio Grande El Paso, Tex.	Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Loving, Pecos, Presidio, Reeves, Terrell.
Fort Worth	G. H. Stoew	County superintendent, Tarrant County School Board.	Courthouse, Fort Worth, Tex.	Denton, Erath, Hood, Johnson, Palo Pinto, Parker, Somervell, Tarrant, Wise.
Houston	J. Hall Sheppard	County superintendent, Harris County School Board.	1225 Elder St., Houston, Tex.	Austin, Brazoria, Colorado City, Ft. Bend, Galveston, Harris, Jackson, Matagorda, Montgomery, Waller, Wharton.
Lubbock	Roy Boyd	County superintendent, Lubbock County School Board.	Courthouse, Lubbock, Tex.	Andrews, Bailey, Borden, Cochran, Cottle, Crosby, Dawson, Dickens, Ector, Floyd, Foard, Gaines, Garza, Hale, Hardeman, Hartley, Haskell, Kent, King, Knox, Lamb, Lubbock, Lynn, Martin, Midland, Motley, Stonewall, Terry, Winkler, Yoakum.
Lufkin	T. J. Wilroy	County superintendent, Angelina County School Board.	Courthouse, Lufkin, Tex.	Angelina, Anderson, Cherokee, Gregg, Harrison, Houston, Nacogdoches, Panola, Polk, Rusk, Sabine, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Trinity, Tyler, Walker, San Jacinto.
Paris	William Wooldridge	County superintendent, Lamar County School Board.	Courthouse, Paris, Tex.	Bowie, Camp, Cass, Collin, Delta, Fannin, Franklin, Grayson, Hopkins, Hunt, Lamar, Marion, Morris, Rains, Red River, Rockwall, Titus, Upshur, Wood.
San Angelo	Bryan Dickson	Superintendent, San Angelo independent school district.	244 Magdalan St., San Angelo, Tex.	Coke, Crane, Crockett, Fisher, Glasscock, Howard, Irion, Mitchell, Nolan, Reagan, Runnels, Schleicher, Scurry, Sterling, Tom Green, Upton, Ward.

Texas distributing agents, commodity distribution program—Continued

District	Name of distributing agent	Title	Address	Counties
San Antonio	W. B. Connell	Superintendent, Hot Wells independent school district.	400 Hot Wells Blvd., San Antonio, Tex.	Atascosa, Bandera, Bexar, Dimmit, Edwards, Frio, Karnes, Kerr, Kimble, Kinney, La Salle, Maverick, McMullen, Medina, Real, Sutton Uvalde, Val Verde, Wilson, Zavala.
Waco	J. E. Batson	County superintendent, McLennan County School Board.	Courthouse, Waco, Tex	Bosque, Coryell, Falls, Freestone, Hill, Hamilton, Limestone, Lampasas, McLennan.
Wichita Falls	B. H. Dinsmore	County superintendent, Wichita County School Board.	Courthouse, Wichita Falls, Tex.	Archer, Baylor, Clay, Cooke, Jack, Montague, Throckmorton, Wichita, Wilbarger. Young
State board of control [1]	Alice L. Miller	Assistant purchasing agent	State Capitol Bldg., Austin, Tex.	Taylor, Travis, Howard, McCulloch, Cooke, Coryell, Kerr, Limestone, Cherokee, Bexar, Navarro, Travis, Tom Green, Kaufman, McLennan, Wichita.
State board of hospitals and special schools.	Mayme Kelly	Director	Austin State Hospital, Austin, Tex.	Serving State institutions located in the above counties.

[1] To be changed to "Division of hospitals and special schools" as soon as the new board is organized.

Where Pioneer Strength of Character Still Prevails

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. COMPTON I. WHITE
OF IDAHO
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 20, 1950

Mr. WHITE of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in these times of myriad modern conveniences we often lose sight of the sturdy character of the strong and faithful American who still carries on in true pioneering style in many of the more or less remote areas of our great Nation.

It is to preserve in the archives of our Capital a vivid portrayal of such scenes still persisting in the broad scope of our national life that I offer herewith two revealing articles from recent pages of the Sandpoint (Idaho) Bulletin:

ODEN-SUNNYSIDE

(Mrs. Oliver Long, reporter)

WINTER SCENE AROUND LAKE PEND OREILLE, IDAHO

January 5 was the last issue of Oden-Sunnyside news. Since then much may have and did happen, but your reporter knows little about it. The snows came down and the wind whipped it about to fill driveways, roads, and fields. In some yards drifts came to the eaves of houses. Snowplows came and threw high walls, over which sometimes only a high truck top can be seen along the highway.

Along the Sunnyside roads the snow plow came through from the north on January 17. They opened on Sunnyside to near the Meeker place, where the lead plow nosed a bank and stopped. Two days later the road toward the east was plowed. That part from the mail boxes west could not be opened by the plows, and on January 23 the Dunn brothers, with their bulldozer, plowed it open. Up to this time we had missed 11 days' mail. The milk producers had to sled the milk to truckers on opened roads. On January 19 Mr. and Mrs. Ralph Earle and Faith Ellen walked in to visit the Longs. Mr. Earle kindly helped shovel the buildings clear of snow, and on January 23 Mr. and Mrs. D. A. Lange also walked in, and they, too, took dinner with the Longs.

The Oden school opened that week, but the Sunnyside bus was unable to take the children that week because of road conditions.

The Extension Club called a meeting for February 6 at Mrs. Ralph Earle's. No report on that.

The Busy Bee Club met last Thursday with Mrs. Max Kluver, with 11 people present.

Last week many white fishermen passed on the way to Sunnyside. No reports on the catches.

Mr. and Mrs. Dick Stockdale and children, of Sandpoint, were seen walking past to visit the Alva McNutt family. That part of the road to the Davis and McNutt homes is open only to teams and sleds.

WINTER FISHING ON LAKE PEND OREILLE

Whitefishing shacks on the ice of Lake Pend Oreille dot the entire area from Sandpoint to Sunnyside, but some fishermen report that the cutthroat trout have driven the whitefish closer to shore.

One fisherman told Dr. C. C. Wendle Sunday that in the Fisherman's Island area near Sunnyside he had to move his location inshore as too many trout were biting out in deeper water.

A plane flew low over the whitefishing shack town Sunday and created a disturbance among fishermen who were seen to toss out fish on the ice which could or could not have been trout, an observer said.

A good many trout have been hooked fishing through the ice for whitefish in the Ellisport Bay district, along with whitefish, reported one Hope resident, who said that more were being returned to the water than were released last year when a reportedly sizable number of cutthroat were retained in catches made in the area.

A Program for Occupation of Western Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JACOB K. JAVITS
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Speaker, there is appended hereto a statement of the Committee on National Affairs on this subject signed by many distinguished Americans and spelling out in detail a positive program by which we may achieve the aims of our German occupation:

We recently emerged victorious from the second of two great wars fought within a single generation to defend democracy. We are still imperiled by German anti-democratic elements as well as by Russian Communist aggression—these threats are not unrelated.

A major failure to date in the fight against totalitarianism by the democracies has been the lack of success in developing a democratic Germany essential to the security of the democratic world. While the Russians are building a totalitarianism of the left in eastern Germany, there is danger of the rebirth of a totalitarianism of the right in western Germany. Both are antidemocratic. An undemocratic Germany, potentially an ally of the forces of Communist aggression, is now and will remain a continuing threat to the peaceful world free men seek.

The minimum objectives proclaimed necessary to assure a democratic Germany have not yet been attained.

1. The German economic war potential has not been brought under effective international control.

2. German industry has not been decartelized.

3. The German federal and state governments have not been effectively denazified as they include many former Nazis and Nazi supporters in key positions, and the all-important civil service has not been liberalized to permit greater employment of existing democratic elements.

4. German educational and cultural institutions have not been democratized.

We seek no Carthaginian peace. We believe that the natural, industrial, and human resources of Germany are necessary to the development of a balanced European prosperity and are therefore essential to the maintenance of international security. But we also firmly believe that these resources threaten world peace unless they are brought within the framework of international control and direction.

We therefore call upon the Government of the United States to take the following measures:

1. Forbid the creation of a national army or national police force in western Germany in accordance with the requirements of the Occupation Statute and the Bonn Accord.

2. Declare that it will continue to maintain occupation forces in western Germany until minimum democratic objectives have been attained and until our withdrawal would clearly not hazard the peace.

3. Insist upon continued and effective international control of the Ruhr and Rhine industries to insure their peaceful utilization, and provide for the decartelized integration of the German economy into that of western Europe.

4. Proceed vigorously to support and assist the democratic elements in Germany in the long-term task of democratizing the economic, political, and cultural institutions of that country.

5. Seek the restoration of German participation in nonmilitary international organizations at the earliest practicable time as

one means of integrating Germany so that it becomes a member in good standing of the family of democratic nations.

Samuel Hopkins Adams, New York; Dr. Henry A. Atkinson, New York; Roger N. Baldwin, New York; William H. Baldwin, New York; Courtenay Barber, Jr., Illinois; G. M. Bellanca, Delaware; Russell G. Bellezza, Maryland; Alfred M. Bingham, Connecticut; Dr. L. M. Birkhead, New York; Jacob Blaustein, Maryland; Raymond B. Bowen, New York; Mrs. Aida Breckinridge, New York; Percy S. Brown, New Hampshire; Struthers Burt, Wyoming; H. H. Butler, New York; Henry B. Cabot, Massachusetts; Samuel Cabot, Massachusetts; A. G. Cameron, Ohio; Dean Harry J. Carman, New York; Carl Carmer, New York; Delbert Clark, New York; Rufus E. Clement, Georgia; William T. Cobb, New York; William F. Cochran, Maryland; Morris L. Cooke, Pennsylvania; Albert S. Coolidge, Massachusetts; Emmett Corrigan, New York; Frank R. Crosswaith, New York; C. Suydam Cutting, New York; J. Clarence Daniels, Jr., New York; A. Powell Davies, District of Columbia; J. Lionberger Davis, Missouri; Joseph M. Dawson, District of Columbia; Dr. Stephen Duggan, Connecticut; Charles P. Eisenhauer, Ohio; Thomas H. Eliot, Massachusetts; John Ellis, New York; Irving M. Engel, New York; Hugo Ernst, Ohio; George Field, New York; Prof. D. F. Fleming, Tennessee; Hugh L. Gaddis, Ohio; Truman K. Gibson, Jr., Illinois; Arthur J. Goldsmith, New York; Sylvan Gotshal, New York; D. Samuel Gottesman, New York; Herman A. Gray, New York; William Green, District of Columbia; Frederick P. Gruenberg, Pennsylvania; Edward O. Hascall, Jr., Michigan; August Heckscher, New York; William H. Hessler, Ohio; Tracy Higgins, New York; Melvin D. Hildreth, District of Columbia; Gen. John Hilldring, District of Columbia; Rt. Rev. Henry W. Hobson, Ohio; Dr. Bryn J. Hovde, New York; B. W. Huebsch, New York; Miss Alice W. Hunt, Rhode Island; Dr. Horace M. Kallen, New York; Dorothy Kenyon, New York; Prof. Hans Kohn, New York; Charles M. LaFollette, District of Columbia; Andrew M. Law, South Carolina; Goodhue Livingston, Jr., New York; Mrs. Burnett Mahon, New York; Frederick C. McKee, Pennsylvania; J. A. Migel, Rhode Island; Newbold Morris, New York, Edgar A. Mowrer, District of Columbia; Lewis Mumford, New York; P. G. Mumford, New York; William C. Murray, New York; Charlton Ogburn, New York; Harry A. Overstreet, California; Rt. Rev. G. Bromley Oxnam, New York; E. W. Palmer, Tennessee; James G. Patton, Colorado; Lewis Perry, Massachusetts; Prof. Ralph Barton Perry, Massachusetts; Henry V. Poor, New York; Arthur Upham Pope, New York; Richard de Rochemont, New York; Mrs. Tobe D. Rosenblum, New York; Richard B. Scandrett, Jr., New York; Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., Massachusetts; F. E. Schuchman, Pennsylvania; Aaron Schoen, New York; Mrs. William Marston Seabury, New York; Eric Sevareid, District of Columbia; Henry Noble Sherwood, Indiana; Mrs. William Dick Sporborg, New York; Admiral William H. Standley, California; Mark Starr, New York; Meier Steinbrink, New York; A. G. Stieglitz, New York; Rex Stout, New York; Clarence Streit, District of Columbia; Herbert Bayard Swope, New York; Telford Taylor, New York; Barent Ten Eyck, New York; F. R. Von Windegger, Missouri; Westmore Willcox, New York; Justice James H. Wolfe, Utah; Max Zaritsky, New York; Committee on National Affairs, New York, N. Y.

Brotherhood Week

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KENNETH B. KEATING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, all over our Nation this past week, there has been an outstanding thought, which is appropriately labeled "Brotherhood Week." And we do well to celebrate it simultaneously as we do with the birthday of our first President, George Washington. For it was the brotherliness of George Washington that did so much to knit the dissident and discontended soldiery of the thirteen independent colonies, into a united fighting force that finally triumphed over Britain's ablest soldiery. And it was Washington's own sense of brotherhood and neighborliness that did so much to unite those thirteen independent and contentious colonies into one nation, indivisible, and powerful enough to prevail against all separative forces.

If anyone will scan the pages of all human history and note carefully the noblest expressions of the wisest of men, he will quickly discover that the Brotherhood of Man has been the greatest ideal, the most desired object of all our human strivings and fightings and inventions and travail. Brotherhood under the common fatherhood of Almighty God was the essence of the religion taught and practiced by Jesus Christ, the head of all Christian churches. Brotherhood was the constantly reiterated lesson which Moses and Aaron and their successors sought to impose upon all Jews.

Especially I commend the National Conference of Christians and Jews for having thus launched this great ideal into the common everyday life of our 150,000,000 citizens, and given it a full week's treatment, in 15,000 pulpits, 10,000 different newspapers and thousands of theaters.

A great many people are spreading the idea that Americans are not as religious and kindly and neighborly a people as they once were, and that things were infinitely better in the good old days.

As to religion, expressed in the factual terms of actual church membership, the statistics are reassuring. Today church membership is nearing the 80,000,000 mark, which is an all-time high. One may quibble or argue as much as he likes but these 80,000,000 members are voluntary church members. They are members by their own active choice and action.

The percentage of population figure confirms this analysis for the percentage of population whch was only 4 to 5 percent in early colonial decades, has steadily grown to 22½ percent in 1890, to 52 percent in 1944, and runs today around 53 or 54 percent of our total population. And that is also an all-time high. It shows how steadily and strong has been the influence of our churches, cathedrals, and synagogues. It proves that year after year the cause of human brotherhood has progressed and will continue to progress. And that very substantial fact should give us all much encouragement against the disappointments and setbacks of which we often complain.

So let us not lose heart at any temporary reversals in the slow but substantial advance we are making. Let us continue in faith and hope and human charity to make the dream come true.

Salute to Gananoque

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include an article by Richard M. McKeon from America for December 24, 1949. Rev. Richard McKeon, S. J., is director of the school of industrial relations at Le Moyne College, Syracuse, N. Y. While dean of St. Joseph's College, Philadelphia, 1935 to 1942, he founded its school of social sciences, a pioneer undertaking in the United States in free adult education in the Christian social program. Father McKeon is a charter member of the Industrial Relations Research Association.

The article follows:

SALUTE TO GANANOQUE

(By Richard M. McKeon)

On November 18, 1949, a modest gentleman journeyed from the little Canadian town of Gananoque, Ontario, to the busy industrial city of Syracuse, N. Y. The gentleman's name was Thomas J. Delaney. He is president of Parmenter & Bulloch Co., Ltd. Rightfully does this company boast to the entire world that it is 100 percent employee owned. Under the title "Every Worker a Capitalist," Mr. Delaney had come to tell the forum of the Le Moyne College School of Industrial Relations the fascinating story of this company, which is successfully putting into practice the principles of the Christian social order. A very large audience of high management officials, labor leaders, professional people, rank and file workers, and students pursuing their degree course in industrial relations showed their appreciation of his address by questioning him for more than an hour. It was a fitting climax to the fourth year of Le Moyne's endeavor to contribute to the industrial welfare of the community.

In a simple, expository style, devoid of any reference to the important part which he had played in the reorganization of the company, Mr. Delaney told the magnetic story of Gananoque. He mentioned that Parmenter and

Bulloch was established 86 years ago. The company produces rivets of all types, riveting machines, and various small metal items, including knitting needles and rings for bulls' noses. In 1946 the Bulloch family decided to sell and started negotiations with prospective buyers. One of these was a large corporation having several plants engaged in the same competitive field. There was grave danger that the Bulloch plant and its operations might be moved to another area. This would have meant loss of work for 200 employees and dismay for their families and gloom for the little town.

Here is where Mr. Delaney enters the picture, though he kept himself in the background as he spoke. He had come to Gananoque many years before, as a member of a Toronto rowing team. Because he liked the town, which is beautifully situated on the St. Lawrence River at the gateway to the Thousand Islands, he decided to remain. Entering the company, he worked himself up to the position of general manager about 10 years ago. His executive ability, together with his pleasing personality, won for him the respect not only of the entire firm but also of the community.

Realizing what the loss of the company would mean to his many friends, he recalled an idea which had made the Graybar Electric Co. a very successful concern. For Graybar, a national distributor of electrical equipment, is owned by its workers. Could he sell this idea of employee-ownership to his fellow workers? The emergency called for quick action. Rallying some leaders around him, he finally convinced the workers, and together they began a campaign to raise the necessary money. The owners were approached and a 30-day option was secured, with the purchasing price set at $500,000.

At this point in his address Mr. Delaney betrayed intense emotion for a moment. For here was the trying challenge. How could a group of 70 women and 140 men in ordinary circumstances raise this amount in a few weeks? What happened? A wonderful act of faith. Homes were mortgaged, war bonds were turned in, loans were secured, merchants fearful of their own welfare contributed. The amount raised was $252,000. No wonder the voice of Mr. Delaney thrilled when he said: "I will always admire and be grateful to my associates for their supreme efforts in raising such a substantial amount of money in a short space of time."

But the goal was far away and the cynics were sniping. Then the owners, hearing about the plan and the efforts of their employees, reduced the price to $525,000. With the ready cooperative help of Goulding & Rose, Ltd., investment brokers of Toronto, a bond issue of $275,000 was floated at very low rates. A plan to redeem these bonds over a 10-year period by means of pay roll deductions were drawn up. One may imagine the joy of Gananoque, after facing many obstacles, with hope often at low ebb, to learn that, when the bonds were offered for sale, the issue was oversubscribed before the certificates could be printed.

To protect the new company, a lengthy trust deed was drawn up by a prominent firm of corporation lawyers. There were many intricate legal details to clarify, for the idea of 100-percent employee-ownership was without precedent in Canada.

One special feature was the establishment of a voting trust. This important suggestion came from the Graybar Electric Co., with its experience of 29 years of successful operation as an employee-owned institution. The investment brokers also insisted on the voting trust before they floated the bond issue. This trust insures continuity of key management. It removes the possibility of an irresponsible group gaining control. Top management decides the policy of the company, but the workers are always kept fully informed about the more important matters.

Having thus explained the formation of the new company, Mr. Delaney now spoke of the results obtained under employee ownership. With justifiable pride he said that the plan had worked far better than they had ever hoped. The company has a happy cooperative spirit, with the result that tremendous gains have been made financially. Although during the past 3 years the number of workers has decreased, productivity has increased. The workers have a sense not only of belonging to but of actually owning the business. They do not waste time and material. They tolerate no careless work, for their own money is involved. They know that their combined efforts will determine the amount of dividends they will receive at the end of the business year. Mr. Delaney smiled when he told how a Toronto industrialist, on visiting the plant and examining the financial statement, exclaimed: "Every other manufacturer I know these days is getting only 3 days' work for 5 days' pay. Man, you're getting 6 for 5."

Every employee is a shareholder. Shares may be purchased through pay-roll deduction. If an employee leaves the company, his shares must be sold to the employees' pool and held for further distribution. An agreement is signed by all to this effect No one outside the company can own shares in it.

When the company was reorganized, there seemed to be no hope of dividends for at least 2 years; none had been paid by the old company for many years. After only 6 months of operation, however, the improved status warranted the payment of a dividend. Thus far six dividends have been paid, representing an annual yield of 5 percent. At the same time, a fair amount of earnings is set aside for reserves.

Mr. Delaney continued: "We have redeemed $77,000 of our bond issue. Our last annual statement showed a ratio of current assets to current liabilites of over 7 to 1. Bankers think that the ratio of 3 to 1 is a good risk. When we bought the company we inherited a bank loan of $130,000, which has since been entirely wiped out. Our company is now in its strongest financial condition. Don't you think this proves the workability and success of employee ownership?"

What about wages and working conditions? The wages are the highest in the industry. The work week is now 40 hours instead of 44. Yet production, even with the present lower work force, shows an increase of 14 percent. There are 2 weeks vacation with pay, with extra time for older workers. A complete renovation of the plant has taken place along lines of greater efficiency and safety. Many of the ideas for improvement have come from the workers. Smoking is allowed on the job and canteen service is available.

The company has an excellent pension plan, to which both employees and company contribute. There is full sick pay and a bonus at Christmas. The company pays the whole cost of a hospitalization plan covering employees and their families.

The workers have a firm faith in the new set-up. They recognize that management must function as in other companies. Accordingly there are a board of directors, officers, and department heads who have the power to hire and fire. Three directors are from the main office, and two are from the shop. These directors keep a close scrutiny over the distribution of shares.

In the question period, which went for a full hour after Mr. Delaney's talk, the keen mind and sincere heart of the speaker captivated his hearers. Here are a few of the questions and answers:

"We understand that the United Steel Workers has a union in your plant. In view of your remarks, what is its main function?

"Its main function seems to be an effort to keep alive. We find it useful for grievance procedures. Thus far no grievance has reached our office.

"What would happen to your company if an industry-wide strike was called? Where would you be?

"We would be sitting pretty. We foresaw such a difficulty, and in our agreement the union is freed from participating in such a strike.

"What if the union should demand a wage increase?

"That is possible but not probable. Our workers know that a wage increase would mean less dividends.

"What is the difference between your policy and that of ordinary profit-sharing firms?

"In other firms, profit-sharing depends upon the decision of management, who frequently are not the owners. Have their workers a strict right to share in such profits, presuming they are receiving fair basic pay? Because we are the owners, we have that right and we pride ourselves that increased efficiency has made this possible. We are not unmindful of our customers in the form of lower prices.

"Have other companies shown an interest in your plan?

"Very many inquiries come to our office. We understand that two companies have set up similar programs but we have no report on their success.

"Do you workers use the time clock?

"Yes and no. All employees with 15 years of service, nearly half the force, do not punch the clock. Personally, I am in favor of tossing time clocks out completely.

"What is outstanding in the attitude of your workers?

"I would say that their most characteristic attitude is a supreme faith in the principle of employee ownership."

Mr. Delaney in his concluding remarks told how the early cynics predicted that the new company would not last 6 months, that it would be a socialistic mess, that the workers would lose everything. Some are still skeptical. Paraphrasing Scripture, he added, "Can any good come out of Gananoque?" and then he gave a smiling invitation to "Come and see."

The last question was, "What would happen in the event of a depression?"

"Well, what would happen to any company in a depression? To us it would mean retrenchment, cutting down budgets, reducing expenses wherever possible. We believe that we could weather a depression better than the average firm because we have a more understanding spirit among our associates."

In 1931 in his masterly encyclical, On the Reconstruction of the Social Order, Pius XI wrote:

"In the present state of human society, however, we deem it advisable that the wage contract should, when possible, be modified somewhat by a contract of partnership, as is already being tried in various ways to the no small gain of the wage earners and of the employers. In this way wage earners are made sharers in some sort in the ownership, or the management, or the profits."

In 1949 at Gananoque, Canada, this sound advice is now being successfully put into practice at the Parmenter & Bulloch plant.

Canada has many famous historical and religious shrines. But with all due respect to tradition and religion, we believe that she may boast about a special industrial shrine to which, we trust, many American representatives of labor and management will make a pilgrimage. On the way they will see the beauty and the peace of the Thousand Islands. For that shrine is at Gananoque, and there they will appreciate the conviction of mind and the contentment of heart reflected in the lives of its capitalist workers.

China Reds To Grab Chennault Planes

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following ominous news story of a strange event in Hong Kong where Great Britain, a supposed ally in the war of survival against Communist aggression, decides to hand over a vast air fleet to our common enemy. The story is from the Washington News of February 24, 1950:

CHINA REDS TO GRAB CHENNAULT PLANES

(By Oland D. Russell)

The Chinese Communists were expected today to lose no time in flying out of Hong Kong the seventy-odd transport planes which have in effect been handed over to them by the supreme court in the British crown colony.

The planes, including communications and maintenance equipment, belong to an American corporation, headed by Maj. Gen. Claire L. Chennault of Flying Tiger fame.

They make up the biggest air fleet in China and for months have been sought by the Chinese Communists. They can be used to ferry military supplies to China from Russia, for dropping parachutists into Indochina, or for an amphibious assault on Formosa.

The Hong Kong court invoked "sovereign immunity" in deciding it could not take the planes under its protection by appointing a receiver for them. The court took the view that since the British had recognized the Communists, the Peiping regime was the legal and sovereign ruler of China and could not be disturbed from its possession of the planes.

ALREADY, RED FLAGS

Though the American owners and representatives of the Civil Aeronautics Authority have been denied the access to the planes, pro-Communist employees of the two former Nationalist airlines have been permitted to board them at Kaitak Airfield where they are impounded. Anticipating a court decision in favor of the Communists, these former employees already have painted red flags on the ships and have been overhauling the motors in preparation for a quick getaway.

British authorities in Hong Kong have been trying for 3 months—even before London recognized the Red regime—to find a legal way of turning over these two completely equipped air lines to the Chinese Communists.

Communist pressure on the local British authorties has been great and the British themselves have not been unmindful of the trade benefits and good will that might accrue to them if they handed over the planes to the Commies.

Still other pressures have been exerted on the Hong Kong British by the London foreign office and the United States State Department for recognition of General Chennault's legal title to the planes.

"GODOWN" SHOWDOWN

The showdown came this week. According to word received here, the Communists got word to the Hong Kong court that for every plane denied them, one British business establishment in Communist-occupied Shanghai would be taken over. "A godown (warehouse) for every plane," as the Reds tersely put it.

Facing this situation realistically, the Hong Kong court yielded to the Communists, taking advantage, according to observers here, of the British election following Washington's Birthday when communications with London and Washington would be at a minimum effectiveness.

The court in effect washed its hands of the whole affair, dumping a ticklish question on the London foreign office, but by choosing the holiday and election-day period, it gave some time leeway to the Communists to get the planes away from Hong Kong.

If any restraint is now to be used, it will have to be done on orders from London for some sort of executive action.

AMERICAN REPRISALS

At stake now is whether American diplomatic power can be used effectively to prod London into measures which still might save some or all of the planes from falling into Communist hands. The State Department has, through representations and notes, backed the Chennault claim to title of the planes and has insisted that the Hong Kong court conduct a trial to establish legality of this title.

But Washington consistently has refused to get tough about it, with the result that the Communists have slugged it out, and apparently have won, in the Hong Kong courts.

Some demands were heard here yesterday for American reprisals against the British through the ECA. It was pointed out that the British by letting planes and equipment valued at $20,000,000 be grabbed off by the Communists in effect have given an American air fleet to the Reds topping in value what the British will get in air equipment from the ECA.

The Columbia Basin

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALT HORAN
OF WASHINGTON
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. HORAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I include here the last three articles in the series by Mr. Leon Starmont on the Columbia River region, entitled "Let's Explore the Basin." There has been widespread interest in this series, both out in the Pacific Northwest and among readers of the RECORD who have followed it here in the Capital.

Again, I want to state that I have had these articles inserted here because they represent one of the most complete attempts yet made to trace the high-spots of development of the Columbia River, and the controversies which have raged and still go on in the Northwest regarding the many conflicting ideas which have been advanced. The statements made are Mr. Starmont's own interpretation of a series of events which are subject to many interpretations. They should serve to indicate, if nothing more, that no one man or three men can ever hope to speak on behalf of all the residents of the great Pacific Northwest—nor should any such group ever be empowered to make decisions regarding development of the Columbia unless they are the direct representatives of those people.

The series also demonstrates what some of our Federal planners are prone to forget—that development of the Columbia region is not something new; it has evolved in thought and planning and action over a period of 60 years. I submit that the same people who have carried that development to date are fully capable of determining what future development should be and of taking the necessary steps to attain it.

For the benefit of all interested, here is an index of the complete series, as they appear in the Appendix of the RECORD:

	Date	Page
Article No.—		
1	Jan. 31	A665
2, 3	Feb. 2	A739
4, 5	Feb. 7	A897
6, 7, 8	Feb. 8	A936
9, 10	Feb. 9	A950
11, 12, 13	Feb. 20	A1246
14, 15, 16	do	A1240
17, 18, 19	Feb. 21	A1297
20, 21, 22	Feb. 27	A1412

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 20)

(By Leon Starmont)

Big Bend residents have started a drive to restore 300,000 acres of high wheat-farming country to the Columbia Basin irrigation project in central Washington.

This would make the qualified area under the Grand Coulee reservoir 800,000 acres. If the Wahluke slope or part of it is later released by the Atomic Energy Commission it would again become a million-acre project, as described by the Bureau of Reclamation.

Frank T. Bell, member of the State Columbia Basin Commission representing the Quincy-Columbia district, reports the directors of that district got behind the endeavor this week and will push it at next week's meeting at Lind, Wash., when directors for all three irrigation districts hold a joint session.

REOPEN TIME FOR CONTRACTS

Quincy-Columbia directors, besides Bell, are J. A. Weber, president; Charles E. Kennedy, E. E. Huffman, and Albert E. Jones.

Concurrence of the State commission and the other districts is taken for granted, Bell said. But Congress will have to amend the law to permit the Bureau of Reclamation to extend or reopen the time for signing recordable contracts.

The Bureau at the same time will be requested to permit veterans to exercise their priorities and pick the tracts they want before the water starts to flow in 1952.

The basin commission will finance these efforts out of its $80,000 appropriation for the biennium, which has been cut to $72,000 at the governor's request.

"That sets no precedent," said Bell. The commission also financed the campaign for recordable contracts started in 1943 and culminating in the contract elections at 15 polling places on July 21, 1945.

The 300,000 acres involved are mostly in the east Columbia district and in Adams County. They include some land in all three districts.

MEANS 22,000 PEOPLE

"We realize the importance of getting this land back into the irrigation districts," said Bell. "It means 3,000 small farms in an area where present holdings are concentrated in a few hands.

"With five persons to a farm, and half as many more in the towns that will serve them,

this means a population of maybe 22,000 that will or will not be added to these three counties (Grant, Adams, and Franklin)."

Bell, an astute politician, has always represented the State basin commission at Washington when appropriation bills were before Congress. He knows his way around the Capital through long service as secretary to former Senator C. C. Dill and later as Federal Commissioner of Fisheries.

"Just to keep the record straight," he said, "I was not in the East on basin business this winter. My trip was on private business. When the last meeting of the commission was called at Spokane January 6, I notified Chairman Jack Rogers I could not attend because I would be in the East. My letter apparently was misunderstood."

HISTORY PROJECTED

Two other topics will be before the basin commission at its next meeting.

One is possible storage on Columbia and Kootenay Rivers in British Columbia for downriver dams. Regional planning is dependent on knowledge of what Canada will do, and results of its studies have not been presented to the international joint commission, it was indicated by Commissioners Bell and Herbert M. Hamblen.

Preparation of an authentic history of the Columbia Basin (Big Bend) project is also to be discussed. So many contradictory versions of past events have been circulated that many believe the facts should be separated from the fables.

A historical outline prepared by E. K. Vande Vere is now in the files of the University of Washington. There are also said to be historical theses in the files of Washington State College.

These documents may be compared with material in the files of Spokane, Wenatchee, Pasco, and Ephrata newspapers, and records of several State and Federal agencies, irrigation districts, chambers of commerce, and other civic groups.

INFORMATION CENTER NEEDED

This suggestion grew from a plan for a Columbia Basin information center made at the basin commission meeting in Spokane on January 6 by Chester C. Kimm, secretary of the Wenatchee Chamber of Commerce.

"It's about time we all started telling the same story," said Kimm yesterday.

Agreement on the facts is preliminary to agreement on policies, he indicated.

Albert Widmer, past president of the Warden Chamber of Commerce, drove to Ephrata Wednesday to assure Frank T. Bell that he had not accused Bell of promoting the Othello-Ephrata route for a north-south State highway, as indicated by this reporter in Tuesday's Spokesman-Review.

"The statement was made, but I am not sure it was by a member of the Warden delegation," said Widmer, referring to last Monday's luncheon of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce's Columbia Basin committee.

Bell says he has taken no part in the controversy over location of the north-south highway.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 21)

(By Leon Starmont)

Many men spent many millions to put the Columbia basin where it is today. At least $2,000,000 was expended in preliminary promotion and surveys between 1900 and 1930. The big power dams, boat locks and irrigation works are monuments to thousands who poured their time and dollars into efforts that many times seemed hopeless.

No record has been located in the area of expenditures by the War Department from 1880 to 1900 above the mouth of the Snake River. Navigation improvements on the Columbia below the Snake had been started in the 1860's, and by 1880 had reached several millions.

FIRST PALOUSE PROJECT

The Federal Government, after passage of the National Reclamation Act in 1902, spent $76,409 in surveys of what was then called the Palouse project, for Big Bend irrigation, but which included the first surveys of ditch lines from Spokane and Pend Oreille Rivers to Grand Coulee and to the Crab Creek area.

Next appears the Spokane chamber of commerce, raising $3,000 in 1910 for surveys of the original Quincy project. Lake Wenatchee was the reservoir then proposed.

Between 1913 and 1915 the State put up $10,000 and the Federal Government $10,200 for two more surveys.

There the matter rested until 1918, when E. F. Blaine of Yakima Valley, after viewing the Pend Oreille with H. Lyold Miller, returned from the National Capital, scheduled to make a talk on apple marketing, and instead gave the address before the Spokane Chamber of Commerce that electrified the whole Northwest.

In the next few years citizens of Spokane raised and spent $38,256 to sell the idea to the rest of the inland empire, not including the personal expenditures of parties that went by special train or car to organize support for the Big Bend project in Kalispell, Mont.; Sandpoint, Idaho; Portland, Oreg.; and Seattle, Tacoma, Yakima, Wenatchee, and Pasco, Wash.

STATE HELPS AGAIN

In 1919, after Gov. Ernest Lister had come to Spokane to check on the reports of enthusiasm he had received from Blaine and Miller, the State legislature appropriated the first $100,000 for what was then called the Columbia Basin project. Lister did not live to sign the bill.

Then came creation at Pasco in 1922 of the Columbia Basin Irrigation League, which in the next 10 years raised and expended in round numbers $250,000. Spokane put up about half this money. Seattle citizens put up about $43,000, Tacoma $11,700, Portland $6,500, Walla Walla and Pasco about $10,400. Northern transcontinental railroads, naturally interested in settling the Big Bend, provided $52,000.

The Federal Government spent $4,043 in 1922 on the Henny report. In 1923 and 1924 there were other Agriculture and Interior Departments expenditures of $105,000. In 1925, $10,648 was spent by the Federal Government. Washington State appropriations in 1926 and 1927 totaled $37,500, and a 1929 fund of $18,000 still had $5,000 in it when the Army engineers' $150,000 survey was completed in 1931. There was then a $50,000 Federal appropriation for a special Columbia Basin project survey.

VARIOUS OTHER AGENCIES

All this money went directly toward creation of what has become the comprehensive plan.

Numerous organizations promoted special or local phases, such as Columbia River Development League at Wenatchee and Ephrata, Inland Empire Waterways Association at Walla Walla, the Montana groups that eventually became the Flathead Citizens' League at Kalispell, and other associations in at least half the counties of the upper basin.

Several chambers of commerce that did not directly finance the Columbia Basin Irrigation League had bureaus or committees working along similar lines.

E. F. Blaine, who started the stalled wheels with his 1918 Spokane speech, became chairman of the State development committee of the Seattle Chamber of Commerce.

Secretary of that committee was Thomas B. Hill, who later became secretary of the State chamber of commerce, then went with the State department of conservation and development at Olympia, still later was secretary of the Washington State Reclamation Association at Olympia, and now is assistant secretary of the Washington State Development Association.

OLD-TIMERS STILL ACTIVE

Four Spokane men active in the early days of the campaign, 32 years ago, are still residing and active in Spokane.

Charles Hebberd was made chairman of the board when the irrigation league was organized. He induced Herbert Hoover, then Secretary of Commerce, to visit the Columbia Basin in 1926.

"We stopped in St. Louis," he recalled yesterday, "where Mr. Hoover addressed the National Rivers and Harbors Congress. He made another talk in Spokane. Then at the league's fifth annual meeting in Seattle he delivered the address that roughly outlined his conception of all-purpose river development."

"Can you," this reporter asked Charles Hebberd, "identify any among the Hoover advisers that might be the actual author of the comprehensive plan?"

"He must have been anonymous," said the veteran reclamationist, with a twinkle. "The plan evolved gradually. It was a process of evolution—not revolution."

NEWSPAPERMEN TOOK PART

James A. Ford, secretary of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce in 1922 as now, became first secretary of the irrigation league.

Ren H. Rice, became assistant secretary, and later served the old basin commission. He now manufactures breakfast foods in Spokane.

W. S. Gilbert, now wintering in the South, was a speaker at the organization meeting at Pasco.

Ford and Rice are former newspapermen.

The late W. H. Cowles, Sr., of the Spokesman-Review was, of course, intensely interested in the Columbia Basin. He assigned several staff members at various times to assist quietly and anonymously in the basin program.

The late Nelson W. Durham, who had been editor of the old Review before it was merged with the Daily Spokesman, back in the early 1890's when Grand Coulee Dam was first suggested, became chairman of the Spokane chamber's Columbia Basin committee. He was also a first-class orator.

DURHAM AND DANA, ORATORS

Speeches by Durham and by Marshall Dana, associate editor of the (Portland) Oregon Journal, featured many a basin-promotion meeting. Dana was again a speaker at an Ephrata meeting last summer, and later at Boise.

Among other newsmen still living who did yeoman service on special phases of the Columbia Basin program are J. G. Parsons of the Priest River (Idaho) Times, now running a paper at Delano, in California's San Joaquin Valley; Harry J. (Hungry Horse) Kelley of the Flathead Monitor at Kalispell, Mont.; J. G. Kelly of the Walla Walla Union-Bulletin; E. B. Aldrich of the Pendleton East Oregonian, and Ole H. Olson, of the Pasco Herald, later State printer, now a State representative from Franklin County.

The Pasco meeting of 1922 was called to order by C. F. Stinson, who now divides his time between Pasco and Spokane. Chairman was the late John A. Gellatly of Wenatchee.

Hundreds of others might be mentioned. Not least among them would be Roy R. Gill, a former president of the Spokane Chamber of Commerce, and chairman of the executive committee of the irrigation league after 1924. He now resides in San Francisco.

LET'S EXPLORE THE BASIN

(Art. 22)

(By Leon Starmont)

These articles started with a story about an 1850 wagon train en route to the Columbia Basin. They have attempted to answer three of the questions asked around that hypothetical campfire:

"Where are we going? Where are we now? How did we get here?"

No job for this reporter is the answer to the fourth and possibly the most important question:

"Which is the right road to the basin objective?"

The opening article said there are six roads ahead. Amendment: There may be seven.

WE NOW HAVE CBIAC

The road to Columbia Basin's goal, half a dozen years ago, seemed to be filled with ruts and bumps.

Too many people were getting in each other's way. Some seemed to be working at cross purposes. Some programs overlapped in one spot and left unoccupied voids in another. Certain interests and localities were yelping that they didn't want some other things done at all.

Out of the confusion then existing has come, by what political experts call democratic processes, the CBIAC. Columbia Basin Inter-Agency Committee is a voluntary association of four Federal departments, the Federal Power Commission, Bonneville Power Administration, and the governments of seven basin States—Washington, Oregon, Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, and Utah.

Chairmanship is rotated among the Federal officials represented. Present chairman is Herbert M. Peet, a former Great Falls and Everett, Wash., editor, employed for several years by the Washington State publicity commission, now with the Department of Agriculture at Portland.

HOOVER'S HAND AGAIN

CBIAC has been functioning 5 years. Most people in the Columbia Basin seem to believe great progress has been made since 1945.

There is, for the first time, a generally accepted program.

Nobody considers it perfect. But it has been reached by residents of the basin, after thorough discussion in open hearings, and in the full light of publicity. If the press coverage has been distorted in a few spots, it certainly is not the fault of the CBIAC idea or the CBIAC personnel.

Under CBIAC auspices, the Bureau of Reclamation and the Corps of Engineers—which means the Interior and Army Departments—arrived by compromise at the present comprehensive plan.

Herbert Hoover gave a rough outline of such a plan in 1926. A quarter century later, under the second President to follow him in the White House, he heads a commission to propose certain improvements in the Federal Government. The Hoover changes, if approved, would automatically streamline and simplify CBIAC.

CVA DEBATE HARDLY CALM

The principal drawback of the present procedure is the necessity of going to Congress every year for appropriations. Of the four plans offered as "better roads" into the future, the one currently in the limelight still leaves that pitfall.

It is CVA.

A lot of people are getting mad about CVA. In fact, the very initials are being used as epithets—much as "bolsheveek" back in the 1920's.

It might be a good idea for the next year for public spokesmen to define the 95 percent of the things on which they agree rather than the 5 percent on which they disagree.

That approach has been tried by the Portland office of the Bureau of Land Management, with the result that age-old enemies discovered areas of friendship.

This reporter so far has found in the Columbia Basin only two men long identified with the basin project who are now friendly toward CVA, and one of them has his fingers crossed.

E. B. Aldrich, publisher of the Pendleton East Oregonian, has published some pro-CVA editorials. He is now on a southern motor tour and could not be reached for comment or explanation.

POOR BILL, SAYS DILL

Ex-Senator C. C. Dill is the other. But he admits the bill now being debated is poorly drawn. He says it doesn't mean what it seems to mean. He sees no reason why the number of proposed directors should not be five or seven rather than three, and why some of them should not be selected by the governors of the basin States rather than by the President.

Most CVA support comes from outside the Columbia Basin.

Officials of the Grange in Washington and Oregon have come out for a CVA. The Grange opposed the Columbia Basin irrigation project until 1931.

Spokesmen for AFL and CIO unions have also come out for a CVA. Organized labor supported the Columbia Basin irrigation project from the start.

The public-power movement is split on a CVA. Some PUD and REA executives are for it, others against it.

There may be similar splits in the Grange and labor movements, but this reporter has not been able to detect them.

Most industrial and commercial executives, reading the CVA bill, are afraid it gives the agency powers to take over all sorts of private business—power, mining, transportation, merchandising and possibly even farming.

They frankly suspect the motives of some CVA supporters. They are not convinced by assurances from ex-Senator Dill and others that "it doesn't mean what it seems to say."

If the fears of businessmen are groundless, they want to be convinced. That is why the demand grows for a series of open hearings in the basin, out of which the bill may be either amended to meet the region's desire for home rule, or abandoned.

There might emerge something called a CVA, either an administration or an authority, that the majority in the basin could accept. The future will tell.

WHY GO TO CONGRESS?

There are also elements, not yet organized, "fed up" with the constant necessity of going to Congress for appropriations.

Former Governor Monrad C. Wallgren long maintained that the State should buy Grand Coulee Dam from the Federal Government, and undertake on its own the rest of the river's development.

Representative WALT HORAN (R. Wash.) has an idea for a regional compact among the Northwest States. Subject to change, it would have a chairman appointed by the President, and four directors, to be selected from a dozen names submitted by the governors of Washington, Idaho, Montana, and Oregon.

An earlier proposal was for an independent Federal corporation, Congress to appropriate the original capital. Several ideas for local control of such a concept have been advanced.

More recent is the notion of an interstate authority, voting its own finances, independent of the Federal Government. Possible models are the New York Port of Authority, covering parts of New York and New Jersey, and "Incodel," a device by which Delaware River waters are allocated among New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and Delaware.

They might be worth studying.

Let's Go to the Roots

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CECIL M. HARDEN

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mrs. HARDEN. Mr. Speaker, under permission to extend my remarks, I call attention to an editorial which appeared in the March edition of the Farm Journal. It was written by one of our great editors, Wheeler McMillen, and it proposes a new agricultural program for this Nation. It seems to me that the content of this editorial is deserving of the most serious consideration of every Member of Congress.

The editorial follows:

LET'S GO TO THE ROOTS

Twenty years ago the big farm problem was surpluses.

Today, 1950, the big farm problem is the fear of surpluses.

During these 20 years huge efforts have been made. The best minds in agriculture, in government, and in business have been applied to the task. No one, not even the Federal Treasury, can say exactly how much tax money has been spent during these 20 years to try to do something about surpluses. But the amount ranges somewhere from $12,000,000,000 to $15,000,000,000, a tremendous sum.

No permanent solution has been achieved. After two decades of well-meant spending, agriculture still operates under programs that are obviously temporary expedients. No farmer will maintain that a sound future for his business has been assured.

What about agriculture's next 20 years? Shall we go on passing a new temporary farm bill in each Congress, spending another fifteen or twenty billions, and then wind up in 1970 still at sea what to do?

Shall we confess that we can proceed only by taxation, spending, restriction, and giving away? Shall we have to surrender freedom to all-powerful government?

Distribution? Millions of dollars have been spent to study that. There is still room for improvement. But no one has yet found out how to get farm products through to consumers without incurring considerable cost. Cooperative efforts, while helpful, have performed no miracles with surpluses.

Meantime, while 20 years have gone by and nearly as many billions have been spent, a variety of permanent advances have been achieved. Among them are hybrid corn, improved crop varieties, better fertilizing and spraying techniques, artificial insemination, DDT 2, 2.4D, quick freezing, improved power and machinery, and chemurgic markets that now total more than a billion two hundred and fifty million dollars a year.

Such permanent advances as these possess one notable common characteristic—they have been won by scientific research. Both public and private research have shared in these accomplishments.

The Federal Government now spends less than $50,000,000 a year to seek new facts about soils, plants, and animals. One chemical company spends more than that for its research. Compare the piddling fifty millions for farm research with the two hundred millions to support the 1948 potato crop.

Then note that the Government spent more than $2,000,000,000 in research to develop the atomic bomb. It now spends $600,000,000 a year on further atomic research—12 times all the expenditure for agricultural research. More will go for the hydrogen bomb. The original two billions was

probably more than all peoples in all time had ever spent for all scientific research.

Experience through half a century with scientific research in agriculture has proved over and over that the benefits invariably repay the costs many times.

The more we learn, the better we realize that present agricultural knowledge is painfully scanty and inadequate. We know too little about soils, too little about improving fertility, too little about plants, too little about controlling pests and diseases, too little about what plants are good for.

We do not know how plants grow. We do not yet know the molecular structure of starch—if we did, hundred of new markets might be found for corn and potatoes. We know how to use only about one-half of 1 percent of the plant kingdom for any purpose at all.

We do know that surpluses in wheat, cotton, and other crops could be prevented if research were to develop from wild plants a few new, more profitable crops to grow on the acres where now we keep on producing too much wheat and cotton.

We know that chemurgic laboratories already have paid for themselves many times by finding new ways, now in commercial production, to use farm products.

We know, too, that scientific research constantly cuts the true costs of farm production.

That is tremendously important. When the costs are cut, farmers can make as much or more profit with any fair price. And if the price is not too high, more people can buy the products they want. And if more people can buy the products, not so much is going to be surplus.

That's why Farm Journal has been publishing articles on how to cut costs of livestock production. If we could sell livestock cheap enough—and still make money—livestock could eat up, or displace, all of our surpluses.

Farm Journal believes that the time has come for bold thinking.

We believe it would be cheaper for taxpayers, more profitable for farmers, and more beneficial for consumers, to tackle the surplus problems with the atomic bomb approach.

Farm Journal proposes that instead of niggling over research funds, and merely nibbling at agricultural scientific opportunities, the Federal Government should make available the largest sums of research money that science could use.

Let us search the whole world thoroughly and fast for new crops—new crops to prevent surplus production, and to provide new goods for human use.

Let us plunge deeply into the search for new uses for all the crops we now grow.

Let us hunt harder for ways to utilize the huge farm wastes and residues.

Let us seek as never before for new knowledge that will cut deeper into the cost of production, and make our agricultural abundance available to more and more people.

We may need to bridge over the immediate future with support prices and similar devices, but let's quit fiddling with nothing but temporary expedients. Let's quit compromising with the surplus problems. Let's put all the power of modern science to work.

If we will do that, less than another 20 years will be needed to establish American agriculture on a permanently sound footing, to be rid of the fear of surpluses, and to relieve agriculture from being propped up with public funds. And unless we do it, we may be puttering around with stop-gap makeshifts 20 years hence.

Not only agriculture benefits from the permanent advances of science. Everybody benefits.

Here is a national farm policy truly in the interest of all the people.

Lobbies Spent Nearly $8,000,000 in 1949

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, I desire to include the lobby report for 1949, compiled by the staff of the Congressional Quarterly News Features, 732 Seventeenth Street NW., Washington, D. C., for the week ending February 24, 1950, volume VIII, No. 8, pages 209–230:

LOBBIES SPENT NEARLY $8,000,000 IN 1949—BUSINESS, PROFESSIONALS LED ALL OTHERS IN SPENDING

Led by American Medical Association, 256 organizations reported to the House that they had spend $7,969,710 in 1949 in Capitol actions.

Biggest spenders include:

1. American Medical Association	$1,522,633
2. Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc	620,632
3. National Association of Electric Companies	388,833
4. United World Federation, Inc	291,672
5. Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons	222,809
6. Association of American Railroads	194,159
7. National Small Businessmen's Association	192,070
8. National Milk Producers Federation (formerly the National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation)	178,161
9. National Association of Real Estate Boards	138,600
10. Colorado River Association	115,120
11. National Association of Margarine Manufacturers	101,037

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

Business groups led all others in total spending reported, though a professional association, the American Medical Association, was the largest single disburser of funds. An organization classified in "general citizens," Committee for Constitutional Government, was second.

Expenditures by categories

1. Business (total)	$3,280,278
General	571,868
Building products, real estate	346,484
Financial	199,485
Food and agricultural products	591,009
Oil, gas, and mining	227,767
Power and communications	553,405
Retail and service	156,631
Transportation (total)	427,953
General	----------
Air	29,276
Highway	17,536
Rail	220,702
Water	160,439
Miscellaneous companies	17,579
Miscellaneous trade groups	188,097
2. Citizens groups (total)	1,015,073
General, civic, civil rights	803,990
Welfare, religious	176,382
Women's groups	34,701
3. Employee groups (total)	257,301
AFL (excluding rail)	138,314
CIO (excluding rail)	42,035
Rail	38,473
Other	38,479
4. Farm groups	$391,595
5. Foreign policy groups	718,556
6. Professional groups	1,672,043
7. Reclamation, rivers and harbors	374,174
8. Tax groups	154,967
9. Veterans, military affairs	105,723
1949 total, all groups	7,969,710

[Congressional Quarterly News Features, Washington, D. C.]

LOBBIES SPENT NEARLY $8,000,000 IN 1949—BUSINESS, PROFESSIONALS LED 256 GROUPS IN SPENDING ON BILLS

DOCTORS TOP ALL

Two hundred and fifty-six organizations—associations, unions, firms—reported to the Congress under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act that they spent $7,969,710 in 1949, an exclusive Congressional Quarterly Log survey revealed.

The American Medical Association led all others in the amount reported spent, $1,522,683, but business groups as a whole led all other categories with $3,280,278.

The round-up, which does not include expenditures of any group which had not made a year-end organizational financial report by the close of business February 10, even if they had previously filed statements for part of 1949, showed that the tempo of lobby spending, or of lobby reporting, continued to increase.

Congressional Quarterly Log's round-ups for roughly comparable dates in 1948 and 1947 showed that a steady advance occurred. Two hundred and six organizations reported spending $6,191,838 during 1949, and 149 organizations reported spending $5,058,357 in 1947. The previous round-ups were done February 4, 1949, and January 28, 1948, respectively, but because the reports are required to be filed with the Clerk of the House between the 1st and 10th of January, the vast bulk of the reports, both numerically and in dollar weight, is on file or being processed by the end of January.

However, it should be remembered that some reporting organizations straggle in with their reports for a period of months, and in some cases, years after they are due. This takes place both out of reluctance to file (with frequent disagreement with the Department of Justice over whether filing is required) and because of bookkeeping or other reporting difficulties. Disagreement with the Justice Department, but with a temporary bowing to its interpretation of the lobby law until clarification by the courts, marked many groups' reports—and doubtlessly only fear of possible prosecution led many to contribute to the swelling report totals.

(For previous expenditures round-ups, for 1949 reports see 1949 Logs, pp. 569, 993, 1391, 1428, 1450, 1474, and 1545, and the 1949 Log Index, and 1950 Log, p. 14. For 1948 year reports, see 1949 Logs, pp. 131, 208, 275, and 304. For 1947 year figures, see 1948 Logs, pp. 51, 73, 86, 110, 139, 155, 167, 183, 197, and 214.)

BIG FIGURES—BIG FIGHTS

The expenditure figures reflect some of the biggest legislative scraps of 1949—some of which are continuing in the Eighty-first Congress. The issues of national, pay-roll-tax paid health insurance versus voluntary prepaid plans; private versus public power; foreign policy matters including world affiliation, displaced persons, tariff policy, etc.; taxation, including excise tax repeal, oleo tax repeal, and additional taxation of the cooperatives; housing and rent control; reclamation, river and harbor work, and division of the waters of the Colorado River; labor relations and minimum wage bills; social security; agricultural program—and many others—find echoes in the reports.

BIGGEST SPENDERS

Eleven organizations, of those which have made final reports, reported expenditures in 1949 of more than $100,000 each. They were led by the American Medical Association's $1,522,683. (The Townsend Plan, Inc., and Townsend National Weekly, Inc., which had a combined expenditures figure for 9 months of $285,371, do not appear in this list, as they had not filed a financial report by Feb. 8.) The big spenders' list:

American Medical Association (AMA said, however, that probably half of this amount could be charged against legislation. All money was from $25 assessments.)	$1,522,683
Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc	620,632
Natl. Assn. of Electric Companies	388,833
United World Federalists, Inc	291,672
Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons	222,809
Assn. of American Railroads	194,159
Natl. Small Business Men's Assn	192,070
Natl. Milk Producers Fedn. (formerly Natl. Cooperative Milk Producers Fedn.)	178,161
Natl. Assn. of Real Estate Boards	138,600
Colorado River Assn	115,120
Natl. Assn. of Margarine Manufacturers	101,037

(Note: Some of above figures are not as reported in fourth quarter report of the group, but rather as totaled by Congressional Quarterly from the four reports of the year.)

In comparing magnitude of expenditures among the leaders, it is important to note that the medical, railroad, real estate, and margarine figures are definitely not the total expenditures of the organizations but rather are allocations to legislative activity on varying bases. The electric companies, World Federalists, displaced persons, small business, milk producers and Colorado River groups appear to have listed total expenditures for all, including legislative, purposes. It is not clear from the report of the Committee for Constitutional Government whether all expenditures of the Committee and its subsidaries are counted.

Another factor affecting evaluation of the big spenders list is that not all reporting groups with total expenditures in excess of $100,000 are on it; because some have made allocations of less than $100,000 to legislative activities from their total budgets, which may have been well over those of the listed leaders.

At least one group not on the list, National Tax Equality Association, said it spent $74,028 on what it called "fringe items"—consisting mainly of the cost of producing and distributing printed matter—which may have prompted others to write to Congress, but did not count in that total the salaries, traveling expenses and other costs of its registered lobbyists nor of various State "tax equality" and "associated businessmen" groups, the expenses of whose lobbyists it paid.

Another group not on the list, Transportation Association of America, may very well have spent enough to be mentioned—it received $371,085 during the year and is working mainly on formulating and popularizing a new national transportation policy—but because of the way in which it files uncumulated ledger sheets, Congressional Quarterly Log has been unable to ascertain its expenditures from the reports.

Finally, it should be remembered that not all organizations and others seeking to influence legislation have filed reports for the full year—in fact some have not filed at all for any part of the year 1949.

OTHER BIG SPENDERS

Other big-spending organizations, either on an all-purpose or on a legislative allocation basis (it is sometimes hard to determine from the form which basis the organization uses), or on a compromise between the two bases, were:

Between $50,000 and $100,000

National Coal Association (allocation)	$99,560
Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix	97,301
The Producers' Council	96,007
National Council of Farmer Cooperatives	95,489
Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville	94,873
Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans	93,746
Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America (allocation)	90,945
Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc	86,175
National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. (allocation)	84,196
National Association of Stevedores, N. Y. C	75,089
American Hotel Association, N. Y. C. (allocation)	74,966
American Federation of Labor (allocation)	74,300
National Tax Equality Association, Chicago ("fringe items")	74,028
National Association of Home Builders (allocation)	71,942
The American Legion, Indianapolis (allocation)	71,769
National Rural Electric Cooperative Association (allocation)	65,014
American Farm Bureau Federation (Washington expenses)	60,134
American Civil Liberties Union, N. Y. C. (9 months)	56,618
Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Indianapolis	56,300
National Grain Trade Council	55,807
American Tariff League, N. Y. C. (total, of which 10 percent is maximum allocable)	55,775
United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago (allocation)	54,824
National Postal Committee for Books, N. Y. C	54,598
American Hospital Association, Chicago (allocation)	53,726

SPENT NOTHING

At the other end of the reported spending spectrum were 29 forms reporting no expenditures or leaving blank the 1949 total expenditures column. At least two of the cases appeared to be new organizations which collected money in 1949, but did not begin spending until 1950. In other cases, the contention is made that the lobbying law or the form does not apply. In some cases, no reason for filing a report appears.

The organizations:

American Council of Style and Design, New York City: None.

Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, Washington Committee (gave average of three previous years as $52,239): Blank.

Chase National Bank of New York: None.

Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping Under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, New York City (New; spent $12,000 in January 1950; showed 1949 receipts): None.

Communications Workers of America (CIO): None.

M. J. Galvin, for 12 Minnesota railroads: None.

Henry Hoyt Morse (registered for Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers): None.

International Telephone and Telegraph Corp., and its subsidiary, American Cable & Radio Corp., New York City: Blank.

Peder Kristian Kristensen (a deportation case): None.

D. D. Richards (registered for Mail Order Association of America): None.

Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., Lansing: None.

Harry Mopsick, Linden, N. J., for self and several tenants' councils: Blank.

George F. Meredith (executive director of National Alliance of Independent Business): None.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc.: None.

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes (New; showed 1949 receipts): None.

National Committee on Resources: None.

National Electrical Contractors Association, by Paul M. Geary: None.

National Farmers Union, Denver: None.

National Fisheries Institute, Inc.: None.

National Home Study Council, by J. S. Noffsinger, director: None.

National League of District Postmasters, by E. A. Meeks, secretary: None.

National Society of Professional Engineers: None.

New York Stock Exchange: None.

Regional Committee for an MVA, Denver: None.

Transportation Association of America, Chicago (file ledger sheet photostats but no total expenditures).

Alan T. Rains (registered for United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Associatiton): None.

Washington (D. C.) Real Estate Board: None.

Hilliard Schulberg (registered for Washington, D. C. Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, Inc.): None.

EXPENDITURES BY CATEGORIES

Business groups led all others in total spending reported, though a professional association, the doctors' AMA, was the largest single disburser of funds. An organization classified in the "general citizens" section, Committee for Constitutional Government, was second.

The classification of an organization is based on what appears to be the main nature of the group—based largely on their names, rather than on the specific legislative objectives they may pursue. Therefore, there would be considerable overlap between categories, with nearly every classification having some groups which have some interest in other categories. In almost every category there are groups interested in tax questions; for example, though only groups with "tax" in their names were set into that category. The groups categorized by objective—tax, foreign policy, and reclamation, rivers and harbors—and the citizens groups, frequently have substantial contributions and direction from groups in economic categories, like business, employee, or farm.

Expenditures, by categories:

Business (total)	$3,280,278
General	571,868
Building products, real estate	346,484
Financial	199,485
Food and agricultural products	591,009
Oil, gas, and mining	227,767
Power and communications	553,405
Retail and service	156,631
Transportation (total)	427,953
General	Blank
Air	29,276
Highway	17,536
Rail	220,702
Water	160,439
Miscellaneous companies	17,579
Miscellaneous trade groups	188,097
Citizens groups (total)	1,015,073
General, civic, civil rights	803,990
Welfare, religious	176,382
Women's groups	34,701

Employee groups (total)	$257,301
AFL (excluding rail)	138,314
CIO (excluding rail)	42,035
Rail	38,473
Other	38,479
Farm groups	391,595
Foreign policy groups	718,556
Professional groups	1,672,043
Reclamation, rivers and harbors	374,174
Tax groups	154,967
Veterans, military affairs	105,723
Total, all groups	7,969,710

Methods of allocation

The Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act does not spell out whether total budget or the portion of expenses judged allocable to legislative efforts shall be reported, nor has there been a decision on which is to be used. There is no clear and universally accepted method of determining how to allocate. The reported expenditure figures, therefore, vary widely as to what they cover.

Some groups which allocate simply report the expenses of their Washington office. Others, like the Chamber of Commerce of the United States, report the whole expenses of various departments and allocate a percentage of publication expense of other departments. Others take a flat percentage of the total as lobbying expense. Some, like the CIO, report the salaries of their lobbyists on individual lobbyist expense forms and other legislative allocations on the organization expense sheet (in which case the figure carried here does not include salaries).

Some organizations report that fraction of their publication costs which the legislative contents bear to the whole content (AFL and United States Savings and Loan League). Others, which have carried many legislative stands in their house organs which are sent to Congressmen and to their members, do not count their publication costs.

Still other organizations do not explain their allocation formula, but give total expense and the amount allocated to lobbying. The National Association of Home Builders adopted this procedure.

WHAT IS INCLUDED?

The totals, in a number of instances, do not include salaries of lobbyists. Some groups, like CIO, report only expenses other than lobbyists' salaries since under another section of the lobby law, registered lobbyists are required to report their receipts and expenses.

The grand total, moreover, by no means includes all the expenditures of all organizations seeking to influence legislation. Records of the Secretary of the Senate show more than 1,700 individuals and organizations registered under the lobby law since its effective date, August 2, 1946. No tabulation has ever been made of exactly how many organizations have registered lobbyists currently working for them. However, it is apparent from comparison of organization expense statements and individual lobbyists' reports that many organizations do not directly report expenses although their lobbyists report their receipts from them.

Thus for a truly complete picture of lobby spending both the statements of organizations and the reports of lobbyists should be analyzed and those salaries of lobbyists not included in the organization statement should be added to the grand total.

One effect of the situation in which the organization leaves it to the lobbyist to report his salary and expense receipts is that the source of the organization's funds is not revealed. Another effect is that organization expenditures, as for literature, local efforts, etc., which were not incurred by the lobbyist are therefore not reported.

In contrast with these omissions, there are undoubtedly some duplications within the grand total. When both a national organization and a local subsidiary branch report, there is obviously some duplication in spending reports caused by contributions to the parent group. One example of this is National Associated Businessmen, Inc., and its local groups.

Reporting errors

In addition to the variety of systems of reporting totals, there also lurks in the path of the surveyor of expenditures the reporting errors of many of the organizations. These are not errors of judgment as to what to report—Congressional Quarterly Log does not presume to guess how the courts will ultimately hold. These are errors introduced by faulty arithmetic—as the addition of 21 and 11 to make 22—or by apparent error in carrying forward previously reported totals, or in failure to carry forward all totals reported for the calendar year, or in carrying forward totals reported for quarters or other periods in years previous to the calendar year under report, or by similar mistakes.

Congressional Quarterly Log has attempted to correct for such errors, where possible in order to arrive at comparable data, and has indicated in the following lists where the figures used are Congressional Quarterly cumulation and not the last figure entered by the organization. Of the 256 reporting organizations in this round-up, at least 51, or one-fifth, appeared to have made reports which contained such mistakes.

DOCTORS' CAMPAIGN

The American Medical Association, Chicago, recorded the biggest expenditures, as it campaigned for voluntary prepaid medical care and against the administration plan for compulsory national prepaid medical care. The AMA, which also took stands on other medical issues before the Congress, collected $2,290,045 in $25-per-member assessments.

AMA spent $1,522,683 in 1949. This figure includes certain salaries, other Washington office items, and the entire $100,000 fee to, and $1,349,451 expenses of, the public relations firm of Whitaker & Baxter for the AMA's national education campaign from January 13 to December 31, 1949. AMA said that expenditures for lobbying probably will not exceed 50 percent of the total spent in any quarter, but reported the million-and-a-half-dollar figure. The figure does not include the research, publishing, and other activities of AMA which are the regular work of the organization.

Whitaker & Baxter also submitted an organizational financial report in behalf of the national education campaign. The expenditures listed in this report are divided into two categories: Those which are considered allocable to Federal legislative activity, and those which are not. The allocable figure for 1949 is $486,033. (In a report to the AMA house of delegates in December, Whitaker & Baxter reported campaign expenses of $1,394,152.)

The campaign report figures are based on the assumption that the principal purpose is not to influence Federal legislation but to acquaint people with the desirability of voluntary prepaid medical care, its advantages over compulsory types, and (flowing from the latter) to secure a lessened public demand for, and a greater public objection to, compulsory systems. Therefore, expenditure figures given are presumed to reflect the legislative part of the purpose.

CONSTITUTIONAL GOVERNMENT

The Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York City, which listed the second highest expenditure total of all reporting groups, $620,632 in 1949, has been an active foe of New Deal and Fair Deal legislation since the battle over President Roosevelt's attempt to alter the philosophy and decisions of the Supreme Court by appointments in 1937.

The committee said it received $196,066 in contributions, of which $34,470 were in fourth quarter. But total receipts were $379,231 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) which included both contributions and income from book sales, rental of lists, etc. (said latter income not re lobbying). The committee had no contributions of $495 or over; it does not solicit them. (Five hundred dollar contributions or over are reportable as to source.) There was no mention, by name, of a CCG affiliate, Fighters for Freedom, which collects money.

Expenditures listed do not include any by name to Features for America's Future, syndicate whose literature the committee frequently sent to Congress, nor to Representative RALPH W. GWINN (Republican, New York), who writes a regular column for committee and syndicate, which is sent to Congress, nor to Fighters for Freedom.

Listed fourth quarter expenditures do include salaries and expenses, advertising, rent, and other office costs, books and other literature, printing and mailing, royalties of $850 to ex-Representative Samuel B. Pettengill, (Democrat of Indiana) and items marked "dinners" to Economic Club, New York City; National Economic Council, New York City; Public Relations Society, New York City; New York Chapter SAM.

Also included in fourth quarter was $150 membership to National Industrial Conference Board, New York City, and $36 membership to Direct Mail Advertising Association.

The fourth quarter list also noted costs of memberships in National Industrial Conference Board, $150; in Direct Mail Advertising Association, $36; and in National Register Publishing Co., $25, all of New York City.

COTTON FUNDS

National Cotton Council of America, Memphis, which received $1,304,563, explained how six segments of the industry support the council. Each segment has its own trade association, but each chips into the council on the following basis:

Assessments, on voluntary basis, come from: Producer-ginner, 10 cents per bale, with ginner collecting for council and paying when producer is delinquent; warehousemen, one-half cent per bale; merchants, 2 cents per bale on merchandised basis; one-half cent per bale on brokerage basis; cottonseed crushers, 5 cents per ton; cotton spinning mills, 5 cents per bale for combined program, of which council's share is normally 3 cents; consumers of raw cotton fibers (other than spinners), 5 cents per bale.

The Council reported spending $26,728 for those Washington office expenses reflecting legislative work.

American Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis, which does not keep its books on a calendar year basis, reported receiving $29,605 during the fourth quarter from four affiliates. Receipts are forwarded by affiliate members on the basis of $25 annual dues from individual members, three-fourths of a cent per bale purchase fees, and 2 cents per bale export fees (Canada not being considered an export country).

The affiliates of ACSA are: Arkansas Cotton Trade Association, Little Rock; Atlantic Cotton Association, Atlanta; California-Arizona Cotton Association, Los Angeles; Oklahoma State Cotton Exchange, Oklahoma City; Southern Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis; and Texas Cotton Association, Waco.

American Cotton Shippers Assn. and affiliates spent $2,459 in the 15-month period from October 1, 1948, to December 31, 1949, on an allocated basis.

National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, Memphis and Washington, is a federation of regional associations: American Ports Cotton Compress & Cotton Warehouse Association; South Atlantic Cotton Warehouse Association; Southwestern Compress & Warehouse Association; and special members in Arizona and California.

The compress and warehouse group said its maximum allocable expenses totaled $7,319, but did not think itself required to file.

Western Cotton Growers Association of California, of Fresno and Bakersfield, filed two reports, differing by a few cents, which showed expenditures via Ralph B. Bunje amounting to $9,647.

For more details on these cotton groups, see pages 219–20 this Log, and 1949 Log index.

CO-OP TAXES

Two national groups and a number of their State affiliates reported spending a total of $175,851, including intergroup transfers, in their campaign to persuade Congress further to tax the cooperatives. These organizations argue that cooperatives should pay taxes on that part of income which the co-ops claim should not be taxed because it is not profit but an overcharge and is returned to the consumers of goods or services bought cooperatively.

One of the national groups, National Associated Businessmen, Inc., reported spending $37,351 and receiving $36,115, with contributions of $500 or more each from the following: Iowa Associated Businessmen, Inc., Ames; Oklahoma Associated Businessmen, Inc., Oklahoma City; New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne; Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., St. Paul; Maryland Associated Businessmen, Inc., Baltimore; Ohio Associated Businessmen, Inc., Columbus; Pennsylvania Associated Businessmen, Inc., Harrisburg; Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.; Nebraska Associated Businessmen, Lincoln; Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Indianapolis; Virginia Associated Businessmen, Inc., Richmond; Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., Milwaukee; Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., Denver; and North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Fargo.

National Tax Equality Association, Inc., reported receiving $536,132 in 1949 and spending for "fringe items" only, $74,028.

The fringe items were mainly for production and distribution of literature and advertisements "which may have suggested or inspired letters to the Congress or which may possibly have been sent to the Congress by members of our association or others." Salaries, rent, etc., are not included in the expenditures reported, though they do appear in the photostatic copy of the ledger sheets which accompany NTEA reports.

Expenditures shown in the photostats included $12,000 retainer fees to Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler in the fourth quarter, and other sums for expenses and/or salaries to various individuals, some of whom are registered for or working for State tax equality or other groups.

Fourth quarter contributions of $500 or more came from 26 firms and one association: Mr. P. W. Anderson, president, Farwell, Ozmun Kirk & Co., St. Paul; Mr. A. G. Rorabeck, president, George Worthington Co., Cleveland; Mr. E. B. Morley, Morley Bros., Saginaw, Mich.; Ben C. McCabe, president, International Elevator Co., Minneapolis; Mr. E. K. Tryon, Edward K. Tryon Co., Philadelphia; Edward F. Pritzlaff, secretary, John Pritzlaff Hardware Co., Milwaukee; Wever Dobson, J. F. Anderson Lumber Co., Minneapolis; Mr. L. D. Nuchols, Charlotte, N. C.; Globe Elevators, division of F. H. Peavey & Co., Duluth; Mr. H. H. Hill, Janney-Semple-Hill & Co., Minneapolis; Mr. A. Wessell Shapleigh, Shapleigh Hardware Co., St. Louis; Mr. E. B. Martindale, president, Van Camp Hardware & Iron Co., Indianapolis; Mr. H. D. Cram, president, the W. Bingham Co., Cleveland; Edwin R. Masback, Jr., Masback Hardware Co., New York City; Mr. C. H. Buhl, Buhl Sons Co., Detroit; Henry J. Allison, president, Allison-Erwin Co., Charlotte, N. C.; Mr. H. G. Dickey, president, Van Dusen Harrington Co., Minneapolis; Leonard Lampert, Jr., president, Lampert Lumber Co., St. Paul; Ray Grisham, Western Cottonoil Co., Abilene, Tex.; Mr. W. F. Stephenson, vice president, Stratton-Warren Hardware Co., Memphis; William Steltz, president, Supplee-Biddle-Steltz Co., Philadelphia; Mr. R. C. Dickerson, secretary, American Cotton Shippers Association, Memphis; Mr. M. J. Claussen, treasurer, Hibbard Spencer, Bartlett & Co., Evanston, Ill.; Mr. W. L. Taylor, president, Wilcox Lumber Co., Detroit Lakes, Minn.; Col. Robert Baker, Fones Bros. Hardware Co., Little Rock; Western Paint & Varnish Co., Duluth; and Mr. H. K. Nilssen, vice president, George A. Clark & Son, Minneapolis.

SHOE CHAINS

The National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., in its first financial report (page 222), showed receipts of $23,150 from various chains for services having nothing to do with lobbying. Those giving $500 or more in 1949 were: A. S. Beck Shoe Corp., New York City, $1,875; The Berland Shoe Stores, Inc., St. Louis, $750; Brasley-Cole Shoe Co., Ltd., Los Angeles, $562; Butler's Inc., Atlanta, $562; Edison Bros. Stores, Inc., St. Louis, $2,000; Karl's Shoe Stores, Ltd., Los Angeles, $750; Gallenkamp's Stores Co., Los Angeles, $750; Miles Shoes, Inc., New York City, $1,125; Sears, Roebuck & Co., Chicago, $2,000; Siegel & Fried, Inc., New York City, $562; Endicott Johnson Corp, Endicott, N. Y., $1,500; G. R. Kinney Co., Inc., New York City, $1,875; Shoe Corp. of America, Columbus, $1,500.

MILK INDUSTRY FOUNDATION

Milk Industry Foundation made its first report under the Federal Regulation of Lobbying Act. According to the Foundation statement, it believes the lobbying law is inapplicable to itself, or, if applicable, then is unconstitutional. Principal purpose of Foundation is not legislative but to improve business methods and sponsor technical and scientific research in milk industry. It enclosed an interchange of letters between Justice Department and self in 1948, when Justice Department asked whether Foundation had filed and Foundation replied that it did not think it was required to and then solicited Justice Department advice if the Department had contrary views. The Foundation said in current statement that it never received a reply from Justice Department. (The Justice letter was dated May 25, 1948, and signed by Irving R. Kaufman; the Foundation reply June 9, 1948, signed Benjamin F. Castle, executive director.)

Castle, in the current statement, said the Foundation has "recently" learned Justice Department position now is that "every person or organization receiving any contributions or expending any money" to influence legislation must file organizational financial reports. Such construction might make lobbying law apply to the Foundation and to everyone else who is concerned about matters of national importance. On this basis, Foundation filed, under protest, but is of opinion that, no matter how lobbying law is construed, and especially as Justice Department construes it, it is unconstitutional, violating first, fifth, and eighth amendments.

Foundation has 1,088 members, whose dues averaged $171 and totaled $186,377 in 1949. Dues are not earmarked for any specific purpose, and no contributions of $500 or more for influencing legislation have been made since effective date of lobbying law. Allocated expenses (see page 219) were $6,038.

TRAMP SHIPPING INDUSTRY

The Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, a new group seeking Federal construction and operational subsidies for nonscheduled ocean freight vessels, reported receipts of $18,500 in December, 1949 and $3,500 in January, 1950, from 21 firms in amounts ranging from $500 to $3,500 (see pp. 63, 223). The contributors (in New York City unless stated): American Foreign Steamship Corp., $2,000; Dichmann, Wright & Pugh, Inc., Norfolk, $500; Fribourg Steamship Co., Inc., $1,500; Polarus Steamship Co., $2,000; Wessel, Duval & Co., Inc., $500; Marine Transport Lines, Inc., $2,500; Blidberg-Rothchild Co., Inc., $500; Eastport Steamship Corp., $500; Stockard Steamship Corp., $500; Prudential Steamship Corp., $1,000; W. W. Battle & Co., Inc., $500; Harvey N. Bryant & Co., $500; Walter A. DeLappe Co., $500; T. J. Stevenson & Co., $2,000; J. H. Winchester & Co., Inc., $500; Eagle Ocean Transportation Corp., $500; Seatraders, Inc., $500; Drytrans, Inc., $1,000; Transfuel Corp., $500; Shipping Enterprises, $500; and in Jan. 1950, Orion Shipping & Trading Co., Inc., $3,500.

ATLANTIC UNION BACKERS

Fourth quarter contributors of $500 or more to the Atlantic Union Committee included former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts and former Secretary of Commerce and Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, the cotton business leader. Total receipts are not given by the Committee, which spent $45,410 during the year (see page 227).

Other contributors during the quarter included: Hugh Moore, Craig Moore and Mrs. Berenice Moore, of Easton, Pa., Hugh Moore is founder and board chairman of the Dixie Cup Co., treasurer of the Committee for the Marshall Plan and one-time chairman of the executive committee of Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies (1940) and consultant in 1945 at the UN San Francisco conference. He is also an official of the Woodrow Wilson Foundation, of American Association for United Nations, and of Americans United for World Organization. Craig Moore is one of the sons of Hugh and Berenice Moore;

Edward Burnham Burling, former law partner of Secretary of State Dean Acheson, and onetime general counsel of the United States Shipping Board (1917–19); and Spencer T. Olin, of the Olin Industries family.

(For list of previous big contributors, see 1949 Log, pp. 1395–96).

The fourth quarter contributors: Former Supreme Court Justice Owen J. Roberts, Philadelphia, $3,000;; former Under Secretary of State Will L. Clayton, of Anderson, Clayton Co., Houston, $2,000; Sydnor Oden, of same firm, $500; Mrs. Bernice Moore, in care of Dixie Cup Corp., Easton, Pa., $1,000; Craig Moore and Hugh Moore, same address, $500 each (Hugh Moore is treasurer of Committee for the Marshall Plan to Aid European Recovery, see p. 228); Mrs. St. John Garwood, Austin, Tex., $1,500; $1,000 each from: Mrs. Jean de Menil, Houston; Edward B. Burling; Mrs. Benjamin M. Baker, Jr., Baltimore; Mrs. S. V. McAshan, Jr., Houston; and Edgar E. Rand, St. Louis.

Five hundred dollars each from Thomas S. Nichols, Mathieson Chemical Corp., New York, N. Y.; Mrs. T. W. Hardy, in care of Hardy Salt Co., St. Louis; Mrs. Robert S. Brookings, Washington; Spencer T. Olin, St. Louis; and R. Fairfax Funsten, St. Louis.

UNEMPLOYMENT BENEFIT ADVISORS

Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc., which operates in the social security field,

reported receipts of $102,415, of which $50,400 was in contributions each over $499. During the fourth quarter, over $499 receipts came from: General Motors Corp., Detroit, $3,500; Joseph Schlitz Brewing Co., Milwaukee; Atlantic Refining Co., Philadelphia; Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Co., Milwaukee; the J. L. Hudson Co., Detroit; Marshall Field Co., Chicago; American Cyanamid Co., New York City, and American Can Co., New York City, each $1,000; Briggs & Stratton, Milwaukee, $800; Pittsburgh Plate Glass Co., Pittsburgh, $750; and $500 each from: F. W. Woolworth Co., New York City; Gulf Oil Co., Pittsburgh; Johns-Manville Corp., New York City; Weirton Steel Co., Weirton, W. Va.; Wheeling Steel Corp., Wheeling, W. Va.; B. F. Goodrich Co., Akron; United States Rubber Co., New York City; Maytag Co., Newton, Iowa; W. A. Sheaffer Pen Co., Fort Madison, Iowa; G. C. Murphy Co., McKeesport, Pa.; Kelsey-Hayes Wheel Co., Detroit; Retail Merchants Association, Pittsburgh; John Morrell & Co., Ottumwa, Iowa; and Pittsburgh Consolidated Coal, Pittsburgh.

(For previous big contributors, see 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1403.)

CIO SUPPORT

The Congress of Industrial Organizations reported $42,035 (see page 226) spent on legislative activities, exclusive of salaries and expenses shown in reports filed by its registered lobbyists. To find how much any one affiliated union gave of that amount, it took that affiliate's proportionate share of CIO total income and prorated the $42,035 on the assumption that each affiliate gave a uniform percentage of its money to CIO for legislative work. On that basis, receipts in excess of $500 each came from: auto workers, $9,556; steelworkers, $8,984; electrical workers, $3,515 (9 months; before expulsion); textile workers, $3,307; clothing workers, $1,239; rubber workers, $1,455; communications workers, $1,239 (last 9 months of year); packinghouse workers, $946; oil workers, $713; woodworkers, $618; transport workers, $589; fur and leather workers, $520; gas, coke and chemical workers, $516; shoe workers, $510; utility workers, $509.

RAILROAD LABOR AFFILIATES

Railway Labor Executives' Association, which spent $8,220 on legislative work (see page 226), speaks for all of organized railway labor which is affiliated with 15 A. F. of L. unions, the railroad membership of CIO marine engineers, and four independent unions' rail membership. (The trainmen and locomotive engineers are not in the RLEA.) The four independents in RLEA are the locomotive firemen and enginemen, conductors, train dispatchers, and machinists (the latter are negotiating reaffiliation with A. F. of L.). In addition, the railway employees' department of A. F. of L. is represented.

The twenty unions whose railway employee membership is covered by RLEA, and which contributed to it, are: Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen and Enginemen, Cleveland; Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, Kansas City, Mo.; Brotherhood of Railway Clerks, Cincinnati; Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees, Detroit; the Order of Railroad Telegraphers, St. Louis; International Association of Machinists, Washington; Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa; Switchmen's Union of North America, Buffalo; American Train Dispatchers Association, Chicago; International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Kansas City, Kans.; International Brotherhood of Blacksmiths, Chicago; Sheet Metal Workers International Association, Washington; International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Chicago; International Brotherhood of Firemen and Oilers, Chicago; Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, Cincinnati; International Longshoremen's Association, New York City; Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen of America, Chicago; National Organization of Masters, Mates and Pilots of America, New York City; National Marine Engineers' Beneficial Association, Washington; and Railroad Yardmasters of America, Chicago.

RAILROAD ASSOCIATION REPORT

The Association of American Railroads' report showed allocated expenditures of $194,159 in 1949. The Association of American Railroads, to figure receipts for the report, allocated receipts, equal to allocated expenditures, and then prorated among member roads on basis of total contributions, included receipts of $500 or more on that basis from 55 railroads.

Allocation of expenditures included: $21,000 given to National St. Lawrence Project Conference (against seaway); $5,000 dues to Transportation Association of America; $2,227 of total paid to E. Hofer & Sons, Portland, for preparing and distributing newspaper items re railroads; salaries, rent, communications and supplies, traveling, printing, and so forth. Fourth quarter printing item included $2,640 for 165,000 copies of This Isn't the Way To Run the Railroads, and other items, in whole or in part.

AAR also regularly lists, in financial reports, the bills it supported or expects to support, those it opposed or expects to oppose, and those it took action on without determination of whether it is for or against. There were 43 bills in the first category, 51 in second, and 88 in third (in some cases bills were duplicates or overlapped in intent, as in those to repeal excise taxes). This is a unique reporting habit, though other groups often mention a few bills acted on; it is not required in organizational report form.

WATER FIGHT

One of the most acrid regional battles in Congress came to a temporary climax February 7 and 8, this year, when the Senate postponed action on the bill to construct the proposed central Arizona reclamation project until February 21.

The financial reports for 1949 of several groups show that the California side seems to have spent more money than the Arizona group in this educational competition, though both sides got their licks in. Arizonians have used movies as a visual method. Californians have countered with such devices as distribution of a one-sentence attack on the project, written on a 7-foot ticker tape and wrapped up in a capsule. Both sides have used colorful pamphlets; one that the Californians used was made up of individual placards which had been sent to Congressmen in 1949, each signed by a different Member of the California congressional delegation.

The Central Arizona Project Association, Phoenix, which backs the project, reported spending $97,301 in 1949. Two California water groups, interested in California's share of the Colorado River's water, spent a combined $135,463, according to their statements. The latter two are the Colorado River Association, Los Angeles, with $115,120, and the Six Agency Committee, also of Los Angeles, with $20,343. The Six Agency group is composed of six California water agencies.

AMERICAN COALITION MEMBERS

Representative JOHN PHILLIPS, Republican of California, himself a member of one of the constituent organizations of the American Coalition, read into the Appendix of the RECORD on February 15, 1950, page A1091, a list of the constituent organizations of the coalition, together with a speech by its retiring president, John B. Trevor, and the resolutions adopted at its January convention.

The coalition, which reported spending $6,395 in 1949, contains the following: Sons of the American Revolution, National Society; Daughters of the American Revolution, National Society; Military Orders of the World Wars; American War Mothers; General Society of the War of 1812; National Society, Sons and Daughters of the Pilgrims; National Society of New England Women; Society of Plymouth Colony Descendants; Federation of Huguenot Societies in America; Congress of State Societies in America; Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, commander in chief; Grand Army of the Republic; National Constitution Day Committee; National Society for Constitutional Security; Regular Veterans Association; Sons and Daughters of Liberty, National Council; Wheel of Progress; Women of Army and Navy Legion of Valor, United States of America.

The American coalition resolutions called for suspension of all immigration into the United States when there are a million unemployed, sharp reduction of the displaced-persons-admission program; opposition to socialized medicine, Federal control of education, and world government; adequate appropriation for the House Un-American Activities Committee, and for the armed forces. It supported military training in the schools and colleges, in lieu of universal military training which it felt would not pass Congress, and urged more recognition of the Marine Corps.

TRANSPORT GROUP REPLIES

Transportation Association of America, in answer to a congressional quarterly log inquiry as to how much it had spent in 1949 and its reason for reporting expenditures as it does, sent a comparative statement of income and expenses for fiscal years ending October 31, 1948, and October 31, 1949.

TAA statement showed fiscal 1949 receipts of $309,047. Comparable figures for fiscal year 1948 were $284,602 income and $273,194 outlay. Donald D. Conn, executive vice president, told CQ TAA files total expenditures for all purposes, less than 5 percent of which is "actually spent in our relations to Congress in Washington." Conn said TAA's "acts, income and expenditures should be available to the Congress in complete detail. * * * In no way does the association consider itself as a lobbying organization in the commonly accepted meaning of that term * * * but, we have no objections whatever to complying with this law."

CAMPAIGN FUNDS FOR MORSE

Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, was given $500 for his campaign by the Committee on National Affairs December 20, 1949, according to the committee's year-end report (see p. 225). The committee also reported receipt of $500 December 19 from Frank Altschul, New York banker, National Planning Association international committee chairman, Council on Foreign Affairs director and Woodrow Wilson Foundation president. The committee, which is headed by Pittsburgh industrialist Frederick C. McKee, has reported other campaign contributions in the past (see Almanac, vol. IV, 1948, p. 445 and 4th page of Lobby Addendum, following index. Also 1949 Log, p. 137) to Senators Matthew M. Neely, Democrat, West Virginia; Estes Kefauver, Democrat, Tennessee; Paul H. Douglas, Democrat, Illinois; and James E. Murray, Democrat, Montana; ex-Senator John Sherman Cooper, Republican, Kentucky; to Representative Jacob K. Javits, Republican, New York, and James G. Fulton, Republican, Pennsylvania; and to candidates running against Representatives Vito Marcantonio, American Labor, New York; Katharine St. George, Republican, New York, and E. E. Cox, Democrat, Georgia.

LOBBY SPENDING—JANUARY 1 TO DECEMBER 31, 1949

Congressional Quarterly's organization expense reports are arranged by type of organization. Where no city is given, organization filed from a Washington, D. C. address.

All expenditures listed are total expenditures reported, except where "allocation" to legislative work or similar qualification is noted.

In all but a few cases, which are specifically noted, expenditure totals are for the entire 12 months of the year.

Business

General

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America: Received for all purposes, $2,585,154. Expenditures reported are the salary and expenses of F. Stuart Fitzpatrick, manager of construction and civic development department, expenditures of department of governmental affairs, and an allocation by possible legislative aim of part of cost of chamber publications other than those put out by Government-affairs department allocation, $90,945.

Council of State Chambers of Commerce, Indianapolis: Received from State chambers, $54,779. Spent, $56,300.

American Chamber of Commerce of Mexico, Mexico City, Federal District: Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $1,507.

Conference of American Small Business Organizations, Inc., Chicago: Received $51,357. Spent for salaries, office expenses, and traveling costs (no itemization of to whom, amounts, date, and purpose), $49,609.

Illinois Manufacturers' Association, Chicago, by James L. Donnelly, executive vice president, Chicago: Said not over $5,000 of his annual salary can reasonably be allocated to Federal lobbying. His expenses (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,853.

Interstate Manufacturers Association, Winona, Minn.: Received $16,200. Allocable expenses, exclusive of $6,000 retainer of lawyer, J. M. George, 2 percent of whose time is maximum spent on reportable work, $553.

George F. Meredith (executive director of National Alliance of Independent Business), none.

National Associated Businessmen, Inc.: Received $36,115. Expenditures included rent and office supplies, printing and communications, advertising (Meneough, Martin & Seymour, Inc., Des Moines, $2,000), insurance and legal services, travel costs, salaries (including Leo Cullinane, registered lobbyist, for publicity, $7,367), and $9,999.96 retainer fees to Vernon Scott and Loring Schuler, organization counselors, $37,351.

Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc., Denver: Reported payments of $158 to NTEA, of which $150 was for making up and printing 5,000 booklets entitled "Colorado Associated Businessmen, Inc.," and $1,333 to NAB as one-half of local group's collection of subscriptions. Other costs for stenographic services, communications, and miscellaneous. No salaries listed. Reported spent, $3,236.

Illinois Associated Businessmen, Inc., Chicago: Received $2,060. Spent, for stenographic typing, supplies, postage, "dinner for Mr. English and guest" ($18) and $25 in $5 gift certificates for five volunteer workers, $436.

Kansas Independent Businessmen's Assocation, Wichita: Spent, for travel, rent, and communications, but no salaries (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,932.

Michigan Associated Businessmen, Inc., Lansing; none.

Minnesota Associated Businessmen, Inc., St. Paul: Received $10,312, including a $1,000 fourth-quarter contribution from Peavey Elevator Co., Minneapolis. Expenditures included $4,392 for Minnesota newspaper advertising; $3,677 for services and $1,221 to NAB for "support;" $233 to NTEA for printing and postage; and miscellaneous travel, office, and communications expenses, $14,283.

Mississippi Associated Businessmen, Inc., Jackson: Received $4.556. Expenditures included dues, typing, and printing items to NTEA; salaries, traveling expenses, rent, communications, and advertising, $5,761.

Missouri-Kansas Businessmen's Association, Inc., Kansas City, Mo.: Received $3,912. (Association fourth-quarter report corrected cumulation error of second and third quarter reports, which had not been adjusted for by Congressional Quarterly Log, either and showed 9-month expenditure of $1,960. Congressional Quarterly cumulation for that period on basis of reports would be $1,909 instead of the $4,252 previously reported.) Expenditures included $951.25 at National Associated Businessmen for printing and mailing, and other items for steno, travel, communications, no salaries. Corrected total (M-KBA figure), $3,291.

New Jersey Associated Businessmen, Inc., Jersey City: Received $1,265. Spent, including dues to National Associated Businessmen, Inc., and postage and stationery items to National Tax Equality Association, $1,823.

New York Associated Businessmen, Inc., Sherburne, N. Y., filed under protest; does not lobby. Received: $7,835. Expenditures included Austin W. Carpenter's salary, traveling costs, communications and $2,682 to NAB for research and bulletin service. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $8,035.

Wisconsin Associated Businessmen, Inc., Milwaukee: Received $2,765. Spent, including $1,355 to NTEA and $50 for membership in Wisconsin State Chamber of Commerce, travel and communication expenses, and no salaries except stenographic, $3,010.

(NOTE.—There is considerable transfer of funds between National Associated Businessmen, National Tax Equality Association, and their State affiliates.)

National Small Business Men's Association, Akron: Received, $184,123. Listed expenditures for all purposes, including publicity; salaries; dues to Akron City Club; Executive Club of Chicago; National Press Club; membership service from Small Business Economic Foundation, Chicago ($1,700); rent and office services, supplies, etc.; $119.95 to Representative CLARENCE CANNON (Democrat, Missouri) for CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reprints of insertions of letters from businessmen demanding Government economy. Spent, $192,070.

Southern States Industrial Council, Nashville: Received, $94,430. Spent, $94,873.

Washington (D. C.) Board of Trade: First report. Receives $15 per member from membership of about 8,000. Spent, estimated maximum attributable, $5,000.

Building Products, Real Estate

The Associated General Contractors of America,, Inc.: Estimated allocation for entire year, including $5,000 salary of Burt L. Knowles, $19,500.

Building Products Institute: Filed by Douglas Whitlock, chairman, in view of uncertainty of coverage of lobbying law. Expenditures, mainly general counsel fees and legal representative fees to firm of Sanders, Gravelle, Whitlock & Howrey, and to Douglas Whitlock of the firm, of which ex-Representative Everett Sanders (Republican, Indiana) is senior partner, $19,385.

Harnischfeger Corp., Milwaukee: First report. Spent for services of registered lobbyist, Donald M. Counihan, Washington, $1,050.

National Association of Home Builders: Receipts arise from two types of dues and four other sources. Receipts from sustaining membership dues totaled $10,965. NAHB reports total expenditures for all purposes and then makes estimated allocation for expenditures believed reportable under lobbying law, but files under protest because of ambiguous and conflicting provisions of lobbying law. Total expenditure (except for separately kept convention and exposition account) was $319,699 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), of which estimated allocation was $71,942.

National Association of Real Estate Boards, its Realtors' Washington Committee and its Public Relations Department, Chicago and Washington: Received $106,463. Allocation of expenses includes travel, printing, tape recording, luncheons, etc., and apportioned part of rent, mailing room costs and parts of salaries based on time spent on legislation (ranging from 12½ percent to 100 percent). The cost of NAREB's publication Headlines, does not appear to be reflected in the statement. Spent (CQ cumulation), $138,600. National Electrical Contractors Association, by Paul M. Geary, executive vice president: None.

The Producers' Council, Inc.: Received $87,450 in 1949, of which eight contributions, of $150 each, came in the fourth quarter from California Redwood Association, San Francisco; Concrete Reinforcing Steel Institute, Chicago; National Terrazzo & Mosaic Association, Washington; Marble Institute of America, Inc., New York City; National Woodwork Manufacturers Association, Chicago; National Paint, Varnish and Lacquer Association, Washington; Portland Cement Association, Chicago; and Vermiculite Institute, Chicago. Filing in view of "uncertain" coverage of the lobbying law. Spent $96,007. Washington (D. C.) Real Estate Board: None.

Financial

American Life Convention, Chicago: Allocated part of salary and expenses of ex-Representative Robert L. Hogg (Republican, West Virginia) for trips to Washington, and so forth, plus 1 percent of regular office expenses to cover allocable activities re Federal legislation, $5,914.

Association of Casualty and Surety Companies, New York City.: Makes quarterly reports on basis of estimated allocations using budget allotment for immediately preceding period and actual expenditures for prior quarters. Thus, each quarter small adjustments are made to correct for differences between estimated budget and estimated actual costs. On this basis, using estimated actual first 9 month costs and estimated October-December budget, spent $5,811.

The Chase National Bank of the City of New York, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Retains firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, of New York City and Washington, for various services, including consideration of Federal tax bills. Expenditures none.

Credit Union National Association, Inc., Madison, Wis.: Reported annual salary of $6,350 to Hubert M. Rhodes for various services; no special pay for lobbying. Phone calls and trips to Congressmen plus cost of notarizing lobbying reports cost $21.

The Equitable Life Assurance Society of the United States, New York City: First filing. Does not believe self subject to lobbying law. Retains law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, New York City, for various legal services performed by various members of that firm. Small part of that service is by Weston Vernon, Jr., of that firm, re Federal tax matters, and he has registered but disclaimed being covered by lobbying law. If any of his activities are covered, portion of fee to Milbank firm attributable to such activities was $487 of fee and $80 expenses in fourth quarter, $567.

Independent Bankers Association, Twelfth Federal Reserve District, Portland, Oreg.: Received $29,738. Expenditures in November included $181.53 to the Palace Hotel for Senator HARRY P. CAIN (Republican, Washington) re an IBA breakfast in San Francisco, $339.25 to United Air Lines for CAIN'S fare in connection with his speaking engagement at the breakfast, $897.82 to the hotel, and various other expenses for the breakfast. IBA backs a bill to regulate bank holding companies; CAIN spoke sympathetically of the IBA viewpoint behind the drafting of the bill. Expenditures of 1949 totaled $42,349.

Life Insurance Association of America, New York City: Allocation based on prorated salaries and expenses of Bruce E. Shepherd, Eu-

gene M. Thore, and Albert Pike, Jr., and of general overhead of New York office, $4,687.

Life Insurance Policyholders Protective Association, New York City: Received $40,081, including $1,000 from Lammot du Pont. Spent, including considerable traveling costs over entire country (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $37,392.

The Morris Plan Corp. of America, New York City: Travel costs to Washington, at invitation of Board of Governors of Federal Reserve System to discuss bank holding company legislation, 183.

National Association of Insurance Agents, New York City: Reserves question of necessity of filing because does not believe expenditures listed fall within purview of lobbying law. "Full disclosure is made as a matter of cooperative good faith," Richard E. Farrer, treasurer, added. No expenditures since those of May 1949 report; those totaled $1,662.

National Association of Mutual Savings Banks, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Received $179,775. Legislative work, besides that on bills previously reported (see 1949 Log, p. 1398), also was re housing bill, S. 2246. Spent, figuring traveling expenses, phone calls, etc., and 15 percent of $34,500-a-year average counsel fee (was $33,000 in first half, $36,000 in last half), $6,755.

National Savings and Loan League: Received $120,577; spent, all purposes, $118,161. Allocation, which included part of salary of Executive Manager Oscar R. Kreutz and national letter (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,063.

New York Stock Exchange, New York City: Does not believe required to file. Retains law firm of Milbank, Tweed, Hope & Hadley, of New York City and Washington, for various legal services, including consideration of Federal tax bills. Expenditures, none.

The Prudential Insurance Co. of America, Newark, N. J.: Allocation based chiefly on salaries and expenses of Milo J. Warner, Toledo, and Charles J. Milton, Jersey City, $32,857.

United States Savings and Loan League, Chicago: Filed without admitting required to do so, but "has discovered that the Attorney General * * * has taken the position that it is subject to the (lobbying) act." League, which won dismissal of indictment lodged against it by Justice Department under lobbying law, reports allocation of spending. Allocation for fourth quarter is based on portions (ranging from 5 to 60 percent) of salaries and fees, expenses of registered lobbyists, communications, cost of that part of confidential bulletin dealing with legislation, percentage of Washington office expenditures, etc. Spent, 1949 allocation, $54,824.

Food and Agricultural Products

American Butter Institute, Chicago: Said impossible to report contributions for lobbying, as funds are collected for all functions. Reported allocated expenditures, including in fourth quarter, $9,285 to public-relations firm of Hill & Knowlton. Allocated in 1949, $46,382.

Harry Hunter (registered for American Corn Millers' Federation, Chicago): For traveling expenses on Washington trips, legal fees, communications, etc., $984.

American Cotton Shippers Association and affiliated members, Memphis: Has not collected money, nor had principal purpose to influence legislation. Filed report in deference to Justice Department view which is believed erroneous. Books are not kept on calendar-year basis, so receipts and expenditures for calendar year are not available as such. Affiliates and receipts expenditures: Allocated retainer from October 1, 1948 to March 31, 1949 was $559. Spent, from April 1 through September 30, 1949, on basis of one-fifth of attorney's fees and expenses, $650. In fourth quarter, gave $1,000 to National Tax Equality Association and allocated one-fifth ($250) of lawyer's retainer. Spent, October 1, 1948 through end of 1949 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), allocated, $2,459.

Association of Sugar Producers of Puerto Rico, Washington Committee: Report merely referred to letter of March 4, 1949, filed with Clerk of the House. Letter said did not believe required to file, but that average expense per year for past 3 years had been $52,239: Blank.

The Best Foods, Inc., New York City: Paid allocable expenses ($1,368) and regular retainer, for all services including legislative ($35,000) of law firm of Davis & Gilbert, New York City (acted on margarine bills), $36,368.

Burley and Dark Leaf Tobacco Export Association, Lexington, Ky.: Received $18,458, from Kentucky, Tennessee, and Virginia tobacco growers, dealers, and warehouse associations. Spent, $21,770.

The Ethanol Committee: Spent, including retainer and expenses of ex-Representative Robert A. Grant (Republican, Indiana), $5,817.

Milk Industry Foundation: First report. Believes not required to report (see p. 212). Total receipts, for all purposes, in 1949 were $186,377. Expenditures reported included part of cost of a March and a May 1949 news letter to members, and $6,000 dues to Dairy Industry Committee, of which the Foundation is part. DIC has filed reports, under protest, so Foundation reports entire $6,000, although not all was for lobbying. Total allocated spending, $6,038.

Millers' National Federation, Chicago: Washington expenses, exclusive of salary, of Herman Fakler, vice president, and A. H. Krueger, Washington representative, $1,177.

Francis X. La France, Esq., of law firm of Swan, Keeney & Smith, Providence, R. I. (registered for Narragansett Brewing Co., Cranston, R. I.): Final report, according to statement on his individual form; was employed re S. 257, now a public law, which limits recovery on under- and over-charges. Individual report said he received $300 in full for services in 1949; organization form said he spent nothing, $300.

National Association of Margarine Manufacturers: Listed some expenditures for 1949, including: Expenses but not salaries of registered lobbyists Paul T. Truitt, Siert F. Riepma and Modane Marchbanks; $10,497 to Leo Burnett Co., Inc., Chicago, for advertising; $43,337 for expenses and $24,000 retainer to public relations firm of Selvage & Lee, N. Y. C. and $250 expenses to Samuel Bledsoe of that firm; $5,000 to American Soybean Association, Hudson, Iowa, for educational activities, and various communications, printing and other miscellaneous costs. Total reported, $101,037.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Inc.: None.

National Association of Refrigerated Warehouses, Missouri Valley Chapter, St. Louis: $5,329.

National Cotton Compress and Cotton Warehouse Association, Memphis and Washington: Group is federation of regional associations. Filed, though convinced not required to, as lobbying is sporadic, infrequent, and incidental to major purposes. Maximum allocable expenses, $7,319.

National Cotton Council of America, Memphis and Washington—received $1,304,563. Federal legislative work done in Washington office only, except for mimeo, stamping and mailing work. Allocation of Washington office expenses reflecting legislative work, $266,728.

National Fisheries Institute, Inc.: None.

National Food Brokers Association: Filed in organization name on organization form, saying counsel, Williams, Myers & Quiggle has advised and it believes self not required to file. During 1949 informed members about S. 2190 and S. 1008, which it opposed. Said some persons might construe that as being lobbying. Said report shows "that part of allocated expenses which might be deemed by some persons to have been incurred for the purpose of influencing legislation." Report said spent nothing. Reports on individual form show expenditures allocation based on part of salary, other items for legislative work (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $261.

National Grain Trade Council: Said only minor and unallocable part of expense total given was for lobbying but did not list by amounts, to whom given and for what purpose. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $55,807.

National Lumber Manufacturers Association: Estimated, in 9- and 12-month reports, that 5 percent of budget expenditures was for lobbying and therefore 5 percent of income was for that purpose (previously listed estimate of 4 percent). Reported receipts were $14,623. Spent for salaries and expenses of George M. Fuller and Robert E. Dougherty and for office expenses (allocated), $18,454.

National Renderers Association: Filed under protest. Fourth quarter receipts included $3,000 from Pacific Coast Renderers Association, San Francisco, and $1,500 from Denver, Utah, and Des Moines plants, for 1948–49 dues. Year's receipts, $25,050. Spent, 1949, $26,706.

St. Louis Local Meat Packers Association (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $13,008.

Southern Pine Industry Committee, New Orleans: Received, $96,321. Expenditures in fourth quarter included $50 to Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., for "publicity," $50. Total expenditures, 1949, all purposes, $93,746.

Alan T. Rains (registered for United Fresh Fruit & Vegetable Association): None.

United States Cane Sugar Refiners Association, Washington and New York City: "No money has been expended so far this year on legislative activity." Annual salaries of association attorney ex-Representative H. M. Baldridge (Republican, Nebraska), $24,000, and of Harold Burke, New York office, $8,500, total, $32,500.

U. S. Cuban Sugar Council, New York City: Doubted applicability of lobbying law. Received (total), $70,473. Spent, for items which might be directly or indirectly connected with pending bills, including council's Bulletin, printing and chart costs, and services and expenses of public relations firm of Ivy Lee and T. J. Ross, New York City (including council secretary's salary, paid by Lee-Ross firm), $34,951.

Hilliard Schulberg (registered for Washington, D. C., Retail Liquor Dealers' Association, Inc.): None.

Western States Meat Packers Association, Inc., San Francisco: Previous report noted only $978, allocated part of a July expense of E. F. Forbes, president and general manager. Fourth quarter report added four quarterly expenses of L. B. Liljenquist, Washington, for mimeo, taxis, secretarial services, and miscellaneous re backing or opposing legislation, bringing total reported spent to $1,629.

Oil, Gas, and Mining

American Petroleum Institute, New York City: Does not believe required to file, but, as Justice Department has expressed contrary view, files pending court construction of act. Allocation of expenses is based on full salaries and expenses of John E. Kane and J. L. Dwyer, Washington employees, 1 percent of salary of Baird H. Markham, then director of American Petroleum Industries Committee of API, a sum listed as $161.11 (his annual salary had been $50,000, but changed during the quarter), and one-half of 1 percent of $75,000 salary of the then president of API, William R. Boyd, Jr., for year

up to November 9. Total allocated expenditures (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $25,799.

District of Columbia Petroleum Industries Committee. Listed salary and expenses of John E. Kane, $1,972.

American Retail Coal Association, Chicago: Allocation of salary and expenses of Bernard E. Urheim, $4,500.

Coal Exporters Association of the United States, Inc.: Does not admit required to file but did so because of Justice Department views. CEA composed of National Coal Association and about 30 exporters of coal and coke and byproducts. Received $48,000. Spent, with no explanation of basis of allocation, $655.

Committee for Pipe Line Companies, Tulsa: Received for all purposes, $44,767. Spent, for Washington and other expenses, including nonlegislative, $38,105.

Fuels Research Council, Inc.: Received $74,806. Did not report names of contributors, as no funds earmarked for lobbying. Composed of about 22 members. Allocated $100 of counsel's time, which was spent discussing with other interested parties proposed amendments to Natural Gas Act, and $321 for total cost of preparing and printing statement against proposed switch to natural gas from bituminous coal at Oak Ridge AEC gas diffusion plant. Senate statement to Congressmen "without intent or expectation of influencing the passage or defeat of legislation." Total allocation, $421.

Gas Appliance Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York City: Allocated fee and expenses of James R. Lee, Washington ($1,300), contribution toward New York Times ad August 9, 1949, for repeal of wartime excise taxes ($500; via Bulova Watch Co., New York City), and to National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, New York City ($5,000), $9,800.

Independent Natural Gas Association of America: Reported total receipts of $93,625. Allocation of expenditures included portions of salaries, based on allocation of time. These were $3,333 to ex-Representative Wesley E. Disney (Democrat, Oklahoma), general counsel; $8,320 to John A. Ferguson, executive director; and $1,933 to Louis E. Whyte, news director. Total allocated spent, $14,947.

National Association of Attorneys General Submerged Lands Committee, Maryland State Attorney General Hall Hammond, chairman: Received $31,838, including $14,000 from State of California; $9,000 from State of Louisiana; $7,000 from State of Texas, and $1,000 from State of Maryland. Expenses included $1,500 monthly salary of Walter R. Johnson, ex-attorney general of Nebraska. Spent $31,167.

National Coal Association: Does not admit required to file. Names of contributing firms not given as funds received were not earmarked for lobbying. Total received $1,973,606. Allocated expenditures, based on percentages of costs of various departments, ranging from zero to 100 percent, with general, and administrative, public relations, law, and legislative departments responsible for allocable expenses. Ex-Representative Carter Manasco's (Democrat, Alabama) $200 weekly part-time salary was 100 percent related to law-making. Spent, allocated, $99,560.

Union Producing Co. and United Gas Pipe Line Co., Shreveport, La.: Action in third quarter in behalf of Union Producing Co. re Natural Gas Act. Allocated fee and travel expense of C. Huffman Lewis, of Wilkinson, Lewis and Wilkinson, $841.

Power and Communications

International Telephone & Telegraph Corp., New York City, by Kenneth E. Stockton, president of American Cable and Radio, above. See above for legislative interest. Stockton's salary is $45,000, no part of which is specifically for lobbying. Doubted lobbying law applicable. Expenditures blank.

American Cable and Radio Corp., New York City, by James A. Kennedy, vice president. Firm is subsidiary of International Telephone & Telegraph, above, and is owner of the Commercial Cable Co., All America Cables and Radio, Inc., and Mackay Radio and Telegraph Co., all engaged in international telegraph business. Firm seeks legislation permitting merger of such firms, including cables of Western Union Telegraph Co. Kennedy's salary, no part of which is allocable, is $22,500. Said lobbying law would "appear inapplicable." Blank.

Clear Channel Broadcasting Service (CCBS), by Harold Hough, treasurer, care of Radio Station WBAP, Fort Worth. Received $55,166. Expenditures reported is part of total spent; part of the reported figure is allocable to lobbying, $26,149.

Commercial Pacific Cable Co., New York City, by Edward K. Wheeler, of Wheeler and Wheeler, law firm. Cable firm retained Wheeler in war damage claim case. Wheeler received $6,000, spent $21. Cost to client (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,021.

National Association of Electric Companies: Received $358,236. Listed all expenses, including legislative. These included fees and expenses of law firm of ex-Representative, ex-Senator Prentiss M. Brown (former OPA head), Brown, Lund & Fitzgerald; $65,000 salary of President Purcell L. Smith and his expenses; fees and expenses of N. W. Ayer & Son, Inc., Philadelphia, for public relations, etc. Spent, $388,883.

National Business Publications, Inc.: Group of publishers of trade, technical, scientific, and professional periodicals. Expenses listed included fees paid to ex-Representative Carter Manasco, Democrat, of Alabama, re postal bills affecting rates on controlled circulation periodicals ($2,400 per quarter) and out-of-pocket expenses of Robert E. Harper, managing director, $8,241.

National Electrical Manufacturers Association, New York City: Received $4,690 (presumably means allocable portion of total receipts). Spent, allocation, $4,429.

National Postal Committee for Books, New York City: Received $51,025, including unstated fourth quarter amount for American Book Publishers Council, Inc., New York City. Filed by Curtis W. McGraw, treasurer. Spent, $54,598.

National Rural Electric Cooperative Association: Received $253,989 membership fees and dues from REA co-ops and power districts, based on 10 cents per connected consumer per year. Reported all expenses, without giving dates and purposes of the amounts to the various payees and without totaling them. Then, in what it said was in accordance with conference of NRECA general counsel with Federal Judge Irving R. Kaufman, who at time of conference had been special assistant to the Attorney General in charge of lobbying law, it allocated from the expenses a figure for cost of trying to influence legislation. Allocation, $65,014.

Retail and Service Groups

(Other than food and agricultural product retail. Formerly under miscellaneous trade groups)

American Hotel Association, New York City: Does not believe self subject to lobbying law. Received $533,669. Total expenses of Washington office $45,049, but only part of that sum is included in total reported under lobbying law, and only part of that part was for lobbying. Washington office deals with about 30 Government agencies. Reported expenditures of Washington office, $29,999, for two salaries and expense. Other expenditures listed were related directly to legislation. They were: $17,500 to James Langan, Boston; $5,000 to Edward H. Miller, Washington; $10,000 to law firm of Cummings, Stanley, Truitt & Cross; $3,000 to William Ingles re Taft-Hartley amendments; and $9,467 to governmental affairs committee of the hotel organization. Total reported, $74,966.

American Institute of Laundering, Joliet, Ill.: Received $39,195. Spent, largely re wage-hour legislation, $17,198.

American Retail Federation: Filed 1949 second and fourth quarter statements January 10, 1949. First and third quarter statements had been filed April 8 and October 10, respectively. Received, from various leading department stores, $126,833. Spent, for four salaries and expenses, travel and meeting, communications and bulletins, $12,111.

Institute of Industrial Launderers, Chicago: Listed $6,000 legal fees and $4,435 disbursements of Stanley I. Posner, and noted disclaimer of applicability of lobbying law. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $10,435.

Linen Supply Association of American, Inc., Chicago: Listed fees and expenses of counsel, Stanley I. Posner, but said his legislative work was incidental to his other services, and consisted mainly of testifying at hearings. Does not believe required to file. The fees and expenses for Posner, $7,114.

National Association of Shoe Chain Stores, Inc., New York City: First report. Received $23,150 for services having nothing to do with lobbying law requirements. Said purpose of filing statement was to enable association representative to present views on pending and proposed bills. Under expenditures, listed estimates of $500 of salary of employee, Edward Atkins, "to be attributable to legislative activities," and $500 of mimeographing and mailing letters and sending telegrams "to be sent" to members of shoe group re pending bills. Thus, though report form is for 1949, expenditures appear to be future (1950) ones. Expenditures, $1,000.

National Institute of Diaper Services, Inc., New York City: Reported fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner, attorney. Only first, third, and fourth quarter statements of NIDS are on file, with items totaling $4,509. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), but Posner's own second quarter report figures plus NIDS three reports add up to total given in NIDS fourth quarter cumulation for the year, $5,860.

National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City: Received $4,350, of which part was not dues but contributions from those persons interested in LIFO. Spent for fees and expenses of two Washington men, John C. Hazen and William Donald McAdams, and $8,128 expenses re booklet. This Is LIFO, $27,947.

Transportation—General

Transportation Association of America, Chicago: Received $371,085 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Instead of expenditure statement showing expenditure total for the year, or for any quarter, has been submitting photostatic copies of the daily expenditure journals, which total various items by the month, but give no other total. Congressional Quarterly Log is unable to arrive at total expenditures, partly through not knowing which of many column totals to count.

Air

Aeronautical Training Society, by Wayne Weishaar, secretary: Believes self and society not required to file. AST received $11,116. Spent for Weishaar's salary, $11,165; for taxies, entertainment, lobby reports (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $15.

Aircraft Industries Association: Does not believe activities fall within scope of lobbying law. Received $684,891 for all purposes. Contributors included aircraft and other firms. Expenditures for purposes which may be attributable to lobbying included $12,666 to Hill & Knowlton, Inc., for salary of Bert C. Goss, association public relations director, $13,647.

Air Transport Association of America: Filed under protest; does not believe required to file, as lobbying is minor part of its functions. But Justice Department has advised ATAA it will enforce lobbying law against anyone, "any significant part of whose activities" is lobbying, so ATAA files. To report receipts, allocated from total receipts an amount equal to expenditures allocated to lobbying, then prorated among the 36 contributing air lines an allocated contribution to ATAA proportionate to each air line's total contribution. On this basis, 29 air lines gave less than $500 each, and 7 gave a total of $12,588. The seven were: American Air Lines, Inc.; Capital Airlines, Inc.; Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Northwest Airlines, Inc.; Pan American Airways, Inc.; Transcontinental & Western Air, Inc.; and United Air Lines, Inc. Expenditures indicated allocated salaries (of persons unnamed), taxies, communications, and, in fourth quarter, $1,250 to National Committee for the Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes. Spent, allocated, $15,584.

Highway

American Trucking Associations, Inc.: Allocated expenses plus unstated percent of salaries of three employees, communications, etc., $15,824.

Judge Joseph M. Wyatt, Baltimore, for a group of District of Columbia cab companies, proposing bills to limit number of District of Columbia taxis (for list see 1949 Log, pp. 477–478): He received $1,500, spent $212. Apparent cost to clients (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,712.

Rail

The American Short Line Railroad Association: Received, for all purposes, $185,815. Spent, allocated, $4,891.

Angelina & Neches River Railroad Co., Keltys, Tex., and 22 other Texas railroad clients of Walter F. Woodul, Houston (see 1949 Log, p. 172 for list): Woodul's salary and expenses, $16,526.

Association of American Railroads (see p. 215 for detail on report): Spent, allocated, $194,159.

The Association of Western Railways, Western Association of Railway Executives, Chicago: Received $1,315. Spent, for Federal legislative purposes, for salary and expenses of Frank E. Haas, $1,315.

The Colorado Railroad Legislative Committee, Denver, $120.

M. J. Galvin, St. Paul (registered for Great Northern Railway and 11 other Minnesota railroad clients (for list see Congressional Quarterly Almanac, vol. IV, p. 429): None.

Illinois Legislative Committee (class I Illinois railroads), Chicago, $271.

Nevada Railroad Association, Reno: NRA is composed of Southern Pacific Co. and the Western Pacific Railroad Co., both of San Francisco, and Union Pacific Railroad Co., of Los Angeles.: Allocated portion of salary and expenses of Raymond E. Marks, secretary-manager for Federal legislative work, $534.

Railroad Security Owners Association, Inc., New York City: Does not believe required to file. Group is maintained by institutional investors in railroad securities. Appears before congressional committees, never has private conferences with Congressmen. Total receipts, $17,460. Spent, allocation, $1,223.

Railway Business Association, Chicago: for transportation tax repeal (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,663.

Water

Carden-Herd claimants: Anderson T. Herd, West Palm Beach Fla.; S. A. Markel, care of Markel Services, Richmond, Va.; Mrs. Rose Porter Carden and George A. Carden, Jr., administrators of Estate of George A. Carden, Sr., deceased, care of O. M. Ruebhausen, New York City: Ex-Representative C. Jasper Bell (Democrat, of Missouri) received $5,000 from Markel and spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $5,080.

Committee for Promotion of Tramp Shipping under American Flag in Foreign Commerce, New York City: First report (see Log, pp. 63,214). Received $18,500 in December, and $3,500 in January, 1950. Paid Ingoldsby, Coles & Wright $12,000 in January 1950 for legal representation. Expenditures listed for 1949: None.

Lake Carriers' Association, Cleveland: Does not believe self subject to lobbying law, nor is report form A suitable to association case. Allocated, for first half and fourth quarter 1949 (no 3d quarter statement filed) (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $3,622.

The National Association of Stevedores, New York City: Received $122,975 from 90-odd steamship lines, stevedoring firms and others. Expenditures reports in past did not include legal fees and expenses to legal counsel, King & Lynch, New York City, as counsel advised this was not required. However, to avoid problems, this report includes such items and lists them for period since October 1947. Fees and expenses for counsel were $718 for the last quarter; full year 1948 fees and expenses were $3,054. These items are over and above previous totals for 1947 and 1948 (Spent $3,034 in 1948). 1949 expenditures included $37,400 fees and $1,433 expenses to King & Lynch, and $45,000 to Burns, Currie, Walker & Rich for account of National Federation of American Shipping, Inc. This, plus $2,056 previously reported, is 1949 total reported expenditures of $75,089.

National Federation of American Shipping, Inc.: Received membership funds from American Merchant Marine Institute, New York City, and Pacific American Steamship Association, and Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, both of San Francsico, for general purposes, and contributions from National Association of Stevedores, New York for work on "overtime-on-overtime" bills. Total receipts not reported. Allocated expenses included parts of salaries, and a $45,000 fee to law firm of Burns, Currie, Walker & Rich, New York City, etc. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $84,196.

Pacific Maritime Association, San Francisco: Final report, "as we are no longer expending any money for the purposes for which we have previously been sending in reports." Does not believe ever was subject to lobbying law but had been advised that Justice Department has taken position similar groups should file financial reports. Association is new group consolidating Waterfront Employers Association of the Pacific Coast and two other associations, and expenditures reported include $28,195 reported earlier in 1949 by waterfront group. Allocation of expenditures re legislation before Congress or to persons "that we are informed have registered" under lobbying law included $250-a-month legislative fees to William Radner, ex-counsel of the United States Maritime Commission, ex-general counsel of War Shipping Administration. Allocation, $37,452.

Miscellaneous Companies

George B. Burnham (registered for Burnham Chemical Co. re proposed tightening of antitrust law): Allocation $4,666.

Revere Copper & Brass, Inc., New York City (see Congressional Quarterly 1949 logs, pp. 995, 1401 for detail): Received $37,000 in 1949 and total of $111,000 in 1947–49 from 11 other copper-using firms. Paid ex-Senator John A. Danaher (Republican, Connecticut) in 1949, for work re extension of copper import duty suspension, $9,000.

Vulcan Detinning Co., Sewaren, N. J.: Allocation, fees and expenses of Henry H. Buckman, consulting engineer, $3,913.

Miscellaneous Trade Groups

American Council of Style and Design, New York City: None.

Associated Third Class Mail Users: Received $28,070.44. Spent, for salaries and professional fees, $28,430.

Bureau of Education on Fair Trade, by Baldwin & Mermey, public relations counsel, New York City: First report. Reported $12,000 retainer and $22,695 expenses, for total cost to Bureau of $34,695.

Consumer Mail Order Association of America, Joplin, Mo.—Spent, including fees to law firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter (Congressional Quarterly cumulation): $16,313.

The Council for Clarification of Pricing Practices, Chicago: Received $15,630. Spent, including $6,000 fee and $5,039 expenses of William Simon, former counsel of the Senate Commerce Trade Practices Subcommittee, Eightieth Congress (see 1949 Log, p. 931): $14,896.

Henry Hoyt Morse, Gardner, Mass. (registered for Institute of Cooking and Heating Appliance Manufacturers): None.

D. D. Richards (registered for Mail Order Association of America): None.

National Agricultural Limestone Association, Inc.: Estimated that ¢4,500 of executive secretary's salary, $85 of his expenses were allocable to lobbying. Mailing costs brought total (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) to $4,913.

National Association of Direct Selling Companies, Winona, Minn.: Total receipts, all purposes, $41,175. Allocable expenses, exclusive of $12,000 annual retainer of lawyer, J. M. George (very little of retainer is attributable to Federal legislation), $3,004.

National Council on Business Mail, Inc., Chicago: Received $26,650. Expenditures for fourth quarter included $100 fee to Louie Marks, Chicago, for preparation lobbying report and $3,316 to Sam O'Neal, former director of publicity for the Democratic National Committee, for his fees ($2,499) and expenses. Total spent, 1949, $35,540.

National Foundry Association, Chicago: Annual salary of Executive Vice President L. E. Roark is $10,000. His expenses (none for second half) were $989.

National Paint, Varnish, and Lacquer Association, Inc.: Allocated, $6.

Office Equipment Manufacturers Institute: Does not believe lobbying law is applicable. Allocable expenditures included $1,250 advance to national committee for the repeal of wartime excise taxes, unprovided for in OEMI budget and to be covered by membership contributions, for total of $2,195.

The Proprietary Association: Receipts, for all purposes, $164,153. Spent for all purposes, $213,140, of which $8,485 was for legislative reference service. Annual cost of informing membership of current events, $21,657, of which fourth quarter proportionated space of these bulletins devoted to commenting or influencing passage or defeat of Federal legislation (11.8 percent) was $614. Adding $614 to previously reported sum, which is listed at $1,841, though composed of figures totaling $1,891, the association arrived at $2,455.

The Rubber Manufacturers Association, Inc., New York City: Interested in Government controls over rubber. Allocation, based on part of employee's time spent and prorated supporting office expenses and other Washington costs (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $3,746.

Silver Users Association: Received $53,400, including $1,000 in fourth quarter from American National Retail Jewelers Association, New York City, for 1949 dues. Spent for Washington office salaries and expenses (Congressional Quarterly correction), $40,915.

Citizens' Groups

Civic, Civil Rights, General

American Civil Liberties Union, New York City: Submitted first, second, and third quarter 1949 reports on January 6, 1950. Received $101,962 in 9 months, including: $47,690 from Betsy B. Davis estate, care of Kurzman & Frank, New York City; $2,000 from Robert Marshall, Civil Liberties Trust, New York City, $1,000 from Trautman Bequest, care of Charles E. Beardsley, Los Angeles; $815 from Anonymous ("an American citizen" whose name "will be released if requested"); and $500 each from: Anne D. Geller estate, care of City Bank Farmers Trust Co., New York City; Mrs. Geraldine Boone, Princeton, N. J.; and Mrs. Jane A. Pratt, Bridgewater, Conn. Spent, 9 months, with no indication of to whom or for what purposes, $56,618.

American Coalition: Received $7,524, including $1,500 from John B. Trevor, New York City, ex-Coalition president and one-time Senate Foreign Relations Committee Subcommittee associate counsel (1920), and $1,000 from Miss Helen Frick, New York City. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,395.

Committee for Constitutional Government, Inc., New York City: Reported spent, $620,-632.

Committee on National Affairs, New York City: Received $500 from Frank Altschul, New York City on December 19 and gave $500 to Senator WAYNE MORSE, Republican of Oregon, December 20, for his campaign. Total receipts for year $1,147. Spent $1,286.

Home Rule Headquarters, Washington, D. C.: First report. Received $93 and spent, chiefly for telegrams, $65.

Washington, D C., Home Rule Committee: Same address and treasurer as Home Rule Headquarters, above. Received $678. Spent $598.

Japanese-American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Inc., Salt Lake City: Received $41,198 including fourth quarter sums of $500 or more from Spokane ADC and from Kikaken Kisei Domei of Northern California, San Francisco. Washington expenses, $6,070.

National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education: Received $13,122. Spent $13,971.

National Committee for Strengthening the Congress: Miscellaneous office, printing, mimeo expenses 1949 through January 6, 1950, $518.

National Consumers League, Cleveland: Received $7,508, including $500 from Textile Workers Union of America (CIO) and $1,000 from UAW-CIO. Spent $1,907.

National Council Junior Order United American Mechanics, Philadelphia: Annual expenses of Charles E. Babcock, Vienna, Va., for which no accounting is required by the order, $1,000.

National Economic Council, Inc., New York City: Fourth quarter receipts were $15,-369 from literature sales, etc., and $12,724 from contributions. Contributors of $500 or over in that quarter, for total of $8,724 were:

Empire State, Inc., New York City: Charles S. Payson, New York City; Ralph P. Mershon, Miami; Crompton & Knowles Loom Works, J. F. Tinsley, Worcester, Mass.; E. G. Howes, Boston; W. H. Regnery, Joanna Western Mills Co., Chicago. (For previous contributors, see 1949 Logs, pp. 1001, 1402.) Total receipts for 1949 $139,818 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Expenditure listed "include all that are properly allocable to lobbying activities. In fact, much of the expense listed is not for lobbying at all. We haven't time to separate them out." Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $41,967.

Harry Mopsick, Linden, N. J. (registered in own behalf, and in interest of National Tenants' Council and other tenant councils): First financial report. Said had no contributions, does not believe required to file, and does so to avoid penalties. Spent, blank.

People's Lobby, Inc. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), spent, $8,992.

Special Committee on Liquor Advertising Bills, by Elizabeth A. Smart, secretary: Received and spent (for paper and stamps), $65.

Tool Owners Union, Inc., Lexington, Mass., and Washington, D. C.: Received $34,970 as follows: $19,285 in membership contribution; $3,324 gifts; $88 income from locals; $3,241 in sales of printed materials, newsletter subscriptions and research services; and $1,042 miscellaneous. Spent, including $5,667 expense advance and $13,333 salary to ex-Representative Fred A. Hartley, Jr. (Republican, New Jersey), president, $43,906.

Welfare, Religious

American Association for Health, Physical Education & Recreation: Operates on $82,935 annual budget for all purposes. Allocated 5 percent of annual salary at rate of $7,000 during January–June; $7,250 July–December of Carl A. Troester, Jr., $356.

American Parents Committee: Received $18,518, including fourth quarter sum of $2,000 from National Committee on the Observance of Mother's Day, New York City, spent, $18,033.

The Christian Amendment Movement, Topeka: Reported contributions from congregations of Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America. Total receipts, from the contributions and other items, $12,669. Spent $88 January 1–9, 1950. Spent, 1949 Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $17,043.

Friends Committee on National Legislation: Received $36,145. Expenditures included printing items paid for to Council for Social Action, National Council Against Conscription, both of Washington, and James P. Warburg, New York City; annual dues to National Peace Conference, New York City; contributions to Women's International League for Peace and Freedom, Philadelphia for services; salaries, expenses, rent, communications and supplies, travel, and so forth, totaling, $38,969.

National Catholic Welfare Conference: Salary and expenses of Washington agent, Eugene J. Butler, Esq., $15,252.

Spokesmen for Children, Inc., New York City: Received $3,860, including $3,500 from Adele Rosenwald Levy, New York City. Spent, including conference tickets from Physicians Forum, New York City ($12) and expenses of Mrs. Theodore Oxholm for Washington trip replanning of 1950 White House conference ($40) in fourth quarter, $554.

Unemployment Benefit Advisors, Inc.: Received $102,415, mostly from nationally known firms. (See 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1403.) Expenditures included a salary and expenses each for Milwaukee and Columbus, Ohio; Washington office expenses, printing, salaries, calendars, transportation and communications, and so forth, $86,175.

Women's groups

American Association of University Women: AAUW information materials to members contains stand on Federal aid to education: support of principle of Federal aid, State control, and no public funds to nonpublic schools—therefore complete support for Barden bill and only partial support for Taft bill. Expenditures listed are salary of Miss Marjorie L. Temple, legislative program associate, $4,100, and information materials to members, $32 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $4,132.

General Federation of Women's Clubs: Expenses of Mrs. J. L. Blair Buck, nonsalaried president; Mrs. Leslie B. Wright, nonsalaried chairman of legislation, telegrams, etc. Mrs. Buck's expense not principally for lobbying. Total reported, $8,166.

League of Women Voters of the United States: Salary and expenses of Muriel Ferris, congressional secretary, and other expenses, $6,505.

National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, New York City: Miss Elsie Dorothey Harper's salary and secretarial help, $3,060.

The National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs, Inc., New York City: Funds derived from dues from 2,327 clubs and sale of publications. Washington representative's salary and expenses, $5,806.

National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Evanston, Ill.: Received $9,043. Expenditures include expense items for Elizabeth A. Smart, but do not appear to duplicate items listed for her in report of Special Committee on Liquor Advertising (see above). Total spent, $5,898.

National Woman's Party: Received $6,624. No expenditures in second half of 1949. Total spent for year, $1,134.

Employee groups

AFL (exclusive of railway labor)

American Federation of Labor: Received on basis of proration of all receipts of per capita tax payments as related to expenditures, $115,306. Expenditures included salaries; estimated portion of portion of material in publication "American Federationist," which might be regarded as falling within lobbying law; communications, supplies, etc. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $74,300.

International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffers, Warehousemen and Helpers of America (AFL), Indianapolis: Previous quarters gave only salary of Fred A. Tobin, Washington, which had totaled $11,250 for first 9 months (Congressional Quarterly cumulation). Fourth quarter report carried his name and address and nothing else. Tobin told Congressional Quarterly total should be $15,000.

National Federation of Post Office Clerks (AFL): Received $3,129 in voluntary contributions from members and locals for legislative and publicity purposes, of which $96 came from a $1-per-member "voluntary assessment." There is also a per capita membership tax. Spent $48,709.

Matthew Dushane (registered for Seafarers International Union of North America, AFL): This report shows no expenditures; previous reports showed (Congressional Quarterly cumulation) $305.

CIO (exclusive of railway labor)

Congress of Industrial Organizations: Allocated expenditures included such items as salaries of three clerks (but not those of registered lobbyists, who filed separate reports), multigraphing and printing costs (but with no item for the CIO News), rent and supplies, pamphlets and releases, and $10,000 given to CIO Housing Committee. Total reported, $42,035.

Communications Workers of America (CIO); None.

Railway labor

Grand International Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, Cleveland: Salary and expenses of John T. Corbett (who has both legislative and industrial relations duties), salary of Miss Helen Corbett, his assistant,

and Washington office rent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $17,946.

Railway Labor Executives' Association: Listed prorated contributions equal to total allocated expenditures. Contributions were from member railway labor groups. Estimated allocated expenditures included portions of salaries, fees and expenses, postage and supplies, documents, furniture, etc. Said a bill may be studied by lawyers, distributed to member unions, and "infrequently be the subject of pamphlet comment." Allocated (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $8,220.

Order of Railway Conductors of America, Cedar Rapids, Iowa: No salary and expense for C. W. Vance, legislative representative. On separate form, salary of vice president and legislative representative W. D. Johnson and expense of national legislative bureau, $12,307

Other employees

Active-Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association, South Portland, Maine (formerly filed as Retired Lighthouse Service Employees' Association): Expenses connected with legislation in first half of 1949, $431, according to report filed in August. January 1950 report referred to a previous statement (not in clerk's files) showing expenditures of $661, and cumulated year's expenditures as $1,114.

International Association of Machinists, salary and expenses of grand lodge representative, $2,700.

National Association of Federal Carrier Employees, by John Stanton Bartlett, president: Expenses for taxi, postage, phone and telegram in informing member chapters on pending bills, approximately $250.

National Association of Retired Civil Employees: Salary and expenses of Lewis H. Fisher, general counsel, and Elmer Johnson, president (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $5,499.

National Association of United States Storekeeper-Gaugers: For services of Robert E. McLaughlin and Francis M. Sullivan, $2,000.

National League of District Postmasters, by E. A. Meeks, secretary: None.

Railroad Pension Conference, New Haven, Conn.: Received $5,639. Spent $5,592.

Retirement Federation of Civil Service Employees of the United States Government: Received contributions from branches and members at naval shipyards, gun factories, air stations and other installations totaling $24,806. Spent $21,324.

Farm groups

American Farm Bureau Federation, Washington office: Reported Washington expenses, which included salaries, rent, communications but not cost of printed publications, subscriptions, and miscellaneous farm program lobbying expenses. Spent (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $60,134.

American National Live Stock Association, Denver: Total receipts, all purposes, $72,795. Allocation based on reportable expense and total salary of F. E. Mollin ($14,048.90) plus other items, $14,837.

Food Producers Council, Inc., by Philip C. Turner, president, Baltimore: Received $3,636 on basis of assumption that only 50 percent of receipts and expenditures are allocable to lobbying. On some basis, cutting expense items in half gives total reported, $3,896.

Forest Farmers Association, by Paul W. Schoen, executive secretary, Valdosta, Ga.: Received $989. Nothing spent in fourth quarter, previous quarters' expenditures for Schoen, $4,289.

National Board of Fur Farm Organizations, Morgan, Utah, by Joseph H. Francis, executive secretary: Did not lobby in fourth quarter. Previous quarters' total, $14,666.

National Council of Farmers Cooperatives: Does not believe required to file. Received $109,243, including $500 or more from each of 45 farm co-ops, some identifiable by name as dealing with cranberries, apples, avocados, almonds, peaches, prunes and apricots, walnuts, dairy products, citrus fruit, eggs, potatoes, tobacco, wool, grain, poultry, raisins, cotton, livestock, rice, wine, and peas. Expenditures are listed by purpose, without giving names of those to whom disbursed. Spent, for all purposes including legislative, $95,489.

National Farmers Union (Farmers Educational and Cooperative Union of America), Denver: None.

National Milk Producers Federation (formerly National Cooperative Milk Producers Federation): Because of uncertainty of meaning of lobbying law provision, full recepits and expenditures are listed regardless of purpose without admitting that law is applicable. Received $224,315.04. Expenditures included those to Hill & Knowlton for public relations work and to the General Federation of Women's Clubs for an advertisement in its publication during fourth quarter. Spent $17,161.

National Wool Growers Association Salt Lake City: Said received no contributions for legislative work. Quotas paid by various State wool growers groups are not specifically collected for above purpose. No receipts figure given. Washington expenses of J. B. Wilson and J. M. Jones, $7,053.

Wyoming Wool Growers Association: First 1949 report. Washington expenses of J. B. Wilson who receives $6,000 annual salary and whose Washington time is devoted to work before executive departments as well as lobbying, $3,424.

Western Cotton Growers Association of California, Fresno, by Ralph B. Bunje: $9,616.

Foreign policy

The American Tariff League, Inc., New York City: Said unfair to attribute to members and contributors intention to pay for lobbying so listed full receipts to avoid designation of part as designed for lobbying. Total receipts, $57,032, of which $52,700 were dues. Total expenditures, of which estimated 10 percent maximum is allocable, included $6,424 to John Lee Coulter for retainer and expenses; $12,500 salary of Richard H. Anthony, secretary, $325 to Felix Morley and $300 to Walter E. Spahr for speech honoraria; $10 dues each to National Federation of Independent Business, San Mateo, Calif., and Trade Association Executives of New York, $55,775.

Atlantic Union Committee, New York City: No total given for receipts. Spent, for salaries, expenses, travel, office costs, communications, etc. (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $45,410.

Citizens Committee on Displaced Persons, New York City: Received $217,525. Spent, $222,809.

Committee to Defend America by Aiding Anti-Communist China, New York City: First report. Received $1,886, of which said $500 from AFL, in care of Jay Lovestone, Intl. Ladies Garment Workers Union, $300 each from ex-Navy Secretary and ex-New Jersey Governor Charles Edison and from Frederick C. McKee, Pittsburgh industrialist (see 1949 Log, pp. 505, 512 and 1950 Log, p. 11). Spent for printing, rent, and office costs, Carnegie Hall rent, no salaries or fees except for fund raising ($800), $1,838.

Committee for Equality in Naturalization: Received $3,703, including $1,500 in last half of 1949 from Japanese American Citizens League Anti-Discrimination Committee, Washington. Spent, for salary and expenses of Robert M. Cullum and printing, $4,722.

Committee for the Intl. Trade Organization: Received $25,000, in amounts of $500 or more, of which the only 4th quarter item was $2,500 from Matthew Fox, New York City (Fox is president of American-Indonesian Corp., partly owned by the Indonesian Government; see 1949 Logs, page 140). Previous quarters contributors included Sen. WILLIAM BENTON (D. Connecticut), who was not a Senator then; he gave an unstated sum, at least $500. Spent, $27,926.

Committee for the Marshall plan to aid European recovery, care of Hugh Moore, treasurer, Easton, Pa.: Spent nothing in second half year. Total for 1949, $1,500.

Peder Kristian Kristensen, by law firm of Spencer & Louisell: Firm received unreported fees and expenses re deportation case which was decided by Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia December 19, 1949. Court held in favor of Kristensen, that he is not ineligible for citizenship and hence deportable solely on ground he had claimed ineligibility in the draft when he was on temporary visa. These receipts and disbursements had nothing to do with lobbying law, said the law firm. Firm was also engaged to support H. R. 3410, a bill for his relief, but no expenditures or fees were had in this connection.

National Council for Prevention of War: Received $37,989 in 1949, including fourth quarter $1,000 contributions from Metals & Controls Corp., Attleboro, Mass., and from Mrs. S. Emlen Stokes, Moorestown, N. J. Expenditures included fourth quarter $70 contribution to National Council Against Conscription, salaries, rent, printing, and communications, and other expenses, $44,195.

Jacob Neubauer by ex-Senator Burton K. Wheeler, Democrat of Montana, of Wheeler & Wheeler law firm: Immigration case. Wheeler received $1,000, spent $9. Cost to Neubauer (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $1,009.

Philippine-American Committee: Spent since committee was formed March 25, including part of salary of Mary Higgins, $6,574.

Republic of Finland, by Emil Hurja: First report. Hurja was paid $10,000 and spent, for travel, and office expense and to Miss Bertha Kruss, $2,500. Total (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $12,500.

United States Committee for a United Nations Genocide convention, New York City: Received $3,750. Spent for printing, communications, travel, no salaries, $2,626.

United World Federalists, Inc., New York City: Said counsel advised it is not required to file, but does so "voluntarily since it has nothing to conceal." Cannot determine whether lobbying law requires report of only relatively small amounts spent re Federal legislation or total expenses for all national, State, and local activities, but, in interest of safety, reports total expenditures. If a segregation were made of expenses within the coverage of the law, it would be less than 15 percent. Did not report total receipts for 1949 or for last quarter. Total fourth quarter receipts of amounts each in excess of $499 totaled $22,329 of which $4,000 was anonymous, $1,000 from Clifton Fadiman, and other amounts, ranging from $500 to $2,000, from 23 individuals or couples. Expenditures during the fourth quarter included $47.28 to William Sims, care of Senator HUBERT HUMPHREY (Democrat, Minnesota), for printing; $27 to Representative BROOKS HAYS (Democrat, Arkansas), for travel expenses; $168.72 to AMVETS for travel expenses; dues and contributions to various State UWF branches, etc. Total spent, all purposes, 1949 (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $291,672.

Professional organizations

American Dental Association, Chicago: Appropriated from general funds $31,085 for 1949 expenses of Council on Legislation,

which works on Federal and State legislation. Members' annual dues, for all purposes, $12 each. Spent, for Federal legislative work, $15,407.

American Hospital Association, Chicago: Appropriation from membership dues for maintenance of Washington Service Bureau (which is not maintained principally for lobbying) equals expenses. Expenses, for salaries, travel, and Washington office costs, $53,726.

The American Institute of Architects, by Edmund R. Purves: Spent, including $33 for reprints for distribution of article on H. R. 3224, "Earned Income Tax Adjustment Act," $292.

American Library Association, Chicago: National Relations office in Washington, has some lobbying duties; Falls Church, Va., office, headed by Mrs. Aubry Lee Graham, now in charge of lobbying. Difficult to break down expenditures between lobbying and other, so listed total, which appears to be total Washington area figure. Paid Representative WRIGHT PATMAN (Democrat, Texas), $52.96 for reprints of library demonstration bill. Spent $17,790.

American Medical Association, Chicago: Allocated, $1,522,683.

James E. Bryan, as agent for Medical Society of New Jersey, Trenton, N. J.: First report. Spent, for pamphlets, printing, and communications, $291.

The American Optometric Association, Inc., development fund, care of Dr. Samuel L. Brown, O. D., Fostoria, Ohio, $7,064.

American Osteopathic Association, Chicago: Allocated expenditures included $14,125 retainer to Lawrence L. Gourley, legal counsel to public relations department, and costs of notices to osteopathic physicians re medical education bill, H. R. 5940, and medical aspects of social security bill, H. R. 6000, $14,646.

Judge Advocates Association: Received $6,531. Spent, $7,429.

National Council of Business Schools, by Dr. J. S. Noffsinger, executive secretary: Fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $6,722.

National Council of Technical Schools by J. S. Noffsinger, director: Fees and expenses of Stanley I. Posner (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $4,480.

National Education Association of the United States, Legislative-Federal Relations Division: Division operates on annual budget of $57,890 covering both legislative and other work. Legislative expenditure estimated allocation (based on partial salaries and full expenses pertinent), $17,188.

National Federation of Private Schools Associations, by J. F. Noffsinger, director: Listed contributors: Pennsylvania Association of Private Vocational Schools, Pittsburgh, $3,090; National Council of Technical Schools, $725; Central Schools Association, Chicago, $2,500; National Home Study Council, $1,000; New Jersey Association of Technical Schools, Newark, $500; and McGraw-Hill Publishing Co., New York City, $500. Did not state total receipts.

Expenditures included Stanley I. Posner's fees and expenses ($1,865), printing, mailing, etc. Total for quarter and for year not given. Congressional Quarterly cumulation, assuming no duplication between third and fourth quarter expenses, $4,325.

National Home Study Council, by J. S. Noffsinger, director: None.

National Socity of Professional Engineers: None.

Reclamation, rivers and harbors

Central Arizona Project Association, by Howard J. Smith, Phoenix: Received $97,943, including $12,000 from Salt River Valley Water Users' Association, Phoenix; $9,700 from the County of Maricopa and other smaller sums from various irrigation districts; $5,000 from Central Arizona Light & Power Co.; $5,000 from Vegetable Growers' Association, Phoenix; other smaller sums from farm and business associations and firms, including Arizona Farm Bureau Federation, and Arizona Wool Growers Association. Spent, including trips to various conventions (Congressional Quarterly cumulation), $97,301.

Colorado River Association, Los Angeles: Received $84,364. Spent $115,120.

Florida Inland Navigation District, Bunnell, Fla.: Fees and expenses of Henry Holland Buckman, consulting engineer, $5,856.

Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Association (for the seaway): Received, in fourth quarter, $2,250, including $1,000 each from State of Minnesota and Nordberg Manufacturing Co. This association is successor to National St. Lawrence Association, which reported first quarter expenditures of $6,761. Expenditures reported for two groups during year would be $21,639. This group's expenditures, $14,678.

National Committee on Resources: None.

National Reclamation Association: Figures for this group are based on reports which duplicate April receipts and expenditures so that there may be excessive statement of items covered in first two reports. Receipts were reported as $41,723; (see 1949 Logs, pp. 996, 1405 for previous contributors), fourth quarter items in excess of $499 each included those from: State of California, Department of Public Works, $1,350; Water Development of Southeastern Colorado, $500; Denver Chamber of Commerce, $700; Oklahoma Water Resources Association, $1,432. Other contributions came from State, county, city, and irrigation and conservancy district agencies of Government, and from associations, chambers of commerce, firms, and individuals. Washington office expenditures in first 9 months, by Congressional Quarterly addition of totals as reported was $23,992. NRA own cumulation for that period was $28,939. Fourth quarter total Washington office expenditures was $10,948, for NRA total, $39,887.

National Rivers and Harbors Congress: Received $18,077. Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $19,103.

National St. Lawrence Project Conference (against the seaway): Received $36,427 during year, of which $21,000 was from Association of American Railroads, $5,100 from National Coal Association, $3,435 from Maritime Association of the Port of New York, $2,016 from Anthracite Institute, Wilkes-Barre, and $500 from C. F. Hood, Cleveland. Spent $35,606.

Regional Committee for an MVA, Denver, first report: None.

Six Agency Committee (six California water agencies), Los Angeles: Received $30,000 from Metropolitan Water District of Southern California; Imperial Irrigation District; Department of Water and Power, City of Los Angeles; Palo Verde Irrigation District; San Diego County Water Authority; and Coachella Valley County Water District. Spent for services of Northcutt Ely, former executive assistant to Interior Secretary and now Washington representative of committee, $20,343.

Texas Water Conservation Association, Austin: Received $18,182 in 1949, including $600 in fourth quarter from Texas Power & Light Co., Dallas. Spent, for publicity work by George Kirksey & Associates, Houston, and for salaries, traveling expenses, and office costs, $19,319.

Taxes

National Committee for Repeal of Wartime Excise Taxes, New York City: First report. Received $23,750 (see p. 180 for contributors). Expenditures for influencing legislation, none.

National Live Stock Tax Committee, Denver (composed of representatives from several livestock groups including American National Livestock Association, National Wool Growers Association, American Hereford Association, American Shorthorn Association, American Aberdeen-Angus Breeders Association, and about 30 other organizations). Received $674. Paid Stephen H. Hart, tax counsel, for work on amendment of tax laws on capital gains on sale of breeding livestock and deductions of ranch expenses (but think none of his activities were lobbying). Signed by F. E. Mollin, who is executive secretary of American National Live Stock Association. Hart's fees ($3,080) and expenses ($578), $3,658.

National Tax Equality Association, Inc., Chicago. Received $536,132. Said does not employ lobbyists, and that expenses were those of "fringe items," the "reporting of which depends upon whether or not they influenced third parties to make their views known to Congress." The "fringe items" are mainly for production and distribution of literature and advertisements "which may have suggested or inspired letters to Congress or which may possibly have been sent to the Congress by members of our Association or others." Salaries, rent, and so forth, are not included in the figures reported, though the fourth quarter figures do appear in the photostatic copy of the ledger sheets which accompanied the report. Spent, for "fringe items," $74,028.

Indiana Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Indianapolis: Received $2,328. Expenditures included items to Indiana State Chamber of Commerce for legislative action calendar service, rent, phone, and secretarial service, $5 dues and $627 quarterly assessment and postage items to NTEA; a $529 third quarter assessment to NAB, and so forth, $2,139.

Allen L. Smith (registered for Louisiana Tax Equality Association, Inc.): Spent, for travel, communications, expenses, including $5 to VFW and $5 to NTEA in November, $824.

Nebraska Tax Equality Committee, Inc., Lincoln: Received $2,572. Reported paid $650 to National Associated Businessmen for pamphlets and bulletins for 6 months (previous report said for dues) and $3 to NTEA for postage. Other costs were for communications. No salaries listed. Reported spent $2,603.

B. E. Groom, secretary, North Dakota Tax Equality Committee, Fargo: Received $12,570. Expenditures in fourth quarter included $1,000 supplies from "National Association Businessmen," $300 traveling expenses for Groom (no salary), $1,061 salary and $585 expenses of F. W. Grawe, rent, office expenses, advertising and communications. Year 1949 total, $11,007.

Tax Equality Committee of Kentucky, Louisville: Received $6,853. Spent $5,113.

Tax Equality League of Utah, E. L. Schoenhals, Salt Lake City, $779.

(NOTE.—There is considerable transfer of funds between National Tax Equality Association, National Associated Businessmen and their State affiliates.)

National Tax Relief Coalition, Greensboro, N. C.: Received $2,900; spent $2,945.

State Tax Association, Houston: Congressional Quarterly cumulation, $35,367.

Twenty Percent Cabaret Tax Committee, Chicago: Received $11,900 (for detail see 1949 Log, p. 1405). Spent, including $10,250 for expenses of Samuel P. Haines, Washington, $12,276.

Washington (D. C.) Taxpayers Association: Received $4,002. Expenditures total includes full fee of Rufus S. Lusk, president, though only 10 percent of fee is applicable to Federal legislative activities, $4,028.

Veterans, military affairs

The American Legion, national headquarters, Indianapolis: Legion neither solicits nor accepts donations for purpose of furthering legislative aims. Total receipts and expenditures are reported annually to

Congress under 1919 incorporation law, and not stated in lobbying reports. Allocation of Washington and legislative salaries and expenses, $71,769.

Disabled American Veterans, for Francis M. Sullivan and Charles E. Foster: Salaries (after taxes and social security) and expenses of the two men, $16,139.

Disabled Emergency Officers of the World Wars: Salary of L. S. Ray for first 10 months of 1949, $2,500.

National Council Against Conscription: Received $7,978, including an anonymous $1,000 during the fourth quarter, sent via Provident Trust Co. of Philadelphia. Expenditures, including fourth quarter payments to National Council for Prevention of War, for rent and supplies, $119; to Fellowship of Reconciliation, New York City, for literature and communications, and other expenditures for clerical salaries, travel, and expenses, etc., total for 1949, $9,002.

Reserve Officers Association of the United States: Received $127,716. Spent for one salary and expenses (no specific part of salary for lobbying), $6,313.

Washington and Freedom

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HARRY L. TOWE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TOWE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address which I gave at the fifteenth annual George Washington's Birthday breakfast, Everyman's Club, First Presbyterian Church, Passaic, N. J., February 22, 1950:

Celebrating the two hundred and eighteenth anniversary of the birth of the Father of our County, we should pause briefly to speculate on the achievements of George Washington and examine his virtues and his accomplishments.

We may ask what dominated and what effused from this, the greatest of all American heroes. Was it his courageous tenacity, his valiant integrity, his sublime faith? Answering ourselves, we know that Washington had all these attributes and that it was the combination making up his character which made him great. Washington accomplished much. He was the leader and driving force in carrying out the successful Revolution, the only completely successful revolution in history in that it accomplished its purpose of creating a free republic. Revolutions in other parts of the globe have been failures, when measured by this standard.

In France the people threw off the tyranny of the monarch, which resulted in a reign of terror, followed by Napoleon, more blood, more terror, with the result that the Government of France is still weak, subject to immediate change, and fearful of another reign of terror.

In China, the revolt against the throne and the Manchu dynasty was never a success. The country became weak, and has now succumbed to the hordes of communism.

In Russia, the revolutionaries seized power in 1917, and eventually the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was born. Its founders promised a new freedom. Today in Russia the people, instead of freedom have misery, tyranny, a complete loss of the little dignity they enjoyed under the czars, and a loss of the right to worship their God as they choose, and in addition they face the daily fear of death.

"AT ALL TIMES THE SERVANTS"

In contrast to all of these attempts to bring complete freedom in all phases of life to the people, Washington's was the only one that succeeded.

Washington led the people in war and led them in peace, led them in framing a Constitution which is the greatest document of its kind in the world's history, and then went on to found the Republic of the United States of America. It was a great thing for Washington to have served in the Revolution and to have achieved independence for the United States. It was great, too, for him willingly to surrender his military power and to become again a private citizen. But it was even greater to construct the framework of a new Nation and in 8 years to clothe the words of its Constitution with reality.

Washington and the other founding fathers were at all times the servants of the people of the new-founded Republic. It may be some time since you have reflected on your concept of just what a republic is. Let me remind you and I will take this sentence from the dictionary: "A republic is a state in which the sovereign power rests in a certain body of the people—the electorate—and is exercised by representatives elected by, and responsible to, them."

The cornerstone which makes our country strong is the Republic's guarantee to all of its citizens of the inherent right of freedom and liberty—freedom to think as you will, work as you will, play as you will, so long as you do not intrude upon the rights of others. Above all, it guarantees the blessed right of freedom to worship according to your own conscience.

AMERICAN WAY OF LIFE

Freedom then—the American way of life—is the force that has made the United States the most productive nation in the history of the world. Because men have been free, their minds have had free play. Their intellects have been stimulated and their inventive genius enriched. The telephone, the radio, the television, the phonograph, the automobile, the laundry machine, the air conditioning, the motion picture, and all the other great inventions conceived and developed in America—all of these things have been the direct products of free men, free to let their inventive genius and their ingenuity have full play.

One of the tragic facts of our era is that more and more people fail to understand this great force of freedom. Champions of philosophies completely alien to American liberty and American success have been peddling their false bills of goods in all quarters of the globe. In Russia, they are called Communists; in Germany, they were Nazis; in Italy, they were Fascists; and in England, they are Socialists.

Already a fourth of the world has become enslaved under communism. Already another fourth of the world is sampling other forms of socialism, all at the expense of human freedom and human rights.

These alien philosophies have a cornerstone, too. It is materialism, materialistic security. The formula to obtain materialistic security is the same in every case. The individual must surrender his freedom for guarantees that he will be clothed and fed. There is no guarantee of how well he will be clothed and fed, yet once he has surrendered his freedom, there is nothing he can do about it. He is trapped forever.

Politicians and governments have been trading on the materialistic desires of the people. It has been the politicians of Europe who have produced communism, socialism, fascism, and nazism.

In this country today, we have a group of fuzzy-minded thinkers who are determined to change our way of life. They are the weak-brained theorists who have been labeled socialistic planners. They are a force in Washington today. They have a formula. Their formula is that if it is necessary for the Government to do a few basic services for the people, there is no reason why the Government should not take over all of the affairs of the people and let the state manage personal lives from the time of birth until the time of death. With complete disregard for the future safety of the country, these socialistic planners have so influenced the present administration that it is unequivocally committed to change the form of government established by Washington and his fellow founders of freedom. It is plain to all clear-thinking men that we are definitely embarked on a program which deviates from our republican system of government, which has made this Nation the greatest in the history of man.

We are adopting the methods that spelled failure for the European nations. Daily we approach the stage where the dignity of the individual, his inherent rights and freedoms, and his sovereignty over his public servants, is being engulfed by the growth of government. This government expansion and control is a sharp challenge to our liberty and freedom.

The Constitution plainly says that the will and desires of the people are sovereign. The Constitution further guarantees that those persons who are elected or appointed to any public office, no matter how exalted are the people's servants and not their masters. It was clearly set forth that the people were going to be the masters, and not the few who served them. During recent years, however, the power of the few has become so great that it is questionable how long our Nation can remain free, as contemplated by Washington and his associates.

WHAT THE GOVERNMENT IS DOING

The growth of Government and Government controls has placed handcuffs on the American businessman, is taxing away his profits, and is endangering the future of his enterprise. In addition to shackling the American businessman, the Government has entered into open competition with him. The Government operates light and power plants; it builds homes and apartments and rents them. The Government is in the insurance business. The Government comes close to fixing wages, pensions, prices, interest and dividends. The Government definitely is in the banking business. The Government is in the food business—the Government buys up millions of dozens of eggs and millions of pounds of potatoes and stores them away until they rot or become poisonous. The fields in which the Government competes with American business and interferes with the private enterprise system is growing daily. Federal bureaucracy is threatening the steel industry, it is threatening the transportation industry, it is endangering the future of the professions, particularly medicine and education.

All these new formulas concocted by the socialistic-planners are put before us in the guise of new government services, something the state is going to do for us, a handout to Utopia. But like the thinking of these planners, this is a false and dishonest line of salesmanship. They don't tell all the story. They don't mention the cost, they don't tell us how much these services are going to increase our tax bill—a tax bill that is today the highest in the peacetime history of our country and increasing every twenty-four hours. They don't tell us that their objective is to make every man, woman and child

a complete ward of the state, as happened in Italy, Germany, Russia, and as is going on in Great Britain today.

TWENTY-SEVEN PERCENT OF INCOME TO TAXES

Everyone of these preposterous schemes of these planners cost money. And spending of Government money means that you must pay more taxes. High taxes is one of the main weapons of the socialistic-planners, and is the principal means they are using in their determination to change the American way of life.

Figures are dull, but I want to use a few to prove this statement. It has long been held by competent students of political science and by economists that when taxes amount to more than 20 percent of your total income, you are no longer wholly able to provide for yourself. When you are taxed more than 20 percent, you must rely on the Government for the difference. Today, the American taxpayer is paying 27 percent of his income to Federal, State, and local governments simply for the privilege of being governed. We are already at least 7 percentage points over the deadline. From the time of Washington down to 1941, 32 Presidents spent $179,620,113,645. In less than 5 years, the present administration has spent $191,081,394,191, and the budget for the coming fiscal year calls for the spending of more than $50,000,000,000, in one way or another. The planners in the present administration ran the country nearly $5,500,000,000 into the red last year, and the deficit spending this year will be approximately another $5,000,000,000.

Under the present deficit-spending policy, last year we daily spent $15,000,000 which we did not have. This is at the rate of $625,000 an hour, and $10,416 a minute.

Just a few other statistics: Twenty years ago, the average American family paid less than $200 a year in taxes. The same family today pays more than $1,300 a year.

Twenty years ago, there was 1 Government employee for every 40 of population. Today there is 1 for every 22.

ONE OF EVERY SEVEN GETS UNITED STATES FUNDS

Twenty years ago, the number of people directly or indirectly receiving money from the Government was 1 out of 40. Today, one out of seven regularly receives Government money.

The public debt today is approximately $257,000,000,000.

With taxation the cornerstone of the movement to change our form of government, and make the people the slaves of the state, instead of its masters, you can see that these planners have made great progress in this means of attack. The higher the tax, the greater danger to our liberty.

Another danger we face is the possibility of a complete surrender to materialism and amorality. This happened in Italy, Germany, it is in full force in Russia and its iron curtain satellites, it is in control in England, and it has invaded our shores. Many of our political leaders have abandoned all sense of true liberalism and morality. They still proclaim themselves to be liberals, but they are trying to sell the American people on the idea that if you have the physical necessities of life, you will be secure and happy. Yet, the fact is that the American people today are not feeling secure, nor feeling happy. The fact is that the British people feel neither secure nor feel happy. Materialism has reached its inevitable goal in Russia, and the people of that vast land have found that the price of physical security is fear.

Many of the world's great leaders understand the fatal weakness in the godless materialism now being sold to the peoples of the earth. Many religious leaders have repeatedly called for a rebirth of morality and a proper understanding of materialism. In public addresses decrying materialism, these leaders point out that the advocates of socialism are destroying the fundamental moral force of the world, the home.

Former Secretary of State James F. Byrnes, of South Carolina, also understands the fatal weakness of materialism and the threat of materialism to our Nation. Twice he has warned that "we are going down the road to statism." Mr. Byrnes declares that if these socialistic planners' programs now being concocted in Washington should be adopted, there is danger that the individual—the farmer, worker, manufacturer, lawyer, or doctor—will soon be an economic slave pulling an oar in the galley of the state.

Former President Herbert Hoover also sees the menace of materialism. The former President said a short time ago, and I quote:

"There is a considerable group of fuzzy-minded people who are engineering a compromise with all these European infections. They fail to realize that our own American system has grown away from the systems of Europe for 250 years. They have a false notion that a collectivist economy can at the same time preserve personal liberty and constitutional government."

There can be no doubt that these planners, determined to change our form of government, have their feet across the threshold of our doors. However, I firmly believe that an overwhelming majority of thinking Americans, real patriotic Americans, want to reverse the trend toward the Socialist state in America. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people recognize the moral and spiritual necessity to preserve freedom. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people are against materialism and amorality. I believe that an overwhelming majority of the American people want to save our Nation and continue our form of government, as established by George Washington and his associates 161 years ago.

Now is the time for each of us to call on our reserves of moral strength. You should withstand the blandishments of those politicians who hold out promises of material security in one hand and hide the other hand containing the shackles of taxation and loss of freedom which are the necessary instruments of such a program. And we the elected servants of the voters must withstand the present trend to be all things to all people in order to secure votes. For as George Washington so aptly stated during the arguments accompanying the framing of the Constitution—"If, to please the public, we offer what we ourselves disapprove, how can we afterward defend our work?"

And, gentlemen, how can we?

The Keating Health Insurance Plan

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD T. MILLER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MILLER of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, my native State of Maryland has always held an honorable and advanced position with respect to medical science and its practical application. There is little support for socialized medicine in the Maryland Free State, but the manner in which it has striven to meet the problem of medical care for the needy and indigent on the local level has won general approbation from those familiar with this activity. It is significant, therefore, that the Sun of Baltimore has shown editorial interest in the plan for expanding the program of national health insurance proposed in H. R. 6819 by my friend and colleague the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING]. I, too, advocate a voluntary program and, like the Sun, I hope the bill will not be squelched in committee.

The editorial in question, from the issue of February 18, last, reads as follows:

THE INCOME TAX AND THE COST OF HEALTH INSURANCE

A bill has been introduced in the United States House of Representatives that proposes an interesting approach to the problem of a national health program. Its sponsor is Representative KENNETH B. KEATING, Republican, of New York.

What Mr. KEATING suggests is an income-tax-allowance plan. That is to say, a taxpayer would be permitted to deduct from his Federal income tax—not his taxable income but the tax itself—a proportion of any premium he has paid for approved health insurance, whether for hospital or medical care.

As the bill is written a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $2,000 would be allowed to deduct 90 percent of the annual premium paid. Deductions would be scaled according to income to the point where a taxpayer with an adjusted gross income of $10,001 and over, would receive credit for only 60 percent of the premium paid.

It is estimated that there already are 52,000,000 persons carrying some form of voluntary health insurance. Mr. KEATING's plan would substitute incentive for compulsion. It would serve as a stimulus for a popular movement that already has made astonishing progress.

The significance of the proposal is that part of the money now paid by an individual to the Government in the form of a Federal income tax would, instead, go to the payment of a health-insurance premium. It is probable that some of the people in the lower-income brackets who now pay a Federal tax would, because of the allowance plan, be relieved of paying any income tax at all.

On the other hand, under President Truman's compulsory insurance plan the premium would be deducted from the pay envelope. It has been estimated that the cost to the wage earners alone would be in the neighborhood of $6,000,000,000 a year. There would be also the tremendous administrative costs of setting up a huge medical bureaucracy run from Washington.

The author of the bill recognizes that there will be objection on the ground that his plan would result in great loss of tax revenue. He admits it, but points out that, on the other hand, it would relieve the Federal Government of the stupendous burden involved in taking over the Nation's whole medical establishment.

Possibly there are circumstances that would make the income-tax-allowance plan impractical. Certainly no judgment should be passed on it until exact figures have been presented and examined. But the bill should not be allowed to be squelched in committee. Voluntary health insurance is one principle preferable to a scheme involving compulsion. Any scheme which promises to encourage the growth of voluntary plans deserves full debate.

St. Lawrence Seaway Will Seriously Affect the Economy of Central Pennsylvania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAMES E. VAN ZANDT
OF PENNSYLVANIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. VAN ZANDT. Mr. Speaker, the boards of governors of the Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa., are opposed to the St. Lawrence seaway project because of its effect on the economy of Pennsylvania.

We who reside in Pennsylvania depend largely upon the coal and railroad industries, and should the St. Lawrence seaway project become a reality, it would wreck our economy and throw thousands of people out of work.

The following resolution adopted by the Chamber of Commerce, Clearfield, Pa., is self-explanatary, and I hope that my colleagues will realize the devastating effects that will follow approval of the St. Lawrence seaway project:

The board of governors of the Chamber of Commerce of Clearfield, at its regular monthly meeting held on Thursday, February 16, unanimously adopted a resolution opposing the St. Lawrence seaway project.

"Our chamber believes that it would require a great expenditure of public funds which cannot be justified at this time; that it would seriously affect the economy of central Pennsylvania and further impair the market of Pennsylvania coal, the basic industry of this area; militate against the establishment of new industry and create unfair sources of competition, by lower transportation costs on foreign-made products."

The St. Lawrence project has been discussed for more than half a century. It has never been found to be an economic development either as a waterway or power scheme. Advocated now as a national defense need it has no basis for justification whatsoever.

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE OF CLEARFIELD,
GEORGE W. GAYLOR, *Secretary.*

Justice for Poland

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JOHN W. McCORMACK
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address by Hon. Maurice J. Tobin, Secretary of Labor, at a meeting sponsored by the western Massachusetts branch of the Polish-American Congress:

I am glad to appear on the justice-for-Poland program and to discuss, as requested, labor conditions behind the iron curtain, with special reference to Poland.

At the very outset, let me say that the pattern of Soviet domination of labor unions is more or less advanced in all the satellite countries. If, in other words, we wish to understand what is happening to the worker in countries like Poland, Rumania, Hungary, we must first realize what communism has done in Russia to the trade-union.

Trade-unions have no trace of independence in the U. S. S. R. They are an instrument of government. They have no right to strike for any purpose. They can merely make representations to a higher authority. They are controlled by a higher authority which does not spring from the union and is not responsible to the union. Unions simply function as part of a one-party state.

In such a situation the individual member, as well as the organization, is a rubber stamp. Opposition to union leadership, which is imposed from above, is opposition to the state and punished as such. Every hint of democracy has been rooted out. Russian unionists are like all other Russians who have not attained official power in the party or the government—just dumb, driven cattle. The only reason for retaining the form of union organization is apparently to increase production. In short, in the Soviet Union the organized worker has the right to be more of a beast of burden than he has been all along.

It is on that account that workers are forced to join unions. If they stay out, they can have no vacations, they are left out in the cold with respect to housing, they are deprived of all the little privileges which are held out as bait to Russian labor. That is why there is a large union membership. In effect, you have to join to avoid being suspected of counter-revolution, and you get nothing for joining except the right to carry out orders.

That is true in Russia. It is also true in Poland. Though the country and the population were reduced during the war, the trade-union membership is four times what it was before the war. You have to belong to the union, though when you belong your position is not improved in any respect. Your wages, hours, conditions of work are set not as a result of the kind of collective bargaining we know, but a collective bargaining which consists largely of a political boss saying "you must" and your saying "I will."

Over 80 percent of more than a thousand key trade-union officials belong to the Polish United Labor Party, which is, of course, Communist controlled, and which in any case runs the state. That can mean but one thing. The worker is a helpless creature of the state. He is regarded as having no interest outside the program of the state. That, at least, is the theory which is being hammered into a fact. The Polish union is not allowed a life of its own. The will of its members counts for nothing. Communism recognizes no right outside the authority of the government to carry out its ruthless purpose.

In such circumstances, where the objective of more and more production, whatever the cost, is paramount, it is not surprising that safeguards against injury and death, which we take for granted, and which even the Communists have put down on paper, do not prove effective. Human life means little under a Communist regime. Man's inhumanity to man is an old story, but it takes on a special brutality when it occurs for the profound purpose of keeping the proletariat on top.

The trade-unionist, unless he happens to be an important Communist official, has no standing, no influence, no part in shaping government policy, no opportunity to improve his lot. The well-being of the ordinary Russia or Polish worker is altogether outside his hands or the hands of his union. He remains ill-fed, ill-housed, ill-paid, for the sake of a future he will never enjoy. His not to reason why, his but to do and die. And if he does not do as required, he dies in a concentration camp. That is the fate of the Polish worker or any worker under a Communist Government.

The living conditions of workers in the Russian trade-unions are bad enough, but they must seem like paradise to those who are not in the unions. I am speaking of the millions in compulsory or slave-labor camps. How many millions we do not know, but the estimate runs from 5 to 20 million. From the reports of former inmates, we learn that the death rate among slave laborers is appalling by reason of the subhuman conditions forced upon them. This is what it means to be a workingman in a Communist country.

It is such conditions which prevail in what we are told are "people's democracies." They are conditions which differ only in degree in the several Soviet-dominated states. Their existence in Poland is accentuated by the fact that communism is not a Polish ideology but is something which has come with Russian conquest. This is not the first time the Poles have suffered from Russian imperialism, but the bitterness of being militarily conquered is made even more unbearable by the way in which Moscow has gone about converting Poland to communism.

The Poles have always been devout Catholics. But religion is poison to the Communists. So in Poland, as in all the satellite countries, the comfort which religion might have brought to oppressed men and women is at best suspect and at worst denied. Religion is a drug, Lenin declared. What he meant was that those who worship God, those who are moved by moral values, cannot be converted to communism, which is antimoral, antispiritual, so committed to materialism that it must root out the heartfelt things of faith.

There is no balm in Gilead for the masses of eastern Europe. They are not working or living except for mere survival. They have been robbed of every freedom. They cannot call their souls their own. Their masters talk about democracy, then profane it by removing every trace of self-government. Is it democracy to say to workers, you may band together, but only to serve the government, never to have a voice in it, never even to have a voice in protesting against wrongs, or in making demands, or in doing anything which is not strictly according to the party line?

The workers of the Western World have become a powerful force for social, economic, and political advancement. In the western democracies, unions are an expression of freedom. In the "people's democracies", unions are an expression of tyranny. Behind the iron curtain, the worker is condemned to a double misery. Politically, he is a cipher. Economically, he is so much raw material. He is being sacrificed on the altar of a deity crueler than any monster worshipped in the early pagan world.

What then is to be said about labor conditions behind the iron curtain? Nothing to gladden the heart of any civilized person. And the worst of it is that we can expect no improvement until this cold war is over. We can pray that this will happen soon, but we must be prepared for a long stretch of international confusion during which there can be little justice for Poland or for any other country in the grip of the Kremlin. For that, or for worse, the United States must be ready, militarily and in every other way.

But I do not doubt that, ultimately, this shadow will be lifted, the iron curtain dissolved, and mankind permitted again to march in peace and security toward a goal now hidden from us. Then there will be justice and freedom for all the children of men. Then Poland, which fought so bravely during the war against totalitarianism, will receive its reward. Then justice will be done for the benefit of the peoples behind the iron curtain, for the benefit of all the countries which are now shut off from the sun of liberty.

Forest Resources in Illinois

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MELVIN PRICE

OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the statement of Mr. Anton J. Tomasek, State forestry chairman, Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs, before the Agriculture Subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. Tomasek's statement follows:

I am deeply grateful for this opportunity to present a statement and on behalf of the organization that sent me I wish to thank you.

I represent the Illinois Federation of Sportsmen's Clubs which has a membership of approximately 100,000 members belonging to some 480 county chapters. Our members are farmers, laborers, small-business men and individuals from all walks of life interested in the conservation of our natural resources. Through their officers and directors they have given approval of the statements to be presented.

I myself am a small-business man in a business not related in any way to forestry. I receive no salary from any public agency. Until 3 years ago I was head of the Illinois State Forestry Division for a period of 11 years. Recently I was appointed a member of our Illinois Department of Conservation Advisory Board by our Governor Stevenson.

My statement is confined to forestry problems of Illinois but no doubt other States are affected equally. I traveled through your great State of Mississippi two weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, and saw this; although as in our State one could readily see that great strides have been made in recent years in the development of the forest resources.

We must remember that money spent on forest resource development is one of the best investments in this country today and I base that upon the fact of what that investment will bring back in the form of dollar dividends in the future. Therefore, these appropriations that you will grant are strictly a loan which will return dividends equivalent to the finest investment and eventually the loan or appropriation, as we call it here, will be paid off Forest lands under good management will do this. It has already been proven on some of our national forest lands and more recently on private land ownerships.

We in Illinois want to place our almost four million acres of timberland of which 95 percent is owned by farmers under the best forest management practices possible. Showing our 204,000 farmers each of whom owns an average of 20 acres of forest land how to do it is a tremendous problem. Our educational program has gone far enough along in Illinois that the average farmer is convinced that good forestry on his land will pay him good dividends in return. Now the problem is to show him how to do it. We have nine foresters in the State now doing as much as they can who are so far behind on requests for their assistance it is embarrassing. Is it not good business to appropriate more money for farm forestry so that more men can be hired to give the farmers the technical assistance they need to manage their farm woodlands properly so that those lands bring in the dividends that they should?

A farmer in Washington County, Ill., provides a typical example of the services a farm forester can provide. This farmer possessed 100 acres of bottomland and upland timber which he never considered too important. The land was too rough and inaccessible for farming or good pasture, so he never considered it as a real paying part of the farm.

When a large mill operator commenced cutting operations in an adjacent tract, this owner thought perhaps that he, too, should cut his trees and get some financial returns while the getting was good. When a sizable offer of $2,000 was given by the millman, the farmer hesitated and wondered. It was then that he contacted the farm forester and wanted a little more information about forestry and especially his woodland of 100 acres.

The forester and the farmer walked through the woods and made a cruise or inventory study, and upon that decided to harvest only the ripe trees and save the younger trees for a future crop. The forester and farmer then marked and volume tallied such trees, made up a list of the quantity and quality of trees now available for selling, and then they contacted many different millmen.

From this action, these marked trees were sold for $2,400 and the majority of that timber tract still stood for periodic future cuts and the stand was benefited by the removal of the overmature ripe trees allowing faster growth on the remainder. The farmer benefited by actually receiving more for less timber; his woodland was left in a highly productive state and the millman benefited by harvesting large trees which brought him more high-quality timber and lumber than would be possible from harvesting small trees. The millman further benefited by being assured of future supplies of quality timber which will be produced by good forest practices. As a result the farmer now considers his woodland as valuable as the cropland and spends slack winter months in his woods doing the things the forester advocated during his visit and follows the simple management plan prepared for the farmer's guidance by the forester.

I see there is no provision for an increase of funds in the budget for farm forestry. I hope every effort will be made for an increase but if the committee feels this an impossibility would you please consider transferring to farm forestry some of the $850,000 increase for planting which I noticed on page 448 of the budget.

I would like to call your attention to the Forest Service research program in Illinois. They are studying timber management, tree planting, and management of plantings old enough to produce forest products, at their experimental forest in the hilly section of southern Illinois. The new and improved methods they are developing will be of tremendous value to timberland owners in southern Illinois and in three adjacent States. The practices developed and demonstrated will assist our farm foresters. The new methods of tree planting will help the Shawnee National Forest, the State forests, and the private-land owners do a better job of tree planting.

This research program has our wholehearted support and it needs to be strengthened. Southern Illinois has three important types of timberlands. The one experimental forest now in operation represents only the hilly oak-hickory type. The present program is not large enough to include forests on the claypan soils which contain nearly 3,600,000 acres of forest land in southern Illinois and southwestern Indiana. Nor is any forest research being done in the bottomland hardwoods along the Wabash, Ohio, Mississippi, and many other rivers and streams. Timber grows more rapidly in the bottomlands and this type is a very important part of the total forest area in southern Illinois.

New and better forestry practices must be developed and demonstrated in each major timber type if we are ever to obtain full use of the forest lands of southern Illinois. We believe the best way to do this is to establish experimental forests in the claypan and bottomland timber types, just as the Forest Service has done already in the hilly lands. In addition to providing the information needed by forest-land owners of southern Illinois, these experimental forests would serve owners in sizable parts of Indiana, Kentucky, and Missouri. Therefore, we recommend that your committee and Congress appropriate funds for the Forest Service to start these two new experimental forests in southern Illinois this year.

Present expenditures are limited to $32,000 for this research center. Needs require an additional $30,000 to expand the work to our other additional forest types. The budget for fiscal year 1951 recommends no increase for the experimental forest and range project of the Forest Service research appropriations. It is my responsibility to express the views of my organization that an increase of this amount is needed and justified by our situation in southern Illinois.

Another item we are interested in is a tree-planting program on the Shawnee National Forest that has already reforested 25,000 acres of denuded land. There remain 10,000 acres yet to be planted of which only 714 acres were completed last year. At this rate it will take nearly 15 years for the Federal Government to complete this job. That does not set a very good example to our people on how to get things done in forestry. Last year the Anderson-Mansfield Act was passed by this Congress to speed up planting on the national forests. The Budget Bureau recommends an appropriation of $889,000 for the reforestation project of the protection and management appropriation. This is certainly a justifiable and necessary activity. The Shawnee National Forest was purchased from private citizens in our State with the idea that the Federal Government could rebuild the forest resources more rapidly than private ownership. The Anderson-Mansfield Act authorized an appropriation of $3,000,000 for planting on these public lands. The fact that this appropriation is in the budget is encouraging however it is hoped that this committee can see its way clear to increase this amount to more nearly the amount of the authorization.

I know you men have a tremendous responsibility in allocating the expenditure of public funds and I have felt in the past that this committee has recommended wisely. Due to public opinion today I know it is difficult to increase appropriations, however I feel even as a conservative businessman that sometimes it is wise to do so. An example is the appropriation of forest-survey money in the past. Illinois for years had no forest survey of its timberlands, until finally 2 years ago it was granted. The survey was made and already the results of it have more than paid off its cost. There are still other States that need the survey.

Investing money, gentlemen, in our forest resources is one of the soundest investments today and I say that not as a forester but as a businessman. Returns in a comparatively few years will not only pay good dividends but also the principal.

All or Nothing Diehards

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. TOM STEED
OF OKLAHOMA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I desire to call the attention of the House to an article written by Marquis Childs in the Washington Post on the subject of the recent House action on the FEPC bill. I think Mr. Childs has made the fairest and most sensible analysis of this proposition that I have read.

It was because I shared almost an identical view in regard to the realism of the situation that I offered the Hays bill as a substitute during House debate. I still think this is the best and most worthy approach to this problem and that the national interest would have been served far better under this particular approach.

The article follows:

In the handling of the fair employment practices issue the Democratic leadership has provided an example of remarkable ineptitude. The net result was an embarrassment to Democratic Members of the House in a bill that has little relation either to reasonable compromise or a strict enforcement measure.

From the beginning it has been perfectly obvious that an FEPC bill with compulsory and penalty provisions could not be passed. If nothing else, a filibuster in the Senate would block it, the Republicans having joined with southern Democrats to make it far more difficult to close debate.

But it was also obvious that a large measure of support could be marshaled behind a fair employment law that would make a start at education and persuasion. Many southern legislators were prepared to accept such a bill. They represent a shifting opinion in the South—outside, of course, of the deep and irreconcilable South—which recognizes the inevitability of change and the need to prepare for it.

A compromise measure such as that of Representative BROOKS HAYS of Arkansas calling for investigation of discrimination in employment, coupled with education of employers and public, would have meant a good start. It would have afforded a test in both North and South of intentions and capabilities, supplementing the experiment of State FEPC commissions which have now accumulated a fair amount of experience.

Such a compromise could have been accepted on a frankly limited basis. Even the most passionate proponents of FEPC could have accepted a test for a period of 2 or 3 years. They are not likely to get as much in that time if they persist in an all-or-nothing attitude.

Then, too, honest advocates of equality of opportunity in the North had come to doubt the wisdom of a Federal law providing punishment for violators. They realized that such a law could be used in the South to inflame latent feeling against minorities.

Both the Democratic leadership and the proponents of an all-out FEPC law seemed to abandon any hope of keeping a substitute measure in bounds.

This was on the theory that whatever bill was sent to the Senate would be certain to be amended before final passage.

The substitute originally introduced by Representative SAMUEL K. MCCONNELL, JR., Republican of Pennsylvania, became in consequence something of a monstrosity. Amendments were slapped on in the confusion of the late-night session providing that women should not be discriminated against and that the disabled should be protected from unfair employment practices. These amendments were mostly the work of Southerners who knew exactly what they were doing.

The Hays bill, if it had been given a chance by the leadership, would have won the votes of a fair number of southern Democrats. Moreover, President Truman had indicated that he would sign it if it came to his desk in anything like its original form.

It is hard to determine who is responsible for the present mess. But a great deal of the blame must rest on the diehard proponents of an all-or-nothing bill.

They can once again use the fair employment issue in the elections this fall. However, as one session of Congress after another fails to produce any legislation, the result may be disillusion and disgust rather than votes. The only real beneficiary is Representative VITO MARCANTONIO, of the fellow-traveling Labor Party, whose aim is to discredit major parties.

The McConnell substitute put administration Democrats on a bad spot. If they voted against it, then they were in the position of opposing the only bill that had a chance of passage. But since it was a Republican-sponsored measure, they could not take very much credit to themselves for going along with it.

One thing clearly demonstrated in the House is that FEPC has become a rather sordid football to be kicked back and forth between the two parties. The ineptitude of the Democrats made it possible for the Republicans to grab the ball and run for a touchdown.

I believe that if the Hays bill had been passed and sent to the Senate it would have had a good chance for passage there. The whole matter would have been taken out of the area of angry attack and counterattack. In a trial interval it could have been determined whether a law without sanctions would serve the cause of equal job opportunity.

Lest We Forget

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. AIME J. FORAND
OF RHODE ISLAND
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. FORAND. Mr. Speaker, there was dedicated in the city of Providence, R. I., last year a new veterans' hospital which up until now is officially known as the Veterans' Administration Hospital, Davis Park, Providence, R. I.

The veterans of Rhode Island, speaking through the United Veterans' Council, which represents all the veterans' organizations in the State, have suggested that this new hospital be named the Capt. Elwood J. Euart Veterans' Memorial Hospital, and I am today introducing a bill which I hope will receive favorable consideration at an early date so that the hospital will officially bear the name of one of Rhode Island's outstanding war heroes, Capt. Elwood J. Euart, who gave his own life to save the lives of men serving under him.

The official records of the War Department reveal the true heroism of Captain Euart, as appears in a letter I received from the Adjutant General. I quote from that letter:

The records show that the United States Army transport *President Coolidge*, carrying approximately 4,000 Army personnel from the United States, was crippled by two mines while entering Espiritu Santo Harbor, New Hebrides, on the morning of October 26, 1942, and the alarm was sounded to abandon ship. Capt. Elwood J. Euart, service number O374388, intelligence officer of the One Hundred and Third Field Artillery Battalion, who had been detailed as troop mess officer for the voyage, was on duty in the enlisted men's mess hall at that time and personally checked the clearing of that area. Having safely reached his abandon-ship station, he learned of men trapped in the hold and went there. By lashing himself to the low end of a rope, he was able to hold it tight enough for men to climb up it to safety, even though the ship was badly listing. Finally, as he attempted to climb up, almost vertically by that moment, with the help of a few men at the other end of the line, the ship careened and sank very quickly. Captain Euart exhausted himself assisting many others, whose lives were thus undoubtedly spared at the expense of his own. For this extraordinary heroism he was posthumously awarded the Distinguished Service Cross.

Dangerous Kind of Politics

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include herewith the following editorial entitled "What's This, Politics?" which appeared in the East St. Louis (Ill.) Journal on Friday, February 24, 1950:

WHAT'S THIS, POLITICS?

Senator MCCARTHY, of Wisconsin, is still at it. He is continuing his vicious campaign against—well, what is his campaign against? He says there are Communists in the State Department, but so far he has failed to prove his charges.

Senator MCCARTHY's charges so far have been in the worst tradition of congressional demagogs. He has made charges, sensational charges, but he has not backed them up or proved them. He has been challenged time and again, but always he has refused to come forward with anything more real than his wild charges. Under the circumstances, it is impossible not to suspect his motives; if he would not be suspected, he should not act so as to arouse suspicion.

But what are Senator MCCARTHY's motives?

Is he honestly concerned about Communists being in the State Department, in the White House entourage? If he is, why does he not come forward and name the dangerous ones? If he believes they are really there and really are dangerous, he should be interested in seeing them removed at the earliest possible moment. The State Department has

promised to fire immediately any Communists that are shown to be on its staff.

But still Senator McCARTHY does nothing but make more charges, confusing charges in which he bandies about different figures that started at 205, dropped to 57, then rose to 81. He is not even consistent as to the number of Communists he says are in the State Department's employ.

Could the Senator's motives be political? It is not pleasant to say, but they could be. The Senator could be more interested in trying to discredit the administration—it being Democratic and he Republican—than in anything else. In fact, if Senator McCARTHY does not come forward soon with more proof than he has offered so far, the only conclusion possible will be that his charges are nothing but politics.

Sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. RALPH HARVEY
OF INDIANA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address by Hon. HOMER E. CAPEHART before the Indiana Society of Washington, D. C., celebrating the sesquicentennial of Indiana Territory, 1800 to 1950. The address deliyered at the Washington National Airport, February 19, 1950, is as follows:

Fellow Hoosiers, we are gathered here today to honor our native State and contemplate 150 years of events which have made Indiana one of the greatest States in this Nation.

We have just paid tribute to Paul Hadley, one of its noblest sons, a distinguished artist who gave us our beautiful banner.

It is fitting and right that we sons and daughters of Indiana, together with many friends of our beloved State, residing here in this great world capital should engage in this celebration commemorative of the 150 years during which Indiana has risen from a pioneer territory to a great State of agriculture, industry and the arts.

Those of us who because of our callings have found it necessary to reside apart from our native soil, gather frequently and exchange the typical Hoosier greeting of a heartfelt handshake and a pleasant word.

Today we are gathered to contemplate the noble history of our great State.

This is a sesquicentennial celebration marking 150 years of development of Indiana from a Territory, through statehood, to the high place of honor she now holds in the Union of States.

Indiana Territory was carved out of the vast area known as the Northwest Territory in the year 1800.

The original Indiana Territory embraced not only Indiana as we know it today, but also the land now included within the borders of our sister State—Illinois.

The territorial capitol was located at Vincennes, Ind., and William Henry Harrison—a great soldier and great citizen—was its first Governor, assuming this duty early in 1801.

He remained Indiana Territorial Governor until late in 1812, when he resigned to assume his military duties in the War of 1812.

Later this great man became the Ninth President of the United States, but unfortunately, he died in 1841 after only one month of service in that high office.

Our first Delegate from Indiana Territory, to the National Congress, was Benjamin Parke, another soldier and citizen of great distinction. He served in Congress as Territorial Delegate from 1805 to 1808, when he became Territorial Judge. In 1817 he was designated Judge of the First United States District Court for the State of Indiana, and continued in that capacity until his death at Salem, Ind., in 1835. Judge Parke had devoted 31 years of his life to the service of our great State.

Judge Parke was succeeded by Jesse B. Thomas as delegate from Indiana Territory. Delegate Thomas, headed a committee to determine whether Indiana Territory should be divided, and in his report urged this division, because the people of Illinois couldn't get across from Illinois to the court at Vincennes on account of muddy swamps.

The report also stated there were 11,000 people west of the Wabash River, and 17,000 east.

The report met violent opposition on the grounds and I quote verbatim "that the expense to the United States for this new government would be $6,950 yearly; that this proceeding might be very convenient to the men who should be appointed governors of judges, but for no other good purpose."

Our third and last territorial delegate was Jonathan Jennings. When it came to selecting the third delegate the people had been granted the right of suffrage. The contest was between Jennings and Thomas Randolph and the issue was slavery. Jennings opposed Indiana becoming a slave State.

Jennings served from November 27, 1809 until Indiana became a State. He made the strong fight for statehood and his efforts were crowned with victory when on December 6, 1816, William Henry Harrison, who had been governor of the Territory for 12 years and who was then a Representative from Ohio, moved a final resolution of statehood, which was adopted. This resolution was passed by the Senate and signed by President James Madison on December 11, 1816.

Delegate Jennings returned to Indiana, became the first governor and later returned to Washington to serve four successive terms to Congress.

Our first Representative in Congress was William Hendricks. He served from December 2, 1816, until his resignation to become Indiana's third governor. At the close of his term as governor he was elected United States Senator for Indiana and served from 1825 to 1837.

Our first two Senators were James Noble and Waller Taylor. The annals of Congress do not indicate Taylor took an active part in debates, but Senator Noble was a strong and effective debater. Senator Noble served in the Senate until his death here in Washington in 1831.

Impressive ceremonies were held in the Capitol, attended by the President and the Cabinet, and Indiana's first Senator was laid to rest in the Eastern Branch Burial Ground (now known as the Congressional Cemetery) here in Washington.

Yesterday, Mr. Hadley and I had the honor to visit the grave of this great man and place a wreath on his grave on behalf of the Indiana Society of Washington.

With Indiana taking her place among the States of the Union in 1816, she embarked on her great career. In public life she not only supplied the early leadership of such men as Parke, Jennings, Hendricks, and Noble, but as the years rolled along, her sons—William Henry Harrison and Benjamin Harrison—served as Presidents of the United States.

Colfax, Hendricks, Fairbanks, and Marshall were elected Vice Presidents and many distinguished sons have served her faithfully and well as Members of Congress and Government officials.

One son, Senator Dan Voorhees, served from 1877 to 1897, became popularly known as the "Tall Sycamore of the Wabash." While in Congress, he planted a tall sycamore at the foot of the Capitol and while the original tree died a few years ago, another sycamore was planted to replace the original tree.

This tree stands today a monument, not only to the memory of the man who introduced the resolution to establish the beautiful building which houses the Library of Congress, but to our State through whose sycamores the candlelights gleam along the Wabash.

Not only have Indiana's sons contributed to the affairs of government, but I need hardly remind you in the field of literature some of the Nation's greatest names are Hoosier—Riley, Wallace, Ade, Tarkington, Dreiser, Nicholson—and in music—Cole Porter, Hoagy Carmichael, Paul Dresser.

Many great sons and daughters throughout 150 years of history.

As Indiana grew, her great resources of coal, oil, gas, limestone, clay were developed by her people. Her fertile fields yield crops of the finest agricultural products—apples, tomatoes, onions, corn, wheat, hogs, turkeys, and again sons and daughters of Indiana took leadership.

The first automobile was built by Elwood Haynes at Kokomo in 1894.

Canals, railroads, wide paved highways, and air lines were established.

While the great wealth and resources of her lands were developing, Indiana took leadership in education as well.

The first State university west of the Appalachian Mountains was established as a State university in Bloomington.

Later, Indiana State Teachers' College was started at Terre Haute in 1870 and Ball State Teachers' College was opened at Muncie in 1917. Purdue University was organized in 1874 and is today one of the leading agriculture and engineering schools of the country.

Religious groups of all faiths founded colleges and today Indiana has the finest educational opportunities for her young sons and daughters.

Soon you will see a picture entitled "Indiana has Almost Everything."

Indiana today, as you will see from this fine picture, is a State in which we can all be justly proud—and in the words of another Hoosier, John McGee—as given to the Indiana Society of Chicago last Saturday night, I close—

"Where springs are sweetest and autumns gayest,
Small towns with Indian names,
The Wabash sparkling white under the summer moon,
Green fields of slowly waving corn,
Autumns full of the smell of burning leaves,
And huesome harvest fields stretching away into a saffron setting sun.
Bittersweet and basketball, pawpaws and pumpkins,
Country church crowds on sunlit Sunday mornings,
Courthouses with worn down front steps,
And trotting races at the county fair,
Land of Lincoln-like lawyers,
Brown County and Turkey Run,
State that remembers canals and covered bridges,
Thomas R. Marshall, Albert J. Beveridge, Benjamin and William Henry Harrison.
Literary land of poets and writers,
James Whitcomb Riley, George Ade, Booth Tarkington,
Theodore Dreiser, Meredith Nicholson and Abe Martin,
Land haunted by red men whose canoes seem to drift down blue green curving rivers,
Land of the Speedway, sycamores, and friendly conversational folk.
'On the Banks of the Wabash'—Hoosierdom and Home."

Eightieth Anniversary of Richmond Avenue Church, Buffalo, N. Y.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ANTHONY F. TAURIELLO
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. TAURIELLO. Mr. Speaker, recently the Richmond Avenue Church of Christ, of Buffalo, N. Y., my home town, celebrated its eightieth anniversary, and I want to join with my fellow Buffalonians in extending felicitations and all best wishes to its pastor, the Reverend W. L. Burner, and to its parishioners on this happy occasion.

This church has had a splendid history of four decades of service to its country, its community, and its parishioners. It occupies a respected place in Buffalo, for it has achieved an enviable record in religious, educational, and community matters and in bringing about cooperation and mutual understanding among the churches of various denominations in western New York.

To the pastor and the parishioners of this church I offer my heartiest congratulations and my sincerest wishes for many more years of good work for God and community.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I am including the following article from the Buffalo Courier-Express in connection with the celebration of this anniversary:

MATERIALISM IN WORLD ASSAILED BY THE REVEREND LANKLER

The hydrogen bomb makes a war of extermination possible because most of the world, even the United States, is gripped by a materialistic philosophy and people are more interested in what they will eat and wear than in seeking the kingdom of God, the Reverend Ralph C. Lankler, of Cortland, said here yesterday.

The Reverend Dr. Lankler spoke at the eightieth anniversary service of the Richmond Avenue Church of Christ, where he was ordained into the ministry 25 years ago. For the last 7 years he has been minister of the First Presbyterian Church in Cortland.

The Reverend Dr. Lankler began his sermon by emphasizing that there is a "great ferment of social upheaval" in the modern word and now "there is the hydrogen bomb hanging like the sword of Damocles over our heads."

"It is inconceivable that human beings as civilized as we are in the United States would ever use a mass killer of civilian population such as the atom bomb, but we did—and we can be assured that if another war comes anything and everything will be used to win it," he said.

The Cortland minister stated that three things have been tried to cure "the sick souls of society and correct the ills of our social order." He listed these as social welfare and justice, psychology and psychiatry, and science and education.

But, he said, although tremendous strides have been made in all these fields, "let us ask ourselves if our Nation is any better morally or spiritually than it was 25 years before many of these improvements for social betterment took place."

"Every economic system should be judged in the light of what it does for the individual and would we say that we are developing individuals of a higher character or more noble character?" he asked.

"On the contrary," he added, "just the opposite is indicated by the vast number of broken homes and delinquent children, the general immorality that seems to have control of our Nation."

Psychology as a means of curing mankind's ill has proven to be a false hope, said the Reverend Dr. Lankler, because, although psychologists can take the mind and emotions apart, they are unable to put the human personality together as a spiritual whole.

Pointing out that humans are fundamentally spiritual creatures, the Reverend Dr. Lankler said "the peace of mind or soul that the troubled souls of our day desire will not be found in books filled with psychological admonitions, but may be established through a right relationship between ourselves and our Creator."

"Peace is not something that we find or earn—it is a gift of God," he said.

Turning to education as a hope, the minister pointed out that Germany and Japan were two of the most literate nations on earth when they started World War II.

"Have we noticed any improvement in the character of our Nation comparable to the growth and development of our educational institutions?" he asked. "Educating a person with evil thoughts or the wrong motives is like putting a stick of dynamite into the hands of a child."

Returning to the theme of his sermon—Christianity is the Answer—the Reverend Dr. Lankler declared:

"Someone has said that the mind that can create the hydrogen bomb can control the hydrogen bomb so that it will not be used for our destruction. I would agree with this statement if it were changed to say 'the human mind controlled by the spirit of God.' We all know that the human mind can be controlled by evil as well as good."

"Christianity is the answer to the sick souls in our troubled world because it has the gospel for that purpose," he concluded. "It teaches us that we cannot be saved without the help of God as revealed through Jesus Christ."

Observances of the Richmond Avenue institution's eightieth anniversary were concluded last night with a pageant depicting the high lights in the church's history. Entitled "The Light of the World," it was written by the Reverend W. L. Burner, pastor, and produced by Mrs. Ralph E. Theobald.

Bank Deposits Safe Because of New Deal FDIC

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. MELVIN PRICE
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. PRICE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I include the following article from the Denver Post of November 2, 1949:

FDIC GUARDS YOUR CASH—BUT OLD GUARD SNATCHES AT NEW DEAL LAURELS

(By Roscoe Fleming)

An engaging aspect of the new deal—now the welfair deal—is the wistful way some of its opponents lay claim to such crumbs of credit for it as they can.

When a movie nowadays shows a run on a bank, with all its ruin and heart-break, most viewers are too young to feel anything but detached historical interest. They can no more imagine it in their own lives than they can a slave auction.

They can't remember when you debated whether your $3.87 would be safer in this bank or in that—and when many folks preferred to stash their savings instead under a mattress or a hearthside brick.

A mighty small rumor could start a mighty big run. Bankers' occupational disease was bankers' nerves, for we were too unsophisticated to know about ulcers.

Nowadays everyone sleeps sweeter, for behind bankers and depositors alike stands the solid safeguarding reality of Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, keeping your funds safe.

It has more than $1,000,000,000 stashed away to guard your $3.87, and has paid back all the money Uncle lent it, so it's on its own feet. Yet you may notice that banks in advertising their membership still refer to it as "a Federal agency." They know what folks think is safe.

Recently the people of a midwestern village discovered that a bank official had handed the stuff out to his friends until there was little left but the furniture.

A generation ago that would have meant community panic, and tragedy for every home. Now FDIC stands solid as a rock. There's surprise and regret, but no panic.

Senator HOMER CAPEHART of Indiana, the bawlbox king, hardly lets a day go by without denouncing the New Deal. But this was different. He told the Senate proudly that Senator VANDENBERG of Michigan was the real father of FDIC, and in Senator CAPEHART'S elegant quote, "stuffed it down F. D. R.'s throat."

Senator VANDENBERG deserves the tribute, the more so since he has often cracked the impermeable shell against reality which the Capeharts exude around themselves like oysters.

But bank failures averaged several hundred yearly throughout the era of wonderful nonsense, rising to several thousand at its catastrophic close, yet succeeding administrations of Senator CAPEHART'S party did nothing effective about it. That was left for F. D. R.'s party to do.

We shouldn't begrudge the crumbs of credit that the Capeharts may be able to snatch from under the overflowing New Deal table.

But isn't it likely that a decade from now some newer Capehart may be wistfully claiming a little of the credit for something they're snarling at now?

Gen. William Booth Taliaferro

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. HOWARD W. SMITH
OF VIRGINIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following address prepared for delivery by the late Hon. Schuyler Otis Bland:

I feel most highly favored, far beyond my ability to express, for the honor which has been conferred upon me in permitting me to participate on this occasion which commemorates the achievements of Gen. William Booth Taliaferro, Confederate States of America.

As a boy and as a young man, it was my privilege and good fortune to know General Taliaferro personally. He was born and reared in my native county of Gloucester.

Among my most beloved friends was his son, William C. L. Taliaferro, who was a student with me at the Gloucester Academy and later at the College of William and Mary. As lawyers, he and I practiced before the bar in Hampton, Elizabeth City, and Newport News, and the devoted friendship we formed as children continued until his death. I can say with all the truth of which I am capable that it lives with me to this solemn hour.

So while I revere General Taliaferro's memory as one of the great men that our State has produced, there is also a sense of personal kinship. His unfailing courtesy to everyone, young and old alike, was at all times so outstanding that every person who met him felt that he was meeting a personal friend. He could even bestow that great gift to the young lad that was I.

General Taliaferro's distinguished career as a soldier in both the Mexican and Civil Wars is well known to all of us here but it is to General Taliaferro, the scholar and the devoted friend of education in Virginia that we pay tribute today.

When his daughter, Nina Taliaferro Sanders, so graciously asked me to make a few remarks on this important occasion, I turned to one of the most highly valued publications in my private library, a small volume entitled "The Seven Wise Men" written by Howard W. Wisemen of the College of William and Mary. "The Seven Wise Men" composed the faculty of William and Mary at the time of its reorganization in 1888 and it was my good fortune to have studied under these gentlemen. They were Dr. Lyon Gardner Tyler, John Leslie Hall, Dr. Thomas Jefferson Stubbs, Lyman Brown Powell Wharton (known to his old students as "Lima Bean"), Hugh Stockdale Bird, Dr. Charles Edward Bishop and Dr. Van Garrett. These were able, patriotic, loyal and hard-working men. I wish that time would permit a more complete discussion of the worth of each of these gentlemen because it was with this faculty that General Taliaferro worked as a member of the board of visitors of the College of William and Mary during that trying time. I remember now, even as though it were yesterday, seeing the board of visitors come into the chapel to greet the faculty and students and how proud I was that I knew personally one of those august gentlemen, General Taliaferro. I can see him now, tall and gracious as he entered, bearing a marked resemblance to Gen. Robert E. Lee, who was to most of us little short of the divine.

To have been a student of the College of William and Mary during the time of these great men was an inspiration and honor that I cherish to this day. A word or a wish from General Taliaferro or any of his co-workers constituted a command to me. There is a temptation to one as he grows old to dwell too long upon the past. I plead guilty and offer as my only excuse the magnificent work done by these men. Their glorious labors I remember and I wish devoutly that all of us could follow in their footsteps.

History has well taken care of the memory of "the Seven Wise Men" and the honorable gentlemen that composed the Board of Visitors but it is one of my warmest possessions that I knew at first hand the splendid contribution these men made to the success and to the honor and glory of William and Mary. To General Taliaferro and each of his colleagues, it was sacred work and a labor of love to make the college an instrument of good government built upon the design and plan of Thomas Jefferson, whom we all regarded as an elder brother. All of them labored for her and sought to make her what she finally became. To each she was and still is a mother. This was the lesson of General Taliaferro and the men like him and that lesson lives with each of us yet.

The general graduated from William and Mary in 1841 and then studied law at Harvard. There he knew as a friend and classmate a young man, George F. Hoar, who was later to represent the State of Massachusetts in the Senate of the United States. When the Civil War was over and the South deep in its poverty of reconstruction, General Taliaferro went to Washington to contact his old friend. As a result of the friendship and respect that Senator Hoar had for the general, his influence was used to secure passage of a bill which reimbursed the College of William and Mary for the damage done to the Wren Building during the Civil War.

Another achievement of General Taliaferro's will be forever recalled. With Colonel Lamb of Norfolk, he reorganized the Alpha chapter of Phi Beta Kappa here at the College of William and Mary. It is interesting to note that General Taliaferro was a member of this society, as were his four sons, James, Warner, William and Edward.

The general served as a loyal and active member of the board of visitors from 1870 until his death in 1898, but he did not confine his interest in matters of education to William and Mary. He was also a member of the board of visitors of the Virginia Military Institute and was one of the founding fathers of the State Female College at Farmville (now known as Longwood College). In his own county of Gloucester he established many public schools for white children and the first free school for Negroes.

On the mace of the College of William and Mary are engraved the names of 29 men, graduates of the college, who made outstanding contributions to education. Here in this distinguished company, which includes Thomas Jefferson, is to be found the name of William B. Taliaferro. This is the tribute—this is the memorial that will forever endure.

I know the warm pride that General Taliaferro's descendants are feeling today. To his daughter, Mrs. Sanders, to his nephew, Dr. Wellford, and to his many grandchildren and great-grandchildren, I extend my affection and my assurance that on this day my pride is equally deep.

I congratulate the College of William and Mary for having had General Taliaferro as a student and as an inspired and tireless worker on its behalf throughout his entire life. To commemorate him today and to hang his portrait in this library is to recognize the enduring achievements of one of the South's great gentlemen and scholars.

Thirty-second Anniversary of the Independence of Lithuania

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the following resolution adopted at a recent meeting of the Knights of Lithuania in commemoration of the thirty-second anniversary of the independence of Lithuania:

RESOLUTION OF KNIGHTS OF LITHUANIA, NEW YORK AND NEW JERSEY DISTRICT

Whereas man has been endowed by his Creator with certain inalienable rights which no human power or authority can wrest from him; and

Whereas chief among these inalienable right is the sovereign right of all peoples to choose for themselves the form of government under which they wish to live; and

Whereas the principles of the Atlantic Charter, which our Government signed, respect and guarantee this right to all nations, both large and small, to govern themselves without interference from any outside source; and

Whereas the allied nations among these our own United States fought World War II presumably for the assurance of peace which cannot be if large nations are allowed against all principles of justice and charity to subject small nations to tyrannical rule; and

Whereas Lithuania, a neutral and liberty-loving nation, has proven by her 21 years (1918–39) of advancement in all fields of endeavor that she is capable of self-rule and has ever respected this right of self-government of all peoples; and

Whereas Soviet Russia has ruthlessly and shamelessly deprived Lithuania of her freedom and is now following a policy of the complete annihilation of her people through merciless deportation into Siberia, through the relentless destruction of her government, industry, culture, and educational system, and through the cruel plunder of her population by wholesale murder and imprisonment; and

Whereas this policy followed by Soviet Russia against Lithuania is openly and defiantly against the principles of the Atlantic Charter and against the democratic policy of our own United States; and

Whereas Soviet Russia is continuing to perpetuate the heinous crime of genocide against the Baltic people: Be it

Resolved, That the Government of the United States firmly evoke the principles of the Atlantic Charter and effectively use its influence upon the United Nations to apply these principles to all nations, both large and small; be it further

Resolved, That the Government of the United States maintain and uphold its present policy of nonrecognition of Russian absorption of the Baltic states and ever use its influence to bring about the immediate and positive restoration of the independence of Lithuania and the other Baltic nations; be it further

Resolved, That our Government insist upon the immediate cessation of atrocities and inhumane treatment now being inflicted upon Lithuanian and the other Baltic peoples by Soviet Russia; be it further

Resolved, That proper provision be made to have protests and grievances addressed by small nonmember countries to the United Nations, be officially acknowledged by the Secretary General, and taken before the Little Assembly; be it further

Resolved, That Lithuania be admitted as a member of the United Nations, and that her official representatives be permitted to enjoy the status of duly elected delegates to that organization; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be forwarded to the President of the United States, His Excellency Harry S. Truman; to the Secretary of State, the Honorable Dean Acheson; to the Senators and Representatives of the States of New Jersey and New York.

Respectfully submitted.

ALEXANDER WESEY,
Chairman.
ANNE M. KLEM,
Secretary.

Celler Offers Resolution To Investigate Denazification Program in Germany

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. EMANUEL CELLER
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 13, 1950

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I have this day offered a resolution authorizing the Committee on Foreign Affairs to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the conduct and status of the denazification program in the zone of Germany under occupation by the United States.

Recent events in Germany indicate that dangerous trends are seriously at work, which if allowed to continue, would undermine the whole import of the denazification program. The acquittal of Wolfgang Hedler, who publicly stated that the extermination of the Jews might have been wrong but there were other ways of getting rid of them, is a flagrant example of this trend. Hedler was tried on charges of spreading anti-Semitism, and was freed by a national court of judges. Our High Commissioner John J. McCloy, protested this acquittal, and has evidenced his desire to put a curb on the growth of nationalism in Germany. But statements and protests in the face of such defiance is not enough. In his Progress Report on Germany, Mr. McCloy states:

> There is nationalism in Germany. There is a nationalist fringe on the extreme right which is more active than it has been. There is a Communist fringe that plays the Soviet game, and there is the persistent tendency of both these fringes to work together.

It has been said that it is difficult to undo the 12-year rule of Hitler in 5 years, but pressing signs of the recurrence of nazism and all its attendant evils show a pattern of regression which must be stopped. Otherwise, we will be faced with the spectre of a third world war with Germany. First the Huns, then the Nazis, and then again the devil reincarnate.

From some quarters we hear that we must use the Nazis to offset the Russians. Such comfort can only be imaginary. We could never rely on the Nazis to fight the Russians. Those who believe this myth might well remember the Hitler-Stalin pact. It is time to question the resurgence of evil forces.

The text of the resolution follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Foreign Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to conduct a full and complete study and investigation of all matters relating to the conduct and status of the denazification program in the zone of Germany under occupation by the United States, especially as concerns (a) the result of transferring responsibility for denazification to the German authorities; (b) whether or not there is infiltration of former Nazis, Nazi supporters, and other antidemocratic elements into denazification tribunals; (c) whether or not former Nazis and other antidemocratic elements have been eliminated from high position in public office and the economic life of Germany; (d) whether or not there has been reinstatement of thousands of Nazi teachers to former or higher positions in the Bavarian and other public school systems; (e) whether or not there is resurgence of intensive anti-Semitism and militant nationalism in the United States zone; (f) whether or not there is a rise of strong new political parties based on Nazi doctrine and militarism; (g) whether or not there has been reappearance of Nazi-type propaganda in the German press; (h) whether or not there is development in the German youth of appreciation of and devotion to democratic institutions; and to report with expedition its findings, together with such recommendations as it deems proper, to the House of Representatives.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-first Congress, to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants, to require by subpena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such correspondence, books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The committee is authorized, with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the service, information, and facilities of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

Proposed Legislation Regarding Traffic Management in the Federal Government

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. CHET HOLIFIELD
OF CALIFORNIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation to provide for an adequate traffic management service in the Federal Government. The proposed legislation is to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by defining the duties and functions of the Administrator of General Services with respect to transportation and traffic management. A Federal Traffic Service is to be created as a constituent unit of the General Services Administration, for the purpose of coordinating the transportation activities of the various departments and agencies and performing central management services that will reduce costs and increase efficiency in the movement of Government traffic.

Uncle Sam spends approximately $1,000,000,000 to move public property as an incident to carrying on the business of Government. By dollar volume of expenditure, Government traffic is big business, and it is high time that it be handled on a businesslike basis. Private corporations have learned the value of efficient traffic management. In proportion the large corporations invest substantially more than the Federal Government for traffic management and they make this investment because it pays off in dollar savings.

What savings can be expected if the Federal Government establishes an adequate traffic-management service? A Hoover Commission task force which gave careful study to this problem, estimated that within the next few years 20 to 25 percent of the Government's transportation bill could be saved. Since this transportation bill approximates $1,000,000,000 a year, possible savings would be $200,000,000 to $250,000,000 yearly.

These savings would result from vigorous action by the Federal Traffic Service, not only to obtain more advantageous rates in the shipping of public property, but also to get the full benefit of existing rates by improved practices and procedures in the traffic field. The Hoover Commission task force noted that the Government is paying the carriers between $50,000,000 and $100,000,000 per year in excess of their legal rates and charges. In other words, even aside from the problem of unreasonable rates, Uncle Sam is overpaying huge sums each year because he lacks the kind of traffic-management organization that can do a job for him. The task force reasons in this connection:

> It must be realized that the loss by the Government of the use of this money, measured not only in terms of the interest value represented but also in terms of the reduction in the activities of those Departments and Agencies whose appropriations have thereby been depleted, is contrary to the best interests of the Government.

The legislation I propose was developed on the basis of the Hoover Commission task-force recommendations with respect to traffic management in the Federal Government. It should be noted that this is not a proposal for a completely new agency or service. The general framework of organization was provided by Public Law 152 of this Congress, the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act. That law opens the door to the development of a traffic-management organization by giving statutory recognition to traffic management as one of the Federal supply functions. However, it was generally understood by the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization, which was responsible for Public Law 152, that further legislation clearly defining the intent of Congress would be necessary in this field and several related fields.

During the Eightieth Congress the Procurement and Buildings Subcommittee of the House Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments held hearings on the problems of traffic management and the feasibility of a central traffic bureau in the Federal Government. The committee unanimously recomended that this matter be further investigated, particularly as to the appropriate form of legislation.

My proposed legislation takes account of the legislative developments in the fields of procurement and property management, as well as of the findings of the Hoover Commission task force which reported on the Federal Supply System.

It is designed to fit into Public Law 152 as a new title.

I believe that the provisions of this bill are in accord with the principles of good management as practiced by large business and industrial organizations. It will register the intent of Congress in a field which has long suffered statutory neglect and it will provide the administrative means for effecting substantial savings.

Missoula Labor Observes Double Anniversary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF

HON. MIKE MANSFIELD

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I am happly to bring to the attention of the House an article which appeared in the Sunday Missoulian of Missoula, Mont., and dated February 19, 1950.

I am proud of the record made by organized labor in western Montana. It is not a new idea out there but it is something which has grown up with our State.

Montana labor has always endeavored to work out solutions of its difficulties on an equitable and fair basis and always with the public interest in mind. I am especially pleased with the creation of the Missoula Labor-Management Board under the chairmanship of the distinguished president of Montana State University, Dr. James A. McCain, and composed of representatives of labor and management. This board has done an outstanding job and its worth has been vindicated on more than one occasion.

Not only is Missoula labor to be commended on its fortieth anniversary but the oldest continuous member of the Trades Council, Oscar Helding, an old friend of mine is also to be congratulated.

To the members of organized labor in Missoula County my congratulations for a job well done over the past 40 years; to the members of the labor-management council, my hope that success will continue to mark your efforts; and to the membership of both organizations—many of them my close personal friends—my prayers that the next half-century will be as fruitful as the years just passed. You all typify the America we love and all of you have contributed to the welfare and betterment of our country.

The article follows:

LABOR IN MISSOULA WILL OBSERVE DOUBLE ANNIVERSARY THIS WEEK

Celebrating the fortieth anniversary of its affiliation with the American Federation of Labor this week, and the one-hundredth anniversary of the birth of Samuel Gompers, long-time president of the A. F. of L., the Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council will move into new quarters in the remodeled ground floor of the union hall. Space has been provided for new offices for unions, and the back part of the ground floor has been made into a clubroom for union members of Missoula County.

The council affiliated with the American Federation of Labor in 1910. The charter, signed by Samuel Gompers, was granted January 11 of that year, and the first meeting after the charter was received was held in February.

Early records of the council were destroyed in 1911 when the building in which the council had its offices burned, but sufficient history of the labor movement in Missoula has been preserved by old-time members to present a picture of the early days of organized labor in Missoula.

COMPLETED IN 1916

The present union hall was completed in 1916, when the Union Hall Co. was organized and local unions subscribed for the stock. The lots on which the building stands were donated by the late Marcus Daly to the Western Labor Union, parent of the present organization.

The ground floor front of the building has been rebuilt with brick and glass blocks, and the offices are air conditioned and soundproofed. The council and unions have occupied cramped quarters on the second floor of the building, but a spokesman said the new offices "will be the finest occupied by any labor organization in Montana."

Thursday night the public will have opportunity to inspect the new quarters.

HELDING'S ANNIVERSARY

Not only is this the birthday party for the council, but also for the delegate with the longest continuous membership in the council. Oscar Helding, delegate from Barbers Union, No. 585, will be a guest of honor. His birthday is Thursday, and he was first seated in the council as a delegate in March 1910. He was president of the council in 1914.

The presidents have been: 1910, James R. Froman, A. W. Williams; 1911, Cuthbert Peat; 1912, D. W. Fitzpatrick; 1913, Charles E. Dodge; 1914, Mr. Helding, J. Brown; 1915, C. A. English; 1916, T. E. Arnoldy; 1917–19, H. B. Cain; 1920, H. C. Johnson; 1921–22, C. H. Cook, H. K. Powell; 1923, T. P. Wilburn, E. F. Klett, John Oberly; 1924, E. E. Bestor; 1925, James M. Gregg; 1926, H. E. Fullerton, T. F. Wright; 1927, N. I. Keator; 1928, Grant Dean, E. F. Klett; 1929, V. E. Crimmins; 1930, L. H. Daly, C. H. Christenson; 1931, Frank Roedl; 1932, Samuel Barrett, 1933–34, S. H. Rivin; 1935–36–37, Ryland Walford, S. A. Barrett; 1938–39, E. A. Atkinson, R. W. Stratton; 1940–41, R. W. Stratton; 1942–43, Pete Baron; 1944, S. H. Rivin; 1945, Laverne Hamilton; 1946–47, Sherman Brock; 1948–49–50, James S. Umber

There are more than 4,000 union members affiliated with the Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council at the present time. Largest unions in Missoula County are Hotel and Restaurant Workers local No. 427, while running so close as to almost equal is Lumber and Sawmill Workers No. 3038 of Bonner, paying per capita to the council on approximately 400 members each. Lathers Union No. 212, with only seven members, is the smallest union in the county.

LABOR-MANAGEMENT BOARD

Following World War II an epidemic of strikes occurred over most of the country and Missoula had some. Labor and civic leaders realized that some better method of settling labor disputes must be found and early in 1948 committees from the central council and the chamber of commerce met and formed the labor-management board of Missoula.

The board consists of 14 members and an impartial chairman. Seven members are appointed from the central labor council and seven from the chamber of commerce, these electing an impartial chairman of the board. Present chairman is Dr. James A. McCain, president of Montana State University, who has held the position for 2 years and was reelected for a third term this month. Representing management on the board are Oakley Coffee, vice chairman, L. A. Colby, H. R. Dix, John E. Hightower, S. J. Howard, Otis J. Mudd, board secretary, and William Steinbrenner. Labor members are Edgar Cozad, vice chairman Herbert T. Bartron, Jr., Donald Chatfield, Frank Matthews, Dene Pfeiffer, James S. Umber, and Reva Walterskirchen.

While not able to head off all work stoppages in the past 2 years, the board has been successful in settling many disputes that might have resulted in stoppages.

Meetings are held in the university school of journalism building, where once each month, oftener if necessary, members of the board sit down to try to iron out those disagreements which have arisen during the month. Often disputes are cleared up in one meeting, sometimes they are referred to subcommittees for a final settlement. One contract took 5 months to settle to the satisfaction of both parties, another one with a different union needed an emergency meeting to settle a dispute which would have resulted in a strike the following morning. In both cases the board's efforts were successful, and these contracts now have clauses specifying that any dispute must be referred to the labor-management board for settlement.

The story of the Missoula County central labor bodies is the story of labor itself in Missoula. Organized over 50 years ago, the first group was originally known as the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council and was affiliated with the Montana State Labor Council. In 1905, the Missoula group became affiliated with the Montana State Federation of Labor, and assumed the name of Missoula County Central Trades and Labor Council.

Because of the fire that destroyed the union hall in 1911, there is no record of the exact date when the first trades and labor council was organized in Missoula. However, the Knights of Labor had a labor assembly in Missoula in 1894 which may have functioned as a central council, but there are no records to prove that a trades and labor council existed in Missoula that year. Mixed assemblies of the Knights of Labor took in all workers who were not eligible for membership in an existing union.

MANY CHANGES

The Western Federation of Miners was organized in 1894 by Ed Boyce and affiliated with the American Federation of Labor. In 1896 the Western Federation of Miners withdrew from the American Federation of Labor and organized the Western Labor Union. Loggers and sawmill workers of western Montana affiliated with this union.

The Federal Labor Union, local No. 43, date of organization unknown, was the mother of most of the building trades before they were organized into separate crafts. Federal Labor Union No. 43 was an affiliate of the Western Labor Union. The local membership consisted of carpenters, laborers, laundry workers, barbers, and other crafts.

Late in 1896 or early in 1897, the Western Labor Union issued a charter to the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council of Missoula—at that time Flathead and Missoula Counties extended to the Idaho border. The jurisdiction of the Western Montana Trades and Labor Council extended from Bonner westward to Idaho and from Idaho on the south to British Columbia on the north.

A convention of the Western Labor Union changed the name of that organization to American Labor Union and new charters were issued to all the affiliated unions bearing the name American Labor Union, without any reorganization taking place.

Late in the year 1904, the general offices of the American Labor Union in Denver closed up for reasons unknown to the membership of that organization. However, the local unions of those organizations func-

tioned as independent unions, while retaining a central labor council.

The Montana State Federation of Labor was chartering unions in 1904 and when the American Labor Union went out of business the unions in western Montana, including the Missoula Trades and Labor Council, that were affiliated with the American Labor Union applied for charters from the Montana State Federation of Labor.

An old cash book of the Missoula Trades and Labor Council indicates that R. A. Fuller was the 1904–05 secretary and that 15 unions were affiliated with the early council. These unions were the stationary engineers, Federal Labor Union No. 43, printers, carpenters, woodworkers, cooks and waiters, plumbers, lumber workers, farmers, barbers, electricians, retail clerks, lathers, painters, and bricklayers.

The Missoula Trades and Labor Council held its charter from the State federation of labor until that organization ceased to issue charters, then the council was chartered by the American Federation of Labor in 1910. While the Missoula Trades and Labor Council has operated under four different charters, it has been in continual existence and functioned continually from the time it first organized regardless from what organization it held a charter.

The American Federation of Labor granted the Missoula council a charter as a direct affiliate on January 11, 1910. At that time the council had increased its membership to 26 unions. At the present time there are 34 unions affiliatel with the central council.

The first American Federation of Labor union chartered in Missoula of which there is record is local No. 277 of the International Typographical Union, chartered on February 2, 1891, and still operating under the same charter. The next oldest charter in Missoula is Carpenters and Joiners Local No. 28, organized in 1895. James Umber, of local No. 28, is now president of the central trades council and Frank Matthews, president of local No. 277, is secretary-treasurer of the council. Another early-day charter still active is the bricklayers and masons, organized in 1897. The cigar-makers union was one of the earliest in Missoula, but that charter has been surrendered and the date of its issue is uncertain. The pioneer unions of Missoula, however, are the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers and the Brotherhood of Locomotive Firemen. Later a lodge of the Order of Railroad Conductors was organized. But the Big Four railroad brotherhoods were never affiliated with the American Federation of Labor or Missoula central labor bodies.

Bombs Over Washington

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CLARK W. THOMPSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. THOMPSON. Mr. Speaker, yesterday's Washington Times-Herald contained an editorial entitled "Bombs Over Washington." It was of unusual interest to me because of its very kindly reference to the people of my home town of Galveston, Tex.

It points to Galvestonians as people who have learned to conquer the elements and who have developed the type of intestinal fortitude which prompts them to remain at home among their friends and kindred spirits whenever there is disaster, or threat of disaster.

Possibly the author of the editorial overdrew the picture slightly. I do not hesitate to recognize people who leave when the hurricane threatens. However, the real old-timers, the ones who built the city and who now maintain it, have learned that there is nothing in a hurricane to cause fear provided you prepare for it.

The spirit of Galveston may well be commended to the people of Washington, or to the people of any other city, as an example of how to behave in time of trouble.

The editorial is appended hereto with appreciation to the Times-Herald:

BOMBS OVER WASHINGTON

How do you think you will behave if the day actually comes that the Russians are over the Capitol dome with the H-bomb?

IT CAN HAPPEN

Thanks to American and British traitors, that's a question we must now ask ourselves. These traitors have armed the Russians with bomb know-how. And incompetents in the White House, State Department, and elsewhere have armed the Russians with the idea that the United States of America will be a soft touch.

As a result here we are, less than 5 years away from the biggest and most terrible war in all human experience, with the President of the United States of America blustering about how tough he is going to be with Stalin hereafter, and the rest of us wondering when and how an even worse war than ever will crash down.

It is obvious that in any such war this beautiful and pleasant city of Washington will be on the front line. And if what the scientists say is true, just one H-bomb will toss the whole town into the trash heap of history.

That is why, every now and then, somebody up on Capitol Hill brings up the subject of an alternate capital of the Republic, and that is why everybody in town knows the ill-kept secret that the Department of Defense is working on just such a proposition.

In the event of war, plain common sense dictates that our military forces must be able to carry on, no matter what happens, and to do that they must have secret and secure places from which to run the fighting.

But as for the President, Congress, and all the rest of us, things are a little different. All of us have to stay here, bombs or no bombs.

For Washington is not only a city. It is a symbol.

WHAT IF YOU RUN?

If this city and all of us in it were wiped out by an H-bomb, what of it? The Republic could still win its war and put together another Federal city wherever, however, and whenever it might choose. The destruction of Washington would be a curable disaster, and no doubt the tears would be dried quicker than we in our vanity might now think.

Every now and then something comes along to remind that man does not live by bread alone, and that when he tries to, he doesn't even get to keep the bread for very long.

It may be unpleasant to think about, but just the same, let's face it. We all die at least once. And nothing rings with more truth than the old saying that a coward dies a thousand times.

Just think how many times you would die if, in the event of war, you really had left Washington to hide in the Ozarks as some so lightly say now they will.

This country wasn't built by people of such a stripe, nor will it survive its present troubles if people of such a stripe set its fashion of thought and behavior. And for better or worse, Washington sets the fashion when a war is on, because the Nation cannot help but watch this city night and day for news of the struggle. So let's face it. In the event of Russian bombers over the Capitol, nobody can leave this town.

For the instinct of survival, we offer you the real American case of Galveston, Tex.

THE INSTINCT OF SURVIVAL

Galveston is right out on an exposed flat point at the edge of the Gulf of Mexico. It is low on the water and cut off from the mainland except by a causeway system. And nature has done all it could to run the Galvestonians away.

On September 8, 1900, a hurricane and tidal wave killed 6,000 of them and devastated the property of nearly all. On August 17, 1914, another hurricane killed 275 more, with heavy property loss.

Hardly a year goes by that Galveston escapes threats of some kind of natural disaster. Every time there is a storm, high water backs up in the channel and reminds the whole town how easily another two-foot lift in the sea could make an end to everything.

What do they do about it? They work hard and build seawalls. But that is not all.

In Galveston there is a rule: You can cross that causeway to the mainland anytime, unless the weather bureau has run up a storm warning. If you cross the causeway then, just keep on going.

For if you come back to town after the danger has passed, you are dead so far as Galveston is concerned. Nobody will do business with you or even speak. They won't even let their children marry your children. They are not talky tough about it. They just forget you or any of your family have ever lived. Consequently, cowardice is seldom seen in Galveston and the city continues to survive the sea.

That's a true story and it is one Americans can understand. We'd better have the Galveston spirit here in these times or it won't matter whether the Russians bother to drop an H-bomb on us.

On the other hand, with the Galveston spirit we can't lose. The place to beat the Russians is in Washington. And that goes all ways at once in cold war or hot.

Address of Hon. John J. Foley on Communism

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. THOMAS J. LANE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include excerpts from a stirring and thrilling address delivered recently by Attorney John J. Foley, former justice of one of the district courts of Massachusetts, before the officers, members, and friends of the William P. Connery, Jr., Post, No. 6, the American Legion, of his home city at their annual banquet. The speaker stressed the dangers of communism and urged his audience to combat this spreading ideology.

The excerpts follow:

CONFIDENCE IS NEEDED

Tomorrow the Nation celebrates the birthday of a man termed, "The Father of Our Country"—born in 1732 and who passed

away 151 years ago. His home in Mount Vernon is virtually a shrine and visited by thousands each year. The messages he left for the world were filled with the hope of peace, but the moving of events has left this hope unfulfilled.

It was only 36 years after the conclusion of the Revolutionary War that we were engaged in the War of 1812. Fifty-nine years later this Nation was nearly torn asunder by the War Between the States. Thirty-three years later we were engaged in the Spanish-American War. After that, only 19 years elapsed when we found ourselves in the First World War, sometimes called the war to end all wars; yet 23 years later we were engaged in the Second World War.

Certainly the record of so-called civilization is pretty poor. Wars don't just happen. They result from the ideas of men, and history proves that it is the ideas of a small group of men that result in such turmoil and bring such horror to millions. It requires no argument to prove to you that there has been something wrong with the thinking and philosophy of the so-called leaders which results in such a black record as that which I have outlined above.

The thinking and philosophy that caused these wars were known. Yet, despite the knowledge of such philosophies, the people themselves did nothing to prevent the trouble which resulted. There seemed to be an inertia among the people—a laziness. Probably it resulted from their desire for rest and quiet after each conflict, and as a result it left those with the dangerous philosophies free to bring about their harmful doings.

At the conclusion of World War I, some men and women of noble purpose tried to construct a strong organization that would avert future wars. The League of Nations was organized by men who saw the ravages of war—men who were willing to devote the rest of their lives on this earth to making that League strong and workable. Woodrow Wilson, President and Commander in Chief, a man possessed of a great and pure mind and with a vision of the future, literally worked himself into his grave in an attempt to breathe life into the League.

DISLOYALTY MUST GO

But because of narrow, picayunish and personal reasons on the part of a powerful group in this country, who were uttering catch phrases, Wilson's great attempt at peace died a-borning. Although our country was then and is now very young, it was extremely powerful, and the League had no chance to live without the cooperation of America. Time moved on and with in came the changes in transportation which meant that our protection of the Atlantic and Pacific oceans amounted to almost nothing.

Not too many years before World War II, a man named Hitler began to make great strides in the German nation, a nation whose susceptability to war-mongering is perhaps the weakest link in its nature. Long before the war began, Hitler indicated that he was a bold and immoral man. He published his famous book, "Mein Kampf," wherein he boasted of the super-race and preaching the gospel of the destruction of men who were not wanted and telling the world that the way to accomplish the results that he and his group wanted was to tell lies and that when those lies failed to tell bigger lies and to keep on lying.

The book became a best seller. People laughed and didn't take it seriously. But when the youth of the recent war were taken from their homes, schools, shops, factories, and stores to be sent overseas to fight, people didn't laugh. The toll in blood and tears and heartaches never can be sufficiently described.

The shooting stopped in 1945. Service men and women and civilians were weary of war and they wanted peace and rest and contentment. The young sought and found temporary surcease in rounds of pleasure. Nearly all were seeking some sort of a soothing sirup for frayed nerves and tired minds and bodies. Five years have now elapsed and most of the people have returned into the grooves of regular living and attempts have been made to return to normalcy.

All these attempts have failed and the condition of the country and the entire world is so bad that it has been described as that of developing into a cold war. There has never existed since the shooting stopped any feeling of warmth and neighborliness or good will between our Nation and that of the Soviet Union. The Soviet Union has vetoed in the United Nations every measure sought to bring about world peace.

They have refused to enter into a workable plan for the control of atomic weapons, such as the Baruch plan; they tried to starve the people of Germany into communism; they have seized countries and butchered and murdered those who tried to thwart their plans. Why has all this happened? It is not merely coincidental. There's a reason back of all this. The reason is an idea—an ideology, a philosophy.

AMERICANS MUST UNITE

Is it another dangerous philosophy? Were the other philosophies that we paid little attention to the kind that led us into dangerous wars? What are we going to do about it? Is it near our own homes? Is it right here in Lynn? Can we afford to ignore it or must we root it out and choke it to death? What is its source? Is it new?

It gained its origin from the brain of a German named Karl Marx, whose father was a lawyer, but who descended from a long line of rabbis. He was born in Germany, 132 years ago. He became a member of the Christian sects, but admittedly not for religious but for political and business. He studied at the University of Berlin and was greatly attracted to the philosophy of a man named Hegel. He turned to others such as Ludwig Feuerbach, whose philosophy was to destroy Christianity by creating in its place a full-fledged materialistic philosophy.

It is this Marx that the present-day communistic leaders deify. Marx issued a paper that you all have heard of and probably very few have read. It is entitled the "Communist Manifesto"—the bible of communism. In it he said: "It may be taken for granted that bloody conflicts are coming." He and other Communist leaders have preached the gospel that in order to attain their means there must never be any limit to chicanery, duplicity, and deviltry.

Another leader of their cause was known as Lenin who said: "It is necessary to use any ruse, cunning, unlawful method, evasion, concealment of the truth." Later Stalin added to this by writing: "Dictatorship means nothing more or less than the power which directly rests on violence, which is not limited by any laws or restricted by any absolute rules." These men admittedly believe in no Supreme Being, and Marx has written, "Man is the supreme being for man."

They, the same as Hitler, have told the world that they have no morals; that they consider no duties or responsibilities nor anything else, except that they will go to any lengths to attain the supremacy of communism. In a recent book by Mr. C. L. Sulzberger called Moscow Again Talks Peace But Fails To Act, he describes Lenin as the pope of bolshevism and he quotes Lenin as saying: "There is no alternative left. Either the Soviet Government triumphs in every advanced country in the world or else."

TO CURB A KNOWN EVIL

He also quotes Lenin as saying "America is strong, everybody is now in debt to her, she is being more and more hated, she is robbing everybody, she cannot come to terms with Europe." That comes from Lenin, whose mummified body is now in a shrine in Soviet Russia. Certainly Lenin had a real hatred for our own country. In his book Mr. Sulzberger also gave the opinion that Soviet Russia believes it is winning the cold war and that its whole purpose is to undermine western civilization and to weaken it until the time is right for them to attempt to attain their ends which would mean the end of America.

Do you recall back 15 or 20 years ago when the so-called intelligentsia would meet in fashionable homes and clubs, earning for themselves the descriptive phrase, "parlor pinks"? Most of them were educated fools. No proper description can be given in detail how they became attracted to such an ungodly philosophy. But we do know they were going about the country with an air of superiority, spilling words and phrases all of which were critical to our form of government and life. They and the Communists of today were and are rather smiled at in the same manner as Hitler was smiled at in the 1930's.

There are individuals, some of whom are leaders in our national life, who today are fomenting the same unrest within our own borders. Recent disclosure of the conviction of Mr. Hiss by a jury's verdict; the new trial of Judith Coplon for another offense after one conviction; the exposure of Dr. Klaus Fuchs, who has been active with atomic hydrogen weapons; the communistic leanings of the leaders of a great electrical union in our own city as well as the traces of disloyalty by irresponsible citizens has become quite disturbing. These people have openly criticized our form of government—the one that twice had come to the rescue of the world during the two world wars.

Disloyalty within our land must not be tolerated. Fortunately, the high percentage of our men in public life are fine and loyal—willing to give their all for our country. We must have confidence in them. The American Legion with its tremendous influence can do much. Your duty is great. Made up of persons who have served, you cannot feel your work is complete. It never will be.

We of World War I did our best for the younger generation for whom we fought. But that generation was let in for much sadness, sorrow, and heartache. You'll do much better. For the sake of your children, your country, and for all creation, strike down the menace of communism wherever it stalks. Marx, Engels, Stalin, Molotov, and their kind promised the conquest and the revolution. These personalities wear no labels. They will be smooth and sleek, but in their fanatical minds and merciless hearts there will only be one desire—to take from you and yours the liberties of man and his dignity. In return they will clothe you with the sickle and scythe of slavery and serfdom. This country was built on and has lived on the sublime belief of trust in God. Ask His assistance to the end that a true peace may be had.

National Science Foundation

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HUGH B. MITCHELL

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, no one knows what the best possible airplane and the best possible use of atomic energy would mean to civilization.

A better source of energy and a cheaper, faster means of communication could

enlarge immeasurably world understanding and enhance world prosperity.

Coming from a State which has given much to both atomic and aviation development, perhaps I am more conscious than some of the vital need for basic research in science. Only basic research made possible the plutonium plant at Richland and the XB–52, the heavy jet bomber of the future, being built by Boeing in Seattle.

In this intensified scientific age only full utilization of potential scientific brains can keep us as a nation at the head of the scientific parade.

But, as contrasted with this need, basic research in the sciences is extremely inadequate. We have been prone to take for granted the benefits of science and technology. We do not realize that every important benefit has been preceded by long years of research in varied fields of scientific endeavor.

Atomic energy, which figures so prominently in our discussions of national security and welfare, is based upon successive scientific developments stretching back through the last century. Many of the outstanding contributions to scientific research which we exploit in our laboratories and in our industrial establishments today were made by persons who lived in distant lands. The world community of science has been blasted to pieces by war. In discharging the new responsibilities thrust upon this Nation for world leadership and for domestic security and welfare it behooves us to take forthright steps to build up our resources in basic scientific research.

Neither our universities nor many of the young people who attend them can afford to carry on in these fields without some assistance from the Federal Government. Modern research is costly and complex. Its results are not often immediately visible for immediate practical application. The reservoir of scientific talent among the Nation's youth will never be sufficiently tapped unless a scholarship program is put into effect.

The National Science Foundation bill provides for wide geographic application of contracts and scholarships. Representing the largest district in the State of Washington, which contains one of the finest State universities in the country, I believe it is important to register our congressional intent that the principle of geographic distribution be fully observed by the administrators who will be responsible for carrying out the terms of this legislation. Too often in the past there has been an undue concentration of scientific research in a few large universities.

As the Members well know, the question of including social sciences within the terms of this legislation has been the subject of considerable discussion. The present bill does not identify the social sciences as such, but it does not expressly eliminate them. I believe we should also register clearly our congressional intent that the social sciences are entitled to due consideration along with the physical sciences. To some this may be a rather touchy affair, but to me it seems evident that we have a lot to learn in ordering our affairs so that people can live wisely and enjoy the fruits of the physical sciences made possible by basic research.

From the information submitted to the committee by the Budget Bureau, as noted in the committee report, it strikes me that the sums probably required for initiating the program and for conducting it through the next 5 years are extremely modest. I believe the National Science Foundation, under the terms of this bill, will provide a valuable instrument for coordinating and integrating the research programs now carried on in rather a haphazard fashion by various Government agencies.

Mr. Speaker, the National Science Foundation bill, H. R. 4846, should be enacted without further delay. This legislation is long overdue. It has been the subject of considerable study in the Seventy-ninth, Eightieth, and Eighty-first Congresses. Hundreds of well-qualified witnesses have testified as to its urgency.

The failure to establish a National Science Foundation heretofore has reflected sharp differences as to certain of its provisions.

It is my understanding that the committee studying this legislation has attempted to resolve these differences in a way reasonably satisfactory to all parties concerned. Although I have some doubts as to the form of administrative organization proposed in H. R. 4846, I firmly believe that we can no longer afford the luxury of leisurely debate.

The important consideration is that this bill will provide a means for establishing and executing a comprehensive national policy in basic scientific research. It is significant that the Hoover Commission specifically recommended the establishment of the National Science Foundation.

This legislation grows out of the vision of the late President Roosevelt who requested Dr. Vannevar Bush to prepare a report on the subject. This report, submitted in July 1945, was appropriately termed "Science—the Endless Frontier." Science is an endless frontier for advancing human welfare and the security of the Nation. Let us pioneer further advances by passing this bil. for a National Science Foundation.

Dangerous Enemies

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. GORDON L. McDONOUGH

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, the danger of foreign agents within our land is one of the most serious threats to our national security. These traitors boring from within must be ferreted out and dealt with as criminals and enemies of the United States before they have an opportunity to further damage our security.

The arrest of Dr. Karl Fuchs revealed the shocking extent to which foreign espionage agents have succeeded in stealing information from our most secret and confidential files.

Certainly it is now evident that there can be no further delay in the enactment of needed legislation to enable the Federal Bureau of Investigation to move against these foreign agents and protect our national security effectively.

An editorial in the Hollywood Citizen News of February 4 adequately summed up the situation, and I am including that editorial here now for the serious consideration of the Members of Congress:

DANGEROUS ENEMIES

J. Edgar Hoover, FBI chief, is reported to have told Senators yesterday that Dr. Karl Fuchs, British scientist, has confessed giving Russia vital information on the assembly of the atomic bomb and some data on the super-secret hydrogen bomb.

Dr. Fuchs was arrested in England yesterday by Scotland Yard agents on information supplied by the American FBI. He was charged with giving "unknown" persons information on the atomic bomb on which he had worked in the United States as a member of a British group.

From Dr. Fuchs is believed to have gone to Russia the information that enabled that country to surprise the United States by developing the atomic bomb a year or two ahead of schedule.

The leaks through Dr. Fuchs are presumed to have been far more dangerous to the security of this country than has been the information given by Canadian and American spies.

The distressing information should cause all loyal Americans to do a little thinking and self-questioning.

Are we going to join with Communists who are enemies of this country in opposition to the Mundt-Nixon bill to require that all Communists in this country register as agents of a foreign country?

Are we going to join with Communists in condemning the FBI for obtaining information on treasonable activities through the tapping of telephone lines?

Are we going to work for the Communists in opposing loyalty tests and in opposing the strengthening of our defenses so that we can meet the attacks of the most powerful, the most vicious, the most dishonorable, and the most treacherous dictatorship in the world's history?

Hasn't the time arrived when we should stop being tolerant of Communists who seek to destroy our liberties?

If a war arises between the Stalin dictatorship and the United States we are going to expect the FBI to have such definite information on all Communists in this country that they can quickly be put behind barbed wire before their sabotage does great damage.

Yet the FBI cannot compile accurate lists without resort to every technique of spying.

If Communists are compelled to register, only those will be put on record who openly admit their membership in the Communist Party. This will be worth while but the FBI needs to know every traitor though he does not join the Communist Party.

Surely the time has come for the Eleanor Roosevelts and the Dean Achesons to stop defending the Alger Hisses after they have been convicted of being traitors to this country.

Americans have a priceless liberty to defend. The kind of life the Russian slaves live is less desirable than death to Americans.

Only death awaits one in Russia who dares whisper that he doesn't like the way the dictators runs his country.

In this country we give everyone a fair trial. Communists on trial cost the country millions of dollars annually. Their funds to employ attorneys to take the time of our courts seem inexhaustible. None would change our conception of fair trials. But we should insist that traitors be treated as criminals.

We should insist that the work of the congressional and legislative committees on un-American activities be pushed. We should insist that all the Government support called for by the FBI be granted.

We don't want war. Let none of the Communist shouters for peace deceive us. But if to do our best to defend our liberties we have to take on war we must accept it. The chances are that if we are constantly alert to safeguard our liberties we shall be able to avoid war.

Certainly we cannot avoid war by refusing to recognize the fifth column that is among us.

Live and Let Live

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. ADOLPH J. SABATH
OF ILLINOIS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I insert a worthy article in the RECORD as it appeared in the Chicago Sun-Times under date of February 27, 1950.

As President Truman stated in his Washington's Birthday speech on foreign policy, "free nations must be prepared to defend themselves, but they know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike."

I suggest that the entire membership read this editorial on a most timely subject, and heed the contents thereof.

The editorial follows:

IS DISARMAMENT POSSIBLE?

In his Washington's Birthday speech on foreign policy President Truman struck a moderate note, evidently intended to cool off public opinion excited by the hydrogen bomb.

Free nations must be prepared to defend themselves, Mr. Truman said, but they know that another great war could destroy victor and vanquished alike.

"Consequently we in the United States are doing and will continue to do all that lies within our power to prevent the horror of another war. We are working for the reduction of armaments and the control of weapons of mass destruction."

Applying this thought to the problems of atomic disarmament, Mr. Truman steered clear of dogmatic insistence upon the Baruch plan. "We ask only for a plan that provides an effective, workable system" of control, he said.

When it comes to methods of "working for the reduction of armaments," the President apparently is not thinking of a direct approach to Russia looking toward negotiation that might make disarmament possible. The State Department this week reiterated its determination not to seek such negotiation, on the ground that if it failed, public opinion might be led to think of "a more desperate alternative."

The assumption that negotiation would inevitably fail may perhaps be worth reexamination.

Some people regard the structure and ideology of the Soviet Union as inherently opposed to the kind of international inspection that is needed to make a disarmament pact workable.

The Soviet Union, however, has the same government today which it had in the twenties and thirties. It is worth remembering that, prior to the rise of Hitler, the two leading advocates of effective disarmament were the United States and the Soviet Union.

For about 10 years between the two wars, serious efforts were made, inside and outside the League of Nations, to bring about general disarmament. Hitler, not Russia, torpedoed these efforts in the end. One American participant in those efforts was Allen W. Dulles, brother of the Republican leader, John Foster Dulles. Allen Dulles wrote, in Foreign Affairs for January 1947:

"On every possible occasion, from the Genoa conference in 1922 to the Geneva conference in 1932–34, the Soviet Union energetically pressed for total disarmament; and when she found that no states were prepared to follow her in such a radical step, she advocated a proportionate reduction of armaments."

Russia's proposal, Dulles reminds us, included provision for an international commission of control which would be "entitled to carry out investigations on the spot in the event of reasonable suspicion of a breach of the present convention."

Russia wanted the disarmament commission to be represented by local subcommissions stationed in every signatory state. Decisions were to be reached by majority vote (i. e., no veto), and were to be binding on all signatories.

These proposals, says Dulles, "were among the most far reaching in respect of the limitation of sovereign authority that any country has ever suggested."

It does not follow, of course, that what Russia was willing to do in 1932 she would be ready to do today. Her expansionist record since 1945 and her breach of numerous agreements have created fear and distrust which the mere signing of a pact would not of itself dispel.

But the full record of Soviet policy since 1917 suggests that there is nothing inherent in the ideology or structure of the Soviet state which makes impossible a disarmament pact that could be checked and supervised by effective international inspection.

The Communist ideology holds that there is something inherent in the ideology and structure of capitalist states which makes disarmament impossible. This is nonsense. It also may be nonsense to assume that the Soviet state is indissolubly wedded to military power and nationalist secrecy.

If both systems can arrive at the basic decision that they had better live and let live—just for the sake of mankind's survival on this planet—then atomic disarmament and general disarmament may become possible.

An effort of true statesmanship in this direction would surely be preferable to the prospect of prolonged cold war constantly moving toward hot war.

How Can We Win Against Communism in Asia When England Gives American-Owned Air Fleet to Chinese Reds?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WALTER H. JUDD
OF MINNESOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. JUDD. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following editorial from the Washington Daily News of February 24, 1950:

HOW CAN WE WIN?

Now that the United States and Britain have recognized the French-sponsored Bao Dai regime in Indochina, French military circles are asking for a common western policy in the Far East, as well as immediate military aid.

A list of the equipment wanted, including light tanks, jeeps, reconnaissance cars, and small-arms ammunition, has been given to our Government, with an additional request for a $100,000,000 economic-rehabilitation loan.

Since we are here being asked to buy into a war, it will be well to get all the facts on the table. We ought to know what we're getting into, and just what chance, if any, we have to win. From this distance, the chance looks dim.

The French, having had an army of 160,000 men in the field for 3 years, have inflicted no serious injury to Ho Chi-minh's Communist forces. Now, according to a Paris report to the New York Times, "an effective blockade of Communist China" is regarded as one of the essentials if victory is to be achieved.

The idea of a blockade of Communist China can be discarded, now that the British court in Hong Kong has awarded the Red government at Peiping 70 transport and passenger planes which Major General Chennault had purchased from the Chinese Nationalists. That decision probably spells the doom of Formosa, as well as killing any prospect of saving Indochina from the Reds.

Some heads should be examined in the State Department and the British foreign office. Britain recognized the Chinese Reds, and now has given them the planes they need to continue their campaign of aggression. The United States has recognized the Bao Dai forces in Indochina, and now is asked to put up the money and the arms to defeat the forces of Ho Chin-minh, which are said to have the active support of the Chinese Reds. Russia, of course, is backing both Red forces.

How can the West hope to win under this kind of leadership?

More Gold Diggers

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. WILLIAM LEMKE
OF NORTH DAKOTA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. LEMKE. Mr. Speaker, few people realize the extent to which the American people are taxed for gifts to foreign nations. We are again about to appropriate several billions for foreign sponging nations under the Marshall plan. This in order to further deplete our natural resources at the expense of the American taxpayer.

Great Britain has become the most persistent gold digger, and our poor old Uncle Sam will have his leg pulled for billions more under the European recovery camouflage. The fact is we have made bums out of some European people and debauched their nations through our stupid foreign policy.

The time has come that we look after our own Nation—not foreign nations. Let us get rid of the foreign ideologies in

the executive branch of our Government. Let us give Dean Acheson and Paul Hoffman a permanent passport to the European nations that they are more interested in than their own.

Take the profits out of the Marshall plan, and there would be no Marshall plan, and there would be no Bill Claytons, no Rockefellers, and no Harrimans for the Marshall plan.

As part of my remarks, I enclose herewith a letter I have received from Mr. James M. Witherow, a resident of Moorhead, Minn.:

MOORHEAD, MINN., *February 13, 1950.*

Hon. WILLIAM LEMKE,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEMKE: We in the Northwest appreciate the efforts of you and some of your associates to keep the expenses of the Federal Government within the taxpaying ability of the people as a whole.

But when we consider the unreasonable number of individuals with which the different departments are staffed, and the extravagant practices in buying with percentages paid to the friends of the administration, we are very much hurt.

This is particularly true with reference to foreign aids to European countries, whose representatives spend a great deal of money and time entertaining friendly Congressmen and Senators, who then vote recklessly for the money requested under the Marshall plan, without paying the slightest attention to the reports of observers sent to Europe for that purpose. From these reporters, we learn that the officeholders of France have been doubled at greatly advanced salaries, with large sums paid out in entertainments and dissipation, while the American Government is asked to spend the money for the military defenses of France, with Belgium, Austria, Poland, and Italy it is the same story. In England, the people have gone wild with drinking and gambling on dogs and ponies. H. J. Taylor reports these gambling expenditures as being from two and a half to four billion dollars per year, and about three hundred Englishmen spend their time as touts selling gambling tickets on the streets of the cities, yet not a single Congressman who went over to Europe to investigate was able to report a single instance although no one in England has denied the allegation. Even Sir Stafford Cripps admits it in bringing in a 25-cent tax on the winnings. Just why the interests of the taxpayers of the United States are neglected in this important matter is something which no one yet has endeavored to explain.

There are many honest industrious Englishman who are entitled to friendly assistance, but the present policy of sending the money of the taxpayers of the United States to be dissipated by the vicious is imposing a greater financial burden upon them and their posterity than the results of the war, because it is undermining their moral habits and depriving them of many of the necessities of daily life.

This is one of the issues which the American people feel justified in placing before the people regardless of party affiliations: Just who are these Congressmen really representing, the taxpayers of the United States or the drunkards and gamblers of Europe? Kindly see how many of them can truly answer this serious question, the correctness of which we must ultimately determine from the votes which they cast when the appropriations were before the House on roll call.

Very truly yours,

JAMES M. WITHEROW.

American Bankers Association To Fight Increase in United States Lending Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. JAY LeFEVRE
OF NEW YORK
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LEFEVRE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an article from yesterday's New York Herald Tribune.

Mr. Speaker, I think the president of the American Bankers Association has done a great service to the people by bringing to their attention the dangers in the centralization of credit in the hands of Federal Government. The examples of this type of financing which we find in Europe should be a sufficient lesson to us who talk of preserving private enterprise. Certainly, Mr. Peterson, the president of American Bankers Association, was very fair in his criticism in that he likewise takes a crack at the banks in their willingness to evade their full share of the risks taken by becoming involved in Government guaranteed loans. Bankers should take the same full share of risks which the businessman must take.

Certainly the tendency to extend Government financing is increasing. I do not believe the average person realizes to what a degree the new housing bill for middle-income families will seriously injure our private loaning institutions. This legislation, if passed, provides for direct Federal loans to a special class—cooperative and nonprofit companies. The cooperative feature is merely a cloak to cover the primary purpose which is the formation of giant nonprofit corporations featuring nonowner occupancy of housing at the expense of all the taxpayers and especially those who own their own homes. To my way of thinking, the $2,000,000,000 involved is simply putting us $2,000,000,000 nearer socialization. This legislation is a severe blow to the veterans and all other Americans who have already invested in housing. The veterans have received over 1,600,000 guaranteed loans under the GI bill and at least that number of loans under the FHA-insured mortgage plan. They are paying interest at the rate of 4 percent or 4½ percent depending upon the type of mortgage. The proposed bill lowers the interest rate to 3 percent. This is unfair to the veterans and home owners and will only promote further confusion.

The article follows:

AMERICAN BANKERS ASSOCIATION TO FIGHT INCREASE IN UNITED STATES LENDING POWER—PETERSON ASSAILS DRIFT TO NATIONALIZATION OF CREDIT

Asserting that a host of legislation providing for more Government loans and credit guaranties is now before Congress, F. Raymond Peterson, chairman of the board of First National Bank & Trust Co., of Paterson, N. J., announced last night that the American Bankers Association, of which he is president, would "oppose these unwarranted uses of taxpayers' money and credit."

In an address at the annual dinner meeting of the Hudson County chapter of the American Institute of Banking in the Plaza Hotel, Jersey City, Mr. Peterson declared: "We are treading perhaps unwittingly on dangerous social and economic ground if the administration of credit is centralized in the hands of the Federal Government.

"Centralization of credit administration in the hands of any government is one of the trappings of the socialism and communism abroad, against which we in this country are spending billions of dollars for defense."

The banker asserted that in recent years the Nation has been confronted with an ever increasing trend toward nationalization of credit.

He pointed out that loans, loan guaranties, and credit commitments of more than 20 Government lending agencies now exceed $26,000,000,000.

"I think no one will dispute the point that loans made directly to borrowers by agencies of the Federal Government are in effect socialized credit," Mr. Peterson said.

"Many of them are uneconomic loans. There is little chance of their ever being repaid. Some of them have been outstanding on the books of some Government agencies for more than 15 years and are still unpaid. Loans by Government agencies to sustain insolvent, dying business are a dissipation of public funds."

Mr. Peterson stated, however, that far more subtle than direct socialization of credit was the influence of Government guaranty of loans made by private lending institutions.

"The fundamental purpose of banking is to take credit risks," the ABA head maintained. "It is not to evade the risk or to attempt to share it with the Government. Government-guaranteed loans are loans in which the lender seeks to divest himself of the risk. Banking alone must either accept or reject that risk. It ought not to be shared with the taxpayers."

Winthrop's Brotherhood Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS
OF
HON. THOMAS J. LANE
OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include the following address I delivered at Winthrop, Mass., at the National Brotherhood Observance on Thursday, February 23, 1950:

I wish that I could extend my personal greetings to each one of the 65 organizations participating in Winthrop Brotherhood Week.

Sixty-five cooperating agencies in one township is eloquent proof that your community means what it says, in its dedication to the goal of human fellowship.

In the larger cities of the United States there are racial and religious ghettos into which people withdraw after their day's work is done. Wherever people congregate to earn their daily bread, however, whether in stores, factories, or on the farms, they learn to respect and to depend upon one another in the teamwork necessary to carry out a common assignment.

This was clearly revealed to us during the recent war. Men and women of different

backgrounds and different beliefs learned to serve together, and that was an illuminating experience for all. In time of common peril, there is no place for affectations of superiority. People need each other as never before and the hair-splitting differences of dogma and ritual melt away as they face danger and suffering and death together.

The cherished memory of any person who went through the ordeal of war is the human comradeship he found with men of all races and creeds. The pity of it is that so many people experience the fellowship of humanity only under the pressure of stern emergencies. And then they withdrew into the ghettos where all are of the same race or go to the same church. This social and spiritual inbreeding limits a person's outlook. It builds up invisible walls, made up of ignorance and fear and misunderstanding, which are nothing but the ghostly creations of neurotic minds.

Democracy had its beginnings in the small towns of the United States where it is possible for most people to come together at town meeting. Just as we assemble here tonight in a larger sense to affirm our belief in racial and religious tolerance. Democracy and religion are basic to the American faith. Our society contradicts itself when it exalts one and rejects the other. For both teach and must practice the brotherhood of man under the Fatherhood of God. It is not enough for a man to be devout in prayer at church services or in works of charity if he discriminates against others at his work or when he exercises his franchise of the vote, because they choose to worship God in a different manner. Likewise, our democracy is failing itself when it denies political or social equality to any man because of his racial origin.

In our century we have seen clever but unscrupulous men try to turn the clock back to the days of ignorance and savagery. They have used the great communication facilities to preach fear and hate, to set people against each other in order to further their own power-mad ambitions.

After the First World War, a few Americans, concerned by this dangerous trend, organized a movement to offset this destructive program of hate by one of constructive understanding and good will. They created the National Conference of Christians and Jews. Its purpose is to dispel the fog of prejudice with the sunlight of truth. Their task is one of heroic proportions, but their success might well be the one factor which can save the world. For today the problem is not how to overcome the forces of nature, but how to overcome the weaknesses in man himself.

One of the organization's chief weapons is the trio teams of minister-priest-rabbi, or of laymen of the three faiths who appear before audiences from coast to coast. The first pilgrimage tour was made in 1933 by Father John Ross, Rabbi Morris Lazaron, and Dr. Everett Clinchy who was president of the council at that time. Advocating justice, amity, and understanding among Protestants, Catholics, and Jews, this team was on the road for 6 weeks, traveling 9,000 miles. Three years later, 25 such traveling teams covered a total of 33,000 miles. Today, the NCCJ is operating from hundreds of American communities and its work is becoming increasingly effective.

During Brotherhood Week, which is observed each year at this time, we see visible evidence of the progress that has been made, and we are reminded of the part each one of us can play in removing bigotry and intolerance from that greater society of which we are all fellow members.

Happily, this week embraces the birthday of George Washington, the Father of our Country, who did so much by his example to show us that we must live for others as well as for ourselves.

Neighborliness was the one factor which enabled the first settlers to survive and make progress as they faced the harsh wilderness of the New World. Even before governments were instituted it was the friendly and cooperative help extended from neighbor to neighbor that served as a support and protection for one another.

As the pioneers moved westward, mutual dependence was imperative. At barn raisings and quilting bees people pitched in to help. The greatest virtue of that period was that a man was judged by his acts and not by his race or his creed.

The Declaration of Independence and the Constitution of the United States are documents unique in human history. They not only set forth the aspirations and the forms of government, they express the rich and rewarding experience of humble men and women who were creating a society born of mutual effort and mutual confidence. The oppressed of all lands came here to make a new beginning, not at the sacrifice of their particular faith or culture but in a heartwarming recognition that there is a place for all. And so our conception of liberty has come to mean freedom of expression as long as it does not take freedom from others.

There is no state religion in our country, favored over all others. There is no special race or class. And there never will be if we expose at every turn those who spread false stories about our neighbors.

It all begins in a harmless way, with a choice bit of gossip, perhaps. And the person to whom it is told cannot resist the temptation to add something to it to make it more interesting before he passes it on to another. Before the false rumor has completed its devious course grave harm is done to the character of a person, a race, or a creed.

And then, when confronted with the wrong they have helped to propagate, people try to pretend that they did not assist in the slander. Or they try to excuse themselves by saying that they meant no harm. But injustice has been done beyond correction.

This is all the more amazing when one considers that millions of our people have had the advantage of a college education which deals in facts and teaches them to separate the true from the false. But how many spike a rumor at the beginning by demanding to know the basis of any allegation?

I am reminded of the unfortunate beating of a young Jewish boy recently, the orphaned son of a man who gave his life for his country in World War II. He was assaulted by some of his young non-Jewish neighbors, which compounds the tragedy. For it reflects the poisonous atmosphere in the homes from which they come. Children are innocent. It is not in their nature to be cruel to their playmates because of differences in race or creed. When they develop unsocial attitudes the blame can be placed squarely on their delinquent parents. This should be a caution to all of us. Youngsters are impressionable, they absorb unthinkingly. Even words spoken lightly between father and mother in the presence of a child concerning a religion or a race may distort that child's viewpoint.

As it did in the case of the youngsters who beat the little Jewish boy. With a tender understanding of the victim's plight and the effect this injustice might have on him as he grew up, Oscar J. Toye, Massachusetts Department Commander of the Jewish War Veterans wrote him an exceptional letter which should be taken to heart by all of us because it is a major contribution to the goal of tolerance in our confused and wayward times. Mr. Toye wrote in part, and I quote: "Your job and mine is to see to it that the few people who do not understand America, do not get hold of it and spoil it. I am very much afraid that because of these boys who beat you and called you 'Jew' you might be led to believe that you were assaulted by Christians. I want you to say to yourself that these boys were not Christians. Christians do not hate others or beat them. The Christian religion, like the Jewish religion, teaches love for one another. I do not care of what parentage these boys are, or to what church they go. When they did what they did to you, they took themselves out of the Christian faith and out of any other religion, and they have no further right to call themselves Christian."

These are plain and humble words, spoken with the simplicity that is truth itself. They strike home to conscience. If, in the secret recesses of our hearts we confess to ourselves that we, too, at some time or another, have been guilty of prejudice, let us pledge this day forth to clean ourselves of such corruption. For the harm we do to others may also be done unto ourselves in payment of the evil we set in motion.

Catholics and Protestants, and people from the multitude of races which compose our Nation, have, in their turn, suffered from intolerance.

It is not my purpose to dwell on these negative aspects, except that they should warn us to control those careless remarks which do injury to others.

Tonight we are paying homage to the ideal of brotherhood. This is a positive and uplifting thought not simply one that refrains from intolerance but one that inspires us to build a confident fellowship in its place.

For the unity of our own Nation, and as an example to others who look to us for hope and guidance, I like to think of that sublime example among many, that took place during World War II.

It was on the United States transport *Dorchester,* sinking fast after suffering a mortal wound. The ship was crowded and there were not enough life preservers to go around. The loaded lifeboats were pulling away from the ship but four men still remained on the sloping deck. They were chaplains—two Protestant, one Catholic, and one Jew. They had given away their own life belts so that others might be saved. And these four chaplains stood on the deck, serene and unafraid as they joined in prayer before they went down to a watery grave together.

The prayers that they said were different in wording, but they were directed to the one God of all. Not for the four clergymen who were going to their deaths, but for the men in the boats who might be saved. There was no time on that slanting deck for smallness of mind or spirit.

The United States is the Nation most representative of humanity in the whole of recorded history. We have opened our arms to the oppressed from all over the world. Wherever you travel in this broad land of ours stop in the main square and look at the names of those who gave up their young lives to preserve and extend the belief that we have in one another. Men of all religions and men of no religion, men whose ancestors emigrated from every nation to find freedom of conscience here.

They offered up their lives not only to win a war but to win the opportunity for us, the living, to build a better world, beginning in our own homes and our own communities.

We cannot repay their sacrifices by cultivating the rank weeds of discrimination for that is the poor husbandry that leads to moral bankruptcy.

That is the way the Communists in Moscow hope we follow to our own undoing. But they do not rely on this alone. Their agents in this country are actively engaged in promoting dissension at every opportunity. They plant lies and rumors about religions and racial groups, trusting that we will pick them up and spread them about others, not knowing that some are directed against ourselves. This is the technique that is calculated to splinter American faith and unity, and make us the unwitting instruments of our own destruction.

Unfortunately, there are some people who bite at the bait. Our job is to enlighten them with the knowledge that they are only playing into the hands of communism.

Maybe this will teach them to hold their tongues and not be the carriers of every vicious rumor.

If not, you and I and the overwhelming majority of fair-minded Americans must make it our business to nail every lie at its source.

We are a moral people. I think most of us try to observe the Golden Rule. And we are the only nation capable of rallying the decent elements in this world to resist and overcome the spreading vice of communism. Already the cynics of the Kremlin wield great power. By alternating falsehoods with force, they first enslave their own people. And they have practiced this divide-and-conquer method in every country they have taken over. Do not underestimate these peddlers of hate. Even more than the Nazis, they have perfected the black art of propaganda, both in the open and undercover. They are constantly at work undermining the intelligence and character of people by feeding the fires of passion and prejudice.

We may expect that this subversive campaign will be stepped up within our own country. How are we prepared to offset it?

Not by shifting the burden of individual responsibility to others. Democracy is not built that way. Totalitarianism is. The high resolve to which we pledge ourselves this night will mean nothing if it is not translated into effective action 365 days a year.

There is a cold war going on in the world of today, and the first objective of the aggressors is to win control of the minds of men. If they succeed, all else will fall in line easily and completely.

The Communist high command is using every psychological trick to deceive and ensnare us. If we are not alert to this danger and are not prepared to stop unfounded rumors in their tracks then we shall be taken in.

At the same time we cannot afford to put ourselves into the strait-jacket of totalitarianism at home in order to mobilize against the encroachment of aggression from abroad, for that would be self-defeating.

The only answer to communism is a dynamic democracy. That is a value not manufactured by our Government. It is made up of the actions and attitudes of tens of millions of Americans, not only preached but practiced in their daily lives.

The Government must depend on you to show respect and understanding of your fellow citizens before it can hope to carry the Voice of America to other peoples. Our one great hope is to reach the people who are quarantined from truth behind the iron curtain and convince them that we want brotherhood among nations. But first we must prove to them that we have achieved it here—in the United States.

Unity at home does not require uniformity. We want a diversity of religious and cultural expression, for out of this richness and variety have come our inspiring development as a Nation.

We are free because we are tolerant.

And because we know that all races are members of the one human family who will someday meet in eternal brotherhood before the Creator of all.

Never before have we felt the need for one another as in this age. Scientific progress has taken the lead over man's ability to achieve that harmony in human relationships which must govern the terrifying instruments of material power.

The race is on.

Which will win?

Unbridled power in the hands of evil men or power employed for the benefit of all?

The choice lies with us the people of the world. As each individual contributes to the cause of human understanding, he adds a part of his spirit to the voice of mankind calling for an end to war and cruelty and exploitation. This is the vital force which can dissolve any injustice.

Strangely enough, intolerance is found more often in large cities than in small communities. Where people are crowded together they seem to know less of each other. Take a big apartment house where people may live next door to each other, but only meet in the elevator or pass by in the hall. They may do this for years without any spirit of neighborliness developing. There is no lonelier feeling than that of a stranger in a big city.

President Truman has stated that only a moral and spiritual awakening can save the world from disaster. In his words, and I quote: "The Protestant church, the Catholic church, and the Jewish synagogue, bound together in the American unity of brotherhood, must provide the shock forces to accomplish this moral and spiritual awakening. No other agency can do it. Unless it is done we are headed for the disaster we deserve."

The paradox of modern society is that it possesses more materials and tools and technical know-how than any other age in history. It has the things with which to produce a better life for all men, free from poverty and the worries which attend it.

What then is holding us back from stepping over the threshold to a new era of peace and prosperity?

There are willful men who make a practice of sowing the seeds of discontent but they alone could not prevail if we, the people, put our hearts and souls to work, for a change, instead of limiting them to a 1-hour exercise on Sunday with those of our own kind.

It is not enough to accept the principle of brotherhood during 1 week of the year. Only as we put it into action at home, in the office, in industrial contacts, in social and political life, in national and international relations, can it become a movement that will cleanse the world of its tensions and its fears.

I do not share the hysterical opinion that all Russians, for instance, are bent on destroying us. They, in turn, have a distorted outlook on the rest of the world because they are not allowed to communicate with other people. When the day comes that their leaders can no longer isolate them, we and they will discover that we have very much in common as fellow human beings.

To hasten that day you and I must make the beginning by lifting the iron curtain of intolerance from our own hearts.

This night marks that beginning for some.

Toward the goal of personal happiness in the society of others and a world at peace.

Counting for the Census

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALVIN F. WEICHEL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. WEICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the taking of the great American census is about to begin and the Bureau of the Census has a vast organization throughout the United States. There is included herewith an editorial from Spencer Canary, editor of the Daily Sentinel-Tribune, of Bowling Green, Ohio, covering the manner of taking the census. Surely a city of 8,000 permanent residents should not be set up as a city with a population of 13,000 because of the fact that there are some 5,000 students temporarily in the community. Such a system would be counting the students in the colleges and universities twice in the American census. It has been the understanding of Congress that the effort is to get the actual population and not an inflated one. I believe that the Bureau of the Census should make known to Congress the method by which it is taking the census for if this double counting is part of the pattern, of what actual good is such a census for any purpose? This census authorized by Congress should be of sufficient importance that the Secretary of Commerce, the Bureau of the Census, and everyone concerned should do it on a common-sense basis and not be a process of counting people as domiciled in two communities at the same time where it is actually known that they are temporarily there as students.

MISCOUNTING OUR POPULATION

Speaking before the Rotary Club here Thursday night, William H. Williams, district supervisor in charge of the census taking in this Thirteenth Congressional District, stated that all the students at Bowling Green State University would be counted as residents of our city.

This method, which the Bureau of the Census has decreed, will not give a real census of Bowling Green's population. Instead of probably being over 8,000, it will make it about 13,000, as those students whose homes are elsewhere will be included as permanent residents. Of course, many have no other home than this and should be counted.

This method of counting the city's population will be not only inaccurate, but is liable to be unfair to it. For one thing, when these students graduate and move away, a business survey later might show a seemingly less population despite the fact that the city was really increasing in actual residents. That would give a black eye to the town. Various State laws and population polls for business might adversely affect it.

This inexact method of counting, of course, is to be Nation-wide; and communities would illegitimately lose or gain population. For instance, Ann Arbor, through its big University of Michigan, and New York, through its great Columbia University, would gain population which should be accredited to other States.

We hope Congressman ALVIN F. WEICHEL and other Congressmen will call on the Bureau of Census to change this erroneous method. Charles Sawyer, as a businessman of Cincinnati and now Secretary of Commerce, under which is the Census Bureau, will recognize that the proposed method is bad.

Our Unsound, Dishonest, Inequitable Social Security Set-Up

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. NOAH M. MASON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 27, 1950

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted to extend my remarks in

the RECORD, I include the following statement made by me to the Senate Finance Committee on the bill H. R. 6000:

Mr. Chairman and members of the Senate Finance Committee, I am one of the three members of the Ways and Means Committee that voted against H. R. 6000 when it was approved in committee. I was also one of the 14 Members in the House that voted "No" when the bill was up for final passage in the House. I feel, therefore, that it is my duty and responsibility to make a statement before the distinguished members of this committee giving very briefly my reasons for opposing the bill.

In my opinion the weight of the testimony during the 3½ months of open hearings before the Ways and Means Committee on our present social-security set-up was to the effect that it was unsound and dishonest, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age. It is a program which if practiced by a private insurance company would land every director and every officer of that company in jail for misappropriation and misuse of trust funds. The program is characterized by the Brookings Institute report on our present social-security set-up as a plan whereby "We (the present generation) do the promising; you (all future generations) do the paying."

The future burden of H. R. 6000 is described on pages 168 and 169 of that same report as an enlarged old-age insurance system that would ease the cash position of the Federal Government today, because the excess of revenues collected today through the social-security tax goes to meet the ordinary expense of the Government, and that means that a substantial part of future social-security costs will have to be met out of future tax revenues. The report estimates that the cost of H. R. 6000 plus the veterans' program will be between $19,000,000,000 and $25,000,000,000 by the year 1970.

Gentlemen, can our economy carry this tremendous additional burden?

Perhaps at this point a concrete illustration to demonstrate how unsound and dishonest our present social-security program is would be in order, therefore I offer the following hypothetical case:

John Smith decides to establish his own social-security program, so he meticulously deducts a certain percent of each pay check he receives and places the cash regularly in his safety deposit box. After doing this for several years and having thus set aside, say $5,000, to insure security in his old age, John Smith starts to spend each month more than he earns—as Uncle Sam does now. Then John Smith hits upon the plan of taking so much cash out of his lockbox to spend each month and placing in the box, in lieu of the cash extracted, promissory notes to himself. If John Smith keeps this up, when he retires he will have only promissory notes to himself to live on—which he has no way of changing into cash for groceries.

That, gentlemen, is exactly what Uncle Sam is doing with the social-security receipts—the only difference being that Uncle Sam has the taxing power to invoke in order to change his I O U's into cash to meet his future social-security obligations. But that involves new taxes, additional taxes, to meet obligations that are supposed to have been paid for already by the beneficiaries. I wonder if that scheme of taxing again the children and grandchildren of the social-security beneficiary for something he and his employer are supposed to have paid for—but Uncle Sam has spent the receipts from the social-security tax for other things—can be called anything but dishonest and immoral, a Ponzi-type shell game that has been sold to the American taxpayer as a plan to provide security in his old age.

On page 176 of the Brookings Institution report the authors recommend that the present social-security set-up be abandoned entirely and a genuine pay-as-you-go system be established in its place. This would do away with all need for reserves, all need for level premiums, all need for costly and elaborate bookkeeping systems, etc. This would mean, as the authors of the report point out, "Our generation would care for its own and trust future generations to do likewise." A very sensible, practical, and wise conclusion for them to reach, it seems to me.

In discussing this social-security problem on the floor of the House, I said:

"Mr. Speaker, the action of the House on H. R. 6000, the social-security bill, has impelled me to do something that I have steadfastly refused to do for over 12 years; namely, to sign the Townsend plan petition now at the Speaker's desk. I signed that petition because when I compare the two programs for social security—the one contained in H. R. 6000 and the one contained in the Townsend plan—I am convinced that the Townsend plan is to be preferred to H. R. 6000.

"In my opinion, after careful consideration, the Townsend plan is more equitable, more practical, more just, much easier and cheaper to administer, and less costly in the long run.

"The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 when fully matured will require the payment of something like $1,000,000,000 per year in interest alone, in addition to the hundreds of millions of dollars each year for administrative costs. The Townsend plan will do away with both the interest on the social-security fund and the heavy administrative costs.

"The social-security plan contained in H. R. 6000 proposes that the Federal Government shall collect up to 8 or 10 billions of dollars per year and spend the same for current Government expenses. The Townsend plan proposes that the Federal Government shall collect 6 or 8 billions of dollars per year and hand it out immediately on a monthly basis to the old people of the Nation for them to spend for the necessities of life. I ask, which is the better plan? Which will bring more happiness to more people? Which can spend the money to a better advantage, the Federal Government or our worthy old people?

"In my opinion the social-security program as set up and amended in H. R. 6000 is both unsound and dishonest. I shall do what I can hereafter to substitute the Townsend plan, or some modification of it, for the administration's social-security program."

Which Political Party Is for the Common People?

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, I feel that it is important that the membership of the House should have the record of the New Deal Administration and its domination by the large financial interests both here and abroad. We hear much about the New Deal or Democrat Party being the champion of small business and the underprivileged people of this country. I am inserting in the RECORD, under leave heretofore granted, a particular record of the New Deal with reference to the influence of foreign financiers as well as our own in forcing this country to spend itself into insolvency. The record referred to appeared in the Washington Times-Herald, Sunday, February 26, 1950:

NEW DEAL OUT BUT WALL STREET REMAINS IN—FINANCIERS LINGER ON IN TRUMAN REGIME

(By Walter Trohan)

The New Deal is gone but the power of Wall Street still lingers on in the Truman administration. In 1933 the New Deal was launched by a small band of men who raised the Blue Eagle of the national recovery administration, killed millions of little pigs, transplanted families, inaugurated leaf raking, promoted boondoggling and plowed under crops.

Almost 2 years ago the last of the original band, Benjamin V. Cohen, left the Government. He was counselor of the State Department. His departure marked the passing of an era, but long before his going the Wall Streeters were edging out New Dealers in Washington influence.

TIES WITH LONDON

The most important programs in the Government came into the hands of men who came from the Nation's financial center and had social and blood ties with London countinghouses and British nobility. New Dealers had been losing influence for 10 years before Cohen left. Today, although a few of them remain in the Government, they have less influence than the Wall Streeters. And President Truman is changing the very name New Deal to Fair Deal.

For many years Franklin D. Roosevelt was regarded as the fountainhead of American policy. Since his death the so-called American bipartisan foreign policy has continued uninterrupted. The long arm of Wall Street has been seen as molding the internationalist policy, and fusing varied groups and varied interests.

At one time Wall Streeters hobnobbed with Communists of Union Square as well as Park Avenue social circles, to bring profits from internationalist spending. In this period Wall Streeters were invited into the New Deal and took it over.

WALL STREETERS SUMMONED

In the earliest days of the New Deal, Wall Streeters were reputedly on the outs with the administration. President Roosevelt had called for driving the money changers out of the temple. However, J. P. Morgan himself was invited to the White House for at least one secret conference. He was discovered leaving the White House late one night.

In 1937, when the New Deal found itself face to face with a depression, President Roosevelt began summoning Wall Streeters to the White House for secret meetings. It was at this time the late Thomas Lamont, who succeeded Morgan as head of J. P. Morgan & Co., began to be a White House visitor.

Morgan was surprised leaving the White House with Myron Taylor, then head of United States Steel, which the Morgan interests controlled. The two smilingly acknowledged a 45-minute visit, which the White House had not announced. When asked about the visit the White House said it was purely social.

"You know I cannot tell you what I talked about with the President in his home," Morgan said.

THE NOBLES ARRIVE

At this time Roosevelt shifted his attention from domestic to international affairs. He was persuaded domestic recovery would come through international stabilization.

British financial interests exerted heavy influence on their American brethren. The doors of Britain's best homes were thrown open to American financiers. Britain knighted leading financiers so that whenever she encountered financial difficulties she could send over the magic of titles to help get desired aid.

For years Viscount Walter Runciman, Sir Josiah Stamp, Lord John Maynard Keynes, and Sir Arthur Salter raced to this country every time British finances became shaky. They were able to return home with relief.

The British showered decorations on American military figures and civilians. Hundreds of decorations went to persons for supporting the British cause in Bundles for Britain and in getting America into the war. Winthrop Aldrich, chairman of the Chase National Bank and leading supporter of British causes, was given the only King's medal ever to be conferred on an American.

General Eisenhower is the only American to receive the British Order of Merit, which is limited to 24 regular members and foreign honorary members. Eisenhower, like General Marshall, wartime Chief of Staff and former State Secretary, holds British decorations which would be knighthoods for Britishers. Both hold honorary degrees from British universities.

KNIGHT OF THE BATH

Alan G. Kirk, ambassador to the Soviet Union, is Knight Commander of the Bath, knighthood organization. Lieutenant General Smith, protege of Marshall, has a similar decoration. American ambassadors to Britain receive British university degrees. The Wall Streeters are able to have internationalist-minded American universities confer honorary degrees on friends and supporters.

Titles were employed in other fields of activity. King George and Queen Elizabeth came to Canada to tie the dominion to the mother country and to woo the United States. Lord Mountbatten, the Duke of Kent, the Duke of Windsor, the Earl of Athlone and a host of lesser British figures came to this country to curry good will.

In 1938 and 1939 Wall Streeters were crowding into the Capital. By 1940 Wall Street, which had opposed the New Deal in 1932 and 1936, was working for the third term. Roosevelt and Wall Street have been widely credited with the strategy which won the Republican nomination for Wendell Willkie, a former Socialist and a former Tammany Hall Democrat, who also was a Wall Street lawyer. Willkie was known to Wall Street secretly as an interventionist although he campaigned as an isolationinst. After his defeat Willkie told a Senate committee his isolationist speeches were just so much campaign oratory. He joined with F. D. R. in pumping for war.

While the Republicans were gathering in Philadelphia for the 1940 nomination, President Roosevelt named Henry L. Stimson, Wall Street lawyer and former Republican Secretary of State, to the post of Secretary of War, and the late Frank Knox, Chicago publisher and 1936 GOP candidate for Vice President, Secretary of the Navy. Both advocated American entry into the war.

Robert P. Patterson, Republican Federal judge and a former Wall Street lawyer, was made Under-Secretary of War. Patterson was a leading interventionist.

James V. Forrestal, head of Dillon, Reed & Co., Wall Street investment house, was named Under-Secretary of Navy. Forrestal came into the New Deal a little before Knox and Stimson, as a White House executive assistant.

Forrestal succeeded Knox on the latter's death and became the first Defense Secretary under President Truman. He leaped to his death a year ago a few weeks after he was eased out of the Cabinet by Mr. Truman for Louis Johnson, Truman campaign fund collector.

MANY SUDDEN DEATHS

Forrestal's death was one of many sudden deaths marking the late days of the New Deal and early days of the Fair Deal. Knox did not survive the war. Roosevelt died suddenly at Warm Springs. Edward R. Stettinius, son of a former Wall Street partner, who joined the New Deal at the time of Wall Street influx, died at the age of 49 last October 31.

Stettinius became Secretary of State in the critical Soviet appeasement days of Yalta and Potsdam, which conferences turned over large sections of Europe and Asia to Russian influence. He represented the United States at the UN founding conference, which spread Soviet influence further, and was American UN representative.

John G. Winant, American Ambassador to Britain, who negotiated the agreement which left the United States without a corridor to Berlin, died by his own hand late in 1948. O. Max Gardner, named to succeed Winant, died before he could take over the post.

A pattern of mysterious deaths surrounded the Alger Hiss spy case. Laurence Duggan, former State Department adviser, died in a still unexplained plunge from the window of his New York office. Insurance investigation ruled out suicide, which strengthened suspicion of murder. Duggan was believed to have knowledge of the inside workings of the pro-Soviet bloc in the State Department.

Harry Dexter White, former Assistant Secretary of the Treasury, who helped draft the Morgenthau harsh peace plan for Germany, died reportedly of an overdose of digitalis after he had been questioned by a House committee on Communist affiliations. Whittaker Chambers, chief witness against Hiss, identified White as a Red spy.

Digitalis is not often employed as a poison. It is prescribed for some heart ailments. Doctors say that an overdose would have to be taken deliberately.

WALL STREETERS RUN WAR

Walter Marvin Smith, Department of Justice attorney, who fell or plunged five stories down a stairwell in the Justice Department on October 28, 1948, and was killed, had notarized the transfer of a 1939 Ford automobile from Hiss to William Rosen, alleged Communist organizer. Sumner Welles, who had examined the stolen Hiss documents and recommended some be suppressed as still of vital import, collapsed of a heart attack during a midnight walk on his Maryland estate. His hands and feet were severely frostbitten. Welles was Undersecretary of State when Hiss and Duggan were in the Department.

Hiss has a Wall Street lawyer handling his appeal from the perjury conviction. He is Robert M. Benjamin. In his first trial, which ended in disagreement, Hiss was defended by Lloyd Paul Stryker, another Wall Street lawyer.

With the third term election Wall Streeters began pouring into the administration by the thousands. Other top posts went to the Street's brokers, lawyers and clients. Lesser street figures poured into legal and administrative posts, many of which kept the holders bomb and battle proof throughout the war.

Wall Streeters ran the war and foreign policy. In the latter effort they had the powerful support of five internationalist organizations. More than 100 directors of the organizations are woven into an interlocking mesh of Wall Street lawyers and Wall Street bankers, insurance and industrial directors.

The five groups are the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, the Foreign Policy Association, the Rockefeller Foundation, the English Speaking Union and the Council on Foreign Relations. The convicted perjurer-spy, Hiss was named president of the Carnegie Foundation through an alliance of Wall Street and the New Deal.

Gen. Eisenhower, wartime allied supreme commander in Western Europe, was made president of Columbia University, through the influence of directors of this group. Political observers believe members of the group are seeking to capture the 1952 G. O. P. nomination for Eisenhower in the interests of promoting internationalism.

About half the directors worked for the Government at one time or another, largely in the State Department. They have common cultural backgrounds, chiefly at Harvard and Columbia. All have been working to promote the bipartisan program which is collapsing in Europe and around the world.

When the Marshall plan was proposed, a Wall Street group raised a propaganda fund. Stimson was national chairman. Contributions came from men who expected to share in the dollars given to Europe.

"RICHEST BABY IN THE WORLD"

One of the heaviest sharers in the Marshall plan funds is Will Clayton, former State Under Secretary for Economic Affairs. Clayton is the former head of Anderson, Clayton Co., world's largest cotton brokers. He has close ties with New York banks. In the State Department he promoted the British 3.75 billion dollar gift-loan and the Marshall plan. ECA records show that in one month his company handled 28 million dollars of cotton under the plan. He and his family own 40 percent of the stock of the company. Reports of the company show that the family's share of the profits runs into tens of millions annually.

Papers and publishers who supported the Marshall plan were rewarded with subsidies which are at the 3 million dollar mark. Sharers include the New York Times, New York Herald Tribune, Time, Inc., Readers Digest, Curtis Publishing Co., Crowell-Collier and more than a dozen others.

Of the thousands of Wall Streeters formerly with the New Deal the most prominent are:

Robert Lovett, Wall Street banker, who was Assistant War Secretary and former Under Secretary of State. He returned to Brown Brothers Harriman & Co., of which he is a partner.

John Nicholas Brown, president of Counting House Corp., Assistant Navy Secretary. Brown was once known as "the richest baby in the world."

William H. Draper, former vice president of Dillon, Read & Co., Under Secretary of the Army.

Philips Hawkins, son-in-law of Draper, Chief of the Property Division of the American Government in Germany.

Arthur M. Hill, president of the Atlantic Greyhound Corp., head of the Army and Navy Munitions Board.

Ferdinand Eberstadt, head of the Wall Street firm bearing his name, served as a member of the Army-Navy Munitions Board.

Bernard M. Baruch, capitalist, served as adviser without portfolio and on the United Nations Atomic Commission.

Herman Baruch, brother of the capitalist, served as Ambassador to the Netherlands.

BANKERS AND LAWYERS

Charles E. Salzman, former vice president of the New York Stock Exchange, Assistant Secretary of State.

Lewis Strauss, partner in the New York banking firm of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., a member until recently of the Atomic Energy Commission.

H. Struve Hensel, Wall Street lawyer, Assistant Secretary of the Navy.

A. L. M. Wiggins, former president of the American Bankers Association and now an Assistant to the Secretary of the Treasury.

Howard C. Peterson, Wall Street lawyer, Assistant War Secretary.

James Paul Warburg, Wall Street banker, Office of War Information.

Nelson Rockefeller, grandson of John D. Rockefeller, Coordinator of Inter-American Affairs and Assistant Secretary of State. Although of military age he came to the Government in 1940 and remained throughout the war.

Myron Taylor, former head U. S. Steel Corp., special envoy to Vatican.

Paul Felix Warburg, member of the banking family, special assistant at London embassy.

Thomas J. Hargrave, president of Eastman Kodak Corp. and Chairman of the Munitions Board.

In 1944 the Wall Streeters worked to get a second nomination for the me-too candidate Willkie. When Willkie came a cropper in the Wisconsin primary, they switched to Gov. Thomas E. Dewey in New York, a former nationalist who switched to the internationalist tinge considered proper by Wall Street. In 1948 the same group won a second nomination for Dewey.

VANDENBERG SWITCHES

In the Dewey campaigns, John Foster Dulles, Wall Street lawyer and former attorney for America First, turned up as an internationalist. He was built up as a great foreign affairs expert. The New Deal gave him a UN post and Dewey named him to the Senate. Dulles succeeded in placing Hiss in the Carnegie post. He and Hiss were associated at the UN founding conference. Dulles was defeated last spring in a race for the Senate vacancy to which he had been appointed, losing to former Gov. HERBERT LEHMAN.

Internationalists and the New Deal took over Senator VANDENBERG, former nationalist who became an internationalist in 1943. VANDENBERG was rewarded by an appointment to the UN founding conference, having an unknown named to oppose him for the Senate, having his nephew, Lt. Gen. Hoyt Vandenberg named commander of the Air Force, and having his son Arthur, Jr., get a high salaried post with Nelson Rockefeller interests in South America. The senator is hoping to maneuver poltically so that his son will succeed him in the Senate in 1953.

During the Presidential campaign Mr. Truman belabored Wall Street. He railed against "Wall Street gluttons of privilege." He took the offensive as the best defense against a charge of Wall Streetism which he expected would be made against his Administration.

STILL IN ADMINISTRATION

The attack was made, but it came from Henry Wallace, darling of the Reds, and failed to influence voters. Wallace charged that of 125 men appointed to key civilian posts by Mr. Truman 97 were big money or big brass.

The administration still has a heavy sprinkling of Wall Streeters, although the majority have returned to the financial center to reap foreign aid dollars.

Those still in the administration include:

State Secretary Dean Acheson, Wall Street lawyer. Acheson's father was born in England and ordained an Episcopal minister in that country. His mother was Canadian born. The father became an Episcopal bishop in Connecticut.

John J. McCloy, Wall Street attorney, now high commissioner to Germany.

Benjamin J. Buttenwieser, of the banking house of Kuhn, Loeb & Co., assistant high commissioner to Germany.

Lewis Douglas, insurance executive, Ambassador to Britain.

W. Averell Harriman, Wall Street banker, roving ECA ambassador.

Cornelius V. Whitney, president Whitney industries, Under Secretary of Commerce.

Paul H. Nitze, vice president Dillon Read & Co., State Department.

Willard L. Thorp, former director and chairman of the board, General Utilities Corp., Assistant Secretary of State.

David K. E. Bruce, member of Maryland family associated with Wall Street interests, Ambassador to France.

Charles U. Ray, Wall Street broker, Ambassador to Norway.

Laurence Steinhardt, corporation lawyer, Ambassador to Canada.

William McChesney Martin, former president of New York Stock Exchange, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury.

Wayne Chatfield Taylor, Chicago investment banker with New York ties, ECA Administration.

Sumner Pike, Wall Street mining and oil firm, Atomic Energy Commission.

Eugene R. Black, New York banker, president of World Bank.

Paul Hoffman, head of Studebaker Corp., which was reorganized by Wall Street, head of ECA.

William C. Foster, New York industrialist, deputy ECA director.

C. Tyler Wood, investment banker, ECA.

Edward T. Dickinson, formerly with United States Steel, ECA.

Hundreds of lesser Wall Streeters, still hold Government posts.

Facts You Should Know

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. DANIEL A. REED

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, February 21, 1950

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, the information which I am inserting as a part of my remarks under leave to extend, heretofore granted, came from a pamphlet entitled "Coal Crisis":

CHRONOLOGY OF EVENTS LEADING TO CURRENT COAL CRISIS

1949

March 14–28: Memorial period called by Lewis; 2 weeks lost production.

May 25: Southern wage conference convened at Bluefield, W. Va.

June 13–20: Stabilization period of mine suspension called by Lewis. One week of lost production.

June 22: Northern and western wage conference convened at White Sulphur Springs.

June 30: Termination date of 1948 wage contracts.

July 5: Lewis' order effective, limiting mines to 3-day week.

September 19: Complete suspension of mining on order of Lewis.

October 3: Western and anthracite mines resume operation at Lewis' order.

October 8: Cyrus Ching asks mine workers and operators to continue negotiations.

October 21: Committee terminates negotiations at White Sulphur Springs.

November 2: Southern conferences suspended when union spokesman fails to appear.

November 9: National committee meets with Cyrus Ching.

November 10: Lewis fails to show up at conference called by Ching.

November 10: Mines resume full operation until November 30 at Lewis' order.

November 26: Southern group requests renewal of negotiations; no reply.

December 5: Three-day week again imposed by Lewis.

December 6: Mine workers announce signing small mines on new contract.

December 28: Southern Coal Producers Association files unfair labor practice charges.

December 30: Similar charges filed by northern and western groups.

1950

January 9: Wildcat strikes begin in Ohio, western Pennsylvania, and northern West Virginia.

January 13: Lewis suggests strikers in Ohio, Pennsylvania, and West Virginia return to work.

January 19: Mine workers in these districts vote not to return to work.

January 25: Dr. James S. Boyd advised President of seriousness of coal supply.

January 26: Northern and western committee invites Lewis to resume negotiations.

January 31: President offers Lewis, Love, Moody, and Moses fact finding.

February 1–2: Northern and western committee meets mine workers in fruitless conference.

February 2–4: All operator groups accept and Lewis rejects President's offer of fact finding.

February 6: Mine workers on complete strike at all mines of these groups.

February 8–9: Public hearing by Presidential Coal Board, Cole presiding.

February 8: Negotiations of all groups with mine workers under Presidential Coal Board supervision.

February 10: Judge R. B. Keech enjoined UMWA from making illegal demands.

February 11: Judge R. B. Keech issues Taft-Hartley restraining order, requiring miners to return to work, mines to be kept in operation, and negotiations to proceed.

February 11: Lewis states he is ordering men back to work.

February 13: No miners working, complete suspension continuous thereafter.

February 15: Wage conferences between UMWA and all groups convened.

February 17: Lewis again orders miners to return, without result.

February 24: Miners have not yet returned to work.

Address by Hon. Leverett Saltonstall, of Massachusetts, at the National Brotherhood Week Observance

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HERBERT R. O'CONOR

OF MARYLAND

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, February 28 (legislative day of Wednesday, February 22), 1950

Mr. O'CONOR. Mr. President, everyone will agree that among the problems which challenge our best efforts is that of a better understanding between and among our citizens of different religions and races. Great strides have been made toward the desired goal which culminated in the designation of National Brotherhood Week. In Baltimore this important observance was held on Washington's Birthday, February 22, and the distinguished senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] was selected to deliver the principal address.

The able Senator from Massachusetts, highly respected for his breadth of vision, his broad understanding of human relations, and his devotion to the welfare of all sects and creeds, made a profound

impression upon our citizens by his timely message.

Realizing the benefits which would be derived from a wide reading of the splendid address of the Senator from Massachusetts, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

As we start the second half of the twentieth century and the emotions of fear of the future, dread of the H-bomb and the atom, are only too common emotions, it is wise for us to meet together to think for a few minutes of the great opportunities that are ours. I am proud to be one of those asked to speak to you during this, our National Brotherhood Week. I am happy to have the chance to tell you of my deep, abiding faith in the great need for a better understanding of one another at home, of our friends abroad, and of the common cause that is our United States.

On such an occasion as this, it seems fitting for us to keep in mind a statement by the author of the Declaration of Independence. Thomas Jefferson, who was a devoted Christian, wrote that "our civil rights have no dependence on our religious opinions." We may add that even if they did, the ethics of a Protestant, a Roman Catholic, a Jew, or a Buddhist have more similarities than differences, and certainly enough to make it possible for them to live together in peace and good will. How appropriate that thought is this week.

In 1940 at the annual dinner of the National Conference of Christians and Jews in Boston, I said, and I repeat now what I said then because it is still my strong and abiding feeling: "All of us—Catholic, Protestant, and Jew; Irishman, Latin, or Anglo-Saxon—came to this country and to this Commonwealth for the same reason—because America spelled religious liberty, equal opportunity for all, respect for the dignity of man, and the right of the pursuit of happiness. Today, as these rights are being threatened in many lands, we in America must take every step to preserve our heritage, our decency, our belief in the sanctity of man and of his right to worship his God in his own way. The National Conference of Christians and Jews does this very thing, does it with splendid dignity and high purpose."

If anything, the need for our rededication to these principles is even more imperative today when we see the dignity of man and his religion under such constant attack in different sections of the world. As Archbishop Cushing of Boston so well put it just a few days ago, the age of reverence for God and deference to religion has undergone a radical change "within the last few decades since the atheists of the Kremlin started their murderous march to the west." I have been greatly concerned in recent weeks with the increasing number of letters I have received pressing for intolerant action against this or that group among us, on religious or racial grounds. The purpose of such efforts is to open up the cracks of our misunderstandings and to pour salt into the wounds of our religious differences.

It will require the vigilance of all of us to resist them, but they can and will be resisted and defeated, if there is understanding among the rest of us and a clear view of what they are trying to do. Let me register here my life-long conviction that progress for America and peace for the world are never spelled in letters of hatred nor in words or acts of contempt for other religious and racial groups. America is a land of many colors and creeds. No color—especially communistic Red—and no creed based upon hatred can ever be good for America.

I know that we can live together in unity. We are doing so today. Consider my own State of Massachusetts. We have, I believe, perhaps a greater diversity of population in Massachusetts than in any other State of the Union. The last census showed that we had just over 4,300,000 people. Of those 2,400,000 were born in another country or are the sons and daughters of parents born in another country. Yet our racial problems have been few. They are few. They are few because basically the people want to live together and to understand each other.

In 1938 I was the chairman of our Greater Boston Community Fund. It had just been established. The biggest problem was to get all our citizens to understand what the fund meant to them. In that year we had approximately 10,000 workers and contributions from over 150,000 people. Now there are over 15,000 workers and contributions from over 300,000 people. That means as a practical matter that we are closer together, more cooperative, more understanding of each other in our common cause.

Think of my feelings, therefore, when I was in the governor's office several years later and read a New York newspaper which had printed some stories about racial discrimination and unrest in the city of Boston—stories of blows being struck because of differences in racial and religious feeling. It made me madder than any one other event in the 6 years that I was in that office. But I quickly realized when I quieted down that if there was any cause for social unrest I should find out what was causing it and how it could be eliminated.

I asked the police to investigate and at the same time I called upon a group of very distinguished citizens—three Protestants, three Jews, and three Catholics—to serve as a committee. It made me very happy that everyone whom I asked accepted. They did study the situation. They made a very thorough and complete report. Summed up, that report pointed out clearly that while there had been some youthful destruction of property, there was certainly no organized effort to discredit any segment of our society.

But what pleases me most is that two governors who are Democrats and one Republican governor have continued that committee. Its purpose is a continuing job. Its goal represents an ideal toward which we must continually be striving. I have always felt that the establishment of that committee was one act of which I will ever be proud because it went to the very heart of what we are and want to be in the United States. That committee stresses, as it has from the beginning, that education must be the principal weapon in any struggle for greater understanding in the fight against intolerance. We can pass legislation that may affect our civil rights, but unless we couple with those laws the understanding that comes with education such laws will prove to be mere words and signify little.

That education in brotherhood must begin in the home and in the grammar schools. It must be a part of the everyday routine of our boys and girls. It must reach into the family where the parents discuss the daily doings at the supper table. It must be very constant and continuing because always, we know, there are forces at work to magnify to the greatest possible proportions even the slightest forms of intolerance. It is a part of their plan to divide and conquer. Even if there is no evidence, or such slight evidence as in the case to which I have just referred, it can be manufactured and built into a mountain of trouble.

If we are to settle these formidable questions of 1950 in the best interests of all our people, then all of us, through ever-improved education, must understand them as clearly as we possibly can. We want improved health for all. We need proper education for all. Are we giving the best possible consideration to these two basic desires of every American? Are we building as best we can, in body and mind, our children of today that they may be the intelligent men and women of tomorrow? These men and women of tomorrow will be responsible for the country we are building today. Are we telling them—clearly, often and eloquently—of the great blessings of liberty and freedom? Are we telling them in our schools, on our playgrounds, in our churches, and, above all, in our homes? In all of these places people meet—young and old. They have things to talk about. They want one another's point of view. Much good can come from well-informed conversation at the breakfast table, over the lunch box, and during dinner at home.

Are we telling our people, young and old, that there are still many places in the world where people cannot meet freely, cannot freely discuss what they wish—are being told, in fact, what they must do and say and even think? In those countries they cannot do what they want to do. They do only what their government tells them to do. They are denied free speech; they are denied a free press; they are even denied their dreams.

Are we explaining to our children in school that the United States is an amazingly big country, that in large sections of it we have the farms that provide us with food and fibers and in other places we have wonderful natural resources, the rivers and the mountains, that provide us with abundant power, with fuel, with all those basic materials from which our great industries are built and which make good jobs possible?

We are now in the second month of a new half-century. Think back over the last 50 years since 1900, and many of us can easily do just that. Would you have considered building a garage in 1900, a hangar, or a radio tower, or an airfield? Who would then have known how to construct a concrete road or build a boat of plastic or put shatterproof glass in a windshield? Yet today the building of a garage, a radio tower, an airfield, a concrete road, and the use of shatterproof glass and plastic is just too common for even a news item. It is just too common because we have made conveniences out of the inventions which came from the minds of free men of science, of imagination, of courage, and of willingness to work. We have built up the present-day comforts in our homes through the ingenuity, the imagination, and the hard work of our womenfolk. Who in 1900 would have believed that this country would have to fight and win two disastrous world wars? We have won two world wars because of the same spirit of inventiveness, independence, and the fighting qualities of our young men. These are facts of our national life of which we are proud. These are now part of our heritage.

Do we make it clearly known to our young people that it takes all types of people with these qualities to make up this country of ours and even to make up the social and business community in which each of us lives? Are we telling them, every day and with all our hearts, that all these things are but part of a common cause and a common goal, the better living and greater opportunity for 150,000,000 Americans?

How true it is that we are only young once. Our children only grow up once. Can we ever neglect for a moment that one opportunity to give them as good an education as we can? The boy who grows up today on the tenant farm may become the industrial leader and even the political leader in the city where we work and live 1,500 miles away. If he is to become a good leader, or even if he is to have an opportunity to get ahead in the city where we live, we want him to be as well educated and to have as great an understanding of our problems as it is possible to have. If he has he will be a

better and more understanding leader in our community. His children will have a better understanding of our children because their father and mother understand us.

In the past 6 years, my experiences as a United States Senator have educated me way beyond the realization I had when I came to Washington. I had no understanding of how little I really knew about our country. I had lived all my life in Massachusetts. I had worked in the legislature and in the Governor's office in my home State. I felt I knew its problems. When a question arose, I had had long enough experience to be able to have a reasonable understanding of what the proper answer should be.

But, since I came to Washington, the scene has been much enlarged. During the past 5 years I have been to Bikini Lagoon, New Zealand and Australia in the far Pacific, and twice to Europe across the Atlantic. I have made four trips around this great country of ours to speak to Lincoln Day gatherings.

On one of these occasions, I spoke in Denver, Colo. There I addressed men and women who earned their livelihood from wool and others who earned their livelihood from mining silver. As a Massachusetts Senator I had tried to get lower prices for raw wool so that our mills at home might continue to be occupied--so that our workers would have jobs—and so that our consumers might have lower-priced clothing. I had worked for lower prices for bar silver, because we in Massachusetts have silver industries.

Yet here we were in Denver, citizens of the same country, diametrically opposed in our thoughts on these two subjects, so important to the welfare of each group. Yet our common goal was the same: greater opportunity for all in the United States. Those people in Colorado were just as good citizens of the United States as those whom I represented at home. It helped me to discuss their problems with them in their homes and at their meetings.

So, in National Brotherhood Week, we must think not only in terms of religion, in terms of national origin, race, creed, and color—we must try equally to overcome misunderstandings of any kind between sections of this country. We in Maryland or in Massachusetts want to know—we must know—what our fellow citizens in New Mexico, North Dakota or Mississippi are thinking.

We meet here in Baltimore, Md., as the century reaches its turning point. We are working this minute, in this meeting, for a better understanding of each other. But if we leave tonight without also thinking of how we may best do our part for a better understanding among peoples of the world, we are falling far short of our goal.

It is only through peace that we can realize the ultimate security. Only if the world is at peace can there be any freedom and opportunity. Now as the months roll by we are learning that this security and peace do not come easily and are not alone the result of victory in war. The science and the skill that won our victory have produced in doing so a bomb of terrible destructive power. It is clear that men's hearts must hold the answer to peace, if these are the products of men's minds.

If we reflect for a moment, we remember that it took 13 years from the signing of the Declaration of Independence to establish a working government under Constitution and its Bill of Rights. So I say to you tonight that no matter how bitter our disappointments may be, we must never give up the principle upon which we have established the United Nations. To give up that principle means defeat and disaster.

I want the United Nations to work. So do you. And it is working. If, however, it is to be the success we pray for, we ourselves must work with it and for it even harder. The will to peace is the vital element in any peace effort, such a will to peace represents itself in resolutions such as were submitted last week in Washington for extension of the structure of the United Nations and in proposals just a few days ago for consideration of disarmament, of international inspection, and of direct peace talks. Whether or not we agree with details of such proposals is not important. They represent essentially that will to peace that is not so clearly apparent among all world leaders but which must exist if we are to live with each other in this world of ours. Likewise the will to peace may require us to be as strongly armed as we may be, firm in the positions we take, and resolute in our determination; still that will to peace must be ever clear.

In order, then, for you and me to give this will to peace real strength, we must try to open every door to better understanding among the peoples of all nations. This is our fundamental task. Whatever may be the tendencies of some around us, you and I must dedicate ourselves continually to the policy of the open mind and the open door of good will to those citizens of all nations who really want peace.

Former Secretary of State Marshall, in a speech before the General Assembly of the United Nations several years ago, stated: "Systematic and deliberate denials of basic human rights lie at the root of most of our troubles and threaten the work of the United Nations. It is not only fundamentally wrong that millions of men and women live in daily terror of secret police, subject to seizure, imprisonment, or forced labor without just cause and without fair trial, but these wrongs have repercussions in the community of nations. Governments which systematically disregard the rights of their own people are not likely to respect the rights of other nations and other people and are likely to seek their objectives by coercion and force in the international field."

What General Marshall stated so well is the unexpressed thought in the minds of us all. That is why we are here tonight. That is why in these few moments we want to rededicate our thoughts to the principles which underlie our Declaration of Independence, our Constitution, and its peerless Bill of Rights.

We must all be ever vigilant to expose dangers which threaten our American unity. We who believe in the American ideal must endeavor to unhold this form of government that makes that ideal live. For this is the government and the land of equal liberties, equal freedom in religion, in the press and in assembly. Cooperation of Jews, of Catholics, and of Protestants in the defense of American democracy, when it is active in our homes, in our schools, in our churches, and in every part of our land, is the living basis of good will and understanding.

Five years ago this week, a handful of American boys raised our flag on Mount Surabachi on Iwo Jima. I have talked with some of those boys. The six men who participated in that heroic deed were Pfc Ira H. Hayes, of Arizona, a full-blooded Pima Indian; Pfc Rene A. Gagnon, of New Hampshire; Navy Ph. M. John H. Bradley, of Wisconsin; Pfc Franklin R. Sousley, of Kentucky; Sgt. Michel Strank, of Pennsylvania; and Sgt. Henry O. Hansen, of Massachusetts. You all know that picture. We all know in our hearts what it represents.

That incident will always remain the symbol of American courage and hardihood, the symbol of what is possible when we work together with a common understanding in a common cause. It is the symbol of our constant fight to maintain liberty and freedom. It is the symbol which we must foster and hold before us in our fight for a greater unity and a better understanding among young and old Americans throughout this country. Then, and only then, can we bring to its finest flower this common cause that is our United States.